 Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P. 2d 52* (holding that policy of the State Board of Equalization, not adopted as regulation, relating to payment of accrued interest on tax deficiency before considering refund claim, may be reviewed through declaratory relief action under *Gov. Code § 11350(a)* without exhausting administrative remedies before *Board); Slocum v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 969, 974-976, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 627* (SBE interpretation contained in reassessment rule [SBE Rule 139] entitled to some but not substantial deference, and rule was held to be invalid because it was inconsistent with the authorizing statute [*Rev & T. Code § 170(a)(2)*], and the California constitution [*Cal. Const. Art. 13, § 15*])].

An action for declaratory relief may not be used to review an adjudicative order or decision [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281*]. For discussion of the appropriate remedy for an adjudicative action, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq. For an example of a complaint for declaratory relief under *Gov. Code § 11350*, see *§ 472B.50, below*.

For general discussion and forms relating to civil actions for declaratory relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[b] Exceptions

An action for declaratory relief under *Gov. Code § 11350* may not be used to challenge any regulation adopted by the Public Utilities Commission, the Division of Industrial Accidents, or the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board [*Gov. Code § 11351(a)*]. Furthermore, since the term "state agency" as used in the California Administrative Procedure Act does not include an agency in the judicial or legislative departments of the state government [*Gov. Code § 11340.9(a)*], the validity of a regulation adopted by an agency in the judicial or legislative branches of the state government may not be tested by an action for declaratory relief.

Finally, an action for declaratory relief may not be used to test the validity of a rule that is not deemed to be a "regulation" according to the California Administrative Procedure Act definition. That definition expressly excludes rules that relate only to the internal management of a state agency, legal rulings of counsel issued by the franchise tax board or state board of equalization, or any form prescribed by a state agency or any instructions relating to the use of the form [*Gov. Code § 11342.600* (regulation defined); *Gov. Code § 11340.9(b), (c), (d)*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*].

[c] Grounds for Declaration of Invalidity

The APA provides that a regulation challenged pursuant to an action for declaratory relief may be declared to be invalid for any one or more of the following reasons [*Gov. Code § 11350(a), (b)*; *see § 472B.15*, for discussion of judicially established standards that predate the APA standards]:

- It substantially fails to comply with the provisions of the APA.

- In the case of an emergency regulation or order to repeal [*Gov. Code §§ 11346.1, 11349.6*], the facts recited in the statement do not constitute an emergency within the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11346.1* [

see Ch. 472A].

- The agency's determination that the regulation is reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute, court decision, or other provision of law that is being implemented, interpreted, or made specific by the regulation is not supported by substantial evidence [*see Gov. Code §§ 11349(a), 11349.1(a)(1)*].

- The agency declaration that a regulation will not have significant adverse economic impact upon small businesses is not supported by substantial evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)(2)*].

In any action for declaratory relief brought with respect to a regulation, the court will not consider the approval of the regulation by the OAL [*see Gov. Code § 11349.3(a)*], or the governor's overruling of a decision of the OAL disapproving the regulation [*Gov. Code § 11350(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 11349.3(b)*].

An agency policy that is not adopted in a formal regulation and does not constitute a long standing-agency interpretation is reviewable by the court independently as a question of law without deference to the agency interpretation and without following the more limited standard of review applicable to formally adopted regulations [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 321-322, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P. 2d 52]* .

See generally Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .

[d] Determination of Validity of Disapproved or Repealed Regulation

Any interested person may bring a declaratory relief action in the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*], to determine the validity of a regulation that the OAL has disapproved or ordered repealed [*Gov. Code § 11350.3*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11349.7* (priority review of regulations), 11349.3 (approval or disapproval of regulations), 11349.6 (approval or disapproval of emergency regulations)]. Presumably, an "interested person" could be a person who would have benefited or suffered a detriment by reason of repeal or OAL disapproval, but it could also include the agency that submitted the regulation for approval. The court may declare the regulation valid if it determines that the regulation meets the six substantive standards used by the OAL [*see Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)*; *see also* Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*] and that the agency has complied with the provisions of the APA. If the court makes such a determination, it may order the OAL to file the regulation with the Secretary of State immediately [*Gov. Code § 11350.3*]. For an example of a complaint for declaratory relief under *Gov. Code § 11350.3, see § 472B.61*, and Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[3] Writ of Mandate

A petition for writ of mandamus (also called writ of mandate) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1084*] under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097* is often coupled with the complaint for declaratory relief in an action seeking judicial review of a regulation [*see Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 574, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664* (declaratory relief claim asserting constitutional challenge that could not be raised in mandamus proceeding joined with mandamus action)]. A writ of mandate may be issued to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person to compel the performance of an act that the law specially enjoins as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*]. The writ is sought to invoke the court's power to order the agency to perform ministerial acts (often a necessary adjunct to declaratory relief), as well as an independent form of relief. This writ, which is used when a regulation is challenged prior to enforcement, must not be confused with the "writ of administrative mandamus," which is prescribed for the review of administrative trial-type (quasi-judicial) hearings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*.

A petition for writ of mandate would not seem to invite a court to interfere with the exercise of legislative power by directing repeal of a regulation. Moreover, the availability of injunctive relief [*see* [4], *below*] would normally preclude

a mandate proceeding; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* requires a lack of an adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. In a mandate proceeding brought to nullify an administrative regulation, however, the California Supreme Court ordered issuance of a writ of mandate directing the agency to rescind the regulation in its entirety [*California Welfare Rights Organization v. Brian (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 237, 243-244, 113 Cal. Rptr. 154, 520 P.2d 970]* .

In *Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617* , the California Supreme Court stated that the writ of mandate may be used to review the validity of a quasi-legislative action [*Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 809, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617]* .

The extent of the relief afforded by mandamus is confined to ministerial acts, that is, the writ will not order the agency to exercise its discretion in a specific manner. For example, an agency may be ordered to promulgate its regulations according to law; however, the court may not order the agency to adopt specific language in its regulations. The agency has the function of making the applicable rules in the area; the judiciary should avoid attempting to invade what is essentially a legislative function [*Pillsbury v. South Coast Regional Com. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 740, 756, 139 Cal. Rptr. 760]* .

A medical device manufacturer (Baxter) that manufactured prescription medical devices which contained a chemical plasticizer (DEHP) that came into contact with the human body filed an administrative petition with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) asking OEHHA to promulgate a regulation determining that DEHP exposure did not pose a significant risk of cancer in humans, and therefore Baxter would be exempt from having to post a warning under the requirements of Proposition 65 [*Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(c)*]. OEHHA denied the petition, and Baxter filed a petition for a writ of mandate, which the trial court denied on grounds that neither Proposition 65 nor OEHHA regulations required the agency to promulgate regulations or make findings that DEHP did not provide a significant risk of cancer in humans. The trial court allowed Baxter to amend its complaint to request declaratory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* to seek the same type of relief, essentially a declaration that exposure to DEHP in Baxter's medical device products did not create a significant risk of cancer in humans, and therefore no warning of such exposure was required under exemptions recognized by the law [*Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(c)*]. The trial court granted that declaratory judgment, and the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment for declaratory relief [*Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Denton (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 333, 344-345, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 430]* .

For discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally by way of petition for extraordinary writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* ; see also Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

[4] Injunction

The complaint or petition for judicial review often states an action for injunction [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*], as well as declaratory relief and mandamus. If a party wants affirmative relief against enforcement, as well as a declaration of a regulation's invalidity, an action for injunctive relief is appropriate. Since mandamus is used to "compel the performance of an act," injunctive relief is often necessary to prohibit acts by the agency, both preliminarily and, following judgment, permanently. A court may not enjoin enforcement of a valid regulation, but if the regulation is declared to be invalid, the court may enjoin enforcement [*see, e.g.,* *Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 401, 128 Cal. Rptr. 183, 546 P.2d 687]* . An injunction prohibiting enforcement of a public statute because the agency responsible for statutory enforcement failed to enact implementing regulations that were arguably required by the statute was reversed on appeal. The appellate court held that the granting of the injunction was improper because: 1) the statute provided that the agency could adopt regulations when necessary, which gives the agency discretion whether to adopt regulations; and 2) the statutory terms were detailed and precise, and thus were specific enough for enforcement by the agency without the adoption of implementing regulations. The scope of court authority to reverse an agency decision not to begin rule making proceedings is very narrow [*Alfaro v. Terhune (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 492, 503-505, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197]* .

For an example of a complaint for injunction, combined with a complaint for declaratory relief, see *§ 472B.60*. For injunctions in general, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenuePublic Officials

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.14

§ 472B.14 Prerequisites to Judicial Review

[1] General Requirements

The terms "standing," "ripeness," and "exhaustion of administrative remedies" commonly arise in the context of challenges to regulations, and the first two are frequently raised as affirmative defenses in these actions--for example, "plaintiff/petitioner lacks standing" or "this action is not ripe for judicial review."

[2] Standing

Gov. Code § 11350(a) expressly allows "any interested person" to seek declaratory relief. "Any interested person" has been interpreted to include even persons who are potentially subject to the regulation [*Stoneham v. Rushen (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 302, 310, 203 Cal. Rptr. 20]* . Moreover, *Gov. Code § 11350* expressly states that standing to seek a judicial determination is not affected by a person's failure to file a petition for amendment or repeal [*see Gov. Code § 11340.7*], or a request for reconsideration of such a petition, with the agency [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*].

The courts have been somewhat more restrictive with respect to standing to bring actions for injunction and mandamus. With respect to an injunction, a plaintiff must plead facts showing a wrongful act that directly resulted in a violation of his or her legal rights in order to have standing to maintain an action for injunction in an individual capacity [*United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 198, 120 P.2d 26]* . With respect to mandamus, the courts will require the petitioner to demonstrate that the writ is necessary to enforce or protect a specific legal right that is clear, present, certain, and substantial [*American Friends Service Committee v. Procunier (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 252, 256, 109 Cal. Rptr. 22* ; *see also Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 354, 254 P.2d 6* (unions that sought writ to compel city officials to set salaries for city employees at rate equal to private industry lacked standing because no benefit would accrue to them if writ were issued)]. There is an exception to this rule when the question is one of public, as opposed to private, interest and petitioner seeks performance of a public duty. In those cases, the usual requirements are relaxed [*American Friends Service Committee v. Procunier (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 252, 256, 109 Cal. Rptr. 22]* . The rationale is that the petitioner need not show that he or she has any legal or special interest in the result; it is sufficient that he or she is interested as a citizen in having the laws executed and the duty in question enforced [*American Friends Service Committee v. Procunier (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 252, 256, 109 Cal. Rptr. 22* , citing *Bd. of Soc. Welfare v. County of L.A. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 98, 100-101, 162 P.2d 627* (purpose of nonprofit corporation plaintiffs in seeking writ of

mandate for prison reform constituted "enforcement of a public duty")].

[3] Ripeness

Because courts will not issue purely advisory opinions, the action of the agency must be ripe for review [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11350(a)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (requiring "actual controversy" for declaratory relief action)]. Ripeness requires that the courts evaluate the rulemaking action as to the fitness of the issues for judicial review and the hardship to the parties if the courts refuse to review the action at the time they are requested to do so [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 171-174, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P.2d 306* ; *Farm Sanctuary, Inc. v. Department of Food & Agriculture (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 495, 501-502, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 75]* . For further discussion of ripeness for judicial review and the timing of review generally, see Ch. 474A, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*. That chapter also includes discussion of when an issue is moot.

[4] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Exhaustion of administrative remedies is not a valid defense in an action for judicial review of administrative rulemaking. As noted [*see § 472B.13[2][a]*], a petition to the agency for repeal or amendment of a regulation pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 11340.6* and *11340.7* is available but not mandatory [*Motion Picture Studio Teachers & Welfare Workers v. Millan (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1190, 1197-1199, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 608* (party challenging agency interpretation of regulation who is seeking to "enforce ... [a] regulation as written" is not required to petition agency to amend regulation prior to seeking judicial review by writ of mandate)]. *Gov. Code § 11350(a)*, in stating that the right to judicial determination is not affected by a person's failure to file a petition with the agency, makes it plain that persons wishing to challenge the validity of a regulation in court are not required to petition the agency first for repeal or amendment. The court in *Hillery v. Rushen (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 1132, 1139* , interpreted *Gov. Code § 11350(a)* to dispense with the requirement of exhaustion of the administrative remedy in declaratory relief cases in which injunctive relief is also sought. The same rationale would probably apply in cases that also seek mandamus [*Hillery v. Rushen (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 1132, 1139]* . Although the *Hillery* court involved only a petition for injunctive relief, the court stated that its construction of *Gov. Code § 11350(a)* was in accord with the decision in *Stoneham v. Rushen (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 729, 188 Cal. Rptr. 130* , which involved a writ of mandate [*Hillery v. Rushen (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 1132, 1139]* . The *Stoneham* court granted both declaratory relief and a writ of mandamus, and set forth the procedural history of the case, without mentioning whether the petitioners had sought administrative relief first [*Stoneham v. Rushen (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 729, 737, 188 Cal. Rptr. 130]* .

Similarly, no authority supports the proposition that a plaintiff/petitioner must have participated in the rulemaking process in order to avoid the defense of failure to exhaust administrative remedies. For further discussion of the requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies in the context of the timing of judicial review, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityStanding

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.15

§ 472B.15 Standards of Judicial Review

[1] Scope of Review

In an action for declaratory relief regarding the validity of a regulation, *Gov. Code § 11350* sets forth four standards under which the reviewing court may declare a regulation to be invalid. First, a regulation is invalid for a substantial failure to comply with the provisions of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*]. This language appears to include both:

- The substantive standards of necessity, clarity, authority, reference, consistency, and nonduplication used by the OAL to review regulations submitted to it [*Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)*].

- The procedural requirements stated elsewhere in the APA.

For a discussion of those substantive standards and procedural requirements, see Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* [*see also* Bolz & Garcia, *The Other Side of Administrative Law*, Cal. Lawyer 47-52 (Nov. 1987)].

Second, an emergency regulation may be declared to be invalid on the ground that the facts recited in the finding of emergency prepared under law [*Gov. Code § 11346.1(b)*] do not constitute an emergency within the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11346.1* [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*; *see* Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* , for a discussion of emergency regulations].

Third, a regulation may be declared invalid if the agency's determination that the regulation is reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute or other provision of law that is being implemented, interpreted, or made specific by the regulation is not supported by substantial evidence [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)(1)*]. Finally, a regulation may be declared invalid if the agency declaration that a regulation will not have significant adverse economic impact upon businesses [*see Gov. Code § 11346.5(a)(8)*] is not supported by substantial evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)(2)*].

The effective date of *Gov. Code § 11349.1* (July 1, 1980), which sets forth the APA's substantive standards, should be noted in examining the appellate decisions concerning the scope of judicial review. Many of those decisions were

rendered in actions predating the substantive standards of that section. The earlier cases do not discuss *Gov. Code § 11349.1*, and speak only in terms of the judicially established standards discussed in [4], *below*. These latter standards are still used by the courts; *Gov. Code § 11350* does not appear to require the courts to rely exclusively on failures to comply with the APA for grounds to declare regulations invalid. Nevertheless, it is almost invariably true that a non-APA ground for declaring a regulation invalid may be restated as a failure to comply with the APA.

[2] Presumption of Validity

The plaintiff has the burden of proving that the regulation in question is invalid. The agency's action comes before the court with a presumption of correctness and regularity [*see Credit Ins. General Agents Asso. v. Payne (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 651, 657, 128 Cal. Rptr. 881, 547 P.2d 993]* . Once a regulation has been filed with the secretary of state for publication in the California Code of Regulations, it is presumed to have been duly adopted in compliance with the APA [*Gov. Code§ 11343.6(a)*; *see Stoneham v. Rushen (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 302, 308, 203 Cal. Rptr. 20]* .

The action of the OAL in approving a regulation or the governor's overruling of a disapproval of a regulation by the OAL will not be considered by a court in any action for declaratory relief brought with respect to a regulation [*Gov. Code § 11350(c)*]. In contrast, an OAL "determination" of whether an uncodified rule is a regulation subject to the approval process may be considered by a court, unless the court proceeding concerns the same issue and parties and was initiated before the request for determination [*Gov. Code § 11340.5(e)*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*].

[3] Deference to Agency's Authority

The California Supreme Court has stated in *Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Air Resources Board (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 502, 208 Cal. Rptr. 850, 691 P.2d 606* , that the courts exercise limited review of administrative rulemaking actions out of deference to the separation of powers between the legislative and the judicial branches, and to the presumed expertise of the agency within the scope of its authority. A reviewing court will not substitute its policy judgment for the agency's in the absence of an arbitrary decision [*Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Air Resources Board (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 502, 509, 208 Cal. Rptr. 850, 691 P.2d 606]* . In *Western Oil*, the plaintiff oil companies challenged a series of air pollution regulations on the grounds that, among other things, the Board (1) had failed to consider the economic effects of the regulations, and (2) did not base the regulations on the Health Department's recommendations, despite the Board's lack of medical expertise in its membership [*Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Air Resources Board (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 502, 507, 208 Cal. Rptr. 850, 691 P.2d 606]* .

Although the Court ultimately found that the Legislature did not require the Board to consider the economic effects and that the Board was required to consider, but not adopt, the Health Department's recommendations [*Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Air Resources Board (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 502, 507, 208 Cal. Rptr. 850, 691 P.2d 606]* , the facts of this case illustrate that a person challenging regulations by judicial review should consider attacking the agency's "presumed expertise" by addressing both evidence that the agency considered in adopting the regulation as well as evidence it did not consider [*see §§ 472B.13, 472B.14*, for a discussion of grounds for declaring a regulation invalid].

The California Supreme Court has articulated the following rules regarding the deference a court must exercise with respect to the administrative agency that promulgated the regulation [*Ontario Community Foundation v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 811, 816, 201 Cal. Rptr. 165, 678 P.2d 378* ; *see Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control Dist. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 408, 425, 261 Cal. Rptr. 384, 777 P.2d 157* (construction of statute by agency charged with its enforcement is entitled to great weight especially when interpretation is congruent with its language and apparent purpose)]:

> • In determining the proper interpretation of a statute and the validity of an administrative regulation, the administrative agency's construction is entitled to great weight, and if there appears to be a reasonable basis for it, a court will not substitute its judgment for that of the administrative body.

- An agency's regulations must be consistent, not in conflict with the statute, and reasonably necessary to effectuate its purpose.

- The function of the court is to inquire into the legality of regulations, not their wisdom.

- Whatever the force of administrative construction, final responsibility for the interpretation of the law rests with the courts.

The California Supreme Court applied a deferential standard of review to a city charter provision. That provision exempted public safety officer promotional rules changes related to compliance with anti discrimination laws from requirements of binding arbitration when there was a collective bargaining impasse between the city and the unions representing fire fighters, and other public safety officers. The provisions in question, S.F. Charter § A8.590-5(g)(3) of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco, gave the city substantial discretion to determine necessary anti discrimination law compliance measures, and the deferential standard of review followed from that grant of discretionary authority. The Supreme Court also upheld the validity of the promotion rule change and concluded that the change in promotion rules was reasonably related to compliance with anti discrimination laws. Since the rules change was valid, the exemption from binding arbitration was enforceable [San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798 v. *City & County of San Francisco (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 653, 661-662, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 868, 133 P.3d 1028]* .

[4] Specific Grounds for Declaration of Invalidity

[a] Action Exceeds Agency's Authority

An administrative regulation is not valid unless it is within the scope of authority [*Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)(2)* ("authority" standard)] conferred on the adopting agency by the enabling statute [*Gov. Code §§ 11342.1, 11342.2*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , for a discussion of the quasi-legislative authority of administrative agencies].

As discussed in Chapter 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* , the agency must cite authority and reference for each regulation that it submits to the OALfor review and ultimate publication in the California Code of Regulations [*Gov. Code § 11349.1*]. An authority note is printed following each regulation in the California Code of Regulations [*see Gov. Code § 11349.8(b)(1)*; *1 Cal. Code Reg. § 14(d)*].

In reviewing an action for declaratory relief and injunction against an agency, the California Supreme Court reiterated the well-settled rule that a regulation that exceeds the agency's authority will be declared invalid [*Association for Retarded Citizens v. Department of Developmental Services (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 384, 391, 211 Cal. Rptr. 758, 696 P.2d 150* (agency spending directives requiring regional centers to cut back in particular manner exceeded agency's authority when statute did not permit agency to control regional centers)]. Although the construction of a statute by the agency is entitled to great weight, final responsibility for the interpretation of the law rests with the courts. In interpreting the statute, if the court concludes that the administrative action under attack has in effect altered or amended the statute or enlarged or impaired its scope, the court must declare it void [*Association for Retarded Citizens v. Department of Developmental Services (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 384, 391, 211 Cal. Rptr. 758, 696 P.2d 150* ; *Morris v. Williams (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 733, 748, 63 Cal. Rptr. 689, 433 P.2d 697* (Court invalidated Medi-Cal regulations that eliminated some health services entirely, even though statute that the regulations interpreted required "proportionate reductions" in services)].

On the other hand, unless an agency's rules are ambiguous, the court will uphold the agency rules if the rules do not exceed the agency's statutory authority [*Public Resources Protection Assn. v. Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 111, 121-122, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 11, 865 P. 2d 728* (court upheld validity of forest practice rules adopted by *Department of Forestry); Robin J. v. Superior Court (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 414, 422-423, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417* (Court of Appeal rejected challenge to validity of regulation and held that regulation governing visitation

between sex offenders and children did not exceed scope of authority of governing statute [*Penal Code § 5058*], and was not inconsistent with the other applicable statutes [*Penal Code § 1202.05* and *Welf & Inst. Code § 362.6* that governed the parties claims in the lawsuit]); *Coors Brewing Co. v. Stroh (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 768, 771-772, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 570* (court upheld validity of alcoholic beverage control regulation that prohibited cash prize sweepstakes because the regulation did not operate more broadly than the statutory prohibition that the regulation implemented)]. When an agency that is acting pursuant to statutory authority adopts regulations to implement or interpret a statute those regulations are presumed to be valid and binding and will be enforced by the courts unless the regulations are inconsistent with the statute or are arbitrary and capricious [*Tomlinson v. Qualcomm, Inc. (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 934, 940-941, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 822* (FEHC regulation held to be valid, and not inconsistent with provisions of California Family Rights Act [*Gov. Code §§ 12945.1-12945.2*])].

[b] Action Violates Controlling Constitutional or Statutory Provision

A regulation that is inconsistent [*Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)(4)* ("consistency" standard)] and in conflict with the statute that authorizes the state agency to adopt regulations implementing, interpreting, making specific, or otherwise carrying out its provisions is invalid [*Gov. Code § 11342.2*; *Slocum v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 969, 974-976, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 627* (SBE interpretation contained in reassessment rule [SBE Rule 139] entitled to some but not substantial deference, and rule was held to be invalid because inconsistent with the authorizing statute [*Rev & T. Code § 170(a)(2)*], and the California constitution [*Cal. Const. Art. 13, § 15*]); *T.H. v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1280, 1285, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532* (school district regulation that mandated referral to an expulsion hearing process for all expulsion offenses was not inconsistent with state statute that gave school principals discretion not to refer students for expulsion hearings in some circumstances; regulation satisfied consistency requirement); *Home Depot, U.S.A., INC. v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1592, 1606-1608 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 302* ; *Professional Engineers in California Government v. State Personnel Board (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 678, 705-706, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 375* (administrative regulations that violate implementing statutes exceed the statutory authority of the agency and are therefore invalid); *see* Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* , for a discussion of the consistency standard].

In reviewing an action for declaratory relief and injunction under the predecessor statute to *Gov. Code § 11350* [*see* former Gov. Code. Code § 11440], the California Supreme Court stated that when the Legislature has delegated to an administrative agency the responsibility to implement a statutory scheme through rules and regulations, a court will interfere only when the agency has clearly overstepped its statutory authority or violated its constitutional mandate [*Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 356, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328* (court held that DMV regulations did not exceed scope of authorizing statute)].

In addition, the "consistency" standard requires the regulation to be in harmony with, and not in conflict with or contradictory to, other existing statutes, court decisions, or other provisions of law such as the federal or state constitutions [*Gov. Code § 11349(d)* (definition of "consistency"); *T.H. v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1280, 1285, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532* (school district regulation that mandated referral to an expulsion hearing process for all expulsion offenses was not inconsistent with state statute that gave school principals discretion not to refer students for expulsion hearings in somecircumstances; nor did the regulations violate students' due process of law rights to notice in an expulsion hearing requirement); *Marshall v. McMahon (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1841, 1848-1850, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220* (DSS regulations upheld as being consistent with governing statute)]. Special attention must be given to this standard in light of the constitutional prohibition against California agencies refusing to enforce statutory provisions because of constitutional infirmities. In California, an agency must enforce a statute even in the face of its clear inconsistency with a constitutional provision absent a holding of unconstitutionality by an appellate court [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5(a)*; *Lockyer v. City & County of San Francisco (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1055, 1085-1086, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 225, 95 P. 3d 459* (a local executive official, who had a ministerial duty to enforce a state statute limiting marriage to couples of the opposite sex, exceeded his authority when he decided unilaterally that the marriage statute was unconstitutional and ordered the clerk office's to start issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. A local

executive official does not possess the authority to refuse to enforce a state statute without a court first determining that the statute is unconstitutional)]. The consistency standard does not, however, preclude the agency from interpreting existing law in the course of discharging its statutory duties [*Regents of University of California v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042, 189 Cal. Rptr. 298]* .

[c] Regulation Is Unclear

Two separate standards require a regulation to be clearly drafted. First, under the APA and its accompanying regulations a statute must meet the substantive standard of clarity to be effective [*Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)(3)*; *see 1 Cal. Code Reg. § 16*]. "Clarity" means written or displayed so that the meaning of the regulation will be easily understood by those persons directly affected by it [*Gov. Code § 11349(c)*]. If the language of a rule is susceptible to two interpretations in the minds of persons directly affected by the rule, it should be considered unclear [*see* Bolz & Garcia, *The Other Side of Administrative Law*, Cal. Lawyer 47, 48 (Nov. 1987)]. The clarity standard is discussed in Chapter 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .

Second, it is a well-settled principle of constitutional law that a law that either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that people of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application violates due process of law [*Connally v. General Constr. Co. (1926) 269 U.S. 385, 391, 46 S. Ct. 126, 70 L. Ed. 322* (statute requiring contractors to pay employees no less than current rate of wages in location where work is performed is so uncertain that it deprives contractors of property without due process); *Cranston v. City of Richmond (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 755, 763, 221 Cal. Rptr. 779, 710 P.2d 845* (regulation allowing discharge of city employee for "conduct unbecoming an employee of the city service" was not unconstitutionally vague as applied to police officer engaged in illegal and dangerous conduct)]. Although challenges for vagueness arise most often in the criminal context, the prohibition against vagueness extends to civil statutes and administrative regulations as well [*see Cranston v. City of Richmond (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 755, 764, 221 Cal. Rptr. 779, 710 P.2d 845]* .

On the other hand, although noncriminal enactments have been subjected to scrutiny on grounds of vagueness, especially in cases involving the right to practice a recognized profession or the exercise of other fundamental rights, that scrutiny has normally been limited to situations in which *First Amendment* rights have been at stake [*Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 658-659, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* (vagueness challenge to PUC rule, which allowed telephone disconnection on probable cause that telephone was being used in violation of law, was unsuccessful because no fundamental right was involved)].

When an administrative regulation is challenged, the standard of constitutional vagueness is less strict than when a criminal law is attacked [*Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 366, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328* (court found DMV regulation that advertised offers be "based on facts" and "clearly set forth" to overcome vagueness attack); *Papachristou v. City of Jacksonville (1972) 405 U.S. 156, 162, 92 S. Ct. 839, 31 L. Ed. 2d 110* (municipal vagrancy ordinance with criminal penalties was held void for vagueness because it failed to give fair notice that particular conduct was forbidden)].

If the challenge does not involve *First Amendment* freedoms, the regulation must be examined in light of the facts of the case at hand [*Cranston v. City of Richmond (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 755, 764-765, 221 Cal. Rptr. 779, 710 P.2d 845* (holding that, under the facts, city regulation permitting discharge for "conduct unbecoming an employee of the city" was not unconstitutionally vague)]. For further discussion of the constitutional vagueness standard, see Ch. 531, *Statutes and Ordinances* .

[d] Action Lacks Sufficient Evidentiary Support for Necessity

[i] "Reasonably Necessary" Standard

Under the APA, whenever by the express or implied term of a statute a state agency has the authority to adopt regulations to implement, interpret, make specific, or otherwise carry out the provision of the statute, no regulation adopted will be valid or effective unless it is "reasonably necessary" to effectuate the purpose of the statute [*Gov. Code § 11342.2*; *see Gov. Code § 11349.1(a)(1)* ("necessity" standard for OAL review); *Coalition for Reasonable Regulation of Naturally Occurring Substances v. California Air Res. Bd. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1258-1259, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 635* (regulation upheld under "reasonablynecessary" standard); *County of Santa Cruz v. State Bd. of Forestry (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 826, 834-835, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 393]* .

"Necessity" means that the agency's record of the rulemaking proceeding demonstrates by substantial evidence the need for a regulation. "Evidence" includes facts, studies, and expert opinion [*Gov. Code § 11349(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11350(b)* specifically states that a regulation may be declared invalid pursuant to a declaratory relief action if the agency's determination that the regulation is reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute, court decision, or law that is being implemented, interpreted, or made specific by the regulation is not supported by substantial evidence [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)*; *Coalition for Reasonable Regulation of Naturally Occurring Substances v. California Air Res. Bd. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1265, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 635* (regulation supported by substantial evidence that agency complied with regulatory requirements); *Pulaski v. California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1315, 1329-1330, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54]* . The evidence considered by the court consists of all material maintained in the rulemaking record [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 11340.5*; *see also* Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*].

Before the 1979 revisions to the APA, courts searched for "any evidence" in the rulemaking record to support the action of the agency [*see* former Gov. Code.Code §§ 11349(a), 11350(b) (before requirement that necessity be supported by substantial evidence)]. In the absence of "any evidence" supporting the action, a rulemaking action could be deemed arbitrary and capricious and the regulation invalid [*see* former Gov. Code. Code §§ 11349(a), 11350(b)]. This rule remains valid for non-APA rulemaking proceedings. The substantial evidence test is used by the superior court hearing the original proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*]. On appeal from the judgment of a trial court in an action to review a regulation, the standard of review is identical to the rule in other cases on appeal [*see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , and Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*].

[ii] Standard for Emergency Regulations

An additional standard applies to the review of emergency regulations. A court may declare an emergency regulation or order invalid on the ground that the facts recited in the finding of emergency prepared under law [*Gov. Code § 11346.1(b)*] do not constitute an emergency within the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11346.1* [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*]. Under that section, a state agency may adopt an "emergency" regulation or order of repeal if it makes a finding of emergency. "Emergency" is defined by law to mean a situation that calls for immediate action to avoid serious harm to the public peace, health, safety, or general welfare [*Gov. Code § 11342.545*]. The finding must be set forth in a written statement [*Gov. Code § 11346.1(b)(1), (2)*].

[e] Action Is Procedurally Defective

A regulation may be declared invalid for a substantial failure to comply with the provisions of the APA [*see Gov. Code § 11350(a)*; *Gov. Code §§ 11346-11347.5* (procedure for adoption of regulations); *Pulaski v. California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1315, 1327-1328, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54]* . The procedural requirements imposed by the APA are discussed in Chapter 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .

In general, the APA emphasizes proper notice to the public, particularly those persons directly affected by the proposed regulation [*Gov. Code §§ 11346.4(a)(1), 11346.5(a)(7), 11346.9(a)(1), 11346.8(c)*]. Further applications and interpretations of the notice requirements of the California APA by the OAL are found in the OAL's regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 44, 45*]. These regulations are entitled to great weight, due to the fact that the OAL is the agency charged

with the administration of the APA [*Gov. Code §§ 11340.1, 11342.4*; *Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 111, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* .

For example, in a declaratory relief and mandamus action, an association of nursing homes challenged the validity of a regulation on the grounds that the agency administrator failed to hold hearings required by the APA prior to adopting the regulation [*California Asso. of Nursing Homes, etc. v. Williams (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 800, 85 Cal. Rptr. 735]* . In that case, the court found that the agency's failure to hold hearings establishing an evidentiary record thwarted judicial review of the regulation and constituted a substantial failure to comply with the procedural requirements of the APA. Therefore, the court held that the challenged regulation was invalid [*California Asso. of Nursing Homes, etc. v. Williams (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 800, 816, 84 Cal. Rptr. 590]* .

Although procedural defects in rulemaking proceedings may be fatal to the regulation, they will not be deemed to offend due process. Constitutional due process guarantees do not attach to administrative agency rulemaking, or "quasi-legislative," proceedings [*Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 364, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328* ; *California Optometric Assn. v. Lackner (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 500, 505-509, 131 Cal. Rptr. 744]* . Due process requirements apply only to administrative proceedings that are adjudicative in nature[*Hannah v. Larche (1960) 363 U.S. 420, 442, 80 S. Ct. 1502, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1307]* . For further discussion of due process as it relates to administrative agencies, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewRule InterpretationAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsJudicial & Legislative RestraintsOverbreadth & Vagueness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.16

§ 472B.16 Judicial Review of Rulemaking in Enforcement Actions

If the regulation objected to is already being enforced--that is, applied by the agency to the objecting party as part of formal adjudicatory proceedings--the time for the preenforcement remedy of declaratory relief has passed [*see Tushner v. Griesinger (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 599, 606, 341 P.2d 416* ; *see* also *§ 472B.11*]. The party seeking to challenge the regulation may raise the issue of the regulation's validity as a defense during the administrative hearing, however, and should challenge the validity of the regulation at all stages of the agency proceedings in order to lay a foundation for later attack of the regulation in court if the agency upholds the regulation. After a hearing in which the agency upholds the regulation, the party objecting to the regulation may seek judicial review pursuant to a petition for administrative mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. A petition may set forth various grounds for the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. A party objecting to the regulation's validity should allege that the agency has abused its discretion, and/or proceeded in excess of its jurisdiction, depending on the nature of the alleged defect in the regulation [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. Abuse of discretion is established if the agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the order or decision is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

Similarly, a party objecting to a regulation in an enforcement action may assert the agency's non-compliance with specific language of the regulation as a defense to an administrative enforcement action. An agency can not avoid its duty to comply with specific language of a regulation by asserting its authority to interpret the regulation [*Acapulco Restaurants, Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 575, 580, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 126]* . However, the defense of non-compliance with the language of a regulation does not constitute a defense to a criminal prosecution unless the legislature has already defined the crime and the penalty, and has authorized the agency to enact rules related to that defined crime [*People v. Figueroa (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1409, 1414-1415, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 216]* .

For a complete discussion of the writ of administrative mandate, the procedures for filing the petition, and the applicable standards for review, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewRule Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.17

§ 472B.17 Estoppel and Rulemaking

The estoppel doctrine may also be used to challenge an agency's regulation. The doctrine of equitable estoppel results from a representation of fact that the party making the representation is not legally permitted to deny [*Baillargeon v. Department of Water & Power (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 670, 678, 138 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; *see* Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 11, *Equity*, § 176 et seq. (9th ed. 1990)]. It may be applied against the government when justice requires it [*City of Long Beach v. Mansell (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 462, 489, 91 Cal. Rptr. 23, 476 P.2d 423]* . The Supreme Court has established the following four elements that are necessary to make a successful claim of equitable estoppel against a public agency [*Driscoll v. City of Los Angeles (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 297, 305, 61 Cal. Rptr. 661, 431 P.2d 245]* :

(1) The agency has knowledge of the facts,

(2) The adverse party has no knowledge of the facts,

(3) The agency intends that the adverse party will rely on its representations, and

(4) The adverse party relies on misrepresentations of the agency to his or her injury.

In general, the argument of estoppel is most likely to succeed in the defense of enforcement actions [*see § 472B.16*] because of its focus on equitable relief to specific parties relying on the representation of the agency. Nevertheless, estoppel has also been raised as the basis of an affirmative claim for relief. For example, in *Shoban v. Board of Trustees (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 534, 81 Cal. Rptr. 112* , teachers were classified for salary purposes according to a school district regulation, and induced to work for the district on the basis of that classification. The district later determined that the teachers had been erroneously classified, reclassified them, and withheld the salary overpayments from their current paychecks. The teachers sought a writ of mandate compelling the agency to restore them to their original classification, and the district cross-complained for declaratory relief regarding the classification. The appellate court affirmed issuance of the writ, and held that the district was estopped from applying the regulation to those teachers and from recovering the alleged overpayments [*Shoban v. Board of Trustees (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 534, 81 Cal. Rptr. 112]* . The Supreme Court of California applied the estoppel doctrine to allow welfare recipients to raise estoppel

as a defense in an administrative hearing when a state welfare agency sought to recoup from welfare recipients those overpayments [*Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 397, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

The Public Utilities Commission could not use the defense of estoppel against a regulated utility because the Commission could not show evidence of reliance by the agency necessary to establish estoppel [*Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Com'n (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1110-1111, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 472B.18-472B.29

[Reserved]

§§ 472B.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.30

§ 472B.30 State Constitution

Administrative agencies that have constitutional authority to exercise (limited) legislative power:

Board of Education. *Cal. Const., art. IX, § 7.5*

Judicial Council. *Cal. Const., art. VI, §§ 6, 18*

Personnel Board. *Cal. Const., art. VII, §§ 2(c), 3, 6(b), (c)*

Public Utilities Commission. *Cal. Const., art. XII, §§ 2, 4, 6*

Regents of the University of California. *Cal. Const., art. IX, § 9(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsGeneral OverviewEducation LawAdministration & OperationBoards of Postsecondary SchoolsAuthorityEducation LawDepartments of EducationState Departments of EducationState Boards of EducationEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.31

§ 472B.31 State Statutes

General provisions for adoption of regulations. *Gov. Code §§ 11346.2-11346.9*

Filing and publication of regulations. *Gov. Code § 11343 et seq.*

California Code of Regulations and Register. *Gov. Code § 11344 et seq.*

Procedure for adoption of regulations. *Gov. Code § 11346 et seq.*

Exemptions from procedural requirements. *Gov. Code § 11346.1*

Judicial review of regulation by declaratory relief action. *Gov. Code § 11350*

Review of Public Utilities Commission regulation. *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*

Review of Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board regulation. *Lab. Code § 5955*

Review of regulation of Board of Governors of State Bar respecting law corporations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6170*

Regulation requiring report does not apply to small business unless state agency finds its applicability necessary for health, safety, or welfare of people of state. *Gov. Code § 11346.3*

Cost impact statements are required. *Gov. Code § 11346.5(a)*

Administrative agencies are required to write regulations in plain, straightforward language. *Gov. Code § 6215*

Publication of rulemaking calendar. *Gov. Code § 11017.6*

Judicial review of validity of regulation ordered repealed or disapproved by Office of Administrative Law is available by declaratory relief action. *Gov. Code § 11350.3*

Reasonable litigation expenses are recoverable by prevailing small business or licensee in civil action against state regulatory agency involving regulatory functions of state agency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Statutory procedure for adoption of regulations generally [*Gov. Code §§ 11346-11347.3*] are not applicable to adoptions of regulations under *Fin. Code §§ 8054* although *Gov. Code §§ 11346.1, 11343.4,* and *11349.6* apply. *Gov. Code § 11346.1(a)*

Administrative review of regulations. *Gov. Code § 11349 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.32

§ 472B.32 Administrative Regulations

Criteria applied in review of proposed regulations. *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5-120*

Procedures for regulatory determinations. *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 121-128*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.33

§ 472B.33 Decisions

[1] Generally

Special authorization is not required for adoption of operational or procedural regulations. *Bank of Italy v. Johnson (1926) 200 Cal. 1, 20, 251 P. 784*

Necessity for authorization to adopt legislative regulation. *City & County of San Francisco v. Padilla (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 388, 400, 100 Cal. Rptr. 223*

Administrative regulation has force and effect of statute. *Associated Beverage Co. v. Board of Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 192, 201, 273 Cal. Rptr. 639* ; *Dabis v. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 704, 706, 122 Cal. Rptr. 800* ; *Rigley v. Board of Retirement (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 445, 450, 67 Cal. Rptr. 185*

Legislature (Congress) is empowered to delegate administrative "power to fill up the details" in general legislation. *Wayman v. Southard (1825) 23 U.S. 1, 42-43, 6 L. Ed. 253*

Regulation is presumptively valid on all grounds in proceeding challenging validity. *Credit Ins. Gen. Agents Ass'n v. Payne (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 651, 657, 128 Cal. Rptr. 881, 547 P.2d 993* ; *Ray v. Parker (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 275, 309, 101 P.2d 665* ; *California Asso. of Nursing Homes, etc. v. Williams (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 800, 810, 84 Cal. Rptr. 590*

Necessity that local agency comply with any procedural requirements made applicable by local charter. *Conroy v. Wolff (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 745, 748, 214 P.2d 529*

Local legislative body is not empowered to impose procedural requirements on local agency in contravention of local charter. *McDonald's Systems of California, Inc. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 525, 537, 119 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Inconsistency between two regulations of same agency does not raise presumption of implicit repeal of earlier regulation unless inconsistency is not otherwise reconcilable. *California Drive-In Restaurant Assn. v. Clark (1943) 22*

Cal. 2d 287

Power to adopt regulations necessarily includes power to amend them. *Hatch v. Ward (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 883, 887, 168 P.2d 22*

Party challenging validity of administrative rule bears burden of stating and establishing grounds of its challenge; agency is not required to anticipateand refute objections to rule. *Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control Dist. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 408, 427 n.20, 261 Cal. Rptr. 384, 777 P.2d 157*

Agency does not declare statute unconstitutional and does not refuse to enforce it by complying with legislative directive to implement statute to extent it does not conflict with federal law. *Reese v. Kizer (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 996, 998, 1002, 251 Cal. Rptr. 299, 760 P.2d 495*

Administrative agency is not limited to exact provisions of statute in adopting regulations to enforce its mandate; agency is authorized to "fill up details" of statutory scheme. *Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 362, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328*

Internal management exception [*Gov. Code § 11342(b)*], excusing noncompliance with statutory rulemaking procedures, has narrow scope; exception is inapplicable when rule is to have general application and is to affect persons subject to regulation by agency. *Union of American Physicians & Dentists v. Kizer (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 490, 497, 272 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Grier v. Kizer (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 422, 435-438, 440, 268 Cal. Rptr. 244*

Policy creating standard for application of already-established wage rates, to cover situation not addressed in statute or regulations, is required to be promulgated under APA rulemaking procedures. *Division of Lab. Stds. Enforcement v. Ericsson Information Systems, Inc. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 114, 128, 270 Cal. Rptr. 75*

Internal administrative order does not supersede legislation adopted by board of supervisors. *Hock Investment Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 438, 448, 263 Cal. Rptr. 665*

[2] Judicial Proceedings

Interested persons not entitled to statutory "fair hearings" because not applicants for, nor recipients of, social service benefits, and otherwise having standing to complain, are permitted to challenge invalid regulations by mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or by action for declaratory relief pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* [*Gov. Code § 11350*]. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 682, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Validity of regulation mandating denial of application for welfare benefits are properly contested at both state (or "fair") hearing provided by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* and in subsequent judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 677, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Mandate is appropriate remedy to compel administrative agency to issue regulations when agency has mandatory duty to adopt such regulations pursuant to statute. *Newland v. Kizer (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 647, 654-656, 257 Cal. Rptr. 450*

Writ of mandate is proper to compel Director of Corrections to comply with Administrative Procedure Act and promulgate regulations; trial court retains inherent power to make any orders necessary and proper for complete enforcement of peremptory writ it had issued, including determination of adequacy of regulations promulgated in compliance with writ. *Stoneham v. Rushen (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 302, 306-307, 310-311, 203 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Gov. Code § 11350 authorizing action for declaratory judgment to test validity of regulation is, in effect, amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*, adding to cases there described in which person may sue for declaratory judgment. *County of Los Angeles v. State Dep't of Public Health (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 425, 443-444, 322 P.2d 968*

Court is empowered to enjoin enforcement of invalid regulation. *Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 401, 128 Cal. Rptr. 183, 546 P.2d 687* ; *Brock v. Superior Court (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 682, 686-688, 81 P.2d 931*

Court is empowered, in appropriate case, to issue writ of mandate compelling agency to repeal invalid regulation. *Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 809, 819-820, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617* ; *California Welfare Rights Organization v. Brian (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 237, 243-244, 113 Cal. Rptr. 154, 520 P.2d 970*

Writ of prohibition or habeas corpus is available in appropriate case for relief against invalid regulation. *In re Petersen (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 177, 181, 331 P.2d 24* (habeas corpus); *Moore v. Municipal Court (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 548, 552-554, 339 P.2d 196*

Regulation adopted by local agency is not subject to judicial notice. *Fickeisen v. Civil Service Com. (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 419, 423, 220 P.2d 605*

Publication of state agency's regulation is not condition precedent to court's taking judicial notice of it. *People v. Haugh (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 603, 607, 31 Cal. Rptr. 74*

[3] Review

Analysis of validity of regulation is essentially same as in case of review of constitutionality of statute. *Knudsen Creamery Co. v. Brock (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 485, 494, 234 P.2d 26*

Regulation held within scope of agency's authority. *Credit Ins. General Agents Asso. v. Payne (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 651, 653, 656, 128 Cal. Rptr. 881, 547 P.2d 993* ; *Kerr's Catering Service v. Department of Industrial Relations (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 319, 330, 19 Cal. Rptr. 492, 369 P.2d 20 , cert. denied, 371 U.S. 818, 83 S. Ct. 31, 9 L. Ed. 2d 58* ; *California Drive-in Restaurant Ass'n v. Clark (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 287, 302, 140 P.2d 657*

Regulation held to exceed scope of agency's authority. *First Industrial Loan Co. v. Daugherty (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 545, 551, 556, 159 P.2d 921* ; *Whitcomb Hotel, Inc. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 753, 756-759, 151 P.2d 233* ; *Stanislaus County Dairymen's Protection Ass'n v. Stanislaus County (1937) 8 Cal. 2d 378, 391-392, 65 P.2d 1305* ; *Boone v. Kingsbury (1928) 206 Cal. 148, 160-163, 273 P. 797*

Requirement that regulation be reasonably necessary does not refer to strict necessity but requires reasonable relation to statutory objective. *Credit Ins. General Agents Asso. v. Payne (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 651, 657, 128 Cal. Rptr. 881* P.2d 993; *Schenley Affiliated Brands Corp. v. Kirby (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 177, 187, 98 Cal. Rptr. 609*

Reasonableness is implicitly required where agency empowered to adopt regulations. *Ex parte McManus (1907) 151 Cal. 331, 336-337, 90 P. 702*

Issue of reasonable necessity is not related to question whether regulation is wise or sensible; court is not entitled to substitute its legislative judgment for agency's. *Morris v. Williams (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 733, 737, 63 Cal. Rptr. 689, 433 P.2d 697* ; *Pitts v. Perluss (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 824, 834, 27 Cal. Rptr. 19, 377 P.2d 83*

Regulation is invalid if varying, enlarging, or restricting terms of statute it purports to implement. *First Industrial Loan Co. v. Daugherty (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 545, 550, 159 P.2d 921* ; *Hodge v. McCall (1921) 185 Cal. 330, 334, 197 P. 86* ; *In re Potter (1913) 164 Cal. 735, 737-740, 130 P. 721* ; *California Teachers Assn. v. Commission on Teacher Credentialing (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1469, 1475, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 126*

Agency is without power to amend regulation so as to change definition of term where Legislature has implicitly adopted administrative definition. *Cooper v. Swoap (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 856, 868, 115 Cal. Rptr. 1, 524 P.2d 97 , cert. denied, 419 U.S. 1022, 95 S. Ct. 498, 42 L. Ed. 2d 296*

Regulation conflicting with statute is not invalid if conflict authorized by *Legislature. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 420, 128 Cal. Rptr. 183, 546 P.2d 687*

Regulation infringing on area where another agency has exclusive control is invalid. *Western Oil & Gas Ass'n v. Orange County Air Pollution Control Dist. (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 411, 418-421, 121 Cal. Rptr. 249, 534 P.2d 1329*

Administrative regulations that alter or amend statute or enlarge or impair its scope are void and are required to be struck down by courts. *Dunn-Edwards Corp. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 644, 655, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 850*

In determining whether regulations are reasonably necessary to effectuate statutory purpose, court does not intervene in absence of arbitrary or capricious decision and court does not need to make such determination if regulations transgress statutory power. *Dunn-Edwards Corp. v. Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 644, 655, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 850*

Regulation challenged as inconsistent with terms or intent of authorizing statute is subject to greater judicial scrutiny than regulation merely challenged as abuse of discretion. *California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 11-12, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*

Administrative action is required to be within scope of authority conferred by enabling statute; administrative directive that in effect alters or amends enabling statute, or enlarges or impairs its scope, is void. *Association for Retarded Citizens v. Department of Developmental Services (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 384, 391, 211 Cal. Rptr. 758, 696 P.2d 150* ; *Norman v. McMahon (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1450, 1453-1454, 275 Cal. Rptr. 698*

In action challenging validity of administrative regulation, trial court did not commit error in refusing to allow plaintiffs to present additional evidence as to reasonableness of regulation because trial court is limited to examination of administrative record. *Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 365 n.11, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328*

Administrative regulations are not unconstitutionally vague, even if portions of them must be refined and developed on case-by-case basis. *Wallace Berrie & Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 60, 65, 219 Cal. Rptr. 142, 707 P.2d 204* ; *Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 365-369, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328*

Court's role in reviewing administrative regulations is limited to inquiring into legality of challenged regulation by determining whether or not regulation (1) is within scope of authority conferred on agency and (2) is reasonably necessary to effectuate purpose of authorizing statute. *Ford Dealers Ass'n v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 347, 355, 185 Cal. Rptr. 453, 650 P.2d 328*

When regulation is consistent with statute and reasonably necessary to effectuate statute's purpose, task of reviewing court is to decide whether agency reasonably interpreted legislative mandate. *Associated Beverage Co. v. Board of*

Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 192, 201, 273 Cal. Rptr. 639

Limited scope of review when regulation is consistent with statute and reasonably necessary to effectuate statute's purpose does not constitute judicial interference with administrative discretion in that aspect of rule making that requires high degree of technical skill and expertise. *Associated Beverage Co. v. Board of Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 192, 201, 273 Cal. Rptr. 639*

On appellate court review of trial court's order in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* mandate proceeding, determination of Office of Administrative Law (OAL) that challenged "underground" regulation was invalid is entitled to due consideration, because OAL is charged with interpreting whether agency rule is regulation as defined in *Gov. Code § 11342(b). Union of American Physicians & Dentists v. Kizer (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 490, 497, 272 Cal Rptr. 886*

Permanent interpretive guidelines adopted by California Coastal Commission are not subject to review by *Office of Administrative Law. California Coastal Com. v. Office of Admin. Law (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 758, 761-764, 258 Cal. Rptr. 560* (construing *Pub. Res. Code § 30333*)

Scope of review of administrative agency's regulations is limited to considering whether challenged provisions are consistent and not in conflict with enabling statute, and reasonably necessary to effectuate its purpose. *301 Ocean Avenue Corp. v. Santa Monica Rent Control Board (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 149, 154, 221 Cal. Rptr. 610*

Administrative order which is legislative in character is subject to same tests of validity as act of *Legislature. Horwarth v. Local Agency Formation Com. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 177, 182, 191 Cal. Rptr. 593*

Task of court reviewing administrative agency's regulation is that of deciding whether or not agency reasonably interpreted legislative mandate. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 679, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

On judicial review of validity of administrative regulation, party challenging regulation has burden of proof because action of administrative agency comes before court with presumption of correctness and regularity. *Geftakys v. State Personnel Board (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 844, 867, 188 Cal. Rptr. 305*

Judicial review of quasi-legislative acts of administrative agency is limited to examination of proceedings before agency to determine whether agency's action arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support, or whether it has failed to follow procedure and give notices required by law; reasoning or wisdom underlying agency action is beyond scope of inquiry. *Geftakys v. State Personnel Board (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 844, 867, 188 Cal. Rptr. 305*

Scope of judicial inquiry into quasi-legislative actions of state agency is restricted to examination of record for procedural compliance and to determine whether or not action taken is arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support; reasoning or wisdom underlying agency action is beyond scope of inquiry. *Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Air Resources Board (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 789, 796, 180 Cal. Rptr. 550*

Industrial Welfare Commission's statements of basis, as required by *Lab. Code § 1177*, sufficiently support administrative orders regulating wages, hours, and conditions of employment when statements detailed factual, legal, and policy considerations that reasonably related to issuance of order. *California Manufacturers Assn. v. Industrial Welfare Com. (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 95, 106-115, 167 Cal. Rptr. 203*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawAgency

RulemakingState ProceedingsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewRule InterpretationAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsExplicit Delegation of AuthorityAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsImplicit Delegation of Authority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.34

§ 472B.34 Law Reviews

Gordon, *Compensable Regulatory Taking: A Tollbooth Rises on Regulation Road*, 12 Real Est. L.J. 211 (1984)

Livingston, *Organizations and Administrative Practice--A Balance to the Corporate State? 26 Hastings L.J. 89 (1974)*

Hannon, *The Philosophy of Administrative Law Making*, 42 State BJ 661 (1967)

Hutchinson, *Rule Making Function of California Administrative Agencies, 15 Hastings L.J. 272 (1964)*

Harris, *State Regulation of Hazards Growing Out of Use of Atomic Energy, 46 Calif. L. Rev. 84 (1958)*

Comment, *Administrative Law and Procedure: Emergency Regulations*, 27 So Cal. L Rev (1953)

Comment, *The Void for Vagueness Rule in California, 41 Calif. L. Rev. 523, 529*-532 (1953)

Note, *Administrative Law: Agency Authority to Develop Policy by Adjudication Rather Than Rule, 36 Calif. L. Rev. 619 (1948)*

Newman, *How Courts Interpret Regulations, 35 Calif. L. Rev. 509 (1947)*

Comment, *Administrative Law: Retroactive Revision of Invalid Regulations, 35 Calif. L. Rev. 92 (1947)*

Note, *Constitutional Law: Delegation of Legislative Power to Administrative Officers: Discretion to Grant or Refuse Permits, 19 Calif. L. Rev. 448 (1931)*

Thelen, *Practice and Procedure Before Administrative Tribunals, 16 Calif. L. Rev. 208 (1928)*

Comment, *Constitutional Law: Delegation of Legislative Power to Administrative Officers: Discretion to Grant or*

Refuse Licenses and Permits, and Power to Make Rules, 15 Calif. L. Rev. 408 (1927)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsJudicial & Legislative RestraintsOverbreadth & Vagueness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.35

§ 472B.35 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 7, *Constitutional Law*, § 533-535 (9th ed 1988)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.36

§ 472B.36 Internet References

NOTE: On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 472B.37-472B.49

[Reserved]

§§ 472B.37[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.50

§ 472B.50 Determine the Appropriate Method of Judicial Review of Agency Rulemaking

[1] Ascertain If an Action for Declaratory Relief Is Appropriate

☐ The challenged action is quasi-legislative (rulemaking) rather than judicial (adjudicatory) [*see § 472B.10[1]*].

☐ Agency has not yet started enforcement proceedings against the party challenging the regulation [*see § 472B.10[1]*].

☐ None of the following alternatives to declaratory relief is appropriate or desirable:

- ☐ Petition for amendment or repeal of the regulation [*see § 472B.10[2][a]*].
- ☐ Priority review by OAL [*see § 472B.10[2][b]*].
- ☐ Defense in an enforcement action [*see § 472B.10[2][c]*].
- ☐ Review of the informal rule pursuant to a request for OAL determination [*see § 472B.10[2][d]*].

[2] Ascertain the Preliminary Activities the Plaintiff Should Perform Before Filing Action

☐ Review of the regulatory code supplement [*see § 472B.11[1]*].

☐ Review of the rulemaking record [*see § 472B.11[2]*].

[3] Ascertain the Following Issues Before Filing Action

☐ Plaintiff's standing to bring action [*see § 472B.13[2]*].

☐ Ripeness of the controversy [*see § 472B.13[3]*].

☐ Whether administrative remedies have been exhausted (non-APA cases) [*see § 472B.13[4]*].

☐ The appropriate court [*see § 472B.12[1]*].

☐ The appropriate venue [*see § 472B.12[1]*].

[4] Ascertain Whether the Plaintiff Should Seek Other Remedies in Declaratory Relief Action

☐ Writ of mandamus [*see § 472B.12[3]*].

☐ Injunction [*see § 472B.12[4]*].

[5] Ascertain the Specific Grounds That May Support a Declaration of Invalidity

☐ The regulation substantially fails to comply with the APA [*see § 472B.14[1]*].

☐ The facts in the statement of emergency (for emergency regulations) do not constitute an emergency [*see § 472B.14[1]*].

☐ The agency's determination of necessity is not supported by substantial evidence [*see § 472B.14[4][d]*].

☐ The action exceeds the agency's authority [*see § 472B.14[4][a]*].

☐ The action violates a controlling constitutional or statutory provision [*see § 472B.14[4][b]*].

☐ The regulation is unclear [*see § 472B.14[4][c]*].

☐ The action is procedurally defective [*see § 472B.14[4][e]*].

[6] Ascertain Methods That May Be Used to Challenge the Validity of a Regulation If the Agency Has Already Initiated Enforcement Proceedings

☐ Assert the invalidity of the regulation as a defense in the administrative hearing [*see § 472B.15*].

☐ Raise the issue of estoppel in the administrative hearing [*see § 472B.16*].

☐ Seek a writ of administrative mandamus if the agency upholds the validity of the regulation [*see § 472B.15*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityStandingAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.51

§ 472B.51 Seeking Declaratory Relief Prior to Enforcement of Regulation

[1] Prior to Litigation

☐ Review actions preceding adoption of regulation [*see* discussion in *§ 472B.12[1]*].

☐ Request rulemaking record for review [*see* discussion in *§ 472B.12[2]*].

☐ Note each and every failure to comply with the APA [*see* discussion in *§ 472B.12[c]*].

☐ Prepare complaint for declaratory relief [for a form, *see*, *§ 472B.60*].

☐ If desired, combine with petition for writ of mandamus, petition for injunction, or both [*see* discussion in *§ 472B.13[3], [4]*].

☐ Prepare verification or accompanying affidavits supporting allegations in complaint.

☐ Be prepared to furnish a bond if seeking temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction.

☐ File action for declaratory relief in superior court [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 472B.13[2][a]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive Relief

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.52

§ 472B.52 Declaratory Relief to Determine Validity of Regulation

[1] Declaratory Relief

☐ Prepare complaint for declaratory relief [*Gov. Code § 11350.3*; *see* discussion in *§ 472B.13[2][d]*; for a form, *see*, *§ 472B.61*].

☐ File action for declaratory relief in superior court [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 472B.13[2][d]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewRule Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 472B.53-472B.59

[Reserved]

§§ 472B.53[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART V. FORMS

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.60

§ 472B.60 Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief Regarding Validity of Administrative Regulation [Gov. Code § 11350]

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief Regarding Validity of Administrative Regulation [Gov. Code § 11350]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND [TEMPORARY RESTRAINING PRELIMINARY AND] FINAL INJUNCTION(S)
_____ [*names*],	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is _____ [*status as interested person, e.g., if attacking regulation of Medical Board of California*, a duly licensed and practicing physician].

2. Defendant is the _____ [*official status, e.g.*, Medical Board of California, an administrative agency in the state government].

3. _____ [*Identify regulation in question, e.g.*, On January 18, 1998, defendant adopted a regulation _____ (*particular identification, if any, e.g.* thereafter published as Section _____ of Title _____ of the California Code of Regulations), a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein *or set out text of regulation if copy is not attached, e.g.*, the provisions of which are as

follows: _____ (*verbatim text*)].

4. _____ [*State nature of present controversy, e.g.*, Pursuant to that regulation, defendant has demanded that plaintiff report all of the information required by the regulation to be reported to defendant; and defendant has threatened to begin disciplinary proceedings against plaintiff if plaintiff does not comply with the regulation. Plaintiff has refused to comply for the reason, which plaintiff has communicated to defendant, that enforcement of the regulation against plaintiff would violate plaintiff's constitutional rights].

5. The regulation in question is not valid for the reason that _____[*specify*].

6. _____[*State facts showing exhaustion of administrative remedies, or lack of administrative remedy, or excuse for failure to exhaust administrative remedies*].

7. _____ [*State facts showing need for preventive relief, if needed, including facts showing need for provisional relief, e.g.*, Because of plaintiff's refusal to comply with the regulation, defendant has begun a disciplinary proceeding against plaintiff which will result in the suspension, or possibly the revocation, of plaintiff's license unless this court enjoins the administrative proceeding pending judgment in this action and thereafter permanently enjoins defendant from prosecuting any disciplinary proceeding against plaintiff because of plaintiff's noncompliance with the regulation. In addition, unless this court gives appropriate provisional and final preventive relief, plaintiff will be obliged to defend himself/herself in administrative proceedings, against charges having no legal merit].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration that the regulation referred to in Paragraph 3 is not valid and that plaintiff has no legal duty to comply with it;

2. _____ [*For preventive relief, e.g.*, For a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction enjoining defendant from enforcing or attempting to enforce the regulation against plaintiff, and from beginning, threatening to begin, or carrying on any disciplinary proceeding against plaintiff because of failure to comply with the regulation, pending judgment in this action; and for a final injunction permanently enjoining defendant from doing any of those acts after judgment];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred [and for reasonable litigation expenses]; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the plaintiff in this action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to matters therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by any interested person wishing a judicial declaration as to the validity of an administrative regulation. The prescribed remedy is an action for declaratory relief [*Gov. Code § 11350*].

[3] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. The public entity defendant need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446(a)*]. However, the verification of the complaint against the public entity does preclude a general denial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The complaint must be filed in the superior court. Venue is to be determined by the rules ordinarily applied in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11350*]. For a discussion of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[5] Allegations

The complaint must show how the plaintiff is interested in a judicial declaration of the validity of the regulation in question; and it must show an actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *Gov. Code § 11350*].

[6] Interested Persons

A person is sufficiently interested to sue under *Gov. Code § 11350* if there is an actual controversy relating to his or her and the agency's (defendant's) legal rights and duties under the regulation in question [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 1060; *Gov. Code § 11350*]. Thus, a trade association whose members are subject to the regulation, but which is not itself subject to it, has been held not to have sufficient interest to sue [*Associated Boat Industries v. Marshall (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 21, 22-23, 230 P.2d 379]* . On the other hand, a corporation has been held to have a sufficient interest to sue where, although not subject itself to the regulation in question, it would suffer impairment of existing contractual rights if the regulation were enforced [*Sperry & Hutchinson Co. v. Cal. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 229, 232-233, 50 Cal. Rptr. 489]* . The requirement that the plaintiff be interested simply reflects the basic principle that actions must be prosecuted by the real party in interest except as otherwise provided by statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 367*].

[7] Scope of Review

When an administrative regulation is challenged in a declaratory relief action, the court's task is to inquire into the legality of the challenged regulation, not its wisdom [*Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 411, 128 Cal. Rptr. 183, 546 P.2d 687]* . The regulation will be presumed valid [*see, e.g.,* *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Reimel (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 172, 175, 70 Cal. Rptr. 407, 444 P.2d 79]* .

The presumption may be overcome by showing any of three following particular defects, among others that might be imagined [*see Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 392, 411, 128 Cal. Rptr. 183, 546 P.2d 687]* :

- There was a substantial failure to comply with the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.* (adoption, filing, publication, and review of regulations) [*Gov. Code § 11350*].

- The regulation is not within the scope of authority conferred on the agency by the Legislature [*see Gov. Code § 11342.1*].

- The regulation is not consistent and not in conflict with the enabling statute and is not reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute [*Gov. Code § 11342.2*].

If the regulation purports to be an emergency regulation, it might also be invalidated because of the absence of a genuine emergency [*see Gov. Code § 11350(a)*].

In addition to any other ground which may exist, a regulation may be declared invalid if the court cannot find that the record of the rulemaking proceeding [*see Gov. Code § 11347.3*] supports the agency's determination that the regulation is reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute, decision, or other legal provision being implemented, interpreted, or made specific by the regulation. Alternatively a regulation may be declared invalid if the agency declaration, pursuant to Gov. Code§ 11346.5(a)(8), that adoption or amendment of the regulation will not have a significant adverse economic impact on business, is in conflict with substantial evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11350(b)*].

The approval of a regulation by the Office of Administrative Law or the governor's overruling of a decision to disapprove a regulation [*see Gov. Code § 11349 et seq.*] may not be considered by a court in any action for declaratory relief brought with respect to the regulation [*Gov. Code § 11350(c)*].

[8] Administrative Remedies

As in many other situations, the plaintiff is required to exhaust administrative remedies, if he or she has any; and it must affirmatively appear in the complaint that he or she has complied with the requirement, or that he or she should be excused for failing to comply, or that the requirement does not apply because there is no administrative remedy. Allegations respecting administrative remedies should be simple statements of fact as to what the plaintiff did or as to the absence of an administrative remedy. It is not sufficient simply to state that he or she has exhausted his or her administrative remedies. The right to judicial determination of the validity of a regulation is not affected by the failure either to petition or to seek reconsideration of a petition filed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11340.7* (petitions to adopt, amend, or repeal administrative regulations) before the agency promulgating the regulation [*Gov. Code § 11350(a)*].

[9] Injunction

In an appropriate case the plaintiff may seek preventive relief (by provisional or final injunction) as well as a mere declaratory judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1062* (cumulation of remedies)]. It will be necessary to show grounds for such relief by proper allegations [*see Civ. Code § 3422* (final injunction); *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (provisional injunction)].

If the plaintiff seeks provisional preventive relief (temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction), he or she must be prepared to furnish a bond [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 529*]; and if the complaint is used (instead of an affidavit) to support a prayer for such relief, it must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527*]. Provisional preventive relief may be

sought whether or not the plaintiff also seeks permanent preventive relief. For discussion and forms for use in an action for preventive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[10] Costs and Attorney's Fees

Costs are recoverable by the plaintiff if he or she prevails [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1028, 1029*]. Reasonable litigation expenses not in excess of $7,500, including attorney's fees, are recoverable by a prevailing small business or licensee (defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(c), (d)*, respectively) in an action between the business or licensee and a state regulatory agency involving to the agency's regulatory functions as applied to the small business or licensee, if the court determines that the action of the agency was undertaken without substantial justification [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*].

[11] Exceptional Cases

The validity of a regulation adopted by the Public Utilities Commission or Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board may not be tested in an action for declaratory relief [*see Gov. Code § 11351*]. The remedy is a certiorari proceeding in an appellate court [*see Lab. Code § 5950*; *Pub. Util. Code § 1756*]. This is also apparently true with respect to regulations adopted by the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 23090*] and the Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control [*see Schenley Affiliated Brands Corp. v. Kirby (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 177, 195-196, 98 Cal. Rptr. 609]* .

[12] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to a proceeding for review of regulations of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board and the Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses and Ch. 492, Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

For discussion and forms relating to actions for declaratory judgment and preventive relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , and Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to a proceeding for review of regulations of the Public Utilities Commission or the Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41: Overview of Public Administrative Law thru Review of Agency Rulemaking-Chs. 470-472B
Chapter 472B REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING
PART V. FORMS

41-472B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 472B.61

§ 472B.61 Complaint for Declaratory Relief Regarding Validity of Administrative Regulation Disapproved or Ordered Repealed by the OAL

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief Regarding Validity of Administrative Regulation Disapproved or Ordered Repealed by the OAL

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*], individually and	)	
on behalf of all others similarly situated,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
_____ [*names*],	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [Status of plaintiff as interested person; *see § 472B.60, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant Office of Administrative Law is an office of the government of the State of California. Defendant _____[*name*] is the Director of defendant Office of Administrative Law and is responsible for its direction and control.

3. On _____[*date*], _____ [*specify agency that adopted regulation in question, e.g.*, the Medical Board of California] duly adopted Regulation No. _____, hereinafter referred to as "the regulation," _____ [which provided as follows: "_____" (*quote regulation*) *or* a true

copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference herein].

4. On _____[*date*], the Office of Administrative Law _____ [*specify action taken by office, e.g.,* disapproved the regulation submitted for review pursuant to _____ (*Government Code section 11349.3 or Government Code section 11349.6 or Government Code section 11349.7*)] _____ [*specify reasons given for action by office, e.g.,* for failure to meet the standards set forth in *Government Code section 11346.1 or* for failure of the Medical Board of California to comply with the provisions of *Government Code section 11340 et seq.*].

5. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendants, in that plaintiff contends that the regulation is valid and enforceable because _____ [*specify reasons why regulation valid e.g.*, the Medical Board of California complied with the provisions of *Government Code section 11340 et seq. or* the regulation meets the standards set forth in *Government Code section 11346.1*], whereas defendants dispute this contention.

6. Plaintiff desires a declaration as to the validity of the regulation. Such a declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his or her rights and duties with respect to the regulation. _____ [*Specify present controversy, e.g.*, Pursuant to the regulation, plaintiff has been exempt from reporting to the Medical Board of California information otherwise required. With the appeal of the regulation plaintiff is now no longer exempt and is required to report the information].

7. _____[*Specify facts showing exhaustion or lack of administrative remedies or excuse for failure to exhaust administrative remedies*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration that the regulation is valid;

2. For an order directing the Office of Administrative Law to file the regulation with the Secretary of State;

3. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired; see § 472B.60.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by any interested person wishing a judicial declaration of the validity of an administrative regulation disapproved or ordered repealed by the Office of Administrative Law pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11349.3, 11349.6* or *11349.7* [*Gov. Code § 11350.3*].

[3] Verification

The public entity defendant need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446(a)*]. However, the verification of the complaint against the public entity does preclude a general denial in superior

court and in some municipal court actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[4] Relief Available

The court may declare the regulation valid if it determines that the regulation meets the standards set forth in *Gov. Code § 11349.1* and that the agency has complied with the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11340-11356*. If the court determines that the regulation is valid it may order the Office of Administrative Law to immediately file the regulation with the Secretary of State [*Gov. Code § 11350.3*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473.syn

§ 473.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473: PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION

§ 473.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Specific Public Agencies

[5] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

§§ 473.03-473.09 [Reserved]

§ 473.10 Administrative Adjudications and Administrative Rule Making Distinguished

§ 473.11 Administrative Ajudication and Civil Trial Compared

§ 473.12 Due Process Considerations in Administrative Adjudications

§ 473.13 The Administrative Adjudication Provisions of the APA

[1] Chapters 4.5 and 5 of the APA

[2] Supplementary Regulations Governing Agency Adjudications

[3] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

§ 473.14 Definitions in the APA Administrative Adjudication Provisions

[1] Applicability of Definitions in Chapters 4.5 and 5

[2] Definitions

[a] "Adjudicative Proceeding"

[b] "Agency"

[c] "Agency Head"

[d] "Decision"

[e] "Party"

[f] "Person"

[g] "Presiding Officer"

§ 473.15 Applicability of the APA Administrative Adjudication Provisions

[1] Applicability of Chapter 4.5

[a] Proceedings Subject to Chapter 4.5 in General

[b] Agency Adjudication Required by Statute or Constitutional Provision

[i] General Rule

[ii] Proceedings in Which Chapter 4.5 Does Not Apply

[iii] Type of Hearing When Chapter 4.5 Applies

[c] State Agencies Subject to Chapter 4.5

[d] Local Agencies

[e] Adoption by Exempt Agencies

[f] Application of Chapter 4.5 to Agency Proceedings Under Chapter 5

[g] Quasi-Public Entities

[2] Applicability of Chapter 5

[a] Applicability Determined by Statutes Relating to Specific Agency

[b] Most Licensing Agencies Are Subject to Chapter 5

§ 473.16 The General Adjudication Procedures of Chapter 4.5

[1] General Provisions for Application of Adjudication Procedures

[a] Adjudication Provisions Supplement Other Controlling Law

[b] Governor's Limited Power to Suspend Adjudication Procedure

[c] Voluntary Waiver of Rights Conferred by Adjudication Provisions

[d] Procedure Used When Adjudicative Proceeding not Required

[e] Agency Decision by Mutual Settlement

[2] General Procedural Provisions of Chapter 4.5

[a] Authority of Agency Head Following Decision

[b] General Provision for Service and Notice

[c] Conduct of Hearing by Electronic Means

[d] Sexual Conduct Evidence in Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, or Sexual Battery Proceedings

[e] Intervention Procedures

[i] Intervention Allowed When Permitted by Regulation

[ii] Motion for Intervention

[iii] Conditional Intervention

[iv] Order Granting or Denying Motion

[v] Order Not Reviewable

[vi] Adoption of Alternatives to Intervention

[f] Written Communications

[3] Other Provisions in Chapter 4.5

§§ 473.17-473.19 [Reserved]

§ 473.20 Summary of Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

§ 473.21 Notice and Opportunity to Be Heard

§ 473.22 Right to a Copy of Governing Procedure

§ 473.23 Public Hearing

§ 473.24 Separation of Function Between Prosecutors and Adjudicators

§ 473.25 Disqualification of Presiding Officer for Bias, Interest, or Prejudice

§ 473.26 Written Decision Stating Factual and Legal Basis

§ 473.27 Agency Decision Must Be Designated to Be Precedent Authority

§ 473.28 Prohibition on Ex Parte Communications

[1] General Prohibition

[2] Definitions

[3] Permissible Ex Parte Communications

[4] Consequences of Ex Parte Communication Violations

[5] Application to Agency Head

§ 473.29 Language Assistance

[1] General Rule Requiring Language Assistance

[2] When the Rule Applies

[a] Generally When Party or Witness Needs Assistance

[b] Agencies Required to Provide Language Assistance

[3] Language Assistance Requirements

[4] Interpreter Requirements

[5] Costs of Interpreters

§§ 473.30-473.39 [Reserved]

§ 473.40 Federal Constitution

§ 473.41 State Constitution

§ 473.42 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473.43 Decisions

§ 473.44 Attorney General Opinions

§ 473.45 Law Reviews

§ 473.46 Text References

§ 473.47 Internet References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.01

§ 473.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides an overview discussion of agency adjudication in California public administrative law. The background discussion in Part II includes:

- Subpart A discusses general hearing procedures for public agency adjudications under the California Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) [*see § 473.10* et seq.].

- Subpart B discusses the fair procedure requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act's "Adjudication *Bill of Rights*" (Gov. Code. Code § 11425.10) [*see § 473.20*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.02

§ 473.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*, through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in § 470.12[5]). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

[4] Specific Public Agencies

For related coverage of adjudicative proceedings before particular public agencies, see:

- Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to licensing proceedings before the department of Alcoholic Beverage Control).

- Ch. 70, *Attorney Admission* and Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of attorneys and proceedings before the State Bar and the State Bar Court).

- Ch. 92, *Automobiles: Drivers' Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to drivers' licensing and proceedings before the Department of Motor Vehicles).

- Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*, § 104.70 et seq. (discussion relating to licensing and discipline of building contractors by the Contractors' State License Board).

- Ch. 118, *Civil Service* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Personnel Board).

- Ch. 209, *Dentists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of dentists and proceedings before the Board of Dental Examiners).

- Ch. 214, *Drugs and Pharmacists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of pharmacists and proceedings before the State Board of Pharmacy).

- Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of physicians and proceedings before the Medical Board of California).

- Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission).

- Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues*, (discussion and forms relating to teacher certification and dismissal proceedings before the State Board of Education and local boards).

- Ch. 527, *Social Services* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Department of Social Service or the State Department of Health Services).

- Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance*, §§ 564.30 et seq., 564.100 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board).

- Ch. 575, *Waters*, §§ 575.10 et seq., 575.210 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Water Resources Control Board and local water districts).

- Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Division of Workers' Compensation and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

For additional cross references to coverage of other particular public agencies, see *§ 470.02[2]*.

[5] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

For discussion and forms relating to claims and actions under the California Tort Claims Act (Gov. Code. Code § 810 et seq.), for damages for injuries arising from the tortious conduct of public agencies or their officers and employees, see

Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPublic MeetingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473.03-473.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.10

§ 473.10 Administrative Adjudications and Administrative Rule Making Distinguished

Many administrative agencies have both rulemaking and adjudicative powers, which are similar to the legislative and judicial powers of legislatures and courts. Rulemaking actions, often referred to as "quasi-legislative" actions, entail formulation of general rules that are applicable to future situations [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n. 2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . Examples of quasi-legislative actions are enacting a zoning ordinance for a specific area [*see Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 473, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304]* , or setting government employee salaries or benefits [*Campbell Municipal Employees Assn. v. City of Campbell (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 416, 425 n. 5, 182 Cal. Rptr. 461]* . The rulemaking power of administrative agencies is discussed in detail in Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , et seq.

In contrast, "adjudicative" actions, often referred to as "quasi-judicial" actions, are those in which the agency has discretion to apply a rule to a specific set of facts [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n. 2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . The agency "adjudicates" when it makes a binding determination that directly affect the legal rights of a particular individual [*Hannah v. Larche (1960) 363 U.S. 420, 442, 80 S. Ct. 1502, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1307]* . Thus, adjudicative actions include those that might otherwise be categorized as executive actions, whenever these are discretionary rather than ministerial actions and involve a binding determination affecting legal rights.

Examples of an adjudicative action are the determination of an application for a variance from an ordinance [*see, e.g., Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*], and the determination of salary or benefits to which a particular employee is entitled under a legislative scheme [*see Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 44, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* .

Formal agency adjudications, in the form of adjudicatory agency hearings under the Administrative Procedure Act, or APA (Gov. Code. Code § 11340 et seq.), or under non-APA adjudicatory proceedings, are the focus of this chapter and Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*, et seq. Adjudicatory agency hearings under the APA are governed by Chapters 4.5 and 5 (Administrative Adjudication) of Division 3 (Executive Department) of Title 2 (California State

Government) of the Government Code [Gov. Code § 11400 et seq. and *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*]. The major category of adjudications requiring these type hearings are themselves the primary example of a binding determination affecting a legal right, that is, proceedings to determine whether to revoke, suspend, deny, or refuse to renew a license [*see Gov. Code §§ 11503, 11504*]. See further discussion in *§ 473.13*. See also further discussion and forms regarding adjudicatory licensing proceedings generally in Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies*.

Whether an action is quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative is important to determine. When an agency conducts a quasi-judicial or adjudicatory proceeding, the affected private party has a right to a hearing [*Anton v. San Antonio Community Hosp., 19 Cal. 3d 802, 829, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442, 567 P.2d 1162 (1977)* (decision to take away doctor's hospital staff privileges for misconduct is adjudicatory, and doctor is entitled to adjudicatory hearing)]. When an agency engages in quasi-legislative or rulemaking action, however, there is no right to any hearing [City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Com., 76 Cal. App. 3d 381, 388, *76 Cal. App. 3d 381, 142 Cal. Rptr. 873 (1978)* (agency decision to approve annexation decision is legislative in nature, and no judicial hearing is required before decision is made); *Mateo-Woodburn v. Fresno Community Hospital & Medical Center, 221 Cal. App.3d 1169, 1182-84, 270 Cal. Rptr. 894 (1990)* (when a hospital changes its policy governing anesthetist staffing, no individual doctor has a right to an adjudicatory hearing before the policy can go into effect)]. In other words, the due process right to a hearing arises when an action is adjudicatory rather than legislative [*Atkins v. Parker (1985) 472 U.S. 115, 129, 105 S. Ct. 2520, 86 L. Ed. 2d 81* ; *Londoner v. Denver (1908) 210 U.S. 373, 28 S. Ct. 708, 52 L. Ed. 1103* ; *Bi-Metallic Inv. Co. v. State Board of Equalization (1915) 239 U.S. 441, 445, 36 S. Ct. 141, 60 L. Ed. 372]* . See further discussion in *§ 473.12*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.11

§ 473.11 Administrative Ajudication and Civil Trial Compared

Formal administrative hearing practice is similar to trial practice, although it generally involves informal, simplified procedures. An attorney representing a party in an administrative proceeding should recognize that despite these procedural differences, adjudicatory proceedings may also involve important substantive and constitutional issues. The client's interests, therefore, should be protected as diligently as in a proceeding before a judicial tribunal.

Differences between a trial and an administrative hearing include the following:

- The parties in an administrative hearing are referred to as complainant and respondent, rather than plaintiff and defendant [*see Gov. Code § 11500(b), (c)* (defining "party" and "respondent" for purposes of *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*, governing administrative adjudication hearings)].

- Decisions are rendered by an administrative law judge (ALJ) or by the agency itself, rather than by a trial judge [*see Gov. Code § 11517(a)*, (b) (under the APA, an ALJ and/or agency decides a case); *see* Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*].

- The time frame for an administrative hearing is generally much shorter than for a civil trial.

- The provisions of the APA (or statutes and regulations governing a particular agency) govern the conduct of the hearing, discovery, and prehearing motions and conferences, rather than the Evidence Code and the Code of Civil Procedure [*see Evid. Code § 300* (Evidence Code applies to court actions except as otherwise provided by statute); *Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (hearings not conducted according to technical rules of evidence, except as provided in *APA); Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 451, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779* (administrative hearings are not governed by Code of Civil Procedure provisions); *see also* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* , Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , and Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

- Although decisions in both forums are subject to judicial review, administrative decisions are

> reviewed primarily by seeking administrative mandamus relief from the superior court, while trial court decisions are usually reviewed in the court of appeal [*see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*].

For further comparison of formal administrative hearings and civil trials, see Chapter 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.12

§ 473.12 Due Process Considerations in Administrative Adjudications

The United States and California Constitutions state that no person may be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*]. These constitutional guarantees apply to administrative adjudicatory action [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 263, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *Kruger v. Wells Fargo Bank (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 352, 366-367, 113 Cal. Rptr. 449, 521 P.2d 441* (California due process provision held to be identical in scope and purpose to the due process provision of the *Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution*)]. Courts balance several factors to determine what procedural due process requires in a particular case [*Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 335, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18* ; *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 263, 90 S. Ct. 1011]* .

Two basic due process issues may arise: (1) whether due process requires a hearing, and (2) what procedures are required at the hearing to satisfy due process requirements. These issues generally arise with respect to agencies or procedures that are not governed by the APA or other statutes governing adjudication [*see* discussion in *§ 473.13*]. Often, statutory adjudication requirements are very specific and more stringent then constitutional due process requirements.

For a detailed discussion of federal and state constitutional due process requirements as delineated by judicial doctrine, as well as related statutory law, see Chapter 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.13

§ 473.13 The Administrative Adjudication Provisions of the APA

[1] Chapters 4.5 and 5 of the APA

Two chapters of the Government Code comprise the Administrative Adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and govern administrative adjudication generally. These chapters were enacted or revised extensively by 1995 legislation that became operative July 1, 1997 [1995 Stats, ch. 938; *see also Gov. Code §§ 11400.10(a), 11501*], and are as follows [*Gov. Code § 11400(a)*]:

- Chapter 4.5, Administrative Adjudication: General Provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*); and
- Chapter 5, Administrative Adjudication: Formal Hearings (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*).

For convenience, they are termed hereafter simply as Chapter 4.5 and Chapter 5.

The APA consists of Chapters 4.5 and 5, together with the rule making and other provisions of Chapters 3.5 (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) and 4 (*Gov. Code § 11370 et seq.*) [*see Gov. Code § 11370*]. Technically, these four chapters are not chapters of the APA itself, but are chapters within Part 1 (State Departments and Agencies) of Division 3 (Executive Department) of Title 2 (California State Government) of the Government Code.

The provisions of Chapter 4.5 are new as of July 1, 1997 [*see Gov. Code § 11400.10(a)*]. Chapter 5, which formerly contained all the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA, was significantly amended as of July 1, 1997: now it is only a part of the administrative adjudication provisions. Thus, any references in another statute or other law (rule of court, executive order, or regulation) to former provisions of Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) are to be construed to applicable provisions of Chapter 4.5 [*see Gov. Code § 11400(b)*]. *Gov. Code § 11400(b)* makes clear that references to the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA (which were previously in Chapter 5 only) are references to both Chapters 4.5 and 5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Some of the new administrative adjudication provisions are based on provisions of the "1981 Model State APA" [Model

State Administrative Procedure Act (1981), promulgated by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws; *see* 15 U.L.A. 1 (1990)], and the "Federal APA" [Federal Administrative Procedure Act (*5 U.S.C. §§ 551-583, 701*-706, 1305, 3105, 3344, 5372, 7521 and related sections)]. Section comments from the California Law Revision Commission to these new provisions of the APA often refer to these sources [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[2] Supplementary Regulations Governing Agency Adjudications

Under the new APA administrative adjudication provisions, agencies have authority to adopt, before, on, or after July 1, 1997, interim or permanent regulations to adjudicative proceedings under Chapter 4.5 or Chapter 5. However, agencies are not authorized by this section to adopt regulations to govern adjudicative proceedings required to be conducted by an administrative law judge employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings, except to the extent the regulations are otherwise authorized by statute [*Gov. Code § 11400.20(a)*].

Revisions of regulations that merely conform to the new law may be adopted by simplified procedures under the rulemaking provisions of the California APA pursuant to *1 Cal. Code Reg. § 100* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code § 11351* (which governs application of APA rulemaking procedures to the Public Utilities Commission, the Division of Worker's Compensation, and the Worker's Compensation Appeals Board), interim regulations need not comply with the provisions of Article 5 (*Gov. Code § 11346 et seq.*), entitled Public Participation: Procedure for Adoption of Regulations, and governing APA rulemaking procedures, or with the provisions of Article 6 (*Gov. Code § 11349 et seq.*), entitled Review of Proposed Regulations and governing Office of Administrative Law review of agency regulations), both part of Chapter 3.5 (Gov. Code. Code § 11340 et seq.), entitled Administrative Regulations and Rulemaking. The interim regulations must, however, comply with Chapter 3.5 in all other respects [*Gov. Code § 11400.20(b)(1)*].

The effect of these provisions is to allow agencies may adopt interim procedural regulations without the normal notice and hearing and Office of Administrative Law review processes of the rulemaking provisions of the APA. However, this does not excuse compliance with the other rulemaking provisions, including, but not limited to, requirements that:

- Regulations be consistent and not in conflict with statute and reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of the statute under *Gov. Code § 11342.2*.

- Regulations be filed and published under *Gov. Code §§ 11343-11344.9*.

- Regulations are subject to judicial review under *Gov. Code § 11350*.

Compliance with these requirements is not required for agencies exempted under *Gov. Code § 11351* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Interim regulations are only valid through December 31, 1998. They may be replaced by or readopted as permanent regulations before then, through the standard administrative rulemaking process. In case permanent regulations are pending on December 31, 1998, interim regulations may be extended up to three months. Permanent regulations governing administrative adjudication are subject to normal rulemaking procedures other than review for necessity under *Gov. Code § 11349.1* (Office of Administrative Law) or 11350 (declaratory relief) in the case of permanent regulations promulgated during the transitional period [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11400.20(b)(2)* and *(3)*].

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the rulemaking provisions of the APA, see Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .

[3] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act contract claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. Other specific regulations will be cited and discussed in subsections of Ch. 473, and in Ch 473A through Ch 473H.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingFormal Rulemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.14

§ 473.14 Definitions in the APA Administrative Adjudication Provisions

[1] Applicability of Definitions in Chapters 4.5 and 5

There are two sets of definitions that govern different aspects of administrative adjudication. The first set, part of the general adjudication provisions of Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11405.10 et seq.*) govern the construction of terms in that chapter [*Gov. Code § 11405.10*]. The second set, set out in *Gov. Code § 11500*, govern construction of terms for the formal hearing procedure under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The following list of definitions details the terms that are defined in the two sets, including when the same or similar term is defined in both sets:

- Adjudicative Proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11405.20*].
- Agency [*Gov. Code §§ 11405.30, 11500(a)*].
- Agency Head [*Gov. Code § 11405.40*], and the related term Agency Member [*Gov. Code § 11500(e)*].
- Decision [*Gov. Code § 11405.50*].
- Party [*Gov. Code §§ 11405.60, 11500(b)*], and the related term Respondent [*Gov. Code § 11500(c)*].
- Person [*Gov. Code § 11405.70*].
- Presiding Officer [*Gov. Code § 11405.80*] and the related term Administrative Law Judge [*Gov. Code § 11500(d)*].

Because Chapter 4.5 applies to adjudicative proceedings required to be conducted under Chapter 5 unless the statutes

related to the proceeding provide otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11501(c)*], the definitions in Chapter 4.5 appear to apply to proceedings under Chapter 5 to the extent that they are not inconsistent with definitions set out in Chapter 5 under *Gov. Code § 11500*.

[2] Definitions

[a] "Adjudicative Proceeding"

"Adjudicative proceeding" is defined to mean an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts pursuant to which an agency formulates and issues a decision [*Gov. Code § 11405.20*]. There is no comparable definition in Chapter 5, *Gov. Code § 11500*.

[b] "Agency"

"Agency" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean a board, bureau, commission, department, division, office, officer or other administrative unit, including the agency head, and one or more members of the agency head or agency employees or other persons directly or indirectly purporting to act on behalf of or under the authority of the agency head. To the extent it purports to exercise authority under Chapter 4.5, an administrative unit otherwise qualifying as an agency shall be treated as a separate agency even if the unit is located within or subordinate to another agency [*Gov. Code § 11405.30*].

This definition in *Gov. Code § 11405.30* is drawn from 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(1) and supplements *Gov. Code § 11000* (defining "state agency" generally). The intent of the definition is to subject as many governmental units as possible to this chapter. The definition explicitly includes the agency head and those others who act for an agency, so as to effect the broadest possible coverage. The definition also would include a committee or council. The last sentence of this definition is in part derived from Federal APA § 551(1) (1988), treating as an agency "each authority of the Government of the United States, whether or not it is within or subject to review by another agency." A similar provision in *Gov. Code § 11405.30* is used to avoid difficulty in ascertaining which is the agency in a situation where an administrative unit is within or subject to the jurisdiction of another administrative unit. An administrative unit of an agency that has no authority to issue decisions or take other action on behalf of an agency is not an "agency" within the meaning of this section [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

"Agency" is defined, for purposes of Chapter 5, to include the state boards, commissions, and officers to which this chapter is made applicable by law, except that wherever the word "agency" alone is used the power to act may be delegated by the agency, and wherever the words "agency itself" are used the power to act shall not be delegated unless the statutes relating to the particular agency authorize the delegation of the agency's power to hear and decide [*Gov. Code § 11500(a)*]. This definition was amended to reference to an enumeration of specific agencies in former Gov. Code. Code § 11501. *Gov. Code § 11501(a)* now provides that the application of Chapter 5 to the hearings of any given agency is to be determined by the statutes relating to that agency [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[c] "Agency Head"

"Agency head" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean a person or body in which the ultimate legal authority of an agency is vested, and includes a person or body to which the power to act is delegated pursuant to authority to delegate the agency's power to hear and decide [*Gov. Code § 11405.40*]. The first part of this definition is taken from Model State APA § 1-102(3). The definition of agency head is included to differentiate for some purposes between the agency as an organic entity that includes all of its employees, and those particular persons in which the final legal authority over its operations is vested. The last part of the definition is drawn from *Gov. Code § 11500(a)* (defining "agency" for purposes of Chapter 5), relating to use of the term, "agency itself," to refer to a nondelegable power to act. An agency may delegate review authority [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. There is no comparable definition of agency head in Chapter 5, *Gov. Code § 11500*.

"Agency member," a related term, is defined, for purposes of Chapter 5, to mean any person who is a member of any agency to which Chapter 5 applies and includes any person who himself or herself constitutes an agency [*Gov. Code § 11500(e)*]. For example, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) [*Veh. Code § 1500*] is headed by a Director [*Veh. Code § 1504*]. DMV must conduct license revocation and suspension hearings pursuant to the formal hearing procedures of Chapter 5 of the California APA [*Veh. Code § 11509(c)*]. In contrast, the New Motor Vehicle Board is a multimember agency, with nine members [*Veh. Code §§ 3000, 3001*], that regulates the new motor vehicle industry [*Veh. Code § 3000 et seq.*], and is part of the DMV [*Veh. Code § 3000*].

[d] "Decision"

"Decision" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean an agency action of specific application that determines a legal right, duty, privilege, immunity or other legal interest of a particular person [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(a)*]. The definition of decision in this statute does not limit the precedential effect of a decision under *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(b)(1)*], nor does it limit the authority of an agency to make a declaratory decision under *Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(b)(2)*]. There is no comparable definition in Chapter 5, *Gov. Code § 11500*.

The definition of decision in *Gov. Code § 11405.50(a)* is taken from the 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(5). The definition makes clear that it includes only legal determinations made by an agency that are of specific applicability because they are addressed to particular or named persons. More than one identified person may be the subject of a decision. Person includes legal entity and governmental subdivision under *Gov. Code § 11405.70* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

A decision includes every agency action that determines any of the legal rights, duties, privileges, or immunities of a specific, identified individual or individuals. In contrast, a regulation, as defined under *Gov. Code § 11342*, is an agency action of general application, applicable to all members of a described class. The decision definition statute should not be interpreted to expand the types of cases in which an adjudicative proceeding is required. Under *Gov. Code § 11410.10*, an adjudicative proceeding is required under Chapter 4.5 only when another statute or the constitution requires such a proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Consistent with the definition of "decision" in this statute, rate making and licensing determinations of specific application, addressed to named or particular parties such as a certain power company or a specific licensee, are decisions subject to Chapter 4.5. However, ratemaking and licensing actions of general application, addressed to all members of a described class of providers or licensees, are regulations as defined in *Gov. Code § 11342* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Furthermore, some decisions may have precedential effect under *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[e] "Party"

"Party" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to include the agency that is taking action, the person to which the agency action is directed, and any other person named as a party or allowed to appear or intervene in the proceeding. If the agency that is taking action and the agency that is conducting the adjudicative proceeding are separate proceedings, the agency that is taking action is a party and the agency that is conducting the adjudicative proceeding is not a party [*Gov. Code § 11405.60*].

The first sentence of the definition of party in *Gov. Code § 11405.60* is taken from *Gov. Code § 11500(b)* (*see below*) and 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(6). The second sentence is new [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. Person is defined in *Gov. Code § 11405.70* [*see* [g], *below*] and includes legal entity and governmental subdivisions. Under this

definition, if an officer or employee of an agency appears in an official capacity, the agency and not the person is the party. A staff division authorized to act on behalf of the agency may be a party under Chapter 4.5 because of the definition of agency [*see* [c], *above*] under *Gov Code § 11405.30* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. The definition of party in this statute does not address the question of whether a person is entitled to judicial review. Standing to seek judicial review is dealt with in other law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

"Party" is defined for purposes of Chapter 5 to include the agency, the respondent, and any other person, other than an officer or employee of the agency in his or her official capacity, who has been allowed to appear or participate in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11500(b)*]. The related term,"respondent" is defined for purposes of Chapter 5 to mean any person against whom an accusation is filed under *Gov. Code § 11503*, or against whom a statement of issues is filed under *Gov. Code § 11504* [*Gov. Code § 11500(c)*; *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* , for discussion of accusations and statements of issue].

[f] "Person"

"Person" is defined for purposes of Chapter 4.5 to include an individual, partnership, corporation, governmental subdivision or unit of a governmental subdivision, or public or private organization or entity of any character [*Gov. Code § 11405.70*].

This definition supplements the definition of person in *Gov. Code § 17*. This definition is drawn from 1981 Model State APA, § 1-102(8), and includes the trustee of a trust or other fiduciary. This definition is broader than the *Gov. Code § 17* definition of person in that it also applies to a governmental subdivision or unit. This aspect of the definition would include an agency other than the agency against which rights under this chapter are asserted by the person. Including these agencies and units of government insures, therefore, that other agencies or other governmental bodies can, for example, apply to an agency for a decision, and will be accorded all the other rights that a person has under Chapter 4.5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

There is no comparable definition of person in Chapter 5, *Gov. Code § 11500*.

[g] "Presiding Officer"

"Presiding officer" is defined for purposes of Chapter 4.5 to mean the agency head, member of the agency head, administrative law judge, hearing officer, or other person who presides in an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11405.80*]. This section is intended for drafting convenience [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. The related term, "administrative law judge," is defined for purposes of Chapter 5, to mean in individual qualified under *Gov. Code § 11502* [*Gov. Code § 11500(d)*]. See Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* , for discussion of the role of ALJ's.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.15

§ 473.15 Applicability of the APA Administrative Adjudication Provisions

[1] Applicability of Chapter 4.5

[a] Proceedings Subject to Chapter 4.5 in General

The general administrative adjudication provisions of Chapter 4.5 apply to all state agency adjudicatory proceedings that are required by statute or constitutional provision, including proceedings under Chapter 5 [*see Gov. Code § 11410.10 et seq.*; *Gov. Code § 11501(c)* (Chapter 4.5 applies to an adjudicative proceeding required to be conducted under Chapter 5, unless the statutes relating to the proceeding provide otherwise); 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* further discussion in [b] et seq., *below*].

The provisions only apply, however, to adjudicative proceeding commenced on or after July 1, 1997, or to proceedings commenced before that date but remanded from a court or other agency on or after July 1, 1997 [*Gov. Code § 11400.10(b), (c)*].

As discussed further in [b][iii] and [2], *below*, the Chapter 4.5 requirements apply to formal hearings conducted under Chapter 5, but also to other types of adjudication proceedings. For discussion of the specific provisions of Chapter 4.5 that apply generally to administrative adjudications, whether or not a formal hearing is required under Chapter 5, see *§§ 473.16* and *473.20* et seq. For detailed discussion and forms relating to Chapter 4.5 requirements in the context of a formal hearing under Chapter 5, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* . For detailed discussion and forms relating to the various alternative adjudication procedures under Chapter 4.5, (e.g., alternative dispute resolution, declaratory decision, emergency decision, and informal hearing), see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

[b] Agency Adjudication Required by Statute or Constitutional Provision

[i] General Rule

Chapter 4.5, Administrative Adjudication: General Provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) applies to a decision by an

agency if, under the federal or state Constitution or a federal or state statute, an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required for formulation or issuance of a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*; *see also* general discussion in [a], *above*].

Gov. Code § 11410.10 states the general principle that an agency must conduct an appropriate adjudicative proceeding before issuing a decision when a statute or the due process clause of the federal or state constitutions necessitates an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts. That hearing is a process in which a neutral decision maker makes a decision based exclusively on the evidence contained in a record made at the hearing or on matters officially noticed. The hearing must at least permit a party to introduce evidence, make an argument to the presiding officer, and rebut opposing evidence [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The applicability of Chapter 4.5 is the same as coverage by the existing provision for administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*, which states that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* applies only when an agency has issued a final decision "as the result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required to be given, evidence is required to be taken, and discretion in the determination of facts is vested in the [agency]." Numerous cases have applied *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* broadly to administrative proceedings in which a statute requires an "administrative appeal" or some other functional equivalent of an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts--an on-the-record or trial-type hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see, e.g., Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Educ. of Eureka City Schools (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240* (teacher's right to appeal grade change was right to hearing, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)* applies); *Chavez v. Civil Service Comm'n of Sacramento County (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 324, 150 Cal. Rptr. 197* (right of "appeal" means hearing required, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is available)].

[ii] Proceedings in Which Chapter 4.5 Does Not Apply

In many cases, statutes or the constitution call for administrative proceedings that do not rise to the level of an evidentiary hearing as defined in *Gov. Code § 11410.10*. For example, the constitution or a statute might require only a consultation or a decision that is not based on an exclusive record or a purely written procedure or an opportunity for the general public to make statements. In some cases, the agency has discretion to provide or not provide the procedure. Chapter 4.5 does not apply in those cases. Examples of cases in which the required procedure does not meet the standard of an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts are [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Report 55 (1995)]:

- Informal consultation between student and disciplinarian before brief suspension from school [*Goss v. Lopez (1975) 419 U.S. 565, 95 S. Ct. 729, 42 L. Ed. 2d 725]* .

- Informal nonadversary review of decision to place prisoner in administrative segregation, prisoner has right to file written statement [*Hewitt v. Helms (1983) 459 U.S. 460, 103 S. Ct. 864, 74 L. Ed. 2d 675]* .

- Informal opportunity for employee to respond orally or in writing to charges of misconduct prior to removal from government job [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P. 2d 774]* .

- Hearing is discretionary not mandatory, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)* is not applicable [*Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Prisoner's right to appeal decision does not require a hearing, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not applicable [*Wasko v. Department of Corrections (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 996, 1001-1002, 259 Cal. Rptr. 764]* .

Chapter 4.5 does not apply to agency action that is pursuant to statutes that do not require evidentiary hearings. Such statutes include the California Environmental Quality Act (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*), the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (*Gov. Code § 11120 et seq.*), and the California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. 55 (1995)].

Chapter 4.5 applies only to proceedings for issuing a "decision," and a decision is an agency action of specific application that determines a legal right, duty, privilege, immunity or other legal interest of a particular person under *Gov. Code § 11405.50*. Therefore, Chapter 4.5 does not apply to agency actions that do not determine a person's legal interests. Similarly, Chapter 4.5 does not apply to rulemaking, which is agency action of general applicability [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Report 55 (1995)].

Chapter 4.5 does not apply when a hearing is required by agency regulations, not a statute or the constitution. Agencies are encouraged to provide procedural protections by regulation even though not required to do so by statute or the constitution. An agency may provide an appropriate procedure for a decision for which an adjudicative proceeding is not required under *Gov. Code § 11415.50* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The Third District California Court of Appeal held that Section 98 [*Labor Code § 98*] hearings conducted by the Labor commissioner are not subject to the provisions of Chapter 4.5 of the California Administrative Procedures Act because those hearings are discretionary and not required by Section 98. Chapter 4.5 applies to agency decisions in which a hearing is required by statute or constitutional provision, and it does not apply when a hearing is not required by statute [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*; *Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 54-56, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . The court of appeal also held that an evidentiary hearing is not required by the constitution (due process of law) because an employer has the right to obtain a trial de novo in the superior court following an adverse decision from a Section 98 hearing. The trial de novo satisfies the requirements of due process of law, so that a Section 98 hearing is not required to protect the employer's due process right to protect their property interest in money [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 59-61, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . The court of appeal also rejected arguments for the application of Chapter 4.5 based on *Gov. Code § 11410.20* (listing agencies subject to Chapter 4.5) and *Gov. Code § 11410.40* (agencies may adopt provisions of Chapter 4.5 by regulation or ordinance). The listing of agencies subject to Chapter 4.5 did not resolve the issue of what agency decisions were subject to Chapter 4.5, and that issue is controlled by the hearings required by law provision of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*]. The DLSE did not properly adopt the APA when it issued a memorandum to that effect [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 56-58, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . Therefore, the Labor commissioner could not utilize the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11425.60* (precedent decision) to designate the *Hartwig* decision as a precedent decision. This is because the *Hartwig* proceeding was a Section 98 proceeding to which Chapter 4.5 did not apply, including *Gov. Code § 11425.60*. Thus, it was invalid to designate Hartwig as a precedent decision [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 65, 68, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* .

[iii] Type of Hearing When Chapter 4.5 Applies

Gov. Code § 11410.10 does not specify what type of adjudicative proceeding should be conducted. If an adjudicative proceeding is required within the meaning of this section, the proceeding may be a formal hearing procedure under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). Thus, Chapter 4.5 provisions apply to any proceeding under Chapter 5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see also* discussion in [f], *below*].

A proceeding subject to Chapter 4.5 may also governed by some other hearing procedure provided by a statute applicable to the particular proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Chapter 4.5 itself makes available several alternatives to the formal hearing procedure under Chapter 5. For example, an informal hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*], an emergency decision [*Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*], or a declaratory decision [*Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*]. *Gov. Code § 11410.10* does not prohibit the waiver of any

procedure [*Gov. Code § 11415.40*], or the settlement of any case [*Gov. Code § 11415.60*], without use of all available proceedings [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

See also discussion in [a], *above*, and [2], *below*.

[c] State Agencies Subject to Chapter 4.5

Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, Chapter 4.5 applies to all agencies of the State of California [*Gov. Code § 11410.20(a)*]. However, Chapter 4.5 does not apply to the California Legislature, the California courts or judicial branch, or the California Governor or the office of the Governor [*Gov. Code § 11410.20(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11410.20 applies Chapter 4.5 to all state agencies unless specifically excepted. The intent of this statute is to apply the provisions to as many state governmental units as possible. Subdivision (a) is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-103(a), while subdivision (b) is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(1). Exemptions from Chapter 4.5 are to be construed narrowly. *Gov. Code § 11410.20(b)* exempts the entire judicial branch, and is not limited to the courts, thus exempted agencies within the judicial branch include the Judicial Council, the Commission on Judicial Appointments, the Commission on Judicial Performance, and the Judicial Criminal Justice Planning Committee. The provision also exempts the Governor's office, and is not limited to the Governor. For an express statutory exception to this latter exemption, *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 106.5*, providing that "proceedings for removal [by the Governor of a board member in the Department of Consumer Affairs] shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, and the Governor shall have all the powers granted therein" [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports. 55 (1995)].

Chapter 4.5 does not apply to specified proceedings of the following agencies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]:

- Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 23083*; *see* Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses*].

- University of California [*Educ. Code § 92001*].

- Public Employment Relations Board [*Gov. Code §§ 3541.3, 3563*; *see* Ch. 118, *Civil Service*].

- Commission on State Mandates [*Gov. Code § 17533*].

- Agricultural Labor Relations Board [*Lab. Code § 1144.5*].

- Military Department [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 105*].

- Department of Corrections [*Penal Code § 2600*; *Department of Corrections v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 780, 786, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 903* (APA procedures are not required to be used, except for appointment of an ALJ, in Department of Correction hearings related to "involuntary administration of psychotropic medication" to prisoners)], Board of Prison Terms, Youth Authority, Youthful Offender Parole Board, and Narcotic Evaluation Authority [*Penal Code § 3006*; *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 1788, 3158*].

- Public Utilities Commission [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701*; *see* Ch. 480, *Public Utilities*].

- State Bar of California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 1701*; *see* Ch. 70, *Attorney Admission* , and Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline*].

However, see discussion in [e], *below*, of exempt agencies discretion to adopt provisions of Chapter 4.5 to govern their proceedings.

[d] Local Agencies

Local agencies are defined to mean a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, or other political subdivision or public corporation in the state other than the state [*Gov. Code § 11410.30(a)*]. Chapter 4.5 does not apply to local agencies except to the extent the provisions are made applicable by statute [*Gov. Code § 11410.30(b)*; *Southern California Underground Contractors, Inc. v. City of San Diego (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 533, 547, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527* (APA provisions apply to state agencies not local entities)]. Chapter 4.5 applies to an agency created or appointed by joint or concerted action of the state and one or more local agencies [*Gov. Code § 11410.30(c)*; *Patterson Flying Service v. California Department of Pesticide Regulation (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 411, 421-422, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 290* (provisions of chapter 4.5 apply to hearings conducted under the authority of the county agricultural commissioner, because the office of county agricultural commissioner is a local agency created or appointed by concerted action of the state and one or more local agencies. The hearing provided the opportunity for the flying service to contest a fine imposed on them for not properly following the label directions for the application of pesticides)].

Gov. Code § 11410.30 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(1). Local agencies are excluded because of the very different circumstances of local government units when compared to state bodies. This statute explicitly applies Chapter 4.5 provisions to joint state and local bodies, so as to effect the broadest possible coverage [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. The administrative adjudication provisions of the California APA are also made applicable by statute to local agencies in a number of circumstances including the following [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]:

- Suspension or dismissal of permanent employee by school district [*Educ. Code § 44944*; *see* Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues*].

- Nonreemployment of probationary employee by school district [*Educ. Code § 44948.5*].

- Evaluation, dismissal, and imposition of penalties on certificated personnel by community college district [*Educ. Code § 87679*].

See also discussion in [2], *below* (adjudicative proceeding under Chapter 5), and [f], *below* (state agency proceedings subject to Chapter 5 requirements).

[e] Adoption by Exempt Agencies

Notwithstanding any other provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10-11410.50* (relating to the application of Chapter 4.5 provisions), an agency may adopt, by regulation, ordinance, or other appropriate action, either all or part of the Chapter 4.5 provisions for the formulation of a decision, even though the agency or decision is exempt from application of Chapter 4.5 [*Gov. Code § 11410.40*].

Gov. Code § 11410.40 is new. An agency may elect to apply Chapter 4.5 even though the agency would otherwise be exempt or the particular action would otherwise be exempt [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. Exempt agencies would include specified state agencies, *see* [b], *above*, most local agencies, see [c], *above*, and agency adjudicative action when a hearing is not mandated by statute or constitutional requirements, see [a], *above*.

[f] Application of Chapter 4.5 to Agency Proceedings Under Chapter 5

Chapter 4.5 applies to an adjudicative proceeding required to be conducted under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), unless the statutes relating to the proceeding provide otherwise [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11410.50 makes clear that the provisions of Chapter 4.5 supplement the formal hearing provisions of Chapter 5. Thus, if an agency is required by statute to conduct a hearing under Chapter 5, the agency may, unless a statute provides otherwise, elect to use alternative dispute resolution or the informal hearing procedure or other appropriate provisions of Chapter 4.5. Also, the general provisions of Chapter 4.5 restricting ex parte communications, regulating precedent decisions, and other provisions, apply to a hearing under Chapter 5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* discussion in [2], *below*].

[g] Quasi-Public Entities

Quasi-public entities are defined as an entity, other than a governmental agency, whether characterized by statute as a public corporation, public instrumentality, or otherwise, that is expressly created by statute for the purpose of administration of a state function [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(a)*]. The provisions of Chapter 4.5 apply to adjudicative proceedings conducted by quasi-public entities when the following three conditions are met [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(b)*]:

- A statute vests the power of decision in the quasi-public entity [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(b)(1)*].

- A statute, the United States Constitution, or the California Constitution, requires an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts for formulation and issuance of the decision. Nothing in this section is intended to create an evidentiary hearing requirement that is not otherwise statutorily or constitutionally imposed [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(b)(2)*].

- The decision is not otherwise subject to administrative review in an adjudicative proceeding to which this chapter applies [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(b)(3)*].

Three statutory definitions are set forth for application of Chapter 4.5 to decisions by quasi-public entities [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(c)*]:

- "Agency" as defined by law [*Gov. Code § 11405.30*; *see § 473.14[2][b]*] includes quasi-public entities [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(c)(1)*].

- "Regulation" includes a rule promulgated by a public entity [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(c)(2)*].

- Language assistance requirements [*Gov. Code § 11435.05 et seq.*; *see § 473.29*] in adjudicative proceedings apply to quasi-public entities as to state agencies under *Gov. Code § 11018* [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(c)(3)*].

The requirements of *Gov. Code § 11410.60(c)* are to be strictly interpreted to carry out legislative intent to apply Chapter 4.5 only to decisions by quasi-public entities that are expressly created by statute to administer a state function [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(d)*]. The requirements of this statute do not apply to a decision made on authority of an approved plan of operation of quasi-public entities regulated or supervised by the Insurance Commissioner [*Gov. Code § 11410.60(e)*].

The Law Revision Commission comments explain the scope of this *Gov. Code § 11410.60* further: it applies Chapter 4.5 to adjudicative decisions of quasi-public entities for which an evidentiary hearing by the quasi-public entity is statutorily or constitutionally required. A typical decision of this type might involve resolution of a membership assessment protest or a hearing on a claim that has been denied (provided the statute or constitution requires a hearing for a decision of that type [*see Gov. Code Section 11405.50* ("decision" is action of specific application that determines

legal right or other legal interest of particular person)]. Chapter 4.5 does not apply to legislative actions such as an election or negotiation and adoption of a health and welfare benefits plan, pension trust, or collective bargaining agreement by an industry or labor organization [27 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 593-594 (1997)].

Gov. Code § 11410.60 does not apply to an entity unless that entity was expressly created by statute for the purpose of administering a state function. Thus Chapter 4.5 governs hearings required to be held by a statutory entity such as the Winegrowers of California Commission [*Food & Agric. Code § 74061*] or the Escrow Agents Fidelity Corporation [*Fin. Code § 17311*]. But the statute does not govern hearings of a private entity such as a licensed health care provider [*Health and Safety Code § 1200 et. seq.*], a labor organization, or a board of trustees established pursuant to statute under an interindemnity, reciprocal, or interinsurance contract between members of a cooperative corporation [*Ins. Code § 1280.7*]. *Gov. Code § 11410.60* does not apply to the State Bar, including proceedings of the State Bar court [27 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 593-594 (1997); *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6001*].

The intent of *Gov. Code § 11410.60* is to provide fair hearing rules where a statute or the constitution requires a hearing. It is not intended to create any new hearing requirements. Thus, for example, this section does not apply to a decision of the Travel Consumer Restitution Corporation where the statute requires that the claim be decided on the written record, "with no hearing to be held" [27 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 593-594 (1997); *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17550.47*].

Although *Gov. Code § 11410.60(b)* makes Chapter 4.5 inapplicable to a quasi-public entity decision if the decision is otherwise reviewable in a proceeding governed by this chapter, the quasi-public entity may voluntarily adopt the procedural protections provided in this chapter [27 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports, pp. 593-594 (1997); *see Gov. Code § 11410.40* (election to apply administrative adjudication provisions)].

[2] Applicability of Chapter 5

[a] Applicability Determined by Statutes Relating to Specific Agency

The provisions of Chapter 5, Administrative Adjudication: Formal Hearings (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), apply to any agency as determined by the statutes relating to that agency [*Gov. Code § 11501(a)*; *Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 883-885, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729* (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 24210* authorized director to appoint ALJ, who was employee of Department, to hear and decide case, and that statute was controlling under *Gov Code §§ 11501(a), 11415.10,* and *11415.20* not APA requirement contained in *Gov. Code § 11502* that ALJ's from Office of Administrative Hearings be used)]. The provisions of Chapter 5 also apply to adjudicative proceedings of an agency created on or after July 1, 1997, unless the statutes relating to the proceeding provide otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11501(b)*].

The provisions of Chapter 4.5, Administrative Adjudication: General Provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), apply to an adjudicative proceeding required to be conducted under Chapter 5, unless the statutes relating to the proceeding provide otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11501(c)*; *see* also *Gov. Code § 11410.50*, and discussion in [1][f], *above*].

Gov. Code § 11501 was amended to make Chapter 5 the default procedure, absent a contrary statute, for agencies created after July 1, 1997, the operative date of the 1995 amendments to the APA adjudication provisions. Chapter 5 is supplemented by the general provisions on administrative adjudication found in Chapter 4.5, which apply to proceedings under Chapter 5. Thus, if an agency is required by statute to conduct a hearing under Chapter 5, the agency may, unless a statute provides otherwise, elect to use alternative dispute resolution or the informal hearing procedure or other appropriate provisions of Chapter 4.5. Also, the general provisions of Chapter 4.5 restricting ex parte communications, regulating precedent decisions, and other provisions, apply to a hearing under Chapter 5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see also Gov. Code § 11502* (use of administrative law judges under Chapter 4.5)].

A listing of specific agencies to which Chapter 5 applies, found in former *Gov. Code § 11501(b)*, was deleted by the

1995 amendments as obsolete. The application of Chapter 5 to the hearings of an agency is determined by the statutes relating to that agency [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*, through Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*, discuss the applicable law governing administrative adjudication for state agencies subject to Chapter 5 requirements, including discussion of the Chapter 4.5 requirements that also apply in formal hearings that are the focus of Chapter 5.

[b] Most Licensing Agencies Are Subject to Chapter 5

Most state licensing agencies were subject to Chapter 5 requirements under the former adjudication provisions of the APA. These continue to be subject to the amended requirements of the new Chapter 5, and are now, in addition, subject to the newly added procedural requirements of Chapter 4.5.

The enabling act for each of these licensing agencies, which delineates the powers and duties for that agency, will state, in one form or another, that agency is required to follow the provisions of Chapter 5 of the California APA (*Gov. Code § 11500*) when it is conducting licensing hearings. For example, see the following list of licensing agencies (extensive but not exhaustive); the citation following each listed agency provides the statute which makes the agency subject to the provisions of Chapter 5 (and therefore also subject to Chapter 4.5 pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 11400(b), 11410.50*, and *11501(c)*):

- Medical Board of California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2230*].

- Board of Psychology (part of the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2965*].

- Physical Therapy Examining Committee of California (part of the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2660*].

- Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Examining Committee (part of the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2533.2*].

- Physician Assistant Examining Committee (part of the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 3528*].

- California Board of Podiatric Medicine (part of the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2230*].

- Board of Registered Nursing (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2750*].

- Board of Dental Examiners (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 1670, 1747*].

- California State Board of Pharmacy (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 4350(c)*].

- Board of Vocational Nurse and Psychiatric Technician Examiners (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2875* (LVN's), 4520 (LPT's)].

- Veterinary Medical Board (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 4875*].

- Osteopathic Medical Board of California (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2230*].

- Board of Chiropractic Examiners (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*16 Cal.Code Reg. § 305*].

- State Board of Accountancy (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 485*].

- Board of Architectural Examiners (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 5561.5*].

- State Board of Registration for Geologists and Geophysicists (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 485, 7861*].

- State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 495, 6776* (engineers), 8781 (land surveyors)].

- Contractors State License Board (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 495, 7091*].

- Structural Pest Control Board (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 8568, 8620*].

- Commission on Teacher Credentialing (part of State Board of Education) [*Educ. Code §§ 44244, 44246*].

- Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ *6980.30, 7510, 7591.19*].

- Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9848*].

- Bureau of Automotive Repair (within the Department of Consumer Affairs) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9884.14, 9889.1*; *Health & Safety Code §§ 44053(a), 44057*].

- Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (within Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 24016, 24300(a)*].

- Department of Real Estate (within Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10100, 10152*].

- Office of Real Estate Appraisers (within Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 485*].

- Department of Motor Vehicles (within Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency) [*Veh. Code §§ 11509(c), 11512(b), 11605(b), 11613(c), 11705(c), 11705.4(b), 11708(b), 11808, 11903(a), 14112*].

- New Motor Vehicle Board (within Department of Motor Vehicles) [*Veh. Code §§ 3066(a), 3067*].

- California Horse Racing Board [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 19461*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawInformal Agency ActionsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.16

§ 473.16 The General Adjudication Procedures of Chapter 4.5

[1] General Provisions for Application of Adjudication Procedures

[a] Adjudication Provisions Supplement Other Controlling Law

The governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding is determined by the statutes and regulations applicable to that proceeding [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 883-885, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729* (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 24210* authorized director to appoint ALJ, who was employee of Department, to hear and decide case, and that statute was controlling under *Gov Code §§ 11501(a), 11415.10,* and *11415.20* not APA requirement contained in *Gov. Code § 11502* that ALJ's from Office of Administrative Hearings be used)]. If no other governing procedure is provided by statute or regulation, an agency may conduct an adjudicative proceeding under the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11415.10(a)*]. The first sentence of *Gov. Code § 11415.10(a)* is taken from *Gov. Code § 11501(a)* (formal hearing procedure applies to agency as determined by statutes relating to agency), while the second sentence enables an agency to use the procedures provided in both Chapter 4.5 and Chapter 5, without further action, in any case where there is no other applicable governing procedure [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11400(a)* (adjudication provisions of the APA consists of Chapters 4.5, *Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*, and *5, Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*)].

Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) supplements the governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11415.10(b)*]. This provision makes clear that the provisions of Chapter 4.5 supplement whatever procedure may otherwise govern a specific agency adjudication, whether they may be the formal hearing procedures of Chapter 5 or some other governing procedural law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Some of the provisions of Chapter 4.5 are optional, for example, the informal hearing procedures of *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.*, the emergency decision procedures of *Gov. Code § 11460.10 et seq.*, and the declaratory decision procedures of *Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.* (*see* Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures* , for detailed discussion of these procedures). The agency determines whether to use any of the optional provisions. The optional provisions do not replace any other agency procedures that serve the same purpose. For example, the informal

hearing procedure provided in this chapter does not replace an agency's own informal hearing procedure, but offers a supplemental alternative. Likewise, the emergency decision procedure does not replace an agency's own procedures for interim suspension or other immediate action, but provides an alternative means of proceeding that an agency may use [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Other provisions of Chapter 4.5 are mandatory (*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11425.10*, the administrative adjudication "*bill of rights*," discussed in *§ 473.20*). The mandatory provisions govern any adjudicative proceeding to which Chapter 4.5 is applicable. Moreover, pursuant to Gov. Code § 11415.10(b), they also apply to supplement any other applicable governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding, except to the extent the mandatory provisions are inconsistent with the statutes setting out that governing procedure. In other words, Chapter 4.5 provisions are not intended to override a conflicting or inconsistent statute or inconsistent federal law that governs a particular matter [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (state or a federal statute or regulation applicable to a particular agency or proceeding prevails over a conflicting or inconsistent provision of Chapter 4.5); *see also* discussion in [b], *below* (Governor may suspend operation of a provision of Chapter 4.5 if loss or delay of federal funds would result from its application)].

[b] Governor's Limited Power to Suspend Adjudication Procedure

To the extent necessary to avoid a loss or delay of funds or services from the federal government that would otherwise be available to the state, The Governor may do any of the following by executive order [*Gov. Code § 11415.30(a)*]:

- Suspend, in whole or in part, any administrative adjudication provision of the Administrative Procedure Act [*Gov. Code § 11415.30(a)(1)*].

- Adopt a rule of procedure that will avoid the loss or delay [*Gov. Code § 11415.30(a)(2)*].

The governor must rescind an executive order issued under this statute as soon as it is no longer necessary to prevent the loss or delay of funds or services from the federal government [*Gov. Code § 11415.30(b)*]. If an administrative adjudication provision is suspended or rule of procedure is adopted under this statute, the Governor is required promptly to report the suspension or adoption to the legislature. The report shall include recommendations concerning any legislation that may be necessary to conform the provision to federal law [*Gov. Code § 11415.30(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11415.30 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-104 [*see also Gov. Code § 8571* (power of Governor to suspend statute in emergency)], but is extended to include a delay in receipt, as well as a loss, of federal funds, and actions that may be taken include provision of an alternate procedure as well as suspension of an existing procedure. The administrative adjudication provisions referred to in *Gov. Code § 11415.30* are the provisions of Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) and Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11400(a)* (providing that Chapters 4.5 and 5 are the administrative adjudication provisions of APA)].

Gov. Code § 11415.30 permits specific functions of agencies to be exempted from applicable administrative adjudication provisions of the APA only to the extent necessary to prevent the loss or delay of federal funds or services. The test to be met is simply whether, as a matter of fact, there will actually be a loss or delay of federal funds or services if there is no suspension or adoption of an alternate procedure. The suspension or adoption is effective only so long as and to the extent necessary to avoid the contemplated loss or delay [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. The governor cannot issue an executive order merely on the receipt of a federal agency certification that a suspension or adoption of an alternate procedure is necessary. The suspension or adoption must be actually necessary. That is, the Governor must first decide that the federal agency is correct in its assertion that federal funds may lawfully be delayed or withheld from the state agency if that agency complies with certain administrative adjudication provisions of the APA, and that the federal agency intends to exercise its authority to withhold or delay those funds if certain administrative adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are followed. However, if these two

requirements are met, the Governor may suspend the provision or adopt an alternate procedure [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[c] Voluntary Waiver of Rights Conferred by Adjudication Provisions

Except to the extent provided by another statute or regulation, a person may waive a right conferred on that person by the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11415.40*; *see Gov. Code § 11400(a)* (referring to Chapters 4.5, *Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*, and *5*, *Gov. Code § 11500*, as the administrative adjudication provisions of APA)].

Gov. Code § 11415.40 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-105. It embodies the standard notion of waiver, which requires an intentional relinquishment of a known right. This statute applies to all affected persons, whether or not parties. A right under the administrative adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act is subject to waiver in the same way that a right under any other civil statute is normally subject to waiver. Although a right may be waived by inaction, a written waiver is ordinarily preferable. A waiver by inaction may be the procedural result of a failure to act [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11506* (failure to file notice of defense is waiver of right to hearing)].

The administrative adjudication provisions referred to by *Gov. Code § 11415.40* are those in Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) and Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11400(a)* (Chapters 4.5 and 5 are the administrative adjudication provisions of APA)].

[d] Procedure Used When Adjudicative Proceeding not Required

An agency may provide any appropriate procedure for a decision for which an adjudicative proceeding is not required [*Gov. Code § 11415.50(a)*]. This provision is subject, of course, to other statutory law that may provide a procedure for decision in a specific agency action [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls over general provisions of Chapter 4.5)].

An adjudicative proceeding is not required for informal fact finding or an informal investigatory hearing, or a decision to initiate or not initiate an investigation, prosecution or other proceeding before the agency, another agency, or a court, whether in response to an application for an agency decision or otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11415.50(b)*]. This provision is taken in part from 1981 Model State APA § 4-101(a), and lists situations in which an agency may issue a decision without first conducting an adjudicative proceeding. For example, a law enforcement officer may, without first conducting an adjudicative proceeding, issue a "ticket" that will lead to a proceeding before an agency or court. Likewise, an agency may commence an adjudicative proceeding without first conducting a proceeding to decide whether to issue the pleading. Nothing in *Gov. Code § 11415.50(b)* implies that Chapter 4.5 applies in a proceeding in which a hearing is not statutorily or constitutionally required [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* Gov. Code. Code § 11410.10 (Chapter 4.5 applies to constitutionally and statutorily required hearings)].

[e] Agency Decision by Mutual Settlement

An agency may formulate and issue a decision by settlement, pursuant to an agreement of the parties, without conducting an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)*].

Subject to *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)* (discussed *below*), the settlement may be on any terms the parties determine to be appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)*]. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, no evidence of an offer of compromise or settlement made in settlement negotiations is admissible in an adjudicative proceeding or civil action, whether as affirmative evidence, by way of impeachment, or for any other purpose, and no evidence of conduct or statements made in settlement negotiations is admissible to prove liability for any loss or damage, except to the extent

provided in *Evid. Code § 1152*. Nothing in this subdivision makes inadmissible any public document created by a public agency [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)*].

Gov. Code § 11415.60(a) codifies the ruling in *Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455* . It is analogous to *Gov. Code § 11420.30* (confidentiality of communications in alternative dispute resolution). The parties are, of course, free to make a stipulation concerning confidentiality of offers of compromise or settlement that goes beyond or otherwise varies the protection of this statute [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *but see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (any conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)].

A settlement may be made before or after issuance of an agency pleading, except that in an adjudicative proceeding to determine whether an occupational license should be revoked, suspended, limited, or conditioned, a settlement may not be made before issuance of the agency pleading. A settlement may be made before, during, or after the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(b)*].

A settlement is subject to any necessary agency approval. An agency head may delegate the power to approve a settlement. The terms of a settlement may not be contrary to statute or regulation, except that the settlement may include sanctions the agency would otherwise lack power to impose [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)*]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)* recognizes that some other statutes provide for agency approval of a settlement. For example, see the following [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]:

- Authority of State Personnel Board to approve settlements [*Gov. Code § 18681*].
- Approval in labor standards enforcement [*Lab. Code § 98.2(d)*].
- Approval of worker's compensation settlement [*Lab. Code § 5001*].
- Approval by Governor of settlement by State Lands Commission [*Pub. Res. Code § 6107*].
- Approval of tax settlements [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7093.5, 9271, 19442, 30459.1, 32471, 40211, 41171, 43522, 45867, 50156.11, 55332*].

[2] General Procedural Provisions of Chapter 4.5

[a] Authority of Agency Head Following Decision

The agency head may do any of the following with respect to the decision of the presiding officer or the agency [*Gov. Code § 11440.10(a)*]:

- Determine to review some but not all issues, or not to exercise any review [*Gov. Code § 11440.10(a)(1)*].
- Delegate its review authority to one or more persons [*Gov. Code § 11440.10(a)(2)*].
- Authorize review by one or more persons, subject to further review by the agency head [*Gov. Code § 11440.10(a)(3)*].

By regulation an agency may mandate review, or may preclude or limit review of a decision of the presiding officer or the agency [*Gov. Code § 11440.10(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.10 is taken from *Gov. Code § 11500(a)* (power to act may be delegated by agency) and 1981

Model State APA § 4-216(a)(1)-(2). It is subject to a contrary statute that may, for example, require the agency head itself to hear and decide a specific issue [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see, e.g., Greer v. Board of Education (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 98, 111, 121 Cal. Rptr. 542* (school board, rather than hearing officer, formerly required to determine issues under Educ. Code § 13443); *see Gov. Code §§ 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls), 11500(a) (power to act may not be delegated where action required by "agency itself" under formal hearing procedure)].

[b] General Provision for Service and Notice

Service of a writing on, or giving of a notice to, a person in a procedure provided in Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) is subject to the following provisions [*Gov. Code § 11440.20*]:

- The writing or notice shall be delivered personally or sent by mail or other means to the person at the person's last known address or, if the person is a party with an attorney or other authorized representative of record in the proceeding, to the party's attorney or other authorized representative. If a party is required by statute or regulation to maintain an address with the agency, the party's last known address is the address maintained with the agency [*Gov. Code § 11440.20(a)*].

- Unless a provision specifies the form of mail, service or notice by mail may be by first class mail, registered mail, or certified mail, by mail delivery service, by facsimile transmission if complete and without error, or by other electronic means as provided by regulation, in the discretion of the sender [*Gov. Code § 11440.20(b)*].

The application of *Gov. Code § 11440.20* is limited to the procedures in Chapter 4.5. It does not, for example, apply to formal hearing procedures under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), which include their own notice and service provisions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11505*].

Gov. Code § 11440.20(b) authorizes delivery by a commercial delivery service as well as by the United States Postal Service. Proof of service may be made by any appropriate method, including proof in the manner provided for civil actions or proceedings [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.306(h)* (proof of service by facsimile transmission); for general discussion and forms relating to proof of service, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[c] Conduct of Hearing by Electronic Means

The presiding officer is permitted to conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means if each participant in the hearing has an opportunity to participate in and to hear the entire proceeding while it is taking place and to observe exhibits [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(a)*]. The presiding officer may not conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means if a party objects [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.30(a) is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-211(4), allowing the presiding officer to conduct all or part of the hearing by telephone, televisions, or other electronic means, such as a telephone conference call. The opportunity to observe exhibits includes a reasonable opportunity to examine and object to exhibits before or at the hearing. While *Gov. Code § 11440.30(a)* permits the conduct of proceedings by telephone, television, or other electronic means, the presiding officer may of course conduct the proceeding in the physical presence of all participants [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[d] Sexual Conduct Evidence in Sexual Harassment, Sexual Assault, or Sexual Battery Proceedings

In employment discrimination and harassment cases [*see Gov. Code § 12940(h), (i)*], civil service discipline cases [*see*

Gov. Code § 19572], and civil service discrimination cases [*see Gov. Code § 19702*], alleging conduct that constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery, evidence of specific instances of a complainant's sexual conduct with individuals other than the alleged perpetrator is subject to the following limitations:

- Evidence is not discoverable, unless it is to be offered at a hearing to attack the credibility of the complainant [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(a)(1)* (only the scope of discovery is limited, not the methods of discovery)].

- Evidence is not admissible at the hearing, unless offered to attack the credibility of the complainant [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(a)(2)*].

- Reputation or opinion evidence regarding the sexual behavior of the complainant is not admissible for any purpose. At the hearing, this evidence is presumed inadmissible absent an offer of proof that establishes both of the following [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(b)*]:

  - The relevance and reliability of the offered evidence; and

  - The probative value of the evidence offered is not substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will create substantial danger of undue prejudice or confuse the issue.

"Complainant" is defined to mean a person claiming to have been subjected to conduct that constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.40 applies not only to agency hearings under Chapter 5 (formal hearing provisions; *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), but also to agency hearings subject to Chapter 4.5 (general and alternative hearing provisions; *Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. These include state agency (*Gov. Code § 11410.20*) hearings when under the federal or state constitution, or a federal or state statute, an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required to formulate and issue a decision [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *Gov. Code § 11410.10*; *see Evid. Code §§ 783, 1106* (similar privileges that apply to court proceedings)].

[e] Intervention Procedures

[i] Intervention Allowed When Permitted by Regulation

Gov. Code § 11440.50 provides for intervention in adjudicative proceedings. This intervention provision applies to the adjudicative proceedings of a state agency only if that agency provides by regulation that *Gov. Code § 11440.50* applies to that agency's proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(a)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.50(a) makes clear that it does not apply to a proceeding unless an agency has acted to make it applicable. This statute provides an optional means by which an agency can provide for intervention. This statute does not provide an exclusive intervention procedure, and an agency may adopt other intervention rules or may preclude intervention entirely, subject to due process limitations [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[ii] Motion for Intervention

When the intervention procedures have been made applicable, intervention decisions are made by the presiding officer (*see Gov. Code § 11405.80*, defining presiding officer) in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)-(e)*].

The prospective intervenor must make a motion for intervention to the presiding officer. The motion must be granted by

the presiding officer if four conditions are satisfied [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1)-(4)*]:

- The motion must be submitted in writing, and copies must be served on all parties identified in the agency's pleading [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1)*].

- The motion should be made as early as practicable in advance of the hearing, and, if there is a prehearing conference [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5*], then the motion should be made in advance of the prehearing conference and should be resolved at the prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(2)*].

- The motion must establish that the proposed intervenor qualifies as an intervenor either under a statute or regulation, or by stating facts that demonstrate that the proposed intervenor's legal rights, duties, privileges, or immunities will be substantially affected by the proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(3)*].

- The presiding officer must determine that allowing the intervention will not impair the interests of justice as well as the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(4)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1) is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-209(a). It provides that the presiding officer must grant the motion to intervene if a party satisfies the standards of the section. *Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(3)* confers standing on an applicant to intervene on demonstrating that the applicant's "legal rights, duties, privileges, or immunities will be substantially affected by the proceeding" [*see Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134* (right to notice and hearing if agency action will constitute substantial deprivation of property rights)]. However, *Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(4)* imposes the further limitation that the presiding officer may grant the motion for intervention only on determining that "the interests of justice and the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding will not be impaired by allowing the intervention." The presiding officer is thus required to weigh the impact that the proceeding will have on the legal rights of the applicant for intervention, as opposed to against the interests of justice and the need for orderly and prompt proceedings [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[iii] Conditional Intervention

When a proposed intervenor qualifies for intervention, conditions on the intervenor's participation in the proceedings can be imposed by the presiding officer, either when the intervention motion is granted, or at a later time [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)*]. *Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)* is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-209(c); it authorizes the presiding officer to impose conditions on the intervenor's participation in the proceeding and is intended to permit the presiding officer to facilitate reasonable intervenor involvement without subjecting the proceeding to unreasonably burdensome or repetitious presentations [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comments, 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. 55 (1995)]. Conditions may include the following [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(1)-(4)*]:

- Limiting the intervenor's participation to designated issues in which the intervenor has a particular interest demonstrated by the motion [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(1)*].

- Limiting or excluding the use of discovery, cross-examination, and other procedures involving the intervenor so as to promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(2)*].

- Requiring two or more intervenors to combine their presentations of evidence and argument, cross-examination, discovery, and other participation in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(3)*].

- Limiting or excluding the intervenor's participation in settlement negotiations [*Gov. Code §*

11440.50(c)(4)].

[iv] Order Granting or Denying Motion

The procedures for intervention orders require the presiding officer to issue an order either granting or denying the intervention motion, specifying any conditions in the order, and briefly stating the reasons for the order as early as practicable in advance of the hearing. The intervention order can be modified at any time by the presiding officer, who must state reasons for the modification. The presiding officer must give prompt notice of all intervention orders, whether granting, denying, or modifying intervention, to all parties to the proceeding, and to the proposed intervenor [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(d)*]. *Gov. Code § 11440.50(d)* is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-209(d). By requiring advance notice of the presiding officer's order granting, denying, or modifying intervention, this provision is intended to give the parties and the applicant's for intervention an opportunity to prepare for the adjudicative proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[v] Order Not Reviewable

The presiding officer's determination as to intervention motions is not subject to administrative or judicial review. It is to be made in light of the two standards for determining intervention motions: whether the interests of justice and the prompt and orderly conduct of the proceedings will be impaired by allowing intervention. The determination is made in the sole discretion, and based on the knowledge and judgment at that time, of the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(e)*].

[vi] Adoption of Alternatives to Intervention

Agencies are not prohibited by *Gov. Code § 11440.50* from adopting regulations that permit participation by a person short of intervention as a party, subject to the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11430.10 et seq.* (governing ex parte communications) [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(f)*]. *Gov. Code § 11440.50(f)* recognizes that there are ways whereby an interested person can have an impact on an ongoing adjudication without assuming the substantial litigation costs of becoming a party and without unnecessarily complicating the proceeding through the addition of more parties. Agency regulations may provide, for example, for filing amicus briefs, testifying as a witness, or contributing to the fees of a party [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[f] Written Communications

Any person submitting a written communication, which is specifically generated for the purpose of being presented at the agency hearing to which it is being communicated, to a state agency in a quasi-judicial proceeding that is directly paid for by anyone other then the person who submitted the written communication shall clearly indicate any person who paid to produce the written communication [*Gov. Code § 11440.60(b)*]. A state agency may refuse or ignore a written communication submitted by an attorney or any other authorized representative on behalf of a client in a quasi-judicial proceeding, unless the written communication clearly indicates the client on whose behalf the communication is submitted to the state agency [*Gov. Code § 11440.60(c)*].

Controlling definitions for this disclosure requirement are as follows:

- "Written communication" is defined to mean any report, study, survey, analysis, letter, or any other document [*Gov. Code § 11440.60(a)(2)*].

- "Quasi-judicial" proceeding is defined to include a proceeding to determine the rights or duties of a person under existing laws, regulations, or policies; a proceeding involving the issuance, amendment, or revocation of a permit or license; a proceeding to enforce compliance with existing law or to impose sanctions for violations of existing law; a proceeding at which action is taken involving the purchase or

sale or property, goods, or services by an agency; or a proceeding at which an action is taken awarding a grant or a contract [*Gov. Code § 11440.60(a)(1)*].

[3] Other Provisions in Chapter 4.5

For discussion of other general agency adjudication procedures provided for in Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), see the following:

- The administrative adjudication "*bill of rights*" [*see § 473.20* et seq.].

- Procedures that may be used instead of the formal hearing procedures of Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), i.e., alternative dispute resolution (*Gov. Code § 11420.10 et seq.*), informal hearing and decision (Gov. Code § 1145.10 et seq.), emergency decision (*Gov. Code § 11460.10 et seq.*), declaratory decision (*Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.*), and conversion of proceeding from one type to another (*Gov. Code § 11470.10 et seq.*) [*see* Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingWaiverAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsAdministrative LawInformal Agency Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Adjudication in General

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473.17-473.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473.17[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.20

§ 473.20 Summary of Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

The administrative adjudication "*bill of rights*," *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*, and specifically *Gov. Code § 11425.10*, specifies the minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied in a hearing that is subject to Chapter 4.5 (*see* discussion in *§ 473.15[1]*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

These requirements are [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(1)-(9)*]:

- The agency shall give the person to which the agency action is directed notice and an opportunity to be heard [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(1)*; *see § 473.21*].

- The agency shall make available to the person to which the agency action is directed a copy of the governing procedure, including a statement whether Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) is applicable to the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(2)*; *see § 473.22*].

- The hearing shall be open to public observation as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.20* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(3)*; *see § 473.23*].

- The adjudicative function shall be separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within the agency as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.30* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(4)*; *see § 473.24*].

- The presiding officer is subject to disqualification for bias, prejudice, or interest as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.40* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(5)*; *see § 473.25*].

- The decision shall be in writing, be based on the record, and include a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.50* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(6)*; *see § 473.26*].

- A decision may not be relied on as precedent unless the agency designates and indexes the decision as precedent as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(7)*; *see § 473.27*].

- Ex parte communications shall be restricted as provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.10* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(8)*; *see § 473.28*].

- Language Assistance shall be made available as provided in *Gov. Code § 11435.05* by an agency described in *Gov. Code § 11018* or *11435.15* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(9)*; *see § 473.29*].

The requirements of *Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)* apply to the governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding without further action by the agency, and they prevail over a conflicting or inconsistent provision of the governing procedure, subject to *Gov. Code § 11415.20* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(b)*]. The governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding may, however, include provisions equivalent to, or more protective of the rights of the person to which the agency action is directed than, the requirements of this section [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(b)*].

Under *Gov. Code § 11425.10 (b)*, the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)* are self executing, they are part of the governing procedure by which an agency conducts an adjudicative proceeding whether or not regulations address the matter. The section does not, however, override conflicting or inconsistent state statutes, or federal statutes or regulations [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1996); *see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)].

If the governing procedure includes regulations that are at variance with the requirements of this section, it is desirable, but not necessary, that the agency revise the regulations. The requirements of this section apply regardless of the regulations. Conforming regulations may be adopted by a simplified procedure under the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act pursuant to *1 Cal. Code Reg. § 100*. Nothing in this section precludes the agency from adopting additional or more extensive requirements than those prescribed by this section [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1996)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.21

§ 473.21 Notice and Opportunity to Be Heard

The agency is required to give the person to which the agency action is directed notice and an opportunity to be heard [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(1)*; *Southern California Underground Contractors, Inc v. City of San Diego (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 533, 547, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527* (provisions of Section 11425.10 apply to state agencies not local entities)]. This is a fundamental requirement of procedural due process of law [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287]* . Since this right is fundamental to fair procedure, it is applicable to all state agency hearings that are subject to Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) and Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*).

The operator of a nude entertainment establishment was not denied any due process of law rights by the decision of the City of San Diego to suspend the operator's required police permit because the operator violated provisions of city regulations that applied to his business. The California Court of Appeal rejected the operator's due process challenge based on untimely notice of the charged violations. Notice regarding most of the violations was given within two weeks of the date of the violation. Delay in the giving notice of the violations did not cause any actual prejudice to the operator, and there was no showing of lost witnesses or other evidence. The operator had the burden of proof of showing actual prejudice from delay, and there was no such proof. Finally, the suspension was based on numerous violations over an extended period of time, and the operator had more than sufficient notice of those violations [*Krontz v. City of San Diego (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1140-1141, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 535]* .

The specific details of notice requirements vary. *Gov. Code § 11440.20* governs notice requirements in adjudicative proceedings that are subject to Chapter 4.5, but not Chapter 5 proceedings [*see § 473.16[2][b]*, for discussion of specific procedural requirements for service and notice under *Gov. Code § 11440.20*]. *Gov. Code §§ 11505, 11506, 11509* govern notice requirements in adjudicative proceedings that are subject to Chapter 5 [*see § 473A.11[6], [10]*, for discussion of specific procedural requirements in adjudicative proceedings that are subject to Chapter 5].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessConstitutional LawBill of

RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.22

§ 473.22 Right to a Copy of Governing Procedure

The agency is required to make available to the person to which the agency action is directed a copy of the governing procedure, including a statement whether Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) is applicable to the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(2)*].

Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(2) requires only that the agency "make available" a copy of the applicable hearing procedure. This requirement is subject to a rule of reasonableness in the circumstances and does not necessarily require the agency routinely to provide a copy to a person each time agency action is directed to the person. The requirements may be satisfied, for example, by the agency's offer to provide a copy on request [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.23

§ 473.23 Public Hearing

An additional procedural right is that the hearing shall be open to public observation as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.20* [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(a)(3)*; 11425.20(a)]. However, the presiding officer has express authority to order closure of a hearing or make other protective orders to the extent necessary or proper [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)*] for any of the following purposes:

- To satisfy the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, federal or state statute, or other law, including but not limited to laws protecting privileged, confidential, or other protected information [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(1)*]. This exception includes statutory protection of trade secrets and other confidential information or privileged information under such statutes as, for example, Evid. Code §§ 1060-1063, Fin. Code §§ 1939, 16120, and 18496 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

- To ensure a fair hearing in the circumstances of the particular case [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(2)*].

- To conduct the hearing, including the manner of examining witnesses, in a way that is appropriate to protect a minor witness or a witness with a developmental disability, as defined in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 4512*, from intimidation or other harm, taking into account the rights of all persons [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(3)*]. This exception codifies part of the decision of *Seering v. Department of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* . The rights of persons taken into account includes the rights of the parties to observe the proceedings in an appropriate manner [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Under the new act, when a hearing is conducted by telephone, television, or other electronic means [*see Gov. Code § 11512(d)* (with consent of all parties, hearing proceedings may be reported electronically), discussed in *§ 473.16[2][c]*], the public hearing procedural requirements are satisfied if members of the public have an opportunity to do both of the following [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)*]:

- At reasonable times, hear or inspect the agency's record, and inspect any transcript obtained by the

agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)(1)*].

- To be physically present at the place where the presiding officer is conducting the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)(2)*].

The right of the public to be present where a hearing is being conducted telephonically does not include the right to participate, and the right of the public to inspect the record does not impose a duty on the agency to provide a copy independent of the California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Presiding officers have authority to conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means (such as a conference telephone call) if each participant in the hearing has an opportunity to participate in and to hear the entire proceeding while it is taking place and to observe exhibits [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(a)*]. The presiding officer also has the authority to conduct the hearing in the physical presence of all participants [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. If any party objects, the presiding officer may not conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11440.30 supplements the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, *Gov. Code § 11120 et seq.* (discussed in Ch. 470B, *Open Meeting Law*). Closure of a hearing should be done only to the extent necessary under this section, taking into account the substantial public interest in open proceedings. It should be noted that under the open meeting law deliberations on a decision to be reached based on evidence introduced in an adjudicative proceeding may be made in closed session [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11126(d)*]. Under the open meeting law, a settlement proposal may be considered by the agency in closed session if it sustains its substantial burden of showing the prejudice to be suffered from conducting an open meeting [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11126(d), (q)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPublic MeetingsSunshine LegislationConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionEvidencePrivilegesTrade SecretsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.24

§ 473.24 Separation of Function Between Prosecutors and Adjudicators

The adjudicative function shall be separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within the agency as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.30* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(4)*].

Gov. Code § 11425.30, in turn, requires internal separation of functions within an agency, which means that the same individual within an agency can not perform inconsistent functions in the same case before the agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.30*]. This section provides that a presiding officer [*see Gov. Code § 11405.80* (defining presiding officer)] is disqualified from presiding in an adjudicative proceeding [*see Gov. Code § 11405.20* (defining adjudicative proceeding)] in the following two situations:

- The person has served as investigator, prosecutor, or advocate in the proceeding or its preadjudicative stage [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(a)(1)*].

- The person is subject to the authority, direction, or discretion of a person who has served as investigator, prosecutor, or advocate in the proceeding or its preadjudicative stage [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(a)(2)*].

Serving means that the person has personally carried out the function and not merely supervised or been organizationally connected with a person who has personally carried out the function. Substantial involvement in a case is required, not merely marginal or trivial participation. What is disqualifying is meaningful participation that is likely to affect an individual with a commitment to a particular result in a case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

However, a presiding officer is not disqualified in the following two circumstances:

- A person may serve as presiding officer in successive stages of an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(b)(1)*].

- A person who has participated only as a decisionmaker or as an advisor to a decisionmaker in a

> determination of probable cause or other equivalent preliminary determination in an adjudicative proceeding or its preadjudicative stage may serve as presiding officer in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(b)(2)*].

The first exception allows a decisionmaker to act in a similar capacity at both the probable cause and final hearing stages. However, the person can not be the decisionmaker at the hearing stage if the person acted in a prosecutorial, investigative, or advocacy role at the probable cause stage [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. Finally, these separation of functions requirements apply also to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(c)*].

Separation of functions is also required as a matter of due process of law when local agency adjudicators decide whether to renew business licenses. A city attorney who acted as an advocate for the city urging nonrenewal of a business license at the application stage could not, consistent with due process of law, act as an advisor to the city manager who decided the business's administrative appeal from the denial of the application and acted as an adjudicative decision maker. This violated the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker [*Nightlife Partners LTD. v. City of Beverly Hills (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 81, 97-98, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 234]* . Similarly, a city attorney who acted as an advocate for the city in a lawsuit brought by a terminated city employee could not also, consistent with due process of law court, act as a decision maker, in the employee's administrative appeal of their termination, which was officially decided by the city manager but in which the city attorney prepared the recommended decision which the city attorney followed [*Walker v. City of Berkeley (9th Cir. 1991) 951 F. 2d 182, 185]* . A terminated police officer challenged the fairness of the administrative hearing before the personnel board of the city on due process of law grounds because the same lawyer who represented the city (Santa Ana) as an advocate in the administrative hearing also had acted as an advisor to the personnel board (the adjudicative decision maker) in other cases, although the lawyer did not act in such a dual capacity in this particular case. The court of appeal held that this was sufficient to show the probability of actual bias, based on the influence that the attorney would have with the board because of the advisory role the attorney played, such that the board would be more likely to believe the attorney for the police department than to believe the plaintiff. The board should not have allowed its legal advisor to act as an advocate before that same board because this creates a substantial risk that the board's judgment will be influenced in favor of the litigant represented by their legal advisor. The employee's right to an impartial decision maker is violated. The court of appeal reversed the judgment terminating the police officer, and remanded the proceeding back to the local agency for a new hearing [*Quintero v. City of Santa Ana (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 810, 816-818, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 896]* . None of the local agencies in these cases was subject to the California APA, which is limited to state agencies.

The due process of law right to cross examine witnesses is not violated in a rent review board hearing proceeding where the issues in the proceeding and the hearing record was based primarily on documentary evidence and reports from experts on both sides in the litigation for which there was no need to test credibility since the issues in the case did not turn on live witness testimony [*Stardust Mobile Estates v. City of San Buenaventura (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1170, 1189-1190, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 218]* . The Court of Appeal also rejected procedural due process challenges based on the lack of discovery and based on conflicting advocacy and advisory roles by outside counsel for the rent board. The court concluded that discovery in mandate proceedings was limited because judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandamus) was based on the hearing record before the agency. The Court of Appeal rejected the conflicting roles defense of unconstitutional bias even though the lawyer in question had advised the rent board. The court distinguished the *Nightlife* case [*Nightlife Partners. v. City of Beverly Hills (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 81, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 234]* factually because the reviewing body in the *Nightlife* case was the city (which the lawyer did advise) and here the reviewing body was the superior court (whom the lawyer did not advise). The defense was rejected because the agency outside counsel did not advise the superior court at the same time as his law firm was acting as an advocate defending the city in the mandamus proceeding before the court [*Stardust Mobile Estates v. City of San Buenaventura (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1170, 1189-1190, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 218]* .

Another California Court of Appeal rejected a due process of law challenge in a *Skelly* [*Skelly v. State Personnel*

Board (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 539 P.2d 774] hearing context based upon the practice that the same public employee that investigated and then initiated the employee discipline proceeding also acted as the *Skelly* [*Skelly v. State Personnel Board (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 539 P.2d 774]* hearing officer. That same employee also made the recommendation that the employee be discharged. There was no due process of law violation because the agency hearing procedure after the *Skelly* [*Skelly v. State Personnel Board (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 539 P.2d 774]* hearing included the following elements: another supervisor imposed the penalty, there was a full evidentiary hearing before a neutral hearing examiner, and there was review of the hearing examiners decision by the civil service commission board [*Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 272, 282-283, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 458]* .

This provision, dealing with the extent to which a person may serve as presiding officer at different stages of the same proceeding, should be distinguished from *Gov. Code § 11430.10*, which prohibits certain ex parte communications. The policy issues regarding ex parte communications between two persons differ from the policy issues in this provision regarding the participation by one individual in two stages of the same proceeding. There may be other grounds for disqualification, however, in the event of improper ex parte communications [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11430.60* (disqualification of presiding officer), 11425.40 (disqualification of presiding officer for bias, prejudice, or interest); *see* discussion in *§ 473.25*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityParticipation in ProsecutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.25

§ 473.25 Disqualification of Presiding Officer for Bias, Interest, or Prejudice

The presiding officer is subject to disqualification for bias, prejudice, or interest as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.40* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(5)*].

The APA "impartial decision maker" standard of *Gov. Code § 11425.40* states that the presiding officer (*see Gov. Code § 11405.80*, defining presiding officer) is subject to disqualification for bias, prejudice, or interest in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(a)*]. Other than that general language, no specific disqualification standards are stated.

However, the following grounds are specified as not sufficient for disqualification [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)*]:

- The presiding officer is or is not a member of a racial, ethnic, religious, sexual, or similar group and the proceeding involves the rights of that group [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(1)*].

- The presiding officer has experience, technical competence, or specialized knowledge of, or has in any capacity expressed a view on, a legal, factual, or policy issue presented in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(2)*].

- The presiding officer has, as a lawyer or public official, participated in the drafting of laws or regulations or in the effort to pass or defeat laws or regulations, the meaning, effect, or application of which is in issue in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(3)*].

These three non-disqualification grounds are taken from similar language in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.2*. The law revision comments note, as to the second ground, that expressions on views may lead to disqualification under *Gov. Code § 11425.30* (neutrality of presiding officer) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. These provisions governing disqualification also apply to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11425.40 applies in all administrative adjudications subject to Chapter 4.5, including a hearing under

Chapter 5 (formal hearing). It supersedes a provision formerly found in *Gov. Code § 11512(c)*. It applies whether the presiding officer serves alone or with others [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.26

§ 473.26 Written Decision Stating Factual and Legal Basis

An administrative adjudication decision must be in writing, be based on the record, and include a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.50* [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(a)(6), 11425.50(a)*].

The statement of the factual basis for the decision may be in the language of, or by reference to, the pleadings. If the statement is no more than mere repetition or paraphrase of the relevant statute or regulation, the statement shall be accompanied by a concise and explicit statement of the underlying facts of record that support the decision. If the factual basis for the decision includes a determination based substantially on the credibility of a witness, the statement shall identify any specific evidence of the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports the determination, and on judicial review the court shall give great weight to the determination to the extent the determination identifies the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports it [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(b)*]. A trial court is required to give great weight to credibility determinations of state agency hearing officers under *Gov. Code § 11425.50(b)*, even when it conducts an independent review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Fukuda v. City of Angels Camp (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 819, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693* ; *Mason v. Office of Administrative Hearings (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1119, 1138-1139, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102* (court of appeal reversed trial court decision which had reversed decision of ALJ which had detailed fact findings. The court of appeal's reversal, relying heavily on *Fukuda*, was based on the failure of petitioner to meet the burden of proof of showing that the administrative findings were contrary to the weight of the evidence in a developmental disabilities case in which there was detailed expert testimony of physicians and psychologists)]. ALJ credibility determinations that are unrelated to witness demeanor, manner or attitude are not entitled to special weight in reviewing the administrative record for substantial evidence, and *Gov. Code § 11425.50* is not applicable in these circumstances. ALJ credibility determinations are unrelated when the ALJ does not identify observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness [*California Youth Authority v. State Personnel Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 575, 579-580, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514]* .

The California Court of Appeal reversed the Board's (ABC Board) decision which had reversed a license suspension decision of the department (Dept. ABC) based on fact finding by the ALJ that the licensee did not reasonably rely on a fake ID to sell alcoholic beverages to an underage buyer, a violation of the alcohol control laws. The Court of Appeals

reversal was based on deference to the ALJ's findings of fact which were based on the ALJ's observations of physical evidence (the fake ID) at the hearing. Both the Court of Appeals, and the Board were required to give deference to the ALJ's fact finding [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1445-1446, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 826]* .

The statement of the factual basis for the decision shall be based exclusively on the evidence of record in the proceeding and on matters officially noticed in the proceeding. The presiding officer's experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge may be used in evaluating evidence [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(c)*; *Vinson v. Snyder (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 182, 186-188, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (presiding officer may use his or her experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge to evaluate evidence without establishing the officer's basis for expertise in the record)].

The information that may be contained in the decision, including a summary of the evidence relied on, is not limited by the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11425.50* [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(d)*].

Finally, a penalty may not be based on a guideline, criterion, bulletin, manual, instruction, order, standard of general application or other rule subject to the rulemaking provisions of Chapter 3.5, Administrative Regulations and Rulemaking (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), unless it has been adopted as a regulation pursuant to those provisions [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(e)*; *see* Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* , for discussion of the agency decision process in formal hearings under Chapter 5].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.27

§ 473.27 Agency Decision Must Be Designated to Be Precedent Authority

An agency adjudicative decision may not be relied on as precedent unless the agency designates and indexes that decision as precedent as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(a)(7), 11425.60(a)*]. In other words, an agency decision may not be expressly relied on as precedent unless it is designated as a precedent decision by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(a)*]. The effect of *Gov. Code § 11425.60(a)* is to limit the authority of an agency to rely on any previous decision unless that decisions has been publicly announced as one having precedential authority [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1997)].

An agency may designate as a precedent decision a decision or part of a decision that contains a significant legal or policy determination of general application that is likely to recur. Designation of a decision or part of a decision as a precedent decision is not rulemaking and need not be done under Chapter 3.5 (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), the rulemaking procedures of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(b)*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , et seq., for discussion and forms relating to APA rule making procedures].

Gov. Code § 11425.60(b) provision provides recognition for the need that agencies have to be able to make law and policy through adjudication as well as through rulemaking. It codifies the practice of a number of agencies to designate important decisions as precedential. These agencies include the Fair Employment and Housing Commission [*Gov. Code § 12935(h)*], the State Personnel Board [*Gov. Code § 19582.5*], and the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*]. *Gov. Code § 11425.60* is intended to encourage agencies to articulate what they are doing when they make new law or policy in an adjudicative decision. An agency may not by precedent decision revise or amend an existing regulation or adopt a rule that has no adequate legislative basis [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The precedent designation system authorized by this statute is an exception from the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11340.5* (prohibiting "underground regulations" [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995) (*see* 1993 OAL Det. No. 1 (ruling by Office of Administrative Law that agency designation of decision as precedential violated former Gov. Code. Code § 11347.5 (*now see Gov. Code § 11340.5*) unless made pursuant to rulemaking procedures))]. Nonetheless, agencies are encouraged to express precedent decisions in the form of regulations, to the extent practicable [25 Cal. L.

Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

An agency's designation of a decision, or part of a decision, or failure to designate a decision or part of a decision, as a precedent decision is not subject to judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(b)*].

An agency is required to maintain an index of significant legal and policy determinations made in precedent decisions. The index must be updated at least annually, unless no precedent decision has been designated since the last preceding update. The index shall be made available to the public by subscription, and its availability shall be publicized annually in the California Regulatory Notice Register [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(c)*]. The index is a public record, available for public inspection and copying [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The statutory requirements for designating and indexing precedent decisions applies to decisions issued on or after July 1, 1997. Agencies are not precluded by this law from designating and indexing as a precedent decision a decision issued before July 1, 1997 [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(d)*]. Making the precedent decision requirements prospective only is designed to minimize the potential burden on agencies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Report 55 (1995)].

Gov. Code § 11425.60 limits the authority of an agency to rely on previous decisions unless the decisions have been publicly announced as precedential [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

The Third District California Court of Appeal held that Section 98 [*Labor Code § 98*] hearings conducted by the Labor commissioner are not subject to the provisions of Chapter 4.5 of the California Administrative Procedures Act because those hearings are discretionary and not required by Section 98. Chapter 4.5 applies to agency decisions in which a hearing is required by statute or constitutional provision, and it does not apply when a hearing is not required by statute [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*; *Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 54-56, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . The court of appeal also held that an evidentiary hearing is not required by the constitution (due process of law) because an employer ha the right to obtain a trial de novo in the superior court following an adverse decision from a Section 98 hearing. The trial de novo satisfies the requirements of due process of law, so that a Section 98 hearing is not required to protect the employer's due process right to protect their property interest in money [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 59-61, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . The court of appeal also rejected arguments for the application of Chapter 4.5 based on *Gov. Code § 11410.20* (listing agencies subject to Chapter 4.5), and *Gov. Code § 11410.40* (agencies may adopt provisions of Chapter 4.5 by regulation or ordinance). The listing of agencies subject to Chapter 4.5 did not resolve the issue of what agency decisions were subject to Chapter 4.5, and that issue is controlled by the hearings required by law provision of the APA [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*]. The DLSE did not properly adopt the APA when it issued a memorandum to that effect [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 56-58, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . Therefore, the Labor commissioner could not utilize the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11425.60* (precedent decision) to designate the *Hartwig* decision as a precedent decision. This is because the *Hartwig* proceeding was a Section 98 proceeding to which Chapter 4.5 did not apply, including *Gov. Code § 11425.60*. Thus, it was invalid to designate *Hartwig* as a precedent decision [*Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 65, 68, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.28

§ 473.28 Prohibition on Ex Parte Communications

[1] General Prohibition

Ex parte communications must be restricted as provided *Gov. Code § 11430.10* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(8)*]. The general prohibition of *Gov. Code § 11430.10* is that, while a proceeding is pending, there shall be no communication, direct or indirect, regarding any issue in the proceeding, to the presiding officer from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party or from an interested person outside the agency, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*].

The Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control violated the ex parte contact provisions of the California Administrative Procedures Act [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*] by following the practice of having the department prosecutor prepare a hearing report after the hearing and issuance of a proposed decision by the Administrative Law Judge and then submitting that report to the chief counsel of the Department before a final decision was reached by the director of the Department in that case [*Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 4-6, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145 P.3d 462]* . The prosecutor's hearing report contained summaries of the issues and evidence presented at the hearing by the prosecutor as well as a recommended resolution of the case with supporting reasons. The report was submitted by the department prosecutor (who had represented the department at an evidentiary hearing before an ALJ) on an ex parte basis to the Chief Counsel of the Department, the prosecutor's supervisor, and the decision making advisor to the Director of the department. The report was not made part of the record in the case, and the report was not served on counsel for the affected licensee. In each of the adjudicatory hearing matters in which this practice was challenged, the ALJ issued a proposed decision dismissing the accusation against an alcoholic beverage licensee (e.g., for selling alcoholic beverages to underage customers), and the Director of the Department rejected that proposed decision, and substituted a department decision suspending the licenses of the licensees for a period of time (15 to 25 days) [*Dept. of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 6-8, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145 P.3d 462]* . The ban on ex parte contacts is designed to ensure a limited internal separation of functions between prosecutorial and decision-making employees who work for a single agency that combines both prosecution and adjudication in the same agency [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 9-11, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145*

P.3d 462] . The California Supreme Court held that the ban on ex parte contacts applies to communications with both presiding officers and agency heads, and includes both the hearing stage and the decision stage of the adjudication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*]. The California Supreme Court ordered the reversal of the Department decisions ordering the suspension of alcoholic beverage licenses in these cases [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 16-18, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145 P.3d 462]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control violated provisions of the California Administrative Procedures Act [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*] because the Department prosecutor sent an ex parte communication (prosecutor's hearing report) to the department decision maker prior to the time the decision maker decided whether or not to adopt the proposed decision of the administrative law judge [*Chevron Stations Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 116, 127, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* . The Court of Appeal in Chevron Stations relied upon the decision of the California Supreme Court in the Quintenar case [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 4-6, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145 P. 3d 462* (Department rejected ALJ proposed decision)]. The Court of Appeal held that the ex parte communication violated the California Administrative Procedures Act [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*] even though the Department adopted the proposed decision of the administrative law judge [*Chevron Stations Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 116, 127, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* . The Court of Appeal also held that the licensee established a prima facie case of a violation of the ex parte communications prohibition in *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10 to 11430.70*. Once that showing was made, the Department had the burden of proof to justify the department's practices under the APA, and the department failed to meet that burden of proof before the Board. The court of appeal rejected the department's efforts to make this showing for the first time on appeal [*Chevron Stations Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 116, 131-133, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* .

The California Sixth District Court of Appeal held that the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control violated provisions of the California Administrative Procedures Act [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*] because the Department allowed its decision makers to have access to prosecuting attorneys reports of hearings prior to the time the decision maker decided whether or not to adopt the proposed decision of the administrative law judge. These hearing reports were not part of the administrative record in the case, and allowing the decision maker access to the reports resulted in extra-record information being considered by the decision maker, in violation of the administrative law principle that the agency record provides the exclusive basis for the decision [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1288-1290, 60 Cal. Rptr.3d 295]* . The Sixth District Court of Appeal in *Rondon* relied upon the decision of the California Supreme Court in the *Quintenar* case [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2006) 40 Cal. 4th 1, 4-6, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585, 145 P.3d 462]*

In *Rondon*, the Sixth District Court of Appeal held that the prosecutor's hearing report was an ex parte communication and that providing access to that report by the Department decision maker violated the California Administrative Procedures Act [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*] even though the Department adopted the proposed decision of the administrative law judge revoking Rondon's retail on sale beer and wine license [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1288-1290, 60 Cal. Rptr.3d 295]* . The Sixth District Court of Appeal also held that the prosecutor's hearing report was extra-record information that violated the administrative law principal that the decision of the administrative agency has to be based on the evidence in the record for decision, not on information outside the record [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1289-1290, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295]* . The court of appeal relied upon on the California Supreme Court decisions in *LaPrade v. Department of Water & Power (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 47, 51-52, 162 P.2d 13* , and *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158, 217 P.2d 22]* . The Sixth District Court of Appeal also decided that no showing of prejudice was required to justify reversal of the Department decision revoking Rondon's license to sell beer and wine [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1290-1291, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295]* . Finally the Sixth District Court of Appeal allowed the introduction of extra-record evidence at the appeal stage on the issue whether the prosecutor's hearing report was distributed or made available to the decision maker [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1286-1287, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295]* . Finally,

the Sixth District Court of Appeal required that Department show a lack of access, or screening of the decision maker, from access to the prosecutor's hearing report [*Rondon v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1287-1288, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295]* . The Sixth District Court of Appeal relied upon the decision in *Howitt v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1575, 1587, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 196* .

In a decision made prior to the adoption of *Gov Code § 11430.10*, the California Court of Appeal held that an improper ex parte communication was made to the ALJ by a lawyer for one party who stated that he feared for his and his co-counsel's safety, as the other party to the adjudication was acting irrationally in the proceeding [*Matthew Zaheri Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1305, 1312-1313, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705]* . The court held that this was an improper ex parte communication, that it was improper not to disclose the communication, but the court upheld the decision reached following the hearing concluding that the merits of the decision were not adversely affected by the communication. The agency placed a state police officer in the hearing room to provide better security in the hearing [*Matthew Zaheri Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1305, 1312-1313, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705]* .

[2] Definitions

Ex parte communications are improper in some circumstances, but not others [*see Gov. Code § 11430.10 et seq.*].

For purposes of the general prohibition (discussed in [1], *above*), a proceeding is pending from the issuance of an agency's pleading, or from an application for an agency decision, whichever is earlier [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(c)*].

The term "interested person outside the agency" is based on federal administrative law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see 5 U.S.C. § 557(d)(1)(A)*; *PATCO v, Federal Labor Relations Authority (1982) 685 F.2d 547, 562, 222 U.S. App. D.C. 97* (interpreting the federal standard to include persons with interest beyond that of members of the general public)]. The pendency of a proceeding includes any period of time between the time an application for a hearing is made and the time the agency's pleading is issued [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

If, while the proceeding is pending, but before serving as presiding officer, a person receives a communication of a type that would violate the provisions of this law if received while the person was serving as a presiding officer, the person, promptly after starting to serve, shall disclose the content of the communication on the record and give all parties an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.40(c)*; *see* [4], *below*].

[3] Permissible Ex Parte Communications

Ex parte communications that are proper under the act include several categories. The first category, generally permissible communications specifically authorized, include the following:

- Communications, including a communication from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party, made on the record at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(b)*].

- Communications that are required for the disposition of an ex parte matter specifically authorized by statute [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(a)*].

- Communications that concern a matter of procedure or practice, including a request for a continuance, that is not in controversy [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(b)*]. This exception does not preclude communications made to a presiding officer or staff assistant regarding noncontroversial matters of procedure and practice, such as the format of pleadings, number of copies required, manner of service, and calendaring and status discussions. Such topics are not considered to be part of the merits of the proceeding provided they are noncontroversial in the context of the specific case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm.

Reports 55 (1995)].

The second category of permissible ex parte communications are those communications otherwise prohibited from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party to a presiding officer, in the following circumstances:

- The communication is for the purpose of assistance and advice to the presiding officer from a person who has not served as investigator, prosecutor or advocate in the proceeding or its preadjudicative stage. An assistant or advisor may evaluate the evidence in the record but shall not furnish, augment, diminish, or modify the evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(a)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning a settlement proposal advocated by the advisor [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(b)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning any of the following matters in an adjudicative proceeding that is non-prosecutorial in character [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)*], including:

  - The advice involves a technical issue in the proceeding and the advice is necessary for, and is not otherwise reasonably available to, the presiding officer, provided the content of the advice is disclosed on the record and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(1)*; *see* [c], *below*].

  - The advice involves an issue in a proceeding of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Delta Protection Commission, Water Resources Control Board, or a regional water quality control board [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(2)*].

The third and final category of permissible ex parte communications include the following:

- The presiding officer's authority to conduct in camera examination of evidence in a proceeding (*see Gov. Code § 11507.7(d), (e)*) is not limited by the prohibition on ex parte communications [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from communicating with adversaries. Only communications from adversaries to presiding officers are precluded. However, presiding officers should give assistance or advice with caution, since there may be an appearance of unfairness if assistance or advice is given to some parties but not others [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from consulting with other agency personnel when the agency conducting the hearing is not a party to the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[4] Consequences of Ex Parte Communication Violations

When an improper ex parte communication is made, there are three consequences, disclosure, notice and opportunity to respond, and if necessary, disqualification of the presiding officer. If a presiding officer receives an improper communication, the officer must place in the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)*] the following:

- If the communication is written, the writing and any written response of the presiding officer to the

communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(1)*].

- If the communication is oral, a memorandum stating the substance of the communication, any response made by the presiding officer, and the identity of each person from whom the presiding officer received the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(2)*].

The presiding officer must also notify all parties that an ex parte communication has been made a part of the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(b)*]. If a party requests an opportunity to address the communication within 10 days after receipt of notice of the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)*]:

- That party must be permitted to comment on the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(1)*]; and

- The presiding officer has discretion to allow the party to present evidence concerning the subject of the communication, including discretion to reopen a hearing that has been concluded [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(2)*].

If a presiding officer receives an improper ex parte communication, the presiding officer may be disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*]. Disqualification is permitted if it is necessary to eliminate the effect of the ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. If the presiding officer is disqualified, the portion of the record pertaining to the ex parte communication may be sealed by protective order of the disqualified presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*].

The purpose of sealing is to remove the improper communication from the view of the successor presiding officer, while preserving it as a sealed part of the record, for purposes of subsequent administrative or judicial review. Granting a protective order is permissive, not mandatory, and is within the discretion of the presiding officer who has knowledge of the improper ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[5] Application to Agency Head

Agency heads [*see Gov. Code § 11405.40* (defining agency head)] who are decision makers are subject to the same requirements as to ex parte communications with several qualifications. The same requirements that govern ex parte communications to presiding officers also govern ex parte communications in an adjudicative proceeding to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(a)*].

There is an exception, however, that applies to individualized ratemaking proceedings. An ex parte communication to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated is permissible in an individualized ratemaking proceeding if the content of the communication is disclosed on the record and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(b)*; *see* discussion in [4], *above*].

Furthermore, there is a prohibition on direct or indirect communication, while a proceeding is pending regarding the merits of any issue in the proceeding, between the presiding officer and the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(a)*]. This rule does not apply when the agency head or other person to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated serves as both presiding officer and agency head, or when the presiding officer does not issue a decision in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityParticipation in ProsecutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.29

§ 473.29 Language Assistance

[1] General Rule Requiring Language Assistance

Language assistance must be made available as provided in *Gov. Code § 11435.05* by an agency described in *Gov. Code § 11018* or *11435.15* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(9)*].

[2] When the Rule Applies

[a] Generally When Party or Witness Needs Assistance

Under the APA, administrative hearings and medical examinations conducted for the purpose of determining compensation or monetary awards, are conducted in the English language [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(a)*].

If a party or the party's witness does not proficiently speak or understand English and requests language assistance before the commencement of the hearing or medical examination, the agency must comply with language assistance requirements (*see Gov. Code § 11435.05 et seq.* (legal requirements)), and the party or witness will be provided with an interpreter by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(b)*].

[b] Agencies Required to Provide Language Assistance

Language assistance must be made available as required by *Gov. Code § 11435.05 et seq.* by state agencies described in *Gov. Code § 11018* (state agencies that conduct administrative hearings but are not subject to Chapter 5, Administrative Adjudication: Formal Hearings, Gov. Code §§ 11500 et seq.) and *Gov. Code § 11435.15* (listed state agencies) [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(9)*].

The listed state agencies in *Gov. Code § 11435.15* include the following agencies [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(a)*]:

- Agricultural Labor Relations Board.

- Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse.
- State Athletic Commission.
- California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board.
- Board of Prison Terms.
- State Board of Barbering and Cosmetology.
- State Department of Developmental Services.
- Public Employment Relations Board.
- Franchise Tax Board.
- State Department of Health Services.
- Department of Housing and Community Development.
- Department of Industrial Relations.
- State Department of Mental Health.
- Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Notary Public Section, Office of Secretary of State.
- Public Utilities Commission.
- Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.
- State Department of Social Services.
- Worker's Compensation Appeals Board.
- Department of the Youth Authority.
- Youthful Offender Parole Board.
- Department of Insurance.
- State Personnel Board.
- California Board of Podiatric Medicine.
- Board of Psychology.

The listed agencies must comply with language assistance requirements notwithstanding general provisions that Chapter 4.5, Administrative Adjudication: General Provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), does not apply to some or all of an

agency's adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(d)*]. The language assistance article's requirements are limited to adjudicative proceedings in which, under the federal or state constitution or a federal or state statute, an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required for formulation and issuance of a decision under the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11410.10* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Agencies that are not listed may chose to adopt language assistance procedures, provided that interpreter selection is consistent with the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11435.30* [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(b)*]. Agencies may also provide interpreters for non-adjudicative proceedings, such as informal fact finding and informal investigatory hearings [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(c)*].

[3] Language Assistance Requirements

Language assistance is defined to mean oral interpretation or written translation into English of a language other than English or of English into another language for a party or witness who cannot speak or understand English or who can do so only with difficulty [*Gov. Code § 11435.05*]. However, interpretation for deaf or hard of hearing parties or witnesses in adjudicative proceedings is governed by *Evidence Code § 754* [*Gov. Code § 11435.10*]. The primary language assistance requirement is that the agency will provide a party or witness with an interpreter when the party or witness is not proficient in the English language [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(b)*]. Agencies must advise parties of interpreter rights when the agency advises that same party of the hearing date or medical examination. Agencies should also encourage parties that are in need of an interpreter to give timely notice to the agency conducting the hearing or medical examination so that appropriate arrangements can be made [*Gov. Code § 11435.60*]. A Spanish speaking motorist whose driver's license was suspended for refusing to take a blood alcohol test challenged the suspension because DMV failed to notify him of the right to have an interpreter at the hearing at the same time that DMV notified the driver when the hearing was scheduled to occur. Failure to provide simultaneous notice of hearing date and interpreter rights violates *Gov. Code § 11435.60*, but this was harmless error because the driver was notified of interpreter rights when he was provided the notice of suspension of his license by the arresting officer, and driver failed to show any prejudice to him from the lack of an interpreter at the DMV hearing [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 968-970, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* . DMV is only required by statute [*Gov. Code § 11435.60*] to provide the notice of the right to an interpreter in English, not other languages [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-971, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* . Interpreters must normally be certified [*Gov. Code § 11435.55*], must not have had any involvement in the issues of the case prior to the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11435.65(b)*], and are subject to confidentiality rules of the agency, if any, that apply to the adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11435.65(a)*].

[4] Interpreter Requirements

Hearing interpreters must be certified under *Gov. Code § 11435.30* [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(a)*]. However, if a certified interpreter can not be present at the hearing, the hearing agency has discretionary authority to provisionally qualify and use another interpreter [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(a)*]. Medical examination interpreters must be certified under *Gov. Code § 11435.35* [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(b)*]. However, if a certified interpreter can not be present at the medical examination, the physician provisionally may use another interpreter if that fact is noted in the record of the medical evaluation [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(b)*]. The State Personnel Board is required to designate the languages for which certification of administrative hearing interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.30*] and medical examination interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.35*] shall be established [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(a)*].

The languages designated shall include, but not be limited to, Spanish, Tagalog, Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Vietnamese until the State Personnel Board finds that there is an insufficient need for interpreting assistance in these languages [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(a)*].

Language designations are to be based on four criteria [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)*]:

- The language needs of non-English speaking persons appearing before the administrative agencies, as determined by consultation with the agencies [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(1)*].

- The cost of developing a language examination [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(2)*].

- The availability of experts needed to develop a language examination [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(3)*].

- Other information the State Personnel Board deems relevant [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(4)*].

The State Personnel Board can charge fees for application to take interpreter examinations, and for annual renewal of certification [*Gov. Code § 11435.45*]. The State Personnel Board has the responsibility to establish, maintain, and annually update lists of certified administrative hearing [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(a)*] and medical examination [*Gov. Code § 11435.35(a)*] interpreters that the Board determines meets minimum standards in interpreting skills and linguistic abilities in languages [*Gov. Code § 11435.40*] designated by the Board [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(a)*; *Gov. Code § 11435.35(a)*].

Listed certified administrative hearing interpreters may be examined by each employing agency to determine the interpreter's knowledge of the employing agency's technical program terminology and procedures [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(a)*]. Court interpreters certified under *Gov. Code § 68562*, and interpreters listed on the Board's recommended list of court and administrative hearing interpreters prior to July 1, 1993, are deemed certified as administrative hearing interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(b)*]. Court interpreters certified under *Gov. Code § 68562*, and certified administrative hearing interpreters, are deemed certified as medical examination interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.35(b)*].

Under three circumstances, the Board can remove persons from the certified interpreters lists [*Gov. Code § 11435.50*]:

- The person is deceased [*Gov. Code § 11435.50(a)*].

- The person notifies the Board that the person is unavailable for work [*Gov. Code § 11435.50(b)*].

- The person does not pay a required annual renewal fee [*Gov. Code § 11435.50(c)*].

[5] Costs of Interpreters

Interpreter costs are paid as determined by the presiding officer at the hearing. The agency that has jurisdiction over the matter will pay interpreter costs if the presiding officer orders the agency to pay the costs. Otherwise, the party requesting the interpreter will pay interpreter costs [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(a)*]. The presiding officer's decision to direct payment shall be based upon an equitable consideration of all the circumstances in each case, such as the ability of the party in need of the interpreter to pay [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(b)*]. However, in hearings before the Worker's Compensation Appeals Board or the Division of Worker's Compensation relating to worker's compensation claims, the payment of the costs of providing an interpreter shall be governed by the rules and regulations of the WCAB, or the Administrative Director of the DWC, as appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyInterpreters

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. The Administrative Adjudication "Bill of Rights"

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473.30-473.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473.30[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.40

§ 473.40 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.41

§ 473.41 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.42

§ 473.42 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code § 11425.10 et seq.*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of Proceedings *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code § 11455.10 et seq.*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of Proceedings *Gov. Code § 11470.10 et seq.*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory Decision *Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10 et seq., 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency Decision. *Gov. Code § 11460.10 et seq.*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications Gov. Code. Code § 11430.10 et seq.

Hearings by Electronic Means *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal Hearings *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.*

Intervention *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language Assistance *Gov. Code § 11435.05 et seq.*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate Hearings *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and Notice *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement Conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual Harassment *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of Rights *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code § 11370.1 et seq.*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.43

§ 473.43 Decisions

Disciplinary action against licensee, finding licensee guilty of gross incompetence, is invalid when administrative record is completely devoid of any statute, rule, regulation, or evidence of an implied standard by which to measure competence of licensee's conduct. *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 527-528, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693*

Administrative regulations that violate acts of Legislature are void. *Selby v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 470, 474, 168 Cal. Rptr. 36*

Act in excess of agency's authority under enabling law are void. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Subject of administrative proceeding is entitled to have statutory procedures strictly followed and fairly construed. *California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Personnel Commission (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 145, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Administrative regulation contrary to enabling law is void. *California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Personnel Commission (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 144, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Agency is not free to ignore its own validly established procedures. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Reference to Administrative Procedure Act for guidance is proper in case not governed by act or other law. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Requirements of due process. *Connolly Development, Inc. v. Superior Court of Merced County (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 803, 818, 823, 132 Cal. Rptr. 477, 553 P.2d 637* ; *Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 208-209, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *Beaudreau v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 448, 458, 121 Cal. Rptr. 585, 535 P.2d 713*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.44

§ 473.44 Attorney General Opinions

Office of administrative hearings precluded from using electronic recording devices instead of using certified shorthand reporters in hearings even if parties waive requirement of "phonographic reporter" under *Gov. Code § 11512(d)*. *65 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 682, 687 (1982)*

Record of conviction is evidence in proceeding under Administrative Procedure Act (against certificated teacher). *34 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 34 (1959)*

Calling respondent as witness in proceeding under Administrative Procedure Act. 11 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 116 (1948)

Administrative Procedure Act supersedes former Cleaning and Dyeing Act respecting disciplinary proceeding against licensee. *8 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 24 (1946)*

Selection of place of hearing under *Gov. Code § 11508*. *7 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 257 (1946)*

Reinstatement of revoked license by Real Estate Commissioner under *Gov. Code § 11522*. *7 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 264 (1946)*

Determination by mail vote whether administrative proceeding shall be presided over by hearing officer acting alone. *7 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 274 (1946)*

Evidence in proceeding under Administrative Procedure Act. 6 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 219 (1945)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.45

§ 473.45 Law Reviews

Asimow, *The Influence of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act on California's New Administrative Procedure Act, 32 Tulsa L.J. 297 (1996)*

Asimow, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Decisions of California Administrative Agencies, 42 U.C.L.A. L. Rev. 1157 (1995)*

Asimow, *Toward a New California Administrative Procedure Act: Adjudication Fundamentals, 39 UCLA L. Rev. 1067 (1992)*

Yore, *No Strings Attached*, 5(1) Cal. Law. 42 (1985)

Moskowitz, *Vermont Yankee in California's Courts, 13 Pac. L.J. 315 (1981)*

Note, *Discovery and Administrative Due Process: A Balance Between an Accused's Right to Discovery and Administrative Efficiency, 8 Hastings Const. L.Q. 645 (1981)*

Note, *Administrative Law--Defense of Entrapment--Defense Is Available in Administrative Proceedings, 7 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 187 (1974)*

Cooper, *Resolving Real Estate Disciplinary Matters Prior to Hearing*, 47 Cal. St. B.J. 330 (1972)

Grunschlag, *Lawyer/Non-Lawyer Decisions in Adjudication of Public Contract Claims: A Study of Administrative Process, 12 Santa Clara Law. 36 (1972)*

Ogden, *California Welfare Fair Hearings: An Adequate Remedy? 5 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 542 (1972)*

Comment, *Legal Problems of Administrative Practice*, 5 U.C. Davis L. Rev. (1972)

Comment, *Trumpets in the Corridors of Bureaucracy: A Coming Right to Appointed Counsel in Administrative Adjudicative Proceedings*, *18 UCLA L. Rev. 758 (1971)*

Molinari, *California Administrative Process: A Synthesis Updated*, *10 Santa Clara Law. 274 (1970)*

Traub, *California's Ombudsmen for Licensees--The Office of Administrative Procedure*, *40 L.A. Bar Bull. 190 (1970)*

Comment, *Discovery in State Administrative Adjudication*, *56 Cal. L. Rev. 756 (1968)*

Bobby, *An Introduction to Practice and Procedure Under the California Administrative Procedure Act*, *15 Hastings L.J. 258 (1964)*

Dietz, *Local Adaptation of the California Administrative Procedure Act--A Plea for Research and Study*, *15 Hastings L.J. 310 (1964)*

Rogge, *A Technique for Change [in Administrative Investigations and Determinations]*, *11 UCLA L. Rev. 481*, *533*-541 (1964)

Comment, *Administrative Sanctions: Regulation and Adjudication*, *16 Stan. L. Rev. 630 (1964)*

Comment, *Discovery Prior to Administrative Adjudications--Statutory Proposal*, *52 Cal. L. Rev. 823 (1964)*

Note, *Economic Due Process and Occupational Licensing in California*, *15 Hastings L.J. 364 (1964)*

Note, *The Effect of a Pardon on License Revocation and Reinstatement*, *15 Hastings L.J. 355 (1964)*

Note, *Hearsay Under the Administrative Procedure Act*, *15 Hastings L.J. 369 (1964)*

Note, *License Revocation: Uncertainty and Due Process*, *15 Hastings L.J. 339 (1964)*

Fick, *The Reform of Administrative Procedure and the Controversy Over Jurisdiction*, *2 Santa Clara Law. 103 (1962)*

Woll, *Informal Administrative Adjudication: Summary of Findings*, *7 UCLA L. Rev. 436 (1960)*

Comment, *Removal of State Administrative Proceedings to the Federal Courts*, *12 Stan. L. Rev. 492 (1960)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Third-Party Participation in Adjudicative Administrative Hearings in California*, *47 Cal. L. Rev. 747 (1959)*

Clarkson, *Practice Before California Licensing Agencies*, *44 Cal. L. Rev. 197 (1956)*

Kuchman, *The Role of the Hearing Officer--A Private Practitioner's Point of View*, *44 Cal. L. Rev. 212 (1956)*

Lakustra, *The Role of the Hearing Officer--Operations in an Agency Not Subject to the APA: Public Utilities Commission*, *44 Cal. L. Rev. 218 (1956)*

Newman, *Two Decades of Administrative Law in California: A Critique*, *44 Cal. L. Rev. 190 (1956)*

tenBroek, *Operations Partially Subject to the APA: Public Welfare Administration*, *44 Cal. L. Rev. 242 (1956)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Agency Calling Party as Witness at Hearing: Government Code Section 11513(b) , 44 Cal. L. Rev. 400 (1956)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Professional and Occupational Licensing: Standard of Conduct for Administrative License Revocation, 44 Cal. L. Rev. 403 (1956)*

Davis, *Administrative Findings, Reasons, and Stare Decisis, 38 Cal. L. Rev. 218 (1950)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Licensing: Change of Board Membership During Proceedings, 38 Cal. L. Rev. 896 (1950)*

Note, *Section 11517 of California Government Code , 21 S. Cal. L. Rev. 182 (1948)*

Kleps, *The California Administrative Procedure Act*, 22 Cal. St. B.J. 391 (1947)

Pfiffner, *The Role of the Lawyer in Public Administration, 20 S. Cal. L. Rev. 37 (1946)*

Comment, *Administrative Law--Administrative Subpoenas--Use and Enforcement of, 20 S. Cal. L. Rev. 66 (1946)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Enforcement of Subpoena of Administrative Agency, 34 Cal. L. Rev. 428 (1946)*

Kleps, *California's Approach to the Improvement of Administrative Procedure, 32 Cal. L. Rev. 416 (1944)*

Note, *Practice Before Administrative Agencies, 29 Cal. L. Rev. 603, 605 (1941)*

McGowen, *The Battle of the Processes, 28 Cal. L. Rev. 277, 288 (1940)*

Dimock, *The Prospect for Administrative Tribunals, 20 Cal. L. Rev. 162 (1932)*

Thelan, *Practice and Procedure Before Administrative Tribunals, 16 Cal. L. Rev. 208 (1928)*

Comment, *Hearsay Testimony: Consideration by Administrative Tribunal, 13 Cal. L. Rev. 384, 394 (1925)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawInformal Agency ActionsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.46

§ 473.46 Text References

California Administrative Hearing Practice (Cal. C.E.B. 1984)

Witkin, California Evidence, Ch. III, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 150-191; Ch. X, *Witnesses*, §§ 787-791; Ch. XII, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1223-1275 (2d ed.)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473 PUBLIC AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473.47

§ 473.47 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes: information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerming Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah **NOTE:** On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service.
http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473A.syn

§ 473A.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473A: COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION

§ 473A.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473A.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Specific Public Agencies

[5] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

§§ 473A.03-473A.09 [Reserved]

§ 473A.10 Agency Discretion to Commence Adjudicatory Proceedings

[1] Ways to Initiate Proceedings

[2] Agency Discretion

[3] Definitions

[4] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

§ 473A.11 Pleadings

[1] Nature of Administrative Pleadings

[2] Who May Initiate Adjudication Proceedings

[a] Agency Employees and Public Officers

[b] Investigative Personnel

[c] Participation in Adjudication by Agency Member Who Files Charges

[d] Third Parties

[3] Accusation

[a] Nature of Accusation

[b] Fair Notice

[c] Allegations

[4] Statement of Issues

[a] Definition

[b] Applicability of California APA Accusation Provisions

[c] Form of Statement of Issues and Verification

[d] Service of Statement of Issues

[5] Amending, Supplementing, or Correcting Accusations or Statements of Issues

[6] Notice of Defense

[a] Nature of Notice of Defense

[b] Effect of Notice of Defense or Failure to File Notice

[c] Contents of Notice

[d] Objection as to Form or Sufficiency of Accusation

[e] Number of Notices and Time of Filing

[f] Admissions and Statements in Mitigation

[g] Affirmative Defenses

[h] Notice of Defense Not Required When Respondent Has Already Requested Hearing

[i] Non-APA Proceedings

[7] Verification

[8] Filing

[9] Service

[a] Accusations and Statements of Issues

[b] Statements of Issues Served and Filed in Response to a Respondent's Request for a Hearing

[c] Notice of Hearing Under the APA

[d] Notice of Hearing in Non-California APA Proceedings

[10] Notice of Hearing

[a] Due Process Requirements

[b] APA Notice Requirements

[c] Computing Time Period for Notice

[d] Postage and Correct Address Not Required for Service by Mail

[e] Notice of Continued Hearings

[11] Time and Place of Hearing

[12] Affirmative Defenses

[13] Demurrers

§ 473A.12 Limitations of Action and Laches

[1] Applicability

[2] Elements of Laches

[a] Unreasonable Delay and Resulting Prejudice

[b] Determining When Delay Is Unreasonable

[c] Determining Prejudice Resulting From Delay

[3] Application of Laches by Agency Itself

§ 473A.13 Unconstitutional Statutes

§ 473A.14 Parties and Interested Third Persons

[1] Definition of Party and Participation of Third Persons

[2] Due Process Right to Participate

[3] Intervention

§ 473A.15 Consolidation and Severance

§§ 473A.16-473A.19 [Reserved]

§ 473A.20 Federal Constitution

§ 473A.21 State Constitution

§ 473A.22 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473A.23 Decisions

[1] Consolidation and Severance

[2] Initial Pleading

[a] Generally

[b] Amendment

[c] Complainant

[d] Contents

[3] Intervention

[4] Limitations and Laches

[5] Notice

[6] Responsive Pleading

[a] Generally

[b] Demurrer

[7] Setting for Hearing

[8] Statement of Issues

§ 473A.24 Text References

§ 473A.25 Internet References

§§ 473A.26-473A.39 [Reserved]

§ 473A.40 Determine the Methods by Which the Agency Initiates Adjudicatory Hearings

§ 473A.41 Responding to Accusation Under APA Guidelines

[1] Request Hearing by Notice of Defense

[2] Motion for Consolidation

[3] Motion for Severance

[4] Request Hearing Without Notice of Defense

[5] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

[6] Change Location of Hearing

[7] Prior to Hearing

[8] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

§ 473A.42 Responding to Statement of Issues When Agency Sends Letter of Denial of Privilege

[1] Requesting a Hearing

[2] Notice of Defense

[3] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

[4] Change Location of Hearing

[5] Motion for Consolidation

[6] Motion for Severance

[7] Prior to Hearing

[8] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

§ 473A.43 Statement of Issues Sent by Agency in Lieu of Letter of Denial

[1] Notice of Defense

[2] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

[3] Change Location of Hearing

[4] Motion for Consolidation

[5] Motion for Severance

[6] Prior to Hearing

[7] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

§ 473A.44 Non-APA Agencies

[1] Responsive Pleadings

[2] Affirmative Defenses

[3] Demurrer or Demurrer-Type Objection

[4] Consolidation or Severance

§ 473A.45 Third Party Participation

[1] Third Party Filing Accusation Under APA

[2] Intervention Permitted by Agency Law

[3] Intervention Is Discretionary

§§ 473A.46-473A.49 [Reserved]

§ 473A.50 Accusation [Gov. Code § 11503]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473A.51 Statement to Respondent [Gov. Code § 11505]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473A.52 Statement of Issues [Gov. Code § 11504]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473A.53 Request for Hearing [Gov. Code § 11504]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473A.54 Notice of Defense [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Request for Hearing

[5] Copies

[6] Objections

[a] Failure to State Sufficient Facts

[b] Form of Initial Pleading

[7] Admissions and Denials

[8] New Matter

[9] Entrapment Defense

[10] Cross References

§ 473A.55 Letter to Accompany Notice of Defense

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473A.56 Letter Request for Extension of Time [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473A.57 Request to Set Aside Default [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.01

§ 473A.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses California public administrative law relating to the commencement of an agency adjudication. It focuses primarily on the commencement procedures applicable to formal hearing conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). Discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Requirements for pleadings and issues in administrative hearings [*see §§ 473A.10, 473A.11*).

- Other provisions and law affecting the commencement of a formal hearing, such as limitation periods, the defense of laches, procedures relating to parties and other interested persons and to the consolidation or severance of hearings [*see §§ 473A.12 -473A.15*).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.02

§ 473A.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For general discussion and overview of agency adjudication under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

For related discussion and forms providing coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*, through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in § 470.12[5]). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

[4] Specific Public Agencies

For related coverage of adjudicative proceedings before particular public agencies, see:

- Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to licensing proceedings before the department of Alcoholic Beverage Control).

- Ch. 70, *Attorney Admission*, and Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of attorneys and proceedings before the State Bar and the State Bar Court).

- Ch. 92, *Automobiles: Drivers' Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to drivers' licensing and proceedings before the Department of Motor Vehicles).

- Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*, § 104.70 et seq. (discussion relating to licensing and discipline of building contractors by the Contractors' State License Board).

- Ch. 118, *Civil Service* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Personnel Board).

- Ch. 209, *Dentists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of dentists and proceedings before the Board of Dental Examiners).

- Ch. 214, *Drugs and Pharmacists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of pharmacists and proceedings before the State Board of Pharmacy).

- Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of physicians and proceedings before the Medical Board of California).

- Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission).

- Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues* (discussion and forms relating to teacher certification and dismissal proceedings before the State Board of Education and local boards).

- Ch. 527, *Social Services* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Department of Social Service or the State Department of Health Services).

- Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance*, § 564.10 et seq. and § 564.100 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board).

- Ch. 575, *Waters*, § 575.10 et seq. and § 575.210 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Water Resources Control Board and local water districts).

- Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Division of Workers' Compensation and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

For additional cross references to coverage of other particular public agencies, see *§ 470.02[2]*.

[5] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

For discussion and forms relating to claims and actions under the California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*) for damages for injuries arising from the tortious conduct of public agencies or their officers and employees, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473A.03-473A.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473A.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.10

§ 473A.10 Agency Discretion to Commence Adjudicatory Proceedings

[1] Ways to Initiate Proceedings

A variety of ways exist to initiate administrative adjudicative proceedings. For administrative adjudications not governed by the adjudication provisions of the California APA (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.* and *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the method of initiating the proceedings depends on the agency's governing law.

This chapter and Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*, through Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*, focus on formal hearings under the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*). These are governed primarily by Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), which sets out the formal hearing procedures that comprise one part of the APA administrative adjudication provisions. The Chapter 5 procedures are supplemented by relevant provisions of Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), which sets out general provisions that make up the remainder of the APA administrative adjudication provisions [*see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.13[1*], for further explanation of the APA and the administrative adjudication provisions of Chapters 4.5 and 5 that comprise a part of the APA]. The formal hearing procedures under Chapter 5 are those which most licensing agencies must use in disciplinary or license denial proceedings [*see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*, for detailed discussion of what proceedings are governed by Chapter 5].

Thus, for example, under Chapter 5 of the APA adjudication provisions, disciplinary hearings against licensees begin with the filing of an accusation [*Gov. Code § 11503*], and license denial hearings begin with the filing of a statement of issues [*Gov. Code § 11504*]. For further discussion of these initial pleadings, see *§ 473A.11*.

Regardless of whether the proceedings of an agency must be initiated with an accusation, statement of issues, or other formal pleading, the first step toward a hearing is often taken when a third party, such as a consumer or another licensee, makes a complaint or report to the agency or requests the agency to hold a hearing [*see § 473A.14*, for discussion of third party participation]. Most agencies are expressly authorized to receive complaints. For example, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 129(b)* requires every Department of Consumer Affairs agency to receive complaints about its licensees.

[2] Agency Discretion

Although a third party may complain to an agency about a licensee or even request a hearing, the agency is not required to hold a hearing. Whether to file an accusation or other pleading and hold a hearing on such a complaint or request is within the agency's discretion [*see Hogen v. Valley Hospital (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 119, 123-125, 195 Cal. Rptr. 5* (report about licensee to *Board of Medical Quality Assurance); Humane Society etc., California Branch Inc. v. Merrill (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 115, 118, 18 Cal. Rptr. 701* (complaint against certificate holder filed with Board of Public Health); *Spear v. Board of Medical Examiners (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 207, 212, 303 P.2d 886* (Board of Medical Examiners requested to file accusation against licensee)].

If an agency has a legal duty to exercise its discretion, the courts can compel the agency to do so [Whitten v. California State Board, etc. *(1937) 8 Cal. 2d 444, 446-447, 65 P.2d 1296* ; *Anderson v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 219, 227, 106 Cal. Rptr. 299* ; *Stevens v. Fox Realty Corp. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 199, 206, 100 Cal. Rptr. 63]* , but they cannot compel it to exercise that discretion in any particular manner. Once an agency has exercised its discretion, the courts will not interfere, unless it is shown that the agency has abused its discretion [*Paule v. State Personnel Board (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 32, 36, 113 Cal. Rptr. 38* ; *Spear v. Board of Medical Examiners (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 207, 212-214, 303 P.2d 886]* . The court may not substitute its discretion for that of the agency [*Spear v. Board of Medical Examiners (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 207, 212, 303 P.2d 886]* .

Even when a third party files an accusation [*see Humane Society etc., California Branch Inc. v. Merrill (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 115, 118-120, 18 Cal. Rptr. 701* (complainant cannot compel Board of Public Health to file accusation, but complainant may file one)], the agency may treat the accusation, and whether to hold a hearing on that accusation, as a matter for its discretion as it would any other public complaint, unless the party has a statutory right to a hearing or a constitutional right to be heard [*see Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134* (due process requires that landowner not be deprived of property rights by administrative action without notice and opportunity to be heard); *see also* discussion in *§ 473A.14[2]*].

The procedure of filing an accusation or statement of issues to initiate a hearing is intended primarily for the benefit of the licensee or applicant, who does have a right to be heard by the agency, but may waive that right [*Gov. Code § 11506(c)* (failure to file notice of defense as waiver of right to hearing); *see Gov. Code §§ 11503* (hearing to revoke or suspend license or other privilege initiated by filing accusation), 11504 (hearing to determine whether license or other privilege should be granted or denied initiated by filing statement of issues), and discussion in *§ 473A.11[6][b]*].

[3] Definitions

Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), governing formal hearings under the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), begins with a list of definitions that include the following [*Gov. Code § 11500*; *see* discussion in [1], *above*, and Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*, § 473.13[1], for discussion regarding Chapter 5 and other components of the APA]:

- "Agency" includes the state boards, commissions, and officers to which Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) is made applicable by law. When the word "agency" alone is used, the power to act may be delegated by the agency, but when the words "agency itself" are used, the power to act shall not be delegated unless the statutes relating to the particular agency authorize delegation of the agency's power to hear and decide [*Gov. Code § 11500(a)*].

- "Party" includes the agency, the respondent, and any person, other than an officer or employee of the agency acting in an official capacity, who has been allowed to appear or participate in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11500(b)*].

- "Respondent" means any person against whom an accusation or statement of issues is filed [*see Gov. Code §§ 11503, 11504* (accusation and statement of issues, respectively); *see also Gov. Code § 11500(c)* and discussion in *§ 473A.11[3], [4]*].

These definitions apply to all other provisions in Chapter 5, unless the context or subject matter indicates otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11500*]. In addition, certain definitions set out in Chapter 4.5 also apply to proceedings under Chapter 5, to the extent that the provisions of Chapter 4.5 apply to formal hearings under Chapter 5 unless inconsistent with statutes specifically applicable to that proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11501(c)*]. For example, the following definition of "adjudicatory hearing" applies in that there is no definition of this term in Chapter 5 [*Gov. Code § 11405.20*]:

- "Adjudicative proceeding" is an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts pursuant to which an agency formulates and issues a decision.

Applicable provisions of Chapter 4.5 are discussed when relevant in this chapter. For detailed discussion of the additional definitions under Chapter 4.5 that may apply, see *Chapter 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.14*.

[4] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act contract claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. Specific regulations applicable to Ch. 473A, Commencing Agency Adjudication, include the following: format and filing of papers [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1006* (1998)]; service and proof of service [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1008* (1998)]; pleadings, notice of defense and withdrawal of defense [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1014* (1998)]; and agency request for hearing and notice of hearing [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1018* (1998)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.11

§ 473A.11 Pleadings

[1] Nature of Administrative Pleadings

Two kinds of pleadings are used to begin formal hearings under the APA. A hearing to determine whether a license or other privilege will be revoked or suspended begins with an accusation [*see* further discussion in [3], *below*]. A license denial hearing begins with a statement of issues [*see* further discussion in [4], *below*].

If the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) do not apply, there is no requirement as to the form of an initial pleading unless the agency's governing statutes impose such a requirement [*see Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12-13, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898* (when due process protections apply, they require an initial pleading to give notice and state the right to an opportunity to be heard, but no particular form required); *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* , for detailed discussion of procedural due protections as they apply to agency actions or proceedings].

Thus, when no specific statutory requirements apply, the only requirement is that the initial pleading must be informative enough to allow the responding party to prepare a defense [*Yanke v. State Dep't of Public Health (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 600, 603, 328 P.2d 556]* . Non-APA pleadings often are typically not as formal as those under required under the formal hearing requirements of the APA. For example, a non-California APA disciplinary action may be initiated by a specially prepared document, such as a "notice of disciplinary action," or by a mere letter.

Non-APA hearings on an agency's denial of a requested action, such as the denial of a license application, are sometimes initiated by pleadings similar to a statement of issues.

Whether the APA's formal hearing provisions of Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) apply to a particular adjudication by a particular agency depends on the statutes relating to that agency [*Gov. Code § 11501(a)*]. In general, the provisions of Chapter 5 apply when they are made applicable by the statutes relating to that agency [*Gov. Code §§ 11500(a), 11501(a)*]. These are hereafter referred to as the "enabling statues" for a particular agency.

In addition, any agencies created on or after July 1, 1997, are subject to the formal hearing requirements of Chapter 5

unless the enabling statutes of that agency provide otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11501(b)*].

Finally, as mentioned above, the provisions of Chapter 4.5, the general procedures of the administrative adjudication provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), apply to an adjudicative proceeding required to be conducted under Chapter 5, unless the statutes relating to the proceeding provide otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11501(c)*]. This means also that the provisions of Chapter 4.5 apply to decisions of agencies when federal or state constitutional or statutory law require an evidentiary hearing to determine facts so as to formulate and issue a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.10*].

Thus any agency, for example the Department of Motor Vehicles (listed as an agency subject to Chapter 5 pursuant to former *Government Code Section 11501(b)(41)*), must follow the APA adjudication procedures unless its enabling statutes provide otherwise [*Gov. Code §§ 11400(b), 11501(a),(c)*; *see Serenko v. Bright (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 682, 689-690, 70 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

See *Chapter 473, Public Agency Adjudication, §§ 473.13, 473.15*, for further discussion.

[2] Who May Initiate Adjudication Proceedings

[a] Agency Employees and Public Officers

Unless the agency's governing statute expressly states who can or cannot initiate a proceeding, an administrative adjudication usually is initiated by a pleading signed and filed by an agency employee or a public officer [*see* discussion in [3], and [4], *below*, for explanation of the two principal kinds of initial pleadings].

Thus, *Gov. Code §§ 11503* and *11504* require that the initial pleading be verified, "unless made by a public officer acting in his official capacity or by an employee of the agency before which the proceeding is to be held."

In practice, the public officer is usually a deputy attorney general, although some statutes authorize particular public officials outside the agency to initiate administrative actions [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 24203* (authorizing hearings on accusations by local legislative bodies and police officials against liquor licensees)].

[b] Investigative Personnel

Agency personnel who conduct investigations may also sign and file charges [*Jacobs v. Board of Dental Examiners (1922) 189 Cal. 709, 713, 209 P. 1006]* . This dual function is not a violation of due process [*Greer v. Board of Education (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 98, 119-120, 121 Cal. Rptr. 542]* .

[c] Participation in Adjudication by Agency Member Who Files Charges

If an agency board member files the charges, however, that member may not participate in the adjudication of the charges unless his or her participation is necessary for the matter to be determined [*Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 723-724, 285 P.2d 636 , appeal dismissed, 350 U.S. 984, 76 S. Ct. 473, 100 L. Ed. 852 (1956)* ; *Nider v. Homan (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 11, 17, 89 P.2d 136]* . To avoid this problem, most boards have their executive officer file the charges.

[d] Third Parties

A private third party may also file an accusation in a proceeding under the California APA [*Gov. Code § 11503*; *Humane Society etc., California Branch Inc. v. Merrill (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 115, 120, 18 Cal. Rptr. 701]* . Unless the governing laws require the agency to hold a hearing when an accusation is filed, the accusation (or statement of issues) will be treated like any other public complaint [*see* discussion in *§ 473A.10* regarding an agency's discretion to act]. The agency is free to ignore an accusation (or statement of issues) filed by a third party complainant unless the

third party has a due process right to a hearing [*Spear v. Board of Medical Examiners (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 207, 212, 303 P.2d 886* ; *see* discussion in [3] and [4] below; for detailed discussion of the application of due process protections to administrative adjudications, *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies*].

[3] Accusation

[a] Nature of Accusation

The APA requires an agency seeking to revoke, suspend, limit, or condition a right, authority, license, or privilege to initiate the action by filing a written accusation. The accusation is a statement of charges that must comply with the following requirements [*Gov. Code § 11503*]:

- States the acts and omissions with which the respondent is charged so the respondent is able to prepare a defense.
- Specifies the statutes and rules that the respondent is alleged to have violated.
- Is drafted in ordinary and concise language.

Compliance with these requirements is a statutory predicate to disciplinary action [*Linda Jones General Builder v. Contractors' State License Board (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1320, 1324, 1326, 240 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *Bohemian Club v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1, 24, 231 Cal. Rptr. 769 , appeal dismissed, 484 U.S. 805, 108 S. Ct. 51, 98 L. Ed. 2d 16 (1987)* ; *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1982) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 526-527, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693]* . An accusation satisfied the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11503* when it stated that the applicant for a real estate license had been denied a license on the grounds that he had been disbarred from the practice of law, and the accusation set forth the statutory sections and Rules of Professional Conduct sections that the applicant had violated which provided the basis for disbarment. The accusation was not required to set forth specific acts of dishonesty committed by the applicant [*Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 223, 228-229, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803]* .

See *§ 473A.50* for a form of accusation, and § 473A.51 for a form of notice of accusation.

[b] Fair Notice

In administrative proceedings, courts are more concerned with fair notice to the respondent than adherence to the technical rules of pleading [*see, e.g.,* *Stearns v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 205, 213, 98 Cal. Rptr. 467, 490 P.2d 1155* (because administrative pleadings not bound by strict rules of pleading, variance between accusation and proof presents no ground for reversal as long as respondent is informed of substance of charge); *Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 941-942, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* (vagueness in accusation not material under liberal rules of administrative pleading as long as respondent is informed of substance of charge); *Wright v. Munro (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 843, 848, 301 P.2d 997* (in administrative proceedings, courts are more concerned with fair notice to respondent than with technical rules of pleading)].

The accusation must specify enough facts to notify the respondent of the agency's allegations and permit the respondent to gather witnesses and evidence to refute the allegations [*Hostetter v. Alderson (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 499, 502, 241 P.2d 230* ; *Stoumen v. Munro (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 302, 306-307, 33 Cal. Rptr. 305]* . The agency is not required to identify all the circumstances of the acts alleged or to specify the evidence that it will present to support the charges [*Nelson v. Dept. Alcoholic Bev. Control (1959) 166 Cal. App. 2d 783, 787-788, 333 P.2d 771* ; *Mast v. State Board of Optometry (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 78, 90-91, 293 P.2d 148]* .

However, procedural due process requires that the board give the accused party fair notice of charges that the agency is

going to rely upon to support discipline [*Sanchez v. City of Los Angeles (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1080-1082, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 188* (notice of proposed 20-day disciplinary suspension was not sufficient to give officer timely notice of proposed pay grade reduction within one-year time period; officer was entitled to reinstatement in pay grade to officer status held before discipline was imposed); *Stokes v. California Horse Racing Board (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 477, 482-483, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (licensed horse trainer received fair notice of charges against him that Board relied upon as basis for discipline)]. Failure to give fair notice violates procedural due process [*Smith v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 229, 241-242, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532* (Board's failure to inform pharmacist that it was going to rely on a theory that he was negligent as pharmacist in charge violated procedural due process of law requirements)].

In a physician licensing revocation action, due process of law required that the physician be given fair notice that the failure to complete a diversion program would be treated as unprofessional conduct that provided its own basis for discipline. While physician disciplinary proceeding are not penal (criminal), and the notice standards are not as specific or strict as in criminal law actions, the statute authorizing discipline must provide a reasonably clear basis for that discipline, and the physician has to be given notice of that consequence. The lack of such clear basis in thestatute lead the court to interpret the statute as not providing authority to discipline a physician for failure to complete a diversion program [*Medical Board of California v. Superior Court (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 163, 173-175, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 403]* .

However, a governing statute (*e.g., Educ. Code § 89539*) may restrict an agency's authority to consider additional facts and circumstances in reviewing an employee termination decision. In that circumstance, the agency must rely on the original charges stated in the notice of dismissal, and may not amend the notice of dismissal to add new charges either before, or after the hearing [*Brooks v. State Personnel Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1068, 1074-1075, 272 Cal. Rptr. 292* ; *Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1164-65, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* . Furthermore, the agency may not rely on the amended charges in reaching its decision [*Brooks v. State Personnel Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1068, 1074-1075, 272 Cal. Rptr. 292]* .

[c] Allegations

Accusations and similar non-APA initial pleadings should contain all of the allegations necessary under the APA and other statutes governing the agency action. These pleadings generally contain allegations concerning:

- Jurisdiction [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 118(b)*].
- Statutory grounds for the action.
- Specific conduct.
- Prior discipline.
- A prayer for relief.

The pleadings often must be verified [*see* [7], *below*] and must be properly served [*see* [9], *below*].

An accusation must state the acts and omissions with which the respondent is charged so that the respondent is able to prepare a defense [*see* [a], *above*, for general requirements].

For non-California APA proceedings, courts have held that statutory allegations are accepted only if the statute itself is explicit enough to advise the respondent of the particular offense forming the basis of the charge [*Smulson v. Board of Dental Examiners (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 584, 589, 118 P.2d 483]* .

Legal conclusions couched as pleading allegations are considered mere surplusage and may be disregarded, so long as the statement of charges is otherwise sufficient [*Shewbridge v. Police Commission (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 787, 791, 149 P.2d 429]* .

[4] Statement of Issues

[a] Definition

A statement of issues is necessary to initiate a formal hearing under the APA to determine whether a right, authority, privilege, or license should be granted, issued, or renewed [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

A statement of issues is a written specification of the statutes and rules with which the respondent must show that he or she has complied; the respondent demonstrates this compliance by producing proof at the hearing. The statement of issues also includes any matters that have come to the attention of the initiating party, the party who files the statement of issues, that would authorize a denial of the agency action that is sought [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

[b] Applicability of California APA Accusation Provisions

The APA's provisions for proceedings on an accusation (*see generally Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.* and *Gov. Code § 11505 et seq.*), also apply to proceedings on a statement of issues [*Gov. Code § 11504.5*]. When, however, the hearing is held at the request of the respondent, the following exceptions apply [*Gov. Code § 11504*; *see* [9], *below*]:

- The provisions of *Gov. Code § 11505* (service of the accusation, discussed in [9], *below*) and *Gov. Code § 11506* (notice of defense, discussed in [6], *below*) do not apply.

- The statement of issues together with the notice of hearing must be delivered or mailed to the parties as provided in *Gov. Code § 11509*.

[c] Form of Statement of Issues and Verification

The form of a statement of issues is similar to that of an accusation [*see* [3], *above*]. It should inform the parties of the specific factual issues raised regarding the agency action sought or the denial of that action. It usually contains a statement that the complainant is acting in an official capacity and sets out the statutory and regulatory provisions applicable to the agency's action. A public employee is immune from liability for his or her disposition of a license application if he or she is authorized to make the determination in question [*see Gov. Code § 821.2*]. Further, a statement of issues need not be verified if issued by a public officer in his or her official capacity, or by an employee of the agency before which the hearing is to be held [*see Gov. Code § 11504*; *see also* [7], *below*]. See *§ 473A.52*, for a statement of issues form.

[d] Service of Statement of Issues

A statement of issues is generally sent in one of two ways:

- Usually an agency denying a license or other privilege sends a denial letter to the applicant; if the applicant responds with a request for a hearing, the agency sends a statement of issues [*cf. Akopiantz v. Board of Medical Examiners (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 331, 332, 304 P.2d 52* (hearing on denial of certificate held without any statement of issues by agency when physician requested hearing and waived statement of issues)]. In this situation, when the hearing is held at the request of the respondent, the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11505* (service of accusation) and *Gov. Code § 11506* (notice of defense) do not apply, and the statement of issues together with the notice of hearing is delivered or mailed to the parties as provided in *Gov. Code § 11509* [*Gov. Code § 11504*; *see* discussion in [9][b], [c], *below*]. See

§ 473A.53, for a form of request for hearing.

- Sometimes an agency sends a statement of issues in lieu of a letter of denial. On these occasions, the statement of issues is served in the same way as an accusation [*Gov. Code § 11504*]. In other words, a statement of issues is served in the same way as an accusation whenever the agency serves it before the respondent requests a hearing [*see* discussion in [9][a], *below*].

Even though *Gov. Code § 11506* (notice of defense, discussed in [6], *below*) does not apply when a hearing on a statement of issues is initiated by the respondent's request for a hearing, it has been suggested that the respondent in such a proceeding should nonetheless plead, file, and serve on all parties before the hearing, any of the defenses described in *Gov. Code § 11506* that he or she wishes to raise [*see* Bobby, *An Introduction to Practice and Procedure Under the California Administrative Procedure Act, 15 Hast. L. J. 258, 261 (1964)*].

[5] Amending, Supplementing, or Correcting Accusations or Statements of Issues

Technical defects in accusations or statements of issues can be rectified in a variety of ways. The APA allows the agency to file or accept the filing of an amended or supplemental accusation or statement of issues before the matter is submitted for decision [*Gov. Code § 11507*; *Button v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 730, 738, 176 Cal. Rptr. 218* (statement of issues); *Stuck v. Board of Medical Examiners (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 751, 756, 211 P.2d 389* (accusation)].

More than one amendment may be permitted [*see 20 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 192, 193 (1952)]* . The APA also allows an agency to order amendment of an accusation or statement of issues after the case is submitted for decision [*Gov. Code § 11516*; *Taylor v. City of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 611, 617, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521]* . An amendment after the case is submitted for decision is generally intended to conform the initial pleading to the proof made at the hearing.

For non-APA proceedings, the liberal rules governing administrative pleadings should allow an agency to amend the initial pleading before the hearing [*see Cook v. Civil Service Commission (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 118, 126-127, 2 Cal. Rptr. 836* (dismissal of police officer by municipal commission after hearing on amended pleadings upheld)]. After the hearing commences, agencies not governed by the APA probably have the same right as APA agencies to amend the initial pleading [*see Tapley v. Abbott (1931) 111 Cal. App. 397, 400, 295 P. 911* (finding of unprofessional conduct upheld despite amendment of pleadings during hearing to conform to proof); *see also Gov. Code § 11516* (APA agencies)].

The California Court of Appeal reversed the Superior Court's dismissal of an enforcement action brought by the Labor Commissioner to enforce an order requiring an employer to rehire an employee with back pay. The Labor Commissioner claimed that the employer had fired the employee in retaliation for the making of a Cal-OSHA complaint against the employer's place of business, and that this was a wrongful retaliatory termination that is prohibited by the provisions of *Labor Code § 6310*. At trial before the superior court, the employer testified that she fired the employee out of fear that the employee would be the next one to file a Cal-OSHA complaint. The Court of Appeal held that the Labor commissioner had jurisdiction in these circumstances over a preemptive termination claim under *Labor Code Section 6310*, which specifically requires that employees actually make workplace safety complaints for the wrongful termination law to apply. The Court of Appeal held that the statute included preemptive termination claims within the scope of the Labor Commissioner's jurisdiction, and that proof of a preemptive termination did not constitute improper variance with the pleadings and the administrative decision, which had plead that a workplace safety violation had been made prior to termination of the employee [*Lujan v. Minagar (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1047-1048, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 861]* .

A pleading that contains some allegations in entirely general terms is not fatally defective when the agency proceeds against the respondent only on other more specific allegations. Thus, an accusation that charged improper and unethical

acts "including but not limited to the following" did not deny due process when the agency proceeded against the respondent only on the specifically enumerated charges [*Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 941-942, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563]* . The liberal rules of administrative pleading require mainly that the pleadings give sufficient notice to enable the accused to prepare a defense [*Hostetter v. Alderson (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 499, 502, 241 P.2d 230* ; *see* discussion in [3][b], *above*].

Technical defects in the pleadings may also be cured if the respondent indicates personal knowledge of the alleged incident. In one case, the respondents in a liquor license suspension proceeding objected to the form of the accusation, claiming that it did not enable them to identify the transactions in which they were alleged to have sold liquor to obviously intoxicated persons. The court held that the vague description of the buyer in the second count of the accusation did not hamper respondents in the preparation of their defense because one of the respondents, when testifying in his own defense, readily identified the incident and the customer, and named several people who were present at the time [*Burako v. Munro (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 688, 690-691, 345 P.2d 124]* .

All parties must be notified of an amended or supplemental accusation or statement of issues. When new charges are presented, the agency must give the respondent a reasonable opportunity to prepare a defense. The agency has discretion to allow the respondent to file a further pleading. New charges, however, are deemed controverted, and objections to the amended or supplemental accusation or statement of issues may be made orally and will be noted on the record [*Gov. Code § 11507*]. If the agency orders amendment of the accusation or statement of issues after the case is submitted for decision, each party will be given the opportunity to argue for reopening the case to introduce additional evidence. If it is shown that the party will be prejudiced unless the case is reopened, the agency must reopen the case to permit introduction of additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11516*].

[6] Notice of Defense

[a] Nature of Notice of Defense

When an accusation is served on a respondent in a formal hearing under the APA proceeding, the respondent may request a hearing by filing a notice of defense with the agency [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*].

A form notice of defense accompanies the accusation when it is served [Gov. Code. § 11505(a)]. The notice usually consists of:

- A brief statement that the respondent acknowledges service of the accusation and the attending forms required by *Gov. Code § 11505*.
- A request for hearing.

See also discussion in [c], *below*, for a detailed list of what the notice of defense may contain.

A notice must be in writing, must be signed by or on behalf of the respondent, and must state the respondent's mailing address. The form notice need not be used [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*]. For forms that may be used in filing a notice of defense, see *§ 473A.54*.

[b] Effect of Notice of Defense or Failure to File Notice

The notice of defense is deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted [*Gov. Code § 11506(c)*; *but see* [d], *below* (discussing requirement to object specifically as to the form of an accusation)].

Failure to file a notice constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing. However, even when the right to a hearing has been

waived by the failure to file a notice of defense, agencies have, and sometimes exercise, the discretion to grant hearings despite the waiver [*Gov. Code § 11506(c)*]. A respondent may request a grant of hearing by way of relief from default for his or her failure to file the notice of defense [*see Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*; for a form that may be used to request that the failure to file a notice of defense not be deemed a waiver of the right to a hearing, *see § 473A.57*].

[c] Contents of Notice

In addition to requesting a hearing, a notice of defense may include the following [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*]:

- An objection to the accusation on the ground that it does not state acts or omissions on which the agency may proceed [*see* [d], *below*].

- An objection to the form of the accusation on the ground that it is so indefinite or uncertain that the respondent cannot identify the transaction or prepare a defense [*see* [d], *below*].

- An admission of the accusation in whole or in part [*see* [f], *below*].

- New matter by way of defense [*see* [f], *below*].

- An objection to the accusation on the ground that compliance with the requirements of a regulation would result in a material violation of another regulation enacted by another department affecting substantive rights [*see* [g], *below*].

[d] Objection as to Form or Sufficiency of Accusation

Failure to object to *form* of the accusation, on the ground that it is so indefinite or uncertain that the respondent cannot identify the transaction or prepare a defense, waives that objection [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(3), (c)*; *Shea v. Board of Medical Examiners (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 564, 576, 146 Cal. Rptr. 653* ; *Collins v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 439, 444, 105 Cal. Rptr. 634* ; *Goldsmith v. Cal. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 866, 872-873, 13 Cal. Rptr. 139]* .

On the other hand, an objection that the accusation does not state acts or omissions on which the agency may proceed raises a question of the agency's jurisdiction over the subject matter. This objection is not waived and may be raised at any stage of the proceeding, including an appeal [*Manning v. Watson (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 705, 710, 239 P.2d 688* ; *Stuck v. Board of Medical Examiners (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 751, 755, 211 P.2d 389]* . This rule applies to non-APA proceedings as well [*Mumaw v. City of Glendale (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 454, 459-460, 76 Cal. Rptr. 245]* .

[e] Number of Notices and Time of Filing

The notice of defense must be filed within 15 days after service of the accusation. The respondent may file one or more notices of defense on any or all of the grounds listed in [c], *above*, but all of them must be filed within the time specified, unless the agency in its discretion authorizes the filing of a later notice [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*]. For a form that may be used to request an extension of time to file a notice of defense, see *§ 473A.56*.

[f] Admissions and Statements in Mitigation

Admissions can be made at any time before or during the hearing. Although one function of the notice of defense is to allow the respondent to admit the accusation in whole or in part (*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(4)*; *see* discussion in [c], *above*), admissions are rarely included in a notice of defense as a matter of practice. Practical considerations dictate that admissions should be few and should be limited to admissions of fact, rather than admissions of violations [*see also* discussion in *§ 473A.54[3] -[8]*].

When admissions are made, they do not preclude evidence of aggravation or mitigation, because such evidence concerns the penalty to be imposed, not the guilt or innocence of the respondent. When making an admission, a respondent should nevertheless expressly reserve the right to offer evidence in mitigation.

Prior to 1997, a respondent was entitled to file a statement by way of mitigation even if he or she did not file a notice of defense [*see* former *Gov. Code § 11506(d)*]. That provision has been eliminated in conformity with the requirement that a respondent now file a notice of defense or else waive his or her right to a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11506(c)*; *see* discussion in [b], *above*]. A respondent wishing to present evidence by way of mitigation must therefore file a notice of defense and simply present the evidence at the hearing as part or all of his or her defense [*see* 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Report 55 (1995), comments to *Gov. Code §§ 11506, 11520*].

[g] Affirmative Defenses

Although affirmative defenses may be raised in the notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(5)*; *see* discussion in [c], *above*], it appears that the failure to raise an affirmative defense in the notice of defense does not waive that defense [*see* discussion in *§ 473A.54[3], [4]*]. Two items in *Gov. Code § 11506(c)* support this statement:

- *Gov. Code § 11506(c)* provides that any objection to the form of an accusation must be raised in the notice of defense or that objection is waived [*see* [d], *above*]. Under the rule of statutory interpretation *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* ("the expression of one excludes the other"), the explicit provision for a waiver of objection as to form implies that any other objection not explicitly mentioned is not similarly waived if it not raised [*see Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 653, 659, 156 Cal. Rptr. 733, 596 P.2d 1149* ; *Garson v. Juarique (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 769, 774-775, 160 Cal. Rptr. 461* ; *see also* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 217, *Statutory Interpretation*].

- *Gov. Code § 11506(c)* also says that a notice of defense is deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted [*see* discussion in [b], *above*].

At least one court, however, did seem to find the failure to raise an affirmative defense in the notice of defense a significant point. In that case the court twice stressed the respondent's failure to raise a claim of laches in the notice of defense, noting that it was of interest that no new matter by way of defense was alleged; but the court's holding that the claim failed was based only its conclusion that the claim was first raised on appeal and no evidence in support of it had been offered in the administrative proceeding or in superior court [*Windham v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 461, 465, 474, 163 Cal. Rptr. 566* (citation omitted)].

Unless some strategic reason exists for withholding a particular affirmative defense, the whole question may be avoided by presenting new matter by way of defense in the notice, as allowed by *Gov. Code § 11506(a)(5)*.

The affirmative defense that compliance with the requirements of a regulation would result in the material violation of another agency's regulation [*see Gov. Code § 11506(a)(6)*] is a recent response to the classic dilemma illustrated by the case of *Barnard v. Carey* [*Barnard v. Carey (D.C. Ohio 1945) 60 F. Supp. 539]* . In *Barnard*, the Internal Revenue Service was threatening to tax soya butter and require it to be labeled as oleomargarine, while the Federal Security Agency threatened to impose penalties if it was labeled as oleomargarine. In the absence of express statutory authority, the federal court used its general equitable jurisdiction and inherent power to resolve the dilemma. A similar dilemma involving regulations can now be raised at the administrative level pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11506(a)(6)*.

[h] Notice of Defense Not Required When Respondent Has Already Requested Hearing

When an agency serves a statement of issues on a respondent before the respondent has made any request for a hearing,

the APA requires the respondent to file a notice of defense [*Gov. Code §§ 11504, 11504.5*]. If, however, the agency files a statement of issues in response to a respondent's request for a hearing, the requirements for filing a notice of defense do not apply [*Gov. Code § 11504*]. Although the respondent is not required to file a notice of defense in the latter event, he or she does not appear to be precluded from doing so, to raise any of the matters listed in *Gov. Code § 11506(a)* (discussed in [c], *above*).

[i] Non-APA Proceedings

In non-APA proceedings, no notice of defense requirement exists. Parties must check the appropriate statutes, ordinances, or regulations to see whether a responsive pleading is required, the form it must take, and the applicable filing procedure. Although failure to raise a jurisdictional issue in a responsive pleading would not waive the issue [*Mumaw v. City of Glendale (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 454, 459-460, 76 Cal. Rptr. 245]* , the failure to object that the complaint does not give adequate notice of the charges may waive any such defects in the complaint [*Vaughn v. Board of Police Commrs. (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 771, 778, 140 P.2d 130 , appeal dismissed, 321 U.S. 751, 64 S. Ct. 639, 88 L. Ed. 1052 (1943)]* .

[7] Verification

Under the APA, both accusations and statements of issues must be verified unless made by a public officer acting in his or her official capacity or by an employee of the agency before which the proceeding is to be held. The verification may be on information and belief [*Gov. Code §§ 11503, 11504*]. A notice of defense does not have to be verified; it need only be signed by or on behalf of the respondent and include the respondent's mailing address [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*].

In the absence of a statutory requirement for verification, pleadings in non-APA proceedings do not have to be verified [*Sullivan v. State Bar (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 488, 493-494, 170 P.2d 888 , overruled on other grounds*; *Stratmore v. State Bar (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 887, 890, 123 Cal. Rptr. 101, 538 P.2d 229* ; *Board of Education v. Jewett (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 64, 69, 68 P.2d 404]* . Guidance for verification procedures can be found in the statutes governing verification in civil pleadings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446* (verification of pleadings in civil actions)]. For a discussion of verification of pleadings in civil actions, with related forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[8] Filing

Administrative pleadings, including APA accusations and statements of issues, are usually "filed" with the administrative agency involved. Accusations and statements of issues are not filed with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). The OAH becomes involved only if the agency sends it the case for hearing. Under the APA, every hearing in a contested case must be presided over by an administrative law judge (ALJ). The agency itself decides whether (1) the ALJ hears the case alone or (2) the agency hears the case with the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(a)*].

The ALJ is assigned by the OAH [*see Gov. Code § 11370.3* (director of OAH assigns an ALJ to every APA hearing and may on agency's request assign an ALJ or other hearing officer to other administrative proceedings)]. After a case has been assigned to an ALJ, copies of all pleadings, motions, and other appropriate documents filed with an agency should also be sent to the ALJ. For further discussion and forms relating to assignment and other procedures involving the ALJ, see Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .

What constitutes "filing" depends on the agency's practice. When a particular pleading is deemed filed by an agency, the date of filing should be indicated on the document. This date is essential for determining time-limit issues. A notice of defense [*see* discussion in [6], *above*] under the APA must be filed within 15 days of service of an accusation [*Gov. Code § 11505(a), (b)*]. A notice of defense is "filed" when it is delivered or mailed to the agency within 15 days after the accusation was personally served on or mailed to the respondent [*Gov. Code §§ 11506(e)* (definition of "filed" with reference to notice of defense), 11505(b) (delivery or mailing within 15 days required)].

[9] Service

[a] Accusations and Statements of Issues

Accusations may be served by sending a copy of the accusation and the required accompanying information to the respondent by regular mail addressed to the last known address of the respondent, or by personal service, at the option of the agency [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 124*]. Statements of issues may be served in the same way unless the respondent has already requested a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11504*; *see* discussion in [b], *below*].

The agency may not make an order that adversely affects the respondent's rights, however, unless the respondent has been served personally or by registered mail, or has filed a notice of defense or otherwise appeared. Service by registered mail to the latest address on file with the agency is effective if the agency requires the respondent to keep his or her current address on file with the agency [*Gov. Code § 11505(c)*]. Registered mail service to an established business address that the regulated business is required to file with the agency satisfies due process requirements of notice prior to license revocation proceedings because this method of notice is reasonably likely to inform the regulated party [*Evans v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 958, 970-971, 26 Cal. Rptr.2d 460* ; *Baughman v. Medical Board (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 398, 403, 46 Cal. Rptr. 498* ; *Miller Family Home, Inc. v. Department of Social Services (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 488, 492-493, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 171]* . Because of this limit on their power to make orders adverse to the respondent, agencies usually effect service by personal service or registered mail. Proof of service can be made as in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11505(c)*]. Proof of service in civil actions is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10 et seq.* [*see generally* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

While the agency may include any information it deems appropriate, when the accusation or statement of issues is served it *must* be accompanied by the following documents [*Gov. Code § 11505(a)*]:

- A form notice of defense.
- Copies of *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7* governing discovery in APA proceedings.
- A statement that the respondent may request a hearing by filing a notice of defense within 15 days after service of the accusation or statement of issues, and that failure to do so will constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing. The statement to the respondent must also include (a) notice that the respondent may be represented by counsel; (b) the name and address of the agency person to contact for discovery; and (c) information on postponing the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11505(b)*].

[b] Statements of Issues Served and Filed in Response to a Respondent's Request for a Hearing

As noted in [a], *above*, a statement of issues in response to a respondent's request for a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11504*] is served and filed differently from a statement of issues served before the respondent has made any request for a hearing. The latter type of statement is similar in nature to an accusation and is subject to the same service and filing requirements [*see* discussion in [a], *above*]. A statement of issues served after a respondent's request for hearing is, by contrast, delivered or mailed to the parties along with a notice of hearing at least 10 days before the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11509*]. The service must include copies of *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*, relating to discovery in APA proceedings, and the name and address of the agency person to contact for discovery [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

For further discussion of the requirements for a notice of hearing, see [c], and [10][b], *below*.

[c] Notice of Hearing Under the APA

In APA proceedings, the agency must either mail or deliver a notice of hearing to all parties [*Gov. Code § 11509*]. The

notice must be delivered or mailed at least 10 days before the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11509*]. For discussion of this requirement, see [10][b], *below*.

[d] Notice of Hearing in Non-California APA Proceedings

In non-APA proceedings, service of pleadings and other documents is sometimes provided for by statute or ordinance. In the absence of statutory requirements for service, some form of actual notice is required [*Simpson v. City of Los Angeles (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 271, 280, 253 P.2d 464 , appeal dismissed, 346 U.S. 802, 74 S. Ct. 37, 98 L. Ed. 333 (1953)* ; *see Milliken v. Meyer (1940) 311 U.S. 457, 463, 61 S. Ct. 339, 85 L. Ed. 278* (due process requires a form of service of process that gives actual notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to be heard)].

[10] Notice of Hearing

[a] Due Process Requirements

Adequate notice of hearing is essential to procedural due process [*Carstens v. Pillsbury (1916) 172 Cal. 572, 577, 158 P. 218* ; *People v. Lockheed Shipbuilding & Constr. Co. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 776, 780-781, 111 Cal. Rptr. 106* ; *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12-13, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898]* . An agency cannot require that adequate notice be waived [*Carroll v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 164, 168-169, 105 P.2d 110]* . For a discussion of the right to notice of administrative action, see Chapter 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* [*see also* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies*].

When a party wants to object to notice, the party should not wait for the hearing to do so. Rather, the party should make a showing of prejudice and request a continuance; if the party has been notified to attend a proceeding, and does so, the party does not have the basis to complain of the insufficiency of the notice [*DeLuca v. Board of Supervisors (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 606, 609, 286 P.2d 395]* .

The operator of a nude entertainment establishment was not denied any due process of law rights by the decision of the City of San Diego to suspend the operators required police permit because the operator violated provisions of city regulations that applied to his business. The California Court of Appeal rejected the operators due process challenge based on untimely notice of the charged violations. Notice regarding most of the violations was given within two weeks of the date of the violation. Delay in the giving notice of the violations did not cause any actual prejudice to the operator, and there was no showing of lost witnesses or other evidence. The operator had the burden of proof of showing actual prejudice from delay, and there was no such proof. Finally, the suspension was based on numerous violations over an extended period of time, and the operator had more than sufficient notice of those violations [*Krontz v. City of San Diego (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1140-1141, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 535]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the California Coastal Commission did not deprive a developer of the due process right to notice of a hearing in which the commission considered a citizen's group appeal of the granting of a coastal development permit sought by the developer. The court concluded that the notice given to the developer was adequate to inform him of the issues to be considered at the hearing. The written notice of the commission hearing considering the appeal of the coastal development permit merely stated the date, time, and place of the hearing, but the commission sent the developer a copy of the appeal document filed by a group of local citizens, and that document contained a statement of the issues on appeal. Also, the developer was familiar with the issues to be appealed since he had participated in the development permit proceedings at the local government (county) level [*Benson v. Cal. Coastal Comm'n (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 348, 353-354, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 580]* .

[b] APA Notice Requirements

The California APA requires an agency to deliver or mail a notice of hearing to all parties at least 10 days before the hearing. The hearing itself cannot be held until the time for respondent to file a notice of defense has expired (15 days

after service of the accusation or statement of issues) [*Gov. Code § 11509*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11505, 11506* (notice of defense); *see also* discussion in [6], *above*]. Although it may include other information, the notice must be substantially in the form required by statute [*Gov. Code § 11509*].

[c] Computing Time Period for Notice

In computing the 10-day-notice period under the California APA, the day of mailing or delivery is excluded and the last day is included [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 12, 1013*]. This method of computation was apparently applied incorrectly in one case [*Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563]* in which the Board of Medical Examiners failed to give notice "*at least* 10 days prior to the hearing" [*Gov. Code § 11509*] because it convened a hearing on the tenth day. The hearing should have begun on the eleventh day [*Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 942, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563]* .

One court of appeal panel held that the extension of time provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* for service by mail does not apply to notice of hearing under *Gov. Code § 11509* [*Governing Board v. Felt (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 156, 163, 127 Cal. Rptr. 381]* , because *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* applies only when some act must be done or a right exercised within a specified number of days after service, and does not apply to the right to be present at a proceeding for which a prescribed notice must be given [*Brown v. Rouse (1897) 115 Cal. 619, 621-622, 47 P. 601]* .

Subsequently, however, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* was amended [1980 Stats., ch. 196, § 2], to provide that the extension of notice time for mailing now applies to notice of a hearing or other proceeding, and includes "any prescribed period of notice." Whether *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* applies to administrative proceedings is not clear. It has been held that it does apply to the time allowed to appeal a decision of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board [*Pesce v. Dept. Alcoholic Bev. Control (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 310, 313, 333 P.2d 15]* . Assuming that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* applies to administrative proceedings, it is arguable that the minimum period of time for a notice of hearing should be 15 days from the date of mailing if the place of address is within California [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* (service of notice by mail extends prescribed period of notice by five days when place of address is within California); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e)* (time extended by two court days when notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or other overnight delivery service)].

In practice, APA notices of hearing usually provide more than either 10 or 15 days' notice. Notices are sent out soon after the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) gives the agency a hearing date. For calendar reasons, OAH regularly sets hearings three or four months in advance.

[d] Postage and Correct Address Not Required for Service by Mail

A mailed notice of hearing under the APA does not require a correct address or prepaid postage, as long as these defects do not impede the respondent's receipt of the notice [*Governing Board v. Felt (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 156, 163-164, 127 Cal. Rptr. 381]* . The mailing requirement of *Gov. Code § 11509* is substantially complied with if the improperly mailed notice is deposited in the mail and reaches the respondent as effectively and speedily as one correctly addressed with adequate postage [*Governing Board v. Felt (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 156, 163-164, 127 Cal. Rptr. 381* ; *Vo v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 820, 825, 826 n.2, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127]* .

[e] Notice of Continued Hearings

The APA does not provide for notice of a continued hearing. Although notice of a continued hearing may not be required when the respondent knows or should know the time and date of the continued hearing [*see McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 715, 187 P.2d 116]* , agencies routinely serve notices of continued hearings.

[11] Time and Place of Hearing

The date, time, and place of a APA hearing is set forth in the notice of hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11509*]. The date and time of the hearing is usually determined by the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) calendar. The place of hearing may be determined by the APA, by the agency, or by agreement of the parties. In the absence of an agreement by the parties, the place of hearing is normally determined either by where the transaction in issue occurred or where the respondent resides.

The time and place of hearing is determined by the agency. The agency shall consult the office, and subject to the availability of its staff, shall determine the time and place of the hearing. The hearing shall be held at a hearing facility maintained by the office in Sacramento, Oakland, Los Angeles, or San Diego and shall be held at the facility that is closest to the location where the transaction occurred or the respondent resides [*Gov. Code § 11508(a)*]. Alternatively, the hearing may be held at either of the following places [*Gov. Code § 11508(b)(1), (2) Gov. Code § 11508(b)(1), (2)*]:

> (1) A place selected by the agency that is closer to the location where the transaction occurred or the respondent resides.
>
> (2) A place within the state selected by agreement of the parties. The respondent may move for, and the administrative law judge has discretion to grant or deny, a change in the place of the hearing. A motion for a change in the place of the hearing shall be made within 10 days after service of the notice of hearing on the respondent [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*]. Unless good cause is identified in writing by the administrative law judge, hearings shall be held in a facility maintained by the office. [*Gov. Code § 11508*].

If the places where the transaction occurred and where the respondent resides are in different appellate districts, and two different hearinglocations are possible, the agency can pick either county [*Gov. Code § 11508(b)(1)*; *Cal-Am Corp. v. Department of Real Estate (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 453, 459, 163 Cal. Rptr. 729]* .

For the convenience of parties and witnesses, and for other reasons such as the incarceration of the respondent, the agency may select a hearing place nearer to the place where the transaction occurred or where the respondent resides than the counties designated for hearings [*Gov. Code § 11508(b)(1)*; *see Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351* (hearing for dentist jailed in San Diego properly held in San Diego although he lived elsewhere); *McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 713-715, 187 P.2d 116* (when respondent resides and transaction occurred in Fresno, agency may hold hearing in Sacramento rather than Los Angeles because Sacramento is closer to Fresno)].

The parties may mutually agree to have the hearing held any place within California [*Gov. Code § 11508(b)(2)*].

The OAH or the agency normally determines the exact location of the hearing within the appropriate county. Hearings in Los Angeles, Oakland, San Diego, and Sacramento are usually held at the local OAH hearing rooms, but are sometimes held in other parts of the counties. Regardless of where the hearing is held, the actual hearing room should be a place in keeping with a formal, quasi-judicial proceeding.

Respondent may move for, and the administrative law judge has discretion to grant or deny, a change in the place of hearing. If respondent wants to change the place of hearing, respondent must make a motion for a change in the place of the hearing within 10 days after service of the notice of hearing on respondent [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*].

[12] Affirmative Defenses

In any adjudicatory proceeding, new matter constituting a defense should be raised early and in the pleadings whenever possible. In civil court proceedings, affirmative defenses are raised in the answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. In

APA proceedings, "new matter by way of defense" may, but need not, be raised in the notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(5)*; *see* discussion in [6][g], *above*].

In other administrative proceedings, affirmative defenses should be raised in accordance with the agency's practice. For example, affirmative defenses are raised in the answer in compensation hearings [*Lab. Code § 5505*]. As with civil proceedings, an affirmative defense not raised in the pleadings may be deemed waived in a compensation hearing [*Lab. Code § 5505*]. Although most ALJs and agencies are liberal in allowing presentation of evidence of defenses regardless of whether the defense could havebeen pleaded, it is a good practice to plead them [*see also* discussion in [6][g], *above*].

The APA procedural requirements refer to "any new matter by way of defense" [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(5)*; *see* discussion in [6][g], *above*]. What constitutes an affirmative defense in non-APA proceedings is less clear. Issues of estoppel, laches, lapse of the applicable statute of limitation, illegality, res judicata, waiver, bankruptcy, and similar matters that go beyond just showing that the administrative charges are not true should be raised as affirmative defenses. Anything the respondent intends to rely on that has not been put at issue by the agency should be affirmatively pleaded to prevent either waiver or unfair surprise.

For further discussion of laches and statutes of limitation, *see § 473A.12*.

[13] Demurrers

Under the APA, a challenge to the sufficiency of the accusation or statement of issues should be included as part of the respondent's notice of defense, although the respondent is not precluded from raising the objection later [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2)*; *see* discussion in [6], *above*].

Similarly, special demurrers based on the form of an allegation, such as a claim that the allegation is indefinite or uncertain [*see Gov. Code § 11506(a)(3)* (respondent may object in notice of defense that form of accusation or statement of issues is so indefinite or uncertain that respondent cannot identify the transaction or prepare a defense)], must also be included in the notice of defense, in order to allow the administrative law judge to consider the objection, and, if it is sustained, to allow time to amend the pleading [*see Gov. Code § 11507* (amended or supplemental pleadings, discussed in [5], *above*)]. *Gov. Code § 11506(b)* provides that the respondent's failure to object to the indefiniteness or uncertainty of the accusation or statement of issues in his or her notice of defense waives all objections as to the form of the accusation or statement [*see* discussion in [6][d], *above*].

Objections to the form of the accusation or statement of issues in the notice of defense usually are not communicated to the assigned ALJ until the notice of defense is marked with the other pleadings at the start of the hearing. By this time, any vagueness or uncertainty in the pleadings may have been cured by discovery [*see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* , for discussion of discovery in administrative hearings], or by the respondent's own knowledge of the event that the pleadings imperfectly describe [*see Burako v. Munro (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 688, 690-691, 345 P.2d 124* (vagueness of allegations in accusation held not to have hampered respondents in preparing defense, because one respondent, testifying in own defense, readily identified the incident and customer, and named several people who were present)]. In practice, an ALJ confronted with impermissibly vague pleadings may provide a limited continuance to a respondent who can establish an inability to prepare a defense or actual surprise at the hearing. However, an ALJ sitting alone cannot grant a motion to dismiss [*Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 175, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226]* .

As for non-APA proceedings, the specific procedures of a number of agencies provide some method by which a respondent may test the sufficiency of written allegations by a demurrer or demurrer-type objection. If no express provision exists for a demurrer, it will be implied [*see Dyment v. Board of Medical Examiners (1922) 57 Cal. App. 260, 262-264, 207 P. 409* (considerations of justice and natural rights require that no one be brought to trial on insufficient charges; this rule applies to medical board license hearings)]. As with APA procedures, any special

demurrer or objection as to form, uncertainty, or indefiniteness, should be raised as early as possible to allow for consideration and amendment, or it may be deemed waived.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityParticipation in ProsecutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.12

§ 473A.12 Limitations of Action and Laches

[1] Applicability

Statutes limiting the time in which an administrative proceeding may be begun are sometimes included in an agency's governing act. These specific statutes of limitation should be raised as affirmative defenses [*see* discussion in *§ 473A.11[12]*]. For example, an accusation against a licensee regulated by the Board of Behavioral Sciences must be brought within three years from the date the Board discovers the alleged act or omission that is the basis for disciplinary action, or within seven years from the date the alleged act or omission that is the basis for disciplinary action occurred, whichever occurs first [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2960.05(a)*].

An accusation brought against a real estate licensee for disciplinary action must be filed within three years of the occurrence of the grounds for disciplinary action [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10101*]. An accusation brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10177(f)* (suspension of a license issued by a different government agency) against a real estate licensee whose law license was suspended by the State Bar was timely filed when it was brought within three years of the date of the suspension of the licensee's law license. The date of the suspension was the date of occurrence of the grounds of the suspension, not the date of the underlying misconduct that led to suspension of the law license [*Herrera v. Department of Real Estate (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 776, 779-780, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 232]* .

Accusations that are brought by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing against employers for violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act, must be brought within two years after the filing of the complaint for group or class complaints under *Gov. Code § 12961*, two years after the filing of complaints under *Civil Code § 51.7*, and one year after the filing of the complaint for all other complaints [*Gov. Code § 12965(a)*].

Statutes of limitation barring civil actions do not apply to administrative actions. In the absence of a specific limitations statute pertaining to an administrative action, that action is not barred by the mere lapse of time [*Bernd v. Eu (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 511, 515-516, 161 Cal. Rptr. 58]* . However, if the delay in commencing an administrative proceeding is an unreasonable delay and the respondent has been prejudiced by this delay, courts have the inherent power to dismiss the proceeding [*Fahmy v. Medical Bd. of California (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 810, 815-816, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486* (laches defense not established because doctor could not prove prejudice in Board's delay in bringing disciplinary

charges against doctor); *Gates v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 921, 925, 156 Cal. Rptr. 791* (on petition for a writ of mandamus)].

The time to be considered in determining whether an unreasonable delay has occurred is the period from the time the agency learned or should have learned the facts on which the action is based to the time the action was formally commenced [*Gore v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 184, 193, 167 Cal. Rptr. 881]* .

The courts also have inherent power to dismiss an administrative proceeding that has been commenced but has not been diligently prosecuted [*Steen v. City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 542, 546-547, 190 P.2d 937]* . In measuring "diligence," the courts apply notions of laches borrowed from the civil law [*Hope Rehabilitation Services v. Department of Rehabilitation (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 938, 948, 261 Cal. Rptr. 123* ; *Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1159, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

[2] Elements of Laches

[a] Unreasonable Delay and Resulting Prejudice

The defense of laches requires unreasonable delay and either the respondent's acquiescence to the act complained of, or prejudice to the respondent resulting from the delay. There is no fixed rule on the circumstances that must exist or on the period of time that must elapse before the doctrine of laches applies. What makes delay unreasonable is that it results in prejudice [*Hope Rehabilitation Services v. Department of Rehabilitation (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 938, 948, 261 Cal. Rptr. 123* ; *Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1159, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

[b] Determining When Delay Is Unreasonable

In administrative cases when no specific statute of limitations applies, but a statute governs an analogous action at law, that period may be borrowed as a measure of the outer limit of reasonable delay. Whether the court will borrow the statutory period depends on the strength of the analogy between the action at law and the administrative proceeding [*Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1158-1160, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

[c] Determining Prejudice Resulting From Delay

Prejudice from delay is often difficult to prove. The inability of a witness to recall exact words is not sufficient [*Vaughn v. State Bar (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 698, 702-703, 108 Cal. Rptr. 806, 511 P.2d 1158]* . A general claim of prejudice is not sufficient, and prejudice cannot be presumed [*Caldwell v. State Bar (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 488, 496, 119 Cal. Rptr. 217, 531 P.2d 785* ; *Lewis v. State Bar (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 704, 714, 108 Cal. Rptr. 821, 511 P.2d 1173* ; *Fahmy v. Medical Bd. of California (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 810, 815-816, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486* (laches defense not established because doctor could not prove prejudice in Board's delay in bringing disciplinary charges against doctor)]. Added difficulty in locating a witness and the loss of a record to determine a conflict in testimony are not necessarily prejudicial [*see* *Taylor v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 424, 434-435, 113 Cal. Rptr. 478, 521 P.2d 470* (loss of contact with witness not prejudicial when party had six months after trial hearing and before hearing of disciplinary board to locate witness and to apply for leave to present additional evidence; claimed certificate of good standing from time when State Bar did not keep such records could have been substantiated by offer in evidence of copy allegedly given to party)]. When the memories of witnesses have diminished to the point that the respondent cannot engage in effective cross-examination, then respondent has been prejudiced by the delay [*Gates v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 921, 925-926, 156 Cal. Rptr. 791]* .

The burden of proving prejudice is on the party asserting it [*Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 361, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617]* . When the delay exceeds the period of an analogous statute of limitations that has been "borrowed" by the court [*see* discussion in [b], *above*], however, the violation of the analogous statute shifts the burden to the agency to prove that the delay was excusable and that the respondent was not prejudiced

by it [*Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1161, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

This burden may be very difficult to meet. To excuse delay, the responsible party must show that exceptional circumstances prevented earlier action. Under these circumstances, mere detrimental reliance on the status quo by the affected party is enough to establish prejudice [*Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1161-1162, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

[3] Application of Laches by Agency Itself

Agencies as well as courts can apply the laches doctrine to dismiss administrative actions; this issue should be raised at the administrative level [*see, e.g.,* *Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1155, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53* (at outset of board hearing, respondent argued that two of the three instances charged were so remote that delay in prosecution should bar their use in the proceeding against him)].

To avoid concerns about waiving laches as an affirmative defense, and to avoid claims that respondent has not exhausted his or her administrative remedies, respondent's counsel should raise laches early as an affirmative defense and make an adequate showing on the record of both unreasonable delay and prejudice. How the ALJ determines the issue may depend on whether the judge has authority to make a final decision [*see* Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*].

If the final decision rests with the agency itself, a decision on laches will be reserved and made part of the judge's proposed decision. If the agency decides not to adopt a proposed decision to dismiss for laches, there will be an administrative hearing on the merits. Counsel must be prepared at the hearing to defend on the merits.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsPleading & ProofGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.13

§ 473A.13 Unconstitutional Statutes

Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5, casts some doubt on whether the constitutionality of a statute on which an agency is proceeding can be raised in an administrative proceeding as an affirmative defense or in a demurrer to the agency's allegations. Section 3.5 declares that an administrative agency has no power to do the following [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*]:

- Declare a statute unenforceable or refuse to enforce it on the basis that it is unconstitutional unless an appellate court has found the statute unconstitutional.

- Declare a statute unenforceable or refuse to enforce it on the basis of federal preemption unless an appellate court has so held.

- Declare a statute unconstitutional.

Although *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*, seems to preclude or severely restrict constitutional challenges at an administrative hearing, these issues should be raised in the pleadings at the administrative level and a record should be made of the challenge. There are several reasons for doing this.

First, the section by its terms does not prevent the mere hearing of a constitutional challenge, only the declaration that a statute is unconstitutional or the refusal to enforce it on this basis [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*]. These terms have led one federal court, applying California law, to hold that the failure to raise a constitutional challenge at the administrative level may limit a later court challenge [*see Southern Pacific Transp. Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (9th Cir. 1983) 716 F.2d 1285, 1291* (preemption claim not raised in administrative hearing is res judicata after California Supreme Court's denial of petition for review)]. Two divisions of the California court of appeals, however, have disagreed [*see Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 975-976, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299* (requirement of exhaustion of remedies no bar when state statute challenged as violation of federal law); *Chevrolet Motor Division v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 539, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270* (failure to challenge constitutionality of statute before administrative tribunal does not waive the issue)].

It is impossible to predict the extent to which an ALJ will allow evidence on a constitutional challenge that may be irrelevant to the issues the agency can actually decide.

Second, *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*, applies to challenges to statutes. It does not affect an agency's enforcement of its own rules or its power to examine evidence concerning them in light of constitutional standards [*Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 669 n.18, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* ; *Lewis-Westco & Co. v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 829, 840, n. 12, 186 Cal. Rptr. 552* ; *see* Dash, Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appea ls *Bd. (9th Cir. 1982) 683 F.2d 1229, 1233-1235* (applying California Law)]. Thus, if the challenge affects regulations, the agency has the power to decide it.

Third, an agency can still interpret the law in discharging its duties. The agency may consult federal law (or constitutional law) to determine if the state law can be enforced without offending the federal law (or the constitution). The preemption issue or the constitutional challenge can thus be resolved by interpreting the state law in a way that avoids the issue [*see* *Regents of University of California v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042, 189 Cal. Rptr. 298]* . In addition, an agency decision on nonconstitutional issues may obviate the consideration of constitutional challenges [*see* *Leek v. Washington Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 43, 53, 177 Cal. Rptr. 196]* .

Fourth, the constitutional challenge may go to legislation already held unconstitutional in the past and that is thus now "patently unconstitutional." If a law is patently unconstitutional, *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*, does not bar an agency from recognizing that fact by refusing to enforce the law [*see* *Schmid v. Lovette (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 466, 473-474, 201 Cal. Rptr. 424]* .

Fifth, if *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*, does prevent the agency from acting on the challenge, a proper record can obviate the need for taking evidence in a later court challenge. The record will expedite the court proceedings and eliminate the issue of whether the respondent exhausted its administrative remedies. A proper record is important because it allows the respondents to show that they exhausted their administrative remedies even when alleging constitutional violations [*Leek v. Washington Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 43, 53, 177 Cal. Rptr. 196]* .

The Court of Appeal held that the Public Utilities Commission was not prohibited by *Cal. Const. Art. III, § 3.5* (administrative agency prohibited from declaring unenforceability or refusing to enforce state statute on grounds that statute is unconstitutional, or inconsistent with federal law, unless appellate court has made such a determination of unconstitutionality, or prohibited by federal law) from enforcing a state statute on grounds that the statute was inconsistent with another state statute that the PUC was required to enforce. PUC did not violate separation of powers by refusing to enforce the inconsistent statute [*Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Co. v. Public Utilities Commission (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 881, 887-888, 891, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 503]* .

A local executive official, the Mayor of the City and County of San Francisco, who had a ministerial duty to enforce a state statute limiting marriage to couples of the opposite sex, exceeded his authority when he decided unilaterally that the marriage statute was unconstitutional and ordered the clerk office's to start issuing marriage licenses to same sex couples. A local executive official does not possess the authority to refuse to enforce a state statute without a court first determining that the statute is unconstitutional. The California Supreme Court issued a writ of mandate ordering the Mayor and other San Francisco officials to enforce the state marriage statute and to correct the consequences of past unauthorized actions [*Lockyer v. City and County of San Francisco (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1055, 1068-1069, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 225, 95 P.3d 459]* . The California Supreme Court did not decide whether the provisions of *Cal. Const. art. III, § 3.5* apply to local officials or merely to state administrative agencies, but the court extensively discussed the history and background that led to the adoption of that provision of the constitution. The court did decide that California law prior to the adoption of that constitutional provision did not allow local officials the authority to determine the constitutionality of state statutes [*Lockyer v. City and County of San Francisco (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1055, 1092-1093, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 225, 95 P.3d 459]* , and did decide that the provisions of *Cal. Const. art. III, § 3.5* "did not grant or

expand" local executive officials authority to determine whether a particular state statute was unconstitutional [*Lockyer v. City and County of San Francisco (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1055, 1085-1086, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 225, 95 P.3d 459]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsAuthority to AdjudicateValidity of LegislationConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.14

§ 473A.14 Parties and Interested Third Persons

[1] Definition of Party and Participation of Third Persons

The APA defines a "party" to include the agency, the respondent, and "any person, other than an officer or an employee of the agency in his or her official capacity, who has been allowed to appear or participate in the proceeding" [*Gov. Code § 11500(b)*; *see also Gov. Code § 11405.60*, definition of party for purposes of *Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*]. This definition, along with other provisions of the APA [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11507* (filing of amended or supplemental accusations or statements of issues); *see also* discussion in *§ 473A.11[5]*], make it clear that agencies may allow interested third persons to become parties and participate in APA adjudicatory proceedings. Further, third persons may be allowed to file verified accusations and statements of issues [*Gov. Code §§ 11503, 11504*; *Humane Society etc., California Branch Inc. v. Merrill (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 115, 120, 18 Cal. Rptr. 701* ; *see § 473A.11[2][c]*]. In addition to this general authority for third party participation, specific authority can be found in some agency statutes [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 24013, 24201* (protests and accusations to Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control); *Pub. Util. Code § 1702* (Public Utilities Commission); *see also* [3], *below*, for a discussion of the new intervention statute].

When no statutory authority exists for third-party participation, an agency may either allow or refuse the participation [*see 32 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 297, 301 (1959)]* . Third-party participation can satisfy the public's desire to be heard, provide additional facts for sound decision making, and balance competing interests. Of course, unlimited participation can also unnecessarily prolong proceedings, increase costs to all participants, and otherwise unfairly interfere with the rights of the original parties. The existence and scope of third-party participation may depend on the balance between these benefits and drawbacks [*see* Note, "Administrative Law: Third-Party Participation in Adjudicative Administrative Hearings in California," *47 Calif. L. Rev. 747, 749 (1959)*].

Determination of who may or must be a party to an administrative proceeding depends on the purpose and effect of the proceeding and the statute under which it is brought. For example, when the parents of a handicapped child sought an administrative hearing to compel the county education office to provide therapy for the child, the county's motion to join the California Children's Services (CCS) as a necessary party was denied. The court of appeals affirmed, noting that the county's claim that CCS was obliged to pay for the therapy was extraneous to the statutory purpose of the hearing,

which was to insure that the services were provided [*Nevada County Office of Education v. Riles (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 767, 775-777, 197 Cal. Rptr. 152]* .

The Court of Appeal held that a tenant who challenged in court a decision of a rent stabilization board denying her request for a rent reduction and rent rollback was required to name the landlord from whom she rented as a necessary party to the judicial proceeding brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*. Because the landlord had an interest in the subject of the action that would be impaired if the tenant prevailed in court, the landlord was required to be named under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389(a)*. The Court of Appeal considered the landlord to be an indispensable party whose absence was fatal to the tenant's claims, and whose absence could not be changed because the tenant's petition was untimely [*Liang v. San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Bd. (2004) 124 Cal.App. 4th 775, 778, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715]* . The Court of Appeal in *Liang* cited, and relied upon *Save Our Bay, Inc. v. San Diego Unified Port Dist. (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 686, 692, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 847* .

[2] Due Process Right to Participate

Neither agency permission nor statutory authority for third-party participation is necessary if that participation is required by due process. In the leading case on point, the California Supreme Court found that approval of subdivisions by local governments involves the application of general standards to specific parcels of real property and therefore is adjudicatory in nature [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 614, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134* ; for discussion of the importance of the distinction between the adjudicatory and rulemaking proceedings of an agency, *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* , and Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*]. The Court concluded that whenever approval of a subdivision will constitute a substantial or significant deprivation of the property rights of other landowners, the affected persons are entitled to a reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard before the approval occurs [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 616, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134]* .

However, if the administrative action is legislative in nature, then due process of law does not apply to the affected property owners. Merger of separate land parcels, which automatically occurred on the effective date of a local ordinance that was adopted for that purpose, was a legislative action, and therefore the affected property owners did not have a due process right to notice and an opportunity to be heard before merger took place [*Moores v. Board of Supervisors of Mendocino Cty. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 883, 889-890, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 206]* .

See also discussion in [3], *below*, regarding intervention.

[3] Intervention

If the agency's governing law grants a party the right to file an accusation or protest, it has been suggested that the party should intervene by filing an accusation or protest with the agency and serving a copy on the other party or parties. If intervention is allowed, but is discretionary, the third party should file a motion to intervene supported by a declaration showing the interest that entitles him or her to intervene [CEB, *California Administrative Hearing Practice* (1984), §§ 2.45-2.47].

Such intervention is allowed under *Gov. Code § 11440.50*. These intervention provisons apply to the adjudicative proceedings of a state agency only if that agency provides by regulation that *Gov. Code § 11440.50* applies to that agency's proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(a)*]. Thus, use of the intervention provisions is optional. When these provisions have been made applicable, intervention decisions are made by the presiding officer in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)-(e)*; *see Gov. Code § 11405.80* (definiting presiding officer)].

The prospective intervenor must make a motion for intervention to the presiding officer. The motion must be granted if four conditions are satisfied [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1)-(4)*]:

- The motion must be submitted in writing, and copies must be served on all parties identified in the agency's pleading [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1)*].

- The motion should be made as early as practicable in advance of the hearing, and, if there is a prehearing conference [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5*], then the motion should be made in advance of the prehearing conference and should be resolved at the prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(2)*].

- The motion must establish that the proposed intervenor qualifies as an intervenor either under a statute or regulation, or by stating facts that demonstrate that the proposed intervenor's legal rights, duties, privileges, or immunities will be substantially affected by the proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(3)*].

- The presiding officer must determine that allowing the intervention will not impair the interests of justice as well as the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(4)*].

When a proposed intervenor qualifies for intervention, conditions on the intervenor's participation in the proceedings can be imposed by the presiding officer, either when the intervention motion is granted, or at a later time [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)*]. Conditioning intervenor participation allows the presiding officer to balance the benefits of reasonable intervenor involvement against the risks of unreasonably burdensome or repititous presentations [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comments, 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. 55 (1995)]. Conditions can include the following [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(1)-(4)*]:

- Limiting the intervenor's partcipation to designated issues in which the intervenor has a particular interest demonstrated by the motion [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(1)*].

- Limiting or excluding the use of discovery, cross-examination, and other procedures involving the intervenor so as to promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(2)*].

- Requiring two or more intervenors to combine their presentations of evidence and argument, cross-examination, discovery, and other participation in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(3)*].

- Limiting or excluding the intervenor's participation in settlement negotiations [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(c)(4)*].

The procedures for intervention orders require the presiding officer to issue an order either granting or denying the intervention motion, specifying any conditions in the order, and briefly stating the reasons for the order as early as practicable in advance of the hearing. The intervention order can be modified at any time by the presiding officer, who must state reasons for the modification. The presiding officer must give prompt notice of all intervention orders, whether granting, denying, or modifying intervention, to all parties to the proceeding, and to the proposed intervenor [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(d)*]. The presiding officers determinations as to intervention motions are not subject to administrative or judicial review. This includes the two standards for determining intervention motions, whether the interests of justice and the prompt and orderly conduct of the proceedings will be impaired by allowing intervention. These determinations are made in the sole discretion, and based on the knowledge and judgment at that time, of the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(e)*].

Agencies are not prohibited by this statute from adopting regulations that permit participation by a person short of intervention as a party, subject to the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11430.10 et seq.* (governing ex parte communications) [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(f)*]. Examples of non-party participation include filing amicus briefs, testifying as a witness, or contributing to the fees of a party [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.15

§ 473A.15 Consolidation and Severance

Gov. Code § 11507.3 provides for consolidation and severance of adjudicative proceedings. When proceedings that involve a common question of law or fact are pending, the administrative law judge may order a joint hearing of any or all the matters at issue in the proceedings. This order can be based on the motion of a party, or on the administrative law judge's own motion. The administrative law judge may order all the proceedings consolidated and may make orders concerning the procedure that may tend to avoid unnecessary costs or delay [*Gov. Code § 11507.3(a)*].

Similarly, the administrative law judge may order a separate hearing of any issue, including an issue raised in the notice of defense, or of any number of issues. This order can be based on the motion of a party, or on the administrative law judge's own motion. The standards for granting separate hearings include furthering convenience, avoiding prejudice, or expedition or economy will be served by separate hearings [*Gov. Code § 11507.3(b)*].

Thus, for state agencies subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions of Gov. Code *§ 11500 et seq., Gov. Code* § 11507.3 provides ample authority for consolidation and severance motions. However for agencies that are not subject to these provisions, the standards used in civil court actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1048*], can be applied to administrative hearings and these hearings may be consolidated if they have common issues of law or fact or involve the same respondent. The agency has discretion whether or not to consolidate hearings [*Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322]* . Some agencies have express authority to exercise this discretion [*see, e.g., Pub. Util. Code § 1703 (PUC)*]. For discussion regarding when the formal hearing provisions apply pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11501*, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

Other than *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, the principal limit on agency discretion is derived from the leading case of *Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Communications Com.* [*Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Com. Com. (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108]* . In *Ashbacker*, the court held "that where two bona fide applications are mutually exclusive the grant of one without a hearing to both deprives the loser of the opportunity which Congress chose to give him" [*Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Com. Com. (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 333, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108]* . The "Ashbacker Doctrine" [*see Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322]* can be viewed as limiting agency discretion whenever interests are so dependent on one another that fairness requires that the proceedings be consolidated.

For agencies that are not subject to *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, it is fair to say that many agencies will grant requests for consolidation because it saves time, but requests for severance will be granted on a showing of good cause. Severance is disfavored because it usually results in a greater expenditure of time and money. To avoid wasting the time of all concerned, motions to consolidate or sever should be made as early as possible. For general discussion of prehearing motions, see Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

For motions that are not subject to *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, the law governing consolidation and severance can be based the Code of Civil Procedure. Thus, factors considered in deciding whether to consolidate or sever include the following [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* (grounds for consolidation or severance in civil actions)]:

- The identity of the law, facts, or parties between (or among) the cases.
- Possible prejudice to the parties.
- The complexity of the issues.
- Possible delays.
- Convenience and economy.

For discussion and forms relating to consolidation and severance in civil actions, see Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473A.16-473A.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473A.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.20

§ 473A.20 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.21

§ 473A.21 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.22

§ 473A.22 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code § 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code § 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harrassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.3, 11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2094*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.23

§ 473A.23 Decisions

[1] Consolidation and Severance

Agency is entitled to consolidate cases having common ground. *Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Communications Comm'n (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 330-333, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108* ; *Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322*

Time limit for decision imposed by statute is directory or mandatory. *Henderling v. Carleson (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 561, 566, 111 Cal. Rptr. 612* (mandatory in circumstances); *Koehn v. State Board of Equalization (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 109, 118-119, 333 P.2d 125* (directory); *Peak v. Industrial Acc. Comm'n (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 926, 932, 187 P.2d 905* (directory)

Decision is required to include written findings where findings required. *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 266, 272, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97*

Findings are not required to be stated with same formality as in judgment. *Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 134, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171*

[2] Initial Pleading

[a] Generally

Minimum requirement for initial pleading: sufficiently informative to enable respondent to prepare defense. *Sunset Amusement Co. v. Board of Police Comm'rs (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 64, 81, 101 Cal. Rptr. 768, 496 P.2d 840* ; *Stoumen v. Munro (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 302, 306-307, 33 Cal. Rptr. 305*

[b] Amendment

Agency's right to amend initial pleading before hearing. *Cook v. Civil Service Commission (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 118, 126-127, 2 Cal. Rptr. 836*

Amendment of initial pleading without giving respondent opportunity to prepare defense before hearing is error. *Raab v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 333, 334, 2 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Agency's right to amend initial pleading after hearing. *Stearns v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 205, 212-215, 98 Cal. Rptr. 467, 490 P.2d 1155* ; *Tapley v. Abbott (1931) 111 Cal. App. 397, 400-401, 295 P. 911*

[c] Complainant

Private individual is complainant. *Humane Society etc., California Branch, Inc. v. Merrill (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119-120, 119-120 n. 1, 18 Cal. Rptr. 701*

[d] Contents

Disciplinary proceeding is required by *Gov. Code § 11503* to be initiated by accusation that specifies statutes and rules that licensee is alleged to have violated; fulfillment of this requirement is statutory predicate for disciplinary action; hence, only violations charged in accusation will support disciplinary action, as disciplinary action cannot be founded on charge not made. *Linda Jones General Builder v. Contractors' State License Board (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1320, 1324, 1326, 240 Cal. Rptr. 180*

Accusation to initiate disciplinary proceedings is required by *Gov. Code § 11503* to specify statutes and rules allegedly violated. *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 527-528, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693*

Contents are required to give adequate notice; technical rules of pleading are secondary. Stearns v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1971) 6 Cal. 3d205, 213-214, *6 Cal. 3d 205, 98 Cal. Rptr. 467, 490 P.2d 1155* ; *Burako v. Munro (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 688, 691, 345 P.2d 124*

Allegation of facts supporting alternative theories are permissible. *Stearns v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 205, 212, 98 Cal. Rptr. 467, 490 P.2d 1155*

Contents, in case not governed by APA, are not required to conform to any model except to extent other statute may otherwise provide; general requirement that pleading be sufficiently informative to permit respondent to prepare defense. *Rudolph v. Athletic Com. of California (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898* ; *Yanke v. State Dep't of Public Health (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 600, 603, 328 P.2d 556*

Mistaken citation of law respondent is alleged to have violated is inconsequential in otherwise sufficient pleading. *Homan v. Board of Dental Examiners (1927) 202 Cal. 593, 597-598, 262 P. 324*

Contents are permitted to be phrased in statutory terms if no statute prohibits it. *Smulson v. Board of Dental Examiners (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 584, 589, 118 P.2d 483* ; *Gustason v. Bd. of Osteopathic Exmrs. (1935) 10 Cal. App. 2d 436, 438, 51 P.2d 1106*

[3] Intervention

Right of third party to intervene in administrative proceeding. *Crumpler v. Board of Administration (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 567, 575, 108 Cal. Rptr. 293*

[4] Limitations and Laches

Time for beginning administrative proceeding is unlimited except to extent statute specifically limits it. *In re Lowenthal (1889) 78 Cal. 427, 429, 21 P. 7* ; *Saxton v. State Bd. of Educ. (1934) 137 Cal. App. 167, 172, 29 P.2d 873* ; *Bold v. Board of Medical Examiners (1933) 133 Cal. App. 23, 25, 23 P.2d 826*

Lack of diligent prosecution is ground for dismissing administrative proceeding. *Steen v. City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 542, 546-547, 190 P.2d 937*

[5] Notice

Personal delivery of initial pleading is not required unless statute provides otherwise. *Colyear v. Tobriner (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 735, 743, 62 P.2d 741* ; *McGinn v. Board of Health (1931) 113 Cal. App. 228, 230, 298 P. 118* ; *Curtin v. Board of Police Comm'rs (1925) 74 Cal. App. 77, 86, 239 P. 355*

Method of service is irrelevant where respondent actually receives notice. *Simpson v. Los Angeles (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 271, 280-281, 253 P.2d 464* ; *McGinn v. Board of Health (1931) 113 Cal. App. 228, 230-231, 298 P. 118* ; *Small v. Smith (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 450, 457, 94 Cal. Rptr. 136*

[6] Responsive Pleading

[a] Generally

Reference to APA in cases not governed by act is permissible to determine reasonable time for responsive pleading. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

[b] Demurrer

Right to demur by separate pleading in case not governed by *APA. Dyment v. Board of Medical Examiners (1922) 57 Cal. App. 260, 263-264, 207 P. 409*

Agency is without jurisdiction if initial pleading fails to state acts or omissions on which agency may proceed. *Rapaport v. Civil Serv. Comm'n (1933) 134 Cal. App. 319, 325, 25 P.2d 265*

Agency is without jurisdiction if no statute authorizes proceeding. *O'Neil v. Department of Professional & Vocational Standards (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 395, 397-398, 46 P.2d 234*

Objection to form of initial pleading is analogous to demurrer for uncertainty. *Stuck v. Board of Medical Examiners (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 751, 756, 211 P.2d 389*

[7] Setting for Hearing

Change of venue for administrative hearing is matter of agency discretion. *Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-476, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136* (discretion is not abused when agency refused to change venue from city which was 64 miles from litigant's place of business absent showing that selection was made arbitrarily or with improper motive)

Reference to APA in cases not governed by act is permissible to determine time for hearing. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Change of venue. *Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351*

[8] Statement of Issues

Agency's right to amend statement of issues pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11507* is not abused when independent challenge of disability claim is allowed despite its omission in initial statement of issues. *Button v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 730, 738, 176 Cal. Rptr. 218*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.24

§ 473A.24 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Hearing Practice (Cal CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Evidence (2d ed), Ch. III, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 150-191; Ch. X, *Witnesses*, §§ 787-791; Ch. XII, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1223-1275

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.25

§ 473A.25 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes: information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerming Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah **NOTE:** On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service.
http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473A.26-473A.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473A.26[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.40

§ 473A.40 Determine the Methods by Which the Agency Initiates Adjudicatory Hearings

☐ Ascertain the extent to which the hearing is subject to the California APA [*see § 473A.11[1]*].

☐ Ascertain what pleadings are used to initiate a hearing [*see § 473A.11[3], [4]*]:

☐ An accusation initiates a hearing to determine if a license or other privilege will be revoked or suspended [*see § 473A.11[3]*].

☐ A statement of issues initiates a license denial hearing [*see § 473A.11[4]*].

☐ Ascertain if the accusation or statement of issues meets content requirements [*see § 473A.11[3], [4]*].

☐ Ascertain if the accusation or statement of issues has been properly served and accompanied by the required information [*see § 473A.11[3], [4]*].

☐ Ascertain if respondent must file a notice of defense in order to receive a hearing [*see § 473A.11[6][b], [9][b]*]:

☐ If a statement of issues was filed in response to respondent's request for a hearing, no notice of defense is required [*see § 473A.11[9][b]*].

☐ Otherwise, failure to file a notice of defense waives the right to a hearing [*see § 473A.11[6][b]*].

- ☐ Ascertain if the parties received sufficient notice of the hearing [*see § 473A.11[10]*].
- ☐ Ascertain if the hearing is barred by laches [*see § 473A.12*].
- ☐ Ascertain if client should request consolidation or severance [*see § 473A.15*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.41

§ 473A.41 Responding to Accusation Under APA Guidelines

[1] Request Hearing by Notice of Defense

☐ Prepare notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11506*; *see § 473A.11[6*]; for a form, *see § 473A.54*].

☐ Request hearing.

☐ Sign or have respondent sign notice.

☐ State respondent's (or counsel's) mailing address.

☐ Verification not required [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*].

☐ Request extension of time to file notice of defense, if necessary [*see § 473A.11[6][e]*; for a letter to request extension of time, *see § 473A.56*]].

☐ File notice of defense with agency making accusation [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*; *see § 473A.11[6][a]*; for a form, *see § 473A.54*].

☐ Must be filed within 15 days after service of accusation.

☐ Include letter stating the following [for a letter, *see*, *§ 473A.55*]:

☐ Dates counsel is not available.

☐ Preference of hearing location.

☐ If pointing out new matter [*see § 473A.54[8]*], request that preliminary hearing be set.

☐ Send copy of notice and letter to Hearing Officer in Charge at Sacramento or Los Angeles office of the OAL.

☐ Send to attention of calendar clerk.

[2] Motion for Consolidation

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see also § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[3] Motion for Severance

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see also § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[4] Request Hearing Without Notice of Defense

☐ Prepare request to set aside default [*Gov. Code § 11506*; *see Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*; for a form, see *§ 473A.57*].

☐ File with agency.

[5] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

☐ Object to notice of hearing.

☐ Make a showing of prejudice and request a continuance [*see § 473A.11[10][a]*].

[6] Change Location of Hearing

☐ Prepare motion to change location of hearing.

☐ File within 10 days after service of notice of hearing [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*; *see § 473A.11[11]*].

[7] Prior to Hearing

☐ After appointment of ALJ, send copies of all pleadings, motions, and other appropriate documents filed with the agency to ALJ.

☐ Gather witnesses and evidence to refute allegations in accusation.

☐ Prepare affirmative defenses, if applicable (may be raised in notice of defense) [*see § 473A.11[12]*].

☐ Prepare evidence of aggravation or mitigation, if applicable [*see § 473A.11[6][f]*].

☐ Prepare defense to amended or supplemental accusation [*see § 473A.11[5]*].

☐ File further pleading if permitted by agency, or

☐ Make orally at hearing, for the record.

[8] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

☐ Agency orders amendment of accusation after case is submitted for decision.

☐ Argue for reopening of case.

☐ Case is reopened.

☐ Introduce additional evidence.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.42

§ 473A.42 Responding to Statement of Issues When Agency Sends Letter of Denial of Privilege

[1] Requesting a Hearing

☐ Prepare a request for a hearing [*Gov. Code § 1504*; *see § 473A.11[4][d]*; for a form, see *§ 473A.53*].

☐ File with agency denying privilege.

[2] Notice of Defense

☐ Prepare notice of defense (optional, but recommended) [*Gov. Code § 11506*; *see § 473A.11[4][d]*; for a form, *see § 473A.54*].

☐ Sign or have respondent sign notice.

☐ State respondent's (or counsel's) mailing address.

☐ Verification not required [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*].

☐ Include letter stating the following [for a letter, *see § 473A.55*]:

☐ Tell agency which dates counsel is not available.

☐ State preference of hearing location.

☐ If pointing out new matter [*see § 473A.54[8]*], request that preliminary hearing be

set.

☐ File notice and letter with agency [*see Gov. Code § 11504*; *see also § 473A.11[4][b]*].

☐ Serve notice and letter on all parties before the hearing.

☐ Send copy of notice and letter to Hearing Officer in Charge at Sacramento or Los Angeles office of the OAL.

☐ Send to attention of calendar clerk.

[3] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

☐ Object to inadequate notice of hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11509*; *see also § 473A.11[9][b]*].

☐ Make a showing of prejudice and request a continuance [*see § 473A.11[10][a]*].

[4] Change Location of Hearing

☐ Prepare motion to change location of hearing.

☐ File within 10 days after service of notice of hearing [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*; *see § 473A.11[11]*].

[5] Motion for Consolidation

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see also § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[6] Motion for Severance

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see also § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[7] Prior to Hearing

☐ After appointment of ALJ, send copies of all pleadings, motions, and other appropriate documents filed with the agency.

☐ Prepare evidence to produce proof at hearing to demonstrate compliance with statutes and rules cited in statement of issues.

☐ Prepare affirmative defenses, if applicable (may be raised in notice of defense) [*see § 473A.11[12]*].

☐ Prepare evidence of aggravation or mitigation, if applicable [*see § 473A.11[6][f]*].

☐ Prepare defense to amended or supplemental accusation [*see § 473A.11[5]*].

☐ File further pleading if permitted by agency, or

☐ Make orally at hearing, for the record.

[8] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

☐ Agency orders amendment of accusation after case is submitted for decision.

☐ Argue for reopening.

☐ Case is reopened.

☐ Introduce additional evidence.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.43

§ 473A.43 Statement of Issues Sent by Agency in Lieu of Letter of Denial

[1] Notice of Defense

☐ Prepare notice of defense (required) [*Gov. Code §§ 11504, 11504.5*; *see § 473A.11[6][h]*; for a form, see *§ 473A.54*].

☐ Request hearing.

☐ Sign or have respondent sign notice.

☐ State respondent's (or counsel's) mailing address.

☐ Verification not required [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*].

☐ Request extension of time to file notice of defense, if necessary [*see § 473A.11[6][e]*; for a letter to request extension of time, *see § 473A.56*]].

☐ File notice of defense with agency [*see Gov. Code § 11504*; § 473A.11[4][b]].

☐ Serve on all parties before the hearing.

☐ Include letter stating the following [for a letter, *see § 473A.55*]:

☐ Tell agency which dates counsel is not available.

☐ State preference of hearing location.

☐ If pointing out new matter [*see § 473A.54[8]*], request that preliminary hearing be set.

☐ Send copy of notice and letter to Hearing Officer in Charge at Sacramento or Los Angeles office of the OAL.

☐ Send to attention of calendar clerk.

[2] Inadequate Notice of Hearing

☐ Objection to notice of hearing.

☐ Make a showing of prejudice and request a continuance [*see § 473A.11[10][a]*].

[3] Change Location of Hearing

☐ Prepare motion to change place of hearing.

☐ File within 10 days after service of notice of hearing [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*; *see § 473A.11[11]*].

[4] Motion for Consolidation

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[5] Motion for Severance

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see § 473A.15*]].

☐ File with agency.

[6] Prior to Hearing

☐ After appointment of ALJ, send copies of all pleadings, motions, and other appropriate documents filed with the agency.

☐ Prepare defense to amended or supplemental statement of issues [*see § 473A.11[5]*].

☐ File further pleading if permitted by agency, or

☐ Make orally at hearing, for the record.

[7] Reopening Case After Submitted for Decision

☐ Agency orders amendment of accusation after case is submitted for decision.

☐ Argue for reopening.

☐ Case is reopened

☐ Introduce additional evidence.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.44

§ 473A.44 Non-APA Agencies

[1] Responsive Pleadings

- ☐ Check appropriate statutes, ordinances, or regulations for the following:
  - ☐ Requirement of responsive pleading.
  - ☐ Form of responsive pleading.
  - ☐ Filing procedure.
- ☐ Verification requirement [*see § 473A.11[7]*].
  - ☐ Check applicable statute.
- ☐ Service [*see § 473A.11[9][d]*].
  - ☐ Check applicable statute or ordinance; if none, actual notice is required.

[2] Affirmative Defenses

- ☐ Raise in accordance with agency practice [*see § 473A.11[12]*].

[3] Demurrer or Demurrer-Type Objection

☐ Check applicable statute or ordinance; if none:

☐ Provision for demurrer is implied [*see § 473A.11[13]*].

☐ Raise as early as possible.

[4] Consolidation or Severance

☐ Check applicable statute or ordinance, or

☐ See *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* in considering whether to consolidate or sever [*see § 473A.15*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.45

§ 473A.45 Third Party Participation

[1] Third Party Filing Accusation Under APA

☐ Prepare form of accusation [*Gov. Code § 11503*; *see § 473A.11[3]*; for a form, see *§ 473A.50*].

☐ Verify accusation [*Gov. Code § 11503*].

☐ File accusation with appropriate agency.

[2] Intervention Permitted by Agency Law

☐ File accusation or protest with agency [*see § 473A.14[3]*].

☐ Serve copies on other parties.

[3] Intervention Is Discretionary

☐ Prepare motion to intervene [*see Gov. Code § 11440.50*; *see also § 473A.14[3]*].

☐ Prepare and attach supporting declaration showing interest.

☐ File motion and declaration with presiding officer.

☐ File motion in advance of hearing or prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(2)*].

☐ Serve on all parties [*Gov. Code § 11440.50(b)(1)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473A.46-473A.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473A.46[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.50

§ 473A.50 Accusation [Gov. Code § 11503]

[1] FORM Accusation [Gov. Code § 11503]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ACCUSATION
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

1. I am _____ [*name of third party or title of agency official, e.g.,* Chief Legal Officer of _____ (*name of agency*)], and file this Accusation _____ [*specify standing to file the pleading, e.g.,* in my official capacity as Chief Legal Officer].

2. During the times mentioned in this accusation, Respondent, _____[*name*], was and is _____ [*specify respondent's legal status, e.g.,* holder of a professional license in _____(*specify*)], and _____[*specify agency*] _____ [issued *or* renewed] that license on _____[*date*].

3. _____ [Consistent with *or* Under the authority of] _____[*specify relevant statute or agency regulation*], Respondent _____[*name*] is charged with the following grounds for _____ [revocation *or* suspension *or other disciplinary limitation or condition on license, privilege, right, or authority*] of his/her _____[*specify license*]:

[*Set forth specific grounds*]

4. These grounds are based upon the following specific _____ [facts *or* conduct]:

[*Set forth specific facts or conduct in ordinary and concise language*]

5. Respondent's conduct violates the following specific laws: _____[*cite specific statutes or agency regulations that are the basis for the accusation*].

6. _____ [*Specify agency action requested, e.g.,* The revocation] of Respondent's _____[*specify license, privilege, etc.*] is requested under the legal authority of _____[*specify relevant statute or regulation*].

_____ [*date*]

_____[*signature*]

_____ [*typed name and official title, if any*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is an example of the accusation used by a public agency to initiate an agency adjudication under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) to suspend, revoke, limit, or make conditional a license, privilege, right, or authority [*Gov. Code § 11503*]. It may be used with appropriate modification by a third party to complain to a public agency concerning the conduct of a licencee or other privilege holder subject to that agency's regulation. The public agency then has discretion to initiate an accusation based on that complaint [*see* discussion in *§ 473A.10[1]*].

It must be verified unless, as is usually the case, it is made by a public officer acting in his or her offical capacity or by an employee of the agency before the proceeding is to be held. The verification may be made on information and belief [*Gov. Code § 11503*].

[3] Cross References

See *§ 473A.11[3]* for detailed discussion of the requirements pertaining to an accusation. See *§§ 473.10[1], [2], 473A.11[2][d],* and *473A.14* for discussion relating to third party complainants.

See Ch. 572, *Verification* , for discussion and forms relating to verification of pleadings generally.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.51

§ 473A.51 Statement to Respondent [Gov. Code § 11505]

[1] FORM Statement to Respondent [Gov. Code § 11505]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STATEMENT TO RESPONDENT
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

To: _____[*name*], Respondent:

You are notified that a written accusation was filed against you, as repondent, on _____[*date*], with _____[*name of agency or board*] charging that there are grounds for _____ [*specify potential action, e.g.*, revoking your _____ (*specify license*) issued or renewed by that agency on _____ (*date*)].

The following items are included with this statement:

1. A copy of the accusation.

2. A form of Notice of Defense for your use in responding to the accusation.

3. A copy of *Government Code Sections 11507.5*, *11507.6*, and *11507.7*, relating the procedures for obtaining discovery from _____[*name of agency or board*].

Unless a written request for a hearing, signed by on behalf of the respondent named in the attached accusation, is delivered or mailed to the agency within 15 days after the accusation was personally served on you or mailed to you, _____[*specify name of agency*] may proceed upon the accusation without a hearing. The request for a hearing may be made by delivering or mailing the enclosed form, entitled Notice of Defense, or by delivering or mailing a notice of defense as provided in *Section 11506 of the Government Code* to: _____[*specify name and address of agency*]. You may, but need not, be represented by counsel at any or all stages of these proceedings.

If you desire the names and addresses of witnesses or an opportunity to inspect and copy the items mentioned in *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code* in the possession, custody or control of the agency, you may contact: _____[*specify name and address of appropriate person in the agency*].

The hearing may be postponed for good cause. If you have good cause, you are obliged to notify the agency, or, if an administrative law judge has been assigned to the hearing, the Office of Administrative Hearings, within 10 working days after you discover the good cause. Failure to give notice within 10 days will deprive you of a postponement.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name and title of agency official*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is an example of the type of statement that is required to be provided by an agency to a respondent named in an accusation, to be delievered with the accusation in order to provide the respondent with the information required under *Gov. Code § 11503*. This form conforms to *Gov. Code § 11503(b),* which sets out the required form of the statement to respondent.

[3] Cross References

See *§ 473A.11[9]* for detailed discussion of the requirements pertaining to the statement to respondent; see also *§ 473A.50* for a form of accusation.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.52

§ 473A.52 Statement of Issues [Gov. Code § 11504]

[1] FORM Statement of Issues [Gov. Code § 11504]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STATEMENT OF ISSUES
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

1. I am the _____ [*title, e.g.,* Chief Legal Officer] of _____[*name of agency*], and file this statement of issues in my official capacity as _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Chief Legal Officer].

2. Under the authority of *Government Code Section 11504*, you are notified that you have a right to a hearing to determine whether _____[*specify nature of action such as granting of right, authority, license, or privilege*] should be _____ [granted *or* issued *or* renewed].

3. You must prove compliance at the hearing with _____[*cite specific statutes or regulations*] by producing proof at the hearing.

4. Also, the following particular matters have come to the agency's attention and would authorize denial by the agency of the action requested by you: _____[*specify*].

5. Unless a written request for a hearing signed by or on behalf of the person named as respondent is delivered or mailed to the agency within 15 days after this statement of issues was personally served on you or mailed to you,

_____[*specify name of agency*] may proceed upon the matter without a hearing.

6. If you desire the names and addresses of witnesses or an opportunity to inspect and copy the items mentioned in *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code* in the possession, custody or control of the agency, you may contact: _____[*specify name and address of appropriate person in the agency*].

7. The hearing may be postponed for good cause. If you have good cause, you are obliged to notify the agency, or, if an administrative law judge has been assigned to the hearing, the Office of Administrative Hearings, within 10 working days after you discover the good cause. Failure to give notice within 10 days will deprive you of a postponement.

8. The following items are enclosed:

A. Copies of *Government Code Sections 11507.5*, *11507.6*, and *11507.7*, relating the procedures for obtaining discovery from _____ [*name of agency or board*].

B. Request for Hearing Form.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name and title of agency official*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is an example of a statement of issues, the pleading used by a public agency to initiate an agency adjudication under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) to determine whether a license, privilege, right, or authority should be granted, issued, or renewed [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

It must be verified unless, as is usually the case, it is made by a public officer acting in his or her offical capacity or by an employee of the agency before the proceeding is to be held [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

[3] Cross References

See *§ 473A.11[4]*, for detailed discussion of the requirements pertaining to a statement of issues. See Ch. 572, *Verification* , for discussion and forms relating to verification of pleadings generally.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.53

§ 473A.53 Request for Hearing [Gov. Code § 11504]

[1] FORM Request for Hearing [Gov. Code § 11504]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	REQUEST FOR HEARING
[Applicant *or* Licensee].	)	
	)	

_____

To: _____[*specify name of agency*]:

_____[*Name*], [an applicant for *or* the holder of] a _____ (*specify license or other privilege*)], received a letter dated _____ from _____[*specify name of agency*], denying his/her [application *or* request for renewal]. Accordingly, his/she requests a hearing on this matter as authorized in *Government Code Section 11504*.

_____ [*date*]

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

Address: _____

_____

Telephone: _____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an applicant or license holder whose application for a license or whose request for renewal has been denied by the licensing agency; it requests a hearing on the denial under *Gov. Code § 11504*. The form is used when:

- The APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) apply.

- The licensing agency sent a letter of denial as distinguished from a statement of issues. If the agency serves and files and statement of issues, the applicant or license holder is then the respondent to that pleading and must file instead a notice of defense under *Gov. Code § 11506*.

[3] Cross References

See *§ 473A.11[4]*, for detailed discussion of the requirements pertaining to a statement of issues under *Gov. Code § 11504*.

See *§ 473A.11[4][d]* for discussion of the procedure for request for hearing when an agency sends a letter of denial rather than a statement of issues.

See *§ 473A.54* for a form of notice of defense.

88 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.54

§ 473A.54 Notice of Defense [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM Notice of Defense [Gov. Code § 11506]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF DEFENSE
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

Respondent _____[*name*] requests that a hearing be held in this matter and further responds as follows:

[*EITHER*]

1. Objects to the [accusation *or* statement of issues] on the ground that it does not state acts or omissions on which this agency may proceed.

[*AND/OR*]

2. Objects to the form of the [accusation *or* statement of issues] on the ground that it is so indefinite and uncertain that he/she cannot identify the transaction and prepare a defense.

[*AND/OR*]

3. Admits that the allegations of Paragraph _____[*number*] of the _____ [accusation *or* statement of issues] are true but denies all other allegations of the _____ [accusation *or* statement of issues].

[*AND/OR*]

4. Objects to the _____ [accusation *or* statement of issues] on the ground that, under the circumstances, compliance with the requirements of _____[*specify regulation providing basis for agency's accusation*] would result in a material violation of _____[*specify other regulation*] that was enacted by _____[*specify other department*] and that affects substantive rights.

[*AND/OR*]

5. Alleges by way of defense that _____[*specify*].

6. Presents new matter by way of defense as follows: _____[*specify*].

Respondent's mailing address is the address of counsel shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of defense in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent in an administrative trial. It may be used instead of the short-form notice of defense provided by the agency [*see Gov. Code § 11505*]. Regular pleading paper such as counsel uses in civil matters is appropriate. Counsel's name, address, State Bar membership number, and telephone number should appear in the upper left-hand corner.

[3] Contents

A notice of defense must be in writing. It must be signed by or on behalf of the respondent. It must state the respondent's mailing address (which may be counsel's address). It need not be verified (whether or not the initial pleading is verified), and it need not follow any particular form [*Gov. Code § 11506(c)*]. The notice may be filed by either delivering it or mailing it to the agency as provided in *Gov. Code § 11505* [*Gov. Code § 11506(e)*].

In the notice of defense the respondent may do any or all of the following [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*]:

- Request a hearing;

- Object to the initial pleading on the ground that it does not state acts or omissions on which the agency may proceed;

- Object to the form of the initial pleading on the ground that it is so indefinite or uncertain that the respondent cannot identify the transaction or prepare his or her defense;

- Admit the truth of the initial pleading or parts of it;

- Object to the initial pleading on the ground that, under the circumstances, compliance with the requirements of a regulation would result in a material violation of another regulation that was enacted by another department and that affects substantive rights; and

- Present new matter by way of defense.

If the initial pleading is subject to a valid objection, the agency, if it is the complainant, has the unqualified right to amend it at any time before the matter is submitted for decision [*Gov. Code § 11507*].

[4] Request for Hearing

A request for a hearing should be included in every notice of defense unless counsel does not want a hearing for tactical reasons. When the notice of defense is sent to the agency, counsel should also send a letter [*see § 473A.55*] telling the agency which dates on his or her calendar are not open and when and where he or she would prefer to have the hearing. Such a letter might be helpful in getting the hearing set for a convenient time and place.

[5] Copies

Copies of the notice of defense and the letter should be sent to the Hearing Officer in Charge at the Sacramento or Los Angeles office of the Office of Administrative Hearings, marked to the attention of the calendar clerk. If counsel wishes for tactical reasons to avoid a hearing, the best way is to concede the merits of the case against his or her client. However, some agencies have power to go on with a hearing nevertheless [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 118*].

[6] Objections

[a] Failure to State Sufficient Facts

The objection that the initial pleading does not state acts or omissions on which the agency may take action [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2)*] is equivalent to a general demurrer for failure to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*] and essentially asserts a lack of jurisdiction.

Counsel should be careful not to confuse this objection with an objection to the form of the pleading [*see Collins v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 439, 444, 105 Cal. Rptr. 634* (even the court was confused)].

[b] Form of Initial Pleading

An objection to the form of the initial pleading that it is so indefinite or uncertain that the respondent cannot identify the transaction in question or prepare his or her defense, is deemed waived if not asserted in the notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11506(b)*]. The analogous objection in a civil action is a special demurrer on the ground of uncertainty [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(f)*; *Wade v. Markwell & Co. (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 410, 418, 258 P.2d 497* (waiver)]. This objection deserves the most careful attention from respondent's counsel. There is only one opportunity to make it, and

often it will be the only viable objection.

When only part of the pleading is subject to objection, it is appropriate to limit the objection to specified defective parts instead of objecting to the entire pleading.

[7] Admissions and Denials

Counsel will need to study the particular case to determine which admissions, if any, should be made. Facts of record about which there can be no reasonable dispute may safely be admitted; to do so will show an attitude of cooperation, which may be helpful to the respondent's case. Generally, however, admissions should be few, and they should always concern facts, never violations. It is unnecessary to make any denials unless admissions are made, and then a denial is necessary only to distinguish what is admitted. The notice of defense is deemed a specific denial of all parts of the initial pleading not expressly admitted [*Gov. Code § 11506*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11504, 11504.5*].

[8] New Matter

A statement of new matter by way of defense is equivalent to an affirmative defense in a civil action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. It appears from the statute that a failure to state new matter in the notice of defense would not deprive the respondent of the unstated defenses [*Gov. Code § 11506(b)*], which he or she would be entitled to raise at the hearing. In practice, administrative law judges tend to allow new matter to be presented at the hearing notwithstanding that no mention of such matter was made in the notice of defense. In considering whether to state new matter in the notice of defense, counsel should consider at least two points. First, a tactical decision not to state new matter in the notice of defense may have the undesirable effect of annoying the administrative law judge or agency at the hearing, if a dilatory purpose is apparent and a continuance becomes necessary to enable the complainant to prepare to meet the newly raised defense. Second, if the complainant or the agency appears to be ignorant of some fact and would not have begun or would not continue the proceeding if the fact were known, it is probably prudent to state that fact in the notice of defense, since it could bring a speedy resolution of the proceeding in the respondent's favor. However, if new matter stated in the notice of defense would not clearly be determinative, perhaps it should be withheld until events at the hearing require raising it to save the respondent's case.

The question, whether a statute is unconstitutional, may not be raised in defense, unless unconstitutionality of the statute has been determined by an appellate court. The same is true as to the question, whether or not a statute is unenforceable under federal law or regulation. A constitutional amendment prohibits an administrative agency from declaring a statute unconstitutional in any circumstance and from declaring a statute unenforceable because of a conflict with the state or federal constitution or a federal law or regulation unless an appellate court has so decided [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*]. Nevertheless, counsel may consider pointing out unofficially that a relevant statute appears to be unconstitutional or unenforceable under federal law or regulation, in the hope that the agency will desist. Also, a continuance might be sought for the purpose of seeking a judicial determination as to the constitutionality or enforceability of a relevant statute.

If the notice of defense states a matter which counsel believes should be heard before the hearing, this sometimes can be arranged. In the letter accompanying the notice of defense [*see § 473A.55*] counsel should point out this special matter and ask that a preliminary hearing be set for resolving it. Although the agency might ignore this request, the hearing officer, when one is assigned, will receive the copies of the letter and the notice of defense forwarded to the Office of Administrative Hearings, and he or she might set the special matter for a preliminary hearing.

[9] Entrapment Defense

The defense of entrapment is available in administrative proceedings at which revocation or suspension of a license to practice a profession or conduct a business is at issue [*Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356,*

367, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121] . An agency may not rely on evidence obtained by deceitful inducement of a licensee to engage in activities which he or she would otherwise not have undertaken [*see Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 365, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* ; *Redner v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 83, 95, 95 Cal. Rptr. 447, 485 P.2d 799]* .

The defense rests on broadly stated grounds of sound public policy and good morals [*Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 363, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* ; *People v. Benford (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 1, 8-9, 345 P.2d 928]* , and is crucial to the fair administration of justice. The function of an enforcement agency is to investigate, not instigate, and to discover, not promote, crime; to apprehend the guilty, not to seduce the innocent [*Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 364, 367, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121]* .

[10] Cross References

For detailed discussion of the requirement relating to the notice of defense, see *§ 473A.11[6]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.55

§ 473A.55 Letter to Accompany Notice of Defense

[1] FORM Letter to Accompany Notice of Defense

_____ [*agency*]

_____ [*address*]

Attention: _____ [*name*]

Re: In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent

No. _____

Dear _____:

Enclosed and transmitted herewith for filing are the original and one copy of the respondent's Notice of Defense in the above-entitled matter.

The following dates are not open on my calendar: _____[*specify*]. The hearing in this matter should not be set for one of those dates, if possible.

If possible, the respondent and I would prefer to have the hearing set for one of the following dates and at one of the following places:

Dates: _____ [*specify*].
Places: _____ [*specify*].

Very truly yours,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form of letter in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent's counsel and should accompany the notice of defense when it is filed. For the related form of notice of defense, see *§ 473A.54*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.56

§ 473A.56 Letter Request for Extension of Time [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM Letter Request for Extension of Time [Gov. Code § 11506]

_____ [*agency*]

_____ [*address*]

Attention: _____ [*name*]

Re: In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent

No. _____

Dear _____:

Respondent _____[*name*] requests an extension of time to and including _____[*date*], within which to file a notice of defense or other appropriate responsive pleading.

Please countersign and return the enclosed copy of this letter to confirm that an extension is granted as requested. If this request will not be granted, please telephone me _____[collect] at the earliest possible time.

Very truly yours,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Respondent

The above request for extension is granted.

_____ [*agency*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

[*title*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of letter request in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent who wishes an extension of time in which to respond. For the related form of notice of defense, see *§ 473A.54*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473A COMMENCING AGENCY ADJUDICATION
PART V. FORMS

41A-473A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473A.57

§ 473A.57 Request to Set Aside Default [Gov. Code § 11506]

[1] FORM Request to Set Aside Default [Gov. Code § 11506]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	REQUEST TO SET ASIDE DEFAULT
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

Respondent requests that his/her failure to file a notice of defense not be deemed a waiver of his/her right to a hearing and that a hearing nevertheless be granted. In support of this request, respondent submits the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, declaration] attached hereto.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Respondent

DECLARATION

I, declare:

_____[*State facts supporting request*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of request in [1], *above*, to set aside a default is for use by the respondent, when the time for filing a notice of defense under *Gov. Code § 11506* or other responsive pleading has passed.

[3] Cross References

See *§ 473A.11[6]* for detailed discussion of notice of defense.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473B.syn

§ 473B.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473B: DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

§ 473B.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473B.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Other Related Chapters

[5] Related Matthew Bender Publications

§§ 473B.03-473B.09 [Reserved]

§ 473B.10 Governing Law

§ 473B.11 Basic Definitions Governing Discovery

§ 473B.12 Methods of Discovery Under the California APA

[1] Exclusive Provision for Discovery

[2] Depositions Not Allowed for Prehearing Discovery

[3] Interrogatories Allowed Only as Form of Written Request

[4] Subpoenas for Production of Documents

[a] Scope of Application

[b] Issuance of Subpoenas for Discovery Purposes

[c] Who May Issue Subpoena

[d] Service of Subpoena

[e] Enforcement of Subpoena

§ 473B.13 Scope of Discovery Under the APA

§ 473B.14 Administrative Discovery Procedures

[1] Request for Discovery

[2] Time Limits

[a] Statutory Time Limits

[b] Availability of Discovery Before Notice of Defense Is Filed

[3] Method for Requesting Discovery

[a] Service by Mail

[b] Keeping Copy of Request and Proof of Service

[4] Complying With Discovery Request

[5] Costs of Copying

§ 473B.15 Limits and Conditions on Discovery

[1] General Limitations

[2] Privileges

[a] Privileged Matter Not Discoverable

[b] The Presumption of Confidentiality and the Burden of Proof

[3] Physician-Patient Privilege

[4] Attorney Work Product

[5] Official Information

[6] Sexual Conduct

§ 473B.16 Enforcement of Discovery Under the California APA

[1] Motion to Compel Discovery

[2] Serving and Filing the Motion

[3] Answer and Hearing on Motion to Compel

[4] In Camera Inspection

[5] Order Granting or Denying Motion

[6] Review of Judge's Order

[7] Sanctions

§ 473B.17 Non-APA Statutory Discovery

[1] Applicability of Non-California APA Discovery Statutes

[2] Investigation and Enforcement

[3] Private Parties

§ 473B.18 Nonstatutory Court Authorized Discovery

[1] Availability

[2] Governing Law

§§ 473B.19-473B.29 [Reserved]

§ 473B.30 Federal Constitution

§ 473B.31 State Constitution

§ 473B.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473B.33 Decisions

[1] General Requirements

[2] Depositions of Witnesses

[3] Discovery Against Party

[4] Subpoenas

§ 473B.34 Text References

§ 473B.35 Internet References

§§ 473B.36-473B.49 [Reserved]

§ 473B.50 Obtaining and Responding to Administrative Discovery

[1] Ascertain Applicable Law Governing Discovery in the Proceeding

[2] Obtaining Discovery Under the APA

[3] Complying With Request for Administrative Discovery Under the APA

§ 473B.51 Initiation of Discovery Under the APA

[1] Notice of Defense

[2] Request for Discovery

[3] Service of Written Request

[4] Noncompliance with Request for Discovery-Petitioner's Option

[5] Respondent's Options

§ 473B.52 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Requesting Subpoena

[2] Service

§ 473B.53 Deposition of Unavailable Witness Under APA Guidelines

[1] Petition for Deposition of Unavailable Witness

[2] Filing

[3] Service

[4] Order Issued

§§ 473B.54-473B.59 [Reserved]

§ 473B.60 Petition to Take Deposition of Unavailable Witness [Gov. Code § 11511]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

[4] Procedure

[5] Cross References

§ 473B.61 Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Content of Request

§ 473B.62 Notice of Noncompliance With Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473B.63 Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Supporting Papers

[4] Service and Filing

[5] Cross References

§ 473B.64 Answer to Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Supporting Papers

§ 473B.65 Order Granting Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473B.66 Order Denying Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 473B.67 Order to Show Cause In Re Contempt [Gov. Code § 11455.20]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.01

§ 473B.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses discovery procedures in an agency adjudication, primarily those that apply to formal hearings under the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The discussion in Part II includes the following:

- The requirements relating to discovery in formal hearings under the APA administrative adjudication provisions [*see §§ 473B.10 -473B.15*).

- Limits and conditions on discovery, enforcement of discovery, non-APA statutory discovery, and nonstatutory court authorized discovery [*see §§ 473B.16* -473B.19].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.02

§ 473B.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For general discussion and overview of agency adjudication under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

For related discussion and forms providing coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication.*
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications.*
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications.*
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview,* through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in *§ 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .
- .

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *§ 470.02[2]*.

[4] Other Related Chapters

For discussion and forms of affidavits and declarations under penalty of perjury in civil actions generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For discussion and forms relating to contempt proceedings in civil actions generally, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

For discussion and forms relating to discovery in civil actions generally, see Ch. 190- 200, *Discovery* .

For further discussion and forms relating to subpoenas in civil actions generally, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

For discussion and forms relating to proof of service in civil actions generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[5] Related Matthew Bender Publications

For additional detailed discussion relating to discovery in civil actions, see DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Chs. 21-32 (Matthew Bender); California Trial Guide, Unit 51; Ch. 190-200, *Discovery* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473B.03-473B.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473B.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.10

§ 473B.10 Governing Law

Some agencies have their own specific discovery statutes as a part of their enabling law. In these cases, their specific discovery statutes apply whether or not they are otherwise subject to the APA [*see Serenko v. Bright (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 682, 689, 70 Cal. Rptr. 1* (California APA is a general law that yields to specific statutes)].

Discovery under the administrative adjudication provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) are governed generally by *Gov. Code § 11507.6* [*see also Gov. Code §§ 11507.5, 11507.7, 11511*]. These statutory discovery provisions of the APA, first enacted in 1968, supplanted case law that had previously shaped administrative discovery, with respect to any proceeding subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11507.5*; *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 166, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *Board of Medical Quality Assur. v. Superior Court (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 860, 862, 141 Cal. Rptr. 83]* . For further discussion of the APA, its administrative adjudication provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.* and *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), and the applicability of those provisions, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* , and Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

Discovery in agency adjudications not subject to the APA, and in which no other specific discovery statute applies, are governed by the decisional law that has developed non-statutory administrative discovery along principles of common law [*see, e.g., Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65* (legislative silence regarding administrative discovery leaves to the courts the task of shaping administrative discovery); *Romero v. Hern (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 787, 791, 81 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.11

§ 473B.11 Basic Definitions Governing Discovery

Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), governing formal hearings under the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), begins with a list of definitions that include the following [*Gov. Code § 11500*; *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.13[1]*, for discussion regarding Chapter 5 and other components of the APA]:

- "Agency" includes the state boards, commissions, and officers to which Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) applies by law. When the word "agency" alone is used, the power to act may be delegated by the agency, but when the words "agency itself" are used, the power to act shall not be delegated unless the statutes relating to the particular agency authorize delegation of the agency's power to hear and decide [*Gov. Code § 11500(a)*].

- "Party" includes the agency, the respondent, and any person (other than an officer or employee of the agency acting in an official capacity) who has appeared or participated in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11500(b)*].

- "Respondent" means any person against whom an accusation is filed. [*Gov. Code § 11500(c)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11503, 11504*, and discussion in Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* , regarding accusation and statement of issues as initial pleadings used by agency to initiate agency adjudication pursuant to formal hearing procedures of *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*].

These definitions apply to all other provisions in Chapter 5, including those relating to discovery, unless the context or subject matter indicates otherwise [*Gov. Code § 11500*]. In addition, certain definitions set out in Chapter 4.5 also apply to proceedings under Chapter 5, to the extent that the provisions of Chapter 4.5 apply to formal hearings under Chapter 5 unless inconsistent with statutes specifically applicable to that proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11501(c)*]. For example, the following definition of "adjudicatory hearing," applies in that there is no definition of this term in Chapter 5 [*Gov. Code § 11405.20*]:

- "Adjudicative proceeding" is an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts pursuant to which an agency formulates and issues a decision.

Applicable provisions of Chapter 4.5 are discussed when relevant in this chapter. For detailed discussion of the additional definitions under Chapter 4.5 that may apply, see *Chapter 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.14*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.12

§ 473B.12 Methods of Discovery Under the California APA

[1] Exclusive Provision for Discovery

Gov. Code § 11507.6 provides the exclusive right to and method of discovery for adjudicatory proceedings under the APA's Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*, entitled Administrative Adjudication: Formal Hearings) [*Gov. Code § 11507.5*; *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 166-167, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220]* . For discussion of when the APA applies to an administrative adjudication, *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*].

Gov. Code § 11507.6 basically provides that a party may obtain discovery by means of a "written request made to another party," and may thereby obtain the names and addresses of witnesses known to the other party, as well as specified statements, writings, and reports for inspection and copying [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*].

Thus, although it sets outs an extensive list of information and materials that may be discovered, it does not provide much detail concerning the method of discovery, other than to specify a "written request" for discovery and to provide that written materials may be inspected and copied. It makes no mention, for example, of the primary methods of discovery in civil actions, such as depositions, interrogatories, and the use of subpoenas to compel the production of documents. Case law clarifying the availability, or nonavailability, of these methods is in [2] through *[4], below*. The items discoverable and the procedures for obtaining discovery by written request under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* are discussed in *further detail in §§ 473B.13* and *473B.14*; limits and conditions affecting prehearing discovery are discussed in *§ 473B.15*.

[2] Depositions Not Allowed for Prehearing Discovery

The APA allows the use of depositions solely to take the testimony of a witness who will be unable to attend the hearing or who cannot be compelled to attend [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *Kenneally v. Medical Board of California (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 489, 502-503, 32 Cal. Rptr.2d 504* (physician was not denied equal protection of the law and *Gov. Code § 11511* was not unconstitutional in restricting discovery depositions to witnesses whose testimony is material and who are unable to attend a hearing or cannot be required to attend a hearing)]. California courts have consistently denied all attempts to conduct discovery using the witness-deposition provision of *Gov. Code § 11511* [*see* *Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 478-479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65* (*Gov. Code § 11511* provides for depositions, not for

discovery, but only to secure evidence for use at the hearing); *Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 439, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815* (no agency duty to issue subpoenas under *Gov. Code § 11511* for prehearing discovery); *Everett v. Gordon (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 667, 669, 671-673, 72 Cal. Rptr. 379* (petition to compel the issuance of subpoenas for prehearing depositions denied); *Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* (no statutory or common law right for psychologist to take deposition of witness before hearing)].

On verified petition of a party, an administrative law judge, or, if an administrative law judge has not been appointed, an agency may order that the testimony of any material witness residing within or without the state be taken by deposition in the manner prescribed by law for depositions in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11511*]. The petition must set forth the following [*Gov. Code § 11511*]:

- Nature of the pending proceeding.
- Name and address of the witness whose testimony is desired.
- Showing of the materiality of the testimony.
- Showing that the witness will be unable or can not be compelled to attend.

The petition must also request an order requiring the witness to apear and testify before an officer named in the petition for that purpose. The petitioning party must serve notice of hearing and a copy of the petition on the other parties at least 10 days before the hearing. When the witness resides outside the state and when the administrative law judge or agency has ordered the taking of the testimony by deposition, the agency shall obtain an order of court to that effect by filing a petition in the Superior Court in Sacramento County. The court proceedings shall be consistent with the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11189* [*Gov. Code § 11511*]. See *§ 473B.60* for a form for a petition for an order to take the deposition of an unavailable witness.

[3] Interrogatories Allowed Only as Form of Written Request

Gov. Code § 11507.6 authorizes discovery through written requests made to another party. Although interrogatories are not specifically mentioned in *Gov. Code § 11507.6*, at least one court has allowed discovery in the form of written interrogatories rather than written requests when applying *Gov. Code § 11507.6*. In that case the court of appeal stated that there was no reason why the respondent should be denied that information because he asked for it in interrogatories rather than in requests [*Romero v. Hern (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 787, 794, 81 Cal. Rptr. 281]* . The court held that the "interrogatories" need not be answered under oath, and it also applied *Gov. Code § 11507.6* to determine which interrogatories the agency was required to answer. Overbroad interrogatories ("shotgun" requests) need not be answered [*Romero v. Hern (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 787, 793-795, 81 Cal. Rptr. 281]* . For discussion of the materials discoverable under *Gov. Code § 11507.6, see § 473B.13*.

In that the scope of discovery is narrower and replies need not be given under oath, a request for discovery in an APA proceeding given in the form of interrogatories is quite different from a set of interrogatories in a civil action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2017.010* (discovery in civil actions generally includes any relevant matter that is not privileged), 2030.010(a) (interrogatories in civil actions must be answered under oath); *see also* Ch. 194, *Discovery: Interrogatories* , for discussion of discovery in civil actions generally]. In fact, the court ruling that permitted "interrogatories" was concerned merely with their form, allowing them only to the extent that they were essentially written requests for discovery that could be answered pursuant to the scope and limits of *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.

Thus, most APA discovery requests are not styled as interrogatories but simply as written requests for discovery. See *§ 473B.61*, for a written request for discovery form.

[4] Subpoenas for Production of Documents

[a] Scope of Application

Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) includes the provisions governing subpoenas in administrative adjudications under the APA. The provisions, set out in *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.*, apply to formal APA adjudication hearing under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11450.05(a)*].

Agencies that are not subject to the Chapter 5 requirements may nevertheless use the APA subpoena procedures. When an agency opts to use the provisions, all provisions of *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.* apply, including but not limited to the issuance of a subpoena requested by a party or an attorney of record for a party under *Gov. Code § 11450.20* [*Gov. Code § 11450.05(b)*].

See Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* for further discussion concerning the proceedings to which Chapters 4.5 and 5 apply.

[b] Issuance of Subpoenas for Discovery Purposes

For discovery purposes, an administrative subpoena is available chiefly for purpose of inspecting records or documents. Under *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.*, subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum may be issued either [*Gov. Code § 11450.10(a)*]:

- To compel attendance at a hearing.
- To compel production of documents at any reasonable time and place or at a hearing.

Alternatively, a custodian of documents that is the subject of a subpoena duces tecum may satisfy the subpoena by delivery of the documents or a copy of the documents, or by making the documents available for inspection or copying, together with an affidavit that satisfies *Evidence Code § 1561* [*Gov. Code § 11450.10(b)*]. This latter procedure is similar to the practice in civil actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

If a custodian does not comply with the subpoena, the subpoena can be enforced, and the custodian can be compelled to appear and produce the documents under the enforcement provisions of *Gov. Code § 11455.10 et seq.* [*see Gov. Code § 11455.10(e)*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Effective July 1, 1997, the use of subpoenas in discovery is broader than formerly, in that a subpoena duces tecum may be issued for production of documents at any reasonable time and place, as well as at a hearing. Witness subpoenas are still limited to attendance at hearings [*Gov. Code § 11450.10(a)*]. Decisions under the prior law should be distinguished; decided under former *Gov. Code § 11510*, they did not permit subpoenas for prehearing discovery, but restricted the use of subpoenas only to compel attendance of witnesses or evidence at the hearing [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 478-479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P. 2d 65* ; *Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 165-167, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220]* .

For discussion of the subpoena requirements in the context of agency investigations as distinguished from discovery, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

[c] Who May Issue Subpoena

Subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum can be issued by the agency or the presiding officer at the request of a party, or by the attorney of record for a party, in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(a)*].

Gov. Code § 11450.20(a) is intended to incorporate the statutory privacy protections applicable in civil actions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm Reports 55 (1995)]. The primary privacy provisions are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, which protects and defines personal records of consumers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(a)(1)*], and which provides for notice to consumers whose personal records are subject to a subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)*]. It also incorporates other procedures set out in Gov. Code § 1985 et seq., such as the requirement that a subpoena duces tecum can not be issued unless an affidavit satisfying the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985* is completed. When the APA subpoena provision do not address a particular procedural issue relating to subpoenas, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.* may be looked at to provide analogous procedures [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see also Sehlmeyer v. Department of General Services (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1072, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 840]* . See Ch. 535, *Subpoenas* , for further discussion and forms relating to subpoenas in civil actions and the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.*

Gov. Code § 11450.20(a) also permits attorneys of record for a party to issue subpoenas, as well as the agency and presiding officer. This is an expansion of subpoena issuers permitted under the APA, in comparison with former APA provisions in effect before July 1, 1997 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[d] Service of Subpoena

Subpoenas may be served throughout California and must be served in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987* (personal service of subpoena on witness) and 1988 (personal service of subpoena by sheriff on concealed witness) [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*].

Alternatively, subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum can be delivered by certified mail return receipt requested or by messenger [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Service by messenger is completed when the witness acknowledges receipt of the subpoena to the sender, by telephone, by mail, or in person, and identifies himself or herself either by reference to date of birth and driver's license number or Department of Motor Vehicles identification number, or the sender may verify receipt of the subpoena by obtaining other identifying information from the recipient. The sender is required to make a written notation of the acknowledgement. A subpoena that is properly issued and acknowledged consistent with these requirements is as enforceable as a subpoena that is personally served [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*].

Witnesses who are residents of the State of California at the time of service of the subpoena are required to attend the hearing to which they have been subpoenaed, but non-residents are not required to attend [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(c)*].

[e] Enforcement of Subpoena

A witness who fails to comply with a subpoena that has been properly issued and acknowledged can be punished for failure to comply with the subpoena as a contempt, and the subpoena can state these consequences [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Enforcement of subpoenas is authorized under *Gov. Code § 11455.10 et seq.* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* discussion of these provisions in *§ 473B.16*]. A witness can be held in contempt for failing or refusing, without substantial justification, to comply with a subpoena as well as other types of orders [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.13

§ 473B.13 Scope of Discovery Under the APA

Under the discovery provision of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), a party is entitled to the following [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]:

- To obtain from another party the names and addresses of known witnesses, regardless of whether they are intended to testify at the hearing.

- To inspect and make a copy of specified writings or documents in the possession or custody or under the control of the other party.

The writings and documents specified are [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]:

- Statements of persons other than the respondent, who are named in the initial administrative pleading or any additional pleading, when it is claimed that the act or omission of the respondent as to this person is the basis for the proceeding.

- A statement pertaining to the subject matter of the proceeding made by any party to another party or person.

- Statements of witnesses then proposed to be called by the party, and of other persons having personal knowledge of the acts, omissions, or events that are the basis for the proceeding, not otherwise included in the two preceding types of statements.

- All writings, including but not limited to reports of mental, physical, and blood examinations and things that the party then proposes to offer in evidence.

- Any other writing or thing that is relevant and would be admissible in evidence.

- Investigative reports made by or on behalf of the agency or other party, pertaining to the subject

matter of the proceeding, to the extent that these reports:

- Contain the names and addresses of witnesses or persons having personal knowledge of the acts, omissions, or events that are the basis of the proceeding.

- Reflect matters perceived by the investigator in the course of his or her investigation.

- Contain, or include by attachment, any statement or writing described above, or any summary of such statement or writing.

"Statements" are defined for the purposes of this provision to include [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]:

- Statements signed or otherwise authenticated by the person described.

- Stenographic, mechanical, electrical, or other recordings or transcripts of oral statements by the person described, or written reports or summaries of these oral statements.

Gov. Code § 11507.6 does not authorize the inspection or copying of anything that is privileged from disclosure by law or is otherwise made confidential or protected as the attorney's work product [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see* discussion in *§ 473B.15* for discussion of these and certain other statutory limits on discovery].

It is apparent that the scope of administrative prehearing discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* is more limited than the scope of discovery in civil actions. In a civil action, a party may generally obtain discovery on any unprivileged matter that is relevant, if the matter is either admissible in evidence or appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010*; *see* Ch. 190- 200, *Discovery*]. Moreover, oral depositions may be taken in civil actions, whereas only the statements and writing set out above may be obtained in administrative discovery [*see also* discussion in *§ 473B.12*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.14

§ 473B.14 Administrative Discovery Procedures

[1] Request for Discovery

To initiate discovery under the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), the party seeking discovery must make a written request to another party [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]. Other than the requirement of a writing, the statute prescribes no particular form [*see § 473B.12[3]* (discussing the effect of framing the request in the form of interrogatories)].

Making a written request for discovery is the only step required to perfect a right to California APA discovery. Thus, for example, declarations or affidavits showing good cause are not required [*but see § 473B.12[4]* (discussing requirements for administrative subpoena)].

See *§ 473B.61* for a form of request for discovery.

[2] Time Limits

[a] Statutory Time Limits

The request for discovery must be made before the hearing and within 30 days after the agency serves the initial pleading. If an additional pleading (such as an amended or supplemental accusation or statement of issues) is served, discovery requests must be made within 15 days of this service [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*].

Adequate time usually exists for discovery because the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) normally sets hearing dates at least 60 to 90 days after service of the initial pleading. If an additional pleading is filed less than 15 days before the hearing, a party might be entitled to a continuance to allow discovery. If the new pleading presents new charges, the respondent is expressly entitled to a reasonable time after service to prepare a defense, which may require a reasonable opportunity for further discovery as well [*Gov. Code § 11507*; for discussion of amending, supplementing, and correcting pleadings, *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*].

If the time for discovery expires before the respondent hires an attorney, the attorney should explain the situation to the agency and ask for more time to conduct discovery. The agency is very likely to cooperate. For discussion of how

failure to comply with these limits may curtail discovery, see *§ 473B.15[1]*.

[b] Availability of Discovery Before Notice of Defense Is Filed

It appears that discovery is available only after the respondent files a notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11507.6* provides that a party is entitled to discovery "after the initiation of a proceeding" in which a respondent or other party is entitled to a hearing on the merits. A respondent, in turn, is not entitled to a hearing on the merits until he or she files a notice of defense [*see Gov. Code § 11506(c)* (failure to file notice of defense waives respondent's right to hearing); *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*]. As a practical matter, many respondents file a request for discovery at the time of filing the notice of defense.

[3] Method for Requesting Discovery

[a] Service by Mail

Discovery is initiated by the parties without the approval or control of the Office of Administrative Hearings or the courts. Requests usually are served by mail. The formal hearing provisions of the APA's Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) does not specify whether timeliness of the request is determined by the date that the request is mailed or the date that the other party receives it. Mailing within the time limits is probably adequate [*cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* (service by mail in civil actions is complete at the time of deposit in a post office, mail box, or similar facility); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e)* (time is extended by two court days when notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or other overnight delivery service); *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.306(h)* (proof of service by facsimile transmission)].

[b] Keeping Copy of Request and Proof of Service

The requesting party should keep a copy of the original request, together with proof of service, in case it becomes important in the subsequent administrative hearing or in a court proceeding. The original is not made part of the administrative record unless it is used for determining motions, evidentiary objections, credibility of witnesses, or other matters connected with the administrative hearing.

[4] Complying With Discovery Request

Because the APA discovery provision, *Gov. Code § 11507.6*, does not provide a formal method for complying with a discovery request, the parties and their attorneys usually arrange an exchange of documents or agree on a time for inspecting and copying. The APA also fails to fix a time limit on compliance, although *Gov. Code § 11507.7(a)* provides that a party may file a motion with the administrative law judge to compel compliance after 30 days [*see* discussion in *§ 473B.15*].

In any case, requests should be complied with within a reasonable time. Failure to comply may be cause for continuance of the administrative hearing or may serve as the basis for a motion to exclude or strike evidence.

[5] Costs of Copying

Because *Gov. Code § 11507.6* entitles a party to inspect and copy documents [*see* discussion in *§ 473B.13*], but does not require the other party to furnish copies, the party who wants the copies must pay for them unless the agency provides the copies. Many agencies do provide copies of discoverable documents, generally for a small fee.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.15

§ 473B.15 Limits and Conditions on Discovery

[1] General Limitations

As discussed more fully in §§ *473B.13[1]* and *473B.14*, a party to an administrative adjudication governed by the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) is limited exclusively to the scope of discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* [*Gov. Code § 11507.5*]. *Gov. Code § 11507.6*, in turn, permits discovery only from another party, and only specified statements, writings in the other party's possession or control. Prehearing depositions and formal interrogatories are not allowed, so that no procedure exists to question another party in order to determine the extent of discoverable material in the other party's possession or control. Because the APA lacks procedures for determining the extent of discoverable matters, voluntary and good faith compliance by the parties is necessary for effective discovery.

The request for discovery must be made within the time periods set forth [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see* discussion in *§ 473B.14[2]*]. Although *Gov. Code § 11524(a)* provides that the agency or the administrative law judge may grant a continuance for good cause shown, discovery may be denied if a party fails to comply with statutory requirements [*see Lax v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 669, 675-676, 172 Cal. Rptr. 258* (failure to file petition to compel discovery within time allowed amounts to waiver of right to continuance); *Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815* (petition for depositions under *Gov. Code § 11511* properly denied because petition failed to establish the materiality of the testimony as required by *Gov. Code § 11511*)]. *Gov. Code § 11507.6* does not require that a response to a request for discovery be made under oath.

[2] Privileges

[a] Privileged Matter Not Discoverable

The APA discovery provision does not authorize the discovery of any writing or thing that is legally privileged from disclosure or is otherwise made confidential or protected as attorney work product [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)*]. This encompasses all privileges that normally could be invoked by a litigant in a civil court case, as well as the attorney work-product protection [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016(b)* (application of privilege restrictions to civil court discovery), *2018* (attorney work-product protection)].

Privileges set out in the Evidence Code are expressly made applicable to both APA and non-APA administrative adjudications [*see Evid. Code §§ 901* ("proceeding" is any action, hearing, investigation, inquest, or inquiry in which testimony can be compelled pursuant to law, including a proceeding conducted by an administrative agency or hearing officer), *910* (*Evid. Code § 900 et seq.*, concerning privileges, apply in all proceedings except as otherwise provided by statute)].

Detailed discussion and forms relating to evidentiary privileges and the attorney work-product protection may be found in Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* [*see also* DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Chs. 21-32 (Matthew Bender); California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender)]. The evidentiary privileges and statutory protections against disclosure are:

- Attorney work-product protection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2018.010-2018.080*; *see also* discussion in *[4], below*].

- Lawyer-client communications [*Evid. Code §§ 950-962*].

- Marital communications and privilege not to testify against spouse [*Evid. Code §§ 970-987*].

- Physician-patient communications [*Evid. Code §§ 990-1007*; *see also* discussion in *[3], below*].

- Psychotherapist-patient communications [*Evid. Code §§ 1010-1027*].

- Clergy-penitent communications [*Evid. Code §§ 1030-1034*].

- Victim-counselor communications for sexual assault or domestic violence [*Evid. Code §§ 1035-1037.7*].

- Official records and information [*Evid. Code §§ 1040-1047*; *see also* discussion in *[5], below*].

- Political vote [*Evid. Code § 1050*].

- Trade secrets [*Evid. Code § 1060*].

- Privilege against self-incrimination [*Evid. Code § 940*; for discussion of the privilege against self-incrimination in agency investigations and inspections, *see* respectively Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* , and Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*].

- Protection of newsperson from contempt for refusal to disclose news sources [*Evid. Code § 1070*].

The evidentiary privileges in *Evid. Code §§ 900-1070* apply even though the rules of evidence themselves do not apply to APA hearings [*Evid. Code § 910* (privileges apply except as otherwise provided by statute; statute making rules of evidence inapplicable does not make privileges inapplicable); *Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (with certain exceptions, APA hearings need not be conducted according to technical rules of evidence, but rules of privilege are effective to extent otherwise required by statute to be recognized at hearing); for discussion of the evidentiary rules applicable to administrative hearings, *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

The privilege afforded a defendant in a criminal case (*Evid. Code § 930*) to refuse to respond as a witness and testify is not available to parties in an administrative proceeding [*McComb v. Superior Court (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 89, 96-98, 137 Cal. Rptr. 233]* . Thus, a party can be compelled to appear and testify, but he or she may invoke the privilege against self-incrimination and refuse to disclose matters that may tend to incriminate him or her [*San Francisco*

Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 231, 235, 172 Cal. Rptr. 42] .

[b] The Presumption of Confidentiality and the Burden of Proof

The burden of establishing that a matter is privileged is generally on the party asserting the privilege [*San Diego Professional Asso. v. Superior Court of San Diego County (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 194, 199, 23 Cal. Rptr. 384, 373 P.2d 448* ; *Chronicle Pub. Co. v. Superior Court (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 548, 565, 7 Cal. Rptr. 109, 354 P.2d 637]* . In contrast to this general rule, communications between the following parties are presumed to have been made in confidence [*Evid. Code § 917*]:

- Attorney-client.
- Physician-patient.
- Psychotherapist-patient.
- Clergy-penitent.
- Husband-wife or marital.

The opponent of the claim of privilege has the burden of overcoming this presumption by proving that the communication was not confidential [*Evid. Code § 917*]. This presumption and the attendant shift in the burden of proof only arise, however, after the party claiming the privilege shows that the applicable relationship exists. For example, a party who claims the psychotherapist-patient privilege must first show that he or she was a "patient" [*see Evid. Code § 1011* (definition of patient for purposes of psychotherapist-patient privilege)], and that the person consulted was a "psychotherapist" [*Mahoney v. Superior Court (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 937, 940-941, 191 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; *see Evid. Code § 1010* (definition of psychotherapist for purposes of psychotherapist-patient privilege)].

[3] Physician-Patient Privilege

The physician-patient privilege [*Evid. Code §§ 990-1007*] is one of the privileges that may be asserted in response to an administrative request for discovery [*Evid. Code §§ 910, 990-1007*; *see* discussion in *[2][a], above*]. *Evid. Code § 1007* purports to limit the privilege by providing that it does not exist in a proceeding (defined under *Evid. Code § 901* to include investigations and inquiries) brought by a public entity to determine whether a right, authority, license, or privilege should be revoked, suspended, terminated, limited, or conditioned.

This limitation on the physician-patient privilege, however, is itself limited by case law holding that the physician-patient privilege creates a "zone of privacy" protected by California's constitutional right to privacy [*Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Gherardini (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 669, 678-679, 156 Cal. Rptr. 55* ; *see Cal. Const., art. I, § 1* (right of privacy)]. Thus, notwithstanding *Evid. Code § 1007*, the physician-patient privilege can be asserted against a request for discovery by an administrative agency.

The right to privacy is not absolute, but an invasion of this right must be justified by a compelling state interest, unless the patient has waived the right of privacy by consenting to the intrusion [*White v. Davis (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 757, 775, 120 Cal. Rptr. 94, 533 P.2d 222* ; *Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Gherardini (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 669, 679-681, 156 Cal. Rptr. 55]* . If there has been no waiver, the agency must show that there is good cause for production of the material sought [*Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 618, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20* ; *Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Gherardini (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 669, 679-682, 156 Cal. Rptr. 55]* . For discussion of agency investigative subpoenas and the right of privacy, including an explanation of "good cause," see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

For detailed, general discussion relating to the physician-patient communication privilege, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* [*see also* DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Chs. 21-32 (Matthew Bender); California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender)].

[4] Attorney Work Product

Under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the formal hearing provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), a party may refuse to disclose information that is protected by the attorney work product rule [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*].

The protection of attorney work-product rule provides absolute protection from discovery for any writing that reflects an attorney's impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal research or theories [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2018.030(a)*]. Other work product of an attorney is not discoverable unless the denial of discovery will unfairly prejudice the party seeking it or will result in an injustice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2018.030(b)*].

The California State Bar, however, may discover the work product of an attorney against whom disciplinary charges are pending, if the work product is relevant to issues of breach of duty by the lawyer. Discovery of this material is subject to approval of the client for whom the work was done. On request and with a showing of good cause, the discovery will also be subject to a protective order to ensure the confidentiality of the work product except for its use by the State Bar in disciplinary investigations and its consideration under seal in State Bar Court proceedings. When a client initiates a complaint against his or her attorney, that client's approval of discovery of the work product is deemed to have been granted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2018.070(c)*; for detailed discussion of the non-APA disciplinary proceedings conducted by the State Bar, *see* Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline*].

The work product privilege does not apply to work product that is relevant to an issue of breach by an attorney of a duty owed to a client arising out of the attorney-client relationship. Thus, clients or former clients who sue lawyers for professional negligence can obtain discovery of attorney work product relevant to their claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2018(f)*].

For detailed, general discussion and forms relating to the attorney work-product protection, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* [*see also* DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice (Matthew Bender); California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender)].

[5] Official Information

"Official information" is information acquired in confidence by a public employee in the course of the employee's duties and not open to or disclosed to the public [*Evid. Code § 1040(a)*]. A public entity, which includes public agencies [*Evid. Code § 200*], has a privilege to refuse to disclose official information if the privilege is claimed by a person authorized by the agency to do so. Disclosure also must either be forbidden by a federal or California statute or be against the public interest. A disclosure is against the public interest if the necessity of preserving the confidentiality of the information outweighs the necessity for disclosure in the interest of justice [*Evid. Code § 1040(b)(2)*].

However, the interest of the public agency in investigating wrongdoing would support the public interest in confidentiality of the records because disclosure of audit manuals would make it easier for licensees to avoid detection of violations of the law [*Suarez v. Office of Administrative Hearings (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1191, 1195-1196, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* . In *Suarez*, an ALJ ordered disclosure of a Department of Real Estate Audit Manual and Enforcement Deputy Manual to a real estate broker charged with fraud. Disclosure was ordered after the broker brought a motion to compel production of the manuals as part of the discovery process related to administrative hearing. Broker argued that manuals were relevant to issues in hearing. The ALJ conducted an in camera examination of the manuals before ordering disclosure. The Court of Appeal upheld the Superior Court's grant of a petition for a writ of

administrative mandate prohibiting disclosure of the manuals under the provisions of *Evid. Code § 1040(b)(2)*. The Court of Appeal held that the audit method used by DRE auditors would not provide the licensee a relevant defense to the charges brought against him, and therefore the need for disclosure of the records (to provide information relevant to the licensee's defense) was outweighed by the public interest in confidentiality [*Suarez v. Office of Admin. Hearings (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1191, 1195-1196, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* .

This privilege does not apply, however, if any person authorized to do so consents that the information be disclosed in the proceeding [*Evid. Code § 1040(b)(2)*]. This exception seems to provide a party with access to information the agency plans to introduce at the hearing. Whether it would allow discovery of official information used in the case but not intended to be used in the hearing is not clear.

For detailed, general discussion and forms relating to official information privilege, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* [*see also* DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Chs. 21-32 (Matthew Bender); California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender)].

[6] Sexual Conduct

In employment discrimination and harassment cases [*see Gov. Code § 12940(h), (i)*], civil service discipline cases [*see Gov. Code § 19572*], and civil service discrimination cases [*see Gov. Code § 19702*], that allege conduct that constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery, any evidence of specific instances of a complainant's sexual conduct with individuals other than the alleged perpetrator is not discoverable, unless it is to be offered at a hearing to attack the credibility of the complainant [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(a)*]. At the hearing, this evidence is presumed inadmissible absent an offer of proof that establishes the following [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(b)*]:

- The relevance and reliability of the offered evidence.

- The probative value of the evidence offered is not substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will create substantial danger of undue prejudice or confuse the issue.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsConstitutional RightsSelf-Incrimination PrivilegeConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessPrivacyGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesAttorney-Client PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesClergy CommunicationsGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesDoctor-Patient PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesGovernment PrivilegesOfficial Information PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesMarital PrivilegesGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesPsychotherapist-Patient PrivilegeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.16

§ 473B.16 Enforcement of Discovery Under the California APA

[1] Motion to Compel Discovery

Gov. Code § 11507.7 provides the remedy for failure to comply with a discovery request under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). Any party claiming that the party's request for discovery pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11507.6* has not been complied with may serve and file with the administrative law judge a motion to compel discovery. The motion must do the following [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(a)*]:

- Name as respondent the party refusing or failing to comply with *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.
- State facts showing that the respondent failed or refused to comply with *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.
- Describe the matter sought to be discovered.
- Give the reason or reasons why the matter is discoverable under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.
- Show that a reasonable and good faith attempt to contact the respondent for an informal resolution has been made.
- Give the ground or grounds of respondent's refusal, as far as known to the moving party.

The motion to compel should contain a clear, complete, and concise statement of each of these items. Because the time for argument and additional evidence may be very limited, the motion, answer, and supporting documents should be complete. For purposes of filing, the motion should be filed with the administrative law judge who has been assigned to hearing the case.

See *§ 473B.63* for a form of motion to compel discovery.

[2] Serving and Filing the Motion

The motion to compel discovery must be served on the respondent party and filed with the administrative law judge within 15 days after the respondent first evidenced failure or refusal to comply with the request for discovery, within 30 days after the request was made and the respondent party has failed to reply to it, or within another time provided by stipulation, whichever period is longer.

Under case law interpreting the former law in effect prior to July 1, 1997, failure to move to compel compliance within the applicaable time periods could be treated as a waiver of the right to do so [*Lax v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 669, 675-676, 172 Cal. Rptr. 258* (failure to file petition to compel discovery within time allowed amounts to waiver of right to get continuance to file petition)].

Although *Gov. Code § 11507.7* prescribes no particular method of service, the motion should be served in the same way as a summons in a civil action; the reasoning is that, despite explicit provision, it is reasonable to assume that Legislature intended to refer to normal practice in civil proceedings [*see § 473B.63*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons); Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[3] Answer and Hearing on Motion to Compel

The hearing on the motion to compel discovery shall be held within 15 days after the motion is made, or a later time that the administrative law judge may on the judge's own motion for good cause determine. The responding party has the right to serve and file a written answer or other response to the motion before or at the time of the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)*].

Most answers claim that the requested discovery is not discoverable matter under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*. They may also claim that the requested discovery is privileged, confidential, attorney work product [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)*; *see § 473B.16[2], [4]*], or evidence of a complainant's sexual conduct [*Gov. Code § 11440.40*; *see § 473B.15[6]*]. Agencies often claim that the requested information is official information [*Evid. Code § 1040*; *see § 473B.15[5]*], or otherwise not discoverable pursuant to a special statute [*see Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 167-176, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220* (writ of mandate to compel compliance with subpoenas before administrative hearing denied because records sought were privileged under *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4514*, 5238)].

See *§ 473B.64* for a form of answer to a motion to compel.

[4] *In Camera* Inspection

Where the matter sought to be discovered is under the custody or control of the respondent party and the party responding to the motion claims that the matter is not discoverable under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* or is privileged, the administrative law judge may order lodged with it matters provided in *Evidence Code § 915(b)*, and may examine the material *in camera* consistent with *Evid. Code § 915(b)* [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(d)*]. For discussion of *Evid. Code § 915*, *see* DeMeo, california deposition and discovery practice, Ch. 21, § 21.21[3].

When possible, the responding party should have the material available at the time of the order so that it can be delivered to the judge for examination, if an examination is ordered.

[5] Order Granting or Denying Motion

The administrative law judge will decide the case on the matters examined in camera, the papers filed by the parties, and such oral argument and additional evidence as the administrative law judge may allow [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(e)*]. Unless otherwise stipulated by the parties, the administrative law judge shall no later than 15 days after the hearing make its order denying or granting the motion. The order shall be in writing setting forth the matters the moving party is entitled to discover under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*. A copy of the order shall be served forthwith by mail by the

administrative law judge on the parties. If the order grants the motion in whole or in part, the order shall not become effective until 10 days after the date the order is served. When the order denies relief to the moving party, the order shall be effective on the date it is served [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)*]. See *§§ 473B.65* and *473B.66* for forms of orders granting or denying relief.

[6] Review of Judge's Order

The administrative law judge's order compelling discovery is enforceable by certification to the superior court of facts to justify the contempt sanction [*see Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.20*]. A court judgment of contempt is not appealable [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a), 1222*]. The administrative law judge may also impose monetary sanctions for bad faith tactics, which are reviewable in the same manner as the decision in the proceeding [*see Gov. Code § 11455.30*; *see* 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995), Comments to *Gov. Code § 11507.7*].

[7] Sanctions

Contempt sanctions can be imposed against a party who fails or refuses, without substantial justification, to comply with a deposition order, discovery request, subpoena, or other order of the presiding officer, or who moves to compel discovery without substantial justification [*Gov. Code § 11455.10*].

Court enforcement of contempt sanctions uses an order to show cause procedure. The presiding officer or the agency head may certify the facts that justify the contempt sanction against a person to the superior court in and for the county where the proceeding is conducted. The court shall thereupon issue an order directing the person to appear before the court at a specified time and place, and then and there to show cause why the person should not be punished for contempt. The order and a copy of the certified statement shall be served on the person. Upon service of the order and a copy of the certified statement, the court has jurisdiction of the contempt proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11455.20(a)*]. The contempt procedures, penalties, and purging grounds are the same as those used in the trial of a civil action in the superior court [*Gov. Code § 11455.20(b)*].

Monetary sanctions are also authorized. The presiding officer may order a party, the party's attorney or other authorized representative, or both to pay reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* [*Gov. Code § 11455.30(a)*]. Bad faith actions or tactics could include failure or refusal to comply with a deposition order, discovery request, subpoena or other order of the presiding officer in discovery, or moving to compel discovery, frivolously or solely intended to cause delay. A person who requests a hearing without legal grounds would not be subject to sanctions under this section unless the request was made in bad faith or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [*see* 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. The order, or denial of an order, is subject to judicial review in the same manner as a decision in the proceeding [*see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* et seq.]. The order is enforceable in the same manner as a money judgment or by the contempt sanction [*Gov. Code § 11455.30(b)*].

For detailed discussion and forms relating to contempt, enforcement of money judgments, and sanctions generally, see respectively Ch. 135, *Contempt* , Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* , and Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

In view of potential sanction liability, parties should be careful about refusing or limiting discovery without substantial justification. If counsel or client is determined to resist a discovery request, and if counsel feels that the material sought is not or may not be discoverable, sending a formal notice of noncompliance to the requesting party by certified mail, with plausible reasons for resisting the request, may favorably impress the administrative law judge when he or she is later deciding whether to impose sanctions [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)* (things not discoverable in APA proceedings); *see also § 473B.13*].

See *§ 473B.62* for a form of notice of non-compliance with an administrative discovery request.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesAttorney-Client PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesGovernment PrivilegesOfficial Information PrivilegeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.17

§ 473B.17 Non-APA Statutory Discovery

[1] Applicability of Non-California APA Discovery Statutes

Discovery under the APA discovery provisions (*Gov. Code § 11507.6*) applies only to agency adjudication proceedings under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*see Gov. Code § 11507.5*; *Bertch v. Social Welfare Dep't (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 524, 527, 289 P.2d 485* ; for discussion of which agency adjudication proceedings are subject to the formal hearing provision of Chapter 5, *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*].

In a few instances, when the APA provisions do not apply, the provisions of the Civil Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016.010-2016.070*] have been made specifically applicable. For example, *Educ. Code § 44944(a)* makes the act applicable in proceedings for dismissal or suspension of school district employees. Absent such a specific statutory authorization, the act does not apply to administrative proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016*; *Romero v. Hern (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 787, 790, 81 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

The Legislature has also enacted numerous statutes governing administrative discovery in proceedings not covered by the APA. Under these non-APA discovery statutes, the range of discovery provided varies from the right of a civil servant to inspect relevant documents and interview other employees when facing adverse action [*Gov. Code § 19574.1*; *see Gov. Code § 19570* (adverse action defined)], to the right of a school district employee in a suspension or dismissal proceeding to employ the full range of discovery allowed in superior court civil actions [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

If a specific discovery statute applies to an administrative proceeding, it controls over the APA discovery provisions that might otherwise apply [*San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 231, 235, 172 Cal. Rptr. 42]* .

[2] Investigation and Enforcement

Most of the non-APA discovery provisions are not so much discovery provisions as they are provisions that authorize state officials and administrative boards to use specific discovery techniques to aid in their investigations and in the enforcement of their regulatory programs. The power to employ information-gathering techniques in connection with agency investigations in general is authorized by *Gov. Code § 11180 et seq.* [*see* Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public*

Agencies for detailed discussion of agency investigations]. The following matters are among those subject to special statutes authorizing administrative discovery in connection with administrative investigations and enforcement proceedings:

- Meat and Poultry Inspection Act investigations [*Food & Agric. Code § 18906*; *see Food & Agric. Code § 18650 et seq.*].

- Escrow agent hearings and investigations [*Fin. Code § 17611*].

- Depositions in investigations by the Fish and Game Commission [*Fish & Game Code §§ 309, 5934*].

- Hearings by the judicial qualification commission [*Gov. Code §§ 68752, 68753*].

- Hearings by the labor commissioner [*Lab. Code § 92*].

- Unemployment insurance appeals, proceedings, hearings, or investigations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1953*].

- Investigating powers of commissioner of corporations [*Corp. Code § 25531*].

- Depositions in investigations or hearings before the Public Utilities Commission [*Pub. Util. Code § 1794*].

- Teacher suspension or dismissal proceedings [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

[3] Private Parties

Non-APA statutory discovery is also available to private parties in some administrative proceedings. The following matters are among those subject to statutes that authorize non-California APA administrative discovery for private parties:

- State Personnel Board hearings [*Gov. Code § 19574.1*; *see Nightingale v. State Personnel Board (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 507, 516-518, 102 Cal. Rptr. 758, 498 P.2d 1006* (when civil servant in disciplinary proceeding failed to show good cause for issuance of interrogatories, court declined to decide whether discovery available was limited to right to inspect documents and interview other employees provided by *Gov. Code § 19574.1*); Ch. 117, *Civil Service*].

- Depositions in investigations or hearings before the Public Utilities Commission [*Pub. Util. Code § 1794*; *see* Ch. 480, *Public Utilities*].

- Teacher suspension or dismissal proceedings [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*; *see* Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues*].

- Discovery in workers' compensation proceedings [*Lab. Code § 5710*; *see* Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation*].

- Depositions in fishway hearings [*Fish & Game Code § 5934*].

- Discovery in peace officer employment discipline proceedings [*Gov. Code § 3303(g)*; *Hinrichs v. County of Orange (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 921, 928-929, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 186* (sheriffs' department

employee had right to discovery of non-confidential reports related to officer's misconduct, and sheriff's department had statutory obligation to disclose reports)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & InspectionGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.18

§ 473B.18 Nonstatutory Court Authorized Discovery

[1] Availability

If the administrative proceeding is not governed by the California APA, and even if there is no other statutory authority for discovery [*see § 473B.18*], it nevertheless may be possible to obtain discovery when "modern concepts of administrative adjudication call for common law rules to permit and regulate the use of the agencies' subpoena power to secure prehearing discovery" [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* . Common law rules have been applied to administrative procedures by court decisions whenever it appears necessary to promote fair hearings and effective judicial review [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* . For example, discovery is appropriate in state bar disciplinary proceedings [*Brotsky v. State Bar (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 287, 298-302, 19 Cal. Rptr. 153, 368 P.2d 697* ; *see* Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* , for discussion and forms relating to State Bar proceedings].

[2] Governing Law

Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65 , is the leading decision regarding common law administrative discovery. This decision arose from an administrative adjudication to revoke the medical licenses of several doctors for performing illegal abortions. The proceeding was brought under the APA before the APA had been amended to provide for discovery. The doctors against whom the proceeding was brought sought subpoenas duces tecum requesting prehearing depositions and production of documents. The Court analogized providing discovery in administrative proceedings to court-developed discovery in criminal cases [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 478-480, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* .

On a showing of good cause and materiality, governed by the standards applicable to civil discovery, and not those for issuing subpoenas duces tecum under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*, the Court allowed subpoenas for the production of any statements made by women named in the accusations and their husbands, and copies of bills, letters, and documents with respect to treatment given the women. Further, the Court allowed depositions of agency employees to enable the doctors to establish good cause for the production of other documents in the agency's files [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 481-482, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* .

The *Shively* decision did not extend discovery to deposing material witnesses generally [*Everett v. Gordon (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 667, 671-673, 72 Cal. Rptr. 379]* .

When seeking discovery under *Shively*, the following considerations are important:

- *Shively* arose out of a disciplinary proceeding that the Court described as having a punitive character because the agency could prohibit the accused doctors from practicing their profession [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 480, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* .

- Since the enactment of *Gov. Code § 11507.6* in 1968, discovery in California APA licensing proceedings (and other California APA proceedings) is exclusively governed by *Gov. Code § 11507.6* [*Gov. Code § 11507.5*; *see § 473B.12[1]*]. The reasoning in *Shively* is still valid, but its application is now much more limited to non-APA proceedings.

- Although there is no absolute right to see everything in an agency's files, items need not be admissible in the hearing to be discoverable [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 481, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* .

- A showing of good cause and materiality is required, but this showing is governed by discovery standards [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 481, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65* (thus, because a weighing of good cause and materiality according to discovery standards would have entitled a defendant charged with criminal abortion to pretrial discovery of statements by the alleged victims to the police, doctors in a disciplinary hearing were entitled to prehearing discovery of statements by the women treated and their husbands)].

- *Shively* has been interpreted as allowing depositions only for ascertaining discoverable matter and preserving testimony as in criminal discovery [*Everett v. Gordon (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 667, 72 Cal. Rptr. 379* ; *Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *Grannis v. Board of Med. Examiners (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 551, 96 Cal. Rptr. 863* ; *see Gov. Code § 11190* (any party to departmental hearing has right to attendance of witnesses on his or her behalf at the hearing or on deposition)]. But inspection of documents under *Shively*, on a showing of good cause and materiality, may extend as far as discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* [*Romero v. Hern (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 787, 793, 81 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

Finally, governmental agencies do not have to rely on court-created discovery rights. They have extensive investigatory and subpoena power that gives them discovery capabilities for gathering information from both party and nonparty sources [*Gov. Code §§ 11180-11191*]. The investigative power of agencies is liberally construed [*Brovelli v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 524, 527-529, 15 Cal. Rptr. 630, 364 P.2d 462]* . Agencies can obtain information even before filing an initial pleading [*Gov. Code § 11189*. *See* discussion in *§ 473B.17*; *see also* Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* , and Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473B.19-473B.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473B.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.30

§ 473B.30 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.31

§ 473B.31 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.32

§ 473B.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.1-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2094*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.33

§ 473B.33 Decisions

[1] General Requirements

Disciplinary action against licensee, finding licensee guilty of gross incompetence, is invalid when administrative record is completely devoid of any statute, rule, regulation, or evidence of an implied standard by which to measure competence of licensee's conduct. *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 527-528, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693*

Administrative regulations that violate acts of Legislature are void. *Selby v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 470, 474, 168 Cal. Rptr. 36*

Act in excess of agency's authority under enabling law are void. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Subject of administrative proceeding is entitled to have statutory procedures strictly followed and fairly construed. *California School Employees Assn. v. Personnel Com. of Pajaro Valley Unified School Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 145, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Administrative regulation contrary to enabling law is void. *California School Employees Assn. v. Personnel Com. of Pajaro Valley Unified School Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 144, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Agency is not free to ignore its own validly established procedures. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Reference to Administrative Procedure Act for guidance is proper in case not governed by act or other law. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Requirements of due process. *Connolly Development, Inc. v. Superior Court of Merced County (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 803, 818, 823, 132 Cal. Rptr. 477, 553 P.2d 637* ; *Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 208-209, 124*

Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774 ; *Beaudreau v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 448, 458, 121 Cal. Rptr. 585, 535 P.2d 713*

[2] Depositions of Witnesses

Issuance of subpoena for taking witness's deposition is discretionary act. *Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 439, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815*

Right to depose witness who will be absent from hearing, in case not governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (hereinafter referred to as "APA"), if agency has subpoena power. *Walker Mining Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 257, 262, 95 P.2d 188*

[3] Discovery Against Party

Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7 are exclusive discovery statutes in administrative proceedings; *Gov. Code § 11510*, governing subpoenas to produce documents and witnesses at administrative hearing, does not provide for discovery prior to administrative hearing. *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 166, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220*

Request by attorney to receive service of all papers for client survives dismissal of proceeding to enforce discovery when request withdrawn or nullified, so that subsequent service of second set of interrogatories on attorney is proper. *Department of Fair Employment & Housing v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 149, 152, 171 Cal. Rptr. 863*

Right to discovery in case not governed by *APA. Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 479-480, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65*

[4] Subpoenas

Administrative subpoenas pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11180 et seq.* *Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 616-618, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Court opinion enunciating rule that declaration in support of investigative subpoena duces tecum for production of patient's hospital records must show good cause, including allegations of fact to demonstrate relevance or materiality of patient's medical records to general charges against doctor, and must show that request can be granted without abuse of third party's constitutionally protected right of privacy (*Cal. Const., art. I, § 1*) is not retroactive. *Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 618-620, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Issuance of subpoena under APA is ministerial act before hearing and discretionary act after hearing has begun. *Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 480-481, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65*

Agency having power to issue subpoena not governed by APA, is required to issue subpoena when requested. *McLeod v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 28-29, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58*

Witness served with administrative subpoena is entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *McLeod v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 31, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58*

Agency lacks power to enforce its own subpoena. *Crocker v. Conrey (1903) 140 Cal. 213, 217, 73 P. 1006*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

110 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.34

§ 473B.34 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

Witkin, California Evidence, Ch. III, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 150-191; Ch. X, *Witnesses*, §§ 787-791; Ch. XII, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1223-1275 (2d ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.35

§ 473B.35 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes: information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah **NOTE:** On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service.
http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473B.36-473B.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473B.36[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.50

§ 473B.50 Obtaining and Responding to Administrative Discovery

[1] Ascertain Applicable Law Governing Discovery in the Proceeding

☐ California APA [*see § 473B.13*].

☐ Other statute [*see § 473B.18*].

☐ Court [*see* § 473B.19].

[2] Obtaining Discovery Under the APA

☐ Request for discovery, to another party, to obtain witness names and address and specified statement and writings in possession or control of that party [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see § 473B.14*].

☐ Request must be made in writing after filing notice of defense, within 30 days after agency filing of initial pleading, and before hearing [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see § 473B.14*].

☐ If other party refuses or fails to comply with request for discovery, and such refusal or failure is not based on valid privilege or protection, serve and file motion with ALJ to compel discovery, within 15 days after first evidence of refusal or failure, within 30 days after service of request, or within time stipulated, whichever is longer [*Gov. Code § 11507.7*; *see § 473B.16*].

☐ If order compelling compliance is obtained by other party still does not comply, utilize sanction procedure [*see § 473B.17*].

[3] Complying With Request for Administrative Discovery Under the APA

☐ Determine extent of discovery to be provided: witness names and address and specified writings or statements in party's possession or control, not otherwise privileged from disclosure or protected by attorney work product doctrine [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see §§ 473B.14, 473B.15*].

☐ Comply or make objection to compliance within time required [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see § 473B.15*].

☐ If other party makes motion to compel, prepare response to motion, giving basis or bases for refusal, for example, evidentiary privilege or attorney work product protection [*Gov. Code § 11507.7*; *see § 473B.16*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.51

§ 473B.51 Initiation of Discovery Under the APA

[1] Notice of Defense

☐ File notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see Gov. Code § 11506(c)*; *see also § 473B.14[2][b]*; for further discussion, see *§ 473A.11[6]*; for a form, see *§ 473A.54*].

[2] Request for Discovery

☐ Prepare and deliver written request for discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see §§ 473B.12[3], 473B.14[1]*; for a form, see *§ 473B.61*].

☐ Request may be filed with the notice of defense [*see § 473B.14[2][b]*].

☐ Timing of request.

☐ Make request before hearing and within 30 days after agency serves initial pleading [Gov. Code § 11570.6; *see § 473B.14[2][a]*].

☐ Additional agency pleadings.

☐ Request discovery within 15 days of service of additional agency pleading (for example, amended or supplemental accusation or statement of issues) [Gov. Code § 11570.6; *see § 473B.14[2][a]*].

[3] Service of Written Request

☐ Mail copy to party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*; *see also § 473B.14[3]*].

[4] Noncompliance with Request for Discovery-Petitioner's Option

☐ Prepare motion to compel discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(a)*; *§ 473B.16*; for a form, *see § 473B.63*].

☐ Attach supporting declaration and memorandum of points and authorities (optional) [*see § 473B.63[3]*].

☐ Prepare, and file with motion, order granting motion to compel discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)*; for a form, *see § 473B.65*].

☐ Serve and file motion with ALJ within whichever period of the following is longer [*see Gov. Code § 11507.7(b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10*; *see also § 473B.16[2]*]:

☐ Fifteen days after respondent first evidenced failure or refusal to comply.

☐ Thirty days after request was made.

☐ Another time provided for by stipulation.

☐ Hearing on motion to compel will be held within 15 days after motion is made [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)*; *see § 473B.16[3]*].

[5] Respondent's Options

☐ Noncompliance with request for discovery.

☐ Prepare notice of noncompliance [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; for a form, see *§ 473B.62*].

☐ Send to requesting party by certified mail [*see § 473B.16[7]*].

☐ Answer to motion to compel discovery.

☐ Prepare answer to motion to compel discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)*; *see § 473B.16[3]*; for a form, see *§ 473B.64*].

☐ Prepare, and file with answer, order denying motion to compel discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)*; for a form, see *§ 473B.66*].

☐ File before or at time of hearing [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)*; *see § 473B.16[3]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.52

§ 473B.52 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Requesting Subpoena

☐ Party requests subpoena or subpoena duces tecum from agency or presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.*; *see also § 473B.12[4][c]*], or

☐ Respondent's attorney of record may issue [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.*; *see also § 473B.12[4][c]*].

[2] Service

☐ Serve according to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987, 1988* [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*; *see § 473B.12[4][d]*], or

☐ Deliver by certified mail return receipt requested, or

☐ By messenger.

☐ Witness must acknowledge receipt of subpoena.

☐ Sender must make written notation of acknowledgment.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.53

§ 473B.53 Deposition of Unavailable Witness Under APA Guidelines

[1] Petition for Deposition of Unavailable Witness

☐ Prepare petition [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *see § 473B.12[2]*]; for a form see, *§ 473B.60*].

☐ Verify petition [*see Gov. Code § 11511*].

[2] Filing

☐ File petition with ALJ, or

☐ File with agency if ALJ has not been appointed.

[3] Service

☐ Serve copy of petition and notice of hearing on other parties [Gov. Code § 15111; *see § 473B.12[2]*].

☐ Serve at least 10 days before hearing.

[4] Order Issued

☐ Proceed as though in a civil action [*see § 473B.60[4]*; Ch. 190- 200, *Discovery*].

☐ Witness resides outside of California.

☐ Agency must obtain court order to take deposition [Gov. Code § 15111; *see § 473B.12[2]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473B.54-473B.59

[Reserved]

§§ 473B.54[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.60

§ 473B.60 Petition to Take Deposition of Unavailable Witness [Gov. Code § 11511]

[1] FORM Petition to Take Deposition of Unavailable Witness [Gov. Code § 11511]

Petition for Order to Take Deposition [*Gov. Code § 11511*]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))	NO. _____ PETITION FOR ORDER TO TAKE DEPOSITION

Respondent represents as follows:

1. _____ [*Nature of pending proceeding, e.g.*, This proceeding was begun by _____ (*name of agency or complainant*) pursuant to Section _____ (11503 *or* 11504) of the Government Code for the purpose of _____ (*specify, in statutory language*)].

2. The testimony of _____[*name*], whose address is _____[*specify*], is material to the issues in this proceeding in that _____[*specify*].

3. _____[*Name*] _____ [will be unable *or* cannot be compelled] to attend the hearing in this proceeding because _____[*specify*].

WHEREFORE, respondent requests that an order be issued requiring _____[*name*] to appear and testify before _____[*name of officer who will take deposition*], _____ [*title, e.g.,* a notary public *or other statement showing person's qualification to take deposition*].

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing or petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1]*, above, is a petition for use by the respondent wishing to take the deposition of a witness who will be unavailable at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *see § 473B.12[2]* for further discussion].

[3] Verification

The petition must be verified and must contain (1) a statement of the nature of the pending proceeding, (2) the name and address of the witness whose testimony is desired, (3) a showing of the materiality of his or her testimony, (4) a showing that he or she will be unable to attend the hearing or cannot be compelled to attend, and (5) a request for an order requiring the witness to appear and testify before an officer named in the petition for that purpose [*Gov. Code § 11511*].

The purpose of identifying in the petition the person before whom the deposition will be given is, evidently, to facilitate the obtaining of a commission in the event one is needed. The taking of the deposition by a person qualified to do so but not identified in the petition would appear to be an inconsequential irregularity, at least when the deposition is taken within the state and no actual prejudice is shown [*see Reimel v. House (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 780, 782-787, 74 Cal. Rptr. 345]* .

[4] Procedure

The petition is filed with the administrative law judge, or, if an administrative law judge has not been appointed, with the agency. The petitioner must serve notice of hearing and a copy of the petition on the other parties at least 10 days before the hearing. If the order is issued, the respondent then proceeds as though in a civil action. If the witness resides outside the state, the agency is required, after the administrative law judge, or the agency, has issued its order, to obtain a court order for the taking of the deposition. A proceeding for this purpose would be maintained in the superior court in Sacramento County [*Gov. Code § 11511*]. The reason for this requirement is that many states enforce commissions to take depositions only if the commissions issue from the court of a sister state [*see* Judicial Council of California, 10th Biennial Report (1944), pages 18, 19, quoted in *Reimel v. House (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 780, 784, 74 Cal. Rptr. 345]*
.

[5] Cross References

For discussion of the provision under *Gov. Code § 11511* for taking the deposition of a witness who will be unavailable at the hearing, see *§ 473B.12[2]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.61

§ 473B.61 Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

[1] FORM Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*agency or person*]:

Pursuant to *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code*, Respondent _____[*name*] requests that you furnish the following to the undersigned at _____[*address*], at the earliest possible time after receiving this request, but in no event later than 30 days after receipt of this request absent a stipulation extending that time:

1. The names and addresses of witnesses to the extent known to you, including, but not limited to, those whom you intend to call to testify at the hearing.

2. The following statement or writings, for inspection or copying, or copies thereof:

a. _____ [*List here and in following paragraphs the items specified in Gov. Code § 11507.6, using general descriptions, e.g.*, Any statement pertaining to the subject matter of this proceeding, made by any party to any other party or person, which is in your possession or custody or under your control].

b. etc.

_____ [*date*]

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1]*, above, is for use by a respondent in an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) to obtain prehearing discovery from the complaining agency under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.

[3] Content of Request

The request for discovery must be written, but there is no other explicit requirements as to form or content [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6*]. For purposes of the record, however, the request should be formulated in the fashion of this form, that is, a paper to be filed in the proceeding. The content will vary according to what information the requesting party wants. For listing of the specific items discoverable under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*, see *§ 473B.14[1]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.62

§ 473B.62 Notice of Noncompliance With Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

[1] FORM Notice of Noncompliance With Request for Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.6]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF NONCOMPLIANCE WITH RE-
Respondent.	)	QUEST FOR DISCOVERY
	)	

_____

To _____[*party requesting discovery*]:

Your request for discovery dated _____, will not be complied with in the following respects, for the reason that the _____[information requested *or* _____ (writing *or* thing) sought to be _____ (inspected *or* copied) [is privileged from disclosure by law [and protected as an attorney's work product in that _____ (*specify*)]:

1. _____ [*In this and sequential paragraphs, as needed, list respects in which compliance is refused, e.g.*, Medical records pertaining to _____ (*name*) will not be made available for inspection or copying _____ (because disclosure of such records is prohibited by *Section 994 of the Evidence Code*)].

2. etc.

_____ [*date*]

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1]*, above, is for use by a respondent in an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), to provide notice to the complaining agency (or other party requesting discovery), of noncompliance based on an evidentiary privilege or other reason for nondisclosure or noncompliance.

[3] Cross References

For discussion of when sanctions will be imposed for failure to comply with a discovery request, see *§ 473B.16[7]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.63

§ 473B.63 Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7]

[1] FORM Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))	NO. _____ MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY

Moving Party respectfully represents:

1. Moving Party and respondent are parties in an administrative proceeding pending before the _____[*agency*] entitled _____[*name of proceeding*], No. _____. Procedural matters in that proceeding are governed by *Government Code Sections 11500-11529* of the Administrative Procedure Act.

2. Within the time required by *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code*, the moving party made a written request to _____[*specify opposing party*] for discovery pursuant to that section. A copy of that request is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. The matters sought to be discovered are described in Exhibit A.

3. The matters sought to be discovered are specified in *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code* as discoverable matters, subject only to such protection against disclosure as the law affords on principles of privilege or confidentiality

or under the doctrine of attorney's work product. The matters requested are discoverable in that [*specify reasons*].

4. Respondent has failed and refused to comply with the request for discovery in that _____[*state facts showing how respondent has failed or refused to comply; specify extent of failure to comply*].

5. Moving Party has made a reasonable and good faith attempt to contact the respondent for an informal resolution of the issue and [*specify facts relating to the attempt and why informal resolution was not successful or did not occur*].

6. Respondent has [failed *or* refused] to comply with the request for discovery _____ [for reasons unknown to petitioner *or* on the ground(s), as stated by respondent, that _____ (*specify*)].

WHEREFORE, moving party prays that an order be issued, as follows:

1. That moving party is entitled to prompt and effective discovery of all matters referred to in the request [and not heretofore discovered]; and

2. That respondent be ordered to comply fully with the request forthwith.

Respectfully submitted,_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Moving Party

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is for use by respondent (or other party) in an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) to move to compel compliance with a previously served request for discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*.

[3] Supporting Papers

Gov. Code § 11507.7, providing for the motion to compel, does not require verification or other support, but it is recommended that the motion be supported by a declaration or memorandum or points and authorities, or both, stating factual and legal reasons why compliance with the request should be ordered.

[4] Service and Filing

The motion should be served and filed within one of the following: (1) 15 days after the respondent first evidenced failure or refusal to comply with *Gov. Code § 11507.6*; (2) within 30 days after the request was made and the party has failed to reply to the request; or (3) within another time provided by stipulation, whichever period is longer [*see Gov. Code § 11507.7(b)*].

Although the method of service is not prescribed in *Gov. Code § 11507.7*, it is reasonable to assume that service should be made as in any other civil proceeding.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to affidavits and declarations under penalty of perjury in civil actions generally, see

Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For discussion and forms relating to memoranda of points and authorities in civil law and motions generally, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

For discussion and forms relating to service of papers, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.64

§ 473B.64 Answer to Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)]

[1] FORM Answer to Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(c)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))	NO. _____ ANSWER TO MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY

Respondent respectfully answers the motion as follows:

1. The allegations of Paragraph _____ [*number*] are true.

2. The allegations of Paragraph _____ [*number*] are true, except that it is not true that _____[*specify*].

3. Except as hereinabove admitted, the allegations of the motion are denied.

4. The following matters referred to in the motion are not discoverable under *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code*, for the reasons specified [*in the following paragraph(s) state the reasons based on statutory or decisional law that the matters are not discoverable despite the provisions of Gov. Code § 11507.6*]:

a. _____ [*Specify item*] is privileged from disclosure by Section _____ [*number*] of the Evidence [*or other code as may be applicable*] Code.

b. _____ [*Item*] is confidential and not subject to discovery under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of _____ [*name and citation of case*].

c. _____ [*Item*] is the work product of respondent's attorney and as such is protected from discovery.

5. On _____[*date*], respondent notified moving party in writing that respondent would not comply with moving party's request for discovery with respect to the matters mentioned in Paragraph 4 above, for the reasons therein stated. A copy of that notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

WHEREFORE, respondent prays that the moving party be denied [any relief *or* any discovery as to the items specified in this answer] and that his/her motion be accordingly denied [as to the items specified in this answer].

Respectfully submitted,_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*status and name of respondent or other answering party*]

[*Verification. See § 473B.60.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of answer in *[1], above*, is for use by the respondent in an administrative proceeding for compliance with a request for discovery. See *§ 473B.16* for discussion of legal requirements for this proceeding.

[3] Supporting Papers

The same considerations with respect to supporting papers offering factual and legal support apply to the answer as well as to the motion to compel. See *§ 473B.63[3]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.65

§ 473B.65 Order Granting Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))	NO. _____ ORDER

The motion of _____[*name*], moving party, pursuant to *Section 11507.7 of the Government Code*, to compel discovery in an administrative proceeding came on regularly for hearing on _____[*date*], the Honorable _____[*name*], Administrative Law Judge, presiding. Moving party appeared by his/her attorney, _____[*name*]; respondent appeared by his/her attorney, _____[*name*]. The administrative law judge has reviewed the and papers on file herein [and the evidence produced at the hearing] and has considered arguments of counsel.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that respondent comply fully, completely, in good faith, and forthwith with the request for discovery made to respondent by moving party on _____[*date*], a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, by furnishing the following information to moving party and permitting moving party to inspect and copy the following writings and things:

1. _____[*Here, and in subsequently numbered paragraphs, list information, writings, and things*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent's claim of privilege is overruled and disallowed as to each of the foregoing.

[On proof made to the satisfaction of the administrative law judge, the judge finds that respondent failed or refused without substantial justification to comply with the requirements of *Section 11507.6 of the Government Code*.

THEREFORE IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that moving party have and recover from respondent the sum of $_____ as and for a reasonable attorney's fee and the sum of $_____ as and for costs herein incurred.]

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

Administrative Law Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is for use by the respondent (or other party) in an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), who has brought a motion to compel administrative discovery under *Gov. Code §§ 11507.6, 11507.7*. The form is for submission to the ALJ for use as the order granting the motion.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of enforcing discovery requests under the APA, see *§ 473B.16*.

For a form of a motion to compel discovery, see *§ 473B.63*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.66

§ 473B.66 Order Denying Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

[1] FORM Order Denying Motion to Compel Discovery [Gov. Code § 11507.7(f)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

The motion of _____[*name*], moving party, pursuant to *Section 11507.7 of the Government Code*, to compel discovery in an administrative proceeding came on regularly for hearing on _____[*date*], the Honorable _____[*name*], Administrative Law Judge, presiding. Moving party appeared by his/her attorney, _____[*name*]; respondent appeared by his/her attorney, _____[*name*]. The administrative law judge has reviewed the and papers on file herein [and the evidence produced at the hearing] and has considered arguments of counsel.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that moving party be and hereby is denied any relief under the motion and that the motion is dismissed.

[On proof made to the satisfaction of the administrative law judge, the judge finds that moving party filed the motion to compel discovery without substantial justification.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent have and recover from moving party the sum of $_____ as and for a reasonable attorney's fee and the sum of $_____ as and for

costs herein incurred.]

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

Administrative law judge

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1]*, above, is for use by the respondent (or other party) in an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), who has opposed a motion to compel administrative discovery under *Gov. Code §§ 11507.6, 11507.7*. The form is for submission to the ALJ for use as the order denying the motion.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of enforcing discovery under the APA, see *§ 473B.16*.

For a form of an answer to a motion to compel discovery, see *§ 473B.64*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473B DISCOVERY IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473B.67

§ 473B.67 Order to Show Cause In Re Contempt [Gov. Code § 11455.20]

[1] FORM Order to Show Cause In Re Contempt [Gov. Code § 11455.20]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE IN RE CONTEMPT
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	

To _____[*name*], above-named respondent:

YOU ARE HEREBY ORDERED to appear before the above-entitled court [in _____ (Department *or* Division)_____ of], located at _____[*name of building, street address, and city*], on _____, [*date and time*], then and there to show cause, if any you have, why you should not be punished for contempt based on the facts set forth in the certified statement attached hereto as Exhibit A to the Order To Show Cause.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order to show cause in *[1]*, above, is used for proceeding to enforce contempt sanctions in the Superior Court against a party to an agency adjudication under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) for failure to comply with an order to provide discovery as required under *Gov. Code §§ 11507.6* and *11507.7* [*Gov. Code §§ 11455.10(e), 11455.20*].

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of the legal requirements that must be established before sanctions will be imposed for failure to comply with a discovery request, see *§ 473B.16[7]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473C.syn

§ 473C.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473C: PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

§ 473C.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473C.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 473C.03-473C.09 [Reserved]

§ 473C.10 Governing Law

[1] APA Requirements

[2] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

§ 473C.11 "Demurrer" or Challenge to Sufficiency of Agency Pleading

§ 473C.12 Motions for Consolidation or Severance

[1] Motions to Consolidate Under the APA

[2] Motion to Consolidate Non-APA Proceedings

[3] Agency Discretion to Grant Consolidation

[a] Consolidation Is Favored But Discretionary

[b] Exceptions: Consolidation Required or Not Available

[4] Motions to Sever

[5] Procedure for Motion to Sever or Consolidate

§ 473C.13 Motions to Dismiss

[1] Dismissal for Failure to State Prima Facie Case

[2] Dismissal by Agency

[3] Voluntary Dismissal by Applicant for License or Permit

§ 473C.14 Other Prehearing Motions

[1] Making and Arguing Prehearing Motions

[2] Motion to Exclude Respondent During Testimony of Minor Who Is Alleged Victim of Sexual Abuse

[3] Motions to Compel Release of Confidential Records

[4] Motions for Change in Place of Hearing

[a] Nature of Motion

[b] Place of Hearing

[c] Grounds for Motion

[d] Procedure for Motion

[e] Discretion to Grant or Deny

[5] Motions in Limine

[6] Motions to Stay, Dismiss, or Continue Action Due to Bankruptcy

§ 473C.15 Continuances

[1] Definition

[2] Authority

[3] Hearing Schedules and Strict Construction of OAH Continuance Policy

[4] Grounds for Continuance

[a] Good Cause Showing Required

[b] OAH Continuance Policy

[i] Grounds Listed in OAH Continuance Policy as Constituting Good Cause

[ii] Establishing Good Cause

[c] Related Judicial Proceedings as Basis for Continuance

[i] Civil Actions

[ii] Criminal Cases

[5] Procrastination or Lack of Preparation as Grounds for Denial of Continuance

[6] Discretion of ALJ

[a] Discretion to Grant or Deny Continuance

[b] Abuse of Discretion

[7] Procedure for Requesting Continuance

[a] Who May Grant a Continuance

[b] When to Request Continuance

[c] Making the Request

[d] Partial Continuance

[e] Poll of Counsel, Ruling, and Rescheduling

[f] Oral Argument

[8] Judicial Review of Denial of Application for Continuance

[9] Notice of Continued Hearing

§§ 473C.16-473C.19 [Reserved]

§ 473C.20 Prehearing Conferences

[1] Background

[2] Provisions of Governing Statute

[a] Motion for Conference and Notice of Conference

[b] Subject Matter of Conference

[c] Conduct of Prehearing Conference

[d] Conversion of Prehearing Conference Into Alternative Dispute Resolution or Informal Hearing Procedure by Consent of Parties

[e] Prehearing Orders

[3] Case Management Program Criteria

[4] Case Management Program Procedures

[a] Scheduling Conference and OAH Notice Form

[b] Preparation for Conference and Attendance of Trial Counsel

[c] Stipulations and Admissions

[d] Exhibits

[e] Witnesses

[i] Witness Lists

[ii] Expert Witnesses

[iii] Estimated Length of Testimony and Summary of Testimony

[iv] Special Arrangements

[v] Rulings on Identity and Number and Motions to Exclude

[f] Prehearing Orders

[i] Requirement of Order and Reporting

[ii] Briefs

[iii] Judicial Review of Prehearing Order as Final Administrative Order

[5] Responsibility of Administrative Law Judge in Case Management Program

§ 473C.21 Negotiation and Settlement

[1] Settlement Conferences

[a] Availability of Formal Conference With ALJ

[b] Assignment to ALJ

[c] Scheduling, Notice, and Preparation

[d] Timing of Settlement Negotiations

[2] Agency Authority to Settle

[3] Disciplinary Guidelines

[4] Model Disciplinary Orders

[5] Costs or Restitution as Condition of Settlement

[6] Diversion Programs

[7] Procedures for Implementing Settlement

[8] Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures

[9] Informal Hearing Procedures

§§ 473C.22-473C.29 [Reserved]

§ 473C.30 Federal Constitution

§ 473C.31 State Constitution

§ 473C.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473C.33 Decisions

[1] Consolidation and Severance

[2] Continuances

[3] Demurrer

[4] Nonsuit

[5] Setting for Hearing

§ 473C.34 Internet References

§§ 473C.35-473B.39 [Reserved]

§ 473C.40 Prehearing Conference

[1] Motion for Prehearing Conference

[2] Preparation for Prehearing Conference

§ 473C.41 Settlement Conferences

[1] Preparation

[2] Implementation of Settlement

§ 473C.42 Motion for Change in Place of Hearing

[1] Motion

§ 473C.43 Requesting a Continuance

[1] Timing of Request

[2] Where to Make Request

[3] Oral Argument

[4] Continuance by Stipulation

[5] Partial Continuance

[6] Judicial Review of Denial of Continuance

§ 473C.44 Miscellaneous Prehearing Motions

[1] Formal APA Hearings

[2] Non-APA Proceedings

§§ 473C.45-473C.49 [Reserved]

§ 473C.50 Motion for Order Setting Matter for Prehearing Conference and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Memorandum

[4] Cross References

§ 473C.51 Order for Prehearing Conference [Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.01

§ 473C.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of prehearing motions and conferences in California public administrative law. The legal discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Subpart A discusses prehearing motions and conferences including motions to consolidate and sever, demurrers, motions to dismiss, and motions for continuance [*see §§ 473C.10 -473C.15*].

- Subpart B discusses prehearing conferences, negotiation, and settlement [*see §§ 473C.20* -473C.22].

Part V includes a forms of motion and declaration for an order setting a matter for a prehearing conference [*see § 473C.50*] and a form of order setting the conference [*see § 473C.51*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.02

§ 473C.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For general discussion and overview of agency adjudication under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

For related discussion and forms providing coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40 et seq., *Appeal: An Overview,* through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, *see § 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* .

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *§ 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeInspectionsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473C.03-473C.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473C.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.10

§ 473C.10 Governing Law

[1] APA Requirements

Prehearing motions and conferences for agency adjudications are governed by various statutes under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), by statute relating to specific agency proceedings, and by decisional law [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11507.3* (consolidation in APA hearings); *Pub. Util. Code § 1703* (consolidation in PUC proceedings); *Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322* (consolidation in other agency proceedings)].

[2] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act contract claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. The regulations that are applicable to Ch. 473C, Agency Pre hearing Procedures, include the following: ex parte applications for temporary or interim orders [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1012* (1998)]; consolidated proceedings and separate hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1016* (1998)]; motion for continuance of hearing [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1042* (1998)]; motions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1022* (1998)]; subpoenas and motion for a protective order [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1024* (1998)]; pre hearing conferences [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1026* (1998)]; settlement conferences and settlements [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1028* (1998)]; and peremptory challenges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1034* (1998)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.11

§ 473C.11 "Demurrer" or Challenge to Sufficiency of Agency Pleading

In agency adjudications under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the responding party may plead a "general demurrer" (*i.e.*, object to the sufficiency of the accusation or statement of issues on the ground that it does not state acts or omissions upon which the agency may proceed) or a "special demurrer" (*i.e.*, object on the ground of uncertainty or indefiniteness) pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2),(3)*]. These objections must be raised in the respondent's notice of defense [*see Gov. Code § 11506*]. For further discussion of the notice of defense, and specifically of the "demurrer" objections of *Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2),(3)*, see *Ch. 473A, Commencing Agency Adjudication, §§ 473A.11[6], [13], 473A.54*. For discussion of these objections in non-APA proceedings, see *§ 473.11[13]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.12

§ 473C.12 Motions for Consolidation or Severance

[1] Motions to Consolidate Under the APA

Gov. Code § 11507.3 provides for consolidation and severance of administrative adjudicative proceedings conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). For discussion regarding when an agency adjudication is subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

When proceedings that involve a common question of law or fact are pending, the administrative law judge may order a joint hearing of any or all the matters at issue in the proceedings. This order can be based on the motion of a party, or on the administrative law judge's own motion. The administrative law judge may order all the proceedings consolidated and may make orders concerning the procedure that may tend to avoid unnecessary costs or delay [*Gov. Code § 11507.3(a)*].

Gov. Code § 11507.3 is based upon *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048*, and is broad enough to enable related cases to be consolidated in a single proceeding even if they were initiated before separate agencies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* (for discussion and forms relating to consolidation and severance in civil actions generally)]. Thus, an agency may conduct a consolidated hearing when more than one of its licensees have allegedly engaged in common activities that are grounds for discipline, for example, the Department of Real Estate may file a consolidated accusation against licensed mortgage loan brokers, salespersons, and brokers involved in a single fraudulent transaction. Similarly, separate agencies may now file a consolidated accusation against a single respondent who comes within the jurisdiction of more than one agency. For example, the filing of fraudulent Medi-Cal claims by a physician may be grounds for suspension of that provider by the Department of Health Services [*see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14123* (grounds for suspension), *14124* (notice of Medi-Cal suspension to appropriate state licensing agency)] as well as grounds for discipline by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2004, 2220-2222, 2227-2228, 2234* (disciplinary provisions for unprofessional conduct)]. The latter type of consolidation was not available under the former APA provisions in effect prior to July 1, 1997.

[2] Motion to Consolidate Non-APA Proceedings

In an agency adjudication not subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions [*see [1], above*], the standards used in civil court actions may be applied, and adjudications may be consolidated at the discretion of the agency when they have common issues of law or fact or involve the same respondent [*Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* and discussion in Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions*].

Some agencies have express authority, outside the APA, to exercise discretion in consolidating hearings [*see, e.g., Pub. Util. Code § 1703 (PUC)*; Ch. 480, *Public Utilities*].

For agencies that are not subject to *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, it is fair to say that many agencies will grant requests for consolidation because it saves time. To avoid wasting the time of all concerned, motions to consolidate should be made as early as possible. Motions should be based on the following grounds under the general civil procedure set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048*:

- The identity of the law, facts, or parties between or among the proceedings.
- Possible prejudice to the parties.
- The complexity of the issues.
- Possible delays.
- Convenience and economy.

For discussion and forms relating to consolidation in civil actions generally, see Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* .

[3] Agency Discretion to Grant Consolidation

[a] Consolidation Is Favored But Discretionary

The decision to consolidate or to refuse to consolidate matters for hearing is within the discretion of the administrative law judge under *Gov. Code § 11507.3(a)*. In non-APA hearings it is within the discretion of the agency [*Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322]* .

Agencies usually favor consolidation and are generally inclined to grant it when a timely request is made, because consolidation saves time and expense. Other than the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11507.3(a)*, there are two limits on the scope of the agency's discretion to grant or deny consolidation, discussed in *[b], below*.

[b] Exceptions: Consolidation Required or Not Available

Although the decision to consolidate or to refuse to consolidate matters for hearing is within the discretion of the administrative law judge under *Gov.Code § 11507.3(a)*, and otherwise, within the discretion of the agency [*Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322]* , this discretion is subject to limits. One such limit is the principle known as the *Ashbacker* doctrine from *Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Com. Com.* [*Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Com. Com. (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108]* , which held that when a hearing will result in the allocation of a single license that constitutes a business opportunity, competing applicants must be considered in a consolidated proceeding [*Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Com. Com. (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 333, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108]* . *Ashbacker* was cited with approval in *Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322* , which concerned mutually exclusive applications for a single opportunity to establish a savings and

loan company in a designated area [*Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322]* .

Note also that, as distinguished from a consolidation of several named parties, there can be no class-action type proceeding involving the representation of similarly situated but absent class members. The APA lacks any provision for handling a proceeding involving a class of similarly situated individuals, such as, for example, procedures to give notice to absent class members, and is therefore constitutionally inadequate for class-action type hearings [*Rose v. City of Hayward (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 926, 936, 179 Cal. Rptr. 287]* . Non-APA proceedings share the same limitation; for example, one court held that a judicial class action was not barred by the applicants' failure to exhaust administrative remedies, because no adequate administrative remedy existed [*Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 690-691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* (determination of entitlement to welfare benefits of a group of similarly situated applicants under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.*)].

[4] Motions to Sever

Gov. Code § 11507.3 provides for the severance of adjudicative proceedings, as well as consolidation, in agency adjudications conducted under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*).

The administrative law judge may order a separate hearing of any issue, including an issue raised in the notice of defense, or of any number of issues. This order can be based on the motion of a party, or on the administrative law judge's own motion. The considerations for determining whether to grant separate hearings include furthering convenience, avoiding prejudice, and serving expedition or economy [*Gov. Code § 11507.3(b)*]. *Gov. Code § 11507.3* provides ample ample authority for severance motions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

With regard to non-APA proceedings, it is fair to say that requests for severance are disfavored and unlikely to be granted absent good cause, in that holding separate hearings would take longer and cost more than a single hearing. To avoid wasting the time of all concerned, motions to sever should be made as early as possible. For motions that are not subject to *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, the law governing severance can be based the general civil procedure under *Civ. Proc. § 1048* [*see [2*], *above*, setting out considerations that apply to severance as well as consolidation motions, and Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* , for discussion and forms relating to severance in civil actions generally].

[5] Procedure for Motion to Sever or Consolidate

A motion to consolidate or sever in a proceeding under the APA's formal hearing provisions should be addressed to the administrative law judge who has been assigned to hear the case [*Gov. Code § 11507.3*].

For Non-APA proceedings, the motion should be made to the agency itself. While neither the OAH, the State Personnel Board, nor the Public Employment Relations Board conducts the equivalent of a law and motion department, it is best to submit the motion in a timely manner, in writing, and with supporting affidavits. A party in opposition should promptly file its response with supporting affidavits. In general, prompt submission and response will get a motion considered sooner and more fully. A vague or unsupported motion is likely to be handled very summarily, whereas a precise and specific motion that is fully supported with arguments and affidavits is more likely to be considered and decided on the merits.

The ruling on a motion to consolidate or sever is customarily made without opportunity for oral argument. Other agencies may, by their own procedural rule or on request, permit argument before ruling on the motion.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of Actions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.13

§ 473C.13 Motions to Dismiss

[1] Dismissal for Failure to State Prima Facie Case

A motion to dismiss for failure to establish a prima facie case (*i.e.*, one that would entitle the agency to prevail if no evidence to the contrary is offered by the respondent) cannot be granted by an ALJ sitting alone [*O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 10-11, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862* ; *Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 175, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226* ; *Frost v. State Personnel Board (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5-6, 11 Cal. Rptr. 718* ; *see Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 8, 221 P.2d 241* ; *Black's Law Dictionary* (5th ed. 1979), p. 1071].

The APA contains no authority for such a motion. Moreover, it would be procedurally awkward, in that a dismissal is a final decision, and the APA gives the agency the power of final decision [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1), (2)* (ALJ sitting alone submits proposed decision to agency, which may accept, modify, or reject it); *see* further discussion in Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*]. Thus, the agency would have to hear the motion, and the hearing would consequently be delayed whenever the motion was made in order to refer it to the agency for determination [*Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 175, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226* ; *Frost v. State Personnel Board (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5-6, 11 Cal. Rptr. 718]* .

A motion to dismiss for failure to establish a prima facie case is the equivalent of a motion for nonsuit in a civil action; a motion for nonsuit is made at the conclusion of the plaintiff's case-in-chief, and the testimony presented is presumed to be true for purposes of ruling on the motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 581c(a),(c)*; *Estate of Callahan (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 609, 612-613, 63 Cal. Rptr. 277, 432 P.2d 965]* . This procedure would further be improper in an agency adjudication under the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), because in these proceedings, the complainant has a statutory right to call the respondent as an adverse witness if the respondent does not elect to testify in his or her own behalf [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*; *see* further discussion in Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*]. Thus, the complainant's evidentiary presentation is not complete until the respondent has testified or the complainant has waived its right to call and examine the respondent [*O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 11, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862* ; *see Gov. Code § 11513(b)* (right to call respondent and examine as if under cross-examination)].

In addition, the right of the complainant agency to amend the accusation after the case has been submitted for decision, and reopen the matter for the taking of further evidence [*Gov. Code § 11516*], would appear also to preclude the ALJ granting a motion to dismiss based on failure to present a prima facie case, even after the respondent's testimony has been presented.

Motions that the ALJ cannot rule on before or during the hearing may, however, be taken under submission with the case. Thus, for example, if such a motion for dismissal were made at the conclusion of the hearing, and the ALJ determination that the complainant had not established a prime facie case, the ALJ may express that determination in his or her proposed decision submitted to the agency. The agency may then adopt, modify, or reject the proposed decision, including the ALJ's determination on that motion [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*; *see* further discussion in Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*].

[2] Dismissal by Agency

In APA adjudications and other agency hearings, the agency may dismiss its own proceeding [*see Kendall v. Bd. of Osteopathic Examiners (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 239, 248-249, 233 P.2d 107 (APA hearing)* ; *Steen v. City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 542, 546-547, 190 P.2d 937* (local agency exercising quasi-judicial functions has inherent power independent of statutory provisions to dismiss proceeding on motion of respondent when proceeding is not diligently prosecuted); *Mauer v. The State Bar (1933) 219 Cal. 271, 275, 26 P.2d 14* (three of five charges against attorney dismissed by State Bar after investigation)].

In this event, a subsequent refiling of the matter may raise an objection of laches, or an objection that the matter is barred by the statute of limitations governing the subject agency [*see Brown v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1157-1163, 213 Cal. Rptr. 53* (professor dismissed by personnel board ordered reinstated, because five-year delay in bringing charges raised bar of laches); *Steen v. City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 542, 546-547, 190 P.2d 937* (local administrative agency exercising quasi-judicial functions has inherent power independent of statutory provisions to dismiss proceeding on motion of respondent when proceeding is not diligently prosecuted); for discussion of laches in administrative actions, *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*].

[3] Voluntary Dismissal by Applicant for License or Permit

The applicant for a permit or license may withdraw the application and move for dismissal of the proceedings. In this situation, it appears that the agency must grant the dismissal, unless there is express statutory authority for the agency to retain jurisdiction, or unless the public interest requires a determination of the matter [*see McDonald v. State Bar (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 768, 771, 141 P.2d 217* ; *Miller v. Board of Police Commissioners (1960) 181 Cal. App. 2d 562, 563-564, 5 Cal. Rptr. 272* (although applicants for business permit requested withdrawal of permit, after hearing but before decision, local ordinance provided that withdrawal of application did not deprive board of power to deny permit); *Johnstone v. Richardson (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 41, 48, 229 P.2d 9* (administrative action revoking seasonal license may be reviewed even though term for license has expired, because otherwise judicial power of review would be defeated)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsNonsuitsInvoluntary NonsuitsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsNonsuitsVoluntary Nonsuits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.14

§ 473C.14 Other Prehearing Motions

[1] Making and Arguing Prehearing Motions

Individual APA cases are selected for a prehearing conference pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11511.5* [*see* discussion in *§ 473C.20*]. The prehearing conference is customarily the only opportunity provided to argue prehearing motions. Prehearing motions should be addressed to the presiding ALJ, in writing, with points and authorities and affidavits as necessary. A motion filed only with the agency will not necessarily be forwarded to the assigned ALJ before the hearing begins. Depending on the nature and timeliness of the motion, the ALJ may rule on the motion prior to hearing. Customarily, the matter is taken under submission to be addressed in the proposed decision.

[2] Motion to Exclude Respondent During Testimony of Minor Who Is Alleged Victim of Sexual Abuse

A motion to exclude the respondent during the testimony of a minor who is the alleged victim of sexual abuse should be made before the hearing to allow time to secure closed-circuit television facilities. This exclusion is deemed not to violate constitutional or statutory rights to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses when the respondent is able to do the following [*Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 303-306, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* ; *see U.S. Const., amend. VI*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 15*; *Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]:

- View the testimony by closed-circuit television.
- Consult with counsel before the minor is cross-examined.

In *Seering*, the complainant's motion to exclude was supported by a declaration by the minor's psychiatrist that if the minor were required to testify in the presence of the respondents she might suffer exacerbated fear and additional injury, and by the minor's testimony that she was fearful of testifying in front of one of the respondents [*Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 303, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422]* .

No decisions have been reported in which exclusion was granted based only on a lay person's affidavit (*e.g.*, a declaration by a parent); nor have reported decisions extended the exclusions to a competent adult victim fearful of

testifying before a respondent [*but see Gov. Code § 11440.40(b)* (absent an offer of proof, evidence of complainant's sexual conduct with persons other than an alleged perpetrator is presumed inadmissible), and discussion of this provisions in Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*]. Nonetheless, there appears to be no reason why it cannot be persuasively argued that the interest in avoiding the psychological harm, cited by the *Seering* court, should apply also to developmentally disabled adults or other clients of community care facilities [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 1502(a), 1508, 1509, 1550* ("community care facilities" defined; license requirements); *Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 304-305, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* (interest to be served by exclusion procedure was ascertainment of truth without undue psychological harm to minor witnesses who were demonstrably afraid)].

[3] Motions to Compel Release of Confidential Records

A party seeking the release of confidential records, such as medical records, in an administrative hearing may be required to establish that the disclosure of the records is justified by a compelling interest. California's constitutional right of privacy (*Cal. Const., art I, § 1*) requires that any invasion of personal privacy be justified by a compelling state interest [*White v. Davis (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 757, 775, 120 Cal. Rptr. 94, 533 P.2d 222]* . Before the hearing, the ALJ or the reviewing court may review the records *in camera* and direct their release only if they meet the compelling interest criteria [*see Gov. Code § 11450.30(b)* (ALJ has authority to grant protective order against enforcement of subpoena to protect against violations of right to privacy)]. For example, investigative subpoenas of the Medical Board of California for the production of the medical records of a licensee-physician's patients are an invasion of the patients' privacy absent patient consent or a compelling state interest. Yet the interest of the Medical Board in investigating the alleged unprofessional conduct of a physician qualifies as a compelling state interest, although even that interest is not enough to justify an overbroad subpoena. The state's intrusion on personal privacy, even though justified by a compelling state interest, must nonetheless be accomplished by the least intrusive means [*see Wood v. Superior Court (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1138, 1147-1150, 212 Cal. Rptr. 811* ; *Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Gherardini (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 669, 679-682, 156 Cal. Rptr. 55* (decisions relating to Board of Medical Quality Assurance, now the Medical Board of California)]. For discussion of the right to privacy and its impact on agency investigations, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

[4] Motions for Change in Place of Hearing

[a] Nature of Motion

In agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), *Gov. Code § 11508(c)* allows the respondent to move for, and gives the administrative law judge the discretion to grant or deny, a change in the place of the hearing. A motion for a change in the place of the hearing must be made within 10 days after service of the notice of hearing on the respondent [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11508(c) codifies a practice authorizing a motion for change of venue recognized by the courts [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 227 (1995); *see Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 471, 473-476, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136* ; *Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 875-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 397* (grounds for change of venue in civil actions)].

In making a change of venue determination, the administrative law judge may weigh the detriment to the moving party of the initial location against the cost to the agency and other parties of relocating the site. Failure to move for a change in the place of the hearing within the 10 day period waives the right to object to the place of the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 227 (1995)]. When seeking a new place for the hearing, the moving party can choose any of the places designated in *Gov. Code § 11508(a), (b)* [*see* discussion in *[b], below*]. For discussion and forms relating to change of venue proceedings in civil actions, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[b] Place of Hearing

The place for the hearing is a matter of agency discretion under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov.Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*see Gov. Code § 11508(a)* and discussion in Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* ; *see also Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 713-715, 187 P.2d 116]* .

Similarly, the place for hearing is a matter for agency discretion under a number of specific agency statutes, such as the following:

- Public Employees Retirement System [*Gov. Code § 20134* (place of hearing by Board of Administration of the Public Employees Retirement System)].

- Teacher's Retirement Board [*Educ. Code § 22217*].

- Department of Real Estate [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019*; *see Cal.-Am. Corp. v. Department of Real Estate (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 453, 163 Cal. Rptr. 729* (interpreting language of place where transactions occurred as place of hearing for Deaprtment of Real Estate agency hearing)].

- Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 24300*].

- Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 376(b)*].

The time and place of hearing is determined by the agency. The agency shall consult the office, and subject to the availability of its staff, shall determine the time and place of the hearing. The hearing shall be held at a hearing facility maintained by the office in Sacramento, Oakland, Los Angeles, or San Diego and shall be held at the facility that is closest to the location where the transaction occurred or the respondent resides [*Gov. Code § 11508(a)*]. Alternatively, the hearing may be held at either of the following places [*Gov. Code § 11508(b)(1), (2)*]:

(1) A place selected by the agency that is closer to the location where the transaction occurred or the respondent resides.

(2) A place within the state selected by agreement of the parties. The respondent may move for, and the administrative law judge has discretion to grant or deny, a change in the place of the hearing. A motion for a change in the place of the hearing shall be made within 10 days after service of the notice of hearing on the respondent [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*]. Unless good cause is identified in writing by the administrative law judge, hearings shall be held in a facility maintained by the office [*Gov. Code § 11508*; *see also Ch 473A, Commencing Agency Adjudication, § 473A.11[11]* for discussion of place of hearing].

In practice, cases are customarily set in the county appropriate for the district where the transaction that gave rise to the hearing occurred, which is often the district where the respondent's business or residence is located and usually the most convenient location for the witnesses and respondent. Reconvening in a second location for taking testimony is usually unnecessary, because *Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)* provides for the service of subpoenas throughout California [for discussion of the issuance of subpoenas under *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq., see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

[c] Grounds for Motion

Under *Gov. Code § 11508(c)*, grounds for changing the place of hearing are not specifically set forth in the language of the statute, but the Law Revision Commission Comments to that section provide that grounds for change of venue include selection of an improper county and promotion of the convenience of witnesses and ends of justice [1995 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 227 (1995); *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 397*].

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a),(c)*, the superior court in a civil action may change venue:

- When the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)* (improper venue); *see Hamilton v. Superior Court of San Mateo County (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 418, 112 Cal. Rptr. 450* (proper court motion)].

- When the convenience of witnesses and the ends of justice would be promoted by the change [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* (inconvenient venue); *see Richfield Hotel Management, Inc. v. Superior Court (Riddell) (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 222, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161* (inconvenient venue motion)].

When the motion to change the place of hearing is based on improper venue (improper place of hearing), the moving party would need to establish that the place of hearing chosen did not satisfy one of the four options under *Gov. Code § 11508* [*Gov. Code § 11508(a), (b)(1), (2), (3)*; *see [b], above*]. When the motion to change the place of hearing is based on inconvenient venue (inconvenient place of hearing), the moving party would need to establish that, although the place of hearing chosen did satisfy one of the four options under *Gov. Code § 11508*, the chosen place of hearing is inconvenient to the parties, and there is another proper venue under *Gov. Code § 11508* that is more convenient to the parties and witnesses. For example, if the agency has chosen the place of hearing under *Gov. Code § 11508(a)* designating one of the four main OAH offices, and a hearing location under *Gov. Code § 11508(b)(2)*, at a place nearer to respondent's residence or the place that the transaction occurred, is both proper and more convenient, then the moving party could request a change in the place of hearing to the latter location. Also, case law has established standards for transfers for convenience which required a showing of economic loss to respondent combined with inconvenience to witnesses [*see Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-476, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136* (motion for change of venue properly denied because respondent's claim that it would be forced to close its plant during the hearing and witnesses would be inconvenienced was not supported with sufficient facts); *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* (motion for change of venue may be granted in civil actn when convenience of witnesses and ends of justice would be promoted by the change)].

A motion for change of venue to permit an on-the-spot examination of a site or premises is generally not favored for the following reasons:

- The time and inconvenience involved in convening the parties, counsel, the court reporter, and the ALJ at the site.

- The difficulty of creating a record of the site viewing.

- The availability of other means to convey the same information, such as videotape, pictures, blueprints, and diagrams.

[d] Procedure for Motion

Gov. Code § 11508(c) allows the respondent to move for, and gives the administrative law judge the discretion to grant or deny, a change in the place of the hearing. A motion for a change in the place of the hearing must be made within 10 days after service of the notice of hearing on the respondent [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*].

Thus, the motion should be filed with the administrative law judge who has been assigned to the hearing. Notice should be given to the other parties. As in a civil action, the motion should be in writing and should be accompanied by a memorandum of points and authorities. In making a change of venue determination, the administrative law judge may weigh the detriment to the moving party of the initial location against the cost to the agency and other parties of relocating the site. Failure to move for a change in the place of the hearing within the 10 day period waives the right to object to the place of the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 227 (1995)].

The motion should be accompanied by a supporting affidavit or declaration making a convincing factual showing of the need for a change of hearing [*see [e], below*].

[e] Discretion to Grant or Deny

The administrative law judge has the discretion to grant or deny a motion for change of venue; a court will not overturn the agency's decision unless the agency abused that discretion [*Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-476, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136]* . The standard for determining whether the agency has abused its discretion depends on how the denial is brought up for review. The general standard for determining abuse of discretion will be that for either administrative mandate or traditional mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1094.5*; for further discussion, *see* Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*]. One court of appeal upheld a denial noting that the appellant had not presented facts to the agency to make a convincing showing in support of the change so as to make denial an abuse of discretion [*Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 475, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136]* .

[5] Motions in Limine

A motion in limine, a motion "on the threshold," is a motion in advance of a proceeding that requests an order that particular evidence be excluded or be admitted only on specified conditions, because the probative value of the evidence is outweighed by the potential for prejudice, or the evidence is protected or privileged [*see* Ch. 373, *Motions in Limine*]. For example, in a civil action the exclusion of expert-witness testimony on a motion in limine was upheld, because the offered testimony was speculative, conjectural, and remote, and thus potentially confusing [*Hyatt v. Sierra Boat Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 325, 337-339, 145 Cal. Rptr. 47]* . Examples of motions in limine granted in administrative proceedings include the following:

- Records of the witness's alcoholism treatment ordered not to be disclosed in the hearing absent prehearing compliance with federal disclosure procedures [*see 42 U.S.C. § 290dd-2* (confidentiality of patient records)].

- Names and identifying information contained in patient psychiatric records ordered to be stricken before the documents are marked [*see Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Hazel Hawkins Memorial Hospital (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 561, 565, 185 Cal. Rptr. 405* (subpoena for medical records not an invasion of privacy when it does not seek names or identifying information)].

The motion in limine should be addressed to the presiding judge of the OAH office that will hear the case with appropriate points and authorities (although the motion in civil actions is frequently oral, it is nevertheless advisable to present supporting points and authorities). The staffing limitations of the OAH rarely permit oral argument of the motion prior to hearing unless the case is selected for a prehearing conference [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5* (prehearing conferences), and discussion in *§ 473C.20*]. For a discussion of motions in limine in civil actions, see Ch. 373, *Motions in Limine* .

[6] Motions to Stay, Dismiss, or Continue Action Due to Bankruptcy

A motion to stay, dismiss, or continue a disciplinary matter because the respondent (as an individual or licensed business entity) has filed for bankruptcy is rarely granted even when the subject license, such as an alcoholic beverage license, can be sold or otherwise considered an asset. The discipline of errant licensees is an exercise of a licensing board's police powers to protect the health and welfare of California citizens [*Binford v. Boyd (1918) 178 Cal. 458, 462, 174 P. 56* ; *Pennington v. Bonelli (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 316, 319-320, 59 P.2d 448]* and is not barred by *11 U.S.C. § 525*, which protects bankrupts and debtors against discriminatory treatment.

In particular, *11 U.S.C. § 525(a)* provides that a governmental unit may not deny, revoke, suspend, or refuse to renew a license, permit, or other similar grant to a person solely because that person is or has been a bankrupt or a debtor or has not paid a debt that was discharged under the Bankruptcy Act [*see 11 U.S.C. §§ 101-1330*]. The purpose of this provision is to insure that bankrupts get the fresh start that the Bankruptcy Act is intended to provide [*Parker v. Contractors State License Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 205, 208-209, 231 Cal. Rptr. 577]* .

Although *11 U.S.C. § 525(a)* bars a licensing board from proceeding against a licensee solely because the licensee sought the protection of the Bankruptcy Act, it does not excuse otherwise impermissible conduct by a licensee. For example, a fraudulent diversion by a licensed contractor of contributions intended for a union health plan creates a debt that may be discharged in bankruptcy proceedings, but the underlying fraud may be charged as grounds to revoke the contractor's license [*Parker v. Contractors State License Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 205, 208-212, 231 Cal. Rptr. 577]* .

Similarly, the Illinois Racing Board's denial of a racing license to a bankrupt was held to be a legitimate exercise of a state occupational licensing board's police power, and not barred by *11 U.S.C. § 525(a)*, because the board's decision was supported by several nondiscriminatory reasons [*In re Alessi (N.D. Ill. 1981) 12 Bankr. 96]* .

The exercise of police power by the licensing entity must be both nondiscriminatory and nonpecuniary. The licensing proceeding cannot seek to recover funds for a debt excused in the bankruptcy proceeding [*In re Aegean Fare, Inc. (D. Mass. 1983) 35 B.R. 923* ; *In re Rath Packing Company (N.D. Iowa 1983) 35 B.R. 615* ; *In re Gencarelli (D.R.I. 1981) 14 B.R. 751]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationConditions of DisclosureGeneral OverviewBankruptcy LawDebtor Benefits & DutiesDiscriminatory Treatment ProtectionConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessPrivacyPersonal InformationGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsPolice Power

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.15

§ 473C.15 Continuances

[1] Definition

A continuance is an order postponing a hearing or other proceeding until a specified date or for a specified period [*see generally* Ch. 136, *Continuances*]. For discussion of motions to stay, dismiss, or continue an action because the respondent has filed for bankruptcy, see *§ 473C.14[6]*.

[2] Authority

Agencies possess the inherent power to postpone a hearing for good cause [*Powers v. Commission on Professional Competence (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 560, 571, 204 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *Shoults v. Alderson (1921) 55 Cal. App. 527, 531, 203 P. 809]* .

For most agencies, that is, those that are subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), this power has been codified in *Gov. Code § 11524(a)*. When an ALJ grants a continuance under *Gov. Code § 11524(a)*, the time limit for commencing a hearing is extended for the period of time equal to the continuance [*see Educ. Code § 44944(a)*; *Wilmot v. Commission on Professional Competence (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1142-1143, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656]* . Once an ALJ has been assigned to the hearing by the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), a continuance may be granted only by the assigned ALJ or by the presiding judge of the appropriate regional office of the OAH for good cause shown [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*]. For discussion of what constitutes good cause, see *[4][a], below*].

[3] Hearing Schedules and Strict Construction of OAH Continuance Policy

The OAH maintains regional offices in Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, and San Diego [*Gov. Code § 11508(a)*]. Cases are scheduled for both Sacramento and Oakland from the Sacramento office. Agencies determine the location, estimate duration of the hearing, and reserve the needed hours or days of hearing time in a particular location with the appropriate OAH regional office.

Calendar staff of the regional offices schedule the requested matter, usually several months in advance of the hearing;

the agency provides notice of hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11509* (notice of hearing); for discussion of notice of hearing, *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*].

Requests for hearings outside the regional office cities are collected by geographic area, and a circuit trip is scheduled for a week of hearing and travel time. Thus, a late request for a continuance of a case would disrupt the schedule and waste hearing time. A hearing in an outlying city that is not completed in the scheduled time not only results in the usual difficulty and cost increases attendant on reconvening the parties, counsel, and the ALJ, but also these problems are exacerbated by the difficulty of rescheduling the added hearing and travel time with other hearings in that geographic area.

Because of these problems of scheduling and increased costs, and because of statutory mandates for prompt hearings [*see, e.g., Educ. Code § 44944* (a hearing to dismiss or suspend a certificated school employee must begin within 60 days after the demand for hearing); *Health & Safety Code § 1551* (Department of Social Services licensees whose community care facilities have been closed by a temporary suspension order have a right to a hearing within 30 days)], the OAH strictly construes its continuance policy [California Administrative Procedure Act Procedures for Administrative Adjudication, Appendix I, Continuance Policy (1987) (OAH Continuance Policy)], and the grounds for continuance.

The OAH Continuance Policy provides: "Unreasonably late requests for continuances, or requests without merit, will not be looked upon favorably. Such requests impede the orderly resolution of disputes and timely administration of justice." The details of this policy and grounds for continuance are discussed in *[4], below*.

[4] Grounds for Continuance

[a] Good Cause Showing Required

The granting of a continuance, whether under the California APA or the inherent power of an agency to postpone the time for a hearing [*see* [2], *above*], depends on the showing of good cause [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*; *Powers v. Commission on Professional Competence (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 560, 570-571, 204 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *see Curtis v. Underwood (1894) 101 Cal. 661, 669, 36 P. 110* (inherent power of courts to postpone for good cause)]. A DMV hearing officer had good cause to grant a continuance of a DMV hearing so that a police office could testify that he was on duty when he observed the motorist drive his car. The testimony would provide proper foundation for the admission of police reports related to stop of driver for DUI violation. Motorist objected to admission of police reports because of lack of foundation. Also the motorist was not prejudiced by the delay in hearing [*Bussard v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 858, 864-866, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 414*].

Gov. Code § 11524 provides no definition of "good cause," but the OAH Continuance Policy and certain court decisions do provide some grounds for continuance that have been approved as constituting "good cause."

[b] OAH Continuance Policy

[i] Grounds Listed in OAH Continuance Policy as Constituting Good Cause

The OAH Continuance Policy is available as Appendix I of the Administrative Procedure Act Procedures for Adjudication, a bound pamphlet published biannually by the OAH.

Copies may be obtained from the OAH at 501 J Street, Suite 230, Sacramento, CA 95814.

The OAH Continuance Policy lists the following events or conditions as the only grounds constituting good cause to continue a hearing [OAH Continuance Policy, Part III]:

- The death of a party, the representative or attorney of a party, a witness to an essential fact, or the parent, child, or a member of the household of any of these, when it is not feasible to substitute another representative, attorney, or witness because of the proximity of the hearing date.

- An order of the administrative law judge, such as an order to compel discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.7* (motion to compel discovery pursuant to request for discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*) [*see* discussion of orders to compel discovery in Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*].

- The incapacitating illness of a party, the representative or attorney of a party, or a witness to an essential fact, when it is not feasible to substitute another representative, attorney, or witness because of the proximity of the hearing date. The ALJ considering a request for continuance on this basis may require a statement by the attending physician reciting the nature and probable duration of the illness and the extent of incapacitation [OAH Continuance Policy, Part IV].

- Lack of notice of the hearing as required in *Gov. Code § 11509* [for discussion of the notice of hearing required under *Gov. Code § 11509*, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*].

- A material change in the status of the case when a change in the parties or pleadings requires postponement, or an executed settlement or stipulated findings of fact obviate the need for a hearing. A partial amendment of the pleadings is not good cause for continuance to the extent that the unamended portion of the pleadings is ready to be heard. The probable resolution of other litigation that may affect the outcome or duration of the hearing or the extent of the parties' participation in the hearing may constitute a material change warranting continuance.

- A stipulation for a continuance signed by all of the parties or their authorized representatives, including an agency representative, that is communicated with a request for continuance to the OAH no later than 25 working days before the hearing. Even with a stipulation, the duration of the hearing may make a continuance inappropriate.

- The substitution of the representative or attorney of a party on a showing that the substitution is required.

- The unavailability of a party, representative, attorney, or witness to an essential fact because of a necessary, conflicting appearance in a judicial matter when (a) the person did not know of the conflict when the hearing date was set and could neither anticipate nor avoid it, and (b) a request for continuance is immediately communicated to the OAH.

- The unavailability of a party, representative, or material witness due to an unavoidable emergency.

[ii] Establishing Good Cause

Part IV of the OAH Continuance Policy provides that, to establish good cause, the evidence of the event or condition that constitutes good cause must be evidence of the sort and to the degree that responsible persons would rely on it in the conduct of serious affairs [*see Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (with certain exceptions, any relevant evidence is admissible in an California APA hearing if it is the sort of evidence that responsible persons are accustomed to rely on in the conduct of serious affairs); *see also* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

The agency or ALJ considering a request for continuance based on a claim of incapacitating illness may require the requesting party to provide a written statement by the attending physician reciting the nature and probable duration of the illness and the extent of incapacitation. A party requesting a continuance because of a conflict due to a judicial

matter must provide the identity of the court and the caption and case number when making the request for the continuance [OAH Continuance Policy, Part IV].

[c] Related Judicial Proceedings as Basis for Continuance

[i] Civil Actions

A related judicial proceeding [*see [b], above*] may be grounds for a continuance, but the existence of a civil suit involving the same parties or the same transaction does not always merit a continuance. Even though the OAH Continuance Policy provides that the probable resolution of other litigation that may affect the outcome or duration of the hearing or the parties' participation in the hearing may constitute a material change that warrants a continuance [OAH Continuance Policy, Part III(E)], the ALJ commonly considers several other factors, including the following:

- The public protection purposes of license discipline proceedings. The court in a civil action can award damages, but cannot revoke a license, discipline the licensee, or otherwise use the remedies available to a licensing agency to protect the public.

- Agency disciplinary proceedings are subject to a different and higher burden of proof than civil actions: in a disciplinary action to revoke or suspend a professional license, the standard of proof is clear and convincing evidence to a reasonable certainty [*Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 856, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* ; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

- The issues to be determined in the two proceedings are seldom identical.

Statements by the appellate court in one reported decision suggest that the agency should permit a continuance for the resolution of a related suit; the statements are dicta, however, and the court did not address the public protection issue. In this case, *Contractors' State License Board v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 557, 10 Cal. Rptr. 95* , a customer sued a contractor for breach of a contract to build a swimming pool. The buyer also complained to the Contractors' State License Board, which instituted disciplinary proceedings. The contractor then cross-complained, and joined the Board as a cross-defendant in the suit, asking the superior court to enjoin the Board's proceedings pending trial of the contract action. The superior court granted the injunction, and the Board appealed. The Court of Appeal held that the superior court should vacate the injunction, because it had no power to enjoin the Board from performing its statutory duties. The appellate court added, however, that the contractor could ask the Board for a stay of its proceedings until the contract question was determined, "and it is not to be assumed that the Board will arbitrarily deny such a stay in view of the fact that" a finding that the contractor breached his contract "would be res adjudicata against [the contractor] in the disciplinary proceedings" [*Contractors' State License Board v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 557, 562, 10 Cal. Rptr. 95* ; for discussion of res judicata in administrative hearings, *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

Requests for continuance because of a related civil action are commonly made when a party injured by the licensee in the transaction that is the basis for the disciplinary action brought by the agency has also filed a civil suit. For example, a customer may notify the Contractors' State License Board of defective construction work, then file a civil suit for damages against the same contractor [*see, e.g.,* *Contractors' State License Board v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 557, 559, 10 Cal. Rptr. 95* (customer sued contractor for breach of contract to build swimming pool and also complained to Board, which instituted disciplinary proceedings)]. Similarly, a buyer of real property who is to testify about fraudulent sales practices in the Department of Real Estate's proceedings to suspend or revoke a real estate salesperson's license may also have sued that licensee and the supervising broker for damages.

[ii] Criminal Cases

The conviction of a crime may result in the denial of an application for an occupational or professional license [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 118, 475, 480, 489*], the suspension or revocation of a license [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 490*], or public reproval [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 495*]. In general, an administrative agency need not stay its hearing while criminal charges are pending against the respondent [*Hankla v. Governing Bd. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 644, 652-653, 120 Cal. Rptr. 827* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1038-1040, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; *Funke v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 449, 454, 81 Cal. Rptr. 662]* . Furthermore, granting an indefinite continuance of an administrative hearing on disciplinary charges to a licensee who is incarcerated in another state but who is represented by counsel solely because the licensee is incarcerated is an abuse of discretion, and does not satisfy good cause standards of *Gov. Code § 11524(a)* [*Arnett v. Office of Admin. Hearings (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 332, 342-343, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 774]* .

[5] Procrastination or Lack of Preparation as Grounds for Denial of Continuance

The OAH does not look with favor on tardy requests for continuances [OAH Continuance Policy; *see* [3], *above*]. An application for a continuance must be filed within 10 working days after the party discovered or should have discovered the event or condition that establishes good cause for the continuance [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)*; *see [7][b], below*].

Under the OAH policy and the statute's requirements, a request for a continuance based on the applicant's procrastination or failure to prepare will almost certainly be denied. Examples include the following:

- Counsel is unprepared for the hearing [*Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12-14, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898* (counsel requested continuance to enable him to prepare defense, claiming 15 days' notice insufficient; appellate court held hearing officer's denial of motion was not abuse of discretion, and licensee was not denied due process)].

- Discovery was not timely requested [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6* (discovery requests); *see also* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*].

- Discovery rights were not promptly enforced [*see Gov. Code § 11507.7* (motions to compel discovery); *see also* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* ; *Lax v. Board of Medical Quality Assur., Dep't of Consumer Affairs (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 669, 172 Cal. Rptr. 258* (failure of licensee to timely enforce discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.7*].

- Counsel failed to subpoena necessary witnesses or documents [*see Gov. Code § 11450.10 et seq.* (subpoenas for attendance or production of documents at hearing); *see also* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* ; *Dresser v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 506, 517-518, 181 Cal. Rptr. 797* (denial of continuance to secure attendance of expert witness no abuse of discretion, because licensee failed to subpoena witness despite ample notice of hearing and three prior continuances on other grounds); *Wilke & Holzheiser, Inc. v. Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 349, 55 Cal. Rptr. 23, 420 P.2d 735]* .

- The party was unreasonably slow to retain counsel [*Skipitar v. Munro (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-6, 345 P.2d 508* (when licensee requested continuance on the day of hearing to obtain an attorney, no abuse of discretion to deny continuance)].

[6] Discretion of ALJ

[a] Discretion to Grant or Deny Continuance

There is no absolute right to a continuance. *Gov. Code § 11524(a)* provides that the agency *may* grant continuances.

Thus, whether agency grants or denies the continuance is a matter for the ALJ's discretion, or that of the agency if it hears the request [*Dresser v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 506, 518, 181 Cal. Rptr. 797* ; *Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1038, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; *Ring v. Smith (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 197, 201, 85 Cal. Rptr. 227* ; *Givens v. Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 529, 532, 1 Cal. Rptr. 446* ; for discussion of who may grant a continuance, *see [7][a], below*].

Some of the factors that an ALJ may consider in exercising that discretion include the following:

- The sufficiency of the showing made in support of the request [*see County of San Bernardino v. Doria Mining & Engineering Corp. (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783-784, 140 Cal. Rptr. 383* (statement about substitution of attorneys insufficient to support motion for continuance in civil action without affirmative showing that substitution was required in interests of justice); *Taylor v. Gordon (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 233, 240, 227 P.2d 64* (unsworn statement of attorney that he had been told client had measles insufficient to support motion for continuance in civil action); *see also Gov. Code § 11524(a)* (showing of good cause required), and discussion in *[4][a], above*].

- The timing of the request [*Skipitar v. Munro (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-6, 345 P.2d 508* (no abuse of discretion to deny continuance when licensee requested a continuance on the day of hearing to obtain an attorney); *see* discussion in *[5], above*, and *[7][b], below*].

- The likelihood that permitting the continuance will result in the production of additional relevant evidence [*Wisuri v. Newark School Dist. (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 239, 243, 55 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

[b] Abuse of Discretion

The ALJ's denial of a request for continuance will be reversed only for an abuse of discretion [*Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 944, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1038, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198]* . In determining whether an abuse of discretion has occurred, the reviewing court considers the sufficiency of the showing by the requesting party, and whether the denial operated to deprive that party of a fair hearing [*see County of San Bernardino v. Doria Mining & Engineering Corp. (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783-784, 140 Cal. Rptr. 383* (request for continuance based on substitution of attorneys denied when there was no affirmative showing that the substitution was required in the interests of justice); *Wood v. City Civil Service Commission (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 105, 110, 119 Cal. Rptr. 175]* .

Courts have upheld, as within the administrative law judge's discretion, continuances of hearings granted on the judge's own motion, to continue hearings due to calendar congestion [*Powers v. Bakersfield City School Dist. (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 560, 204 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *Young v. Governing Bd. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 769, 115 Cal. Rptr. 456]* . For discussion of the showing necessary to establish abuse of discretion when a writ of administrative mandamus is sought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* to review a final administrative order or decision, see Chapter 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

[7] Procedure for Requesting Continuance

[a] Who May Grant a Continuance

Until the case is assigned to an ALJ, the agency that filed the case may grant a continuance [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*; OAH Continuance Policy, Section I(C)]. Requests at that early stage should be made directly to the agency.

After assignment, only the presiding judge of the appropriate regional office of the Office of Administrative Hearings

where the case is to be heard, his or her designee [OAH Continuance Policy, Section I(C)], or the assigned ALJ can grant a continuance [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*]. The case is deemed "assigned" to an ALJ when it is scheduled for specific hearing dates [OAH Continuance Policy, Section I(B)].

[b] When to Request Continuance

The OAH Continuance Policy states that a hearing may be continued at any time if good cause exists [*but see* discussion in [5], *above* (procrastination as grounds for denial of a request for continuance)]. The issue, however, of when a hearing may be continued, is not the same as that as when a request for continuance must be filed. The party requesting a continuance must apply for the continuance within 10 working days after the party discovered or should have discovered the event or condition that establishes the good cause for the continuance [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)*]. A continuance may be granted for good cause after the 10 working days have passed, but only if the party seeking the continuance is not responsible for and has made a good faith effort to prevent the condition or event establishing the good cause [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)*].

Depending on the ground for the request, special time limits may apply. For example, if continuance is by stipulation of the parties, the signed stipulation and a request for continuance must be communicated to the OAH no later than 25 working days before the hearing [OAH Continuance Policy, Part III(F)]. Similarly, if a continuance is requested on the ground of unavailability due to a necessary, conflicting appearance in a judicial matter, the conflict and the request must be immediately communicated to the OAH [OAH Continuance Policy, Part III(H); *see* [4][b][i], *above*].

[c] Making the Request

In practice, counsel can request a continuance by telephoning the presiding judge of the OAH regional office that will hear the matter, and stating the basis for the request with appropriate specifics as described in the OAH Continuance Policy, such as the nature and duration of an illness or the particulars of a judicial conflict [for details of the required particulars, see OAH Continuance Policy, Parts III, IV; *see also [4][b], above*]. As a courtesy, and to mitigate agency opposition to the continuance, counsel should first advise the agency counsel or the deputy attorney general representing the agency of the grounds for the continuance, and explore whether alternative arrangements can be made. Thus, a declaration in lieu of the appearance of an unavailable witness, or a stipulation concerning a factual matter, might resolve the problem without the need for a continuance. The agency attorney (or deputy attorney general) customarily opposes the continuance request. One reason for such opposition is that the client agency is charged for the reserved hearing time if another matter cannot be scheduled for that time.

[d] Partial Continuance

If the petitioner has only one witness who is unavailable or a calendar conflict for only a portion of the dates set for the hearing, the petitioner should consider requesting only a partial continuance. Agency counsel may well accept a proposal that the agency present its case-in-chief and the parties reconvene later for respondent's witnesses, or that the matter be heard with the exception of a single unavailable witness. In practice, a continuance request to which agency counsel assents is more likely to be granted.

[e] Poll of Counsel, Ruling, and Rescheduling

The ALJ to whom the continuance request is made polls the opposing counsel to determine if the request is opposed. When the ALJ rules on the request, both counsel will be orally advised of the ruling. The ALJ may condition granting the request on the prompt rescheduling of the case for specified dates or may leave resetting the matter to the agency counsel. A party who is considering a request for a continuance should include the question of rescheduling in his or her considerations.

The availability of hearing dates for the continued matter is particularly important for cases scheduled in outlying areas.

Requests for hearings outside the regional office cities are collected by geographic area, and a circuit trip is scheduled for a week of hearing and travel time. When such a case is continued, it cannot simply be assigned to the next hearing date if the hearing is still to be held on the circuit, but must be rescheduled by the same process, which will require waiting until there are enough hearings in that area to justify scheduling a circuit trip for an ALJ. A considerable delay may therefore result.

[f] Oral Argument

Due to staffing limitations, the OAH does not customarily hear argument on motions such as a request for a continuance. The parties have no right to oral argument on the matter. If the request for continuance is denied, or if the requesting party believes that the request merits oral argument, a request for a brief hearing of that matter may be made to the ALJ who is considering the request. If oral argument is permitted, the request for continuance should be reduced to writing with appropriate declarations, then served on opposing counsel and filed with the OAH in advance of the time set for argument.

[8] Judicial Review of Denial of Application for Continuance

An application for judicial review of the denial by an ALJ of a continuance request must be filed in superior court within 10 working days following the denial or be barred from judicial review as a matter of jurisdiction [*Gov. Code § 11524(c)*]. The party applying for review must give notice to the agency and to any other parties. This notice may be given orally at the same time the application is denied or in writing when application is made in court for judicial relief. These provisions do not apply to the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control [*Gov. Code § 11524(c)*]. For discussion of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, generally, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* . If there is no written order of denial by the ALJ, counsel can file a declaration stating that the request was denied.

[9] Notice of Continued Hearing

The California APA contains no requirement of formal notice of a continued hearing. It is enough if the respondent has actual knowledge of the date of the hearing [*McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 715, 187 P.2d 116]* . If a respondent has neither formal notice nor actual knowledge, the respondent has been denied due process [*see Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* (basic requirement of due process is the opportunity to be heard; there must be timely and adequate notice)]. For discussion of the general requirement of notice of hearing under *Gov. Code § 11509*, see Chapter 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* . For discussion of due process considerations in administrative proceedings generally, see Ch.470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Prehearing Motions and Continuances

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473C.16-473C.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473C.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Prehearing Conferences, and Negotiation and Settlement

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.20

§ 473C.20 Prehearing Conferences

[1] Background

The matters heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) range in complexity from a license denial based on a final criminal conviction that involves relatively simple questions of law and fact, to multi-party matters scheduled for several months of hearing that involve complex legal issues and technical, difficult factual disputes. Before 1987, the difficulty of hearing the more complex cases without some prehearing clarification of factual and legal issues prompted informal prehearing conferences. The increasing number of these complex cases caused the OAH to propose amending the California APA to provide statutory authority for prehearing and settlement conferences. The amendment, *Gov. Code § 11511.5*, was enacted effective January 1, 1987 [Stats. 1986, Ch. 597, § 2; Ch. 899, § 1].

The prehearing conference, like a pretrial conference in a civil matter is held to identify and define factual and legal issues and to expedite the hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(1) to (12)*; *cf.* Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule 212, and discussion in Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings*]. It may also be used:

- To explore settlement possibilities and consider settlement conferences [*Gov. Code §§ 11511.5(b)(1), 11511.7*].

- The use of alternate dispute resolution procedures [*Gov. Code §§ 11511.5(b)(11), 11420.10-11420.30*; *see* discussion in *§ 473C.21[8*], *below*, and Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* (discussion of alternative dispute resolution)].

- The use of informal hearing procedures [*Gov. Code §§ 11511.5(b)(11), 11445.10-11445.60*; *see* discussion in *§ 473C.21[9*], *below*, and Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* (discussion of informal hearings)].

[2] Provisions of Governing Statute

[a] Motion for Conference and Notice of Conference

A prehearing conference may be held on the motion of a party or by the order of the administrative law judge [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*]. For a form that may be used in moving for a prehearing conference, see *§ 473C.50*. The ALJ will set the time and place for the conference, and the ALJ is required to give reasonable written notice of the conference to all parties [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*]. The conference is conducted by the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*].

[b] Subject Matter of Conference

The prehearing conference may deal with one or more of the following [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)*]:

- Exploration of settlement possibilities [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(1)*; *see Gov. Code § 11511.7* and *§ 473C.21*].

- Preparation of stipulations [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(2)*].

- Clarification of issues [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(3)*].

- Rulings on the identity and the number of witnesses [Gov. Code § 1511.5(b)(4)].

- Objections to offers of evidence [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(5)*].

- Order of presentation of evidence and cross-examination [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(6)*].

- Rulings regarding issuance of subpoenas and protective orders [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(7)*; *see Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.* (governing subpoenas), and discussion regarding subpoenas in Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* , and Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

- Schedules for the submission of written briefs [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(8)*].

- Schedules for the commencement and conduct of the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(8)*].

- Exchange of witness lists and of exhibits or documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(9)*; *see* 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 232 (1995) (noting that this provision is not intended to provide a new discovery procedure; if a party has not availed itself of discovery within the time periods provided by *Gov. Code Section 11507.6*, it should not be permitted to use the prehearing conference as a substitute for statutory discovery; the prehearing conference is limited to an exchange of witness lists and of exhibits or documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing)].

- Motions for intervention [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(10)*; *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* , and Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* , for further discussion regarding intervention].

- Exploration of the possibility of using alternate dispute resolution or informal hearing procedures [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(11)*; *see* Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* for further discussion regarding alternative dispute resolution and informal hearing procedures].

- Any other matters that will promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(12)*].

[c] Conduct of Prehearing Conference

The administrative law judge may conduct all or part of the prehearing conference by telephone, television, or other electronic means if each participant in the conference has an opportunity to participate in and to hear the entire proceeding while it is taking place [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(c)*].

While *Gov. Code § 11511.5(c)* permits the conduct of proceedings by telephone, television, or other electronic means (including conference telephone calls), the presiding officer may of course conduct the proceedings in the physical presence of all participants [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

[d] Conversion of Prehearing Conference Into Alternative Dispute Resolution or Informal Hearing Procedure by Consent of Parties

With the parties consent, the prehearing conference can be converted into one of the following [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(d)*]:

- An immediate alternative dispute resolution proceeding.
- An immediate informal hearing.
- An alternative dispute resolution proceeding to be conducted at another time.
- An informal hearing to be conducted at another time, subject to the right of a party to object to the use of the informal hearing procedure under *Gov. Code § 11445.30*.

See further discussion in *§ 473C.21[8],[9]*, and discussion and forms relating to these procedures, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* [*see also Gov. Code § 11420.10 et seq.*].

[e] Prehearing Orders

The ALJ issues a prehearing order incorporating the matters determined at the prehearing conference. The ALJ may direct one or more of the parties to prepare a prehearing order [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)*]. For an example of a prehearing conference order, see *§ 473C.51*.

[3] Case Management Program Criteria

The staffing limitations of the OAH do not permit a prehearing conference in every case; typical short cases do not require a conference. The presiding ALJ of each regional office, or a designee, selects the cases that will be included in what the OAH calls the Case Management Program (CMP). In the first year after the enactment of *Gov. Code § 11511.5*, the cases designated for case management had one or more of the following characteristics:

- Scheduled for four or more days of hearing.
- Filed as Commission on State Mandate test claims [*see Gov. Code §§ 17550-17616* (reimbursement of local agencies and school districts for costs mandated by state)].
- Filed as toxic substances violations [*see Health & Safety Code § 25187* (hearings on hazardous waste and hazardous substance violations)].
- Filed as Stull Act teacher dismissal proceedings [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932* (grounds for dismissal), *44944* (conduct of hearing); *see* Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment*

Issues].

- Involved numerous parties.

Cases in which respondents are not represented by counsel are rarely assigned to case management.

[4] Case Management Program Procedures

[a] Scheduling Conference and OAH Notice Form

Matters assigned to the Case Management Program will be set for a prehearing conference before the ALJ who will eventually hear the case [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*; *see [2][a], above*]. If settlement negotiations take place, however, OAH policy provides for referral of the negotiations to another ALJ [*see § 473C.21[1][b]*].

The conference is usually set in the regional office about six to eight weeks before the hearing, but may be conducted by a telephone conference call. The notice form used by the OAH identifies the following matters that may be considered at the prehearing conference; the matters listed in this form are similar to, but not identical with, the subjects for prehearing conferences listed in *Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)* [*see [2][b], above*]:

- Clarification of factual and legal issues in dispute.

- Stipulations to factual matters and to the admission of exhibits, including waiving foundation requirements and waiving other objections regarding exhibits and testimony.

- Special defenses, such as collateral estoppel or res judicata, entrapment, discriminatory enforcement, and statute of limitations or laches.

- Jurisdictional and due process matters, including objections to the form and sufficiency of pleadings, motions to consolidate, and motions to sever.

- The identity of and limitations on the number of witnesses, the need for interpreters, and the scheduling and order of witnesses.

- Resolution of remaining discovery problems, claims of privilege, motions to quash, protective orders, and subpoenas.

- Exchange of witness lists and of exhibits or documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing.

- Motions for Intervention.

- Use of alternative dispute resolution or informal hearing procedures.

- Any other matters that will promote the orderly and efficient conduct of the hearing.

[b] Preparation for Conference and Attendance of Trial Counsel

Thorough preparation for the prehearing conference is essential to achieve its purposes and to make the arrangements necessary to an orderly and efficient hearing. Counsel should prepare written motions with points and authorities as necessary and send copies to opposing counsel and the ALJ before the prehearing conference. Trial counsel, rather than junior associates without authority to act for the client, must attend. Counsel should either obtain authority from the

client to enter into stipulations and agreements or insure that the client is present.

[c] Stipulations and Admissions

The judge will attempt to narrow the contested issues by seeking stipulations and admissions, and may order amendment or clarification of the pleadings [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(2)* (matters that may be dealt with at prehearing conference include the preparation of stipulations); *see also [2][b], above*]. When the facts are essentially undisputed, the parties can avoid the expense of an unnecessary hearing by providing the ALJ with a statement of stipulated facts. The remaining legal issues can be briefed and argued, as necessary.

[d] Exhibits

Parties are customarily ordered to produce a written list of all exhibits at the prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(9)*], as well as a copy of each exhibit so that it may be marked. The ALJ may mark the exhibits at the conference, or direct counsel to do so. If opposing counsel has not received a set of exhibits during discovery, an additional set of exhibits must be provided for opposing counsel. To avoid confusion at the hearing, voluminous documents, such as medical records or a title insurance file, require uniform pagination. Counsel may be directed to meet after the conference to eliminate duplicate exhibits, paginate exhibits, "sanitize" exhibits by striking protected or identifying information (such as the last name of a patient), or to copy video and audio tapes [*see Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Hazel Hawkins Memorial Hospital (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 561, 565, 185 Cal. Rptr. 405* (subpoena of medical records upheld against right of privacy challenge because the subpoena sought neither disclosure of the patients' identity nor identifying medical information)].

The ALJ will ask the parties to agree to waive foundation requirements for exhibits and to stipulate that the exhibits are admissible. Frequently, parties agree to the admission of all exhibits at the prehearing conference, perhaps because prehearing conferences tend to be less antagonistic and confrontational than hearings.

[e] Witnesses

[i] Witness Lists

Counsel are required to present a complete witness list at the prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(9)*]. The list must identify any expert witnesses, and provide a curriculum vitae or resume for each. Failure to identify a witness before the hearing may provide grounds to exclude the testimony of that witness [*Aengst v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 275, 283, 167 Cal. Rptr. 796* (evidence of polygraph test properly excluded because polygraph was of questionable scientific reliability and was administered by friendly polygrapher, and appellant failed to include name of polygrapher in witness list before hearing)].

[ii] Expert Witnesses

The ALJ will seek stipulations that the individuals offered as expert witnesses are experts, and will review the proposed scope of the experts' testimony. Frequently, parties offer written reports by the experts, and stipulations to admit the reports as direct evidence may eliminate the need for calling an expert witness on peripheral issues. Lengthy and complex hypothetical questions are frequently posed to expert witnesses, and the questions may be made even less intelligible by the direction that the expert assume additional facts or elements. The ALJ may order the parties to reduce all proposed hypothetical questions to writing and provide copies to opposing counsel and the ALJ before the hearing.

To save costs and accommodate the schedule of an expert witness, a party may request that the witness be scheduled for a specific time, and that the testimony of other witnesses be interrupted, if necessary, for the examination of the expert. If the expert testimony will contain, or the subject of the hearing involves, scientific, technical, or arcane terms, the ALJ may require the parties to furnish a glossary of any such words or terms.

[iii] Estimated Length of Testimony and Summary of Testimony

An accurate estimate of the expected length of the testimony of proposed witnesses is essential to determining if the time reserved for hearing is sufficient, thus avoiding the delay and expense of reconvening the parties, counsel, and the ALJ for continued hearings. Continuances are disfavored, and the need for such a delay must be promptly communicated to the prehearing judge [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)* (party must ordinarily apply for continuance within 10 working days of discovering need); *see also § 473C.15[7][b]*]. Counsel may be required to furnish brief statements of the matters to which each witness will testify.

In practice, discussion of summaries of testimony in the conference has shortened the hearing by eliminating the need to call some witnesses. In one conference, for example, a witness summary revealing that various witnesses would be called to testify as custodians of records could prompt a stipulation that the records be admitted. In another case, the proposed testimony of a property appraiser about methods of valuation and the value of the subject property might become unnecessary if the parties stipulate that the appraiser's report can come in as direct evidence. The summary of proposed testimony also might allow prehearing orders limiting the questions that can be posed. For example, a summary stating that a police officer will be called to testify about a report of child abuse at a child day-care facility may prompt a prehearing direction by the ALJ that the proposed witness will not be asked the identity of the caller, because such information is protected by *Health & Safety Code § 1596.853(b)*.

[iv] Special Arrangements

Any need for special arrangements for witnesses should be raised at the prehearing conference. Such special arrangements might include the following:

- Need for an interpreter [*Gov. Code §§ 11435.15(a), 11435.20(b), 11435.60*; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

- Accessibility for handicapped persons.

- Scheduling problems.

- Exclusions to protect alleged minor victims of abuse [*see Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 303-306, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* (exclusion of respondent to protect minor upheld); *see also § 473C.13[4][b]*].

[v] Rulings on Identity and Number and Motions to Exclude

At the prehearing conference, the ALJ may rule on the identity and number of witnesses [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(4)*]. At the prehearing conference or the start of the hearing, counsel may make a motion to exclude witnesses until they have testified.

[f] Prehearing Orders

[i] Requirement of Order and Reporting

The preferences of individual ALJs vary with regard to the reporting of the proceeding. Frequently, the conference is off the record during discussion of the items enumerated in the OAH Notice [*see [4][a], above*], and the reporter is called in near the end of the conference to transcribe the stipulations, agreements, admissions, and rulings made. In addition, the ALJ will issue, or direct a party to prepare for his or her signature, a written prehearing order memorializing these matters [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)*; *see [2][c], above*].

[ii] Briefs

Another matter that may arise at the prehearing conference is the schedule for submission of written briefs [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(8)*; *see also [2][b], above*]. Parties may be directed, or may request the opportunity, to file points and authorities on evidentiary or legal issues on which a ruling is not made at the prehearing conference itself. Usually, the ALJ will issue a prehearing order ruling on the disputed matter sufficiently in advance of the hearing date to permit counsel to adjust their presentation or strategy. As for whether the order is subject to judicial review before the hearing, see *[iii], below*. Points on which briefs have been filed and orders issued include the following:

- The admissibility of polygraph results [*see Aengst v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 275, 283, 167 Cal. Rptr. 796* (polygraph evidence ruled inadmissible by ALJ)].

- Testimony by respondent's former attorney about advice given to respondent on the ultimate question of law.

- The disclosure of the names of child-abuse informants [*see Health & Safety Code § 1596.853(b)* (names of persons complaining about violations of applicable requirements by child day-care facility will not be disclosed to licensee)].

- The exclusion of evidence allegedly found in an illegal search when the search was conducted by a police agency unrelated to the complainant [*see Governing Board v. Metcalf (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 546, 111 Cal. Rptr. 724* (exclusionary rule does not apply to proceeding to discipline teacher on moral grounds)].

[iii] Judicial Review of Prehearing Order as Final Administrative Order

Whether the prehearing order is a "final administrative order" subject to judicial review by a petition for administrative mandamus before the hearing begins apparently depends on the scope of the order and its effect on the hearing. No reported cases address this issue.

[5] Responsibility of Administrative Law Judge in Case Management Program

The OAH Case Management Program provides, with few exceptions, that the ALJ who will hear the case on its merits will conduct the prehearing conference, issue all prehearing orders, and otherwise have responsibility for the expeditious and orderly conduct of the case. If there is to be a settlement conference, however, OAH policy dictates that the ALJ who is to hear the case should refer the matter to another ALJ for a settlement conference [*see Gov. Code § 11511.7(b)*, and discussion in *§ 473C.21[1][b]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsQualifications

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Prehearing Conferences, and Negotiation and Settlement

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.21

§ 473C.21 Negotiation and Settlement

[1] Settlement Conferences

[a] Availability of Formal Conference With ALJ

Exploration of settlement possibilities in prehearing conferences under the California APA is expressly provided for in *Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(1)*, but prehearing conferences are available only for selected complex cases.

Gov. Code § 11511.7 authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). The administrative law judge may order the parties to attend and participate in a settlement conference. The administrative law judge shall set the time and place for the settlement conference, and shall give reasonable written notice to all parties [*Gov. Code § 11511.7(a)*]. Under this section, settlement conferences may, but are not required to, be separate from the prehearing conference at which exploration of settlement issues may occur. Attendance and participation at the settlement conference is mandatory. Communications made in settlement negotiations are protected under *Gov. Code § 11415.60* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

Gov. Code § 11415.60 allows agencies to make decisions by settlement [*see* generally Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions*]. Because the settlement practices and procedures of agencies that are not subject to the formal hearing provisions of the APA may vary, counsel should consult the administrative agency to determine the particular practices employed and settlement resources available.

[b] Assignment to ALJ

Although prehearing conferences are normally handled by the ALJ who is to hear the case on its merits, settlement conferences are referred to another ALJ as a matter of OAH policy. *Gov. Code § 11511.7* authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). The administrative law judge at the settlement conference shall not preside at the hearing unless otherwise stipulated by the parties. The administrative law judge may conduct all or part of the settlement conference by telephone, television, or other electronic means if each participant in the conference has an opportunity to participate in

and to hear the entire proceeding while it is taking place [*Gov. Code § 11511.7(b)*].

[c] Scheduling, Notice, and Preparation

For the convenience of counsel, a settlement conference may be scheduled after the prehearing conference and on the same day. Notice of a settlement conference is customarily given by the appropriate OAH regional office. *Gov. Code § 11511.7* authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). The administrative law judge is required to give reasonable written notice to all parties of the settlement conference. The Counsel should either appear with their clients or have authorization to enter settlement agreements. The staff limitations of the OAH preclude serial settlement conferences. To take advantage of the settlement conference, counsel must arrive with a realistic view of what can be achieved and with various settlement proposals prepared.

[d] Timing of Settlement Negotiations

The timing of settlement negotiations is critical. While respondents are usually more amenable to settlement as the hearing date approaches, agencies that have invested the time and expense to prepare for hearing become less and less inclined to settle as the hearing date draws nearer. Respondents' counsel should initiate settlement efforts promptly after receipt of the accusation [*see Gov. Code § 11503* (initiation of California APA disciplinary hearing by filing of accusation)], or other initial pleading. The prayer for relief or the recommendation for discipline in the pleading will suggest a starting point for settlement negotiations.

[2] Agency Authority to Settle

Agencies and agency attorneys have the same options to settle cases on any legitimate terms as are available to private litigants and attorneys [*Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 117, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . In addition to the authority to explore settlement possibilities in prehearing conferences granted by *Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(1)*, agencies have the implied authority to negotiate settlement terms not expressly authorized by statute, including terms that provide for cost recovery, as long as the settlement provisions do not violate public policy [*Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 114-116, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . This implied authority was recognized in the leading case of *Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455* , in which the court of appeal noted that this authority would provide the following benefits to both parties [*Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 115, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455]* :

- Greater flexibility in resolving disputes.
- Increased economy and efficiency.
- Time saved.
- Fewer enforcement problems, because any conditions imposed on a licensee are voluntarily accepted.

Gov. Code § 11511.7 authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). *Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)* codifies the rule in the *Rich Vision* case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 150 (1995)]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)* provides, in relevant part, that an agency may formulate and issue a decision by settlement, pursuant to an agreement of the parties, without conducting an adjudicative proceeding. Subject to *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)*, the settlement may be on any terms the parties determine are appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)* provides, in turn, that a settlement is

subject to any necessary agency approval. *Gov. Code § 11415.60* is subject to a specific statute to the contrary governing the matter [*see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)* recognizes that some other statutes provide for agency approval of a settlement; these statutes include the following [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 150 (1995)]:

- State Personnel Board authority to approve settlements [*Gov. Code § 18681*].
- Labor standards enforcement settlement approval [*Lab. Code § 98.2(d)*].
- Worker's compensation settlement approval [*Lab. Code § 5001*].
- Governor's approval of State Lands Commission settlement [*Pub. Res. Code § 6107*].
- Approval of tax settlements [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7093.5, 9271, 19442, 30459.1, 32471, 40211, 41171, 43522, 45867, 50156.11, 55332*].

[3] Disciplinary Guidelines

Most licensing agencies have disciplinary guidelines that recommend maximum and minimum penalties for particular violations. For example, the Medical Board of California publishes The Manual of Disciplinary Guidelines and Model Disciplinary Orders. A copy of the manual is available from the Board's Sacramento office. The Bureau of Automotive Repair publishes the Bureau of Automotive Repair Guidelines for Disciplinary Penalties and Terms of Probation (dated July 3, 1987). A copy of these guidelines may be obtained by a written request to either the Bureau or the deputy attorney general who is representing the Bureau in a given action. Both of these agencies have adopted disciplinary guidelines. Familiarity with these guidelines and the recommended maximum and minimum penalties can help counsel to prepare a settlement offer that the agency is more likely to accept.

Comparing the recommended penalties for different offenses may indicate the ranking or significance of the violation in that agency's disciplinary scheme, and may thus suggest how willing the agency is likely to be to negotiate. Counsel should also consult the guidelines to see how the severity of the penalty to be imposed is determined. Knowing the aggravating and mitigating factors that apply to the client's case will allow counsel to make a better bargain for the client. For a list of some of the agencies that have disciplinary guidelines or model disciplinary orders, see [4], *below*.

[4] Model Disciplinary Orders

Another factor that counsel should be aware of before beginning settlement talks is model disciplinary orders, also called model probationary conditions. These model orders are proposed revocation language and probation terms suggested by the licensing agency. For example, the Board of Pharmacy in its regulations sets disciplinary conditions of probation that apply to a pharmacist [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1773*], or a pharmacy permit [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1773*], unless the Board directs otherwise [*16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1773(a), 1774(a)*]. Knowledge of the applicable probation options will help counsel to devise a reasonable settlement offer and to get the best deal for the client.

In addition to the Board of Pharmacy, agencies that have established model disciplinary orders, disciplinary guidelines, or both, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The Board of Registered Nursing.
- The Board of Chiropractic Examiners.
- The Contractors' State License Board.

- The Board of Dental Examiners.
- The Psychology Examining Committee.
- The Structural Pest Control Board.
- The Board of Vocational Nurse and Psychiatric Technician Examiners.
- The Medical Board of California.
- The Bureau of Automotive Repair.
- The Department of Real Estate.

A copy of the guidelines or the model disciplinary orders is usually available from the agency in question on request.

[5] Costs or Restitution as Condition of Settlement

Some agencies have the authority to require the payment of costs or restitution. These payments may be imposed as a condition of settlement. For example, agencies authorized to recover the costs of the investigation and prosecution of the disciplinary proceeding if the accusation is sustained include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The Podiatry Examining Committee [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2497.5*].
- The Board of Pharmacy [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3*].
- The Acupuncture Committee [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 4959*].

Similarly, the Contractors' State License Board has the authority to order a licensee to pay a specified sum to an injured owner of a construction project in lieu of correcting deficient work [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7099*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 881*].

[6] Diversion Programs

Various health-related licensing agencies have established programs to identify and rehabilitate licensees impaired by abuse of alcohol and other drugs, and mental and physical illness [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2770-2770.14*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1446-1449* (nurses); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 4360* (pharmacists); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2243*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1357-1357.8* (doctors); *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2340-2356* (doctors); *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1357-1357.8* (physicians and surgeons)].

Counsel who represent impaired licensees in disciplinary proceedings should consider using available diversion programs even if the impairment is not the focus of the accusation. For example, although drug abuse may have contributed to a physician's grossly negligent treatment of a patient, an accusation may charge the violation without reference to the impairment, which may be unknown to the licensing agency. On the other hand, alcohol or drug dependency or mental or physical illness of a licensee that could endanger public safety can itself be the basis for license discipline. In either case, the licensee's successful and cooperative participation in the diversion program can stay the prosecution of the license discipline proceeding [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 4360* (pharmacy diversion program is voluntary alternative to traditional discipline); *but see Bus. & Prof. Code § 4369(b)* (participation no defense to disciplinary action by Pharmacy Board)].

Violation of diversion program requirements, including alcohol or drug testing requirements, may lift the stay [*see, e.g., 16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1357.5* (causes for termination of physician's participation in diversion program), 1358 (alcohol and drug tests may be required of physician on probation)]. The records of diversion programs are confidential and are purged after the licensee's completion of the program [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2770.12* (nurses); *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1449* (nurses)].

If the agency does not conduct a diversion program, counsel may wish to propose participation in Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, or a similar program as part of a negotiated settlement.

[7] Procedures for Implementing Settlement

A proposed settlement agreement reached by the parties in a licensing proceeding with or without the participation of the ALJ must be adopted or approved by the board or agency itself [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)*; *Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 115, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . Once the parties in a licensing proceeding have executed a stipulated settlement, the licensee can not withdraw his or her consent to the terms of the settlement until the agency has had a reasonable opportunity to act upon the settlement [*Frankel v. Board of Dental Examiners (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 534, 552-553, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 128]* .

However, note that discipline imposed on a dentist by the Board of Dental Examiners under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 1670* and *1670.1* based on misdemeanor convictions of the dentist and entered into pursuant to a stipulation between the dentist and the Board could not be set aside even though the criminal convictions were later vacated by the granting of a habeas corpus writ because the dentist is bound by the stipulation [*Stermer v. Board of Dental Examiners (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 128, 130-131, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 294]* .

The ALJ or the parties' counsel will customarily write the settlement agreement in the form of a proposed decision [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)* (ALJ hearing case alone will submit proposed decision to agency)]. The admitted or stipulated facts, jurisdictional findings, and the statutory basis for discipline should be set forth as well as the settlement terms.

[8] Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures

Under the new law, agencies have the option, with the consent of all parties, to refer disputes that are the subject of adjudicative proceedings to resolution by alternative dispute resolution procedures including the following [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(1), (2), (3)*]:

- Mediation by a neutral mediator.
- Binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator.
- Nonbinding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator.

The specific governing law applicable to a particular agency, that requires use of arbitration or mediation in adjudicative proceedings, is controlling over this law, and this law applies to agencies that are not subject to specific statutory requirements unless the agency adopts regulations making this law inapplicable to adjudicative proceedings before this agency [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(b), (c)*]. The Office of Administrative Hearings [*Gov. Code §§ 11370.3, 11370.5*] is required to adopt model regulations for alternative dispute resolution [*Gov. Code § 11420.20*], and the law provides for confidentiality of communications in alternative dispute resolution proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11420.30*].

For more detailed dicussion, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* .

[9] Informal Hearing Procedures

Agencies may conduct adjudicative proceedings using the informal hearing procedures provided for and subject to the limitations of *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(a)*]. For further discussion of this procedure, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsImplicit Delegation of AuthorityGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Prehearing Conferences, and Negotiation and Settlement

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473C.22-473C.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473C.22[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.30

§ 473C.30 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.31

§ 473C.31 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.32

§ 473C.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of Proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of Proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harrassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.3-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2094*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.33

§ 473C.33 Decisions

[1] Consolidation and Severance

Agency is entitled to consolidate cases having common ground. *Ashbacker Radio Corp. v. Federal Communications Comm'n (1945) 326 U.S. 327, 330-333, 66 S. Ct. 148, 90 L. Ed. 108* ; *Bostick v. Martin (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 179, 183, 55 Cal. Rptr. 322*

Time limit for decision imposed by statute is directory or mandatory. *Henderling v. Carleson (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 561, 566, 111 Cal. Rptr. 612* (mandatory in circumstances); *Koehn v. State Board of Equalization (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 109, 118-119, 333 P.2d 125* (directory); *Peak v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 926, 932, 187 P.2d 905* (directory)

Decision is required to include written findings where findings required. *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 266, 272, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97*

Findings are not required to be stated with same formality as in judgment. *Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 134, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 934, 85 S. Ct. 940, 13 L. Ed. 2d 821 (1965)*

[2] Continuances

Appellant is not entitled to continuance for purpose of filing petition to compel discovery pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11507.7* when limitation period for filing petition has expired. *Lax v. Board of Medical Quality Assur. (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 669, 675-676, 172 Cal. Rptr. 258*

Respondent is not entitled to continuance for purpose of obtaining counsel or having counsel present if given adequate opportunity to get counsel and have counsel present. *Skipitar v. Munro (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-6, 345 P.2d 508*

[3] Demurrer

Right to demur by separate pleading in case not governed by *APA. Dyment v. Board of Medical Examiners (1922) 57 Cal. App. 260, 263-264, 207 P. 409*

Agency is without jurisdiction if initial pleading fails to state acts or omissions on which agency may proceed. *Rapaport v. Civil Serv. Comm'n (1933) 134 Cal. App. 319, 325, 25 P.2d 265*

Agency is without jurisdiction if no statute authorizes proceeding. *O'Neil v. Department of Professional & Vocational Standards (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 395, 397-398, 46 P.2d 234*

Objection to form of initial pleading is analogous to demurrer for uncertainty. *Stuck v. Board of Medical Examiners (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 751, 756, 211 P.2d 389*

[4] Nonsuit

Hearing officer is not empowered to grant request in nature of motion for nonsuit. *O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 11, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862*

[5] Setting for Hearing

Change of venue for administrative hearing is matter of agency discretion. *Keller Industries, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-476, 177 Cal. Rptr. 136* (discretion is not abused when agency refused to change venue from city which was 64 miles from litigant's place of business absent showing that selection was made arbitrarily or with improper motive)

Reference to APA in cases not governed by act is permissible to determine time for hearing. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Change of venue. *Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.34

§ 473C.34 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes: information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: link to text of Cal. Code of Regulations (http://ccr.oal.ca.gov); OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473C.35-473B.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473C.35[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.40

§ 473C.40 Prehearing Conference

[1] Motion for Prehearing Conference

☐ Prepare motion [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*; *see § 473C.20[2]*]; for a form, *see § 473C.50*].

☐ Prepare declarations, as necessary.

☐ Prepare points and authorities, as necessary [*see § 473C.20[4][b]*].

☐ File with ALJ.

[2] Preparation for Prehearing Conference

☐ Prepare prehearing conference order [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)*; *see § 473C.20[2][e]*; for a form, *see § 473C.51*].

☐ Send copies to opposing counsel.

☐ Send copies to ALJ.

☐ Prepare stipulations [*see § 473C.20[4][c]*].

☐ Prepare written list of all exhibits for marking [*see § 473C.20[4][d]*].

☐ Prepare witness list [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(9)*; *see § 473C.20[4][e]*].

☐ Identify expert witnesses on list [*see § 473C.20[4][e][ii]*].

☐ Provide curriculum vitae or resume for each expert witness.

☐ Prepare proposed hypothetical questions in writing, if requested by ALJ.

☐ Provide copies to ALJ before hearing.

☐ Provide copies to opposing counsel before hearing.

☐ Make request that expert witnesses be scheduled for a specific time.

☐ Provide glossary of terms if requested by the ALJ.

☐ Prepare request for special arrangements [*see § 473C.20[4][e][iv]*].

☐ Prepare motion to exclude witnesses until they testify [*see § 473C.20[4][e][v]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsQualifications

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.41

§ 473C.41 Settlement Conferences

[1] Preparation

☐ Prepare various settlement proposals [*see § 473C.21[1][c]*].

[2] Implementation of Settlement

☐ Prepare proposed settlement agreement [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*; *see § 473C.21[7]*].

☐ Execute and have opposing party execute agreement.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.42

§ 473C.42 Motion for Change in Place of Hearing

[1] Motion

- ☐ Prepare motion [*see § 473C.14[4]*].
  - ☐ Prepare and attach memorandum of points and authorities.
  - ☐ Prepare and attach supporting declaration or affidavit.
- ☐ Filing.
  - ☐ File with ALJ assigned to the hearing.
  - ☐ File within 10 days after service of notice of hearing [*Gov. Code § 11508(c)*].
- ☐ Notice.
  - ☐ Give notice to other parties.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.43

§ 473C.43 Requesting a Continuance

[1] Timing of Request

☐ Request within 10 working days after the discovery of, or when the event or condition that establishes good cause for the continuance, should have been discovered [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)*; *see § 473C.15[7][b]*].

[2] Where to Make Request

☐ Prior to assignment to ALJ, request continuance from agency [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*; *see § 473C.15[7][a]*].

☐ After assignment to ALJ, make request to appropriate regional OAH [*Gov. Code § 11524(a)*; *see § 473C.15[7][a]*].

☐ Telephone request to presiding judge of the OAH regional office that will hear the matter [*see § 473C.15[7][c]*].

[3] Oral Argument

☐ Request brief hearing for oral argument (optional) [*see § 473C.15[7][f]*]. If granted:

☐ Prepare request in writing to present at hearing.

☐ Attach appropriate declarations.

☐ Serve on opposing counsel.

☐ File with OAH.

[4] Continuance by Stipulation

☐ Inform OAH no later than 25 working days before hearing [*see § 473C.15[7][b]*].

[5] Partial Continuance

☐ Consider request for partial continuance [*see § 473C.15[7][d]*].

[6] Judicial Review of Denial of Continuance

☐ Prepare application for judicial review [*see § 473C.15[8]*].

☐ File in superior court within 10 working days following denial [*Gov. Code § 11524(c)*; *see § 473C.15[8]*].

☐ Notify agency and other parties.

☐ Give orally at time application is denied, or

☐ In writing when application is made.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.44

§ 473C.44 Miscellaneous Prehearing Motions

[1] Formal APA Hearings

☐ Preparing motions generally [*see § 473C.14*].

☐ Address to presiding ALJ.

☐ Attach points and authorities and affidavits, as necessary.

☐ Attach supporting declarations or affidavits, as necessary.

☐ Demurrer

☐ Raise in notice of defense [*Gov. Code § 11506*; *see § 473A.11[6]*].

☐ General demurrer [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2), (3)*; *see § 473C.11*].

☐ Special demurrer [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(2), (3)*; *see § 473C.11*].

☐ Motion to consolidate [*Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see § 473C.12[1]*].

☐ Motion to sever [*Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see § 473C.12[4]*].

☐ Motion to exclude respondent during testimony of minor who is alleged victim of sexual abuse [*see*

§ 473C.14[2]].

☐ Motion to compel release of confidential records [*see § 473C.14[3]*].

☐ Motion in limine [*see § 473C.14[5]*].

[2] Non-APA Proceedings

☐ Motion to consolidate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* (grounds under general civil procedure); *see also § 473C.12[2]*].

☐ Make as early as possible.

☐ Attach supporting affidavits [*see § 473C.12[5]*].

☐ Address to and file with agency [*see § 473C.12[5]*].

☐ Motion to sever [*Gov. Code § 11507.3*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* (grounds under general civil procedure); *see also § 473C.12[4]*].

☐ Make as early as possible.

☐ Attach supporting affidavits [*see § 473C.12[5]*].

☐ Address to and file with agency [*see § 473C.12[5]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473C.45-473C.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473C.45[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.50

§ 473C.50 Motion for Order Setting Matter for Prehearing Conference and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)]

[1] FORM Motion for Order Setting Matter for Prehearing Conference and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))	NO. _____ MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING MATTER FOR PREHEARING CONFERENCE AND SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

_____

Respondent _____[*name*] moves the administrative law judge for an order that a prehearing conference be conducted in the above-entitled matter. The motion is made on the grounds that _____[*specify grounds*], and that a prehearing conference will promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the hearing. The motion is based on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, and on the records and file herein.

_____ [*date*]
Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Respondent

[*Include declaration in support of motion for order setting matter for prehearing conference, if necessary*]

DECLARATION

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for respondent *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____[*In this and subsequent paragraphs, set forth facts within declarant's personal knowledge showing that a prehearing conference will promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the hearing*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of motion in *[1], above*, is for use by the respondent in an agency adjudication to secure a prehearing conference. The administrative law judge may conduct the conference on the motion of a party or by the judge's own order. If a conference is ordered, the administrative law judge must set the time and place for the conference and give reasonable written notice to all parties [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*].

[3] Memorandum

It is not clear whether a memorandum must accompany a motion for a prehearing conference [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*], but it is highly recommended. In civil law and motion practice in superior and municipal courts, however, the absence of a memorandum may be construed by the court as an admission that a motion is not meritorious and cause for its denial [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1113*].

[4] Cross References

See *§ 473C.20* for discussion of the legal requirements related to prehearing conferences, and see *§ 473C.20[2][b]*, for an enumeration of the matters that may raised in the conference. See also discussion in *§ 473C.20[4][b]* regarding the motion and supporting papers.

For discussion and form relating to declarations in civil actions generally, see Ch.15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473C PREHEARING PROCEDURES IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473C.51

§ 473C.51 Order for Prehearing Conference [Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)]

[1] FORM Order for Prehearing Conference [Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PREHEARING CONFERENCE ORDER
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

A prehearing conference in the above-entitled matter was held before the undersigned on _____[*date*]. _____ [*Specify name of each attorney appearing and party represented, and name of each party appearing in person, e.g.,* _____ (*name*) appeared as counsel for the _____ (*agency*) and _____ (*name*) appeared as counsel for respondent].

[*Set forth nature of case and matters resolved at conference, e.g.:*]

1. Nature of Case. This is an adjudicatory hearing for _____[*set forth concise and descriptive statement of case*].

2. Stipulations. The following matters have been stipulated to by the parties: _____[*specify, setting forth each matter in a separately lettered subparagraph*].

3. Clarification of Issues. The following are the issues remaining in dispute and the factual and legal contentions made

by each party with respect to them: _____ [*list each disputed issue in a separately lettered subparagraph followed by factual and legal contentions of each party with respect to it*].

4. Rulings. The following rulings were made at the prehearing conference: _____ [*specify rulings on identity and limitation of number of witnesses, issuance of subpoenas and protective orders, evidentiary rulings, and/or the order of presentation of evidence and cross examination, setting forth concise and descriptive statement of each ruling in a separately lettered subparagraph*].
_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
Administrative Law Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in *[1], above*, is for use by respondent in an agency adjudication to assist the administrative law judge to prepare a prehearing order. When a prehearing conference is held, the administrative law judge is required to issue a prehearing order incorporating the matters determined at the prehearing conference. The administrative law judge may direct one or more of the parties to prepare the order [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(e)*; *see § 473C.20*].

For an enumeration of matters that may be raised at the conference, see *§ 473C.20[2][b]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473D.syn

§ 473D.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473D: PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS

§ 473D.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473D.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 473D.03-473D.09 [Reserved]

§ 473D.10 Tactics and Preparation Prior to Service of the Accusation or Charging Document

[1] Importance of Early Action

[2] Investigators

[a] Arrival of Investigator

[b] Duty to Talk With Investigator

[c] Duty to Allow Records to Be Viewed or Copied

[i] Agency Subpoena Power

[ii] Medical Records and the Right to Privacy

[d] Duty to Cooperate With Agency Investigations

[3] Request for Interview by Agency at Agency Offices

[4] Demand for Investigative Deposition

[5] Diversion Programs

[6] Malpractice

[7] Going Direct to Agency Counsel

§ 473D.11 Tactics and Preparation After Accusation or Charging Document Is Served

[1] Service of Accusation or Statement of Issues

[2] Response to Accusation or Statement of Issues

[a] Notice of Defense

[b] Special Notice of Defense

[3] APA Discovery

[a] Requests for Discovery

[b] Continuing Discovery

[c] Agency Files

[d] Scope of APA Discovery

[e] Enforcement of Discovery Rights

[f] Prehearing Depositions

[g] Eliminating Surprise

§ 473D.12 Scheduling and Continuances

[1] Setting the Hearing Date

[2] Requesting a Continuance

[a] OAH Does Not Favor Continuances

[b] Possible Solutions

§ 473D.13 Prehearing Conferences

[1] Purpose of Prehearing Conference

[2] Preparation for Prehearing Conference

§ 473D.14 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Reviewing the Charging Document

[2] Investigation

[3] Use of Experts

[4] Organization of Documents

[5] Preparation of Witnesses

[a] Taking Statements

[b] Rehearsal of Witness

[6] Preparation of Client

[a] Education of Client

[b] Rehearsal of Client

[7] Use of Demonstrative Evidence

[8] Trial Briefs

§ 473D.15 Settlements

[1] Desirability of Settlement

[2] Settlement Conferences

[3] Evaluating an Administrative Case

[4] Tactical Considerations in Communicating With Agency Counsel

[5] Authority to Settle

[6] Creative Settlement Options

[7] Stipulating for Settlement

[a] Necessity for Writing

[b] Consent of Client

[8] Post-Settlement Considerations

§§ 473D.16-473D.19 [Reserved]

§ 473D.20 Introduction to Prehearing Tactics and Procedures

§ 473D.21 Prehearing Injunctions and Restraining Orders

[1] Overview

[2] Injunctions Against Violations of Statutes Administered by Boards Within Department of Consumer Affairs

[a] General Requirements

[b] Restitution to Victims and Reimbursement of Agency

[c] Remedy Not Exclusive

[d] Use in Conjunction With Other Statutes Authorizing Injunctive Relief

[3] Orders Restraining Licensees From Practicing Healing Arts

[a] General Requirements

[b] Supporting Affidavits and Memorandum of Points and Authorities

[c] Issuance of Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)

[4] Orders Restraining Licensees From Practicing Professions Other Than Healing Arts

[5] Professional and Vocational Licensing Statutes Authorizing Injunctive Relief

[6] Citation Enforcement System

§ 473D.22 Seeking Prehearing Injunctive Relief

§ 473D.23 Opposing Petitions for Prehearing Injunctive Relief

§ 473D.24 Prehearing Termination of Licensee's Telephone Service

[1] When to Seek Termination

[2] Authority for Termination

[3] Method to Secure Termination

[4] Method to Restore Telephone Service

§ 473D.25 Evidence by Affidavit

[1] General Procedure

[2] Required Notice

§ 473D.26 Prehearing Briefs

§§ 473D.27-473D.39 [Reserved]

§ 473D.40 Federal Constitution

§ 473D.41 State Constitution

§ 473D.42 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473D.43 Decisions

§ 473D.44 Text References

§ 473D.45 Internet References

§§ 473D.46-473D.49 [Reserved]

§ 473D.50 Determine the Appropriate Respondent Tactics With Respect to Investigation and Preparation for Hearing

§ 473D.51 Determine the Likelihood That an Agency May Take Unanticipated Prehearing Steps in a Professional or Vocational Licensing Proceeding

§ 473D.52 Response to Accusation or Statement of Issues

§ 473D.53 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Review

[2] Investigation

[3] Witnesses

[4] Documents

[5] Client

[6] Demonstrative Evidence

[7] Briefs

§ 473D.54 Requesting Discovery Under the APA

[1] Request for Discovery

[2] Motion to Compel Discovery

155 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.01

§ 473D.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the prehearing preparation and tactics in a public agency adjudication, primarily one conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The legal background discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Subpart A discusses respondent's tactical considerations in investigation, scheduling and other prehearing matters [*see §§ 473D.10 -473D.15*].

- Subpart B discusses agency counsel's prehearing tactics in professional and vocational licensing cases including action such as injunctive relief, termination of a licensee's telephone service, evidence by affidavit, and prehearing briefs [*see §§ 473D.20 -473D.26*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.02

§ 473D.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For general discussion and overview of agency adjudication under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

For related discussion and forms providing coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview,* through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in §§ *470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* .

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *§ 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

157 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473D.03-473D.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473D.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.10

§ 473D.10 Tactics and Preparation Prior to Service of the Accusation or Charging Document

[1] Importance of Early Action

The time before the accusation or charging document is served is crucial to the investigation and preparation of an administrative law case [*see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* , for a discussion of the initial pleadings in agency hearings].

If a licensee or other person learns that charges are about to be filed, it may be possible to intervene with the administrative agency and prevent formal charges. If counsel is consulted at this time, he or she can initiate discussions to try to satisfy the agency without the need for a hearing. Clients should be advised to call as soon as they realize that they may be the subject of an investigation. If counsel believes that the agency is mistaken in its approach or that extenuating or mitigating circumstances would dissuade the agency from noticing a hearing or imposing penalties, it may be appropriate to talk with the agency or its investigator. Just learning why the agency is investigating the client and what the agency knows may justify talks with the agency.

The period before charges are filed is the only opportunity that counsel will have to avoid some of the following negatives:

- The time and expense consumed by an investigation and hearing.

- The bad publicity, with attendant harm to the client's business and the client's reputation, that the mere filing of charges, or even an investigation without charges, may generate [*see [6], below*].

- The possibility of revealing information that may be used against the client in criminal or administrative proceedings [*see [2][b], [d], below*].

- The possibility of violating the rights of another in attempting to cooperate with the agency [*see [2][c], below*].

[2] Investigators

[a] Arrival of Investigator

An individual may first discover that he or she is the subject of concern to an agency when approached by the agency's investigator. Typically, the investigator arrives at the client's place of business or employment unannounced, and seeks to discuss the matter with the client or asks for the production of documents. Because an administrative hearing is not a criminal case, due process does not require the investigator to inform a licensee of his or her rights regarding the investigation [*see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* , for a discussion of procedural due process requirements applicable to agency actions].

As discussed in *[b], below*, the licensee may choose to remain silent unless required by statute to cooperate with the investigator. In any event, an attorney representing a person or business licensed by the state, should advise his or her client to get in touch immediately if they are approached by a state investigator.

[b] Duty to Talk With Investigator

In general, a person has no duty to talk with an investigator. However, particular statutes require licensees to cooperate with agency investigations (*see [d], below*). If the person under investigation does speak with the investigator, the declarant's statements will be admissible against him or her in any subsequent administrative hearing as statements by a party [*see Evid. Code § 1220* (statements offered against the declarant in an action in which he or she is a party are not barred by the hearsay rule)]. Under the special rules applicable to APA hearings, even hearsay is admissible to supplement or explain other evidence, but hearsay is not sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in a civil action [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)(d)*; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*]. Statements by employees may also be introduced against the licensee at a subsequent hearing as authorized admissions if the declarant was authorized to speak for the licensee [*see Evid. Code § 1222* (authorized admissions not barred by hearsay rule); *see also* California Trial Guide, Unit 40, § 40.32]. For these reasons, counsel should be consulted immediately on contact by an investigator, so that it can be determined when and if discussions with the agency's representative should occur.

[c] Duty to Allow Records to Be Viewed or Copied

[i] Agency Subpoena Power

Frequently, investigators will serve an investigative subpoena [*see Gov. Code §§ 11180-11191* (investigative subpoenas of state agencies)]. State agencies have the power to serve subpoenas requesting the production of documents [*Gov. Code § 11181(e)*], promulgating interrogatories pertinent or material to any inquiry, investigation, hearing, proceeding, or action [*Gov. Code § 11181(f)*] or, on occasion, requesting that the person submit to a prehearing deposition under oath [*Gov. Code § 11189*].

If the person served with the subpoena declines to appear or to provide the requested materials, the agency may proceed to the superior court to seek enforcement of the subpoena [*see Gov. Code §§ 11187* (petition to superior court to compel attendance of witness or production of documents), 11188 (court order, contempt power)]. There are no penalties for failing to honor the subpoena prior to a court order directing that the person served comply with the subpoena [*People v. West Coast Shows, Inc. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 462, 470, 89 Cal. Rptr. 290]* . If an investigative subpoena is issued to depose a licensee, he or she may refuse to answer specific questions by invoking the privilege against self-incrimination [*Fielder v. Berkeley Properties Co. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 30, 39, 99 Cal. Rptr. 791]* .

Attorneys called by clients who have been visited by an investigator should caution those clients not to produce any documents and not to discuss anything with the investigator until the attorney has had an opportunity to review the subpoena, if any, and make inquiries concerning the purpose of the investigator's visit. Attorney and client can then

decide whether the client will gain or lose by cooperating with the agency.

For detailed discussion regarding administrative subpoenas used for investigative purposes, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

[ii] Medical Records and the Right to Privacy

If the investigative subpoena demands patient records from a health care provider, the provider may be in a dilemma. Patients have a right to privacy in their medical records. If a physician discloses those records prior to a court order, he or she may well violate the patient's right to privacy [*see Cutter v. Brownbridge (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 836, 843, 845-848, 228 Cal. Rptr. 545* (declaration by psychotherapist, describing his diagnosis of patient and disclosing personal details learned in therapy, violated patient's constitutional right to privacy, and was not protected by the *Civ. Code § 47(b)* privilege for statements in official proceedings unless the therapist first asserted the psychotherapist-patient privilege as provided in *Evid. Code § 1015*)].

Without the patient's consent, a state agency may not have access to patients' medical records unless it first shows good cause. Good cause may be shown by the presentation of competent evidence sufficient to permit a court to make an independent finding that the particular records sought are relevant, material, and essential to a focused inquiry within the agency's authority [*Wood v. Superior Court (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1138, 1149, 212 Cal. Rptr. 811* ; *see* Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*].

Health care providers, therefore, need to exercise special caution in complying with investigative subpoenas. Contact with counsel is absolutely necessary to make certain that the rights of both the patients and the health care provider are protected.

[d] Duty to Cooperate With Agency Investigations

A few statutes require cooperation with agency investigations. For example, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7111.1* provides that the failure or refusal of a licensee of the Contractors' State License Board to respond to a written request to cooperate in the investigation of a complaint against that licensee is cause for disciplinary action. No appellate decisions, however, define cooperation in this context or discuss the inevitable tension between the individual's constitutional rights (i.e., the privilege against self-incrimination and the right to privacy) [*see U.S. Const., amend. V* (privilege against self-incrimination); *Cal. Const., art. I, § 1* (right to privacy)]. This tension is heightened by the disciplinary sanctions and criminal penalties that many licensing laws impose for violation of their provisions. A licensee who refuses to cooperate may be penalized by the agency. A licensee who cooperates may waive constitutional protections by providing information that will be used to discipline or criminally punish the licensee.

For discussion of constitutional rights as a bar to agency investigations, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* .

[3] Request for Interview by Agency at Agency Offices

Instead of sending an investigator to visit the person under review, the agency may request that the person come to the agency offices for an interview. Both the Contractors' State License Board and the Medical Board of California use this procedure. Because agency investigators are skillful at interviewing, a licensee or person under investigation should never attend such a meeting without counsel present.

[4] Demand for Investigative Deposition

An agency has the power to demand that a person appear at an appointed place, generally the attorney general's office, and submit to questioning under oath by the agency or its representative [*see Gov. Code §§ 11180-11191* (agency

investigative powers), *11181(e)* (power to subpoena attendance of witnesses and production of testimony), *11181(f)* (power to promulgate interrogatories pertinent or material to any inquiry, investigation, hearing, proceeding, or action), *11189* (deposition procedures)].

As with the production of documents [*see* discussion in *[2][c][i], above*], no penalties exist for refusing to be deposed until a court has ordered the deposition [*see Gov. Code §§ 11188* (court may exercise contempt power on failure to comply with order), *11189* (court may punish for contempt after order on petition for deposition); *Marcus v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 598, 603, 111 Cal. Rptr. 101* (agencies have no inherent contempt power)].

After a court order, if the person still declines to appear and testify, the court may enforce the subpoena through its contempt powers [*Gov. Code § 11188*]. For discussion and forms relating to contempt orders generally, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

[5] Diversion Programs

If substance abuse by a licensee is at issue, many agencies provide diversion programs as a possible alternative to disciplinary action.

For example, a physician may apply for the Medical Board of California's diversion program [*see 16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1357-1357.8*]. If a licensee voluntarily enters the diversion program, that fact is confidential and will not be shared with the Board's enforcement division [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1357.8(a)*].

Information received before the physician's acceptance into the program or that does not relate to the physician's application to or participation in the program is not confidential, however, and may be used in disciplinary or criminal proceedings against the physician [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1357.8(b)*].

On the successful completion of the diversion program, the program records for that physician will be destroyed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2355(a)*]. Similar programs exist for registered nurses [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2770-2770.14*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1446-1449*], pharmacists [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 4360*], and dentists [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 1695-1699*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1020.1-1020.8*].

For additional discussion of diversion programs, see Chapter 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

[6] Malpractice

If malpractice is at issue, it is sometimes appropriate to retain experts, prepare a report on the circumstances surrounding the alleged malpractice, and provide it to the agency. This lets the agency know the licensee's defense, but it also may convince the agency not to file an accusation. The filing of an accusation may do serious harm to the client's professional standing or personal reputation that cannot be overcome by a victory in the hearing.

[7] Going Direct to Agency Counsel

If counsel or the client has had difficult relations with the agency or its investigators, and if counsel feels that there is an absolute defense to any potential charges, calling the agency's counsel may resolve the matter without formal charges. On rare occasions, informal settlements can be made even when the client is not entirely innocent. These infrequent victories depend in large part on counsel's creativity in fashioning a settlement that will satisfy the agency that it has done its duty in protecting the public.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessPrivacyGeneral OverviewHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationPatient ConfidentialityGeneral OverviewTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.11

§ 473D.11 Tactics and Preparation After Accusation or Charging Document Is Served

[1] Service of Accusation or Statement of Issues

In formal hearings under the APA, there are two kinds of charging documents. Hearings to discipline licensees begin with an accusation [*Gov. Code § 11503*], and hearings on the denial of an application for the grant or renewal of a license or other privilege begin with a statement of issues [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

The statement of issues is served in the same way as an accusation unless the hearing is held at the respondent's request [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

The accusation or statement of issues must be accompanied by the following [*Gov. Code § 11505(a)*]:

- A statement that respondent may request a hearing by filing a notice of defense [*see [2], below*], and that failure to do so waives the right to a hearing.
- A form entitled "Notice of Defense," that may be used to request a hearing [*see [2][a], below*].
- A copy of the discovery provisions of the APA [*see Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*].

Usually, the accusation or statement of issues is also accompanied by the agency's request for discovery under *Gov. Code § 11507.6*. For discussion of discovery provisions and tactics, see *[3], below*, and Chapter 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

For discussion about the legal requirements related to accusations and statement of issues, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .

[2] Response to Accusation or Statement of Issues

[a] Notice of Defense

Counsel's first response to agency charges should be to file the notice of defense, which may be signed by the respondent or by counsel on behalf of respondent [*Gov. Code § 11506(d)*]. Although the notice of defense must be filed within 15 days after respondent receives the accusation [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*], it is not unusual for the person charged to bring the accusation and other materials to counsel more than 15 days after receiving the accusation. When that happens, counsel should immediately call the agency's counsel and request additional time to file the notice of defense. Agency counsel will usually cooperate, and a time may be agreed on between counsel when the notice of defense is due [*see Gov. Code § 11506(b)* (failure to file notice of defense waives right to hearing, but agency may authorize filing of a later notice); *Gov. Code § 11506(c)* (agency may in its discretion grant a hearing even though respondent has failed to file a timely notice of defense, and has waived right to a hearing)]. If the notice of defense is not filed within the time required by statute or the time agreed on, the agency may hold a default hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 11506(c), 11520(b)*].

For detailed discussion and forms relating to notice of defense, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* . For discussion of default hearings, see Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

[b] Special Notice of Defense

The charges in an accusation must be specific enough so that the respondent can prepare his or her defense [*Gov. Code § 11503*]. Vague and uncertain allegations that do not detail the facts or conduct on which the accusation is based are subject, in effect, to a special demurrer [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)(3)*]. To make such a "demurrer," counsel must include an objection to the form of the accusation in the notice of defense [*see Gov. Code § 11506(a)(3)*]. The objections to the form of the accusation should be specific and detailed. If only some of the allegations are vague or uncertain, the objection should specify those allegations. Counsel should request a prehearing conference on the objections raised [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)* (prehearing conferences authorized); *see also § 473D.13*], because if the charges are not fleshed out before the hearing, counsel will be unable to prepare an adequate defense for respondent.

If respondent has already filed the notice of defense without including any objection to the form of the accusation, counsel should simply file a special notice of defense making that objection. The accusation is subject to challenge until the time allowed for filing a notice of defense has passed [*Gov. Code § 11506(b)* (respondent may file one or more notices of defense on any or all the specified grounds within the time stated)]. Even if the time for filing has passed, counsel should nonetheless prepare a special notice of defense detailing why the form of the accusation is deficient, and file it with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) [*Gov. Code §§ 11370.3-11370.5*] or with the agency itself if the agency uses in-house administrative law judges (ALJ). Even when the time for filing a notice of defense has passed, the OAH tends to hear and consider counsel's objections so as not to waste time when the hearing commences.

[3] APA Discovery

[a] Requests for Discovery

Counsel should request discovery.

Discovery in APA proceedings is governed by *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*. Discovery in non-APA proceedings may be governed by special statutes or regulations of the charging agency [*see, e.g., Educ. Code § 44944(a)* (school district employee in suspension or dismissal proceeding may employ the full range of discovery allowed in superior court civil actions)]. In the absence of any statutory or regulatory provision, the courts have held that fairness and "modern concepts of administrative adjudication" usually require some form of discovery [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 479-482, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* .

To request discovery under the APA, a party must serve a written request for discovery on the other party before the hearing and within 30 days after service by the agency of the initial pleading or within 15 days after service of any

additional pleading [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]. Although these time limits should be strictly complied with if possible, an attorney who is not retained until after the 30-day time period has elapsed should nonetheless file a discovery request with the agency. Agencies usually honor late discovery requests, because adequate discovery before the hearing saves everyone time in the long run. Granting a late discovery request can help save time in the following ways:

- Facts learned in discovery may lead to settlement.
- Discovery can clarify the factual and legal issues.
- If a document is not available because a late discovery request is denied, respondent will simply request a subpoena requiring the production of that document at the hearing. Subpoenas can be issued by the agency or the assigned ALJ, at the request of a party, or by the attorney of record for a party [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(a)*]. Subpoena requests made before or during the hearing may be granted, provided that legal requirements are satisfied [*Gov. Code §§ 11450.10(a), 11450.20(a), (b)*].

When a document is produced at the hearing, counsel will probably request a recess or continuance [*see Gov. Code § 11524(a)* (agency may grant continuances); *see § 473D.12[2]*] to examine the document. Thus, the subpoena procedure causes delay and inconvenience for all parties, but discovery allows all materials to be reviewed well in advance of the hearing.

For detailed discussion of administrative discovery, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[b] Continuing Discovery

The discovery request should ask for continuing discovery, that is, counsel should request that the other party continue to make discoverable material available for inspection or copying when that material is received after the other party has complied with the initial discovery request. In exchange, counsel should promise agency counsel that the agency's discovery request will be considered a request for continuing discovery. Continuing discovery can help prevent the delays that may result when documents are produced at the last minute. For discussion of possible delays produced by lack of discovery, see *[a], above*. There is no statutory basis for a continuing discovery request, but it makes good practical sense, and agency attorneys are usually willing to cooperate.

For discussion regarding what is discoverable material in an administrative hearing, see *[d], below*, and Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications.*

[c] Agency Files

Respondent's discovery request should demand discovery of three files:

- The agency counsel's file.
- The agency's file on the respondent.
- The investigator's file.

The deputy attorney general or agency counsel will have a file that includes documents or materials provided by the investigator. This is the file agency counsel will copy and forward in response to a discovery request, but there are two other crucial files. The investigator has his or her own file, usually with handwritten notes, working papers, or both. These notes and working papers can be invaluable in determining the sources of the investigator's information. This file should reveal the people to whom the investigator talked and his or her impressions of witnesses. The agency should

also have a file on the respondent, especially if the case is a licensing agency case. This file will include the licensee's application and renewal forms and may contain other useful material, such as complaints against the licensee.

Sometimes agency counsel will object to the inspection of the investigator's file by respondent's counsel on the ground that the file is privileged because it is official information [*see Evid. Code § 1040* (privilege of public entity to bar disclosure of official information); *Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)* (privileged or confidential material including attorney work product is not subject to administrative discovery)]. For further discussion, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[d] Scope of APA Discovery

Under the APA, a party is entitled to discover any names and addresses of witnesses known to the other party and to inspect and copy any writing or other thing that is relevant, admissible, and in the possession, custody, or control of the other party [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*]. Discovery does not include attorney work product, confidential matters, or anything that is privileged from disclosure by law [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)*]. In certain proceedings alleging sexual misconduct [*see Gov. Code §§ 12940* (employment discrimination and harassment cases), *19572* (civil service discipline cases), *19702* (civil service discrimination cases)], evidence of the complainant's sexual conduct with anyone except the alleged perpetrator is generally not discoverable [*Gov. Code § 11440.40*]. For discussion of non-APA discovery and a more detailed discussion of the scope of APA discovery, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[e] Enforcement of Discovery Rights

Any party may seek to enforce a discovery request [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see also [a], above*] by filing a motion to compel discovery with the administrative law judge who has been assigned to hear the case [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(a)*]. The motion must show that the moving party made a reasonable and good faith attempt to contact the other party for an informal resolution of the discovery issue. For more detailed discussion, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[f] Prehearing Depositions

Gov. Code § 11511 allows a party to petition the administrative law judge, or if an administrative law judge has not been appointed, the agency, to take the testimony of any material witness by deposition on a showing that the testimony of the witness will be material and that the witness is unable to attend or cannot be compelled to attend the hearing. On this showing, the administrative law judge, or the agency may order the witness to be deposed in accordance with *Gov. Code § 11189*, which provides for depositions pursuant to an investigative subpoena. For discussion of investigative subpoenas, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

Since no witness outside of California can be compelled by subpoena to attend an administrative hearing [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*], *Gov. Code § 11511* appears to allow counsel to depose any out-of-state witness, even one who intends to appear at the hearing. *Gov. Code § 11511* was intended to allow depositions for the preservation of testimony, not for discovery, but, as a practical matter, discovery is precisely what takes place [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 478-479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65]* . For more detailed discussion, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[g] Eliminating Surprise

Between the end of the time for filing a discovery request and the beginning of the hearing, some discoverable evidence is almost always found [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6* (scope and request for discovery); *see also* [a] and [d], *above*]. If agency counsel and respondent's counsel have agreed to continuing discovery, the risk of being surprised at the hearing by newly uncovered evidence is minimized. If, however, opposing counsel do not cooperate, or if either party suspects that discoverable matter is being concealed, this problem should be raised with the agency or the ALJ as soon as

possible, at the prehearing conference, if one is being held [*Gov. Code § 11511.5* (prehearing conferences authorized); *see also § 473D.13*; for extended discussion, *see* Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*].

To promote the orderly conduct of hearings and to keep gamesmanship at a minimum, ALJs are often willing to order complete discovery prior to hearing even when the time allowed for a discovery request under *Gov. Code § 11507.6* has passed [*see* discussion in *[a*], *above* and Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*].

If discoverable material is offered in evidence at the hearing that was not produced prior to hearing, counsel should move for a continuance of the hearing to review this evidence [*see Gov. Code § 11524* (continuances); *see also § 473D.12*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.12

§ 473D.12 Scheduling and Continuances

[1] Setting the Hearing Date

After a notice of defense is filed by the respondent under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the agency counsel will request a hearing date from the calendar clerk at the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). Usually, agency counsel informs the calendar clerk of the dates on which he or she is available for hearing.

Unfortunately, respondent's counsel frequently is not asked when he or she is available for hearing, which can cause problems, because continuances are not favored by OAH administrative law judges (ALJ), as explained in *[2], below*.

See Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , for detailed discussion of continuance motions.

[2] Requesting a Continuance

[a] OAH Does Not Favor Continuances

A party may apply for a continuance, but neither the OAH nor the agencies subject to the APA favor continuances, and the ALJs are not enthusiastic about granting them [*see* the OAH Continuance Policy, available from the OAH as Appendix I to the APA, Procedures for Administrative Adjudication (1987)]. The primary reason for this reluctance is that OAH hearing calendars are fully and precisely scheduled, so that any cancellation is likely to leave a gap that cannot be filled. This lost hearing time wastes the time and money of all parties, and it annoys the OAH considerably. If the hearing time cannot be rescheduled, the complainant agency usually has to pay for that time, which displeases the agency. For further discussion of the OAH attitude to continuances, see Chapter 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

[b] Possible Solutions

The best solution to the continuance problem is to try to avoid ever needing one. The attempt to avoid needing a continuance is important even if it becomes necessary to ask for a continuance, because whether a continuance will be

allowed often depends on how hard the requesting party tried to avoid needing it. For example, a continuance applied for after the 10-day limit set out in *Gov. Code § 11524(b)* may nonetheless be granted for good cause if the party asking for the continuance is not responsible for the condition or event establishing the good cause, and has in fact made a good faith effort to prevent that condition or event [*Gov. Code § 11524(b)*]. Before requesting a continuance, counsel should consider approaching the agency or its counsel and trying to negotiate a solution. A continuance that is supported by the agency is much more likely to be accepted by the ALJ. For example, perhaps a partial continuance would be sufficient. Agency counsel may well accept a proposal that the agency present its case-in-chief and the parties reconvene later for respondent's witnesses, or that the matter be heard with the exception of a single unavailable witness. Or perhaps a declaration in lieu of the appearance of an unavailable witness, or a stipulation concerning a factual matter, might resolve the problem without the need for a continuance.

If the need for a continuance is unavoidable, and the agency is not interested in any compromises, it is best to move for a continuance as soon as is feasible, and to support the motion as strongly as possible. Do not merely ask for a continuance. The request for continuance must state in detail the facts that establish good cause, and the existence of these facts should be fully supported with sworn affidavits. Counsel should also file a memorandum of points and authorities citing any authorities that support the request. Counsel should notify opposing counsel of the motion, and furnish him or her with a copy of the motion and supporting papers. If counsel does not have time for the formality of a written motion, the request can be made orally. Many ALJs even accept continuance requests over the telephone. But however the request is made, counsel should be prepared to support that request as fully as if it were a written motion.

For detailed discussion of continuances, see Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.13

§ 473D.13 Prehearing Conferences

[1] Purpose of Prehearing Conference

On the motion of a party or by order of an ALJ, the ALJ may hold a prehearing conference [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*]. This conference may deal with any matter that will promote the orderly and prompt conduct of the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(12)*]. In practice, the purposes of the prehearing conference include the following:

- To insure that the ALJ understands all of the issues to be presented at the hearing.
- To insure that all documents are identified and prepared.
- To insure that all witnesses are identified to each party.
- To promote fairness and avoid the gamesmanship aspect of adversary proceedings.
- To explore settlement possibilities.
- To explore the possibilities of using alternative dispute resolution

procedure, and informal hearing procedures.

The prehearing conference is an opportunity for both counsels to discuss settlement possibilities, or to resolve evidentiary issues and to clarify legal issues [*Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)*]. The prehearing conference also affords counsel for both parties a unique opportunity to know what the adversary is going to present at trial [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(9)* (exchange of witness lists and exhibits and documents to be offered in evidence at the hearing)]. On occasion, this knowledge promotes settlements. For further discussion of settlement tactics, see *§ 473D.15*. For further discussion of prehearing conferences, including a complete list of the matters that may be considered at a prehearing conference, see Chapter 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

[2] Preparation for Prehearing Conference

At the prehearing conference, the ALJ typically requires all parties to be prepared to present all of the documentary evidence available, to identify witnesses, and to discuss the issues involved in the hearing. Counsel should come to the prehearing conference prepared as if he or she were going to the hearing [*see § 473D.14*]. Counsel's preparations for the conference should include at least the following:

- All documents should be indexed in the order of presentation planned for the hearing.

- All legal arguments should be fully briefed with trial briefs on issues of evidence as well as any other matters of law that will come before the judge at the hearing.

- Counsel should be generally prepared to argue his or her position on every significant issue of law or fact.

- If objections are contemplated at hearing, counsel should be ready to make those objections at the prehearing conference.

- A trial brief should be prepared to support counsel's arguments at the prehearing conference.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.14

§ 473D.14 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Reviewing the Charging Document

Preparation is the key to winning, and preparation begins with a thorough review of the accusation or other charging document. Only by a meticulous review of each and every fact on which the charges are based and a similar review of the elements of the cause of action alleged can counsel begin to prepare for hearing.

For every fact essential to each allegation, counsel should do the following:

- Determine how that fact will be proved.
- Determine whether there is sufficient evidence to prove the fact.
- Determine whether there is any basis for objection to the evidence.
- Determine whether any other facts potentially disprove or mitigate the fact alleged.

Only by a detailed review like that described above will counsel be able to determine whether the conduct alleged falls within the jurisdiction of the complainant agency and whether any legal defenses exist to the facts, if proved.

[2] Investigation

After a careful review of the administrative agency's charging documents [*see [1], above*], counsel should tenaciously investigate every fact at issue. The key is to take nothing for granted. For purposes of investigation, counsel should assume that every fact alleged in the charging document is or may be false. Simply because a charging document is filed by a state agency or by the attorney general's office does not mean that the facts have been verified independently by counsel for the agency. Every witness, every potential witness, and every document should be scrutinized thoroughly.

The allegations of counsel's own client should be regarded, privately, with the same skepticism and subjected to a scrutiny equally rigorous.

[3] Use of Experts

If the preparation or presentation of the case calls for an expert, get the best expert you can afford. Administrative cases often require experts, especially when a professional is accused of failing to conform to the standards of the profession. Charges of this kind may be leveled at any licensed professional, including a neurosurgeon [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 2234* (physicians and surgeons may be disciplined for unprofessional conduct, including negligence and incompetence); *see* also Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline*], a pest control operator [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 8642, 8643* (negligence as basis for disciplinary action against pest control operator)], or an engineer [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6775(b)* (board may discipline licensed engineer for negligence or incompetence)]. The standards by which the malpractice of these different professionals is determined will vary from agency to agency. The elucidation of these standards frequently requires the testimony or advice of experts.

Use of the best expert available is important, because a capable and persuasive expert can educate the ALJ into understanding and accepting respondent's view of the issue. The quality of expert assistance also offers counsel a possible advantage over the agency, because agencies often do not retain experts of unimpeachable quality. Counsel cannot afford to throw away this potential advantage by simply putting up one expert for every agency expert. Counsel must "out-expert" the agency by using only well qualified experts. If the problem involves a complicated roof construction project, counsel should seek out the most prominent roof expert in the state rather than employing any contractor who happens to have a license to build roofs. This advice may seem self-evident, but failure to get truly expert advice and testimony on technical issues is a frequent and costly mistake.

[4] Organization of Documents

Many administrative cases involve extensive documentation. For example, appeals from Medi-Cal audits [*see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14170* (audit of Medi-Cal payments), *14171* (administrative appeal of Medi-Cal audits)] involve large numbers of documents that must be categorized and presented to the ALJ in an organized, readable fashion. Hospital charts and physicians' or dentists' records can also be lengthy and complicated. Counsel must make certain to organize these documents for presentation to the ALJ so that all of the following are true:

- The documents are readable and make sense in themselves.
- The documents are labeled and organized so that each document is clearly related to the applicable charge or defense.
- The documents are understandable in the context of the case.

No matter how thorough the prepared documentation is and no matter how completely it supports respondent's case, all documentation is useless unless the ALJ can read it and understand it. To insure that the documents do make a clear and persuasive presentation, counsel must organize them into a cohesive package, then index and tabulate the documents so that the ALJ can review them with a minimum of effort. This organizational process will also help counsel to determine which documents are relevant and which support counsel's position.

[5] Preparation of Witnesses

[a] Taking Statements

It seems obvious that witnesses need to be prepared before they testify, but it is surprising how many witnesses are put on the stand without any preparation. The first issue in witness preparation is whether to take a formal statement from

that witness. Written statements of witnesses are discoverable [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(c)*], but counsel's notes on an interview are attorney work product and are protected from discovery [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)*; *see § 473D.11[3][d]*]. The question counsel must determine for each witness is whether it is more important to preserve the testimony of that witness against possible failures of recollection by taking a signed statement or to guard that witness's testimony from discovery by recording it only in the form of interview notes. In either event, counsel should interview every witness who may be called to testify.

For further discussion see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[b] Rehearsal of Witness

To insure that the witness is truly prepared, counsel should rehearse the witness's testimony and the expected cross-examination. This rehearsal will give the witness confidence and prepare the witness for what will happen during the course of the testimony. At the hearing, the witness's character may be attacked, and his or her credibility may be questioned. Failure to prepare the witness for this cross-examination is unfair to the witness, and can be costly for the client. Counsel should test the witness's observations or opinions and challenge his or her assumptions. The bases for opinions of expert witnesses need to be meticulously examined. Alerting a witness to his or her weaknesses is essential to preparation of the witness.

[6] Preparation of Client

[a] Education of Client

Counsel should inform the client how the hearing will be conducted and what may happen during the proceedings. The client should be fully informed on all facts and issues pertinent to the hearing. The client must understand the weaknesses and strengths of his or her case. For example, if the client is a physician facing discipline for negligence or incompetence [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 2234* (unprofessional conduct); *see also* Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline*], the client must become an expert in all of the medical procedures at issue. Do not assume that the client is an expert on any given medical issue merely because the client is a licensed physician. Counsel should retain consultants who are recognized experts to school the client, if necessary. The client should consult and study authoritative medical textbooks. The client should even be tested by the consultants or by counsel on all the relevant medical issues. The goal is to instill confidence in the client as well as to educate the client.

On the importance of retaining the best experts available, see *[3], above*.

[b] Rehearsal of Client

After the client has been educated, he or she should be rehearsed. The client must know what questions counsel will ask on direct examination and must rehearse answering those questions. Tone of voice, posture, and manner of speaking, as well as the content of the answer, all determine the credibility of the client. Rehearsal of cross-examination is even more important. Here, counsel must anticipate the questions that opposing counsel will ask. Counsel must help the client learn how to answer the tough questions. Of course, the best advice is to tell the truth, but how the truth is told sometimes makes the difference. For example, whether the client should merely answer a question as briefly as possible or should embellish the answer with explanations is a tactical decision counsel should make *in advance* on every point that can be anticipated.

[7] Use of Demonstrative Evidence

Demonstrative evidence, also known as "real evidence," is evidence other than testimony that is addressed directly to the senses; physical objects, such as models, charts, photographs, clothing, and weapons, are examples [*see Black's Law Dictionary* (5th ed., 1979), p. 389].

Demonstrative evidence is admissible, and counsel should always consider using it [*see Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (relevant evidence admissible); *Evid. Code § 140* ("evidence" includes material objects and other things presented to the senses offered to prove the existence or nonexistence of a fact)]. Charts and graphs to explain complicated financial issues, diagrams to portray the scene of a significant incident, or anatomical exhibits to clarify medical issues can be crucial to the success of counsel's case. Frequently, when an attractively done chart is used, the ALJ will focus on the chart throughout the testimony. If counsel's point is evident from the chart, counsel is getting that point across visually as well as verbally.

Counsel should also consider using slide shows. For example, in a hearing involving medical malpractice, a slide presentation can be used to demonstrate that the physician/client is an expert on the medical procedure in question. The client can act as a teacher, and if the performance effectively demonstrates the client's knowledge, it can help persuade the ALJ that the client did not commit malpractice. A slide show is also an excellent technique to clarify the medical issues by visualization. The value of demonstrative evidence in any case involving complex issues cannot be underestimated.

For discussion of evidentiary rules in administrative hearings, see Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

[8] Trial Briefs

Preparing trial briefs on the legal issues involved in the hearing is important, not only because it allows counsel to prepare for the relevant legal issues in advance of the hearing, but also because the briefs may assist the ALJ in resolving those issues. It is important that trial briefs be ready and be presented at the outset of the hearing. Resolving legal issues at this early stage may eliminate the need for some testimony or dictate the presentation of evidence during the hearing. Also, a well-researched trial brief may favorably impress the ALJ.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceAdmissibilityEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.15

§ 473D.15 Settlements

[1] Desirability of Settlement

Settlement is often desirable to reduce the expense of a hearing and to ensure the result. Early settlement can also preclude or minimize the damaging notoriety that the investigation, charges, and hearing may produce. Because settlement talks are almost always appropriate, the prehearing conference may be used for this purpose [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(1)* (permissible matters in rehearing conference include exploration of settlement possibilities), and discussion in *§ 473D.13*]. For further discussion of settlement procedures under the APA, see Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .

[2] Settlement Conferences

Gov. Code § 11511.7 authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agencies subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). The administrative law judge may order the parties to attend and participate in a settlement conference. The administrative law judge shall set the time and place for the settlement conference, and shall give reasonable written notice to all parties [*Gov. Code § 11511.7(a)*]. Under this section, settlement conferences may, but are not required to, be separate from the prehearing conference at which exploration of settlement issues may occur. Attendance and participation at the settlement conference is mandatory. Communications made in settlement negotiations are protected under *Gov. Code § 11415.60*[25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 150 (1995)].

Gov. Code § 11415.60 allows agencies to make decisions by settlement. See Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* , for a fuller discussion of this provision. Because the settlement practices and procedures of agencies that are not subject to Chapter 5 of the APA vary, counsel should consult the administrative agency to determine the particular practices employed and settlement resources available.

[3] Evaluating an Administrative Case

As in civil actions, counsel must properly evaluate the case by making an objective assessment of the relevant strengths and weaknesses of the positions of both sides. A skeptical evaluation of all factual allegations and a realistic appraisal of

the legal issues should give counsel a reasonable idea of the probabilities of success or failure.

[4] Tactical Considerations in Communicating With Agency Counsel

The tactical issue in discussing settlement with agency counsel is always how much of the case to reveal. Although both sides will reveal a great deal during prehearing discovery, counsel may still hesitate to disclose additional information. For example, because APA does not provide for the use of depositions for discovery purposes, although depositions may be used to obtain testimony of an unavailable witness [*see Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 478-479, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65* (*Gov. Code § 11511* provides for depositions not for discovery, but to secure evidence for use at the hearing); *see also* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* , and discussion in *§ 473D.11[3][f]*], agency counsel has no way of discovering the testimony of respondent's experts unless they have prepared written statements outlining their expected testimony [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6(c)* (statements of witnesses are discoverable)]. In order to settle a case, counsel may need to reveal expert testimony and any other evidence he or she intends to produce. If counsel is certain that the agency intends to try the matter, however, he or she should not gratuitously inform the opponent of the evidence and testimony that will be produced at hearing.

[5] Authority to Settle

In many cases, agency counsel will not have the ultimate authority to settle. In particular, settlement stipulations in cases involving license discipline must be approved by a vote of the licensing board [*Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Board of Medical Examiners (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 115, 192 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . Usually, however, agency counsel and agency staff have a good idea of what the board will approve, and agreed-on stipulations are rarely disapproved.

Gov. Code § 11511.7 authorizes settlement conferences to be held for agency adjudications conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). *Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)* also provides that an agency may formulate and issue a decision by settlement, pursuant to an agreement of the parties, without conducting an adjudicative proceeding. Subject to *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)*, the settlement may be on any terms the parties determine are appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)* provides, in relevant part, that a settlement is subject to any necessary agency approval [*Gov. Code § 11415.60(c)*; *see* Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* , for a fuller discussion of settlement]. *Gov. Code § 11415.60* is subject to a specific statute to the contrary governing the matter [*see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)]. These provisions codify the rule in the *Rich Vision* case and recognize that in some instances other statutes provide for agency approval of a settlement [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 150 (1995)].

See Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , for further discussion of settlement authority.

As a practical matter, most agency counsel are willing to settle cases and will be amenable to reasoned discussions. The following are among the factors that may influence agency willingness to settle:

- The agency's belief in the strength of its case.
- The seriousness of the alleged violation.
- The agency's intent to either obtain compliance or impose penalties.
- The proximity of the hearing.

Sometimes, agency counsel is reluctant to settle due to unrealistic notions regarding the strength of the agency's case. In that situation, counsel must try to educate opposing counsel without antagonizing him or her, and without revealing all of counsel's anticipated hearing tactics.

[6] Creative Settlement Options

A great variety of settlement options exist in administrative cases. For example, in administrative professional disciplinary actions, the options are far broader than simple suspension of the professional license. Appropriate solutions could include the following:

- Expanded continuing education [*see, e.g., 16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1773(a)(4), (b)(1)* (probation conditions for pharmacist)].

- Community service time [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2228(d)* (community service as probation option for physicians); *see also* Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline*].

- Entry into drug or alcohol diversion programs [*see, e.g.,* Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1357-1357.8 (diversion program for physicians); for discussion of the regulation of physicians, *see also* Ch.414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline*].

- Monitoring of the client's professional practice [*see, e.g., 16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1773(a)(3), (b)(4)* (probation conditions for pharmacist)].

- Fiscal or accounting controls.

Many other solutions may be available depending on the charges and the facts of the case. Respondent's counsel may ask the agency counsel about these potential solutions. Agency counsel are often willing to cooperate in developing solutions that fit the problem.

[7] Stipulating for Settlement

[a] Necessity for Writing

All settlements should be reduced to writing. The language of the settlement document is critical because it will define the duties and obligations of both parties during the post-settlement stage [*see [7], below*]. Frequently, settlements result in the imposition of probation in license discipline cases. The stipulation generally provides that violating the terms of probation is in and of itself a cause for disciplinary action. Therefore, each and every proposed term and condition of probation must be carefully scrutinized to check that respondent can comply with the terms, that the terms are reasonable, and that the language of the stipulation expresses the terms clearly. For example, if continuing education is a requirement of probation, clarify whether a continuing education must be approved in advance by the agency or what courses will be acceptable, and whether the respondent will be required to take a test on the subject matter of the continuing education course [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2228(a)* (additional professional training and passing examination as probation option for physicians); *see also* Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline*].

[b] Consent of Client

Because of the serious consequences to the client that may occur following settlement with the agency, counsel must explain the full ramifications of any settlement in detail to the client before the client can truly be considered to have given an informed consent to the settlement. For example, possible ramifications of settlement might include the following:

- Further disciplinary action by a hospital in a medical malpractice case.

- The cancellation of professional liability insurance.

- Newspaper or television publicity.

- Charges brought by other licensing agencies, if the client has multiple professional licenses.

- Action by state Medi-Cal authorities [*see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14000-14196* (the Medi-Cal Act)], or by federal Medicaid [*see 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396-1396s* (Medicaid provisions)] and Medicare [*see 42 U.S.C. §§ 1395-1395ccc* (Medicare provisions)] authorities.

- Disciplinary actions by professional societies or trade associations of which the client is a member.

- Permanent loss of clients or business during a suspension period.

Therefore, counsel should review the written stipulation with the client line by line, to ensure that he or she understands and agrees to each and every term of the stipulation.

[8] Post-Settlement Considerations

As discussed in *[7][a], above*, a violation of a settlement stipulation is often a violation of the respondent's probation, and will probably lead to disciplinary action. Counsel must therefore thoroughly advise the client of what the settlement terms require during the post-settlement period. For example, if approval of continuing education or agreements or arrangements with third parties is part of the settlement, counsel must impress on the client the importance of requesting approval in a timely fashion. If license suspension is a term of the settlement, counsel must ensure that the client understands what suspension really means so that there is not even the appearance of impropriety during the suspension period [*see, e.g., 16 Cal. Code Reg. § 1772* (suspended pharmacist must not enter any pharmacy prescription area or engage in any pharmacy-related service)]. If monetary payments are a term of the settlement, counsel must stress the importance of making those payments on time. Counsel should continue to advise the client through the period of the settlement, because counsel probably understands the terms and obligations incurred in the settlement better than anyone else. Proper performance of settlement obligations is absolutely necessary if the client is to avoid further difficulties with the agency.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Respondent's Prehearing Preparation

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473D.16-473D.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473D.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.20

§ 473D.20 Introduction to Prehearing Tactics and Procedures

Many practitioners make the mistake of treating the notice of defense [*see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*] and prehearing discovery [*see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*] as the beginning and end of the prehearing phase of a professional or vocational license discipline case. There are, however, prehearing tactics and procedures that can be used during this phase to control the scope and direction of a case or to otherwise secure an advantage. Although most of the tactics discussed in this chapter are used by counsel for the administrative agency, it is important for counsel for the responding licensee or registrant to be aware of these tactics.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesRevocation & SuspensionLegal EthicsSanctionsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.21

§ 473D.21 Prehearing Injunctions and Restraining Orders

[1] Overview

To understand the role of prehearing injunctions and restraining orders in agency prehearing practice, the following five questions should be considered:

- Who may seek injunctive relief or a restraining order against a licensee? The answer depends on the statute that is the basis for the equitable relief. Some statutes allow the licensing agency itself to file the appropriate petition with the court [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(a)* (authorization for superior court issuance of injunction on petition filed by board)], while other statutes may also allow the petition to be filed by either the attorney general or the local district attorney [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 3430* (authorization for superior court issuance of injunction on petition filed by Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Committee, attorney general, or county district attorney)].

- What relief can be granted by the court? Again, the answer depends on the statute that authorizes the equitable relief. Some statutes allow for injunctive relief, restraining orders, or both [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.5(a)* (injunction, other appropriate restraining order), *125.7* (temporary restraining order, other appropriate order)]. Other statutes allow for orders of restitution to persons injured as a result of the licensee's acts and omissions, and even reimbursement to the petitioning agency for expenses incurred in the investigation relating to the petition [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(b)* (restitution), *§ 125.5(c)* (reimbursement to board for expenses)]. Significantly, most of these remedies are nonexclusive, and counsel for the licensee may be faced with multiple grounds for equitable relief in the same petition [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(d)* (remedy provided by *§ 125.5* "shall be in addition to, and not a limitation on," authority provided in any other Bus. & Prof. Code section)].

- When will a licensing agency seek equitable relief? A licensing agency is most likely to seek injunctive relief against a licensee when: (a) the prohibited acts or omissions are of relatively recent origin; (b) the prohibited acts or omissions will continue unless judicially restrained; (c) the prohibited

acts or omissions possibly constitute a threat to the public health, safety, or welfare; and (d) enough evidence has been gathered to sustain the allegations at an administrative hearing.

- Where will an agency file a petition for injunctive relief against a licensee? Again, this answer depends on the statute that constitutes the basis for the relief sought. For example, some statutes require the petition to be filed in the superior court for the county where the acts or omissions occurred [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(a), (b)*], while others require the petition to be filed in the superior court in the county of the licensee's place of business or residence [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 7028.3* (contractor's license law)].

- Why will a licensing agency seek this form of relief? Most administrative agencies do not routinely seek equitable relief against licensees before an administrative disciplinary hearing. This relief is usually sought when the licensee's acts or omissions under the color of the license constitute an ongoing or impending threat to the public health, safety, and welfare, or when the prohibited acts will continue unless enjoined or restrained by a court [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8(a)*].

The statutes authorizing injunctive relief discussed in the sections below are Business and Professions Code statutes that generally tie in with administrative actions. Other statutes exist in the Business and Professions Code that authorize injunctive relief, but that do not necessarily tie in with administrative disciplinary actions against a licensee. Sections not related to administrative discipline are not within the scope of this chapter.

[2] Injunctions Against Violations of Statutes Administered by Boards Within Department of Consumer Affairs

[a] General Requirements

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5 authorizes the issuance of injunctions or other appropriate restraining orders against persons who have engaged or are about to engage in acts constituting violations of the statutes or regulations administered or enforced by any board within the Department of Consumer Affairs. The term "board" includes a commission, bureau, division, agency, and a medical quality review committee [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(a)*]. Jurisdiction to issue the relief is vested in the superior court for the county in which the violation occurs or is about to occur. The petition is filed by the administrative agency charged with enforcing the statute in question, with the approval of the director of the Department of Consumer Affairs. Proceedings under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*, which relate to injunctive relief [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(a)*]. See Ch. 303, *Injunctions* , for detailed discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief in civil actions.

[b] Restitution to Victims and Reimbursement of Agency

In addition to authorizing the issuance of injunctive or other appropriate relief, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* further authorizes the appropriate superior court to issue orders as follows:

- For any person who has violated the statutes or regulations administered or enforced by any board within the Department of Consumer Affairs, to make restitution to persons injured as a result of the violation. The court may only order this relief, however, if the board files a petition with approval of the director of the Department of Consumer Affairs seeking this relief [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(b)*].

- For a person subject to an injunction or restraining order [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(a)*], or a person required to make restitution [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(b)*], to reimburse the petitioning board for expenses incurred by the board in the investigation relating to the petition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(c)*].

Also, licensing boards may request administrative law judges in disciplinary proceedings to order a licensee found to have committed a violation of the licensing act to pay a sum not to exceed the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of the case [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3(a)*].

[c] Remedy Not Exclusive

The remedy provided by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* is not exclusive. The remedy operates as an addition to, rather than a limitation on, other statutes in the Business and Professions Code that authorize injunctive relief or other appropriate restraining orders [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5(d)*; *see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*].

[d] Use in Conjunction With Other Statutes Authorizing Injunctive Relief

Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* may be used alone, the statute is more commonly used in tandem with the portion of an agency's statutes that specifically authorize injunctive relief or restraining orders for violating that agency's laws or regulations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* is commonly used on its own when an agency seeks to curtail unlicensed activity on the part of an individual who is not licensed with, or registered by, the agency in question; however, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* does not authorize the court to restrain the licensee from engaging in a profession for which he or she is licensed. Rather, it authorizes the court to enjoin or restrain the respondent from violating the licensing laws in question [*cf. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.5* and *125.7*].

[3] Orders Restraining Licensees From Practicing Healing Arts

[a] General Requirements

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7 authorizes a court, on petition filed by the board, to issue temporary restraining orders (TROs), or other appropriate orders to restrain a licensee from engaging in all or any part of the business or profession for which he or she is licensed. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* applies to the boards in the Department of Consumer Affairs that regulate the healing arts professions, including the Chiropractic and Osteopathic Boards [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 500-4998*]. The remedies of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* are in addition to those set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*].

Jurisdiction is vested in the superior court for the county in which the licensee has engaged, or is about to engage, in acts or omissions constituting violations of the appropriate licensing statutes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*]. Proceedings under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* are governed by the Code of Civil Procedure chapter relating to injunctive relief [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*], unless otherwise specifically stated in the statute [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(c)*]. In contrast to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5*, the petition seeking relief does not require the approval of the director of the Department of Consumer Affairs; however, the petition must be accompanied by supporting affidavit(s) and a memorandum of points and authorities [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*; *see [b], below*].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7 is most commonly used by agencies against healing arts practitioners who have committed acts or omissions constituting gross negligence, incompetence, or repeated negligent acts, and who give the appearance that they will continue to commit such acts or omissions unless prevented from practicing as authorized by their license or certificate. Because of the extreme nature of this remedy, the use of the remedy is reserved for instances in which the public is palpably at risk. Further, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* is sometimes used in conjunction with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* if the board is seeking reimbursement of investigative expenses and/or restitution to persons injured as a result of the licensee's violations of the statutes governing his or her licensed activities.

[b] Supporting Affidavits and Memorandum of Points and Authorities

A petition for relief under *Bus. & Prof. § 125.7* must be accompanied by appropriate supporting affidavit(s) and a

memorandum of points and authorities. The supporting affidavits must show that the licensee has engaged in or is about to engage in acts or omissions constituting a violation of the appropriate regulatory statutes. If the court is satisfied that the continued licensed activity of the licensee will endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, the court may issue an order temporarily restraining the licensee's licensed activity [*Bus. & Prof. § 125.7(a)*]. Although the statute specifies that the affidavits themselves must show the commission or impending commission of the proscribed acts or omissions, the statute does not state whether the affidavit must also show the threat to the public health, safety, or welfare. Because the courts almost invariably decide this type of case on the affidavits alone, the better practice is to include both elements in the affidavit(s). The superior court may not issue a TRO, or any other appropriate order, however, without notice to the licensee unless it appears from the facts shown in the supporting affidavit(s) that serious injury would result to the public before the matter could be heard on notice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(b)*].

For forms of memoranda for use supporting a petition for a TRO, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender); see also Ch. 303, *Injunctions* , for discussion and forms relating to TRO's generally.

[c] Issuance of Temporary Restraining Order (TRO)

When a superior court issues a TRO pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*, several time clocks are set in motion. Within a time period to be allowed by the court, but in any event no more than 30 days after the issuance of the TRO, the petitioning board must file an accusation against the respondent licensee pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11503* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(d)*]. The accusation must be served on the licensee pursuant to the APA [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(d)*; *see Gov. Code § 11505*; *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*]. Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(d)* does not specify whether the accusation must be served within the designated period, this apparent ambiguity is seldom a problem, inasmuch as the evidence supporting the petition is generally the same evidence that supports the accusation. Thus, because the board's case is usually completed or nearing completion when the petition is filed, it is not uncommon for the accusation to be prepared contemporaneously with the petition for temporary restraining order, and to be submitted as an attachment to the petition.

Once the accusation is filed and served, the licensee must be accorded all the rights and privileges of the formal hearing provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*). If a licensee respondent requests a hearing on the accusation, however, the board must provide the licensee with a hearing within 30 days of the date of request. Further, a decision must be rendered by the board within 15 days of the date the decision is received from the administrative law judge. If the board fails to provide the licensee with a timely hearing or decision, the court may nullify the previously issued restraining order. [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(d)*]. A restraining order issued pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* is dissolved by operation of law when the board's decision becomes subject to judicial review pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandamus) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7(d)*; *see Gov. Code § 11523*; *see also* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* et seq., for detailed discussion of judicial review].

[4] Orders Restraining Licensees From Practicing Professions Other Than Healing Arts

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8 authorizes a court, on petition filed by the board, to issue TROs, or other appropriate orders to restrain a licensee from engaging in all or any part of the business or profession for which he or she is licensed. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* applies to those boards in the Department of Consumer Affairs that regulate the professions and vocations other than the healing arts; specifically, the boards regulating accountants, attorneys, architects, advertisers, contractors, collection agencies [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 5000-9998.8*], boxin wrestling, martial arts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 18600-18880*], and the home furnishings industry [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 19000-19214*]. There are numerous professions and vocations in which an unethical or incompetent licensee can so endanger the public health, safety, and welfare that the licensee must be immediately restrained, pending a disciplinary hearing to revoke the license or registration. For example, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* is commonly used by the Bureau of Automotive Repair to temporarily restrain licensees who issue large numbers of certificates of compliance to vehicles that do not actually comply with the applicable pollution control standards.

The remedies of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* are in addition to those set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.5* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8*]. Jurisdiction is vested with the superior court for the county in which the licensee has engaged, or is about to engage, in acts or omissions constituting violations of the appropriate licensing statutes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8*]. The proceedings under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* are governed by the Code of Civil Procedure chapter relating to injunctive relief (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8(c)*]. The procedures under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* are virtually identical to those of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*, and the above discussion of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7* is generally applicable to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.8* [*see [3], above*].

[5] Professional and Vocational Licensing Statutes Authorizing Injunctive Relief

Many additional statutes in the Business and Professions Code relate directly to injunctions or restraining orders for violations of specific professional or vocational licensing statutes. Although such professional and vocational licensing statutes can generally be used independently, they are nonexclusive remedies and are routinely used in conjunction with *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.5, 125.7* or *125.8* [*see [2]-[4], above*].

Virtually all of the specific professional and vocational licensing statutes that authorize the granting of injunctive relief require that any proceedings under the applicable section be governed by the Code of Civil Procedure chapter relating to injunctive relief [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*]. Some of these sections also specify that a petition for injunctive relief need not allege facts showing or attempting to show a lack of an adequate remedy at law or irreparable injury [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 9851* (relating to the Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair)]. Even in the absence of a statutory waiver of this showing, however, there is essentially a de facto presumption of inadequate remedy or irreparable injury to the public if violations of professional or vocational statutes are allowed to continue unabated. For example, if a legislative body has authorized an injunctive remedy in the context of a violation of a professional or vocational statute, the Legislature has determined as a matter of law that irreparable injury attends a violation of the statute [*Porter v. Fiske (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 332, 338, 171 P.2d 971]* . Similarly, this rationale applies to the less drastic relief afforded by a TRO, which accomplishes the same purpose as an injunction, but for a more limited time [*Paul v. Wadler (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 615, 625, 26 Cal. Rptr. 341* ; *see § 473D.22*].

Most of the professional and vocational licensing statutes that authorize injunctive relief empower the court to enjoin violations of the specific licensing act of which the statute is a part. Some of the licensing statutes authorizing injunctive relief go further, and also empower the court to issue TROs that actually restrain the licensee from engaging in the specified profession or vocation [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 7028.3* (contractors' licenses)]. The various statutes also differ as to who is authorized to petition for injunctive relief. Most statutes authorize either the agency itself or the executive officer of the agency to seek the injunctive relief [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 5122*]. Other statutes also authorize the attorney general or the district attorney of the county where the violations took place to seek the specified injunctive relief [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 3430* (hearing aid dispensers)].

Some statutes authorize more than one licensing agency to seek injunctive relief. For example, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2545* authorizes the Board of Optometry, the Division of Allied Health Professions of the Medical Board of California, and the Osteopathic Medical Board of California, as well as the attorney general's office, and the district attorney's office in the county where the violation took place, to seek injunctive relief and restraining orders against licensees who violate the statutory requirements. Further, some licensing acts relating to healing arts allow 10 or more individuals who are licensed under a specific act to petition to enjoin or restrain someone similarly licensed from violating their common licensing act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 3094* (optometry)]. Because only a licensing agency is empowered to bring disciplinary action against a licensee, however, in the event that an injunction is granted based on a petition brought by 10 or more licensees against a fellow licensee, an undertaking is generally required pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 529* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 529* (undertaking, justification of sureties); *see* Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertaking*]. Public entities or officers are exempt from this undertaking requirement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.220* (public entities exempt from bond requirements in actions or proceedings)].

[6] Citation Enforcement System

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.9 authorizes most licensing agencies within the Department of Consumer Affairs to establish by regulation a citation enforcement system which allows the agency to issue to a licensee a citation containing an order of abatement or an order to pay an administrative fine assessed by the agency when the licensee has violated the relevant licensing act or related agency regulations [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.9(a)*]. Order of abatement issued under the citation system are an administrative alternative to a court injunction. Licensees who wish to contest a citation can request a hearing that will be held under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.9(b)(4)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsTemporary Restraining OrdersGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.22

§ 473D.22 Seeking Prehearing Injunctive Relief

A petition to a superior court for injunctive relief and/or a restraining order before an administrative hearing regarding professional or vocational licensing matters should be reserved for situations in which it is apparent that the licensee's prohibited conduct will continue unabated unless enjoined or restrained by the court. Once the determination is made to draft and file the petition, several factors must be considered, as follows:

- Whether the petition is being filed in the proper superior court. Some statutes require the petition to be filed in the superior court for the county in which a licensee has committed, or is about to commit, the act or omission that constitutes a violation of the statutes governing his or her licensed activities [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.5, 125.7, 125.8*]. Other statutes may allow more latitude, and may also authorize the filing of the petition in the superior court for the county in which the licensee maintains a place of business or resides [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 7028.3* (contractor's license law)].

- Whether the investigation of the facts necessary to support the imposition of discipline against the licensee has been completed. The facts that support the imposition of discipline that will be alleged in the accusation are the same facts that are necessary to support the granting of the petition for prehearing injunctive relief or restraining order.

- Whether the contents of the petition are sufficient for the court to grant the relief.

A grant of equitable relief requires more than the mere recitation in the petition of the facts tending to show violations of a licensing law. Such a petition rises or falls on the basis of the supporting affidavits. The most helpful affidavits are those that educate the court by setting forth acts illustrating violation or threatened violation of a licensing law, blending these facts into the specific statute that has been or is about to be violated. If appropriate, the affidavit should illustrate how the violation constitutes a threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. For example, in one case in the author's experience, a successful petition for a TRO against an automotive repair dealer who was violating the smog check statutes was supported by affidavits of Bureau of Automotive Repair program representatives who had examined certain noncomplying vehicles that were falsely certified by the respondent. The affiants: (1) stated the facts

surrounding their inspections of several vehicles, noting the instances in which the emission control devices were missing from the vehicles, (2) identified the pollutants that each device would control were it in place, and the statutory and regulatory violations committed by the licensee for certifying a vehicle lacking the required emission control devices, and (3) concluded with their opinions that the escape of the various pollutants into the atmosphere as a result of the required devices being missing constituted a danger to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. These affidavits provided the judge with a preview of the complainant's case against the licensee at the administrative hearing and showed a reasonable probability that the licensing agency would prevail on the merits at the administrative hearing.

When a public agency seeks to enjoin a violation of a statute specifically providing for injunctive relief, a rebuttable presumption arises that the potential harm to the public outweighs the potential harm to the defendant when the agency establishes that it is reasonably probable that the agency will prevail on the merits. The court must evaluate the relative actual harm to the parties only if the defendant shows that he or she will suffer grave or irreparable harm from issuance of a preliminary injunction. Once the defendant has made such a showing, an injunction will issue only if, after considering the certainty of the outcome of the merits and the consequences to each party of granting or denying an injunction, the court determines that an injunction is proper. An injunction may legitimately issue, however, if it is fairly clear that the agency will prevail on the merits, even though the agency is unable to prevail in the balancing of probable harm, as long as the defendant's probable harm does not outweigh the harm likely to result from the denial of an injunction [*IT Corp. v. County of Imperial (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 63, 73, 196 Cal. Rptr. 715, 672 P.2d 121]* .

For a licensing agency to establish a reasonable probability that it will prevail on the merits, it is helpful to the agency to have the accusation prepared at the time the petition is filed, with the accusation appended to the petition as an exhibit. The court is then informed as to the statutory violations alleged in the accusation and is able evaluate whether the evidence, as articulated in the affidavits, supports these allegations. Including the accusation as an exhibit is particularly helpful when the agency is seeking injunctive relief or a restraining order pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.7* or *125.8*, because it shows the court that the agency is prepared to give the licensee a hearing on the matters alleged in the accusation within the time frames set forth in those statutes [*see § 473D.21[3], [4], above*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsTemporary Restraining OrdersGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.23

§ 473D.23 Opposing Petitions for Prehearing Injunctive Relief

Counsel for the licensee respondent has a difficult task in opposing a proceeding to enjoin or restrain the client's licensed activities before an administrative disciplinary hearing. The licensing agency has almost always completed its investigation leading up to the filing of disciplinary action against the licensee, and the facts gathered during the investigation are set forth in support of the petition. Counsel for the licensee must counter this advantage on short notice, with a limited chance to conduct an independent investigation of the facts. Further, if the petition is granted and the accusation is served immediately thereafter, counsel for the licensee may have only 45 days or less to prepare for the hearing.

Counsel for the licensee, however, may be able to counter the licensing agency's tactical advantage. Ideally, the licensee will have knowledge of the impending proceeding during the course of the investigation, and will immediately inform counsel. Once counsel learns of the investigation, counsel should contact the licensing agency to attempt to establish the exact nature of the investigation and to see if the matter can somehow be resolved. If it appears that the client is in fact violating the agency's regulatory statutes, counsel should advise the client to comply with the regulatory statutes. Once the nature of the investigation is determined, counsel should start to prepare a defense immediately and should try to anticipate whether the alleged violations are of such a nature that the licensing agency may attempt to secure prehearing injunctive relief or a restraining order against his or her client.

In practice, attorneys routinely discover the nature of the violations that their clients have allegedly committed when the client presents counsel with a copy of the petition for injunctive relief. In this situation, because the courts typically decide these cases on the basis of the affidavits and witnesses are seldom permitted to testify [*see § 473D.25*], counsel should immediately focus on securing information for the preparation of counter-affidavits. The affidavits should be geared toward showing the court that it is not reasonably probable that the licensing agency will prevail on the merits at the administrative hearing. If the licensee respondent is unable to make this showing, the affidavits should attempt to demonstrate to the court that the potential harm to the defendant in granting the equitable relief so outweighs any potential harm to the public that no injunction should issue even though the agency is likely to prevail on the merits [*see IT Corp. v. County of Imperial (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 63, 73, 196 Cal. Rptr. 715, 672 P.2d 121]* . Counsel should also consider presenting mitigating evidence by affidavit that tends to show that the alleged violations will not continue.

Finally, if the case against the licensee seems particularly compelling, counsel should consider seeking a stipulation from the petitioner under which the licensee would agree to curtail certain licensed activities pending a final decision in the administrative matter. For example, a physician who practices obstetrics and gynecology might stipulate that he or she would practice no obstetrics, the source of the alleged violations, in return for being allowed to practice gynecology until a final decision and order was issued following the administrative hearing. Similarly, an automotive repair dealer might stipulate that no smog inspections, the source of the alleged violations, would be performed until a final decision and order was issued following an administrative hearing, in return for being allowed to conduct business as an automotive repair dealer.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.24

§ 473D.24 Prehearing Termination of Licensee's Telephone Service

[1] When to Seek Termination

When a licensee's telephone is used to violate or assist in violating the law, the licensing agency, under certain circumstances, may petition the superior court for a finding of probable cause to terminate the licensee's telephone service. Although the licensing agency may seek this action against the licensee independent of any license discipline proceeding, procedures for terminating a licensee's telephone service are usually coupled with a disciplinary action against the licensee. An agency's action to terminate a licensee's telephone service almost always occurs prior to an administrative disciplinary hearing. Because some professions and vocations licensed or regulated by the state, such as collection agencies, repossessors, and television and appliance repair services, are particularly telephone intensive, the licensed activities may be severely curtailed by terminating telephone service [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 149* (statutory authority for designated agencies to seek termination of telephone service when unlicensed persons perform services requiring license from designated agency)].

[2] Authority for Termination

The authority for court-ordered termination of telephone service is found in Public Utilities Commission Decision No. 91188, Case No. 4930 [3 Cal. PUC 2d 87; *see Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 646, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* ; *see also* PUC Decision No. 71797 (1966) (Rule 31)]. Pursuant to this rule, the California Public Utilities Commission requires every communications utility operating under its jurisdiction to refuse service to a new applicant and to disconnect existing service to a customer on receipt from any authorized official of a law enforcement agency of a writing, signed by a magistrate [*see Penal Code §§ 807, 808*], finding that probable cause exists to believe either of the following [3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91 (App. B)]:

- That the use made or to be made of the service is prohibited by law.

- That the service is or will be used as an instrumentality, directly or indirectly, to violate or to assist in the violation of the law.

The magistrate's writing must also include a finding that probable cause exists to believe not only that the subject telephone facilities have been or are about to be used in the commission or facilitation of illegal acts, but that the character of these acts is such that, absent immediate and summary action in the premises, significant dangers to public health, safety, or welfare will result [3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91-92 (App. B)].

The California Supreme Court has determined that these provisions for denying or terminating telephone service satisfy the constitutional requirements of due process [*Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 646, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* (the constitutional safeguards required by the Court in addition to those set forth in Rule 31 [PUC Decision No. 71797 (1966)]] have been incorporated into PUC Decision No. 91188 [3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91 (App. B); *see* *Sokol v. Public Utilities Commission (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 247, 53 Cal. Rptr. 673, 418 P.2d 265]* .

Thus, the discontinuance of communication facilities used in the commission or furtherance of illegal acts may be proper without a prior hearing, provided that any person aggrieved by the action receives immediate notice and has the right to immediately file a complaint to request interim relief pending resolution of the complaint [*Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 646, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* ; *see* PUC Decision No. 91188, 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91 (App. B)].

[3] Method to Secure Termination

A licensing agency may terminate a licensee's telephone service by filing a complaint in the superior court seeking findings of probable cause to terminate telephone service pursuant to the appropriate rules of the communications utility that provides the telephone service. Although this complaint may be filed alone, it is usually coupled with a petition for a TRO and/or injunctive relief. The complaint for findings of probable cause should clearly set forth the authority of the court to grant this relief and should possibly include a copy of the Public Utilities Commission Order requiring utilities to include the termination provisions in their tariff schedules, as well as the tariff rule itself [*see* PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 89, 91 (App. B)].

The affidavits used to support a petition for a TRO or other injunctive relief will generally support a finding of probable cause to terminate telephone service. The affidavits should clearly show that the licensee's telephone number has been or is being used in the commission or facilitation of illegal acts. The affiants must also state that the character of these acts is such that, absent immediate and summary action, significant dangers to the public health, safety, or welfare will result [*see* PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91-92 (App. B); *see also* *Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 664, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289]* . Once the magistrate makes a finding of probable cause, and the finding is delivered to the communications utility by an authorized official of the law enforcement agency, the utility must immediately disconnect the telephone service, or refuse service to the new applicant [*see* PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 91-92 (App. B)].

The utility must immediately notify the applicant or subscriber in writing that the disconnection or refusal of service is made pursuant to a request by a law enforcement agency. The notice must identify the agency and include a copy of the rule with an accompanying statement that the applicant or subscriber may request information and assistance from the Commission at its San Francisco or Los Angeles office [PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 92 (App. B); *see [4], below*].

[4] Method to Restore Telephone Service

An applicant or subscriber whose telephone service has been denied or disconnected pursuant to this rule and who wishes to have the service initiated or restored must file a complaint with the Commission and may include a request for interim relief in the complaint. Once this relief is requested, the Commission must schedule a public hearing on the complaint to be held within 20 calendar days of the filing of the complaint. This remedy is exclusive. The concerned law enforcement agency has the right to notice of the hearing from the Commission, and has the right to participate in

the hearing, including the right to present evidence and argument, and to present and cross-examine witnesses [PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 92 (App. B)].

At the expiration of 15 days after the refusal or disconnection of service, the utility must, on written request of the applicant or subscriber, provide or restore service unless the law enforcement agency gives the utility written notice of the agency's objection to the provision or restoration of service. If the law enforcement agency objects, the sole remedy of the applicant or subscriber is to file a complaint with the Commission as described above [PUC Decision No. 91188 (1980), 3 Cal. PUC 2d 87, 93 (App. B)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsTemporary Restraining OrdersConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesService TerminationsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.25

§ 473D.25 Evidence by Affidavit

[1] General Procedure

Gov. Code § 11514 (affidavits) sets forth a procedure by which a party may introduce affidavits into evidence as if the affiant had testified orally at the hearing. This procedure may cripple opposing counsel's case if the attorney inadvertently waives the right to cross-examine the affiant by failing to request cross-examination within the proscribed time. A party to a hearing or a continued hearing may introduce an affidavit into evidence, with the same effect as if the affiant had testified orally at the hearing but without having the affiant subject to cross-examination, if the following requirements are met [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*]:

- The party mails or delivers a copy of any affidavit that the party proposes to introduce into evidence to the opposing party at least 10 days before the hearing.

- The party mails or delivers proper notice with the affidavit [*see Gov. Code § 11514(b)*; *see also [2], below*].

- The opposing party does not request cross-examination of the affiant in a timely manner.

An opposing party who fails to request cross-examination of an affiant in a timely manner is not entitled to complain on appeal of a deprivation of rights by the admission of the affidavit into evidence [*see Park Motors, Inc. v. Cozens (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 12, 17-18, 122 Cal. Rptr. 337]* . If the opposing party properly requests the right to cross-examine the affiant, however, and the proponent does not produce the affiant at the hearing, the affidavit may be introduced into evidence, but is only accorded the same effect as other hearsay evidence and thus does not support a finding in and of itself [*Gov. Code §§ 11513(c), (d), 11514(a)*]. Because a request to cross-examine the affiant does not require the proponent to produce the affiant at the hearing, the opposing party should subpoena the affiant if cross-examination is desired [*see 6 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 219 (1945)]* .

There are several circumstances under which counsel should consider using *Gov. Code § 11514*, including the

following:

- When the affiant is potentially unavailable as a witness.
- When the demeanor of a potential witness may be harmful to the case or may cast doubts on the witness's credibility.
- When a potential witness's testimony would be brief and not pivotal.
- When a potential witness would be called solely as a character witness.
- When a proposed witness may be vulnerable to cross-examination.

In addition, in some situations the parties may wish to agree on evidence by affidavit, such as when both parties agree on the contents of the proposed testimony, the witness is not necessarily a key witness, and cross-examination of the witness would not be particularly productive or enlightening. Counsel for the opposing party may also consider waiving the right to cross-examine an affiant whose physical appearance on the witness stand may be quite compelling, such as an elderly person, child, or member of the clergy, and whose cross-examination might not be particularly helpful to the cross-examining party.

[2] Required Notice

Gov. Code § 11514(b) sets forth the requirements for the notice accompanying the copy of the affidavit sent to opposing counsel. The notice must be substantially in the form set forth in the statute and must inform the recipient of the following matters [*Gov. Code § 11514(b)*]:

- The accompanying affidavit of the named affiant will be introduced as evidence at the hearing.
- The named affiant will not be called to testify orally at the hearing.
- Opposing counsel will not be entitled to question the named affiant at the hearing unless opposing counsel notifies the proponent of the affidavit or the proponent's attorney that counsel wishes to cross-examine the affiant.
- Opposing counsel must mail or deliver the request to cross-examine the affiant to the proponent of the affidavit or the proponent's attorney on or before a specified date that is seven days after the mailing or delivery date of the affidavit to opposing counsel.

Note that *Gov. Code § 11514* sets a minimum but not a maximum time for service of the notice of intent to introduce the affidavit and of the affidavit itself. Thus, a tactical advantage may be gained by serving the required notice at the earliest possible time, either with or immediately after the agency's complaint, or with or immediately after the notice of defense for the respondent. Although this step may be tactically effective, it may not stimulate a cordial relationship between opposing counsel.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityEvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.26

§ 473D.26 Prehearing Briefs

Some attorneys habitually prepare the equivalent of a trial brief to be presented to the administrative law judge (ALJ) at the commencement of the hearing. In general, however, this step does not give the party a particular tactical advantage, because: (1) the ALJ does not normally read these briefs until conclusion of the hearing, or (2) the hearing may focus on issues other than those raised in the brief. Further, the opposing party is invariably given an opportunity to rebut the points raised in the brief, usually after having had the benefit of hearing and seeing the evidence.

If counsel for one of the parties has a significant issue that he or she feels should be brought to the attention of the ALJ at the outset of the hearing, counsel would be better served by submitting a prehearing brief to the ALJ, with a copy to opposing counsel, approximately two weeks before the hearing the commences. This tactic is particularly helpful when: (1) there is a possibility that the statute of limitations may bar the agency from taking disciplinary action against the licensee, or (2) an issue of res judicata or estoppel may have an impact on the forthcoming administrative hearing. The filing of a prehearing brief may be beneficial in that the brief can serve to focus the ALJ's attention on the issues as defined by the attorney filing the brief, and enable the ALJ to anticipate, and prepare for, issues that may be raised by a party as a preliminary matter. The brief might otherwise be irrelevant to the matters alleged in the administrative complaint, but that may nonetheless aid in the presentation of a particular defense. Although a well-written and well-reasoned prehearing brief may be of assistance in securing favorable preliminary rulings, counsel should be mindful of the fact that ALJs do not have the authority to summarily dismiss a case [*see Frost v. State Personnel Board (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 11 Cal. Rptr. 718* ; *see also* Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*].

The use of a preliminary brief is not appropriate in all circumstances, and counsel should carefully consider whether there is a preliminary issue of sufficient importance to warrant briefing. Further, even if such issues exist, counsel may nevertheless wish to forego the filing of a preliminary brief to avoid educating the opposition as to the theory of his or her case prematurely.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Agency Counsel's Prehearing Tactics in Professional and Vocation Licensing Hearings

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473D.27-473D.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473D.27[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.40

§ 473D.40 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.41

§ 473D.41 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.42

§ 473D.42 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code § 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code § 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.3-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.43

§ 473D.43 Decisions

Appellant is not entitled to continuance for purpose of filing petition to compel discovery pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11507.7* when limitation period for filing petition has expired. *Lax v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 669, 675-676, 172 Cal. Rptr. 258*

Respondent is not entitled to continuance for purpose of obtaining counsel or having counsel present if given adequate opportunity to get counsel and have counsel present. *Skipitar v. Munro (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-6, 345 P.2d 508*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.44

§ 473D.44 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Hearing Practice (Cal. C.E.B. 1984)

Witkin, California Evidence, Ch. III, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 150-191; Ch. X, *Witnesses*, §§ 787-791; Ch. XII, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1223-1275 (2d ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.45

§ 473D.45 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes: information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah **NOTE:** On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes: OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service.

http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

179 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473D.46-473D.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473D.46[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.50

§ 473D.50 Determine the Appropriate Respondent Tactics With Respect to Investigation and Preparation for Hearing

☐ Ascertain the status of the investigation.

- ☐ A charging document has been filed.
- ☐ An investigator has approached the client.
- ☐ The agency has requested documents from the client.

☐ If the client has been approached by an investigator, determine what degree of cooperation with the investigation is advisable or required.

☐ If the agency has requested documents, decide whether to surrender them.

☐ If the client is mentally ill or a substance abuser, determine if the agency has a diversion program that may be available as an alternative to discipline [*see § 473D.10[5]*].

☐ Ascertain desirability of moving for a continuance of the hearing [*see § 473D.12*].

☐ Ascertain desirability of moving for a prehearing conference [*see § 473D.13*].

☐ Ascertain what must be done to prepare for the hearing [*see § 473D.14*].

☐ If desirable, ascertain how to pursue settlement [*see § 473D.15*].

☐ Ascertain what actions client must take to avoid any post-settlement problems with the agency [*see § 473D.15[8]*].

☐ Compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement.

☐ Prompt filing of any reports.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.51

§ 473D.51 Determine the Likelihood That an Agency May Take Unanticipated Prehearing Steps in a Professional or Vocational Licensing Proceeding

☐ Ascertain the likelihood that a prehearing injunction and restraining order may be issued [*see §§ 473D.21 -473D.23*].

☐ Ascertain the likelihood that on order terminating licensee's telephone service will be issued [*see § 473D.24*].

☐ Determine whether to use affidavits to present evidence [*see § 473D.25*].

☐ Determine whether to use prehearing briefs to prepare the administrative law judge for issues to be raised as a preliminary matter [*see § 473D.26*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsTemporary Restraining OrdersEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesService TerminationsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.52

§ 473D.52 Response to Accusation or Statement of Issues

☐ Prepare notice of defense [*see § 473D.11[2][a]*; for a form, see *§ 473A.54*; for further discussion of the notice of defense, see *§§ 473A.11[6]*, *473A.40*].

☐ Include objection to form of accusation, if applicable [*see Gov. Code § 11506(a)(3)*; *see § 473D.11[2][b]*].

☐ Request prehearing conference on objections raised [*see Gov. Code § 11511.5(a)*; *see also § 473D.11[3][b]*].

☐ File within 15 days after respondent receives accusation [*Gov. Code § 11506(a)*; *see § 473D.11[2][a]*].

☐ Call agency's counsel and request additional time to file notice of defense, if necessary [*see Gov. Code § 11506(b), (c)*; *see also § 473D.11[2][a]*].

☐ Objections to form of accusation not included in notice of defense.

☐ File special notice of defense making the objection [*see Gov. Code § 11506(b)*; *see also § 473D.11[3][b]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.53

§ 473D.53 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Review

☐ Review the accusation or charging document [*see § 473D.14[1]*].

[2] Investigation

☐ Investigate facts at issue [*see § 473D.14[2]*].

[3] Witnesses

☐ Obtain expert witnesses [*see § 473D.14[3]*].

☐ Prepare witnesses [*see § 473D.14[5]*].

☐ Written statement [*see § 473D.14[5][a]*].

☐ Rehearse witnesses [*see § 473D.14[5][b]*].

[4] Documents

☐ Organize documents [*see § 473D.14[4]*].

[5] Client

☐ Prepare client [*see § 473D.14[6]*].

☐ Educate client [*see § 473D.14[6][a]*].

☐ Rehearse client [*see § 473D.14[6][b]*].

[6] Demonstrative Evidence

☐ Prepare demonstrative evidence [*see § 473D.14[7]*].

[7] Briefs

☐ Prepare trial briefs [*see § 473D.14[8]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473D PREHEARING PREPARATIONS IN AGENCY ADJUDICATIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473D California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473D.54

§ 473D.54 Requesting Discovery Under the APA

[1] Request for Discovery

☐ Prepare written request [for a form, see *§ 473B.61*; for further discussion, see *§§ 473A.14[1], 473B.50*].

☐ Request applicable files [*see § 473D.11[3][c]*].

☐ Include request for continuing discovery [*see § 473D.11[3][b]*].

☐ Service

☐ Serve request before hearing and within 30 days after service by agency of initial pleading [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see § 473D.11[3][a]*].

☐ Serve within 15 days after service of any additional pleading [*Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see § 473D.11[3][a]*].

[2] Motion to Compel Discovery

☐ Prepare motion [*see Gov. Code § 11507.6*; *see also § 473D.11[3][e]*; for a form, see *§ 473B.63*; for further discussion, see *§§ 473B.16, 473B.50[4]*].

☐ File with ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11507.7(a)*].

☐ See Ch. 473B for detailed discussion.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473E.syn

§ 473E.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473E: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES

§ 473E.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473E.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Other Related Chapters

§§ 473E.03-473E.09 [Reserved]

§ 473E.10 Governing Statutes

§ 473E.11 Status and Appointment of ALJs Under the APA

[1] Office of Administrative Hearings

[a] Purpose of OAH

[b] Staff of Administrative Law Judges

[c] Costs

[2] Qualifications

[3] Duties

§ 473E.12 Role and Function of ALJs in APA Hearings

[1] Hearing by ALJ Alone or ALJ With Agency Members

[2] ALJ Hearing Case Alone

[3] Agency Itself Hearing Case

[4] Power of Decision

§ 473E.13 Agency Hearing Officers in Non-APA Hearings

[1] General Requirements

[2] Role and Function

[3] County Hearing Officers

§§ 473E.14-473E.19 [Reserved]

§ 473E.20 Fair Hearing Standards

[1] Introduction

[2] Constitutional Standard

[3] APA Standard

[4] Non-APA Standards

§ 473E.21 Grounds for Disqualification

[1] Bias and Prejudice

[2] Prejudgment

[a] Questions of Law or Policy

[b] Adjudicative Facts

[3] Personal Prejudice

[4] Financial Interest

[a] Direct Interest

[b] Restriction of Competitors

[c] Composition of Board

[d] Political Reform Act of 1974

[5] Personal Involvement or Relationship

[a] Friends, Acquaintances, and Coworkers

[b] Former Counsel or Co-counsel

[c] Family Relationship to Party

[d] Family Relationship With Lawyer in Proceeding

[e] Personal Knowledge

[6] Other Grounds for Disqualification

[a] Lack of Impartiality

[b] Physical Impairment

[7] Non-Disqualification Grounds

[8] Multiple Roles of Agencies

[a] Prosecution, Investigation, and Adjudication

[i] Constitutional Standards

[ii] APA Standard

[b] Legal Representation

[c] Party Who Imposed Penalty Must Consent to Reduction of Penalty by Reviewing Body

§ 473E.22 Disqualification Procedures

[1] APA Procedures

[a] Request for Disqualification, Waiver, and Timeliness

[b] Contents of Affidavit

[c] Determination of Bias

[d] Peremptory Challenges

[2] Non-APA Procedures

[3] Judicial Review of Decision

§ 473E.23 Rule of Necessity

[1] General Requirements

[2] APA Proceedings

§ 473E.24 Ex Parte Communications

[1] Introduction

[2] APA Requirements

[a] Definitions and Basic Prohibitions

[b] Permissible Communications

[c] Consequences of Violations

[d] Application to Agency Head

[3] Non-APA Requirements

§ 473E.25 ALJ Code of Ethics

[1] Applicability

[2] Incorporation of Code of Judicial Ethics

[a] Code of Judicial Ethics Incorporated Generally

[b] Excluded Provisions of Code of Judicial Ethics

[3] Compliance With and Enforcement of Code

[4] Collective Bargaining Rights Not Affected

§§ 473E.26-473E.29 [Reserved]

§ 473E.30 Federal Constitution

§ 473E.31 State Constitution

§ 473E.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473E.33 Decisions

[1] Conduct of Hearing

[2] Disqualification of Agency Member

[3] Disqualification of Administrative Law Judge

§ 473E.34 Text References

§ 473E.35 Internet References

§§ 473E.36-473E.39 [Reserved]

§ 473E.40 Request for Disqualification of ALJ or Agency Member

[1] Motion to Disqualify

[2] Peremptory Challenge

§ 473E.41 Disqualification in Non-APA Procedures

§ 473E.42 Waiver of Disqualification

[1] Written Waiver

§§ 473E.43-473E.59 [Reserved]

§ 473E.60 Motion to Disqualify ALJ or Agency Member and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473E.61 Written Waiver of Disqualification [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.01

§ 473E.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of administrative law judges (ALJs) in California public administrative law. The legal background discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Subpart A discusses ALJ issues including appointment, status, role, and function of ALJs, the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), the role of ALJs both in adjudications under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) non-APA agency adjudications [*see §§ 473E.11 -473E.13*].

- Subpart B discusses impartial decision making and bias, including fair hearing standards, bias and prejudice, disqualification procedures, the rule of necessity, and ex parte communications [*see §§ 473E.20 -473E.24*].

Part V includes a form of motion to disqualify an administrative law judge or agency member [*see § 473E.60*] and a form of waiver of disqualification [*see § 473E.61*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.02

§ 473E.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

For additional cross references to coverage of agency adjudications before specific agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*, through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

For forms for use in drafting memoranda in judicial proceedings to review a public agency decision, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, see *§ 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.

- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

[4] Other Related Chapters

For discussion and forms relating to the disqualification of judges in civil actions generally, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473E.03-473E.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473E.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Law Judges

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.10

§ 473E.10 Governing Statutes

Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) and the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is governed generally by Chapter 4, "Office of Administrative Hearings," Gov. Code. Code §§ 11370-11370.5. Chapter 4 is one of four Government Code chapters that comprise the Administrative Procedure Act (APA); the others are Chapter 3.5 (Rulemaking; Gov. Code. Code § 11340 et seq., Chapters 4.5 and 5 (Administrative Adjudication; Gov. Code. Code § 11400 et seq. and Gov. Code. Code § 11500 et seq., [*see* Gov. Code. Code § 11370 (citation of APA)]. Technically, these four chapters are not chapters of the APA itself, but are chapters within Part 1 (State Departments and Agencies) of Division 3 (Executive Department) of Title 2 (California State Government) of the Government Code. For convenience, they are often referred to simply as Chapter 4, Chapter 4.5, etc.

The conduct and disqualification of ALJs, when acting as the presiding officer in an administration adjudication, are governed also by Article 6 of Chapter 4.5, "The Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights*," Gov. Code. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60, and Article 7, "Ex Parte Communication," Gov. Code. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Law Judges

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.11

§ 473E.11 Status and Appointment of ALJs Under the APA

[1] Office of Administrative Hearings

[a] Purpose of OAH

The Office of Administrative Hearings (the OAH), previously called the Office of Administrative Procedure, was established by the APA as a centralized office, responsible for the conduct of administrative hearings [*Gov. Code § 11370.2*]. The OAH combines the hearing functions that, in dissimilar and disparate ways, had been formerly exercised by the staff and boards of various licensing agencies. It was designed, in other words, to establish uniformity in agency proceedings and eliminate "an almost unbelievable diversity" in agency procedures that had arisen in the absence of any centralized organizing agency [*see* Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, pp. 10, 11].

The OAH has promulgated administrative regulations under *Gov. Code § 11370.5(b)* which set out the procedures by which OAH conducts hearings before ALJ's who work for the OAH [*see 1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000 et seq.*]. These regulations should be consulted to determine specific procedural requirements during the prehearing, hearing, and post-hearing stages of proceedings before such ALJ's.

[b] Staff of Administrative Law Judges

The OAH is under the direction and control of an executive officer known as the director [*Gov. Code §§ 11370.1, 11370.2(a)*], who is appointed by the governor subject to confirmation of the Senate [*Gov. Code § 11370.2(b)*].

The director must appoint and maintain a staff of full-time ALJs [*Gov. Code § 11370.3*; *see Gov. Code § 11502* (qualifications), and discussion in [3], *below*]. The director may also appoint a staff of pro tempore, part-time ALJs sufficient to fill the needs of the various state agencies [*Gov. Code § 11370.3*]. The director assigns an ALJ in the following instances [*Gov. Code § 11370.3*]:

- For any adjudicatory hearing under the APA's formal hearing provisions (Gov. Code. Code § 11500

et seq.).

- At the request of any agency, and at the director's discretion, to conduct other administrative proceedings not arising under the APA's formal hearing provisions.

The ALJs of the OAH are deemed to be employees of the OAH, rather than of the agency to which they are assigned. Note that, after the enactment of the APA in 1945 and before 1985, ALJs were known as "hearing officers" [*see* Stats. 1985, Ch. 324]; decisions under the prior law thus use this term.

When the Judicial Council recommended formation of a centralized agency to maintain a staff of qualified hearing officers that state agencies would be required to use in adjudicatory hearings, it observed that the success of such a plan required hearing officers to be well-qualified in the fields of law and procedure and, thus, accorded the position a relatively independent status [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 13]. As a result, the ALJs have the independence and tenure necessary for them to perform their duties free from outside influences, which the Council believed would result from civil service status and employment subject to the control of the central agency rather than the licensing agencies [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 14].

[c] Costs

The costs of the ALJs' services are borne by the agencies that use them [*Gov. Code § 11370.4*]. The parent agency of the OAH, the State Department of General Services, annually establishes hourly rates for its ALJs and shorthand reporters that are calculated to cover the OAH's costs of the operation, including personnel, travel, training, and other expenses [*see Gov. Code § 11370.4*]. ALJs maintain records of the time devoted to such things as preparation for and conduct of the hearing, researching and writing the decision, and travel associated with each case, all of which is billed to the agency.

Licensing agencies authorized to collect costs of investigation and prosecution may request that the ALJ fix appropriate costs in the proposed decision [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2497.5* (Board of Podiatric Medicine)]. Costs of a teacher dismissal or suspension hearing are shared equally by the governing board of the school district that filed the accusation and the dismissed or suspended teacher; when an accusation is dismissed, the costs are borne by the district alone [*Educ. Code § 44944(e)*].

[2] Qualifications

To ensure that the positions will be held by persons of experience who are qualified in the procedural field, *Gov. Code § 11502(b)* requires each ALJ to have been admitted to law practice in California for at least five years immediately preceding the appointment [*Gov. Code § 11502(b)*; *see* Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 14]. The term "immediately" means that the appointee must have been in practice at least five years continuously, counting back from the date of appointment. In addition, each judge must possess any additional qualifications established by the State Personnel Board for the particular class of position involved [*Gov. Code § 11502(b)*]. That Board conducts civil service examinations as necessary to establish lists of qualified individuals from which the director may appoint ALJs. A presiding ALJ, designated by the director, performs supervisory and administrative functions in each of the regional offices located in Oakland, San Diego, Sacramento, and Los Angeles [*see Gov. Code § 11508(a)* (location of hearings)].

[3] Duties

The primary duty of an ALJ is to preside over adjudicatory hearings in contested APA cases [*Gov. Code §§ 11502, 11512(a)*; for further discussion of that duty, *see § 473E.12*]. In addition, ALJs conduct other kinds of hearings for state

agencies and boards, and conduct civil service hearings, retirement system entitlement hearings, and other matters for local agencies, cities, and counties. Since 1965, California counties and other local public entities have been authorized to contract with the OAH for the services of an ALJ to conduct their hearing proceedings [*Gov. Code § 27727*]. The role and function of the ALJ in these other kinds of hearings is usually set out in the relevant civil service rules, retirement provisions, or regulations of the agency that has contracted with the OAH for that service [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 27722* (county hearings)]. The cost of the ALJ is charged at the same hourly rate established for APA matters [*see* [1][c], *above*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Law Judges

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.12

§ 473E.12 Role and Function of ALJs in APA Hearings

[1] Hearing by ALJ Alone or ALJ With Agency Members

Any hearing in a contested case conducted under the APA's formal hearing provisions (Gov. Code. Code § 11500 et seq.) must be presided over by an ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(a)*].

The particular agency, however, determines whether the assigned ALJ will hear the case alone, or whether the "agency itself" (*i.e.*, agency members) will hear the case together with the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(a)*; *Usher v. County of Monterey (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 210, 218-219, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 274]* . That agency cannot assign a hearing officer to preside over the hearing, but must assign an ALJ to preside over the hearing, or have the agency hear the case with an ALJ presiding [*Gov. Code § 11512(a)*; *Gov. Code § 21156*; *Langan v. City of El Monte (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 608, 617-618, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 254]* . The ALJ's duties vary depending on this determination. An agency may change its initial determination regarding who will hear the case. The court of appeal has held that due process was not denied to a respondent when an agency itself started to hear a case, but midway through the hearing decided to withdraw and let the ALJ continue to hear the case alone [*Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 421, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . This same procedure is authorized by *Gov. Code § 11512(e)*, for circumstances in which an agency quorum no longer exists while a hearing is in progress [*Gov. Code § 11512(e)*].

The requirement that an ALJ hear the case, either alone or with agency members, was designed to eliminate the actual or seeming unfairness whenever agency members hearing the case would seek legal advice from the prosecuting agency attorney because of their unfamiliarity with procedural law and complex legal issues [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council, Dec. 31, 1944, pp. 19, 20].

[2] ALJ Hearing Case Alone

In practice, most cases under the APA are heard by ALJs sitting alone. Agency members generally participate only in important cases, cases requiring the application of specialized knowledge, or cases involving agency policy. The matters most frequently heard by an agency itself are Board of Medical Quality license discipline accusations in which either incompetence or gross negligence is alleged [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2234(b), (d), 2332(d), (e)*], and petitions to restore a

suspended license or amend probationary terms filed with the Board of Medical Quality or Board of Registered Nursing [*Gov. Code § 11522*; *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 2332(f), 2760*]. The latter are typically brief hearings conducted during the agency's regularly scheduled meetings. A respondent does not have a right to a hearing by the agency itself [*Gov. Code § 11512(a)*], and the difficulty of convening board or commission members for a lengthy hearing conducted during the business day accounts for the relative infrequency of the agency hearings.

When an ALJ alone hears a case, he or she exercises all the powers necessary to conduct the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. In effect, the ALJ is a deputy of the agency [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 20]. The ALJ must conduct the hearing, weigh the evidence, and research and apply the law. Within 30 days after the case is submitted, the ALJ must prepare a proposed written decision containing a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision, and the penalty, if any, in a form that may be adopted by the agency as the decision in the case [*Gov. Code §§ 11517(c)(1), 11425.50*].

In one of the earlier appellate decisions following the initial enactment of APA, the court of appeal concluded that, so long as the agency retains the authority to approve or reject the proposed decision of an ALJ, its delegation of power to the ALJ, to decide the case alone, is specifically authorized by statute and is not a violation of due process [*Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 398-399, 184 P.2d 323]* . *Gov. Code § 11517* provides that when an ALJ acts alone, the agency may adopt his or her decision without reading or otherwise familiarizing itself with the record [*Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 398-399, 184 P.2d 323* ; *see Griggs v. Board of Trustees (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 93, 98, 37 Cal. Rptr. 194, 389 P.2d 722* (interpreting similar provisions in Education Code governing teacher dismissal hearings); for discussion of the record on decision, *see* Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*].

This principle was extended one step further in a case in which the hearing officer who conducted the hearing died before preparing a recommended decision. The agency appointed a new hearing officer who reviewed all of the evidence presented at the hearing and prepared a recommended decision that the agency adopted [*Keith v. San Bernardino County Retirement Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 411, 414-415, 271 Cal. Rptr. 649]* .

[3] Agency Itself Hearing Case

When the agency itself hears the case, the ALJ presides at the hearing, rules on the admission and exclusion of evidence, swears witnesses, advises the agency on matters of law, and otherwise assists the agency as requested [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. While the agency itself may exercise all other powers relating to the conduct of the hearing, it may also delegate any or all of those powers to the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*].

[4] Power of Decision

Whether the ALJ alone or the agency itself has heard the case, the agency has the power to decide the case [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*]. If an ALJ has heard the case, the agency may take one of the following actions [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*]:

- Adopt the ALJ's proposed decision in its entirety [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(A)*].

- Reduce or otherwise mitigate any proposed penalty and adopt the balance of the proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(B)*].

- Make technical or other minor changes in the proposed decision and adopt it as the decision. Action by the agency under this option is limited to a clarifying change or a change of a similar nature that does not affect the factual or legal basis of the proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(C)*].

- Reject the proposed decision and decide the case on the record, including the transcript, or an agreed

statement of the parties, with or without taking additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*].

- Reject the proposed decision and refer the case to the same ALJ if reasonably available, otherwise to another ALJ to take additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*].

The agency's authority to decide the case includes the authority to decide some but not all of the issues in the case [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)(iii)*].

When the ALJ hears the case alone, the agency's power of decision includes the power to review any evidentiary rulings of the ALJ who conducted the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*], but this review power can not be exercised until the ALJ's hearing is completed, and the ALJ has issued a proposed decision. It is not proper for the agency to review evidentiary rulings of the ALJ before the hearing has been completed [*Fireman's Fund Insurance Companies v. Quackenbush (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 599, 605-608, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732* (Insurance Commissioner could not review on interlocutory basis evidentiary rulings of ALJ conducting Prop. 103 rollback hearing, while hearing was still pending under requirements of APA, *Gov. Code § 11512*, and agency-specific provisions of Insurance Code)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Law Judges

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.13

§ 473E.13 Agency Hearing Officers in Non-APA Hearings

[1] General Requirements

Various state agencies employ in-house hearing officers or ALJs to conduct hearings which are not subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions (Gov. Code. Code § 11500) [*see Gov. Code § 11501(a)* (APA applies only to extent required by agency's governing law); *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*].

Appointment of in house ALJ's who are employees of the agency whose cases they adjudicate is frequently authorized by the agency governing statute, and that specific statute is controlling as to ALJ appointment over the more general provisions of the APA which require use of OAH ALJ's [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 883-885, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729* Cal. Rptr. 2d729 (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 24210* authorized director to appoint ALJ, who was employee of Department, to hear and decide case, and that statute was controlling under *Gov Code §§ 11501(a), 11415.10*, and *11415.20* not APA requirement contained in *Gov. Code § 11502* that ALJ's from Office of Administrative Hearings be used)].

Non-APA hearings include the following:

- Social services entitlement proceedings [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10950-10967*; *see* Ch. 517, *Social Services*].

- Hearings to suspend or revoke motor vehicle operator licenses [*Veh. Code §§ 12500, 13350-13368, 14100*; *see* Ch. 92, *Automobiles: Drivers' Licenses*].

- Civil service hearings [*Gov. Code §§ 18670-18683*; *see* Ch. 118, *Civil Service*].

- Medi-Cal audit appeals [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14123, 14124*].

Although in-house hearing officers are frequently employed by and under the direction of the same agency that is the

investigator and prosecutor in the matter, this combination of functions within the agency is not, per se, a violation of due process without a showing of actual bias [*Griggs v. Board of Trustees (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 93, 98, 37 Cal. Rptr. 194, 389 P.2d 722* ; *see § 473E.21[6]*]. Employment of the ALJ (and payment of the ALJ) by the agency holding the hearing does not violate the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker, and does not require disqualification of the ALJ because the financial interest of the ALJ is too remote to require disqualification without a showing of actual bias. Furthermore, ALJ's are unlikely to be influenced to rule in favor of their employer by the desire for continued employment, because ALJ's are protected by civil service law [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 885-887, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729]* . However, when the ALJ has a strong direct financial interest in the resolution of the case, then the ALJ can be disqualified without a showing of actual bias [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1032-1034, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280]* . Similarly, appointment of the ALJ by the department does not violate due process of law because bias will not be presumed based on appointment, no showing of actual bias was made, and there was adequate judicial review of the ALJ's decision by the Board, and the courts [*CMPB Friends, Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 1250, 1257-1259, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 914]* . However, internal separation of functions is required by *Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)* [*see § 473E.21*].

[2] Role and Function

The role and function of hearing officers or ALJs in non-California APA matters is established by statutory or other authority permitting delegation of the agency's adjudicatory function. For example, the State Personnel Board can properly delegate conduct of the evidentiary hearing and preparation of a proposed decision to its hearing officer and may adopt a proposed decision upholding the dismissal of civil service employees without review of the record, evidence, or written arguments of the parties [*Gov. Code § 19582(a), (b)*; *see Fichera v. State Personnel Board (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 613, 618-619, 32 Cal. Rptr. 159* (dismissal of police officers by state personnel board upheld)].

[3] County Hearing Officers

The board of supervisors of any county may appoint an attorney as county hearing officer to hear contested matters for the various boards, agencies, commissions, or committees of the county [*Gov. Code § 27720*]. A county hearing officer, or a deputy or assistant hearing officer, must be an attorney admitted to practice for at least five years prior to appointment [*Gov. Code § 27724*]. The hearing officer may be authorized by ordinance or resolution to do any of the following [*Gov. Code § 27721*]:

- Conduct the county hearing.
- Issue subpoenas.
- Receive evidence.
- Administer oaths.
- Rule on questions of law and the admissibility of evidence.
- Prepare a record of the proceedings.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding

OfficersDuties & PowersGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Law Judges

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473E.14-473E.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473E.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.20

§ 473E.20 Fair Hearing Standards

[1] Introduction

An attorney representing a party in an administrative adjudication should ensure that the presiding ALJ, agency members, or presiding officer will provide his or her client with a fair hearing. Fair hearing standards that must be met are set forth in the due process clauses of the United States and California Constitutions [*see* [2], *below*], in the APA, and in other statutes and regulations governing specific agencies [*see § 473E.12[3], [4]*]. The APA also sets standards of conduct concerning ex parte communications with the ALJ or presiding officer [*see § 473E.24*]. In addition, certain fact situations may arise that indicate an adjudicator's bias or inability to conduct a fair hearing [*see § 473E.21*].

The procedures required to challenge the impartiality of an ALJ or agency member are set forth in the APA and other statutes and regulations governing particular agencies [*see § 473E.22*]. However, the "rule of necessity" may require a person who is otherwise disqualified to participate in an administrative hearing [*see* discussion in *§ 473E.23*]. The APA sets forth specific rules governing ex parte communications between the adjudicator and persons interested in the outcome of the hearing.

[2] Constitutional Standard

An impartial, unbiased adjudicator is an essential element of procedural due process [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7* (due process clauses); *Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc. (1980) 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S. Ct. 1610, 64 L. Ed. 2d 182* ; *Morrissey v. Brewer (1972) 408 U.S. 471, 489, 92 S. Ct. 2593, 33 L. Ed. 2d 484* ; *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 271, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287]* . Thus, a respondent whose professional future will be determined by a licensing agency or whose livelihood or property interests will be affected by a contested proceeding has an absolute right to the consideration of the case by an objective, competent, and fair ALJ or agency. As the U.S. Supreme Court stated in *Marshall v. Jerrico, Inc. (1980) 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S. Ct. 1610, 64 L. Ed. 2d 182* :

> The Due Process Clause entitles a person to an impartial and disinterested tribunal in both civil and criminal cases. This requirement of neutrality in adjudicative proceedings safeguards the two central concerns of procedural due process, the prevention of unjustified or mistaken deprivations and the

> promotion of participation and dialogue by affected individuals in the decisionmaking process. The neutrality requirement helps to guarantee that life, liberty, or property will not be taken on the basis of an erroneous or distorted conception of the facts or the law.

Fairness requires an absence of actual bias in the trial of cases, and should preclude even the probability of bias [*In re Murchison (1954) 349 U.S. 133, 136, 75 S. Ct. 623, 99 L. Ed. 942]* . Procedural due process of law standards are violated when an agency decision maker has a personal financial interest in the proceedings [*Gibson v. Berryhill (1973) 411 U.S. 564, 579, 93 S. Ct. 1689, 36 L. Ed. 2d 488]* . However, the institutional structure of agencies that combines investigation, prosecution, and adjudication in the same agency does not violate due process of law [*Withrow v. Larkin (1975) 421 U.S. 35, 56-57, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d 712]* .

A county retirement board did not violate due process of law by both investigating and adjudicating retirement benefits applications. The Board can select unilaterally and compensate hearing officers consistent with due process of law. Due process of law does not require that the applicant participate in the hearing officer selection process Board selection and compensation of hearing officers does not, by itself, establish bias against applicants for retirement benefits on the part of the hearing officers [*McIntyre v. Santa Barbara County Employees' Retirement System (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 730, 735-736, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 565]* .

When the ALJ has a strong direct financial interest in the resolution of the case, then the ALJ can be disqualified under the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker without a showing of actual bias [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1032-1034, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280]* . However, when the financial interest is remote, indirect, and uncertain, then proof of actual bias is required to establish a violation of the due process right to an impartial decision maker. Proof of the appearance of bias is not sufficient [*Gai v. City of Selma (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 213, 219-220, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910]* . Thus, when an administrative decision maker's financial interest was too remote, indirect, and uncertain, it did not operate to trigger the probability of actual bias standard for due process scrutiny of decision makers with financial interests [*Gai v. City of Selma (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 213, 228-229, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910]* . The appearance of bias standard applicable to trial court judges, set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)(c)*, does not apply to administrative hearing officers [*Gai v. City of Selma (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 213, 233, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910]* .

For a complete discussion of procedural due process requirements applicable to administrative adjudication, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

[3] APA Standard

The APA requires an ALJ or agency member to voluntarily disqualify himself or herself and withdraw from any case in which there are grounds for disqualification, including disqualification under *Gov. Code § 11425.40* (bias, prejudice, or interest) [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.21* for grounds for disqualification]. The parties may waive the disqualification by a writing that recites the grounds for disqualification. A waiver is effective only when signed by all parties, accepted by the administrative law judge, or agency member, and included in the record. For a form of waiver, see *§ 473E.61*.

Any party may request the disqualification of any ALJ or agency member by filing an affidavit, prior to the taking of evidence at a hearing, stating specifically the grounds for claiming that the administrative law judge or agency member is disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.22*, for a discussion of procedural requirements for disqualification]. Ex parte communications with presiding officers are also prohibited in certain circumstances and are permissible in other circumstances [*see Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*, and discussion in *§ 473E.24*]. A presiding officer who receives an improper ex parte communication may be disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*; *see § 473E.24*].

The APA impartial decision maker standard states general grounds for disqualification including bias, prejudice, or

interest in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(a)*; *State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 840-842, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189* (Board members participation in rule making proceedings with water policy council, as well as staff communications about related matters did not provide a valid basis for disqualification of Board members based on bias, prejudice, or interest in the proceeding under *Gov. Code § 11425.40(a)*)], and the act states specific grounds that are not sufficient for disqualification [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)*; *see §§ 473E.21, 473E.22*].

The right to challenge an adjudicator on the grounds of bias, prejudice, or financial interest is a departure from common law principles. For that reason, and because delay and calendaring difficulties necessarily result from such challenges, the Judicial Council drafted the APA to require that a motion for disqualification be timely made and supported by an affidavit [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, pp. 18-20; *see Gov. Code § 11512(c)*, and discussion in *§ 473E.22*].

Agency hearing officers and agencies that conduct proceedings not governed by Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) are subject to the impartial decision maker requirements of Chapter 4.5, that is, *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(5)* and *11425.40*, if those agencies are state agencies, and a hearing is constitutionally or statutorily required [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11410.20(a)*; for further discussion of these provisions, determining the applicability of Chapter 4.5 provisions, *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

[4] Non-APA Standards

Agencies that are not subject to the requirements of the APA may be subject to fair hearing standards, established by regulation or agency policy, similar to the APA impartial decision maker standard. For example, ALJs who conduct proceedings for the Department of Developmental Services are subject to an agency promulgated "fair and impartial hearing" standard [*17 Cal. Code Reg. § 50604(A)*]. Similarly, the hearing officer in a Medi-Cal proceeding for the Department of Health Services, and in a Department of Mental Health proceeding, is subject to disqualification if he or she is unable to provide a fair or impartial hearing, or if he or she has an interest in the proceedings [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 51043(a)*; *9 Cal. Code Reg. § 1565*]. A workers' compensation judge is subject to the same standards that govern referees [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*; *Lab. Code § 5311*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 641* (grounds for disqualification of referees)].

If no regulations or informal guidelines provide fair hearing standards, the adjudicator's impartiality may still be reviewed on appeal, pursuant to a writ of administrative mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *Clark v. City of Hermosa Beach (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1168-1169, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223* (writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is proper vehicle to review claim of property owner that city had denied owner fair hearing)]. The writ is framed as an inquiry into the validity of an administrative decision, specifically, the deprivation of a fair hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1094.5(a), 1094.5(b)*; *see § 473E.22[4]*]. For further discussion of judicial review pursuant to a writ of administrative mandate, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.21

§ 473E.21 Grounds for Disqualification

[1] Bias and Prejudice

Certain factual situations involving the adjudicator's lack of impartiality in an administrative hearing are quite common and have been the subject of numerous judicial opinions. Some situations, such as financial interest in the outcome, have been addressed in statutes or rules [*see* [4], *below*].

When considering making a request to disqualify an adjudicator [*see § 473E.22*], it is important to determine the existence of all possible grounds for disqualification; the cumulative impact of several kinds of bias may be just as important for disqualification as that of one overriding basis [Maloney, *Disqualification of Administrative Law Judges in California, 16 U.S.F. L. Rev. 229, 243*-244 (1982)].

It is useful to refer to the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1*, and case law construing that statute, for specific grounds for disqualification that apply to judges in civil actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1*]. Many of these grounds can be adapted to disqualification motions brought in administrative hearings [*see* detailed discussion in Ch. 317, *Judges*].

In *Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* , the California Supreme Court articulated a two-part process for disqualification based on bias. First, the affidavit for disqualification must set forth "legally sufficient facts demonstrating bias." Second, the bias or prejudice must be "sufficient to impair the judge's impartiality" [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 792, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151]* . The first part of the test is crucial, because once the existence of bias has been established, it will not be difficult to demonstrate that a fair and impartial trial or hearing appears improbable. The challenging party must show actual bias, rather than the mere appearance of bias [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 793, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* ; *see also Clark v. City of Hermosa Beach (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1172-1173, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223* (city council member had conflict of interest and personal animosity toward property owner, and therefore property owner was deprived of right to impartial decisionmaker which is a fair hearing requirement)].

Thus, the *appearance* of bias standard set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)(c)*, while applicable to trial court judges, does not apply to administrative hearing officers. Proof of actual bias, rather than its appearance, is necessary to show a violation of the due process right to an impartial decision maker in an administrative hearing [*Gai v. City of Selma (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 213, 219-220, 228-233, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910* (administrative decision maker's financial interest was too remote, indirect, and uncertain to trigger the probability of actual bias standard for due process scrutiny of decision makers with financial interests)].

The APA impartial decision maker standard states that the presiding officer is subject to disqualification for bias, prejudice, or interest in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(a)*; *Gov. Code § 11405.80* (definition of presiding officer)]. Other than that general language, no specific disqualification standards are stated in the act. Also, the act states specific grounds that are not sufficient for disqualification [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)*; *see* [7], *below*]. Disqualification grounds apply also to agency heads and other persons or bodies to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(c)*], and agencies that conduct adjudicative proceedings have the option of adopting regulations that authorize peremptory challenges of the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(d)*; *see Gov. Code § 11405.20* and discussion in *§ 473E.22*].

[2] Prejudgment

[a] Questions of Law or Policy

Historically, the preconceptions or bias that an ALJ or agency member brings to an adjudication regarding issues of law or policy have not been deemed to be grounds for disqualification [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 790, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* ; *see* Davis, Administrative Law Treatise, vol. 3, § 19:2 (2d ed. 1980)]. In contrast to the broad variety of matters heard by courts, the subject matter of cases heard by a particular administrative agency and its ALJs and hearing officers is necessarily limited by the jurisdiction of the agency. Thus, an agency adjudicator is predictably familiar with the elements of, and case law concerning, the most common proceedings before the agency. For example, entrapment is frequently asserted in accusations concerning the sale of alcoholic beverages to a minor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 25658*] who turns out to be a police decoy. Entrapment is also a common defense in other kinds of disciplinary hearings [*see, e.g.,* *Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* (entrapment defense asserted in Board of Medical Examiners hearing, to charges of unprofessional conduct in prescribing narcotics for nonmedical use); *Wong v. State Bar (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 528, 125 Cal. Rptr. 482, 542 P.2d 642* (entrapment defense asserted in hearing by Disciplinary Board of State Bar, to charges of soliciting money to bribe policemen to permit illegal gambling)]. Consequently, an ALJ who has repeatedly encountered the issue would be expected to know the relevant case law. This familiarity with the relevant law is an element of competence, rather than impermissible prejudgment [*see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:2 (2d ed. 1980)].

Even a publicly expressed view concerning the wisdom or desirability of a law or precedent will not disqualify the proponent of that view from hearing a matter to which the law will pertain [*Christal v. Police Commission (1939) 33 Cal. App. 2d 564, 571, 92 P.2d 416* (an advocate of rule requiring police officers to testify before grand jury was not disqualified from deciding whether the rule had been violated); *see* *Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 772, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* (campaign promises of an elected official)].

In *Laird v. Tatum (1972) 409 U.S. 824, 93 S. Ct. 7, 34 L. Ed. 2d 50* , a memorandum decision on a motion to recuse (*i.e.*, disqualify), the U.S. Supreme Court considered prejudgment of legal issues reflected in announced or established opinions. The Court found that neither the oath, the disqualification statute, nor the practice of the former justices of the Court guarantees a litigant that each judge will start off "from dead center" in his or her willingness or ability to reconcile the opposing arguments of counsel with his or her understanding of the Constitution and the law; quite simply, it is not a ground for disqualification that a judge has previously expressed an understanding of the meaning of some particular provision of the Constitution [*Laird v. Tatum (1972) 409 U.S. 824, 839, 93 S. Ct. 7, 34 L. Ed. 2d 50]* .

Two of the three grounds that are expressly deemed not sufficient grounds by themselves for disqualification are similar to the prejudgment issues discussed above [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)*]. These are that a presiding officer is not disqualified solely because that officer:

- Has experience, technical competence, or specialized knowledge of, or has in any capacity expressed a view on, a legal, factual, or policy issue presented in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(2)*].

- Has as a lawyer or public official participated in the drafting of laws or regulations or in the effort to pass or defeat laws or regulations, the meaning, effect, or application of which is in issue in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(3)*].

These standards are taken from *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.2* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 159 (1995)].

A party to an administrative hearing may argue that an adjudicator's mind is "irrevocably closed" on a legal issue, as illustrated by prior statements or involvement [*Trade Com. v. Cement Institute (1948) 333 U.S. 683, 701, 68 S. Ct. 793, 92 L. Ed. 1010, 44 F.T.C. 1460* ; *cf. American Cyanamid Company v. F. T. C. (1966) 363 F.2d 757* (agency chairperson had served as counsel to the investigating agency)]. Nevertheless, it is highly unlikely that an agency member could ever be disqualified on that basis, if for no other reason than the impossibility of proof [*see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:2 (2d ed. 1980)]. A possibly applicable civil litigation standard that is somewhat similar to, or can be used to raise, prejudgment or closed mind issues, is the "substantial doubt about the judge's capacity to be impartial" standard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)(B), (C)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*].

[b] Adjudicative Facts

In contrast to the prejudgment of legal or policy issues, and adjudicator's prejudgment of the controversy itself, that is, the facts at issue in a case, is generally a ground for disqualification [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 790, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* ; *see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:2 (2d ed. 1980)]. Prejudgment of the facts constitutes actual bias for purposes of the *Andrews* test [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 792, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* ; *see* [1], *above*]. The mere exposure to adjudicative facts prior to the hearing, however, is not necessarily grounds for disqualification [Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:2 (2d ed. 1980)]. A party attempting to disqualify an adjudicator on the basis of prejudgment of facts may encounter difficulties in proof. Direct evidence of prejudgment of the facts at issue can be found if the adjudicator has made the prejudgment on the record [*see, e.g., Pacific etc. Conference of United Methodist Church v. Superior Court (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 72, 87-88, 147 Cal. Rptr. 44* (judge indicated in a letter to all counsel that plaintiffs would probably prevail in the case)].

Prejudgment of the controversy itself or the facts of a particular case may also be demonstrated by prior statements made outside of the court records [*see, e.g., Perlman v. Shasta Joint Jr. College Dist. Bd. of Trustees (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 873, 883, 88 Cal. Rptr. 563* (board decided case pursuant to telephone conversations prior to hearing); *Cinderella Career and Finishing Schools, Inc. v. F. T. C. (1970) 425 F.2d 583, 591, 138 U.S. App. D.C. 152* (agency's chairman made speech announcing his position about facts prior to hearing)]. A possibly applicable civil litigation standard that is somewhat similar to, or can be used to raise, prejudgment of adjudicative facts issues, is the "substantial doubt about the judge's capacity to be impartial" standard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)(B), (C)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*].

[3] Personal Prejudice

A personal bias or prejudice toward a person, as distinguished from an attitude about an issue, may be a ground for disqualification when it is strong enough. Prejudice may take the form of either animosity or favoritism [*see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:5 (2d ed, 1980)]. The ALJ's conduct during the hearing may be used to show a

degree of partiality that denied a party a fair hearing. It is often difficult, however, to prove a sufficient degree of prejudice. For example, prejudice or bias justifying disqualification will not be assumed from any of the following:

- An adjudicator's uniform belief in the evidence offered by one party [*Andrews v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 795, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151]* .

- Brusque or hostile behavior [*West Coast etc. Co. v. Contractors' etc. Bd. (1945) 72 Cal. App. 2d 287, 299-300, 164 P.2d 811]* .

- Interposing cross-examination [*Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 15, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898]* .

Uniform rulings for one party in a case have been used to claim bias against the other party, with mixed success [*see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise*, vol. 3, § 19:5 (2d ed, 1980)]. In *Labor Board v. Pittsburgh S. S. Co. (1949) 337 U.S. 656, 69 S. Ct. 1283, 93 L. Ed. 1602* , a key case on the issue of partiality, the Supreme Court reversed a federal appellate court decision that held that the evaluation of evidence by a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board demonstrated prejudice. The lower court had found that the unvarying repudiation of every witness for the petitioner because of falsity, evasion, or faint recollection, along with the consistent exaltation of every union witness as truthful, forthright, and accurate, completely destroyed any confidence that it might otherwise place in the findings of the trial examiner [*Labor Board v. Pittsburgh S. S. Co. (1948) 167 F.2d 126, 128-129]* . Based on a review of the entire transcript, however, the Supreme Court stated that total rejection of an opposing view does not, by itself, impugn the integrity or competence of a trier of fact. Instead, the Court found that the record displayed a "discriminating evaluation of the facts" [*Labor Board v. Pittsburgh S. S. Co. (1949) 337 U.S. 656, 659-660, 69 S. Ct. 1283, 93 L. Ed. 1602]* .

An applicable civil litigation standard that is somewhat similar to, or can be used to raise, personal prejudice issues, is the "substantial doubt about the judge's capacity to be impartial" standard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)(B), (C)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*]. The standard provides that bias or prejudice towards a lawyer in the proceeding may be grounds for disqualification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)*]. Also, personal bias or prejudice concerning a party would satisfy this standard, and is serious enough in civil litigation to be a nonwaivable ground for disqualification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.3(b)(2)(A)*].

[4] Financial Interest

[a] Direct Interest

A lack of objectivity and fairness that would require disqualification is presumed when the adjudicator has a substantial and direct financial interest in the subject of, or is a party to, a contested hearing. When the adjudicator has a financial interest or economic stake in the contested matter, the likelihood of bias is so great that no additional proof of actual bias is required for disqualification [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1020, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280* (disqualification of hearing officer upheld based on financial interest bias grounds which violated due process of law because hearing officer was hired on ad hoc basis by county attorney, and chances for future appointment by county may be based on county preferences for hearing officers whose past decisions ruled in favor of county); *Andrews v. AgriculturalLabor Relations Bd. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 781, 793 n. 5, 171 Cal. Rptr. 590, 623 P.2d 151* ; *Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 116, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

Financial interest bias on the part of a judge violates the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267, 271, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* (right to an impartial decisionmaker)]. The due process financial interest disqualification standards apply equally to administrative law judges and temporary administrative hearing officers. Bias is presumed when there is a direct financial interest on the part of a

judge [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1024-1025, 1020, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280]* . Disqualifying financial interests include the following: 1) judges compensation is dependent on the result of the adjudication [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1030-1031, 1020, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280* (administrative hearing officer has disqualifying financial interest in outcome of adjudication based on prospect of future employment by county who hired hearing officer on ad hoc basis); *Ward v. Village of Monroeville, Ohio (1972) 409 U.S. 57, 60, 93 S. Ct. 80, 34 L. Ed. 2d 267* (judge who was also local mayor added to village budget from fines imposed is judge's court); *Tumey v. State of Ohio (1927) 273 U.S. 510, 523, 47 S. Ct. 437, 71 L. Ed. 749* (judge's salary paid out of fines imposed in judge's court)] and 2) a judge adjudicates their own case [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1027-1028, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280* ; *Aetna Life Ins. Co. v. Lavoie, (1986) 475 U.S. 813, 821-825, 106 S. Ct. 1580, 89 L. Ed. 2d 823* (state supreme court justice had disqualifying financial interest in participating in ruling on bad faith refusal to pay insurance claim when judge had a similar claim pending in the same court system); *Gibson v. Berryhill (1973) 411 U.S. 564, 578-579, 93 S. Ct. 1689, 36 L. Ed. 2d 488* (professional optometrist board members could not adjudicate discipline cases against corporate optometrists because revocation decisions would increase business opportunities for professional optometrists); *Friedman v. Rogers (1979) 440 U.S. 1, 18-19, 99 S. Ct. 887, 59 L. Ed. 2d 100* (due process requirements are more strict in discipline cases, because there is a right to an impartial decision maker, and outside of discipline action state optometry board could consist of majority of independent optometrists without violating due process of law)].

The financial interest bias rule codified in the *Haas* case that is applicable to adjudicators does not apply to the legal advisor to an adjudicative agency, the city personnel board, because the legal advisor advised the board of applicable laws and did not act in an adjudicative role in the proceeding [*Gilbert v. City of Sunnyvale (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 1264, 1281-1282, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 297* (court rejected due process of law challenge to pre-termination hearing procedures brought by discharged police officer)]. The financial interest bias rule codified in the *Haas* case also was not violated by an award of $1.8 million in prehearing costs related to disciplinary proceedings against an accounting firm. The award was paid to the Board of Accountancy to reimburse the Board for extensive costs incurred in investigating and preparing for hearing a discipline case against the accounting firm. The Board did not have an improper pecuniary interest because the cost award was authorized and regulated by statute, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 5107*, and this statute protected the Board from improper influences related to the cost award. This is because the cost award was made by the administrative law judge (ALJ) who heard the case, and that ALJ did not have a financial interest in the cost award that he or she assessed. The ALJ was employed by the Office of Administrative Hearings, and did not benefit financially for the cost award. The Board has the authority to decrease or eliminate the award, or to affirm the award, but not to increase the cost award [*McBride v. The Bd. of Accountancy of the State of Cal. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 518, 525-527, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 287]* .

However, employment of the ALJ (and payment of the ALJ) by the agency holding the hearing does not violate the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker, and does not require disqualification of the ALJ because the financial interest of the ALJ is too remote to require disqualification without a showing of actual bias. ALJ's are unlikely to be influenced to rule in favor of their employer by the desire for continued employment, because ALJ's are protected by civil service law. Furthermore, the ALJ can not be disqualified based upon reasonable doubts about the impartiality of the ALJ because there is nothing in the record as to the selection process of ALJ's for particular hearings that supports a claim of bias, and bias will not be presumed [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 885-887, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729]* . However, when the ALJ has a strong direct financial interest in the resolution of the case, then the ALJ can be disqualified without a showing of actual bias [*Haas v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 1017, 1032-1034, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 45 P.3d 280]* . The *Haas* rule was held not to be applicable to the ALJ employment facts and circumstances presented in the Department case [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 880, 885-887, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729* (ALJ's were appointed under the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 24210*)].

Payment of attorney's fees under *Labor Code § 98.2* to the Labor Commissioner for representing an indigent employee

at the de novo hearing before the superior court did not violate the due process of law rights of the employer because there was no showing that the hearing officer was biased, and no showing that the hearing officer had a financial interest in the case. Attorneys fees that are collected by the agency (Labor Commissioner) from employer parties does not violate due process of law rights of employers [*Lolley v. Campbell (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 367, 370-371, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571, 48 P.3d 1128]* .

The applicable civil litigation standard disqualifies a judge from deciding a lawsuit when the judge, the judge's spouse, and a minor child of the judge living in the household, have a financial interest, including fiduciary financial interests, in the subject matter or in a party to the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(3)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*].

[b] Restriction of Competitors

Licensing and other actions of agencies or boards may have an economic effect on the subject licensees or industry, including the licensed agency or board members themselves. For example, a board may have the power to determine the number of competitors that licensees will have [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 23958* (Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control may deny an application for a license if issuance would result in or add to an undue concentration of licenses)].

Because the minimum educational and training standards and examinations required of applicants are set by the various professional licensing agencies [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. §§ 2493* (podiatry), 2736 (nursing), 10153 (real estate)], standards established to assure the competency of licensees necessarily limit the number of practitioners in a given field [*see Chevrolet Motor Division v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 538, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270* (discussion of the distinction between a board's regulation of members of its own occupation and attempted regulation of the economic interests of others with that occupational group)].

Only a direct and personal financial involvement, however, would disqualify a member from deciding a contested case. For example, in one instance, a determination of the Alabama Board of Optometry that employment by a corporation constituted unprofessional conduct would have eliminated nearly half of the optometrists in the state, with the result that the Board members and other private practitioners "would fall heir to this business." The federal district court concluded that the Board members' personal pecuniary interests were so great that the Board could not constitutionally hear the matter. The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed, holding that disqualification for financial interest applies to administrative adjudicators, as well as members of the judiciary [*Gibson v. Berryhill (1973) 411 U.S. 564, 579, 93 S. Ct. 1689, 36 L. Ed. 2d 488]* .

[c] Composition of Board

The membership of many state boards and commissions is established in statute or regulation to reflect or represent particular views or expertise. For example, the State Building Standards Commission membership must include an architect, a civil engineer, a representative of organized labor in the building trades, and a licensed contractor [*Health & Safety Code § 18921*].

Three cases involving the New Motor Vehicle Board establish that the economic effect of the composition of such an agency, as well as the financial interests of individual members, may be evaluated for bias. In *American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 138 Cal. Rptr. 594* , the appellate court held that the composition of the state New Motor Vehicle Board, which required that four members be new car dealers, denied a vehicle franchisor an unbiased hearing in violation of due process of its termination of a franchise [*American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 987, 138 Cal. Rptr. 594]* . The court found that the Board's dealer members have an economic stake in every franchise termination case that comes before them. The ability of franchisors to terminate any dealership, including that of a Board member, depends on the Board's interpretation of "good cause." It is to every dealer's advantage not to permit termination for low sales performance. If the franchise of a direct competitor of a dealer member is being terminated, however, the member may be more financially interested in

ruling in favor of the franchisor. The court observed that the objectionable financial interests need not be uniform or identical among the Board members. The objectionable feature of dealer-membership on the Board is the likelihood that such a controversy will be decided on the financial interests of the Board members, rather than on the merits [*American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 987-988, 138 Cal. Rptr. 594]* .

A subsequent statutory amendment that allowed the dealer members to participate in, but not decide, contested matters did not cure the constitutional defect. In *Chevrolet Motor Division v. New Motor Vehicle Bd (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270* , the court found that the presence of biased members on the Board presents a substantial probability that decisions will be made on the basis of inappropriate considerations, and the fact that those members do not technically "decide" the disputes does not alter that probability [*Chevrolet Motor Division v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 540-541, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270]* .

Similarly, in *Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1* , the appellate court was persuaded by the manufacturer's argument that the statutory scheme ensured lopsided participation of the car dealers in the Board proceeding without any representation by the manufacturers, and thereby denied the manufacturers the right to a fair hearing by an adjudicatory body free from bias and financial interest. Due to the constitutional infirmity of the cited statutory sections, the court held the decision of the Board to be void in its entirety [*Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 113, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

Licensing agency boards benefit from the expertise brought to issues before those agencies by professional licensees' who are board members. The value of the expertise is offset somewhat by professional interests. Having public (non-professional) board members provides neutrality, or lack of professional interests, but these members often lack expertise in the profession that they are regulating.

[d] Political Reform Act of 1974

The Political Reform Act of 1974 [*see Gov. Code § 81000 et seq.*] requires every agency to promulgate a conflict of interest code [*Gov. Code § 87300*]. The code must include a provision disqualifying any agency employee from any action in which the employee has a financial interest, when it is reasonably foreseeable that the interest may be materially affected by the decision [*Gov. Code § 87302(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 87103*].

An ALJ or agency member has a "financial interest" if it is reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public in general, on the adjudicator or his or her family, business, or property in which he or she has an interest [*Gov. Code § 87103*]. For example, an adjudicator would be barred from participating in a license discipline proceeding that would affect a nursing home in which the adjudicator held stock or other financial interests [*see Gov. Code § 87103* ("financial interests" defined)].

Hearing the application for retirement benefits of a member of the Public Employment Retirement System in which the adjudicator is also a member would not be prohibited, however, because denial or approval of the application would not have a "material" financial effect on the adjudicator's financial interest in the benefit system [*see Gov. Code § 87103* ("financial interests" defined)].

State agency policy makers, such as board or commission members, may not accept honoraria for speeches nor gifts over $250, if the member would be required to report the receipt of income or gifts on their statement of economic interest [*Gov. Code §§ 89502* (honorarium), 89503 (gifts over $250)].

A party should be able to easily ascertain an adjudicator's financial interests. The majority of state-employed ALJs and hearing officers are required by the Political Reform Act of 1974 and the conflict of interest codes of their respective agencies to complete and file statements disclosing their financial interests, including other employment for compensation, positions with businesses or other entities, property interests, and loans [*Gov. Code §§ 87200, 87302(c)*;

see Gov. Code §§ 87300-87313 (requiring each agency to adopt a conflict of interest code)]. These disclosure statements must be filed within 30 days of assuming office, unless the individual resigns the position within 12 months of the initial appointment, or within 30 days of receiving notice of the filing obligation [*Gov. Code § 87302(a), (d)*]. To establish disqualification due to financial interest, counsel may append the statement, which is a public record, to the affidavit submitted when requesting disqualification [*see Gov. Code § 11512(c)* (request pursuant to APA); *see also § 473E.22*, and discussion of access to public records under the Public Records Act, *Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.* in Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*].

The Political Reform Act contains a "rule of necessity" exception, which allows an adjudicator who would otherwise be disqualified by his or her financial interest to nonetheless participate in a decision if the matter could not legally be acted on or decided without his or her participation [*Gov. Code § 87302(c)*]. The exception apparently applies only to agency heads or administrative officers, rather than ALJs or hearing officers assigned to conduct the hearing. For further discussion of the rule of necessity, see *§ 473E.23*.

[5] Personal Involvement or Relationship

[a] Friends, Acquaintances, and Coworkers

A party to an administrative adjudication may perceive an ALJ or agency member to be partial toward personal friends and acquaintances involved in the proceedings [*see* Maloney, *Disqualification of Administrative Law Judges in California, 16 U.S.F. L. Rev. 229, 243*-244 (1982)]. For example, the investigators, peace officers, and staff of the various state licensing agencies frequently testify before ALJs of the OAH. Employees of the same agency may appear before in-house hearing officers in benefit hearings, and appointing authorities may participate in civil service proceedings with equivalent regularity.

Friendship and business associations with participants in a proceeding, however, generally do not constitute grounds for disqualification [*Parrish v. Board of Comm'rs, 524 F.2d 98, 102* (judge's business associations and friendship with some of defendants and counsel did not constitute grounds for disqualification). Note: a business association will probably result in disqualification, however, if the adjudicator has a financial interest in the outcome due to this association [*see* [4], *above*]. The fact that an adjudicator knows a witness or party, and has a general belief in that individual's honesty, does not demand disqualification or indicate that the evidence will not be fairly weighed [*Rohr v. Johnson (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 208, 211, 150 P.2d 5]* . Nonetheless, the ALJ or hearing officer should avoid making off-the-record remarks or behavior that would suggest to a respondent or private counsel that the adjudicator is acquainted with agency counsel or witnesses.

[b] Former Counsel or Co-counsel

Frequently, an ALJ or agency hearing officer has either been the attorney for a party involved in a present action or proceeding, or has practiced with the current counsel. The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(2)* that require disqualification of a judge who has served as counsel for a party to the current case in a proceeding involving the same issues are instructive (but not directly applicable) for ALJs or hearing officers. Nonetheless, a "cooling off" period in which the newly appointed adjudicator refrains from hearing cases involving his prior client agency or cases about which he or she has personal knowledge is advisable.

[c] Family Relationship to Party

ALJs and agency members are not necessarily disqualified on the basis of a family relationship with a party. In contrast, a judge is prohibited from hearing an action in which he or she is a party, or is related to a party or agent of a party by specified consanguinity or affinity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(4)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*]. The regulations governing specific agencies may, however, require disqualification when the adjudicator is related to a party. For example, the regulations governing the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board incorporate the standards applicable to referees,

which include disqualification on the ground of kinship [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*; *Lab. Code § 5311*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 641* (grounds for disqualification of referees)]. Similarly, a hearing panel member in a Board of Prison Terms proceeding may be disqualified on the basis of a close personal relationship with the prisoner [*15 Cal. Code Reg. § 2250*].

[d] Family Relationship With Lawyer in Proceeding

When a judge, or judge's spouse, has a family relationship, as defined by statute, with a lawyer in the proceeding, or the associate of a lawyer in the proceeding, the applicable civil litigation standard calls for disqualification of the judge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(5)*]. It is not clear whether this standard will apply to ALJs or agency members, or even whether this type of conflict will occur very frequently. For further discussion of this grounds for disqualification, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[e] Personal Knowledge

When a judge, or judge's spouse, or family member of the judge or spouse, as defined by statute, to the judge's knowledge, is likely to be a material witness in the proceeding, then the judge is deemed to have a disqualifying personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts relating to the proceeding under the applicable civil litigation standard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(1)*]. It is not clear whether this standard will apply to ALJs or agency members, or even whether this type of conflict will occur very frequently. For further discussion of this grounds for disqualification see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[6] Other Grounds for Disqualification

[a] Lack of Impartiality

Under the applicable civil litigation standard, a judge may be disqualified under three related standards focusing on impartiality. These three standards are [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(6)*]:

- The judge believes that his or her recusal would further the interests of justice.
- The judge believes that there is a substantial doubt as to his or her capacity to be impartial.
- A person aware of the facts might reasonably entertain a doubt that the judge would be able to be impartial. It is not clear whether this standard will apply to ALJs or agency members, or even whether this type of conflict will occur very frequently.

A planning commission member who wrote a newsletter article attacking a proposed real estate development project while that project was pending before the planning commission violated the "unacceptable probability of actual bias standard" by voting on the project as a planning commission member while at the same time having publicly opposed the project. The developer's due process of law right to an impartial decision maker was violated by the participation of the planning commission member in voting on the project while having prejudged the facts of the matter [*Nasha L.L.C. v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 470, 483-484, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772]* .

The appearance of bias standard (reasonable doubts about a hearing officer's impartiality) was found to be applicable in an administrative hearing conducted by a hospital to determine whether a physician should have his hospital staff privileges revoked [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 484-485, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780*]. The Court of Appeal relied upon the fair hearing standards for hospital peer review hearings codified in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 809.2(a)* [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 487-488, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* . The standard was met as to the presiding officer, a retired judge, who presided over a three-member hearing panel, because the judge had a lengthy relationship with the hospital that was a party to the

administrative hearing. This relationship included the judge's service on the Hospital Foundation's Board of Governors, a fund raising entity, as well as the judge's prior service as a mediator, arbitrator, and hearing officer in cases in which the hospital was a party. The hospital had hired the judge as a hearing officer for several cases related to doctor's hospital privileges, including a previous case with the same physician as had challenged the hearing officer in this case [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 483-484, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* . The court of appeal held that these facts met the *Haas* standard for avoiding "potential financial conflicts of interest in the selection of administrative hearing officers to obviate even the possibility of bias" [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 485-486, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* . These facts met the appearance of bias standard, and the retired judge hearing officer had the potential for further appointments by the hospital to be a hearing officer in other cases, and this circumstance created a "possible temptation" to favor the hospital [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 484-485, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* . Based on this holding, the Court of Appeal reversed the judgment of the trial court denying a writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*, and ordered that the writ be granted, and the challenged administrative decision be set aside [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 488, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* .

For further discussion of this grounds for disqualification, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[b] Physical Impairment

When a judge is temporarily or permanently physically impaired such that the judge is unable to properly perceive the evidence or is unable to properly conduct the proceedings, then the judge is disqualified under the applicable civil litigation standard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(7)*]. It is not clear whether this standard will apply to ALJs or agency members, or even whether this type of conflict will occur very frequently. For further discussion of this grounds for disqualification see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[7] Non-Disqualification Grounds

Under the new act, the APA impartial decision maker standard states general grounds for disqualification including bias, prejudice, or interest in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(a)*], and the act states three specific grounds that are not sufficient for disqualification without further evidence of bias, interest, or prejudice on the part of the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)*]. These grounds include the following reasons that the judge:

- Is or is not a member of a racial, ethnic, religious, sexual, or similar group and the proceeding involves the rights of that group [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(1)*].

- Has experience, technical competence, or specialized knowledge of, or has in any capacity expressed a view on, a legal, factual, or policy issue presented in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(2)*].

- Has as a lawyer or public official participated in the drafting of laws or regulations or in the effort to pass or defeat laws or regulations, the meaning, effect, or application of which is in issue in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(b)(3)*].

These three non-disqualification grounds are taken from similar language in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.2*. The law revision comments note, as to the second ground, that expressions on views may lead to disqualification under *Gov. Code § 11425.30* (neutrality of presiding officer) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 159 (1995); *see* [8], *below*, for discussion of this issue]. These provisions governing disqualification also apply to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(c)*].

The Court of Appeal held that a hearing officer's previous service on a hearing panel in a case between the same hospital and the same doctor with similar issues in both hearings was not disqualifying because the hearing officer was

not reviewing a previous decision made by him in the same case. Rather, the hearing officer was considering a new but related set of issues in a new administrative proceeding. Hearing officers are precluded from reviewing their own decisions, but not from hearing a new case that is factually related to a previous case heard by them. The Court of Appeal relied upon the fair hearing standards for hospital peer review hearings codified in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 809.2(a)* [*Yaqub v. Salinas Valley Mem. Healthcare Sys. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 474, 487-488, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780]* .

[8] Multiple Roles of Agencies

[a] Prosecution, Investigation, and Adjudication

[i] Constitutional Standards

California licensing boards and agencies receive complaints, reports, and notification of criminal convictions of licensees. They review qualifications and conduct investigations that may result in an accusation, denial of a license application, or other action against a licensee; they also initiate actions to deny, limit, and revoke licenses, as part of their licensing responsibilities. The agency also serves as adjudicator in those actions even when the agency members do not participate in the hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*; *see also § 473E.11[1]*]. Under the APA, the agency makes the ultimate decision to adopt, reject, or otherwise act on the proposed decision of the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*; *see § 473E.11[4]*].

Under both federal and California law, this combination of investigatory, prosecutory, and adjudicatory functions within an agency, commission, or board is not, per se, a violation of due process absent a showing of actual bias [*Withrow v. Larkin (1975) 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d 712* ; *Kloepfer v. Commission on Judicial Performance (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 826, 833-834, 264 Cal. Rptr. 100, 782 P.2d 239* ; *Griggs v. Board of Trustees (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 93, 98, 37 Cal. Rptr. 194, 389 P.2d 722* ; *Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 392, 184 P.2d 323* . *see Howitt v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1575, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 196* (different lawyers in county counsel's office could represent employee and advise board, thus combining advocacy role with role as advisor to decision making body, so long as the two lawyers are screened from contact with each other related to the representation)].

A county retirement board did not violate due process of law by both investigating and adjudicating retirement benefits applications. The Board can select unilaterally and compensate hearing officers consistent with due process of law. Due process of law does not require that the applicant participate in the hearing officer selection process Board selection and compensation of hearing officers does not, by itself, establish bias against applicants for retirement benefits on the part of the hearing officers [*McIntyre v. Santa Barbara County Employees' Retirement System (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 730, 735-736, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 565]* . In *Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 184 P.2d 323* , an insurance agent whose license was revoked characterized the insurance commissioner as "... accuser and judge [who] by his decision won his own case," although the commissioner had adopted without change the decision of the hearing officer. The court in *Hohreiter* observed that no court has held proceedings to be invalid, the trial abortive, and the accused deprived of due process of law, simply because an administrative board both prefers and tries the charge. It stated that the mere fact that the administrative board is both accuser and judge in no way adversely affects the rights of the accused [*Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 392-393, 184 P.2d 323* ; *see Kloepfer v. Commission on Judicial Performance (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 826, 833-834, 264 Cal. Rptr. 100, 782 P.2d 239* (Commission on Judicial Performance may combine accusatory, investigatory, and adjudicatory functions in proceedings against judge); *Chosick v. Reilly (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 334, 338, 270 P.2d 547* (Board of Equalization could serve as both accuser and judge in revocation of liquor license); *Murphy v. Board of Medical Examiners (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 161, 162-163, 170 P.2d 510* (Board of Medical Examiners could make the accusation against a doctor, as well as hear the evidence and render a decision to revoke his license)].

Similarly, in a teacher dismissal proceeding, the court observed that the responsibility to issue pleadings to dismiss a teacher and the authority to act on the proposed decision of the hearing officer who conducted the contested hearing

were necessarily vested in a single agency, the school board. It stated that, by the very nature of the administrative process, the agency or one of its agents or representatives is bound to be involved in the initiation and prosecution of charges [*Greer v. Board of Education (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 98, 119-120, 121 Cal. Rptr. 542]* . An independent inquiry by a school board prior to a formal hearing is not inconsistent with its power to hold the formal hearing [*Greer v. Board of Education (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 98, 119-120, 121 Cal. Rptr. 542]* .

However, a child care contractor that was debarred for three years by the state agency that administered child care contracts was entitled under a due process liberty interest claim to a hearing before an impartial arbiter or tribunal on justification for the debarment. Due process of law was violated when one member of the hearing panel had participated in agency staff decisions that were challenged in the hearing process as that member could not both investigate and adjudicate in the same case [*Golden Day Schools, Inc. v. State Department of Education (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 695, 709-711, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917]* .

A police officer who was reassigned to a lower pay grade by his employer has a significant private interest in continued receipt of his paycheck [*Gilbert v. Homar (1997) 520 U.S. 924, 932, 117 S. Ct. 1807, 138 L. Ed. 2d 120]* , and therefore was entitled under due process of law to hearing procedures in which the police department had the burden of proof of showing that the criteria in the department manual for reassignment to a lower pay grade have been established. The agency procedures placed the burden of proof on the police officer, and that violated due process of law [*Brown v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 155, 175-177, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474* ; *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 85, 92-94, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911]* . The due process right to a neutral decision maker was also violated because the police chief both authorized the reassignment to a lower pay grade and was also the final decision maker at the end of the administrative hearing. This lack of neutrality, coupled with other factors, results in a significant risk of unfairness to the police officer, whose property interests under due process of law are adversely affected [*Brown v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 155, 177-179, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474]* . However, limiting the pool of hearing officers to high ranking employees within the police department does not violate due process of law because the officers are employees of the police department, and the affected police officer picks three possible hearing officers from the list of eligible officers [*Brown v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 155, 178-179, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474]* .

Separation of functions is also required as a matter of due process of law when local agency adjudicators decide whether to renew business licenses. A city attorney who acted as an advocate for the city urging nonrenewal of a business license at the application stage could not, consistent with due process of law, act as an advisor to the city manager who decided the business's administrative appeal from the denial of the application and acted as an adjudicative decision maker. This violated the due process of law right to an impartial decision maker [*Nightlife Partners Ltd. v. City of Beverly Hills (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 81, 97-98, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 234]* . Similarly, a city attorney who acted as an advocate for the city in a lawsuit brought by a terminated city employee could not also, consistent with due process of law court, act as a decision maker, in the employee's administrative appeal of their termination, which was officially decided by the city manager but in which the city attorney prepared the recommended decision that the city attorney followed. [*Walker v. City of Berkeley (9th Cir. 1991) 951 F. 2d 182, 185]* . The California Supreme Court held that due process of law was not violated when an attorney for the State Water Resources Control Board was the agency prosecutor in a specific administrative proceeding and that same agency attorney advised the Board in an unrelated administrative proceeding [*Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Board (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 731, 734, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 610, 199 P. 3d 1142]* . In so holding, the California Supreme Court concluded that neither due process of law nor the California APA are violated by combining advocacy and advising functions within the same agency so long as there is separation of functions internally on a case by case basis. Thus, the same agency employee could not perform conflicting functions (advocacy versus advising) in the same case. To establish that the tribunal is biased in the due process manner requires a showing of actual bias when separation of function issues are the bases for showing bias. The probability of bias standard was rejected by the court in this setting, and that standard only applies when there are disqualifying financial interests [*Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. State Water Resources Control Board (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 731, 737-738, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 610, 199 P. 3d 1142 , disapproving Quintero v. City*

of Santa Ana (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 810, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 896 (an agency attorney who performs conflicting roles of advocacy and advising agency in unrelated cases violate due process of law)]. None of the local agencies in these cases was subject to the California APA, which is limited to state agencies.

The First District Division 1 California Court of appeal held that a property owner was not denied due process of law because of dual incompatible roles of an agency attorney because the attorney acted only in a legal advisory role for the agency at the administrative hearing level and did not act as an advocate at that level [*Witt Home Ranch, Inc. v. County of Sonoma (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 543, 568-570, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 123*].

[ii] APA Standard

Agency proceeding subject to Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), must satisfy the internal separation of functions requirements that are part of the APA's Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(4), 11425.30*]. Specifically, this requires that the adjudicative function must be separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within the agency as provided in *Gov. Code § 11425.30* [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(4)*].

Gov. Code § 11425.30 requires internal separation of functions within an agency, which means that the same individual within an agency can not perform inconsistent functions in the same case before the agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.30*]. This section provides that a presiding officer is disqualified from presiding in an adjudicative proceeding in the following two situations [*see Gov. Code §§ 11405.80* (defining presiding officer), 11405.20 (defining adjudicative proceeding)]:

- The person has served as investigator, prosecutor, or advocate in the proceeding or its pre-adjudicative stage [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(a)(1)*].

- The person is subject to the authority, direction, or discretion of a person who has served as investigator, prosecutor, or advocate in the proceeding or its pre-adjudicative stage [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(a)(2)*].

Serving means that the person has personally carried out the function and not merely supervised or been organizationally connected with a person who has personally carried out the function. Substantial involvement in a case is required, not merely marginal or trivial participation. What is disqualifying is meaningful participation that is likely to affect an individual with a commitment to a particular result in a case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 157 (1995)].

However, a presiding officer is not disqualified in the following two circumstances:

- A person may serve as presiding officer in successive stages of an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(b)(1)*].

- A person who has participated only as a decision maker or as an advisor to a decision maker in a determination of probable cause or other equivalent preliminary determination in an adjudicative proceeding or its pre-adjudicative stage may serve as presiding officer in the proceeding.

The first exception allows a decision maker to act in a similar capacity at both the probable cause and final hearing stages. However, the person can not be the decisionmaker at the hearing stage if the person acted in a prosecutorial, investigative, or advocacy role at the probable cause stage [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 157 (1995)]. Finally, these separation of functions requirements apply also to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11425.30(c)*].

Agency hearing officers and agencies that conduct proceedings not governed by Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the APA's formal hearing provisions, are subject to the internal separation of function requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(4), 11425.30* if those agencies are state agencies and an evidentiary hearing is required to held by statute or constitutional provision [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11410.20(a)*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , for further discussion of these requirements].

[b] Legal Representation

Administrative agencies customarily obtain legal advice from the same counsel that represents their interests in contested administrative hearings. The majority of state licensing agencies, including the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, Contractors' State License Board, Board of Registered Nursing, and the Bureau of Automotive Repair, are represented by the attorney general's office in license disciplinary hearings. The deputy assigned to advise the agency in its executive sessions may have represented the agency in the contested matter at hand.

In contrast, agencies such as the Department of Real Estate, Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, and Department of Motor Vehicles, which are represented by house counsel in licensing hearings, rely on that counsel for legal advice. No reported California case suggests that such a system is impermissible; the situation may be inevitable in public agencies [*Ford v. Civil Service Commission (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 692, 697, 327 P.2d 148* (members of county counsel's office represented both recorder's office, which had fired respondent, and civil service commission, which conducted hearing to review termination)].

[c] Party Who Imposed Penalty Must Consent to Reduction of Penalty by Reviewing Body

In some cases, regulations or local charters may require the consent of the official who imposed a penalty before an administrative reviewing body may reduce that penalty. This kind of requirement does not violate due process by denying the penalized party a fair and impartial decision maker. For example, a city charter provision gave city employees the right to have disciplinary measures reviewed by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners, but limited the Board's authority by providing that any penalty reduction recommended by the Board must be consented to by the same official who originally imposed the penalty. The court rejected a due process challenge to this charter provision, analogizing it to those procedures in which an agency investigates, files a charge, and then adjudicates the matter [*Burrell v. City of Los Angeles (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 568, 577-581,257 Cal. Rptr. 427]* . For decisions stating that it is not a denial of due process for an agency to both prosecute and adjudicate, see [a][i], *above*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsFinancial InterestsCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsPersonal BiasConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.22

§ 473E.22 Disqualification Procedures

[1] APA Procedures

[a] Request for Disqualification, Waiver, and Timeliness

A party may request the disqualification of an ALJ or agency member who has not voluntarily withdrawn under disqualification standards [*see Gov. Code § 11425.40*] by filing an affidavit prior to the taking of evidence at a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*].

The parties may waive the disqualification by a writing that recites the grounds for disqualification. A waiver is effective only when signed by all parties, accepted by the administrative law judge or agency member, and included in the record [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.61*, for a waiver form]. Waiver of disqualification here is similar to waiver of disqualification of judges in civil litigation [*see Code Civ. Proc.§ 170.3(b)(1)*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*].

The issue of disqualification must be timely raised at the administrative level. It cannot be first asserted on judicial review [*Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 143, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* ; *Kendall v. Bd. of Osteopathic Examiners (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 239, 248, 233 P.2d 107* ; *Barkin v. Board of Optometry (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 75 Cal. Rptr. 337]* . Because of last-minute settlements and other matters that affect the hearing calendar, however, a party's attorney may be unable to identify the particular ALJ assigned to the hearing until shortly before the matter commences. To allow a timely motion to disqualify, diligent counsel with a valid concern about the bias of a particular ALJ should contact the presiding judge of that office to request early identification of the assigned personnel.

The identity of board and commission members is readily available from their staff, but counsel can rarely predict which members will be present at a meeting to consider a particular proposed decision. The Board of Medical Quality Assurance and other agencies that have matters heard by a panel of the agency [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*] customarily notify counsel before the hearing of the name of the members who will sit. Because the motion for disqualification can be made only after the identity is known, the "timeliness" of a motion should date from that notification rather than the notice setting the matter for hearing.

Although the APA requires the affidavit to be filed before the hearing commences [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*], it does not set forth the procedure to be used when bias is discovered after the hearing commences. Presumably, a party who for good reason was unaware of a fact establishing bias prior to the hearing may raise the issue of bias and move to disqualify immediately on discovering the grounds for bias [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 170.3(c)(1)* (party may request disqualification of judge at earliest opportunity after discovery of facts constituting grounds for disqualification)].

[b] Contents of Affidavit

The affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2003* ("affidavit" defined as written declaration under oath, made without notice to adverse party)] must state with particularity the grounds on which the party claims that the administrative law judge or agency member is disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; for a form of motion to disqualify and supporting declaration, which, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*, may be used in lieu of an affidavit, *see § 473E.60*]. It must state facts, rather than conclusions and assertions, that establish grounds for disqualification under the relevant standards which include:

- Bias, prejudice, and interest [*Gov. Code § 11425.40*; *see § 473E.21[1] to [7]*].
- Combination of functions [*Gov. Code § 11425.30*; *see § 473E.21[8]*].
- Ex parte communications [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*; *see § 473E.24*].

Because voir dire of the ALJ and panel members is not permitted, if a party believes that an agency member is biased but cannot establish this fact by affidavit, counsel will not have an opportunity at the hearing to attempt to establish the charge [*see, e.g., Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 946, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* (holding that the respondent, a licensed psychologist, had no right to examine agency members or the ALJ as to possible disqualification on voir dire); *see also Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 414, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465* (teacher dismissal hearing pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44944*)].

[c] Determination of Bias

The APA provides that the unchallenged agency members must review the affidavit when it alleges bias of a member of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*]. In practice, panel or agency members frequently withdraw when any member is challenged, even though the unchallenged members would provide a quorum, and permit the ALJ to hear the matter alone. Nonetheless, the APA prohibits agency members from withdrawing voluntarily or from being disqualified if the disqualification would prevent the existence of a quorum qualified to act in a particular case, except that a substitute qualified to act may be appointed by the appointing authority [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*].

This would mean that in cases in which the agency hears the action with the administrative law judge, the agency may appoint qualified substitutes, such as other members of a multi member board, as an alternative to either designating the ALJ to hear the case alone, or retaining disqualified agency members to hear the case to preserve a quorum. When an affidavit is filed against an ALJ who will hear the case alone, the ALJ must decide the matter [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*]. When both the ALJ and the agency will hear the case, the agency must make the determination regarding the ALJ's bias [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*].

In practice, when other staff are available to hear the matter, many ALJs will elect to remove themselves once challenged, even when not persuaded that the affidavit establishes bias. These challenges are carefully scrutinized, however, to assure that the motion is not a veiled effort at "judge-shopping," or a tactical measure to continue the case. This concern about challenges solely for purposes of delay was identified by the Judicial Council's report proposing the disqualification procedure in the APA [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 21]. Counsel or parties should not anticipate that a challenge to a particular ALJ will delay or continue the proceeding;

sufficient staff are usually available to whom cases can be reassigned when the motion is granted.

[d] Peremptory Challenges

Agencies that conduct adjudicative proceedings may provide by regulation for peremptory challenge of the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(d)*]. Peremptory challenges are used in jury selection in civil litigation, to excuse jurors from sitting on a trial jury, without specific proof of grounds for disqualification [*see Code Civ. Proc § 226(b)*; *see* Ch. 322, *Juries and Verdicts*]. Peremptory challenges are also used in civil litigation to disqualify a trial judge without specific proof of grounds for disqualification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.6*; *see* Ch. 317, *Judges*]. Under the APA standard, peremptory challenges are not allowed unless a specific agency adopts a regulation authorizing peremptory challenges of the presiding officer.

This peremptory challenge by regulation standard applies in all administrative adjudication subject to Chapter 4.5 (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), and in those administrative adjudications subject to Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995) *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , for more detailed discussion of the applicability of various provisions of the APA].

[2] Non-APA Procedures

Agencies not subject to the APA are generally subject to statutes or regulations that govern the procedure for disqualification of the ALJ or hearing officer. Many of these statutes and regulations contain provisions similar to those of the APA. For example, proceedings to disqualify a workers' compensation judge under *Lab. Code § 5311* are initiated by filing a petition, which must be supported by an affidavit stating in detail facts establishing grounds for disqualification [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*]. A party requesting the disqualification of a hearing officer in a Medi-Cal proceeding must file an affidavit stating in detail the basis for his or her claim that a fair and impartial hearing cannot be given, or stating that the hearing officer has an interest in the proceeding [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 51043(b)*].

If the governing statutes and regulations do not require a specific procedure, the party wishing to disqualify an ALJ or hearing officer may make a motion supported by an affidavit based on that required by the APA.

[3] Judicial Review of Decision

The determination of any agency member or ALJ to refuse to disqualify himself or herself, or the administrative decision regarding bias, is subject to review pursuant to a writ of administrative mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. The writ is framed as an inquiry into the validity of an administrative decision, specifically, the deprivation of a fair hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1094.5(a), 1094.5(b)*]. This method of judicial review is discussed in Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq. Even if a member of an agency should have been disqualified, however, reversible error does not occur when a quorum or sufficient number of qualified agency members adopted or made the decision [*Thompson v. City of Long Beach (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 235, 243, 259 P.2d 649]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.23

§ 473E.23 Rule of Necessity

[1] General Requirements

Even when an ALJ, agency member, or other hearing officer is disqualified from hearing a case, he or she may still be required to serve under the "rule of necessity." This rule allows an otherwise disqualified person to hear and decide a contested matter when that person's participation is indispensable to the conduct or resolution of the case, and his or her refusal to act would prevent a determination of the proceeding [*Nider v. Homan (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 11, 17-18, 89 P.2d 136* ; *see* Davis, *Administrative Law Treatise* (2d ed. 1980), Vol. 3, § 19:9].

Although the rule of necessity applies to individual adjudicators or officials [*Federal Construction Co. v. Curd (1918) 179 Cal. 489, 493, 177 P. 469* ; *Scannell v. Wolff (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 489, 492, 195 P.2d 536]* , it usually involves membership on the only board or agency that is authorized to decide an issue [*Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App.2d 443, 452, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779]* . For example, in *Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779* , the court stated that only the appointed civil service commission can dismiss a civil service employee and held that the commission was required to hear and decide a dismissal matter, despite allegations that its members were biased [*Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 452, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779]* . Similarly, in court in *Gonsalves v. City of Dairy Valley (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 400, 71 Cal. Rptr. 255]* , found that, because granting a zoning variance is reserved to the elected city council, council members need not disqualify themselves from that decision, even when each councilman had a financial interest in the applicant business [*Gonsalves v. City of Dairy Valley (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 400, 404, 71 Cal. Rptr. 255]* . The court in *Gonsalves* summarized the rule of necessity as follows [*Gonsalves v. City of Dairy Valley (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 400, 404, 71 Cal. Rptr. 255]* :

> The rule is well settled that where an administrative body has a duty to act upon a matter which is before it and is the only entity capable to act in the matter, the fact that the members may have a personal interest in the result of the action taken does not disqualify them to perform their duty. It is a rule of necessity which has been followed consistently.

The rule applies when an entire board or commission is subject to disqualification, or when a quorum could not be achieved absent the disqualified members [*Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 452, 2 Cal. Rptr.*

779] . When a quorum or sufficient number of qualified members would remain after the challenged or disqualified members step down, however, the rule of necessity does not apply or insulate the agency decision from reversal [*Nider v. Homan (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 11, 18, 20, 89 P.2d 136]* . The California Court of Appeal applied the "rule of necessity" to prohibit a doctor's claim that the board of directors of a private hospital medical center which had terminated the doctor's staff privileges was structurally biased against the doctor. The court extended the rule of necessity to a private body, the hospital's board of directors, because the hospital had been delegated by statute the authority to provide peer review of physicians [*Weinberg v. Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1112-1113, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* .

The rule does not shelter the decision reached by the board or agency from judicial scrutiny for bias; it permits the board or agency to make a decision that can be reviewed [*Dyment v. Board of Medical Examiners (1922) 57 Cal. App. 260, 266, 207 P. 409]* . The court reviewing the decision of such a commission must inquire whether there was a fair trial. A fair trial contemplates an impartial trial [*Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 452, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779* ; *Barkin v. Board of Optometry (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 714, 718-719, 75 Cal. Rptr. 337]* . For a detailed discussion of fair trial issues, see Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[2] APA Proceedings

The APA has codified the rule of necessity in *Gov. Code § 11512(c)*, which provides that no agency member may withdraw voluntarily or be subject to disqualification, if his or her disqualification would prevent the existence of a quorum qualified to act in the particular case [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*]. When the Judicial Council recommended codification of the rule in the APA, it recognized that the rule was well established in California law: "This section preserves the 'rule of necessity' ... which will not permit disqualification where it would render the agency incapable of acting" [Tenth Biennial Report of the Judicial Council of California, Dec. 31, 1944, p. 20]. The statutory rule of necessity does not apply to an ALJ in a APA matter. Thus, a disqualified ALJ must withdraw from any case in which he or she cannot accord a fair and impartial hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*], and another ALJ will be assigned to the matter. This makes sense because there are more than one ALJ who can be assigned to hear an administrative hearing.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.24

§ 473E.24 Ex Parte Communications

[1] Introduction

An ex parte communication by a party or interested individual to an ALJ or agency member during an administrative adjudication is defined to be a communication made while a proceeding is pending to the presiding officer in that proceeding by an employee or representative of an agency that is a party or from an interested person outside the agency, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*]. Ex parte communications raise the following significant concerns:

- The message will affect the adjudicator's neutrality and objectivity.

- The information or opinion transmitted will not be reflected in the record or be available for consideration by a court reviewing the adjudicator's decision.

- A party unaware of the content of the communication will be unaware of the need to rebut the information.

Ex parte communications also raise fairness concerns, that both sides will not be heard in a contested case, or that one side has greater influence because that side can present their argument without being challenged by their opponent.

It is unethical for a lawyer to make an improper ex parte communication to a judge or judicial officer upon the merits of a contested matter pending before the judge [*Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)*], and it is improper for judges to make or receive similar ex parte communications from a lawyer in a pending or impending proceeding [Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3C(7)].

Ex parte communications are a greater problem in administrative agencies than in civil or criminal litigation, because agencies frequently communicate with regulated industries, licensees, or both, on an ex parte basis when deciding policy issues in rulemaking. Thus, the agency and interested outsiders will be talking frequently about issues of

common interest. However, improper ex parte communications are prohibited in contested adjudicative hearings [*see* [2], *below*].

[2] APA Requirements

[a] Definitions and Basic Prohibitions

Under APA provisions that became operative July 1, 1997, ex parte communications are improper in some circumstances and are proper in others [*Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*]. The prohibition on ex parte communications provides that while the proceeding is pending there shall be no communication, direct or indirect, regarding any issue in the proceeding, to the presiding officer from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party or from an interested person outside the agency, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*]. For purposes of this prohibition, a proceeding is pending from the issuance of an agency's pleading, or from an application for an agency decision, whichever is earlier [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(c)*].

The term "interested person outside the agency" is based on federal administrative law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55,164 (1995); *see 5 U.S.C. § 557(d)(1)(A)*; *PATCO v, Federal Labor Relations Authority (1982) 685 F.2d 547, 562, 222 U.S. App. D.C. 97* (interpreting the federal standard to include persons with interest beyond that of members of the general public)]. The pendency of a proceeding includes any period of time between the time an application for a hearing is made and the time the agency's pleading is issued [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995)].

Furthermore, if, while the proceeding is pending but before serving as presiding officer, a person receives a communication of a type that would violate the provisions of this law if received while the person was serving as a presiding officer, the person, promptly after starting to serve, shall disclose the content of the communication on the record and give all parties an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.40(c)*; *see* [c], *below*].

[b] Permissible Communications

Ex parte communications that are proper under the act include several categories. The first category, general permissible communication specifically authorized by the language of the act, include the following:

- Communications, including a communication from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party, made on the record at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(b)*].

- Communications that are required for the disposition of an ex parte matter specifically authorized by statute [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(a)*].

- Communications that concern a matter of procedure or practice, including a request for a continuance, that is not in controversy [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(b)*]. This exception does not preclude communications made to a presiding officer or staff assistant regarding noncontroversial matters of procedure and practice, such as the format of pleadings, number of copies required, manner of service, and calendaring and status discussions. Such topics are not considered to be part of the merits of the proceeding provided they are noncontroversial in the context of the specific case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 165 (1995)].

Under a second category, communications otherwise prohibited, from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party to a presiding officer, are permissible in the following circumstances:

- The communication is for the purpose of assistance and advice to the presiding officer from a person

who has not served as investigator, prosecutor or advocate in the proceeding or its pre-adjudicative stage. An assistant or advisor may evaluate the evidence in the record but shall not furnish, augment, diminish, or modify the evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(a)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning a settlement proposal advocated by the advisor [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(b)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning any of the following matters in an adjudicative proceeding that is non-prosecutorial in character including [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)*]:

  - The advice involves a technical issue in the proceeding and the advice is necessary for, and is not otherwise reasonably available to, the presiding officer, provided the content of the advice is disclosed on the record and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(1)*; *see* [c], *below*].

  - The advice involves an issue in a proceeding of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Delta Protection Commission, Water Resources Control Board, or a regional water quality control board [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(2)*].

A third (and final) category is comprised of permissible communications noted in the Law Revision Commission comments, including the following:

- The presiding officer's authority to conduct in camera examination of evidence in a proceeding [*see Gov. Code § 11507.7(d), (e)*] is not limited by the prohibition on ex parte communications [*Gov. Code § 11430.10*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995)].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from communicating with adversaries. Only communications from adversaries to presiding officers are precluded. However, presiding officers should give assistance or advice with caution, since there may be an appearance of unfairness if assistance or advice is given to some parties but not others [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11430.10*].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from consulting with other agency personnel when the agency conducting the hearing is not a party to the proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *Gov. Code § 11430.10*].

[c] Consequences of Violations

When an improper ex parte communication is made, there are three consequences, disclosure, notice and opportunity to respond, and if necessary, disqualification of the presiding officer. If a presiding officer receives an improper communication, the officer must place the following in the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)*]:

- If the communication is written, the writing and any written response of the presiding officer to the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(1)*].

- If the communication is oral, a memorandum stating the substance of the communication, any response made by the presiding officer, and the identity of each person from whom the presiding officer received the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(2)*].

The presiding officer must also notify all parties that an ex parte communication has been made a part of the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(b)*]. If a party requests an opportunity to address the communication within 10 days after receipt of notice of the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)*]:

- The party must be permitted to comment on the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(1)*].

- The presiding officer has discretion to allow the party to present evidence concerning the subject of the communication, including discretion to reopen a hearing that has been concluded [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(2)*].

If a presiding officer receives an improper ex parte communication, the presiding officer may be disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*]. Disqualification is permitted if it is necessary to eliminate the effect of the ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 169 (1995)]. If the presiding officer is disqualified, the portion of the record pertaining to the ex parte communication may be sealed by protective order of the disqualified presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*]. The purpose of sealing is to remove the improper communication from the view of the successor presiding officer, while preserving it as a sealed part of the record, for purposes of subsequent administrative or judicial review. Granting a protective order is permissive, not mandatory, and is within the discretion of the presiding officer who has knowledge of the improper ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 169 (1995)].

[d] Application to Agency Head

Agency heads [*see Gov. Code § 11405.40* (defining agency head)] who are decision makers are subject to the same requirements as to ex parte communications with several qualifications. The same requirements that govern ex parte communications to presiding officers also govern ex parte communications in an adjudicative proceeding to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(a)*].

There is, however, an exception that applies to individualized rate making proceedings. An ex parte communication to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated is permissible in an individualized rate making proceeding if the content of the communication is disclosed on the record and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(b)*; *see* [c], *above*].

Furthermore, there is a prohibition on direct or indirect communication, while a proceeding is pending regarding the merits of any issue in the proceeding, between the presiding officer and the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(a)*]. This rule does not apply when the agency head or other person to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated serves as both presiding officer and agency head, or when the presiding officer does not issue a decision in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(b)*].

[3] Non-APA Requirements

Non-APA proceedings are governed by *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)*, which prohibits a State Bar member from communicating with a judicial officer on the merits of a contested matter before that officer, except in open court or under other exceptions [*Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)* (other exceptions include consent and ex parte matters; *see Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)(1)-(5)*); for further discussion, *see* Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics*].

The California Court of Appeal held that an ex parte communication by the chief of staff of a hospital to the Board of

Directors of the hospital that related to the Board's decision to terminate a doctor's staff privileges was not improper (even though the content of the chief of staff's report was not placed in the record of the peer review proceeding) because the doctor failed to raise the issue before the Board, thereby waiving the right to raise the issue on appeal and because the doctor failed to show actual bias from the giving of the report to the board as such reports were authorized by the constitution of the medical staff [*Weinberg v. Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1115-1116, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* .

Because of the scope of the APA ex parte requirements, non-APA requirements would apply primarily to hearings before local agencies [*see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , for further discussion of the scope of application of APA provisions].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.25

§ 473E.25 ALJ Code of Ethics

[1] Applicability

The ALJ ethics provisions may be referred to as the Administrative Adjudication Code of Ethics [*Gov. Code § 11475*]. For convenience it is here referred to as the ALJ Code of Ethics.

The ALJ Code of Ethics applies to the following persons:

- An administrative law judge, by which is meant an incumbent of that position, as defined by the State Personnel Board, for each class specification for Administrative Law Judge [*Gov. Code § 11475.10(a)(1)*].

- A presiding officer to which the ALJ Code of Ethics is made applicable by statute or regulation [*Gov. Code § 11475.10(a)(2)*; *see also Gov. Code § 11405.80* (defining "presiding officer")].

Under *Gov. Code § 11475.10(a)(1)*, the ALJ Code of Ethics applies not only to ALJ's who preside at adjudicative hearing but also to any supervisory or management level administrative law judge or chief administrative law judge whose function relates directly or indirectly to the adjudicative process.

Conversely, under *Gov. Code § 11475.10(a)(2)*, the ALJ Code of Ethics does not apply to an to an agency head or hearing officer who presides in an administrative adjudication but who is not an ALJ, absent a special statute or regulation. The language "statute or regulation" means that the ALJ Code of Ethics may be made applicable, in situations when it would otherwise not apply, both by the Legislature and also by a particular agency that, by regulation, elects to make it applicable [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.10*; *see* discussion in [4], *below*]. When the ALJ Code of Ethics does not apply, other ethical considerations may nevertheless apply to the hearing and nonhearing conduct of state agency presiding officers [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.10* (citing, for example, *Gov. Code § 19572*, relating to cause for discipline)].

The ALJ Code of Ethics applies notwithstanding any general statute providing that *Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.* does not apply to some or all of a particular state agency's adjudicative proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11475.10(b)*]. In other words, it applies to an ALJ even when the proceeding over which he or she is presiding is otherwise exempt from Chapter 4.5 (), the APA's general provisions relating to administrative adjudications [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.10*; *see, e.g. Gov. Code § 15609.5* (Board of Equalization proceedings exempt); *Pub. Util. Code § 1701* (PUC proceedings exempt)].

[2] Incorporation of Code of Judicial Ethics

[a] Code of Judicial Ethics Incorporated Generally

Except as otherwise provided (*see Gov. Code § 11475.40*, discussed in [b], *below*), the Code of Judicial Ethics adopted by the Supreme Court under *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 18(m)* governs the hearing and nonhearing conduct of an ALJ or other presiding officer to which the ALJ Code of Ethics applies [*Gov. Code § 11475.20*].

The effect of *Gov. Code § 11475.20* is to incorporate generally the Code of Judicial Ethics into the ALJ Code of Ethics. The Code of Judicial Ethics thus becomes applicable generally in administrative adjudications [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.20*]. This incorporation by reference includes subsequent amendments and additions to the Code of Judicial Ethics, as adopted by the Supreme Court effective January 15, 1996. It is intended that interpretations of the Code of Judicial Ethics in its application to the judicial system, whether made by court rule or decision, should also be applied in administrative adjudication, to the extent relevant to the circumstances of administrative adjudication [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.20*]. The text of the Code of Judicial Conduct, set out in Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, may be found at the Internet site of the California Judiciary [*see* http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov]. For discussion of the Code of Judicial Ethics in the context of disqualification of judges for cause, see Ch. 317, *Judges* , Part III.

Because the Code of Judicial Ethics governs the conduct of judges, the following definitions apply to provide a general guide in converting terms in the Code of Judicial Ethics for application to administrative adjudications [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.30*]:

- "Appeal" means administrative review [*Gov. Code § 11475.30(a)*].

- "Court" means the agency conducting an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11475.30(b)*].

- "Judge" means administrative law judge or other presiding officer to which the ALJ Code of Ethics applies. Related terms, including "judicial," "judiciary," and "justice," mean comparable concepts administrative adjudication [*Gov. Code § 11475.30(c)*].

- "Law" includes regulation and precedent decision [*Gov. Code § 11475.30(d)*].

It is intended that these definitions be applied in a manner to effectuate their general purpose without requiring strict or grammatically precise rigidity in the conversion of terms. Likewise, other terms not included in these definitions should be converted in an appropriate manner to effectuate the general intent to apply the Code of Judicial Ethics to the circumstances of administrative adjudication [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.30*].

The provisions of the Code of Judicial Ethics thus incorporated are designed to supplement other standards that also apply to the conduct of an ALJ, including the following [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.20*]:

- Disqualification for bias (*see Gov. Code § 11425.40* and discussion in *§ 473E.21[1]*).

- Enforcement of the ALJ Code of Ethics (*see Gov. Code § 11475.50* and discussion in [3], *below*).

- Disciplinary action for failure of good behavior (*see Gov. Code § 19572*).

- The requirements generally applicable to designated employees of state agencies (*see Gov. Code § 89500 et seq.*).

[b] Excluded Provisions of Code of Judicial Ethics

Notwithstanding the general incorporation of the Code of Judicial Ethics into the ALJ Code of Ethics (*see* [a], *above*), the following provisions of the Code of Judicial Ethics are expressly excluded from the ALJ Code of Ethics:

- Canon 3B(7), to the extent it relates to ex parte communications [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(a)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3B(7)]. This exclusion reflects that fact that special provisions, and not the Code of Judicial Ethics, govern ex parte communications in administrative adjudication [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*; *see* discussion in *§ 473E.24*].

- Canon 3B(10) (judge may not express opinion of jury verdict to jurors) [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(b)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3B(10)]. This exclusion simply reflects the fact that juries are not used in administrative adjudication [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*].

- Canon 3D(3) (judge required to report indictment or conviction of most crimes to Commission on Judicial Performance) [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(c)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3D(3)]. This exclusion reflects the fact that the provision is not relevant to ALJ's, who are not under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Judicial Performance [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*].

- Canon 4C (restricting a judge's participation in governmental, civic, or charitable activities) [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(d)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 4C]. This exclusion means that an ALJ law judge is not precluded from engaging in activities of this type, except to the extent the activities may conflict with general limitations on the administrative law judge's conduct [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40* (citing, for example, the general limitations on extrajudicial activities set out in Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 4A].

- Canons 4E(1), 4F, and 4G [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(e)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canons 4E(1), 4F, 4G]. The exclusion of these provisions, relating to fiduciary activities, private employment in alternative dispute resolution, and the practice of law, reflect the fact that these matters are the subject of the employing agency's incompatible activity statement pursuant to *Gov. Code § 19990* [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*].

- Canons 5A through 5D; however, the introductory paragraph of Canon 5 applies to persons subject to the ALJ Code of Ethics notwithstanding *Gov. Code § 3201 et seq.*, relating to political activities of public employees [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(f)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canons 5A-5D]. Under this exclusion, an ALJ or other presiding officer must avoid political activity that may create the appearance of political bias or impropriety, such as participation in political activity related to an issue that may come before the ALJ or other presiding officer. By making the introductory paragraph of Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canons 5 applicable, this subsection limits the political activities of administrative law judges even though other

public employees might be able to participate in those activities under the *Hatch Act* (*Gov. Code § 3201 et seq.*). This subsection is not intended to preclude an ALJ or other presiding officer from appearing at a public hearing or officially consulting with an executive or legislative body or public official in matters concerning the judge's private economic or personal interests, or to otherwise engage in political activities relating to salaries, benefits, and working conditions [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*; *see also* discussion of *Gov. Code § 11475.70* in [4], *below*].

- Canon 6 (regarding compliance with the Code of Judicial Ethics) [*Gov. Code § 11475.40(g)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 6]. The exclusion of Canon 6 reflects the fact that its provisions are superseded by the compliance and enforcement provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11475.50* and *11475.60* (discussed in [3], *below*) [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40*].

Generally, the exclusions of *Gov. Code § 11475.40* are designed to adapt the Code of Judicial Ethics for application to ALJ's. Other provisions of the Code of Judicial Ethics, although not expressly excluded, may be minimally relevant to an ALJ [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.40* (citing, for example, Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3C(4) (administrative responsibilities of judges)].

[3] Compliance With and Enforcement of Code

Except as provided in *Gov. Code § 11475.60(b)*, a person to whom the ALJ Code of Ethics applies must comply immediately with all applicable provisions of the Code of Judicial Ethics [*Gov. Code § 11475.60(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11475.60(b)* sets out a transition clause with respect to compliance with Canon 4D(2), relating to business and commercial activities. Specifically, a person to whom the ALJ Code of Ethics applies must comply with Canon 4D(2) of the Code of Judicial Ethics as soon as reasonably possible and must do so in any event within a period of one year after the ALJ Code of Ethics operative date (*i.e.*, within one year after January 1, 1999) [*Gov. Code § 11475.60(b)*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 4D(2)].

A violation of an applicable provision of the Code of Judicial Ethics, or a violation of the restrictions and prohibitions on accepting honoraria, gifts, or travel that otherwise apply to elected state officers pursuant to *Gov. Code § 89500*, by an ALJ, or other presiding officer to whom the ALJ Code of Ethics applies, is cause for discipline by the employing agency pursuant to *Gov. Code § 19572* [*Gov. Code § 11475.50*]. This provision, which supersedes Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 6A, is not precatory but mandatory. Appropriate discipline is the responsibility of the agency that employs the ALJ. Thus, if an ALJ employed by the OAH violates the code of ethics in a hearing conducted for another agency, the OAH is the disciplining entity, and not the other agency. An agency may apply appropriate disciplinary procedures [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.50*]. It should be noted that a person may also institute disciplinary proceedings directly before the State Personnel Board with the consent of the board [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.50* (citing *Gov. Code § 19583.5* and *2* Cal. Code Reg. 51.9)].

A violation of the ALJ Code of Ethics by an ALJ is not per se grounds for disqualification, or reversal of a decision, of that ALJ, but the violation may be indicative of the ALJ's violation of other procedural requirements [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.50* (citing, as an example, disqualification for bias, etc., under *Gov. Code § 11425.40*); for further discussion of disqualification, *see § 473E.21* and *§ 473E.23*].

[4] Collective Bargaining Rights Not Affected

Nothing in the ALJ Code of Ethics is to be construed or is intended to limit or affect the rights of an ALJ or other presiding officer under *Gov. Code § 3512 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11475.70*]. This provision makes it clear that the ALJ Code of Ethics does not interfere with collective bargaining rights guaranteed to state employees under the Ralph C.

Dills Act (*Gov. Code § 3512 et seq.*). These include the right to form, join, and participate in activities of employee organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation on all matters of employer-employee relations, to refuse to join or participate in the activities of employee organizations, or to represent themselves individually in their employment relations with the state [Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Gov. Code § 11475.70*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesLegal EthicsJudicial Conduct

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearing Standards and Disqualification

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473E.26-473E.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473E.26[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.30

§ 473E.30 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.31

§ 473E.31 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.32

§ 473E.32 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code. §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code § 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code § 11435.05-11435.65*

Administrative Adjudication Code of Ethics (also referred to in this chapter as the ALJ Code of Ethics). *Gov. Code § 11475 et seq.*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.1-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsJudicial Conduct

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.33

§ 473E.33 Decisions

[1] Conduct of Hearing

Who may or must be party to administrative proceeding depends on purpose and effect of proceeding and particular statute under which proceeding brought; standard set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 389*, requiring joinder of necessary and indispensable parties in judicial proceedings, is not appropriate for administrative proceedings when joinder of parties would defeat purpose of administrative proceeding. *Nevada County Office of Education v. Riles (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 767, 775, 777, 197 Cal. Rptr. 152*

Agency is entitled to allow hearing officer to conduct hearing alone and present proposed decision to agency. *Armistead v. City of Los Angeles (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 319, 324, 313 P.2d 127*

Agency is entitled to begin hearing along with hearing officer and then withdraw midway through, leaving hearing officer to conclude hearing alone. *Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 421, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465*

[2] Disqualification of Agency Member

In case not governed by APA, bias and prejudice are not implied and are required to be clearly established; party's unilateral perception of bias is insufficient, standing alone, to serve as basis for disqualification of adjudicator; prejudice is required to be shown against particular party and required to be significant enough to impair adjudicator's impartiality. *Gray v. City of Gustine (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 621, 632, 273 Cal. Rptr. 730*

In case not governed by APA, challenge to fairness of adjudicator is required to set forth concrete facts demonstrating bias or prejudice. *Gray v. City of Gustine (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 621, 632, 273 Cal. Rptr. 730*

In case not governed by APA, fact that city council members heard evidence of city manager's investigation of police chief is insufficient, standing alone, to recuse city council from hearing chief's case. *Gray v. City of Gustine (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 621, 632, 273 Cal. Rptr. 730*

Rule of necessity: member may not be disqualified if presence necessary to enable agency to act. *Caminetti v. Pac. Mutual L. Ins. Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 344, 366, 139 P.2d 908 , cert. denied sub nom., Neblett v. Caminetti (1944) 320 U.S. 802, 64 S. Ct. 428, 88 L. Ed. 484*

Respondent is not entitled to examine agency members as on voir dire to determine ground for disqualification. *Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 414, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465*

Necessity to present ground for disqualification at hearing if then known; necessity to follow established disqualification procedure, if any. *Kendall v. Bd. of Osteopathic Examiners (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 239, 233 P.2d 107*

Disqualification in case not governed by *APA. Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 443, 449-450, 452, 2 Cal. Rptr. 779 , cert. denied sub nom., Boyd v. Fresno County 364 U.S. 893, 81 S. Ct. 224, 5 L. Ed. 2d 188*

Agency member is not disqualified because of foreknowledge of evidence. *Wisuri v. Newark School Dist. (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 239, 243, 55 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Agency member is not disqualified because of personal opinion about wisdom of law to be enforced. *Western Airlines, Inc. v. Schutzbank (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 218, 231, 66 Cal. Rptr. 293*

[3] Disqualification of Administrative Law Judge

Any person with relevant knowledge is entitled to make affidavit to support request for disqualification of hearing officer. *Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 413, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465*

Necessity to present ground for disqualification at hearing, if ground then known. *Kendall v. Bd. of Osteopathic Examiners (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 239, 248, 233 P.2d 107*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.34

§ 473E.34 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Hearing Practice (Cal. C.E.B. 1984)

Witkin, California Evidence, Ch. III, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 150-191; Ch. X, *Witnesses*, §§ 787-791; Ch. XII, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1223-1275 (2d ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.35

§ 473E.35 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah **NOTE:** On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service.
http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473E.36-473E.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473E.36[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.40

§ 473E.40 Request for Disqualification of ALJ or Agency Member

[1] Motion to Disqualify

☐ Prepare motion [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.22[1][a]*; for a form, see *§ 473E.60*].

☐ Prepare affidavit [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.22[1][b]*; for a form, see *§ 473E.60*, which includes a declaration that may be used in lieu of an affidavit under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*].

☐ File affidavit or declaration prior to hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.22[1][a]*].

[2] Peremptory Challenge

☐ Do agency regulations allow a peremptory challenge [*Gov. Code § 11425.40(d)*; *see § 473E.22[1][d]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.41

§ 473E.41 Disqualification in Non-APA Procedures

☐ Check applicable statutes or regulations [*see § 473E.22[2]*].

☐ If provisions for disqualification do not exist, make a motion supported by affidavit based on APA procedures [*see §§ 473E.22[2], 473E.40*; for a form, see *§ 473E.60*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.42

§ 473E.42 Waiver of Disqualification

[1] Written Waiver

☐ Prepare written waiver [*Gov. Code § 11512(c)*; *see § 473E.22[1][a]*; for a form of waiver, see *§ 473E.61*].

☐ Obtain all parties' signatures.

☐ Obtain acceptance of ALJ or agency member.

☐ Have included in the record.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473E.43-473E.59

[Reserved]

§§ 473E.43[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART V. FORMS

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.60

§ 473E.60 Motion to Disqualify ALJ or Agency Member and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

[1] FORM Motion to Disqualify ALJ or Agency Member and Supporting Declaration [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*name of agency*]

In the matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent	)))))	No. _____ REQUEST TO DISQUALIFY [ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE *or* AGENCY MEMBER]

_____

Respondent requests that _____[*name of agency*] issue an order disqualifying _____ [*name of person to be disqualified*], the _____ [administrative law judge *or* agency member] from participating in this matter. This motion is made on the ground that _____ [*name of person to be disqualified*] cannot accord a fair and impartial hearing or consideration in this matter, as set forth in the supporting declaration, which is attached hereto.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION

I, _____ [*name of respondent*], Respondent in this matter, declare that _____ [*name of person to be disqualified*], the _____ [administrative law judge *or* agency member], cannot accord a fair and impartial hearing or consideration in this matter, for the following reasons: _____[*state specific reasons*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an example of a request for disqualification and a supporting declaration that conform to the APA requirements [*see Gov. Code § 11512(c)*]. For agencies not subject to the APA, counsel should check the governing statutes and regulations for any different requirements.

Code Civ. Proc. § 2003 requires an affidavit to be written and made under oath [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (requirements for declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of affidavit)].

For a discussion of the disqualification procedures, see *§ 473E.22*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473E PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
PART V. FORMS

41A-473E California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473E.61

§ 473E.61 Written Waiver of Disqualification [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

[1] FORM Written Waiver of Disqualification [Gov. Code § 11512(c)]

BEFORE THE _____ [*name of agency*]

In the matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent	)))))	No. _____ WRITTEN AGREEMENT TO WAIVE DISQUALIFICATION

It is hereby agreed by the parties that the disqualification of Administrative Law Judge _____, the presiding officer of the hearing in the above matter, on the basis that this judge is disqualified because of (specify grounds) to preside in the hearing in the above matter is hereby waived.
Dated: _____.

_____

Signature of Agency Representative

_____

Signature of Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a waiver for use when all the parties in an administrative hearing agree to waive the

disqualification of the judge.

Under *Gov. Code § 11512(c)*, the parties may waive disqualification of the presiding officer by a writing that recites the grounds for disqualification. A waiver is effective only when signed by all parties, accepted by the administrative law judge or agency member, and included in the record. For further discussion of the procedures required to waive the disqualification of an administrative law judge, see *§ 473E.22[1][a]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473F.syn

§ 473F.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473F: AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS

§ 473F.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473F.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Specific Public Agencies

[5] Other Related Chapters

§§ 473F.03-473F.09 [Reserved]

§ 473F.10 Nature of Agency Hearings

§ 473F.11 Presiding Officer at Hearing

[1] Administrative Law Judge

[2] Agency Members

§ 473F.12 Public Hearings

[1] APA Provisions

[2] Relationship to Open Meetings Acts

[3] Exclusion of Witnesses

[4] Exclusion of Parties

[5] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

§ 473F.13 English Language and Language Assistance

[1] When APA Requirements Apply

[2] Language Assistance Requirements

[3] Interpreter Requirements

[4] Costs of Interpreters

§ 473F.14 Subpoenas

[1] APA Procedures

[a] Scope of Application

[b] Issuance

[c] Issuer

[d] Service

[e] Enforcement

[f] Objections and Protective Orders

[g] Witnesses, Mileage, and Fees

[h] Written Notice

[2] Non-APA Procedures

§ 473F.15 Conduct of the Hearing

[1] Opening Statements

[a] When Opening Statements Are Used

[b] Guidelines for Use

[2] Hearing Briefs

[3] Oaths and Affirmations

[4] Direct Examination

[a] Nature and Purpose

[b] Guidelines for Direct Examination of Witnesses

[c] Guidelines for Refreshing Witness's Recollection

[5] Expert Witnesses

[a] Nature of Experts

[b] Qualification

[6] Cross-Examination

[a] Nature and Purpose

[b] Guidelines for Cross-Examination of Witnesses

[7] Redirect and Recross-Examination

[8] Examination by ALJ or Agency Member

[9] Rebuttal Evidence

[10] Bifurcation

[a] Nature of Bifurcation

[b] Reasons for Requesting Bifurcation

[c] Procedure and Ruling on Motion

[11] Depositions

[a] Authority to Order

[b] Contents of Petition

[c] Procedure for Petition and Order Taking Deposition

[12] Motion for Nonsuit or Dismissal

[13] Argument

[a] Order of Presentation

[b] Guidelines for Argument

[c] Written Argument

[14] Holding Record Open

[15] Decision

[16] Sanctions and Enforcement

[a] Sanctions

[b] Enforcement

[17] Right to Counsel

§ 473F.16 Record of the Hearing

[1] Reporting

[2] Transcripts

§ 473F.17 Defaults

[1] APA Proceedings

[a] License Issuance and Renewal Cases

[b] License Discipline Cases

[c] Mitigation

[d] Reconsideration of Default

[2] Non-APA Defaults

§ 473F.18 Persuasion

[1] Persuasion in Administrative Hearings

[2] Guidelines for Persuasion

§§ 473F.19-473F.29 [Reserved]

§ 473F.30 Administrative Rules of Evidence

[1] Criminal Rules of Evidence Are Generally Inapplicable

[2] Liberal Nature of Rules

[3] Guidelines for Production of Evidence

§ 473F.31 Basic Hearing Objections

[1] Irrelevant Evidence

[2] Evidence That Necessitates Undue Consumption of Time

[3] Objectionable Form of Question

[a] Leading Questions

[b] Narrative Questions

[c] Other Objectionable Questions

[4] Cumulative Evidence

[5] Guidelines for Objection Procedure

[6] Offers of Proof

[7] Foundation and Authentication

[a] Establishing a Proper Foundation

[b] Authentication of Writings

[8] Secondary Evidence Rule

[9] Failure to Object

§ 473F.32 Administrative Hearsay

[1] General Requirements

[2] Objection Requirement

[3] Other Inadmissible Hearsay

[4] Non-APA Hearings

§ 473F.33 Privileges

[1] Application in Administrative Proceedings

[2] Self-Incrimination

[a] Compared to Application in Civil and Criminal Trials

[b] Application to Public Employees

[c] Application to Drivers' Licenses

[3] Sexual Privacy

[a] Scope of Privilege

[b] APA Proceedings

§ 473F.34 Exclusionary Rule

[1] General Requirements

[2] Application to Administrative Proceedings

[a] Factors Used to Determine Application

[b] Administrative Inspections

[c] Vicarious Exclusionary Rule

[d] Guidelines for Objecting to Illegally Obtained Evidence

§ 473F.35 Illegally Obtained Confessions and Entrapment

§ 473F.36 Presumptions

[1] Nature and Types

[2] Rebuttable Presumptions

§ 473F.37 Affidavits

§ 473F.38 Official Notice

[1] Nature of Official Notice

[2] Matters Subject to Official Notice

[3] Notice and Opportunity to Refute

§ 473F.39 Mitigation, Extenuation, and Rehabilitation Evidence

[1] General Requirements

[2] Mitigation and Extenuation Evidence

[a] Use of Evidence

[b] Examples of Evidence

[c] Presentation of Evidence

[3] Rehabilitation Evidence

[a] Nature of Evidence

[b] Criteria for Rehabilitation

[4] Admissions of Liability

§ 473F.40 Views

[1] Use in Administrative Proceedings

[2] Entering on Record

§ 473F.41 Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

[1] Nature of Doctrines

[2] Application to Administrative Hearings

[a] Required Elements

[b] Role of Burden of Proof

[3] Offensive Use of Collateral Estoppel

§§ 473F.42-473F.49 [Reserved]

§ 473F.50 Order of Proof

[1] General Requirements

[2] Customary Order in Civil Cases

[3] Modification of Customary Order in Administrative Hearings

[4] Order in Particular Matters

[5] Consideration on Appeal

§ 473F.51 Determining Burden of Proof

[1] General Rules

[2] APA Provisions

[3] License and Permit Applications

[4] License Renewal

[5] License Discipline

[a] Revocation and Suspension

[b] Citations

[6] License Reinstatement

[7] Employee Discipline

[a] Proceedings to Dismiss or Discipline

[b] Civil Service Employees

[c] Name-Clearing Hearings

[8] Teacher Dismissal or Suspension

[9] Benefit Entitlement

[10] Safety Regulation Enforcement

[11] Review on Appeal

§ 473F.52 Standard of Proof

[1] Preponderance of Evidence Standard

[2] Clear and Convincing Evidence Standard

[a] Applicable to Revocation of Professional Licenses

[b] Inapplicable to Citations

[c] Inapplicable to Teacher Dismissal Hearings

[d] Instructions Regarding Standard

[3] Criminal Standard

§ 473F.53 Meeting the Burden of Proof

[1] Admissions

[a] Types of Admissible Evidence

[b] Criminal Admissions

[2] Hearsay

[a] Need for Objection

[b] Exceptions to Hearsay

[3] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

[4] Official Notice

[a] Used to Satisfy Burden of Proof

[b] Practical Considerations

§ 473F.54 Shifting the Burden of Proof

[1] Equitable Estoppel

[a] Nature of Doctrine

[b] Application to Administrative Agencies

[c] When Estoppel Does Not Apply

[2] Affirmative Defenses

[a] Burden on Respondent

[b] Claim of Discrimination

[c] Discrimination in License Testing Procedures

§§ 473F.55-473F.59 [Reserved]

§ 473F.60 Federal Constitution

§ 473F.61 State Constitution

§ 473F.62 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473F.63 Decisions

[1] General Requirements

[2] Conduct of Hearing

[3] Contempt

[4] Disqualification of Counsel

[5] Estoppel

[6] Evidence

[7] Expert Witnesses

[8] Presiding Officers

[9] Hearings

[10] Judicial Notice

[11] Jurisdiction

[12] Nonsuit

[13] Official Notice

[14] Order and Burden of Proof

[15] Record of Proceedings

[16] Right to Counsel

[17] Stay of Execution

[18] Subpoenas

§ 473F.64 Text References

§ 473F.65 Internet References

§§ 473F.66-473F.69 [Reserved]

§ 473F.70 Prehearing Considerations

[1] Exclusion of Witnesses

[2] Interpreters

[3] Witness Fees and Mileage

§ 473F.71 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Opening Statement

[2] Hearing Brief

[3] Witnesses

[4] Expert Witnesses

[5] Bifurcation

[6] Depositions

[7] Closing Argument

§ 473F.72 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Procedure

[2] Party Served With Subpoena

§ 473F.73 Use of Affidavits at Hearing

[1] Affidavits

[2] Party Receiving Affidavit and Notice

§ 473F.74 Official Notice

[1] Request

[2] Refuting Officially Noticed Matter

§ 473F.75 Default

[1] Failure to File Notice of Defense or to Attend Hearing

[2] Respondent Fails to Receive Actual Notice

§§ 473F.76-473F.89 [Reserved]

§ 473F.90 Notice of Intention to Use Affidavit or Declaration [Gov. Code § 11514]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473F.91 Request for Official Notice [Gov. Code § 11515]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473F.92 Request for Opportunity to Refute Officially Noticed Matter [Gov. Code § 11515]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.01

§ 473F.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses hearings in administrative adjudications in California public agencies. The legal background discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Subpart A, discussing the nature of agency hearings and hearing procedures governing language assistance, subpoenas, conduct of the hearing, record of the hearing, defaults, and argument [*see §§ 473F.10* -473F.19].

- Subpart B, discussing rules of evidence in agency hearings, including administrative rules of evidence, basic hearing objections, administrative hearsay, privileges, the application of the exclusionary rule, illegally obtained confessions and entrapment, presumptions, affidavits, "judicial" or official notice, mitigation, extenuation, and rehabilitation evidence, views, and claim and issue preclusion [*see §§ 473F.30 -473F.41*].

- Subpart C, discussing burden of proof in agency hearings, the order of proof, determining the applicable burden of proof, standard of proof, meeting the burden of proof, and shifting the burden of proof [*see §§ 473F.50 -473F.54*].

Part V includes a form of notice of intention to use a declaration or affidavit [*see § 473F.90*], a form of request for official notice [§ 473F.91], and a form of request for opportunity to refute any officially matter [*see § 473F.92*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsay

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.02

§ 473F.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40 et seq., *Appeal* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, *see § 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies.*
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies.*

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

[4] Specific Public Agencies

For related coverage of adjudicative proceedings before particular public agencies, see:

- Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to licensing proceedings before the department of Alcoholic Beverage Control).

- Ch. 70, *Attorney Admission* and Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of attorneys and proceedings before the State Bar and the State Bar Court).

- Ch. 92, *Automobiles: Drivers' Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to drivers' licensing and proceedings before the Department of Motor Vehicles).

- Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*, § 104.70 et seq. (discussion relating to licensing and discipline of building contractors by the Contractors' State License Board).

- Ch. 118, *Civil Service* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Personnel Board).

- Ch. 209, *Dentists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of dentists and proceedings before the Board of Dental Examiners).

- Ch. 214, *Drugs and Pharmacists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of pharmacists and proceedings before the State Board of Pharmacy).

- Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of physicians and proceedings before the Medical Board of California).

- Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission).

- Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues* (discussion and forms relating to teacher certification and dismissal proceedings before the State Board of Education and local boards).

- Ch. 527, *Social Services* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Department of Social Service or the State Department of Health Services).

- Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance*, § 564.30 et seq. and § 564.100 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board).

- Ch. 575, *Waters* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Water Resources Control Board and local water districts).

- Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Division of Workers' Compensation and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

For additional cross references to coverage of other particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

[5] Other Related Chapters

For discussion and forms relating to trial proceedings in civil actions generally, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

For discussion and forms relating to default proceedings in civil actions generally, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* , and Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.03-473F.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.10

§ 473F.10 Nature of Agency Hearings

An administrative hearing is a proceeding similar to a nonjury civil court trial. The degree of formality varies with the kind of hearing, but most administrative hearings are formal and conducted in a quasi-judicial manner [*see Nishkian v. City of Long Beach (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 749, 752, 230 P.2d 156* (hearings must be at least quasi-judicial in nature, and must provide a record for court review)]. Thus, good trial skills and preparation are as necessary in administrative hearings as they are in court trials. This subpart compares hearing practice to trial practice, emphasizing the differences. It discusses preliminary matters such as subpoenas and covers hearings from opening statements to submission. Hearings conducted by administrative law judges alone are compared with those conducted by administrative law judges with agency members present. It also points out, as some of the common errors committed by lawyers during agency hearings, and includes a few general trial practice techniques that apply to hearings as well.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.11

§ 473F.11 Presiding Officer at Hearing

[1] Administrative Law Judge

An administrative law judge (ALJ) or other hearing officer usually presides over an administrative hearing. The case may also, however, be heard by agency members directly [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*; *see* [2], *below*]. When an ALJ alone hears a case, he or she has all the powers necessary to conduct the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. An ALJ's discretion is broad, but limited by the statutes or ordinances applicable to the hearing and due process [*see Rose v. City of Hayward (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 926, 936-937, 179 Cal. Rptr. 287* (ALJ presiding over APA hearing must exercise discretion within scope of statutory and constitutional limitations; thus, ALJ could not hear class action in violation of statute); *see also* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* (discussion of due process issues)].

For example, the ALJ can determine the order of proof [*Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 412, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . Other actions, such as determining motions, are also within the judge's discretion [*Ehrlich v. McConnell (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287, 29 Cal. Rptr. 283]* . The judge controls the order of testimony and the introduction of evidence [*Douglass v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 645, 658-659, 190 Cal. Rptr. 506]* . For detailed discussion and forms relating to the duties of an ALJ or presiding officer, see Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .

[2] Agency Members

Some administrative hearings are heard directly by agency members, with an ALJ presiding [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*]. When that is the case, the administrative law judge presides at the hearing, rules on the admission and exclusion of evidence, and advises the agency on matters of law. The agency exercises all other powers relating to the conduct of the hearing but may delegate any of the powers to the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. Whether agency members hear a case depends on the particular nature of the case and the availability of the professional members. Professional agency members sometimes hear cases involving professional licensing discipline. Long-running cases are usually heard by an ALJ alone, however, because of the unavailability of members. Even if an APA case begins with agency members hearing it, the ALJ will complete the hearing alone if a quorum is lost during the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(e)*].

Because agency members are similar to a jury, counsel should use all of the persuasive trial techniques he or she would use in a jury trial. Agency members differ from a jury, however, in that they usually have expertise in the professional subject matter of the hearing and have a special commitment to their profession. Attorneys must thus consider this factor when presenting the case. For further discussion of the specific powers exercised by the agency itself in an administrative hearing, see Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.12

§ 473F.12 Public Hearings

[1] APA Provisions

The APA's Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* (*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*) applies to agency hearings conducted under the APA's formal hearings formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*see Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501*]. This *bill of rights* specifies the minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 154 (1995)].

One of the procedural requirements is a public hearing, specifically that the hearing shall be open to public observation [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(3), 11425.20(a)*]. However, the presiding officer has express authority to order closure of a hearing or make other protective orders to the extent necessary or proper for any of the following purposes [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)*]:

- To satisfy the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, federal or state statute, or other law, including but not limited to laws protecting privileged, confidential, or other protected information [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(1)*]. This exception includes statutory protection of trade secrets and other confidential information or privileged information under such statutes as, for example, Evid. Code§§ 1060-1063, Fin. Code §§ 1939, and 18496 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 156 (1995)].

- To ensure a fair hearing in the circumstances of the particular case [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(2)*].

- To conduct the hearing, including the manner of examining witnesses, in a way that is appropriate to protect a minor witness or a witness with a developmental disability, as defined in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 4512*, from intimidation or other harm, taking into account the rights of all persons [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(3)*]. This exception codifies part of the decision of *Seering v. Department of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* . The rights of persons taken into account includes the rights of the parties to observe the proceedings in an appropriate manner [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 156 (1995)].

Public hearing rights are also provided to police officers charged with misconduct under the Police Officers *Bill of Rights* statute [*Gov. Code § 3304*] because the police officers have an interest in receiving vindication, and the county has provided no reason to justify a closed hearing [*Caloca v. County of San Diego (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 433, 445-447, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 3]* .

When a hearing is conducted by telephone, television, or other electronic means [*see Gov. Code § 11512(d)* (with consent of all parties, hearing proceedings may be reported electronically)], the public hearing procedural requirements are satisfied if members of the public have an opportunity to do both of the following [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)*]:

- At reasonable times, hear or inspect the agency's record, and inspect any transcript obtained by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)(1)*].

- Be physically present at the place where the presiding officer is conducting the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(b)(2)*].

The right of the public to be present where a hearing is being conducted telephonically does not include the right to participate, and the right of the public to inspect the record does not impose a duty on the agency to provide a copy independent of the California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 156 (1995); for discussion of the Public Records Act, *see* Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*].

Presiding officers have authority to conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means (such as a conference telephone call) if each participant in the hearing has an opportunity to participate in and to hear the entire proceeding while it is taking place and to observe exhibits [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(a)*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 179 (1995)]. The presiding officer also has the authority to conduct the hearing in the physical presence of all participants [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 179 (1995)]. If any party objects, the presiding officer may not conduct all or part of a hearing by telephone, television, or other electronic means [*Gov. Code § 11440.30(b)*].

[2] Relationship to Open Meetings Acts

Neither the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act (*Gov. Code § 11120 et seq.*; governing state bodies) nor the Ralph M. Brown Act (*Gov. Code § 54950 et seq.*; governing local agencies), which provide for open agency meetings, have been applied to administrative hearings. It is unlikely that they could be applied, because administrative hearings are neither meetings of a state or legislative body, nor legislative hearings [*see Gov. Code §§ 11123* (state body meetings must be open), 54953 (meetings of local agency legislative body must be open)]. They are judicial-like adjudicatory hearings.

Nevertheless, the practice of holding open administrative hearings is consistent with California's public policy of open meetings as expressed in those acts [*see Gov. Code §§ 11120, 54950* (declarations of legislative intent that people of California remain informed regarding acts of public agencies)]. Furthermore, some rules applicable to administrative hearings contain provisions similar to these acts. For example, non-APA hearing rules may provide for closed hearings in employee discipline cases unless the employee requests a public hearing. Similarly, in APA hearings conducted by the agency itself [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*], the ALJ presiding at the hearing generally has the board, panel, or commission hearing the case go into closed session to decide the case. Both open meeting acts provide for closed sessions in employee matters [*Gov. Code §§ 11126(a), 54957*; *see Titus v. Civil Service Com. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 357, 363, 181 Cal. Rptr. 699* (local agency held closed session to consider dismissal of sheriff's department employee); *Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 948-949, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563* (state agency held closed session to consider revocation of psychologist's license to practice)].

The California Law Revision Commission Comments relating to *Gov. Code § 11425.20* notes that the provisions of this section supplement the Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act. Closure of a hearing should be done only to the extent

necessary under this section, taking into account the substantial public interest in open proceedings. Under the open meeting law deliberations on a decision to be reached based on evidence introduced in an adjudicative proceeding may be made in a closed session [*Gov. Code § 11126(d)*]. Also, under the open meeting law, a settlement proposal may be considered by the agency in closed session if it sustains the substantial burden of showing the prejudice to be suffered from conducting an open meeting, citing *Gov. Code § 11126(d), (q)* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 156 (1995)].

Finally, the public hearing requirements do not apply to a prehearing conference, settlement conference, or proceedings for alternative dispute resolution other than binding arbitration [*Gov. Code § 11425.20(c)*; for discussion of prehearing and settlement conferences and proceedings for alternative dispute resolution, *see* respectively Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , and Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions*].

For detailed discussion of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and Ralph M. Brown Act, relating to open agency meetings, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Licensing* .

[3] Exclusion of Witnesses

The APA does not provide for the exclusion of witnesses. In practice, however, witnesses are often excluded from administrative hearings so that they cannot hear other witnesses' testimony, in civil actions [*see Evid. Code § 777* (witnesses may be excluded from courtroom when other witnesses are testifying)].

Any request or motion to exclude witnesses should be made before any testimony is heard. The ALJ has the discretion to refuse the request, but usually grants it. The ALJ may first ask the requesting counsel why the witnesses should be excluded, however, particularly if it appears the request is made out of habit. While opposing counsel can certainly request that the exclusion be mutual, the judge is likely to exclude all witnesses even if a mutual request is not made [*see Evid. Code § 777(a)* (court may exclude any witness not under examination); *People v. Guy (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 13 Cal. Rptr. 17* (exclusion of witnesses in criminal trial)].

[4] Exclusion of Parties

Parties usually cannot be excluded from hearings [*see, e.g., Evid. Code § 777(b)* (party to an action cannot be excluded from court trial)]. A party in a civil proceeding has a due process right, under the *Fifth* and *Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution*, to cross-examine and confront witnesses [*In re Mary S. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 414, 419, 230 Cal. Rptr. 726* ; *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* (discussing due process as it applies in agency proceedings)].

In administrative proceedings, this right is often afforded by statute; the APA expressly grants parties the right to cross-examine and confront adversary witnesses [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*; *see § 473F.15[4], [6]*]. However, a licensee incarcerated in another state but who is represented by counsel does not have an absolute right to be present at an administrative hearing at which disciplinary charges against him will be adjudicated [*Arnett v. Office of Admin. Hearings (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 332, 338, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 774]* .

Different rules apply to cases involving possible minor victims of a party, in which the minor may feel unable to testify freely in the presence of that party [*see Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(3)* (authority of presiding officer to close hearing or make other protective orders when witness is a minor), and discussion in [1], *above*]. In administrative hearings, like other criminal and civil proceedings, the right to cross-examine and confront a minor witness can be adequately protected through the use of closed-circuit television, without having the party physically present in the room where the minor is testifying [*Seering v. Department of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 304-305, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* (in hearing involving revocation of day care license based on alleged child molestation, licensee was excluded from hearing during child's testimony)]. In an appropriate case, the minor witness could probably give the testimony outside the hearing room [*see Penal Code § 1347* (in criminal sexual abuse cases, minor's testimony may be taken outside

courtroom and transmitted via closed-circuit television)]. However, this arrangement would not allow the judge much control over (or observation of) the minor witness during testimony [*see Gov. Code § 11425.20(a)(3)* (authority of presiding officer to close hearing or make other protective orders when witness is a minor), and discussion in [1], *above*].

[5] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act contract claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. The regulations that are applicable to Ch. 473F Agency Adjudication Hearings, include the following: conduct of hearing by telephone, television or other electronic means [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1030* (1998)]; interpreters and accommodations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1032* (1998)]; conduct of proceedings and sealing the record [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1036* (1998)]; and request for expenses after default [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1044* (1998)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPublic MeetingsSunshine LegislationEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.13

§ 473F.13 English Language and Language Assistance

[1] When APA Requirements Apply

Under the APA, administrative hearings and medical examinations conducted for the purpose of determining compensation or monetary awards, are conducted in the English language [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(a)*]. If a party or the party's witness does not proficiently speak or understand English and requests language assistance before the commencement of the hearing or medical examination, and the agency must comply with language assistance requirements of the APA, then the party or witness will be provided with an interpreter by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(b)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65* (language assistance legal requirements)].

Language assistance in administrative hearings is part of the APA's Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* (*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*) [*see* further discussion in Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*]. Language assistance must be made available as required by *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65* by state agencies described in *Gov. Code § 11018* (state agencies that conduct administrative hearings but are not subject to Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions; *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) and *Gov. Code § 11435.15* (listed state agencies) [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(9)*]. The listed state agencies in *Gov. Code § 11435.15* include the following agencies [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(a)*]:

- Agricultural Labor Relations Board.
- Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse.
- State Athletic Commission.
- California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board.
- Board of Prison Terms.
- State Board of Barbering and Cosmetology.

- State Department of Developmental Services.
- Public Employment Relations Board.
- Franchise Tax Board.
- State Department of Health Services.
- Department of Housing and Community Development.
- Department of Industrial Relations.
- State Department of Mental Health.
- Department of Motor Vehicles.
- Notary Public Section, Office of Secretary of State.
- Public Utilities Commission.
- Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development.
- State Department of Social Services.
- Worker's Compensation Appeals Board.
- Department of the Youth Authority.
- Youthful Offender Parole Board.
- Department of Insurance.
- State Personnel Board.
- California Board of Podiatric Medicine.
- Board of Psychology.

These listed agencies must comply with language assistance requirements notwithstanding other provisions in Chapter 4.5, the general administrative adjudication provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), which include the language assistance requirements, that provide that the chapter's provisions do not apply to some or all of an agency's adjudicative proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(d)*].

The language assistance article's requirements are limited to adjudicative proceedings in which an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required for formulation and issuance of a decision by federal or state constitutional provisions or by federal or state statute [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 172 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11410.10*]. However, agencies that are not listed may chose to adopt language assistance procedures, provided that interpreter selection is consistent with the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11435.30* [*Gov. Code § 11435.15(b)*]. Agencies may also provide interpreters for nonadjudicative proceedings, such as informal fact finding and informal investigatory hearings [

Gov. Code § 11435.15(c)].

[2] Language Assistance Requirements

Language assistance is defined to mean oral interpretation or written translation into English of a language other than English or of English into another language for a party or witness who cannot speak or understand English or who can do so only with difficulty [*Gov. Code § 11435.05*]. However, interpretation for deaf or hard of hearing parties or witnesses in adjudicative proceedings is governed by *Evid. Code § 754* [*Gov. Code § 11435.10*]. The primary language assistance requirement is that the agency will provide a party or witness with an interpreter when the party or witness is not proficient in the English language [*Gov. Code § 11435.20(b)*]. Agencies must advise parties of interpreter rights when the agency advises that same party of the hearing date or medical examination. Agencies should also encourage parties that are in need of an interpreter to give timely notice to the agency conducting the hearing or medical examination so that appropriate arrangements can be made [*Gov. Code § 11435.60*]. Interpreters must normally be certified [*Gov. Code § 11435.55*], must not have had any involvement in the issues of the case prior to the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11435.65(b)*], and are subject to confidentiality rules of the agency, if any, that apply to the adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11435.65(a)*].

[3] Interpreter Requirements

Hearing interpreters must be certified under *Gov. Code § 11435.30* [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(a)*]. However, if a certified interpreter can not be present at the hearing, the hearing agency has discretionary authority to provisionally qualify and use another interpreter [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(a)*]. Medical examination interpreters must be certified under *Gov. Code § 11435.35* [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(b)*]. However, if a certified interpreter can not be present at the medical examination, the physician provisionally may use another interpreter if that fact is noted in the record of the medical evaluation [*Gov. Code § 11435.55(b)*]. The State Personnel Board is required to designate the languages for which certification of administrative hearing interpreters and medical examination interpreters shall be established [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(a)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11435.30, 11435.35*]. The languages designated shall include, but not be limited to, Spanish, Tagalog, Arabic, Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Vietnamese, until the State Personnel Board finds that there is an insufficient need for interpreting assistance in these languages [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(a)*]. Language designations are to be based on four criteria [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)*]:

- The language needs of non-English speaking persons appearing before the administrative agencies, as determined by consultation with the agencies [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(1)*].
- The cost of developing a language examination [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(2)*].
- The availability of experts needed to develop a language examination [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(3)*].
- Other information the State Personnel Board deems relevant [*Gov. Code § 11435.40(b)(4)*].

The State Personnel Board can charge fees for application to take interpreter examinations, and for annual renewal of certification [*Gov. Code § 11435.45*]. The State personnel Board has the responsibility to establish, maintain, and annually update lists of certified administrative hearing and medical examination interpreters that the Board determines meet minimum standards in interpreting skills and linguistic abilities in languages designated by the Board [*Gov. Code § 11435.40*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11435.30(a), 11435.35(a)*].

Listed certified administrative hearing interpreters may be examined by each employing agency to determine the interpreter's knowledge of the employing agency's technical program terminology and procedures [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(a)*]. Court interpreters certified under *Gov. Code § 68562*, and interpreters listed on the Board's recommended list of court and administrative hearing interpreters prior to July 1, 1993, are deemed certified as administrative hearing

interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.30(b)*]. Court interpreters certified under *Gov. Code § 68562*, and certified administrative hearing interpreters, are deemed certified as medical examination interpreters [*Gov. Code § 11435.35(b)*].

Under three circumstances, the Board can remove persons form the certified interpreters lists [*Gov. Code § 11435.50*]:

- The person is deceased.
- The person notifies the Board that the person is unavailable for work.
- The person does not pay a required annual renewal fee.

Gov. Code § 11435.60 requires an applicable agency, like DMV, to give notice of the right to an interpreter at the same time as giving notice of administrative hearing dates. A Spanish speaking motorist whose driver's license was suspended for refusing to take a blood alcohol test challenged the suspension because DMV failed to notify him of the right to have an interpreter at the hearing at the same time that DMV notified the driver when the hearing was scheduled to occur. Failure to provide simultaneous notice of hearing date and interpreter rights violates *Gov. Code § 11435.60*, but this was harmless error because the driver was notified of interpreter rights when he was provided the notice of suspension of his license by the arresting officer, and driver failed to show any prejudice from the lack of an interpreter at the DMV hearing [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 968-970, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* . DMV is only required by statute [*Gov. Code § 11435.60*] to provide the notice of the right to an interpreter in English, not other languages [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-971, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* .

[4] Costs of Interpreters

Interpreter costs are paid as determined by the presiding officer at the hearing. The agency that has jurisdiction over the matter will pay interpreter costs if the presiding officer orders the agency to pay the costs. Otherwise, the party requesting the interpreter will pay interpreter costs [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(a)*]. The presiding officer's decision to direct payment shall be based upon an equitable consideration of all the circumstances in each case, such as the ability of the party in need of the interpreter to pay [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(b)*].

However, in hearings before the Worker's Compensation Appeals Board or the Division of Worker's Compensation, relating to worker's compensation claims, the payment of the costs of providing an interpreter shall be governed by the rules and regulations of the WCAB, or the Administrative Director of the DWC, as appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyInterpretersWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.14

§ 473F.14 Subpoenas

[1] APA Procedures

[a] Scope of Application

Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50 govern subpoena practice in administrative adjudication. They apply to adjudicative proceedings, as defined by *Gov. Code § 11405.20*, which are required to be conducted under Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11450.05(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 11501* for the scope of application of Chapter 5, and discussion in *Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

Agencies that are not subject to the formal hearing provisions of the APA are permitted to use the subpoena procedures under *Gov. Code § 11450.05 et seq.* When they are used, all the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50* apply to the agency adopting them, including but not limited to issuing a subpoena requested by a party or an attorney or record for a party under *Gov. Code § 11450.20* [*Gov. Code § 11450.05(b)*].

[b] Issuance

Under *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*, subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum can be issued for attendance at a hearing and for production of documents at any reasonable time and place or at a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11450.10(a)*].

Alternatively, a custodian of documents that is the subject of a subpoena duces tecum may satisfy the subpoena by delivery of the documents or a copy of the documents, or by making the documents available for inspection or copying, together with an affidavit that satisfies *Evidence Code § 1561* [*Gov. Code § 11450.10(b)*]. This latter procedure is similar to the practice in civil actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.010* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 189 (1995); for detailed discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.010*, *see* Ch. 195, *Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence*].

If a custodian does not comply with the subpoena, the subpoena can be enforced, and the custodian can be compelled to appear and produce the documents under the APA provisions for the enforcement of orders and imposition of sanctions

(*Gov. Code § 11455.10 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(e)*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 189 (1995)].

[c] Issuer

Subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum can be issued by the agency or the presiding officer at the request of a party, or by the attorney of record for a party, in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1985.4* [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(a)*]. This provision incorporates privacy protections from civil practice [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm Reports 55, 190 (1995)]. The primary privacy provisions are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, which protects and defines personal records of consumers and provides for notice to consumers whose personal records are being subpoenaed. Similar provisions, in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6*, protect employment records.

Attorneys of record for a party can issue subpoenas, as well as the agency and presiding officer. This is an expansion of subpoena issuers, as compared to APA provision in effect prior to July 1, 1997 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 190 (1995)].

Furthermore, a subpoena duces tecum can not be issued unless an affidavit is completed satisfying the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985* (affidavit showing good cause for production of materials described and requested in subpoena duces tecum) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 190 (1995)].

When the subpoena provisions do not address a particular procedural issue relating to subpoenas, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1985.4* may be looked to for analogous procedures [*see* 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 190 (1995); *see also Sehlmeyer v. Department of General Services (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1072, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 840]* . For discussion and forms relating to subpoenas in civil actions generally, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

[d] Service

Subpoenas may be served throughout California, and must be served in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987* (personal service of subpoena on witness) and 1988 (personal service of subpoena by sheriff on concealed witness) [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Alternatively, subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum can be delivered by certified mail return receipt requested or by messenger [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Service by messenger is completed when the witness acknowledges receipt of the subpoena to the sender, by telephone, by mail, or in person, and identifies himself or herself either by reference to date of birth and driver's license number or Department of Motor Vehicles identification number, or the sender may verify receipt of the subpoena by obtaining other identifying information from the recipient. The sender is required to make a written notation of the acknowledgment. A subpoena that is properly issued and acknowledged consistent with these requirements is as enforceable as a subpoena that is personally served [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Witnesses who are residents of the State of California at the time of service of the subpoena are required to attend the hearing to which they have been subpoenaed, but non-residents are not required to attend [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(c)*].

[e] Enforcement

A witness who fails to comply with a subpena that has been properly issued and acknowledged can be punished for failure to comply with the subpoena as a contempt, and the subpoena can state these consequences [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*]. Enforcement of subpoenas is authorized under *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.20* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 190 (1995)]. These provisions supplant the provisions of former Gov. Code. Code § 11525 [*see Parris v. Zolin (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 839, 843, 50 Cal. Rptr 2d 109, 911 P. 2d 9* (construing enforcement language of former Gov. Code. Code § 11525 as requiring agency to transmit certification of facts to enforcing court for court to have jurisdiction to begin contempt proceedings)].

Persons who fail or refuse to comply with a subpoena, without substantial justification, are subject to the contempt

sanction [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(e)*; *see § 473F.15[16]* (enforcement of orders and sanctions)].

A party requesting a continuance based upon the failure of a witness to appear at the time and place required for the appearance or testimony pursuant to the subpoena must prove that the party has complied with these requirements. The continuance shall only be granted for a period of time that would allow personal service of the subpoena and in no event longer than that allowed by law [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*].

[f] Objections and Protective Orders

Persons who are served with subpoenas or subpoenas duces tecum may object to the terms of the subpoena by a motion for a protective order, including a motion to quash [*Gov. Code § 11450.30(a)*]. The objection shall be resolved by the presiding officer on terms and conditions that the presiding officer declares. The presiding officer may make another order that is appropriate to protect the parties or the witness from unreasonable or oppressive demands, including violations of the right to privacy [*Gov. Code § 11450.30(b)*].

A subpoena or subpoena duces tecum that is issued by the agency on its own motion may be quashed by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11450.30(c)*]. This statute addresses matters not previously covered by statute but covered by regulation in some agencies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 190 (1995); *see, e.g., 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 61* (Public Utilities Commission); *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1987.3* and Ch. 535, *Subpoena* (subpoenas in civil actions generally)].

[g] Witnesses, Mileage, and Fees

Witnesses appearing pursuant to a subpoena or a subpoena duces tecum, who are not parties to the proceeding, are entitled to receive the same mileage and fees allowed by law to a witness in a civil case [*Gov. Code § 11450.40(a), (b)*]. Payment of the fees must be made by the party at whose request the witness was compelled by subpoena to attend [*Gov. Code § 11450.40*]. Officer or employees of the state or political subdivisions of the state are not entitled to receive fees under this statute [*Gov. Code § 11450.40(b)*]. Mileage and fees for witnesses in civil cases are determined by *Gov. Code §§ 68092.5-68093*. Witness fees for public officers and employees are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 68096.1-68097.10* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 191 (1995)].

[h] Written Notice

As an alternative to service of a subpoena when a party witness or person for whose benefit a proceeding is prosecuted or defended is sought to be produced, a written notice can be served on the attorney for the party or person requiring the witness to attend, with the time and place of the hearing specified. Service of the written notice to attend must be made in the manner and is subject to the conditions provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987* (service of written notice to attend in a civil action) [*Gov. Code § 11450.50(a)*; *see* Ch. 535, *Subpoena* , for further discussion of these requirements in civil actions].

[2] Non-APA Procedures

Many statutes and ordinances governing specific agencies provide for the issuance of subpoenas in non-APA administrative hearings and other proceedings. The procedure for their issuance and use depends on the statutory authority and practice of the agency issuing them. Non-APA "state departments" have express statutory authority to issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents [*Gov. Code § 11181(e)*]. The executive and administrative work of state government is divided into "departments as provided by law" [*Gov. Code § 11150*]. These departments are discussed, but not defined, in *Gov. Code §§ 11150-11201*. There are about 30 officially designated departments and about 30 more de facto departments, as discussed in more detail in Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* .

School boards have the authority to issue subpoenas to compel attendance of witnesses at disciplinary hearings

conducted by the school board under the provisions of *Educ. Code § 48918(i)(1)*. That authority is discretionary, not mandatory, and a school board's decision to not issue subpoenas is reviewed for abuse of discretion [*Woodbury v. Brown-Dempsey (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 421, 438-439, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 124* (no abuse of discretion found in school board's denial of subpoenas for witnesses in disciplinary hearing because there was no showing that witnesses for whom subpoenas were sought had any relevant information to give relating to the factual issues in the hearing)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsWitnessesLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.15

§ 473F.15 Conduct of the Hearing

[1] Opening Statements

[a] When Opening Statements Are Used

In contrast to civil court trials [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(1)* (jury trials), 631.7 (nonjury trials)], attorneys for the parties do not generally make opening statements in administrative hearings. Opening statements are primarily made when a board, panel, or commission is hearing the case, rather than an ALJ sitting alone, or when a case is factually complex [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)* and discussion in *§ 473F.11*]. Sometimes the respondent's opening statement is reserved until the beginning of the respondent's case-in-chief. For a general discussion of opening statements in civil actions, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[b] Guidelines for Use

When an opening statement is made, the following general guidelines should be followed:

- Use the statement to present the theory of the case and facts that you intend to prove.
- Use the statement to tell a story or preview testimony, but not to present argument.
- Make the statement clear, concise, and positive in tone.
- Do not overstate evidence.
- If appropriate, use the statement to volunteer weaknesses without unduly emphasizing them.

[2] Hearing Briefs

A hearing brief is also appropriate in a complex case. The brief should be served on the judge and other parties as early

as possible. There is no particular form for a hearing brief, but it should be short and cover issues that will arise during the hearing, such as evidentiary problems, burden of proof, or order of proof. The brief should also contain a statement of the case and any special law the judge should be aware of before and during the hearing.

[3] Oaths and Affirmations

Testimony taken from witnesses in administrative hearings must have the same threshold guarantee of truthfulness as testimony taken in a court [*Marlow v. Orange County Human Services Agency (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 290, 293, 167 Cal. Rptr. 776]* . Testimony not given under oath may raise due process issues [*see Broussard v. Regents of University of California (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 636, 184 Cal. Rptr. 460* ; *see also* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions On Public Agencies* (discussing due process requirements as they apply to agency proceedings)].

The APA expressly requires oral evidence to be given under oath or affirmation [*Gov. Code § 11513(a)*]. If a witness refuses to take an oath or affirmation after being ordered to do so by the ALJ, that fact can be certified to the superior court for an order to show cause why the witness should not be held in contempt [*Gov. Code §§ 11455.10(b), 11455.20(a),* and discussion in *§ 473F.15[16]* (enforcement of orders and sanctions)].

Oaths or affirmations are usually administered by the ALJ or hearing reporter, but any agency, agency member, secretary of an agency, hearing reporter, or ALJ has the power to administer oaths and affirmations [*Gov. Code § 11528*]. Because the APA does not prescribe the specific form of oath or affirmation to be used in an administrative hearing, the oath or affirmation used in civil actions and proceedings should be sufficient [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2094*, and Ch. 392, *Oath and Affirmation*].

[4] Direct Examination

[a] Nature and Purpose

Direct examination of witnesses is fundamental to trial and administrative hearing practice; virtually all administrative hearings include direct examination. The APA expressly provides for the right to examine witnesses in hearings conducted under Chapter 5 (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), the APA's formal hearing provisions [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. Furthermore, the right to present and rebut evidence, which includes the right to direct examination of witnesses, is part of the APA's Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights*, which applies to all state agency hearings, whether or not the agency is required to follow the APA formal hearings provisions, so long as the agency adjudication is one in which an evidentiary hearing is required by federal or state constitutional provisions or by federal or state statutes [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11410.20*].

Under the administrative adjudication *bill of rights*, the agency is required to give the person to which the agency action is directed notice and an opportunity to be heard, including the opportunity to present and rebut evidence [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(1)*]. Due process may also require direct examination of witnesses [*see Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* (due process requirements applicable when New York welfare authorities terminated federal aid without notice or hearing); *but see Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 340, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18* (due process does not require evidentiary hearing prior to initial termination of social security disability benefit payments)].

For a complete discussion of procedural due process requirements applicable to adjudicatory hearings, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* . For further discussion of the applicability of the APA administrative adjudication provisions under Chapter 4.5 (general, including the Administrative *Bill of Rights*) and Chapter 5 (formal hearing), see *Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*.

[b] Guidelines for Direct Examination of Witnesses

Direct examination should clearly, logically, and convincingly present the facts. This objective may be ensured by complying with the following procedures:

- Properly prepare the witness before he or she is called, so the witness knows what questions are going to be asked and is prepared to answer them.

- Ensure that the witness is able to testify from memory without frequent reference to investigative reports and other documents [*see* [c], *below* (refreshing a witness's recollection)]. It is important to control the use of documents carefully, and encourage witnesses not to bring documents to the witness stand; the witness, rather than the documents, should be the focus of attention.

- Organize the direct examination by chronology or some other logical order. Set up the background and scene before eliciting the action.

- Keep direct examination questions short and simple:

  - Ask only questions regarding "who, what, where, when, how, or why."

  - Ask open-ended questions, such as "What happened next?"

  - Use common words; avoid "police talk" and other "insider jargon" that could confuse the witness or reporter, and antagonize the opposing counsel and judge.

  - Listen to the witness's answer and appear interested in his or her answer.

For a discussion of direct examination (*see Evid. Code §§ 760-778*) in trial court proceedings in civil actions, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[c] Guidelines for Refreshing Witness's Recollection

With proper preparation, a witness's present recollection will rarely have to be refreshed. When necessary, however, the following procedures may be used:

- To properly establish a foundation for refreshing recollection, ensure that the witness's memory has really been exhausted by asking the witness directly whether he or she remembers anything else.

- If the witness should remember additional facts, ask the witness whether there is anything that would refresh his or her recollection.

- If the witness identifies a report or other document that would refresh his or her recollection, do the following:

  - Mark it for identification.

  - Show document to opposing counsel and indicate that fact on the record.

  - Give the exhibit to the witness, ask whether he or she recognizes it, and have the witness read it.

  - Ask the witness whether the exhibit has refreshed his or her recollection on the

subject.

- Take the exhibit back from the witness.

- Have the witness testify on the basis of the refreshed recollection.

If this procedure does not refresh a witness's recollection, a statement previously made by the witness may be admissible as past recollection recorded, an exception to the hearsay rule [*see Evid. Code § 1237*; *see also* discussion in *§ 473F.30* et seq., regarding evidentiary rules]. For further discussion concerning refreshing a witness's recollection in civil actions generally, see Ch. 551, *Trial* , and *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 20.16* (Matthew Bender).

[5] Expert Witnesses

[A] Nature of Experts

Administrative hearings frequently involve expert witnesses. An expert witness has special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education on the subject of the testimony [*Evid. Code § 720*]. In court proceedings, an expert's opinion is limited to those subjects that, because they are sufficiently beyond common experience, require an expert's opinion to assist the trier of fact [*Evid. Code § 801(a)*]. The expert's opinion must be based on matters, perceived by or personally known to the expert, of a type that reasonably may be relied on by an expert in forming the opinion [*see Evid. Code § 801(b)*]. Expert observation of proposed special education placement for autistic child before due process hearing was required, and it was improper for the superior court to deny an order compelling the school district to allow the expert hired by the parents of the child to observe the proposed placement before the due process hearing [*Benjamin G. v. California Special Ed. Hearing Office (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 875, 883-884, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366]* . For further discussion of the rules governing experts in court proceedings in civil actions, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[b] Qualification

If the opposing party does not make a lack-of-qualification objection, a witness may testify as an expert witness without being formally qualified as an expert [*see Evid. Code § 720(a)* (expertise must be shown when other party objects)]. If that party does object, the qualification question becomes a preliminary fact to be determined by the ALJ [*see Evid. Code § 405* (determinations of preliminary fact)]. The determination is within the sound discretion of the judge [*Cooper v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 931, 947, 123 Cal. Rptr. 563]* .

What attorneys frequently overlook when qualifying an expert is that the qualification must relate to the particular subject about which the expert is asked to express an opinion [*Miller v. Los Angeles County Flood Control Dist. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 689, 700-701, 106 Cal. Rptr. 1, 505 P.2d 193* ; *Hyman v. Gordon (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 769, 774, 111 Cal. Rptr. 262]* . For this reason, it is often impossible to determine whether a qualification is sufficient until the question for the expert opinion is actually asked. Thus, the time to object is immediately after an opinion question.

The Court of Appeal held that the Medical Board of California deprived a physician of due process of law by conducting a fundamentally unfair physician license revocation hearing when the Board disqualified all of the doctor's experts as to standard of care thereby precluding the doctor from putting on any evidence in his defense to charges that the doctors treatment of several patients was grossly negligent or was an extreme departure from the standard of practice [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1137, 1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . The Court of Appeal also applied the independently judgment test to review the fairness of the administrative hearing as a matter of law [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1140-1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . Finally the Court of Appeal held that this case must be remanded to the Medical Board to consider the evidence presented by the doctor's experts. It was not proper for the reviewing (superior) court to admit the evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*, and then to reweigh the evidence to support the Medical Board's fact findings because this was an unfair proceeding. It

is the agency's responsibility to consider the evidence erroneously excluded and to make an informed decision based on that evidence and agency expertise. Thus, a remand to the agency is required [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1146-1147, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* .

The qualification of an expert witness in administrative proceedings is similar to the procedure in courts. No formal tender of the expert witness is made. After questions concerning qualifications are asked, the standard kind of questions to elicit opinion follow. If there is some question about the qualification of the witness to answer an opinion question, a lack-of-qualification objection should be raised immediately after the question is asked. The ALJ will then determine whether the expert is qualified to testify. To help in the determination, the objecting attorney may conduct voir dire; sometimes the judge will ask questions. For further discussion of the qualification of experts, see *California Trial Guide, Unit 60, § 60.30* (Matthew Bender).

[6] Cross-Examination

[a] Nature and Purpose

Like direct examination (*see* [4], *above*), due process may require the right to cross-examine in administrative hearings [*see* *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* (due process requirements applicable when New York welfare authorities terminated federal aid without notice or hearing); *Jennings v. Jones (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1083, 1091, 212 Cal. Rptr. 134* (county's refusal to provide caseworker at welfare pre-termination hearing denied respondent due process right of cross-examination); *but see* *Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 340, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18* (due process does not require evidentiary hearing prior to initial termination of social security disability benefit payments)].

The APA expressly provides for the right to examine witnesses in hearings that are subject to Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. Furthermore, the right to present and rebut evidence, which includes the right to direct and cross-examination of witnesses, is part of the APA's Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights*, which applies to all state agency hearings, whether or not the agency is required to follow Chapter 5, so long as that agency is required to hold an evidentiary hearing by federal or state constitutional provisions or by federal or state statutes [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11410.20*].

Under the administrative adjudication *bill of rights*, the agency is required to give the person to which the agency action is directed notice and an opportunity to be heard, including the opportunity to present and rebut evidence [*Gov. Code § 11425.10(a)(1)*]. Furthermore, the formal hearing provisions of the APA expressly provide that each party has the right to cross-examine opposing witnesses [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. The scope of cross-examination under the formal hearing provisions is not limited to the scope of the direct examination; a witness may be cross-examined on any relevant matter [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. If the respondent does not testify in his or her own behalf, he or she may be called, typically by the agency, and examined as if under cross-examination [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. Parties also have the right to impeach witnesses regardless of which party first called the witness to testify [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. For a discussion of cross-examination principles in civil proceedings, see California Trial Guide, Unit 70 (Matthew Bender).

[b] Guidelines for Cross-Examination of Witnesses

The following guidelines are intended to help an attorney avoid the most common mistakes made on cross-examination in an administrative hearing:

- Cross-examine any witness that will help your client's case more than harm it; but never cross-examine a witness whose testimony can further harm your client's case and cannot help it.

- Attempt to obtain favorable testimony by getting the witness to agree to facts that favor your client's

case and support your client's theory.

- Attempt to discredit the witness's testimony by asking questions that will show bias, prejudice, contradiction, and other factors that make the witness less believable.

- In order to both obtain favorable testimony and make the witness less believable, get the favorable facts first, while the witness's credibility is still high.

- Never use cross-examination to repeat, and thereby make more clear and compelling, the other side's case. A witness's testimony almost never falls apart during a second telling; instead, it usually makes the other side's case more clear and compelling and helps that side carry its burden of proof. When respondent is not represented, however, counsel for the agency may want to ask some questions of the respondent to assure fairness and to make a more complete record [*see Gonzalez v. Freeman (D.C. Cir. 1964) 334 F.2d 570, 578-579, 118 U.S. App. D.C. 180* (governmental agency has an obligation to be fair)].

- Control the witness with precise leading questions:

  - Ask the witness to answer "yes" or "no" whenever possible.

  - Avoid open-ended questions that begin with "how" or "why."

- Never argue with a witness; arguing is unprofessional and is a no-win situation for the attorney, since only the witness is under oath.

[7] Redirect and Recross-Examination

In court trials, a witness who has been examined once cannot be reexamined as to the same matter without discretionary leave of court, but the witness may be reexamined as to any new matter on which he or she has been examined by the other party [*Evid. Code § 774*]. Redirect and recross-examination of a witness is customarily permitted in administrative hearings.

Unlike direct and cross-examination [*see* [4], [6], *above*], there is no express provision in the APA concerning the scope of redirect and recross. ALJ's generally follow the approach used in court trials. They are often very liberal in permitting additional questions, but if questioning becomes extensive, they will warn all counsel and then require that additional questions be within the scope of prior questions [*see* Ch. 551, *Trial* , for further discussion of examination of witnesses in civil actions].

[8] Examination by ALJ or Agency Member

ALJs will sometimes ask a witness questions if testimony needs clarification or if information that is important to deciding the case has not been sufficiently covered [*see Estate of Dupont (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 276, 289-290, 140 P.2d 866* (judge had power to question various witnesses in probate matter)]. They usually ask questions after the parties are through examining the witness and then allow the parties to ask follow-up questions. If the matter is being heard by the agency directly, agency members will often ask questions. The presiding ALJ or agency practice controls the procedure by which they ask questions [*see Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. Neither the ALJ nor agency members should ask questions in such a way as to become an advocate of one of the parties or show partiality or bias [*Cooper v. Superior Court (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 291, 301, 10 Cal. Rptr. 842, 359 P.2d 274]* . If a party has grounds for objecting to a question asked by the ALJ or agency member, he or she should object. Under the APA, the ALJ will rule on the objection [*see Gov. Code § 11512(b)*]. Furthermore, ALJ rulings admitting and excluding evidence are reviewed in the

same manner and to the same extent as the ALJ's proposed decision in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*].

[9] Rebuttal Evidence

Rebuttal evidence in administrative proceedings is usually evidence put on by the agency after the respondent and other parties have rested their case-in-chief. The right to present evidence in response to rebuttal evidence is expressly permitted by the APA and is grounded in the due process required in administrative proceedings [*Hegglin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 162, 175, 93 Cal. Rptr. 15, 480 P.2d 967* ; *Pence v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 48, 50-51, 45 Cal. Rptr. 12, 403 P.2d 140* ; *see Gov. Code §§ 11425.10(a)(1)* (APA administrative adjudication *bill of rights*), and 11513(b) (APA formal hearing provisions)].

It is not always clear, however, what constitutes proper rebuttal. The scope of rebuttal is largely in the discretion of the judge [*Diamond Springs Lime Co. v. American River Constructors (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 581, 604, 94 Cal. Rptr. 200* (trial court has discretionary authority over the scope of rebuttal)]. In rebuttal, an ALJ may allow evidence that could have been presented in the case-in-chief [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 607(6)* (after parties in court have presented their evidence, they may only offer rebuttal evidence unless court permits them to offer evidence on their original case)].

However, ALJs often will not allow rebuttal evidence that is cumulative or properly part of the case-in-chief [*see People v. Carter (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 737, 753, 312 P.2d 665]* . For this reason, an attorney should never save evidence from his or her case-in-chief to present in rebuttal, and should only use rebuttal to contradict or clarify new and unexpected evidence presented by the other side.

An ALJ who has a very restricted view of what is proper rebuttal can waste time, since this approach tends to force the parties to put everything into their case-in-chief, even when the evidence may turn out to be unnecessary. If a case is likely to have rebuttal evidence, it is a good idea to discuss with the ALJ his or her approach to that evidence before resting the case-in-chief. For further discussion of rebuttal evidence and the evidentiary rules applicable at an administrative hearing, see *§ 473F.30* et seq.

[10] Bifurcation

[a] Nature of Bifurcation

Administrative hearings are occasionally bifurcated: the ALJ opens the hearing, receives some evidence, and continues the remainder of the evidence-taking to a time in the future. The ALJ may set that future date at the time of bifurcation or may leave it to be set later. Bifurcation should be contrasted with continuance, which involves continuing an entire hearing at a later date. Bifurcation should also be contrasted with consolidation and severance under *Gov. Code § 11507.3*, which involves combining or separating matters for hearing. See Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , for discussion of continuances, consolidation, and severance.

[b] Reasons for Requesting Bifurcation

A party's reasons for moving to bifurcate a hearing include the reasons for granting continuances generally. Counsel should consult the "California Administrative Procedure Act Procedures for Administrative Adjudication, Appendix I, Continuance Policy" (OAH Continuance Policy), a bound pamphlet published biannually by the Office of Administrative Hearings. Copies may be obtained from the OAH, 501 J St., Suite 230, Sacramento, CA 95814. Reasons for bifurcation may be unique to a particular hearing, for example, a party may move to bifurcate a hearing for one of the following reasons:

- To avoid inconveniencing witnesses. In APA hearings and other administrative hearings, the unavailability of a respondent's witness is generally good cause for a continuance [*see, e.g.,* OAH Continuance Policy § III-H]. Thus, when unavailability becomes known only at the time of the hearing,

it may support a motion to bifurcate. By bifurcating the hearing rather than continuing it in its entirety, the testimony of witnesses who are present can be taken, and the respondent's case, or just the testimony of the unavailable witness, can be received later.

- To commence the hearing within a statutorily required period by opening the record to receive some documentary evidence or to call a witness to be sworn [*see Powers v. Commission on Professional Competence (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 560, 563-564, 204 Cal. Rptr. 185* (to comply with statutory period, ALJ convened hearing within 60 days after request for hearing was filed to swear in witness and then accept request for continuance)].

See Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* , for further discussion relating to the OAH Continuance Policy and continuances generally.

[c] Procedure and Ruling on Motion

By analogy to the procedure for requesting a continuance, a party probably should make a motion to bifurcate a hearing in writing, or orally on the record [*see* OAH Continuance Policy §§ I-D, III (request for continuance must be written or made orally on the record)]. Bifurcation of a hearing, however, is not favored by most ALJs. First, it often creates future calendar problems. When the case comes up again, the original judge must generally hear it since some evidence has already been received. Second, bifurcation creates a delay in deciding the case. When the case is heard again, the evidence heard at the earlier time has begun to fade from memory, making it more difficult to decide. This is why, in the analogous case of continuances, it is within the sound discretion of the ALJ to grant or deny them [*Gov. Code § 11524*; OAH Continuance Policy].

For a general discussion of the bifurcation of a court trial in a civil action, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

[11] Depositions

[a] Authority to Order

Under the APA, any party to an administrative proceeding may petition an administrative law judge, or if an administrative law judge has not been appointed, the agency to order the taking of the deposition of an unavailable material witness, residing in or out of the state, for use in the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *Kenneally v. Medical Board of California (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 489, 502-503, 32 Cal. Rptr.2d 504* (physician was not denied equal protection of the law and *Gov. Code § 11511* was not unconstitutional in restricting discovery depositions to witnesses whose testimony is material and who are unable to attend a hearing or cannot be required to attend a hearing)].

Giving the ALJ authority to order depositions eliminates the concern that courts have expressed regarding the constitutionality of an agency combining its accusatory and adjudicatory functions when it orders a deposition [*see Blinder, Robinson & Co. v. Tom (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 283, 226 Cal. Rptr. 339* (court of appeal held constitutional the procedure of having the agency order the deposition, when party challenged former *Gov. Code § 11511* on grounds that it allows prosecuting attorney to make rulings on relevance of adversary's evidence)].

[b] Contents of Petition

The petition must be verified and must set forth all of the following [*Gov. Code § 11511*]:

- The nature of the pending proceeding.

- The name and address of the witness.

- A showing of why the witness's testimony is material.
- A showing that the witness is unable or cannot be compelled to attend.
- A request for an order requiring the witness to appear and testify before an officer named in the petition.

Ordering a deposition is not a ministerial act by the agency [*Stevenson v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 433, 439, 88 Cal. Rptr. 815]* . Thus, the requirements of the Government Code should be strictly observed, in particular the required showings of materiality and inability to attend the hearing. For an example of a petition for an order of deposition, see Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .

[c] Procedure for Petition and Order Taking Deposition

The petitioner is required to serve notice of hearing and a copy of the petition on the other parties at least 10 days before the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511*]. If the witness resides outside California, and the ALJ or the agency has ordered the taking of the testimony by deposition, the agency is required to first obtain a court order for the deposition by filing a petition in the Sacramento Superior Court [*Gov. Code § 11511*], and the court proceedings will follow *Gov. Code § 11189* (petition procedure). A court order is necessary because many states enforce commissions to take depositions only if the commissions issue from a court of another state [*see* Judicial Council of California, 10th Biennial Report (1944), pp. 18, 19; *see also* *Reimel v. House (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 780, 784, 74 Cal. Rptr. 345* (quoting Judicial Council report)].

[12] Motion for Nonsuit or Dismissal

Motions for nonsuit or dismissal [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581, 581c*], and all other motions in the nature of a demurrer to the evidence made during court trials are generally not appropriate during an administrative hearing. Neither the APA, nor most other statutes and regulations governing non-APA hearings, provide for these motions.

In addition to this lack of authority, the granting of such a motion might be procedurally awkward, because in many administrative proceedings conducted by an ALJ alone, the final decision rests with the agency, following a proposed decision by the ALJ [*see Gov. Code §§ 11440.10* (general procedural provisions), and 11517(b) (formal APA hearing)]. Because a dismissal is a final decision, the agency would need to hear the motion, requiring a delay in the ordinary proceedings before the ALJ.

For these reasons, ALJs cannot entertain motions to dismiss an action at the close of an agency's evidence [*Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 175, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226* ; *Frost v. State Personnel Board (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 11 Cal. Rptr. 718]* . Under the APA, these motions could also be premature because an agency's case may include evidence from the respondent if he or she does not testify in his or her own behalf [*see Gov. Code § 11513(b)*; *O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 10-11, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862]* .

Motions that the ALJ cannot hear during the hearing might, however, be taken under submission with the case. For example, the applicant for a permit or license might move to withdraw the application prior to the submission of the ALJ's proposed decision on it [*see, e.g.,* *Miller v. Board of Police Commissioners (1960) 181 Cal. App. 2d 562, 563-564, 5 Cal. Rptr. 272* (although applicants for business permit requested withdrawal of permit after hearing but prior to filing of proposed decision with board, local ordinance provided that withdrawal of application did not deprive board of power to deny permit)]. The ALJ can then determine the motion in the proposed decision submitted to the agency [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*]. The agency will then adopt, modify, or reject the proposed decision including the decision on the motion [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*; *see* Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* , for further discussion].

[13] Argument

[a] Order of Presentation

At the close of evidence and before submission of the case, the parties in administrative hearings often present oral argument. By analogy to cases heard by a trial court, the presiding ALJ may limit the duration of argument [*see, e.g., People v. Stout (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 184, 200, 57 Cal. Rptr. 152, 424 P.2d 704* (trial court's imposition of two-hour limit on final argument held to be reasonable exercise of court's discretion)]. Limitations are rarely necessary, however, because the parties usually keep their argument short. Counsel for the agency usually opens and closes the argument. The respondent argues between the opening and closing. However, the parties may waive any argument. If the agency waives opening argument, the respondent argues and the agency makes its closing argument. The agency's closing argument should be limited to rebuttal of the respondent's argument [*Kling v. Crown Finance Corp. (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 33, 35, 146 P.2d 54]* .

By analogy to cases heard in court, the respondent may then be allowed to reply to the agency's closing argument [*see Potapoff v. Mattes (1933) 130 Cal. App. 421, 426, 19 P.2d 1016* (court permitted defendants to reply to plaintiff's closing argument)].

[b] Guidelines for Argument

For an effective argument when arguing the facts and theory of the case, the following guidelines may be helpful:

- Organize the argument by the specific allegations in the pleadings.
- Emphasize the allegations most in dispute.
- Weave the law into the facts and allegations.
- Whenever possible, include a specific recommended disposition of the case. For example, if recommending probation would be appropriate, address the conditions of probation.

[c] Written Argument

Argument may also be written. It is often written in complex factual cases and in cases raising unusual questions of law. ALJs usually grant a request by a party to submit written argument. A time schedule for receiving written argument is then established, and the record will be held open to receive the argument [*see* [14], *below*].

[14] Holding Record Open

Occasionally in administrative hearings, a need will arise to hold the record of the hearing open to receive additional evidence at a later time. The evidence may be documentary or testimonial [*see Gov. Code § 11513(b)* (party has right to introduce exhibits as evidence in hearing)]. Requests to hold the record open should be made during the hearing, and a time for the future submission of the case should be set. If the additional evidence must be rebutted by the other side, the record will also be held open to allow rebuttal.

[15] Decision

Whether the ALJ alone or the agency itself has heard the case, governing statutes generally grant the power of decision to the agency. The ALJ usually prepares the written decision for the agency. Under the APA, if an ALJ has heard the case alone, he or she must prepare a proposed decision in the case within 30 days after the case is submitted [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*]. The agency may then adopt, modify, or reject the ALJ's proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*].

If the agency itself has heard the case, the agency members decide the case during an executive session, with the ALJ present as an advisor [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)(1), (3)*]. No member who did not hear the evidence may vote on the decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)(2)*; *Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 417-419, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465]* .

For a complete discussion of agency decisions, see Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

[16] Sanctions and Enforcement

[a] Sanctions

The orders of a presiding officer are enforceable through the use of the contempt sanction [*Gov. Code § 11455.10*] and monetary sanctions [*Gov. Code § 11455.30*]. The presiding officer can order a party, the party's attorney, or other authorized representative, or both, to pay reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* [*Gov. Code § 11455.30(a)*].

Monetary sanctions can be awarded against a party, including an agency, for bad faith actions or tactics. Bad faith actions or tactics could include failure or refusal to comply with a deposition order, discovery request, subpoena, or other order of the presiding officer in discovery, or moving to compel discovery, frivolously or solely intended to cause delay. A person who requests a hearing without legal grounds would not be subject to sanctions under this statute unless the request was made in bad faith or frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* Ch. 510, *Sanctions* , for discussion of sanctions in civil actions]. Orders imposing or denying monetary sanctions are subject to judicial review in the same manner as a decision in the proceeding. Sanctions orders are enforceable in the same manner as a money judgment or by the contempt sanction [*Gov. Code § 11455.30(b)*].

Contempt sanctions can be imposed against persons in an adjudicative proceeding before an agency, for any of the following [*Gov. Code §§ 11455.10, 11405.20, 11405.30, 11405.70*]:

- Disobedience of or resistance to a lawful order [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(a)*].

- Refusal to take the oath or affirmation as a witness or thereafter refusal to be examined [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(b)*].

- Obstruction or interruption of the due course of the proceeding during a hearing or near the place of the hearing by any of the following [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(c)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1209*; *see* Ch. 135, *Contempt* , for discussion of contempt sanctions in civil actions]:

  - Disorderly, contemptuous, or insolent behavior toward the presiding officer while conducting the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(c)(1)*].

  - Breach of the peace, boisterous conduct, or violent disturbance [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(c)(2)*].

  - Other unlawful interference with the process or the proceedings of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(c)(3)*].

- Violation of the prohibition of ex parte communications under *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.70* [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(d)*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , and 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* , for discussion of ex parte communications].

- Failure or refusal, without substantial justification, to comply with a deposition order, discovery request, subpoena, or other order of the presiding officer, or moving, without substantial justification, to compel discovery [*Gov. Code § 11455.10(e)*; *see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* , for discussion of discovery].

[b] Enforcement

Orders imposing or denying monetary sanctions are subject to judicial review in the same manner as a decision in the proceeding. Monetary sanctions orders are enforceable in the same manner as a money judgment or by the contempt sanction [*Gov. Code § 11455.30(b)*; *see* Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*].

The presiding officer or agency head may certify the facts that justify the contempt sanction against a person to the superior court in and for the county where the proceeding is conducted. The court must thereupon issue an order directing the person to appear before the court at a specified time and place, and then and there to show cause why the person should not be punished for contempt. The order and a copy of the certified statement must be served on the person. Upon service of the order and a copy of the certified statement, the court has jurisdiction of the matter [*Gov. Code § 11455.20(a)*]. The same proceedings can be used, the same penalties imposed, and the person charged may purge the contempt in the same way, as in the case of a person who has committed a contempt in the trial of a civil action in the superior court [*Gov. Code § 11455.20(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222* for laws governing contempt proceedings in civil actions; *see also* Ch. 135, *Contempt* (contempt proceedings in civil actions)].

[17] Right to Counsel

A party to an administrative proceeding is entitled to be represented by retained counsel when the proceeding is such that the party's interest might be prejudiced if the right to representation by counsel were denied [*Steen v. Board of Civil Service Commrs. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 716, 727, 160 P.2d 816* ; *Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 540, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Although the right to counsel is not essential to a fair hearing in all types of administrative proceedings [*see Perlman v. Shasta Joint Jr. College Dist. Bd. of Trustees (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 873, 879-880, 88 Cal. Rptr. 563* (right to counsel not essential to fair hearing in proceedings for suspension of college student)], in proceedings to revoke or suspend a license or other administrative action of a disciplinary nature the licensee is entitled to have counsel of his or her own choosing [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543-544, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see also Gov. Code § 11509* (form for notice of hearing includes statement of parties' right to be represented by counsel at own expense)]. However, due process does not require that counsel be furnished to a licensee when the licensee personally cannot afford to hire counsel [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see Gov. Code § 11509* (form for notice of hearing includes statement that party is not entitled to appointment of attorney at public expense)]. Further, in administrative proceedings no constitutional requirement exists that the hearing officer or the agency advise a party that he or she is entitled to be represented by counsel, although in proceedings subject to the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*], there is a statutory requirement that the agency notify all parties before the hearing of their right to be represented by counsel [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543-544, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see Gov. Code § 11509*; *see also Gov. Code §§ 11500(a)* ("agency" defined), 11501(a) (application of *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.* to agencies as determined by statutes relating to those agencies); *see also* Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication]. The availability of the *Fifth Amendment* privilege against self-incrimination is deemed sufficient protection against the possibility that criminal charges might arise out of the conduct for which disciplinary proceedings are brought [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 541, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see In re Groban (1957) 352 U.S. 330, 333, 77 S. Ct. 510, 1 L. Ed. 2d 376* (witnesses compelled to testify before state fire marshal have no constitutional right to counsel); *but see Szmaciarz v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 904, 917-919, 145 Cal. Rptr. 396* (privilege against self-incrimination unavailable and adverse inferences from refusal to testify may be drawn in administrative hearing on suspension of correctional officer, unless state seeks to subject officer to some criminal liability)].

The general common law rule that corporations must be represented by counsel (licensed attorneys) in litigation before courts of record (other than small claims courts) does not apply to adjudicative proceedings before administrative tribunals, and the Board's decision to affirm the Department's revocation of a corporation's liquor license was not void for lack of jurisdiction because non attorney president of corporation represented corporation in administrative license revocation hearing [*Camille v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 1094, 1101-1103, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 758]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld the Superior Court's assumption of jurisdiction over the law practice of a former attorney who had resigned from the state bar while disciplinary charges were pending. The State Bar of California had requested the assumption of jurisdiction, authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180*, because the former attorney represented clients in state administrative hearings, including hearings of the Medical Board of California. The court of Appeal concluded that the former attorney was representing clients in state agency hearings, and he was not eligible to practice law. The court of Appeal also held that the Superior Court could not lawfully assume jurisdiction over the former attorney's federal agency practice because state law prohibiting unauthorized practice of law is preempted by federal regulations setting standards for practice by attorneys before federal courts and agencies [*Benninghoff v. Superior Court (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 61, 64-65, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 759]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessSelf-Incrimination PrivilegeEvidenceCompetencyAffirmations & OathsEvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationScopeEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsQualificationsEvidenceTestimonyRefreshing RecollectionGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.16

§ 473F.16 Record of the Hearing

[1] Reporting

In virtually all administrative proceedings, a record is kept. Express or implied statutory requirements, or agency practice, determines the requirement and method of recording. Due process may also require the hearing to be recorded [*see Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* (due process requirements applicable when New York welfare authorities terminated federal aid without notice or hearing); *Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 823, 828, 324 P.2d 920* (record of administrative proceeding was inadequate to enable court to determine validity of administrative action)].

The APA requires that agency hearings conducted under Chapter 5, the formal hearing provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), to be reported by a stenographic reporter [*Gov. Code § 11512(d)*]. This means recording by any method whereby a literal record is made of what is said, from which an accurate transcription can be made by audio or visual methods [*Funke v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 449, 455 , 1 Cal. App. 3d 449, 81 Cal. Rptr. 662* (proceedings reported by stenographer using Stenocord machine comply with statutory requirement)]. With the consent of the parties, however, hearings may be reported electronically [*Gov. Code § 11512(d)*]. If properly done, electronic reporting can provide a record of about the same quality as that of reporters. Nonetheless, before consenting to electronic reporting, it is important to carefully consider the need for an accurate transcript in the future proceedings [*see County of Madera v. Holcomb (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 226, 230-231, 66 Cal. Rptr. 428* (electrical recording device rendered certain portions of record unclear); *Aluisi v. County of Fresno (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 823, 824-825, 324 P.2d 920* (because shorthand reporter was unavailable for hearing, electrical device was used that rendered incomplete record of proceedings)].

The Court of Appeal upheld a judgment setting aside the DMV's suspension of a motorist's driver's license after an administrative per se law suspension hearing which was challenged by the motorist in court. The judgment was set aside because the DMV failed to file with the court a complete administrative record of the hearing. The DMV lost a portion of the hearing record because the hearing tape containing the testimony of the motorist and his expert witness was erased. The DMV also refused to pay the cost of reconstructing the missing part of the hearing record, $1,500 for the

motorist's attorney and expert witness to appear at a new hearing [*Frase v. Gourley (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 762, 764-765, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432]* .

The *Frase* case decision was distinguished in the decision in *Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-972, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220* , based on a failure of the driver to request that DMV improve the transcript, or provide assistance in scheduling a new hearing [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-971, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* .

The Court of Appeal reversed the County of Merced's granting of a conditional use permit, and the county's certifying of a final environmental impact report under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for a project approval sought by a mining company. The court held that the county failed to provide an adequate and complete administrative record for judicial review making it difficult for the appellate court to determine whether the county make the necessary findings required by CEQA before issuing the permit [*Protect Our Water v. County of Merced (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 362, 372-374, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 726]* .

Under the APA Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights*, which applies to all state agency hearings in which an evidentiary hearing is required, by federal or state constitutional provisions, or by federal or state statute (including but not limited to hearing under the APA formal hearing provisions), the agency is required to base its decision on the record of the hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10, 11410.20*]. It is difficult to enforce a decision on the record requirement without a transcript of the hearing.

It was reversible error for the superior court to decide an administrative mandamus case and to deny the petition without reviewing the administrative record. In denying the petition before the administrative record had been prepared, the court was unable to weigh the evidence and to decide the sufficiency of the evidence to support the fact findings that provided the basis for the agency decision [*Ocheltree v. Gourley (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 1013, 1017-1018, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* .

[2] Transcripts

In hearings governed by Chapter 5, the APA formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), parties may order transcripts from the Office of Administrative Hearings by making a request for a complete or partial record of the proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11523*]. For administrative hearings that are subject to the administrative adjudication *bill of rights*, that applies to all state agency hearings, whether or not the agency is required to follow the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), whenever the agency is required to hold an evidentiary hearing by federal or state constitutional provisions, or by federal or state statutes, that agency is required to base its decision on the record of the hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10, 11410.20*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , for discussion of the scope of application of these APA provisions].

It is difficult to enforce a decision on the record requirement without a transcript. In those case, as well as in non-APA hearings, parties may obtain transcripts from the agency or from the reporter directly. In some cases, tape recordings may have to be transcribed by the party requesting a transcript [*see* *Darley v. Ward (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 257, 261, 168 Cal. Rptr. 481, 617 P.2d 1113]* .

It is important to learn the procedures for reporting and transcribing the hearing being conducted. If the procedures raise concerns about an adequate record, these concerns should be resolved before the hearing begins. In some cases, it may be advisable to hire an additional reporter to come in to record the proceedings to preserve a record and provide a transcript. The cost of such a record might even be recovered if a judicial review is successful [*Marlow v. Orange County Human Services Agency (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 290, 294-295, 167 Cal. Rptr. 776* (respondent who hired court reporter for hearing, despite tape recording by agency, was reasonable, and therefore cost of reporting was properly awarded to him)]. If a daily transcript is desired, it is almost always necessary to provide for them personally.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsCourtsCourt Personnel

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.17

§ 473F.17 Defaults

[1] APA Proceedings

[a] License Issuance and Renewal Cases

A hearing to determine whether a right, authority, license, or privilege should be granted, issued, or renewed is initiated by filing a statement of issues [*Gov. Code § 11504*]. The agency may deny issuance in the form of a statement of issues, or it may simply deny issuance and provide the statement if the unsuccessful applicant requests a hearing on the denial [*Gov. Code § 11504*]. A respondent who has not requested a hearing defaults either by failing to file a notice of defense to the statement within 15 days after service of a statement of issues or by failing to appear at the hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 11504, 11504.5, 11520(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 11506(a)* (time limit for notice of defense)].

However, notwithstanding the default of the respondent, the agency or the ALJ, before a proposed decision is issued, have discretion to grant a hearing on reasonable notice to the parties. If the agency and the ALJ make conflicting orders under this provision, the agency order takes precedence [*Gov. Code § 11520(b)*]. Also, the ALJ may order the respondent, or the respondent's attorney or other authorized representative, or both, to pay reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of the respondent's failure to appear at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11520(b)*].

Furthermore, within seven days after service on the respondent of a decision based on the respondent's default, the respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied upon. The agency in its discretion may vacate the decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)*]. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Failure of the person to receive notice served pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11505* [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(1)*].

- Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(2)*].

For discussion and forms relating to a statement of issues and other initial agency pleadings, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* . For discussion and forms relating to default procedures and relief from default in civil actions generally, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* , and Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

Agencies governed by Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), handle a default in different ways. Some agencies never file a statement of issues unless the applicant requests a hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11504* (agency must provide statement upon request for hearing)]. Other agencies will sometimes file a statement of issues without an applicant's request for hearing. When an applicant requests a hearing and the agency files a statement of issues, some agencies will not set the matter for hearing if they do not receive a notice of defense. The agency will write its own default decision [*see Gov. Code § 11520(a)* (agency may take action when respondent fails to file notice of defense)].

Other agencies will set the matter for hearing, regardless of not receiving a notice of defense, if the proof of the allegations in the case involves testimony in addition to documents. If the agency receives a notice of defense but the respondent does not appear at the hearing, some agencies will take the case off calendar and write their own default decision. Other agencies will withdraw the case only if it is a documentary case and without testimony. In summary, the practices of agencies vary greatly with respect to defaults in statement of issues cases, and often depend on the kind of case. Practices also change within agencies over time. It is thus important to contact the agency to determine its current default practice.

[b] License Discipline Cases

An agency initiates a hearing to determine whether a right, authority, license, or privilege should be revoked, suspended, limited, or conditioned by filing an accusation [*Gov. Code § 11503*; *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*].

The agency has express authority to treat either the respondent's failure to file a notice of defense within 15 days after service of an accusation or respondent's failure to appear at the hearing, as a default [*Gov. Code §§ 11506(c), 11520(a)*]. However, notwithstanding the default of the respondent, the agency or the ALJ, before a proposed decision is issued, have discretion to grant a hearing on reasonable notice to the parties. If the agency and the ALJ make conflicting orders under this provision, the agency order takes precedence [*Gov. Code § 11520(b)*]. Also, the ALJ may order the respondent, or the respondent's attorney or other authorized representative, or both, to pay reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of the respondent's failure to appear at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11520(b)*].

Within seven days after service on the respondent of a decision based on the respondent's default, the respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied upon. The agency in its discretion may vacate the decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)*]. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Failure of the person to receive notice served pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11505* [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(1)*].

- Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(2)*].

As in license issuance cases [*see* [a], *above*], the proper agency practice for defaults in accusation cases is not completely clear. In accusation cases, the agency has the burden of proof. Thus, hearings are normally held regardless of a respondent's failure to file a notice of defense or appear at the hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11520(a)*]. Failure to file a timely notice of defense to an accusation is a waiver of the right to a hearing, however, and granting a hearing is then discretionary with the agency [*Gov. Code §§ 11506(c), 11520(b)*]. When respondent fails to file a notice of defense or

fails to appear at the hearing, the agency may act based on the respondent's admissions, affidavits, and "other evidence" [*Gov. Code § 11520(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11520(a)* strongly implies that this "other evidence" is evidence taken in a hearing. It must be relevant evidence [*see Carl S. v. Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 365, 369, 178 Cal. Rptr. 753* (court held that hearsay evidence was incompetent and therefore insufficient to support commission's finding that respondent was unfit to teach)].

For these reasons, agencies usually have a default hearing in accusation cases regardless of whether a notice of hearing is filed. At the hearing, the agency attorney presents the case very much like a contested case, except that affidavits are more often used [*see Gov. Code § 11520(a)* (agency may use affidavits as evidence)]. Unsworn multiple hearsay statements are not sufficient [*Carl S. v. Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 365, 372, 178 Cal. Rptr. 753]* .

[c] Mitigation

Under the new act, former Gov. Code. Code § 11520(b), relating to the right of a defaulting respondent to make a showing by way of mitigation, is superseded by the procedures to cure a default under *Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*. Under those procedures, as explained in [a], and [b], *above*, the ALJ or agency have discretion to do the following [*Gov. Code § 11520*]:

- Grant a hearing notwithstanding respondent's default.
- Vacate a decision and grant a new hearing.

The respondent may make a showing by way of mitigation as a defense in the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 251 (1995)]. What this means is that if respondent wants to present mitigation defense, he or she has to invoke the procedures to cure a default under *Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*.

[d] Reconsideration of Default

When a default decision has been made, by the agency alone or by an ALJ whose decision is adopted by the agency [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*], a respondent may still be able to get a hearing on the merits. Under the new act, within seven days after service on the respondent of a decision based on the respondent's default, the respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied upon. The agency in its discretion may vacate the decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)*]. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Failure of the person to receive notice served pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11505* [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(1)*].
- Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(2)*].

When a respondent is seeking reconsideration of a default based on failure to receive actual notice of the hearing, respondent must support the claim of lack of actual notice with proof and must show that lack of notice was not due to inexcusable neglect or to respondent avoiding service [*Evans v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 958, 974-976, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460]* . The agency may order a reconsideration of all or part of the case, on its own motion or on the petition of any party, within any of the following time limits [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]:

- Thirty days after the delivery or mailing of the decision to respondent.
- The effective date of the decision, if it occurs before that 30-day period elapses.

- The expiration of a stay (which may not be longer than 30 days) granted by the agency to enable the respondent to request a reconsideration.

The APA does not prescribe the form and contents of a petition by the respondent. Because most agencies prefer to have decisions made on the merits, they may grant the petition for reconsideration. Therefore, if a respondent has received a default decision and desires a hearing, it is important to contact the agency immediately and petition for reconsideration, setting forth good reasons for having a further hearing. The agency itself may reconsider the case on all pertinent parts of the record, and any additional evidence and argument permitted, or it may assign the case to an administrative law judge [*Gov. Code § 11521(b)*].

[2] Non-APA Defaults

In non-APA hearings, when a respondent is given adequate notice and an opportunity to defend, agencies also have the power to proceed in default [*Rinaldo v. Board of Medical Exmrs. (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 345, 351, 42 P.2d 724* (board revoked doctor's license to practice at hearing which respondent did not attend); *McGinn v. Board of Health (1931) 113 Cal. App. 228, 231, 298 P. 118* (board discharged hospital watchman at hearing that respondent did not attend)].

A statute usually provides the authority for default on respondent's failure to file a required response or to appear at a hearing; however, the authority may be implied. Because the procedure for handling default cases varies from agency to agency, uniform practices cannot be assumed; the agency should be contacted in each individual case. Most non-APA agencies can also set aside a default or reconsider a default decision if they still have jurisdiction to do so under their statute or other governing authority [*see, e.g.,* Cal. State B. Rules Proc., Rule 555 (default due to nonappearance of respondent at formal hearing may be set aside for good cause upon timely application)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingWaiverEvidenceRelevanceRelevant EvidenceGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.18

§ 473F.18 Persuasion

[1] Persuasion in Administrative Hearings

Because most administrative hearings are conducted by an individual ALJ who may have some background in the administrative subject area of the hearing, persuasion techniques in an administrative hearing are different from those in a jury trial, and sometimes different than those in a court trial. The points discussed in [2], *below*, should be considered regarding persuasion in an administrative hearing.

For a discussion of persuasion in court trials generally, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[2] Guidelines for Persuasion

The following guidelines are intended to help an attorney determine which persuasion techniques to exercise in an administrative hearing:

- Prove all of your facts in the hearing; don't expect another chance to prove your case. The administrative hearing is the "trial" of the facts and usually creates the only record on which the facts will be determined and reviewed.

- Always make a full understandable record, because the ALJ, or the judge who later reviews the record, may not be knowledgeable about technical subjects.

- Avoid extensive review of an expert's qualifications; less time is expended when resumes are used.

- Avoid theatrics, which are generally inappropriate; it is far more effective to fully and efficiently prove your case.

- Use objections; this use improves the quality of proof and increases your knowledge about avoiding objections and presenting evidence properly.

- Know and understand the law, including regulations, that apply to the procedures in the hearing.
- Be creative:
    - Explore procedures that can help resolve the controversy or portions of it.
    - Consider the use of stipulations of fact, prehearing and settlement conferences, motions in limine, and other resolution procedures.
- Be flexible; not all administrative hearings are alike, and due to the limited use of discovery, unexpected events often occur.
- Properly prepare witnesses and exhibits:
    - Schedule witnesses to avoid long waits.
    - Have exhibits in presentable form with copies for the other side.
- Be professional:
    - Respect the judge, opposing parties, and witnesses.
    - Act and look well prepared and knowledgeable.
    - Demonstrate dedication to your client within the bounds of fairness.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Hearing Procedures

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.19-473F.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.30

§ 473F.30 Administrative Rules of Evidence

[1] Criminal Rules of Evidence Are Generally Inapplicable

The rules of evidence in administrative hearings are administrative rules, neither purely criminal nor purely civil. Without a statute making it applicable, the California Evidence Code does not apply to administrative proceedings [*Evid. Code § 300* (applicable to court actions, except as otherwise provided by statute)]. Although administrative proceedings may be punitive in nature, they are not criminal in nature and need not be conducted in accordance with the rules of procedure or evidence employed in criminal courts [*Webster v. Board of Dental Examiners (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 534, 537, 110 P.2d 992* ; *Suckow v. Alderson (1920) 182 Cal. 247, 251, 187 P. 965* ; *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 173, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *Gore v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 184, 198, 167 Cal. Rptr. 881]* . In some instances, however, criminal rules of evidence may apply [*see Coburn v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 801, 809-810, 148 Cal. Rptr. 134* (disciplinary hearing of State Personnel Board applied evidence code provisions regarding misdemeanor conviction); *see also §§ 473F.33, 473F.34*].

[2] Liberal Nature of Rules

Administrative proceedings are not conducted according to strict or technical rules of evidence [*Coburn v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 801, 809, 148 Cal. Rptr. 134* ; *Camp v. Brock (1946) 170 P.2d 702]* . The APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) provides that an administrative hearing under Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), need not be conducted according to technical rules relating to evidence and witnesses, except as provided in the APA [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*].

Thus, relevant evidence will be admitted if it is the kind of evidence on which responsible people are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule that might make the admission of that evidence over objection improper in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *see § 473F.31[1]*].

Hearsay evidence that is not admissible in civil actions can be used to supplement or explain other evidence but over timely objection is not sufficient by itself to support a fact finding [*Gov. Code § 11513(d)*; *see § 473F.32*]. Rules of privilege are applicable [*Gov. Code § 11513(e)*; *see § 473F.33*]. The presiding officer has discretion to exclude

evidence if its probative value is outweighed by the probability that its admission will necessitate undue consumption of time [*Gov. Code § 11513(f)*; *see § 473F.31*]. The "irrelevant and unduly repetitious" evidence standard of former *Gov. Code § 11513* is replaced by the general standard of *Evidence Code § 352* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 240 (1995)]. *Evidence Code § 352* provides as follows: "The court in its discretion may exclude evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will (a) necessitate undue consumption of time or (b) create substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing the issues, or of misleading the jury" [*Evid. Code § 352*; *see* California Trial Guide (Matthew Bender), for more detailed discussion of evidence issues in civil actions].

Although administrative rules of evidence are not strict, parties to an administrative proceeding have a due process right to a fair hearing, which includes the right to present issues of fact and law in a deliberate, regular, and orderly manner [*H. Moffatt Co. v. Hecke (1924) 68 Cal. App. 35, 39, 228 P. 546]* . The APA expressly provides for such a hearing that includes the following protections [*Gov. Code § 11513(a), (b)*; *see Desert Turf Club v. Board of Supervisors (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 446, 455, 296 P.2d 882* (common sense and fair play dictate certain basic requirements for the conduct of any hearing at which facts will be determined)]:

- Testimony on oath or affirmation.
- The right to call and examine witnesses.
- The right to introduce exhibits.
- The right to cross-examine opposing witnesses on any relevant matter.
- The right to impeach any witness.
- The right to rebut evidence.

[3] Guidelines for Production of Evidence

Administrative rules of evidence are an amalgam of evidentiary principles. Administrative law judges (ALJs) determine them by looking to express statutory provisions such as *Gov. Code § 11513*, rules that the courts have applied to administrative proceedings, rules of evidence in both criminal and civil cases, and general common law evidentiary principles. Like other judges, however, ALJs vary in their application of evidentiary rules during administrative proceedings. Counsel in an administrative hearing should generally comply with the following guidelines:

- Produce evidence in the same manner as in a civil court trial.
- Raise novel or unusual evidentiary issues before or as early as possible during the hearing.
- Do not rely on the liberal application of rules of evidence when preparing for an administrative hearing.
- Present all admissible evidence at the administrative hearing, rather than saving it for a possible court review [*see Greenblatt v. Munro (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 596, 326 P.2d 929* (party in administrative hearing cannot make skeletal presentation with expectation of making a more complete showing before a court)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceRelevanceConfusion, Prejudice & Waste of TimeEvidenceRelevanceRelevant EvidenceEvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.31

§ 473F.31 Basic Hearing Objections

[1] Irrelevant Evidence

Irrelevant evidence is objectionable [*Evid. Code §§ 350* (no evidence is admissible except relevant evidence), and 351 (except as otherwise provided by statute, all relevant evidence is admissible; *Neely v. California State Personnel Bd. (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 487, 493, 47 Cal. Rptr. 64* (irrelevant evidence could not be inquired into at personnel hearing))].

To be relevant, evidence (including credibility evidence) must have "any tendency in reason to prove or disprove any disputed fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action" [*Evid. Code § 210*]. Under the APA, any relevant evidence will be admitted if it is the sort of evidence "on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs," regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule that might make the admission of the evidence over objection improper in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*]. For further discussion of the relevance objection in the context of court trials, see California Trial Guide, Unit 22, Pts. C-F (Matthew Bender).

[2] Evidence That Necessitates Undue Consumption of Time

In court proceedings, an objection can be made whenever a question is asked that reasonably calls for an answer that has already been given [*see Evid. Code §§ 765(a), 774*; *see also California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 20.15[11]* (Matthew Bender)].

In APA administrative proceedings, however, the presiding officer has discretion to exclude evidence if its probative value is outweighed by the probability that its admission will necessitate undue consumption of time [*Gov. Code § 11513(f)*]. *Gov. Code § 11513(f)* replaces the "irrelevant and unduly repetitious" evidence standard of former Gov. Code. Code § 11513 with the general standard of *Evidence Code § 352* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 240 (1995); *see Evid. Code § 352(a)* (court has discretion to exclude evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will necessitate undue consumption of time)]. In practice, an ALJ is usually concerned about the needless consumption of time as are other judges. An objection on the basis of repetitious evidence should be stated as "undue consumption of time," although the objection is sometimes incorrectly expressed as "asked and

answered."

[3] Objectionable Form of Question

[a] Leading Questions

Objections to the form of questions can and should be made. For example, leading questions [*see Evid. Code § 764*] are improper except when used during cross-examination and in a few other circumstances, such as for preliminary questions and when memory has been exhausted. When leading questions are used, they move the focus of the testimony from the witness to the examiner and thereby detract from the impact of the answer. For this reason, the opposing side infrequently objects to leading questions. Nevertheless, they should not be used for persuasive testimony. See also discussion in *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 20.15[1]* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Narrative Questions

Narrative questions, that is, those that are excessively open-ended [*see Evid. Code § 765(a)*], are objectionable because they allow a witness to inject inadmissible evidence into a hearing without an opportunity for objection. In addition to being objectionable, it is often an ineffective way of presenting testimony. See also *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 20.15[2]* (Matthew Bender).

[c] Other Objectionable Questions

Objections are also appropriate for questions that assume facts not in evidence or misstate evidence, or that are confusing, misleading, ambiguous, vague, unintelligible, speculative, compound, or argumentative [*see Evid. Code § 765*]. These kinds of questions are inefficient and often elicit ineffective testimony. For a discussion of these and other objections to the form of a question, see *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 20.15*.

[4] Cumulative Evidence

Cumulative evidence results when many witnesses give essentially the same testimony without adding anything new, or when many exhibits demonstrate the same thing. Like unduly repetitious evidence, it is objectionable [*see Evid. Code § 352* (admission of evidence necessitates undue consumption of time)]. In administrative proceedings the ALJ is not the final judge of facts, however, because the agency makes the final decision [*see Gov. Code § 11517*; *see also § 473F.10* et seq.].

Therefore, cumulative evidence can be properly included in cases with sharply conflicting testimony [*see Evans v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1945) 71 Cal. App. 2d 244, 248-249, 162 P.2d 488* (cumulative evidence was allowed in case in which respondent claimed that dermatitis was contracted in course of employment, and evidence conflicted regarding whether disease was confined to exposed parts of body)]. See also *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, § 22.50[3]* (Matthew Bender).

[5] Guidelines for Objection Procedure

Objections in an administrative hearing should be made in the same way they are made in court proceedings. The following guidelines cover the main procedural points:

- Make the objection promptly.
- If the question is improper, object before the witness begins to answer.
- Allow the question to be completed before objecting, except when it becomes apparent that the

question itself is prejudicial as well as objectionable. In hearings with only an ALJ or hearing officer [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*], however, there is less possibility of prejudice than in hearings with a board or panel.

- Make an initial objection. If the objection is not so obvious that it is ruled on immediately, follow the initial objection with specific grounds for the objection. The grounds should be stated succinctly and should not include extensive argument--for example, "The question is leading," or "The question calls for an irrelevant answer," or simply, "Irrelevant."

- If argument on the objection is appropriate, wait for the ALJ to invite argument or ask to be heard. After an objection to the form of a question is made, opposing counsel will often voluntarily reform the question and no ruling on the objection will be necessary. If a ruling is necessary, however, and the ALJ does not make a clear ruling, ask for a ruling.

- If an objection is made either during the answer or at its end--for example, when the answer is unresponsive--include a motion to strike the improper part of the answer. In administrative proceedings, motions to strike are not granted frequently, but they should be made to protect the record.

[6] Offers of Proof

Offers of proof are especially important in administrative proceedings, because the records of these hearings are frequently reviewed by administrative bodies with final decision authority or appellate review authority, and by the courts. If an objection is sustained and results in the exclusion of important evidence, counsel should make an offer of proof if there is a question about the correctness of the ALJ's ruling. A reviewing authority will then be aware of what evidence was excluded. To make an offer of proof, counsel must simply ask the ALJ for permission to do so. The ALJ will normally grant permission, but he or she may have the attorney make the offer after any board or panel members are dismissed [*see Gov. Code § 11517(b)(1)* (members of agency may hear case together with ALJ)]. The offer of proof should consist of the substance, purpose, and relevance of the excluded evidence [*see Evid. Code § 354(a)* (applicable in court proceedings)]. For a discussion of the offer of proof in a trial court context, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[7] Foundation and Authentication

[a] Establishing a Proper Foundation

Foundations for exhibits should be established in administrative hearings in the same manner as in court proceedings [*see White v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 699, 705-706, 180 Cal. Rptr. 516* (court refused to admit document of several hundred pages, when lack of foundation required court to speculate on its relevancy and reliability); *see also Evid. Code §§ 403, 405* (applicable to court proceedings)]. Although technical rules of evidence are not followed in administrative hearings, establishing a proper foundation for documents and other exhibits goes to their relevance and credibility [*see Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *see also § 473F.30*]. A proper foundation can establish whether the evidence is the sort of evidence "on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs" [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (requirement for admissibility); *see § 473F.30*]. A forensic lab that tested motorist's blood for alcohol and which reported blood alcohol reading of.08 or above did not comply with state regulations requiring new blood alcohol testing procedures, and therefore test results were not sufficiently reliable for use under the administrative per se suspension law [*Baker v. Gourley (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1263, 1264-1265, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 348* (reversal of driver's license suspension under administrative per se suspension law because DMV is required to establish that motorist had blood alcohol level at.08 or above at the time of driving to suspend motorists driver's license. Introduction of valid chemical test results is a necessary element of proof, as DMV can not show substantial evidence of that BA level merely by behavior associated with intoxication, and DMV could not rely on chemical test results as lab which tested blood sample did not comply with state regulations requiring new alcohol

testing procedures)].

Another California Court of Appeal held that breath alcohol test results were admissible in DMV administrative per se driver's license suspension hearing but the results were not entitled to much weight because the results were unreliable, as the administering officer failed to follow the guidelines contained in administrative regulations [*17 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 1215.1(b), 1219.3*], which required a 15-minute observation period before the administration of the breath test. Because the test results had so little weight, they did not adequately support a fact finding that the motorist was driving with a blood alcohol level in excess of 0.08. Thus, the DMV order suspending the motorist's license was reversed because the blood alcohol level fact finding was not supported by evidence of sufficient reliability [*Roze v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1176, 1188-1190, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829]* .

However, in criminal prosecutions for driving under the influence of alcohol, the Highway Patrol's lack of compliance with administrative regulations in administering alcohol screening tests does not preclude admission of those test results for lack of reliability. Rather, substantial compliance with administrative regulations is an alternative means of assuring reliability, and the trial court could also have admitted the test results based on other indicia of reliability [*People v. Williams (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 408, 416-418, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 854, 49 P.3d 203]* .

Furthermore, a forensic alcohol analysis prepared by a criminalist was inadmissible and did not come within the public employee records exception [*Evid. Code § 1280*] to the hearsay rule because DMV, which had the burden of proof on this issue provided no foundation evidence to show that the criminalist had an official duty to perform and record the forensic alcohol analysis results. Without the foundation evidence, the hearsay exception did not apply, the evidence was hearsay, and the evidence could not provide sufficient evidence to support a fact finding as to the driver's blood alcohol level [*Furman v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 416, 418-419, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a one-week delay in the preparation of report of forensic alcohol test results raised substantial concerns about lapse of memory by analysts that had conducted the test, such that the report was not found to be timely, and the official records exception to the hearsay rule [*Evid. Code § 1280(b)*] did not apply to allow the reports to be admissible in the DMV license suspension administrative hearing. Timeliness of the report is a foundational requirement for admissibility of reports under the official records hearsay exception [*Glatman v. Valverde (2006) 146 Cal. App. 4th 700, 703-705, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 319]* .

Proponents of an exhibit should always offer it when the witness is still on the stand, usually immediately after the foundation is established, in order to avoid forgetting to move exhibits into evidence before resting the proponents' case, or forgetting entirely. Counsel objecting to a lack of proper foundation should do so when the exhibit is offered into evidence, not when it is marked for identification. From the proponents' point of view, if an objection is sustained, the witness will still be available to supply missing foundation elements. For further discussion of establishing a proper foundation, see *California Trial Guide, Unit 21, § 21.11* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Authentication of Writings

Writings and conversations must be authenticated for the same reasons that a foundation should be established [*see Evid. Code §§ 1400-1421* (authentication of documents in court proceedings)]. For example, signed writings usually must be shown to have authentic signatures. The identity of parties to a conversation must also be demonstrated. Videotapes are considered to be writings that must be authenticated before being admitted into evidence. Unauthenticated videotapes cannot be properly admitted into evidence, and without an authenticating foundation these videotapes are considered to be irrelevant and unreliable evidence [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 349-351, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* . For a discussion of authentication, see California Trial Guide, Unit 30 (Matthew Bender).

[8] Secondary Evidence Rule

The content of a writing may be proved by an otherwise admissible original [*Evid. Code § 1520*]. However, under the "Secondary Evidence Rule," the content may also generally be proved by otherwise admissible secondary evidence [*Evid. Code § 1521(a)*]. Secondary evidence must be excluded only when the court determines a genuine dispute exists concerning material terms of the writing and justice requires the exclusion, or if admission would be unfair [*Evid. Code § 1521(a)*]. Secondary evidence must be authenticated in order to be "otherwise admissible" [*Evid. Code §§ 1401, 1521(c)*]. Oral testimony is generally not admissible to prove the content of a writing, except under limited statutory exceptions [*Evid. Code § 1523*].

The Secondary Evidence Rule has replaced the former "Best Evidence Rule" in California [*see* Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Evid. Code § 1521*]. The newer rule conforms more closely to the practice in administrative adjudication proceedings, in which authenticated secondary evidence, such as a photocopy or computer printout, is admitted so long as it is relevant and of a type upon which responsible persons customarily rely in serious affairs [*see Gov. Code § 11513(c)* and discussion in *§ 473F.30*; *see also Evid. Code §§ 1552, 1553* (printed representations of computer information and images stored on a video or digital medium are presumed to be accurate representations of the information and images represented)].

For more detailed discussion of the Secondary Evidence Rule, see California Trial Guide, Unit 31 (Matthew Bender).

[9] Failure to Object

In trial courts, the failure to make a timely objection to the admission of evidence or a motion to strike and to clearly give grounds for the objection or motion can constitute a waiver of the right to complain about the erroneous admission of evidence [*Evid. Code § 353* (verdict or judgment will not be reversed based on erroneous admission of evidence when no objection or motion to exclude evidence was made)]. The same rule applies in administrative hearings [*see Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 139, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171* (court found that hearsay evidence was of probative value when it was not objected to when offered); *Tennant v. Civil Service Com. (1946) 77 Cal. App. 2d 489, 498, 175 P.2d 568* (respondent could not later object to fact that report was not introduced at hearing, after he failed to object at hearing)]. This rule applies even if the party failing to object is unrepresented [*August v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 52, 64, 70 Cal. Rptr. 172]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewEvidenceAuthenticationGeneral OverviewEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceFoundational RequirementsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofOffers of ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofTimelinessEvidenceRelevanceConfusion, Prejudice & Waste of TimeEvidenceRelevanceRelevant EvidenceEvidenceTestimonyExaminationLeading Questions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.32

§ 473F.32 Administrative Hearsay

[1] General Requirements

"Hearsay evidence" is evidence of a statement that is made other than by a witness while testifying at the hearing that is offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted [*Evid. Code § 1200(a)*]. It can consist of oral or written verbal expression, or nonverbal conduct intended as a substitute for oral or written verbal expression [*Evid. Code § 225*]. Videotapes can also be hearsay evidence. Videotapes are considered to be writings that must be authenticated before being admitted into evidence. Unauthenticated videotapes cannot be properly admitted into evidence, and without an authenticating foundation these videotapes are considered to be irrelevant and unreliable evidence. Admission of these videotapes was objected to and the videotapes (of a school district employee) were hearsay evidence offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 350-351, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* . In contrast to court proceedings, objectionable hearsay is often admissible in administrative proceedings. For a discussion of application of the hearsay rule and its exceptions in civil trials, see California Trial Guide, Unit 40 (Matthew Bender).

The APA provides that hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but over timely objection is not sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11513(d)*]. The objection is timely if made before submission of the case or on reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*].

The Third District California Court of Appeal held that the admission into evidence of a prior administrative law judge decision was permissible under *Gov. Code § 11513(c)* because the ALJ decision was reliable evidence. That decision, which was hearsay, properly supplemented other evidence under *Gov. Code § 11513(d)*, and did not consume an undue amount of time under *Gov. Code § 11513(f)*. The prior judge's decision assisted in proving that two teachers had special training and experience for teaching community day school, and therefore the school district was justified in laying off more senior teachers and retaining these two teachers consistent with the requirements of *Educ. Code § 44955(d)*. The prior ALJ decision addressed a prior reduction in force by the same school district, and the qualifications of the same two teachers were discussed in that prior decision [*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School District (2009)170 Cal. App. 4th*

127, 140-142, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 13] .

This otherwise objectionable hearsay evidence that is used to supplement or explain other evidence is referred to as "administrative hearsay." The rule that administrative hearsay may not be used by itself and without other evidence to support a finding of fact is called the "residuum rule." A finding cannot be based on administrative hearsay without a residuum of other evidence that supplements or explains the finding [*Gov. Code § 11513(d)*; *Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 223, 229-230, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803* (hearsay evidence contained in State Bar Court and Review Department opinions, and in unpublished court of appeal decision upholding fraud judgment opinion was hearsay evidence admitted for purpose of supplementing or explaining other admissible evidence and this hearsay evidence was properly admitted for this purpose under *Gov. Code § 11513 (d)*)].

The California Supreme Court decided issues related to the admissibility and sufficiency under *Gov. Code § 11513(c)* of unsworn police reports used in administrative per se hearings conducted by the DMV. The Court decided that a police officer's unsworn report, containing both an admission by a defendant that he was driving a car at the time of an arrest for driving while intoxicated and witness statements that defendant was driving while intoxicated, was admissible under *Gov. Code Section 11513(c)* in a driver's license suspension hearing under "administrative per se" procedure for purposes of showing that defendant was driving at the time of arrest [*Lake v. Reed (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 448, 460-461, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 860, 940 P. 2d 311]* . The police officer's report fit under the public employee hearsay exception, and the driver's admission fit under the party admission exception. The other witness statements are admissible to supplement the statements admitted under hearsay exceptions, and the evidence presented was sufficient to prove that defendant was driving at the time of the arrest [*Lake v. Reed (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 448, 461-462, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 860, 940 P. 2d 311]* . Further, an unsworn and uncertified blood or urine forensic laboratory report showing the blood alcohol level of a driver arrested for driving while intoxicated is admissible under *Gov. Code Section 11513(c)*, and is within the public employees exception to the hearsay rule [*Lake v. Reed (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 448, 466-467, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 860, 940 P. 2d 311]* .

There is a substantial amount of case law that similarly addresses administrative hearsay issues [*Jackson v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 730, 737, 27 Cal. Rptr.2d 712* (driver's admission that he was driving motor vehicle that was contained in arresting officer's arrest report is competent evidence under hearsay exceptions for admissions by a party and for public employee records); *see* *Lake v. Reed (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 448, 467, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 860, 940 P. 2d 311* (forensic alcohol report is official DMV record admissible at administrative per se hearing when admission requirements are satisfied); *Shea v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1057, 1059, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 896* (forensic alcohol report prepared by an unsupervised trainee inadmissible as official record); Manning v. Department of motor vehicles *(1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 273, 276* , *61 Cal. App. 4th 273, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 647* (forensic alcohol report inadmissible when unsupervised trainee performed test and there was discrepancy between signature date and date test sample went to laboratory); *Carlton v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1428, 1432, 250 Cal. Rptr. 809* (police officer's opinion in computerized accident report held to be hearsay and insufficient to support a license revocation because the report would not be admissible under the business records or official records exceptions to the hearsay rule); *Szmaciarz v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 904, 913-914, 145 Cal. Rptr. 396* (hearsay testimony of witnesses regarding respondent's marijuana use was admissible, because it would be admissible in a civil action over objection as an admission by a party); *Hildebrand v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1562, 1571-1573, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234* (fire captains' hearsay statement was admissible in administrative hearing both as part of arresting officer's arrest report (admissible as a public employee record) and was admissible (under *Gov. Code § 11513(d)* to supplement driver's statements at the time of the arrest (admissible as a party admission)); *McNary v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 688, 694-695, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 55* (officer's sworn report containing report of another officer's personal observations that arrested person had been driving are admissible public employee records; citing and following *Gananian); Robertson v. Zolin (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 147, 152-153, 51 Cal. Rptr 2d 420* (hearsay evidence offered by driver supplemented DMV evidence and was sufficient to support finding that blood test was not reliable); *Gananian v. Zolin (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 634, 640, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 384* (officer's sworn report containing report of another officer's personal observations are

admissible public employee records); *Cantrell v. Zolin (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 128, 133-134, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 238* (officer's statement was not hearsay as to reasonable cause to believe issue)].

A scientific investigation division report, showing the blood alcohol level of a driver, was not properly authenticated because the report was not signed and thus the report did not come within the official records exception to the hearsay rule. The report was hearsay within the meaning of *Gov. Code § 11513(d),* and did not satisfy the requirements of that section for admissibility over objection in civil actions. Therefore, the report, which provided the only evidence of blood alcohol level, was not substantial evidence to support a finding necessary to support a license suspension for driving with a blood-alcohol level of .08 or more, and a driver's license suspension was properly revoked [*Jacobson v. Gourley (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1333-1334, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 349]* .

Forensic lab blood test results were not admissible in evidence in DMV administrative hearing because the Department of Justice (DOJ) lab report containing the test results was not prepared at or near the time of the recorded event, as required for the public employee records exception [*Evid. Code § 1280(b)*] to the hearsay rule. Thus, it was not an abuse of discretion for the trial court to exclude the lab report of the blood test results from admission into evidence. Preparation of the report one week after the analysis was completed was not sufficient in the absence of any information as to when the test results were entered into the lab database [*Molenda v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 974, 990-991, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 792]* . Also, *Veh. Code § 23612(g)(2)* permits the DMV to receive or retrieve electronically evidence of a licensee's blood alcohol results directly from a government forensic database and provides that the electronic information is the best available evidence of the test results, but *Veh. Code § 23612(g)(2)* is not an exception to the hearsay rule. Thus, the lab report could be challenged on hearsay grounds notwithstanding compliance with the requirements of *Veh. Code § 23612(g)(2)* [*Molenda v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 974, 996-997, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 792]* . Furthermore, the PAS test results were not admissible because of inadequate foundation since there was insufficient evidence that the test results met the foundations requirements of the DMV regulations [*17 Cal. Code Regs. §§ 1215*-1222.2]. The evidence related to PAS test results also did not meet the foundational requirements of properly functioning equipment, a properly administered test, and a qualified operator [*Molenda v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 974, 1000-1001, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 792]* . Finally the DMV cannot rely upon the presumption of official duty codified in *Evid. Code § 664* to establish the foundation for admissibility of the PAS test results [*Molenda v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 974, 1004-1005, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 792]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that Medi-Cal patient's claim detail reports (prepared by the state department of health services) that were used for an audit comparison with patient records for purposes of determining compliance by dentists with Denti-Cal program requirements were official records within the meaning of *Evid. Code § 1280,* and were therefore admissible as an exception to the hearsay rule in an administrative hearing, and did not have to be authenticated to be admissible in the administrative hearing [*Bhatt v. Dep't of Health Servs. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 923, 929-931, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 335]* .

The California Supreme Court held that an arresting officer's unsworn statement contained in an unsworn report that supplemented the officer's sworn report of the arrest of a motorist for violating drunk driving laws could be admitted into evidence in a DMV administrative per se license suspension hearing, and the unsworn report could be used by the DMV for purposes of deciding a motorists' challenge to the license suspension. The unsworn report was admissible under the provisions of *Veh. Code § 13557* allowing admission of other evidence related to the sworn report notwithstanding that the unsworn report is hearsay evidence [*MacDonald v. Gutierrez (2004) 32 Cal. 4th 150, 153, 81 P.3d 975]* . Another Court of Appeal reversed a trial court decision that reversed a DMV administrative per se law decision suspending a motorist's drivers license for driving with a blood alcohol level of.08 or more. The court of appeal held that the driver had the burden of proof to show that blood collection procedures were not properly performed. There is a rebuttable presumption under *Evid. Code § 664* that the procedures were properly completed [*Petricka v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1341, 1347-1348, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 909]* . The presumption under *Evid. Code § 664* of proper completion of a breath test by a police officer was not rebutted by testimony that

continuous observation of a motorist for 15 minutes before giving a breath test does not require direct and unbroken eye contact for the time period [*Manriquez v. Gourley (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1227, 1238-1240, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 209]* .

The Court of Appeal upheld the DMV's suspension of a motorist's drivers license for driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI) notwithstanding that the arresting "officer failed to sign the portion of the sworn arrest report certifying that he [the officer] obtained ... [the driver's] breath test samples in the regular course of duties." The court held that there was substantial evidence based on two alternative grounds: 1) the statutory presumption of *Evid. Code § 664* that the police officer properly administered the breath test with properly operating equipment, and 2) the officer provided sworn testimony at the DMV suspension hearing which supported the reliability of the breath test results [*Morgenstern v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 366, 369, 374, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 46]* . The Court of Appeal upheld the DMV's suspension of a motorist's drivers license for driving under the influence of alcohol (DUI) notwithstanding a challenge to the adequacy of facts supporting probable cause to arrest the motorist for drunk driving. The Court held that the police officer's report contained specific facts supporting the probable cause requirements, and that report was supplemented by live testimony at the hearing, and other unsworn police reports [*Grundy v. Gourley (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 20, 24-25, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 104]* .

[2] Objection Requirement

Under the new act, the APA provides that hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but over timely objection is not sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions. The objection is timely if made before submission of the case or on reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*]. This provision, operative July 1, 1997, expressly requires a timely objection and therefore resolves a former split in the courts over whether an objection was required for administrative hearsay to be insufficient to support fact findings other than when it is used to supplement or explain other evidence.

This split existed under former Gov. Code. Code § 11513(c), as interpreted by the various districts of the California Court of Appeal regarding whether administrative hearsay that has not been objected to may be used to make a finding of fact. The First District Court of Appeal had repeatedly held that administrative hearsay that has not been objected to is sufficient to support a finding in the absence of contrary evidence, that is, an objection is necessary to preclude use of hearsay alone to make a finding of fact [*see Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 546, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* (court stated that hearsay evidence that has not been objected to serves to shift the burden of producing evidence of the existence or nonexistence of fact disclosed); *Kirby v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1019-1020, 87 Cal. Rptr. 908* (court stated that hearsay admitted without objection will have probative value unless there is some admissible evidence to the contrary); *Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 139, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 934, 85 S. Ct. 940, 13 L. Ed. 2d 821 (1964)* (court permitted introduction of objectionable hearsay admitted without objection to be considered in support of a finding)].

The Second, Third, and Fourth Districts, however, did not require an objection to preclude use of administrative hearsay alone to support a finding of fact [*see San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1189, 220 Cal. Rptr. 351* (court stated that lack of an objection does not convert incompetent evidence into substantial evidence to support a finding); *Martin v. State Personnel Bd. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 573, 582-583, 103 Cal. Rptr. 306* (court stated that, contrary to *Savelli, Kirby,* and *Borror* cases, the absence of objection to hearsay will not support a finding of fact); *see also* discussion in *Frudden Enterprises, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 262, 270 n.5, 201 Cal. Rptr. 371* (split of authority between districts regarding effect of objection to hearsay is inapplicable to ALRB proceedings, which are not governed by the APA)].

As noted above, the new act resolves this split by expressly requiring an objection for administrative hearsay to be sufficient.

[3] Other Inadmissible Hearsay

Although administrative hearsay is admissible in administrative hearings over objection that it is hearsay [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*], it may be inadmissible for other reasons. For example, a proper foundation is required for many documents, writings, and other exhibits that may contain contain administrative hearsay. Even before the hearsay issue arises, counsel must lay a proper foundation for these hearsay exhibits and authenticate them [*see § 473F.31[7]*]. Administrative hearsay may not be admissible because it is not "the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs" [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*]. Double and triple hearsay and hearsay that is little more than gossip can be inadmissible because it is so unreliable. This threshold test of reliability applies to any relevant evidence being offered in an administrative hearing.

For example, videotapes can also be considered to be hearsay evidence. Videotapes are considered to be writings that must be authenticated before being admitted into evidence. Unauthenticated videotapes cannot be properly admitted into evidence, and without an authenticating foundation these videotapes are considered to be irrelevant and unreliable evidence. Admission of these videotapes was objected to and the videotapes (of a school district employee) were considered to be hearsay evidence offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 350-351, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* .

[4] Non-APA Hearings

Standards of hearsay admissibility can also apply in non-APA administrative hearings [*see Minaker v. Adams (1921) 55 Cal. App. 374, 377, 203 P. 806* (order of board of medical examiners revoking a license was not reversed on ground that some of evidence was hearsay, because sufficient proper evidence was also given)].

But the hearsay rules are sometimes different in non-APA proceedings. For example, various courts have held that hearsay admitted without objection is sufficient to sustain a finding in Agricultural Labor Relations Board proceedings [*see Frudden Enterprises, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 262, 270, 201 Cal. Rptr. 371* (split of authority between districts regarding effect of objection to hearsay is inapplicable to ALRB proceedings, which are not governed by the APA); *see also Flaherty v. Board of Retirement (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 397, 414, 18 Cal. Rptr. 256* (court stated that hearsay, if not objected to when offered, can be of probative value); *Fox v. San Francisco Unified School District (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 885, 891, 245 P.2d 603* (by failing to appear at hearing, respondent waived right to object that testimony was hearsay, when that hearsay was of sufficient probative value to show cause for his dismissal)].

By statute, those proceedings are conducted, so far as practicable, in accordance with the Evidence Code [*Lab. Code § 1160.2*], which requires a timely and specific objection on the record before a judgment will be reversed due to the erroneous admission of evidence [*see Evid. Code § 353(a)*].

At least one court has held that, in the absence of a statutory authorization, it is error to admit hearsay over objection in administrative hearings [*August v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 52, 64, 70 Cal. Rptr. 172]* . For this reason, counsel should check the statutes and evidentiary rules for particular non-APA agency proceedings to determine the standard to be applied to hearsay.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceFoundational RequirementsEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceVisual FormatsEvidenceHearsayRule ComponentsStatementsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofTimeliness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.33

§ 473F.33 Privileges

[1] Application in Administrative Proceedings

The privileges set forth in the Evidence Code division on privileges apply in both APA and non-APA administrative proceedings [*Evid. Code § 901*; *Gov. Code § 11513(e)*].

Those privileges include all of those that normally could be invoked in a civil court case, including:

- Lawyer-client [*Evid. Code §§ 950-962*].
- Husband-wife [*Evid. Code §§ 970-987*].
- Physician-patient [*Evid. Code §§ 990-1007*].
- Psychotherapist-patient [*Evid. Code §§ 1010-1027*].
- Clergyman-penitent [*Evid. Code §§ 1030-1034*].
- Sexual assault victim-counselor [*Evid. Code §§ 1035-1036.2*].
- Trade secrets [*Evid. Code § 1060*].
- Self-incrimination [*Evid. Code § 940*].
- News sources [*Evid. Code § 1070*].

A testimonial privilege must be properly claimed by the party who is entitled to invoke the privilege in the administrative hearing, or the privilege will be waived and testimony that is excludable under the privilege will be

admissible at the hearing [*Calvert v. State Bar (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 765, 781, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684, 819 P.2d 424]* . For further discussion of privileges, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* , and California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender).

Other privileges required by statute to be recognized at the hearing also apply [*Gov. Code § 11513(e)*]. For example, all information and records obtained while providing services to mentally or developmentally disabled persons are confidential [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4514, 5328*; *see Macomber v. State Personnel Bd. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 986, 995-996, 242 Cal. Rptr. 631* (medical records of psychiatric patients were privileged and not subject to subpoena duces tecum when no exceptions to privilege applied); *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 169, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220* (operators of community care facility for developmentally disabled youths were not entitled to production of patients' confidential records in license revocation proceedings; those records are absolutely privileged except for specific exceptions)].

In the absence of a statute, privileges are not recognized [*Evid. Code § 911*; *Gov. Code § 11513(e)*; *see Chronicle Pub. Co. v. Superior Court (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 548, 565, 7 Cal. Rptr. 109, 354 P.2d 637* (burden of establishing that the evidence is within the terms of the statute creating privilege is on party asserting the privilege)].

With respect to communications between welfare claimants and lay representatives authorized to represent them in hearings under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, however, a privilege has been found to be implicit in a statute authorizing the representation [*Welfare Rights Organization v. Crisan (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 766, 772, 190 Cal. Rptr. 919, 661 P.2d 1073]* .

When a privilege is invoked, no adverse inference may be drawn from its invocation [*Evid. Code § 913(a)*].

The protection that the law affords to an attorney's work product is often described as a privilege [*see, e.g., National Steel Products Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 476, 485, 210 Cal. Rptr. 535]* , but it is not one of the privileges set out in *Evid. Code §§ 900-1070*. It has been suggested that this protection is more accurately described as the work product doctrine [*Kizer v. Sulnick (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 431, 435 n.3, 248 Cal. Rptr. 712]* . For discussion of the work product doctrine, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* , and California Trial Guide, Unit 51 (Matthew Bender). The work product doctrine applies to protect attorney work product from administrative discovery and administrative subpoenas [*Gov. Code § 11507.6(f)*; *Kizer v. Sulnick (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 431, 435, 440-441, 248 Cal. Rptr. 712* ; *see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* ; *see also* Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*].

Another privilege recognized by law is the right to make a privileged publication or broadcast in legislative, judicial, or other proceedings authorized by law that are judicially reviewable by writ of mandate [*Civ. Code § 47(b)*; *Ellenberger v. Espinosa (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 943, 953, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (statements made by former patients of dentist in administrative proceedings against dentist brought by Board of Dental Examiners give rise to a claim of privilege under *Civ. Code §§ 47* and *43.8* from civil liability for damages caused by the statements)].

Unlike other privileges, this privilege does not protect against disclosure of testimonial or documentary evidence. Rather, this privilege provides immunity from civil liability for tort damages against the maker of the statement if the statement is made in an official proceeding, such as in an adjudicatory hearing before an administrative law judge in which the statement would otherwise lead to liability because it is defamatory. The privilege does not apply to communications made in furtherance of an act of intentional destruction or alteration of physical evidence undertaken for the purpose of depriving a party to litigation of the use of that evidence, whether or not the content of that communication is otherwise privileged under this statute [*Civ. Code § 47(b)(2)*]. For purposes of this exception, "physical evidence" is defined as evidence under the Evidence Code [*see Evid. Code § 250*] or as property under the Code of Civil Procedure [*Civ. Code § 47(b)(2)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2031*].

The purpose of this exception is to make it easier to disclose destruction of documents or other physical evidence in litigation so that sanctions, penalties, or civil liability can be enforced against the person destroying the documents. The scope of this privilege and the exception include agency adjudication under the APA, because these proceedings are judicially reviewable by writ of mandate [*see Civ. Code § 47(b)*].

[2] Self-Incrimination

[a] Compared to Application in Civil and Criminal Trials

The privilege afforded a defendant in a criminal case to refuse to respond as a witness and to testify [*Evid. Code §§ 404, 940*; *see California Trial Guide, Unit 51, § 51.30[2]* (Matthew Bender)] is not available to parties in administrative proceedings [*In re Vaughan (1922) 189 Cal. 491, 495, 209 P. 353* ; *McComb v. Superior Court (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 89, 98, 137 Cal. Rptr. 233]* .

A party in an administrative proceeding may invoke the privilege against self-incrimination, however, if called as a witness [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 542, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

In APA proceedings, if a respondent does not testify in his or her own behalf, he or she may be called and examined as if under cross-examination [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*]. One court has interpreted this provision as a requirement that the agency rest its case temporarily, to allow the respondent to exercise his or her right to testify, before the agency can call the respondent as its own witness [*O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 12, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862]* .

This interpretation apparently has given rise to the agency practice of resting, subject to calling the respondent as a witness if he or she does not testify. The procedure is a compromise between the criminal rule that a defendant may not be compelled to be a witness [*Evid. Code § 930*], and the rule in civil cases that a party can be called at any time [*Evid. Code § 776(a)*; *see 11 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 116 (1948)* (respondent in administrative hearing may not be called as a witness until he or she has had an opportunity to testify in his or her own behalf and has failed to do so)].

[b] Application to Public Employees

In administrative proceedings, public employees may also exercise their privilege against self-incrimination. By doing so, however, they may risk the loss of their employment if its exercise is inconsistent with their public duty [*see Steinmetz v. Cal. State Board of Education (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 816, 824-825, 285 P.2d 617 , cert. denied, 351 U.S. 915, 76 S. Ct. 708, 100 L. Ed. 1448* (college professor who refused to disclose whether he was Communist party member was required to choose between disclosing information relevant to his fitness for public employment, and losing that employment)]. Public employees sometimes must yield some of the privileges that are enjoyed by other citizens [*Garner v. U.S. (1976) 424 U.S. 648, 655, 424 U.S. 648, 655, 96 S. Ct. 1178, 47 L. Ed. 2d 370* ; *Forstner v. City Etc. of San Francisco (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 625, 632, 52 Cal. Rptr. 621* ; *see Gardner v. Broderick (1968) 392 U.S. 273, 279, 88 S. Ct. 1913, 20 L. Ed. 2d 1082* (policeman may not, however, be dismissed from office for refusing to waive privilege against self-incrimination)].

The California Supreme Court held that a county could terminate a county employee for insubordination based on the employee's assertion of the privilege against self incrimination as grounds for refusal to answer questions in a county internal investigation of the employee's conduct without the county granting the employee immunity from criminal prosecution based upon answers to those questions [*Spielbauer v. County of Santa Clara (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 704, 710, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 590, 199 P.3d 1125]* . The Supreme Court explained that a public employee can be compelled by threat of job discipline to answer employer's questions so long as the employee is not required to waive the constitutional protection against criminal use of the answers. The public employer is not required to seek and obtain a formal grant of immunity as a condition of requiring answers to questions [*Spielbauer v. County of Santa Clara (2009) 45 Cal. 4th*

704, 710, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 590, 199 P.3d 1125] .

[c] Application to Drivers' Licenses

The privilege against self-incrimination does not permit an individual to avoid the suspension of his or her driver's license under the financial responsibility law [*Fahlgren v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 930, 937, 231 Cal. Rptr. 229* ; *Veh. Code §§ 16000-16075* (financial responsibility law)].

A driver's own accident report can be used to suspend his or her license [*Fahlgren v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 930, 936, 231 Cal. Rptr. 229]* .

[3] Sexual Privacy

[a] Scope of Privilege

The constitutional right of sexual privacy, both within and without the marital relationship, is a fundamental liberty arising from both the United States and California constitutions. The California right has been described as a protective "zone of privacy" surrounding sexual behavior. The right to sexual privacy may be asserted by refusing to answer questions that unreasonably intrude on the right. The right is not absolute, but disclosure of sexual information cannot be compelled if disclosure would not serve the compelling state interest of facilitating truth in legal proceedings [*see Vinson v. Superior Court (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 833, 841, 239 Cal. Rptr. 292, 740 P.2d 404* (mere initiation of sexual harassment suit does not waive plaintiff's sexual privacy interests)].

[b] APA Proceedings

In employment discrimination and harassment cases [*see Gov. Code § 12940(h), (i)*], civil service discipline cases [*see Gov. Code § 19572*], and civil service discrimination cases [*see Gov. Code § 19702*], alleging conduct that constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery, evidence of specific instances of a complainant's sexual conduct with individuals other than the alleged perpetrator is subject to the following limitations:

- The evidence is not discoverable, unless it is to be offered at a hearing to attack the credibility of the complainant [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(a)(1)* (only the scope of discovery is limited, not the methods of discovery)].

- The evidence is not admissible at the hearing, unless offered to attack the credibility of the complainant [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(a)(2)*].

Also, reputation or opinion evidence regarding the sexual behavior of the complainant is not admissible for any purpose. At the hearing, this evidence is presumed inadmissible absent an offer of proof that establishes the following [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(b)*]:

- The relevance and reliability of the offered evidence.

- That the probative value of the evidence offered is not substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will create substantial danger of undue prejudice or confuse the issue.

Complainant is defined to mean a person claiming to have been subjected to conduct that constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery [*Gov. Code § 11440.40(c)*].

The provisions of this statute apply not only to agency hearings under Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), but also to agency hearings subject to Chapter 4.5, the APA's general provisions for

administrative adjudications (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)].

These include state agency evidentiary hearings that are required under federal or state constitutional provisions or under federal or state statute [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11410.20*; *see Evid. Code §§ 783, 1106* (for similar privileges that apply to court proceedings)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessPrivacyGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesAttorney-Client PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesClergy CommunicationsGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesDoctor-Patient PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesPsychotherapist-Patient PrivilegeGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesSelf-Incrimination PrivilegeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.34

§ 473F.34 Exclusionary Rule

[1] General Requirements

The *Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution* protects individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures [*U.S. Const., amend. IV*]. In *Mapp v. Ohio (1961) 367 U.S. 643, 81 S. Ct. 1684, 6 L. Ed. 2d 1081* , the U.S. Supreme Court held that the protection of the *Fourth Amendment* extends to the states through the *Fourteenth Amendment*.

Thus, evidence obtained in violation of the Constitution is inadmissible in a state court [*Mapp v. Ohio (1961) 367 U.S. 643, 655, 81 S. Ct. 1684, 6 L. Ed. 2d 1081]* . This exclusionary rule was first applied in criminal cases [*see, e.g., People v. Bilderbach (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 757, 763-764, 44 Cal. Rptr. 313, 401 P.2d 921* (discussion of exclusionary rule as applied to admissibility of marijuana found in defendant's car during illegal search)].

However, it has also been applied in selected civil proceedings. For example, it has been used in a proceeding for forfeiture of a car used in unlawful transportation of marijuana when there was a close identity to the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement [*People v. One 1960 Cadillac Coupe (1964) 62 Cal. 2d 92*]. It has also been applied in a civil narcotic addict commitment proceeding that was closely identified with the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement and the deterrent policy for applying the rule [*People v. Moore (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 674, 72 Cal. Rptr. 800, 446 P.2d 800 , overruled on other grounds*; *People v. Thomas (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 630, 139 Cal. Rptr. 594, 566 P.2d 228]* . For further discussion of the exclusionary rule, see California Criminal Defense Practice, Divisions III, IV, and IX (Matthew Bender).

[2] Application to Administrative Proceedings

[a] Factors Used to Determine Application

In contrast to criminal and civil proceedings, the exclusionary rule has generally not been applied in administrative proceedings. In *Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* , the California Supreme Court identified the following factors that should be balanced to determine whether the exclusionary rule applies in a particular proceeding [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 227-228, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991]* :

- Whether the purposes of the proceeding are similar to the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement.

- Whether application of the rule would serve any real deterrence to illegal searches and seizures in the type of case.

- The social consequences of its application.

- Whether the evidence was obtained under circumstances that shock the conscience.

Based on these factors, the Court did not apply the rule in state bar disciplinary proceedings [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 230, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991]* . It particularly noted the lack of any deterrent effect, the social consequences of applying the rule, and the effect thereof on the integrity of the judicial process. The Court noted, however, that it is possible that the demands of due process could not countenance use of evidence obtained by unlawful means in a proceeding conducted by a governmental agency. It stated that the rules must be worked out ona case-by-case basis in this and other license revocation proceedings [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 230, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991]* .

In an administrative parole revocation proceeding, the Court refused to apply the exclusionary rule because while some identity existed between the revocation proceedings and the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement, practically no deterrent effect would be gained by its application [*In re Martinez (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 641, 649-650, 83 Cal. Rptr. 382, 463 P.2d 734]* . Similarly, because of a lack of deterrence, the exclusionary rule was not applied to the dismissal of an elementary school teacher for public sexual conduct. The court recognized the importance of teachers setting proper examples for children, and that children are entitled to special protection [*Governing Board v. Metcalf (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 546, 111 Cal. Rptr. 724]* .

In *Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657* , the court of appeal restated the general inapplicability of the exclusionary rule to administrative proceedings, and refused to apply the rule in high school disciplinary proceedings against a student for possession of marijuana [*Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 546, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657]* . The court considered the social costs in terms of harm to other students and damage to the morale of parents and teachers [*Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 546, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657]* . The court pointed out that while administrative penalties may also be punitive, they are primarily designed to protect the public from the practices of the offender; this distinction justifies the general rule that the remedy of exclusion is not available in administrative proceedings [*Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 546, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657]* .

The Fourth District, Division 3, California Court of Appeal refused to apply the exclusionary rule to exclude evidence that a driver was driving while intoxicated in a DMV administrative hearing. The driver argued that the evidence should be excluded because the arresting officer's stop of the motorist was invalid. The stop was invalid because it was based on outdated information that the driver's vehicle had been stolen. The superior court excluded the same evidence and dismissed criminal charges of driving while intoxicated against the same driver relying upon the California Supreme Court decision in *People v. Ramirez (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 541, 194 Cal. Rptr. 454, 668 P.2d 761* [*Park v. Valverde (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 877, 879-881, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 895]* . In deciding to not apply the exclusionary rule to administrative proceedings, the court concluded that any additional deterrent value (deterring police misconduct) of applying the rule to DMV proceedings was offset by the danger to both the motorist and the public form drunk driving, given the DMV's primary responsibility to protect the public from drunk drivers by getting those drivers off the roads [*Park v. Valverde (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 877, 886-888, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 895]* .

In a related area, involuntary conservatorship proceedings, the California Supreme Court refused to apply the

exclusionary rule to those proceedings and used the test of whether the deterrent effect of the rule outweighed its social costs [*Conservatorship of Susan T. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 1005, 1018-1021, 36 Cal. Rptr.2d 40, 884 P.2d 988]* . Similarly, the California Supreme court concluded that evidence that has been ordered suppressed in a criminal proceeding under *Penal Code § 1538.5(d)* is admissible in a DMV license suspension administrative hearing because neither *Penal Code § 1538.5(d)* nor the exclusionary rule apply to administrative proceedings [*Gikas v. Zolin (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 841, 858-860, 25 Cal. Rptr 2d 500, 863 P.2d 745]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a police officer had reasonable cause to stop a motorist's vehicle to investigate erratic driving based on a call from an anonymous cell phone user. Therefore evidence of the motorist driving while intoxicated that was obtained by the police officer as a result of that stop was admissible in an administrative hearing conducted by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to suspend the motorist's license for drunken driving. The court of Appeal did not decide whether the criminal law exclusionary rule applied to DMV administrative hearings [*Lowry v. Gutierrez (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 926, 929-930, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 912]* .

[b] Administrative Inspections

The *Fourth Amendment* also prohibits unreasonable searches without a warrant in the form of an administrative inspection [*Camara v. Municipal Court (1967) 387 U.S. 523, 534, 87 S. Ct. 1727, 18 L. Ed. 2d 930* (inspection of personal residence); *See v. Seattle (1967) 387 U.S. 541, 545-546, 87 S. Ct. 1737, 18 L. Ed. 2d 943* (inspection of commercial premises)].

If evidence obtained during an illegal administrative inspection is offered in an administrative proceeding, the factors set out in *Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* [*see* [a], *above*] should be used to determine if the evidence should be excluded.

Although that evidence generally will not be excluded, the balance may be different if an administrative agency is doing the inspection. Specifically, the deterrence factor may be more important. Although criminal authorities may not consider the effect that an illegal search and seizure will have on a later administrative proceeding before conducting the illegal search, administrative authorities would be more aware of the administrative implications. It should be noted, however, that the granting of many licenses by the state is subject to the condition and implied consent of the licensee that the premises, books, and records related to the licensed activity are open for inspection in order to effectively supervise and regulate the activity. Reasonable inspection is often required by the statutes regulating the licensed activity. The absence of a warrant would not necessarily mean an administrative inspection is illegal [*see Rush v. Obledo (9th Cir. 1985) 756 F.2d 713, 722* (statute permitting warrantless searches of licensed day-care facilities did not violate *Fourth Amendment*, when regulation limited time and place of searches)].

Further, not all routine administrative investigations are considered unreasonable without an administrative warrant [*see, e.g., Wyman v. James (1971) 400 U.S. 309, 91 S. Ct. 381, 27 L. Ed. 2d 408* (routine visit by caseworker to home of AFDC recipient was not unreasonable search in violation of *Fourth Amendment*); *People v. Firstenberg (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 570, 155 Cal. Rptr. 80 , cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1012, 100 S. Ct. 660, 62 L. Ed. 2d 641 (1980)* (warrantless inspection of licensed nursing facility was not unreasonable search in violation of *Fourth Amendment*, when statutory inspection provisions limited time, place, and scope of search)].

For a more extensive discussion of administrative inspections and the constitutional requirements for use of warrants, see Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

[c] Vicarious Exclusionary Rule

In the past, the "vicarious exclusionary rule" was applied in California to give criminal defendants standing to object to the introduction of evidence seized in violation of the rights of a third person, rather than just the rights of the defendant [*People v. Martin (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 755, 290 P.2d 855]* .

The truth-in-evidence provision of Proposition 8 [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 28(d)*] abrogated that rule [*In re Lance W. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 873, 210 Cal. Rptr. 631, 694 P.2d 744]* . Since the vicarious exclusionary rule no longer applies in criminal proceedings, it is extremely unlikely that it will apply in administrative proceedings [*see Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 624-625, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20* (in case decided before Proposition 8, court refused to apply vicarious exclusionary rule, citing lack of authority for extension of criminal rule to civil administrative proceedings)].

[d] Guidelines for Objecting to Illegally Obtained Evidence

Counsel should object to illegally obtained evidence at the administrative level [*Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1042, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198]* , in accordance with the following guidelines:

- Raise a search and seizure issue as early in the administrative proceeding as possible.

- A written motion in limine to exclude evidence made in advance of the hearing or during a prehearing conference is appropriate.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsConstitutional RightsSearch & SeizureAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeInspectionsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureExclusionary RuleConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureWarrants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.35

§ 473F.35 Illegally Obtained Confessions and Entrapment

With respect to both the exclusion of an illegally obtained confession or admission in an administrative proceeding and the availability of an entrapment defense in such a proceeding, factors similar to those set out in *Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* [*see § 473F.34[2][a]*], should be considered.

The California Supreme Court has held that exclusion of an illegally obtained confession is not necessary in an administrative parole revocation proceeding, but exclusion may result if the confession had been coerced or had resulted from egregious police conduct [*In re Martinez (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 641, 650, 83 Cal. Rptr. 382, 463 P.2d 734* ; *see Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 227, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991]* .

In an administrative license revocation proceeding, the California Supreme Court held that the defense of entrapment is available because of the social policy that the state has no business fostering crime, and because the state objective of ferreting out physicians who engage in illegal drug traffic is not furthered by entrapment of a doctor who would otherwise not have engaged in such traffic [*Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* ; *see Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 229, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991]* .

In a workers' compensation proceeding, the California Supreme Court excluded a movie obtained by fraudulent inducements of private investigators. The deceitful inducements caused the applicant to engage in the filmed activities [*Redner v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 83, 97, 95 Cal. Rptr. 447, 485 P.2d 799* (movie showed applicant riding horseback, despite claims of disability)].

In State Bar proceedings, the entrapment defense has been held not to apply when no employees of the State Bar played a role in the entrapment [*Wong v. State Bar (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 528, 531, 125 Cal. Rptr. 482, 542 P.2d 642]* .

The entrapment defense in administrative proceedings requires proof that the law enforcement officers conducted themselves in ways, such as pressuring the person by overbearing conduct such as badgering, cajoling, or importuning the person, that were likely to induce a normally law abiding person to commit an illegal act. It is not enough to prove that only an opportunity to act improperly was given to the person [*Arellanes v. Civil Service Com. (1996) 41 Cal.*

App. 4th 1208, 1216-1217, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 73 (deputy sheriff failed to prove that his discharge was due to entrapment) citing *People v. Lee (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 829, 835, 268 Cal. Rptr. 595]* .

The exclusion of illegally obtained confessions and admissions and the availability of the entrapment defense are issues decided on a case-by-case basis. Like the exclusionary rule, these issues should be raised as early as possible.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityConstitutional ProtectionsHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesRevocation & SuspensionLegal EthicsSanctionsDisciplinary ProceedingsHearingsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsFraud

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.36

§ 473F.36 Presumptions

[1] Nature and Types

Although the APA does not mention presumptions, the presumptions applicable to court proceedings [*see Evid. Code §§ 600-669.5*] have been applied in administrative proceedings.

A presumption is not evidence; it is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another fact, or group of facts, established in the case [*Evid. Code § 600(a)*]. In contrast, inferences are rational deductions of fact drawn from other established facts that are not required by law [*Evid. Code § 600(b)*].

Some presumptions can be conclusive [*Evid. Code § 601*]. For example, the facts recited in a written instrument (recitals) are conclusively presumed to be true as between the parties to that instrument, or their successors [*Evid. Code § 622*]. Most presumptions are rebuttable [*see Evid. Code §§ 601-602*]. Many statutes providing that a fact or group of facts is prima facie evidence of another fact create rebuttable presumptions [*Evid. Code § 602*].

[2] Rebuttable Presumptions

Some rebuttable presumptions affect the burden of producing evidence. In administrative proceedings, they require the ALJ to apply the presumption unless other evidence contradicts the assumed fact. If the other evidence is substantial so that the contrary of the presumption could properly be found, the presumption drops out of the ALJ's decision making process and the formerly assumed fact is simply determined on all the evidence [*Evid. Code § 604*].

In that case, if the party relying on the original presumption produced no independent evidence to support it, the formerly assumed fact could not be found. Further, the burden of proof would not change. If the evidence is not sufficient to meet a party's burden of proof regarding the formerly assumed fact, the other party will prevail. Other rebuttable presumptions affect the burden of proof itself. When they apply, the other party has the burden of proof to show the nonexistence of the assumed fact [*Evid. Code § 606*].

The other party must not only put on substantial evidence to support a finding of nonexistence, but must also carry the

burden of proof on the issue [*see Evid. Code § 550*]. The party with the burden of proof on an issue takes the risk of losing if there is a failure of proof.

It is therefore important to determine the type of rebuttable presumption. Presumptions affecting the burden of producing evidence are used simply to facilitate the determination of a particular issue [*Evid. Code § 603*]. For example, the presumption that letters properly addressed and mailed were received is such a presumption [*Evid. Code § 641*]. Presumptions established to implement some public policy, other than the determination of a particular issue, affect the burden of proof [*Evid. Code § 605*].

For example, an employer who fails to secure the payment of workers' compensation is presumed negligent [*Lab. Code § 3708*]. This presumption is clearly based on public policy and affects the burden of proof. In a dental license suspension case, the court applied the rebuttable presumption that the law has been obeyed [*Messner v. Board of Dental Examiners (1927) 87 Cal. App. 199, 205, 262 P. 58]* .

A similar rebuttable presumption, applied in an action to suspend or revoke a securities broker's certificate, is the presumption against fraud [*Abrams v. Daugherty (1922) 60 Cal. App. 297, 304, 212 P. 942]* . There is also a presumption of fair dealing [*Transportation Bldg. Co. v. Daugherty (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 604, 614, 169 P.2d 470]* . A rebuttable presumption that the regular course of business was followed affects the burden of producing evidence. That presumption has been applied in a liquor license suspension case [*Kirby v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1017, 87 Cal. Rptr. 908]* .

Similarly, it is presumed that administrative agencies have properly performed their duties [*Martin v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 259, 264, 341 P.2d 291* ; *Utah Construction Co. v. Richardson (1921) 187 Cal. 649, 654, 203 P. 401]* .

For example, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) can rely on the official duty presumption provided by *Evid. Code § 664* when police officers comply with the requirements of Title 17 [*17 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1219 to 1221.5*] to conduct breath tests to determine the blood alcohol level of drivers arrested for driving under the influence of alcohol. When the presumption is applicable, the test results are presumed to be valid, the test results are admissible in evidence, and the DMV does not have to provide any additional evidence to support the test results. At that point, the driver may rebut the presumption by offering evidence that Title 17 was, in fact, not complied with, notwithstanding the presumption. If the driver is successful, then the presumption is rebutted, and the test results are not admissible, absent additional foundational evidence being offered by the DMV. If the driver is not successful, than the presumption is not rebutted, the evidence is admissible, and the DMV's license suspension decision is supported by substantial evidence [*Hernandez v. Gutierrez (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 168, 172-173, 176, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307* (driver failed to rebut presumption of official duty by failing to show lack of compliance with requirements of Title 17)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.37

§ 473F.37 Affidavits

Agencies often use affidavits to avoid bringing in witnesses to testify to records, files, and computerized information. Agencies may use them in default cases without giving any notice to the defaulting party [*Gov. Code § 11520(a)*].

In a APA administrative hearing, affidavits, which would otherwise be hearsay, may be treated as oral testimony in two circumstances. First, the parties may stipulate to so treat them. Second, *Gov. Code § 11514* requires a party to mail or deliver a copy of any affidavit that the party proposes to introduce into evidence, together with a notice regarding the opposing party's right to cross-examine the affiant [*Gov. Code § 11514(b)*] to the opposing party at least 10 days before the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*; *see § 473F.90*, for a form that can be used to give notice].

If a party fails to satisfy the mailing or delivering within 10 days requirement, then the affidavit can not be admitted into evidence at the hearing [*McNary v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 688, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 55]* . If the party meets the 10 day requirement, then the opposing party will waive any right to cross-examine the affiant unless he or she mails or delivers a request to cross-examine to the proponent within seven days following the proponent's mailing or delivery of the affidavit and notice [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*].

If such a waiver occurs, the proponent can offer the affidavit at the hearing, and it will be given the same effect as if the affiant had testified orally [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*]. If the opposing party properly requests cross-examination but the proponent does not physically produce the affiant as a witness at the hearing, the affidavit can still be introduced into evidence, but as administrative hearsay [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*; *Monaghan v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 1621, 1626-1627, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 167* ; *see Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 598, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63* (court applied rule similar to that contained in APA to Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, which is not governed by the APA); *see also § 473F.32* (administrative hearsay)].

This statutory administrative hearsay exception does not restrict admission in administrative hearings of evidence that is hearsay but that satisfies other exceptions to the hearsay rule [*Poland v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1139, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . To assure the right to cross-examine, therefore, the opposing party should subpoena the affiant.

If an affidavit is used like oral testimony, it may still be subject to objection for reasons other than hearsay. For example, parts of it may not be the sort of evidence "on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs" [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *see § 473F.31[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayEvidenceHearsayExceptionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.38

§ 473F.38 Official Notice

[1] Nature of Official Notice

In reaching a decision in a APA proceeding, the ALJ and agency may take "official notice" of any fact that may be judicially noticed by a court [*see Evid. Code §§ 450-460* (judicial notice)], and of any generally accepted technical or scientific matter within the agency's special field [*Gov. Code § 11515*].

Like judicial notice in court proceedings, the use of official notice in administrative proceedings establishes a relevant law or fact without the necessity of formal proof. Officially noticed facts can be used to contradict other facts and can be the basis of a finding of fact [*Mack v. State Board of Education (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 370, 373, 36 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . Official notice can be substituted for expert testimony [*Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 140, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792]* . Official notice can also be taken in non-APA hearings [*Cantrell v. Board of Supervisors (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 471, 477, 197 P.2d 218]* .

[2] Matters Subject to Official Notice

Matters that may be officially noticed include the following:

- Matters of scientific certainty [*McAllister v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 408, 414, 71 Cal. Rptr. 697, 445 P.2d 313* (fact that smoke is visible because it contains incompletely oxidized materials may be officially noticed)].

- An agency's own files and records [*Broyles v. Mahon (1925) 72 Cal. App. 484, 491, 237 P. 763]* .

- The existence and contents of permits and license ordinances [*Greif v. Dullea (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 986, 998, 153 P.2d 581]* .

- Matters within the expertise of board members [*Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 140, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* (lay board members were qualified to

determine whether actions of hospital were grossly negligent); *Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 194, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357* (ingredients of drug and whether it constitutes dangerous drug under statute was scientific matter within special field of State Board of Pharmacy)].

[3] Notice and Opportunity to Refute

The agency or ALJ may take official notice of a matter either before or after submission of a case [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. The parties present at the hearing must be informed of the matters to be officially noticed, and those matters must be noted or referred to in the record or appended to the record [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. On request, parties must be given a reasonable opportunity to refute the officially noticed matters by evidence or by written or oral presentation of authority. The agency may determine the manner of refutation [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. See *§ 473F.92*, for a form requesting opportunity to refute officially noticed matters.

If a party wants the ALJ or agency to take official notice of a matter, he or she must make a request and give notice to the other party. The notice to the parties may be given orally or in writing. It must be complete and specific enough to give an effective opportunity for rebuttal, and help build a record adequate for judicial review.

The administrative record or decision should indicate what matters were officially noticed on the basis of agency expertise [*Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 140, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792]* . If the request and notice come after the matter is submitted and the record is closed, the record must be reopened to give the other party a reasonable opportunity to refute the matter with evidence or other authority [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. For an example of a party's request for official notice, see *§ 473F.91*.

It is common in administrative hearings for agency counsel to request the ALJ to take official notice of matters in the pleadings, such as the name of the complainant, the capacity in which the complainant made the accusation or statement of issues, and statutory and regulatory matter set out in the pleadings. Counsel generally makes an oral request to notice such matters at the beginning of the hearing, and, in the absence of a proper objection, the ALJ normally grants the request.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceOfficial NoticeEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.39

§ 473F.39 Mitigation, Extenuation, and Rehabilitation Evidence

[1] General Requirements

In many administrative proceedings, particularly those involving licensing, evidence of mitigation, extenuation, and rehabilitation is more important than evidence disproving a code violation. It is both necessary and entirely appropriate for a respondent's attorney to put on strong mitigation, extenuation, and rehabilitation evidence at the same time allegations of any wrongdoing are being contested. This evidence often achieves a client's ultimate goal of retaining or acquiring a license, even though the license may be conditioned or subject to terms of probation. The respondent has greatest control over this type of evidence.

[2] Mitigation and Extenuation Evidence

[a] Use of Evidence

Mitigation and extenuation evidence are similar. Mitigation evidence reduces moral culpability for a violation of the law. Extenuation evidence renders a violation less aggravated or reprehensible. Both can affect an administrative penalty. Mitigation evidence is not admissible to justify or excuse the violation; it only goes to moral culpability and penalty [*Richards v. Gordon (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 735, 742, 62 Cal. Rptr. 466]* . For example, mitigation evidence cannot be used to deny a criminal conviction [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 493* (record of conviction is conclusive evidence of the fact that the conviction occurred)].

[b] Examples of Evidence

Mitigation and extenuation evidence in licensing cases can include evidence of the following:

- The facts and circumstances surrounding the commission of a crime [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 493* (board may inquire into circumstances surrounding commission of crime to fix the degree of discipline)].

- The economic, employment, professional, and personal consequences to the respondent and to others

that certain penalties will have.

- The respondent's professional reputation, license history, and employment record.

- The respondent's attempt to mitigate injuries to others.

- The respondent's good faith [*O'Reilly v. Board of Medical Examiners (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 381, 388, 58 Cal. Rptr. 7, 426 P.2d 167* (doctor's unprofessional conduct in allowing unlicensed doctors to practice medicine was mitigated by his good faith in allowing them to "assist" him)].

- The respondent's personal history and reputation.

[c] Presentation of Evidence

Mitigation and extenuation evidence are usually presented during a respondent's defense. Counsel may use affidavits or written statements. If they are not otherwise admissible, the agency counsel may stipulate to their introduction, usually as administrative hearsay [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *see § 473F.32*], rather than a substitute for oral testimony.

Former Gov. Code. Code § 11520(b), relating to the right of a defaulting respondent to make a showing by way of mitigation, is superseded by the procedures to cure a default under *Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*. Under those procedures, as explained § 473F.17[1][a], and [b], the ALJ or agency have discretion to:

- Grant a hearing notwithstanding respondent's default [*Gov. Code § 11520(b)*].

- Vacate a decision and grant a new hearing [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)* (agency only)].

The respondent may make a showing by way of mitigation as a defense in the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 251 (1995)]. What this means is that if respondent wants to present a mitigation defense and mitigation evidence, he or she has to invoke the procedures to cure a default under *Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*, to be able to do so.

[3] Rehabilitation Evidence

[a] Nature of Evidence

Rehabilitation evidence concerns the restoration of dignity and capacity. It relates only to what an individual has done since a violation that might provide justification for the agency to completely or partially ignore that violation. Rehabilitation evidence is especially important in license application cases. Conduct that would have prevented an individual from obtaining a license in the past may not affect the present, due to intervening time and efforts on the part of the individual to become entitled to the license. Because of the time that elapses between conduct that subjects a licensee to discipline and the actual discipline, rehabilitation evidence may also be presented to help determine an appropriate discipline when it is imposed. Rehabilitation evidence is the primary evidence presented in reinstatement and reduction of penalty hearings [*see Gov. Code § 11522* (reinstatement and reduction procedures)].

[b] Criteria for Rehabilitation

Some agencies have regulations that set out criteria, relating directly to the licensed activity, to evaluate the rehabilitation of a licensee [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 480* (board may deny a license based on conviction of a crime or act of fraud or deceit)]. The key to showing rehabilitation is showing changed behavior by evidence of affirmative action on the part of the respondent [*Housman v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 308, 318, 190 P.2d 653]* . Some general rehabilitation evidence includes the following:

- The respondent's activities since the offensive conduct including personal stability, employment history, community involvement, educational and rehabilitation programs.

- The respondent's acceptance of responsibility for the past conduct and current attitude toward it.

- The respondent's current reputation, both generally and with respect to the past conduct.

- The time that has elapsed since the past conduct without other problems of a similar nature, and respondent's efforts to avoid those problems.

If an agency has established specific criteria for evaluating rehabilitation, evidence should be directed to these criteria [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 480(b)* (license cannot be denied if person has met all of rehabilitation criteria developed by a board regulated by the Business and Professions Code)].

No person can be denied a license solely on the basis of a felony conviction, if a certificate of rehabilitation has been received [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 480(b)*; *see Penal Code § 4852.01* (certificate of rehabilitation)].

[4] Admissions of Liability

In adjudicative proceedings subject to Chapter 4 (commencing with *Gov. Code § 11400*) or Chapter 5 (commencing with *Gov. Code § 11500*), the portion of statements, writings, or benevolent gestures expressing sympathy or a general sense of benevolence relating to the pain, suffering, or death of a person involved in an accident and made to that person or to the family of that person shall be inadmissible as evidence of an admission of liability. A statement of fault, however, which is part of, or in addition to, any of the above shall not be inadmissible pursuant to this section [*Gov. Code § 11440.45(a)*; *Evid. Code § 1160*]. "Accident" is defined to mean an occurrence resulting in injury or death to one or more persons which is not the result of willful action by a party [*Gov. Code § 11440.45(b)(1)*]. "Benevolent gestures" are defined to mean actions which convey a sense of compassion or commiseration emanating from humane impulses [*Gov. Code § 11440.45(b)(2)*]. "Family" is defined to mean the spouse, parent, grandparent, stepmother, stepfather, child, grandchild, brother, sister, half brother, half sister, adopted children of parent, or spouse's parents of an injured party [*Gov. Code § 11440.45(b)(3)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.40

§ 473F.40 Views

[1] Use in Administrative Proceedings

Code Civ. Proc. § 651 provides that a court may order a judge or jury to view property, places, objects, experiments, or demonstrations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 651*].

Although the APA is silent on taking views outside the hearing room, parties to administrative proceedings sometimes request the ALJ to take views. The ALJ may grant the request if there is a real need for the view, and the need is not outweighed by the time it will consume. Often, however, the view is not really needed because it would constitute cumulative evidence [*see § 473F.31[4]*], and the time it takes would be wasteful. Therefore, counsel should carefully address both of these concerns in the request for the view. ALJs are sometimes skeptical about the value of a view.

In the context of special education law, the California Court of Appeal held that expert observation of a proposed special education placement for autistic child before a due process hearing was required, and it was improper for the superior court to deny an order compelling the school district to allow the expert hired by the parents of the child to observe the proposed placement before the due process hearing [*Benjamin G. v. California Special Ed. Hearing Office (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 875, 883-884, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366]* . While expert observation is not the same as a view, and this precedent is limited to the area of special education law, observation of a building or an accident scene may be useful to preparation for a hearing.

[2] Entering on Record

Making views a part of the record is also difficult. Conversations during the view must be reported or otherwise placed into the record [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 651(b)* (proceedings at a view must be recorded to the same extent as courtroom proceedings)].

A possible alternative to actually reporting during the view is to carefully put on the record, before the view takes place, exactly what the parties want the ALJ to see during the view. The ALJ may then be able to take the view without additional conversation on the record. After the view, the ALJ can put on the record exactly what was seen. Other

procedures are possible and may be stipulated to as long as the record is complete. Any finding of fact based on a view must be supported by the record. See Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* , for a discussion of the record for decision.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceRelevanceConfusion, Prejudice & Waste of Time

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.41

§ 473F.41 Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

[1] Nature of Doctrines

A decision in a prior administrative or judicial proceeding may be admitted to determine a later collateral administrative or judicial proceeding under the doctrine of collateral estoppel. Collateral estoppel precludes a party from relitigating in a second proceeding matters litigated and determined in a prior proceeding [*Teitelbaum Furs, Inc. v. Dominion Ins. Co., Ltd. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 601, 604, 25 Cal. Rptr. 559, 375 P.2d 439* ; *Lucido v. Superior Court (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 335, 347-348, 272 Cal. Rptr. 767, 795 P. 2d 1223* (collateral estoppel was not applicable to preclude subsequent criminal prosecution of individual when same issue arose at probation revocation hearing and probation was not revoked. This was because of public policy including the integrity of judicial determinations); *Castillo v. City of Los Angeles (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 477, 481-483, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 870* (issue preclusion (collateral estoppel) based on prior administrative adjudication of same issue, whether discharge was for good cause, applied to preclude subsequent civil lawsuit for wrongful discharge because the issues were the same, the issues were actually and necessarily litigated; the judgment in the administrative proceedings were final and on the merits)].

Collateral estoppel is a secondary aspect of res judicata, the doctrine that bars a second suit on the same cause of action between the same parties or parties in privity with them [*Clark v. Lesher (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 874, 880, 299 P.2d 865* ; for discussion of res judicata and the consequences of failing to seek judicial review of an administrative determination, *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*]. Collateral estoppel focuses on issues litigated, while res judicata focus on causes of action.

A workers' compensation claimant filed a worker's compensation claim before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) against an illegally uninsured employer while at the same time filing a civil action in Superior Court for negligence against the same employer as authorized by *Labor Code § 3706*. The claimant settled the civil action for $20,000 without seeking approval of the WCAB as to the settlement, and the civil action was dismissed with prejudice. The employer then moved to dismiss the worker's compensation claim based on the settlement of the Superior Court action. The Court of Appeal held that res judicata principles did not require the dismissal of the worker's compensation claim. The civil action for negligence and the worker's compensation claim were based on two different primary rights,

and were therefore different claims. The court also held that the legislature had intended cumulative remedies to be available for workers in these cases, in which an employer was illegally uninsured [*Le Parc Community Association v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1161, 1171-1174, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 408]* .

Res judicata has barred the relitigation in a collateral civil proceeding of a zoning issue previously decided by a city board of permit appeals [*City and County of San Francisco v. Ang (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 673, 159 Cal. Rptr. 56]* . It has also barred a second appeal to an administrative board on the issue of timeliness of the first appeal to the same administrative board when no statute provided for reconsideration [*Hollywood Circle, Inc. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 728, 13 Cal. Rptr. 104, 361 P.2d 712]* .

A party's failure to challenge adverse findings of a quasi-judicial administrative agency proceeding by means of a mandate action in the superior court means that those findings are binding in a later civil action [*Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 484, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410* ; Risam v. *County of Los Angeles (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 412, 419-420, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 267* (employee's failure to challenge agency decision finding no FEHA violation bound employee and prohibited later civil action by employee alleging FEHA violation)]. When a public employee files discrimination claims against a public employer based on the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) [*Gov. Code § 12900*], and based on Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) [*42 U.S.C. § 2000e*], the employee's failure to have the public employer agency's final adverse findings judicially reviewed and set aside means that those adverse findings are binding on the public employee in a later civil action as to claims under the California FEHA, but the adverse findings are not binding as to claims under Title VII. [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 65-66, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 5 P.3d 874* ; *Miller v. City of Los Angeles (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1380-1382, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 510* (citing the *Johnson* case; discharged employee's FEHA complaint was barred by former employee's failure to timely file a petition for administrative mandamus to challenge decision of Board of Civil Service Commissioners; former employee withdrew from administrative hearing process after hearing officer had submitted report recommending discharge of the former employee); *Brand v. Regents of the University of California (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1368-1370, 72 Cal. Rptr.3d 419* (citing the *Johnson* case; internal grievance decision denying employee's grievances did not have collateral estoppel impact on later lawsuit by employee against university employer for damages for unlawful retaliation under whistleblower protection statute. This was because the fact-finding procedures used in the grievance process did not have judicial or quasi-judicial character necessary for collateral estoppel to apply)].

The California Court of Appeal relied on the *Johnson* decision to hold that a city firefighter who was dismissed for cause was precluded from relitigating in later court actions adverse determinations made by the city council because the firefighter failed to seek judicial review and failed to overturn the city council decision. Thus, the principles of issue preclusion prohibit the firefighter from relitigating issues determined against him in the city council dismissal decision [*Smith v. City of Napa (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 194, 198-199, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 908]* . However, the California Supreme Court held that a state employee pursuing a whistleblower retaliation complaint under *Gov. Code § 8547.8* against agency officials where the state employee worked was only required to pursue a complaint with the State Personnel Board under *Gov. Code § 19683*. The employee was not required to request a hearing before an ALJ working for the State Personnel Board (SPB), nor was the employee required to seek judicial review under administrative mandamus before filing a civil action for damages based on whistleblower retaliation. The employee was only required to receive the findings of the executive officer of the SPB based on review of the complaint. The employee was not required to exhaust administrative or judicial remedies to challenge those findings before filing a civil lawsuit. Furthermore, the executive officer's findings (which were adverse to the employee) were not binding on the employee as a matter of issue preclusion because the executive officer's findings were not a final judgment following an administrative hearing [*State Board of Chiropractic Examiners v. Superior Court (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 963, 968, 973, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 576, 201 P. 3d 457]* .

Similarly, although the doctrine of collateral estoppel developed to give conclusive effect to a prior court adjudication, the California Supreme Court has held that it also applies when the prior adjudication was administrative [*People v.*

Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 477, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321 ; *Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 708, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899* ; *Oquendo v. California Institution for Women (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 520, 523, 260 Cal. Rptr. 688]* .

[2] Application to Administrative Hearings

[a] Required Elements

The California Supreme Court reaffirmed the continued validity under stare decisis (precedent decision) of the court's previous decision in *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* , which applied collateral estoppel provisions to administrative agency decisions and holding that a subsequent criminal prosecution for the same misconduct could be precluded by collateral estoppel when the agency decision exonerated the welfare recipient of welfare fraud charges [*People v. Garcia (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1070, 1074, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 75, 141 P.3d 197]* . The California Supreme Court concluded that the continued validity of *People v. Sims* was not affected by 1984 statutory amendments to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11483* because the state of California had the discretion to seek restitution first or prosecution first under those amendments [*People v. Garcia (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1070, 1082-1083, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 75, 141 P.3d 197]* . The California Supreme Court also concluded that the continued validity of *People v. Sims* was not affected by the 1990 California Supreme Court decision in *Lucido v. Superior Court (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 335, 272 Cal. Rptr. 767, 795 P. 2d 1223* in which the court held that collateral estoppel did not prohibit relitigation in a criminal proceeding of an issue previously litigated in a probation revocation hearing in which the defendant prevailed [*People v. Garcia (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1070, 1083-1084, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 75, 141 P.3d 197]* . However, the doctrine of collateral estoppel precluded relitigation in a criminal prosecution for welfare fraud and perjury of issues that were actually litigated and necessarily determined in a prior administrative proceeding [*People v. Garcia (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1070, 1089, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 75, 141 P.3d 197]* . The California Supreme Court remanded the case to the Court of Appeal to determine whether the issues actually litigated in the administrative proceeding were identical to the issues in the criminal proceeding. The Court of Appeal on remand is required to determine whether the same issues of welfare fraud and perjury were litigated in the administrative proceeding as were litigated in the criminal proceeding in which the defendant welfare recipient was convicted of welfare fraud and perjury after the agency decision determined that welfare overpayments were the result of administrative error [*People v. Garcia (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1070, 1090-1091, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 75, 141 P.3d 197]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a public transportation authority was not collaterally estopped from litigating the issue of the composition of a public employee bargaining unit that included supervisors and managers because there was a prior proceeding in which the department of industrial relations identified as the existing bargaining unit five years prior to the current proceeding. Collateral estoppel did not apply because the appealing parties failed to satisfy their burden of proof to show that the same issue was actually litigated in the prior proceeding. This was because the record of the prior proceeding was incomplete, and the court could not determine to what extent this same issue was actually litigated in the prior proceeding [*Santa Clara Valley Trans. Auth. v. Rea (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1303, 1311-1313, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 511]* .

In *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* , the California Supreme Court held that an administrative Department of Social Services "fair hearing" decision, which exonerated a welfare recipient of fraud charges, collaterally estopped a subsequent criminal prosecution for the same misconduct. The Court adopted the principle that collateral estoppel may be applied to decisions made by administrative agencies when (1) the administrative agency is acting in a judicial capacity, (2) the agency resolves disputed issues of fact properly before it, and (3) all parties have had an adequate opportunity to litigate their claims [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* .

The court stated that application of collateral estoppel to these administrative decisions comports with the public policy underlying the doctrine of limiting litigation by preventing a party who has had one fair trial on an issue from again

drawing it into controversy [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* . The Court found (1) that the Department of Social Services hearing was a judicial-like adversary proceeding because of the procedures it followed and the adjudicatory nature of the hearing officer's decision, (2) that the Department had statutory jurisdiction to decide the disputed issues of fact, and (3) that the fair hearing provided the parties an adequate opportunity to fully litigate their claims [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-481, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* .

The Court also found that the three requirements of traditional collateral estoppel had been met: (1) the issue decided at the previous proceeding was identical to the one sought to be litigated, (2) the administrative decision resulted in a final judgment on the merits, and (3) the party against whom collateral estoppel was asserted was a party or in privity with a party at the prior proceeding, because the county (which litigated in the fair hearing), and district attorney's office (which sought to prosecute the criminal proceeding), were both county agencies representing the interests of the state [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 484-487, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* ; *see* *Lerner v. Los Angeles City Board of Education (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 382, 398, 29 Cal. Rptr. 657, 380 P.2d 97* (agents of the same government are in privity with each other, since they represent the right of the government); *Pitts v. City of Sacramento (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 853, 858, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 838* (issue preclusion did not apply to police officer's second mandate proceeding, as findings on this issue in a prior lawsuit were not essential to the judgment because the appellate court affirmed the prior judgment on a different basis than this particular issue); *Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 708, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899* (collateral estoppel not applicable because issues were not identical); *City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 605-606, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723* (collateral estoppel not applicable because party to be estopped was neither a party to nor in privity with a party to the prior determination); *Carmel Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. State of California (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 536, 234 Cal. Rptr. 795* (the various state agencies are agents of the state in privity with other state agencies)].

A dental patient acted as an assignee of the dentist and asserted a claim against the dentist's professional liability insurer for breach of contract for refusing to defend or indemnify dentist in the dental patient's underlying tort action for sexual misconduct against the dentist. The Court of Appeal held that the patient was collaterally estopped from asserting in the action against the insurer that the dentist's conduct was negligent and therefore within the scope of risks covered by the insurance policy. Collateral estoppel was based on the Dental Board's findings that the dentist had sexually abused the patient, and that the dentist was found to have committed intentional misconduct with the patient. Those findings were contained in a Dental Board decision that was final, and that was preceded by a full adversary adjudicatory hearing before an ALJ who took testimony and made findings that the dentist's conduct was intentional and sexually motivated. The patient litigated these issues in the ALJ hearing. Therefore, she is bound by the agency findings, and she is estopped to deny that the conduct of the dentist was intentional. The patient is the dentists' assignee in this action, and she is held to be in privity with the dentist, and equally estopped as a privy as she would be as a party [*Marie Y. v. General Star Indemnity Co. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 928, 954-956, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 135]* .

The Court of Appeal held that a contractor licensee regulated by the Contractor's State License Board (CSLB) was judicially estopped from asserting in a civil lawsuit that he had withdrawn from completing a development project based on advice of counsel when the contractor had taken an inconsistent position before the CSLB and had asserted that he had not abandoned the project. The Board concluded that there was no basis for disciplining the contractor licensee because of lack of proof that the contractor had abandoned the project. The court of appeal concluded that judicial estoppel applied because the two positions taken by the contractor were inconsistent. The court also noted that collateral estoppel may apply and lead to the same result [*Furia v. Helm (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 945, 957-959]* .

It should also be noted that the issues presented in an administrative proceeding are often different from those in companion criminal prosecutions and civil cases. Courts have refused to apply the *Sims* rule when the issues in the different proceedings were not identical [*see* *People v. Wilson (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 1149, 1157, 215 Cal. Rptr. 694* (issue in administrative hearing was termination of welfare benefits due to financial disqualification; the issue in the subsequent criminal case was welfare fraud and perjury); *People v. Rodriguez (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 650, 653, 206*

Cal. Rptr. 79 (issue at administrative hearing was termination of AFDC and food stamp benefits based on husband's residency on particular date; issue in criminal complaint was welfare fraud based on different residency dates)].

As discussed in [b], *below*, the issues in criminal and administrative proceedings may not be identical due to the different burden of proof. Thus, for example, the California Supreme court held that dismissal of criminal charges for drunk driving by a court, based on its determination that the arrest of defendant for driving while intoxicated was unlawful, did not preclude the administrative agency (DMV), from relitigating the issue of the lawfulness of the arrest in administrative proceedings that the agency held to determine whether to suspend defendant's driver's license for driving while intoxicated [*Gikas v. Zolin (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 841, 857, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 500, 863 P. 2d 745]* .

Similarly, one court of appeal held that the doctrine of res judicata did not apply to preclude a civil proceeding for unfair business practices in which civil penalties were sought against an owner of an auto repair business when a prior administrative proceeding against the same owner for the same violations of the Automotive Repair Act led to a determination that the owner's business registration was suspended for 14 days, the owner was required to pay $4,600 in investigation costs, and the owner's registration was placed on a three-year probation [*People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 964, 972, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504]* .

Another court of appeal held that an arbitration decision of a state agency does not be given preclusive effect to a civil rights cause of action under section 1983 (*42 U.S.C. § 1983*), when to do so would be contrary to the intent of Congress in creating that cause of action [*Brosterhous v. State Bar of California (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 315, 326-327, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 87, 906 P.2d 1242]* .

The Court of Appeal held that a prior judicial challenge to an interim housing code enforcement program based on whether that program was exempt from environmental review under CEQA did not have collateral estoppel effect on a later judicial challenge to a permanent housing code enforcement program based on whether the permanent program was exempt from environmental review under CEQA. The inapplicability of collateral estoppel to preclude the second challenge to the permanent program was based on the difference in the two programs as to duration and scope which meant that the exemption from environmental review issues were also different [*Apartment Assn. of Greater Los Angeles v. City of Los Angeles (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1162, 1168-1170, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the completion of a Public Utilities Commission (PUC) investigation into fraud charges against a regulated utility (Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) without the PUC reaching any decision about those charges did not have collateral estoppel effect on a related civil lawsuit claim for fraud damages brought against PG&E by consumers [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* . The fraud issues had been referred to the PUC under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, and the trial court had stayed the civil lawsuit pending PUC resolution of the fraud issues. When the PUC closed its investigation, having taken no action, the trial court lifted the stay, and granted a motion for judgment on the pleadings brought by PG&E. The court of appeal reversed the judgment, and held the PUC decision to close the investigation did not have collateral estoppel effect on the civil lawsuit because there was no PUC ruling or decision on the merits, there were no parties to the proceeding, and the PUC was not acting in an adjudicatory capacity [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* .

Another California Court of Appeal held that collateral estoppel principles precluded a challenger to the denial of a real estate license from offering evidence impeaching prior judgments against the challenger in a civil fraud lawsuit and a state bar disbarment proceeding. These judgments were used as the basis of license denial by the Department of Real Estate. The ALJ ruled at the challenger's hearing that this evidence could not be admitted, as these were final judgments, and collateral estoppel principles prohibited impeachment of those judgments. This ruling was upheld on appeal [*Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 223, 230-231, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that while claim preclusion (res judicata) and issue preclusion (collateral estoppels)

principles are applicable to wage claim decisions by the California Labor Commissioner under *Lab. Code § 98*, because wage claim orders are final, binding judgments under *Lab. Code § 98.2*, claim preclusion (res judicata) principles did not bar the filing of common law and statutory tort claims by plaintiff employees against defendant employers, because the Labor Commissioner did not have subject matter jurisdiction, the authority to adjudicate, those type of tort claims, only wage claims [*Noble v. Draper (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 1, 11-13, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 3*]. However, collateral estoppels principles do apply to bar one of the plaintiff's tort claims based on the Labor Commissioner's finding in the prior wage claim administrative proceeding that this plaintiff was not an employee of the defendant employer [*Noble v. Draper (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 1, 5, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 3*].

The First District Division 5, California Court of Appeal held that the *Cal. Const. art. 13, § 32* language, "No legal or equitable process shall issue in any proceeding in any court against this State or any officer thereof to prevent or enjoin the collection of any tax. After payment of a tax claimed to be illegal, an action may be maintained to recover the tax paid, with interest, in such manner as may be provided by the Legislature," which is also known as the "pay first, litigate later" rule takes precedence over principles of collateral estoppel. Thus, a company's declaratory and injunctive relief action against the State of California was properly dismissed. The company sought a declaratory judgment that the company did not owe $1.2 million in state taxes because its drivers were independent contractors, not employees of the company. The company argued that the State of California was collaterally estopped from relitigating the employee issue because in prior state administrative agency proceedings between the company and the state of California, the company's drivers were determined to be independent contractors, not employees. The court of appeal held that the Section 32 principle takes precedence over collateral estoppel. The State was not precluded from relitigating the employment status issue against the company, and from collecting the tax. The company's challenge to the employment tax liability would have to be litigated after the company paid the tax [*California Logistics, Inc. v. State of California (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 242, 245-247, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 825*].

[b] Role of Burden of Proof

In *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* [*see* [a], *above*], collateral estoppel was applied in favor of a defendant in a later criminal prosecution.

The higher burden of proof in the later proceeding did not prevent application of the doctrine, because if the agency failed to meet the first, lower burden (preponderance of the evidence), it would necessarily fail to meet the higher burden required in the criminal proceeding [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 485, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* .

If a defendant were acquitted in a criminal proceeding with a higher burden of proof, however, the acquittal does not mean that the criminal proceeding bars an administrative proceeding with a lower burden of proof [*Holt v. Department of Food & Agriculture (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 427, 433, 218 Cal. Rptr. 1* (acquittal of respondent in prior criminal proceedings did not bar subsequent administrative action, because different burden of proof made the issues in each proceeding nonidentical)].

In a criminal motion to suppress evidence, however, when the burden of proof is a preponderance of the evidence, collateral estoppel has been applied to an administrative proceeding [*Buttimer v. Alexis (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 754, 194 Cal. Rptr. 603]* .

[3] Offensive Use of Collateral Estoppel

The use of collateral estoppel may be either defensive (the plaintiff is estopped from litigating a claim that the plaintiff previously litigated and lost against another defendant) or offensive (the defendant is estopped from relitigating issues that the defendant previously litigated and lost against another plaintiff). Both the United States Supreme Court and a California Court of Appeal have suggested that the offensive use of collateral estoppel is less likely to promote judicial

economy and may be unfair to the defendant [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 329-330, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552* ; *Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* . Both courts nonetheless held that the offensive use of collateral estoppel should be permitted in the broad discretion of the trial court [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 331, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552* ; *Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* .

The offensive use of collateral estoppel should not be allowed, however, when the plaintiff could have joined in the first proceeding [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 331, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552* ; Restatement (Second) of Judgments, § 29(3) and Comment e] or when its use would be unfair to the defendant, as when the defendant has little incentive to vigorously defend in the first proceeding [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 330-331, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552* ; *Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906-907, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* .

Although the court of appeals in *Imen* did allow the offensive use of an administrative determination [*Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906-908, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* , it has been suggested that the offensive use of collateral estoppel may require a stronger showing that the prior opportunity to litigate was adequate [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 331 n.16, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552]* .

The Court of Appeal held that the public interest exception to collateral estoppel applied to permit relitigation of an issue of law, whether a school district complied with the requirements of a statute [*Educ. Code § 51747*], related to short term independent study requirements, notwithstanding that a prior appeal panel had upheld the school district's compliance with the statute. The public interest exception is based on Section 28 of the Restatement Second of Judgments [Rest. 2d Judgments § 28]. The court held that the exception was applicable in this case because of the impact of applying collateral estoppel to future cases raising issues related to public funding of school districts throughout the State of California [*Modesto City Sch. v. Education Audits Appeal Panel (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1365, 1379-1380, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 831]* . The court cited and relied upon the California Supreme Court decision in *Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 259, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438* .

The California Supreme Court held that the state Water Resources Control Board was not collaterally estopped from requiring a timber company to comply with water quality monitoring requirements notwithstanding that the state Department of Forestry had approved the timber company's timber harvesting plan, and that plan did not contain water quality requirements to protect rivers near the areas to be logged. The state water board and regional water quality boards had participated in the timber harvesting plan approval process but they were not collaterally estopped from imposing their own requirements. The two reasons that collateral estoppel did not apply were that 1) the forest practices act had a savings clause stating that the forest practice act did not operate as a limitation on the authority of other state agencies to regulate under other statutes; and 2) the interagency review and approval process that led to the adoption of the timber harvesting plan was not a judicial process, did not use adversary procedures such as cross examination of witnesses, and thus lacked judicial character, and was essentially a collaborative process in which the water quality boards role was a consultative participation in the approval process [*Pacific Lumber Co. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 37 Cal. 4th 921, 935-936, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 220, 126 P.3d 1040]* .

The First District, Division 3, California Court of Appeal held that collateral estoppel did not apply in a proceeding (application for compensation benefits) before the victim compensation and government claims board under Penal code § 4900 to give preclusive effect to a determination of factual innocence made in a judicial proceeding under *Penal Code § 851.8* [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1168, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* . Even though the issues were the same [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1175-1176, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* , and even though there was a privity relationship between the district attorney in the *Penal Code § 851.8* proceeding, and the attorney general in the claims board proceedings [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1174-1175, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* , the factual innocence issue was not actually litigated in the *Penal*

Code § 851.8 proceeding because there was a stipulation as to that issue. Thus, collateral estoppel did not apply because the actually litigated requirement was not satisfied [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1176-1178, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* . Furthermore, collateral estoppel did not apply because of public policy reasons having to do with the integrity of the court system. Other public policy reasons to not apply collateral estoppel included not promoting judicial economy as it would not lessen repetitive litigation. Finally, the offensive use of collateral estoppel in this case would not protect against harassment from vexatious litigation because the party seeking to use this doctrine brought both proceedings [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1178-1180, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* .

The First District Division 4 California Court of Appeal held that a health care plan was collaterally estopped from relitigating the coverage issue of whether or not a health care providers diabetes related treatment was experimental (and there not covered by the plan) because the same coverage issue had previously been litigated by the California Public Employees Retirement System (CALPERS) and the health care plan was in privity with CALPERS, and therefore bound by the prior determination under collateral estoppels principles [*California Physicians' Service v. Aoki Diabetes Research Institute (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1506, 1510, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 646*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare Decisis

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Rules of Evidence

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.42-473F.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.42[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.50

§ 473F.50 Order of Proof

[1] General Requirements

This part discusses the burden of proof applicable in administrative adjudicatory hearings, including license discipline proceedings, benefit entitlement hearings, civil service matters, hearings concerning liberty interests, and license application controversies. It contrasts the burden of proof with the order of proof, and discusses an adjudicator's authority to set the procedure for the taking of evidence. It examines the "clear and convincing evidence" and "preponderance of evidence" standards used in administrative hearings. Affirmative defenses and other matters that affect the burden of proof are also covered.

The "burden of proof" is the evidentiary standard that the moving party must meet to prevail in the case [*see* definition in § 473F.51[1]]. In contrast, the "order of proof" describes the procedure for taking evidence in the hearing. Because the APA does not set forth the order of proof that must be used in a hearing, the administrative law judge (ALJ) or agency hearing the case establishes the order. The general authority of the ALJ or agency to conduct a hearing includes the authority to establish the order of proof [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)*; *see also* Part A]. When the ALJ alone hears the case, he or she exercises all powers relating to the conduct of the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 11511.5(b)(6)* (order of presentation of evidence and cross-examination may be set at the prehearing conference)]. When the agency itself hears the case, the ALJ rules on the admission and exclusion of evidence, but the agency exercises all other powers relating to the conduct of the hearing that it has not delegated to the ALJ [*Gov. Code § 11512(b)*].

[2] Customary Order in Civil Cases

The customary order of proof in a civil case, which is generally followed in administrative hearings, is as follows [*Code Civ. Proc. § 607*]:

- Plaintiff's statement of the issue and his or her case.
- An optional statement of defense by defendant.

- Plaintiff's production of evidence.
- Defendant's opening statement, if deferred previously, and production of defendant's evidence.
- Additional evidence on the original cases if permitted by the court.
- Rebuttal evidence.
- Argument.

When separate multiple plaintiffs or defendants appear by different counsel, the court must determine their relative order in the presentation of evidence and argument [*Code Civ. Proc. § 607(8)*]. The usual order of proof in civil cases may be modified by the assertion of a special defense, such as the statute of limitations; the matter may be tried separately before the other issues [*Code Civ. Proc. § 597*; *see County of Kern v. Superior Court (1972) 82 Cal. App. 3d 396, 147 Cal. Rptr. 248* (absolute requirement in medical malpractice cases that the statute of limitations issue be tried first)].

Similarly, issues or parts of issues, such as questions of liability and damages, may be bifurcated and separately heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 598*]; and for judicial economy, equitable issues may be heard before legal issues [*Jaffe v. Albertson Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 592, 609, 53 Cal. Rptr. 25* ; *Peterson v. Peterson (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 312, 321, 168 P.2d 474]* . For additional discussion of the order of proof, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[3] Modification of Customary Order in Administrative Hearings

The agency or ALJ may follow the customary order of proof, modify that order, or order issues tried out of order. Modification may be used to assist witnesses, counsel, or a party appearing in propria persona, or for the efficiency and convenience of the forum [*see Ehrlich v. McConnell (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287, 29 Cal. Rptr. 283* (the order of procedure was properly addressed to the discretion of the hearing officer)]. Such changes to the customary order of proof do not shift or otherwise affect the burden of proof.

Nevertheless, not all of the considerations that prompt modifications of the customary order of proof in judicial proceedings pertain in administrative matters. For example, considerations affecting the order of proof in civil or criminal proceedings to assure that a jury will not hear or be influenced by impermissible matters do not apply in an administrative proceeding heard by a panel [*see Gov. Code § 11512(a)* (agency itself may hear case together with ALJ)]; panel members reflect particular expertise and are not treated in the same manner as lay jurors.

Special or equitable defenses, such as the statute of limitations or estoppel, customarily involve a controverted issue of fact [*see, e.g.,* Bus. & Prof. Code § 7119 (last day of work on the job by the contractor alleged to have abandoned a construction project); *Knight v. Board of Administration (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 973, 978-979, 196 Cal. Rptr. 423* (communications made by a government official on which a party relied)]. Such issues, and other mixed questions of law and fact, are taken under submission by the ALJ after an evidentiary hearing or the submission of a stipulated statement of facts, and addressed in the proposed decision.

[4] Order in Particular Matters

As the moving party [*see § 473F.51[9]*], an applicant for disability or retirement benefits customarily proceeds with the production of evidence; that order of proof is frequently modified by the ALJ to permit the agency to present evidence on preliminary issues--such as the membership of the applicant in the retirement system, whether requisite filings for benefits were lodged with the agency, and so forth.

In license denial proceedings, the agency generally presents evidence of the application and the information on which the agency determined to deny the application before the applicant's evidentiary presentation. For example, although the burden of proof in protest proceedings of the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 24013-24016* (protest proceedings)] is on the protesting party [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 24300(a)* (APA governs procedure); *see also § 473F.51[2]*], the Department customarily presents evidence of the license application file and its investigation prior to the protesting party's presentation of evidence.

The ALJ or agency must resolve at the outset of proceedings the order of proof to be followed in multiple party matters, such as separate applications for a single available permit, or multiple respondents consolidated in a single license discipline accusation. The adjudicator may consider factors of potential prejudice, convenience, and fairness. The order of proof set between multiple parties will not be disturbed on appeal absent a clear abuse of discretion resulting in a miscarriage of justice [*Diamond Springs Lime Co. v. American River Constructors (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 581, 602, 94 Cal. Rptr. 200* (contractor unsuccessfully argued that order of proof requiring it to present its defense before another party proceeded was an abuse of discretion)].

[5] Consideration on Appeal

In general, an adjudicator's broad discretion to determine the order of proof will not be disturbed on appeal [*County of San Luis Obispo v. Bailey (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 518, 527, 93 Cal. Rptr. 859, 483 P.2d 27* ; *Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 584, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330* ; *Meyer Koulish Co. v. Cannon (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 419, 430, 28 Cal. Rptr. 757]* .

For example, denial of a dismissed teacher's request to present evidence of arbitrary enforcement of district rules before the school district's case in chief was held to be within the discretion of the ALJ to set the order of proof. The court found that there was no denial of due process in denying petitioner's strategic move to show that other teachers had violated district policy before there had been any evidence of violations on her part [*Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 412, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465]* .

Such a ruling on the order of proof applies only to when evidence may be presented and should not be construed as a ruling on admissibility [*Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 413, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *Le Cyr v. Dow (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 457, 460, 86 P.2d 900]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.51

§ 473F.51 Determining Burden of Proof

[1] General Rules

Unlike a criminal proceeding, in which the state has the burden of proof [*Penal Code § 1096*], or a civil proceeding, in which the burden rests on the party asserting a claim or defense [*Evid. Code § 500*], the burden of proof in an administrative proceeding is not as easily fixed. It may be determined by statute [*see* [2], *below*].

Absent a statute or other authority fixing the burden, the moving party or party seeking to change the status quo bears the burden of proof [*Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 113, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351* (city denied police officer due process in termination hearing by failing to assume the burden of proving charge that he had used excessive force in making arrest); *Martin v. State Personnel Bd. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 573, 582, 103 Cal. Rptr. 306]* .

The burden in particular types of proceedings are discussed in [3]-[10], *below*. The burden is not necessarily on the party who drafts the pleadings or statement of the case [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 24300* (Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control drafts the pleadings in a protest proceeding, but the burden is on the protesting party)], however, or on the party who arranges for the hearing before the ALJ [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 17555*; *2 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1187.1, 1187.2* (the Commission on State Mandates provides for a hearing, but is not a real party in interest in disputes concerning state mandated costs)].

For discussion of the burden of proof in trial court proceedings, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[2] APA Provisions

The APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) does not identify the party who bears the burden of proof except by implication. With respect to license issuance, the APA provides that a hearing to determine whether a license should be issued or renewed is initiated by a "statement of issues" [*Gov. Code § 11504*].

The statement must specify the statutes and rules with which the respondent must show compliance by producing proof

at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11504*; *see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*]. This requirement suggests that the burden of proof is on the respondent [*see* [3], *below*].

The California Court of Appeal held that the applicant for a liquor license had the burden of proof under *Gov. Code § 11504* to establish eligibility at a hearing held by the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control. The decision to grant a conditional license to the applicant did not shift the burden of proof to protestors who were opposing the granting of a liquor license. The court of appeal applied the express language of *Gov. Code § 11504* that the "respondent must show compliance by producing proof at the hearing," and concluded that this language meant that the applicant for the liquor license was the respondent who had the burden of proof at the hearing [*Coffin v. Alcoholic Bev. Control Appeals Bd. (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 471, 476-477, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 420]* .

With respect to license discipline, the APA provides that a hearing to determine whether a license should be revoked or suspended is initiated by the filing of an "accusation," which must state the charged acts or omissions so that respondent can prepare his or her defense [*Gov. Code § 11503*].

This requirement suggests that the burden is on the accusatory party [*see* [6], *below*]. With respect to default proceedings, used when the respondent fails to file a notice of defense or appear at the hearing, the agency may act without taking evidence in cases in which the burden of proof is on the respondent to establish that he or she is entitled to the agency action sought [*Gov. Code § 11520*].

With respect to a petition for reinstatement or reduction in penalty, which in practice is the elimination or modification of probationary terms, the APA permits a disciplined licensee to petition the agency for that action after a year has elapsed from the effective date of the suspension or revocation [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. The burden of proof is on the petitioner to present either oral or written argument, such as character witnesses, before the agency [*Gov. Code § 11522*; *see* [6], *below*].

[3] License and Permit Applications

The burden of proof is customarily placed on the applicant for a license or permit, unless the relevant ordinance or statute provides to the contrary [*Martin v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 259, 265, 341 P.2d 291* (burden of proof is on applicant for license in application proceedings); *So. Cal. Jockey Club v. Cal. etc. Racing Bd. (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 167, 177, 223 P.2d 1]* .

For example, an applicant may be required to prove his or her good moral character [*Martin v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 259, 265, 341 P.2d 291* (applicant for liquor license); *Hora v. City and County of San Francisco (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 375, 379, 43 Cal. Rptr. 527* (applicant for massage parlor business permit)], or the ability to adequately work with others [*Pick v. Santa Ana-Tustin Community Hospital (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977, 182 Cal. Rptr. 85* (doctor-applicants for county hospital staff membership)].

Placing the burden of proof on all issues in connection with a permit application on the applicant for a development permit within the coastal zone does not violate due process, and allocation of the burden of proof often serves as an effective tool for shaping social policies; the consumer of natural resources should bear the responsibility for justifying his or her actions [*CEEED v. California Coastal Zone Conservation Com. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 306, 330, 118 Cal. Rptr. 315]* .

Similarly, the burden of proof is properly placed on the applicant proposing an airport expansion to establish that the requirements set forth in the relevant statute have been met [*Bakman v. Department of Transportation (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 665, 688-689, 160 Cal. Rptr. 583]* .

[4] License Renewal

License renewal is frequently an almost automatic function of the agency on the payment of renewal fees. In those circumstances, the agency generally does not require the licensee to provide additional proof of fitness, or exercise its discretion in renewing the license [*see Hall v. Scudder (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 433, 437, 168 P.2d 990* (statutes governing renewal of real estate license imposed no duty on renewal applicant to prove fitness for license, and no power on agency to investigate fitness)].

An agency cannot use the renewal process to effect a license revocation without the procedural protections of an evidentiary hearing. For example, the real estate commissioner was prohibited from refusing to renew the license of a broker convicted of bigamy since the last renewal. The licensee's renewed license could, however, be revoked on the basis of that felony conviction in a subsequent disciplinary proceeding [*Payne v. Real Estate Commissioner (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 532, 536, 209 P.2d 419]* .

When completion of continuing education is required for license renewal, the burden of proving compliance with the requirement is on the licensee. For example, the Board of Vocational Nurse and Psychiatric Technician Examiners requires renewing licensees to submit proof of having completed during the preceding two years 30 hours of continuing education acceptable to the Board [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 2540.1*].

In practice, some agencies provide forms on which the licensee may certify that the education was completed rather than submit the related certificates or transcripts. By various verification programs and "spot-checks," the agencies attempt to assure that the required continuing education has been completed. The submission of a false statement regarding the requirement is itself grounds for license revocation [*Bus. & Prof. § 480*].

[5] License Discipline

[a] Revocation and Suspension

The burden of proof in administrative hearings to revoke or suspend a license is on the party filing the charges against the licensee [*Daniels v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 532, 536, 189 Cal. Rptr. 512, 658 P.2d 1313* (suspension of driver's license); *Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 856, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* (suspension of doctor's license); *Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 212-213, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71* (revocation of real estate license); *De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 610, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289* (revocation of real estate license)].

The standard of proof applicable at hearings to revoke or suspend a license is higher than that used in other types of administrative hearings [*see § 473F.52[2]*]. The burden of proof, however, shifts to the respondent to provide an affirmative defense [*Anderson v. Board of Dental Examiners (1915) 27 Cal. App. 336, 338, 149 P. 1006* ; *see Whetstone v. Board of Dental Exmrs. (1927) 87 Cal. App. 156, 164, 261 P. 1077]* . For further discussion of the shifting of the burden of proof, see *§ 473F.54[2]*.

[b] Citations

Some licensing agencies use "citation" proceedings as an alternative to disciplinary proceedings to revoke or suspend a license. A license citation is comparable to a traffic ticket to the extent that, for a charged statutory or regulatory violation, the cited licensee is ordered to pay a civil penalty, analogous to a fine, and correct any deficient work. For example, the Contractors' State License Board may issue a citation in lieu of initiating a proceeding to revoke or suspend a contractor's license [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 7099-7099.7*].

A contractor may contest a citation, including the amount of the penalty, the violation cited, and period allowed for corrective action in a hearing in which the burden of proof is on the charging agency [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 7099.3*].

For a discussion of the standard of proof applicable to citation hearings, see *§ 473F.52*.

[6] License Reinstatement

In general, when a statute does not provide otherwise, the applicant for reinstatement of a license has the burden of proof regarding not only qualification for licensure, but also rehabilitation when the license was revoked for cause [*Maggart v. State Bar (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 439, 443, 175 P.2d 505* ; *Housman v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 308, 315, 190 P.2d 653* (burden rests on the petitioner to prove that he or she has been rehabilitated and is entitled to have his or her license restored, and not on the board to prove to the contrary)].

An agency's statute or regulations may identify the elements that the petitioner must prove to merit reinstatement. For example, the Board of Veterinary Medicine requires the petitioner to furnish two verified recommendations from licensees [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 4887*].

In the absence of specific reinstatement criteria, counsel should refer to the provisions of the agency regarding rehabilitation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 482*]. State licensing agencies and the licensing boards organized within the Department of Consumer Affairs [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 101.6*] are required to develop criteria for evaluating the rehabilitation of (1) an applicant denied a license for conviction of a crime, fraud or dishonesty, or making a false statement in a license application [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 482*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 480* (grounds for license denial)]; and (2) a licensee whose license is revoked or suspended for conviction of a crime [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 482*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 490* (grounds for suspension or revocation of license)].

The burden of proof is on the party claiming to have been rehabilitated [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 482*]. The rehabilitation criteria are generally found in the regulations adopted by licensing agencies. For example, a Department of Real Estate licensee whose license was revoked or suspended pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 480* can present evidence of restitution of monetary losses of injured parties, abstinence from alcohol or controlled substances, stability of family life, or community service for purposes of rehabilitation [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2912*].

[7] Employee Discipline

[a] Proceedings to Dismiss or Discipline

In a proceeding to discipline or dismiss an employee, the burden of proof is on the agency asserting cause for discipline, absent an ordinance, statute, or union agreement to the contrary [*Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 113, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

A statute or other requirement that the employee bear the entire burden of proof to establish that the discharge was improper may violate due process; however, the reviewing court may uphold the dismissal when a review of the entire record establishes that the agency did present evidence to prove the charges [*Pipkin v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 652, 658-659, 147 Cal. Rptr. 502]* .

Due process is not offended when the employer presents evidence of the employee's unauthorized absence, and thereafter the burden shifts to the employee to prove that the absence was justified [*Baker v. Wadsworth (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 253, 263, 85 Cal. Rptr. 880]* .

Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351 states that it is axiomatic in disciplinary administrative proceedings that the burden of proving the charges rests on the party making the charges; the obligation of a party to sustain the burden of proof requires the production of evidence for that purpose [*Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 113, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351]* . The *Parker* case is significant for its careful analysis of the preliminary departmental "proceeding" before the police chief. The court rejected the city's argument that

its burden of proof was satisfied at that level and thereafter the burden shifted to the employee. It stated that prior to the administrative hearing before the city manager, there had been no production of evidence or testimony of witnesses. Since the administrative hearing was the first evidentiary inquiry into the facts giving rise to appellant's discharge, the city, not the employee, was required to bear the burden of proof [*Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 113, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

A police officer who was reassigned to a lower pay grade by his employer has a significant private interest in continued receipt of his paycheck [*Gilbert v. Homar (1997) 520 U. S. 924, 932,117 S. Ct. 1807, 138 L. Ed. 2d 120]* , and therefore was entitled under due process of law to hearing procedures in which the police department had the burden of proof of showing that the criteria in the department manual for reassignment to a lower pay grade have been established. The agency procedures placed the burden of proof on the police officer, and that violated due process of law [*Brown v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 155, 175-177, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474* ; *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 85, 92-94, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911]* . Similarly, police officers charged with misconduct were entitled under Police Officers *Bill of Rights* statute [*Gov. Code § 3304*] to administrative appeal with de novo review, and with the burden of proof on the police department, to establish the facts that provide the basis for the charges against the officers [*Caloca v. County of San Diego (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 433, 443-445, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 3]* .

[b] Civil Service Employees

In *Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* , the California Supreme Court stated that a civil servant's interest in his or her permanent state employment is a property interest that is protected by the due process provisions of both the federal and state constitutions [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 206, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774]* .

Thus, the employee is entitled to notice of termination and the right to respond to the charges, before the termination becomes effective [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 215, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774]* . At the evidentiary hearing to challenge the action taken, the burden of proof is on the employer to establish cause for dismissal by a preponderance of the evidence [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 204 n.19, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *see § 473F.52*, for a discussion of standards of proof].

Frequently, counsel or union representatives will decide to waive a pre-termination *Shelly* hearing to avoid providing the employer representative with a prior hint of the evidence and defense that the respondent will offer at the evidentiary hearing before the Civil Service Commission or its hearing officer. Whether the tactic is purely strategic or represents a view that a *Shelly* hearing is a meaningless formality is unclear.

[c] Name-Clearing Hearings

The rapidly growing body of case law concerning the pre-termination right to a hearing of an employee dismissed for alleged conduct that would stigmatize the employee's reputation or impair the opportunity for future employment [*Board of Regents v. Roth (1972) 408 U.S. 564, 569-570, 92 S. Ct. 2701, 33 L. Ed. 2d 548* ; *Murden v. County of Sacramento (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 302, 310, 206 Cal. Rptr. 699* ; *Williams v. Department of Water & Power (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 677, 684-685, 181 Cal. Rptr. 868* ; *Lubey v. City and County of San Francisco (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 340, 346, 159 Cal. Rptr. 440]* , commonly termed "name-clearing" hearings [*Codd v. Velger (1977) 429 U.S. 624, 627, 97 S. Ct. 882, 51 L. Ed. 2d 92]* , does not clearly identify which party has the burden of establishing that the dismissal would have that effect.

This burden relates to the employee's right to have a pre-termination hearing to refute the charges and clear his or her name, rather than to refute proof of the charges at a formal termination hearing, which may not be required by law. In several cases, the damage to reputation and future employment was assumed or implied by the court [*see* *Murden v.*

County of Sacramento (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 302, 308-309, 206 Cal. Rptr. 699 (charge concerning sexual conversations with other employees); *Lubey v. City and County of San Francisco (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 340, 347, 159 Cal. Rptr. 440* (court must assume that when police officers apply for new employment, potential employers will inquire into their prior job experience and reasons for their termination as policemen); *see also Paul v. Davis (1976) 424 U.S. 693, 711-712, 96 S. Ct. 1155, 47 L. Ed. 2d 405* (one of the charges impugned petitioner's character and morality, and, if circulated, would damage his reputation and seriously impair his ability to find employment in his chosen profession)].

The common characteristic of the cases in which the courts assume such consequences to character and future employment is that the termination or dismissal was based on charges of moral turpitude or sexual misconduct [*see Bollow v. Federal Reserve Bank (1981) 650 F.2d 1093, 1101 , cert. denied, 455 U.S. 948, 102 S. Ct. 1449, 71 L. Ed. 2d 662* (an accusation of moral turpitude is sufficiently serious to stigmatize the employee); *Murden v. County of Sacramento (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 302, 308, 206 Cal. Rptr. 699* (only the charge concerning sexual conversations with other employees provided grounds for a name-clearing hearing and allegations of incompetence did not)].

A few decisions suggest that the terminated employee has the burden of proving that the termination merits a name-clearing hearing [*see Williams v. Department of Water & Power (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 677, 684-685, 181 Cal. Rptr. 868* (appellant must show her dismissal was based on charges of misconduct that stigmatize her reputation or seriously impair her opportunity to earn a living, when termination was merely for excessive absenteeism, and civil service commission advised her that she could be considered for another job)].

When the basis for the termination is not identified, and the dismissal is publicly characterized as a vacation at the request of the employee, the stigmatizing effect of later publicity arising out of litigation will not be imputed to the dismissal [*Hill v. California State University, San Diego (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1081, 1091-1093, 238 Cal. Rptr. 799]* .

Once the right to a name-clearing hearing has been admitted or assumed, the evidentiary hearing on the merits of the termination resembles a traditional civil service dismissal case with the burden of proof on the agency to establish grounds for dismissal by a preponderance of the evidence [*see* discussion of standards of proof in § 473F.52]. The terminated individual is apprised of and given the opportunity to refute the charges [*Murden v. County of Sacramento (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 302, 312, 206 Cal. Rptr. 699]* .

[8] Teacher Dismissal or Suspension

The Education Code sets forth a complex statutory scheme identifying the grounds for dismissal or suspension of permanent certificated school employees, the rights and defenses available to those employees, and the hearing procedure used in those matters [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932-44956*]. The burden of proof in those proceedings is on the school district, which must establish cause for dismissal or suspension [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932-44934*]. Like an accusation [*see Gov. Code § 11503*], the written statement of charges must specify instances of behavior and the acts or omissions constituting the charge so that the teacher will be able to prepare his or her defense [*Educ. Code § 44934*].

A unique aspect of the statutory scheme is the required remedial period within which the employee may attempt to remedy unprofessional conduct and/or unsatisfactory performance [*Educ. Code § 44938*]. No reported case law addresses the burden of proof with regard to this provision. In practice, the charging party presents evidence that the opportunity for remediation was provided to the employee, with necessary written notice of the charges, and specific instances of behavior to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge [*Educ. Code § 44938(a), (b)*]. Apparently, the employee who asserts that the required remediation period was not provided, or that such an error operates as a bar to the dismissal or suspension, would have the burden of proof to establish those defenses. For a discussion of the applicable standard of proof in a teacher suspension or dismissal proceeding, see *§ 473F.52*.

[9] Benefit Entitlement

In the absence of a statutory provision to the contrary, the applicant for disability, retirement, or other such benefits has the burden of proof as the moving party to establish a right to the entitlement [*Greatorex v. Board of Administration (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 54, 57, 154 Cal. Rptr. 37* (retirement benefits); *Lindsay v. San Diego Ret. Bd. (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 156, 161, 41 Cal. Rptr. 737* (disability benefits)].

The legislative purpose of a benefit program may operate to alter the traditional burden on the moving party, or create presumptions affecting the allocation of the burden. For example, the state unemployment insurance program designed to provide benefits to claimants who have paid into the system has a presumption in favor of the applicant for benefits. In consequence, the employer has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence [*see § 473F.52*, for a discussion of standards of proof] that the benefits should be denied because the claimant was discharged for misconduct or quit without cause [*Perales v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 332, 340-341, 108 Cal. Rptr. 167]* .

The burden of proof in a benefit entitlement matter may shift to the agency when modification or suspension of benefits to current recipients is proposed. For example, the applicant for disability retirement benefits from the Public Employees Retirement System [*see Gov. Code § 21150* (mandatory retirement for disability)] has the burden of proving a substantial inability to perform the usual duties of the job, and that burden is unaffected by the general rule that pension statutes are to be liberally construed [*Mansperger v. Public Employees' Retirement System (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 873, 876-877, 86 Cal. Rptr. 450]* .

Once the claimant has been found to be disabled, however, the burden in a hearing to establish cause to cancel those benefits appears to shift to the agency to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the retiree is sufficiently recovered from the disability to resume the job duties [*Gov. Code §§ 21197, 21198*; *Cansdale v. Board of Administration (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 656, 665, 130 Cal. Rptr. 880* ; *see § 473F.52*, for a discussion of standards of proof].

[10] Safety Regulation Enforcement

The enforcement of CAL/OSHA safety regulations and the assessment of civil penalties for violation of those regulations required that the enforcing agency, the Department of Industrial Regulations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health, has the burden of proof to establish a prima facie case but showing a lack of reasonable diligence was not part of the prima facie case. The employer subject to the penalty assessment had the responsibility to show reasonable diligence as an affirmative defense under the controlling statute, *Labor Code § 6432*. [*Overaa Construction v. California Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 235, 246-247, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 154* (employer failed to assert reasonable diligence as a defense at the administrative hearing)].

[11] Review on Appeal

In an administrative hearing, the better practice is for the ALJ or agency to clearly state in the decision the party on whom the burden was placed and the standard of proof applied [*see § 473F.52*].

In the absence of such a clear statement, however, the reviewing court will not assume an error. Administrative findings need not be stated with the formality required of judicial findings, and therefore will be liberally construed to support rather than defeat the order under review [*Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 212-213, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofBurden ShiftingGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.52

§ 473F.52 Standard of Proof

[1] Preponderance of Evidence Standard

Just as the nature of the proceeding determines who has the burden of proof, it also determines by what standard of proof that burden is satisfied. In general, except in license revocation or suspension proceedings, the "preponderance of evidence" standard applicable in civil proceedings [*see Evid. Code § 115*] is also used in administrative hearings [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 204, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795]* . The preponderance of evidence standard is also used in proceedings to suspend or revoke food processor's licenses because these licenses are not professional licenses that require substantial education and training prior to applying for the license [*San Benito Foods v. Veneman (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1889, 1894-1895, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571* ; *see* [2][a], *below*, for discussion of burden of proof standard used in professional license suspension or revocation proceedings].

"Preponderance of evidence" is usually defined in terms of probability of truth--that is, when the evidence has more convincing force than the evidence opposed to it [*People v. Superior Court (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 316, 319 n.4, 95 Cal. Rptr. 757* ; *see* Witkin, *California Evidence*, § 157 (3d ed. 1986)]. For further discussion of the preponderance of the evidence standard, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[2] Clear and Convincing Evidence Standard

[a] Applicable to Revocation of Professional Licenses

In a disciplinary action to revoke or suspend a professional license, which concerns "the totality of professional employment opportunity involving vested interest rights," the standard of proof is "clear and convincing evidence to a reasonable certainty" [*Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 856, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* (suspension of doctor's license); *Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 212-213, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71* (revocation of real estate license); *see* *Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1040, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795* (because hearing involved only dismissal of teacher, rather than deprivation of his right to pursue his profession, "clear and convincing" standard did not apply)].

[b] Inapplicable to Citations

Courts apparently have not extended the "clear and convincing evidence" standard to any discipline of a professional license, such as public reproval or termination of a particular employment, which is less than revocation or suspension. *The Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* , court's clear identification of license hearings to revoke or suspend a professional license, without listing the lesser forms of discipline against a license, has resulted in the application of the *Ettinger* standard only in revocation or suspension proceedings.

Thus, the preponderance of the evidence standard is used in less severe disciplinary proceedings against a licensee, such as a license citation authorized by the statutes regulating contractors [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 7099-7124.6*], optometrists [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 3095*], and automotive repair facilities [*Health & Safety Code § 44050*].

[c] Inapplicable to Teacher Dismissal Hearings

Counsel in teacher dismissal or suspension proceedings [*see § 473F.51[8]*] frequently assert that the *Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* , standard should apply.

The argument has repeatedly failed because the courts reason that only a particular job with a particular school district is at issue, and not the employee's teaching credential [*see Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing may, however, revoke a credential in a separate hearing for the same acts or matters charged to dismiss a teacher [*see Educ. Code §§ 44420-44437* (grounds for suspension or revocation of credential)], or for criminal convictions that may be grounds for dismissal [*see Educ. Code §§ 44424, 44426, 44437* (specified criminal offenses constituting grounds for revocation of certificate); *see also Educ. Code §§ 44932(a)(8), (11)* (dismissal upon conviction of felony or any crime involving moral turpitude, or for alcoholism or drug abuse), 44940 (compulsory leave of absence and suspension of credential for teachers charged with sex offenses, specified drug offenses, murder, or attempted murder; notice of dismissal and employee's right to request hearing)].

Like other license revocation hearings under the APA [*see Educ. Code § 44246* (credential revocation hearings must be held pursuant to the APA)], the clear and convincing standard applies to teacher license revocation hearings as well [*see Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039-1040, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795* (court stated that although preponderance of the evidence standard applied to teacher dismissal, higher standard of proof would apply in hearing for revocation of teaching credential); *Carl S. v. Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 365, 369, 178 Cal. Rptr. 753* (commission had burden of presenting evidence establishing a prima facie case against the teacher for immoral conduct); *see also Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 238, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375* (court held that teacher's life diplomas could not be revoked for homosexual conduct unrelated to teacher's fitness to teach)].

[d] Instructions Regarding Standard

Board or panel members frequently request further description or explanation of the commonly termed " *Ettinger* standard" [*Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601]* .

The ALJ may advise them that the burden is greater than preponderance of the evidence, but less than proof beyond a reasonable doubt [*see* [3], *below*]. For this reason, an explanation of the standard to be applied in the case may be given to the ALJ for use as instructions during the executive session in which the case will be considered [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)* (decision in case)].

Such proposed instructions should be provided in writing to the opposing counsel and the ALJ prior to the commencement of the hearing to permit consideration and review. Counsel may solicit the stipulation of opposing counsel to the suggested language. Opposing counsel and the ALJ will likely disfavor proposed instructions first presented at the conclusion of the respondent's case. Parties and counsel do not have a right to be present during panel instruction; that activity is considered to be part of the executive session.

[3] Criminal Standard

The courts have rejected arguments that the criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt should apply in administrative hearings, reasoning that the need to protect the public from incompetence warrants a lower standard of proof than is required to punish a criminal offender [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 225, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* ; *Webster v. Board of Dental Examiners (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 534, 537-538, 110 P.2d 992* ; *Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 213, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.53

§ 473F.53 Meeting the Burden of Proof

[1] Admissions

[a] Types of Admissible Evidence

An agency may use a party's admissions to meet the burden of proof in an administrative hearing. For example, the out-of-court admissions of the respondent may alone support the necessary findings, even when the respondent at hearing denies making the admission [*Hansen v. Civil Service Board (1957) 147 Cal. App. 2d 732, 737-738, 305 P.2d 1012* (firefighter made admissions regarding his presence in the firehouse on and off duty in an intoxicated condition)].

In addition, statements contained in a stipulated settlement of a related civil action for fraud and misrepresentation, or in an affidavit of the licensee, are admissible in a discipline hearing as admissions of the licensee [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 546, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Bohn v. Watson (1954) 130 Cal. App. 2d 24, 26, 33, 278 P.2d 454]* . Furthermore, a default judgment in a civil action may be used as a judicial admission in a subsequent proceeding [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 532, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

[b] Criminal Admissions

A guilty plea to a criminal offense constitutes an admission of every element of the charged offense, and that admission may be used in an administrative discipline proceeding as if the defendant had been tried before a jury and found guilty on evidence covering all material facts [*Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 190, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357* , citing *People v. Ward (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 604, 258 P.2d 86]* .

For example, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 480* and *490*, governing contractors, permit license discipline or denial on the ground of conviction of a crime substantially related to the duties, functions, or qualifications of a licensee [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 480, 490*]. For those purposes, a "conviction" includes a plea of guilty, a verdict of guilty, and a conviction on a plea of nolo contendere [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 480(a)(1)*; *Hollingsworth v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 172, 176, 10 Cal. Rptr. 343]* . A plea of nolo contendere itself is not an admission absent a conviction on that plea [*In re Hallinan (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 243, 247, 272 P.2d 768]* .

A nolo contendere plea can not be admitted into evidence and can not be used at an administrative disciplinary hearing conducted by a county civil service commission [*County of Los Angeles v. Civil Service Com. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 620, 627-628, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256]* .

In practice, to meet the burden of proof to establish conviction of a crime, the agency presents further evidence or argument that the conviction is related to the subject license. Frequently, a convicted licensee or applicant will present evidence that the conviction is unrelated to the scope of a license. However, presentation of evidence of ongoing psychotherapy, indicia of the respondent's remorse, or suggested probationary terms limiting the licensee's activities may be a more effective strategy [*see § 473F.30* et seq., regarding the introduction of mitigating and extenuating evidence].

[2] Hearsay

[a] Need for Objection

Gov. Code § 11513(d) provides that hearsay evidence may be used to supplement or explain other evidence, but over timely objection will not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *Daniels v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 532, 538, 189 Cal. Rptr. 512, 658 P.2d 1313* ; *Imachi v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 809, 817, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478]* .

As discussed in *§ 473F.30* et seq., under the new act, the APA provides that hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but over timely objection is not sufficient in itself to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions. The objection is timely if made before submission of the case or on reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)* (operative July 1, 1997)].

This statutory amendment expressly requires a timely objection and therefore resolves a split in the courts over whether an objection was required for administrative hearsay to be insufficient to support fact findings other than when it is used to supplement or explain other evidence. This split existed under former Gov. Code. Code § 11513(c), as interpreted by the various districts of the California Court of Appeal regarding whether administrative hearsay that has not been objected to may be used to make a finding of fact [*see Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 546, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* (court stated that hearsay evidence that has not been objected to serves to shift the burden of producing evidence of the existence or nonexistence of fact disclosed); *Martin v. State Personnel Bd. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 573, 582-583, 103 Cal. Rptr. 306* (court stated that, contrary to *Borror* and other cases, the absence of objection to hearsay will not support a finding of fact)].

The general rule in administrative matters not governed by the APA is that hearsay alone will not sustain a finding [*Walker v. City of San Gabriel (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 879, 881, 129 P.2d 349* ; *Layton v. Merit System Commission (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 58, 67, 131 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . Some courts have held that hearsay admitted without objection is sufficient to sustain a finding [*Frudden Enterprises, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 262, 270, 201 Cal. Rptr. 371]* . For further discussion of the use of hearsay in administrative proceedings, see *§ 473F.30* et seq.

[b] Exceptions to Hearsay

In practice, when a quantity of hearsay comes into the administrative record, no identification of particular evidence as an exception to the hearsay rule is made. In a court proceeding, an objection will trigger counsel's argument on the evidence--for example, whether a document is a business record--and the judge's ruling will be made on the record and may be reviewed on appeal. Many ALJs offer an equivalent procedure to permit counsel to argue that ostensible hearsay is civilly admissible and may sustain a finding and to permit a ruling on the record of the characterization of the

evidence. These ALJs advise counsel or the parties that the proponent asserting an exception to the hearsay rule must immediately identify that exception when the evidence comes in; the parties will then argue or agree to the matter and a ruling will be made on the record. In the alternative, an ALJ may take the matter under submission, accept briefs on the issue, and indicate the characterization of the evidence in the proposed decision. Diligent counsel will request that practice or another means of establishing that evidence is admissible over objection when the evidence is essential to the case and should not be considered as mere hearsay.

[3] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

As discussed in *§ 473F.30* et seq., the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel are applicable to administrative hearings in which the agency exercises a quasi-judicial function and resolves disputed issues of fact properly before it which the parties have had an adequate opportunity to litigate [*see People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 478-479, 489-490, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* (administrative decision collaterally estopped a subsequent criminal prosecution on the same charges); citing *United States v. Utah Constr. Co. (1966) 384 U.S. 394, 422, 86 S. Ct. 1545, 16 L. Ed. 2d 642]* .

Application of these theories is particularly difficult because the status or ranking of the various administrative tribunals that have jurisdiction over related controversies is unclear, and the outcome may well depend on which forum can provide the earliest hearing. Further difficulty results from the conflicts in the reported cases, acknowledged by the Supreme Court to be "probably impossible to distinguish or reconcile" [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 477, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* , and the different burdens of proof applied in civil, criminal, and administrative matters [*see § 473F.52*].

[4] Official Notice

[a] Used to Satisfy Burden of Proof

As discussed in *§ 473F.30* et seq., an ALJ or agency may take official notice of any fact that may be judicially noticed by a court [*see Evid. Code §§ 450-460* (judicial notice); *see* California Trial Guide, Unit 20], and of any generally accepted technical or scientific matter within the agency's technical field [*Gov. Code § 11515*].

The burden of proof may be met in whole or in part by official notice [*Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 194, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357* (court stated that official notice, used by hearing officer to ascertain that certain drugs were "dangerous," provides a shorthand method of proving facts over which there is no dispute)].

Official notice may be used to contradict other evidence, and support findings of fact and a judgment based on those findings [*Mack v. State Board of Education (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 370, 373, 36 Cal. Rptr. 677* ; *Del Bosque v. Singh (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 487, 489, 65 P.2d 951]* . An agency may officially notice evidence presented in a prior related proceeding; that evidence may rebut proof offered at the pending proceeding [*Brewer v. Railroad Commission (1922) 190 Cal. 60, 78, 210 P. 511]* .

[b] Practical Considerations

Counsel who propose that an ALJ or agency take official notice of a matter should make a timely request, with copies of written materials for opposing counsel and the record as appropriate [*Gov. Code § 11515*; *see § 473F.30* et seq.]. An ALJ will frequently solicit counsel to request official notice of a matter that will aid the trier of fact, such as a technical dictionary to assist in the review of reports in evidence containing technical terms.

Requests for official notice of statutory and decisional law, standard texts such as the Uniform Building Code, or common slang such as street names for drugs, are generally granted; however, sociological or political matters are

problematic [*see* *Mack v. State Board of Education (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 370, 374, 36 Cal. Rptr. 677* (fact that the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of U.S. federal and state government by violence or other unlawful means, officially noticed by hearing officer, is not "of common and general knowledge, and certain and indisputable")].

Even "scientific" matters may be inappropriate for official notice, when no clear consensus exists (*e.g.*, the appropriate treatment of allergies), or when technical knowledge is in its infancy (*e.g.*, AIDS research). An ALJ or agency may leave resolution of many contested scientific or technical matters to the merits of the evidence offered by the parties, rather than taking official notice of those matters. Furthermore, an ALJ will be disinclined to take official notice of matters disputed by the parties, even with the opportunity for rebuttal required by *Gov. Code § 11515*. When a dispute exists, the ALJ may attempt to have the parties stipulate to the controverted matter. Such a stipulation, like official notice, is a substitute for formal proof.

When a request for official notice is denied, counsel must be prepared to prove the matter by other evidence. He or she is unlikely to obtain a continuance merely because the denial was not anticipated.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceOfficial NoticeCriminal Law & ProcedureGuilty PleasGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayExceptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofTimeliness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.54

§ 473F.54 Shifting the Burden of Proof

[1] Equitable Estoppel

[a] Nature of Doctrine

The doctrine of equitable estoppel prevents a party who has intentionally led another by statement or conduct to believe a matter is true and to act on that belief from contradicting that statement or conduct in litigation arising from it [*Evid. Code § 623*]. In order to invoke the doctrine of equitable estoppel to bar the moving party from proceeding with the action, the party seeking to invoke the doctrine must establish the following elements [*Driscoll v. City of Los Angeles (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 297, 305, 61 Cal. Rptr. 661, 431 P.2d 245* ; *Morrison v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 211, 217, 252 Cal. Rptr. 293* ; *Evans v. City of Los Angeles (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 142, 148-149, 193 Cal. Rptr. 282]* :

- The party to be estopped must be apprised of the facts.
- The party to be estopped must intend that his or her conduct will be acted on, or must so act that the party asserting the estoppel had a right to believe it was so intended.
- The other party must be ignorant of the true state of the facts.
- The other party must rely on the conduct to his or her injury.

While the existence of estoppel is a question of law, the proponent of the theory has the burden of producing evidence of the elements of estoppel [*see* *Evans v. City of Los Angeles (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 142, 150, 193 Cal. Rptr. 282* (appellant failed to show that (1) respondent intended his conduct to be acted on, and (2) appellant relied on the conduct)]. Estoppel will not be recognized when the party asserting estoppel has knowledge of the true facts, and therefore can not prove the 3rd element (ignorance of the true facts) [*In re A.O. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1054, 1059, 16 Cal. Rptr 3d 117]* .

As a practical matter, the burden then shifts to the party to be estopped (usually the government agency) to establish that despite such elements estoppel should not lie, or that the application of the theory to the subject case should be limited.

[b] Application to Administrative Agencies

Early cases expressed judicial reluctance to apply the doctrine against a governmental entity, based on the traditional concept of sovereign immunity. Ordinarily, estoppel should not be invoked when to do so would be harmful to some specific public policy or public interest, or when it would enlarge the power of a governmental agency or expand the authority of a public official [*Shoban v. Board of Trustees (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 534, 544, 81 Cal. Rptr. 112]* .

The court in *Crumpler v. Board of Administration (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 567, 108 Cal. Rptr. 293* , after an exhaustive analysis of the history and present application of the theory, found that a city police department was estopped from reclassifying its animal control officers from "safety" to "miscellaneous retirement system" members, retroactively to the date of membership in the system. Nevertheless, the court would not extend estoppel to preclude the board from reclassifying petitioners prospectively from the date of the board's decision. It found that public interest and policy would be adversely affected if petitioners, despite the discovery of the mistaken classification, were required to be continued to be carried as local safety members when all other contract members performing similar duties and functions were classified as miscellaneous members [*Crumpler v. Board of Administration (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 567, 584, 108 Cal. Rptr. 293]* .

The California Supreme Court recently recognized the validity of the defense of equitable estoppel to prohibit welfare agencies from enforcing procedural conditions to eligibility of welfare recipients. In so holding, the Court concluded that application of equitable estoppel to administrative agencies does not violate the judicial powers doctrine [*Lentz v. McMahon, 49 Cal. 3d 393, 406-407, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83 (1989)]* . Equitable estoppel was applied to preclude a county from recouping public assistance payments from a father when the county had knowledge of the father's whereabouts, and failed to notify him. [*County of Orange v. Carl D. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 429, 431-432, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 440]* .

The Court of Appeal held that the Franchise Tax Board was estopped from asserting that the taxpayer had failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing a lawsuit when the Board had offered to deny the taxpayers' refund claim summarily so that the taxpayer could file a lawsuit. The Board claimed that the taxpayer had underpaid state taxes by $97,000. The taxpayer paid the taxes and filed a claim for a refund. The Board conceded that no tax was due, but argued that the tax paid by the taxpayer should be retained by the board because of the taxpayer's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The Court of Appeal applied the doctrine of equitable estoppel and concluded that the Board was estopped from asserting procedural limits on the taxpayer's claim for a refund [*J.H. McKnight Ranch, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 978, 991-993, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 339]* .

However, the party asserting estoppel must have relied to his or her detriment on the misleading governmental policy or the estoppel doctrine will not be applicable [*Robinson v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 226, 244-245, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d. 782, 825 P. 2d 767* ; *Walsh v. Board of Administration (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 682, 710, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118]* .

The First District Division 2 California Court of Appeal rejected the application of equitable estoppel against a city and county and its airport commission that had reduced incentives to taxicab drivers operating clean air taxicabs serving San Francisco Airport. The court of appeal rejected the estoppel defense because the taxicab drivers could not have reasonably relied upon the city incentives resolution as binding the city to make no further changes in the incentives contained in the resolution. The drivers sued the city for breach of contract when incentives for CNG cabs were reduced by action of the city and county. The drivers argued that equitable estoppel should be applied to estop the city from denying liability for breach of contract. The court of appeal rejected the defense because of a lack of reasonable reliance by the drivers, and because the court did not want to limit the city's exercise of the police power through the recognition

of equitable estoppel [*Cotta v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1550, 1566-1568, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 612*].

The Third District California Court of Appeal applied the principles of equitable estoppel to excuse the filing of an untimely administrative complaint before the Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the failure to exhaust administrative remedies by an employee who brought an employment discrimination action against an employer. Equitable estoppel applied because the employee diligently pursued the administrative remedy and reasonably relied on the conduct of department officials that the limitations period was not something to be concerned about [*Holland v. Union Pacific Railroad Company (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 940, 946-948, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 145*].

The California Court of Appeal held that the California Coastal Commission did not deprive a developer of the due process right to participate in an appeal hearing based on statements made by the commission staff that the developer probably did not have to attend the appeal hearing. The court rejected an equitable estoppel defense concluding that the developer could not have reasonably relied on staff recommendations not to attend the appeal hearing. The appeal hearing was to consider an appeal of a coastal development permit received by the developer from a local government body. The developer was presumed to know the law, that the commission, not the staff, decides what actions are taken at appeal hearings. Finally, the developer could not show prejudice to his development project from his failure to appear at the appeal hearing, as the developer appeared at a later do novo hearing at which he was given the opportunity to challenge the appeal [*Benson v. Cal. Coastal Comm'n (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 348, 355-356, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 580]* .

The Court of Appeal held that a city was estopped from arguing that a landowner's failure to bring an administrative mandate action bars thelandowner's right to recover damages for the value of property from the city in a condemnation proceeding. The city was estopped because it had illegally violated a preliminary injunction granted against it prohibiting the very action, building a curb that eliminated a driveway and a parking space, the lawfulness of which could have determined by a writ of administrative mandate. The city was also estopped because it elected to file a condemnation lawsuit against the landowner, and that was a remedy that was inconsistent with the argument that the landowner must file an administrative mandate action to determine whether the city's building action was lawful. Finally, the city was estopped because the landowner, in filing an action for a permanent injunction against the city, was complying with the substance of an administrative mandate action requirement [*Hurwitz v. City of Orange (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 835, 843, 845-846, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 213]* .

The estoppel doctrine will not be recognized when the party asserting estoppel knew the true facts and, therefore, could not have detrimentally relied on the other party's misleading conduct. Estoppel will also not be recognized when a governmental policy that benefits the public would be invalidated by applying estoppel to the government entity [*Santa Barbara County Flower & Nursery Growers Ass'n v. County of Santa Barbara (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 864, 876, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489]* . Estoppel will also not be recognized when applying estoppel will have the effect of rewriting a statutory limitation on a benefit or privilege (time spent by a teacher teaching under an emergency permit is excluded by statute from the time needed to establish permanent status as a teacher) [*Smith v. Governing Bd. of Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 563, 569-570, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* . Estoppel will also not be recognized when the party asserting estoppel has not been misled by the agency. In this case, the school district did not mislead the teacher as to the legal effect of the teacher's employment under an emergency permit [*Smith v. Governing Bd. of Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 563, 569-570, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* .

Some courts will apply waiver as a doctrine that precludes a government agency from taking a position on appeal of a challenge to agency action. The California Court of Appeal rejected a waiver argument and concluded that the County of Santa Barbara did not waive a statutory exemption under the Coastal Commission Act [*Pub. Resources Code §§ 21080.5, 21080.9*] from completing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) when it unnecessarily prepared an EIR as part of a proposed amendment to its local coastal plan related to greenhouse development [*Santa Barbara County Flower & Nursery Growers Ass'n v. County of Santa Barbara (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 864, 868-869, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489]* .

Furthermore, the Court of Appeal held that a taxpayer was estopped from benefitting from a statutory provision [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)*] that continued a taxpayer's declared valuation of real property when the assessment board failed to decide an application for tax assessment reduction within two years of the date that the taxpayer filed the application. The Board required the taxpayer to complete a general waiver of the two-year time period for completing the Board decision. The taxpayer filed a limited waiver, which did not comply with the Board requirement, the Board mistakenly accepted the limited waiver, and the taxpayer demanded the benefit of the valuation rule. The Court of Appeal held that the taxpayer was estopped to claim the benefit of the rule because the taxpayer was guilty of a "wrongful misleading silence" in failing to inform the board that it had mistakenly accepted the taxpayer's limited waiver when its policy required a general waiver [*Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 41-42, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658]* .

The California Court of Appeal rejected the assertion of equitable estoppel against an employee organization by a school district because the litigation position of the organization was not inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement that addressed similar issue. Since there was no inconsistency, there was no change of position by the school district, and no basis for the application of equitable estoppel as a defense [*California School Employees Association v. Tustin Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 510, 521-522, 55 Cal. Rptr.3d 739* (laches and unclean hands defenses were also rejected)].

Another California Court of Appeal rejected the application of equitable estoppel as a defense to enforcement of a restoration order by the California Coastal Commission against a home owner with a three hole golf course on the homeowner's property [*Feduniak v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1381-1382, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591]* . The Court of Appeal rejected this defense against the Coastal Commission because of lack of proof of three elements of estoppel: 1) The Commission lacked knowledge that the golf course violated the easement and permit conditions [*Feduniak v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1361-1362, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591]* ; 2) regulatory inaction by the Commission related to the golf course for many years did not satisfy the requirement that the Commission intended that others would take action based upon its failure to enforce the requirements of the law [*Feduniak v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1366-1368, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591* (no basis for detrimental reliance by homeowner merely because commission did not enforce the law for a number of years)]; and 3) application of estoppel against a government agency would nullify a strong land use related policy designed to protect the public [*Feduniak v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1375-1376, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591]* .

The California Supreme Court held that the City of Goleta was not estopped to deny approval of a developer's subdivision's map because no city official expressly represented that it would give approval. Also, the city's adoption of county ordinances at the time the city incorporated did not create a reasonable expectation on the developer's part that its final subdivision map would receive ministerial approval by the city [City of Goleta v. Superior Court *(2006) 40 Cal. 4th 270, 279-281, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 114, 147 P. 3d 1037]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a county was subject to estoppel based on the language used in a claim rejection letter under the procedures required by the California Tort Claims Act. The language of the letter estopped the county for asserting the defense of statutes of limitation under the Tort Claims Act [*Sofranek v. Merced County (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1250-1252, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426* (claim rejection letter language was reasonably relied upon by claimant who filed his lawsuit consistent with reasonable understanding of six-month limitations language in second claim rejection letter)].

[c] When Estoppel Does Not Apply

Even when the proponent of the doctrine has established all of the elements of estoppel, the doctrine will not bind a governmental agency when the public protection would be endangered or an expansion of the agency's authority would result [*Morrison v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 211, 218-219, 252 Cal. Rptr. 293* ; *Pettitt v. City of Fresno (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 813, 823, 110 Cal. Rptr. 262* (city was not estopped from denying the validity

of a building permit issued in violation of a zoning ordinance); *Merco Constr. Engineers, Inc. v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 154, 160, 79 Cal. Rptr. 23* (estoppel cannot be used to enlarge an agency's power, set forth by statute)].

Furthermore, estoppel will not bar a licensing agency from revoking a license erroneously issued or retained in contravention of law [*Jacques, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 448, 462, 318 P.2d 6* (liquor license was revoked for lewd shows on premises); *Joseph George, Distributor v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 702, 712-713, 308 P.2d 773* (liquor license revoked for inactive business)], or compel an agency to employ an individual who does not meet civil service standards [*Patten v. Cal. State Personnel Board (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 168, 173, 234 P.2d 987* (temporary employee did not rank on list of eligible persons for permanent position)].

In a case in which a funeral director's license was revoked for violation of statutory trust provisions, even assuming that the licensee established all of the elements of estoppel, the strong public policy and a statute prohibiting the licensee's unauthorized use of funds received in connection with preneed funeral arrangement would prohibit the application of estoppel against the licensing agency [*Mount Vernon Memorial Park v. Board of Funeral Directors & Embalmers (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 874, 888, 145 Cal. Rptr. 275]* . Before a litigant can assert estoppel against an administrative agency, the agency must engage in some affirmative misleading conduct [*Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1053, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286]* . Equitable estoppel will not apply against a public agency when application of equitable estoppel would nullify strong rule of public policy or would expand agency's powers in contravention of statutes and constitutional considerations [*Fleice v. Chualar Union Elementary School Dist. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 886, 893-895, 254 Cal. Rptr. 54]* . For example, it did not apply to prevent an agency from revoking an architect's license, as that would violate the public policy of precluding licensure of those found to be unfit to practice that profession [*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 763, 793-794, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 952 P. 2d 641]* .

[2] Affirmative Defenses

[a] Burden on Respondent

Although the burden of proof in a disciplinary action is on the party bringing the charges [*Parker v. City of Fountain Valley (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 99, 113, 179 Cal. Rptr. 351* (city denied police officer due process in termination hearing by failing to assume the burden of proving charge that he had used excessive force in making arrest); *see § 473F.51[7]*], the burden of proof is on the respondent to establish an affirmative defense [*Anderson v. Board of Dental Examiners (1915) 27 Cal. App. 336, 338, 149 P. 1006]* .

Decisional law, however, does not address whether the standard of proof is identical to the standard by which the moving party must establish its case [*see § 473F.52*, for a discussion of standards of proof]. In a license revocation proceeding in which a dentist was charged with permitting an unlicensed employee to use the paraphernalia of his office to perform dental work, the burden of proof at the outset of the hearing was on the licensing agency; the burden of proof to establish the affirmative defense that the employee was in fact licensed was on the respondent [*Anderson v. Board of Dental Examiners (1915) 27 Cal. App. 336, 338, 149 P. 1006* ; *see Whetstone v. Board of Dental Exmrs. (1927) 87 Cal. App. 156, 164, 261 P. 1077]* .

[b] Claim of Discrimination

Respondents who are the subject of discipline in a variety of civil service, licensing, permit issuance, zoning, and other administrative matters may endeavor to assert as an "affirmative defense" that the proceeding or parties to it are motivated by discriminatory intent or bias. In *Overturf v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 979, 985-986, 150 Cal. Rptr. 657* , discriminatory enforcement was impliedly recognized as a valid defense in an

administrative disciplinary hearing against three pari-mutuel employees, but the evidence did not establish selective enforcement on an invidious basis under the *equal protection clause*.

In consequence, the application of the defense to proven charges was not addressed by the court [*Overturf v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 979, 985-986, 150 Cal. Rptr. 657]* . *Overturf* is significant for the incorporation of an invidious criterion standard. A person alleging that he or she has been discriminatorily picked out must demonstrate that he or she has been deliberately singled out for prosecution on the basis of some invidious criterion. The unlawful administration by state officers of a state statute that is fair on its face, resulting in its unequal application to those who are entitled to be treated alike, is not a denial of equal protection unless it contains an element of intentional or purposeful discrimination [*Overturf v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 979, 985, 150 Cal. Rptr. 657* , *quoting Murgia v. Municipal Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 286, 297, 124 Cal. Rptr. 204, 540 P.2d 44]* .

In practice, ALJs will frequently require the party asserting the defense to make an offer of proof such as that used in a court proceeding to overcome the presumption of good faith prosecution [*see Evid. Code § 664*; *see also* Ch. 551, *Trial*]. The proponent is required to describe the evidence that will be offered to show that the respondent was deliberately singled out for prosecution on the basis of an identified invidious criterion, and that the disciplinary proceeding would not have been pursued except for the discriminatory intent of the moving party [*People v. Smith (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 1103, 1133, 203 Cal. Rptr. 196]* .

In order to successfully assert the defense that an agency discriminated against a licensee, it is necessary to show that (1) other violators not only had not been, but would not be proceeded against; and (2) that the failure to proceed against the other violators was not due to laxity of enforcement or some other reason, but was arbitrary, purposeful, and intended to discriminate against that licensee [*Ehrlich v. McConnell (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 280, 288, 29 Cal. Rptr. 283]* .

[c] Discrimination in License Testing Procedures

When bias or discrimination in the testing procedures of the licensing agency is admitted or assumed, those errors alone do not entitle the applicant to a license. The court will not assume the discretion of the agency to order licensure of an applicant who has otherwise not established that he or she has passed the licensing examination. Whatever other orders the court may issue to correct improper action by an agency, it does not have the expertise to make the ultimate determination as to the qualifications of a particular applicant [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Jaffee v. Psychology Examining Com. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 160, 169, 154 Cal. Rptr. 687]* .

Similarly, an ALJ will not order licensure of an applicant who has not passed an allegedly biased examination.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelElementsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofBurden ShiftingEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofOffers of Proof

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Burden of Proof at the Hearing

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.55-473F.59

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.60

§ 473F.60 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.61

§ 473F.61 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.62

§ 473F.62 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.1-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing Activity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.63

§ 473F.63 Decisions

[1] General Requirements

Disciplinary action against licensee, finding licensee guilty of gross incompetence, is invalid when administrative record is completely devoid of any statute, rule, regulation, or evidence of an implied standard by which to measure competence of licensee's conduct. *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 527-528, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693*

Administrative regulations that violate acts of Legislature are void. *Selby v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 470, 474, 168 Cal. Rptr. 36*

Act in excess of agency's authority under enabling law are void. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Subject of administrative proceeding is entitled to have statutory procedures strictly followed and fairly construed. *California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Personnel Commission (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 145, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Administrative regulation contrary to enabling law is void. *California School Employees Assn. v. Personnel Com. of Pajaro Valley Unified School Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 144, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436*

Agency is not free to ignore its own validly established procedures. *Frates v. Burnett (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 63, 71, 87 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Reference to Administrative Procedure Act for guidance is proper in case not governed by act or other law. *Rudolph v. Athletic Commission (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 1, 12, 1 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Requirements of due process. *Connolly Development, Inc. v. Superior Court of Merced County (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 803, 818, 823, 132 Cal. Rptr. 477, 553 P.2d 637* ; *Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 208-209, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *Beaudreau v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 448, 458, 121 Cal. Rptr. 585, 535 P.2d*

713

[2] Conduct of Hearing

Who may or must be party to administrative proceeding depends on purpose and effect of proceeding and particular statute under which proceeding brought; standard set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 389*, requiring joinder of necessary and indispensible parties in judicial proceedings, is not appropriate for administrative proceedings when joinder of parties would defeat purpose of administrative proceeding. *Nevada County Office of Education v. Riles (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 767, 775, 777, 197 Cal. Rptr. 152*

Agency is entitled to allow hearing officer to conduct hearing alone and present proposed decision to agency. *Armistead v. City of Los Angeles (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 319, 324, 313 P.2d 127*

Agency is entitled to begin hearing along with hearing officer and then withdraw midway through, leaving hearing officer to conclude hearing alone. *Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 421, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465*

[3] Contempt

Persons subject to license revocation proceeding are entitled to petition superior court to seek enforcement of subpoena when administrative agency refuses to seek enforcement of subpoena under *Gov. Code § 11525*. *Gilbert v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 161, 167, 238 Cal. Rptr. 220*

[4] Disqualification of Counsel

In case not governed by APA, county counsel's office that acts as both advocate for county sheriff and adviser to county quasi-independent administrative board in deputy sheriff's hearing before board is not subject to disqualification on due process grounds if deputy county counsel represents sheriff, county counsel advises board, and county counsel's office can assure that adviser for board is screened from inappropriate contact with advocate for sheriff. *Howitt v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1575, 1586-1587, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 196*

[5] Estoppel

Existence of estoppel is largely a question of fact; weighing of policy concerns that must be conducted in case of estoppel against government are, in part, a question of law. *Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 403, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83*

Administrative hearing is appropriate forum for determining applicability of equitable estoppel, in absence of statute barring administrative consideration of estoppel. *Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 402-406, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83*

Balancing test is used to determine whether equitable estoppel should apply against governmental entity; estoppel is applicable if policy interests against application of estoppel are outweighed by burden on individual that would result if estoppel not applied. *Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 400-401, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83*

Estoppel is applicable against government when required by justice and right, but inapplicable when it would result in nullification of strong rule of policy adopted for benefit of public. *Morrison v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 211, 218, 252 Cal. Rptr. 293* (government not estopped from excluding from racetrack person

convicted of crime involving moral turpitude)

[6] Evidence

Administrative board is required to accept intended meaning of uncontradicted and unimpeached evidence as true. *Martori Brothers Distributors v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 721, 728, 175 Cal. Rptr. 626, 631 P.2d 60*

Ex parte observation of evidence by hearing officer is permissible when hearing officer provides parties sufficient notice of, and opportunity to respond to evidence obtained from observation. *Zuniga v. County of San Mateo Dep't of Health Services (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1521, 1531-1532 n.8, 267 Cal. Rptr. 755*

Inapplicability of exclusionary and vicarious exclusionary rules developed in criminal cases in disciplinary proceeding against doctor. *Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 616-626, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Split of authority as to whether or not uncorroborated hearsay evidence can be used to support finding when hearsay was admitted without objection. *Carl S. v. Commission for Teacher Preparation & Licensing (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 365, 370-371, 178 Cal. Rptr. 753*

Oral evidence is taken only on oath or affirmation, and use of unsworn witnesses is agency violation of procedural due process in hearing on termination of participant in methadone maintenance program. *Marlow v. OrangeCounty Human Services Agency (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 290, 292, 167 Cal. Rptr. 776*

Evidence of misdemeanor conviction is admissible at disciplinary hearing if relevant on issue of credibility or as tending to prove or disprove a material fact in issue. *Coburn v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 801, 809, 148 Cal. Rptr. 134*

Criminal theories of evidence are generally inapplicable in administrative trial. *Schullman v. State Bar (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 526, 536 n.4, 111 Cal. Rptr. 161, 516 P.2d 865* ; *Webster v. Board of Dental Examiners (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 534, 537-538, 110 P.2d 992*

Necessity to treat as evidence only such information as is presented at hearing. *Desert Turf Club v. Board of Supervisors (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 446, 455, 296 P.2d 882*

Test for applicability of exclusionary rule. *Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 226-229, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991*

Evidence obtained by entrapment is inadmissible. *Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 364, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* ; *Governing Board v. Metcalf (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 546, 549, 111 Cal. Rptr. 724*

Evidence obtained by deceit is inadmissible. *Redner v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 83, 95, 95 Cal. Rptr. 447, 485 P.2d 799*

Rule against use of outside evidence. *Boreta Enterprises, Inc. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 85, 104, 84 Cal. Rptr. 113, 465 P.2d 1* ; *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158-159, 217 P.2d 22* ; *La Prade v. Department of Water & Power (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 47, 51, 162 P.2d 13* ; *Armistead v. City of Los Angeles (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 319, 324, 313 P.2d 127*

Hearsay is sufficient to support finding if admitted over objection pursuant to exception to hearsay rule. *Walker v. City of San Gabriel (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 879, 881, 129 P.2d 349* , disapproved on other grounds in *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 152, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Layton v. Merit System Commission (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 58, 68, 131 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Admissibility of record of conviction based on plea of nolo contendere. *Cartwright v. Board of Chiropractic Examiners (1974) 16 Cal. 3d 762, 768-774, 129 Cal. Rptr. 462, 548 P.2d 1134* ; *Grannis v. Board of Medical Examiners (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 551, 557, 96 Cal. Rptr. 863*

Agency is decider of credibility of witnesses. *Mullen v. Department of Real Estate (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 295, 301, 251 Cal. Rptr. 12* ; *Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 876, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351*

Respondent is entitled to invoke privilege against compelled self-incrimination if called to testify. *Ex parte Clarke (1894) 103 Cal. 352, 354*

Agency is not entitled to call respondent until respondent has had opportunity to present evidence. *O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 12, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862*

[7] Expert Witnesses

At administrative hearing to revoke license to operate family day care home for children, based on allegations that one of home operators had sexually abused child attending home, administrative law judge committed error in allowing testimony of child's psychiatrist that child had been molested because he viewed her behavior as consistent with "child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome"; syndrome was not shown to be scientific method of proving molestation that was generally accepted in scientific community in which it was developed. *Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 308-315, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422* (holding error harmless under facts of case)

[8] Presiding Officers

Request for appointment of hearing officer is not necessary; appointment is required under APA. *National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 593, 220 P.2d 962*

Hearing held without hearing officer, where one is required, is in excess of agency's jurisdiction. *Moyer v. State Board of Equalization (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 651, 653-654, 295 P.2d 583* ; *National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 592, 220 P.2d 962*

Hearing officer is required to be present during hearing. *National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 592, 220 P.2d 962*

[9] Hearings

Death of hearing officer before whom evidence was presented and issuance of recommended decision by different hearing officer is not denial of procedural due process when party was afforded opportunity to be heard and decision of county retirement board resulted from board's own independent review of testimony and other evidence presented at hearing, even though board adopted hearing officer's findings and conclusions. *Keith v. San Bernardino County Retirement Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 411, 415, 271 Cal. Rptr. 649*

Express constitutional right to confrontation is confined to criminal proceedings, although party in civil proceeding has

due process right under *U.S. Const., amends. V, XIV,* to cross examine and confront witnesses and as afforded same right by statute (*Gov. Code § 11500(f)(2)*) in state agency hearing; but unlike criminal proceeding where express constitutional right to confrontation exists, constitutional right at civil proceeding as involving general notions of procedural due process. *Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 304, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422*

In proceeding to revoke license to operate family day care home for children, exclusion of operators of home from hearing during testimony of child who allegedly had been sexually assaulted by one of operators does not violate their due process right or their right under *Gov. Code § 11500(f)(2)* to confront and cross examine adversary witnesses when operators viewed child's testimony by live, closed-circuit television and consulted with counsel prior to cross examination. *Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 304, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422*

[10] Judicial Notice

California Administrative Procedure Act requires notice and opportunity to rebut whenever administrative agency intends to take official notice of any generally accepted technical or scientific matter within agency's special field, or of any fact which may be judicially noticed by California courts. *Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 140, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* (citing *Gov. Code § 11515* and *Evid. Code § 450 et seq.*)

[11] Jurisdiction

Writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* is proper to challenge agency's authority to proceed with hearing on ground that agency lacked subject matter jurisdiction to hear issues raised in accusation. *Motors Ins. Corp. v. Division of Fair Employment Practices (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 209, 215-216, 173 Cal. Rptr. 332*

[12] Nonsuit

Hearing officer is not empowered to grant request in nature of motion for nonsuit. *O'Mara v. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 8, 11, 54 Cal. Rptr. 862*

Presumptions established by Evidence Code are applicable in administrative proceeding. *Samson Market Co. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 1215, 1223, 81 Cal. Rptr. 251, 459 P.2d 667*

[13] Official Notice

Agency is entitled to take official notice of facts subject to judicial notice in *California. McAllister v. Workmen's Compensation Appeals Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 408, 414, 71 Cal. Rptr. 697, 445 P.2d 313* ; *Cantrell v. Board of Supervisors (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 471, 477, 197 P.2d 218*

[14] Order and Burden of Proof

Respondent is entitled to have case against him presented first. *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 159, 217 P.2d 22* ; *La Prade v. Department of Water & Power (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 47, 51-52, 162 P.2d 13*

Burden of proof in disciplinary proceedings is on party asserting affirmative. *De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 610, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289*

Respondent has burden of proof in license application case. *Martin v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal.*

2d 259, 265, 341 P.2d 291 ; *CEEED v. California Coastal Zone Conservation Com. (1974) 43 Cal. App.3d 306, 330, 118 Cal. Rptr. 315* ; *Hora v. City and County of San Francisco (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 375, 379, 43 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Amount of proof required in disciplinary proceeding. *Furman v. State Bar (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 212, 229, 83 P.2d 12* ; *Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 212, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71* ; *Small v. Smith (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 450, 457, 94 Cal. Rptr. 136*

Presumptions established by Evidence Code are applicable in administrative proceeding. *Samson Market Co. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 1215, 1223, 81 Cal. Rptr. 251, 459 P.2d 667*

[15] Record of Proceedings

Requirement of record by phonographic reporter refers to literal record of what is said, capable of accurate transcription. *Funke v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 449, 455, 81 Cal. Rptr. 662*

Cost of record obtained by respondent to exhaust administrative remedies is recoverable in proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* if respondent prevails. *Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 796-797, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009*

[16] Right to Counsel

Respondent is entitled to be represented by counsel. *Molina v. Munro (1959) 145 Cal. App. 2d 601*

Respondent is not entitled to appointed counsel or to be advised by agency of right to counsel. *Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525*

Respondent is not entitled to continuance for purpose of obtaining counsel or having counsel present at hearing if adequate opportunity to get counsel and have counsel present was given. *Givens v. Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 529, 532, 1 Cal. Rptr. 446* ; *Skipitar v. Munro (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 1, 345 P.2d 508*

Agency is not required to look after respondent's interests as counsel might, in absence of counsel. *August v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 52, 64, 70 Cal. Rptr. 172* ; *Griswold v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 807, 810, 297 P.2d 762*

[17] Stay of Execution

Agency is empowered to stay execution of decision until date when respondent will actually feel effect of it. *Medlock Dusters, Inc. v. Christensen (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 565, 569-570, 110 Cal. Rptr. 805*

[18] Subpoenas

Administrative subpoenas pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11180 et seq.* *Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 616-618, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Court opinion enunciating rule that declaration in support of investigative subpoena duces tecum for production of patient's hospital records must show good cause, including allegations of fact to demonstrate relevance or materiality of patient's medical records to general charges against doctor, and must show that request can be granted without abuse of

third party's constitutionally protected right of privacy (*Cal. Const., art. I, § 1*) is not retroactive. *Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 618-620, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20*

Issuance of subpoena under APA is ministerial act before hearing and discretionary act after hearing has begun. *Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 480-481, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65*

Agency having power to issue subpoena not governed by APA, is required to issue subpoena when requested. *McLeod v. Board of Pension Comm'rs (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 28-29, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58*

Witness served with administrative subpoena is entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *McLeod v. Board of Pension Comm'rs (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 31, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58*

Agency lacks power to enforce its own subpoena. *Crocker v. Conrey (1903) 140 Cal. 213, 217, 73 P. 1006*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceOfficial NoticeAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.64

§ 473F.64 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Hearing Practice (Cal CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Evidence, Ch. II, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 80-126, Ch. IX, *Witnesses*, §§ 1086-1092; Ch. XI, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1906-2000 (3rd ed. 1986)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.65

§ 473F.65 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

NOTE:
On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.66-473F.69

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.66[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.70

§ 473F.70 Prehearing Considerations

[1] Exclusion of Witnesses

☐ Prepare request or motion to exclude [*see § 473F.12[3]*].

☐ Make request or motion prior to testimony [*see § 473F.12[3]*].

[2] Interpreters

☐ Request interpreter [*see § 473F.13*].

☐ Pay interpreter cost, if applicable [*Gov. Code § 11435.25(a)*; *see § 473F.13[4]*].

[3] Witness Fees and Mileage

☐ Pay fees, if applicable [*Gov. Code § 11450.40(a)*; (b); *see § 473F.14[1][g]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityEvidenceCompetencyInterpretersEvidenceTestimonySequestration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.71

§ 473F.71 Preparation for Hearing

[1] Opening Statement

☐ Prepare opening statement, if appropriate [*see § 473F.15[1][a], [b]*].

[2] Hearing Brief

☐ Prepare hearing brief, if appropriate [*see § 473F.15[2]*].

☐ Serve on ALJ and other parties as soon as possible.

[3] Witnesses

☐ Direct examination.

☐ Prepare questions for direct examination [*see Gov. Code § 11513(b)*; *see § 473F.15[4][a], [b]*].

☐ Prepare witness for direct examination [§ 473F.15[4][b], [c]].

[4] Expert Witnesses

☐ Prepare for cross-examination [*Gov. Code § 11513(b)*; *see § 473F.15[5], [6]*].

[5] Bifurcation

☐ Prepare motion to bifurcate, if applicable [*Gov. Code § 11524*; *see § 473F.15[10]*].

☐ Prepare in writing, or

☐ Make orally on the record.

[6] Depositions

☐ Prepare petition for order to take deposition of unavailable witness [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *see § 473F.15[11][b]*].

☐ Prepare order.

☐ Serve notice of hearing and copy of petition at least 10 days prior to hearing [*Gov. Code § 11511*; *see § 473F.15[11][c]*].

[7] Closing Argument

☐ Prepare closing argument [*see § 473F.15[13]*].

☐ Oral, or

☐ Written.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityEvidenceTestimonyExaminationDirect ExaminationEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.72

§ 473F.72 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Procedure

☐ Prepare subpoena [*see § 473F.14*; *see also § 473B.51*].

☐ Subpoena duces tecum requires affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*; § 473F.14[1][c]].

☐ Serve subpoena [*Gov. Code § 11450.20(b)*; *see § 473F.14[1][d]*].

☐ Subpoena alternative.

☐ Prepare written notice alternative to subpoena [*Gov. Code § 11450.50(a)*; *see § 473F.14[1][h]*].

☐ Serve on opposing party's attorney or attorney of person requested to attend.

[2] Party Served With Subpoena

☐ Motion for protective order, including motion to quash [*Gov. Code § 11450.30(a)*; *see § 473F.14[1][f]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceOfficial NoticeAdministrative LawAgency

AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.73

§ 473F.73 Use of Affidavits at Hearing

[1] Affidavits

☐ Prepare affidavit or declaration [*see § 473F.37*].

☐ Prepare notice of intent to use affidavit or declaration [*Gov. Code § 11514(b)*; for a form, *see § 473F.90*].

☐ Mail or deliver affidavit and notice to opposing party at least 10 days before hearing [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*; *see § 473F.37*].

[2] Party Receiving Affidavit and Notice

☐ Right to cross-examine affiant.

☐ Mail or deliver request to cross-examine affiant within seven days after proponent of affidavit mailed or delivered affidavit and notice [*Gov. Code § 11514(a)*; *see § 473F.37*].

☐ Subpoena affiant [*see § 473F.37*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.74

§ 473F.74 Official Notice

[1] Request

☐ Prepare request for official notice [*Gov. Code § 11515*; § 473F.38[3]; for a form, *see § 473F.91*].

☐ File with agency or ALJ.

☐ Give written or oral notice to other parties.

[2] Refuting Officially Noticed Matter

☐ Prepare request for opportunity to refute [*Gov. Code § 11515*; § 473F.38[3]; for a form, *see § 473F.92*].

☐ File with agency or ALJ.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.75

§ 473F.75 Default

[1] Failure to File Notice of Defense or to Attend Hearing

☐ Agency files default.

☐ Make request to vacate default [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)*; *see § 473F.17[1][a], [b]*].

☐ Prepare written motion.

☐ Serve on agency within seven days of receiving notice of default [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)*; *see § 473F.17[1][a], [b]*].

☐ Prepare mitigation defense, if appropriate [*see Gov. Code § 11520(b)*; § 473F.17[1][c]].

[2] Respondent Fails to Receive Actual Notice

☐ Agency files default.

☐ Prepare petition to reconsider default [*Gov. Code § 11520(c)(1)*; *see § 473F.14[1][d]*].

☐ File within applicable time limits [*see Gov. Code § 11521(a)*; § 473F.17[1][d]].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473F.76-473F.89

[Reserved]

§§ 473F.76[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.90

§ 473F.90 Notice of Intention to Use Affidavit or Declaration [Gov. Code § 11514]

[1] FORM Notice of Intention to Use Affidavit or Declaration [Gov. Code § 11514]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))))	NO. _____ NOTICE OF INTENTION TO USE _____ [AFFIDAVIT *or* DECLARATION]

The accompanying _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] of _____ [*name of affiant or declarant*] will be introduced as evidence at the hearing in the above-entitled proceeding. _____ [*Name of affiant or declarant*] will not be called to testify orally. You will not be entitled to question him/her unless you notify the undersigned at _____[*address*] that you wish to cross examine him/her. To be effective, your request must be mailed or delivered to the undersigned on or before _____[*specify date seven days after mailing or delivering notice and copy of affidavit or declaration*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form set out in [1], *above*, is for use by a respondent who wishes to use a witness's affidavit (or declaration) in evidence at the hearing. The contents of the notice are prescribed by statute [*see Gov. Code § 11514(b)*]. For discussion, see *§ 473F.37*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.91

§ 473F.91 Request for Official Notice [Gov. Code § 11515]

[1] FORM Request for Official Notice [Gov. Code § 11515]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))))	NO. _____ REQUEST FOR OFFICIAL NOTICE

Respondent requests that the _____[*agency*] take official notice of, and refer in the record to, _____ [*specify matter*].

Official notice may be taken as requested because the matter _____ [is generally accepted technical or scientific matter within the special field of the _____ (*agency*) *or* may be judicially noticed by the courts of California pursuant to Section _____ of the Evidence Code].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form set out in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent who wishes an agency to take official notice of some matter in the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. For discussion of official notice, see *§ 473F.38*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473F AGENCY ADJUDICATION HEARINGS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473F California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.92

§ 473F.92 Request for Opportunity to Refute Officially Noticed Matter [Gov. Code § 11515]

[1] FORM Request for Opportunity to Refute Officially Noticed Matter [Gov. Code § 11515]

BEFORE THE _____ [agency]

In the Matter of _____ [*name*], Respondent.	)))))))	NO. _____ REQUEST FOR OPPORTUNITY TO REFUTE OFFICIALLY NOTICED MATTER

Respondent requests a reasonable opportunity to refute _____[*matter in question*], which the _____[*agency*] proposes to notice officially under *Section 11515 of the Government Code*.

Respondent further requests that the _____[*agency*] permit refutation to be made by _____ [*specify written or oral presentation of authority, or both*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form set out in [1], *above*, is for use by a respondent who wishes to request an opportunity to refute matter that the agency has proposed to notice officially in the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11515*]. For discussion of official notice, see *§ 473F.38*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473G.syn

§ 473G.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473G: AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS

§ 473G.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473G.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[2] Judicial Review

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

[4] Other Related Chapters

§§ 473G.03-473G.09 [Reserved]

§ 473G.10 Nature of Decision Process

§ 473G.11 Exclusiveness of the Record

[1] Due Process Requirement

[2] Purpose of Rule

[3] Application of Rule

[4] APA Requirements

[5] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

§ 473G.12 Ex Parte Communications

[1] General Requirements

[2] APA Requirements

[a] Definitions and Basic Prohibitions

[b] Permissible Communications

[c] Consequences of Violations

[d] Application to Agency Head

[3] Non-APA Requirements

§ 473G.13 Administrative Decisions Under the APA

[1] Alternative Hearing Procedures

[2] Decision When Agency Itself Hears Case

[a] Preparation of Decision

[b] Vote of Members

[3] Proposed Decision When ALJ Hears Case

[a] Time Limit for Decision

[b] Agency's Options on Receiving Decision

[c] Deemed Adoption

[4] Adoption of Proposed ALJ Decision

[5] Rejection of Proposed ALJ Decision

[a] Decision on Record

[b] Remand to ALJ

[6] Time Limits for Decision

[7] Service and Effective Date of Decision

§ 473G.14 Factual and Legal Basis of Decision

[1] APA Requirement

[2] Form and Function

[a] Need for Factual Basis Supported by Substantial Evidence

[b] Use of Factual Bases

[3] Types of Factual Bases

[a] Operative Facts

[b] Other Facts

[4] Formality

[5] Implied Findings and Liberal Construction

[6] Legal Bases of Decision

[a] Nature of Determination

[b] EXAMPLE: Serving Alcoholic Beverages to Minor

[c] EXAMPLE: Physician's Unprofessional Conduct

§ 473G.15 Orders

§ 473G.16 Discovering Decision Processes and Reasoning

§ 473G.17 ALJ Decisionmaking

[1] Role of Judges

[2] Determination of Facts

[3] Proof of the Case

[4] Influence of Experts

[5] Role of Pleadings

§ 473G.18 Precedent Decisions Under the APA

§§ 473G.19-473G.29 [Reserved]

§ 473G.30 Effective Date of Decision

[1] Introduction

[2] Effective Date

§ 473G.31 Early Effective Date

[1] General Rules

[2] Effect on Reconsideration Period

[3] Effect on Sanctions

[4] Effect on Appeal

§ 473G.32 Stay of Execution

§ 473G.33 Rehearing or Reconsideration

[1] Right Determined by Statute

[2] Petition for Reconsideration

[3] APA Order for Reconsideration

[a] Power to Order Reconsideration

[b] Denial or Grant of Petition

§ 473G.34 Correction of Mistakes or Clerical Errors in Decisions

§ 473G.35 Consequences of Agency Adjudicatory Decisions

[1] Introduction

[2] License Revocation or Suspension

[3] License Denial

[4] Criminal Penalties

[5] Award of Benefits

[6] Damages

[7] Equitable Remedies

[8] Civil Penalties

[9] Attorneys Fees

[10] Hearing Costs

[11] Restitution Orders

§ 473G.36 Reinstatement of Licenses

[1] Petition

[2] Proceedings After Petition Is Filed

[3] Decision

§§ 473G.37-473G.39 [Reserved]

§ 473G.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 473G.41 Federal Constitution

§ 473G.42 State Constitution

§ 473G.43 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473G.44 Decisions

[1] Clerical Mistakes

[2] Contested Cases

[3] Law of the Case

[4] Reconsideration Under Administrative Procedure Act

[5] Rehearing

[6] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

§ 473G.45 Text References

§ 473F.46 Internet References

§§ 473G.47-473G.49 [Reserved]

§ 473G.50 Mistake or Clerical Error in Decision

§ 473G.51 Reconsideration of Agency Decision

§ 473G.52 Reinstatement or Reduction of Penalty

§ 473G.53 Judicial Review

§§ 473G.54-473G.69 [Reserved]

§ 473G.70 Petition for Reconsideration [Gov. Code § 11521]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 473G.71 Petition for Restoration of Rights [Gov. Code § 11522]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.01

§ 473G.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the procedures for issuing a decision following an agency adjudication under California public administrative law. The legal background discussion in Part II includes the following:

- Subpart A, discussing the procedural requirements for decisions after formal hearings under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), including nature of decision process, exclusiveness of the record, ex parte communications, the APA decision process, factual and legal bases of decisions, orders, discovering decision process and reasoning, ALJ decision making, and precedent decisions under the APA [*see §§ 473G.10 -473G.18*].

- Subpart B, discussing the effective date and consequences of an agency decision, including stay of execution, rehearing or reconsideration, correcting mistakes or clerical errors in decisions, consequences of decision, and reinstatement of licenses [*see §§ 473G.30 -473G.36*].

Part V includes a form of petition for reconsideration [*see § 473G.70*] and a form of petition for restoration of rights [*see § 473G.71*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte Contacts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.02

§ 473G.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.

For related discussion and forms providing more detailed coverage of adjudication methods under the APA other than that of formal hearing, see Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[2] Judicial Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40 et seq., *Appeal* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, *see § 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies.*

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

[4] Other Related Chapters

For related coverage of adjudicative proceedings before particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public*

Administrative Law, § 470.02[2].

For discussion and forms relating to decisions or judgements in civil actions generally, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

For discussion and forms relating to direct or collateral relief from judgments in civil actions generally, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473G.03-473G.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473G.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.10

§ 473G.10 Nature of Decision Process

This subpart explains the due process rule that requires a decision in an administrative adjudication hearing to be based solely on the record created at that hearing. It covers the administrative decision making process, including proposed and final decisions under the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA; *Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), findings of fact, determinations of issues, and orders. The rules regarding ex parte communications with the presiding officer are also examined. This subpart also contains a practical discussion of considerations that influence the decisions of an administrative law judge (ALJ).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.11

§ 473G.11 Exclusiveness of the Record

[1] Due Process Requirement

Due process of law requires that adjudicatory administrative decisions be full and fair and based solely on evidence that is part of the record [*Button v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 730, 738, 176 Cal. Rptr. 218]* . Fairness and justice demand that those decisions not be based on secret evidence that the parties cannot challenge and rebut [*Carstens v. Pillsbury (1916) 172 Cal. 572, 576-577, 158 P. 218]* . Administrative agencies that exercise quasi-judicial powers and are required to make a determination after a hearing cannot act on their own information [*Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 139-141, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* ; *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158, 217 P.2d 22]* . Nothing may be treated as evidence if it has not been introduced as such, because a hearing requires that the party be apprised of the evidence against him or her in order to refute, test, and explain it [*La Prade v. Department of Water & Power (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 47, 51-52, 162 P.2d 13]* .

[2] Purpose of Rule

The exclusiveness of the record rule serves three purposes [*Fairbanks v. Alaska Pub. Utils. Comm'n (Alaska 1980) 611 P.2d 493, 495* ; *see Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 516-517, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* (agency granting variance from zoning ordinance must make appropriate findings, so that record enables parties to seek review)]:

- It helps to insure that the agency does not make decisions that have no adequate basis in fact.

- It gives opposing parties the opportunity to challenge the agency's reasoning process and the correctness of the decision.

- It affords reviewing courts the opportunity to evaluate the agency's decision.

It was reversible error for the superior court to decide an administrative mandamus case and to deny the petition without

reviewing the administrative record. In denying the petition before the administrative record had been prepared, the court was unable to weigh the evidence and to decide the sufficiency of the evidence to support the fact findings that provided the basis for the agency decision [*Ocheltree v. Gourley (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 1013, 1017-1018, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* .

Evidence taken outside the record will not be grounds for reversal of the decision if the circumstances show that no likelihood for prejudice existed [*see Gore v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 184, 191-192, 167 Cal. Rptr. 881* (fact that panel member had acted improperly in making agency decision was not grounds for reversal, when panel subsequently made same decision without that member, and no evidence was introduced to show that other members were affected by his improper conduct)].

[3] Application of Rule

The exclusiveness of the record rule has been applied in many settings. It prevents an administrative law judge (ALJ) from deciding an issue that was precluded from the hearing; only the record of what is at issue during the hearing becomes part of the record for decision [*see Button v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 730, 738-739, 176 Cal. Rptr. 218* (in hearing by retiree to change retirement status from "service" to "disability," ALJ's finding that retiree was not disabled on retirement was improper, because existence of disability was not at issue)].

An expert opinion based on the transcripts of a hearing, which was not received into evidence but was communicated to a board without the knowledge of the affected party, cannot be used by the board to decide the case [*Rogers v. Retirement Board (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 751, 757-758, 241 P.2d 611* ; *see Corcoran v. S.F. etc. Retirement System (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 738, 745, 251 P.2d 59* (retirement board's use of doctors' reports, received in evidence by board after submission of the case, was improper)].

An agency cannot determine that topless waitresses are contrary to public welfare and morals without evidence in the record regarding the evils alleged to be causally associated with topless waitresses [*Boreta Enterprises, Inc. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 85, 103-104, 84 Cal. Rptr. 113, 465 P.2d 1]* . The rule was not applied, however, in a case in which a penalty was mitigated after a suggestion to do so was received from the deciding authority's superior. The court concluded that the deciding authority did not change its decision based on any extrinsic evidence or information [*Guilbert v. Regents of University of California (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 233, 242-243, 155 Cal. Rptr. 583]* .

[4] APA Requirements

Agencies that are required to follow Chapter 5, the formal hearing provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), are required to make a decision on the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11517(c), (d)*]. The Administrative Adjudication " *Bill of Rights*" (*Gov. Code § 11425.10-11425.60*), requires that an agency decision be based on the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code §§ 11425(a)(6), 11425.50(c)*].

This *bill of rights* sets forth the minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied in a hearing that is subject to Chapter 4.5, the general adjudication provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*). This includes hearings by a state agency in which federal or state constitution provisions, or a federal or state statute, require an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts in order to formulate and issue a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.20*]. It also includes any hearing subject to Chapter 5, the APA'a formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501*; *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15* (discussion of the scope of application of Chapters 4.5 and 5)].

[5] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges[*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. The regulations that are applicable to Chapter 473G, Agency Adjudication Decisions, include the following: reporting of hearings, administrative records and ordering the transcript [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1038* (1998)]; enforcement of orders and sanctions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1040* (1998)]; agency request for costs of investigation and prosecution of the case [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1042* (1998)]; request for expenses after default [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1044* (1998)]; and briefs and amicus briefs [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1046* (1998)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.12

§ 473G.12 Ex Parte Communications

[1] General Requirements

Violation of the exclusiveness of the record rule frequently takes the form of an ex parte communication to the adjudicator after a matter has been submitted [*see § 473G.11*]. A good example of how far some courts have gone to prevent the use of ex parte communications in decisionmaking is illustrated by a Texas case, *First Savings & Loan, Etc. v. Vandygriff (Tex. Civ. App. 1980) 605 S.W.2d 740* . In this case, the state savings and loan commissioner denied an application for a new savings and loan at a hearing. After the denial was final, organizers of the savings and loan met with the commissioner to give him a different view of the economic conditions in the area where the savings and loan was to be located than that reflected in the order denying the application. The organizers then refiled the application with the commissioner, another hearing was held, and the commissioner approved the application. The court set aside this approval order because of the ex parte contact with the commissioner, even though it occurred when the first order was final and no application was pending, and even though the commissioner stated on the record of the second hearing that the meeting took place but that his new order was based only on the record of the second hearing [*First Savings & Loan, Etc. v. Vandygriff (Tex. Civ. App. 1980) 605 S.W.2d 740, 743]* . Based on a statute prohibiting ex parte communications, it was presumed that the meeting with the organizers led to the findings that supported the new order. The offended party, another savings and loan, did not have to show that the commissioner was persuaded by secret information [*First Savings & Loan, Etc. v. Vandygriff (Tex. Civ. App. 1980) 605 S.W.2d 740, 742]* .

An ex parte communication by a party or interested individual to an ALJ or agency member during an administrative adjudication is defined to be a communication made while a proceeding is pending to the presiding officer in that proceeding by an employee or representative of an agency that is a party or from an interested person outside the agency, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*]. Ex parte communications raise the following significant concerns:

- The message will affect the adjudicator's neutrality and objectivity.
- The information or opinion transmitted will not be reflected in the record or be available for

consideration by a court reviewing the adjudicator's decision.

- A party unaware of the content of the communication will be unaware of the need to rebut the information.

Ex parte communications also raise fairness concerns, that both sides will not be heard in a contested case, or that one side has greater influence because that side can present their argument without being challenged by their opponent.

It is unethical for a lawyer to make an improper ex parte communication to a judge or judicial officer upon the merits of a contested matter pending before the judge [*Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)*; *Mathew Zaheri Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1305, 1316-1318, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* (ex parte communication by counsel to ALJ held to be misconduct but not reversible error)]. It is also improper for judges to make or receive similar ex parte communications from a lawyer in a pending or impending proceeding [Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. II, Code of Judicial Ethics, Canon 3C(7)].

Ex parte communications are a greater problem in administrative agencies than in civil or criminal litigation, because agencies frequently communicate with regulated industries, licensees, or both, on an ex parte basis when deciding policy issues in rulemaking. Thus, the agency and interested outsiders will be talking frequently about issues of common interest. However, improper ex parte communications are prohibited in contested adjudicative hearings [*see* [2], *below*].

[2] APA Requirements

[a] Definitions and Basic Prohibitions

Under provisions operative July 1, 1997, ex parte communications are improper in some circumstances but not others [*see Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*]. The prohibition on ex parte communications provides that while the proceeding is pending there shall be no communication, direct or indirect, regarding any issue in the proceeding, to the presiding officer from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party or from an interested person outside the agency, without notice and opportunity for all parties to participate in the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(a)*].

For purposes of this prohibition, a proceeding is pending from the issuance of an agency's initial pleading, or from an application for an agency decision, whichever is earlier [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(c)*]. The term "interested person outside the agency" is based on federal administrative law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *see 5 U.S.C. § 557(d)(1)(A)*; *see PATCO v. Federal Labor Relation Authority (1982) 685 F.2d 547, 562, 222 U.S. App. D.C. 97* (interpreting the federal standard to include persons with interest beyond that of members of the general public)]. The pendency of a proceeding includes any period of time between the time an application for a hearing is made and the time the agency's pleading is issued [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995)].

Furthermore, if, while the proceeding is pending but before serving as presiding officer, a person receives a communication of a type that would violate the provisions of this law if received while the person was serving as a presiding officer, the person, promptly after starting to serve, shall disclose the content of the communication on the record and give all parties an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.40(c)*; *see* [c], *below*].

[b] Permissible Communications

Ex parte communications that are proper under the act include several categories. The first category, permissible communications, include the following:

- Communications, including a communication from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party, made on the record at the hearing [*Gov. Code § 11430.10(b)*].

- Communications that are required for the disposition of an ex parte matter specifically authorized by statute [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(a)*].

- Communications that concern a matter of procedure or practice, including a request for a continuance, that is not in controversy [*Gov. Code § 11430.20(b)*]. This exception does not preclude communications made to a presiding officer or staff assistant regarding noncontroversial matters of procedure and practice, such as the format of pleadings, number of copies required, manner of service, and calendaring and status discussions. Such topics are not considered to be part of the merits of the proceeding provided they are noncontroversial in the context of the specific case [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 165 (1995)].

The second category of permissable ex parte communications, otherwise prohibited from an employee or representative of an agency that is a party to a presiding officer, include communications in the following circumstances:

- The communication is for the purpose of assistance and advice to the presiding officer from a person who has not served as investigator, prosecutor or advocate in the proceeding or its preadjudicative stage. An assistant or advisor may evaluate the evidence in the record but shall not furnish, augment, diminish, or modify the evidence in the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(a)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning a settlement proposal advocated by the advisor [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(b)*].

- The communication is for the purpose of advising the presiding officer concerning any of the following matters in an adjudicative proceeding that is nonprosecutorial in character [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)*]:

  - The advice involves a technical issue in the proceeding and the advice is necessary for, and is not otherwise reasonably available to, the presiding officer, provided the content of the advice is disclosed on the record and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(1)*; *see* [c], *below*].

  - The advice involves an issue in a proceeding of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, Delta Protection Commission, Water Resources Control Board, or a regional water quality control board [*Gov. Code § 11430.30(c)(2)*].

The third and final category of permissible ex parte communications are:

- The presiding officer's authority to conduct in camera examination of evidence in a proceeding (*see Gov. Code § 11507.7(d), (e)*) is not limited by the prohibition on ex parte communications [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *Gov. Code § 11430.10*].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from communicating with adversaries. Only communications from adversaries to presiding officers are precluded. However, presiding officers should give assistance or advice with caution, since there may be an appearance of unfairness if assistance or advice is given to some parties but not others [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *Gov. Code § 11430.10*].

- Presiding officers are not prohibited from consulting with other agency personnel when the agency conducting the hearing is not a party to the proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 164 (1995); *Gov. Code § 11430.10*].

[c] Consequences of Violations

When an improper ex parte communication is made, there are three consequences: disclosure, notice and opportunity to respond, and if necessary, disqualification of the presiding officer. If a presiding officer receives an improper communication, the officer must place in the record of the proceeding the following:

- If the communication is written, the writing and any written response of the presiding officer to the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(1)*].

- If the communication is oral, a memorandum stating the substance of the communication, any response made by the presiding officer, and the identity of each person from whom the presiding officer received the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(a)(2)*].

The presiding officer must also notify all parties that an ex parte communication has been made a part of the record [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(b)*]. If a party requests an opportunity to address the communication within 10 days after receipt of notice of the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)*]:

- The party must be permitted to comment on the communication [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(1)*].

- The presiding officer has discretion to allow the party to present evidence concerning the subject of the communication, including discretion to reopen a hearing that has been concluded [*Gov. Code § 11430.50(c)(2)*].

If a presiding officer receives an improper ex parte communication, the presiding officer may be disqualified [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*]. Disqualification is permitted if it is necessary to eliminate the effect of the ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 169 (1995)].

If the presiding officer is disqualified, the portion of the record pertaining to the ex parte communication may be sealed by protective order of the disqualified presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11430.60*]. The purpose of sealing is to remove the improper communication from the view of the successor presiding officer, while preserving it as a sealed part of the record, for purposes of subsequent administrative or judicial review. Granting a protective order is permissive, not mandatory, and is within the discretion of the presiding officer who has knowledge of the improper ex parte communication [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 169 (1995)].

[d] Application to Agency Head

Agency heads who are decisionmakers are subject to the same requirements as to ex parte communications with several qualifications [*see Gov. Code § 11405.40* (definition of agency head)]. The same requirements that govern ex parte communications to presiding officers also govern ex parte communications in an adjudicative proceeding to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(a)*].

There is, however, an exception that applies to individualised ratemaking proceedings. An ex parte communication to the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated is permissible in an individualized ratemaking proceeding if the content of the communication is disclosed on the record

and all parties are given an opportunity to address it in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11430.50* [*Gov. Code § 11430.70(b)*; *see* [c], *above*].

Furthermore, there is a prohibition on direct or indirect communication, while a proceeding is pending regarding the merits of any issue in the proceeding, between the presiding officer and the agency head or other person or body to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(a)*]. This rule does not apply when the agency head or other person to which the power to hear or decide in the proceeding is delegated serves as both presiding officer and agency head, or when the presiding officer does not issue a decision in the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11430.80(b)*].

[3] Non-APA Requirements

Non-APA proceedings are governed essentially by the general provision of *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)*, which prohibits an attorney who is a member of the California State Bar from communicating with a judicial officer on the merits of a contested matter before that officer, except in open court or under other exceptions [*Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)*; other exceptions include consent and ex parte matters, *see Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-300(B)(1)-(5)*].

This rule has been interpreted to apply to administrative proceedings. [California State Bar Formal Ethics Opinion No. 1984-82; *see* Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics*]. Because of the scope of the APA ex parte requirements, non-APA requirements would apply primarily to hearings before local agencies [*see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

The California Court of Appeal held that an ex parte communication by the chief of staff of a hospital to the Board of directors of the hospital that related to the Board's decision to terminate a doctor's staff privileges was not improper (even though the content of the chief of staff's report was not placed in the record of the peer review proceeding) because the doctor failed to raise the issue before the Board, thereby waiving the right to raise the issue on appeal, and because the doctor failed to show actual bias from the giving of the report to the board as such reports were authorized by the constitution of the medical staff [*Weinberg v. Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1115, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* .

When an agency attorney advises a non-APA agency during the pendency of an administrative proceeding, issues of procedural due process may also arise [*see Midstate Theatres, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 864, 875-876, 128 Cal. Rptr. 54* (member of county counsel's office represented county assessor and also advised the board of supervisors holding tax assessment hearing); *Ford v. Civil Service Commission (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 692, 697, 327 P.2d 148* (county counsel's office advised civil service commission, which held discharge hearing, and also represented employer); *see also* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* , for further discussion of due process in administrative hearings].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsLegal EthicsProfessional ConductGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.13

§ 473G.13 Administrative Decisions Under the APA

[1] Alternative Hearing Procedures

Under the APA, the agency itself may hear a case with an ALJ presiding [*Gov. Code § 11517(a), (b)*; *see* [2], *below*], or the case may be heard by an ALJ alone [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*; *see* [3], *below*]. The agency determines which hearing option will be used [*Gov. Code §§ 11512(a), 11517(a)*]. For further discussion of these two hearing options, see Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* . As discussed in [2]-[5], *below*, the decisionmaking procedure in a particular case depends on the hearing option used.

[2] Decision When Agency Itself Hears Case

[a] Preparation of Decision

When the agency itself hears the case [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)*], its decision is normally prepared by the ALJ that presides at the hearing and advises the agency [*see Gov. Code § 11512(c)(1)* (duties of presiding ALJ); *see also* Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* (role of ALJs)]. The ALJ is expected to be present during the consideration of the case, and, if requested, shall assist and advise the agency in making its decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)(1)*]. No proposed decision is required. The decision is final, and its findings reflect a consensus of the agency members' views of the evidence. It must be issued by the agency within 100 days after the case has been submitted [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)(3)*].

[b] Vote of Members

When a contested case is heard before an agency itself, no member of the agency who did not hear the evidence may vote on the decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(b)(2)*]. The California Supreme Court has held that this provision does not require auditory perception of all the evidence by each board member who votes [*Cooper v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 242, 246, 217 P.2d 630]* . The agency members must be acquainted with the record and exercise their own independent judgment on the case, but need not be physically present when the evidence is produced [*Cooper v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 242, 246, 217 P.2d 630* ; *see* *Old Santa Barbara Pier*

Co. v. State of California (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 250, 255-257, 139 Cal. Rptr. 332 (interpreting similar provision applicable to coastal zone conservation commission)].

[3] Proposed Decision When ALJ Hears Case

[a] Time Limit for Decision

In most APA adjudicatory proceedings, an ALJ hears the case alone [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*]. He or she must prepare a written proposed decision for the agency within 30 days after the case is submitted, in a form that may be adopted as the decision in the case [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*; *see* Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* (role of ALJs)]. No penalty is imposed when an ALJ renders a written proposed decision more than 30 days after the case is submitted thereby violating the 30 day time limit (e.g., decision was rendered 120 days late). The time limits are directory, not mandatory, and *Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)* does not specify any penalty for the ALJ's failure to render a timely decision [*Anserv Insurance Services Inc. v. Kelso (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 197, 207-208, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 357]* .

Failure of the ALJ to deliver a proposed decision within the time required does not prejudice the rights of the agency in the case. Thirty days after the receipt of the proposed decision, a copy of the proposed decision shall be filed by the agency as a public record and shall be served by the agency on each party and his or her attorney. The filing and service is not an adoption of a proposed decision by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*].

[b] Agency's Options on Receiving Decision

On receipt of the proposed decision, the agency will take one of the following actions [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*]:

- Adopt the proposed decision in its entirety [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(A)*; *see* [4], *below*].

- Adopt the decision but reduce or otherwise mitigate the proposed penalty [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(B)*; *see* [4], *below*].

- Make technical or other minor changes in the proposed decision and adopt it as the decision. Action by the agency is limited to a clarifying change or a change of a similar nature that does not affect the factual or legal basis of the proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(C)*; *see* [4], *below*].

- Reject the proposed decision, and decide the case itself on the record created before the ALJ, including the transcript, or an agreed statement of the parties [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*; *see* [5][a], *below*].

- Reject the proposed decision, and refer (remand) the case to the ALJ who presided, or another ALJ, to take additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*; *see* [5][b], *below*].

In APA proceedings, however, almost all proposed ALJ decisions are adopted by the agency. A similar system applies in non-APA proceedings [*see, e.g., Lab. Code § 5315* (appeals board may accept, modify, or reject decision of workers' compensation judge); *Pub. Util. Code § 311(b)* (commissioner may adopt, modify, or reject proposed decision of ALJ) *Golde v. Fox (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 167, 188, 159 Cal. Rptr. 864* (real estate commissioner is not required to accept the ALJ's recommendation)]. In contrast, under the federal administrative system, an initial decision by an ALJ becomes the decision of the agency without further proceedings, unless appealed [*see 5 U.S.C. § 557(b)*].

[c] Deemed Adoption

The ALJ's proposed decision will be deemed adopted by the agency 100 days after delivery to the agency, unless within

that time the agency either notifies the parties that the proposed decision is not adopted and commences proceedings to decide the case on the record [*see Poliak v. Board of Psychology (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 342, 348-349, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 866* (agency notice of nonadoption following vote not to adopt proposed decision satisfies requirement of commencing proceedings within 100 days); *see also* [5][a], *below*], or remands the case to the ALJ to take additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*; *see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*; *see also* [5][b], *below*].

The California Court of Appeal held that the proposed decision of an administrative law judge was deemed adopted under the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)* when the Department of Health Services rejected the proposed decision of the ALJ within 100 days, but the Department then failed to issue a final decision within 100 days of the rejection of the ALJ's proposed decision [*St. Francis Medical Center v. Shewry (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1556, 1559-1561, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 895]* .

Within 30 days after receiving a proposed decision, however, the agency must file a copy of the decision as a public record, and serve copies on each party and his or her attorney [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*; *see* Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*]. The filing and service is not an adoption of a proposed decision by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*]. For this reason, agencies usually decide what action to take on the case within 30 days after receiving the proposed decision, rather than waiting up to the 100-day period for automatic adoption to notify the parties of its action [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*]. However, the 30-day time limit is directory, not jurisdictional, and an agency has 100 days under the statute to decide whether or not to reject the proposed decision, and decide the case itself [*Outdoor Resorts etc. Owners' Assn. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 696, 703, 273 Cal. Rptr. 748]* .

While the agency is deciding what action to take within this 30-day period, the parties are not entitled to have a copy of the ALJ's proposed decision served on them [*Greer v. Board of Education (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 98, 111, 121 Cal. Rptr. 542* ; *American Federation of Teachers v. San Lorenzo Unified School Dist. (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 132, 136, 80 Cal. Rptr. 758]* .

[4] Adoption of Proposed ALJ Decision

When the agency adopts the ALJ's proposed decision, the agency does not have to read or familiarize itself with the record [*Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 393-399, 184 P.2d 323* ; *see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(A)*]. This rule allows the agency to exercise adjudicatory power, without requiring it to review the record in a case in which an opportunity for a fair hearing has already been afforded before the ALJ [*Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 398, 184 P.2d 323]* . This same rule also applies in non-APA proceedings [*see Nat. Auto. & Cas. Co. v. Ind. Acc. Com. (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 20, 30, 206 P.2d 841* (under Labor Code provision, commission could follow referee's recommendation, without reviewing the record, and could make a decision contrary to referee's recommendation after reviewing the record)]. In contrast, if the agency rejects the proposed decision and decides the case itself, the decision must be based on the record [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*; *see* [5][b], *below*].

However, the ALJ's proposed decision has to be based on the record. Agencies that are required to follow Chapter 5, the formal hearing provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), are required to make a decision on the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1), (2)*]. The Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* (*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*), requires that an agency decision be based on the record of the proceeding [*Gov. Code §§ 11425(a)(6), 11425.50(c)*]. Further, it sets out minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied in a hearing that is subject to Chapter 4.5, the general administrative adjudication of APA (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), which includes state agency hearings in which an evidentiary hearing is required by federal or state constitution provisions (due process) or federal or state statutes in order to formulate a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.20*]. These requirements also apply to agency hearings subject to the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501*; *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

The agency can make the following changes to a proposed ALJ decision on adoption [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*]:

- Reduce or otherwise mitigate the proposed penalty [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(B)*].

- Make technical or other minor changes. Action by the agency is limited to a clarifying change or a change of a similar nature that does not affect the factual or legal basis of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(C)*].

In these situations the agency makes the appropriate change and adopts the balance of the proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(B), (C)*].

[5] Rejection of Proposed ALJ Decision

[a] Decision on Record

If the agency rejects the ALJ's proposed decision, it may decide the case on the record, including the transcript, or an agreed statement of the parties, with or without taking additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*].

The record includes the transcript, or an agreed statement of the parties [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*], any additional evidence taken [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*], the proposed decision, and all other evidence received [*see Gov. Code § 11523* (complete record for purposes of judicial review)].

A copy of the record must be made available to the parties. The agency may require payment of fees covering direct costs of making the copy [Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)]. On stipulation of the parties, the agency may decide the case on the record without including the transcript [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*]. In making any decision on the record, the agency must allow the parties to present either oral or written argument before the agency itself [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*; *Ventimiglia v. Board of Behavioral Sciences (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 296, 299-300, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 423* (licensee entitled to present oral or written argument before agency under *Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)(ii)* on remand to agency following judicial review by petition for writ of administrative mandate. Board's failure to allow argument before board by licensee was an abuse of discretion for failure to follow procedures required by law under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*)].

The agency elects the form of the argument [*see McGraw v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 490, 493-495, 211 Cal. Rptr. 620* (court held, in interpreting parallel Vehicle Code provision, that the agency has the discretion to determine whether the argument will be oral or written)]. If the agency receives additional oral evidence [*see Compton College Federation of Teachers v. Compton Community College Dist. (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 437, 441, 166 Cal. Rptr. 595* (board rejected proposed decision and conducted hearing to receive additional evidence regarding student enrollment as it affected teacher's lay-off)], all members who vote on the decision must hear the oral evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*].

The agency's decision authority includes the authority to decide some but not all issues in the case [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*]. When deciding the case itself, the agency can adopt all of the ALJ's proposed decision, except for the proposed penalty. The agency can reject the proposed penalty, and can impose a greater penalty under the provisions of former *Gov. Code § 11517(c)* [*Alford v. Dep't of Motor Vehicles (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 560, 562-563, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 222]* .

When the agency decides the case itself on the record created before the ALJ, it is necessary that the agency members who vote on the decision be familiar with the record. Although they did not actually hear the evidence and were not physically present when the evidence was produced, deciding agency members must be acquainted with the record and exercise their own independent judgment on the case [*Cooper v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 242, 246, 217 P.2d 630* ; *see* [2][b], *above*].

It is not completely clear whether or not agency members must actually read the entire transcript that is part of the record, but that action probably is not required [*see Allied Compensation Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 115, 119-120, 17 Cal. Rptr. 817, 367 P.2d 409* (obligation of panel members is to achieve a substantial understanding of the record by any reasonable means, including the use of the referee's summary); *Moyer v. State Board of Equalization (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 651, 655, 295 P.2d 583* (in order to "review" the evidence at reconsideration hearing, the agency members need not read the full transcript); *but see Morgan v. United States (1936) 298 U.S. 468, 481, 56 S. Ct. 906, 80 L. Ed. 1288* (court found that required hearing was denied when secretary of agriculture, who signed rate order, did not hear or read any evidence presented at the hearing)].

The limits of informed judgment have not yet been set; however, one court has stated that when an agency calls for a transcript of a hearing conducted by an ALJ and also receives additional evidence itself [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*], the agency must examine the record including the transcript of evidence presented before the hearing officer [*Feist v. Rowe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 404, 418, 83 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . However, the agency decisionmaker is not required by due process of law requirements to be physically present when the evidence is produced. Due process requires that the decisionmaker read and consider the evidence, or a transcript of the evidence [*Bockover v. Perko (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 479, 487-488, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423]* . There is no due process violation in agency procedures that allow the agency to reject the administrative law judge's recommendation as to a decision without providing the affected person an additional opportunity to present oral or written argument to the agency [*Boctor v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 560, 571-572, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 861]* .

When the agency commences proceedings to decide the case upon the record and has ordered a transcript of the proceeding, the agency has 100 days from delivery of the transcript to make its decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*]. If the agency finds that special circumstances require more time, it can issue an order that delays its decision for up to 30 more days and specifies the reasons for delay [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*]. Although the APA does not expressly provide a decision period when the parties stipulate that a transcript is not required [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*], the decision must probably be made 100 days from the date of the stipulation. Since transcripts are usually called for, this issue rarely arises.

When an agency rejects an ALJ's proposed decision and decides a case itself, its decision is prepared by its staff. The APA does not appear to require the agency to have an ALJ preside when it decides a case itself, even though argument is heard and additional evidence may be received [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*; *Yanke v. State Dep't of Public Health (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 600, 603, 328 P.2d 556* ; *Chosick v. Reilly (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 334, 336, 270 P.2d 547]* . An ALJ is required to be present during an agency's consideration of a case when the agency originally hears that case [*Gov. Code § 11517(a), (b)(1)*], but this provision does not expressly apply to cases in which the agency makes its own decision after rejecting an ALJ's proposed decision [*see Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(E)*].

A community college district that was required to follow APA procedure prior to terminating an instructor validly terminated the instructor even though it issued a pre-termination notice prior to a required hearing before an ALJ. Although this notice violated the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11517*, which does not allow the agency to make a final decision before the ALJ has held the hearing and written a proposed decision, the court construed the notice to be valid. Furthermore, the instructor was given a fair hearing before the ALJ, and the agency's final decision to terminate the instructor was reached by the agency after considering the ALJ's proposed decision. Finally, the agency adopted a timely final decision prior to the effective date of termination [*California Teachers Association v. Butte Community College District Board of Trustees (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1293, 1303-1306, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269]* .

[b] Remand to ALJ

During the 100-day period before a proposed decision is deemed adopted [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*], the agency may refer the case back, that is, remand the case, to the same ALJ, if reasonably available, otherwise, to another

administrative law judge, to take additional evidence [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*]. Remands are usually granted when new evidence has become available or the agency sets aside a default to allow a respondent to present evidence [*see Gov. Code § 11520(b), (c)*].

The ALJ hears the additional evidence and prepares another proposed decision on the additional evidence, transcript, and other papers that are part of the record of the prior hearing [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)(D)*; *see* [a], *above*]. Copies of the proposed decision must be provided to each party and his or her attorney, as in an initial proposed decision [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(1)*; *see* [3], *above*]. The agency can adopt this second proposed decision without being familiar with the record, just as it could adopt the first decision [*Strode v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 291, 297-298, 15 Cal. Rptr. 879* ; *see* [4], *above*].

[6] Time Limits for Decision

Most statutory time limits in administrative proceedings are "directory" rather than "mandatory" or jurisdictional in nature, unless a contrary intent is clearly expressed [*see* E dwards v. *Steele (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 406, 410, 158 Cal. Rptr. 662, 599 P.2d 1365* (board's failure to comply with time limitations for decision on appeal did not have effect of invalidating its actions taken after the deadline; intent of ordinance was to ensure that aggrieved party would have reasonably timely hearing and decision on administrative appeal); *Compton College Federation of Teachers v. Compton Community College Dist. (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 437, 443, 166 Cal. Rptr. 595* (statute requiring that order of teachers' seniority be determined within specific time period was directory, rather than mandatory; noncompliance did not invalidate action taken by board)].

Time limits are treated as mandatory, however, when a statute setting the limit makes time of the essence and specifies the consequences of noncompliance [*Palmer v. City of Ojai (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 280, 293, 223 Cal. Rptr. 542* (provision of Gov. Code requiring agency to take action within specified time after receiving application for development project was mandatory, because penalty was specified); *see City of Coronado v. California Coastal Zone Conservation Com. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 570, 576-577, 138 Cal. Rptr. 241* (decision of coastal commission denying application for permit became final after 60 days; party appealing denial could not waive that statutory period and later obtain permit)]. It is unlikely, therefore, that the automatic adoption period of 100 days after delivery of the proposed decision to the agency is merely directory [*Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)*; *see* [3][c], *above*].

[7] Service and Effective Date of Decision

A California APA agency's decision in a case, whether it is the agency's own decision or its adoption of an ALJ proposed decision, must be filed immediately on issuance and becomes a public record [*Gov. Code § 11517(d)*]. Copies of the decision must be delivered to the parties personally or sent to them by registered mail [*Gov. Code §§ 11517(d), 11518*]. A copy must also be served on each party's attorney [*Gov. Code § 11517(d)*].

The agency's decision becomes effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the respondent unless one of the following occurs [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*]:

- A reconsideration is ordered within that time [*Gov. Code § 11521*; *see § 473G.33*].
- The agency orders that the decision become effective sooner.
- A stay of execution is granted [*see Gov. Code § 11519(b)*; *see § 473G.32*].

For further discussion of the effective date, see *§§ 473G.30, 473G.31, below* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.14

§ 473G.14 Factual and Legal Basis of Decision

[1] APA Requirement

The APA Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* (*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*) requires that an agency decision be in writing, be based on the record of the proceeding, and include a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision [*Gov. Code §§ 11425(a)(6), 11425.50(a)*]. *Gov. Code § 11425.10* sets forth the minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied in a hearing that is subject to Chapter 4.5, the APA's general administrative adjudication provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), which includes state agency hearings when, under the federal or state constitution or a federal or state statute, an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required to formulate and issue a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.20*]. These requirements also apply to agency hearings that are subject to the Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501*; *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

The statement of the factual basis for the decision may be in the language of, or by reference to, the pleadings. If the statement is no more than mere repetition or paraphrase of the relevant statute or regulation, the statement shall be accompanied by a concise and explicit statement of the underlying facts of record that support the decision. If the factual basis for the decision includes a determination based substantially on the credibility of a witness, the statement shall identify any specific evidence of the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports the determination, and on judicial review the court shall give great weight to the determination to the extent the determination identifies the observed demeanor, manner, or attitude of the witness that supports it [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(b)*].

The statement of the factual basis for the decision shall be based exclusively on the evidence of record in the proceeding and on matters officially noticed in the proceeding. The presiding officer's experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge may be used in evaluating evidence [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(c)*; *Vinson v. Snyder (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 182, 186-188, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (presiding officer may use his or her experience, technical competence, and specialized knowledge to evaluate evidence without establishing the officer's basis for expertise in the record)]. The information that may be contained in the decision, including a summary of the evidence relied on, is not limited by the

requirments of this statute [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(d)*].

Finally, a penalty may not be based on a guideline, criterion, bulletin, manual, instruction, order, standard of general application or other rule subject to the rulemaking provisions of Chapter 3.5, the administrative regulation and rulemaking provisions of the APA (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*), unless it has been adopted as a regulation pursuant to that chapter [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(e)*; for discussion of the APA rulemaking provisions, *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , et seq.].

Requiring a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision is consistent with similar requirements in the trial courts [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 632* and Ch. 551, *Trials*]. Under prior law, fact findings were required in administrative adjudicatory proceedings [*Swars v. Council of City of Vallejo (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 867, 871, 206 P.2d 355* ; *Respers v. University of Cal. Retirement System (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 864, 873, 217 Cal. Rptr. 594* ; *Farmer v. City of Inglewood (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 130, 138 n.7, 185 Cal. Rptr. 9]* when the agency acted in an adjudicatory capacity. Fact findings are not required when an agency acts in a quasi-legislative capacity, unless required by statute [*Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Air Resources Board (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 789, 793-795, 180 Cal. Rptr. 550* ; *City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. City Council (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 869, 882-891, 129 Cal. Rptr. 173]* .

Under the law operative July 1, 1997, factual and legal basis for the decision are used in place of the terms fact findings and legal conclusions. It is likely that providing a factual basis for a specific agency decision will satisfy fact finding requirements.

[2] Form and Function

[a] Need for Factual Basis Supported by Substantial Evidence

The form of agency factual bases vary, but their common function has been clearly set out in *Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* , which applies to all agency findings, state and local, APA and non-APA, that are subject to administrative mandate proceedings [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514 n.12, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandate provision); *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq. (mandate and other forms of judicial review)].

Under *Topanga*, the agency that renders the challenged decision must set forth findings to "bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and ultimate decision or order" [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*]. The focus is on the findings, not just the ultimate action of an agency. The findings must be supported by substantial evidence, and the ultimate action must be supported by the findings [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *see Parkmerced Residents Organization v. San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization Etc. Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1235, 1243, 258 Cal. Rptr. 774* (basic findings must be supported by evidence and ultimate findings must flow rationally from basic findings)].

If the agency's ultimate action had to be supported by substantial evidence, court review of agency actions would be almost useless and the purposes for proper findings would not be served. On review, therefore, both the evidence and the agency's ultimate decision are compared to the findings, not to each other [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*]. The factual bases for decision under the APA provisons operative July 1, 1997, are equivalent to the findings in the *Topanga* decision.

[b] Use of Factual Bases

The *Topanga* approach to fact finding (discussed in [a], *above*), forces administrative agencies to draw legally relevant

subconclusions supportive of its ultimate decision and action. Findings enable the reviewing court to trace and examine the agency's analysis. Reviewing courts should not have to search through the record to determine whether some creditable evidence supports some line of factual and legal conclusions that support the agency's action [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*]. Findings serve other purposes as well. They serve a public relations function by helping to persuade. They enable the parties to determine whether and on what basis they should seek review. They help prevent "shooting from the hip" and encourage open, reasoned decisions. Governmental action should not be secret; when it is, power is misused and arbitrary action results.

[3] Types of Factual Bases

[a] Operative Facts

In keeping with *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* , discussed in [2][a], *above*, findings should be made honestly and presented convincingly. The facts that are found should be operative facts that have legal significance; they should not be the raw evidentiary facts contained in the record, nor conclusory facts that just parrot statutory language. "Finding" evidentiary facts makes the fact-finder little more than a scrivener preparing evidence summaries [*see* *Morris v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 704, 714, 41 Cal. Rptr. 351* (APA does not require ALJ to prepare a summary of *all* the evidence)].

It provides little analysis and is not a bridge. Statutes, however, may require findings of evidentiary facts [*see, e.g., Lab. Code § 5313* (appeals board or workers' compensation judge must make findings on all facts involved in controversy and must provide parties with summary of evidence received and relied on)]. Statutory language can be used in the "determination of issues" or the "ultimate finding" [*see* [6], *below*]. It should not be part of the findings of fact unless the statutory language itself provides the operative facts that need to be found. Fact findings should be limited to those facts that the administrative agency is required to find under the governing statute to support the agency decision [*Bobus v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 680, 686* (DMV hearing officer was not required to make specific finding that driver had consumed alcoholic beverages prior to driving while intoxicated to support suspension of driver's license under *Veh. Code § 23136* because the statute does not require that type of finding with minor drivers, only the requisite blood alcohol level finding)].

[b] Other Facts

Facts other than operative facts should also be included in findings. These additional facts set the stage for the operative facts. They may include jurisdictional facts, background facts, and credibility facts. But they should not be a recitation of testimony or other evidence. Such evidentiary facts should be left in the record and not put into findings. When additional facts are included in findings, they are usually set out in separate paragraphs so that the determination of issues or ultimate finding can clearly refer to operative facts found.

[4] Formality

Courts have often said that findings of fact in administrative proceedings need not be stated with the formality required in judicial proceedings [*Saleeby v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 547, 567, 216 Cal. Rptr. 367, 702 P.2d 525* ; *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 517 n.16, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *McNeil's Inc. v. Contractors' State License Board (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 322, 326, 68 Cal. Rptr. 640]* . Trial courts, however, are no longer required to make findings of facts and conclusions of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; *see* [1], *above*]. Instead, they issue statements of decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; *see* Ch. 551, *Trial*].

Because ALJs spend much more time writing proposed decisions than civil trial court judges spend writing statements of decision, ALJs' findings are often more formal. Furthermore, the requirements of *Topanga Asso. for Scenic*

Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12 also contribute to the relative formality of administrative findings [*see* [2], *above*].

[5] Implied Findings and Liberal Construction

In the past, courts have sometimes presumed the finding of necessary facts from the action of an administrative agency [*Swars v. Council of City of Vallejo (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 867, 872, 206 P.2d 355* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1040-1041, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198]* . The courts also have implied findings [*see, e.g., Consolidated Steel Corp. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 368, 370, 57 P.2d 919* (court found that evidence of injured finger sustained implied finding of new and further disability)].

When findings existed, they have been liberally construed to support the resulting order [*Realty Projects, Inc. v. Smith (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 204, 213, 108 Cal. Rptr. 71* ; *McNeil's Inc., v. Contractors' State License Board (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 322, 326, 68 Cal. Rptr. 640]* . Irregular findings have sometimes been found to be nonprejudicial [*Strode v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 291, 303, 15 Cal. Rptr. 879]* .

Since *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* [*see* [2][a], *above*], courts have been more reluctant to presume or imply findings [*see, e.g., Saleeby v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 547, 567, 216 Cal. Rptr. 367, 702 P.2d 525* (court found that State Bar was required to provide information sufficient to notify parties and the courts of the basis for its administrative action); *Respers v. University of Cal. Retirement System (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 864, 872-873, 217 Cal. Rptr. 594* (board was required to make findings supporting its denial of disability benefits to permit meaningful judicial review); *Wheeler v. State Bd. of Forestry (1982) 144 Cal. App. 3d 522, 528-529, 192 Cal. Rptr. 693* (in its decision to revoke forester's license for incompetence, board failed to include in its findings any authority for a standard by which to measure licensee's conduct); *Farmer v. City of Inglewood (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 130, 138-139, 185 Cal. Rptr. 9* (notice of final action of employee discharge did not constitute a statement of grounds for the termination); *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 84, 95-96, 139 Cal. Rptr. 214* (zoning administrator's decision to issue a use permit was deficient because its findings did not include consideration of environmental problems)].

It is unlikely, however, that the concepts of implied and presumed findings have been totally eliminated. To eliminate them would make virtually every administrative decision subject to successful attack. These concepts still have a role to play [*see, e.g., Golde v. Fox (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 167, 179, 188, 159 Cal. Rptr. 864* (a finding that the illegal conduct of a real estate licensee is substantially related to a licensee's qualifications and duties may be implied); *see also Kateen v. Department of Real Estate (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 481, 486, 215 Cal. Rptr. 295* (in its decision to revoke a license, department of real estate was not required to include findings that no mitigation appeared or that no aggravating factors existed)].

A licensing agency was not required under former *Gov. Code § 11518* to make specific fact findings as to the penalty imposed on a license holder. So long as the agency made specific fact findings that supported some sanction for professional misconduct, the agency's decision to revoke a doctor's license did not have to be supported by specific findings showing why a lesser sanction was inappropriate [*Williamson v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance, 217 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1346-1347, 266 Cal. Rptr. 520 (1990)]* .

Under the provisions operative July, 1, 1997, requiring that the factual and legal bases of a decision be stated [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(a), (b)*; *see* [1], *above*], it is unclear to what extent the case law regarding implied findings remains a valid interpretation of APA requirements.

[6] Legal Bases of Decision

[a] Nature of Determination

The APA expressly requires the written decision to state the legal basis for the decision [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(a)*; *see* [1], *above*].

Non-APA agencies may refer to this procedure as determining the "ultimate fact" or making the "ultimate finding." Like conclusions of law, the determination of issues or ultimate finding is a statement of the legal significance of the operative facts found in the findings of fact. Ultimate findings alone are not sufficient to support an administrative determination; it must be supported by findings of fact [*Parkmerced Residents Organization v. San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization Etc. Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1235, 1243, 258 Cal. Rptr. 774]* . It is usually a statement of a mixed question of law and fact that clarifies and determines legal status and uses the language of the applicable law [*see Parkmerced Residents Organization v. San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization Etc. Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1235, 1243, 258 Cal. Rptr. 774* (ultimate finding is usually expressed in language of statutory standard; ultimate finding is conclusion of law or determination of mixed question of law and fact)].

The following examples, set out in [b] and [c], *below*, provide an illustration of the determination of issues.

[b] EXAMPLE: Serving Alcoholic Beverages to Minor

LAW: *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25658(a)* makes it illegal to serve a minor alcoholic beverages. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25660* provides that demanding, being shown, and relying on bona fide evidence of majority is a defense.

EVIDENCE: The evidence presented at the hearing shows that a minor was served beer without a request for an "I.D."

FINDING: The finding of fact on the defense issue should follow the language of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25660* because it contains the operative facts that must be found. It should read: "Respondent did not demand, was not shown, and did not act in reliance upon bona fide evidence of majority."

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE: The legal consequences of the above lack of defense and other findings on serving the beer, can be stated: cause for discipline of respondent's license was established for violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25658(a)*.

[c] EXAMPLE: Physician's Unprofessional Conduct

LAW: *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2234(b)* permits discipline of a physician who is guilty of "unprofessional conduct," which is defined to include "gross negligence." Gross negligence is not defined in the Code, but courts have defined it to mean "the want of even scant care or an extreme departure from the ordinary standard of conduct" [*Kearl v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1052, 236 Cal. Rptr. 526]* .

EVIDENCE: The evidence showed that respondent doctor operated on a high-risk patient at a hospital without an intensive care unit. No expert testified regarding the want of even scant care or an extreme departure from the ordinary standard of conduct.

FINDING: The finding of fact should focus on the failure of proof. It should read: "It was not proved that respondent's operation on a high-risk patient at a hospital without an ICU indicated the want of even scant care or was an extreme departure from the ordinary standard of conduct and was gross negligence."

DETERMINATION OF ISSUE: The legal consequences of this failure of proof should be stated as follows: cause for discipline of respondent's license was not established for unprofessional conduct and violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2234(b)* [*see, e.g., Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* (facts of case used in example)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFactual DeterminationsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.15

§ 473G.15 Orders

The agency's ultimate action or order and the conclusions on which it is based must be supported by findings of fact under the *Topanga* rule [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 516, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *see § 473G.14[2][a]*]. The kinds of orders an administrative agency can issue depends on its legislative or constitutional authority. In the area of license discipline, this authority usually includes revocation or suspension of a license, with or without stays of execution, and probation with terms and conditions. Some statutes provide for civil penalties and the recoupment of investigation and other costs. Statutes may authorize "cease and desist orders" or "temporary suspension orders." Applications for licenses may be denied or granted with restrictions and conditions. Proceedings may be dismissed, in whole or in part. Under the new act, penalties may not be based on guidelines without the guidelines being properly adopted as regulations [*Gov. Code § 11425.50(e)*; *see § 473G.14[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.16

§ 473G.16 Discovering Decision Processes and Reasoning

It is improper for counsel to attempt to discover the processes by which an adjudicative administrative decision was reached, other than through examination of the findings. For example, in *United States v. Morgan (1941) 313 U.S. 409, 61 S. Ct. 999, 85 L. Ed. 1429* , the district court authorized a deposition of the secretary of agriculture, and at a later time the secretary testified at the trial. He explained how he reached his decision on a marketing order, including his study of the record, his consultations with staff, and his conferences with the examiner who heard the evidence. The testimony showed that he dealt with the enormous record in a manner not unlike the practice of judges in similar situations. But the Supreme Court held that he should not have been examined [*United States v. Morgan (1941) 313 U.S. 409, 422, 61 S. Ct. 999, 85 L. Ed. 1429]* . Justice Frankfurter said that just as a judge cannot be subjected to such an examination because it would be destructive of judicial responsibility, the administrative process must be equally respected. Courts and administrative adjudications are collaborative instrumentalities of justice, and the appropriate independence of each should be respected by the other [*United States v. Morgan (1941) 313 U.S. 409, 422, 61 S. Ct. 999, 85 L. Ed. 1429]* .

The *Morgan* rule is followed in California [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 257-258, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Southern California Underground Contractors v. City of San Diego (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 533, 541, 548, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527* (appellate court presumed that city council reviewed written briefs as part of making decision); *Hornung v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1095, 1099-1100, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 382* (Morgan rule applied to Commissioners of Board of Prison Terms who decide whether to grant or deny parole to prisoners)]. It precludes inquiry outside the administrative record to determine what evidence was considered and what reasoning was employed by an administrative decision maker [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* ; *Department of Alcoholic Bev.Control v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 720, 728, 173 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . For this reason, counsel must look to the findings to determine the reasoning process of an adjudicative administrative decision. The mind and methods of the decisionmaker cannot otherwise be explored.

In an interesting exception to the *Morgan* rule, a city manager who had final decisional authority over personnel decisions, and who ordered demotion of a city supervisor, testified that he did not listen to audiotapes of the personnel

hearing nor did he read the transcript of the hearing, and there was no statement of fact findings to support the recommendation of the local civil service commission that held the hearing. Rather, he based his decision on information supplied by the personnel director. This information was not placed in the record of the proceedings, and the demoted employee had no notice of this evidence nor any opportunity to controvert the evidence. The appellate court set aside the decision and required the city manager to give the employee a fair independent review. The court noted that a total absence of an independent review is inadequate [*Vollstedt v. City of Stockton, 220 Cal. App. 3d 265, 276-277, 269 Cal. Rptr. 404 (1990)]* . In civil law suits, heads of agencies may not be deposed when they do not have personal knowledge of factual information related to material issues in the lawsuit [*Nagle v. Superior Court (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1465, 1468-1469, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 281* ; *Westly v. Superior Court (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 907, 910-912, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 154* (state Attorney General and state Controller could not be deposed unless significant factual information can only be obtained from those officials. The Court of Appeal vacated the trial court's denial of a request for a protective order prohibiting the depositions of these two officials in a civil lawsuit because there were no factual issues as to which these officials would have personal factual information. The Court of appeal required the superior court to enter protective orders prohibiting those depositions on remand)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.17

§ 473G.17 ALJ Decisionmaking

[1] Role of Judges

The role of judges, including ALJs, is misunderstood by many attorneys, who do not fully appreciate the limits of the decisionmaking process. It is very difficult for a person in the role of an advocate to know how a judge decides a case, without assuming the role of impartial adjudicator. With a better understanding and appreciation of what takes place in a judge's mind when a case is decided, however, many attorneys would present better cases and be more successful. The following comments are offered to improve this understanding and appreciation.

[2] Determination of Facts

Judges decide cases, not "the truth." They try to end controversies by determining, as best they can, what the facts are that gave rise to the controversy. A judge is more confident of some facts and less confident of others and, it is hoped, is never deluded into believing that the "facts" found are necessarily the "truth." This distinction is important to advocates, because their role should be to present evidence of believable facts, not absolute truth. Believable facts are human in scale; they are consistent with human experience and motivation. They get their believability from a worldly theme.

This worldly theme or "theory of the case" is what persuades a judge to find facts consistent with it. It is this theory of the case that attorneys should give more attention to.

[3] Proof of the Case

Judges are skeptics. The law requires them to be, by imposing various evidentiary burdens of proof [*see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* , for a discussion of the burden of proof]. Judges must always demand that the proponent of a proposition prove it. This demand for proof is often silent, and therefore easily slighted. When it is expressed, counsel should never be frustrated by a judge's skepticism, regardless of how awkwardly it may be expressed.

Judges are particularly skeptical when being asked to believe that which is contrary to experience. Good judges are aware that things may not be as they seem or as they were in the past; but to convince a judge to break with reasonable

expectations requires a careful presentation. An advocate must clearly show that the old rules do not apply. He or she must also make a good record. Judges know that their work will be reviewed against the record. They will not be inclined to adopt a novel idea, regardless of sympathies, if the record is not convincing. A reviewing authority may also have to be convinced.

[4] Influence of Experts

Judges are not awed by experts. They know that most controversies have experts for every contention. The influence of an expert, therefore, usually depends on the believability he or she gains by knowing the specific facts under controversy, having first-hand experience with those facts or similar facts in the past, and admitting the limits of expertise regarding the facts.

[5] Role of Pleadings

Pleadings are essential to the administrative decision process [*see* Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* (discussing pleadings used to initiate an agency hearing)]. Attorneys rarely appreciate the importance of administrative pleadings and how they direct and limit a judge's decision. If the pleadings are drafted properly, they set out what has to be proved for the successful prosecution or defense of a case, particularly in APA cases where the pleadings contain more detailed allegations.

With proper pleadings, an ALJ can look at each allegation and apply the appropriate burden of proof to determine whether the allegation was proved and should be found to be true. Counsel, therefore, should check the sufficiency of the allegations in the pleadings and prepare and present their evidence to specifically meet those allegations. Other evidence should be presented, for example, evidence of background, mitigation, aggravation, damages, or penalty; but evidence on each of the specific allegations of the pleadings must be clearly presented. The only findings that are appropriate for an ALJ to make are those necessary to decide the allegations made and, if true, the consequences that should follow. When an attorney gets caught in other issues, it usually detracts from this decision process and can result in unfavorable findings. Case presentations should be simple, clear, and concise.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.18

§ 473G.18 Precedent Decisions Under the APA

The APA Administrative Adjudication *Bill of Rights* (*Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*), requires that an agency decision may not be relied on as precedent unless the agency designates and indexes the decision as precedent [*Gov. Code §§ 11425(a)(7), 11425.60(a)*]. The *bill of rights* sets forth the minimum due process and public interest requirements that must be satisfied in a hearing that is subject to Chapter 4.5, the general provisions of APA's administrative adjudication provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), which includes state agency hearings when, under the federal or state constitution or a federal or state statute, an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is required to formulate and issue a decision [*Gov. Code § 11410.20*].

These requirements also apply to agency hearings that are subject to the Chapter 5, the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*), [*Gov. Code §§ 11410.50, 11501*; *see Ch. 473, Pubic Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

An agency decision may not be expressly relied on as precedent unless it is designated as a precedent decision by the agency [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(a)*]. This statute limits the authority of an agency to rely on previous decisions unless the decisions have been publicly announced as precedential [25 Cal. L. Rev Comm. Reports 55, 162 (1997)].

An agency may designate as a precedent decision a decision or part of a decision that contains a significant legal or policy determination of general application that is likely to recur. Designation of a decision or part of a decision as a precedent decision is not rulemaking and need not be done under Chapter 3.5, the APA rulemaking provisions (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(b)*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , et seq. (discussion of rulemaking)].

This provsion provides recognition for the need that agencies have to be able to make law and policy through adjudication as well as through rulemaking. It codified the practice of a number of agencies to designate important decisions as precedential. These agencies include the Fair Employment and Housing Commission [*Gov. Code § 12935(h)*], the State Personnal Board [*Gov. Code § 19582.5*], and the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*].

This statute is intended to encourage agencies to articulate what they are doing when they make new law or policy in an adjudicative decision. An agency may not by precedent decision revise or amend an existing regulation or adopt a rule that has no adequate legislative basis [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 163 (1995)]. The precedent designation system authorised by this statute is an exception from the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11340.5* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 163 (1995); *see* 1993 OAL Det. No. 1 (determination by Office of Administrative Law that agency designation of decision as precedential violates former *Gov. Code § 11347.5* (*now Gov. Code § 11340.5*) unless made pursuant to rulemaking procedures)].

Nonetheless, agencies are encouraged to express precedent decisions in the form of regulations, to the extent practicable [25 Cal. L. Rv. Comm. Reports 55, 163 (1995)]. An agency's designation of a decision, or part of a decision, or failure to designate a decision or part of a decision, as a precedent decision is not subject to judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(b)*].

An agency is required to maintain an index of significant legal and policy determinations made in precedent decisions. The index must be updated at least annually, unless no precedent decision has been designated since the last preceding update. The index shall be made available to the public by subscription, and its availability shall be publicised annually in the California Regulatory Notice Register [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(c)*]. The index is a public record, available for public inspection and copying [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 163 (1995)]. The statutory requirements for designating and indexing precedent decisions applies to decisions issued on or after July 1, 1997. Agencies are not precluded by this law from from designating and indexing as a precedent decision a decision issued before July 1, 1997 [*Gov. Code § 11425.60(d)*]. Making the precedent decision requirements prospective only is designed to minimize the potential burden on agencies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 163 (1995)].

Precedential decisions of state agencies are often found on the agency's web site. For example, the California Horse Racing Board provides access to its precedential decisions on the agency web site at www.chrb.ca.gov. Nine state agencies maintain precedential decisions under the APA, including the Horse Racing Board. An additional ten agencies maintain precedential decisions under the authority of their own statutes, including the State Personnel Board, whose decisions are posted found on the agency web site at www.spb.ca.gov/spblaw/precedrd.cfm. A complete current list of state agencies with precedential decisions can be found in Henke's California Law Guide (Matthew Bender, 6th ed., 2002), Chapter 8, *California Administrative Law*, § 8.04[2].

Litigants who challenge agency action often will request that the appellate court grant judicial notice of precedential decisions of that agency. The courts will often grant those requests, which obviates proof of the authenticity of an agency precedential decision [*Auburn Woods I Homeowners Assn. v. Fair Employment & Housing Comm'n (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1578, 1591, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 669* ; *California Dept. of Corrections v. State Personnel Bd. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1601, 1611, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedural Requirements for Decisions After Formal Hearings

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473G.19-473G.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473G.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.30

§ 473G.30 Effective Date of Decision

[1] Introduction

This subpart discusses the effective date of an agency decision and analyzes the impact that a stay of execution or early effective date has on the decision and the parties; it also discusses the procedure for requesting reconsideration of a decision. In addition, the part lists the consequences of an agency decision to a party, including sanctions, benefits, and remedies. Finally, it covers the reinstatement of a license after a decision revoking or suspending the license.

[2] Effective Date

In APA adjudicatory proceedings, the agency's decision in a case is ordinarily effective 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to the parties [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 11518* (mailing requirements)]. The decision may have a different effective date, however, if the agency takes one of the following actions [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*]:

- Orders that the decision become effective sooner than 30 days after delivery [*see § 473G.31, below*].
- Grants a stay of execution [*Gov. Code § 11519(b)*; *see § 473G.32, below*].
- Orders a reconsideration within the 30-day period after delivery [*Gov. Code § 11521*; *see § 473G.33, below*].

The agency has the authority to grant an application to correct a mistake or clerical error in the decison [*Gov. Code § 11518.5*]. If the agency grants the application and sets the matter for further proceedings, then the effective date of the decision will be delayed [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(b)*; *see § 473G.34*]. This provides a fourth alternative to the normal effective date of a decision.

When an agency decision becomes effective, the agency is free to enforce its decision, including imposing sanctions such as fines or license revocation [*see § 473G.35*]. Enforcement may be stayed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*], however, when a party seeks judicial review of the decision by filing a petition for writ of administrative mandate [*Gov.*

Code § 11523; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. For a discussion of judicial review, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

The person to which the agency action is directed may not be required to comply with a decision unless the person has been served with the decision [*see Gov. Code § 11505*] or has actual knowledge of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(e)*]. A nonparty may not be required to comply with a decision unless the agency has made the decision available for public inspection and copying or the nonparty has actual knowledge of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(f)*].

These provisions distinguish between the effective date of the decision and the time when it can be enforced. "Actual knowledge" is intended to include not only knowledge that a decision has been issued, but also knowledge of the general contents of the decision as it relates to the person who is required to comply with it. If a question arises whether a particular person had actual knowledge of a decision, this issue must be determined like other fact questions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 250 (1995)]. The binding effect of a decision on nonparties who have actual knowledge may be illustrated by a state law that prohibits wholesalers from delivering alcoholic beverages to liquor dealers unless the dealers hold valid licenses from the state beverage agency. If the agency issues a decision revoking the license of a particular dealer, this decision is binding on any wholesaler who has actual knowledge of it, even before the decision is made available for public inspection and copying. The decision binds all wholesalers, including those without actual knowledge, after it has been made available for public inspection and copying [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 250 (1995)]. Finally, agencies are not precluded by these provisions from taking immediate action to protect the public interest under the emergency decision provisions of *Gov. Code § 11460.10 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11519(g)*; *see* Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesStays of Proceedings & SupersedeasGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

95 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.31

§ 473G.31 Early Effective Date

[1] General Rules

An agency may order a decision to become effective sooner than 30 days after it is delivered or mailed to respondent [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*]. The earliest date on which a decision may become effective is the date on which it is mailed or delivered [*Koons v. Placer Hills Union Sch. Dist. (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 484, 490, 132 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . The right of a party to apply to the agency to correct a mistake or clerical error in the decision within 15 days after service of a copy of the decision on the party, but not later than the effective date of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(a)*; *see § 473G.34*], may impact the ability of an agency to make a decision effective earlier than the 15-day period. Also, as discussed in [2]-[4], *below*, a number of important procedural consequences flow from an agency's order to make a decision effective sooner than 30 days from mailing or delivery to the parties.

[2] Effect on Reconsideration Period

An agency's power to order reconsideration of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*; *see § 473G.33*] expires on the effective date of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]. Thus, an early effective date is unfavorable to a respondent to the extent that it shortens the period in which the respondent may petition for reconsideration. If the agency makes the decision effective on delivery, it completely precludes the party from filing a petition for reconsideration. This action, however, does not deprive the responding party of its constitutional or statutory rights [*Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 304, 196 P.2d 20* ; *Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 176, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226* ; *Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 402-403, 184 P.2d 323]* .

The party may still seek judicial review, regardless of whether or not he or she sought reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11523*]. Nonetheless, counsel for the respondent should request at the hearing that the effective date of the decision, if unfavorable to the respondent, should be set to allow the filing of a petition for reconsideration.

[3] Effect on Sanctions

An agency sanction, such as license revocation [*see § 473G.35[2]*] generally becomes effective immediately on the

effective date of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*; *Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 176, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226]* . For example, a licensee is subject to license revocation sooner then the usual 30 days after delivery of the decision if the agency orders the effective date to be earlier than 30 days or immediate on delivery [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*].

[4] Effect on Appeal

Generally, a party has 30 days from the last day in which reconsideration can be ordered to file a petition for judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see* [2], *above*]. Since reconsideration can be ordered for 30 days after delivery or mailing of the decision, unless the agency sets an earlier effective date [*Gov. Code § 11521*], the appealing party could have up to 60 days from the date the decision is rendered to file an appeal. When an agency orders an early effective date, the period for reconsideration is shortened, thereby shortening the period for appeal. Thus, counsel must determine exactly when the decision becomes effective in order to accurately compute the appropriate time period for filing an appeal. See Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq., for discussion of judicial review of agency decisions.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.32

§ 473G.32 Stay of Execution

The APA provides that a stay of execution may be included in the decision, or granted by the agency at any time before the decision becomes effective [*Gov. Code § 11519(b)*]. The granting of a stay suspends the enforcement of the decision or the carrying out of agency sanctions as a result of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(b)*; *see § 473G.35* (enforcement)]. An agency may stay execution of its decision to defer imposition of a penalty until the penalty will actually serve a disciplinary purpose [*Medlock Dusters, Inc. v. Christensen (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 565, 569-570, 110 Cal. Rptr. 805* (suspension of crop dusting license was deferred until after the slack season was over)].

If the statutes governing an agency grant it the authority to make a conditional order, the stay of execution may be accompanied by an express condition that the respondent comply with specified terms of probation [*Gov. Code § 11519(b)*]. Those terms must be just and reasonable in light of the findings and decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(b)*]. Specified terms of probation may include an order of restitution. Where restitution is ordered and paid pursuant to this law, the amount paid shall be credited to any later judgment in a civil action [*Gov. Code § 11519(d)*].

The granting of a stay of execution does not change the time for filing an appeal, which is 30 days from the last day to request reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see § 473G.30*; *see also* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq. (judicial review of agency decisions)]. If the respondent was required to register with any public officer, a notification of any suspension or revocation must be sent to the officer after the decision has become effective [*Gov. Code § 11519(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesStays of Proceedings & Supersedeas

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.33

§ 473G.33 Rehearing or Reconsideration

[1] Right Determined by Statute

The California Supreme Court has ruled that, when the legislature specifies by statute that reconsideration or rehearing of an adverse decision of an agency *may* be sought by an affected party, such reconsideration is not *required* before seeking judicial review, at least as to any issues already litigated before and finally decided by the agency. Reconsideration is only necessary to raise new issues that have not previously been presented to the agency [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 493-494, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* .

Rehearings in administrative proceedings are not essential to due process; only a hearing before judgment is required [*Whitley v. Superior Court (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 75, 81, 113 P.2d 449]* . The right to a rehearing or reconsideration of a final administrative order, and any duty to seek either, exists only if a statute provides for later consideration [*Olive Proration etc. Com. v. Agri. etc. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 204, 209, 109 P.2d 918* ; *SaveOxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 149-150, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . California administrative agencies do not have authority to reopen or reconsider an adjudicative decision, unless a statute permits such action [*Gutierrez v. Board of Ret. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 745, 749, n.3, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 837]* . Nevertheless, an agency may rescind a decision that exceeds its jurisdiction. However, the tax assessment appeals board was authorized to reinstate the taxpayer's application under its governing statute [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)*], and the Board's later revocation of that reinstatement was improper, as that statue did not limit the board's power of reinstatement in a manner that would authorize revocation [*Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 39-40, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658]* . California agencies have no inherent or implied power to rehear or reconsider a final decision [*Heap v. City of Los Angeles (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 405, 407, 57 P.2d 1323]* . The APA, however, expressly provides for reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11521*; *see* [2], [3], *below*]. Other statutes provide for rehearing applications within relatively short periods of time [*Pub. Util. Code § 1731(c)* (Public Utility Commission decisions in specific case; application for rehearing must be filed within 10 days after date of issuance of order or decision)].

[2] Petition for Reconsideration

When requesting or petitioning for a rehearing or reconsideration, counsel should follow the controlling statute. If the

statute sets forth the grounds for the petition, only those grounds should be used. If no grounds are set forth in the statute, as in the APA [*see Gov. Code § 11521*], all appropriate grounds should be presented. If a ground for the petition is that new evidence has been discovered, counsel should show the nature of the evidence, why it is important, and why it was not introduced at the hearing. An affidavit or declaration can be used for this purpose. Some statutes expressly require a showing of good cause [*see, e.g., Lab. Code § 5803* (Workers' Compensation Appeals Board may rescind, alter, or amend any order, award, or decision for good cause); *see also Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. v. Indus. A.C. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 314, 316, 57 P.2d 501* (Industrial Accident Commission has jurisdiction to rescind a former decision on good cause, but not a mere change of opinion)]. The APA, however, does not require such a showing [*Gov. Code § 11521*].

For an example of a petition for reconsideration under the APA, *see § 473G.70* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473* (standards used to vacate or set aside judgments in civil actions); *see also* Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* (discussion and forms relating to setting aside or vacating judgment in civil actions)]. Some of the civil action standards set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* are analogous to grounds for granting reconsideration under *Gov. Code § 11521*.

Failure to petition for a rehearing may waive the issues for review [*see, e.g., Lab. Code § 5904* (in workers' compensation proceedings, a petitioner for reconsideration is deemed to have waived all objections other than those set forth in the petition for reconsideration); *Alford v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 198, 206, 169 P.2d 641* (under *Lab. Code § 5904* (issue was waived when petition for rehearing did not raise it)].

Because the APA does not require the petitioner to set out the grounds for reconsideration, it is not clear whether an issue is similarly waived in APA proceedings. With respect to new evidence and arguments based on it, however, the failure to use reasonable diligence to present it to the agency, including requesting reconsideration, is a waiver [*Nicky Blair's Restaurant v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Board (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 941, 956-957, 167 Cal. Rptr. 516* ; *Schoenen v. Board of Medical Exrs. (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 909, 915, 54 Cal. Rptr. 364]* .

When a statute permits a party to seek reconsideration or rehearing of an adverse decision of an agency, such reconsideration is not required before seeking judicial review as to issues already litigated before and finally decided by an agency. Reconsideration by the agency must be sought only as to new issues not previously presented to the agency [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 493-494, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* .

[3] APA Order for Reconsideration

[a] Power to Order Reconsideration

Under the APA, an agency can order a reconsideration of all or part of the case on the petition of any party, or on its own motion [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]. The agency is required to notify the petitioner of the time limits for petitioning for reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]. The power to order a reconsideration expires as follows [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]:

- Thirty days after delivery of a decision to respondent.

- On the effective date of the decision if that date occurs prior to the expiration of the 30-day period [*see § 473G.30* (effective date)].

- At the termination of a stay not to exceed 30 days that the agency may grant to permit filing of a petition for reconsideration.

If the agency needs more time to evaluate a petition for reconsideration filed before expiration of any of these applicable periods, it may grant a stay of the expiration for no more than 10 days, solely for the purpose of considering the petition

[*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*].

The 10-day stay time period authorized by *Gov. Code § 11521(a)* for review by a state agency of a filed petition for reconsideration is the maximum time period that an agency may stay the effective date of the decision while it considers the petition for reconsideration. The Medical Board of California granted a 28-day stay of the decision, and then ordered reconsideration of the Board's previous decision to dismiss accusations of misconduct against a physician. The California Supreme Court held that the Board's order granting reconsideration was void for lack of jurisdiction because the Board only had authority to stay the decision for 10 days, not 28 days [*Bonnell v. Medical Board (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1255, 1258, 82 P.3d 740]* . The court based the decision on the language of the statute, which was very clear as to the 10-day limit for filed petitions. The Supreme court based its decision on the plain language of the statute, and did not use legislative history, and did not defer to and rejected the contrary agency interpretation that the 30-day stay period could be applied to filed petitions [*Bonnell v. Medical Board (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1255, 1264-1266, 82 P.3d 740]* .

[b] Denial or Grant of Petition

A petition is deemed denied if not acted on within the required time periods [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]. If an agency denies a rehearing or reconsideration, absent an abuse of discretion, the denial will not be set aside [*Clendaniel v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 659, 662, 111 P.2d 314]* . If reconsideration is granted, the agency itself may reconsider the case on all the pertinent parts of the record and any additional evidence and argument that it permits, or the agency may assign the case to an administrative law judge (ALJ) [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]. Ordering reconsideration effectively vacates the agency's original decision. Furthermore, because the first decision is no longer effective, there is no appealable decision and thus the parties must wait for the completion of the reconsideration process for the issuance of a second decision that will be appealable under the APA. If oral evidence is introduced before the agency itself, no agency member may vote unless he or she heard the evidence [*Gov. Code § 11521(b)*].

In practice, the case is ordinarily assigned to the same ALJ that heard it initially. Since the agency itself can reconsider the case on the record created by an ALJ and additional evidence and argument, however, a new ALJ could probably be assigned to prepare a proposed decision from the same record and additional evidence [*see Gov. Code § 11521(b)*]. An ALJ must follow the same procedure for a proposed decision that is required in an initial hearing [*Gov. Code § 11521(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 11517* (procedures); *see also* Pt. A (hearing procedures)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.34

§ 473G.34 Correction of Mistakes or Clerical Errors in Decisions

Under an APA provision operative July, 1, 1997, mistakes or clerical errors in decision can be corrected without parties to the decision having to file an action for judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11518.5*]. Within 15 days after service of a copy of the decision on a party, but not later than the effective date of the decision, the party may apply to the agency for correction of a mistake or clerical error in the decision, stating the specific ground on which the application is made. Notice of the application must be given to the other parties to the proceeding. This application is not a prerequisite for seeking judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(a)*]. The agency may refer the application to the administrative law judge who formulated the proposed decision or may delegate its authority to one or more persons [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(b)*]. The agency may deny the application, grant the application and modify the decision, or grant the application and set the matter for further proceedings. The application is considered denied if the agency does not dispose of it within 15 days after it is made or a longer time that the agency provides by regulation [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(c)*].

Agencies are not prohibited by this statute from modifying a decision to correct a mistake or clerical error, on the motion of the agency or the motion of the ALJ. An agency modification must be made within 15 days after issuance of the decision [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(d)*]. The agency is required to, within 15 days after correction of a mistake or clerical error in the decision, serve a copy of the correction on each party on which a copy of the decision was previously served [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(e)*].

Gov. Code § 11518.5 is intended to provide parties, including the agency that is a party to the proceeding, a limited right to remedy mistakes in the decision without the need for judicial review. This procedure is intended to apply to correction of factual or legal errors in the decision. *Gov. Code § 11518.5* supplements the authority in *Gov. Code § 11517* of the agency head to adopt a proposed decision with technical or other minor changes [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 248 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.35

§ 473G.35 Consequences of Agency Adjudicatory Decisions

[1] Introduction

An agency decision may impose sanctions or impart benefits to a party. Agency sanctions include license revocation and suspension [*see* [2], *below*], and license denial [*see* [3], *below*]. Administrative remedies include award of benefits [*see* [5], *below*], damages [*see* [6], *below*], injunctions, and other orders [*see* [7], *below*].

An agency cannot award administrative remedies or implement administrative sanctions ordered in a decision, however, without statutory authority delegating that power [*see, e.g.,* *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1393, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323 (Fair Employment and Housing Commission did not have statutory authority to order punitive damages)* ; *American Federation of Labor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 1017, 1022-1023, 920 P.2d 1314* (neither administrative law judge nor agency can award interest on retroactive benefits when there is no statutory authority to do so)]. Some agency remedies or sanctions are enforced by the agency following an administrative hearing, and others are enforced through the judicial system [*Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323* (administrative enforcement); *Commodore Home Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 211, 185 Cal. Rptr. 270, 649 P.2d 912* (civil enforcement)].

[2] License Revocation or Suspension

State licensing agencies have the authority to suspend or revoke licenses [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 23.7* ("license" is specifically defined to mean license, certificate, registration, or other means to engage in a business or profession regulated by the Business and Professions Code, which includes most licensed professions and businesses, or referred to in Sections 1000 (governing chiropractors) or 3600 (governing osteopathic physicians and surgeons))] they have issued [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2227* (revocation of physician's license); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 1670* (Board of Dental Examiners may revoke license of dentist following hearing conducted pursuant to APA)]. License revocation following an administrative hearing does not violate the constitutional due process or statutory rights of licensees [*O'Reilly v. Board of Medical Examiners (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 381, 58 Cal. Rptr. 7, 426 P.2d 167 , cert. denied,* *390 U.S. 944, 88 S. Ct. 1019, 19 L. Ed. 2d 1132* ; *Cooper v. State Board of Equalization (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 672, 290 P.2d 914* ;

Marlo v. Board of Medical Examiners (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 276, 246 P.2d 69] . License revocation may also be based on improper conduct that occurred before the license was issued [*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 763, 768, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 952 P.2d 641]* . A physician could be disciplined for unprofessional conduct under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2239(a)* when the physician had two or more convictions for misdemeanor alcohol related driving violations [*Griffiths v. Superior Court (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 757, 762, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* . The physician's constitutional rights to due process of law and equal protection of the law are not violated by discipline based on alcohol consumption related convictions because there is a rational connection between those convictions and a physician's license to practice medicine [*Griffiths v. Superior Court (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 757, 770-771, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* .

The grounds for revoking or suspending licenses are set forth by statute [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2234* (unprofessional conduct by physicians); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2761* (unprofessional conduct by nurses); *Finnerty v. Board of Registered Nursing (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 219, 227-229, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 364* (court of appeal affirmed gross negligence by nurse finding which supported Board of Registered Nursing's revocation of nurse's license with revocation stayed and nurse placed on probation for three years)], or are contained in agency regulations. The APA authorizes state agencies that have revoked or suspended a person's license to reinstate that license or to reduce the penalty [*Gov. Code § 11522*; *see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2307* (reinstatement of physician's licenses); *see § 473G.36*]. Lesser disciplinary sanctions that can be awarded by agencies include placing a licensee on probation [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2227(a)(3)* (licensed physician can be placed on probation); *Zabetian v. Medical Board of California (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 462, 468-469, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* (two year probation period imposed on physician based on finding of unprofessional conduct due to two acts of repeated negligence)], publicly reprimanding a licensee [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2227(a)(4)* (public reprimand of licensed physician)], or taking other action against a licensee, such as requiring training or supervision [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2227(a)(5)* (ALJ or agency may order any other appropriate action against disciplined physician)].

The California Court of Appeal upheld the validity of the Medical Board of California posting on the agency web site information related to disciplinary records of licensees regulated by the Board. The court rejected a challenge by a physician to the board's disclosure on its web site of information relating to the doctor's completion of probation in discipline actions, as well as disclosure of the case numbers under which the doctor was required to complete probation. The court held that public disclosure of discipline information was required by the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 803.1* and *2027*, and this disclosure mandate included probation completion and case number information [*Szold v. Med. Bd. of Cal. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 591, 598-599, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 665]* .

The Court of Appeal upheld the authority of a hospital peer review committee to summarily suspend a doctor's hospital clinical privileges to protect the well-being of prospective patients at that hospital. The doctor suffered from depression, mental distress, and severe family and personal stresses, that made it very difficult for her to act professionally toward her patients. The hospital acted under the statutory authority of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 809.5*, which authorized medical peer review bodies to suspend clinical privileges of a doctor immediately when there was imminent danger to the health of any person. The hospital based its suspension decision on the risks to prospective patients at the hospital. The Court of Appeal held that harm to prospective patients was within the scope of the hospital peer review body's authority to summarily suspend a physician, given that the needs of public safety outweigh the doctor's due process rights [*Medical Staff of Sharp Mem'l Hosp. v. Superior Court (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 173, 181-183, 16 Cal. Rptr 3d 769]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Department of Real Estate did not have authority to revoke the license of a real estate licensee based on a criminal conviction of unlawful intercourse with a minor because the Director relied upon a invalid presumption that minors can not consent to sexual intercourse. The governing law supporting license revocation, section 2910 [*Tit. 10 Cal. Code Regs. § 2910 (a)(5)*] of the real estate department's regulations, required proof that the person was a non-consenting participant in the conduct punished by the criminal law. This requirement was based on governing statutes, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 481, 490*, and *10177*, which required the department to show that when licensees are convicted for crimes of moral turpitude, the department must prove that the conviction was

substantially related to the licensee's fitness to engage in the profession in order for the department to suspend or revoke the license of the licensee based on the conviction [*Donaldson v. Department of Real Estate (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 948, 950-951, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 577]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Department of Real Estate (DRE) did not have statutory authority under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 490* to revoke the license of a real estate broker who entered a guilty plea to misdemeanor battery related to a domestic violence incident. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 490* authorized licensing agencies to suspend or to revoke the licenses of licensee's subject to regulatory jurisdiction of those agencies when the licensees were convicted of criminal offenses when the crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of the business or profession for which the license was issued [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 490*]. The Court of Appeal held that section 490 did not authorize the revocation of the real estate broker's license, as that statute limited agency authority and did not independently authorize the license revocation [*Petropoulos v. Dept. of Real Estate (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 554, 567-568, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 812* (misdemeanor battery conviction did not involve moral turpitude so that DRE could not rely on *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10177(b)* to revoke license)].

A county civil service commission's decision to reduce the penalty awarded (from demotion in rank to a 30-day suspension without back pay) against a sergeant who allegedly made false statements and was found to have acted with insubordination and willful disobedience during the investigation of a gender harassment claim against him brought by a female deputy was reversed by the Sixth District California Court of Appeal, which found that the reduction in penalty was an abuse of discretion given the seriousness of the employee misconduct by the sergeant [*County of Santa Cruz v. Civil Service Commission of Santa Cruz (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1584-1585]* . While this decision is not a licensing case, similar principles apply to judicial review of civil service penalty determinations with public employees.

For further discussion and forms relating to licensing proceedings, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] License Denial

California licensing agencies have the statutory authority to deny licenses to applicants who do not meet minimum standards of qualifications for the license [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2080* (applicant for doctor's license must meet standards for issuance of license)]. These agencies may also deny an applicant's license for violation of statutory standards that would also justify revocation or suspension of the license if the conduct were committed by a license holder [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2221* (applicant for doctor's license will be denied license if guilty of unprofessional conduct)]. Because license applicants must apply for their license, and must satisfy the agency that they meet the minimum standards of the agency, most agencies make initial decisions whether to grant or deny a license based on examinations [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 1630* (examination for dentist's license)], and a written application file [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 1628* (applicant for dentist's license must file application and provide sufficient evidence of graduation from approved dental college)]. An applicant whose license has been denied has the statutory right to request a hearing under the APA to show that he or she is entitled to be granted the license [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 1628.5* (applicant whose dental license is denied can request hearing under APA); *Gov. Code § 11504*; *see Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 246 P.2d 656]* .

For example, a disbarred attorney applied for a license to sell real estate. His license application was denied. He requested a hearing to challenge the denial. The denial was upheld by the ALJ based on the applicant's prior disbarment. The Court of Appeal upheld that decision and ruled on a number of issues relevant to administrative adjudication. The court held that an accusation satisfied the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11503* when it stated that the applicant for a real estate license had been denied a license on the grounds that he had been disbarred from the practice of law, and the accusation set forth the statutory sections and Rules of Professional Conduct sections that the applicant had violated which provided the basis for disbarment. The accusation was not required to set forth specific acts of dishonesty committed by the applicant [*Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 223, 228-229, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803]* . The court also held that collateral estoppel principles precluded a challenger to the denial of a real estate license from offering

evidence impeaching prior judgments against the challenger in a civil fraud lawsuit and a state bar disbarment proceeding. These judgments were used as the basis of license denial by the Department of Real Estate. The ALJ ruled at the challenger's hearing that this evidence could not be admitted, as these were final judgments, and collateral estoppel principles prohibited impeachment of those judgments. This ruling was upheld on appeal [*Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 223, 230-231, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803]* .

[4] Criminal Penalties

The statutes governing an administrative agency frequently include provisions that make certain conduct of its licensees illegal and punishable criminally. For example, a statute may make prohibited conduct a felony [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 585* (individuals who commit fraud related to medical degrees are guilty of a felony punishable by a fine or imprisonment)], a misdemeanor [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 556* (failure to report eye disease case to health department is a misdemeanor punishable by fine)], or an infraction [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 146(a), (d), 146.5(a), (d)*]. An agency may also be given statutory authority to adopt administrative regulations that are enforceable criminally [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 556* (persons who violate agency rules adopted under this statute are guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by fine)]. Criminal penalties are enforced through the normal judicial process: the district attorney files charges against the licensee and prosecutes the case.

A licensee can also be sanctioned administratively for the same conduct that is punishable criminally, by having his or her license revoked or suspended [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 652* (paying or accepting fees for patient referrals is a misdemeanor and constitutes grounds for suspension or revocation of the license)]. For a discussion of the doctrine of collateral estoppel, which prevents relitigation of an issue determined in a prior judicial or administrative proceeding in a later proceeding, see *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* (administrative Department of Social Services decision, which exonerated a welfare recipient of fraud charges, collaterally estopped a subsequent criminal prosecution for the same misconduct) [*see also* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*].

[5] Award of Benefits

One of the major functions of administrative agencies is to award or grant benefits to individuals who are eligible for those benefits as a matter ofstatutory entitlement. The major benefit granting agencies in California are the Department of Social Services (welfare benefits), the Employment Development Department (unemployment), and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (workers' compensation benefits). A party is entitled to the benefits awarded in an agency decision on the effective date of that decision [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*; *see § 473B.30*]. Administrative law judges can not award interest on retroactive benefits without statutory authority [*AFL v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 1017, 1022-1023, 56 Cal. Rptr. 109, 920 P.2d 1314*].

[6] Damages

It is unusual for an administrative agency to be given the power to award damages, as distinct from restitution, in an administrative hearing. Damage awards are an administrative remedy that must be expressly authorized by statute [*Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323* ; *Lance Camper Manufacturing Corp. v. Republic Indemnity Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 194, 200-201, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 622]* . For example, the ALRB does not have statutory authority to award compensatory damages under *Labor Code § 1160.3* to persons injured in their property or business by unlawful secondary boycott activity [*United Farm Workers v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 303, 322-323, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696]* .

The California Supreme Court has addressed the issue of whether the Fair Employment and Housing Act (*see Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*) authorizes the award of punitive damages. In *Commodore Home Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 211, 185 Cal. Rptr 270, 649 P.2d 912* , the litigants received a "right-to-sue" letter when the agency did not initiate a hearing within the statutory deadline [*see Gov. Code § 12965(b)*]. The Court held that the

litigants could receive punitive damages in the civil action, along with other remedies authorized by the Act in *Gov. Code § 12970(a)*. The Court based its holding on a principle of statutory interpretation: when statutes create a new cause of action, all remedies available to other civil claimants are also available to parties filing claims under the statutory cause of action, unless the Legislature expresses a contrary intent [*Commodore Home Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 211, 215, 185 Cal. Rptr. 270, 649 P.2d 912]* .

in *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323* , however, the Court held that the Fair Employment and Housing Commission itself cannot award punitive damages under *Gov. Code § 12970(a)* when it decides an employment discrimination claim [*Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1393, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323]* . The Legislature usually specifies whether punitive damages, and sometimes compensatory damages, are authorized; an agency cannot devise punitive measures when a statute is essentially remedial [*Dyna-Med, Inc. v. FairEmployment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1388, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323]* . For example, the Fair Employment and Housing Commission is specifically authorized to award actual and punitive damages in housing discrimination cases [*Gov. Code § 12987(a)(3)* (civil penalties), (a)(4) (actual damages)]. Effective January 1, 1993, *Gov. Code § 12970* was amended to authorize the Commission to award administrative fines, civil penalties, and damages for emotional distress [*Gov. Code § 12970(a)(3)* (emotional distress damages), (c) (administrative fines), (d) (standards), and (e) (civil penalties)]. The legislature intended these amendments to be a response to the *Dyna-Med* and *Peralta* decisions of the California Supreme Court [1992 Stats., ch. 911, § 1(c)]. The effect of the legislative amendments is to give clear statutory authority to the Commission to award emotional distress damages [*Gov. Code § 12970(a)(3)*], and a type of punitive damages [*Gov. Code § 12970(c), (d), (e)* (with a maximum of $150,000, including the amount of administrative fines, for each aggrieved person and against each respondent)]. The court decisions in *Dyna-Med* and *Peralta* had concluded that the commision id not have statutory authority to award either type of damages remedy. Because of the legislative amendments, the Commission has clear authority to award both types of damages.

However, the FEHC does not have statutory authority to award compensatory damages for emotional distress suffered in an employment discrimination case that is adjudicated before the agency [*Gov. Code § 12970(a)*; *Peralta Community College Dist v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 40, 57, 276 Cal. Rptr. 114, 801 P.2d 357]* . A litigant who seeks to recover emotional distress damages must file a civil lawsuit in court seeking recovery for common law claims related to employment discrimination. Those common law claims are not pre-empted by the Fair Employment & Housing Act [*Gov. Code §§ 12900-12996*; *Rojo v. Kliger (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 65, 83, 276 Cal. Rptr. 130, 801 P.2d 373]* . Also, litigants may seek judicial relief for common law nonstatutory claims without exhausting administrative remedies before the FEHC [*Rojo v. Kliger (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 65, 89, 276 Cal. Rptr 130, 801 P.2d 373]* .

A local rent control board can not properly award treble damages based on tripling the amount of excess rent awarded because treble damage awards are not reasonably necessary to enforce rent control laws, and because treble damages are likely to lead to arbitrary and disproportionate results. Thus, treble damage awards by this board violate the substantive limitations of the judicial powers doctrine which requires that the administrative remedy be authorized by statute, and be reasonably necessary to carry out the administrative agencies primary legitimate regulatory purposes [*McHugh v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 348, 378-379, 261 Cal. Rptr. 318, 777 P.2d 91]* .

The California Supreme Court held that Section 12987 of the Fair Employment and Housing Act [*Gov. Code § 12987*] is invalid under the judicial powers clause insofar as it authorizes general compensatory damages for emotional distress suffered as a result of unlawful housing discrimination [*Walnut Creek Manor v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 245, 251, 284 Cal. Rptr. 718, 814 P.2d 704]* . The court also interpreted the punitive damages provisions of the same statute to limit such awards to the statutory maximum of $1,000 for a single course of discriminatory conduct against one complaining party [*Walnut Creek Manor v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 245, 271-273, 284 Cal. Rptr. 718, 814 P.2d 704]* .

The California Supreme Court upheld an award of $10,000 in general compensatory damages for emotional distress and lost housing opportunity [*Gov. Code § 12987(a)(4)*] that was awarded to a successful African American female claimant who sought damages for racial discrimination in housing against a landlord who refused to rent to the claimant. The damages were awarded, along with a $10,000 civil penalty in an administrative proceeding before the Fair Employment and Housing Commission [*Konig v. Fair Employment and Housing Commission (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 743, 745-746, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 50 P.3d 718]* . The Supreme Court distinguished the *Walnut Creek Manor* case decision and concluded that the award of damages in this case did not violate the judicial powers clause of the California Constitution [*Cal. Const. Art. VI, § 1*] because legislative amendments to the FEHA statute solve separation of powers problems in the statute. *Gov. Code § 12989* allows claimants the option of bringing their claims in the court system instead of before the administrative agency [*Konig v. Fair Employment and Housing Commission (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 743, 757-758, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 50 P.3d 718]* . Finally, the FEHA statute [*Gov. Code § 12955.6*] provides for the same scope of remedies as are available in federal administrative adjudications under the federal Fair Housing law [*42 U.S.C. § 3601*; *Konig v. Fair Employment and Housing Commission (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 743, 750-751, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 50 P.3d 718]* .

The judicial powers clause of the California Constitution was similarly violated when an agency attempted to take jurisdiction over claims for compensatory and punitive damages based on statutory and common contract and tort law violations brought by a car dealer against a car manufacturer when the agency did not have statutory authority to determine those claims [*Hardin Oldsmobile v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 585, 597-598, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 583]* .

Practitioners who are litigating administrative remedies questions must therefore examine the statute applicable to the particular agency to determine what damages are available. Statutes regarding remedies generally specify both the substantive standards for awarding remedies, and the remedies that are authorized.

An affected private entity, whose due process rights were violated by a state agency when the agency refused to provide notice or a hearing before refusing to recertify the entity as an approved product seller, is not entitledto recover damages for the due process violation based solely on the California Constitution's [Cal. Const. Art. I, *7*] due process provisions [*Carlsbad Aquafarm, Inc. v. State Department of Health Services (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 809, 811-812, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 87]* .

[7] Equitable Remedies

Administrative agencies are frequently authorized to award equitable remedies when they are the most appropriate remedy for a specific type of harm. For example, the Fair Employment and Housing Act authorizes the Commission to order reinstatement or upgrading of employees, and to award back pay [*Gov. Code § 12970(a)(1)*; International Union etc. v. *Fair Emp. Practice Com. (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 504, 81 Cal. Rptr. 47 , cert. denied, 397 U.S. 1037, 90 S. Ct. 1356, 25 L. Ed. 2d 648]* . Injunctive relief must be specifically authorized by statute [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.7, 125.8* (Department of Consumer Affairs may seek temporary restraining order)]. Furthermore, an agency itself may not issue an injunction. The agency (or district attorney or attorney general, on agency request) [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 651(j)* (attorney general may bring action in appropriate forum to enjoin prohibited advertising by healing arts licensee)] must bring an action in superior court [*see, e.g., Gov. Code §§ 12973, 12974* (Fair Employment and Housing Department may obtain injunction in civil action brought in superior court)], and must satisfy the requirements of both the statute authorizing the action for injunction and of the Code of Civil Procedure [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534* (governing injunctions)]. The Superior court may also issue a temporary restraining order to enjoin a licensee from endangering the public health, safety, or welfare while engaging in the business or profession for which he or she is licensed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.7*].

Note, however, that agencies may order administrative remedies, such as cease and desist orders [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 149(a)(1), (c), (d)*], that are similar to judicially ordered injunctions [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 12970(a)* (Fair Employment

and Housing Commission may order licensee to cease and desist from unlawful practices)].

The Santa Monica Rent control board could properly make excess rent determinations and award restitution of excess rents from a landlord to a tenant [*McHugh v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 348, 375, 261 Cal. Rptr. 318, 777 P.2d 91]* , but the Board could not authorize the tenant to immediately withhold excess rent [*Floystrup v. City of Berkeley Rent Stabilization Bd. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1315-1317, 268 Cal. Rptr. 898]* , because this denied the landlord the right to judicial review. The board order that permitted immediate withholding of excess rent violates the procedural limitations on the remedial powers of administrative agencies contained in the judicial powers doctrine, which requires judicial review of agency orders before they are enforced, based on the principle of judicial check on administrative agencies [*McHugh v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 348, 376-377, 261 Cal. Rptr. 318, 777 P.2d 91]* .

Back pay is an equitable remedy awarded in employment law settings. It is often coupled with reinstatement to a former position when an employee has been wrongfully terminated [*Norton v. San Bernardino Unified School District (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 749, 751-753, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 917* (reinstatement of school district employee upheld by court of appeal); *Hulings v. State Department of Health Care Services (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1118, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 81* (the court of appeal held that a peace officer employee was entitled by statute to mandatory reinstatement without undergoing new background investigation)]. Former deputy attorney general was terminated for cause without being given *Skelley* hearing to challenge termination, a violation of due process of law, as employee had civil service protection and could only be terminated for cause. Former deputy had resigned from job one month after termination date, and before *Skelley* hearing could be started. The Court of Appeal held that former deputy was entitled to back pay until date that State Personnel Board completed *Skelley* hearing process, and issued decision on the merits of employee's termination. Employee had been denied back pay after date of resignation, and Court of Appeal decision extended back pay rights for almost seven years [*Roe v. State Personnel Bd. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1032-1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 207]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld the denial of a petition for writ of mandate brought by a former employee of the county office of education. The former employee was injured on the job and was unable to perform the duties of her previous job due to disability. She was discharged, and she sought reinstatement and back pay to her previous position as a para-educator with the county. The Court of Appeal affirmed the decision of the superior court which held that the former employee's status was governed by the Public Employees Retirement System statutes and that under those statutes the former employee was not eligible for reinstatement to her previous job nor for back pay, but she was eligible to be placed on the 39 month re-employment list under the provisions of *Educ. Code § 45192* [*Jones v. Los Angeles County Office of Education (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 983, 991-992, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 617]* . The Second District, Division 1, California Court of Appeal similarly held that an employee of the Los Angeles Unified School District who was wrongfully demoted was not entitled to reinstatement and full back pay for periods of time in which he was unable to return to work due to a non-work related disability [*Davis v. Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Commission (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1126-1127, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 69]* .

[8] Civil Penalties

Legislation often delegates to agencies the authority to impose civil penalties for conduct that violates requirements set by statutes or by agency regulations [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 651(k)* (administrative fines awardable with a maximum of $10,000 per event when physicians intentionally violate advertising laws); *Health & Safety Code § 1424*; *Water Code § 13350(d)(1), (2)* (maximum civil liability of $15,000 per day, or $20 per gallon of waste discharged)]. The primary purpose of civil penalties is to ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory standards. Unlike awards of monetary damages, there is no requirement that actual harm be suffered before statutory civil penalties can be assessed. Furthermore, civil penalties can be assessed for negligent conduct without proof of malice, willfulness, or intentional conduct. In contrast to money damages that compensate persons harmed by wrongful conduct, civil penalties help to finance enforcement costs [*Kizer v. County of San Mateo (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 139, 148, 279 Cal. Rptr. 318, 806 P.2d*

1353] . Civil penalties can be imposed against both public and private entities, and these penalties are not punitive damages for purposes of the Government Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*) [*People ex rel. Younger v. Superior Court (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 30, 39, 127 Cal. Rptr. 122, 544 P.2d 1322* (private entities); *Kizer v. County of San Mateo (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 139, 145, 279 Cal. Rptr. 318, 806 P.2d 1353* (public entities); *see Gov. Code § 818*]. The Court of Appeal held that civil penalties of $25,000 can be imposed against a public entity under the provisions of the Unruh Act, *Civ. Code § 52(b)(2),* without violating the provisions of *Gov. Code § 818*, which prohibits punitive damages awards against public entities under the California Government Tort Claims Act [*Gov. Code §§ 810-818.9*]. This is because civil penalties under the Unruh Act, which protects civil rights, are not punitive damages. Furthermore,civil penalties are designed to provide ample compensation to plaintiff's for civil rights violations so as to encourage plaintiffs to file civil rights lawsuits. These civil penalties are also not solely punitive and are not imposed primarily for punishment, and thus do notviolate the provisions of *Gov. Code § 818* [*Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Auth. v. Superior Court (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 261, 267-269, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* . Licensing agencies also have the authority to issue administrative citations to licensees who violate statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to their licensed business or profession. The citation can contain orders of abatement, or orders to pay administrative fines [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 125.9(a), 148*]. Civil penalties may be imposed by a city against a public works contractor for violation of the fair practices act [*Pub. Con. Code § 4110*] but the city cannot obtain those penalties by filing a civil lawsuit [*Thompson Pacific Constr., Inc. v. City of Sunnyvale (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 525, 539-540, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 175]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld a $100,000 penalty assessment imposed by the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement against an employer that failed to obtain worker's compensation insurance from an authorized insurer. The court held that the penalty assessment which was authorized under *Labor Code § 3722 (a)* could not be withdrawn because the DLSE did not have discretion to withdraw the penalty assessment under *Labor Code § 3727.1* [*Starving Students, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1357, 1361, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 583]* . The court of appeal also rejected constitutional challenges to the penalty assessment under due process of law holding that the amount of the penalty was reasonable under the circumstances because it was based on the size of the employer and the amount of money saved by paying premiums to an unauthorized insurer [*Starving Students, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1357, 1368-1369, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 583]* .

Licensing agencies have the authority to assess administrative penalties against licensee's or applicants for licenses in disciplinary proceedings as an additional sanction based on established criteria [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 5116* (Accounting Board)]. Licensing agencies also have the authority to seek award to the agency and against the disciplined licensee of the reasonable costs for investigating and prosecuting the disciplinary proceeding against the licensee, including attorney's fees. The amount of costs awarded is based upon findings made by the Administrative Law Judge that heard and decided the proceeding [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 5107* (Accounting Board)].

Fines authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 12023* (fines based on sale of individual packages), and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 12024* (fines based on sale of entire lot) were imposed by local agency (county sealer of weights and measures) against grocery company for violating laws requiring accurate weighting of seafood. The Court of Appeal upheld the assessment of multiple fines against the grocery company for inaccurately weighted seafood based on the sale of each improperly labeled seafood package, rather than imposing one fine for all the seafood related weight violations. The Court rejected the company's argument that the provisions of *Penal Code § 654* prohibited multiple fines under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 12023*. However, the Court of Appeal held that *Penal Code § 654* prohibited duplicative fines under both *Bus. & Prof. Code § 12024* and under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 12023* for the same mislabeling violation. Thus, the Court of Appeal stayed the fines under the provisions of *Penal Code § 654* [*Ralph's Grocery Co. v. California Department of Food & Agriculture (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 694, 700-701, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 869]* .

The Court of Appeal upheld the award of $243,000 in mandatory minimum penalties imposed by the Central Valley Reg'l Water Quality Control Board under *Water Code § 13385* against the City of Brentwood for violations related to

the city's waste water discharge permit. In upholding the denial of the city's petition for a writ of administrative mandamus challenging the amount of the penalties, the Court of Appeal held that the city had the burden of proof of showing that a statutory exception applied to avoid mandatory liability for penalties, and that the statutory term defined the relevant time period for penalty purposes referred to the 180-day time period prior to each violation [*City of Brentwood v. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 714, 717, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 322]* .

The California Supreme Court held that provisions of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act which prohibits states from regulating the advertising and promotion of cigarettes [*15 U.S.C. § 1334(b)*] did not preempt a California statute [*Health & Safety Code § 118950*] that regulated the free distribution of cigarettes [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 707, 719, 726, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814, 124 P. 3d 408]* . The California Supreme court also held that it was improper for the trial court to have granted summary judgment on the issue of whether $14,826,200 in fines imposed against the company were excessive within the meaning of the U.S. Constitution [*U.S. Const., Amend. 8*] and the California constitution [*Cal. Const. Art. 1, § 17*]. The fines were imposed under statutory authority [*Health & Safety Code § 118950*] that authorized $200, $500, and $1000 fines for the first, second, and any additional violations of the statute at each event [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 707, 712-713, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814, 124 P.3d 408]* . The court remanded the lawsuit to the trial court for a hearing on defendant company's good faith belief defense (that it in good faith believed that its conduct complied with the statute), and on the issue of whether the attorney general delayed notifying the company that its conduct violated the statute for the purpose of allowing the penalties to accumulate in amount [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 707, 730-732, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814, 124 P.3d 408]* .

The California Medical Board's decision to fine a physician $500 for aiding the unlicensed practice of medicine in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2264* was upheld by the Court of Appeal. The court concluded that there was substantial evidence in the administrative record before the board that the physician had knowledge that the clinic where he practiced was partially owned by two individuals who were not licensed to practice medicine in California [*Steinsmith v. Medical Board of California (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 458, 465-466, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115]* . However, the Medical Board of California did not have statutory authority under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 805(h)* to impose a $5,000 civil penalty against a physician and a facility administrator in an administrative adjudicatory proceeding brought under the Administrative Procedure Act [*Gov. Code §§ 11400-11529*]. This is because the language of the statute requires that the action be brought by the Attorney General in a civil action in a court of law, not by the agency in an administrative proceeding [*Gilliland v. Medical Board of California (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 208, 219-220, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 863]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Public Utilities Commission has statutory authority (jurisdiction) under *Pub. Util. Code § 2107* to impose fines directly on public utilities regulated by the PUC, with litigation in the superior court only necessary to collect unpaid fines [*Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 735-737, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733]* . The California Court of Appeal denied a petition for a writ of review brought by wireless carriers to challenge a decision of the California Public Utilities Commission that imposed substantial fines against wireless service providers in California for unjust and unreasonable practices, including charging customers early termination fees to cancel contracts without permitting a grace period, for failing to disclose to customers known network problems and misleading customers regarding network coverage and service. The court rejected the carriers preemption argument and held that the provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, that preempt state and local regulation of market entry and rates charged by wireless mobile telephone providers [*47 U.S.C. § 332 (c)(3)(A)*] did not preempt decisions by the California Public Utilities Commission. The court also upheld the imposition of substantial fines ($12 million) against the wireless carriers, and rejected due process arguments against the imposition of fines [*Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 728, 729, 747, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733]* .

The California Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment of the superior court denying a construction company's petition for a writ of administrative mandate that requested reversal of the decision of the California Occupational Safety and

Health Appeals Board, which upheld the decision of the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health that cited the company for violation of a safety order, and assessed a $5,000 civil penalty against the company. The company was cited for a violation of General Industry Safety Order 1592 [*Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 1592(e)*] as a result of an accident on the job that led to serious injuries suffered by an employee of the company [*Teichert Const. v. Cal. Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 883, 886-887, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 833]* . The regulation was not unconstitutionally vague under due process of law principles applicable to administrative regulations. The constitutional vagueness standards for administrative regulations are less strict than for criminal laws, and the vagueness challenge is assessed based on the complaining party's conduct in the specific facts of the case to which the regulation is being applied. The regulation was upheld because the agency interpretation of the regulations meaning was reasonable under the circumstances [*Teichert Const. v. Cal. Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 883, 890-892, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 833]* .

[9] Attorneys Fees

Private litigants can not recover attorneys fees from the agency under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* (the Private Attorney General statute) when they prevail against an agency at an administrative hearing and thereby resolve the dispute without having to file a lawsuit [*Hospital Systems v. Office of Statewide Health etc. Development (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1686, 1692-1693, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922]* . However, attorneys fees are recoverable from an agency by a prevailing private party when legal services for administrative proceedings are closely linked to judicial proceedings [*Wallace v. Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley, Inc. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 836, 848-849, 216 Cal. Rptr. 649]* . However, when administrative proceedings are unrelated to judicial proceedings, then attorneys fees for legal services in those administrative proceedings are not recoverable from an agency by a prevailing private party [*Californians for Responsible Toxics Management v. Kizer (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 961, 971, 259 Cal. Rptr. 599]* . Attorneys fees are recoverable from an agency by a prevailing private party when legal services for related federal judicial proceedings are closely linked to state judicial proceedings in which the fee award is made [*Children's Hospital & Medical Center v. Bonta' (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 740, 781-782, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 629]* . The amount of a fee award will not be overturned on appeal unless the amount is manifestly excessive [*Children's Hospital & Medical Center v. Bonta' (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 740, 756, 782-783, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 629* (appellate court affirmed attorneys fee award in amount of $827,145, and held that both rates charged ($380 per hour), and number of hours spent on case were reasonable)]. Attorney's fees are recoverable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* for work done by an attorney in opposing an amicus curiae brief filed by the county in a related case [*Ramon v. County of Santa Clara (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 915, 917-918, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 278]* . A trial court's decision whether or not to award attorneys fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* is reviewable for abuse of discretion [*Draeger v. Reed (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1525-1526, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 378* (trial court's denial of fee award for lack of significant benefit to public held to be properly within its discretion); *Roybal v. Governing Board of the Salinas City Elementary School District (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1143, 1148-1150, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 146* (attorneys' fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* was abuse of discretion because of lack of significant public benefit); *Lyons v. Chinese Hospital Assn. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1336, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 550* (denial of attorneys' fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* was abuse of discretion)]. An award of attorneys fees under *Code Civ Proc. § 1021.5* in favor of a county as a prevailing party and against the Department of Fish and Game acting through the California Wildlife Conservation Board was affirmed by the California Court of Appeal. The county had successfully challenged under the Williamson Act the Department's proposal to convert agricultural land into wildlife habitat. The award was upheld, and the court of appeal also held that the catalyst theory did not apply to this case, and did not have to be satisfied by the prevailing party to recover attorney's fees [*County of Colusa v. Cal. Wildlife Conservation Board (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 637, 657-659, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that attorneys had standing to intervene in a client's lawsuit for purposes of seeking attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*. The attorneys had a sufficient interest in the award of attorney's fees to support permissive intervention under *Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)* [*Lindelli v. Town of San Anselmo (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1499, 1502, 43 Cal. Rptr.3d 707]* . The attorneys were entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* as both clients and attorneys could be prevailing parties for purposes of fee awards [*Lindelli*

v. Town of San Anselmo (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1499, 1516-1517, 43 Cal. Rptr.3d 707] . The Fourth District, Division 2, California Court of Appeal held that a public employees' union that prevailed in a lawsuit under the police officers procedural *bill of rights* act (POBRA) [*Gov. Code §§ 3300 et. seq*] could recover attorneys fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* [*Riverside Sheriffs' Assn. v. County of Riverside (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 414, 417, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295]* .

The California court of Appeal held that the California Attorney general could not recover $173,450 in attorneys fees incurred in litigation with county agency defendants to enforce provisions of the subdivision map act even though the attorney general was the prevailing party in that lawsuit because the attorney general could not satisfy the financial burden requirement for recovery of attorneys fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* [*People ex rel Brown v. Tehama County Board of Supervisors (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 422, 456* (attorney general has public duty to enforce state laws acting on behalf of the people of the state of California. Attorney general can not properly be awarded attorney fees for performing public duty, and thus can not meet financial burden criteria of statute)].

Another California Court of Appeal upheld the trial court's denial of an award of attorneys fees to a group of citizens that sought a writ of mandate to compel the City and County of San Francisco to investigate an unreported change of ownership of commercial property in downtown San Francisco. The property was eventually reassessed, and the city received a 64 million dollar increase in property tax revenue as a result. However, the plaintiff's could not recover their attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* because they could not show that they took steps to settle the dispute before filing the lawsuit, an essential element of the catalyst theory necessary to show that the plaintiffs efforts led to the legal change of position in favor of the city notwithstanding that the plaintiffs were not the prevailing parties in the underlying litigation [*Abouab v. City and County of San Francisco (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 643, 664-666, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 206*]. Further, the plaintiffs could not recover attorneys fees under the common fund and substantial benefit theories because equitable circumstances prohibited their recovery under these theories [*Abouab v. City and County of San Francisco (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 643, 672-674, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 206*].

The Fourth District Division 1 California Court of Appeal upheld an award of attorney's fees under the private attorney general statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*] against the Community Development Commission of the City of Escondido based upon the application of the catalyst theory adopted by the California Supreme court in *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp. (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 553, 566, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 331, 101 P.3d 140]* to the challenger (Hogar). The court of appeal held that the challenger was a prevailing party under the private attorney general statute because the challengers lawsuit was the catalyst for the commission to change its position and provide 20 percent of gross tax receipts to a low cost housing fund [*Hogar v. Community Development Commission of the City of Escondido (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1358, 1365-1368, 69 Cal. Rptr 3d 250*]. The court of appeal also held that the challenger was entitled to a fully compensatory lodestar fee even though the challenger did not prevail on all claims. The court rejected a negative lodestar reduction for partial success by the challenger because of substantial success, long-term impact, and related claims [*Hogar v. Community Development Commission of the City of Escondido (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1358, 1368-1370, 69 Cal. Rptr 3d 250*]. The court of appeal also held that the challenger could recover attorney's fees for work done prior to the filing of the complaint, and for work done in prosecuting the motion for attorney's fees, but the court upheld the trial court's rejection of a multiplier to the lodestar (reasonable hours times a reasonable hourly rate) fee amount [*Hogar v. Community Development Commission of the City of Escondido (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1358, 1370-1372, 69 Cal. Rptr 3d 250*].

The First District Division 3 California Court of Appeal upheld an award of $55,010 in attorney's fees under the private attorney general statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*] against the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations brought by a union enforcing the prevailing wage law for public works projects. The court held that the department was an opposing party against whom an award of fees could be enforced because the department was responsible for making the policy decision that was the subject of the lawsuit [*Plumbers and Steamfitters, Local 290 v. Duncan (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1094-1096, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184*]. The court also upheld the award on statutory grounds, that the litigation enforced important rights affecting the public interest. This was because the department's policy decision,

which limited the scope of prevailing wage laws, was designated as a precedential decision that would have been likely to impact other public works projects and other unions in the future. [*Plumbers and Steamfitters, Local 290 v. Duncan (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1096-1098, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184*]. Finally, the court upheld the recovery of attorney's fees for charges incurred by the union for computerized legal research [*Plumbers and Steamfitters, Local 290 v. Duncan (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1099, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184*].

The Second District Division 3 California Court of Appeal upheld an award of $50,000 in attorney's fees, split equally between the city of Los Angeles and the project developer under the private attorney general statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*] to a challenger based upon a successful challenge to the environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act undertaken by the city in approving a residential development project. The court upheld a $25,000 award against the developer and concluded that the developer was an opposing party under the statute against whom attorney's fees could be awarded, even though the city was responsible for the approval and review decisions [*Mejia v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 151, 159-162, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 228*]. The court also held that the challenger satisfied the requirements for a statutory private attorney general award in that the financial burden of the litigation was out of proportion to the personal stake of the plaintiff challenger who was a real property owner and resident next to the proposed development [*Mejia v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 151, 158-159, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 228*]. Finally, the court held that the fee award did not improperly infringe on the developer's *first amendment* right to petition the government for redress of grievances, including the right of access to the courts [*Mejia v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162-163, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 228*].

The California Court of Appeal upheld an attorney's fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* of $216,495.34 against the Department of Health Services for legal fees incurred by plaintiffs in defending against DHS efforts to modify an injunction previously granted against DHS notwithstanding that parties waited three years to seek the fee award. The Court of Appeal held that DHS was not prejudiced by the delay in seeking attorney's fees [*Crespin v. Shewry (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 259, 271-272, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 696]* . Another California Court of Appeal affirmed the superior court's denial of an attorney's fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* sought by a harness operator against CAL-EXPO. The operator had challenged bidding contract practices used by CAL-EXPO for harness racing. The denial of attorneys fees was based on the financial burden element of the statutory test. The Court of Appeal upheld the fact findings of the trial court that the harness operator had a significant financial interest in the litigation (as a competitor of the successful contractor with CAL-EXPO), and thus the cost of the lawsuit was not disproportionate to the litigants economic interest in the lawsuit [*Arnold v. California Expo. and State Fair (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 498, 509-511, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 790]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld an award of $17,314.35 in attorney's fees, and $979.00 in costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* against the City of Berkeley, sought by neighbors of a proposed housing development, for denial of due process hearing rights. The award was partial and did not include all of the approximately $90,000 in legal fees and approximately $6,000 in costs paid by the neighbors to challenge the approval in court. The court of appeal upheld the trial court award applying the abuse of discretion standard of review, and held that the neighbors' partial success in court on the due process claim, that they were deprived of the right to go before the city council to challenge the project at the meeting in which the city council originally approved the project, was sufficient for them to be considered successful parties within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* [*Bowman v. City of Berkeley (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 173, 176-178, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 447]* . The court also held that the neighbors satisfied the significant public benefit and substantial private burden tests for fee awards under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* [*Bowman v. City of Berkeley (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 173, 180-182, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 447]* .

Another California Court of Appeal upheld the trial court's denial of an attorney's fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* to a group of challengers of a proposed project and against the city of La Habra. The Court of Appeal held that the significant public benefit element of statutory fees was not met, in that the challengers established that there was a minor inadequacy in the city's mitigated negative declaration that did not comply with CEQA, and this was not a sufficient public benefit justifying a fee award. Therefore it was not an abuse of discretion for the superior court to deny

the fee award requested [*Concerned Citizens of La Habra v. City of La Habra (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 329, 334-336, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 599]* . Another California Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's denial of an attorney's fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* to a group of challengers of a proposed project and against the County of Merced. Project approval had been reversed and remanded because the administrative record was not adequate for judicial review. Based on this result, the challengers were successful parties within the meaning of the statute, who accomplished a significant public benefit, requiring the county to provide an adequate administrative record for the reviewing court to determine compliance with CEQA requirements. The court of appeal held that it was an abuse of discretion to deny the fee award, and reversed and remanded to determine the amount of the fee award [*Protect Our Water v. County of Merced (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 488, 497-498, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 202]* .

The First District Division 1 California Court of Appeal held that a taxpayer could recover attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* as a prevailing party in a tax refund action against the California Franchise Tax Board. The taxpayer was not limited to recovery of attorney's fees under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717* [*Ventas Finance I, LLC v. California Franchise Tax Board (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1207, 1211-1213, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 823*]. The First District Division Five California Court of Appeal held that a taxpayer could recover attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* and was not limited to recovery of fees under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717*. However, the taxpayer was limited to the lodestar amount and was not entitled to a multiplier [*Northwest Energetic Services, LLC v. California Franchise Tax Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 841, 875-877, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 642*]. The Third District California Court of Appeal reversed an order of the superior court denying an award of attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* to a nonprofit organization. The superior court had denied the fee award based on the necessity for private enforcement criteria, that the nonprofit organizations efforts were unnecessary because a public entity had achieved the same success in the underlying litigation as a private attorney general. The court of appeal held that the necessity criteria were met, and that the nonprofit organization was entitled to attorney's fees. The court noted that it was irrational to provide a fee award to the public entity under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*, and to deny a fee award to the nonprofit organization when both had contributed to the same successful result [*State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 304, 306-308, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 842*].

To determine the amount of the attorney fee award under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*, the court first determines the "lodestar" amount by compiling the reasonable hourly compensation of the attorneys involved in the case. Then, the court can increase or decrease the amount of the award based on a number of factors. In one case, the court properly applied a 1.5 multiplier to the lodestar amount ($86,671) to award a total fee of $130,006 in favor of the union and against Caltrans. The multiplier was justified by the novelty and difficulty of the issues, the attorney's skill, excellent results, and the importance of the rights enforced in the lawsuit [*Edgerton v. State Personnel Board (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1362-1363, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5 gives the superior court discretion to award reasonable litigation expenses, including attorneys fees, to a small business or licensee, in civil actions between small businesses or licensees that are engaged in civil litigation against a state regulatory agency involving the regulatory functions of that agency as applied to the small business or licensee when the small business or licensee prevails and the court determines that the agency action was undertaken without substantial justification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(a)*; *Wang v. Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1152, 268 Cal. Rptr. 669]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.8 authorizes awards of attorneys fees to injured persons when unlicensed individuals cause injury or damage to another person as a result of providing goods or performing services for which a license is required under specified provisions of the Business and Professions Code [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.8(a)*].

Under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3*, a licensing agency within the Department of Consumer Affairs may, upon the resolution of a disciplinary proceeding, recover from a licensee found to have violated the licensing requirements the reasonable costs of the agency's investigation and enforcement of the violation. This may include attorneys fees charged by Attorney General's office for representing an agency in a license revocation proceeding [*Angelier v. State Board of*

Pharmacy (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 592, 600-601, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213] .

A State Board of Chiropractic Examiners order requiring a disciplined chiropractor to pay $17,500 costs to reimburse the Board for pre hearing investigative and prosecution costs in his case was challenged on grounds that the regulation which authorized payment of pre hearing costs, *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 317.5*, was facially unconstitutional because it violated the due process of law rights of the chiropractor ordered to pay those costs. The due process of law violation alleged was that the prospect of having to pay such costs would discourage chiropractors from requesting hearings when facing discipline charges brought by the Board. The California Supreme court rejected this claim, held that the regulation is not unconstitutional on its face, and did not violate due process of law [*Zuckerman v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 32, 46-48, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701, 53 P.3d 119]* . The Court analyzed the due process claim based on the three factors set forth in the US Supreme Court decision in *Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed. 2d 18* , and concluded that the discretionary nature of the authority to award costs, and the availability of judicial review to challenge specific costs orders, reduced the risk of error for such orders, and satisfied due process of law requirements [*Zuckerman v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 32, 44-46, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701, 53 P.3d 119]* . The Supreme Court noted that the provisions of the regulations were similar to *Bus & Prof. Code § 125.3*, and that the Chiropractic Examiners Board had been added to the list of agencies who had the authority to recover similar costs under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3*, but that statutory amendment occurred after the order in the Zuckerman case was entered. Therefore, the decision did not address the constitutionality of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3* [*Zuckerman v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 32, 37-38, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701, 53 P.3d 119]* .

Gov. Code § 800 authorizes awards of attorneys fees to complaining parties in civil actions to appeal or review awards, findings, or determinations of administrative proceedings when those administrative proceedings determinations were the result of arbitrary or capricious action by public entities or officers acting in their official capacity. The complaining party must prevail in the civil action, and can recover reasonable attorneys fees at the rate of $100 per hour up to $7,500 in total fees [*Gov. Code § 800*; *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15* ; *Kistler v. Redwoods Community College Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1326, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 417]* . Attorneys fees may not be awarded under *Gov. Code § 800* to a petitioner whose driver's license was suspended, when petitioner challenged a letter from a DMV driver safety officer stating that the petitioner's suspension could not be set aside; such a letter is not a "determination of an administrative proceeding" that is a necessary prerequisite to recovery under that statute [*Gustafson v. Zolin (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1361, 1363, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 645]* . Attorneys fees may not be awarded under *Gov. Code § 800* against the Medical Board of California for asserting a position on appeal that raised a question of first impression. Even though the Board lost as to the argument that it made on appeal, the argument was not wholly without merit, and it was not made arbitrarily or in bad faith [*Gilliland v. Medical Board of California (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 208, 220-221, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 863]* . Attorney's fees may be awarded against a school district under *Gov. Code § 800* when the school district engaged in arbitrary and capricious actions by failing to provide the superior court with any defense or rationale for its actions [*Reis v. Biggs Uni. Sch. Dist. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 809, 822-824, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 393* (court upheld $7,500 attorney fees award)].

The California Court of Appeal held that attorneys fees (in the amount of $6,334) were properly awarded under *Gov. Code § 800* to a father of a high school student who successfully challenged the school district's decision that prevented the high school student form participating in high school athletics [*Zuehlsdorf. v. Simi Valley Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 249, 257-258, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* . The daughter was reinstated into the athletics program after the superior court granted a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction enjoining the school district from prohibiting the students athletic participation. The superior court found that the denial of athletic participation by the school district was arbitrary and capricious within the meaning of *Gov. Code § 800* [*Zuehlsdorf. v. Simi Valley Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 249, 254-255, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* . The superior court denied an application by the father for a permanent injunction because of mootness in that the student had completed the athletic season, and there was no need to further enjoin the school district. The Court of Appeal upheld the fee award concluding that there was an adequate factual finding that the school district acted arbitrarily and capriciously in

denying athletic participation [*Zuehlsdorf. v. Simi Valley Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 249, 255-256, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* , and that the father was a prevailing party under *Gov. Code Section 800* notwithstanding the denial of the permanent injunction on the grounds of mootness, because the father achieved his litigation objectives, getting his daughter reinstated into the athletic program at her high school [*Zuehlsdorf. v. Simi Valley Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 249, 256-257, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* .

Bus. & Prof. Code § 125.3 authorizes the Medical Board of California to recover investigative costs and attorneys fees incurred in a license revocation proceeding from the physician whose medical license was revoked in that proceeding [*Schneider v. Medical Board of California (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 351* ; *see also Oranen v. State Board of Chiropractic Examiners (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 258, 261-263, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287* (upholding decision by State Board of Chiropractic Examiners ordering a chiropractor to pay reasonable investigative and enforcement costs of a proceeding which led to revocation of the chiropractor's license)]. The Fair Employment and Housing Commission also has the statutory authority to award to a prevailing party, other than the state, reasonable attorneys fees and costs against any party other than the state, including expert witness fees [*Gov. Code § 12987(a)(3)*].

Attorney's fees under *Labor Code § 98.2* were properly awarded against an employer who appealed an order of the Labor Commissioner to pay wages to an employee and lost the appeal (de novo hearing) in the Superior court. The Supreme Court allowed an award of attorney's fees under the statute notwithstanding that the employee was unable to pay for his own attorney, and the Labor Commissioner represented the employee in the Superior court at the de novo hearing without cost to the employee, because the court interpreted the statutory language "attorneys fees incurred" to include indigents who are not personally obligated to pay fees to their attorneys [*Lolley v. Campbell (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 367, 370-371, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571, 48 P.3d 1128]* . Attorneys fees awarded under *Labor Code § 98.2* are limited to fees incurred in the trial de novo civil proceeding and do not include fees incurred in the administrative proceeding before the labor commissioner to recover overtime wages [*Sampson v. Parking Service 2000 Com, Inc. (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 212*]. The Third District California Court of Appeal upheld an award $40,000 in attorneys' fees under *Labor Code 1194* to an employee who prevailed in a civil lawsuit for unpaid overtime compensation. The civil lawsuit was a *Labor Code § 98.2* appeal from an administrative decision. The fees were awarded were for fees incurred in the superior court on the appeal. The court of appeal held that *Labor Code § 1194* authorizes fee awards in these circumstances [*Eicher v. Advanced Business Integrators, Inc. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1363, 1378-1380, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 114]* .

Attorneys fees awarded by PUC under *Pub. Util. Code § 1802*, which authorizes awards to utility customers for fees incurred in participating in judicial review proceedings related to PUC decisions, to consumer intervenors properly included $250,000 in fees incurred by a non-profit consumer advocacy organization (TURN) for participation in federal court lawsuit brought by regulated utilities to overturn PUC decisions in which the organization has participated as a consumer advocate [*Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Comm'n of the State of California (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1043-1044, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 441]* .

The California Court of Appeal affirmed an order of the California Public Utilities Commission that a nonprofit consumer advocacy organization could not recover attorney's fees under *Pub. Util. § 1802* for a court challenge to a settlement of a lawsuit between a regulated electric utility (Southern California Edison) and the California Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The PUC concluded that the challenge was not successful and did not make a substantial contribution to the PUC proceedings. The court also affirmed an order that TURN was not entitled to a multiplier to increase the amounts of the fees awarded for participating in lawsuits related to electrical deregulation. However, the court reversed the order of the PUC requiring payment of outside counsel's compensation at the same rate as inside counsel. The court held that was an abuse of discretion [*The Utility Reform Network v. Public Utilities Commission (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 522, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 791*].

The California Supreme Court held that attorneys fees awards against public entities under the provisions of the private attorney general fee award statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*] and under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA)

fee award statute [*Gov. Code § 12965(b)*] can be authorized under the "catalyst" theory without proof of a judicially recognized change in the legal relationship between the parties, such as a judgment on the merits, a consent decree, or a court ordered settlement [*Tipton-Whittingham v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 604, 607-608, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371, 101 P.3d 174]* . The question was certified to the California Supreme Court by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals that was deciding an appeal of a district court opinion that upheld an award of $1.7 million in attorney's fees against the City of Los Angeles based on the two California statutes. The award was made in a class action sex discrimination lawsuit brought by female officers and employees of the Los Angeles Police Department against the department. The plaintiffs sought injunctive relief and damages. The parties conducted settlement negotiations, which lead to a consent decree in federal court that was later revoked. Subsequent settlement discussions led to the LAPD voluntarily making changes in work conditions that responded to the discrimination claims, and that were very similar to the terms of the revoked consent decree. The claims for injunctive relief were dismissed, and later plaintiffs recovered an award of attorneys fees [*Tipton-Whittingham v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 604, 607-608, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371, 101 P.3d 174]* . In recognizing the catalyst theory with lawsuits against public entities, the Supreme Court noted the limitation that attorneys fees cannot be awarded when the lawsuit has "merely caused the acceleration of the issuance of government regulations or remedial measures" when that process had started prior to the filing of the lawsuit [*Tipton-Whittingham v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 604*]. The California Court of Appeal reversed an award of attorney's fees under the private attorney general statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*] that had been granted based on application of the "catalyst" theory, and remanded for reconsideration based on the limitations placed on that theory in the California Supreme Court decision in *Graham v. Daimler Chrysler Corp. (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 553, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 331, 101 P. 3d 140* , decided at the same time as the California Supreme Court decision in *Tipton-Whittingham v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 604, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371, 101 P. 3d 174* , both of which accepted the catalyst theory, but set limits on its application [*Godinez v. Schwarzenegger (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 73, 77-78, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 270* , 33 Cal. Rpt. 3d 270 (1.9 million dollar fee award against the State of California based on catalyst theory)].

The California Court of Appeal held that a nonprofit corporation, the Marine Forests Society, could not recover appellate attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* because it was not a prevailing party as to the claims for which it sought attorney's fees. The corporation sought injunctive relief against the California Coastal Commission to prohibit the commission from commencing cease and desist proceedings against the corporation's experimental manmade reef on the ocean floor. The corporation was successful in challenging the legislative appointment authority for the Commissioners of the California Coastal Commission. However, its successful litigation related to appointment did not change the behavior of the commission, only the legislature's behavior, and thus neither the judicially sanctioned relief nor the catalyst theory are applicable (citing the Graham decision), and the corporation was not a prevailing party (successful litigant) under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 867, 869-871, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32*].

The California Supreme Court held that the catalyst theory requirement that the party seeking attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* make a reasonable attempt to settle the dispute with defendant prior to litigation did not apply to recovery of fees in cases that did not rely on the catalyst theory. In non-catalyst theory cases, the reasonable attempt factor would be considered as part of the court's equitable discretion in determining whether the necessity and financial burden of private enforcement requirement for fee recovery under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* was satisfied, but it would not be a requirement for fee recovery [*Vasquez v. State of California (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 243, 247-249, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466, 195 P.3d 1049*].

Attorneys fees that are awarded under *Gov. Code § 12965*, which awards prevailing parties, other than public agencies or officials, reasonable attorneys fees in court litigation under The California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) [*Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*], belong to the attorneys who earned those fees when there is no enforceable contractual agreement that decides who is entitled to those attorneys fees [*Flannery v. Prentice (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 572, 575-577, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809, 28 P.3d 860]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld an award of $39,472.30 in trial related attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 12965*

in favor of a city and against a former city employee who brought a frivolous lawsuit claiming racial discrimination under the FEHA statute. The court held that while the trial court that ordered the fee award has the responsibility to consider the losing parties' financial status, the losing party in this case did not offer any evidence of financial or income information that would support a lowered fee award. Therefore, the fee order was not an abuse of discretion. The court of appeal denied the city appellate attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 12965* because the former employee's appeal was not frivolous as to the issue of whether the fee awarding court has to consider the losing parties ability to pay [*Villanueva v. City of Colton (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 1202-1204, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 343*].

The California Court of Appeal held that a taxpayer, who successfully challenged the assessment by the State Board of Equalization (SBE) of past sale taxes due plus interest, and received a refund equal to 90 percent of the past due taxes plus interest, was not entitled to recovery of attorney's fees and costs under the provisions of *Rev. and Tax Code § 7156* because the SBE's legal positions related to the assessments had enough reasonable basis so that the taxpayer could not satisfy the requirement that the agency position "was not substantially justified" [*Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 899, 910-911, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* . However, the taxpayer was entitled to recover costs and expert witness fees under *Code Civ. Proc §§ 998, 1028*, and *1032*, as the taxpayer substantially prevailed in his challenge to the assessment, and the provisions of *Rev & Tax Code § 7156* are not the exclusive means for a costs recovery by a prevailing litigant [*Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 899, 914-915, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* .

The California Supreme Court held that political advocacy groups (e.g., the California Business Council) who unsuccessfully defended the constitutionality of state statutes that granted improper preferences based on race or gender, were not "opposing parties" for purposes of the California private attorney general statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*], and therefore could not be held liable for attorney's fees awarded to the successful prevailing plaintiff. Advocacy groups participated in the litigation initially as amicus curiae, but later intervened as real parties in interest, and defended the statutes constitutionality on the merits. This holding was supported by the advocacy group's political or ideological interest in the litigation, which differentiated that group from the normal defendant in litigation that had a direct interest in litigation, or has duty to defend the underlying statute. Furthermore, a contrary holding would discourage parties from participating in litigation as amicus curiae [*Connerly v. State Personnel Bd. (2006) 37 Cal. 4th 1169, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 788, 797-799, 129 P.3d 1]* .

The California Court of Appeal reversed an award of attorney's fees under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) fee award statute [*Gov. Code § 12965(b)*] and held that the trial court judge had committed an abuse of discretion in making the fee award [*Horsford v. Board of Trs. of Cal. State Univ. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 359, 366, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644]* . The trial court abused its discretion by completely rejecting the time records submitted by the attorneys seeking fees, in not using the attorney's time records as the initial basis for the lodestar determination (reasonable hours times a reasonable hourly rate), in failing to consider a higher hourly rate for an out of town attorney, in failing to consider relevant factors for awarding enhancement multipliers to the lodestar fee award, in relying on the public entity status of the defendant to deny any enhancement multiplier, and in requiring the attorneys to obtain full compensation form their clients under the terms of the contingency fee agreement [*Horsford v. Board of Trs. of Cal. State Univ. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 359, 397-399, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644]* .

[10] Hearing Costs

The California Supreme Court held that a statutory cost sharing provision [*Educ. Code § 44944*] which required a teacher who lost a suspension or dismissal hearing to pay one half of the costs of the administrative law judge who heard the case violated due process of law [*California Teachers Assn v. State of Cal. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 327, 337, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425, 975 P. 2d 622]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a provision in a memorandum of understanding agreement (between a city and the public employees association) which required that an employee who sought to challenge their termination from public employment had to share equally in the cost of paying a hearing officer to hear the employee's appeal from a job termination violated the employee's due process of law right to a

hearing, and this right could not be waived [*Florio v. City of Ontario (2005) 130 Cal. App 4th 1462, 1465-1467, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 841]* . However, the California Court of Appeal rejected an argument that the financial interest bias rule codified in the *Haas* case was violated by an award of $1.8 million in pre-hearing costs related to disciplinary proceedings against an accounting firm. The Court held that the Board did not have an improper pecuniary interest in the outcome of the discipline proceedings. The award was paid to the Board of Accountancy to reimburse the Board for extensive costs incurred in investigating and preparing for hearing a discipline case against the accounting firm. The Board did not have an improper pecuniary interest because the cost award was authorized and regulated by statute, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 5107*, and this statute protected the Board from improper influences related to the cost award. This is because the cost award was made by the administrative law judge (ALJ) who heard the case, and that ALJ did not have a financial interest in the cost award that he or she assessed. The Board has the authority to decrease or eliminate the award, or to affirm the award, but not to increase the cost award [*McBride v. California Board of Accountancy (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 518, 525-527, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 287]* .

[11] Restitution Orders

License holders that are regulated by the Department of Motor Vehicles under *Veh. Code § 11703.2* can be required to provide restitution for financial losses or damages suffered by a person as a condition of the issuance of a license. Restitution orders can be issued by administrative law judges as part of an adjudicatory decision. Failure to pay money owed under a restitution order provides separate grounds for the DMV to not issue a license [*Veh. Code § 11703.2*]. Specifically, a decision rendered against a licensee under Article 1 (commencing with Section 11700) of Chapter 4 of Division 5 of the Vehicle Code may include an order of restitution for any financial loss or damage found to have been suffered by a person in the case [*Gov. Code § 11519.1(a)*]. Furthermore, the failure to make the restitution in accordance with the terms of the decision is separate grounds for the Department of Motor Vehicles to refuse to issue a license under Article 1 (commencing with Section 11700) of Chapter 4 of Division 5 of the Vehicle Code, and constitutes a violation of the terms of any applicable probationary order in the decision [*Gov. Code § 11519.1(b)*]. Finally, nothing in this section is intended to limit or restrict actions, remedies, or procedures otherwise available to an aggrieved party pursuant to any other provision of law [*Gov. Code § 11519.1(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesRevocation & SuspensionLegal EthicsSanctionsDisbarmentsReal Property LawBrokersDiscipline, Licensing & Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.36

§ 473G.36 Reinstatement of Licenses

[1] Petition

Under the APA, a person whose license has been suspended or revoked [*see § 473G.35[2]*] may petition the agency for reinstatement or reduction of penalty [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. The APA provisions do not apply, however, if the agency is required by statute to comply with different procedures for reinstatement or reduction of penalty [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. Under the APA, the licensee cannot file the petition until one year has elapsed from either the effective date of the decision revoking or suspending the license, or the denial of a similar petition [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. Although the APA does not prescribe the form and contents of a petition, counsel should check for specific requirements in the statutes governing the particular agencies. For an example of a petition for reinstatement, see *§ 473G.71*.

[2] Proceedings After Petition Is Filed

An agency must notify the attorney general of the filing of a reinstatement or reduction petition [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. Both the petitioner and the attorney general must be given the opportunity to present either oral or written argument before the agency itself [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. The burden is on the petitioner to prove that he or she has been rehabilitated and is entitled to have his or her license restored [*Housman v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 308, 312, 190 P.2d 653* ; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* , for a discussion of the burden of proof].

[3] Decision

The agency itself must decide the petition. It must state the reasons for its decision granting or denying the petition, and must specify any terms and conditions that it reasonably deems appropriate to impose as a condition of reinstatement [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. A statement of reasons (1) allows a reviewing court to determine why an agency made its decision, and thus to ascertain whether substantial evidence exists to support that decision, and (2) advises the rejected petitioner for reinstatement of his or her deficiencies, so that he or she may correct them [*Crandell v. Fox (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 760, 765, 150 Cal. Rptr. 426]* . If the agency fails to specify its reasons for granting or denying a petition, the court will reverse and remand the decision. For example, in *Crandell v. Fox (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 760, 150 Cal.*

Rptr. 426 , the Court of Appeal held that the agency's statement that the petitioner had failed to demonstrate to its satisfaction that he had undergone sufficient rehabilitation to warrant reinstatement of his license was insufficient [*Crandell v. Fox (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 760, 764, 150 Cal. Rptr. 426* (petition to reinstate real estate license)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Effective Date and Consequences of Agency Decision

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473G.37-473G.39

[Reserved]

§§ 473G.37[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.40

§ 473G.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For forms for use in drafting memoranda in judicial proceedings to review a public agency decision, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.41

§ 473G.41 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.42

§ 473G.42 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.43

§ 473G.43 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harrassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.1-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.44

§ 473G.44 Decisions

[1] Clerical Mistakes

Agency is empowered to correct clerical mistakes in decision by nunc pro tunc order. *Russ v. Smith (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 385, 391, 70 Cal. Rptr. 813*

[2] Contested Cases

Statutory requirement that agency members hear evidence does not mean members must listen to witness testify. *Cooper v. State Bd. of Medical Examiners (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 242, 246, 217 P.2d 630*

Failure to serve copy of proposed decision before adoption of it is not denial of due process. *Stoumen v. Munro (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 302, 314, 33 Cal. Rptr. 305*

[3] Law of the Case

Agency is prohibited from acting inconsistently with court order once court has passed on question of law in its review of agency action; decision of reviewing court establishes law of the case and binds agency in all further proceedings. *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1279, 1291, 265 Cal. Rptr. 162, 783 P.2d 749*

[4] Reconsideration Under Administrative Procedure Act

Under *Gov. Code § 11521(a)*, agency is deemed to have acted on petition for reconsideration when it issues formal order; when no formal order issued within 30-day statutory period for granting petition, petition is not acted on within meaning of statute and deemed denied even though agency members cast requisite number of votes to grant petition. *Gamm v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 34, 35, 181 Cal. Rptr. 23*

OSHA Board has acted on petition for reconsideration within 30-day limit for purpose of retaining jurisdiction when it took petition under submission and stayed administrative law judge's decision. *Newbery Electric Corp. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 641, 648, 176 Cal. Rptr. 734*

Agency loses jurisdiction to reconsider if it makes decision effective on delivery. *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 304, 196 P.2d 20*

Stay of decision to allow reconsideration is required to be actually ordered. *Koehn v. State Board of Equalization (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 109, 113, 333 P.2d 125*

[5] Rehearing

Rehearing is not essential to due process. *Whitley v. Superior Court (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 75, 81, 113 P.2d 449*

Agency is authorized to reconsider without rehearing where it has continuing jurisdiction. *Olive Proration etc. Com. v. Agri. etc. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 204, 209, 109 P.2d 918*

Power to reconsider is distinguishable from power to reopen case. *Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 316-317, 144 P.2d 4*

Power to hold rehearing is not inherent. *Heap v. City of Los Angeles (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 405, 407, 57 P.2d 1323*

Second hearing is not rehearing but original hearing where first hearing void; power to hold such second hearing is inherent. *Ferdig v. State Personnel Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 96, 108, 77 Cal. Rptr. 224, 453 P.2d 728* ; Aylward v. State Bd. etc. *(1948) 31 Cal. 2d 833, 839, 192 P.2d 929*

Statement of ground to support request for rehearing is not required in absence of statutory requirement. *Argonaut Ins. Exchange v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 706, 711, 321 P.2d 460*

Agency is principal judge of cause for hearing where rehearing may be had for good cause. *Clendaniel v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 659, 661-662, 111 P.2d 314*

Good cause for rehearing is cause, unknown to agency at time of original decision, rendering decision wrong or unfair. *Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. v. Ind. A.C. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 314, 316, 57 P.2d 501*

Agency is not empowered to give rehearing simply because it later concluded original decision was wrong. *Pullman Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 379, 388, 170 P.2d 10* ; *Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. v. Ind. A.C. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 314, 316, 57 P.2d 501*

Discovery of new evidence is cause for rehearing only if new evidence makes different result likely. *Clendaniel v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 659, 661-662, 111 P.2d 314* ; *Cahill v. E.B. & A.L. Stone Co. (1914) 167 Cal. 126, 135, 138 P. 712* ; *Daggs v. Personnel Commission (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 925, 929, 82 Cal. Rptr. 157*

Necessity to raise all possible grounds for rehearing in order to exhaust administrative remedies. *People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 88, 216 P.2d 441* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 295, 109 P.2d 942*

Agency is required to give rehearing on timely application where cause exists. *Helmick v. Industrial Acci. Com.*

(1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 651, 655-656, 116 P.2d 658

Agency is not required to consider second or subsequent petition for rehearing. *Goodrich v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 604, 611, 140 P.2d 405* .

Rehearing is required to proceed in manner of original hearing. *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 363, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617*

[6] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

Res judicata is not applicable if issue of law or fact essential to adjudication of administrative claim has been reserved for future determination, or if the administrative agency has decided that one party should have relief but the amount of the damages, or the form or scope of other relief, remains to be determined. *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1279, 1290-1291, 265 Cal. Rptr. 162, 783 P.2d 749*

Application of res judicata rules is more flexibly applied to administrative orders than to judicial orders. *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1279, 1290, 265 Cal. Rptr. 162, 783 P.2d 749*

Collateral estoppel is applicable to final adjudication of administrative agency of statutory creation so as to preclude relitigation of same issues in subsequent case when: (1) administrative agency acted in judicial capacity, (2) it resolved disputed issues properly before it, and (3) all parties were provided with opportunity to fully and fairly litigate their claims. *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* ; *Carmel Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. State of California (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 534-535, 234 Cal. Rptr. 795*

Finality for purposes of administrative collateral estoppel is two-step process in which: (1) decision must be final with respect to action by administrative agency, and (2) decision must have conclusive effect. *Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 168-169, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Decision attains requisite administrative finality for collateral estoppel purposes when agency has exhausted its jurisdiction and possesses no further power to reconsider or rehear claim. *Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 169, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Decision attains requisite conclusiveness for collateral estoppel purposes when decision is free from direct attack. *Long Beach Unified Witkin Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 169, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Determination of particular issue in administrative proceeding does not preclude relitigation of same issue in subsequent proceeding if, in interim period between two administrative proceedings, decision by appellate court has created new law that would have affected determination of issue in first administrative proceeding. *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1538, 1544, 263 Cal. Rptr. 351*

Administrative adjudication is sometimes accorded collateral estoppel effect in subsequent judicial proceeding; in absence of statutory rule, issue of availability of collateral estoppel as to particular kinds of administrative adjudications is ascertained as matter of common law. *Mahon v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 616, 621, 245 Cal. Rptr. 103*

Administrative body's order for license revocation is properly given effect in later proceeding because meaningful judicial review was available by petition for writ of mandate. *Miller v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 1378, 238 Cal. Rptr. 915*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsLaw of the Case

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.45

§ 473G.45 Text References

Judicial Council of California, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Agency Practice (Cal CEB 1970)

Witkin, California Evidence, ch. II, *Judicial Notice*, §§ 80-126; ch. IX, *Witnesses*, §§ 1806-1892; ch. XI, *Introduction of Evidence at Trial*, §§ 1906-2000 (3d ed. 1986)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473F.46

§ 473F.46 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerming Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

NOTE:
On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473G.47-473G.49

[Reserved]

§§ 473G.47[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.50

§ 473G.50 Mistake or Clerical Error in Decision

☐ Prepare application for correction of mistake or clerical error [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(a)*; *see § 473G.34*].

☐ File application within 15 days after service of decision, but not later than effective date of decision [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(a)*; *see §§ 473G.31[1], 473G.34*].

☐ Give notice to other parties in proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11518.5(a)*; *see § 473G.34*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.51

§ 473G.51 Reconsideration of Agency Decision

- ☐ Prepare petition [*Gov. Code § 11521*; *see § 473G.33[2]*, for a form, see *§ 473G.70*].
- ☐ Prepare affidavit or declaration [*Gov. Code § 11521*; *see § 473G.33[2]*].
- ☐ File with agency within applicable time limits [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*; *see § 473G.33[3][a]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.52

§ 473G.52 Reinstatement or Reduction of Penalty

☐ Prepare petition for reinstatement or reduction of penalty [*Gov. Code § 11522*; *see § 473G.36[1]*].

☐ File one year after effective date of decision or denial of a similar petition [*Gov. Code § 11522*; for a form, *see § 473G.71*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.53

§ 473G.53 Judicial Review

☐ Prepare petition for judicial review whether or not reconsideration was sought [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see § 473G.31[2]*].

☐ File within 30 days from last day in which reconsideration can be ordered [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see Gov. Code § 11521* (earlier date); § 473G.31[4]].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473G.54-473G.69

[Reserved]

§§ 473G.54[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.70

§ 473G.70 Petition for Reconsideration [Gov. Code § 11521]

[1] FORM Petition for Reconsideration [Gov. Code § 11521]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*]	)	PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

Respondent requests that the _____[*agency*] reconsider its decision in this proceeding, and in support of this request respondent represents:

1. _____ [*Here, and in subsequently numbered paragraphs, specify grounds on which reconsideration is sought, e.g.*, The findings set forth in the decision are not supported by the evidence in that _____ (*specify*)].

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form of petition for reconsideration in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent who wishes the agency to reconsider an adverse decision. For discussion of reconsideration, see *§ 473G.33*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473G AGENCY ADJUDICATION DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-473G California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473G.71

§ 473G.71 Petition for Restoration of Rights [Gov. Code § 11522]

[1] FORM Petition for Restoration of Rights [Gov. Code § 11522]

BEFORE THE _____ [*agency*]

	)	
In the Matter of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*]	)	PETITION FOR RESTORATION OF RIGHTS
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

Respondent requests that the _____[*agency*] _____ [restore respondent's _____ (*e.g.*, license) *or* reduce the penalty imposed against respondent in this proceeding], and in support of this request respondent represents:

1. One year has elapsed from the _____ [effective date of the decision in this proceeding *or* date when respondent's last previous request of this nature was denied], which date was _____.

2. _____ [*Specify grounds on which agency might restore rights or reduce penalty, e.g.,* For the past two years respondent has been an active member of Alcoholics Anonymous, has regularly attended meetings of that organization, and has absolutely refrained from consuming any alcoholic beverages whatever, all with the result that respondent has become rehabilitated from his/her previous condition of addiction to alcohol which was the cause for the original disciplinary action of the _____ (*agency*) against respondent].

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Respondent

[2] Use of Form

The form of petition for restoration of rights in [1], *above*, is for use by the respondent where a cause for discipline has been removed or the respondent has become rehabilitated. At least one year must elapse after the effective date of the decision to suspend or revoke the respondent's license before he or she may petition for restoration of his or her rights [*Gov. Code § 11522*]. For discussion regarding restoration of rights, see *§ 473G.36*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 473H.syn

§ 473H.syn Synopsis to Chapter 473H: ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS

§ 473H.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 473H.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Alternative Resolution Procedures

[2] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

[3] Judicial Remedies and Review

[4] Public Administrative Law Generally

[5] Specific Public Agencies

[6] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

§§ 473H.03-473H.09 [Reserved]

§ 473H.10 Governing Law

[1] APA Requirements

[2] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

[3] Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures

[a] General Regulations

[b] Mediation Regulations

[c] Arbitration Regulations

[d] Declaratory Decision Regulations

§ 473H.11 Definitions

[1] "Adjudicative Proceeding"

[2] "Agency"

[3] "Agency Head"

[4] "Decision"

[5] "Party"

[6] "Person"

[7] "Presiding Officer"

§ 473H.12 Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes

[1] Referral With Party Consent

[2] Model Regulations

[3] Confidentiality of Communications

§ 473H.13 Informal Hearing Procedure

[1] Legislative Findings

[2] Applicable Proceedings

[3] Notice of Hearing and Objection

[4] Authority of Presiding Officer and Applicable Hearing Procedures

[5] Discretion to Deny or Convert Informal Hearing

[6] Presenting Proof as to Material Facts in Dispute

§ 473H.14 Emergency Decision Procedure

[1] Authority for Emergency Decision Procedure

[2] Regulations Authorizing Emergency Decisions for Temporary, Interim Relief

[3] Requirement of Immediate Danger to Public Health, Safety, or Welfare

[4] Notice and Hearing Requirement

[5] Emergency Decision and Adjudicative Proceeding

[6] Agency Record and Judicial Review

§ 473H.15 Declaratory Decision Procedure

[1] Authority for Declaratory Decision

[2] Application and Issuance of Decision

[3] Notice and Applicable Law

[4] Agency Action

[5] Declaratory Decision

[6] Model Regulations

§ 473H.16 Conversion of Agency Proceedings

[1] Authority of Presiding Officer or Other Agency Official

[2] Conversion Procedures

[a] Appointment of Successor

[b] Record of Original Proceeding

[c] Duties of Official Responsible for New Proceeding

[3] Regulations

§§ 473H.17-473H.19 [Reserved]

§ 473H.20 Federal Constitution

§ 473H.21 State Constitution

§ 473H.22 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

[2] Related Statutes

§ 473H.23 Internet References

§§ 473H.24-473H.29 [Reserved]

§ 473H.30 Alternative Dispute Resolution

[1] Options

[2] Procedure

§ 473H.31 Objection to Informal Hearing Procedure

§ 473H.32 Emergency Decision

§ 473H.33 Declaratory Decision

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.01

§ 473H.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), which became operative July 1, 1997, and which introduce a number of alternative decision making procedures that may be utilized in lieu of a formal agency hearing to resolve a public agency adjudication. These procedures are:

- Alternative dispute resolution by mediation or arbitration [*see § 473H.12*].
- Informal hearings [*see § 473H.13*].
- Emergency decisions [*see § 473H.14*].
- Declaratory decisions [*see § 473H.15*].
- Conversion of an agency adjudication from one type of proceeding to another proceeding [*see § 473H.16*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.02

§ 473H.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Alternative Resolution Procedures

For discussion and forms relating to the alternative resolution procedures discussed in this chapter, applicable to civil actions generally as distinguished from agency actions, see:

- Ch. 30, *Using Alternative Dispute Resolution* .
- Ch. 31, *Mediation* .
- Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .
- Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration: Appointment of Arbitrator and Conduct of Proceeding*
- Ch. 34, *Conrtractual Arbitration: Judicial Review* .
- Ch. 35, *Arbitration and Conciliation of International Commercial Disputes* .
- Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* .
- Ch. 37, *Judicially Mandated Civil Action Mediation* .
- Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief.*

[2] Related Coverage of Agency Adjudication

For general discussion and overview of agency adjudication under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

For related discussion and forms providing coverage of the other stages of an agency adjudication under the formal

hearing provisions of the APA, see:

- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] Judicial Remedies and Review

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview,* through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

[4] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, *see §§ 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* .

[5] Specific Public Agencies

For related coverage of adjudicative proceedings before particular public agencies, see:

- Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to licensing proceedings before the department of Alcoholic Beverage Control).
- Ch. 70, *Attorney Admission* and Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of attorneys and proceedings before the State Bar and the State Bar Court).
- Ch. 92 *Automobiles: Drivers' Licenses* (discussion and forms relating to drivers' licensing and proceedings before the Department of Motor Vehicles).
- Ch. 104, *Building Contracts, § 104.70 et seq.* (discussion relating to licensing and discipline of building contractors by the Contractors' State License Board).
- Ch. 118, *Civil Service* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Personnel Board).
- Ch. 209, *Dentists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of dentists and proceedings before the Board of Dental Examiners).
- Ch. 214, *Drugs and Pharmacists* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of pharmacists and proceedings before the State Board of Pharmacy).
- Ch. 414, *Physicians: Licensing and Discipline* (discussion and forms relating to licensing and discipline of physicians and proceedings before the Medical Board of California).
- Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission).

- Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues* (discussion and forms relating to teacher certification and dismissal proceedings before the State Board of Education and local boards).

- Ch. 527, *Social Services* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Department of Social Service or the State Department of Health Services).

- Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance*, §§ 564.30 et seq, 564.100 et seq. (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board).

- Ch. 575, *Waters* , §§ *575.10 et seq., 575.210 et seq.* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the State Water Resources Control Board and local water districts).

- Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* (discussion and forms relating to proceedings before the Division of Workers' Compensation and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board).

For additional cross references to coverage of other particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

[6] Other Chapters Relating to Public Agencies

For discussion and forms relating to access to records of a state or local agency under the California Public Records Act (Gov. Code. Code. Code *§ 6250 et seq.*), see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For discussion and forms relating to claims and actions under the California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*), for damages for injuries arising from the tortious conduct of public agencies or their officers and employees, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473H.03-473H.09

[Reserved]

§§ 473H.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.10

§ 473H.10 Governing Law

[1] APA Requirements

The following two chapters of the Government Code comprise the administrative adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*Gov. Code §§ 11400.10(a), 11501*]:

- Chapter 4.5, Administrative Adjudication: General Provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), and
- Chapter 5, Administrative Adjudication: Formal Hearings (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*).

For convenience, they are termed hereafter simply as Chapter 4.5 and Chapter 5. Technically, these chapters are not chapters of the APA itself, but are chapters within Part 1 (State Departments and Agencies) of Division 3 (Executive Department) of Title 2 (California State Government) of the Government Code.

Chapter 5 sets out the APA provisions governing formal hearings. These provisions are discussed in detail in Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* through Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

Chapter 4.5 sets out provisions which became operative July 1, 1997 [*see Gov. Code § 11400.10(a)*]. It includes a number of general provisions, such as those governing ex parte communications, language assistance, enforcement, and procedural rights in agency adjudication. These general procedural provisions of Chapter 4.5 are discussed in Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

The remaining provisions of Chapter 4.5, relating to alternative adjudication procedures, are the focus of this chapter:

- Alternative dispute resolution (*Gov. Code § 11420.10 et seq.*).
- Informal hearing (*Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.*).
- Emergency decision (*Gov. Code § 11460.10 et seq.*).

- Declaratory decision (*Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.*).
- Conversion of proceeding (*Gov. Code § 11470.10 et seq.*).

The provisions of Chapter 4.5 generally apply to public agency proceedings in which a evidentiary hearing is required by statute or constitutional provision [*see Gov. Code § 11410.10 et seq.*]. For further discussion of the applicability of Chapter 4.5 provisions, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .

[2] Office of Administrative Hearings Regulations Governing Hearing Procedures

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations cover the subjects of general APA hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1046* (1998)], special hearing procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1100-1148* (1997)], alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)], arbitration procedures for state contract act contract claims [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1393* (1997)], and protest arbitration procedures *1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1998)]. The basic purpose [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)], definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1002* (1998)], and principles of interpretation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1004* (1998)], are set forth in specific regulations. Specific regulations that are applicable to to Ch. 473H, Alternative Agency Adjudications, include informal hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1027* (1998)], and all of the regulations listed above, except for the general hearing procedures regulations.

[3] Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures

[a] General Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations governing alternative dispute resolution procedures in chapter 3, agency alternatives to formal hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1997)]. The subjects of the general ADR regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1210*] include the following:

- Scope of regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1200* (1997)];
- Purpose of regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1202* (1997)];
- Definitions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1204* (1997)];
- Referral to ADR [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1206* (1997)];
- Standards of conduct for neutrals [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1208* (1997)]; and
- Resumes for neutrals [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1210* (1997)].

[b] Mediation Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations governing alternative dispute resolution procedures in chapter 3, agency alternatives to formal hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1997)]. The subjects of the mediation regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1212-1230*] include the following:

- Definitions for Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1212* (1997)];
- Initiating Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1214* (1997)];

- Appointment of Mediator [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1216* (1997)];
- Cost of Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1218* (1997)];
- Date, Time, and Place of Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1220* (1997)];
- Attendance at Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1222* (1997)];
- Statements before Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1224* (1997)];
- Confidentiality [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1226* (1997)];
- Agreements [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1228* (1997)]; and
- Termination of Mediation [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1230* (1997)].

[c] Arbitration Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations governing alternative dispute resolution procedures in chapter 3, agency alternatives to formal hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1997)]. The subjects of the arbitration regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1232-1258*] include the following:

- Definitions for Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1232* (1997)];
- Agreement to Arbitrate [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1234* (1997)];
- Selection of Arbitrator [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1236* (1997)];
- Costs of Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1238* (1997)];
- Timing and Scheduling the Hearing [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1240* (1997)];
- Discovery [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1242* (1997)];
- Conference before Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1244* (1997)];
- Statements before Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1246* (1997)];
- Attendance at Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1248* (1997)];
- Authority of Arbitrators [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1250* (1997)];
- Procedures at Arbitration [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1252* (1997)];
- Defaults [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1254* (1997)];
- Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256* (1997)]; and
- Proceeding De Novo [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1258* (1997)].

[d] Declaratory Decision Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations governing alternative dispute resolution procedures in chapter 3, agency alternatives to formal hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1997)]. The subjects of the declaratory decision regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1260-1292*] include the following:

- Definitions for Declaratory Decisions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1260* (1997)];
- Scope of Declaratory Decisions [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1262* (1997)];
- Application for Declaratory Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1264* (1997)];
- Initial Agency Review of Application [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1266* (1997)];
- Agency Notice of Application for Declaratory Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1270* (1997)];
- Initial Decision to Consider Application [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1272* (1997)];
- Denial of Application [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1274* (1997)];
- Agency Notice of Declaratory Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1276* (1997)];
- Requests for Notice of Declaratory Decision Proceedings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1278* (1997)];
- Written Comments to Agency [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1280* (1997)];
- Request to Become a Party or Intervenor [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1282* (1997)];
- Hearings [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1284* (1997)];
- Declaratory Decision Proceeding Record [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1286* (1997)];
- Issuance and Service of a Declaratory Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1288* (1997)];
- Judicial Review of a Declaratory Decision [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1290* (1997)]; and
- Proceeding De Novo [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1290* (1997)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory Right

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.11

§ 473H.11 Definitions

[1] "Adjudicative Proceeding"

"Adjudicative proceeding" is defined to mean an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts pursuant to which an agency formulates and issues a decision [*Gov. Code § 11405.20*].

[2] "Agency"

"Agency" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean a board, bureau, commission, department, division, office, officer or other administrative unit, including the agency head, and one or more members of the agency head or agency employees or other persons directly or indirectly purporting to act on behalf of or under the authority of the agency head. To the extent it purports to exercise authority under Chapter 4.5, an administrative unit otherwise qualifying as an agency shall be treated as a separate agency even if the unit is located within or subordinate to another agency [*Gov. Code § 11405.30*].

This definition in *Gov. Code § 11405.30* is drawn from 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(1) and supplements *Gov. Code § 11000* (defining "state agency" generally). The intent of the definition is to subject as many governmental units as possible to this chapter. The definition explicitly includes the agency head and those others who act for an agency, so as to effect the broadest possible coverage. The definition also would include a committee or council. The last sentence of this definition is in part derived from Federal APA § 551(1) (1988), treating as an agency "each authority of the Government of the United States, whether or not it is within or subject to review by another agency." A similar provision in *Gov. Code § 11405.30* is used to avoid difficulty in ascertaining which is the agency in a situation where an administrative unit is within or subject to the jurisdiction of another administrative unit. An administrative unit of an agency that has no authority to issue decisions or take other action on behalf of an agency is not an "agency" within the meaning of this section [25 Cal.L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 137-138 (1995)].

[3] "Agency Head"

"Agency head" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean a person or body in which the ultimate legal authority of an agency is vested, and includes a person or body to which the power to act is delegated pursuant to authority to delegate the

agency's power to hear and decide [*Gov. Code § 11405.40*]. The first part of this definition is taken from Model State APA § 1-102(3). The definition of agency head is included to differentiate for some purposes between the agency as an organic entity that includes all of its employees, and those particular persons in which the final legal authority over its operations is vested. The last part of the definition is drawn from *Gov. Code § 11500(a)* (defining "agency" for purposes of Chapter 5), relating to use of the term, "agency itself," to refer to a nondelegable power to act. An agency may delegate review authority [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 138 (1995)].

[4] "Decision"

"Decision" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to mean an agency action of specific application that determines a legal right, duty, privilege, immunity or other legal interest of a particular person [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(a)*]. The definition of decision in this statute does not limit the precedential effect of a decision under *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(b)(1)*], nor does it limit the authority of an agency to make a declaratory decision under *Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 11405.50(b)(2)*].

The definition of decision in *Gov. Code § 11405.50(a)* is taken form the 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(5). The definition makes clear that it includes only legal determinations made by an agency that are of specific applicability because they are addressed to particular or named persons. More than one identified person may be the subject of a decision. "Person" includes legal entity and governmental subdivision under *Gov. Code § 11405.70* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 138-139 (1995)].

A decision includes every agency action that determines any of the legal rights, duties, privileges, or immunities of a specific, identified individual or individuals. In contrast, a regulation, as defined under *Gov. Code § 11342.600*, is an agency action of general application, applicable to all members of a described class. The decision definition statute should not be interpreted to expand the types of cases in which an adjudicative proceeding is required. Under *Gov. Code § 11410.10*, an adjudicative proceeding is required under Chapter 4.5 only when another statute or the constitution requires such a proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 139 (1995)].

Consistent with the definition of "decision" in this statute, rate making and licensing determinations of specific application, addressed to named or particular parties such as a certain power company or a specific licensee, are decisions subject to Chapter 4.5. However, ratemaking and licensing actions of general application, addressed to all members of a described class of providers or licensees, are regulations as defined in *Gov. Code § 11342* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 139 (1995)].

Furthermore, some decisions may have precedential effect under *Gov. Code § 11425.60* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 139 (1995)].

[5] "Party"

"Party" is defined in Chapter 4.5 to include the agency that is taking action, the person to which the agency action is directed, and any other person named as a party or allowed to appear or intervene in the proceeding. If the agency that is taking action and the agency that is conducting the adjudicative proceeding are separate proceedings, the agency that is taking action is a party and the agency that is conducting the adjudicative proceeding is not a party [*Gov. Code § 11405.60*].

The first sentence of the definition of party in *Gov. Code § 11405.60* is taken from *Gov. Code § 11500(b)* (*see below*) and 1981 Model State APA § 1-102(6). The second sentence is new [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 139 (1995)]. Person is defined in *Gov. Code § 11405.70*, *see* [g], *below*, and includes legal entity and governmental subdivisions. Under this definition, if an officer or employee of an agency appears in an official capacity, the agency and not the person is the party. A staff division authorized to act on behalf of the agency may be a party under Chapter 4.5 because

of the definition of agency [*see* [c], *above*] under *Gov Code § 11405.30* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 139-140 (1995)]. The definition of party in this statute does not address the question of whether a person is entitled to judicial review. Standing to seek judicial review is dealt with in other law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 140 (1995)].

[6] "Person"

"Person" is defined for purposes of Chapter 4.5 to include an individual, partnership, corporation, governmental subdivision or unit of a governmental subdivision, or public or private organization or entity of any character [*Gov. Code § 11405.70*].

This definition supplements the definition of person in *Gov. Code § 17*. This definition is drawn from 1981 Model State APA, § 1-102(8), and includes the trustee of a trust or other fiduciary. This definition is broader than the *Gov. Code § 17* definition of person in that it also applies to a governmental subdivision or unit. This aspect of the definition would include an agency other than the agency against which rights under this chapter are asserted by the person. Including these agencies and units of government insures, therefore, that other agencies or other governmental bodies can, for example, apply to an agency for a decision, and will be accorded all the other rights that a person has under Chapter 4.5 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 140 (1995)].

[7] "Presiding Officer"

"Presiding officer" is defined for purposes of Chapter 4.5 to mean the agency head, member of the agency head, administrative law judge, hearing officer, or other person who presides in an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11405.80*]. This section is intended for drafting convenience [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 140 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.12

§ 473H.12 Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes

[1] Referral With Party Consent

An agency, with the consent of all the parties, may refer a dispute that is the subject of an adjudicative proceeding for resolution by any of the following means [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)*]:

- Mediation by a neutral mediator [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(1)*]. Mediators may use any mediation technique under *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 151 (1995)]. For discussion of mediation techniques generally, see Ch. 32, *Mediation* (in vol. 4 on Alternative Dispute Resolution).

- Binding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator. An award in a binding arbitration is subject to judicial review in the same manner as provided under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1285-1287.6* [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(2)*]. *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(2)* authorizes delegation of the agency's binding authority to decide, with the consent of all parties [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 151 (1995)]. For discussion of binding arbitration and their judicial review generally, see Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration* , et seq. (in vol. 4 on Alternative Dispute Resolution).

- Nonbinding arbitration by a neutral arbitrator. The arbitrator's decision in a nonbinding arbitration is final unless, within 30 days after the arbitrator delivers the award to the agency head, a party requests that the agency conduct a de novo adjudicative proceeding. If the decision in the de novo proceeding is not more favorable to the party electing the de novo proceeding, the party shall pay the costs and fees specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21* insofar as applicable in the adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(3)*]. *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(3)* parallels the procedure applicable to judicial arbitration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.20 et seq.* The costs and fees specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21* for a civil proceeding may not all be applicable in an adjudicative proceeding, but *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(3)* requires such costs and fees to be assessed to the extent they are applicable [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 151 (1995)]. For discussion of the parallel procedure of judicial arbitration, see Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* (in vol. 4 on Alternative Dispute Resolution).

If another statute requires mediation or arbitration in a particular adjudicative proceeding, that statute prevails over the foregoing provisions of *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)* [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(b)*]. *Gov. Code § 11420.10(b)* recognizes that other statutes, applicable to specific agencies or specific agency proceedings, may require alternative dispute resolution techniques [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 151 (1995)].

The provisions of *Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)* do not apply to the extent that a particular agency, by regulation, provides it is not applicable in a proceeding of that agency [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(c)*]. In other words, if there is no statute requiring the agency to use mediation or arbitration, this statute applies unless the agency makes it inapplicable by regulation under *Gov. Code § 11420.10(c)* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 151 (1995)].

[2] Model Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) is required to adopt and promulgate model regulations for alternative dispute resolution under this law. The model regulations govern alternative dispute resolution by an agency under this law, except to the extent that the agency by regulation provides inconsistent rules or provides that the model regulations are not applicable in a proceeding of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11420.20(a)*]. The model regulations must include provisions for selection and compensation of a mediator or arbitrator, qualifications of a mediator or arbitrator, and confidentiality of the mediation or arbitration proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11420.20(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11420.20 authorizes regulations to govern the details of alternative dispute resolution proceedings. In addition to the matters listed in *Gov. Code § 11420.20(b)*, the regulations may address other issues such as cost allocation, discovery, and enforcement and review of alternative dispute resolution. This statute does not require each agency to adopt regulations. The model regulations developed by the OAH will automatically govern mediation or arbitration for an agency, unless the agency provides otherwise. The agency may choose to preclude mediation or arbitration altogether [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 152 (1995)].

The Office of Administrative Hearings adopted regulations [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1000-1440* (1997)] to govern hearing procedures in hearings conducted before OAH administrative law judges [*1 Cal. Code Reg. § 1000* (1998)]. The regulations include alternative dispute resolution procedures [*1 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1200-1292* (1999)]. Specific regulations governing ADR are discussed in *§ 473H.10[3]*.

[3] Confidentiality of Communications

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a communication made in alternative dispute resolution under this law is protected to the following extent [*Gov. Code § 11420.30*]:

- Anything said, any admission made, and any document prepared in the course of, or pursuant to, mediation under this law is a confidential communication, and a party to the mediation has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent another from disclosing the communication, whether in an adjudicative proceeding, civil action, or other proceeding. This subdivision does not limit the admissibility of evidence if all parties to the proceeding consent [*Gov. Code § 11420.30(a)*]. This provision is analogous to *Evid. Code § 1119(a)* (mediation) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 153 (1995)].

- No reference to nonbinding arbitration proceedings, a decision of the arbitrator that is rejected by a party's request for a de novo adjudicative proceeding, the evidence produced, or any other aspect of the arbitration may be made in an adjudicative proceeding or civil action, whether as affirmative evidence, by way of impeachment, or for any other purpose [*Gov. Code § 11420.30(b)*]. This provision is taken from *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.25* (arbitration) and former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1616(c) (arbitration) [*now see Cal. Rules of Ct., 3.826*]; it protects confidentiality of a proposed decision in nonbinding

arbitration that is rejected by a party. It does not protect a decision accepted by the parties in a nonbinding arbitration, nor does it protect an award in a binding arbitration [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 153 (1995); *see also Gov. Code § 11425.20* (open hearings)].

- No mediator or arbitrator is competent to testify in a subsequent administrative or civil proceeding as to any statement, conduct, decision, or order occurring at, or in conjunction with, the alternative dispute resolution [*Gov. Code § 11420.30(c)*]. This provision derives from *Evid. Code § 703.5* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 153 (1995)].

- Evidence otherwise admissible outside of alternative dispute resolution under this law is not inadmissible or protected from disclosure solely by reason of its introduction or use in alternative dispute resolution under thus law [*Gov. Code § 11420.30(d)*].

The policy of *Gov. Code § 11420.30* is not to restrict access to information but to encourage dispute resolution [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 153 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilege

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.13

§ 473H.13 Informal Hearing Procedure

[1] Legislative Findings

An agency may conduct an adjudication under the informal hearing procedures of *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*, subject to any limitations set out in those provisions [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(a)*].

Legislative findings concerning informal hearing are [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(b)*]:

- The informal hearing procedure is intended to satisfy due process and public policy requirements in a manner that is simpler and more expeditious than hearing procedures otherwise required by statute, for use in appropriate circumstances [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(b)(1)*].

- The informal hearing procedure provides a forum in the nature of a conference in which a party has an opportunity to be heard by the presiding officer [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(b)(2)*].

- The informal hearing procedure provides a forum that may accommodate a hearing where by regulation or statute a member of the public may participate without appearing or intervening as a party [*Gov. Code § 11445.10(b)(3)*].

Gov. Code § 11445.10 states the policy that underlies the informal hearing procedure. The circumstances where the simplified procedure is appropriate are provided in *Gov. Code § 11445.20* (when informal hearing may be used). The simplified procedures are outlined in *Gov. Code § 11445.40* (procedure for informal hearing). Basic due process and public policy protections of the administrative adjudication *bill of rights* are preserved in the informal hearing under *Gov. Code §§ 11445.40(a)* (procedure for informal hearing) and 11425.10 (administrative adjudication *bill of rights*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 183-184 (1995)].

Thus, for example, the presiding officer must be free of bias, prejudice, and interest; the presiding officer must be neutral, the adjudicative function being separated from the investigative, prosecutorial, and advocacy functions within the agency; the hearing must be open to public observation; the agency must make language assistance available; ex

parte communications are restricted; the decision must be in writing, be based on the record, and include a statement of the factual and legal basis of the decision; and the agency must designate and index significant decisions as precedents [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 184 (1995)].

Reference in *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.* to the "presiding officer" is not intended to imply unnecessary formality in the proceeding. The presiding officer may be the agency head, an agency member, an administrative law judge, or another person who presides over the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 184 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11405.80* (presiding officer defined)].

[2] Applicable Proceedings

Subject to the requirements of *Gov. Code § 11445.30* (governing notice of hearing and objections to use of informal hearing procedures), an agency may use an informal hearing procedure in any of the following proceedings, if, in the circumstances, its use does not violate another statute or the federal or state constitution [*Gov. Code § 11445.20*]:

- A proceeding where there is no disputed issue of material fact [*Gov. Code § 11445.20(a)*]. This provision permits the informal hearing to be used, regardless of the type or amount at issue, if no disputes issue of material fact has appeared, for example, a power plant siting proceeding in which the power company and the Energy Commission have agreed on all material facts. However, if consumers intervene and dispute material facts, the proceeding may be subject to conversion from an informal hearing procedure to a formal or other type of hearing procedure consistent with *Gov. Code § 11470.10 et seq.* (conversion of proceeding procedures, discussed in *§ 473H.15*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185 (1995)].

- A proceeding where there is a disputed issue of material fact, if the matter is limited to (1) a monetary amount of not more than $1,000, (2) a disciplinary sanction against a student that does not involve expulsion from an academic institution or suspension for more than 10 days, (3) a disciplinary sanction against an employee that does not involve discharge from employment, demotion, or suspension for more than 5 days, or (4) a disciplinary sanction against a licensee that does not involve an actual revocation of a license or an actual suspension of a license for more than five days (this does not, however, preclude an agency from imposing a stayed revocation or a stayed suspension of a license in an informal hearing) [*Gov. Code § 11445.20(b)(1)-(4)*; *City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1377, 1384-1385, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 450* (informal adjudicative hearing procedures properly used for public hearing related to issuance of NPDES permit, as agency had authorized such hearing procedures by regulations [*23 Cal Code Reg. §§ 648(d)* and *648.5.1*], and the hearing was quasi-judicial, exempt from rulemaking procedures under *Gov. Code § 11352(b)*, and not subject to the formal adjudicative hearing procedures of *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11523*)]. This provision permits an informal hearing to be used, even if a disputed issue of material fact has appeared or if the amount or other stake involved is relatively minor; also, an informal hearing procedure may be used if the if the sanction imposed in the decision falls within its limitations, even though a greater penalty may result if a party fails to comply with the sanction imposed in the decision. The reference to a "licensee" in *Gov. Code § 11445.20(b)(4)* includes a certificate holder [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185 (1995)].

- A proceeding where, by regulation, the agency has authorized use of an informal hearing [*Gov. Code § 11445.20(c)*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185 (1995)].

- A proceeding where an evidentiary hearing for determination of facts is not required by statute but where the agency determines the federal or state constitution may require a hearing [*Gov. Code § 11445.20(d)*].

Gov. Code § 11445.20(c) imposes no limits on the authority of the agency to adopt the informal hearing by regulation, other than the general limitation that use of the informal hearing procedure is subject to statutory and constitutional due process requirements. Thus, an agency by regulation may authorize use of the informal hearing procedure in a case where the amount in issue or sanction exceeds the amount provided in *Gov. Code § 11445.20(b)*, so long as use of the informal hearing procedure would not contravene other statutes or due process of law [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185 (1995)].

Each subdivision in *Gov. Code § 11445.20* provides an independent basis for conducting an informal hearing. For example, if there is no issue of material fact, an agency may conduct an informal hearing under *Gov. Code § 11445.20(a)* whether or not a disciplinary sanction that exceeds the limits of *Gov. Code § 11445.20(b)* may result from the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185 (1995)].

Nothing in *Gov. Code § 11445.20* implies that this procedure is required in a proceeding in which a hearing is not statutorily or constitutionally required, including an agency's authority in minor disciplinary matters to make an investigation with or without a hearing as it deems necessary [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 185-186 (1995); *see Gov. Code §§ 11410.10* (application to constitutionally and statutorily required hearings), *11415.50* (when adjudicative proceeding not required)].

[3] Notice of Hearing and Objection

The notice of hearing sent by an agency initiating a hearing must state the agency's selection of the informal hearing procedure [*Gov. Code § 11445.30(a)*].

A responding party must, in his or her responsive pleading, raise any objection to use of informal hearing procedures [*Gov. Code § 11445.30(b)*]. The presiding officer is required to resolve an objection to the use of the informal hearing procedure before the hearing on the basis of the pleadings and any written submissions in support of the pleadings. An objection to the use of the informal hearing procedure in a disciplinary proceeding involving an occupational license shall be resolved in favor of the licensee [*Gov. Code § 11445.30(c)*].

A litigant that challenged the administrative record supporting the issuance of an NPDES permit, and also made specific objections to specific documents supporting the permit issuance, waived the right to object to the admission of the documents, by not making the objections before or at the time of the administrative hearing. The litigant was properly notified that the permit hearing would follow informal adjudicative hearing procedures in which liberal rules governing introduction of evidence applied, and it failed to object to evidence introduction until it challenged the permit in court [*City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1377, 1384-1385, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 450* (informal adjudicative hearing procedures properly used for public hearing related to issuance of NPDES permit, as agency had authorized such hearing procedures by regulations [*23 Cal Code Reg. §§ 648(d)* and *648.5.1*], and the hearing was quasi-judicial, exempt from rulemaking procedures under *Gov. Code § 11352(b)*, and not subject to the formal adjudicative hearing procedures of *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11523*)].

Gov. Code § 11445.30 provides a procedure for resolving objections to the use of the informal hearing procedure in advance of the hearing [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 186 (1995); *see also Gov. Code § 11511.5* (prehearing conference)]. However, conversion to a formal hearing or other type of hearing may be appropriate if during the course of the hearing circumstances indicate the need for it [*see Gov. Code §§ 11445.50* (cross-examination), *11445.60* (proposed proof) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 186 (1995)].

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the pleadings in an agency adjudication, including the notice of hearing and the respondent's notice of defense, see Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .

[4] Authority of Presiding Officer and Applicable Hearing Procedures

In an informal hearing, the presiding officer is required to regulate the course of the proceeding. The presiding officer is required to permit the parties, and may permit others, to offer written or oral comments on the issues. The presiding officer may limit the use of witnesses, testimony, evidence, and argument, and may limit or eliminate the use of pleadings, intervention, discovery, prehearing conferences, and rebuttal [*Gov. Code § 11445.40(b)*].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*, the hearing procedures otherwise required by statute for an adjudicative proceeding apply to an informal hearing [*Gov. Code § 11445.40(a)*]. For detailed discussion and forms relating to agency hearing procedures generally, see Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

Gov. Code § 11445.40 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-402. This statute indicates that the informal hearing is a simplified version of a formal hearing. The informal hearing need not have a prehearing conference, discovery, or testimony of anyone other than the parties. It is intended to permit agencies to allow public participation when appropriate [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 186-187 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11445.10*].

[5] Discretion to Deny or Convert Informal Hearing

The presiding officer has discretion to deny use of the informal hearing procedure, or to convert an informal hearing to a formal hearing after an informal hearing is commenced, if it appears to the presiding officer that cross-examination is necessary for proper determination of the matter and that the delay, burden, or complication due to allowing cross-examination in the informal hearing will be more than minimal [*Gov. Code § 11445.50(a)*]. This provision gives the presiding officer discretion to limit availability of the informal hearing in situations when it appears that substantial cross-examination will be necessary [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 187 (1995)]. For discussion of conversion under *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*, see *§ 473H.16*.

Agencies have authority to specify, by regulation, categories of cases in which cross-examination is deemed not necessary for proper determination of the matter under the informal hearing procedure. Nevertheless, the presiding officer may allow cross-examination of witnesses in an informal hearing notwithstanding an agency regulation if it appears to the presiding officer that in the circumstances cross-examination is necessary for proper determination of the matter [*Gov. Code § 11445.50(b)*]. This provision permits an agency to specify types of informal hearings in which cross-examination will be precluded. In recognition of the possibility that occasionally a case may demand cross-examination for proper determination of a matter, the presiding officer has limited authority to depart from the general procedure for cases of that type [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 187 (1995)].

The actions of the presiding officer under *Gov. Code § 11445.50* are not subject to judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11445.50(c)*].

[6] Presenting Proof as to Material Facts in Dispute

If the presiding officer has reason to believe that material facts are in dispute, the presiding officer may require a party to state the identity of the witnesses or other sources through which the party would propose to present proof if the proceeding were converted to a formal or other applicable hearing procedure. If disclosure of a fact, allegation, or source is privileged or expressly prohibited by a regulation, statute, or the federal or state constitution, the presiding officer may require the party to indicate that confidential facts, allegations, or sources are involved, but not to disclose the confidential facts, allegations, or sources [*Gov. Code § 11445.60(a)*].

If a party has reason to believe that essential facts must be obtained in order to permit an adequate presentation of the case, the party may inform the presiding officer regarding the general nature of the facts and the sources from which the party would propose to obtain the facts if the proceeding were converted to a formal or other hearing procedure [*Gov.*

Code § 11445.60(b)].

Gov. Code § 11445.60 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-403 [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 188 (1995)]. For discussion of conversion of proceedings under *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*, see *§ 473H.16*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.14

§ 473H.14 Emergency Decision Procedure

[1] Authority for Emergency Decision Procedure

Subject to the limitations set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*, an agency may conduct an adjudicative proceeding under the emergency decision procedure of those provisions [*Gov. Code § 11460.10*].

This provision makes available an emergency decision procedure for decisions in which an adjudicative proceeding is required [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 193 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11410.10* (application to constitutionally and statutorily required hearings)]. The emergency decision procedure does not apply to an agency decision to seek injunctive relief [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 193 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.50* (when adjudicative proceeding not required)]. The decision whether to use the emergency decision procedure, if available, is in the discretion of the agency. The provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* supplement and do not replace other statutes that provide for interim suspension orders or other emergency orders [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 193 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.10* (regarding applicable procedure); *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.16[1][a]*]. For other statutes on interim suspension orders and other emergency orders see the following [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 193-194 (1995)]:

- Order for interim suspension of licensee [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 494*].
- Order for interim suspension of attorney [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6007(c)*].
- Order for interim suspension of real estate licensee [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10086(a)*].
- Immediate suspension of disruptive student, teacher, staff member, or administrator [*Educ. Code § 66017*].
- Emergency suspension of approval of private postsecondary institution to operate [*Educ. Code § 94319.12*].

- Immediate removal of officer or employee of savings association [*Fin. Code § 8201(f)*].
- Community care facilities [*Health & Safety Code § 1550.5*].
- Residential care facilities for the elderly [*Health & Safety Code § 1569.50*].
- Child day care facilities [*Health & Safety Code § 1596.886*].
- Trucking license [*Pub. Util. Code § 1070.5*].
- DMV licenses of manufacturers, transporters, and dealers [*Veh. Code § 11706*].

The California Court of Appeal rejected both a facial and an as applied challenge to statutory procedures in the California Education Code [*Educ. Code § 56366.6(a), (b)*; *5* Cal. Code Regs. § 3068] that provided for a post-suspension and post-revocation hearing to private special education schools that had their certifications to operate suspended or revoked by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The schools argued that they were entitled to a pre-suspension or pre-revocation hearing. The Court of Appeal rejected that argument based upon the application of the three *Mathews v. Eldridge (1976) 424 U.S. 319, 335, 96 S. Ct. 893, 47 L. Ed 2d 18* factors, the private interest, the risk of error with existing procedures, and the governmental interest, as well as California due process of law principles [*Cal. Const., Art. 1, Sect. 7(a)*]. The court held that a post-suspension or post-revocation hearing satisfied due process of law requirements because it provides a reasonably prompt method for determining the validity of a suspension or revocation in circumstance in which there is a strong governmental interest, protecting disabled children [*Cal. Ass'n of PSES v. Cal. Dept. of Educ. (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 360, 374-376, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 888]* . The Court of Appeal also held that the statutory procedures do not provide for the issuance of emergency decisions, and thus the certification suspension and revocation procedures for nonpublic, nonsectarian schools are not subject to the emergency decision procedures requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* [*California Ass'n of PSES v. Cal. Dept. of Educ. (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 360, 378-379, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 888]* .

[2] Regulations Authorizing Emergency Decisions for Temporary, Interim Relief

An agency may issue an emergency decision for temporary, interim relief under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* if the agency has adopted a regulation that provides that the agency may use the procedures set out therein [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(a)*]. An agency regulation is required to elaborate the application of the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* to an emergency decision by the agency, including all of the following [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(b)*]:

- Define the specific circumstances in which an emergency decision may be issued under *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(b)(1)*].
- State the nature of the temporary, interim relief that the agency may order [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(b)(2)*].
- Prescribe the procedures that will be available before and after issuance of an emergency decision under *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*. The procedures may be more protective of the person to which the agency action is directed than those provided under *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(b)(3)*].

The emergency decision procedures of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* do not apply to an emergency decision, including a cease and desist order or an interim or temporary suspension order, issued pursuant to other express statutory authority [*Gov. Code § 11460.20(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11460.20 requires specificity in agency regulations that adopt an emergency decision procedure. Notwithstanding these requirements, a statute on emergency decisions, including cease and desist orders and temporary suspension orders, applicable to a particular agency or proceeding prevails over the provisions of this law governing emergency decision procedures [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 194 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.20* (conflicting or inconsistent statute controls)].

[3] Requirement of Immediate Danger to Public Health, Safety, or Welfare

An agency may only issue an emergency decision under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* in a situation involving an immediate danger to the public health, safety, or welfare that requires immediate agency action [*Gov. Code § 11460.30(a)*]. An agency may only take action under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* that is necessary to prevent or avoid the immediate danger to the public health, safety, or welfare that justifies issuance of an emergency decision [*Gov. Code § 11460.30(b)*]. An emergency decision issued under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* is limited to temporary, interim relief. The temporary, interim relief is subject to judicial review under *Gov. Code § 11460.80*, and the underlying issue giving rise to the temporary, interim relief is subject to an adjudicative proceeding under *Gov. Code § 11460.60* [*Gov. Code § 11460.30(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11460.30 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-501(a)-(b). The emergency decision procedure is applicable only if the agency has adopted an authorizing regulation [*see Gov. Code § 11460.20*]. The authority for an emergency decision to avoid immediate danger to the public health, safety, or welfare includes avoiding adverse effects on the environment, such as to fish and wildlife [25 Cal. L Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 195 (1995)].

[4] Notice and Hearing Requirement

Before issuing an emergency decision under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*, the agency shall, if practicable, give the person to which the agency action is directed notice and opportunity to be heard [*Gov. Code § 11460.40(a)*]. Notice and hearing under *Gov. Code § 11460.40* may be oral or written, including notice and hearing by telephone, facsimile transmission, or other electronic means, as the circumstances permit. The hearing may be conducted in the same manner as an informal hearing [*Gov. Code § 11460.40(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 11445.60* (procedure for informal hearing)].

Gov. Code § 11460.40 applies to the extent practicable in the circumstances of the particular emergency situation. The agency must use its discretion to determine the extent of the practicability, and give appropriate notice and opportunity to be heard accordingly [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995)]. By regulation the agency may prescribe the emergency notice and hearing procedure [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 195 (1995); *see, e.g.,* State Bar Rules of Procedure, Transitional Rules 789-798 (proceedings re involuntary transfer to inactive status upon a finding that the attorney's conduct poses a substantial threat of harm to the public or the attorney's clients)]. The regulation may be more protective of the person to which the agency action is directed than the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 196 (1995)].

[5] Emergency Decision and Adjudicative Proceeding

The agency is required to issue an emergency decision, including a brief explanation of the factual and legal basis and reasons for the emergency decision, to justify the determination of an immediate danger and the agency's emergency decision to take the specific action [*Gov. Code § 11460.50(a)*]. The agency shall give notice to the extent practicable to the person to which the agency action is directed. The emergency decision is effective when issued or as provided in the decision [*Gov. Code § 11460.50(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11460.50 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-501(c)-(d). Under this provisions the agency has

flexibility to issue its emergency decision orally, if necessary to cope with the emergency [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 196 (1995)].

After issuing an emergency decision under *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80* for temporary, interim relief, the agency is required to conduct an adjudicative proceeding under a formal, informal, or other applicable hearing procedure to resolve the underlying issues giving rise to the temporary, interim relief [*Gov. Code § 11460.60(a)*]. The agency is required to commence an adjudicative proceeding under another procedure within 10 days after issuing an emergency decision under the requirements of Gov. Code. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80, notwithstanding the pendency of proceedings for judicial review of the emergency decision [*Gov. Code § 11460.60(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11460.60 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-501(e). If the emergency proceedings have rendered the matter completely moot, this statue does not direct the agency to conduct useless follow-up proceedings, since these would not be required in the circumstances [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 196 (1995)].

[6] Agency Record and Judicial Review

In an emergency decision procedure, the agency record consists of any documents concerning the matter that were considered or prepared by the agency. The agency is required to maintain these documents as its official record [*Gov. Code § 11460.70*]. This provision is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 4-501(f) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 197 (1995)].

When an emergency decision is issued under the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*, the person to which the agency action is directed may obtain judicial review of the decision in the manner provided in *Gov. Code § 11460.80* without exhaustion of administrative remedies [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(a)*]. Judicial review under *Gov. Code § 11460.80* shall be pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* subject to the following provisions [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(b)*]:

- The hearing shall be on the earliest day that the business of the court will admit of, but no later than 15 days after service of the petition on the agency [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(b)(1)*].

- When it is claimed that the findings are not supported by the evidence, abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(b)(2)*].

- A party, on written request to another party, before the proceedings for review and within 10 days after issuance of the emergency decision, is entitled to appropriate discovery [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(b)(3)*].

- The relief that may be ordered on judicial review is limited to a stay of the emergency decision [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(b)(4)*].

Gov. Code § 11460.80 is taken from *Gov. Code § 11529(h)* (interim suspension of medical care professional) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm Reports 55, 197 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingFormal RulemakingAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesStays of Proceedings & SupersedeasAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of Remedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.15

§ 473H.15 Declaratory Decision Procedure

[1] Authority for Declaratory Decision

Subject to the limitations set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*, an agency may conduct an adjudicative proceeding under the declaratory decision procedures set out therein [*Gov. Code § 11465.10*].

Gov. Code § 11465.10 et seq. create, and establish all of the requirements for, a special proceeding to be known as a "declaratory decision" proceeding. The purpose of the proceeding is to provide an inexpensive and generally available means by which a person may obtain fully reliable information as to the applicability of agency administered law to the person's particular circumstances [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 198 (1995)].

An agency not governed by Chapter 4.5, the APA's general adjudication provisions (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*), of which this procedure is a part, nonetheless has general power to issue a declaratory decision. This power is derived from the power to adjudicate [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 198 (1995); *see, e.g.,* M. Asimow, Advice to the Public from Federal Administrative Agencies 121-22 (1973)]. However, the specific declaratory decision procedure provided in *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70* applies only to proceedings that are subject to Chapter 4.5, including a proceeding under the APA's formal hearing provisions (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 198 (1995); *see Gov. Code §§ 11410.50* (application where formal hearing procedure required), *11501* (application of chapter); *see also* Gov. Code. *Code § 11410.10* (application to constitutionally and statutorily required hearings)].

[2] Application and Issuance of Decision

A person may apply to an agency for a declaratory decision as to the applicability to specified circumstances of a statute, regulation, or decision within the primary jurisdiction of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(a)*]. Under *Gov. Code § 11465.20(a)*, a declaratory decision may determine whether the subject of the proceeding is or is not within the agency's primary jurisdiction [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 199 (1995); *see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 302-303, 109 P. 2d 942* ; *United Insurance Co. v. Maloney (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 155, 157-158, 273 P. 2d 579]* .

The agency in its discretion may issue a declaratory decision in response to the application. The agency shall not issue a

declaratory decision if any of the following applies [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(b)*]:

- Issuance of the decision would be contrary to a regulation adopted under the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70* [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(b)(1)*; *see* Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* , et seq., for discussion of the procedure by which an interested person may petition requesting adoption, amendment, or repeal of a regulation under *Gov. Code §§ 11347-11347.1*].

- The decision would substantially prejudice the rights of a person who would be a necessary party and who does not consent in writing to the determination of the matter by a declaratory decision proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(b)(2)*]. This provision prohibits an agency from issuing a declaratory decision that would substantially prejudice the rights of a person who would be a necessary party, and who does not consent to the determination of the matter by a declaratory decision proceeding. A necessary party is one that is constitutionally entitled to notice and an opportunity to be heard, a flexible concept depending on the nature of the competing interests involved [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 199 (1995); *Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d. 605, 612, 617, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P. 2d 1134]* . Such a person may refuse to give consent because in a declaratory decision proceeding the person might not have all of the same procedural rights the person would have in another type of adjudicative proceeding to which the person would be entitled [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 199 (1995)].

- The decision involves a matter that is the subject of pending administrative or judicial proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(b)(3)*].

Gov. Code § 11465.20(a), (b) are taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(a). Unlike the model act, issuance of a declaratory decision under this statute is discretionary with the agency, not mandatory [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 199 (1995)].

An application for a declaratory decision is not required for exhaustion of the applicant's administrative remedies for purposes of judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(c)*]. This provision makes clear that application for a declaratory decision is not a necessary part of the administrative process. A person may seek judicial review of an agency action after other administrative remedies have been exhausted; the person is not required to seek declaratory relief as well. Nothing in this subdivision authorizes judicial review without exhaustion of other applicable administrative remedies [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 199 (1995)].

[3] Notice and Applicable Law

Within 30 days after receipt of an application for a declaratory decision, an agency shall give notice of the application to all persons to which notice of an adjudicative proceeding is otherwise required, and may give notice to any other person [*Gov. Code § 11465.30*].

Gov. Code § 11465.30 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(c) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 200 (1995); *see also Gov. Code § 11440.20* (notice)].

The provisions of a formal, informal, or other applicable hearing procedure do not apply to an agency proceeding for a declaratory decision except to the extent provided in *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*, or to the extent the agency so provides by regulation or order [*Gov. Code § 11465.40*]. This provision is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(d). It makes clear that the specific procedural requirements for adjudications imposed by the formal hearing procedure or other applicable hearing procedure on an agency when it conducts an adjudicative proceeding are inapplicable to a proceeding for a declaratory decision unless the agency elects to make some or all of them applicable. Regulations specifying precise procedures available in a declaratory proceeding may be adopted under *Gov. Code §*

11465.70. The reason for exempting a declaratory decision from usual procedural requirements for adjudications is to encourage an agency to issue a decision by eliminating requirements it might deem onerous. Moreover, many adjudicative provisions have no applicability. For example, cross-examination is unnecessary since the application establishes the facts on which the agency should rule. Oral argument could also be dispensed with [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 200 (1995)].

Note that there are no contested issues of fact in a declaratory decision proceeding because its function is to declare the applicability of the law in question to facts furnished by the applicant. The actual existence of the facts on which the decision is based will usually become an issue only in a later proceeding in which a party to the declaratory decision proceeding seeks to use the decision as a justification of the party's conduct. Note also that the party requesting a declaratory decision has the choice of refraining from filing such an application and awaiting the ordinary agency adjudicative process. A declaratory decision is, of course, subject to provisions governing judicial review of agency decisions and for public inspection and indexing of agency decisions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 200 (1995); *see, e.g., Gov. Code §§ 6250-6268* (California Public Records Act), discussed in Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*]. A declaratory decision may be given precedential effect, subject to the provisions governing precedent decisions [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 201 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11425.60* (precedent decisions)].

[4] Agency Action

Within 60 days after receipt of an application for a declaratory decision, an agency shall do one of the following, in writing [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)*]:

- Issue a decision declaring the applicability of the statute, regulation, or decision in question to the specified circumstances [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)(1)*].

- Set the matter for specified proceedings [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)(2)*].

- Agree to issue a declaratory decision by a specified time [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)(3)*].

- Decline to issue a declaratory decision, stating in writing the reasons for its actions. Agency action under this paragraph is not subject to judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)(4)*]. The decision by an agency not to issue a declaratory decision is within the absolute discretion of the agency and is therefore not reviewable [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)(4)*; 25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 201-202 (1995); *see also Gov. Code § 11465.20* (declaratory decision permissive)].

Gov. Code § 11465.50(a) is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(e). The requirement that an agency dispose of an application within 60 days ensures a timely agency response to a declaratory decision application, thereby facilitating planning by affected parties [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 201 (1995)].

A copy of the agency's action under *Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)* must be served promptly on the applicant and any other party [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(b)*]. *Gov. Code § 11465.50(b)* is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(f). It requires that the agency communicate to the applicant and to any other parties any action it takes in response to an application for a declaratory decision. This includes each of the types of actions listed in paragraphs (1)-(4) of *Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)*. Service is made by personal delivery or mail or other means to the last known address of the person to which the agency action is directed [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 201 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11440.20*].

If an agency has not taken action under *Gov. Code § 11465.50(a)* within 60 days after receipt of an application for a declaratory decision, the agency is considered to have declined to issue a declaratory decision on the matter [*Gov. Code § 11465.50(c)*].

[5] Declaratory Decision

A declaratory decision shall contain the names of all parties to the proceeding, the particular facts on which it is based, and the reasons for its conclusion [*Gov. Code § 11465.60(a)*]. A declaratory decision has the same status and binding effect as any other decision issued by the agency in an adjudicative proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11465.60(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11465.60 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(g). A declaratory decision issued by an agency is judicially reviewable; is binding on the applicant, other parties to that declaratory proceeding, and the agency, unless reversed or modified on judicial review; and has the same precedential effect as other agency adjudications. A declaratory decision, like other decisions, only determines the legal rights of the particular parties to the proceeding in which it was issued. The requirement in *Gov. Code § 11465.60(a)*, that each declaratory decision issued contain the facts on which it is based and the reasons for its conclusion, will facilitate any subsequent judicial review of the decision's legality. It also ensures a clear record of what occurred for the parties and for persons interested in the decision because of its possible precedential effect [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 202 (1995)].

[6] Model Regulations

The Office of Administrative Hearings is required to adopt and promulgate model regulations under *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70* that are consistent with the public interest and with the general policy of *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70* to facilitate and encourage agency issuance of reliable advice. The model regulations shall provide for all of the following [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(a)*]:

- A description of the classes of circumstances in which an agency will not issue a declaratory decision [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(a)(1)*].

- The form, contents, and filing of an application for a declaratory decision [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(a)(2)*].

- The procedural rights of a person in relation to an application [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(a)(3)*].

- The disposition of an application [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(a)(4)*].

The regulations adopted by the Office of Administrative Hearings under this authority apply in an adjudicative proceeding unless an agency adopts its own regulations to govern declaratory decisions of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(b)*]. These provisions do not apply in an adjudicative proceeding to the extent an agency by regulation provides inconsistent rules or provides that these provisions are not applicable in a proceeding of the agency [*Gov. Code § 11465.70(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11465.70 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 2-103(b). An agency may choose to preclude declaratory decision altogether. Regulations should specify all of the details surrounding the declaratory decision process including a specification of the precise form and contents of the application; when, how, and where an application is to be filed; whether an applicant has the right to an oral argument; the circumstances in which the agency will not issue a decision; and the like [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 203 (1995)].

Regulations also should require a clear and precise presentations of facts, so that an agency will not be required to rule on the application of law to unclear or excessively general facts. The regulations should make clear that, if the facts are not sufficiently precise, the agency can require additional facts or a narrowing of the application. Agency regulations on this subject will be valid so long as the requirements they impose are reasonable and are within the scope of agency discretion. To be valid these rules must also be consistent with the public interest, which includes the efficient and effective accomplishment of the agency's mission, and the express general policy of this article to facilitate and

encourage the issuance of reliable agency advice. Within these general limits, therefore, and agency may include in its rules reasonable standing, ripeness, and other requirements for obtaining a declaratory decision [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 203 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersPrimary Jurisdiction

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.16

§ 473H.16 Conversion of Agency Proceedings

[1] Authority of Presiding Officer or Other Agency Official

Subject to applicable regulations adopted under *Gov. Code § 11470.50*, at any point in an agency proceeding, the presiding officer or other agency official responsible for the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)*]:

- May convert the proceeding to another type of agency proceeding provided for by statute if the conversion is appropriate, is in the public interest, and does not substantially prejudice the rights of a party [*Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)(1)*].

- Must convert the proceeding to another type of agency proceeding provided for by statute, if required by regulation or statute [*Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)(2)*].

A proceeding of one type may be converted to a proceeding of another type only on notice to all parties to the original proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.10(b)*].

Gov. Code § 11470.10 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-107(a)-(b). For purposes of this statute, a "party" in the case of an adjudicative proceeding means "party" as defined in *Gov. Code § 11405.60* (*see* definition in *§ 473H.11[5]*); in the case of a rulemaking proceeding, it means an active participant in the proceeding or one primarily interested in its outcome [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 204 (1995)].

Agency proceedings covered by *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50* include a rulemaking proceeding as well as an adjudicative proceeding. The conversion provisions may be irrelevant to some types of proceedings by some agencies, and in that case these provisions would be inapplicable. Under *Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)(1)*, a proceeding may not be converted to another type of proceeding that would be inappropriate for the action being taken. For example, if an agency elects to conduct a formal hearing in a case in which it could have elected an informal hearing initially, a subsequent decision to convert to an informal hearing would be appropriate. The further limitation in *Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)(1)*, that the conversion must not substantially prejudice the rights of a party, must also be satisfied. The courts will have to decide on a case-by- case basis what constitutes substantial prejudice. The concept includes both the

right to an appropriate procedure that enables a party to protect its interests, and freedom of the party from great inconvenience caused by the conversion in terms of time, cost, availability of witnesses, necessity of continuances and other delays, and other practical consequences of the conversion. Of course, even if the rights of a party are substantially prejudiced by a conversion, the party may voluntarily waive them [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 204 (1995); *see Gov. Code § 11415.40*].

The limitation on discretionary conversion of an agency proceeding from one type to another, to avoid substantial prejudice to the rights of a party, is not intended to disturb an existing body of law. In certain situations an agency may lawfully deny an individual an adjudicative proceeding to which the individual would otherwise be entitled by conducting a rulemaking proceeding that determines for an entire class an issue that otherwise would be the subject of a necessary adjudicative proceeding [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55 (1995); *see* Note, *The Use of Agency Rulemaking To Deny Adjudications Apparently Required by Statute, 54 Iowa L. Rev. 1086 (1969)*]. Similarly, the substantial prejudice limitation is not intended to disturb the existing body of law allowing an agency, in certain situations, to make a determination through an adjudicative proceeding that has the effect of denying a person an opportunity the person might otherwise be afforded if a rulemaking proceeding were used instead [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 204-205 (1995)].

Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)(2) makes clear that an agency must convert a proceeding of one type to a proceeding of another type when required by regulation or statute, even if a nonconsenting party is prejudiced thereby. Under this provision, however, both a discretionary and a mandatory conversion must be accompanied by notice to all parties to the original proceeding so that they will have a fully adequate opportunity to protect their interests. Within the limits of this statute, an agency should be authorized to use procedures in a proceeding that are most likely to be effective and efficient under the circumstances [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 205 (1995)]. *Gov. Code § 11470.10(a)* allows an agency this flexibility. For example, an agency that wants to convert a formal hearing into an informal hearing, or an informal hearing to a formal hearing, may do so under this provision if the conversion is appropriate and in the public interest, if adequate notice is given, and if the rights of the parties are not substantially prejudiced [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 205 (1995)].

Similarly, an agency called on to explore a new area of law in a declaratory decision proceeding may prefer to do so by rulemaking. That is, the agency may decide to have full public participation in developing its policy in the area and to declare law of general applicability instead of issuing a determination of only particular applicability at the request of a specific party in a more limited proceeding. So long as all of the standards in this statute are met, this statute would authorize such a conversion from one type of agency proceeding to another. While it is unlikely that a conversion consistent with all of the statutory standards could occur more than once in the course of a proceeding, the possibility of multiple conversions in the course of a particular proceeding is left open by the statutory language. In an adjudication, the prehearing conference could be used to choose the most appropriate form of proceeding at the outset, thereby diminishing the likelihood of a later conversion [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 205 (1995)].

[2] Conversion Procedures

[a] Appointment of Successor

If the presiding officer or other agency official responsible for the original proceeding would not have authority over the new proceeding to which it is to be converted, the agency head shall appoint a successor to preside over or be responsible for the new proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.20*]. This statute is taken form 1981 Model State APA § 1-107(c). It deals with the mechanics of transition from one type of proceeding to another [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 206 (1995)].

[b] Record of Original Proceeding

To the extent practicable and consistent with the rights of parties and the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*, relating to the new proceeding, the record of the original agency proceeding shall be used in the new agency proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.30*].

Gov. Code § 11470.30 is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-107(d). It seeks to avoid unnecessary duplication of proceedings by requiring the use of as much of the agency record in the first proceeding as is possible in the second proceeding, consistent with the rights of the parties and the requirements of the applicable statute governing the hearing procedure [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 206 (1995)].

[c] Duties of Official Responsible for New Proceeding

After a proceeding is converted from one type to another, the presiding officer or other agency official responsible for the new proceeding shall do all of the following [*Gov. Code § 11470.40*]:

- Give additional notice to parties or other persons necessary to satisfy the statutory requirements relating to the new proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.40(a)*].

- Dispose of the matters involved without further proceedings if sufficient proceedings have already been held to satisfy the statutory requirements relating to the new proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.40(b)*].

- Conduct or cause to be conducted any additional proceedings necessary to satisfy the statutory requirements relating to the new proceeding, and allow the parties a reasonable time to prepare for the new proceeding [*Gov. Code § 11470.40(c)*].

Gov. Code § 11470.40 is drawn from the 1981 Model State APA § 1-107(e) [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Reports 55, 207 (1995)].

[3] Regulations

An agency may adopt regulations to govern the conversion of one type of proceeding to another. The regulations may include an enumeration of the factors to be considered in determining whether and under what circumstances one type of proceeding will be converted to another [*Gov. Code § 11470.50*]. *Gov. Code § 11470.50* is taken from 1981 Model State APA § 1-107(f). Adoption of regulations is permissive, rather than mandatory [25 Cal. L. Rev. Comm Reports 55, 207 (1995)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral Overview

128 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473H.17-473H.19

[Reserved]

§§ 473H.17[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.20

§ 473H.20 Federal Constitution

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.21

§ 473H.21 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.22

§ 473H.22 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Procedure Act

Accusation. *Gov. Code § 11503*

Administrative adjudication *bill of rights*. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.10-11425.60*

Administrative Law Judges. *Gov. Code § 11502*

Affidavits. *Gov. Code § 11514*

Agency decisional authority. *Gov. Code § 11440.10*

Agencies to which act applies. *Gov. Code §§ 11410.10, 11501*

Amendment of pleadings. *Gov. Code §§ 11507, 11516*

Applicability of provisions to statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504.5*

Conduct of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Consolidation of proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Contempt. *Gov. Code §§ 11455.10-11455.30*

Continuances. *Gov. Code § 11524*

Conversion of proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11470.10-11470.50*

Decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11516-11520, 11526*

Declaratory decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11465.10-11465.70*

Definitions of terms. *Gov. Code §§ 11405.10-11405.80, 11500*

Depositions. *Gov. Code § 11511*

Discovery. *Gov. Code §§ 11507.5-11507.7*

Disqualification. *Gov. Code §§ 11425.30, 11425.40, 11512*

Emergency decision. *Gov. Code §§ 11460.10-11460.80*

Evidence. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.10, 11440.40, 11513*

Ex parte communications. *Gov. Code. Code §§ 11430.10-11430.80*

Hearings by electronic means. *Gov. Code § 11440.30*

Informal hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11445.10-11445.60*

Intervention. *Gov. Code § 11440.50*

Language assistance. *Gov. Code §§ 11435.05-11435.65*

Judicial review. *Gov. Code § 11523*

Notice of defense. *Gov. Code § 11506*

Notice of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11509*

Oaths. *Gov. Code § 11528*

Official notice. *Gov. Code § 11515*

Reconsideration. *Gov. Code § 11521*

Reporting proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11512*

Restoration of rights. *Gov. Code § 11522*

Separate hearings. *Gov. Code § 11507.3*

Service and notice. *Gov. Code § 11440.20*

Service of initial pleading. *Gov. Code § 11505*

Settlement conferences. *Gov. Code § 11511.7*

Sexual harassment. *Gov. Code § 11440.40*

Statement of issues. *Gov. Code § 11504*

Subpoenas. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Time and place of hearing. *Gov. Code § 11508*

Waiver of rights. *Gov. Code § 11415.40*

[2] Related Statutes

Affidavit of good cause as required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*

Witness served with subpoena as entitled to demand one day's fees and mileage allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*

Witness fees and mileage allowances. *Gov. Code §§ 11191, 68093, 68097.2*

Right to have subpoena issued. *Gov. Code § 11190*

Office of Administrative Hearings. *Gov. Code §§ 11370.1-11370.5*

Board of supervisors of county as empowered to establish county hearing officer. *Gov. Code §§ 27720, 27721*

Oaths used in civil proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2094-2097*

Evidentiary effect of plea of nolo contendere. *Penal Code § 1016*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.23

§ 473H.23 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

NOTE:
On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 473H.24-473H.29

[Reserved]

§§ 473H.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.30

§ 473H.30 Alternative Dispute Resolution

[1] Options

☐ Mediation [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(1)*; *see Gov. Code § 11420.10(b)*; *§ 473H.12[1]*].

☐ Binding arbitration [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(2)*; *see Gov. Code § 11420.10(b)*; *§ 473H.12[1]*].

☐ Nonbinding arbitration [*Gov. Code § 11420.10(a)(3)*; *see Gov. Code § 11420.10(b)*; *§ 473H.12[1]*].

[2] Procedure

☐ Obtain consent of all parties [*see § 473H.12[1]*].

☐ Obtain agency referral [*see § 473H.12[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.31

§ 473H.31 Objection to Informal Hearing Procedure

☐ Object in responsive pleading [*Gov. Code § 11445.30(b)*; *see § 473H.13[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.32

§ 473H.32 Emergency Decision

☐ Obtain judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11460.80(a), (b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *§ 473H.14[6]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 473H ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES FOR AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-473H California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 473H.33

§ 473H.33 Declaratory Decision

☐ Apply to agency for declaratory decision [*Gov. Code § 11465.20(a)*; *see § 473H.15[2]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 474.syn

§ 474.syn Synopsis to Chapter 474: AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS

§ 474.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 474.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

[2] Agency Adjudication

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 474.03-474.09 [Reserved]

§ 474.10 Nature of Mandate Proceedings

[1] General Nature of Remedy

[2] Procedure

[3] Ordinary and Administrative Mandate Distinguished

§ 474.11 Review in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[1] Nature of Review

[2] Administrative Officials and Bodies Subject to Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[3] Actions and Decisions Reviewable in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[a] Quasi-Legislative Action or Decision

[b] Refusal to Perform Ministerial Action

[c] Adjudicatory Action or Decision That Is Not Subject to Review in Administrative Mandate Proceedings

[4] Facts and Evidence on Which Review Is Based

[5] Relief Available

§ 474.12 Review in Administrative Mandate Proceedings

[1] Nature of Review

[2] Administrative Officials and Bodies Subject to Administrative Mandate Proceedings

[3] Prerequisites for Review of Administrative Order or Decision in Administrative Mandate Proceeding

[a] Adjudicatory Order or Decision

[b] Final Order or Decision

[c] Order or Decision Resulting From Evidentiary Hearing Required by Law

[d] Improper Petition for Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 Relief Not to Be Dismissed if Adequate for Ordinary Mandate

[4] Facts and Evidence on Which Review Is Based

[5] Relief Available

[a] Reversal or Annulment of Order if Agency Acted in Excess of Jurisdiction

[b] No Control or Limitation of Discretion Vested in Agency; Remand Required

[c] When Substantial Evidence Standard Applies

[d] When Independent Judgment Standard Applies

§ 474.13 Requirements Common to All Mandate Proceedings

[1] Beneficially Interested Petitioner

[a] Nature of Requirement

[b] Judicially Recognized Exceptions to Requirement

[c] Effect of Statute Providing for Participation in Administrative Proceeding

[2] Lack of Adequate Remedy at Law

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[4] When Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Is Not Required

[a] Claim That Administrative Entity Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction Under Governing Statutes

[b] Challenge to Constitutionality of Governing Statutes

[c] Administrative Remedy Is Inadequate or Unavailable

[d] Pursuit of Administrative Remedy Is Futile

[e] Petitioner Is Threatened With Irreparable Injury

[f] Application of Rule Is Contrary to Public Interest

[g] Concurrent Primary Jurisdiction

§ 474.14 Defenses Common to All Mandate Proceedings

[1] Statute of Limitations

[2] Equitable Defenses

[a] Laches

[b] Unclean Hands

[c] Waiver

[d] Estoppel

§ 474.15 Res Judicata and the Failure to Seek Judicial Review

§§ 474.16-474.19 [Reserved]

§ 474.20 Review by Other Extraordinary Writs

[1] Prohibition

[2] Certiorari

[3] Extraordinary Writ

§ 474.21 Action for Declaratory Relief

§ 474.22 Action for Injunctive Relief

§ 474.23 Orders and Decisions Reviewable Under Special Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

[1] Decisions of the Public Utilities Commission

[2] Decisions of the State Bar

[3] Orders, Rules, and Decisions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board

[4] Orders of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board

[5] Orders of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board

[6] Certain Orders and Determinations of the Public Employment Relations Board

§§ 474.24-474.29 [Reserved]

§ 474.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 474.31 Federal Constitution

§ 474.32 State Constitution

§ 474.33 State Statutes

§ 474.34 Decisions

[1] Generally

[2] Acts Subject to Judicial Review

[3] Finality of Decision

[4] Hearing Required by Law

[5] Evidence Required to Be Taken

[6] Beneficial Interest

[7] Lack of Other Remedies

[8] Res Judicata

[9] Limitation and Laches

[10] Questions Not Presented to Agency

[11] Judicial Review

[a] Right

[b] Scope

[c] Proceedings

§ 474.35 Law Reviews

§ 474.36 Text References

§ 474.37 Internet References

§§ 474.38-474.49 [Reserved]

§ 474.50 Determine Availability of and Procedure for Judicial Review

§ 474.51 Petition for Writ of Mandate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.01

§ 474.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of the availability of judicial review, including the following in Part II:

- Subpart A discusses availability of judicial review under ordinary mandate and administrative mandate [*see § 474.10* et seq.].

- Subpart B discusses availability of judicial review under other writs, actions, and specialized orders and decisions [*see § 474.20* et seq.].

The terms mandate and mandamus are interchangeable. In the Legal Background in this chapter, the writ is referred to by the term mandate.

A Research Guide [Part III; *see § 474.30* et seq.] and a Procedural Checklist [Part IV; *see § 474.50* et seq.] are also included.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.02

§ 474.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

For related discussion concerning judicial review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*, et seq. (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

For memoranda of points of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for writs of mandate generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Agency Adjudication

For detailed discussion and forms relating to agency adjudications that are the subject of the judicial review discussed in

this chapter, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.
- Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in § 470.12[5]). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

141 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474.03-474.09

[Reserved]

§§ 474.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.10

§ 474.10 Nature of Mandate Proceedings

[1] General Nature of Remedy

The proper method for obtaining judicial review of most administrative acts or decisions is by instituting a proceeding for issuance of a writ of mandate [*see Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 328-329, 109 P.2d 935]* .

The writ of mandate is a broad remedy that enables interested persons to compel performance of a legal duty when the law provides no other adequate remedy [*Dowell v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 483, 486-487, 304 P.2d 1009* ; *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 837, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757* ; *Potomac Oil Co. v. Dye (1909) 10 Cal. App. 534, 537, 102 P. 677]* . The writ is characterized as an extraordinary legal remedy that performs the equitable function of alleviating deficiencies in traditional legal remedies [*Dowell v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 483, 486,304 P.2d 1009* ; *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 837, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757]* .

Issuance of the writ is governed in large part by equitable considerations [*Dowell v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 483, 486, 304 P.2d 1009* ; *Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 795, 136 P.2d 304* ; *Advance Medical Diagnostic Laboratories v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 263, 274, 129 Cal. Rptr. 723]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that it would treat a doctor's petition for a writ of habeas corpus as a request for a writ of mandate requiring the Superior Court to vacate an order prohibiting the doctor from practicing medicine while criminal charges were pending. This was because the issues raised in the petition alleged the trial court exceeded its jurisdiction in making the prohibition order as a bail condition. Also, the issues in the petition were legal not factual, and there was no need for an evidentiary hearing to decide those issues [*Gray v. Superior Ct. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 629, 636, fn. 3, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50* ; *Alfredo A. v. Superior Ct. (1994) 6 Cal. 4th 1212, 1217, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 623, 865 P. 2d 56* (habeas corpus petition treated as petition for writ of mandate)].

[2] Procedure

A proceeding for the issuance of a writ of mandate is a special civil proceeding governed by the provisions of Title I of Part Three of the Code of Civil Procedure [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1063 et seq.*]. The California Constitution gives the Supreme Court, the courts of appeal, and the superior courts concurrent original jurisdiction of mandate proceedings [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. However, unless a case presents issues of great public importance that require prompt resolution, the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal generally decline, as a matter of judicial policy, to exercise their original jurisdiction [*San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Johnson (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 937, 944-945, 92 Cal. Rptr. 309, 479 P.2d 669* ; *Roma Macaroni Factory v. Giambastiani (1933) 219 Cal. 435, 436-438, 27 P.2d 371* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Nesvig (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 600, 601-602, 41 Cal. Rptr. 916* ; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*; for a discussion of the rules that govern mandate proceedings and other original proceedings in the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Procedures*].

A mandate proceeding is instituted by filing a petition in a proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*]. The official, board, or agency involved and other interested parties must be served with the petition and may file responsive pleadings [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1089*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.49(f), (g)]. Depending on the nature of the administrative action and the issues raised by the parties, the court may determine the petitioner's entitlement to relief on the basis of any of the following:

- The pleadings [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1094*; *Town of Hayward v. Pimental (1895) 107 Cal. 386, 390-391, 40 P. 545* ; *Rodriguez v. Municipal Court (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 521, 526-527, 102 Cal. Rptr. 45* ; *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 835, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757]* .

- An administrative record [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. 1094.5(a)*; *Merz v. Board of Supervisors (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 933, 937, 195 Cal. Rptr. 370* ; *Transcentury Properties, Inc. v. State of California (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 835, 842, 116 Cal. Rptr. 487* ; *Housman v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 308, 313, 190 P.2d 653]* .

- Evidence presented by the parties [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1090, 1094.5(e)*; *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79 n. 6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 670-671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193* ; *English v. City of Long Beach (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 311, 316-317, 250 P.2d 298]* .

If the court determines that mandate relief is warranted, it issues a peremptory writ of mandate directing the administrative body or officer to take the action that is required by law [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1087, 1094.5(f)*]. For a detailed discussion of the procedural aspects of a mandate proceeding, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[3] Ordinary and Administrative Mandate Distinguished

Controlling statutes provide for review of administrative actions and decisions in two types of mandate proceedings: ordinary mandate and administrative mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1094.5*]. The type of mandate applicable in any case is determined by the nature of the administrative action or decision to be reviewed [*Tielsch v. City of Anaheim (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 570, 574, 206 Cal. Rptr. 738]* .

Administrative mandate proceedings, the most common type of mandate proceedings, are used to review actions or decisions of an administrative body or officer acting in a judicial capacity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 101, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Neighbors in Support of Appropriate Land Use v. County of Tuolumne (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 997, 1004-1005, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 882* (issuance of conditional use permit is a quasi-judicial administrative action reviewable under administrative mandate); *Estes v. City of Grover City (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 509, 514, 147 Cal. Rptr. 131* ; County of L.A. v. Tax Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 830,*

833, 73 Cal. Rptr. 469 ; *see § 474.12*, for a more detailed discussion of the types of actions and decisions reviewable in administrative mandate proceedings].

Ordinary mandate proceedings are used to review actions or decisions of an administrative body or officer acting in a legislative or executive capacity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Neighbors in Support of Appropriate Land Use v. County of Tuolumne (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 997, 1004-1005, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 882* (approval of a development agreement is a legislative act reviewable under ordinary mandate); *Wagner Farms, Inc. v. Modesto Irrigation District (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 765, 772-773, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683* (approval of a transmission line project is a quasi-legislative action review able in ordinary mandate); *Environmental Charter High Sch. v. Centinela Valley Union High Sch. Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 139, 145, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417* (school district decision to deny charter school use of district facilities for 2003-2004 school year was reviewed under ordinary mandate); *Karlson v. City of Camarillo (1980) 100 Cal. App. 3d 789, 798, 161 Cal. Rptr. 260* (legislative actions); *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 833-834, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757* (ministerial actions); *see § 474.11*, for a more detailed discussion of the kinds of actions and decisions reviewable in ordinary mandate proceedings].

The Court of Appeal reversed the denial of writs of ordinary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] and administrative [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*] mandate, and held that both types of mandate could appropriately be ordered in an action brought by Medi-Cal beneficiaries that sought reimbursement from the State Department of Health Services of covered expenses paid to providers. The court determined that ordinary mandate could be used to order the agency to adopt procedures providing for timely reimbursement of recipients' expenses, and administrative mandate could be used to review decisions following administrative hearings that denied reimbursement [*Conlan v. Bonta (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 745, 751-753, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 788* , mod. den. reh.].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.11

§ 474.11 Review in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[1] Nature of Review

Ordinary mandate proceedings are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*. In an ordinary mandate proceeding, the court conducts a limited review and is authorized to determine only two kinds of issues [*Fullerton Joint Union High School Dist. v. State Bd. Of Education (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 779, 187 Cal. Rptr. 398, 654 P.2d 168* , 786, *32 Cal. 3d 779, 187 Cal. Rptr. 398, 654 P.2d 168* ; *Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Air Resources Board (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 789, 794, 180 Cal. Rptr. 550* ; *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Com. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 381, 392-393, 142 Cal. Rptr. 873]* :

- Whether the administrative action or decision was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support; or

- Whether the administrative body or officer gave the notices and followed the procedures required by law [*Mileikowsky v. Tenet Healthsystem (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 531, 554-555, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171* , *overruled in part by Mileikowsky v. West Hills Hospital & Medical Center (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 1259, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 203 P.3d 1113* (hearing required by law); *DeCuir v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 75, 82, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102]* .

For a discussion of the issues reviewed and the standards of review in ordinary mandate proceedings, see *Ch. 474B, Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474B.30* et seq.

[2] Administrative Officials and Bodies Subject to Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

Code Civ. Proc. § 1085 provides that a writ of mandate may be issued by any court "to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station ... ." This broad language clearly means that, in a proper case, ordinary mandate will lie against any administrative officer or body [*Santa Clara County Counsel Atty's Assn. v. Woodside (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 525, 540-542, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617, 869 P.2d 1142* ; *cf. California Housing Finance Agency v. Elliott (1976) 17 Cal.*

3d 575, 579, 131 Cal. Rptr. 361, 551 P.2d 1193 ; *Glendale City Employees' Assn., Inc. v. City of Glendale (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 328, 344 n.24, 124 Cal. Rptr. 513, 540 P.2d 609* ; *People ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 480, 491, 96 Cal. Rptr. 553, 487 P.2d 1193* ; *Johnson v. City and County of San Francisco (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 7, 19-20, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 8* (property owners sought declaratory relief and a writ of mandate to challenge notice provisions of city and county rental ordinance on grounds that provisions were preempted by state law. The California Court of Appeal held that it was proper to grant a writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085* and *1086* against the city and county of San Francisco to prevent the city and county from enforcing an ordinance that was preempted by a state statute); *City of Arcadia v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1409, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* ; *Klajic v. Castaic Lake Water Agency (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 5, 11-12, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 746* ; *McLeod v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 27, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58]* . A writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate) must be brought against the governmental body that took the action challenged in the mandate proceeding [*Sacramento County Alliance of Law Enforcement v. County of Sacramento (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1012, 1020-1021, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 202* (denial of petition for writ of mandate affirmed on appeal because petitioners erroneously named county as respondent, and they were required to name county civil service commission as proper party respondent)].

[3] Actions and Decisions Reviewable in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[a] Quasi-Legislative Action or Decision

Quasi-legislative actions of an administrative body--actions that it performs in a legislative capacity--are reviewable in ordinary mandate proceedings [*Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 809, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617* ; *Environmental Protection & Information Center v. California Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 459, 521, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28, 187 P.3d 888* (regulatory approvals related to streambed alteration agreement did not require findings, and agreement was not invalid without findings because statutory approval process did not required that a hearing be held by law. Agreement was reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate)); *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1264, 1275-1277, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 580* (agency decision to list chemical under Proposition 65 was quasi-legislative action reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate)); *O.W.L. Foundation v. City of Rohnert Park (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 568, 585-586, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (city adoption of water supply assessment was reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate) even though city held public hearing related to adoption because no hearing was required by law); *SN Sands Corporation v. City and County of San Francisco (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 185, 191-192, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 885* (the award of a contract by a public entity is a quasi-legislative act that is judicially reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate)); *Association of Irritated Residents v. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control Dist. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 535, 542-543, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 590* (agency decision to adopt rule regulation volatile organic compound emissions was a quasi-legislative action reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate)); *Friends of the Sierra Railroad v. Tuolumne Park and Recreation District (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 643, 651-652, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 500* (County district to sell a piece of district property was quasi-legislative action (nonadjudicatory in character) subject to judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate); *Western States Petroleum Ass'n v. South Coast Air Quality Mgmt. Dist. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1012, 1018-1019, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 354* (adoption of emission reduction rule by air quality management district was quasi-legislative action subject to judicial review under *Code Civ Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate); *State Water Resources Control Bd. Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 726-727, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189* (adoption of water quality control plan is quasi-legislative act); *City of Arcadia v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1409, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* (decision to adopt trash total maximum daily load standard (TDML plan) as part of regional water quality control plan was quasi-legislative action reviewable under ordinary mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*]); *Fed. of Hillside and Canyon Ass'ns v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1195, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 543* (city's adoption of general plan for land use and development is legislative act reviewable by writ of ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Reclamation District No. 684 v. State Dept. of Indus. Rel. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1000, 1004-1005, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 269* (director of state agency made prevailing wage determination for

particular construction project under authority conferred by administrative regulations. Director's decision is quasi-legislative action that is subject to judicial review by writ of ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*); *Vasquez v. Happy Valley Union School District (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 969, 980-981, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 15* (ordinary mandamus is the proper remedy to challenge a school district's assignment, classification, or discipline of a teacher); *Marshall v. Pasadena Unified School Dist. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1241, 1253, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 344* (school district decision to award contract to construction company based on emergency resolution which bypassed competitive bidding procedures was a legislative act reviewable under ordinary mandate); *Carrancho v. California Air Resources Board (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1255, 1265-1267, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 536* (agencies preparation of diversion plans and progress reports based on statutory requirements are quasi-legislative acts reviewable in ordinary mandate); *Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1209, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762* ; *Carlton Santee Corp. v. Padre Dam Mun. Water Dist. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 14, 18-19, 174 Cal. Rptr. 413* ; *Karlson v. Camarillo (1980) 161 Cal. Rptr. 260]* .

An action may be quasi-legislative even though it:

- Determines the propriety of relief requested in a petition [*Wilson v. Hidden Valley Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 271, 279, 63 Cal. Rptr. 889]* ; or

- Is based on an evaluation of evidence presented at a hearing [*Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1211-1212, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762* ; *Heist v. County of Colusa (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 841, 846, 213 Cal. Rptr. 278]* .

The distinction between a quasi-legislative action and an adjudicatory action is that a quasi-legislative action involves the formulation of a rule or policy to be applied to all future cases, while an adjudicatory action involves the actual application of the rule to a specific set of facts [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n.2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1209-1210, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762* ; *Patterson v. Central Coast Regional Com. (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 833, 840, 130 Cal. Rptr. 169]* . For example, the enactment of a zoning ordinance for a particular area is a quasi-legislative action because it involves the adoption of a rule to be applied to all landowners within the area [*see Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 473, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304* , *overruled in part by Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279, 297, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442, 159 P.3d 33* ; *see also Toso v. City of Santa Barbara (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 934, 942, 162 Cal. Rptr. 210* (denial of application for rezoning is legislative action)]. The determination of an application for a variance from the ordinance is an adjudicatory action because it involves the application of established rules to a specific set of facts applicable to a particular landowner [*see Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *Allen v. Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 877, 881-882, 34 Cal. Rptr. 232]* . Similarly, the fixing of employee salaries or benefits by a governmental body is a quasi-legislative action [*Campbell Municipal Employees Assn. v. City of Campbell (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 416, 425 n.2, 182 Cal. Rptr. 461]* , while the determination of the salary or benefits to which a particular employee is entitled under a legislative scheme is an adjudicatory function [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 44, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . A litigant's challenge to adoption of air quality regulations by an agency, which is quasi-legislative action, is properly brought as a petition for traditional mandate [*Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 567-568, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268]* .

The California Building Standards Commission's approval of building standards is a quasi-legislative act of administrative rulemaking that is judicially reviewable in an ordinary mandate proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* [*Plastic Pipe and Fittings Association v. California Building Standards Commission (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1390, 1406-1407, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 393* (Commission adopted Uniform Plumbing Code provisions but excluded provisions of Code allowing use of PEX pipes because of concerns about public health. Trade association challenged exclusion by writ of mandate in superior court. Court of appeal reversed superior court grant of petition allowing

challenge)].

[b] Refusal to Perform Ministerial Action

The refusal of an administrative official or body to perform a ministerial action is reviewable in an ordinary mandate proceeding [*City of Dinuba v. County of Tulare (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 859, 868-869, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614, 161 P.3d 1168* (county had ministerial duty to calculate and distribute property tax revenue to city); *Lazan v. County of Riverside (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 453, 459-460, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 394* (county had ministerial duty to file disability application on behalf of disabled employee); *Great Western Sav. & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 403, 414, 107 Cal. Rptr. 359* ; *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 834, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757]* .

A ministerial action is one that an administrative official or body is required by law to perform at the occurrence of a certain contingency [*Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 83, 87 P.2d 848* ; *Morris v. Harper (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 52, 62, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62* ; *Ridgecrest Charter Sch. v. Sierra Sands Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 986, 1002-1003, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 648* ; *Great Western Sav. & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 403, 413, 107 Cal. Rptr. 359* ; *Palmer v. Fox (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 453, 458, 258 P.2d 30]* .

In determining whether an action is ministerial, the critical question is whether the official or body is authorized to exercise judgment or discretion. An administrative entity's duty to act is ministerial when the controlling statutes do not vest the entity with discretion to determine whether the prescribed contingency has occurred or what action should be taken at the occurrence of that contingency [*Glendale City Employees' Assn., Inc. v. City of Glendale (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 328, 344, 124 Cal. Rptr. 513, 540 P.2d 609* (computation and payment of salaries in accordance with binding memorandum of understanding is ministerial function); *Jenkins v. Knight (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 220, 223-224, 293 P.2d 6* (governor's duty to call election to fill legislative vacancy is ministerial when controlling constitutional provision does not give governor discretion to determine whether election should be called); *Great Western Sav. & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 403, 413-414, 107 Cal. Rptr. 359* (city council's duty to approve final subdivision map on compliance with tentative map conditions was ministerial when it had no discretion under state law to withhold approval or impose additional conditions); *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 834-835, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757* (duty of public commission to implement resolution requiring restoration of building as a historical monument was ministerial when it had no discretion to rescind or withdraw resolution); *see also Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 83, 87 P.2d 848* (explaining difference between discretionary and minist erial actions); *V.S. v. Allenby (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 665, 669-671, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 143* (mandamus is proper to compel the California Department of Social Services to direct county welfare departments to comply with statutory requirements under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 16507.6* within 180 days of foster care placement; department had ministerial duty to direct compliance by county welfare departments)].

Mandamus is proper to compel performance when an agency fails to perform a statutorily mandated obligation to license correctional treatment centers for provision of medical services [*Morris v. Harper (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 52, 58-60, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62]* . Ordinary mandate was proper to compel a county to trim or remove trees on county property that exceeded height limits for the clear zone of an airport. County had mandatory ministerial duty under both state statutes [*Pub. Util. Code § 21659(a)*] and county ordinances to trim or remove trees that exceeded obstruction standards impacting navigable airspace [*Rancho Murieta Airport, Inc. v. County of Sacramento (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 323, 326-327, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 309]* .

Mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* is not proper when there is no ministerial duty for the agency to perform. Mandamus was not proper because the Board of Registered Nursing had discretion as to how it evaluated course work of out of state nursing college graduates who are seeking California nursing licenses under the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2376*. A New York college that administered a distance learning nursing degree program challenged the

Board's change in practice where it reviewed the course work completed by individual applicants for nursing licenses in California rather than grant a blanket equivalency recognition for all nursing graduates of that college [*Excelsior College v. Cal. Bd. of Registered Nursing (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1218, 1237-1239, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* . Mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* also was not proper due to a lack of a ministerial duty as the Department of Conservation did not have affirmative mandatory duties under the Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Act to provide convenient, economical, and efficient beverage container redemption opportunities for California consumers [*Shamsian v. Dept. of Conserv. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 621, 640-642, 39 Cal. Rptr.3d 62]* . Mandamus is not proper to enforce a contractual obligation with a public entity [*300 DeHaro Street Investors v. Department of Housing and Community Development (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1240, 1252-1254, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98* (ordinary mandamus not proper when developer challenges denial of rent increase by department when department and developer have a rental contract. Breach of contract action coupled with declaratory relief is the proper way to challenge the denial of a rent increase)]. Mandamus is not proper for a court to order the state legislature to appropriate moneys form future budget acts to reimburse counties because this would violate separations of powers [*County of San Diego v. State of California (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 580, 593-595, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489*].

Ordinary mandate was not proper to challenge the Department of Health Services (DHS) failure to implement children's health program for babies because there was no clear present ministerial duty requiring department to include "deemed eligibility" requirements in program that was based on presumptive eligibility requirements. Without a clear specific duty, ordinary mandate was not available to challenge DHS action [*Doe v. Bonta (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 13, 16-17, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66* (residents of county who challenged county's approval of residential development project and certification of environmental impact report complied with requirements of governing statute when they requested a hearing, even though they did not request a hearing date)]. When there is no clear ministerial duty owed by DMV to a vehicle owner, ordinary mandate is not available [*Moran v. Cal. Dep't of Motor Vehicles (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 688, 690, 693, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116* (vehicle owner challenged DMV refusal to register vehicle because of lack of salvage certificate; Court of Appeal affirmed judgment denying writ of mandate because DMV did not owe owner a ministerial duty, and owner could not show a lack of an adequate remedy at law)]. When there is no clear ministerial duty on the part of a city to provide a subdivision developer with a specific amount of credit for private open space, ordinary mandate is not available [*Branciforte Heights, LLC v. City of Santa Cruz (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 914, 939-940, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 96]* .

[c] Adjudicatory Action or Decision That Is Not Subject to Review in Administrative Mandate Proceedings

An administrative action or decision is considered to be adjudicatory in nature when the administrative entity applies policies or rules to the facts of a specific case to determine whether an individual is entitled to relief or subject to punitive action [*see* *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Assn. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n.2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Estes v. City of Grover City (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 509, 514, 147 Cal. Rptr. 131* ; *Patterson v. Central Coast Regional Com. (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 833, 840, 130 Cal. Rptr. 169* ; *see § 474.12[3][a]*, for discussion of adjudicatory acts and decisions]. Some administrative adjudicatory actions or decisions are subject to review in ordinary mandate proceedings. Ordinary mandate proceedings are used to review adjudicatory actions or decisions when administrative mandate is not available because the administrative entity is not required by law to hold an evidentiary h earing [*American Board of Cosmetic Surgery v. Medical Board of California (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 534, 547-548, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 574* (ordinary mandate proper because Medical Board was not required by law to hold a hearing before denying a specialty board equivalency application); *Munroe v. Los Angeles County Civil Service Commission (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1295, 1302-1303, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716* (wit of ordinary mandate proper way to review decision of Commission denying former employee's late filing of an appeal challenging the employee's discharge from county employment. The Commission ruled that the employee failed to establish good cause for a late appeal, and that ruling was not an abuse of discretion); *Blue Cross of California v. Department of Health Services (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 322, 329, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772* (ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* is applicable because hearing officer's decision is not based on proceeding in which hearing is required to be given by law); *Decuir v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 75, 83, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102* (applicant for civil service employment

must seek judicial review through ordinary mandate); *Weary v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 189, 194-195, 189 Cal. Rptr. 442* (decision upholding adverse performance rating); *Taylor v. State Personnel Bd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 498, 505, 161 Cal. Rptr. 677* (decision upholding 10-day suspension); *Shuffer v. Board of Trustees (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 208, 218-219, 136 Cal. Rptr. 527* (decision imposing requirements for completion of degree on graduate student)]. This principle is true even when an entity that is not required to hold an evidentiary hearing holds one [*Weary v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 189, 194-195, 189 Cal. Rptr. 442* ; *Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 879-880, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161* ; *Taylor v. State Personnel Bd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 498, 505, 161 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . For a discussion on the requirement of an evidentiary hearing as a prerequisite of administrative mandate, see *§ 474.12[3][c]*.

[4] Facts and Evidence on Which Review Is Based

In an ordinary mandate proceeding, the administrative action or decision is reviewed in light of evidence presented by the parties in court, as well as that contained in the official record of the administrative proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1090*; *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79 n.6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 670-671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193]* . In determining whether an administrative action or decision was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support, however, the court may only consider evidence that was before the administrative body or officer [*Lewin v. St. Joseph Hospital of Orange (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 368, 387 n. 13, 146 Cal. Rptr. 892* ; *Brock v. Superior Court (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 594, 607-608, 241 P.2d 283]* .

In determining whether there is substantial evidence to support an agency's quasi-legislative action, such as the adoption of air quality regulations, the reviewing court may generally only consider the administrative record [*Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 574, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268]* . Extra-record evidence cannot be introduced in court in traditional mandate actions reviewing quasi-legislative action to show that the agency has not proceeded in a manner required by law [*Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 577, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268* ; *San Joaquin Local Agency Formation Commission v. Superior Court (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 159, 163, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 93* (protective order prohibiting taking depositions of LAFCP commissioners and executive officer was justified because extra record evidence was not admissible in ordinary mandate proceeding, and deliberative process privilege would be violated if discovery allowed); *Carrancho v. California Air Resources Board (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1255, 1269, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 536*]. The "reasonable diligence" exception to this rule only allows introduction of extra-record evidence when the evidence existed before the agency made its decision and the evidence could not have been presented to the agency before the decision was made in the exercise of reasonable diligence [*Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 579, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268]* .

[5] Relief Available

The principal form of relief available in an ordinary mandate proceeding is a peremptory writ of mandate--a form of court order--compelling the administrative official or entity to take the actions that are mandatory under the law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Forest Lawn Co. v. City Council (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 343, 346, 53 Cal. Rptr. 452* ; *Bollotin v. Workman Service Co. (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 339, 342-343, 275 P.2d 599]* . When an administrative entity has discretion to determine whether an adequate factual basis exists for a given action or decision, or to determine what type of action or decision is warranted under a set of facts, a peremptory writ issued in an ordinary mandate proceeding cannot compel the entity to exercise its discretion in a particular way or to reach a particular result [*Common Cause v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 432, 445-446, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574, 777 P.2d 610* ; *Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 315, 144 P.2d 4* ; *Better Alternatives for Neighborhoods v. Heyman (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 663, 672, 260 Cal. Rptr. 758* ; *Riggs v. City of Oxnard (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 526, 530, 201 Cal. Rptr. 291]* . When, however, undisputed facts establish that a petitioner is entitled to a particular action or decision as a matter of right, the writ may compel that action or decision [*County of Sacramento v. Loeb (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 446,*

449-450, 206 Cal. Rptr. 626 (writ issued to compel State Department of Mental Health to recommend payment of counties' claims for reimbursement under Short-Doyle Act); *Thelander v. City of El Monte(1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 736, 748, 195 Cal. Rptr. 318* (writ issued to compel city and pension board to award disability pension to petitioner)]. For example, when an agency is required by law to issue regulations, then the issuance of the regulations is a public duty that a citizen has a right to compel by a petition for a writ of mandate [*Newland v. Kizer (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 647, 652, 654-656, 257 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *Madera Community Hospital v. County of Madera (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 136, 152, 201 Cal. Rptr. 768]* . The court may not, however, compel the agency to exercise its discretion in a particular manner by mandating the substance and content of the regulations [*Newland v. Kizer (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 647, 655, 257 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *Sklar v. Franchise Tax Board (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 616, 625-626, 230 Cal. Rptr. 42]* .

A peremptory writ issued in an ordinary mandate proceeding may also compel an administrative entity to do any of the following:

- Exercise its discretion and make a determination, when it has refused to act [*Ballard v. Anderson (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 873, 884-885, 95 Cal. Rptr. 1, 484 P.2d 1345* (writ issued to compel County Therapeutic Abortion Committee to determine minor's application for abortion without requiring parental consent); *Hollman v. Warren (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 351, 355, 196 P.2d 562* (writ issued to compel governor to exercise discretion concerning appointment of notaries public)].

- Annul its action or decision, when it has exceeded its powers [*Aylward v. State Board etc. Examiners (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 833, 839, 192 P.2d 929* (writ issued to compel State Board of Chiropractic Examiners to annul order canceling chiropractic licenses when order made without notice or hearing); *B.W. v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 219, 233-234, 215 Cal. Rptr. 130* (writ issued to compel Medical Board of California to annul order imposing disciplinary action against physician when statute prohibited imposition of disciplinary action under facts of case)].

- Set aside its decision and exercise its discretion in accordance with applicable laws and rules, when it has acted arbitrarily or failed to follow applicable procedural rules [*Anderson v. Phillips (1975) 13 Cal. 3d. 733, 737, 119 Cal. Rptr. 879, 532 P.2d 1247* (writ issued to compel presiding judge to exercise discretion to assign business to duly appointed judge under proper interpretation of applicable law); *see also Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 819-820, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617* (writ issued to compel California State Air Resources Board to vacate unauthorized regulation and enforce emission control program according to governing statute); *Fidelity & Cas. Co. of New York v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1016, 163 Cal. Rptr. 339* (writ issued to compel Workers' Compensation Appeals Board to determine petition for reconsideration according to statutory and constitutionally mandated procedures)].

- Perform a duty that is purely ministerial [*Glendale City Employees' Assn., Inc. v. City of Glendale (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 328, 344, 124 Cal. Rptr. 513, 540 P.2d 609* (writ issued to compel city to pay employee salaries according to binding memorandum of understanding); *Harbach v. El Pueblo de Los Angeles etc. Com. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 828, 834, 92 Cal. Rptr. 757* (writ issued to compel public commission to follow resolution to relocate and restore historical building)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.12

§ 474.12 Review in Administrative Mandate Proceedings

[1] Nature of Review

Administrative mandate proceedings are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. In an administrative mandate proceeding, the court reviews a final adjudicatory order or decision of an administrative entity to determine one or more of the following matters [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 123-124, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799,514 P.2d 111* ; *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 595, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* :

- Whether the entity proceeded without jurisdiction or, alternatively, exceeded its jurisdiction.

- Whether the entity conducted a fair trial [An administrative entity proceeds by conducting a hearing. However, the statutory wording "fair trial" is used here to distinguish these issues from the constitutional issue of "notice and fair hearing."].

- Whether the entity committed a prejudicial abuse of discretion. An abuse of discretion is established only by a showing that [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 123-124, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111* (complaint sufficiently alleged abuse of discretion); *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 595, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63* (evidence sufficient to support finding that Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board abused its discretion in allowing unemployment benefits)]:

  - The entity has not proceeded in the manner provided by law;

  - The order or decision is not supported by the findings; or

  - The findings are not supported by the evidence.

Depending on the nature of the order or decision and the administrative entity, the court reviews the sufficiency of the evidence supporting an administrative order or decision under one of two standards established by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*. These standards are as follows:

- The "independent judgment" standard, which is applied by the court when an order or decision of an administrative entity that is not constitutionally vested with judicial powers affects a fundamental vested right; in this instance, the court reweighs the evidence and makes its own independent findings of fact [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734-735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* (decision upholding termination of welfare benefits reviewable under independent judgment standard); *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28* (decision denying death allowance claimed under provisions of county retirement plan reviewable under independent judgment standard); *Los Angeles County Employees' Assn. v. Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 294* (decision upholding discharge of permanent civil service employee reviewable under independent judgment standard); *Guymon v. Board of Accountancy (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 128 Cal. Rptr. 137* (decision revoking license to practice accountancy reviewable under independent judgment standard); *see also Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 137-147, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* (discussing when independent judgment standard applies)].

- The court applies the "substantial evidence" standard when the administrative entity has exercised judicial powers granted to it by the California Constitution; in this instance, the court reviews the evidence only to determine whether the administrative entity's findings are supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record [*County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1176, 1186, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 419* (substantial evidence review specified by statute *Gov. Code § 17559(b)* for decision of Commission on State Mandates which is a constitutional agency under *Cal. Const. Art. XIII, § 6*); *Respers v. University of Cal. Retirement System (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 864, 873-874, 217 Cal. Rptr. 594* (decision of University of California Retirement System denying retirement benefits reviewable under substantial evidence standard); *Jones v. Superior Court (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 725, 727-730, 170 Cal. Rptr. 837* (decision of California Horse Racing Board suspending trainer's license reviewable under substantial evidence standard)]. The court also used this standard when the administrative order or decision does not affect a fundamental vested right [*Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 824, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115* (school board's decision not to rehire probationary teacher reviewable under substantial evidence standard); *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 147-148, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* (decision of commissioner of corporations approving recapitalization plan for closely held corporation reviewable under substantial evidence standard); *Whaler's Village Club v. California Coastal Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 240, 251, 220 Cal. Rptr. 2* (decision of California Coastal Commission imposing conditions on development of coastal property reviewable under substantial evidence standard); *Toczauer v. State Bd. of Registration (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1069-1070, 98 Cal. Rptr. 211 , appeal dismissed, 406 U.S. 913, 92 S. Ct. 1806, 32 L. Ed. 2d 113* (decision of State Board of Registration denying application for registration as industrial engineer under grandfather clause reviewable under substantial evidence standard)]. Decisions of the Commission on State Mandates denying test claims by local agencies are reviewable in court only by administrative mandamus [*County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1176, 1186, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 419* (judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* specified by *Gov. Code § 17559(b)* for decision of Commission on State Mandates which is a constitutional agency under *Cal. Const. Art. XIII, § 6*)].

For a more detailed discussion of the applicability of the independent judgment and substantial evidence standards of review in administrative mandate proceedings, see *Ch. 474B, Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474B.16*.

[2] Administrative Officials and Bodies Subject to Administrative Mandate Proceedings

Gov. Code § 11523 provides that adjudicatory orders and decisions made under the procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act are reviewable by writ of mandate. However, review by administrative mandate proceedings is not limited to those administrative officials and bodies subject to the Administrative Procedures Act. Under the broader provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, administrative mandate lies against any administrative entity issuing a formal adjudicative order or decision meeting the prerequisites specified in section 1094.5 [*Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 100-101, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Boren v. State Personnel Board (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 634, 637, 234 P.2d 981* ; *El Dorado Irrigation Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 937, 960, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 468* (water resources control board performs adjudicatory functions in allocating water rights; challenges to water rights decisions are reviewed under administrative mandamus statute, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*); *Bldg Industry Ass'n of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 866, 879, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 128* (state water board decision approving municipal storm water sewer permit was subject to judicial review by petition for a writ of mandate under *Water Code § 13330(a)* and *Code Civ Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandate); the prerequisites for review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* are discussed in [3], *below*]. Decisions of private universities to deny tenure to a professor, or to revoke the tenure of a tenured professor, are subject to challenge by administrative mandate [*Pomona College v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1716, 1729, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 662* (denial of tenure); *Gutkin v. University of So. California (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 967, 978-979, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115* (revocation of tenure); *Pollock v. Univ. of S. Cal. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1416, 1425-1426, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 122* (revocation of tenure)]. Decisions of private universities to impose academic discipline on students are subject to challenge by administrative mandate because university disciplinary proceedings provide for a formal evidentiary hearing [*Gupta v. Stanford Univ. (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 407, 411-412, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 192]* . Administrative mandate is not available to review decisions of arbitrators [*Zazueta v. County of San Benito (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 106, 110-111, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678]* .

However, some state agency decisions are not subject to judicial review under a writ of administrative mandate. The State Water Resources Control Board refused to review a decision of a regional water quality control board assessing substantial administrative penalties against a farm property owner for violating provisions of water pollution control laws. The State Board had discretion to review regional board decisions under *Water Code § 13320(a)* but the Board had adopted regulations [*Cal. Code Regs., tit. 23, § 2052 (a)(1)*] limiting review of regional board decisions to those that raise substantial issues. The Court of Appeal held that the decision of the state board refusing to review the regional board decision was not subject to judicial review under administrative mandate [*Johnson v. State Water Resources Control Board (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1107, 1112-1114, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 441]* . The Court of Appeal in *Johnson* cited and relied upon the Court of Appeal decision in *People ex rel. Cal. Regional Wat. Quality Control Bd. v. Barry (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 158, 176-177* in ruling on the case. The Court of Appeal also noted that the regional board order was subject to judicial review, and the property owner had a pending action in the superior court challenging that regional board order [*Johnson v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1107, 1112-1114, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 441]* .

[3] Prerequisites for Review of Administrative Order or Decision in Administrative Mandate Proceeding

[a] Adjudicatory Order or Decision

An administrative order or decision is reviewable in an administrative mandate proceeding only if it is adjudicatory in nature [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n.2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *American Canyon Community United for Responsible Growth v. City of American Canyon (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1069-1071, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 312* (city decision concluding that supplemental environmental review was not necessary when project changed was adjudicative decision review able under administrative mandate); *State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 720-722, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189* (board decisions that allocate water rights are adjudicatory decisions that are reviewable by administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*); *Wilson v. Hidden Valley Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 271, 279, 63 Cal. Rptr. 889* ;

Brock v. Superior Court (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 594, 598-601, 241 P.2d 283] . An action or decision is adjudicatory when it involves the application of existing rules and policies to a specific set of facts to reach a conclusion affecting the rights of a specific person [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n. 2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Estes v. City of Grover City (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 509, 514, 147 Cal. Rptr. 131* ; *Patterson v. Central Coast Regional Com. (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 833, 840, 130 Cal. Rptr. 169]* . Common types of adjudicatory decisions subject to review in administrative mandate proceedings are those that, on the basis of factual determinations relating to the applicability of controlling laws or regulations, do one or more of the following:

- Grant or deny a land use permit or variance [*Saad v. City of Berkeley (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1206, 1211, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95* (denial of a land use permit to build a residence on a lot); *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Government v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 357, 366-367, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485* (approval of a zoning variance to expand a school playground)].

- Deny or revoke licenses or permits that are prerequisites to engaging in certain activities [*see, e.g., Selby Realty Co. v. San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111* (denial of application for building permit); *Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 326 P.2d 850* (revocation of teaching credential); *Guymon v. Board of Accountancy (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 128 Cal. Rptr. 137* (revocation of license to practice accountancy)].

- Deny or terminate government benefits [*see, e.g., Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (denial of application for welfare benefits); *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* (termination of welfare benefits); *King v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 199, 101 Cal. Rptr. 660* (denial of application for unemployment insurance benefits)].

- Impose discipline or penalties under a regulatory scheme [*see, e.g., Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 196 P.2d 20* (suspension of medical license); *McConville v. Alexis (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 593, 159 Cal. Rptr. 49* (suspension of driver's license); *David Kikkert & Associates, Inc. v. Shine (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 112, 86 Cal. Rptr. 161* (suspension of collection agency license)].

- Terminate government employment [*see, e.g., Jabola v. Pasadena Redevelopment Agency (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 931, 178 Cal. Rptr. 452* (discharge of employee terminable only for cause); *Los Angeles County Employees' Assn. v. Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 294, 152 Cal. Rptr. 415* (discharge of permanent civil service employee)].

- Claims for reimbursement by local government entities or school districts for increased costs incurred by local government that are mandated by state statutes. The Commission on State Mandates [*Gov. Code § 17525*] has the responsibility to determine whether claims for reimbursement will be granted. Those decisions are subject to judicial review under a writ of administrative mandamus [*Gov. Code § 17551*]. Increased costs incurred by school districts for providing hearings, including federally required hearing procedures, meet the "higher level of service" requirement of *Cal. Const., Art. XIII B, § 6*, and therefore satisfy the requirements for a reimbursable state mandate for all hearing costs incurred by school districts when state law requires suspension and mandates expulsion of a student found to have committed certain offenses [*Educ. Code § 48915*], but not when state law makes expulsion discretionary [*Educ. Code § 48915*]. Costs related to discretionary expulsions, including costs for hearing procedures that exceed federal law requirements, do not satisfy the higher level of service requirement for reimbursement by the state [*San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 859, 866-867, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466, 94 P.3d 589]* .

- Property tax assessment disputes in which the taxpayer applies for a reduction of a tax assessment, requests a hearing after the tax assessment board denies that application, and the assessment board fails to provide a hearing to the taxpayer on his claim. Administrative mandate applies regardless of whether the Board in fact held a hearing [*Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 36-37, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658]* .

[b] Final Order or Decision

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, only a "final order or decision" can be reviewed in an administrative mandate proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Prip v. City of Santa Barbara (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 626, 630-631, 29 Cal. Rptr. 558]* .

State agency decisions subject to the APA [*see Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*; *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*] are final 30 days after the agency decision is delivered or mailed to the respondent, unless the agency orders a reconsideration within the 30-day period, grants a stay of execution, or orders the decision to be effective at an earlier date [*Gov. Code § 11519(a)*; *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 304, 196 P.2d 20* ; *Governing Board v. Commission on Professional Competence (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 447, 455, 140 Cal. Rptr. 206* ; *Kramer v. State Board of Accountancy (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 163, 176, 19 Cal. Rptr. 226]* . For more detailed discussion of the finality of decisions and period of limitations under the APA, see *Ch. 474A, Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions, §§ 474A.10[3][b]* and *474A.20[2][b]*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b) sets forth the rules for determining the finality of certain types of decisions or orders made by a decision or order of a local agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(a), (e)*]. Section 1094.6 applies to decisions suspending, demoting, or dismissing an officer or employee, revoking, or denying an application for a permit, license, or other entitlement, or denying an application for a retirement benefit or allowance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(e)*]. Section 1094.6 applies to those agencies, other than school districts, that are defined as local agencies by *Gov. Code § 54951*, which defines a local agency as "a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency. For discussion of the rules for determining finality of a decision and the period of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*, see *Ch. 474A, Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions, §§ 474A.10[3][b]* and *474A.20[3][c]*.

The finality of agency adjudicatory decision not subject to the APA is determined by examining provisions of the agency governing statute. For example, decisions of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board are final when issued and the appealing party must file its petition for review within 30 days "of the date of issuance of the Board's order ... " [*Lab. Code § 1160.8*; *United Farm Workers of America v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 912, 915, 210 Cal. Rptr. 453, 694 P.2d 138]* .

The rules for determining when other adjudicative decisions or orders are final for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* are not covered by statute and do not appear to have been discussed by California appellate courts. Under decisions arising in other contexts, the finality of administrative orders and decisions is determined by ascertaining the intent of the legislative scheme under which the administrative entity is empowered to act. An order or decision is ordinarily deemed final when, under the applicable legislative scheme, the entity loses its jurisdiction to reconsider the decision and reach a different conclusion [*Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 323, 144 P.2d 4* ; *In re Fain (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 376, 390, 135 Cal. Rptr. 543* ; *McDonald's Systems of California, Inc. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1975) 119 Cal. Rptr. 26]* . *Gov. Code § 11523* appears to confirm, by implication, the applicability of this general rule to decisions governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*see Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*], since it provides that the limitations period for proceedings to review such decisions commences on the termination of the administrative agency's power to order reconsideration.

[c] Order or Decision Resulting From Evidentiary Hearing Required by Law

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 applies only when an administrative order or decision is made as a result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required and evidence must be taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Keeler v. Superior Court (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 596, 598-599, 297 P.2d 967* ; *Department of Corrections v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1100, 1106-1107, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473* (review of decision based on administrative hearing required for renewed petition for involuntary medication of prisoner); *Weary v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 189, 194-195, 189 Cal. Rptr. 442* ; *Taylor v. State Personnel Bd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 498, 505, 161 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . When the administrative entity is not required to conduct an evidentiary hearing, its order or decision cannot be reviewed in an administrative mandate proceeding, even if the entity has discretion to conduct an evidentiary hearing and does, in fact, base its decision on an evidentiary hearing [*Weary v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 189, 194-195, 189 Cal. Rptr. 442* ; *Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 879-880, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161* ; *Taylor v. State Personnel Bd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 498, 505, 161 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . Absent other provisions negating the requirement for an evidentiary hearing, however, a requirement for such a hearing may be implied from provisions in the controlling legislative scheme that either preclude the administrative entity from acting in the absence of cause [*Ratliff v. Lampton (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 226, 230, 195 P.2d 792* ; *Steen v. Board of Civil Service Commrs. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 716, 723, 160 P.2d 816]* or grant a right of appeal [*Chavez v. Civil Service Com. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 324, 332, 150 Cal. Rptr. 197]* .

Administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not available when the party seeking a writ of administrative mandamus did not have a right to an evidentiary hearing under the law [*300 DeHaro Street Investors v. Department of Housing and Community Development (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1240, 1250-1252, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98* (no hearing required by law when department denied rent increase sought by developer. Judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* was not available)]. Mandamus was sought by a New York college that administered a distance learning nursing degree program. The Court of Appeal held that mandamus was not proper because the college did not have a due process protected property interest in the continued recognition of equivalency for that program by the California Board of Registered Nursing. Thus, the college did not have the right to an evidentiary hearing to challenge the Board's change in practice to review the course work completed by individual applicants for nursing licenses in California rather than grant a blanket equivalency recognition for all nursing graduates of that college [*Excelsior College v. Cal. Bd. of Registered Nursing (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1218, 1237-1239, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* .

The California Supreme Court has also inferred a right to a hearing to ensure that the law is consistent with requirements of due process of law [*Traverso v. People ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1152, 1163-1166, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217, 864 P.2d 488]* . The California Court of Appeal held that the child abuse or neglect reporting statutes [*Penal Code §§ 11165.7, 11165.9, 11169*] required an "active investigation" by the social services agency (SSA), and contemplated some form of hearing to a parent responding to a child abuse charge that was reported to the child abuse central index (CACI). Thus, the Superior Court had jurisdiction to review a parent's challenge to the SSA decision to report the parent for suspected child abuse under a writ of administrative mandate authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* because the decision of the county met the requirement that "by law a hearing is required to be given" [*Burt v. County of Orange (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 273, 281-283, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373]* .

However, judicial review is not available for recoupment efforts based on an audit of hospital performance of terms and conditions of a negotiated contract for MediCal services unless there has been a prior administrative review of the recoupment efforts [*Cedars-Sinai Med. Center v. Shewry (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 964, 976-978, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 48]* .

[d] Improper Petition for Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 Relief Not to Be Dismissed if Adequate for Ordinary Mandate

Even when relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is unavailable because the board or agency was not required to hold

an evidentiary hearing, a court should not dismiss a petition for administrative mandate if the allegations of the petition entitle the petitioner to ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* [*Coelho v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 968, 971, 257 Cal. Rptr. 557* ; *see* *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 673-674, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032* (demurrer to petition for extraordinary relief should be overruled when the allegations of the petition entitle the petitioner to ordinary mandate, even though the petition erroneously requests administrative mandate)]. For discussion of ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, see *§ 474.11*.

[4] Facts and Evidence on Which Review Is Based

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e) authorizes the court to admit additional relevant evidence if it finds either one of the following: (1) the evidence could not have been produced at the administrative hearing in the exercise of due diligence; or (2) the evidence was improperly excluded at the administrative hearing.

The California Court of Appeal held that a developer had the right to introduce new evidence relating to bias by the decision maker at the superior court level during the mandamus proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*. The developer satisfied the statutory test that the evidence could not have been produced at the administrative hearing under the reasonable diligence standard because he did not have the opportunity to take the deposition of the commissioner until the mandamus proceeding was in the superior court. Thus, the new evidence of the commissioner's bias could properly have been introduced at the judicial review stage [*Nasha L.L.C. v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 470, 485-486, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that there was no valid basis to remand a matter to permit the school district a second chance to present authentication evidence so that videotape evidence could be properly admitted into evidence at an administrative hearing [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 346-347, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* . The foundation (authentication evidence) was not improperly excluded from evidence, as it was never offered into evidence by the district, and there was no showing as to why the foundation evidence could not have been presented, with reasonable diligence, at the original hearing. Thus, there was no basis for a remand for new evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 350-351, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* . The videotape evidence was considered to be hearsay evidence. Videotapes are also considered to be writings that must be authenticated before being admitted into evidence. Unauthenticated videotapes can not be properly admitted into evidence, and without an authenticating foundation these videotapes are considered to be irrelevant and unreliable evidence. Admission of these videotapes was objected to and the videotapes (of a school district employee) were considered to be hearsay evidence offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted [*Ashford v. Culver City Unified Sch. District (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 344, 350-351, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* .

Except in those cases in which *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* authorizes the admission of additional evidence, the court's review of the administrative order or decision must be based solely on the record of the proceedings before the administrative body [*Pegues v. Civil Service Com. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 95, 103-104, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* ; *PMI Mortgage Ins. Co. v. City of Pacific Grove (1981) 128 Cal. App. 3d 724, 729, 179 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *Transcentury Properties, Inc. v. State of California (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 835, 842, 116 Cal. Rptr. 487]* .

In cases in which the court is authorized to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence, a court admitting additional evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* has discretion to either proceed to make its independent assessment of the evidence or to remand the case to the administrative body with directions to reconsider the order or decision in light of the additional evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(d)*; *Tiholiz v. Northridge Hospital Foundation (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1197, 1204-1205, 199 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 616-617, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* .

In instances in which the substantial evidence standard applies, the court must remand the case for reconsideration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(d)*].

For discussion of when these different standards apply, see *Ch. 474B, Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474B.16*.

[5] Relief Available

[a] Reversal or Annulment of Order if Agency Acted in Excess of Jurisdiction

When the administrative body has acted in excess of its jurisdiction by determining a matter it is not constitutionally or legislatively empowered to determine, the judgment directs the entity to reverse or annul its order or decision, but will not authorize further proceedings [*see BMW of North America, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 980, 994, 209 Cal. Rptr. 50* ; *Foth v. City of Long Beach (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 520, 530-531, 270 P.2d 868]* .

[b] No Control or Limitation of Discretion Vested in Agency; Remand Required

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 governs the relief that may be awarded in an administrative mandate proceeding. Section 1094.5 authorizes the court to set aside the administrative order or decision and to direct the administrative body to reconsider it or to proceed in the manner required by law. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* also provides that the court may not enter a judgment that limits or controls the discretion vested in the administrative body. Thus, when discretion to make particular determinations is vested in the administrative body, the court cannot substitute its decision for that of the administrative body. If the administrative body has abused its discretion, the proper procedure is for the court to remand the case to the administrative body for rehearing or reconsideration, not to decide it on the merits [*Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 265, 246 P.2d 656* ; *Carson Gardens L.L.C. v. City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 856, 858-859, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 768* (superior court exceeded judicial authority when it decided what the correct amount of a rent increase would be instead of remanding decision back to rent review board to decide rent increase question); *Walters v. Pine Cove CountyWater Dist. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 498, 500, 2 Cal. Rptr. 253* ; *National Auto. & Cas Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 594, 220 P.2d 962]* . Nonetheless, when a court determines that a penalty is so excessive as to constitute an abuse of discretion, the court has the power to direct the agency to set a lesser penalty than the penalty found to be excessive. The precise terms of this lesser penalty remain within the agency's discretion [*Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 495, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

A remand to the administrative body for rehearing or further proceedings is ordinarily ordered when the administrative body has acted in one or more of the following ways:

- Failed to follow applicable procedural rules [*Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 268, 246 P.2d 656* ; *National Auto & Cas Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 594, 220 P.2d 962]* ;

- Denied the petitioner a fair hearing [*English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d. 155, 159-160, 217 P.2d 22* ; *Walters v. Pine Cove County Water Dist. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 498, 500, 2 Cal. Rptr. 253]* ;

- Made findings that are insufficient to support the decision or to permit adequate review [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* ; *American Funeral Concepts v. Board of Funeral Directors & Embalmers (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 303, 311 n.7, 186 Cal. Rptr. 196* ; *Hadley v. City of Ontario (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 121, 130, 117 Cal. Rptr. 513]* .

- Failed to comply with court ordered methodologies on remand [*Carson Gardens L.L.C. v. City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 856, 858-859, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d*

768 (rental review board rent increase decision was reversed on judicial review because board failed to include mortgage interest costs in determining fair rate of return calculation. On remand, board again failed to include mortgage interest costs in determining rent increase, and reviewing court overturned board's decision a second time. However, superior court exceeded judicial authority when it decided what the correct amount of a rent increase would be instead of remanding decision back to rent review board a second time to decide rent increase question)].

The Court of Appeal held that the Medical Board of California deprived a physician of due process of law by conducting a fundamentally unfair physician license revocation hearing when the Board disqualified all of the doctor's experts as to standard of care, thereby precluding the doctor from putting on any evidence in his defense to charges that the doctors treatment of several patients was grossly negligent or was an extreme departure from the standard of practice [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1137, 1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . The Court of Appeal also applied the independent judgment test to review the fairness of the administrative hearing as a matter of law [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1140-1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . Finally the Court of Appeal held that this case must be remanded to the Medical Board to consider the evidence presented by the doctor's experts. It was not proper for the reviewing (superior) court to admit the evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*, and then to reweigh the evidence to support the Medical Board's fact findings because this was an unfair proceeding. It is the agency's responsibility to consider the evidence erroneously excluded and to make an informed decision based on that evidence and agency expertise. Thus, a remand to the agency is required [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1146-1147, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* .

[c] When Substantial Evidence Standard Applies

If the evidence is insufficient to support the findings of the administrative body in a case in which the substantial evidence standard applies, the court will take one of two actions, depending on the nature of the evidence adduced at the administrative hearing:

- If there are material conflicts in the evidence so that it will support more than one decision or order, the court must remand the case for rehearing or further proceedings; it may not make its own findings and decide the matter on the merits [*Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 268, 246 P.2d 656* ; *Walters v. Pine Cove County Water Dist. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 498, 500-501, 2 Cal. Rptr. 253]* .

- If the evidence is such that it will support only one particular order or decision, the court may direct the administrative body to enter that order or decision [*Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 677, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749* , overruled on other grounds, *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* ; *Ross Gen. Hosp., Inc. v. Lackner (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 346, 354, 147 Cal. Rptr. 801]* .

[d] When Independent Judgment Standard Applies

If the factual findings made by a court reviewing the evidence under the independent judgment standard establish the petitioner's right to a particular order or decision, the judgment may direct the administrative body to enter that order or decision [*see, e.g.,* *Byrnes v. Riles (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 204 Cal. Rptr. 100* (directing school district to grant handicapped student's claim for private school tuition and transportation); *Anderson v. City of La Mesa (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 657, 660-661, 173 Cal. Rptr. 572* (directing city to grant application for variance and use permit); *Quintana v. Board of Administration (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1021, 127 Cal. Rptr. 11* (directing board to grant disability claim)]. But, when the administrative body has discretion to determine what penalty should be imposed, or what action should be taken as a result of the facts found by the court, the case is remanded for determination of the appropriate penalty or action [*see* *Zink v. City of Sausalito (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 662, 666, 139 Cal. Rptr. 59]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.13

§ 474.13 Requirements Common to All Mandate Proceedings

[1] Beneficially Interested Petitioner

[a] Nature of Requirement

Standing to bring a mandate action is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*, which requires that the petitioner be "beneficially interested" in the administrative action or decision at issues [*Carsten v. Psychology Examining Com. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 793, 796, 166 Cal. Rptr. 844, 614 P.2d 276* ; *Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6* ; Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange *(1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 818, 832, 173 Cal. Rptr. 602]* . The requirement of petitioner's beneficial interest applies in administrative mandate as well as ordinary mandate proceedings [*Employees Service Asso. v. Grady (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 817, 826, 52 Cal. Rptr. 831* ; *Grant v. Board of Medical Examiners (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 820, 826, 43 Cal. Rptr. 270]* .

The steelworkers union had standing (was beneficially interested) under *Code of Civil Procedure § 1086* as a citizen litigant to challenge regulatory approvals related to a streambed alteration agreement [*Environmental Protection & Information Center v. California Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 459, 479-481, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28, 187 P.3d 888*]. A nonprofit corporation and a low income plaintiff had standing as citizen litigants to challenge the alleged failure of a city to adopt a low income housing plan [*Urban Habitat Program v. City of Pleasanton (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1561, 1580-1581, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300*]. Counties had standing to challenge the constitutionality of state laws that imposed direct obligation on counties, but counties did not have standing to challenge the constitutionality of state laws that did not impose obligations of counties [*County of San Diego v. San Diego NORML (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 798, 817-818, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 461*]. Hospitals have standing to challenge a freeze on Medicaid reimbursement rates enacted by the state legislature. Hospitals are beneficially interested under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* because they have an interest in the proper administration of the Medicaid laws that is distinct from the interest of the public at large in that they are adversely affected by the reimbursement rate freeze [*Mission Hospital Regional Medical Center v. Shewry (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 460, 478-480, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 639*].

Members of the public have standing under the public trust doctrine to challenge harm to the public trust related to wildlife including raptors and other birds allegedly harmed by wind turbines [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL*

Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1364-1366, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588]. However, members of the public seeking to challenge harm to the public trust must file a lawsuit against the responsible public agencies, the County of alameda, and the California Department of Fish and Game, which are charged with enforcing the public trust. They may not file a lawsuit against the operators of the wind turbines that have allegedly caused the harm [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1366-1368, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588*]. Failure to join the County of Alameda under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* is grounds for dismissing the action. The county is a necessary party because it issued the wind turbine permits being challenged. Because the limitations period for challenging the issuance of the permits has expired, the county cannot be joined to the lawsuit and the county is an indispensable party [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1371-1373, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588*].

An academic senate of a community college was determined to have the requisite beneficial interest, and therefore had standing, to challenge a community college board of trustee's adoption of revised hiring policies without giving the academic senate the meaningful opportunity to participate in the adoption process. The academic senate had a beneficial interest because under the law, the senate had a real interest, not merely an advisory role, in that senate members were elected by the faculty, and the senate had the responsibility to agree jointly on faculty hiring policies [*Irvine Valley College Academic Senate v. Board of Trustees of the South Orange County Community College District (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 1482, 1487-1489, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 336]* .

A pharmaceutical company that manufactured a drug, Oxandin, did not have standing to challenge the contract provisions between the Department of Health Services and an outside vendor, Ramsdell, that administered the AIDS Drug Assistance Program's (ADAP) under the statutory authority of *Health & Safety Code § 120955(a)(2)*. The pharmaceutical company was not a party to the contract [*Savient Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Department of Health Services (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1457, 1465-1466, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689]* . An outdoor advertising company that sought writ of mandate to challenge validity of amendment to city zoning ordinance did not have standing to bring challenge based on failure to complete an environmental review under CEQA [Regency Outdoor Advertising, inc. v. *City of West Hollywood (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 825, 829-830, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 287]* .

Cell phone companies had standing to challenge the constitutionality of city ordinance imposing local government fee on cell phone users to fund city's 911 communication system notwithstanding that the fee was paid by cell phone customers. The companies business operations were closely linked to enforcement of the ordinance, as the companies had to collect and remit the fees to the city, and the companies competitive standing could be affected [*Andal v. City of Stockton (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 86, 94-95, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34*].

An apartment owners association had standing to sue to challenge a rent stabilization ordinance on behalf of its members. The association challenged the ordinance through a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief. The association satisfied a three part test for associational standing: 1) members of the association could have sued to raise the same challenges; 2) the interests to be protected are related to the purpose of the organization; and 3) the association can assert their claim and seek the requested relief without individual owners having to be a part of the lawsuit [*Apt. Ass'n of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 119, 128-130, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 575]* .

However, landowners were not aggrieved parties for purposes of challenging the addition of encroachment lands with required habitat mitigation conditions and, therefore, did not have standing to challenge that decision because they could not show that they would suffer an immediate, pecuniary, and substantial injury, as they would not be required to pay habitat mitigation costs [*State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 829-831, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189]* . An irrigation district did not have standing to challenge a trial court judgment in favor of that district, as the district was not an aggrieved party for purposes of appeal [*El Dorado Irrigation Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 937, 977-978, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 468]* .

Under the standing requirement imposed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*, a writ of mandate is issued only when it is necessary to protect some special right of the petitioner, or if the petitioner will suffer some substantial damage if it is

denied [*see, e.g.,* *Ballard v. Anderson (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 873, 876, 95 Cal. Rptr. 1, 484 P.2d 1345* (physician subject to criminal prosecution for performing unapproved abortion had standing to petition for writ compelling Therapeutic Abortion Committee to pass on applications without requiring parental consent); *Citizens Assn. for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 151, 159, 217 Cal. Rptr. 893* (petitioners living or working in close proximity to site had standing to petition for writ compelling county board of supervisors to set aside actions enabling construction of proposed shopping center); *Cooperrider v. Civil Service Com. (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 495, 499-500, 158 Cal. Rptr. 801* (nonresident applicant for civil service position had standing to petition for writ compelling civil service commission to accept and process application notwithstanding residency requirement); *Taschner v. City Council (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 48, 56, 107 Cal. Rptr. 214* (petitioner owning property in affected area had standing to petition for writ invalidating ordinance limiting height of buildings), *disapproved on other grounds, Associated Home Builders, Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 596 n.14, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473* ; *Jefferson Union Sch. Dist. v. City Council (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 264, 267, 277 P.2d 104* (school district had standing to petition for writ terminating proceedings for annexation of territory within its geographical boundaries)].

The California Court of Appeal held that an association of home health care providers, one of those providers and a disability rights advocacy group had associational standing to sue on behalf of recipients of Medi-Cal services to ensure that the department of health services fulfilled its responsibilities to Medi-Cal recipients and made sure that payment rates for providers are sufficient to enlist enough providers to provide adequate care and services to recipients [*California Association for Health Services v. Department of Health Services (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 696, 706-707, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102]* .

The writ will not issue in a case in which the petitioner has no direct interest in the legal duty sought to be compelled and will gain no benefit from its performance [*see, e.g.,* *Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6* (labor official who was not city employee, resident, or taxpayer had no standing to bring mandate action to compel city to fix salaries of city employees at prevailing rates); *McDonald v. Stockton Met. Transit Dist. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 436, 442-443, 111 Cal. Rptr. 637* (users of transit system had no standing to bring mandate action to compel transit district to construct bus shelters in accordance with terms of federal grant); *Silva v. City of Cypress (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 374, 376-377, 22 Cal. Rptr. 453* (petitioner who had no interest in any property located in the area affected and was not personally affected had no standing to challenge decision granting variance)]. As a rule, the petitioner must have some special interest to be served or some particular right to be protected over and above those common to the public at large [*Carsten v. Psychology Examining Com. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 793, 796, 166 Cal. Rptr. 844, 614 P.2d 276* ; *Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 818, 832, 173 Cal. Rptr. 602* ; *see, e.g., Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc. v. San Francisco Airports Commission (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 352, 361-363, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 654, 981 P.2d 499* (association of building contractors had standing to represent interests of its members to challenge project stabilization agreement related to expansion of airport based upon showing that agreement infringed on the associational rights of its members or had anti-competitive impact on those members)]. A special district did not have standing to challenge a county's determination as to the district's allocated share of property tax revenue because the district did not have a property interest in tax increments received. This is because the County had unlimited discretion to decide the tax allocation that the district received [*Embarcadero Mun. Improvement Dist. v. County of Santa Barbara (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 781, 787-788]* .

A competitor (Waste Management, Inc.) did not have standing to challenge the Waste Management Board's approval of permitting a solid waste facility by a competing company (Browning-Ferris Co.) without requiring CEQA review. This is because the challenging competitor's interests related to extra costs it incurred through having to complete CEQA review of its own permitting process, and the lower costs that the permitting competitor (Browning Ferris Co.) had because it did not have to complete CEQA review for its permitting process. Commercial and competitive interests are not beneficial interests within the meaning of standing requirements. Also, those interests were not within the zone of interests protected or preserved by CEQA. The challenging competitor cannot use the citizen suit standing alternative because it is not seeking to vindicate environmental interests protected by CEQA, but rather is seeking to vindicate its own economic and competitive interests [*Waste Management of Alameda County, Inc. v. County of Alameda (2000)*

79 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1229-1230, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 740] . However, a competitor (Burtec) trash company did have standing to challenge a city's approval of a conditional use permit granted to another trash company (Taormina) based on the adequacy of the public notice required by CEQA. This is because the challenging company (Burtec) was a taxpayer and a property owner with a close geographic proximity to the site of the solid waste facility receiving the CUP, and the company was seeking to enforce a public duty and a proper express beneficial interest concerning the adequacy of public notice under CEQA [*Burrtec Waste Industries, Inc. v. City of Colton (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1138-1139, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 410]* . Another California Court of Appeal held that an organization had standing to challenge CEQA compliance because one of its members was a homeowner residing near one of the building projects who spoke in opposition to the projects at the public hearing prior to the approval of the projects by the City [*Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1202-1204, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203]* . Two litigants who challenged a decision of the State Water Resources Control Board had standing to seek disqualification of the attorney general and to challenge the attorney generals's failure to comply with *Water Code § 186* (which prohibited dual representation by the attorney general of the board and another state agency when both are parties to litigation) because these two litigants who challenged the boards adjudicatory decision have a direct and substantial interest in a neutral decision maker, and both are within the zone of interests protected by *Water Code § 186* [*State Water Resources Control Board v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 907, 915-916, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 784]* .

The petitioner's interest must be a present interest. The writ will not issue when it would be of no practical benefit to the petitioner due to events occurring after the administrative action or decision [*Clementine v. Board of Civ. Ser. Commrs. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 112, 114, 117 P.2d 369* (proceeding to compel certification of names on civil service eligible list dismissed when list expired)].

A physician whose license to practice medicine was suspended had standing ("beneficial interest") to challenge the suspension at the time he filed his mandate action. His standing was made moot by the completion of the suspension during the time of judicial review under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)* [*Medical Board of California v. Superior Court (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1008-1009, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381]* . In contrast, a former property owner who sought a writ of mandate to compel a county planning department to issue certificates of compliance of the real property with old subdivision maps did not have a beneficial interest sufficient to be granted administrative mandamus when due to a mortgage foreclosure, he was divested of all interest in the real property in question [*County of San Luis Obispo v. Superior Court (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 288, 292-293, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753]* .

The California Supreme Court held that the Director of the Department of Conservation had standing (i.e., a beneficial interest) sufficient to allow the Director to petition for a writ of mandate challenging the reclamation plans and financial assurances approved by the County of El Dorado for surface mining operations regulated under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 [*Pub. Resources Code § 2710 et. seq.*; People ex. *Rel. Dept. of Conservation v. El Dorado County (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 971, 980-981, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 109, 116 P. 3d 567* . The California Supreme Court also held that the attorney general did not have standing to file a lawsuit under the California False Claims Act (CFCA) for civil remedies related to the assets of an insolvent insurance company as to which the Insurance Commissioner has acquired title, because those assets are not "state funds" within the meaning of the CFCA. The Court also held that the attorney general has standing to seek civil penalties under the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), but not restitution, and only injunctive relief that serves to protect the public and serve a law enforcement function [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1303-1305, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a pension plan that sought a refund of property taxes and penalties paid by the trustee of the plan for the plan did not have standing to bring the refund action because the plan had not paid the tax itself, and the tax refund statutes [*Rev. & Tax Code § 5140*] require that only the person who has paid the tax may maintain a refund action. Thus, the plan, which was the real party in interest, did not have standing to bring the refund action for a refund greater than two million dollars [*IBM Pers. Pension Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1294, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 656]* .

The Court of Appeal held that taxpayer standing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 526a*] was sufficient to satisfy the beneficial interest standard required for ordinary mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] so that a taxpayer could challenge the awarding of the interim contract by a city as an illegal expenditure of city funds. Furthermore, the competitor who was not chosen for the interim contract also had standing because it met the direct and substantial interest standard, and was within the zone of interests protected by *Election Code § 9241* [*Lindelli v. Town of San Anselmo (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1106-1107, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453* (mandamus challenge to city award of an interim contract pending the results of a referendum)].

The California Court of Appeal held that a citizen/taxpayer had standing to challenge procedures used by the Department of Social Services to exempt employees of community care facilities from employment prohibitions based on criminal convictions. The court noted that the citizen/taxpayer had shown determination in pursuing the litigation against the department which satisfied the purpose of the standing requirement to ensure an actual controversy between parties with adverse interests [*Gresher v. Anderson (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 88, 114, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 408* ; *Doe v. Saenz (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 960, 999, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 126* (plaintiffs that challenged department procedures related to exempt criminal conviction provisions had taxpayer standing to challenge adequacy of statutory procedures)].

The California Court of Appeal held that a graduated student of a private college did not have standing under the California Leonard Law [*Educ. Code § 94367*] to bring tort and statutory violation claims against the college because the statute required that the student be enrolled in the college at the time the lawsuit was filed. The former student filed this lawsuit after he graduated from the college. Thus, the former student was limited to seeking relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandamus) [*Antebi v. Occidental College (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1542, 1544-1545, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 277]* .

[b] Judicially Recognized Exceptions to Requirement

California courts have recognized two main exceptions to the general rule requiring that the petitioner have a direct and immediate personal interest in the administrative order or decision.

First, when a case involves a question of public right and seeks to procure the enforcement of a duty owed to the public, as opposed to one owed to an individual applicant or party, the petitioner need not show a direct or special interest in the order or decision at issue. The petitioner's interest as a citizen in having the laws properly enforced is sufficient [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 144, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* (petition for writ requiring Department of Benefit Payments to properly calculate income to be offset against welfare benefits); *Hollman v. Warren (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 351, 357, 196 P.2d 562* (petition for writ to compel governor to appoint notaries public); *Bd. of Soc. Welfare v. County of Los Angeles (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 98, 100-101, 162 P.2d 627* (petition for writ to compel county to refund erroneously collected repayment of old age assistance benefits); *American Friends Service Committee v. Procunier (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 252, 256, 109 Cal. Rptr. 22* (petition for writ to require Department of Corrections and Adult Authority to formulate rules and regulations in accordance with Administrative Procedure Act)]. A private citizen who sued to challenge the constitutionality of statutory affirmative action programs under equal protection of the law as well as for violating Proposition 209 [*Cal. Const. Art. I, § 31*] had standing as both a citizen and a taxpayer to maintain the lawsuit [*Connerly v. State Personnel Bd. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 16, 28-31]* . Citizen standing was recognized when a construction company and its president challenged a school district's award of a contract to another construction company when the contract award was made under an emergency resolution that allowed the district to bypass competitive bidding procedures that are normally required. The challenger's sought to protect the public tax dollars by seeking to enforce competitive bidding laws which are designed to facilitate the award to contracts to the lowest responsible bidder [*Marshall v. Pasadena Unified School Dist. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1241, 1250-1252, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 344]* . This exception promotes a policy of ensuring that governmental bodies do not frustrate the purpose of legislation establishing important public rights [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 144, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* ; *Bd. of Soc. Welfare v. County of L.A. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 98, 100-101, 162 P.2d 627* ; *California Homeless*

and Housing Coalition v. Anderson (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 450, 458-459, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639] .

Second, when a case presents issues that are of great public importance and that are likely to recur, a court has inherent discretion to decide it even though the issuance of a writ will not benefit the petitioner [*Ballard v. Anderson (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 873, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 1, 484 P.2d 1345* (petition for writ compelling Therapeutic Abortion Committee to process minor petitioner's application for approval of abortion without requiring parental consent determined notwithstanding petitioner's ineligibility due to expiration of 20-week statutory period); *City of Garden Grove v. Superior Court (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 355, 369-371, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 656* (city had standing to seek mandamus review challenge court order requiring return of lawfully seized marijuana); *Kirstowsky v. Superior Court (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 745, 749, 300 P.2d 163* (petition for writ compelling vacation of order excluding public from criminal trial determined despite conclusion of trial)].

A public interest group entity that was created after a challenged governmental practice started had standing to challenge legality of housing fund payment calculations in mandamus action against city commission because the public rights exception permits plaintiff to have standing notwithstanding the lack of a beneficial interest in the proceedings [*Hogar v. Community Development Commission of the City of Escondido (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1288, 1294-1296, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 497]* .

[c] Effect of Statute Providing for Participation in Administrative Proceeding

A person or entity authorized by statute to participate in an administrative proceeding is deemed to have a sufficient beneficial interest to obtain judicial review of an order or decision made in that proceeding by mandate [*Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 330, 109 P.2d 935* (employer authorized by Unemployment Insurance Act to participate in proceeding to determine claimant's eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits had standing to petition for writ to annul decision awarding benefits); *California School Employees Association v. Tustin Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 510, 523-524, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 739* (*Gov. Code § 3543.8* gives employee organizations standing to sue in court on behalf of members of organization to seek prospective relief for those members); *Yamada Brothers v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 112, 126, 159 Cal. Rptr. 905* (employer authorized by ALRB regulations to oppose administrative petition for extension of union's certification had standing to seek review of order extending certification in mandate proceeding); *Memorial Hosp. of So. Cal. v. State Health Planning Council (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 167, 177-178, 104 Cal. Rptr. 492* (other hospitals authorized by statute and administrative regulations to participate in administrative hearing on convalescent hospital's application to covert to acute care center had standing to petition for writ compelling hearing on application); *see also Covert v. State Board of Equalization (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 125, 130, 173 P.2d 545* (person whose complaint was basis of proceedings for revocation of on-sale liquor license had standing to seek review of State Board of Equalization decision dismissing complaint in mandate proceeding)]. However, a petitioner who is not a person or entity authorized by statute to participate in a particular proceeding may nonetheless be entitled to obtain judicial review of an order or decision made in that proceeding if the person or entity is sufficiently interested in or affected by the order or decision [*cf. Peery v. Superior Court (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 837, 841, 176 Cal. Rptr. 533, 633 P.2d 198* (property owners were aggrieved parties entitled to bring mandate proceeding to review order denying motion to expunge lis pendens even though they were not parties to the underlying lawsuit); *Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 75, 33 P.2d 669* (petitioner aggrieved by justice court order for substitution of judgment debtor is party beneficially interested within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* and thus may seek writ of certiorari annulling order even though he was not a party to the underlying action)]. This principle does not apply when legislation provides that some other party or entity, such as local government, has the sole and exclusive right to use statutory procedures to enforce statutory or constitutional rights [*Kinlaw v. State (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 326, 334-336, 285 Cal. Rptr. 66, 814 P.2d 1308]* .

The California Court of Appeal interpreted the "interested person" language of *Gov. Code § 54960(a)* and *Gov. Code § 54960.1(a)* very broadly to include all citizens of the state of California; it is not to be limited to residents or taxpayers of the city, county, or district legislative body whose action was being challenged on grounds of Brown Act violations.

This broad interpretation meant that plaintiff, who was a taxpayer and resident of Los Angeles County, had standing to bring a Brown Act action against the Orange Unified School District even though he did not reside within the boundaries of the school district nor did he pay property taxes in that district. The court's rationale was that any citizen of California has the right to enforce the public's right to know what their elected governmental officials are doing and whether they are following the law. Plaintiff is not required to have a personal stake in the lawsuit because he is enforcing public rights [*McKee v. Orange Unified School District (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1316-1318, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 774]* .

[2] Lack of Adequate Remedy at Law

The writ of mandate was created to supply a remedy for cases in which a specific legal right exists with no specific legal remedy with which to enforce it [*Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 82, 87 P.2d 848* ; *Royal Convalescent Hospital, Inc. v. State Board of Control (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 788, 794, 160 Cal. Rptr. 458]* . Thus, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* requires that, to establish entitlement to issuance of the writ, a petitioner must show that a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy does not exist in the ordinary course of the law [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366, 217 P.2d 951* ; *Barnard v. Municipal Court (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 324, 326, 298 P.2d 679* ; *Lohr v. Superior Court (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 231, 234, 244 P.2d 5]* . This requirement applies to administrative mandate as well as ordinary mandate proceedings [*Grant v. Board of Medical Examiners (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 820, 826, 43 Cal. Rptr. 270]* .

To preclude the use of mandate, the alternative remedy generally must meet the following two qualifications [*Dufton v. Daniels (1923) 190 Cal. 577, 582, 213 P. 949* ; *Robertson v. Library Trustees (1902) 136 Cal. 403, 405, 69 P. 88* ; *Cory v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1158, 1167, 195 Cal. Rptr. 586* ; *Ross v. Board of Education (1912) 18 Cal. App. 222, 225, 122 P. 967]* :

- The remedy must be equally convenient, beneficial, and effective; and
- It must be capable of directly affording and enforcing the relief sought in the mandate proceeding.

Mandate will not lie when an adequate alternative remedy has been lost due to the petitioner's delay or neglect unless a sufficient showing is made to excuse the petitioner's failure to pursue the remedy [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 370-371, 217 P.2d 951* ; *Andrews v. Police Court (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 479, 480, 133 P.2d 398* ; *Wadey v. Justice Court (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 426, 428-429, 1 Cal. Rptr. 382]* .

The rule requiring a petitioner to show the lack of another legal remedy is not jurisdictional, but rather is a rule of procedure, the application of which is committed to the sound discretion of the court [*McKannay v. Horton (1907) 151 Cal. 711, 716, 91 P. 598* ; *see also Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366, 217 P.2d 951* ; *Running Fence Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 400, 408, 124 Cal. Rptr. 339]* . The issue of the adequacy of other remedies is a question of fact; thus, its determination is largely within the court's discretion and depends on the particular circumstances of the case [*Barnard v. Municipal Court (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 324, 326, 298 P.2d 679* ; *La Mar v. Superior Court (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 126, 131-132, 196 P.2d 98* ; *San Francisco v. Superior Court (1928) 94 Cal. App. 318, 320, 271 P. 121]* .

Ordinarily, a writ of mandate is not a proper remedy when the relief sought by the petitioner can be obtained in any of the following ways:

- In an action for damages [*ABI, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 669, 687-688, 200 Cal. Rptr. 563* ; *Wenzler v. Municipal Court (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 128, 132-133, 45 Cal. Rptr. 54* ; *Johnston v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 516, 517, 107 P.2d 102* ; *Coombs v. Smith (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 454, 455, 62 P.2d 380]* .

- In a special statutory action, proceeding or hearing [*see, e.g., Sherman v. Quinn (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 661, 665, 192 P.2d 17* (action for refund of taxes improperly collected); *Donnellan v. Hite (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 43, 45, 293 P.2d 158* (special proceeding for order preventing error in printing of election ballot); *Rhode Island Ins. Co. v. Downey (1949) 95 Cal. App. 2d 220, 247, 212 P.2d 965* (hearing required in proceeding for order authorizing seizure of insolvent insurer)].

- By means of another extraordinary writ [*see, e.g., Klose v. Superior Court (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 913, 925-926, 217 P.2d 97* (writ of quo warranto); *Nider v. City Commission (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 14, 26, 97 P.2d 293* (writ of review)].

- When another statutory remedy is available [*Barratt American, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 685, 704-705, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149, 124 P. 3d 719* (Mitigation Fee Act [*Gov. Code §§ 66000-66025*], provided adequate legal remedy under *Gov. Code § 66016* for developer to challenge building permit fees and therefore mandamus was not available for the same challenge)].

- Tax refund litigation (*Little v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Board (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 915, 922-924* , 66 Cal. Rtpr. 3d 401 (challenge to assessment of real property could not be brought using ordinary mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* because there is an adequate remedy at law in paying the taxes owed and filing a lawsuit in the superior court for a refund of taxes paid; mandamus can not be used to prevent or enjoin the collection of taxes under *Cal Const. Art. 13, § 32*).

Mandate usually is not precluded, however, simply because the petitioner can obtain a comparable remedy in an action for declaratory or injunctive relief [*California Teachers Assn. v. Nielsen (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 25, 28-29, 149 Cal. Rptr. 728* ; *County of Los Angeles v. State Dep't of Public Health (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 425, 446, 322 P.2d 968* ; *Brock v. Superior Court (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 594, 603, 241 P.2d 283]* .

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Before seeking relief in a mandate proceeding, the petitioner must exhaust available administrative remedies [*Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 794, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009* ; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 292, 109 P.2d 942; Richards v. Dep't of Alcoholic Beverage Control (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 304, 309, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782 (restaurant owner's failure to apply for transfer of license or for original license when he purchased restaurant was a failure to exhaust administrative remedies that precludes his lawsuit challenging the department's revocation of an alcoholic beverage license issued to the prior owner)]* . This requirement applies in both administrative mandate proceedings [*Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 794, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009* ; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106, 280 P.2d 1]* and ordinary mandate proceedings [*see Horack v. Franchise Tax Board (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 363, 368, 95 Cal. Rptr. 717]* .

The California Supreme Court affirmed the dismissal of a lawsuit brought against the Regents of the University of California by a former employee who had been terminated. The employee challenged the termination claiming that it was retaliatory in violation of *Gov. Code § 12653* and *Labor Code § 1102.5*, which provide protection for so called "whistleblowers," that is employees who disclose wrongdoing by their employers and are fired from employment as a result. The court held that the former employee's lawsuit was barred because the employee failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing her lawsuit. Specifically, the court held that the former employee failed to exhaust required university internal administrative remedies (filing a grievance under UCSF's policies and procedures for reporting improper governmental activities) before filing her lawsuit [*Campbell v. Regents of Univ. of Cal. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 311, 317-318, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 320, 106 P.3d 976]* .

This requirement must be met for the court to have subject matter jurisdiction; it is not merely a procedural rule subject to the discretion of the court [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 292, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Horack v. Franchise Tax Board (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 363, 368, 95 Cal. Rptr. 717* ; *People v. Coit Ranch, Inc. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 52, 57, 21 Cal. Rptr. 875* ; *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382* ; *Barnes v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 365, 380-381, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 87* ; *Wright v. State (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 659, 664-665, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* and cannot be waived by the parties' stipulation or consent [*Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513]* , or by a party's failure to raise it [*People v. Coit Ranch, Inc. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 52, 57, 21 Cal. Rptr. 875* ; *but see* *Doster v. County of San Diego (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 257, 260, 251 Cal. Rptr. 507* (exhaustion of administrative remedies is a fundamental rule of procedure, but it is not a condition of jurisdiction); *Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 220-223, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470* (exhaustion of administrative remedies is merely procedural requirement that may be waived); for discussion of *Green, see* Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*].

The exhaustion requirement is judicially created [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 292, 109 P.2d 942]* , and applies even if the controlling statutes do not expressly make exhaustion of administrative remedies a condition of judicial relief [*Woodard v. Broadway Fed. S. & L. Assn. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 218, 221, 244 P.2d 467* ; *A. Teichert & Son, Inc. v. State of Cal. (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 736, 746, 48 Cal. Rptr. 225]* . The purpose of the rule is to lighten the workload of overburdened courts by requiring litigants to initially resort to administrative proceedings that may afford the remedies sought, thus obviating the need for judicial proceedings [*Bozaich v. State of California (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 688, 698, 108 Cal. Rptr. 392* ; *Morton v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 977, 982, 88 Cal. Rptr. 533]* . Exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements for an employee to bring employment discrimination claims against the county employer requires that the employee obtain a right to sue letter from the EEOC as a prerequisite to filing a lawsuit bringing Title VII claims against the county. It is not sufficient for the employee plaintiff to have obtained a right to sue letter from the State Department of Fair Employment and Housing to file a lawsuit that includes Title VII claims [*Roman v. County of Los Angeles (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 316, 325-326, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 13]* .

Prisoners must exhaust administrative remedies before seeking judicial relief. A prisoner who sued the Department of Corrections for medical malpractice, and failure to furnish medical care, failed to complete the prison administrative review process before filing his lawsuit. As a result, his court claim was barred by failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The court noted a number of policies furthered by the exhaustion requirements including "bolstering administrative autonomy, mitigating damages, giving agencies the opportunity to make factual findings, encouraging settlement, filtering out frivolous claims, fostering better prepared litigation, and promoting judicial economy" [*Wright v. State (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 659, 666-667, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* . Prison administrative remedies must be exhausted even though the prisoner could not recover damages except by going to court. Substantial compliance is not enough. The prisoner must complete all three levels of prison administrative review of his grievances [*Wright v. State (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 659, 667-668, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* .

The exhaustion of administrative remedies requirement applies not only to the overall claim for relief made by a petitioner, but to individual contentions and issues raised in support of that claim. In general, a contention or issue that is not raised at the administrative level may not be considered in a subsequent mandate proceeding [*Gilroy Citizens for Responsible Planning v. City of Gilroy (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 911, 919-921, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102* (citizens group failed to raise certain issues during public comment period for environmental impact report, and therefore failed to meet issue exhaustion requirements for exhaustion of administrative remedies; citizens group raised other issues in public comment period, and those issues can be raised in court challenge to adequacy of EIR, but not the issues that were not raised in public comment period); *Evans v. City of San Jose (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1123, 1137-1138, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 675* (issue exhaustion requirement avoids unnecessary litigation, provides a more complete record for judicial review and ensures that agency expertise is utilized. Citizens who participate in city redevelopment hearings are not held to the same high standard as are lawyers in specific proceedings, but citizens have to be specific enough in raising issues

before the city so that the city has the opportunity to respond to that issue prior to judicial review. A response that is too general will not satisfy the issue exhaustion requirement); *Hobson v. Raychem Corporation (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 630-632, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (exhaustion of administrative remedies requirement not satisfied when an employee failed to file an administrative charge specifically identifying the alleged discrimination that provided the basis for the later lawsuit); *Pegues v. Civil Service Com. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 95, 103-104, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* ; *NBS Imaging Systems, Inc. v. State Bd of Control (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 328, 336-337, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 237* ; *American Alliance Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 601, 609, 184 Cal. Rptr. 674* ; *Griswold v. Mt. Diablo Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 648, 652-653, 134 Cal. Rptr. 3* ; *Savoy Club v. Boardof Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1042, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198]* . Issue exhaustion requirements also compel the plaintiff to raise issues at successive stages of the administrative process to preserve those issues for later judicial review. Thus, a litigant who raises an issue before the first administrative agency that can consider the issue, but who fails to raise that same issue in an administrative appeal to an administrative agency that has final decision making authority, has not satisfied issue exhaustion requirements and cannot raise that same issue on judicial review [*Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. County of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 589-590, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880]* . However, the exhaustion requirement is met when the allegations in a civil lawsuit are similar to or reasonably related to the charges presented to the agency [*Soldinger v. Northwest Airlines, Inc. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 345, 381-383, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747* (discrimination charges brought by plaintiff employee before DFEH agency that were later the basis of a civil lawsuit)]. Similarly, an appealing party satisfied exhaustion requirements even though it was not a formal applicant in the administrative proceeding, when its business partner did exhaust administrative remedies before the agency as to issues that the appealing party was raising on appeal [*CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1080-1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652]* . Issue exhaustion requirements did not have to be satisfied under *Pub. Res. Code Section 21177(b)* (requiring raising of objection during public comment period or during public hearing as prerequisite to challenging approval in court) to challenge agency approval of sales agreement because the agency decision to give approval was not a project within the requirements of CEQA, and the CEQA process of preparation of an EIR would take place after the date of the approval agreement [*Concerned McCloud Citizens v. McCloud Community Services District (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 181, 189-191, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* .

An agency's grievance procedures satisfy due process requirements for exhaustion of administrative remedies in that the remedy is constitutionally adequate by providing reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard. Neither the lack of subpoena power nor the advisory nature of the decision of the hearing body make the procedures inadequate in due process terms [*Bockover v. Perko (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 479, 487-488, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423]* .

To satisfy the requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies, a petitioner must not only institute all available administrative proceedings, but must pursue them to completion and receive a final determination on the merits [*McHugh v. County of Santa Cruz (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 533, 538-539, 109 Cal. Rptr. 149* ; *Fiscus v. Dept. Alcoholic Bev. Control (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 234, 236, 317 P.2d 993]* . When applicable statutes and regulations provide for an interagency or intra-agency appeal of an initial administrative decision, the petitioner must take the appeal [*see, e.g., Lynn v. Duckel (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 845, 849-850, 299 P.2d 236* ; *Vernon & Vernons, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 943, 945-946, 171 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *Grant v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 606, 609, 145 Cal. Rptr. 699]* .

When a statute specifies that reconsideration or rehearing of an adverse decision of an agency *may* be sought by an affected party, reconsideration is not *required* prior to seeking judicial review, at least with respect to issues litigated before and finally decided by the agency. Reconsideration is required only when raising issues not previously presented to the agency [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 493-494,87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* . Statutory provisions consistent with this rule include the following:

- *Gov. Code § 11523* expressly provides that failure to seek reconsideration of an administrative decision governed by the Administrative Procedure Act shall not affect the right to petition for mandate.

- Provisions similar to those in *Gov. Code § 11523* exist in a number of statutes specifically applicable to other administrative proceedings [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 19588* (failure to seek rehearing before State Personnel Board decision shall not affect right to petition for mandate)].

A litigant's contentions need not be presented to the administrative entity in the most precise or effective manner [*Graham v. Bryant (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 66, 70, 266 P.2d 44* ; *see also Citizens Assn. for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 151, 163, 217 Cal. Rptr. 893]* . Exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were satisfied when litigants adequately presented the specific grounds for non-compliance with CEQA issue to the agency before the close of the public hearing [*State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 793-795, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189]* . A litigant's deliberate refusal to participate in a scheduled hearing, however, is deemed a failure to exhaust an administrative remedy and precludes the litigant from obtaining judicial review of a decision made in that hearing [*Doyle v. City of Chino (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 681, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844]* .

Gov. Code § 18671.1 specifies that the State Personnel Board must decide appeals from an employee of a departmental disciplinary action within specified time limits (90 days or six months). If the Board fails to reach a decision within the time limits, the statute deems administrative remedies to be exhausted, but the Board does not lose jurisdiction over the appeal because the time limit is directory not mandatory [*California Correctional Peace Officers Assn. v. State Personnel Bd. (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1133, 1138, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693, 899 P.2d 79]* .

However, when the employee has not waived the time limit for decision, the employee may seek judicial review by writ of mandate against the Board to compel the Board to decide that appeal by a specified date. Alternatively, the employee may seek judicial review by writ of mandate against the employing agency to set aside the adverse action. If the Board reaches a decision while the mandate proceeding against the employing agency is pending, the employee may, but is not required to, dismiss the mandate proceeding and seek review of the Board's decision by petition for a writ of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*California Correctional Peace Officers Assn. v. State Personnel Bd. (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1133, 1138-1139, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693, 899 P.2d 79]* . State civil service employees who brought employment discrimination claims under California Fair Employment and Housing Act, *Gov. Code § 12900*, had the choice of whether to exhaust administrative remedies with the State Personnel Board (Board), or of exhausting administrative remedies by filing a claim with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). Employees filed a claim with DFEH, and received a right to sue letter. Employees were held to have exhausted administrative remedies requirements by filing claim with DFEH, and were not required to also pursue administrative remedies with Board [*Ruiz v. California Department of Corrections (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 891, 896-898, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139]* .

Plaintiff former employee's lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles asserting FEHA claims of employment discrimination due to physical disability by the city against plaintiff was not barred by the Plaintiff's failure to exhaust internal grievance remedies provided under the Los Angeles city charter. Plaintiff had exhausted FEHA administrative remedies by obtaining a "right to sue" letter from the DFEH, and that was sufficient. Plaintiff was not required to exhaust both sets of administrative remedies as a precondition to filing his FEHA lawsuit in court. The court's rationale for the holding included reasons: 1) FEHA preemption of local government laws, 2) public employees have the same rights under FEHA as private employees, and 3) public employees have a choice between pursuing the internal grievance remedies provided by their governmental employer, or choosing the FEHA remedies, with a right to sue letter, and a civil lawsuit [*Schifando v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1074, 1082-1090, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 457, 79 P.3d 569]* .

A former employee of Los Angeles County Probation Department brought a disability discrimination claim against her employer. She filed a grievance with the County Civil Service Commission and completed the hearing process, and the hearing officer issued a decision that was adverse to her claims. While she challenged the hearing office recommended findings before the Commission, she did not file a petition for a writ of administrative mandate to overturn the

Commission's final decision. Rather, she filed a complaint for discrimination with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), received a right-to-sue letter, and then filed a civil lawsuit against the Probation Department for disability discrimination in violation of the FEHA [*Gov. Code § 12940(a)*]. Her civil lawsuit was filed before the Commission had issued a final decision in her grievance action. The Court of Appeal held that the employee's FEHA lawsuit was barred because she failed to exhaust administrative and judicial remedies by failing to file a petition for a writ of administrative mandate to challenge the commission's final decision [*Page v. Los Angeles Cty. Probation Dept. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1142-1143, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . In so holding, the Court of Appeal cited and relied upon California Supreme Court decisions in *Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 72, 5 P.3d 874* and *Schifando v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1074, 1088, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 457, 79 P.3d 569]* . The Court of Appeal noted that the employee made a choice as to the forum to assert her discrimination claims, the civil service commission, but failed to exhaust the administrative and judicial remedies related to that forum [*Page v. Los Angeles Cty. Probation Dept. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1142-1143, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . Rather, the employee entered the "procedural minefield" of pursuing one administrative remedy, the civil service commission process, and then in midstream choosing the other administrative remedy, a FEHA claim, without properly exhausting the administrative and judicial remedies associated with the civil service commission process [*Page v. Los Angeles Cty. Probation Dept. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1142-1143, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* .

Similarly, an employee of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) who was terminated from employment had the choice of pursuing the internal administrative remedies provided by HACLA, or pursuing the FEHA administrative remedy, before filing a civil lawsuit alleging disability discrimination in violation of the FEHA statute [*Williams v. Housing Auth. of City of Los Angeles (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 708, 720-721, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 374]* . Furthermore, that employee is not required to exhaust administrative remedies to bring a FEHA-related non-statutory claim (wrongful termination based on public policy) when an agency decision on the FEHA-related claim could have preclusive effect on the FEHA statutory claim [*Williams v. Housing Auth. of City of Los Angeles (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 708, 727-728, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 374]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that former employees of a private employer had to comply with notice and exhaustion requirements of *Labor Code § 2699.3(a)* before filing civil law suits for civil penalties under *Labor Code § 2698*, but that those employees claims for unpaid wages, and for statutory penalties paid to the employee, could be brought to court in a civil lawsuit without the employees having to comply with the same notice and exhaustion requirements [*Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 365, 371-372, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 31]* .

Failure to exhaust administrative remedies is not excused by parties' lack of legal representation nor by incorrect advice as to required procedures by agency officials [*Park Area Neighbors v. Town of Fairfax (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1450-1451, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334]* . Motorist's failure to request a hearing within ten (10) days to challenge a driver's license suspension under the provisions of *Veh. Code § 13558*, constitutes a failure to exhaust administrative remedies that precludes judicial review of the suspension decision by the DMV [*Marquez v. Gourley (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 710, 712-714, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 784]* . A physician was not excused from completing a hospital peer review process before filing a tort lawsuit and seeking damages in the Superior Court because the hospital failed to start the hearing within the required 60-day time period. Failure to start on time does not make an administrative remedy inadequate or unavailable. Further, the physician was required to raise the issue of hearing officer bias before the hearing officer first [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Sacramento Superior Court (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 85, 91, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 744]* . For further discussion of the rule requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[4] When Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Is Not Required

[a] Claim That Administrative Entity Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction Under Governing Statutes

Judicial relief is not precluded under the exhaustion doctrine by a failure to seek a possible administrative remedy if the constitutional provisions or statutes under which the administrative agency operates do not vest it with subject matter jurisdiction over the type of claim or controversy at issue [*County of Alpine v. County of Tuolumne (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 787, 798, 322 P.2d 449* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Dept. of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 457, 260 P.2d 41* ; *Residents for Adequate Water v. Redwood Water District (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1801, 1807-1808, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 123]* . Compliance with the exhaustion requirement will not be excused, however, because a petitioner claims that the controlling statutes did not empower the agency to act under the facts of a particular case [*United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 194-195, 120 P.2d 26* ; *Metcalf v. County of Los Angeles (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 267, 270-273, 148 P. 2d 645* ; *McAllister v. County of Monterey (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 253, 284-286, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116* ; *People v. Sonleitner (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 350, 363-365, 8 Cal. Rptr. 528]* .

The administrative jurisdiction exception to exhaustion of administrative remedies was held to be applicable to the issue of the proper limitations period for bringing unfair labor practice claims before the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB). The California Supreme Court excused the District from adjudicating the limitations issue before PERB, and allowed the District to go to court to resolve this issue. In applying the administrative jurisdiction exception, the Supreme Court utilized a three-part test: 1) the injury or burden that exhaustion will impose; 2) the strength of the legal argument that the agency lacks jurisdiction; and 3) the extent to which administrative expertise may aid in resolving the jurisdictional issue. The Court held that as to the first factor, while the district would not be unduly burdened by having to exhaust administrative remedies, there was a strong public interest in definitively resolving the legal issue presented. As to the second factor, the District's legal argument is very strong. As to the third factor, the issue before the court are purely legal, within court expertise, and the court had the benefit of PERB's views on the issues in the case in the appellate briefs it filed with the Court [*Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control Dist. v. Cal. Pub. Emp. Relations Bd. (2005) 35 Cal 4th 1072, 1081-1083, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234, 112 P. 3d 623]* .

The administrative jurisdiction exception to exhaustion of administrative remedies did not apply to excuse failure to exhaust administrative remedies by a challenger to a coastal development permit who failed to appeal to the California Coastal Commission a county decision to grant the permit to a neighboring landowner. The challenger argued that the county action was void and therefore exhaustion was not required, but the court of appeal rejected that argument and held that exhaustion is required for as applied challenges to agency action based on voidness. The Coastal Commission had jurisdiction over this type of dispute at the appellate level [*McAllister v. County of Monterey (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 253, 284-286, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

[b] Challenge to Constitutionality of Governing Statutes

A litigant who claims that a statute under which an administrative agency operates is unconstitutional on its face may raise the claim in a judicial proceeding to review an order or decision of the agency, even if it was not raised at the administrative level [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Andal v. City of Stockton (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 86, 93-94, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34* (constitutional challenge brought by cell phone companies and their customers to challenge constitutionality of city ordinance imposing local government fee on cell phone users to fund city's 911 communication system. Administrative remedies need not be exhausted to raise constitutional challenge in court); Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle *Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 115, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617-620, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . However, this exception does not apply to a claim that a governing statute is unconstitutional as applied to the facts of a particular case [*Security First Nat. Bk. v. County of Los Angeles (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 319, 321, 217 P.2d 946* ; *Griswold v. Mt. Diablo Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 648, 652-653, 134 Cal. Rptr. 3* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1042, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; *but see Anderson v. Department of Real Estate (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 696, 701 n.2, 155 Cal. Rptr. 307]* , and is subject to a number of other important qualifications [*see* Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*].

[c] Administrative Remedy Is Inadequate or Unavailable

Exhaustion of an administrative remedy is not required when the administrative remedy is inadequate or is unavailable to the petitioner [*Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* ; *Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Board (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 227, 237-238, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388* ; *Daniels v. Shasta-Tehama-Trinity J. Community College Dist. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 909, 927, 260 Cal. Rptr. 867* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358* ; *Martino v. Concord Community Hosp. Dist. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 51, 56, 43 Cal. Rptr. 255]* . For example, a petitioner is not required to submit a claim to an administrative body that is unable to directly grant relief because it only has the power to render advisory decisions [*Pearson Candy Co. v. Waits (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 615, 619, 165 P.2d 674* ; *James v. Marinship Corp. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 721, 744-745, 155 P.2d 329* ; *Pasillas v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 312, 358-359, 202 Cal. Rptr. 739]* .

The mere possibility that the petitioner may be able to obtain some relief from an administrative entity is not sufficient to require the satisfaction of the exhaustion doctrine; a clearly defined set of procedures must exist under which the petitioner is entitled to submit the claim at issue and have it evaluated and resolved [*Rosenfield v. Malcolm (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 559, 566-567, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505, 421 P.2d 697* ; *City of Coachella v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Com. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1277, 1287-1288, 258 Cal. Rptr. 795* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 813, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358* ; *see also Martino v. Concord Community Hosp. Dist. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 51, 56-57, 43 Cal. Rptr. 255]* . For example, an insured was not required to exhaust administrative remedies under CAARP (California Automobile Assigned Risk Plan) [*Ins. Code § 11620*] before filing a bad faith lawsuit against an insurer because the CAARP regulatory scheme does not provide a remedy to resolve disputes relating to claims for benefits [*Hightower v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860-861, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 348]* . Termination of doctor's hospital staff privileges for cause was challenged by doctor because of lack of a pre-termination hearing. The court of appeal concluded that physician had a due process and statutory [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 809*] right to a pre-termination hearing before staff privileges could be terminated [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1147-1150, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . The Court of Appeal held that physician was entitled to a preliminary injunction reinstating staff privileges until the required hearing procedures were completed [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1160, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . The court also held that physician did not have to exhaust internal hospital grievance procedures, including a post-termination procedure to assert a claim that the hospital failed to follow hearing procedures required by law (statutory procedures codified under *Bus & Prof. Code § 809*) [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1154-1155, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598* ; *Payne v. Anaheim Mem'l Med. Ctr. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 729, 739, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 230* (hospital bylaws did not provide for an internal grievance hearing to remedy doctor's complaint about discriminatory comments; therefore hospital administrative remedies did not have to be exhausted because there was no such remedy)].

An administrative remedy must have some procedures to be considered adequate. The absence of any internal remedies means that there is not an adequate administrative remedy [*Life Care Ctrs. of Cal. v. CalOptima (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1169, 11771178, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 387* ; *Unfair Fire Tax Com. v. City of Oakland (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1424, 1429-1431, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 701* (city ordinance did not provide adequate administrative remedy because the ordinance had no procedural mechanisms for submission, evaluation, and resolution of the appeal specified under the ordinance; so, litigant is not required to exhaust that remedy and can file lawsuit)]. This exception is discussed in greater detail in Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.

[d] Pursuit of Administrative Remedy Is Futile

A petitioner is not required to pursue an administrative remedy when it is reasonably certain that the decision of the administrative entity will be adverse [*Eldridge v. City of Palo Alto (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 613, 633, 129 Cal. Rptr. 575* (when city rezoned geographical area in which petitioner's land was located to change minimum size of parcel required for building from 1 to 10 acres for specific purpose of creating open-space area, petitioners were not required to apply for variance allowing construction on one-acre parcels before seeking review of zoning ordinance); *Ogo*

Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761 (when city rezoned petitioner's property to limit it to manufacturing uses for express purpose of preventing petitioner from constructing low-income housing, petitioner not required to apply for variance before commencing mandate action to compel city to set aside); *cf. Gantner & Mattern Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 314, 318, 109 P.2d 932* (dicta acknowledging exception)]. Conversely, if the petitioner cannot show that the agency decision is reasonably certain to be adverse, the futility exception does not apply [*Sea & Sage Audubon Society, Inc. Planning Comm. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 412, 418-419, 194 Cal. Rptr. 357, 668 P.2d 664* ; *Economic Empowerment Foundation v. Quackenbush (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 677, 692, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 323]* . However, the futility of pursuing a particular claim before an administrative entity cannot be established by merely showing that the entity has ruled adversely on claims or contentions similar to the petitioner's in other cases [*Gantner & Mattern Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 314, 318, 109 P.2d 932* ; *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 92-93, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *In re Serna (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1014, 143 Cal. Rptr. 350]* . The petitioner must make a showing of some declaration or conduct on the part of the entity that positively demonstrates that the entity has taken an adverse position on the particular application or claim asserted by petitioner [*Gantner & Mattern Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 314 318, 109 P.2d 932* ; *see also Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 92-93, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441]* . The futility exception is discussed in greater detail in Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.

[e] Petitioner Is Threatened With Irreparable Injury

Failure to exhaust an administrative remedy may be excused when pursuing the administrative remedy would result in irreparable injury to the petitioner [*Greenblatt v. Munro (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 596, 606-607, 326 P.2d 929* ; *cf. United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 196, 120 P.2d 26* (dicta acknowledging rule)]. The scope of this exception, however, is severely restricted [*In re Serna (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1014-1015, 143 Cal. Rptr. 350* (exception is not applicable even if administrative action at issue constitutes direct, immediate, and irremediable infringement on religious beliefs and practices); *Humbert v. Castro Valley County Fire Protection Dist. (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 1, 6, 29 Cal. Rptr. 158* (exception applies only to cases in which rate order of regulatory commissions imposes a confiscatory rate on a public utility)]. The irreparable injury exception is discussed in greater detail in Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.

[f] Application of Rule Is Contrary to Public Interest

A few California decisions have excused failures to exhaust available administrative remedies on the ground that application of the exhaustion doctrine under the facts presented would be contrary to some important public interest [*Lindeleaf v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 861, 870-871, 226 Cal. Rptr. 119, 718 P.2d 106* ; *Hull v. Cason (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 344, 358-359, 171 Cal. Rptr. 14* ; *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282]* . For further discussion of the "public interest" exception applied in these cases, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[g] Concurrent Primary Jurisdiction

When the legislature has vested concurrent original jurisdiction over a particular type of claim or controversy in the courts and an administrative agency, a litigant need not apply to the administrative agency for relief before utilizing the judicial remedy [*Scripps etc. Hospital v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 669, 673-674, 151 P.2d 109* ; *Elmore v. Imperial Irrigation Dist. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 185, 192-193, 205 Cal. Rptr. 433* ; *California School Employees Assn. v. Travis Unified School Dist. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 202 Cal. Rptr. 699* ; *Muir v. Steinberg (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 264, 269, 17 Cal. Rptr. 431]* .

The Public Utilities Commission had primary jurisdiction over issues raised in a civil lawsuit brought by plaintiffs against Pacific Gas & Electric Company for unfair business practices (*Bus & Prof. Code § 17200*, and *Bus. & Prof.*

Code § 17500], and fraud. Primary jurisdiction was not exclusive, and thus dismissal of the civil action was improper. Rather, the civil lawsuit was stayed pending further action before the PUC [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 287, 299-301, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479]* . In a second appellate decision (Wise II), the California Court of Appeal held that the completion of a Public Utilities Commission (PUC) investigation into fraud charges against a regulated utility, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) without the PUC reaching any decision about those charges did not have collateral estoppel effect on a related civil lawsuit claim for fraud damages brought against PG&E by consumers [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* . The fraud issues had been referred to the PUC under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, and the trial court had stayed the civil lawsuit pending PUC resolution of the fraud issues. When the PUC closed its investigation, having taken no action, the trial court lifted the stay, and granted a motion for judgment on the pleadings brought by PG&E. The court of appeal reversed the judgment, and held the PUC decision to close the investigation did not have collateral estoppel effect on the civil lawsuit because there was no PUC ruling or decision on the merits, there were no parties to the proceeding, and the PUC was not acting in an adjudicatory capacity [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* . The Superior court properly refused to apply the primary jurisdiction doctrine and submit a lawsuit claim related to the validity of a land use under a conditional use permit to the city planning department because the issues in the lawsuit involved statutory interpretation that is appropriate for judicial resolution, and there were no issues requiring the fact finding expertise of the administrative agency [*Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc v. Astoria Hotel, Inc. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 139, 142-143, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 924]* .

Primary jurisdiction doctrine did not apply to justify dismissal of lawsuit brought by customers against suppliers of telephones and telephone service suppliers for damages for improper charges assessed for monthly telephone rental service. The damage lawsuit was authorized by *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, the lawsuit would not adversely affect the commission's decisions or orders, and the issues in the lawsuit did not require application of commission's specialized regulatory expertise to decide claims for damages [*Cundiff v. GTE California, Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395, 1412-1414,125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* .

Insured had the right to file a civil lawsuit in Superior Court under the unfair competition law [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17210*] against an insurance company to challenge insurer's use of absence of prior insurance as a rating factor in determining eligibility for good driver discounts, and other purposes, in violation of *Ins. Code § 1861.02* (part of Proposition 103). The court of appeal rejected the argument that the Insurance Commissioner had exclusive primary jurisdiction to decide such issues, concluded that exhaustion of administrative remedies was not applicable, and upheld the right of insureds (under the provisions of *Ins. Code §§ 1861.03* and *1861.10*) to file a civil lawsuit to challenge in court such insurer practices under the UCL law [*Donabedian v. Mercury Insurance Co. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 968, 986-987, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 45]* .

The superior court has subject matter jurisdiction under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* to award intentional tort damages, including exemplary damages, for fraud sought in a civil lawsuit by a customer against a public utility regulated by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) when that regulated utility engages in willful and unlawful activities. The resolution of the lawsuit and the award of damages would not violate *Pub. Util. Code § 1759* which restricts the authority of the courts, including the superior court, to review decisions or orders of the PUC. The award of damages in this lawsuit by a customer of a regulated utility would not "hinder or frustrate" the PUC's supervisory or regulatory policies [*Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Communications Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 417-419, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Department of Managed Health Care has concurrent jurisdiction over enforcement of the provisions of *Health & Safety Code § 1371.4*, part of the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, and that the provisions of the statute can be privately enforced by emergency room physicians filing civil lawsuits [*Bell v. Blue Cross of Cal. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 211, 216-218, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 688]* . The Court of Appeal also gave deference to the Department of Managed Health Care's interpretation of *Health & Safety Code § 1371.4* (that health care providers have the right to privately enforce provisions of the statute through filing lawsuits under the unfair competition law, as well as for breach of contract, and quantum meruit, when a health care plan did not

provide adequate reimbursement for the value of service rendered by emergency room physicians) and concluded that physicians had standing to file a lawsuit against a health care service plan [*Bell v. Blue Cross of Cal. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 211, 217-219, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 688]* .

An insured trucking company filed a tort cross-complaint in a court lawsuit for breach of contract to collect disputed premium charges in an action that was brought against the insured by a collection agency as an assignee of the insurer. The tort cross-complaint alleged that the insurer had breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing owed to its insured, and had also committed fraud, in relation to an insurance premium billing dispute between the insured and the insurer. The insurer was assigned to provide automobile liability insurance to the insured company under the California Automobile Assigned Risk Plan. The insured recovered a substantial jury verdict against the insurer [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 923-924, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* . The California Supreme Court upheld the Court of Appeal, which had reversed the trial court judgment for the insured, but disagreed on the rationale for that decision. The California Supreme Court rejected the Court of Appeals holding that exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were applicable and not satisfied. Rather, the Supreme Court held that exhaustion of administrative remedies was not required, but that the doctrine of primary jurisdiction did apply and required the trial court to stay its decision-making and refer the premium billing dispute issue to the Department of Insurance and the State Insurance Commissioner [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 923-924, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* . The Court reasoned that exhaustion of administrative remedies did not apply because the insured's tort claims, and the insurer's breach of contract claims, were within the superior court's jurisdiction, and the Insurance Commissioner had no authority to decide these common law claims. However, primary jurisdiction did apply because one of the issues in this lawsuit, the validity of premium billing by the insurer under the CAARP program, was within the regulatory authority and expertise of the California Insurance Commissioner. The court concluded that the premium dispute issue had to be referred to the Insurance Commissioner for resolution, the referral would promote a uniform application of complex insurance regulations, and that the referral would utilize the insurance agency's expertise in regulating insurer's operating under the CAARP program, thereby helping to ensure a more accurate determination of the premium billing dispute issue in the lawsuit [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 933-934, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* .

In a breach of contract lawsuit, defendant's defense (that the contract was void because plaintiff acted as a talent agency, but was unlicensed in violation of the act) based on the Talent Agencies Act, *Labor Code §§ 1700-1700.47*, must first be brought before the Labor Commissioner under *Labor Code § 1700.44(a)*, and the civil lawsuit for breach of contract must be stayed pending resolution by the Labor commissioner of issues related to the Talent Agencies Act defense [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 47-48, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . Furthermore, a defense based on the Talent Agencies Act does not have to be raised within the one year statute of limitations [*Labor Code § 1700.44(a)*] for bringing actions or proceedings under the Act as the one year statute applies only to claims for affirmative relief, not to defenses [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 51-54, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . The Labor Commissioner has exclusive jurisdiction to determine talent agency act related issues that arise in a breach of contract lawsuit in court. The Commissioner has jurisdiction to determine whether the contract involved the services of a talent agency, and if so, to determine that the contract is void and unenforceable. These issues must first be submitted to the Commissioner to be decided, with the opportunity for a do novo appeal to the superior court after the commissioner makes a decision [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 55-57, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . When a Talent Agency Act defense arises in civil lawsuit in court, the superior court proceeding should be stayed, and a "petition to determine controversy" should be filed with the Commissioner. The merits of that defense cannot be considered by the court until the defense has been decided by the commissioner [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 58-59, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . The Labor Commissioner has exclusive original jurisdiction over disputes under the Talent Agencies Act and issues related to the validity of contracts must first be submitted to the Commissioner, notwithstanding that the contract has a mandatory arbitration clause requiring arbitration of those disputes. The arbitration action was properly stayed pending a resolution of the Act issues by the Commissioner [*Ferrer v. Preston (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 440, 445-447, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628]* .

The California Public Utilities Commission had exclusive jurisdiction to resolve a dispute between a city and a telephone company over which of the parties was required to pay the costs of compliance with a city ordinance requiring utilities to move overhead facilities underground. The superior court properly granted the telephone company's demurrer without leave to amend because the superior court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this dispute [*City of Anaheim v. Pacific Bell Tel. Co. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 838, 841-842, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 725]* .

The California Supreme Court also held that the attorney general did not have standing to file a lawsuit under the California False Claims Act (CFCA) for civil remedies related to the assets of an insolvent insurance company as to which the Insurance Commissioner has acquired title because those assets are not "state funds" within the meaning of the CFCA [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1302-1303, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* . The Court also held that the attorney general has standing to seek civil penalties under the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), but not restitution, and only injunctive relief that serves to protect the public and serve a law enforcement function [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1303-1304, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* . In holding that the attorney general could not bring a restitution related claim under the UCL law, the Court based its decision on the exclusive authority granted to the Insurance Commissioner under *Insurance Code § 1037(f)* [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1304-1306, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* .

For further discussion of concurrent primary jurisdiction, see *Ch. 474A, Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions, § 474.12[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingPersonal StakeCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.14

§ 474.14 Defenses Common to All Mandate Proceedings

[1] Statute of Limitations

Mandate proceedings must be commenced within the limitation period prescribed by applicable statutes [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*; *Gov. Code § 11523*; *Veh. Code § 14401*], or if no applicable statute exists, within the four-year limitation period prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* [*Valvo v. University of Southern California (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 887, 894, 136 Cal. Rptr. 865]* . A mandate proceeding not commenced within the applicable limitation period is barred [*Barlow v. City Council of Inglewood (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 688, 697, 197 P.2d 721* ; *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 794, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214]* .

The statute of limitations does not start running until the agency has reached a final decision. A petition for writ of mandate is not time barred when the agency decision sought to be challenged is tentative and not final until further steps have been completed by the agency [*Cequel III Communications I, LLC v. Local Agency Formation Commission of Nevada County (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 310, 315-316, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32* (cable television provider's challenge to LAFCO determination was not time barred)].

The 90-day time period under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)* does not begin to run until the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* is given to the party seeking to petition for judicial review [*Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 922, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97* ; *El Dorado Palm Springs, Ltd. v. Rent Review Com. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 335, 344-345, 281 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . When the final day of the 90-day period falls on a Sunday, and the record is silent on when notice of judicial review limitations was given, a petition filed on the following Monday is not barred [*Lowe v. City of Commerce (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1075, 1079-1080, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356]* .

Administrative mandate proceedings are also subject to the general dismissal for delay in prosecution provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.120* (dismissal for failure to bring case to trial within five years of filing lawsuit); *Binyon v. State (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 952, 956-957, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673]* . For a more detailed discussion of statutes of limitation applicable to mandate proceedings, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of*

Agency Decisions .

[2] Equitable Defenses

[a] Laches

The equitable defense of laches is available in a mandate proceeding [*Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 366, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Bakersfield City School Dist. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1273-1275, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 486* (temporary employees mandamus remedies not precluded by laches); *People v. Department of Housing & Community Dev. (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 185, 195, 119 Cal. Rptr. 266* ; *Audubon Soc. v. City of Moreno Valley (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 593, 606, 609, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 897* (mandate action barred by laches as a matter of law)]. Laches may apply to bar a proceeding commenced well within the period prescribed by the applicable statute of limitations [*People v. Department of Housing & Community Dev. (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 185, 195, 119 Cal. Rptr. 266* ; *Corcoran v. City of Los Angeles (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 839* (disapproved to extent it implies that prejudice is assumed or that delay without more is a defense in *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617)]* . To sustain this defense, the evidence must show both of the following [*Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 624, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258* ; *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 359, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Green v. Board of Dental Examiners (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 786, 793-795, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 140]* :

- An unreasonable delay on the part of the petitioner; and
- Either:
  - Acquiescence to the order or decision by petitioner; or
  - Prejudice to adverse parties as a result of the delay [*see, e.g.,* *Lam v. Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 29, 39-40, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 137* (laches not established as defense when affected party fails to make sufficient showing as to prejudice from delay)].

If there is an analogous statute of limitations that may be borrowed for purposes of measuring what time period constitutes reasonable delay and an agency's delay in taking action exceeds that borrowed time period, the burden of proof as to both elements of laches (unreasonable delay and prejudice) shifts to the agency, in the form of a rebuttable presumption. In this situation, the agency must offer evidence showing why laches does *not* bar the agency action [*Fountain Valley Regional Hospital and Medical Center v. Bonta (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 316, 324-326, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139]* .

The laches defense barred the filing of a petition for a writ of administrative mandate challenging discharge of an employee when more than three years passed from the date of the agency decision before the superior court ruled on a summary judgment motion brought by the agency on the petition. The delay period included both the time before, and the time after the filing of the petition for administrative mandate. The employee failed to pursue court determination of his petition for more than 18 months after waiting a substantial period of time (another 18 months) to file the petition. The unreasonable delay element was satisfied on these facts. The prejudice element is satisfied because if the former employee wins his lawsuit and is reinstated with back pay, the agency would have to had to make double wage payments as well as having to reorganize its employment structure to include the reinstated employee. The laches defense precluded relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*. It was the only applicable timing defense because the agency failed to notify the employee of the 90 day statutory of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*. The granting of a summary judgment by the superior court based on the defense of laches is reviewed de novo. [*Johnson v. City of*

Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 68-70, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 5 P.3d 874] . The laches defense was rejected in a Tanner Act lawsuit because the party asserting the defense could not show that prejudice resulted from delay in the administrative proceedings [*Padres Hacia una Vida Mejor v. Davis (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1123, 1134-1135, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 727]* .

For a more detailed discussion of the defense of laches, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

[b] Unclean Hands

The equitable defense of unclean hands is also applicable in mandate proceedings; it is used to deny relief to a petitioner who has been guilty of wrongful conduct in connection with the matter that is the subject of the petition [*Allen v. Los Angeles County District Council of Carpenters (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 805, 811-812, 337 P.2d 457* ; *Wallace v. Board of Education (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 611, 617, 147 P.2d 8* ; *Dierssen v. Civil Service Commission (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 53, 57-58, 110 P.2d 513]* . A showing that the petitioner has been guilty of wrongful conduct in an unrelated matter is not sufficient to establish the defense [*Pepper v. Superior Court (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 252, 259, 142 Cal. Rptr. 759* ; *McCarthy v. City of Oakland (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 546, 552, 141 P.2d 4]* .

[c] Waiver

The Court of Appeal held that a city did not waive the right to asset statute of limitations defenses to a claim for interest on refunds for sewer service fees when the city made refund payments without asserting limitations defenses as to those payments [*Utility Audit Co., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 950, 953, 959, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 520]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a building industry association did not waive the right to make legal arguments challenging the validity of a storm water system water permit on grounds that the permit violated the federal clean water statute by failing to challenge superior court factual findings related to permit requirements [*Bldg. Industry Ass'n of San Diego County v. State Water Resources Control Bd (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 866, 880-881, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 128]* . Another California Court of Appeal held that a developer did not waive the right to raise the issue of decision maker bias during the mandamus proceeding in the Superior Court because the developer raised the issue before the planning commission by requesting reconsideration of the adverse decision based on new facts of bias [*Nasha L.L.C. v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 470, 484-485, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a litigant waived the right to assert on appeal an issue that the opposing parties failed to satisfy a statutory time limit for asserting a position in the trial court because the litigant failed to raise this issue before the trial court where fact issues related to the time limit could have been resolved [*San Ramon Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. Contra Costa County Employees' Retirement Assn. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 343, 350-351, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 724]* . Another California Court of Appeal held that an objecting party waived the right to claim that the appealing party failed to exhaust administrative remedies because the objecting party failed to raise this issue in the trial court [*DuFauchard v. U.S. Financial Management, Inc. (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1502, 1511-1513, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 615*]. The Court of Appeal also held that a county retirement board's decision to adopt new employer contribution amounts for employees of a county fire protection district was not an act to further the board's right of petition or free speech within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16* (commonly known as the anti-SLAPP statute), and thus the Board could not seek dismissal of the District's lawsuit against the board based on that statute [*San Ramon Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. Contra Costa County Employees' Retirement Assn. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 343, 357-358, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 724]* .

[d] Estoppel

The Court of Appeal held that the defense of equitable estoppel did not apply to prohibit the County of Los Angeles retirement agency from reclassifying deputy district attorneys as general members for retirement purposes even though

attorneys had previously been employed as deputy sheriffs, and properly had safety member classification at that time. Change in status of employment changed retirement system member status. County lacked authority to continue to classify attorneys as safety members, and thus equitable estoppel defense was not applicable against county [*Medina v. Board of Retirement Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 864, 870-871, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 634]* . Another Court of Appeal held that the defense of equitable estoppel did not apply to prohibit the Victim's Compensation and Government Claims Board from asserting the defense of statute of limitations (based on the three-year statute of limitations from the date of the crime) to deny two crime victims compensation from the crime victim restitution fund. The victims' estoppel claim was based on the failure of the law enforcement officers to inform the victims of the availability of restitution claim funds [*Moore v. State Bd. of Control (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 371, 384-386]* . Another court of appeal held that the estoppel defense did not apply to prohibit a county board of appeals from raising a statute of limitations defense to a challenge to the granting of a building permit [*Honig v. San Francisco Planning Dept. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 520, 529-530, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 649]* . The actions of a subordinate government agency cannot provide the basis for an estoppel defense against the government agency that has the authority to review the subordinate agency [*Independent Roofing Contractors v. California Apprenticeship Council (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1330, 1337-1338, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 477]* . Equitable estoppel was not recognized as a defense when the asserting party could not prove injurious reliance [*State Water Resources Control Board Cases (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 818-820, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189]* .

The Court of Appeal recognized the defense of equitable estoppel and held that a county employer was equitably estopped from asserting the defense of exhaustion of administrative remedies for a wrongful termination lawsuit brought by a former county employee who alleged unlawful retaliation for disclosing wrongful conduct by other county employees. The court recognized the estoppel defense based on the negligent acts of county employees that led the former employee to conclude that there was no administrative remedy available to her before she filed her lawsuit [*Shuer v. County of San Diego (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 476, 486-487, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 776]* .

The Court of Appeal held that a city was estopped from arguing that a landowner's failure to bring an administrative mandate action bars the landowner's right to recover damages for the value of property from the city in a condemnation proceeding. The city was estopped because it had illegally violated a preliminary injunction granted against it prohibiting the very action, building a curb that eliminated a driveway and a parking space, the lawfulness of which could have been determined by a writ of administrative mandate. The city was also estopped because it elected to file a condemnation lawsuit against the landowner, and that was a remedy that was inconsistent with the argument that the landowner must file an administrative mandate action to determine whether the city's building action was lawful. Finally, the city was estopped because the landowner, in filing an action for a permanent injunction against the city, was complying with the substance of an administrative mandate action requirement [*Hurwitz v. City of Orange (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 835, 843, 845-846,19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 213]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the California Department of Corrections was not estopped from challenging the jurisdiction of the juvenile court by sending a form letter to a mother telling her that she would have to seek a court order from the juvenile court to enforce visitation rights of her children with their incarcerated father. The rule invoking estoppel against a party that files a lawsuit in a court and later seeks to attack that court's jurisdiction was not applicable because the CDC did not file a lawsuit in this court [*Robin J. v. Superior Court (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 414, 422-423, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417]* .

The California Supreme Court held that the City of Goleta was not estopped to deny approval of a developer's subdivision's map because no city official expressly represented that it would give approval. Also, the city's adoption of county ordinances at the time the city incorporated did not create a reasonable expectation on the developer's part that its final subdivision map would receive ministerial approval by the city [City of Goleta v. Superior court *(2006) 40 Cal. 4th 270, 279-281, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 114, 147 P. 3d 1037]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a county was subject to estoppel based on the language used in a claim rejection letter under the procedures required by the California Tort Claims Act. The language of the letter estopped the county for asserting the defense of statutes of limitation under

the Tort Claims Act [*Sofranek v. Merced County (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1250-1252, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426* (claim rejection letter language was reasonably relied upon by claimant who filed his lawsuit consistent with reasonable understanding of six-month limitations language in second claim rejection letter)]. The Second District Division 7 California Court of Appeal held that a litigant who challenged the subject matter jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission on judicial review was estopped to contest that jurisdiction by participating fully in the administrative proceedings before the commission without contesting the Commission's jurisdiction [*Mt. Holyoke Homes, LP v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 830, 842-843, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 452*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureEquityMaximsClean Hands PrincipleCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsEquitable EstoppelGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsWaivers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.15

§ 474.15 Res Judicata and the Failure to Seek Judicial Review

A final administrative decision on the merits, like a final judicial decision on the merits, has res judicata effect, and failure to seek judicial review of an agency's decision will prevent any later challenge to the merits of that decision in a collateral proceeding [*Monroe v. Trustees of the California State Colleges (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 399, 405-406, 99 Cal. Rptr. 129, 491 P.2d 1105* ; *Stockton v. Department of Employment (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 264, 267-268, 153 P.2d 741* ; *California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1493, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567* ; *Knickerbocker v. City of Stockton (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 235, 243-244, 244 Cal. Rptr. 764]* . A party adversely affected by an administrative decision should therefore carefully weigh the consequences before deciding not to seek judicial review.

Similarly, the failure of a party to appeal a superior court judgment granting a peremptory writ of mandate to the court of appeal waives the litigant's right to challenge the terms of the judgment in a later appeal in the same matter [*Carson Gardens L.L.C. v. City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 856, 866-867, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 768* (rent review board was unable to challenge requirement that it use mortgage interest costs as part of fair rate of return analysis for rent increase because this was required as part of the terms of the judgment)].

Res judicata bars not only those claims actually litigated in a prior proceeding, but also those that could have been litigated as part of that cause of action [*California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1499, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567]* . A CEQA cause of action that was litigated to a final judgment in a prior administrative proceeding that was then judicially reviewed in court precludes the same challenge to the adequacy of the same EIR in a later administrative and judicial proceeding absent some significant change in material facts. The adequacy of an EIR under CEQA involves the same cause of action and the same primary right when the EIR was prepared by a city as part of the city's general plan adoption [*Federation of Hillside and Canyon Ass'ns v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1195, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 543* (city's adoption of general plan for land use and development is legislative act reviewable by writ of ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*)]. Claim preclusion did not apply to preclude a police officer's second writ of administrative mandate proceeding against her employer based on the affirmance by the Court of Appeal of the denial of a prior administrative mandate petition. This is because the two petitions did not involve the same primary right [*Pitts v. City of Sacramento (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 853, 856-857, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 838]* .

A former employee who challenged her dismissal from a private university alleged fraud and breach of contract claims in both her first and second lawsuit. The appellate court ruling in the first lawsuit that the former employee's exclusive remedy to challenge dismissal was by filing an administrative mandamus lawsuit was a final judgment on the merits that precluded her filing a second lawsuit asserting the same claims for fraud and breach of contract. The second lawsuit and those claims were barred under res judicata grounds by the final judgment in the prior lawsuit [*Pollock v. Univ. of S. Cal. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1416, 1427-1428, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 122]* .

A former tenured professor at a private university who challenged his dismissal from his tenured position alleged both tort and breach of contract claims in a civil lawsuit against the university. The Court of Appeal held that the professor's claims were barred by the doctrine of exhaustion of judicial remedies because the professor failed to challenge his dismissal by bringing a writ of administrative mandamus action against the university in superior court [*Gutkin v. University of So. Cal. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 967, 979-980, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115]* . A student at a private university who was suspended for cheating challenged the action of the university by filing a lawsuit against the university alleging both tort and breach of contract claims. The Court of Appeal held that the student's claims were barred by the doctrine of exhaustion of judicial remedies because the student failed to challenge the discipline decision by filing a writ of administrative mandate proceeding against the university in superior court [*Gupta v. Stanford Univ. (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 407, 411-412, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 192]* .

A former employee of Los Angeles County Probation Department brought a disability discrimination claim against her employer. She filed a grievance with the County Civil Service Commission and completed the hearing process, and the hearing officer issued a decision that was adverse to her claims. While she challenged the hearing office recommended findings before the Commission, she did not file a petition for a writ of administrative mandate to overturn the Commission's final decision. Rather, she filed a complaint for discrimination with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH), received a right-to-sue letter, and then filed a civil lawsuit against the Probation Department for disability discrimination in violation of the FEHA [*Gov. Code § 12940(a)*]. Her civil lawsuit was filed before the commission had issued a final decision in her grievance action. The Court of Appeal held that the employee's FEHA lawsuit was barred because she failed to exhaust administrative and judicial remedies by failing to file a petition for a writ of administrative mandate to challenge the commission final decision [*Page v. Los Angeles County Probation Dept. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1142-1143, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . In so holding, the Court of Appeal cited and relied upon California Supreme Court decisions in *Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 72, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 5 P.3d 874* and *Schifando v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1074, 1088, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 457, 79 P.3d 569* . The Court of Appeal noted that the employee made a choice as to the forum to assert her discrimination claims, the civil service commission, but failed to exhaust the administrative and judicial remedies related to that forum [*Page v. Los Angeles County Probation Dept. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1142-1143, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* .

The res judicata effects of a final, unappealed administrative decision are not altered by the fact that the judgment was wrong or that it rested on a legal principle later overruled [*California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1498, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567]* .

An agency decision is not final for purposes of res judicata and collateral estoppel until the statute of limitations for filing judicial challenges to the agency decision has expired [*Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 170, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449]* .

A party's failure to challenge adverse findings of a quasi-judicial administrative agency proceeding by means of a mandate action in the superior court means that those findings are binding in a later civil action [*Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 484, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410]* . When a public employee files discrimination claims against a public employer based on the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) [*Gov. Code § 12900*], and based on Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) [*42 U.S.C. § 2000e*], the employee's failure to have the public employer agency's final adverse findings judicially reviewed and set aside

means that those adverse findings are binding on the public employee in a later civil action as to claims under the California FEHA, but the adverse findings are not binding as to claims under Title VII. [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 65-66, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 5 P.3d 874]* .

A related issue is whether a litigant may challenge by writ of administrative mandate a disciplinary sanction that was negotiated in a settlement to which the litigant agreed in the administrative proceeding. Settlements of administrative discipline proceedings are binding on the employee who agreed to the settlement, absent fraud, mistake, undue influence, or duress [*Zazueta v. County of San Bernadino (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 106, 110, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678* (employee's agreement to arbitrate disciplinary proceeding, which led to termination of employee, could not be challenged by writ of mandate); *Stermer v. Board of Dental Examiners (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 128, 135-136, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 294* (licensee who stipulated to settlement of disciplinary proceedings may not challenge by writ of mandate discipline imposed under settlement even though underlying criminal conviction was later set aside)], particularly in cases in which the employee agreed to a less serious form of discipline in the settlement, and thereby avoided termination from employment [*Alhambra Police Officers Assn. v. City of Alhambra Police Dept. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1413, 1420-1421, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 432]* .

For further discussion of the application of res judicata to administrative proceedings, see *Ch. 473F, Agency Adjudication Hearings, § 473F.41*. For general discussion of the principles governing res judicata and collateral estoppel, see Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Review by Writ of Mandate

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474.16-474.19

[Reserved]

§§ 474.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Review in Other Actions and Proceedings

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.20

§ 474.20 Review by Other Extraordinary Writs

[1] Prohibition

The issuance of a writ of prohibition restrains an official or body exercising judicial powers from acting in excess of its jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1102*; *Bird v. Justice Court (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 674, 677, 6 Cal. Rptr. 502]* . Prohibition is no longer available to control the proceedings of local agencies and state agencies of legislative origin [*Aronoff v. Franchise Tax Board (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 177, 181-182, 32 Cal. Rptr. 1, 383 P.2d 409* ; Whitten v. California State Board, etc. *(1937) 8 Cal. 2d 444, 445-446, 65 P.2d 1296]* , because the California Supreme Court has held that these agencies do not possess judicial powers [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 42-44, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 565, 59 P.2d 119]* . Although in theory prohibition may be used to restrain proceedings by an administrative agency that has been constitutionally vested with judicial powers [*see, e.g., Bartosh v. Bd. of Osteopathic Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 486, 488-489, 186 P.2d 984]* , this use of the writ is extremely rare. For a more detailed discussion of the writ of prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[2] Certiorari

The writ of certiorari, also called the writ of review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1067*] lies to annul and prevent enforcement of a completed judicial act of an official or body that has exceeded its jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1068, 1071, 1074*; *Estrin v. Superior Court (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 670, 674-675, 96 P.2d 340]* . Because it has been held that local agencies and statewide agencies of legislative origin do not possess judicial powers [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 42-44, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 565, 59 P.2d 119]* , certiorari is no longer available to review their actions and decisions [*Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 565, 59 P.2d 119]* . Although certiorari is still proper in some cases to review orders and decisions of statewide agencies of constitutional origin when it is claimed they have exceeded their jurisdiction [*see Sail'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1, 7, 95 Cal. Rptr. 329, 485 P.2d 529]* , even this use of the writ has been largely supplanted by the writ of mandate [*cf. Sail'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1, 7, 95 Cal. Rptr. 329, 485 P.2d 529]* . For a more detailed discussion of the writ of certiorari, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of*.

[3] Extraordinary Writ

Bus. & Prof. Code § 2337 authorizes preferential review by the superior court of decisions to revoke, suspend, or restrict physicians' licenses. These cases are given priority in trial or hearing setting, and there is a requirement that the hearing or trial be set within 180 days from the filing of the action. Continuances can only be granted upon good cause. Review of the superior court's decision in the appellate process is by a petition for an extraordinary writ [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2337*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2337* provides for review of the superior court decision, not by direct appeal, but by a petition for extraordinary writ. *Bus. &Prof. Code § 2337* does not violate the appellate jurisdiction clause of the California Constitution, *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 11*, which provides for appellate jurisdiction by the courts of appeal in cases where the superior courts have original jurisdiction [*Leone v. Medical Board of California (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 660, 664-665, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 995 P.2d 191]* . A litigant who seeks appellate review of the superior court's denial of a petition for a writ of mandate to set aside the Medical Board of California's decision to place a physician on two years probation for unprofessional conduct must proceed by petition for an extraordinary writ under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2337*. When a litigant erroneously files an appeal of the superior court judgment, the appellate court will treat the improper appeal as a proper extraordinary writ when the issue on appeal is a question of law, the issue has been thoroughly briefed by the litigants, and the issue has not been previously decided [*Zabetian v. Medical Board of California (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 462, 465-467, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* ; *Conlan v. Shewry (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1354, 1365-1366, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 667* (appeal from nonappealable order treated as petition for extraordinary relief)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Review in Other Actions and Proceedings

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.21

§ 474.21 Action for Declaratory Relief

An action for declaratory relief may not be used either:

- To review an adjudicative order or decision [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 126-127, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111]* ; or

- To adjudicate the rights of a specific party who has an adequate administrative remedy [*Taylor v. Swanson (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 416, 418, 187 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

Declaratory relief is not available to review adjudicatory orders that are reviewable by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*] under administrative mandamus [*County of Los Angeles v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 985, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 619, 631-632]* .

An action for declaratory relief may, however, be used to obtain a determination of the constitutionality or validity of statutes, ordinances, or regulations under which an administrative entity operates [*Olszewski v. Scripps Health (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 798, 807-808, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 69 P.3d 927* ; *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 682, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032* ; *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Environmental Defense Project of Sierra County v. County of Sierra (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 877, 884-886, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 474* (actual controversy requirement met because parties disagreed on proper interpretation of planning and zoning law and whether streamlined zoning process violates provisions of the government code); *Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency v. Amrhein (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 1364, 1377-1378, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 484* (declaratory relief proceeding available when validation proceeding is not available); *Connerly v. Schwarzenegger (2006) 146 Cal. App. 4th 739, 746-748, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203* (actual controversy required for declaratory relief; challenge mooted by invalidation of statute in another lawsuit); *Levi v. O'Connell (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 700, 705-706, 50 Cal. Rptr.3d 691* (declaratory relief requirements satisfied because actual current controversy existed between mother of gifted minor child and California Department of Education over department's constitutional and statutory obligations to fund an appropriate education for child); *Viacom Outdoor, Inc. v. City of Arcata (2006)*

140 Cal. App. 4th 230, 234, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300 (declaratory judgment sought to determine whether city ordinance requiring city permit to rebuild billboards destroyed in windstorm was preempted by state law, Outdoor Advertising Act; Court of Appeal held that city ordinance was not preempted by state law); *Andal v. City of Stockton (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 86, 88-89, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34* (declaratory relief action brought by cell phone companies and their customers to challenge constitutionality of city ordinance imposing local government fee on cell phone users to fund city's 911 communication system); *City of Arcadia v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1401-1402, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* (challenge to validity of trash total maximum daily load (TDML) standard under water pollution control laws); *Martin v. City and County of San Francisco (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 392, 408, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 470* (challenge to applicability of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process to interior remodeling of private home that was historic landmark); *Lane v. City of Redondo Beach (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 251, 255, 122 Cal. Rptr. 189* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaratory relief)]. An action for declaratory relief can properly be brought to challenge the approval of a health care service plan by the Department of Managed Health Care. This challenge provides an actual controversy suitable for resolution by a claim for declaratory relief [*Viola v. Dept. of Managed Health Care (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 373, 379, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 821* (plaintiffs challenged approval of health plans with mandatory binding arbitration clauses claiming that these clauses violated the right to a civil jury trial)]. *Gov. Code § 11350* expressly provides that any interested person may bring a declaratory relief action to obtain a judicial determination of the validity of any administrative regulation governed by the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA). For discussion of judicial review of rulemaking procedures, see Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* . The APA is located in *Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*

In a proper case, an action for declaratory relief may be joined with a petition for mandate [*City of Arcadia v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1409, 1426, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* (decision to adopt trash total maximum daily load standard (TDML plan) as part of regional water quality control plan was quasi-legislative action reviewable under ordinary mandate, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085;* cities could also seek declaratory relief challenging validity of plan but scope of declaratory relief was limited to matters as to which there is a present controversy); *Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 574, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664* (declaratory relief claim asserting constitutional challenge to zoning ordinance that could not be raised in administrative mandate proceeding properly joined with mandate proceeding seeking review of decision on application for land use permit); *Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc v. Helliker (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1145, 1164, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 191* (litigant filed complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief coupled with petition for writ of mandate. The California Court of Appeal upheld a modified declaratory judgment issued by the *Superior Court); Johnson v. City and County of San Francisco (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 7, 12-13, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 8* (property owners sought declaratory relief and a writ of mandate to challenge notice provisions of city and county rental ordinance on grounds that provisions were preempted by state law)]. Declaratory relief is not available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* when there is no actual controversy. Ripeness is required for declaratory relief [*Stonehouse Homes v. City of Sierra Madre (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 531, 539-541, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223* (declaratory relief action was not ripe when developer challenged planning commission decision while developer was also appealing decision to city council; the dispute between the developer and the city council was neither concrete enough for declaratory relief nor was there hardship to the developer from not providing declaratory relief at this time)].

A medical device manufacturer (Baxter) that manufactured prescription medical devices which contained a chemical plasticizer (DEHP) that came into contact with the human body filed an administrative petition with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) asking OEHHA to promulgate a regulation determining that DEHP exposure did not pose a significant risk of cancer in humans, and therefore Baxter would be exempt from having to post a warning under the requirements of Proposition 65 [*Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(c)*]. OEHHA denied the petition, and Baxter filed a petition for a writ of mandate, which the trial court denied on grounds that neither Proposition 65 nor OEHHA regulations required the agency to promulgate regulations or make findings that DEHP did not provide a significant risk of cancer in humans. The trial court allowed Baxter to amend its complaint to request declaratory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* to seek the same type of relief, essentially a declaration that exposure to DEHP in Baxter's medical device products did not create a significant risk of cancer in humans, and therefore no

warning of such exposure was required under exemptions recognized by the law [*Health & Safety Code § 25249.10(c)*]. The trial court granted that declaratory judgment, and the Court of Appeal affirmed the judgment for declaratory relief [*Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Denton (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 333, 344-345, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 430]* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingRule Application & InterpretationValidityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsScopeCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Review in Other Actions and Proceedings

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.22

§ 474.22 Action for Injunctive Relief

When available administrative remedies are inadequate to protect a party from imminent and irreparable injury, injunctive relief may be granted to restrain a threatened administrative action or to restrain the enforcement of an administrative decision [*Associated Cal. Loggers, Inc. v. Kinder (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 34, 45, 144 Cal. Rptr. 786* ; *Heyenga v. City of San Diego (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 756, 760, 156 Cal. Rptr. 496]* . For a discussion of the use of temporary restraining orders by the attorney general's office, see Ch. 473D, *Prehearing Preparations in Agency Adjudications* . For a more detailed discussion of actions for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary Injunctions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Review in Other Actions and Proceedings

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.23

§ 474.23 Orders and Decisions Reviewable Under Special Constitutional and Statutory Provisions

[1] Decisions of the Public Utilities Commission

Judicial review of decisions of the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) may be obtained in either the California Supreme Court or in the California Courts of Appeal [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756-1759*]. An advocacy organization representing utility consumers challenged the Public Utility Commission's (PUC) acceptance of a settlement offer made by San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) as a means to resolve a pending federal lawsuit brought by SDG&E against the PUC. The organization filed a petition for a writ of review in the Court of Appeal. The court upheld the acceptance of the settlement by the PUC, and concluded that the agency decision to accept the settlement did not violate controlling statutes [*Pub. Util. Code § 332.1*] nor did it violate California Constitution [*Cal. Const., Art III, §§ 3, 3.5*] provisions [*Utility Consumers Action Network v. Public Utilities Com. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 644, 648-649, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 597]* . The City of St. Helena filed a petition for a writ of review in the Court of Appeal to seek annulment of Public Utility Commission (PUC) decisions that had conferred public utility status on the Napa Valley Wine Train, Inc. The California Court of Appeal granted annulment of the decisions, holding that the Wine Train did not qualify as a common carrier providing transportation and therefore was not subject to regulation by the PUC as a public utility [*City of St. Helena v. Public Utilities Comm'n (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 793, 796-797, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713]* . The California Court of Appeal granted a writ of review to determine the issue of whether the Public Utilities Commission's (PUC) statutory jurisdiction over railroad crossings under *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1201, 1202* applied to light rail transit crossings built by public transit districts. The court held that this jurisdiction did not apply, and the court annulled contrary PUC decisions [*Santa Clara Valley Trans. Authority v. PUC (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 346, 350-351, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 270]* . The California Court of Appeal denied a petition for a writ of review brought by wireless carriers to challenge a decision of the California Public Utilities Commission that imposed substantial fines against wireless service providers in California for unjust and unreasonable practices, including charging customers early termination fees to cancel contracts without permitting a grace period, for failing to disclose to customers known network problems and misleading customers regarding network coverage and service. The court rejected the carriers preemption argument and held that the provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, that preempt state and local regulation of market entry and rates charged by wireless mobile telephone providers [*47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3)(A)*] did not preempt decisions by the California Public Utilities Commission.

The California Supreme Court also upheld the imposition of substantial fines against the wireless carriers, and rejected due process arguments against the imposition of fines [*Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 728, 729, 747, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733]* .

Another California Court of Appeal granted a petition for a writ of review brought by energy utilities regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. The utilities challenged the PUC decision to require payment of prevailing wages to workers on utility construction projects. The court upheld that challenge based on the PUC's failure to follow its own procedural rules. The PUC failed to raise the prevailing wage issue in the initial scoping memo that identifies the issues to be addressed in the rulemaking proceeding and this failure violated provisions of the PUC's own procedural rules. The PUC's failure to follow its own procedural rules meant that the PUC failed to proceed in the manner required by law [*Cal. Code Regs., tit. 20, § 6.3*; *So. Cal. Edison Co. v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1104-1106, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485]* . The court rejected a federal preemption challenge brought by the companies and held that the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act [*29 U.S.C. §§ 151-160*] did not preempt decisions of the California Public Utilities Commission requiring public utilities to pay prevailing wages to workers on energy utility construction projects. The prevailing wage requirement is a substantive employment term that does not impact collective bargaining or employee organizing efforts [*So. Cal. Edison Co. v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1100-1102*]. For a discussion of review of decisions of the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* .

[2] Decisions of the State Bar

Disciplinary actions taken by the State Bar may be reviewed either by the California Supreme Court or by a California Court of Appeal in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the California Supreme Court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6082*]. For a discussion of review of State Bar disciplinary actions, see Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* .

[3] Orders, Rules, and Decisions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board

Orders, rules, and decisions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) are reviewable only in a proceeding for a writ of review in the California Supreme Court or in the California Courts of Appeal [*Lab. Code §§ 5950-5955*]. The legislative history of *Lab. Code § 5955* establishes that the superior courts do not have jurisdiction to review any decisions or order of the Industrial Accident Commission (now WCAB) [*Loustalot v. Superior Court (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 905, 910, 186 P. 2d 673]* . The superior court lacked jurisdiction to issue a writ of administrative mandamus directed to the WCAB whose decisions may only be reviewed by the court of appeal, or the supreme court. The writ was sought by a former public employee who sought disability retirement benefits from PERS, and who challenged in superior court the WCAB's decision that it did not have jurisdiction to decide whether the employee's disability was caused by her job. The court of appeal concluded that the superior court lacked jurisdiction to issue the writ [*Abraham v. Worker's Compensation Appeals Board (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1087-1088, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 820]* . For further discussion of review of decisions of the WCAB, see Ch. 577, *Worker's Compensation* . For extensive coverage of WCAB proceedings and judicial review of them, see Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Worker's Compensation (Matthew Bender).

[4] Orders of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board

Orders of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board may be reviewed only in a proceeding for a writ of review in the California Supreme Court or in the court of appeal for the district in which the proceeding arose [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090-23090.5*]. For a discussion of review of orders of the Alcoholic Beverage Controls Appeals Board, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* .

[5] Orders of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board

Judicial review of an order of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board can be obtained only by filing a petition requesting that the order be modified or set aside in the court of appeal for the appellate district in which the subject

unfair labor practice was alleged to have been committed [*Lab. Code § 1160.8*].

[6] Certain Orders and Determinations of the Public Employment Relations Board

Unit determinations and unfair practice case orders made by the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) may be reviewed only by way of a petition for an extraordinary writ in the court of appeal for the appellate district in which the unit determination or unfair practice dispute occurred [*Gov. Code §§ 3520(c), 3542(c), 3564(c)*]. For extensive coverage of these proceedings and judicial review of them, see California Public Sector Relations (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesLabor & Employment LawCollective Bargaining & Labor RelationsUnfair Labor PracticesGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsSanctionsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppealsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Review in Other Actions and Proceedings

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474.24-474.29

[Reserved]

§§ 474.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.30

§ 474.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to forms for judicial review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

155 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.31

§ 474.31 Federal Constitution

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *U.S. Const., amend. IV*

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.32

§ 474.32 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*

Separation of powers doctrine. *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*

Jurisdiction to give extraordinary relief. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.33

§ 474.33 State Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act. *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*

Allocation of burden of proof. *Evid. Code § 500*

Amendment of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)*

Answers to complaints generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-431.30*

Appeals in civil actions and proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 901-914, 1109-1110b*

Authority of court to adopt suitable procedure where none specifically provided by statute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 187*

Certiorari. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1109*

Civil actions and proceedings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et. seq.*

Contempt. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*

Copies of pleadings are required to be served on adverse parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 465*

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021 et. seq.*

Demurrers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10-430.80*

Demurrer raises issue of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 589*

Discovery. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016.010-2036.050*

Effect of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Effect of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*

Entry of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*

Fee for transcribing record. *Gov. Code § 69950*

Filing initial pleading begins proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 350, 411.10*

Filing of various papers constitutes appearance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*

Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107-1109*

New trials. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 656-663.2*

Power of court to impanel jury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*

Prohibition. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1102-1105, 1107-1109*

Recovery of attorney's fees when administrative action arbitrary or capricious. *Gov. Code § 800*

Recovery of litigation expenses, including attorney's fees, by small business or licensee when agency action undertaken without substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Review of administrative decision by mandate proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Review of decisions by Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (and Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control). *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090-23090.2*

Review of decisions by Board of Governors of State Bar or Committee of Bar Examiners. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6082*

Review of decision by local housing enforcement agency to abate nuisance; independent judgment test. *Health & Safety Code § 17980.8*

Review of decisions by Public Utilities Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756, 1759*

Review of decisions by Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board. *Lab. Code § 5950*

Right to demur to answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.20*

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-417.40*

Special proceedings and actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 20-23*

Testimony in subsequent civil proceeding of person presiding at quasi-judicial proceeding. *Evid. Code § 703.5*

Time limitations on review of local agency decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Writ as order in writing issued in name of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.34

§ 474.34 Decisions

[1] Generally

Scope of court's inquiry extends to whether administrative agency proceeded without or in excess of jurisdiction, whether there was fair trial, and whether there was prejudicial abuse of discretion. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 675, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484* *SaveOxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 148-149, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Unimportance of plaintiff's pleading being in form of petition for mandate when proper basis for issuance of mandamus is alleged. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 673, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not possessed of separate and distinctive legal personality and is not removed from general law of mandamus or exempted from established principles, requirements, and limitations of general law of mandamus. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 673-674, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is appropriate procedure for review of administrative order or decision resulting from adjudicatory proceeding. *Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 849, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623 P.2d 180*

Administrative decision is generally reviewable in proceeding for writ of mandate. *Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 82-85, 87 P.2d 848* ; Whitten v. California State Board, etc. *(1937) 8 Cal. 2d 444, 445-446, 65 P.2d 1296* (prohibition proceeding as inappropriate); *Standard Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 562-565, 59 P.2d 119* (certiorari proceeding as inappropriate)

Proceeding is occasionally subject to principles generally applied in criminal proceedings. *Bravo v. Cabell (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 834, 838-840, 114 Cal. Rptr. 618, 523 P.2d 658*

Adjudicatory decisions of all agencies, state and local, with few exceptions, are subject to review in mandate

proceeding governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Topanga Ass'n for a Scenic Community v. Los Angeles County (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514 n. 12, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 101, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 397, 184 P.2d 323*

Proceeding is subject to equitable considerations even though generally classified as legal proceeding. *San Diego County Dep't of Public Welfare v. Superior Court of San Diego County (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 101 Cal. Rptr. 541, 496 P.2d 453* ; *Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 795, 136 P.2d 304*

Court's inquiry is limited to whether administrative decision was legally wrong; question of propriety, wisdom, or the like, is not proper for judicial inquiry. *Faulkner v. Cal. Toll Bridge Authority (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 329, 253 P.2d 659*

Trial court is without power to cure agency's improper findings or to substitute its discretion for that of agency regarding form of discipline. *American Funeral Concepts v. Board of Funeral Directors & Embalmers (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 303, 311, 186 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is available to provide review whenever agency exercises adjudicatory function in considering facts presented in administrative hearing. *Jabola v. Pasadena Redevelopment Agency (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 931, 934, 178 Cal. Rptr. 452*

Mandate proceeding for review of administrative decision is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.3, now see Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et. seq.* as well as *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107,* and *1108*. *Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 270, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328*

Writ of mandate is permitted to be issued when there is a clear, present, and usually ministerial duty on defendant's part and clear, present, and beneficial right in plaintiff to performance of that duty. *Goldfarb v. Civil Service Com. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 633, 635, 275 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Mandate is appropriate remedy to compel exercise of discretion by government officer, but is not available to control exercise of discretion unless, under facts of case, discretion can be exercised in only one way. *Pacific Bell v. California State & Consumer Services Agency (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 107, 118, 275 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Although court may compel administrative agency to act, court is not permitted to substitute its discretion for discretion properly vested in agency. *Vega v. City of West Hollywood (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1342, 1352, 273 Cal. Rptr. 243*

Courts are recommended to let administrative boards and officers work out their problems with as little judicial interference as possible. *Vega v. City of West Hollywood (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1342, 1352, 273 Cal. Rptr. 243*

Acts in excess of power conferred on agency by Constitution or statute are void and mandate is available to nullify or rescind such acts. *Brooks v. State Personnel Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1068, 1072, 272 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not available to review quasi-legislative determination of governmental body, such as adoption of redevelopment plan. *Leach v. City of San Marcos (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 648, 656, 261 Cal. Rptr. 805*

When parties have proceeded under wrong writ of mandate, such as proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (traditional mandate) when they should have proceeded under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandate), reviewing court is required to determine whether trial court considered appropriate evidence and applied appropriate standard of review, based on facts of case. *Eureka Teacher's Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 366, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240*

Administrative mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is required to be used in all writ cases challenging validity of any final administrative order or decision made in any proceeding in which by law, expressly or impliedly, (1) hearing is required, (2) evidence is required to be taken, and (3) discretion in determining facts is vested in inferior board. *Eureka Teacher's Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 361, 362, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240*

Administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not granted when administrative order or decision did not result from proceeding in which, by law, hearing was required at which evidence was required to be taken; review of such order or decision, if any, is by traditional mandate. *TaylorBus Service, Inc. v. San Diego Bd. of Education (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1331, 1339, 241 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Action by real parties in interest for malicious prosecution based on mandate proceedings that resulted in order remanding matter for reconsideration with respect to correctness of standard used to assess evidence is precluded because petitioner prevailed on its procedural challenge, even though its petition was ultimately denied. *Sierra Club v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1138, 1144-1147, 214 Cal. Rptr. 740*

[2] Acts Subject to Judicial Review

Traditional mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* and not administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is appropriate method of review of denial of claim from Client Security Fund (*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6140.5*), because of absence of clear statutory requirement for hearing on claim or of record sufficient for *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* review, and because writ petition to Supreme Court was fundamental challenge to Bar's adoption of Rules of Procedure, Rules 670-688 (*now see* State Bar Rules of Procedure, Client Security Fund Matters, Rules 1-25) and thus was challenge to Bar's quasi-legislative actions. *Saleeby v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 547, 561, 216 Cal. Rptr. 367, 702 P.2d 525* ; *Bollengier v. Doctors Medical Center (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1115, 1124, 272 Cal. Rptr. 273*

Traditional mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, rather than administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, is appropriate method of review of nonadjudicatory administrative actions. *Personnel Com. v. Board of Education (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1466, 273 Cal. Rptr. 288*

Judicial intervention is warranted in traditional mandamus proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* when public entity adopts rule or makes policy decision of general application that is shown to be arbitrary, capricious, contrary to public policy, unlawful, or procedurally unfair. *Personnel Com. v. Board of Education (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1466, 273 Cal. Rptr. 288*

Appellate court is authorized to treat traditional mandamus proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* as if it were administrative mandamus proceeding brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* if latter code section applies. *Bollengier v. Doctors Medical Center (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1115, 1125, 272 Cal. Rptr. 273*

Traditional mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, rather than administrative mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, is proper method for reviewing quasi-legislative proceeding in which no hearing was required by law. *Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1212, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762*

Administrative mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, rather than traditional mandate procedure, is proper to challenge validity of school board's change of student's grade under *Educ. Code §§ 49066, 49067*, and *49070*. *Eureka Teacher's Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 361, 362, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240*

City's decision to grant or deny development allotment prerequisite to grant of building permit under growth limitation ordinance is quasi-judicial function, despite potential impact on planning decisions, and reviewable in action under

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5. *Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 176-177, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670*

Administrative mandamus is not appropriate remedy to review quasi-legislative actions of administrative agencies; such acts are reviewable only by action for declaratory relief or traditional mandamus. *Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 168-169, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P.2d 306*

Existence of ripe controversy is basic prerequisite to judicial review of administrative acts; adoption of guidelines formulating general policy intended to govern future decisions, as opposed to application of rules to peculiar facts of individual case, does not meet ripeness requirement. *Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 168-169, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P.2d 306*

Writ of mandamus is appropriate for inquiry into validity of any final administrative order or decision made as result of proceeding in which hearing is required to be given, evidence is required to be taken, and discretion in determination of facts is vested in inferior tribunal. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 675, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Review governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is available only where all conditions imposed by that section exist. *Keeler v. Superior Court of Sacramento County (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 596, 599, 297 P.2d 967* ; *Winkelman v. City of Tiburon (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 834, 840, 108 Cal. Rptr. 415*

Compliance by State Board of Control with claims procedure used by persons erroneously convicted and imprisoned for felonies is subject to review pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* because statutory procedures are quasi-adjudicative and favorable recommendation by board is valuable property right. *Diola v. State Board of Control (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 580, 585-586, 185 Cal. Rptr. 511*

Decision by State Board of Control on low bidder's protest of public procurement contract award is reviewable in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* administrative mandate proceedings. *National Coach Corp. v. State Bd. of Control (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 750, 755, 187 Cal. Rptr. 261*

Decision of county board of supervisors not to designate hospital as "tertiary center" for treatment of severe trauma injuries is legislative act not affecting or ascertaining any vested or existing right and reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* rather than *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Santa Ana Tustin Community Hospital v. Board of Supervisors (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 644, 653-654, 179 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Administrative mandamus is improper method for review of State Board of Control decision rejecting plaintiff's Medi-Cal claims, since administrative mandamus is only available to correct decisions which impose tax, disciplinary burden, suspension of employment, or denial or revocation of a license or permit. *Royal Convalescent Hospital, Inc. v. State Board of Control (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 788, 794, 160 Cal. Rptr. 458*

[3] Finality of Decision

Review governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is available only when administrative decision is final. *California v. Superior Court (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 245, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281*

Conditional terms of administrative decision does not affect question whether it is final. *Ginns v. Savage (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 520, 525, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377, 393 P.2d 689* ; *Negaard v. Department of Aeronautics (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 92, 95, 107 Cal. Rptr. 920*

[4] Hearing Required by Law

Review governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not available when law did not require hearing before decision, even if hearing held. *No Oil, Inc. v. Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 74-75 n.3, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *Keeler v. Superior Court of Sacramento County (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 596, 599, 297 P.2d 967*

Hearing requirement refers to adjudicative hearing, not legislative hearing. *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*

Hearing is required by law when agency's regulation requires it even though no statute requires it. *Keeler v. Superior Court (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 596, 599, 297 P.2d 967*

Hearing is not required by law when law authorizes administrative action without hearing. *Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 271, 246 P.2d 656* ; *Fuchs v. Los Angeles County Civil Service Com. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 709, 714-715, 110 Cal. Rptr. 311*

Administrative mandamus is not available when regulation governing administrative appeal process contained no express provision requiring agency to hold formal hearing or to take and preserve testimony; implication of requirement of formal adjudication is improper when underlying proceeding is informal administrative action. *Wasko v. Department of Corrections (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 996, 1001, 259 Cal. Rptr. 764*

Court did not commit error in assuming that hearing is not required by law when neither party cited statute requiring hearing nor suggested that hearing is required by constitutional principles of due process. *California Ass'n of Highway Patrolmen v. Department of Personnel Admin. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 352, 359, 229 Cal. Rptr. 729*

Administrative mandamus review pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is limited to instances in which agency administrative hearing is required by law; administrative hearing not required by law is reviewable under traditional mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*. *Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 138-139, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212*

Hearing that could be granted at discretion of commission is not "required by law" for purposes of review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Weary v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 189, 195, 189 Cal. Rptr. 442*

Requirement for hearing, set out in agency's regulations, is not affected by agency's characterization of such hearing as in no sense a trial. *Poschman v. Dumke (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 932, 938, 107 Cal. Rptr. 596*

[5] Evidence Required to Be Taken

Requirement for hearing necessarily implies requirement that evidence be taken. *Boreta Enterprises, Inc. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 85, 104, 84 Cal. Rptr. 113, 465 P.2d 1* ; *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158, 217 P.2d 22* ; *La Prade v. Department of Water & Power (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 47, 52, 162 P.2d 13*

[6] Beneficial Interest

Necessity that applicant for writ of mandate be beneficially interested in issuance of writ. *Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6* ; *Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 270, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328*

Person who participated in administrative proceeding is beneficially interested in issuance of writ. *Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm'n (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 330, 109 P.2d 935* ; *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. California Coastal Zone Conservation Comm'n (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 76, 82-83, 129 Cal. Rptr. 57*

Organization is beneficially interested in issuance of writ when member directly affected by administrative decision. *International Asso. of Fire Fighters v. Palo Alto (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 295, 298, 32 Cal. Rptr. 842, 384 P.2d 170* ; *Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 121-130, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724*

County department of health has standing to bring petition for administrative mandate against county's civil service commission to reexamine penalties imposed on department's employees, because department has beneficial interest in subject matter of proceedings. *Department of Health Services v. Kennedy (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 799, 801-802, 209 Cal. Rptr. 595*

[7] Lack of Other Remedies

Mandate proceeding governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is prescribed remedy for review of most administrative adjudicatory decisions. *Sipper v. Urban (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 138, 144-145, 137 P.2d 425*

[8] Res Judicata

Rule of res judicata. *Price v. Sixth Dist. Agricultural Asso. (1927) 201 Cal. 502, 515, 258 P. 387*

Res judicata is applicable only when earlier decision involved identical issue, final judgment on merits, and same party or party in privity; WCAB finding of service connected disability is not binding on retirement board when board was neither party nor in privity with party to WCAB proceedings. *Kimbrough v. Police & Fire Retirement System (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1150-1152, 208 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Plea of res judicata is appropriate when judgment has once been given against petitioner on merits. *Ellenberger v. City of Oakland (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 6, 7, 288 P.2d 138* ; *Cohn v. Isensee (1920) 45 Cal. App. 509, 510-511, 188 P. 278*

Appellate court has discretion to hear petition for writ following judgment on merits against petitioner in superior court if remedy of appeal would not afford adequate relief. *Farley v. Healey (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 325, 326-327, 62 Cal. Rptr. 26, 431 P.2d 650* (issue related to upcoming election; appeal too slow)

Necessity to raise issue of res judicata; failure to raise issue deemed waiver of objection. *Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 638, 198 P.2d 1* ; *Vinot Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Pasadena (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 246, 251 n.1, 100 Cal. Rptr. 217*

[9] Limitation and Laches

Period within which petition must be filed is period of limitation, not jurisdictional requirement; rules of limitation applied in ordinary civil actions and proceedings are applicable. *Ginns v. Savage (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 520, 524, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377, 393 P.2d 689*

Limitation period is prescribed by either *Code Civ. Proc. § 338* (three years) or *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* (four years) if not otherwise prescribed. *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 357 n. 3, 82 Cal. Rptr.*

337, 461 P.2d 617 Request to agency for preparation of record [*Gov. Code § 11523*] has statutory effect of extending period of limitation if addressed to official reporter. *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 305-307, 196 P.2d 20*

In administrative mandate proceeding, respondent agency is estopped to assert statute of limitations for filing petition if its conduct caused petitioner to delay filing petition; some affirmative misleading conduct on agency's part is necessary to support finding of estoppel. *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1053, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286*

Failure of agency to respond to petitioner's inquiries concerning appeal of agency's decision is insufficient to estop agency from raising defense of statute of limitations on petitioner's late filing of administrative mandate petition when agency neither owed nor assumed duty to advise petitioner of his rights and therefore did not take unfair advantage of petitioner. *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1053, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286*

Ninety-day period for seeking judicial review of local agency decision (*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*) does not commence to run until agency provides notice pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f).* *Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 920, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97*

Statute of limitations for writ of mandate under *Gov. Code § 11523* is inapplicable when agency has not held formal hearing in compliance with *Administrative Procedure Act. Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1365-1366, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219*

Licensee whose untimely petition for writ of mandate to review revocation proceeding failed to survive demurrer based on *Gov. Code § 11523* (30-day statute of limitations) is unable to attack revocation collaterally by later petition challenging conditions on license reinstatement; licensee's claim that underlying revocation hearing was unconstitutional is still barred by *Gov. Code § 11523*, whether or not order sustaining demurrer had res judicata or collateral estoppel effect. *Miller v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 1376-1377, 238 Cal. Rptr. 915*

Statute of limitations for writ of mandate under *Gov. Code § 11523* applies to decision of local representative acting as delegate of board of administration of Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS). *Garner v. City of Riverside (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 510, 515516, 216 Cal. Rptr. 486*

Ninety-day filing period prescribed by *Veh. Code § 14401* is strictly enforced statute of limitations precluding avoidance on grounds of good cause. *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175-1176, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Time period within which mandamus petition must be filed is statute of limitations, and rules of law regarding limitations of actions are applicable to mandamus proceedings. *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Whether government agency's action is sufficiently culpable to estop it from asserting statute of limitations is dependent on whether agency acted in unconscionable manner or set out to take unfair advantage of plaintiff in advising plaintiff of his or her rights. *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1177, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Ninety-day statute of limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*, providing time within which review by mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* may be sought, is not subject to extension of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* when agency decision is served by mail. *Tielsch v. City of Anaheim (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 570, 578-580, 206 Cal. Rptr. 740*

Statute of limitations for writ of administrative mandate runs from time copy of agency's decision delivered or mailed to claimant; when copy of decision never sent to claimant, his attorney's examination of city's file on case constitutes constructive notice substantially equivalent to delivery of board's decision to claimant. *Collier v. City of Pasadena (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 917, 935, 191 Cal. Rptr. 681*

Ninety-day limitation period provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* is retroactively applicable to petition for writ of administrative mandate brought by discharged county employee, when city adopted *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* subsequent to discharge and hearing but notified plaintiff of 90-day limit within which to seek judicial review at time civil service commission adopted hearing officer's findings, thus affording plaintiff a reasonable time to exercise his remedy. *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 451-452, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Thirty-day filing period prescribed by *Gov. Code § 11523* is strictly enforced statute of limitations precluding avoidance on grounds of good cause, mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 794-795, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214*

Laches is available defense in appropriate case. *Hadley v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 389, 395, 105 Cal. Rptr. 500*

Nature of laches defense. *Conti v. Board of Civil Serv. Comm'rs (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 356-362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Vernon Fire Fighters Assn. v. City of Vernon (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 710, 719, 223 Cal. Rptr. 871* ; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 840, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817*

[10] Questions Not Presented to Agency

Agency is without power to determine constitutionality of act creating it. *Burrey v. Embarcadero Mun. Improvement Dist. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 671, 676 n. 4, 97 Cal. Rptr. 203, 488 P.2d 395*

Agency is without authority to determine validity of conviction on which discipline based. *Thomas v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 335, 337-338, 90 Cal. Rptr. 586, 475 P.2d 858* ; *Fitch v. Justice Court (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 492, 495, 101 Cal. Rptr. 227*

Administrative remedies are generally not exhausted unless every question, factual and legal, is presented to agency. *People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 88, 216 P.2d 441*

Public hearings, rather than appeal from judgment in writ proceeding regarding environmental impact report, is proper forum to raise new environmental concerns. *Save San Francisco Bay Ass'n v. San Francisco Bay Conservation Etc. Com. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 908, 935, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117*

Petitioner is not entitled to raise question on review that was not presented to agency unless omission to present is excusable. *Morris v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 110 Cal. Rptr. 630* ; *Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 545, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[11] Judicial Review

[a] Right

Legislature's act in conferring on Supreme Court exclusive jurisdiction to review certain decisions by State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (*see Pub. Res. Code § 25531*) is properly within Legislature's comprehensive powers over Public Utilities Commission matters under *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 5*; *County of Sonoma v.*

State Energy Resources Conservation etc. Com. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 361, 367-371, 220 Cal. Rptr. 114, 708 P.2d 693

Review in appellate court is generally unavailable for policy reasons except in unusual case. *Clean Air Constituency v. California State Air Resources Bd.(1974) 11 Cal. 3d 801, 808, 114 Cal. Rptr. 577, 523 P.2d 617* ; *Cohen v. Superior Court (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270-271, 72 Cal. Rptr. 814* (explaining policy)

Person wronged, or threatened with being wronged, by action of administrative agency has judicial remedy, even if no statute prescribes remedy. *Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm'n (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 325, 109 P.2d 935* ; *Mojave River Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court (1927) 202 Cal. 717, 729, 262 P. 724*

Administrative decision is not appealable to any court in California; statute providing for such appeal actually provides for original proceeding for review. *Collier & Wallis, Ltd. v. Astor (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 202, 204-205, 70 P.2d 171* ; *Mojave River Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court (1927) 202 Cal. 717, 724, 262 P. 724*

Court is required to consider merits of administrative mandamus petition alleging that administrative agency's decision was not supported by substantial evidence, even though relief through traditional mandate, not administrative mandate, was proper remedy for petitioner under facts of petitioner's case. *Coelho v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 968, 970-971, 257 Cal. Rptr. 557*

School district has standing under former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 2253.5* (*now see Gov. Code §§ 17500-17524*) to seek judicial review of State Board of Control's denial of district's claim for reimbursement of costs of complying with statutes that created Cal. OSHA and allegedly mandated reimbursement because, notwithstanding board's prior denial of similar claim by another school district in which no judicial review had been sought, whether Cal. OSHA law mandates reimbursable costs is question of law for court to decide. *Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. State of California (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 686, 688-692, 245 Cal. Rptr. 140*

Dismissal of public employee by redevelopment agency is subject to judicial review pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Jabola v. Pasadena Redevelopment Agency (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 931, 934-935, 178 Cal. Rptr. 452*

[b] Scope

Administrative decision on facts other than those establishing agency's jurisdiction is subject to independent judgment review by court only where decision substantially affects vested fundamental right and agency is not empowered by Constitution to exercise quasi-judicial power. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 44-45, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144-147, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Technical errors are to be disregarded on judicial review. *Schweiger v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 507, 517, 90 Cal. Rptr. 729, 476 P.2d 97* ; *Walsh v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 747, 748, 36 P.2d 1072*

Judicial review of internal agency matters is inappropriate in most cases. *Nelson v. Dean (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 873, 881, 168 P.2d 16*

Judicial review does not extend to question whether administrative decision was correct in sense of being wise, prudent, or good. *Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm'n (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 331, 109 P.2d 935* ; *McDonough v. Goodcell (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 741, 748, 91 P.2d 1035*

Administrative decision on legal question is subject to independent judgment review by court. *Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm'n (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 325-327, 109 P.2d 935*

Administrative decision based on incorrect understanding of law is not erroneous for that reason if correct on any legal theory. *Bank of Italy v. Johnson (1926) 200 Cal. 1, 28-29, 251 P. 784* ; *Ward v. Flood (1874) 48 Cal. 36, 47*

Judicial interference with agency's exercise of discretion is inappropriate in absence of evidence of fraud, corruption, improper motives or influences, plain disregard of duty, gross abuse of power, or violation of law. *Doble Steam Motors Corp. v. Daugherty (1924) 195 Cal. 158, 166, 232 P. 140*

Administrative decision on facts establishing agency's jurisdiction is subject to independent judgment review by court. *Allen v. Railroad Comm'n (1918) 179 Cal. 68, 75, 175 P. 466 , cert. denied, 249 U.S. 601, 39 S. Ct. 259, 63 L. Ed. 797 (1919)*

Standard of review for administrative regulation is rational basis test, not strict scrutiny, when regulation has only incidental effect on exercise of political rights. *Oxnard Harbor Dist. v. Local Agency Formation Com. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 259, 269, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 819*

Remand to administrative agency is proper when errors in admission of evidence before agency existed or when original hearing before agency was conducted by unauthorized hearing officer; but remand is not proper when administrative agency errs in results reached at hearing. *Newman v. State Personnel Bd. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 41, 49, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601*

Scope of judicial review of legislative-type activity is limited to examination of record before agency decision makers to determine if their actions were arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support. *Morgan v. Community Redevelopment Agency (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 243, 258, 284 Cal. Rptr. 745*

Concept of affirmance of trier of fact's conclusions if supported by substantial evidence is fortified in cases of review of administrative board's determinations because of board's presumed expertise. *San Diego Adult Educators v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1124, 1130-1131, 273 Cal. Rptr. 53*

Relationship of reviewing court to any agency such as Public Employment Relations Board (PERB), whose primary responsibility is to determine scope of statutory duty to bargain and resolve charges of unfair refusal to bargain, is generally one of deference. *San Diego Adult Educators v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1124, 1131, 273 Cal. Rptr. 53*

In terms of construction of law to be utilized by PERB, determinations made within agency's area of expertise are to be accorded deference, and determinations are to be accepted unless found to be clearly erroneous. *San Diego Adult Educators v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1124, 1131, 273 Cal. Rptr. 53*

When statewide agency is delegated quasi-judicial power by California Constitution, reviewing court is limited to determining whether there was substantial evidence supporting agency's decision; in making this determination, reviewing court is required to consider all relevant evidence in administrative record, including evidence that fairly detracts from evidence supporting agency's decision. *Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1091, 1092, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Review of agency resolution of necessity in eminent domain proceeding is accomplished by traditional writ of mandate, not by writ of administrative mandamus; agency is not required to make findings. *Anaheim Redevelopment Agency v Dusek (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 249, 258-261, 239 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Writ of mandate is not properly issued to compel public administrative agency possessing discretionary power to act in particular manner. *McClure v. County of San Diego (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 807, 812, 236 Cal. Rptr. 653*

Trial court is authorized under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* to receive evidence of events that transpired after administrative hearing; better practice is to remand action for agency redetermination in light of new evidence. *Curtis v. Board of Retirement (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 293, 299, 223 Cal. Rptr. 123*

Scope of judicial inquiry into quasi-legislative actions of state agency (decision of California State Air Resources Board on standards for sulfur dioxide emissions) is restricted to examination of record for procedural compliance and to determine whether action taken was arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking in evidentiary support; reasoning or wisdom underlying agency action is beyond scope of inquiry. *Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Air Resources Board (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 789, 796, 180 Cal. Rptr. 550*

Judicial review of administrative orders involves evaluation of whether or not agency acted within scope of authority, using fair procedures in reasonable action. *California Mfr. Assn. v. Industrial Welfare Comm'n (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 95, 106, 167 Cal. Rptr. 203*

Judicial review in both trial and appellate court is based on substantial evidence test when vested rights are not involved. *City of Walnut Creek v. County of Contra Costa (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1016, 1017, 162 Cal. Rptr. 224*

Court is not permitted to usurp agency's legislative power during judicial review. *Brock v. Superior Court (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 594, 603, 241 P.2d 283*

[c] Proceedings

Judicial review by proceeding for traditional writ of mandate is available in appropriate case (e.g., failure to perform statutory duty, act of ministerial nature). *California v. Superior Court, State of (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 247, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Sail'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1, 7, 22, 95 Cal. Rptr. 329, 485 P.2d 529* ; *People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623*

Damages are not recoverable in administrative mandate proceeding governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *California v. Superior Court, State of (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 245-246, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281*

Court is empowered to regard complaint for declaratory judgment as petition for writ of mandate governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandate) if it contains all necessary allegations. *Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 321, 329, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110* ; *Hostetter v. Alderson (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 499, 500, 241 P.2d 230*

Judicial review by proceeding for writ of certiorari is unavailable where agency not empowered by Constitution to exercise judicial functions. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 42-43, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Standard Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 559-565, 59 P.2d 119*

Agencies and employees are generally immune under Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code §§ 810-996.6*) from liability for damages based on discretionary acts, including licensing activities in particular. *Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 127, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111* ; *O'Hagan v. Board of Zoning Adjustment (1973) 38 Cal. App. 3d 722, 728, 730, 113 Cal. Rptr. 501* ; *Burns v. City Council (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 999, 1004-1005, 107 Cal. Rptr. 787*

Rules respecting injunction against enforcement of statute are applicable also to enforcement of ordinance.

Crittenden v. Superior Court (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 565, 569, 39 Cal. Rptr. 380, 393 P.2d 692 ; *Mock v. Santa Rosa (1899) 126 Cal. 330, 342-343, 58 P. 826*

Collateral attack on judgment of California court is not to be based on any evidence other than judicial record. *Johnson v. Hayes Cal Builders, Inc. (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 35 Cal. Rptr. 618, 387 P.2d 394*

Administrative decision is subject to collateral attack in same way as judgment. *Aylward v. State Board etc. Examiners (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 833, 839, 192 P.2d 929* ; *Forbes v. Hyde (1866) 31 Cal. 342, 347* (judgment void for lack of jurisdiction as subject to collateral attack wherever and whenever it is invoked) Court lacks power to give relief having effect of enjoining agency from enforcing statute. *Modern Barber Col. v. Cal. Emp. Stab. Com. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 720, 723, 192 P.2d 916* (writ of mandate)

Judicial review by proceeding for writ of habeas corpus is available in appropriate case. *Loustalot v. Superior Court (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 905, 910, 186 P.2d 673*

Action for declaratory judgment is proper in appropriate case. *California Physicians' Serv. v. Garrison (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 790, 800-801, 172 P.2d 4* ; *Lord v. Garland (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 840, 851-852, 168 P.2d 5* ; *Sandelin v. Collins (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 147, 150-151, 157, 33 P.2d 1009*

Administrative attempt to enforce valid statute in unconstitutional manner is subject to injunction. *Brock v. Superior Court (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 605, 610, 86 P.2d 805*

Judicial review by proceeding for writ of prohibition is unavailable where agency not empowered by Constitution to exercise judicial functions. Whitten v. California State Board, etc. *(1937) 8 Cal. 2d 444, 445-446, 65 P.2d 1296*

Court lacks power to enjoin agency from enforcing statute. *Moore v. Superior Court (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 421, 424, 57 P.2d 1314*

Invalid enactment is not a statute; administrative attempt to enforce invalid enactment as subject to injunction. *Reclamation Dist. v. Superior Court (1916) 171 Cal. 672, 676, 154 P. 845* ; *Wheeler v. Herbert (1908) 152 Cal. 224, 228, 92 P. 353*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityStandingAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingPersonal StakeCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.35

§ 474.35 Law Reviews

Maher, *War Stories: The Non-Adversarial Process by Which Veterans Are Awarded Disability Benefits Works Fine Without Lawyers and Judicial Review ... Or Does It?* 5(5) Cal. Law. 38 (1985)

Henke, *Judicial Review of Local Government Administrative Decisions in California, 10 U.S.F. L. Rev. 361 (1976)*

The Supreme Court of California 1973-1974: Administrative Law, 63 Cal. L. Rev. 11 (1975)

Note, *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Association: Determining the Scope of Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions in California, 26 Hastings L.J. 1465 (1975)*

The Supreme Court of California 1972-1973: Administrative Law, 62 Cal. L. Rev. 408 (1974)

Bogaard, *The Strumsky Case: Expanding Judicial Review of Local Administrative Decisions, 50 Lab. Arb. Rep. (BNA) 65 (1974)*

Forkosch, *Judicial De Novo Review of Administrative Quasi-Judicial Fact Determinations, 25 Hastings L.J. 963 (1974)*

Read, *The Scope of Judicial Review of Probationary Teacher Dismissal in California: Critique and Proposal, 21 UCLA L. Rev. 1257 (1974)*

The Supreme Court of California 1971-1972: Administrative Law, 61 Cal. L. Rev. 289 (1973)

Note, *Procedural Due Process Protection for Probationary Teachers' First Amendment Rights: Bekiaris v. Board of Education*, 24 Hastings L.J. 1227 (1973)

The Supreme Court of California 1970-1971: Administrative Law, 60 Cal. L. Rev. 759 (1972)

The Supreme Court of California 1969-1970: Administrative Law, 59 Cal. L. Rev. 58 (1971)

The Supreme Court of California 1968-1969: Administrative Law, 58 Cal. L. Rev. 135 (1970)

Ehrman, *Administrative Appeal and Judicial Review of Property Tax Assessments in California--The New Look, 22 Hastings L.J. 1 (1970)*

Schwarz, *Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Under the Mexican Writ of Amparo: Some Possible Applications to Judicial Review in the United States, 7 Cal. West L. Rev. 331 (1970)*

Lesar, *Timing of Judicial Review Under the Administrative Procedure Act, 56 Cal. L. Rev. 1491 (1968)*

Reed, *Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies in California, 56 Cal. L. Rev. 1061 (1968)*

The Supreme Court of California 1966-1967: Administrative Law, 55 Cal. L. Rev. 1067 (1967)

Comment, *Basic Findings' and Effective Judicial Review of the California Public Utilities Commission, 13 UCLA L. Rev. 313 (1966)*

Kleps, *Certiorarified Mandamus Reviewed: The Courts and California Administrative Decisions 1949-1959, 12 Stan. L. Rev. 554 (1960)*

Netterville, *Agencies and the Courts--Judicial Review: The "Independent Judgment" Anomaly, 44 Cal. L. Rev. 262 (1956)*

Netterville, *Administrative "Questions of Law" and the Scope of Judicial Review in California,"* *29 So Cal. L. Rev. 434 (1956)*

Netterville, *The Substantial Evidence Rule in California Administrative Law, 8 Stan. L. Rev. 563 (1956)*

Comment, *Scope of Judicial Review of Local Administrative Agencies in California, 29 So. Cal. L. Rev. 332 (1956)*

Bancroft, *Substantial Evidence Rule: Review of Entire Record, 40 Cal. L. Rev. 119 (1952)*

Ice and Ice, *Judicial Review of Rulings by California Administrative Agencies, 2 Hastings L.J. 48 (1951)*

Kleps, *Certiorarified Mandamus: Court Review of California Administrative Decisions 1939-49, 2 Stan. L. Rev. 285 (1950)*

Comment, *Court Misapplies Substantial Evidence Rule in Reviewing Administrative Board Decision, 1 Stan. L. Rev. 326 (1949)*

Note, *Administrative Law--Judicial Review of Orders of State-Wide Boards Exercising Statutory Jurisdiction, 22 So. Cal. L. Rev. 49 (1948)*

Bamford, *Administrative Law: Judicial Review of Determinations of Corporation and Insurance Commissioners and Other State-Wide Administrative Tribunals,"* *34 Cal. L. Rev. 741 (1946)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Scope of Trial de Novo in Mandamus Proceeding to Review Decision of State*

Administrative Body, *31 Cal. L. Rev. 436 (1943)*

McGovney, *The California Chaos in Court Review of the Decisions of State Administrative Agencies*, *15 So Cal. L. Rev. 391 (1942)*

McGovney, *Court Review of Administrative Decisions in California; The Pending State Constitutional Amendment (Art. IV, Sec. lb)*, *30 Cal. L. Rev. 507 (1942)*

Bufford, *Writ of Mandate Held Available for Reviewing Administrative Agencies*, 16 State BJ 306 (1941)

Holbrook, *Judicial Review of Determinations by County Boards of Equalization*, *14 So Cal. L. Rev. 276 (1941)*

McGovney, *Administrative Decisions and Court Review Thereof, in California*, *29 Cal. L. Rev. 110 (1941)*

Turrentine, *Restore Certiorari to Review State-Wide Administrative Bodies in California*, *29 Cal. L. Rev. 279 (1941)*

Note, *Administrative Law: Judicial Review: Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies*, *29 Cal. L. Rev. 515 (1941)*

Peters, *Review of Administrative Board Rulings Limited to Writ of Mandate*, 14 State BJ 313 (1939)

Note, *Administrative Law: Method and Scope of Judicial Review of Administrative Findings*, *27 Cal. L. Rev. 738 (1939)*

Radin, *The Courts and Administrative Agencies*, *23 Cal. L. Rev. 469 (1935)*

Comment, *Judicial Review of Administrative Findings on "Fundamental" or "Jurisdictional" Facts*, *21 Cal. L. Rev. 266 (1933)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.36

§ 474.36 Text References

Judicial Council, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Mandamus (Cal. C.E.B. 2d ed. 1989)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 30, 257 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.37

§ 474.37 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerning Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

NOTE:
On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or providing input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474.38-474.49

[Reserved]

§§ 474.38[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.50

§ 474.50 Determine Availability of and Procedure for Judicial Review

- ☐ Ascertain if the prerequisites exist for seeking a writ of mandate [*see § 474.13*]:
  - ☐ Is the potential petitioner beneficially interested [*see § 474.13[1]*]?
  - ☐ Is there a lack of adequate remedy at law [*see § 474.13[2]*]?
  - ☐ Have administrative remedies been:
    - ☐ Exhausted [*see § 474.13[3]*]; or
    - ☐ Excused [*see § 474.13[4]*].
- ☐ Consider defenses that the agency could raise to a mandate proceeding [*see § 474.14*]:
  - ☐ Statute of limitations [*see § 474.14[1]*].
  - ☐ Laches [*see § 474.14[2][a]*].
  - ☐ Unclean hands [*see § 474.14[2][b]*].
- ☐ Determine proper type of judicial review to pursue [*see § 474.10[3]*]:
  - ☐ Ordinary mandate, for quasi-legislative actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; for discussion, *see §*

474.11].

☐ Administrative mandate, for quasi-judicial actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; for discussion, *see § 474.12*].

☐ Identify any additional statute or statutes governing review of agency's decision:

☐ Administrative Procedure Act [*see Gov. Code 11410.10 et seq.*; for discussion, *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*].

☐ Local agency subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* [*see § 474.12[3][b]*].

☐ Agency governed by particular constitutional provisions or statutes specific to that agency [*see § 474.23*].

☐ Consider other possibly applicable types of relief:

☐ Writ of prohibition (to restrain acts in excess of jurisdiction) [*see § 474.20*].

☐ Writ of certiorari (to prevent enforcement of acts in excess of jurisdiction [*see § 474.20*].

☐ Action for injunctive relief (to restrain threatened administrative action or enforcement of administrative decision) [*see § 474.22*].

☐ Action for declaratory relief (to obtain judicial determination of validity of administrative regulation) [*see § 474.21*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureEquityMaximsClean Hands PrincipleCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474 AVAILABILITY OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474.51

§ 474.51 Petition for Writ of Mandate

☐ Prepare petition for writ of mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *see § 474.10[2*]; for a form of petition for writ of ordinary mandate, see *Ch. 471B, Licensing by Public Agencies, § 471B.100*].

☐ All papers must comply with superior court rules [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.100-2.119, 3.1110*].

☐ Verify petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

☐ Prepare memorandum.

☐ Prepare proposed alternative writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*; for a form, see *Ch. 471B, Licensing by Public Agencies, § 471B.101*].

☐ Serve involved official, board, or agency [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490; § 474 .10[2]*].

☐ Serve other interested parties [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490; § 474 .10[2]*].

☐ File petition with proof of service in proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490; § 474 .10[2]*].

☐ For more detailed procedural checklist for use in ordinary mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358,

Mandate and Prohibition .

☐ For procedural checklist and forms for use in seeking petition for administrative mandate as distinguished from ordinary mandate, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 474A.syn

§ 474A.syn Synopsis to Chapter 474A: TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS

§ 474A.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 474A.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

[2] Agency Adjudication

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 474A.03-474A.09 [Reserved]

§ 474A.10 Claim Must Be Ripe for Adjudication

[1] Nature of Ripeness Requirement

[2] Ripeness Requirement in Proceeding to Compel Performance of Ministerial Duty

[a] Duty Must Be a Present One

[b] Administrative Entity Must Actually Refuse to Perform

[3] Ripeness Requirement in Proceeding to Review Adjudicative Decision or Order

[a] Order or Decision Must Have Direct and Immediate Effect on Petitioner

[b] Necessity of Final Order or Decision

[i] Requirement of Finality

[ii] Finality of Decision of State Agency Subject to APA

[iii] Finality of Decision of Local Agency Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6

[iv] Finality of Decision Absent Controlling Statute

§ 474A.11 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Required

[1] Jurisdictional Nature of Exhaustion Requirement

[2] Applicability of Requirement

[a] Effect of Statutory Provisions

[b] All Individual Claims, Contentions, and Objections Must Be Raised Before Administrative Body

[c] Class Actions

[3] What Constitutes Exhaustion of Administrative Remedy

[a] Completed Proceedings With Final Decision on Merits

[b] Full Presentation of Issues at All Stages

§ 474A.12 Exceptions to Rule: When Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Not Required

[1] Administrative Remedy Unavailable or Inadequate

[a] Nature of Exception

[b] Administrative Body Cannot Grant Relief Sought

[c] Procedures for Obtaining Relief Are Inadequate

[2] Exhaustion Would Be Futile

[3] Court Vested With Concurrent Primary Jurisdiction

[4] Administrative Entity Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction

[5] Statute Under Which Administrative Entity Operates Is Unconstitutional on Its Face

[6] Threat of Irreparable Injury Exists

[7] Public Interest Disserved by Application of Rule

§ 474A.13 Expedited Review of Decisions on Permit or Entitlement Involving Constitutionally Protected Speech

§§ 474A.14-474A.19 [Reserved]

§ 474A.20 Proceeding Not Commenced Within Applicable Statute of Limitations Period Is Barred

[1] Applicability of Statute of Limitations Defenses

[2] Applicable Limitation Periods

[a] General Rules for Determining

[b] Decisions Subject to the APA

[c] Local Agency Decisions Reviewable in Administrative Mandate Proceedings Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6

[3] Commencement and Running of Limitation Period

[4] Expedited Judicial Review of First Amendment Related Claims

§ 474A.21 Proceeding May Be Barred by Laches

§ 474A.22 Proceeding May Be Dismissed If Moot

§ 474A.23 Dismissal for Delay in Prosecution

§§ 474A.24-474A.29 [Reserved]

§ 474A.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 474A.31 Federal Constitution

§ 474A.32 State Constitution

§ 474A.33 State Statutes

§ 474A.34 Decisions

[1] Generally

[2] Moot Questions

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[4] Conditions for Exhaustion

[5] Exceptions to Exhaustion

[6] Compliance With Exhaustion Requirement

[7] Exhaustion and Constitutional Questions

[8] Pleading Exhaustion

§ 474A.35 Law Reviews

§ 474A.36 Text References

§§ 474A.37-474A.49 [Reserved]

§ 474A.50 Determine If Timing Is Proper for a Mandate Proceeding

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.01

§ 474A.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of the timing of judicial review in California public administrative law, including the following in Part II:

- Subpart A discusses ripeness of an action for judicial review and exhaustion of administrative remedies [*see §§ 474A.10 -474A.12*].

- Subpart B discusses statute of limitations, laches, and mootness [*see §§ 474A.20 -474A.22*].

A Research Guide [Part III; *see § 474A.30* et seq.] and Procedural Checklist [Part IV; *see § 474A.50*] are also included.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.02

§ 474A.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

For related discussion concerning judicial review by California courts of agency adjudications, see

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*, et seq. (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

For memoranda of points of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for writs of mandate generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Agency Adjudication

For detailed discussion and forms relating to agency adjudications that are the subject of the judicial review discussed in

this chapter, see

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.
- Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in § 470.12[5]). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474A.03-474A.09

[Reserved]

§§ 474A.03[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. When Mandate Proceedings May Be Commenced

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.10

§ 474A.10 Claim Must Be Ripe for Adjudication

[1] Nature of Ripeness Requirement

The requirement of ripeness is essentially a requirement of an actual existing controversy that has reached a stage at which adjudication is appropriate. Ripeness requires that the issues of a case be concrete and specific enough for a court to render a definite judgment upon them, and that there would be hardship to the parties seeking review if the court did not decide them [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 171, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P.2d 306* ; *Urban Habitat Program v. City of Pleasanton (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1561, 1580-1581, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300* (challenge by nonprofit corporation and low income plaintiff to alleged failure of city to adopt low income housing plan was ripe for judicial review even though city had not taken action on any specific permit); *Teachers' Retirement Board v. Genest (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1012, 1040-1041, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 326* (declaratory relief action challenging legality of legislative diversion of $500 million in funds allocated to teachers' retirement system was ripe for adjudication because budget reduction was completed at time of declaratory relief lawsuit); *Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group v. City of San Jose (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 689, 708-709, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 868* (nuisance claim was not ripe for judicial review at this time because the harm alleged was speculative and indefinite); *Hayward Area Planning Association v. Alameda County Transportation Authority, (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 95, 102-105, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744* (dispute over legality of highway route alignment that differed from route proposed when tax revenue measure was approved by voters held to be ripe for judicial resolution even though agency had not completed final approval of project)]. Similarly, a dispute is not ripe for purposes of declaratory relief before the agency has exercised its discretion and decided whether to issue a building permit to the building owner seeking declaratory relief [*Martin v. City and County of San Francisco (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 392, 407, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 470* (challenge to applicability of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process and to discretion of local government body based on local ordinance conferring discretion on agency to grant or deny remodeling permits to interior remodeling of private home that was historic landmark)]. In mandate proceedings, the requirement has a number of different aspects.

For example the California Court of Appeal held that a landowner's regulatory takings claim was ripe for judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandamus) when the county agency made it very clear in denying a subdivision permit that the homeowner could not build a second single family home on his six acre property. In these

circumstances, the homeowner was not required to apply for a permit to build that second family home for his dispute to be ripe for adjudication [*Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1299-1301, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316]* .

In *PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Comm'n (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1194-1196, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630* , the California Court of Appeal followed the two part test originally applied to ripeness questions by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Abbott Laboratories v. Gardner (1967) 387 U.S. 136, 148-149, 87 S. Ct. 1507, 18 L. Ed. 2d 681* , and incorporated into California law the case of *Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Comm'n (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 171, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P. 2d 306* . The test identified two ripeness questions: 1) the fitness of the issues for judicial decisions; and 2) the hardship to the parties of withholding court consideration. The Court of Appeal held that a PUC interim interpretation of a priority condition (relating to utility holding companies maintaining debt to equity and capital expenditure ratios in the utilities plant and equipment) was not ripe for review because the PUC has not applied its interpretation to a concrete set of facts (thereby failing to satisfy the fitness criteria), and therefore the utility holding companies have not suffered any concrete negative consequences from the interpretation (thereby failing to satisfy the hardship criteria) [*PG & E Corp. v. Public Utilities Com. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1217-1219, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630]* .

When the petitioner seeks to compel the performance of a ministerial duty [*see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , for discussion of ministerial actions], the action is ripe for adjudication only if:

- The duty is a present one, that is, one that an administrative official or entity is obligated to perform at the time the proceeding is commenced [*see* [2][a], *below*]; and

- The administrative official or entity has actually refused to perform the duty [*see* [2][b], *below*].

When the petitioner seeks judicial review of an adjudicative act or decision, the action is ripe for adjudication only if:

- The act or decision has a direct and immediate effect on the petitioner [*see* [3][a], *below*]; and

- The action or decision is final [*see* [3][b], *below*].

[2] Ripeness Requirement in Proceeding to Compel Performance of Ministerial Duty

[a] Duty Must Be a Present One

Usually, a writ of mandate is issued to compel an administrative official or body to perform a ministerial act only when the petitioner shows that the official or body had a present duty to perform the act--that is, the administrative entity had a duty to perform the act at the time the mandate proceeding was commenced [*Communist Party v. Peek (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 536, 540, 127 P.2d 889* ; *McGinnis v. Mayor and Common Council (1908) 153 Cal. 711, 715, 96 P. 367* ; *Northridge etc. Water Dist. v. McDonell (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 123, 127-128, 322 P.2d 25* ; for discussion of what constitutes a ministerial act, *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*]. In general, mandate does not lie to compel the performance of future acts [*Communist Party v. Peek (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 536, 540, 127 P.2d 889* ; *Diller v. Flynn (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 449, 453, 38 Cal. Rptr. 229]* . To avoid multiple proceedings or to prevent a proceeding from becoming moot before it can be decided, however, the present duty requirement is sometimes relaxed if the conduct or declarations of the administrative entity make it clear that it does not intend to perform the act when the time for performance arrives [*Young v. Gnoss (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 18, 21 n. 4, 101 Cal. Rptr. 533, 496 P.2d 445* (proceeding to compel registrar to register petitioner as voter commenced prior to close of registration period); *King v. Martin (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 791, 795-796, 98 Cal. Rptr. 711* (writ compelling director of Department of Social Welfare to render fair hearing decisions within 60-day period fixed by law issued as to administrative proceedings in which period had not expired when mandate proceeding was commenced); *Imperial Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Caminetti*

(1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 494, 497-498, 139 P.2d 693 (writ issued to compel insurance commissioner to renew license for fiscal year beginning after commence ment of mandate proceeding when propriety of commissioner's failure to renew for preceding fiscal year was also before the court)].

When the duty of an administrative official or body is conditional, the petitioner must show the occurrence of the required conditions [*see Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Rolph (1920) 184 Cal. 557, 559, 194 P. 1005* ; *Lima v. Woodruff (1930) 107 Cal. App. 285, 287, 290 P. 480* ; *Nelson v. Anderson Etc. Irr. Dist. (1921) 51 Cal. App. 92, 98-99, 196 P. 292]* . Ordinarily, a showing is required that the petitioner has made a demand for performance of the duty at issue [*Nelson v. Anderson Etc. Irr. Dist. (1921) 51 Cal. App. 92, 98, 196 P. 292* ; *see also Jensen v. McCullough (1928) 94 Cal. App. 382, 388-389, 271 P. 568]* . A demand is not required, however, when the petitioner can show either of the following:

- The duty is one that affects the public at large and its performance will confer no immediate benefit on the petitioner [*Jensen v. McCullough (1928) 94 Cal. App. 382, 388-389, 271 P. 568* ; *Thoits v. Byxbee (1917) 34 Cal. App. 226, 235-236, 167 P. 166]* .

- A demand would have been futile [*Briare v. Matthews (1927) 202 Cal. 1, 8-9, 258 P. 939* ; *Bank of America v. Cory (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 66, 84, 210 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

[b] Administrative Entity Must Actually Refuse to Perform

Mandate lies only when there has been an actual refusal, not an anticipated refusal, of an administrative entity to perform a ministerial duty [*Regents of University of California v. State Bd. of Equalization (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 660, 669, 140 Cal. Rptr. 857* ; *Northridge etc. Water Dist. v. McDonell (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 123, 127-128, 322 P.2d 25* ; *George v. Beaty (1927) 85 Cal. App. 525, 531, 260 P. 386]* . The writ does not issue against an administrative officer or body willing to comply with a prescribed legal duty [*Sutro Heights Land Co. v. Merced Irr. Dist. (1931) 211 Cal. 670, 704, 296 P. 1088* ; *McMullen v. Glenn-Colusa Irr. Dist. (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 696, 700-701, 62 P.2d 1083* ; *George v. Beaty (1927) 85 Cal. App. 525, 529, 260 P. 386* ; *but see King v. Martin (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 791, 796, 98 Cal. Rptr. 711* (claimed inability to comply due to budgetary restrictions no defense)]. The petitioner is not required, however, to show an express refusal of the officer or body to act; any conduct signifying an unequivocal intention not to act is sufficient [*Palmer v. Fox (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 453, 456, 258 P.2d 30]* .

[3] Ripeness Requirement in Proceeding to Review Adjudicative Decision or Order

[a] Order or Decision Must Have Direct and Immediate Effect on Petitioner

Unless review of administrative regulations is authorized by law [*see* Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*], the courts only review an administrative body's adjudication or determination of a factual or legal question when the decision is the basis for an order or decision that directly and immediately affects a specific person or entity [*Western Surgical Supply Co. v. Affleck (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 388, 391, 242 P.2d 929* ; *see also Teed v. State Board of Equalization (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 162, 163-164, 55 P.2d 267]* . Mandate is not available to review adoption of a policy that requires a particular legal or factual issue to be resolved in a specific way [*Western Surgical Supply Co. v. Affleck (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 388, 391, 242 P.2d 929* (mandamus not available to review regulations and orders of State Pharmacy Board interpreting law to require supervision of certain activities by licensed pharmacist absent showing that they had been enforced against petitioner); *see also Teed v. State Board of Equalization (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 162, 163-164, 55 P.2d 267* (SBE's policy of considering certain activities as taxable not reviewable in extraordinary writ proceeding in absence of showing it had been directly applied to petitioner)].

[b] Necessity of Final Order or Decision

[i] Requirement of Finality

An adjudicative order or decision can be reviewed in a mandate proceeding only if it has become final [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Peter R. Gadd, Inc. v. Workman (1927) 200 Cal. 384, 388-389, 253 P. 700* ; *Bleeck v. State Board of Optometry (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 415, 432, 95 Cal. Rptr. 860* ; *see also Prip v. City of Santa Barbara (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 626, 630-631, 29 Cal. Rptr. 558]* .

In most cases, the statutes that govern judicial review of an administrative action or decision expressly or by necessary implication provide when the action or decision becomes final for the purpose of judicial reviews [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)* (certain decisions of local agencies adopting provisions of § 1094.6); *Gov. Code § 11523* (decisions of statewide agencies subject to the APA); *Labor Code § 1160.8* (orders of Agricultural Labor Relations Board); *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410* (decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board); *Veh. Code § 14401(a)* (order refusing, canceling, suspending, or revoking driver's license)].

A State Personnel Board decision that revoked the termination of plaintiff employee by defendant agency employer was final for purposes of plaintiff's filing a writ of mandate petition seeking reinstatement and back pay against defendant agency. The decision was final for appeal purposes even though not final for enforcement purposes because SPB did not have the authority to rehear or reconsider the decision to revoke termination of plaintiff after adopting the decision of an ALJ upon rehearing [*Gov. Code § 18710*; *Lomeli v. Department of Corrections (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 788, 797-798, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179]* . The petition was not premature because plaintiff filed within the one-year time period [*Gov. Code § 19630*] within which defendant agency could have filed its own petition for a writ of mandate challenging the SPB decision [*Lomeli v. Department of Corrections (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 788, 796-797, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179]* . *Code Civ. Proc §§ 1049, 1109*, and *1110*, which govern civil actions and provide that a judgment is not final until appeals have been completed, or the time for appeal has ended, do not apply to administrative hearings and govern only civil actions [*Lomeli v. Department of Corrections (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 788, 796-797, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179]* .

Note that the date on which an administrative order or decision becomes final and the date on which the applicable limitation period begins to run are not necessarily the same [*see, e.g., Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 922-924, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97* (90-day limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* does not run from date of final decision, but from date of notice of decision), discussed in *§ 474A.20[3]*]. For example, a decision is final when issued in final form by the agency, and an aggrieved party could seek judicial review of that decision at that time. However, the 90-day statute of limitations that commences upon the giving of notice under *Code of Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* is tolled until the notice is given by the agency. Nonetheless, an aggrieved party does not have an unlimited time period to seek judicial review; the doctrine of laches applies to the timeliness of the parties' efforts to obtain judicial review [*El Dorado Palm Springs Ltd. v. Rent Review Com. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 335, 346, 281 Cal. Rptr. 327]* .

For a discussion of the commencement of limitation periods, see *§ 474A.20[3]*. For a discussion of the closely related requirement that a petitioner must exhaust available administrative remedies, see *§§ 474A.11* and *474A.12*.

[ii] Finality of Decision of State Agency Subject to APA

Gov. Code § 11523 provides that a petition to obtain review of a decision of a statewide agency subject to the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*] "shall be filed within 30 days after the last day on which reconsideration can be ordered." By necessary implication, therefore, a decision governed by the APA becomes final on the expiration of the time for ordering reconsideration. The time for ordering reconsideration expires as follows [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*]:

- Thirty days after the delivery or mailing of a decision to the petitioner;
- If the agency establishes a date within that 30-day period as the effective date of the decision, on the

effective date; or

- If the agency establishes the date on which a stay that does not exceed 30 days terminates as the effective date, on the effective date.

[iii] Finality of Decision of Local Agency Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b) sets forth rules for determining the finality of certain decisions of local agencies.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6 applies to decisions subject to review in administrative mandate proceedings suspending, demoting, or dismissing an officer or employee; revoking or denying an application for a permit, license, or other entitlement; or denying an application for a retirement benefit or allowance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* applies to local agencies, as defined in *Gov. Code § 54951,* other than school districts. *Gov. Code § 54951,* defines a local agency is "a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission, or agency thereof, or other local public agency."

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*, the following rules apply:

- When no provision exists for reconsideration of the decision, or for a written decision or written findings supporting the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*], in any applicable statute, regulation, or rule, the decision or order is final on the date it is announced.

- When a provision exists for reconsideration, but reconsideration is not sought, the decision or order is final on the expiration of the period for seeking reconsideration.

- When a provision for reconsideration exists and reconsideration is sought, the decision or order is final on the date that reconsideration is rejected.

- When there is a provision for a written decision or written findings, the decision is final upon the date it is mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, including a copy of the affidavit or certificate of mailing, to the party seeking the writ, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* does not apply to extend the time for filing the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*].

In making a final decision under Section 1094.6, a local agency must provide notice to the party that the time for seeking judicial review is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)*]. For the purpose of this notice requirement, a "party" is an officer or employee who has been suspended, demoted, or dismissed; a person whose license or permit has been revoked or suspended; a person whose application for a license or permit has been denied; or a person whose application for a retirement benefit or allowance has been denied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)*].

A court of appeal has held that this scheme is not as simple as it appears to be. In *Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97* , the court held that a local agency's decision is not final for the purpose of determining the limitation period until the notice of decision required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* has been given. This means that the 90-day period for filing a petition for review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* runs from the date of notice, not the date of decision [*Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 922-924, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97]* . However, another court distinguished between finality of agency decisions and timing of the 90-day notice period [*see El Dorado Palm Springs, Ltd. v. Rent Review Com. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 335, 346, 281 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . Under this view, a decision is final when issued in final form by the agency, and an aggrieved party may seek judicial review of the decision at that time. However, the 90-day statute of limitation that commences on the giving of notice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* is tolled until the notice is given by the agency. This view does not give an aggrieved party an unlimited time period to seek judicial review should the agency fail to give the 1094.6(f) notice; the doctrine of

laches applies to the timeliness of the parties' efforts to obtain judicial review [*El Dorado Palm Springs, Ltd. v. Rent Review Com. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 335, 346, 281 Cal. Rptr. 327]* .

[iv] Finality of Decision Absent Controlling Statute

In the absence of controlling statutes, the question of when an administrative order or decision becomes final must be determined under California decisional law [*O.W.L. Foundation v. City of Rohnert Park (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 568, 584-585, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (city adoption of water supply assessment was final agency action for judicial review even though EIR was not adopted at time of challenge to water supply assessment such that dispute was ripe for judicial review under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085* (ordinary mandate); *California Water Impact Network v. Newhall County Water Dist (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1464, 1471, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 393* (water district adoption of water supply assessment was not final agency action until EIR has been adopted under CEQA requirements)]. California decisions have not yet directly addressed the question of when an administrative order or decision is final for the purposes being ripe for judicial review. Under decisions in other contexts, however, the finality of an administrative order or decision is determined by ascertaining the legislative intent of the statute under which the administrative entity is empowered to act. An order or decision is ordinarily deemed to be final under its statute when the entity loses jurisdiction to reconsider the order or decision and reach a different conclusions [*Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 323, 144 P.2d 4* ; *In re Fain (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 376, 390, 135 Cal. Rptr. 543* ; *McDonald's Systems of California, Inc. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 525, 543-544, 119 Cal. Rptr. 26]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. When Mandate Proceedings May Be Commenced

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.11

§ 474A.11 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Required

[1] Jurisdictional Nature of Exhaustion Requirement

Before seeking judicial review of an administrative action or decision, a petitioner must fully use and exhaust all available administrative remedies [*In re Dexter (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 921, 925, 160 Cal. Rptr. 118, 603 P.2d 35* ; *Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local Union No. 104 v. Rea (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1074-1075, 1080-1081, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 672* (labor union mandamus and declaratory relief action challenging prevailing wage law decision of director of department of industrial relations was barred by union's failure to exhaust administrative remedies in that union failed to file petition with director under *Labor Code § 1773* within 20 days of advertising call for bids to seek agency review of the prevailing wage determination); *Richards v. Dep't of Alcoholic Beverage Control (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 304, 309, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782* (restaurant owner's failure to apply for transfer of license or for original license when he purchased restaurant was a failure to exhaust administrative remedies that precludes his lawsuit challenging the department's revocation of an alcoholic beverage license issued to the prior owner); *American Alliance Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 601, 609, 184 Cal. Rptr. 674* ; *Doyle v. Chino, City of (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 681, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844]* . Compliance with this basic requirement is a prerequisite to the right to seek review of the action or decision in proceedings for ordinary mandate [*see* *Horack v. Franchise Tax Board (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 363, 368, 95 Cal. Rptr. 717]* and administrative mandate [*Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 794, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009* ; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106, 280 P.2d 1]* .

The purpose of this requirement is as follows:

- Lighten the burden of overworked courts when effective administrative remedies are available [*Duffy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1163, 199 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Bozaich v. State of California (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 688, 698, 108 Cal. Rptr. 392]* .

- Give administrative tribunals an opportunity to exercise judgment and discretion on matters within their area of expertise without prior judicial interference [*San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society, Inc.*

v. County of San Bernardino (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 738, 748, 202 Cal. Rptr. 423 ; *Associated Cal. Loggers, Inc. v. Kinder (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 34, 43, 144 Cal. Rptr. 786]* .

- Promote judicial efficiency by facilitating development of a complete record that draws on administrative expertise [*Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 476, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410* ; *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 980, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379]* .

The exhaustion requirement is a judicially created rule [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 292, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 979, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379]* . This rule has been characterized as flexible, and is subject to a number of judicially created exceptions [*County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 73, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750* ; *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 979-980, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379* . Exceptions to the rule are discussed in *§ 474A.12, below*]. Application of the rule, however, is not a matter committed to the discretion of the court; unless a recognized exception to the rule is established, the court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over a proceeding initiated by a petitioner who has failed to exhaust available administrative remedies [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 293, 109 P.2d 942* ; *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 73, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750* ; *Wilkinson v. Norcal Mutual Ins. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 307, 318, 159 Cal. Rptr. 416]* .

A significant consequence of classification of the requirement as a jurisdictional rule is that it cannot be waived by stipulation or consent of an adverse party [*Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513* ; *Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 347, 359-360, 62 Cal. Rptr. 364]* , or by a party's failure to raise the issue [*People v. Coit Ranch, Inc. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 52, 57, 21 Cal. Rptr. 875* ; *see also Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 384, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73]* . A failure to comply with the rule cannot be cured. Once a failure to exhaust administrative remedies is established, the court must order the matter dismissed; the court may not abate the judicial proceeding pending completion of administrative proceedings [*Miller v. United Airlines, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 878, 890, 220 Cal. Rptr. 684* ; *Wilkinson v. Norcal Mutual Ins. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 307, 318, 159 Cal. Rptr. 416]* .

Note that in the more recent case of *Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470* , an appellate court disagreed with the interpretation of *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 109 P.2d 942* , the seminal case on which the above analysis was based [*Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 220-223, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . The court in *Green* held that the exhaustion doctrine is merely a procedural rule that can be waived, and thus, that the exhaustion of administrative remedies is not a necessary prerequisite to the court's subject matter jurisdiction [*Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 222-223, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . The Fourth District, Division 3 California Court of Appeal held that the exhaustion of administrative remedies defense was waived by the county in a retaliatory termination lawsuit brought by a former employee of the county because the county failed to assert the defense in the proceeding before the superior court. The court of appeal rejected the jurisdiction rationale, and held that exhaustion of administrative remedies is a judicially created rule of procedure that can be waived on appeal if not asserted before the superior court [*Mokler v. County of Orange (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 121, 133-135, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 568*]. In *Doster v. County of San Diego (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 257, 260, 251 Cal. Rptr. 507* , the court said that exhaustion of administrative remedies is a fundamental rule of procedure, but it is not a condition of jurisdiction. This case, however, fell within the recognized exception allowed when exhaustion would be futile. For discussion of the futility exception, see *§ 474A.12[2]*. Contractor association's judicial challenge to Department of Industrial Relations's decision to rescind prevailing wage determination was not barred by exhaustion of administrative remedies [*California Slurry Seal Association v. Department of Industrial Relations (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 651, 661-662, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38]* .

Exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were satisfied under Fair Employment and Housing Act statute [*Gov. Code § 12960(b)*] when DFEH complaint was verified by attorney for employee who brought complaint not

employee himself [*Blum v. Superior Court (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 418, 428-429, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 902]* . A parolee that filed a habeas corpus petition in court to challenge a parole condition exhausted administrative remedies by filing administrative appeal with Department of Adult Parole Operations, notwithstanding that Department failed to decide appeal [*In re Hudson, (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1, 7-8, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 74]* . A citizens group that challenged a city's certification of a final environmental impact report by petitioning for a writ of mandate satisfied exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements by having group leaders or legal counsel attend, participate, and object to the approval of the environmental impact report at all planning commission and city council meetings that discussed the development project for which the environmental review was conducted. The citizens group was not required to file an appeal of the planning commission recommendation to trigger city council review of the planning commission decision [*Citizens for Open Government v. City of Lodi (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 865, 876-878, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 636]* . An environmental group that challenged a county's certification of a final environmental impact report (FEIR) and approval of a mining project was held to have exhausted administrative remedies by sufficiently raising issues about the inadequacy of the FEIR at the county decision making level, as well as at the superior court level, and the group was not required to have raised before the county exactly the same issue as the superior court based its decision on to overturn the certification by the county. The group was not required to be as specific in raising issues from an administrative hearing [*Western Placer Citizens for an Agricultural & Rural Environment v. County of Placer (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 890, 897-899, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 799*].

Issue exhaustion requirements were satisfied and the baseline issue was adequately raised before the agency when another party (Caltrans) raised the issue in a comment letter. Therefore, exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were satisfied, and the party challenging the agency decision for lack of compliance with CEQA requirements can raise this issue on judicial review [*Woodward Park Homeowners Association v. City of Fresno (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 683, 711-713, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102]* .

[2] Applicability of Requirement

[a] Effect of Statutory Provisions

Previously, the Supreme Court held that a petitioner was required to exhaust an administrative remedy made available by statute, even when the statutory language provided that use of the remedy was permissive rather than mandatory [*Alexander v. State Personnel Bd. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 198, 200, 137 P.2d 433]* . In *Alexander,* the Court applied this rule specifically in the context of administrative rehearings. The rule in *Alexander* was, however, subsequently overruled [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 510, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* . In *Sierra Club*, the Court held that, when a statute specifies that reconsideration or rehearing of an adverse decision of an agency *may* be sought by an affected party, reconsideration is not necessarily *required* prior to seeking judicial review. It is not necessary to seek reconsideration or rehearing in order to raise for a second time the same evidence and legal arguments previously presented to the agency, solely to exhaust administrative remedies. The general rule requiring exhaustion of remedies remains valid, however: an agency must be given an opportunity to reach a reasoned and final conclusion on all issues over which it has jurisdiction before those issues are raised in a judicial forum. Thus, a request for reconsideration or rehearing remains a necessary prerequisite to judicial review when there is new evidence, changed circumstances, or new legal arguments which the agency did not have the opportunity to consider in original administrative proceeding [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 493-494, 510, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* . Moreover, statutory hearings rights must be requested even if the language of the statutory right to a hearing is permissive, or judicial review is precluded by failure to exhaust administrative remedies. For example, a motorist's failure to request a hearing within 10 days to challenge a driver's license suspension under the provisions of *Veh. Code § 13558*, constitutes a failure to exhaust administrative remedies that precludes judicial review of the suspension decision by the DMV [*Marquez v. Gourley (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 710, 712-714, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 784* ; *In re Darlene T (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 938-940, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119* (failure to challenge denial of benefits by seeking an administrative hearing under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* is a failure to exhaust required administrative remedies)].

The California Supreme Court affirmed the dismissal of a lawsuit brought against the Regents of the University of California by a former employee who had been terminated. The employee challenged the termination, claiming that it was retaliatory in violation of *Gov. Code § 12653* and *Labor Code § 1102.5*, which provide protection for so called "whistle blowers," that is employees who disclose wrongdoing by their employers and are fired from employment as a result. The court held that the former employee's lawsuit was barred because the employee failed to exhaust administrative remedies before filing her lawsuit. Specifically, the court held that the former employee failed to exhaust required university internal administrative remedies (filing a grievance under UCSF's policies and procedures for reporting improper governmental activities) before filing her lawsuit [*Campbell v. Regents of Univ. of Cal. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 311, 317-318, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 320, 106 P.3d 976]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a state university employee who filed an action for damages for retaliation under the California Whistleblower Protection Act [*Gov. Code § 8547.12*] was required to exhaust administrative and judicial remedies before filing a civil lawsuit. The employee had failed to file a petition for a writ of administrative mandamus to challenge the action of the university in retaliating against him, and was required to seek mandamus relief before bringing the civil lawsuit. The Court of Appeal ordered a remand of the matter to the trial court to give the employee the opportunity to amend the complaint to add a petition for a writ of mandate [*Ohton v. Board of Trustees of the California State University (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 749, 769-771, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 111]* .

The Court of Appeal held that in a dispute between two local government entities related to payment for mental health services provided to handicapped students under federal law [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*], that the two entities had failed to exhaust administrative remedies related to unfunded state mandates [*Gov. Code § 17581*], and to administrative remedies provided under *Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5, §§ 4600-4670*. Thus, the two local entities could not properly file a lawsuit in court to obtain judicial enforcement of one of those agencies responsibilities to fund mental health service for handicapped students under federal law [*Tri-County Special Educ. Local Plan Area v. County of Tuolumne (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 563, 569, 574, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 884]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that former employees of a private employer had to comply with notice and exhaustion requirements of *Labor Code § 2699.3(a)* before filing civil law suits for civil penalties under *Labor Code § 2698*, but that those employees claims for unpaid wages, and for statutory penalties paid to the employee, could be brought to court in a civil lawsuit without the employees having to comply with the same notice and exhaustion requirements [*Caliber Bodyworks, Inc. v. Superior Court (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 365, 371-372, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 31]* .

A petitioner is similarly not required to pursue an administrative remedy when a statute does one of the following:

- Grants the court concurrent primary jurisdiction over the type of controversy involved [*see, e.g., Scripps etc. Hospital v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 669, 673-674, 151 P.2d 109* ; *California School Employees Assn. v. Travis Unified School Dist. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 202 Cal. Rptr. 699* ; *Muir v. Steinberg (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 264, 269, 17 Cal. Rptr. 431* ; for discussion of concurrent primary jurisdiction, *see § 474A.12[3]*].

- Expressly provides that exhaustion of the remedy is not a prerequisite to seeking judicial relief [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 11523* (failure to seek reconsideration of decision made under the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*] not a bar to mandate proceeding), *Gov. Code § 19588* (failure to petition State Personnel Board for rehearing not a bar to mandate proceeding or civil action); *Elec. Code § 17* (administrative complaint procedures established by Secretary of State's office under federal law [*42 U.S.C. 15512*] do not have to be exhausted before pursuing other state or federal remedies)].

A plaintiff filing a court lawsuit to enforce civil remedies that are part of a state anti-discrimination statute is not

required to exhaust all administrative remedies when there are two such remedies. Exhaustion of one of the two remedies is sufficient. Plaintiff former employee's lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles asserting FEHA claims of employment discrimination due to physical disability was not barred by the Plaintiff's failure to exhaust internal grievance remedies provided under the Los Angeles city charter. Plaintiff had exhausted FEHA administrative remedies by obtaining a "right to sue" letter from the DFEH, and that was sufficient. Plaintiff was not required to exhaust both sets of administrative remedies as a precondition to filing his FEHA lawsuit in court. The court's rationale for the holding included reasons: 1) FEHA preemption of local government laws, 2) public employees have the same rights under FEHA as private employees, and 3) public employees have a choice between pursuing the internal grievance remedies provided by their governmental employer, or choosing the FEHA remedies, with a right to sue letter, and a civil lawsuit [*Schifando v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1074, 1081-1090, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 457, 79 P.3d 569* ; *Ahmadi-Kashani v. The Regents of the University of California (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 449, 459-461, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 556* (citing the *Schifando* case, the court of appeal held that employee claiming sexual harassment and filing claim under FEHA statute was not required to complete internal grievance procedures that did not provide a quasi-judicial hearing but merely provided for an informal opportunity to discuss grievance. The grievance procedure was not an administrative remedy that had to be exhausted before the employee could proceed to litigate her FEHA claim in the court system)].

Plaintiff former employee filed civil lawsuit against former employer asserting FEHA claim. Plaintiff had previously filed administrative complaint with DFEH. DFEH issued a right to sue letter to plaintiff, but later rescinded right to sue letter to provide opportunity for further resolution of claim. DFEH proposed a resolution of claim which was not accepted. Plaintiff then filed lawsuit without obtaining a second right to sue letter. Defendant asserted failure to exhaust administrative remedies as grounds for granting JNOV motion following substantial jury verdict in plaintiff's favor. The Court of Appeal held that "under *Gov. Code § 12965* employee's right to sue arose by operation of law when the DEFEH failed to resolve the matter within one year from the time she filed her administrative complaint." Obtaining a second right to sue letter is not required to exhaust administrative remedies in this case [*Grant v. Comp USA, Inc (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 637, 640, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177]* .

[b] All Individual Claims, Contentions, and Objections Must Be Raised Before Administrative Body

An essential aspect of the exhaustion requirement is that before its actions are subjected to judicial review, an administrative entity should be given the opportunity to consider and respond to the articulated contentions of interested parties [*Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 1198, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *see also Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 510, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* . Accordingly, all of a party's claims, contentions, and objections must be presented at the administrative level; the court is precluded from considering those that are not [*Friends of Lagoon Valley v. City of Vacaville (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 807, 831-832, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 251* (exhaustion doctrine precludes raising issues on judicial review that were not raised in administrative proceeding; challenger could not litigate density bonus issue because that issue was not presented to the city in the administrative proceeding); *Central Delta Water Agency v. State Water Resources Control Bd (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 245, 250, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 898* (challengers of adequacy of environmental impact report (EIR) prepared by State Water Board as part of approval process for water appropriation project waived the right to challenge adequacy of EIR on grounds that there was a failure to describe feasible mitigation measures because parties did not exhaust administrative remedies by failing to present this same argument to the public agency preparing the EIR during the public hearing or the public comment period as required by *Pub. Res. Code § 21177(a)*); *Hobson v. Raychem Corporation (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 630-632, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (exhaustion of administrative remedies requirement not satisfied when an employee failed to file an administrative charge specifically identifying the alleged discrimination that provided the basis for the later lawsuit); *Pegues v. Civil Service Com. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 95, 103-104, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* ; *NBS Imaging Systems, Inc. v. State Bd of Control (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 328, 336-337, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 237* ; *Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 1197, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *City of Walnut Creek v. County of Contra Costa (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1019-1020, 162 Cal. Rptr. 224]* . However, the exhaustion requirement is met when the allegations in a civil lawsuit are similar to or

reasonably related to the charges presented to the agency [*Soldinger v. Northwest Airlines, Inc. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 345, 381-383, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747* (discrimination charges brought by plaintiff employee before DFEH agency that were later the basis of a civil lawsuit); *Mani Brothers Real Estate Group v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1385, 1395-1396, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 79* (challengers to modified downtown development project adequately raised objections to use of 2005 addendum at city council meetings and council committee meetings such that exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were satisfied)]. This rule includes not only factual contentions and issues, but all of the following:

- Individual claims [*People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 92, 216 P.2d 441* (counterclaim asserting right to offsets against tax liability); *Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 1197* , *153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855* (claim that city's approval of construction plans was in violation of California Environmental Quality Act)].

- Defenses [*Bohn v. Watson (1954) 130 Cal. App. 2d 24, 37, 278 P.2d 454* (statute of limitations defense to disciplinary proceeding)].

- Legal issues and contentions [*People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 87-88, 216 P.2d 441* (contention that California Use Tax could not be imposed on mail order sales); *NBS Imaging Systems, Inc. v. State Bd. of Control (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 328, 337, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 237* ; *City of Walnut Creek v. County of Contra Costa (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1019-1020, 162 Cal. Rptr. 224* (contention that density of approved project exceeded that allowed by general plan)].

- Procedural objections [*Butte View Farms v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 961, 971, 157 Cal. Rptr. 476* (judicial review of administrative officer's revocation of subpoena precluded by petitioner's failure to file exception in administrative hearing); *Housing Development Co. v. Hoschler (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 379, 390, 149 Cal. Rptr. 400* (petitioner precluded from asserting that administrative proceeding should have been stayed when it failed to make explicit request for stay)].

- All party defendants in FEHA cases [*Medix Ambulance Service, Inc. v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 109, 117-118, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 249* (Plaintiff in FEHA litigation could not sue a party defendant who was not named in the administrative complaint filed with DFEH)].

- Default judgments must be set aside [*Gonzalez v. Beck (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 598, 605-607, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 843* (employer required by *Labor Code Section 98(f)* to move to set aside administrative award before Labor Commissioner prior to seeking judicial review form default in administrative proceeding)].

However, a party challenging the order of a regional water quality control board is not required to request a hearing before that regional board under *Water Code § 13330(b)* so long as that party so long as that party petitions the state water quality control board for review under the provisions of *Water Code § 13320(a)* [*Schutte & Koerting, Inc. v. Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1385-1387, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 54*].

As an exception, however, a claim that a statute under which an administrative proceeding is being conducted is unconstitutional on its face need not be raised before an administrative body of legislative origin because it does not have the power to determine the constitutionality of statutes [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; *State of California v. Superior Court, (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617-620, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . For discussion of this exception and its scope, see *§ 474A.12[5]*.

Before a taxpayer can file a lawsuit for a refund, the taxpayer has to exhaust administrative remedies by bringing a

claim for a refund to the State Board of Equalization. The refund claim is required to specify the grounds for a refund, and lawsuits against the Board must be based on those grounds. However, a litigant may present a contention in a lawsuit even though the refund claim did not expressly raise that same contention if the contention is intertwined with contentions that were expressly raised in the refund claim. Unstated contentions that are clearly implied from expressly stated contentions in the refund claim can be brought consistent with exhaustion requirements. A litigant sufficiently raised the issue of reliance on federal copyright law in her refund claim when she referred to the "right of reproduction" and otherwise implicitly alleged a nontaxable copyright transfer. Thus, she could assert these contentions in her lawsuit against the Board [*Preston v. State Board of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 206-208, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148]* .

Plaintiff former employee's common law wrongful termination claim against the University of California was properly the subject of a summary judgment motion granted in favor of the university because plaintiff failed to exhaust internal university grievance procedures available to employees. Plaintiff was required to complete internal grievance procedures before filing her wrongful discharge lawsuit [*Palmer v. Regents of the University of California (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 899, 903-905, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 567]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a citizens group failed to raise certain issues during the public comment period for an environmental impact report (EIR), and therefore that group failed to meet issue exhaustion requirements for exhaustion of administrative remedies. However, the citizens group raised other issues in the EIR public comment period, and those issues could be raised in a court challenge to the adequacy of the EIR as issue exhaustion requirements were met, but not the issues that were not raised in the EIR public comment period [*Gilroy Citizens for Responsible Planning v. City of Gilroy (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 911, 919-921, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102]* .

[c] Class Actions

The exhaustion requirement applies to class actions and operates to bar a class action when the contentions made on behalf of the class have not been presented in an appropriate administrative proceeding [*Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 985-986, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379* (failure to challenge premium rates in administrative proceedings precludes class action seeking recovery of excess medical malpractice insurance premiums); *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 96, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441* (class action challenging validity of ordinance regulating commercial signs precluded when named plaintiffs failed to apply for variances); *Morton v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 977, 983-984, 88 Cal. Rptr. 533* (class action seeking to compel city to pay overtime for certain activities of police officers precluded when petitioners failed to use grievance procedure)]. If the named plaintiffs or petitioners have not personally initiated or participated in administrative proceedings, however, they may be able to satisfy the exhaustion requirement by showing that the contentions they are making have been presented in an appropriate administrative forum by other members of the class [*Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 247, 267-268, 104 Cal. Rptr. 761, 502 P.2d 1049* (exhaustion requirement satisfied when class members other than named petitioners challenged decision to grant use permit in administrative proceedings); *Tarkington v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1508-1510, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 131* (so long as some class members exhausted administrative remedies before filing class action lawsuit, other class members who did not exhaust administrative remedies were not excluded from class member status by their failure to exhaust administrative remedies); *see also Harrison v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 852, 859-861, 118 Cal. Rptr. 828* (exhaustion requirement satisfied despite named plaintiffs' failure to appear or produce evidence at administrative hearing on validity of special assessment when Board knew of their contentions by numerous written protests and oral presentations of other class members)]. When some class members have adequately raised common factual or legal issues justifying relief in administrative proceedings, the relief granted by the court may run to other class members who failed to use or exhaust their individual administrative remedies [*Harrison v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 852, 859-861, 118 Cal. Rptr. 828* (when Board adequately apprised of grounds on which special assessment declared invalid by appeals filed by other property owners, assessment invalidated as to those property owners who failed to use administrative procedure to object to assessment or who failed to raise contentions ultimately upheld by court)].

[3] What Constitutes Exhaustion of Administrative Remedy

[a] Completed Proceedings With Final Decision on Merits

The exhaustion requirement is not satisfied merely by the institution of administrative proceedings; the petitioner must pursue all available administrative proceedings to completion and receive a final decision on the merits [*McHugh v. County of Santa Cruz (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 533, 538-539, 109 Cal. Rptr. 149* ; *Thomas v. Shewry (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1480, 1485-1486, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 105* (podiatrist failed to timely file administrative appeals of reenrollment application and audit obligations. Podiatrist sought writ of mandamus to overturn denial of reenrollment application and audit obligations; writ denied because of failure to exhaust administrative remedies); *Chase Bank v. City and County of San Francisco (174 Cal. App. 4th 1201, 1209-1211, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906* (bank failed to timely file a tax refund claim with city assessment appeals board; bank's lawsuit for a refund of taxes paid was precluded by bank's failure to exhaust administrative remedies for failure to file a timely refund claim); *Fiscus v. Dept. Alcoholic Bev. Control (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 234, 236, 317 P.2d 993]* . When applicable statutes and regulations allow the petitioner to appeal an initial administrative decision to another administrative body or officer, the petitioner must do so [*see, e.g.,* *Lynn v. Duckel (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 845, 849-850, 299 P.2d 236* ; *Vernons & Vernons, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 943, 945-946, 171 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *Grant v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 606, 609, 145 Cal. Rptr. 699]* .

However, the California Supreme Court held that a state employee pursuing a whistleblower retaliation complaint under *Gov. Code § 8547.8* against agency officials where the state employee worked was only required to pursue a complaint with the State Personnel Board under *Gov. Code § 19683*. The employee was not required to request a hearing before an ALJ working for the State Personnel Board (SPB), nor was the employee required to seek judicial review under administrative mandamus before filing a civil action for damages based on whistleblower retaliation. The employee was only required to receive the findings of the executive officer of the SPB based on review of the complaint. The employee was not required to exhaust administrative or judicial remedies to challenge those findings before filing a civil lawsuit. Furthermore, the executive officer's findings (which were adverse to the employee) were not binding on the employee as a matter of issue preclusion because the executive officer's findings were not a final judgment following an administrative hearing [*State Board of Chiropractic Examiners v. Superior Court (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 963, 968, 973, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 576, 201 P.3d 457]* . Furthermore, the Second District Division 3 California Court of Appeal held that a former county employee who filed a whistleblower retaliation complaint against his former employer did not have to exhaust either an internal administrative remedy or the remedy provided by *Labor Code § 98.7* (filing a complaint with the Labor Commissioner) before filing his lawsuit in superior court [*Lloyd v. County of Los Angeles (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 320, 323-324, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872]* .

When, however, an applicable statute or regulation provides that a petitioner *may* seek reconsideration or rehearing of an adverse decision of an agency, such reconsideration is not always a prerequisite to seeking judicial review. It is not necessary to seek reconsideration or rehearing in order to raise for a second time the same evidence and legal arguments previously presented to the agency, solely to exhaust administrative remedies [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 510, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543* (overruling a contrary decision in *Alexander v. State Personnel Board (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 198, 200, 137 P.2d 433*)]. The general rule requiring exhaustion of remedies remains valid, however: in the sense an agency must be given an opportunity to reach a reasoned and final conclusion on all issues over which it has jurisdiction before those issues are raised in a judicial forum. Thus, a request for reconsideration or rehearing remains a necessary prerequisite to judicial review when there is new evidence, changed circumstances, or new legal arguments which the agency did not have the opportunity to consider in original administrative proceeding [*Sierra Club v. San Joaquin LAFCO (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 489, 493-494, 510, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 702, 981 P.2d 543]* .

This is consistent with *Gov. Code § 11523*, which provides that a failure to seek reconsideration under of an agency decision governed by the APA does not affect the right to seek judicial review by mandate [*see also, e.g., Gov. Code §*

19588 (failure to seek rehearing before State Personnel Board shall not affect right to petition for mandate)].

State civil service employees who brought employment discrimination claims under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [*Gov. Code § 12900*] had the choice of whether to exhaust administrative remedies with the State Personnel Board (Board), or of exhausting administrative remedies by filing a claim with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH). Employees filed a claim with DFEH, and received a right to sue letter. Employees were held to have exhausted administrative remedies requirements by filing claim with DFEH, and were not required to also pursue administrative remedies with Board [*Ruiz v. California Department of Corrections (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 891, 896-898, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139]* . Thus, in this case context, completing all administrative proceedings means completing one of the two available options, but not both. Similarly, an employee of the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles (HACLA) who was terminated from employment had the choice of pursuing the internal administrative remedies provided by HACLA, or pursuing the FEHA administrative remedy, before filing a civil lawsuit alleging disability discrimination in violation of the FEHA statute [*Williams v. Housing Auth. of City of Los Angeles (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 708, 720-721, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 374]* . Furthermore, that employee is not required to exhaust administrative remedies to bring a FEHA-related non-statutory claim (wrongful termination based on public policy) when an agency decision on the FEHA-related claim could have preclusive effect on the FEHA statutory claim [*Williams v. Housing Auth. of City of Los Angeles (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 708, 727-728, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 374]* . The First District, Division 5, California Court of Appeal held that a former employee of a community college district did not have to exhaust administrative remedies that included an internal grievance procedure before challenging his demotion and termination based on claims of discrimination under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA). Exhaustion was not required because the internal grievance procedures were established by collective bargaining agreement, not by statute, and arbitration not judicial review by mandamus was the enforcement and review mechanism. Also, the employee did not have to exhaust administrative remedies for his non statutory claims [*Ortega v. Contra Costa Community College District (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1080-1084, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*].

Exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements for an employee to bring employment discrimination claims against the county employer requires that the employee obtain a right to sue letter from the EEOC as a prerequisite to filing a lawsuit bringing Title VII claims against the county. It is not sufficient for the employee plaintiff to have obtained a right to sue letter from the State Department of Fair Employment and Housing to file a lawsuit that includes Title VII claims [*Roman v. County of Los Angeles (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 316, 325-326, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 13]* . Before a litigant can bring a lawsuit to challenge an assessment under the Citrus Pest Control District Law [*Food & Agric. Code § 8401 et seq.*], the litigant must exhaust administrative remedies by challenging the pest control district's budget for the assessment year. This would allow the district to respond to the merits of the objections and to modify the budget based on those objections [*Wallich's Ranch Co. v. Kern County Citrus Pest Control Dist. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 878, 883-885, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 875* ; *People ex. rel. Lockyer v. Sun Pacific Farming Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 619, 641-642, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115]* .

Prisoners must exhaust administrative remedies before seeking judicial relief. A prisoner who sued the Department of Corrections for medical malpractice, and failure to furnish medical care, failed to complete the prison administrative review process before filing his lawsuit. As a result, his court claim was barred by failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The court noted a number of policies furthered by the exhaustion requirements including "bolstering administrative autonomy, mitigating damages, giving agencies the opportunity to make factual findings, encouraging settlement, filtering out frivolous claims, fostering better prepared litigation, and promoting judicial economy" [*Wright v. State (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 659, 666-667, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* . Prison administrative remedies must be exhausted even though the prisoner could not recover damages except by going to court. Substantial compliance is not enough. The prisoner must complete all three levels of prison administrative review of his grievances [*Wright v. State (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 659, 667-668, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 92]* .

The Third District California Court of Appeal held that an employee's discrimination lawsuit against the employer was not barred by failure to exhaust administrative remedies because the court recognized that the employee's failure to file

a timely complaint with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing was equitably excused. Circumstance justifying equitable excuse included facts that the employee relied on the DFEH representative's assurances that he would meet the required deadline, the employee was diligent in pursuing the administrative complaint, the employee raised the timeliness issue with the DFEH, and he was only slightly late in filing the agency complaint [*Holland v. Union Pacific Railroad Company (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 940, 946-948, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 145]* .

[b] Full Presentation of Issues at All Stages

The exhaustion doctrine requires that a litigant make a full presentation to the administrative entity on all issues at all prescribed stages of the administrative proceedings [*Edgren v. Regents of University of California (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 515, 520, 205 Cal. Rptr. 6* ; *Bleeck v. State Board of Optometry (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 415, 432, 95 Cal. Rptr. 860]* . Thus, even a litigant who has initiated appropriate administrative proceedings is barred from seeking judicial relief when he or she has failed to participate at some subsequent stage of the proceedings [*Edgren v. Regents of University of California (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 515, 520, 205 Cal. Rptr. 6* (after initiating grievance proceedings, plaintiff withdrew from hearing and declined to participate further); *Doyle v. Chino, City of (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 681, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844* (after filing administrative appeal, petitioner refused to attend hearing); *Rudolph v. Fulton (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 339, 341-343, 2 Cal. Rptr. 807* (after plaintiff's administrative appeal from decision upholding disciplinary action resulted in order remanding case for further hearing, plaintiff withdrew from administrative proceedings)]. However, an appealing party was held to have satisfied the exhaustion requirement, even though it had not been a formal party to the administrative proceeding, when its business partner did exhaust administrative remedies before the agency as to issues that the appealing party raised on appeal [*CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1080-1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652]* .

The issue exhaustion requirement avoids unnecessary litigation, provides a more complete record for judicial review, and ensures that agency expertise is utilized. Citizens who participate in city redevelopment hearings are not held to the same high standard as are lawyers in specific proceedings, but citizens have to be specific enough in raising issues before the city so that the city has the opportunity to respond to that issue prior to judicial review. A response that is too general will not satisfy the issue exhaustion requirement [*Evans v. City of San Jose (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1123, 1137-1138, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 675*].

Issue exhaustion requirements also compel the plaintiff to raise issues at successive stages of the administrative process to preserve those issues for later judicial review. Thus, a litigant who raises an issue before the first administrative agency that can consider the issue, but who fails to raise that same issue in an administrative appeal to an administrative agency that has final decision making authority has not satisfied issue exhaustion requirements, and cannot raise that same issue on judicial review [*Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. County of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 589-590, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880]* .

Issue exhaustion requirements also require a litigant to assert issues before the superior court in a mandate proceeding challenging agency action as a precondition to raising those same issues on appeal. This issue is technically exhaustion of judicial remedies, and issue exhaustion applies even though the issue raised is a legal question, not a factual question, i.e., the unconstitutionality of a fine on grounds of excessiveness [*Fair Political Practices Commission v. Californians Against Corruption (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 269, 282-284, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659* (defendants were precluded challenging fine on grounds of unconstitutional excessiveness because defendants had failed to assert this issue in mandate proceeding agency decision to impose fine)]. The failure of a party to raise a due process issue before the ALJ meant that this issue could not be brought on appeal; the party waived the right to raise the claim that the agency failure to follow APA procedures violated due process of law [*Niles Freeman Equipment v. Joseph (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 765, 787-788, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 690*].

Judicial review is also precluded when a litigant has merely objected to some proposed action or decision without articulating any specific factual or legal contentions [*Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton (1984) 153 Cal.*

App. 3d 1194, 1197, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855 (objections to proposed project on general environmental grounds insufficient to exhaust administrative remedies for violations of *California Environmental Quality Act); Barnes v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 994, 1001-1002, 173 Cal. Rptr. 742* (plaintiff who failed to present factual documentation in support of tax refund claim did not exhaust administrative remedies)]. Thus, a litigant must ordinarily present a specific factual or legal issue for decision at the administrative level to preserve that issue for subsequent judicial review [*Coalition for Student Action v. City of Fullerton (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1194, 1197, 200 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *Barnes v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 994, 1001-1002, 173 Cal. Rptr. 742]* . The California Court of Appeal held that a local citizens group had satisfied exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements by raising objections to the project approval no later than the close of the public hearing on the project approval as required by the CEQA statute *Pub. Res. Code § 21177(a), (b)* [*Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1199-1200, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203]* . In another case, the Fifth District California Court of Appeal held that a local citizens group that challenged the approval by a city of a subdivision development failed to exhaust administrative remedies as to issues related to CEQA violations under state CEQA guidelines [§ 15152(g)], and also as to issues related to General Plan consistency. The citizens group did not raise these issues before the city council and therefore the city council did not have an opportunity to consider these issues. Because they failed to raise these issues before the city council, the challengers could not raise these issues on judicial review [*Porterville Citizens for Responsible Hillside Development v. City of Porterville (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 885, 909-911, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 105*]. In another case, the Second District, Division 4, California Court of Appeal held that an employers' group that challenged an assessment for unemployment insurance contributions failed to exhaust administrative remedies because it failed to complete the administrative proceeding it started by filing the petition for reassessment [*American Employers Group, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 836, 843-845, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233*]. On the other hand, because parties to an administrative proceeding are usually not represented by counsel, less specificity is needed to preserve an issue for review in an administrative proceeding than in a judicial proceeding [*East Peninsula Ed. Council, Inc. v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School Dist. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 155, 176-177, 258 Cal. Rptr. 147* ; *Citizens Assn. for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 151, 163, 217 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *see also Graham v. Bryant (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 66, 70, 266 P.2d 44]* .

A citizens group that challenged a town's granting of a permit for a development project satisfied exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements because a member of that group, which was formed after the town approved the project, presented objections to the development project during the public comment period mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 21177(c)*]. The citizens group's verified petition for writ of mandate identified several members of the group who had presented objections to the project during the comment stage, and that was sufficient to show exhaustion of administrative remedies [*Maintain Our Desert Env't v. Town of Apple Valley (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 430, 437-439, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 322]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityJurisdiction & VenueCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureClass ActionsPrerequisitesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. When Mandate Proceedings May Be Commenced

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.12

§ 474A.12 Exceptions to Rule: When Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Not Required

[1] Administrative Remedy Unavailable or Inadequate

[a] Nature of Exception

Under one of the most frequently invoked exceptions to the exhaustion doctrine, exhaustion is not required when the remedy is unavailable or inadequate [*Tiernan v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 211, 217, 188 Cal. Rptr. 115, 655 P.2d 317* ; *Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* ; *Endangered Habitats League, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Board (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 227, 237-238, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358]* . This exception does not apply, however, when an administrative remedy has been lost as a result of a petitioner's failure to assert it in a timely manner, or as a result of some other neglect on the part of petitioner [*Roth v. City of Los Angeles (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 679, 686-687, 126 Cal. Rptr. 163]* .

A physician was not excused from completing a hospital peer review process before filing a tort lawsuit and seeking damages in the Superior Court because the hospital failed to start the hearing within the required 60-day time period. Failure to start on time does not make an administrative remedy inadequate or unavailable. Further, the physician was required to raise the issue of hearing officer bias before the hearing officer first [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Sacramento Superior Court (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 85, 91, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 744]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that a group of physicians that challenged the refusal of the hospital at which they worked to order a consolidated hearing rather then hold eight individual hearings failed to exhaust administrative remedies because there was an available internal hospital remedy available (appeal of the JRC decision to the hospital board) to challenge the refusal to consolidate the hearing. The California Court of Appeal held that the failure to exhaust administrative remedies required reversal of the petition granting a writ of mandate requiring the consolidation of the hearings [*Eight Unnamed Physicians v. Medical Executive Committee Of Medical Staff of Washington Township Hospital (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 503, 512-513, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 100]* .

Another California Court of Appeal that an unsuccessful bidder for a state contract failed to exhaust administrative

remedies required to challenge the award of the contract to another bidder [*Imagistics International, Inc. v. Department of General Services (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 581, 584, 59 Cal. Rptr.3d 18]* . The protestor challenged the adequacy of the administrative remedies by claiming that the protest arbitration process violated due process of law because the protest coordinator and the Office of Administrative Hearings were too closely aligned with the Department of General Services. The protestor claimed that it violated due process of law to have a small body of OAH hearing officers hear bid protests because DGS is a repeat player in bid protests administrative proceedings. The Court of Appeal rejected this argument and found that due process of law was not violated in these circumstances. Thus, the bid protestor was required to pursue the administrative remedy specified in these circumstances, protest arbitration [*Imagistics International, Inc. v. Department of General Services (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 581, 591-592, 59 Cal. Rptr.3d 18]* .

[b] Administrative Body Cannot Grant Relief Sought

An administrative remedy is generally considered unavailable or inadequate when the administrative body cannot grant the relief sought by the petitioner [*Tiernan v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 211, 217, 188 Cal. Rptr. 115, 655 P.2d 317* ; *Pasillas v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 312, 358-359, 202 Cal.Rptr. 739]* . Thus, a petitioner is not ordinarily required to pursue proceedings before an administrative body in any of the following circumstances:

- It is only authorized to render advisory opinions [*Pearson Candy Co. v. Waits (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 615, 619, 165 P.2d 674* ; *James v. Marinship Corp. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 721, 744-745, 155 P.2d 329* ; *Pasillas v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 312, 358-359, 202 Cal. Rptr. 739]* .

- It is not empowered to grant the type of relief sought by the petitioner [*see* *Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* (plaintiffs seeking tort damages for injuries sustained doing work that was illegally made a condition of welfare assistance were not required to challenge validity of condition in administrative appeal of decision terminating welfare grant); *Salimi v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 216, 221-222, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 640* (employer who sued worker's compensation insurer for bad faith and breach of contract did not have to exhaust WCAB and Department of Insurance administrative remedies before bringing civil action); *Miller v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1665, 1676, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 584* (auto dealer that sued auto manufacturer seeking damages for fraud related to auto allocation was not required to exhaust administrative remedies with New Motor Vehicle Board before bringing common law fraud claim); *Lance Camper Manufacturing Corp. v. Republic Indemnity Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 194, 199-201, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 622* (employer suing worker's compensation insurer for breach of contract and bad faith was not required to seek relief from insurance commissioner); *Daniels v. Shasta-Tehama-Trinity J. Community College Dist. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 909, 927, 260 Cal. Rptr. 867* (teachers challenging layoffs were not required to assert rehire rights against employees not on the seniority list and not yet hired); *Shernoff v. Superior Court (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 406, 409, 118 Cal. Rptr. 680* (plaintiffs seeking damages for illegal fixing of insurance rates were not required to seek relief from insurance commissioner when commissioner was empowered only to make order enjoining future illegal conduct); *California State Employees' Assn. v. Williams (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 390, 394-395, 86 Cal. Rptr. 305* (plaintiffs challenging legality of state contracts with private entities were not required to request hearing before State Personnel Board when Board was empowered only to investigate and remedy violations of law in connection with appointments to civil service positions); *Bernstein v. Smutz (1947) 83 Cal. App. 2d 108, 114-115, 188 P.2d 48* (petitioner seeking writ to compel granting of variance not required to apply to city zoning administrator for variance when administrator was not empowered to grant variance under applicable ordinance)].

- It has no discretion, under the circumstances of the particular case, to grant the relief sought by the

petitioner [*see* *Tiernan v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1982) 188 Cal. Rptr. 115, 655 P.2d 317* (temporary employee challenging University's failure to adopt regulations requiring notice of non-reappointment was not required to institute grievance proceeding when grievance committee had no discretion to recommend change in university rules or policies); *Vogulkin v. State Board of Education (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 424, 434-435, 15 Cal. Rptr. 335* (petitioner whose teaching credential was revoked for conviction of sex offense was not required to appeal to State Board when statute mandating revocation gave State Board no discretion to reinstate license)].

- The agency's governing statute does not provide a forum for resolving disputes relating to the claim asserted [*Hightower v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860-861]* .

Accordingly, a litigant seeking damages is generally not required to pursue proceedings before an administrative body that is not empowered to grant monetary relief [*see, e.g.,* *Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* ; *Lance Camper Manufacturing Corp. v. Republic Indemnity Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 194, 199-201, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 622* ; *Lachman v. Cabrillo Pacific University (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 941, 945-946, 177 Cal. Rptr. 21* ; *Shernoff v. Superior Court (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 406, 409, 118 Cal. Rptr. 680]* . The exhaustion doctrine may apply to bar a damage claim, however, if an administrative remedy will either

- Enable the litigant to avoid or mitigate damages [*Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 476, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410* ; *Wilkinson v. Norcal Mutual Ins. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 307, 317, 159 Cal. Rptr. 416]* ; or

- Resolve, or substantially facilitate the resolution of, the basic controversy underlying the damage claim [*Edgren v. Regents of University of California (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 515, 521-522, 205 Cal. Rptr. 6* ; *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 983-987, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379]* .

A teacher was not required to exhaust internal grievance procedures in a collective bargaining agreement between the teacher's union and the school district prior to filing a lawsuit asserting a claim for differential pay benefits under *Education Code § 44977*. The claim for benefits was brought under the statute, and this claim was different from the differential pay benefit provided in the collective bargaining agreement. The arbitration agreement grievance procedure, which ended with binding arbitration, was applicable to the agreement but not to claims for enforcement of statutory rights under the Education Code [*Veguez v. Governing Bd. of the Long Beach Uni. Sch. Dist. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 406, 416-417, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 526]* .

[c] Procedures for Obtaining Relief Are Inadequate

Even when an administrative entity is authorized to grant relief through its continuing supervisory or investigatory powers, a possible administrative remedy may be considered inadequate if the procedures for obtaining the remedy are insufficient or defective [*Common Cause v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 432, 441, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574, 777 P.2d 610* ; *Rosenfield v. Malcolm (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 559, 566-567, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505, 421 P.2d 697* ; *Unnamed Physician v. Board of Trustees of Saint Agnes Medical Center (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 607, 619-621, 113 Cal. Rptr 2d 309* ; *Jacobs v. State Bd. of Optometry (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1029, 147 Cal. Rptr. 225]* . Exhaustion is thus not required if the applicable statutes, rules, and ordinances do not establish a clearly defined set of procedures under which the petitioner is entitled to submit his or her claim to an administrative entity and have it evaluated and resolved [*Common Cause v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 432, 441, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574, 777 P.2d 610* ; *Rosenfield v. Malcolm (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 559, 566-567, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505, 421 P.2d 697* ; *Unfair Fire Tax Committee v. City of Oakland (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1424, 1429-1431, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 701* (city ordinance did not provide adequate administrative remedy because the ordinance had no procedural mechanisms for submission, evaluation, and resolution of the appeal specified under the ordinance; so litigant is not required to exhaust that remedy and can file lawsuit); *City of Coachella v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Com. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1277, 1287-1288, 258 Cal. Rptr. 795*

; *Jacobs v. State Bd. of Optometry (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1029, 147 Cal. Rptr. 225* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 813, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358* ; *see also Henry George School of Social Science v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 82, 85, 6 Cal. Rptr. 661]* .

An administrative remedy may be considered inadequate if the applicable rules fail to provide for notice and the right to a hearing, the taking of testimony, the submission of legal arguments or other procedural protections mandated by due process requirements [*Glendale City Employees' Assn., Inc. v. City of Glendale (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 328, 342-343, 124 Cal. Rptr. 513, 540 P.2d 609* , *cert. denied, 424 U.S. 943, 96 S. Ct. 1411, 47 L. Ed. 2d 349* ; *Bush v. California Conservation Corps (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 194, 203-204, 185 Cal. Rptr. 892* ; *Superior Strut & Hanger Co. v. Port of Oakland (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 987, 1002, 140 Cal. Rptr. 515* ; *Sunnyvale Public Safety Officers Assn. v. City of Sunnyvale (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 732, 736, 127 Cal. Rptr. 863* ; *see also Roth v. City of Los Angeles (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 679, 687-691, 126 Cal. Rptr. 163]* .

Termination of doctor's hospital staff privileges for cause was challenged by doctor because of lack of a pre-termination hearing. The court of appeal concluded that physician had a due process and statutory [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 809*] right to a pre-termination hearing before staff privileges could be terminated [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1147-1150, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . The Court of Appeal held that physician was entitled to a preliminary injunction reinstating staff privileges until the required hearing procedures were completed [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1160, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . The court also held that physician did not have to exhaust internal hospital grievance procedures, including a post-termination procedure to assert a claim that the hospital failed to follow hearing procedures required by law (statutory procedures codified under *Bus & Prof. Code § 809*) [*Sahlolbei v. Providence Healthcare, Inc. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1137, 1154-1155, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598* ; *Payne v. Anaheim Mem'l Med. Ctr. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 729, 739, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 230* (hospital bylaws did not provide for an internal grievance hearing to remedy doctor's complaint about discriminatory comments; therefore hospital administrative remedies did not have to be exhausted because there was no such remedy)].

Furthermore, a litigant was not required to participate in a public hearing to challenge the award of a contract that was part of a legislative action (city council interim contract public hearing) before challenging the award of the contract in court. There was no available administrative remedy to exhaust by participating in the public hearing, so exhaustion was not required [*Lindelli v. Town of San Anselmo (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1105-1106, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453* (mandamus challenge to city award of an interim contract pending the results of a referendum)].

Due process does not, however, require any particular form of notice or method of procedure. An agency's grievance procedures satisfy due process requirements for exhaustion of administrative remedies if the procedures provide reasonable notice and a reasonable opportunity to be heard [*Bockover v. Perko (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 479, 486, 34 Cal. Rptr.2d 423* (citing *Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 80-81, 87 P.2d 848*)]. Thus, for example, neither the lack of subpoena power nor the advisory nature of the decision of the hearing body make the procedures inadequate in due process terms [*Bockover v. Perko (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 479, 487, 34 Cal. Rptr.2d 423]* .

[2] Exhaustion Would Be Futile

Exhaustion of an administrative remedy is not required when pursuit of the remedy would be futile [*In re Joshua S (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 261, 274-275, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 460, 159 P.3d 49* (futility exception recognized based on ineligibility of children for AFDC benefits while under legal guardianship); *Sanchez v. City of Los Angeles (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1078-1079, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 188* (futility exception to exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements applied to arguments not raised by police officer in disciplinary administrative proceedings, arguments later raised on appeal as to lack of timely notice and a challenge to police chief's role in discipline process because police department's position on these issues was unyielding); *Huntington Beach Police Officers' Assn. v. City of Huntington Beach (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 492, 498-499, 129 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830,*

834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761] . Under this exception, the exhaustion requirement is excused if the petitioner can demonstrate that the decision of the administrative entity is certain to be adverse [*George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 654, 662, 221 Cal. Rptr. 488, 710 P.2d 288* ; *Collins v. Woods (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 439, 442-443, 204 Cal. Rptr. 650]* . Conversely, the futility exception does not apply when the petitioner cannot show that the agency decision is reasonably certain to be adverse [*Sea & Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Comm'n. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 412, 418-419, 194 Cal. Rptr. 357, 668 P.2d 664* ; *Economic Empowerment Foundation v. Quackenbush (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 677, 692, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 323]* .

The futility exception is a very narrow one; it applies only when the petitioner "can positively state that the [administrative agency] has declared what its ruling will be in a *particular* case" [*Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control Dist. v. Cal. Pub. Emp. Relations Bd. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 1072, 1081, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234, 112 P. 3d 623* ; *Jonathan Neil & Assoc., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 936, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055* ; *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 654, 662, 221 Cal. Rptr. 488, 710 P.2d 288* ; *City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 39 (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 938, 947-948, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516* (city could not satisfy futility exception by showing that agency denied request for an injunction; city had to show and failed to show that agency would inevitably rule against city on administrative claim); *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 77-78, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750]* . To come within the exception, the petitioner must establish the following elements:

- There must be some declaration or conduct on the part of the administrative entity that demonstrates that it had predetermined its position [*George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 654, 662-663, 221 Cal. Rptr. 488, 710 P.2d 288* ; *Doyle v. Chino, City of (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 683, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844]* . Futility cannot be established by the petitioner's speculation or subjective feelings [*Doyle v. Chino, City of (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 683, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844]* .

- The declarations or conduct relied on by the petitioner must be that of the decision making entity itself [*see* *Doyle v. Chino, City of (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 681-683, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844* (evidence of city manager's predisposition insufficient to establish futility of appeal to city council); *Call v. Feher (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 434, 440, 155 Cal. Rptr. 387* (letter from agency's executive officer expressing opinion that board would not grant relief insufficient to show futility of application to governing board of *California Tahoe Regional Planning Agency); La Costa Beach Homeowners Assn. v. Wayne (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 327, 331, 152 Cal. Rptr. 355* (absent evidence that commission mechanically followed staff recommendations, adverse staff recommendation insufficient to establish futility of appeal to California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission)].

- The declarations or conduct relied on by the petitioner must show a predetermined position that necessitates an adverse ruling in petitioner's particular case [*Gantner & Mattern Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 314, 318, 109 P.2d 932* ; *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 77-78, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750* ; *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 92-93, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441]* . This element cannot be established merely by showing that the administrative entity has ruled adversely to the contentions made by petitioner in deciding other matters [*Gantner & Mattern Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 314, 318, 109 P.2d 932* ; *In re Serna (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1014, 143 Cal. Rptr. 350]* , or that it is generally hostile toward the type of claim asserted by petitioner [*see* *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 77-78, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750* ; *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 92-93, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441]* .

The futility exception applies when the administrative body from whom relief would be sought has previously taken a position that would require denial of the petitioner's current claim and the past positions were taken in the following

circumstances:

- Related proceedings involving the petitioner [*Collins v. Woods (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 439, 442-443, 204 Cal. Rptr. 650* (when hearing officer had approved retroactive application of statute in prior hearing, petitioner was not required to seek another hearing on propriety of continued retroactive application); *Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761* (when board amended zoning ordinance specifically to prevent construction of petitioner's low-income housing project, petitioner was not required to apply for variance)].

- Informal dealings and communications preliminary to the initiation or completion of formal proceedings [*Jacobs v. State Bd. of Optometry (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 1022, 1029, 147 Cal. Rptr. 225* (plaintiff not required to formally petition State Board of Optometry to enact regulations when Board's response to letter demanding enactment made it plain that Board would not take requested action); *Huntington Beach Police Officers' Assn. v. City of Huntington Beach (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 492, 498-499, 129 Cal. Rptr. 893* (association not required to seek formal hearing before personnel board on change in employees' work schedules when city consistently took the position that it was a nonnegotiable management prerogative throughout extended grievance proceedings)].

[3] Court Vested With Concurrent Primary Jurisdiction

When applicable statutes give concurrent primary jurisdiction over a particular type of controversy to the court and an administrative agency, exhaustion of the administrative remedy is not a prerequisite to use of the judicial remedy [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 448-452, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709* ; *Scripps etc. Hospital v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 669, 673-674, 151 P.2d 109* ; *Southbay Creditors Trust v. General MotorsAcceptance Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1080, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* ; *California School Employees Assn. v. Travis Unified School Dist. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 202 Cal. Rptr. 699* ; *Muir v. Steinberg (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 264, 269, 17 Cal. Rptr. 431]* . A legislative intent to vest the court with concurrent primary jurisdiction has been found in the following instances:

- The statutes creating the administrative remedy expressly provide that they shall not supersede the statutes creating the judicial remedy [*Wygant v. Victor Valley Joint Union High School Dist. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 319, 322-323, 214 Cal. Rptr. 205* ; *California School Employees Assn. v. Travis Unified School Dist. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 202 Cal. Rptr. 699]* .

- A legislative act provides both administrative and judicial remedies and does not expressly condition the availability of the judicial remedy on the exhaustion of the administrative remedy [*Scripps etc. Hospital v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 669, 673-674, 151 P.2d 109* ; *Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc v. Helliker (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1159-1161, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 191* (litigant filed complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief coupled with petition for writ of mandate). The California Court of Appeal held that litigant, who was pesticide manufacturer regulated by Department of Pesticide Registration was not required to exhaust administrative remedies before filing lawsuit in court, as the California legislature provided for a judicial remedy as an alternative to the administrative remedy); *Muir v. Steinberg (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 264, 269, 17 Cal. Rptr. 431]* .

- The statutes governing the judicial proceeding authorize the court to refer cases to the administrative entity for investigation and report [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 448-452, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* .

- The statutes expressly authorize court jurisdiction over all common law and statutory claims originally cognizable in the courts and provide that a party may commence action to litigate any of those

claims in any court of competent jurisdiction [*Southbay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1079-1080, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (construing *Veh. Code § 3050(e)*)].

An intent to grant the court concurrent primary jurisdiction may not be inferred, however, merely from the absence of an express statutory provision making exhaustion of the administrative remedy a prerequisite to the institution of judicial proceedings [*cf. A. Teichert & Son, Inc. v. State of Cal. (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 736, 746, 48 Cal. Rptr. 225* ; *Woodard v. Broadway Fed. S. & L. Assn. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 218, 221, 244 P.2d 467]* .

The State of California filed an unfair business practices (under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*) lawsuit against mobile home park owners for violating city rent control ordinances. The Court of Appeal held that the Superior Court had primary jurisdiction to adjudicate the unfair business practices claims and to award civil penalties against the defendants for violating the unfair business practices law. The Superior Court properly exercised discretion to adjudicate the claims and to interpret the ordinance an appropriately judicial function [*People v. Beaumont Investment, Ltd (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 102, 124-127, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 429]* .

When the Legislature has established a scheme under which a court is prohibited from exercising discretion under the primary jurisdiction doctrine, the court must honor the scheme, and may not decline to adjudicate a suit on the basis that available administrative processes should first be invoked and completed. If, however, there is no legislation precluding a court from exercising its discretion under the primary jurisdiction doctrine, then the court may exercise its discretion and decline to hear a lawsuit until the administrative process has been completed [*Farmers Ins. Exchange v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 377, 394, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487, 826 P.2d 730]* .

An insured trucking company filed a tort cross-complaint in a court lawsuit for breach of contract to collect disputed premium charges, which action was brought against the insured by a collection agency as an assignee of the insurer. The tort cross-complaint alleged that the insurer had breached the covenant of good faith and fair dealing owed to its insured, and had also committed fraud, in relation to an insurance premium billing dispute between the insured and the insurer. The insurer was assigned to provide automobile liability insurance to the insured company under the California Automobile Assigned Risk Plan (CAARP). The insured recovered a substantial jury verdict against the insurer [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 923-924, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* . The California Supreme Court upheld the Court of Appeal, which had reversed the trial court judgment for the insured, but disagreed on the rationale for that decision. The California Supreme Court rejected the Court of Appeals holding that exhaustion of administrative remedies requirements were applicable and not satisfied. Rather, the Supreme Court held that exhaustion of administrative remedies was not required, but that the doctrine of primary jurisdiction did apply and required the trial court to stay its decision-making and refer the premium billing dispute issue to the Department of Insurance and the State Insurance Commissioner [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 923-924, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* . The Court reasoned that exhaustion of administrative remedies did not apply because the insured's tort claims, and the insurer's breach of contract claims, were within the superior court's jurisdiction, and the Insurance Commissioner had no authority to decide these common law claims. However, primary jurisdiction did apply because one of the issues in this lawsuit, the validity of premium billing by the insurer under the CAARP program, was within the regulatory authority and expertise of the California Insurance Commissioner. The court concluded that the premium dispute issue had to be referred to the Insurance Commissioner for resolution, and that referral would promote a uniform application of complex insurance regulations, the referral would utilize the insurance agency's expertise in regulating insurer's operating under the CAARP program, thereby helping to insure a more accurate determination of the premium billing dispute issue in the lawsuit [*Jonathan Neil & Assocs., Inc. v. Jones (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 917, 933-934, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 849, 94 P.3d 1055]* .

The California Public Utilities Commission had exclusive jurisdiction to resolve a dispute between a city and a telephone company over which of the parties was required to pay the costs of compliance with a city ordinance requiring utilities to move overhead facilities underground. The superior court properly granted the telephone company's demurrer without leave to amend because the superior court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over this

dispute [*City of Anaheim v. Pacific Bell Tel. Co. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 838, 841-842, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 725]* . The California Public Utility commission has exclusive authority under Pub. Util. Code § 1159 to decide how to allocate revenues received by regulated utilities form leasing or licensing its facilities. However, claims related to easements and other property interests on land rights of way owned by a regulated utility are not barred from court consideration by Pub. Util. Code § 1159 [*Koponen v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 345, 357-358, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22*].

The Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) had exclusive jurisdiction to resolve an unfair labor practice dispute between a city employer and a public employee union. The City and County of San Francisco filed a lawsuit seeking to compel the union to participate in arbitration to resolve the labor dispute between the city and the city employees represented by the union. Arbitration was required by the city charter. The First District, Division 5, California Court of Appeal held that *Government Code § 3509* granted PERB exclusive jurisdiction to decide the arbitration dispute [*City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 39 (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 938, 940-941, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516]* .

The California Supreme Court also held that the attorney general did not have standing to file a lawsuit under the California False Claims Act (CFCA) for civil remedies related to the assets of an insolvent insurance company as to which the Insurance Commissioner has acquired title because those assets are not "state funds" within the meaning of the CFCA [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1302-1303, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* . The Court also held that the attorney general has standing to seek civil penalties under the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), but not restitution, and only injunctive relief that serves to protect the public and serve a law enforcement function [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1303-1304, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* . In holding that the attorney general could not bring a restitution related claim under the UCL law, the Court based its decision on the exclusive authority granted to the Insurance Commissioner under *Insurance Code § 1037(f)* [*State of Cal. v. Altus Fin. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1284, 1304-1306, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 498, 116 P.3d 1175]* .

The Public Utilities Commission had primary jurisdiction over issues raised in a civil lawsuit brought by plaintiffs against Pacific Gas & Electric Company for unfair business practices [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500*] and fraud. Primary jurisdiction was not exclusive, and thus dismissal of the civil action was improper. Rather, the civil lawsuit was stayed pending further action before the PUC [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 287, 299-301, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479]* . In a second appellate decision (Wise II), the California Court of Appeal held that the completion of a Public Utilities Commission (PUC) investigation into fraud charges against a regulated utility, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) without the PUC reaching any decision about those charges did not have collateral estoppel effect on a related civil lawsuit claim for fraud damages brought against PG&E by consumers [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* . The fraud issues had been referred to the PUC under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, and the trial court had stayed the civil lawsuit pending PUC resolution of the fraud issues. When the PUC closed its investigation, having taken no action, the trial court lifted the stay, and granted a motion for judgment on the pleadings brought by PG&E. The court of appeal reversed the judgment, and held the PUC decision to close the investigation did not have collateral estoppel effect on the civil lawsuit because there was no PUC ruling or decision on the merits, there were no parties to the proceeding, and the PUC was not acting in an adjudicatory capacity [*Wise v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 725, 742-743, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222]* .

The superior court properly refused to apply the primary jurisdiction doctrine and submit a lawsuit claim related to the validity of a land use under a conditional use permit to the city planning department because the issues in the lawsuit involved statutory interpretation that is appropriate for judicial resolution, and there were no issues requiring the fact finding expertise of the administrative agency [*Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc v. Astoria Hotel, Inc. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 139, 142-143, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 924]* .

Pub. Util. Code § 1759, which precludes superior court jurisdiction to review orders of the Public Utilities Commission

(PUC), or to interfere with the PUC in the performance of its official duties, does not prohibit or preempt tort damage claims in superior court lawsuits alleging violations of federal and state drinking water standards brought by water consumers against water providers regulated by the PUC. However, damage actions against those providers for conditions that meet state water quality standards are precluded or preempted because this would interfere with PUC regulation, as are injunctive relief claims against those providers [*Hartwell Corp. v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 256, 276-279, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 38 P.3d 1098]* . Furthermore, all claims, both for damages and for injunctive relief, and whether or not based on violation of water quality standards, brought by water consumers against water providers and industrial defendants that are not regulated by the PUC are not precluded or preempted by *Pub. Util. Code § 1759* [*Hartwell Corp. v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 256, 282-283, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 38 P.3d 1098]* .

Pub Util. Code § 1759, which precludes superior court jurisdiction to review orders of the Public Utilities Commission or to interfere with the PUC in the performance of its official duties, does not prohibit district attorneys from enforcing false advertising and unfair business practice laws, by filing civil lawsuits in the superior court against public utility companies within the regulatory jurisdiction of the PUC. Concurrent civil enforcement actions brought by public prosecutors, and similar administrative enforcement actions brought by the PUC are not precluded by *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*, and parallel administrative and civil enforcement actions can be coordinated by the litigants and the superior court to avoid actual conflicts that would interfere with the PUC's regulatory authority [*People v. Pac. Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1137-1139, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201]* .

The superior court has subject matter jurisdiction under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* to award intentional tort damages, including exemplary damages, for fraud sought in a civil lawsuit by a customer against a public utility regulated by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) when that regulated utility engages in willful and unlawful activities. The resolution of the lawsuit and the award of damages would not violate *Pub. Util. Code § 1759* which restricts the authority of the courts, including the superior court, to review decisions or orders of the PUC. The award of damages in this lawsuit by a customer of a regulated utility would not "hinder or frustrate" the PUC's supervisory or regulatory policies [*Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Communications Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 417-419, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the Department of Managed Health Care has concurrent jurisdiction over enforcement of the provisions of *Health & Safety Code § 1371.4*, part of the Knox-Keene Health Care service Plan Act of 1975, and that the provisions of the statute can be privately enforced by emergency room physicians filing civil lawsuits [*Bell v. Blue Cross of Cal. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 211, 216-218, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 688]* . The Court of Appeal also gave deference to the Department of Managed Health Care's interpretation of *Health & Safety Code § 1371.4* (that health care providers have the right to privately enforce provisions of the statute through filing lawsuits under the unfair competition law, as well as for breach of contract, and quantum meruit, when a health care plan did not provide adequate reimbursement for the value of service rendered by emergency room physicians) and concluded that physicians had standing to file a lawsuit against a health care service plan [*Bell v. Blue Cross of Cal. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 211, 217-219, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 688]* .

Insured had the right to file a civil lawsuit in Superior Court under the unfair competition law [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17210*] against an insurance company to challenge insurer's use of absence of prior insurance as a rating factor in determining eligibility for good driver discounts, and other purposes, in violation of *Ins. Code § 1861.02* (part of Proposition 103). The court of appeal, which rejected the argument that the Insurance Commissioner had exclusive primary jurisdiction to decide such issues, concluded that exhaustion of administrative remedies was not applicable and upheld the right of insureds (under the provisions of *Ins. Code §§ 1861.03* and *1861.10*) to file a civil lawsuit to challenge in court such insurer practices under the UCL law [*Donabedian v. Mercury Insurance Co. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 968, 986-987, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 45]* .

In a breach of contract lawsuit, defendant's defense (that the contract was void because plaintiff acted as a talent agency, but was unlicensed in violation of the act) based on the Talent Agencies Act, *Labor Code §§ 1700-1700.47*, must first

be brought before the Labor Commissioner under *Labor Code § 1700.44(a)*, and the civil lawsuit for breach of contract must be stayed pending resolution by the Labor commissioner of issues related to the Talent Agencies Act defense [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 47-48, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . Furthermore, a defense based on the Talent Agencies Act does not have to be raised within the one year statute of limitations [Labor code § 1700.44(a)] for bringing actions or proceedings under the act as the one year statute applies only to claims for affirmative relief, not to defenses [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 51-54, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . The Labor Commissioner has exclusive jurisdiction to determine Talent Agency Act related issues that arise in a breach of contract lawsuit in court. The Commissioner has jurisdiction to determine whether the contract involved the services of a talent agency, and if so, to determine that the contract is void and unenforceable. These issues must first be submitted to the Commissioner to be decided, with the opportunity for a do novo appeal to the superior court after the commissioner makes a decision [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 55-57, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* . When a Talent Agency Act defense arises in civil lawsuit in court, the superior court proceeding should be stayed, and a "petition to determine controversy" should be filed with the Commissioner. The merits of that defense can not be considered by the court until the defense has been decided by the commissioner [*Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 42, 58-59, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14, 26 P.3d 343]* .

The primary jurisdiction doctrine authorizes a stay of court action not a dismissal of a complaint through the granting of a demurrer. The primary jurisdiction doctrine is not applicable when any relevant administrative proceedings have already been completed at the time that a stay of the civil lawsuit is sought [*AICCO, Inc. v. Insurance Co. of North America (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 579, 594-595, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359]* .

Primary jurisdiction doctrine did not apply to justify dismissal of lawsuit brought by customers against suppliers of telephones and telephone service suppliers for damages for improper charges assessed for monthly telephone rental service. The damage lawsuit was authorized by *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, the lawsuit would not adversely affect the commission's decisions or orders, and the issues in the lawsuit did not require application of commission's specialized regulatory expertise to decide claims for damages [*Cundiff v. GTE California Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395, 1412-1414,125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* .

In deciding whether to stay an auto dealer's cross-complaint against an auto manufacturer for fraud until the New Motor Vehicle Board could exercise primary jurisdiction over related issues of automobile allocations among dealers, the trial court was not automatically required to grant a requested stay of the dealer's cross-complaint in the civil action, but rather was expected to exercise discretion and balance the competing interests of the agency's technical expertise on allocation issues against the dealer's right to a jury trial in court on the damages claim based on fraud allegations in the cross-complaint [*Miller v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1665, 1677-1678, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 584]* .

When a trial court applies the doctrine of primary jurisdiction, it is improper for the court to dismiss the action. Rather, it is required to stay the action in court pending resolution of the issues within the administrative agency's expertise [*Southbay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1081, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1]* . It is an abuse of discretion for a trial court to refer a case to an agency under the primary jurisdiction doctrine when the issues in the case consist of common law tort and contract claims that are within the court's jurisdiction and not within the agency's jurisdiction [*Southbay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1083, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1]* . In exercising its discretion related to primary jurisdiction, the trial court should consider agency expertise, the need for uniformity in application of agency regulations, the expense to the affected party of agency proceedings, the adequacy of agency remedies for the affected claims, and the potential for delay in the court case from agency referral under primary jurisdiction [*Southbay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1082-1083, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1]* .

The doctrine of primary jurisdiction provides that a court will abstain from determining an otherwise justiciable claim that requires the determination of issues over which an agency has primary jurisdiction. Whether an agency has primary jurisdiction depends on the extent and amount of regulatory power vested in that agency [*Industrial Commun. Sys.,*

Inc. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (9th Cir. 1974) 505 F.2d 152, 156, 1974-2 Trade Cas. (CCH) P75291] . An agency has primary jurisdiction when either of the following applies:

- One or more of the issues in the court action should be referred to the agency to protect the integrity of or achieve the uniformity required by the regulatory scheme [*United States v. Philadelphia Nat. Bank (1963) 374 U.S. 321, 353, 83 S. Ct. 1715, 10 L. Ed. 2d 915* ; *Keogh v. Chicago & N. R. Co. (1922) 260 U.S. 156, 163, 43 S. Ct. 47, 67 L. Ed. 183* ; *Texas & P. R. Co. v. Abilene Cotton Oil Co. (1907) 204 U.S. 426, 439-441, 448, 27 S. Ct. 350, 51 L. Ed. 553* ; 4 Davis, Administrative Law Treatise, ch. 22, *Primary Jurisdiction*, § 22:1 (2d ed. 1978); Fremlin, *Primary Jurisdiction and the Federal Maritime Commission, 18 Hastings L.J. 733, 744, 778*]; or

- The court action would require the determination of issues that are within the special knowledge or expertise of the regulating agency [*United States v. Western P. R. Co. (1956) 352 U.S. 59, 63-64, 77 S. Ct. 161, 1 L. Ed. 2d 126* ; *Industrial Commun. Sys., Inc. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (9th Cir. 1974) 505 F.2d 152, 156, 1974-2 Trade Cas. (CCH) P75291* ; 4 Davis, Administrative Law Treatise, ch. 22, *Primary Jurisdiction*, § 22:1 (2d ed. 1978); Fremlin, *Primary Jurisdiction and the Federal Maritime Commission, 18 Hastings L.J. 733, 744, 778*].

Even when an agency has primary jurisdiction, however, judicial consideration of the matter "is not thereby ousted, but only postponed" [*United States v. Philadelphia Nat. Bank (1963) 374 U.S. 321, 353, 83 S. Ct. 1715, 10 L. Ed. 2d 915]* . Primary jurisdiction is not a jurisdictional doctrine in any strict sense [*E. B. Ackerman Importing Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 595, 600, 39 Cal. Rptr. 726, 394 P.2d 566]* . "It is a doctrine allocating the lawmaking power" by transferring the power of making the initial determination "from court to agency" [*United States v. Western P. R. Co. (1956) 352 U.S. 59, 65, 77 S. Ct. 161, 1 L. Ed. 2d 126* ; 4 Davis, Administrative Law Treatise, ch. 22, *Primary Jurisdiction*, § 22:1 (2d ed. 1978); Jaffe, *Primary Jurisdiction Reconsidered, 102 Univ. Pa. L. Rev. 577, 583, 584 (1954)*].

The primary jurisdiction doctrine did not require a court that decided a civil action for injunctive relief based on statutory violations to defer to an agency as to an issue of statutory interpretation of the statute administered by the agency, because courts have expertise in interpreting statutes [*Hewlett v. Squaw Valley Ski Corporation (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 499, 528-529, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118*].

The California Court of Appeal rejected a challenge to denial of a petition to intervene in a civil lawsuit brought by the California Public Employees Relations Board. The lawsuit challenged the constitutionality of legislation changing retirement benefits terms for new state employees. The Board's argument for intervention was that the Board has exclusive initial jurisdiction over claims for violations of state employee collective bargaining rights. The Court of Appeal upheld the denial of the intervention petition because the constitutional issue (whether the statute impaired the obligation of contracts) was not within the exclusive initial jurisdiction of the Board. Therefore, the Board did not have the right to intervene in the lawsuit [*California Assn. of Professional Scientists v. Schwarzenegger (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 371, 380-382, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 354*].

The State Personnel Board had concurrent jurisdiction with the superior court to decide claims related to the Police Officers Procedural *Bill of Rights* Act [*Gov. Code § 3309.5*]. The Board had jurisdiction to consider a statute of limitations defense asserted by a Department of Corrections (CDC) employee as a bar to adverse employment action brought by the CDC [*Alameida v. State Personnel Bd. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 46, 52-54, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 383]* .

[4] Administrative Entity Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction

A failure to seek relief that might be available from an administrative entity does not preclude judicial relief if, in fact, the entity is not vested by a constitutional provision or statute with subject matter jurisdiction over the type of

controversy at issue [*County of Alpine v. County of Tuolumne (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 787, 798, 322 P.2d 449* ; *County of L.A. v. Dept. of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 457, 260 P.2d 41* ; *Mazda Motor of America, Inc v. California New Motor Vehicle Board (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1451, 1460-1461, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 866* (Board did not have statutory authority to adjudicate dispute between dealer and distributor, and thus dispute was not within agency's jurisdiction)]. This exception does not apply when it is merely claimed that the administrative entity has no jurisdiction to act in the case of a particular party or under a particular set of facts [*United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 194-195, 120 P.2d 26* ; *People v. Sonleitner (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 350, 363-365, 8 Cal. Rptr. 528]* . Administrative remedies do not have to be exhausted when the agency lacks administrative jurisdiction over the challenged action [*Hard v. Cal. State Emples. Ass'n (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 708, 711-712, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 615* (PERB did not have administrative jurisdiction over internal changes in union structure)]. The administrative jurisdiction exception did not apply to excuse exhaustion of administrative remedies before PERB when the trial court decided that PERB had exclusive jurisdiction over a labor dispute between a city and a public employees union [*City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 39 (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 938, 949-950, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516]* .

The administrative jurisdiction exception to exhaustion of administrative remedies was held to be applicable to the issue of the proper limitations period for bringing unfair labor practice claims before the Public Employee Relations Board (PERB). The California Supreme Court excused the District from adjudicating the limitations issue before PERB, and allowed the District to go to court to resolve this issue. In applying the administrative jurisdiction exception, the Supreme Court utilized a three-part test: 1) the injury or burden that exhaustion will impose; 2) the strength of the legal argument that the agency lacks jurisdiction; and 3) the extent to which administrative expertise may aid in resolving the jurisdictional issue. The Court held that as to the first factor, while the district would not be unduly burdened by having to exhaust administrative remedies, there was a strong public interest in definitively resolving the legal issue presented. As to the second factor, the District's legal argument is very strong. As to the third factor, the issue before the court are purely legal, within court expertise, and the court had the benefit of PERB's views on the issues in the case in the appellate briefs it filed with the Court [*Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control Dist. v. Cal. Pub. Emp. Relations Bd. (2005) 35 Cal 4th 1072, 1081-1083, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234, 112 P. 3d 623* ; *California- Nevada Annual Conference United Methodist Church v. City and County of San Francisco (First Dist., Div. 3, 2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1559, 1569-1570, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 64* (administrative jurisdiction exception recognized; *Coachella* case cited; immediate review of resolution to start landmark designation process for church building)]. The administrative jurisdiction exception was recognized and a developer was not required to exhaust administrative remedies with the Commission before challenging the Coastal Commission's statutory authority to designate property as an environmentally sensitive habitat area (ESHA) during the appeal to the Commission of a local government's grant of a coastal development permit (CDP) [*Security National Company, Inc. v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 402, 416-418, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*].

An employee was not required to plead that she served a copy of an administrative complaint (right to sue letter) upon her employer within 60 days as a jurisdictional prerequisite to going to court to bring a FEHA lawsuit. The employee sought and received the right to sue letter from FEHA, and then filed a civil lawsuit within one year of receiving that right to sue letter. Pleading service on her employer was NOT a requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies under the FEHA statute [*Gov. Code § 12962*; *Wasti v. Superior Court (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 667, 669-670, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 625]* .

The administrative jurisdiction exception to exhaustion of administrative remedies did not apply to excuse failure to exhaust administrative remedies by a challenger to a coastal development permit who failed to appeal to the California Coastal Commission a county decision to grant the permit to a neighboring landowner. The challenger argued that the county action was void and therefore exhaustion was not required, but the court of appeal rejected that argument and held that exhaustion is required for as applied challenges to agency action based on voidness. The Coastal Commission had jurisdiction over this type of dispute at the appellate level [*McAllister v. County of Monterey (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 253, 284-286, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

Claims that the administrative entity lacks jurisdiction because the statutes under which it operates are unconstitutional are governed by different rules [*see* [5], *below*].

[5] Statute Under Which Administrative Entity Operates Is Unconstitutional on Its Face

A litigant who claims that a statute under which an administrative entity operates is unconstitutional on its face is not required to raise that constitutional claim before the administrative entity [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Andal v. City of Stockton (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 86, 93-94, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34* (constitutional challenge brought by cell phone companies and their customers to challenge constitutionality of city ordinance imposing local government fee on cell phone users to fund city's 911 communication system. Administrative remedies need not be exhausted to raise constitutional challenge in court); *Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 115, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617-620, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . This exception is a narrow one and it is subject to a number of important qualifications:

- The rule has only been applied to administrative agencies of legislative origin and appears to be based on the rationale that these agencies, not being vested with judicial powers, have no power to pass on constitutional claims [*see Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617-620, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . A different rule may apply to administrative agencies of constitutional origin, because these agencies are vested with judicial powers, and thus have the power to pass on the constitutionality of the statutes under which they operate [*cf. Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 618-619, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187* ; *Walker v. Munro (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 67, 73-74, 2 Cal. Rptr. 737]* .

- The exception does not apply to a claim that a controlling statute cannot constitutionally be applied under the facts of a particular case; a claim that a statute is unconstitutional as applied will not be considered by the courts unless it has been raised at the administrative level [*Security-First Nat. Bk. v. County of Los Angeles (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 319, 321, 217 P.2d 946* (application of tax claimed to violate equal protection); *Griswold v. Mt. Diablo Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 648, 652-653, 134 Cal. Rptr. 3* (disciplinary action claimed to violate petitioner's *First Amendment* rights); *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1042, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198* (application of licensing ordinance); *but see Anderson v. Department of Real Estate (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 696, 701 n.2, 155 Cal. Rptr. 307* (claim that application of regulatory statute to activities conducted by petitioner violated petitioner's *First Amendment*rights need not be raised at administrative hearing)].

- The assertion of a constitutional claim does not allow a litigant to bypass the administrative process and present other claims directly to the courts. A litigant who challenges the facial constitutionality of controlling statutes must still raise other claims at the administrative level or they will not be considered in any judicial proceeding [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251-252, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Flores v. Los Angeles Turf Club (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 736, 745-748, 13 Cal. Rptr. 201, 361 P.2d 921]* .

- When an administrative agency has the power to grant the litigant alternative relief that would make the constitutional claim moot, a failure to apply to the agency for such alternative relief may preclude the litigant from raising the constitutional claim in the courts [*Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 94-95, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441* (failure to seek variance precludes attack on facial constitutionality of zoning ordinance); *cf. Leek v. Washington Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 43, 53, 177 Cal. Rptr. 196* (plaintiffs precluded from asserting

constitutional challenges to District practices by failure to pursue statutory administrative remedies that could have obviated need to litigate constitutional issues)].

[6] Threat of Irreparable Injury Exists

Exhaustion of an administrative remedy is not required when it will result in irreparable injury to a litigant [*see, e.g., United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 196-197, 120 P.2d 26* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 296-297, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 89, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761]* . California decisions have declared that a failure to exhaust an administrative remedy will be excused when irreparable injury will result if an administrative hearing is permitted to proceed and its orders made effective without prior judicial interference [*Hesperia Land Development Co. v. Superior Court (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 865, 876, 7 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *Greenblatt v. Munro (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 596, 605-606, 326 P.2d 929]* . Some decisions have stated that the "irreparable injury" necessary to justify application of the exception may be found only in very limited circumstances [*see, e.g., In re Serna (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1014-1015, 143 Cal. Rptr. 350* ; *Humbert v. Castro Valley County Fire Protection Dist. (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 1, 6, 29 Cal. Rptr. 158* ; *Mortgage Finance Corp. v. Watson (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 640, 641, 232 P.2d 54]* , and although the exception has frequently been acknowledged, it has rarely been applied [*Department of Personnel Administration v. Superior Court (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 155, 170-171, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714* (irreparable injury exception recognized); *City and County of San Francisco v. International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 39 (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 938, 948-949, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516* (irreparable injury exception not recognized].

When an administrative action or order becomes effective before the administrative review process is completed and will inflict irreparable injury on a litigant, it is clearly appropriate for the court to apply the irreparable injury exception and to issue a writ or injunction to prevent the administrative action or order from *taking effect* before its validity is determined [*Heyenga v. City of San Diego (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 756, 760, 156 Cal. Rptr. 496* ; *see also United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 196-197, 120 P.2d 26* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 296-297, 109 P.2d 942]* . Except in the most extraordinary circumstances, however, the exception may not be applied to allow a litigant to bypass an administrative review process and obtain direct review of an administrative action or decision in court [*cf. Board of Police Commissioners v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 420, 432-434, 214 Cal. Rptr. 493* ; *United Insurance Co. v. Maloney (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 155, 156-157, 273 P.2d 579]* .

Neither the adverse publicity that may result from the pendency of administrative proceedings [*Mortgage Finance Corp. v. Watson (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 640, 641, 232 P.2d 54]* , nor the potential drastic impact of an adverse decision [*Board of Police Commissioners v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 420, 432-434, 214 Cal. Rptr. 493* ; *Mountain View Chamber of Commerce v. City of Mountain View (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 82, 90-91, 143 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *Wilkinson v. Norcal Mutual Ins. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 307, 316, 159 Cal. Rptr. 416]* constitutes irreparable injury. The irreparable injury exception also may not be used to enable a litigant to avoid completion of an administrative review process [*cf. Board of Police Commissioners v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 420, 432-434, 214 Cal. Rptr. 493* ; *United Insurance Co. v. Maloney (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 155, 156-157, 273 P.2d 579* ; for an example of an extraordinary fact situation in which the California Supreme Court might justifiably have relied on the irreparable injury exception in excusing a litigant's failure to complete an administrative review process but declined to do so, *see Sail'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1, 7, 95 Cal. Rptr. 329, 485 P.2d 529]* .

[7] Public Interest Disserved by Application of Rule

An exception to the exhaustion requirement may be allowed in cases in which application of the rule would disserve an important public interest [*Lindeleaf v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 861, 870-871, 226 Cal. Rptr. 119, 718 P.2d 106* ; *Hull v. Cason (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 344, 358-359, 171 Cal. Rptr. 14* ; *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282]* .

This "public interest" exception has been applied in a number of contexts. For instance, in *Lindeleaf v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 861, 226 Cal. Rptr. 119, 718 P.2d 106* , the petitioner challenged the Agricultural Labor Relations Board's practice of delegating the responsibility for conducting hearings on election objections to independent hearing officers. The petitioner claimed that the controlling statutes did not authorize the Board to delegate this duty. Although the petitioner had not raised this objection before the Board, the California Supreme Court elected to invoke its power to hear important questions of public policy and decide this issue. In making this decision, the court observed that it affected not only the litigants, but also the parties to every nonfinal Board decision on an election challenge that was heard by an independent hearing examiner [*Lindeleaf v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 861, 870-871, 226 Cal. Rptr. 119, 718 P.2d 106]* .

In *Hull v. Cason (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 344, 171 Cal. Rptr. 14* , the plaintiffs challenged the hiring practices of a city fire department as being racially discriminatory. The appellate court decided not to dismiss the case even though the defendants claimed that the plaintiffs failed to exhaust their administrative remedies under California's Fair Employment Practice Act and the Federal Civil Rights Act. The court noted that the action had been litigated for seven years and that its prompt determination would be in the public interest and would end grave uncertainty in the lives and careers of many persons who would be affected by the outcome [*Hull v. Cason (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 344, 358-359, 171 Cal. Rptr. 14]* .

In *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282* , the petitioners sought to challenge as violative of the California Environmental Quality Act a conditional use permit and a tentative subdivision map allowing development of certain real property. Although they were not titled parties to the administrative proceedings, petitioners were entitled to appear at the public hearings that led to these actions and to appeal them to the town council. Although the petitioners failed to use these administrative remedies, the appellate court refused to apply the exhaustion doctrine to bar their action. The court held that such a result would totally disserve the public interest, and held that a private individual's failure to use an administrative remedy to challenge governmental action taken in a proceeding to which he or she was not a party does not bar him or her from seeking judicial relief to enforce rights held in common with members of the general public [*Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersPrimary JurisdictionCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. When Mandate Proceedings May Be Commenced

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.13

§ 474A.13 Expedited Review of Decisions on Permit or Entitlement Involving Constitutionally Protected Speech

Once it is final, a decision by a public agency regarding the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit or other entitlement "for expressive conduct protected by the *First Amendment*" (*U.S. Const., amend. I*) is subject to expedited judicial review. The petition seeking review, for example, must be filed within 21 calendar days after the decision becomes final, and the court must issue its decision on review within the earlier of 20 days after submission or 50 days after the filing of the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)*]. For a full discussion of the expedited procedures, see *Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474C.27*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechExpressive Conduct

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. When Mandate Proceedings May Be Commenced

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474A.14-474A.19

[Reserved]

§§ 474A.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. When Proceedings May Be Barred or Dismissed as Untimely

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.20

§ 474A.20 Proceeding Not Commenced Within Applicable Statute of Limitations Period Is Barred

[1] Applicability of Statute of Limitations Defenses

A mandate proceeding is a special civil proceeding and, thus, is subject to the general rules of law on limitation of actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *Ginns v. Savage (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 520, 524, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377, 393 P.2d 689* ; *Jones v. Board of Police Commissioners (1903) 141 Cal. 96, 98, 74 P. 696]* . Consequently, a mandate proceeding is ordinarily barred if it is not commenced within the applicable limitation period [*Barlow v. City Council of Inglewood (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 688, 697, 197 P.2d 721* ; *Westside Hospital v. Belshe (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 672, 675, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* ; *Vo v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 820, 825, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* ; *California Standardbred Sires Stakes Com., Inc. v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 751, 756, 282 Cal. Rptr. 656* ; *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 794, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214]* .

[2] Applicable Limitation Periods

[a] General Rules for Determining

Numerous statutes establish periods of limitation for proceedings to review different types of administrative actions. Two that are widely applicable are *Gov. Code § 11523*, governing decisions subject to the APA *see* [b], *below*], and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*, governing many decisions of specified local agencies [*see* [c], *below*]. There are also many statutes that are more narrowly directed to specific agencies or specific decisions. For example:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 19463* (*Capitol Racing v. California Horse Racing Board (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 892, 899-900, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 384* (*Bus. & Prof. Code Section 19463* (30-day time limit) for filing petition for administrative mandate was controlling, not *Gov. Code Section 11523* (30-day time limit). The challenge of Capitol Racing to the decision of the board was held to be untimely because it was filed more than 30 days after the date that the decision was issued by the Board.)

- *Educ. Code § 44929.21* (March 15th is the date by which notice must be given to school teacher in

second year of employment that teacher will not be reelected (rehired) for next school year) [*Peoples v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 463, 465, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 383* (school district ordered to reinstate teacher who had been notified on May 27th of school year that she would not be rehired for following school year; Court of Appeal affirmed superior court decision that notice was untimely)].

- *Educ. Code §§ 44939, 44944* (four-year time limit for introduction of evidence related to misconduct of teacher prior to date of notice of intention to dismiss teacher subject to application of equitable estoppel doctrine) [*Atwater Elementary School District v. California Department of General Services (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 227, 231-233, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233, 158 P.3d 794]* .

- *Educ. Code § 87789* (39-month time period from effective date of disability retirement for college professor to seek reinstatement as full-time academic employee of community college) [*Franzosi v. Santa Monica Community College District (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 442, 444, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 25* (professor's petition for a writ of mandate ordering him reinstated as a full-time academic employee was denied on grounds of lack of timeliness, and denial was affirmed by court of appeal)].

- *Gov. Code § 3304(d)* (one year statute of limitations for charter city to discharge police officer) [*Mays v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 313, 317-318, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 891, 180 P. 3d 935* (notice required by *Gov. Code § 3304(d)* is satisfied when officer is notified within one year statutory period that the employing agency proposed that specific misconduct charges will be adjudicated by a board of rights; n otice of specific proposed discipline is permitted but not required); *Moore v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 373, 376, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 218* (former officer's failure to raise one-year statute of limitations issue before departmental board of rights hearing precluded appellate review of that issue); *Parra v. City and County of San Francisco (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 977, 988-990, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 822* (tolling provisions applied to one-year statute during investigation of incident giving rise to discipline); *Breslin v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1064, 1068, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 14* (disciplinary charges not timely filed under one-year statute); *Bettencourt v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1098-1100, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 402* (disciplinary charges were timely filed because civil litigation tolling provisions applied and tolled running of one-year statute); *Sanchez v. City of Los Angeles (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1081-1082, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 188* (notice of proposed 20-day disciplinary suspension was not sufficient to give officer timely notice of proposed pay grade reduction within one year time period; officer was entitled to reinstatement in pay grade to officer status held before discipline was imposed); *Jackson v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 899, 906-907, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 325* ; *Alameida v. State Personnel Bd. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 46, 52-54, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 383* (one-year statute barred disciplinary action against correction officer employed by CDC)]. The California Department of Corrections was not required to mail notice of adverse action within one year of discovery of officer's misconduct under provisions of *Gov. Code § 3304(d)* [*Sulier v. State Personnel Bd (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 21, 31-32, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 615* (The California Department of Corrections did not violate a correction officer's due process rights by informally notifying the officer of the proposed discipline of demotion from corrections sergeant to corrections officer that the CDC might impose for the officer's misconduct. Further, the CDC later served the officer formal notice that satisfied the officer's *Skelly* rights)].

- *Gov. Code § 12960(d)* Administrative complaints must be filed with Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) within one year of unlawful act [*McDonald v. Antelope Valley Community College District (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 88, 96-97, 84 Cal.Rptr. 3d 734, 194 P.3d 1026* (equitable tolling doctrine applied to include time period in which employee was pursuing a community college's internal grievance procedure such that one-year time period was tolled during time it took to complete

grievance process. Complaint was timely)].

- *Gov. Code § 19635* (three-year statute of limitations for bringing misconduct charges against state employees of California Department of Corrections) [*California Department of Corrections v. State Personnel Board (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 797, 799-800, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 665* (running of three year statute of limitations on underlying misconduct charges did not prohibit bringing of disciplinary actions against corrections employees based upon dishonest denials of those same charges)].

- *Gov Code § 65009(c)(1)(E)* (90-day statute of limitations for court lawsuit by residential owner to challenge conditions imposed on land development permit pursuant to county ordinance) [*Travis v. County of Santa Cruz (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 757, 762-763, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 404, 94 P.3d 538* (landowner who filed writ of mandate action in court within 90 days of final agency decision issuing permit with disputed conditions brought lawsuit on a timely basis); *Arcadia Development Company v. City of Morgan Hill (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 253, 256, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598* (developer's challenge to 10-year extension of density restriction by voters in city was timely because developer brought challenge within 90 days after voters approved extension. Extension decision created a new cause of action with a new limitations period); *Honig v. San Francisco Planning Dept. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 520, 529-530, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 649* (landowners challenge to building permit was subject to 90-day limitations period applicable to variances under *Gov. Code § 65009(c)(1)(E)*); *Royalty Carpet Mills v. City of Irvine (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1115, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 282* (petition must be served within 90-day time period; failure to timely serve petition within 90 days bars claim on limitations grounds)].

- *Gov. Code § 65009(d)(1)* (90-day limitations period for notifying local land use agency applicable to challenges to local agency decisions related to low income housing [*Urban Habitat Program v. City of Pleasanton (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1561, 1573-1574, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300*].

- *Gov. Code § 66020* (180-day time period under Mitigation Fee Act was the applicable time period for filing petition for writ of mandamus (ordinary mandate writ under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*) to challenge park fees imposed by city on developer) [*Branciforte Heights, LLC v. City of Santa Cruz (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 914, 928-929, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 96* (developer that utilizes fee protest procedures to challenge fees imposed by city has right to file a mandate petition to challenge fees within 180 days)].

- *Gov. Code § 66499.37* (90-day service of summons requirement that governs subdivision map act litigation applied to CEQA challenge to city approval of final tract map for subdivision) [*Friends of Riverside's Hills v. City of Riverside (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 743, 746, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 695* (dismissal of petition for writ of mandate for lack of timely service affirmed on appeal)].

- *Labor Code § 3725* (45-day statute of limitation to file a petition for a writ of mandate from an order of the Labor commissioner) [*Department of Industrial Relations, Div. of Labor Standards Enforcement v. Atlantic Baking Co., Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 891, 894-895, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (45-day statute of limitations which starts from mailing of notice of findings and findings is not extended five days under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* which authorizes a five-day extension for service by mail so that petition for writ of mandate that was filed 50 days after mailing of notice of findings and findings was not timely filed under *Labor Code § 3725*)].

- *Labor Code § 5410* (five-year time period from date of injury to file petition to reopen worker's compensation case). Fair notice to employers required that claims to reopen benefits be filed within five years of the date of injury. Untimely claims cannot be acted upon by the WCAB, as the Board lacks jurisdiction to recognize a late claim against an employer [*Granite Construction Co. v. Workers'*

Compensation Appeals Board (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1453,1461-1462, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828] .

- *Pub Res. Code § 4601.3* (30-day statute of limitations for filing a petition for writ of administrative mandate to challenge decisions of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection under Section 4601.3 was controlling over *Gov. Code § 11523* time limits for filing mandate petition) [*Cockshott v. Dept of Forestry and Fire Protection (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 235, 238-240, 22 Cal. Rptr.3d 675]* .

- *Pub. Res. Code § 21167(b)* (30-day statute of limitations to file writ of mandamus to challenge notice of determination by agency under *Pub. Res. Code § 21152(a)* [(*Citizens for a Megaplex-Free Alameda v. City of Alameda (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 91, 108-110, 56 Cal. Rptr.3d 728* (writ of mandate challenging disposition and development agreement and mitigated negative declaration was untimely because it was not filed within 30 days of the city filing the notice of determination. It was too late to file the writ five months later.)]

- *Pub. Res. Code § 21167(d)* (determination that preparation of environmental impact report not required) [*Stockton Citizens for Sensible Planning v. City of Stockton (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 332, 336-338, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 632* (letter from director of city department to developer was not approval of project sufficient to start 35-day limitations period running nor was letter a determination by a public agency)].

- *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.4(a)* (90-day statute of limitations for requesting a hearing after filing petition for writ of mandate challenging certification of environmental impact report) [*Leavitt v. County of Madera (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1502, 1507-1508, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 101* (residents of county who challenged county's approval of residential development project and certification of environmental impact report complied with requirements of governing statute when they requested a hearing, even though they did not request a hearing date)].

- *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.4(a)* (Court challenger who alleged CEQA violations as to the adequacy of an EIR and who filed a writ of administrative mandate proceeding in Superior Court failed to request hearing on merits of CEQA violations within 90 days of filing mandate action as required by law); [*Fiorentino v. City of Fresno (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 596, 598, 59 Cal. Rptr.3d 30* (CEQA petition brought by challengers was properly dismissed because of failure to file request for hearing within 90 days of filing petition. Filing the request for hearing on the 91st day did not cure the failure to meet the deadline for requesting a hearing under the statute)]. Failure to file within 90 days meant that dismissal of mandate action was required. Failure to file was caused by attorney for challenger whose mistake was determined by Court of Appeal to be inexcusable neglect which did not justify relief from dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Nacimiento Regional Water Management Advisory Committee v. Monterey County Water Resources Agency (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 961, 964-965, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 921]* . However, in another case, the Court of Appeal held that another challenger (ASDAN) properly requested a hearing under the same statute within 90 days of filing CEQA petition in court. This is because the challenger filed a request for a hearing with the court within 90 days, and that is all that the law requires [*Association for Sensible Dev. at Northstar, Inc v. Placer County (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1289, 1292, 1295, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440]* . Similarly, another Court of Appeal held that a challenger's request for hearing was timely, notwithstanding that the challenger did not request a hearing date at the time of requesting a hearing. The Court held that *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.4* requires a timely request for a hearing, but does not require that the request set a hearing date [*Leavitt v. County of Madera (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1502, 1507, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 101]* .

- *Rev. & Tax Code § 51.5(b)* (four-year statute of limitations for escape assessments seeking to correct effects of under assessment of property by county assessors) [Kuperman v. Assessment Appeals Board

No. 1 *(2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 918, 929-931, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703* (taxpayer's application for reduction of base year value was not timely filed, and is therefore time barred under four year statute of limitations)].

- *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18622, 19059, 19060* (two years) (taxpayer's failure to report adjustment on federal income tax due for a particular year to Franchise Tax Board results in the inapplicability of California statute requiring Board to give notice to taxpayer of state tax deficiency within two years of taxpayer reporting adjustment. Notice of deficiency assessment can be given by Board at any time; four year general statute of limitations for state tax deficiency assessments (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19057*) is not applicable to this case) [*Ordlock v. Franchise Tax Bd., 38 Cal. 4th 897, 911-912, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212, 135 P.3d 628]* .

- *Pub. Res. Code § 30801* (decision of California Coastal Commission or regional coastal commission); *Serra Canyon Co., Inc. v. Cal. Coastal Comm'n (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 663, 668-669, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 110* (claim was time barred under 60-day time period to challenge Coastal Commission decision); *Strother v. California Coastal Commission (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 873, 877-879, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 831* (part of claim challenging decision of Coastal Commission was time barred under 60-day time period, but challenges to Commission rulings on certified regulatory exemption were not time barred under *Pub. Res. Code § 21080.5*).

- *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410* (decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board).

- *Veh. Code § 14401(a)* (order refusing, canceling, suspending, or revoking driver's license).

- *Water Code § 1126(b)* (30-day statute of limitations to challenge final order of State Water Resources Control Board [*North Gualala Water Co. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1606-1607, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 821* (company challenge to state water resources control board interpretation was untimely); *Phelps. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 89, 100-101, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 350* (farmers challenge to Board imposition of water diversion restrictions was untimely)].

- *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* (decision affecting application for or receipt of public social services).

- *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14171(j)* (six month statute of limitations) [*see* *Westside Hospital v. Belshe (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 672, 674, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* ; *Florence Western Medical Center v. Bonta (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 493, 500-501, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 609* (six month time period starts to run from date that affected party receives notice of decision by mailing by certified mail copy of decision to party)].

The Court of Appeal reversed the granting of a demurrer by the trial court on statute of limitations grounds to a complaint filed that challenged the granting of a power plant development application by the California Energy Commission (CEC). The decision of the CEC approving the development project was issued on March 21, 2001. The decision was filed with the CEC docket unit on March 26, 2001. The complaint was filed on May 11, 2001. The applicable limitations statute, *Pub. Resources Code § 25901*, provides that a writ of mandate must be filed within 30 days after the CEC issues its decision. The court held that the decision was final for purposes of judicial review 30 days after the decision was filed with the CEC docket unit, and therefore the administrative mandamus complaint was filed within the limitations period. This was because a CEC regulation, *Cal. Code Reg. Tit. 20, § 1720.4*, provided that the CEC can specify in a decision an effective date different than the date of filing with the docket unit, and that specified date is controlling. In this case, the CEC decision specified that the decision was final for purposes of judicial review 30 days after the date of filing the decision with the docket unit. The court concluded that the finality provision in the

decision was controlling [*Figueroa v. California Energy Resources Conservation and Development Comm'n. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1115, 1120-1121, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 376]* .

An administrative entity may not establish, by ordinance, regulation, or rule, a limitation period that is shorter than the limitation period provided or authorized by statute [*Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 385-388, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73]* .

If no such specific statute governs, then the statute of limitations applicable to an action for a writ of mandate depends on the nature of the right or obligation to be enforced by the action [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 141 n.10, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* ; *Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1367, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . When the action is one based on a statutory liability, the proceeding is governed by the three-year period prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* for "an action upon a liability created by statute" [*Urban Habitat Program v. City of Pleasanton (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1561, 1578-1579, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300* ; *Hogar v. Community Development Commission of Escondido (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1288, 1295-1296, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 497* (three year time period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* applies to claim of plaintiff that city redevelopment agency improperly calculated payments to a redevelopment related housing fund); *Raymond v. Christian (1937) 24 Cal. App. 2d 92, 113-116, 74 P.2d 536* ; *Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1367, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219* ; *see also Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 386, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73* ; *Pacific Coast Medical Enterprises v. Department of Benefit Payments (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 197, 215, 189 Cal. Rptr. 558]* . However, claims for and administrative reclassification decisions by PERS are not subject to the three year time period for statutory claims and claims based on mistake under *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a), (d)* [*City of Oakland v. Public Employees' Retirement System (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 29, 47, 51, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151]* . If no other limitation period applies, the action is governed by the four-year period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* for "[a]n action for relief not herein before provided for" [*Geneva Towers Limited Partnership v. City and County of San Francisco (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 769, 773-775, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 107, 60 P.3d 692* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 343* does not apply to lawsuit against city and county for property tax refund because the specific six month statute of limitations in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141* applies to all actions for property tax refunds); *Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 386, 216 Cal. Rptr.733, 703 P.2d 73* ; *Valvo v. University of Southern California (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 887, 894, 136 Cal. Rptr. 865* ; *Allen v. Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 877, 884-885, 34 Cal. Rptr. 232]* .

[b] Decisions Subject to the APA

Gov. Code § 11523 establishes the applicable limitation periods for judicial review of decisions subject to provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*see Gov. Code §§ 11400, 11501*; *Fair Employment and Housing Commission v. Superior Court (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 629, 633-634, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 409* (30-day statute of *Gov. Code § 11523* applies to petitions for writs of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* challenging decisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission because the FEHC's governing statutes, and regulations, incorporate requirements of the California Administrative Procedure Act, including *Gov. Code § 11523*); *Allen v. Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 877, 882-883, 34 Cal. Rptr. 232* ; *see also Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.* (APA); for discussion of when the APA applies, *see Ch. 473, Public Agency Adjudication, § 473.15*]. Under *Gov. Code § 11523*, a petition for a writ of mandate to review the decision of an administrative agency must be filed within one of the following periods [*see Ginns v. Savage (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 520, 523, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377, 393 P.2d 689* ; *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 795, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214* ; *DeCordoba v. Governing Board (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 155, 159, 139 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *see also Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 379, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73]* :

- Within 30 days after the last day on which the agency can order reconsideration; or
- Within 30 days after the delivery of the record to petitioner, if, within 10 days after the last day on

which reconsideration can be ordered, the petitioner requests the agency to prepare all or any part of the administrative record.

Appellants are not required to pay for the transcript at the time the request to prepare the transcript is submitted to extend the filing deadline under *Gov. Code § 11523* [*Jahangiri v. Medical Board of California (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1663-1664, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187]* . Under the new act, *Gov. Code § 11523* (operative July 1, 1997) provides, in relevant part, that upon request of the petitioner for a record of the proceedings, the complete record of the proceedings, or the parts thereof as are designated by the petitioner in the request, shall be prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings or the agency and shall be delivered to the petitioner within 30 days after the request, which time shall be extended for good cause shown upon payment of the fee specified in *Gov. Code § 69950* for the transcript, the cost of preparation of other portions of the record and for certification thereof [*Gov. Code § 11523*].

Under the APA, an agency's power to order reconsideration expires as follows [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*; *see* *Ginns v. Savage (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 520, 525, 39 Cal. Rptr. 377, 393 P.2d 689* ; *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 304-306, 196 P.2d 20]* :

- Thirty days after the delivery or mailing of a decision to the petitioner;

- If the agency establishes a date within that 30-day period as the effective date of the decision, on the effective date; or

- If the agency establishes the date on which a stay that does not exceed 30 days terminates as the effective date, on the effective date.

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11521* that allow the agency to terminate the time for ordering reconsideration, the 30-day period allowed by *Gov. Code § 11523* for the filing of a petition and the 10-day period that it allows for requesting the record do not begin to run until a copy of the decision is delivered or mailed to the petitioner [*De Cordoba v. Governing Board (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 155, 160, 139 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *Koons v. Placer Hills Union Sch. Dist. (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 484, 490, 132 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . Petitions that are not filed within the applicable time limits are barred because *Gov. Code § 11523* is a statute of limitations [*Vo v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 820, 825, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* ; *California Standardbred Sires Stakes Com., Inc. v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 751, 756-759, 282 Cal. Rptr. 656* ; *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 794, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214]* .

Gov. Code § 11523 applies only when judicial review is sought after an agency has held a formal hearing under the APA [*see Gov. Code § 11400, 11410.10, 11523*; for discussion, *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*]. Thus, this limitation period does not apply, for example, to a petition for mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* seeking to compel an agency to hold such a hearing [*Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1365-1367, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . This limitation period also does not apply when a specific statute applicable to a particular agency is controlling [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see, e.g., Veh. Code § 14401* (*Department of Motor Vehicles); Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175-1176, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 19463* (*California Horse Racing Board); California Standardbred Sires Stakes Com. Inc. v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 751, 758-759, 282 Cal. Rptr. 656]* .

[c] Local Agency Decisions Reviewable in Administrative Mandate Proceedings Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b) establishes the applicable limitation period for commencement of administrative mandate proceedings to review adjudicative administrative decisions of local agencies that suspend, demote, or dismiss an officer or employee; revoke or deny an application for a permit, license, or other entitlement; impose a civil or

administrative penalty, fine, charge or cost; or deny an application for a retirement benefit or allowance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(e)*; County of San Diego v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 548, 554, 195 Cal. Rptr. 895*]. Section 1094.6 applies to those agencies, other than school districts, that are defined as local agencies by *Gov. Code § 54951*, which defines a local agency as a county, city, whether general law or chartered, city and county, town, school district, municipal corporation, district, political subdivision, or any board, commission or agency thereof, or other local public agency.

Under *Code Civ. Proc § 1094.6*, an administrative mandate petition to review a local agency decision must be filed no later than the ninetieth day after the date on which the decision becomes final [*see Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 385, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73* ; *Holden v. Los Angeles City Ethics Comm'n (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1276, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 858* (petition for writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6* challenging decision of city ethics commission was time barred because petition was filed more than 90 days after date decision was final; decision was final when Commission adopted findings and an order at a public meeting); *Tielsch v. City of Anaheim (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 576, 578, 206 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; for discussion of when a decision becomes final under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b), see § 474A.10[3][b]*], unless the petitioner files a sufficient request for preparation of an administrative record within 10 days after the decision becomes final; if a sufficient request is filed within the 10-day period, the 90-day period is extended to no later than the thirtieth day following the date on which the record is mailed or personally delivered to the petitioner or the petitioner's attorney of record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b), (d)*]. The 90-day limitation period starts to run only when the required notice is served on the party; service on the party's attorney does not start this period running [*Herman v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 819, 823, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144]* . A petition was untimely when notice and acknowledgment of service by the agency was not completed (by the city clerk signing the form) until the 91st day after the agency action was final. Service requirements were governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* [*Wagner v. City of South Pasadena (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 943, 949-950, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91]* .

The 90-day time period under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)* does not begin to run until the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* is given to the party seeking to petition for judicial review [*Liang v. San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Bd. (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 775, 776-777, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715* (tenant who challenged board order filed petition on 91st day after date of mailing notice. The Court of Appeal upheld dismissal of the petition because the petition was untimely and was not properly filed within 90 days); *Cummings v. City of Vernon (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 919, 922, 263 Cal. Rptr. 97* ; *El Dorado Palm Springs, Ltd. v. Rent Review Com. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 335, 344-345, 281 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . The agency mailing the notice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(f)* must include a written statement verified by oath or affirmation, or a written statement attesting to the date that the decision was mailed to the party by first class mail, postage prepaid. This is what the statutory language "including a copy of the affidavit or certificate of mailing" means for purposes of triggering the 90-day statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*. Failure to include the written statement with the notice of decision precludes the statute of limitations from starting to run [*Donnellan v. City of Novato (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1097, 1106-1108, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882]* . When the final day of the 90-day period day falls on a Sunday, and the record is silent as to when notice of judicial review limitations was given, a petition filed on the following Monday day is not barred [*Lowe v. City of Commerce (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1075, 1079-1080, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356]* .

A petition for administrative mandamus that challenged a decision of a school district to withhold moneys owed to a contractor for violations of prevailing wage laws following an administrative hearing was timely filed within the 90 day time period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*, which was the applicable statute of limitations. The trial court erred in applying the limitations period of *Gov. Code §§ 11521* and *11523*, which do not apply to school district administrative hearings because these sections are limited to administrative proceedings conducted by administrative law judges from the Office of Administrative Hearings [*Mobley v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1243-1244]* .

Any conflicting state or federal law that provides a shorter period of limitation applies instead of Section 1094.6 [*Code*

Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(g) (in other respects, Section 1094.6 prevails over any conflicting provision in any otherwise applicable law)].

A court action for declaratory and injunctive relief brought by local business owners to challenge the validity of a zoning ordinance adopted by a city was untimely and barred by the applicable statute of limitations, which requires that a challenge to the ordinance must be brought within 90 days of the adoption of the ordinance by the city. The challenge was brought four years after the ordinance was adopted [*Gov. Code § 65009*; *Buena Park Motel Association v. City of Buena Park (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 302, 308-309, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 645]* . This specific statute of limitations [*Gov. Code § 65009*] was applicable rather than the 90-day time period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)* because Section 1094.6 only applies when a local agency makes an administrative adjudicative decision, which was not the case because the city adopted an ordinance.

[3] Commencement and Running of Limitation Period

Most special statutes that establish limitation periods for specific types of proceedings state when the limitation periods begin to run [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b), (d)*, discussed under [2][c], *above*; *Gov. Code § 11523*, discussed under [2][b], *above*]. For example, *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14171(j)* provides that the "final decision of the director shall be reviewable in accordance with *Section 1094.5 of the Code of Civil Procedure* within six months of the issuance of the director's final decision." The term "issuance" in this statute refers to the date the decision is adopted, not the date it is mailed [*Westside Hospital v. Belshe (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 672, 679, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* (petition untimely when filed more than six months after date decision was adopted)]. Another court held, however, that the term "issuance" in this same statute refers to the date a decision is mailed rather than the date it is adopted [*HealthSmart Pacific Inc. v. Belshe (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1202, 1207-1208, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 685]* .

In the absence of an express statutory provision, the commencement and running of the applicable limitation period is governed by the following rules:

- The applicable limitation period ordinarily starts to run when the underlying right or duty sought to be enforced in the proceeding first arose, and not on completion of the administrative proceedings instituted to enforce an underlying right or secure performance of an underlying duty [*Monroe v. Trustees of the California State Colleges (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 399, 405 n.2, 99 Cal. Rptr. 129, 491 P.2d 1105* ; *Dillon v. Board of Pension Commrs. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 427, 430-431, 116 P.2d 37* ; *Farmer v. City of Inglewood (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 130, 140-141, 185 Cal. Rptr. 9* ; *Union Paving Co. v. City Council (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 440, 442, 11 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

- The applicable statute of limitations will not start to run in cases of employee misconduct until the administrative agency discovers, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the misconduct even though the misconduct itself happened at an earlier time [*Gov. Code § 3304(d)* (one-year statute of limitation for cases of employee discipline based on public agencies discovery of misconduct); *Haney v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-9, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 411]* .

- The limitation period is tolled during the time the petitioner is pursuing administrative remedies to secure enforcement of an underlying right or performance of an underlying duty [*Monroe v. Trustees of the California State Colleges (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 399, 405 n.2, 99 Cal. Rptr. 129, 491 P.2d 1105* ; *Dillon v. Board of Pension Commrs. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 427, 431, 116 P.2d 37* ; *Farmer v. City of Inglewood (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 130, 140-141, 185 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

- The limitations period is tolled for 30 days under *28 U.S.C. Section 1367* when a federal district court dismisses without prejudice a federal civil rights lawsuit under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* that includes a pendent claim for administrative mandamus in federal court. The pendent claim for administrative

mandamus is governed by the tolling provisions of Section 1367 [*Guevara v. Venture County Community College Dist. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 167,169, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50*].

- The limitation period for filing a complaint with the administrative agency is not tolled by filing a lawsuit in court before seeking relief from the agency [*Lab. Code § 1700.44(c)*; *Greenfield v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 743, 748-749, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179* (talent agency act claim must be filed with labor commissioner within one year of occurrence of violation of act. Filing lawsuit in superior court within that one-year time period does not toll statute of limitations for filing administrative claim with labor commissioner)].

- When the underlying duty to be enforced is conditioned on a demand for performance, the petitioner cannot postpone commencement of the limitation period by deferring an appropriate demand. The period starts to run when the petitioner was first entitled to make the demand [*Dillon v. Board of Pension Commrs. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 427, 430, 116 P.2d 37* ; *Union Paving Co. v. City Council (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 440, 442, 11 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

The Second District Division One California Court of Appeal held that equitable tolling of the applicable statute of limitations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*] for challenging denial of unemployment insurance benefits by filing a petition for a writ of administrative mandate applied and continued after the superior court denied reconsideration of an order sustaining demurrer for misjoinder of parties until filing of new petition for writ of administrative mandate correcting that error [*Tarkington v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1502-1504, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 131]* .

[4] Expedited Judicial Review of First Amendment Related Claims

In 1999 the Legislature enacted *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8* in response to the Ninth Circuit's opinion in *Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (1998 9th Cir.) 154 F.3d 1097* , in which a federal court of appeals panel held that a city ordinance regarding a business license was unconstitutional in that it did not provide for prompt judicial review, including a prompt hearing and a prompt judicial decision, of a business' challenge to enforcement of the ordinance based on claims that the ordinance constituted a prior restraint on constitutionally protected free speech [*see Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (1998, 9th Cir.) 154 F.3d 1097, 1101-1102* (challenge by adult bookstore)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8 provides for expedited judicial review of *first amendment* related claims that arise in permit proceedings [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(a)*]. It applies to review the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit or other entitlement for expressive conduct protected by *U.S. Const., amend. I* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(b)* (defining "permit," "entitlement," "permit applicant," and "public agency" for purposes of the statute)]. A public agency has the authority to designate permits subject to review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(a)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(c)*].

The expedited judicial review procedure provides for shortened time periods for seeking judicial review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)*]:

- Within five court days after receipt of written notification from a permit applicant that the permit applicant will seek judicial review of a public agency's action on the permit, the public agency must prepare, certify, and make available the administrative record to the permit applicant.

- Either the public agency or the permit applicant may bring an action in accordance with the procedure set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*. If the permit applicant brings the action, the action shall be in the form of a petition for writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or *Code Civ. Proc. §*

1094.5, as appropriate.

- The party bringing the action pursuant under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8* must file and serve the petition on the respondent no later than 21 calendar days following the public agency's final decision on the permit. The title page of the petition must contain the following language in 18-point type: "ATTENTION: THIS MATTER IS ENTITLED TO PRIORITY AND SUBJECT TO THE EXPEDITED HEARING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES CONTAINED IN SECTION 1094.8 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE."

- The clerk of the court must set a hearing for review of the petition no later than 25 calendar days from the date the petition is filed. Moving, opposition, and reply papers shall be filed as provided in the California Rules of Court. The petitioner shall lodge the administrative record with the court no later than 10 calendar days in advance of the hearing date.

- Following the conclusion of the hearing, the court shall render its decision in an expeditious manner consistent with constitutional requirements in view of the particular facts and circumstances. In no event shall the decision be rendered later than 20 calendar days after the matter is submitted or 50 calendar days after the date the petition is filed, whichever is earlier.

Additional provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8* govern the assignment of temporary judges to handle expedited review proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(e)*], and the parties' right to waive, by joint stipulation, any of the time limits [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(f)*].

The 21-day statute of limitations codified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8 (d)* for actions seeking to review issuance of permits that affect expressive conduct did not apply to a challenge by a third-party resident of a county to a decision of the county board of supervisors to approve 14 conditional use permits requested by a billboard advertiser for billboards to be placed in the desert [*Stearn v. County of San Bernadino (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 434, 443-444, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 330]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechExpressive ConductGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTolling

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. When Proceedings May Be Barred or Dismissed as Untimely

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.21

§ 474A.21 Proceeding May Be Barred by Laches

The equitable defense of laches may be applied to bar a mandate proceeding even when it has been commenced well within the applicable statute of limitations [*Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 624, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258* ; *Conti v. Board of Civil ServiceCommissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 366, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1368, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219* ; *People v. Department of Housing & Community Dev. (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 185, 195, 119 Cal. Rptr. 266* ; *San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. City of Moreno Valley (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 593, 606, 609, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 897* (mandate action barred by laches as a matter of law)]. A defense of laches may be based on a delay in prosecuting a mandate proceeding as well as a delay in instituting it [*Vernon Fire Fighters Assn. v. City of Vernon (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 710, 720, 223 Cal. Rptr. 871]* .

In general, applicability of the laches defense is a question of fact to be to be determined in light of all applicable circumstances, and the trial court exercises a wide discretion in deciding whether the defense should be sustained [*Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 624, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258* ; *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 366, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 265, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328]* . A mere lapse of time can never be sufficient, by itself, to establish the defense. The evidence must show that the petitioner (1) delayed unreasonably and (2) acquiesced in the decision or order complained of or that adverse parties were prejudiced by the delay [*Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 624, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258* ; *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 366, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1368, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . The party asserting the defense has the burden of proving the necessary elements [*Green v. Board of Dental Examiners (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 786, 793-795, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 140* ; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 840, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817]* . Prejudice is not presumed to have resulted from a showing of unreasonable delay, but must be affirmatively demonstrated [*Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 624, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258* ; *Conti v. Board of Civil Service Commissioners (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 351, 361, 82 Cal. Rptr. 337, 461 P.2d 617* ; *Robert F. Kennedy Medical Center v. Department of Health Services (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1357, 1362, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 180* ; *Ragan v. City of Hawthorne (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1361, 1368, 261 Cal. Rptr. 219]* .

If there is an analogous statute of limitations that may be borrowed for purposes of measuring what time period constitutes reasonable delay and an agency's delay in taking action exceeds that period, the burden of proof as to both elements of laches (unreasonable delay and prejudice) shifts to the agency in the form of a rebuttable presumption. In this situation, the agency must offer evidence showing why laches does not bar the agency action [*Fountain Valley Regional Hospital and Medical Center v. Bonta (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 316, 324-326, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139]* .

The laches defense barred the filing of a petition for a writ of administrative mandate challenging discharge of an employee when more than three years passed from the date of the agency decision before the superior court ruled on a summary judgment motion brought by the agency on the petition. The delay period included both the time before, and the time after the filing of the petition for administrative mandate. The employee failed to pursue court determination of his petition for more than 18 months after waiting a substantial period of time (another 18 months) to file the petition. The unreasonable delay element was satisfied on these facts. The prejudice element is satisfied because if the former employee wins his lawsuit and is reinstated with back pay, the agency would have to had to make double wage payments as well as having to reorganize its employment structure to include the reinstated employee. The laches defense precluded relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*. It was the only applicable timing defense because the agency failed to notify the employee of the 90-day statutory of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*. The granting of a summary judgment by the superior court based on the defense of laches is reviewed de novo [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 68-70, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 5 P.3d 874]* .

When the laches defense is raised on appeal, the litigant raising that defense must normally have raised the laches defense before the agency or the trial court and, if not, the laches defense is waived unless the facts showing the elements of laches are undisputed and shown by the evidence in the case [*City of Oakland v. Public Employees' Retirement System (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 29, 51-52, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151]* . The laches defense requires specific fact findings as to delay and prejudice that must first be developed by evidence at an administrative hearing before the legal and equitable issues can be considered by the court on judicial review [*Piscioneri v. City of Ontario (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1048-1049, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38]* .

The California Court of Appeal rejected the application of the laches defense to a lawsuit brought by the City and County of San Francisco against a property owner to enforce requirements for adequate sprinkler systems in buildings to maintain compliance with fire safety regulations. The court held that laches is not available as a defense when a city's lawsuit concerns a public policy issue, and the issue of fire safety for high rise buildings is such a public policy issue that precludes recognition of the laches defense [*City and County of San Francisco v. Ballard (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 381, 394-396, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* .

The California Court of Appeal accepted the laches defense and held that it precluded a teacher's lawsuit for reinstatement as a regular employee against the San Francisco Community College District [*Womack v. San Francisco Community College District (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 854, 865-866, 54 Cal. Rptr 3d 558]* . The court held that the teacher waited too long to challenge an adverse personnel decision. Public employees who want to challenge adverse personnel decision by their employers must see writ review within a reasonable time after completion of the administrative proceeding. The teacher waited nine years to claim the right to full time employment from the time that the teacher first taught a full time unit load. The teacher filed a writ of mandamus action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, but then waited three years to prosecute the mandamus action and obtain a hearing on the merits. The court of appeal did not accept the reasons offered by the plaintiff for these delays, specifically ignorance of the law, because the teacher had an experienced attorney to represent him. The court held that the teacher acquiesced in the challenged employment action and that the school district was prejudiced by the substantial delay in making the teacher's challenge in that the district had the potential for increased liability for back pay in the form of a seven year wage differential if the teacher had been misclassified [*Womack v. San Francisco Community College District (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 854, 865-866, 54 Cal. Rptr 3d 558]* .

The California court of Appeal rejected the application of a laches defense to a lawsuit brought by a public employee union against a school district to challenge the deduction of pay from classified employees who were on disability leave, The laches defense was rejected by the court of appeal because the school district failed to meet the burden of proof of showing that there was any prejudice to the district from the union's alleged delay in objecting to the deduction practice [*California School Employees Association v. Tustin Unified School District (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 510, 521-522, 55 Cal. Rptr.3d 739* (equitable estoppel and unclean hands defenses were also rejected)].

Another California Court of Appeal rejected the application of the laches defense to actions taken by the California Coastal Commission ordering that homeowners who had developed a three hole golf course on their land restore the land to its native state as an area of dunes with vegetation. Laches was rejected as a defense to enforcement of the order by the Commission, because there was no unreasonable delay in the enforcement of the easement, no acquiescence by the commission in the easement violation and the application of the defense would nullify an important public policy [*Feduniak v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1381-1382, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsPleading & ProofGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. When Proceedings May Be Barred or Dismissed as Untimely

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.22

§ 474A.22 Proceeding May Be Dismissed If Moot

A writ of mandate does not issue when it will be useless or ineffective [*Roscoe v. Goodale (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 271, 273, 232 P.2d 879]* , or when it will be of no practical benefit to the petitioner [*Clementine v. Board of Civ. Ser. Commrs. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 112, 114, 117 P.2d 369]* . A mandate proceeding is dismissed as moot in these instances [*Roscoe v. Goodale (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 271, 274, 232 P.2d 879* ; *Clementine v. Board of Civ. Ser. Commrs. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 112, 114-115, 117 P.2d 369]* . A mandate proceeding is also moot when a public entity has complied with a judgment while challenging its validity in the reviewing court [*MHC Operating Limited Partnership v. City of San Jose (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 204, 214, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 564* ; *Marshall v. Pasadena Unified School Dist. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1241, 1258-1259, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 344]* .

A mandate proceeding is moot when, as a result of events occurring after the action or decision at issue, (1) the issuance of a writ will no longer benefit the petitioner [*see, e.g.,* *Rogers v. Board of Directors of Pasadena (1933) 218 Cal. 221, 224, 22 P.2d 509* ; *Clementine v. Board of Civ. Ser. Commrs. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 112, 114-115, 117 P.2d 369]* ; or (2) the administrative entity is no longer empowered or able to perform the duty at issue [*see, e.g.,* *Treber v. Superior Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 128, 134, 65 Cal. Rptr. 330, 436 P.2d 330* ; *McClatchy v. Matthews (1901) 135 Cal. 274, 276, 67 P. 134]* . The administrative entity's belated performance of a duty sought to be enforced may also render the proceeding moot [*see, e.g.,* *Bollotin v. Workman Service Co. (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 339, 342, 275 P.2d 599* , *cert. denied,* *349 U.S. 969, 75 S. Ct. 892, 99 L. Ed. 1290* ; *Mitchell v. Warren (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 594, 213 P.2d 413]* . A lawsuit for declaratory and injunctive relief is moot when the defendant voluntarily, and in good faith, discontinued the challenged conduct. That includes circumstances in which a community college district revised policies to eliminate permit requirements (that were challenged in a lawsuit) after the lawsuit was filed [*O'Toole v. Superior Court (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 488, 513, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 531]* .

A mandate proceeding is not moot when, although the statute or regulation under appeal is repealed or expires of its own force, a material part of the statute or regulation is reenacted [*Montalvo v. Madera Unified Sch. Dist. Bd. of Education (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 323, 329, 98 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *Californians for Political Reform Foundation v. Fair Political Practices Comm'n. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 472, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 606* (emergency regulation expired, but agency adopted permanent regulation with similar provisions)]. A litigant's claims for injunctive relief based on

violations of a former statute are not mooted by a current statute changing the law when the current statute does not immunize or excuse the agency from liability for violating previous law [*Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc v. Helliker (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1158-1159, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 191]* .

An action is not moot when the court decision can still have some practical impact [*Simi Corporation v. Garamendi (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1496, 1503-1504, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 207* (employer plaintiff's settlement of related civil lawsuit against workers' compensation insurer did not make employer's mandamus action against insurance commissioner moot because employer reserved right to maintain mandamus action, and insurer agreed to comply with results of mandamus action as part of settlement)], or the parties requested remedies are still available and can be granted [*McKee v. Orange Unified School Dist. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1315-1316, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 774* (litigant sought declaratory and injunctive relief against school district to prevent future violations of the Brown Act (local agency open meeting act). This relief was still available even thought school district sold the property that was the subject of the agenda item)].

An important exception to the general rule requiring dismissal of moot proceedings occurs when a proceeding presents issues of public importance that are likely to recur; a court has inherent discretion to decide these issues even when the proceeding is technically moot [*Atwater Elementary School District v. California Department of General Services (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 227, 230-231, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233, 158 P.3d 794* (moot case will be decided because it is a matter of statewide importance); *State of Cal. ex rel State Lands Com. v. Superior Court (1995) 11 Cal 4th 50, 61, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399, 900 P.2d 648* (moot case will be decided because it is a matter of statewide importance); *Ballard v. Anderson (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 873, 876-877, 95 Cal. Rptr. 1, 484 P.2d 1345* ; *Board of Education v. Watson (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 829, 832, 48 Cal. Rptr. 481, 409 P.2d 481* ; *Corrales v. Bradstreet (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 33, 46-47, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 440* (moot case will be decided because it is a matter of general public interest that is likely to recur); *Ombudsman Services of Northern California v. Superior Court (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1233, 1240, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 456* (case may not be moot because of conditional nature of settlement but also matter to be decided is a matter of general public interest that is likely to recur); *Californians for Alternatives to Toxics v. Cal. Dept. of Pesticide Reg. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1049, 1069-1070, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 393* (challenge to registration renewal on an annual basis was not mooted by agency decision to grant subsequent year renewal because important public policy issue are likely to recur, and the annual nature of renewals makes it likely that a judicial challenge to a prior renewal will not be completed before the next annual renewal happens); *Californians for Fair Representation v. Superior Court (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 15, 22-23, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 148* (court of appeal decided to resolve technically moot issue that has significant public interest, and was likely to recur); *Environmental Charter High Sch. v. Centinela Valley Union High Sch. Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 139, 144, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417* (the expiration of 2003-2004 school year while an appeal was pending did not moot appeal of trial court order requiring district to provide facilities for charter school for 2003-2004 school year because the dispute between parties whether district was required to provide facilities to charter school was likely to recur in future school years); *Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority v. PUC (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 346, 355-356, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 270* (dispute between PUC and light rail transit district over whether PUC has jurisdiction over light rail crossings built by transit districts is matter of public importance that is likely to recur in the future with this or other transit districts); *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1202-1204, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203* (lawsuit challenging CEQA compliance by City was not moot notwithstanding approval and building of part of shopping center subject to EIR requirement because City could require modifications of project as conditions of reapproval); *Arnold v. California Exp. and State Fair (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 498, 503-504, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 790* (statutory issues and attorneys fees issues between parties not mooted by defendant's replacement of challenged contract during litigation process because these issues still have to be resolved by the courts); *Tracy A. v. Superior Court (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 1309, 1313-1315, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 684* (continuing public interest in appellate court resolution of moot issue); *Vernon v. State of California (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 114, 120-122, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 121* (continuing public interest in appellate court resolution of moot issue); *Hernandez v. Gutierrez (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 168, 172-173, 176 n.3, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307* (driver's death while appeal was pending did not moot appeal because issues on appeal are broad, likely to recur, and public interest in lawful enforcement of drunk driving laws, support applying mootness exception to this appeal); *Defend the Bay v. City of Irvine (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1261,*

1278, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 176 (mandate proceeding to challenge adequacy of environmental impact report settled after oral argument on appeal; court refused to dismiss appeal on mootness grounds because the issues decided on appeal were important matters of continuing public interest); *In re Stevens (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1228, 1232-1233, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168* (parolee challenged parole condition by writ of habeas corpus; challenged condition was voluntarily changed by Board of Prison Terms; Court of Appeal decided issue presented in appeal notwithstanding mootness claim because issue raised novel question of continuing public interest); *Kirstowsky v. Superior Court (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 745, 749, 300 P.2d 163]* . Moreover, California courts have adopted the federal mootness standard that allows review of moot issues when those issues are capable of repetition but not easily susceptible of review [*Cal. State Personnel Bd. v. California State Employees Assn (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 758, 763, n.1, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 201, 115 P. 3d 506* (constitutional challenge by State Personnel Board to post and bid programs; issue of continuing public interest that is likely to recur but evade review); *Alfredo A. v. Superior Court (1994) 6 Cal. 4th 1212, 1219, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 623, 865 P.2d 56* (non-administrative law case); *Department of Corrections v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1100, 1106, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473* (review of administrative hearing); *Lindelli v. Town of San Anselmo (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1104, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453* (mandamus challenge to city award of an interim contract pending the results of a referendum)].

A mandate proceeding is not moot when the decision reached by the court on the merits will be binding in a related pending court proceeding between the same parties [*Shafer v. Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1397-1398, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670]* .

County employee association sought disclosure under California Public Records Act [*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*] of county records related to reimbursement of travel expenses for judges and court management employees, which the Court of Appeal ruled were exempt from disclosure under the courts records exemption to the California Public Records Act [*Gov. Code § 6252(a)*]. The Superior Court for Orange County, a party to the lawsuit, sought to dismiss the petition on the grounds of mootness when the employee association conceded that the public records act did not apply, and because the superior court complied with the request under applicable court rules. The Judicial Council had adopted Rule 6.702, which required the trial courts to maintain records related to court budgets and management information, and to disclose these records upon a valid written request [Cal. Ct. Rule 6.702]. The Court of Appeal rejected the mootness arguments, holding that there was still a controversy between the parties as to whether the superior court fully complied with the disclosure request under Rule 6.702, and that the employees association still had a legitimate right to seek disclosure of the documents, even though the association's original reason, to facilitate salary increase negotiations, was no longer relevant because the salary increase had been reinstated. Furthermore, petitions to enforce disclosure of records under the Rule must be filed with the superior court, not the court of appeal [*Orange County Employees Assoc. v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 287, 294-296, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 201]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityMootnessGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityMootnessEvading Review ExceptionCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityMootnessPublic Interest ExceptionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. When Proceedings May Be Barred or Dismissed as Untimely

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.23

§ 474A.23 Dismissal for Delay in Prosecution

Administrative mandate proceedings are subject to dismissal for delay in prosecution under the general provisions of Code of Civil Procedure [*Binyon v. State (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 952, 956-957, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673* (upholding dismissal for failure to bring case to trial within five years of filing lawsuit as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.120*); for discussion and forms relating to dismissal for delay, *see* Ch. 212, *Dismissal*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

178 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. When Proceedings May Be Barred or Dismissed as Untimely

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474A.24-474A.29

[Reserved]

§§ 474A.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.30

§ 474A.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to forms for judicial review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.31

§ 474A.31 Federal Constitution

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *U.S. Const., amend. IV*

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

181 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.32

§ 474A.32 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*

Separation of powers doctrine. *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*

Jurisdiction to give extraordinary relief. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.33

§ 474A.33 State Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act. *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*

Allocation of burden of proof. *Evid. Code § 500*

Amendment of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*

Answers to complaints generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-431.30*

Appeals in civil actions and proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 901-914, 1109-1110b*

Authority of court to adopt suitable procedure where none specifically provided by statute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 187*

Certiorari. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1109*

Civil actions and proceedings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307 et seq.*

Contempt. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*

Copies of pleadings are required to be served on adverse parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 465*

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021 et seq.*

Demurrers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10-430.80*

Demurrer raises issue of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 589*

Discovery. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016.010-2036.050*

Effect of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Effect of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*

Entry of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*

Fee for transcribing record. *Gov. Code § 69950*

Filing initial pleading begins proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 350, 411.10*

Filing of various papers constitutes appearance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*

Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107-1109*

New trials. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 656-663.2*

Power of court to impanel jury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*

Prohibition. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1102-1105, 1107-1109*

Recovery of attorney's fees when administrative action arbitrary or capricious. *Gov. Code § 800*

Recovery of litigation expenses, including attorney's fees, by small business or licensee when agency action undertaken without substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Review of administrative decision by mandate proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Review of decisions by Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (and Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control). *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090-23090.2*

Review of decisions by Board of Governors of State Bar or Committee of Bar Examiners. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6082*

Review of decision by local housing enforcement agency to abate nuisance; independent judgment test. *Health & Safety Code § 17980.8*

Review of decisions by Public Utilities Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756, 1759*

Review of decisions by Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board. *Lab. Code § 5950*

Right to demur to answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.20*

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-417.40*

Special proceedings and actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 20-23*

Testimony in subsequent civil proceeding of person presiding at quasi-judicial proceeding. *Evid. Code § 703.5*

Time limitations on review of local agency decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Writ is order in writing issued in name of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewArbitrary & Capricious ReviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.34

§ 474A.34 Decisions

[1] Generally

Scope of court's inquiry extends to whether administrative agency proceeded without or in excess of jurisdiction, whether there was fair trial, and whether there was prejudicial abuse of discretion. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 675, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484* *Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 148-149, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Unimportance of plaintiff's pleading being in form of petition for mandamus when proper basis for issuance of mandamus is alleged. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 673, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not possessed of separate and distinctive legal personality and is not removed from general law of mandamus or exempted from established principles, requirements, and limitations of general law of mandamus. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 673-674, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is appropriate procedure for review of administrative order or decision resulting from adjudicatory proceeding. *Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 849, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623 P.2d 180*

Administrative decision is generally reviewable in proceeding for writ of mandate. *Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 82-85, 87 P.2d 848* ; Whitten v. California State Board, etc. *(1937) 8 Cal. 2d 444, 445-446, 65 P.2d 1296* (prohibition proceeding as inappropriate); *Standard Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 562-565, 59 P.2d 119* (certiorari proceeding as inappropriate)

Proceeding is occasionally subject to principles generally applied in criminal proceedings. *Bravo v. Cabell (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 834, 838-840, 114 Cal. Rptr. 618, 523 P.2d 658*

Adjudicatory decisions of all agencies, state and local, with few exceptions, are subject to review in mandate

proceeding governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Topanga Ass'n for a Scenic Community v. Los Angeles County (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514 n. 12, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 101, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Hohreiter v. Garrison (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 384, 397, 184 P.2d 323*

Proceeding is subject to equitable considerations even though generally classified as legal proceeding. *San Diego County Dep't of Public Welfare v. Superior Court of San Diego County (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 101 Cal. Rptr. 541, 496 P.2d 453* ; *Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 795, 136 P.2d 304*

Court's inquiry is limited to whether administrative decision was legally wrong; question of propriety, wisdom, or the like, is not proper for judicial inquiry. *Faulkner v. California Toll Bridge Auth. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 329, 253 P.2d 659*

Trial court is without power to cure agency's improper findings or to substitute its discretion for that of agency regarding form of discipline. *American Funeral Concepts v. Board of Funeral Directors & Embalmers (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 303, 311, 186 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is available to provide review whenever agency exercises adjudicatory function in considering facts presented in administrative hearing. *Jabola v. Pasadena Redevelopment Agency (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 931, 934, 178 Cal. Rptr. 452*

Mandate proceeding for review of administrative decision is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062a, now see Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* as well as *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107,* and *1108*. *Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 270, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328*

Writ of mandate is permitted to be issued when there is a clear, present, and usually ministerial duty on defendant's part and clear, present, and beneficial right in plaintiff to performance of that duty. *Goldfarb v. Civil Service Com. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 633, 635, 275 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Mandate is appropriate remedy to compel exercise of discretion by government officer, but is not available to control exercise of discretion unless, under facts of case, discretion can be exercised in only one way. *Pacific Bell v. California State & Consumer Services Agency (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 107, 118, 275 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Although court may compel administrative agency to act, court is not permitted to substitute its discretion for discretion properly vested in agency. *Vega v. City of West Hollywood (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1342, 1352, 273 Cal. Rptr. 243*

Courts are recommended to let administrative boards and officers work out their problems with as little judicial interference as possible. *Vega v. City of West Hollywood (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1342, 1352, 273 Cal. Rptr. 243*

Acts in excess of power conferred on agency by Constitution or statute are void and mandate is available to nullify or rescind such acts. *Brooks v. State Personnel Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1068, 1072, 272 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not available to review quasi-legislative determination of governmental body, such as adoption of redevelopment plan. *Leach v. City of San Marcos (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 648, 656, 261 Cal. Rptr. 805*

When parties have proceeded under wrong writ of mandate, such as proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (traditional mandate) when they should have proceeded under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (administrative mandate), reviewing court is required to determine whether trial court considered appropriate evidence and applied appropriate standard of review, based on facts of case. *Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 366, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240*

Administrative mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is required to be used in all writ cases challenging validity of any final administrative order or decision made in any proceeding in which by law, expressly or impliedly, (1) hearing is required, (2) evidence is required to be taken, and (3) discretion in determining facts is vested in inferior board. *Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 361, 362, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240*

Administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not granted when administrative order or decision did not result from proceeding in which, by law, hearing was required at which evidence was required to be taken; review of such order or decision, if any, is by traditional mandate. *TaylorBus Service, Inc. v. San Diego Bd. of Education (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1331, 1339, 241 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Action by real parties in interest for malicious prosecution based on mandate proceedings that resulted in order remanding matter for reconsideration with respect to correctness of standard used to assess evidence is precluded because petitioner prevailed on its procedural challenge, even though its petition was ultimately denied. *Sierra Club v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1138, 1144-1147, 214 Cal. Rptr. 740*

[2] Moot Questions

Dismissal of proceeding for mootness is proper when administrative decision was set aside by agency before proceeding began. *Crestlawn Memorial Park Asso. v. Sobieski (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 43, 47, 26 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Dismissal of proceeding for mootness is proper when agency complies with alternative writ command to set aside decision. *Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193*

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Parties to contract are entitled to make exhaustion of administrative remedies a condition of suing on contract, and condition are enforceable. *A. Teichert & Sons, Inc. v. State, (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 736, 746-747, 48 Cal. Rptr. 225*

Plaintiff in any action, but especially in one for review of administrative action or decision, is required to exhaust any available administrative remedy before suit. *Tiernan v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 211, 216 n. 5, 188 Cal. Rptr. 115, 655 P.2d 317* ; *McKee v. Bell-Carter Olive Co. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1234, 231 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *Hayward v. Henderson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 64, 70, 151 Cal. Rptr. 505* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291, 109 P.2d 942*

Policy considerations underlying exhaustion doctrine do not necessarily justify extension of requirement to related constitutional and common law claims not specifically within agency's jurisdiction. *Rojo v. Kliger (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 65, 85, 87-88, 276 Cal. Rptr. 130, 801 P.2d 373* (as applied to *Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.* (Fair Employment and Housing Act), exhaustion not required before filing civil action for damages alleging nonstatutory cause of action)

Mere possession by some official body of continuing supervisory or investigatory power is not itself sufficient to afford "administrative remedy" unless statute or regulation under which power is exercised establishes clearly defined machinery for submission, evaluation, and resolution of complaints by aggrieved parties. *Common Cause v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 432, 441, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574, 777 P.2d 610* ; *Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Assn. v. Valley Racing Assn. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1538, 1552-1554, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698*

When administrative tribunal is created by Legislature, requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies is jurisdictional. *George Arakelian Farms,Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 654, 661, 221 Cal. Rptr. 488, 710 P.2d 288*

Plaintiff claiming breach of written purse agreement is not required to exhaust administrative remedies before California Horse Racing Board prior to filing complaint in superior court for damages, because board is a regulatory and disciplinary entity only, with no authority to award affirmative monetary relief. *Horsemen's Benevolent & Protective Assn. v. Valley Racing Assn. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1538, 1554, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698*

Administrative remedy is provided only when administrative body is required to actually accept, evaluate, and resolve disputes or complaints; doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies is not applicable when no specific administrative remedies are available to plaintiff. *City of Coachella v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Com. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1277, 1287-1288, 258 Cal. Rptr. 795* (traditional mandate proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*)

Purported failure to pursue administrative remedy is not jurisdictional bar to seeking judicial relief; rather, exhaustion rule is procedural, to which exceptions include when resort to administrative process would be futile because it is clear what administrative decision would be. *Doster v. County of San Diego (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 257, 260-261, 251 Cal. Rptr. 507*

Doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies is not matter of juridical discretion, but is fundamental rule of procedure; when administrative remedy is provided by statute, relief is required to be sought from administrative body and remedy exhausted before courts will act; when no exception applies, exhaustion of administrative remedy is jurisdictional prerequisite to resort to courts. *White v. State of California (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 452, 473, 240 Cal. Rptr. 732*

Requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies requires exhaustion of remedy of administrative writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* before filing action for damages. *City of Fresno v. Superior Court (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1484, 1491, 234 Cal. Rptr. 136* ; *Logan v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit District (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 116, 123-124, 185 Cal. Rptr. 878*

Petition for writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* based on theory that city's unilateral transfer of petitioner to newly created position after petitioner's disability arose was abuse of discretion is improper remedy when writ was sought before respondent made decision on petitioner's disability retirement hearing; transfer and denial of retirement is adjudicatory act and proper remedy is petition under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Tielsch v. City of Anaheim (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 570, 573-574, 206 Cal. Rptr. 738*

Exhaustion doctrine is to be applied in particular instance due to extreme utility to courts, or is to be held inapplicable due to alleged inadequacy of administrative remedy, after qualitative analysis on case-by-case basis with concentration on whether paramount need for agency expertise outweighs other factors. *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 981, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Exhaustion doctrine is applicable in action for declaratory or equitable relief. *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 986, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Failure to exhaust applicable administrative remedies is incurable jurisdictional defect. *Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 979-987, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Party is not permitted to circumvent exhaustion requirement by bringing action for declaratory relief rather than administrative mandamus. *Walter H. Leimert Co. v. California Coastal Com. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 222, 232, 196 Cal. Rptr. 739*

Petitioners' attempt to circumvent furnishing of information at administrative level by applying to courts for assistance

is failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *United States Steel Corp. v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 473, 480-481, 192 Cal. Rptr. 677*

When statute creates right that did not exist at common law and provides comprehensive system of administrative enforcement, requirement that administrative remedies be exhausted is perhaps implied; but when statutory remedy provides for enforcement of preexisting common-law right, newer statutory remedy is considered only cumulative. *Hentzel v. Singer Co. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 290, 303, 188 Cal. Rptr. 159*

When statute does not constitute comprehensive system of administrative enforcement, provides for no administrative remedy other than maintenance of suit by agency, and shows no legislative intent to preclude individual from suing on own behalf, statutory remedy is not exclusive and does not destroy individual's common law cause of action. *Hentzel v. Singer Co. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 290, 303, 188 Cal. Rptr. 159*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion by dismissing action on grounds that plaintiffs failed to exhaust their administrative remedies when plaintiffs failed to plead facts showing Insurance Commissioner ruled on their petition, and in light of plaintiffs' prior attempts to state causes of action against defendants without exhausting administrative remedies. *County of Los Angeles v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 77, 87-88, 182 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Defendant is also subject to exhaustion of remedies requirement in appropriate case. *San Mateo County v. Palomar Holding Co. (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 194, 197, 201-202, 24 Cal. Rptr. 905*

Legislative omission to require exhaustion of remedies is not ground for holding administrative remedy merely cumulative; doctrine requiring exhaustion is applicable. *Flores v. Los Angeles Turf Club (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 736, 747, 13 Cal. Rptr. 201, 361 P.2d 921* ; *Alexander v. State Personnel Bd. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 198, 200, 137 P.2d 433*

Exhaustion requirement is designed for benefit of courts, not to aid litigants. *Bozaich v. State of California (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 688, 698, 108 Cal. Rptr. 392* ; *Morton v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 977, 982, 88 Cal. Rptr. 533* ; *Dunham v. City of Westminster (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 245, 248, 20 Cal. Rptr. 772*

Requirement to exhaust administrative remedies is jurisdictional. *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 293, 109 P.2d 942*

Defendant is subject to being estopped from asserting plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *Los Angeles Fire & Police Protective League v. Los Angeles (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 67, 75, 99 Cal. Rptr. 908*

Parties is entitled to stipulate that exhaustion requirement will be disregarded. *Selby Realty Co. v. O'Bannon (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 917, 923, 82 Cal. Rptr. 807*

[4] Conditions for Exhaustion

Requirement that writ of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* issue only if decision is final is aspect of exhaustion requirement. *Bollengier v. Doctors Medical Center (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1115, 1125, 272 Cal. Rptr. 273*

When administrative machinery exists for resolution of disputes, courts will not entertain those disputes until administrative procedures fully utilized and exhausted because to do so would be in excess of their jurisdiction. *American Alliance Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 601, 609, 184 Cal. Rptr. 674*

Exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required when administrative agent is not empowered to adjudicate or

award damages remedy provided for by statute. *Lachman v. Cabrillo Pacific University (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 941, 944-945, 177 Cal. Rptr. 21*

Necessity that clearly defined machinery exist for submitting, evaluating, and resolving complaints. *Rosenfield v. Malcolm (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 559, 566, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505, 421 P.2d 697* ; *California State Employees' Assn. v. Williams (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 390, 394-395, 86 Cal. Rptr. 305* ; *Martino v. Concord Community Hosp. Dist. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 51, 56-57, 43 Cal. Rptr. 255* ; *Henry George School of Social Science v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 82, 85-87, 6 Cal. Rptr. 661*

Administrative remedy is not provided by agency's invitation to participate in or undertake ad hoc proceeding. *Endler v. Schutzbank (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 162, 168, 65 Cal. Rptr. 297, 436 P.2d 297* ; *Alta-Dena Dairy v. San Diego County (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 66, 73-74, 76 Cal. Rptr. 510*

Remedy exists if established by administrative regulation as well as by statute. *Wilson v. Civil Serv. Comm'n (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 340, 344-347, 36 Cal. Rptr. 559*

Plaintiff's stipulation at administrative level that proceeding might be conducted administratively is equivalent to establishment of administrative remedy by law. *California v. Superior Court (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 87, 95, 93 Cal. Rptr. 663*

Plaintiff is not required to abandon judicial proceeding when administrative remedy, unavailable when judicial proceeding was begun, finally becomes available. *Eye Dog Foundation v. State Bd. of Guide Dogs for the Blind (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 536, 543-544, 63 Cal. Rptr. 21, 432 P.2d 717*

Agency with regulatory power is not necessarily able to give relief administratively. *California Oregon Power Co. v. Superior Court (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 858, 869, 291 P.2d 455*

Administrative remedy is absent where agency has power to give relief and power to establish remedy but has not established remedy. *Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 272, 280, 113 Cal. Rptr. 338*

Plaintiff is required to apply first to agency with apparent power to give relief; agency is entitled to decide in first instance whether it can give relief. *United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 195, 120 P.2d 26*

Agency decision giving relief is subject to being set aside where agency erroneously assumed jurisdiction. *County of Alpine v. County of Tuolumne (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 787, 798, 322 P.2d 449*

[5] Exceptions to Exhaustion

Plaintiff is not required to exhaust administrative remedy where statute gives free choice to pursue either judicial or administrative remedy. *City of Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 689, 290 P.2d 520* ; *Scripps etc. Hospital Inc. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 669, 673* *McKee v. Bell-Carter Olive Co. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1234, 231 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedy where denial of relief would cause irreparable injury. *United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 196-197, 120 P.2d 26* ; *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 293, 296, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Greenblatt v. Munro (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 596, 605-607, 326 P.2d 929*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where case presents extraordinary circumstances. *Sail'er Inn, Inc. v. Kirby (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 1, 6-7, 95 Cal. Rptr. 329, 485 P.2d 529*

Exhaustion is not required when agency has no pervasive and self-contained system of administrative procedure for general regulation to assess or prevent harm that plaintiff seeks to redress and factual issues in case are not so complex or technical as to exhibit paramount need for specialized agency fact-finding expertise. *Rojo v. Kliger (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 65, 87-88, 276 Cal. Rptr. 130, 801 P.2d 373* (as applied to *Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.* (Fair Employment and Housing Act), exhaustion not required before filing civil action for damages alleging nonstatutory cause of action)

Plaintiffs is not excused from requirement of exhausting administrative remedies on ground that they were public interest organization seeking to further public, rather than private, rights when they had notice of administrative proceedings and actively participated at every stage of the hearing process. *Sea & Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Com. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 412, 417-418, 194 Cal. Rptr. 357, 668 P.2d 664*

Although exhaustion of administrative remedies is required unless it can be positively stated that the public entity has already decided its ruling in particular case, plaintiffs are not excused from requirement on ground of futility of further administrative action when city council's actions indicated that it favored proposed community development project, but council never addressed plaintiffs' legal challenge to adequacy of environmental impact report, which formed the basis of plaintiffs' underlying administrative mandamus action. *Sea & Sage Audubon Society, Inc. v. Planning Com. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 412, 417-418, 194 Cal. Rptr. 357, 668 P.2d 664*

In proceeding to challenge administrative regulation, exhaustion of administrative remedies is unnecessary if agency's prior conduct indicates that administrative challenge to regulation would be futile. *Union of American Physicians & Dentists v. Kizer (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 490, 503-504, 272 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Grier v. Kizer (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 422, 430-431, 268 Cal. Rptr. 244*

When tax is nullity as matter of law, administrative remedies are not required to be exhausted before seeking judicial remedy. *Britt v. City of Pomona (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 265, 270 n.2, 272 Cal. Rptr. 724*

Fact that case involves issue of law resolved in appellate courts does not justify exception to exhaustion requirement. *Sacramento County Deputy Sheriffs' Assn. v. County of Sacramento (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 280, 287, 269 Cal. Rptr. 6*

Party has standing to challenge ordinance or statute invalid on its face without first exhausting its administrative remedies. *Floystrup v. City of Berkeley Rent Stabilization Bd. (1990)) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1317, 268 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Individual plaintiff challenging administrative acts is not required to personally exhaust remedies before responsible administrative bodies when coplaintiffs have repeatedly appeared before administrative bodies and asserted objections that form basis of plaintiff's action. *Leff v. City of Monterey Park (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 674, 681, 267 Cal. Rptr. 343*

Rule of exhaustion of administrative remedies does not apply when administrative remedy is unavailable or inadequate; corollary of this rule excuses resort to administrative procedure when class relief is sought and administrative procedure affords no remedy for class. *White v. State of California (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 452, 464, 240 Cal. Rptr. 732*

Exhaustion doctrine is inapplicable where challenge is to constitutionality of statute and no forum or administrative remedy is provided for issues raised. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1209, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

In action by counties, which sought judicial declaration that legislative bills were invalid because state had failed to

satisfy constitutional requirement that subvention be provided for reimbursement of costs imposed on local government, futility exception was not applicable; fact that some, even if few, of claims submitted to administrative process had been funded precludes plaintiffs from establishing futility exception. *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 77-78, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Lack of jurisdiction exception is not applicable because agency is limited in damages it may award. *Edgren v. Regents of University of California (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 515, 521, 205 Cal. Rptr. 6*

Teacher whose permanent status was disputed by school board is entitled to writ of mandate to direct recognition of status without first having to exhaust administrative remedies when resolution of status was subject to judicial construction of statute. *California Teachers' Assn v. Governing Board (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 735, 749, 193 Cal. Rptr. 650*

Plaintiff is not required to exhaust administrative remedies when administrative procedures were nonexistent or constitutionally inadequate in that they failed to satisfy due process requirements. *Bush v. California Conservation Corps (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 194, 203-204, 185 Cal. Rptr. 892*

Availability of exception to exhaustion doctrine on grounds that administrative agency lacks subject matter jurisdiction is matter to be determined by agency itself before judicial relief may be obtained. *Alta Loma School Dist. v. San Bernardino County Com. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 542, 555-556, 177 Cal. Rptr. 506*

Failure to exhaust administrative remedies does not bar habeas corpus relief when criminal conviction for violation of zoning ordinance was unsupported by law. *In re Scarpitti (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 434, 443, 177 Cal. Rptr. 387*

Exhaustion of administrative remedies is not required when Legislature clearly required judicial rather than merely administrative remedy be available. *Lachman v. Cabrillo Pacific University (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 941, 944-945, 177 Cal. Rptr. 21*

Futility is exception to general rule of exhaustion of administrative remedies, but police chief failed to support contention with evidence in case of wrongful discharge where chief willfully did not attend administrative appeal before city council because of alleged bias against him. *Doyle v. Chino (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 677-680, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where he asserts public interest instead of his private interest and relief would not be available if denied in plaintiff's action. *Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 114, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 811, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where he did not know about remedy, had no means of knowing about it, and could not reasonably have been expected to know about it. *Gaylord v. Pasadena (1917) 175 Cal. 433, 440-441, 166 P. 348* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 811, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where such failure was due to circumstances beyond plaintiff's control. *Hollon v. Pierce (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 468, 476, 64 Cal. Rptr. 808* ; *Ahlstedt v. Board of Educ. (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 845, 855, 180 P.2d 949*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where such failure was due to agency's refusal to entertain proceeding. *In re Faucette (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 338, 343, 61 Cal. Rptr. 97*

Plaintiff is entitled to relief despite failure to exhaust administrative remedies where enforcement of exhaustion requirement would be unreasonable. *Kenney v. Wolff (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 592, 594-595, 191 P.2d 88* (unreasonably short time period for pursuing administrative remedy)

Plaintiff is not required to exhaust administrative remedies where he seeks judicial relief from administrative act beyond agency's powers. County of Los *Angeles v. Department of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 457, 260 P.2d 41*

Plaintiff is required to pursue administrative remedy even though facts of case, in light of history of similar cases, make denial of administrative relief virtually certain. *Flores v. Los Angeles Turf Club (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 736, 748, 13 Cal. Rptr. 201, 361 P.2d 921* ; *Contra Ogo Associates v. Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834-835, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761* ; *In re Faucette (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 338, 343, 61 Cal. Rptr. 97*

Failure to pursue available administrative remedy is not excusable merely because remedy is cumbersome or inefficient, or merely because remedy was designed for individual cases whereas plaintiff seeks relief for class. *Morton v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 977, 983-984, 88 Cal. Rptr. 533* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358*

[6] Compliance With Exhaustion Requirement

Fact that plaintiff had filed petition for writ of mandate, but voluntarily dismissed petition prior to disposition, amounts to failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *City of Fresno v. Superior Court (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1484, 1489, 234 Cal. Rptr. 136*

Necessity that administrative remedies be pursued to conclusion, on merits if possible. *McHugh v. County of Santa Cruz (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 533, 538-539, 109 Cal. Rptr. 149* ; *Graham v. Bryant (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 66, 70, 266 P.2d 44*

In class action, exhaustion requirement is complied with when some member of class exhausted administrative remedy, even if plaintiff did not. *Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 247, 268, 104 Cal. Rptr. 761, 502 P.2d 1049*

[7] Exhaustion and Constitutional Questions

Termination of utility service without notice reasonably calculated to apprise respondents of availability of administrative procedure to consider complaint of erroneous billing and without opportunity to present complaint to designated employee empowered to review disputed bills and rectify error is deprivation of property interest without due process of law. *Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div. v. Craft (1978) 436 U.S. 1, 98 S. Ct. 1554, 56 L. Ed. 2d 30, 46-47*

Agency does not declare statute unconstitutional nor refuse to enforce it by complying with legislative directive to implement statute to extent it does not conflict with federal law. *Reese v. Kizer (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 996, 998, 1002, 251 Cal. Rptr. 299, 760 P.2d 495*

Agency is without power to declare its enabling law unconstitutional. *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 250-251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281*

Failure to pursue administrative remedies is not excused by fact that administrative relief would depend on agency's construing statute or determining whether plaintiff's constitutional rights were violated. *Bank of America v. Mundo*

(1951) 37 Cal. 2d 1, 4, 229 P.2d 345 ; *City & County of San Francisco v. San Mateo County (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 196, 201, 222 P.2d 860* ; *Security-First Nat. Bk. v. County of L.A. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 319, 320-322, 217 P.2d 946* ; *Metcalf v. County of Los Angeles (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 267, 270, 148 P.2d 645* ; *Savoy Club v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1042, 91 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; *Morton v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 977, 984-985, 88 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Plaintiff seeking judgment on basis that law is unconstitutional is not entitled to relief if law is constitutional and he could have gotten, but did not seek, administrative relief. *West Publishing Co. v. McColgan (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 705, 711-712, 166 P.2d 861*

Agency is empowered to declare one of its own regulations unconstitutional. *United States v. Superior Court (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 189, 195, 120 P.2d 26*

Agency is bound to accept constitutionality of law it has duty to enforce. *Rubin v. Board of Directors (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 119, 124-125, 104 P.2d 1041*

Requirement of exhaustion is not applicable to action challenging constitutionality of statute establishing administrative agency's status and functions. *Lund v. California State Employees Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 174, 183, 271 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Litigant who seeks to challenge constitutionality of statute under which agency operates is not required to raise issue of constitutionality in proceedings before agency as condition of raising issue in courts; party, after pursuing available administrative procedure, is able to present constitutional claim for first time in courts. *Floystrup v. City of Berkeley Rent Stabilization Bd. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1317, 268 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Counties are not excused from exhausting administrative remedies established by Legislature for presenting claims for reimbursement of costs of state-mandated programs, even though self-executing constitutional provision required state to provide subvention for reimbursement of such costs. *County of Contra Costa v. State of California (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 62, 75-76, 222 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Constitutional basis for plaintiff's action does not excuse failure to pursue administrative remedy if administrative relief was available on any basis. *Leek v. Washington Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 43, 52-53, 177 Cal. Rptr. 196* ; *Banville v. Los Angeles County (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 563, 571, 4 Cal. Rptr. 458*

Rational relation test, rather than strict scrutiny, is sufficient to uphold regulation prohibiting corporal punishment in private school even though such punishment was permitted in public school; public and private schools are not similarly situated classes so as to trigger strict scrutiny. *Johnson v. Department of Social Services (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 878, 886, 177 Cal. Rptr. 49*

[8] Pleading Exhaustion

Exhaustion is required to be specifically pleaded, and allegation is subject to demurrer as contention and legal conclusion when pleaded otherwise. *Kirkpatrick v. City of Oceanside (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 267, 277, 283 Cal. Rptr. 191* (permitting plaintiffs to amend complaint to specifically plead exhaustion)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion

of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityMootnessGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.35

§ 474A.35 Law Reviews

See articles listed in Ch. 474, § 474.35

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.36

§ 474A.36 Text References

Judicial Council, Tenth Biennial Report (1944)

California Administrative Mandamus (Cal. CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 30, 257-331 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

186 of 187 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474A.37-474A.49

[Reserved]

§§ 474A.37[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474A TIMING OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474A.50

§ 474A.50 Determine If Timing Is Proper for a Mandate Proceeding

☐ Ascertain if the case is ripe for adjudication.

☐ In a proceeding to compel performance of a ministerial duty:

☐ The administrative entity or official is obligated to perform when the proceeding is commenced [*see § 474A.10[2][a]*]; and

☐ The administrative entity or official has actually refused to perform the duty [*see § 474A.10[2][b]*].

☐ In a proceeding to review an adjudicative decision or order:

☐ The order or decision has a direct and immediate effect on the petitioner [*see § 474A.10[3][a]*]; and

☐ The order or decision has become final [*see § 474A.10[3][b]*].

☐ Ascertain if administrative remedies have been exhausted.

☐ Petitioner must have pursued all available administrative proceedings to completion and received a final decision on the merits [*see § 474A.11[3][a]*].

☐ Petitioner must have made a full presentation to the administrative entity on all issues at all prescribed stages of the administrative proceedings [*see § 474A.11[3][b]*].

- ☐ Ascertain if the exhaustion requirement has been excused.
  - ☐ The administrative remedy is unavailable or inadequate [*see § 474A.12[1]*].
  - ☐ Exhaustion would be futile [*see § 474A.12[2]*].
  - ☐ Court and agency are vested with concurrent primary jurisdiction [*see § 474A.12[3]*].
  - ☐ Administrative entity lacks subject matter jurisdiction [*see § 474A.12[4]*].
  - ☐ Statute under which administrative entity operates is unconstitutional on its face [*see § 474A.12[5]*].
  - ☐ Exhaustion of remedy will result in irreparable injury [*see § 474A.12[6]*].
  - ☐ Public interest is disserved by application of rule [*see § 474A.12[7]*].
- ☐ Ascertain when proceedings may be barred as untimely.
  - ☐ Proceeding is not commenced within the applicable statute of limitations period [*see § 474A.20*].
  - ☐ Proceeding may be barred by laches if [*see § 474A.21*]:
    - ☐ Petitioner delayed unreasonably; and
    - ☐ Petitioner acquiesced in the decision complained of or adverse parties were prejudiced by delay.
  - ☐ Proceeding may be dismissed as moot if [*see § 474A.22*]:
    - ☐ Writ would be useless or ineffective;
    - ☐ Writ would be of no practical benefit to petitioner;
    - ☐ Writ will no longer benefit petitioner;
    - ☐ The administrative entity is no longer empowered to perform the duty at issue; or
    - ☐ The administrative entity belatedly performed the duty sought to be enforced.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityRipenessAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersPrimary JurisdictionCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityRipenessGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 474B.syn

§ 474B.syn Synopsis to Chapter 474B: STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS

§ 474B.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 474B.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

[2] Agency Adjudication

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 474B.03-474B.09 [Reserved]

§ 474B.10 Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

[1] The Writ of Mandate and Mandate Proceedings

[2] Ordinary and Administrative Mandate

§ 474B.11 Agency Action Without or in Excess of Jurisdiction

[1] Nature of Jurisdiction Issue

[2] Duration and Extent of Agency's Jurisdiction

[3] Court Remedies for Lack of Agency Jurisdiction

§ 474B.12 Lack of a Fair Hearing

[1] Right to a Hearing

[2] Hearing Provided

[3] Fair Hearing Afforded

[a] Nature of Fair Hearing Requirement

[b] Agency Bias or Prejudice

§ 474B.13 Prejudicial Abuse of Discretion

[1] Nature of Abuse of Discretion

[2] Exercise of Discretion

[3] Prejudice Requirement

§ 474B.14 Agency Action in Manner Required by Law

[1] Agency Procedures Required by Law

[2] Right to Counsel for Petitioner

[3] Agency Constructions of Law

[4] Agency Decisions to Admit and Exclude Evidence

[a] Admissibility of Evidence in Administrative Proceedings

[b] Use of Illegally Obtained Evidence

[c] Results of Prior Criminal and Civil Proceedings

[5] Agency Penalty Determinations

[6] Conditioning Administrative Rights on Waiver of Constitutional Rights

[7] Constitutionality of Enabling Act

§ 474B.15 Order or Decision Supported by Findings

[1] Whether Findings Made by Agency

[2] Sufficiency of Agency Findings

[3] Decision Supported by Implied Findings

§ 474B.16 Findings Supported by Evidence

[1] Abuse of Discretion for Lack of Evidence

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Error in the Record

[a] Nature of Error Requirement

[b] Availability of Discovery to Obtain Information Not in Record

[4] Applicability of Independent Judgment Test

[a] Decision Must Substantially Affect Fundamental, Vested Right

[i] Decisions of State Agency

[ii] Adjudicatory Decisions of Local Agency and Quasi-Judicial Decisions of State Agency

[b] Fundamental Rights

[c] Vested Rights

[d] Limited Trial De Novo

[e] Judicial Review of Penalty Assessments

[5] Applicability of Substantial Evidence Test

[a] Nature and Applicability of Test

[b] Decisions of Constitutional Agencies

[c] Decisions Made Under Statutory Substantial Evidence Test

[d] Decisions of Private Hospital Boards

[e] The Record for Decision

§ 474B.17 Proper Scope of Review in the Appellate Courts

[1] Whether the Trial Court Properly Applied the Independent Judgment Test

[2] Whether the Trial Court Properly Applied the Substantial Evidence Test

§ 474B.18 Issues That Are Not Reviewable by Administrative Mandate

[1] Issues That Were Not Presented to the Agency

[2] Issues That Are Moot

§§ 474B.19-474B.29 [Reserved]

§ 474B.30 Whether Petitioner Has Clear, Present Right to Performance of Clear, Present Ministerial Duty

§ 474B.31 Whether Petitioner Seek Review of Quasi-Legislative Action

§ 474B.32 Whether Agency Was Required by Law to Hold Hearing

§ 474B.33 Whether Agency Action Was Arbitrary, Capricious, or Lacking in Evidentiary Support

[1] Applicability of Substantial Evidence Test

[2] Applicability of Independent Judgment Test

§§ 474B.34-474B.39 [Reserved]

§ 474B.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 474B.41 Federal Constitution

§ 474B.42 State Constitution

§ 474B.43 State Statutes

§ 474B.44 Decisions

[1] Abuse of Discretion

[a] General Requirements

[b] Failure to Proceed in Manner Required by Law

[c] Decision Not Supported by Agency Findings

[2] Administrative Construction

[3] Administrative Hearings

[4] Appeal

[5] Burden of Proof and Producing Evidence

[6] Findings Not Supported by Evidence

[a] Independent Judgment Review

[b] Substantial Evidence Review

[c] Constitutional Rights Case

[7] Findings of Fact

[8] Jurisdiction and Jurisdictional Review

[9] Penalties

[10] Questions of Law

[11] Review of Fairness of Trial

[a] General Requirements

[b] Constitutional Considerations

[c] Use of Illegally Seized Evidence

[12] Validity of Enabling Act

§ 474B.45 Text References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.01

§ 474B.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of judicial review standards and issues in California public administrative law, including the following in Part II:

- Subpart A discusses judicial review standards and issues under administrative mandate [§§ 474B.10-474B.18].

- Subpart B discusses judicial review standards under ordinary mandate [§§ 474B.30-474B.33].

A Research Guide is also included as Part III [§ 474B.40 et seq.].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.02

§ 474B.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

For related discussion concerning judicial review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.
- Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*.

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for writs of mandate generally, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Agency Adjudication

For detailed discussion and forms relating to agency adjudications that are the subject of the judicial review discussed in

this chapter, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication*.
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*.
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges*.
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*.
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions*.
- Ch. 473H, *Alternative Administrative Adjudication Procedures*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (general discussion of judicial power is in § 470.12[5]). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*.
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies*.

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules*.
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures*.
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*.

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474B.03-474B.09

[Reserved]

§§ 474B.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.10

§ 474B.10 Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

[1] The Writ of Mandate and Mandate Proceedings

A party who is aggrieved by a decision of an administrative agency may seek judicial relief from the decision by petitioning an appropriate court for a writ of mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]. The writ of mandate is a broad remedy that empowers a court to compel the performance of a legal duty when the law provides no other adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Dowell v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 483, 486-487, 304 P.2d 1009* ; *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , for a detailed discussion regarding the nature of mandate proceedings].

[2] Ordinary and Administrative Mandate

California law recognizes two principal types of mandate proceedings:

- Traditional, or "ordinary" mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*; *see § 474B.30* et seq.].
- Administrative mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*].

Ordinary mandate, which is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, is available to compel agencies to perform ministerial acts and to correct acts outside the agency's legal powers [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (mandate will issue to compel performance of act which the law specifically enjoins); *Environmental Protection & Information Center v. California Dept. of Forestry & Fire Protection (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 459, 478-479, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28, 187 P.3d 888* (standard of review for ordinary mandate is abuse of discretion when the issue on appeal is whether an agency failed to proceed in a manner required by law); *Saleeby v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 547, 561-562, 216 Cal. Rptr. 367, 702 P.2d 525* (mandate will lie to correct administrative acts that exceed agency's legal powers); *People ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 480, 491, 96 Cal. Rptr. 553, 487 P.2d 1193* (mandate will lie to compel performance of clear duty imposed by law)]. Administrative mandate, which is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, is used to review the adjudicatory decisions of an administrative agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 101, 280 P.2d 1* ; *Estes v. City of Grover City (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 509, 514,*

147 Cal. Rptr. 131 ; County of Los Angeles v. Tax Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 830, 833, 73 Cal. Rptr. 469]* . For this purpose, an adjudicatory decision is an administrative order or decision made as the result of a proceeding in which, by law, a hearing is required to be given, evidence is required to be taken, and discretion in the determination of facts is vested in the agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

This chapter covers issues that may be raised in a mandate proceeding and the proper standard for review of an agency decision when the decision is subjected to judicial review, either by a trial or appellate court. Because the distinction between administrative mandate and ordinary mandate vitally affects the issues that may be considered and the proper standards of review for mandate proceedings, the two types of mandate are treated separately. For a detailed consideration of differences between ordinary and administrative mandate, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* . For forms of a petition for writ of mandate for use in administrative proceedings, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.11

§ 474B.11 Agency Action Without or in Excess of Jurisdiction

[1] Nature of Jurisdiction Issue

One of the issues on which review of an administrative agency's adjudicatory decision may be sought is whether the agency acted without, or in excess of, its jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. Few reported cases deal specifically with questions of agency jurisdiction as reviewed by administrative mandate. Principles generally governing the jurisdiction of courts, together with cases dealing with agency jurisdiction in the context of writs of certiorari and prohibition may provide useful analogies in assessing whether a petitioner is entitled to a writ of mandate on the ground that the agency acted without jurisdiction [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1068, 1071, 1074* (writ of review or certiorari), 1102 (prohibition)].

The term "jurisdiction" is used in a variety of situations with different meanings. In its most basic sense, jurisdiction refers to the power of a tribunal to hear and determine a case, with reference to its authority over the parties and the subject matter [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288-290, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 845-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674]* . The concept of jurisdiction also covers (1) questions of the manner in which the tribunal acts, (2) its compliance with statutory and procedural requirements, and (3) the kind of relief the agency may grant [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288-290, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 845-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674]* . Indeed, an agency may be said to exceed its jurisdiction whenever it takes action outside its defined power, whether the source of the law providing that definition is constitutional, statutory, or decisional [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288-290, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Miller v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 1379, 238 Cal. Rptr. 915]* .

An agency may lack jurisdiction to review the decision of another agency [*City of Half Moon Bay v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 795, 805-806, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213* (California Coastal Commission lacked appellate jurisdiction to modify a coastal development permit issued by a city under court order)].

When an agency acts pursuant to a statute that is later declared unconstitutional, final proceedings of the agency based

on the statute are immune from collateral attack [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 796-797, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593* ; *Miller v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 1379, 238 Cal. Rptr. 915]* . Agency action in excess of the agency's jurisdiction should be distinguished from agency action that is contrary to law although within the agency's jurisdiction [*see Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 845-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674* (court judgment granting relief prohibited by law must be distinguished from judgment in which relief is simply in excess of amount to which party is entitled under applicable law)]. If a decision or order is erroneous but not beyond the jurisdiction of the agency, it is subject to correction on appeal or other review; but, once it becomes final, it is enforceable and not subject to collateral attack [*see Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 845-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674* (judgment of superior court)].

[2] Duration and Extent of Agency's Jurisdiction

Statutes governing the adjudicatory functions of an administrative agency generally limit the time within which the agency has power to act. The statutes may also specify the nature of the relief the agency may grant and other relevant procedural matters. With respect to the decisions of a licensing agency, whether expiration or voluntary surrender of a license divests the agency of jurisdiction to bring disciplinary proceedings against the licensee may become an issue. For example, the statute governing agencies in the Department of Consumer Affairs provides that expiration, suspension, cancellation, or forfeiture of a license by operation of law does not deprive the agency of authority to institute or continue disciplinary proceedings against the licensee during any period when the license may be renewed, reissued, restored, or reinstituted [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 118(b)*; *see Cal. Pacific Collections, Inc. v. Powers (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 135, 140, 74 Cal. Rptr. 289, 449 P.2d 225* (voluntary surrender of license issued under Collection Agency Act); *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 101* (agencies within Department of Consumer Affairs)]. A similar question may arise on the effect of withdrawal of an application for a license or permit. In the absence of a statute providing that the agency retains authority to institute a disciplinary proceeding or take other adverse action against a party who has withdrawn an application for a license, such proceeding or action is outside the agency's jurisdiction [*McDonald v. State Bar (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 768, 770-771, 141 P.2d 217* (State Bar Act contains no provision permitting Committee of Bar Examiners to proceed with investigation and determine application on merits after request for withdrawal); *Miller v. Board of Police Commissioners (1960) 181 Cal. App. 2d 562, 563-564, 5 Cal. Rptr. 272* (Los Angeles Municipal Code provided that withdrawal of application did not deprive Board of Police Commissioners of jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation of applicant); *see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 118(a)* (withdrawal of application does not deprive agency under Department of Consumer Affairs of authority to institute or continue disciplinary proceedings unless agency has consented to withdrawal)].

In general, when a decision of an administrative agency becomes final, the agency loses jurisdiction to alter or modify the decision unless authority to do so is conferred by statute [*Guilbert v. Regents of University of California (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 233, 243, 155 Cal. Rptr. 583]* . An agency subject to the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*see Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*] retains authority to reconsider its decisions for 30 days after the decisions are delivered or mailed, or until the date set by the agency for termination of the decision if that date is within the 30-day period, or at the termination of a stay granted for the purpose of filing an application for reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11521(a)*; *see* Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* , for discussion of reconsideration of agency decisions]. The governing statutes of an agency not subject to the APA must be consulted to determine if the agency's jurisdiction continues after it makes a final decision. If a statute clearly evidences the Legislature's intent that an agency should exercise continuing jurisdiction and have power to alter or modify its decisions, the agency's exercise of such power is within its jurisdiction [*Olive Proration etc. Com. v. Agri. etc. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 204, 209, 109 P.2d 918]* .

When an agency or a litigant fails to comply with time limits set forth in a governing procedural statute, the question may arise whether the statutory time limitation is mandatory and jurisdictional or merely directory [*see Edwards v. Steele (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 406, 409, 158 Cal. Rptr. 662, 599 P.2d 1365]* . Whether a time limitation is "mandatory" or "directory" does not refer to whether the requirement is "permissive" or "obligatory," but whether failure to comply with the limitation will or will not have the effect of invalidating the action to which the procedural requirement relates [

Edwards v. Steele (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 406, 409, 158 Cal. Rptr. 662, 599 P.2d 1365 ; *Morris v. County of Marin (1977) 18 Cal. 3d 901, 908, 136 Cal. Rptr. 251, 559 P.2d 606]* . Unless a contrary intent is clearly expressed, requirements relating to the time within which acts must be done are usually deemed to be directory rather than mandatory [*Edwards v. Steele (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 406, 409, 158 Cal. Rptr. 662, 599 P.2d 1365]* . The courts have used various tests to determine whether time requirements are mandatory or directory. They consider, for example, whether the statute contains a consequence or penalty for failure to act within the designated time, whether the time provisions relate to matters of substance or are merely of mere convenience, and whether the consequence of holding the time limitation to be mandatory would defeat or promote the purpose of the statute [*Garcia v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Education (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 807, 811, 177 Cal. Rptr. 29]* . However, even when a time limitation is deemed to be mandatory, due process may require that it not be applied in a particular case if to do so would deprive a litigant of substantive or procedural rights [*see* *Edwards v. Steele (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 406, 412, 158 Cal. Rptr. 662, 599 P.2d 1365* (15-day time limit for hearing zoning appeal held not to be mandatory when property owner's noncompliance was wholly beyond his control); *Ursino v. Superior Court (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 611, 620-622, 114 Cal. Rptr. 404* (application of 40-day time limit for hearing appeal from Board of Permit Appeals would constitute denial of due process when Board unable to act in time due to vacancies)].

The courts have recognized an exception to the general rule that an administrative agency loses jurisdiction when its decision becomes final. When an agency's decision is in excess of its jurisdiction (because it is based on an erroneous conclusion of law) or is otherwise void, the decision is not binding on the agency [*Aylward v. State Board etc. Examiners (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 833, 839, 192 P.2d 929]* . In such a case, the agency still has unexercised power to proceed within its jurisdiction [*Aylward v. State Board etc. Examiners (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 833, 839, 192 P.2d 929]* .

[3] Court Remedies for Lack of Agency Jurisdiction

When a defect in the agency's jurisdiction is asserted in a mandate proceeding, the court's action will depend on the nature of the defect. If the agency clearly acted outside its jurisdiction, the court must set aside the agency's order or action [*Mumaw v. City of Glendale (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 76 Cal. Rptr. 245]* . If the agency had jurisdiction to act and the circumstances still permit it to do so, the court should remand the matter to the agency for further consideration [*National Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Downey (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 586, 594, 220 P.2d 962]* . If the agency failed to make necessary findings on jurisdictional facts, the court must remand the matter to the agency with instructions to make such findings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)* (abuse of discretion is shown if order or decision not supported by findings); *see § 474B.15* for discussion of the requirement that an agency decision or order be supported by findings]. If the agency made jurisdictional findings, but it is claimed that the findings are not supported by the evidence, the court must review those findings under the appropriate standard of review [for discussion of the requirement that findings be supported by evidence, *see § 474B.16*; for "independent judgment" test, *see §§ 474B.16[4], 474B.33[2]*; for "substantial evidence" test, *see §§ 474B.16[5], 474B.33[1]*].

When an agency conducts an administrative hearing, and rules that it lacks jurisdiction because there was no employer-employee relationship between the plaintiff and the defendant, the agency is required by *Labor Code § 98.1* to file a timely decision after the hearing so that the affected individual can file an appeal under [*Labor Code § 98.2*] which provides forde novo review in the superior court. Although the agency decision whether to accept the claim, or whether to hold a hearing on the claim is not subject to do novo review, the agency is precluded from summarily dismissing the claim for wages for lack of jurisdiction after conducting the hearing, as the affected person has the right to appeal the agency action to challenge the finding that they were not an employee [*Vos Post v. Palo/Haklar & Associates (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 942, 948-949, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671, 4 P.3d 928]* .

However, an employer was precluded from challenging by writ of administrative mandate a decision of the unemployment insurance appeals board (UIAB) concluding that an individual who worked for that employer was an employee rather than an independent contractor. The employer was prohibited by the provisions of the California Constitution [Cal. Const. Art. XIII, § 32, Unemp. Ins. Code § 1851, and *Modern Barber Colleges vs. Cal. Emp.*

Stabilization Comm'n (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 720, 192 P.2d 916] . These principles prohibit the use of administrative mandamus to challenge the board's decision because this would effectively restrain the collection of a tax, and California law requires that the challenger pay the tax and sue for a refund [*First Aid Servs. of San Diego, Inc. v. Cal. Employment Dev. Dep't (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1470, 1473-1474, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 663]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewExceeding Statutory AuthorityAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.12

§ 474B.12 Lack of a Fair Hearing

[1] Right to a Hearing

Another issue on which review of an administrative agency's adjudicatory decision may be sought is whether a "fair trial" occurred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. The requirement of a "fair trial" applies only to a proceeding in which, by law, a hearing is required to be given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. In this context, therefore, the words "fair trial" mean a "fair hearing" before an agency that is required to afford a hearing. If the statute governing the agency does not provide for a hearing, or if the statute leaves the grant of a hearing to the agency's discretion, a person aggrieved by the agency's action is precluded from seeking review through administrative mandate [*Mahdavi v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 326, 333-335, 136 Cal. Rptr. 421* (Fair Employment Practice Act, *Gov. Code §§ 12900-12906*, does not require hearing on filing of complaint by person alleging employment discrimination)]. A hearing requirement need not be expressly set forth in the governing statute; however, such a requirement may be implied if necessary to effectuate the purposes of the statute [*Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 362, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240* ; *Chavez v. Civil Service Com. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 324, 332, 150 Cal. Rptr. 197]* . Deputy sheriff had the right to an evidentiary hearing under *Gov. Code § 3304(b)(3)* to challenge firearm related restrictions imposed on deputy by sheriff. Hearing rights are enforced by the grant of a writ of mandate [*Gordon v. Horsley (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 336, 352, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910]* .

New Motor Vehicle Board had implied authority to dismiss dealer's protest of manufacturer's termination of dealer's franchise for a specific type of car when the undisputed facts showed good cause for termination as a matter of law. Thus, there was no need for an evidentiary hearing on termination issues. Dealer's due process rights were not violated because dealer failed to take opportunity to challenge facts asserted by manufacturer which provided good cause for termination [*Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 637-639, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501]* .

[2] Hearing Provided

If a party is entitled by law to a hearing and none is provided, the party is denied a fair trial [*Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 265,246 P.2d 656]* . In such a case, the reviewing court must remand the matter to the

agency for further proceedings, and may not decide the matter on the merits [*Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 265, 246 P.2d 656]* .

The Court of Appeal held that the Medical Board of California deprived a physician of due process of law by conducting a fundamentally unfair physician license revocation hearing when the Board disqualified all of the doctor's experts as to standard of care, thereby precluding the doctor from putting on any evidence in his defense to charges that the doctor's treatment of several patients was grossly negligent or was an extreme departure from the standard of practice [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1137, 1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . The Court of Appeal also applied the independent judgment test to review the fairness of the administrative hearing as a matter of law [*Sinaiko v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1140-1141, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* . Finally the Court of Appeal held that this case must be remanded to the Medical Board to consider the evidence presented by the doctor's experts. It was not proper for the reviewing (superior) court to admit the evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*, and then to reweigh the evidence to support the Medical Board's fact findings because this was an unfair proceeding. It is the agency's responsibility to consider the evidence erroneously excluded and to make an informed decision based on that evidence and agency expertise. Thus, a remand to the agency is required [*Sinaiko v. Superior Ct. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1146-1147, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 371]* .

[3] Fair Hearing Afforded

[a] Nature of Fair Hearing Requirement

When it exercises adjudicative functions, an administrative agency is a quasi-judicial body [*see* *Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 612-613, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134* (county acts as quasi-judicial body when it approves subdivision map)]. As such, the agency is bound by the same obligations as a court to insure that all proceedings before it are conducted fairly [*Wood v. City Civil Service Commission (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 105, 110, 119 Cal. Rptr. 175* (agency's denial of continuance for absence of party's counsel denied party fair trial)]. Whether a hearing was fair must be determined, first, with reference to the statutes and regulations (if any) that govern the agency. Second, the principles of constitutional due process must be considered, since a fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process [*Withrow v. Larkin (1975) 421 U.S. 35, 46, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d 712* ; *In re Murchison (1954) 349 U.S. 133, 136, 75 S. Ct. 623, 99 L. Ed. 942* ; *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restriction on Public Agencies* , for a discussion of due process issues]. For an agency subject to the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*; *see Gov. Code §§ 11500(a)* ("agency" defined), 11501(b) (enumerated agencies)], the Act itself must be consulted for applicable procedures [*see Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.* (administrative adjudication); *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* for discussion of adjudication by agencies subject to the APA]. For an agency not subject to the APA, no particular form of notice or hearing is required. If the relevant statute provides for reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard, and if the agency's decision is based on evidence adduced at the hearing, a fair trial has been provided [*English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158, 217 P.2d 22* ; *Drummey v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 75, 80-81, 87 P.2d 848]* . The procedure required varies with the factual context and nature of the action [*see* *Perlman v. Shasta Joint Jr. College Dist. Bd. of Trustees (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 873, 880, 88 Cal. Rptr. 563* (suspension and expulsion hearing before college board)]. The method of proceeding is controlled by the hearing officer and generally resembles that employed in civil trials, but the lack of formal procedural rules in the governing statute does not violate due process [*Temple of Inspired Living v. Department of Social Service (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 564, 569, 158 Cal. Rptr. 816* ; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* , for discussion of general procedural coverage in administrative hearings; *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* , for a discussion of due process issues].

[b] Agency Bias or Prejudice

Bias or prejudice on the part of an agency may deprive a party of a fair trial and serve as a basis for relief in mandate proceedings [*see* *Withrow v. Larkin (1975) 421 U.S. 35, 47, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d 712* (suit for injunction)].

Procedural due process dictates that an agency not act when, under the facts of the case, the probability of bias is too high to be constitutionally tolerable [*Mennig v. City Council (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 341, 350, 150 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *see Withrow v. Larkin (1975) 421 U.S. 35, 47, 95 S. Ct. 1456, 43 L. Ed. 2d 712* (suit for injunction)]. Thus, a person who is personally embroiled in a dispute or has a substantial pecuniary interest in its outcome may not properly adjudicate the dispute [*Gibson v. Berryhill (1973) 411 U.S. 564, 579, 93 S. Ct. 1689, 36 L. Ed. 2d 488* ; *Mennig v. City Council (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 341, 350-351, 150 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *see Taylor v. Hayes (1974) 418 U.S. 488, 501-503, 94 S. Ct. 2697, 41 L. Ed. 2d 897* (trial judge became embroiled in running dispute with counsel for defendant); *Doyle v. City of Chino (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 673, 682, 172 Cal. Rptr. 844* (writ denied when city official personally embroiled in dispute is not member of adjudicating agency)]. Disqualifying bias may not be inferred solely from the circumstances of an adjudicator's private life; thus, due process is not denied merely because an agency is composed in whole or in part of members of the regulated business or profession [*American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 991-992, 138 Cal. Rptr. 594]* . Nor will bias or prejudice on the part of one member of a multi-member board disqualify the entire board from acting [*American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 993, 138 Cal. Rptr. 594* ; *Borders v. Anderson (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 401, 417, 22 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . If a majority of the board members voted in favor of a disputed decision, the fact that one member who voted for the decision was biased will not invalidate it [*Thompson v. City of Long Beach (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 235, 243-244, 259 P.2d 649]* . If the membership of a board is slanted in favor of a particular class of litigants, however, due process is denied and decisions by the board must be invalidated [*see American Motors Sales Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 983, 992-993,138 Cal. Rptr. 594* (statute required that four of nine members of board that adjudicated economic disputes between car manufacturers and dealers be car dealers and did not require that any of remaining members be manufacturers)].

A county retirement board did not violate due process of law by both investigating and adjudicating retirement benefits applications. The Board can select unilaterally and compensate hearing officers consistent with due process of law. Due process of law does not require that the applicant participate in the hearing officer selection process Board selection and compensation of hearing officers does not, by itself, establish bias against applicants for retirement benefits on the part of the hearing officers [*McIntyre v. Santa Barbara County Employees' Retirement System (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 730, 735-736, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 565]* .

The so-called "rule of necessity" significantly limits the usefulness of arguments based on bias or prejudice. Under this rule, when a administrative agency has a duty to act on a matter before it and it is the only entity capable of acting in the matter, the fact that the members may have a personal interest in the result of the action taken does not disqualify them from performing their duty [*Caminetti v. Pac. Mutual L. Ins. Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 344, 366, 139 P.2d 908* ; *Gonsalves v. City of Dairy Valley (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 400, 404, 71 Cal. Rptr. 255]* .

A reviewing court may not consider a claim of bias or prejudice unless it was raised at the agency hearing [*see Anton v. San Antonio Community Hosp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 802, 826, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442, 567 P.2d 1162* ; *Thompson v. City of Long Beach (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 235, 242-243, 259 P.2d 649* ; *see also § 474B.16[3]* for discussion of the requirement that error asserted as grounds for issuance of mandate must appear in record], or unless the petitioner shows that the claim could not have been raised in the administrative proceedings [*Barkin v. Board of Optometry (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 75 Cal. Rptr. 337]* . Mere assertions of prejudice are insufficient to establish disqualifying bias. A party who claims that a member of an agency hearing board was biased must present specific evidence from which the reviewing court can properly infer the existence of bias [*see Noguchi v. Civil Service Com. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1521, 1536-1537, 232 Cal. Rptr. 394* (hearing board request of county administrator's office to conduct audit of department headed by petitioner, chief medical examiner of county, did not constitute evidence of prejudice)]. For a more detailed discussion of agency bias and prejudice, see Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemands & RemittitursAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.13

§ 474B.13 Prejudicial Abuse of Discretion

[1] Nature of Abuse of Discretion

Another issue on which review of an administrative agency's adjudicatory decision may be sought is whether the agency committed "any prejudicial abuse of discretion" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. Abuse of discretion may be established by showing any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]:

- The agency failed to proceed in the manner required by law [*see § 474B.14*].
- The agency's order or decision is not supported by the findings [*see § 474B.15*].
- The agency's findings are not supported by the evidence [*see § 474B.16*].

[2] Exercise of Discretion

To determine whether an agency has abused its discretion in a specific case, the court must first ascertain that the action taken was in fact anexercise of discretion. The functions, powers, and duties of administrative agencies are classified as either discretionary or ministerial. Discretion in this context refers to powers conferred by law on an agency or officer to perform official acts according to the dictates of the officer's judgment [*People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623]* . Ministerial acts, on the other hand, are those that an official is required to perform in a prescribed manner in obedience to the mandate of legal authority and without regard to his or her own judgment or opinion concerning the propriety or impropriety of the act to be performed, when a given state of facts exists [*People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623]* . In general, discretionary powers conferred on administrative agencies are in the nature of public trusts and may not be surrendered or delegated in the absence of statutory authorization; conversely, the performance of ministerial tasks, including the investigation and determination of facts preliminary to discretionary agency action, may be delegated [*see California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Personnel Commission (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 144, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436]* .

The California Department of Corrections prison supervisor staffing policies and practices which included "cross-covering" and "redirecting" were challenged on grounds of risks to employee safety. The court of appeals affirmed the denial of a writ of mandate by the trial court and concluded that the policies were within the discretion of the prison warden who implemented the policies and practices, and there was no abuse of discretion in staffing decisions because the policy required consideration of safety risks and used a target ceiling [*California Corrctional Supervisors Organization, Inc. v. Department of Corrections (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 824, 832-833, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 595]* . The Department of Industrial Relations did not abuse its discretion in rescinding a prevailing wage determination without conducting a wage survey, which is not required, because the Department considered the appropriate information in the evaluation process [*California Slurry Seal Association v. Department of Industrial Relations (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 651, 666-667, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38]* .

The abuse of discretion standard of review applies to writ of mandate proceedings challenging an agency's compliance with CEQA requirements of preparing an environmental impact report under *Pub Res. Code § 21061* [*City of Marina v. Board of Trustees of the Cal. State Univ. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 341, 355-356, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 355, 138 P. 3d 692* (abuse of discretion standard of review applies under CEQA [*Pub. Resources Code § 21168.5*]); *Great Oaks Water Co v. Santa Clara Valley Water Dist. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 956, 966-968, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 506* (the agency findings were adequate for making exemption determination, therefore there was no abuse of discretion.); *Riverwatch v. Olivenhain Municipal Water District (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1186, 1199-1201, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 625* (agency compliance with CEQA requirements in approving treated waste water supply agreement was subject to abuse of discretion review); *Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 598, 604-605, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 249* ; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1105-1106, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 104]* . The abuse of discretion standard of review also applies to writ of mandate proceedings brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* to challenge the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's approval of timber harvesting plans (THP) under the requirements of the Z'Berg-Nejedly Forest Practices Act of 1973, *Pub. Res. Code § 4582.6* [*Ebbetts Pass Forest Watch v. Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1345-1346, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808]* . The Court of Appeal upheld the approval of the THPby the Department and noted that the THP was the "functional equivalent" of an environmental impact report under CEQA, *Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.* [*Ebbetts Pass Forest Watch v. Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1338-1339, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808]* .

Agency penalty determinations are within the discretion of the agency and are reviewed for abuse of discretion [*Kazensky v. City of Merced (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 44, 53, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356* (city terminated employees for misconduct; Superior court issued writ of mandamus reinstating employee, and requiring use of progressive discipline; Court of appeal reversed writ and upheld termination decision based on abuse of discretion standard of review); *Kolender v. San Diego County Civil Service Comm'n (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 716, 720-722, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (county sheriff terminated sheriff's deputy for lying to cover up physical abuse of an inmate by another deputy; civil service commission reduced sanction to 90-day suspension concluding that termination was excessive; sheriff petitioned for writ of mandate challenging commission decision; superior court denied petition, an court of appeal reversed denial of petition. Holding that it was abuse of discretion for commission to reduce sanction, and that termination was not an excessive sanction in these circumstances)].

An agency can impose more severe discipline than recommended by a hearing officer without reviewing the agency record related to the penalty in circumstances under which the weight of the evidence in the agency record supports the findings of misconduct. The trial court applied the independent judgment test (because public employment is a fundamental vested right) and found that the weight of the evidence supported the fact findings related to misconduct. The trial court standard of review for agency penalty determinations is abuse of discretion, not independent judgment [*Spanner v. Rancho Santiago Community College Dist. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 584, 591-592, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (classified employee of school district was permanently demoted by district for misconduct; hearing officer had recommended that employee be warned and given opportunity to change behavior; Court of Appeal upheld denial of employee's mandate petition challenging demotion)].

A county civil service commission's decision to reduce the penalty awarded (from demotion in rank to a 30-day suspension without back pay) against a sergeant who allegedly made false statements and was found to have acted with insubordination and willful disobedience during the investigation of a gender harassment claim against him brought by a female deputy was reversed by the Sixth District California Court of Appeal, which found that the reduction in penalty was an abuse of discretion given the seriousness of the employee misconduct by the sergeant [*County of Santa Cruz v. Civil Service Commission of Santa Cruz (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1584-1585]* .

[3] Prejudice Requirement

Even if an agency's decision constitutes an abuse of discretion, the decision will not be overturned unless prejudice has resulted to the petitioner from the decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1221-1221, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 203* (certification of EIR by city without considering urban decay and air quality effects in environmental assessment precluded informed public participation and decision making and was therefore a prejudicial abuse of discretion); *Steele v. L.A. County Civil Service Com. (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 129, 137-138, 333 P.2d 171]* . A petitioner is generally prejudiced by a decision only if it has substantially affected his or her rights [*Steele v. L.A. County Civil Service Com. (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 129, 137-138, 333 P.2d 171]* . If the agency's decision would have been the same absent its abuse of discretion, the petitioner has not been prejudiced and mandate relief should not be granted [*see Roark v. State Bar (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 665, 668, 55 P.2d 839* (proceedings to disbar attorney)]. For example, if improper or objectionable evidence was introduced in the administrative proceedings, prejudice is not shown if other competent evidence supports the agency's decision [*Roark v. State Bar (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 665, 668, 55 P.2d 839* ; *Cooley v. State Bd. of Funeral Directors (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 293, 298-299, 296 P.2d 588* ; *West Coast etc. Co. v. Contractors' etc. Bd. (1945) 72 Cal. App. 2d 287, 299-300, 164 P.2d 811]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.14

§ 474B.14 Agency Action in Manner Required by Law

[1] Agency Procedures Required by Law

One statutory ground for establishing abuse of discretion is a showing that the agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *see § 474B.13[1]*]. A wide variety of procedural defects may establish that the agency failed to proceed in the manner required by law, including:

- Denial of subpoena or discovery rights [for discussion, *see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications*].
- Denial of the right to counsel [*see* [2], *below*].
- Failure of the agency to correctly construe the law [*see* [3], *below*].
- Errors in admitting and excluding evidence [*see* [4], *below*].
- Failure to properly determine penalties [*see* [5], *below*].

Other procedural errors may also establish failure. For example, an agency's use of an erroneous legal standard in making its determinations has been held to constitute a failure to proceed in the manner required by law [*No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 88, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *Department of Corrections v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1100, 1106-1107, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 473* (judicial review of decision based on administrative hearing required for renewed petition for involuntary medication of prisoner)], as has the exercise of agency discretion in a manner that conflicts with the spirit of the law or impedes or defeats the ends of substantial justice [*see* *Walsh v. Kirby (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 95, 103, 118 Cal. Rptr. 1, 529 P.2d 33* (imposition of cumulative penalties on holder of alcoholic beverage license amounted to de facto revocation of license, contrary to provisions of Alcoholic Beverage Control Act); *see also* *Fisher v. Board of Police Commissioners (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 298, 301, 45 Cal. Rptr. 859* (action by board members did not constitute effective exercise of discretion as

required by city charter when proceedings did not culminate in order adopted by majority of members)]. Other failures to follow statutory procedures, such as holding a hearing in the absence of an administrative law judge (ALJ) when the statutes require an ALJ to preside [*see Gov. Code §§ 11512(a)* (ALJ must preside over every hearing in a contested case), 11517(a) (ALJ must be present during consideration of contested case); *Usher v. County of Monterey (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 210, 218-219, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 274]* , and the failure of agency members to familiarize themselves with the evidence in matters heard outside the members' presence [*see Gov. Code § 11517(b)(1)* (when contested case heard before agency itself, no member who did not hear evidence may vote on decision); *Old Santa Barbara Pier Co. v. State of California (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 250, 257, 139 Cal. Rptr. 332* (requirement that quorum of State Coastal Zone Conservation Commission "act" on appeal is satisfied even though members not present at first of two meetings had familiarized themselves with presentations at first meeting and with other material relating to appeal)], may also establish failure to proceed in the manner required by law.

In particular cases, facts showing that an agency has not proceeded in the manner required by law may be similar (or even identical) to facts showing that the agency has denied a litigant a "fair trial" [*see § 474B.12* for discussion of denial of "fair trial" as a ground for issuance of mandate]. Thus, under the facts of a given case, a failure to proceed in the manner required by law may also constitute a deprivation of a fair trial, and vice versa.

[2] Right to Counsel for Petitioner

A party to an administrative proceeding is entitled to be represented by retained counsel when the proceeding is such that the party's interest might be prejudiced if the right to representation by counsel were denied [*Steen v. Board of Civil Service Commrs. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 716, 727, 160 P.2d 816* ; *Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 540, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Although the right to counsel is not essential to a fair hearing in all types of administrative proceedings [*see Perlman v. Shasta Joint Jr. College Dist. Bd. of Trustees (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 873, 879-880, 88 Cal. Rptr. 563* (right to counsel not essential to fair hearing in proceedings for suspension of college student)], in proceedings to revoke or suspend a license or other administrative action of a disciplinary nature the licensee is entitled to have counsel of his or her own choosing [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543-544, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see also Gov. Code § 11509* (form for notice of hearing includes statement of parties' right to be represented by counsel at own expense)]. However, due process does not require that counsel be furnished to a licensee when the licensee personally cannot afford to hire counsel [Borror v. Department of Investment *(1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see Gov. Code § 11509* (form for notice of hearing includes statement that party is not entitled to appointment of attorney at public expense)]. Further, in administrative proceedings no constitutional requirement exists that the hearing officer or the agency advise a party that he or she is entitled to be represented by counsel, although in proceedings subject to the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*], there is a statutory requirement that the agency notify all parties before the hearing of their right to be represented by counsel [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 543-544, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see Gov. Code § 11509*; *see also Gov. Code §§ 11500(a)* ("agency" defined), 11501(a) (application of *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.* to agencies as determined by statutes relating to those agencies); *see also* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication*]. The availability of the *Fifth Amendment*privilege against self-incrimination is deemed sufficient protection against the possibility that criminal charges might arise out of the conduct for which disciplinary proceedings are brought [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 541, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see In re Groban (1957) 352 U.S. 330, 333, 77 S. Ct. 510, 1 L. Ed. 2d 376, 76 Ohio Law Abs. 368* (witnesses compelled to testify before state fire marshal have no constitutional right to counsel); *but see Szmaciarz v. State Personnel Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 904, 917-919, 145 Cal. Rptr. 396* (privilege against self-incrimination unavailable and adverse inferences from refusal to testify may be drawn in administrative hearing on suspension of correctional officer, unless state seeks to subject officer to some criminal liability)]. The general common law rule that corporations must be represented by counsel (licensed attorneys) in litigation before courts of record (other than small claims courts) does not apply to adjudicative proceedings before administrative tribunals, and the Board's decision to affirm the Department's revocation of a corporation's liquor license was not void for lack of jurisdiction because non attorney president of corporation represented corporation in administrative license revocation hearing [*Camille v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2002) 99 Cal. App.*

4th 1094, 1101-1103, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 758] .

[3] Agency Constructions of Law

Administrative agencies have both the power and the duty to construe the law applicable to cases adjudicated by them, but their constructions of the law are not conclusive on the courts [*California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 11, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2* ; *Miller & Lux Inc. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1919) 179 Cal. 764, 766, 178 P. 960* ; *Godshalk v. City of San Diego (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 459, 468, 94 Cal. Rptr. 42]* . A reviewing court has the constitutional power to construe the law applicable to any case and, if convinced that an administrative agency has based a decision on an erroneous interpretation of the law, to overturn the decision [*People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623]* . When appropriate, the court may simply ignore an agency's erroneous conclusion of law [*Strode v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 291, 303, 15 Cal. Rptr. 879]* . The reviewing court makes an independent determination of the validity of the agency's interpretation and application of its governing statute [*City of Long Beach v. Department of Industrial Relations (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 942, 949, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 518, 102 P.3d 904* (reviewing court exercises independent judgment in determining meaning of statutory term "public work" for purposes of Prevailing Wage Law); *North Gualala Water Co. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1586-1588, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 821* (de novo review standard applied to determination of "subterranean stream" language in water law agency jurisdiction statute); *Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. P.U.C. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 729-730, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733* (independent judgment test applied to interpretation of statute related to agency scope of jurisdiction); *Greystone Homes, Inc. v. Cake (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-9, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 183* (independent judgment test applies to determination of "public work" for purposes of prevailing wage law); *Placer County Local Agency Formation Com. v. Nevada County Local Agency Formation Com. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 793, 803-804, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 729* (de novo review standard applies to determine meaning of statutory terms related to authority of county local agency formation commissions); *Harroman Co. v. Town of Tiburon (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 388, 392-393, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72* ; *City of Coachella v. Riverside County Airport Land Use Com. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1277, 1289, 258 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

The court will give some deference to the agency interpretation of its governing statute [*North Gualala Water Co. v. State Water Resources Control Board (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1589-1590, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 821* (court of appeal gave limited deference to agency interpretation of statutory term ("subterranean stream") related to agency water law jurisdiction that was determined by agency in adjudicatory capacity in permitting proceeding)], but ultimately the court will decide the statutory interpretation issue as a question of law subject to the de novo review standard [*Connerly v. State Personnel Bd. (2006) 37 Cal. 4th 1169, 1175-1176, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 788, 129 P.3d 1* (interpretation of "opposing parties" language in attorney's fees statute, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*, was subject to do novo review standard of review, not abuse of discretion, as the meaning of a statute is a question of law when there are no disputed fact issues. Note that there was no agency interpretation in this lawsuit); *Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1289-1290, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316* (notwithstanding independent judgment test, County interpretation of Coastal Act incorporated into County's local coastal plan (LCP) regulations is entitled to substantial deference ("great weight") because the statewide coastal commission certified the LCP)]. The court also will decide interpretive questions of fact related to the legal issue that are based on stipulated facts as questions of law subject to the de novo review standard [*Automotive Funding Group, Inc. v. Garamendi (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 846, 851, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 912* (car finance lender that offered loss damage waiver program was not providing insurance subject to regulation by Insurance Commissioner)]. The Court of Appeal rejected the insurance commissioner's interpretation of *Cal. Ins. Code § 22* as covering lender's LDW provision, and concluded that the collision damage waiver program was not insurance subject to the regulatory authority of the Insurance commissioner [*Automotive Funding Group, Inc. v. Garamendi (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 846, 855-857, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 912]* .

The California Court of Appeal interpreted the meaning of the term "incident" for purposes of determining a challenge to cost reimbursement statutes for costs incurred by CHP officers in stopping and arresting drivers subject to DUI laws. In construing the statute, the court rejected application of the longstanding administrative interpretation principle for

deciding the meaning of the statutory term. The court also considered, but did not give controlling weight to, an opinion letter written by a legislative counsel that supported the interpretation that the court ultimately concluded was the proper meaning of the term [*California Highway Patrol v. Superior Court (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 488, 501-503, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 16]* .

The State Board of Equalization publishes the Business Tax Law Guide which contains "Annotations," which are summaries of opinions by agency attorneys as to the business tax impact of transactions subject to California business taxes. The annotations are responses to requests for legal opinions by the agency, and by businesses subject to tax jurisdiction by the agency. These annotations contain agency interpretations of the meaning of statutes enforced by the agency [*Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 1, 4-5, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 960 P.2d 1031]* . However, the annotations are not adopted agency regulations, and therefore there is a different standard of review applicable to these annotations. The standard of review that applies to agency interpretations of statutes enforced by the agency is the independent judgment of the court giving deference to the determination of the agency appropriate to the circumstances of the agency action, with a de novo review of the merits of the legal issue before the court. It was erroneous for the lower court to give controlling weight to the agency interpretation of the statute contained in the agency annotation [*Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 1, 7-8, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 960 P.2d 1031]* . In the Yamaha decision, the California Supreme Court departed from, and did not follow the "strong deference" approach of federal administrative law [*see* *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. NRDC (1984) 467 U.S. 837, 104 S. Ct. 2778, 81 L. Ed. 2d 694*]. However, the Court of Appeals followed the *Chevron* case and deferred to a federal agency interpretation contained in a federal regulation as to an issue, post-payment audit of Medi-Cal providers claims, that was governed by federal law [*RCJ Medical Services, Inc. v. Bonta' (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 986, 992-993, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223]* .

The California Supreme Court gave no deference to agency interpretations of the governing statute, the Knox-Keene Act provisions contained in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2556* (prohibiting business and financial relationship between opticians and licensed optometrists), that were contained in two documents: 1) a petition filed by the California Attorney General, representing the California Board of Optometry with the Federal Trade Commission; and 2) internal memoranda from the Medical Board of California's division of licensing and from the Department of Corporations. These agencies had responsibility for administering the Knox Keene Act. The interpretations were entitled to no deference because these documents were not produced at the time of statutory enactment, but rather much later. Also, the documents did not discuss the relevant statutory language, and their content did not contain a careful discussion of the issues before the Supreme Court. The memoranda were advice letters written by agency staff, and those memos are entitled to less deference than a formally adopted agency regulation. Finally, appellate courts are less deferential to agency interpretations of governing statutes because the agency does not have a comparative advantage over the appellate courts in interpreting statutes [*People v. Cole (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 964, 987-988, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 261, 135 P.3d 669]* .

The California Supreme Court gave significant weight to interpretations of the State Board of Equalization (SBE) that when changes in federal tax liability are made by the IRS, the four year general tax statute of limitations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19057*] for giving notice of deficiency assessments is replaced by the limitations provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19059* (FTB has two years from date taxpayers notify board of IRS deficiency assessment) and 19060 (notice of state tax deficiency assessment can be given at any time when taxpayer fails to give notice to board of federal tax deficiency assessment). While the Supreme Court retained the ultimate responsibility for interpreting those statutory provisions, the Court gave substantial weight to the SBE's longstanding statutory construction of the four year statute's applicability because the SBE is the state agency charged with the enforcement of the statute [*Ordlock v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 897, 910-911, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212, 135 P.3d 628]* .

The California Supreme Court held that a 2003 legislative amendment to the California Fair Employment and Housing Act provisions [*Gov. Code § 12940(j)(1)*] that provided for employer liability for sexual harassment of employees by third party non-employees (including customers and clients) clarified existing law, and therefore the amended statute could be applied to a lawsuit that was pending before the California courts at the time of the enactment of the legislative

amendment. The Supreme court rejected an argument that the legislative amendment had retroactive effect, and thus could not be applied to pending cases [*Carter v. California Dept. of Veterans Affairs (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 914, 918, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223, 135 P.3d 637]* . The legislature can not declare existing law in a later amendment that is contrary to a definitive interpretation of a California statute by the California Supreme Court, but if the California Supreme Court has not definitively interpreted a statue, the legislature can clarify the meaning by a later amendment. That amendment will be considered to be declaratory of existing law and applicable to pending cases [*Carter v. California Dept. of Veterans Affairs (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 914, 922-923, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223, 135 P.3d 637]* . The California Supreme Court rejected the statutory interpretation advocated by the California Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) because that interpretation was contrary to language in the uncodified portion (section one) of *Gov. Code § 12940*, which portion could be used to determine legislative intent even though the uncodified portion was not enacted as binding law [*Carter v. California Dept. of Veterans Affairs (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 914, 924-925, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223, 135 P.3d 637]* .

The Insurance Commissioner's interpretation of its own administrative regulations is to be respected and given some weight based on the merits of the interpretation by a court that is deciding the issue of how to interpret the regulation. However, the ultimate decision of how to interpret the regulation is a question of law to be decided by the court, and the agency's interpretation is not binding on the court [*State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Quackenbush (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 65, 71, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381]* . Thus, a court has rejected the Insurance Commissioner's interpretations of its own regulations that were inconsistent with the terms of the regulations, or with related regulatory provisions of law [*see* *State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Quackenbush (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 65, 71-72, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381]* . However, another court gave strong deference to the Insurance Commissioner's interpretation of the weight ordering mandate in Proposition 103 related statutes based on agency technical expertise and the time and effort spent addressing issue [*Spanish Speaking Citizens' Foundation, Inc. v. Low (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1236-1237, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 75]* .

The California Court of Appeal upheld the Department of Social Services agency's interpretation of the meaning of the term "child support" in the maximum family grant statute because the agency interpretation was consistent with the language of the statute and with the legislative intent of the statute [*Sneed v. Saenz (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1220, 1234, 1246, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 563]* . In another case, the California Court of Appeal adopted the following approach to assessing the weight of a PUC interpretation of the agencies jurisdiction over utility holding companies. PUC's interpretation of the scope of agency jurisdiction is not controlling, is scrutinized more carefully, and is given the weight justified by the carefulness, thoroughness, and consistency of the agencies reasoning in support of the interpretation [*PG & E Corp. v. Public Utilities Comm'n (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1194-1196, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630]* . In a third case, the California Court of Appeal upheld an agency interpretation by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) of the requirements of the law related to commercial registration of trucks. The DMV interpretation applied to trucks that had been converted into vehicles with living quarters. The DMV interpreted the commercial vehicle statutory definition [*Cal. Veh. Code § 260*] to refer to the design of the vehicle, and not to whether the vehicle was used in business. The DMV interpretation was contained both in agency policy statements and based on declarations of experienced California Highway Patrol officers who enforced the law [*California Career Schools v. DMV (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 10, 14-16, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 813]* . On the contrary, when a court decides an issue related to interpreting an agency regulation, it does not defer to agency expertise in interpreting the regulation when the plain language of the regulation compels an interpretation different from the agency, or when the language of the rule does not require administrative expertise to interpret [*Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Com'n (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1105-1106, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684]* .

The California Supreme Court deferred to the agency interpretation by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) of its governing statute, *Fam. Code § 8617*, because of agency expertise and because the interpretation was adopted at "authoritative legal and policymaking levels of the agency." The agency had interpreted the statute to permit second parent adoptions. The CDSS had adopted forms and procedures to "facilitate second parent adoptions." The challenge was based on the argument that CDSS, an executive branch agency, exercised legislative powers by recognizing a type of adoption that was not authorized by the legislature. The Court rejected this challenge and held that

CDSS had reasonably interpreted a statute authorizing independent adoptions to allow the type of adoption for which they had provided forms and procedures [*Sharon S. v. Superior Court (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 417, 436-437, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 699, 73 P.3d 554]* .

The Court of Appeal reversed a trial court decision granting a writ of mandate, and held that the Insurance Commissioner's interpretation of its own regulations was entitled to deference by the trial court and should be followed. The interpretive issue related to when a worker's compensation claim is officially closed because of the claimant's failure to prosecute the claim. The Insurance Commissioner interpreted that requirement to mean that the WCAB or a Court had to take official action to dismiss the claim for failure to prosecute. The employer argued that the insurer's closing of a claim file was sufficient. The employer's experience rating was based in part on the number of past meritorious claims. The Court of Appeal held that the Insurance Commissioner's interpretation was entitled to deference because of agency expertise citing *Yamaha Corp. of Am. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 1, 12, 78 Cal. Rptr 2d 1, 960 P.2d 1031* (deference based on agency expertise, when agency has comparative interpretive advantage over courts, agency interpretation formally adopted and followed consistently), and this expertise driven interpretation is controlling notwithstanding that the language of the regulation could be read another way [*Simi Corporation v. Garamendi (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1496, 1511-1512, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 207]* .

When there is no agency interpretation of a relevant statutory provision at issue in judicial review, the court will treat the issue of interpreting the statute as a question of law, and will apply the independent judgment (de novo) standard of review [*McKee v. Orange Unified School Dist. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1316, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 774]* . When appellate courts interpret statutes and apply the statutes to undisputed facts, the interpretive issue is treated as a question of law that is subject to the do novo review standard. When interpreting the statute, the appellate court will look to the language of the statute, as well as the statutory purpose. The legislative intent of the statute may be determined from the language of the statute if it is clear and unambiguous, but if not, the literal meaning will give way to interpretation based on legislative intent, and harmonizing all related provisions of the statute [*State of California ex rel Nee v. Unumprovident Corp. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 442, 445-446, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 491]* . Appellate courts interpret agency regulations using similar principles of construction and interpretation as are sued in interpreting statutes, including looking at the plain meaning of the text, looking at the context of the language, the purpose of the regulation, the history and background of the regulation, and the enforcing agencies interpretation of the regulation [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1687, 1695-1696, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 339]* .

The Court of Appeal reversed the decision of the ABC (Board) which had reversed the order of the DABC (Department) suspending a liquor licensee's license for 10 days. The suspension was ordered because the licensee sold alcohol to an underage decoy in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25658(a)*. The Board reversed the suspension because the police officer had the decoy (an underage person purchasing alcohol) make the required face to face identification of the alcohol seller outside the store premises, not inside. The Board interpreted *Cal. Code Reg., tit 4. § 141(b)(5)* to require an inside the premises face to face identification. The Board reversed the suspension because of lack of compliance with the regulation. The Court of Appeal rejected the Board's interpretation, and held that the plain language of the regulation, as well as its history, did not support an inside the store premises identification requirement. The Court of Appeal annulled the Board decision, and remanded the action back to the Board to reinstate the license suspension. The Court of Appeal used similar principles, plain language, and history of the regulation, to decide the regulation interpretation question as would be used to decide a question of statutory interpretation. The court did not defer to the agency interpretation nor did it rely on agency expertise [*Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1687, 1696-1698, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 339]* .

Cities must comply with applicable provisions of state law when approving housing development projects. The appellate courts determine whether those provisions of law are applicable to the city's approval process. The courts will interpret the language of the statute to determine the legislative intent. The statutory language is examined in context of the overall statute, and the plain meaning of the words of the statute will be followed in most circumstances. When there

is more than one reasonable interpretation of the language of the statute, the courts will also look at the purpose of the statute, legislative history, and public policy [*Coalition of Concerned Communities, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 34 Cal 4th 733, 737-738, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 676, 101 P. 3d 563* (Mello Act affordable housing requirements did not apply to City of Los Angeles's approval of housing development project in coastal zone because no housing was to be built within coastal zone); *Elsner v. Uveges (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 915, 929, 938, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 530, 102 P. 3d 915* (employee of roofing subcontractor was injured on job while working on scaffolding. Employee filed third-party tort lawsuit against general contractor. Employee sought to offer evidence of Cal-OSHA regulations relating to scaffolding standards to establish a negligence per se standard of care, and shift burden of proof to general contractor defendant. California Supreme Court interpreted the statutory language and held that the statutory change in the law could not be applied retroactively to a pre-amendment accident)]. Similarly, the California Supreme Court held that amendments to *Labor Code Section 1720(a)(1)* which changed the definition of "public works" for purposes of the prevailing wage laws applied prospectively not retroactively [*City of Long Beach v. Dep't of Industrial Relations (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 942, 953, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 518, 102 P.3d 904* (statutory amendments are presumed to have prospective application only unless legislation clearly provides for retroactive application)].

The Court of Appeal reversed the trial court decision granting a writ of mandate setting aside the granting of a water quality discharge permit to a refinery. The trial court decision was based on the lack of a numeric water quality based effluent limit for dioxin discharges. The trial court granted the writ of mandate on the grounds that controlling federal regulations required a numeric limit. The court of Appeal reversed the trial court decision, and concluded that the federal regulation did not require a numeric limit in all cases. The Court based this conclusion on a California water quality state agency decision which interpreted federal water quality law to not require numeric limits in permits in all cases. The water quality agencies determined that the challenged permit would be issued without a numeric limit because such a limit was not feasible. Therefore the permit was not invalid for failure to contain a numeric limit on discharges [*Communities for a Better Environment v. State Water Resources Control Board (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1089, 1103-1105, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 76]* .

Abuse of discretion by an agency may be shown when the agency fails to act consistently in applying its governing statutes, and the agency's actions result in prejudice to a party [*Sierra Club v. State Bd. of Forestry (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 1215, 1236, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19, 876 P.2d 505* ; *Schoen v. Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 556, 565, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 343]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the California Coastal Commission abused its discretion in including an ocean boater's right to a view of the coastline as a factor in regulating development in the coastal zone. This has not been recognized by the California legislature as a valid factor to consider, and thus the commission has not been given statutory authority to consider this factor. The court of appeal reversed the denial of a petition for a writ of administrative mandate sought by a landowner who challenged the imposition of special conditions on the owner's coastal development permit to build a residence. The court of appeal ordered the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate setting aside the commission decision, and requiring the commission to rehear the matter without considering the invalid factor [*Schneider v. Cal. Coastal Comm'n (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1339, 1341-1343, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 867]* .

[4] Agency Decisions to Admit and Exclude Evidence

[a] Admissibility of Evidence in Administrative Proceedings

Administrative proceedings are not governed by the technical rules of evidence that apply in civil proceedings [*Jenner v. City Council (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 490, 496, 331 P.2d 176* ; *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* , for discussion of rules of evidence in administrative proceedings]. In proceedings subject to the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*], relevant evidence is admissible, unless privileged, if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible people are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs [*Gov. Code § 11513(c)*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* ,

for overview of agency adjudication].

Under the new act, hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but over timely objection hearsay standing alone is not sufficient to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions. The objection is timely if made before submission of the case or on reconsideration [*Gov. Code § 11513(d)* (operative July 1, 1997); *see* Stats. 1995, ch. 938, § 40]. This statutory amendment expressly requires a timely objection and therefore resolves a split in the courts over whether an objection was required for administrative hearsay to be insufficient to support fact findings other than when it is used to supplement or explain other evidence. This split existed under former *Gov. Code § 11513(c)*, as interpreted by the various districts of the California Court of Appeal regarding whether administrative hearsay that has not been objected to may be used to support a finding of fact [*see Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 546, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* (hearsay evidence that has not been objected to serves to shift the burden of producing evidence of the existence or nonexistence of fact disclosed); *Martin v. State Personnel Bd. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 573, 582-583, 103 Cal. Rptr. 306* (contrary to *Borror* and other cases, the absence of objection to hearsay will not support a finding of fact)].

The general rule in administrative matters not governed by the APA is that hearsay alone will not sustain a finding [*Walker v. City of San Gabriel (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 879, 881, 129 P.2d 349* ; *Layton v. Merit System Commission (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 58, 67, 131 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . Some courts have held that hearsay admitted without objection is sufficient to sustain a finding [*Frudden Enterprises, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 262, 270, 201 Cal. Rptr. 371]* .

For a general consideration of evidence in administrative hearings and a detailed discussion of the admission of hearsay in administrative proceedings, see Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

[b] Use of Illegally Obtained Evidence

The due process requirements of criminal law apply in administrative proceedings only when the proceedings (1) can result in the deprivation of liberty, property, or property rights, and (2) bear a close resemblance to the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement [*see Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 539-542, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525* (real estate licensee not entitled to appointed counsel in disciplinary proceedings); *Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 367, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121* (defense of entrapment available in license revocation proceeding)]. Nevertheless, in reviewing an administrative decision the court may consider whether evidence used against the petitioner was obtained in violation of state [*see Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*] or federal [*see U.S. Const., amend. IV*] constitutional prohibitions against unreasonable searches and seizures, and, if so, whether use of the evidence deprived the petitioner of due process of law [*see Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 229-230, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* (disbarment of attorney); *Goldin v. Public Utilities Commission (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 638, 669, 153 Cal. Rptr. 802, 592 P.2d 289* (agency not permitted to use illegally seized evidence in proceeding to terminate business telephone service); *Western States Petroleum Association v. State Department of Health Services (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 999, 1006-1007, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117]* .

In determining whether the exclusionary rule should apply in administrative proceedings, the courts consider whether the particular proceedings bear a close resemblance to the aims and objectives of criminal law enforcement and whether, in light of its rationale, the rule is necessary to prevent the state from profiting by its own wrong, or to prevent law enforcement officers from violating the constitutional rights of individuals [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 226-227, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* ; for discussion of application of the exclusionary rule in administrative hearings, *see* Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings*]. The courts must decide on a case-by-case basis whether to apply the rule [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 229, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* (exclusionary rule inapplicable in attorney disciplinary proceedings); *see Pating v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 608, 624-625, 182 Cal. Rptr. 20* (physician could not assert exclusionary rule to prevent introduction of medical records obtained by investigator without administrative subpoena in license revocation proceedings)]. If exclusion of

illegally obtained evidence would have no deterrent effect on the state or its officers, due process does not generally require that the evidence be excluded [*Emslie v. State Bar (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 229, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991* ; for detailed consideration of the exclusionary rule, *see* California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 20, *Principles of Search and Seizure* ; Ch. 21, *Search Warrants* ; Ch. 22, *Warrantless Searches* ; and Ch. 23, *Search and Seizure Motions* (Matthew Bender)].

[c] Results of Prior Criminal and Civil Proceedings

Unless a statute provides that a prior criminal conviction is sufficient to support disciplinary action, evidence of such a conviction is admissible in administrative proceedings on the same basis as other hearsay evidence--that is, it may be used only to explain or supplement other evidence in the record [*see* *Manning v. Watson (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 705, 711, 239 P.2d 688* (although hearsay, record of conviction admissible because conviction in federal court is kind of evidence on which responsible persons rely)].

A guilty plea in a criminal proceeding may be admissible in a subsequent administrative proceeding (for example, a license revocation hearing) as an admission against interest [*Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 190-191, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357]* . In mandate proceedings in which the court exercises its independent judgment on the evidence, the court must assess the weight and significance of the guilty plea and any testimony offered to explain the circumstances under which it was given [*Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 190-191, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357* ; *see § 474B.16[4]* (independent judgment test)].

Whether previous acts committed by a party to a disciplinary proceeding show moral turpitude is a question of law to be decided by an appellate court [*Yakov v. Board of Medical Examiners (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 67, 74 n.7, 64 Cal. Rptr. 785, 435 P.2d 553]* . Neither exoneration in a prior civil action nor acquittal in a prior criminal proceeding is res judicata in a subsequent administrative license proceeding [*Lundborg v. Director Dept. Professional etc. Standards (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 141, 146, 64 Cal. Rptr. 650]* .

[5] Agency Penalty Determinations

Administrative agencies are usually vested with discretion to fix penalties for infractions within their jurisdiction. When an agency exercises its discretion to fix a penalty, the courts may not disturb the penalty unless the agency has committed a manifest abuse of discretion [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 217, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *Barber v. State Personnel Bd. (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 395, 404, 134 Cal. Rptr. 206, 556 P.2d 306* ; *Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 494-495, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *Zink v. City of Sausalito (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 662, 665, 139 Cal. Rptr. 59]* . This holds true even when the court is authorized to exercise its "independent judgment" in reviewing the evidence [*Cadilla v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966-967, 103 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; for discussion of the "independent judgment" test, *see § 474B.16[4]*]. In mandate proceedings, the court is not authorized to substitute its own judgment for that of the agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)* (order granting writ shall not limit or control in any way discretion legally vested in agency); *Cadilla v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966-967, 103 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *Cummings v. Civil Service Commission (1996) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1643, 1653-1654, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 775]* . Thus, if reasonable minds might differ as to the propriety of the penalty imposed, the agency did not abuse its discretion [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 589, 594, 43 Cal. Rptr. 633, 400 P.2d 745]* .

When an appellate court reviews a trial court's judgment granting or refusing to grant a writ of administrative mandate based on a challenge to an agency's exercise of discretion in imposing a penalty, the appellate court uses the same scope of review as the trial court, and must determine whether the administrative agency properly exercised its discretion. The appellate courts review, on a de novo basis, the agency's exercise of discretion in imposing a penalty [*Osburn v. Department of Transportation (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1339, 1344, 270 Cal. Rptr. 761* ; *Talmo v. Civil Service Com. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 210, 227-228, 282 Cal. Rptr. 240]* .

An administrative penalty may not be set aside on the ground that it was determined after consideration of violations not charged in the accusation and not considered on the question of whether discipline should be imposed [*see Ralph Williams Ford v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 494, 499-500, 106 Cal. Rptr. 340 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 974, 94 S. Ct. 283, 38 L. Ed. 2d 217* (once agency found charged violations had taken place, it was entitled to consider related violations to evaluate what administrative penalty and conditions of probation would be suitable)]. Uncharged offenses may be considered for purposes of penalty determination, although those offenses may not be considered on the threshold question of whether discipline should be imposed [*see Ralph Williams Ford v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 494, 499-500, 106 Cal. Rptr. 340 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 974, 94 S. Ct. 283, 38 L. Ed. 2d 217* (related violations considered in determining penalty)].

Although an agency's discretion to determine penalties may be broad, it is never unlimited. Agency discretion must always be guided by fixed legal principles and exercised in such a way as to serve the ends of substantial justice [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 589, 594-595, 43 Cal. Rptr. 633, 400 P.2d 745]* . If no reasonable person could have determined that the penalty imposed by an agency was appropriate, its imposition constitutes an abuse of discretion [*Wingfield v. Fielder (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 209, 221, 105 Cal. Rptr. 619]* . Abuse of discretion may be found, for example, when an agency has imposed the highest allowable penalty despite the existence of mitigating factors [*see Magit v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 74, 87-88, 17 Cal. Rptr. 488, 366 P.2d 816* (abuse of discretion to revoke license of physician whose decision to permit unlicensed physicians to administer anesthetics under his control resulted from good faith reliance on advice of counsel); *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 589, 595, 43 Cal. Rptr. 633, 400 P.2d 745* (abuse of discretion to revoke beer and wine license when agency's own schedule of penalties provided for maximum 75-day suspension for proven offense)].

The overriding consideration in determining whether the penalty imposed on a public employee was so excessive as to constitute an abuse of discretion is the extent to which the employee's conduct resulted in, or if repeated is likely to result in harm, to the public service [*Haney v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1, 11-12, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 411* (police department's discharge of police officer was justified by harm to public interest standard, as police officer showed dishonesty and lack of integrity by holding Memorial Day barbecue during work duty while also falsifying police reports related to officer's duties on day of barbecue); *Deegan v. City of Mountain View (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 37, 52, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690]* . Other relevant factors include the circumstances surrounding the misconduct and the likelihood of a recurrence [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 218, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 494, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

If the court concludes that an agency abused its discretion in assessing a penalty, it may remand the matter to the agency with instructions to reconsider the case in light of the court's order and to take such further action as is specially enjoined on it by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)*; *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 589, 594, 43 Cal. Rptr. 633, 400 P.2d 745]* . Moreover, if the court determines that one of the agency's finding was unsupported by the evidence, it should ordinarily remand the case for redetermination of the penalty [*see Bonham v. McConnell (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 304, 306, 288 P.2d 502* ; *Neely v. California State Personnel Bd. (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 487, 494, 47 Cal. Rptr. 64]* , unless, on the basis of the administrative record, it determines beyond any real doubt that the agency would have imposed the same penalty on the findings approved by the court [*Strode v. Board of Medical Examiners (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 291, 304, 15 Cal. Rptr. 879]* .

[6] Conditioning Administrative Rights on Waiver of Constitutional Rights

Administrative agencies may not condition or deny rights and privileges on the basis of a party's exercise of constitutional rights unless a compelling state interest justifies the limitation of those rights and no narrower restriction can be imposed [*see Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 585-586, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480* (unconstitutional to condition employment of public school teacher on absention from off-duty political activity); *Fort*

v. Civil Service Commission (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 331, 334-338, 38 Cal. Rptr. 625, 392 P.2d 385 (unconstitutional to condition county employment on absention from off-duty political activity)]. Special scrutiny is required when an administrative decision affects fundamental rights [*Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 591-592, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* . When an aggrieved party presents evidence tending to show that an agency's decision resulted from official dissatisfaction with his or her exercise of constitutional rights, the trial court in mandate proceedings must make an independent judicial determination of the ultimate question of whether the agency acted for the reasons stated in its findings or because of the aggrieved party's exercise of constitutional rights [*Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 590, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* . On appeal from the decision of the trial court, the appellate court's scope of review is identical to that of the trial court, except that it must uphold the trial court's determination as to the reason for the dismissal if that determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the entire record [*Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 587, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* .

[7] Constitutionality of Enabling Act

The writ of mandate appears to be available in appropriate cases to challenge legislation creating an administrative agency or authorizing an agency to perform certain functions. Such a challenge may be directed to the constitutionality of the enabling act, asserting either that the agency has no jurisdiction to act or that the agency's power was unconstitutionally applied to the aggrieved person [*see* *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 250-251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* (land developer challenged constitutionality of California Coastal Commission)]. Alternatively, it may involve a procedural claim that in acting pursuant to the legislative directive the agency abused its discretion by violating due process and thereby failed to proceed as required by law, or denying the petitioner a fair trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; for requirement of fair trial, *see § 474B.12*; for a discussion of due process issues, *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies*]. If a party wishes to mount a general challenge to the constitutionality of a statute, the appropriate action is a declaratory judgment suit, not a petition for a writ of administrative mandate [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* , *12 Cal. 3d 237, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* . If the party asserts only that the statute is unconstitutional as applied to him or her, however, the issue is properly raised before the agency in mandate proceedings [*State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Taylor v. Swanson (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 416, 418, 187 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityHearsayAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsConstitutional RightsSearch & SeizureAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewRule InterpretationAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewStatutory InterpretationConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureExclusionary RuleConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessSelf-Incrimination Privilege

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.15

§ 474B.15 Order or Decision Supported by Findings

[1] Whether Findings Made by Agency

An abuse of discretion may be established by showing that the agency's order or decision was not supported by findings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *see* Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* (formal and substantive requirements of findings)]. Findings are necessary to bridge the analytic gap between the raw evidence and the ultimate decision so that the grounds on which the agency acted will be clearly disclosed and adequately sustained [*Securities and Exchange Com. v. Chenery Corp., (1942) 318 U.S. 80, 94, 63 S. Ct. 454, 87 L. Ed. 626* ; *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*]. Findings are required not only by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*], but also by principles of fundamental fairness, because findings enable the parties to determine whether (and on what basis) they should seek review and, if review is granted, they apprise the court of the basis for the agency's decision [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515-517, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 267, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97* ; *Mahoney v. San Francisco City etc. Employees' Ret. Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 1, 3-6, 106 Cal. Rptr. 94]* .

Further, findings facilitate orderly analysis by the agency itself and foster a public view of the administrative decisionmaking process as careful and reasoned [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 516, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12]* . If a reviewing court determines that the agency has failed to make findings, it should remand the case to the agency for appropriate findings [*see* *Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* (administrators' depositions not adequate substitute for findings); *Glendale Memorial Hosp. & Health Center v. Department of Mental Health (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 129, 139-141, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101* (absence of specific findings prevents meaningful judicial review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, and appropriate remedy is to remand to agency to make proper findings)].

[2] Sufficiency of Agency Findings

Although an administrative agency's findings need not be stated with the formality required of judicial proceedings, they must be clear enough to be understandable and complete enough to enable the reviewing court to ascertain the basis for the agency's decision [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d*

506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12 ; *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 272, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97* ; *Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 367-368, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240]* . In the absence of more formal findings, the courts have held the following to be sufficient to constitute required findings:

- A summary of factual data [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12]* .

- The language of a motion [*Hamilton v. Board of Supervisors (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 64, 67-68, 75 Cal. Rptr. 106]* .

- A reference in a motion to a staff report [*McMillan v. American Gen. Fin. Corp. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 175, 184, 131 Cal. Rptr. 462]* .

Oral remarks of agency members preserved in a hearing transcript have been held insufficient, however, since such remarks reflect the views of the individual members rather than the agency's findings [*Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 179, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670]* . Also insufficient are findings that merely repeat the language of governing legislation [*see* *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 517 n.16, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12]* . To facilitate judicial review, the findings must reveal the agency's analytic processes by setting forth findings of fact on subissues building toward the ultimate statutory conclusions [*City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. City Council (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 869, 889, 129 Cal. Rptr. 173]* . The California Court of Appeal held that the Board of Accountancy made adequate fact findings that met the *Topanga* standard of "bridging the analytic gap between the raw evidence and the ultimate decision" and provided an adequate factual basis for the Board's disciplinary decision [*McBride v. California Board of Accountancy (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 518, 530-532, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 287]* .

[3] Decision Supported by Implied Findings

In appropriate cases, reviewing courts may imply findings if necessary to uphold agency action [*see, e.g.,* *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 84, 91-92, 139 Cal. Rptr. 214* (requirements of findings may be satisfied by something other than written findings so labeled)]. While full findings are required on all material issues, failure to make an express finding on an issue will not compel the reviewing court to overturn the agency's decision if the missing finding would result, by necessary implication, from the express findings that are made [*Golde v. Fox (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 167, 179, 159 Cal. Rptr. 864]* . However, it is uncertain how far the courts will go in inferring missing findings in view of the clearly stated rule that findings are required by fundamental fairness [*see* *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515-517, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* (orderly functioning of process of review requires that grounds on which agency acted be clearly disclosed); *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 267, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97* (findings indispensable as basis for review); *see also* [1], *above*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFactual DeterminationsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of Discretion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.16

§ 474B.16 Findings Supported by Evidence

[1] Abuse of Discretion for Lack of Evidence

Prejudicial abuse of discretion may be established by showing that the agency's findings are not supported by the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. When it is claimed that the findings are not supported by the evidence, the court's role in reviewing the agency's action depends on the nature of the case. If the case is one in which the court is authorized by law to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*; *see* [4], *below* ("independent judgment" test)]. In all other cases, abuse of discretion is established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*; *see* [5], *below* ("substantial evidence" test)].

When a trial court exercises independent judgment review of agency fact findings, the trial court is required to give a strong presumption of correctness to the agency's fact findings. This means that when the trial court exercises independent judgment review, the trial court is free to substitute its own findings, but only after first giving due respect to the agency's findings. The enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)* by the California legislature indicates legislative acceptance of this approach [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 817-819, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693* ; *Mason v. Office of Administrative Hearings (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1119, 1138-1139, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102]* .

[2] Burden of Proof

When a trial court exercises independent judgment review of agency fact findings, the party seeking to overturn agency action has the burden of proof of showing that agency fact findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence [*Sager v. County of Yuba (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1049, 1053-1054, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (former deputy sheriff that challenged county retirement decision had the burden of proof to show that the county's decision was not supported by the evidence)]. The burden of proof standard codified in *Evid. Code § 500* applies to writ proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. The party seeking review has the burden of proof, to persuade, and not merely the burden of production, to come forward with evidence [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 819-821, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977*

P.2d 693] .

In administrative proceedings, as in ordinary civil actions, the party asserting the affirmative generally has the burden of proof, including both the initial burden of going forward with the evidence and the burden of persuasion by a preponderance of the evidence [*So. Cal. Jockey Club v. Cal. etc. Racing Bd. (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 167, 177, 223 P.2d 1* (party seeking permit for construction of horse racing track had burden of showing at least that public interest and purposes of horse racing law would not be detrimentally affected by grant of application); *McCoy v. Board of Retirement (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1051-1052 n.5, 228 Cal. Rptr. 567* (party seeking service-connected disability retirement allowance had burden of proving by preponderance of evidence that his hypertension was service-connected)]. Thus, unless the governing statute provides otherwise [*see, e.g.,* *Fascination, Inc. v. Hoover (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 260, 262, 246 P.2d 656* (ordinance provided that license to operate amusement game would be granted unless appropriate departments of city government determined that business for which permit was sought would not comply with applicable laws and ordinances)], an applicant for a license or permit has the burden of establishing his or her qualifications [*Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 134, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171* , *cert. denied,* *380 U.S. 934, 85 S. Ct. 940, 13 L. Ed. 2d 821 (1965)]* .

Differing standards are used in proceedings concerning dismissal of a party from public employment and those regarding suspension or revocation of a professional license. In proceedings in which a party is contesting his or her dismissal from public employment, the administrative agency has the burden of proving the propriety of its action by a preponderance of the evidence, while the employee may defend against dismissal by establishing that the conduct for which he or she is dismissed was justified [*Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 204 n.19, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *see* *21 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 132, 139 (1953)]* .

Unlike dismissal from public employment, which deprives the employee of a particular job, suspension or revocation of a professional license in effect takes away the licensee's right to practice the profession, and a higher standard of proof is required [*Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039-1040, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795* (proceedings for reinstatement of public high school teacher)]. Thus, in proceedings to suspend or revoke a professional license, the applicable standard of proof is clear and convincing proof to a reasonable certainty, and not a mere preponderance of the evidence [*Furman v. State Bar (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 212, 229, 83 P.2d 12* (attorney disbarment); *Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 853, 856, 185 Cal. Rptr. 601* (medical license suspension or revocation); *Small v. Smith (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 450, 457, 94 Cal. Rptr. 136* (real estate broker's license revocation)].

A claim that the agency used an incorrect standard of proof in disciplinary proceedings may not be raised for the first time at the hearing on the petition for a writ of mandate [*Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1007-1008, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490* ; *see* *Morris v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 110 Cal. Rptr. 630* (administrative error cannot be asserted in mandate proceedings unless it was first raised in agency proceedings)]. When the administrative record does not explicitly disclose the standard of proof applied by the hearing officer, the reviewing court presumes that the correct standard was applied [*Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1007-1008, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

[3] Error in the Record

[a] Nature of Error Requirement

The court in mandate proceedings may not ordinarily consider evidence outside the administrative record [*Sierra Club v. California Coastal Comm'n (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 839, 863-864, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316, 111 P. 3d 294* (California Supreme Court refused to consider arguments based on evidence that was not part of the administrative record before Commission, without a showing that the reasonable diligence or improper exclusion exceptions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*] were applicable, which showing was not made in this appeal)], and administrative error generally cannot be

asserted in mandate proceedings unless it was first raised in the agency proceedings [*Morris v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 110 Cal. Rptr. 630* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* (evidence outside record may be considered only when court finds that in exercise of reasonable diligence evidence could not have been produced, or evidence was improperly excluded)]. The California Court of Appeal held that the superior court was correct in not considering evidence that was submitted for the first time in that court, but that had not been introduced into the administrative record before the Insurance Commissioner, when the trial court was evaluating the merits of the claims presented in the mandate proceeding. The mandate proceeding was brought to challenge the denial by the Insurance Commissioner of claims of former employees of an insurance company that was in conservatorship. The superior court offered to remand the case back to the Insurance Commissioner so that the evidence could be considered by the Commissioner. When that was rejected, the superior court ruled against the parties seeking a writ of mandate concluding that the denial of the claims was not an abuse of discretion based on the evidence presented before the Insurance Commissioner [*Garamendi v. Golden Eagle Ins. Co. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 452, 459, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 239]* . Accordingly, a petitioner may have difficulty establishing that the agency committed prejudicial error not appearing in the record. If the court is persuaded that error not appearing in the record has prejudiced the petitioner, however, it can remand to the agency to correct the error or issue a peremptory writ of mandate commanding the agency to remedy its error [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)*].

[b] Availability of Discovery to Obtain Information Not in Record

Reviewing courts will not grant discovery for the purpose of probing agency members as to their reasoning in taking the complained of action, even when the petitioner contends that he or she was denied a fair hearing [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 774, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375]* . Discovery in mandate proceedings is available only if reasonably calculated to produce evidence admissible under *Code Civ.Proc. § 1094.5(e)* [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 774, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* ; *see § 474B.14[1]*].

[4] Applicability of Independent Judgment Test

[a] Decision Must Substantially Affect Fundamental, Vested Right

[i] Decisions of State Agency

Whether judicial review of an administrative decision should be restricted to determining whether the decision is supported by "substantial evidence" on the whole record or should be extended to an "independent examination" by the court depends on whether the decision affects a vested, fundamental right of the individual [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1356 n.4, 263 Cal. Rptr. 214* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)* (independent judgment and substantial evidence tests)]. The courts must decide on a case-by-case basis whether an administrative decision substantially affects fundamental, vested rights and thus requires independent judgment review [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33]* . In determining which test to apply in a given case, the court must first consider whether the right in question is a fundamental and basic right that will suffer substantial interference by the action of the administrative agency [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242]* . If it is such a fundamental right, the court must next determine whether the right is possessed by and vested in, or merely sought by, the individual [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242]* . If the right is vested and fundamental, it is too important to be relegated exclusively to administrative extinction, and an administrative decision denying or revoking the right must be subjected to full and independent judicial review [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242]* .

The California Supreme has rejected arguments that it reconsider and abandon the rule of independent judgment review, noting that policy considerations for change in the standard of review should acted on by the Legislature rather than the

judiciary [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 823-824, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693]* .

The California Court of Appeal for the Fourth District held that the independent judgment standard of review applied to an appeal by two oil companies that challenged the decision of the director of conservation affirming the decision of the State Oil and Gas Supervisor directing the plugging and abandoning of 28 oil wells owned by the companies that were still in operation. The court held that the right to continue to operate oil wells was a fundamental right "of particular importance in the current economic climate" [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 398-399, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*]. The right to operate oil wells was also vested because these oil wells had been either in operation or in idle status for many years. The order to plug and abandon the wells terminated the right to extract oil and that impacted the fundamental vested right [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 398-399, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*]. When fundamental vested rights are affected, the independent judgment standard of review must be applied by the reviewing court. The statutory exception permitting the substantial evidence standard of review to be applied when the legislature mandates that standard of review does not apply here, because the governing statute, *Public Resources Code Section 3355*, does not clearly express a substantial evidence standard of review, and does not contain required due process procedural safeguards" [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 398-399, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*]. *Public Resources Code Section 3355* did not expressly state that the substantial evidence standard of review applied to decisions of the director [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 409-411, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687]* . The statutory procedures contained in *Public Resources Code Sections 3350 to 3359* lacked some fundamentals of due process of law, including no separation of prosecutorial and adjudicatory functions, inadequate notice because no written notice of charges is required, no right to file an answer, no specification of burden of proof, and no right to have a hearing conducted consistent with the evidence code [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 411-413, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*]. Because of the lack of procedural due process safeguards, the independent judgment standard of review must be applied to challenges of the decision of that director. Finally, the statement of decision requested by the appealing parties must be prepared on remand when the reviewing court applies the independent judgment standard of review [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 413, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*].

[ii] Adjudicatory Decisions of Local Agency and Quasi-Judicial Decisions of State Agency

Formerly, adjudicatory decisions of local agencies and statewide agencies of limited territorial jurisdiction (as opposed to statewide agencies invested with judicial power by the California Constitution) were reviewable only under the "substantial evidence" test [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 35, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . This rule was abrogated by the California Supreme Court in *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 38, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* . The Court held that, for purposes of judicial review, there is no rational or legal basis for distinguishing between these different kinds of agencies [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . Thus, like decisions of other administrative agencies, decisions of local agencies must be reviewed under the independent judgment standard if they affect fundamental, vested rights; if they do not affect fundamental, vested rights, they are reviewable under the substantial evidence standard [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . However, the rule is otherwise with respect to statewide agencies that are vested with quasi-judicial power by the state constitution [*see* [5][b], *below*].

[b] Fundamental Rights

The California Supreme Court has delineated two kinds of analysis necessary to determine whether a particular right is or is not fundamental. One kind of analysis is necessary to determine whether a right is fundamental for purposes of applying equal protection and due process rights; a second is necessary to determine if the courts must exercise independent judgment when reviewing administrative decisions [*Berlinghieri v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 392, 394-395, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383]* . When determining which rights are fundamental for due process purposes, the court must consider whether: (1) the right is specifically guaranteed by the Constitution;

(2) the right affects the integrity of the political process; and (3) denial or limitation of the right would have a disproportionate impact on a discrete and insular minority [*Berlinghieri v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 392, 397, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383* , *citing U.S. v. Carolene Products Co. (1938) 304 U.S. 144, 152-153 n.4, 58 S. Ct. 778, 82 L. Ed. 1234]* . When determining whether a right is fundamental for purposes of applying the independent judgment test to administrative decisions, the courts must determine whether the claimed right is important enough to individuals in their life situations to require independent judicial review of the evidence [*Berlinghieri v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 392, 395, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383]* .

In applying the independent judgment test, the personal nature of the right is more important than its constitutional basis or its impact on a particular segment of society [*Berlinghieri v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 392, 395, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383]* . The courtsmust consider (1) the impact of the right in human terms, (2) its importance to the person who seeks to protect it, as well as (3) its economic importance [*Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 779, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144-145, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Kerrigan v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 43, 50, 154 Cal. Rptr. 29* , *cert. denied, 444 U.S. 930, 100 S. Ct. 273, 62 L. Ed. 2d 187]* . The crucial question is not how much harm or damage would result from a revocation or denial of the right, but the essential character of the right itself [*Dickey v. Retirement Board. (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 745, 751, 129 Cal. Rptr. 289, 548 P.2d 689* (right to disability benefits is fundamental as it directly affects employee's ability to support family while unable to work)]. Under this application, the following have been deemed fundamental rights:

- The right to unemployment compensation [*Thomas v. California Emp. Stab. Com. (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 501, 504, 247 P.2d 561]* .

- The right to continue to receive welfare and pension benefits [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734-735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* (welfare benefits); *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* (pension benefits); *O'Connor v. State Teachers' Retirement System (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1610, 1620, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (pension benefits); *see also Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (denial of public assistance); *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1298-1299, 281 Cal. Rptr. 421, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492* (same)].

- The right to practice a trade or profession [*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 763, 788-789, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 952 P.2d 641* (licensed architect); *Yakov v. Board of Medical Examiners (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 67, 75, 64 Cal. Rptr. 785, 435 P.2d 553* (licensed physician); *Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 508, 326 P.2d 850* (credentialed teacher); *Guymon v. Board of Accountancy (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1011-1012, 128 Cal. Rptr. 137* (licensed accountant)].

- The right to continued public employment [*Logan v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 116, 125-126, 185 Cal. Rptr. 878* (bus driver for public transit district); *Pipkin v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 652, 661, 147 Cal. Rptr. 502* (deputy sheriff); *see also Kazensky v. City of Merced (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 44, 51-52, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356* (local government position); *Webster v. Trustees of Cal. State University (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1462-1463, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 150* (state university system position)].

- The right to continue to hold a driver's license [*Lake v. Reed (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 448, 456-457, 65 Cal. Rptr 2d 860, 940 P.2d 311* ; *Arburn v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1480, 1484, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 15* ; *Elizabeth D. v. Zolin (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 347, 353, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852* ; *Coombs v. Pierce (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 568, 575-576, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 249* ; *Santos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 537, 546, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10* ; *Berlinghieri v.*

Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 392, 395, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383] .

- The right to remain at the California Youth Authority [*Mardesich v. California Youthful Offender Parole Bd. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1361, 1367, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 294]* .

- The right to review takings of property by local land use regulations [*Hensler v. City of Glendale (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 1, 16, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 244, 876 P.2d 1043]* .

- The right to continue to operate oil wells [*Termo Company v. Luther (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 394, 398-399, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687*].

Purely economic rights, on the other hand, have been held entitled to less sensitive judicial scrutiny [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144-145, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* (minority shareholders had no fundamental, vested right to prevent recapitalization of corporation by majority shareholders); *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 103, 280 P.2d 1* (water company had no fundamental, vested right to divert water from river); *Faulkner v. Cal. Toll Bridge Authority (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 328-330, 253 P.2d 659* (owners of Bay Bridge bonds had no fundamental, vested right to prevent construction of second toll bridge); *SP Star Enterprises v. City of Los Angeles (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 459, 470-471, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 152* (business offering adult nude entertainment did not have a fundamental vested right in an application for a conditional use permit for the sale and on-site consumption of alcohol; the impact of any permitting decision was purely economic); *Jaramillo v. State Board for Geologists and Geophysicists (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 880, 889-891, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 170* (a small business owner who was not licensed geophysicist was found to have practiced geophysics in violation of the law because he did not have a valid license. The business owner challenged the agency decision, and the court of appeal held that the owner did not have a fundamental vested right to continue to operate his business, and thus the substantial evidence test applied to judicial review of agency fact findings); *Kawasaki Motors Corp. v. Superior Court (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 200, 203-204, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 863* (motorcycle franchisee that challenged order of New Motor Vehicle Board permitting franchisor to terminate franchise did not have a fundamental vested right to maintain franchise which was a purely economic privilege); *Concord Communities, L.P. v. City of Concord (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1407, 1413-1414, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 511* (rent control board's decision to deny mobile home park owner's requested rent increases involved rights that were economic privileges which did not affect fundamental vested rights, and therefore substantial evidence test applied)]. However, an agency decision to suspend the business license of a food processor was subject to the independent judgment standard of review because the plaintiff's business license was determined to be a fundamental, vested right [*San Benito Foods v. Veneman (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1889, 1897, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571]* . Similarly, an agency decision to revoke a conditional use permit, when the holder of the permit had acted in reliance on the permit, is reviewed under the independent judgment standard of review because the conditional use permit was determined to be a fundamental vested right [*Malibu Mountains Recreation, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 359, 369-370, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25]* .

However, when the Contractor's State Licensing Board imposed a $350 fine against a licensed contractor for violations of the contractor licensing law, the Court of Appeal held that the independent judgment test did not apply because the contractor was not being deprived of the right to practice his trade, as would be the case if his license were being revoked; he was merely being fined for violating the law. The court noted that the existence of a public discipline record does not prevent the contractor from doing business in that occupation. Therefore, fining a contractor as the result of a discipline proceeding does not implicate a fundamental vested right, and thus the substantial evidence test applied to review the agency's fact findings [*Handyman Connection of Sacramento, Inc. v. Sands (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 867, 880-881, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 727]* .

[c] Vested Rights

The word "vested" generally refers to a right already possessed or legitimately acquired [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976)*

16 Cal. 3d 731, 735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698] . For purposes of determining whether a right is vested in this sense, the courts have generally distinguished between applicants and recipients [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698]* . In the licensing area, for example, the courts have held that an applicant for a license does not have vested rights in the license, while a person who already holds a license does [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698]* .

Before the Supreme Court rendered its decision in [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476]* , the courts also held that an applicant for welfare benefits had no vested right to the benefits [*Taylor v. Martin (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 1057, 1059, 105 Cal. Rptr. 211]* , but that one who had already qualified for benefits and was receiving them did [*Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 735, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698]* . In *Frink*, the Court abrogated the earlier distinction between applicants for and recipients of welfare benefits, holding that the right of the needy disabled to public assistance is as fundamental as the right of a recipient to continued benefits and, in both cases, administrative decisions denying benefits should be reviewed under the independent judgment test [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 178-180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* ; *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1299, 281 Cal. Rptr. 421, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492* (independent judgment test applies to judicial review of agency decision denying claim for Medi-Cal benefits)].

The right to seek employment may, in appropriate cases, be vested, even though the employment itself is not. Equal employment opportunities have, for example, been held to be both fundamental and vested, so that when a job-seeker presents evidence showing a denial of those equal opportunities, an administrative decision unfavorable to the job-seeker must be subjected to the independent judgment of the courts [*Kerrigan v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 43, 51, 154 Cal. Rptr. 29 , cert. denied, 444 U.S. 930, 100 S. Ct. 273, 62 L. Ed. 2d 187* (statutorily conferred right to be free of age discrimination in seeking employment is vested right)].

In appropriate cases, the doctrine of equitable estoppel may be invoked to establish that a right is vested [*City of Long Beach v. Mansell (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 462, 489, 91 Cal. Rptr. 23, 476 P.2d 423* ; *Stanson v. San Diego Coast Regional Com. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 38, 49, 161 Cal. Rptr. 392]* . An estoppel may be established for this purpose if a person (or agency), knowing the relevant facts, makes representations or engages in conduct that a person seeking a right relies on to his or her detriment [*City of Long Beach v. Mansell (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 462, 489, 91 Cal. Rptr. 23, 476 P.2d 423* ; *Stanson v. San Diego Coast Regional Com. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 38, 49, 161 Cal. Rptr. 392]* . In one case, for example, a property owner sought to open a restaurant in a commercial building within a protected coastal zone. Relying on representations from an agent of the regional coastal commission that a coastal development permit was not necessary, the property owner obtained building permits, expended substantial sums of money for remodeling, and entered into leases with rentals contingent on the opening of the restaurant. The court held that the property owner could proceed without obtaining a coastal permit even though one was, in fact, required, since the commission was estopped to enforce the requirement [*Stanson v. San Diego Coast Regional Com. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 38, 49, 161 Cal. Rptr. 392]* . Once a vested right is acquired through estoppel, it cannot be impaired or destroyed without due process of law [*Stanson v. San Diego Coast Regional Com. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 38, 49, 161 Cal. Rptr. 392]* .

[d] Limited Trial De Novo

When the court is required to exercise its independent judgment in reviewing the decision of an administrative agency, the petitioner is entitled to what has been called a limited trial de novo [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 143 n.10, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 914, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33]* . In a limited trial de novo, the court may receive only the following kinds of evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 143 n.10, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242]* :

- Evidence produced at the agency hearing.
- Relevant evidence that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced at the

hearing.

- Evidence that the agency improperly excluded.

When a trial court exercises independent judgment review of agency fact findings, the trial court is required to give a strong presumption of correctness to the agency's fact findings. This means that when the trial court exercises independent judgment review, the trial court is free to substitute its own findings but only after first giving due respect to the agency's findings. The enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)* by the California legislature indicates legislative acceptance of this approach [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 817-819, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693]* . When a trial court exercises independent judgment review of agency fact findings, the party seeking to overturn agency action has the burden of proof of showing that agency fact findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence. The burden of proof standard codified in *Evid. Code § 500* applies to writ proceedings; the party seeking review has the burden of proof, to persuade, and not merely the burden of production, to come forward with evidence [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 819-821, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693]* .

In exercising its independent judgment, the court determines whether the weight of the evidence supports the agency's decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*; *Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 914, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33]* . Although appellate decisions have not been uniform on the point, the better view is that the court's fact-finding responsibility extends to making determinations as to the credibility of the witnesses in the agency proceeding based on the record of their testimony, giving appropriate weight to the fact that the agency or its hearing officer heard and saw the witnesses and had the opportunity to make its own assessment of their credibility [*Pittsburg Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 964, 977, 194 Cal. Rptr. 672* ; *Guymon v. Board of Accountancy (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1014-1015, 128 Cal. Rptr. 137]* . Trial courts are required to give great weight to credibility determinations of state agency hearing officers under the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11425.50(b)*, even when the trial court conducts independent judgment review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 819, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693]* . However, the trial court's independent judgment does not encompass setting aside an agency decision that is based on uncontradicted evidence [*Ruttenberg v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1277, 1282, 240 Cal. Rptr. 249]* .

A court's statement of decision in applying the independent judgment standard in this situation has been held to be sufficient, despite a lack of detailed fact findings, when the court stated that the agency's findings were supported by the weight of the evidence, thereby incorporating by reference the agency's detailed findings [*Angelier v. State Board of Pharmacy (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 592, 598-599, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213]* .

[e] Judicial Review of Penalty Assessments

Judicial review of an agency assessment of a penalty is very limited and the standard of review is arbitrary, capricious, or abuse of discretion [*Kazensky v. City of Merced (1990 65 Cal. App. 4th 44, 54, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356* ; *Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 272, 279, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 458]* . The reviewing court can not substitute its judgment for that of the agency and can not overturn a penalty assessment that has a reasonable basis of support. The appellate court review of a trial court penalty determination is de novo and without deference to the trial court [*Deegan v. City of Mountain View (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 37, 46, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690* ; *Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 272, 279, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 458]* . The California Court of Appeal reversed the superior court decision that overturned a penalty assessment by a city review board of upholding the discharge of a public employee when the employee was found to have committed serious misconduct that reflected adversely on other public employees of the same agency. The discharge penalty had a reasonable basis in the fact record and the agency did not abuse its discretion in sustaining the discharge of the public employee. Therefore it was improper for the superior court to overturn the penalty assessed against the employee [*Flippin v. Los Angeles City Board of Civil Service Commissioners (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 272, 283-284, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 458]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that it was an abuse of discretion for a county civil service commission to reduce a disciplinary penalty imposed by a county sheriff on a county employee from a permanent demotion to a temporary demotion. The sheriff challenged the change in penalty by petitioning for a writ of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Kolender v. San Diego County Civil Service Commission (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 464, 466-467, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 84* (penalty reduction was abuse of discretion because criteria for penalty assessment in law enforcement employment is harm to public service, and commission erroneously relied upon inaccurate performance evaluation to reduce penalty)].

The Second District California Court of Appeal reversed and remanded the denial of a petition for a writ of mandate brought by a police officer terminated by the Los Angeles Police Department for on-the-job misuse of police department computers. The officer sought reinstatement. The court of appeal concluded that it was an abuse of discretion (specifically, a misapprehension of the law) for the police department to base termination in part on misconduct of the police officer that occurred more than two years before the department filed an administrative complaint against the officer. The court of appeal remanded the matter to the police department to reconsider the appropriate punishment for misconduct within the two-year time period [*Chrisman v. City of Los Angeles (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 29, 38-39, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 701]* .

[5] Applicability of Substantial Evidence Test

[a] Nature and Applicability of Test

When the independent judgment test does not apply, the court is restricted to determining whether an agency's findings are supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*]. Substantial evidence has been defined as evidence of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value, or as relevant evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion [County of San Diego v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 548, 555, 195 Cal. Rptr. 895]* .

The substantial evidence test does not apply to questions of law [*Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1092, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312* , *198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312]* . Accordingly, a reviewing court must independently determine the application of laws, regulations, and procedures, even when applying the substantial evidence test [*Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1092, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312]* . The substantial evidence test requires the court to resolve reasonable doubts in favor of the agency decision, and to uphold the decision if there is any substantial evidence to support the findings [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514-515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *Security Environmental Systems, Inc. v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 110, 132, 280 Cal. Rptr. 108]* . The reviewing court is not permitted to substitute its own judgment for that of the agency [*Common Cause v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 432, 445, 261 Cal. Rptr. 574, 777 P.2d 610* ; *Security Environmental Systems, Inc. v. South Coast Air Quality Management Dist. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 110, 133, 280 Cal. Rptr. 108]* .

Judicial review of CEQA compliance by local agencies that approve development projects subject to CEQA is de novo review from the standpoint of the agency action. The appellate courts determine the substantive CEQA issues (issues of law) by using the independent judgment test to decide whether the local agency made errors of law as demonstrated in the administrative record before the agency. The local agency factual determinations are reviewed under the substantial evidence test [*Citizens for a Megaplex-Free Alameda v. City of Alameda (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 91, 102, 110-111, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728* (substantial evidence supports city decision not to require a supplemental EIR)].

The substantial evidence test applies to judicial review of fact findings related to a claim filed under *Penal Code § 4900* with the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board for compensation from the state of California

for damages caused by erroneous conviction and imprisonment [*Tennison v. California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1164, 1181-1183, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 88]* . The substantial evidence test applies to judicial review of fact findings supporting a decision by the California Coastal Commission to deny a landowner a coastal development permit [*LT-WR, L.L.C. v. California Coastal Commission (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 770, 780-781, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417]* .

The substantial evidence test applies to judicial review of fact findings supporting business franchise termination decisions [*Kawasaki Motors Corp. v. Superior Court (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 200, 203-204, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 863* (motorcycle franchisee that challenged order of New Motor Vehicle Board permitting franchisor to terminate franchise did not have a fundamental vested right to maintain franchise which was a purely economic privilege)]. The substantial evidence test applies to judicial review of fact findings supporting a Department of Industrial Relations stop work order and penalty issued against a business to enforce worker's compensation insurance requirement against that business which had erroneously classified employees as independent contractors [*JKH Enterprises, Inc. v. Dept. of Industrial Relations (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1046, 1061-1062, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 563* (enforcing requirement that air courier services business purchase and maintain worker's compensation insurance impacts purely economic interests and does not impact fundamental or vested rights)]. Judicial review of facts findings related to the California Medical Board's decision to fine a physician $500 for aiding the unlicensed practice of medicine in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2264* is based on the substantial evidence test, not the independent judgment test, because there is no licensing sanction imposed by the Board against the physician [*Steinsmith v. Medical Board of California (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 458, 464-465, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115]* . The substantial evidence test also applies to judicial review of the adequacy of an Environmental Impact Report prepared by an agency and the validity of a related permit issued by that agency when the appealing party asserts that the permit violates the California Environmental Quality Act [*Pub. Resources Code § 21000*; *California Oak Found. v. City of Santa Clarita (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1219, 1225-1227, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434* ; *Sierra Club v. County of Napa (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1490, 1497-1498, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* . The substantial evidence test applied to judicial review of a public agency determination that a decision to close two schools was exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act [*Pub. Resources Codes § 21000*; *San Lorenzo Valley Mty. Advocates for Responsible Educ. v. San Lorenzo Valley Unified Sch. Dist. (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1356, 1386-1387, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 128]* . The substantial evidence test applied to judicial review of a city's factual determination that a downtown residential project was exempt from environmental review under CEQA as an urban in fill project [*Banker's Hill, Hillcrest, Park W. Cmty. Pres. Group v. City of San Diego (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 249, 267-268, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 537* (extensive discussion of fair argument versus substantial evidence standard of review for judicial review of CEQA related decisions)]. The substantial evidence fair argument test (that a project may have adverse environmental effects) was not satisfied in a mandamus proceeding challenging a mitigated negative declaration related to a subdivision development approved by a city council. This was because the record before the city council did not support the fair argument test, and extra record evidence may not be considered by the courts to support the fair argument test [*Porterville Citizens for Responsible Hillside Development v. City of Porterville (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 885, 889-891, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 105*]. The substantial evidence fair argument test was satisfied for a proposed project to convert timberland into a vineyard, and thus significant effects on the environment from the project required that the permitting agency (CDF) prepare an environmental impact report before granting the permit [*Sierra Club v. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 370, 382, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 9* (agency adopted mitigated negative declaration, and the court held that the preparation of an environmental impact report was required)]. The substantial evidence test applied to the agency decision upholding the citation of an employer for a serious safety violation that led to the death of an employee, and to the fact findings of the agency. The agency decision and fact findings will be upheld if they have reasonable support in the evidentiary record even though some of the evidence in the record would support opposite fact findings [*Sully-Miller Contracting Co. v. Cal. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 684, 692, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 742* (court of appeal held that substantial evidence supported findings related to primary employer and related to failure of contractor injury protection program to meet standards required by agency regulations); *Overaa Construction v. California Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 235, 249-251, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 154* (substantial evidence supported fact finding that controlling employer was lacking reasonable diligence in failing to provide a protective system for

excavations in excess of five feet. Failure to provide the system violated Cal/OSHA safety regulations, and justified the assessment of civil penalty against employer)]. The substantial evidence test applied to the denial of a mobile home park owner's petition for a writ of administrative mandate challenging the city's failure to approve the full rent increase sought by the owner [*Los Altos El Granada Investors v. City of Capitola (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 629, 648, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434]* . The substantial evidence test applies to a city decision to revoke a permit for a building to be used as an autopsy facility. There was no vested right to the permit because the applicant did not satisfy the good faith reliance test [*Autopsy/Post Services, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 521, 526-527, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 303]* . The substantial evidence test also applies to the agency decision to adopt a redevelopment plan and to the findings supporting that decision [*Evans v. City of San Jose (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1123, 1145-1146, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 675]* .

[b] Decisions of Constitutional Agencies

Decisions and orders of agencies on which the California Constitution confers adjudicative powers are reviewed under the substantial evidencestandard, whether or not a fundamental vested right is involved [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 35-36, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . For an agency to fit within this category, judicial power must have been directly vested in it by the Constitution [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 35-36, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Covert v. State Board of Equalization (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 125, 131-132, 173 P.2d 545]* .

The substantial evidence test applies to judicial review of decisions of the State Personnel Board because the Board is an agency with constitutional adjudicatory authority [*Pollak v. State Personnel Board (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1404, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39* ; *State Personnel Bd. v. Department of Personnel Admin. (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 512, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 142, 123 P.3d 169* (state personnel board drives adjudicatory authority from state constitution)].

The substantial evidence test applies to decisions of the Commission on State Mandates because the Commission is an agency with constitutional adjudicatory authority [*County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1176, 1186, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 419* (substantial evidence review specified by *Gov. Code § 17559(b)* for decision of Commission on State Mandates which is a constitutional agency under *Cal. Const. Art. XIII, § 6*)].

[c] Decisions Made Under Statutory Substantial Evidence Test

The California Supreme Court has held that the Legislature may provide for review under the substantial evidence standard of decisions of statewide agencies on which the California Constitution does not confer judicial power [*Tex-Cal Land Management, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 335, 342-346, 156 Cal. Rptr. 1, 595 P.2d 579* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Commission on State Mandates (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 805, 814-815, 38 Cal. Rptr.2d 304]* . If the Legislature provides that findings of an administrative agency may be reviewed only to determine if they are supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, and if the procedures of the agency guarantee administrative due process, judicial review is properly limited to the substantial evidence test [*Tex-Cal Land Management, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 335, 344-346, 156 Cal. Rptr. 1, 595 P.2d 579]* .

The FEHC decision following an administrative hearing that found allowing a disabled resident of a condominium association to have a companion dog to be a reasonable accommodation for the resident's depression related disability, notwithstanding that the association prohibited residents from owning dogs, and that the association unlawfully discriminated against the resident by refusing to make this specific reasonable accommodation, was supported by substantial evidence. This finding was a mixed question of law and fact and was subject to substantial evidence review [*Auburn Woods I Homeowners Assn. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1578, 1595-1596, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 669]* .

[d] Decisions of Private Hospital Boards

Notwithstanding the general rule that reviewing courts must exercise their independent judgment when fundamental, vested rights are at stake, the substantial evidence test applies to decisions of private hospital boards, decisions of boards of directors of districts organized pursuant to the Local Hospital District Law, and decisions of governing bodies of municipal hospitals [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(d)*; *see Health & Safety Code § 32000 et seq.* (*Local Hospital District Law); Weinberg v. Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr.(2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1106-1107, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6* (substantial evidence test applied to decision of hospital board to terminate staff privileges of physician; court interpreted *Bus. & Prof. Code § 809.05* to provide deferential review of hospital board decision when the board acted within delegated authority); *see* [4], *above* (independent judgment test)]. If the petitioner makes a preliminary showing of substantial evidence of discriminatory actions prohibited by *Health & Safety Code § 1316*, however, the court must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence, and abuse of discretion will be established if the court determines that the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(d)*].

[e] The Record for Decision

When the court applies the substantial evidence test, the agency's findings must be supported by substantial evidence in the light of the whole record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)*]. Accordingly, the reviewing court must consider the entire record [*LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 638 n.22, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432]* . It may not isolate evidence that supports the agency's findings and disregard other relevant evidence, but must consider all evidence in the administrative record, including evidence that fairly detracts from the evidence supporting the agency's decision [County of San Diego v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 548, 554, 195 Cal. Rptr. 895* ; *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 638 n.22, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432]* . The court in mandate proceedings thus engages in a revaluation of the evidence, at least to the extent of comparing the relative value of the testimony of the various witnesses to determine whether the evidence supporting the agency decision or the evidence opposing it has greater weight [*see Greenberg v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 792, 799, 112 Cal. Rptr. 626* (substantial evidence test applied in workers' compensation case)].

The California Court of Appeal held that the reviewing court defers to the trier of fact on issues of witness demeanor and credibility, and that substantial evidence supported the hearing officer's decision to believe a sheriff's deputy explanation that he was sloppy and disorganized in writing a report, but not untruthful [*Kolender v. San Diego County Civil Serv. Comm'n (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 1150, 1154-1155, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 209* (no abuse of discretion by county civil service commission in reducing sanction of termination imposed by sheriff on sheriff's deputy with rank of sergeant, and replacing that sanction with 90-day suspension, reinstatement, and demotion to rank of deputy sheriff)]. Another California Court of Appeal held that an agency decision to deny a real estate license to a disbarred attorney was supported by substantial evidence, notwithstanding the admission of hearsay evidence, because the hearsay evidence was admitted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11513(d)* for the purpose of supplementing and explaining other properly admitted evidence [*Berg v. Davi (2005) 130 Cal App. 4th 223, 229-230, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803]* .

The reviewing court applying the substantial evidence test is confined to consideration of evidence in the administrative record [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 572-574, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . However, the court may also determine whether any relevant evidence exists that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced before the agency, or whether any evidence exists that was improperly excluded by the agency. If such evidence exists, the court may remand the case to the agency for reconsideration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*]. A party who attacks the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the agency's decision has the burden of producing the record of the administrative proceedings in the reviewing court [*Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 367, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240]* . For a more detailed discussion of the record for decision, see Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions* .

When the court conducts judicial review of an agency's compliance with CEQA statutory requirements, particularly as to the decision to use a mitigated negative declaration and to not prepare an Environmental Impact Report, the court will

examine the administrative record as a whole, and the court will not consider additional evidence added to the appellate record that was not part of the administrative record [*Architectural Heritage Assn. v. County of Monterey (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1095, 1110-1111, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 469]* . The Court of Appeal upheld the superior court's denial of a motion to augment the administrative record in an ordinary mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] proceeding in which the residents of a mobile home park sought to rescind an EIR certification. The court held that judicial review of the adequacy of the EIR had to be based on the administrative record before the agency, and that extrinsic evidence that was not before the agency, or that related to developments after the EIR decision was made, could not be included in the record for judicial review [*El Morro Comty. Ass'n v. California Dep't of Parks & Recreation (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1341, 1358-1359, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 445]* . There are differences in the rules for the administrative records in administrative mandate and ordinary mandate, but the policy reasons for a decision on the record is the same in both types of cases.

The Court of Appeal reversed the County of Merced's granting of a conditional use permit, and the county's certifying of a final environmental impact report under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for a project approval sought by a mining company. The court held that the county failed to provide an adequate and complete administrative record for judicial review making it difficult for the appellate court to determine whether the county make the necessary findings required by CEQA before issuing the permit [*Protect Our Water v. County of Merced (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 362, 372-374, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 726]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFactual DeterminationsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.17

§ 474B.17 Proper Scope of Review in the Appellate Courts

[1] Whether the Trial Court Properly Applied the Independent Judgment Test

In cases in which the trial court properly applied the independent judgment test, the appellate court reviews the trial court's decision as it would in an ordinary civil appeal [*Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33* ; *see § 474B.16[4]* for discussion of the independent judgment test]. Therefore, errors of law are subject to its cognizance, but factual findings may be overturned only when the findings are not supported by substantial evidence (including evidence in the administrative record) [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 143 n.10, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33* ; *Sarka v. Regents of Univ. of Cal. (2006) 146 Cal. App. 4th 261, 270-271, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 810* (substantial evidence supported findings that physician was terminated for insubordination and not principally for advocating appropriate medical care for patients); *Smith v. City of Napa (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 194, 198-199, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 908* ; *California Career Schools v. DMV (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 10, 13-14, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 813* ; *Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1288-1289, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316* ; *Schmitt v. City of Rialto (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 494, 501, 210 Cal. Rptr. 788]* . The appellate court's function in reviewing the evidence is thus to decide whether credible, competent evidence supports the trial court's judgment [*Yakov v. Board of Medical Examiners (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 67, 71, 64 Cal. Rptr. 785, 435 P.2d 553* ; *Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 184, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357]* . In performing this function, the appellate court must resolveall conflicts in the evidence in favor of the judgment and draw all legitimate and reasonable inferences in its support [*Kerrigan v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 43, 52, 154 Cal. Rptr. 29* , *cert. denied, 444 U.S. 930, 100 S. Ct. 273, 62 L. Ed. 2d 187]* .

When a trial court makes fundamental errors in applying the independent judgment test, the appellate court should reverse and remand the decision back to the trial court to review the agency decision under independent judgment review, and the appellate court should not automatically affirm the trial court decision, nor automatically reverse, and reinstate the agency decision. This is because the trial court reasonably could decide that the agency fact findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence under a proper independent test [*Fukuda v. City of Angels (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 805, 824-825, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696, 977 P.2d 693* ; *Mason v. Office of Administrative Hearings (2001) 89 Cal.*

App. 4th 1119, 1138-1139, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102] .

[2] Whether the Trial Court Properly Applied the Substantial Evidence Test

In cases in which the trial court properly applied the substantial evidence test, the appellate court must review the entire administrative record to determine whether substantial evidence supports the agency's determination [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 149, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Lincoln Place Tenants Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 1491, 1503, 1506, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 353* (substantial evidence supported agency decision that building was not a significant historical or cultural asset); *Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1288-1289, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316* ; *Schmitt v. City of Rialto (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 494, 501, 210 Cal. Rptr. 788* ; *see § 474B.16[5]* for discussion of the substantial evidence test]. In such cases, the trial court itself exercises an essentially appellate function in that only errors of law appearing on the administrative record are subject to its cognizance [*Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915-916, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33]* . The trial and appellate courts occupy identical positions with respect to the administrative record, the function of each being to determine whether that record is free from legal error [*Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915-916, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33* ; *Los Alamitos Gen. Hosp., Inc. v. Lackner (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 417, 423, 149 Cal. Rptr. 98]* . In determining whether substantial evidence supports the fact findings of the agency whose decision is being reviewed, the appellate court plays the same role as the trial court [*California Fair Employment & Housing Comm'n v. Gemini Aluminum Corp. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1004, 1010-1011, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906* (Court of Appeal reversed trial court grant of writ of mandate based on substantial evidence standard for fact finding; trial court had found a lack of substantial evidence for Commission fact findings and court of appeal disagreed, and concluded that there was substantial evidence for Commission fact findings); *Friends of Santa Clara River v. Castaic Lake Water Agency (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-9, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 625* (mandate action to review decision of public water agency to adopt an urban water management plan under *Water Code § 10651*; appellate court plays same role as superior court in examining administrative record to decide whether there was a prejudicial abuse of discretion by agency); *California Dept. of Corrections v. State Personnel Bd. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1601, 1611-1612, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390* ; *Pasternak v. Boutris (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 907, 921-922, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 493* (agency fact finding not supported by substantial evidence in whole record; same substantial evidence test used by trial court and appellate court)]. The appellate court may reverse the agency decision only when a reasonable person could not have reached the conclusion reached by the agency. To determine whether there is substantial evidence, the court examines the entire administrative record, and considers all of the evidence, both evidence supporting the decision, and evidence that does not support the decision. The court will weigh the evidence to a limited extent to fairly estimate the worth of the evidence, but it will not weigh the preponderance of the conflicting evidence as that is the role of the agency [*Kirkorowicz v. California Coastal Com. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 980, 986-987, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 124]* .

When the court conducts judicial review of an agency's compliance with CEQA statutory requirements, particularly as to the decision to use a mitigated negative declaration and not to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, the court will examine the administrative record as a whole, the court will not consider additional evidence added to the appellate record that was not part of the administrative record, and the court will overturn the agency decision to not prepare an EIS as an abuse of discretion if there is substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that the affected project will have significant environmental impacts. The fair argument standard, which applies to EIS preparation decisions, is far less deferential to administrative agencies fact findings than the normal presumption that agency findings are correct [*Architectural Heritage Assn. v. County of Monterey (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1095, 1109-1111, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 469]* .

The California Court of Appeal held that the environmental checklist used by regional water quality control boards to ensure compliance with CEQA while adopting trash total maximum daily load standard plans (TDML plans) was deficient, did not comply with CEQA requirements, and failed the fair argument standard, in that there was sufficient evidence of a fair argument that the project may have a significant impact on the environment thereby necessitating the completion of an environmental impact report (EIR) before the TDML plan was approved [*City of Arcadia v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1420-1422, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* (decision to adopt trash

total maximum daily load standard (TDML plan) as part of regional water quality control plan was quasi-legislative action reviewable under ordinary mandate, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*)].

The California Court of Appeal reversed the denial of a petition for a writ of mandate by the Superior Court and held that the fair argument standard for substantial evidence was satisfied as to city land use policies and potential aesthetic affects thus requiring the City of Sacramento to prepare an environmental impact report before approving a residential housing project. The city had approved the project without preparing an EIR and had rather adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (NMD). The Court of Appeal reversed the denial of the petition and remanded the approval decision for preparation of an EIR [*The Pocket Protectors v. City of Sacramento (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 903, 908, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 791* ; *Lighthouse Field Beach Rescue v. City of Santa Cruz (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1170, 1202-1203, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 901* (fair argument standard not satisfied based on administrative record in case); *Mejia v. City of Los Angeles (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 322, 326-327, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 788* (fair argument standard satisfied thereby requiring preparation of environmental impact report (EIR))].

The California Court of Appeal held that the fair argument standard for judicial review of CEQA-related decisions as to the adequacy of an environmental impact report (EIR) was not applicable to a challenge to an agency decision that a prior program EIR sufficiently analyzed the potential environmental impacts of a city redevelopment project, that the project was within the scope of the previously prepared EIR and that no new EIR was required to be prepared [*Citizens for Responsible Equitable Environmental Development v. City of San Diego Redevelopment Agency (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 598, 609-611, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 249]* . Another California Court of Appeal concluded that there was substantial evidence in the record to support the issuance by the regional water board of a municipal storm sewer permit [*City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1377, 1387-1388, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 450]* . Cities that were regulated by the Board and had to comply with permit conditions challenged the procedures used to issue the permits, as well as the permit conditions, and the expense of complying with the permits. The Court of Appeal rejected the challenge to the evidence supporting the permit conditions, and noted that the Board could rely on staff recommendations for permit conditions, and those recommendations satisfied the substantial evidence in the administrative record requirements for informal administrative adjudicative hearings [*City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1377, 1387-1388, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 450]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemands & RemittitursAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFactual DeterminationsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial Evidence

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.18

§ 474B.18 Issues That Are Not Reviewable by Administrative Mandate

[1] Issues That Were Not Presented to the Agency

In order to obtain judicial review of a claim of error in an administrative proceeding, the issue generally must have been presented to the agency [*American Alliance Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 601, 609, 184 Cal. Rptr. 674* ; *see* *Fermin v. Department of Employment (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 586, 589-590, 29 Cal. Rptr. 642* , *cert. denied,* *375 U.S. 888, 84 S. Ct. 166, 11 L. Ed. 2d 118* (no provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* for hearing and deciding matters not presented to agency)]. This prerequisite is an aspect of the general rule that, when administrative procedures exist to resolve a dispute, the courts will not entertain the dispute until the administrative procedures are fully used and exhausted [Ameri can *Alliance Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 601, 609, 184 Cal. Rptr. 674* ; *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , for general consideration of the exhaustion of administrative remedies as a prerequisite to judicial review]. This rule does not apply when the claimed error could not have been corrected in the agency proceedings [*Morris v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 110 Cal. Rptr. 630]* . For example, when the agency lacks authority to determine the issue, the general rule does not apply [*see* *Burrey v. Embarcadero Mun. Improvement Dist. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 671, 676 n.4, 97 Cal. Rptr. 203, 488 P.2d 395* ; *Thomas v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 335, 338, 90 Cal. Rptr. 586, 475 P.2d 858* (DMV had no power to pass on validity of drunk driving convictions during license suspension proceedings)]. Agencies lack authority to determine the constitutional validity of prior criminal convictions that have collateral impact on licensing schemes such as the Department of Motor Vehicles drivers license authority. Therefore, reviewing courts cannot ordinarily grant a petition for a writ of mandate against an agency based on invalidity of a criminal conviction [*Thomas v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1974) 3 Cal. 3d 335, 338, 90 Cal. Rptr. 586, 475 P.2d 858* ; *Romo v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 251, 257, 280 Cal. Rptr. 33* ; *Gaston v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 74, 81, 281 Cal. Rptr. 173* ; *Morris v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 151, 153, 282 Cal. Rptr. 130]* . Additionally, a limited exception applies to the requirement that issues raised on appeal must have been presented to the agency in the administrative hearing. The appellate court has discretion to hear new issues or arguments relating to questions of law when public policy or the public interest is concerned [*Taye v. Coye (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1339, 1345, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27]* .

[2] Issues That Are Moot

When an administrative agency vacates a decision before the court reviews it, the issues asserted in the mandate proceedings are moot and the writ should be denied [*Crestlawn Memorial Park Asso. v. Sobieski (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 43, 47, 26 Cal. Rptr. 421]* . Similarly, if the agency complies with the provisions of an alternative writ, or if it demonstrates its willingness to perform the requested act, the issue is moot and a peremptory writ of mandate is improper [*Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193]* . The court hearing a mandate proceeding is required to consider any facts arising after the filing of the pleadings that render the dispute moot or the remedy useless [*Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193]* . However, an issue does not become moot merely because a penalty imposed by the agency in the challenged proceedings has been completed or complied with during the pendency of the mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*; *see Goldberg v. Regents of the University of California (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 867, 873 n.6, 57 Cal. Rptr. 463* (mandate proceedings challenging suspension of students from university not moot after expiration of suspension; suspensions and dismissals remained on students' academic records)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of Remedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474B.19-474B.29

[Reserved]

§§ 474B.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.30

§ 474B.30 Whether Petitioner Has Clear, Present Right to Performance of Clear, Present Ministerial Duty

Ordinary mandate is available to compel agencies to perform ministerial acts and to correct abuses of discretion and acts outside the legal powers of administrative agencies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Saleeby v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 547, 561-562, 216 Cal. Rptr. 367, 702 P.2d 525* ; *People ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 480, 491, 96 Cal. Rptr. 553, 487 P.2d 1193* ; *see § 474B.10[2]*]. Two basic requirements must be met before a writ in ordinary mandate proceedings will issue [*Loder v. Municipal Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 859, 863, 132 Cal. Rptr. 464, 553 P.2d 624 , cert. denied, 429 U.S. 1109, 97 S. Ct. 1143, 51 L. Ed. 2d 562* ; *Jackson v. Gourley (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 966, 977-978, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72* ; *Wasko v. Department of Corrections (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 996, 1000, 259 Cal. Rptr. 764* ; *Quirk v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733, 244 Cal. Rptr. 924]* :

- A clear, present, ministerial duty must exist on the part of the agency or official.
- The petitioner must have a clear, present, beneficial right to the performance of that duty.

Ordinary mandate is available when an agency has clearly abused its discretion [*Ridgecrest Charter Sch. v. Sierra Sands Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 986, 1002-1003, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 648* ; *Thelander v. City of El Monte (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 736, 748, 195 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . An agency clearly abuses its discretion by denying a party an important procedural right. For example, under the APA [*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*], subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum must be issued at the request of any party to compel attendance of witnesses or production of documents at hearing [*Gov. Code § 11510(a)*], and a denial of the subpoenas may be redressed by issuance of a writ of ordinary mandate [*see McLeod v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 27, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58* (failure to issue subpoenas reviewable in ordinary rather than administrative mandate proceedings since issuance of subpoenas is a ministerial and not discretionary function); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate)]. Similarly, many administrative litigants have important discovery rights that, in appropriate cases, may be enforced through ordinary mandate proceedings [*Shively v. Stewart (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 475, 479-482, 55 Cal. Rptr. 217, 421 P.2d 65* ; *see* Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* for discussion of discovery rights in proceedings subject to the APA and for statutes authorizing discovery in non-APA proceedings].

The party requesting the subpoenas must pay for the witnesses' fees, mileage, and expenses of subsistence [*Gov. Code § 11510(c)*; *see McLeod v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 23, 31, 94 Cal. Rptr. 58* (agency may condition issuance of subpoenas on party's acceptance of obligation to pay witnesses' ordinary fees and travel expenses); *Nick v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1407, 1413-1414, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* . (driver's license holder required to pay witness fee to subpoena arresting CHP officer to compel appearance at DMV license suspension hearing)]. The fees and mileage are calculated as prescribed by law for witnesses in civil actions in superior court [*Gov. Code § 11510(c)*]. Witness who must attend hearings at a distant location requiring an overnight stay are entitled to expenses of subsistence [*Gov. Code § 11510(c)*]. For discussion of agency subpoena power, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

Ordinary mandate is also available to challenge the validity of local ordinances on the grounds that these ordinances were adopted without compliance with CEQA [*Pub. Res. Code §§ 21168.5, 21168.6, 21168.9*] requirements [*Friends of Sierra Madre v. City of Sierra Madre (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 165, 194-196, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 214, 19 P.3d 567* ; *Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 568, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsOrdinances & Regulations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.31

§ 474B.31 Whether Petitioner Seek Review of Quasi-Legislative Action

Ordinary mandate is available to review actions taken by an agency in its legislative capacity [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 34 n.2, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1209, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762]* . Actions taken by agencies in their legislative capacities (often called quasi-legislative action) are aimed at formulating rules to be applied to future cases [*see* *Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 139, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212* (State Water Resources Control Board acts quasi-legislatively when it formulates rules planning for future uses of state's water resources)]. In contrast, adjudicatory actions (often called quasi-judicial action) are designed to apply established rules to particular facts [*Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 176, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670]* .

Classification of an administrative decision as adjudicatory or legislative does not depend on the nature of the agency, the procedural characteristics of the administrative process, nor the breadth or narrowness of the agency's discretion [*Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 176, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670]* . Rather, it depends on the essential characteristics of the action taken. If in taking its action the agency applied established criteria to facts specific to the individual case, the action is adjudicatory rather than legislative [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 615, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134* ; *San Diego Bldg. Contractors Assn. v. City Council (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 205, 212, 118 Cal. Rptr. 146, 529 P.2d 570]* . On the other hand, if the agency adopted a broad, generally applicable rule of conduct, the action is legislative [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 613, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134]* . Applying this distinction, the courts have held that administrative action that zones or rezones property is legislative [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 514, 516, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* , while administrative action that applies zoning enactments to particular parcels of property, for example, by approving a subdivision map [*Woodland Hills Residents Assn., Inc. v. City Council (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 825, 833-834, 118 Cal. Rptr. 856* , *rev'd on other grounds,* *23 Cal. 3d 917, 154 Cal. Rptr. 503, 593 P.2d 200 (1979)]* , granting a zoning variance [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12*], or granting a development permit [*Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 176, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670]* , is adjudicatory. An agency's preparation of a plan conforming to statutory requirements is legislative action reviewable in ordinary mandate [*Carrancho v. California Air Resources*

Board (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1255, 1265-1267, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 536 (agency's preparation of diversion plans and progress reports based on statutory requirements are quasi-legislative acts reviewable in ordinary mandate)].

Merger of separate land parcels, which automatically occurred on the effective date of a local ordinance, adopted for that purpose, was a legislative action, and therefore the affected property owners did not have a due process right to notice and an opportunity to be heard before merger took place [*Moores v. Board of Supervisors (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 883, 889-890, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 206]* .

Legislative action that is judicially reviewable by ordinary mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] includes the following types of actions:

- Adoption or amendment of an ordinance [*Friends of Sierra Madre v. City of Sierra Madre (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 165, 172-174, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 214, 19 P.3d 567]* ; and

- Adoption of administrative regulations [*Western States Petroleum Assn. v. Superior Court (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 559, 566-568, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139, 888 P.2d 1268]* .

- Adoption of a statute [*Hess Collection Winery v. Cal. Agricultural Labor Relations Board (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1584, 1598, 1601, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 609* (legislature's adoption of mandatory interest arbitration statute governing collective bargaining between employer and agricultural employees was quasi-legislative action with a limited scope of judicial review)].

- Setting of compensation for public employees [*Wirth v. State of Cal. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 131, 137-139, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 623* (correctional supervisors organization sought petition for writ of mandate to compel Department of Personnel Administration to provide equal salary increases to supervisors as increases to rank and file employees)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLegislationEnactmentGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsOrdinances & RegulationsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.32

§ 474B.32 Whether Agency Was Required by Law to Hold Hearing

Administrative mandate review is limited to those cases in which the administrative agency is required by law to hold a hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see § 474B.12[1]*]. The fact that a hearing was in fact held, even though not required, does not make administrative mandate available [*Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 138, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212]* . Thus, if the agency determines on its own motion to reconsider a previously taken administrative action, administrative mandate will not lie [*Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 138-139, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.33

§ 474B.33 Whether Agency Action Was Arbitrary, Capricious, or Lacking in Evidentiary Support

[1] Applicability of Substantial Evidence Test

In ordinary mandate proceedings, the court's scope of review is comparatively narrow [*Kelly v. County of Los Angeles (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 910, 918-920, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 335* (substantial evidence standard of review for fact findings in ordinary mandate, and de novo review standard of review for questions of law, including questions of statutory interpretation); *C.V.C. v. Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 919, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123]* . The agency's action will be upheld unless the court determines that it was arbitrary, capricious, or lacking in evidentiary support [*California Hotel & Motel Assn. v. Industrial Welfare Com. (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 200, 212, 157 Cal. Rptr. 840, 599 P.2d 31* ; *Endangered Habitats League v. County of Orange (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 777, 782-783, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177* ; *Better Alternatives for Neighborhoods v. Heyman (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 663, 671-673, 260 Cal. Rptr. 758* ; *Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1209, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762* ; *Marina County Water Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 132, 139, 209 Cal. Rptr. 212]* , or unless the agency failed to follow proper procedures or failed to give notice as required by law [*Joint Council of Interns & Residents v. Board of Supervisors (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1202, 1209, 258 Cal. Rptr. 762* ; *Taylor Bus Service, Inc. v. San Diego Bd. of Education (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1331, 1340, 241 Cal. Rptr. 379]* . Stated differently, the court is confined to an inquiry whether the administrative agency has abused its discretion and limited by the notion that, if reasonable minds might disagree, the court may not substitute its judgment for that of the agency [*Better Alternatives for Neighborhoods v. Heyman (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 663, 672, 260 Cal. Rptr. 758* ; *C.V.C. v. Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 919, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123]* . The burden is on the petitioner to show that no substantial evidence whatsoever supported the agency's findings [Taylor Bus *Service, Inc. v. San Diego Bd. of Education (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1331, 1340-1341, 241 Cal. Rptr. 379]* .

[2] Applicability of Independent Judgment Test

Notwithstanding the comparatively narrow scope of judicial review generally available in ordinary mandate proceedings, the reviewing court may exercise its independent judgment in ordinary mandate proceedings when constitutional rights are involved [*Manjares v. Newton (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 365, 370-371, 49 Cal. Rptr. 805, 411 P.2d 901* ; *Gilbert v. City of Sunnyvale (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 1264, 1274-1275, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 297* ; *C.V.C. v.*

Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 919, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123] . If the agency's decision adversely impacts on a constitutionally protected right or interest, the court must exercise its independent judgment in reviewing the decision, even in ordinary mandate proceedings [*C.V.C. v. Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 919, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123]* .

The appellate court will also apply the independent judgment test as the standard of review when the appellate court has to decide questions of law on undisputed facts [*Environmental Charter High Sch. v. Centinela Valley Union High Sch. Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 139, 145-146, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 417* (school district decision to deny charter school use of district facilities for 2003-2004 school year was reviewed under ordinary mandate)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewArbitrary & Capricious ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewConstitutional RightAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474B.34-474B.39

[Reserved]

§§ 474B.34[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.40

§ 474B.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to forms for judicial review, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.41

§ 474B.41 Federal Constitution

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *U.S. Const., amend. IV*

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.42

§ 474B.42 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*

Separation of powers doctrine. *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*

Jurisdiction to give extraordinary relief. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.43

§ 474B.43 State Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act. *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*

Allocation of burden of proof. *Evid. Code § 500*

Amendment of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*

Answers to complaints generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-431.30*

Appeals in civil actions and proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 901-914, 1109-1110b*

Authority of court to adopt suitable procedure where none specifically provided by statute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 187*

Certiorari. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1109*

Civil actions and proceedings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307 et. seq.*

Contempt. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*

Copies of pleadings are required to be served on adverse parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 465*

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021 et. seq.*

Demurrers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10-430.80*

Demurrer raises issue of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 589*

Discovery. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016-2036*

Effect of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Effect of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*

Entry of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*

Fee for transcribing record. *Gov. Code § 69950*

Filing initial pleading begins proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 350, 411.10*

Filing of various papers constitutes appearance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*

Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107-1109*

New trials. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 655-663.2*

Power of court to impanel jury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*

Prohibition. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1102-1105, 1107-1109*

Recovery of attorney's fees when administrative action arbitrary or capricious. *Gov. Code § 800*

Recovery of litigation expenses, including attorney's fees, by small business or licensee when agency action undertaken without substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Review of administrative decision by mandate proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Review of decisions by Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (and Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control). *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090-23090.2*

Review of decisions by Board of Governors of State Bar or Committee of Bar Examiners. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6082*

Review of decision by local housing enforcement agency to abate nuisance; independent judgment test. *Health & Safety Code § 17980.8*

Review of decisions by Public Utilities Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756, 1759*

Review of decisions by Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board. *Lab. Code § 5950*

Right to demur to answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.20*

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-417.40*

Special proceedings and actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 20-23*

Testimony in subsequent civil proceeding of person presiding at quasi-judicial proceeding. *Evid. Code § 703.5*

Time limitations on review of local agency decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(b)*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Writ as order in writing issued in name of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.44

§ 474B.44 Decisions

[1] Abuse of Discretion

[a] General Requirements

In absence of clear abuse of discretion, courts will uphold decision by Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control to suspend license for violation of liquor laws. *Provigo Corp. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 561, 566, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638, 869 P.2d 1163*

Under California administrative law, abuse of discretion occurs when party is denied right to present defense, to present testimony of key witnesses, or to take testimony out of state. *Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1098, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Administrative body does not abuse its discretion by failing to accept factual findings of administrative law judge who originally heard matter. *Gov. Code § 11517(c)* allows administrative body to refuse to adopt administrative law judge's proposed decision and to decide case itself on record, including transcript, with or without taking additional evidence. *Mixon v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1306, 1310, 1310 n.2, 237 Cal. Rptr. 884*

In mandate proceeding to review administrative order, determination of penalty imposed by administrative body is not disturbed on appeal in absence of manifest abuse of discretion. *Flowers v. State Personnel Bd. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 753, 761, 220 Cal. Rptr. 139*

Discretionary authority is not subject to delegation unless statute provides otherwise. *California School Employees Assn. v. Personnel Com. of Pajaro Valley Unified School Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139, 144, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436* ; *Sacramento Chamber of Commerce v. Stephens (1931) 212 Cal. 607, 610, 299 P. 728* ; *Webster v. Board of Education (1903) 140 Cal. 331, 332, 73 P. 1070*

Ministerial act is subject to delegation; approval or ratification of act after performance is equivalent to delegation. *California School Employees Assn. v. Personnel Com. of Pajaro Valley Unified School Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 139,*

144-145, 89 Cal. Rptr. 620, 474 P.2d 436 ; *Mott v. Horstmann (1940) 36 Cal. 2d 388, 391, 224 P.2d 11*

Distinction between discretionary and ministerial acts. *Williams v. Stockton (1925) 195 Cal. 743, 748, 235 P. 986* ; *People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431-432, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623*

[b] Failure to Proceed in Manner Required by Law

Abuse of discretion by administrative agency as established if agency has not proceeded in manner required by law. *Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 675, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032*

Failure to follow spirit of law even though following letter of law is failure to proceed in manner required by law. *Walsh v. Kirby (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 95, 103-106, 118 Cal. Rptr. 1, 529 P.2d 33*

Failure to recognize and act on implications of law's explicit requirements is failure to proceed in manner required by law. *No Oil, Inc. v. Los Angeles, City of (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79-89, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66*

Administrative official are without authority to harmonize statutes. *People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 432-433, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623*

Necessity of making timely and sufficient objection in administrative proceeding to agency's failure to proceed in manner required by law. *Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 545, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[c] Decision Not Supported by Agency Findings

Necessity for findings to support administrative decision where factual determinations were made. *Topanga Ass'n for a Scenic Community v. Los Angeles County (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 515-517, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* ; *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 267, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97* ; *Swars v. Council of City of Vallejo (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 867, 871, 206 P.2d 355* ; *William Dal Porto & Sons, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1213, 237 Cal. Rptr. 206* ; *County of Los Angeles v. State of California (1985) 183 Cal. App. 3d 566, 579, 215 Cal. Rptr. 139* ; *Mahoney v. San Francisco City etc. Employees' Ret. Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 1, 3-6, 106 Cal. Rptr. 94*

Findings are required to be sufficiently clear to be understandable. *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 272, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97*

Findings requirement where application for license denied. *In re Sturm (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 258, 268-270, 113 Cal. Rptr. 361, 521 P.2d 97* (prisoner's application for parole)

Requirement that agency's findings must bridge analytical gap between facts (raw evidence) and ultimate decision is not satisfied when findings are not fact-specific but merely declare general conclusion. *California Aviation Council v. City of Ceres (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1384, 1394-1395, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 163*

Hearing officer's findings provide ample basis for determination of agency's reasoning on judicial review when decision included four-page summary of evidence, three-page analysis of evidence explaining decision's reasoning, nine findings of fact, and six conclusions of law. *Getz v. City of West Hollywood (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 625, 630, 284 Cal. Rptr. 631*

Findings that bridge analytical gap between raw evidence and ultimate decision or order are sufficient when agency

proceeding involves noncomplex issues. *Zuniga v. County of San Mateo Dep't of Health Services (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1521, 1530, 267 Cal. Rptr. 755*

Findings supporting administrative action, made in language of applicable ordinance, are adequate if ordinance requires that administrative action not be taken unless facts set forth in ordinance have been proved. *Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1363, 263 Cal. Rptr. 214*

Findings made by incorporation by reference are proper; reference in administrative decision to administrative rule (without setting forth rule's language) is sufficient when rule citation, read together with factual findings, makes reasoning for administrative decision clear. *Parkmerced Residents Organization v. San Francisco Rent Stabilization etc. Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1235, 1244, 258 Cal. Rptr. 774*

Findings are required to be legally relevant. *City and County of San Francisco v. Board of Permit Appeals (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1099, 1109, 255 Cal. Rptr. 307*

Transcript of agency proceedings does not constitute sufficient findings when motion and oral remarks did not disclose basis for agency decision. *Pacifica Corp. v. City of Camarillo (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 168, 179-180, 196 Cal. Rptr. 670*

Administrative findings are not required to be stated with same formality required of judicial findings; findings are required to be liberally construed to support rather than defeat order under review. *Horwarth v. Local Agency Formation Com. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 177, 183, 191 Cal. Rptr. 593*

Administrative findings set forth solely in language of applicable statute are insufficient. *American Funeral Concepts v. Board of Funeral Directors & Embalmers (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 303, 309, 186 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Findings requirement are met where agency expressly adopts findings prepared by staff or proposed by hearing officer. *Webb v. State Personnel Board (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 542, 548, 94 Cal. Rptr. 115*

Failure to make findings is cause for remand where decision might have been based on any of several grounds. *Hadley v. City of Ontario (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 121, 128-129, 117 Cal. Rptr. 513*

Lack of findings is not reversible error where evidence clearly shows what findings must have been. *Webb v. State Personnel Board (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 542, 548, 94 Cal. Rptr. 115* ; *Lees v. Bay Area Air Pollution Control Dist. (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 850, 853-854, 48 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Findings of fact in support of proposed administrative disciplinary decision are required to clearly set forth factual and legal basis for decision. *Medlock Dusters, Inc. v. Dooley (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 496, 502, 181 Cal. Rptr. 80*

[2] Administrative Construction

Administrative construction of law is occasionally necessary but never conclusive; final construction is judicial function. *Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1919) 179 Cal. 764, 766, 178 P. 960* ; *Godshalk v. City of San Diego (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 459, 468, 94 Cal. Rptr. 42*

Agency guidelines interpreting statute under which agency decision was made are not relevant to court's inquiry on mandate review of agency decision when guidelines were issued after date of agency decision, despite rule that agency interpretation of statute is entitled to great weight. *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 678, 694, 183 Cal. Rptr. 395*

Agency's interpretation of regulation is deserving of great weight, but ultimate resolution of interpretation is question of law, resting with courts. *Sangster v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1033, 1040, 249 Cal. Rptr. 235* ; *Skyline Homes, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 663, 669, 174 Cal. Rptr. 665*

Courts are empowered to set aside administrative decision based on wrong construction of law. *People ex rel. Fund American Companies v. California Ins. Co. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 423, 431, 117 Cal. Rptr. 623*

Agency's first-time construction of 16-year-old statute is not entitled to great weight. *Department of Water & Power v. Energy Resources Conservation & Development Com. (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 206, 220, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 289*

[3] Administrative Hearings

As in ordinary civil actions, party asserting affirmative at administrative hearing has burden of proof, including both initial burden of going forward and burden of persuasion by a preponderance of the evidence; preponderance of evidence does not mean necessarily preponderance of the number of witnesses; various elements go into determining weight to be given statements of parties on one side or other of a controversy, their opportunities for observation, mental capacity, standing, credibility, and numbers. *McCoy v. Board of Retirement (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1051 n.5, 228 Cal. Rptr. 567*

[4] Appeal

Petition for review of Agriculture Labor Relations Board order filed three days late is deemed to have been timely filed when petition was submitted to clerk's office on final day for seeking review, but was not verified as required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.498*, and was returned by clerk for verification; even though time limit is jurisdictional, technical noncompliance in form of petition does not bar review. *United Farm Workers of America v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 912, 914-916, 210 Cal. Rptr. 453, 694 P.2d 138*

Good cause exists for raising issue for first time on appeal of denial of petition for writ of administrative mandate when case relied on for raising issue was decided after opening brief was filed, court afforded all parties opportunity to respond to the issue, and issue was one of law. *J. L. Thomas, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 916, 923 n.6, 283 Cal. Rptr. 815*

When presented with uncontradicted facts on appeal in tax matters, appellate court is free to make its own determinations; appellate review of legal questions is undertaken independently, so appellate court is not bound by trial court's determination. *Rain Bird Sprinkler Mfg. Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 784, 794, 280 Cal. Rptr. 362*

Appellate court's function, in reviewing determinations made by superior court in its independent judgment review of administrative agency decision, is to apply substantial evidence test to factual findings; appellate court upholds trial court's factual determinations when supported by substantial evidence gleaned from administrative record. *Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Wat. Resources Control Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 548, 553, 275 Cal. Rptr. 250*

Even though trial court's determination of issues of fact are reviewable under substantial evidence test, trial court's determination of issues of law are fully reviewable by appellate court, and appellate court is not bound either by agency's preliminary resolution of issues of law or by trial court's subsequent decision. *Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Wat. Resources Control Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 548, 553, 275 Cal. Rptr. 250*

When applying substantial evidence test on review of trial court's denial of petition for writ of administrative mandate, appellate court: (1) ascertains whether evidentiary record reveals substantial support, contradicted or uncontradicted, that trial court's determinations are correct; (2) resolves all evidentiary conflicts in respondent's favor; (3) indulges all reasonable inferences to uphold judgment; and (4) defers to trial court on inferences reasonably deduced from facts. *Geoghegan v. Retirement Board (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1525, 1529, 272 Cal. Rptr. 419*

When applying substantial evidence test on review of trial court's denial of petition for writ of administrative mandate, appellate court is bound by trial court's factual interpretation if undisputed facts can support more than one interpretation. *Geoghegan v. Retirement Board (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1525, 1529, 272 Cal. Rptr. 419*

Scope of appellate court's review of administrative mandate is coextensive with that of superior court when superior court employs substantial evidence test, and therefore appellate court is not bound by determinations of superior court. *Brooks v. State Personnel Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1068, 1071-1072, 272 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Denial of administrative mandate claim is appealable final judgment within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1064*, notwithstanding fact that additional claims have not yet been resolved by trial court. *Bullock v. City and County of San Francisco (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1086, 271 Cal. Rptr. 44*

In administrative mandate action, appellate review is limited to issues in record at administrative level; additional evidence is admissible only when it was unavailable at time of administrative hearing, or improperly excluded from record. *Schaeffer Land Trust v. San Jose City Council (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 612, 625 n.9, 263 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Duties of appellate and trial courts in determining whether administrative record is free from legal error are identical; appellate court conducts own independent review, and superior court's disposition of issues is not conclusive. *Schaeffer Land Trust v. San Jose City Council (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 612, 622, 263 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Determination of whether administrative action was arbitrary or capricious is issue of fact for trial court over which appellate court has no power to weigh or judge effect of evidence or to resolve conflicts in it. *Jones v. Pierce (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 736, 747, 245 Cal. Rptr. 149*

To review denial of writ of mandate, determination of whether writ sought was traditional mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is necessary; determination is essential because nature of review undertaken by trial court and ultimately by court of appeal is determined by nature of writ. *Taylor Bus Service, Inc. v. San Diego Bd. of Education (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1331, 1339, 241 Cal. Rptr. 379* (determining writ sought was traditional mandate)

Appellate court applies substantial evidence test when trial court applies that test under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(c)* to review administrative proceeding. *Anne B. v. State Bd. of Control (1984) 165 Cal. App. 3d 279, 284, 209 Cal. Rptr. 83* (reversal of trial court denial of petition for writ of administrative mandate to review decision by State Board of Control)

When findings of trial court are based on its proper exercise of independent judgment, appellate court applies substantial evidence standard to trial court's findings; however, when trial court's appropriate standard of review is substantial evidence or abuse of discretion, appellate court reviews administrative decision, not trial court's decision. *Schmitt v. City of Rialto (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 494, 501, 210 Cal. Rptr. 788*

Standard of review on appeal is dependent on appropriate standard of review at trial court level; standard of review at trial court level is dependent on type of rights affected by administrative proceeding. *Kimbrough v. Police & Fire Retirement System (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1148, 208 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Appellate courts generally do not consider matters presented for first time on appeal. *Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 143, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* (appellant-petitioner in administrative writ of mandate proceeding waived right to raise issues of bias of panel member and variance between charges and findings in administrative proceeding by failing to raise them in trial court)

Scope of review on appeal. *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 593, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480* ; *Petrucci v. Board of Medical Examiners (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 83, 87, 117 Cal. Rptr. 735*

Nonappealable orders include order sustaining demurrer to petition, order denying motion to reconsider ruling on demurrer and to recall and quash peremptory writ, order denying motion to amend petition, and order denying motion to strike petition. *Rittersbacher v. Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County (1934) 220 Cal. 535, 539, 32 P.2d 135* , *cert. denied, 293 U.S. 592, 55 S. Ct. 107, 79 L. Ed. 686* ; *Gayle v. Hamm (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 250, 252 n.3, 101 Cal. Rptr. 628* ; *Sunseri v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 309, 319, 36 Cal. Rptr. 553* ; *McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 46, 47, 168 P.2d 65*

Appeal is taken from judgment, not writ; appeal from writ is subject to dismissal. *DeMartini v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 787, 794, 30 Cal. Rptr. 668* ; *Kindig v. Palos Verdes Homes Ass'n (1939) 33 Cal. App. 2d 349, 355, 91 P.2d 645*

When issue of proper standard of proof not raised by appellant at original administrative hearing to revoke appellant's license or in subsequent action for writ of administrative mandate challenging revocation of license, appellant is precluded from raising issue for first time on appeal from trial court's denial of petition for writ. *Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Proper standard of appellate review when trial court used substantial evidence test is whether or not findings of agency (not trial court) were supported by substantial evidence. *Pacific Coast Medical Enterprises v. Department of Benefit Payments (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 197, 208-209, 189 Cal. Rptr. 558*

County board's return of writ stating compliance with peremptory writ of mandate is waiver of right to appeal regarding validity of trial court's judgment granting writ; however, order following hearing on adequacy of board's return to writ relates to enforcement of judgment and thus is appealable since issue was trial court's assessment of and reaction to adequacy of board's return. *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 964, 971-972, 187 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Court that issues writ of mandate retains continuing jurisdiction to make any order necessary to its enforcement; when writ remands matter to administrative body with directions to proceed in certain manner, and return states that court's mandate has been carried out, petitioner is able to challenge validity of that claim by new petition under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* or by supplemental petition, or court, on its own motion or that of petitioner, either oral or written, may order respondent to reconsider further. *City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 964, 971-972, 187 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Order denying petition out of hand (refusing issuance of alternative writ) is appealable. *Burrus v. Municipal Court (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 233, 238, 111 Cal. Rptr. 539*

[5] Burden of Proof and Producing Evidence

Respondent has burden to go forward with evidence where evidence on particular issue peculiarly within respondent's knowledge. *Morris v. Williams (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 733, 760, 63 Cal. Rptr. 689, 433 P.2d 697* ; *Garcia v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 689, 694, 263 P.2d 8* ; *California Medical Assn. v. Brian (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 637, 651*

Person attacking administrative decision has burden of showing trial court that administrative proceedings unfair, in excess of jurisdiction, or show prejudicial abuse of discretion; otherwise, presumption of regularity of proceedings prevails. *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Agency has burden of proof where administrative charge was that petitioner made material misrepresentation to obtain license. *De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 605-606, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289* ; *Jones v. Maloney (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 80, 89, 234 P.2d 666*

[6] Findings Not Supported by Evidence

[a] Independent Judgment Review

Right to pursue lawful business or occupation is fundamental. *Truax v. Raich (1915) 239 U.S. 33, 41, 36 S. Ct. 7, 60 L. Ed. 131* ; *Purdy & Fitzpatrick v. California (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 566, 579, 79 Cal. Rptr. 77, 456 P.2d 645*

Tenured state university professor over 70 years of age terminated from employment for substandard performance who timely applied for continuation of tenure had vested right to continued employment and was entitled to independent review of administrative record. *Webster v. Trustees of Cal. State University (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1462, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 150*

Driver's license is fundamental vested right for purpose of selecting standard of judicial review of administrative decision to suspend or renew license; trial court is required to exercise independent judgment in reviewing administrative record. Berlinghieri v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 33 Cal. 3d392, 397-398, *33 Cal. 3d 392, 188 Cal. Rptr. 891, 657 P.2d 383* ; *Webb v. Miller (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 625, 232 Cal. Rptr. 50* ; *Lee v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 275, 284, 191 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Substantial evidence rule is standard of review applying to decision denying doctor's initial application for hospital privileges because applicant has no vested or fundamental right to appointment; right of doctor to continue to practice in hospital is fundamental and administrative decision denying reappointment to staff is reviewable under independent judgment rule. *Unterthiner v. Desert Hospital Dist. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 285, 293, 298, 188 Cal. Rptr. 590, 656 P.2d 554* ; *Anton v. San Antonio Community Hosp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 802, 820-825, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442, 567 P.2d 1162* ; *Smith v. Vallejo General Hospital (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 450, 455, 216 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 leaves to courts establishment of standards for determining which cases require independent judgment review and which cases require substantial evidence review. *Unterthiner v. Desert Hospital Dist. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 285, 293, 298, 188 Cal. Rptr. 590, 656 P.2d 554* ; *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 173, 174, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*

For purposes of determining applicability of independent judgment review, terms "fundamental" and "vested" are not used to establish absolutes, but are used in relative sense; weighing of both fundamental nature and vested nature of right determines whether or not independent judgment review is required. *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 177, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*

Even when trial court must exercise its independent judgment on evidence, its findings are sustained on appeal if supported by substantial evidence on whole record. *Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 135, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* ; *Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1005, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Ultimate question in each case in determining whether or not independent judgment standard or substantial evidence standard applies is whether or not affected right is deemed to be of sufficient significance to preclude its extinction or abridgement by body (administrative agency) lacking judicial power. *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 176, 178, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*

Nature of right rather than harm or damage involved in interference with it is factor determining whether it is fundamental. *Dickey v. Retirement Board (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 745, 751, 129 Cal. Rptr. 289, 548 P.2d 689* ; *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698*

Court is authorized to exercise independent judgment to determine whether or not findings are supported by weight of evidence when administrative decision substantially affects vested fundamental right and agency not directly authorized by state constitution to exercise judicial functions. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 35, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 143, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *see also Los Alamitos General Hosp., Inc. v. Lackner (1978) 149 Cal. Rptr. 98*

Vested rights arise from statutes. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 33, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29*

Measure of fundamental right is effect in human terms and importance to individual in life situation. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 145, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Vested right is one already possessed. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Whaler's Village Club v. California Coastal Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 240, 251, 220 Cal. Rptr. 2*

Right to receive license applied for is not, but right to keep license already acquired is, vested right. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Vested right is one so fixed as not to be subject to divestiture without owner's consent. *Adoption of Graham (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 899, 905, 27 Cal. Rptr. 163, 377 P.2d 275*

Vested right is existing valuable privilege. *Bertch v. Social Welfare Dep't (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 524, 529, 289 P.2d 485*

Vested rights arise from laws of property. *Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 105-106, 280 P.2d 1*

In administrative mandate proceeding in which trial court has properly exercised its independent judgment on evidence, trial court's factual determinations are conclusive on appeal if supported by substantial evidence. *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 308, 196 P.2d 20* ; *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 452, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Attack in mandate proceeding on credibility of witnesses in administrative proceeding is permissible in appropriate case. *Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 799-800, 136 P.2d 304*

Vested rights arise from professional licenses. *Laisne v. State Bd. of Optometry (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 831, 835, 123 P.2d 457*

Nature of hearing de novo. *Collier & Wallis, Ltd. v. Astor (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 202, 205, 70 P.2d 171*

On review of trial court's exercise of independent judgment, appellate court reviews record to determine whether or not trial court's findings supported by substantial evidence. *Lee v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d*

275, 284, 191 Cal. Rptr. 23 .

Dismissal of county employee involves fundamental right and thus trial court's determination governed by independent judgment test. *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 452, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

On appeal from judgment denying petition for writ of administrative mandate when trial court required to, and did, exercise independent judgment on evidence and record before board, scope of review of appellate court is limited to determination of whether or not evidence, viewed in light most favorable to respondent, sustains findings of trial court, resolving any reasonable doubts in favor of such findings. *Schrier v. San Mateo County Employees' Retirement Assn. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 957, 961, 191 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Tenured teachers possess vested rights and their discharge is subject to independent judgment review by court in administrative mandate proceeding; less stringent substantial evidence test is applicable in case of probationary employees whose rights are not vested. *Alexander v. Board of Trustees (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 567, 572, 188 Cal. Rptr. 705*

Since Unemployment Insurance Act benefits constitute property rights for purposes of judicial review, parties are entitled to independent evaluation of evidence by superior court, including findings on all essential fact questions. *Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 661, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837*

In reviewing decision of Board of Medical Quality Assurance to revoke professional license, independent judgment is standard to be used by trial court except when determining penalty imposed. *Dresser v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 506, 510, 181 Cal. Rptr. 797*

Right of probationary teacher to be rehired for next school year is not a vested right requiring independent judgment review. *Mt. San Antonio College Faculty Assn. v. Board of Trustees (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 27, 34, 177 Cal. Rptr. 810*

Administrative suspension or revocation of existing license is subject to independent judgment review by court in administrative mandate proceeding. *Brewer v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 155 Cal. Rptr. 643*

Policeman's right to injury leave pay, to retirement benefits, and to reemployment are vested rights and are fundamental in nature; trial court, in reviewing administrative decisions relating to such rights, is required not only to examine administrative record for errors of law but to exercise its independent judgment on evidence as disclosed in limited trial de novo; trial court is required to weigh evidence and exercise its independent judgment on weight of evidence produced. *Roccaforte v. City of San Diego (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 877, 886, 152 Cal. Rptr. 558*

Retirement benefit rights in public employees retirement system are fundamental and vested. *Depuy v. Board of Retirement (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 392, 396-397, 150 Cal. Rptr. 791*

Absence of record sufficient to permit independent judgment review is ground for remand for new hearing. *Hadley v. City of Ontario (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 121, 127, 117 Cal. Rptr. 513*

No person is entitled to conduct business free of governmental control. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 145-146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Northern Inyo Hosp. v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 14, 23, 112 Cal. Rptr. 872*

Right to benefit from grandfather clause does not confer any vested right on applicant for license. *Toczauer v. State Bd. of Registration (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1069-1071, 98 Cal. Rptr. 211*

Court is unable to assess weight of uncontradicted evidence. *David Kikkert & Associates, Inc. v. Shine (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 112, 116, 86 Cal. Rptr. 161*

Parties are entitled to reconstruct record for independent judgment review in event record of evidence was not made. *Charles L. Harney, Inc. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 442, 444-445, 15 Cal. Rptr. 870* (record reconstructed by parties)

Vested rights arise from contracts. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 147-148, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Reed v. City Council of Roseville (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 628, 636, 141 P.2d 459*

Independent judgment test under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is appropriate standard of review of county board decision awarding public employee service-connected disability retirement benefits. *County of Alameda v. Board of Retirement (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 902, 910, 251 Cal. Rptr. 267, 760 P.2d 464*

County's direct pecuniary interest in challenging retirement system award is basis for applying independent judgment standard of review. *County of Alameda v. Board of Retirement (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 902, 908-909, 251 Cal. Rptr. 267, 760 P.2d 464*

Denial of application for conditional use permit does not affect fundamental interests that would warrant independent judgment review. *Smith v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 188, 199-200, 259 Cal. Rptr. 231*

Trial court is required to review administrative agency's adjudicatory decisions de novo if: (1) those decisions affect fundamental vested rights; and (2) administrative agency of legislative origin and Legislature has not provided that substantial evidence test should govern review of its decisions. *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 729, 740-741, 252 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Public employees' claim for backpay for work performed in higher classification involves fundamental right for purposes of applying independent judgment standard of review because it directly affects employees' ability to continue to support their families; claim involves vested right because employees would be entitled to compensation for work already performed. *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 729, 742, 252 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Trial court properly applies "independent judgment" test to review administrative record in mandate proceeding brought to compel Department of Social Services to set aside its decision revoking license to operate family day care home for children, because trial court must exercise its independent judgment on evidence if decision of administrative agency substantially affects fundamental vested right, and right to engage in such occupation is such a right. *Seering v. Dept. of Social Services (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 298, 302, 302 n.1, 239 Cal. Rptr. 422*

In mandate proceeding involving fundamental or vested rights, such as right to disability retirement benefits, or whenever authorized by law, trial court is required independently to judge administrative record to determine if findings were supported by weight of evidence. *Swehla v. Teachers' Retirement Bd. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1092, 237 Cal. Rptr. 789* ; *Gatewood (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 311, 322, 220 Cal. Rptr. 724*

When reviewing administrative decision through writ of mandate and decision affects substantially fundamental vested right, trial court is required to exercise its independent judgment to determine whether evidence supports findings; independent review requires trial court to make its own determination based on evidence at administrative hearing; independent review requires appellate court to decide whether credible and competent evidence supports trial court's judgment. *Martinez v. County of Tulare (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1430, 1436-1437, 235 Cal. Rptr. 851*

Revocation of restricted real estate broker's license is fundamental but not vested right and therefore subject to substantial evidence and not independent judgment review, because very nature of restricted license is indication to holder that rights granted from it are neither vested nor permanent. *Apollo Estates, Inc. v. Department of Real Estate (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 625, 635-636, 220 Cal. Rptr. 199*

In mandate proceeding to review disciplinary action taken by county civil service commission against sheriff's deputy, trial court is required to apply "substantial evidence" test, even though deputy's fundamental vested right of employment was involved, when petitioner sheriff did not himself possess such right. *Carpenter v. Civil Service Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 446, 450-452, 220 Cal. Rptr. 407*

Employer's rights to establish practices and procedures and to impose conditions of employment do not constitute fundamental vested right so as to require judicial review of administrative decision by application of independent judgment test. *Carpenter v. Civil Service Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 446, 451, 220 Cal. Rptr. 407*

Independent judgment standard is proper when decision of administrative agency with statewide jurisdiction reviewed in mandate proceeding. *Eisenberg v. Myers (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 814, 820, 196 Cal. Rptr. 270*

[b] Substantial Evidence Review

Decisions of agency of constitutional authority are reviewed only to determine whether substantial evidence supports determination, even when vested rights are involved. *Coleman v. Department of Personnel Administration (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1102, 1125, 278 Cal. Rptr. 346, 805 P.2d 300*

Substantial evidence test requires reviewing court to consider all relevant evidence, including evidence detracting from agency's decision. *Sierra Club v. California Coastal Commission (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 602, 610, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 779*

Substantial evidence test is proper to review findings and decision by California Fair Employment and Housing Commission concerning whether employer may exclude fertile women from certain types of jobs involving exposure to lead. *Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 517, 531, 267 Cal. Rptr. 158*

Case involving abuse of discretion in area of land use regulation does not involve fundamental vested rights; substantial evidence test is appropriate scope of review. *Topanga Assn. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1356 n.3, 263 Cal. Rptr. 214*

Substantial evidence test is applicable on judicial review of decision by Department of Rehabilitation that independent care provider owed it reimbursement for prior funding overpayment; speculation that decision would cause care provider to curtail habilitation services to developmentally disabled (and thereby implicate fundamental vested right of disabled to such services) is insufficient to justify independent judgment review because state must fill void if independent care provider cannot provide services. *Hope Rehabilitation Services v. Department of Rehabilitation (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 938, 944, 261 Cal. Rptr. 123*

Substantial evidence rule does not apply to questions of law; reviewing court is free to determine independently application of laws, regulations, or procedures; this construction of rule applies to interpretation of policies and procedures of University of California that have status of statutes in its internal governance, and clearly come into play when facts are undisputed. *Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1092-1093, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Substantial evidence is relevant evidence that reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support conclusion. *Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1091, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Department of Personnel Administration is authorized to make final factual findings in matters of constructive resignation under *Gov. Code § 19996.2*; review by trial court is limited to substantial evidence test. *Allen v. Dept. of Personnel Administration (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 355, 362, 238 Cal. Rptr. 317*

Findings by ALRB are entitled to respect, but are properly set aside when record does not justify decision under substantial evidence test. *J. R. Norton Co. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 874, 888, 238 Cal. Rptr. 87*

Employer's right to establish its employment practices and procedures and to impose conditions of employment is not a fundamental vested right; substantial evidence test is applicable on review of administrative complaint that city had engaged in racial discrimination in administration and application of promotional examination. *City and County of San Francisco v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 976, 984, 236 Cal. Rptr. 716*

In administrative mandate proceedings, trial court exercises its independent judgment on evidence, and appellate court merely reviews whole record to determine whether trial court's findings are supported by substantial evidence. *Kearl v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1052, 236 Cal. Rptr. 526*

Evidence is substantial if any reasonable trier of fact could have considered it reasonable, credible, and of solid value; evidence of one credible witness possibly constitutes substantial evidence. *Kearl v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1052, 236 Cal. Rptr. 526*

When substantial evidence test applies, superior court exercises essentially appellate function in determining whether administrative findings are supported by substantial evidence; scope of appellate review is coextensive with that of superior court. *Division of Occupational Safety & Health v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 794, 800, 234 Cal. Rptr. 661*

County's right to discharge hospital employee is neither fundamental nor vested, therefore trial court properly used substantial evidence test to review personnel board's findings. *County of Santa Clara v. Willis (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1240, 1250, 225 Cal. Rptr. 244*

Although Board of Medical Quality Assurance required to find by clear and convincing evidence, and superior court exercises independent judgment review, appellate court is required only to determine whether superior court's findings are supported by substantial evidence. *Yellen v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1057-1058, 220 Cal. Rptr. 426*

Even when contradicted by direct testimony, persuasive circumstantial evidence constitutes substantial evidence for inferences based on it. *Norris v. State Personnel Board (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 393, 398-399, 219 Cal. Rptr. 895*

In mandate proceeding to review disciplinary action taken by county civil service commission against sheriff's deputy, trial court is required to apply "substantial evidence" test, even though deputy's fundamental vested right of employment was involved, when petitioner sheriff did not himself possess such right. *Carpenter v. Civil Service Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 446, 450-452, 220 Cal. Rptr. 407*

When administrative decision neither involves nor substantially affects fundamental vested right, trial court is required to review entire administrative record to determine whether findings are supported by substantial evidence, and if agency committed any errors of law. *Whaler's Village Club v. California Coastal Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 240, 251, 220 Cal. Rptr. 2*

Penalty-reducing decision of civil service commission is reviewable in superior court mandate proceeding only for abuse of discretion. *Lowe v. Civil Service Com. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 667, 677, 210 Cal. Rptr. 673*

Independent review by trial court is appropriate when right affected is fundamental vested right; substantial evidence is appropriate scope of review when trial court standard was independent review. *Kimbrough v. Police & Fire Retirement System (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1149, 208 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Appellate court is required to use substantial evidence test to review trial court's independent review of administrative decision; in such case, however, court of appeal is not merely echoing determination of trial court, which it may reverse when supported only by scintilla of evidence. *Bowman v. Board of Pension Commissioners. (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 937, 943-944, 943 n.3, 202 Cal. Rptr. 505*

Review of administrative agency's finding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is limited to determination of whether findings are supported by record (substantial evidence test), even when fundamental vested right is involved, when agency derives its adjudicative powers from *California Constitution. Goggin v. State Personnel Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 96, 102, 202 Cal. Rptr. 587*

Fair procedure requires adequate notice and reasonable opportunity to be heard; rigid adherence to fixed formula of procedure is not required. *Tiholiz v. Northridge Hospital Foundation (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1197, 1202, 199 Cal. Rptr. 338*

Court is limited to determining whether findings are supported by substantial evidence in light of whole record when administrative decision does not substantially affect vested fundamental right or agency directly authorized by Constitution to exercise judicial functions. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 35, 44-45, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *see also Alamitos General Hosp., Inc. v. Lackner (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 417, 423, 149 Cal. Rptr. 98*

Requirement that entire record, not merely evidence supporting administrative decision, be examined. *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 638 n.22, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432* (construing *Lab. Code § 5952*)

Substantial evidence is evidence of ponderable legal significance, reasonable in nature, credible, and of solid value. *People v. Bassett (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 122, 138-139, 70 Cal. Rptr. 193, 443 P.2d 777* ; *Estate of Bristol (1944) 23 Cal. 2d 221, 223, 143 P.2d 689* ; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 837 n.2, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817*

Substantial evidence in light of whole record means substantial evidence as opposed to scintilla of evidence. *Martin v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 238, 246, 340 P.2d 1*

In action for administrative mandate, trial court is under no duty to prepare findings of fact and conclusions of law in absence of timely request for statement of decision under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1005, n.3, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Substantial evidence rule requires trial court to start with presumption that record contains evidence to sustain every finding of fact and burden is on appellant to show that there is not substantial evidence whatsoever to support findings. *Pescosolido v. Smith (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 964, 970, 191 Cal. Rptr. 415*

Administrative board, as trier of fact, is sole arbiter of all conflicts in evidence, conflicting interpretations thereof, and conflicting inferences reasonably drawn therefrom, and is sole judge of credibility of witnesses. *Pescosolido v. Smith*

(1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 964, 970-971, 191 Cal. Rptr. 415

Landowner's application for exercise of administrative discretion in area of land use is subject to substantial evidence test, as no fundamental vested rights exist. *Rasmussen v. City Council (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 842, 848-849, 190 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Discharge of probationary teachers, whose rights are not vested, is subject to substantial evidence test. *Alexander v. Board of Trustees (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 567, 572, 188 Cal. Rptr. 705*

Power of appellate review of sufficiency of evidence begins and ends with determination of whether or not there is any substantial evidence, contradicted or uncontradicted, which will support finding of fact; factual matters are viewed most favorably to prevailing party and conflicts are decided in favor of respondent. *12319 Corporation v. Business License Com. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 54, 64, 186 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Substantial evidence test is applicable standard of review with respect to disciplinary actions taken against state university employee. *Washington v. State Personnel Bd. (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 636, 640, 179 Cal. Rptr. 637*

Standard is whether or not entire administrative record discloses substantial evidence (reasonable, credible, and of solid value) such that reasonable trier of fact could have found as it did. *Parker v. State Personnel Bd. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 84, 87, 174 Cal. Rptr. 333*

Court is required to draw all legitimate and reasonable inferences in support of agency's findings, not to reweigh evidence. *Fair Employment Practice Com. v. State Personnel Bd. (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 322, 333, 172 Cal. Rptr. 739*

[c] Constitutional Rights Case

Review procedure when petitioner claims administrative decision not actually based on alleged grounds but based on official dissatisfaction with exercise of constitutional rights such as freedom of speech. *Adcock v. Board of Educ. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 60, 65-66, 109 Cal. Rptr 676, 513 P.2d 900* ; *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 591-593, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480*

Findings requirement in case of alleged official dissatisfaction with exercise of constitutional rights. *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 592-593, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480*

Independent judgment review required when constitutionally protected interest at stake. *Lichter v. United States (1947) 334 U.S. 742, 791-792, 68 S. Ct. 1294, 92 L. Ed. 1694* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 148 n.5, 148 n.6, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *C.V.C. v. Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 919, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123*

[7] Findings of Fact

When trial court denied driver's petition for writ of mandate seeking to set aside decision of DMV to suspend driver's license, and findings of fact not requested from or expressly issued by trial court, on appeal findings necessary to support judgment are implied and judgment is affirmed if supported by any substantial evidence. *Lee v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 275, 284, 191 Cal. Rptr. 23* .

When there is no statement of decision to reveal specific findings of trial court, findings of fact and conclusions of law necessary to support judgment are implied, and judgment is affirmed if supported by substantial evidence. *Kearl v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1052, 236 Cal. Rptr. 526*

[8] Jurisdiction and Jurisdictional Review

Superior court is generally proper court for filing petition for writ of mandate reviewing administrative decision. *Roma Macaroni Factory v. Giambastiani (1933) 219 Cal. 435, 436-437, 27 P.2d 371* ; *Cohen v. Superior Court (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270-271, 72 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Court has discretion to refuse to consider repetitive applications. *Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770-771, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982*

Meaning of jurisdiction, lack of jurisdiction, and excess of jurisdiction. *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 287-291, 109 P.2d 942*

Meaning of jurisdiction in prohibition and certiorari cases. *Rodman v. Superior Court (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 262, 269-270, 89 P.2d 109*

Administrative agency does not act without fundamental jurisdiction or in excess of its jurisdiction when it acts pursuant to authority of statute later declared unconstitutional. *Miller v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 1379, 238 Cal. Rptr. 915*

[9] Penalties

Abuse of discretion was not shown when an employee was discharged when other employees who had engaged in similar misconduct were not discharged because similar wrongs do not require equal penalties. *Pegues v. Civil Service Com. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 95, 106, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705*

If administrative agency has imposed single discipline for multiple charges, some of which are found not sustained by evidence, and if there is real doubt whether or not same action would have been taken on proper findings, matter is returned to agency for redetermination of penalty. *Franz v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 124, 144, 181 Cal. Rptr. 732, 642 P.2d 792* ; *Vollstedt v. City of Stockton (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 265, 277, 269 Cal. Rptr. 404*

In determining abuse of discretion in imposition of penalty in context of public employee discipline, extent to which employee's conduct resulted in, or if repeated conduct is likely to result in, harm to public service is overriding consideration. *Skelly v. State Personnel Bd. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 194, 218, 124 Cal. Rptr. 14, 539 P.2d 774* ; *County of Santa Clara v. Willis (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1240, 1251, 225 Cal. Rptr. 244*

Propriety of penalty imposed by administrative decision is not matter for judicial inquiry except to determine whether agency abused its discretion. *Nightingale v. State Personnel Board (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 507, 515, 102 Cal. Rptr. 758, 498 P.2d 1006* ; *Martin v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 287, 291, 341 P.2d 296* ; *Martinez v. County of Tulare (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1430, 1438, 235 Cal. Rptr. 851* ; *Fout v. State Personnel Bd. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 817, 821, 186 Cal. Rptr. 452* ; *Marino v. Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 461, 464, 110 Cal. Rptr. 45* ; *Wingfield v. Fielder (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 209, 221, 105 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Court is empowered to require agency to reconsider penalty where abuse of discretion shown by failure of evidence to support charges or some of them. *O'Reilly v. Board of Medical Examiners (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 381, 389, 58 Cal. Rptr. 7, 426 P.2d 167* ; *Magit v. Board of Medical Examiners (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 74, 87-88, 17 Cal. Rptr 488, 366 P.2d 816* ; *Collins v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 439, 445, 105 Cal. Rptr. 634* ; *Wingfield v. Fielder (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 209, 223, 105 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Penalty is within limits of agency's discretion if reasonable minds might differ as to whether it is appropriate. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. etc. Appeals Bd. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 589, 594, 43 Cal. Rptr. 633, 400 P.2d 745* ; *Wingfield v. Fielder (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 209, 221, 105 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Test of abuse of discretion in imposition of penalty is whether reasonable person would have determined penalty imposed to be appropriate. *MacFarlane v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 84, 91, 330 P.2d 769* ; *Weiss v. State Bd. of Equalization (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 772, 775, 256 P.2d 1* ; *Marino v. Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 461, 464, 110 Cal. Rptr. 45* ; *Wingfield v. Fielder (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 209, 221, 105 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Absent abuse of discretion by administrative agency, neither appellate nor trial court is free to substitute its discretion for that of agency concerning degree of punishment imposed. *Fout v. State Personnel Bd. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 817, 821, 186 Cal. Rptr. 452* ; *Dresser v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 506, 518, 181 Cal. Rptr. 797*

In considering whether or not abuse of discretion occurred in discipline of public employee, overriding consideration is extent to which employee's conduct resulted in, or if repeated is likely to result in, harm to public service; other factors include circumstances surrounding misconduct and likelihood of recurrence. *Fout v. State Personnel Bd. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 817, 821, 186 Cal. Rptr. 452*

Agency is entitled to consider evidence outside record when setting penalty. *Ralph Williams Ford v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 494, 500, 106 Cal. Rptr. 340 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 974, 94 S. Ct. 283, 38 L. Ed. 2d 217*

Court is empowered to find abuse of discretion if penalty is grossly disproportionate to cause for discipline. *Turner v. Hatch (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 759, 765-766, 92 Cal. Rptr. 643* ; *Carroll v. Kern County Civil Serv. Comm'n (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 727, 733, 90 Cal. Rptr. 128*

[10] Questions of Law

When facts before administrative agency are uncontradicted, trial court's determination of their legal effect involves solely question of law. *Apte v. Regents of University of California (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1084, 1093, 244 Cal. Rptr. 312*

[11] Review of Fairness of Trial

[a] General Requirements

Prejudice is not shown by agency member's public expression of views before hearing where issue is one of public interest. *Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 780-782, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375*

Prejudice on part of agency members is question in review proceeding only if raised in administrative proceeding. *Thompson v. City of Long Beach (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 235, 243, 259 P.2d 649*

Prejudice of fewer than majority of agency members does not affect petitioner's interests. *Thompson v. City of Long Beach (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 235, 243, 259 P.2d 649*

Nature of review on question whether petitioner received fair administrative trial. *English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 158-160, 217 P.2d 22*

Unlikelihood that challenged agency member would disqualify himself or be found disqualified does not excuse failure to present question of prejudice to agency. *Caminetti v. Pac. Mutual L. Ins. Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 344, 366, 139 P.2d 908* ; *Barkin v. Board of Optometry (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 75 Cal. Rptr. 337*

Administrative officer is not subject to removal from case because of prejudice if his absence would render agency unable to function. *Caminetti v. Pac. Mutual L. Ins. Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 344, 366, 139 P.2d 908*

Even if chief of public agency which instituted administrative action had conflict of interest under *Gov. Code §§ 87100* and *87103*, her signing of revised accusation against petitioners is insufficient grounds for disturbing administrative decision. *Citizens Capital Corporation v. Cathcart (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 793, 797-799, 801, 186 Cal. Rptr. 515*

Prejudice on part of agency members is question in review proceeding despite failure to raise it in administrative proceeding if question could not be presented to agency as practical matter. *Barkin v. Board of Optometry (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 75 Cal. Rptr. 337*

[b] Constitutional Considerations

Right to procedural protection depends on balance between individual's interest in avoiding grievous loss and government's interest in summary adjudication. *Morrissey v. Brewer (1972) 408 U.S. 471, 480, 92 S. Ct. 2593, 33 L. Ed. 2d 484* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144-146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Opportunity for hearing is generally required to precede government deprivation of fundamental right instead of following it. *Fuentes v. Shevin (1972) 407 U.S. 67, 80, 92 S. Ct. 1983, 32 L. Ed. 2d 556* ; *Blair v. Pitchess (1971) 96 Cal. Rptr. 42, 486 P.2d 1242*

Procedural requirements for hearing varies according to government function, character of private interest, and nature of later proceedings. *Boddie v. Connecticut (1971) 401 U.S. 371, 378, 91 S. Ct. 780, 28 L. Ed. 2d 113* ; *McCullough v. Terzian (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 647, 653-655, 87 Cal. Rptr. 195, 470 P.2d 4*

Availability of independent judicial review salvages otherwise unconstitutional administrative procedure. *Lichter v. United States (1947) 334 U.S. 742, 791-792, 68 S. Ct. 1294, 92 L. Ed. 1694* ; *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 148 n.5, 148 n.6, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Determination whether right is fundamental depends on its effect in human terms and its importance to individual in life situation. *Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 144, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242*

Initiation of disciplinary proceedings two years and nine months after public employee's misconduct is not denial of due process when, by employee's admission, misconduct also amounted to violation of criminal statute which contained three-year limitations period. *Nicolini v. County of Tuolumne (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 619, 632-633, 235 Cal. Rptr. 559*

Probationary public employee terminated after hearing was not denied due process when he had been represented by counsel and had opportunity to confront witnesses and present evidence in defense but chose not to, and instead admitted charges of misconduct and only offered evidence in mitigation of penalty. *Lukin v. City and County of San Francisco (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 807, 814, 232 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Due process does not entitle assistant professor to full adversary hearing on denial of tenure; nontenured professor has no cognizable property interest in renewal of employment and thus denial of tenure does not deprive him of any liberty

or property interest sufficient to require formal hearing under due process clause. *King v. Regents of University of California (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 812, 815, 189 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Statutory omission of prior hearing is no deprivation of due process if person has right to judicial hearing before suffering actual deprivation of fundamental right. *C.V.C. v. Superior Court (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 909, 918, 106 Cal. Rptr. 123*

[c] Use of Illegally Seized Evidence

Applicability of exclusionary rule to administrative trials. *Emslie v. State Bar of California (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 210, 226-230, 113 Cal. Rptr. 175, 520 P.2d 991*

Excludability of evidence obtained by entrapment. *Patty v. Board of Medical Examiners (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 356, 367, 107 Cal. Rptr. 473, 508 P.2d 1121*

[12] Validity of Enabling Act

Validity of law authorizing performance of ministerial act is issue in traditional mandate proceeding for writ to compel performance of act. *California Educational Facilities Authority v. Priest (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 593, 598, 116 Cal. Rptr. 361, 526 P.2d 513*

Validity of substantive portions of enabling act is issue in mandate proceeding for review of administrative decision. *H.W. Rohl Co. v. County of San Diego (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 707, 711, 28 Cal. Rptr. 196* (not reviewable); *Floresta, Inc. v. City Council of San Leandro (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 599, 611-612, 12 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFactual DeterminationsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofInitial Burden of PersuasionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474B STANDARDS IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474B.45

§ 474B.45 Text References

California Administrative Mandamus (Cal CEB 2d ed. 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 30, 257-331 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 474C.syn

§ 474C.syn Synopsis to Chapter 474C: PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS

§ 474C.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 474C.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

[2] Agency Adjudication

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

§§ 474C.03-474C.09 [Reserved]

§ 474C.10 Governing Law

[1] Petitioner's Choice of Mandate Procedures

[2] Alternative Writ Procedure

[3] Noticed Application Procedure

§ 474C.11 Availability of Administrative Mandate

[1] Finality of Administrative Decision

[2] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[3] Time Limitations

[4] Res Judicata

§ 474C.12 Jurisdiction and Venue

[1] Concurrent Jurisdiction of Superior Courts and Appellate Courts

[2] Exercise or Nonexercise of Original Jurisdiction by Appellate Courts

[3] Venue

§ 474C.13 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court

[1] General Pleading Rules

[2] Parties

[3] Essential Allegations

[4] Other Allegations of Error

[5] Allegations Showing Need for Temporary Stay

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Prayer

[8] Verification

[9] Points and Authorities

[10] Service

[11] New Trial Motion

§ 474C.14 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

[1] Essential Allegations

[2] Points and Authorities

[3] Method of Reproduction

[4] Case Number and Cover

[5] Copies

[6] Service

§ 474C.15 Alternative Writ of Mandate

[1] Nature of Alternative Writ

[2] Writ Combined With Order Authorizing Issuance of Writ

[3] Preparation and Presentation to Court

[4] Issuance of Writ

[5] Notice

[6] Service

§ 474C.16 Separate Order for Issuance of Alternative Writ of Mandate

§ 474C.17 Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] Noticed Application Procedure

[2] Notice

[3] Points and Authorities

[4] Service

[5] Issuance of Peremptory Writ Without Alternative Writ in Appellate Court

§ 474C.18 Stay of Agency Decision

[1] Court Discretion to Issue Stay

[2] Stay of Decisions by Agencies Regulating Health-Related Professions

[3] Stay Bonds

§ 474C.19 Return

[1] Nature of Return

[2] Demurrer

[3] Answer

[4] Points and Authorities

[5] Time Limits

§ 474C.20 Intervention

[1] Intervention by Real Party in Interest

[2] Requirements for Intervention by Third Party

[3] Conditional Nature of Right to Intervene

[4] Procedure for Intervention

§ 474C.21 Replication

[1] Countervailing Affirmative Allegations of Answer

[2] Verification

[3] Time to File and Serve

§ 474C.22 Discovery

§ 474C.23 Administrative Record

[1] Requirement That Record Be Filed

[2] Time for Filing

[3] Request and Preparation

[4] Costs

[5] Incomplete Record

§ 474C.24 Hearing

[1] Preparation for Hearing

[2] When There Is No Opposition

[3] Burden of Proof

[4] Evidence

§ 474C.25 Judgment

[1] Granting or Denying Relief

[2] Tentative Decision

[3] Statement of Decision

[4] Preparation and Filing of Judgment and Notice of Entry of Judgment

[5] Preparation of Judgment in Appellate Court

[6] Costs

[7] Attorney's Fees and Litigation Expenses

§ 474C.26 Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] Nature and Function of Peremptory Writ

[2] Enforcement

§ 474C.27 Expedited Procedures Apply to Review of Permit or Entitlement Decision That Involves Constitutionally Protected Speech

[1] When Expedited Review Applies

[2] Expedited Procedures for Judicial Hearing

[3] Expedited Procedures for Judicial Decision

[4] Joint Waiver of Expedited Procedures Permitted

§§ 474C.28-474C.39 [Reserved]

§ 474C.40 Nature of Ordinary Mandate

§ 474C.41 Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] General Procedure in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

[2] Parties

[3] Essential Allegations

[4] Prayer for Relief

[5] Points and Authorities

[6] Filing in Appellate Court

[7] Service and Filing

§ 474C.42 Expedited Review of Permit or Entitlement Decision Involving Constitutionally Protected Speech

§§ 474C.43-474C.49 [Reserved]

§ 474C.50 Nature of Appealable Orders

[1] One Final Judgment Rule

[2] Judgments in Mandate Proceedings

§ 474C.51 Procedures for Initiating Appeal

[1] Notice of Appeal

[2] Transcript and Record on Appeal

[3] Stays on Appeal

§ 474C.52 Supreme Court Review of Judgment of Court of Appeal

§ 474C.53 Standards of Appellate Review

§§ 474C.54-474C.59 [Reserved]

§ 474C.60 Federal Constitution

§ 474C.61 State Constitution

§ 474C.62 State Statutes

§ 474C.63 California Rules of Court

§ 474C.64 Local Rules of Court

§ 474C.65 Decisions

[1] Administrative Record

[2] Agency Scope of Review

[3] Alternative Writ of Mandate

[4] Answer

[5] Continuances

[6] Costs and Attorneys Fees

[7] Default Cases

[8] Demurrers

[9] Discovery

[10] Evidence

[11] Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[12] Points and Authorities in Opposition

[13] Remand to Administrative Level

[14] Replication

[15] Service of Petition

[16] Summary Disposition

[17] Venue

§ 474C.66 Law Reviews

§ 474C.67 Text References

§ 474C.68 Internet References

§§ 474C.69-474C.79 [Reserved]

§ 474C.80 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court

§ 474C.81 Noticed Application Procedure

[1] Papers

[2] Filing

[3] Service

§ 474C.82 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

§ 474C.83 Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate

§ 474C.84 Response to Petition for Writ of Mandate (Return)

[1] Demurrer

[2] Answer

[3] Memorandum

§ 474C.85 Replication

§ 474C.86 Judgment

[1] Prevailing Party

[2] Peremptory Writ of Mandate

§ 474C.87 Appeal

[1] Court of Appeal Review

[2] Supreme Court Review

§§ 474C.88-474C.89 [Reserved]

§ 474C.90 Petition for Administrative Writ of Mandate to Review Administrative Decision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

[4] Caption and Introduction

[5] Essential Allegations

[6] Alleging Facts Subject to Judicial Notice

[7] Identity of Petitioner

[8] Petitioner's Standing to Sue

[9] Identity of Respondent

[10] Evidentiary Hearing Required

[11] Making of Final Administrative Decision

[12] Invalidity of Decision

[13] Abuse of Discretion

[14] Evidence Not Supporting Findings

[15] Findings Not Supporting Decision

[16] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[17] Lack of Other Remedy

[18] Attorneys' Fees

[19] Prayer for Relief

[20] Service

[21] Cross References

§ 474C.91 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

§ 474C.92 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

§ 474C.93 Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Signature on Writ

§ 474C.94 Alternative Writ of Mandate (Order Included)--Alternative Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.95 Separate Order for Issuance of Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.96 Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

§ 474C.97 Palma Notice in Appellate Court

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.98 Order for Preparing and Filing Administrative Record

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.99 Order to Temporarily Stay Administrative Decision and to Show Cause

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.100 Order Staying Administrative Decision Pending Judgment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.101 Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.102 Notice of Hearing on Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.103 Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

§ 474C.104 Replication to Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

[4] Filing

[5] Service

[6] Cross References

§ 474C.105 Judgment Granting Relief

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Judgment

[4] Cross References

§ 474C.106 Judgment Granting Relief (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

[1] Form

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.107 Judgment Denying Relief

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.108 Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 474C.109 Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.01

§ 474C.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides a discussion of procedures for seeking mandate relief of administrative agency decisions. The legal background discussion in Part II includes:

- Subpart A, addressing the procedural aspects of seeking administrative mandate relief [*see §§ 474C.10 -474C.26*].

- Subpart B discusses procedural aspects of seeking ordinary mandate relief [*see §§ 474C.40 -474C.41*].

- Subpart C briefly sets forth considerations for seeking appellate review of mandate decisions [*see §§ 474C.50 -474C.53*].

Part V includes the following forms:

- Petition for Administrative Mandate in the superior court [*see §§ 474C.90, 474C.91*], or appellate court [*see § 474C.92*].

- Alternative Writ of Administrative Mandate or order directing its issuance [*see §§ 474C.93 -474C.95*].

- Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Administrative Mandate in superior court [*see § 474C.96*], and appellate court [*see § 474C.97*].

- Order for preparing and filing administrative record [*see § 474C.98*].

- Orders concerning stay of administrative decision pending review [*see §§ 474C.99, 474C.100*].

- Demurrer to Petition for Administrative Mandate [*see § 474C.101*], notice of hearing on demurrer [

see § 474C.102], answer to petition [*see § 474C.103*], and replication to answer [*see § 474C.104*].

- Judgment granting or denying relief on Petition for Administrative Mandate [*see §§ 474C.105 -474C.107*].

- Peremptory Writ of Administrative Mandate [*see § 474C.108*].

- Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate [*see § 474C.109*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.02

§ 474C.02 Cross References

[1] Related Coverage of Judicial Review

For related discussion concerning judicial review by California courts of agency adjudications, see:

- Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .
- Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For other related discussion and forms relating to judicial review generally, see:

- Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overiew,* through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* (discussion and forms relating to civil appeals).
- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of orders by extraordinary writ of mandate or prohibition).
- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of* (discussion and forms relating to immediate judicial review of civil proceedings by extraordinary writ of review).

For discussion and a form relating to expedited judicial review of public agency's decisions relating to the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit involving expressive conduct protected by *U.S. Const., amend. I*, see Ch. 59, *Assemblies, Meetings, and Demonstrations* .

For memoranda of points of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for writs of mandate generally, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Agency Adjudication

For detailed discussion and forms relating to agency adjudications that are the subject of the judicial review discussed in this chapter, see:

- Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* .
- Ch. 473A, *Commencing Agency Adjudication* .
- Ch. 473B, *Discovery in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications* .
- Ch. 473E, *Public Administrative Law Judges* .
- Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .
- Ch. 473G, *Agency Adjudication Decisions.*
- Ch. 473H, *Alternative Adminstrative Adjudication Procedures* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to licensing agencies, including licensing adjudications, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

[3] Public Administrative Law Generally

For related discussion of California public administrative law generally, including discussion of public agency functions and powers (including adjudicative or quasi-judicial powers), and organization generally, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* (for general discussion of judicial power, *see § 470.12[5]*). For detailed discussion of the general procedures imposed in agency proceedings by constitutional due process and related statutory requirements, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to the law governing access to and conduct of meetings by California public agencies, see Ch. 470B, *Public Agency Meetings* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating to the law governing disclosure of public records under the California Public Records Act [*Cal. Gov. Code §§ 6250 et seq.*], see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to agency investigations and inspections, see:

- Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .
- Ch. 471A, *Inspections by Public Agencies* .

For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to the legislative or rulemaking functions of California public agencies, including judicial review of these functions, see:

- Ch. 472, *Public Agency Rules* .
- Ch. 472A, *Agency Rulemaking Procedures* .
- Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* .

For additional cross references to coverage of particular public agencies, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.02[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechExpressive Conduct

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART I. SCOPE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.03-474C.09

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.10

§ 474C.10 Governing Law

[1] Petitioner's Choice of Mandate Procedures

Two statutory procedures are used to initiate mandate proceedings: (1) the alternative writ procedure; and (2) the noticed application procedure. The petitioner may choose to follow either procedure. In the alternative writ procedure, the proceedings are initiated by the filing of a petition and the issuance of an alternative writ commanding the party to whom it is directed (the respondent) to either perform a specified act or to show cause before the court at a specified time and place why he or she has not done so [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*; *see [2*], *below; see also § 474C.15[1]*]. In the noticed application procedure, the proceedings are initiated by filing a petition for a peremptory writ. No alternative writ is issued, but the petitioner makes a noticed motion for issuance of a peremptory writ [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1088.5*; *see [3], below*]. A peremptory writ is one that commands the performance of a specified act and does not give the respondent the option to show cause why he or she has not done so [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*].

[2] Alternative Writ Procedure

The alternative writ procedure is the most commonly used method for initiating mandate proceedings. Under this procedure, the attorney for the petitioner prepares the petition, the alternative writ, and an order for issuance of the alternative writ. Unless the court makes an ex parte order that the writ be issued without service, a copy of the petition must be served on the respondent and proof of service must be filed with the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (for good cause, court may grant writ ex parte); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1088* (when application is made without notice to adverse party, court may issue alternative writ only)].

The alternative writ is deposited with the clerk at the time the petition is filed. Typically, the alternative writ remains deposited but not filed for five days after the petition and proof of service of the petition are filed. Within those five days, the respondent may serve on the petitioner, and file with the court, points and authorities in opposition to the granting of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. After the five days have expired, the court examines the papers on file and either grants or denies the petition for the alternative writ [*see City of Culver City v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972)29 Cal. App. 3d 404, 412, 105 Cal. Rptr. 602* (failure to wait five days deprives court of jurisdiction to issue alternative writ)].

Except when otherwise ordered by the court, the alternative writ must be served in the same manner as a summons in a civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons in civil actions)]. The alternative writ may be made returnable (*i.e.*, it may specify that a hearing on the writ will be held) at any time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1108*]. After the hearing has been held, the court will make an order either granting or denying the alternative writ. For further discussion of the alternative writ procedure, see *§§ 474C.13 -474C.16*. For forms of alternative writs, see *§§ 474C.93 -474C.95*.

[3] Noticed Application Procedure

Under the noticed application procedure, the petitioner seeks a peremptory writ without first seeking an alternative writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5* (procedure when no alternative writ sought)]. Although this procedure is used less frequently than the alternative writ procedure, it is preferred by some trial courts [*see* San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 8.1]. Under the noticed application procedure, the petitioner files a petition with the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. At the time the petition is filed (or at any time thereafter), the petitioner gives notice of a motion for a peremptory writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003* (an application for an order is a motion), *1088* (application for peremptory writ on "due notice"), *1094* (noticed motion for judgment on peremptory writ); for noticed motion procedure in civil cases, *see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*]. For further discussion of the noticed application procedure, see *§ 474C.17*. For a form of notice of motion for issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate, see *§ 474C.96*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.11

§ 474C.11 Availability of Administrative Mandate

[1] Finality of Administrative Decision

Decisions or orders of administrative agencies must be final before they can be reviewed in administrative mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Peter R. Gadd, Inc. v. Workman (1927) 200 Cal. 384, 388-389, 253 P. 700* ; *Governing Board v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 324, 329, 217 Cal. Rptr. 457]* . Finality is generally determined by reference to the statute or regulation governing judicial review of the agency decision. When no statute directly applies, however, finality must be determined under applicable case law. For a general consideration of the requirement of finality, with rules for determining when an administrative decision is final for purposes of seeking judicial review, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[2] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Closely related to the requirement of finality is the requirement that the petitioner exhaust his or her administrative remedies before seeking judicial relief [*see* *Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 384, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73* ; *Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Bd. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 794, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009]* . Exhaustion of administrative remedies is required except when administrative remedies are unavailable or inadequate [*Tiernan v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 211, 217, 188 Cal. Rptr. 115, 655 P.2d 317* ; *see* *Roth v. City of Los Angeles (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 679, 686-687, 126 Cal. Rptr. 163* (failure to attend hearing constituted failure to exhaust administrative remedies)], or when pursuit of those remedies would be futile [*Huntington Beach Police Officers' Assn. v. City of Huntington Beach (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 492, 498-499, 129 Cal. Rptr. 893* (exhaustion is not required when agency has made it clear that its ruling would be adverse to petitioner)]. For a general consideration of the requirement that administrative remedies be exhausted before judicial review is sought, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* . For a detailed discussion of the exhaustion requirement, and exceptions to it, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[3] Time Limitations

Judicial review of an administrative decision must be sought within the applicable limitations period [*Barlow v. City Council of Inglewood (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 688, 697, 197 P.2d 721* ; *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207]* . Statutes governing review of specific types of administrative actions set forth time periods within which mandate proceedings must be brought. For example, when the action relates to a claim of entitlement to compensation under a statute imposing monetary liability on an administrative entity, the three-year period prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* governs the proceeding [*Raymond v. Christian (1937) 24 Cal. App. 2d 92, 113-116, 74 P.2d 536* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* (action on a liability created by statute, other than a penalty or forfeiture)]. If no other statute applies, the four-year period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* governs an action to review an administrative action or decision [*Hittle v. Santa Barbara County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 374, 386, 216 Cal. Rptr. 733, 703 P.2d 73* ; *Valvo v. University of Southern California (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 887, 894, 136 Cal. Rptr. 865* ; *Allen v. Humboldt County Board of Supervisors (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 877, 884-885, 34 Cal. Rptr. 232* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 343* (action for "relief not hereinbefore provided")].

Mandate proceedings are generally barred if not commenced within the applicable limitations period [*Barlow v. City Council of Inglewood (1948)32 Cal. 2d 688, 697, 197 P.2d 721* ; *Sinetos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1172, 1175, 207 Cal. Rptr. 207* ; *Kupka v. Board of Administration (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 791, 794, 176 Cal. Rptr. 214]* . For a general consideration of the limitations periods for administrative mandate, together with applicable periods for specific actions and agencies, see Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[4] Res Judicata

When a superior court has ruled adversely on the merits of a petition for mandate, the rule of res judicata bars a subsequent filing for the same writ in either the superior court or an appellate court [*Ellenberger v. City of Oakland (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 6, 7, 288 P.2d 138* ; *Cohn v. Isensee (1920) 45 Cal. App. 509, 510-511, 188 P. 278]* . For example, when a petitioner seeking to set aside an agency decision later voluntarily dismissed the administrative mandamus petition before trial, the dismissal was held to have the legal effect of making the agency decision final for purposes of issue preclusion and precluding a lawsuit for damages based on the agency decision [*Mola Development Corp. v. City of Seal Beach (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 405, 407, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* .

The defense of res judicata is waived, however, unless raised by the party relying on it [*Vinot Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Pasadena (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 246, 251 n.1, 100 Cal. Rptr. 217]* . Thus, a second application may be considered on the merits if the respondent fails to assert a judgment in a prior proceeding [*Vinot Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Pasadena (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 246, 251 n.1, 100 Cal. Rptr. 217]* .

Additionally, when the superior court has adversely disposed of a petition on some grounds other than the merits, the rule of res judicata does not preclude a second proceeding either in an appellate court or in another superior court [*Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982]* .

In the interests of the orderly administration of justice, the court in which a second petition is filed may refuse to consider repetitive applications for mandate in the absence of unusual or changed circumstances [*Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770-771, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982* ; *People v. Municipal Court (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 362, 365, 92 Cal. Rptr. 248* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* (writ of mandate available when no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy exists)].

For forms of a petition for writ of mandate in superior court to review administrative decisions, see *§§ 474C.90, 474C.91*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityFinal Order RequirementCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.12

§ 474C.12 Jurisdiction and Venue

[1] Concurrent Jurisdiction of Superior Courts and Appellate Courts

The Supreme Court of California, the California Court of Appeal, and the superior courts all have original jurisdiction in mandate proceedings [Cal. *Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*]. Most petitions for writs of mandate are filed in the superior court, however, because the superior courts are in a better position to determine disputed questions of fact than the appellate courts [*Roma Macaroni Factory v. Giambastiani (1933) 219 Cal. 435, 436-437, 27 P.2d 371* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Nesvig (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 600, 602, 41 Cal. Rptr. 916]* , and the appellate courts, as a matter of policy, decline to exercise their original jurisdiction except in extraordinary cases [*Adams v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 146, 150 n.7, 113 Cal. Rptr. 145, 520 P.2d 961]* .

[2] Exercise or Nonexercise of Original Jurisdiction by Appellate Courts

Although the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court possess original jurisdiction in mandate proceedings [*see [1], above*], they will grant mandate relief only when the issues presented are of great importance and must be resolved promptly [*Adams v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 146, 150 n.7, 113 Cal. Rptr. 145, 520 P.2d 961* ; *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 674-675, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hickman (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 841, 845, 59 Cal. Rptr. 609, 428 P.2d 593]* . Appellate courts typically refuse to entertain mandate proceedings if the proceedings could just as well have been instituted in the superior court [*Cohen v. Superior Court (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270, 72 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hastings (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 419, 421, 282 P.2d 100]* . Recognizing that original proceedings in appellate courts are the exception rather than the rule, the California Rules of Court require that if a petition for mandate (or certiorari or prohibition) might lawfully have been made to a lower court in the first instance, the petition must set forth the circumstances that, in the opinion of the petitioner, render it proper that the writ should originally issue from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*].

Circumstances in which appellate courts have chosen to exercise their original jurisdiction include the following:

- Cases involving the qualification of ballot initiatives [*Farley v. Healey (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 325, 326-327, 62 Cal. Rptr. 26, 431 P.2d 650* ; *Perry v. Jordan (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 87, 90-91, 207 P.2d 47]* .

- The legality of property assessment procedures [*State Board of Equalization v. Watson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 307, 310-311, 66 Cal. Rptr. 377, 437 P.2d 761* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hickman (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 841, 845, 59 Cal. Rptr. 609, 428 P.2d 593]* .

- The constitutionality of statutes with widespread and immediate impact on the public [*San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Johnson (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 937, 944-945, 92 Cal. Rptr. 309, 479 P.2d 669* (anti-busing statute); *Westbrook v. Mihaly (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 765, 773, 87 Cal. Rptr. 839, 471 P.2d 487* (statute requiring two-thirds vote to approve bond issues)].

The appellate courts will not exercise original mandate jurisdiction if another mandate proceeding is pending in the superior court [*People v. County of Tulare (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 317, 320, 289 P.2d 11* ; *W.R. Grace & Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 720, 727, 151 P.2d 215* ; *Irvine v. Gibson (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 14, 16, 118 P.2d 812]* , although the proceedings in the lower court must be between the same parties and on the same cause of action to bar similar proceedings in the higher court [*Perry v. Jordan (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 87, 90, 207 P.2d 47]* .

If the appellate court declines to exercise mandate jurisdiction, it ordinarily will deny the petition without prejudice to the filing of a subsequent petition in a lower court [*Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 247, 268, 104 Cal. Rptr. 761, 502 P.2d 1049* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hastings (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 419, 421, 282 P.2d 100]* . Denial of a writ of mandate without opinion is not res judicata on the legal issues presented by the application unless the sole possible ground of denial was that the court acted on the merits, or unless it affirmatively appears that the denial was intended to be on the merits [*Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 247, 268, 104 Cal. Rptr. 761, 502 P.2d 1049* ; *Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982]* . If the appellate court issues an alternative writ, however, the issuance constitutes a determination that the case is a proper one for exercise of its jurisdiction [*Westbrook v. Mihaly (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 765, 773, 87 Cal. Rptr. 839, 471 P.2d 487* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hickman (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 841, 845, 59 Cal. Rptr. 609, 428 P.2d 593]* .

However, due process of law does not provide litigants a second opportunity for judicial review in the superior court when the California Supreme court has summarily denied a petition for writ of mandate to challenge a decision of the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission [*Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group v. State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1441, 1449-1450, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392]* .

For a form of a petition for writ of mandate to file in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court, see *§ 474C.92*.

[3] Venue

Unless a more specific venue statute applies, venue in mandamus proceedings against state agencies and public entities is governed by the same venue statutes as other civil actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (venue statutes in code of civil procedure apply to mandamus proceedings); *Regents of the University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534-535, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P. 2d 457* ; *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Control Appeals Board (1961) 197 Cal. App.2d 759, 765, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* . These venue statutes include *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(a)* (actions to recover statutory penalties or forfeitures), *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* (actions against public officers), and *Code Civ. Proc. § 401* (when proper venue for actions against state agencies is located in Sacramento county, venue is proper in any county in which state attorney general has an office). More specific venue statutes include venue for actions against the board of nursing examiners [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2714* (venue is proper in counties in which Board has offices including Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles)], and venue for actions against the board of vocational nurse and

psychiatric technicians examiners [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2853* (venue is proper in counties in which Board has offices including Sacramento, San Francisco, and Los Angeles)].

The county in which the "cause of action arose" is the proper county for the trial of an administrative mandate action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*; *Duval v. Contractors State License Board (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 532, 535,271 P.2d 194* ; *Sutter Union High School District v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797-798, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182* (venue for a teacher's challenge to dismissal from employment was the county in which the employing school district was located)]. The proper venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* (county in which cause of action arose) for a lawsuit challenging the alleged improper expenditure of public tax funds to remove a public university teacher was the county in which the expenditures occurred not the county in which the university had its headquarters [Regents of the University of California v. Superior court *(1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 538-539, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P. 2d 457]* . The proper venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* (county in which cause of action arose) for a lawsuit challenging the validity of an environmental impact report prepared by a regional transit agency for construction of a toll road was the county in which the toll road would be constructed notwithstanding that the transit agency was located in an adjacent county and that the lawsuit sought to enforce public rights [*California State Parks Foundation v. Superior Court (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 826, 832-833, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715]* . The proper venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* (county in which cause of action arose) for a lawsuit challenging proceedings before the New Motor Vehicle Board to revoke a temporary permit to sell new motor vehicles was the county in which the car dealer's business was located [*Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 501-503*]. In license revocation cases, the courts have held that the cause of action "arises" in the county in which the licensee carries on his or her business or profession and in which he or she will be hurt by enforcement of the order or revocation [*Duval v. Contractors State License Board (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 532, 533-536, 271 P.2d 194* (proper venue for mandate action to set aside revocation of contractor's license is county in which contractor's business was situated); *Cecil v. Superior Court (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 793, 799, 140 P.2d 125* (proper venue for mandate proceeding to set aside revocation of milk distributor's license is county in which milk distributor carried on business)]. In cases involving the dismissal of public employees, the proper county for trial is the county in which the dismissal takes place; in other words, the county in which the employee was employed immediately before the dismissal [*Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 931-933, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925]* .

There is no indication in the cases that venue also attaches to the county in which acts forming the basis for the administrative proceedings (such as the acts constituting grounds for revocation of a license) are performed [*Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 932, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925]* . In license revocation cases, the courts are solely concerned with the question of the licensee's business address or (if there is more than one address) with the headquarters or center of the licensee's operations [*Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 932, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925]* . Similarly, in cases of dismissal from public employment, the county in which the dismissal takes place determines the venue of a subsequent mandate action, even if part of the employee's duties were performed in other counties [*Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 931-933, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.13

§ 474C.13 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court

[1] General Pleading Rules

Except as otherwise provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1063 et seq.*, mandate proceedings are subject to the same rules of pleading that apply in other civil actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . Accordingly, a petition for a writ of mandate must allege specific facts showing entitlement to relief [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . If it does not allege such facts, the petition is subject to general demurrer or summary denial [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* .

All papers filed in mandate proceedings in the superior court must comply with the rules of court for the superior court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.3* ("papers" includes all documents, excepted exhibits or copies of documents, which are offered for filing in any case in the superior courts)]. Under these rules, the following must be set forth beneath the number of the case:

- The nature of the paper [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*].
- The character of the action or proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*].
- The date, time, and location, if ascertainable, of any scheduled hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)(1)*].
- The nature or title of any attached document other than an exhibit [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)(2)*].
- The trial date, if set [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)(4)*].

For forms of a petition for writ of mandate that may be filed in the superior court, see *§§ 474C.90 -474C.91* and

474C.93 -474C.94.

[2] Parties

The parties to a mandate proceeding are typically referred to as the "petitioner," the "respondent," and the "real party in interest." The "petitioner" is the person who seeks the issuance of the writ. To petition for a writ of mandate, a person must be "beneficially interested" in the outcome of the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The "respondent" is the administrative agency that made the challenged order or decision and that has authority to set it aside. The agency itself, and not any officer or employee of the agency, should be named as the respondent, even when officers of the agency are required by law to be served [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (service on presiding officer, secretary, or majority of members); *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* (improper to name State of California and employees of California Coastal Zone Conservation Commission as respondents, since only Commission had power to set aside decision)]. Similarly, the particular agency that rendered the decision, and not a department of which the agency is a part, should be named as the respondent [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* . The petitioner's failure to name the California Coastal Commission as a party to a mandate action brought against a county board of supervisors was a failure to join an indispensable party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389*. This is because the Commission held a hearing and issued a decision granting the building permit that was challenged in the mandate action for failure to prepare an environmental impact report under CEQA [*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*] legislation [*Kaczorowski v. Mendocino County Board of Supervisors (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 564, 566-567, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14]* . A writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* (ordinary mandate) must be brought against the governmental body that took the action challenged in the mandate proceeding [*Sacramento County Alliance of Law Enforcement v. County of Sacramento (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1012, 1020-1021, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 202* (denial of petition for writ of mandate affirmed on appeal because petitioners erroneously named county as respondent, and they were required to name county civil service commission as proper party respondent)].

Members of the public have standing under the public trust doctrine to challenge harm to the public trust related to wildlife including raptors and other birds allegedly harmed by wind turbines [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1364-1366, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588*]. However, members of the public seeking to challenge harm to the public trust must file a lawsuit against the responsible public agencies, the County of Alameda, and the California Department of Fish and Game, which are charged with enforcing the public trust. They may not file a lawsuit against the operators of the wind turbines that have allegedly caused the harm [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1366-1368, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588*]. Failure to join the County of Alameda under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* is grounds for dismissing the action. The county is a necessary party because it issued the wind turbine permits being challenged. Because the limitations period for challenging the issuance of the permits has expired, the county cannot be joined to the lawsuit and the county is considered to be an indispensable party [*Center for Biological Diversity v. FPL Group, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1349, 1371-1373, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588*].

The California Court of Appeal held that the State Water Resources Control Board was not a proper defendant in a mandate proceeding brought by the city to challenge the adoption of a municipal storm sewer permit. The permit was adopted by the Regional Board, also a party to the lawsuit, and the state board's dismissal of an administrative appeal by the city meant that the regional board's decision adopting the permit with specified conditions was final for purposes of judicial review [*City of Rancho Cucamonga v. Regional Water Quality Control Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1377, 1383-1384, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 450]* . In another case, a county Department of Environmental Health was not a necessary party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* to an administrative mandamus proceeding to challenge an agreement for a municipal water district to provide treated wastewater to a trucking company for delivery to a landfill [*Riverwatch v. Olivenhain Municipal Water District (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1186, 1215-1215, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 625]* .

A "real party in interest" is any person (other than a petitioner or a respondent) whose interests would be directly

affected by the outcome of the proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*; *see Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501-502, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190* (developer of real estate project was real party in interest when environmental group petitioned for writ of mandate to set aside permit for project)]. When the petition seeks relief that, if granted, would injure or affect the interest of a third person, the third person is an indispensable party to the proceedings and should be named as a real party in interest [*Bank of California v. Superior Court (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 516, 522, 106 P.2d 879* ; *Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 389(a)* (compulsory joinder of parties)]. A petition that fails to name the real party in interest may be dismissed [*Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501-502, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190]* , and a judgment rendered without proper joinder of a real party in interest may be vacated or set aside [*Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc. v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 700, 703-704, 238 Cal. Rptr. 422* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 663(1)* (judgment or decree may be set aside when incorrect or erroneous legal basis)]. The failure to name a real party in interest cannot be cured by amending the petition to name the party after the statute of limitations has expired [*Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501-502, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190]* .

The petition should not only name the real party in interest but should also set forth his or her capacity--that is, it should identify him or her as the real party in interest [*Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc. v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 700, 703-704, 238 Cal. Rptr. 422]* . A real party in interest who has not been named in the petition may intervene in the proceedings at his or her own option [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)*; *Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 881, 150 Cal. Rptr. 606* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (unless otherwise provided, *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings)]. For discussion of intervention, see *§ 474C.20*.

The California Court of Appeal held that the Office of Administrative Hearings was neither a necessary nor an indispensable party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)* in a writ of administrative mandate proceeding brought by a minor (acting through a guardian ad litem) to challenge the decision of an administrative law judge (ALJ) provided by the Department of General Services Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) [*Hayes v. State Dep't of Developmental Services (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1523, 1529, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 363]* . The superior court had dismissed the petition for failure to join OAH as a party before the 90-day statute of limitations had expired. The minor sought to challenge the decision of the ALJ affirming the termination of funding for the educational part of the minor's special education services. The Court of Appeal reasoned that the OAH was a neutral judicial tribunal, that OAH was the representative of the department of developmental services, and that the only interest OAH would have in the court proceedings was in the upholding of the ALJ decision, and that interest could be more strongly presented by the funding agency, Alta. Finally OAH could not have collaterally attacked a court decision overturning an ALJ decision because as the department's representative, it would have been bound by a judgment against the department [*Hayes v. State Dept. of Developmental Services (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1523, 1531-1534, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 363]* .

The Fourth District, Division 1, California Court of Appeal held that a hearing officer who heard an administrative appeal that affirmed a denial of a rent increase was not an indispensable party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* in an administrative mandate proceeding brought by a mobile home park owner against a city and a city manufactured homes fair practices commission. The court reasoned that the hearing officer was an agent of the city and commission, the city and commission would defend the hearing officer's decision on judicial review, the commission could set aside the hearing officer's decision and require that a new hearing be held, and the ordinance does not require the hearing officer to be named as a respondent in the administrative mandate proceeding [*TG Oceanside v. City of Oceanside (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1368-1370, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 320*].

[3] Essential Allegations

Every petition for a writ of mandate in administrative mandate proceedings must contain allegations showing the petitioner's right to the relief requested:

1. The petition must allege facts showing the petitioner's beneficial interest in the subject matter of the action; in other words, that the petitioner has a right to the relief sought [*Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351-352, 254 P.2d 6]* . This requirement is generally met by an allegation of the petitioner's status as a party to the administrative proceedings. If the petitioner is not a natural person, the petition should also establish the petitioner's capacity to bring suit as a legal entity [*Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6]* .

2. The petition must allege facts showing the identity of the respondent agency. Counsel should note that the agency, and the members of a multi-member agency, are the proper parties in administrative mandate proceedings, rather than the state or the agency's employees [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* .

3. The petition must allege facts showing that the case is a proper one for issuance of a writ under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. This showing may be established by alleging the following:

(a) That the agency that rendered the decision had discretion to determine the relevant facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

(b) That a hearing is required by law to be held for the determination of those facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

(c) That evidence is required to be taken at the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

(d) That the agency rendered a final decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

(e) That the decision is invalid. Invalidity of the agency's decision may be shown by any of the following allegations:
(i) That the agency acted without or in excess of its jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

(ii) That the petitioner did not receive a fair trial before the agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

(iii) That the agency abused its discretion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. Abuse of discretion, in turn, may be shown by setting forth facts tending to show any of the following:
(A) That the agency failed to proceed in the manner required by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

(B) That the agency's decision is not supported by the agency's findings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

(C) That the findings are not supported by the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. When the petitioner asserts that the agency's findings are not supported by the evidence, the petition must either allege the substance of the evidence or be accompanied by a transcript of the evidence, attached as an exhibit and incorporated by reference [*Faulkner v. Cal. Toll Bridge Authority (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 330-331, 253 P.2d 659]* .

4. The petition must allege that the petitioner does not have plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

For a form of a writ of mandate for use in an administrative proceeding and further discussion of the allegations, see *§ 474C.90*. For an alternative form of the petition, see *§ 474C.91*.

[4] Other Allegations of Error

The petition may also contain certain other allegations of administrative error. For example, it may allege that the agency improperly excluded evidence favorable to the petitioner, to his or her prejudice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* (court may remand case to agency when agency improperly excluded evidence)], or that the agency received incompetent evidence over the petitioner's timely and sufficient objection [*Borror v. Department of Investment (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 545, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . The petition may also allege that the agency based its decision on evidence not received at the hearing [*English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 159, 217 P.2d 22]* , or that it incorrectly interpreted applicable law [*Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California E. Com. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 325-326, 109 P.2d 935]* .

When appropriate, the petition may allege the existence of evidence that could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been produced at the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*]. Evidence of this nature may be considered in cases in which the court is authorized to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence. When the substantial evidence test applies, however, the court must remand the case to the agency for reconsideration in light of the new evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*; for discussion of independent judgment and the substantial evidence test, *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions*].

For forms and further discussion of these allegations, see *§§ 474C.90, 474C.91*.

[5] Allegations Showing Need for Temporary Stay

If the petitioner wants the court to stay the operation of the agency's decision, the petition should include allegations showing the need for a stay [*see § 474C.90*]. Although the court has discretion to grant or deny a stay, it may not grant a stay if it is satisfied that it would be against the public interest to do so [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g), (h)(1)*]. For a general consideration of stays of administrative decisions, see *§ 474C.18*.

[6] Attorney's Fees

Although attorney's fees are not routinely recoverable in mandate proceedings [*see Wilkerson v. City of Placentia (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 435, 444, 173 Cal. Rptr. 294* (attorney's fees not recoverable when writ of mandate sought recovery of lost wages and benefits but did not seek review of administrative decision)], some statutory provisions allow their recovery in specified circumstances. *Gov. Code § 800* allows the recovery of fees when the administrative decision resulted from arbitrary or capricious action or conduct and when the complainant is personally obligated to pay the attorney's fees. For example, the dismissal of a deputy sheriff who had six and one-half years of excellent and unblemished service for a minor incident resulting from the deputy's refusal to fix a ticket was an arbitrary act by a public entity [*Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 496, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1* (affirming finding of arbitrary act, but remanding on issue of whether complainant was personally obligated to pay fees); *see Abshear v. Teachers' Retirement Board (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1629, 1638-1639, 282 Cal. Rptr. 833* (teacher challenged Board's denial of disability allowance and recovered attorney's fees because Board's denial was arbitrary and capricious); *A.B.C. Federation of Teachers v. A.B.C. Unified Sch. Dist. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 332, 342-343, 142 Cal. Rptr. 111* (attorney's fees recoverable in mandate proceedings to review decision of school district); *Redondo Beach Police Officers Assn. v. City of Redondo Beach (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 595, 597, 137 Cal. Rptr. 384* (attorney's fees recoverable in mandate proceedings to compel city to recognize bargaining unit); *Olson v. Hickman (1972) 25 Cal.*

App. 3d 920, 922-924, 102 Cal. Rptr. 248 (attorney's fees recoverable in mandate proceedings to review decision of local public agency)]. On the other hand, a denial of an application for disability retirement based on an erroneous interpretation of the law is not an arbitrary or capricious act, and the plaintiff-employee, though entitled to disability, was not entitled to attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* [*Burdick v. Board of Retirement (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1248, 1256, 246 Cal. Rptr. 555]* .

An agency's action is arbitrary and capricious if it encompasses conduct that is not supported by a fair or substantial reason, shows a stubborn insistence on following unauthorized conduct, or amounts to a bad faith legal dispute [*Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 79, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15* ; *Abshear v. Teachers' Retirement Board (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1629, 1638, 282 Cal. Rptr. 833* (Board's decision denying disability allowance to teacher was not supported by a fair and substantial reason and therefore was arbitrary and capricious); *Santos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 537, 551-552, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10* (DMV's suspension of driver's license without sufficient proof of facts justifying suspension coupled with DMV pursuit of case against driver with evidence showing the weakness of DMV proof without DMV's supplying easily obtainable missing information); *but see American President Lines, Ltd. v. Zolin (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 910, 933-934, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (erroneous decision by agency head was not in bad faith and therefore attorneys fees could not be awarded against agency under arbitrary and capricious standard)]. In such a case, the petitioner may collect reasonable attorney's fees computed at $100 per hour up to a total of $7,500 in addition to any other relief granted or costs awarded, but only if the petitioner is personally obligated to pay the fees [*Gov. Code § 800*; *Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 496-497, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *A.B.C. Federation of Teachers v. A.B.C. Unified Sch. Dist. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 332, 342-343, 142 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

Gov. Code § 800 applies when the administrative action is taken by any public entity under the Government Code or any other provision of state law [*Gov. Code § 800*; *Olson v. Hickman (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 920, 923, 102 Cal. Rptr. 248]* . It does not apply to decisions of the State Board of Control [*Gov. Code § 800*]. Fees are recoverable under *Gov. Code § 800* only when there is an appeal of a decision based upon an administrative hearing [*Kistler v. Redwoods Community College Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1326, 1336-1337, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 417]* .

Similarly, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5* grants the court discretion to award certain small businesses and licensees "reasonable litigation expenses" in any civil action between the businesses or licensees and state regulatory agencies when the court determines that the agency's action was undertaken without any substantial justification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1028.5(c)* ("small business" defined), *1028.5(d)* ("licensee" defined)]. For purposes of this rule, "reasonable litigation expenses" means any expenses not in excess of $7,500 that the judge finds were reasonably incurred in opposing the agency action, including court costs, expenses incurred in administrative proceedings, attorney's fees, and witness fees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(b)*].

If attorney's fees or litigation expenses are recoverable under the facts of the case, the petition should include allegations showing that the petitioner is entitled to those fees or expenses. Failure to do so may result in waiver [*see Rutherford v. Board of Trustees (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 775, 782, 112 Cal. Rptr. 560* (no error in denying fees under *Gov. Code § 800* when petition did not allege that agency action was arbitrary or capricious or that petitioners were personally obligated to pay fees)].

For forms and further discussion of petitions for writ of mandate requesting attorney's fees and litigation costs, see *§§ 474C.90, 474C.91*.

[7] Prayer

The prayer should request all of the relief the petitioner seeks. This request will typically include an alternative writ and a peremptory writ. If a stay of the agency's decision is desired, the prayer should also request a temporary stay and an order to show cause why the stay should not be continued pending resolution of the judicial proceedings [*see § 474C.18*

for discu ssion of stay of agency decision]. If attorney's fees are recoverable [*see* [6], *above*], the prayer should also include a request for fees. For forms and further discussion of these prayers for relief, see *§§ 474C.90, 474C.91*.

[8] Verification

The petition must be verified unless the petitioner is a public entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5* (verification requirements); *see, e.g., Murrieta Valley Unified School Dist. v. County of Riverside (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1222-1223, 279 Cal. Rptr. 421* (public entity school district exempt from *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* verification requirement)]. The verification should state that the allegations of the petition are true and correct of the petitioner's own knowledge, since allegations on information and belief are hearsay and furnish no proof of the facts stated [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 203-205, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . If the petition is not verified or if the verification is defective, the court may permit the defect to be cured by amendment [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* . For forms and further discussion of verification, see *§§ 474C.90, 474C.91*.

[9] Points and Authorities

Although a memorandum of points and authorities must be filed and served with a petition for writ of mandate when the petition is filed in the California Court of Appeal or Supreme Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)*; *see § 474C.14[2]*], neither the Code of Civil Procedure nor the California Rules of Court require points and authorities when the petition is filed in the superior court.

Whether or not a memorandum of points and authorities is required, it is advisable to include one. Points and authorities will strengthen the petition by specifying the legal grounds on which the writ is sought and by anticipating legal defenses that may be asserted by the respondent or by the real party in interest. Counsel should also note that the superior court has discretion to summarily deny a petition for a writ of mandate, and that a memorandum of points and authorities may help to avert that outcome [*see Kingston v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 76 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . For model points and authorities in support of petitions in administrative mandate cases, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* , and Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[10] Service

The petition and the memorandum of points and authorities must be served on the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, by delivering a copy to each person by personal service or by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* apply to service of petition), *Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (rules relating to civil actions applicable to and constitute rules of practice for special proceedings); *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.10* (civil actions); *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10* (personal service), *415.30* (service of summons by mail), *1011* (service on attorney or party), *1013a* (proof of service by mail)]. Personal service is customary, however, and usually preferable to service by mail. First, personal service eliminates doubt as to whether the respondent and the real party in interest have in fact received notice. Second, personal service eliminates the need for waiting 20 days after mailing to determine if the respondent and the real party in interest will acknowledge receipt of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(d)* (if person to whom copy of summons and complaint are mailed does not acknowledge receipt within 20 days, he or she is liable for reasonable expenses incurred thereafter in serving or attempting to serve the party by another method)]. Third, service by mail will extend the prescribed period of notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* (prescribed period of notice and right or duty to do any act or make any response within any prescribed period is extended 5 days if place of address is within California, 10 days if outside California but within United States, and 20 days if outside United States); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e)* (time is extended by two court days when notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or other overnight delivery service)]. For extended discussion of service of summons and complaint, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

When the respondent is a board or commission, service must be made on the presiding officer or secretary, or on a majority of the members [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. In most cases, proof of service must be filed with the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. Thus, service must be completed *before* the petition is filed. Proof of service is not required, however, if the court grants the alternative writ ex parte [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (in its discretion and for good cause, court may grant application ex parte, without notice or service of petition)]. Counsel should ascertain local court rules and practices before seeking a writ ex parte [*see, e.g.*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.36-9.41 (ex parte procedure)]. Further, proof of service need not be filed with the petition if no alternative writ is sought, although proof of service must be lodged with the court before a hearing or any other action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*; for further discussion of the noticed application procedure, *see §§ 474C.10[3], 474C.17*].

[11] New Trial Motion

A motion for a new trial can be made in an administrative mandamus proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. This is because the new trial procedures [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 655-663.2* are made applicable by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1110*] to administrative mandamus proceedings. Further, a litigant can seek a readjudication of factual issues decided against the litigant. The litigant is required to file a motion for new trial in the trial court that adjudicated those factual issues. Failure to file a motion for a new trial precludes the court from readjudicating those factual issues. [*Pollak v. State Personnel Board (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1405-1406, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewArbitrary & Capricious ReviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesJoinderCompulsory JoinderCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProceduresRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.14

§ 474C.14 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

[1] Essential Allegations

The legal and factual basis for issuance of a writ of mandate in administrative mandate proceedings is the same whether the writ is issued by the superior court or a reviewing court. Thus, a petition for a writ of administrative mandate filed in the California Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court should contain the same allegations as a petition filed in the superior court [for discussion of essential allegations if petition is filed in superior court, *see §§ 474C.13[3], 474C.90[5]*]. However, the appellate courts will grant mandate relief only when the issues presented are of great public importance and must be resolved promptly [*see Adams v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 146, 150 n.7, 113 Cal. Rptr. 145, 520 P.2d 961* ; *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 674-675, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hickman (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 841, 845, 59 Cal. Rptr. 609, 428 P.2d 593]* , and will typically refuse to entertain mandate proceedings if the proceedings could just as well have been instituted in the superior court [*Cohen v. Superior Court (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270, 72 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *County of Sacramento v. Hastings (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 419, 421, 282 P.2d 100]* . Recognizing that original proceedings in appellate courts are the exception rather than the rule, the California Rules of Court require that, if a petition for mandate (or certiorari or prohibition) might lawfully have been made to a lower court in the first instance, the petition must set forth the circumstances that, in the opinion of the petitioner, render it proper that the writ should originally issue from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)(1)*; for rules governing the exercise or nonexercise of original jurisdiction by appellate courts, see *§ 474C.12[2]*]. Additionally, if any board, officer, or tribunal in the discharge of duties of a public character is named as respondent, the petition must disclose the name of the real party in interest, if any, or the party whose interest would be directly affected by the proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)(2)*; for rules relating to real parties in interest, *see § 474C.13[2]*]. For a form of a petition for a writ of mandate in the Court of Appeal or Supreme Court, see *§ 474C.92*.

[2] Points and Authorities

Although a memorandum of points and authorities is not always required to accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court [*see § 474C.13[9]*], a memorandum of points and authorities *must* be filed and served with a petition for writ of mandate when the petition is filed in the Court of Appeal or Supreme Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule*

8.490(b)(5); for model points and authorities in support of petitions in administrative mandate cases, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition*].

[3] Method of Reproduction

A petition for writ of mandate may be reproduced by any process that produces a clear, black image of letter quality [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(1)*]. The petition must conform, as far as practicable, to the rules for briefs [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40, 8.204*]. Typewritten original copies and carbon copies may not be filed without the permission of the chief justice or the presiding justice, and will ordinarily be permitted only when the petitioner is without counsel and proceeding in forma pauperis, and all other typewritten brief smust be filed as photocopies [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.40, 8.204(b)*].

[4] Case Number and Cover

A petition for a writ of mandate filed in the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal must have a cover. The cover, so far as is practicable, should be colored red [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*]. In addition to the usual matters set forth in court papers, the cover must contain all of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)*]:

- The title of the case.
- The name, address, and telephone number of counsel for the petitioner.
- The name of the trial judge.
- The number of the case in the trial court, if any.
- The California State Bar membership number of the attorney filing the petition and of every attorney who joins in the petition.

For a model cover for a petition to an appellate court for a writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* , Form 8. For a form of a petition for a writ of mandate in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court, see *§ 474C.92*.

[5] Copies

If the petition is filed in the Supreme Court, an original and thirteen copies must be filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(a)(1)*]. If the petition is filed in the Court of Appeal, an original and four copies must be filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(b)(1)*].

[6] Service

The petition and the memorandum of points and authorities must be served on the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, by delivering a copy to each person by personal service or by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.* applicable to service of petition), *Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (rules relating to civil actions applicable to and constitute rules of practice for special proceedings); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* (rules governing civil actions generally); *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10* (personal service), *415.30* (service of summons by mail), *1011* (service on attorney or party), *1013(a)* (extension of time when service is by mail), *(c), (e)* (time extended by two court days when notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or other overnight delivery service), *1013a* (proof of service by mail)]. Personal service is customary, however, and usually preferable to service by mail [*see § 474C.13[10]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal Delivery

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.15

§ 474C.15 Alternative Writ of Mandate

[1] Nature of Alternative Writ

An alternative writ of mandate is a court order commanding the party to whom it is directed (the respondent) to perform a specified act, or to show cause before the court at a specified time and place why he or she has not done so [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*; *see § 474C.10[2]*]. When directed to an administrative agency, an alternative writ of mandate typically orders the agency to set aside a disputed order or decision, or to show cause why the order or decision was proper and should be sustained. The court will issue an alternative writ when the petition sufficiently alleges a cause of action that, if proven, could lead to the issuance of a peremptory writ [*Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 149, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; for discussion of the peremptory writ, *see § 474C.17*]. An alternative writ is not a final judicial determination that the petitioner is entitled to relief, but rather a means for bringing the respondent into court [*McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 716, 187 P.2d 116]* . Its effect is to place the respondent on notice that the petitioner has made a sufficient showing to cast doubt on the validity of its decision [*Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 149, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . For a form of a petition for an alternative writ of mandate that may be filed in superior court, see *§ 474C.93*. For a form that includes an order with the alternative writ, see *§ 474C.94*.

The court may deny the alternative writ out of hand, even before notice has been given to the respondent or any opposition to the issuance of the writ has been registered [*Kingston v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 76 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . Failure to deny a writ out of hand, however, does not constitute a final determination that the petitioner is entitled to relief. At any time after the alternative writ is issued, the court may determine that the petition is insufficient and that the writ should be denied [*McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 716, 187 P.2d 116]* . Denial of the writ is improper, however, if the facts alleged in the petition would, if true, entitle the petitioner to the issuance of a peremptory writ [*Kingston v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 549, 553-554, 76 Cal. Rptr. 614]* .

[2] Writ Combined With Order Authorizing Issuance of Writ

In most counties, the alternative writ and the court's order authorizing issuance of the alternative writ appear in the same

document [for a form, *see § 474C.94*]. In some counties, however, a separate order for issuance of the alternative writ is required. Local rules and practice should be ascertained before preparing the writ. When a separate order is required, counsel should prepare the alternative writ as set forth below and also prepare the separate order set forth in *§ 474C.95*.

[3] Preparation and Presentation to Court

In the superior court, counsel for the petitioner customarily prepares the alternative writ. The writ should bear the same title, number, and names of the parties as the petition. Immediately below the number, it should specify the date, time, and location, if ascertainable, of any scheduled hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)(2)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.3* ("papers" includes all documents, except exhibits or copies of documents, that are offered for filing in any case in the superior courts); *see also § 474C.13[1]*]. When the writ is sought from an appellate court the writ is generally prepared by the court itself [for jurisdiction of appellate courts to issue writs of mandate, *see § 474C.12*; for petition for writ of mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court, *see § 474C.92*].

When the petition is filed in the superior court, the alternative writ should be presented to the court in chambers at the same time as the petition. Counsel should consult local rules and practice for the particular judge or department to which the writ should be presented. For forms of petitions that may be filed in superior court, see *§§ 474C.93, 474C.94*.

[4] Issuance of Writ

If satisfied that the facts stated in the petition are sufficient, the court is empowered to authorize issuance of the alternative writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (for good cause, court may grant application ex parte, without notice or service of petition)]; however, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* permits the respondent and the real party in interest to serve and file points and authorities in opposition to the granting of the writ within five days after service and filing of the petition. Therefore, at least when the petition has been served before it is filed, the court customarily waits five days before granting or denying the writ. Although one division of the Court of Appeal has held that failure to wait five days after the petition is filed deprives the court of discretion to grant the alternative writ [*City of Culver City v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 404, 412, 105 Cal. Rptr. 602]* , the California Supreme Court has not ruled on the issue. Whether a particular court will grant the petition ex parte depends largely on local rules and practice, which should be consulted before proceeding.

Although the alternative writ is a judicial order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 17(b)(6)* ("writ" is order issued in name of court or judicial officer); *Painter v. Berglund (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 63, 70, 87 P.2d 360]* , the clerk customarily issues it, on order of the court, under the clerk's signature and the court's seal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1108* provides that the writ may be made returnable (*i.e.*, a date may be set for a hearing on the writ) "at any time." In the usual case, however, the clerk will determine the return date.

[5] Notice

Unless the court, in its discretion and for good cause, grants the alternative writ ex parte [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see also [4], above*], proof of service of the petition must be filed with the petition [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. Although the Code of Civil Procedure does not require the court to issue an order granting leave to file the petition without accompanying proof of service when it authorizes issuance of the alternative ex parte, counsel should always determine whether local court rules impose any such requirement.

[6] Service

Unless the court orders otherwise, the alternative writ must be served in the same manner as a summons in a civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons in civil actions); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings)]. Although either personal service or service by mail is permissible [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10* (personal service),

415.30 (service by mail)], personal service is usually preferable [*see § 474C.13[10]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCourt Personnel

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.16

§ 474C.16 Separate Order for Issuance of Alternative Writ of Mandate

It is the local practice in some counties for the court order authorizing issuance of the alternative writ to be separate from the writ itself. Counsel should ascertain local rules and practice in this respect. If a separate order is required, the form set forth in *§ 474C.95* may be used, and the alternative writ set forth in *§ 474C.93* may be used as the alternative writ, with the appended court order set forth at the end of that form. Although this order is not required to be served on the respondent or the real party in interest, it is good practice to serve a courtesy copy with the petition and the alternative writ [for requirements service of petition and alternative writ, *see §§ 474C.13[10], 474C.14[6], 474C.15[6]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.17

§ 474C.17 Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] Noticed Application Procedure

Instead of seeking an alternative writ of mandate as a preliminary step to the issuance of a peremptory writ after notice, the petitioner may move the court for issuance of a peremptory writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003* (application for an order is a motion), *1088* (application for peremptory writ upon "due notice"), *1094* (noticed motion for judgment on peremptory writ); *see § 474.15* for legal requirements governing alternative writ of mandate, and §§ *474C.93*, *474C.94* for forms; *see also* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* for discussion of noticed motion procedure in civil cases generally]. When this procedure is followed, no alternative writ is requested or issued. Although the noticed application procedure is used less frequently than the alternative writ procedure, some courts prefer it [*see, e.g.,* San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 8.1]; however, the appellate courts apparently do not follow this procedure [*see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* , Comments to Form 13]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5* provides that proof of service of the petition need not be filed with the petition when the noticed application procedure is used in a trial court, the California Rules of Court require that proof of service of the petition must be filed in all cases when the writ is sought in a reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 8.490(b)*]. Thus, the rules are subject to the inference that the noticed application procedure is not to be used in appellate courts.

[2] Notice

The notice of motion may be filed at the same time as or any time after the petition is filed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088* provides that the petitioner must give at least 10 days' notice of the motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1089.5*, however, gives the respondent 30 days after the petition is filed (or 30 days after a copy of the administrative record is received, if not filed with the petition) to answer or otherwise respond to the petition. Thus, notice should be sufficient to allow the respondent the necessary 30 days. Immediately below the number, the notice of motion should set forth the date, time, and location, if ascertainable, of any scheduled hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1120(b)(2)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.3* ("papers" includes all documents, except exhibits or copies of documents, that are offered for filing in any case in the superior courts); *see also § 474C.13 [1]*]. Proof of service of the petition need not be filed with the petition, although it must be lodged with the court before any hearing or other action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[3] Points and Authorities

A party filing a notice of motion is required to file and serve a memorandum of points and authorities [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. The absence of the memorandum may be construed by the court as an admission that the motion is not meritorious, and be cause for its denial [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*].

[4] Service

Copies of the notice and petition must be served on the respondent and the real party in interest [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088* (notice of motion must be served on each person against whom writ is sought), *1107* (petition must be served on respondent and real party in interest); *see also Younger v. Jordan (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 757, 758-759, 269 P.2d 616* (real party in interest is indispensable party and must be served)]. When the noticed application procedure is used, service may be accomplished in the same manner as in an ordinary civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1107, 1109* (rules relating to civil actions applicable to and constitute rules of practice for special proceedings); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* (civil actions generally)]. The rules for service of summons in civil actions permit service to be by personal delivery or by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10* (personal service), *415.30* (service by mail)]. Personal service is customary, however, and is almost always preferable to service by mail [*see* discussion in *§ 474C.13[10]*].

[5] Issuance of Peremptory Writ Without Alternative Writ in Appellate Court

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*, the court may issue a peremptory writ without first issuing an alternative writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088* provides that, if the application is on "due notice," the peremptory writ may be issued "in the first instance"--that is, without the issuance of an alternative writ. It further states that "notice of the application, when given, must be at least 10 days" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*]. Pursuant to the authority of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*, the appellate courts have developed the practice of issuing peremptory writs without first issuing alternative writs [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 178, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . This procedure was once considered appropriate only when unusual circumstances required that the appellate court take immediate action [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 178, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . In recent years, the courts of appeal have increasingly resorted to issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance when it appears that (1) the petition and opposing papers on file adequately address the issues raised by the petition, (2) no factual dispute exists, and (3) the additional briefing following issuance of an alternative writ is unnecessary to the disposition of the petition [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 178, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* .

More recently, the California Supreme Court has limited the circumstances under which a peremptory writ can be issued under Section 1088, stressing that the accelerated *Palma* procedure should be the exception, not the routine [*Ng v. Superior Court (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 29, 35, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856, 840 P.2d 961* ; *Alexander v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 1218, 1222-1223, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397, 859 P.2d 96]* . The Court stated that generally, the procedure should be used only when the petitioner's right to relief is so obvious that no purpose could reasonably be served by plenary consideration of the issue, such as when the right to relief is conceded or when the record demonstrates a clear error under well-settled principles of law and undisputed facts. Another situation justifying the use of the *Palma* procedure arises when an unusual urgency exists that requires acceleration of the normal process. Otherwise, the normal writ procedure, including issuance of an alternative writ, should be followed [*Ng v. Superior Court (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 29, 35, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856, 840 P.2d 961* ; *Alexander v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 1218, 1223, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397, 859 P.2d 96]* .

The procedure of issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance differs sharply from the usual procedure of first issuing an alternative writ. When an alternative writ is first issued, the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, have an opportunity to make a return, to file points and authorities, and to appear at the hearing in opposition to the petition. This opportunity is not afforded when the court issues a peremptory writ without first issuing an alternative writ. Recognizing this key difference, the Supreme Court held that a court may properly issue a peremptory writ without first

issuing an alternative writ only when the respondent and/or real party in interest have notice that the petitioner is seeking or the court is considering the issuance of a peremptory writ under those circumstances [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 179-180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . Adequate notice is not provided by merely serving the petition on the respondent and the real party in interest, since it is rare that a court will issue a peremptory writ without first issuing an alternative writ, even when the petition requests that relief, and the mere possibility that the court may take such action does not provide notice that it is likely to do so [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 179-180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . Instead, the respondent and the real party in interest must be put on notice that a peremptory writ without an alternative writ is being sought or considered. The Court stated that the notice may be given either by the court or by the petitioner [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc.(1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . It further stated that an appellate court, absent exceptional circumstances, should not issue a peremptory writ in the first instance without having received, or solicited, opposition from the party or parties adversely affected [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* .

Following the mandate of *Palma*, if the petitioner seeks the issuance of a peremptory writ without an alternative writ, formal notice must be given to the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, that the court is considering such a procedure. A sample form of a *Palma* notice is set forth in *§ 474C.97*. Note that a *Palma* notice must be given only when the respondent and the real party in interest do not have notice that a peremptory writ may issue in the first instance. If the petitioner files a notice of motion for the issuance of a peremptory writ, the requirements of notice are adequately met and an additional *Palma* notice need not be given [*see § 474C.96* for a form of a notice of motion].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.18

§ 474C.18 Stay of Agency Decision

[1] Court Discretion to Issue Stay

The court in which a petition for a writ of mandate is filed may stay the operation of the administrative decision unless it is satisfied that a stay would be against the public interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*]. This decision is discretionary, and there is no due process right to a stay of enforcement of an agency order pending judicial review [*Medical Bd. of California v. Superior Court (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1462, 278 Cal. Rptr. 247]* . When issued, a stay will be effective pending the court's judgment, or until (1) a notice of appeal has been filed from the judgment or (2) the time for filing a notice of appeal has expired [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*]. In determining whether a stay would be against the public interest, the court must weigh the public interest in each case [*Sterling v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 176, 187, 214 Cal. Rptr. 71]* . An order denying a stay is not appealable [*Gibson v. Savings & Loan Commissioner (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 269, 271-272, 85 Cal. Rptr. 799]* . For forms of an order to stay the operation of an administrative decision, see *§§ 474C.99, 474C.100*.

[2] Stay of Decisions by Agencies Regulating Health-Related Professions

The court may stay certain administrative orders or decisions of specified agencies regulating health-related professions, and orders or decisions of other agencies under limited circumstances, only if it is satisfied (1) that the public interest will not suffer and (2) that the respondent is unlikely to ultimately prevail on the merits [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(h)(1)*]. To determine whether the respondent is unlikely to ultimately prevail, the court must make a preliminary assessment of the merits of the petition for the writ and conclude that the petitioner is likely to obtain relief [*Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Superior Court (1980) 114 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276, 170 Cal. Rptr. 468* ; *Medical Bd. of California v. Superior Court (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1461-1462, 278 Cal. Rptr. 247* (trial court abused its discretion in staying agency order because respondent could not show that he was likely to prevail on the merits)]. A court that fails to make this determination has no jurisdiction to issue a stay order [*Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Superior Court (1980) 114 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276, 170 Cal. Rptr. 468]* .

This rule applies to orders or decisions of licensed hospitals and state agencies when a statute requires a hearing to be held under the California Administrative Procedure Act (APA) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(h)(1)*; *see Gov. Code § 11340*

et seq. (APA)]. It applies to all decisions of agencies that issue licenses under the healing-arts provisions of the Business and Professions Code [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 500 et seq.* (healing arts)], the Osteopathic Initiative Act [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 3600 et seq.* (Osteopathic Initiative Act)], and the Chiropractic Initiative Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(h)(2)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 1000 et seq.* (Chiropractic Initiative Act)]. It applies to decisions of other state agencies only if the agency has adopted the proposed decision of the administrative law judge in its entirety or has adopted the proposed decision but reduced the proposed penalty pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11517(c)(2)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(h)(2)*]. For a discussion of statutory provisions governing stays of administrative mandate proceedings on appeal, see *§ 474C.51[3]*.

[3] Stay Bonds

The statute empowering the court to stay the operation of administrative decisions pending judgment in mandate proceedings does not require the petitioner to file a bond or undertaking as a condition of obtaining a stay order [*Venice Canals Resident Home Owners Assn. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 675, 679, 140 Cal. Rptr. 361* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)* (stay of administrative decision)]. When necessary to prevent abuses in the use of the stay, however, the court has inherent power to condition a stay on the posting of a bond [*Venice Canals Resident Home Owners Assn. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 675, 680, 140 Cal. Rptr. 361]* . Thus, the court may require a bond when the rights of third parties would be adversely affected by the stay [*Venice Canals Resident Home Owners Assn. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 675, 680, 140 Cal. Rptr. 361* (trial court properly required bond to protect persons who had received permits from California Coastal Commission and thereafter started construction in good faith)]. The Bond and Undertaking Law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*], which specifies formal and substantive requirements for bonds and undertakings in civil actions, is applicable in mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* applicable to and constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesStays of Proceedings & SupersedeasCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesHealthcare LawBusiness Administration & OrganizationLicensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.19

§ 474C.19 Return

[1] Nature of Return

The response to a petition for a writ of mandate is called a return [*Central Bank v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 592, 600, 146 Cal. Rptr. 503]* . The return may consist of a demurrer, a verified answer, or both [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*]. The general rules of pleading and practice applicable in civil actions apply to returns in mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* apply to and constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings); *Central Bank v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 592, 600, 146 Cal. Rptr. 503* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10 et seq., 431.10 et seq.* (governing demurrers and actions in civil actions, respectively)]. All parties (including respondents and real parties in interest) on whom the petition has been served have the right to make a return [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)* (when petition is filed in appellate court, respondent or real party in interest or both, jointly or separately, may make return); *Central Bank v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 592, 600, 146 Cal. Rptr. 503]* .

[2] Demurrer

A demurrer in a mandate proceeding, like a demurrer in a civil action, tests the legal sufficiency of the petition [*Larson v. City of Redondo Beach (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 332, 337, 103 Cal. Rptr. 592]* . It raises issues of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 589(a)*] that must be tried by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 591*]. When ruling on a demurrer, the court assumes the truth of all material facts that have been properly pleaded [*Rosenfield v. Malcolm (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 559, 563, 55 Cal. Rptr. 505, 421 P.2d 697* ; *Stanton v. Dumke (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 199, 201, 49 Cal. Rptr. 380, 411 P.2d 108]* . If the petition does not plead facts showing that the petitioner is entitled to the relief prayed, however, a demurrer on the ground that the petition fails to state a cause of action should be sustained [*Faulkner v. Cal. Toll Bridge Authority (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 330, 253 P.2d 659* ; *Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . The statutory grounds for demurrer appear in *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10*.

A memorandum of points and authorities should be filed with every demurrer. A "general demurrer" is a demurrer on the ground that the pleading to which the demurrer is directed (*e.g.*, a complaint or a petition) does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*]. A demurrer on any other ground [*Code Civ.*

Proc. § 430.10(a)-(d), (f)-(i)] is a "special" demurrer. The court may construe the absence of points and authorities as an admission that a special demurrer is not meritorious and as a waiver of all grounds of demurrer not supported in the memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100* (rules applicable to civil law and motion in superior and municipal courts), *3.1113(b)* (contents of memorandum of points and authorities)].

Under the Rules of Court, a demurrer must state on the first page immediately below the number of the case the name of the party filing the demurrer and the name of the party whose pleading is the subject of the demurrer [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320(c)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.3(2)* ("papers" includes all documents, except exhibits or copies of documents, that are offered for filing in any case in the superior courts)]. In the same place, it must set forth the date, the time, and the location, if ascertainable, of any scheduled hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)(2)*; *see § 474C.13[1]*]. The rules also require that a party filing a demurrer serve and file with the demurrer a notice of hearing specifying a hearing date in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005* (time for notice of motion unless extended because notice is served by mail), *1013(c), (e)* (time is extended by two court days when notice is served by facsimile transmission, express mail, or other overnight delivery service)]. For a form of notice of hearing on a demurrer, see *§ 474C.102*.

Although the respondent may file a demurrer without concurrently filing an answer, the better practice is to file an answer at the same time as the demurrer. If the return is by demurrer alone, the court is not required to permit an answer to be filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1089* (if return is by demurrer alone, court "may allow" answer to be filed)]. In original proceedings in the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal, if the return is by demurrer alone and the demurrer is not sustained, a peremptory writ of mandate may issue without leave to answer [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(e)*].

For a general consideration of demurrers in civil actions, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* . For a form of a demurrer to a petition for a writ of mandate, see *§ 474C.101*.

[3] Answer

The answer must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)*]. An unverified answer will be ineffective to deny the allegations of a verified petition and will permit the court to regard the allegations of the petition as true [*Central Bank v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 592, 600, 146 Cal. Rptr. 503]* . Like answers to complaints in civil actions, the answer to a verified petition for a writ of mandate should deny all material allegations of the petition that the answering party does not wish to admit [*see Baumgardner v. City of Hawthorne (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 512, 517, 231 P.2d 864* (material allegations of petition not denied are deemed admitted)]. Further, it should allege any affirmative defenses that may be available, such as the petitioner's lack of capacity to sue [*see Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6]* , or failure to exhaust administrative remedies [for further discussion of the requirement that the petitioner exhaust administrative remedies before petitioning for mandate, *see* Ch. 474A, *Timing of Judicial Review*]. For a form of an answer to a petition for writ of mandate, see *§ 474C.103*.

[4] Points and Authorities

Within five days after service of the petition for an alternative writ, the respondent and the real party in interest may file points and authorities in opposition to issuance of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. Points and authorities may also be filed in support of any demurrer [*see [2], above*], and in opposition to any motion for issuance of a peremptory writ [for discussion of requirements for a notice of motion for peremptory writ of mandate, *see § 474C.17*; for a notice of motion form, *see § 474C.96*]. A memorandum of points and authorities is a brief of the legal issues governing disposition of the case [*Wilson v. L.A. County Civil Service Com. (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 426, 431, 229 P.2d 406]* . It will almost always be useful and, in some cases (e.g., where the sole question to be decided is a question of law), it may be essential to effective opposition to issuance of the writ. Points and authorities, however, cannot serve as a substitute for a return by demurrer or answer when a return is required [for discussion of return, *see [1], above*; for answer, *see [3], above*].

[5] Time Limits

In mandate proceedings in the superior court, the return may be served and filed at any time on or before the return date specified in the alternative writ or the date set for hearing of the petitioner's motion for issuance of a peremptory writ, if any [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see § 474C.15* for discussion of the requirements for an alternative writ of mandate; for forms, *see §§ 474C.93*, *474C.94*; for discussion of the requirements for a notice of motion for issuance of peremptory writ, *see § 474C.17*; for a form, *see § 474C.94*]. When the petition seeks a peremptory writ of mandate without also requesting issuance of an alternative writ, the return may be made within 30 days after the petition is filed (if a record of the administrative proceedings is filed with the petition or if no record of the administrative proceedings is required) or within 30 days after the respondent and the real party in interest receive the administrative record (if the record has been requested pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11523*, but is not filed with the petition) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089.5*; *see Gov. Code § 11523* (on request and payment of fees, administrative record must be prepared by agency and delivered to petitioner within 30 days)].

In original mandate proceedings in the Court of Appeal or Supreme Court, the return must be made at least five days before the date set for hearing, unless a different return date is specified by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.20

§ 474C.20 Intervention

[1] Intervention by Real Party in Interest

A "real party in interest" is any person (other than a petitioner or a respondent) whose interests would be directly affected by the outcome of the proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*; *see Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501-502, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190* (developer of real estate project was real party in interest when environmental group petitioned for writ of mandate to set aside permit for project)]. When a petition for a writ of mandate seeks relief that, if granted, would injure or affect the interest of a third person, the third person is an indispensable party to the proceedings and must be named as a real party in interest [*Bank of California v. Superior Court (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 516, 522, 106 P.2d 879* ; *see § 474C.13[2]*]. A real party in interest who has not been named in a petition for a writ of mandate may choose to disregard the proceedings and not be bound by them [*Greif v. Dullea (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 986, 995, 153 P.2d 581* ; *see Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc. v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 700, 703-704, 238 Cal. Rptr. 422* (judgment rendered without proper joinder of real party in interest may be vacated or set aside); *Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501-502, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190* (petition that fails to name the real party in interest may be dismissed)]. Alternatively, such a party may, at his or her option, move the court for leave to intervene in the proceedings [*Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 881, 150 Cal. Rptr. 606* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)* (intervention generally)].

Whether a real party in interest should disregard the proceedings or seek to intervene should be decided on a case-by-case basis. A party who chooses to disregard the proceedings need not retain counsel to oppose the petition, of course, but future legal complications may eventually compel the party to retain counsel. In any event, a real party in interest may find it advantageous to give evidence to the court and to make legal arguments. Additionally, a party who has been granted leave to intervene may appeal from an adverse judgment [*Greif v. Dullea (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 986, 991-993, 153 P.2d 581]* . An intervenor will, however, be bound by the judgment if it is not reversed.

[2] Requirements for Intervention by Third Party

A party who seeks to intervene must have either an interest in the matter in litigation or in the success of one of the

parties to the action, or an interest against both of them [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)*; *Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 881, 150 Cal. Rptr. 606]* . The interest must, however, be direct and not consequential--that is, it must be of such a character that the intervenor will either gain or lose by the direct legal operation and effect of the judgment [*Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 881, 150 Cal. Rptr. 606]* .

[3] Conditional Nature of Right to Intervene

The right to intervene is conditional rather than absolute in most cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)* (on timely application, person "may" intervene)]. The court generally has discretion to determine whether a person should be permitted to intervene in pending litigation. In determining whether intervention should be permitted, the courts have traditionally balanced the interests of the original parties against the proposed intervenor's interest, taking into consideration the need to avoid delay in litigation and multiplicity of suits [Note, *Civil Procedure; Intervention, 9 Pac. L.J. 356 (1977)*].

In some circumstances, however, an absolute right to intervene arises. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 387(b)*, a person who claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the pending action, and who is so situated that the disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede that person's ability to protect his or her interest, has an absolute right to intervene, unless his or her interest is adequately represented by existing parties. Other statutes also confer an absolute right to intervention in specified circumstances [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1250.230* (person claiming legal or equitable interest in property subject to eminent domain process has right to intervene), 1421 (attorney general has right to intervene in action or special proceeding involving property subject to escheat); *Gov. Code § 12606* (attorney general has right to intervene in environmental action)].

[4] Procedure for Intervention

A party may intervene by moving the court for leave to file a complaint in intervention [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)*]. The statute does not specify when a motion to intervene must be made, except that it must be "timely" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(a)*]. A motion for leave to intervene would appear to be timely in the following circumstances [Note, *Civil Procedure; Intervention, 9 Pac. L.J. 356, 357 (1977)*]:

- If the motion is made within a reasonable time after the prospective intervenor learns that the proceedings are in progress.
- If the trial would not be delayed by the intervention.
- If the original parties would not be prejudiced or inconvenienced by the intervention.

After judgment has been entered, a person who has an absolute right to intervene may do so by moving to vacate the judgment [*Simac Design, Inc. v. Alciati (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 146, 152, 154 Cal. Rptr. 676* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 663(1)* (court may set aside and vacate judgment on grounds of incorrect or erroneous legal basis)]. If the motion to intervene is denied, the moving party must appeal from the denial in order to be able to appeal the judgment in the mandate proceedings [*In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 916, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303]* . A real party in interest who was named in the petition can appeal the judgment, however, even if he or she did not move to intervene at the trial level [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 919, 923, 54 Cal. Rptr. 346]* . For further discussion and forms relating to intervention generally, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionMotions to InterveneCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionRight to InterveneCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Vacate

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.21

§ 474C.21 Replication

[1] Countervailing Affirmative Allegations of Answer

When an answer to a petition for a writ of mandate alleges facts constituting an affirmative defense, the petitioner must countervail the allegations, either by offering proof at the trial or by filing a separate pleading denying the allegations [*Lotus Car Ltd. v. Municipal Court (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 264, 268, 69 Cal. Rptr. 384* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1091*]. If the allegations of an answer are not adequately countervailed by proof or pleading, they are deemed admitted, and the court may accept them as true [*Hunt v. Mayor & Council of Riverside (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 619, 623, 191 P.2d 426* ; *Steiger v. Board of Supervisors (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 352, 359, 300 P.2d 210]* . This rule applies, however, only to matters sufficient to constitute a defense. Thus, if the answer consists of irrelevant assertions or conclusions of law rather than material allegations of ultimate fact, the new matter is not sufficient to constitute a defense, and the petitioner is under no obligation to countervail it [*Most v. First Nat. Bank of San Diego (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 425, 432, 54 Cal. Rptr. 669* (petitioner need not countervail return when it consists of irrelevant matters and conclusions of law)]. A pleading that denies affirmative allegations of an answer is called a "replication" [*Lotus Car Ltd. v. Municipal Court (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 264, 268, 69 Cal. Rptr. 384]* . Although a pleading is not required when proof will be offered at the hearing, a pleading obviates the need for presenting proof on every issue raised by the affirmative allegations of the answer and thus simplifies the production of evidence at the hearing.

[2] Verification

The Code of Civil Procedure contains no requirement that a replication be verified. It is prudent to verify the replication, however, since both the petition and the answer in mandate proceedings are required to be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086* (verified petition), *1089* (verified answer)].

[3] Time to File and Serve

The replication should be filed before the return date stated in the alternative writ, or the date set for the hearing on the motion for a peremptory writ if an alternative writ is not sought. If the petitioner lacks sufficient time to prepare the replication because the respondent serves the answer immediately before the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*

(answer may be filed on date for return of alternative writ or date on which application for peremptory writ is noticed)], a continuance should be sought to permit its filing. The petitioner must serve the replication on the answering party [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1109* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings), 1011 et seq. (service of papers in civil actions)]. For further discussion and a form of replication to an answer to a petition for a writ of mandate, see *§ 474C.104*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.22

§ 474C.22 Discovery

Administrative mandate proceedings are special proceedings to which the discovery provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure apply [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 21-23* (defining actions and special proceedings); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2016(b)(1)* ("action" includes special proceeding of a civil nature), 2017(a) (unless otherwise limited by court order, discovery available regarding any relevant matter, not privil eged, in pending "action" or any motion made in "action")]. Discovery in mandate proceedings is available on a showing that it is reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 774, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* ; *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 293, 304, 130 Cal. Rptr. 814]* . Admissible evidence in mandate review of agency decisions is limited to the evidence contained in the record of the proceedings before the agency, together with relevant evidence that could not have been produced in the exercise of reasonable diligence, or that was improperly excluded at the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*; *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 257-258, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* . A petitioner cannot obtain discovery with respect to the matters relied on by agency members in making their determinations or the reasoning process they used in making their decision [*United States v. Morgan (1941) 313 U.S. 409, 422, 61 S. Ct. 999, 85 L. Ed. 1429* ; *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 257-258, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 293, 308, 130 Cal. Rptr. 814]* . This limitation applies even when the petitioner challenges the constitutionality of the statute or regulation under which the agency acted [*Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 293, 307, 130 Cal. Rptr. 814]* , or alleges that the agency denied him or her a fair trial [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 775-779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375]* . When the agency has made findings, inquiry outside the administrative record to determine what evidence the agency considered and the reasoning it employed is precluded [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375]* . Ifthe agency did not make findings, the petitioner's remedy, depending on the circumstances of the case, is to request that the court annul the administrative action or remand the matter to the agency for findings, not to depose agency members as a substitute for findings [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375]* .

If the trial court compels discovery and one of the parties wishes to contest the order, the party should seek a writ of prohibition in an appellate court [*Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 782, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537*

P.2d 375] . The appellate court will review the granting of the discovery order under the abuse of discretion standard of review, and will reverse the order when the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* have not been satisfied [*Pomona Valley Hospital Medical Center v. Superior Court (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 93, 109, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743]* . If the trial court denies discovery and one of the parties wishes to contest the order, the party should, depending on the circumstances of the case, seek a writ of prohibition or mandate in an appellate court [*Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 293, 303, 130 Cal. Rptr. 814]* . For discussion and forms relating to the writ of prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordDisclosure & DiscoveryAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of Discretion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.23

§ 474C.23 Administrative Record

[1] Requirement That Record Be Filed

An administrative order or decision cannot ordinarily be challenged on evidentiary grounds unless the administrative record (or a relevant part of the record) is obtained and filed with the court [*see Alford v. Pierno (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 682, 690, 104 Cal. Rptr. 110* (petitioner could not claim that findings were not supported by evidence, since no transcript of evidence received by agency was filed with court)], because an administrative order or decision enjoys a presumption of regularity and will not be disturbed on review unless the petitioner sustains his or her burden of showing that it is invalid [*Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Huntington Park Redevelopment Agency v. Duncan (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 17, 25, 190 Cal. Rptr. 744* ; *see Evid. Code § 664* (presumption that official duty has been regularly performed)]. Since evidentiary review of agency decisions is limited to evidence contained in the record of proceedings before the agency, plus (1) evidence that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced at the hearing, and (2) evidence that the agency improperly excluded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*; *No Oil, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79 n.6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *see § 474C.24[4]*], if the record is not placed before the court, it will be difficult if not impossible for the petitioner to establish what evidence the agency considered or improperly excluded. In the absence of a record, sufficiency of the evidence is not ordinarily open to question, and the court may presume that the findings were supported by substantial evidence [*Weinberg v. Cedars Sinai Med. Ctr. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1106-1107, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6* (principle applied to judicial review of hospital decision to terminate staff privileges of physician; physician failed to include evidence in the record on appeal); *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893]* .

A mandate petitioner's failure to obtain and file a copy of the administrative record with the superior court before filing its opening brief, and the subsequent failure of that petitioner to file an opening brief, provided a valid reason for the superior court to dismiss the mandate petition, particularly because the petitioner based its failure to obtain the record on its erroneous belief that it was not required to pay for the costs of preparing the record [*Black Historical Society v. City of San Diego (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 670, 677-678, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 378]* .

A motion to augment the administrative record to include 47 additional documents that the city agency did not include in the certified record was properly denied by the Superior Court because the because the appellants did not provide a transcript of the trial court proceedings related to their motion, nor did they include the trail court order denying their motion. In that circumstance, the Court of Appeal ruled against the appellants for failure to provide an adequate record relating to an issue challenged on appeal [*Eureka Citizens for Responsible Government v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 357, 366-367, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485]* .

It was reversible error for the superior court to decide an administrative mandamus case and to deny the petition without reviewing the administrative record. In denying the petition before the administrative record had been prepared, the court was unable to weigh the evidence and to decide the sufficiency of the evidence to support the fact findings that provided the basis for the agency decision [*Ocheltree v. Gourley (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 1013, 1017-1018, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* .

It was reversible error for the superior court to issue terminating sanctions dismissing a mandamus petition that challenged an environmental report under CEQA because the challenging parties failed to prepare the administrative record in a timely manner. Under the circumstances, dismissal (authorized under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128*) was too harsh a sanction when there were lesser sanctions available that would have ensured preparation of the administrative record. The record must be prepared within 60 days of filing the petition under the provisions of *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.6*) [*Leavitt v. County of Madera (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1502, 1526-1527, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 101* (residents of county who challenged county's approval of residential development project and certification of environmental impact report failed to timely prepare and file administrative record of proceedings. Dismissal was too severe a sanction, and superior court failed to make adequate finding supporting dismissal as a sanction)].

[2] Time for Filing

The record may be filed with the petition or with the respondent's points and authorities, or filed subsequently pursuant to a court order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. When the petitioner proceeds by the noticed application procedure, the Code of Civil Procedure requires that the record be filed "as expeditiously as possible" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; for discussion of the noticed application procedure, *see § 474C.17*]. In such a case, the record may be filed by the petitioner with the petition, by the respondent (after payment of the costs by the petitioner, where required), or as otherwise directed by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. If the petitioner proceeds by the noticed application procedure and the record is essential to his or her case (*i.e.*, he or she seeks an evidentiary review of the agency's decision), the respondent has 30 days after service of the petition (if the record is filed with the petition) or 30 days after receipt of a copy of the record (if the record is requested but not filed with the petition) within which to answer or otherwise respond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089.5*]. In any event, the Rules of Court require that the party intending to use a part of the administrative record in an administrative mandate case must lodge that part of the record with the court at least five days before the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1140*].

[3] Request and Preparation

Administrative records are ordinarily prepared at the request of the petitioner. When the decision or order to be reviewed was made by an agency subject to *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*, upon request of the petitioner the Office of Administrative Hearings or the agency is required to prepare and deliver the record (or that part of the record designated by the petition) within 30 days after the request and payment of the transcription fee [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see Gov. Code § 69950* (transcription fee); *see also Gov. Code §§ 11500(a)* ("agency" defined), *11501(a)* (application of Chapter 5 of the APA, *Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*, to agencies as determined by statutes relating to those agencies)]. When the decision or order was made by any "local agency," other than a school district, as defined in *Gov. Code § 54951*, the record must be prepared by the agency or its decision makerand delivered to the petitioner within 190 days after he or she has filed a written request for it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(c)*; *Watts v. Civil Service Board (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 939, 943-944, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 349* (petitioner must request that agency prepare record; transcript prepared by friend of

petitioner insufficient and no error to exclude it from record); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(a)* (with the exception of school district, "local agency" defined by *Gov. Code § 54951*)]. A complete record will include the transcript of proceedings, all pleadings, notices, and orders, any proposed decision by a hearing officer, the final decision, all admitted exhibits, all rejected exhibits in the possession of the agency or its decision maker, all written evidence, and any other papers in the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6(c)* (local agency); *Gov. Code § 11523* (agency subject to APA)]. When the record is preserved on electronic tape but has not been transcribed on paper, the court has discretion to order production of the tape or to grant a reasonable continuance for preparing of a written transcript [*Darley v. Ward (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 257, 263, 168 Cal. Rptr. 481, 617 P.2d 1113]* . The tatutes do not specify any particular form of request. A letter addressed to the agency by the petitioner or counsel for the petition will be sufficient. For an application to prepare and file the administrative record, see *§ 474C.98*.

Appellants are not required to pay for the transcript at the time the request to prepare the transcript is submitted to extend the filing deadline under *Gov. Code § 11523* [*Jahangiri v. Medical Board of California (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1663-1664, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187]* . However, the new *Gov. Code § 11523* which becomes operative July 1, 1997, provides, in relevant part, that upon request of the petitioner for a record of the proceedings, the complete record of the proceedings, or the parts thereof as are designated by the petitioner in the request, shall be prepared by the Office of Administrative Hearings or the agency and shall be delivered to the petitioner, within 30 days after the request, which time shall be extended for good cause shown, upon payment of the fee specified in *Gov. Code § 69950* for the transcript, the cost of preparation of other portions of the record, and for certification thereof [*Gov. Code § 11523*].

[4] Costs

The petitioner bears the initial expense of obtaining the administrative record for purposes of judicial review of the agency proceedings. On conclusion of the mandate proceedings, the costs of preparing the record are taxable as costs [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1094.5(a), 1094.6(c)* (local agency); *Gov. Code § 11523* (agency subject to APA)]. The agency can recover its costs for preparation of the record from the petitioner who sought administrative mandate when the agency is a prevailing party on judicial review under the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11523* [*Gamage v. Medical Board (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 936, 937-938, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* .

Similarly in CEQA proceedings that are reviewable under ordinary mandate [*Code Civ,. Proc. § 1085*] and not reviewable under administrative mandate [*Code Civ,. Proc. § 1094.5*], costs for the preparation of the record of the proceeding under *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.7* can be awarded to the prevailing party. Allowable costs include those costs identified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5* so long as the costs are reasonable as to amount and are reasonably necessary to the conduct of the litigation. The prevailing party has the responsibility to make both showings [*Wagner Farms, Inc. v. Modesto Irrigation District (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 765, 773-775, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683]* .

An indigent petitioner who cannot afford to pay the costs of the transcript may proceed *in forma pauperis* under *Gov. Code § 68511.3* and the Rules of Court implementing that section, if the transcript is necessary to a proper review of the administrative proceedings. The respondent must then pay the cost of the transcript [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Board of Medical Quality Assurance v. Superior Court (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 691, 696-701, 250 Cal. Rptr. 182]* . The petitioner may apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* by using the form prescribed in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.51(a)*. To secure a waiver of the transcript costs, the petitioner must also file the Application for Waiver of Additional Court Fees and Costs as prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.62* [*see* Cal. Rules of 3.51(a)], specifically requesting waiver of the cost of the transcript in the application.

[5] Incomplete Record

In many types of administrative hearings, court reporters are not regularly employed to transcribe the proceedings, or are employed only for portions of the proceedings. Some hearings are tape-recorded, with transcription difficulties occasionally arising from inaudible portions of the tape. A petitioner who seeks review of a decision that is supported

by an inadequate record faces the problem of obtaining a record sufficient for the court to exercise its review functions. When a full record of the administrative proceedings was not kept, the parties may be able to reconstruct the record for the reviewing court or produce a summary of the evidence on which the court can exercise its judgment [*see Woodard v. Personnel Commission (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 552, 558-561, 152 Cal. Rptr. 658* ; *Andersen v. Regents of University of California (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 763, 772-773, 99 Cal. Rptr. 531* (noting parties did not object to use of summaries)]. If the parties are unable to produce a sufficient record, however, the court will remand the case to the agency for a new hearing [*Chavez v. Civil Service Com. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 324, 332, 150 Cal. Rptr. 197* ; *Elizabeth D. v. Zolin (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 347, 356-358, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852]* .

The Court of Appeal upheld a judgment setting aside the DMV's suspension of a motorist's driver's license after an administrative per se law suspension hearing which was challenged by the motorist in court. The judgment was set aside because the DMV failed to file with the court a complete administrative record ofthe hearing. The DMV lost a portion of the hearing record because the hearing tape containing the testimony of the motorist and his expert witness was erased. The DMV also refused to pay the cost of reconstructing the missing part of the hearing record, $1,500 for the motorist's attorney and expert witness to appear at a new hearing [*Frase v. Gourley (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 762, 764-765, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432]* . The *Frase* case decision was distinguished in the decision in *Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-972, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220* , based on a failure of the driver to request that DMV improve the transcript or provide assistance in scheduling a new hearing [*Leal v. Gourley (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 963, 970-971, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* .

The Court of Appeal reversed the County of Merced's granting of a conditional use permit, and the county's certifying of a final environmental impact report under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for a project approval sought by a mining company. The court held that the county failed to provide an adequate and complete administrative record for judicial review making it difficult for the appellate court to determine whether the county make the necessary findings required by CEQA before issuing the permit [*Protect Our Water v. County of Merced (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 362, 372-374, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 726]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsProceedings in Forma PauperisGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsDepositions & TranscriptsCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewReversible ErrorsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumption of Regularity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.24

§ 474C.24 Hearing

[1] Preparation for Hearing

Before the scheduled date of the hearing on the petition, any necessary discovery must be completed, and any appropriate motions for disposition of the case without trial must be made [*see § 474C.22* for discussion of discovery in mandate proceedings]. In addition, a trial memorandum setting forth in detail the relevant factual and legal arguments in support of the party's position, with citations to the administrative record, should be filed with the court. Although the Code of Civil Procedure contains no provisions as to the timing of these pretrial procedures, local court rules must be consulted for specific requirements.

[2] When There Is No Opposition

A peremptory writ may not be granted by default [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*]. Thus, a court must hear a petition for administrative mandate even though there is no appearance in opposition to the petition [*Rodriguez v. Municipal Court (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 521, 526, 102 Cal. Rptr. 45]* . When neither the respondent nor the real party in interest appears at the hearing, the court must proceed to examine the verified pleadings. If the pleadings establish the material facts, the hearing is not one to try issues of fact but to determine questions of law [*Rodriguez v. Municipal Court (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 521, 526, 102 Cal. Rptr. 45* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094* (if return raises only questions of law, or puts in issue immaterial statements, court must hear argument of the case)], and the case may be resolved on the pleadings [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 205, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . If the pleadings raise a factual controversy, however, the court may proceed to hear other evidence. In this situation, the petitioner's right to relief will depend on the evidence adduced at the hearing [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 205, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . If the agency has complied with the terms of the alternative writ or taken action in accordance with the prayer of the petition (e.g., set aside its decision or order), the petition is moot and should be dismissed [*Bruce v. Gregory (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 666, 671, 56 Cal. Rptr. 265, 423 P.2d 193* ; *Crestlawn Memorial Park Asso. v. Sobieski (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 43, 47, 26 Cal. Rptr. 421* ; *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , for further discussion of actions taken by agencies].

[3] Burden of Proof

The party challenging the administrative decision in the mandate proceeding has the burden of proving that the decision should be set aside, regardless of whether the petitioner or the respondent had the burden of proof in the proceedings before the agency [*Huntington Park Redevelopment Agency v. Duncan (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 17, 25, 190 Cal. Rptr. 744 , cert. denied, 464 U.S. 895* ; *Fair v. Fountain Valley School Dist. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 180, 187, 153 Cal. Rptr. 56]* , because an administrative decision enjoys a presumption of regularity when the allegations of the petition have been adequately denied [*Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Alford v. Pierno (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 682, 690-691, 104 Cal. Rptr. 110* ; *see Evid. Code § 664* (presumption that official duty has been regularly performed)]. Therefore, the petitioner is responsible for demonstrating in what respect the administrative proceedings were unfair, in excess of jurisdiction, or otherwise invalid [*Alford v. Pierno (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 682, 690-691, 104 Cal. Rptr. 110]* .

[4] Evidence

The evidence admissible at the hearing on the petition for the peremptory writ is ordinarily limited to the administrative record [*Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 366-367, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240* ; *Lake v. Civil Service Commission (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 224, 227, 120 Cal. Rptr. 452]* . However, the court may determine whether relevant evidence exists that was improperly excluded in the agency proceedings or that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*]. If the court determines that there is such evidence, the court may take one of two actions. If the case is one to which the substantial evidence standard of evidentiary review applies, the court may set aside the agency's decision and remand the case to the agency for further consideration in light of the additional evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e), (f)*; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 616-617, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . If the case is one to which the independent judgment standard of review applies, the court may admit the evidence in the mandate proceedings and consider that evidence in addition to the administrative record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 617, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . For discussion of the substantial evidence test and the independent judgment test, see Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Evidence of events occurring after the date of the agency hearing may be received by a court employing the independent judgment standard of review [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 596-597, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* . The court is not obliged to admit such evidence in all cases. In keeping with the general principle that an administrative agency should have the first opportunity to decide the case on the basis of all the evidence, the court may properly decide to remand the case to the agency for redetermination in light of the new evidence, particularly when the evidence would have been crucial to the administrative decision [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 597 n.4, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

A foundation for the court's receipt of evidence not admitted in the agency proceedings may be laid either by oral testimony or by affidavit [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 597, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* . Affidavits are properly admissible for this purpose, provided that the opposing party is accorded the right of cross-examination and that double hearsay not be admitted [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 597-598, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordDisclosure & DiscoveryAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemands & RemittitursAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumption of RegularityEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of

ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.25

§ 474C.25 Judgment

[1] Granting or Denying Relief

Following the trial of a mandate proceeding, the court must enter judgment either granting the petitioner relief and commanding the agency to set aside its decision or denying the requested relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)*]. If there are no triable issues of fact or the matter is decided based solely on the administrative record, then the proper way to proceed is to move for judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094*. It is not proper to move for summary adjudication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1291-1292, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316]* . If the court grants relief, it will often order the agency to reconsider the case in light of the court's opinion and judgment, and it may order the agency to take other action required by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)*; *Horwitz v. City of Los Angeles (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1344, 1347, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 295* (neighbors of homeowner challenged owner's remodeling permit, which violated front yard setback requirements of city. Homeowner had erroneously calculated setbacks. Writ of mandate had been granted requiring that permits be revoked, and Court of Appeal affirmed judgment with revocation remedy)]. The court, however, may not limit or control in any way the discretion legally vested in the agency, such as by attempting to alter the agency's penalty determination [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(f)*; *see Cadilla v. Board of Medical Examiners (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966-967, 103 Cal. Rptr. 455* (propriety of penalty rests in sound discretion of agency and will not be disturbed absent a manifest abuse of discretion)]. The court is also precluded from performing the agency's function; it may only order the agency to perform a duty required by its governing statutes [*Sunrise Retirement Villa v. Dear (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 948, 954-955, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 416]* . If the court denies the requested relief, it will typically discharge any alternative writ it has previously issued [*see, e.g., Jenkins v. Knight (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 220, 226, 293 P.2d 6* (alternative writs discharged and peremptory writs denied)]. For forms of judgments granting relief, see *§§ 474C.105, 474C.106*. For a form of judgment denying relief, see *§ 474C.107*.

[2] Tentative Decision

The court will announce its tentative decision at the conclusion of the hearing or, if the case is taken under submission, at some later time. When the court's decision is announced in open court, it is entered in the minutes of the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*]. When the decision is announced later, the clerk must send a copy of the minutes entry or

of the written statement of tentative decision to all parties who appeared at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*]. The tentative decision is not a judgment and is not binding on the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*]. If the court later modifies or changes its tentative decision, the clerk must mail a copy of the modification or change to all parties who appeared at the trial [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*].

[3] Statement of Decision

The former requirement that findings of fact and conclusions of law be issued "upon the trial of a question of fact by the court" was abolished in 1981. *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* now permits parties appearing at the trial to request that the court issue a statement of decision explaining the factual and legal basis for its decision on each of the principal controverted issues at trial. Although, in its current form, *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* does not explicitly limit the availability of the statement of decision to cases involving "the trial of a question of fact," the courts have so limited it, generally treating the former findings of fact as identical to the present statement of decision.

Before 1981, the courts had held that findings were required when issues of fact were tried by the court [*Hadley v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 389, 394, 105 Cal. Rptr. 500* ; *Delany v. Toomey (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 570, 571-572, 245 P.2d 26]* but not when the only issues to be determined by the court were legal issues [*International Asso. of Fire Fighters v. Palo Alto (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 295, 300-301, 32 Cal. Rptr. 842, 384 P.2d 170]* . Since questions of fact were clearly tried when the court reviewed the evidence under the independent judgment test, findings were required in independent judgment cases [*Roccaforte v. City of San Diego (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 877, 886-887, 152 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *Whitlow v. Board of Medical Examiners (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 478, 483, 56 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Walls (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 284, 288-289, 2 Cal. Rptr. 847* ; *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions,* for discussion of the independent judgment test]. When review was required only under the substantial evidence test, however, findings were not required, since the issue was one of law rather than fact [*Friends of Lake Arrowhead v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 497, 518, 113 Cal. Rptr. 539* ; *Cow Hollow Improvement Club v. Board of Permit Appeals (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 160, 171, 53 Cal. Rptr. 610* ; *Savelli v. Board of Medical Examiners (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 124, 131, 40 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , for discussion of the substantial evidence test].

Since 1981, the courts have generally analyzed the new requirement of a statement of decision in the same way as they analyzed the former requirement for findings. They have held that a statement of decision is not required when the only contested issue at trial presents a question of law [*Enterprise Ins. Co. v. Mulleague (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 528, 531, 539-540, 241 Cal. Rptr. 846]* , and that a statement of decision is required when a court is required to exercise its independent judgment in reviewing the administrative record [*Kazensky v. City of Merced (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 44, 67, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356* ; *Bevli v. Brisco (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 812, 822, 212 Cal. Rptr. 36]* . In terms of the sufficiency of a statement of decision, one court has held that a statement was sufficient despite a lack of detailed fact findings, since the court did state that the agency's findings were supported by the weight of the evidence and thus incorporated by reference the detailed findings of the agency [*Angelier v. State Board of Pharmacy (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 592, 598-599, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213]* .

In any event, a statement of decision is not required unless a timely request is made. In general, a request for a statement of decision must be made within 10 days after the court announces its tentative decision. If the trial is concluded within one calendar day, or in less than eight hours over more than one day, however, the request must be made before the case is submitted for decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. The request for a statement of decision must specify the controverted issues on which the party is requesting a statement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

When the trial is concluded in less than one calendar day, or in less than eight hours over more than one day, the statement of decision may be made orally on the record in the presence of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. In all other cases, the statement of decision must be in writing, unless the parties appearing at trial agree otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. The court in its tentative decision may state whether a statement of decision will be prepared by the court

or by a designated party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*]. For forms and discussion relating the statement of decision, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

[4] Preparation and Filing of Judgment and Notice of Entry of Judgment

After the court has announced its tentative decision, the court typically requests that the prevailing party prepare a judgment. Counsel for the prevailing party should submit the judgment to the court for signature and entry. Then counsel is required to prepare and mail a copy of the notice of entry of judgment to all parties who have appeared in the action and to file with the court the original notice of entry of judgment accompanied by the proof of service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a)*]. When a prevailing party is not represented by counsel, or when the court so orders, the clerk of the court is required to mail notice of entry of judgment to all parties who have appeared in the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(b), (c)*]. For forms of judgment granting relief, see *§§ 474C.105, 474C.106*. For a form of judgment denying relief, see *§ 474C.107*.

[5] Preparation of Judgment in Appellate Court

The Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court include the judgment in the opinion embodying the decision. Counsel need not prepare the judgment in those courts.

[6] Costs

Costs of mandate proceedings may be recovered by the prevailing party, as in civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)* (governing recovery of costs in any action or proceeding); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* constitute rules of practice in mandate and other special proceedings)]. Thus, the following parties are entitled to recovery of costs as a matter of right [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)(4)*]:

- A party with a net monetary recovery.
- A defendant in whose favor a dismissal is entered.
- A defendant, when neither plaintiff nor defendant obtains any relief.
- A defendant, from those plaintiffs who do not recover any relief against that defendant.

In other situations, the identity of the prevailing party is determined by the court, which may, in its discretion, allow costs and apportion them between the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)(4)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1034* (authority of Judicial Council to establish rules relating to allowable costs); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1700* (prejudgment costs)]. Costs incurred in preparing the administrative record are specifically recoverable by a petitioner who has prevailed in seeking a writ of administrative mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

[7] Attorney's Fees and Litigation Expenses

In certain cases, attorney's fees and litigation expenses may be recoverable as part of the judgment in an administrative mandate proceeding [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5* (court may award certain small businesses and licensees "reasonable litigation expenses" when agency's action was undertaken without any substantial justification); *Gov. Code § 800* (attorney's fees recoverable when administrative decision resulted from arbitrary or capricious action); *Santos v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 537, 551-552, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10* ; *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 79, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15]* . For a general consideration of the recoverability of attorney's fees and litigation expenses in mandate proceedings, see *§ 474C.13[6]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.26

§ 474C.26 Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] Nature and Function of Peremptory Writ

If judgment is entered for the petitioner, a peremptory writ of mandate must be issued without delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1095*]. If counsel for the petitioner prepares the judgment [*see § 474C.25[4]*], he or she should also prepare a peremptory writ and present it to the court with the judgment. The peremptory writ must command the respondent to do the act required to be performed, either immediately after receipt of the writ or at some other specified time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*]. If appropriate to the facts of the case, the writ may order the respondent to reconsider its order or decision in light of the court's opinion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e), (f)*; *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 616-617, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . In every case, the language of the peremptory writ must conform to that of the judgment [*State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Ct. (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 467, 475, 127 P.2d 4]* . If the judgment and the writ conflict, the judgment controls [*State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Ct. (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 467, 475, 127 P.2d 4]* .

[2] Enforcement

When a peremptory writ of mandate has been issued and directed to an agency, if it appears to the court that any member of the agency or a person on whom the writ was personally served has, without just excuse, refused or neglected to obey the writ, the court may, on motion, impose a fine not exceeding $1,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1097*; *Carroll v. Civil Service Commission (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 727, 733, 90 Cal. Rptr. 128* ; *Carson Gardens L.L.C. v. City of Carson Mobilehome Park Rental Review Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 856, 867-868, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 768]* . For a persistent refusal to obey, the court has authority to order imprisonment of the disobedient party until the writ is complied with, and may make any orders necessary and proper for the enforcement of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1097*]. In addition to this specific mechanism for enforcement of the writ, a refusal to obey the writ may be punished as a contempt of court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1209(a)(5)* (disobedience of any lawful judgment, order, or process of the court is contempt); *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 181, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893* (dictum; once writ is issued and served, it must be obeyed on pain of fine or contempt); *Housing Authority of Los Angeles v. Los Angeles (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 682, 688, 256 P.2d 4* (respondent in mandate proceedings found not to have violated writ, but court assumed that willful disobedience of writ would be punishable as contempt); *Healdsburg*

Police Officers Assn. v. City of Healdsburg (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 444, 457, 129 Cal. Rptr. 216 (judgment issuing writ and orders of contempt issued thereon affirmed)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil Contempt

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.27

§ 474C.27 Expedited Procedures Apply to Review of Permit or Entitlement Decision That Involves Constitutionally Protected Speech

[1] When Expedited Review Applies

Expedited procedures for judicial review, by either administrative or ordinary mandate, apply to certain public agency decisions implicating freedom of speech safeguards under *U.S. Const., amend. I*. Specifically, the procedures apply to any decision by a public agency regarding the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit or other entitlement "for expressive conduct protected by the *First Amendment*" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(a)*].

The decision may be one by a city, county, city and county, a joint powers authority or similar public entity formed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65850.4*, or any other public entity authorized by law to issue permits for expressive conduct protected by the *First Amendment* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(b)(3)* (defining "public agency" for purposes of the expedited procedure provisions)].

One example of the type of agency decision subject to expedited review is the denial by a municipal agency of a permit to operate an adult bookstore. The was the situation presented to the court of appeals in *Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (1998) 154 F.3d 1097* , the case which prompted the enactment of expedited review procedures under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8* [*see* 1999 Stats., ch. 49, § 2].

A public agency may itself designate the permits or entitlements that it issues which it deems eligible for expedited review, by adopting an ordinance or resolution to that effect, specifically listing the eligible permits or entitlements [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(c)*].

[2] Expedited Procedures for Judicial Hearing

When applicable, the expedited review procedures described below supersede any requirement or procedure to the contrary that is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097* that otherwise govern mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)*].

Either the public agency or the permit holder or applicant may bring an action in accordance with the procedure set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(1)*. If the permit applicant or permit holder brings the action, it must in the form of a petition for writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or a petition for writ of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, as appropriate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(2)*].

Expedited review then has the following features:

- Within five court days after receipt of written notification from a permit applicant that the applicant will seek judicial review of a public agency's action on the permit, the public agency must prepare, certify, and make available the administrative record to the permit applicant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(1)*]. "Permit applicant" includes a permit holder, and "permit" means any permit or other entitlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(b)(1), (2)*].

- The party bringing the action must file and serve the petition on the respondent no later than 21 calendar days following the public agency's final decision on the permit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(3)*].

- The title page of the petition must contain the following language in 18-point type [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(3)*]:

"ATTENTION: THIS MATTER IS ENTITLED TO PRIORITY AND SUBJECT TO THE EXPEDITED HEARING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES CONTAINED IN SECTION 1094.8 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE."

- Moving, opposition, and reply papers are to be filed as otherwise required by the Rules of Court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(4)*].

- The clerk of the court must set a hearing for review of the petition no later than 25 calendar days from the date the petition is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(4)*].

- The petitioner must lodge the administrative record with the court no later than 10 calendar days in advance of the hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(4)*].

For a form of petition for expedited mandate review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*, see *Ch. 59, Assemblies, Meetings, and Demonstrations, § 59.50A*.

[3] Expedited Procedures for Judicial Decision

Following the conclusion of an expedited hearing under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*, the court is required to render its decision in an expeditious manner consistent with constitutional requirements in view of the particular facts and circumstances. In no event shall the decision be rendered later than 20 calendar days after the matter is submitted or 50 calendar days after the date the petition is filed, whichever is earlier [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(5)*].

If the presiding judge of the court in which the action is filed determines that, as a result of either the press of other court business or other factors, the court will be unable to meet any one or more of the deadlines provided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*, he or she is required to request the temporary assignment of a judicial officer to hear the petition and render a decision within the requisite time limits, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 68543.8*. Given the short time period involved, such a request is entitled to priority [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(e)*].

[4] Joint Waiver of Expedited Procedures Permitted

In any action subject to the expedited procedures of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*, the parties to the action are permitted jointly to waive the time limits provided by that section [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechExpressive ConductGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Procedures for Administrative Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.28-474C.39

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.40

§ 474C.40 Nature of Ordinary Mandate

Ordinary mandate, or traditional mandate, is a special proceeding that results in the issuance by the court of a writ to compel an inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person to perform an act specially enjoined by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 21* (actions and special proceedings), 22 ("action" defined), 23 ("special proceeding" defined)]. For this purpose, an act specially enjoined by law may be a duty associated with an office, trust, or station, such as admitting a person to the use and enjoyment of an office to which he or she is entitled and from which he or she is unlawfully precluded by the inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , for a discussion of kinds of acts enjoined by law]. Ordinary mandate may also be used to restrain an official from the unlawful performance of a duty, in which case it is referred to as "prohibitory mandate" [*Planned Parenthood Affiliates v. Van de Kamp (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 245, 263, 226 Cal. Rptr. 361]* . Note that this "prohibitory mandate" is not the same as the relief sought in a petition for a writ of prohibition.

The writ of mandate in ordinary mandate proceedings is available to compel a public entity or official to perform a clear, present, and usually ministerial duty when the petitioner has a clear, present, and beneficial right to the performance of that duty [*City of Dinuba v. County of Tulare (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 859, 868-869, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614, 161 P.3d 1168* (county had ministerial duty to calculate and distribute property tax revenue to city); *People ex rel. Younger v. County of El Dorado (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 480, 491, 96 Cal. Rptr. 553, 487 P.2d 1193* ; *Quirk v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733, 244 Cal. Rptr. 924]* . It is also an appropriate remedy to compel government officials to exercise their discretion [Los Angeles County Employees Assn. Local 660 v. *County of Los Angeles (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 1, 8, 108 Cal. Rptr. 625]* , or to control an agency's unreasonable and arbitrary action constituting abuse of discretion [*see Sanders v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 252, 261, 90 Cal. Rptr. 169, 475 P.2d 201* (courts will interfere when action taken by agency is so palpably unreasonable and arbitrary as to indicate an abuse of discretion as a matter of law)]. It is not, however, an appropriate remedy to compel an agency to exercise its discretion in a particular manner [*Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 315, 144 P.2d 4* ; *Barrett v. Stanislaus County Employees Retirement Assn. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1593, 1613-1614, 234 Cal. Rptr. 900]* . For a detailed discussion of the availability of ordinary mandate, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

Before instituting ordinary mandate proceedings in any case involving an administrative decision, counsel should consider carefully whether ordinary mandate or administrative mandate is the correct review mechanism. The administrative mandate procedure of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is to be used in all writ cases challenging the validity of any final administrative order or decision made as a result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required, evidence must be taken, and discretion in the determination of facts is vested in the agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see § 474C.10* et seq.]. Although a division of authority exists, it has been held that (1) the parties may not waive a choice of the wrong writ procedure, and (2) the reviewing court is charged with determining whether the trial court considered the appropriate evidence and applied the appropriate standard of review based on the case facts [*Eureka Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 353, 361-366, 244 Cal. Rptr. 240* ; *see California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 833, 844-845, 139 Cal. Rptr. 155* (presentation of matter as ordinary rather than administrative mandate was harmless error; sufficient evidence existed in record alone to reflect abuse of discretion and petitioner suffered no prejudice by use of wrong review standard); *Mahdavi v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 326, 336-337, 136 Cal. Rptr. 421* (although filed as administrative mandate proceeding, appellate court reviewed matter as ordinary writ and held that the trial court had duty to issue ordinary writ if warranted by facts when administrative mandate was inapplicable)]. A detailed discussion of the availability of these two mandate procedures is presented in Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decsions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.41

§ 474C.41 Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] General Procedure in Ordinary Mandate Proceedings

The judicial procedures in ordinary mandate proceedings are similar to judicial procedures in administrative mandate proceedings. Thus, the rules relating to petitions for the writ, alternative writ and noticed application procedures, jurisdiction and venue, returns, intervention, replications, discovery, preparation and filing of the administrative record, hearings, the preparation and entry of judgment, and the issuance of the peremptory writ are virtually identical whether a writ of administrative mandate or a writ of ordinary mandate is sought. The allegations of the petition in ordinary mandate proceedings differ from the allegations of the petition in administrative mandate proceedings, since different rules govern availability of the writ. Similarly, the provisions of the judgment in ordinary mandate proceedings differ from the judgment in administrative mandate, since the relief that the court may grant in ordinary mandate proceedings differs from the relief that may be granted in administrative mandate proceedings [*see § 474C.40* for general considerations related to the useof ordinary mandate proceedings and the relief that may be granted]. For a detailed discussion of administrative mandate proceedings, see *§ 474C.10* et seq.

[2] Parties

As in administrative mandate proceedings, the parties to an ordinary mandate proceeding are called the "petitioner" and the "respondent." If the petition seeks relief that, if granted, would injure or affect the interest of a third person, the third person is an indispensable party to the proceedings and should be named as the "real party in interest" [*Bank of California v. Superior Court (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 516, 522, 106 P.2d 879* ; *Sierra Club, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 495, 501, 157 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 389* (compulsory joinder of parties)]. For a discussion of parties to mandate proceedings, including special rules relating to real parties in interest, see *§ 474C.13[2]*.

[3] Essential Allegations

The petition in ordinary mandate proceedings must contain allegations showing all of the following:

- The petitioner's legal capacity to sue.
- The identity and legal capacity of the respondent.
- The identity of the real party in interest and his or her interest in the mandate proceedings.
- That the petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, other than the writ sought by the petition.

If the petitioner seeks a writ to compel the respondent to perform a duty, the petition should allege facts showing that the respondent has a clear, present, and ministerial duty to carry out a particular act, and that the petitioner has a clear, present, and substantial right to the performance of that duty. If the petitioner seeks to compel the respondent to exercise discretion, the petition should allege facts showing that the respondent has discretion under a particular statute but has failed or refused to exercise that discretion. If the petitioner seeks a writ to correct an abuse of discretion, the petition should allege facts showing that the respondent has discretion under a particular statute and has abused that discretion in a particular way.

For a form of a petition for a writ of ordinary mandate that includes all of these allegations, see *§ 474C.109*.

[4] Prayer for Relief

The prayer should request all of the relief the petitioner seeks, including the issuance of an alternative writ of mandate if the alternative writ procedure is employed [*see §§ 474C.10[2], 474C.15* for discussion of thealternative writ procedure]. If an applicable statute provides for recovery of attorney's fees or litigation expenses, the petition should also include an appropriate request, with allegations in the body of the petition that demonstrate the statutory basis for the recovery of fees or expenses [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(g)* (recovery of attorney's fees and other reasonable litigation expenses by small business or licensee); *Gov. Code § 800* (recovery of attorney's fees in proceedings resulting from arbitrary or capricious conduct by public agency or officer); *see also § 474C.13[6*] for discussion relating to recovery of attorney's fees and litigation expenses]. As is the case in administrative mandate proceedings, the petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 446* (requirements of verification); *see § 474C.13[8]* for discussion of verification].

[5] Points and Authorities

Neither the Code of Civil Procedure nor the California Rules of Court require points and authorities when a petition for a writ of mandate is filed in the superior court. However, a petition originally filed in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court must be accompanied by points and authorities [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)*; *see § 474C.14[2]*]. Local rules may also require that points and authorities accompany a petition filed in superior court. Whether they are required or not, it is advisable to include points and authorities with every petition because they will strengthen the petition and may help to anticipate possible defenses. For a general consideration of points and authorities in mandate proceedings, see *§§ 474C.13[9], 474C.14[2]*.

[6] Filing in Appellate Court

The form *set forth in § 474C.109* is designed to be used when the petition is filed in the superior court. A petition for a writ of mandate may, in an extraordinary case, be filed in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court in the first instance. When the petition is filed in an appellate court, it must set forth the circumstances that, in the opinion of the petitioner, render it proper that the writ should originally issue from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(a)*]. For form of a petition for a writ of mandate in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court, see *§ 474C.92*. For a general consideration of petitions for writ of mandate (whether administrative or ordinary) in appellate courts, see *§ 474C.14*.

[7] Service and Filing

The petition and the memorandum of points and authorities must be served on the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, by delivering a copy to each person by personal service or by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.* service of papers); *see* Code Civ. Proc. §§ *415.10* (personal service), *415.30* (service of summons by mail), *1011* (service on attorney or party), *1013(a)* (proof of service by mail)]. Personal service is customary and usually preferable to service by mail [*see § 474C.13[10]*]. Service must be made on the presiding officer, the secretary, or a majority of the members of the respondent agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesJoinderCompulsory JoinderCivil ProceduresPartiesJoinderIndispensable PartiesCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesStatutory AwardsCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.42

§ 474C.42 Expedited Review of Permit or Entitlement Decision Involving Constitutionally Protected Speech

Expedited procedures for judicial review apply to public agency decisions regarding permits or entitlements that involve speech protected under *U.S. Const., amend. I*. The procedures apply when review is initiated by a petition for ordinary writ of mandate as well as when it is initiated by a petition for writ of administrative mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)*]. For discussion of these expedited procedures, see *§ 474C.27*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Ordinary Mandate

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.43-474C.49

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.43[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Appeal From Mandate Proceedings

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.50

§ 474C.50 Nature of Appealable Orders

[1] One Final Judgment Rule

Unless expressly authorized by law, an appeal lies only from a final judgment in an action or proceeding [*Knodel v. Knodel (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 752, 760, 122 Cal. Rptr. 521, 537 P.2d 353* ; *Gibson v. Savings & Loan Commissioner (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 269, 271, 85 Cal. Rptr. 799* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 901* (review of judgment or order), 904 (appeal in civil action or proceeding), 904.1(a)(1) (appeal from superior court judgment), 1064 (judgment in special proceeding is the final determination of the rights of the parties therein)]. This rule is often called the "one final judgment" rule [*Degnan v. Morrow (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 557]* . The rule finds its basis in the principle that multiple appeals in a single action would be costly and oppressive, and that review of intermediate rulings should await final disposition of the case [*Knodel v. Knodel (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 752, 760, 122 Cal. Rptr. 521, 537 P.2d 353* ; *Degnan v. Morrow (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 557]* . For purposes of the "one final judgment" rule, a judgment is final when no issue is left for the future consideration of the court except compliance or noncompliance with the judgment [*Knodel v. Knodel (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 752, 760 n.11, 762, 122 Cal. Rptr. 521, 537 P.2d 353]* . Conversely, a judgment is not final when further judicial action is essential to a final determination of the rights of the parties [*Degnan v. Morrow (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 557]* . The appealability of a judgment or order under the "one final judgment" rule is a jurisdictional issue and may be raised by the court sua sponte even when not raised by the parties [*Elmore v. Imperial Irrigation Dist. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 185, 190, 205 Cal. Rptr. 433* ; *Degnan v. Morrow (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 82 Cal. Rptr. 557]* .

[2] Judgments in Mandate Proceedings

A judgment granting a petition for a writ of mandate is ordinarily a final judgment and, as such, appealable under the "one final judgment" rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1064*; *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 181-182, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893]* . Whether a judgment (or order) denying a petition for a writ of mandate is appealable under the rule is sometimes a more difficult question. The appealability of a judgment denying a petition depends on whether further orders in the proceedings are contemplated [*Covina-Azusa Fire Fighters Union v. City of Azusa (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 48, 56, 146 Cal. Rptr. 155]* . If the trial court denies a writ petition and contemplates no further action or orders on the petition, an appeal may be taken from the judgment or order denying the writ order [

Bettencourt v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1098-1100, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 402 (order denying petition for writ of mandate was final judgment because basis for order, statute of limitations defense, applied to all claims in lawsuit including claims other than mandamus); *Covina-Azusa Fire Fighters Union v. City of Azusa (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 48, 56, 146 Cal. Rptr. 155* ; *see Watkins v. City of Santa Ana (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 393, 397, 234 Cal. Rptr. 406* (minute order denying petition for writ of mandate appealable; trial court found it had no jurisdiction over matter, clearly contemplating no further action)]. On the other hand, when it is clear that denial of an alternative writ of mandate does not amount to dismissal of the petition and that further action is contemplated, the order denying the writ is not appealable [*Covina-Azusa Fire Fighters Union v. City of Azusa (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 48, 56, 146 Cal. Rptr. 155* ; *Gibson v. Savings & Loan Commissioner (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 269, 271, 85 Cal. Rptr. 799]* .

A trial court order denying a petition for a writ of administrative mandate is not an appealable order when the mandate petition is joined with other claims that have not been decided at the time of the order. Similarly, this order is not an appealable judgment, as this would not be a final determination of all of the parties rights, and allowing an appeal in this setting would result in multiple appeals and would violate the "one final judgment" rule [*Griset v. Fair Political Practices Com'n (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 688, 696-697, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149, 23 P. 3d 43]* . In contrast, a trial court order that resolves all of a litigant's claims is an appealable judgment, and the order can be amended to convert it into a judgment if it is not so stated [*Griset v. Fair Political Practices Com'n (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 688, 698-700, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149, 23 P. 3d 43]* . Once there is a final judgment in the action, the litigation is ended as to all claims alleged in plaintiff's complaint, and the court of appeal lacks any authority to consider a second appeal of the merits of the plaintiffs claims in that action. Neither the "intervening change in controlling law" exception to the law of the case doctrine nor the res judicata and collateral estoppel doctrine exceptions of the same type are applicable [*Griset v. Fair Political Practices Com'n (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 688, 701-702, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149, 23 P. 3d 43]* .

If a statement of decision was contemplated but not made, the proper procedure is to reverse rather than to dismiss an appeal from a minute order entered below [*Covina-Azusa Fire Fighters Union v. City of Azusa (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 48, 57, 146 Cal. Rptr. 155* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 632* (statement of decision in lieu of findings of fact and conclusions of law); *see also § 474C.25* for discussion of judgments and statements of decision in administrative mandate proceedings].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionFinal Judgment RuleCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Appeal From Mandate Proceedings

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.51

§ 474C.51 Procedures for Initiating Appeal

[1] Notice of Appeal

Unless special provisions exist, provisions governing appeals in civil actions generally apply in mandate proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g), (h)* (provisions for stays of agency decisions pending appeal); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 901 et seq.* (appeals in civil actions)]. A party who seeks to appeal from a trial court's grant or denial of a writ of mandate must prepare and file a timely notice of appeal with the clerk of the superior court. Unless otherwise provided by law, notice of appeal is timely if it is filed (1) within 60 days of mailing notice of entry of judgment by the clerk of the court, (2) within 60 days of service of written notice of entry of judgment by any party on the party filing the notice of appeal, or (3) within 180 days after entry of judgment, whichever is earliest [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.104(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.108* (grounds for extending period to file notice of appeal)]. For forms and discussion relating to the notice of appeal, see Ch. 40, *Appeal* .

[2] Transcript and Record on Appeal

If the appellant wishes to present any points that require a consideration of the oral proceedings, he or she must serve on the respondent and file with the clerk of the superior court a notice to prepare a reporter's transcript of the oral proceedings within 10 days after filing the notice of appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.130(a)*]. Also within 10 days after the filing of the notice of appeal, the appellant is required to serve on the respondent and file with the clerk of the superior court a notice specifying the items he or she wishes to have included in the record on appeal or copied in the clerk's transcript [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.120(a)*], unless an agreed or settled statement is to be used [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.134, 8.137*], or unless the parties file a written stipulation specifying the items to be included [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.120(b)*]. Alternatively, any party may compile an appendix in lieu of a clerk's transcript, provided he or she serves and files with the clerk of the superior court a notice of an election to do so within 10 days after filing the notice of appeal, and unless the superior court for good cause shown otherwise orders [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124*]. The notice of election and a copy of any notice to prepare a reporter's transcript must be served on the clerk of the Court of Appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124(a)*]. Counsel must confer and attempt to reach agreement on a possible joint appendix [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124(d)*].

[3] Stays on Appeal

If an appeal is taken from a judgment denying a writ of mandate, any further stay of the agency's order or decision must be requested from the court to which the appeal is taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*]. If a stay is in effect at the time the notice of appeal is filed, however, it will continue by operation of law for 20 days from the filing of the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*]. If an appeal is taken from a judgment granting a writ of mandate, the agency's order or decision will automatically be stayed pending determination of the appeal, unless the court to which the appeal is taken orders otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g)*]. No stay may be imposed or continued if the court is satisfied that it is against the public interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(g), (h)(1)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsAutomatic StaysCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Appeal From Mandate Proceedings

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.52

§ 474C.52 Supreme Court Review of Judgment of Court of Appeal

When the Court of Appeal issues a judgment granting or denying a writ of mandate, the decision is subject to review in the Supreme Court without the necessity of filing a notice of appeal [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 12*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.1000]. Review in the Supreme Court may be effected by either (1) seeking a transfer of the cause from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court before the Court of Appeal has made a final decision [*Cal. Const., Art. VI, § 12(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.552, 10.1000*], or (2) seeking review of the Court of Appeal's decision after it has become final [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.504*]. A cause will be transferred to the Supreme Court before final decision only if it presents issues of imperative public importance requiring prompt resolution by the Supreme Court and justifying a departure from normal appellate processes [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.552*]. The Supreme Court will review a decision of the Court of Appeal after it has become final only in one or more of the following circumstances [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.500*]:

- It appears necessary to secure uniformity of decision or the settlement of important questions of law.
- The Court of Appeal was without jurisdiction of the cause.
- The decision of the Court of Appeal lacks the concurrence of the required majority of qualified judges.

The California Rules of Court set forth rules for petitions and specify time limits within which cases may be transferred to or reviewed by the Supreme Court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.532* (when decisions become final), 8.552 (transfer before final decision), 8.504 (review by Supreme Court), 8.60 (extending time), 8.68 (shortening time)]. For a detailed consideration of the review of Court of Appeal decisions by the Supreme Court, see Ch. 40, *Appeal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsCase TransfersCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Appeal From Mandate Proceedings

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.53

§ 474C.53 Standards of Appellate Review

The standard of review on appeal from the judgment of a trial court in administrative mandate proceedings depends on the standard properly used by the trial court in reviewing the agency's decision. In cases in which the independent judgment standard applies, the appellate court reviews the findings of the trial court to determine whether they are supported by substantial evidence in the whole record [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 143 n.10, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Schmitt v. City of Rialto (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 494, 210 Cal. Rptr. 788* ; *see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , for discussion of independent judgment test]. In such cases, the function of the appellate court is similar to its function in ordinary civil appeals--that is, it may take cognizance only of errors of law, and a factual finding may be overturned only if the evidence received by the trial court is insufficient as a matter of law to sustain the finding [*Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33]* . The appellate court must decide whether credible, competent evidence supports the trial court's judgment [*Yakov v. Board of Medical Examiners (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 67, 71, 64 Cal. Rptr. 785, 435 P.2d 553* ; *Arenstein v. California State Bd. of Pharmacy (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 179, 184, 71 Cal. Rptr. 357]* , and it must resolve all conflicts in the evidence, drawing all legitimate and reasonable inferences in the support of the judgment [*Kerrigan v. Fair Employment Practice Com. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 43, 52, 154 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

In cases in which the substantial evidence standard applies, the same standard applies on appeal [*see* Ch. 474B, *Standards in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , for discussion of the substantial evidence test]. The appellate court reviews the entire administrative record to determine whether substantial evidence supported the determination of the agency, not that of the trial court [*Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 149, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242* ; *Schmitt v. City of Rialto (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 494, 501, 210 Cal. Rptr. 788]* . In substantial evidence cases, the trial court itself exercises an appellate function, in that it takes cognizance only of errors of law appearing on the administrative record. The trial and appellate courts thus occupy identical positions with respect to the administrative record, the duty of both being to determine whether that record is free from legal error [*Merrill v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 907, 915-916, 80 Cal. Rptr. 89, 458 P.2d 33* ; *Los Alamitos Gen. Hosp., Inc. v. Lackner (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 417, 423, 149 Cal. Rptr. 98]* .

As to issues of law, the standard of review on appeal is the de novo review standard [*Rosenblit v. Superior Court*

(1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1442, 282 Cal. Rptr. 819] . An appellate court can affirm a trial court judgment on an issue of law for a different reason than the rationale given by the trial court. Even though the trial court may have used an incorrect rationale, if there is any valid legal theory to support affirming the judgment of the trial court, that judgment will be upheld [*Belair v. Riverside County Flood Control Dist. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 550, 568, 253 Cal. Rptr. 693, 764 P. 2d 1070* ; *Pollak v. State Personnel Board (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1408, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceSufficiency of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Appeal From Mandate Proceedings

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.54-474C.59

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.54[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.60

§ 474C.60 Federal Constitution

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *U.S. Const., amend. IV*

Due process clause. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.61

§ 474C.61 State Constitution

Due process clause. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizures. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*

Separation of powers doctrine. *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*

Jurisdiction to give extraordinary relief. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.62

§ 474C.62 State Statutes

Administrative Procedure Act. *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*

Allocation of burden of proof. *Evid. Code § 500*

Amendment of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*

Answers to complaints generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-431.30*

Appeals in civil actions and proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 901-914, 1109-1110b*

Authority of court to adopt suitable procedure where none specifically provided by statute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 187*

Certiorari. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1109*

Civil actions and proceedings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307 et. seq.*

Contempt. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*

Copies of pleadings are required to be served on adverse parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 465*

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021 et. seq.*

Demurrers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10-430.80*

Demurrer raises issue of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 589*

Discovery. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2016.010-2036.050*

Effect of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Effect of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*

Entry of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*

Fee for transcribing record. *Gov. Code § 69950*

Filing initial pleading begins proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 350, 411.10*

Filing of various pape rs constitutes appearance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*

Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107-1109*

New trials. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 656-663.2*

Power of court to impanel jury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*

Prohibition. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1102-1105, 1107-1109*

Recovery of attorney's fees when administrative action arbitrary or capricious. *Gov. Code § 800*

Recovery of litigation expenses, including attorney's fees, by small business or licensee when agency action undertaken without substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Review of administrative decision by mandate proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Review of decisions by Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board (and Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control). *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090-23090.2*

Review of decisions by Board of Governors of State Bar or Committee of Bar Examiners. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6082*

Review of decision by local housing enforcement agency to abate nuisance; independent judgment test. *Health & Safety Code § 17980.8*

Review of decisions by Public Utilities Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756, 1759*

Review of decisions by Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board. *Lab. Code § 5950*

Right to demur to answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.20*

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.10-417.40*

Special proceedings and actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 20-23*

Testimony in subsequent civil proceeding of person presiding at quasi-judicial proceeding. *Evid. Code § 703.5*

Time limitations on review of local agency decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.6*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Writ is order in writing issued in name of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.63

§ 474C.63 California Rules of Court

Rules of procedure in superior courts. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.1 et seq.*

Civil law and motion rules. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1100 et seq.*

Application of civil law and motion rules to proceedings on petition for writ of mandate. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*

Lodging of record in administrative mandate cases. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1140*

Review of decision of State Bar Court, or action of Board of Governors of State Bar, appointed board or committee, or chief executive officer or designee, authorized to make determination under State Bar Act or California Rules of Court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 9.13*

Appeals. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.1 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.64

§ 474C.64 Local Rules of Court

Los Angeles County

Procedure relating to prerogative writs. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 9.31

San Diego County

Prerogative writs. San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 8.1

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.65

§ 474C.65 Decisions

[1] Administrative Record

Untranscribed tape recordings of administrative proceedings sometimes provides adequate means of review. *Darley v. Ward (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 257, 261, 168 Cal. Rptr. 481, 617 P.2d 1113*

In administrative mandate action, court reviews administrative record and receives additional evidence only if that evidence was unavailable at time of hearing or improperly excluded from record. *McIntosh v. Aubry (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1576, 1592, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*

In reviewing decision by San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission under McAteer-Petris Act [*Gov. Code § 66600 et seq.*], appellate court is not authorized to take judicial notice of material outside administrative record. *Save San Francisco Bay Ass'n v. San Francisco Bay Conservation Etc. Com. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 908, 929 n.7, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117*

Granting of writ of mandate is improper in absence of complete administrative record, including tapes or record of agency hearing. *Buckhart v. San Francisco Residential Rent etc., Bd. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1032, 1035-1036, 243 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Report and transcript of public hearing that was not before city council when it approved environmental impact report is not admissible in administrative mandate action to compel city to set aside its approval since appellate review is limited to issues in record at administrative level unless, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, additional evidence was unavailable at time of administrative hearing or was improperly excluded from record. *Browning-Ferris Industries v. City Council (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 852, 861, 226 Cal. Rptr. 575*

Petitioner for writ of administrative mandate has responsibility to make available to trial court an adequate record of administrative proceeding. *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 453, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Review is limited to administrative record except as to unavailable or improperly excluded evidence. *No Oil, Inc. v.*

Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79 n.6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66

Request to the agency for preparation of record [*Gov. Code § 11523*] has effect of extending period of limitation if addressed to official reporter. *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 305-307, 196 P.2d 20*

[2] Agency Scope of Review

In review of administrative findings regarding discipline of policeman, municipal body as properly reading entire transcript of administrative proceeding, pursuant to municipal ordinance allowing review of administrative findings and recommendations in order to affirm, revoke, or modify action taken; request for writ of mandate, on ground that reviewing body exceeded proper scope of review, was properly denied by trial court. *Musquiz v. City of Huntington Park (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 876, 880-881, 225 Cal. Rptr. 817*

[3] Alternative Writ of Mandate

Code Civ. Proc. § 1107 provides for respondent's points and authorities in opposition to issuance of alternative writ. *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 683 n.16, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231*

Agency compliance is among acceptable responses to alternative writ of mandate and as terminating litigation. *Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Com. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 140, 149, 224 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Court is required to withhold issuance of alternative writ until passage of five-day period in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* for filing respondent's points and authorities in opposition. *Culver v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 404, 412, 105 Cal. Rptr. 602*

Court has discretion to deny issuance of alternative writ if petition fails to allege prima facie case for relief. *Kingston v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 76 Cal. Rptr. 614* ; *Black v. State Personnel Board (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 904, 909, 289 P.2d 863*

Alternative writ is merely means by which court brings respondent within its jurisdiction. *McPheeters v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 709, 716, 187 P.2d 116*

[4] Answer

Allegations not expressly denied in answer are deemed admitted. *Dulaney v. Municipal Court (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 77, 81, 81 n.3, 112 Cal. Rptr. 777, 520 P.2d 1*

Trial court correctly found petitioner lacked clean hands, in light of petitioner's failure to either file replication or submit proof countervailing respondent agency's affirmative defense that he obtained his contractor's license fraudulently. *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Board (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1054, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286*

Answer filed with points and authorities in opposition to issuance of alternative writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*] is premature. *Kim v. Chinn (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 854, 854, 117 P.2d 368*

Answer by fewer than quorum of members of multimember agency is no answer at all. *People v. Supervisors of City & County of San Francisco (1865) 27 Cal. 655, 668-670*

Necessity for verification of answer by public officer. *Lertora v. Riley (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 171, 176, 57 P.2d 140* (not

required); *City & County of San Francisco v. Itsell (1889) 80 Cal. 57, 60, 22 P. 74* (required); *Seckels v. Department of Indus. Relations (1929) 98 Cal. App. 647, 648, 277 P. 497* (not required)

Lack of verification is defect correctable by amendment. *Security T. & S. Bk. v. Fidelity & D. Co. (1920) 184 Cal. 173, 176, 193 P. 102* ; *Board of Education v. Mulcahy (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 418, 423, 123 P.2d 114* ; *Jenssen v. R.K.O. Studios, Inc. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 705, 707, 67 P.2d 757*

Objection to lack of verification is waived if not made at or before filing of responsive pleading. *Greenfield v. Steamer Gunnell (1856) 6 Cal. 67, 68*

Withdrawal of answer after filing is concession that facts alleged in petition are true. *Western States Constr. Co. v. Municipal Court of San Francisco (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 146, 149, 238 P.2d 562*

Answer denying allegations of petition puts burden on petitioner to prove right to relief. *Alford v. Pierno (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 682, 690-691, 104 Cal. Rptr. 110*

[5] Continuances

In administrative mandate proceeding, trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying plaintiff's motion for continuance, when plaintiff conceded only purpose for motion was to allow plaintiff time to properly analyze administrative record, and plaintiff had almost one week to conduct analysis prior to hearing. *Foster v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 444, 448-449, 190 Cal. Rptr. 893*

[6] Costs and Attorneys Fees

Right to recover attorney's fees does not extend to further proceedings after judgment in party's favor. *Le Blanc v. Swoap (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 741, 743-744, 129 Cal. Rptr. 304, 548 P.2d 704*

Expense of preparing record for purpose of exhausting administrative remedies is recoverable cost. *Ralph's Chrysler-Plymouth v. New Car Dealers Policy & Appeals Board (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 792, 796, 106 Cal. Rptr. 169, 505 P.2d 1009*

Expense of preparing record is recoverable cost. *Moran v. Board of Medical Examiners (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 301, 315, 196 P.2d 20*

Necessity for costs to be awarded in judgment. *Union Trust Co. v. Superior Court (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 541, 543, 90 P.2d 582* ; *Gould v. Moss (1910) 158 Cal. 548, 549, 111 P. 925*

Costs are recoverable by prevailing party as matter of right. *Power v. May (1898) 123 Cal. 147, 152-153, 55 P. 796*

Award of attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* was reversible error in absence of evidence that complainant was personally obligated to pay fees. *Richardson v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 486, 496-497, 250 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Erroneous interpretation of law does not suggest per se that action of public entity or officer thereof was arbitrary or capricious; attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* are not recoverable when nothing in record justifies conclusion that administrative board's action was arbitrary or capricious. *Indian Springs, Ltd. v. Palm Desert Rent Review Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 127, 137-138, 238 Cal. Rptr. 112*

City council's "eleventh hour" resolution reducing appeals board's authority in violation of meet and confer requirements, and its decision to uphold plaintiff's termination despite board's contrary recommendation, constitutes arbitrary and capricious conduct justifying award of attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*. *Cerini v. City of Cloverdale (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1471, 1481-1482, 237 Cal. Rptr. 116*

"Complainant" entitled to attorney's fees within meaning of *Gov. Code § 800* is person who initiates appellate review of adverse determination in administrative hearing. *Stirling v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1305, 1310, 235 Cal. Rptr. 56* (holding that real party in interest in proceeding for extraordinary writ was not "complainant" within meaning of statute)

Proceeding for writ of mandate or prohibition initiated by General Counsel for Agricultural Labor Relations Board, to require Board to adopt standards for reviewing settlements during unfair labor practice proceedings and to apply those standards to specific settlement, was not arbitrary and capricious conduct authorizing attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*. *Stirling v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1305, 1313, 235 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* are not recoverable when agency's action was neither arbitrary nor capricious. *Gatewood v. Board of Retirement (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 311, 324 n.5, 220 Cal. Rptr. 724*

Right to recover attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* is applicable only if plaintiff is appealing from determination of administrative proceeding and is inapplicable when plaintiff seeks to enforce administrative determination. *Los Angeles Police Protective League v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 55, 65, 212 Cal. Rptr. 251*

In mandate proceeding in which county board of supervisors' decision to abandon county road was upheld, trial court's award to county of costs, including county staff time expended to produce documents for plaintiff at plaintiff's request and by court order, was proper and within sound discretion of trial court. *Heist v. County of Colusa (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 841, 851, 213 Cal. Rptr. 278*

Gov. Code § 800 is remedial statute designed to enable employees to seek relief in courts against arbitrary or capricious action by public entities or officers, and is to be liberally construed; *Gov. Code § 800* is not limited to appeal or review from formal administrative hearing and was properly applied when employee's grievance was summarily denied in letter without any formal adminstrative hearing. *Forrest v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 357, 366-368, 206 Cal. Rptr. 595*

Trial court's finding that certain administrative findings and determinations were not supported by record does not itself consititute evidence of arbitrary and capricious conduct so as to authorize attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*. *Byrnes v. Riles (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1182, 204 Cal. Rptr. 100*

Part-time community college instructors who sought and obtained writ of mandate requiring district to grant them status as regular employees and pro rata pay equivalent to full-time instructors were not entitled to attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*; *Gov. Code § 800* is inapplicable when petitioners did not seek review of an award, finding, or other determination of an administrative proceeding. *Ferris v. Los Rios Community College Dist. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11, 194 Cal. Rptr. 16*

Finding that public entity or officer engaged in "conduct not supported by fair or substantial reason" or "unsubstantiated determinations" is prerequisite to award of attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*, and is not recoverable in case of honest legal dispute. *Seghesio v. County of Napa (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377, 185 Cal. Rptr. 224*

Finding in support of award of attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* that governmental conduct was arbitrary and capricious is sustained on appeal unless abuse of discretion shown. *Ellerbroek v. Saddleback Valley Unified School*

Dist. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 348, 376-377, 177 Cal. Rptr. 910

Public assistance recipient is entitled to attorney's fees on appeal from denial of writ in mandate proceeding to compel county's compliance with fair hearing decision of Department of Benefit Payments because enforcement of appellant's rights confers important benefit on general public. *Blackburn v. Sarsfield (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 143, 150-151, 178 Cal. Rptr. 15*

When petitioner had borne costs of preparing trial record in administrative hearing and cost was necessary and reasonable, reimbursement was properly awarded by trial court. *Marlow v. Orange County Human Serv. Agency (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 290, 294, 167 Cal. Rptr. 776*

Attorney's fees are not recoverable under *Gov. Code § 800* (public entity's or officer's arbitrary or capricious conduct) unless administrative action was arbitrary or capricious. *Marlow v. Orange County Human Serv. Agency (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 290, 295, 167 Cal. Rptr. 776*

City's denial of application for permit to relocate building, based on unconstitutional ordinance prohibiting relocation of certain buildings, was arbitrary and capricious within meaning of *Gov. Code § 800* in light of all circumstances, and applicant was therefore entitled to attorney's fees under that code section. *Reeves v. City of Burbank (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 770, 778-780, 156 Cal. Rptr. 667*

Court was without subject matter jurisidiction to order reporter at administrative hearing to prepare transcript of administrative hearing and to fix price for transcript. *Barwis v. Superior Court (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 239, 241, 150 Cal. Rptr. 758*

Claim was unwarranted when school board's action denying back salary reflected bona fide dispute concerning interpretation of statute governing back salary. *Von Durjais v. Board of Trustees (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 681, 688-689, 148 Cal. Rptr. 192*

Recovery of attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800* (capricious and arbitrary administrative conduct). *Midstate Theatres, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 211, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894* ; *Madonna v. County of San Luis (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 61-62, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916*

[7] Default Cases

Appearance without answer is concession that facts alleged in complaint are true. *Western States Constr. Co. v. Municipal Court of San Francisco (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 146, 149, 238 P.2d 562* ; *Pereria v. Wallace (1900) 129 Cal. 397, 400, 62 P. 61* ; *Jaquith v. Justice's Court (1926) 77 Cal. App. 542, 544-547, 247 P. 224*

Allegations of complaint are not deemed admitted by respondent's failure to appear. *Jackson School Dist. v. Culbert (1901) 134 Cal. 508, 509-510, 66 P. 741* ; *Jaquith v. Justice's Court (1926) 77 Cal. App. 542, 544-547, 247 P. 224*

Respondent appears by answer, demurrer, notice of motion to strike or for change of venue, or written notice of appearance. *Rodriguez v. Municipal Court (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 521, 526, 102 Cal. Rptr. 45*

[8] Demurrers

Return by demurrer alone admits allegations of petition. *Kennedy v. Ross (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 569, 571, 170 P.2d 904*

Statutes governing demurrers in civil actions and proceedings are applicable in mandate proceeding. *W.R. Grace &*

Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 720, 726-727, 151 P.2d 215

Answer raising only questions of law is equivalent of demurrer. *Hayward v. Pimental (1895) 107 Cal. 386, 390, 40 P. 545* ; *Gayle v. Hamm (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 250, 252-253 n.3, 101 Cal. Rptr. 628*

Demurrer filed with points and authorities in opposition to issuance of alternative writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*] is premature. *Kim v. Chinn (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 854, 854, 117 P.2d 368*

[9] Discovery

Petitioner is not entitled on discovery to probe mental processes of agency members in reaching decision. *Fairfield v. Superior Court (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 768, 774-775, 777-779, 122 Cal. Rptr. 543, 537 P.2d 375* ; *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 257-258, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Board of Dental Examiners v. Superior Court (1975) 55 Cal. App. 3d 811, 814, 127 Cal. Rptr. 865*

Petitioner is entitled to discovery with respect to evidence unavailable at time of administrative trial or evidence improperly excluded. *State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 257, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281*

Petitioner seeking administrative review of agency's decision rendered pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11517(c)* is not entitled to discover whether or not agency actually satisfied its statutory duty to review hearing officer's proposed decision; when agency renders findings in quasi-judicial proceeding, petitioner is precluded from inquiry outside administrative record. *Governing Board v. Superior Court (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1158, 1160-1162, 213 Cal. Rptr. 771*

[10] Evidence

In mandate proceeding, trial court's denial of motion to strike respondents' evidence that was not part of administrative record is not abuse of discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* when evidence pertained to issue first raised by petitioner in mandate petition, respondents had no reason to anticipate petitioner would raise issue, and respondents consequently had no reason to offer evidence on that issue at administrative hearing. *Cranston v. City of Richmond (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 755, 773, 221 Cal. Rptr. 779, 710 P.2d 845*

In administrative mandate action, court reviews administrative record and receives additional evidence only if that evidence was unavailable at time of hearing or improperly excluded from record. *McIntosh v. Aubry (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1576, 1592, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*

Review of legal theories does not involve receipt of evidence that was not before administrative agency. *Division of Occupational Safety & Health v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 794, 801, 234 Cal. Rptr. 661*

Trial court is authorized under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* to receive evidence of events which transpired after administrative hearing; better practice to remand action for agency redetermination in light of new evidence. *Curtis v. Board of Retirement (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 293, 299, 223 Cal. Rptr. 123*

If trial court employs independent standard of review on issue of procedural fairness of administrative hearing, then trial judge is able to admit evidence on such issue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)* without remanding case to administrative tribunal. *Tiholiz v. Northridge Hospital Foundation (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1197, 1204-1205, 199 Cal. Rptr. 338*

Court is empowered to receive evidence only where evidence unavailable at administrative trial or unlawfully

excluded. *No Oil, Inc. v. Los Angeles (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 68, 79 n.6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 34, 529 P.2d 66* ; *Hadley v. City of Ontario (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 121, 126-127, 117 Cal. Rptr. 513*

Court is not required to receive evidence petitioner merely neglected to present at administrative trial. *Wilke & Holzheiser, Inc. v. Dept. of Alcoholic Bev. Control (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 349, 377, 55 Cal. Rptr. 23, 420 P.2d 735* ; *Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 799, 136 P.2d 304*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e) as permitting court in mandate proceeding to receive evidence that could not have been produced with reasonable diligence or that was wrongfully excluded at prior administrative hearing. *Curtin v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 481, 484, 176 Cal. Rptr. 690*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e) constitutes statutory authority for use of affidavits as direct evidence at administrative mandate hearings in superior court subject to rules governing right of cross examination and to prohibition against double hearsay. *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 598, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63*

Failure to produce expert witness's testimony is not excusable because of unavailability of expert unless there was no other reasonable source of same evidence. *American Chemical Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 45, 55, 116 Cal. Rptr. 751*

Trial in superior court is more like appellate review than new trial. *Campbell v. Board of Dental Examiners (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 872, 875, 95 Cal. Rptr. 351*

[11] Peremptory Writ of Mandate

Judgment controlls in event of conflict between terms of judgment and terms of peremptory writ. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 467, 475, 127 P.2d 4*

Peremptory writ can be issued where justice requires, even if terms cannot conform to terms of alternative writ. *Johnson v. Fontana County F.P. Dist. (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 380, 391-392, 101 P.2d 1092*

Notice of motion for enforcement is required. *McDonald v. Severy (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 629, 631, 59 P.2d 98*

Trial court properly refused to remand matter to agency for corrective action when it remanded matter to agency with directions to issue permit without conditions imposed by agency, and further proceedings were unnecessary because agency had already considered matter carefully when it imposed conditions. *Whaler's Village Club v. California Coastal Com. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 240, 263, 220 Cal. Rptr. 2*

Board's failure to make findings supporting its adjudicatory administrative decision is prejudicial and precludes meaningful judicial review; peremptory writ of mandate, which ordered board to vacate its decision subject to its right to review further existing records and make findings adequate to apprise court of reasons for its decision, is appropriate. *Respers v. University of Cal. Retirement System (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 864, 870-873, 217 Cal. Rptr. 594*

Enforcement of peremptory writ is matter of compliance with duties rather than punishment. *King v. Martin (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 791, 796, 98 Cal. Rptr. 711*

Peremptory writ can be issued before entry of judgment. *Healy v. Stationers Corp. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 601, 604, 39 Cal. Rptr. 679*

Petitioner is not entitled to have errors in trial reviewed in proceeding for enforcement of writ. *Gunn v. Superior*

Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 203, 206-207, 173 P.2d 328

[12] Points and Authorities in Opposition

Memorandum of points and authorities allowed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* is in nature of brief for court's benefit. *Mercer-Fraser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 102, 129, 251 P.2d 955* ; *Peter v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 515, 521, 178 P.2d 73*

Memorandum of points and authorities allowed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* is not substitute for demurrer or answer. *Wilson v. L.A. County Civil Service Com. (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 426, 431, 229 P.2d 406*

[13] Remand to Administrative Level

Remand to agency with determinative powers is proper when court finds that hearing was denied. *Johnston v. Trustees of Cal. State University & Colleges (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1003, 1012, 199 Cal. Rptr. 175*

[14] Replication

Factual allegations in answer are deemed true unless controverted by pleading (replication) or proof. *California Portland Cement Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 578, 582 n.5, 63 Cal. Rptr. 5, 432 P.2d 700* ; *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1054, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *Antoine v. Department of Public Health (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 215, 221-222, 108 Cal. Rptr. 689*

Right of petitioner to file replication to answer. *Scott v. Superior Court (1928) 205 Cal. 525, 526-527, 271 P. 906* ; *McClatchy v. Matthews (1901) 135 Cal. 274, 276, 67 P. 134* ; *Kahn v. East Bay Mun. Util. Dist. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 397, 414, 116 Cal. Rptr. 333*

[15] Service of Petition

Copies of petition and supporting papers should be served before filing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*] unless prior service is excused by court order. *Miller v. Hamm (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 860, 866 n.6, 88 Cal. Rptr. 538*

Effect of service requirements in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*. *Mercer-Fraser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 102, 129, 251 P.2d 955* ; *Peter v. Board of Supervisors of Kern County (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 515, 521, 178 P.2d 73*

Service of copy of petition is required to give notice of pending proceeding. *Ursino v. Superior Court (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 611, 617, 114 Cal. Rptr. 404*

[16] Summary Disposition

Summary disposition not on merits does not preclude subsequent original proceeding in appellate court. *Goddard v. Security Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 47, 51-53, 92 P.2d 804*

Appellate court is not required to entertain subsequent original proceeding following summary disposition in superior court. *People v. Municipal Court (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 362, 365, 92 Cal. Rptr. 248* ; *Hartigan v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1918) 38 Cal. App. 763, 764, 177 P. 484*

[17] Venue

Plaintiff suing local agency is unable to institute action in neutral county as of right [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]; county in which action arose is proper venue [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*] *Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797-798, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Venue of mandate proceeding for review of administrative decision is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*. *Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 930-931, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925*

County where the cause, or some part thereof, arose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*] is determined by where petitioner most directly or seriously affected by administrative decision in question resides. *Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 931-933, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925* ; *Duval v. Contractors State License Bd. (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 532, 533-536, 271 P.2d 194* ; *Cecil v. Superior Court (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 793, 799, 140 P.2d 125*

Parties in mandate proceeding are entitled to seek change of venue. *Bloom v. Oroville-Wyandotte Irrigation Dist. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 102, 103, 93 P.2d 164*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordDisclosure & DiscoveryAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemands & RemittitursAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesStatutory AwardsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsDepositions & TranscriptsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.66

§ 474C.66 Law Reviews

See chapters listed in Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions , § 474.35*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.67

§ 474C.67 Text References

California Administrative Mandate (Cal. C.E.B. 2d ed. 1989)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 30, 257-331 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.68

§ 474C.68 Internet References

Office of Administrative Hearings. This site includes information and location concerning specific OAH offices; an OAH hearing guide; information concerming Administrative Procedure Act statutes, regulations, and proposed regulations; OAH forms; information concerning alternative dispute resolution procedures; and declaratory decisions. http://www.dgs.ca.gov/oah

NOTE:
On and after July 1, 1998, The OAL is required by *Gov. Code § 11340.1(b)* to make the full text of the California Code of Regulations, with reference citations and history notes, available on the Internet free of charge.

Office of Administrative Law. This site includes OAL publications; links to OAL statutes and regulations relating to rulemaking; regulations submitted to the OAL for review, and information for contacting or provding input to the OAL regarding rulemaking. http://www.oal.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies. http://www.ca.gov

Department of Consumer Affairs. This site includes links to sites maintained by many state agencies that are under this department, as well as links to agency sites. http://www.dca.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes text of constitution, codes, and statutes (including complete text of APA); and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationAlternative Dispute ResolutionAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.69-474C.79

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.69[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.80

§ 474C.80 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court

☐ Verify that administrative record is filed with the court [*see § 474C.23[1]*].

☐ If it is not, prepare and file ex parte application and order for preparation and filing of administrative record [*see § 474C.23*; for a form, *see § 474C.98*].

☐ Prepare petition for writ of mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *§ 474C.10[2*]; for forms, *see § 474C.90 -474C.91*, *474C.93 -474C.94*].

☐ All papers must comply with superior court rules [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.100-2.119, 3.1110*; *see also § 474C.13[1]*].

☐ Verify petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *see § 474C.13[8]*].

☐ Prepare memorandum, if applicable [*see § 474C.13[9]*].

☐ Prepare alternative writ [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.100*; §§ *474C.10[2]*, *474C.13[1]*, *474C.15[1]*, *[3]*, *474C.16*; for forms, *see §§ 474C.93 -474C.94*].

☐ Include order on same document [*see § 474C.15[2*]; for a form, *see § 474C.94*], or

☐ Prepare separate order for issuance of alternative writ [*see § 474C.15[2*], for a form, *see § 474C.95*].

☐ Present to court in chambers at same time as petition [*see § 474C.15[3]*].

☐ Ex parte issuance (notice and service not required) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see § 474C.15[4]*].

☐ Prepare order to stay decision, if applicable [*see § 474C.13[5]*; *§ 474C.18*; for forms, *see §§ 474C.99 -474C.100*].

☐ Serve copy of petition and memorandum on respondent and real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1107, 1109*; *see §§ 474C.10[2], 474C.13[10]*].

☐ File petition and proof of service with court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see §§ 474C.10[2], 474C.15[5]*; *see also § 474C.12* (jurisdiction and venue)].

☐ Deposit alternative writ with clerk at time petition is filed [*see § 474C.10[2]*].

☐ Writ remains deposited but not filed for five days.

☐ After five days court examines papers on file and either grants or denies petition for alternative writ.

☐ Serve alternative writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*; *see § 474C.15[6]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.81

§ 474C.81 Noticed Application Procedure

[1] Papers

☐ Verify that administrative record is filed with the court [*see § 474C.23[1]*].

☐ If it is not, prepare and file ex parte application and order for preparation and filing of administrative record [*see § 474C.23*; for a form, *see § 474C.98*].

☐ Prepare petition for issuance of peremptory writ [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1088.5*; *see § 474C.17[1]*].

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.100, 3.1110*; *see § 474C.17[2*]; for a form, *see § 474C.96*].

☐ Use *Palma* notice if filing in appellate court [*see § 474C.17[5*], for a form, *see § 474C.97*].

☐ Prepare memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113*; *see § 474C.17[3]*].

[2] Filing

☐ File petition.

☐ File notice of motion with petition or within applicable time period [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1088, 1089.5*; *see § 474C.17[2]*].

☐ File memorandum with notice of motion [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.113; *see § 474C.17[3]*].

[3] Service

☐ Serve copy of notice and petition on respondent and real party in interest [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1088, 1107, 1109*; *§ 474C.17[4]*].

☐ Serve memorandum with notice of motion [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.113; *see § 474C.17[3]*].

☐ Proof of service.

☐ File with petition, or

☐ File before any hearing or other action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.82

§ 474C.82 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

- ☐ Prepare petition for writ of mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; for a form, *see § 474C.92*].
  - ☐ Verify petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *see § 474C.92[3]*].
  - ☐ Petition must have a red cover [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *§ 474C.14[4]*].
- ☐ Prepare memorandum (mandatory) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *see § 474C.14[2]*].
  - ☐ File and serve with petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *see § 474C.14[2]*].
- ☐ Filing.
  - ☐ Supreme Court.
    - ☐ File original and 13 copies of petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40*; *see § 474C.14[5*]; *see also § 474C.14[3]*].
  - ☐ Court of Appeal.
    - ☐ File original and four copies of petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40*; *see § 474C.14[5*]; *see also § 474C.14[3]*].

☐ Service.

☐ Serve petition and memorandum of points and authorities on respondent and real party in interest.

☐ Serve by mail or personal service [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1107, 1109*; *see § 474C.14[6]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.83

§ 474C.83 Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate

- ☐ Prepare petition [*see § 474C.41*; for a form, *see § 474C.109*].
  - ☐ Verify petition [*see § 474C.109[3]*].
- ☐ Prepare memorandum [*see § 474C.41[5]*].
- ☐ Serve petition and memorandum on respondent and real party in interest [*see § 474C.41[7]*].
- ☐ File petition with the court [*see § 474C.41[6]*].
- ☐ For more detailed procedural checklist for use in ordinary mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.84

§ 474C.84 Response to Petition for Writ of Mandate (Return)

[1] Demurrer

☐ Prepare demurrer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10* (statutory grounds for demurrer); *§ 474C.19[2*]; for a form, *see § 474C.101*].

☐ General demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*; *see § 474C.19[2]*].

☐ Special demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(a)-(d), (f)-(i)*; *see § 474C.19[2]*].

☐ Prepare memorandum of points and authorities [*see § 474C.19[4]*].

☐ Prepare notice of hearing [*see § 474C.19[2*]; for a form, *see § 474C.102*].

☐ Serve and file with demurrer [*see § 474C.19[2]*].

☐ Prepare answer (optional) [*see § 474C.19[3*]; for a form, *see § 474C.103*].

☐ Verify answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *see § 474C.19[3]*].

☐ Serve with demurrer (optional) [*§ 474C.19[3]*].

☐ Serve and file within applicable time limits [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1089, 1089.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct.,*

Rule 8.490; *see Gov. Code § 11523*; *§ 474C.19[5]*].

[2] Answer

☐ Prepare answer [*see § 474C.19[3*]; for a form, *see § 474C.103*].

☐ Verify answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *see § 474C.19[3]*].

☐ Serve with the demurrer (optional) [*see § 474C.19[3*]; for a form, *see § 474C.103*].

☐ Serve and file within applicable time limits [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1089, 1089.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*; *see Gov. Code § 11523*; *§ 474C.19[5]*].

[3] Memorandum

☐ Within five days, respondent may serve on petitioner, and file with court, memorandum in opposition to writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see §§ 474C.10[2], 474C.19[4]*].

☐ File alone, or

☐ File with demurrer.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.85

§ 474C.85 Replication

- ☐ Prepare replication [*see § 474C.21*; for a form, *see § 474C.104*].
  - ☐ Verify form [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1089*; *§ 474C.21[2]*].
- ☐ Filing and service.
  - ☐ Serve on answering party [*see § 474C.21[3]*].
  - ☐ File with proof of service before return date in alternative writ [*see §§ 474C.21[3], 474C.104[5]*], or
  - ☐ File with proof of service before date of hearing for peremptory writ [*see §§ 474C.21[3], 474C.104[5]*].
- ☐ Continuance to file replication.
  - ☐ Prepare if necessary [*see § 474C.21[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.86

§ 474C.86 Judgment

[1] Prevailing Party

☐ Prepare judgment [*see § 474C.25[4*]; for forms, *see §§ 474C.105 -474C.106*; *see also § 474C.107* (judgment denying relief)].

☐ Submit judgment to court for signature and entry [*see § 474C.25[4]*].

☐ Prepare and mail copy of notice of entry of judgment to all parties [*see § 474C.25[4]*].

☐ File original notice of entry of judgment and proof of service by mail with court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a)*; *see § 474C.25[4]*].

☐ Recover costs [*see § 474C.25[6]*].

[2] Peremptory Writ of Mandate

☐ Prepare peremptory writ [*see § 474C.26[1*]; for a form, *see § 474C.108*].

☐ Present to court along with judgment [*see § 474C.26[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.87

§ 474C.87 Appeal

[1] Court of Appeal Review

☐ Notice of appeal.

☐ Prepare notice of appeal [*see § 474C.51[1]*].

☐ File with clerk of the superior court within applicable time limits [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.104*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.108*; *§ 474C.51[1]*].

☐ Transcript and record.

☐ Prepare notice to prepare reporter's transcript of oral proceedings [*see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ Serve on respondent within 10 days after filing notice of appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.130*; *see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ File with clerk of superior court within 10 days after filing notice of appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.130*; *see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ Serve on clerk of the Court of Appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124*].

☐ Prepare notice specifying items to be included in record or copied in clerk's transcript [*see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ Serve on respondent within 10 days after filing notice of appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.120*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.120, 8.134, 8.137*; *§ 474C.51[2]*].

☐ File with clerk of superior court within 10 days after filing notice of appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.120, 8.134, 8.137*; *see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ Notice of election to compile appendix in lieu of clerk's transcript [*see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ File with clerk of superior court within 10 days after filing notice of appeal [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124*; *see § 474C.51[2]*].

☐ Serve on clerk of the Court of Appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.124*].

☐ For more detailed procedural checklists for use in appeal to court of appeal, see Ch. 40, *Overview of Civil Appeals* , et seq.

[2] Supreme Court Review

☐ Two methods.

☐ Seek transfer of cause from Court of Appeal to Supreme Court before final decision [*see § 474C.52*].

☐ Seek review after final decision [*see § 474C.52*].

☐ For more detailed procedural checklists for use in review by Supreme Court, see Ch. 53, *Supreme Court Review* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsCase TransfersCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime LimitationsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 474C.88-474C.89

[Reserved]

§§ 474C.88[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.90

§ 474C.90 Petition for Administrative Writ of Mandate to Review Administrative Decision

[1] FORM Petition for Administrative Writ of Mandate to Review Administrative Decision

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Respondents.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	

_____

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. _____[*If petitioner is not an individual, state petitioner's identity as corporation, partnership, or other entity*].

2. Respondent _____ [*identify, e.g.,* Medical Board of the State of California] is _____ [*status of respondent in state or local government, e.g.,* an administrative agency in the Department of Consumer Affairs, which is a department in the Agriculture and Services Agency of the state government].

3. _____ [*Authority of respondent to exercise discretion in determining relevant facts, and requirement that hearing be held, e.g.,* Under *Sections 2220 et seq. of the Business and Professions Code*, the Board has discretion to determine whether a ground exists for suspension or revocation of a physician's and surgeon's certificate, and particularly whether _____ (*specify facts constituting ground for action*). Pursuant to *Section 2230*

of the Business and Professions Code and *Sections 11500-11528 of the Government Code*, the Board is required to hold a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of those facts].

4. _____ [*Facts regarding holding of hearing, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), at _____ (*specify meeting place*) a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue whether a ground exists for suspension or revocation of the physician's and surgeon's certificate which petitioner then held and which was then in full force and effect. Petitioner attended the hearing. On _____ (*date*), petitioner received the Board's decision and order _____ (*effect of decision and order, e.g.,* revoking petitioner's physician's and surgeon's certificate) on the ground that _____ (*specify, if possible*). _____ (*State fact of application for reconsideration, if appropriate, and adverse result*)].

5. _____ [*Reasons for invalidity of decision e.g.,* The Board's decision and order are invalid for the following reasons:

a. The hearing officer found that _____ (*state all findings*). The Board does not have authority to revoke a physician's and surgeon's certificate on any of those grounds.

b. At the hearing, petitioner tried to offer evidence to show that _____ (*facts provable by evidence in question*). This evidence was in the form of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the testimony of _____ (*name*)). The hearing officer ruled that this evidence was not admissible, and it was not received. The evidence was admissible and should have been received.

c. The hearing officer found that _____ (*state specific findings*). The evidence received at the hearing does not support these findings, as petitioner alleges more particularly hereinafter].

6. _____ [A verbatim transcript of the record of the hearing, containing the evidence received, is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof *or* The substance of the evidence received at the hearing is as follows: _____ (*state substance of evidence*)]. [*If petitioner claims that evidence does not support findings, add:* The evidence does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ (*specify*).] [*If petitioner claims that incompetent evidence was received, add:* Petitioner objected at the hearing to the following evidence, on the grounds indicated, but in each instance petitioner's objection was not sustained, and the evidence was received: _____ (*identify evidence, e.g.,* the testimony of _____ (*name*) which was offered to show _____ (*specify and state ground for objection, e.g.,* which was objected to on the ground that _____ (*specify*)).]

[7. *Add, if appropriate:* Petitioner has the following relevant evidence which was not presented at the hearing: _____ (*describe completely*). This evidence could not be produced at the hearing because _____ (*specify why, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, petitioner could not produce evidence and why, if appropriate, evidence could not be produced on reconsideration.*) This evidence tends to show that _____ (*state what evidence will prove*).]

[8. *If case involves denial of application for license, permit, or the like, add:* Petitioner meets all of the qualifications for _____ (*specify, e.g.,* a physician's and surgeon's certificate) established by law. Petitioner duly applied on _____ (*date*) for a _____ (*specify, e.g.,* physician's and surgeon's certificate), in compliance with all statutes and administrative regulations governing the application.]

[*EITHER, if attorney's fees are claimed under Gov. Code § 800*]

[9. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has become and is obligated personally to pay

to his/her counsel, _____ (*name*), attorney's fees _____ (exceeding $7,500 *or* in the sum of $_____).]

[*OR, if litigation expenses are claimed under Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*]

[9. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner incurred the following litigation expenses in addition to other costs: _____ (*list reasonable expenses, e.g.,*

a. Attorney's fees in the sum of $_____;

b. Costs of the administrative proceedings in the amount of $_____;

c. Witness fees in the amount of $_____).]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used*: For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its order of _____[*date*], _____ (*specify effect of order, e.g.*, revoking petitioner's physician's and surgeon's certificate), (*if application for license, permit, or the like was denied, add*: and to reconsider whether petitioner is entitled to receive a _____ (*specify, e.g.*, physician's and surgeon's certificate) as applied for,) (*if license, permit, or the like was suspended, revoked, or otherwise restricted, add*: and to reinstate petitioner's _____ (*specify, e.g.*, physician's and surgeon's certificate) as it existed before that order was issued,) or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner will seek stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, add*: For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____[*date*], _____ (*specify effect of order*), until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending the judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [to the same effect as the alternative writ except for the order to show cause *or set out terms at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*;

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [and for reasonable litigation expenses]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition

and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is a petition for a writ of mandate for use by the person aggrieved to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision (and resulting order, if any) that the petitioner's license application be denied or that a license be suspended or revoked, or that a penalty or probationary conditions be imposed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*].

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration under penalty of perjury)]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

[4] Caption and Introduction

The petition will be filed in the superior court. The caption will, therefore, reflect that fact and identify the county where the petition is filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 422.30* (caption of pleading), *1109*]. In setting out the title of the proceeding [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 422.30* (caption of pleading), *1109*], counsel should describe the respondent as an administrative agency without using any individual's name. Generally, the petition should name as respondent the decision-making authority of the agency [*Elliott v. Contractors' State License Board. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1056, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286]* , particularly since the petitioner may otherwise run the risk of denial of the writ for failure to state a cause of action because the appropriate agency decision-making authority is not named as a party [*see Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1050, 1056* (declining to consider whether petitioner's failure to name appropriate decision-making authority would have been sufficient reason, standing alone, to deny writ)].

The parties are customarily called "petitioner" and "respondent" because the initial pleading is customarily called a "petition" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The parties may be called "plaintiff" and "defendant" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1063*], but this is seldom done. If there are two or more petitioners or respondents, all must be identified in the caption of the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 422.40*, 1109].

The character of the proceeding, which must be briefly stated in the caption [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*], is sufficiently described by the phrase "PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]." Generally, there is no requirement that the petition expressly refer to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. Whether or not a local rule requires it, inclusion of a citation to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* in the caption is advisable because it will avoid confusion [*see Grimes v. Hoschler (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 305, 308 n.3, 115 Cal. Rptr. 625, 525 P.2d 65]* .

It is customary to begin the petition with an introductory phrase such as "Petitioner respectfully represents" or, more simply, "Petitioner alleges."

[5] Essential Allegations

The petition must state facts tending to show the following:

1. Discretion to determine certain relevant facts is vested in the agency whose decision is the subject of the proceeding (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

2. By law a hearing is required to be held for the purpose of determining those facts (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

3. Evidence is required to be taken at the hearing (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

4. A final administrative decision was made as a result of that hearing and the determination of those facts (Paragraph 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

5. The decision is invalid [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*] because of one or more of the following defects:

a. The agency proceeded without or in excess of authority (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

b. The petitioner was denied a fair trial (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

c. The agency abused its discretion (see the first fact above) in one of the following ways:

i. It did not proceed in the manner required by law (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

ii. The decision is not supported by the findings resulting from the administrative hearing (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

iii. The findings are not supported by the evidence (Paragraphs 5 and 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

If it is contended that the findings are not supported by the evidence, the petition must allege the substance of the evidence or, if a record of the evidence is available, must be accompanied by a transcript of the evidence attached as an exhibit and incorporated by reference.

If there is relevant evidence which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, the petitioner could not have produced at the hearing, the petition should allege the substance of that evidence and facts showing why it could not have been produced in the administrative hearing (Paragraph 7).

In addition to the foregoing, the petition must show the following:

6. The petitioner is beneficially interested in issuance of the writ--that is, he or she has standing to sue (Paragraph 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

7. The petitioner has exhausted administrative remedies [*see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291-296, 109 P.2d 942]* .

8. The petitioner has no plain and speedy remedy in the ordinary course of law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[6] Alleging Facts Subject to Judicial Notice

Ultimate facts which are provable by judicial notice [*see Evid. Code § 451* (mandatory judicial notice)], such as that the agency has discretion to determine certain facts, that a hearing is required by law, and that evidence is required to be taken, should be alleged. There is some authority in decisions of the Supreme Court for the proposition that such facts will be noticed whether or not they have been alleged [*see Loranger v. Nadeau (1932) 215 Cal. 362, 365, 10 P.2d 63* , *overruled on different point; Reich v. Purcell (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 551, 555, 63 Cal. Rptr. 31, 432 P.2d 727* ; *see also Stanton v. Dumke (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 199, 201-202, 49 Cal. Rptr. 380, 411 P.2d 108* (court as required when ruling on sufficiency of demurrer to consider facts subject to judicial notice, as though they are alleged in petition)]. However, judicial notice merely does away with the necessity for evidence as to the facts noticed [*Varcoe v. Lee (1919) 180 Cal. 338, 344, 181 P. 223]* . The better practice is to allege such facts.

[7] Identity of Petitioner

If the petitioner is not a natural person, the petition should allege the petitioner's identity as an existing legal entity entitled to sue (*i.e.,* to come into court) [*see Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6]* . This is sometimes referred to as the capacity to sue (Paragraph 1).

[8] Petitioner's Standing to Sue

A petition for writ of mandate will be granted only where it is necessary to protect a substantial right and only when it is shown that some substantial damage will be suffered by the petitioner if the petition is denied. The writ will not be issued except on the verified petition of a person beneficially interested [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]; it will not be issued where the petitioner fails to show that it will subserve or protect some right or interest of his or hers; it will not be issued where it is apparent that the petitioner has no direct interest in the act sought to be coerced and that no benefit can accrue to him or her from its performance. Therefore, it is necessary for the petitioner to allege facts showing that he or she has some right or interest in the act sought to be coerced. In other words, the petitioner must show in his or her petition that he or she has standing to sue. This is the nature of the requirement concerning beneficial interest [*see Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6* (distinguishing capacity and standing to sue)].

The requirement that the petitioner be beneficially interested in issuance of the writ has been discussed in *Ch. 474, § 474.13*. It is unlikely that a petition could fail to show the petitioner's beneficial interest, if his or her participation in the administrative proceeding is alleged. It is not necessary to use the words "beneficially interested" in the petition (Paragraph 4).

If necessary, the petition may be amended to show the petitioner's beneficial interest [*Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 107, 280 P.2d 1]* .

Where the administrative decision complained of is to the effect that an application for a license was denied, it will be necessary for the petitioner to allege facts showing that he or she complied with all lawful requirements for issuance of the license and that issuance of it would be proper [*see Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 123-126, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111* ; *Mann v. Board of Medical Examiners (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 30, 40, 187 P.2d 1* ; *Hippen v. Ford (1900) 129 Cal. 315, 316, 61 P. 929* (petitioner seeking writ to compel issuance of liquor license as required to prove that all necessary steps to qualify were taken)]. An allegation that the petitioner qualified for the license and that he or she duly applied for it should be sufficient (Paragraph 8) [*see Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 123, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111* ; *Hippen v. Ford (1900) 129 Cal. 315, 316, 61 P. 929* (conceding sufficiency of allegation that petitioner duly complied with all laws, rules, ordinances, and regulations of municipality and performed all requirements necessary under law for issuance of liquor license); *Babcock v. Goodrich (1874) 47 Cal. 488, 512* (allegation in petition for writ of mandate that certain orders were duly given and made by board of supervisors as sufficient allegation of board's authority to make them)].

[9] Identity of Respondent

Insofar as a party seeks review of a final official administrative action, only the agency (and its members, if a multimember body) would be proper respondents in the mandate proceeding. Neither mere employees of the agency nor the state should be named as respondents; no relief is available against them [*State of California v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* .

In several cases decided before it became the practice to review administrative decisions in a mandate proceeding, the rule was stated that a writ of mandate will not be issued against an office but must be directed to the person holding the office and, as a corollary rule, that the successor of an officer who dies, resigns, or is removed from office must be made a party to the proceeding if the proceeding is to be continued [*see George v. Beaty (1927) 85 Cal. App. 525, 532, 260 P. 386* ; *see also Ex parte Tinkum (1880) 54 Cal. 201, 203]* . The rules developed because historically the writ of mandate corrected a personal default by an officer consisting in his or her wrongful refusal to perform a legal duty. It was obviously unfair to pass along to a new office holder the consequences of his or her predecessor's default, such as a liability for paying costs or the possibility of being held in contempt. The use of a mandate proceeding for review of an administrative decision changes the circumstances that gave rise to those rules. If a mandate proceeding is used for that purpose, "[o]fficial and not personal action is the gravamen of the [petition]. Thus, it is the board [or other agency] as such, and not the individual members, that is the actual [respondent]" [*Sperry & Hutchinson Co. v. Cal. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 229, 236, 50 Cal. Rptr. 489* (action for declaratory relief respecting regulation prohibiting pharmacists from giving trading stamps to purchasers of prescription drugs and for injunction; on demurrer by members of Board of Pharmacy, action dismissed as to them individually; judgment for plaintiff modified accordingly and affirmed)]. This reasoning extends to proceedings against officers (*e.g.,* the Director of Motor Vehicles) as well as those against multimember agencies. In practice a mandate proceeding for review of an administrative decision has been brought against an officer or agency sued by official title or name on many occasions, and the propriety of doing so has not been questioned.

[10] Evidentiary Hearing Required

The conditions precedent to maintaining a mandate proceeding for review of an administrative decision include a requirement in the law that a hearing be given and that evidence be taken at that hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. In alleging the existence of the condition, it should be sufficient to state that for the purpose of determining certain facts which the respondent agency has discretion to determine, the agency is required by certain statutes to hold a hearing and receive evidence (Paragraph 3). It should be noted that the procedural requirements imposed by statute or decision are matters for judicial notice [*see Evid. Code § 451*].

[11] Making of Final Administrative Decision

Since the purpose of review under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is to inquire into the validity of a final administrative decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*], the petition should contain a short narrative of events showing that a final decision was made (Paragraph 4). The essential facts in such a narrative are that a hearing was held, that the purpose of the hearing was to receive evidence relevant to the determination of certain facts, and that the petitioner both attended the hearing and did whatever else was necessary to exhaust his or her administrative remedies (such as seeking a reconsideration).

[12] Invalidity of Decision

The reasons why the decision is invalid may be stated in statutory terms, for the court's convenience in understanding the basis for the petitioner's complaint, but statutory language alone is not sufficient. Facts must be alleged (Paragraph 5) [*see, e.g., Ward v. County of Riverside (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 353, 358, 78 Cal. Rptr. 46]* .

Counsel preparing a petition should take care not to make the allegations of invalidity too cryptic. The possible defects in the administrative proceeding are somewhat confusingly described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, and there appears to be some overlap between several of them. If counsel is unsure whether a particular defect is, for example, a denial of a fair hearing or a failure to proceed in the manner required by law, the statutory language should not be used, and only the facts should be alleged.

Commonly alleged defects are the improper exclusion of evidence, the failure of the evidence received to support the findings, and the failure of the findings to support the order or decision. Other grounds for attack include the agency's incorrect interpretation of the law [*see Bodinson Mfg. Co. v. California Employment Comm'n (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 321, 325-326, 109 P.2d 935]* , the lack of credibility of the witnesses who testified at the administrative hearing [*see Dare v. Bd. of Medical Examiners (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 790, 799-800, 136 P.2d 304]* , the receipt of incompetent evidence over a timely and sufficient objection [*see Borror v. Department of Inv. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 531, 545, 92 Cal. Rptr. 525]* , and the agency's consideration of evidence not received at the hearing [*see English v. City of Long Beach (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 155, 159, 217 P.2d 22]* .

[13] Abuse of Discretion

Abuse of discretion is almost always alleged, both because it is a vague charge and also because most petitioners attack the receipt of evidence, consideration of it, and decision making on the basis of findings. Abuse of discretion is established if evidence was not received in the manner required by law, or if the evidence does not support the findings, or if the findings do not support the order or decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

In alleging an abuse of discretion, words expressing a legal conclusion to that effect should be avoided. Such words include: arbitrary, capricious, fraudulent, wrongful, and unlawful [*Faulkner v. California Toll Bridge Auth. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 329, 253 P.2d 659]* . These words do not describe facts, and only facts should be alleged [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.10, 1109*; *Boren v. State Personnel Board (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 634, 638, 234 P.2d 981]* .

[14] Evidence Not Supporting Findings

When it appears that an administrative decision is within the agency's authority and that in making the decision the agency conducted a hearing, heard the interested parties, and acted on substantial evidence, the court may not conclude that the agency abused its discretion unless a complete transcript of all the evidence on which the agency acted is attached to the petition, or, at least, the substance of all of the evidence which the agency received is alleged. The petition must also state particularly "the elements, aspects and principles wherein such evidence, considered in the light of the [petitioner's] contention, supports the conclusion that the [agency] abused the discretion vested in it. By no other means, since the averment of naked conclusions adds nothing, can the pleading show that the agency in a case such as this did in fact abuse its discretion" [*Faulkner v. California Toll Bridge Auth. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 330-331, 253 P.2d 659]* .

The party intending to use a part of the administrative record in a case brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* must lodge that part of the record at least five days before the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1140*].

In the absence of the evidence, an abuse of discretion cannot be shown by mere allegations of what the agency did or did not consider. If the petitioner is to prevail, he or she must attack what the agency actually did on the basis of the evidence before it. For example, only in the light of the evidence before the agency when it acted could the agency's refusal to hear further evidence be shown to be erroneous, or could the inference be drawn that the agency abused its discretion in not doing something other than what it did [*Faulkner v. California Toll Bridge Auth. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 317, 331, 253 P.2d 659]* .

See Paragraph 6 for an example of the method of pleading a failure of the evidence to support the findings.

[15] Findings Not Supporting Decision

When the decision was not supported by the findings, that will be evident if the findings are recited. Every finding must independently fail to support the decision (Paragraph 5). A failure to negate all legitimate grounds for the administrative action would probably be a ground for demurrer, at least on this one point [*see Peck v. Board of Supervisors (1891) 90 Cal. 384, 385, 27 P. 301* (petition for writ to compel supervisors to repair county road; demurrer sustained when petition did not allege facts showing county did not abandon road); *see also W.R. Grace & Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 720, 731, 151 P.2d 215* (fact that agency based decision on erroneous ground as not warranting issuance of writ if there was other legal justification for decision; dictum reporting rule)].

[16] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

A court of appeal has held that a petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision sufficiently shows the exhaustion of administrative remedies if it alleges that petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies and has no appeal nor any plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law [*Wong v. Regents of University of California (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 823, 827, 829, 93 Cal. Rptr. 502]* . This seems an extreme view, since the petition in the case at bench did not otherwise disclose that available administrative remedies had been exhausted. The statement that petitioner has exhausted his administrative remedies is unquestionably a legal conclusion, and the pleading of legal conclusions cannot be recommended as a substitute for stating the facts. The better practice is to state as facts what actually was done, such as attendance at the hearing and an application for reconsideration with an adverse result (Paragraph 4).

[17] Lack of Other Remedy

The requirement that no other plain and speedy remedy be available to the petitioner in the ordinary course of law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] has been discussed in *Ch. 474, Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions, § 474.13[2]*.

The lack of another plain and speedy remedy should appear from the allegations of the petition taken as a whole [*see Ross v. O'Brien (1934) 1 Cal. App. 2d 496, 501, 36 P.2d 1108]* , and it should not be necessary to try to set out facts in a separate allegation tending to show that the condition exists. Attorneys have been accustomed to allege, in so many words, that petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law [*see, e.g., Wong v. Regents of University of California (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 823, 829, 93 Cal. Rptr. 502]* , but this is unnecessary. If the petition states facts on which the writ may be issued [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1094.5*], the court should have no difficulty in determining that no plain and speedy remedy exists in the ordinary course of law [*see Rescue Army v. Municipal Court (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 460, 466-467, 171 P.2d 8]* .

[18] Attorneys' Fees

Attorney's fees might be recoverable, pursuant to a statutory provision [*see Gov. Code § 800*]. For a discussion of attorneys' fees, see *§ 474C.13[6]*. In cases involving a small business or licensee (defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(c), (d)*, respectively), attorney fees might be recoverable along with other reasonable litigation expenses under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*, in which case *Gov. Code § 800* will not apply [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(g)*]. For a discussion, see *§ 474C.13[6]*.

[19] Prayer for Relief

The prayer must necessarily be framed in terms of the relief which the court may give in the light of what the petitioner will prove. For a discussion of the contents of the judgment, when it is in favor of the petitioner, see *§ 474C.25*. An alternative writ will be requested unless the notice procedure is used. The petitioner should specify what terms he or she desires in the alternative writ.

If a stay of operation of the administrative decision will be sought, the prayer should include a request for a temporary stay order and an order to show cause why the stay should not be extended until the judicial proceeding has been concluded.

A peremptory writ should be requested, of course. If the notice procedure is used instead of the alternative writ procedure, the desired terms of the peremptory writ should be recited. If an alternative writ is sought, however, it is sufficient to refer to the terms of the alternative writ (except for the language respecting the order to show cause).

Attorney's fees and reasonable litigation expenses should be requested if they can properly be sought, and a request for costs should be included.

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration under penalty of perjury)]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

[20] Service

When a petition for a writ of mandate is filed, it must be accompanied by proof of service of a copy of the petition on the respondent and the real party in interest named in the petition. The petition is served according to the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* governing the service of papers generally. However, if a petition is sought pursuant to the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5* (filed in a trial court and no alternative writ sought), proof of service need not be filed with the petition, and the action may be filed and served in the same manner as an ordinary action. When the real party in respondent's interest is a board or commission, the service must be made on the presiding officer, or on the secretary, or on a majority of the members, of the board or commission [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*].

The court in which the petition is filed, in its discretion and for good cause, may grant the petition ex parte without notice or service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*].

[21] Cross References

For other forms for use in mandate proceedings, including writs of mandate, alternative, and peremptory writs, see *§ 474C.91* et seq.

For forms of allegations of petitioner's (or plaintiff's) capacity to sue, see Ch.20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, and discussion of the subject, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

For memoranda of points of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for writs of mandate generally, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing petitions for administrative mandate, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.91

§ 474C.91 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Respondents.	)	Time: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Location: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Petitioner petitions this court for a writ of mandate under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5* and alleges:

1. At all times mentioned in this petition, petitioner has been and now is _____ [*describe petitioner's legal capacity to sue, if not a natural person, and any license, certificate, or permit held, e.g.:* a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and the holder of a collection agency license duly issued by respondent].

2. At all times mentioned in this petition, respondent has been and now is _____ [*specify nature of agency, e.g.:* an administrative agency within the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumers Affairs of the State of California]. [*If respondent is a board or commission, specify composition, e.g.:* The chairperson of respondent is

_____ (*name*), the secretary is _____ (*name*), and it is composed of _____ (*number*) members.]

3. Under _____[*specify statutory source of agency's authority to exercise discretion in determining relevant facts*], respondent has discretion to determine whether there are grounds to suspend or revoke a _____ [*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license]. [*If appropriate, further specify respondent's discretion, e.g., by stating factual determinations required by statute*.]

4. Under _____[*specify statutes that require respondent to hold hearing*], respondent is required to hold a hearing and to take evidence to enable it to exercise its discretion.

5. _____ [*Provide chronological description of administrative action, e.g.:* On _____ (*date*), a statement of issues was filed with respondent to institute a proceeding to determine whether grounds exist for the suspension of petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license). The statement of issues was served on petitioner on _____ (*date*), and on _____ (*date*), petitioner filed a notice of defense with respondent. On _____ (*date*), a hearing was held at _____ (*location*) before an administrative law judge, who rendered a proposed decision that was adopted by respondent as its own, effective _____ (*date*). A copy of that decision, which is now final, is attached as Exhibit A.]

6. Respondent's decision is invalid for the following reasons: [*Insert one or more of the following allegations, as appropriate to the facts of the case:*]

a. Respondent acted _____ [without *or* in excess of its] jurisdiction, as follows: _____ [*specify facts*].

b. Petitioner did not receive a fair trial before respondent, as follows: _____ [*specify facts*].

c. Respondent committed a prejudicial abuse of discretion by failing to proceed in the manner required by law, as follows: _____ [*specify facts showing failure to proceed in manner required by law*].

d. Respondent committed a prejudicial abuse of discretion, in that the decision is not supported by the findings, as follows: _____[*specify facts showing that decision is not supported by findings*].

e. Respondent committed a prejudicial abuse of discretion, in that the findings are not supported by the evidence. The administrative law judge found that _____[*state particular findings not supported by evidence*].

[*If transcript of evidence is attached to petition, insert following:*]

A verbatim transcript of the record of the hearing, containing the evidence received, is attached as Exhibit _____ and made a part of this petition.

[*Or, if substance of evidence is included in petition, insert following:*]

The substance of the evidence received at the hearing is as follows: _____[*state substance of evidence*].

[*Continue as follows:*]

The evidence does not support the findings, as follows: _____[*specify*].

f. Evidence was improperly received, over petitioner's objection, at the hearing, as follows: _____ [*specify evidence received and grounds upon which objection(s) made*].

g. At the hearing, petitioner offered evidence that _____ [*specify*]. The administrative law judge ruled this evidence inadmissible. The evidence was admissible and should have been received, as follows: _____ [*specify reasons*].

h. Petitioner has the following evidence that was not presented at the hearing: _____ [*specify*]. Petitioner was unable, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, to produce this evidence at the hearing because _____ [*specify reasons*]. This evidence tends to show that _____ [*specify*].

7. Petitioner does not have a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.

[*If stay of agency decision is sought, insert following:*]

8. If respondent's decision is not stayed pending the judgment of this court, petitioner will be irreparably harmed, in that _____[*specify facts showing irreparable harm*].

[*If petitioner seeks attorney's fees under Gov. Code § 800, include the following:*]

9. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has become personally obligated to pay to _____[*name*], _____ [his/her/its] counsel, attorney's fees _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in excess of $7,500] computed at $100 per hour.

[*If petitioner seeks litigation expenses under Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5, include the following:*]

10. Petitioner is a _____ ["small business" as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(c) or* "licensee" as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(d)*]. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has incurred the following litigation expenses in addition to other costs: [*list expenses, e.g.:*]

a. Court costs in the amount of $_____.

b. Witness fees in the amount of $_____.

c. Expenses of the administrative proceedings in the amount of $_____.

d. Attorney's fees in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays the court for judgment as follows:

1. For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision dated _____, _____ [*describe effect of order, e.g.:* suspending petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license)], or to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same

effect should not be issued;

[*If petitioner seeks stay of agency decision, include the following:*]

2. For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its decision dated _____, _____ [*describe effect of order, e.g.:* suspending petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license)] until further order of the court, and to show cause why operation of that decision should not be stayed pending the court's judgment in this proceeding;

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision dated _____, _____ [*describe effect of order, e.g.:* suspending petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license)].

[*If petitioner seeks attorney's fees or litigation expenses, include the following:*]

4. For reasonable _____ [attorney's fees *or* litigation expenses], in addition to any other relief granted or costs awarded;

5. For all costs of suit incurred in this proceeding; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know its contents. I declare under penalty of perjury [*if executed outside California, add:* under the laws of the State of California] that the same is true and correct to my own knowledge.

Executed on _____[*date*], at _____[*place*].

_____ [*signature*]
Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, may be used to petition a superior court for judicial review of an administrative decision. This form is an alternative to the *form in § 474C.90*. It is a generic form readily adaptable to a wide variety of circumstances, whereas the § 474C.90 form is more specific. See *§ 474C.13* for discussion of the requirements for this form.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. §*

446 [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.92

§ 474C.92 Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate in Court of Appeal or Supreme Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*OR*]

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
_____ APPELLATE DISTRICT
[DIVISION _____]
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
[_____, (*name*)	)	
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Petitioner petitions this court for a writ of mandate under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5* and alleges:

[*Set forth essential allegations for issuance of writ as set forth in § 474C.91 and continue as follows:*]

1. This petition is made to this Court in the first instance, rather than to the [superior court or the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of _____], for the following reasons: _____[*specify circumstances that render it necessary and proper that writ issue from the appellate court*].

2. The issues presented in this petition are of great public importance and require prompt resolution, as follows: _____[*specify reasons*].

[*Include prayer; see § 474C.91* .]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*name*]

[*For verification, see § 474C.91*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, should be used when the petition for writ of mandate will be filed in the Court of Appeal, or the California Supreme court. See *§ 474C.14* for discussion of when it is appropriate to file the petition in these courts.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration under penalty of perjury)]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.93

§ 474C.93 Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

[1] FORM Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ALTERNATIVE WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Respondents.	)	Time: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Location: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*respondent*]:

Good cause appearing, you are commanded, immediately after receipt of this writ, to set aside your decision made _____[*date*], in the matter entitled _____[*title of administrative proceeding*]; or, in the alternative, to appear on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, located at _____[*name of building and street address*], in _____[*city*], California, and then and there to show cause why you have not done so.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*],
Clerk,
By _____ [*signature*],
Deputy

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is an alternative writ for use by the petitioner in a mandate proceeding for review of an administrative decision. The form does not include an order for issuance of the writ, and should be used in conjuction with the form of order *set forth in § 474C.95* when local court rules require that the order be be separate. See *§ 474C.15* for discussion of requirements for this form.

[3] Signature on Writ

The alternative writ of mandate is a judicial order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 17*; *Painter v. Berglund (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 63, 70, 87 P.2d 360* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*] which logically may be signed by a judge. However, the practice appears to be that the court signs an order to the clerk commanding the clerk to issue the alternative writ; and the clerk signs the writ and affixes the court's seal. The order for issuance of the writ may be a simple one-line directive to the effect of "Let the writ issue." It may be appended to the petition or to the alternative writ (in which case it usually is in the form of "Let the foregoing writ issue"). Local practice and superior court rules should be consulted on this point.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.94

§ 474C.94 Alternative Writ of Mandate (Order Included)--Alternative Form

[1] FORM Alternative Writ of Mandate (Order Included)--Alternative Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ALTERNATIVE WRIT OF MANDATE AND OR-
_____ [*name*],	)	DER DIRECTING ISSUANCE
Respondents.	)	Date: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Time: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Location: _____
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*name*], Respondent:

Good cause appearing from the verified petition of _____[*name*] for a writ of mandate on file herein,

YOU ARE COMMANDED, _____ [immediately on receipt of this writ *or* on or before _____ (*date*),] to _____ [*specify what respondent is ordered to do, e.g.:* set aside your decision dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____]; or

IN THE ALTERNATIVE, to show cause before this court at the courtroom thereof at _____[*address*] on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, why you have not done so.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*]
Clerk,
By _____ [*signature*]
Deputy

ORDER

Let the foregoing writ issue.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this alternative writ and a copy of the petition be served on respondent [*add, if there is real party in interest:* and real party in interest] on or before _____[*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is an alternative writ for use by a petitioner in administrative mandate proceedings. It includes an order for issuance of the writ, and therefore should not be used if local court rules require that the order be separate. See *§ 474C.15* for discussion of the requirements for this form.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.95

§ 474C.95 Separate Order for Issuance of Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

[1] FORM Separate Order for Issuance of Alternative Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1087]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER DIRECTING ISSUANCE OF ALTERN-
_____ [*name*],	)	ATIVE WRIT OF MANDATE
Respondents.	)	Date: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Time: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Location: _____
	)	
	)	

_____

Good cause appearing from the verified petition of _____[*name*] for a writ of mandate on file herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that an alternative writ of mandate issue under the seal of this court directed to the above-named respondent commanding _____ [him/her/it], _____ [immediately on receipt of the writ or on or before _____ (*date*)], to _____ [*specify what respondent is ordered to do, e.g.:* set aside _____ (his/her/its) decision dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____]; or

IN THE ALTERNATIVE, to show cause before this court at the courtroom thereof at _____[*address*]

on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, why _____ [he/she/it] has not done so.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the alternative writ and a copy of the petition be served on respondent [*add, if there is real party in interest:* and real party in interest] on or before _____[*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

[2] Use of Form

This form is a separate order for issuance of an alternative writ in administrative mandate proceedings. See *§ 474C.16* for discussion of requirements for this form, and when to use the form.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.96

§ 474C.96 Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Peremptory Writ of Mandate in Superior Court to Review Administrative Decision

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITIONER'S NOTICE OF MOTION FOR AN
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF PEREMP-
Respondents.	)	TORY WRIT OF MANDATE
[_____ (*name*),	)	Date: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	

_____

To _____[*names of respondent(s) and real party or parties in interest*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in _____ [Department *or* Division] of this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], California, petitioner will move the court for a peremptory writ of mandate commanding respondent, _____ [immediately on receipt of the writ *or* on or before _____ (*date*)], to _____ [*specify what respondent is to be ordered to do, e.g.:* set aside _____ (his/her/its) decision dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____]. The motion will be made on the grounds that _____[*specify legal basis on*

which writ may be granted, as discussed in memorandum of points and authorities].

The motion will be based on this notice, on the verified petition of _____[*name*] on file in this action, a copy of which is served with this notice, on the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed together with this notice, on the papers and records on file in this matter, and on such oral and documentary eviden ce as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, should be used when the petitioner adopts the noticed application procedure to seek a writ of mandate. See *§§ 474C.10[1], [3]* and *474C.17* for discussion of when it is appropriate to use the noticed application procedure.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration under penalty of perjury)]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.97

§ 474C.97 *Palma* Notice in Appellate Court

[1] FORM *Palma* Notice in Appellate Court

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*OR*]

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
_____ APPELLATE DISTRICT
[DIVISION _____]
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____ NOTICE OF MOTION FOR PEREMP-
Respondent.	)	TORY WRIT OF MANDATE WITHOUT ALTERN-
[_____, (*name*)	)	ATIVE WRIT
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

To [*names of respondent(s) and real party or parties in interest*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the above-entitled court has been asked to and is considering the grant of a peremptory writ in this matter without first issuing an alternative writ. Before ruling, however, the court invites a response from respondent [*add, if there is a real party in interest:* and real party in interest] to the petition on or before _____[*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, may be used to give the respondent and the real party in interest, if any, notice that an appellate court is considering the issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate without first issuing an alternative writ. It is designed to comply with the holding in *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893* . In some courts of appeal, a *Palma* notice is prepared and issued by the court. Counsel should ascertain the particular court's practice in this regard before preparing or submitting this notice. For discussion of the limits on the use of the accelerated *Palma* procedure, see *§ 474C.17[5]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.98

§ 474C.98 Order for Preparing and Filing Administrative Record

[1] FORM Order for Preparing and Filing Administrative Record

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER AND EX PARTE APPLICATION WITH
Respondent.	)	SUPPORTING DECLARATION FOR PREPARING
	)	AND FILING ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
	)	

_____

ORDER

Good cause appearing from the application and supporting declaration hereinafter set forth,

IT IS ORDERED that [*add if required by court*: upon receipt from the petitioner of the sum of $_____ (*estimated cost of preparing transcript*)], _____[*name of respondent agency or officer*] shall forthwith cause a transcript to be prepared of the _____ [entire *or* following designated parts of the] record of the proceedings before him/her/it in the matter entitled _____[*title of proceeding before agency or officer*], No. _____.

The transcript is to cover _____[*designated parts of record, if only parts of record are to be prepared*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that promptly after the transcript has been prepared, _____[*name of respondent agency or officer*] shall file it in the above-entitled proceeding in this court and shall cause a copy of it to be delivered to the petitioner.
Dated: _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

APPLICATION

Petitioner hereby applies for the foregoing order on the ground that, as more particularly set out in the declaration of _____ [petitioner *or name of declarant*] hereinafter, petitioner's efforts to obtain a transcript of the record of the proceedings before _____[*name of respondent agency or officer*], entitled _____[*title*], No. _____ have not been successful. [*Add, if necessary*: Petitioner is informed by the official reporter that the estimated cost of preparing the transcript is $_____.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Petitioner

DECLARATION

I, _____[*name*], declare:

_____[*Facts as to petitioner's efforts to obtain transcript of record, including dates and what was done, and unsuccessful result*].

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on _____[*date*], at _____[*city*], California.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, combining an ex parte application with supporting declaration and an order for preparation and filing of the administrative record is for use by the petitioner who has been unable to obtain the record from the agency. The court is empowered by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)* to order the agency to prepare and file the record. For further discussion, see *§ 474C.23*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.99

§ 474C.99 Order to Temporarily Stay Administrative Decision and to Show Cause

[1] FORM Order to Temporarily Stay Administrative Decision and to Show Cause

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND TEMPORARY
_____ [*name*],	)	STAY ORDER
Respondents.	)	Date: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Time: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Location: _____
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*name*], Respondent:

Good cause appearing from the verified petition of _____[*name*] for a writ of mandate on file herein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, pending a hearing on this order, you stay the operation of your _____ [decision *or* order] dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____];

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that you show cause before this Court at the courtroom thereof at _____[*address*] on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, why the foregoing stay should not be continued pending entry of judgment in this

action.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order _____ [*describe other documents to be served, e.g.:* and copies of the petition and of any supporting affidavits, declarations, and points and authorities on file herein] be served on respondent [*add, if there is real party in interest:* and real party in interest] on or before _____[*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, may be used as an order to show cause and an order temporarily staying the operation of an administrative decision or order. Immediately below the number, the order should set forth the date, the time, and the location, if ascertainable, of any scheduled hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.100-2.119* ("papers" includes all documents, except exhibits or copies of documents, which are offered for filing in any case in the superior courts); *see also § 474C.13[5]* for discussion of requirements for temporary stays].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.100

§ 474C.100 Order Staying Administrative Decision Pending Judgment

[1] FORM Order Staying Administrative Decision Pending Judgment

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	STAY ORDER
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Respondents.	)	Time: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Location: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*name*], Respondent:

The order to show cause and temporary stay order in the above-entitled matter came on regularly to be heard before the Court on _____[*date*]. _____[*name*] appeared as attorney for petitioner.

[*EITHER*]

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for respondent.

[*OR*]

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for real party in interest, _____[*name*].

[*OR*]

There were no appearances for _____ [*name and capacity, e.g.:* respondent].

[*CONTINUE*]

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that respondent stay the operation of its _____ [decision *or* order] dated _____, in the administrative proceedings entitled _____ pending judgment in this action.
Dated: _____.

_____[*signature*]
Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, may be used for an order staying the operation of an administrative decision pending judgment in a mandate proceeding. See *§ 474C.18* for discussion of requirements for stay orders.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.101

§ 474C.101 Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	_____ [RESPONDENT'S *or* REAL
_____ [*name*],	)	PARTY IN INTEREST'S] DEMURRER TO PETI-
Respondents.	)	TIONER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
[_____ (*name*),	)	Date: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	

_____ [Respondent *or* Real party in interest] demurs to the petition for writ of mandate herein on [each of] the following ground(s):

[*Specify grounds for demurrer, as appropriate, stating each ground separately, e.g.:*

1. The court has no jurisdiction of the subject of the cause of action alleged in the petition.

2. The petitioner does not have the legal capacity to sue.

3. The petition fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action.]

[*Continue with further grounds, as necessary*.]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [Respondent *or* Real Party in Interest]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is a demurrer for use by the respondent or real party in interest to challenge the petitioner's legal basis for seeking a writ of mandate. See *§ 474C.19* for discussion of requirements for use of this form.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.102

§ 474C.102 Notice of Hearing on Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Notice of Hearing on Demurrer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF HEARING ON _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[RESPONDENT'S *or* REAL PARTY IN IN-
Respondents.	)	TEREST'S] DEMURRER TO PETITIONER'S PETI-
[_____ (*name*),	)	TION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____

_____

TO THE ABOVE-NAMED PETITIONER AND TO _____ [HIS/HER/ITS] ATTORNEY:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [respondent's *or* real party in interest's] demurrer to the petition for writ of mandate herein, a copy of which is served herewith, has been set for hearing before the above-entitled court at the courtroom thereof at _____[*address*] on _____[*date*]. at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard.
Date: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [Respondent *or* Real Party in Interest]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is a notice of demurrer for use by the respondent or real party in interest to serve on the petitioner. See *§ 474C.19* for discussion of requirements for use of this form.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.103

§ 474C.103 Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	_____ [RESPONDENT'S *or* REAL
_____ [*name*],	)	PARTY IN INTEREST'S] ANSWER TO PETITION-
Respondents.	)	ER'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
[_____ (*name*),	)	Date: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	

_____

_____ [Respondent, _____ (*name*) *and/or* Real party in interest, _____ (*name*)], answer[s] the petition for writ of mandate in the above-captioned proceeding as follows:

[*Set forth one or more of the following paragraphs as appropriate*]

1. _____ [Admit *or* Admits] that _____[*specify allegations of petition that are admitted*].

2. _____ [Deny *or* Denies] each and every allegation in the petition not expressly admitted.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[*Allege facts constituting affirmative defense*.]

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

[*Allege facts constituting affirmative defense, and set out any additional affirmative defenses in a similar manner, then continue with the following:*]

WHEREFORE, _____ [respondent *and/or* real party in interest] pray[s] for judgment as follows:

1. That the petition for writ of mandate herein be denied;

[*Add the following if an alternative writ has been issued:*]

2. That the alternative writ of mandate herein be discharged;

[*Continue with the following:*]

3. That this proceeding be dismissed;

4. That _____ [he/she/it/they] recover all costs in this proceeding;

5. That the court grant such other and further relief as is proper.
Date: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [Respondent *or* Real Party in Interest]

VERIFICATION

I, [*name*] , am the _____ [respondent *or* real party in interest] in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing answer and know its contents. I declare under penalty of perjury [*if executed outside California, add:* under the laws of the State of California] that the same is true and correct to my own knowledge.

Executed on _____[*date*], at _____[*place*].

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [Respondent *and/or* Real Party in Interest]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is an answer for use by the respondent or real party in interest to deny all the material allegations of the petition that the answering party does not wish to admit. See *§ 474C.19* for discussion of requirements for use of this form.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.104

§ 474C.104 Replication to Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Replication to Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITIONER'S REPLICATION TO ANSWER TO
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Respondents.	)	Date: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Time: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	Location: _____
	)	
	)	

_____

Petitioner(s) _____ [reply *or* replies] to the answer of _____[*description of party as respondent or real party in interest*] as follows:

[*Set forth one or more of following paragraphs, as appropriate:*]

1. _____ [Admit *or* Admits] that _____[*specify allegations of answer that are admitted*].

2. _____ [Deny *or* Denies] each and every allegation in said answer not heretofore expressly admitted.

3. In Reply to the _____[*specify number of affirmative defense*] affirmative defense, _____ [*specify response such as,* admit, *or* deny] the allegations of that affirmative defense.

[*CONTINUE*]
Date: _____.
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing replication and know its contents. I declare under penalty of perjury [*if executed outside California, add:* under the laws of the State of California] that the same is true and correct my own knowledge.

Executed on _____[*date*], at _____[*place*].

_____ [*signature*]
Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form of replication in *[1], above*, is for use by the petitioner to reply to the answer of the respondent or real party in interest, or both, to petitioner's writ petition [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1091*]. As shown in this form, the replication can consist of denials, affirmative allegations, or both. Allegations in the replication are considered with the same effect as allegations in the writ petition [*see English v. City of Long Beach (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 311, 315, 250 P.2d 298]* . A replication is a pleading that denies or controverts the affirmative allegations of an answer [*see Lotus Car Ltd. v. Municipal Court (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 264, 268, 69 Cal. Rptr. 384]* . Factual allegations in the answer to a petition for a writ of mandate must be countervailed by proof at trial or by replication, or they are taken as true [*California Portland Cement Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 578, 582 n.5, 63 Cal. Rptr. 5, 432 P.2d 700* ; *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1054, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286]* . If, however, matters alleged in the answer are not sufficient to constitute a defense, then the court is not required to accept them as true and the petitioner is not required to controvert them [*Most v. First Nat. Bank of San Diego (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 425, 432, 54 Cal. Rptr. 669* ; *see Miller v. Eisenhower Medical Center (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 614, 625 n.10, 166 Cal. Rptr. 826, 614 P.2d 258]* . See *§ 474C.21* for discussion of requirements for use of this form.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

[4] Filing

If an alternative writ is sought, petitioner can file the replication at any time before the return date set forth in the alternative writ. If an alternative writ is not sought, petitioner can file the replication at any time before the hearing date

on the motion for a peremptory writ. If the respondent or a real party in interest does not serve an answer until at or immediately prior to the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*], petitioner should request a continuance of the hearing to prepare and file a replication if one is deemed necessary.

[5] Service

Because a replication is not permitted in a civil action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 422.10*], there is no statute that explicitly provides for service. Nevertheless, *Code Civ. Proc. § 465* provides that all pleadings subsequent to the complaint be filed with the clerk or judge, together with proof of service, unless a summons needs to be issued, and copies thereof served on the adverse party or that party's attorney [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 465*]. Because *Code Civ. Proc. § 465* is applicable to administrative mandate proceedings pursuant to the general incorporating provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*, a replication must be served on the attorney for the adverse party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*]. Either service by mail or personal service would be acceptable [*see generally* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[6] Cross References

For a replication form used in ordinary mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

California Administrative Mandate, Ch. 11 (Cal. C.E.B. 2d ed. 1989)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 197, 315 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.105

§ 474C.105 Judgment Granting Relief

[1] FORM Judgment Granting Relief

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	JUDGMENT
_____ [*name*],	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	

This cause came on regularly for trial on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____] of the above-entitled court, the Honorable _____[*name*], Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appearing by his/her attorney, _____[*name*], and respondent appearing by his/her/its attorney, _____[*name*], _____ [*add, if appropriate:* and evidence having been presented] and the cause having been argued and submitted for decision _____ [*add, if appropriate:*, and the court having made and caused to be filed its written findings of fact and conclusions of law],

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED as follows:

1. A peremptory writ of mandate shall be issued and directed to respondent, _____[*name*] commanding respondent, _____ [immediately after receiving the writ *or at some other specified time*], to set aside the decision made by respondent on _____[*date*], in the matter entitled

_____[*title of administrative proceeding*];

2. _____ [*Add, if appropriate:* The writ shall further command respondent to reconsider the said matter in the light of this judgment _____ (and the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed in this proceeding)].

3. _____ [*Add, if appropriate:* The writ shall further command respondent to _____ (*specify such further action as respondent is specially enjoined by law to take, e.g.,* modify its examination procedures so as to remove from consideration in the granting of licenses any question or issue relating to the applicant's age [except as to whether the applicant is an adult], sex, or race)].

4. _____ [*Add, if appropriate:* Petitioner shall have and recover from respondent the sum of $_____ as and for attorney's fees pursuant to *Section 800 of the Government Code*].

5. Petitioner shall have and recover from respondent petitioner's costs and disbursements in this proceeding in the sum of $_____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*],
Judge of the Superior Court

Judgment entered on _____[*date*], in Vol. _____ of the Judgment Book, page _____.

_____ [*signature*],
Clerk
By _____ [*signature*],
Deputy

[2] Use of Form

The form of judgment in *[1], above*, is for use by the petitioner who has successfully petitioned for administrative mandate in the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. For a discussion of the requirements for judgments, see *§ 474C.25*.

[3] Contents of Judgment

If a trial was held, the law contemplates that the judicial proceeding will be terminated by a judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 577* (judgment defined), 1094.5, 1109; *International Asso. of Fire Fighters v. Palo Alto (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 295, 300-301, 32 Cal. Rptr. 842, 384 P.2d 170* ; *Hadley v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 389, 394, 105 Cal. Rptr. 500]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e) provides that "[t]he court shall enter judgment either commanding [the] respondent to set aside the ... decision, or denying [the petition for] the writ." In practice the judgment is that a writ of mandate shall issue commanding the respondent (agency) to set aside the decision, either immediately after receipt of the writ or at some other specified time [*e.g., Associated Brewers Distributing Co. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 583, 589, 55 Cal. Rptr. 772, 422 P.2d 332* ("Let a peremptory writ of mandate issue requiring respondent ... to set aside its order ... "); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1087* (form of peremptory writ)]. If the judgment is against the petitioner, it is simply that the petition is denied. In such a case the judgment usually also orders that the alternative writ is discharged [*e.g., Jenkins v. Knight (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 220, 226, 293 P.2d 6]* . If the judgment is in favor of the

petitioner, it may also order the respondent to reconsider the case in the light of the court's opinion and judgment; and it may order the respondent to take such further action as is specially enjoined on the respondent by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. These further orders may appropriately be included in the writ, which is itself nothing more than a judicial order giving effect to the judgment [*see Painter v. Berglund (1939) 87 P.2d 360* (defining writ as a written order issued by a court)]. The judgment may not limit or control in any way the discretion legally vested in the respondent (agency).

In an appropriate case the judgment will simply remand the case for further administrative proceedings. The trial court has inherent authority to do this [*Keeler v. Superior Court (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 596, 600, 297 P.2d 967]* , but the Code of Civil Procedure also gives the court this authority [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*]. Remand is particularly appropriate where evidence was improperly excluded or where the petitioner could not, with reasonable diligence, have produced certain relevant evidence at the administrative hearing, and the court has no authority to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(d)*].

Where the issue in the trial court is whether the administrative decision is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record or whether there has been an abuse of discretion, findings are not essential to effective appellate review of the decision of the trial court. In such cases, the issue being essentially one of law, findings are not required [*Friends of Lake Arrowhead v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 497, 518, 113 Cal. Rptr. 539* ; *Contra Beloin v. Blankenhorn (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 662, 664, 218 P.2d 552]* .

A minute order has been held to be inappropriate for disposing of a petition for a writ of mandate and not to constitute a final judgment in the proceeding. However, a minute order could constitute notice of the court's intended decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*], with a consequence that a party wanting written findings of fact would be required to request them within 10 days after announcement of mailing of the minute order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*] lest he be held to have waived his right to have them [*Hadley v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 389, 395, 105 Cal. Rptr. 500]* .

In 1981, the California legislature amended *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, replacing findings of fact and conclusions of law in general civil actions with a statement of decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, as amended, provides that on request of any party appearing at trial made within 10 days after the court announces its tentative decision, the court must issue a statement of decision explaining the factual and legal basis for its decision as to each principal controverted issue. The procedures provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*, have been modified accordingly.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to costs, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*

For discussion and forms relating to trial court findings and conclusions, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision*

For discussion and forms of judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.106

§ 474C.106 Judgment Granting Relief (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

[1] Form Judgment Granting Relief (Alternative Form) [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]

[*For Caption, see § 474C.105* .]

JUDGMENT GRANTING PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE

The above-entitled matter came on regularly for trial before the above-entitled Court on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], in _____ [Division *or* Department] _____ thereof, the Honorable _____[*name of judge*] presiding, without a jury. _____[*name*] appeared as attorney for petitioner.

[*Use one or more of following recitals, as appropriate:*]

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for respondent.

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for real party in interest, _____[*name*].

There were no appearances for _____ [*name and capacity, e.g.:* respondent].

[*Continue as follows:*]

The record of administrative proceedings having been introduced in evidence and _____ [other *or* no other] evidence having been received by the Court, the matter having been argued [*include if applicable:* and the Court having made and caused to be filed its written statement of decision in this matter],

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. A peremptory writ of mandate shall issue commanding respondent to set aside its decision dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____[*title of administrative proceedings*] _____ [*describe effect of order, e.g.:* suspending petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license)].

[*Add following if case is to be remanded to agency for further proceedings:*]

2. The writ shall further command respondent to reconsider its decision in the the aforesaid proceedings in light of this judgment (and the Court's statement of decision in this proceeding) and take such further action as is specially enjoined on respondent by law.

[*Continue as follows:*]

3. Petitioner shall recover _____ [his/her/its] costs and disbursements in this action in the amount of $_____.

[*If attorney's fees or litigation expenses are recoverable, add following:*]

4. Petitioner shall recover from respondent _____ [attorney's fees or litigation expenses] in the amount of $_____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

Judgment entered on _____, in Vol. _____ of the Judgment Book.

_____ [*signature*]
Clerk

[2] Use of Form

The form of judgment granting relief in *[1], above*, may be used by a party who has successfully petitioned for administrative mandate in the superior court. This form is an alternative to *§ 474C.105*. For a discussion of the requirements for this form, see *§ 474C.25*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.107

§ 474C.107 Judgment Denying Relief

[1] FORM Judgment Denying Relief

[*For Caption, see § 474C.105* .]

JUDGMENT DENYING PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE

The above-entitled matter came on regularly for trial before the above-entitled Court on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], in _____ [Division *or* Department] _____ thereof, the Honorable _____[*name of judge*] presiding, without a jury. _____[*name*] appeared as attorney for petitioner.

[*Use one or more of following recitals, as appropriate:*]

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for respondent.

_____[*name*] appeared as attorney for real party in interest, _____[*name*].

There were no appearances for _____ [*name and capacity, e.g.*, respondent].

[*Continue as follows:*]

The record of administrative proceedings having been introduced in evidence and _____ [other *or* no other] evidence having been received by the Court, the matter having been argued [*include if applicable:* and the Court having made and caused to be filed its written statement of decision in this matter],

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The peremptory writ of mandate applied for herein is denied;

[*Add following if alternative writ of mandate was issued:*]

2. The alternative writ of mandate granted herein is discharged;

[*Continue as follows:*]

3. _____ [Respondent (*name*) *and/or* Real party in interest _____ (*name*)] shall recover _____ [his/her/its/their] costs and disbursements in this action in the amount of $_____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

Judgment entered on _____[*date*], in Vol. _____ of the Judgment Book.

_____ [*signature*]
Clerk

[2] Use of Form

The form of judgment denying relief in *[1], above*, may be used by a party who has successfully defended against a petition for a writ of mandate in the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. For a discussion of the requirements for use of this form, see *§ 474C.25*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.108

§ 474C.108 Peremptory Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Peremptory Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PEREMPTORY WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Respondents.	)	Time: _____
[_____ (*name*),	)	Location: _____
Real Party in Interest.]	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*name*], Respondent:

WHEREAS, on _____[*date*], judgment was entered in this action, ordering that a peremptory writ of mandate be issued from this Court,

THEREFORE, YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED, _____ [immediately on receipt of this writ *or specify other date or time, e.g.:* within _____ days from the date that a copy of this writ is served on you] to set aside your decision dated _____, in the proceedings entitled _____[*title of administrative proceedings*], _____ [*describe effect of order, e.g.:* suspending petitioner's _____ (*specify license, certificate, or permit, e.g.:* collection agency license)], and to _____ [*specify what the judgment orders respondent to do, e.g.:* reconsider said decision in the light of

this Court's judgment (*add, if there was a statement of decision:* and statement of decision on file herein) and take further action specially enjoined on you by law].

[*The following paragraph is optional but recommended:*]

YOU ARE FURTHER COMMANDED to make and file a return to this writ _____ [on or before _____ (*date*) *or* within _____ days from the date a copy of this writ is served on you] showing what you have done to comply with this writ.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*], Clerk
By: _____ [*signature*]
Deputy

LET THE FOREGOING WRIT ISSUE.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge

[2] Use of Form

The form of peremptory writ in *[1], above*, may be used by a party who has successfully petitioned for administrative mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1087, 1094.5*]. For a discussion of the requirements for this form, see *§ 474C.26*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapter 474C PROCEDURES IN REVIEWING AGENCY DECISIONS
PART V. FORMS

41A-474C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 474C.109

§ 474C.109 Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Ordinary Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date of Hearing: _____
Respondents.	)	Time of Hearing: _____
	)	Location of Hearing: _____
	)	

_____

Petitioner petitions this court for a writ of mandate under *Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1085* and *1086* and alleges:

1. At all times mentioned in this petition, petitioner has been and now is _____ [*describe petitioner's legal capacity to sue, if not a natural person, and any license, certificate, or permit held, e.g.:* a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and the holder of a collection agency license duly issued by respondent].

2. At all times mentioned in this petition, respondent has been and now is _____ [*specify nature of agency, e.g.:* an administrative agency within the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumers Affairs of the State of California]. [*If respondent is a board or commission, specify composition, e.g.:* The chairperson of respondent is _____ (*name*), the secretary is _____ (*name*), and it is composed of _____ (*number*) members].

3. Real party in interest _____[*name*] has an interest that is directly affected by this proceeding, as

follows: _____[*specify facts*].

[*If respondent has failed to perform ministerial duty, use the following:*]

4. Pursuant to _____[*cite and describe statutory source of agency's duty*], respondent has a clear, present, and ministerial duty to _____[*specify nature of duty*].

[*Or, if respondent has failed or refused to exercise its discretion, use the following:*]

4. Pursuant to _____[*cite and describe statute or regulation conferring discretion on respondent*], respondent has discretion to _____[*specify nature of discretion*]. Respondent has _____ [failed *or* refused] to exercise its discretion, as follows: _____[*specify facts showing way in which respondent has failed or refused to exercise its discretion*].

[*Or, if respondent has abused its discretion, use the following:*]

4. Pursuant to _____[*cite and describe statute or regulation conferring discretion on respondent*], respondent has discretion to _____[*specify nature of discretion*]. Respondent has abused this discretion, as follows: _____[*specify facts showing how respondent has abused discretion*].

[*If petitioner seeks performance of respondent's duty, include the following:*]

5. Petitioner has a clear, present, and substantial right to the performance of respondent's duty, as follows: _____[*specify facts showing petitioner's entitlement to performance of duty, including exhaustion of administrative remedies and the making of any required demand or facts excusing such a demand*]. At all times relevant to this petition, respondent has been able to perform its duty, but has _____ [failed *or* refused] and continues to _____ [fail *or* refuse] to do so.

[*Continue with the following:*]

6. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, other than the writ sought by this petition, as follows: _____[*specify facts showing lack of other legal remedy*].

[*If petitioner seeks attorney's fees under Gov. Code § 800, include the following:*]

7. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has become personally obligated to pay to _____[*name*], _____ [his/her/its] counsel, attorney's fees _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in excess of $7,500] computed at $100 per hour.

[*If petitioner seeks litigation expenses under Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5, include the following:*]

8. Petitioner is a _____ ["small business" as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(c) or* "licensee" as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5(d)*]. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has

incurred the following litigation expenses in addition to other costs:

[*List expenses, e.g.:*]

a. Court costs in the amount of $_____.

b. Witness fees in the amount of $_____.

c. Expenses of the administrative proceedings in the amount of $_____.

d. Attorney's fees in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays the court for judgment as follows:

1. For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to _____[*specify act sought to be compelled*], or, alternatively, to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;

2. For a peremptory writ of mandate directing respondent to _____[*specify act sought to be compelled*].

[*If petitioner seeks attorney's fees or litigation expenses, insert the following:*]

3. For reasonable _____ [attorney's fees *or* litigation expenses] in addition to any other relief granted or costs awarded;

4. For all costs of suit incurred in this proceeding; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, may be used to seek a writ of ordinary mandate in the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]. For discussion of requirements for this form, see *§ 474C.41*.

[3] Verification

A verification is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. The requirements for a verification are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration under penalty of perjury)]. If the petition was inadvertently not verified, the court may allow an amendment for the purpose of supplying a verification [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 41A: Public Agency Adjudications Judicial Review-Chs. 473-479
Chapters 475-479 [RESERVED]

41A-475 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 475-479

[RESERVED]

Chapters 475[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 480.syn

§ 480.syn Synopsis to Chapter 480: PUBLIC UTILITIES

§ 480.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 480.02 Cross References

§§ 480.03-480.09 [Reserved]

§ 480.10 Governing Law

§ 480.11 "Public Utility" Defined

§ 480.12 Public Utilities Commission

[1] PUC a Constitutional or "Independent" Agency

[2] Jurisdiction of PUC Over Public Utilities

[3] Regulatory Power

[4] Petition by Interested Persons to Adopt, Amend, Repeal Regulation

[a] In General

[b] Scope of Right to Petition

[i] "Interested Persons" Is Construed Broadly

[ii] "Regulation" Limited to General Applicability and Future Effect

[iii] Not Means of Requesting Reconsideration

[c] Time to Grant or Deny Petition

[i] Six Months From Date of Receipt

[ii] Extension to Allow Public Review and Comment

[d] Statement of Reasons for Denial

§ 480.13 Rates Charged by Public Utility

§ 480.14 Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity

[1] When Required

[2] Exceptions for Extension of Existing Service

[3] Exemptions

§§ 480.15-480.19 [Reserved]

§ 480.20 Procedures Established by PUC

§ 480.21 Application and Complaint Proceedings Compared

§ 480.22 Complaints Against Public Utilities

[1] Who May File

[2] Service and Filing of Notice of Hearing

[3] Answer

[4] Joinder

[5] Intervention

[a] Generally

[b] Participation Without Intervention

§ 480.23 Categorization Determination by PUC

[1] Preliminary Determination of Category Generally

[a] Determination Required

[b] Categories Defined

[i] "Quasi-Legislative" Defined

[ii] "Adjudication" Defined

[iii] "Ratesetting" Defined

[c] Ex Parte Communication on Categorization Issues

[2] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by Application

[a] Application

[b] Proposed Schedule

[c] Protest or Response

[d] Preliminary Determination of Category and Need for Hearing

[i] Content and Timing of Resolution

[ii] Multiple Category and Other Proceedings

[iii] Preliminary Determination Not Appealable

[e] Appealable Determination of Category and Need for Hearing

[3] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by Complaint

[a] Complaint

[b] Instructions to Answer

[c] Answer

[d] Ruling on Scoping Memo

[4] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by PUC Order Instituting Investigation

[5] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by PUC Order Instituting Rulemaking

[6] Determination in Proceedings Filed Before January 1, 1998

[7] Appeals of Categorization

[a] Appeal Is Prerequisite for Standing to Seek Judicial Review

[b] Time Limit for Request

[c] Content of Appeal

[d] Service of Appeal

[e] Response to Appeal

[f] Decision on Appeal

[8] Approval of Changes to Preliminary Determinations

§ 480.24 Proceedings Without Hearings

§ 480.25 Prehearing Conference

§ 480.25A Ruling on Scoping Memorandum

§ 480.26 Intervenor's Fees and Expenses

[1] Availability of Compensation

[2] Amount of Compensation

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Compensation

[a] Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation

[b] Preliminary Ruling on Eligibility for Compensation

[c] Request for Award of Compensation

[d] Verification of Basis for Award

[e] Decision to Grant or Deny Award

[4] Payment of Compensation by Utility

§ 480.27 Deposit of Funds

§§ 480.28-480.39 [Reserved]

§ 480.40 Hearing Procedures Generally Applicable

§ 480.40A Role of Presiding Officers

[1] Commissioners or Administrative Law Judge

[2] Authority

§ 480.41 Right to Be Heard and Introduce Evidence

§ 480.42 Attendance of Witnesses

§ 480.43 Record of Proceedings

§ 480.44 Issuance and Form of Order

§ 480.45 Service of Order

§ 480.46 Operative Date of Order or Decision

§§ 480.47-480.49 [Reserved]

§ 480.50 Defined

§ 480.51 Ex Parte Communication on Categorization Issues

[1] In General

[2] Period Between Beginning of Proceeding and Category Determination

[a] Proceeding Initiated by Application

[b] Proceeding Initiated by Complaint

[c] Proceeding Initiated by Order Instituting Investigation

[d] Proceeding Initiated by Order Instituting Rulemaking

[e] Formal Proceedings Filed Before January 1, 1998

[3] Period After Category Determination

[a] Adjudication Hearing

[b] Ratesetting Hearing

[i] Generally Prohibited

[ii] Oral Ex Parte Communications

[iii] Written Ex Parte Communications

[iv] PUC May Establish Periods Without Ex Parte Communication

[c] Quasi-Legislative Hearing

[4] Circumstances Causing Restrictions on Ex Parte Communication to No Longer Apply

§ 480.52 Ex Parte Communication in Enforcement-Related and Other Covered Proceedings

[1] Applicable Proceedings

[a] Enforcement-Related Proceeding

[b] Other Covered Proceedings

[c] Consolidated Proceedings

[2] Augmentation of Ex Parte Communication Provisions

§ 480.53 Written Report of Ex Parte Communication

§ 480.54 Sanctions for Improper Ex Parte Communication

§§ 480.55-480.59 [Reserved]

§ 480.60 Applicable Procedures

§ 480.61 Scoping Memo Governs Manner of Proceedings

§ 480.62 Challenge to Administrative Law Judge

[1] Authority for Reassignment

[2] Automatic Reassignment

[a] Petition

[b] Supporting Declaration

[c] Time Limit for Filing Petition

[d] Ruling on Petition

[e] Circumstances Permitting Unlimited Peremptories

[3] Reassignment for Cause

[a] Grounds

[i] Financial Interest

[ii] Bias, Prejudice, or Interest

[b] Circumstances Not Constituting Grounds

[c] Declaration

[d] Filing and Service

[e] Limit on Number of Petitions

[f] Administrative Law Judge's Ability to Request Reassignment

[g] Waiver

[4] Prior Rulings of Reassigned ALJ Not Set Aside

[5] Ban on Ex Parte Communications.

§ 480.63 Ex Parte Communications Prohibited

§ 480.64 Decision

[1] Submission for Decision

[2] Content

[3] Filing and Service

[4] When Presiding Officer's Decision Becomes PUC Decision

[5] Comments on Draft Decision

[6] Table of Decisions

§ 480.64A Oral Argument on Rehearing

§ 480.65 Review by PUC

[1] Initiation of Review

[a] Appeal By Interested Party

[b] Request for Review By PUC

[c] Content of Appeal or Request for Review

[d] Service of Appeal or Request for Review

[2] Response to Appeal or Request for Review

[3] Consideration of Presiding Officer's Decision in Closed Session

[4] PUC Decision Must Be Based on Record Developed by Presiding Officer

[5] Vote in Public Meeting

[6] Explanation of Changes Required

§ 480.66 Time Limit to Resolve Adjudication Cases

§ 480.67 Determination Regarding Ability to Pay Penalties or Fines

§§ 480.68-480.79 [Reserved]

§ 480.80 Applicable Procedures

§ 480.81 Principal Hearing Officer

[1] Prehearing Designation

[2] Minimum Attendance Requirement

[3] Decision as Proposed Decision

§ 480.82 Party's Request for Presence of Commissioner

§ 480.83 Ex Parte Communication

§ 480.84 Challenges to Administrative Law Judge

[1] Exclusive Means of Reassignment

[2] Automatic Reassignment

[a] When Available

[b] Second Automatic Reassignment on Petition by Good Faith Declarant

[c] Time Limit for Filing Petition and Declaration

[d] Ruling on Petition

[3] Reassignment for Cause

§ 480.85 Proposed and Alternate Decision

§ 480.86 Oral Argument Before PUC

§ 480.87 Final Decision of PUC

[1] Submission for Decision

[2] Proposed Decision

[3] Adoption, Modification, or Setting Aside of Proposed Decision

[4] Time Limit of Final Decision

[5] Consideration of Decision in Closed Session

§§ 480.88-480.99 [Reserved]

§ 480.100 Applicable Procedures

§ 480.101 Roles of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge

§ 480.102 Ex Parte Communication Permitted

§ 480.103 Preparation and Presentation of Proposed Rule or Order

§ 480.104 Final Oral Argument Before PUC

§ 480.105 Final Rule or Order of PUC

[1] May Adopt, Modify, or Set Aside Proposed Decision

[2] Time Limit for Final Decision

§§ 480.106-480.119 [Reserved]

§ 480.120 Rescission or Amendment of Order by PUC

§ 480.121 Conclusiveness of Orders and Decisions

§ 480.122 Application for Rehearings

§ 480.123 Petitions to Reopen Proceedings

§§ 480.124-480.129 [Reserved]

§ 480.130 PUC Authority

§ 480.131 No Representation by Attorney

§ 480.132 Pleadings Limited to Complaint and Answer

§ 480.133 Hearing

§ 480.134 Rehearing

§§ 480.135-480.139 [Reserved]

§ 480.140 Code of Civil Procedure Generally Applies

§ 480.141 Limited Power of Trial Court in PUC Matters

§ 480.142 Jurisdiction of Appellate Courts

§ 480.143 Stay

[1] Must Comply With Code and Rules

[2] Scope of Stay

[3] Notice and Hearing

[4] Order Suspending Decision of PUC

[5] Temporary Stay

[a] Proper Case and Time for Grant

[b] Grounds Allowing Grant

[c] Duration of Temporary Stay

[d] Hearing of Application Given Precedence

[e] Endorsement, Filing, and Content of Temporary Stay

[f] Temporary Stay Granted Without Notice

[6] Suspending Bond

[7] Stays Relating to Decision Affecting Rate or Classification

[a] Decision Denying Increase in Rate or Classification

[b] Decision Authorizing Increase or Decrease

§ 480.144 Petition for Writ of Review

[1] Time to Petition

[2] Petition Must Be Verified

[3] Proper Court for Petition

[a] Court of Appeal to Review Adjudicatory Proceeding

[b] Supreme Court to Review Non-adjudicatory Proceeding

[c] Review of Decisions Pertaining Solely to Water Corporations

[3a] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

[4] Service of Petition

§ 480.145 Answer and Reply

§ 480.146 Hearing and Determination

[1] Preference for Public Utilities Proceedings Over Other Civil Business

[2] Scope of Review

[a] In General

[b] Adjudicatory Proceedings

[c] Other Than Adjudicatory Proceedings

[3] Appearances and Judgment

[4] Writ Must Be Returnable at Specified Time and Place

[5] Effect of Denial of Writ

§ 480.147 Review in Supreme Court of Court of Appeal Decisions

§§ 480.148-480.159 [Reserved]

§ 480.160 State Constitution

§ 480.161 Federal Statutes

§ 480.162 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

[2] Regulation of Public Utilities

[3] PUC

[4] Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity

[5] Acquisition or Duplication of Public Utility Property or Service

[6] Regulation of Crossings

§ 480.163 Administrative Regulations

§ 480.164 Decisions

[1] Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

[a] Dedication to Public Service

[b] Nondelegable Duty

[c] Limitations of Liability

[2] PUC Authority Generally

[a] Jurisdiction of PUC

[i] Generally

[ii] Exclusive Jurisdiction

[iii] Concurrent Jurisdiction

[b] Limits to PUC Authority

[c] Unconstitutional Practices

[d] Rates

[e] Refunds

[f] Relocation of Public Utility

[g] Transfer of Public Utilities

[3] PUC Authority Over Particular Public Utilities

[a] Grade Crossings

[b] Telephones

[i] Equipment

[ii] Rates

[4] Municipalities

[a] Control by Municipality

[b] Control by PUC

[c] Utility User's Tax

[5] Proceedings Before PUC

[a] Attorney-Client Privilege

[b] Hearings Before PUC

[c] Decision of PUC

[d] Petition to Reopen Proceeding

[e] Costs and Fees

[6] Intervention by PUC

[7] Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

[8] Civil Actions Involving Public Utilities

[a] Jurisdiction of Superior Court

[b] Effect of PUC Approval on Pending Litigation

[c] Stay Pending Investigation by PUC

[d] Particular Actions

[i] Determination of Public Utility Status

[ii] Condemnation by Public Utility

[iii] Commencement or Disruption of Service

[iv] Unlawful Operation

[v] Inequitable Charges

[vi] Collection of Undercharges

[vii] Infringement of Public Utility's Constitutional Right

[viii] Nuisance

[ix] Fraud

[x] Exemplary Damages

[xi] Termination of Public Utility Franchise

§ 480.165 Attorney General Opinions

§ 480.166 Law Reviews

§ 480.167 Text References

§ 480.168 Internet References

§§ 480.169-480.189 [Reserved]

§ 480.190 Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC

[1] General Form of Complaint

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Who May File

[d] Form and Size

[i] In General

[ii] Transmittal Letter

[iii] Separate Documents for Unrelated Subjects or Different Types of Action

[e] Joinder

[f] Contents of Form

[i] General Requirements

[ii] No Direct Damage Required

[iii] Informal Resolution Allegation

[g] Verification

[h] Copies

[i] Filing

[i] Location

[ii] Acceptance and Rejection of Documents Tendered for Filing

[iii] Assignment of Docket Number

[iv] Acknowledgement of Filing

[j] Amended Complaint

[2] Allegation of Discriminatory Rate

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Compensation for Intervention

[3] Answer to Complaint

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Time for Answer

[d] Verification

[e] Extension of Time

[f] Contents of Answers

[4] Petition to Intervene

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] When Leave Will Be Granted

[d] Broadening of Issues

[e] Effect of Granting of Leave

§ 480.191 Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[1] General Form of Application

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents of Application

[d] Attachments

[i] Organizational Documents and Authorization to Transact Business

[ii] Financial Statement

[e] Copies

[f] Environmental Impact Reports

[g] Amendments

[2] Application For Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Operate and Construct or Extend Facilities

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents of Application

[d] Verification

[3] Application For Approval of Rate Change by Public Utility

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents of Attachments When Rate Increase Is Sought

[i] Balance Sheet and Income Statement

[ii] Current Rates

[iii] Statement of Proposed Increases or Changes

[iv] Summary of Earnings

[v] Exhibits for Specific Utilities

[d] Verification

[e] Notice of Proposed Rate Change

[i] By Mail

[ii] By Publication

[iii] To Customers

[f] Hearing Procedure Before the PUC

[4] Application By Public Utility to Issue Stock or Evidence of Indebtedness or to Assume Liabilities

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Description of Purposes

[d] Verification

[5] Joint Application by Public Utilities to Sell, Lease, or Encumber Utility Property or Rights; Merge or Consolidate Facilities; or Acquire Stock of Another Utility

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Additional Requirements for Carriers

[d] Verification

§ 480.192 Application Proceedings Before the PUC on Shortened Tariff Docket

[1] Application

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Required Allegations

[d] Verification

[e] Copy of Application

[f] Application of Rules to Procedure

[2] Protest

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Verification

[d] Time and Address for Mailing

[e] Service

[f] Copy On Request

§ 480.193 Proceedings to Review Categorization Determination by the PUC

[1] Request for Rehearing of Determination

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Time for Request

§ 480.194 Proceedings to Review Order or Decision of the PUC

[1] Petition for Rehearing or Order or Decision

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents

[d] Time for Filing

[e] Time for Granting or Denying Application

[f] Response

[g] Effect of Application

§ 480.195 Proceedings to Adopt, Amend, Repeal Regulation

[1] Petition by Interested Person

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents

[d] Verification

§§ 480.196-480.199 [Reserved]

§ 480.200 Proceedings to Review PUC Order or Decision

[1] Petition for Writ of Review of Order or Decision

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Proper Court for Filing Petition

[d] Verification

[e] Proof of Service

[f] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

[2] Application to Transfer to Single Appellate District

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Any Party May Seek Order

[d] Transfer Order Sent to Parties by Clerk

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.01

§ 480.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses proceedings before and involving the California Public Utilities Commission (hereafter "PUC").

The chapter contains the following forms for use before the PUC:

- Forms for use in complaint proceedings, including forms of complaint, answer, and petition to intervene [*see § 480.190*].

- Forms for use in application proceedings, including forms of application for certificate of public convenience and necessity, rate change approval, stock issuance, and sale of property [*see § 480.191*].

- Forms for use in application proceedings on shortened tariff docket, including forms of application and protest [*see § 480.192*].

- Forms for use in proceedings to review categorization determination, including petition for rehearing of determination [*see § 480.193*].

In addition, the chapter contains the following forms for use in proceedings to review PUC orders or decisions:

- Form of petition for Writ of Certiorari to Review Order or Decision [*see § 480.200[1]*].

- Form of application to Transfer to Single Appellate District [*see § 480.200[2]*].

NOTE:

Deregulation of Electricity Providers. The 1996 legislation concerning deregulation of electric utilities, which was implemented between January 1, 1998 and December 31, 2002 [*see Pub. Util. Code § 330*], is generally beyond the scope of this chapter. This legislation has some indirect impact, in that it establishes "deregulated" methods for ratesetting among electric utilities that differ from the general ratesetting procedures discussed in this chapter. Detailed information concerning implementation of the

law concerning deregulation of electricity providers may be found at the Internet site maintained by the PUC [*see* www.cpuc.ca.gov].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawGas IndustryNatural Gas ActCertificates of Need

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.02

§ 480.02 Cross References

For additional discussion and forms relating to actions against common carriers and other utilities relating to rates or other matters regulated under the Public Utilities Code, see the following:

- *Ch. 109, Carriers, § 109.60 et seq.*
- Ch. 511, *Sanitation and Sewerage Districts* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions against common carriers and other public utilities for tort or contract liability, see the following:

- Ch. 16, *Airplanes and Airports* .
- Ch. 102, *Bridges* .
- Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars* .
- Ch. 109, *Carriers* .
- Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .
- Ch. 484, *Radio and Television* .
- Ch. 485, *Railroads* .
- Ch. 511, *Sanitation and Sewerage Districts* .
- Ch. 522, *Ships and Shipping* .

- Ch. 544, *Taxicab* .
- Ch. 545, *Telephone and Telegraph Communications* .
- Ch. 553, *Trucks* .

For discussion and forms relating to public agency proceedings under the Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) and judicial review of those proceedings, see Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsAir TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsWatercraftGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesRates & Tariffs

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.03-480.09

[Reserved]

§§ 480.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.10

§ 480.10 Governing Law

The law governing the PUC and public utilities in general is found in Cal. Const., art. XII, and the Public Utilities Code.

The rules and procedures governing proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission are set out in *20 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1-88*, including the PUC's code of ethics, rules of practice, and illustrative forms.

The text of the Public Utilities Code and the PUC rules and procedures, together with other information relating to the PUC and PUC proceedings, are available through the Internet site maintained by the PUC [*see* http://www.cpuc.ca.gov].

NOTE:

Designation of PUC Rules of Practice and Procedure. The rules of practice and procedure established by the PUC are cited throughout this chapter by their "section" designation under the California Code of Regulations. The PUC frequently refers to these provisions by its own "rule" number; the number of both section and rule are the same in many, *but not all*, instances. Where the rule number differs from the section number, that distinction is noted in this chapter as, for example, in the following instance: *20 Cal. Code Reg., § 63.4* (Rule 63.1).

The text of the PUC rules and procedures, also noting the distinction between section and rule numbers, may be found at the Internet site maintained by the PUC [*see* http://www.cpuc.ca.gov]. The text of the Public Utilities Code and other information relating to the PUC may be found at this site.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.11

§ 480.11 "Public Utility" Defined

The term "public utility" includes every common carrier, toll bridge corporation, pipeline corporation, gas corporation, electrical corporation, telephone corporation, telegraph corporation, water corporation, sewer system corporation, and heat corporation through which the service is performed for or the commodity delivered to the public or any portion thereof [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(a)*]. Definitions of the foregoing entities are set out in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 211-242*. See also *§ 480.12[2]* for further definition of public utilities within the jurisdiction of the PUC.

Notwithstanding *Pub. Util. Code § 216*, "public utility" does not include a motor carrier of property [*Pub. Util. Code § 216.5*; *see* Ch. 109, *Carriers*]. It also does not include a holding company that is the parent corporation of a utility [*PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1197, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.12

§ 480.12 Public Utilities Commission

[1] PUC a Constitutional or "Independent" Agency

The PUC is created and empowered by the constitutional provisions set out in Cal. Const., art. XII. This constitutional status means, among other things, that the PUC is very much an "independent" agency empowered to establish its own procedures for adjudicatory proceedings [*Cal. Const., art. XII, § 2* (procedures are "subject to statute and due process"); *S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Peevey (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 781, 792, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703, 74 P.3d 795* (determining scope of PUC authority)], and as such is not subject to the Administrative Procedures Act (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*) that governs most other public state agencies [*see also* discussion in *§ 480.20* and in Ch. 470, *Overview of Public Administrative Law , § 470.12[3]*].

The rules established by the PUC under *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 2*, which govern its hearings and other proceedings, are set out in *20 Cal. Code Reg., §§ 1-88*, "subject to statute" as set out in *Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*

[2] Jurisdiction of PUC Over Public Utilities

Whenever an entity as defined under *Pub. Util. Code § 216(a)* (discussed in *§ 480.11*) performs a service or delivers a commodity to the public or any portion thereof for which any compensation or payment whatsoever is received, that entity is a public utility subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the PUC and *Pub. Util. Code §§ 201-2115* [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(b)*; *City of Anaheim v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 838, 844, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 725* (PUC has exclusive jurisdiction to resolve dispute about who must pay for relocation of telephone company's overhead facilities to underground)]. However, the PUC has no jurisdiction over municipally owned utilities unless expressly provided by statute [*Santa Clara Valley Transp. Auth. v. Public Utils. Comm'n (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 346, 356, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 270* (PUC does not have exclusive railroad crossing jurisdiction over municipally owned light rail crossings pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1201, 1202*)].

When any person or corporation performs any service or delivers any commodity to any person, private corporation, municipality or other political subdivision of the state that in turn either directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, performs that service or delivers that commodity to or for the public or some portion of the public, that person or

corporation is a public utility subject to the jurisdiction, control, and regulation of the PUC and *Pub. Util. Code §§ 201-2115* [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(c)*].

Ownership or operation of a facility that employs cogeneration technology or producing power from other than a conventional power source orthe ownership or operation of a facility that employs landfill gas technology does not make a corporation or person a public utility, within the meaning of *Pub. Util. Code § 216*, solely because of the ownership or operation of that facility [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(d)*; *see also Pub. Util. Code §§ 218, 222, 224, 228* (defining "electrical corporation," "gas corporation," "heat corporation," and "pipeline corporation," respectively), 224.5 (defining "landfill gas technology")]. However, the PUC has limited jurisdiction over holding companies that are the parent corporations of utilities to the extent necessary to regulate the utilities [*PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1201, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630* (PUC had jurisdiction to enforce requirement that holding companies give first priority to capital requirements of utility subsidiaries as necessary to meet their obligation to serve)].

No corporation or person constitutes a public utility within the meaning of *Pub. Util. Code § 216* solely by reason of engaging directly or indirectly in developing, producing, transmitting, distributing, delivering, or sellingany form of heat derived from geothermal or solar resources or from cogeneration technology to any privately owned or publicly owned public utility, or to the public or any portion of the public [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(e)*].

Ownership or operation of a facility that sells compressed natural gas at retail to the public for use only as a motor vehicle fuel, and the sale of compressed natural gas at retail from such a facility to the public for use only as a motor vehicle fuel, does not make the corporation or person a public utility within the meaning of *Pub. Util. Code § 216* solely because of that ownership, operation, or sale [*Pub. Util. Code § 216(f)*; *see also Pub. Util. Code § 216(g)*, 218.5 (ownership or operation of exempt wholesale generator, as defined, does not make person public utility)].

A qualifying small power producer, as defined, owning or operating a small power production facility is not a public utility subject to the general jurisdiction of the PUC solely because of the ownership or operation of the facility [*Pub. Util. Code § 218.5*].

The PUC does not have the power to regulate publicly-owned municipal utilities in the absence of a legislative grant of authority [*see Cal. Const., art. XI, § 9*; *Gov. Code § 39732*; *American Microsystems, Inc. v. City of Santa Clara (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042, 187 Cal. Rptr. 550]* .

[3] Regulatory Power

The PUC has the general power to regulate public utilities [*Pub. Util. Code § 701*]. This includes regulation of the following matters:

- Rates [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 727-744*].
- Equipment, practices, and facilities [*Pub. Util. Code § 761 et seq.*].
- Books and accounts [*Pub. Util. Code § 791 et seq.*].
- Stocks and security transactions [*Pub. Util. Code § 816 et seq.*].
- Transfer or encumbrance of property [*Pub. Util. Code § 851 et seq.*].

Thus, for example, public utilities may not issue certain stocks, bonds, notes, or other evidence of indebtedness without PUC approval [*Pub. Util. Code § 818*], nor may they sell or encumber any or all of their property that is necessary or

useful in the performance of their duties to the public without approval of the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 851*].

However, the PUC may, by order or rule, exempt any public utility or class of public utility from the provisions of *Pub. Util. Code § 851 et seq.* if it finds that the application thereof with respect to the public utility or class of public utility is not necessary in the public interest. The PUC may establish rules or impose requirements necessary to protect the interest of the customers or subscribers of the exempted public utility or class of public utility. These rules or requirements may include, but are not limited to, notification of a proposed sale or transfer of assets or stock, and provision for refunds or credits to customers or subscribers [*Pub. Util. Code § 853(b)*].

The PUC may petition the superior court for the appointment of a receiver to assume possession and operating control over the property of a water or sewer system corporation after notice and hearing determining that the corporation is unable or unwilling to adequately serve its ratepayers, that it has been abandoned by its owners, or that it is unresponsive to rules and orders [*Pub. Util. Code § 855*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)* (appointment of receiver at PUC request)].

The PUC also has the power to enter into binding contracts and settle lawsuits brought against it by utility companies [*see Utility Consumers Action Network v. Public Utilities Com. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 644, 654, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 597* (acceptance of settlement offer did not contravene *Pub. Util. Code § 332.1(c)* which requires PUC to track and recover shortfall, if any, between emergency rate ceiling and utility's actual electricity costs)].

In addition, one court of appeal has held that the PUC has the authority to directly impose fines on public utilities [*Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. Public Utilities Com. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 735-737, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733]* .

[4] Petition by Interested Persons to Adopt, Amend, Repeal Regulation

[a] In General

Interested persons may petition the Commission to adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(a)*]. Within a specified time, discussed under [c], *below*, the Commission must either deny the petition or institute a proceeding to adopt, amend, or repeal legislation [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(a)*].

The Commission is required to amend its rules of practice and procedure (*20Cal. Code Reg § 1 et seq.*) to provide specific procedures for handling these petitions. Until it does so, the Commission must implement this petition procedure under its existing rules [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(e)* (amendments to be made prior to July 1, 2001)].

Therefore, pending clarification by the Commission, it appears that a regulation petition would be subject to the rules relating to determination of the need for a hearing and categorization [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1*]. For further discussion of these procedures, see *§ 480.23*.

The petition procedure under *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5* does not prevent the Commission from conducting any proceeding to adopt, amend, or repeal a regulationusing notice and comment rulemaking procedures, without an evidentiary hearing [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(f)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg § 14.1 et seq.* (regulations governing rulemaking)]. An exception applies with regard to a regulation that was adopted after an evidentiary hearing and is subsequently being amended or repealed. In such a case the parties to the original proceeding retain any right to an evidentiaryhearing under *Pub. Util. Code § 1708* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(f)*]. *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(f)* applies to all proceedings, not just those initiated by the petition procedure under *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(a)-(e)* [*Southern California Edison Company v. Public Util. Com. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 982, 994, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 211]* .

For a form of petition to adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation, see *§ 480.195*.

[b] Scope of Right to Petition

[i] "Interested Persons" Is Construed Broadly

"Interested persons," as used in *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(a)*, is to be construed broadly, and not as a bar to standing [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708(a)*].

[ii] "Regulation" Limited to General Applicability and Future Effect

"Regulation," as used in *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(a)*, is not to be construed to refer to all orders and decisions of the Commission. Rather, the term is to be construed as a general reference to rules of general applicability and future effect [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708(a)*].

The Commission has authority to more precisely define the term "regulation" for the purpose of *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708(b)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(e)* (amendments to rules of practice and procedure providing more specific procedures to be made prior to July 1, 2001)].

[iii] Not Means of Requesting Reconsideration

Petitions under *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5* are not a vehicle for asking the Commission to reconsider any or all of its decisions, or for asking the Commission to reconsider recently decided matters when there has been no change in circumstances [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708(c)* (Legislature intends that Commission delegate to staff authority to deny in order to provide for efficient administration of section 1708.5)].

[c] Time to Grant or Deny Petition

[i] Six Months From Date of Receipt

Within six months from the date of receipt of the petition, the Commission must either deny the petition or institute a proceeding to adopt, amend, or repeal the regulation [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(b)(1)*].

[ii] Extension to Allow Public Review and Comment

The Commission may extend the six month period for consideration of a petition pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(b)(1)* to allow public review and comment pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 311(g)* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(b)(2)*].

[d] Statement of Reasons for Denial

If the Commission denies a petition, the order or resolution of the Commission must include a statement of the Commission's reasons for that denial [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(c)*].

If the Commission finds that it is precluded by law from granting a petition, the statement of reasons for denial must identify the relevant provisions of law [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingFormal RulemakingAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingInformal RulemakingEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative

ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.13

§ 480.13 Rates Charged by Public Utility

All charges demanded or received by any public utility, or by any two or more public utilities, for any product or commodity furnished or to be furnished for any service rendered or to be rendered must be just and reasonable. Every unjust or unreasonable charge demanded or received for such product or commodity or service is unlawful. Every public utility must furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities, including telephone facilities as defined in *Civ. Code § 54.1*, as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public [*Pub. Util. Code § 451*].

Except as provided in *Pub. Util. Code § 455* (hearings on filed schedules not increasing rates or resulting in rate increases), no public utility can change any rate or so alter any classification, contract, practice, or rule as to result in any new rate, except on a showing before the PUC and a finding by the PUC that the new rate is justified [*see Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*; *S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Peevey (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 781, 804-805, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703, 74 P.3d 795* (application, but no public hearing, required for rate change)]. In addition, every common carrier and public utility must publish schedules of its rates and make them available to the public [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 486-489*]. Discrimination in rates is prohibited [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(a)*], and common carriers are prohibited from charging less than established rates [*Pub. Util. Code § 458*].

One way a utility may justify a rate increase is to recover specific costs. As a condition precedent to any increase, petitioners must establish a memorandum account as a mechanism to track expenses they are attempting to recover [*Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 455*; *Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1104, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684]* . These accounts automatically become effective 40 days after filing of a non-rate advice letter with the PUC, provided the filing does not raise rates and the action is not suspended or modified by the PUC during those 40 days [Cal. Pub. Util. Comm'n. Gen. Order 96-A; *Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1106, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.14

§ 480.14 Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity

[1] When Required

No railroad corporation whose railroad is operated primarily by electric energy, street railroad corporation, gas corporation, electrical corporation, telegraph corporation, telephone corporation, water corporation, or sewer system corporation can begin the construction of a street, railroad, or of a line, plant, or system, or any extension thereof, without obtaining from the PUC a certificate of public convenience and necessity [*Pub. Util. Code § 1001*].

Passenger stage corporations must also obtain a certificate before commencing operations [*Pub. Util. Code § 1031*].

[2] Exceptions for Extension of Existing Service

There are exceptions to the certificate requirement [*see [1], above*] for extensions of lawful (that is, already certificated) existing service within or to territory already served by the public utility, if the extension is necessary in the ordinary course of the public utility's business [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1001*].

In a case of service that cannot physically be confined to the public utility's existing service area (for example, radiotelephone service offeredby a wireline utility in the area presently served by it), an extension of service without new certification would be permissible only if service does not extend more than incidentally outside the existing service area [*Industrial Communciations Systems, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 572, 577-579, 150 Cal. Rptr. 13, 585 P.2d 863]* .

[3] Exemptions

Unless the PUC determines that the public interest requires that the construction not be exempt from *Pub. Util. Code § 1001* [*see [1], above*], it must exempt from the requirements of *Pub. Util. Code § 1001* the construction of any line, plant, or system, or extension, located outside California if the public utility derives 75 percent or more of its operating revenues from outside the state [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1001.5(a)*].

The public interest determination must be made within 90 days of the date of the utility's application for exemption, or the construction is exempt [*Pub. Util. Code § 1001.5(b)* (subject to extension of up to 60 days on agreement of PUC and utility under *Pub. Util. Code § 1001.5(c)*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawGas IndustryNatural Gas ActCertificates of NeedEnergy & Utilities LawTransportation & PipelinesCertification & LicensesEnvironmental LawSolid WastesPermitsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.15-480.19

[Reserved]

§§ 480.15[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.20

§ 480.20 Procedures Established by PUC

All hearings, investigations, and proceedings before the PUC are governed by *Pub. Util. Code §§ 201-2115* and by rules of practice and procedure adopted by the PUC set out in *20 Cal. Code Reg., §§ 1-88*. In the conduct these proceedings, the technical rules of evidence need not be applied. No informality in any hearing, investigation, or proceeding or in the manner of taking testimony may invalidate any order, decision, or rule made, approved, or confirmed by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701*].

The rules and procedures of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* apply to any formal proceeding, except for a complaint under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13.2* (expedited complaint procedure) that is filed after January 1, 1998 [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(a)*]. For a discussion distinguishing between formal and information proceedings generally, see Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies* .

The rules and procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* also apply to formal proceedings filed before January 1, 1998 under specified circumstances [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(b), (e)*]. Any proceeding to which the rules and procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* do not apply will be handled under the otherwise applicable PUC rules and procedures contained in 20 Cal. Code Reg. [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(c)*].

When the rules and procedures relating categorization determination (*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.*) apply to a proceeding by virtue of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(b)(2)*, nothing in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* may be construed to render invalid, or to require repetition of, procedural steps taken prior to such applicability. However, those procedural steps taken after such applicability must comply with *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* whenever requiring that compliance would not invalidate or repeat procedural steps taken previously [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(e)*].

In addition, the PUC is required to adopt, and has adopted, procedures on the disqualification of administrative law judges in its proceedings, for bias or prejudice, similar to the procedures governing other hearing officers and superior court judges [*Pub. Util. Code § 309.6(a)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg., § 63.1 et seq.*, discussed in *§ 480.62*; for discussion of disqualification of trial court judges and hearings officers generally, see respectively Ch. 317, *Judges* , and Ch. 473E,

Public Administrative Law Judges].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.21

§ 480.21 Application and Complaint Proceedings Compared

A public utility proceeds before the PUC for any type of relief by means of an application [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 15-43, 88*; *see* forms of application in §§ *480.191, 480.192*]. Other entities or persons may proceed by either complaint or petition, as appropriate [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1702*, and discussion and *forms in §§ 480.22, 480.190*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.22

§ 480.22 Complaints Against Public Utilities

[1] Who May File

Complaints may be made by the any of the following persons or entities by written petition or complaint setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*]:

- PUC on its own motion.
- Corporation or person.
- Chamber of commerce.
- Board of trade.
- Labor organization.
- Civic, commercial, mercantile, traffic, agricultural, or manufacturing association or organization.
- Body politic or municipal corporation.

A complaint may include any rule or charge established or fixed by or for any public utility, in violation or claimed to be in violation of any provision of law or of any order or rule of the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*].

No complaint will be entertained by the PUC, except on its own motion, as to the reasonableness of any rates or charges of any gas, electrical,water, or telephone corporation, unless it is signed by the mayor or the president or chairperson of the board of trustees or a majority of the council, PUC, or other legislative body of the city or city and county within which the alleged violation occurred, or by not less than 25 actual or prospective consumers or purchasers of the gas,

electrical, water, or telephone service [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*].

The PUC is not required to dismiss any complaint because of the absence of direct damage to the complainant [*Pub. Util. Code § 1703*].

For forms of complaint before the PUC, see *§ 480.190[1], [2]*.

[2] Service and Filing of Notice of Hearing

On the filing of a complaint, the PUC must cause a copy thereof to be served on the corporation or person complained of [*Pub. Util. Code § 1704*].

Service in all hearings, investigations, and proceedings pending before the PUC may be made on any person on whom a summons may be served in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure and may be made personally or by mailing in a sealed envelope, registered, with postage prepaid [*Pub. Util. Code § 1704*].

The PUC must fix the time when, and place where, a hearing will be had on the complaint and must serve notice thereof, not less than 10 days before the time set for hearing, unless the PUC finds that public necessity requires that the hearing be held at an earlier date [*Pub. Util. Code § 1704*].

For purposes of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.*, governing formal proceedings before the PUC, a proceeding initiated by an application or complaint is filed as of the date it was tendered for filing in compliance with the rules and procedures of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2 et seq.* (filing of documents) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*].

A proceeding initiated by a PUC order is filed as of the date of issuance of the order [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*].

[3] Answer

Within 30 days after the date of service of the complaint, the defendant must answer the complaint. The PUC, the chief administrative law judge, or the presiding officer may require the filing of an answer within a shorter time [*20 Cal. Code Reg § 13*].

A request for an extension of time to answer may be made in the manner provided by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13*. The answer must admit or deny each material allegation in the complaint and must set forth any new matter constituting a defense. Jurisdictional defects are not waived if they are not included in the answer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13.1*].

For a form of answer to a complaint before the PUC, see *§ 480.190[3]*.

[4] Joinder

All matters upon which complaint may be founded may be joined in one hearing, and no motion will be entertained against a complaint for misjoinder of causes of action or grievances or misjoinder or nonjoinder of parties. In any review by the courts of orders or decisions of the PUC, the same rule applies with regard to joinder of causes and parties [*Pub. Util. Code § 1703*].

[5] Intervention

[a] Generally

In a complaint proceeding, petitions to intervene and become a party to the proceeding must be in writing, must set forth the grounds of the proposed intervention, the position and interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and whether

petitioner's position is in support of or opposition to the relief sought. Permission to intervene will not be granted except on averments which are reasonably pertinent to the issues already presented, but does not unduly broaden them. If such permission is granted, the petitioner thereby becomes an intervenor and a party to the proceeding to the degree indicated by the order allowing intervention or by the presiding officer at the hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 53*].

For forms of petition for intervention in a complaint proceeding before the PUC, see *§ 480.190[4]*.

[b] Participation Without Intervention

In an investigation or application proceeding, or in such a proceeding when heard on a consolidated record with a complaint proceeding, an appearance may be entered at the hearing without filing a pleading, if no affirmative relief is sought, if there is full disclosure of the persons or entities on whose behalf the appearance is to be entered, if the interest of such persons or entities in the proceeding and the position intended to be taken are stated fairly, and if the contentions will be reasonably pertinent to the issues already presented and any right to broaden them unduly is disclaimed. A person or entity in whose behalf an appearance is entered in this manner becomes a party to and may participate in the proceeding to the degree indicated by the presiding officer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 54*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureParties InterventionGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawElectric Power IndustryRatesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawElectric Power IndustryState RegulationRate Setting & Tariffs

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.23

§ 480.23 Categorization Determination by PUC

[1] Preliminary Determination of Category Generally

[a] Determination Required

The PUC is required to determine whether a proceeding requires a hearing. The determination must be consistent with due process, publicpolicy, and statutory requirements [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*; for discussion of due process requirements as they apply generally to public agency proceedings, *see* Ch. 470A, *Due Process Restrictions on Public Agencies*].

If the matter requires a hearing, the PUC must also determine whether the matter requires a quasi-legislative, an adjudication, or a ratesetting hearing [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*]. The terms "category," "categorization," or "categorized" refer to this procedure [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(a)*]. Definitions of each of these classifications are provided in *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(1)-(3)*, and are discussed in *[b], below*.

If the PUC under *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1* has determined that an adjudication case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2* apply. These procedures are discussed in *§ 480.60* et seq.

[b] Categories Defined

[i] "Quasi-Legislative" Defined

Quasi-legislative cases, for purposes of statutory regulation of formal hearings before the PUC [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*], are cases that establish policy, including, but not limited to, rulemaking and investigations which may establish rules affecting an entire industry or class of entities within the industry [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(2)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(d)*].

[ii] "Adjudication" Defined

Adjudication cases, for purposes of statutory regulation of formal hearings before the PUC [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*], are enforcement cases and complaints except those challenging the reasonableness of any rates or charges as specified in Section 1702 [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(2)*].

"Adjudicatory" proceedings are [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(b)*]:

- Enforcement investigations into possible violations of any provision of statutory law or order or rule of the Commission, and

- Complaints against regulated entities, including those complaints that challenge the accuracy of a bill, but excluding those complaints that challenge the reasonableness of rates or charges, past, present, or future.

[iii] "Ratesetting" Defined

"Ratesetting" proceedings are proceedings in which the PUC sets or investigates rates for a specifically named utility or utilities, or establishes a mechanism that in turn sets the rates for a specifically named utility or utilities. "Ratesetting" proceedings include complaints that challenge the reasonableness of rates or charges, past, present, or future [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(c)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(3)* (ratesetting cases include, but are not limited to, general rate cases, performance-based ratemaking, and other ratesetting mechanisms)].

For purposes of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.*, governing formal proceedings before the PUC, other proceedings may be categorized as ratesetting, as described in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(c)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(c)*].

[c] Ex Parte Communication on Categorization Issues

The PUC has established regulations regarding ex parte communication on case categorization issues, as required by statute [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*]. Those regulations are contained in *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 7, 7.1*, and are discussed in § 450.51.

[2] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by Application

[a] Application

Any person that files an application after January 1, 1998, must state in the application all of the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)*]:

- The proposed category for the proceeding (*see [1][b], above*).

- The need for hearing.

- The issues to be considered.

- A proposed schedule (*see [b], below*).

As described in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(a)*, the PUC must issue a resolution that preliminarily categorizes and preliminarily determines the need for hearing in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)*].

A proceeding initiated by an application is filed as of the date it was tendered for filing in compliance with the rules and procedures of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2 et seq.* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*].

For forms of application, see *§ 480.191*.

[b] Proposed Schedule

Any party's proposed schedule for purposes of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6* must be consistent with the proposed or finally determined category, as appropriate [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(e)*].

If the proposed or finally determined category is an adjudicatory proceeding, the proposed schedule must include a deadline for resolving the proceeding within 12 months or less [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(e)*].

If the proposed or finally determined category is a ratesetting or quasi-legislative proceeding, the proposed schedule must include a deadline for resolving the proceeding within 18 months or less [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(e)*].

The proposed schedule must also take into account all of the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(e)*]:

- The number and complexity of issues to be considered.
- The number of parties expected to participate.
- The need for and expected duration of hearings.
- Any other factors that the party wants the assigned commissioner to weigh in ruling on the scoping memorandum (for further discussion relating scoping memoranda, *see § 480.25A*).

[c] Protest or Response

Any person protesting or responding to an application must state in the protest or response [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(2)*]:

- Any comments or objections regarding the applicant's statement on the proposed category.
- Need for hearing.
- Issues to be considered.
- Proposed schedule.

[d] Preliminary Determination of Category and Need for Hearing

[i] Content and Timing of Resolution

By resolution at each PUC business meeting, the PUC must preliminarily determine, for each proceeding initiated by application filed on or after the PUC's prior business meeting, the category of the proceeding and the need for hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(a)*].

The preliminary determination may be held for one PUC business meeting if the time of filing did not permit an informed determination [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(a)*].

[ii] Multiple Category and Other Proceedings

When a proceeding may fit more than one category as defined in *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5(b), 5(c),* and *5(d)* (discussed under *[1][b], above*), the PUC may determine which category appears most suitable to the proceeding, or may divide the subject matter of the proceeding into different phases or one or more new proceedings [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(b)*].

When a proceeding does not clearly fit into any of those categories, the proceeding will be conducted under the rules that apply to the ratesetting category unless and until the PUC determines that the rules that apply to one of the other categories, or some hybrid of the rules, are best suited to the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(c)*].

In exercising its discretion in these situations, the PUC must so categorize a proceeding and must make such other procedural orders as best to enable the PUC to achieve a full, timely, and effective resolution of the substantive issues presented in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(d)*].

[iii] Preliminary Determination Not Appealable

The preliminary determination is not appealable but must be confirmed or changed by assigned commissioner's ruling under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3),* discussed under *[e], below*. As discussed below, the assigned commissioner's ruling under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3)* regarding the category is subject to appeal under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.1(a)*].

[e] Appealable Determination of Category and Need for Hearing

The assigned commissioner must consider the application, protests, and responses, and the prehearing conference statements (if one is held) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3)*].

The assigned commissioner must rule on the category, need for hearing, and scoping memo. The ruling must also designate the principal hearing officer or presiding officer, as appropriate. The assigned commissioner has discretion to rule on any or all of these matters on the record at the prehearing conference [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3)* (for further discussion relating scoping memoranda, *see § 480.25A*)].

The ruling, only with regard to the category, is appealable under the procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3)*].

[3] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by Complaint

[a] Complaint

Any person who files a complaint after January 1, 1998, must state in the complaint the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*]:

- The proposed category for the proceeding.
- The need for hearing.
- The issues to be considered.
- A proposed schedule.

A proceeding initiated by a complaint is filed as of the date it was tendered for filing in compliance with the rules and procedures of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2 et seq.* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*].

[b] Instructions to Answer

The Docket Office must serve instructions to answer on the defendant, with a copy to the complainant, indicating [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*]:

- The date when the defendant's answer must be filed and served, and
- The administrative law judge assigned to the proceeding.

The instructions to answer must also indicate the category of the proceeding and the need for hearing, as determined by the chief administrativelaw judge in consultation with the President of the Commission. The determination regarding the category is appealable under the procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*].

[c] Answer

The defendant must state in the answer any comments or objections regarding the complainant's statement on the need for hearing, issues to be considered, and proposed schedule [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(2)*].

[d] Ruling on Scoping Memo

The assigned commissioner must consider the complaint and answer, and the prehearing conference statements (if one is held), and must rule on the scoping memo. The ruling must also designate the principal hearing officer or presiding officer, as appropriate [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(3)* (for further discussion relating scoping memoranda, *see § 480.25A*)].

The assigned commissioner has discretion to rule on any or all of these matters on the record at the prehearing conference [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(3)*].

Effective January 1, 2004, in a ratesetting or quasi-legislative case, the commissioner must resolve the issues raised in the scoping memo within 18 months of the date the scoping memo is issued, unless the commission makes a written determination that the deadline cannot be met, including findings as to the reason, and issues an order extending the deadline. No single order may extend the deadline for more than 60 days [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(a)*]. The commission may specify in a scoping memo a resolution date later than 18 months from the date the scoping memo is issued, if the scoping memo includes specific reasons for the necessity of a later date and the commissioner assigned to the case approves the date [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(b)*].

[4] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by PUC Order Instituting Investigation

A PUC order to show cause or order instituting investigation, issued after January 1, 1998, must determine the category and need for hearing, and must attach a preliminary scoping memo. The order, only with regard to the category, is appealable under the procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(1)* (for further discussion relating scoping memoranda, *see § 480.25A*)].

A proceeding initiated by a PUC order is filed as of the date of issuance of the order *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*.

Any person filing a response to an order to show cause or order instituting investigation must state in the response any objections to the order regarding the need for hearing, issues to be considered, or schedule, as set forth in the order [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(1)*].

At or after the prehearing conference if one is held, the assigned commissioner must rule on the scoping memo. The ruling must also designate the principal hearing officer or the presiding officer, as appropriate [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §*

6(c)(1)].

Effective January 1, 2004, in a ratesetting or quasi-legislative case, the commissioner must resolve the issues raised in the scoping memo within 18 months of the date the scoping memo is issued, unless the commission makes a written determination that the deadline cannot be met, including findings as to the reason, and issues an order extending the deadline. No single order may extend the deadline for more than 60 days [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(a)*]. The commission may specify in a scoping memo a resolution date later than 18 months from the date the scoping memo is issued, if the scoping memo includes specific reasons for the necessity of a later date and the commissioner assigned to the case approves the date [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(b)*].

[5] Determination in Proceeding Initiated by PUC Order Instituting Rulemaking

A PUC order instituting rulemaking, issued after January 1, 1998, must preliminarily determine the category and need for hearing, and must attach a preliminary scoping memo [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)* (for further discussion relating scoping memoranda, *see § 480.25A*)].

Any person filing a response to an order instituting rulemaking must state in the response any objections to the order regarding the category, need for hearing, and preliminary scoping memo [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)*].

At or after the prehearing conference if one is held, the assigned commissioner must rule on the category, need for hearing, and scoping memo [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)*].

If the proceeding is categorized as ratesetting, the ruling must also designate the principal hearing officer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)*].

The ruling, only with regard to category, is appealable under the procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)*].

[6] Determination in Proceedings Filed Before January 1, 1998

When the rules and procedures of this Article apply to a proceeding by virtue of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(b)(2)* (relating to proceedings filed before January 1, 1998), the ruling or order that determines a hearing should be held must also preliminarily determine the category for the proceeding, and must set a prehearing conference [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(d)*].

At or after the prehearing conference, the assigned commissioner must rule on the category, need for hearing, and scoping memo. The ruling must also designate the principal hearing officer or presiding officer, as appropriate. The ruling, only with regard to the category, is appealable under the procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(d)*].

[7] Appeals of Categorization

[a] Appeal Is Prerequisite for Standing to Seek Judicial Review

If the PUC's decision regarding the nature of the proceeding is not appealed to the PUC within the time period stated in [a], *above*, the decision is not subsequently subject to judicial review [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*].

Only those parties who have requested a rehearing within the time period stated in [b], *below*, subsequently has standing for judicial review. The review is only available at the conclusion of the proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*].

[b] Time Limit for Request

The PUC's decision regarding the nature of the proceeding is subject to a request for rehearing within 10 days of the date of that decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*]. "Appeal of categorization" means a request for rehearing of the determination of the category of a proceeding *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(a)*.

More particularly, any party may file and serve an appeal to the Commission, no later than 10 days after the date of any of the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4(a)*]:

- An assigned commissioner's ruling on category pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3), (c)(2),* or *6(d)*.
- The instructions to answer pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*.
- An order to show cause or order instituting investigation pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(1)*.

[c] Content of Appeal

The appeal must state why the designated category is wrong as a matter of law or policy [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4(a)*].

For a form of request for rehearing of categorization determination, see *§ 480.193[1]*.

[d] Service of Appeal

The appeal must be served on the Commission's General Counsel, the chief administrative law judge, the President of the PUC, and all persons who were served with the ruling, instructions to answer, or order [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4(a)*].

[e] Response to Appeal

Any party, no later than 15 days after the date of a categorization from which timely appeal has been taken pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4(a),* may file and serve a response to the appeal.

The response must be served on the appellant and on all persons who were served with the ruling, instructions to answer, or order. The PUC is not obligated to withhold a decision on an appeal to allow time for responses. Replies to responses are not permitted [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4(b)*].

[f] Decision on Appeal

The PUC must render its decision regarding the appeal within 30 days [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*].

[8] Approval of Changes to Preliminary Determinations

If there is no timely appeal under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4*, but the assigned commissioner, pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 6(a)(3), (c)(2),* or *6(d),* changes the preliminary determination on category, the assigned commissioner's ruling must be placed on the PUC's Agenda for approval of that change [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.5(a)*].

If the assigned commissioner, pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 6(a)(3), (c)(2),* or *(d),* changes the preliminary determination on need for hearing, the assigned commissioner's ruling must be placed on the PUC's Consent Agenda for approval of that change [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingFormal RulemakingConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewJurisdictional PrerequisitesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.24

§ 480.24 Proceedings Without Hearings

Whenever there is a final determination in a proceeding, pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6-6.5*, that a hearing is not needed in the proceeding, ex parte communications must be permitted, as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(e)*. In all other respects, the rules and procedures in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 et seq.* cease to apply to that proceeding. However, the scoping memo issued for the proceeding will continue to apply to the proceeding as to all matters covered in the memo [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.6*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.25

§ 480.25 Prehearing Conference

The PUC on initiating a hearing must assign one or more PUC commissioners to oversee the case and an administrative law judge when appropriate. The assigned commissioner is required to schedule a prehearing conference [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(b)*]. He or she must set the prehearing conference as soon as practicable after the PUC makes the assignment [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*].

The ruling setting the prehearing conference may also set a date of filing and serving prehearing conference statements [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*]. Such statements may address the schedule, the issues to be considered, any matter related to the applicability of this Article to the proceeding, and any other matter specified in the ruling setting the prehearing conference [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.25A

§ 480.25A Ruling on Scoping Memorandum

The assigned commissioner must prepare and issue by order or ruling a "scoping memo" that describes the issues to be considered and the applicable timetable for resolution [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(b)*].

Specifically, at or after the prehearing conference, if one is held, the assigned commissioner must rule on the scoping memo for the proceeding, which must finally determine the schedule (with projected submission date) and issues to be addressed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*]. The PUC fails to proceed in the manner required by law under *Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)* if it considers issues beyond those identified in the scoping memo [*Southern California Edison Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1104-1106, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485]* .

If there is no prehearing conference, the assigned commissioner must rule on the scoping memo for the proceeding as soon as possible after the timely filing of the responsive pleadings. Responsive pleadings for this purpose consist of protests, responses, or answers, as appropriate [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*].

Effective January 1, 2004, in a ratesetting or quasi-legislative case, the commissioner must resolve the issues raised in the scoping memo within 18 months of the date the scoping memo is issued, unless the commission makes a written determination that the deadline cannot be met, including findings as to the reason, and issues an order extending the deadline. No single order may extend the deadline for more than 60 days [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(a)*]. The commission may specify in a scoping memo a resolution date later than 18 months from the date the scoping memo is issued, if the scoping memo includes specific reasons for the necessity of a later date and the commissioner assigned to the case approves the date [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.5(b)*].

In an adjudicatory proceeding, the scoping memo must also designate the presiding officer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.26

§ 480.26 Intervenor's Fees and Expenses

[1] Availability of Compensation

Public utility customers may be entitled to compensation for participating or intervening in PUC proceedings involving electric, gas, water, and telephone utilities [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801, 1801.3(a)*].

The PUC is required to award reasonable fees for advocates and expert witnesses together with other reasonable costs of preparing for and participating in a hearing or proceeding to any customer who complies with *Pub.Util. Code § 1804* and satisfies the following requirements [*Pub. Util. Code § 1803*]:

- The customer's presentation makes a substantial contribution to the adoption, in whole or in part, of the PUC's order or decision; and

- Participation or intervention without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship.

The PUC also may award compensation to a customer whose participation materially supplements, complements, or contributes to the presentation of another party, including the PUC staff, if the customer's participation makes a substantial contribution to a PUC order or decision, consistent with the legislative intent behind compensation articulated in *Pub. Util. Code § 1801.3* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1802.5*].

Any group or association that represents the interests of small agricultural customers in a proceeding and that would otherwise be eligible for an award of compensation under the financial hardship terms of *Pub. Util. Code § 1804* [discussed in *[3], below*] without the presence of large agricultural customers, as determined by the PUC, may not be deemed ineligible solely because that group or organization also has members that are large agricultural customers [*Pub. Util. Code § 1812*].

The definition of "compensation" is set out under *[2], below*. The definitions of "customer," "party," "proceeding," "significant financial hardship," "small commercial customer," and "substantial contribution" are set out in *Pub. Util. Code § 1802*.

[2] Amount of Compensation

"Compensation" means payment for all or part, as determined by the PUC, of reasonable fees for advocates and expert witnesses as well as other reasonable costs of preparing for and participating in a proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1802(a)*; *see The Utility Reform Network v. Public Utilities Commission (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 522, 535, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 791* (substantial contribution to PUC decision does not automatically entitle intervener to compensation for all ensuing judicial proceedings without regard to changed circumstances or results achieved)]. "Other reasonable costs" means reasonable out-of-pocket expenses directly incurred by a customer that are directly related to the contentions or recommendations made by the customer that resulted in a substantial contribution [*Pub. Util. Code § 1802(d)*]. "Compensation" includes the fees and costs of obtaining an award and obtaining judicial review, if any [*Pub. Util. Code § 1802(a)*].

The computation of compensation awarded must take into consideration the market rates paid to persons of comparable training and experience who offer similar services. The compensation awarded may not, in any case, exceed the comparable market rate for services paid by the PUC or the public utility, whichever rate is greater, to persons of comparable training and experience who are offering similar services [*Pub. Util. Code § 1806*; *see The Utility Reform Network v. Public Utilities Commission (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 522, 535-537, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 791* (PUC abused its discretion when it compensated outside counsel at same rate it compensated in-house counsel)].

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Compensation

[a] Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation

A customer who intends to seek an award of compensation must file and serve onall parties to the proceeding a notice of intent to claim compensation within 30 days after the prehearing conference is held [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(1)*].

In cases in which no prehearing conference is scheduled or where the Commission anticipates that the proceeding will take less than 30 days, the administrative law judge may establish a deadline for the filing of notices of intent [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(1)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 76.74(a)*].

In cases where parties cannot reasonably identify issues within the time set by statute or by the administrative law judge's ruling under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 76.74(a)* for the filing of the notice of intent, or when new issues emerge after the time set for filing, the administrative law judge may specify an appropriate procedure for accepting new or revised notices of intent [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(1)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 76.74(b)*].

The notice of intent to claim compensation must contain both of the following [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(2)(A)*]:

- A statement of the nature and extent of the customer's planned participation in the proceeding as far as it is possible to set it out when the notice of intent is filed.

- An itemized estimate of the compensation that the customer expects to request, given the likely duration of the proceeding as it appears at the time.

The notice of intent may include a showing by the customer that participation in the hearing or proceeding would pose a significant financial hardship. Alternatively, this showing can be included in the request for award submitted under *Pub. Util. Code § 1804(c)* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(2)(B)*; *see* discussion in *[c], below*].

[b] Preliminary Ruling on Eligibility for Compensation

Within 15 days after service of the notice of intent, the administrative law judge may direct the staff, and may permit any other interested party, to file a statement responding to the notice [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a)(2)(C)*].

If the notice of intent includes a showing of significant financial hardship, the administrative law judge, in consultation with the assigned commissioner, must issue a preliminary ruling within 30 days after the notice was filed, addressing whether the customer will be eligible for an award of compensation. The ruling must address whether a showing of significant financial hardship has been made. A finding of significant financial hardship in the preliminary ruling creates a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in other PUC proceedings commencing within one year after the date of that finding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(b)(1)*].

Regardless of whether the notice of intent includes a showing of significant financial hardship, the administrative law judge may issue a ruling addressing issues raised by the notice. A finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures compensation. Similarly, the customer's failure to identify a specific issue in the notice or to precisely estimate potential compensation will not preclude an award of reasonable compensation if a substantial contribution is made [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1804(b)(2)* (aspects of notice that ruling may point out)].

[c] Request for Award of Compensation

After issuance of a final order or decision by the PUC in the hearing or proceeding, a customer who has been found eligible for an award of compensation may, within 60 days, file a request for an award. The request must contain, at a minimum, a detailed description of services and expenditures and a description of the customer's substantial contribution to the hearing or proceeding. The PUC staff, and any other party, may file a response to the request within 30 days after service of the request [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(c)*].

[d] Verification of Basis for Award

The PUC may audit the customer's records and books to verify the basis for the award. The PUC must preserve the confidentiality of the customer's records in making its audit. Within 20 days after completion of the audit, the PUC must direct an audit report to be prepared and filed. Any other party may file a response to the audit report within 20 days after the report is filed [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(d)*].

[e] Decision to Grant or Deny Award

Within 75 days after the filing of the request for compensation [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1804(c)*, and discussion in *[c], above*] or within 50 days after the filing of an audit report [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1804(d)*, and discussion in *[d], above*], whichever occurs later, the PUC is required to issue a determination of whether the customer has made a substantial contribution to the final order or decision in the hearing or proceeding. If the PUC finds that the customer requesting compensation has made a substantial contribution, the PUC must describe the contribution and determine the amount of compensation to be paid in accordance with the terms of *Pub. Util. Code § 1806* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1804(e)*; *see* discussion in *[2], above*].

The PUC is required to deny any request for an award to any customer who attempts to delay or obstruct the orderly and timely fulfillment of the PUC's responsibilities [*Pub. Util. Code § 1808*].

[4] Payment of Compensation by Utility

Any award of compensation will be paid by the public utility that is the subject of the hearing, investigation, or proceeding, as determined by the PUC, within 30 days. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any award paid by a public utility will be allowed by the PUC as an expense for the purpose of establishing rates of the utility [*see Pub.*

Util. Code § 1807].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.27

§ 480.27 Deposit of Funds

Except as provided in *Pub. Util. Code § 1702.2(b)*, any funds entrusted to the PUC by any person or corporation filing a complaint against a public utility shall be deposited in trust by the PUC in the custody of the Treasurer, as specified in *Gov. Code. Code § 16305.3* (deposit of state money in trust) [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(a)*].

If the amount of funds entrusted to the PUC by a person or corporation filing a complaint against a public utility exceeds $20,000, the PUC may deposit the funds in trust in an insured account with a bank or a federal or state savings and loan association, bearing interest at rates up to the maximum permitted by law. The PUC shall pay these funds, together with the interest paid thereon to the party specified in the PUC's order or decision on that complaint [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
1. Prehearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.28-480.39

[Reserved]

§§ 480.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.40

§ 480.40 Hearing Procedures Generally Applicable

Pub. Util. Code § 1705, discussed in *§ 480.41* et seq, sets forth procedures that govern hearings before the PUC generally.

For procedures that apply to a particular type of proceeding, see the following:

- Adjudication hearings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2*, discussed in *§ 480.60* et seq.].
- Ratesetting hearings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3*, discussed in *§ 480.80* et seq.].
- Quasi-legislative hearings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4*, discussed in *§ 480.100* et seq.].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.40A

§ 480.40A Role of Presiding Officers

[1] Commissioners or Administrative Law Judge

When evidence is to be taken in a proceeding before the PUC, one or more of the commissioners, or an administrative law judge, may preside at the hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 62*].

[2] Authority

The presiding officer may do any of the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63*]:

- Set hearings and control their course.
- Administer oaths.
- Issue subpoenas.
- Receive evidence.
- Hold appropriate conferences before or during hearings.
- Rule on all objections or motions which do not involve final determination of proceedings.
- Receive offers of proof.
- Hear argument.
- Fix the time for the filing of briefs.

The presiding officer may take such other action as may be necessary and appropriate to the discharge of his or her duties, consistent with the statutory or other authorities under which the PUC functions and with the rules and policies of the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofOffers of Proof

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.41

§ 480.41 Right to Be Heard and Introduce Evidence

At the time fixed for any hearing before the PUC or a commissioner or the time to which the hearing has been continued, the complainant and the corporation or person complained of are entitled to be heard and to introduce evidence. In addition, whatever corporations or persons that the PUC allows to intervene also are entitled to be heard and introduce evidence [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*; *see § 480.22[5]*, discussing intervention generally].

The parties are entitled to be heard in person or by an attorney [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

121 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.42

§ 480.42 Attendance of Witnesses

The PUC must issue process to enforce the attendance of all necessary witnesses [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.43

§ 480.43 Record of Proceedings

A reporter appointed by the PUC must take down a complete record of all proceedings and testimony before the PUC or any Commissioner on any formal hearing [*Pub. Util. Code § 1706*].

In case of an action to review any order or decision of the PUC, the following constitutes the record of the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1706*]:

- A transcript of the testimony.
- All exhibits or copies of the transcript introduced.
- A transcript of the pleadings, record, and proceedings in the cause.

However, if the petitioner and PUC stipulate that certain questions alone and a specified portion only of the evidence must be certified to the Supreme Court and court of appeal for its judgment, the stipulation, and the questions and evidence specified in the stipulation, will constitute the record on review [*Pub. Util. Code § 1706*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.44

§ 480.44 Issuance and Form of Order

After the conclusion of the hearing, the PUC must make and file its order, containing its decision. Except for decisions filed after hearings held under *Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1* (expedited small claims procedure; *see § 480.130*), the decision must separately state findings of fact and conclusions of law by the PUC on all issues material to the order or decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.45

§ 480.45 Service of Order

A copy of the order, certified under the seal of the PUC, must be served on the corporation or person complained of, or the corporation's or person's attorney [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.46

§ 480.46 Operative Date of Order or Decision

The order, of its own force, takes effect and becomes operative 20 days after the service of the order except as otherwise provided by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*]. Note, however, that *Pub. Util. Code § 1731(a)*, as amended, requires the PUC to set an effective date when issuing an order or decision, and also provides that date may be a date prior to the issuance of the order or decision.

An order of the PUC continues in force either for a period designated in the order or until changed or abrogated by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

If the PUC believes that an order cannot be complied with within 20 days, it may prescribe such additional time as in its judgment is reasonably necessary to comply with the order, and may on application and for good cause shown, extend the time for compliance fixed in its order. Decisions rendered in response to complaints filed and processed pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1* (expedited small claims procedure; *see § 480.130*), may not be considered as precedent or binding on the PUC or the courts of this state [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
a. General Hearing Procedures

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.47-480.49

[Reserved]

§§ 480.47[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.50

§ 480.50 Defined

"Ex parte communication," for purposes of statutory regulation of hearings before the PUC [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*], means any oral or written communication between a decision maker and a person with an interest in a matter before the PUC concerning substantive, but not procedural issues, that does not occur in a public hearing, workshop, or other public proceeding, or on the official record of the proceeding on the matter [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(4)* (also defining "person with interest"); for various definitions promulgated by PUC, *see 20 Cal. Code Reg., §§ 1.3, 5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.51

§ 480.51 Ex Parte Communication on Categorization Issues

[1] In General

Rules governing ex parte communication in categorization proceedings vary, depending on the following factors:

- The manner in which the proceedings are iniated (for example, by application).
- The relevant stage of the proceedings.
- What category has been determined, whether by preliminary determination or appealable determination.

Ex parte communications that occur during the period between the beginning of a proceeding and the determination of the category of that proceeding, are governed by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)*]. These provisions are discussed under *[2]*, et seq., *below*.

Ex parte communications concerning categorization of a given proceeding are permitted, but must be reported under pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7.1* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(f)*]. The phrase, "ex parte communications concerning categorization," means a written or oral communication on the category of any proceeding, between an interested person and any commissioner, any commissioner's personal advisor, the chief administrative law judge, any assistant chief administrative law judge, or the assigned administrative law judge that does not occur in a public hearing, workshop, or other public setting, or on the record of the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(g)*].

For discussion of the rules governing ex parte communication in enforcement-related proceedings or other covered proceedings, see *§ 480.52*.

[2] Period Between Beginning of Proceeding and Category Determination

[a] Proceeding Initiated by Application

In a proceeding initiated by application filed after January 1, 1998, the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)* apply during the period during the filing and the PUC's preliminary determination of category pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(1)*]. Thus, oral and written ex parte communications are permitted, with specified limitations. These limitations are discussed under [3][b], *below*.

After the PUC makes a preliminary determination of category under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)*, the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b), (c)*, or *(d)* apply, depending on the preliminary determination [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(1)*]:

- If the preliminary determination is that the matter is an adjudication case, ex parte communications are generally prohibited [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(b)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b)*; discussed under *[3][a], below*].

- If the preliminary determination is that the matter is a ratesetting case, oral and written ex parte communications are permitted, with specified limitations [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)*; discussed under *[3][b], below*].

- If the preliminary determination is that the matter is a quasi-legislative case, ex parte communications are permitted without limitations [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(b)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(d)*; discussed under *[3][c], below*].

Similarly, after the assigned commissioner's appealable determination of category under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(3)*, the applicable requirements depend on that determination unless and until it is modified by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* or *6.5(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(1)*].

[b] Proceeding Initiated by Complaint

In a proceeding initiated by complaint filed after January 1, 1998, regardless of the complainant's proposed category for the proceeding, ex parte communications are prohibited until the date of service of the instructions to answer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(2)*].

After the date of service of the instructions to answer, the applicable requirements depend on the determination of category in the instructions to answer, unless and until that determination is modified by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(2)*].

For discussion related to proceedings initiated before January 1, 1998, see *[e], below*. For discussion relating to ex parte communication under a particular category, see *[3], below*.

[c] Proceeding Initiated by Order Instituting Investigation

In a proceeding initiated after January 1, 1998, by order instituting investigation or order to show cause, the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b), (c)*, or *(d)* apply, depending on the order's determination of category, unless and until such determination is modified by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(3)*].

For discussion related to proceedings initiated before January 1, 1998, see *[e], below*. For discussion relating to ex parte communication under a particular category, see *[3], below*.

[d] Proceeding Initiated by Order Instituting Rulemaking

In a proceeding initiated after January 1, 1998, by order instituting rulemaking, the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b), (c),* or *(d)* apply, depending on the order's preliminary determination of category [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(4)*]. For discussion related to proceedings initiated before January 1, 1998, see *[e], below*. For discussion relating to ex parte communication under a particular category, see *[3], below*.

After the assigned commissioner's appealable determination of category, the applicable requirements shall depend on such determination unless and until it is modified by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* or *6.5(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(4)*].

[e] Formal Proceedings Filed Before January 1, 1998

In formal proceedings filed *before* January 1, 1998, to which the category determination rules apply by virtue of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(b)(2)* (*see* discussion in *§ 480.20*), the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b), (c),* or *(d)* apply, depending on the preliminary determination of category under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(d)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(5)*]. For discussion relating to ex parte communication under a particular category, see *[3], below*.

After the assigned commissioner's appealable determination of category, the applicable requirements depend on the determination unless and until it is modified by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6.4* or *6.5(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(a)(5)*].

[3] Period After Category Determination

[a] Adjudication Hearing

Ex parte communications are prohibited in adjudication cases [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(b)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b)*].

For a discussion of the circumstances in which the prohibition against ex parte communication ceases, see [4], *below*. For discussion relating to adjudication proceedings generally, see *§ 480.60*, et seq.

[b] Ratesetting Hearing

[i] Generally Prohibited

Ex parte communications are generally prohibited in ratesetting cases [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*]. Ex parte communications are permitted, however, only if they are consistent with the restrictions stated in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)*]. These restrictions are discussed under *[ii]*, et seq., *below*.

In addition, ex parte communications are subject to the reporting requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7.1* [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)*, discussed in *§ 480.53*].

For a discussion of the circumstances in which the restrictions to ex parte communication cease, see [4], *below*. For discussion relating to adjudication proceedings generally, see *§ 480.60* et seq.

[ii] Oral Ex Parte Communications

Oral ex parte communications are permitted at any time with a commissioner provided that the commissioner involved does the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(1)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*]:

- Invites all parties to attend the meeting or sets up a conference call in which all parties may participate.

- Gives notice of this meeting or call as soon as possible, but no less than three days before the meeting or call.

If an ex parte communication meeting or call is granted by a decisionmaker to any party individually, all other parties must be sent a notice at the time that the request is granted. The notice must be no less than three days before the meeting or call. The other parties must be offered individual meetings of a substantially equal period of time with that decisionmaker [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(2)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*; *see also 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(f)* (defining "decisionmaker")].

The party requesting the initial individual meeting must notify the other parties that its request has been granted, at least three days prior to the date when the meeting is to occur. At the meeting, the party requestingthe meeting must produce a certificate of service of the notification on all other parties. If the communication is by telephone, the party requesting the call must provide the decisionmaker with the certificate of service before the start of the call. The certificate may be provided by facsimile transmission [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(2)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*].

[iii] Written Ex Parte Communications

Written ex parte communications are permitted at any time provided that the party making the communication serves copies of the communication on all other parties on the same day the communication is sent to a decisionmaker [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(3)*; *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*].

[iv] PUC May Establish Periods Without Ex Parte Communication

In any ratesetting proceeding, the PUC may establish a period during which no oral or written communications on a substantive issue in the proceeding may be permitted between an interested person and a commissioner, a commissioner's personal advisor, the chief administrative law judge, any assistant chief administrative law judge, or the assigned administrative law judge [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(4)*; *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*].

The period may begin not more than 14 days before the PUC meeting date on which the decision in the proceeding is scheduled for PUC action. If the decision is held, the PUC may permit oral or written communications on a substantive issue in the proceeding for the first half of the hold period, and may prohibit those communications for the second half of the period. In such a case, however, the period of prohibition must begin not more than 14 days before the PUC meeting date to which the decision is held [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(4)*; *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*].

In all ratesetting proceedings in which hearings have been held and a proposed decision has been filed and served, there must be a prohibition on communications as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)*. The first day of the prohibition on communications will be the day of the Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting at which the proposed decision is scheduled to be discussed and will continue through the conclusion of the Business Meeting at which a vote of the proposed decision is scheduled. If a proposed decision is held at the Business Meeting, when the hold is announced the PUC will also announce whether and when there will be a further prohibition on communications, consistent with the requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(4)*].

[c] Quasi-Legislative Hearing

Ex parte communications are permitted without any restrictions [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(b)*]. In addition, ex parte communications in any quasi-legislative proceeding are allowed without a reporting requirement [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(d)*].

[4] Circumstances Causing Restrictions on Ex Parte Communication to No Longer Apply

Under certain circumstances, the limitations on ex parte communications in categorization proceedings under *20 Cal.*

Code Reg. §§ 7 (b) and *(c)*, and the reporting requirements under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7.1* cease to apply [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(e)*].

The restrictions on ex parte communications cease to apply, and ex parte communications must be permitted in any proceeding in which [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(e)*]:

- No timely answer, response, protest, or request for hearing is filed after the pleading initiating the proceeding,
- All such responsive pleadings are withdrawn, or
- There has been a final determination that a hearing is not needed in the proceeding.

If there has been a request for hearing, however, the requirements continue to apply unless and until the request has been denied [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingFormal RulemakingEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.52

§ 480.52 Ex Parte Communication in Enforcement-Related and Other Covered Proceedings

[1] Applicable Proceedings

[a] Enforcement-Related Proceeding

In any enforcement-related proceeding, no decisionmaker may have any oral or written ex parte communication with any party to the proceeding concerning any substantive issue involved in the proceeding, unless the communication is reported within three working days in accordance with the reporting requirements set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.4*, discussed in *§ 480.53*. Communications limited to the hearing schedule, location, and format, filing dates and identity of parties are procedural inquiries that do not need to be reported [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(a)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(f)* (defining "decisionmaker")].

This rule applies from the commencement of the enforcement-related proceeding to its submission to the PUC. After the proceeding has been submitted to the PUC, and until the date of issuance of a final order in such proceeding, ex parte communications between parties and decisionmakers concerning any substantive issue involved in the proceeding are prohibited [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(a)*].

[b] Other Covered Proceedings

In all covered proceedings, other than enforcement-related proceedings, any oral or written ex parte communication between a decisionmaker and any party to the proceeding concerning any substantive issue involved in the proceeding, must be reported within three working days, in accordance with the reporting requirements set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.4*, discussed in *§ 480.53*. These reporting requirements apply from the commencement of the proceeding to the date of issuance of a final order in that proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(b)*].

[c] Consolidated Proceedings

When enforcement-related proceedings, covered by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(a)*, and other covered proceedings, covered by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(b)*, are consolidated, the ALJ must by ruling prior to the date of submission determine the extent to which the prohibition provisions governing enforcement-related proceedings apply [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.3(c)*].

[2] Augmentation of Ex Parte Communication Provisions

In augmentation of the provisions of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.1 et seq.*, the PUC, or the assigned administrative law judge with the approval of the assigned commissioner, may issue an ex parte communications ruling tailored to the needs of any specific proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.6(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.53

§ 480.53 Written Report of Ex Parte Communication

Ex parte communications that must be reported under provisions governing categorization proceedings (*see § 480.51*), enforcement-related and other covered proceedings (*see § 480.52[1][a],[b]*), and consolidated proceedings (*see § 480.52[1][c]*) must be reported by the party or interested person [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1.4(a), 7.1(a)*].

The report must be made whether the communication was initiated by the party, interested person, or the decisionmaker. They must be reported within three working days of the communication by filing (but not serving) the original and 12 copies of a "Notice of Ex Parte Communication" (Notice) with the Commission's San Francisco Docket Office [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1.4(a), 7.1(a)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(c)(4)*]. In the case of enforcement-related and other covered proceedings, the notice must be provided simultaneously to the assigned ALJ.

The notice must include the following information [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1.4(a), 7.1(a)*]:

- The date, time and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written or a combination.

- The identity each of the recipients or decisionmaker involved, the persons initiating the communication, as well as the identity of any persons present during such communication.

- A description of the party's or interested person's, but not the decisionmaker's, communication and its content. In the case of enforcement-related and other covered proceedings, a copy of any written material or text used during the communication must be attached (including audiovisual material, in categorization proceedings).

These reporting requirements apply to ex parte communications in ratesetting proceedings and to ex parte communications concerning categorization. In a ratesetting proceeding, communications with a commissioner's personal advisor must also be reported under the procedures specified in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7.1(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg.*

§ 7.1(b).

The filing of a notice must be reported promptly thereafter in the PUC's Daily Calendar [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.4(b)*]. Parties may obtain a copy of the Notice and any attachments from the PUC's Central File room or from the filing party, who must provide it to the requesting party without delay [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1.4(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.54

§ 480.54 Sanctions for Improper Ex Parte Communication

The PUC may impose such penalties and sanctions, or make any other order, as it seems appropriate to ensure the integrity of the record and to protect the public interest [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1.5(c), 7(g)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
b. Ex Parte Communications

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.55-480.59

[Reserved]

§§ 480.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.60

§ 480.60 Applicable Procedures

If the PUC pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1* has determined that a adjudication case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2* apply [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.61

§ 480.61 Scoping Memo Governs Manner of Proceedings

The assigned commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge is required to hear the case in the manner described in the scoping memo [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(b)* (preparation and issuance of scoping memo; discussed in *§ 480.25A*)]. The scoping memo is an order or ruling describing the issues to be considered in a proceeding and the timetable for resolving the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(m)*]. The scoping memo is to designate whether the assignedcommissioner or the assigned administrative law judge is to preside in the case [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 5(m)*; *see Southern CaliforniaEdison Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1104-1106, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485* (PUC fails to proceed in manner required by law under *Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)* if it considers issues beyond those identified in scoping memo)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.62

§ 480.62 Challenge to Administrative Law Judge

[1] Authority for Reassignment

The provisions of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 62 et seq.* are the exclusive means available to a party to a PUC proceeding to seek reassignment of that proceeding to another Administrative Law Judge [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.1*]. A party may petition for automatic reassignment (*see [2], below*), or under certain circumstances, may petition for reassignment for cause (*see [3], below*) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 63.2, 63.5*].

[2] Automatic Reassignment

[a] Petition

A party is entitled to petition, once only, for automatic reassignment of a proceeding to another administrative law judge, when [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*]:

- The proceeding is preliminarily determined to be adjudicatory by application [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)*; *see § 480.23[2]*], or is a proceeding filed before January 1, 1998 [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(d)*; *see § 480.23[6]*].

- The proceeding is determined to be adjudicatory by complaint [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*; *see § 480.23[3]*], or PUC order instituting investigation [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(1)*; *see § 480.23[4]*].

The petition must be in accordance with the provisions of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)* (parties entitled to one peremptory challenge of assignment of ALJ)].

Except as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 63.3* and *63.4*, no party in an adjudicatory proceeding will be permitted to make more than one petition for reassignment in the proceeding. In an adjudicatory proceeding when there is more than

one complainant or similar party, or more than one defendant or similar party, only one petition for automatic reassignment for each side may be made [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*].

The petition must be filed and served in the proceeding in which reassignment is sought, and on the chief administrative law judge and the president of the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*].

[b] Supporting Declaration

The petition must be supported by declaration under penalty of perjury (or affidavit by an out-of-state person) in substantially the form set forth in the statute [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*].

When the party seeking automatic reassignment is one of several parties aligned on the same side in the proceeding, the declaration must include a showing that either [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*]:

- No previous petition for automatic reassignment has been filed in the proceeding, or
- The interests of the petitioner are substantially adverse to those of any prior petitioner for automatic reassignment in the proceeding.

[c] Time Limit for Filing Petition

Any petition and supporting declaration filed under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*, discussed under *[a]* and *[b]*, *above*, must be filed no later than 10 days after the date of the notice of the assignment or reassignment [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(c)*].

[d] Ruling on Petition

On the filing of a petition for automatic reassignment, the chief administrative law judge, subject only to the restrictions in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(d)* on the number and timeliness of petitions in a given proceeding, must issue a ruling reassigning the proceeding to another administrative law judge. The chief administrative law judge, in consultation with the president of the PUC, must issue a ruling explaining the basis for denial whenever a petition for automatic reassignment is denied [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(d)*].

[e] Circumstances Permitting Unlimited Peremptories

Irrespective of the limits in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2* on number of petitions for automatic reassignment, any party is entitled to file a petition for reassignment in any adjudicatory proceeding or ratesetting proceeding in which the then-assigned administrative law judge [*Pub. Util. § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.3*]:

- Has served within the previous 12 months in any capacity in an advocacy position at the PUC or has been employed by a regulated public utility,
- Has served in a representative capacity in the proceeding, or
- Has been a party to the proceeding.

A petition under this subsection must be supported by declaration under penalty of perjury (or affidavit by an out-of-state person) setting forth the factual basis for the petition, and must be filed and served as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)* (discussed under *[a]* through *[c]*, *above* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.3*].

Any petition and supporting declaration filed pursuant to this rule must be filed no later than 10 days after the date of

the notice of the assignment or reassignment. The chief administrative law judge, in consultation with the president of the PUC, must issue a ruling explaining the basis for denial whenever a petition for reassignment made pursuant to this rule is denied [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.3(b)*].

[3] Reassignment for Cause

[a] Grounds

[i] Financial Interest

Any party is entitled to file a petition for reassignment in any adjudicatory, ratesetting, or quasi-legislative proceeding when the administrative law judge has a financial interest in the subject matter in a proceeding or in a party to the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(1)*].

"Financial interest" means ownership of more than a 1 percent legal or equitable interest in a party, or a legal or equitable interest in a party of a fair market value in excess of $1,500, or a relationship as director, advisor or other active participant in the affairs of a party [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(a)*].

An administrative law judge is deemed to have a financial interest if:

- A spouse or minor child living in the administrative law judge's household has a financial interest [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(1)(A)*], or

- The administrative law judge or his or her spouse is a fiduciary who has a financial interest [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(1)(B)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(c)*, defining "fiduciary"].

An administrative law judge has a duty to make reasonable efforts to be informed about his or her personal and fiduciary interests and those of his or her spouse and the personal financial interests of the children living in the household [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(1)*].

Each of the following are not considered a "financial interest":

- Ownership in a mutual or common investment fund that holds securities unless the administrative law judge participates in the management of the fund [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(a)(1)*].

- An office in an educational, religious, charitable, fraternal, or civic organization [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(a)(2)*].

The proprietary interest of a policyholder in a mutual insurance company, or a depositor in a mutual savings association, or a similar proprietary interest, is a "financial interest" in the organization only if the outcome of the proceeding could substantially affect the value of the interest [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(a)(3)*].

[ii] Bias, Prejudice, or Interest

Any party is entitled to file a petition for reassignment in any adjudicatory, ratesetting, or quasi-legislative proceeding when the administrative law judge has bias, prejudice, or interest in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(2)*].

[b] Circumstances Not Constituting Grounds

The following are not grounds for reassignment for cause:

- The administrative law judge is or is not a member of a racial, ethnic, religious, sexual or similar group and the proceeding involves the rights of such a group [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.5(a)*].

- The administrative law judge has experience, technical competence, or specialized knowledge of or has in any capacity expressed a view on a legal, factual or policy issue presented in the proceeding, except as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.3*, relating to automatic reassignment, as discussed under *[a], above* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.5(b)*].

- The administrative law judge has, as a representative or public official participated in the drafting of laws or regulations or in the effort to pass or defeat laws or regulations, the meaning, effect, or application of which is in issue in the proceeding. The exception to this, however, is when the administrative law judge believes that the prior involvement was such as to prevent the administrative law judge from exercising unbiased and impartial judgment in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.5(c)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(b)*, defining "representative"].

[c] Declaration

A petition filed pursuant to this rule must be supported by a declaration under penalty of perjury (or affidavit by an out-of-state person) setting forth the factual basis for the petition [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(b)*].

[d] Filing and Service

A petition for reassignment based on cause must be filed and served as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)* (*see [1][a], above*) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(b)*].

A petition and supporting declaration filed pursuant to this rule must be filed at the earliest practicable opportunity and in any event no later than 10 days after the date the petitioner discovered or should have discovered facts set forth in the declaration filed pursuant to this rule. The chief administrative law judge, in consultation with the president of the PUC, and after considering any response from the assigned administrative law judge, must issue a ruling addressing a petition for reassignment filed under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(b)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(c)*].

[e] Limit on Number of Petitions

A party may file no more than one petition for reassignment of an administrative law judge under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4* unless facts suggesting new grounds for reassignment are first learned of or arise after the petition was filed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(d)*].

Repetitive petitions for reassignment not alleging facts suggesting new grounds for reassignment must be denied by either the chief administrative law judge or by the administrative law judge against whom they are filed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(d)*].

[f] Administrative Law Judge's Ability to Request Reassignment

The administrative law judge must request reassignment and withdraw from a proceeding in which there are grounds for reassignment for cause unless the parties waive the reassignment under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.7*, discussed under *[g], below* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.6(a)*].

[g] Waiver

An administrative law judge, after determining that there is basis for his or her reassignment for cause, must disclose the basis on the record, and may ask the parties whether they wish to waive the reassignment. A waiver of reassignment

must recite the basis for reassignment and is effective only when signed by all parties, and included in the record [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.7*].

The administrative law judge may not seek to induce a waiver and must avoid any effort to discover which representatives or parties favored or opposed a waiver of reassignment [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.7*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(b)*, defining "representative"].

[4] Prior Rulings of Reassigned ALJ Not Set Aside

If an administrative law judge is reassigned, the rulings he or she has made up to that time may not be set aside in the absence of good cause [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.8*].

[5] Ban on Ex Parte Communications.

Ex parte communications regarding the assignment or reassignment of particular administrative law judges are prohibited. Any written response by the assigned administrative law judge to a petition for reassignment for cause must be filed and served in the proceeding in which the reassignment was requested [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.9*].

"Ex parte communication" includes all communications defined as ex parte communications elsewhere in the PUC rules of practice and procedure (*see, e.g., 480.50* et seq.). The term also includes a communication between an administrative law judge and other decisionmakers about a petition for reassignment of a proceeding to which the administrative law judge is currently assigned [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.10(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.63

§ 480.63 Ex Parte Communications Prohibited

Ex parte communications are generally prohibited in adjudication cases [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(b)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(b)*]. For discussion of regulations governing ex parte communication in categorization proceedings generally, see *§ 480.50*.

For a discussion of the circumstances in which the prohibition against ex parte communication ceases, see *§ 480.50[4]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.64

§ 480.64 Decision

[1] Submission for Decision

An adjudicatory proceeding stands submitted for decision by the PUC after the taking of evidence, and the filing of briefs or the presentation of oral arguments as prescribed by the PUC or the presiding officer. The PUC's Daily Calendar must include a table of submission dates listing all such dates (with the corresponding proceedings) that occurred during the two weeks preceding the date of the calendar [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(a)*].

[2] Content

In an adjudicatory proceeding in which a hearing was held, the presiding officer must prepare a decision setting forth the findings, conclusions, and order [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(b)*].

[3] Filing and Service

The decision of the presiding officer must be filed with the PUC and served on all parties without undue delay, not later than 60 days after submission [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(b)*].

[4] When Presiding Officer's Decision Becomes PUC Decision

The decision of the presiding officer constitutes the proposed decision when one is required by law, and becomes the decision of the PUC if no appeal or request for review is filed within 30 days after the date the decision is served on the parties in the proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(b)*].

[5] Comments on Draft Decision

The comment procedure in Rules 77.1-77.6 does not apply to a presiding officer's decision. However, the presiding

officer has discretion, at any time before the 30-day appeal period has begun to run, to authorize comments on a draft decision or a portion thereof [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(b)*].

[6] Table of Decisions

The PUC's Daily Calendar must include a table that lists, for the two weeks preceding the date of the calendar, each decision of the presiding officer that has become the decision of the PUC. The table must indicatethe proceeding so decided and the date when the presiding officer's decision became the decision of the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.64A

§ 480.64A Oral Argument on Rehearing

In any adjudicatory proceeding, if an application for rehearing is granted, the parties shall have an opportunity for final oral argument before the assigned administrative law judge (or before the assigned commissioner, if the latter presides at the rehearing) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.65

§ 480.65 Review by PUC

[1] Initiation of Review

[a] Appeal By Interested Party

The complainant, defendant, respondent, or any intervenor in an adjudicatory proceeding may file and serve an appeal of the decision of the presiding officer within 30 days of the date the decision is served on the parties in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(c)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)* ("any interested party" may appeal)].

[b] Request for Review By PUC

The PUC may itself initiate a review of the proposed decision on any grounds [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*]. Any commissioner may request review of the decision of the presiding officer in an adjudicatory proceeding by filing and serving a request for the review within 30 days of the date the decision is served on the parties in a proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(d)*].

[c] Content of Appeal or Request for Review

Appeals and requests for review must set forth specifically the grounds on which the appellant or requestor believes the decision of the presiding officer to be unlawful or erroneous [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(e)*].

The purpose of an appeal or request for review is to alert the PUC to a potential error, so that the error may be corrected expeditiously by the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(e)*]. Vague assertions as to the record or the law, without citation, may be accorded little weight [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(e)*].

[d] Service of Appeal or Request for Review

Appeals and requests for review must be served on all parties and accompanied by a certificate of service [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(e)*].

The time for filing and serving an appeal or request for review is discussed under *[a]* and *[b]*, respectively, *above*.

[2] Response to Appeal or Request for Review

Any party may file and serve its response no later than 15 days after the date the appeal or request for review was filed. In cases of multiple appeals or requests for review, the response may be to all such filings and may be filed 15 days after the last such appeal or request was filed. Replies to responses are not permitted [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(f)*].

The PUC is not obligated to withhold a decision on an appeal or request for review to allow time for responses to be filed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(f)*].

[3] Consideration of Presiding Officer's Decision in Closed Session

In any adjudicatory proceeding in which a hearing is held, the PUC may meet in closed session to consider the decision of the presiding officer that is under appeal pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(c)*, discussed under *[1][a], above* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(c)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(g)*].

[4] PUC Decision Must Be Based on Record Developed by Presiding Officer

The PUC decision must be based on the record developed by the assigned commissioner or the administrative law judge [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(g)*].

[5] Vote in Public Meeting

The vote on the appeal or a request for review must be in a public meeting and must be accompanied by an explanation of the PUC's decision [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(g)*].

[6] Explanation of Changes Required

A decision different from that of the presiding officer must include or be accompanied by a written explanation of each of the changes made to the presiding officer's decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.2(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.66

§ 480.66 Time Limit to Resolve Adjudication Cases

Adjudication cases must be resolved within 12 months of initiation unless the PUC makes findings why that deadline cannot be met and issues an order extending that deadline [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.67

§ 480.67 Determination Regarding Ability to Pay Penalties or Fines

The PUC may determine that a respondent lacks, or may lack, the ability to pay potential penalties or fines or to pay restitution that may be ordered by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(e)(1)*]. If so, the PUC may order the respondent to demonstrate, to the PUC's satisfaction, sufficient ability to pay. The respondent must demonstrate the ability to pay, or make other financial arrangements satisfactory to the PUC, within seven days of the PUC commencing an adjudication case. The PUC may delegate to the attorney to the PUC the determination of whether a sufficient showing has been made by the respondent of an ability to pay [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(e)(2)*].

Within seven days of the PUC's determination of the respondent's ability to pay, the respondent is entitled to an impartial review by an administrative law judge, of the sufficiency of the showing made by the respondent of the respondent's ability to pay. The review by an administrative law judge becomes part of the record of the adjudication and is subject to the PUC's consideration in its order resolving the adjudication case. The administrative law judge may enter temporary orders modifying any financial requirement made of the respondent pending the review by theadministrative law judge [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(e)(3)*]. A respondent that is a public utility regulated under a rate-of-return or rate-of-margin regulatory structure or that has gross annual revenues of more than $100,000,000 generated within California is presumed to be able to pay potential penalties or fines or to pay restitution that may be ordered by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(e)(4)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
c. Adjudication Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.68-480.79

[Reserved]

§§ 480.68[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.80

§ 480.80 Applicable Procedures

If the PUC pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1* has determined that a ratesetting case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3* apply [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.81

§ 480.81 Principal Hearing Officer

[1] Prehearing Designation

The assigned Commissioner must determine prior to the first hearing whether the Commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge shall be designated as the principal hearing officer [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*].

[2] Minimum Attendance Requirement

The principal hearing officer must be present for more than one-half of the hearing days [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*]. An assigned commissioner acting as the principal hearing officer is bound by this minimum attendance rule [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*].

Whether or not the assigned commissioner is the principal hearing officer, he or she must be present at the closing argument [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*].

[3] Decision as Proposed Decision

The decision of the principal hearing officer is the proposed decision. An alternate decision may be issued by the assigned Commissioner or the assigned administrative law judge who is not the principal hearing officer [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities

LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.82

§ 480.82 Party's Request for Presence of Commissioner

A party may request the presence of the assigned commissioner at a formal hearing or specific portion of a formal hearing [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*]. The term, "formal hearing" generally refers to a hearing at which testimony is offered or comments or argument taken on the record. A workshop is not a formal hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(2)*]. "Present" or "presence" at a hearing or argument means physical attendance in the hearing room, sufficient to familiarize the attending commissioner with the substance of the evidence, testimony, or argument for which the commissioner's presence is required or requested [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(4)*].

The request may be made in a pleading or a prehearing conference statement. Alternatively, the request may be made by filing and serving on all parties a letter to the assigned commissioner, with a copy to the assigned administrative law judge [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*].

The request should be made as far as possible in advance of the formal hearing, and should specify the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*]:

- The witnesses and/or issues for which the assigned commissioner's presence is requested.
- The party's best estimate of the dates when such witnesses and subject matter will be heard.
- The reasons why the assigned commissioner's presence is requested.

The assigned commissioner has sole discretion to grant or deny, in whole or in part, any such request. Any request that is filed five or fewer business days before the date when the subject hearing begins may be rejected as untimely [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.83

§ 480.83 Ex Parte Communication

Ex parte communications are generally prohibited in ratesetting cases [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c)*]. Oral and written ex parte communications are permitted, however, when they comply with specified restrictions [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 480.50[3][b]*.

For discussion of regulations governing ex parte communication in categorization proceedings generally, see *§ 480.50*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.84

§ 480.84 Challenges to Administrative Law Judge

[1] Exclusive Means of Reassignment

The provisions of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 62 et seq.* are the exclusive means available to a party to a PUC proceeding to seek reassignment of that proceeding to another Administrative Law Judge [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.1*]. A party may petition for automatic reassignment (*see [2], below*), or under certain circumstances, may petition for reassignment for cause (*see [3], below*) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 63.2, 63.5*].

If an administrative law judge is reassigned, the rulings he or she has made up to that time may not be set aside in the absence of good cause [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.8*].

Ex parte communications regarding the assignment or reassignment of particular administrative law judges are prohibited. Any written response by the assigned administrative law judge to a petition for reassignment for cause must be filed and served in the proceeding in which the reassignment was requested [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.9*].

[2] Automatic Reassignment

[a] When Available

A party to a proceeding is entitled to petition, once only, for automatic reassignment of that proceeding to another Administrative Law Judge, in the following circumstances [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*]:

- The proceeding is preliminarily determined to be ratesetting by application [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(a)(1)*; *see § 480.23[2]*], PUC order instituting rulemaking [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(2)*; *see § 480.23[5]*]. or is a proceeding filed before January 1, 1998 [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(d)*; *see § 480.23[6]*].

- The proceeding is determined to be ratesetting by complaint [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(b)(1)*; *see §*

480.23[3]], or PUC order instituting investigation [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 6(c)(1)*; *see § 480.23[4]*].

A person or entity declaring the intention in good faith to become a party to such proceeding, is also entitled to petition, once only, for automatic reassignment of the above proceedings to another administrative law judge [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*].

No more than two automatic reassignments may be permitted in the same proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*].

There are circumstances, however, in which unlimited peremptories are permitted [*see Pub. Util. § 1701.2(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.3, see § 480.62[2][e]*].

The petition must be in accordance with the provisions of *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*]. The petition must be filed and served as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*, discussed in *§ 480.62[2][a]*]. The petition must be supported by a declaration similar in form and substance to that set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*, discussed in *§ 480.62[2][b]* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*].

[b] Second Automatic Reassignment on Petition by Good Faith Declarant

A party to the proceeding, or a person or entity declaring the intention in good faith to become a party to the proceeding, may petition for another automatic reassignment no later than 10 days following the date of such ruling. The petition must be filed and served as provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*, discussed in *§ 480.62[2][a]*]. The petition must be supported by a declaration similar in form and substance to that set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(a)*, discussed in *§ 480.62[2][b]* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*].

The second automatic reassignment of the proceeding is not be subject to further petitions under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)*].

[c] Time Limit for Filing Petition and Declaration

The petition and supporting declaration must be filed no later than 10 days after the date of the notice of the assignment or reassignment [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(c)*].

A second petition for automatic reassignment of a ratesetting proceeding must be filed no later than 10 days following the date of the ruling on the first petition for automatic reassignment filed pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(b)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(c)*].

[d] Ruling on Petition

Whenever a timely petition for automatic reassignment of a ratesetting proceeding is filed, the chief administrative law judge, promptly at the end of the 10-day period specified in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.2(c)*, discussed under *[c], above*, must issue a ruling reassigning the proceeding.

[3] Reassignment for Cause

Any party is entitled to file a petition for reassignment in any adjudicatory, ratesetting, or quasi-legislative proceeding when the administrative law judge has a financial interest in the subject matter in a proceeding or in a party to the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.4(a)(1)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 480.62[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.85

§ 480.85 Proposed and Alternate Decision

The principal hearing officer must present the proposed decision to the full PUC in a public meeting. The alternate decision, if any, must also be presented to the full PUC at that public meeting. The alternate decision must be filed with the PUC and must be served on all parties simultaneously with the proposed decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*].

The presentation to the full PUC must contain the following [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(a)*]:

- A record of the number of days of the hearing.
- The number of days that each Commissioner was present.
- Whether the decision was completed on time.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.86

§ 480.86 Oral Argument Before PUC

A party has the right to make a final oral argument before the PUC, if the party so requests within the time and in the manner specified in the scoping memo or later ruling in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(d)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(d)*].

A quorum of the PUC must be present for such final oral argument. To the extent permitted by law, any commissioner who is surplus to thequorum may attend the argument from a remote location linked to the hearing room via audio, visual, and/or textual media establishing real-time, two-way communication [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(d)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.87

§ 480.87 Final Decision of PUC

[1] Submission for Decision

A ratesetting and quasi-legislative proceeding stands submitted for decision by the PUC after the taking of evidence, and the filing of briefs or the presentation of oral arguments, as ordered in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(a)*].

The PUC's Daily Calendar includes a table of submission dates listing all such dates (with the corresponding proceedings) that occurred during the two weeks preceding the date of the calendar [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(a)*].

[2] Proposed Decision

In ratesetting and quasi-legislative proceedings, the presiding officer must prepare a proposed decision setting forth recommendations, findings, and conclusions. The proposed decision must be filed with the PUC and served on all parties without undue delay, not later than 90 days after submission [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(b)*].

As provided in *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 77.1-77.6*, parties may comment on the proposed decision [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(b)*]. Applicants in matters involving buses, vessels, public utility sewer systems, or public utility pipelines may make an oral or written motion to waive the filing of comments on the proposed decision. Any party objecting to that waiver will have the burden of demonstrating that filing of comments is in the public interest [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(b)*].

[3] Adoption, Modification, or Setting Aside of Proposed Decision

The PUC may, in issuing its decision, adopt, modify, or set aside the proposed decision or any part of the decision based on evidence in the record [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(e)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(b)*].

[4] Time Limit of Final Decision

The PUC, in issuing its decision in a ratesetting or quasi-legislative proceeding, may adopt, modify, or set aside all or part of the proposed decision, based on the evidence in the record. The decision of the PUC must be issued not later than 60 days after issuance of the proposed decision. The PUC may extend the deadline for a reasonable period under extraordinary circumstances. The 60-day deadline must be extended for 30 days if any alternate decision is proposed [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(e)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(c)*].

[5] Consideration of Decision in Closed Session

In a ratesetting proceeding in which a hearing was held, the PUC may meet in closed session to consider its decision, provided that the PUC has established a period as described in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(4)* (*see § 480.51[3][b][iv]*, relating to period of no oral or written communications on substantive issue in proceeding) [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(d)*].

In no event may the period during which the PUC may meet in closed session exceed the period described in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 7(c)(4)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
d. Ratesetting Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.88-480.99

[Reserved]

§§ 480.88[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.100

§ 480.100 Applicable Procedures

If the PUC pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1* has determined that a quasi-legislative case requires a hearing, the procedures prescribed by *Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4* apply [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.101

§ 480.101 Roles of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge

The assigned administrative law judge acts as an assistant to the assigned commissioner in quasi-legislative cases [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(a)*].

The assigned commissioner must be present for formal hearings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(a)*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(e)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(4)* (defining "present" for purposes of this rule, discussed in *§ 480.81[2]*)].

The term "formal hearing" generally refers to hearing at which testimony is offered or comments or argument taken on record; workshop is not formal hearing. In a quasi-legislative proceeding, "formal hearing" includes a hearing at which testimony is offered on legislative facts, but does not include a hearing at which testimony is offered on adjudicative facts [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(2)*].

For the purpose of commissioner attendance, "adjudicative facts" answer questions such as who did what, where, when, how, why, with what motive or intent [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(1)*]. "Legislative facts" are the general facts that help the tribunal decide questions of law and policy and discretion [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(f)(3)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationImpartialityEx Parte ContactsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.102

§ 480.102 Ex Parte Communication Permitted

Ex parte communications are permitted without any restrictions [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(b)*]. For discussion of regulations governing ex parte communication in categorization proceedings generally, see *§ 480.50*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.103

§ 480.103 Preparation and Presentation of Proposed Rule or Order

The assigned Commissioner must prepare the proposed rule or order with the assistance of the administrative law judge. The assigned Commissioner is required to present the proposed rule or order to the full PUC in a public meeting. The report must include the number of days of hearing and the number of days that the Commissioner was present [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.104

§ 480.104 Final Oral Argument Before PUC

A party has the right to make a final oral argument before the PUC, if the party so requests within the time and in the manner specified in the scoping memo or later ruling in the proceeding [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(d)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(c)*].

A quorum of the PUC must be present for such final oral argument. To the extent permitted by law, any commissioner who is surplus to the quorum may attend the argument from a remote location linked to the hearing room via audio, visual, and/or textual media establishing real-time, two-way communication [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8(d)*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.105

§ 480.105 Final Rule or Order of PUC

[1] May Adopt, Modify, or Set Aside Proposed Decision

The PUC may, in issuing its rule or order, adopt, modify, or set aside the proposed decision or any part of the rule or order [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(d)*].

For discussion of when a quasi-legislative proceeding stands submitted for decision by the PUC under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 8.1(a)*, see *§ 480.87[1]*. For discussion relating to preparation, filing, service of proposed decision, and comments the proposed decision, see *§ 480.87[2]*.

[2] Time Limit for Final Decision

The final rule or order of the PUC must be issued not later than 60 days after the issuance of the proposed rule or order. Under extraordinary circumstances the PUC may extend this date for a reasonable period. The 60-day period shall be extended for 30 days if any alternate rule or order is proposed pursuant to Section 311 [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.4(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
2. Hearing Procedures
e. Quasi-Legislative Hearing

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.106-480.119

[Reserved]

§§ 480.106[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
3. Posthearing Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.120

§ 480.120 Rescission or Amendment of Order by PUC

The PUC may at any time, upon notice to the parties, and with opportunity to be heard as provided in the case of complaints, rescind, alter, or amend any order or decision made by it. Any order rescinding, altering, or amending a prior order or decision has, when served on the parties, the same effect as an original order or decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1708*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
3. Posthearing Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.121

§ 480.121 Conclusiveness of Orders and Decisions

In all collateral actions or proceedings, the orders and decisions of the PUC which have become final are conclusive [*Pub. Util. Code § 1709*].

When the PUC exercises its judicial power, its orders or decisions have the conclusive effect of res judicata as to the issues involved when they are again brought into question in subsequent proceedings between the same parties [*Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 852 n.3, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758* ; *People v. Western Air Lines, Inc. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 621, 630, 268 P.2d 723]* .

When the PUC exercises its legislative power, such as when it fixes rates, its orders or decisions do not have the same effect [*see Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 851-852, 852 n.3, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758]* . Therefore, its determination of, for example, property rights in a rate-making proceeding is subject to relitigation in any court of law that is asked to determine those interests [*Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 852 n.3, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
3. Posthearing Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.122

§ 480.122 Application for Rehearings

After any order or decision has been made by the PUC, any party to the action or proceeding, or any stockholder or bondholder or other party pecuniarily interested in the public utility affected, may apply for a rehearing in respect to any matters determined in the action or proceeding and specified in the application for rehearing. The PUC may grant and hold a rehearing on those matters, if in its judgment sufficient reason is made to appear. No cause of action arising out of any order or decision of the PUC accrues in any court to any corporation or person unless the corporation or person has filed application to the PUC for a rehearing within 30 days after the date of issuance or within 10 days after the date of issuancein the case of an order issued pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 816 et seq.* or *851 et seq.* (relating to security transactions and the transfer or encumbrance of utility property).

"Date of issuance" in this context means the date when the PUC mails the order or decision to the parties to the action or proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1731(b)*]. The application for a rehearing must set forth specifically the ground or grounds on which the applicant considers the decision or order to be unlawful. No corporation or person may in any court urge or rely on any ground not so set forth in the application [*Pub. Util. Code § 1732*].

In the event that a rehearing of an adjudication case is granted the parties must have an opportunity for final oral argument [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.2(d)*].

For a form of petition for rehearing, see *§ 480.194[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
3. Posthearing Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.123

§ 480.123 Petitions to Reopen Proceedings

After conclusion of hearings, but before issuance of a decision, a party to the proceeding may serve on all other parties and file with the PUC, a petition to set aside submission and reopen the proceeding for the taking of additional evidence, or for consideration of a settlement or stipulation under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 51 et seq.*

The petition must specify the facts claimed to constitute grounds in justification of the petition, including material changes of fact or of law alleged to have occurred since the conclusion of the hearing. It must contain a brief statement of proposed additional evidence and explain why that evidence was not previously adduced [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 84*].

When time to petition for a rehearing has passed, a petition to reopen does not lie to serve the purpose of a petition for rehearing [*Northern California Asso. to Preserve Bodega Head & Harbor, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 126, 134, 37 Cal. Rptr. 432, 390 P.2d 200]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
3. Posthearing Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.124-480.129

[Reserved]

§§ 480.124[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.130

§ 480.130 PUC Authority

The PUC is empowered to hear complaints against any utility company, if the amount of money claimed does not exceed the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court as set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)*, by an expedited complaint procedure [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)* (jurisdictional limit in small claims court as $5,000)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.131

§ 480.131 No Representation by Attorney

A party to such a hearing may not be represented by an attorney [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.132

§ 480.132 Pleadings Limited to Complaint and Answer

No pleading other than the complaint and answer is necessary [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.133

§ 480.133 Hearing

A hearing without a reporter will be held within 30 days after the answer is filed [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(c)*]. Unlike the regular claim procedure, the PUC is not required to make or file a written decision [*Pub. Util. Code § 1705*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.134

§ 480.134 Rehearing

The parties may file applications for rehearing pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1731* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(d)*]. If a rehearing is granted, the rehearing will be conducted under the PUC's regular hearing procedure [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702.1(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Proceedings Before PUC
4. Expedited Small Claims Procedure

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.135-480.139

[Reserved]

§§ 480.135[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.140

§ 480.140 Code of Civil Procedure Generally Applies

The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to writs of review apply to judicial review proceedings instituted in the Supreme Court or court of appeal under *Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*, so far as they do not conflict with the Public Utilities Act (*Pub. Util. Code § 201 et seq.*) [*Pub. Util. Code § 1758 et seq.*; *see also* discussion in *§§ 480.142, 480.144*].

For discussion and forms relating to proceedings for writ of review generally, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.141

§ 480.141 Limited Power of Trial Court in PUC Matters

A trial court is bound to follow an order of the PUC with regard to status of a public utility [*Pratt v. Coast Trucking Inc. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 139, 149-153, 39 Cal. Rptr. 332]* .

An order of the PUC cannot be effectively overruled by action of a superior court [*Anchor Lighting v. Southern California Edison Company (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 541, 548, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780* (PUC interpretation of Public UtilitiesCode will not be disturbed even if invalid unless it fails to bear reasonable relation to statute's purposes and language); *Pellandini v. Pacific Limestone Prod. Inc. (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 774, 777, 54 Cal. Rptr. 290]* . For example, when the PUC has acted on regulation of advertising in telephone books, it has exclusive jurisdiction over a claim of discrimination in the advertising and an action does not lie in superior court [*Dollar-A-Day Rent-A-Car Sys. Inc. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 454, 457-462, 102 Cal. Rptr. 651]* . Similarly, an injunction in superior court against a water company enjoining it from reversing a stock transfer is improper when the injunction interfered with the jurisdiction of the PUC, which had ordered the transfer [*Hickey v. Roby (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 752, 763-769, 77 Cal. Rptr. 486]* . A superior court does have authority to abate a nuisance caused by a public utility [*California Oregon Power Co. v. Superior Court (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 858, 870-871, 291 P.2d 455 , cert. denied, (1956) 352 U.S. 823]* . Moreover, a superior court can decide the public utility status of a mutual water company when the PUC has not determined the issue [*Ventura County Waterworks Dist. v. Susana Knolls Mut. Water Co. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 672, 678-679, 87 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewStatutory InterpretationAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.142

§ 480.142 Jurisdiction of Appellate Courts

No court in California, except the Supreme Court and the court of appeal, to the extent specified in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756-1767*, has jurisdiction to review, reverse, correct, or annul any order or decision of the PUC or to suspend or delay the execution or operation thereof, or to enjoin, restrain, or interfere with the PUC in the performance of its official duties, as provided by law and the rules of court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1759(a)*]. However, courts can hear cases where the claim does not hinder or frustrate PUC's policies or claims against unregulated providers who are not within PUC's purview [*Hartwell Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 27 Cal. 4th 256, 282, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 38 P.3d 1098]* . In addition, where a civil action brought by public prosecutors against a public utility does not usurp any exclusive power of the PUC and is authorized expressly by statute, the California Supreme Court has held that the superior court and the PUC possess concurrent subject matter jurisdiction [*Orloff v. Pac. Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1144-1155, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201* (district attorneys may prosecute civil actions for consumer fraud against public utilities regulated by PUC)].

Under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* courts may hear claims against public utilities for damages, whereas *Pub. Util. Code § 1759* defines and limits the power of courts to pass judgment on, or interfere with, the PUC's decisions. Both statutes dictate which courts have jurisdiction to engage in these activities. Only appellate courts can review decisions and orders of the PUC and interfere with its actions, whereas suits for damages against utilities can be brought in the trial court [*Anchor Lighting v. Southern California Edison Company (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 541, 549-550, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780* ; *Cundiff v. GTE California Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395, 1405-1406, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* . However, a plaintiff's attempt to obtain relief under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* may have the effect of interfering with the PUC's regulation of utilities, and thus be barred [*Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 4* (*Pub. Util. Code § 2106* "must be construed as limited to those situations in which an award of damages would not hinder or frustrate the [PUC's] declared supervisory and regulatory policies"); *Koponen v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 345, 350-351, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22* ; *Anchor Lighting v. Southern California Edison Company (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 541, 549-550, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780* ; *Cundiff v. GTE California Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395, 1405-1406, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* (suit against telephone company for unnecessary rental charges allowed to go forward)].

For claims under PUC's purview, writ of mandate may be issued by the Supreme Court to the PUC, and, with regard to complaint enforcement or other adjudicatory proceedings, by the court of appeal to the PUC, in all proper cases as prescribed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* [*Pub. Util. Code § 1759(b)*; *cf. Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)* (writ of review may be made to court of appeal to review adjudicatory matters and to Supreme Court for all other matters), and discussion in *§ 480.144[3]*].

In enacting *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*, the Legislature exercised its plenary power conferred by the California Constitution to confer additional authority and jurisdiction on the Commission, and establish the manner and scope of review of commission action in a court of record [*see Ford v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 696, 707* (discussing former *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1085 provides in turn that a writ of mandate may be issued to an inferior tribunal, corporation, board or person, to compel performance of an act specially enjoined by law, or to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right or office to which that party is entitled but to which that party has been unlawfully precluded by the tribunal, corporation, board, or person. For detailed discussion and forms relating generally to extraordinary relief by writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.143

§ 480.143 Stay

[1] Must Comply With Code and Rules

Any stay or suspension of an order or decision of the PUC may be granted only in accordance with *Pub. Util. Code § 1756 et seq.* and the rules of court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1761(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 480.144*].

[2] Scope of Stay

A stay may be issued against any order or decision of the PUC, other than anorder or decision increasing or decreasing rates or changing a rate classification [*Pub. Util. Code § 1761(b)*].

[3] Notice and Hearing

No order staying or suspending an order or decision of the PUC may be made by the Supreme Court or court of appeal except on five days' notice and after hearing [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(a)*]. An exception to the five day notice rule applies in the case of a temporary stay [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1762(c)*, discussed in *[5][a], below*].

[4] Order Suspending Decision of PUC

If the order or decision of the PUC is stayed or suspended, the order suspending it must contain a specific finding, based on evidence submitted to the court and identified by reference [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(a)*]. The specific finding made under *Pub. Util. Code § 1762(a)* must certify that great or irreparable damage would otherwise result to the petitioner and specify the nature of the damage [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(b)*].

[5] Temporary Stay

[a] Proper Case and Time for Grant

The Supreme Court or court of appeal may grant a temporary stay restraining the operation of the PUC order or

decision, other than an order or decision authorizing an increase or decrease in rates or changing a rate classification, at any time before the required hearing and determination of the application for a stay. The temporary stay may be granted when, in the opinion of the court, irreparable loss or damage would result to petitioner unless the temporary stay is granted [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(c)*].

[b] Grounds Allowing Grant

No temporary stay may be granted by the Supreme Court or court of appeal unless it clearly appears from specific facts shown by the verified petition that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the applicant before notice can be served and hearing had on a motion for a stay as provided in this chapter [*Pub. Util. Code § 1763(a)*].

[c] Duration of Temporary Stay

The temporary stay must remain in force only until the hearing determination of the application for a stay on notice [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(c)*].

[d] Hearing of Application Given Precedence

The hearing of the application for a stay must be given precedence and assigned for hearing at the earliest practicable day after the expiration of the notice [*Pub. Util. Code § 1762(c)*].

[e] Endorsement, Filing, and Content of Temporary Stay

Every temporary stay must [*Pub. Util. Code § 1763(b)*]:

- Be endorsed with the date and hour of issuance.
- Be forthwith filed in the clerk's office and entered of record.
- Define the injury and state why it appears to be irreparable and why the order was granted without notice.
- By its terms expire within a time after entry not to exceed 10 days as the court may fix, unless within the time so fixed the order is extended for a like period for good cause shown and the reasons for the extension entered of record.

[f] Temporary Stay Granted Without Notice

In case a temporary stay is granted without notice, the matter of the issuance of a stay must be set down for hearing at the earliest possible time, and when it comes up for hearing the party obtaining the temporary stay must proceed with the application for a stay. If the party does not so proceed, the court shall dissolve the temporary stay [*Pub. Util. Code § 1763(c)*].

[6] Suspending Bond

In case the order or decision of the PUC is stayed or a temporary stay granted, the order of the Supreme Court or court of appeal may not become effective until a suspending bond is executed and filed with and approved by the court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1764*].

The suspending bond must be payable to the people of the State of California and sufficient in amount and security to insure the prompt payment by the party petitioning for the review, of all damages caused by the delay in the

enforcement of the order or decision of the PUC. The suspending bond must also be sufficient to ensure payment for all money which any person or corporation may be compelled to pay pending the review of the proceedings for transportation, transmission, product, commodity, or service in excess of the charges fixed by the order or decision of the PUC, in case the order or decision is sustained [*Pub. Util. Code § 1764*]. For discussion and forms relating to bonds generally, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[7] Stays Relating to Decision Affecting Rate or Classification

[a] Decision Denying Increase in Rate or Classification

In case the Supreme Court or court of appeal stays any order or decisiondenying to the utility an increase in any rate or classification, the court may condition the stay or temporary stay so as to permit petitioner to charge a higher rate pending the determination of the review. The court may attach other reasonable conditions to the stay or temporary stay [*Pub. Util. Code § 1765*].

[b] Decision Authorizing Increase or Decrease

Under no circumstance may the Supreme Court or court of appeal stay or suspend any order or decision by the PUC authorizing an increase or decrease in rates or changing any rate classification [*Pub. Util. Code § 1766(a)*].

If a PUC order or decision authorizing any increase or decrease in rates, or changing any rate classification, is set aside by the Supreme Court or court of appeal, the matter must be referred back to the PUC for further action consistent with the order of the court. The PUC, in taking this further action, may not authorize refunds, and any relief ordered by the PUC that shall have the effect of increasing or decreasing rates shall be prospective only [*Pub. Util. Code § 1766(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesStays of Proceedings & SupersedeasEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.144

§ 480.144 Petition for Writ of Review

[1] Time to Petition

Any aggrieved party may petition for a writ of review in the court of appeal or the Supreme Court for the purpose of having the lawfulness of the original order or decision or of the order or decision on rehearing inquired into and determined as follows [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(a)*]:

- If the application for rehearing was denied, within 30 days after the PUC issues its decision denying the application.
- If the application for rehearing was granted, within 30 days after the PUC issues its decision on rehearing.
- If no decision on rehearing has been issued, at least 120 days after the application is granted.

For purposes of *Pub. Util. Code § 1756*, the issuance of a decision or the granting of an application is construed to have occurred on the date when the PUC mails the decision or grant to the parties to the action or proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(d)*].

[2] Petition Must Be Verified

The petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(a)*]. For a form of petition for writ of review, see *§ 480.200[1]*.

[3] Proper Court for Petition

[a] Court of Appeal to Review Adjudicatory Proceeding

When the decision of the PUC was issued in an adjudicatory proceeding, the petition for writ of review may be filed in

the court of appeal [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Construing *Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)*. Before the enactment of *Pub. Util. Code § 1756*, operative January 1, 1998, petitions for writ of review to review PUC decisions were filed only in the Supreme Court. As noted in *[1], above*, *Pub. Util. Code § 1756(a)* now provides that petitions may generally be filed in either the court of appeal or the Supreme Court. *Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)* provides, in turn, that the petition "may only be filed with the Supreme Court" to review non-adjudicatory PUC matters (discussed in *[b], below*), whereas the petition "may be filed in the court of appeal" to review adjudicatory PUC decisions.

The clause relating to review of adjudicatory decisions, in using "may" rather than "may only" or "shall," would appear, when read with *Pub. Util. Code § 1756(a)*, to permit petitions for review of adjudicatory decisions to be filed in *either* the court of appeal or the Supreme Court. Because, however, only the "court of appeal" is expressly mentioned in connection with petitions to review adjudicatory provisions, it is also arguable that this language is intended to provide that the filing of such petitions *should* be done only in the court of appeal. Although the language is ambiguous, the latter interpretation, under which petitions to review adjudicatory decisions are to be filed only in the court of appeal, would appear to be more consistent with the apparent intent of the provision (*i.e.*, to lighten the Supreme Court's burden in reviewing PUC matters by sharing that burden with the court of appeal). It is also more consistent with other provisions enacted at the same time, particularly *Pub. Util. Code § 1758(c)*, which establishes a procedure for the Supreme Court's review of court of appeal decisions rendered under *Pub. Util. Code § 1756 et seq.* [*see* discussion in *§ 480.147*]. Finally, this interpretation is more consistent with the rule applicable to writ proceedings generally, that when more than one court has original jurisdiction [*see, e.g., Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*], a petition for an extraordinary writ is ordinarily to be filed in the lowest court capable of granting relief. If petitions for review of adjudicatory decisions may be filed in either the court of appeal or the Supreme Court, the procedure under *Pub. Util. Code § 1758(c)* could be circumvented by filing initially in the Supreme Court, rendering that provision superfluous.

As a practical matter, the parties will usually prefer in any event to seek review, at least initially, in the court of appeal.

The venue of a petition filed in the court of appeal under *Pub. Util. Code§ 1756* is the judicial district in which the petitioner resides. If the petitioner is a business, venue is in the judicial district in which the petitioner has its principal place of business in California [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(e)*].

Any party may seek from the Supreme Court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, an order transferring related actions to a single appellate district [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(e)*; *see Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 10.1000*]. For a form of application to transfer related actions to a single appellate district, see *§ 480.200[2]*.

For discussion of the various court of appeal districts and the counties within each district, and discussion relating to the transfer of causes in the reviewing courts generally, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , and Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision* .

[b] Supreme Court to Review Non-adjudicatory Proceeding

In all matters other than adjudicatory proceedings, the petition for writ of review may only be filed in the Supreme Court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)*].

[c] Review of Decisions Pertaining Solely to Water Corporations

Generally, review of decisions pertaining solely to water corporations may only be by petition for writ of review in the Supreme Court. Review of complaint or enforcement proceedings, however, may be in the court of appeal or the Supreme Court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(f)*].

[3a] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

If a party files a motion, application, or opposition to a motion or application in the court of appeal before filing its principal brief, the party must serve and file its Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons at the time it files the first such motion, application, or opposition and must include a copy of this certificate in the party's principal brief. If no motion, application, or opposition to a motion or application is filed before the parties file their principal briefs, each party must include its certificate in its principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)(1)*]. If the identity of any party or any entity or person subject to disclosure has not been publicly disclosed in the proceedings and a party wants to keep that identity confidential, the party may serve and file an application for permission to file its certificate under seal separately from its principal brief, motion, application, or opposition. If the application is granted, the party must file the certificate under seal and without service within 10 days of the court's order granting the application [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)(2)*].

If a party is an entity, the certificate must list any other entity or person that the party knows has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(1)*]. All parties must also list any person or entity, other than the parties themselves, that has a financial or other interest in the outcome of the proceeding that the party reasonably believes the justices should consider in determining whether to disqualify themselves under Canon 3E of the Code of Judicial Ethics [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(2)*]. If the party knows of no entity or person that is required to be disclosed under the rule, he or she must so state in the certificate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(3)*]. Furthermore, if a party learns of changed or additional information that must be disclosed under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208,* he or she must promptly serve and file a supplemental certificate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(f)*].

The petitioner's certificate must be included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(c)(2)*]. The certificate of the real party in interest must be included in the answer [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(c)(2)*]. The certificate must appear after the cover and before the tables [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(c)(2)*]. If a party fails to file a certificate, the clerk must notify the party by mail that the party must file the certificate within 10 days after the clerk's notice is mailed and that failure to comply will result in one of the following sanctions: (A) If the party is the petitioner, the court will strike the petition; (B) If the party is the respondent or the real party in interest, the court will strike the document [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(c)(3)*].

[4] Service of Petition

The petition for review must be served upon the executive director and general counsel of the PUC either personally or by service at the office of the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(c)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(a)*].

The petition must also be served upon any real parties in interest. A real party in interest is one who (1) was a party of record to the action or proceeding before the PUC, and (2) presented before the PUC a position adverse to that taken before the PUC by the petitioner for review [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.145

§ 480.145 Answer and Reply

Within 35 days after the petition is filed, the PUC or any real party in interest may serve and file an answer. Within 25 days after an answer is filed, the petitioner may serve and file a reply [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(b)*]. For a form of answer for use in writ of review in an appellate court generally, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.146

§ 480.146 Hearing and Determination

[1] Preference for Public Utilities Proceedings Over Other Civil Business

The reviewing courts must prefer over specified actions and proceedings pertaining to public utilities over other business, irrespective of position on the calendar. The following proceedings must be heard and determined in preference to all other civil business, except election clauses [*Pub. Util. Code § 1767*]:

- All actions and proceedings under *Pub. Util. Code § 201 et seq.*

- All actions or proceedings to which the PUC or the people of the State of California are parties in which any question arises under *Pub. Util. Code § 201 et seq.*

- All actions or proceedings to which the PUC or the people of the State of California are parties in which any question arises under or concerning any order or decision of the PUC.

- Any action or proceeding in which the attorney of the PUC is allowed to intervene, on application of the attorney of the PUC.

- The Supreme Court must grant expedited consideration to any party or PUC petition alleging that the court of appeal has assumed jurisdiction to review a PUC decision over which the court of appeal has no jurisdiction [*Pub. Util. Code § 1758(d)*].

[2] Scope of Review

[a] In General

No new or additional evidence may be introduced in the Supreme Court and the court of appeal, but the cause will be heard on the record of the PUC as certified to by it [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757*].

The findings and conclusions of the PUC on questions of fact are final and are not subject to review except as specified below. Such questions of fact include ultimate facts and the findings and conclusions of the PUC on reasonableness and discrimination [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757*].

In any proceeding in which the validity of an order or decision is challenged on the ground that it violates any right of petitioner under the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court or court of appeal exercises an independent judgment on the law and the facts, and the findings or conclusions of the PUC material to the determination of the constitutional question are not final [*Pub. Util. Code § 1760*].

[b] Adjudicatory Proceedings

In a complaint, enforcement, or other adjudicatory proceeding, the review by the appellate court may not extend further than to determine, on the basis of the entire record which must be certified by the PUC, whether any of the following occurred:

- The order or decision of the commission was an abuse of discretion [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(1)*].
- The commission has not proceeded in the manner required by law [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(2)*].
- The commission acted without, or in excess of, its powers or jurisdiction [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(3)*].
- The decision of the commission is not supported by the findings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(4)*].
- The order or decision was procured by fraud [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(5)*].
- The order or decision of the commission violates any right of the petitioner under the Constitution of the United States or the California Constitution [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(a)(6)*].

No new or additional evidence may be introduced upon review by the court. The PUC's findings and conclusions on findings of fact are final and may not be subject to review except as provided in by law. The questions of fact must include ultimate facts and findings and the PUC's conclusions on reasonableness and discrimination [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757.1(c)*]. However, this general rule of deference to interpretations of statutes subject to the PUC's regulatory jurisdiction does not apply when the issue is the scope of the PUC's jurisdiction [*PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1194, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630* (determining scope of PUC's jurisdiction with respect to utilities' holding companies)].

[c] Other Than Adjudicatory Proceedings

In a non-adjudicatory review proceeding before the Supreme Court, the review does not extend further than to determine whether the PUC has regularly pursued its authority, including a determination of whether the order or decision under review violates any right of the petitioner under the Constitution of the United States or California [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1757*; *Southern California Edison Company v. Public Utilities Commission (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 700]* .

The standard of review under *Pub. Util. Code § 1757*, discussed in *[a]* and *[b]*, *above*, does not apply to ratemaking or licensing decisions of specific application addressed solely to water corporations [*Pub. Util. Code § 1757(c)*]. In reviewing decisions pertaining solely to water corporations, the review may not be extended further than to determine whether the PUC has regularly pursued its authority, including a determination of whether the order or decision under review violates any right of the petitioner under the Constitutions of the United States or California [*Pub. Util. Code §*

1757.1(b)].

[3] Appearances and Judgment

The PUC and each party to the action or proceeding before the PUC may appear in the review proceeding. Upon the hearing the Supreme Court or court of appeal must enter judgment either affirming or setting aside the order or decision of the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1758(a)*].

[4] Writ Must Be Returnable at Specified Time and Place

If the writ issues, it must be made returnable at a time and place specified by court order and must direct the PUC to certify its record in the case to the court within the time specified [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(a)*].

[5] Effect of Denial of Writ

Denial of review by the appellate court is a ruling on the merits and constitutes a holding that the PUC regularly pursued its authority [*Union City v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 277, 279, 67 Cal. Rptr. 816* (petition denied by Supreme Court; decided before petitions were authorized to be heard by court of appeal as well as Supreme Court)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewAdministrative RecordGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewScope & Standards of ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.147

§ 480.147 Review in Supreme Court of Court of Appeal Decisions

The Supreme Court may review a decision by the court of appeal rendered under *Pub. Util. Code § 1756 et seq.* in the manner provided for other civil actions [*Pub. Util. Code § 1758(c)*].

The Supreme Court must grant expedited consideration to any party or PUC petition alleging that the court of appeal has assumed jurisdiction to review a PUC decision pertaining solely to water corporations over which the court of appeal has no jurisdiction [*Pub. Util. Code § 1758(d)*].

For discussion and forms relating to proceedings in the Supreme Court to review a decision of the court of appeal, see Ch. 53, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial Review

178 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.148-480.159

[Reserved]

§§ 480.148[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.160

§ 480.160 State Constitution

Appointment and removal of members of PUC. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 1*

Power of PUC to establish own procedures. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 2*

Definitions of public utilities. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 3*

Regulation of rates and charges by PUC. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 4*

Legislative power to increase jurisdiction of PUC. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 5*

Duties of PUC. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 6*

Prohibition against free passes and conflicts of interest. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 7*

Limitation on municipal regulation of public utilities. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 8*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.161

§ 480.161 Federal Statutes

Conditions under which federal district court is prohibited from enjoining state rate order. *28 U.S.C. § 1342*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.162

§ 480.162 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

Persons and corporations. *Pub. Util. Code § 204 et seq.*

Transportation. *Pub. Util. Code § 208 et seq.*

Rates. *Pub. Util. Code § 210*

Common Carriers. *Pub. Util. Code § 211 et seq.*

Procedure for PUC hearings. *Pub. Util. Code § 1701 et seq.*

Small claims procedures. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1702.1, 1705, 1706, 1731*

Procedure for rehearings. *Pub. Util. Code § 1731 et seq.*

Judicial review. *Pub. Util. Code § 1756 et seq.*

Witnesses. *Pub. Util. Code § 1791 et seq.*

Official documents as evidence and fees therefor. *Pub. Util. Code § 1901 et seq.*

Private energy producers. *Pub. Util. Code § 2802 et seq.*

[2] Regulation of Public Utilities

Application to interstate and foreign commerce. *Pub. Util. Code § 202*

Establishment of expedited procedures for public utilities in presidentially declared emergency. *Pub. Util. Code § 325*

Investigation and resolution of consumer complaints related to activities of entities providing electrical service. Pub. Util. Code § 394.12

Notice to consumer of right to file small claims or other action against electrical corporation for damages to property resulting from curtailment of electricservice due to failure to reasonably provide service within reasonable time after fire, flood, earthquake or other disaster. *Pub. Util. Code § 394.27*

Minimum standards for offering electrical services to residential and small commercial customers. *Pub. Util. Code § 394.4*

Facilities. *Pub. Util. Code § 556 et seq.*

Reports. *Pub. Util. Code § 581 et seq.*

Generally. *Pub. Util. Code § 701 et seq.*

Limitation on investment in diversification ventures. *Pub. Util. Code § 701.5*

Rates. *Pub. Util. Code § 727 et seq.*

Equipment, practices, and facilities. *Pub. Util. Code § 761 et seq.*

Books and accounts. *Pub. Util. Code § 791 et seq.*

Stock and security transactions. *Pub. Util. Code § 816 et seq.*

Transfer and encumbrance of utility property. *Pub. Util. Code § 851 et seq.*

Access to utilities' computer models by PUC. *Pub. Util. Code § 1821 et seq.*

Gas Producers' Cooperative Associations. *Pub. Util. Code § 3001 et seq.*

Decommissioning of nuclear facilities. *Pub. Util. Code § 8321 et seq.*

[3] PUC

Organization. *Pub. Util. Code § 301 et seq.*

Appointment of public adviser to assist public and ratepayers in proceedings before PUC. *Pub. Util. Code § 321*

Annual work plan access guide to scheduled rate-making proceedings and other PUC decisions. *Pub. Util. Code § 321.6*

Remedies and punishment. *Pub. Util. Code § 2100 et seq.*

[4] Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity

Utilities subject to certification. *Pub. Util. Code § 1001 et seq.*

Passenger stage corporation. *Pub. Util. Code § 1031 et seq.*

Interstate and Foreign Motor Carriers of Household Goods and Passengers Act. *Pub. Util. Code § 3901 et seq.*

Motor Carriers of Property Permit Act. *Veh. Code § 34600 et seq.*

[5] Acquisition or Duplication of Public Utility Property or Service

Valuation of public utility properties. *Pub. Util. Code § 1351 et seq.*

Determination of just compensation for acquisition of public utilities property. *Pub. Util. Code § 1401 et seq.*

Service duplication. *Pub. Util. Code § 1501 et seq.*

[6] Regulation of Crossings

Railroad crossings. *Pub. Util. Code § 1201 et seq.*

Protection of grade crossings. *Pub. Util. Code § 1231 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearingsEnergy & Utilities LawElectric Power IndustryState RegulationGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsValuationTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.163

§ 480.163 Administrative Regulations

Code of ethics for practice before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1*

Formal requirements of pleadings and briefs before PUC. 20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2-8.01

Computation of Time. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.2*

Filing Fees. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.3*

Inspection of and subscription to daily calendar. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.4*

Case Information System Identification Number. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.5*

Protests; requests for hearings before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 8.1-8.15*

Complaints and PUC investigations. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9-14*

PUC rulemaking. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 14.1-14.6*

Applications generally. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 15-17.3*

Applications for authority to increase rates. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 23, 24*

Applications of common carriers to increase rates under shortened-procedure tariff docket. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 25-32*

Applications to issue stock or evidence of indebtedness or to assume liabilities. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 33, 34*

Applications to sell, lease, or encumber utility property or rights; to merge or consolidate facilities; to acquire stock of

another utility; or to acquire or control a utility. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 35-37*

Applications to construct, alter, or abolish railroad crossings. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 38-41*

Other applications and procedures. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 42, 43*

Applications for exemptions from rules regarding underground telephone and electric lines. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 43.1-43.8*

Prehearing procedure and exchange of exhibits. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 49, 50*

Hearings. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 52-58*

Subpoenas to appear before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 59-61.1*

Presiding officers at proceeding before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 62, 63.7*

Evidence in hearings before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 64-74*

Briefs and oral argument in proceedings before Public Utilities PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 75, 76*

Decisions and proposed reports of PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 77-83*

Reopening proceedings before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 84*

Rehearings before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 85-86.2*

Construction and amendment of PUC rules. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 87*

Illustrative forms for proceedings before PUC. *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingState ProceedingsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRehearings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.164

§ 480.164 Decisions

[1] Regulation of Public Utilities Generally

[a] Dedication to Public Service

Bus company has property dedicated to public service of certain communities, and therefore PUC has jurisdiction to order it to extend service over certainroutes in those communities. *Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 406, 410-417, 67 Cal. Rptr. 97, 438 P.2d 801*

Water company is subject to PUC regulation when it had dedicated property to public use by selling water to public. *Yucaipa Water Co. No. 1 v. Public Utilities Com. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 823, 828-832, 9 Cal. Rptr. 239, 357 P.2d 295*

Gas company not subject to jurisdiction of PUC unless it has dedicated its property to public service. *Richfield Oil Corp. v. Public Util. Comm'n (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 419, 428-433, 6 Cal. Rptr. 548, 354 P.2d 4*

Water company was found not to have dedicated its service to public use in area by entering into contract to supply subdivider with water in future and, thus, is not subject to PUC's regulation of water service in that area. *Cal. Water & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 488-500, 334 P.2d 887*

Private mobile communication service of telephone company is subject to regulation by PUC. *Commercial Communications v. Public Util. Comm'n (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 512, 518-526, 327 P.2d 513*

[b] Nondelegable Duty

Public utility's duty to comply with rules of PUC regarding installation of utility poles is nondelegable to independent contractor. *Snyder v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 793, 797-803, 285 P.2d 912*

[c] Limitations of Liability

PUC rate allowing telephone company to limit liability for inadequate service precludes any award of damages above the credit allowance allowed in rate. *Waters v. Pacific Telephone Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 7-12, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161*

Limitations on liability are properly included in tariffs as subject clearly within the PUC's regulatory powers; thus, tariffs limited cellular telephone company's maximum exposure in negligence suit brought by victim who was assaulted after she was unable to summon help on her cellular telephone. *Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1013, 1017-1018, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894*

PUC's rules with regard to gas meter testing does not preclude other methods of proving overcharge by public utility. *Masonite Corp. v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6-11, 135 Cal. Rptr. 170*

Limitation of liability provisions in telegraph rates limiting liability for nondelivery of telegrams is binding on public, whether or not they have notice of such limitations. *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 549-554, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361*

[2] PUC Authority Generally

[a] Jurisdiction of PUC

[i] Generally

In construing deeds to ascertain existing rights of utility for purposes of exercising ratemaking power, PUC acts within its constitutional and statutory jurisdiction by ordering utility to (1) enforce utility's easement for water rights against record titleholders of specified property, and (2) record notice of intent to preserve easements pursuant to *Civ. Code § 887.060*, and by ordering (1) intervention in proceedings before State Water Resources Control Board to prevent record titleholders from obtaining rights inconsistent with those held by utility under easement, and (2) forwarding of copies of instant PUC decision to title insurance companies to ensure that future purchasers of burdened property would have actual notice of easement. *Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 851, 862, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758*

PUC is not empowered under its general powers to implement mandatory program when legislature has provided express authority for permissive program. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 653, 657-659, 156 Cal. Rptr. 733, 596 P.2d 1149* (mandatory home insulation financing program was annulled; but note that effect of decision modified by 1979 enactment of *Pub. Util. Code § 2789*, which authorized PUC to permit or require corporation subject to its jurisdiction to institute conservation programs including related financial assistance)

PUC has authority to directly impose fines on public utilities. *Pacific Bell Wireless, LLC v. Public Utilities Com. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 718, 735-737, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733*

PUC has exclusive jurisdiction to resolve dispute about who must pay for relocation of telephone company's overhead facilities to underground because claims concern matter about which PUC authorized to make policy, over which it has assumed jurisdiction, and which it continues to regulate. *City of Anaheim v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 838, 844, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 725*

PUC has limited jurisdiction over holding companies that are parent corporations of utilities to enforce requirement that holding companies give first priority to capital requirements of utility subsidiaries as necessary to meet their obligation to serve. *PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1201, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630*

Despite Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5, PUC has authority to refuse to enforce statute if the enforcement would violate inconsistent later enacted statute. *The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company v. Public Utilities Commission (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 881, 887-889, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 503*

[ii] Exclusive Jurisdiction

PUC has exclusive jurisdiction over action brought by ratepayer against utility, which allegedly discriminated by charging plaintiff commercial rather than domestic rates, because gravamen of complaint was question of what rate schedule was appropriate for plaintiff's type of facility, a recreational vehicle park. *Schell v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1045-1046, 251 Cal. Rptr. 667*

PUC has acted on regulation of advertising in telephone books and, therefore, has exclusive jurisdiction over claim of discrimination in regulation of such advertising. *Dollar-A-Day Rent-A-Car Sys. Inc. v. Pacific Tel & Tel. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 454, 457-462, 102 Cal. Rptr. 651*

Order of PUC is only reviewable in Supreme Court; such order is not capable of being effectively overruled by action of superior court. *Pellandini v. Pacific Limestone Prod. Inc. (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 774, 777, 54 Cal. Rptr. 290*

Ex parte preliminary injunction against water company enjoining company from reversing stock transfer is improper when the injunction interfered with the jurisdiction of PUC which had ordered the transfer and when the PUC was not a party to proceeding in which the injunction had been issued. *Hickey v. Roby (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 752, 763-769, 77 Cal. Rptr. 486*

Trial court is bound to follow order of PUC with regard to status of public utility. *Pratt v. Coast Trucking Inc. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 139, 149-153, 39 Cal. Rptr. 332*

Superior court does not have jurisdiction over declaratory relief action involving telephone billing practice matter that was within jurisdiction of PUC. *Harmon v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 6 Cal. Rptr. 542*

[iii] Concurrent Jurisdiction

Pollution control district and PUC have concurrent jurisdiction over permission to construct power plant, and both their requirements are applicable. *Orange County Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Public Util. Com. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 945, 951-954, 95 Cal. Rptr. 17, 484 P.2d 1361*

Supreme Court has distinguished between situations in which PUC's authority is pitted against authority of local government involving matter of statewide concern (overwhich PUC is normally found to have paramount jurisdiction), and other situations in which PUC jurisdiction conflicts with other than local agency (over which PUC directives have not been given such controlling effect); this authority does not clearly allow for concurrent jurisdiction over utility-related activity at different levels of government, but only for concurrent regulation by equivalent agencies. *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. City of Carlsbad (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 785, 801, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534* (*citing Orange County Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Public Util. Com. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 945, 951, 95 Cal. Rptr. 17, 484 P.2d 1361*)

[b] Limits to PUC Authority

PUC does not have authority to regulate wine train because it provides round-trip excursion, rather than picking up passengers at one location and taking them to another location. *City of St. Helena v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 793, 802, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713*

PUC does not have authority to determine claims alleging that telephone company violated the Unfair Business Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*), or the False Advertising Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*) together, the Unfair Competition Law, because claims brought under those statutes must be brought in court. *Greenlining Institute v. Public Util. Com. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1328, 1334, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 736*

PUC does not have authority to regulate sightseeing boat line that does not take passengers from one place to another. *Golden Gate Scenic Steamship Lines Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 373, 377-380, 19 Cal. Rptr. 657, 369 P.2d 257*

PUC does not have authority to condition transfer of operating authority on priority of payment to certain creditors. *Hempy v. Public Utilities Com. (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 214, 217-218, 14 Cal. Rptr. 436, 363 P.2d 476*

Cable television is not public utility and therefore does not have constitutional right to fair return on investment. *Orange County Cable Communications Co. v. City of San Clemente (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 165, 170, 130 Cal. Rptr. 429*

[c] Unconstitutional Practices

Termination of utility service without notice reasonably calculated to apprise respondents of availability of administrative procedure to consider complaint of erroneous billing and without opportunity to present complaint to designated employee empowered to review disputed bills and rectify error is deprivation of property interest without due process of law. *Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div. v. Craft (1978) 436 U.S. 1, 98 S. Ct. 1554, 56 L. Ed. 2d 30, 46-47*

Tariff regulation that required that subscribers who transmitted recorded telephone messages to include their names and addresses is unconstitutional violation of freedom of speech. *Huntley v. Public Util. Comm'n (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 67, 71-78, 69 Cal. Rptr. 605, 442 P.2d 685*

Termination of phone service based on unlawful use predicated solely on affidavit of police to that effect is unconstitutional. *Sokol v. Public Utilities Com. (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 247, 251-256, 53 Cal. Rptr. 673, 418 P.2d 265*

[d] Rates

In determining reasonableness of utility rates, rate of return is defined as payment for use of property of another. *Hansen v. City of San Buenaventura (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 1172, 1182, 233 Cal. Rptr. 22, 729 P.2d 186*

Basic principle of rate-making by PUC exists to establish a rate that will permit utility to recover its cost and expenses plus reasonable return on value of property devoted to public use. *City and County of San Francisco v. Public Utilities Com. (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 119, 129, 98 Cal. Rptr. 286, 490 P.2d 798*

Utility company's credit rules are valid and not violative of equal protection when they had reasonable relation to their purpose of reducing bad debt losses. *Wood v. Public Utilities Com. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 288, 293-296, 93 Cal. Rptr. 455, 481 P.2d 823*

Responsibility for rate setting is with PUC and, unless its action is clearly shown to be confiscatory, courts do not interfere. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 634, 647, 44 Cal. Rptr. 1, 401 P.2d 353*

Schedules of rates issued by PUC and limitations of liability therein are part of contract between public utility and

customer. *Hischemoeller v. National Ice & Cold Storage Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 318, 325, 294 P.2d 433*

Rate fixing for publicly owned municipal utility is function within exclusive province of municipality, and courts intrude only in limited cases when rates shown to be unreasonable, unfair, or fraudulently or arbitrarily established; refusal of city to pass through cost savings to rate payers is not unreasonable or arbitrary rate fixing. *American Microsystems, Inc. v. City of Santa Clara (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042, 187 Cal. Rptr. 550*

Sewer rates related to burden on system is reasonable and not discriminatory and therefore is valid. *Boynton v. City of Lakeport Mun. Sewer Dist. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 91, 93-96, 104 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Airport is public utility but different charges for same services are justified by lower rates to persons who had long-term lease commitment to airport. *City & County of San Francisco v. Western Air Lines, Inc. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 105, 126-146, 22 Cal. Rptr. 216*

Carrier is bound by published rate. *Transmix Corp. v. Southern Pac. Co. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 257, 262-269, 9 Cal. Rptr. 714*

[e] Refunds

Public utility's refunds to customers are subject to Unclaimed Property Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 1500 et seq.*). *Cory v. Public Utilities Com. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 522, 528, 189 Cal. Rptr. 386, 658 P.2d 749*

Disposition of refunds received by utilities from gas suppliers. *California Mfrs. Assn. v. Public Utilities Com. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 836, 848, 157 Cal. Rptr. 676, 598 P.2d 836*

[f] Relocation of Public Utility

If utilities must be moved or relocated in order to construct or operate a rapid transit system, a new and additional burden on such facilities is created and the district must pay the relocation costs. *Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority v. Pacific Bell Telephone (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 658, 664-666, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 556*

Relocation costs of public utility are not compensable pursuant to *Gov. Code § 7262(a)(1)*, which provides compensation for expenses of moving business to persons displaced by written order to vacate real property for public use. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Redevelopment Agency (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 151 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Common law rule that franchised utilities must bear cost of relocating equipment moved at request of municipality (codified under *Pub. Util. Code § 6297*) does not apply to dispute between utility and private developer as to who would bear costs of relocating power poles and lines necessitated by road widening by developer that was not a governmental act but a condition imposed on developer by county in approving developer's housing development. *Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Dame Construction Co. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 233, 236-241, 236 Cal. Rptr. 351*

When private party, on its own initiative and not that of government, develops parcel of land and thereby creates or aggravates need for public improvement that requires relocation of existing utility equipment, private party is required to bear necessary relocation costs. *Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Dame Construction Co. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 233, 241, 236 Cal. Rptr. 351*

Public utility accepting franchise rights in public streets subject to implied obligation to relocate its facilities therein at its own expense when necessary to make way for proper governmental use of streets. *East Bay Muni. UtilityDist. v. Richmond Redevelopment Agency (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 789, 793, 124 Cal. Rptr. 606*

[g] Transfer of Public Utilities

Pub. Util. Code § 851, prohibiting public utility from selling or encumbering all of its necessary property without approval by PUC, does not contemplate private enforcement under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* (damages action for unlawful activities by public utility). *Barnett v. Delta Lines, Inc. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 674, 683-684, 187 Cal. Rptr. 219*

Transfer of ownership of public utility is void without approval of PUC but executory contract to transfer is valid. Transport Clearings-- *Bay Area v. Simmonds (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 405, 420, 38 Cal. Rptr. 116*

Sale or transfer of assets of public utility is void unless and until approved by PUC but parties are able to enter into executory contract of sale that is enforceable by courts. *Dillingham v. Schipp (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 553, 559, 316 P.2d 1014*

[3] PUC Authority Over Particular Public Utilities

[a] Grade Crossings

Pub. Util. Code § 1202.3, relating to closure or apportionment of costs of improving publically-used railroad crossings, by PUC is constitutional and does not confer on private persons discretion as to whether crossing should be closed. *Southern Pac. Transportation Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 308, 313-315, 134 Cal. Rptr. 189, 556 P.2d 289*

Grade crossing is not legally created unless approval of PUC has been obtained. *Breidert v. Southern Pac. Co. (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 398, 406, 77 Cal. Rptr. 262*

PUC has exclusive jurisdiction over railroad crossings and authority to order railroad to close crossing of public road over railroad tracks. *City of Union City v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 277, 279-281, 67 Cal. Rptr. 816*

[b] Telephones

[i] Equipment

Use of customer-owned telephone equipment is proscribable only if it is shown that instrument would have adverse effect on telephone network as whole. *Phonetele, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 125, 129, 113 Cal. Rptr. 16, 520 P.2d 400*

[ii] Rates

PUC properly authorized telephone company to raise intrastate rates by $264 million to offset effect of installation costs; in offset proceeding, PUC properly determined whether significant and not reasonably foreseeable change in item of expense or revenue occurred that would seriously affect utility or ratepayers unless taken into account; all other items of expense and revenue are held constant as estimated in utility's most recent general rate proceeding; PUC properly used using more recent data in later offset proceeding to develop estimate of installation costs, without revising estimate of installation revenues in earlier general rate proceedings. *City and County of San Francisco v. Public Utilities Com. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 523, 528-534, 217 Cal. Rptr. 43, 703 P.2d 381*

PUC has authority to require telephone company to implement competitive bidding practice in purchase of central

office switching equipment. *General Telephone Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 817, 822-827, 195 Cal. Rptr. 695, 670 P.2d 349*

Automatic annual adjustment of telephone rates based on income taxes is valid option for *PUC. City of Los Angeles v. Public Utilities Com. (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 680, 693-704, 125 Cal. Rptr. 779, 542 P.2d 1371*

Telephone rate set by PUC overturned. *City of Los Angeles v. Public Utilities Com. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 331, 337-359, 102 Cal. Rptr. 313, 497 P.2d 785*

Telephone rate is invalid for failure of PUC to consider imputed accounting method of computing depreciation when company's imprudent management prevented it from actually using beneficial computation of depreciation. *City & County of San Francisco v. Public Util. Comm'n (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 119, 126-130, 98 Cal. Rptr. 286, 490 P.2d 798*

PUC's rate for telephone service is proper. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Comm'n (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 634, 656-676, 44 Cal. Rptr. 1, 401 P.2d 353*

[4] Municipalities

[a] Control by Municipality

Fact that nonresident users of city-owned water company are subject to higher rate than those customers residing within city limits does not alone prove rate unreasonable and hence invalid; rather, nonresidents are required to show that discrimination is not based on cost of service or some other reasonable basis. *Hansen v. City of San Buenaventura (1987) 42 Cal. 3d 1172, 1181, 233 Cal. Rptr. 22, 729 P.2d 186*

Publicly owned municipal utilities are not regulated by PUC or any other supervising agency in absence of legislative grant of authority, and therefore are not required under PUC rules to pass along savings in operating costs to ratepayers. *American Microsystems, Inc. v. City of Santa Clara (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042-1043, 187 Cal. Rptr. 550*

Initiative that required city, operating its own electrical distribution system, to charge its customers same rate is lifeline rate of public utility constitutes unlawful delegation of authority to PUC. *Bock v. City Council (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 52, 55, 167 Cal. Rptr. 43*

Control of municipally-owned public airport rests with city and allows it to regulate when jet aircraft may take off. *Stagg v. Municipal Court (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-323, 82 Cal. Rptr. 578*

City has power to regulate location of overhead utility lines and poles. *Modesto Irr. Dist. v. City Modesto (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 652, 655-658, 27 Cal. Rptr. 90*

[b] Control by PUC

City does not have authority to regulate matters over which PUC has been granted regulatory power, specifically its authority to regulate the design or construction of gas pipelines. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. City of Vernon (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 209, 217, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 661*

Publicly owned municipal utilities are not regulated by PUC or any other supervising agency in absence of legislative grant of authority. *American Microsystems, Inc. v. City of Santa Clara (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042, 187 Cal. Rptr. 550*

PUC has authority over certain aspects of operations of publically-owned transit district. *Los Angeles Met. Transit Authority v. Public Util. Com. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 863, 868-870, 31 Cal. Rptr. 463, 382 P.2d 583*

When PUC issued certificate of public convenience and necessity for ferry service to city, city is required to issue use permit for ferry terminal. *Harbor Carriers, Inc. v. Sausalito (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 773, 775, 121 Cal. Rptr. 577*

[c] Utility User's Tax

Municipally imposed utility user's tax is valid. *Rivera v. City of Fresno (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 132, 137-139, 98 Cal. Rptr. 281, 490 P.2d 793*

Irrigation districts functioning under state law and selling electricity are required to collect city utility user's tax. *City of Modesto v. Modesto Irrigation Dist. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 504, 506-508, 110 Cal. Rptr. 111*

[5] Proceedings Before PUC

[a] Attorney-Client Privilege

Power of PUC to compel testimony is subject to statutory limitation of attorney-client privilege (Evid. Code. Code § 910) in absence of unambiguous statutory directive to contrary. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 31, 38-39, 42, 265 Cal. Rptr. 801, 784 P.2d 1373*

Utility that did nothing to place in issue its privileged attorney-client communications did not impliedly waive its attorney-client privilege. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 31, 42, 265 Cal. Rptr. 801, 784 P.2d 1373*

[b] Hearings Before PUC

PUC is required to consider anti-trust implications of contracts involved in application for certificate of public convenience and necessity. *Northern California Power Agency v. Public Util. Comm'n (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 370, 377-381, 96 Cal. Rptr. 18, 486 P.2d 1218*

PUC is required to separately state findings of fact and conclusions of law after hearing. *Southern Pacific Co. v. Public Utilities Com. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 243, 244, 65 Cal. Rptr. 737, 436 P.2d 889* ; *Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 811, 813, 56 Cal. Rptr. 484, 423 P.2d 556*

Competitor is entitled to present evidence in hearing before PUC that it could provide better service than applicant for certificate of public convenience and necessity. *Ventura County Waterworks Dist. v. Public Util. Com. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 462, 464, 39 Cal. Rptr. 8, 393 P.2d 168*

Party filing complaint aggrieved by discriminatory rate has right to have PUC make order that resolves issues and fixes fair rate. *Cal. Portland Cement Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 171, 176, 315 P.2d 709*

[c] Decision of PUC

Property rights determined in PUC rate-making proceeding are subject to relitigation in court, because rate-making is exercise of legislative power of *PUC. Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 852 n.3, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758*

Although decisions of PUC are not binding on California appellate courts, appellate courts are able to look to these rulings for assistance when deciding cases involving issues that also come before *PUC. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Dame Construction Co. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 233, 240, 236 Cal. Rptr. 351*

[d] Petition to Reopen Proceeding

When time to petition for rehearing has passed, petition to reopen proceeding does not lie to serve purpose of petition for rehearing. *Northern California Asso. to Preserve Bodega Head & Harbor, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 126, 134, 37 Cal. Rptr. 432, 390 P.2d 200*

[e] Costs and Fees

Nonattorney, appearing in representative capacity before PUC in quasi-judicial reparations action is entitled to award by PUC of fees and costs under common fund theory. *Consumers Lobby Against Monopolies v. Public Utilities Com. (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 891, 913-915, 160 Cal. Rptr. 124, 603 P.2d 41*

[6] Intervention by PUC

Pub. Util. Code § 851 (prohibiting public utility from disposing, without PUC authorization, of property necessary and useful in performance of its duties), when read together with *Pub. Util. Code §§ 761* and *762* (authorizing PUC to require that utility ensure its ability to provide adequate service), permits PUC to prevent disposal of property by indirection, such as by failure to exercise or safeguard rights possessed by utility. *Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 862, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758* (upholding authority of PUC to, among other things, order utility to enforce easement for water rights against record titleholders and intervene in specified proceedings to prevent record titleholders from obtaining rights inconsistent with those held by utility under its easement)

PUC has right to intervene in action to overturn stipulated void judgment between parties in undercharge case. *Ryerson v. Riverside Cement Co. (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 789, 793-796, 72 Cal. Rptr. 595*

PUC has right to intervene to set aside judgment for extrinsic fraud in undercharge action when judgment is in conflict with PUC's order. *People ex rel. Public Util. Comm'n v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119-122, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*

[7] Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

Provision that petition for rehearing may be taken as denied within 20 days after its filing is not starting time to file petition for writ of certiorari. *Sokol v. Public Util. Comm'n (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 247, 251-252, 53 Cal. Rptr. 673, 418 P.2d 265*

Whether wine train is public utility is question of fact, subject to review by the substantial evidence standard. However, interpretation of Public Utilities Code is question of law subject to independent review. *City of St. Helena v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 793, 802, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713*

General rule of deference to PUC interpretation of statutes subject to its regulatory jurisdiction does not apply when issue is scope of PUC's jurisdiction. *PG&E Corp. v. Public Utilities Commission (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1174,*

1194, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 630

Denial of petition for writ of certiorari (review) by Supreme Court is decision on merits that PUC had jurisdiction. *City of Union City v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 277, 277-279, 67 Cal. Rptr. 816*

[8] Civil Actions Involving Public Utilities

[a] Jurisdiction of Superior Court

Where civil action brought by public prosecutors against public utility does not usurp exclusive power of PUC and was authorized by statute, superior court and PUC have concurrent subject matter jurisdiction. *Orloff v. Pac. Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1144-1155, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201*

Functions of PUC does not include determination of (1) validity of contracts, (2) whether claims may be asserted under contract, or (3) interests in or title to property, because these are questions for courts. *Camp Meeker Water System, Inc. v. Public Utilities Com. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 845, 861, 274 Cal. Rptr. 678, 799 P.2d 758*

Claims alleging that telephone company violated the Unfair Business Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*) or the False Advertising Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*), together, the Unfair Competition Law, must be brought in superior court. *Greenlining Institute v. Public Util. Com. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1328, 1334, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 736*

Jurisdiction of superior court is limited to situations in which relief sought would not hinder or frustrate PUC's declared supervisory and regulatory policies. *Brian T. v. Pacific Bell (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 894, 900-901, 258 Cal. Rptr. 707*

[b] Effect of PUC Approval on Pending Litigation

Existence of PUC approval as condition precedent to completion of merger of two corporations does not, as matter of law, deprive one corporation of causes of action against third corporation for tortious interference. *SCEcorp v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 673, 678, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 372*

[c] Stay Pending Investigation by PUC

In action for damages against public utility, trial court abused its discretion by denying utility's motion for order staying action, when pending investigation by PUC encompasses practices that are central to that litigation. *Pacific Bell v. Superior Court (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 137, 140, 231 Cal. Rptr. 574*

[d] Particular Actions

[i] Determination of Public Utility Status

Superior court has jurisdiction to decide status as nonexempt mutual water company when PUC had not yet determined issue. *Ventura County Waterworks Dist. v. Susana Knolls Mut. Water Co. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 672, 678-679, 87 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[ii] Condemnation by Public Utility

Filing of complaint with PUC does not oust superior court of jurisdiction in condemnation by public utility to acquire property for project to which complaint is directed. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Parachini (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 159, 163, 105 Cal. Rptr. 477*

[iii] Commencement or Disruption of Service

Superior court has jurisdiction over action to force public utility to furnish service in accordance with applicable tariff and rates. *Vila v. Tahoe Southside Water Utility (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 469, 477-480, 43 Cal. Rptr. 654*

Discontinuance of service by public utility pursuant to rules filed with PUC is defense to action for such discontinuance. *Morse v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 854, 859, 314 P.2d 192*

[iv] Unlawful Operation

Limousine service stated cause of action for damages pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, permitting damages for harm resulting from unlawful operation, when rival limousine service operated in same area without certificate of public convenience and necessity. *Golden Sedan Service Inc. v. Airport Limousine Service (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 359, 363-367, 175 Cal. Rptr. 317* .

Cause of action is stated against PUC for failure to revoke bus company's operating authority for failure to carry required insurance when plaintiff was injured by bus company's negligence and could not collect judgment. *Elson v. Public Utilities Com. (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 577, 581-589, 124 Cal. Rptr. 305*

[v] Inequitable Charges

Cause of action is stated for declaratory and injunctive relief against city charging four times as much for service outside city limits as for servicewithin city limits. *Elliott v. City of Pacific Grove (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 53, 57-60, 126 Cal. Rptr. 371*

[vi] Collection of Undercharges

Nonlicensed carrier is not precluded from bringing action to collect its undercharges. *Keller v. Thornton Canning Co. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 963, 966-969, 59 Cal. Rptr. 836, 429 P.2d 156*

Action to collect undercharges is capable of being brought in superior court. *Gardner v. Rich Mfg. Co. (1945) 68 Cal. App. 2d 725, 729-733, 158 P.2d 23*

[vii] Infringement of Public Utility's Constitutional Right

PUC impermissibly burdens private utility company's *First Amendment* rights when it required company to include in company's billing envelopes speech of a third party with which company disagreed. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Utilities Comm'n (1986) 475 U.S. 1, 20-21, 106 S. Ct. 903, 89 L. Ed. 2d 1*

[viii] Nuisance

Superior court has authority to abate nuisance caused by public utility. *California Oregon Power Co. v. Superior*

Court (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 858, 870-871, 291 P.2d 455

[ix] Fraud

PUC's tariff did not restrict liability of telecommunications company engaged in fraud. Cal. Civ. Code § 2106 permits an action against a public utility that engages in an activity prohibited or declared unlawful. Additionally, "if [a] court finds that the act or omission was willful, it may, in addition to the actual damages, award exemplary damages." *Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Communications Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 418, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392* .

Action for damages against gas company for fraudulent misrepresentation as to amount of gas that development would use is not barred by law making rebates illegal. *Empire West v. Southern California Gas Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 805, 809-812, 117 Cal. Rptr. 423, 528 P.2d 31*

[x] Exemplary Damages

Although *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* authorizes exemplary damages to "persons affected," Legislature intends to limit those damages to persons (or their personal representatives or successors in interest) who are themselves direct victims of public utility's willful act or omission; award of exemplary damages to parents of child killed by speeding train is improper under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*. *Vander Lind v. Superior Court (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 358, 367, 194 Cal. Rptr. 209*

[xi] Termination of Public Utility Franchise

Quo warranto action in superior court is proper to oust public utility of franchise for failing to supply proper water unless Public Utilities PUC has assumed jurisdiction over regulation and control of utility. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 403-410, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersJurisdictionCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCommunications LawTelephone ServicesMobile Communications ServicesEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesOvercharging

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.165

§ 480.165 Attorney General Opinions

PUC is authorized to grant to public utility rate increase that fixes different rates for service between different classes of customers provided PUC's decision is supported by its findings of fact based on evidence obtained at hearing held for such purpose and classification is reasonable. *64 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 405 (1981)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.166

§ 480.166 Law Reviews

Lakusta and Renton, *California Supreme Court Review of Decisions of the Public Utilities Commission--Is the Court's Denial of a Writ of Review a Decision on the Merits? 39 Hastings L.J. 1147 (1988)*

Goodrich, *The Limits of Municipal Power, 4 Cal. Law. 26 (1984)*

Note, *Using Market Bidding to Regulate the Transfer Price of Utility Affiliated Coal, 36 Stan. L. Rev. 1215 (1984)*

Colton, *Excess Capacity: Who Gets the Charge From the Power Plant? 34 Hastings L.J. 1133 (1983)*

Lawrence and Minan, *Solar Energy and Public Utility Rate Regulation, 26 UCLA L. Rev. 550 (1979)*

Kuersteiner and Herbach, *The Robin Hood Doctrine: Is It the Official Refund Policy of the California Public Utilities Commission? 12 U.S.F. L. Rev. 655 (1978)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawSolar & Biomass IndustriesEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral Overview

186 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.167

§ 480.167 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 8, *Constitutional Law*, §§ 1084-1110 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemaking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.168

§ 480.168 Internet References

California Public Utilities Commission. This site includes: text of rules of practice and procedure before the PUC (*20 Cal. Code Reg., § 1 et seq.*), PUC calendars and agenda; contact directory; general information about the PUC; PUC news releases; link to text of the Public Utilities Code. http://www.cpuc.ca.gov

California Home Page. This site includes links to other sites maintained by numerous state agencies including the PUC. http://www.ca.gov

California Courts. This site includes: general information about state court organization and specific court; text of recently filed slip opinions; court minutes and calendars; text of California Rules of Court; Judicial Council forms and other information promulgated by the Judicial Council; links to sites of most Court of Appeal districts, with text of local appellate rules, forms, and internal operating procedures; links to other sites maintained by local trial courts, state government agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes; and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

Matthew Bender. This site includes: links to Matthew Bender publications and Shepard's citation service. http://www.bender.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsLegislationEnactment

188 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.169-480.189

[Reserved]

§§ 480.169[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.190

§ 480.190 Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC

[1] General Form of Complaint

[a] FORM Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC--General Form of Complaint

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*],	)	
Complainant,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*]
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

The complaint of_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each complainant*] respectfully shows:

1. That Defendant(s) is/are_____[*full name and address of each defendant*].

2. _____[*Here and in succeeding numbered paragraphs, set forth fully and clearly the facts constituting the grounds of the complaint and the injury complained of*].

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests an order_____[*state clearly and concisely the exact relief desired*].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Complainant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Complainant

_____

[*attorney's address, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if attorney consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*]

VERIFICATION

I,_____[*name*], am the complainant in the above-entitled matter. I have read the foregoing document and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of complaint set out in *[a], above,* is for use in filing a complaint before the PUC charging a violation by a public utility [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*]. The complaint is based on the illustrative form of complaint for PUC matters that is set out in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*.

For further discussion relating to complaint proceedings, see *§ 480.22*.

[c] Who May File

A complaint about the reasonableness of rates of a gas, electrical, water, or telephone corporation must be signed by either the mayor, chairman of the board of trustees, or majority of the board of trustees of the legislative body of the city where the violation occurred or at least 25 actual or prospective customers. Other complaints can be made by any person [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*].

[d] Form and Size

[i] In General

The complaint must be typewritten, printed, or reproduced on paper 81/2 inches wide and 11 inches long. The type must be no smaller than 10 points. The impression must use either one and one-half or double spacing. Footnotes and quotations in excess of a few lines, however, may be single-spaced. Both sides of the paper may be used. A document of more than one page must be bound on the left side or upper left-hand corner [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2*].

Any exhibits annexed must be legibly reduced or folded to the same size.

All documents tendered for filing must have a blank space of at least 11/2 inches tall by 21/2 inches wide in the upper right-hand corner for a docket stamp and must show on the first page [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.1(a)*]:

- At the top, the heading "BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA."
- In the upper left below the heading, the caption for the proceeding.
- To the right of the caption, the docket number (if one has been assigned).
- Below the caption and docket number, the title of the document and the name of or shortened designation for the party tendering the document.

The title page may extend to additional pages if these required items cannot be set forth on one page. The name, mailing address, telephone number, and, if available, facsimile transmission number of the person authorized to receive service and other communications on behalf of the party tendering the document must be set forth either on the title page of the document or following the signature at the end of the document, along with (if consenting to service by electronic mail) the signer's electronic mail address [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.1*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.2*]. Documents initiating new proceedings must leave a space to the right of the caption for the docket number [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.1*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*].

Persons and corporations regulated by the PUC must include their assigned Case Information System (CIS) Identification Number in the captions of documents initiating new proceedings and in the titles of other documents filed in existing cases [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.1(c)*].

[ii] Transmittal Letter

If a transmittal letter is submitted, it must not be bound to the tendered document. All copies must be clear and permanently legible [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2*, *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.7(c)* (letter transmitting documents to Docket Office for filing is not required unless acknowledgment of filing pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.1* is requested)].

[iii] Separate Documents for Unrelated Subjects or Different Types of Action

Separate documents must be used to address unrelated subjects or to ask the PUC or the administrative law judge to take essentially different types of action. For example, a document entitled "Complaint and Motion for Protective Order" would be improper. The filing must be split up into two separate documents [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.1(b)*].

[e] Joinder

All matters on which a complaint may be founded may be joined in one hearing and no motion will be entertained

against a complaint for misjoinder of causes of action or grievances or misjoinder or nonjoinder of parties [*Pub. Util. Code § 1703*].

[f] Contents of Form

[i] General Requirements

Complaints must state the full name, address, and telephone number of each complainant and his or her attorney, if any, and of each defendant. The specific act complained of must be set forth in ordinary and concise language. The complaint must be so drawn as to completely advise the defendant and the PUC of the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 10*]:

- The facts constituting the grounds of the complaint.
- The injury complained of.
- The exact relief which is desired.

Additional requirements must be satisfied when both the complainant and defendant are radio/telephone utilities, and the complaint alleges unlawful or improper actions or intentions by the defendant [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 10.1*].

[ii] No Direct Damage Required

The PUC is not required to dismiss any complaint because of the absence of direct damage to the complainant [*Pub. Util. Code § 1703*].

[iii] Informal Resolution Allegation

A complaint that does not allege that the matter has first been brought to the staff for informal resolution may be referred to the staff to attempt to resolve the matter informally [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 10*].

[g] Verification

Complaints or amendments to complaints must be verified by at least one complainant [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*]. Alternative forms of verifications are set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*.

[h] Copies

An original plus 12 conformed copies of a complaint or amendment thereto, plus two additional copies for each named defendant, must be presented to the PUC for filing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 11*].

[i] Filing

[i] Location

Unless otherwise directed, the complaint must be tendered for filing at either of the following docket offices of the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(a)*]:

Docket Office
California Public Utility Commission
State Building

505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102-3298

Docket Office
California Public Utility Commission
320 West 4th Street, Suite 500
Los Angeles, California 90013

Docket Office
State Building
California Public Utility Commission
1350 Front Street
San Diego, CA 92101-3607

All documents sent through the mail must be addressed to the Commission's Docket Office in San Francisco.

Only hand-delivered documents will be accepted by the Los Angeles or San Diego office. First-class postage charges to San Francisco must be paid at the time documents are tendered to the Los Angeles or San Diego office. Payment of postage charges may be made by check or money order [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(a)*].

[ii] Acceptance and Rejection of Documents Tendered for Filing

Tendered documents are not considered filed until they have been reviewed and accepted for filing by the Docket Office in San Francisco [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(b)*].

If a document complies with the PUC rules of practice and procedure (20 Cal. Code Reg.) and is accepted for filing by the Docket Office in San Francisco, the filing will be recorded as of the date it was first tendered for filing at the Commission's San Francisco, Los Angeles, or San Diego office [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(c)*].

Any tendered document that does not comply with applicable rules, PUC orders, or statutes may be rejected. Rejected documents will be returned with a statement of the reasons for the rejection. Documents submitted in response to a rejected document will not be filed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(d)*].

If a tendered document does not comply with applicable requirements, the Docket Office, with the consent of the party tendering the document, may retitle the document or strike part of the document, and the document as modified may be accepted for filing. The party tendering the document must notify all parties served with the document of the modification or striking [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(e)*].

If a tendered document does not comply with applicable requirements, the party tendering the document may, in the body of the document, request waiver of the requirements to which the document does not conform. The request must state the reasons justifying the waiver. The assigned administrative law judge will decide whether or not to waive the requirements as requested. If the waiver is granted, the document will be filed as of the date it was tendered for filing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(f)*].

If a tendered document is in substantial, but not complete, compliance with *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2 through 2.6*, the Docket Office may notify the party tendering the document of the defect. If the defect is cured within seven days of the date of this notification, the document will be filed as of the date it was tendered for filing, provided that the document was properly served as required by the PUC rules of practice and procedure on or before the date the document was

tendered for filing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(g)*].

Acceptance of a document for filing is not a final determination that the document complies with all requirements of the PUC and is not a waiver of such requirements. The Commission, the Executive Director, or the administrative law judge may require amendments to a document, and the PUC or the administrative law judge may entertain appropriate motions concerning the document's deficiencies [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(h)*].

[iii] Assignment of Docket Number

If a document initiates a new proceeding, the proceeding will be assigned a docket number when the document is accepted for filing. The chief administrative law judge is required to maintain a docket of all proceedings [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(i)*].

[iv] Acknowledgement of Filing

The Docket Office will provide an acknowledgment of the filing of any document on request, provided the filing party furnishes, at the time the document is tendered, an extra copy of a letter of transmittal or of the document and a self-addressed envelope with postage fully prepaid. The extra copy of the letter of transmittal or of the document will be stamped with the filing stamp and docket number and returned by mail [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3.1*].

[j] Amended Complaint

An amendment may be filed before the hearing, provided it is served on all known interested parties, filed at least five days before the hearing, and contain a certification of service. Thereafter, an amendment may be permitted or directed by the commissioner or presiding officer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.6*].

[2] Allegation of Discriminatory Rate

[a] FORM Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC--Allegation of Discriminatory Rate

Defendant's published tariff for hauling_____[*specify commodity*] from_____[*specify first place*] to_____[*specify second place*] is $_____ per ton. Defendant's published tariff for hauling_____[*specify commodity*] from_____[*specify third place*] to_____[*specify fourth place*] is $_____ per ton. The distance from_____[*specify first place*] to_____[*specify second place*] is substantially the same as the distance from_____[*specify third place*] to_____[*specify fourth place*]. Defendant is thus charging substantially different rates to haul the same cargo the same distance, which discrimination injures plaintiff, who has to pay the higher rate to ship its_____[*specify commodity*].

[b] Use of Form

The form of allegation set out in *[a], above*, is for use as Paragraph 2 of the form provided in *[1][a], above*, when the complaint is based on a discriminatory rate.

[c] Compensation for Intervention

Pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 1801 et seq.*, the PUC may award reasonable advocate's fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs of participation or intervention in a hearing or proceeding to any customer who complies with *Pub. Util. Code § 1804* and who satisfies the requirements set forth in *Pub. Util. Code § 1803* [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1803*].

For discussion of the procedure and rules involved in obtaining compensation for intervention, see *§ 480.26*.

[3] Answer to Complaint

[a] FORM Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC--Answer to Complaint

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*],	)	
Complainant,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ANSWER OF _____ [*name or*
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	*shortened designation of party tendering document*]
Defendant(s).	)	[(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)]
	)	
	)	

Defendant(s)_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each defendant joining in answer*], for answer to the above complaint, respectively show(s):

1. _____[*Here, and in succeeding numbered paragraphs, admit or deny material allegations of the complaint, and set forth any matters constituting a defense*].

WHEREFORE, Defendant(s) request(s) that _____ [the complaint be dismissed *or other appropriate request*].

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Defendant(s)

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant(s) _____ [*name*]

_____

[*attorney's address, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if attorney consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*]

VERIFICATION

I,_____[*name*], am the defendant in the above-entitled matter. I have read the foregoing document and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of answer set out in *[a], above*, is for use in answering a complaint before the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 1702*]. The form is based on the form of answer for PUC matters set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 13, 88*.

For additional comments related to answers in complaint proceedings, see *§ 480.22[3]*. For additional comments pertaining to use of this form in complaint proceedings, see *[1], above*.

Documents for filing are tendered to the appropriate PUC docket office under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3*. For discussion relating to acceptance and rejection of tendered documents generally, see *§ 480.190[1][i]*.

[c] Time for Answer

Within 30 days after the date of service of the complaint, the defendant must answer the complaint. The PUC, the chief administrative law judge, or the presiding officer may require the filing of an answer within a shorter time. If an amendment to a complaint is filed before receipt of the answer, the defendant's time to answer the complaint is 30 days from the date of service of the amendment, unless otherwise directed. Amendments to a complaint made subsequent to the filing of an answer need not be answered [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13*].

[d] Verification

At least one of the defendants filing an answer must verify it, but if more than one answer is filed in response to a complaint against multiple defendants, each answer must be separately verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*].

[e] Extension of Time

Requests for an extension of time to answer must be directed to the chief administrative law judge or the presiding officer in writing and a copy served on all parties. The request must indicate complainant's acquiescence to the extension of time or the measures taken by Defendant in his or her unsuccessful effort to obtain acquiescence. The chief administrative law judge or the presiding officer must notify the parts of his or her ruling [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13*].

[f] Contents of Answers

The answer must admit or deny each material allegation in the complaint and must set forth any new matter constituting a defense. Its purpose is to fully advise the complainant and the PUC of the nature of the defense. It should also set forth any defects in the complaint which require amendment or clarification. Failure to indicate jurisdictional defects does not waive these defects and does not prevent a motion to dismiss made thereafter. Answers must comply with the format requirements of *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2-2.6* and include the full name, address, and telephone number of defendant and his or her attorney, if any, and indicate service on all complainants [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 13.1*].

[4] Petition to Intervene

[a] FORM Complaint Proceedings Before the PUC--Petition to Intervene

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*], Complainant, vs. _____ [*name*], [and DOES I through _____,] Defendant(s).	))))))))	NO. _____ PETITION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)] TO INTERVENE

The petition to intervene of_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each petitioner*] respectfully shows:

1. Petitioner is_____[*specify petitioner's status and interest*]. Petitioner _____ [supports *or* opposes] the relief sought in the complaint herein.

2. Petitioner's position is_____[*specify position Petitioner intends to advocate if petition is granted*].

WHEREFORE, Petitioner requests that it be allowed to intervene in this proceeding.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Petitioner

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of petition to intervene set out in *[a]*, above, is for use to obtain leave to appear in a complaint proceeding.

For additional comments, see *[1], above*. For further discussion regarding intervention, see *§§ 480.22[5], 480.26*.

Documents for filing are tendered to the appropriate PUC docket office under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3*. For discussion relating to acceptance and rejection of tendered documents generally, see *§ 480.190[1][i]*.

[c] When Leave Will Be Granted

Leave will not be granted except on averments that are reasonably pertinent to the issues already presented but do not unduly broaden them [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 53*].

[d] Broadening of Issues

If the petitioner seeks a broadening of the issues and shows that they would not thereby be unduly broadened, the petition must be served and filed by petitioner at least 10 days, and the parties may serve and file replies, at least five days before the matter is called for hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 53*].

[e] Effect of Granting of Leave

If leave is granted, the petitioner becomes an intervener and a party to the proceeding to the degree indicated by the order allowing intervention or by the presiding officer at the hearing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 53*].

190 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.191

§ 480.191 Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[1] General Form of Application

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC--General Form of Application

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of _____ [*name*], to _____ [*purpose of application*],	))))	Application No. _____ APPLICATION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)]

_____

The application of_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. Communications in regard to this application are to be addressed to_____[*name, title, address,, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if applicant consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*].

2. The applicant was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to do business, and doing business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____ County, California. A copy of applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

3. _____[*Here, and in succeeding numbered paragraphs, set forth the specific facts required by the*

applicable rules, together with additional facts and material]. WHEREFORE, applicant requests an order_____[*state clearly and concisely the specific authorization sought by applicant including appropriate reference to the statutory provision or other authority under which PUC authorization or relief is sought*]. Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if attorney consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*]

VERIFICATION

[*EITHER*]

I,_____[*name*], am the applicant in the above-entitled matter. I have read the foregoing document and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[*OR*]

I,_____[*name*], am an officer of the applicant corporation herein and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. I have read the foregoing document and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*Corporation name*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

_____ [*title of corporate officer*]

[b] Use of Form

The general form of application set out in *[a], above*, is for use in making an application to the PUC. This application is based on the form of application for PUC matters set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88* with certain additions as required by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 15*.

For requirements related to form and size of documents filed in PUC proceedings, see *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2*, discussed in *§ 480.190[1][d]*. For a comparison between complaint proceedings and application proceedings, see *§ 480.21*.

Documents for filing are tendered to the appropriate PUC docket office under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3*. For discussion relating to acceptance and rejection of tendered documents generally, see *§ 480.190[1][i]*.

[c] Contents of Application

All applications must state clearly and concisely the authorization or relief sought, cite by appropriate reference the statutory provision or other authority under which PUC authorization or relief is sought, and, in addition to specific requirements for particular applications set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 18 et seq.*, state the following [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 15*]:

- The exact legal name of each applicant and the location of principal place of business and, if an applicant is a corporation, trust, association, or other organized group the state under the laws of which that applicant was created or organized.

- The name, title, address,, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if the applicant consents to e-mail service, the e-mail address of the person to whom correspondence or communications in regard to the application are to be addressed. Notice, order, and other papers may be served on the person so named, and such service is deemed to be service on the applicant.

- Any additional information that may be required by the PUC in a particular proceeding.

- Applications for ex parte action must set forth the basis for such request, and those seeking the granting of relief pending full hearing must set forth the necessity for that relief.

In addition to otherwise complying with the rules of practice and procedure of the PUC (*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 1 et seq.*), each application for authority to abandon passenger stage service, or reduce service to less than one trip per day (excluding Saturday and Sunday), must include exhibits specified in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 15(e)* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 15(e)*].

[d] Attachments

[i] Organizational Documents and Authorization to Transact Business

Any applicant other than a natural person must submit with the application a copy of the entity's organizing documents and evidence of the applicant's qualification to transact business in California. If current documentation has previously been filed with the Commission, the application need only make specific reference to that filing [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.2*].

[ii] Financial Statement

Wherever the rules provide that a financial statement must be annexed to the application, such statement, unless otherwise provided, must be prepared as of the latest available date and must show the following information [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.3*]:

- Amount and kinds of stock authorized by articles of incorporation and amount outstanding.

- Terms of preference of preferred stock, whether cumulative or participating, or on dividends or assets, or otherwise.

- Brief description of each security agreement, mortgage and deed of trust on applicant's property, showing date of execution, debtor and secured party, mortgagor and mortgagee and trustor and beneficiary, amount of indebtedness authorized to be secured thereby and amount of indebtedness actually secured together with sinking fund provisions.

- Amount of bonds authorized and issued, giving name of public utility which issued same, describing each class separately, and giving date of issue, par value, rate of interest, date of maturity and how secured, together with amount of interest paid thereon during the last fiscal year.

- Each note outstanding, giving date of issue, amount, date of maturity, rate of interest, in whose favor, together with amount of interest paid thereon during the last fiscal year.

- Other indebtedness, giving same by classes and describing security, if any, with a brief statement of the devolution or assumption of any portion of such indebtedness on or by any person or corporation if the original liability has been transferred, together with amount of interest paid thereon during the last fiscal year.

- Rate and amount of dividends paid during the five previous fiscal years, and the amount of capital stock on which dividends were paid each year.

- A balance sheet as of the latest available date, together with an income statement covering period from close of last year for which an annual report has been filed with the PUC to the date of the balance sheet attached to the application.

[e] Copies

Any person tendering a document for filing must submit an original and seven exact copies of the document. This quantity includes attachments,but does not include the transmittal letter, if any [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.5*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2.7(c), 3.1* (relating to transmittal letters)].

After an official service list is established in a proceeding (*see* Rule 2.3(e), (f), (g)), any person tendering a document for filing in that proceeding must submit an original and four copies of the document [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.5*].

[f] Environmental Impact Reports

The PUC has adopted extensive rules that discuss when an environmental impact report or negative declaration must be prepared and provide the procedures for the preparation thereof [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 17.1*].

[g] Amendments

An amendment may be filed before the hearing, provided it is served on all known interested parties, filed at least five days before the hearing, and contains a certification of service. Thereafter, amendments may be permitted or directed by the PUC or presiding officer [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.6*].

[2] Application For Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Operate and Construct or Extend Facilities

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC--Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[*Caption. See [1][a], above*.]

The application of _____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. The applicant was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to do business, and doing business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____ County, California. A copy of Applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

2. All communications in respect to this application are to be addressed to _____[*name, title, address, and telephone number*].

3. The applicant requests a certificate issued by the Public Utilities Commission under *Public Utilities Code Section 1001* declaring that public convenience and necessity require, and will require, the _____ [construction *or* extension] of the following facilities: _____ [*specify type of construction needed, e.g.,* and electrical plant] to be constructed at _____, for the purpose of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* furnishing electrical power to the City or District of _____].

4. In order to provide the services mentioned above, the applicant proposes to build the following facilities:

(a) _____ [*Describe fully the proposed construction, e.g.,* An electrical plant of the following size and specifications: _____].

(b) _____ [*Describe fully any additional facilities to be constructed in order to furnish the proposed services*].

5. The applicant proposes to render services authorized by the requested certificate in the following localities:_____[*state fully and in detail the area proposed to be covered by applicant's utility*]; the following _____[*public utilities or persons other than public utilities*] are likely to compete with the proposed utility of applicant: _____[*specify names and addresses*]. A certificate of service of this application on each of the possible future competitors of Applicant mentioned above is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

6. A map showing the location of the proposed construction of applicant and its relation to all other possible future competitors is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

7. The applicant has been granted a permit by the_____[*specify governmental agency*] to operate as _____ [*specify type of service, e.g.,* electrical company] in _____[*specify location covered by the franchise*]. A copy of the permit is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.

8. Present and future public convenience and necessity require and will require the _____ [construction *or* extension] and operation of these facilities and service because _____ [*state facts indicating that service is required and that public convenience and necessity will be served*].

9. The costs of the construction and operation of the proposed utility are set forth in a schedule attached hereto as Exhibit E and made a part hereof.

10. Applicant has the financial means to construct and operate said proposed utility as shown in the applicant's balance sheet to _____[*date*] attached hereto as Exhibit F. and made a part hereof.

11. The following proposed rates to be charged for the services to be rendered by the utility are set forth in a schedule attached hereto as Exhibit G and made a part hereof.

12. _____[*State any other additional data which may be necessary*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that a certificate be issued declaring that the present public convenience and necessity requires and will require the construction and operation of petitioner's facilities and that petitioner be granted a permit to build, operate, and maintain those facilities.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See [1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

CAUTION:
The construction or extension of a thermal energy facility or facility with associated electric transmission

lines must first be certified by the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, and thereafter must be issued a certificate by the PUC [*see Pub. Res. Code § 25500*; *County of Sonoma v. State Energy Resources Conservation etc. Com. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 361, 364-365, 220 Cal. Rptr. 114, 708 P.2d 693* ; *Voices of the Wetlands v. California State Water Resources Control Board (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1268, 1293-1294, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 487* ; *see also Pub. Res. Code § 25500 et seq.*]. The Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction of review over the decision by either commission [*Pub. Res. Code § 25531*; *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756-1759*; *County of Sonoma v. State Energy Resources Conservation etc. Com. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 361, 365-366, 220 Cal. Rptr. 114, 708 P.2d 693* ; *Voices of the Wetlands v. California State Water Resources Control Board (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1268, 1295, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 487* ; *Santa Teresa Citizen Action Group v. California Energy Commission (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1441, 1446, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392* (suit filed in superior court subject to demurrer without leave to amend)].

The form of application set out in *[a], above*, is for use in applying to the PUC for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the construction or extension of applicant's facilities. For additional comments, see *[1], above*.

For further discussion related to certificates of public convenience and necessity, see *§ 480.14*.

[c] Contents of Application

There are further requirements related to specific public utilities [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 18*].

[d] Verification

The application must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*].

[3] Application For Approval of Rate Change by Public Utility

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC--Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[*Caption. See [1][a].*]

The application of _____ [*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. Applicant was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to do business, and is doing business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____ [*city*], California. A copy of applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

2. All communications in respect to this application are to be addressed to _____ [*name, title, address and telephone number*].

3. Applicant requests approval by the Commission of _____ [*specify requested rate change, e.g.,* an increase of rates] for the services herein described pursuant to *Public Utilities Code Sections 451* and *454* of the based on the evidence and other reasons set forth in this application.

[*ADD, if applicant seeks rate increase*]

4. The following items, in accordance with Rule 23 of the Public Utilities Commission, are attached hereto as Exhibits B through E respectively and made a part hereof:

(a) A balance sheet and an income statement of petitioner up to _____ [*date*];

(b) A statement of the rates, currently in effect, that are proposed to be increased;

(c) A statement of the proposed increases or changes that will result in increase;

(d) A schedule of applicant's property and equipment; a statement of the original cost of the property and equipment, and a statement of the depreciation reserve applied thereto; and

(e) A summary of earnings.

[*Include additional exhibits or statements, as required under Rule 23 (20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23 in specific circumstances*)]

[*CONTINUE*]

5. Applicant will be ready to proceed with its showing on _____[*date*].

WHEREFORE, applicant respectfully requests that the proposed _____ [*specify requested rate change, e.g.,* increase of rates] herein mentioned be found justified and that this Commission approve these rates.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See [1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above*, is for use in applying to the PUC for a rate change or alteration of any classification, contract, practice, or rule resulting in a new rate [*see Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*; *S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Peevey (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 781, 804-805, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703, 74 P.3d 795* (application, but no public hearing, required for rate change)].

For additional comments, see *[1], above*.

For discussion related ratesetting proceedings, see *§ 480.80* et seq.

[c] Contents of Attachments When Rate Increase Is Sought

[i] Balance Sheet and Income Statement

The balance sheet must be of the latest available date. There must also be an income statement covering the period from the close of the last year for which an annual report was filed with the PUC to the date of the balance sheet [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(a)*].

[ii] Current Rates

The statement of current rates need not be in tariff form [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(b)*].

[iii] Statement of Proposed Increases or Changes

The statement need not be in tariff form but must set forth the proposed rate structure with reasonable clarity. Except as to carriers, the statement must also show the amount of proposed gross revenues together with the percentage of increase, if in excess of one percent, estimated to result from the proposed rates [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(c)*].

In the case of carriers, when a general rate increase application is filed, the statement must include an estimate of the amount of additional annual gross revenue estimated to result from the increase, which must be based on the amount of involved traffic handled for the preceding calendar year and must indicate the percentage by which the estimate exceeds the gross revenues on the involved traffic for the preceding calendar year, if more than one percent [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(c)*].

In the case of gas, electric, telephone, telegraph, water and heat utilities, the proposed revenue increase, if in excess of one percent, must be shown by appropriate rate classifications. If the percentage of increase in revenue is one percent or less, applicant must so state in its application [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(c)*].

[iv] Summary of Earnings

The summary of earnings must be on a depreciated rate base for the test period or periods on which the applicant bases its justification for an increase. If adjusted or estimated results are shown for successive periods, they should be on a consistent basis. Whenever adjusted results are shown, the recorded results for the same periods should also be shown [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23(e)*].

[v] Exhibits for Specific Utilities

For requirements for additional exhibits related to specified utilities, *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23*.

[d] Verification

The application must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*].

[e] Notice of Proposed Rate Change

[i] By Mail

If the applicant for an authorization to increase rates is a gas, electric, telephone, telegraph, water, or heat utility, or,

with respect to passenger fares a street railroad corporation, a passenger stage corporation, a railroad corporation, a vessel common carrier or a passenger air carrier, the applicant must name in its application and, within 10 days after filing its application with the PUC, mail a notice to the following, stating in general terms the proposed increases in rates or fares [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*]:

- The state, by mailing to the Attorney General and the Department of General Services, when the state is a customer or subscriber whose rates or fares would be affected by the proposed increase.

- Each county, by mailing to the county counsel (or district attorney if the county has no county counsel) and county clerk, and each city, by mailing to the city attorney and city clerk, listed in the current roster published by the Secretary of State within, from, to, or in which the proposed increase is to be made effective.

- Any other parties whom applicant deems appropriate. The applicant must promptly notify the PUC of the mailing.

The notice must also state that a copy of the application and related exhibits will be furnished by the applicant on written request. The applicant must also mail copies of the application and related exhibits to such parties and within such times as may be required by the PUC [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

[ii] By Publication

Gas, electric, telephone, telegraph, water or heat utilities, within 10 days after the filing of the application, must publish at least once in a newspaper of general circulation in the county within, from or to which the increasesare proposed to be made effective a notice, in general terms, of the proposed increases in rates or fares [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

The notice must state that a copy of the application and related exhibits may be examined at the offices of the PUC in San Francisco or Los Angeles and in such offices of the applicant as are specified in the notice, and must state the locations of those offices [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

Proof of publication must be filed with the PUC at or prior to the opening of such hearing as may be had on the application [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

[iii] To Customers

Whenever any electrical, gas, heat, telephone, water, or sewer system corporation files an application to change any rate, other than a change reflecting and passing through to customers only new costs to the corporation that do not result in changes in revenue allocation, for the services or commodities furnished by it, the corporation shall furnish to its customers affected by the proposed rate change notice of its application to the PUC for approval of the new rate [*Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

The corporation may include the notice with the regular bill for charges transmitted to the customers within 45 days if the corporation operates on a 30-day billing cycle, or within 75 days if the corporation operates on a 60-day billing cycle. If more than one application to change any rate is filed within a single billing cycle, the corporation may combine the notices into a single notice if the applications are separately identified [*Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

The notice must state the amount of the proposed rate change, expressed in both dollar and percentage terms for the entire rate change as well as for each customer classification; a brief statement of the reasons the change is required or sought; and the mailing address of the PUC to which any customer inquiries may be directed regarding how to

participate in, or receive further notices regarding the date, time, or place of, any hearing on the application, and the mailing address of the corporation to which any customer inquiries relative to the proposed rate change may be directed [*Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 24*].

This notice requirement does not apply to any rate change proposed by a corporation pursuant to an advice letter submitted to the PUC in accordance with PUC procedures for this means of submission. The procedures for advice letters may include provision for notice to customers or subscribers on a case-by-case basis, as determined by the PUC [*Pub. Util. Code § 454(a)*].

[f] Hearing Procedure Before the PUC

The PUC may adopt rules it considers reasonable and proper for each class of public utility providing for the nature of the showing required in support of proposed rate changes, the form and manner of the presentation of the showing, with or without a hearing, and the procedure to be followed in the consideration thereof [*see Pub. Util. Code § 454(b)*].

The PUC must permit individual public utility customers and subscribers affected by a proposed rate change, and organizations formed to represent their interests, to testify at any hearing on the proposed rate change [*see Pub. Util. Code § 454(c)*].

[4] Application By Public Utility to Issue Stock or Evidence of Indebtedness or to Assume Liabilities

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC--Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[*Caption. See [1][c].*]

The application of _____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. Applicant was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____, authorized to do business, and doing business, in the State of California, with its principal place of business in_____[*city*], California. A copy of Applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

2. All communications in respect to this application are to be addressed to_____[*name, title, address, and telephone number*].

3. Applicant's balance sheet and income statement as of _____[*date*], are attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

4. Applicant performs the following services _____[*state kind of services in area of performance*].

5. A schedule showing applicant's property and equipment, its original cost, and the depreciation and amortization reserves applicable thereto is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

6. Applicant requests authority pursuant to Section(s) _____ of the Public Utilities Code to issue_____[*state the amount, kind, and terms of stock, bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness desired to be issued or the amount and description of the indebtedness desired to be assumed*]. Copies of the relevant documents defining the terms of the proposed securities are attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof. [Copies of the plan for reorganization or retirement of securities are attached hereto as Exhibit E and made a part

hereof.]

[*EITHER*]

7. The purposes for which the above-described securities are to be issued are_____[*state purposes in detail*].

[*OR*]

7. The consideration to be received by the applicant for assuming the above-described indebtedness is $_____ and the reasons for such assumption are_____[*specify reasons*].

8. _____ [*Set forth a statement corresponding to the statement required by Section 2 of General Order 104-A as to all known matters designated by that section for inclusion in the annual report but occurring or proposed subsequent to the period covered by the last annual report filed by the applicant or that no such matters have occurred or attach latest proxy statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 33(e))*].

WHEREFORE applicant requests that this Commission issue its order authorizing applicant to _____ [sell *or* issue *or* assume] the _____ [stock *or* notes *or* liabilities] described above, in the manner described above, and for the consideration described above.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See [1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of application set out in *[a], above*, is for use in applying to the PUC for authorization to sell or issue securities or assume indebtedness. For additional comments, see *[1], above*.

[c] Description of Purposes

The purposes for which the approval is sought must be described as follows [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 33(c)*]:

- If for property acquisition, a detailed description thereof, the consideration to be paid therefor, and the method of arriving at the amount.

- If for construction, completion, extension, or improvement of facilities, a description thereof in reasonable detail, the cost or estimated cost thereof, and the reason or necessity for the expenditures.

- If for improvement of service, a statement of the character of the improvements proposed, or if for maintenance of service, a statement of the reasons why service should be maintained from capital.

- If for discharge or refunding of obligations, a full description of the obligations to be discharged or refunded, including the character, principal amount, discount, or premium applicable thereto, date of incurrence, date of maturity, rate of interest, and other material facts concerning such obligations, together with a statement showing the purposes for which such obligations had been incurred, or the proceeds expended, and the PUC's decisions, if any, authorizing the incurrence of such obligations.

- If for the financing of the acquisition and installation of electrical and plumbing appliances and agricultural equipment which are sold by other than a public utility, for use within the service area of the public utility, a statement of the reason or necessity for such financing.

- If for reorganization or readjustment of indebtedness or capitalization, or for retirement or exchange of securities, a full description of the indebtedness or capitalization to be readjusted or exchanged; complete terms and conditions of the merger, consolidation, exchange or other reorganization; a pro forma balance sheet, if possible, giving effect to such reorganization, readjustment, or exchange; and a statement of the reason or necessity for the transaction.

- If for reimbursement of moneys actually expended from income, or from any other moneys in the treasury, a general description of the expenditures for which reimbursement is sought, the source of such expenditures, the periods during which such expenditures were made, and the reason or necessity for such reimbursement.

[d] Verification

The application must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*].

[5] Joint Application by Public Utilities to Sell, Lease, or Encumber Utility Property or Rights; Merge or Consolidate Facilities; or Acquire Stock of Another Utility

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC--Application Proceedings Before the PUC

[*Caption. See [1][c]*.]

The application of _____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. Applican t_____[*name of first applicant*] was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ authorized to do business, and doing business, in the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____[*city*], California. A copy of Applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

2. All communications to applicant _____[*name of first applicant*] in respect to this application are to be addressed to_____[*name, title, address, and telephone number*].

3. Applicant _____[*name of second applicant*] was, and is, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to do business, and is doing business in the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____[*city*], California. A copy of Applicant's articles of incorporation is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

4. All communications to applicant _____[*name of second applicant*] in respect to this application are to be addressed to_____[*name, title, address, and telephone number*].

5. Applicant _____[*name of first applicant*] is performing the following services: _____[*specify*]. The territory served is _____[*specify*].

6. Applicant _____[*name of second applicant*] is performing the following services:_____[*specify*]. The territory served is _____[*specify*].

7. Applicants _____[*name*] and _____[*name*] request authority from this Commission to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* transfer property of applicant _____ (*name*) to applicant _____ (*name*)] pursuant to Sections _____ of the Public Utilities Code.

[*EITHER*]

8. _____ [*If the application is not for consolidation and merger, add:* The balance sheet and income statements of applicant _____ (*name*) as of _____[*date*], are attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof. The balance sheet and income statement of applicant _____ (*name*) as of_____[*date*], are attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*If the application is for consolidation and merger, add:* The financial statement of applicant _____ (*name*) in accordance with Public Utilities Commission Rule 17 as of _____ (*date*), is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof. The financial statement of applicant _____ (*name*) in accordance with Public Utilities Commission Rule 17 as of _____ (*date*), is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof. A pro forma balance sheet showing the effect of the merger is attached hereto as Exhibit E and made a part hereof].

[*CONTINUE*]

9. A description of the property involved in the transaction including its book cost and original cost is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ [E *or* F] and made a part hereof.

[*EITHER, if the transaction is for transfer or sale of property*]

[10. The agreed purchase price and the terms for payment are as follows: _____ (*specify*). A copy of

the deed or contract of sale is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ (F *or* G) and made a part hereof.]

[*OR, if the transaction is one for the merger or consolidation*]

[10. A copy of the plan of merger or consolidation is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ (G *or* H) and made a part hereof.]

[*CONTINUE*]

[11. *State the detailed reasons on the part of each applicant for entering into the proposed transaction, and all facts warranting the same.*]

WHEREFORE, Applicants_____[*name*] and_____[*name*] jointly request an order pursuant to *Public Utilities Code Sections 851-853* of the authorizing applicant _____ [*specify, e.g.,* to sell] and applicant _____ [*specify, e.g.,* to buy] the above-described property.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See [1][a]*.]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above*, is for use in applying to the PUC for authorization to transfer property between two public utilities or to consolidate and merge two public utilities. For additional comments, see *[1], above*. PUC Rule 17, referred to in the form, is codified at *20 Cal. Code Reg., § 17*.

[c] Additional Requirements for Carriers

If the transaction involves a certificate or operating right of a common carrier, *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 37* provides for additional requirements for the application.

[d] Verification

The application must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2.4*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.192

§ 480.192 Application Proceedings Before the PUC on Shortened Tariff Docket

[1] Application

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC on Shortened Tariff Docket--Application

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of _____ [*name*], under the Shortened-Procedure Tariff Docket to _____ [*here state specifically or by reference the increase in rates sought to be made and specify short notice as well as long and short haul authority, if any, sought*].	))))	Application No. _____ APPLICATION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)]--SHORTENED-PROCEDURE TARIFF DOCKET

_____

The application of_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each applicant*] respectfully shows:

1. Authorization is requested to_____[*state clearly and concisely the specific authority or authorities sought, together with the current rates, fares, charges, or rules being increased*].

2. This application is based on the following facts and circumstances:_____[*here and in succeeding numbered paragraphs or attached exhibits, set forth the specific facts required by the applicable rules, a statement of or reference to exhibits showing present and proposed rates, fares, charges or rules and the additional facts and circumstances deemed to be material*].

3. The position of the interested parties in this matter is as follows:_____[*here list the position of each interested party insofar as known*].

4. Applicant will furnish a copy of this application to any interested party on written request.

5. In the knowledge and belief of applicant, the increases proposed above do not require a public hearing and would not increase applicant's California intrastate gross revenue by as much as one percent. Applicant's belief is based on_____[*specify facts and circumstances on which the belief is based*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Applicant

_____

[*attorney's address, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if attorney consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*]

[*Verification. See § 480.191[1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of application set out in *[a], above*, is for use when the shortened-procedure tariff docket is applicable. It can be used only for applications of common carriers to increase any rate or so alter any classification, contract, practice, or rule as to result in any increase in rate [*20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 25-32*]. The form in *[a], above*, is based on the form of application under shortened-procedure tariff docket set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*, with certain additions required by *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 25*.

[c] Required Allegations

Applications may not be processed under the Shortened-Procedures Tariff Docket unless the application shows that, in the knowledge and belief of the applicant, the proposed increases do not require public hearing and the application contains a statement of the facts and circumstances on which such belief is based and would not increase applicant's California intrastate gross revenue by as much as one percent [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 25*].

[d] Verification

The application must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 26*].

[e] Copy of Application

The applicant must promptly furnish a copy of the application to each interested party making a written request therefor to the applicant [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 28*].

[f] Application of Rules to Procedure

Applications and protests on the Shortened-Procedure Tariff Docket are subject to *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2*, *2.1* and *2.5*. They are not subject, however, to the other provisions relating to the filing of documents generally (*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 2 et seq.*), to the provisions relating to applications generally (*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 15 et seq.*), or to the provisions relating to applications for authority to increase rates generally (*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 23 et seq.*) [*see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 25 et seq.* (preamble)].

[2] Protest

[a] FORM Application Proceedings Before the PUC on Shortened Tariff Docket--Protest

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of _____ [*name*], under the Shortened-Procedure Tariff Docket to _____ [*here state specifically or by reference the increase in rates sought to be made and specify short notice as well as long and short haul authority, if any, sought*].	))))	Application No. _____ PROTEST OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)]--SHORTENED-PROCEDURE TARIFF DOCKET

_____

The protest of_____[*state exact legal name, mailing address, and telephone number of each protestant*] respectfully shows:

1. _____[*Here and in succeeding numbered paragraphs or attached exhibits, state the facts constituting the grounds for the protest and show how protestant is affected by the proposed increase and indicate in what respects the proposed increase is not justified*].

2. Applicants, as shown on the following list, have been served with a copy of this protest by_____[*state manner of service*]:_____[*list the names and addresses of parties served*].

3. Protestant will furnish a copy of this protest to any other interested party on written request.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Protestant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Protestant

_____

[*attorney's address, telephone number, facsimile transmission number, and, if attorney consents to e-mail service, e-mail address*]

[*Verification. See § 480.191[1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above*, is for use in protesting rate increases on the shortened-procedure tariff docket. The form is based on the form of protest set forth in *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 88*.

For additional comments, *see [1], above*, and *§ 480.191[1]*.

[c] Verification

The form of protest in *[a], above*, must be verified [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(d)*].

[d] Time and Address for Mailing

The protest must reach the PUC not later than the 30th day following the listing of the application in the daily calendar [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(f)*]. It must be mailed to the PUC at State Building, San Francisco, CA 94101.

[e] Service

One copy of each protest must simultaneously be served on each applicant or its attorney or agent. Service must be made pursuant to *20 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2.3* and *2.3.1* [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 31*].

[f] Copy On Request

Protestant must promptly furnish a copy of the protest to each party making a written request therefore [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 32*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.193

§ 480.193 Proceedings to Review Categorization Determination by the PUC

[1] Request for Rehearing of Determination

[a] FORM Proceedings to Review Categorization Determination by the PUC--Request for Rehearing of Determination

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*EITHER, for complaint proceedings*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Complainant,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION OF _____ [*name or*
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	*shortened designation of party tendering document*]
Defendant(s).	)	[(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)] FOR REHEARING OF CATEGOR-
	)	IZATION DETERMINATION
	)	

_____

[*OR, for application proceedings*]

	)	
Application of _____ [*name*],	)	Application No. _____
to _____ [*purpose of applica-*	)	PETITION OF _____ [*name or*
tion],	)	*shortened designation of party tendering document*]

[(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)] FOR REHEARING OF CATEGORIZATION DETERMINATION

_____

[*CONTINUE*]

Petitioner_____[*name*], respectfully, requests a rehearing before the Commission of its categorization determination, Decision No. _____ rendered on_____[*date*], pursuant to *Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1(a).*

The rehearing is sought on the following grounds: _____ [*state specifically the grounds on which the applicants consider the determination unlawful, e.g.,* the Commission's determination is not consistent with due process, public policy, and statutory requirements].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

_____ [Applicant *or* Complainant *or* Defendant]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [Applicant *or* Complainant *or* Defendant]

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See § 480.191[1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above,* is for use in petitioning for a rehearing of a categorization determination before the PUC. The PUC must determine whether [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*]:

- A proceeding requires a hearing.
- The matter requires a quasi-legislative, an adjudication, or a ratesetting hearing.
- For further discussion related to categorization determinations, see *§ 480.23*.

Documents for filing are tendered to the appropriate PUC docket office under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3*. For discussion relating to acceptance and rejection of tendered documents generally, see *§ 480.190[1][i]*.

[c] Time for Request

The PUC's decision regarding the nature of the proceeding is subject to a request for rehearing within 10 days of the date of the decision. If the decision is not appealed to the PUC within that time period it is not subsequently subject to judicial review. Only those parties who have requested a rehearing within that time period shall subsequently have standing for judicial review and that review is only be available at the conclusion of the proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1701.1(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.194

§ 480.194 Proceedings to Review Order or Decision of the PUC

[1] Petition for Rehearing or Order or Decision

[a] FORM Proceedings to Review Order or Decision of the PUC--Petition for Rehearing or Order or Decision

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*EITHER, for complaint proceedings*]

_____ [*name*], Complainant, vs. _____ [*name*], [and DOES I through _____,] Defendant(s).	))))))))	NO. _____ PETITION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.,* U1001C)] FOR REHEARING

_____

[*OR, for application proceedings*]

Application of _____ [*name*], to _____ [*purpose of application*],	))))	Application No. _____ PETITION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable,*

e.g., U1001C)] FOR REHEARING

_____

[*OR, for application proceedings under the shortened-procedure tariff docket*]

Application of _____ [*name*], under the Shortened-Procedure Tariff Docket to _____ [*here state specifically or by reference the increase in rates sought to be made and specify short notice as well as long and short haul authority, if any, sought*].	))))	Application No. _____ PETITION OF _____ [*name or shortened designation of party tendering document*] [(_____) (*CIS number, if applicable, e.g.*, U1001C)] FOR REHEARING--SHORTENED-PROCEDURE TARIFF DOCKET

_____

[*CONTINUE*]

Petitioner_____[*name*], respectfully, requests a rehearing before the Commission of Decision No. _____ rendered on_____[*date*], by that Commission, pursuant to *Public Utilities Code Section 1731*.

The rehearing is sought on the following grounds:_____[*state specifically the grounds on which the applicants consider the decision or order unlawful*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

_____ [Applicant *or* Complainant *or* Defendant]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [Applicant *or* Complainant *or* Defendant] _____ [*name*]

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*Verification. See § 480.191[1][a]*.]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above*, is for use in petitioning for a rehearing before the PUC. It may be filed by any losing party or any stockholder or bondholder or other party pecuniarily interested in the public utility affected [*Pub. Util. Code § 1731*].

Documents for filing are tendered to the appropriate PUC docket office under *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 3* [*but see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 25 et seq.* (preamble; provisions do not apply to applications and protests on Shortened-Procedure Tariff Docket)]. For discussion relating to acceptance and rejection of tendered documents generally, see *§ 480.190[1][i]*.

[c] Contents

The application for a rehearing must set forth specifically the ground or grounds on which the applicant considers the decision or order to be unlawful. No corporation or person may in any court urge or rely on any ground not so set forth in the application [*Pub. Util. Code § 1732*]. Vague assertions as to the record or the law, without citation, may be accorded little attention [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 86.1*].

[d] Time for Filing

The application for rehearing must be filed within 30 days after the date of issuance of the PUC's order or decision, or within 10 days after the date of issuance in the case of an order issued pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code §§ 816-830* or *851-856* (relating to security transactions and the transfer or encumbrance of utility property). In this context, "date of issuance" means the date when the PUC mails the order or decision to the parties to the action or proceeding [*Pub. Util. Code § 1731(b)*; *see 20 Cal. Code Reg. § 85*].

[e] Time for Granting or Denying Application

Any application for a rehearing made 10 days or more before the effective date of the order as to which a rehearing is sought must be either granted or denied before the effective date or the order will stand suspended until the application is granted or denied. However, absent further order of the PUC, the order will not stand so suspended for more than 60 days after the date of filing of the application, at which time the suspension will lapse, the order will become effective, and the application may be taken by the party making it to be denied. Any application for a rehearing made within less than 10 days before the effective date of the order as to which a rehearing is sought and not granted within 60 days may be taken by the party making the application to be denied unless the effective date of the order is extended for the period of the pendency of the application [*Pub. Util. Code § 1733*].

[f] Response

A response to an application for rehearing is not necessary. Any response may be filed and served no later than 15 days after the day the application for rehearing was filed. In instances of multiple applications for rehearing, the response may be to all such applications and may be filed 15 days after the last application for rehearing was filed. The PUC is not obligated to withhold a decision on an application for rehearing to allow time for a response to be filed [*20 Cal. Code Reg. § 86.2*].

[g] Effect of Application

An application for rehearing does not excuse any corporation or person from complying with and obeying any order or decision or any requirement of any order or decision of the PUC theretofore made or operate in any manner to stay or postpone the enforcement thereof, except in such cases and on such terms as the PUC by order directs [*Pub. Util. Code § 1735*; *20 Cal. Code Reg. § 86*]. An application for rehearing is a necessary prerequisite to an appeal [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 1731(b), 1756*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.195

§ 480.195 Proceedings to Adopt, Amend, Repeal Regulation

[1] Petition by Interested Person

[a] FORM Proceedings to Adopt, Amend, Repeal Regulation--Petition by Interested Person

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Petition of _____ [*name*] [, CIS NO. _____,], an interested person, to _____ [adopt a regulation *or* amend *or* repeal _____ (*identify regulation, e.g., 20 Cal. Code Reg § 14.1*)].

DOCKET NO. _____

PETITION OF_____[*name or shortened designation of party*] TO _____ [ADOPT *or* AMEND *or* REPEAL] REGULATION

Petitioner_____[*name*] ["Petitioner"], an interested person, respectfully, requests that the Commission:

[*EITHER, if petition requests Commission to adopt a regulation*]

1. Adopt the following regulation:_____[*state substance of the proposed regulation*].

[*OR, if petition requests Commission to amend existing regulation*]

1. Amend _____ [identify regulation, e.g., 20 Cal. Code Reg § 100.1] as follows:

_____ [*state clearly and concisely the proposed amendment, e.g.,* delete the existing subdivision [a] and substitute: _____ (*set forth proposed language*)].

[*OR, if petition requests Commission to repeal existing regulation*]

1. Repeal _____ [*identify regulation, e.g.,* 20 Cal. Code Reg § 100.1].

[*CONTINUE*]

2. This request is made pursuant to *Public Utilities Code Sections 1708* and *1708.5*.

3. The regulation that Petitioner proposes for _____ [adoption *or* amendment *or* repeal] is a rule of general applicability and future effect, because _____[*set forth explanation as necessary*].

4._____[*Concisely state any facts and law supporting petition*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Petitioner

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

_____

[*attorney's address and telephone number*]

[*If petition contains factual assertions, include appropriate verification. See § 480.191[1][a].*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of petition in *[a], above*, is for using in petitioning the Commission to adopt, amend, or repeal a regulation. For further discussion of the procedures related to this petition, see *§ 480.12[4]*.

[c] Contents

Pleadings relating to matters not specifically mentioned in the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (*20 Cal. Code Reg § 1 et seq.*) must comply with *20 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2 through 2.6, 15* and *16*, relating to format and contents generally [*20 Cal. Code Reg § 42*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 1708.5(e)* (Commission must implement regulation petition procedure under its existing rules and amend its rules with specific procedures prior to July 1, 2001)].

The proposed regulation (or amendment or repeal of an existing regulation) must be a rule of general applicability and

future effect [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1708(a)*] (*see* Paragraph 3).

A petition must concisely state the facts and law supporting the petition the specific relief or ruling requested [*20 Cal. Code Reg §§ 45* and *46* (relating to motions, petitions, and other requests)] (*see* Paragraph 4).

[d] Verification

Pub. Util. Code §§ 1708, 1708.5 do not state whether a verification is required and specific regulations relating to this petition do not currently exist. By analogy, under the Commission's notice and comment rulemaking procedures (*20 Cal. Code Reg § 14.1 et seq.*), all pleadings that contain factual assertions must be verified. Unverified factual assertions are given only the weight of argument [*20 Cal. Code Reg § 14.5*]. Therefore, to be cautious, the petitioner should verify the petition if he or she is supporting the petition with assertions of fact.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Proceedings Before the PUC

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 480.196-480.199

[Reserved]

§§ 480.196[Reserved]

196 of 196 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 480 PUBLIC UTILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Judicial Review of PUC Decisions

42-480 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 480.200

§ 480.200 Proceedings to Review PUC Order or Decision

[1] Petition for Writ of Review of Order or Decision

[a] FORM Proceedings to Review PUC Order or Decision--Petition for Writ of Review of Order or Decision

[*EITHER*]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*OR*]

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL, _____ [*specify number, e.g.,* SECOND] APPELLATE DISTRICT, OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*CONTINUE*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	)	CIVIL NO. _____
Respondent,	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW
[_____ (*name*),	)	
Real Party in Interest].	)	
	)	

_____

TO THE HONORABLE _____ [CHIEF *or* PRESIDING] JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE _____ [SUPREME COURT *or* COURT OF APPEAL OF THE _____ (*specify number, e.g.,* _____ SECOND) APPELLATE DISTRICT] OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to do business in the State of California with its principal place of business in_____[*city*], California.

2. Respondent is the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California ("Respondent").

[3. Real party in interest is _____ (*name*) and has an interest which is directly affected by this proceeding in that _____ (*specify reasons which make person real party in interest*)].

4. On_____[*date*], Respondent issued its _____ [order *or* decision] in proceeding number _____ entitled _____ [*specify*].

5. Respondent acted beyond its authority in _____ [making the order *or* rendering the decision] in that_____[*specify how order was beyond authority of PUC*].

6. Enforcement of the _____ [decision *or* order] will require Petitioner to_____[*show effect of decision or order on petitioner's rights*] to the injury and detriment of Petitioner.

WHEREFORE Petitioner prays:

1. That a writ of review issue out of this Court to Respondent commanding it to certify fully to this Court at a specified time and place the record and proceedings in the above-described proceeding so that the same may be inquired into and determined by this Court;

2. That the above-described proceeding be fully heard and considered by this Court and the _____ [order *or* decision] made by Respondent be annulled and set aside;

3. That an order issue from the Court requiring Respondent during the pendency of this proceeding to desist from further proceedings in the above-mentioned cause;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. That Petitioner be granted such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled matter. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[b] Use of Form

The form of petition set out in *[a], above,* is for use in seeking a writ of review from the Supreme Court or court of appeal to review an order ordecision of the PUC. For discussion concerning the use of this method for review, see generally *§§ 480.140, 480.142*.

For discussion of time for filing petition, see *§ 480.144[1]*. For discussion of scope of review, see *§ 480.146[2]*. Answer to the petition and reply to the answer are discussed in *§ 480.145*. For discussion of requests to stay enforcement of a PUC order or decision pending disposition of the petition, see *§ 480.143*.

[c] Proper Court for Filing Petition

When the decision of the PUC was issued in an adjudicatory proceeding, the petition for writ of review may be filed in the court of appeal. In all matters other than adjudicatory proceedings, the petition for writ of review may only be filed in the Supreme Court [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(b)*]. For further discussion concerning the determination of the proper court for filing, see *§ 480.144[3]*.

[d] Verification

The petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496*].

[e] Proof of Service

The petition must be accompanied by proof of service of copies on the PUC and on any real parties in interest. A real party in interest is one who [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.496(a)*]:

- Was a party of record to the action or proceeding before the PUC, and
- Presented before the PUC a position adverse to that taken before the PUC by the petitioner for review.

[f] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

Each party to an appeal must serve and file a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons at the time it files its first document in the Court of Appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*] and must include a copy of the certificate in its principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*]. If a party is an entity, the certificate must list any person or entity, other than the parties themselves, that the party knows has an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(1)*]. All parties must also list any person or entity, other than the parties themselves, that has a financial or other interest in the outcome of the proceeding that the party reasonably believes the justices should consider in determining whether to disqualify themselves under Canon 3E of the Code of Judicial Ethics [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(2)*]. If the party knows of no entity or person that is required to be disclosed under the rule, he or she must so state in the certificate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(e)(3)*]. Furthermore, if a party learns of changed or additional information that must be disclosed under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*, he or she must promptly serve and file a supplemental certificate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(f)*].

[2] Application to Transfer to Single Appellate District

[a] FORM Proceedings to Review PUC Order or Decision--Application to Transfer to Single Appellate District

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE	)	CIVIL NO. _____
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	)	APPLICATION FOR ORDER TRANSFERRING
Respondent,	)	RELATED ACTIONS TO THE
[_____ (*name*),	)	_____ [*specify number, e.g.,*
Real Party in Interest].	)	SECOND] APPELLATE DISTRICT, COURT OF
	)	APPEAL

TO THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

1. _____ [*Identify party seeking transfer, e.g.,* Applicant is a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to do business in the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California].

2. The following actions are pending review in different districts of the Court of Appeal:_____[*identify each related matter on review, by name of parties, case number, appellate district, and date filed*].

3. These actions are related, in that_____[*set forth facts showing that each of the matters identified in paragraph 2 are related*].

4. The _____ [*specify number, e.g.,* Second] Appellate District of the Court of Appeal is the proper district for hearing and determining these actions, because _____[*set forth grounds facts showing that the matters should be transferred to the particular appellate district*].

WHEREFORE Petitioner prays:

1. That an order issue out of this Court transferring_____[*identify each matter to be transferred*] to the _____ [*specify number, e.g.,* Second] Appellate District of the Court of Appeal.

2. That the clerk of the court(s) of the court(s) from which the cause(s) are transferred immediately transmit to the to the _____ [*specify number, e.g.,* Second] Appellate District of the Court of Appeal the original record, briefs, and all original papers and exhibits on file in the cause.

[3. _____ (*If the transfer is made because the matter was taken to the wrong court,* That the petitioner be ordered to pay the clerk of the _____[*specify number of district court to which the cause is transferred, e.g.,* Second] Appellate District of the Court of Appeal the fee required by law for the filing of the record in the first instance.]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See[1], above.*]

[b] Use of Form

The form set out in *[a], above*, is for use in seeking an order from the Supreme Court transferring related actions to a single appellate district [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(e)*; *see Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 10.1000*].

For discussion of transfer of causes in the reviewing courts generally, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* and Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision* .

[c] Any Party May Seek Order

Any party may seek from the Supreme Court, pursuant to California Rules of Court, an order transferring related actions to a single appellate district [*Pub. Util. Code § 1756(e)*].

[d] Transfer Order Sent to Parties by Clerk

The clerk of the court to which the cause is transferred must promptly send each party a copy of the order of transfer showing the new case number [*see Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 10.1000(a)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 481.syn

§ 481.syn Synopsis to Chapter 481: PUBLIC WORKS

§ 481.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 481.02 Cross References

§§ 481.03-481.09 [Reserved]

§ 481.10 Governing Law

[1] Construction of Public Contracts

[2] Rules Governing Incorporation of Plans and Specifications

§ 481.11 Competitive Bidding Requirements

[1] Statutory Schemes

[2] Outreach Programs

§ 481.12 Purpose of Competitive Bidding Requirements

§ 481.13 Solicitation of Bids

§ 481.14 Statutory Exceptions to Bidding Requirements

[1] Interests of Public Entity Not Furthered by Bidding

[2] Emergency

§ 481.15 Judicial Exceptions to Bidding Requirements

[1] Failure Generally to Serve Purposes of Bidding Statutes

[2] No Exception

[3] Undesirability or Impossibility of Advertising for Bids

[4] Undeveloped State of Art

[5] Employment of Skilled Professionals

[6] Lack of Advantage in Complying With Bidding Requirements

[7] Contracts Relating to "Municipal Affairs" of Charter Cities

§ 481.16 Failure to Comply With Competitive Bidding Requirements

[1] Contract Is Void

[2] No Estoppel Is Permitted to Be Invoked Against Public Entity

[3] No Recovery in Quantum Meruit Is Permitted

[4] Appellate Court's Duty to Protect Public Entity

§ 481.17 Submission of Bid

§ 481.18 Withdrawal of Bid

§ 481.19 Consideration of Bids by Awarding Authority

[1] Rejection of Bids Not in Best Interests of Public

[2] Relief of Unsuccessful Bidder

[a] Setting Aside of Bid Award, Generally

[b] Successful Bidder's Labor Law Violations

[3] Duty to Award Contract to Lowest Responsible Bidder

[a] General Rule

[b] Bid Deviating From Specifications

[c] Right to Notice of Reasons for Rejection of Local Bidder

[d] Damages Recoverable on Misaward by Public Entity

§ 481.20 Classification of License When Contract Awarded

§ 481.21 Making of Award Gives Rise to Contract

§ 481.22 Relief of Bidders

[1] Governing Law

[2] "Bid" Defined

[3] Notice of Mistake Is Required for Relief From Bid

[4] Consent by State to Relief From Bid

[5] Action for Recovery of Amount Forfeited

[a] Complaint

[b] Showing Required for Relief From Forfeiture

§ 481.23 Public Entity's Remedy on Contractor's Wrongful Failure to Enter Into Contract

§ 481.24 Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

[1] Purpose of Act

[2] Deadline for Submission of Bids

[3] Listing of Subcontractor in Bid

[4] Permitted Substitutions

[5] Hearing on Requested Substitution

[6] Procedural Prerequisites for Substitution Based on Clerical Error

[a] Two-Day Notice Requirement

[b] Determination by Awarding Authority

[7] Violation of Act

[a] Statutory Penalties

[b] Remedy of Listed Subcontractor

§ 481.25 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[1] Arbitration

[2] Presentation of Claim to Public Entity

[a] Requirements

[b] Pleading Compliance With Gov. Code § 945.4

[3] Resolution of Claims Between Contractor and Local Agency of $375,000 or Less

[a] Presentment to Local Agency

[b] Procedure Once Suit Is Filed

§ 481.26 Contractual Waiver of Claims

§ 481.27 Liability of Public Entity for Fraudulent Concealment on Claims of Extra Work

§§ 481.28-481.39 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.40 Governing Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Statutory Stop Notice Provisions Is Sole Remedy

§ 481.41 Definitions

[1] Claimant

[2] Public Work

[3] Public Entity

[4] Work of Improvement

[5] Contract

[6] Original Contractor

[7] Laborer

[8] Materialman

§ 481.42 Public Stop Notice Provisions

[1] Construction

[2] Purpose

§ 481.43 Nature of Remedy

§ 481.44 Stop Notice Remedy Is Cumulative

§ 481.45 Person Entitled to Serve Stop Notice

[1] In General

[2] Works of Improvement

[3] Site Improvements

[4] Union Trust Fund Liens

[5] Hazardous Waste Removal

[6] Furnisher of Labor or Materials

[a] In General

[b] Contractor and Materialman Distinguished

§ 481.46 Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

[1] Duty Measured by Extent of Liability of Public Entity

[2] Breach of Duty to Withhold

§ 481.47 Amount Required to Be Withheld

[1] Claim and Costs

[2] Amount Permitted to Be Claimed in Stop Notice

§ 481.48 Priorities of Claims to Withheld Funds or Garnishment

[1] Assignment of Contract

[2] Insufficient Funds to Satisfy Claims

[a] Distribution

[b] Forfeiture of Right to Pro Rata Distribution

§ 481.49 Enforcement of Stop Notice Rights

[1] Prerequisites to Entitlement to Enforcement

[2] Action to Enforce Stop Notice

§ 481.50 Bond to Release Withheld Funds

§ 481.51 Summary Proceedings by Original Contractor for Determination of Stop Notice Rights

[1] Commencement of Proceedings

[2] Service of Affidavit on Public Entity

[3] Service of Affidavit on Claimant

[4] Counteraffidavit by Claimant

[5] Action for Declaration of Rights of Respective Parties

[a] Commencement of Action

[b] Hearing to Determine Rights of Respective Parties

[6] Right to Jury Trial

[a] Determination of Rights

[b] Appeal From Order

[c] Effect of Order

§§ 481.52-481.69 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.70 Governing Statutes

§ 481.71 Payment Bonds

[1] Defined

[2] Performance Bond Distinguished

[3] Construction

[4] Sole Condition of Recovery

[5] Exoneration or Release of Sureties

§ 481.72 When Payment Bond Required

§ 481.73 Purpose of Requiring Payment Bond

§ 481.74 Action on Payment Bond

[1] In General

[2] Giving of Notice Is Prerequisite

§ 481.75 Indemnification Agreement

§ 481.76 Right of Original Contractor to Require Subcontractor's Bond

§§ 481.77-481.89 [Reserved]

§ 481.90 State Statutes

[1] Arbitration of Public Works Contracts

[2] Competitive Bidding Requirements for Public Entities

[3] Contract Clauses

[4] County Government

[5] License Verification

[6] Minority Business Enterprises

[7] Payment

[8] Relief From Active Negligence Void

[9] Relief of Bidders

[10] Resolution of Claims

[11] Small Business Procurement and Contract Act

[12] State Contract Act

[13] Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

§ 481.91 Decisions

[1] Classification of License

[2] Compliance With Bidding Requirements

[3] Consideration of Bids by Awarding Authority

[a] Duty to Award Contract to Lowest Responsible Bidder

[b] Rejection of Bids Not in Best Interest of Public

[c] Relief of Unsuccessful Bidder

[4] Failure to Comply With Competitive Bidding Requirements

[5] Fair Practices Act

[6] Judicial Exceptions to Bidding Requirement

[a] Contracts Relating to "Municipal Affairs"

[b] Employment of Skilled Professionals

[c] Failure Generally to Serve Purposes of Bidding Statutes

[d] Undesirability or Impossibility of Advertising for Bids

[7] Law Governing Construction of Public Contracts

[a] Interpretation Generally

[b] Rules Governing Incorporation of Plans and Specifications

[8] Making of Award Gives Rise to Contract

[9] Miscellaneous Contractual Provisions

[10] Preparation Costs

[11] Public Entity's Remedy on Contractor's Wrongful Failure to Enter Into Contract

[12] Purpose of Competitive Bidding Requirements

[13] Relief of Bidders

[14] Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

[15] Void Contracts

§ 481.92 Attorney General Opinions

§ 481.93 Law Reviews

§ 481.94 Text References

§§ 481.95-481.109 [Reserved]

§ 481.110 State Statutes

[1] Amount Required to Be Withheld

[2] Bond to Release Withheld Funds

[3] Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

[4] Enforcement of Stop Notice Rights

[a] Action to Enforce Stop Notice

[b] Prerequisites to Entitlement to Enforcement

[5] Persons Entitled to Serve

[6] Priorities of Claims to Withheld Funds

[7] Stop Notice Is Sole Remedy

[8] Summary Proceedings for Determination of Stop Notice Rights

§ 481.111 Decisions

[1] Amount Required to Be Withheld

[2] Construction of Public Stop Notice Provisions

[3] Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

[a] In General

[b] Breach of Duty to Withhold

[4] Nature of Remedy

[5] Persons Entitled to Serve Stop Notice

[6] Purpose of Public Stop Notice Provisions

[7] Release Bond

[8] Stop Notice Remedy as Cumulative

[9] Summary Proceeding to Determine Rights

[10] Time to File

§ 481.112 Law Reviews

§ 481.113 Text References

§§ 481.114-481.129 [Reserved]

§ 481.130 California Legal Forms

§ 481.131 State Statutes

[1] Actions on Payment Bonds

[2] General Bond Provisions

[3] Payment Bonds

§ 481.132 Decisions

[1] Attorneys' Fees

[2] Limitation of Actions

[3] Payment Bonds

[a] Actions Thereon

[b] Purpose

[4] Persons Entitled to Payment

[5] Sufficiency of Notice of Claim

§ 481.133 Attorney General Opinions

§ 481.134 Law Reviews

§ 481.135 Text References

§§ 481.136-481.149 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.150 Scope of Checklist

§§ 481.151-481.169 [Reserved]

§ 481.170 When Notice Is Required

§ 481.171 Preparation of Notice

§ 481.172 Time of Service

§ 481.173 Place and Manner of Service

§ 481.174 Effect of Giving Preliminary Notice

§§ 481.175-481.189 [Reserved]

§ 481.190 Preparation

§ 481.191 Service

§ 481.192 Effect

§§ 481.193-481.209 [Reserved]

§ 481.210 When Bond May Be Filed

§ 481.211 Who May File

§ 481.212 Amount of Bond

§ 481.213 Condition of Bond

§ 481.214 With Whom Filed

§ 481.215 Release of Withheld Funds

§ 481.216 Liability Under Bond

§§ 481.217-481.229 [Reserved]

§ 481.230 Preparation of Affidavit

§ 481.231 Service of Affidavit on Public Entity

§ 481.232 Service of Affidavit and Notice on Claimant

§ 481.233 Release of Money or Bonds Withheld

§§ 481.234-481.249 [Reserved]

§ 481.250 Preparation of Complaint or Petition

§ 481.251 Filing of Complaint or Petition

§ 481.252 Service of Complaint or Petition

§ 481.253 Hearing

§§ 481.254-481.269 [Reserved]

§ 481.270 Commencement of Time to File Action to Enforce

§ 481.271 Expiration of Time to File Action to Enforce

§ 481.272 Jurisdiction

§ 481.273 Venue

§ 481.274 Notice

§ 481.275 Claimants' Right to Join in Pending Action

§ 481.276 Consolidation of Actions

§ 481.277 Dismissal

§§ 481.278-481.289 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.290 Scope of Checklist

§ 481.291 Service of Post-Completion Bond Notice (Public Works)

§ 481.292 Time Limitations

§ 481.293 Preparation of Complaint

§ 481.294 Venue

§§ 481.295-481.309 [Reserved]

§ 481.310 Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verifications

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Venue

[6] Pleading Presentation of Claim to Public Entity

[7] Statute of Limitations

[8] Cross References

§ 481.311 Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract for Construction of Retaining Wall--Breach of Warranty and Fraudulent Concealment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contract Liability for Fraudulent Concealment

[4] Decisions

§ 481.312 Complaint by Contractor Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 481.313 Complaint by Subcontractor Against General Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 481.314 Complaint Against Public Entity for Cancellation of Erroneous Bid and Forfeiture of a Bid Bond [Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)]--By Contractor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

§ 481.315 Complaint for Damages--By Subcontractor Listed in General Contractor's Original Bid Against General Contractor--Original Contractor's Breach of Duty Not to Substitute Another Subcontractor for Listed Subcontractor Without Proper Consent of Public Entity [Pub. Contract Code § 4107]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Action for Damages Against Prime Contractor

[4] Decisions

§§ 481.316-481.329 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.330 Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work) [Civ. Code § 3098]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Notice

[4] Disciplinary Action Against Licensed Contractor Failing to Give Notice

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 481.331 Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Notice

[4] Claims Covered

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 481.332 Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]--California Department of Transportation Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 481.333 Release of Stop Notice

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 481.334 Release of Stop Notice--California Department of Transportation Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 481.335 Declaration [or Certificate] Under Penalty of Perjury by Original Contractor That Amount Withheld Under Stop Notice Is Improperly Withheld--And Demand for Release [Civ. Code § 3198]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

[5] Cross References

§ 481.336 Notice to Claimant of Filing of Contractor's Affidavit [Civ. Code § 3199]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Text References

[4] Cross References

§ 481.337 Complaint [or Petition] by Original Contractor for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

§ 481.338 Notice of Order Granting Hearing and of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Motion for Hearing

[4] Text References

[5] Cross References

§ 481.339 Notice of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 481.340 Notice of Motion and Motion for Order for Hearing to Determine Rights Under Complaint for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 481.341 Order Determining Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3203]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Right to Jury Trial

[4] Res Judicata

[5] Service of Order on Public Entity

[6] Text References

§ 481.342 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Written Contract--And to Enforce Payment of Claim in Stop Notice [Civ. Code § 3210]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time of Commencement

[4] Notice of Action

[5] Joinder With Other Actions

[6] Prior Claims Against Public Entity Not Required

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[9] Text References

[10] Cross References

§ 481.343 Notice of Commencement of Action on Stop Notice Claim [Civ. Code § 3211]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

[5] Cross References

§ 481.344 Complaint in Interpleader--By Public Entity When Total Amount Claimed in Stop Notices Exceeds Amount Withheld

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

[5] Cross References

§§ 481.345-481.359 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 481.360 Post-Completion Bond Notice (Public Works) [Civ. Code §§ 3227, 3252(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Form

[4] State Statutes

§ 481.361 Complaint Against Original Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Joinder of Contractor and Surety

[4] Joinder of Stop Notice Action

[5] State Statutes

[6] Text References

[7] Cross References

§ 481.362 Complaint Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Subcontractor's Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART I. SCOPE

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.01

§ 481.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms for use in actions on public works contracts and the subcontracts thereunder. It includes forms of complaints for use in action by prime contractors on public works projects against a public entity [*see §§ 481.310, 481.311*] and against a subcontractor [*see § 481.312*] and a form of complaint by a subcontractor against a prime contractor on a public works project [*see § 481.313*]. It also includes a form of complaint by a contractor against a public entity for relief from an erroneous bid [*see § 481.314*] and a form of complaint by a subcontractor against a contractor [*see § 481.315*] for violation of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Gov. Code § 4100 et seq.*].

This chapter also discusses and contains forms relating to the withholding of payment on public works contracts as well as containing a procedural checklist for enforcement of claims stated in stop notices. It includes the following:

- Forms of notice by a claimant [*see §§ 481.330 -481.332*].
- Forms of releases of stop notices [*see §§ 481.333, 481.334*].
- Forms to contest the amount withheld [*see §§ 481.335 -481.341*].
- Forms for enforcing rights arising from a stop notice [*see §§ 481.342, 481.343*].
- A form for use by a public entity for the purpose of interpleader [*see § 481.344*].

This chapter also discusses payment bonds and contains forms of complaint [*see §§ 481.360, 481.361*] for use in an action on a payment bond.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesInterpleadersGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic

Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionSubcontractorsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART I. SCOPE

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.02

§ 481.02 Cross References

For discussion of building contracts generally and a form of complaint by a contractor against a municipality for breach of a building contract, a form of complaint by a contractor against a public entity for damages for breach of contract, negligence, and fraud and injunctive relief restraining expenditure of moneys from a construction fund, and a form of complaint by a subcontractor against the original contractor for breach of building contract for extras with joinder of a municipality withholding payment from the original contractor, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For a discussion, procedures, and forms of claims against public entities, see Ch. 467, *Public Entities and Officers: Enforcement of Judgments Against Public Entities* .

For a discussion and forms for use in stop notice proceedings involving private works of improvement, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions on payment bonds for private works, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

For discussion and forms relating to a surety's right to subrogation, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions against sureties on bonds, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionSubcontractorsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawTerminationsDamagesPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART I. SCOPE

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.03-481.09

[Reserved]

§§ 481.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.10

§ 481.10 Governing Law

[1] Construction of Public Contracts

Generally, there are no special rules of law governing the interpretation or effect of public contracts simply because a governmental body is a party to the contract [*M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 704, 235 P.2d 7]* . Thus, a contract between a governmental body and a private individual is ordinarily subject to the same rules of construction as is a contract between private individuals [*Hawley v. Orange County Flood Control Dist. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 708, 713, 27 Cal. Rptr. 478* ; *Oberg v. Los Angeles (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 151, 158, 281 P.2d 591]* . For a discussion of these rules of construction, see generally Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* , and Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Rules Governing Incorporation of Plans and Specifications

Usually, a contract between a public entity and a private individual incorporates by reference the plans and specifications for the public project to be constructed which were adopted by the public entity. In such a case, the contract will be construed with respect to the plans and specifications incorporated by reference since effect must be given to a writing incorporated into the contract by reference. However, a plan of work is subsidiary to the contract, and the latter is controlling in the case of discrepancy. Where the language of the contract permits, the specifications will be construed so as to uphold the validity of the contract [*Oberg v. Los Angeles (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 151, 159, 281 P.2d 591]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawContract InterpretationSpecificationsPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.11

§ 481.11 Competitive Bidding Requirements

[1] Statutory Schemes

Although, as discussed in *§ 481.10[1]*, a contract between a governmental body and a private individual is ordinarily subject to the same rules of construction as is a contract between private individuals, the execution or letting of a public works contract is normally subject to statutory or regulatory competitive bidding requirements. A large, separate body of statutory, regulatory, and decisional law governs the application of these requirements.

There are several statutory schemes governing competitive bidding in California, depending on the particular public entity involved in letting the public works contract in question. The State Contract Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 10100 et seq.*] generally governs contracts let by (1) the state Department of Water Resources as to any project under the jurisdiction of that department, (2) the state Department of General Services as to any project under the jurisdiction of that department, (3) the Department of Boating and Waterways as to any project under the jurisdiction of that department pursuant to *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 65-67.3* (beach erosion control), and (4) the state Department of Transportation as to all other projects [*Pub. Contract Code § 10106 et seq.*].

Statutory competitive bidding requirements for county governments are governed by *Pub. Contract Code § 20121 et seq.* Such requirements for city governments are governed by *Pub. Contract Code § 20160 et seq.*

Competitive bidding requirements for contracts let by the Regents of the University of California are governed by *Pub. Contract Code § 10500 et seq.*, while such requirements for contracts let by the trustees of the California State University are governed by *Pub. Contract Code § 10700 et seq.*

Contracts for the construction of certain public projects let under particular acts or under the authority of particular districts normally must comply with competitive bidding requirements [*see, e.g., Pub. Contract Code §§ 20482* (contract under Municipal Improvement Act of 1913), 20601 (contracts let by county waterworks districts)].

In addition, the Small Business Procurement and Contract Act (*Gov. Code § 14836 et seq.*) establishes a preference for

small businesses in construction work on state facilities or procurement of goods, when responsibility and quality are equal. Civil penalties are provided for specific prohibited acts including making false statements for the purpose of obtaining certification as a small business enterprise [*Gov. Code §§ 14842, 14842.5*]. Similarly the Department of Transportation is charged to develop a program for the awarding of highway construction contracts funded solely by state funds to minority businesses; and civil penalties are provided for specified acts including attempts to obtain certification as a minority business enterprise on the basis of false information [*Sts. & Hy. Code §§ 94.3, 94.4*].

Although there are a number of variations among the statutory schemes concerning the specific requirements for letting public works contracts, for the most part these schemes contain similar provisions with respect to the most important features of the competitive bidding requirements. The discussion of competitive bidding requirements, *below*, is an outline of the general law governing these features. When appropriate, specific reference is made to the State Contract Act for typical provisions that illustrate these features.

A request for public bids must be sufficiently detailed, definite, and precise so as to provide a basis for full and fair competitive bidding on a common standard; in addition, the request must be free of any restrictionstending to stifle competition [*Konica Business Machines v. Regents of University of California (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 449, 456, 253 Cal. Rptr. 591]* .

[2] Outreach Programs

Proposition 209, approved by the voters on November 5, 1996, added *§ 31 to article I of the California Constitution* . *Section 31* provides in part: "The State shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting" [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 31(a)*]. It defines the "State" to include the State itself, any city, county, city and county, public university system, including the University of California, community college district, school district, special district, or any other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 31(f)*].

Proposition 209 was held to bar an "outreach program" that required contractors bidding on city projects to use a specified percentage of minority and women subcontractors or to document efforts to include minority and women subcontractors in their bids [*Hi-Voltage Wire Works, Inc. v. City of San Jose (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 537, 562,101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653, 12 P.3d 1068]* . Because the city rejected any bid that failed to comply with these race and sex based requirements, the essential structure of the program discriminated on an impermissible basis against prime contractors that neither engaged in outreach nor met the evidentiary presumption, and it granted preferential treatment to those that did [*Hi-Voltage Wire Works, Inc. v. City of San Jose (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 537, 562,101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653, 12 P.3d 1068]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBusiness Aids & AssistanceMinority, Women-Owned & Disadvantaged BusinessesMinority-Owned BusinessesPublic Contracts LawBusiness Aids & AssistanceSmall BusinessesPublic Contracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.12

§ 481.12 Purpose of Competitive Bidding Requirements

The competitive bidding requirement is founded on the salutary public policy declared by the Legislature to protect the taxpayers from fraud, corruption, and carelessness on the part of public officials and the waste and dissipation of public funds [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 88, 124 P.2d 34]* . Thus, the competitive bidding statutes are intended to be for the benefit and protection of the public and not the bidders [*Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 152, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.13

§ 481.13 Solicitation of Bids

A public entity must normally solicit bids for a public project in compliance with competitive bidding requirements when the total cost of the project exceeds a certain defined amount and the project itself comes within the terms of the particular statute or provision that defines those public projects subject to the competitive bidding requirements.

Under the State Contract Act, "project" includes the erection, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any state structure, building, road, or other state improvement of any kind the total cost of which will exceed a total cost of $250,000 for calendar year 2010, and thereafter be subject to a formula adjustment at two-year intervals [*Pub. Contract Code § 10105*]. If the estimated total cost of any construction project or work exceeds $25,000, the district or agency must solicit bids in writing and award the work to the lowest responsible bidder. Alternatively, work in excess of $25,000 may be carried out by day labor if it is determined that the award of a contract, acceptance of bids, or acceptance of further bids is not in the state's best interests [*Pub. Contract Code § 10108*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsInvitations for Bids

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.14

§ 481.14 Statutory Exceptions to Bidding Requirements

[1] Interests of Public Entity Not Furthered by Bidding

A public entity usually has the statutory right or reserves the right to have a public project performed by day's labor under the public entity's supervision, or by contract on informal bids, or by a combination thereof [*see Pub. Contract Code § 10122* (State Contract Act)], if compliance with the competitive bidding requirements is not deemed to be in the best interests of the public entity or the public. Although often such a right may be exercised by the public entity only after the public entity has solicited bids for the public project in question [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20167* (municipalities)], under the State Contract Act, such a right may be exercised at any time after the approval of plans, specifications, and estimates of cost [*see Pub. Contract Code § 10122(d)*].

[2] Emergency

Work may be done on a public works project by day labor, by contract on informal bids, or by a combination of both in the case of emergency, such as an act of God (e.g., storm, flood, fire, earthquake), for immediately required work and remedial measures [*see Pub. Contract Code §§ 10122, 20168*; *see also Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 356, 291 P. 839* (defining "emergency")].

Notwithstanding the project cost limits of *Pub. Contract Code § 10105* ($250,000 in 2010 and adjusted on a formula in subsequent years), work in excess of $25,000 that would otherwise constitute a project is not permitted to be done by day labor unless the requirements of *Pub. Contract Code § 10122* are met [*Pub. Contract Code § 10122.6*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationCompetitive ProposalsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.15

§ 481.15 Judicial Exceptions to Bidding Requirements

[1] Failure Generally to Serve Purposes of Bidding Statutes

As noted by the cases in *§ 481.91[4]*, ordinarily a public agency must comply with the terms of a statute which requires the letting of certain contracts by a public agency and the advertising for bids with respect to those contracts coming within the terms of the statutes [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 87-88, 124 P.2d 34* ; *see Killeen v. San Bruno (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 479, 483, 128 Cal. Rptr. 760]* . However, even though a statute may require competitive bidding in the case of a particular contract, the public agency may make a contract without complying with the statute if there is a necessarily implied exception to the competitive bidding requirements [*see Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 354-356, 291 P. 839]* . These exceptions are set forth below. It should be noted that courts appear to construe strictly the right of a public agency to contract for the construction of a public work without complying with competitive bidding requirements in the absence of statutory exception. Generally, the creation of a judicial exception to a competitive bidding requirement is considered improper since it is an infringement on the prerogative of the Legislature, which has created the existing exceptions to such requirements [*Killeen v. San Bruno (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 479, 483, 128 Cal. Rptr. 760]* .

An exception to the competitive bidding requirement for a particular contract may arise when the purposes of the requirement are not served by such bidding. Thus, competitive bidding statutes, which are founded on a public policy designed to protect taxpayers from fraud, corruption, and carelessness on the part of public officials and from the waste and dissipation of public funds, are not to have such a construction as to defeat this purpose, to impede the usual and regular progress of the public business, or to deprive the inhabitants, even temporarily, of those things necessary and indispensable to their subsistence, their health, or the security and protection of their persons or property [*Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 354, 291 P. 839]* .

[2] No Exception

If to exempt a public agency from statutory competitive bidding requirements would permit possible favoritism, fraud, or corruption in the letting of other public construction contracts, even though the particular contract may appear to come within one of the judicial exceptions to the competitive bidding requirements, the public agency will be required

to comply with such requirements [*see Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 866, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601]* . For example, a management contractor who is hired to perform services and lend his or her experience and expertise in the preparation of the final plans for a public project, and who in that respect may be likened to an engineer or an architect whose service may be procured without strict compliance with competitive bidding requirements [*see § 481.91[6][b]*], may still be required to be employed through the competitive bidding process if his or her duties and obligations, such as a guarantee of the outside price for the final plans based on subcontract bids, are more closely akin to the traditional lump sum general construction contracting where the contractors enter the project process on the completion of working drawings [*see Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 866, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601]* .

[3] Undesirability or Impossibility of Advertising for Bids

A public agency is not required to comply with competitive bidding requirements for a particular project if it is undesirable or impossible to advertise for bids for the work. This exception applies if the nature of the contracts to be let require the services of the particular person or company with whom or with which the public agency desires to contract [*see Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 355, 291 P. 839* (municipality permitted to contract with general contractor without complying with ordinance requiring competitive bidding if, because of nature of work contractor was already doing, contractor was only one who could enter into agreement with city); *Riverside County v. Whitlock (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 863, 877-878, 99 Cal. Rptr. 710* (municipality permitted to contract with utility for construction of gas distribution system without complying with competitive bidding requirements of *Sts. & Hy. Code § 10501* of Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 when utility had been issued certificate to provide natural gas service to area in question)].

[4] Undeveloped State of Art

If the type of work planned by the public agency has not developed sufficiently to enable the agency to have a reasonable basis for comparison between or among the offered contracts in question, the agency is not required to comply with the competitive bidding requirements since under such circumstances advertising for bids would be unnecessary [*Hodgeman v. San Diego (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 610, 618, 128 P.2d 412]* .

[5] Employment of Skilled Professionals

A public agency may employ a person who is highly and technically skilled in his or her science or profession without complying with an otherwise applicable competitive bidding statute [*City & County of San Francisco v. Boyd (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 606, 620, 110 P.2d 1036]* . For example, an architect is considered an artist whose work requires taste, skill, and technical learning and ability of a rare kind, and a public agency is not required to advertise and obtain several bids in connection with contracting for theservices of an architect when the lowest bidder might be also the least capable and most inexperienced [*Cobb v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 93, 95, 285 P.2d 41]* . This exception also applies (1) to a civil engineer who is hired to advise a municipality concerning its traffic and transit problems [*see City & County of San Francisco v. Boyd (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 606, 620, 110 P.2d 1036]* , (2) to a nonprofit corporation that is employed to plan, operate, and maintain a city zoo [*see Hiller v. Los Angeles (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 685, 694, 17 Cal. Rptr. 579]* , and (3) to actors and musicians who are employed to present a play in a municipal park [*see Adams v. Ziegler (1937) 22 Cal. App. 2d 135, 137-138, 70 P.2d 537]* .

[6] Lack of Advantage in Complying With Bidding Requirements

When the nature of the improvements to be constructed or services to be provided are such that competitive proposals would not produce an advantage, statutes requiring competitive bidding do not apply [*Riverside County v. Whitlock (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 863, 877-878, 99 Cal. Rptr. 710* (contracts based on rates and charges for construction of natural gas service facilities governed by rate schedule approved by Public Utilities Commission do not require city to entertain competitive bids); *California Motor Express, Ltd. v. Chowchilla Union High School Dist. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d*

314, 318-319, 20 Cal. Rptr. 768 (competitive bidding requirements of Educ. Code § 18051 for school districts are not applicable to contract whose rates are fixed and made uniform by Interstate Commerce Commission)].

[7] Contracts Relating to "Municipal Affairs" of Charter Cities

When an expenditure by a general law city [*see Gov. Code § 34102*] for a public project, as defined in *Pub. Contract Code § 20161*, exceeds the amount specified in *Pub. Contract Code § 20162*, it must be contracted for and let to the lowest responsible bidder [*Pub. Contract Code § 20162*]. However, a charter city is not subject to this statute with respect to a public project which relates to a matter constituting a "municipal affair" [*Smith v. Riverside (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 529, 534-535, 110 Cal. Rptr. 67]* . Whatever may be the subject matter of a municipal contract, the mode in which a city chooses to contract is a municipal affair. Since there is neither a pervasive state policy regarding what contracts must be let by competitive bidding nor any substantial outside pressure with respect to a local decision on this matter, a charter city is not required to comply with competitive bidding requirements in the absence of any restrictions and limitations otherwise contained in its charter [*Smith v. Riverside (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 529, 534-537, 110 Cal. Rptr. 67* (holding that whether work for extension or development of city public utilities facilities will be done by contract on competitive bidding or by city forces is municipal affair)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsChartersGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction ContractsPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLocal Contracts Generally

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.16

§ 481.16 Failure to Comply With Competitive Bidding Requirements

[1] Contract Is Void

Generally, a contract wholly beyond the power of a public entity is void. It cannot be ratified; no estoppel to deny its validity can be invoked against the public entity; and ordinarily no recovery in quasi contract can be had for work performed under it. Moreover, generally the mode of contract for a public entity is the measure of the power to contract. A contract made in disregard of the prescribed mode is unenforceable [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 88, 124 P.2d 34]* . Thus, ordinarily, compliance with the terms of a statute requiring the letting of certain contracts by a public agency, such as a municipal corporation or a county, by competitive bidding and the advertising for bids is mandatory with respect to those contracts coming within the terms of the statute; a contract made without compliance with the statute is void and unenforceable as being in excess of the agency's power [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 87-88, 124 P.2d 34]* . Furthermore, persons dealing with the public agency are presumed to know the law with regard to the requirement of competitive bidding and act at their peril [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 89, 124 P.2d 34]* .

[2] No Estoppel Is Permitted to Be Invoked Against Public Entity

Although it is true that in some exceptional cases or situations where justice and right require it, a governmental body may be bound by estoppel, neither the doctrine of estoppel nor any other equitable principle may be invoked against a governmental body where it would operate to defeat the effective operation of the competitive bidding statutes which were adopted to protect the public [*Paterson v. Board of Trustees (1958) 321 P.2d 825]* . Thus, a court may not, by the application of the doctrine of estoppel, abrogate a bidding statute and make a new contract between the parties where in effect the court would create and enforce an illegal contract. For example, a subsequent promise by a public entity to pay more than the contract price that was not awarded in compliance with competitive bidding requirements may not be enforced, even though the elements of estoppel may be otherwise present, since to permit enforcement of the promise would completely disregard the salutary provisions of the bidding statutes and would afford a method by which the public entity and persons dealing with it could evade the law [*Paterson v. Board of Trustees (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 811, 820, 321 P.2d 825]* .

[3] No Recovery in Quantum Meruit Is Permitted

The fact that a public district or body has received the benefit of labor and materials furnished under a contract that is void by reason of the failure of the district or body to comply with applicable competitive biddingstatutes, does not entitle a contractor who has furnished the labor and materials to recover their reasonable value in an action in quantum meruit [*Reams v. Cooley (1915) 171 Cal. 150, 151-157, 152 P. 293]* . Although this may work a hardship on the contractor, the contractor is bound no less than the public entity to be sure that the competitive bidding requirements are complied with. When the contractor neglects this or chooses to take the hazard, the contractor is considered to be a mere volunteer and suffers only what he or she ought to have anticipated [*Reams v. Cooley (1915) 171 Cal. 150, 157, 152 P. 293]* .

Moreover, not only may the contractor not recover the reasonable value of labor and materials furnished to a public entity under a void contract, but a right of action exists to recover any funds paid to the contractor for labor and materials furnished the entity in contravention of a statute requiring competitive bidding. Such an action may be prosecuted by the public entity or by a taxpayer since the taxpayer would otherwise be helpless to compel observance of the law if the public agency could have the work done and pay the charges therefor in violation of the competitive bidding requirement [*Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 89, 124 P.2d 34]* .

[4] Appellate Court's Duty to Protect Public Entity

The fact that neither the public entity nor the contractor argued the propriety of the public entity having paid anything to the contractor in violation of a competitive bidding requirement does not preclude an appellate court from raising the issue on its own motion. The principle that precludes recovery for work done without compliance with the competitive bidding requirement and requires return to the public entity of payments made on an invalid contract also requires an appellate court to exercise its duty, on its own, if necessary, to protect the public entity [*Greer v. Hitchcock (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 334, 337, 76 Cal. Rptr. 376* (requesting parties to brief right of contractor to retain payments made by public entity, but holding that such payments were made pursuant to valid contract)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefQuantum MeruitPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationAgency & Authority of Government OfficersActual AuthorityPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationImplied ContractsImplied-in-Law ContractsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsBid Responsiveness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.17

§ 481.17 Submission of Bid

The procedure for submitting bids to a public entity is usually governed by statute or regulation. Under the State Contract Act, the contractor must use a standard proposal form as his or her bid. Otherwise the bid is disregarded [*Pub. Contract Code § 10166*]. Most public entities require that the bid be accompanied by some form of bidder's security. Under the State Contract Act, such security may be cash, a cashier's check, a certified check, or a bidder's bond [*Pub. Contract Code § 10167*]. Bidder's security must also be provided for local agency projects under the Local Agency Public Construction Act [*see, e.g., Pub. Contract Code §§ 20107, 20192(b), 20201.5*].

The bidder is also required to submit a noncollusion affidavit with his or her bid. The affidavit, which must be in the form set forth by *Pub. Contract Code § 7106*, generally provides (1) that the bidder is not making the bid in the interest or on behalf of any undisclosed person; (2) that the bid is genuine and not a sham; (3) that the bidder has not induced or conspired with another person to put in a false or sham bid or that anyone would refrain from submitting a bid; (4) that the bidder has not sought with anyone to fix a bid price or to secure any advantage against the public body awarding the contract of anyone interested in the proposed contract; (5) that all statements in the bid are true; and (6) that the bidder has not submitted his or her bid to effectuate a collusive or sham bid [*see Pub. Contract Code § 7106*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.18

§ 481.18 Withdrawal of Bid

In the absence of any applicable statute or regulation, a bid may be withdrawn at any time before it is opened and declared. Once opened and declared, the contractor's bid is in the nature of an irrevocable option giving the public entity a contract right [*M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 700, 235 P.2d 7]* . Under the State Contract Act, any bid may be withdrawn at any time before the time fixed in the public notice for the opening of bids only by written request for the withdrawal of the bid made in the manner provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 10169* [*see Pub. Contract Code § 10169*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationAgency & Authority of Government OfficersActual AuthorityPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsCancellationPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.19

§ 481.19 Consideration of Bids by Awarding Authority

[1] Rejection of Bids Not in Best Interests of Public

The competitive bidding statutes are not intended to be for the benefit of bidders, but for the benefit and protection of the public [*Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 152, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Rubino v. Lolli (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1062, 89 Cal. Rptr. 320]* .

Hence, the call for bids and the law confer on the awarding authority the duty of exercising its judgment as to whether it is in the best interests of the public entity to award the contract in question to the lowest bidder [*Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 816-817, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Judson Pac.-Murphy Corp. v. Durkee (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 377, 381-382, 301 P.2d 97]* . In this respect, the State Contract Act provides that, if the director deems the acceptance of the lowest responsible bid or bids is not in the best interests of the state, after stating his or her reasons for rejecting the bid or bids, he or she may reject all bids and proceed by day's labor or advertise for other bids in the manner required by the Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 10185*].

Consequently, the lowest qualified bidder generally has no legal right to compel acceptance of his or her bid [*Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 816-817, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Judson Pac.-Murphy Corp. v. Durkee (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 377, 381-382, 301 P.2d 97]* . By reserving authority to reject any and all proposals by virtue of a statute or bid proposal, the public entity's exercise of discretion is absolute. Even if it errs in the exercise of its discretion, the unsuccessful bidder has no legally cognizable cause for complaint [*Old Town Dev. Corp. v. Urban Renewal Agency (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 313, 331, 57 Cal. Rptr. 426]* . Stated differently, a court may not interfere with the public entity's discretionary authority by substituting its judgment for that of the public entity. The public entity is the final arbiter of the public interest and its decision, however capricious or erroneous, cannot be set aside [*Stanley-Taylor Co. v. Supervisors (1902) 135 Cal. 486, 488, 67 P. 783* (holding that mandamus does not lie to force award of contract to lowest bidder for printing forms under advertisement for bids where advertisement stated that board reserved right to reject any and all bids if the public good so required)].

[2] Relief of Unsuccessful Bidder

[a] Setting Aside of Bid Award, Generally

Although generally the lowest qualified bidder has no legal right to compel the acceptance of his or her bid and the awarding authority's decision is not subject to review, when an award is made in violation of the law, such as when an award is made to a bidder who is not properly qualified or licensed, or made pursuant to specifications that are illegal and invalid and that fail to provide for full and fair competitive bidding, the public entity has abused its discretion and the bidding procedure may be set aside [*Konica Business Machines v. Regents of University of California (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 449, 453-457, 253 Cal. Rptr. 591* (setting aside contract that had been awarded to bidder who did not comply with specifications in public entity's request for bids); *Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 823, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798* (under *Gov. Code § 4303*, contracts for construction of public works or purchase of materials for public use must be let to persons who use raw and manufactured products of the United States as superseded by treaty agreements with foreign governments); *Judson Pac.-Murphy Corp. v. Durkee (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 377, 382-383, 301 P.2d 97* (not upsetting awarding authority's decision when lack of license was deemed in particular case to be technical violation)]. A court has the power to determine whether an abuse of discretion exists in such a case in a mandate proceeding. The unsuccessful bidder is entitled to apply for a writ of mandate as a party beneficially interested when, as a result of the issuance of the writ, a new bid call must be made and the unsuccessful bidder would have the opportunity to bid on the new bid invitation [*Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 824, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798]* .

However, if the award is set aside but the unsuccessful bidder would have no greater opportunity to bid on a competitive basis than he or she had in bidding on the original proposal, mandamus will not lie to correct any abuse of discretion by the awarding authority. For example, if, when the award is set aside, the awarding authority either is under no legal compulsion to award a new contract in compliance with competitive bidding requirements or may alter its specifications in such a manner as to insure that the contract will be awarded to the original successful bidder, the unsuccessful bidder may not have the original award set aside [*Old Town Dev. Corp. v. Urban Renewal Agency (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 313, 331-332, 57 Cal. Rptr. 426* ; *see Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 151-157, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

Similarly, an unsuccessful bidder may not sue the public entity for damages either for fraud or for breach of contract arising out of an award of a contract allegedly illegally made to one other than the lowest qualified bidder when the public entity is under no compulsion to award the contract to any particular bidder. Although an unsuccessful bidder in such a case may have a cause of action for fraud if he or she alleges that the awarding authority impliedly represented in its bid invitation that it would consider the bids in good faith and not merely to gain the benefit of such bidder's research and expertise, which representation was false in that the authority never intended to consider the bids in determining whether the contract in question should be awarded, the public entity is immune from any liability since it is not liable for an injury caused by any misrepresentation by an employee of the public entity [*see Gov. Code § 818.8*; *Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 151-155, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525* (holding that under *Gov. Code § 818.8*, public entity is immune from liability for alleged misrepresentations by its employees)]. With respect to an action for damages arising out of breach of contract, because there is no contractural relationship between the bidder and the entity until a bid is accepted, no action may be predicated on the proposition that the arbitrary exercise of the entity's discretion breached an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing since such a covenant exists only if there is an express contract [*Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 155-156, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Finally, no contract action may be predicated on liability based on promissory estoppel. Although the public entity may impliedly represent an existing intent to consider the bids in good faith, this representation does not constitute a promise that thereafter it would consider the bids before rejecting them. Such a promise, necessary for any liability based on promissory estoppel, is inconsistent with the public entity's express right to reject any and all bids [*Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 156-157, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

[b] Successful Bidder's Labor Law Violations

In certain circumstances, the second lowest qualified and responsible bidder on a public works contract (or any person that entered into a contract with the second lowest bidder before the letting of the bids on the public works contract) may have a right of action against the successful bidder, pursuant to both the Labor Code [*see Lab. Code § 1750*] and the Public Contract Code [*see Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102, 20104.70*]. If the successful bidder has been convicted of a violation of the workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.*] or the Unemployment Insurance Code, there is a rebuttable presumption that the accepted bid was lower than the second lowest bid because of such a violation [*Lab. Code § 1750(a)(2)*; *Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102(a)(2), 20104.70(a)(2)*]. The second lowest bidder (or a contractor with the second lowest bidder) may bring an action for damages based on that presumption [*see Lab. Code § 1750(a)(1)*; *Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102(a)(1), 20104.70(a)(1)*]. If the second lowest bidder was convicted of a violation of either or both of those laws within one year before submission of the second lowest bid, however, the second lowest bidder has no such right of action unless affirmative steps were taken to correct the violation [*Lab. Code § 1750(f)*; *Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102(d), 20104.70(d)*].

The court may award costs and attorney's fees to the prevailing party in the action [*Lab. Code § 1750(c)*; *Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102(b), 20104.70(b)*].

[3] Duty to Award Contract to Lowest Responsible Bidder

[a] General Rule

Although the public entity normally reserves the right to reject any and all bids if the public interest so requires, when the entity makes an award, it must normally make the award to the lowest responsible bidder [*Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 867, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601* ; *see Pub. Contract Code § 10180* (requiring department under State Contract Act to award contract to lowest responsible bidder)]. Thus, under a statute or other applicable provision requiring the contract to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, the contract must be awarded to the lowest bidder unless it is found that he or she is not responsible, that is, is not qualified to do the particular work under consideration. The awarding authority does not make this finding if it determines that a bidder other than the lowest bidder was superior to the lowest bidder in its ability to perform the contract and yet does not determine whether the lowest bidder was also qualified to perform the contract. In such a case, an award to a bidder other than the lowest bidder may be set aside [*Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 867-870, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601]* . In making the determination of whether the lowest bidder is responsible, the awarding authority is not limited to determining whether the bidder is trustworthy. Rather, while that term "responsible" includes the attribute of trustworthiness, it also has reference to the quality, fitness, and capacity of the low bidder to perform the proposed work satisfactorily [*Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 867, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601* (based on wording of former *Gov. Code § 25454, now see Pub. Contract Code § 20128*, requiring county board of supervisors to award contract to lowest responsible bidder); *see Pub. Contract Code § 2000* (local agency may require that contract be awarded to lowest responsible bidder engaging in minority hiring)].

The duty to award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder imposed by a city charter did not conflict with a subcontractor outreach program that required prime contractors to provide minority, women's, and other business enterprises an equal opportunity to compete for and participate in the performance of city contracts. Noting that competitive bidding requirements necessarily imply equal opportunities to all whose interests or inclinations may impel them to compete at the bidding, the California Supreme Court found that, in fact, a major purpose of the subcontractor outreach program being challenged was to guard against favoritism and improvidence by prime contractors thereby advancing a primary goal of competitive bidding [*Domar Electric, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1994) 9 Cal. 4th 161, 173-174, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521, 885 P.2d 934]* .

However, minimum bidding laws must be strictly construed, and may not be extended beyond the specific provisions enacted by the Legislature [*Domar Electric, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1994) 9 Cal. 4th 161, 173, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d*

521, 885 P.2d 934] . For example, because the Legislature has not enacted an explicit requirement that public funds raised through the sale of revenue bonds under the authority of the Revenue Bond Law of 1941 [*Gov. Code § 54300 et seq.*], and entrusted to county water districts, are subject to a lowest bidder requirement, the courts are precluded from imposing such a requirement [*Associated Builders & Contractors v. Contra Costa Water Dist. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 466, 469-471, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 600]* .

[b] Bid Deviating From Specifications

When a public entity's request for bids states that the requested goods or services are required to meet certain specifications, the public entity may not award the contract to a bidder whose bid deviates from the specifications if other bids do conform to the specifications [*see Konica Business Machines v. Regents of University ofCalifornia (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 449, 454-457, 253 Cal. Rptr. 591* (setting aside contract that was awarded on nonconforming bid)]. A bid substantially complying with specifications, however, may be acceptable when the variance could not have affected the amount of the bid or given the bidder a benefit or advantage not allowed to other bidders [Konica Business Machines v. Regents of University ofCalifornia *(1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 449, 454, 253 Cal. Rptr. 591* ; *see Ghilotti Construction Co. v. City of Richmond (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 897, 904-909, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 389]* .

[c] Right to Notice of Reasons for Rejection of Local Bidder

Before awarding a public works contract to one other than the lowest bidder, a public entity must (1) notify the low monetary bidder of any evidence reflecting on his or her responsibility received from others or adduced as a result of independent investigation, (2) afford the bidder an opportunity to rebut the adverse evidence, and (3) permit him or her to present evidence that he or she is qualified to perform the contract. The lowest bidder does not, however, have a right to a full evidentiary hearing in the form of a quasi-judicial proceeding before his or her rejection as a nonresponsible bidder [*Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 870-871, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601]* .

[d] Damages Recoverable on Misaward by Public Entity

The misaward by a public entity of a public works contract to one other than the lowest responsible bidder does not give the latter a cause of action in tort for monetary damages against the public entity. Since the competitive bidding requirements are imposed solely for the benefit and protection of the public rather than for the benefit of the bidders, the misaward constitutes only an abuse of discretion by the awarding entity in determining the identity of the bidder, and therefore the making of the misaward comes within the discretionary immunity to tort liability established by *Gov. Code §§ 815, 815.2(b)*, and *820.2* [*Swinerton & Walberg Co. v. City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 98, 101, 114 Cal. Rptr. 834]* .

However, the unsuccessful bidder does have a cause of action in contract based on promissory estoppel since the public entity in its solicitation of bids promises to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder and the lowest bidder has reasonably relied on this promise by expending sums in the preparation of its bid to its detriment. The fact that the lowest bidder could not have compelled the public entity to award the contract to him or her because of a provision in the notice soliciting bids that any and all bids might be rejected does not affect the reasonableness of the bidder's reliance since otherwise the public entity's promise to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder would be an illusory one and would render the whole competitive bidding promise nugatory [*Swinerton & Walberg Co. v. City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 98, 104, 114 Cal. Rptr. 834]* . Allowing recovery of some measure of damages once injunctive relief is no longer effectively available furthers the purposes of the competitive bidding laws by encouraging proper challenges to misawarded public contracts by the most interested parties, and deterring government misconduct [*Kajima/Ray Wilson v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Auth. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 305, 314, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747, 1 P.3d 63]* .

An unsuccessful lowest responsible bidder may recover bid preparation costs under a theory of promissory estoppel but may not recover lost profits [*Kajima/Ray Wilson v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Auth. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 305, 314, 317-318, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747, 1 P.3d 63]* . A bidder reasonably incurs bid preparation costs in reliance on the representation that if the contract is awarded, it will be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. However, when a bid is submitted, the bidder does not know whether the contract will even be awarded or whether it will be the lowest responsible bidder. Furthermore, the lowest bid may be an unprofitable one. Given these uncertainties, bid preparation costs, not lost profits, are the only costs reasonably incurred [*Kajima/Ray Wilson v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Auth. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 305, 315-316, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747, 1 P.3d 63]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawConsiderationPromissory EstoppelPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationAgency & Authority of Government OfficersActual AuthorityPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsInvitations for BidsPublic Contracts LawGovernmental ImmunitiesSovereign ImmunityPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.20

§ 481.20 Classification of License When Contract Awarded

Any public entity, as defined in *Pub. Contract Code § 1100*, the University of California, and the California State University must specify the classification of the contractor's license that a contractor must possess at the time a contract is awarded. The specification must be included in any plans prepared for a public project and in any notice inviting bids required by the Public Contract Code. The requirement applies only to contractors who contract directly with the public entity [*Pub. Contract Code § 3300(a)*]. A contractor who is not awarded a public contract because of the failure of any entity to comply with *Pub. Contract Code § 3300(a)* may not receive damages for the loss of the contract [*Pub. Contract Code § 3300(b)*].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 7059(b), which provides that "in public works contracts, ... the awarding authority shall determine the license classification necessary to bid and perform the project," allows agencies to specify that only designated license categories will be permitted to bid on a project. This allows an agency to make a pre-bid determination that the public would be better served in terms of quality and economy by letting the project only to licensees with the most appropriate experience, while minimizing the need for subcontractors [*M&B Construction v. Yuba County Water Agency (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1361, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231]* .

Prior to awarding a contract for work to be performed by a contractor, the state entity must verify with the Contractors' State License Board that the person seeking the contract is licensed in a classification appropriate to the work to be undertaken [*Pub. Contract Code § 6100(a)*]. In lieu of verification, the entity may require the person seeking the contract topresent his or her pocket license or certificate of licensure and provide a signed statement that swears, under penalty of perjury, that the license or certificate of licensure presented belongs to the person seeking the contract, and is in a classification appropriate to the work to be undertaken [*Pub. Contract Code § 6100(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & Awards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.21

§ 481.21 Making of Award Gives Rise to Contract

Normally, the provisions governing competitive bidding require that the public entity provide detailed and exhaustive plans and specifications of the work being bid on in the proposal for bids, in the information and instructions to bidders, in the notice inviting bids, and in the required bid forms. Although these provisions usually also require that, after an award has been made, a formal written contract must be executed and appropriate bonds furnished for faithful performance of the work and for the payment of subcontractors, laborers, and materialmen, the contract itself is a brief document referring to the writings that detail the plans and specifications for a statement of the obligation of the parties. Hence, in the letting of contracts for the doing of public works where the legislative body or the administrative officer is required by statute to call for bids and must under competitive bidding conditions let the contract to the lowest responsible bidder, the making of the award gives rise to a contract between the public body or agent and the successful bidder [*City of Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 694, 290 P.2d 520* ; *see Greer v. Hitchcock (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 334, 337, 76 Cal. Rptr. 376]* .

Because a contract does arise on the making of the award, the successful contractor may not be relieved of his or her bid except either in the manner provided by statute, or if no statute is applicable, by satisfying the requirements for rescission [*see M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 700, 235 P.2d 7* ; *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 463-464]* . Similarly, because the public entity has exercised its discretion with respect to the time and manner of making public improvements and the purchasing of supplies, the legislative function is exhausted, its duty becomes purely ministerial, and the contract awarded in compliance with the competitive bidding requirements cannot be impaired at the option of the public entity. Hence, when a bid has been accepted by the proper authorities, such acceptance cannot be revoked [*City of Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 695, 290 P.2d 520]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsCancellation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.22

§ 481.22 Relief of Bidders

[1] Governing Law

The right of a contractor to relief from a bid mistake after the bid has been opened and declared or the time prescribed by statute or regulation for withdrawal of the bid has passed is generally governed by *Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.* in the case of any bid submitted to a public entity for a public work described in *Pub. Contract Code § 5100(b)* if the public entity is the state, the Regents of the University of California, a county, a city and county, a city, a district, a public authority, a public agency, or any other political subdivision or public corporation of the state [*Pub. Contract Code § 5100(a)*; *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 462-464, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

The Legislature enacted *Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.* in 1971 to establish a comprehensive statutory procedure in connection with public contracts to enable a contractor to claim relief from a bid mistake by following the procedures set forth in these provisions [*see A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 462, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* . Prior to 1971, if the bid was not for a contract to be awarded under the State Contract Act or the California State University and Colleges Contract Law [*Pub. Contract Code § 10700 et seq.*], a contractor was entitled to relief from a bid mistake when the bid was subject to rescission on proper equitable grounds [*see M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 700-703, 235 P.2d 7]* since, once the bid is opened and declared, it is in the nature of an irrevocable option constituting a contract right of which the public entity cannot be deprived without its consent unless the requirements for rescission are satisfied. Such requirements were satisfied (1) if the public entity knew or had reason to know of the contractor's error, such as when the contractor notified the public entity of a bid mistake before the public entity attempted to accept the bid, (2) if the mistake was material to the contractor and was not the result of neglect of a legal duty, (3) if enforcement of the contract would be unconscionable, (4) if the public entity could be placed in status quo, and (5) if the contractor gave prompt notice of the election to rescind and restored or offered to restore to the other public entity everything of value received under the contract [*see M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 700-701, 235 P.2d 7]* .

However, with the enactment of *Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.*, a contractor has a statutory remedy and is not required to rely on the equitable doctrine of rescission. *Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.* establishes the exclusive

procedure for relieving a bidder from a mistake in a bid submitted to a public entity in *Pub. Contract Code § 5100(a)*, and a failure to comply with the procedure may be deemed a waiver of the right to relief [*A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 463-464, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

[2] "Bid" Defined

For the purposes of *Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.*, a bid means any proposal submitted to a public entity in competitive bidding for theconstruction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any structure, building, road, or other improvement of any kind [*Pub. Contract Code § 5100(b)*].

[3] Notice of Mistake Is Required for Relief From Bid

To be relieved of his or her bid, the contractor must first give five working days' notice to the public entity after the opening of the bids, specifying in the notice in detail how the mistake occurred [*Pub. Contract Code § 5103(b)*; *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 465, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* . Other than the notice to the public entity, no claim is required before bringing an action for relief from the bid [*Pub. Contract Code § 5104*].

The notice requirement of *Pub. Contract Code § 5103(b)* is intended to provide the public entity with definite and specific information about the nature of the mistake so that the public entity can make an informed decision as to whether or not to consent to grant relief from the bid. Although strict compliance with *Pub. Contract Code § 5103(b)* is not required if the contractor has otherwise substantially complied with the section, a contractor has neither strictly nor substantially complied with *Pub. Contract Code § 5103(b)* if he or she merely informs the public entity that a clerical or mathematical mistake was made in filling out the bid [*A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 464, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

[4] Consent by State to Relief From Bid

If an awarding authority for the state consents to relieve a bidder of a bid because of mistake, the authority must prepare a report in writing to document the facts establishing the existence of each element required by *Pub. Contract Code § 5103* [*see § 481.22[5]]*. The report must be available for inspection as a public record. In the case of the University of California or a California State University, the report must be filed with the regents and the trustees, respectively [*Pub. Contract Code § 5101(b)*].

[5] Action for Recovery of Amount Forfeited

[a] Complaint

A contractor claiming relief from a bid mistake may not be relieved of the bid unless by consent of the awarding authority, nor may the contractor make any change in the bid because of the mistake [*Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)*]. Instead, the contractor may bring an action against the public entity in a court of competent jurisdiction in the county in which the bids were opened for the recovery of the amount forfeited, without interest or costs [*Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)*].

The complaint must be filed, and a summons served on the director of the department or chief of the division or other head of the public entity under which the work is to be performed, or an appearance made, within 90 days after the opening of the bid. Otherwise, the action must be dismissed [*Pub. Contract Code § 5102*].

If plaintiff fails to recover judgment, he or she must pay all costs incurred by the public entity, including reasonable attorney's fees to be fixed by the court [*Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)*].

[b] Showing Required for Relief From Forfeiture

Under *Pub. Contract Code § 5103*, the bidder must establish the following, to the satisfaction of the court:

(1) A mistake was made;

(2) The bidder gave the public entity written notice within five working days after the opening of the bids of the mistake, specifying in the notice in detail how the mistake occurred;

(3) The mistake made the bid materially different than the bid the bidder intended [*see Elsinore Union Unified School Dist. v. Kastorff (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 380, 389, 6 Cal. Rptr. 1, 353 P.2d 713* (holding, in action to rescind mistaken bid, that mistaken bid of $89,994 was materially different from bid of $96,494, which sum would have been actual bid if omitted item had been included)]; and

(4) The mistake was made in filling out the bid and not due to an error in judgment or to carelessness in inspecting the site of the work, or in reading the plans or specifications.

The distinction drawn in *Pub. Contract Code § 5103(d)* between a mistake made in filling out the bid and an error in judgment is similar to the distinction drawn in cases involving rescission of mistaken bids. A mistake made in a bid that would entitle a contractor to rescission was one due to clerical error, such as in mathematical computation or in the transposition of figures from work sheets to final bid forms, whereas an error in judgment involved, for example, underestimating the cost of labor or materials [*see White v. Berrenda Mesa Water Dist. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 894, 902, 87 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . Similarly, a mistake in an action for the rescission of a mistaken bid was an error which did not arise out of the neglect of a legal duty. A contractor would not be considered to have made an error involving a neglect of legal duty if the error made sometimes occurred in the conduct of the reasonable and cautious business person [*see M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 702, 235 P.2d 7]* . It should also be noted that in an action to rescind a mistaken bid, if the mistake in question involved both a clerical error and an error in judgment, a court would permit rescission of the mistaken bid if to do otherwise would be grossly unjust and set a harsh and unnecessary precedent [*White v. Berrenda Mesa Water Dist. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 894, 902, 905-906, 87 Cal. Rptr. 338]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUnconscionabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsMinor Informalities & Irregularities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.23

§ 481.23 Public Entity's Remedy on Contractor's Wrongful Failure to Enter Into Contract

If a bidder has not substantially complied with the provisions governing the right to relief from a mistaken bid or the contractor has otherwise refused to enter into a contract with the public entity after being awarded the contract, the public entity, depending on the wording of the bid invitation and the executed bid, on the terms of the security deposited and on the language of any other applicable statute or contract [*see Petrovich v. Arcadia (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 78, 85, 222 P.2d 231]* may be (1) limited to the recovery of the amount of security deposited, either as a penalty or as liquidated damages [*see A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* , (2) limited to the recovery of the amount of actual damages suffered by the public entity up to the amount stated in the security [*see Petrovich v. Arcadia (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 78, 80-86, 222 P.2d 231]* , or (3) permitted to recover both the amount of security deposited and, in addition, the amount of damages suffered for breach of contract [*see A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

The general rule that forfeitures in the nature of a penalty are not favored and that language must be so construed so as to avoid a forfeiture, if that is possible, applies to the construction of the various types of security the public entity may require the bidder to deposit in submitting his or her bid for a public project. In the absence of statutory or contract language providing otherwise or words indicating that the full sum of the security is to be forfeited or treated as liquidated damages, the security may be construed as a guarantee which measures the public entity's compensatory right to the extent of the actual damage only. In such a case, the sum stated in the security, such as the liability of the surety on a bid bond, would be deemed to be established for the actual damage resulting from the bidder's breach, but limited by the sum stated in the security [*see Petrovich v. Arcadia (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 78, 85, 222 P.2d 231]* .

However, although provisions for forfeitures in the nature of a penalty are generally not favored, the public entity does have the right to require guarantee deposits to accompany bids, and to forfeit them in the event of the failure or refusal of the successful bidder to enter into a contract. Provisions requiring a deposit accompanying a bid for a public contract, or for forfeiture thereof, as necessary as a matter of public policy [*A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* . Hence, the public entity has the power to enforce full recovery of the sum stated in the security, regardless of the actual damages suffered, where the statute or contract declares a forfeiture [*Petrovich v. Arcadia (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 78, 83, 222 P.2d 231* ; *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466, 126 Cal.*

Rptr. 585] . It should be noted that where, by the terms of the bid invitation or instructions, the obligation of the bidder is clearly limited to the amount of the security, the public entity is limited to recovery of the amount of the security as a penalty or liquidated damages [*A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

In the absence of any provisions specifying that the amount of the security must be forfeited as liquidated damages on the failure of the successful bidder to enter into a contract with the public entity, the entity is also not precluded from seeking any additional damages for breach of contract for the difference between the contract's lowest bid and the next lowest bid [*see* *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 466-467, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawContract ProvisionsLiquidated DamagesPublic Contracts LawTerminationsDamagesPublic Contracts LawTerminationsPerformance Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.24

§ 481.24 Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

[1] Purpose of Act

The Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*] is designed to prevent the practices of bid shopping and bid peddling in connection with public works projects. Bid shopping is the use of the lowest bid already received by the general or prime contractor to pressure other subcontractors into submitting even lower bids [*Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 726 n.7, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* ; *Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 128 Cal. Rptr. 632]* .

Because the practices of bid shopping and bid peddling in connection with the construction, alteration, and repair of public improvements often result in poor quality of material and workmanship to the detriment of the public, deprive the public of the full benefits of fair competition among prime contractors and subcontractors, and lead to insolvencies and loss of wages to employees [*see Pub. Contract Code § 4101*], bid shopping is prohibited by the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act after the award of the prime contract [*Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 361, 365, 128 Cal. Rptr. 632* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107*)]. Although bid shopping and peddling prior to the award of the prime contract foster the same evils, they are not prohibited because they have the effect of passing the reduced costs onto the public in the form of lower prime contract bids [*see Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 726 n.7, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975]* .

[2] Deadline for Submission of Bids

The bid invitation and the public notice must specify the place the bids are to be received and the date and time by which they must be received.The specified date and time must be extended by no less than 72 hours if the officer, department, board, or commission taking bids issues any material changes, additions, or deletions to the invitation later than 72 hours before the bid closing [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104.5(a)*]. In this context, "material change" means a change with a substantial cost impact on the total bid as determined by the awarding agency [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104.5(b)*]; and "bid invitation" includes any documents issued to prime contractors that contain descriptions of the work to be bid or the content, form, or manner of submission of bids to bidders [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104.5(c)*].

[3] Listing of Subcontractor in Bid

To protect the original subcontractor against replacement by either another subcontractor or by the prime contractor, the Act requires that any officer, department, board, or commission taking bids for the construction of any public work or improvement provide in the specifications prepared for the work or improvement, or in the general conditions under which the bid will be received for the doing of the work incident to the public work or improvement, that any person making a bid or offer to perform the work must, in his or her bid or offer, set forth the name and the location of the place of business of each subcontractor who will perform work or labor or render service to the prime contractor in or about the construction of the work or improvement, or a subcontractor licensed by the state who, under subcontract to the prime contractor, specially fabricates and installs a portion of the work or improvement according to detailed drawings contained in the plans and specifications, in an amount in excess of one-half of one percent of the prime contractor's total bid [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104(a)(1)*]. In the case of bids or offers for the construction of streets or highways, including bridges, the foregoing information regarding the subcontractor is required when the construction is in excess of one half of 1 percent or $10,000, whichever is greater [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104(a)(1)*]. At the option of a state or local agency, the prime contractor may be allowed to submit any information requested by the entity taking bids concerning a subcontractor, other than the subcontractor's name and business location, up to 24 hours after the deadline established for receipt of bids [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104(a)(2)*].

The bid or offer must also state the portion of the work that will be done by each subcontractor under the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act. The prime contractor shall list only one subcontractor for each portion as is defined by the prime contractor in the bid [*Pub. Contract Code § 4104(b)*]. Because the Act permits the prime contractor to define the "portion" of work to be done by each subcontractor, there is no statutory requirement that the subcontractor's work be stated as a percentage of the contract. Whether the Act requires the prime contractor to express a subcontractor's portion as any more than the type of work the subcontractor will perform, for example, "paving and excavation" or "carpentry, millwork, and interior woodwork," is not clear [*see Valley Crest Landscape v. City Council and City of Davis (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1432, 1438-1440, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 184]* .

Once the prime contractor's bid is accepted, he or she is forbidden to make any substitution for the subcontractor designated in the original bid except with the consent of the contracting agency as provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 4104* [*see Coast Pump Associates v. Stephen Tyler Corp. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 421, 424-426, 133 Cal. Rptr. 88* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4104, now see Pub. Contract Code § 4104*)]. A general contractor who practices circumvention in bidding as a prime contractor pursuant to *Pub. Contract Code § 4104* (requirement to list subcontractors) by listing another contractor who will in turn sublet portions constituting the majority of the work covered by the prime contract, violates the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act, and is subject to the penalties set forth in *Pub. Contract Code §§ 4110* and *4111* [*Pub. Contract Code § 4105*].

A prime contractor who fails to specify a subcontractor or who specifies more than one subcontractor for the same portion of work to be performed under the contract in excess of one-half of one percent of the prime contractor's total bid agrees that he or she is fully qualified to perform that portion himself or herself and must perform that portion. If after the contract is awarded the prime contractor subcontracts any portion of the work, the prime contractor is subject to the penalties named in *Pub. Contract Code § 4111*, unless he or she complies with *Pub. Contract Code § 4107* or *4109* [*Pub. Contract Code § 4106*].

However, the prime contractor may sublet or subcontract any portion of the work in excess of one-half of one percent of the prime contractor's total bid for which no subcontractor was designated in the original bid in a case of public emergency or necessity if a finding is made, which is reduced to writing as public record of the awarding authority, setting forth the facts constituting the emergency or necessity [*Pub. Contract Code § 4109*]. The prime contractor may also sublet or subcontract any portion of the work in excess of one-half of one percent of the prime contractor's total bid for which his or her original bid did not designate a subcontractor if such work is done in the performance of "change orders" causing changes or deviations from the original contract [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107(c)*].

[4] Permitted Substitutions

To protect the original subcontractor against replacement by either another subcontractor or by the prime contractor, the right of the prime contractor to make substitution and the discretion of the awarding authority to consent to substitution is limited to those situations enumerated in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*, all of which are keyed to the unwillingnessor inability of the listed subcontractor to perform properly [*see Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 726, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107(a), now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*); *Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 361, 128 Cal. Rptr. 632* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107(a), now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*)].

Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a) provides that the prime contractor whose bid is accepted may not substitute any person as subcontractor in place of the subcontractor listed in the original bid, except that the awarding authority, or its duly authorized officer, may, except as otherwise provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*, consent to the substitution of another person as a subcontractor when the following apply:

- The subcontractor listed in the bid, after having had a reasonable opportunity to do so, fails or refuses to execute a written contract for the scope of work and price specified in the subcontractor's bid, when the contract, based on the general terms, conditions, plans, and specifications for the project involved or the terms of that subcontractor's written bid, is presented to him or her by the prime contractor.

- The listed subcontractor becomes insolvent or the subject of an order for relief in bankruptcy.

- The listed subcontractor fails or refuses to perform his or her subcontract.

- The listed subcontractor fails or refuses to meet the bond requirements of the prime contractor [*see Pub. Contract Code § 4108*].

- The prime contractor demonstrates to the awarding authority, or its duly authorized officer, subject to the further provisions of *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*, that the name of the subcontractor was listed as the result of an inadvertent clerical error.

- The listed subcontractor is not licensed pursuant to the Contractors' State License Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.*].

- The awarding authority, or its duly authorized officer, determines that the work performed by the listed subcontractor is substantially unsatisfactory and not in substantial accordance with the plans and specifications, or that the subcontractor is substantially delaying or disrupting the progress of the work.

- The listed subcontractor is ineligible to work on a public works project pursuant to *Lab. Code § 1777.1* or *1777.7*.

- The awarding authority determines that a listed subcontractor is not a responsible contractor [*see Pub. Contract Code § 1103*].

[5] Hearing on Requested Substitution

Before the approval of the prime contractor's request for a substitution of a listed subcontractor as provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*, the awarding authority or its duly authorized officer must give written notice of the prime contractor's request and the reasons therefor to the listed subcontractor. The notice must be served by certified or

registered mail to the last known address of the subcontractor. If the listed subcontractor who has been notified does not submit written objections to the awarding authority within five working days, he or she is deemed to have consented to the substitution. If written objections are filed, the awarding authority must give written notice of at least five working days to the listed subcontractor of a hearing by the awarding authority on the request for substitution [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*].

The agency must give the notice, and the contractor is not liable for failure to give it [*W.J. Lewis v. C. Harper Constr. Co. (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 27, 30, 171 Cal. Rptr. 806* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107(a)*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)*)].

[6] Procedural Prerequisites for Substitution Based on Clerical Error

[a] Two-Day Notice Requirement

The awarding authority may authorize a substitution if the name of the subcontractor was listed as the result of an inadvertent clerical error [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)(5)*]. *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* specifies the procedures to be followed when a contractor asserts a claim of clerical error. A substitution that is based on inadvertent clerical error but which is not effected in compliance with *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* may not be sustained, and the prime contractor in such a case is in violation of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*see Coast Pump Associates v. Stephen Tyler Corp. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 421, 427, 133 Cal. Rptr. 88* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107.5*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*)].

Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5 requires that the prime contractor, as a condition to the assertion of a claim of inadvertent clerical error in the listing of a subcontractor, give written notice, within two working days after the time of the prime bid opening by the awarding authority, to the awarding authority and copies of the notice to both the listed subcontractor and the intended subcontractor who had bid to the prime contractor prior to the bid opening. While this two-day notice requirement is obligatory, rather than permissive, it can be satisfied through substantial compliance. For example, a prime contractor substantially complied with the notice requirement when it gave the awarding authority the required written notice but orally notified the erroneously-listed subcontractor by phone the day after prime bids were opened. The prime contractor then sent written notice to the erroneously-listed subcontractor on the fourth working day after the bid opening [*see Cal-Air v. Auburn Union School Dist. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 655, 667-671, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703]* .

Any listed subcontractor who has been notified by the prime contractor in accordance with *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* as to an inadvertent clerical error must be allowed six working days from the time of the prime bid opening within which to submit to the awarding authority and to the prime contractor a written objection to the prime contractor's claim of inadvertent clerical error. Failure of the listed subcontractor to file the written notice within the six working days is primary evidence of his or her agreement that an inadvertent clerical error was made [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*].

[b] Determination by Awarding Authority

If, within six working days of the time the prime bids were opened, the listed subcontractor submits a written objection, the awarding authority must investigate the claims of the parties and hold a public hearing to determine the validity of the claims [*Pub. Contract Code §§ 4107, 4107.5*].

The awarding authority must, after a public hearing as provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107* and in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, consent to the substitution of the intended subcontractor (1) if (a) the prime contractor, (b) the subcontractor listed in error, and (c) the intended subcontractor each submit an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the awarding authority along with additional

evidence as parties may wish to submit that an inadvertent clerical error was in fact made, provided that the affidavits from each of the three parties are filed within eight working days from the time of the prime bid opening; or (2) if the affidavits are filed by both the prime contractor and intended subcontractor within the specified time but the listed subcontractor does not submit within six working days, to the awarding authority and to the prime contractor, written objection to the prime contractor's claim of inadvertent clerical error as provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*].

Any determination made must be based on the facts contained in the declarations submitted under penalty of perjury by all three parties and supported by testimony under oath and subject to cross examination. The awarding authority may, on its own motion or that of any other party, admit testimony of other contractors, any bid registries or depositories, or any other party in possession of facts which may have a bearing on the decision of the awarding authority [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5*].

To justify what was clearly a proper result, one court held that the affidavit requirements of *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* are not essential and should be construed as directory rather than mandatory. The court upheld the awarding authority's consent to substitution of subcontractors based on an inadvertent clerical error despite the facts that no party submitted an affidavit or a declaration under penalty of perjury and no testimony was taken at the noticed hearing [*see Cal-Air v. Auburn Union School Dist. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 655, 671-675, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703]* .

[7] Violation of Act

[a] Statutory Penalties

A prime contractor violating any of the provisions of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act violates his or her own contract and the awarding authority may exercise the option, in its own discretion, of (1) canceling the contractor or (2) assessing the prime contractor a penalty in an amount of not more than 10 percent of the amount of the subcontract involved to be deposited in the fund out of which the prime contract is awarded. The prime contractor is entitled to a public hearing and five days' notice thereof in any proceeding pursuant to *Pub. Contract Code § 4110* [*Pub. Contract Code § 4110*].

The courts lack jurisdiction to impose penalties under the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 4110*; *Thompson Pacific Construction, Inc. v. City of Sunnyvale (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 525, 539, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 175]* . Rather, penalties may be imposed only by the awarding authority [*Thompson Pacific Construction, Inc. v. City of Sunnyvale (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 525, 539, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 175]* . *Public Contract Code Section 4110* plainly gives the awarding authority discretion to impose monetary penalties for violation of the Act, but there is no provision anywhere in the Act that allows the awarding authority to pursue a civil action for monetary penalties. Although the trial courts have a range of inherent powers that they may exercise in order to accomplish complete justice between parties, a court has no power to award civil monetary penalties in the absence of explicit statutory authorization [*Thompson Pacific Construction, Inc. v. City of Sunnyvale (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 525, 539, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 175]* .

In addition, violation of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act by a licensee under the Contractors' State License Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.*] constitutes grounds for disciplinary action by the Contractors' State License Board [*Pub. Contract Code § 4111*].

[b] Remedy of Listed Subcontractor

The listed subcontractor who has been replaced by the prime contractor in violation of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act has no contractual right against the prime contractor based on the fact that he or she was listed in the prime contractor's bid. The listing by the general contractor of the subcontractor that the general

contractor intends to retain is in response to statutory command under the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*see Pub. Contract Code § 4104*] and cannot reasonably be construed as an expression of acceptance [*Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969)71 Cal. 2d 719, 723, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4104*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4104*)]. Moreover, there is no acceptance of the subcontractor's bid by operation of law under the doctrine of promissory estoppel, since the prime contractor has made no promise or offer to the subcontractor by listing the subcontractor in compliance with the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act, which is intended to induce action or forbearance of a definite and substantial character [*see Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 723-724, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4104*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4104*)].

However, since the purpose of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act is to protect both the public and subcontractors from the evils of the proscribed unfair bid shopping and bid peddling, it confers the right on the listed subcontractor to perform the subcontract unless statutory grounds for a valid substitution exist. This right may be enforced by an action for damages against the prime contractor to recover the benefit of the bargain the listed subcontractor would have realized had he or she notwrongfully been deprived of the subcontract [*Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 727, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code §§ 4100, 4101*; *now see Pub. Contract Code §§ 4100, 4101*, respectively); *see Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 361, 366-367, 128 Cal. Rptr. 632* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107*)].

However, the listed subcontractor has no remedy against the public entity. The public entity is not liable for a violation of the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act, since there is no statutory provision for the recovery of damages against a public entity for its consenting to a substitution of subcontractors in violation of *Pub. Contract Code § 4107*. Moreover, the listed subcontractor is not a third-party beneficiary of the contract between the prime contractor and the public entity that would give rise to a cause of action against the public entity for breach of contract, since the listed subcontractor is at most an incidental beneficiary, having been listed in the prime contractor's bid in response to a statutory command and not because the contracting parties' purpose was expressly to benefit the subcontractor [*Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 727-728, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code §§ 4100, 4101*; *now see Pub. Contract Code §§ 4100, 4101*, respectively)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsBridges & RoadsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsInvitations for BidsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.25

§ 481.25 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[1] Arbitration

If a public works contract provides for arbitration of disputes arising under it, the parties are bound by the contract to proceed with arbitration before turning to the courts. By general law, a written agreement to submit to arbitration an existing controversy or a controversy thereafter arising is valid, enforceable, and irrevocable, save on such grounds as exist for the revocation of any contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

It has been the practice of public agencies to provide in a public works contract for resolution by some representative of the agency of disputes arising under the contract. The courts have generally upheld the provision and enforced them against contractors [*see Wiechmann Eng'rs v. California ex rel. Dep't of Public Works (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 741, 107 Cal. Rptr. 529* ; *People ex rel. Dep't of Public Works v. McNamara Corp. Ltd. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 641, 104 Cal. Rptr. 822* ; *Clack v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Public Works (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 743, 80 Cal. Rptr. 274* ; *Macomber v. State (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 391, 58 Cal. Rptr. 393* . The law was changed in 1978, however, by a statute that apparently repudiated those decisions. As a result, any dispute arising from a construction contract with a public agency that contains a provision that one party to the contract, or one party's agent or employee, must decide any disputes arising under that contract, must be resolved by submitting the dispute to independent arbitration, if mutually agreeable, or by litigation in a court of competent jurisdiction [*Civ. Code § 1670*].

[2] Presentation of Claim to Public Entity

[a] Requirements

Presentation of a claim pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 900-935.7* is not required to commence a legal action or arbitration proceeding for money or damages on a contract with the state, but any action or proceeding must be commenced no later than six months after either of the following [*Pub. Contract Code § 19100(a)*]:

- The contracting agency's final written decision under claim provisions; or

- The accrual of the cause of action, if there are no contract claim provisions.

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 946.4* (inadequate statement concerning public agency on file with Roster of Public Agencies during 70 days following accrual of cause of action) and 946.6 (petition for relief from *Gov. Code § 945.4* where public entity rejects late claim), no suit for money or damages may be brought against the public entity on a cause of action for which a claim is required to be presented until a written claim therefor has been presented to the public entity and has been acted on by the public entity, or has been deemed to have been rejected by the public entity [*Gov. Code § 945.4*].

[b] Pleading Compliance With Gov. Code § 945.4

Satisfaction of the procedural prerequisite of filing a claim for damages against the public entity before bringing an action on the claim is an element of a contractor's cause of action against the public entity. The absence from a complaint of any allegation of the presentation of a written claim against the public entity forecloses that complaint from setting forth a cause of action against the public entity on any theory [*see Wilson v. People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 665, 668, 76 Cal. Rptr. 906]* .

[3] Resolution of Claims Between Contractor and Local Agency of $375,000 or Less

[a] Presentment to Local Agency

Public works claims between a contractor and a local agency of $375,000 or less that arise from contracts entered into on or after January 1, 1991,must first be presented to the agency in writing, along with documentation necessary to substantiate the claim, on or before the final payment date [*Pub. Contract Code §§ 20104(a)(1), (d), 20104.2(a)*]. This procedure should be followed before the claimant files a claim under the general claim provisions [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20104.2(e)*; *see also Gov. Code §§ 900-935.7*].

For these purposes, a "claim" is a separate demand by a contractor for any of the following: (1) a time extension; (2) payment of money or damages arising from work done by, or on behalf of, the contractor pursuant to the contract and payment of which is not otherwise expressly provided for, or the claimant is not otherwise entitled to; or (3) an amount the payment of which is disputed by the local agency [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104(b)(2)*]. This claim procedure does not apply to tort claims [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.2(f)*], or when the agency has elected to resolve disputes by arbitration [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104(a)(2)*; *see Pub. Contract Code § 10240 et seq.* (arbitration statutes)].

Once the claim has been presented in writing, the local agency must respond to the claim, or may request additional documentation supporting the claim or relating to any defenses the agency may have against the contractor. The response or request must be in writing and made within a specified period of time, the length of which depends on whether the claim is greater or less than $50,000 [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20104.2(b), (c)*]. If the claim remains unresolved after this exchange, or if the agency fails to respond to the contractor's written claim, the contractor may notify the agency in writing to demand an informal conference to meet and confer to settle the disputed issues [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.2(d)*]. If the claim, or any portion, remains in dispute after the meet and confer conference, the claimant may file a claim under the general claim provisions of the Government Code [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.2(e)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 900-935.7*].

[b] Procedure Once Suit Is Filed

If a public works claim of $375,000 or less remains unresolved and a suit is filed, the court must submit the matter to nonbinding mediation within 60 days, but no earlier than 30 days, following the filing or responsive pleadings, unless both parties mutually stipulate to waive mediation [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.4(a)*]. If the dispute remains unresolved after nonbinding mediation, the case must be submitted to judicial arbitration [*Pub. Contract Code §*

20104.4(b); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.10 et seq.*; for complete discussion of judicial arbitration, *see* Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration*]. At the request of either party, the court may order any witnesses to participate in the mediation or arbitration process [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.4(c)*].

Once the judicial arbitration is concluded, either party may request a trial de novo [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.20*]. However, if the requesting party does not obtain a more favorable judgment at trial, that party must pay the other party's attorney's fees arising from the trial [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.4(b)(3)*] as well as costs and fees incurred after election of the trial de novo [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21*].

If the contractor receives an arbitration award or judgment, the local agency must also pay interest on the award or judgment at the legal rate from the date the suit was filed [*Pub. Contract Code § 20104.6(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment InterestGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionArbitration & Mediation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.26

§ 481.26 Contractual Waiver of Claims

Provisions in public works contracts with public entities that provide that acceptance of a payment otherwise due a contractor is a waiver of all claims against the public entity arising out of the work performed under the contract, or provisions that condition the right to payment on submission of a release by the contractor of all such claims, are against public policy, and are null and void. However, public entities are not prohibited from including and enforcing a contract provision which provides that the payment of undisputed contract amounts is contingent on the contractor furnishing the public entity with a release of all claims against the public entity arising by virtue of the public works contract related to those amounts. Disputed contract claims in stated amounts may be specifically excluded by the contractor from the operation of the release [*Pub. Contract Code § 7100*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawContract ProvisionsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawTerminationsWaiver

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.27

§ 481.27 Liability of Public Entity for Fraudulent Concealment on Claims of Extra Work

If a contracting agency furnishes inaccurate project information, such as soil reports, as a basis for bids, it may be liable for damages on a breach of warranty theory. Generally, fraudulent concealment gives rise to an action in tort; however, such an action for misrepresentation against public agencies is barred by *Gov. Code § 818.8*. However, an action in contract for breach of warranty is proper. Thus, a public entity may be liable for a misrepresentation which constitutes such a breach of contract as to make the contractor unable to perform according to the contract provisions, or may be liable for furnishing misleading plans and specifications under the concept of a breach of an implied warranty of their correctness [*E. H. Morrill Co. v. State of California (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 787, 793, 56 Cal. Rptr. 479, 423 P.2d 551* ; *Salinas v. Souza & McCue Constr. Co. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 217, 222, 57 Cal. Rptr. 337, 424 P.2d 921]* .

Generally, a cause of action for nondisclosure of material facts arises in at least three instances: (1) the defendant makes representations but does not disclose facts that materially qualify the facts disclosed, or that render the disclosure likely to mislead; (2) the facts are known or accessible only to defendant, and defendant knows they are not known to or reasonably discoverable by the plaintiff; and (3) the defendant actively conceals discovery from the plaintiff [*Warner Constr. Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 285, 294, 85 Cal. Rptr. 444, 466 P.2d 996]* .

A public entity is not liable for an imprudent or careless investigation on the part of the contractor, and a careless contractor cannot convert his or her own lack of diligence into a case of fraudulent concealment against the entity, on the theory that it was guilty of fraudulent concealment in not furnishing him or her with information that he or she made no effort to secure for himself or herself [*Weichmann Eng'rs v. California ex rel. Dep't of Public Works (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 741, 753, 107 Cal. Rptr. 529]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachCauses of ActionBreach of WarrantyPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' LiensTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationNondisclosureGeneral Overview

23 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.28-481.39

[Reserved]

§§ 481.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.40

§ 481.40 Governing Statutes

[1] In General

Stop notices for public works of improvement are governed by *Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214*. Definitions of terms used in these code provisions are contained in *Civ. Code §§ 3082-3106*. Except as otherwise provided in these provisions, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* governing procedure in civil actions are applicable to, and constitute the rules of practice in, the proceedings mentioned in *Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214* governing stop notices for public works. The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062a*, relative to new trials and appeals, except insofar as they are inconsistent with the provisions governing stop notices for public works or with rules adopted by the Judicial Council, apply to the proceedings mentioned in *Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214* governing stop notices for public works of improvement [*see Civ. Code § 3259*].

Although the statutes governing mechanics' liens do not apply to any public work [*see Gov. Code § 3109*], the mechanics' lien law, that is, that law governing the right to a mechanics' lien or stop notice in connection with a private work of improvement and the right to a stop notice in connection with a public work of improvement, is an integrated and harmonious scheme and applicable code sections must be construed together. In the absence of a specific, contrary legislative mandate, all rules applicable to statutory provisions governing both private and public works of improvement apply with equal effect to both [*Sunlight Elec. Supply Co.v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782* ; *see Hendrickson v. Bertelson (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 430, 432, 35 P.2d 318]* .

[2] Statutory Stop Notice Provisions Is Sole Remedy

The rights of all persons furnishing labor, services, equipment, or materials for any public work of improvement, with respect to any fund for payment of construction costs, are governed exclusively by *Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214* [*Civ. Code § 3264*]. No person may assert any legal or equitable right with respect to such fund, other than a right created by direct written contract between such person and the person holding the fund, except pursuant to the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214* [*Civ. Code § 3264*; *see Boyd & Losvesee Lumber Co. v. Western Pacific Financial Corp. (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 460, 465, 118 Cal. Rptr. 699]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.41

§ 481.41 Definitions

The definitions set forth below govern the construction of the stop notice provisions for public works of improvement unless the context otherwise requires a different construction [*Civ. Code § 3082*].

[1] Claimant

A claimant is any person entitled to record a claim of lien, to give a stop notice in connection with any work of improvement, or to recover on any payment bond, or any combination of the foregoing [*Civ. Code § 3085*].

[2] Public Work

A public work is any work of improvement contracted for by a public entity [*Civ. Code § 3100*].

[3] Public Entity

A public entity includes the state, Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state [*Civ. Code § 3099*].

[4] Work of Improvement

A work of improvement includes, but is not restricted to, the construction, alteration, addition to, or repair, in whole or in part, of any building, wharf, bridge, ditch, flume, aqueduct, well, tunnel, fence, machinery, railroad, or road, the seeding, sodding, or planting of any lot or tract of land for landscaping purposes, the filling, leveling, or grading of any lot or tract of land, the demolition of buildings, and the removal of buildings. Except as otherwise provided, a work of improvement includes the entire structure or scheme of improvement as a whole [*Civ. Code § 3106*].

[5] Contract

A contract is an agreement between an owner (public entity) and any original contractor providing for the work of

improvement or any part thereof [*Civ. Code § 3088*].

[6] Original Contractor

An original contractor is any contractor who has a direct contractual relationship with the owner [*Civ. Code § 3095*].

[7] Laborer

A laborer is any person who, acting as an employee, performs labor or bestows skill or other necessary services on any work of improvement [*Civ. Code § 3089(a)*].

"Laborer" also includes any person or entity, including an express trust fund [*see Civ. Code § 3111*], to whom a portion of the compensation of a laborer, as defined in *Civ. Code § 3089(a)*, is paid by agreement with that laborer or the laborer's collective bargaining agent. To the extent that such a person or entity has standing to maintain a direct legal action to collect any portion of compensation owed for a laborer, that person or entity has standing to enforce any rights under the mechanics' lien law to the same extent as the laborer. The intent of this statutory provision is to give effect to the public policy in favor of protecting laborers' entire compensation on works of improvement, regardless of the form in which that compensation is to be paid [*Civ. Code § 3089(b)*].

[8] Materialman

A materialman is any person who furnishes materials or supplies to be used or consumed in any work of improvement [*Civ. Code § 3090*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.42

§ 481.42 Public Stop Notice Provisions

[1] Construction

The provisions governing the mechanics' lien law, including the provisions governing stop notice for public works of improvement, are remedial in character, and are to be liberally construed in their entirety with a view to effect their objects and to promote justice [*Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782* ; *see Hendrickson v. Bertelson (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 430, 432, 35 P.2d 318]* .

[2] Purpose

There can be no mechanics' or materialmen's lien for labor or supplies on property belonging to the public and used for public purposes [*SunlightElec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782* ; *see Civ. Code § 3109*]. That is, a claimant who would otherwise be entitled to a charge on a work of improvement to which the claimant has supplied labor or materials as security for the obligation owed to him or her by the prime or original contractor does not have such security in the case of labor or materials furnished to a public work of improvement [*see Mercantile Collection Bureau v. Roach (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 355, 357, 15 Cal. Rptr. 710]* . Accordingly, in addition to other procedures generally available for the enforcement of contracts, the Legislature has provided the special remedy of the stop notice procedure without lien rights for intercepting funds due from a public agency to a contractor both to protect the interest of those to whom the prime or original contractor may incur debts in connection with a public works project and to protect both the public and the public property from the serious, adverse effects which would result from permiting liens on such property [*see Pacific Employers Ins. Co. v. California (1970) 91 Cal. Rptr. 273, 477 P.2d 129* ; *Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143* ; *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.43

§ 481.43 Nature of Remedy

Instead of being a charge on a public work of improvement, the stop notice for public works constitutes a lien on the property or earnings of the contractor held by the public agency [*United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907]* . Accordingly, on the receipt of a stop notice in connection with a public works project, the public entity must withhold from the original contractor, or from any person acting under his or her authority, money or bonds (if bonds are to be issued in payment for the work of improvement) due or to become due to the contractor in an amount sufficient to answer the claim stated in the stop notice and to provide for the entity's reasonable cost of any resulting litigation [*Civ. Code § 3186*]. Thus, when the notice is filed, the claimant immediately has a right against the earnings of the contractor held by the public agency, and thereby, in effect, imposes a trust obligation on the public agency [*United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.44

§ 481.44 Stop Notice Remedy Is Cumulative

The right of a claimant to the use of the stop notice procedure for public works is cumulative both to the remedies generally available for the enforcement of contracts and to other remedies provided by the Legislature to ensure the payment of claims of laborers and materialmen on public works projects [*see Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc.(1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143* ; *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 522, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298]* . Thus, in his or her action to enforce a stop notice, the claimant may, simultaneously with or independently of the action, seek a personal judgment against the contractor or subcontractor with whom the claimant contracted for the work performed on the public project [*see George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 522, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298]* , and, in addition, may seek to enforce the obligation under the public works contractor's payment bond under *Civ. Code §§ 3247-3252* and *Pub. Contract Code § 7103* [*see Consolidated Elec. Distributors, Inc. v. Kirkham, Chaon & Kirkham, Inc. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 54, 61, 95 Cal. Rptr. 673* ; for discussion and forms for use in an action on a contractor's payment bond, see *§§ 481.70 et seq., 481.360* et seq.].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.45

§ 481.45 Person Entitled to Serve Stop Notice

[1] In General

Except for an original contractor, that is, any contractor who has a direct contractual relationship with the public agency [*see Civ. Code § 3095*], any person mentioned in *Civ. Code § 3110* or *3112* (persons entitled to mechanics' liens), or mentioned in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.7* (hazardous waste hauler), or furnishing provisions, provender, or other supplies, may serve a stop notice on the public entity responsible for the public work in accordance with the provision of *Civ. Code § 3179 et seq.* governing stop notices [*Civ. Code § 3181*]. Statutory and decisional authority that prescribe the prerequisites for entitlement to a mechanics' lien on a private work of improvement generally govern the right to a stop notice in connection with public works of improvement [*see George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520-522, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298]* . For a complete discussion of these requirements, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

[2] Works of Improvement

Generally, the persons who may avail themselves of the stop notice procedure for public works of improvement include mechanics, materialmen, contractors, subcontractors, lessors of equipment, artisans, architects, registered engineers, licensed land surveyors, machinists, builders, teamsters, draymen, and all persons and laborers of every class performing labor or bestowing skill or other necessary services on, or furnishing materials or leasing equipment to be used or consumed in, or furnishing appliances, teams, or power contributing to the work of improvement [*Civ. Code §§ 3110, 3181*].

[3] Site Improvements

Any stop notice claimant who, at the instance or request of the public agency (or any person acting by the agency's authority or under the agency, as contractor or otherwise), has made any site improvement may serve a stop notice as provided in *Civ. Code § 3181* [*see Civ. Code §§ 3112, 3181*]. A site improvement includes the demolishing or removing of improvements, trees, or other vegetation located thereon, drilling test holes, grading, filling, or otherwise improving of any lot or tract of land or the street, highway, or sidewalk in front of or adjoining any lot or tract of land, constructing

or installing sewers or other public utilities therein, constructing any areas, vaults, cellars, or rooms under such sidewalks, or making any improvements thereon [*Civ. Code § 3102*].

[4] Union Trust Fund Liens

For purposes of the mechanics' lien law, an express trust fund to which a portion of a laborer's total compensation is to be paid pursuant to an applicable employment agreement or a collective bargaining agreement for the provision of benefits (including, but not limited to, employer payments for health and welfare, pension, vacation, travel time, subsistence pay, apprenticeship or other training programs, specified worker protection and assistance programs or committees, industry advancement and collective bargaining agreement administrative fees, and similar purposes [*see Lab. Code § 1773.1*]) is entitled to assert the same rights and claims as laborers performing labor on, or bestowing skill or other necessary services on, a work of improvement, to the extent of the compensation agreed to be paid to that express trust fund for labor on that improvement only [*Civ. Code § 3111*]. As amended in 1999 [*see* Stats. 1999, ch. 795, § 7], *Civ. Code § 3111* is intended to reinstate the ability of laborers and employee trust funds to use mechanics' liens and creditor priorities to obtain payment of unpaid wages and fringe benefits. The amendment was drafted in an attempt to avoid having state remedies for collection of those wages and fringe benefits be preempted by the federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) [24 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.]. Prior to this amendment, the California Supreme Court held that *Civ. Code § 3111* was preempted by ERISA [*see Carpenters So. Cal. Admin. Corp. v. El Capitan Development Co. (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1041, 1049-1054, 282 Cal. Rptr. 277, 811 P.2d 296]* .

[5] Hazardous Waste Removal

A subcontractor registered as a hazardous waste hauler pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 25163* is entitled to serve a stop notice on a public entity as provided in *Civ. Code § 3181* when the contractor who contracted with the public entity for the investigation, removal or remedial action, or disposal of hazardous waste fails to pay the subcontractor within 10 days after the investigation, removal or remedial action, or disposal is completed [*Civ. Code § 3181*; *see Pub. Contract Code § 4107.7*].

[6] Furnisher of Labor or Materials

[a] In General

A person furnishing labor or materials used in, on, or about the performance of public work may avail himself or herself of the stop notice procedure, providing the work or material is furnished at the instance of the prime or original contractor or a subcontractor having charge, in whole or in part, of the project [*Theisen v. Los Angeles County (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 170, 177, 5 Cal. Rptr. 161, 352 P.2d 529* ; *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298* (relying on language contained in former Code Civ. Proc. § 1192.1, *now see Civ. Code § 3110*].

Thus, when materials furnished to a subcontractor become a part of the subcontractor's general equipment and are of such a nature that, in the usual course of events, they will not be entirely used and consumed on the job for which they were purchased, a claim therefor is not subject to the statutory stop notice procedure. Similarly, when only a part of the material furnished to a subcontractor is used in the performance of the latter's contract, the remainder being diverted to other uses, and it is impossible to estimate what part was used in performance of the contract, a claim therefor is not within the scope of the statutory stop notice procedure [*George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 521, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298* (insufficient evidence that tires and tire services furnished by plaintiff were used up in highway project required reversal of judgment for plaintiff in action on stop notice)].

[b] Contractor and Materialman Distinguished

No stop notice rights may be conferred on a person furnishing labor or materials for a public project unless the labor or

materials is furnished at the instance of a contractor or subcontractor having charge, in whole or in part, of the project. Thus, the stop notice procedure applicable to public work is not available to those whose relationship to the work is only that of vendor of materials to a materialman [*Theisen v. Los Angeles County (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 170, 177, 5 Cal. Rptr. 161, 352 P.2d 529]* .

The essential feature that establishes one as a subcontractor rather than as a materialman and that the materialman must show to be entitled to enforce a stop notice [*see George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520-521, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298]* , is that in the course of performance of the prime or original contract the person to whom the materials were furnished constructed at the job site or elsewhere, a definite, substantial part of the work of improvement in accordance with the plans and specifications of the contract [*Theisen v. Los Angeles County (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 170, 183, 5 Cal. Rptr. 161, 352 P.2d 529]* . Under this definition, it is sufficient that a person perform an important or material part of the total work of improvement in order to perform a substantial part of the work [*George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298* ; *see Piping Specialties Co. v. Kentile, Inc. (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 586, 588-589, 40 Cal. Rptr. 537]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesHazardous Materials Transportation Safety & Security Reauthorization ActGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawCollective Bargaining & Labor RelationsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.46

§ 481.46 Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

[1] Duty Measured by Extent of Liability of Public Entity

On receipt of the stop notice, the public entity must withhold money or bonds, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3186*, either that are due or that are to become due [*see Civ. Code § 3186*]. The provisions governing stop notices for public works do not prohibit the payment of any money or bonds to the original contractor or to his or her assignee unless a stop notice is on file before the disbursing officer has actually surrendered possession of the warrant, check, bonds, or money [*Civ. Code § 3187(a)*].

Because the public entity must withhold money or bonds that are due or to become due, the extent of the public entity's liability to the stop notice claimant after a stop notice has been served is measured by the extent of the public entity's liability to the original contractor [*Dorris v. Alturas School Dist. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 30, 33, 142 P. 795* (decided under former Code Civ. Proc. § 1184; *now see Civ. Code § 3186*)]. That liability may be measured either by the terms of the contract between the public entity and the original contractor or by the terms of the various statutes governing public works contracts [*see Harsco Corp. v. Department of Public Works (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276-278, 98 Cal. Rptr. 337* ; *Dorris v. Alturas School Dist. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 30, 30-33, 142 P. 795]* . For example, when the original contractor abandons the project in breach of its contract with the public entity, the entity, by the terms of the contract, is obligated to pay the full contract price only on completion of the contract; and when the cost of completion is greater than the amount owing from the entity to the contractor, a stop notice claimant has no rights to those remaining funds in the hands of the public entity [*see Dorris v. Alturas School Dist. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 30, 33, 142 P. 795]* . Similarly, moneys withheld by a public entity pursuant to Pub. Contract Code § 1026 (mandatory retention by public entity of at least 10 percent of contract price until final acceptance and completion of project) are not subject to the claims of stop notices when the contractor has abandoned the project and the cost of completion exceeds the original contract price and consumes all of the retained funds [*Harsco Corp. v. Department of Public Works (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276-280, 98 Cal. Rptr. 337]* .

[2] Breach of Duty to Withhold

When a proper and timely stop notice has been served on a public entity, the entity is not permitted to exercise any

discretion concerning theamount to be withheld in response to the notice. Even when the original contractor in good faith contests the validity or amount of a stop notice claim, the full amount of the claim is withheld, subject to the provisions governing the amount that must be withheld (*see* cases in § 481.111[1]) and pending the filing of a surety bond under *Civ. Code § 3196* (*see § 481.50*) or the commencement of summary proceedings to determine the validity of the stop notice or the amount of claim stated in the stop notice (*see § 481.51*) [*see Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 585, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143]* .

When the public entity ignores the stop notice, or fails to withhold the amount that is required to be withheld, an action in equity lies by stop notice claimants injured thereby against the public entity [*see United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907]* . Moreover, when the public individuals served with the stop notice willfully disregard their duty to withhold sufficient funds, they are personally liable to the stop notice claimants injured thereby [*see United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 230, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907* ; *L. W. Blinn Co. v. Pioneer Drainage Dist. (1920) 50 Cal. App. 364, 370-371, 195 P. 750* (decided under former Code Civ. Proc. § 1184, which required "owner" to withhold money in action involving drainage district)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawPerformanceInspection & Acceptance of Goods & ServicesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.47

§ 481.47 Amount Required to Be Withheld

[1] Claim and Costs

The amount the public entity must withhold on receipt of a stop notice is an amount sufficient to answer the claim stated in the stop notice and to provide for the reasonable cost incurred by the entity in any resulting litigation [*Civ. Code § 3186*]. The public entity is permitted to pay the original contractor or his or her assignee any money due the contractor or assignee in excess of an amount sufficient to answer the total amount of the claims stated in stop notices on file at the time of the payment plus such interest and court costs as might be reasonably anticipated in connection with the claims [*Civ. Code § 3187*].

[2] Amount Permitted to Be Claimed in Stop Notice

Although no statute expressly defines the amount that may be claimed in a stop notice, that amount may be determined by analogy to *Civ. Code § 3123* regulating similar protection afforded to suppliers under the mechanics' lien law [*University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 266, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836* ; *see Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782]* . *Civ. Code § 3123* provides that the amount of lien that may be claimed by a mechanics' lien claimant may be either (1) the reasonable value of the labor, services, equipment, or materials furnished or (2) for the price agreed on by the claimant and the person with whom the claimant contracted, whichever is less. Thus, it would seem that the stop notice claimant is similarly limited to claiming in his or her stop notice either the reasonable value of the labor, services, equipment, or materials furnished or the contract price, whichever is less [*see University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 266, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836]* . When the labor, services, equipment, or materials furnished by the claimant is less than that specified in the contract, the reasonable value of the labor, service, equipment, or materials furnished is limited to a proportion of the contract price reflecting the amount of progress made toward the completion of the work [*University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 266-267, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.48

§ 481.48 Priorities of Claims to Withheld Funds or Garnishment

[1] Assignment of Contract

No assignment by the original contractor of any of the money due or to become due to him or her under the contract, or for "extras" in connection therewith, whether made before or after the service of a stop notice, takes priority over a stop notice for public works of improvement and such assignment has no effect on the rights of the stop notice claimants [*Civ. Code § 3193*]. Any garnishment of the money by any creditor of the original contract pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.710 et seq.*, and any statutory liens thereon, are subordinate to the rights of all stop notice claimants [*Civ. Code § 3193*].

[2] Insufficient Funds to Satisfy Claims

[a] Distribution

If the money withheld pursuant to stop notices is insufficient to pay in full all of the valid claims stated in such notices, the money must be distributed among the stop notice claimants in the same ratio that their respective claims bear to the aggregate of such valid claims, without regard to the order of time in which their respective notices may have been served or their respective actions, if any have been commenced [*Civ. Code § 3190*].

However, the stop notice claimant may recover from the contractor or his or her sureties any deficit that may remain unpaid after the pro rata distribution in an action on the contractor's payment bond for public work as provided in *Civ. Code §§ 3247-3252* [*Pub. Contract Code § 7103*; *see Civ. Code § 3191*].

[b] Forfeiture of Right to Pro Rata Distribution

Any person who willfully gives a false stop notice to the public entity or who willfully includes in his or her notice labor, services, equipment, ormaterials not furnished for the work of improvement with respect to which the notice is given, forfeits all right to participate in the pro rata distribution of money or bonds withheld [*Civ. Code § 3192*].

A public entity is liable for interest on the amount withheld, commencing 60 days after the notice of claim, if the entity admits that the amount is owed [*Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 771, 777-780, 181 Cal. Rptr. 332* ; *see Gov. Code § 980*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawPerformanceAssignment & NovationReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.49

§ 481.49 Enforcement of Stop Notice Rights

[1] Prerequisites to Entitlement to Enforcement

A claimant is entitled to enforce a stop notice only if he or she has complied with each of the following conditions: (1) the claimant has given the preliminary 20-day notice (public work) in accordance with *Civ. Code § 3098* if required by that section (for an outline of the requirements for serving a preliminary 20-day notice (public work) and when the notice must be served, *see* the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.170-481.174*); and (2) the claimant has filed his or her stop notice as defined in *Civ. Code § 3103* and in accordance with *Civ. Code § 3184* specifying the time limit for effective service of a stop notice (for an outline of the requirements relating to the preparation and service of a stop notice, *see* the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.190, 481.191*) [*Civ. Code § 3183*].

[2] Action to Enforce Stop Notice

An action against the original contractor and the public entity to enforce payment of the claim stated in the stop notice may be commenced at any time after 10 days from the date of the service of the stop notice on the public entity and must be commenced not later than 90 days following the expiration of the period within which stop notices must be filed as provided in *Civ. Code § 3184* [*Civ. Code § 3210*]. For an outline of the procedures that must be followed in an action to enforce a stop notice claim, see the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.270-481.277*. There is a split in authority as to whether the public agency may be estopped to rely on the statute of limitation. One court has held that a public agency could not be estopped [*A.J. Setting Co. v. Trustees of Cal. State University and Colleges (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 374, 382-384, 174 Cal. Rptr. 43]* . Another court has held that estoppel may be raised when the subcontractor filed a claim with the city, the city represented that it was looking into the claim, and the subcontractor could not recover from the contractor [*Structural Steel Fabricators, Inc. v. City of Orange (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1206, 1211-1212, 286 Cal. Rptr. 24]* . This case was remanded to the trial court, which ruled that the subcontractor failed to prove estoppel; however, the trial court held that the subcontractor's stop notice enforcement action was timely filed nonetheless because the statute of limitations was equitably tolled while the subcontractor pursued its claim against the general contractor and a bonding company. The court of appeal affirmed, holding that the doctrine of equitable tolling can be applied to defeat a statute of limitations defense [*Structural Steel Fabricators, Inc. v. City of Orange (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 459, 464-467, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 867]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsEquitable EstoppelGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGovernmental EntitiesGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.50

§ 481.50 Bond to Release Withheld Funds

If the original contractor or subcontractor disputes the correctness, validity, or enforceability of any stop notice, the public entity may, in its discretion, permit the original contractor to file a bond, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3196*, with the public entity. On the filing of such a bond, the public entity may not withhold any money or bonds (if bonds are to be issued in payment for the work of improvement) from the original contractor on account of the stop notice. The surety or sureties on such bond are jointly and severally liable to the stop notice claimant with the surety or sureties on any original contractor's payment bond furnished pursuant to *Civ. Code §§ 3247-3252* [*Civ. Code § 3196*; for a discussion of such payment bonds, *see §§ 481.70 -481.76*]. For an outline of the procedures and other requirements for obtaining a bond for release of withheld funds, see the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.210-481.216*.

A stop notice release bond is considered to be "given in an action or proceeding" for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc § 996.440(a)* (motion to enforce liability on bond without need for independent action) and thus may be enforced by the summary procedures set forth in the Bond and Undertaking Law [*Grade-Way Contruction Co. v. Golden Eagle Ins. Co. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 826, 830-835, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*]. The summary enforcement procedure provides for a motion made after entry of final judgment in the action in which the bond is given. Judgment must be entered against the surety unless the surety files affidavits showing a triable issue of fact [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*].

For a discussion and forms regarding the summary procedure, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.51

§ 481.51 Summary Proceedings by Original Contractor for Determination of Stop Notice Rights

[1] Commencement of Proceedings

If the original contractor asserts that (1) the claim on which the stop notice is based is not included within the types or classifications of claims referred to in *Civ. Code §§ 3196-3205* (release of stop notice), (2) the claimant is not one of the persons named in *Civ. Code § 3181* [*see § 481.45*], (3) the amount of the claim as specified in the stop notice is excessive, or (4) there is no basis in law for the claim as referred to andset out in the stop notice, he or she may have the question determined in a summary proceedings in accordance with the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 3198-3205* [*Civ. Code § 3197*]. The original contractor may also commence such proceedings to decrease the amount of the bond after it has filed a surety bond with the public entity, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3196*, and obtained the release of money withheld pursuant to the claimant's stop notice [*see Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143]* .

[2] Service of Affidavit on Public Entity

To contest the validity or amount of the claim, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3197*, the original contractor must serve an affidavit and a copy thereof on the public entity, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3198*, alleging the legal grounds on which he or she bases his or her claim and the facts in support thereof, and demanding the release of all or such portion of the money or bonds as is allegedly withheld improperly or in an excessive amount [*Civ. Code § 3198*].

[3] Service of Affidavit on Claimant

On receipt of the general contractor's affidavit, the public entity must serve on the claimant, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3199*, a copy of the affidavit and the demand for release together with a written notice stating that the public entity will release such money or bonds, or such portion of either as has been demanded, unless the claimant files with the public entity a counteraffidavit on or before the time designated in the notice [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

[4] Counteraffidavit by Claimant

If the claimant desires to contest the original contractor's affidavit and demand for release, he or she must, within the time allowed under *Civ. Code § 3198*, serve on the public entity a counteraffidavit alleging the details of his or her claim and rebutting the allegations of the original contractor's affidavit as provided in *Civ. Code § 3200*. If no such counteraffidavit is served on the public entity within the time allowed, then the public entity must forthwith release the money or bonds, or such portion thereof as has been demanded by such affidavit, without further notice to the claimant [*Civ. Code § 3200*]. For a more detailed outline of the procedures an original contractor must follow to obtain a release of withheld funds under *Civ. Code § 3200*, see the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.230-481.233*.

The public entity is neither responsible for the validity of the affidavit or counteraffidavit nor liable in any manner for making such release [*Civ. Code § 3200*].

[5] Action for Declaration of Rights of Respective Parties

[a] Commencement of Action

If the claimant has served a counteraffidavit on the public entity, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3200*, together with proof of service, either the original contractor or the claimant may file an action in the appropriate superior court for a declaration of the respective rights of the parties [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

The Civil Code does not specify in what manner the action must be commenced. Although the manner in which an original contractor may dispute a stop notice under *Civ. Code §§ 3197-3205* is termed a "summary proceeding" in *Civ. Code § 3197* and, in addition *Civ. Code § 3202* (as discussed below) provides that the affidavit and counteraffidavit constitute the pleadings for the purpose of hearing the matter after either party has moved the court for such a hearing following the filing of the action, it would appear that *Civ. Code § 3201* nevertheless contemplates that the original contractor or claimant file a complaint, or perhaps a petition [*see § 481.337*], for a declaration of the rights of the respective parties. However, in lieu of a complaint or petition, local court practice has permitted counsel to file an order to show cause why a hearing should not be granted and why the court should not determine the respective rights of the parties to the funds withheld by the public agency pursuant to the claimant's stop notice.

An order to show cause, or even a noticed motion, is a possible alternative for counsel if an action has already been commenced by the claimant to enforce payment of the claim stated in the stop notice since, in such a case, the court would already have had jurisdiction over the parties to the summary proceeding. However, particularly if no action has been filed to enforce the claim stated in the stop notice, the filing of an order to show cause is not recommended since *Civ. Code § 3201* clearly requires an action be filed by the original contractor or claimant before either party may request a hearing on the matter. In any case, counsel should determine whether there is any particular local court practice before proceeding to file an action for declaration of the rights of the respective parties under *Civ. Code § 3201*.

[b] Hearing to Determine Rights of Respective Parties

After filing an action for a declaration of the respective rights of the parties under *Civ. Code § 3201*, either the original contractor or the claimant is entitled to a hearing by the court for the purpose of determining his or her rights under the affidavit and demand for release and the counteraffidavit. Such hearing must be granted by the court within 15 days from the date of making such motion, unless continued by the court for good cause. The party making the motion for hearing must give not less than five days'notice in writing of such hearing to the public entity and to the other party [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

At the hearing the original contractor has the burden of proof. The affidavit and counteraffidavit are filed with the court by the public entity and constitute the pleadings, subject to the power of the court to permit an amendment in the interest of justice. The affidavit of the original contractor is deemed controverted by the counteraffidavit, and both are received in evidence [*Civ. Code § 3202*].

[6] Right to Jury Trial

[a] Determination of Rights

Nothing contained in *Civ. Code §§ 3197-3205* governing summary proceedings for a declaration of rights of the respective parties concerning a claim stated in a stop notice may be construed to deprive any party of the right to a trial by jury in any case where such right is given by the California Constitution. However, a jury trial may be waived in the same manner as in the trial of an action [*Civ. Code § 3204*].

When the hearing is before the court sitting without a jury and no evidence other than the affidavit and counteraffidavit is offered, if the court is satisfied that sufficient facts are shown thereby, it may make its determination thereon [*Civ. Code § 3203*]. However, the manner in which the court makes it determination is not restricted in the same manner as it would be at the hearing on a motion for summary judgment. That is, the court is not foreclosed from making a conclusive determination of the rights of the parties when the allegations of the counteraffidavit effectively controvert the allegations of the affidavit of the original contractor. Instead, the court may order the hearing continued for the production of other evidence, oral or documentary, or the filing of other affidavits and counteraffidavits [*Civ. Code § 3203*]. In addition, local court practice may permit such evidence to be produced without requiring the matter be continued.

At the conclusion of the hearing, the court must make and enter its order determining whether or not the demand for release should be allowed. No findings are required [*Civ. Code § 3203*]. When the original contractor's affidavit asserts that the amount of the claim specified in the stop notice is excessive, the court may enter its order releasing such portion of the money or bonds withheld pursuant to the stop notice as it determines was withheld improperly or in an excessive amount [*see University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 265-267, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836]* .

[b] Appeal From Order

The statutes governing the summary proceedings to release or decrease the amount of claim demanded in the stop notice make no provision for appellate review of an order entered in such a summary proceeding, and such review is not permitted both because the order is not a judgment and because of the delays which necessarily accompany the prosecution of such an appeal [*see Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 586-587, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143]* . However, a writ of review, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077*, is an appropriate means to review such an order [*University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 265, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836]* .

[c] Effect of Order

An order determining whether or not the demand for release should be allowed, as provided in *Civ. Code § 3203*, also determines the right of the claimant to have the money or bonds further withheld by the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3203*]. However, no determination in the summary proceeding is res judicata with regard to any right of action by the claimant against either the principal or surety on any labor or material bond or with regard to any right of action against any party personally liable to the claimant [*Civ. Code § 3205*].

For a detailed outline of the summary proceedings to determine the rights of the parties to withheld funds, see the Procedural Checklists in §§ *481.250-481.253*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural

ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.52-481.69

[Reserved]

§§ 481.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.70

§ 481.70 Governing Statutes

Payment bonds are defined in *Civ. Code § 3096*. Provisions relating to bonds in general are contained in *Civ. Code §§ 3225-3228*. Actions on payment bonds which are required from an original contractor on certain public works are governed by *Civ. Code §§ 3247-3252* and *Pub. Contract Code § 7103*.

These code provisions are expressly made applicable to the Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 set forth in *Sts. & Hy. Code § 10000 et seq.* [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20496*]. However, these sections are expressly made inapplicable to the Improvement Act of 1911 set forth in *Pub. Contract Code § 20457 et seq.* [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20461*]. The provisions of the Improvement Act of 1911 for a labor and material bond are contained in the Public Contracts Code [*see Pub. Contract Code §§ 20457-20464*]. This chapter does not cover these bond provisions and counsel is referred to *Pub. Contract Code § 20457 et seq.* for the statutory provisions for a labor and material bond under the Improvement Act of 1911.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.71

§ 481.71 Payment Bonds

[1] Defined

A payment bond is a bond with good and sufficient sureties that is conditioned for the payment in full of any claimant and which also by its terms is made to inure to the benefit of all such claimants so as to give these persons a right of action to recover on the bond [*Civ. Code § 3096*].

[2] Performance Bond Distinguished

A performance bond is an undertaking furnished by a contractor for the faithful performance of the contract by the contractor guaranteeing that the work undertaken will be done according to the terms of the contract [*see Gordy v. United Pacific Ins. Group (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 445, 448, 52 Cal. Rptr. 438]* . In contrast, the payment bond guarantees the satisfaction of the obligations of all claimants who have furnished labor or materials to a work of improvement [*see Civ. Code § 3096*; *Gordy v. United Pacific Ins. Group (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 445, 448-449, 52 Cal. Rptr. 438]* . If the bond by its terms guarantees performance by the contractor and payment by the contractor of all obligations for material, equipment, and labor required in the work contracted for, the bond is both a performance and a payment bond [*Gordy v. United Pacific Ins. Group (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 445, 448-449, 52 Cal. Rptr. 438]* .

[3] Construction

Any payment bond is construed most strongly against the surety and in favor of all persons for whose benefit the bond is given [*Civ. Code § 3226*].

[4] Sole Condition of Recovery

The sole condition of recovery on any payment bond for any claimant is that the claimant has not been paid the full amount of his or her claim [*Civ. Code § 3226*]. In substance, the surety on a payment bond guarantees the integrity and solvency of the contractor. The inefficiency of the claimant, such as the failure to require a contractor to authorize the claimant to retain an owner's check in payment of the contractor's indebtedness to him or her, is considered a risk

incident to the surety's undertaking and does not relieve him or her of liability [*Ferry v. Ohio Farmers Ins. Co. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 651, 659, 27 Cal. Rptr. 471]* . Under no circumstances is a surety released from liability to a claimant by reason of a breach of contract between the owner and original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3226*].

[5] Exoneration or Release of Sureties

The surety or sureties on any payment bond may not be exonerated or released from the obligation of the bond by any of the following: (1) changes, alterations, or modifications in or of any contract, plans, specifications, or agreement pertaining or relating to the furnishing of labor, materials, or equipment therefor; (2) changes or modifications of any terms of payment or extension of the time for any payment pertaining or relating to any scheme or work of improvement; (3) a rescission or attempted rescission of any contract, agreement, or bond; (4) conditions precedent or subsequent in the bond attempting to limit the right of recovery of claimants otherwise entitled to recover under any contract, agreement, or bond; and (5) any fraud practiced by any person other than the claimant seeking to recover on the bond where the bond is given for the benefit of the claimants [*Civ. Code § 3225*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.72

§ 481.72 When Payment Bond Required

Every original contractor to whom a public works contract in excess of $25,000 is awarded by a public entity, except as provided in *Pub. Contract Code § 7103(d)* (discussed *below*), must file a bond with the officer or public entity by whom the contract was awarded [*Civ. Code § 3247(a)*]. The bond must be in a sum not less than 100 percent of the total amount payable under the terms of the contract [*Civ. Code § 3248(a)*]. The bond must be executed by an admitted surety insurer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311(a)*]. The public agency approving the bond has a duty to verify the admitted surety status of the party executing the bond. The agency may fulfill this duty by either [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311(b)*]:

- Printing out information from the Department of Insurance website confirming that the surety is an admitted surety insurer and attaching that information to the bond; or

- Obtaining a certificate from the county clerk confirming that the surety is an admitted insurer and attaching the certificate to the bond.

The bond must provide that if the contractor or his or her subcontractor fails to pay any of the persons named in *Civ. Code § 3181* (persons entitled to serve stop notices) or amounts due under the Unemployment Insurance Code with respect to work or labor performed under the contract, the sureties will pay for the same to the extent specified in the bond and, if suit is brought on the bond, a reasonable attorney's fee to be fixed by the court [*Civ. Code § 3248(b)*].

Every original contractor to whom a public works contract in excess of $25,000 is awarded by a state entity is also required to file a bond with the officer or public entity by whom the contract was awarded. The bond must be in a sum not less than 100 percent of the total amount payable by the terms of the contract [*Pub. Contract Code § 7103(a)*]. In this context, "state entity" means every state office, department, division, bureau, board, or commission, but does not include the Legislature, the courts, any agency in the judicial branch of government, or the University of California. All other public entities are governed by *Civ. Code § 3247* [*Pub. Contract Code § 7103(d)*].

The bond must be approved by the officer or body or state entity by whom the contract was awarded. Before approving the bond, the public entity must determine that the surety is a sufficient admitted surety insurer; a public entity that fails

to investigate may be liable for breach of a mandatory duty [*Walt Rankin & Associates, Inc. v. City of Murietta (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 605, 624, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 48* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311(a)*]. Additionally, the public or the state entity must state, in its call for bids for a contract, that a payment bond is required in the case of expenditures in excess of $25,000 [*Civ. Code § 3247(a)*; *Pub. Contract Code § 7103(a)*]. A payment bond filed and approved in accordance with *Civ. Code § 3247* or *Pub. Contract Code § 7103* is sufficient to enter on the performance of work undera duly authorized contract that supplements the contract for which the bond was filed, if the requirement of a new bond is waived by the public or the state entity [*Civ. Code § 3247(b)*; *Pub. Contract Code § 7103(b)*].

Approval of a payment bond must be carried out in conjunction with the provisions of the Bond and Undertaking Law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*], which imposes a mandatory duty on the public entity to investigate the sufficiency of a proposed surety [*see Walt Rankin & Associates, Inc. v. City of Murrieta (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 605-622, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 48* (city was liable to unpaid subcontractor when city failed to investigate bogus surety that defaulted on payment bond); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311*].

Providers of architectural, engineering, and land surveying services pursuant to a contract with a public or a state entity for any public work are not original contractors within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 3247* and *Pub. Contract Code § 7103*, and are not required to post or file the payment bond required thereunder [*Civ. Code § 3247(c)*; *Pub. Contract Code § 7103(c)*]. Public utilities are not public entities within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 3247*, and therefore a contractor contracting with a public utility also is not required to post a public works bond [*Automatic Sprinkler Corp. v. Southern Cal. Edison (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631-633, 266 Cal. Rptr. 662]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.73

§ 481.73 Purpose of Requiring Payment Bond

The purpose of a public works contractor's payment bond is to give materialmen and laborers who furnish materials for and render services on public works an additional means of receiving compensation [*Consolidated Elec. Distributors, Inc. v. Kirkham, Chaon & Kirkham, Inc. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 54, 60, 95 Cal. Rptr. 673]* . The provisions governing payment bonds for public works thus create a fund in lieu of the building or other work of improvement itself against which such materialmen and laborers might proceed as an additional and contemporaneous remedy to actions on their contracts or on claims stated in stop notices [*Powers Regulator Co. v. Seaboard Surety Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 338, 345,22 Cal. Rptr. 373* ; *Pneucrete Corp. v. U.S. Fid. & G. Co. (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 733, 737, 46 P.2d 1000* ; *see Civ. Code § 3250*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.74

§ 481.74 Action on Payment Bond

[1] In General

An action against the sureties on the payment bond may be brought by any claimant, or his or her assignee, at any time after the claimant has ceased his or her performance, and before the expiration of six months after the period in which stop notices may be filed under *Civ. Code § 3184* [*Civ. Code § 3249*]. Under *Civ. Code § 3184*, a stop notice must be served before the expiration of (1) 30 days after the recording of a notice of completion or notice of cessation, if such a notice is recorded, or (2) 90 days after completion or cessation, if no notice of completion or notice of cessation is recorded [*Civ. Code § 3184*; *see W.F. Hayward Co. v. Transamerica Ins. Co. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1101, 1106-1110, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 468* (30-day cessation of labor on public work of improvement constituted "completion" of project under *Civ. Code §§ 3086, 3184*, and commenced running of 90-day stop notice period)].

It should be noted, however, that the filing of a stop notice with the public entity is not a condition precedent to the maintenance of an action against the sureties on the payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3250*]. Moreover, the action on the payment bond is not in any sense based on the personal liability of the contractor. The bond creates a direct obligation and affords a right of action against the principal and the surety. Hence, because the action is based on the obligation of the bond, the bond provides a separate and distinct and statutory remedy which is enforceable without reference to any contract between the contractor and materialman or laborer [*Powers Regulator Co. v. Seaboard Surety Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 338, 345, 22 Cal. Rptr. 373* ; *Pneucrete Corp. v. U.S. Fid. & G. Co. (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 733, 738, 46 P.2d 1000]* .

The prevailing party in the action on the payment bond may be awarded a reasonable attorney's fee to be taxed as costs [*Civ. Code § 3250*]. Costs may be awarded even if the prevailing party prevails on technical grounds, rather than on the merits [*Winick Corp. v. Safeco Insurance Co. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1502, 1507-1508, 232 Cal. Rptr. 479]* .

[2] Giving of Notice Is Prerequisite

To enforce a claim on any payment bond given in connection with a public work, a claimant who is not exempted by *Civ. Code § 3098(a)* must give either a 20-day preliminary notice as provided in *Civ. Code § 3098* or a post-completion

bond notice as provided in *Civ. Code § 3252(b)* [*Civ. Code § 3252*]. For a form and outline of requirements for giving a 20-day preliminary notice, see *§§ 481.170 -481.174* (checklist), 481.330 (form).For an outline of the requirements for giving a post-completion bond notice and other procedural requirements for bringing an action on a contractor's payment bond, see *§§ 481.290 -481.294*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesReasonable FeesCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.75

§ 481.75 Indemnification Agreement

When an original contractor obtains a payment bond, the bonding company generally requires him or her to sign an agreement providing that the contractor will indemnify the bonding company against any loss it might suffer. In many situations a bonding company will have to pay claims only if the original contractor is liable to the claimant. However, a material and labor bond is a primary and direct obligation to materialmen and laborers without regard to the original contract. Even though an original contractor owes nothing to suppliers of his or her subcontractor, the bonding company is obligated under the statutorily required bond to pay the claims of unpaid suppliers to a subcontractor. A release by a supplier to a subcontractor of any claims against the original contractor is not effective to release the bonding company [*see Bonded Prod. Co. v. R.C. Gallyon Constr. Co., Inc. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 186, 190-191, 39 Cal. Rptr. 347* ; *Powers Regulator Co. v. Seaboard Surety Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 338, 345-347, 22 Cal. Rptr. 373]* .

For the above reasons, an original contractor will assume, in practice, the obligation of paying claims of suppliers to his or her subcontractors unless these suppliers release all obligations of the bonding company to them before progress payments are made by the original contractor to his or her subcontractors.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.76

§ 481.76 Right of Original Contractor to Require Subcontractor's Bond

The original contractor may require a subcontractor to furnish a bond to indemnify the original contractor for any loss he or she might sustain as a result of a subcontractor's default under *Civ. Code § 3248* [*Civ. Code § 3248(b)*]. If the prime contractor requests that the subcontractor furnish a bond or bonds issued by an admitted surety at the prime contractor's expense, with the prime contractor as obligee, and the subcontractor fails to do so, the prime contractor may reject the bid and substitute another subcontractor subject to *Pub. Contract Code § 4107* (substitution restrictions). The subcontractor must obtain a bond at its own expense only if the prime contractor in the written or published request for subbids specifies that the subcontractor must bear the expense, and clearly specifies the amount and requirements of the bond or bonds [*Pub. Contract Code § 4108*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.77-481.89

[Reserved]

§§ 481.77[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.90

§ 481.90 State Statutes

[1] Arbitration of Public Works Contracts

Arbitration of public works contract claims. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 22200, 22201*

[2] Competitive Bidding Requirements for Public Entities

Community college districts. Educ. Code § 20084

Exceptions to competitive bidding requirements for contracts let by trustees of California State University. *Pub. Contract Code § 10722*

City government. *Pub. Contract Code § 20163*

Reclamation districts. Pub. Contract Code § 20920 et seq., Water Code § 50907

[3] Contract Clauses

Provisions purporting to indemnify public agency by design professional against liability for claims against public agency are unenforceable, except for claims arising from design professional's negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct. *Civ. Code § 2782.8(a)*

Provisions governing acceptance of payment due contractor as waiver of claims against public entity. *Pub. Contract Code § 7100*

Provision for payment of extra compensation to contractor for cost reduction changes in specifications for public

project. *Pub. Contract Code § 7101*

Provisions limiting contractee's liability for delay to extension of time do not preclude recovery of damages when contractee is responsible for delay and when delay is unreasonable under circumstances. *Pub. Contract Code § 7102*

Provisions required when contract of local public entity involves digging trenches or other excavations deeper than four feet below surface. *Pub. Contract Code § 7104*

Submission of noncollusion affidavit required in any bid for public works contract. *Pub. Contract Code § 7106*

[4] County Government

Bridges. *Pub. Contract Code § 20404*; *Sts. & Hy. Code §§ 1320, 1331*

Building construction. *Pub. Contract Code § 20125*

Highways. *Pub. Contract Code § 20392*

Harbor districts. Harb. & Nav. Code § 6680

Port districts. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 20750-20758*

River port districts. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 20760-20769*

Regional park districts. *Pub. Res. Code § 5594*

Sewerage districts. *Health & Safety Code § 5010*

State of *California. Pub. Contract Code § 10122*

Waterworks districts. *Pub. Contract Code § 20601*

[5] License Verification

Verification of licensure prior to award of contract by state agency or department. *Pub. Contract Code § 6100*

[6] Minority Business Enterprises

Actions to enjoin issuance of bonds or enforcement of contracts for professional bond services based on awarding department's failure to meet minority and women's business goals specified in *Gov. Code §§ 16850-16856* are prohibited. *Gov. Code § 16856*

Local agency may require minority hiring by lowest responsible bidder before awarding contract. *Pub. Contract Code § 2000*

Certification of minority and women business enterprises for purposes of awarding public contracts. *Pub. Contract Code § 2050 et seq.*

Department of Transportation is charged to develop program to regulate awarding of highway construction contracts funded solely by state funds to minority enterprises. *Sts. & Hy. Code § 94.3*

Civil penalties for acts relating to fraudulent procurement of certification as minority business enterprise. *Sts. & Hy. Code § 94.4*

[7] Payment

Maximum time, from receipt of undisputed invoice, for state agency to issue warrant for payment for performance under contract and avoid late payment penalties. *Gov. Code § 927.4*

[8] Relief From Active Negligence Void

Clause in construction contract with public agency that relieves agency from liability for its active negligence is void. *Civ. Code § 2782(b)*

[9] Relief of Bidders

Second lowest bidder is entitled to right of action against successful bidder convicted of violations for failure to provide workers' compensation unemployment insurance. *Lab. Code § 1750*, Pub. Contract Code §§ *19102, 20104.70*

Relief of bidders in case of bid submitted to state, Regents of University of California, county, city and county, city, district, public authority, public agency, or other political subdivision or public corporation of state. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 5100-5107*

[10] Resolution of Claims

General claims provisions. *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.*

Construction claims of $375,000 or less between contractor and local agency. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 20104-20104.6*

[11] Small Business Procurement and Contract Act

Preference for small businesses in certain construction and procurement contracts. *Gov. Code §§ 14836-14843*

Preference for small businesses owned by disabled veterans. *Gov. Code §§ 14838(f), 14838.6*

Penalty provisions. *Gov. Code §§ 14842, 14842.5*

[12] State Contract Act

Preparation of plans and specifications by the Department of Transportation before entering into contract. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10120-10127*

Notices to bidders. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10140-10141*

Requirements for bids in public works contracts. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10160-10169*

Awards of public works contracts to bidders. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10180-10185*

Requirements for contracts for public works. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10220-10227*

Performance of public works contracts. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10250-10264*

Penalties for willful violations of contract for public works. *Pub. Contract Code §§ 10280-10284*

[13] Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

Purpose of Act. *Gov. Code § 4101*

Legal or equitable rights or remedies of original or substituted contract against prime contractor and of state against prime contractor are not limited or diminished by Act. *Gov. Code § 4103*

Requirement of listing of subcontractor in prime contractor's bid for work in amount in excess of one-half of one percent of total bid. *Gov. Code § 4104*

Extension of deadline for bid submission in case of material change to bid invitation later than 72 hours prior to bid closing. *Pub. Contract Code § 4104.5*

Consequences of failure to specify subcontractor. *Gov. Code §§ 4106, 4107(b), 4109*

Procedure by which public entity may consent to substitution of subcontractors. *Gov. Code §§ 4107, 4107.5*

Statutory penalties for violation of Act. *Gov. Code §§ 4110, 4111*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsBridges & RoadsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationCompetitive ProposalsPublic Contracts LawBusiness Aids & AssistanceSmall BusinessesPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionArbitration & Mediation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.91

§ 481.91 Decisions

[1] Classification of License

Bus. & Prof. Code § 7059(b) allows agencies to specify that only designated license categories will be permitted to bid on project. *M&B Construction v. Yuba County Water Agency (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1361, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231*

[2] Compliance With Bidding Requirements

Project stabilization agreement entered into between airports commission and union trade council for airport expansion project, under which contractors were required to use union hiring hall for any new hires needed beyond their own core workforce and to pay union wages and benefits, was consistent with state and local competitive bidding law. *Associated Builders & Contractors, Inc. v. San Francisco Airports Com. (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 352, 365, 981 P.2d 499*

Competitive bidding required even though cost of public work is not to be paid out of public funds but rather from funds collected by person or company with whom or which public entity contracted for work performed. *East Bay Garbage Co. v. Washington Township Sanitation Co. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 708, 713, 344 P.2d 289*

Lease of public land requires compliance with bidding requirements. *Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1366-1368, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458*

Fact that no contract was involved in city public project did not permit city to avoid competitive bidding requirements when project otherwise met conditions of former *Gov. Code § 37902* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 20162*). *Killeen v. San Bruno (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 479, 482, 128 Cal. Rptr. 760*

[3] Consideration of Bids by Awarding Authority

[a] Duty to Award Contract to Lowest Responsible Bidder

Pub. Contract Code § 10115 et seq., requiring state departments to award contracts to "lowest responsible bidder meeting or making good faith efforts to meet" minority, women, and disabled business enterprise goals, is invalid as unconstitutional violation of equal protection principles. *Monterey Mechanical Co. v. Wilson (9th Cir. 1997) 125 F.3d 702, 714-715* ; *Barlow v. Davis (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1258, 1267, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 752*

Duty to award contract to lowest responsible bidder imposed by city charter not in conflict with subcontractor outreach program that required prime contractors to provide minority, women's, and other business enterprises equal opportunity to compete for and participate in performance of city contracts. *Domar Electric, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1994) 9 Cal. 4th 161, 173-174, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521, 885 P.2d 934*

Contract must be awarded to lowest bidder unless it is found that he or she is not responsible, i.e., not qualified to do particular work under consideration. *Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 867, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

When public entity does not comply with requirement that contract be awarded to lowest responsible bidder, award must be set aside. *Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 870, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

Word "responsible" in context of statute requiring award to lowest responsible bidder does not refer solely to attribute of trustworthiness, but also refers to quality, fitness, and capacity of low bidder to perform proposed work satisfactorily. *Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 867, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

Although due process did require quasi-judicial proceeding prior to rejection of low monetary bidder as nonresponsible bidder, public entity was required to notify that bidder of any evidence reflecting on his or her responsibility received from others or adduced as result of independent investigation, afford him or her opportunity to rebut any adverse evidence, and permit him or her to present evidence that he or she was qualified to perform contract. *City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 871, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

City's subcontractor outreach program, which required evaluation of bidders' good faith in conducting outreach efforts with regard to minority and women-owned businesses, did not violate equal protection even though program referred to expected level of minority and women-owned business participation. *Domar Electric, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 810, 825-827, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 822*

Failure of Legislature to enact explicit lowest bidder requirement in connection with construction projects of county water districts funded by authority of Revenue Bond Law of 1941, *Gov. Code § 54300 et seq.*, precludes courts from imposing such requirement. *Associated Builders & Contractors v. Contra Costa Water Dist. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 466, 469-471, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 600*

Fact that bid was not signed on signature line did not preclude award of contract when bid was signed elsewhere and bond was signed. *Menefee v. County of Fresno (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1175, 1178-1180, 210 Cal. Rptr. 99*

Public entity's promise in its solicitation of bids to award contract to lowest responsible bidder and bidder's reasonable and detrimental reliance on this promise permit bidder to bring action for breach of contract based on promissory estoppel when public entity did not award contract to lowest responsible bidder. *Swinerton & Walberg Co. v. City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 98, 104-105, 114 Cal. Rptr. 834*

Misaward of public works contract to one other than lowest responsible bidder constituted only abuse of discretion by awarding entity in determining identity of such bidder and therefore making of misaward came within discretionary immunity to tort liability established by *Gov. Code §§ 815, 815.2(b)*, and *820.2*. *Swinerton & Walberg Co. v. City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 98, 101, 114 Cal. Rptr. 834* ; *Rubino v. Lolli (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1063-1064, 89 Cal. Rptr. 320*

Allegations in cause of action to effect that successful bidder and public entity conspired to make misaward of contract in question to one other than lowest responsible bidder was sufficient to constitute cause of action for conspiracy by unsuccessful bidder. *Swinerton & Walberg Co. v. City of Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 98, 106, 114 Cal. Rptr. 834*

[b] Rejection of Bids Not in Best Interest of Public

Mandamus was not permitted to lie to force award of contract to lowest bidder for printing form under advertisement for bids when advertisement statedthat board reserved right to reject any and all bids if public good so required. *Stanley-Taylor Co. v. Supervisors (1902) 135 Cal. 486, 488, 67 P. 783*

State's request for prototype did not create implied promise that it would award contract to lowest bidder because such implication would render right of rejection meaningless when prototype is found not to be in best interests of state. *Pacific Architects Collaborative v. State of California (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 110, 124, 166 Cal. Rptr. 184*

Competitive bidding statutes were not passed for benefit of bidders but for benefit and protection of public. *Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 152, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Rubino v. Lolli (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1062, 89 Cal. Rptr. 320*

Until such time as bid is accepted, no contractual relationship exists between bidder and entity. *Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 155, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525*

Public entity's implied representation of existing intent to consider bids in good faith does not imply promise that thereafter it would consider bids before rejecting them when public entity is permitted to reject any and all bids. *Universal By-Products, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 145, 156, 117 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[c] Relief of Unsuccessful Bidder

Unsuccessful lowest responsible bidder may recover bid preparation costs, but may not recover lost profits, under theory of promissory estoppel. *Kajima/Ray Wilson v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Auth. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 305, 316, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 747, 1 P.3d 63*

Unsuccessful bidder who seeks to compel public agency to set aside award of contract to successful bidder on ground that agency had abused its discretion in making award has no legally cognizable cause or complaint, even if agency did err in exercising its discretion, if, after setting aside award, bidders would have no necessary right to rebid on competitive basis. *Old Town Dev. Corp. v. Urban Renewal Agency (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 313, 331-332, 57 Cal. Rptr. 426*

Awarding of contract by public official pursuant to specifications that are illegal and invalid and that fail to provide for full and fair competitive bidding, is abuse of discretion that may be corrected by mandamus. *Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 823, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798*

[4] Failure to Comply With Competitive Bidding Requirements

Ordinarily, compliance with terms of statute requiring letting of certain contract by public agency such as municipal corporation or county by competitive bidding and advertising for bids is mandatory with respect to those contracts coming within terms of statute; contract made without compliance with statute is void and unenforceable because it is in excess of agency's power. *Miller v. Mckinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 87-88, 124 P.2d 34*

Persons dealing with public agency are presumed to know law with respect to requirement of competitive bidding and to act at their peril. *Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 89, 124 P.2d 34*

Right of action exists to recover moneys paid to contractor for work and materials furnished public agency when they were furnished in contravention of statute requiring competitive bidding. *Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 89, 124 P.2d 34*

Fact that public district or body has received benefit of labor and materials furnished under contract void by reason of failure of district or body to comply with competitive bidding statutes does not entitle contractor to recover on an action in quantum meruit. *Reams v. Cooley (1915) 171 Cal. 150, 151-157, 152 P. 293*

Because enabling legislation was silent as to competitive bidding requirements, local service authority for freeway emergencies authorized by *Sts. & Hy. Code § 2550* was not required to apply competitive bidding principles in awarding contract for emergency call box system; legislature's failure to specifically exempt service authorities from competitive bidding requirements did not indicate intent to subject them to these requirements. *San Diego Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies v. Superior Court (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1466, 1468-1470, 244 Cal. Rptr. 440*

Neither doctrine of estoppel nor any other equitable principle may be invoked against governmental body when it would operate to defeat effective operation of policy adopted to protect public. *Paterson v. Board of Trustees (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 811, 819, 321 P.2d 825*

[5] Fair Practices Act

Fair Practices Act (*Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*) as addressed to efficient and economical supervision of public works projects and is not solely, or even primarily, for protection of private interests; purpose of act is to ensure that contracting authority has opportunity to investigate and approve any subcontractor who is proposed to work on project. *R.M. Sherman Co. v. W.R. Thomason, Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 559, 566, 236 Cal. Rptr. 577*

[6] Judicial Exceptions to Bidding Requirement

Use of own employees by municipality is not necessarily implied exception to competitive bidding requirements of former *Gov. Code § 37902* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 20162*) (requirement of competitive bidding by city). *Killeen v. San Bruno (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 479, 483, 128 Cal. Rptr. 760*

[a] Contracts Relating to "Municipal Affairs"

State general bidding procedures does not bind chartered cities when subject matter of bid constitutes municipal affair; thus, award of contract for refreshment stands in city park, which is matter of municipal concern, is controlled by local rather than state legislation. *R & A Vending Services, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1188, 1192, 218 Cal. Rptr. 667*

Contract by city for repairs is "municipal affair" and thus is not subject to state law bidding requirements. *Piledrivers' Local Union v. City of Santa Monica (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 509, 512-514, 198 Cal. Rptr. 731*

Decision whether work for extension or development of city public utilities must be done by contract on competitive bidding or by city forces is municipal affair. *Smith v. Riverside (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 529, 537, 110 Cal. Rptr. 67*

Whether work for extension or development of city public utilities must be done by contract on competitive bidding or by city forces is municipal affair when municipal activity at issue is not distribution of electricity and water but mode chosen to build and extend distribution facilities. *Smith v. Riverside (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 529, 536-537, 110 Cal. Rptr. 67*

[b] Employment of Skilled Professionals

Management contractor who performs services and lends his or her experience and expertise in preparation of final plans, and who in this respect may be likened to engineer or architect, is permitted to perform these services procured without strict compliance with competitive bidding requirements. *Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 866, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

Employment of person who is highly and technically skilled in his or her science or profession is one that may properly be made without competitive bidding. *City & County of San Francisco v. Boyd (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 606, 620, 110 P.2d 1036* (civil engineer); *Cobb v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 93, 95, 285 P.2d 41* (architect)

[c] Failure Generally to Serve Purposes of Bidding Statutes

County must comply with competitive bidding requirements when obligations of management contractor, who differs from traditional contractor in fact that he or she lends his or her experience and expertise in preparation of working drawings for public project, is sufficiently similar to obligations of contractor bidding on final working drawings. *Inglewood-L.A. County Civic Center Auth. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 861, 866, 103 Cal. Rptr. 689, 500 P.2d 601*

[d] Undesirability or Impossibility of Advertising for Bids

Exception to requirement of competitive bidding is founded on undesirability or impossibility of advertising for bids for particular work, such as when contractor who is awarded contract is only party capable of entering into particular agreement. *Kennedy v. Ross (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 569, 581, 170 P.2d 904* ; *Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 354, 355, 291 P. 839* ; *Riverside County v. Whitlock (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 863, 878, 99 Cal. Rptr. 710*

[7] Law Governing Construction of Public Contracts

[a] Interpretation Generally

No special rules govern interpretation of public contract simply because governmental body is party to contract. *M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 704, 235 P.2d 7*

Contract includes implied provisions necessary to effectuate intention of parties. *Tonkin Construction Co. v. County of Humboldt (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 828, 831, 233 Cal. Rptr. 587*

Contract between governmental body and private individual is ordinarily subject to same rules of construction as contract between private individuals. *Tonkin Construction Co. v. County of Humboldt (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 828, 831, 233 Cal. Rptr. 587* ; *Trimont Land Co. v. Truckee Sanitary District (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 330, 355, 193 Cal. Rptr. 568* ; *Hawley v. Orange County Flood Control Dist. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 708, 713, 27 Cal. Rptr. 478* ; *Oberg v. Los Angeles (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 151, 158, 281 P.2d 591*

[b] Rules Governing Incorporation of Plans and Specifications

Absent contract provision explicitly disclaiming responsibility of public body for accuracy of contested information, general disclaimer of warranty was insufficient to absolve public body of responsibility for positive and material misrepresentations in plans, on which contractor had right to rely. *Tonkin Construction Co. v. County of Humboldt (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 828, 834, 233 Cal. Rptr. 587* ; *Wunderlich v. State of California (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 777, 783, 56 Cal. Rptr. 473, 423 P.2d 545*

Although contract must be construed with respect to plans and specifications incorporated by reference, plan of work is subsidiary to contract and latter is controlling in case of discrepancy; when language thereof will permit, specifications are to be construed so as to uphold validity of contract. *Oberg v. Los Angeles (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 151, 159, 281 P.2d 591*

When municipal contracts are required to be let on public bidding, proposals and specifications inviting such bids must be sufficiently detailed, definite, and precise so as to provide basis for full and fair competitive bidding on common standard and, in addition, must be free of any restrictions tending to stifle competition. *Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. v. Superior Court (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 803, 821, 25 Cal. Rptr. 798*

[8] Making of Award Gives Rise to Contract

When legislative body or administrative officer is required by statute to call for bids in letting of contracts for doing of public works and must let contract to lowest responsible bidder, making of award gives rise to contract between public body or agent and successful bidder. *Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 694, 290 P.2d 520* ; *M.F. Kemper Constr. Co. v. Los Angeles (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 696, 700, 235 P.2d 7*

Although municipal corporation has discretion as to time and manner of making corporate improvements and purchase of supplies, when this discretion has been exercised, and contract made relative thereto, legislativefunction has been exhausted, and contract so made is not permitted to be impaired at option of municipality. *Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 695, 290 P.2d 520*

Contract was awarded when San Francisco Public Utilities Commission approved bid and awarded contract by resolution; municipal code section requiring department head's signature on contract and instructing department head to "let" contracts for public works in excess of $50,000 to "lowest reliable and responsible bidder" did not give PUC department head discretionary authority to rescind contract. *Transdyn/Cresci, JV v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 746, 757, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 512*

Although failure to let contract in mode prescribed by statute would not defeat claim for restitution by public entity against successful bidder for payments received under contract, where any other action is taken by entity to award contract in manner prescribed by statute, award gives rise to contract between entity and bidder. *Greer v. Hitchcock (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 334, 337, 76 Cal. Rptr. 376*

[9] Miscellaneous Contractual Provisions

General contractor could recover damages arising out of delays attributable to municipality's failure to disclose known restrictions on project performance, to obtain necessary permits, and to provide timely access to project site, notwithstanding clause in contract precluding award of delay damages. *Howard Contracting, Inc. v. G.A. MacDonald Construction Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 38, 44, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 590*

Fact that public entity occupied unfinished building did not preclude award of liquidated damages for delay in completing construction. *Vrgora v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 1178, 1186-1188, 200 Cal. Rptr. 130*

Liquidated damages for delay clause in public works was valid because damage to public from delay was unascertainable. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 771, 780-783, 181 Cal. Rptr. 332*

Former *Gov. Code § 14376* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 10226*), requiring state contracts to include provisions for forfeiture of specified sum to state for delays in completion, is, in effect, legislative determination that late charges imposed on construction company by state contract are valid liquidated damages; late charge is not covered by contractual property damage liability provisions of liability insurance policy. *Silva & Hill Constr. Co., Inc. v. Employers Mut. Liab. Ins. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 914, 920-926, 97 Cal. Rptr. 498*

School districts have power to include in construction contracts executed by them clauses usual in that industry, including arbitration clauses. *Viola, Inc. v. Santa Barbara High Sch. Dist. (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 425, 428, 80 Cal. Rptr. 784*

Highway construction contract that incorporated standard specifications of State Division of Highways, § 9(f) thereof, providing for administrative settlement of disputed contract items by state highway engineer whose determination was declared to be conclusive and binding except in case of gross error, established nonjudicial remedy for settlement of disputed contract claims that had to be pursued to completion before recourse to courts and had impact on scope of judicial inquiry. *Clack v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Public Works (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 743, 745-748, 80 Cal. Rptr. 274*

Under public works contract delay attributable to the public entity did not deprive it of liquidated damages for delays occasioned by contractor when contract contained completion date provision that specified liquidated damages to be deducted from payments due contractor in event of late completion; in such a case, no apportionment or damages, but rather apportionment of the quantum of delay in terms of time. *Nomellini Constr. Co. v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Wat. Resources (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 240, 246, 96 Cal. Rptr. 682*

[10] Preparation Costs

Absent intent to defraud bidder, preparation costs for bid are not recoverable because bids are normal part of cost of doing business and are considered voluntary activity of contractor designed to secure additional business. *Pacific Architects Collaborative v. State of California (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 110, 125, 166 Cal. Rptr. 184*

[11] Public Entity's Remedy on Contractor's Wrongful Failure to Enter Into Contract

Public entity has power to enforce full recovery when statute or contract declares forfeiture, usually as liquidated damages. *Petrovich v. Arcadia (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 78, 83, 222 P.2d 231*

[12] Purpose of Competitive Bidding Requirements

Manifest policy of law under former Pol. Code § 4041.18 (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 20128*) requires competitive bidding when county engages in construction or repair of improvements costing more than named amount in statute; and in this respect statute is not required to be given restricted meaning or be limited to places where public assembles. *Miller v. McKinnon (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 83, 93-94, 124 P.2d 34* (structures and buildings attached to rock quarry as public buildings)

Competitive offers or bids have no other object but to insure economy and exclude favoritism and corruption in furnishing labor, services, property, and materials for use of public entity. *Los Angeles Dredging Co. v. Long Beach (1930) 210 Cal. 348, 353, 291 P. 839* (involving competitive bidding requirement of municipal corporation)

[13] Relief of Bidders

Municipality is without power, in absence of fraud, mutual mistake, or some other ground of rescission, to rescind contract awarded to lowest responsible bidder. *Susanville v. Lee C. Hess Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 684, 695, 290 P.2d 520*

Relief for clerical error available only for errors in general contractor's bid, not subcontractor's bid; general contractor therefore is not required to request relief from bid as condition of holding responsible subcontractor who made clerical error in bid for subcontract. *Diede Constr., Inc. v. Monterey Mech. Co. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 380, 387-388, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 763*

School district that deliberately failed to provide contractor information as to how to properly withdraw mistaken bid and then awarded bid to contractor was estopped from enforcing contract. *Emma Corp. v. Inglewood Unified School Dist. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1018, 1031, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 213*

Bidder who made mistake was precluded from rebidding on project under Pub. Contract Code § 4205 when rebid was on substantially same construction even though certain deferments were not in rebid. *Colombo Construction Co. v. Panama Union School Dist. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 868, 875-877, 186 Cal. Rptr. 463*

Former *Gov. Code §§ 4200-4208* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.*), governing relief from bid mistakes, were enacted to establish comprehensive statutory procedure in connection with public contracts so as to enable contractor to claim relief from bid mistake by following statutory procedures. *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 462, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585*

Former *Gov. Code §§ 4200-4208* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.*) established exclusive procedure for relieving bidder from mistake in bid submitted to public entity listed in former *Gov. Code § 4200(a)* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 5100(a)*); failure to comply with procedure is waiver of right to relief. *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 463-464, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585*

[14] Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act

Subcontractor listed in contractor's bid on public work had right conferred by former *Gov. Code § 4107* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107*) to perform subcontract unless statutory grounds for valid substitution existed; this right was enforceable by action for damages against prime contractor to recover benefit of bargain listed subcontractor would have realized had he or she not wrongfully been deprived of subcontract. *Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 727, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975*

Public entity's consenting to substitution of subcontractors by general contractor in violation of former *Gov. Code §*

4107 (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107*) gave rise to no liability on part of entity to subcontractor because there was no statute authorizing recovery of damages from it in such case. *Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 727, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975*

Subcontractor had cause of action for breach of statutory duty [*Pub. Contract Code § 4107*] when prime contractor listed subcontractor on bid with respect to "concrete masonry units" and "glass pavers" but did not award it the "glass paver" work; although factors raised by prime contractor indicated its intention was to list second subcontractor as subcontractor for glass pavers, those factors did not appear on face of submitted bid, and prime contractor did not correct its error within statutory time limit. *R.J. Land and Associates Construction Co. v. Kiewit-Shea (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 416, 426-427, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 615*

Legislature has power to provide for administrative sanctions with respect to licensee who violates regulation deemed to be in public interest. *Merco Constr. Engineers, Inc. v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 154, 159, 79 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Prime contractor is forbidden to make substitutions in place of subcontractor designated in original bid except with consent of contracting agency after contractor's bid has been accepted; when wrongful substitution is made, substituted subcontractor is entitled to recover as damages benefit of the bargain it would have realized had it not wrongfully been deprived of subcontract. *Coast Pump Associates v. Stephen Tyler Corp. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 421, 424-426, 133 Cal. Rptr. 88*

Although act does not specifically provide for private right of action in violation of any of its provisions, injured member of public for whose benefit act was enacted may bring action. *Bay Cities Paving & Grading Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 361, 366-367, 128 Cal. Rptr. 632*

Action brought on ground that prime contractor on public construction project had violated Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act by refusing to honor bid submitted by plaintiff as subcontractor. *Coast Pump Associates v. Stephen Tyler Corp. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 421, 423-424, 133 Cal. Rptr. 88*

Doctrine of substantial compliance is applicable to requirement of *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.5* that prime contractor give written notice to listed subcontractor within two days of opening of prime bid that subcontractor was listed due to inadvertent clerical error. *Cal-Air v. Auburn Union School Dist. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 655, 667-671, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703*

[15] Void Contracts

Subcontract between prime contractor and subcontractor for work on public improvement project was void under both *Civ. Code §§ 1598* and *1608* because subcontractor was not identified in prime bid and had been assigned work without city's consent, in violation of *Pub. Contract Code §§ 4106, 4107*. *R.M. Sherman Co. v. W.R. Thomason Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 559, 563, 236 Cal. Rptr. 577* (acknowledging that *Civ. Code §§ 1598* and *1608* are not always applied literally and, in many cases, have simply been overlooked or ignored)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.92

§ 481.92 Attorney General Opinions

California law provides no basis for exempting local public works projects financed with federal funds under Title X of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 from statutory competitive bidding requirements that are otherwise applicable. *59 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 242, 242-252 (1976)*

Construction manager who acts in nature of overall project coordinator among various prime contractors rather than as general contractor on project and who performs no contstruction work on project may be hired without public bidding. *57 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 417, 417-421 (1974)*

Contractor who has failed to file labor and material bond as required by former *Gov. Code § 4200* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 5100*) is not permitted to recover reasonable value of labor and materials furnished for public project. 38 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 143, 143-148 (1961)

Provisions in public works contract in event of change of plans or for doing of extra work are properly included in such contract. *11 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 33, 34 (1948)*

County was not permitted to pay for painting of memorial building when competitive bidding requirements were not complied with. *10 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 187, 187-189 (1947)*

Cost-plus contracts for construction of school district buildings are not permitted unless bid fixes maximum cost to district. *8 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 226, 226-228 (1946)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationCompetitive ProposalsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSealed BidsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawTypes of

ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.93

§ 481.93 Law Reviews

Moss, Hunt, and Sandler, *Public Works: Bidding Disputes, the Contract With the Public Body, Performance Disputes, Claims on California State and Local Projects and Federal Claims Under the Miller Act,* 16 Bev. Hills B.J. 145 (1982)

Comments, *Due Process in Public Contracts; Pre-Award Hearings to Determine Responsibility of Bidders, 5 Pacific L.J. 142 (1974)*

Penne, *Legal Remedies of the Government Subcontractor, 32 So. Cal. L. Rev 1 (1958)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionBid ProtestsPublic Contracts LawDispute ResolutionSubcontractorsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.94

§ 481.94 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 503, 505, 510, 515, 537, 647 (10th ed. 2005)

Acret, Attorney's Guide to California Construction Contracts and Disputes (Cal. CEB 1976), Ch. 4, *Public Contract Disputes*

Acret, California Construction Law Manual, Ch. 10, *Public Contracts*

52 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.95-481.109

[Reserved]

§§ 481.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.110

§ 481.110 State Statutes

[1] Amount Required to Be Withheld

Public entity is required to withhold amount sufficient to answer claim and provide for entity's reasonable cost of litigation. *Civ. Code §§ 3186, 3187*

[2] Bond to Release Withheld Funds

Bond to release funds withheld pursuant to stop notice when contractor or subcontractor disputes validity of stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3196*

[3] Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

Duty of public entity. *Civ. Code § 3186*

Duty of public entity when possession of funds has been surrendered. *Civ. Code § 3187*

[4] Enforcement of Stop Notice Rights

[a] Action to Enforce Stop Notice

Time for commencement of action to enforce stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3210*

Expiration of period within which action to enforce stop notice must be commenced. *Civ. Code § 3210*

Effect of action not commenced within statutory time period. *Civ. Code § 3210*

Notice of commencement of stop notice action. *Civ. Code § 3211*

Dismissal of action for failure to prosecute. *Civ. Code § 3212*

Joinder of claimants and consolidation of separate actions. *Civ. Code § 3214*

Effect of dismissal of any stop notice action. *Civ. Code § 3123*

[b] Prerequisites to Entitlement to Enforcement

Requirement that 20-day preliminary notice (public work) be given, if required. *Civ. Code § 3183(a)*

Requirement that proper and timely stop notice be filed. *Civ. Code § 3183(b)*

[5] Persons Entitled to Serve

Persons entitled to serve stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3181*

[6] Priorities of Claims to Withheld Funds

Insufficient funds to satisfy claims. *Civ. Code § 3191*

Deficit may be recovered in payment bond action. *Civ. Code § 3191*

Forfeiture of right to pro rata distribution. *Civ. Code § 3192*

Assignment or garnishment of contract. *Civ. Code § 3193*

[7] Stop Notice Is Sole Remedy

Statutory stop notice remedy is sole remedy for claims against funds held for payment of construction costs. *Civ. Code § 3264*

[8] Summary Proceedings for Determination of Stop Notice Rights

Right of original contractor to summary proceeding to determine validity of stop notice or amount claimed in stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3197*

Service of affidavit by original contractor on public entity. *Civ. Code § 3198*

Service of affidavit by public entity on claimant. *Civ. Code § 3199*

Counteraffidavit by claimant. *Civ. Code § 3200*

Effect of failure to serve counteraffidavit. *Civ. Code § 3200*

Action for declaration of rights of respective parties. *Civ. Code § 3201*

Hearing to determine rights of respective parties. *Civ. Code §§ 3201-3203*

Effect of court order determining validity of stop notice or amount stated in stop notice. *Civ. Code §§ 3203, 3205*

Right to jury trial. *Civ. Code § 3204*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensLien PrioritiesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.111

§ 481.111 Decisions

[1] Amount Required to Be Withheld

Amount that may be claimed in stop notice and that is required to be withheld may be determined by analogy to *Civ. Code § 3123* regulating similar protection afforded to suppliers under mechanics' lien law. *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782*

When labor or materials furnished by stop notice claimant are less than that specified in contract due to fault of original contractor, reasonable value of such labor or materials is limited to proportion of contract price reflecting amount of progress made toward completion of work. *University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 266-267, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[2] Construction of Public Stop Notice Provisions

Transmittal and notice requirements of *Civ. Code §§ 3098* and *3091* are strictly construed. *San Joaquin Blocklite, Inc. v. Willden (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 361, 366, 368, 228 Cal. Rptr. 842*

Provisions governing mechanics' lien law, including provisions governing stop notices for public works of improvement, are remedial in character and must be construed with view to effect their objects and to promote justice. *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782*

Mechanics' lien law including stop notice provisions for public works of improvement [*Civ. Code §§ 3179-3214*] is integrated and harmonious scheme and applicable code sections of that law must be construed together. *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782*

[3] Duty to Withhold Money or Bonds Due or to Become Due

[a] In General

Once stop notices were filed, city was prohibited by *Civ. Code §§ 3186* and *3193* from paying amount sufficient to satisfy stop notice claims to contractor's assignee, and contractor did not retain any interest in assigned contract that would enable contractor to recover these funds from city. *Stanislaus Pump, Machinery & Construction Corp. v. City of Modesto (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1442, 1447, 246 Cal. Rptr. 601*

Extent of liability of public entity to stop notice claimant after stop notice has been served is measured by extent of liability of public entity to original contractor. *Dorris v. Alturas School Dist. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 30, 33, 142 P. 795* (decided under former Code Civ. Proc. § 1184, now *Civ. Code § 3186*)

When (1) original contractor abandons project in breach of contract with public entity, (2) entity, by terms of contract, is obligated to pay full contract price only on completion of project, and (3) cost of completion is greater than amount owing from entity to contractor, stop notice claimant has no rights to remaining funds in hands of public entity. *Dorris v. Alturas School Dist. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 30, 33, 142 P. 795*

Money withheld by public entity pursuant to former *Gov. Code § 14402* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 10261*), requiring retention of 10 percent of contract price until acceptance and completion of project, is not subject to claims of stop notices when contractor has abandoned project and cost of completion exceeds contract price. *Harsco Corp. v. Department of Public Works (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 272, 276-280, 98 Cal. Rptr. 337*

[b] Breach of Duty to Withhold

Action in entity is permitted by laborers and materialmen against public entity who disregards their properly filed stop notices. *United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Individuals responsible for withholding funds subject to stop notice are personally liable to claimants injured by failure to withhold such funds. *L.W. Blinn Co. v. Pioneer Drainage Dist. (1920) 50 Cal. App. 364, 370-371, 195 P. 750*

[4] Nature of Remedy

Filing of stop notice, in effect, imposes trust obligation on public entity by creating equitable assignment or garnishment pro tanto in favor of stop notice claimant. *United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907*

[5] Persons Entitled to Serve Stop Notice

Person furnishing labor or materials used in, on, for, or about the performance of a public work is able to avail himself or herself of stop notice procedure provided he or she furnished work or materials at instance of prime contractor or subcontractor having charge, in whole or in part, of project. *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Stop notice procedure is not available to person furnishing materials or services to subcontractor under a state work project unless materials and services are used in, on, for, or about the performance of the work. *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 521, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298*

When materials furnished to subcontractor become part of subcontractor's general equipment and are of such a nature that, in usual course of events, they will not be entirely used or consumed on job for which they were purchased, a claim therefor is not subject to statutory stop notice procedure. *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 521, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298*

When only part of material furnished to subcontractor was used in performance of latter's contract, remainder being diverted to other uses, and it is impossible to estimate what part was used in performance of contract, a claim therefor is not subject to stop notice procedure. *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 521, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Stop notice procedure is not available to one whose relationship to work is only that of vendor of materials to materialman rather than that of contractor or subcontractor. *Theisen v. Los Angeles County (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 170, 177, 5 Cal. Rptr. 161, 352 P.2d 529*

One who agrees with original contractor to perform substantial, specified portion of work of construction that is subject of original contract in accordance with plans and specifications by which original contractor is bound as subcontractor capable of conferring stop notice rights, even though he or she does not undertake to incorporate such portion of project structure into work of improvement. *Theisen v. Los Angeles County (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 170, 183, 5 Cal. Rptr. 161, 352 P.2d 529*

[6] Purpose of Public Stop Notice Provisions

Statutory scheme of *Civ. Code §§ 3186* and *3193* gives maximum protection to stop notice claimants, whose interests statutory arrangement is designed to protect. *Stanislaus Pump, Machinery & Construction Corp. v. City of Modesto (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1442, 1447, 246 Cal. Rptr. 601*

In addition to other procedures generally available for enforcement of contracts, Legislature has provided by statute special remedies to protect interests of those to whom prime contractor may incur debts in connection with public works project. *Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143*

In order to give protection to materialmen and labor claimants and yet protect both public and public property, Legislature has provided stop notice procedure without lien rights for intercepting funds due from public agency to contractor on public works projects. *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782*

Effect of stop notice is to assure to claimant preference over general creditors of prime contractor in distribution of proceeds of contract. *Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143*

[7] Release Bond

Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*) is applicable to stop notice release bonds provided under *Civ. Code § 3196*. *Milo Equipment Corp. v. Elsinore Valley Mun. Water Dist. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1282, 1288, 253 Cal. Rptr. 126*

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(1)* (three-year period for liability created by statute; *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*) was applicable statute of limitations in action against surety on stop notice release bond because these bonds are essential part of statutory scheme conferring stop notice rights on subcontractors. *Winick Corp. v. General Insurance Co. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 142, 148, 231 Cal. Rptr. 606* (dictum)

Public entity that honors *Civ. Code § 3196* surety bond by releasing to general contractor funds withheld by reason of dispute over stop notice filed with entity by supplier of materials to subcontractor is relieved of any liability resulting from stop notice. *Cal-Pacific Materials Co. v. Redondo Beach City School Dist. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 652, 654, 156 Cal. Rptr. 590*

Alternative procedure for release of funds held pursuant to stop notice claim provided by former Code Civ. Proc. § 1190.1 [*now see Civ. Code § 3103*] is not obligatory; filing of stop notice, and filing of release bond followed by filing of action are so related that it can be said that release bond is obtained in connection with action within meaning of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1035* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.250*), allowing premiums paid on such bonds to be recoverable costs. *Acoustics, Inc. v. Trepte Constr. Co. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 887, 916, 92 Cal. Rptr. 723*

City was liable to subcontractor when city permitted release bond to be written by same bonding company as wrote labor and material bond. *Azusa Western, Inc. v. West Covina (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 259, 263-264, 119 Cal. Rptr. 434*

[8] Stop Notice Remedy as Cumulative

Stop notice remedy is cumulative to other remedies claimant might have and, thus, is not barred by fact that claimant obtains personal judgment against prime contractor. *George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 522, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Action on stop notice is capable of being joined with action on labor and material bond, but the two actions are independent and one is cumulative to the other. *Consolidated Elec. Distributors, Inc. v. Kirkham, Chaon & Kirkham, Inc. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 54, 61, 95 Cal. Rptr. 673*

[9] Summary Proceeding to Determine Rights

Trial court's order resolving a summary proceeding is not appealable. *Jasper Constr., Inc. v. University Casework Sys., Inc. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 582, 114 Cal. Rptr. 143*

Trial court's order may be tested by appellate court on writ of review. *University Casework Sys., Inc. v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 263, 265, 115 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[10] Time to File

Completion of work on contract is not "cessation of labor" referred to in *Civ. Code § 3086*; date of acceptance of work triggers 90-day period to file stop notice under *Civ. Code § 3184*. *Krueger Brothers Builders, Inc. v. San Francisco Housing Authority (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6-7, 243 Cal. Rptr. 585*

Filing of stop notice before contractor had right to be paid was proper. *Central Indus. Eng'r Co. v. Strauss Constr. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 460, 464-466, 159 Cal. Rptr. 564*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts &

SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.112

§ 481.112 Law Reviews

Miller, *Validity of the Stop Notice as a Summary Remedy*, 48 State BJ 44 (1973)

Moss, *The Stop Notice Remedy in California--Updated, 47 LA Bar B 299 (1972)*

Finch, *Public Contracts--Stop Notices in Calfornia, 2 Lincoln L Rev 1 (1966)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensLien PrioritiesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.113

§ 481.113 Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

California Mechanics' Liens and Other Remedies (Cal CEB 1972), Ch. 4, *Claims on Public Works*, §§ 4.2-4.35; Ch. 5, *Foreclosure of Mechanics' Lien*, §§ 5.24-5.33; Ch. 11, *Government*, §§ 11.1-11.58

Acret, California Construction Law Manual (3d ed 1975) Ch. 11, *Claims of Subcontractors and Suppliers on Public Jobs*

Marsh, California Mechanics' Lien Law and Construction Industry Practice, Ch. 6, *Representing a Stop Notice and Payment Bond Claimant on California Public Works* (Parker 5th ed. 1994)

53 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Public Works and Contracts*, §§ 55-86 (1979)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction ContractsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.114-481.129

[Reserved]

§§ 481.114[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.130

§ 481.130 California Legal Forms

For a form of a public work payment bond, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 31, *Mechanics' Liens* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.131

§ 481.131 State Statutes

[1] Actions on Payment Bonds

Either 20-day preliminary notice or post-completion bond notice is prerequisite to bond action. *Civ. Code §§ 3098, 3252*

Filing of stop notice not necessary. *Civ. Code § 3250*

Labor or materials must be furnished before claimant entitled to action on contractor's bond. *Civ. Code § 3267*

Certified copy of bond is admissible. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.260*

[2] General Bond Provisions

Exoneration or release of sureties on obligations in bonds. *Civ. Code § 3225*

Sole condition of recovery on bond. *Civ. Code § 3226*

Good and sufficient bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.610*

[3] Payment Bonds

Payment bond defined. *Civ. Code § 3096*

Where payment bond required. *Civ. Code § 3247*; *Pub. Contract Code § 7103*

Requirements for payment bond approval. *Civ. Code § 3248*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.132

§ 481.132 Decisions

[1] Attorneys' Fees

Subcontractor who is claimant on stop notice release bond entitled to recover attorneys' fees from surety based on attorneys' fee clause in subcontract, so long as total recovery against surety does not exceed penal sum of bond. *National Technical Systems v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 415, 424-425, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465*

When subcontractor required to arbitrate claim against contractor, subcontractor is entitled to recover attorneys' fees in arbitration in action against surety to recover on payment bond. *Liton Gen. Engineering Contractor, Inc. v. United Pacific Insurance (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 577, 585-593, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200*

[2] Limitation of Actions

Resolution under facts of case of issue whether action on labor and material bond was barred by statute of limitations [*Civ. Code § 3249*] required consideration of provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 3086* (defining "completion"), 3093 (recordation of completion of work), and 3184 (stop notices). *Fidelity Sound Systems, Inc. v. American Bonding Co. (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 13, 17-19 , 149 Cal. Rptr. 674* (holding action was not barred)

[3] Payment Bonds

[a] Actions Thereon

Subcontractor who is claimant on stop notice release bond entitled to recover attorneys' fees from surety based on attorneys' fee clause in subcontract, so long as total recovery against surety does not exceed penal sum of bond. *National Technical Systems v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 415, 424-425, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465*

Surety on payment bond was liable for penalties imposed on contractor pursuant to *Pub. Contract Code § 10262.5* for

failure to make progress payments to subcontractor. *Washington Internat. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 981, 989, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 282*

Liability of surety on contractor's bond in public works contract. *Bonded Prod. Co. v. R.C. Gallyon Constr. Co., Inc. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 186, 190-191, 39 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Right of surety on contractor's bond to be subrogated to right to foreclose stop notice liens after payment of claims. *United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Joinder of contractor and sureties in action on bond. *Sunset Lumber Co. v. Smith (1928) 95 Cal. App. 307, 312, 272 P. 1068*

Action for labor or materials against surety without joining contractor and without having first filed notice of verified claim with public agency that entered into public works contract. *Adams v. Christopher (1931) 119 Cal. App. 40, 45, 5 P.2d 948*

[b] Purpose

Bond provisions enacted to create fund in lieu of the building or work itself against which materialmen and laborers can proceed are additional or cumulative remedy to public works stop notice procedure. *Pneucrete Corp. v. U.S. Fid. & G. Co. (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 733, 736-737, 46 P.2d 1000*

Purpose of public works contractor's bond is to give materialmen and laborers who furnish materials for and render services on public works an additional means of receiving compensation. *Consolidated Elec. Distributors, Inc. v. Kirkham, Chaon & Kirkham, Inc. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 54, 60, 95 Cal. Rptr. 673*

[4] Persons Entitled to Payment

Entity that contracted to furnish its employees to contractor for work on construction project was entitled to mechanics' lien and thus to recover on payment bond, and was not required to have contractor's license. *Contractors Labor Pool, Inc. v. Westway Contractors, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 152, 163, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

Person who provides personnel services and advances funds to cover payroll but does not employ workers is not entitled to recover in capacity of person who furnishes labor to project. *Primo Team, Inc. v. Blake Construction Co. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 801, 807-810, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701*

[5] Sufficiency of Notice of Claim

Partial compliance with *Civ. Code § 3098* notice requirements does not bar relief under *Civ. Code § 3252(b)* (allowing claim when 20-day notice "was not given as provided in *Section 3098*) provided written notice is given to surety and bond principal within 15 days after recordation of notice of completion for amount of any claim for which *§ 3098* notice was not timely given. *American Buildings Co. v. Bay Commercial Construction, Inc. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1201, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539*

Designation as "stop notice" of instrument intended as required notice under payment bond statute does not preclude instrument's consideration for other purposes. *General Elec. Co. v. Central Surety & Ins. Corp. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 590, 594, 43 Cal. Rptr. 48*

In action on contractor's bond for public work, notice preceding action on bond and addressed to superintendent of public agency concerned, reciting copies for contractors, bonding company, and subcontractor, and mailed to contractors and received by registered or certified mail within 90 days from date on which supplier last furnished materials for which claim was made constituted substantial compliance with statute. *General Elec. Co. v. Central Surety & Ins. Corp. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 590, 596, 43 Cal. Rptr. 48*

General contractor had sufficient notice of nature and state of debt owed plaintiff for materials supplied to subcontractor by schedule showing amounts due from subcontractor to materialmen so as to comply with statutory notice provision when schedule had been personally handed to general contractor's agent and read by president and general manager, who admitted he could correlate plaintiff's job number to his contract. *California Elec. Supply Co. v. United Pac. Life Ins. Co. (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 138, 146, 38 Cal. Rptr. 479*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.133

§ 481.133 Attorney General Opinions

Municipal water district was not barred, by virtue of contractor's failure to post payment bond under *Civ. Code § 3247*, from making payments under architectural or engineering contracts entered into after January 1, 1971. *63 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 633 (1980)*

If services contracted for consist of conducting investigations and surveys to determine whether or not construction of, work of improvement should be undertaken, one contracting with public entity to provide these services does not need to post payment bonds required by *Civ. Code § 3247* (payment bonds on public works); however, if services contracted for consist of designing and supervising work of improvement, payment bond must be posted prior to time these services commence. *62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 753 (1979)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.134

§ 481.134 Law Reviews

Moss, *Bond Practices*, 44 Cal. St. B.J. 537 (1969) (relating to performance bonds)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.135

§ 481.135 Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 453, *Payment Bonds* , pt. C (Matthew Bender)

Marsh, California Mechanics' Lien Law and Construction Industry Practice, Ch. 6, *Representing a Stop Notice and Payment Bond Claimant on California Public Works* (LexisNexis 6th ed. 1998)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.136-481.149

[Reserved]

§§ 481.136[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-A California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at: http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
1. Scope

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.150

§ 481.150 Scope of Checklist

NOTE:

The following are checklists of procedures required in enforcing stop notices for public works. These checklists are not exhaustive and other procedures may be required [*see Civ. Code § 3259* (except as otherwise provided, procedures governing civil trials, new trials, and appeals therefrom under *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* are applicable to mechanics' lien law provisions)]. These checklists do, however, attempt to set forth those procedures most commonly utilized.

Counsel should also note that the various steps and time requirements as to filing and service of notice are for the purpose of providing protective measures and a necessary warning to those to whom notice is being given or on whom service is being made. Strict compliance with the provisions governing the enforcement of stop notice rights is required if the failure to comply with one or more of these provisions results in injury to the public entity. However, if no right of the public entity is adversely affected by a failure to comply with a procedural requirement, such as a failure to comply with a time for service requirement, then the requirement, unless made so by specific mandate, is not a jurisdictional factor requiring the collapse of any remedy of which the procedural requirement forms a part [*see* Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) *226 Cal. App. 2d, 47, 50* , *37 Cal. Rptr. 782]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
1. Scope

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.151-481.169

[Reserved]

§§ 481.151[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.170

§ 481.170 When Notice Is Required

1. Actual laborers for wages are not required to give a preliminary notice [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

2. Any person having a direct contractual relationship with the original contractor is not required to give a preliminary notice [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

3. Any person not described in Paragraphs 1-2, *above*, who furnishes labor or materials for a public work, who has not been paid therefor, and who intends to file a stop notice, must file a written preliminary notice with the contractor and the public agency concerned [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

NOTE:
The failure of a subcontractor who is licensed under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* to give a preliminary notice constitutes grounds for disciplinary action by the Registrar of Contractors if the contract price to be paid to the subcontractor exceeds $400 [*Civ. Code § 3098(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.171

§ 481.171 Preparation of Notice

1. Contents.

See *§ 481.330* [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

2. Execution.

Although there is no express requirement that the notice be signed and dated, both are recommended to show that the claimant has given the notice within the required time period [*see Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

NOTE:
It is recommended that the notice be signed by the employee of the claimant with which the public entity would correspond and be dated as of the date of mailing by registered or certified mail.

3. Verification.

Neither required nor recommended.

4. Copies.

a. One for service on public entity;

b. One for service on original contractor;

c. If served by a materialman to a subcontractor, one courtesy copy to be mailed to subcontractor;

d. Three or more additional copies if notice is to be used as an exhibit to an affidavit under *Civ. Code § 3200* or to a complaint to enforce a stop notice claim under *Civ. Code § 3210*; and

e. One office copy.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.172

§ 481.172 Time of Service

Service of the preliminary notice must be made not later than 20 days after a claimant has first furnished labor, services, equipment, or materials to the job site [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

NOTE:

Preliminary notice must be served not later than 20 days after first furnishing labor, services, equipment, or materials for a claimant to be entitled to enforce a stop notice for all that he or she has or will furnish to the jobsite. A notice given at any later time entitles the claimant only to enforcement of a stop notice for that labor, equipment, services, or materials furnished within 20 days before the service of the notice and at any time thereafter [*see Civ. Code § 3098(a), (d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.173

§ 481.173 Place and Manner of Service

1. Personal delivery.

Personal service may be effected on the contractor and the public agency concerned [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

NOTE:
If the public work is contracted by the Department of Transportation or the Department of General Services, personal service is to be made on the Department's disbursing officer [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

2. Delivery by mail.

Service may be made by mail on either the original contractor or the public entity by first-class mail, registered mail, or certified mail, postage prepaid [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

a. With regard to the original contractor, and any subcontractor contracted with, delivery may be made to any place he or she maintains an office or conducts his or her business, or to his or her residence [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

b. In case of any public works constructed by the Department of Transportation or the Department of General Services, such notice is to be mailed to the office of the disbursing officer of the department.

NOTE:
Service by registered or certified mail is recommended since such service is complete at the time of deposit [*Civ. Code § 3098(a)*].

3. Affidavit of service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*].

Neither required nor recommended.

NOTE:

A preliminary 20-day notice is not effective to serve as a basis for withholding funds under a stop notice unless the public entity, any subcontractors contracted with, and the original contractor are served. For this reason, it is recommended that the preliminary notice [*see § 481.330*] be addressed to all parties served, thereby indicating to each party that the other party was served. If this is done, there is no need to attach an affidavit of service on the contractor to the notice served on the public entity. An affidavit of proof of service would make the notice too formidable in appearance. When service on all parties is by registered or certified mail, sufficient proof of service would exist if the fact of service would become an issue.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.174

§ 481.174 Effect of Giving Preliminary Notice

1. When required under *Civ. Code § 3098*.

a. Entitles claimant to enforce a stop notice [*Civ. Code § 3183(a)*].

NOTE:
***Civ. Code § 3183* is not specifically to the effect that a preliminary notice is a necessary condition precedent to filing a stop notice but only a necessary condition precedent to its enforcement. At the same time, *Civ. Code § 3098* provides that a person without a direct contractual relationship with the contractor may file such a notice, but that no payment may be withheld from any such contractor unless the preliminary notice is given.**

The nature of the statutory language may have definite legal and practical consequences, depending on the meaning of the word "enforce." For example, a claimant who did not serve a preliminary notice but did serve a stop notice for which a preliminary notice is required both as a basis for the withholding of funds due the contractor by the public entity and for its enforcement by action under *Civ. Code § 3210* perhaps may still qualify as a stop notice claimant under *Civ. Code § 3190* if the withheld funds being distributed among claimants are insufficient to pay all the claims in full.

b. Entitles claimant to enforce a claim on a payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3252(a)*; *see Civ. Code §§ 3227, 3252(b), 3253(b)* for timing and form of alternative post-completion bond notice that may be given instead of a 20-day preliminary notice to entitle claimant to enforce a claim on a payment bond; *see also §§ 481.291, 481.360*].

2. When not required under *Civ. Code § 3098*.

Even though a subcontractor who has a direct contractual relationship with the original contractor probably does not need to file a preliminary notice, it is recommended that a licensed contractor file a preliminary notice because of the uncertainty, discussed in the Note, *above*, of when disciplinary action is permitted for failure of a subcontractor who is a licensed contractor to file a preliminary notice.

NOTE:

Although a stop notice [*Civ. Code § 3103*] is similar in content to a preliminary notice [*Civ. Code § 3098*], the difference is that the preliminary notice need not be signed or verified and is filed within 20 days after the claimant first commenced work or furnished materials, and that a stop notice must be signed and verified and must mention the amount in value of that work already done or materials furnished and of the whole agreed to be done or furnished. Thus, if a preliminary notice is not required, a notice intended as a preliminary notice may be treated by the public entity as a legally enforceable stop notice if the notice happened to be signed and verified and to have included all data necessary for a legally enforceable stop notice. For this reason, a preliminary 20-day notice should never be verified.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
2. Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work)

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.175-481.189

[Reserved]

§§ 481.175[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
3. Service of Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.190

§ 481.190 Preparation

1. Contents.

See *§ 481.331* [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

2. Execution.

Must be signed by the claimant or his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

3. Verification.

Must be verified by the claimant or his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

4. Copies.

a. One for service on the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3181*]; and

b. One courtesy copy to be mailed to original contractor, if desired.

NOTE:
Although the original contractor must be served with the preliminary 20-day notice to have a stop notice serve as a basis for the withholding of funds [*Civ. Code § 3098*], he or she need not be served with the actual stop notice. The reason for this is that the contractor has already been notified of those materialmen and suppliers to his or her subcontractors who have filed the preliminary 20-day notice.

c. If served by a materialman to a subcontractor, one courtesy copy to be mailed to subcontractor and to

the subcontractor's bonding company, if desired.

d. Three or more additional copies if notice is to be used as an exhibit to an affidavit under *Civ. Code § 3200* or to a complaint under *Civ. Code § 3210*.

NOTE:

The original contractor may require a subcontractor to furnish a bond to indemnify the original contractor for any loss he or she might sustain as a result of a subcontractor's default under *Civ. Code § 3248* [*Civ. Code § 3248(b)*].

Funds withheld may be inadequate to meet in full the claim of the claimant, and both the bonding company of the original contractor and the original contractor could become judgment proof. By notifying both the subcontractor and his or her bonding company, the claimant could protect all possible methods of having his or her claim paid in full.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
3. Service of Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.191

§ 481.191 Service

1. Prerequisite for effective service.

A stop notice claimant must have given a preliminary 20-day notice (public work) when required by *Civ. Code § 3098(a)* [*Civ. Code § 3183(a)*]. For requirements relating to service of the preliminary notice, see procedures in §§ *481.170-481.174*.

2. Place of Service.

a. For a public work for the state, notice must be filed with the director of the department which let the contract [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

NOTE:
Unlike service of the preliminary 20-day notice (public work), which may be served generally on the public agency with the exception of any public work constructed by the Department of Public Works or the Department of General Services of the state, in which case the preliminary 20-day notice must be served on the disbursing officer, the stop notice may only be effectively served on the state by filing the notice with the director of the department that let the contract. In the case of a stop notice served in connection with a contract let by either the Department of Transportation or the Department of Water Resources, the difference in the manner in which the preliminary 20-day notice and the stop notice is served is resolved in those two department's official forms [*see* *§ 481.332*] by serving the stop notice on the directors of the departments, in care of the disbursing officer in the case of the Department of Transportation, and in care of the comptroller in the case of the Department of Water Resources. Counsel should consult counsel of other departments of the state if in doubt as to which officer on whom service of a stop notice is considered effective. It should be

noted, however, that, particularly in the absence of any prejudice suffered by the state [***see*** *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782]* , the code provisions governing the service of a stop notice are interpreted liberally, and actual or even constructive knowledge of the receipt of a stop notice may be effective to give the claimant a right against the earnings held by the state agency [***see*** *United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 236-238, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907]* .

b. For any other public work, the stop notice must be filed in the office of the controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer, whose duty is to make payments under the contract or with the commissioners, managers, trustees, officers, board of supervisors, board of trustees, common council, or other body by whom the contract was awarded [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

3. Manner of service.

A stop notice may be served either personally or by registered or certified mail with the same effect as personal service [*Civ. Code § 3103*].

NOTE:
Although service by first-class mail is permissible (but not recommended) for a preliminary 20-day notice, a stop notice, if by mail, can be only by registered or certified mail.

4. Who may file.

Any person furnishing labor or materials for a public work [*Civ. Code §§ 3110, 3112*], other than an original contractor or any person mentioned in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.7* (hazardous waste hauler), may file a stop notice [*Civ. Code § 3181*].

5. Time limit.

a. If notice of completion or cessation has been recorded: 30 days after recording of a notice of completion (sometimes referredto in public works as a notice of acceptance) or notice of cessation, if such a notice is recorded [*Civ. Code § 3184(a)*].

NOTE:
A notice of completion that may be recorded by a public agency is not provided for in the mechanics' lien law. Presumably, however, the contents of the notice of completion must be substantially the same as that which must be contained in a notice of completion that an owner may record for the purpose of shortening the time period in which a mechanics' lien claimant must record his or her claim of lien [*see* *Civ. Code §§ 3093, 3115, 3116*]. Thus, to be effective the notice must contain, among other things that would not be applicable to a public work, all of the following [*Civ. Code § 3093*]:

- **The date of completion, other than a cessation of labor (see discussion later in this note of cessation) [*but see*** *Civ. Code § 3093(a)* (recital of erroneous date of completion does not affect validity of notice if true date of completion is within 10 days preceding date of recording of notice)].

- **A description of the site sufficient for identification containing the street address of the site, if any [*see* *Civ. Code § 3093(d)*** (if sufficient legal description of site is given, validity of notice is not affected by fact that street address recited is erroneous or omitted)].

- **The name of the original contractor.**

The notice must be recorded in the office of the county recorder of the county in which the site is located, within 10 days after the completion. A notice of completion in otherwise proper form, verified and containing the information required by *Civ. Code § 3093,* must be accepted by the recorder for recording and must be deemed duly recorded without acknowledgment [*Civ. Code § 3093*].

***Civ. Code § 3086* provides that in the case of any work of improvement that is subject to acceptance by any public entity (this presumably includes all public works as defined in *Civ. Code § 3100,* because a public work is any work of improvement contracted for by a public entity), the completion of the work of improvement is deemed to be the date of the acceptance. However, except as to contracts awarded under the State Contract Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 10100 et seq.*], a cessation of labor on any public work for a continuous period of 30 days is a completion thereof [*Civ. Code § 3086*].**

A notice of cessation that may be recorded by a public agency is also not provided for in the mechanics' lien law. However, by analogy to the requirements for a notice of cessation for a private work, the notice should contain at least (1) the approximate date when the cessation of labor commenced; (2) a statement that the cessation has continued until the recording of the notice of cessation; (3) a description of the site sufficient for identification, containing the street address, if any (if a sufficient legal description of the site is given, the validity of the notice is not, however, affected by the fact that the street address is erroneous or omitted); and (4) the name of the original contractor [*see Civ. Code § 3092*]. The notice must be recorded in the office of the county recorder of the county in which the site is located and is effective only if there has been a continuous cessation of labor for at least 30 days prior to the recording [*Civ. Code § 3092*].

b. If no notice of completion (acceptance) or cessation has been recorded: 90 days after completion or cessation [*Civ. Code § 3184(b)*].

NOTE:

As noted above, completion of a public work is the date of the acceptance of the work or, except for contracts let pursuant to the State Contract Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 10100 et seq.*], a cessation of labor for a continuous period of 30 days [*see* *Civ. Code § 3086*; ***see also* *Krueger Brothers Builders, Inc. v. San Francisco Housing Authority (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6, 243 Cal. Rptr. 585* (completion of work on contract is not "cessation of labor" referred to in *Civ. Code § 3086*; date of acceptance of work is triggering 90-day period)]. Thus, it is unclear whether, in the case of a completion brought about by a cessation of labor for 30 days on a public work, a stop notice claimant must serve his or her stop notice within 90 days after the cessation of labor or 120 days after such cessation.**

c. If contract is for investigation, removal, or remedial action, or disposal of hazardous waste: 10 days after completion, if the conditions of *Pub. Contract Code § 4107.7* have been met [*Civ. Code § 3181*].

6. Affidavit of service by mail.

Not required or recommended.

NOTE:
Service by registered or certified mail is sufficient proof of service if the fact of service should become an issue.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawPerformanceGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawPerformanceInspection & Acceptance of Goods & ServicesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
3. Service of Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.192

§ 481.192 Effect

1. Duty to withhold imposed on public entity.

On receipt of a stop notice, the public entity must withhold from the original contractor, or any person acting under his or her authority, money or bonds due or to become due to the contractor in an amount sufficient to answer the stop notice claim and to pay the entity's reasonable costs of litigation [*Civ. Code § 3186*].

2. Prerequisite of duty to withhold.

Stop notice must be on file before the disbursing officer has actually surrendered possession of the warrant, check, bonds, or money [*Civ. Code § 3187*].

3. Extent of duty to withhold.

Amount in excess of the claim and interest and court costs to be reasonably anticipated may be released to the contractor [*Civ. Code § 3187*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
3. Service of Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.193-481.209

[Reserved]

§§ 481.193[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.210

§ 481.210 When Bond May Be Filed

When original contractor or subcontractor disputes the validity or enforceability of a stop notice and when the public entity grants permission to file the bond [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

NOTE:

The term "subcontractor" in *Civ. Code § 3196* probably includes subcontractors with or without a direct contractual relationship with the original contractor [*see* *Civ. Code § 3104* defining subcontractor]. The former law (former Code Civ. Proc. § 1192.1(f)) allowed the contractor, subcontractor, or other person against whom a claim was filed to dispute its validity or enforceability. As a result of the legislative intention [1969 Stats., ch. 1362, § 10] not to change preexisting law, *Civ. Code § 3196* probably will be construed consistent with the prior law.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.211

§ 481.211 Who May File

The original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

NOTE:

The bond may be filed by the original contractor and not the subcontractor because it is the original contractor who has a direct contractual relationship with the public entity. To protect itself, however, the original contractor may require its subcontractors to furnish a bond to indemnify the original contractor for any loss he or she might sustain as a result of a subcontractor's default under *Civ. Code § 3248* [*Civ. Code § 3248(b)*]. However, the original contractor's right to require a bond of a subcontractor includes only those contractors with a direct contractual relationship with the original contractor or those required to be listed under the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*]. Thus, an original contractor may not be able to release funds withheld as a result of a breach by a sub-subcontractor without filing a bond under *Civ. Code § 3196*, even though he or she had no right to require the sub-subcontractor to furnish a bond to indemnify him or her for losses sustained.

To protect himself or herself, the original contractor could, in subcontracts with his or her subcontractors, require approval by him or her or, at least, notification of all sub-subcontractors by his or her subcontractors. Although the preliminary 20-day notice notifies the original contractor of potential claimants, a person performing actual labor for wages need not file a preliminary notice. By requiring approval or notification of all sub-subcontractors, the subcontractor who fails to obtain this approval or to provide this notification would breach his or her subcontract, thereby, perhaps, allowing indemnification of the original contract under a subcontractor's bond if one is required by the original contractor.

Until future legislative amendments or judicial decisions, the interplay between the merchanics'

liens and stop notice code sections and the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*] will remain uncertain.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.212

§ 481.212 Amount of Bond

One hundred twenty-five percent of the stop notice claim [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.213

§ 481.213 Condition of Bond

The bond is conditioned on payment to the claimant of his or her claim together with his or her costs of suit in the action if he or she recovers in the action [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

82 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.214

§ 481.214 With Whom Filed

The public entity [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.215

§ 481.215 Release of Withheld Funds

The public entity, on the filing of the bond, releases the withheld funds to the original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.216

§ 481.216 Liability Under Bond

The liability of the bonding company is a joint and several one with the surety or sureties under the payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3196*].

NOTE:

The payment bond must be executed by an admitted surety insurer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311(a)*]. The public agency approving the bond has a duty to verify the admitted insurer status of the party executing the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311(b)*]. The release bond, however, must be executed by a corporate surety [*Civ. Code § 3196*]. Although *Civ. Code § 3196* provides that the surety or sureties on the release bond are jointly and severally liable to the stop notice claimant with the surety or sureties on any payment bond, it would appear that ordinarily there can be only one surety on the release bond, even though there may be several sureties on the payment bond.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
4. Bond for Release of Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.217-481.229

[Reserved]

§§ 481.217[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
5. Release of Withheld Funds on Affidavit by Original Contractor

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.230

§ 481.230 Preparation of Affidavit

1. Contents.

See *§ 481.335*.

2. Execution.

Must be signed by the original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3198*].

3. Verification.

Required by implication of law.

NOTE:
An affidavit is a written declaration under oath, made without notice to the adverse party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*]. The legislative intent is clear to use the word affidavit as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*. Moreover, becuase the affidavit can be treated both as a pleading and as evidence [*Civ. Code § 3202*], it clearly must be under oath.

4. Copies.

a. Two for service on public entity [*Civ. Code § 3198*];

b. Three or more copies if claim is to be used as an exhibit to a complaint; and

c. One office copy.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
5. Release of Withheld Funds on Affidavit by Original Contractor

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.231

§ 481.231 Service of Affidavit on Public Entity

1. Place of service.

Not specified in statutory law, but apparently the office of the public entity involved in the public work.

2. Manner of service.

Not specified in statutory law, but apparently service could be personal or by registered or certified mail.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
5. Release of Withheld Funds on Affidavit by Original Contractor

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.232

§ 481.232 Service of Affidavit and Notice on Claimant

1. Who may serve.

Service on the claimant is made by the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

NOTE:
Because the original contractor serves two copies on the public entity, one of these two copies is used by the public entity for service by it on the claimant.

2. Place of service.

The address of the claimant as shown on his or her stop notice claim or his or her last known address [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

3. Manner of service.

Either personally or by registered or certified mail [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

4. Papers served.

a. Affidavit and demand for release [*see § 481.335*]; and

b. Notice [*see § 481.336*] that public entity will release money or bonds withheld unless the claimant files a counteraffidavit with the public entity on or before a time designated in the notice, which must be not less than 10 days nor more than 20 days after service on the claimant of a copy of the affidavit [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

5. Proof of service.

By affidavit prepared by the public entity and executed by the person responsible for mailing the affidavit and notice or responsible for personal service. The affidavit should be verified [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

NOTE:

If the claimant files a counteraffidavit, he or she should do so on or before the time designated in the notice, alleging the details of his or her claim, and setting forth in detail the specific basis on which he or she rebuts the allegations of the original contractor's affidavit, together with proof of service of a copy of the counteraffidavit on the original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3200*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
5. Release of Withheld Funds on Affidavit by Original Contractor

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.233

§ 481.233 Release of Money or Bonds Withheld

If the claimant does not file a counteraffidavit with proof of service on the original contractor within the time allowed, the public entity must immediately release the money or bonds [*Civ. Code § 3200*].

NOTE:

Under *Civ. Code § 3200*, the public entity is not responsible for the validity of the affidavit and counteraffidavit, and under *Civ. Code § 3200*, is not liable for making the release.

Under *Civ. Code § 3200*, the money or bonds must be released if the counteraffidavit is not filed "within the time allowed." The quoted language probably refers to the time designated in the notice [*see § 481.336*] served on the claimant. However, the time designated could be prior in time to the maximum time that could have been allowed, which would be not more than 20 days after service of a copy of the affidavit on the claimant. To be on the safe side, the public entity would probably not release the funds until 20 days have passed from service of a copy of the affidavit on the claimant and, in so doing, would probably not be violating its obligation to release the funds.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
5. Release of Withheld Funds on Affidavit by Original Contractor

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.234-481.249

[Reserved]

§§ 481.234[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
6. Proceedings to Determine Rights of Parties to Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.250

§ 481.250 Preparation of Complaint or Petition

1. Contents.

See *§ 481.337*.

2. Execution.

By the party bringing the proceedings or by his or her attorney [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

NOTE:
The party bringing the proceeding may be either the original contractor or the claimant [*Civ. Code § 3201*]. The proceedings areinitiated by a pleading, and Code of Civil Procedure sections on pleadings, such as *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*, would be applicable when appropriate and not inconsistent with the procedure set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 3201-3205*.

3. Verification.

Recommended.

NOTE:
***Civ. Code § 3201* does not require verification. Under *Civ. Code § 3202*, the affidavit and counteraffidavit constitute the pleadings, and, of course, the affidavit and counteraffidavit must be verified. Insofar as the complaint or petition that initiates the proceedings is also a pleading, it could also be verified. Under *Civ. Code § 3203*, a determination may be reached on no evidence except the affidavit and counteraffidavit. Insofar as a determination could be based on facts set forth in the complaint or petition, an additional reason would exist for its verification.**

4. Copies.

a. One for service on the defendant or respondent;

b. One for service on the public entity;

c. One for filing with the appropriate superior court, together with proof of service on both the defendant or respondent and the public entity; and

d. One office copy.

NOTE:
Procedures set forth in the Code of Civil Procedure for both actions and summary proceedings are not appropriate for the actual filing of the complaint to determine rights to withheld funds. Under *Civ. Code §§ 3201-3202*, both the defendant or respondent and the public entity must receive notice of the filing of the complaint or petition. In addition, because the affidavit and counteraffidavit constitute the pleadings, a summons need not be served on the parties. It is recommended that service on the defendant or respondent and the public entity be either by personal service or by registered or certified mail, with an affidavit of proof of service attached to the original complaint or petition filed with the court.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
6. Proceedings to Determine Rights of Parties to Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.251

§ 481.251 Filing of Complaint or Petition

1. Venue (county)

Proceedings should be filed in the appropriate superior court for a declaration of the respective rights of the parties [*Civ. Code § 3201*]. Proper counties for filing would be the county where the contract was to be performed, or in which the contract in fact was entered into, or the county of the proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395*].

2. Jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction to hear the proceedings is in the superior court only [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

NOTE:

Venue relates to the proper county for trial of an action, and jursidiction relates to the power of a court to adjudicate the matter.

If the proceedings are brought in a superior court other than one in a proper county, the action may be transferred under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397* .

3. Fees.

Plaintiff pays the filing fee when the first paper is filed in the action or proceeding. The total amount required may vary from court to court, and from county to county. Generally, filing fees are fixed by statute [*see Gov. Code §§ 70611-70613*]. If payment of filing fees is made by check that is later returned without payment, the court will notify the party who tendered the check that (1) the check has been returned without payment; (2) an administrative charge [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 411.20(g)*] has been imposed to reimburse the court for the costs of processing the returned check and providing notice that

the check has been returned; and (3) the party has 20 days from the date the notice was mailed to pay the filing fee and administrative charge in cash, by certified check, or by any other means specified by the court but not by traveler's or personal check. If the person who tendered the check is only acting on behalf of a party, the clerk must notify not only the person who tendered the check, but also the party or that party's attorney if the party is represented [*Code Civ. Proc. § 411.20(a)*]. If a trial or other hearing is scheduled to begin before the 20-day period expires, the fee must be paid before the trial or hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 411.20(e)*]. The clerk will void the filing if the party who tendered a returned check or on whose behalf a returned check was tendered, or the party who paid less than the required fee or on whose behalf the fee was paid, has not paid the full amount of the fee and administrative charge within the 20-day period, or before the date set for trial or hearing, as applicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 411.20(b), (e)*]. If an adverse party files a responsive pleading, together with a filing fee, in response to a pleading that is voided due to a returned check, the adverse party's filing is not required and will be voided. The court will mail to the parties or their attorneys notice that the initial paper and response have been voided. The responding party's filing fee will be refunded on request provided the request is made within 20 days from the date on which the notice was mailed. No administrative charge will be imposed on the responding party. The refund is available if the adverse party has filed only a responsive pleading, but not if he or she has also filed a cross-complaint or other first paper seeking affirmative relief for which there is a filing fee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 411.20(c)*]. If in doubtas to local practice, counsel should check with the local court clerk to determine theamount of fees payable before filing his or her complaint or petition.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsExclusive JurisdictionCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsFiling FeesCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
6. Proceedings to Determine Rights of Parties to Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.252

§ 481.252 Service of Complaint or Petition

1. Persons to be served.

a. The defendant or respondent [*Civ. Code § 3201*]; and

b. The public entity [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

NOTE:
***Civ. Code § 3201* does not require service of the complaint on the defendant or respondent and the public entity. However, because either the original contractor or the claimant is entitled to obtain a hearing on the complaint or petition, it is apparent that the defendant should be notified of the filing of the complaint. At the hearing, the public entity must file the affidavit and counteraffidavit with the court [*Civ. Code § 3202*], and for this reason should receive notice of the filing of the complaint or petition. However, even if service of the complaint on the public entity is not required by implication of law, the public entity, along with the defendant or respondent, must receive five days' notice in writing of the hearing [*Civ. Code § 3202*].**

If counsel should decide to obtain an ex parte order for the hearing date [*see § 481.338*], he or she could serve the complaint and ex parte order at the same time, filing with the complaint and ex parte order an affidavit of service of both the complaint or petition and the ex parte order, which constitutes notice of the hearing on the defendant or respondent and the public entity.

2. Place of service.

The address of the defendant or respondent as shown on papers previously filed with the public entity or his or her last known address, and the address of the public entity to which previous notices and affidavits have been filed.

3. Manner of service.

Personal service or service by registered or certified mail is recommended.

NOTE:

***Civ. Code § 3201* does not mention the manner of service that should be used. Service by summons [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-417.40*] would not seem appropriate to proceedings under *Civ. Code § 3201*. A summons under *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20* must contain a direction that the defendant file with the court a written pleading in response to the complaint within 30 days after the summons is served on him or her. However, a responsive pleading is not necessary to a complaint or petition for a declaration of rights to withheld funds, because, under *Civ. Code § 3202*, the affidavit and counteraffidavit constitute the pleadings, and, under *Civ. Code § 3201*, only notice of the hearing on the complaint is legally required. Although service of the complaint or petition on both the public entity and defendant or respondent is recommended, this service is thus apparently not legally required. Because the complaint or petition, if verified, can be used as evidence at the hearing, it should be served on the parties who may appear at the hearing.**

4. Affidavit of service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1013, 1013a*].

To the extent appropriate, proof of service by affidavit is recommended.

NOTE:

***Civ. Code § 3201* does not specify the method of service. Service by first-class mail is not recommended, but, instead, should be either personal service or service by registered or certified mail. Thus, proof of service could be shown by either the records of certification or registration or by the affidavit.**

5. Time limits.

The hearing must be within 15 days from the making of motion for a hearing and five days' notice must be given of the hearing [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

NOTE:

No time limit is specified for the service of the complaint or petition, partly for the reason that service of the complaint or petition, independent of service of a notice for a hearing, is probably not legally required.

Although *Civ. Code § 3201* is not clear on this point, notice of a motion for a hearing is apparently not legally required and only a written notice of the hearing is required. Thus, an ex parte application for the granting of a hearing date would seem appropriate [*see* *§ 481.338* for ex parte order]. However, where an ex parte order is not obtained, the written notice could be of the hearing [***see*** *§ 481.339*]. If counsel desires to give a written notice of the motion for a hearing, he or she should use § *481.340*, which is for use when the court would go through the formality of granting the motion on the date set for the hearing and then proceed to conduct the hearing itself. In any event, counsel should check local court practice before deciding which of §§ *481.338-481.340* he or she should use.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
6. Proceedings to Determine Rights of Parties to Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.253

§ 481.253 Hearing

1. Burden of proof.

The original contractor has the burden of proof at the hearing [*Civ. Code § 3202*].

NOTE:
***Civ. Code § 3197* gives the following four grounds for the original contractor's affidavit:**

- **Claim is not of the type or classification for which a stop notice can be filed;**
- **The claimant is not qualified to file a stop notice;**
- **The amount of the claim is excessive; and**
- **There is no basis in law for the claim set out in the stop notice.**

***Civ. Code § 3202*, which provides that at the hearing the original contractor has the burden of proof, is based on statutory language in former Code Civ. Proc. § 1190.1(c) enacted before the Evidence Code, which was effective January 1, 1967. Under *Evid. Code § 502*, a party with the burden of proof is required to meet one of the following burdens: (1) to raise a reasonable doubt as to the existence or nonexistence of a fact; (2) to establish the existence or nonexistence of a fact by a preponderance of the evidence; (3) to establish the existence or nonexistence of a fact by clear and convincing proof; or (4) to establish the existence of a fact beyond a reasonable doubt.**

The legislative intent was probably to impose on the original contractor the burden of proving the nonexistence of a factual ground for a stop notice by a preponderance of the evidence.

2. Nature of presumption established.

The presumption established by *Civ. Code § 3202* is probably a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence [*see Evid. Code §§ 550(b), 601, 603-604*] and not a presumption affecting the burden of proof [*see Evid. Code §§ 605, 606*].

NOTE:

To state that a party has the burden of proof as to the nonexistence of a fact is another way of stating that the other party is entitled to either a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or a presumption affecting the burden of proof as to the existence of a particular fact. A presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence is established to facilitate the determination of an action [*Evid. Code § 603*], while a presumption affecting the burden of proof is established to implement some public policy other than to facilitate the determination of an action [*Evid. Code § 605*].

The legislative intent was probably to impose on the original contractor the burden of producing evidence. Once this burden is met, the claimant clearly would not be entitled to a presumption in his or her favor. Under *Evid. Code § 550(b)*, the burden of producing evidence as to a particular fact is initially on the party with the burden of proof as to that fact. The legislative intent was most likely to impose on the original contractor such a burden and not to entitle the claimant to a presumption affecting the burden of proof. Thus, even though the original contractor must establish his or her defense to the stop notice claim by a preponderance of the evidence, once the burden of producing evidence has been met, the claimant would not be entitled to a presumption as to the existence of a particular fact. Because at the hearing both the affidavit and counteraffidavit may be treated as evidence [*Civ. Code § 3203*], both parties would have introduced evidence and no presumption would operate unless the original contractor's affidavit did not fulfill the burden of producing evidence that resulted from the filing of a stop notice by the claimant.

3. Jury trial.

The stop notice procedure is not to be construed as to deprive any party of the right to a jury trial when this right is given by the California Constitution [*Civ. Code § 3204*].

NOTE:

Ordinarily, a demand for a jury trial is made in the Case Management Statement (Judicial Council Form CM-110) [*see* *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.725, 3.727(13)*]. However, a case management statement is not the appropriate way to obtain a hearing date on the complaint or petition to determine the rights of the parties. It would seem that if the claimant desires a jury trial, he or she should demand a jury trial prior to or at the start of the hearing. If a motion for a hearing is heard before the actual start of the hearing, a demand for a jury trial would not seem appropriate until the court has granted the motion.

4. When hearing is ordered continued.

a. Demand for jury trial: If a demand for a jury trial is made at the time and place set for a hearing, the court should apparently order the hearing continued for the production of other evidence.

b. Hearing before court sitting without a jury: If no evidence other than the affidavit and counteraffidavit is offered, and the court is dissatisfied with the sufficiency of the facts shown thereby, it must order the hearing continued for the production of other evidence, oral or documentary, or the filing of other affidavits and counteraffidavits [*Civ. Code § 3203*].

5. Court order.

a. Contents.

See *§ 481.341*.

b. Findings.

Not required [*Civ. Code § 3203*].

c. Nature of order.

A determination of whether or not the demand for release of money or bonds will be allowed.

d. Service.

The original contractor must serve a copy of the order on the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3203*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury DemandsCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of EvidenceEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofProof Beyond Reasonable DoubtReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
6. Proceedings to Determine Rights of Parties to Withheld Funds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.254-481.269

[Reserved]

§§ 481.254[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.270

§ 481.270 Commencement of Time to File Action to Enforce

An action against the original contractor and the public entity to enforcepayment of the claim stated in the stop notice may be commenced at any time after 10 days from the date of service of the stop notice on the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3210*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.271

§ 481.271 Expiration of Time to File Action to Enforce

An action cannot be commenced more than 90 days following the expiration of the period within which stop notices must be filed as provided in *Civ. Code § 3184* [*see § 481.191*, Paragraph 5]. No such action may be brought to trial and no judgment may be entered until the expiration of the 90-day period. No money or bond can be withheld by reason of any such notice longer than the expiration of the 90-day period unless proceedings are commenced by the claimant in a proper court within that time to enforce his or her claim. If the proceedings have not been commenced, the stop notice ceases to be effective and the moneys or bonds withheld are required to be paid or delivered to the contractor or other person to whom they are due [*Civ. Code § 3210*].

NOTE:

To give notice to a stop notice claimant of the commencement of the time period in which an action to enforce payment of the claim stated in the stop notice must be brought, *Civ. Code § 3185* provides that no later than 10 days after the filing of a notice of completion or after the cessation of labor has been deemed a completion of the public work or after the acceptance of completion, whichever is later, the public entity must give notice of the expiration of that period to each stop notice claimant by personal service, or registered or certified mail, if the claimant has paid to the public entity the sum of $2 at the time of filing the stop notice. When service is by registered or certified mail, service is complete at the time of the deposit of the registered or certified mail in the United States post office, addressed to the claimant at the address shown on the stop notice claim [*Civ. Code § 3185*]. If the public agency fails to give the notice of expiration, it may be estopped to rely on the statute of limitation. If the amount withheld is paid to the contractor because an action was not filed within the limitation period, the contractor also may be estopped to rely on the statute of limitation [*J. H. Thompson Corp. v. DC Construction (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1359-1361* ,] . Under appropriate circumstances, the statute of limitations may also be equitably tolled [*see Structural Steel Fabricators, Inc. v. City of Orange (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 459, 464-467 , 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 871]* . For further discussion of estoppel and equitable tolling, see *§ 481.49[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsEquitable EstoppelGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTollingReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.272

§ 481.272 Jurisdiction

In the absence of a contrary, specific legislative mandate, the jurisdictional rules that apply under the mechanics' lien law also apply to an action to enforce a stop notice claim [*Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 50 37 Cal. Rptr. 782]* .

Thus, the superior court has jurisdiction of a stop notice enforcement action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless it is a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(6)*]. An action to enforce and foreclose a mechanics' lien (and, presumably an action to enforce a stop notice claim) is a limited civil action if the amount of the lien, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(6)*]. When an action to enforce the lien affects property that is also affected by a similar pending action that is not a limited civil case, or when the total amount of the liens sought to be foreclosed against the same property exceeds $25,000, the action is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(6)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsExclusive JurisdictionReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.273

§ 481.273 Venue

The action is to be filed in a proper court [*see Civ. Code § 3210*], and a proper county would be where the contract is to be performed, or in which it was entered into, or the county in which a defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueIndividual Defendants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.274

§ 481.274 Notice

1. Contents.

See *§ 481.343*.

2. Notice of the commencement of the action must be given to the public entity within five days and in the same manner as provided for a stop notice under *Civ. Code § 3103* [*Civ. Code § 3211*].

3. Personal service or service by registered or certified mail is recommended.

NOTE:
In *Sunlight Elec. Supply Co. v. McKee (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 47, 37 Cal. Rptr. 782* , a notice filed 14 days after the commencement of an action was held to be substantial compliance with former Code Civ. Proc. § 1197.1(b) if no detriment was shown resulting from failure to serve the notice within five days.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessTime LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.275

§ 481.275 Claimants' Right to Join in Pending Action

Stop notice claimants may join in a pending action to enforce a stop notice [*Civ. Code § 3214*].

NOTE:

The law is unclear as to whether a party can qualify as a stop notice claimant under *Civ. Code § 3214* when he or she has served a stop notice but has not served a required preliminary 20-day notice. Since the preliminary notice is intended to notify the original contractor and the public entity of the potential claim, the better rule would be that a stop notice claimant who has not filed a valid preliminary 20-day notice should be treated as a claimant for purposes of *Civ. Code § 3214*. Neither the original contractor nor public entity would be prejudiced by such treatment.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsImpleaderCivil ProcedureParties JoinderPermissive JoinderCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of ActionsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.276

§ 481.276 Consolidation of Actions

1. By court first acquiring jurisdiction: When separate actions are commenced, the court first acquiring jurisdiction may consolidate them [*Civ. Code § 3214*].

2. On request of public entity: The court must require all claimants to moneys withheld pursuant to stop notices to be impleaded in one action [*Civ. Code § 3214, see § 481.344*].

NOTE:

A claimant may have filed an unenforceable stop notice. A stop notice might be effective as a notice in the sense that the requirements of *Civ. Code § 3184* have been fulfilled, but the notice might not be enforceable under *Civ. Code § 3183* for failure to give a required preliminary 20-day notice. The law is unclear as to whether the claimant under an unenforceable stop notice can qualify as a claimant under *Civ. Code § 3214*. Under *Civ. Code § 3214*, such a claimant would not be enforcing the stop notice in the sense of requiring the public entity to withhold funds, and he or she would only be sharing in funds withheld as a result of enforceable stop notices filed by other claimants. The claimant would also be sharing in the funds not because he or she is enforcing the stop notice but only because the public entity has requested the court to implead him or her in an action involving the respective rights of claimants to funds withheld by a public entity.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.277

§ 481.277 Dismissal

If an action is not brought to trial within two years after its commencement, the court may, in its discretion, dismiss the action for want of prosecution [*Civ. Code § 3212*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to Prosecute

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Withholding Payment on Public Works
7. Enforcement of Rights Arising From Stop Notice

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.278-481.289

[Reserved]

§§ 481.278[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.290

§ 481.290 Scope of Checklist

NOTE:

The following checklists are illustrative of the procedures commonly utilized by counsel in actions on contractor's payment bonds. Other procedures may be required. In addition, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.*, except as otherwise provided, are applicable to, and constitute the rules of practice in, the proceedings relating to stop notices and payment bonds [*Civ. Code § 3259*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Public Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.291

§ 481.291 Service of Post-Completion Bond Notice (Public Works)

NOTE:

Service of either a 20-day preliminary notice (public work) or a post-completion bond notice will allow a claimant to enforce a claim against a payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3252*]. Claimants not required to serve a 20-day preliminary bond notice are also not required to serve a post-completion bond notice [*see Civ. Code §§ 3098(a), 3252(a)*]. For a form and outline of requirements for giving a 20-day preliminary notice, see *§§ 481.170 -481.174*, and see *§ 481.330*.

The post-completion notice requirement, which is seemingly inconsistent with the 20-day preliminary notice alternative, was enacted, effective January 1, 1995 [*see* 1994 Stats., ch 974 § 7], to protect the rights of "unsophisticated" laborers and materialmen who may not be aware of the 20-day preliminary notice requirement.

1. Contents of notice.

See *§ 481.360*.

2. Manner of service.

The post-completion bond notice may be served by personal delivery, or by depositing the notice in the mail, postage prepaid, certified or registered, and addressed in accordance with any of the following that may be applicable [*Civ. Code § 3227(a)*]:

a. If to an individual surety, at his or her residence or place of business, if known. If to an individual surety whose residence is unknown, then in care of the clerk of the county in which the bond has been recorded.

b. If to a corporate surety, at the office of or in care of the agent designated by the surety in the bond as the address to which notice must be sent.

c. At the office of or in care of any officer of the surety in California.

d. At the office of or in care of the statutory agent of the surety in California.

e. To the bond principal at the last known address.

f. By service in the manner provided by law for the service of a summons in a civil action.

The preliminary bond notice must be served by mailing the same by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the original contractor at any place he or she maintains an office, or

3. Time limitation.

The post-completion bond notice must be given within 15 days after recording of a notice of completion. If no notice of completion has been recorded, the time for giving written notice to the surety is extended to 75 days after completing the work of improvement [*Civ. Code § 3252(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.292

§ 481.292 Time Limitations

1. Commencement of period within which suit may be brought.

Suit against surety on payment bond may be brought after the claimant has furnished the last of the labor or materials, or both [*Civ. Code § 3249*].

2. Expiration of period within which suit may be brought.

Suit must be commenced before the expiration of six months after the period in which stop notices may be filed as provided in *Civ. Code § 3184* [*Civ. Code § 3249*].

NOTE:

However, the filing of a stop notice is not a condition precedent to the maintenance of an action against the surety on the payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3250*].

If the suit on the payment bond is going to be combined with enforcement of the stop notice action, which must be commenced within 90 days after the period for filing stop notices has expired [*Civ. Code § 3210*], then an action joining these two causes of action should be instituted during such 90-day period.

For a discussion of the above code sections and the determination of the commencement of various periods involved, see *Fidelity Sound Systems, Inc. v. American Bonding Co. (1978) 149 Cal. Rptr. 674* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety BondsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.293

§ 481.293 Preparation of Complaint

The essential allegations for a complaint for recovery on a contractor's payment bond are:

1. Capacity or residence of plaintiff (generally optional unless plaintiff is suing in a representative capacity or it is necessary to establish plaintiff's right to maintain the action);

2. Name and capacity (and residence, where venue is to be based thereon) of defendant or each defendant if there is more than one;

3. Agency allegations, if appropriate. See Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used ;* and

4. Facts establishing the right of plaintiff to bring an action on a contractor's payment bond. See *§ 481.361*, Paragraphs 6-12 of the Second Cause of Action:

a. If plaintiff is a contractor, that he or she is licensed as such;

b. That the plaintiff performed labor or furnished materials for and actually used in or consumed in a public work;

c. That the labor performed or materials furnished were at the instance of the original contractor;

d. Dates on which labor or materials were furnished;

e. Full performance of the contract (or, if not entirely performed, the excuse therefor accorded in the contract);

f. Amount due plaintiff on contract; and

g. That the original contractor, as principal, and a surety or sureties executed a bond which, by its terms was made to inure to the benefit of the plaintiff, as a claimant, and gave him or her right to recover on the bond.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.294

§ 481.294 Venue

A defendant surety corporation may be sued in the county where the contract is made or is to be performed or where the obligation or liability arises or the breach occurs; it may also be used in the county where the principal place of business of the corporation is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395, 395.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueCorporationsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationSubcontracts & SubcontractorsSurety Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.295-481.309

[Reserved]

§§ 481.295[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.310

§ 481.310 Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (Breach of Con-
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	tract)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a duly licensed _____ [general *or* painting *or specify other type of contractor*] contractor under the laws of the State of California and engaged in business as such in the _____ [City *or* City and County] of _____, [County of _____,] California.

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

3. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] was, and now is, a _____ [*specify capacity of defendant public entity, e.g.*, municipal corporation, duly organized and

existing under the laws of the State of California, and situated in the County of _____ *or* a chartered city, existing as such under the laws of the State of California, and situated in the County of _____].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] acting through _____ [*specify public department, board, or agency, e.g.*, the Board of Public Works], and by virtue of the authority granted _____ [*specify statute, charter, e.g.*, by the charter of the defendant city], entered into a contract in writing with plaintiff for the construction of _____ [*describe construction project*]. A true and correct copy of the contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint.

5. By the terms of the contract, all of the work was to be performed in accordance with the plans and the specifications _____ [more fully described in the contract *or* which are attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and made a part of this complaint].

6. Thereafter, plaintiff in all respects complied with the conditions and provisions of the contract, and all of the work was performed by plaintiff in the presence of inspectors of defendant in accordance with the plans and specifications _____ [contained in *or* attached to and forming a part of] the contract; all of the work was accepted by the inspectors as having been performed in accordance with the plans and specifications.

7. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] that plaintiff had completed all of the work to be performed by him/her under the provisions of the contract, and plaintiff requested final inspection of the work so that plaintiff could receive payment therefor.

8. On _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] notified plaintiff that the work would not be accepted until certain additional work had been performed, namely: _____ [*describe additional work*]. Plaintiff refused to perform such additional work [unless additional compensation was paid] on the ground that plaintiff had fulfilled all of his/her contractual obligations with defendant. By reason of the refusal of defendant to accept the work performed by plaintiff or to pay plaintiff therefor, [or to recognize plaintiff's right to additional compensation,] plaintiff, pursuant to a reserved right to claim additional compensation for such additional work [, as specified in a notice delivered to defendant on _____ (*date*), a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit C and made a part of this complaint], completed all of the [required] additional work. All of the construction work performed by plaintiff was accepted by the defendant on _____ [*date*].

9. All of the additional work directed by defendant was performed by plaintiff at a cost of $_____, all to the damage of plaintiff in this amount, and work and services performed and materials supplied by plaintiff were reasonably worth this amount.

10. Under the provisions of the contract between plaintiff and defendant, plaintiff could not receive compensation for the work performed by him/her until such time as the project had been accepted as complete by defendant.

11. Prior to the commencement of this action, and on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff presented to defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] a claim for damages in the sum of $_____ for breach of contract whichare sought in this action. A true and correct copy of the claim is attached to this complaint as Exhibit D and made a part of this complaint.

12. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] _____ [rejected this claim in its entirety *or* allowed this claim in the amount of $_____ and rejected it as to the remainder].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment [against defendants, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint for damages for breach of contract is for use by a general contractor against a public entity that wrongfully refused to accept the work performed by the contractor and required the contractor to perform certain additional work that the contractor did perform but for which he or she was not fully compensated under the terms of the general contract.

[3] Verifications

A public entity need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. The verification of a complaint against a public entity does, however, preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[4] Jurisdiction

Superior courts have original jurisdiction in all cases except those given by statute to other trial courts [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. If the demand, exclusive of interest, or the value of the property amounts to $25,000 or less, except in certain

cases (not relevant here), the case will be classified as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases the first page of the first paper filed must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000. The first page of the first paper filed must also identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 72055*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[5] Venue

In a breach of contract action, proper venue is in the county where the defendant resides, where the contract was to be performed, or where the contract was entered into. The county in which the obligation was incurred will be deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed unless there is a special contract in writing to the contrary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If the defendant in the contract action is a corporation, the action may also be brought in the county in which the corporation has its principal place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

[6] Pleading Presentation of Claim to Public Entity

A claim for compensation arising out of a contract between a contractor and a public entity must be presented to the public entity in accordance with the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* [*see Gov. Code § 905* (local public entities), *Gov. Code § 905.2* (state)]. The claim must be presented to the public entity as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 915-915.4* not later than one year after the accrual of the cause of action [*see Gov. Code § 911.2(a)*], which is the date on which the cause of action would be deemed to have accrued within the meaning of the statute of limitations which would be applicable thereto if there were no requirement that a claim be presented to and be acted on by the public entity before an action could be commenced thereon [*Gov. Code § 901*].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 946.4* (inadequate statement concerning public agency on file with Roster of Public Agencies during 70 days following accrual of cause of action) and 946.6 (petition for relief from *Gov. Code § 945.4* where public entity rejects late claim), no suit for money or damages may bebrought against the public entity on a cause of action for which a claim is required to be presented until a written claim therefor has been presented to the public entity and has been acted on by the board, or has been deemed to have been rejected by the board [*Gov. Code § 945.4*]. Satisfaction of this procedural prerequisite is an element of a contractor's cause of action against a public entity. A complaint must allege thepresentation of a written claim against the public entity (*see* Paragraph 11); otherwise, it does not set forth a cause of action against the public entity on any theory [*see Wilson v. People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 665, 668, 76 Cal. Rptr. 906]* .

[7] Statute of Limitations

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 946.4* (inadequate statement concerning public agency on file with Roster of Public Agencies during 70 days following accrual of cause of action) and 946.6 (relief from requirement of *Gov. Code § 945.4*), any suit brought against a public entity on a cause of action for which a claim is required to be presented must be commenced: (1) if written notice is given in accordance with *Gov. Code § 913* by the public entity, not later than six months after the date such notice is personally delivered or deposited in the mail, or (2) if such written notice is not given by the public entity, within two years after the accrual of the cause of action [*Gov. Code § 945.6(a)*]. This two-year period may be extended if the claimant and the board extend the period within which the board is required to act on the claim presented by the claimant [*see Gov. Code §§ 912.4(b), 945.6(a)(2)*].

[8] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to Fax service and filing of papers, see Ch. 264, *Fax Service and Filing of Papers*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.311

§ 481.311 Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract for Construction of Retaining Wall--Breach of Warranty and Fraudulent Concealment

[1] FORM Complaint by Contractor Against Public Entity for Damages for Breach of Contract for Construction of Retaining Wall--Breach of Warranty and Fraudulent Concealment

[*Caption. See § 481.310.*]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

[2. *Allegation of plaintiff's contractor's license. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Allegation of capacity of defendant as public entity. See § 481.310, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a written contract for the construction of _____ [*describe work to be performed under contract, e.g.*, a retaining wall of a type known as a sidehill bridge], which contract consisted of the following documents: (1) contract dated _____; (2) plans and specifications; (3) instructions to bidders; (4) bid proposal, and (5) standard specification No. _____ of the Department of Public Works, City of _____.

5. The contract, in part, provides as follows: _____ [*set forth contract provisions, e.g.*,

a. Contractor agrees to furnish all material, equipment, and labor necessary for the construction of and to construct the retaining wall for the lump sum of $_____.

b. Contractor agrees to furnish said material, equipment, and labor, and to perform said work strictly in accordance with the plans, and any specifications therefor, and instructions to bidders and bid proposal therefor, which were duly approved and adopted by the _____ (*name of public agency, e.g.*, Board of Public Works) of _____ (*name of public entity*) at its meeting of _____ [*date*].

c. It is expressly understood and agreed that the instructions to bidders, the notice inviting bids, the contractor's proposal, and said plans and specifications, all of which are on file in the office of _____ (*name of public agency, e.g.*, Board of Public Works) constitute a part of this contract, and each of the parties hereto does hereby expressly convenant and agree to carry out and fully perform each and all of the provisions of the documents on his/her/its part to be performed.

d. That in constructing _____ (*specify work to be done under contract, e.g.*, the retaining wall), plaintiff was to _____ (*describe work to be done leading to unforeseen condition, e.g.*, install anchorcaissons and soldier beams detailed in the plans and specifications, through the specified procedure of drilling unsupported holes in the ground of some 12 to 34 feet in depth, which drilling procedure did not contemplate use of rotary mud).

e. Contractor agrees to begin work within _____ (*number*) days after execution of the contract, to complete the work within _____ (*number*) calendar days, and to pay a penalty of $_____ for each unexcused calendar day over these _____ (*number*) days as liquidated damages.

f. The _____ (*name of public entity*) agrees to pay the contractor for the performance of this work, as mentioned above, the sum hereinabove set forth, at the time and in the manner provided in the specifications, namely, the lump sum of $_____, to be paid within _____ (*number*) days after job acceptance by defendant _____ (*name of public entity*).]

6. Standard specification No. _____, forming a part of the contract, provides in part as follows: _____ [*set forth pertinent specifications, e.g.*,

2-1. These specifications, the plans, the project specifications, the instructions to bidders, and the notice inviting bids are all essential parts of the contract.

No deviations from the plans and specifications will be permitted except such as are authorized by the engineer to meet exigencies of construction. Section 2-1 is set forth in full in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

2-8. CHANGED OR UNFORESEEN CONDITIONS. During the progress of the work, if the contractor should encounter subsurface or latent conditions materially different from those shown on the plans or indicated in the project specifications, or unknown conditions of a nature differing materially from those ordinarily encountered and generally recognized as being inherent in work of the character being performed, he/she must, before proceeding further with work affecting or affected by such conditions, immediately notify the engineer who will promptly make an investigation. If conditions do materially differ and the contractor could not reasonably have been expected to ascertain, in advance, the true nature of the existing conditions, a change order will be issued to provide for any increase or decrease in cost and difference in contract time resulting from any such condition. Section 2-8 is set forth in full in Exhibit B, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

3-3. BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Board of Public Works of _____ (*name of public entity*) has the final authority in all matters affecting the work covered by these specifications.

THE ENGINEER. Within the scope of the contract, the engineer is authorized to decide matters with respect to the

interpretation of the plans and specifications, to approve necessary changes in plans up to $_____ in cost, and to initiate changes in plans or the scope of the work, irrespective of cost, for submission to the board for final action.

THE INSPECTOR. Within the scope of the contract, the inspector is authorized to enforce compliance with plans and specifications, to determine the acceptability of materials and workmanship, and to prepare and process progress payment estimates on cash contracts. In the event of dispute between the contractor and the inspector, the latter is authorized to reject materials or suspend the work until any questions at issue can be referred to and decided by the board, or, in cases affecting the engineering features of the work, the engineer. Section 3-3 is set forth in full in Exhibit C, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

3-6. METHODS AND APPLIANCES. The methods, labor, equipment, and other facilities used by the contractor must be such as will assure performance of the work in accordance with the plans and specifications, within the time specified for completion.

5-1. TIME FOR STARTING WORK. Unless otherwise provided, the contractor must begin work within _____ (*number*) calendar days of the date of execution of the contract by the board. After commencement of the work, the contractor must prosecute the work diligently to completion within the prescribed time limit. Section 5-1 is set forth in full in Exhibit D, which attached hereto and made a part hereof.

5-2. If, through the fault of the city, the contractor must suspend operations and incurs expenses or sustains losses which could not have been avoided by the judicious handling of forces and equipment, and if by a diligent prosecution of the work he/she could not have completed the work before such suspension, the contractor will be paid such amounts as may be agreed on between the contractor and the board to be a fair and reasonable comprehension and a commensurate extension of contract time will be granted. Section 5-2 is set forth in full in Exhibits E and F, which are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

6-7. PROTECTION AND RESTORATION OF PROPERTY. The contractor will protect all public and private prop erty insofar as it may be endangered by his/her operations and he/she will take every reasonable precaution to avoid damage to such property. Section 6-7 is set forth in part in Exhibit G, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

7-3. PAYMENT SCHEDULES FOR LUMP SUM BIDS OR BID ITEMS. When required by the project specifications, the contractor will submit to the Bureau of Contract Administration within _____ (*number*) days after award of contract, a detailed schedule, in triplicate, to be used as the basis for determining progress payments on a lump sum bid or any designated lump sum bid item. Such a schedule will equal in total the lump sum price and will be in such form and detail and supported byevidence sufficient to satisfy the Bureau of Contract Administration that it correctly represents a reasonable apportionment of the lump sum, and will further be of a form and nature that will readily enable the inspector to determine the amounts of progress payments. Section 7-3 is set forth in full in Exhibit H, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

7-5. PAYMENTS ON CASH CONTRACTS. At the expiration of _____ (*number*) days from the date of acceptance of the work by the board, the amount deducted from the final estimate and retained by the city will be paid to the contractor, with the exception of such amounts as are required by law to be further retained. Section 7-5 is set forth in part in Exhibit I, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.

110-1.4. CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE PILES. Cast-in-place concrete piles must have steel casings or shells driven to the required bearing, the shells being left permanently in place and filled with concrete. Section 110-1.4 is set forth in part in Exhibit J, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof.]

7. _____ [*Set forth other pertinent provisions of plans and specifications, e.g.*, the plans and

specifications contain 16 general notes. Note 7 provides that holes for the soldier beams and anchor caissons must be made by boring and/or drilling. Note 8 states that soldier beams and anchor caissons must be cast in place within unsupported holes, except that where, in the opinion of the engineer, the holes are subject to caving or sloughing, or are in any way unstable, the walls must be temporarily supported by steel casings or shells. Before placing the steel casing or shells, as much of the loose soil as is practical must be removed from the holes. The general notes are set forth in Exhibit K, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof].

8. Defendant issued these plans and specifications to plaintiff for the purpose and with the intention that plaintiff (1) believe the recitals contained therein; (2) rely on them; and (3) act on them, including _____ [*specify any particular plans, specifications, or test reports on which plaintiff detrimentally relied, e.g.*, the log of test borings, included therein, which reported that the soil was coarse sand with clay binder.]

9. Defendant represented and impliedly warranted to plaintiff that these plans and specifications were engineeringly possible to execute, that it was engineeringly possible to construct _____ [*describe work to be performed under contract, e.g.*, the retaining wall] according to the terms of the contract, and, in particular _____ [*specify particular item either represented on which plaintiff relied or warranted which defendant breached, e.g.*, that the wall depicted on the plans would actually reach the ground level, and that it was engineeringly possible to drill the caisson and soldier beam holes without support, except for casing, as specified in the contract].

10. Defendant further represented and warranted that defendant had made full disclosure to plaintiff of all information and knowledge in its possession as to the _____ [*describe, e.g.*, subsoil conditions prevailing at the construction site essential to the proper bidding of the contract by plaintiff; and, in addition, defendant represented and warranted to plaintiff that defendant had not misrepresented or concealed any pertinent knowledge relating to the subsurface soil conditions prevailing at the job site, and that, instead, defendant had made a full disclosure of such conditions].

11. The plans and specifications were incorrect and misleading in that: _____ [*specify, e.g.*,

a. The wall as depicted did not extend to the actual ground level;

b. Contrary to the implied representations and warranties therein, it was engineeringly impossible to drill the holes for the caissons and soldier beams by the unsupported and casing drilling procedures therein specified because of the unstable soil conditions;

c. Contrary to the requirements of the contract, it was engineeringly impossible to drill the holes and at the same time cast the caissons in place in unsupported holes or in holes supported by steel casings;

d. Defendant misrepresented soil conditions in the test holes as being coarse sand with clay binder when in fact it was coarse sand with minute binder; and

e. Defendant concealed the fact that two preliminary test holes made by defendant at the job site had in fact caved in at eight feet and 21 feet, that these tests holes had indicated cohesionless and flowing sand, and that subsurface caving would likely occur if holes were bored in the area for piles or caissons].

12. Defendant, at all times herein mentioned, had full knowledge and information in its possession of the true _____ [*specify, e.g.*, subsoil] conditions at the job site and intentionally concealed and withheld the knowledge and information from plaintiff, who was ignorant thereof at all times prior to, and at the time of, entering into the contract.

13. Plaintiff believed and reasonably relied on the plans and specifications and on defendant's implied representations and warranties as herein alleged in making its bid in the amount of $_____, and entered into the contract by reason of this belief and reliance.

14. By reason of its misrepresentations and concealment, as herein alleged, defendant breached its implied warranty that the plans and specifications were correct and plaintiff, as a result, was unable to perform according to the contract provisions.

15. _____ [*Describe detriment incurred as a result of defendant's misrepresentation and concealment, e.g.*, After commencement of work under the contract, plaintiff, for the first time, learned the true condition of the subsoil and, after experiencing continual caving in of the unsupported holes, requested a change order from defendant to permit it to drillthe holes with rotary mud and for a concomitant increase in the contract price. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, in breach of Section 2-8 of the standard specification No. _____, set forth hereinabove, refused to issue a change order on the ground that the plans required only the drilling of the holes, leaving the method to plaintiff's discretion, and hence no change order was needed. Defendant directed plaintiff to continue with the work. To avoid collapse of the entire work area and the concomitant costs of repair and potential liability to third persons who might have been injured in such collapse, and to avoid possible imposition of penalties imposed by the contract for failure to timely complete construction, plaintiff, as directed by defendant, proceeded with the project using rotary mud].

16. Had the plans and specifications correctly set forth the true conditions of the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, subsoil], plaintiff's bid for the job would have been in the sum of $_____, instead of the sum of $_____ which it bid.

17. As a result of defendant's breach of warranty and concealment and its failure to issue a change order as herein alleged, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____, as the additional cost of construction attributable to defendant's misrepresentations, plus the sum of $_____ as a reasonable profit on the additional work.

[18. As a further result of defendant's breach of warranty and concealment and its failure to issue the change order as herein alleged, plaintiff was compelled to bear the additional cost of construction out of its own resources, which in turn forced a curtailment in its construction operations, damaging plaintiff in the sum of $_____, and a curtailment of its research, damaging plaintiff in the sum of $_____, which in turn led to a reduction of bonding capacity, damaging plaintiff in the sum of $_____, and destroyed plaintiff's former advantageous competitive position in the industry, thereby damaging plaintiff in the sum of $_____.]

19. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff presented to defendant a claim for damages for breach of contract in the amount of $_____. A copy of this claim is attached hereto as Exhibit I and made a part hereof.

20. On _____ [*date*], defendant rejected the claim in its entirety. A copy of said rejection is attached hereto as Exhibit J and made a part hereof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____ as additional costs of construction;

2. For the sum of $_____ as a reasonable profit on the additional work;

3. For the sum of $_____ for loss of profits resulting from the impairment of plaintiff's capital;

4. For the sum of $_____ for losses resulting from curtailment by plaintiff of its research;

5. For the sum of $_____ for reduction of plaintiff's bonding capacity;

6. For the sum of $_____ for destruction of plaintiff's former advantageous competitive position;

7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint for damages for breach of contract is for use by a contractor against a public entity when the public entity, by the terms of the contract or in its plans and specifications, has misrepresented the conditions that defendant would encounter in performing the required work under the contract [*see Warner Constr. Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 285, 293-294, 85 Cal. Rptr. 444, 466 P.2d 996]* .

The illustrative fact situation set forth in this form is adapted from the third and fourth causes of action set forth in plaintiff's complaint in *Warner Constr. Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 285, 289-290, 293, 85 Cal. Rptr. 444, 466 P.2d 996* , in which the Supreme Court reversed judgment for plaintiff on the issue of damages only.

[3] Contract Liability for Fraudulent Concealment

Although fraudulent concealment often composes the basis for an action in tort, tort actions for misrepresentation aganst public agencies are barred by *Gov. Code § 818.8*. However, the contractor retains a cause of action in contract against the public entity based on the theory that the furnishing of misleading plans and specifications by the public body constitutes a breach of an implied warranty of their correctness. The fact that the breach was fraudulent or misleading does not make the rule inapplicable [*see Warner Constr. Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 285, 293-294, 85 Cal. Rptr. 444, 466 P.2d 996]* .

A contractor's cause of action for breach of contract based on the nondisclosure of material facts may arise in at least three instances: (1) the defendant makes representations but does not disclose facts that materially qualify the facts disclosed, or that render his or her disclosure likely to mislead (*see* Paragraphs 8, 9); (2) the facts are known or accessible only to the defendant, and the defendant knows they are not known to or reasonably discoverable by the plaintiff (*see* Paragraph 10); and (3) the defendant actively conceals discovery from the plaintiff (*see* Paragraph 12) [*Warner Constr. Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 285, 294, 85 Cal. Rptr. 444, 466 P.2d 996]* .

[4] Decisions

Availability of dredge was implied term of contract for construction of seawall based on explicit provisions regarding time within which work had to be performed and requirement that contractor coordinate with contractor hired by Army Corps of Engineers, who was to provide dredge necessary for backfill; contractor was entitled to recover costs of protecting and repairing wall during seven months prior to arrival of dredge. *Tonkin Construction Co. v. County of Humboldt (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 828, 832-834, 233 Cal. Rptr. 587*

State was liable for failure to inform contractor of tidal difficulties on prior repair of identical part of bridge 200 feet from part being bid. *Welch v. State of California (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 546, 555-556, 188 Cal. Rptr. 726*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.312

§ 481.312 Complaint by Contractor Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM Complaint by Contractor Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[*Caption. See § 481.310.*]

[1. *Allegation of plaintiff's contractor's license. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

2. _____ [*Allege capacity and residence of defendant, e.g.*, Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____ County, California.

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 481.310, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was engaged in his/her business as a general contractor and submitted a bid for a construction job known as _____ [*name of construction*] in _____ [*city*], California, for _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, the Department of Public Works of the State of California]. In accordance with bidding instructions, the bid had to be submitted in writing to the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, Department of Public Works] in _____ [*city*], California, not later than _____ [*time*], on _____ [*date*].

5. Prior to the submission of plaintiff's bid for the construction of the _____ [*state the particular improvement subject of the plaintiff's bid*], plaintiff received from defendant at his/her office at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California, a verbal promise that defendant would perform, furnish, and install all of the _____ [*specify portion of improvement, e.g.*, chalk, tack, and bulletin boards] in accordance with the plans and specifications for the _____ [*name of construction*] for the sum of $_____.

6. Plaintiff relied on the verbal promise of defendant and used the bid of defendant in computing his/her bid for submission to the _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, Department of Public Works of the State of California] for the _____ [*state improvement*].

7. In reliance on defendant's promise as stated above, plaintiff, in submitting his/her final bid for the construction of the _____ [*state improvement*], did name defendant as a subcontractor to be employed to furnish and install the _____ [*specify work to be performed by the subcontractor*] on the _____ [*state improvement*] at the sum of $_____ agreed by defendant.

8. Plaintiff's bid for the general construction of the _____ [*state improvement*] was accepted and approved by the _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, Department of Public Works of the State of California] on _____ [*date*].

9. Although plaintiff has made repeated requests and demands on defendant to perform the work as he/she agreed, defendant has failed, neglected, and refused to perform, furnish, and install the _____ [*specify work to be performed by the subcontractor*] in accordance with his/her promise, and continues to refuse and neglect to perform this work.

10. To fulfill his/her commitment pursuant to his/her contract with _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, the Department of Public Works] for the construction of _____ [*state improvement*], plaintiff was compelled to, and did, obtain and install the _____ [*specify work to be performed by the subcontractor*] at a cost to plaintiff of $_____.

11. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____, the difference between the cost to plaintiff of obtaining the _____ [*specify work to be performed by the subcontractor*] in the amount of $_____ and the promise and bid of defendant to furnish and install the _____ [*specify work to be performed by the subcontractor*] in the amount of $_____; although plaintiff has demanded payment of these damages, defendant has failed, refused, and neglected, and continues to fail, refuse, and neglect, to pay this sum, or any other sum.

[*Prayer. See § 481.310.*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a contractor in an action for breach of contract against a subcontractor when the subcontractor has failed to perform the contract and the contractor has had to hire another subcontractor to perform the work at a cost over and above the defendant subcontractor's bid.

[3] Cross References

For a form of complaint for damages for breach of a building contract by a contractor against a subcontractor in which a surety is joined, and a form of complaint for declaratory relief and damages for breach of contract by a contractor against a subcontractor for the subcontractor's delay, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.313

§ 481.313 Complaint by Subcontractor Against General Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[1] FORM Complaint by Subcontractor Against General Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract on Public Work

[*Caption. See § 481.310.*]

[1. *Allegation of plaintiff's contractor's license. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff, if appropriate. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

[4. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 481.310, Paragraph 2.*]

5. On _____ [*date*], the _____ [*name of public entity, e.g.*, State of California], by and through the _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, Department of Public Works], entered into a written contract, which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, with defendant whereby defendant as general contractor and in consideration of the payment of the sum of $_____ agreed to perform the following work: _____ [*specify work to be performed by general contractor*].

6. On _____ [*date*], defendant entered into a written subcontract with plaintiff under which plaintiff as the subcontractor, in consideration of the payment of the sum of $_____, agreed to do certain _____ [*describe, e.g.*, electrical *or* painting *or* plumbing, *etc.*] work, the _____ [*describe*] work being a portion of that work to be performed by defendant for _____ [*name of public entity*]. The _____ [*describe*] work was to be performed in accordance with the terms of the contract between defendant and _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, Department of Public Works]. A copy of

the written subcontract between plaintiff and defendant is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

7. Pursuant to the subcontract between plaintiff and defendant, plaintiff commenced work, and continued his/her work under the subcontract until on or about _____ [*date*], at which time defendant repudiated the subcontract and gave plaintiff written notice canceling the subcontract and requested that plaintiff cease and desist from all further work on the project; on or about the same time, defendant did request bids from other subcontractors for a portion of the _____ [*describe*] work which was covered by the subcontract plaintiff had with defendant, and which was to be done by plaintiff in accordance with the terms of the subcontract, and did sublet a portion of this work to other subcontractors, all in violation of the terms of the subcontract between plaintiff and defendant.

8. Plaintiff was in no way in default of the subcontract, and to mitigate any damages caused by defendant's repudiation and breach of his/her subcontract with plaintiff immediately canceled preparations to continue with the performance of the subcontract with defendant.

9. Plaintiff has been at all times herein mentioned, and now is, ready, willing, and able to carry out the subcontract and to perform all things provided by the subcontract on his/her part to be performed; plaintiff has demanded of defendant that he/she be allowed to proceed to carry out the subcontract, and to furnish the materials and labor provided thereby, but defendant wrongfully refused, and continues to refuse, to allow plaintiff to continue to carry out the subcontract, or any part thereof.

10. By reason of the facts herein alleged, defendant has wrongfully repudiated and breached the subcontract to the damage of plaintiff in the sum of $_____ on account of work performed and materials purchased, and $_____ on account of profit lost, or a total of $_____ by reason of the repudiation and breach of the subcontract by defendant, as herein alleged.

11. Plaintiff has demanded that defendant pay the sum of $_____, but defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to pay this sum, or any other sum.

[*Prayer. See § 481.310.*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint for damages for breach of contract on a public work is for use by a subcontractor against a general contractor who has repudiated the subcontract.

[3] Cross References

For a form of complaint for damages for breach of a building contract for "extras" by a subcontractor against the prime contractor in which a municipality is joined based on a cause of action for withholding payment from the prime contractor pursuant to the subcontractor's stop notice, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.314

§ 481.314 Complaint Against Public Entity for Cancellation of Erroneous Bid and Forfeiture of a Bid Bond [Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)]--By Contractor

[1] FORM Complaint Against Public Entity for Cancellation of Erroneous Bid and Forfeiture of a Bid Bond [Pub. Contract Code § 5101(a)]--By Contractor
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR CANCELLATION OF BID
vs.	)	AND RELIEF FROM FORFEITURE OF BID BOND
_____ [*names*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendants.	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Allegation of plaintiff's contractor's license. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff, if appropriate. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant as public entity. See § 481.310, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant called for competitive bidding for the _____ [construction *or* performance] of a public project consisting of _____ [*set forth nature of project*].

5. Plaintiff submitted its bid of $_____ to defendant pursuant to defendant's solicitation for competitive bidding, accompanying its bid with a bidder's bond, executed by an admitted surety insurer, made payable to the _____ [director *or specify other head of public agency*] of the _____ [*name of public agency, e.g.*, Department of Transportation of the State of California] under which the above-described project was to be performed. This bond was in an amount equal to _____ percent of the amount bid. A copy of this bond is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], the bids were opened and plaintiff's bid was approximately $_____ lower than the next bid.

7. After the bids were opened, plaintiff realized that it had made a mistake in filling out the bid due to a _____ [clerical *or* mathematical *or specify other error other than one due to error in judgment or to carelessness in inspecting site of work or in reading plans and specifications*] error in that _____ [*describe*]. This mistake made plaintiff's bid materially different than plaintiff intended it to be in that plaintiff intended its bid to be in the amount of $_____.

8. Within five days after the opening of the bids, namely on _____ [*date*], plaintiff gave written notice to defendant that it had made a mistake in filling out the bid, specifying in detail how the mistake was made, namely: _____ [*specify how mistake was made*].

9. Plaintiff requested that defendant cancel plaintiff's bid and relieve plaintiff from a forfeiture of the amount of the bidder's bond.

10. On or about _____ [*date*], the defendant, through _____ [*specify defendant's agent, e.g.*, the city attorney], sent a formal contract to plaintiff with plaintiff's bid figure of $_____ unchanged.

11. Plaintiff immediately informed defendant that it would not perform the work for $_____, whereafter defendant notified plaintiff that unless the work was performed, it would take action to forfeit the $_____ bid bond posted by plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That plaintiff be permitted to cancel its bid;

2. That plaintiff be granted relief from forfeiture of its bid bond;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a general contractor in an action against a public entity to cancel an erroneous bid and recover the forfeiture of the bid security bond. This complaint must be filed and the summons served on the director of the department of the chief of the division or other head of the public entity under which the work is to be performed or an appearance made within 90 days after the opening of the bid [*Pub. Contract Code § 5102*]. Although the usual claim that is required to be made to a public entity before bringing an action is not necessary [*Pub. Contract Code § 5104*], written notice of the mistake must be given the public entity within five working days after the opening of the bids [*Pub. Contract Code § 5103*].

[3] Decisions

Former *Gov. Code §§ 4200-4208* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 5100 et seq.*), establishing procedure whereby contractor making erroneous bid to a public entity can claim relief without necessity of filing action in rescission, is exclusive procedure for relieving bidder from mistaken bid. *A & A Elec., Inc. v. King (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 457, 464, 126 Cal. Rptr. 585*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.315

§ 481.315 Complaint for Damages--By Subcontractor Listed in General Contractor's Original Bid Against General Contractor--Original Contractor's Breach of Duty Not to Substitute Another Subcontractor for Listed Subcontractor Without Proper Consent of Public Entity [Pub. Contract Code § 4107]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages--By Subcontractor Listed in General Contractor's Original Bid Against General Contractor--Original Contractor's Breach of Duty Not to Substitute Another Subcontractor for Listed Subcontractor Without Proper Consent of Public Entity [Pub. Contract Code § 4107]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
vs.	)	DUTY NOT TO SUBSTITUTE SUBCONTRACT-
_____ [*names*],	)	OR FOR LISTED SUBCONTRACTOR WITHOUT
Defendants.	)	PROPER CONSENT
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Allegation of plaintiff's contractor's license. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff, if appropriate. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of public entity*] through _____ [*name of particular public authority*] called for competitive bidding for the _____ [construction *or* performance] of a public project consisting of _____ [*set forth nature of project*].

5. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff submitted a subcontract bid for _____ [*specify subcontract work bid on*] for use by defendant in the _____ [*specify public project, e.g.*, construction of a sewage collection system] for _____ [*name of public entity*].

6. Defendant, preparatory to bidding on the prime contract, listed plaintiff as a subcontractor for _____ [*specify subcontract work*] on an authorized bid form in compliance with the requirements of *Section 4104 of the Public Contract Code*.

7. On _____ [*date*], defendant's bid was accepted by _____ [*name of public entity*] and a written contract for the _____ [construction *or* performance] of _____ [*specify public project*] was executed on _____ [*date*].

8. After the execution of the above-mentioned contract, on or about _____ [*date*], defendant requested permission of _____ [*name of public entity*] to substitute another subcontractor for plaintiff.

9. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of public entity*] consented to the request of defendant in violation of *Section 4104 of the Public Contract Code* in that there was no statutory ground under which _____ [*name of public entity*] was authorized to permit the substitution of another subcontractor for plaintiff.

10. Before and after the substitution of another subcontractor for plaintiff for the _____ [construction *or* performance] of _____ [*specify subcontract work*], plaintiff had and has been at all times herein mentioned ready, willing, and able to carry out the subcontract for which it bid; plaintiff has demanded of defendant that it be allowed to proceed to carry out the work required under the subcontract, but defendant has wrongfully refused, and continues to refuse, to permit plaintiff to carry out such work.

11. By reason of the facts herein alleged, plaintiff has incurred damages in the sum of $_____ on account of the profit lost from wrongfully being deprived of the subcontract.

12. Between the time plaintiff learned that it had been listed as a subcontractor in the prime contract awarded to defendant and the time it was notified of the intended substitution, it incurred expenses in the amount of $_____ in preparation for the performance of the subcontract.

13. Plaintiff has demanded that defendant pay the sum of $_____, but defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to pay this sum, or any other sum.

[*Prayer. See § 481.310.*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a subcontractor against the prime contractor on a public works contract when the prime contractor had listed the subcontractor in its bid or offer to perform the prime contract, but following the award of the contract substituted another subcontractor for the listed subcontractor without the lawful consent of the public entity [*see Pub. Contract Code §§ 4104, 4107*].

[3] Action for Damages Against Prime Contractor

Although the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [*Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*] does not specifically provide a remedy for the subcontractor who has been unlawfully denied the right to perform the subcontract for which he or she was listed in the prime contractor's bid to the public entity, since the purpose of the Act is to protect both the public and subcontractors from the evils of the proscribed unfair bid shopping and bid peddling, the Act confers the right on the listed subcontractor to perform the subcontract unless statutory grounds for a valid substitution exist. That right may be enforced by an action for damages against the prime contractor to recover the benefit of the bargain the listed subcontractor would have realized had he or she not been wrongfully deprived of the subcontract. Such a cause of action is based on the prime contractor's breach of the obligation contained in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107* not to substitute any person as subcontractor in place of the listed subcontractor except with the consent of the awarding authority when a statutory ground for this consent exists as enumerated in *Pub. Contract Code § 4107(a)* [*Southern Cal. Acoustics Co. v. C.V. Holder, Inc. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 719, 727, 79 Cal. Rptr. 319, 456 P.2d 975* (interpreting former *Gov. Code § 4107*; *now see Pub. Contract Code § 4107*)].

[4] Decisions

Contractor was not liable for substitution of contractor on bid when there was substitution hearing at which public entity determined that there were adequate grounds for substitution and subcontractor did not seek review of that decision but commenced separate action. *Interior Systems, Inc. v. Del W. Webb Corp. (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 312, 316-320, 175 Cal. Rptr. 301*

To foster purpose of preventing practices of bid shopping and bid peddling, the Subletting and Subcontracting Fair Practices Act [former *Gov. Code §§ 4100-4113* (*now see Pub. Contract Code § 4100 et seq.*)] requires any prime contractor bidding on public works to designate what portion of work will be done by each subcontractor and to list only one subcontractor for each portion as defined by prime contractor in his or her bid. *Bay Cities Paving & Grading, Inc. v. Hensel Phelps Constr. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 361, 365, 128 Cal. Rptr. 632*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
A. Actions on Public Works Contracts

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.316-481.329

[Reserved]

§§ 481.316[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-B California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.330

§ 481.330 Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work) [Civ. Code § 3098]

[1] FORM Preliminary 20-Day Notice (Public Work) [Civ. Code § 3098]

To _____ [*public agency*], _____ [*address*] and to _____ [*original contractor*], _____ [*address*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the undersigned [has performed (and will perform) *or* has furnished (and will furnish)] _____ [labor *or* services *or* equipment *or* materials] to the construction project located at _____ [*describe job site sufficiently for identification*].

The following information is given as required by *Civil Code Section 3098*:

1. The _____ [labor *or* services *or* equipment *or* materials] _____ [performed (and to be performed) *or* furnished (and to be furnished)] _____ [is *or* are] _____;

2. _____ [Labor *or* Services *or* Equipment *or* Materials] _____ [was *or* were] _____ [performed *or* furnished] _____ [on _____ (*date*), *or* from _____ (*date*), *or* from _____ (*date*), to _____ (*date*), *or* to date]; and

The _____ [labor *or* services *or* equipment *or* materials] _____ [was *or* were] [and will be] _____ [performed *or* furnished] to _____ [*name of party who contracted for their purchase*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of claimant*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of preliminary 20-day notice (public work) must be given when required by *Civ. Code § 3098* before a claimant is entitled to enforce a stop notice [*see Civ. Code § 3183(a)*]. In addition, no payment in connection with a public work project may be withheld from the original contractor unless a claimant who is required to serve this notice has caused the notice to be given to the contractor and the public agency concerned [*see Civ. Code § 3098(a)*]. The above notice also may be given when required by *Civ. Code § 3098* before a claimant asserts a claim against a payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3252(a)*; *see Civ. Code §§ 3227, 3252(b)* setting forth form and timing of alternative post-completion bond notice that may be given instead of a 20-day preliminary notice before asserting a claim against a payment bond; *see also § 481.360*].

For a complete outline describing when this notice must be given, by and to whom the notice is served, and the place and manner of service, see *§ 481.170* et seq.

[3] Contents of Notice

A preliminary 20-day notice (public work) is a written notice from a claimant that is given before the filing of a stop notice or the assertion of a claim against a payment bond on public work and must state with substantial accuracy a general description of labor, service, equipment, or materials furnished or to be furnished and the name of the party to whom the same was furnished [*Civ. Code § 3098*].

[4] Disciplinary Action Against Licensed Contractor Failing to Give Notice

When the contract price to be paid to any subcontractor on a particular work of improvement exceeds $400, the failure of that contractor, who is licensed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.*, to give the preliminary 20-day notice (public work) constitutes grounds for disciplinary action by the Registrar of Contractors [*Civ. Code § 3098(b)*].

[5] State Statutes

Service of notice personally or by first-class, registered, or certified mail. *Civ. Code § 3098(a)*

Who must give and be given preliminary notice. *Civ. Code § 3098(a)*

Disciplinary action by Registrar of Contractors for failure of subcontractor to serve a preliminary notice when contract is over $400. *Civ. Code § 3098(b)*

Notice requirements not applicable to express trust fund. *Civ. Code § 3098(c)*

When notice must be furnished. *Civ. Code § 3098(a), (d)*

Service of preliminary notice is necessary prerequisite to enforcement of stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3183(a)*

[6] Decisions

Transmittal and notice requirements of *Civ. Code § 3098* are strictly construed; compliance with transmittal and notice requirements of statute is required even when general contractor has actual notice of existence and identity of material supplier. *San Joaquin Blocklite, Inc. v. Willden (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 361, 364-366, 228 Cal. Rptr. 842*

[7] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, Stop Notices, § 452.33 (Matthew Bender)

[8] Cross References

For a form of a preliminary 20-day notice (private work), see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.331

§ 481.331 Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]

[1] FORM Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]

To _____ [*name and address of public entity; specify subdivision thereof, if appropriate*]:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that _____ [*name of claimant*], the undersigned, whose address is _____ [*specify*], _____ [performed *or* agreed to perform *or* furnished *or* agreed to furnish] _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] _____ [for *or* to] _____ [*name of contractor or subcontractor for or to whom the labor, materials, services, or equipment was performed or furnished*] _____ [to be used in *or* used in] the public work of improvement consisting of the _____ [performance *or* construction] of _____ [*give location and general description of public work*]. This public work is being _____ [performed *or* constructed] pursuant to the original contract entered into between you and _____ [*name*], the original contractor for the work of improvement.

The following _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] has/have been _____ [performed *or* furnished] _____ [on _____ (*date*), *or* between the dates of _____, and _____]: _____ [*state in general terms*].

The _____ [contract price *or* reasonable value] of the _____ [labor *or* services *or* equipment *or* materials], being the whole of the amount in value agreed to be _____ [performed *or* furnished], is $_____, of which sum $_____ plus interest at the rate of _____ percent per year from _____ [*date*], has not been paid after deduction of all just credits and offsets. The amount of the _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] already _____ [performed *or* furnished] is $_____.

Therefore, the undersigned hereby requests and demands that you withhold sufficient funds to satisfy this claim as

required under *Civil Code Section 3186* relating to stop notices for public works.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of claimant*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare that:

I am the person named as claimant in the foregoing stop notice.

I have read it and know the contents thereof. It is true and contains, among other things, a correct statement of my demand. I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California.

_____ [*signature of claimant*]

[2] Use of Form

This form must be given by a stop notice claimant to a public entity responsible for the public work for which the claim is made. On receipt of the stop notice, it is the duty of the public entity to withhold from the original contractor, or from any person acting under his or her authority, money or bonds (when bonds are to be issued in payment for the work of improvement) due or to become due to the contractor in an amount sufficient to answer the claim stated in the stop notice and to provide for the entity's reasonable cost of any litigation incurred [*Civ. Code § 3186*]. For a form of a stop notice used by the Department of Transportation, see *§ 481.332[1]*. For an outline relating to service of the stop notice, see *§§ 481.170 -481.174*.

[3] Contents of Notice

Under *Civ. Code § 3103*, a stop notice is a written notice, signed and verified by the claimant. It must state in general terms the following:

- The kind of labor, materials, services, or equipment furnished or agreed to be furnished by such claimant;

- The name of the person for or to whom the same was done or furnished; and

- The amount in value, as near as may be, of that already done or furnished and of the whole agreed to be done or furnished.

[4] Claims Covered

A stop notice on a public job clearly covers labor or materials agreed to be furnished by the claimant. The duty of the public entity to withhold from the original contractor money or bonds sufficient to answer the claim stated in the stop notice would apparently also cover the claim for labor, materials, services, or equipment that had not been furnished at the time of service of the stop notice. Thus, even though stop notice claimants share in funds withheld without regard to the order of time in which their respective notices may have been served [*Civ. Code § 3190*], a potential stop notice claimant would have an advantage in filing his or her notice before furnishing labor, materials, services, or equipment.

When the public entity is making progress payments to the original contractor, the public entity is probably required to

withhold from the first money that becomes due to the contractor sufficient money to cover the claim of a stop notice claimant who files his or her notice before furnishing labor or materials [*see Diamond Match Co. v. Silberstein (1913) 165 Cal. 282, 286, 131 P. 874* (holding that owner has duty to withhold funds from first money that may become due to contractor)]. When the funds withheld are not in an amount sufficient to meet the demands of all stop notice claimants, the stop notice claimant who filed before furnishing labor, materials, services, or equipment could recover from the public entity the whole amount of his or her claim if the public entity did not honor the stop notice by withholding from the amount of the first money to become due to the original contractor money sufficient to cover the claim [*see United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907* (stating that laborer or materialman has cause of action in equity against public entity who disregards properly filed stop notice)]. Usually, the claimant would recover from the bonding company and the bonding company would, in turn, be subrogated to the claimant's cause of action against the public entity [*see United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907]* .

[5] State Statutes

Stop notice; contents, verification, and service. *Civ. Code § 3103*

Right of laborers and materialmen to recover their claims against general contractor by filing stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3181*

Conditions to service of stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3183*

Time to file stop notices. *Civ. Code § 3184*

[6] Decisions

Stop notice may be filed even before due date of payment; *Civ. Code § 3184* (time to file stop notice) does not require otherwise. *Central Indus. Eng'r Co. v. Strauss Constr. Co. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 460, 464, 465, 159 Cal. Rptr. 564*

[7] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, Stop Notices, §§ 452.31 -452.35 (Matthew Bender)

[8] Cross References

For a form of stop notice for a private work, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.332

§ 481.332 Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]--California Department of Transportation Form

[1] FORM Stop Notice [Civ. Code §§ 3103, 3181-3187]--California Department of Transportation Form

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form of stop notice may be used in connection with a public work of improvement the original contract for which has been let by authority of the Department of Transportation of the State of California. The department does not require a stop notice claimant to use this form, but recommends its use because the claimant would be assured of complying with the requirements for the format of the stop notice.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.331*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.333

§ 481.333 Release of Stop Notice

[1] FORM Release of Stop Notice

To _____ [*name and address of public entity; specify subdivision thereof, if appropriate*]:

The undersigned hereby withdraws and releases the stop notice filed on _____ [*date*], with the above-named public entity against _____ [*name of original contractor*] in the amount of $_____ for _____ [labor *or* services *or* equipment *or* materials] _____ [performed *or* furnished] in connection with the original contract [, numbered _____], for the _____ [performance *or* construction] of the public work of improvement consisting of _____ [*give location and general description of public work*].

The undersigned also hereby releases _____ [*name of public entity*], and its subdivisions and agents, from any further duty under *Section 3186 of the Civil Code* to withhold money or bonds in response to the stop notice, and waives any right of action against them that might accrue thereunder.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of notice claimant*]

_____ [*name of firm, if appropriate*]

_____ [*address*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of release of stop notice should be supplied by the original contractor or subcontractor to a stop notice claimant after the claimant has been paid the sum claimed in the stop notice. The original contractor should be certain that the claimant prepares this form and files it with the appropriate public entity so that the amount withheld can be

released to the original contractor. For a form of release of stop notice used by the Department of Transportation, see *§ 481.334*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.334

§ 481.334 Release of Stop Notice--California Department of Transportation Form

[1] FORM Release of Stop Notice--California Department of Transportation Form

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form of release of stop notice is for use when the claimant has released his or her stop notice, which had been filed in connection with a public work of improvement let by authority of the Department of Transportation of the State of California. The form is recommended to be used by the contractor obtaining the release, but the department does not require that it be used.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.335

§ 481.335 Declaration [or Certificate] Under Penalty of Perjury by Original Contractor That Amount Withheld Under Stop Notice Is Improperly Withheld--And Demand for Release [Civ. Code § 3198]

[1] FORM Declaration [or Certificate] Under Penalty of Perjury by Original Contractor That Amount Withheld Under Stop Notice Is Improperly Withheld--And Demand for Release[Civ. Code § 3198]

To _____ [*name and address of public entity, and subdivision thereof, if appropriate*]:

I, _____, the undersigned, _____ [declare *or* certify] that:

I am a general contractor duly authorized and licensed to do business as such in _____ County, California.

As such licensed contractor, I am engaged in the construction of a _____ [*name of public work project, e.g.*, bridge] at _____ [*location of project*] under a contract entered into with _____ [*name of public entity*] on _____ [*date*].

On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of stop notice claimant*] filed with _____ [*name of public entity*] a stop notice demanding a withholding of $_____ from the funds due to the undersigned by _____ [*name of public entity*], on the ground that _____ [*name of claimant*] has a right to the amount so requested to be withheld for labor and materials furnished to the undersigned during the construction of the above-described project.

The undersigned is rightfully entitled to the amount of $_____ which is improperly withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*] in that _____ [*specify grounds, e.g.*, the claimant is not within the group of persons authorized by Sections 3110-3112 and *3181 of the Civil Code*].

WHEREFORE, the undersigned demands the release of the _____ [sum of $_____ *or* bonds] withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*].

The address of the undersigned, for purposes of service, is _____ [*street*], _____ [*city*], California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration or certificate is for use by an original contractor to obtain the release of a stop notice that the contractor asserts is not valid or enforceable because (1) the claim on which the notice is based is not included within the types or classifications of claims referred to in the provisions governing stop notices, (2) the claimant is not a person named in *Civ. Code §§ 3110-3112* and *3181, (3)* the amount of the claim is excessive, or (4) there is no basis in law for the claim referred to [*see Civ. Code § 3197*].

The public entity must be served with the above declaration or certificate and one copy thereof. Although *Civ. Code § 3198* does not so specify, it is recommended that both copies be signed originals because the public entity would want a signed original; and if the public entity later files a copy with the court under *Civ. Code § 3202*, that copy should be a signed original. For a discussion relating to the service of and actions on a stop notice, see *§§ 481.190 -481.192, 481.270 -481.277*.

[3] State Statutes

Declaration under penalty of perjury as substitute for affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[4] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to stop notices on public works, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.336

§ 481.336 Notice to Claimant of Filing of Contractor's Affidavit [Civ. Code § 3199]

[1] FORM Notice to Claimant of Filing of Contractor's Affidavit [Civ. Code § 3199]

To _____ [*claimant who filed the stop notice*]:

Please take notice that on _____ [*date*], _____ [*name*] the original contractor engaged by _____ [*name of public entity*] to build a _____ [*name of public work project, e.g.,* dam] at _____ [*location of project*] has filed an affidavit and demand for release with this _____ [*name of public entity*] disputing your claim under your stop notice filed on _____ [*date*], and demanding the release of the funds claimed by you. A copy of the affidavit and demand is attached to this notice and served herewith.

You are further notified that the amount of $_____ will be released to the original contractor by this _____ [*name of public entity*] unless you file with us a counteraffidavit on or before _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of authorized*

agent of public entity]

[2] Use of Form

This form, notifying the claimant that the public entity will release the money claimed unless the claimant files a counteraffidavit on or before the time designated in the notice, must be served, along with a copy of the affidavit and the demand for release, on the claimant by the public entity [*Civ. Code § 3199*]. Service may be either personal or by registered or certified mail [*Civ. Code § 3199*].

[3] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.335*.

127 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.337

§ 481.337 Complaint [or Petition] by Original Contractor for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM Complaint [or Petition] by Original Contractor for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*EITHER*]

	)	
_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATION OF RIGHTS
_____ [*name*(*s*)], Defend-	)	TO
ant(s)],	)	WITHHELD FUNDS
	)	[*Civ. Code § 3201*]

_____

[*OR*]

	)	
	)	NO. _____

In the Matter of the Dispute Between _____, Petitioner and Original Contractor, and _____, Respondent and _____ [Subcontractor *or* Claimant] as to Rights to Funds Withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*], Public Entity.	))))	PETITION FOR DECLARATION OF RIGHTS TO WITHHELD FUNDS [*Civ. Code § 3201*]

[1. *Allegation of license if plaintiff is original contractor. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] entered into a written contract with [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] for the erection and construction of _____ [*name of public work project*], at _____ [*city*], California, and on or about _____ [*date*], pursuant to the contract, _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] commenced the construction of the _____ [*name of public work project*].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] entered into a written contract with [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] _____ [*name*] under the terms of which the latter agreed to _____ [*describe, e.g.*, install doors and windows on the project], for the sum of $_____. A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [defendant *or* claimant] _____ [*name*] _____ [furnished *or* was to furnish] _____ [labor *or* materials] for use in the project as specified in _____ [plaintiff's *or* petitioner's *or* original contractor's] affidavit filed with [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] on or about _____ [*date*]. A copy of the affidavit is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

7. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] _____ [*name*] filed with [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] a stop notice requesting that the _____ [*name of public entity*] withhold from funds due to _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] the amount of $_____ claimed by _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] _____ [*name*], as the value of the _____ [labor *or* materials] furnished by _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] _____ [*name*] to _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] under the contract mentioned above.

8. Thereafter, and after notice of _____ [defendant's *or* respondent's *or* claimant's] claim, _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] filed his/her affidavit with [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] on _____ [*date*], disputing the _____ [defendant's *or* respondent's *or* claimant's] claim and demanding a release of the funds withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*] under the stop notice filed by _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant].

9. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] filed with [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] a counteraffidavit contesting _____ [*plaintiff's or* petitioner's *or* contractor's] affidavit. A copy of the counteraffidavit is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

10. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Petitioner *or* Original contractor] has demanded from [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] that the funds withheld be released, but _____ [*name of public entity*] has refused, and continues to refuse, to release the funds, or any part thereof, to _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor].

WHEREFORE, _____ [plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor] prays:

1. For a declaration that he/she is entitled to have the money withheld by [defendant] _____ [*name of public entity*] released to him/her;

2. For a declaration that _____ [defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant] is _____ [not entitled to any part of the money *or* is entitled to only _____ (*specify portion*)];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint or petition is for use by an original contractor in an action for a declaration of the respective rights of a stop notice claimant and original contractor to the funds which had been withheld by the public entity pursuant to the claimant's stop notice. The form may be used either as a petition or complaint. Although either form (petition or complaint) should be sufficient to satisfy the statutory requirement for commencing an "action" under *Civ. Code § 3201*, neither form is recommended as the better or more appropriate means for commencing the action since, insofar as the procedure by which the original contractor may contest the validity or enforceability of, or amount of claim in, the stop notice, is termed a "summary proceeding," a petition would seem more appropriate, while, insofar as the means by which the claimant or original contractor may have a hearing on the affidavit and counteraffidavit is termed "action," a complaint would seem more appropriate. In any case, counsel should determine whether there is a local court practice before commencing an action for a declaration of the respective rights of the parties. For an outline of the procedures and other requirements involved in an action for a declaration of rights to withheld funds, see *§§ 481.250 -481.253*.

[3] State Statutes

When counteraffidavit by claimant has been filed as provided in *Civ. Code § 3200*, either claimant or original contractor is permitted to file action in appropriate superior court for declaration of respective rights of parties to funds withheld pursuant to claimant's stop notice. *Civ. Code § 3201*

[4] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.338

§ 481.338 Notice of Order Granting Hearing and of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM Notice of Order Granting Hearing and of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF ORDER
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	GRANTING
_____ Defendant(s)].	)	HEARING
[*OR*]	)	AND OF HEARING
In the Matter of the Dispute Between	)	Date: _____
_____, Petitioner and Original Con-	)	Time: _____
tractor, and _____, Respondent and	)	Location: _____
_____ [Subcontractor *or* Claimant]	)	Judge: _____
as to Rights to Funds Withheld by	)	Date Action Filed: _____
_____ [*name of public entity*], Pub-	)	Trial Date: _____
lic Entity.	)	
_____		

To _____ [*name of claimant and his/her designation as defendant, respondent, or claimant*] and _____ [*name of department head, board, commission, or officer of the public entity*]:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on _____ [*date*], upon ex parte motion of the undersigned, the above-entitled court entered an order for a hearing on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of [_____ (Department or Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*name of building and street address*], in _____ [*city*], California. The hearing will be for the purpose of determining the rights of the above-entitled parties to _____ [moneys *or* bonds] being withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*]. The affidavit and counteraffidavit filed with _____ [*name of public entity*] will constitute the pleadings in the above-entitled proceeding, subject to the power of the above-entitled court to permit an amendment in the interest of justice [, and subject to the right of the _____ (defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant) to demand a jury trial at the time and place set for the above-mentioned hearing]. [Upon demand of the _____ (plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor), the hearing will be before a jury.]

_____[*Name of department head, board, commission, or officer of the public entity*] was ordered as a part of the above-mentioned order to file the affidavit and counteraffidavit now in his/her/its possession with the above-entitled court on or before _____ [*date*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice must be given to the public entity and to the opposing party by the party making the motion, which may be either the claimant or the original contractor, for a hearing for the purpose of determining his or her rights under the affidavit and demand for release and the counteraffidavit [*Civ. Code § 3201*].

[3] Motion for Hearing

Although the procedure of obtaining a hearing for a determination of the rights to funds being withheld is not clearly set forth under *Civ. Code § 3201*, the section does not require a written notice of the motion for a hearing. Specifically, *Civ. Code § 3201* provides that the hearing must be granted by the court. Thus, an ex parte application or motion would seem to be an appropriate way of obtaining a hearing date to determine the rights of the parties. *Civ. Code § 3201* does require a notice in writing of the hearing, which must be given not less than five days before the hearing. Therefore, a written notice of the hearing on determining the rights of the parties to the funds would fulfill statutory requirements. The motion for a hearing apparently can be made and granted before notice is given on the hearing.

However, two other procedures are also possible. First, counsel can give notice of the hearing, without previously having obtained a court order for a hearing, and then move at the time set for the hearing that the court should order the hearing; immediately thereafter the court would proceed to hear the matter [*see § 481.339*]. Secondly, it would be possible to treat the notice as a notice of motion to be made at the time and place designated without actually giving notice of the hearing determining the rights of the parties [*see § 481.340*].

Nevertheless, the better practice would be to file the complaint or petition, immediately thereafter making an ex parte application for the hearing. The complaint or petition and the court order would then be served on the claimant and the public entity, along with proof of service made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*. A summons need not be served because

an answer by the party served is not required. *Civ. Code § 3202* (formerly Code Civ. Proc. § 1090.1(c)) specifically provides that the affidavit and counteraffidavitconstitute the pleadings and that the affidavit of the original contractor is deemed controverted by the counteraffidavit.

Because of the alternative procedures allowable under *Civ. Code § 3201*, counsel should check local court practice before preparing the complaint or petition, or any application for a court order for a hearing, or the notice of the motion or the hearing.

When counsel believes that his or her client is constitutionally entitled to a trial by jury and has decided to demand one, he or she should probably present to the court a written demand for jury trial along with the application for an ex parte order for a hearing. If he or she decides against a jury trial, but believes that a constitutional right to a jury trial does exist, the opposing party should be notified of his or her right to a jury trial in the notice that is served on him or her.

[4] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.337*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.339

§ 481.339 Notice of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM Notice of Hearing on Determination of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[*Caption, introduction. See § 481.338.*]

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the above-captioned matter has been set for hearing _____ [before the court *or* before a jury] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*name of building and street address*], in _____ [*city*], California. The hearing will be held pursuant to *Section 3201 of the Civil Code* and will be for the purpose of determining the rights of the above-entitled parties to funds being withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*], which must, pursuant to the above-mentioned code section, file the affidavit and counteraffidavit by the parties to this proceeding with the above-entitled court.

[The above matter has been set for a hearing subject to the right of the above-named _____ (defendant *or* respondent *or* claimant) to demand a jury trial by a written demand therefor served prior to or at the time and place set for the above-mentioned hearing.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice may be used when an ex parte application has not previously been granted by the court. At the time of the hearing, counsel for the party setting the matter for hearing should move that the court grant the hearing, and after the application is granted, the hearing would then be conducted. No written notice is given of the actual application or motion for the hearing under the above form since *Civ. Code § 3201* does not require a written notice of motion. However, if one is desired, see *§ 481.340*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 481.337, 481.338*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.340

§ 481.340 Notice of Motion and Motion for Order for Hearing to Determine Rights Under Complaint for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion and Motion for Order for Hearing to Determine Rights Under Complaint for Declaration of Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3201]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER FOR HEARING TO DETERMINE RIGHTS TO WITHHELD FUNDS [, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*), AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order for a hearing [and will demand a trial by jury] on the above complaint for a declaratin of rights to funds withheld pursuant to _____ [plaintiff's *or* defendant's *or* petitioner's *or* respondent's] stop notice. The motion will be made on the grounds that such a hearing must be granted by the court pursuant to *Section 3201 of the Civil Code*.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion should be used only when local court practice is such that the motion for a hearing or a court order is treated as a noticed motion. In this event, a memorandum of points and authorities should accompany the notice of motion. *Civ. Code § 3201* does not specifically require a notice of a motion for a hearing or a notice of motion for a determination of rights but only that a notice of the hearing be given.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 481.337, 481.338*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.341

§ 481.341 Order Determining Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3203]

[1] FORM Order Determining Rights to Withheld Funds [Civ. Code § 3203]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER
_____ [*name*], Defendant.	)	DETERMINING RIGHTS TO
	)	WITHHELD FUNDS
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*name of moving party*] for an order for a hearing on the complaint for _____ [a declaration of rights *or* an order declaring that he/she/it is entitled to the sum of $_____ withheld by _____ (*name of public entity*) pursuant to a stop notice filed by _____ [*name*] on _____ [*date*], and for an order to have this sum of $_____ released to him/her/it] came on regularly for hearing by this court this date on notice duly and regularly served. _____ [Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ (*name*) and defendant appeared by counsel _____ (*name*) *or* No appearance was made on behalf of _____ (plaintiff *or* defendant)].

The matter having been fully submitted and argued and proof having been made to the satisfaction of this court, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff is [not] entitled to have released to him/her/it the sum of $_____ withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*] [and that this sum of money be

released by the _____ (*name of public entity*) to the _____ (plaintiff *or* petitioner *or* original contractor)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in a summary proceeding to determine whether or not a demand for release will be allowed.

At the hearing, the original contractor has the burden of proof [*Civ. Code § 3202*]. The purpose of the hearing is to determine whether the funds withheld should be further withheld or released to the contractor. The actual payment of the claim would be by action filed under *Civ. Code § 3210-3214*.

[3] Right to Jury Trial

When the right to a jury trial is given by the state constitution [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*], the procedure on release of a stop notice is not to be construed as depriving any party of the right to a jury trial [*Civ. Code § 3204*]. Whether a jury trial is constitutionally required would depend, in part, on the grounds given in the affidavit filed by the contractor for the release of withheld funds to him or her. If the ground given is that there is no basis in law for the claim set forth in the stop notice, a jury trial would not ordinarily be constitutionally required. However, if the ground given is that the amount of the claim as set forth in the stop notice is excessive, a question of fact requiring a jury trial might constitutionally be present.

When the hearing is before the court sitting without a jury, the court may make its determination on the affidavit and counteraffidavit if they contain sufficient facts. However, the court may order the hearing continued from the production of other evidence [*Civ. Code § 3203*].

[4] Res Judicata

The court determination resulting from the proceedings is not res judicata as to any right of action that the claimant has against either the principal or surety on or under the payment bond coming under *Civ. Code § 3247 et seq.* or *Pub. Contract Code § 7103* or as to any right of action against any party personally liable to the claimant [*Civ. Code § 3205*]. The effect of this provision is that the court determination is not res judicata as to any action brought by the claimant for breach of contract or under the payment bond. However, the court determination would apparently be res judicata as to an action brought by the claimant under *Civ. Code §§ 3210-3214* against the public agency to enforce payment of his or her claim.

[5] Service of Order on Public Entity

The original contractor is required by statute [*Civ. Code § 3203*] to serve a copy of the court order on the public entity.

[6] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.342

§ 481.342 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Written Contract--And to Enforce Payment of Claim in Stop Notice [Civ. Code § 3210]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Written Contract--And to Enforce Payment of Claim in Stop Notice [Civ. Code § 3210]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND TO EN-
_____ [*names*],	)	FORCE PAYMENT OF CLAIM IN STOP NOTICE
Defendants.	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract)

[1. *Allegation of license if plaintiff is subcontractor. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant contractor. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

[4. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 481.310, Paragraph 2.*]

5. Defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ [*describe, e.g.*, municipal corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and situated in the County of _____ *or* chartered city, existing as such under the laws of the State of California, and situated in the County of _____ *or give other capacity of defendant public entity*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] acting through _____ [*specify, e.g.*, the Board of Public Works], and by virtue of the authority granted _____ [*describe source of authority, e.g.*, by the charter of the defendant city], entered into a contract with defendant _____ [*name of original contractor*] for the construction of a certain public work of improvement consisting of _____ [*describe construction project*].

[*EITHER*]

[7. *If plaintiff is subcontractor, allege:* On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff entered into a contract with defendant _____ (*name of original contractor*) as original contractor, whereby plaintiff agreed to perform a certain, specified portion of the original contract, namely _____ (*specify work agreed to be performed*). Defendant _____ (*name of original contractor*) agreed to pay plaintiff the contract price of $_____ on the completion of the contract. Pursuant thereto, on or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff performed all conditions, covenants, and promises under the contract which he/she agreed to perform and furnished all necessary services, materials, and equipment to be used, and which were actually used, on or in the construction of the public work.]

[*OR*]

[7. *If plaintiff is materialman, allege:* Between _____ (*date*), and _____ (*date*), inclusive, at the special instance and request of defendant _____ (*name of original contractor*), plaintiff furnished certain _____ (labor *or* services *or* materials *or* equipment) to be used, and which were actually used, on or in the public works construction project identified above.]

8. The _____ [total contract price *or* reasonable value] of the _____ [labor *or* services *or* materials *or* equipment] so _____ [performed *or* furnished and used as mentioned above] [, which price was the reasonable value of the same], amounts to the sum of $_____; although demand therefor has been made, no part of this sum has been paid, except the sum of $_____, and the sum of $_____ remains due, owing, and unpaid over and above all credit and offsets.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Enforcement of Stop Notice)

9. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates, as though fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1-8, inclusive, of the First Cause of Action.

[10. *If plaintiff was required to serve preliminary 20-day notice (public work) under Civ. Code § 3098, allege:* Plaintiff filed his/her/its preliminary 20-day notice (public work), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit

A and made a part hereof, with defendant _____ (*name of public entity*), defendant _____ (*name of original contractor*) [*add if any subcontractors contracted with* and _____ (*name of subcontractors*)] on _____ (*date*), pursuant to *Section 3098 of the Civil Code*.]

11. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff filed his/her/its stop notice, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof, with defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] pursuant to Sections 3103 and 3181 through 3184 of the Civil Code.

12. In this stop notice plaintiff demanded that defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] withhold sufficient funds to answer the plaintiff'sclaim contained in the stop notice, which claim was for the sum of $_____, the sum that remains unpaid _____ [by *or* under plaintiff's contract with] defendant _____ [*name of original contractor*], as alleged above.

13. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that on the date that defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] received the stop notice as alleged above, it had in its possession sufficient funds due or to become due to defendant _____ [*name of original contractor*] to answer the plaintiff's claim stated in such stop notice.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____ as principal, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent per day from _____ [*date*], to the date of judgment against defendant _____ [*name of original contractor*];

2. That the funds withheld by defendant _____ [*name of public entity*] in accordance with the demand made in the stop notice be paid to the plaintiff on account of this judgment;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action to enforce the payment of the claim stated in a stop notice that has been timely filed when the public entity or original contractor has not paid the claim.

[3] Time of Commencement

The action must be filed no sooner than 10 days after the stop notice has been served on the public entity and no later than 90 days following the expiration of the period within which stop notices must be filed [*Civ. Code § 3210*].

[4] Notice of Action

The plaintiff must give notice to the public entity of the action within five days after commencement of the action by registered or certified mail [*Civ. Code § 3211*; *see § 481.343*].

[5] Joinder With Other Actions

The different causes of action arising out of a public works construction project are often united. Thus, a cause of action on the contract [*see § 481.313*] and/or an action on the payment bond [*see § 481.361*] may be joined with an action to enforce the payment of the claim stated on a stop notice.

[6] Prior Claims Against Public Entity Not Required

Because the action is against the funds withheld and the public entity is a mere custodian of the funds, the claimant is not required to comply with the claims procedure of *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 3265*].

[7] State Statutes

Service of notice. *Civ. Code § 3103*

Enforcement of rights arising from stop notice. *Civ. Code §§ 3210-3214*

[8] Decisions

If action to enforce stop notice is not timely filed, action to enforce stop notice against public entity is barred. *A. J. Setting Co. v. Trustees of Cal. State Univ. & Colleges (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 374, 380-385, 174 Cal. Rptr. 43*

[9] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

California Mechanics' Liens and Other Remedies (Cal. CEB 1972), Ch. 4, *Claims on Public Works*, §§ 4.30-4.34; Ch. 5, *Foreclosure of Mechanics' Lien*, §§ 5.24-5.33

Marsh, California Mechanics' Lien Law Handbook (2d ed.), §§ 6.18-6.37

[10] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to an action to enforce a stop notice on private works, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For alternative forms of prayers and verification, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* , and Ch. 572, *Verification* , respectively

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.343

§ 481.343 Notice of Commencement of Action on Stop Notice Claim [Civ. Code § 3211]

[1] FORM Notice of Commencement of Action on Stop Notice Claim [Civ. Code § 3211]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF COMMENCEMENT OF ACTION
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	ON STOP NOTICE CLAIM
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

To _____ [*name of director of department of public entity, in case of state entity, or name of controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer, in case of public entity other than state*]:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that the above-named plaintiff has commenced an action [, as alleged in the complaint attached hereto,] against the above-named defendants to enforce a stop notice filed by the above-named plaintiff with you on _____ [*date*].

The action is to enforce the payment of a claim in the amount of $_____ for _____ [*describe labor or materials furnished*] _____ [performed *or* furnished] to _____ [*name of person for or to whom labor or materials was/were performed or furnished*] for _____ [*describe work of improvement*] being constructed by a contract between you and _____ [*name of original contractor*], dated _____ [*date*].

You are also referred to the preliminary 20-day notice filed with you on _____ [*date*], and the

above-mentioned stop notice, filed with you on _____ [*date*], for further particulars of plaintiff's claim which is the subject of the above entitled action.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of plaintiff*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice is to be used to fulfill the requirements of *Civ. Code § 3211* that provide that notice of the commencement of an action to enforce rights arising from a stop notice be given to the public entity within five days of the commencement of the action.

[3] State Statutes

Five days' notice of action required. *Civ. Code § 3211*

[4] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 452, *Stop Notices* (Matthew Bender)

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.342*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.344

§ 481.344 Complaint in Interpleader--By Public Entity When Total Amount Claimed in Stop Notices Exceeds Amount Withheld

[1] FORM Complaint in Interpleader--By Public Entity When Total Amount Claimed in Stop Notices Exceeds Amount Withheld

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT IN INTERPLEADER
_____ [*names*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendants.	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, _____ [*state capacity of plaintiff public entity, e.g.*, a public corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California for the following purposes: _____ (*specify purposes*)].

[2. *Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 481.310, Paragraph 2.*]

4. [Plaintiff] _____ [*name*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ [*name*

of controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer] of _____ [*name of public entity*].

[5. Defendant _____ (*name*) is the trustee in bankruptcy for the estate of _____ (*name of original contractor*).]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*name of public entity*] acting through _____ [*name of department or other public body, e.g.*, the Board of Public Works], and by virtue of the authority granted _____ [*describe, e.g.*, by the charter of plaintiff city], entered into a contract in writing with [defendant] _____ [*name of original contractor*] for the _____ [construction *or* performance] of _____ [*describe work of improvement*]. A copy of the contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint.

7. There remains due and owing to _____ [*name of original contractor*] from plaintiff [_____ (*name of public entity*)] for work performed under the contract, the sum of $_____. The sum of $_____ represents the full and complete indebtedness of plaintiff [_____ (*name of public entity*)] to [*defendant*] _____ [*name of original contractor*] or to any other person or persons, whether individual or corporate, arising out of the contract.

8. Defendants _____ [*names of stop notice claimants*] served plaintiff(s) [_____ (*name of public entity*) and] _____ [*name*] as _____ [*name of controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer*] with written stop notices pursuant to *Section 3181 through 3186 of the Civil Code*, in the amounts and on the dates shown therein. The notices were verified, properly served, and contained the statement required by law. Copies of these notices are attached to this complaint as Exhibits B through _____ and made a part of this complaint. Plaintiff(s) have released no funds whatsoever held to the account of _____ [*name of original contractor*] under the above-described original contract since the date on which the first of these notices was filed with plaintiff(s).

9. The total sum represented by the stop notices is $_____. This sum greatly exceeds the sum withheld by _____ [*name of public entity*] under the original contract described herein. As between and among the parties who filed stop notices, plaintiff(s) is/are in doubt as to whom it/they should pay the withheld funds, or whether any of the parties are entitled to any of the funds withheld, or whether the parties are entitled under *Section 3190 of the Civil Code* to only a pro rata portion of the funds withheld.

[10. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s) (_____ (*name of public entity*) and) _____ (*name*) received notification from _____ (*name*), that _____ (*name of original contractor*) had assigned the accounts receivable under the contract to _____ [*name of controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer*] on _____ (*date*). A copy of the notification of assignment is attached to this complaint as Exhibit _____ and made a part of this complaint.]

11. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*names of sureties*] entered into an agreement with, and executed and delivered to plaintiff [_____ (*name of public entity*)] their bond for faithful performance of the work to be constructed, guaranteeing that no expense whatsoever, other than the stipulated contract price, should fall on plaintiff and guaranteeing payment in full, of all claims of persons performing labor on or furnishing material to be used in construction of the project, if the general contractor failed to pay the same. Pursuant to the provisions of the bond, _____, [*names of sureties*] notified plaintiff(s) on _____ [*date*], that it was entitled to all funds held to the account of _____ [*name of original contractor*] by plaintiff(s). A copy of the bond is attached to this complaint as Exhibit _____ and made a part of this complaint.

[12. _____ (*Name of original contractor*) is in bankruptcy. The number of the bankruptcy is _____. On _____ (*date*), demand was made on the plaintiff(s) (_____ (*name of public entity*) and) _____ (*name of controller, auditor, or other public disbursing officer*) by the attorneys for _____ (*name*), the trustee in bankruptcy for the estate of _____ (*name of original contractor*), for the payment to the trusteeof the sum of $_____. A copy of the demand is attached to this complaint as Exhibit _____ and made a part of this complaint.]

[13. _____ (*Name*(*s*) of stop notice claimant(s)) has/have brought suit against plaintiff(s) in the Superior Court of the County of _____ to enforce payment of a stop notice claim filed with plaintiff in connection with labor and materials to be furnished pursuant to the original contract described herein. The above-named suit bears the number _____.]

[14. _____ (*Name of surety company*) has brought suit against plaintiff(s) in the Superior Court of the County of _____ to enforce the demand made by it on plaintiff (_____ (*name of public entity*)). This suit bears the number _____.]

15. Plaintiff(s) is/are holding the sum of $_____ under the contract with _____. Plaintiff(s) is/are required to withhold this sum pursuant to law. Plaintiff(s) do/does not know which defendants, if any, are entitled to the funds withheld and cannot safely determine which claims are right and lawful or entitled to priority. _____ [Plaintiff(s) is/are ready and willing to deposit *or* Upon filing this complaint, plaintiff(s) has/have deposited] with the clerk of this court the funds withheld in the amount of $_____.

16. This action is brought by plaintiff(s) without any collusion with any of the defendants.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. That defendants, and each of them, be required to interplead and litigate between and among themselves their respective claims to the funds withheld by plaintiff(s);

2. That the court adjudge and declare the mutual and legal rights and liabilities of the parties with reference to the funds in question;

3. That defendants, and each of them, be joined from bringing or pursuing any action under *Section 3210 of the Civil Code*;

4. That plaintiff(s) be discharged from all liability to defendants, and each of them;

5. That plaintiff(s) be awarded its/their costs and reasonable attorney's fees; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a public entity in an action to interplead the claims of stop notice claimants who have served valid stop notices. The form may be used either before any actions have been filed by the stop notice claimants to enforce payment of their claims or after such actions have been filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 386(a), (b)*]. With appropriate modifications, the form may also be used by the public entity in a cross action [*see* Ch. 314, *Interpleader*].

Accompanying this complaint, the public entity should serve on the defendants notice of motions for a court order consolidating actions already filed, if appropriate, and for an interlocutory order in interpleader and for an injunction, together with supporting memoranda of points and authorities and affidavits.

[3] State Statutes

Procedure when funds withheld is insufficient to pay all valid claims. *Civ. Code § 3190*

Right to consolidate actions or to implead various claims. *Civ. Code § 3214*

Interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 386, 386.5*

[4] Text References

Acret, California Construction Law Manual, Ch. 11, *Claims of Contractors and Suppliers on Public Jobs*

Marsh, California Mechanics' Lien Law, Ch. 9, *California Public Works*

[5] Cross References

See generally Ch. 314, *Interpleader*

For a form of complaint of interpleader brought by a construction lender, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

135 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
B. Withholding Payment on Public Works

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 481.345-481.359

[Reserved]

§§ 481.345[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
C. Payment Bonds

42-C California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

NOTE:

SB 189, which was introduced in February 2009 as a two-year bill, would comprehensively revise, reorganize, and consolidate the law governing stop notices and payment bonds on public works projects in the Public Contract Code. The proposed legislation is the product of a recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission, which may be consulted at http://www.clrc.ca.gov/pub/Printed-Reports/REC-H821.pdf. The legislation would be operative January 1, 2011. If SB 189 is enacted, this chapter will be updated in a future release.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.360

§ 481.360 Post-Completion Bond Notice (Public Works)
[Civ. Code §§ 3227, 3252(b)]

[1] FORM Post-Completion Bond Notice (Public Works)
[Civ. Code §§ 3227, 3252(b)]

To: _____ [*name of surety*] and _____ [*name of bond principal*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that _____ [on _____ (*date*), *or* between the dates of _____ (*date*) and _____ (*date*)], I, _____ [*name*], the undersigned, _____ [performed *or* agreed to perform *or* furnished *or* agreed to furnish] _____ [to *or* for] _____ [*name of subcontractor to or for whom the labor, services, materials, or equipment was done or furnished*] in connection with the _____ [performance *or* construction] of _____ [*describe public work of improvement*].

The following _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] _____ [has *or* have] been _____ [performed *or* furnished]: _____ [*describe*].

The amount in value of the [labor *or* material *or* services *or* equipment] already furnished is $_____.
The amount in value of the [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] to be furnished is $_____
Dated: .

_____ [*signature of claimant*]

[2] Use of Form

Either this form of post-completion bond notice or a 20-day preliminary notice must be given by a claimant, other than a claimant specifically exempted from giving a 20-day preliminary notice under *Civ. Code § 3098(a)*, as a prerequisite to enforcement of a claim on a payment bond [*Civ. Code §§ 3098, 3252*; for a form of 20-day preliminary notice, *see §*

481.330]. This post-completion notice must be given to the surety and the bond principal within 15 days after recording a notice of completion, or if no notice of completion has been recorded, within 75 days after completing the work of improvement [*Civ. Code § 3252(b)*]. For further details of who must give this notice and the time, place, and manner of service, see *§§ 481.290 -481.294*.

[3] Contents of Form

This notice must be in writing and contain all of the following [*Civ. Code § 3227(b)*]:

(1) The kind of labor, services, equipment, or materials furnished or agreed to be furnished by the claimant.

(2) The name of the person for whom the labor, services, equipment, or materials were furnished.

(3) The amount in value, as near as may be determined, of any labor, services, equipment, or materials already furnished or to be furnished.

[4] State Statutes

Written notices required to be given to enforce claim on payment bond (public work). *Civ. Code § 3252*

Contents of post-completion bond notice to be given to surety and bond principal in accordance with *Civ. Code § 3252(b). Civ. Code § 3227(b)*

Service of post-completion bond notice. *Civ. Code § 3227(a)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.361

§ 481.361 Complaint Against Original Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

[1] FORM Complaint Against Original Contractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
_____ [*names*],	)	CONTRACT AND FOR RECOVERY ON CON-
Defendants.	)	TRACTOR'S PAYMENT BOND
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract)

[1. *Allegation of license if plaintiff is a subcontractor. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant original contractor. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of public entity*], hereinafter referred to as the "public entity," made and entered into a contract in writing with defendant, _____ [*name of original contractor*], under the terms of which this defendant covenanted and agreed to do all of the work and furnish all of the materials necessary to _____ [perform *or* construct] a work of improvement consisting of _____ [*describe work of improvement*], in _____ County, California, and described specifically as follows: _____ [*give legal description*]. [A copy of this contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint.]

5. Between _____ [*date*] and _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [performed for *or* furnished to] defendant _____ [*name of original contractor*] the following _____ [*state and describe labor, materials, services, or equipment performed or furnished; if materials, services, or equipment were furnished, add* : to be used, and which were actually used, in the _____ (performance *or* construction) of the work of improvement contracted to be done as mentioned above]. The total contract value of the _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment] so _____ [performed *or* furnished] [and used], which sum is the reasonable value of the _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment], amounts to the sum of $_____. No part of this sum has been paid and the whole amount remains due, owing, and unpaid, over and above all just credits and offsets.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(On Public Works Payment Bond)

6. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates, as though fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1-5, inclusive, of the First Cause of Action.

7. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of surety*], hereinafter referred to as the "surety," was, and now is, an admitted surety insurer, as that term is defined in *Code of Civil Procedure Section 995.120*.

8. Contemporaneously with the execution of the aforesaid contract, defendant original contractor, as principal, and defendant surety executed a payment bond for the purpose of complying with Sections 3096 and 3247 through 3252 of the Civil Code, which was thereafter, on _____ [*date*], filed with and approved by the public entity. This bond was in the sum of $_____, was conditioned, and provided that if the original contractor or any of his/her subcontractors failed to pay for any materials, provisions, provender, or other supplies, used in, on, for, or about the _____ [construction *or* performance] of the work of improvement, or for any work or labor done thereon of any kind, that the surety on the bond would pay the same. [A copy of the payment bond is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and made a part of this complaint.]

[*If materials were furnished by one not under direct contractual relationship with original contractor allege:*]

[*EITHER*]

9. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff gave to defendant _____ [*name of surety*] and _____ [*name of bond principal*] _____ [in person *or* by United States certified (registered) mail, postage prepaid, addressed to this defendant at _____ (*address*) and bond principal at _____ (*address*)] as provided in *Civil Code Section 3227(a)*, the written notice as required by *Civil*

Code Section 3252(b), in the form prescribed by *Civil Code Section 3227(b)*. [A copy of this notice is attached to this complaint as Exhibit _____ and made a part of this complaint.]

[*OR*]

9. On or about _____ [*date*], within 20 days after plaintiff first furnished _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment *or combination thereof*], plaintiff served a preliminary 20-day notice (public work) ondefendant _____ [*contractor*] and on _____ [*the public agency concerned*] in accordance with the provisions of *Civil Code Section 3098*. [A copy of this notice is attached to this complaint, marked as Exhibit _____, and made a part of this complaint.]

[10. As a further condition of the payment bond, the principal and surety promised and agreed to pay reasonable attorney's fees to be fixed by the court in case suit was brought on the bond and undertaking. The sum of $_____ constitutes reasonable attorney's fees to be allowed for plaintiff's attorney's fees herein.]

11. A balance of the amount claimed, in the sum of $_____, is past due, owing, and unpaid. Plaintiff has made demand on defendant _____ [*name of surety*] for payment of the balance, but it has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to pay the same, or any part thereof.

12. The statutory provisions, incorporated into the attached payment bond, require the payment by defendants, and each of them, of reasonable attorney's fees, to be fixed by the court.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent from _____ [*date*], until paid;

2. For reasonable attorney's fees [in the sum of $_____];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action brought by a subcontractor, materialman, or laborer against the original contractor on a public works project and the surety on a payment bond in situations where the original contractor, as principal, and the surety have made and executed a payment bond pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3247*.

[3] Joinder of Contractor and Surety

A claimant may maintain a direct suit against the surety without having to first bring a suit against the principal, the original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3248*]. The obligation of the surety is primary and direct and is enforceable without relation to the original contract. Moreover, it would appear under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* not to be compulsory to join the contractor as a party in an action against the surety. Nevertheless, it is a matter of common practice to include a separate action on the contract against the contractor with the suit against the surety on the payment bond. When the claimant is in privity of contract with the contractor, the action is on the contract. When there is no such privity, the general contractor owes the claimant nothing and the surety is directly liable along with the subcontractor who does have contractual privity with the claimant [*see Powers Regulator Co. v. Seaboard Surety Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 338, 345, 22 Cal. Rptr. 373]* .

[4] Joinder of Stop Notice Action

The suit on the payment bond is a separate remedy distinct from any stop notice rights that the claimant might have. The filing of a stop notice is not a condition precedent to the maintenance of a payment bond action. There is no requirement that the public entity be brought into the suit in order for the plaintiff to enforce his or her rights under the payment bond [*Civ. Code § 3250*]. However, in the event that a stop notice has been filed, the actions on the payment bond and the stop notice may be combined into one lawsuit. Counsel need only combine the above complaint with the allegations *set forth in § 481.342* and by including the public entity as a defendant.

[5] State Statutes

Contractor's bond for public work. *Civ. Code § 3247*

Approval of bond by officer or body awarding contract. *Civ. Code § 3247*

Amount of bond. *Civ. Code § 3248(a)*

Condition of bond; attorney's fees in case of suit. *Civ. Code § 3248(b)*

Beneficiaries of bond. *Civ. Code § 3248(c)*

Time for suit against sureties. *Civ. Code § 3249*

Maintenance of action without filing stop notice or suing public officer or body. *Civ. Code § 3250*

Right to attorney's fees in bond action. *Civ. Code § 3250*

Sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.311*

[6] Text References

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 453, Payment Bonds, §§ 453.33 -453.35 (Matthew Bender)

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.360*.

For a form of complaint on a private works payment bond, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* , and Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* , respectively

139 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 481 PUBLIC WORKS
PART V. FORMS
C. Payment Bonds

42-481 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 481.362

§ 481.362 Complaint Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Subcontractor's Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

[1] FORM Complaint Against Subcontractor for Damages for Breach of Contract--And Against Surety on Subcontractor's Payment Bond [Civ. Code §§ 3096, 3098, 3227, 3247-3252]--By Subcontractor, Laborer, or Materialman

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
_____ [*names*],	)	CONTRACT AND FOR RECOVERY ON SUB-
Defendants.	)	CONTRACTOR'S PAYMENT BOND
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Breach of Contract)

[1. *Allegation of license if plaintiff is a subcontractor. See § 481.310, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 481.311, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Capacity and residence of defendant subcontractor. See § 481.312, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of original contractor*] and defendant, _____ [*name*], made and entered into a contract in writing under the terms of which the defendant, referred to below as subcontractor, agreed to provide _____ [*describe labor, materials, services, and/or equipment*].

5. After executing the contract referred to above, the subcontractor then entered into a contract with the plaintiff for the _____ [*describe work or materials to be furnished*].

6. Between _____ [*date*], and _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [furnished to *or* performed for] the subcontractor the following _____ [*state and describe labor, materials, supplies, and/or equipment performed or furnished; if materials, supplies, or equipment were furnished, add* to be used, and that were actually used, in the provision of _____ (*labor, materials, services, and/or equipment*) contracted for as stated above]. The total contract value of the _____ [labor *or* materials *or* supplies *or* equipment *or any combination*] so provided as stated above, which sum is the reasonable value of the [labor *or* materials *or* supplies *or* equipment *or any combination*] amounts to the sum of $_____. No part of this sum has been paid and the whole amount remains due, owing, and unpaid over and above all just credits and offsets.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(On Contractor's Payment Bond)

7. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates, as though fully set forth herein, Paragraphs 1-6, inclusive.

[8. *Capacity of defendant surety, See § 481.361, Paragraph 7*]

9. Contemporaneously with making the above contract between the original contractor and the subcontractor, in accordance with the terms of the contract, and before the subcontractor entered into the performance of the provision of _____ [*labor, materials, services, and/or equipment*], the subcontractor, as principal and defendant _____ [*name*], as surety, made and executed their bond and undertaking designated as payment bond for the purpose of complying with *Civil Code Sections 3096, 3098, 3227,* and *3247 through 3252*. This bond was in the sum of $_____, was conditioned, and provided that if the subcontractor failed to pay for any materials, provisions, provender, or other supplies, used in, on, for, or about the provision of _____ [*labor, materials, services, and/or equipment*] that the surety on the bond would pay the same. [A copy of the payment bond is attached to this complaint, marked as Exhibit _____, and made a part of this complaint.]

[10. *Allegation of agreement to pay attorney's fees. See § 481.361, Paragraph 10.*]

[*EITHER*]

[11. *Allegation of service of post-completion bond notice. See § 481.361, Paragraph 9 (first alternative).*]

[*OR*]

[11. On or about _____ [*date*], within 20 days after plaintiff first furnished _____ [labor *or* materials *or* services *or* equipment *or combination thereof*], plaintiff served a preliminary 20-day notice (public work) on _____ [*original contractor*], [on _____ *any other subcontractors contracted with*], and on _____ [*the public agency concerned*] in accordance with the provisions of *Civil Code Section 3098*. [A copy of this notice is attached to this complaint, marked Exhibit _____, and made a part of this complaint.]

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against the defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. The sum of $_____, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent from _____ [*date*], until paid;

2. Plaintiff's cost of suit, including reasonable attorney fees;

3. Such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 481.310.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action brought by a subcontractor, materialman, or laborer against a subcontractor on a public works project and the surety on a payment bond in situations when the subcontractor, as principal, and the surety have made and executed the payment bond in accordance with the subcontractor's promise in his or her contract with the original contractor [*see Civ. Code § 3096*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges as part of the plaintiff's cause of action against the surety on the subcontractor's payment bond: (1) the execution of a payment bond, pursuant to the original contract (*see* Paragraph 4), designed to inure to the benefit of the plaintiff (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 3096* (subcontractor is permitted to be principal on payment bond)]; (2) the contract between the subcontractor and the plaintiff (Paragraph 5); and (3) its performance (Paragraph 6).

[4] State Statutes

Subcontractor may be principal of payment bond. *Civ. Code § 3096*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 481.361*.

For a form of complaint on a private works payment bond, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* , and Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* , respectively

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 482.syn

§ 482.syn Synopsis to Chapter 482: QUIETING TITLE

§ 482.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 482.02 Cross References

§§ 482.03-482.09 [Reserved]

§ 482.10 Governing Statutes

§ 482.11 Gist of Quiet Title Action

§ 482.12 Objectives of Action; Related Actions

§ 482.13 Title Report Requirement

§ 482.14 Asserting Equitable Interest Against Legal Title

§ 482.15 Action as Equitable Remedy; Jury Trial

[1] When Jury Trial is Available

[2] Necessity to "Do Equity"

§ 482.16 Action Respecting Tax-Defaulted Property

[1] Status of Property

[2] Right of Redemption

[3] Notice That Property is Subject to Sale for Nonpayment of Taxes

[4] Sale of Tax Certificates

§ 482.17 Action Respecting Property Tax Lien

§ 482.18 Action Respecting Improvement Assessment Lien

§ 482.19 Action Respecting Tidelands and Navigable Waters

§ 482.20 Boundary Line Agreements

§ 482.21 Action Respecting in Situ Oil or Gas

§ 482.22 Private Assertion of Public Interest

§ 482.23 Hearing and Proof

[1] Presumptions

[2] Overcoming Ancient Gaps in Title

§ 482.24 Effect of Judgment

§§ 482.25-482.39 [Reserved]

§ 482.40 State Statutes

[1] Generally

[2] Oil or Gas Deposit

[3] Presumptions

[4] Procedure

[5] Tax-Defaulted Property

[6] Tax or Assessment Lien

[7] Sale of Tax Certificates

[8] Tidelands and Navigable Waters

§ 482.41 Decisions

[1] Actions to Quiet Title (Examples)

[2] Costs

[3] Defenses

[4] Effect of Judgment

[5] Effect of Taxes on Void Conveyance

[6] Asserting Equitable Interest Against Legal Title

[7] Evidence and Proof

[8] Invalid Tax Deeds

[9] Joinder of Causes of Action

[10] Jury Trial

[11] Other Actions Compared

[12] Parties

[13] Plaintiff's Right to Bring Action

[14] Pleading

[15] Purpose of Action

[16] Restitution

[17] Statute of Limitations

[18] Unclean Hands

§ 482.42 Attorney General Opinions

§ 482.43 Law Reviews

§ 482.44 Text References

§§ 482.45-482.59 [Reserved]

§ 482.60 Plaintiff's Checklist

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

[3] Preliminary Investigation and Determinations

[4] Essential Allegations of Complaint

[5] Lis Pendens

[6] Service of Summons

§ 482.61 Defendant's Checklist

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

[3] Essential Allegations of Answer and Cross Complaint

§§ 482.62-482.79 [Reserved]

§ 482.80 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Limitation of Action

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Caption

[6] Plaintiff

[a] Identity and Capacity

[b] When Property Belongs to Decedent's Estate

[7] Defendants

[a] Defendants Determine Scope of Action

[b] Particular Capacity of Defendant

[c] Dissolved Corporation

[d] State or State Agency

[e] Heirs; Representative of Decedent's Estate; Affidavit

[f] When Required Defendant Is Believed to Be Deceased

[g] Unknown Defendants

[h] Fictitious Defendants

[i] Defendants Required by Court to Be Joined

[8] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

[9] Required Allegations

[a] Property and Adverse Claims

[b] Plaintiff's Seisin or Possession Within Five Years

[c] Water Rights

[d] Equitable Right to Relief

[i] In General

[ii] Action Based on Breach of Sale Contract

[10] Prayer

[11] Verification

[12] Process

[13] Lis Pendens

[14] Costs

[15] Recovery of Expenses

[16] State Statutes

[17] Decisions

[a] Allegations

[b] Limitation of Action

[c] Parties

[d] Prayer

[18] Text References

[19] Cross References

§ 482.81 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--By Purchaser of Tax-Defaulted Property Sold at Tax Sale [Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Defendants

[a] Who Must Be Named

[b] State of California

[c] Unknown Claimants

[d] Personal Representative

[e] Heirs; Devisees; Persons Believed Dead

[f] Owners of Special Assessments

[4] Allegations

[5] Verification

[6] Notice of Pendency of Action

[7] Process

[a] Form of Summons

[b] Posting of Summons

[c] Service of Summons

[d] Service by Publication on Unknown Defendants

[e] When County Is Defendant

[8] Defaults

[9] Judgment

[10] Cancellation of Special Assessments

[11] Cumulation of Remedies

[12] State Statutes

[13] California Rules of Court

[14] Cross References

§ 482.82 Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030]--Disclaiming Any Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Verification

[4] Cross Reference

§ 482.83 Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030(a)]--By Defendant Claiming Interest

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations in Answer

[4] Cross Complaint

[a] Affirmative Relief

[b] Allegations in Cross Complaint

[5] Appearance by Unnamed Person With Interest in Property

[6] Equitable Defenses

[7] Limitation of Action

[8] Laches as Defense

[9] Propriety of Demurrer Based on Laches

[10] Verification

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Cross References

§ 482.84 Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 742]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Right to Judicial Order

[4] Notice

[5] Grounds

[6] Points and Authorities

[7] State Statutes

[8] California Rules of Court

[9] Cross References

§ 482.85 Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 742, 743]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents; Service

[4] Liability for Injury

§ 482.86 Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 632] for Plaintiff--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Scope of Judgment

[a] In General

[b] When Any Interest Is Part of Decedent's Estate

[c] Prohibitive Relief

[4] Interlocutory (Conditional) Judgment

[5] Persons Bound by Judgment

[6] Statement of Decision

[7] Description of Property and Interests

[8] Costs

[9] Motion for New Trial or to Vacate Judgment

[10] Appeal

[11] Recording of Judgment

[12] California Rules of Court

[13] Decisions

[14] Cross References

§ 482.87 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8] to Quiet Title Against United States of America [28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(f), 2409a]

[1] FORM

[2] Source of Form

[3] Use of Form

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Limitation

[6] Parties

[7] Allegations

[a] Jurisdiction

[b] Nature of Plaintiff's Interest

[c] Derivation of Plaintiff's Interest

[d] Nature of Government's Interest

[e] Facts Negating Limitation of Action

[8] Prayer; Signature; Verification

[9] Government's Disclaimer of Interest

[10] Government's Election to Retain Possession

[11] Adverse Possession

[12] Lis Pendens

[13] Costs

[14] Actions Unaffected by 28 U.S.C. § 2409a

[15] State Statutes

[16] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART I. SCOPE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.01

§ 482.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the resolution of conflicting claims of ownership to property through use of an action to quiet title. It includes a procedural checklist and the following forms:

- A complaint in general form [*see § 482.80*].
- A complaint for use by a purchaser of tax-deeded property [*see § 482.81*].
- An answer disclaiming any interest in the subject property [*see § 482.82*].
- An answer asserting the defendant's interest [*see § 482.83*].
- A notice of motion [*see § 482.84*] for an order [*see § 482.85*] permitting a party to make a survey of real property.
- A judgment in general form for use by the plaintiff and adaptable for use by the defendant [*see § 482.86*].
- A complaint in general form for use in a federal court action to quiet title to real property against the United States [*see § 482.87*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawAdverse PossessionClaims By & Against Governmental EntitiesReal Property LawAdverse PossessionProcedureReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART I. SCOPE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.02

§ 482.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims of adjoining landowners, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Possession* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine a claim of title based on adverse possession, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to animals, see *Ch. 23, Animals: Civil Liability, § 23.128,* and Ch. 24, *Animals: Liens* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to works of art, see Ch. 57, *Art* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims based on an assignment, see Ch. 60, *Assignments* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding for attachment, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims based on a bailment, see Ch. 93, *Bailments* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding to determine adverse claims to the property of a bankrupt, see Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to deposits in financial institutions, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action by an executor for restoration by the maker of a lost note made payable to the decedent, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims based on the location of a boundary, see Ch.

101, *Boundaries* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims where a real estate broker acquired property adversely to the client, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action for invalidation and cancellation of an instrument which supports an adverse claim, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to personal property, as well as a proceeding for provisional relief, see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to community property, see Ch. 122, *Community Property* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to personal property by way of compensatory relief (damages), see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to shares of stock and stock certificates, see Ch. 163, *Corporations: Transfers of Shares* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when the conditions described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* exist, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property dedicated or purportedly dedicated to public use, see Ch. 183, *Dedication* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims and cancel or reform a deed, see Ch. 184, *Deeds* .

For discussion and forms for use in the provisional remedy of deposit in court, see Ch. 211, *Deposit in Court* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding for dissolution of a marriage, in which adverse claims to property may be determined, see Ch. 222, *Dissolution of Marriage: Property Division and Valuation* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to an easement, see Ch. 240, *Easements* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims involving possession of real property, other than claims based on a landlord-tenant relationship, see Ch. 241, *Ejectment* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when the government takes property by condemnation for public use, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to unclaimed property when escheat is involved, see Ch. 252, *Escheat (Unclaimed Property).*

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when an escrow is involved, see Ch. 253, *Escrows* .

For discussion and forms for use in asserting a third-party claim to personal property under levy of execution, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.310* et seq.

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when a fence is involved, see Ch. 266, *Fences* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims based on a fraudulent or purportedly fraudulent conveyance, see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to property transferred in satisfaction of a gambling debt, see Ch. 272, *Gambling* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims involving a garageman's lien, see Ch. 274, *Garages and Gas Stations* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to a gift or purported gift, see Ch. 278, *Gifts* .

For discussion and forms for use in a guardianship or conservatorship proceeding, with respect to determining adverse claims to property, see Ch. 290C, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Actions and Disputed Claims* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding to determine adverse claims when a homestead or purported homestead is involved, see Ch. 295, *Homesteads* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding to determine adverse claims by establishing the identity of a grantor who used different names in acquiring and transferring property, see Ch. 299, *Identity, Establishment of.*

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims by way of preventive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when insurance is involved, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims of third parties, when the plaintiff asserts no interest in the property, see Ch. 314, *Interpleader* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims involving irrigation water, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims of joint tenants or tenants in common, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Comon* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property on the theory of unlawful detainer or forcible entry and detainer, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to fixtures or to demised premises when an option to purchase is involved, see Ch. 334, *Landlord and Tenant: Claims for Damages* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims of secured parties, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when a life estate is involved, see Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .

For discussion and forms for use in recording a notice of the pendency of an action (lis pendens) affecting real property, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to literary property, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to felled timber (logs), see Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to lost or unclaimed property, when escheat is not involved, see Ch. 355, *Lost and Unclaimed Property* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to reestablish lost public records affecting title, see Ch. 356, *Lost Papers* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims when mechanics' liens are involved, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims respecting mining property, see Ch. 363, *Mining* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to motion picture film (print), see Ch. 370, *Motion Pictures* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims respecting in situ deposits of oil or gas, see Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas* .

For discussion and forms for use in intervening in a civil action, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims by partition, see Ch. 397, *Partition* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims respecting inventions, see Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims between principal and agent, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to corporate franchises and public offices, see Ch. 483, *Quo Warranto* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding for appointment of a receiver, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims by reformation of an instrument, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to chattel paper or inventory subject to a security interest, see Ch. 500, *Sales and Secured Transactions* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property which is the site of a public school, see Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims by way of ordering specific performance of a contract, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

For discussion and forms for use in a proceeding to establish the termination of a tenancy or an estate by reason of a person's death, see Ch. 441, *Probate: Disposition Without Administration* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property when title insurance is involved, see Ch. 548, *Title Insurance* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to a trademark or trade name, see Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property on the theory of trespass, see Ch. 550, *Trespass* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property when a trust deed or mortgage is involved, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to property subject to a trust, see Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to real property arising under a sale agreement, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action to determine adverse claims to water, see Ch. 575, *Waters* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsBailmentsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleFraudulent TransfersReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTortsIntentional TortsConversionGeneral Overview

143 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART I. SCOPE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 482.03-482.09

[Reserved]

§§ 482.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.10

§ 482.10 Governing Statutes

The action discussed in this chapter is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.* (state court action) and by *28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(f), 2409a* (federal court action against United States involving title to real property). The state statute was enacted in 1980, effective January 1, 1981. It made the quiet title judgment in rem, that is, effective against both named and unknown defendants [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.030*; *see § 482.42*]. Prior to its enactment, ordinary quiet title actions were only effective against named defendants [former *Code Civ. Proc. § 738*]. The state statutes and rules governing practice in civil actions in general apply to quiet title actions except where they are inconsistent with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.060*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsTrue in Rem ActionsReal Property LawAdverse PossessionClaims By & Against Governmental EntitiesReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.11

§ 482.11 Gist of Quiet Title Action

If one person claims to be the owner of an interest in property, and another person claims to be the owner of an interest in the same property, and the two claims conflict, either may sue the other for a judgment resolving that conflict. The judgment will declare who owns what interest and may give other specific or preventive relief to the extent required under the circumstances. The cause of action is explicitly authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010*, which provides that an action may be brought to establish title against adverse claims to real or personal property or any interest therein. "Claim" is defined as including a legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in property or cloud on title [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010(a)*]. "Property," to use the term in its broadest possible sense [15 Calif. L. Rev. Comm'n 1194 (1979)], is defined as including real property and, to the extent applicable, personal property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010(b)*].

These provisions do not limit the interests that may be determined or the persons against whom they may be quieted; they are intended to provide the broadest possible forum for clearing title to the fee or any other interest in property [15 Calif. L. Rev. Comm'n 1194 (1979)].

The action is called an action to quiet title because the effect of the judgment is to quiet adverse claimants to the rightful owner's title (claim of ownership). By the doctrine of res judicata, the judgment precludes further litigation and thereby tends to make the rightful owner's title secure.

The action is, in effect, a foreclosure action not unlike that which a secured lender might bring to collect the debt by foreclosing the borrower's interest in the security (property) [*see Jones v. Sacramento Sav. & L. Ass'n (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 522, 530, 56 Cal. Rptr. 741]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.12

§ 482.12 Objectives of Action; Related Actions

Most quiet title actions involve ownership of some interest in real property, and they usually are brought for the purpose of foreclosing adverse claims of the sort that show up as exceptions on title reports. The plaintiff's objective, generally, is to make his or her title marketable, although he or she may not contemplate transferring it in the near future. A quiet title action is also appropriate to establish that the plaintiff has acquired title by adverse possession [*see* Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession*]. An action for this purpose, which merely declares who owns what interests in the property, is the kind of action that commonly is called a quiet title action, and the kind that is the subject of this chapter. If in any action or proceeding, establishing or quieting title to property is at issue, the court in its discretion may, upon motion of any party, require that the issue be resolved pursuant to the provisions of the quiet title statute to the extent practicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.030(b)*].

The remedy provided by the quiet title statute is cumulative and not exclusive of any other remedy, form, or right of action or proceeding provided by law for establishing or quieting title to property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.030(a)*].

When a mere declaration of ownership will not suffice to make the plaintiff's title whole (subject to legitimate and unobjectionable interests such as utility company easements), plaintiff may desire to pursue various forms of additional relief. This additional relief might include reforming the plaintiff's deed [*see* Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments*], establishing a boundary [*see* Ch. 101, *Boundaries* , and Ch. 266, *Fences*], cancelling another deed, a deed of trust, or a mortgage [*see* Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* , Ch. 184, *Deeds* , and Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*], and restoring the public record of the plaintiff's title after it has been lost or destroyed [*see* Ch. 356, *Lost Papers*].

In some cases the plaintiff will not have record or legal title but will have an equitable claim to that title. The type of action discussed in this article is not appropriate in such a case [*see § 482.14*]. If the claim is based on the defendant's acquisition of title through fraud, through acting as the plaintiff's agent, or through some other manner not entitling the defendant to keep it, the plaintiff may sue to establish a resulting or constructive trust [*see* Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* and Ch. 562, *Trusts: Resulting Trusts*].

When the plaintiff wants to establish title for the purpose of enjoying some right of ownership, the issue of title is

secondary. The ultimate purpose of the lawsuit determines the character of the action. Usually that purpose is to recover possession of the property [*see* Ch. 93, *Bailments* , Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery* , Ch. 241, *Ejectment* , and Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

There is a special proceeding for use in the case where the plaintiff's title is rendered doubtful because a predecessor took title by one name and conveyed by another [*see* Ch. 299, *Identity, Establishment of*].

If no specific action is appropriate, an action for declaratory relief may be the proper method of proceeding [*see* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawAdverse PossessionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsProperty DescriptionsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesReformationReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.13

§ 482.13 Title Report Requirement

The court on its own motion may, and on motion of any party must, make such orders as appear appropriate requiring the plaintiff to procure a title report and designate a place where it shall be kept for inspection, use, and copying by the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.040(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.14

§ 482.14 Asserting Equitable Interest Against Legal Title

When a dispute arises as to ownership of the present interest, and one claimant (usually the defendant) has, while the other claimant (usually the plaintiff) lacks, record title, a quiet title action is inappropriate. The outcome is ordained by the simple fact that one party has record title and is, therefore, the owner. Assuming, as is the usual case, that the plaintiff asserts an equitable interest against the holder of the legal title, the gist of his or her complaint is that while the defendant admittedly owns the present interest, he or she ought not to own it, but, instead, ought to transfer ownership to the plaintiff for whatever reason (e.g., the defendant took title as the plaintiff's agent, for convenience). The plaintiff should sue for a judgment declaring the defendant to be the owner as a resulting or a constructive trustee only, and directing the defendant to transfer ownership to the plaintiff [*see, e.g., Nevarez v. Nevarez (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 596, 21 Cal. Rptr. 70]* .

Although such an action may be described generally as a quiet title action, it is not the sort of action that courts commonly have in mind when they use that label. Therefore, it has been held that the owner of an equitable interest may not maintain a quiet title action against the holder of legal title [*see Santoro v. Carbone (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 721, 732, 99 Cal. Rptr. 488]* . One of the reasons for this rule is that if the plaintiff were allowed to prove some basis for an equitable interest (e.g., fraud) under a general allegation of ownership, the defendant might be taken by surprise unfairly [*O'Keefe v. Aptos Land & Water Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 772, 781, 286 P.2d 417]* .

When the plaintiff asserts an equitable interest against the holder of legal title, the complaint is demurrable if it alleges merely that the plaintiff owns the present interest in the property. What the plaintiff contends is that he or she has a right to own it, but that the defendant actually owns it; thus, the plaintiff's allegation of ownership is improper. It is necessary that the complaint show the basis for the claim that the plaintiff has a right to own the present interest. For instance, if the defendant induced the plaintiff to convey the present interest by a fraudulent agreement, the complaint must so allege. Moreover, if the plaintiff's right depends on his or her having taken some preliminary step (e.g., rescinding a fraudulent agreement),the complaint must show that he or she has taken it or that there is an excuse for his or her not having taken it [*see Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 214-217, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12]* .

Thus, there may be two fundamentally different cases. In the one that is the subject of this chapter the plaintiff appropriately may allege, prove, and have a judgment that he or she is the owner of a specified interest in particular

property. In the other case, the plaintiff can only allege, prove, and have a judgment that the defendant is the owner, but wrongly, and must transfer ownership to the plaintiff. Forms appropriate for use in the latter case are included in Ch. 560, *Trusts*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawOwnership & TransferEquitable Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.15

§ 482.15 Action as Equitable Remedy; Jury Trial

[1] When Jury Trial is Available

A declaration of the nature and extent of the parties' interests in particular property is equitable relief as distinguished from legal relief; therefore, the action is governed by equitable principles [*see Santoro v. Carbone (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 721, 731, 99 Cal. Rptr. 488]* . This means, among other consequences, that trial by jury is not a matter of right [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 592*; *Hartman v. Burford (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270, 51 Cal. Rptr. 309* (reporting rule)].

Nothing in the quiet title statute limits any authority the court may have to grant such equitable relief as may be proper under the circumstances of the case [Code Civ. Pro. § 760.040(c)].

When the plaintiff seeks not only a declaration of his or her rights but also recovery of possession, the rule is different because *Code Civ. Proc. § 592* provides: "In actions for the recovery of specific, real, or personal property, with or without damages, ... an issue of fact must be tried by a jury, unless a jury trial is waived, or a reference is ordered, as provided in this code." An action for the recovery of property is regarded as a legal, as distinguished from an equitable, remedy. Therefore, when the plaintiff seeks both a declaration of rights and recovery of possession, the action is partly equitable and partly legal. In such a case, trial by jury is a matter of right with respect to the legal issues (i.e., the right to recover possession) but not with respect to the equitable issues (i.e., ownership) [*see, e.g., Robinson v. Puls (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 664, 665-666, 171 P.2d 430* (reporting rule)].

Regarding the question of a jury trial, the courts have distinguished three kinds of quiet title actions:

- When the plaintiff is out of possession and seeks to establish his or her title primarily for the purpose of recovering possession, the action is regarded as a legal action for the recovery of property, and a jury trial is a matter of right [*see, e.g., Medeiros v. Medeiros (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 69, 73, 1 Cal. Rptr. 696]* .

- When the plaintiff is in possession and the defendant seeks to recover possession, the action is partly equitable (on the plaintiff's side) and partly legal (on the defendant's side), and a jury trial is a matter of

right for the defendant if he or she alleges that he or she was recently dispossessed [*see, e.g., Donahue v. Meister (1891) 88 Cal. 121, 128-129, 25 P. 1096]* .

- When the plaintiff is in possession and the defendant does not seek to recover possession, the action is purely equitable, and a jury trial is not a matter of right, even if the plaintiff alleges a right to possession. If the defendant does seek to recover possession but cannot allege that he or she was recently dispossessed, the action remains equitable, and there is no right to a jury trial unless the equitable issues (ownership) are resolved against the plaintiff [*Thomson v. Thomson (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 671, 681-683, 62 P.2d 358]* .

Whether the action is equitable, legal, or partly legal and partly equitable, determines not only the question of a jury trial, but other matters as well. For example, when there are equitable issues, equitable defenses such as laches, unclean hands, and fraud are available.

[2] Necessity to "Do Equity"

"He who seeks equity must do equity" is a well-recognized principle in equity jurisprudence. It means that a court will not give equitable relief to a party unless he or she has acknowledged or conceded, or will admit and provide for, all the equitable rights, claims, and demands justly belonging to the adverse party and growing out of, or necessarily involved in, the subject matter of the controversy. This principle of equity is applicable to an action to quiet title. A familiar instance of its application is when the court precludes a mortgagor from quieting his or her title against an outlawed mortgage payment of the mortgage debt. In such a case, when the debt is not paid or not required to be paid, the court does not decree that the plaintiff has no interest in the property, but dismisses the action for want of equity in the plaintiff's cause [*O'Brien v. O'Brien (1925) 197 Cal. 577, 584-585, 241 P. 861]* .

A person does not have to be a bona fide purchaser to quiet title. Therefore, a purchaser of land with knowledge of mortgages barred by the statute of limitations can quiet title to the land [*Mix v. Sodd (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 386, 389-392, 178 Cal. Rptr. 736]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsDo Equity PrincipleCivil ProcedureEquityReliefCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsActions in EquityCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.16

§ 482.16 Action Respecting Tax-Defaulted Property

[1] Status of Property

Property on which property taxes are delinquent becomes "tax-defaulted," by operation of law and declaration of the tax collector [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 126, 3436*].

[2] Right of Redemption

The property remains subject to the original owner's redemption rights until those rights are terminated [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4101*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3707*]. If not redeemed within five years (or three years if the property is nonresidential commercial property, or is not an owner-occupied residence and would be suitable as low-income housing, or is subject to a nuisance-abatement lien) after it becomes tax-defaulted, the property is subject to sale by the tax collector [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691(a)(1)(A), (b)(1)(A)*]. Redemption may be made until the close of business on the last day prior to the date the sale begins and requires payment of all taxes, penalties, and costs due [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3707(a)(1), 4101, 4102*]. The right of redemption revives if the property is not sold [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3707(d)*]. If the tax collector approves a sale as a deferred-payment transaction and does not receive full payment on or before the date the tax collector requires payment pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3693.1*, the right of redemption is revived on the next business day following that date [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3707(a)(2)*]. On redemption of property subject to a power of sale, the tax collector must execute and record a rescission of any notice of power of sale [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691.4, 4112(c)*]. After redemption, the redemptioner or any person claiming through the redemptioner may bring a quiet title action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4113*]. Tax-defaulted property that remains unredeemed may be sold [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691, 3692(a)*]. The purchaser or anyone claiming through him or her may bring a quiet title action [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727, 3950*; *see § 482.81* and its Comments].

[3] Notice That Property is Subject to Sale for Nonpayment of Taxes

The tax collector must execute a notice whenever a parcel becomes subject to the power of sale, and the county clerk must take acknowledgment of the notice without charge [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691.1*]. The notice must specify [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691.2*]:

- That five years or more have elapsed since the taxes or assessments on the parcel were declared in default.

- That the property was duly assessed for taxation and the tax legally levied.

- That the property is subject to sale for nonpayment of taxes.

- The amount of taxes originally declared to be in default, unless there has been a partial cancellation of taxes, a redemption from a portion of taxes, or a correction under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4831.5* and *4876.5*, in which case the amount must be the balance remaining.

- A metes and bounds or lot-block-tract description of the property.

The notice must be recorded with the county recorder, who may not charge for the recording. After recordation, the notice must be forwarded to the tax collector [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691.4*]. The tax collector must file the notice in his or her office and keep a record to show the subsequent disposition of the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691.5*]. On request of the Controller, the tax collector must report the disposition of all tax-defaulted parcels subject to tax collections power to sell in his or her county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691.6*].

[4] Sale of Tax Certificates

A county may sell tax certificates if the sale is approved by the board of supervisors and authorized in writing by the controller [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691, 3694, 4511*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4505* (definition); *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 4501 et seq.*].

A certificate represents an intangible property right to receive all amounts due with respect to a delinquency in connection with secured roll property or property on the supplemental roll. A certificate may be issued for a separately assessed parcel, or for multiple parcels with separate assessments, that is delinquent or defaulted at the time of the offer of sale of the certificate. A certificate may not be issued for any subsequent year taxes or assessments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4505(a)*].

The certificate must contain information specified by statute [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4505(a)*], and may be in the form of a physical certificate or in book-entry form, including an electronic medium, in the discretion of the county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4505(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawDeedsTypesTax DeedsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax Sales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.17

§ 482.17 Action Respecting Property Tax Lien

An action may be brought at any time against the state or any county or city to quiet title against the lien of any taxes that have been canceled [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4990.3*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4986-5073* (cancellation of assessments and tax liens)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.18

§ 482.18 Action Respecting Improvement Assessment Lien

An action may be brought to determine adverse interests in, or liens or clouds on the title to, real property arising out of any public improvement assessment or any bond issued to represent such an assessment, when the lien of the assessment or bond is presumed to have been extinguished under *Civ. Code § 2911*; or to determine adverse interests in, or liens or clouds on the title to, real property by reason of any certificate issued on a sale made to satisfy any public improvement assessment or bond, when the sale was made more than four years before the action is begun and no deed pursuant thereto was issued before the action is begun or before January 1, 1951, whichever is the later [*Code Civ. Proc. § 801.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsPublic ImprovementsAssessmentsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.19

§ 482.19 Action Respecting Tidelands and Navigable Waters

A person claiming an interest in real property that the state claims is situated in the former bed of a navigable river or stream may bring a quiettitle action against the state to determine the adverse claims [*Pub. Res. Code § 6461*; *see Pub. Res. Code §§ 6462, 6465*]. The state is the owner of all land below the water of a navigable stream [*Civ. Code § 670*]. Except when the grant under which the land is held indicates a different intent, the owner of land bordering on a navigable stream takes to the edge of the stream at low-water mark [*Civ. Code § 830*]. When, from natural causes, land forms by imperceptible degrees on the bank of a river or stream, navigable or not navigable, either by accumulation of material or by recession of the stream, the land belongs to the owner of the bank, subject to any existing right-of-way over the bank [*Civ. Code § 1014*].

A person claiming title to tideland under a state patent may bring a quiet title action against the state, or against the state and other persons, to determine the validity of the patent or establish the boundaries of the land granted by it [*Pub. Res. Code § 6463*; *see Pub. Res. Code §§ 6462, 6465*]. The state is the owner of all land below tidewater and below the ordinary high-water mark bordering on tidewater within the state [*Civ. Code § 670*]. Except when the grant under which the land is held indicates a different intent, the owner of land bordering on tidewater takes to the ordinary high-water mark [*Civ. Code § 830*].

A person claiming title to land adjoining tideland or submerged land under a patent issued by the United States or by the state may bring an action against the state, or against the state and other persons, to fix and determine the boundary between the adjoining land and the tideland or the submerged land that it adjoins [*Pub. Res. Code § 6464*; *see Pub. Res. Code §§ 6462, 6465*].

The State Lands Commission has power to bring a quiet title action for the purpose of establishing the ordinary high-water mark or the ordinary low-water mark of any of the swamp, overflowed, marsh, tide, or submerged lands of the state, whenever it is deemed expedient or necessary [*Pub. Res. Code § 6357*].

The grantee of any interest in land that the State Lands Commission conveyed in an exchange for filled or reclaimed tideland or submerged land or the bed of a navigable waterway pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 6307* may bring a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.020(b)*; *Pub. Res. Code § 6307(e)*] to obtain a judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc.*

§ 764.080 [*see § 482.20* for discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.080*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsPropertyReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawWater RightsAccretion, Avulsion & RelictionReal Property LawWater RightsBoundaries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.20

§ 482.20 Boundary Line Agreements

An action to quiet title may be brought to confirm the validity of a boundary line agreement entered into between the state and the owner of shoreline property pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 6357* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.020(b)*]. In such an action, the court must receive evidence on the nature of the agreement. After receiving the evidence, the court must render a statement of decision, including a recitation of the facts and a determination that the agreement meets the statutory criteria. If the court finds the agreement to be valid, the judgment must quiet title in the parties named in the agreement in accordance with the agreement. All such actions must be set on the trial calendar within one year from the filing of the memorandum to set, unless the court extends the time for good cause. No such action may be brought until the State Lands Commission has approved the agreement following a public hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.080(a)*]. These provisions cannot be construed to limit the rights of the public in bringing or participating in such actions [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(c), 764.080(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsEvidenceHearsayExceptionsPublic RecordsGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayExceptionsRecords of Documents Affecting Property InterestsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsReal Property LawAdverse PossessionElements of Adverse ClaimsReal Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationProcedureReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.21

§ 482.21 Action Respecting in Situ Oil or Gas

A person claiming an interest in in situ oil or gas may bring, or intervene in, a quiet title action against the state, or against the state and other persons, or may intervene in a quiet title action brought by the state, to determine adverse claims to the deposit [*Pub. Res. Code § 6814*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.22

§ 482.22 Private Assertion of Public Interest

A private person may sue or defend in his or her capacity as a member of the public, to establish public ownership of an interest in property. For example, he or she may assert a public easement against someone claiming unqualified ownership of the present interest in real property [*see Marks v. Whitney (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 251, 261-262, 98 Cal. Rptr. 790, 491 P.2d 374]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLimited Use RightsEasementsPublic Easements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.23

§ 482.23 Hearing and Proof

The court must examine into and determine the plaintiff's title against the claims of all the defendants. The court must not enter judgment by default but must in all cases require evidence of plaintiff's title and hear such evidence as may be offered respecting the claims of any of the defendants, other than claims the validity of which is admitted by the plaintiff in the complaint. The court must render judgment in accordance with the evidence and the law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010*].

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010* has been referred to as a prohibition against default judgments, it does not preclude entry of a defendant's default. Rather, it simply provides that a plaintiff does not have a right to entry of judgment in his or her favor as a matter of course following entry of the defendant's default in a quiet title action. Thus, a judgment may be entered in a quiet title action following default, provided the evidentiary requirements of § 764.010, including a hearing, live testimony, and authentication of the underlying real property records, are met [*Yeung v. Soos (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th576, 580-581, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 502* ; *Winter v. Rice (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 679, 683, 222 Cal. Rptr. 340]* .

The plaintiff will prevail, if at all, only by proving that he or she owns the interest claimed or at least some interest. He or she cannot prevail merely by showing that the defendant does not own the interest the defendant claims, or appears to have, or by showing that the defendantowns no interest. The usual expression of this rule is that the plaintiff can prevail only on the strength of his or her own title and not on the weakness of his or her adversary's [*see, e.g.,* Gerhard v. Stephens *(1968) 68 Cal. 2d 864, 918, 69 Cal. Rptr. 612, 442 P.2d 692* ; *Kunza v. Gaskell (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 201, 207, 154 Cal. Rptr. 101* ; *Valle v. Ingram (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 761, 767, 117 P.2d 869]* . The rule also applies to the defendant when he or she claims an interest and seeks affirmative relief. It is possible, therefore, that neither party will be able to prevail [*see, e.g., Harmon Enterprises, Inc. v. Vroman (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 517, 334 P.2d 628* (relief sought, on opposing claims, by both plaintiff and defendant; judgment against each party on his claim affirmed)].

In making his or her proof, the plaintiff may rely on any presumptions in his or her favor [*see, e.g., Pilkington v. Fausone (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 349, 351-352, 90 Cal. Rptr. 38]* . Since documentary evidence will often be involved, one of the more important presumptions is that facts recited in a written instrument (except a recital of consideration) are conclusively presumed to be true as between the parties to the instrument and their successors in interest [*Evid.*

Code § 622]. This presumption, being conclusive, can be a powerful aid [*see, e.g., Carpenter v. Smallpage (1934) 220 Cal. 129, 133, 29 P.2d 841* (presumption relied on in finding evidence sufficient to support judgment)].

A person is presumed to own property which he or she possesses or over which he or she exercises acts of ownership [*Evid. Code §§ 637, 638*]. If the plaintiff proves possession, he or she has made a prima facie case, but the presumption of ownership based on possession may be rebutted [*Evid. Code § 630*; *see, e.g., Bond v. Aickley (1914) 168 Cal. 161, 163, 141 P. 1188]* . Mere possession is not sufficient when real property is involved, however. The plaintiff also must meet the test for adverse possession [*see Civ. Code §§ 1006, 1007*].

A plaintiff not in possession must establish that he or she has record or paper title by tracing the chain of title to any of four sources [*Ernie v. Trinity Lutheran Church (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 702, 706, 336 P.2d 525* ; *San Diego Improvement Co. v. Brodie (1932) 215 Cal. 97, 100-101, 8 P.2d 1027]* :

- The government;
- A grantor in possession;
- A grantor common to both plaintiff and defendant; or
- A grantor who himself or herself obtained a quiet title judgment.

If the plaintiff claims title as an heir or as a legatee or devisee, he or she must trace his or her decedent's title in this manner, since the probate court's decree of distribution establishes only that the plaintiff takes whatever title his or her decedent had [*Rockey v. Vieux (1919) 179 Cal. 681, 682-683, 178 P. 712]* . The only exception to this rule requiring the tracing of title is that when the defendant rests his or her claim on title derived from the plaintiff, it is unnecessary for the plaintiff to trace his or her title [*Thiele v. Security Trust & Sav. Bank (1927) 202 Cal. 758, 760, 262 P. 308]* .

A judgment in a quiet title action establishing a party's ownership is no less a document of title than is a deed or a bill of sale. This means, among other consequences, that the party in whose favor the judgment was given may offer the judgment in evidence in any subsequent lawsuit concerning that title, without having referred to it in his or her pleading [*see, e.g., Kipp v. Reed (1920) 183 Cal. 49, 51, 190 P. 363]* .

When in an action to quiet title, or to determine adverse claims, to real or personal property, the validity or interpretation of any gift, devise, bequest, or trust, under any will or instrument purporting to be a will, whether or not it has been admitted to probate, is involved, the will or instrument purporting to be a will is admissible in evidence. All questions concerning the validity of any gift, devise, bequest, or trust must be finally determined in the action. However, if the will has been admitted to probate and the gift, devise, bequest, or trust has been interpreted by a final decree of the probate court, the interpretation is conclusive as to the proper construction thereof. Nothing set forth in this paragraph deprives a party of the right to a jury trial in any case in which by law, the right is given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.020*].

[1] Presumptions

Among the various presumptions established by statutes, the following will often be helpful in quiet title actions (two others--that recitals in written instruments, except as to consideration, are presumptively true as between the parties [*Evid. Code § 622*], and that a person presumptively owns the property he or she possesses or over which he or she exercises acts of ownership [*Evid. Code §§ 637, 638*]--have already been discussed):

- **Landlord's Title.** A tenant is not permitted to deny the title of his or her landlord at the time of the

commencement of the relationship [*Evid. Code § 624*].

- **Date of Writing.** A writing is presumed to have been truly dated [*Evid. Code § 640*].

- **Performance of Duty to Convey.** A trustee or any other person, whose duty it was to convey real property to a particular person, is presumed to have actually conveyed to him or her when such presumption is necessary to perfect the title of such person or his or her successor in interest [*Evid. Code § 642*].

- **Authenticity of Ancient Document.** A deed, a will, or any other writing purporting to create, terminate, or affect an interest in real or personal property is presumed to be authentic if (a) it is at least 30 years old, (b) it is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity, (c) it was kept or (if found) was found in a placewhere such writing, if authentic, would be likely to be kept or found, and (d) it has been generally acted on as authentic by persons having an interest in the matter [*Evid. Code § 643*].

- **Ownership of Beneficial Title.** The owner of the legal title to property is presumed to be the owner of the full beneficial title. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing proof [*Evid. Code § 662*].

- **Acknowledgment.** A certificate of the acknowledgment of a writing other than a will, or a certificate of the proof of such a writing, is prima facie evidence of the facts recited in the certificate and the genuineness of the signature of each person by whom the writing purports to have been signed if the certificate meets the requirements of *Civ. Code §§ 1180-1207* [*Evid. Code § 1451*].

- **Official or Notary Signature.** A signature is presumed to be genuine and authorized if it purports to be the signature, affixed in his or her official capacity, of (a) a public employee of the United States, (b) a public employee of any public entity in the United States, or (c) a notary public within any state of the United States [*Evid. Code § 1453*; *see Evid. Code § 1454* (signature of foreign official)].

- **Recorded Documents.** The record of an instrument or any other document purporting to establish or affect an interest in property is prima facie evidence of the existence and content of the original recorded document and its execution and delivery by each person by whom it purports to have been executed if (a) the record is in fact a record of an office of a public entity and (b) a statute authorized such a document to be recorded in that office [*Evid. Code § 1600*; *see Evid. Code § 1601* (lost or destroyed public records); *see also Evid. Code §§ 1603* (deeds executed pursuant to legal process), 1604 (certificate of purchase or location of lands), 1605 (copies of Spanish title papers)].

- **Nonacceptance of Dedication for Public Improvement.** If a proposal is heretofore or hereafter made to dedicate real property for public improvement, there is a conclusive presumption that the proposed dedication was not accepted if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 771.010*]:

  - The proposal was made by filing a map only;

  - No acceptance of the dedication was made and recorded within 25 years after the map was filed;

  - The real property was not used for the purpose for which the dedication was proposed within 25 years after the map was filed; and

- The real property was sold to a third person after the map was filed.

An action is authorized to clear title of a proposal to dedicate property for public improvement if there is such a conclusive presumption. The action must be pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.010-764.070*, as described in this article. The public entity to which the dedication was proposed must be named as a defendant and the judgment in the action clears the title of the proposed dedication and removes the cloud created by the proposed dedication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 771.020*].

[2] Overcoming Ancient Gaps in Title

A plaintiff who relies on record title might be confronted with an ancient gap in his or her chain of title which he or she cannot close. For example, he or she might trace his or her title back to an early date when an unrecorded transfer was made, the deed being now lost and all witnesses being dead. In such a case, when it is impossible to close the gap in the chain of title, the only practical means of foreclosing the interests which might be claimed by the successors of the title holder on the far side of the gap is to proceed on a theory of adverse possession. Success in that case will depend on proving all of the various elements prescribed by statute [*see* Code Civ. Proc. §§ 332-335]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsEvidenceHearsayExceptionsAncient DocumentsEvidenceHearsayExceptionsRecords of Documents Affecting Property InterestsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsReal Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationElementsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.24

§ 482.24 Effect of Judgment

The judgment in a quiet title action entered in a proceeding commenced after January 1, 1981 is in rem. It is binding and conclusive on all of the following persons, regardless of any legal disability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.030*]:

(1) All persons known and unknown who were parties to the action and who have any claim to the property, whether present or future, vested or contingent, legal or equitable, several or undivided; and

(2) Except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045*, all persons who were not parties to the action and who have any claim to the property which was not of record at the time the lis pendens was filed or, if none was filed, at the time the judgment was recorded.

Except to the extent provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)(2)*, the judgment does not affect a claim in the property or a part of the property of any person who was not a party to the action if either of the following conditions is satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045*]:

(1) The claim was of record at the time the lis pendens was filed or, if none was filed, at the time the judgment was recorded; or

(2) The claim was actually known to the plaintiff or would have been reasonably apparent from an inspection of the property at the time the lis pendens was filed, or, if none was filed, at the time the judgment was entered.

However, a claimant may be bound by the proceeding if the claim was acquired from a party after commencement of the proceeding and withactual knowledge of the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 764.045* and Law Revision Commission Comments, 1908(a)(2)].

Nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045(b)*shall be construed to impair the rights of a bona fide purchaser or encumbrancer for value dealing with the plaintiff or the plaintiff's successors in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045(b)*].

The relief granted in an action or proceeding directly or collaterally attacking the judgment in the action, whether based on lack of actual notice to a party or otherwise, shall not impair the rights of a purchaser or encumbrancer for value of the property acting in reliance on the judgment without knowledge of any defects or irregularities in the judgment or proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.060*]. This provision is intended to enhance the marketability of property as to which an in rem quiet title decree has been rendered. When the rights of such a bona fide purchaser have intervened, the person who successfully collaterally attacks the quiet title judgment will only have a cause of action for damages [15 Cal. L. Rev. *Comm. 1208* (1979)].

Notwithstanding the above, the judgment in the action is not binding or conclusive on the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.070*]: (1) the state, unless individually joined as a party to the action; and (2) the United States, unless the United States is individually joined as a party to the action, and federal law authorizes judgment in the action to be binding or conclusive as to its interests. *28 U.S.C. § 2410* authorizes an action against the United States in state court to quiet title to real or personal property on which the United States has or claims a mortgage or other lien. Thus, this type of judgment against the United States would be conclusive.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 482.25-482.39

[Reserved]

§§ 482.25[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.40

§ 482.40 State Statutes

[1] Generally

Right to sue to reestablish public record of title after loss or destruction of record. *Code Civ. Proc. § 751.02*

Right to sue to reestablish boundaries and quiet title after dislocation of boundaries by natural or man-made earth movement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 751.50*

Procedure for quieting title and effect of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*

Recordation of notice of intention to preserve interest that will otherwise be unenforceable by statute creates liability for damages, including attorney's fees, if done for purpose of slandering title to real property, and damages are recoverable in action to quiet title. *Civ. Code § 880.360*

Right to damages including attorney's fees in action to clear title when buyer on recorded contract of sale refuses to execute release of contract after failing to satisfy conditions specified in contract. *Civ. Code § 886.020*

Right to sue to determine adverse claim for money or property on alleged obligation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050*

Right to bring quiet title action against shareholders of dissolved corporation. *Corp. Code § 2011*

Governing board of school or community college district as empowered to clear title to adjacent property by quitclaim deed. *Educ. Code §§ 39291, 81301*

[2] Oil or Gas Deposit

Right to sue to quiet title to in situ oil or gas, or to intervene in such suit. *Pub. Res. Code § 6814*

[3] Presumptions

Possession alone as not sufficient to maintain quiet title action involving real property. *Civ. Code §§ 1006, 1007*

Probate court's interpretation of will, when will involved, as conclusive if such interpretation has become final. *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.020*

Nonacceptance of proposed dedication by map only after 25 years as conclusively presumed where land has been sold to third person and used as if free of dedication, and acceptance has not been recorded. *Code Civ. Proc. § 771.010 et seq.*

Purpose and effect of presumptions affecting burden of producing evidence. *Evid. Code §§ 603, 604*

Facts recited in written instrument (except recital of consideration) conclusively presumed true as between parties to instrument and successors. *Evid. Code § 622*

Tenant is not permitted to deny landlord's title at beginning of landlord-tenant relationship. *Evid. Code § 624*

Presumption of ownership based on possession is rebuttable. *Evid. Code § 630*

Person presumed to own property he or she possesses or over which he or she exercises acts of ownership. *Evid. Code §§ 637, 638*

Writing is presumed truly dated. *Evid. Code § 640*

Trustee or other person having duty to convey real property presumed to have conveyed when presumption necessary to perfect obligee's title. *Evid. Code § 642*

Ancient document meeting certain tests is presumed authentic. *Evid. Code § 643*

Owner of legal title is presumed owner of beneficial title. *Evid. Code § 662*

Acknowledgment meeting statutory requirements [*Civ. Code § 1180 et seq.*] is prima facie evidence of facts therein recited and genuineness of signatures. *Evid. Code § 1451*

When signature of public official, notary public, or foreign official presumed genuine and authorized. *Evid. Code §§ 1453, 1454*

Presumptions concerning documents affecting title to property. *Evid. Code §§ 1600-1605*

[4] Procedure

Party to action concerning real property or affecting title or right of possession is entitled to record notice of pendency of action (lis pendens). *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20*

Right to jury trial in action for recovery of property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*

Declaratory relief procedure. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060-1062a*

Transfer of quiet title action on formation of new county. *Gov. Code § 23382*

[5] Tax-Defaulted Property

Action by defaulting owner against taxing agency to determine validity of deed to agency based on tax delinquency must be brought within one year after date of execution of deed. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 175*

Judgment quieting state's title to tax-deeded property cuts off right of redemption. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3614.5*

Action by original owner alleging invalidity of or irregularity in proceedings for sale of tax-defaulted property by taxing agency to private party must be brought within one year after date of execution of tax collector's deed. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3725*

Purchaser of tax-deeded property is entitled to sue to quiet title. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727, 3950*

Action based on alleged invalidity or irregularity in sale of tax-deeded property by taxing agency to itself or other public entity must be brought within one year after date of execution of instrument on which claim of invalidity or irregularity is based. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3809*

Former owner (delinquent taxpayer) is entitled to redeem tax-defaulted property. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4101*

Right to rescission of notice of power of sale deed on redemption. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4112*

Redemptioner is entitled to sue to quiet title after redemption. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4113*

[6] Tax or Assessment Lien

Right to sue to quiet title against public improvement assessment lien. *Code Civ. Proc. § 801.1*

Right to sue to quiet title against tax lien that has been canceled. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4990.3*

Cancellation of assessments and tax liens. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4986-5073*

[7] Sale of Tax Certificates

Power of tax collector to sell tax certificates on tax-defaulted property. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691, 4511*

Approval of board of supervisors. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3694*

General definitions relating to tax certificates. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4501-4505*

Authorization and administration of tax certificate sales. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4511-4513*

Procedures and requirements relating to tax certificate sales. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4521-4531*

Rights of holders of tax certificates with regard to redemptioner, taxpayer, county, or any other persons. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4920(c)*

[8] Tidelands and Navigable Waters

State is owner of land below water in navigable stream and below tidewater. *Civ. Code § 670*

Ownership of land bordering on navigable stream or tidewater. *Civ. Code § 830*

Ownership of land formed by accumulation at stream bank or recession of stream. *Civ. Code § 1014*

Action by state to establish boundary (high-water mark or low-water mark) of tideland, swamp, or submerged land. *Pub. Res. Code § 6357*

Right to sue to quiet title to former bed of navigable river or stream. *Pub. Res. Code § 6461*

Service of process in suit under *Pub. Res. Code §§ 6461, 6463,* and *6464*. *Pub. Res. Code § 6462*

Right to sue to quiet title to tideland under state patent. *Pub. Res. Code § 6463*

Right to sue to establish boundary between tideland or submerged land and adjoining land. *Pub. Res. Code § 6464*

Plat [map] may be exhibit to complaint in suit under *Pub. Res. Code §§ 6461, 6463,* and *6464*. *Pub. Res. Code § 6465*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceHearsayExceptionsPublic RecordsGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsReal Property LawDeedsTypesTax DeedsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensTax LiensReal Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationProcedureReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawWater RightsBoundariesTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax Sales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.41

§ 482.41 Decisions

[1] Actions to Quiet Title (Examples)

To establish leasehold. *German-American Sav. Bank v. Gollmer (1909) 155 Cal. 683, 102 P. 932*

To establish right of reentry for breach of condition. *Thornton v. Middletown Educ. Corp. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 707, 70 P.2d 234*

To clear adverse claims. *Castro v. Barry (1889) 79 Cal. 443, 21 P. 946* ; *Akley v. Bassett (1924) 68 Cal. App. 270, 228 P. 1057*

By vendor against defaulting purchaser. *Keele v. Clouser (1928) 92 Cal. App. 526, 268 P. 682*

To establish equitable interest. *Bacon v. Bacon (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 540, 69 P.2d 884*

To clear record of tenant's interest. *Black v. Arnold Best Co. (1954) 124 Cal. App. 2d 378, 268 P.2d 513*

To invalidate zoning ordinance clouding title by illegally restricting use, thus depreciating value. *Bank of America v. Atherton (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 268, 140 P.2d 678*

[2] Costs

Plaintiff is not allowed to recover costs in quiet title action when defendant allows default judgment to be taken against

defendant. *Thorson v. Western Development Corp. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 206, 212, 59 Cal. Rptr. 299*

[3] Defenses

Statute of limitations does not commence to run against plaintiff seeking to quiet title to real property while plaintiff is in possession of property. *Muktarian v. Barmby (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 558, 560-561, 47 Cal. Rptr. 483, 407 P.2d 659*

Action by former husband to quiet title in family residence previously awarded to now deceased former wife in dissolution proceeding was estopped by default divorce judgment because residence had been listed in former wife's petition for dissolution, and husband failed to appeal disposition of property. *Badillo v. Badillo (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1010-1012, 177 Cal. Rptr. 56*

When evidence supports findings of agreed boundary line with prior uncertainty as to its location, doctrine of estoppel may apply. *Roman v. Ries (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 65, 68, 66 Cal. Rptr. 120*

No statute of limitations runs against plaintiff seeking to quiet title while plaintiff is in possession of property. *Oates v. Nelson (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 18, 22, 74 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Fraud, even if properly pleaded, does not constitute a defense or counterclaim to action to quiet title; counterclaim for damages is properly subject to demurrer when prayer would not tend to diminish or defeat plaintiff's recovery, that is, to quiet title. *California Trust Co. v. Gustason (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 268, 273, 101 P.2d 74*

Judgment in a prior quiet title action will bind representative of same real party in interest in subsequent action. *Walker v. Hansen (1933) 218 Cal. 619, 621, 24 P.2d 764*

When prior quiet title action is pending between same parties to determine title to same property, defendant may move for dismissal on that ground. *Chapman v. Moore (1907) 151 Cal. 509, 511, 91 P. 324*

[4] Effect of Judgment

Judgment against one or more of several defendants in quiet title action is proper whenever severable judgment is proper. *Thorson v. Western Development Corp. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 206, 215, 59 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Applied to judgments, rule is that description in judgment affecting real property should be certain and specific, and that an impossible, wrong, or uncertain description, or no description at all, renders judgment erroneous and void. *Newman v. Cornelius (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 279, 284, 83 Cal. Rptr. 435*

[5] Effect of Taxes on Void Conveyance

Payment of taxes pursuant to county assessment does not breath life into void conveyance. *People ex rel. Cal. v. Drinkhouse (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 931, 939, 84 Cal. Rptr. 773*

[6] Asserting Equitable Interest Against Legal Title

Person claiming only equitable interest is not allowed to bring "quiet title" action against holder of legal title. *Santoro v. Carbone (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 721, 732, 99 Cal. Rptr. 488* (overruled on other grounds in *Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 30, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P. 2d 212*); *O'Keefe v. Aptos Land & Water Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 772, 781, 286 P.2d 417* (giving reason for rule)

Claimant of equitable interest is entitled to sue holder of legal title to establish resulting or constructive trust. *Nevarez v. Nevarez (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 596, 600, 21 Cal. Rptr. 70*

Plaintiff asserting equitable interest is required to allege specific facts supporting claim and to show in complaint that any preliminary steps (e.g., rescission of fraudulent transaction) have been taken. *Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 214-217, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12*

[7] Evidence and Proof

Tracing title to government, grantor in possession at the time of the conveyance to the plaintiff, or to source common to chains of title of plaintiff and defendant. *Hohn v. Riverside County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 605, 610, 39 Cal. Rptr. 647*

Type of evidence admissible in action to quiet title. *Holloman v. Richmond (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 501, 502-505, 39 Cal. Rptr. 614*

Evidence tracing title to source from which all parties to action claim to derive title is sufficient in action for quiet title. *Walley v. P.M.C. Inv. Co. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 218, 219-220, 68 Cal. Rptr. 711*

Burden is on plaintiff in quiet title action to show superior title in plaintiff; action must prevail on strength of plaintiff's title and not on weakness of defendant. *Potter v. Los Angeles County (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 280, 284, 285, 59 Cal. Rptr. 335*

Weight and sufficiency of evidence in quiet title action. *Devereaux v. Frazier Mountain Park & Fisheries Co. (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 323, 331-333, 56 Cal. Rptr. 345*

In action to quiet title based on adverse possession burden is on claimant to prove every necessary element: (1) possession must be by actual occupation under such circumstances as to constitute reasonable notice to the owner; (2) it must be hostile to the owner's title; (3) holder must claim the property as his or her own, under either color of title or claim of right; (4) possession must be continuous and uninterrupted for five years; and (5) holder must pay all taxes levied and assessed upon property during period. *Dimmick v. Dimmick (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 417, 421, 24 Cal. Rptr. 856, 374 P.2d 824*

Presumption of ownership based on possession [*see Evid. Code §§ 637, 638*] is rebuttable. *Bond v. Aickley (1914) 168 Cal. 161, 163, 141 P. 1188*

Plaintiff relying on record or "paper" title is required to trace title to government, or to grantor in possession, or to common grantor, or to grantor who obtained quiet title judgment. *Ernie v. Trinity Lutheran Church (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 702, 706, 336 P.2d 525* ; *San Diego Improvement Co. v. Brodie (1932) 215 Cal. 97, 100-101, 8 P.2d 1027*

Plaintiff claiming title as heir or as legatee or devisee is required to trace decedent's title; probate court's decree of distribution does not establish more than plaintiff's right to whatever title decedent had. *Rockey v. Vieux (1919) 179 Cal. 681, 682-683, 178 P. 712*

Plaintiff is not required to trace plaintiff's title when defendant's claim rests on title derived from plaintiff. *Thiele v. Security Trust & Sav. Bank (1927) 202 Cal. 758, 760, 262 P. 308*

Judgment quieting title is document of title and admissible as such without reference to it in offering party's pleading. *Kipp v. Reed (1920) 183 Cal. 49, 51, 190 P. 363*

Plaintiff, in quiet title action, is required to prove title in himself or herself superior to that of defendant, rather than prevailing only by establishing plaintiff's own title and not by relying on weakness in defendant's title. *Gerhard v. Stephens (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 864, 918, 69 Cal. Rptr. 612, 442 P.2d 692* ; *Valle v. Ingram (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 761, 767, 117 P.2d 869*

Plaintiff in quiet title action is required to prevail on strength of his or her own title and not on weakness of defendant's title. *Millyard v. Faus (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 76, 82, 73 Cal. Rptr. 697*

Defense of laches does not bar the quieting of title when party asserting defense fails to demonstrate that he or she was in adverse possession of contested property during period of delay. *Gerhard v. Stephens (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 864, 904-905, 69 Cal. Rptr. 612, 442 P.2d 692*

In action to quiet title to certain tidelands in San Diego County, trial court's holding that property in question constituted sovereign tide and submerged lands of state held in trust for public uses and purposes of commerce, navigation, and fisheries by district, affirmed. *Dillon v. San Diego Unified Port Dist. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 296, 299-300, 103 Cal. Rptr. 765*

Mistaken belief of ownership and payment of taxes does not prove adverse possession when there was no substantial enclosure and no usual cultivation or improvement. *Safwenberg v. Marquez (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 301, 310, 123 Cal. Rptr. 405*

[8] Invalid Tax Deeds

Conveyance of property under tax sale in which tax collector is financially interested is void. *People ex rel. Cal. v. Drinkhouse (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 931, 935, 84 Cal. Rptr. 773* (summary judgment for state against grantee in action to quiet title affirmed)

Although deed made in violation of *Gov. Code § 1090*, forbidding county officers to be financially interested in any

contract made by them in their official capacity or to be purchasers at any sale made by them in such capacity ab initio carries no title, judicial decision is required to effectuate nullification against nominal title. *People ex rel. Cal. v. Drinkhouse (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 931, 936, 84 Cal. Rptr. 773*

[9] Joinder of Causes of Action

Demands for relief by way of ejectment and for damages arising out of withholding of property is incident to cause of action to quiet title and properly joined with it. *South Shore Land Co. v. Petersen (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 725, 741, 38 Cal. Rptr. 392*

When relief sought in cross complaint was for decree quieting defendant's title and damages, award of damages sought was being incidental and ancillary to prayer for decree reforming written contract and declaring plaintiff to hold property in trust for defendant, and was proper. *California Trust Co. v. Cohn (1932) 214 Cal. 619, 628-629, 7 P.2d 297*

[10] Jury Trial

Action is governed by equitable principles. *Santoro v. Carbone (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 721, 731, 99 Cal. Rptr. 488* (overruled on other grounds in *Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 30, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P. 2d 212*)

Jury trial is not matter of right in equitable action. *Hartman v. Burford (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270, 51 Cal. Rptr. 309* (reporting rule)

In action involving recovery of possession, jury trial is matter of right on legal issue (possession) but not on equitable issue (ownership). *Robinson v. Puls (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 664, 665-666, 171 P.2d 430* (reporting rule); *Donahue v. Meister (1891) 88 Cal. 121, 128-129, 25 P. 1096*

Jury trial is matter of right in legal action for recovery of property. *Medeiros v. Medeiros (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 69, 73, 1 Cal. Rptr. 696*

In action where defendant seeks recovery of possession after long-standing ouster, jury trial on legal issue (possession) is not matter of right unless equitable issue (ownership) resolved against plaintiff. *Thomson v. Thomson (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 671, 681-683, 62 P.2d 358*

[11] Other Actions Compared

Distinctions between modern statutory form and old equitable proceeding to quiet title. *Castro v. Barry (1889) 79 Cal. 443, 446, 21 P. 946* ; *Donahue v. Meister (1891) 88 Cal. 121, 124-125, 25 P. 1096*

Ejectment and quiet title distinguished. *Medeiros v. Medeiros (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 69, 73, 1 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *Landregan v. Peppin (1892) 94 Cal. 465, 469-470, 29 P. 771* ; *Keele v. Clouser (1928) 92 Cal. App. 526, 531, 268 P. 682*

Dedication, easement, and quiet title discussed. *Burlingame v. Norberg (1930) 210 Cal. 105, 107-108, 290 P. 587*

Action to remove cloud on title and quiet title distinguished. *Castro v. Barry (1889) 79 Cal. 443, 445, 21 P. 946* ; *Hughes v. Beekley (1927) 85 Cal. App. 313, 316, 259 P. 337* ; *Kroeker v. Hurlbert (1940) 38 Cal. App. 2d 261, 265, 101 P.2d 101*

Declaratory relief and quiet title discussed. *Marra v. Aetna Constr. Co. (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 375, 377, 101 P.2d 490* ; *Ephraim v. Metropolitan Trust Co. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 824, 833, 172 P.2d 501*

In action to quiet title and to enjoin sale under deed of trust by debtor's (trustor's) buyer against creditor (beneficiary), when there was single debt secured by both real and personal property and creditor elected to judicially foreclose only on personal property, creditor thereby lost its security interest in real property as against all parties even though debtor did not raise one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*] as affirmative defense in judicial foreclosure proceedings. *Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 741, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329*

[12] Parties

Heirs are represented in gross by administrator-plaintiff, and in quiet title action, such heirs, although they may be joined as parties, are neither necessary nor indispensable parties. *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538*

In quiet title action, executor or administrator in an undistributed estate is party against whom action required to be brought. *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538*

[13] Plaintiff's Right to Bring Action

Third party grantee who took property by quitclaim deed from bankruptcy trustee had no standing to bring quiet title action to attack tax conveyance or sale on ground that it was null and void because it was made in violation of bankruptcy automatic stay when neither debtor nor trustee took any action to discharge tax lien, redeem property, or set aside conveyance to state or subsequent sale. *Campbell v. Lauigan (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 651, 659, 248 Cal. Rptr. 747*

Holder of equitable interest in real property is not entitled to maintain quiet title action against owner of legal title. *Stafford v. Ballinger (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 289, 294-295, 18 Cal. Rptr. 568*

Court may not quiet vendor's title when vendor has accepted part payment of the purchase price unless vendor refunds the excess of the part payments over the damage caused by vendee's breach; rule is applicable when vendee has willfully defaulted. *Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 187, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828*

Owner of fee interest in real property subject to servitude is entitled to have extent and burdens of servitude defined and determined; complaint in quiet title action does not need to specifically allege nature of defendant's claim, nor attack its validity. *Warren v. Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 24, 32-33, 96 Cal. Rptr. 317*

Private person is entitled to assert public claim, as member of public. *Marks v. Whitney (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 251, 261-262, 98 Cal. Rptr. 790, 491 P.2d 374*

[14] Pleading

Defendant in quiet title action claiming fraudulent conduct on part of plaintiff is required to allege specific facts constituting fraud, not rely on general allegations asserting defendant's ownership and denying that of plaintiff. *Moss Estate Co. v. Adler (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 581, 584, 261 P.2d 732* ; *Strong v. Strong (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 540, 545-546, 140 P.2d 386*

Defendant was not entitled to amend answer so as to allege fraud of plaintiff, when such answer was sought to be filed on the eve of trial, and defendant was aware of facts at the time original answer was filed. *Moss Estate Co. v. Adler (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 581, 586, 261 P.2d 732*

In quiet title action, answer denying plaintiff's title and right to possession is sufficient to permit defendant to raise issues of estoppel and agreed boundary. *Roman v. Ries (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 65, 69, 66 Cal. Rptr. 120*

Defendant claiming title in himself or herself to the property described in plaintiff's complaint pleads defendant's own title in the answer, and, without filing counterclaim or cross complaint, is asking for affirmative relief quieting own title against plaintiff. *Furnivall v. Groves (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 846, 847-848, 317 P.2d 117*

When cross complaint in quiet title action is unnecessary since full relief may be granted defendant pursuant to his or her answer, omission of plaintiff to answer cross complaint filed by defendant does not confer on clerk of court authority to enter plaintiff's default. *Furnivall v. Groves (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 846, 848, 317 P.2d 117*

Pleading in quiet title action is sufficient against general demurrer if it contains allegations essential to statement of one cause of action, even though unsuccessful attempt is made to state facts calling for other or different relief. *South Shore Land Co. v. Petersen (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 725, 740, 38 Cal. Rptr. 392*

Fact that facts pleaded in complaint might also show a cause of action in unlawful detainer or quiet title is of no significance when relief granted is in ejectment, and averments of complaint are sufficient to state a cause of action in ejectment, and prayer is for relief that can be granted in the action. *Chinese Hosp. Foundation Fund v. Patterson (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 627, 632, 81 Cal. Rptr. 795*

Under title peculiar to quiet title actions, defendant is required to seek affirmative relief in cross complaint; if plaintiff fails to establish title, defendant is entitled to affirmative judgment declaring rights asserted in answer. *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538*

[15] Purpose of Action

Purpose of quiet title action is being to finally settle and determine, as between parties, all conflicting claims to property in controversy and to decree to each interest or estate therein as the parties may be entitled to. *Yuba Inv. Co.*

v. Yuba Consol. Gold Fields (1926) 199 Cal. 203, 209, 248 P. 672 ; *Newman v. Cornelius (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 279, 284, 83 Cal. Rptr. 435*

Action is type of foreclosure action. *Jones v. Sacramento Sav. & L. Ass'n (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 522, 530, 56 Cal. Rptr. 741*

Action embraces every type of claim whereby plaintiff might be deprived of property or have title clouded or value depreciated. *Castro v. Barry (1889) 79 Cal. 443, 447, 21 P. 946* ("to determine any adverse claim whatever"); *Head v. Fordyce (1860) 17 Cal. 149, 151*

[16] Restitution

State is not bound to make or to offer reimbursement to grantees of consideration given by them for void deed pursuant to tax sale in which tax collector was interested as condition to maintaining action to quiet title to property. *People ex rel. Cal. v. Drinkhouse (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 931, 939, 84 Cal. Rptr. 773*

[17] Statute of Limitations

Quiet title action by homeowners' association with respect to parking spaces that property management company transferred to its president rather than association in violation of CC&Rs was timely; statute of limitations for action to quiet title did not begin to run until adverse claim was asserted against person holding the property, and homeowners' association had exclusive and undisputed possession of spaces. *Crestmar Owners Assn. v. Stapakis (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1228-1230, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 231*

Conveyance to railroad in 1901 providing that right-of-way would revert to grantors or their assigns if railroad operations ceased for six months conveyed fee interest subject to condition subsequent; successor in interest's failure to record intent to preserve future interest as required by Marketable Record Title Act [*Civ. Code § 880.020 et seq.*] barred owner's quiet title action. *Severns v. Union Pacific Railroad (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1209, 1220-1221, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 100*

Application of statute of limitations in quiet title action depends on underlying theory of relief; when theory is based on fraud or mistake, *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* is applicable, with period beginning when plaintiff discovered or should have discovered facts constituting fraud or mistake. *Ankoanda v. Walker-Smith (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 610, 612, 615, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39*

Since there is no statute of limitations governing quiet title actions as such, reference is ordinarily made to underlying theory of relief to determine which statute applies. *Oates v. Nelson (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 74 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Party in possession of property runs risk that doctrine of laches will bar party's action to quiet title if his or her delay in bringing action prejudices claimant. *Oates v. Nelson (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 18, 22, 74 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Action to quiet title that is dependent on cancellation or reformation of written contract or deed on ground of fraud or mistake is subject to three-year statute of limitations. *Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140-141, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(4)*; *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*)

[18] Unclean Hands

Undisputable equitable principle is that those who seek aid of equity must sue in good faith, and any unconscionable conduct that relates to transaction may give rise to defense of unclean hands and bar relief. *Samuelson v. Ingraham (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 804, 806, 77 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Rule that person who comes into equity must come with clean hands is not applied when to do so would create an injustice, it being neither proper nor necessary to sacrifice justice in order to vindicate honor of court. *Hill v. Younkin (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 880, 883, 79 Cal. Rptr. 509*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsActions in EquityGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawAdverse PossessionElements of Adverse ClaimsReal Property LawOwnership & TransferEquitable InterestsReal Property LawOwnership & TransferEquitable InterestsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful Detainer

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.42

§ 482.42 Attorney General Opinions

Subdivision Map Act (*Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*) and county subdivision ordinances enacted pursuant thereto are not applicable to tax collector's sale of portion of tax-deeded parcel pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3691*; under *Gov. Code § 66499.35*, purchaser of portion of tax-deeded parcel at tax sale is entitled to certificate of compliance with Subdivision Map Act. 64 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 814 (1981)

County is entitled to maintain quiet title action to determine nature of public claim on real property in unincorporated area. *4 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 249 (1944)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsState RegulationReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.43

§ 482.43 Law Reviews

Willemsen, *Improving California's Quiet Title Laws, 21 Hastings L.J. 835 (1970)*

Comment, *The Case for an In Rem Quiet Title Decree, 38 So. Cal. L. Rev. 608 (1965)*

Comment, *California Procedures for Obtaining Judicial Decrees Binding on Unborn or Unascertained Persons, 5 Hastings L.J. 199 (1954)*

Note, *Code Pleading: Nature of a 'Cause of Action': Count Quieting Title to Realty and Personalty States But One Cause of Action, 12 Cal. L. Rev. 303 (1924)*

Note, *Constitutional Law: Constitutionality of the Declaratory Judgment, 11 Cal. L. Rev. 289 (1923)*; *10 Cal. L. Rev. 158 (1922)*

Harrison, *California Legislation of 1921 Providing for Declaratory Relief, 9 Cal. L. Rev. 362 (1921)*

Note, *Mortgages: Bar of the Statute of Limitations as Ground for Quieting Title, 5 Cal. L. Rev. 258 (1917)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.44

§ 482.44 Text References

California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 370, *Quieting Title and Determining Adverse Claims* (Matthew Bender)

Ogden's Revised California Real Property Law (Cal CEB 1975), Vol. 2, Ch. 17, *Mortgages and Deeds of Trust*, §§ 17.46, 17.60; Ch. 21, *Real Property Taxes*, § 21.19; Ch. 23, *Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions*, §§ 23.18, 23.29; Ch. 27, *Title Litigation*, §§ 27.9, 27.10, 27.31, 27.52-27.56, 27.60, 27.61, 27.66, 27.67, 27.69, 27.71, 27.77; Ch. 28, *Bankruptcy and Its Impact on Title*, § 28.18

Witkin, California Procedure (2d ed), Vol. 1, *Jurisdiction*, § 154; Vol. 2, *Actions*, §§ 78-80, 261, 432, 599; Vol. 3, *Pleading*, §§ 105, 210, 522-534, 569, 710, 901, 935, 936; Vol. 4, *Judgment*, §§ 14, 19, 91

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 12, *Real Property*, §§ 208, 743; vol. 7,*Constitutional Law*, § 100; vol. 9, *Taxation*, §§ 259, 267, 288, 289 (10th ed. 2005)

41 Cal. Jur. 2d, *Quieting Title and Determining Adverse Claims*

74 C.J.S., *Quieting Title*

65 Am. Jur. 2d, *Quieting Title and Determination of Adverse Claims*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawRestrictive CovenantsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim

ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 482.45-482.59

[Reserved]

§§ 482.45[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.60

§ 482.60 Plaintiff's Checklist

NOTE:
The following checklist is illustrative only of the basic points which counsel for a plaintiff in a quiet title action should cover.

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

NOTE:
Not all of the following facts will be ascertainable from the client in the initial interview. Subsequent interviews may be required, or it may be necessary to ascertain the facts from other persons, including the potential defendant(s), by use of discovery proceedings.

1. Facts relating to plaintiff:

a. Name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff.

b. Capacity of plaintiff (such as minor, adult, corporation, unincorporated association, partner in partnership, public employee, etc.)

c. Additional facts, as desired, relating to plaintiff's stability and financial solvency (such as employ ment status, prior residences, credit, bank, and personal references).

2. Facts relating to defendant(s):

a. Name and address of each potential defendant.

NOTE:
In a quiet title action, potential defendants are (1) all persons having a record interest in the property, whether or not in possession, (2) all persons in possession of

the property, whether or not they have record title, (3) all persons having a claim on the property whose names can be ascertained by plaintiff through the exercise of reasonable diligence, and (4) other persons unknown to plaintiff claiming any right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property adverse to plaintiff's ownership. If real property is involved, a preliminary title report from a title insurance company will be helpful in discovering potential defendants.

b. Capacity of each potential defendant (such as corporation, unincorporated association, agent, employee, or public entity).

3. Facts relating to potential cause of action.

a. Nature of plaintiff's title.

b. If tax-deeded property is involved, the following:

(1) Date property was deeded by county tax collector to state.

(2) Date state, through county tax collector, sold property to plaintiff.

(3) Date plaintiff's deed was recorded, and book-and-page reference to recording.

(4) Whether or not plaintiff has paid all taxes after the date of his or her purchase of the property.

c. Whether or not plaintiff is in possession of the property, and the duration of plaintiff's possession.

d. If plaintiff claims title by virtue of an instrument, the nature of the instrument, its date of execution, and the date of recordation (if recorded).

e. Facts available relating to plaintiff's predecessor in interest.

f. If plaintiff's title depends on the validity or interpretation of a gift, bequest, or trust under a will, or an instrument purporting to be a will, facts on whether or not the will has been probated; if probated, the date of the final decree of distribution and the construction given in that decree to the gift, bequest, or trust.

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

NOTE:
Not all of the following documents will be obtainable from the client in the initial interview. Subsequent interviews may be required, or, when circumstances will permit it, they may be mailed to the attorney. It may, however, be necessary to obtain documents from someone other than the client. Notes following the documents listed indicate sources from which such documents may be obtained. If the contents of any such document must be proved at trial, the document itself must be presented [*Evid. Code § 1520*] unless secondary evidence is admissible [*see* *Evid. Code §§ 1521-1523*].

1. When real property is involved, a preliminary title report, which will show matters of record

pertaining to the property, but not matters outside the record, such as possession.

NOTE:
A preliminary title report is obtainable from a title insurance company that issues policies for properties in the area where the subject property is situated. Counsel may want to consider getting a litigation guarantee instead of a title report.

2. When adverse claims to the property involve the boundary between it and adjacent property, a surveyor's report giving a metes and bounds description of the property may be necessary.

NOTE:
When the property is legally described in a subdivision map that has been recorded, a metes and bounds description of the property will not be necessary. Its lot and block number of a subdivision map of record ordinarily will be a sufficient description. When the property is not described in a subdivision map, a grant deed to the property ordinarily will give a metes and bounds description. However, when the action will be on a parcel of property that has not been previously legally described by metes and bounds or as a part of a subdivision map, a surveyor's report probably will be necessary to obtain a legally sufficient description of the property. In some situations, a title insurance company may be willing to write up a legal description of the property as an incidental service during the preparation of a preliminary title report or a litigation guarantee.

3. The original of the deed, instrument, or other document by which plaintiff claims title to the property.

NOTE:
If the original is unavailable, and the document is a matter of record, a certified copy of the document should be obtained from the recorder of the county where the property is situated.

4. If tax-deeded property is involved, tax receipts showing the payment of all taxes levied after plaintiff's purchase of the property.

NOTE:
The client will either have a tax receipt showing of taxes or, in some counties, his or her cancelled check will serve as proof of payment.

[3] Preliminary Investigation and Determinations

1. Investigation and interviews.
If the facts or documents obtained indicate that a possible cause of action exists, counsel will want to interview witnesses and conduct whatever preliminary investigation the facts require.

2. Actions and relief (among others):

a. Quiet title action to determine adverse claims [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*; *see § 482.80*].

b. Action for declaratory relief to determine adverse claims [*Civ. Code § 3367*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060-1062a*].

c. Action to determine adverse claims to tax-deeded property [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*; *see § 482.81*].

d. Action for cancellation of an instrument [*see Civ. Code § 3412*; *see also* Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*].

e. Action to recover possession of real property [*see Civ. Code § 3375*] or for ejectment [*see* Ch. 241, *Ejectment*].

f. Action to reestablish destroyed land records [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 751.01-751.28*; *see also* Ch. 356, *Lost Papers*].

g. Action to reform a deed [*see Civ. Code § 3399*; *see also* Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments*].

h. Proceeding to determine grantor's identity [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 771.010-771.020*; *see also* Ch. 299, *Identity, Establishment of*].

i. Action by creditor [*see Civ. Code § 3439.01(c)*] to set aside a fraudulent conveyance [*see Civ. Code § 3439.07*; *see also* Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*].

j. Action to determine adverse claims when a lien for taxes has been cancelled [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4990.3*; *see also* Ch. 540, *Taxes and Assessments*].

k. Action to determine adverse claims to the former bed of a navigable river or stream [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 6461-6462*].

l. Intervention in condemnation proceeding [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 387, 1250.230*; *see also* Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain*].

m. Third-party claim to property under levy of execution [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 720.110, 720.210*; *see also Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.310* et seq.].

[4] Essential Allegations of Complaint

1. A description of the property that is the subject of the action. In the case of tangible personal property, the description must include its usual location. In the case of real property, the description must include both its legal description and its street address or common designation, if any.

2. The title of the plaintiff as to which a determination is sought and the basis of the title. If the title is based on adverse possession, the complaint must allege the specific facts constituting the adverse possession.

3. The adverse claims to the title of the plaintiff against which a determination is sought.

4. The date as of which the determination is sought. If the determination is sought as of a date other than the date the complaint is filed, the complaint must include a statement of the reasons why a determination as of that date is sought.

5. A prayer for the determination of the title of the plaintiff against the adverse claims [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

761.020].

For form, see *§ 482.20*.

[5] Lis Pendens

Immediately on the commencement of the action, the plaintiff must file a lis pendens in each county in which any real property described in the complaint is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010(b)*; *see* Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*].

[6] Service of Summons

1. Serve all the named defendants [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

2. Obtain an order for service of process on unknown defendants and serve them by publication [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 763.010-763.030*; *see § 482.80*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPublicationCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawAdjoining LandownersBoundariesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.61

§ 482.61 Defendant's Checklist

NOTE:
The following checklist is illustrative only of the basic points which counsel for a defendant in a quiet title action should cover.

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

1. General facts.

Ascertain the same general facts as when representing plaintiff [*see § 482.60*].

2. Facts required for the answer.

NOTE:
Counsel should advise the client not to discuss the case with any other person without counsel's approval.

a. Allegations of complaint.

Ascertain which of the facts alleged in the complaint are true, which are false, and which the defendant can neither confirm nor deny.

NOTE:
If the defendant disclaims all interest in the property, or suffers judgment to be had against him or her without an answer, the plaintiff cannot recover costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.030(b)*].

b. Defenses.

(1) Bar of limitation or laches [*see §§ 482.80* and *482.83*; *see also* Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*].

(2) Res judicata [*see* Ch. 491, *Res Judicata*].

(3) Pendency of prior action [*see* Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions*].

(4) Estoppel [*see, e.g., Burrow v. Carley (1930) 210 Cal. 95, 104, 290 P. 577* ; *Baillarge v. Clark (1904) 145 Cal. 589, 593, 79 P. 268* ; *but see Dooley's Hardware Mart v. Trigg (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 337, 339, 75 Cal. Rptr. 745]* .

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

Obtain the same documents as when representing plaintiff [*see § 482.60*].

[3] Essential Allegations of Answer and Cross Complaint

1. Any claim the defendant has;

2. Any facts tending to controvert such material allegations of the complaint as the defendant does not wish to be taken as true;

3. A statement of any new matter constituting a defense; and

4. If defendant seeks affirmative relief such as quieting title in himself or herself, allegations in a cross complaint seeking suchrelief similar to those in a complaint to quiet title [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.020, 761.040*; *see § 482.60[4]*].

For forms, see *§§ 482.81 -482.83*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsCross-ClaimsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsEquitable EstoppelGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

168 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 482.62-482.79

[Reserved]

§§ 482.62[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.80

§ 482.80 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*], Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name(s) of known defendant(s)*], [*if person required to be named as defendant is dead, and plaintiff knows identity of personal representative, add:*; _____ (*name*), as _____ (*description, e.g.,* Executor *or* Administrator (With Will Annexed)) of the Estate of _____ (*name*), Deceased(, and as devisee)] [*if person required to be named as defendant is believed by plaintiff to be dead but plaintiff does not know identity of personal representative, and/or if plaintiff wishes to include unknown successors of known decedent, add:*; the testate and intestate successors of _____ (*name of decedent*), _____ (deceased *or* believed to be deceased), and all persons claiming by, through, or under such _____ (decedent *or* person)] [*if unknown defendants are included, add:*; all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to Plaintiff's title, or any cloud on Plaintiff's title thereto] [; and DOES I-_____, inclusive],	)	COMPLAINT TO QUIET TITLE

Defendant(s).

_____

Plaintiff(s) alleges/allege:

[1. *Allege each plaintiff's identity and capacity, if necessary*.]

[2. *Allege each known defendant's identity and capacity, if necessary, including, if known to plaintiff(s), the personal representative of a deceasedperson required to be named as a defendant (see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(a)), and/or a person required to be named as a defendant who plaintiff(s) believe(s) to be deceased (see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(3)).*]

[3. *If heirs and devisees of a defendant who is deceased, or believed to be deceased, are sued as defendants but their names are not known to plaintiff(s), allege:* (Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and thereon allege(s) that) _____ (*name*) is deceased; plaintiff(s) does/do not know the names of decedent's heirs and devisees(, except for _____ (*state names of any known heirs and devisees, who should be included above as named defendant(s)*)),) and therefore denominate(s) these defendants herein as "the testate and intestate successors of _____ (*name of deceased person*), (believed to be) deceased, and all persons claiming by, through, or under such _____ (decedent *or* person)" (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the successor defendants"). These successor defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title; and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

[4. *If "all persons unknown" are named as defendants, allege:* The defendants herein named as "all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud on plaintiff's title thereto" (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the unknown defendants") are unknown to plaintiff(s). These unknown defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title; and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

[5. Plaintiff(s) is/are ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I through _____, and therefore sue(s) these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff(s) will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and thereon allege(s) that each of these fictitiously named defendants claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

6. _____ [Plaintiff is the sole owner *or* Plaintiffs are the owners concurrently, as _____ (joint tenants *or* tenants in common *or* partners *or* husband and wife), of _____ (*specify interest, e.g.,* the fee simple title) _____ (of *or* in *or* to) certain _____ (real *or* personal) property, namely _____ (*set forth particular description; in the case of personal property, description must include usual location; in the case of real property, description must include both legal description and street address or common designation, if any*].

7. The basis of plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title is _____ [*describe basis of plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title, e.g.,* a deed from _____ (*name of grantor*) granting the above-described property in fee simple to plaintiff(s) dated _____, and recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book/Reel _____, page/image _____].

[8. *If any of the plaintiff's claim ownership of the present interest in real property, allege:* Plaintiff(s) was/were _____ (seized *or* possessed) of the above-described property within five years of the commencement of this action.]

[*Unless there are few enough adverse claims against title that they can all be described in Paragraph 10, continue with as many separate paragraphs as are necessary, describing one known adverse claim per paragraph, e.g.:*]

9. [Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and on such information and belief allege(s) that] [D]efendant _____ [*name*] claims an interest adverse to plaintiff(s) in the above-described property as _____[*describe adverse interest, e.g.,* the holder of a lien representing an unsatisfied judgment against _____ (*name of judgment debtor*), a former owner of the property that is the subject of this action. The abstract of judgment was recorded on _____ (*date*), in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book/Reel _____, page/image _____ (and appears as exception number _____ on the title report issued by _____ (*name of title insurance company or abstractor*) on _____ (*date*), a copy of which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof)]. Some of the unknown defendants[, specifically those additionally designated as DOES _____ through _____,] claim interests in the property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' as assignees and successors of defendant _____ [*name*].

[*CONTINUE*]

10. Plaintiff(s) is/are seeking to quiet title against the claims of defendant(s) as follows: _____ [*describe claim held by each named defendant, e.g.,* a quitclaim deed from _____ (*name of grantor*) granting the above-described property to _____ (*name of defendant*) dated _____ (date), and recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book/Reel _____, page/image _____ (*continue with whichever are applicable:*; the claims of the successor defendants described in Paragraph 3; the claims of all unknown defendants described in Paragraph 4, whether or not the claim or cloud is known to plaintiff(s); and the unknown, uncertain, or contingent claim, if any, of _____ (*name*) more fully described in Paragraph 11)]. The claims of defendant(s) are without any right whatever and such defendant(s) _____ [has *or* have] no right, title, estate, lien, or interest whatever in the above-described property or any part thereof [except the following: _____ (*set forth any adverse claims of which plaintiff(s) admits/admit the validity, e.g.,* the utility easement held by Pacific Gas and Electric Company)].

[11. *If the claim of a named defendant is unknown, uncertain, or contingent, allege:* The claim of _____ (*name of defendant*) is _____ (unknown *or* uncertain *or* contingent). (*If the lack of knowledge, uncertainty, or contingency is caused by a transfer to an unborn or unascertained person or class member, or by a transfer in the form of a contingent remainder, vested remainder subject to defeasance, executory interest, or similar disposition, allege:* _____ (*Name*), age _____, is the person who would be entitled to an adverse claim if _____ (*describe contingency*) had occurred prior to the commencement of this action.) (*If such person is subject to a legal disability, allege:* Such person is subject to _____ (*specify legal disability*).)]

12. Plaintiff(s) seek(s) to quiet title as of _____ [*date*]. [*If the date is a date other than the date the complaint is filed, allege why a determination as of that date is sought.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) prays/pray as follows:

1. For a judgment that plaintiff(s) is/are _____ [*specify interest claimed, e.g.*, the owner(s) in fee simple] of the property and that defendant(s) has/have no interest in the property adverse to the plaintiff(s);

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff(s)

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am [one of] the plaintiff(s) in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:
If a person required to be named as a defendant is dead, or is believed by plaintiff to be dead, and the plaintiff knows of no personal representative, plaintiff must file an affidavit with the complaint stating these facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(1)*; *see generally* Ch. 15, ***Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations see also*** *§§ 482.80[7][e], [f]*].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of complaint is a general form for use by a person claiming ownership of an interest in real or personal property who wishes to quiet title to that interest, thereby invalidating any adverse claims alleged in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020*; *see §§ 482.11, 482.12*].

Plaintiff may wish to obtain a title report before commencing the action. If plaintiff intends to add unknown persons as defendants, an examination of the record title and an inspection of the property will be necessary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b)*]. Also, the court may order plaintiff to obtain a title report and keep it available for inspection and copying by the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.040(b)*].

For an appropriate form to use when the plaintiff asserts title to property as a purchaser of tax-defaulted property, see *§ 482.81*.

Forms appropriate to use in a variety of factual situations are included in other chapters in this set. For a list of these chapters, see *§ 482.02*.

[3] Limitation of Action

If the plaintiff is in possession of the property, his or her right of action is not subject to limitation, but if he or she is out of possession, there is a limitation period, depending on the theory of relief [*see Muktarian v. Barmby (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 558, 560-561, 47 Cal. Rptr. 483, 407 P.2d 659* , and § 482.83].

The rule of nonlimitation when the plaintiff is in possession does not apply, however, when the plaintiff sues to clear his or her title of the cloud cast by a tax collector's deed to the state because of tax delinquency. In such a case, there is a special statutory limitation of one year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 175*], and the general rule does not apply [*Sears v. County of Calaveras (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 518, 521, 289 P.2d 425* ; *see also* Ch. 540, *Taxes and Assessments*].

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040(a)*], and the action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b), 580(b)(3)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*]. The court has complete jurisdiction over the parties to the action and the property described in the complaint and is deemed to have obtained possession and control of the property for the purposes of the action with complete jurisdiction to render the quiet title judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040(b)*].

Subject to the power of the court to transfer actions, the proper county for the trial of a quiet title action is one of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.050*]:

- When the subject of the actions is real property or real and personal property, the county in which the real property, or some part thereof, is located; or

- When the subject of the action is personal property, the county in which the personal property is principally located at the commencement of the action or in which the defendants, or any of them, reside at the commencement of the action.

[5] Caption

The caption must include the names of all parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.40*]. Plaintiff must name as defendants the persons having adverse claims to the title of plaintiff against which a determination is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.010*], including a person required to be named as a defendant who plaintiff believes is deceased [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(3)* (*§ 482.80[7][f]*); *see also § 482.81*], or, if known to plaintiff, the personal representative of a decedent [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(a)* (*§ 482.80[7][e]*)].

Three categories of defendants that may be necessary or appropriate in a particular case are denominated by specific language set forth in the statutes: (1) unknown defendants [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 762.020(a), 762.060(a)*; *see discussion under § 482.80[7][g]*]; (2) unknown heirs and devisees of a deceased adverse claimant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(2)*; *see discussion under§ 482.80[7][e]*]; and (3) unknown heirs and devisees of a person required to be named as a defendant and whom plaintiff believes is deceased [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(3)*; *see discussion under§ 482.80[7][f]*]. Some people also additionally designate testate and intestate successors and "all persons unknown" as DOES. That is not recommended because it differs from the statutory language of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 762.030(b)(2), (3), 762.060*, by which those defendants are to be designated, and because it may limit the in rem effect of the judgment by limiting the number of adverse claimants in those classes [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 763.030(b)* (discussed under Process, *below*); Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)* (*see § 482.80[7][a]*)].

The caption may also include fictitious defendants pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* because the rules governing civil actions generally are applicable in quiet title actions unless they are inconsistent with quiet title provisions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.060*; *see also* discussion § 482.80[7][h]].

[6] Plaintiff

[a] Identity and Capacity

If the plaintiff is not a natural person, the complaint should allege the plaintiff's identity as an existing legal entity entitled to come into court; if the plaintiff sues in a special capacity, the complaint should allege this capacity to show that the plaintiff is entitled to relief, if other facts alleged are true (Paragraph 1) [*see Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6* (distinguishing standing and capacity to sue)].

[b] When Property Belongs to Decedent's Estate

Ordinarily, an action with respect to property belonging to a decedent's estate will be brought by the personal representative. *Prob. Code § 9654* provides, however, that the heirs or devisees may themselves, or jointly with the personal representative, maintain an action for possession of property or to quiet title to property against any person except the personal representative. Unlike former Prob. Code § 581 (repealed operative July 1, 1988), *Prob. Code § 9654* applies to real as well as personal property [*see* Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to 1987 repeal of Prob. Code § 581].

It appears that an action may be maintained by any one or more of the heirs or devisees; it is not required that they all join as plaintiffs [*see Bank of America v. Atherton (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 268, 274, 140 P.2d 678]* .

[7] Defendants

[a] Defendants Determine Scope of Action

The plaintiff must name as defendants the persons having adverse claims to the title of the plaintiff against which a determination is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.010*]. If the name of a person required to be named as a defendant is not known to plaintiff, the plaintiff must so state in the complaint and must name as parties all persons unknown in the manner described in *§ 482.80[7][g]* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.020(a)*]. By naming unknown defendants in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060*, plaintiff essentially gives the action an in rem effect [*see* Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*].

[b] Particular Capacity of Defendant

If the defendant is not a natural person, the complaint should allege the defendant's identity as an existing entity against which the court's judgment will operate, such as a corporation (Paragraph 2) [*see Tanner v. Best (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 442, 445, 104 P.2d 1084]* .

If the defendant is sued in a particular capacity (e.g., as executor of a will, as trustee, and so forth), the complaint should allege that capacity (Paragraph 2) [*see, e.g., Katleman v. First Nat'l Bank (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 520, 524, 28 Cal. Rptr. 135* (discharged executor as not subject to suit in representative capacity); *see also* discussion *§ 482.80[5]*].

[c] Dissolved Corporation

When a corporation has been dissolved, the former shareholders may be sued in the corporate name on any cause of action arising against thecorporation before dissolution [*Corp. Code § 2011(a)*]. In particular, a quiet title action may be brought against the former shareholders in the corporate name. Any judgment in such an action will bind each and all of the former shareholders or other persons having any equity or other interest in the dissolved corporation, to the extent of their interests, and will have the same force and effect as a judgment in an action governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50* (jurisdiction over party as extending from service of summons through subsequent proceedings) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.60* (jurisdiction over trustees and shareholders of corporation that forfeited charter as existing from service of

summons on any trustee) [*Corp. Code § 2011(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40, Corp. Code § 2011(b)* (service of summons)].

[d] State or State Agency

The state may be joined as a party to a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.090(a)*]. With respect to a quiet title action, it appears that the state or a state agency is subject to suit except when a statute specially gives immunity [*see Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999-1000, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918* (action to quiet title to water rights)].

[e] Heirs; Representative of Decedent's Estate; Affidavit

If a person required to be named as a defendant is dead and the plaintiff knows of a personal representative, the plaintiff must join the personal representative [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(a)*]. If a person required to be named as a defendant is dead, or is believed by the plaintiff to be dead, and the plaintiff knows of no personal representative, the plaintiff must state these facts in an affidavit filed with the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(1)*]. For discussion of the formalities required in an affidavit and a general form of affidavit, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

When it is stated in the affidavit that such person is dead, the plaintiff may join as defendants "the testate and intestate successors of _____ (*name of deceased person*), deceased, and all persons claiming by, through, or under such decedent," naming them in that manner [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)*]. A judgment rendered against the personal representative is binding on all of the heirs even if they are not parties, and a judgment in favor of the heirs' claims should be rendered in the name of the personal representative, not in the names of the heirs (Paragraph 3) [*Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538* ; *see Prob. Code § 573(a)* (cause of action as not lost by death but maintainable by, or against, personal representative)].

Since the personal representative of a decedent's estate represents all of the heirs, he or she may not maintain a quiet title action against some of them [*Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538]* .

[f] When Required Defendant Is Believed to Be Deceased

If a person required to be named as a defendant is believed by plaintiff to be deceased, plaintiff knows of no personal representative, and plaintiff so states in the affidavit required to be filed with the complaint in such a case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(1)* (requirement of affidavit); *see generally* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*], the person believed to be deceased may still be named as a defendant. Plaintiff may also join that person's successors by naming them in the complaint as "the testate and intestate successors of _____ (*name of person believed to be deceased*), believed to be deceased, and all persons claiming by, through, or under such person" (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)(3)*].

[g] Unknown Defendants

In addition to the persons required to be named as defendants in the action, the plaintiff may name as defendants "all person unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud upon plaintiff's title thereto," naming them in that manner (Paragraph 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(a)*]. For discussion of whether or not to additionally designate the unknown defendants as DOES, see discussion § 482.80[5].

If unknown defendants are named, the plaintiff must name as defendants the persons having adverse claims that are of record or known to the plaintiff or reasonably apparent from an inspection of the property (Paragraphs 2, 4, 9, 10) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b)*]. Apparently the holder of a claim of record is required to be a named, or "known" defendant, though he or she may still be served by publication if his or her location and identity cannot be determined after

reasonable diligence [*see* Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(a), (b)*].

Naming unknown defendants and serving them by publication [*see discussion under§ 482.81[7]*)] will entitle plaintiff to a judgment that is essentially an in rem judgment against the whole world [*see* Cal. L. Rev. Comm. Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 764.030, 764.045* (discussed in the Introduction *§ 482.41[4]*)]. A person who is in open and actual possession of the property cannot be named as an unknown defendant [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(c)* (discussed *§ 482.81[7]*)].

[h] Fictitious Defendants

The plaintiff may also name unknown defendants as DOES pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 760.060* (rulesgoverning civil actions generally as applicable in quiet title actions unless they are inconsistent with quiet title provisions)]. For discussion of whether or not to additionally designate the unknown defendants as DOES, see discussion under Caption, *above.* For additional examples of DOE allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

[i] Defendants Required by Court to Be Joined

The court on its own motion may, and on the motion of any party must, make such orders as appear appropriate for joinder of such additional parties as are necessary or proper [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.040(a)*]. For discussion and forms relating to joinder of parties generally, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

[8] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

The court on its own motion may, and on motion of any party must, make such orders for appointment of guardians ad litem as appear necessary to protect the interest of any party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.080*]. Appointment of guardians ad litem is discussed in Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* .

[9] Required Allegations

[a] Property and Adverse Claims

By statute, the complaint must include the following allegations:

(1) A description of the property that is the subject of the action. In the case of tangible personal property, the description must include its usual location. In the case of real property, the description must include both its legal description and its street address or common designation, if any (Paragraph 6) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*]. This requirement does not preclude the joinder of several properties or of real and personal property, if appropriate [15 Cal. L. Rev. Comm. 1198 (1979)].

(2) The title of the plaintiff as to which a determination is sought and the basis of the title. If the title is based on adverse possession, the complaint must allege the specific facts constituting the adverse possession (Paragraphs 6, 7) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(b)*; *see generally* Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession*].

(3) The adverse claims to the title of the plaintiff against which a determination is sought (Paragraphs 9-11) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*]. If the plaintiff admits the validity of any adverse claim, the complaint must so state (Paragraph 10) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(c)*]. If the claim or the share or quantity of the claim of a person required to be named as a defendant is unknown, uncertain, or contingent, the plaintiff must so state in the complaint. If the lack of knowledge, uncertainty, or contingency is caused by a transfer to an unborn or unascertained person or class member, or by a transfer in the form of a contingent remainder, vested remainder subject to defeasance, executory interest, or similar disposition, the plaintiff must also state in the complaint, so far as is known to the plaintiff, the name, age, and legal

disability, if any, of the person in being who would be entitled to the claim had the contingency on which the claim depends occurred prior to the commencement of the action (Paragraph 11) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.020(b)*].

(4) The date as of which the determination is sought. If the determination is sought as of a date other than the date the complaint is filed, the complaint must include a statement of reasons why a determination as of that date is sought (Paragraph 12) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)*].

(5) A prayer for the determination of the title of the plaintiff against the adverse claims [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)*].

[b] Plaintiff's Seisin or Possession Within Five Years

When the plaintiff claims a present interest in real property (i.e., the interest entitling the owner to immediate possession [*Civ. Code § 689*]), whether or not he or she actually seeks to recover possession, he or she is deemed to sue for the recovery of real property within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 318*, a statute of limitations implicitly requiring the plaintiff to prove (and, therefore, allege) that "the plaintiff, his/her ancestor, predecessor, or grantor, was seised or possessed of the [real] property in question, within five years before the commencement of the action" (Paragraph 8) [*see Safwenberg v. Marquez (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 301, 311, 123 Cal. Rptr. 405]* .

The statute requires either seisin--that is, the right of possession--or actual possession. If the plaintiff shows that he or she has legal title, he or she shows seisin, even when someone else is in actual possession [*Tobin v. Stevens (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 945, 949-951, 251 Cal. Rptr. 587* ; *Schoenfeld v. Pritzker (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 117, 121, 64 Cal. Rptr. 592]* . Moreover, it is apparent that if the plaintiff relies on possession (because someone else holds legal title), he or she must meet the test of adverse possession.

Obviously, when the plaintiff claims a future interest, *Code Civ. Proc. § 318* does not apply. One reason is that the plaintiff's action cannot be characterized as one for the recovery of the property, but a more compelling reason is that in many cases it would be impossible to show seisin or possession in himself or herself or a predecessor within five years before commencement of the action.

[c] Water Rights

Water rights are deemed to be real property, and a quiet title action may be maintained to determine adverse claims to water rights [*see Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999 n.5, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* .

There are special pleading rules when the plaintiff claims ownership of a riparian right [*see Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828-829, 306 P.2d 807* ; for discussion and appropriate forms, see *Ch. 575, Waters, § 565.10* et seq.].

[d] Equitable Right to Relief

[i] In General

Since the plaintiff seeks equitable relief, he or she is required to establish an equitable right to relief. If equity demands that the plaintiff restore the defendant to a prior position, the complaint should include allegations showing that the plaintiff has done, or offered to do, whatever equity demands [*see, e.g., Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 187, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828* (plaintiff seller, defendant buyer, under real property sale contract; plaintiff as required to restore payments, less damages)].

[ii] Action Based on Breach of Sale Contract

When the purpose of the action is to foreclose a conditional purchaser's interest following default and cancellation of the

agreement, the plaintiff (seller) need not refund any part of the amount paid toward the price if that amount is less than the "benefit of his bargain" [*Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 120-121, 208 P.2d 367]* . However, if that amount exceeds the benefit of the bargain, the plaintiff is not entitled to a judgment quieting title unless he or she refunds the excess [*Baffa v. Johnson (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 36, 39, 216 P.2d 13]* .

[10] Prayer

The complaint must include a prayer for the determination of the title against adverse claims [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(e)*].

The plaintiff may, if he or she wishes, add to the prayer a request for prohibitive relief, such as, "That defendant[s] be enjoined from making any further claim to the property adverse to plaintiff, by legal action or otherwise." A judgment including such an injunction is proper [*Wolf v. Gall (1916) 174 Cal. 140, 145, 162 P. 115]* .

[11] Verification

The complaint must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*].

[12] Process

The form, content, and manner of the service of summons is the same as in civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(a)*]. The procedure to be followed if the names of all the defendants will not fit in the box on the Judicial Council form of summons is *set forth in § 482.81*.

If, on affidavit, it appears to the satisfaction of the court that the plaintiff has used reasonable diligence to ascertain the identity and residence of and to serve summons on the persons named as unknown defendants and persons joined as testate or intestate successors of a person known or believed to be dead, the court must order service by publication pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*. The court may, in its discretion, appoint a referee to investigate whether or not the plaintiff has used reasonable diligence to ascertain the identity and residence of persons sought to be served by publication, and the court may rely on the report of the referee instead of the affidavit of the plaintiff in making the order for service by publication. Service is not authorized by publication on any person named as an unknown defendant who is in open and actual possession of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(b), (c)*]. As a condition of establishing that the party to be served pursuant to publication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50* cannot with reasonable diligence be served in another manner, the court may not require that a search be conducted of public databases where access by a registered process server to residential addresses is prohibited by law or by published policy of the agency providing the database. These databases include, but are not limited to, voter registration rolls and records of the Department of Motor Vehicles [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(e)*].

Whenever the court orders service by publication, the order is subject to the following conditions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.020*]:

- The plaintiff must post, not later than 10 days after the date the order is made, a copy of the summons and complaint in a conspicuous place on the real property that is the subject of the action.

- The plaintiff must record, if not already recorded, a lis pendens.

- The publication must describe the property that is the subject of the action. In addition to particularly describing the property, the publication must describe the property by giving its street address, if any, or other common designation. However, if a legal description of the property is given, the validity of the publication is not affected by the fact that the street address or other common designation recited is

erroneous or omitted.

Whenever the court orders service by publication, the publication may [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.030(a)*]:

- Name only the defendants to be served by publication.
- Describe only the property in which the defendants to be served thereby claim interests.

Judgment against a defendant who fails to appear and answer following service by publication is conclusive against the defendant named in respect only to property described in the publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.030(b)*].

Whenever the court orders service by publication, the court before hearing the case must require proof that the summons has been served, posted, and published as required and that the lis pendens has been filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.040*].

Service of summons is fully discussed in Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[13] Lis Pendens

Immediately on the commencement of a quiet title action by filing the complaint, the plaintiff must file a lis pendens in the office of the county recorder of each county in which any real property described in the complaint is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010*].

Before recording the notice, the plaintiff must cause a copy of the notice to be mailed, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to all known addresses of the parties to whom the plaintiff's claim is adverse and to all owners of record of the real property affected by the plaintiff's claim as shown by the latest county assessment roll. If there is no known address for service on an adverse party or owner, then as to that party or owner a declaration under penalty of perjury to that effect may be recorded in lieu of a filed proof of service, and service on that party is not required. Immediately after recording the notice, the plaintiff must file a copy of the notice in the court in which the action is pending. Upon an adverse party's being joined in the action, the notice must be served on that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.22*].

Any notice of pendency of action is void and invalid as to any adverse party or owner of record unless mailing requirements have been met for that party or owner and a proof of service in the form and content specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a* has been recorded with the notice of pendency of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.23*] (or an in-lieu declaration has been recorded as described above).

From the time of recording of the notice of pendency of action, any purchaser, encumbrancer, or other transferee of the real property described in the notice is deemed to have notice of the pendency of the action as it relates to the real property, but only insofar as the action is pending against parties not fictitiously named. The plaintiff's rights and interest in the property, as ultimately determined in the pending noticed action, relate back to the date of recording of the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.24*].

[14] Costs

If the defendant disclaims, in the answer, any interest or estate in the property, or suffers judgment to be taken against him or her without answering, the plaintiff is not entitled to recover costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)*].

[15] Recovery of Expenses

If the plaintiff sues on account of the defendant's breach of an agreement to convey title to real property by quitclaim

deed, the plaintiff's expenses in quieting his or her title, including not only litigation costs but also reasonable attorney's fees and the expenses, if any, incurred in entering the property, are recoverable as damages [*see Civ. Code § 3306a*]. A count alleging appropriate facts in support of a plea for damages may be included in the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 427.10(a)*]. The proper trial procedure in such a case would be first to try the issue of title and then to impanel a jury for trial of the damages issue [*see, e.g., Connell v. Bowes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 870, 872, 123 P.2d 456]* .

[16] State Statutes

Procedure for making state agency defendant when it has nonproperty-tax lien on property. *Civ. Code § 2931a*

Measure of damages for breach of promise to give quitclaim deed as expenses of quiet title action and entry on property plus attorney's fees. *Civ. Code § 3306a*

Specific relief as including declaring and determining parties' rights other than by award of damages. *Civ. Code § 3367*

Necessity that plaintiff or predecessor, in action involving "recovery of real property," be seised or possessed of property within five years before action begun. *Code Civ. Proc. § 318*

Lis pendens. *Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*

Necessity, in action for recovery of real property, to describe property with such certainty that officer levying execution can identify it. *Code Civ. Proc. § 455*

Procedure for quieting title and effect of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010-764.080*

Cause of action as not lost by death but maintainable by or against personal representative. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.20, 377.30, 377.40*

Action by heirs or devisees without joining personal representative. *Prob. Code § 9654*

[17] Decisions

[a] Allegations

Necessity to plead facts showing equitable right to relief, when equity demands plaintiff take preliminary step. *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 120, 208 P.2d 367*

Pleading requirements when suit involves riparian water rights. *Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828-829, 306 P.2d 807*

Seller suing conditional purchaser after default is required to refund excess of amount paid toward price over "benefit

of his bargain," but is not required to refund any part of amount paid if that amount is less than benefit of thebargain. *Baffa v. Johnson (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 36, 39, 216 P.2d 13* ; *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 120-121, 208 P.2d 367*

Plaintiff claiming equitable interest is entitled to sue defendant who also claims equitable interest, to determine whose claim is superior. *Tuffree v. Polhemus (1895) 108 Cal. 670, 676-677, 41 P. 806* ; *O'Keefe v. Aptos Land & Water Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 772, 781-782, 286 P.2d 417*

Necessity to allege, in action involving real property, that plaintiff or predecessor was seized or possessed of property within five years before action begun. *Safwenberg v. Marquez (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 301, 311, 123 Cal. Rptr. 405*

Showing of legal title shows seisin, even if someone else is in possession. *Schoenfeld v. Pritzker (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 117, 121, 64 Cal. Rptr. 592*

In action by surviving joint tenant to quiet title to certain moneys, complaint need not allege how joint tenancy was created. *Daniels v. Harney (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 400, 401, 244 P.2d 773*

In action to quiet title to corporate stock, it was sufficient to allege ownership in plaintiffs, and was not necessary to make allegations relating to chain of title through which plaintiffs derived ownership. *Hardison v. Corbett (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 310, 320-321, 130 P.2d 226*

Necessity to identify claimed interest; complaint is demurrable if alleging only "some interest." *Peck v. Martinez (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 855, 855-856, 117 P.2d 7*

Description of property is required to be specific. *Rapaport v. Forer (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 271, 275, 66 P.2d 1242* (description of money as "funds on deposit" insufficient)

Plaintiff is entitled to judgment quieting title to whatever interest he or she proves. *Hurt v. Pico Inv. Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 106, 113-114, 15 P.2d 203*

[b] Limitation of Action

Action by plaintiff in possession is not subject to limitation; action by plaintiff out of possession is subject to some statute of limitation, depending on underlying theory of relief. *Muktarian v. Barmby (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 558, 560-561, 47 Cal. Rptr. 483, 407 P.2d 659*

Action by plaintiff in possession to invalidate tax collector's deed is subject to one-year limitation under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 175* and *3521*. *Sears v. County of Calaveras (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 518, 521, 289 P.2d 425*

Application of statute of limitations in quiet title action depends on underlying theory of relief; when theory is based on fraud or mistake, *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* applies, with period beginning when plaintiff discovers or should have discovered facts constituting fraud or mistake. *Ankoanda v. Walker-Smith (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 610, 612, 615, 52*

Cal. Rptr. 2d 39

[c] Parties

Distinction between standing and capacity to sue. *Parker v. Bowron (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 344, 351, 254 P.2d 6*

Statutes permitting suit against all unknown persons with constructive service by publication or posting is constitutional. *Title & Document Restoration Co. v. Kerrigan (1906) 150 Cal. 289, 307-314, 88 P. 356*

Vendor of real property is entitled to bring quiet title action even though no longer owner in order to perform warranty that title free from encumbrances. *Mitchell v. American Reserve Ins. Co. (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 220, 224, 167 Cal. Rptr. 760 , disapproved on other grounds in Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 36-39, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931*

State or state agency is subject to suit in quiet title action unless statute specifically gives immunity. *Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999-1000, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918*

Personal representative of decedent's estate is proper party when claim made by, on behalf of, or against heirs; personal representative is not entitled to bring quiet title action against heirs. *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538 , disapproved on other grounds in Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 930, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919*

Successors in interest of party are bound by judgment. *Lake Merced Golf & Country Club v. Ocean Shore R. Co. (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 421, 433, 23 Cal. Rptr. 881*

Heirs or devisees, or any one of them, are entitled to bring quiet title action under former Prob. Code § 581 (*now see Prob. Code § 9654*) without personal representative. *Bank of America v. Town of Atherton (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 268, 274, 140 P.2d 678*

Necessity to identify defendant, if not individual, as entity against which court's judgment can operate. *Tanner v. Best (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 442, 445, 104 P.2d 1084*

[d] Prayer

Judgment giving prohibitive relief against further assertion of adverse claim is proper. *Wolf v. Gall (1916) 174 Cal. 140, 145, 162 P. 115*

[18] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 613-629 (4th ed. 1997)

[19] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to an action based on adverse possession, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession*

For discussion and forms relating to lis pendens, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*

For discussion and forms relating to joinder and intervention, see Ch. 395, *Parties*

For discussion and forms relating to an action to invalidate a tax collector's deed, see Ch. 540, *Taxes and Assessments*

For discussion and forms relating to an action involving water rights, see Ch. 575, *Waters*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.81

§ 482.81 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--By Purchaser of Tax-Defaulted Property Sold at Tax Sale [Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020]--By Purchaser of Tax-Defaulted Property Sold at Tax Sale [Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*], Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
[The State of California;]	)	COMPLAINT TO QUIET TITLE
_____[*name(s) of known defendant(s)*] [; the heirs and devisees of _____(*name*), deceased] [; _____ (*name of personal representative*), as _____ (*description, e.g.,* Executor *or* Administrator (With Will Annexed)) of the Estate of _____ (*name*), Deceased(, and as devisee)] [; _____ (*name*), believed to be deceased, and his/her heirs and devisees] [; the owner or any person claiming an interest in a special assessment lien _____ (*describe lien as described in bond or assessment records of district in which it was issued*); _____ (*name(s) of payee(s) as shown on bonds representing special assessment*); _____(*name*), as Treasurer of _____ (*governmental entity*) and collecting agent and trustee of funds collected for the unknown owners] [; and also all other persons unknown, claiming any right, title, estate, lien, or in-	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*]

terest in the real property described in the complaint,
adverse to Plaintiff's ownership or any cloud on
Plaintiff's title thereto] [; and DOES I-
_____, inclusive],
Defendants.

Plaintiff(s) alleges/allege:

[1. *Allege each plaintiff's identity and capacity, if necessary.*]

[2. *Allege identity and capacity of each known defendant, if necessary, including, the personal representative of a deceased person who appears to have an interest in the land or any claim or cloud on plaintiff's title (seeProb. Code § 573(a)), and/or a person who has an interest, claim, or cloud and who plaintiff believes to be deceased (see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3952).*]

[3. *If heirs and devisees of a defendant who is deceased, or believed to be deceased, are sued as defendants but their names are not known to plaintiff(s), allege:* (Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and thereon allege(s) that) _____ (*name*) is deceased; plaintiff(s) does/do not know the names of decedent's heirs and devisees(, except for _____ (*state names of any known heirs and devisees, who should be included above as named defendant(s)*)),) and therefore denominate(s) these defendants as "the heirs and devisees of _____ (*name of deceased person*), (believed to be) deceased," (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the successor defendants,") pursuant to *Section 3952 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*. These successor defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title; and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

[4. *If "all persons unknown" are named as defendants, allege:* The defendants herein named as "all other persons unknown, claiming any right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the real property described in the complaint, adverse to plaintiff's ownership or any cloud on plaintiff's title thereto" (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the unknown defendants") are unknown to plaintiff(s). These unknown defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the hereinafter-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title; and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

[5. *Fictitious defendants, if appropriate. See § 482.80, Paragraph 5.*]

[6. *If unknown persons owning or claiming an interest in a special assessment lien are made defendants, allege:* Plaintiff(s) does/do not know the names of the owner(s) and persons claiming an interest in the special assessment lien _____ (*describe assessment lien as it is described in the bond or assessment records of the district in which it was issued*), except _____ (*state names of any known owners of claimants, who should be included above as named defendant(s)*), who is/are named herein as defendant(s) because he/she/they is/are shown on the records of the Treasurer as the owner(s) and person(s) claiming an interest in the above-described special assessment lien, and therefore plaintiff(s) name(s) this/these unknown defendant(s) herein as "the owner or any person claiming an interest in a special assessment lien" described above. Defendant _____ (*name*) is the Treasurer of _____ (*government entity*) and is sued as collecting agent and trustee of the funds collected for unknown owners of the special assessment lien hereinafter referred to or for persons claiming an interest therein. The Treasurer's records show the following persons to be the owners thereof or claimants of an interest therein: _____ (*names*). (*If the special assessment is represented by a bond, add:* The payee on the bond

representing the special assessment is _____ (*name*). All of the persons named in this paragraph are made defendants pursuant to *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 3955*.)]

7. _____ [Plaintiff is the sole owner *or* Plaintiffs are the owners concurrently, as _____ (joint tenants *or* tenants in common *or* partners *or* husband and wife),] of _____ [*specify interest, e.g.,* the fee simple title] _____ [in *or* to] certain real property that was subject to a power of sale for nonpayment of taxes, namely: _____ [*set forth legal description of property and street address or common designation, if any*].

8. On _____ [*date*], a declaration of default with respect to the above-described real property was recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book/Reel _____, page/image _____. On or about _____[*date*], the above-described real property became subject to a power of sale for nonpayment of taxes. Plaintiff(s) [claim ownership through _____ (*name(s)*) who] purchased the property from the tax collector of _____ County, California. The deed from the tax collector to plaintiff(s) dated _____ was recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book/Reel _____, page/image _____. All subsequent taxes [and assessments] levied and payable have been paid.

[*Unless there are few enough adverse claims against title that they can all be described in Paragraph 10, continue with as many separate paragraphs as are necessary, describing one known adverse claim per paragraph, e.g., as appears below in Paragraph 9. Add allegations concerning defendants whose claims are of record and/or unknown, uncertain, or contingent, if appropriate; see § 482.80, Paragraphs 9 and/or 11.*]

9. The defendants named above in Paragraph 6, both those who are named and those who are unknown to plaintiff, claim a special assessment lien on the property that is the subject of this action for assessments claimed to be owing and unsatisfied arising from _____ [*describe bond or assessment as it is described in assessment records of district in which it was issued*].

[*CONTINUE*]

10. [*Claims against which plaintiff(s) seek(s) to have title quieted. See § 482.80, Paragraph 10.*]

11. [*Date on which plaintiff(s) seek(s) to quiet title. See § 482.80, Paragraph 11.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) prays/pray as follows:

1. For a judgment that plaintiff(s) is/are _____[*specify interest claimed, e.g.,* the owner(s) in fee simple] of the property and that defendant(s) has/have no interest in the property adverse to plaintiff(s);

[2. *If a determination of the interests of the owners of special assessment liens is sought:* For a determination of the interests of the holders of special assessment liens];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____[*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff(s)

[*Verification. See § 482.80.*]

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of complaint is for use by a person who has purchased tax-defaulted property, including purchases made from other taxing agencies under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3771-3841*, or a person claiming through him or her, to obtain a judgment quieting his or her title [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727, 3950*]. For further discussion, see the Introduction under Actions Respecting Tax-Defaulted Property, *above.* The process of tax default, redemption, and sale by the local tax collector is discussed in more detail in *Ch. 540, Taxes and Assessments, § 540.30* et seq.

[3] Defendants

[a] Who Must Be Named

The complaint must name as defendants all persons who are known to the plaintiff, or who appear of record, to have some interest in, or claim on, the land described in the complaint, if the interest or claim arose before the date of the tax deed, other than persons owning a special assessment, unless plaintiff seeks to determine the interest or claim of those persons [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3951*].

[b] State of California

The state may be made a party defendant if the property was sold prior to September 14, 1984 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3951*]. Under the system in effect since September 14, 1984, the state is not a party to the process of tax default, redemption, and sale. Under the transition rule, sales or deeds to the state that occurred before September 14, 1984, and with respect to which a right of redemption still existed on that date, were cancelled as of September 14, 1984; and the property was deemed to be tax-defaulted as of the date of its sale to the state and became subject to a power of sale for nonpayment of taxes [Stats. 1984, ch. 988, § 74(a)]. The local tax collector was required to record a release of equity or quitclaim deed for and on behalf of the state [Stats. 1984, ch. 988, § 74(b)].

[c] Unknown Claimants

The complaint may name as defendants persons unknown to the plaintiff who claim any right, interest, lien, or claim on the land, or any cloud onplaintiff's title thereto, arising before the date of the tax deed from the state [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3952*].

All unknown claimants, except two categories of unknown claimants [*see* the *discussions under §§ 482.81[3][e], [f]*], are required to be described in the complaint as follows: "Also all other persons unknown, claiming any right, title, estate, lien or interest in the real property described in the complaint, adverse to plaintiff's ownership or any cloud upon plaintiff's title thereto" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3953*].

[d] Personal Representative

Generally, an action does not abate by the death of a person, but may be maintained against his or her personal representative [*Prob. Code § 573(a)*; *see also § 482.80*].

[e] Heirs; Devisees; Persons Believed Dead

In any case in which any person who appears to have had an interest in the land described in the complaint, or any claim or cloud on the plaintiff's title, is known to be dead, the heirs and devisees of the person may be sued as "the heirs and devisees" of the person, naming him or her. If the person is only believed to be dead, and that belief is alleged in the complaint on information and belief, the heirs and devisees of the person may also be sued as "the heirs and devisees" of the person, naming him or her, provided that he or she is also named as a defendant [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3952*].

[f] Owners of Special Assessments

Owners of special assessments need not be made defendants unless the plaintiff seeks to determine the interests or claims of those persons [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3951*]. Generally a deed from a county tax collector will be subject to special assessment liens for (1) installments of special assessments that will become payable after the time of the sale; (2) special assessments of any taxing agency that did not consent to the sale; (3) special assessments that were not included in the amount necessary to redeem the tax-defaulted property; and (4) unpaid assessments under the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 [*Sts. & Hy. Code § 8500 et seq.*] and unpaid special taxes under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 [*Gov. Code § 53311 et seq.*] that are not satisfied as a result of the sale proceeds being applied pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4671 et seq.* or that are being collected through a foreclosure action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3712(a)-(c), (f), (h)*].

Unknown defendants owning or claiming an interest in a special assessment are required to be described in the complaint as follows: "The owner or any person claiming an interest in a special assessment lien _____ [*description of lien as described in bond or assessment records of district in which it was issued*]" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3954*].

Whenever unknown defendants owning or claiming an interest in special assessments are made defendants, the following persons are also required to be made defendants: (1) the payee, as shown by the bond representing the special assessment, if any; (2) the owner of the special assessment, or any person claiming an interest therein, as shown by the treasurer's records; and (3) the treasurer, as the collecting agent and trustee of the funds collected for the unknown owners of a special assessment or persons claiming an interest therein [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3955*]. A "treasurer" does not actually have to have the official title "Treasurer," but is any person who is the custodian of the funds collected on special assessments and/or who has the duty to cancel the assessments when they are paid [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3971*].

"Special assessment" means any assessment levied pursuant to any of the improvement acts of the state, whether or not represented by a bond, which are liens on a specific parcel of real property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3972*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint is required to allege that (1) tax-defaulted property was purchased at a tax sale, and (2) all subsequent taxes levied and payable have been paid (Paragraph 8) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*].

In other respects, the complaint is the same as in an ordinary action [*see § 482.80*].

[5] Verification

The complaint must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*].

[6] Notice of Pendency of Action

Within 10 days after the filing of the complaint, the plaintiff is required to file, or cause to be filed, in the office of the county recorder of the county where the property is situated, a notice of the pendency of the action as prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20* (lis pendens generally) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3956*]. For discussion of such notices generally, and suitable general forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[7] Process

[a] Form of Summons

The summons is required to contain, in addition to the matter prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20* (contents of summons generally), a description of theproperty and a statement of the object of the action. In the summons, unknown defendants are required to be designated as they are designated in the complaint [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3957*].

That form can be adapted as follows:

(1) If the block for listing defendants is not large enough to accommodate the designation of defendants as in the complaint, either a facing page containing a complete caption or a following page on which the caption is continued may be attached. Local rules should be consulted. If a facing page is used, it should reproduce the caption which appears on the complaint, but the title of the paper would, of course, be "SUMMONS" instead of "COMPLAINT." If a following page is used, it should be referred to in the block for listing defendants on the Judicial Council form. A reference such as "(continued on attached page)" should be satisfactory. The names of known defendants other than the first-listed name should not be indicated by the abbreviation "et al." because *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20* requires that the summons contain the "names of the parties to the action" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20*].

(2) Because the printed Judicial Council form of summons does not provide enough space for typing a description of the property and a statement of the object of the action, another page should be attached. It should conform to the requirements in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.100 et seq.* (format of papers generally). The description of the real property may be single-spaced [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.108(2)*]. On the face of the Judicial Council form, in the block containing the word "SUMMONS" there should appear a reference to the additional page, such as "WITH [or AND] ATTACHMENT." (It is also advisable to include such a reference when the designation of defendants is continued on an additional page.)

If the designation of defendants is continued on an additional page, it should be separate from the additional page containing the description of the property and the statement of the object of the action.

If any pages are attached to the Judicial Council form, the proof of service on the reverse side of that form should refer to the attachment. For example, the balance of the first line following "I served the summons" can be stricken and replaced with "with [or and] attachment and complaint as follows:". If more than one additional page is attached, the reference should be to "attachments."

[b] Posting of Summons

Within 30 days after the issuance of the summons, the plaintiff must post, or cause to be posted, in a conspicuous place on the property, a copy of the summons [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3958*].

[c] Service of Summons

All known defendants are required to be served in the manner required by law for service of summons in a civil action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3959*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons in civil action)].

[d] Service by Publication on Unknown Defendants

All unknown defendants must be served by publication as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*, but it must appear by affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) that the plaintiff used reasonable diligence to ascertain the identities of unknown defendants, including persons sued as "heirs and devisees" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3960*]. As a condition of establishing that the party to be served pursuant to publication under *Code Civ. Proc. §*

415.50 cannot with reasonable diligence be served in another manner, the court may not require that a search be conducted of public databases where access by a registered process server to residential addresses is prohibited by law or by published policy of the agency providing the database. These databases include, but are not limited to, voter registration rolls and records of the Department of Motor Vehicles [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(e)*].

All unknown defendants served by publication must have the same rights as are provided by law for other defendants on whom personal service or service by publication is made. The action must proceed against the unknown defendants in the same manner as against the other defendants who are served personally or by publication. Regardless of any legal disability, any unknown defendant who has been served, and anyone claiming under him or her, who has or claims to have any right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property, or cloud on the title thereto, or who owns or claims to own an interest in a special assessment lien adverse to the plaintiff when the action is begun, must be concluded by a judgment in the action as if the action were brought against, and personal service were made on, that person by his or her name. Service must be deemed complete on the completion of the publication [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3961*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3972* ("special assessment" defined)].

[e] When County Is Defendant

If the county is named as a defendant, service of process must be made on the tax collector of the county in which the property is situated [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 160*].

[8] Defaults

No judgment establishing the rights of any of the defendants as to the property shall be rendered on the default of a defendant unless the court requires proof of the facts alleged [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3962*].

[9] Judgment

On the trial of the action, the court must determine the rights of all the parties [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3963*].

If the court orders a sale of the property or the partition of it, that must be done in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 872.010 et seq.* (governing partition actions), except that the proceeds of sale belonging to unknown special assessment owners, or persons claiming an interest in these special assessments, must be paid to the "treasurer," to be held by him or her as in like instances of collections by the treasurer of special assessments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3965*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3971* (defining "treasurer," and *discussed under § 482.81[3][f]*)].

If the right, title, interest, lien, or estate of a known or an unknown defendant established by the judgment is based on a special assessment or arises from a special assessment, the judgment must direct the treasurer to cancel the special assessments on his or her records [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3966*].

If the court determines that none of the defendants have any right, title, interest, lien, or estate in the property, the court shall render judgment for the plaintiff under the tax deed; and if any of the defendants claims to be the owner of, or to have an interest in, a special assessment, and the court determines the special assessment to be invalid or inferior to the plaintiff's title, the judgment must direct that the treasurer cancel the assessment on his or her records [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3967*].

The judgment, after becoming final, is conclusive against all of the persons named in the complaint who have been served, and against all unknown persons, and all heirs and devisees of any named defendant served as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3960* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3968*; *§ 482.81[7][d]*].

[10] Cancellation of Special Assessments

After the judgment becomes final, a certified copy of it must be delivered to the treasurer [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3971* (definition)]. On receipt of the copy, he or she must cause to be canceled the special assessment [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3972* (definition)] described in the judgment. The treasurer must, on his or her records, mark the special assessment as follows: "Canceled by judgment of court, superior court case number _____ [*number*]" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3969*].

[11] Cumulation of Remedies

The remedy provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950 et seq.* shall be construed as cumulative and not exclusive of any other remedy, form, or right of action, or proceeding now allowed by law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3970*].

[12] State Statutes

Lis pendens generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*

Contents of summons generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20*

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 160, 3959, 3960*

Partition generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 872.010 et seq.*

Purchaser of tax-defaulted property is entitled to bring quiet title action. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727, 3950*

Defendants; state is permissible defendant if property was sold prior to September 11, 1984. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727, 3951-3955*

Contents of complaint; verification is required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*

Unknown defendants; heirs and devisees; unknown owners of special assessment liens. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3952-3955*

Notice of pendency of action is required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3956*

Summons; additional contents required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3957*

Posting of summons is required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3958*

Conclusiveness of judgment on unknown defendants. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3961*

Default judgment without proof is prohibited. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3962*

Trial and judgment; partition or sale of property; cancellation of special assessments. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3963-3966*

Contents of judgment; conclusiveness on defendants. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3967, 3968*

Treasurer as required to cancel special assessment in appropriate case. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3969*

Remedy under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950 et seq.* is cumulative. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3970*

Definitions: "special assessment"; "treasurer." *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3971, 3972*

[13] California Rules of Court

Form of papers generally. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.100 et seq.*

Descriptions of real property may be single-spaced. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.108(2)*

[14] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to lis pendens, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*

For discussion and forms relating to partition, see Ch. 397, *Partition*

For discussion of service of summons, and forms of summons and proof of service, as well as forms for use in connection with publication of summons, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For a related form, see *§ 482.80*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.82

§ 482.82 Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030]--Disclaiming Any Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)]

[1] FORM Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030]--Disclaiming Any Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*names*],	)	ANSWER (Disclaimer of Interest)
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Defendant [_____ (*name, if there are several defendants*)], answering the complaint, disclaims any interest or estate in the property described in the complaint and prays that the action be dismissed as to him/her/it.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the defendant in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing answer and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged

on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of answer is for use by a defendant who disclaims any interest or estate in the property described in the complaint in a quiet title action. The defendant may either file an answer or suffer judgment to be taken against him, her, or it without filing an answer, and in either case, the plaintiff will thereby be precluded from recovering costs from that defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)*]. Dismissal of the action against any disclaiming defendant is proper [*Jeffords v. Young (1925) 197 Cal. 224, 226, 239 P. 1054]* .

[3] Verification

The answer must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(a)*].

[4] Cross Reference

For a related form, *see § 482.83*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.83

§ 482.83 Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030(a)]--By Defendant Claiming Interest

[1] FORM Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 761.030(a)]--By Defendant Claiming Interest

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*names*],	)	ANSWER
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Defendant [_____ (*name, if there are several defendants*)] answers the complaint as follows:

1. _____ [*Set forth any claim that defendant has to the property, e.g.*, Defendant is a contingent remainderman to the property under a declaration of trust made by _____ [*name*] on _____ [*date*] and recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book _____, page _____].

[2. _____ (*Set forth any facts tending to controvert such material allegations of the complaint as the defendant does not wish to be taken as true, e.g.*, Plaintiff did not take title to the property by the deed from _____(*name of grantor*) dated _____because _____ (*name of grantor*) was incompetent when he/she executed the deed.)]

[3. *Set forth affirmative defenses, as appropriate, e.g., limitation of action, laches, res judicata, another action pending, etc.; see Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions ; Ch. 345, Limitation of Actions ; Ch. 491, Res Judicata ; and other appropriate*

articles.]

WHEREFORE, defendant prays judgment as follows:

1. That plaintiff(s) take nothing by his/her/their complaint;

2. That defendant be awarded his/her costs herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 482.82.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of answer is for use by a defendant who claims an interest in the property adverse to that of the plaintiff. A defendant may seek a decree quieting title in the interest by a cross complaint. *§ 482.80* may be adapted for use as a cross complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.040*; *discussion under § 482.83[4]*]. In most situations, the defendant should seek to quiet title to his or her interest because such a judgment can quiet title against all named and unknown cross defendants [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.030*; *see § 482.24*].

[3] Allegations in Answer

The answer must set forth [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030*]:

(1) Any claim defendant has.

(2) Any facts tending to controvert any material allegations of the complaint that the defendant does not wish to be taken as true.

(3) A statement of any new matter constituting a defense.

It should be noted that the quiet title statutes require more in an answer than in an ordinary civil action. The defendant must set forth his or her own claim and must plead facts that controvert plaintiff's allegations. Denials of plaintiff's allegations are not sufficient.

[4] Cross Complaint

[a] Affirmative Relief

A defendant may, by cross complaint, seek affirmative relief in a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.040*]. If affirmative relief is sought, a cross complaint must be filed; affirmative relief may not be claimed in the answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(c)*]. The cross complaint is required to be a separate document [*Code Civ. Proc. § 428.40*]. The cross complainant may seek affirmative relief against the plaintiff or plaintiffs, against other defendants, or against third parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*; *see* Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*]. However, a defendant who claims an adverse interest does not have to assert any affirmative relief as against the plaintiff. A simple judgment in a quiet

title action in favor of the defendant, that the plaintiff take nothing by the complaint and that the defendant recover costs, operates as an estoppel on the plaintiff, determining title as between the parties, and protects the defendant against any further claim of the plaintiff as fully as would an affirmative judgment in the defendant's favor [*Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 830-831, 306 P.2d 807* ; *Warden v. Stoll (1930) 210 Cal. 374, 377, 291 P. 835* ; *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538]* .

[b] Allegations in Cross Complaint

A cross complaint to quiet title must contain the same allegations as a complaint to quiet title [*see § 482.80*]. If the defendant seeks a determination of title as of a date other than the date specified in the complaint, the cross complaint must include the date and a statement of the reason why a determination as of that date is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.040(b)*].

[5] Appearance by Unnamed Person With Interest in Property

Any person who has a claim to the property described in the complaint may appear in the proceeding. Whether or not the person is named as a defendant in the complaint, the person must appear as a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.050*]. The appearance by an unnamed defendant ordinarily will be made by filing a motion to intervene and then, with the court's permission, a complaint in intervenor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387*; *see* Ch. 395, *Parties*]. If a party wants to appear and file an answer without filing a complaint in intervenor, the statute appears to authorize a motion to appear by an unnamed defendant.

[6] Equitable Defenses

If the plaintiff's title is not defective and cannot be proved to be inferior but is subject to being defeated on an equitable ground (e.g., fraud, mistake, unclean hands, etc.), the defendant may assert his or her equitable defense if he or she supports it with appropriate factual allegations [*see, e.g., Strong v. Strong (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 540, 546, 140 P.2d 386]* . Although the plaintiff is precluded from asserting, in a quiet title action, an equitable interest adverse to the defendant's legal title [*see* the discussion in the Introduction under Asserting Equitable Interest Against Legal Title, *above*], the defendant may assert an equitable interest in defense against the plaintiff's legal title [*see, e.g., Baucum v. Le Baron (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 593, 595, 289 P.2d 266* ; *Wade v. Howe (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 435, 439, 38 P.2d 439]* .

When the defendant asserts an equitable defense, if the defense is good, he or she may be required to do equity as a condition of receiving a final judgment. For instance, if the defendant alleges and proves that the deed he or she gave to the plaintiff, and on which the plaintiff's complaint for quiet title is based, was intended to be a mortgage, the court may, and should, require the defendant to pay the underlying debt before the court renders judgment against the plaintiff [*see Bloom v. Bloom (1929) 207 Cal. 70, 72-73, 276 P. 568* ; *see also § 482.86*]. Therefore, when pleading an equitable defense, the defendant should allege that he or she has done, or offered to do, whatever equity demands that he or she do.

[7] Limitation of Action

Because there is no statute of limitations governing quiet title actions as such, it is ordinarily necessary to refer to the underlying theory of relief to determine which statute applies. When the plaintiff is in possession of the property, however, this analysis is unnecessary because no limitation applies. The reasoning is that the person in possession will not necessarily know of dormant adverse claims of persons not in possession, and even if he or she does know of a potential adverse claimant, he or she is not obliged to take any action until an adverse claim is asserted against him or her. However, the question of limitation notwithstanding, a person in possession runs the risk that laches will bar his or her right to relief if he or she delays bringing a lawsuit and thus prejudices the defendant [*Muktarian v. Barmby (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 558, 560-561, 47 Cal. Rptr. 483, 407 P.2d 659]* .

[8] Laches as Defense

It has been held that in a quiet title action concerning real property, laches is not a defense if the defendant "fails to demonstrate that he was in adverse possession of the contested property during the period of delay" [*Gerhard v. Stephens (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 864, 904, 69 Cal. Rptr. 612, 442 P.2d 692]* . As an example of the kind of case in which laches may be asserted successfully, see *Lundgren v. Lundgren (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 582, 54 Cal. Rptr. 30* .

[9] Propriety of Demurrer Based on Laches

A demurrer asserting laches could not be sustained unless the complaint shows on its face an unexplained, unreasonable delay and some prejudicial effect on the defendant. Even if the complaint showed such a defect, however, the court should not sustain a general demurrer but should proceed to a judgment (in favor of the defendant) so as to achieve the purpose of finally disposing of conflicting claims to the property [*Warren v. Atchison, T. & S.F. Ry. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 24, 36, 36 n. 4, 96 Cal. Rptr. 317]* .

[10] Verification

The answer and cross complaint must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.020, 761.030*].

[11] State Statutes

Procedure for intervention. *Code Civ. Proc. § 387*

Persons against whom cross complaint may be brought. *Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*

Content of answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030*

Content of cross complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.040*

[12] Decisions

Defendant is entitled to assert equitable defense, even against plaintiff's apparent legal title, if defense is specifically alleged. *Strong v. Strong (1943)22 Cal. 2d 540, 546, 140 P.2d 386* ; *Baucum v. Le Baron (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 593, 595, 289 P.2d 266* ; *Wade v. Howe (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 435, 439, 38 P.2d 439*

Action by plaintiff in possession is not subject to limitation. *Muktarian v. Barmby (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 558, 560-561, 47 Cal. Rptr. 483, 407 P.2d 659*

Defendant is entitled to assert laches in defense, if in adverse possession. *Gerhard v. Stephens (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 864, 904, 69 Cal. Rptr. 612, 442 P.2d 692* ; *Lundgren v. Lundgren (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 582, 54 Cal. Rptr. 30* (laches asserted successfully)

Demurrer based on laches is not sustainable unless defect appears on face of complaint; judgment finally disposing of conflicting claims (in defendant's favor) is better procedure than sustaining demurrer on basis of laches. *Warren v.*

Atchison, T. & S.F. Ry. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 24, 36, 36 n. 4, 96 Cal. Rptr. 317

Simple judgment in defendant's favor, that plaintiff take nothing and defendant recover costs, protects defendant against future claims by plaintiff as fully as would an affirmative judgment in defendant's favor. *Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 830-831, 306 P.2d 807* ; *Warden v. Stoll (1930) 210 Cal. 374, 377, 291 P. 835* ; *Jay v. Dollarhide (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1031, 84 Cal. Rptr. 538*

[13] Cross References

For discussion of various affirmative defenses generally and appropriate forms of alleging them, see Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions* ; and Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*

For discussion of answers generally and appropriate forms of denials and affirmative defenses, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

For alternative forms of captions of complaints and cross complaints, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion of cross complaints and appropriate forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion of demurrers generally and appropriate forms, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers, Motions for Nonsuit and Judgment*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.84

§ 482.84 Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 742]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 742]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
Plaintiff,	)	DER PERMITTING SURVEY
vs.	)	[Telephone Appearance]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To each _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] named above, and to the attorney of record for each such party:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order permitting entry on the property described in the complaint for the purpose of making a survey or surveys and other measurements

for use in this action. The motion will be made on the ground that _____ [*specify legal grounds, e.g.,* without a survey fixing the eastern boundary of the parcel known as Smith's Addition No. 4, interpretation of the grant from John Smith to Richard and Mary Roe, dated March 19, 1989, will be impossible].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion, and with the accompanying form of order [*see § 482.85*], it may be used by either party, in an appropriate case, to gain entry to real property for the purpose of making a survey, when a survey is necessary for adjudication.

[3] Right to Judicial Order

In an action "for the recovery of real property" the court may make an order permitting a party "to enter upon the property and make survey and measurement thereof, and of any tunnels, shafts, or drifts therein, for the purpose of the action, even though entry for such purpose has to be made through other lands belonging to parties to the action" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 742*].

The above statute, apparently, has not been construed, applied, or even mentioned, in any appellate case. But it probably can be applied in any quiet title action that amounts to an action "for the recovery of real property," such as one where ownership of the present interest [*see Civ. Code § 689*] is at issue.

[4] Notice

The order may not be made except on noticed motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 742*]. For discussion of the usual procedure for making a noticed motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[5] Grounds

The order may not be made except for good cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 742*]. Any showing of the need, as a practical matter, for a survey or other measurements of the property would probably establish cause.

[6] Points and Authorities

A supporting memorandum must accompany the notice [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1114(a)* (motions for which memorandum is not required)]. It may be included on the same paper, after counsel's signature. A sufficient memorandum, in most cases, would need nothing more than the text of *Code Civ. Proc. § 742*.

For additional discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[7] State Statutes

Court, in action for recovery of real property, is empowered to make order, on noticed motion and for good cause, allowing party to make survey or measurements for purpose of action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 742*

[8] California Rules of Court

"Papers" includes all documents, except exhibits or copies of documents, offered in support of motion. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.3(2)*

Papers not to be filed accompanying motion. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.250(a)*

[9] Cross References

For discussion of motions and orders generally and appropriate forms, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.85

§ 482.85 Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 742, 743]

[1] FORM Order Permitting Party to Make Survey of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 742, 743]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER PERMITTING SURVEY
Plaintiff,	)	[Telephone Appearance]
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*name of moving party*] came on regularly for hearing this date. Plaintiff(s) appeared by _____ [*name*(*s*)], counsel; and defendant(s) appeared by _____ [*name*(*s*)], counsel.

On proof of good cause made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, Straight & Narrow, Inc., licensed surveyors, and persons under their direction, shall be permitted to enter on the property commonly known as Smith's Addition No. 4 to the City of Goldland in Mountain County, and adjacent parcels held of record by parties to this action, for the purpose of making a survey fixing the eastern boundary of Smith's Addition No. 4. This entry shall be permitted at such times,

and as often, as Straight & Narrow, Inc., deems necessary for making the survey as expeditiously as possible, but in no event shall the making of the survey be undertaken in a manner that unduly interferes with the present and customary uses of any party or other person in possession. On completion of the survey, Straight & Narrow, Inc., shall furnish to the court and to each party a map, conforming to current standards of land surveying, illustrating the survey. _____ (*Name of moving party*) shall make all necessary arrangements with Straight & Narrow, Inc., concerning the making of the survey and shall be liable, pending the judgment in this action, for all costs, charges, and fees attending the making of the survey].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is an order for use by the party who moves for an order permitting a survey of real property in connection with a quiet title action.

[3] Contents; Service

The order must describe the property--a metes and bounds description probably is not necessary--and a copy must be served on the owner or occupant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 743*].

[4] Liability for Injury

If any unnecessary injury is done to the property in the course of making the survey, the party who obtained the order permitting the survey is liable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 743*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.86

§ 482.86 Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 632] for Plaintiff--General Form

[1] FORM Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 632] for Plaintiff--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*], Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name(s) of known defendant(s)*]	)	NO. _____
	)	JUDGMENT
[*if person required to be named as defendant is dead, and plaintiff named the personal representative, add:*; _____(*name*), as _____ (*description, e.g.,* Executor *or* Administrator (With Will Annexed)) of the Estate of _____(*name*), Deceased(, and as devisee)] [*if person required to be named as defendant was believed by plaintiff to be dead but plaintiff did not know identity of personal representative, and/or if plaintiff included unknown successors of known decedent, add:*; the testate and intestate successors of _____ (*name of decedent*), _____ (deceased *or* believed to be deceased), and all persons claiming by, through, or under such person] [*if unknown defendants were included, add:*; and all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to Plaintiff's title, or any cloud on Plaintiff's title thereto],	)	
Defendant(s).		

_____

This cause came on regularly for trial on _____ [*date*], in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, the Honorable _____ [*name of judge*], Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Plaintiff(s) appeared by _____[*name(s)*], counsel; and defendant(s) appeared by _____ [*name(s)*], counsel. Oral and documentary evidence was presented by _____ [both *or* all] parties. The cause was argued and submitted for decision. A statement of decision _____ [has been made and filed *or* was not requested].

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ADJUDGED, ORDERED, AND DECREED that:

1. As of _____ [*date*], _____ [*name(s)*], plaintiff(s) herein, _____ [was the sole owner *or* were the owners concurrently, as _____ (joint tenants *or* tenants in common *or* partners *or* husband and wife),] of _____ [*specify interest, e.g.,* the title in fee simple] [in *or* to] the following _____ [real *or* personal] property, to wit: _____ [*set forth particular description, as in a deed (if real property) or a bill of sale (if personal property) or other document of title*].

[2. *If necessary, in case of concurrent ownership of unequal shares, state* : Such persons own undivided interests in these property as follows: _____ (*specify names and interests, e.g.,* John Smith, 29/167th undivided interest; Mary Jones, 111/167th undivided interest; Richard Roe, 27/167th undivided interest).]

[3. _____ (*If appropriate, identify encumbrances, e.g.,* The title is subject to the easement of Sunshine Power & Light Company shown at Book 587, page 56, of the records of the recorder of Mountain County).]

4. _____ [*Name(s)*], defendant(s) herein, owns/own _____ [*specify interest of defendant, if any, e.g.,* no right, title, estate, interest, or lien, whatever, in the property].

5. Plaintiff(s) do/does have and recover his/her/their costs from defendant(s).
Dated: _____.

_____[*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of judgment is for use by the plaintiff in a quiet title action. The form does not include any relief other than a declaration of the parties' interests in the property in question. Commonly, however, and particularly when the property in question is real property, additional relief is given for the sake of making the declarative part of the judgment effective. Injunctive relief is often given [*see Mansfield v. Kaiser (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 632, 637, 1 Cal. Rptr. 555]* .

The caption on the judgment should be complete, as on the complaint. The parties should not be identified by the abbreviation "et al." but should all be named, because the judgment is a "document of title" [*see Welch v. Kai (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 374, 381, 84 Cal. Rptr. 619* ; *see also Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828* (judgment described as "muniment of title and prima facie evidence of ownership")].

Regarding preparation and entry of judgment and service of notice of entry, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

This form of judgment may be adapted for use by a defendant who seeks and obtains affirmative relief.

[3] Scope of Judgment

[a] In General

A quiet title action is brought, as authorized by the statute, for the purpose of determining any adverse claim that may be asserted therein by a defendant to the property in controversy. This does not mean that the court is simply to ascertain, as against a plaintiff shown to have a legal interest, whether or not such defendant has *some interest*, but also that the court shall declare and define the interest held by the defendant, if any, so that the plaintiff may have a judgment finally adjudicating the extent of his or her own interest in the property in controversy. The object of the action is to finally settle and determine, as between the parties, all conflicting claims to the property in controversy, and to decree to each party such interest or estate therein as he or she may be entitled to [*Peterson v. Gibbs (1905) 147 Cal. 1, 5, 81 P. 121]* .

[b] When Any Interest Is Part of Decedent's Estate

When it appears that some party has an interest derived from an estate and the estate has not been administered, the court may not determine the nature and extent of that interest. Jurisdiction to make such a determination is given exclusively to the probate court [*Marsh v. Edelstein (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 132, 142-143, 88 Cal. Rptr. 26]* .

[c] Prohibitive Relief

A judgment including an injunction against the defendant's further assertion of any claim to the property adverse to the plaintiff's is proper [*Wolf v. Gall (1916) 174 Cal. 140, 145, 162 P. 115]* . Such an injunction may be included if the plaintiff requests it. An appropriate form is, "The defendant(s) is/are enjoined to make no further claim to said property adverse to plaintiff(s), by legal action or otherwise, on the basis of any fact or facts which were proved, or which might have been proved, in this action." The qualification is advisable in order not to enjoin the defendant from asserting in a future action some claim that arises after the judgment.

[4] Interlocutory (Conditional) Judgment

When the plaintiff is entitled to relief if he or she does some act that equity demands (e.g., restores money paid by the defendant toward the purchase price of the property), it is proper for the court to render an interlocutory judgment stating the conditions that must be fulfilled before a final judgment will be rendered. Similarly, when the plaintiff is entitled to relief on the basis of the defendant's failure to do some act which equity demands he or she be given a chance to do, the court should render an interlocutory judgment. If the conditions specified in the interlocutory judgment are subsequently fulfilled (in the one case) or remain unfulfilled (in the other case), a final judgment may be rendered in the plaintiff's favor, but otherwise, judgment should be rendered against the plaintiff [*see Bloom v. Bloom (1929) 207 Cal. 70, 73, 276 P. 568* ; *see also Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 87, 230 P.2d 816* ; *Perry v. West Coast Bond etc. Co. (1934) 136 Cal. App. 557, 559, 29 P.2d 279]* .

[5] Persons Bound by Judgment

The judgment is binding and conclusive on all of the following persons, regardless of any legal disability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.030*]:

- All persons known and unknown who were parties to the action and who have any claim to the property, whether present or future, vested or contingent, legal or equitable, several or undivided; and

- Except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045*, all persons who were not parties to the action and

who have any claim to the property that was not of record at the time the lis pendens was filed or, if none was filed, at the time the judgment was recorded. *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045* is discussed in *§ 482.24*.

[6] Statement of Decision

On request of any party appearing at trial, the court shall issue a statement of decision explaining the factual and legal basis for its decision regarding each principal controverted issue. The request is to be made within 10 days after the court announces a tentative decision or, if the trial has lasted less than one calendar day or less than eight hours over more than one day, prior to submission of the matter for decision. After a statement of decision is requested, any party may make proposals regarding its content. The statement will be in writing unless the parties agree otherwise; however, if trial is completed within one calendar day or within eight hours over more than one day, the statement of decision may be made orally on the record in the presence of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

[7] Description of Property and Interests

The judgment is a kind of document of title; therefore, it should describe the property and the owners' interests as precisely, and in the same manner, as does a deed, or a bill of sale, or any other document of title [*see Dalusio v. Boone (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 253, 260-262, 75 Cal. Rptr. 287]* . An impossible, wrong, or uncertain description, or no description at all, renders a quiet title judgment erroneous and void [*Newport v. Hatton (1924) 195 Cal. 132, 156, 231 P. 987* ; *Newman v. Cornelius (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 279, 284, 83 Cal. Rptr. 435]* . Some practitioners believe that typographical and other errors are minimized by using the legal description copied from a title insurance policy as an exhibit to the judgment.

[8] Costs

If the defendant disclaims in his or her answer any interest or estate in the property or suffers judgment to be taken against him or her without an answer, the plaintiff cannot recover costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(b)*]. The foregoing form of judgment is not appropriate for use in case of a default. Regarding default cases, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[9] Motion for New Trial or to Vacate Judgment

If any of certain irregularities exist [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657*], counsel may move for a new trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 659*], or if the judgment is based on incorrect or erroneous conclusions of law not consistent with, or supported by, findings of fact, counsel may move to vacate the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 663*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

[10] Appeal

Any party aggrieved by the judgment may appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 902*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , et seq.

A judgment that leaves any issue for later determination is an interlocutory judgment and, therefore, is generally not appealable, although certain types of interlocutory judgments (not relevant here) are appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(1), (8), (9), (11)*; *Pomper v. Superior Court (1923) 191 Cal. 494, 495-496, 216 P. 577]* .

[11] Recording of Judgment

If real property is involved, a certified copy of the judgment should be recorded in the county where the real property is

situated. From the time of filing with the recorder, the certified copy is notice to all persons of its contents, and any subsequent purchaser, mortgagee, or lienholder is charged with having the same notice that he or she would have had if the judgment were a duly recorded deed or other instrument of transfer [*Gov. Code § 27326*; *Civ. Code § 1213*].

[12] California Rules of Court

Statement of decision. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*

[13] Decisions

Judgment in quiet title action is document of title and prima facie evidence of ownership. *Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828*

Interlocutory judgment is appropriate when party entitled to judgment should do equity first. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 87, 230 P.2d 816* ; *Bloom v. Bloom (1929) 207 Cal. 70, 73, 276 P. 568* ; *Perry v. West Coast Bond etc. Co. (1934) 136 Cal. App. 557, 559, 29 P.2d 279*

Judgment leaving any issue for later determination is interlocutory and, therefore, not appealable. *Pomper v. Superior Court (1923) 191 Cal. 494, 495-496, 216 P. 577*

Judgment is conclusive not only on parties but also on persons claiming through them. *Estate of Clark (1923) 190 Cal. 354, 360, 212 P. 622* ; *Holman v. Toten (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 309, 314, 128 P.2d 808*

Judgment enjoining defendant from making further adverse claims to property is proper. *Wolf v. Gall (1916) 174 Cal. 140, 145, 162 P. 115*

Court is without jurisdiction to determine nature and extent of interest derived from estate still in administration, except to find that party has such interest as may be determined by probate decree. *Marsh v. Edelstein (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 132, 142-143, 88 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Caption of judgment is improper if merely referring to first-named party on each side and others as "et al." *Welch v. Kai (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 374, 381, 84 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Description of property in judgment must be same as description in deed or other document of title. *Dalusio v. Boone (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 253, 260-262, 75 Cal. Rptr. 287*

Injunctive relief is incidental relief in quiet title action. *Mansfield v. Kaiser (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 632, 637, 1 Cal. Rptr. 555*

[14] Cross References

For discussion of, and forms relating to, appeal, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , et seq.

For discussion of default cases and appropriate forms for use in such a case, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*

For discussion of judgments generally and appropriate forms, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

For discussion and forms of motions for a new trial or to vacate a judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial*

For discussion and forms relating to statements of decision, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 482 QUIETING TITLE
PART V. FORMS

42-482 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 482.87

§ 482.87 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8] to Quiet Title Against United States of America [28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(f), 2409a]

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8] to Quiet Title Against United States of America [28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(f), 2409a]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
_____ District of California
[_____ Division]

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	No. _____
Defendant.	)	COMPLAINT
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. This is an action under *Section 2409a of Title 28 of the United States Code* for adjudication of a disputed title to real property in which the United States claims an interest, other than a security interest or water rights. Jurisdiction is based on *Section 1346(f) of Title 28 of the United States Code*.

2. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner _____ [*specify ownership, e.g.*, in fee simple of *or* as joint tenant of an undivided interest in *or* of a reversionary interest in *or the like*] that certain parcel of

real property [*if improved property, and if appropriate, add:* and all improvements situated thereon], located in _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____[*set forth metes and bounds or other satisfactory description*].

3. The circumstances under which plaintiff acquired the aforementioned interest are as follows: _____ [*set out chain of title, with names and dates and descriptions of interests transferred*].

4. The United States of America claims _____[*specify interest which government claims or might claim, e.g.,* a reversionary interest in the real property hereinabove described, pursuant to the Act of _____ (*specify date, e.g.,* July 1, 1862), _____ (*set forth citation to statutes*)].

5. Plaintiff first learned of the claim of the United States on _____, 19_____. Plaintiff could not have learned of the claim of the United States before _____ 19_____, because _____ [*specify*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That this court determine and adjudge that the United States has no interest adverse to the plaintiff's interest in the real property hereinabove described; and

2. That plaintiff is the owner _____ [*specify ownership asserted by plaintiff*].

_____[*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff
_____ [*address*]

[2] Source of Form

The foregoing form is based on the facts of *Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709* .

[3] Use of Form

The foregoing form of complaint is for use by any person claiming an interest in, and wishing an adjudication of title to, real property in California in which the United States claims an interest, other than a security interest [*see 28 U.S.C. § 2410*] or water rights [*see 43 U.S.C. § 666*]. A quiet title action against the United States in such a case is authorized by *28 U.S.C. § 2409a*.

A judgment for the plaintiff will not necessarily mean that the plaintiff may take possession of the property even if the plaintiff has a present interest [*see § 482.87[10]*].

Until the enactment of *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* in 1972, the federal government asserted sovereign immunity against being sued in quiet title actions generally. That section is a waiver of sovereign immunity and a consent to be sued in any quiet title action [*Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 710]* , although the section does not apply to or affect certain actions [*see 28 U.S.C. § 2409a(a)*; *see also* the References *§ 482.87[15]*].

When the United States has or claims a mortgage lien or any other lien with respect to real or personal property, a quiet title action is authorized by *28 U.S.C. § 2410*.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The United States district courts have exclusive jurisdiction of actions under *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* to quiet title [*28 U.S.C.*

§ 1346(f)].

The action must be brought in the district where the property is located, and if the property is located in two or more districts, the action may be brought in any of them [*28 U.S.C. § 1402*].

[5] Limitation

An action under *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* may be barred if it is not begun within 12 years after the date when the plaintiff, or the plaintiff's predecessor in interest, knew, or should have known, of the claim of the United States [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(f)*]. Thus it is possible that the plaintiff's right to sue may be foreclosed through no default on his or her part, because his or her predecessor in interest may have known of the government's claim many years earlier [*see, e.g., Gendron v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 402 F. Supp. 46, 47-48 , aff'd, 524 F.2d 1154 (1975)* (plaintiff's predecessor in interest knew of government's claim 75 years before plaintiff filed suit)].

Despite the fact that no quiet title action could be brought against the United States (except under *28 U.S.C. § 2410* where the government claimed only a security interest) before October 25, 1972, when *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* became law, the 12-year period of limitation did not begin on that date. If the limitation period had begun on that date, then until October 26, 1984, every person with a colorable claim of interest in real property adverse to the United States could sue to quiet title, regardless of how stale the claim was. But Congress rejected a proposal to make the waiver of immunity embodied in *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* fully retroactive (to the virtual beginning of the republic, if not earlier) in favor of the 12-year limitation period [*Hatter v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1975) 402 F. Supp. 1192, 1194]* .

The period begins to run on actual or constructive knowledge by the plaintiff, or a predecessor in interest of, any claim, or possible claim, of interest on the part of the government, whether or not the government's interest is to be characterized as "legal" or "merely equitable" [*Hatter v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1975) 402 F. Supp. 1192, 1194-1195]* .

[6] Parties

The United States "may be named as a party defendant" pursuant to *28 U.S.C. § 2409a(a),* but the United States will not necessarily be the only defendant. The government may claim only a partial interest in the real property. If the plaintiff and the government are not the only claimants, all other persons claiming an interest in the property should be joined as defendants, or as plaintiffs, depending on how the interests align [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 19* (necessary joinder of parties)]. When a person who should join as plaintiff refuses to do so, he or she may be made a defendant or, in proper cases, an involuntary plaintiff [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 19(a)*].

The title of the action in the complaint, but not in other pleadings, must contain the names of all parties [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 10(a)*].

[7] Allegations

[a] Jurisdiction

The plaintiff is required to state the grounds on which the court's jurisdiction depends [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)(1)*; for discussion and illustrative jurisdictional allegations, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*]. It is customary to make the jurisdictional allegation in the first paragraph.

[b] Nature of Plaintiff's Interest

The complaint must set forth with particularity, but in a "short and plain statement" [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)(1)*], the nature of the right, title, or interest which the plaintiff claims in the real property [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(c)*]. This allegation

will necessarily include a description of the property [*see Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 711]* . Paragraph 2 of this form illustrates a sufficient form of this allegation.

[c] Derivation of Plaintiff's Interest

The complaint must set forth with particularity, but in a "short and plain statement" [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)(1)*], the circumstances under which the plaintiff acquired the claimed right, title, or interest (Paragraph 3) [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(c)*]. The plaintiff's failure to set out this information is a defect in pleading which may be attacked by a motion for a more definite statement [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 12(e)*] or by a motion to dismiss [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 12(b)*; *Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 711]* .

The allegation must trace the plaintiff's chain of title. The evident purpose of this requirement, which is not imposed on the plaintiff in a state action in California, is to ease the government's burden in responding to quiet title complaints. The derivation of plaintiff's interest is a matter of evidence ordinarily, but the plaintiff in an action under *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* must plead his or her chain of title so that, if there is a gap, the government can obtain a prompt disposition by moving to dismiss [*see Gendron v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 402 F. Supp. 46, 47 , aff'd, 524 F.2d 1154 (1975)* (complaint, with exhibited deeds, revealed gap in plaintiff's chain of title; action dismissed); *Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 711* (evident purpose of requirement to plead chain of title)]. The government is an extensive landowner. This pleading requirement enables the government to avoid going to trial on quiet title complaints that lack merit.

[d] Nature of Government's Interest

The complaint must set forth with particularity, but in a "short and plain statement" [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)(1)*], the right, title, or interest claimedby the United States (Paragraph 4) [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(c)*]. It is not sufficient to allege that the government claims no right, title, or interest whatsoever even if in fact the plaintiff has received official assurance (e.g., from the Secretary of the Interior or his or her staff) that this is the case. Presumably there is some interest that the government might claim; otherwise, there is no reason to sue. The plaintiff is required to allege that the government claims the interest that it might claim, whether or not the plaintiff knows that the facts are otherwise [*Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 712* ; regarding the effect of the government's disclaimer of interest when filed in the action, *see § 482.87[9]*].

[e] Facts Negating Limitation of Action

The action is subject to a 12-year limitation period [*see 28 U.S.C. § 2409a(f)*; *see also* the discussion *§ 482.87[5]*]. On the basis of apparent legislative intent behind the limitation provision in *28 U.S.C. § 2409a(f)*, it has been held that the plaintiff must allege the date on which the plaintiff, or the plaintiff's predecessor in interest, knew, or should have known, of the claim of the United States [*Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 713]* . This allegation may be contained in the paragraph alleging the plaintiff's chain of title [*see, e.g., Gendron v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 402 F. Supp. 46, 48 , aff'd, 524 F.2d 1154 (1975)]* . If, in complying with the pleading requirements, the plaintiff is forced to reveal in the complaint that the action is apparently barred because either the plaintiff or a predecessor in interest knew, or should have known, of the government's claim more than 12 years before the action was begun, the plaintiff will be obliged to allege facts negating the limitation, if he or she can (Paragraph 5).

[8] Prayer; Signature; Verification

The complaint must contain a demand for judgment for the relief to which the plaintiff deems himself or herself entitled [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)(1)*]. The form of prayer in the foregoing complaint is the one customarily used.

The complaint must be signed by the plaintiff's attorney, or by the plaintiff if he or she is not represented by an attorney; and the signer's address must be stated. The signature of an attorney or party constitutes a certificate by him or her that [

Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(b)]:

- He or she has read the complaint;

- To the best of his or her knowledge, information, and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, it is warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;

- The factual contentions have, or are likely (after reasonable investigation) to have, evidentiary support; and

- It is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation.

If a court determines that a party has violated any of the provisions of *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(b)*, it may impose on the party, attorney, or law firm responsible for the violation sanctions limited to measures sufficient to deter the same or similar conduct, consisting of nonmonetary directives or penalties to be paid to the court [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(c)*].

Except when otherwise specifically provided by rule or statute, a complaint need not be verified [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*]. No rule or statute requires that a complaint under *28 U.S.C. § 2409a* be verified.

[9] Government's Disclaimer of Interest

If the government makes an extrajudicial disclaimer of interest in the real property, that fact is inconsequential [*§ 482.87[7][d]*].

If the United States disclaims all interest in the real property or any interest in it adverse to the plaintiff at any time prior to the actual commencement of the trial, and this disclaimer is confirmed by court order, the jurisdiction of the district court will cease unless it has jurisdiction of the civil action or suit on a ground other than and independent of the authority conferred by *28 U.S.C. § 1346(f)* [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(d)*]. *Section 1346(f)* gives the district courts exclusive jurisdiction of actions under *28 U.S.C. § 2409a*.

Because it has been held that the government's disclaimer before the action has been begun does not relieve the plaintiff of the burden of pleading the government's interest [*Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 712* ; *§ 482.87[7][d]*], it seems that the disclaimer referred to in *28 U.S.C. § 2409a(d)* must come not only at any time prior to the actual commencement of the trial but also after the commencement of the action. Moreover, if it is to be confirmed by order of the court, the disclaimer must necessarily be made in the action. The court would have no knowledge of an extrajudicial disclaimer.

[10] Government's Election to Retain Possession

The main objection to waiving sovereign immunity against being sued in a quiet title action was that if a plaintiff were successful, he or she might be able to dispossess the government and thereby interfere with the operation of the government. Therefore, *28 U.S.C. § 2409a(b)* provides that in a quiet title action, if the judgment is adverse to the United States, the government may elect to retain possession or control of the real property or any part of it on payment to the plaintiff of an amount that the district court in the same action determines is just compensation for this possession or control" [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(b)*; *see Buchler v. United States (E.D. Cal. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 709, 710-711]* .

[11] Adverse Possession

Nothing in Title *28 of the United States Code, Section 2409a*, authorizing quiet title actions generally against the United States, is to be construed as permitting suits against the United States based on adverse possession [*28 U.S.C. § 2409a(g)*]. It is a general rule that no person can gain title to property by possession adverse to the government.

[12] Lis Pendens

A notice of an action pending in any United States district court that concerns real property may be recorded in the office of the recorder of the county in which the property is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.5*], and the requirements of California lis pendens statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*] must be complied with in order to give constructive notice of the United States district court action as it relates to real property in California [*see* 28 U.S.C. § 1968 (notice of pendency of action of any United States district court action concerning real property as recordable under state statutes)]. For further discussion and appropriate forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[13] Costs

Except as otherwise specifically provided by statute, a judgment for costs (as enumerated in *28 U.S.C. § 1920*, but not including the fees and expenses of attorneys) may be awarded to the prevailing party in any civil action brought by or against the United States or any agency or official of the United States acting in his or her official capacity in any court having jurisdiction of the action. A judgment for costs when taxed against the United States must, in an amount established by statute, court rule, or order, be limited to reimbursing in whole or in part the prevailing party for the costs incurred by the party in the litigation [*28 U.S.C. § 2412(a)(1)*; *see 28 U.S.C. § 2412(a)(2)*]. In addition to awarding these costs, and unless expressly prohibited by statute, a court may award reasonable fees and expenses of attorneys to the prevailing party in any civil action brought by or against the United States or any agency or official of the United States acting in his or her official capacity in any court having jurisdiction of the action. The United States is liable for the fees and expenses to the same extent that any other party would be liable under the common law or under the terms of any statute that specifically provides for an award [*28 U.S.C. § 2412(b)*; *see 28 U.S.C. § 2412(c)-(f)*].

[14] Actions Unaffected by 28 U.S.C. § 2409a

Intervention by United States in any action in which United States claims tax lien under Internal Revenue Code. *I.R.C. § 7424*

Certain judicial proceedings involving property on which United States has tax lien under Internal Revenue Code. *I.R.C. § 7425*

Miscellaneous actions arising out of enforcement of tax laws (specifically, Internal Revenue Code). *I.R.C. § 7426*

Miscellaneous actions in which United States is sued. *28 U.S.C. § 1346*

Partition action in which United States is joint tenant. *28 U.S.C. § 1347*

Actions against United States in Court of Federal Claims. *28 U.S.C. § 1491*

Quiet title action in which United States claims only security interest. *28 U.S.C. § 2410*

Actions to adjudicate water rights in which United States has, or claims, an interest. *43 U.S.C. § 666*

[15] State Statutes

Notice of pendency of action in United States district court concerning real property in California as recordable in county where property situated. *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20*

[16] Cross References

For discussion of pleading jurisdiction and illustrative forms of jurisdictional allegations, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 483.syn

§ 483.syn Synopsis to Chapter 483: QUO WARRANTO

§ 483.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 483.02 Cross References

§§ 483.03-483.09 [Reserved]

§ 483.10 Governing Statutes and Regulations

§ 483.11 Definitions

[1] Relator

[2] Franchise

[3] Public Officer

[4] Usurpation of Franchise or Office

§ 483.12 Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

[1] Determine Right to Office or Franchise

[2] Parties Defendant

[3] Quo Warranto an Exclusive Remedy

§ 483.13 Distinguished From Mandate

§ 483.14 Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

§ 483.15 Jurisdiction

§ 483.16 Time to Commence Action

[1] Three Months to Attack Annexations

[2] Six Months to Attack Certain Acts

[3] Sixty Days to Attack Attempted Validation

[4] Where No Time Limit

§ 483.17 Joinder of Defendants

§ 483.18 Who May Bring Action

[1] In General

[2] On Complaint of Private Party as Relator

[a] Presented to Attorney General

[b] Attorney General's Discretion in Acting on Relator's Application

[3] On Attorney General's Own Information

[4] At Direction of Governor

[5] By Board of Supervisors or by Legislative Body of Municipal Corporation

[a] Regarding Franchise Within Jurisdiction of Board or Legislative Body

[b] Limitation

§ 483.19 Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

[1] Form and Contents of Application for Leave to Sue

[2] Service on Proposed Defendant

[3] Submission of Application to Attorney General

[4] Appearance by Proposed Defendant

[a] Statement of Facts

[b] Time to Appear

[5] Provisional Leave to Sue Where Urgency Shown

[6] Reply by Relator

[7] Undertaking as Condition of Issuance

[8] Issuance of Leave to Sue

[9] Approval of Complaint

[a] Filed With Leave to Sue

[b] Notice of Filing to Attorney General

§ 483.20 Attorney General Controls Prosecution of Action

[1] Withdrawal or Dismissal of Action

[2] Notices to Attorney General

§ 483.21 Remedying Usurpation of Public or Corporate Office

[1] Challenging Title to Office

[2] Incumbent's Salary Withheld Pending Outcome

[3] Abatement of Action

§ 483.22 Remedying Usurpation of Franchise by Person

[1] In General

[2] Statutes as Applicable to Public Corporations

[3] Remedy Against Public Corporation

[4] Validity of Annexation of Territory

[a] Determined by Compliance With Enabling Statute

[b] Time at Which Validity of Annexation Tested

[5] Completeness of Proceedings Required

§ 483.23 Remedying Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

[1] Unlawful Exercise of Privilege by Corporation

[2] Corp. Code § 1801 as Concurrent Remedy

§ 483.24 Judgment

§ 483.25 Effect of Judgment

[1] Exclusion of Usurper

[2] Costs and Fine Levied on Defendant

[3] Right to Assume Office

[a] Assumption of Office

[b] Damages Awarded

[4] Judgment Not Retroactive

§ 483.26 Appeal

[1] Who May Appeal

[2] When Appeal Moot

[3] No Stay of Enforcement Pending Appeal

§§ 483.27-483.39 [Reserved]

§ 483.40 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

§ 483.41 State Constitution

§ 483.42 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

[2] Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

[3] Distinguished From Mandate

[4] Effect of Judgment

[5] Joinder of Defendants

[6] Judgment

[7] Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

[8] Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

[9] Time to Commence Action

[10] Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

[11] Usurpation of Franchise by Person

[12] Usurpation of Public Office

[13] Who May Bring Action

§ 483.43 Administrative Regulations

§ 483.44 Decisions

[1] Appeal

[a] No Stay of Enforcement Pending Appeal

[b] When Appeal Moot

[c] Who May Appeal

[d] Attorney General as Controlling Prosecution of Action

[2] Definitions

[a] Franchise

[b] Public Officer

[c] Relator

[3] Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

[4] Distinguished From Mandate

[5] Effect of Judgment

[a] Cost; Fine

[b] Exclusion of Usurper

[c] Judgment as Not Retroactive

[d] Right to Assume Office

[i] Right to Salary

[ii] Damages Awarded

[6] Governing Statutes

[7] Jurisdiction

[8] Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

[9] Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

[10] Time to Commence Action

[a] Three Months to Attack Annexations

[b] Where No Time Limit

[11] Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

[a] What Constitutes Usurpation

[b] Corp. Code § 1801 as Concurrent Remedy

[12] Usurpation of Franchise by Person

[a] Completeness of Proceedings Required

[b] Remedy Against Public Corporation

[c] Statutes Applicable to Public Corporations

[d] Validity of Annexation of Territory

[i] Determining Validity

[ii] Time at Which Validity of Annexation Tested

[13] Usurpation of Public Office

[a] What Constitutes Usurpation

[b] Abatement of Action

[14] Who May Bring Action

[a] Board of Supervisors or Legislative Body of Municipal Corporation

[b] On Complaint of Private Party

[i] Attorney General's Discretion in Acting on Relator's Application

[ii] Attorney General Not Estopped by Relator's Actions

§ 483.45 Attorney General Opinions

§ 483.46 Law Reviews

§ 483.47 Text References

§§ 483.48-483.49 [Reserved]

§ 483.50 Relator's Checklist

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

[3] Preliminary Determinations

[4] Preparation of Application for Leave to Sue

[5] Service on Proposed Defendant

[6] Proof of Service

[7] Submission to Attorney General

[8] Provisional Leave to Sue Where Urgency Shown

[9] Relator's Reply to Showing by Proposed Defendant

[10] Relator's Undertaking

[11] Obtain Leave to Sue From Attorney General

[12] Conform Complaint to Attorney General's Directions

[13] File Complaint

[14] Inform Attorney General of Filing

[15] No Changes in Complaint Without Approval

[16] Notices to Attorney General

[17] Discovery and Trial

[18] Motions After Trial

[19] Appeal

§ 483.51 Defendant's Checklist

[1] Appearance by Proposed Defendant in Response to Application

§§ 483.52-483.69 [Reserved]

§ 483.70 Notice to Proposed Defendant [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)] for Use by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time for Response by Proposed Defendant

[4] Number of Copies

[5] Accompanying Papers

[6] Cross References

§ 483.71 Application for Leave to Sue [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2] in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803] by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Number of Copies

[4] Accompanying Papers

§ 483.72 Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Oust Usurping Public Officer--For Use Where Officer Holds Two Incompatible Offices

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Venue

[6] Parties

[7] No Statute of Limitations

[8] Sufficiency of Complaint

[9] Verification Required

[10] Number of Copies

[11] Cross References

§ 483.73 Allegations for Use Where Another Person Is Rightfully Entitled to Public Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 804]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Prayer to Include Restoration of Claimant

[4] Damages

§ 483.74 Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Annexation Proceedings

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Adaptation for Use by Municipality Under Code Civ. Proc. § 811

[4] Allegations

[5] Venue

[6] Statutes of Limitation

[7] Cross References

§ 483.75 Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Charter Amendment Proceedings

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 483.76 Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; Corp. Code § 1801; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Exclude Corporation From Wrongful Exercise of Franchise and to Forfeit Its Corporate Charter

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Parties Where Corporate Franchise Questioned

[4] Venue

[5] Cross References

§ 483.77 Statement of Facts [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)] by Relator in Support of Application for Leave to Sue in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Number of Copies

[4] Cross References

§ 483.78 Declaration of Personal Service of Papers in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(d), 5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Proof of Service Required

[4] Cross References

§ 483.79 Undertaking for Leave to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 810; 11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6, 28]

[1] FORM

[2] Source of Form

[3] Use of Form

§ 483.80 Judgment in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 805, 809]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART I. SCOPE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.01

§ 483.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the statutory action of quo warranto [*see 483.10* et seq.] and provides a Research Guide [*see 483.40* et seq.], Procedural Checklist [*see 483.50* et seq.], and forms for use by a private party in bringing an action in quo warranto.

The forms are:

- Notice of a pending quo warranto application [*see § 483.70*].
- Application to the Attorney General for leave to sue in quo warranto [*see § 483.71*].
- Complaint for use in ousting a usurping public officer [*see § 483.72*] with allegations for use when another is rightfully entitled to the usurped office [*see § 483.73*].
- Complaint for use in determining the validity of annexation proceedings by a municipality [*see § 483.74*].
- Complaint for use in determining the validity of municipal charter amendments [*see § 483.75*].
- Complaint for use in seeking the forfeiture of a corporation's charter for wrongful exercise of its franchise [*see § 483.76*].
- Statement of facts in support of an application to sue in quo warranto [*see § 483.77*].
- Declaration of personal service [*see § 483.78*].
- Undertaking for use when leave to sue in quo warranto has been granted by the Attorney General [*see § 483.79*].

- Judgment for use in quo warranto actions [*see § 483.80*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundariesGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsCharters

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART I. SCOPE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.02

§ 483.02 Cross References

Related chapters in this publication include:

- For discussion and forms relating to staying enforcement on judgment and commencing appeal, see Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal* , and Ch. 43, *Appeal: Stay of Proceedings*

- For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for use in winding up and dissolving corporations, see Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*

- For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms relating to seeking declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

- For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms relating to bringing an action to contest an election, see Ch. 243, *Elections*

- For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms for use in seeking writs of mandate and prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

- For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms for use in seeking a writ of certiorari, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipTermination & Winding UpGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART I. SCOPE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 483.03-483.09

[Reserved]

§§ 483.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.10

§ 483.10 Governing Statutes and Regulations

Quo warranto is a statutory civil action in California governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 803-811, 11* Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1-11, 28.1, and all of the pertinent procedural and practice provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.* [*People v. Richmond (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 107, 117, 296 P.2d 351* (annexation challenged in superior court as trial de novo and not mere review of prior decision by city council on that issue)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.11

§ 483.11 Definitions

[1] Relator

A relator is a private party who brings a quo warranto action in the name of the people or in the name of the Attorney General after securing the permission of the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*; *Brown v. Memorial Nat. Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 538, 329 P.2d 118* (implied consent of Attorney General to prosecution of cross complaint by private party)]. The action is said to be brought by relation of that party [*People v. Milk Producers Asso. (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 442, 212 P. 957* (proceeding brought on complaint of private person); *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089* (proceeding brought on complaint of bar association)].

A relator need not be entitled to a contested office in order to bring the action [*People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 242-243, 22 P. 1039]* .

[2] Franchise

A franchise is a special privilege to perform certain acts or exercise certain functions. It is conferred on a corporation or individual by a government duly empowered legally to grant the privilege. If the privilege is one that any individual may enjoy without a permit from the government or if it is a right which one individual may grant to another without approval of a government, then it is not a franchise [*City of Oakland v. Hogan (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 333, 346, 106 P.2d 987]* . For example, the right to practice law is in the nature of a franchise from the state [*People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089]* . The right to operate a public utility, such as a private wharfinger out of business on public lands [*City of Oakland v. Hogan (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 333, 358, 106 P.2d 987]* or the exclusive distribution of water within the territorial limits of a municipality [*San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 717, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753]* , are examples of franchises conferred by local governments.

[3] Public Officer

An individual holding a public office is a public officer. A public office is the right, authority, and duty created and

conferred by law by which, for a given period, an individual is invested with power to perform a public function for the public benefit. The term public office includes the positions of city attorney [*People ex rel. Chapman v. Rapsey (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 636, 640, 107 P.2d 388]* , clerk of the court [*Bennett v. Superior Court (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 841, 845, 281 P.2d 285]* , and police officer [*Estrada v. Indemnity Ins. Co. (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 129, 134-135, 322 P.2d 294]* . But a person exercising no independent powers conferred by the state or operating under the direct control and supervision of a local body is not considered a public officer [*Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 94, 251 P.2d 321* (party committeman held not public officer because performing duties and exercising powers for particular political party and not for government); *Main v. Claremont Unified School Dist. (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 189, 205, 326 P.2d 573* (city or district superintendent of schools held not public officer because under direct control of local school board)]. It is unclear if quo warranto may be brought against an "acting" officer appointed to fill the role of an ousted official temporarily [*Nicolopulos v. City of Lawndale (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1226, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420]* .

[4] Usurpation of Franchise or Office

The "usurpation of franchise or office" is defined as the "unjust intrusion on or exercise of any office, franchise, or liberty belonging to another" [Black's Law Dictionary]. It occurs for example, where a corporation exercises a power which it has no right to exercise [*People v. Rosenstein-Cohn Cigar Co. (1900) 131 Cal. 153, 157, 63 P. 163]* or where a person occupies a public office as a result of an invalid election *[27 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 249, 252 (1956)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.12

§ 483.12 Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

[1] Determine Right to Office or Franchise

A quo warranto action may be brought to determine the right of a defendant to exercise an office or franchise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 805*] and to exclude a usurper from the office or franchise usurped [*Code Civ. Proc. § 809*]. The remedy is addressed to preventing a continued exercise of an unlawfully asserted authority rather than to correcting what has already been done under that authority. For instance, a quo warranto action may be brought to forfeit a franchise held by a privately owned public utility but not to seek sanctions for failure of the utility to furnish pure or palatable water to its customers [*Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582]* .

[2] Parties Defendant

The Attorney-General may bring a quo warranto action, either upon his or her own information or upon the complaint of a private party, as follows [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*]:

- Against a person who usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercise any public office, either civil or military.

- Against a person who usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises any franchise.

- Against a corporation, either de jure or de facto, which usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or exercises a franchise.

[3] Quo Warranto an Exclusive Remedy

Quo warranto affords the exclusive remedy as to matters coming within its scope [*Wilson v. City of San Bernardino (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 603, 611, 9 Cal. Rptr. 431* ; *see Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469* (quo warranto is the exclusive remedy for trying title to public office)] in the absence of constitutional or statutory regulations providing otherwise [*Cooper v. Leslie Salt Co. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 627, 633, 75 Cal. Rptr. 766, 451 P.2d 406* ; *International Assn. of Firefighters v. City of Oakland (1985) 174 Cal. App.*

3d 687, 694, 220 Cal. Rptr. 256] . For example, the validity of an annexation could not be determined in action to recover taxes while a quo warranto action challenging the annexation was pending [*Southwest Exploration Co. v. County of Orange (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 549, 556, 283 P.2d 257* (not reaching question whether validity could be challenged in tax action if quo warranto action were not pending)].

A municipal corporation authorized to bring a quo warranto action without the approval of the attorney general may, however, bring an action for declaratory relief to determine the validity of the existence of another political subdivision [*San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753]* .

Corp. Code § 1801 makes available a remedy concurrent with the remedy provided by quo warranto [*Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . For discussion of when *Corp. Code § 1801* and quo warranto are both available, see the discussion *§ 483.23*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.13

§ 483.13 Distinguished From Mandate

Mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097*] may be brought in any court except a municipal court. It may be issued to compel the performance of an act which the law specifically enjoins such as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*]. For example, mandate to compel the performance of a legal duty is the proper remedy for attacking the validity of annexation proceedings prior to the completion of the proceedings [*Colton v. Rialto (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 174, 181-182, 40 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *Cothran v. Town Council (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 647, 650, 26 Cal. Rptr. 319* (mandate to compel termination of annexation proceedings)]. However, once annexation proceedings are complete, quo warranto is the only remedy by which their validity may be attacked [*Los Angeles County v. City Council (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 20, 26, 20 Cal. Rptr. 363* ; *People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423]* .

It should be observed, however, that a writ of mandate will issue only to enforce the performance of a clear legal duty and not to compel an action involving discretion [*Nider v. City Commission (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 14, 26, 97 P.2d 293]* . Thus, the Attorney General may be compelled to institute a quo warranto action by a writ of mandate where an abuse of discretion is shown in the Attorney General's refusal to bring the action on application of a relator [*Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29* (court of appeal holding that mandate proper to compel Attorney General to institute quo warranto action where abuse of discretion shown but finding no abuse of discretion in Attorney General's refusal of the application for leave to sue involved in the particular situation presented to the court); *see also International Assn. of Firefighters v. City of Oakland (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 687, 698, 220 Cal. Rptr. 256* (declaratory relief actions dismissed as quo warranto action is exclusive remedy; leave to file action presumed forthcoming, however if leave not extended by Attorney General, reasons for denial are judicially reviewable by mandamus)].

Mandate may also issue to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of an office to which he or she is entitled, and from which he or she is being unlawfully precluded by an inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*]. However, mandate may not be used to try title to an office [*Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 94,251 P.2d 321]* or to compel payment of a salary to a person out of office but rightfully entitled to it [*Nider v. City Com. of Fresno (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 14, 26, 97 P.2d 293]* . Nevertheless, title to public office may be determined incidentally to a mandate proceeding. Thus, it is proper to determine by way of

mandate whether the public office claimed by a person legally exists [*Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 93-94, 251 P.2d 321* (party committeeman not a public officer)] or whether a vacancy in an office exists [*Klose v. Superior Court (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 913, 918, 217 P.2d 97* (vacancy created when councilman became nonresident of district governed)]. In addition, quo warranto is the proper remedy to challenge title to a public office [*Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469]* .

For additional discussion of the timeliness of a quo warranto action, see the discussion in *§ 483.22[5]*. And for discussion, procedural checklists,and forms for use in bringing mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundaries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.14

§ 483.14 Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

Declaratory relief may be sought in an original superior court action or in a cross complaint in a pending superior court action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060 et seq.*]. The proceeding asks for a declaration of rights and duties with respect to a written instrument, property, or the respective interests of the party bringing the action and another in a written instrument or property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]. Declaratory relief may be prayed for alone or with other relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*] and is cumulative with any other forms of relief prayed for [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062*]. When invoked to remedy the abuse, misuse, or nonuse of a franchise, an action in quo warranto partakes of the essentials of a proceeding for declaratory relief [*Oakland v. Key Sys. (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 427, 441-442, 149 P.2d 195* (action in quo warranto by city port commission to determine right of defendant to exercise franchise for wharfing and docking on tideland area within territorial limits of municipality)]. However, quo warranto seeks the exclusion of the defendant from a wrongfully exercised office or franchise [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 809*] rather than a declaration of the respective rights of contesting parties to exercise the office or franchise [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]. For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms for use in bringing a proceeding for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.15

§ 483.15 Jurisdiction

Quo warranto falls into the residual category of causes of action within the original jurisdiction of the superior court [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 407, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582* (superior court's jurisdiction to cancel franchise)]. The superior court has jurisdiction in quo warranto as an unlimited civil case since jurisdiction in quo warranto has not been specifically included in the matters that may be classified as limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.16

§ 483.16 Time to Commence Action

[1] Three Months to Attack Annexations

An action to contest the validity of proceedings for the incorporation of a municipal corporation, the annexation of territory to a municipal corporation, or for the consolidation of municipal corporations must be brought within three months after the completion of the proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 does not refer specifically to quo warranto actions, the three-month limitation imposed by the statute has consistently been applied to quo warranto actions [*see 23 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 300, 304 (1954)* ; *People v. Los Angeles (1928) 93 Cal. App. 532, 536, 538, 269 P. 934* (quo warranto action to contest validity of annexation); *see People v. Town of Corte Madera (1952) 115 Cal. App. 2d 32, 37-38, 251 P.2d 988* (section 3491/2 not applicable to contest subsequent void proceedings which follow completed proceedings to annex same territory)].

[2] Six Months to Attack Certain Acts

An action to contest the validity of acts or proceedings taken under color of law to form, organize, incorporate, dissolve, consolidate, change organization or reorganize, or to change the territorial boundaries of, a city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district within any of the foregoing, must be brought within six months from the date of completion of the acts or proceedings contested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*].

If no action is commenced within six months to contest the acts or proceedings, they are held valid, legal, and incontestable. These code sections do not supercede any existing statute prescribing a shorter period of limitation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*].

[3] Sixty Days to Attack Attempted Validation

The legislative body of a city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district, annexed area, or zone within any of the foregoing, may seek to confirm, validate, and declare legally effective certain acts or proceedings undertaken by the entity under color of law provided the legislative body of the entity instructs its clerk or secretary to mail a notice to all owners of property within the entity, as their names and

addresses appear on the last equalized assessment roll or are known to the clerk or secretary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*]. The notices to property owners must include the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*]:

- The name of the entity.
- The date the entity, or zone or improvement district within the entity, was ordered formed or its territory changed by annexation or otherwise.
- The amount of bonds authorized, if any.
- A statement that there are 60 calendar days in which any property owner may file an action contesting the validity of the formation of the entity, improvement district, or zone, the change of boundaries by annexation or otherwise, or the validity of any bond authorization.
- Any additional information the legislative body of the entity deems pertinent.

The clerk or secretary mailing the notices must also make and file a certificate of mailing with the legislative body of the entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*].

Therefore, a property owner has 60 calendar days from the date the notices are mailed in which to contest the validity of the following acts or proceedings taken under color of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*]:

- The formation, organization, incorporation, or any change in the territorial boundaries of a city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district, annexed area, or zone within any of the foregoing; or
- The authorization, issuance, sale, or exchange of bonds of the entity or territory.

If no action is commenced by any property owner within the 60-day period to contest the acts or proceedings described, the formation of the entity, improvement district, zone, the change of boundaries by annexation or otherwise, or the bond authorization become valid and uncontestable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*].

[4] Where No Time Limit

Lapse of time is not a bar to bringing a quo warranto action to oust a usurping public officer. Although laches could bar relief, it is assumed that the Attorney General will not permit the institution of a quo warranto action where the claim is stale or the state has ceased to have a present interest in the claim [*People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 585, 158 P. 1036* (no staleness found in claim of ousted police captain where he asserts rights to office at all times and undertakes various legal proceedings to have title, salary, and position restored to him)]. Action may require the election of a new official, since it is unclear if quo warranto may be brought against an "acting" officer appointed to fill the role of an ousted official temporarily [*Nicolopulos v. City of Lawndale (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1226, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420]* . Moreover, lapse of time is not a bar in bringing a quo warranto action against a corporation illegally exercising a franchise. The continued wrongful exercise of the franchise is considered a continuously renewed usurpation on which a new cause of action arises each day [*People v. Jefferds (1899) 126 Cal. 296, 302, 58 P. 704]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundariesGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.17

§ 483.17 Joinder of Defendants

Where several persons claim to be entitled to the same office or franchise, an action in quo warranto may be brought against all of them in order to try their respective rights to the office or franchise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 808*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureParties Joinder General OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.18

§ 483.18 Who May Bring Action

[1] In General

A quo warranto action may be brought:

- By the Attorney General on the complaint of a private party as a relator [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].
- By the Attorney General on his or her own information [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*].
- By the Attorney General at the direction of the governor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*].
- By the board of supervisors of a county or city and county [*Code Civ. Proc. § 811*].
- By the legislative body of a municipal corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 811*].

[2] On Complaint of Private Party as Relator

[a] Presented to Attorney General

A proposed complaint and application for leave to sue may be presented to the Attorney General by a private party, called a relator [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1-2*]. For discussion of the procedural requirements for presenting a proposed complaint and application for leave to sue to the Attorney General, see the discussion in *§ 483.19*.

A relator has no right to sue if Attorney General refuses to act on the relator's application or takes a position contrary to the relator [*In re Veterans' Industries Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 925, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303]* .

When the Attorney General has reason to believe a franchise is being usurped and brings a quo warranto action against the alleged usurper, he or she is not estopped by the acts or conduct of the relator in other actions between the relator and the defendant [*People ex rel. Downey v. Downey County Water Dist. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 786, 803, 21 Cal.*

Rptr. 370 (contract between relator and defendant not an estoppel against Attorney General for public policy reasons)].

[b] Attorney General's Discretion in Acting on Relator's Application

The Attorney General has some discretion in passing on the complaints brought before him or her alleging a public wrong to be remedied by a quo warranto action [*People v. Milk Producers Ass'n (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 444, 212 P. 957]* . In acting on a relator's application, the Attorney General considers initially whether there exists a substantial question of law or fact that requires judicial resolution, and if so, whether the proposed quo warranto action would serve the overall public interest [83 Ops. Cal. Att'yGen. 63, 64, 69 (2000) (leave to sue denied after finding no substantial question of law or fact sufficient to require judicial resolution on issue whether defendant refused or neglected to timely file oath of office); *see, e.g.,* [*Campbell v. Mosk (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 640, 648, 17 Cal. Rptr. 584* (refusal of leave to sue proper where suit would involve three governmental agencies in expensive litigation, no legalprotests were filed at the appropriate time to object to the annexation in question, the bulk of voters in the annexed territory favored annexation, and the proposed relator's interest presented a private rather than public question)].

The Attorney General does not abuse his or her discretion by refusing to permit suit in quo warranto unless he or she acts in an arbitrary manner, denying without good cause a well-founded case presented by a relator. For instance, no abuse of discretion is found where the process of examining the relator's application is shown to have been thorough [*Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 172, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29* (letter from Attorney General refusing relator's application and indicating conclusions and giving reasons for them)]. However, where the abuse of discretion by the Attorney General in refusing leave to sue is extreme and clearly indefensible [*Lamb v. Webb (1907) 151 Cal. 451, 454, 91 P. 102, 91 P. 646]* , the Attorney General may be compelled to institute suit by a writ of mandate [*Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469]* instructing him or her to proceed in the name of the people [*Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

[3] On Attorney General's Own Information

An Attorney General may bring a quo warranto action on his or her own information and is required to bring the action whenever he or she has reason to believe the grounds for bringing it exist [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*]. However, it should be observed that the Attorney General rarely files a quo warranto action on his or her own information under this provision.

[4] At Direction of Governor

An Attorney General is required to bring a quo warranto action when directed to do so by the governor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*].

[5] By Board of Supervisors or by Legislative Body of Municipal Corporation

[a] Regarding Franchise Within Jurisdiction of Board or Legislative Body

A quo warranto action may be maintained by a board of supervisors or by the legislative body of a municipal corporation where the board or body has jurisdiction to grant or withhold the franchise alleged to be usurped [*Code Civ. Proc. § 811*; *see City of Oakland v. Hogan (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 333, 358, 106 P.2d 987* (where legislative body had jurisdiction to grant or withhold franchise to operate private wharf on public lands, legislative body could maintain quo warranto action against alleged usurpers of franchise)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 811* thus enables boards of supervisors and municipal corporations to initiate their own action without going through or waiting for the Attorney General to commence the action [*Olson v. Sacramento County (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 316, 326, 79 Cal. Rptr. 140]* .

[b] Limitation

Under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 811*, a board of supervisors or legislative body may bring quo warranto actions against persons usurping franchises but not against persons usurping public office [*San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1960) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundariesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.19

§ 483.19 Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

[1] Form and Contents of Application for Leave to Sue

The relator commences an action in quo warranto by preparing an application for leave to sue [for the form of application, *see § 483.71*]. In addition to the application itself, the application consists of the following:

- A verified proposed complaint prepared for the signatures of the Attorney General, a Deputy Attorney General, and the attorney for the relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*; for forms, *see §§ 483.72 -483.76*].

- A verified statement of facts [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*; for a forms, *see § 483.77*].

- A memorandum of points and authorities showing why the action should be brought in the name of the people and supporting the relator's contention that a public office or franchise is being usurped, intruded into, or unlawfully held or exercised by the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(b)*].

- A notice informing the proposed defendant that the relator is about to apply to the Attorney General for leave to sue in quo warranto and that he or she may show cause, if any, why leave to sue should not be granted in accordance with the relator's application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*; for a form, *see § 483.70*].

After service of these documents on the proposed defendant, the relator will add the proof of service [*see § 483.78*] to the application for leave to sue [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*].

[2] Service on Proposed Defendant

The relator must serve the application for leave to sue on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2(d)*].

[3] Submission of Application to Attorney General

The relator must file the application for leave to sue with the Attorney General within five days after service of the application on the proposeddefendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*]. The application submitted must include proof of service of the application [*see § 483.78*] on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*].

[4] Appearance by Proposed Defendant

[a] Statement of Facts

The proposed defendant may appear and show cause why leave to sue should not be granted by the Attorney General in accordance with the relator's application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].

The proposed defendant may file a verified statement of facts [*see § 483.77*] in response to that filed by the relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*] together with proof or admission of service [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 5*].

[b] Time to Appear

The proposed defendant is allowed 15 days, after service on him or her of the application, in which to appear and show cause where the service on the proposed defendant occurs in the county where the proceeding is brought. Where the service on the proposed defendant takes place outside the county in which the proceeding is brought, he or she is allowed 20 days in which to appear. A shorter time may be prescribed by the Attorney General in special cases or on a showing of good cause. In addition, an extension of time may be granted by (1) the Attorney General on a showing of good cause or (2) a stipulation between the relator and proposed defendant filed with the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

[5] Provisional Leave to Sue Where Urgency Shown

The Attorney General may issue leave to sue provisionally where the relator files an application for leave to sue [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*] stating the reasons therefor and an undertaking [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*] with approved sureties. Provisional leave to sue may issue only in special cases and on a sufficient showing of urgent necessity by the relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 10*]. For example, the Attorney General may find a special case to exist where it appears that it is necessary to preserve the status quo pending a decision on the application by the Attorney General. And the Attorney General may find urgent necessity where it appears that the statute of limitations may bar the filing of the complaint at a later time.

The relator must file the provisional leave to sue issued by the Attorney General with the complaint in quo warranto [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*]. However, the relator may take no action beyond filing the complaint and having summons issued until the Attorney General rules on the application for leave to sue. Furthermore, the defendant may appear before the Attorney General and show cause why leave to sue should not be granted. The Attorney General may then determine the relator's right to maintain and prosecute the action in quo warranto [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 10*].

[6] Reply by Relator

The relator may reply within 10 days to any showing by the proposed defendant why the application should not be granted. Further time may be granted on a showing of good cause or on the relator and proposed defendant filing a stipulation with the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 4*]. Proof or admission of service must accompany the relator's reply [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 5*].

[7] Undertaking as Condition of Issuance

When a quo warranto action is to be brought on the information or application of a relator, the Attorney General requires the relator to enter into an undertaking, with sureties to be approved by the Attorney General [*Code Civ. Proc.*

§ 810; *People v. Petroleum Rectifying Co. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 289, 290, 68 P.2d 984]* . It should be noted that sureties meeting the approval of the Attorney General are corporate sureties.

The regulations promulgated by the Attorney General require the relator to present an undertaking [*see § 483.79*] executed to the State of California in the sum of $500 within 10 days of receiving notice that the application for leave to sue is approved unless further time is granted [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*]. The undertaking must state that the relator or sureties will pay any judgment for costs or damages recovered against the plaintiff and all costs and expenses incurred in the prosecution of the quo warranto action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*; *see* 11 Cal. Code Reg § 28].

[8] Issuance of Leave to Sue

The Attorney General transmits leave to sue in the name of the people, in writing, to the relator on receipt and approval of the undertaking [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*].

[9] Approval of Complaint

[a] Filed With Leave to Sue

The attorney general may suggest or direct changes in or amendments to the proposed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*] submitted by the relator. The approved complaint [*see §§ 483.72 -483.76*] and leave to sue are filed simultaneously with the clerk of the court. Thereafter, the relator may not change, amend, or alter the complaint without the approval of the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*].

[b] Notice of Filing to Attorney General

The relator must immediately inform the Attorney General of (1) the date on which the complaint is filed and (2) the court number of the filed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.20

§ 483.20 Attorney General Controls Prosecution of Action

[1] Withdrawal or Dismissal of Action

Whether a quo warranto action is brought on the Attorney General's own information or on the complaint of a relator, the Attorney General has control of the action at all times [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601]* .

For this reason, the Attorney General may, at any and every stage of the quo warranto action, withdraw, discontinue, or dismiss the action as seems fit and proper to him or her and may, at his or her option, assume the management of the quo warranto action at any time [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 8*]. However, no statutory provision points out the exact manner in which the Attorney General's control over quo warranto actions is to be exercised. Likewise, no statutory provision prevents the Attorney General from acting with or through the relator [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 456, 275 P.2d 601* (motion for new trial as brought at direction of Attorney General even where notice of intention to move for new trial signed by attorney for relator)].

[2] Notices to Attorney General

The relator must notify the Attorney General without delay of every proceeding had, motion made, paper filed, or thing done with respect to a quo warranto action. Furthermore, the relator must promptly send the Attorney General a copy of every paper or document filed by any of the parties to the action, including the judgment. And, when the relator is served with any paper by the opposing party, the relator must forward an additional copy of that paper to the Attorney General at once [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.21

§ 483.21 Remedying Usurpation of Public or Corporate Office

[1] Challenging Title to Office

Quo warranto actions may be brought to remedy the usurpation of a public office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*] by challenging title to the office [*Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469]* .

The usurpation may be in the nature of one person holding two incompatible offices, thus creating a vacancy in one of them [*People ex rel. Chapman v. Rapsey (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 636, 644, 107 P.2d 388* (positions of municipal judge and city attorney held by one individual); *People v. Garrett (1925) 72 Cal. App. 452, 458, 237 P. 829* (justice of the peace named police judge in same jurisdiction)]. Such usurpation also may be in the nature of two persons holding certificates of election declaring them entitled to exercise the same office [*People v. Davidson (1905) 2 Cal. App. 100, 103, 83 P. 161]* .

In addition, usurpation may be in the nature of a person holding office on the board of directors of a private corporation as the result of an invalid election [*Guaranty Loan Co. v. Fontanel (1920) 183 Cal. 1, 8-9, 190 P. 177* (applied against directors of loan company); *Stesel v. Santa Ana R. Water Co. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 117, 124, 94 P.2d 1052* (applied against directors of private water company)].

[2] Incumbent's Salary Withheld Pending Outcome

When the title of an incumbent of a public office is contested, no warrant is thereafter drawn or paid for his or her salary until title to the office is finally determined [*Gov. Code § 1130*] unless he or she holds the certificate of election or commission and discharges the duties of the office [*Gov. Code § 1132*]. When an action is instituted to try title, the clerk of the court in which the action is pending certifies the facts to the officers whose duty it would otherwise be to draw the warrant or pay the salary [*Gov. Code § 1131*].

[3] Abatement of Action

A quo warranto action is abated where the defendant voluntarily surrenders the challenged office [*People v. Muehe*

(1931) 114 Cal. App. 739, 740, 300 P. 829] or is validly appointed to the office *[25 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 223, 224-225 (1955)* (leave to sue denied where second valid appointment of proposed defendant to seat on city council supercedes first invalid appointment)]. Ouster of the defendant from office thus becomes an unnecessary act unless the prosecution of the action is required for some purpose beyond the ouster of the defendant for the benefit of the plaintiff [*People v. Muehe (1931) 114 Cal. App. 739, 740, 300 P. 829* ; *25 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 223, 225 (1955)]* , such as determining another claimant's right to the office [*People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 586, 158 P. 1036]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersTerms in OfficeElectionsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.22

§ 483.22 Remedying Usurpation of Franchise by Person

[1] In General

Quo warranto actions may be brought to remedy the usurpation of a franchise by a person [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 803* (by or with consent of Attorney General), *811* (by board of supervisors or legislative body of municipal corporation)].

[2] Statutes as Applicable to Public Corporations

A municipal corporation is a "person" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 803 [20 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 93, 94 (1952)]* and, while *Code Civ. Proc. § 811* refers only to persons usurping a franchise, it is also applied against public corporations and governmental bodies [*San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716, 717, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753* (applied against irrigation district)].

[3] Remedy Against Public Corporation

A quo warranto action may be brought to challenge the validity of incorporation or to attack the regularity of organization of municipal or other public corporations, such as reclamation or irrigation districts [*Wilson v. City of San Bernardino (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 603, 611, 9 Cal. Rptr. 431]* and county water districts [*Alden v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 764, 768, 28 Cal. Rptr. 387]* . This is true whether their jurisdiction is de jure or de facto [*Bray v. Payne (1930) 210 Cal. 465, 469, 292 P. 478]* . Such an action may also be brought to challenge the validity of a county charter [*Santa Clara County v. Hayes Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 615, 618, 275 P.2d 456]* .

Quo Warranto is also, for example, a proper remedy to challenge county's consolidation of corrections department and probation office on grounds that corrections and probation are incompatible offices and it was improper to subordinate corrections to probation [*People ex rel. Deputy Sheriffs' Assn. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1471, 1476, 1491, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 322]* .

[4] Validity of Annexation of Territory

[a] Determined by Compliance With Enabling Statute

In annexing territory, a municipal or other public corporation is subject to the statute which authorizes the annexation. That statute constitutes the measure of power to be exercised by the municipality [*City of Port Hueneme v. City of Oxnard (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 385, 393, 341 P.2d 318]* . The annexation proceeding is subject to court interference in quo warranto for usurpation of a franchise only to the extent the attempted annexation goes beyond the enabling statute in a basic and fundamental respect [*Olson v. City of Hawthorne (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 51, 53, 45 Cal. Rptr. 48* (courts will interfere with annexation proceeding in case of fraudulent abuse of powers conferred by statute; cancellation of voters' registrations of residents so territory could be annexed as "uninhabited" found not fraudulent where voters relinquished registrations voluntarily and with full knowledge of effect of their act); *People v. Town of Corte Madera (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 726, 732, 218 P.2d 810* (contiguity requirement of annexation statute violated)] or amounts to a fraudulent abuse of the powers conferred by the enabling statute.

[b] Time at Which Validity of Annexation Tested

The validity of an act of annexation is determined as of the date it purportedly took place. For instance, where a water district merges with a city by operation of law, subsequent acts by the water district to annex territory outside the city limits are void from their inception for want of a legally existing entity with jurisdiction to effect an annexation [*People ex rel. Downey v. Downey County Water Dist. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 786, 802-803, 21 Cal. Rptr. 370]* .

[5] Completeness of Proceedings Required

Except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4* (60 days to challenge territorial change or bond authorization after date notice sent by public entity), a quo warranto action to challenge an annexation cannot be brought until the annexation proceedings are complete [*People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423]* and the annexing municipal corporation or district is exercising control over the territory allegedly annexed [*Amer. Distl. Co. v. City Council, Sausalito (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 660, 667, 213 P.2d 704* ; *City of Colton v. City of Rialto (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 174, 181-182, 40 Cal. Rptr. 766]* . Prior to the time at which proceedings are complete and the right to bring a quo warranto action matures, the proper remedy to test the validity of the proceedings is certiorari and the proper remedy to compel termination of the proceedings is mandate [*San Mateo County v. City Council (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 220, 221, 335 P.2d 1013* (proceeding in certiorari and mandate questioning legality of a city council's resolution giving notice of the proposed annexation of territory situated in another county)]. Likewise, a quo warranto action to challenge the validity of a charter is possible only after the charter is put into effect [*Santa Clara County v. Hayes Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 615, 618, 275 P.2d 456* ; *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 169, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundaries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.23

§ 483.23 Remedying Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

[1] Unlawful Exercise of Privilege by Corporation

A quo warranto action may be brought to remedy the usurpation of a franchise by a corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*]. A corporation usurps a franchise when:

- It exercises a privilege unlawful for it to exercise [*People v. Merchants Protective Corp. (1922) 189 Cal. 531, 539-540, 209 P. 363* (practice of law); *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089* (unlawful privilege exercised where corporationengages in practice of law by employing attorneys to provide legal services for its members and clients)].

- Performs acts either not authorized or forbidden to it [*People v. Milk Producers Ass'n (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 441, 212 P. 957* (nonprofit corporation operating for profit and violating statutes prohibiting trusts in restraint of trade)].

- Misuses and abandons its franchise [*People ex rel. Boole v. Northwestern P. R. Co. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 120, 122-123, 66 P.2d 697* (no cause of action shown for cancellation of franchise for nonuse and abandonment when complaint shows some services actually rendered)].

However, quo warranto is not a means by which censorship is imposed on a corporation for abuse of the franchise granted to it. For instance, a court will not forfeit an insurance company's franchise to underwrite automobile liability policies for having published advertisements on the subject of excessive jury verdicts in several national magazines [*People v. American Auto. Ins. Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 317, 326, 282 P.2d 559]* .

[2] Corp. Code § 1801 as Concurrent Remedy

The remedy in quo warranto is concurrent with that provided by *Corp. Code § 1801* [*Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 405, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582* ; *Brown v. Memorial Nat. Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 540, 329 P.2d 118]* . Under the provisions of *Corp. Code § 1801*, the Attorney General is authorized to bring an action for the involuntary dissolution of a domestic or purportedly domestic corporation which has seriously

offended against a provision of the statutes regulating corporations [*Corp. Code § 1801(a)(1)*], has fraudulently abused or usurped corporate privileges or powers [*Corp. Code § 1801(a)(2)*], has violated any provision of law by act or default that is a ground for forfeiture of corporate existence [*Corp. Code § 1801(a)(3)*; *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 405, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582]* , or has failed to pay taxes as required by the Bank and Corporation Tax Law to the Franchise Tax Board for five years [*Corp. Code § 1801(a)(4)*]. *Corp. Code § 1801* gives the corporation an opportunity to cure its derelictions by charter amendment or other corporate action [*Corp. Code § 1801(b)*; *Brown v. Memorial Nat'l Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 540, 329 P.2d 118]* before an action to dissolve the corporation is brought [*Corp. Code § 1801(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipInvoluntary DissolutionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoTax LawState & Local TaxesFranchise TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.24

§ 483.24 Judgment

Judgment [*see § 483.80*] may be rendered in every case on the right of the defendant to exercise an office or franchise. And, judgment may also be rendered on the right of the person alleged to be entitled to an office, as justice requires [*Code Civ. Proc. § 805*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.25

§ 483.25 Effect of Judgment

[1] Exclusion of Usurper

When a defendant, against whom a quo warranto action is brought, is adjudged guilty of usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding an office, franchise, or privilege, judgment is rendered to the effect that the defendant is excluded from the office, franchise, or privilege [*Code Civ. Proc. § 809*]. A judgment ousting or excluding a usurper is self-executing [*People v. West Side County Water Dist. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 228, 233, 246 P.2d 119]* and requires no process for its enforcement [*People v. Westmoreland (1933) 135 Cal. App. 517, 519, 27 P.2d 394]* . For instance, a judgment in quo warranto finding that a water district did not form as a result of failing to meet basic statutory requirements is fatal to the existence of the purported district without additional proceedings by the court [*People v. West Side County Water Dist. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 228, 233, 246 P.2d 119]* .

[2] Costs and Fine Levied on Defendant

The defendant must pay the costs of the action if found guilty of usurpation of an office or franchise. In addition, the court may, in its discretion, impose on the defendant a fine not exceeding $5,000. Although quo warranto is a civil action, the imposition of the fine permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 809* is clearly penal in nature and is not for the purpose of compensating the state or returning to the state anything belonging to it. For this reason the imposition of the fine rests solely within the discretion of the court and is not based on evidence of loss or damage [*People v. Sutter St. Ry. Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 545, 547, 62 P. 104]* . Thus, where usurpation of a franchise is shown to have been purposeful and willful, a fine may be imposed on the corporate usurper as a punishment [*People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 363, 244 P. 1089]* . And, where the usurpation of a public office is shown, the fine may be imposed on the defendant whether or not the relator is found rightfully entitled to the office [*People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 243, 22 P. 1039]* . When collected, the fine is paid into the treasury of the state [*Code Civ. Proc. § 809*].

[3] Right to Assume Office

[a] Assumption of Office

If judgment is rendered in favor of the right of a person alleged to be entitled to an office, that person is entitled to take

and execute the office after taking the oath of office and executing an official bond as required by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 806*] and is then entitled to draw his or her salary as an officer de jure [*see Bledsoe v. Colgan (1902) 138 Cal. 34, 36-37, 70 P. 924]* .

[b] Damages Awarded

If judgment is made in favor of the person alleged to be entitled to the office, he or she may recover the damages sustained as a result of the usurpation of office by the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 807*]. In the absence of a statute providing otherwise, the measure of damages recoverable by a party rightfully entitled to an office is the salary and fees payable to the usurper during his or her incumbency in the office [*Chubbuck v. Wilson (1907) 151 Cal. 162, 164, 90 P. 524]* . However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 807* does not authorize as the recovery of damages the amount of salary or compensation of which the rightfully entitled party was deprived when the defendant received that salary or compensation by virtue of holding a certificate of election or commission and exercising the office [*Chubbuck v. Wilson (1907) 151 Cal. 162, 168-169, 90 P. 524* (sheriff holding certificate of election and discharging duties of county sheriff protected by *Gov. Code § 1132* during pendency of action contesting title to office)].

[4] Judgment Not Retroactive

A judgment of exclusion is not retroactive. For instance, a judgment of ouster, or exclusion, has no legal effect on the exercise of a defendant municipal corporation's franchise prior to the entry of judgment [*Bray v. Payne (1930) 210 Cal. 465, 471, 292 P. 478* (court questioning consolidation as unable to rule on status of de facto municipal corporation to attempt consolidation)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.26

§ 483.26 Appeal

[1] Who May Appeal

The relator may appeal from an adverse judgment only after first securing the approval of the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 11*; *People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601]* . The approval may be informal, as where the Attorney General transmits a timely dated letter consenting to an appeal by the relator [*People ex rel. Bellflower v. Bellflower County Water Dist. (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 344, 347, 55 Cal. Rptr. 584]* .

[2] When Appeal Moot

An appeal by a defendant found guilty of usurping an office, and thus excluded from the office, becomes moot if that defendant resigns from the disputed office [*People v. Craig (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 615, 616-617, 72 P.2d 135* (appeal dismissed where associate justice of court of appeals resigns after judgment of ouster)].

[3] No Stay of Enforcement Pending Appeal

The perfecting of an appeal does not stay proceedings, in the absence of an order of the trial court providing otherwise or of a writ of supersedas, where a party to the proceeding is adjudged guilty of usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding a public office, civil or military, in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 917.8*; *Day v. Gunning (1899) 125 Cal. 527, 528-529, 58 P. 172* (applicable to public officer ousted by judgment in quo warranto action but not by judgment in election contest)]. Because the operation of a judgment ousting a usurping defendant is not stayed by an appeal, the relator, in qualifying for the office, may properly enter into the duties of the office during the pendency of the appeal [*People v. Campbell (1902) 138 Cal. 11, 18, 70 P. 918* (relator assuming office of superior court judge where appeal taken by intervener)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 483.27-483.39

[Reserved]

§§ 483.27[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.40

§ 483.40 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

For forms of memoranda for use in quo warranto proceedings, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 199, *Quo Warranto* (Matthew Bender)

For further discussion of quo warranto actions involving corporations, see Ballantine and Sterling,California Corporation Laws (4th ed.), Ch. 15, *Dissolution and Winding Up*, § 320.06

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.41

§ 483.41 State Constitution

Residual jurisdiction of superior court. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional Sources

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.42

§ 483.42 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

In absence of trial court's order or writ of supersedas, no stay of enforcement is permitted for party found guilty of usurpation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.8*

[2] Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

Quo warranto excludes defendant from wrongfully exercised office or franchise. *Code Civ. Proc. § 809*

Statutes governing declaratory relief, generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060 et seq.*

Declaratory relief seeks declaration of rights and duties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*

Declaratory relief is cumulative with any other relief prayed for. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3*

[3] Distinguished From Mandate

Statutes governing mandate, generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097*

Mandate compels act enjoined by law and resulting from office, trust, or station. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*

Mandate compels admission of party to use and enjoyment of office to which he or she entitled and precluded unlawfully. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*

[4] Effect of Judgment

Judgment in favor of person alleged to be entitled to office entitles that person to take office on taking oath and executing any required bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 806*

Judgment in favor of person alleged to be entitled to office entitles that person to recover damages sustained as result of usurpation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 807*

Defendant found guilty of usurpation is required to pay costs of action; court has discretion to impose fine not exceeding $5,000. *Code Civ. Proc. § 809*

Judgment excludes defendant found guilty of usurpation from office, franchise, or privilege. *Code Civ. Proc. § 809*

[5] Joinder of Defendants

Joinder of defendants is permitted where several persons claim to be entitled to same office or franchise. *Code Civ. Proc. § 808*

[6] Judgment

Judgment is rendered on right of defendant to exercise office or franchise and may be rendered on right of person alleged to be entitled to office. *Code Civ. Proc. § 805*

[7] Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

Parties against whom quo warranto may be brought; grounds for action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*

Quo warranto as action to determine right of defendant to exercise office or franchise. *Code Civ. Proc. § 805*

Quo warranto as action to exclude usurper from office or franchise usurped. *Code Civ. Proc. § 809*

[8] Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

Attorney General as requiring undertaking as condition of issuing leave to sue in quo warranto; contents of undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 810*

[9] Time to Commence Action

Three months in which to attack validity of annexations, incorporations, or consolidations of municipal corporations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2

Six months from completion of acts or proceedings under color of law to contest validity. *Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*

Acts or proceedings deemed valid after six months; six months as not superceding any other statute's imposition of shorter or longer period of limitation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*

Acts or proceedings deemed valid 60 days after notice to property owners; 60 days in which property owners may contest change in boundaries or bond authorization. *Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*

[10] Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

Quo warranto as brought to remedy usurpation of franchise by corporation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*

Grounds for dissolving corporation or forfeiting charter of corporation. *Corp. Code § 1801(a)*

Opportunity for corporation to cure its derelictions by charter amendment or other corporate action. *Corp. Code § 1801(b)*

[11] Usurpation of Franchise by Person

Quo warranto as brought to remedy usurpation of franchise by person. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 803, 811*

[12] Usurpation of Public Office

Quo warranto as brought to remedy usurpation of public office. *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*

When incumbent's title to office contested, no warrant of payment as issued until title determined. *Gov. Code § 1130*

Certification of fact of contest of title from clerk of court to officer whose duty is to draw warranto or pay salary. *Gov. Code § 1131*

Warrants of payment as issued to incumbent whose title contested where incumbent holds certificate of election or commission and exercises duties of office. *Gov. Code § 1132*

[13] Who May Bring Action

Who may bring action in quo warranto. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 803, 811*

Attorney General as bringing quo warranto action on own information where reason to believe grounds for bringing it exist. *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*

Attorney General as required to bring action at direction of governor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*

Quo warranto action as brought by board of supervisors or legislative body of municipal corporation against usurper of franchise. *Code Civ. Proc. § 811*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureParties Joinder General OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.43

§ 483.43 Administrative Regulations

Relator as private party bringing quo warranto action after securing permission of Attorney General. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*

Submission of application to Attorney General within five days after service on proposed defendant. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*

Relator as presenting Attorney General with proposed complaint and application for leave to sue in quo warranto. *11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1-2*

Application for leave to sue as served on proposed defendant. *11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2(d)*

Form and contents of application for leave to sue. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)-(c)*

Proposed defendant's appearance to show cause why leave to sue should not be granted. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*

Application as submitted to Attorney General required to include proof of service on proposed defendant. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*

Verified statement of facts by proposed defendant in response to relator's statement of facts. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*

Time in which proposed defendant may appear; shortening of time; extensions of time. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*

Time in which relator may reply to proposed defendant's showing. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 4*

Proof or admission of service as required. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 5*

Amount of undertaking; time in which to present to attorney general; contents of undertaking. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*

Leave to sue transmitted in writing to relator on receipt of undertaking. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*

Changes in proposed complaint at Attorney General's direction; complaint and leave to sue filed simultaneously; no changes in complaint without Attorney General's approval. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*

Attorney General's power to withdraw, discontinue, dismiss, or assume management of quo warranto action at any time. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 8*

Relator as required to inform Attorney General of filing of complaint. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*

Relator as required to notify Attorney General of all developments, including all papers served by or to relator. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*

When provisional leave to sue will issue. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 10*

Approval of Attorney General required for appeal by relator from adverse judgment. *11 Cal. Code Reg § 11*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.44

§ 483.44 Decisions

[1] Appeal

[a] No Stay of Enforcement Pending Appeal

Because no stay of appeal, relator as properly entering into duties of office on qualifying for office. *People v. Campbell (1902) 138 Cal. 11, 18, 70 P. 918*

No stay of appeal as to public officer ousted by judgment in quo warranto but stay of appeal permitted as to public officer in election contest. *Day v. Gunning (1899) 125 Cal. 527, 528-529, 58 P. 172*

[b] When Appeal Moot

Appeal by defendant found guilty of usurping public office as moot when defendant resigns from disputed office. *People v. Craig (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 615, 616-617, 72 P.2d 135*

[c] Who May Appeal

Approval of Attorney General required for appeal by relator from adverse judgment. *People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601*

Attorney General's approval as permitted to be informal, such as a timely dated letter to relator. *People ex rel. Bellflower v. Bellflower County Water Dist. (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 344, 347, 55 Cal. Rptr. 584*

[d] Attorney General as Controlling Prosecution of Action

Attorney General as having control of quo warranto action at all times. *People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal.*

App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601

No statutory provisions as pointing out manner in which Attorney General's control exercised or preventing Attorney General from acting through relator. *People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 456, 275 P.2d 601*

[2] Definitions

[a] Franchise

Right to operate public utility as a franchise. *San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 717, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753* (exclusive distribution of water within territorial limits of municipality)

Right to operate a public utility as a franchise. *City of Oakland v. Hogan (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 333, 358, 106 P.2d 987* (private wharfinger out of business on public lands)

Franchise as special privilege to perform certain functions conferred by government on person or corporation. *City of Oakland v. Hogan (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 333, 346, 106 P.2d 987*

Right to practice law as a franchise. *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089*

[b] Public Officer

Person as not a public officer if no exercise of independent powers conferred by state. *Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 94, 251 P.2d 321*

Public officer as conferred by law with right to perform public function for specified period of time for public benefit. *People ex rel. Chapman v. Rapsey (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 636, 640, 107 P.2d 388*

Person as not a public officer if under direct control and supervision of local body. *Main v. Claremont Unified School Dist. (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 189, 205, 326 P.2d 573*

Police officer as public officer. *Estrada v. Indemnity Ins. Co. (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 129, 134-135, 322 P.2d 294*

Clerk of court as public officer. *Bennett v. Superior Court (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 841, 845, 281 P.2d 285*

[c] Relator

Relator is not required to be person entitled to contested office. *People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 242-243, 22 P. 1039*

Relator as private party bringing quo warranto action after securing permission of *Attorney General. Brown v. Memorial Nat'l Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 538, 329 P.2d 118*

When action brought by relation of a party. *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089* ; *People v. Milk Producers Ass'n (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 442, 212 P. 957*

Usurpation of franchise as occurring where corporation exercises power it has no right to exercise. *People v. Rosenstein-Cohn Cigar Co. (1900) 131 Cal. 153, 157, 63 P. 163*

[3] Distinguished From Declaratory Relief

Action in quo warranto to remedy abuse, misuse, or nonuse of franchise as having essential of proceeding in declaratory relief. *Oakland v. Key Sys. (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 427, 441-442, 149 P.2d 195*

[4] Distinguished From Mandate

Mandate as incapable of trying title to office. *Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 94, 251 P.2d 321*

Title to public office as properly determined incidental to mandate proceeding. *Stout v. Democratic County Cent. Comm. (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 91, 93-94, 251 P.2d 321*

Challenge to title to public office as proper in quo warranto. *Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469*

Mandate issues only to enforce performance of clear legal duty and not to control action involving discretion. *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29* ; *Nider v. City Commission (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 14, 26, 97 P.2d 293*

Mandate as proper remedy to attack validity of annexation proceedings prior to completion. *City of Colton v. City of Rialto (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 174, 181-182, 40 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *Cothran v. Town Council (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 647, 650, 26 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Quo warranto as only proper remedy to attack completed annexation proceedings. *Los Angeles County v. City Council (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 20, 26, 20 Cal. Rptr. 363* ; *People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*

Whether vacancy exists in public office as properly determined in mandate. *Klose v. Superior Court (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 913, 918, 217 P.2d 97*

Mandate as incapable of compelling payment of salary to person wrongfully excluded from public office to which entitled. *Nider v. City Commission (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 14, 26, 97 P.2d 293*

[5] Effect of Judgment

[a] Cost; Fine

Fine authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 809* as penal in nature and not for purpose of compensating state or returning to state anything belonging to it. *People v. Sutter St. Ry. Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 545, 547, 62 P. 104*

Fine to be imposed on defendant as not dependent on whether or not relator found rightfully entitled to office. *People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 243, 22 P. 1039*

Corporation as fined under *Code Civ. Proc. § 809* when usurpation found to be purposeful and willful. *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 363, 244 P. 1089*

[b] Exclusion of Usurper

Judgment ousting or excluding defendant as self-executing. *People v. West Side County Water Dist. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 228, 233, 246 P.2d 119* ; *People v. Westmoreland (1933) 135 Cal. App. 517, 519, 27 P.2d 394*

[c] Judgment as Not Retroactive

Judgment of exclusion as not retroactive. *Bray v. Payne (1930) 210 Cal. 465, 471, 292 P. 478*

[d] Right to Assume Office

[i] Right to Salary

Once person entitled to office takes office, he or she as entitled to draw salary as officer de jure. *Bledsoe v. Colgan (1902) 138 Cal. 34, 36-37, 70 P. 924*

[ii] Damages Awarded

Measure of damages for person found rightfully entitled to office. *Chubbuck v. Wilson (1907) 151 Cal. 162, 164, 168-169, 90 P. 524*

[6] Governing Statutes

Quo warranto as civil action governed by pertinent procedural and practice provisions of *Code of Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.*). *People v. Richmond (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 107, 117, 296 P.2d 351*

[7] Jurisdiction

Quo warranto as falling within original jurisdiction of superior court. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 407, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582*

[8] Nature and Purpose of Quo Warranto

Declaratory relief actions brought by firefighters union and individuals as not maintainable to determine validity of local propositions adopted by city electorate that amended city charter, because exclusive method of attack on city charter amendments lies in quo warranto action that may only be brought by *Attorney General. International Assn. of Firefighters v. City of Oakland (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 687, 694-698, 220 Cal. Rptr. 256*

Remedy of quo warranto as addressed to preventing continued exercise of unlawfully asserted authority. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Quo warranto as exclusive remedy to test validity of existence of irrigation district in absence of constitutional or statutory regulations providing otherwise. *Cooper v. Leslie Salt Co. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 627, 633, 75 Cal. Rptr. 766, 451 P.2d 406*

Remedy provided by *Corp. Code § 1801* as concurrent with remedy provided by quo warranto. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 405, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Quo warranto an exclusive remedy as to matters within its scope. *Wilson v. City of San Bernardino (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 603, 611, 9 Cal. Rptr. 431*

[9] Procedure by Which Relator Brings Action

Attorney General as requiring undertaking as condition of issuing leave to sue in quo warranto. *People v. Petroleum Rectifying Co. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 289, 290, 68 P.2d 984*

[10] Time to Commence Action

[a] Three Months to Attack Annexations

Three-month limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 as inapplicable to contest of subsequent void proceedings which follow completed proceedings to annex same territory. *People v. Town of Corte Madera (1952) 115 Cal. App. 2d 32, 37-38, 251 P.2d 988*

[b] Where No Time Limit

Lapse of time as not a bar to bringing quo warranto action against corporation illegally exercising franchise. *People v. Jefferds (1899) 126 Cal. 296, 302, 58 P. 704*

Lapse of time as not a bar to bringing quo warranto action to oust usurping public officer. *People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 585, 158 P. 1036*

[11] Usurpation of Franchise by Corporation

[a] What Constitutes Usurpation

Quo warranto as not a means by which censorship imposed on corporation for abuse of franchise granted to it. *People v. American Auto. Ins. Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 317, 326, 282 P.2d 559*

Corporation usurps franchise when misusing and abandoning its franchise. *People v. Northwestern Pac. R.R. Co. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 120, 122-123, 66 P.2d 697*

Corporation usurps franchise when exercising privilege unlawful for it to exercise. *People v. California Protective Corp. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 354, 361, 244 P. 1089* (unauthorized practice of law)

Corporation usurps franchise when doing acts not authorized or forbidden to it. *People v. Milk Producers Ass'n (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 441, 212 P. 957* (violation of statutes prohibiting trusts in restraint of trade)

[b] Corp. Code § 1801 as Concurrent Remedy

Remedy provided by *Corp. Code § 1801* concurrent with remedy in quo warranto. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399,128 Cal. Rptr. 582* ; *Brown v. Memorial Nat. Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 540, 329 P.2d 118*

Grounds for action taken under *Corp. Code § 1801*. *Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 405, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Corp. Code § 1801 gives corporation an opportunity to cure its derelictions by charter amendment or other corporate action. *Brown v. Memorial Nat'l Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 540, 329 P.2d 118*

[12] Usurpation of Franchise by Person

[a] Completeness of Proceedings Required

Action to challenge validity of charter is possible only after charter put into effect. *Santa Clara County v. Hayes Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 615, 618, 275 P.2d 456* ; *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 169, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Action in quo warranto may not be brought until annexing municipality exercises control over territory alleged to be annexed. *Amer. Distl. Co. v. City Council, Sausalito (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 660, 667, 213 P.2d 704* ; *City of Colton v. City of Rialto (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 174, 181-182, 40 Cal. Rptr. 766*

Action in quo warranto can not be brought until annexation proceedings completed. *People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*

Prior to completion of proceedings, proper remedy to test validity of proceedings as certiorari and proper remedy to terminate proceedings as mandate. *San Mateo County v. City Council (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 220, 221, 335 P.2d 1013*

[b] Remedy Against Public Corporation

Quo warranto action as brought to challenge validity of county charter. *Santa Clara County v. Hayes Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 615, 618, 275 P.2d 456*

Quo warranto as applicable against public corporation whether its jurisdiction is de jure or de facto. *Bray v. Payne (1930) 210 Cal. 465, 469, 292 P. 478*

Quo warranto may be used to question legal existence of county water district. *Alden v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 764, 768, 28 Cal. Rptr. 387*

Quo warranto as applicable against county water districts. *Alden v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 764, 768, 28 Cal. Rptr. 387*

Quo warranto action as brought to challenge validity of incorporation or to attack regularity of organization of municipal or other public corporation. *Wilson v. City of San Bernardino (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 603, 611, 9 Cal. Rptr. 431*

[c] Statutes Applicable to Public Corporations

Code Civ. Proc. § 811 as applicable against public corporations and governmental bodies. *San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753*

[d] Validity of Annexation of Territory

[i] Determining Validity

Statute authorizing annexation of territory by municipality as measure of power to be exercised. *City of Port Hueneme v. City of Oxnard (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 385, 393, 341 P.2d 318*

Challenge to annexation of unincorporated territory to city as required to be made by quo warranto, or by action pursuant to validating statute, but not by mandamus. *Hills for Everyone v. Local Agency Formation Comm'n (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 461, 466, 164 Cal. Rptr. 420*

Annexation proceedings as subject to quo warranto action to extent annexation amounts to fraudulent abuse of powers conferred by enabling statute. *Olson v. City of Hawthorne (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 51, 53, 45 Cal. Rptr. 48*

Annexation proceedings as subject to quo warranto action to extent they go beyond enabling statute in basic and fundamental respect. *People v. Town of Corte Madera (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 726, 732, 218 P.2d 810*

[ii] Time at Which Validity of Annexation Tested

Validity of annexation as determined as of date it purportedly took place. *People ex rel. Downey v. Downey County Water Dist. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 786, 802-803, 21 Cal. Rptr. 370*

[13] Usurpation of Public Office

[a] What Constitutes Usurpation

Usurpation as occurring where one person holds two incompatible offices. *People ex rel. Chapman v. Rapsey (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 636, 644, 107 P.2d 388* ; *People v. Garrett (1925) 72 Cal. App. 452, 458, 237 P. 829*

Usurpation as occurring where persons hold offices on boards of directors of private corporations as result of invalid elections. *Guaranty Loan Co. v. Fontanel (1920) 183 Cal. 1, 8-9, 190 P. 177* ; *Stesel v. Santa Ana R. Water Co. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 117, 124, 94 P.2d 1052*

Quo warranto as brought to challenge title to public office. *Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469*

Usurpation as occuring where two persons hold certificates of election to same office. *People v. Davidson (1905) 2 Cal. App. 100, 103, 83 P. 161*

[b] Abatement of Action

Quo warranto action as abated by voluntary surrender of challenged office by defendant. *People v. Muehe (1931) 114 Cal. App. 739, 740, 300 P. 829*

Ouster of defendant as unnecessary unless some other purpose would be served. *People v. Muehe (1931) 114 Cal. App. 739, 740, 300 P. 829*

Action as permitted to determine another claimant's right to office. *People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 586,*

158 P. 1036

[14] Who May Bring Action

[a] Board of Supervisors or Legislative Body of Municipal Corporation

Code Civ. Proc. § 811 as enabling boards of supervisors and municipal corporations to initiate own actions without going through or waiting for *Attorney General. Olson v. Sacramento County (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 316, 326, 79 Cal. Rptr. 140*

Boards of supervisors and municipal corporations as permitted to bring quo warranto actions only against persons usurping franchises and not against persons usurping public offices. *San Ysidro Irrigation Dist. v. Superior Court (1960) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753*

[b] On Complaint of Private Party

[i] Attorney General's Discretion in Acting on Relator's Application

Abuse of discretion found where Attorney General's refusal of leave to sue extreme and clearly indefensible. *Lamb v. Webb (1907) 151 Cal. 451, 454, 91 P. 102, 91 P. 646*

Attorney General as compelled to institute suit where abuse of discretion shown. *Visnich v. Sacramento County Bd. of Education (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 684, 690, 112 Cal. Rptr. 469*

Attorney General compelled to sue in quo warranto by writ of mandate instructing him or her to do so. *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29*

No abuse of discretion by Attorney General unless he or she acts arbitrarily in denying relator's application. *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 172, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29*

In passing on application, Attorney General as determining whether public interest would be served by institution of suit. *Campbell v. Mosk (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 640, 648, 17 Cal. Rptr. 584*

Attorney General as having discretion in passing on complaints brought before him or her. *People v. Milk Producers Ass'n (1923) 60 Cal. App. 439, 444, 212 P. 957*

[ii] Attorney General Not Estopped by Relator's Actions

Attorney General as not estopped in bringing action by acts or conduct of relator in other actions between relator and alleged usurper. *People ex rel. Downey v. Downey County Water Dist. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 786, 803, 21 Cal. Rptr. 370*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal

GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundariesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.45

§ 483.45 Attorney General Opinions

Leave to sue denied as to question whether de facto annexation of an area by a water district after merger by district with water company previously serving area without approval of local county LAFCO, and without issuance of PUC certificate of public convenience and necessity violated state law because same issues have been raised in pending judicial and administrative proceedings and adequate remedy is available to challenge lack of certificate without starting a quo warranto proceeding. *80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 279 (1997)* (No. 97-801)

Leave to sue granted to test whether mayor forfeited office under *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 7*, by accepting two first-class upgraded tickets without payment therefor at time of receipt. *76 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 1, 4 (1993)*

Leave to sue granted to test right of individual to hold concurrently offices of chief of fire protection district, director of fire protection district, and city council member. *76 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 38, 44 (1993)*

Leave to sue granted to test right of individual to hold incompatible offices of school district trustee and community services district director. *75 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 112, 117 (1992)*

Leave to sue denied when no substantial issue of fact or law is presented as to defendant's compliance with residence requirement for holding position on county board of supervisors; action in quo warranto as not serving public interest. *75 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 287, 289, 290 (1992)*

Quo warranto as inappropriate remedy for testing validity of proposed statewide initiative. *75 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 70 (1992)*

Leave to sue denied because service on governmental board by attorney employed in local nonelected position does not violate doctrine of incompatible public offices. *74 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 86 (1991)*

Leave to sue denied because position in question was not a public office and therefore no substantial issue of law was presented as to whether that position was incompatible with membership on city council. *74 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 82*

(1991)

Leave to sue denied when resolution of dispute regarding public official's residence would not serve public interest. *72 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 15 (1989)*

Leave to sue denied when resolution of dispute regarding public official's residence would not serve public interest. *72 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 8 (1989)*

Leave to sue granted to resolve dispute between right to hold public office and right of the electorate to determine how their public officers shall be chosen. *72 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 1 (1989)*

Circumstances under which private party may sue in quo warranto. *67 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 151, 153-154 (1984)*

Attorney General's standards in passing on relator's application. *35 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 214, 216 (1960)*

Attorney general determines whether state of facts or questions of law exist to justify submission of matter to court in quo warranto action in passing on application for leave to sue. *35 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 214, 216 (1960)* ; *28 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 369, 373 (1956)* ; *22 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 113, 121 (1953)*

Quo warranto as proper remedy to test validity of incorporation once city has attained de facto existence. *28 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 369, 372 (1956)*

Usurpation of office occurs where person occupies public office as result of invalid election. *27 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 249, 252 (1956)*

Ouster of defendant as unnecessary unless some other purpose would be served. *25 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 223, 225 (1955)*

Quo warranto action is abated where defendant validly appointed to office. *25 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 223, 224-225 (1955)*

Validity of emergency ordinance in annexation proceeding as substantial question to be decided in quo warranto. *24 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 146, 151 (1954)*

Three-month limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 applies to quo warranto actions. *23 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 300, 304 (1954)*

Question of whether private corporation abused its franchise in publishing controversial advertisements influencing potential jurors as properly brought in quo warranto. *22 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 113, 121-122 (1953)*

Quo warranto as proper remedy to challenge validity of annexation proceedings. *20 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 93, 95 (1952)*

Municipal corporation is "person" within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*. *20 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 93, 94 (1952)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoGovernmentsLegislationInitiative & ReferendumGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsBoundaries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.46

§ 483.46 Law Reviews

Comment, "Quo Warranto to Enforce a Corporate Duty Not to Pollute the Environment," 1 Ecol. L.Q. 653 (1971)

Note, "Quo Warranto," *15 Hastings L.J. 222 (1963)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.47

§ 483.47 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 4, *Pleading*, § 139; Vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 7-10; Vol. 9, *Appeal*, § 255, 284 (4th ed., 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 483.48-483.49

[Reserved]

§§ 483.48[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.50

§ 483.50 Relator's Checklist

[1] Facts to Be Ascertained

NOTE:
The following checklist is for use by a relator in bringing an action in quo warranto. It is illustrative of procedures commonly used and is not intended to be exhaustive. Procedures not mentioned in this checklist may be required in a given action. A publication on quo warranto is available from the Attorney General's Office. Counsel may wish to obtain this publication for additional insight on the procedures to follow and the Attorney General's considerations in granting or refusing leave to sue in quo warranto.

NOTE:
Not all of the following facts will be ascertainable from the client in the initial interview. Subsequent interviews may be required, or it may be necessary to ascertain the facts from others, including the potential defendant, by use of discovery proceedings.

1. Facts concerning the relator.

a. Name, address, and telephone number of the relator.

b. Capacity of the relator, such as adult, trustee, conservator, guardian, executor, partnership, or domestic or foreign corporation.

c. Additional facts, as desired, related to relator's stability, financial solvency, employment status, prior residences, credit, banks, and personal references.

2. Facts concerning potential defendants.

a. Name, address, and telephone number of each potential defendant, including:.

(1) . A person usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding or exercising a public office, civil or military, in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*].

(2) A person usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding or exercising a franchise in California [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 803, 811*].

(3) A corporation, de jure or de facto, usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding or exercising a franchise in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 803*].

b. Capacity of each potential defendant, such as individual, partnership, municipal corporation, or private domestic or private foreign corporation.

3. Facts concerning the potential cause of action.

a. Office or franchise being usurped, intruded into, or unlawfully held or exercised.

b. Nature of usurpation:

(1) Whether an individual is holding a public office to which he or she is not entitled.

(2) Whether an individual is holding two incompatible offices.

(3) Whether a municipal corporation is purporting to annex territory by means of prohibited procedures.

(4) Whether a municipal corporation is attempting to alter its charter by means of invalid submission to the electorate.

(5) Whether a private corporation is acting in violation of its charter by doing acts prohibited to it.

(6) Whether individuals are claiming to act as a corporation which has no existence.

c. Name of the person, if any, rightfully entitled to hold the usurped office or franchise.

d. Damages, if any, sustained by the relator as a result of the usurpation.

e. Conduct by the defendant sufficient to justify a request that the court impose a fine.

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

Obtain copies of all documentary evidence suggested by the facts relating to the potential cause of action. Documents to be obtained might include the following:

1. Certificates of election or appointment in an action to try title to office.

2. Maps indicating purportedly annexed territory in an action against a municipal corporation.

3. Corporate charters or bylaws in an action against a corporation allegedly usurping its franchise.

[3] Preliminary Determinations

1. If an office is alleged to be usurped, whether the relator, or any other person, is rightfully entitled to the office.

2. If the action is to contest the validity of an annexation by a public entity, whether the complaint can be brought within the statutory period of limitation.

NOTE:

***Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 places a three-months' time limitation on all actions, including quo warranto, concerning the validity of annexation and consolidation proceedings. This section binds the State. It prohibits any contest of those proceedings after three months have elapsed after the filing in the office of the Secretary of State of the certified copy of the ordinance of the city to which the territory is annexed [*People v. Los Angeles (1928) 93 Cal. App. 532, 535-538, 269 P. 934]* .**

***Code Civ. Proc. § 349* 1/2 does not, however, permit a municipal corporation to annex territory within the boundaries of a second municipality, even though the latter does not contest the proceedings within the three-month period [*People v. Town of Corte Madera (1952) 115 Cal. App. 2d 32, 37-41, 251 P.2d 988]* .**

3. If the action is to contest the validity of other acts by a public entity, whether the complaint can be brought within the statutory period of limitation.

NOTE:

***Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1* provides a six-month limitation from the date of completion for the filing of an action to contest the validity of any acts or proceedings taken under color of law for the formation, organization, incorporation, dissolution, consolidation, change of organization or reorganization of, or for any change in the territorial boundaries of any city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation, or other public entity, or improvement district within any of the foregoing.**

***Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1* states that it does not amend or repeal any existing statute prescribing a shorter period of limitation.**

Since *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 preexisted *Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1* and prescribes a limitation of three months from the date of completion for the filing of an action concerning the validity of annexation and consolidation proceedings, it would appear that *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 would control in most situations in which quo warranto is available to contest municipal activity.

4. If the action is to contest the validity of other acts by a public entity giving notice to its property owners, whether the complaint can be brought within the statutory period of limitation.

NOTE:

***Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4* provides a 60-day limitation from the date notice is mailed to all property owners within an entity for the filing of an action by any of the property owners to contest the validity of the acts or proceedings taken under color**

of law to (1) form, organize, incorporate, or change the territorial boundaries of any city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district, annexed area, or zone within any of the foregoing, or (2) authorize, issue, sell, or exchange the bonds of the entity or territory [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*].

5. Whether another remedy, such as mandate, declaratory relief, or certiorari, would be more appropriate than quo warranto (*i.e.*, whether the right to sue in quo warranto has matured).

[4] Preparation of Application for Leave to Sue

1. Prepare proposed complaint by:

a. Reviewing essential allegations [*see §§ 483.72 -483.76*].

b. Drafting complaint.

c. Including places in the proposed complaint for the signature of the Attorney General, a Deputy Attorney General, and the attorney for the relator as attorneys for the plaintiff [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

d. Having the proposed complaint verified [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

2. Prepare a statement of facts by:

a. Drafting a statement of facts [*see § 483.77*] underlying the proposed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

NOTE:
The statement of facts may present a chronology of events giving rise to the cause of action in quo warranto and may be accompanied by relevant supporting exhibits.

b. Having the statement of facts verified [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

3. Draft a memorandum of points and authorities showing why the proposed action should be brought in the name of the people and supporting the contention of the relator that a public office or franchise is being usurped, intruded into, or unlawfully held or exercised by the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(b)*].

4. Draft a notice to the proposed defendant [*see § 483.70*] informing him or her or it of the following:

a. That the relator is about to apply to the Attorney General for leave to sue in quo warranto, and

b. That the proposed defendant may appear and show cause, if he or she or it has any, why leave to sue should not be granted in accordance with the relator's application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].

5. Prepare the application for leave to sue [*see § 483.71*].

6. Print originals and copies:

a. Original of each paper, except Notice to Proposed Defendant, to be submitted to the Attorney General

[*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*].

b. Original or originals of Notice to Proposed Defendant to be served on each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2(c)*].

c. Copies of each paper, except Notice to Proposed Defendant, for each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].

d. Copy of Notice to Proposed Defendant to submit to Attorney General.

e. Copy of proposed complaint to submit with the original to Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*].

f. Copy of each paper for office file.

g. Copy for each paper client, if desired.

h. Any additional copies desired.

[5] Service on Proposed Defendant

Serve the proposed defendant with [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*]:

1. A copy of the application for leave to sue.

2. A copy of the complaint.

3. . A copy of the statement of facts.

4. A copy of the memorandum of points and authorities.

5. The original notice to the proposed defendant.

[6] Proof of Service

Prepare proof of service [*see § 483.78*] of the application on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*].

[7] Submission to Attorney General

File the following with the Attorney General within five days after service of the application for leave to sue on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*]:

1. Original and one copy of the verified proposed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

2. A verified statement of facts supporting the proposed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

3. A memorandum of points and authorities [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(b)*].

4. A copy of the notice to the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].

5. Proof of service of the application on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*].

NOTE:

The documents should be mailed or taken to the Office of the Attorney General nearest in location to the county in which the action is proposed to be brought. The Attorney General has offices in Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. On receipt of the application for leave to sue from the proposed relator, the Attorney General acknowledges the receipt of these papers by means of a letter to the proposed relator with a copy to the proposed defendant.

[8] Provisional Leave to Sue Where Urgency Shown

The Attorney General may grant provisional leave to sue where the relator shows a special case and an urgent necessity that leave to sue issue [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 10*].

NOTE:

Provisional leave to sue is often granted if it appears that the statute of limitations may bar the filing of the complaint at a later time or if it appears that special steps are necessary in order to preserve the status quo pending a decision on the relator's application by the Attorney General.

1. Prepare the application for leave to sue. See *[4], above*. State in the application the reasons why provisional leave to sue should issue [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg § 10*].

2. Serve the proposed defendant. See *[5], above*.

3. Prepare an undertaking with approved sureties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6*, 28]. See *[10], below*.

4. Submit the application for leave to sue to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*] together with the undertaking with sureties [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6, 10*]. See [7], *above*.

[9] Relator's Reply to Showing by Proposed Defendant

1. Reply, if desired, to any showing by the proposed defendant why the application should not be granted [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 4*].

2. Submit any such reply with the Attorney General within 10 days following the proposed defendant's showing [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 4*].

3. Extensions of time to reply may be granted by:

a. The Attorney General on a showing of good cause, or

b. A stipulation between the relator and proposed defendant filed with the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 4*].

4. File any reply with proof or admission of service [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 5*].

[10] Relator's Undertaking

NOTE:

Leave to sue is granted or denied by the Attorney General in the form of an opinion letter to the

relator. Where leave to sue is granted, the relator must then present an undertaking to the Attorney General before he or she will issue leave to sue [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *People v. Petroleum Rectifying Co. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 289, 290, 68 P.2d 984]* .

1. Present an undertaking [*see § 483.79*] executed to the State of California in the sum of $500 [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*] and stating that the relator or sureties will pay:

a. Any judgment for costs or damages recovered against the plaintiff, and

b. All costs and expenses incurred in the prosecution of the quo warranto action [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6*, 28].

2. Be certain that the sureties are approved by the Attorney General [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*].

NOTE:
In practice, the Attorney General most often requires a corporate, rather than individual, surety.

3. Present the undertaking within 10 days after receiving notice that the application for leave to sue is granted, unless further time is granted [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*].

[11] Obtain Leave to Sue From Attorney General

The Attorney General transmits leave to sue in the name of the people, in writing, to the relator on receipt and approval of the undertaking [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*].

[12] Conform Complaint to Attorney General's Directions

Make any changes in or amendments to the proposed complaint as suggested or directed by the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*].

[13] File Complaint

File the approved complaint [*see §§ 483.72 -483.76*], together with the leave to sue, with the clerk [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*] of the superior court [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10* (residual jurisdiction of superior court)] for the proper county.

NOTE:
The proper county in which to bring a quo warranto action is: the county in which the defendant, or if several, some of the defendants, reside [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]; the county, city and county, or county in which the city or local agency is situated when the defendant is a county, city and county, city or local agency [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*]; or the county in which a corporation has its principal place of business [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

[14] Inform Attorney General of Filing

Immediately inform the Attorney General of:

1. The date on which the complaint is filed; and

2. The court number of the filed complaint [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

[15] No Changes in Complaint Without Approval

Make no changes, amendments, or alterations in the complaint after its filing without the approval of the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 7*].

[16] Notices to Attorney General

NOTE:

The Attorney General has control of the quo warranto action at all times [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601]* . For this reason, the Attorney General may, at any and every stage of the quo warranto action, withdraw, discontinue, or dismiss the action as seems fit and proper to him or her.In addition, the Attorney General may, at his or her option, assume the management of the quo warranto action at any time [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 8*].

No statutory provisions point out the exact manner in which the Attorney General's control over the quo warranto action is exercised. Likewise, no statutory provisions prevent the Attorney General from acting with or through the relator [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 456, 275 P.2d 601]* . Generally, the actual burden of discovery, trial and appeal, is borne by the attorney for the relator. Only rarely does the Attorney General actively participate in the court proceedings. Nevertheless, the name of the Attorney General and his or her deputies must appear on all pleadings and briefs filed by the relator.

Notify the Attorney General without delay of every proceeding had, motion made, paper filed, or thing done with respect to a quo warranto action [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

1. Send a copy of every paper or document filed by any of the parties to the action, including the judgment, promptly to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

2. Forward an additional copy of any paper served on the relator by the opposing party to the Attorney General at once [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 9*].

NOTE:

In sending or forwarding the foregoing information to the Attorney General, the relator need not follow formal noticing procedures. Instead, the relator may indicate the documents or other information sent to the Attorney General by means of a cover letter or explanatory note.

[17] Discovery and Trial

NOTE:

After filing of the complaint, a quo warranto action proceeds in the same manner as any other civil action [*see* *People v. Richmond (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 107, 117, 296 P.2d 351* (quo warranto action governed by all the pertinent procedural and practice provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.*). Hence, this guide offers no specific suggestions for discovery and trial.

For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms for use in discovery and trial in a quo warranto action, see Ch. 190-200: *Discovery* Ch. 372, ***Motions and Orders*** and Ch. 551, ***Trial*** .

[18] Motions After Trial

Secure the Attorney General's consent before making motions after trial [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal.*

App. 2d 452, 457, 275 P.2d 601 (motion for new trial as proper when filed at express direction of Attorney General but signed by relator's attorney)].

NOTE:

For discussion, procedural checklists, and forms for use in moving for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, for a new trial, and to set aside and vacate judgment and enter another and different judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

[19] Appeal

Secure the Attorney General's approval before appealing from any adverse judgment by the trial court [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 11*].

NOTE:

Because a quo warranto action is under the control of the Attorney General at all times [*People v. Huntington Beach (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 452, 455, 275 P.2d 601]* , any attempt by the relator alone to appeal from an adverse judgment without first securing the permission of the Attorney General is ineffectual for any purpose [*People v. Petroleum Rectifying Co. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 289, 291, 68 P.2d 984]* .

The approval by the Attorney General may be informal, as where the Attorney General transmits a timely dated letter consenting to an appeal by the relator [*People ex rel. Bellflower v. Bellflower County Water Dist. (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 344, 347, 55 Cal. Rptr. 584]* .

It should also be noted that the perfecting of an appeal does not stay proceedings, in the absence of an order of the trial court providing otherwise or of a writ of supersedas, where a party to the proceeding is adjudged guilty of usurping, intruding into, or unlawfully holding a public office, civil or military [*Code Civ. Proc. § 917.8*].

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for use in instituting an appeal and staying enforcement of a judgment pending appeal, see Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal* , and Ch. 43, ***Appeal: Stay of Proceedings*** .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.51

§ 483.51 Defendant's Checklist

[1] Appearance by Proposed Defendant in Response to Application

NOTE:
The following checklist is for use by a proposed defendant in opposing an action in quo warranto. It is illustrative of procedures commonly used. It is not intended to be exhaustive. Procedures not mentioned in this checklist may be required in a given action.

1. Prepare and file with the Attorney General a verified statement of facts [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*] in response to that submitted by the proposed relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*]. For a form of statement of facts which can be adapted by a proposed defendant for use in opposing the proposed relator's application, see *§ 483.77*.

NOTE:
The proposed defendant's appearance to oppose the granting of leave to sue may be in person or in writing. At the present time, conferences are rarely held, and the Attorney General prefers to base his or her decision on the pleadings submitted by the proposed relator and the proposed defendant. Nevertheless, the Attorney General may require a conference at which both the proposed relator and proposed defendant assert their respective positions. The appearance, where in person or in writing, should set forth the reasonswhy leave to sue should not be granted in accordance with the proposed relator's application.

2. Have the statement of facts verified [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

3. Serve the statement of facts on the proposed relator.

4. Prepare a declaration of service [*see § 483.78*] on the proposed relator.

5. Submit the statement of facts to the Attorney General with proof or admission of service on the proposed relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 5*].

6. File any statement of facts, or other appearance with the Attorney General within the following times after service of the application for leave to sue:

a. Within 15 days, if service occurs in the county where the action is brought, or

b. Within 20 days, if service occurs outside the county where the action is brought [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

NOTE:
The Attorney General may prescribe a shorter period of time in which to appear in special cases or on a showing of good cause [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

7. Extensions of time to appear may be granted by:

a. The Attorney General on a showing of good cause, or

b. A stipulation between the relator and proposed defendant filed with the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo Warranto

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 483.52-483.69

[Reserved]

§§ 483.52[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.70

§ 483.70 Notice to Proposed Defendant [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)] for Use by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

[1] FORM Notice to Proposed Defendant [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)] for Use by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The People of the State of California on the Relation of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	))))))	NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO SUE

To _____ [*name(s)*], proposed defendant(s):

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*name*], the proposed relator, is about to apply to the Attorney General of the State of California for leave to sue in quo warranto.

In accordance with Title 11, Sections 1 and 2, of the California Code of Regulations, the following documents are enclosed:

(1) A copy of the relator's application for leave to sue in quo waranto;

(2) A copy of the proposed verified complaint;

(3) A copy of the verified statement of facts in support of the application for leave to sue; and

(4) A copy of the memorandum of points and authorities in support of the application for leave to sue.

FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that you have _____ [15 *or* 20] days after service of this notice to appear and show cause, if you have any, why leave to sue should not be granted in accordance with the relator's application.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for the Proposed Relator

[2] Use of Form

The notice in *[1], above,* for use by the proposed relator, as required by the Attorney General. It informs the proposed defendant of the pendency of an application for leave to sue in quo warranto by the proposed relator and gives the proposed defendant time in which to object to the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].

The service of the original of this notice and its accompanying documents on the proposed defendant is necessary before a proposed relator may file the application for leave to sue with the attorney general [*see 11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*; *see also 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)* (proof of service)].

[3] Time for Response by Proposed Defendant

Where the proposed defendant is served in the county in which the quo warranto action is to be brought, the time given for response to the notice is 15 days. And where the proposed defendant is served in a county other than the one where the action is to be brought, the time given for response to the notice is 20 days [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 3*].

[4] Number of Copies

Prepare the following copies of the notice to the proposed defendant:

- Original to be served on each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2(c)*].
- Copy to be submitted to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].
- Copy for office file.
- Copy for client, if desired.
- Any additional copies desired.

[5] Accompanying Papers

The original of the notice to the proposed defendant must be accompanied by:

- A copy of the application [*see § 483.71*] for leave to sue [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].

- A copy of the proposed verified complaint [*see §§ 483.72 -483.76*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

- A copy of the verified statement of facts [*see § 483.77*] in support of the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

- A copy of the memorandum of points and authorities in support of the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(b)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for preparing papers for service and for preparing proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 4, *Pleading*, § 139; Vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 8, 9 (4th ed., 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.71

§ 483.71 Application for Leave to Sue [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2] in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803] by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

[1] FORM Application for Leave to Sue [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2] in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803] by Relator [11 Cal. Code Reg § 1]

BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The People of the State of California on the Relation of	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO SUE
vs.	)	
_____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

In accordance with *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure*, application is hereby made by _____ [*name of relator*] for leave to sue in quo warranto in the name of the People of the State of California.

In accordance with *Title 11, Section 2, of the California Code of Regulations*, the following documents are enclosed:

(1) An original and one copy of the proposed verified complaint prepared for the signatures of the Attorney General, a Deputy Attorney General, and the attorney for the relator;

(2) A verified statement of facts in support of this application;

(3) A memorandum of points and authorities in support of this application;

(4) A copy of the notice directed to the proposed defendant advising him/her/it of this application and giving him/her/it _____ [15 *or* 20] days in which to appear and show cause why leave to sue should not be granted; and

(5) Proof of service of the foregoing documents on the proposed defendant.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for the Proposed Relator

[2] Use of Form

The form in *[1], above*, is for use by a proposed relator in applying to the Attorney General for leave to sue in quo warranto under *Code Civ. Proc. § 803*. For discussion, see *§§ 483.18[2]* and *483.19*.

The contents of the documents to accompany the application are prescribed by *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*.

The application, together with the accompanying documents prescribed by *11 Cal. Code Reg § 2* [*see [4], below*], must be presented to the Attorney General within five days after service on the proposed defendant of copies of the accompanying documents [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].

[3] Number of Copies

Prepare the following copies of the application for leave to sue:

- Original to be submitted to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*].
- Copy for each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].
- Copy for office file.
- Copy for client, if desired.
- Any additional copies desired.

[4] Accompanying Papers

The original of the application must be accompanied by:

- An original and one copy of the proposed verified complaint [*see §§ 483.72 -483.76*] prepared for the signatures of the Attorney General, a deputy attorney general, and the attorney for the relator as plaintiff's attorney [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

- A verified statement of facts [*see § 483.77*] in support of the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

- A memorandum of points and authorities in support of the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(b)*].

- A copy of the notice [*see § 483.70*] to the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(c)*].

- Proof of service [*see § 483.78*] of these documents on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(d), 5*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.72

§ 483.72 Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Oust Usurping Public Officer--For Use Where Officer Holds Two Incompatible Offices

[1] FORM Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Oust Usurping Public Officer--For Use Where Officer Holds Two Incompatible Offices

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

The People of the State of California on the Relation of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	))))))	NO. _____ COMPLAINT IN QUO WARRANTO

The People of the State of California, on the Relation of _____ [*name of relator*], complain of defendant(s) [, and each of them], and for cause of action allege:

1. This action is brought pursuant to *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name*], the defendant, was a resident of _____ County, California.

3. The position of _____ [*state public office alleged to be usurped*] is an _____ [elective *or* appointive] office of the _____ [*governmental unit, e.g.,* City of _____], State of California.

4. Commencing on or about _____[*date*], _____ [*name*], the defendant, has usurped,

intruded into, and unlawfully held and exercised the office of _____ [*state position alleged to be usurped*].

5. _____ [*Allege specific facts, if desired, giving rise to the grounds or defects in defendant's title to the office, e.g.*, On or about _____[*date*], the defendant was _____ (elected *or* appointed) to the office of _____ (*describe position, e.g.*, attorney) for the City of _____, _____ County, California. The defendant entered into possession of the office and has exercised the duties thereof to the present time].

6. _____ [*Allege additional facts, if desired, giving rise to the grounds or defects in defendant's title to office, e.g.*, Thereafter, on or about _____[*date*], the defendant was (elected *or* appointed) to the office of _____ (*describe position, e.g.*, city attorney) for the City of _____,_____ County, California. The defendant entered into possession of the office and has exercised the duties thereof to the present time].

7. _____ [*Allege grounds of defects of usurpation as created by the facts presented in preceedings paragraphs, e.g.*, The positions of _____ (*specify*) and _____ (*specify*) are incompatible in that _____ (*specify the basis of incompatibility, e.g.*, the office of _____ (*specify*) is superior to the office of _____ (*specify*) and a clash of duties is likely to arise in the exercise of both offices simultaneously)].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For judgment determining that the defendant is not entitled to hold or exercise the office of _____ [*specify position alleged to be usurped*] and ordering him/her ousted from the office;

[2. For the defendant to be fined pursuant to *Section 809 of the Code of Civil Procedure*;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*],

Attorney General for the State

of California

By: _____ [*signature*]

Deputy Attorney General for

the State of California

By: _____ [*signature*]

Attorney for the Relator

Attorneys for the People of the

State of California

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the relator in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief and, as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in *[1], above,* is for use by the relator in a quo warranto action to oust a public officer from a position which he or she is usurping.

The form is based on a situation in which the defendant attempts to occupy and perform the duties of two incompatible offices [*see People ex rel. Chapman v. Rapsey (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 636, 107 P.2d 388* (defendant purporting to hold positions of city judge and city attorney); *People v. Garrett (1925) 72 Cal. App. 452, 237 P. 829* (defendant purporting to hold positions of justice of the peace and police judge); 76 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 38, 44 (1993) (leave to sue granted to test right of individual to hold concurrently offices of chief of fire protection district, director of fire protection district, and city council member); 75 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 112, 117 (1992) (leave to sue granted to test right of individual to hold incompatible offices of school district trustee and community services district director); for discussion, *see § 483.21*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in *[1], above,* alleges:

- That the action is brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 803* (Paragraph 1).
- The defendant's residence to establish venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (Paragraph 2).
- The position alleged to be usurped (Paragraph 3).
- The usurpation of that position by the defendant (Paragraph IV) [*People v. Hayden (1935) 9 Cal. App. 2d 312, 313, 49 P.2d 314]* .
- Specific facts giving the grounds or defects in defendant's title (Paragraphs 5-7) [*People ex rel. Paganini v. Corte Madera (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 726, 218 P.2d 810]* .

[4] Jurisdiction

A quo warranto action must be brought in the superior court as an unlimited civil case [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10* (residual jurisdiction of superior court)].

[5] Venue

A quo warranto action may be brought against an individual defendant in the county in which that defendant resides at the commencement of the action. If there is more than one defendant, the proper county is the county in which some of the defendants reside [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[6] Parties

The person holding a contested office is a necessary party to the action in quo warranto [*Susanville v. Long (1904) 144 Cal. 362, 365, 77 P. 987]* . However, the relator bringing the action need not be the person rightfully entitled to the office [*People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 243, 22 P. 1039]* .

In a case in which quo warranto is the proper remedy, the cause of action is vested in the People, and not in any individual or group, no matter how affected they may be, or how much more the subject matter may touch their interests than it does other members of the citizenry. A complaint by an individual or group for quo warranto is subject to demurrer for failure to state a cause of action, and the defect may be raised at any time during proceedings [*Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 170-171, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

[7] No Statute of Limitations

Although laches could bar relief, lapse of time is not a bar to bringing a quo warranto action to oust a public officer. It is assumed that the attorney general will not permit the institution of a quo warranto action if the claim is stale or the state has ceased to have a present interest in the claim [*People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 585, 158 P. 1036]* .

[8] Sufficiency of Complaint

A complaint in a quo warranto action is sufficient if it pleads the ultimate fact of usurpation in general terms. When the complaint is couched in general terms, the defendant bears the burden of proof with respect to the alleged usurpation, being required to move for example, the right to lawfully hold a challenged office [*People v. Hayden (1935) 9 Cal. App. 2d 312, 313, 49 P.2d 314]* or the validity of annexation proceedings [*People ex rel. Smith v. San Jose (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 57, 59, 222 P.2d 947]* .

A complaint in quo warranto is also sufficient if it pleads specific grounds or defects to show an alleged usurpation [*People ex rel. Paganini v. Corte Madera (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 726, 218 P.2d 810]* . When specific facts are relied on to show usurpation, the pleader assumes the burden of allegation and proof. In addition, where specific allegations are made, the complaint is subject to a general demurrer by the defendant if the facts stated do not constitute a cause of action [*People v. City of Palm Springs (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 38, 41, 331 P.2d 4]* . For example, a complaint is sufficient which pleads specific facts that two persons were declared elected to one office, that they received certificates, qualified, and were performing the duties of the office, and that they were usurpers and intruders [*People v. Davidson (1905) 2 Cal. App. 100, 103, 83 P. 161]* .

It should be noted, however, that in practice the Attorney General requires the relator to set forth specific, detailed, and certain allegationsof all the facts relating to the cause of action in considering the application for leave to sue. Moreover, the attorney general requires that the facts presented by the relator be by direct allegation and not on information and belief *[27 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 249, 253 (1956)]* .

[9] Verification Required

A complaint brought by a relator in quo warranto under *Code Civ. Proc. § 803* must be verified [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of declaration)]. Verification of the complaint requires that the defendant file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] and also precludes a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[10] Number of Copies

Prepare the following copies of the proposed complaint:

- Original and one copy to be submitted to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].
- Copy for each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].
- Copy for office file.
- Copy for client, if desired.
- Any additional copies desired.

[11] Cross References

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms related to proceedings to contest elections, see Ch. 243, *Elections*

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, § 7 (4th ed., 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.73

§ 483.73 Allegations for Use Where Another Person Is Rightfully Entitled to Public Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 804]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use Where Another Person Is Rightfully Entitled to Public Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 804]

1. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of person rightfully entitled to office*] was a resident of _____ County, California.

2. _____ [*Name*] is the person rightfully entitled to hold and exercise the position of _____ [*position being usurped*] _____ [*allege specific facts, if desired, showing person entitled to assume office usurped by defendant, e.g.*, by reason of the fact that _____ (*name*) holds a valid certificate of _____ (election *or* appointment) to the position].

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in *[1], above,* are for use by a relator in a complaint in quo warranto to oust a usurping public officer. The allegations state the name of the person rightfully entitled to the office as permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 804*. Thus, the right of another person to occupy the office may be determined in the same action which tries the defendant's right to the office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 805*; *People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 586, 158 P. 1036]* . These allegations are for use in addition to those allegations in the complaint in *§ 483.72*.

[3] Prayer to Include Restoration of Claimant

When these allegations are used in a complaint to oust a public officer, the prayer should include a request for an order determining the claimant entitled to the usurped office and putting the claimant in possession of the office [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 806*].

Although ouster of the defendant from the usurped office is independent of determination of relator's right to the office [*People v. Fleming (1893) 100 Cal. 537, 541, 35 P. 163* ; *see People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 243, 22 P. 1039* (relator in quo warranto need not be person claiming to be entitled to contested office)], the right of one thought to be

holding office unlawfully and the right of one claiming to be entitled to it are properly adjudicated in the same action [*People v. Bailey (1916) 30 Cal. App. 581, 586, 158 P. 1036]* .

[4] Damages

If the judgment decrees that a person alleged to be entitled to an office is so entitled, the person may recover, by action, the damages he or she may have sustained by reason of the defendant's usurpation of the office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 807*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.74

§ 483.74 Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Annexation Proceedings

[1] FORM Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Annexation Proceedings

[*Caption. See § 483.72.*]

The People of the State of California, on the Relation of _____ [*name of relator*], complain of defendant(s) [, and each of them], and for cause of action allege:

1. This action is brought pursuant to *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name*], the defendant, was a municipal corporation existing, qualifying, and acting under a charter granted by the Legislature of the State of California and adopted pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the State of California.

3. The annexation of property by a municipal corporation is governed by _____ [*indicate statutes related to the allegedly invalid annexation, e.g., Government Code § 56000 et seq.*] _____ [commonly known as _____ (*indicate name by which the statutes known, if applicable, e.g.,* the Cortese Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985)].

4. On or about _____[*date*], the defendant commenced proceedings to annex the real property situated as follows: _____ [*describe location of property sought to be annexed, e.g.,* the _____ (*name*) Tract located on the _____ (*specify direction, e.g.,* northern) boundary of the town of _____ (*name*) and consisting of _____ (*number*) acres. A map of the area sought to be annexed is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

5. The proceedings to annex the territory described above were defective and violative of _____ [

specify code section violated, e.g., Section _____ (*number*) of the Government Code] in that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, the territory alleged to be annexed was not contiguous to the defendant *or* a majority of the inhabitants of the territory sought to be annexed did not agree to the annexation *or any other requirement not satisfied by the purported annexation*].

6. Commencing on or about _____[*date*], defendant has exercised its control and dominion in the form of municipal jurisdiction and powers over the described territory.

7. In defectively and invalidly commencing and completing the foregoing annexation proceedings, the defendant, _____ [*name*], usurped, intruded into, and unlawfully held and exercised a franchise within the meaning of *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

[8. On or about _____ (*date*), defendant mailed notification to plaintiff of defendant's purpose of confirming, validating, and making legally effective the _____ (acts *or* proceedings) complained of herein. (A copy of defendant's notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.)]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows;

1. For judgment determining that the annexation proceedings were improper, that the defendant is without any control or dominion over the described territory, and that the described territory is not a part of the defendant in any manner;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*]

Attorney General for the State

of California

By: _____ [*signature*]

Deputy Attorney General for

the State of California

By: _____ [*signature*]

Attorney for the Relator

Attorneys for the People of the

State of California

[*Verification. See § 483.72*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in *[1], above,* is for use by the relator in a quo warranto action to challenge the validity of a purported annexation by a municipal corporation. The form is based on a situation in which the defendant municipality claims to have annexed uninhabited contiguous territory and is exercising its jurisdiction over the territory [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 803*; *People v. City of Palm Springs (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 38, 41-42, 331 P.2d 4* ; *see also Gov. Code § 56100 et seq.* (requirements for valid territorial annexation); for discussion, *see § 483.22*[4,[5]].

[3] Adaptation for Use by Municipality Under Code Civ. Proc. § 811

The form of complaint in *[1], above,* may be adapted for use by a board of supervisors of a county, or city and county, or by the legislative body of a municipal corporation in bringing a quo warranto action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 811*; *San Ysidro Irr. Dist. v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 708, 716-717, 16 Cal. Rptr. 609, 365 P.2d 753* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 811* as applicable against either persons or governmental bodies usurping franchise)]. Counsel will want to add a paragraph to the form alleging the plaintiff's capacity to bring the action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 811*. In addition,counsel should adapt the caption and introductions to reflect the party bringing the action. For additional forms for use as captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

When brought by a board of supervisors of a county, or city and county, or by the legislative body of a municipal corporation, the complaint in quo warranto need not be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. However, the defendant must file a verified answer unless it would subject him or her to criminal prosecution or unless the defendant is also a county, city, or other public corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- That the action is brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 803* (Paragraph 1).
- The defendant's capacity (Paragraph 2).
- The statutes regulating annexation attempts by defendant (Paragraph 3).
- The commencement of proceedings to annex specific described property (Paragraph 4).
- The defective nature of the annexation proceedings (Paragraph 5) [*see People v. City of Palm Springs (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 38, 331 P.2d 4]* .
- The exercise of control by the defendant over the area claimed to be annexed in the proceedings (Paragraph 6) [*Amer. Distl. Co. v. City Council, Sausalito (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 660, 667, 213 P.2d 704]* .
- The facts enumerated above as constituting a usurpation by the defendant (Paragraph 7).
- If action brought in response to notification of attempted validation, the assertion that the defendant mailed the notification (Paragraph 8) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*].

[5] Venue

A quo warranto action against a county, city and county, city or local agency may be brought in that county, city and county, or the county in which the city or local agency is situated unless the action is brought by the county, city and county, city or local agency, in which case the action may be brought in any county, or city and county, not a party to the action and in which the city or local agency is not situated. When brought in the same county, or city and county, an

action, on the motion of either party, must be transferred to another county, or city and county [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 394*].

[6] Statutes of Limitation

An action to contest the validity of proceedings for the incorporation of a municipal corporation, the annexation of territory by a municipal corporation, or for the consolidation of municipal corporations must be brought within three months after the commencement of the proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2]. The three-month limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 is consistently applied to quo warranto actions *[23 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 300, 304 (1954)* ; *People v. Los Angeles (1928) 93 Cal. App. 532, 536, 538, 269 P. 934]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*1/2 does not, however, apply to contests of subsequent void proceedings which follow completed proceedings to annex territory [*People v. Town of Corte Madera (1952) 115 Cal. App. 2d 32, 38, 251 P.2d 988]* .

An action to contest the validity of acts or proceedings taken under color of law to form, organize, incorporate, dissolve, consolidate, change organization or reorganize, or to change the territorial boundaries of a city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district within any of the foregoing, must be brought within six months from the date of completion of the acts or proceedings contested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*]. The limitation prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 349.1* does not supercede the shorter limitation prescribed by any other statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 349.1*].

An action to contest acts or proceedings taken under color of law for the formation, organization, incorporation, or any change in the territorial boundaries of a city, county, city and county, special district, public corporation or other public entity, or an improvement district, annexed area, or zone within any of the foregoing, or to contest the authorization, issuance, sale, or exchange of bonds of the entity or territory, must be brought within 60 calendar days of the mailing of a notice to all property owners in the entity or territory of the entity's attempted validation of such acts or proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349.4*].

[7] Cross References

For discussion, procedural guide, and forms related to proceedings to challenge a purported annexation prior to completion of annexation proceedings, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* ; and Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* , respectively

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 7, 10 (4th ed., 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.75

§ 483.75 Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Charter Amendment Proceedings

[1] FORM Complaint in Quo Warranto Against Municipal Corporation [Code Civ. Proc. § 803]--To Determine Validity of Charter Amendment Proceedings

[*Caption. See § 483.72.*]

The People of the State of California, on the Relation of _____ [*name of relator*], complain of defendant(s) [, and each of them], and for cause of action allege:

1. This action is brought pursuant to *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name*], the defendant, was a municipal corporation existing, qualifying, and acting under a charter granted by the Legislature of the State of California and adopted pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the State of California.

3. _____ [*Allege capacity of relator, if desired, e.g.*, The relator in this action is _____ (*specify, e.g*, a labor organization within the meaning of Section _____ of the Labor Code and a recognized public employee organization within the meaning of Section _____ of the Government Code. As one of its functions, the relator represents public employees on matters related to their employment conditions, including wages and hours)].

4. The process of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, bargaining between public employees unions and local governments, including the defendant] is governed by _____ [*indicate statutes related to the allegedly invalid charter amendment, e.g., Sections 3500 to 3510 of the Government Code*] _____ [commonly known as the _____ (*indicate name by which statutes known, if applicable, e.g.*, Meyers-Milias-Brown Act)].

5. On or about _____[*date*], the defendant submitted to the electorate of _____ [city *or* county] a resolution to amend its charter to provide for the following: _____ [*specify purpose and subject of resolution, e.g.*, disciplinary actions against any public employees participating in a strike or job action against the defendant].

6. On or about _____[*date*], a majority of the electorate approved the foregoing resolution. The charter amendment thus approved was thereafter filed with the Secretary of State.

7. The proceedings described above which were taken by the defendant to amend its charter were defective and violative of _____ [*specify code section, or sections, violated, e.g.*, Section(s) _____ (*number*) of the Government Code] in that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, no reasonable written notice was given to public employees unions regarding a resolution directly related to matters within the scope of their representation *or* defendant failed to meet and confer in good faith with public employees unions regarding wages, hours, or conditions of employment prior to arriving at policy governing wages, hours, or conditions *or any other requirement not satisfied by the defendant in presenting the foregoing resolution to the electorate*].

8. Commencing on or about _____[*date*], defendant has undertaken to act under color of the defective and invalid charter amendment and, in doing so, has usurped, intruded into, and unlawfully held and exercised powers not belonging to it.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For judgment determining that the charter amendment is null and void and of no legal effect and that the defendant has unlawfully usurped the powers of the state of California in undertaking to act under color of the amendment;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*name*]

Attorney General for the

State of California

By: _____

[*signature*]

Deputy Attorney General for

the State of California

By: _____

[*signature*]

Attorney for the Relator

Attorneys for the People of

the State of California

[*Verification. See § 483.72*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in *[1], above,* is for use by the relator in bringing a quo warranto action to challenge the validity of a charter amendment purportedly adopted by a municipal corporation. The form is based on a situation in which the defendant municipality is acting under color of law in attempting to give the purported amendment legal effect [*see Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29* (proceeding in mandate and prohibition by labor unions to test validity of process of enacting city charter improper; action properly brought in quo warranto)].

Quo warranto is the exclusive remedy to challenge the validity of a city charter once it is put into effect [*Santa Clara County v. Hayes Co. (1954)43 Cal. 2d 615, 618, 275 P.2d 456* ; *Oakland Mun. Improvement League v. City of Oakland (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 165, 168-169, 100 Cal. Rptr. 29]* . Declaratory relief actions brought by firefighters union and individuals are not available to determine the validity of local propositions adopted by the city electorate that amended a city charter, because the exclusive method of attack on city charter amendments lies in a quo warranto action that may only be brought by the Attorney General [*International Assn. of Firefighters v. City of Oakland (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 687, 694-698, 220 Cal. Rptr. 256]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.76

§ 483.76 Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; Corp. Code § 1801; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Exclude Corporation From Wrongful Exercise of Franchise and to Forfeit Its Corporate Charter

[1] FORM Complaint in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. § 803; Corp. Code § 1801; 11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)]--To Exclude Corporation From Wrongful Exercise of Franchise and to Forfeit Its Corporate Charter

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

The People of the State of California on the Relation of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	))))))	NO. _____ COMPLAINT IN QUO WARRANTO

The People of the State of California, on the Relation of _____ [*name of relator*], complain against defendant(s) [, and each of them], and for cause of action allege:

1. This action is brought pursuant to *Section 803 of the Code of Civil Procedure* and *Section 1801 of the Corporations Code*.

2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name*], the defendant was a private corporation organized, existing, and doing business under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ County.

3. Defendant has _____ [*allege conduct by defendant evidencing serious offenses against statutes regulating corporations or fraudulent abuse or usurpation of corporate powers, e.g.*, provided its customer with water that is impure, unwholesome, unpalatable, and a danger to the lives of human beings and, in doing so, failed to comply

with the standards established in this state with respect to the supplying of water for use by human beings _____ (as provided by Section(s) _____ of the Health and Safety Code)].

4. By reason of the foregoing _____ [acts *or* omissions] defendant has been guilty of unlawful conduct for which it should suffer the forfeiture of its corporate _____ [existence *or* franchise].

[*EITHER*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing the requisite notice by the attorney general to defendant to remedy the violations complained of, e.g.*, On orabout _____[*date*], and at least 30 days prior to the institution of this action, the Attorney General gave the defendant written notice of the conduct complained of. A copy of the written notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. Since that time, defendant has failed to institute proceedings to correct the violations complained of].

[*OR*]

5. _____ [*Allege that defendant's conduct is uncorrectable, e.g.*, The defendant cannot correct the conduct complained of by amending its articles of incorporation or by any other corporate action].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For judgment _____ [dissolving and forfeiting defendant's corporate existence *or* appointing a receiver for winding up defendant's affairs *or* compelling defendant's board of directors to wind up defendant's affairs subject to the supervision of this court;

[2. For the defendant to be fined pursuant to *Section 809 of the Code of Civil Procedure*;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated:_____.

_____ [*name*]

Attorney General for the

State of California

By: _____

[*signature*]

Deputy Attorney General for

the State of California

By: _____

[*signature*]

Attorney for Relator

Attorneys for the People of

the State of California

[*Verification. See § 483.72*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by the relator in bringing a quo warranto action against a private corporation under *Code Civ. Proc. § 803* and *Corp. Code § 1801*. The form is based on a situation in which a corporation in exercising its franchise is seriously offending the statutes which regulate it [*see Citizens Utilities Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 403-407, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582* (remedy in quo warranto and under *Corp. Code § 1801* concurrent)]. For discussion, see *§ 483.23*.

[3] Parties Where Corporate Franchise Questioned

If the legal existence of a corporation is questioned, the quo warranto action must be brought against the individuals wrongfully exercising the franchise to act as a corporation. On the other hand, where a legally existing corporation usurps privileges or powers not granted to it by its charter, the quo warranto action is brought against the corporation [*People v. Stanford (1888) 77 Cal. 360, 363, 18 P. 85, 19 P. 693]* . Whenever a corporation is made a party defendant, its legal existence cannot then be attacked in quo warranto [*People v. Stanford (1888) 77 Cal. 360, 364, 18 P. 85, 19 P. 693* (complaint alleging nonexistence of corporation concedes its existence by naming it as party to action); *but see People v. Montecito Water Co. (1893) 97 Cal. 276, 278, 32 P. 236* (corporation a necessary party where substantial compliance with incorporation statutes creates de facto corporation)].

[4] Venue

Venue of an action against a corporation is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*. For discussion, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in winding up or dissolving a corporation, see Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*

Ballantine and Sterling,California Corporation Laws, Ch. 15, *Dissolution and Winding Up*, § 320.06 (4th ed. Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.77

§ 483.77 Statement of Facts [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)] by Relator in Support of Application for Leave to Sue in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2]

[1] FORM Statement of Facts [11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)] by Relator in Support of Application for Leave to Sue in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2]

BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The People of the State of California on the Relation of	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	STATEMENT OF FACTS
vs.	)	
_____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

_____ [*Allege facts such as identity and capacity of relator, e.g.,* I am the President of the _____ (*name of public employees union*) and I have been authorized to make this statement on its behalf. _____ (*Name of public employees union*) is a recognized employee organization employed by _____ (*specify city or county*)].

_____ [*Allege specific facts giving rise to cause of action alleged in proposed complaint, e.g.,* On or about _____[*date*], the proposed defendant, _____ (*name*), met and adopted a resolution for submission to the electorate of _____ (*specify city or county*). The resolution adopted for submission provided for an amendment to the proposed defendant's charter as follows: _____ (

specify purpose and subject of resolution, e.g., for disciplinary actions against any public employees participating in a strike or job action against the proposed defendant)].

_____ [*Allege specific facts, if any, showing attempts by relator to resolve actions by proposed defendant, e.g.*, Upon being notified of the proposed defendant's action in adopting the foregoing resolution, I requested by letter that the proposed defendant meet and confer with _____ (*name of public employees union*) pursuant to _____ (*statutes governing bargaining between public employees union and proposed defendant*) prior to submitting the foregoing resolution to the electorate. A copy of my letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. No response has been received from the proposed defendant to the date of this action].

_____ [*Allege facts showing action taken by proposed defendant and amounting to usurpation complained of, e.g.*, On or about _____[*date*], a majority of the electorate approved the foregoing resolution. The charter amendment approved by this resolution was thereafter filed with the Secretary of State. The proposed defendant mailed a copy of the charter amendment thus approved to each employee of its _____ (*name of public employees union*) and indicated its intention to enforce the provisions of the charter amendment against _____ (*name of public employees union*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of statement of facts in *[1], above*, is for use in the relator's application for leave to sue in quo warranto [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1, 2*]. It accompanies the proposed complaint, memorandum of points and authorities, notice to the proposed defendant, and proof of service [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2*].

The statement of facts submitted by the relator must be verified [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].

The factual situation described in the statement of facts could be used in conjunction with the complaint *outlined in § 483.75*. The statement of facts should be altered and modified by the relator, as appropriate, to accomodate the nature of the usurpation complained of.

In addition, it should be noted that this form of statement of facts may be altered and adapted by the proposed defendant for use in opposing the relator's application for leave to sue.

[3] Number of Copies

Prepare the following copies of the statement of facts:

- Original to be submitted to the Attorney General [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(a)*].
- Copy for each proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 1*].
- Copy for office file.

- Copy for client, if desired.
- Any additional copies desired.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in making declarations under penalty of perjury, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.78

§ 483.78 Declaration of Personal Service of Papers in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(d), 5]

[1] FORM Declaration of Personal Service of Papers in Quo Warranto [11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(d), 5]

BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

The People of the State of California on the Relation of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	))))))	DECLARATION OF SERVICE

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am, and was at the time of the service hereinafter mentioned, at least 18 years of age and not a party to the above-entitled action. My _____ [residence *or* business] address is _____, California. I am a citizen of the United States and _____ [a resident of *or* employed in] _____ County, California.

I served the _____ [*nature of papers served, e.g.*, Notice of Application for Leave to Sue, Application for Leave to Sue, Complaint in Quo Warranto, Statement of Facts, and Memorandum of Points and Authorities] by _____ [*state, e.g.*, delivering to and leaving with the following person(s) the foregoing documents] at the time and place indicated below:

Name of	Name of Person	Street	Date and

Defendant Served Relationship to Defendant	With Whom Left Title or	Address and City	Time of Service
_____	_____	_____	_____

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration of service in *[1], above,* is for use by the proposed relator where personally serving the proposed defendant with documents other than a summons and complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465, 1010, 1013a, 1016*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010.5-1013, 1020* (manner of service), 2015.5 (form of declaration)]. The Attorney General prefers personal service on the proposed defendant pursuant to *11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 1* and *2(d)* rather than service by mail.

This form of declaration may be adapted by the proposed defendant for use where personal service of the opposing statement of facts, or other showing, is effected on the proposed relator [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(c), 3, 5*]. Likewise, this form of declaration may be adapted by the proposed relator for use where personal service of any reply to the statement of facts, or other showing, is effected on the proposed defendant [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 4, 5*]. Where either the proposed defendant or the proposed relator serve papers by mail, the foregoing form of declaration may be adapted to indicate the date and place of deposit in the mail, the name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope, and that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage thereon fully prepaid [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(1)*]. For additional forms of declaration where service is by substitution or by mail, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] When Proof of Service Required

The proposed relator is required to present proof of service of the notice of application for leave to sue, application for leave to sue, complaint in quo warranto, statement of facts, and memorandum of points and authorities on the defendant to the attorney general when permission to sue in quo warranto is sought [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 2(d)*]. Likewise, the proposed relator must present proof of service to the attorney general of any reply to the proposed defendant's showing in opposition to the application [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 4, 5*]. In addition, proof of service is required of the proposed defendant with respect to service of the statement of facts, or other showing, in opposition to the proposed relator's application [*11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 2(c), 3, 5*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion, procedural checklist, and alternative forms for use in serving parties with papers, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.79

§ 483.79 Undertaking for Leave to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 810; 11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6, 28]

[1] FORM Undertaking for Leave to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 810; 11 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6, 28]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

The People of the State of California on the Relation of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*], Defendant(s).	)))))))	NO. _____ UNDERTAKING FOR LEAVE TO SUE IN QUO WARRANTO

WHEREAS, the above-named Relator desires to commence an action in the Superior Court of _____ County, against the above-named defendant(s);

NOW, THEREFORE, We the undersigned, in consideration of the premises, and of the granting by the Attorney General of the State of California leave to bring suit in the name of the People of the State of California, _____ [*name and address of relator*] as Principals, and _____ [*name and address of corporate surety approved by attorney general*] as Surety, do jointly and severally undertake and promise that the Relator will pay any judgment for costs and damages that may be recovered against the plaintiff herein, and all costs and expenses incurred in the prosecution of this action not exceeding $500, in which amount we acknowledge ourselves jointly and severally bound to the State of California.

WITNESS our hands and seals, _____[*date*].

_____ [*seal*]

_____ [*seal*]

_____ [*seal*]

_____ [*seal*]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
_____ COUNTY) ss.
)

_____ [*Name of surety*], Surety in the above undertaking, being severally duly sworn, each for itself, says that it is worth the amount specified in this undertaking over and above all its just debts and liabilities, and that it is _____ [*specify activity, e.g., doing business*] within the State of California.

_____ [*signature*

of surety or surety's representative]

Subscribed and sworn to before me
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Source of Form

The form of undertaking in *[1], above,* is based on 11 Cal. Code Reg. § 28.1. It does not conform to the content requirements of the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*), which generally governs undertakings. For example, in addition to information contained in this form, an undertaking must state addresses at which principal and sureties may be served with notices, papers, and other documents [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320*] and state that the sureties are jointly and severally liable on the obligations of the bond, on the provision of the Bond and Undertaking Law, and on the statute providing for the bond [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320(b)*]. However, the Bond and Undertaking Law also states that its provisions apply to an undertaking executed pursuant to any California statute, except to the extent that the statute prescribes a different rule or is inconsistent [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.020(a)*]. It further provides that the term "statute" includes an administrative regulation promulgated pursuant to a statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.180(a)*]. Since this form is based on an administrative code section promulgated pursuant to a statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 810*], the provisions of the Bond and Undertaking Law may not apply to the extent that the administrative code section sets forth an inconsistent form of undertaking.

For a form of undertaking that is sufficient under the Bond and Undertaking Law, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[3] Use of Form

The form of undertaking in *[1], above,* is for use by the relator to satisfy the Attorney General's requirement than an undertaking be furnished as a condition for issuance of leave to sue in quo warranto [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*]. The relator must file the undertaking for $500 with the Attorney General within 10 days of receiving

notice that leave to sue is granted, unless further time is allowed [*11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*; *see People v. Petroleum Rectifying Co. (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 289, 290, 68 P.2d 984 (Attorney General may require relator to give security for costs)]* .

The sureties must be approved by the Attorney General [*Code Civ. Proc. § 810*; *11 Cal. Code Reg § 6*]. The Attorney General usually requires that the undertaking be by a corporate surety because the Attorney General's Office prefers not to maintain actions against personal sureties for the amount of the undertaking. In addition, the Attorney General requires that the relator sign the undertaking as principal.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 483 QUO WARRANTO
PART V. FORMS

42-483 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 483.80

§ 483.80 Judgment in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 805, 809]--General Form

[1] FORM Judgment in Quo Warranto [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 805, 809]--General Form

[*Caption. See §§ 483.72, 483.74*]

The above-entitled cause came on for trial in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court. Plaintiff appeared by _____ [*name*], Attorney General of the State of California, _____ [*name*], Deputy Attorney General of the State of California, and _____ [*name*], Attorney for the Relator, _____ [*name of relator*]. Defendant appeared by _____ [*name*], his/her/its attorney. Evidence, both oral and documentary, was presented and considered. The matter was argued and submitted. The court was fully informed and advised in the premises of both parties, _____ [and the court (,on request of _____ (plaintiff *or* defendant),) caused its written statement of decision to be made and filed herein *or*; no statement of decision was requested].

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. That the defendant is guilty of usurping, intruding into, and unlawfully holding and exercising _____ [*specify, e.g.*, the office of _____ (*specify position usurped, e.g.*, city attorney) *or* control over invalidly annexed territory *or* a corporate franchise to _____ (*specify rights under corporate charter, e.g.*, the franchise to practice law)].

2. That the defendant is, therefore, excluded from the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, office *or* privilege *or* franchise] described above.

3. _____ [*If another person is found rightfully entitled to a usurped office:* That _____ (*name*) is rightfully entitled to hold and exercise the office of _____ (*specify position, e.g.*, city attorney)].

4. _____ [*If another person is found rightfully entitled to a usurped office:* That the defendant pay to _____ (*name*) the sum of $_____ as damages for the usurpation of the office of _____ (*specify position usurped*)].

[5. That the defendant pay a fine in the sum of $_____.]

6. That the defendant pay the costs of suit herein, assessed at $_____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The general form of judgment in *[1], above,* is for use when the relator prevails in a quo warranto proceeding.

The judgment may rule both on the defendant's right to the office or franchise and on the right of another party alleged to be entitled to the office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 805*]. The person found entitled to office may execute the office after taking oath and posting bond, as required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 806*].

The judgment may award damages to the person found rightfully entitled to the office that was usurped [*Code Civ. Proc. § 807*; *see Chubbuck v. Wilson (1907) 151 Cal. 162, 164, 168-169, 90 P. 524* (measure of damages)].

In addition, the defendant ousted from an office or franchise by the judgment must pay the costs of the action, and is subject to a fine [*Code Civ. Proc. § 809*; *see. People v. Bingham (1889) 82 Cal. 238, 243, 22 P. 1039* (fine imposed on defendant is not dependent on whether relator is found entitled to office)].

The judgment is self-executing [*People v. West Side County Water Dist. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 228, 233, 246 P.2d 119* ; *People v. Westmoreland (1933) 135 Cal. App. 517, 519, 27 P.2d 394]* .

In the case of a corporation, the court may order dissolution or other or partial relief it deems just and expedient. The court may also appoint a receiver to wind up the corporation's affairs or order the wind up of the corporation's affairs by its board subject to court supervision [*Corp. Code § 1801(c)*].

[3] Cross References

For futher discussion of the judgment and appeal, see *§ 483.24 -483.26*

For discussion and forms for use in preparing judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 484.syn

§ 484.syn Synopsis to Chapter 484: RADIO AND TELEVISION

§ 484.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 484.02 Cross References

§§ 484.03-484.09 [Reserved]

§ 484.10 Governing Statutes

§ 484.11 Federal Regulation of Radio and Television

[1] In General

[2] Restrictions on Antennas

§ 484.12 Contracts for Sale of Advertising Time

[1] Enforcement

[2] Unilateral Cancellation of Advertising Contracts

§ 484.13 Breach of Employment Contract

§ 484.14 Remedies for Breach of Employment Contract

[1] Right to Accounting

[2] Compensation After Wrongful Discharge

[3] Restoration to Position From Which Discharged

§ 484.15 Restrictions on Employment of Minors

§ 484.16 Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law

[1] In General

[2] Regulation of "Service Dealers"

[3] Regulation of "Service Contractors"

[a] In General

[b] Contract Sellers

[c] Reimbursement Insurance

[d] Contract Administrators

[4] Remedies Under Law

§ 484.17 Customer Service Standards of Cable Television Operators and Other Video Providers

[1] Adoption

[2] Installation, Disconnection, Service, and Repair

[a] In General

[a1] Access to Property Owned by Party Other Than Occupant

[b] Employee Identification

[c] Telephone Availability

[d] Complaints

[e] Billing

[f] Refunds

[g] Rate Increases and Channel or Programming Changes or Deletions

[h] Termination of Service

[i] Disclosure of Customer Information

[3] Annual Notice Describing Standards

[a] To Employees, Customers, and Local Governments

[b] To New Customers

[4] Annual Report on Meeting Standards

[5] Effect of Standards on Franchise or License Provisions

[6] Dispute Resolution

[7] Cumulative Remedies for Violation

[8] Civil Penalty

[a] Failure to Distribute Notice Annually

[b] Failure to Meet Standards

[i] Assessment Procedure

[ii] Payment

§ 484.18 Liability of Cable Television Company for Service Delay

[1] Subscriber Notification Requirements

[2] Small Claims Action for Damages

[3] Defenses

[4] Waiver Void

§ 484.19 Liability for Unauthorized Reception of Subscription Television Signals

§ 484.20 Liability for Damaging Cable Television Corporation Property

§§ 484.21-484.39 [Reserved]

§ 484.40 Federal Statutes

§ 484.41 State Statutes

§ 484.42 Administrative Regulations

§ 484.43 Decisions

[1] Breach of Employment Contract

[2] Contracts for Sale of Advertising Time

[3] Covenants Against Antennas

[4] Electronic Repair Dealer Registration Law

[5] Federal Regulation of Radio and Television Channels

[6] Remedies for Breach of Employment Contract

[7] Satellite Antennas

[8] Subscription Television

[a] In General

[b] Taxation

[c] Unauthorized Reception of Signals

§ 484.44 Attorney General Opinions

§ 484.45 Law Reviews

§§ 484.46-484.59 [Reserved]

§ 484.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302] by Radio or Television Station for Breach of Contract by Advertising Sponsor

[1] FORM

[2] Source of Form

[3] Use of Form

[4] Allegations

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Verification

[7] California Constitution

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

[10] Text References

[11] Cross References

§ 484.61 Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527], and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526] Injunction--By Advertising Sponsor Against Radio or Television Station--To Terminate Commercial Announcements for Sponsor

[1] FORM

[2] Source of Form

[3] Use of Form

[4] Allegations

[5] Verification

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] Text References

[9] Cross References

§ 484.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302]--By Television Actor Against Television Producer for Breach of Contract

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART I SCOPE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.01

§ 484.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the governmental regulation of radio and television, contracts for sale of advertising time on radio and television, and employment contracts involving workers in radio and television. It discusses special employment problems of minors in radio and television and the regulation of radio and television repair work. It also discusses causes of action relating to cable television, including small claims liability to a subscriber for delay of service and liability to a cable television corporation for property damage. In addition, liability for unauthorized reception under both California and federal law is discussed.

The chapter includes a form of complaint for damages for breach of contract by a radio or television station against an advertising sponsor [*see § 484.60*], a form of complaint for injunctive relief by an advertising sponsor against a radio or television station refusing to terminate commercials after cancellation of contract by the advertising sponsor [*see § 484.61*], and a form of complaint for damages for breach of an employment contract by a television actor against a producer refusing to compensate the actor [*see § 484.62*].

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in bringing or defending a defamation action against a radio or television broadcaster, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in bringing an action concerning public disclosure of a person's private life, and for discussion, procedures, and forms for use in defending the public disclosure of private facts, see Ch. 429, *Privacy* .

In addition, for other chapters relating to this chapter, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*; Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts* ; Ch. 14, *Advertising* ; Ch. 121, *Common Counts* ; Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* ; Ch. 140, *Contracts* ; Ch. 303, *Injunctions* ; Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* ; Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* ; Ch. 365, *Minors: Contract Actions* ; and Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Communications LawBroadcastingGeneral OverviewCommunications LawCable SystemsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawPrivacyGeneral OverviewCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesDefamationLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsBreachLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsChild LaborTortsIntentional TortsDefamationProcedureTortsIntentional TortsInvasion of PrivacyPublic Disclosure of Private FactsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART I SCOPE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.02

§ 484.02 Cross References

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an accounting action, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*.

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an action to recover money, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*; Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts* ; Ch. 121, *Common Counts* ; and Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and forms concerning advertising regulations, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

For discussion and forms for use when goods are unsolicited or services not performed, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an action for breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in obtaining injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in bringing or defending a defamation action against a radio or television broadcaster, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

For discussion and forms for use in enjoining plagiarism, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* .

For discussion and forms for use in an action for breach of an employment contract, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* .

For discussion and forms for use in petitioning for approval of a minor's employment contract for artistic services, see Ch. 365, *Minors: Contract Actions* .

For discussion and forms for use by a third party against principals and their agents, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use when facts concerning a person's private life are publicly disclosed, and

for discussion, procedures, and forms for use in defending the public disclosure of private facts, see Ch. 429, *Privacy* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawContent RegulationAdvertisingCommunications LawPrivacyGeneral OverviewCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesCopyrightCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesDefamationContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsBreachTortsIntentional TortsInvasion of PrivacyPublic Disclosure of Private FactsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART I SCOPE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 484.03-484.09

[Reserved]

§§ 484.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.10

§ 484.10 Governing Statutes

The repair of radios, televisions, and other electronic equipment is governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9800 et seq.* (Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law).

California law governing the cable industry includes:

- *Civ. Code § 1722(b)* (small claims action for delay of service by cable television company).
- *Corp. Code § 14400* (treble damages for injury to cable television corporation property).
- *Gov. Code § 53066 et seq.* (franchise or license to construct community antenna television systems).
- *Gov. Code § 53066.4* (lockbox made available to cable television system subscribers).
- *Gov. Code § 53088.5 et seq.* (cable system delinquent payment fees).
- *Penal Code § 593d* (unauthorized connection with cable system as punishable by fine and/or imprisonment and creating liability for civil damages).
- *Penal Code § 593e* (unauthorized manufacture, distribution, sale, possession, attachment, or other provision of device for decoding or intercepting transmission of subscription television service as punishable by fine and/or imprisonment and as creating liability for civil damages).
- *Pub. Util. Code § 215.5* (cable television corporation defined).

The provision of channels of video services to residences is subject to *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.* (Cable Television and Video Provider Customer Service and Information Act), and *Gov. Code § 53088 et seq.* (Video Customer Service Act).

A variety of California statutes governs the business of producing radio and television programs, including:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7319(c)* (persons employed in radio and television production exempt from cosmetology licensing requirements).

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14700* (filing of affidavit of authorship of radio script, radio program, or motion picture scenario with Secretary of State).

- *Gov. Code § 14671* (leasing of state property for radio or television purposes when in state's best interest).

- *Gov. Code § 26155* (conditions under which boards of supervisors may authorize contributions to nonprofit educational radio and television stations).

- *Lab. Code § 271* (deposit of funds sufficient to pay wages of individuals employed in radio or television broadcasting enterprise).

- *Lab. Code § 1308.5* (consent of Labor Commissioner required for employment of certain minors in radio broadcasting or television studio).

- *Pub. Util. Code § 768.5* (authority of Public Utilities Commission to require health and safety measures of cable television corporations).

Statutes relating to defamation in broadcasts include *Civ. Code § 48.5* (defamation by means of visual or sound radio broadcasts) and *Civ. Code § 3425.3* (single publication of libel or slander in broadcast over radio or television).

Miscellaneous statutes relating to radio and television include:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17531.6-17531.9* (injunctive relief by state against manufacturer, processor, or distributor of falsely labeled television picture tubes).

- *Educ. Code §§ 33120, 41920, 51870-51879.5, 62000, 71035, 78311* (use of instructional television broadcasts or closed-circuit television programs in schools).

- *Veh. Code § 27602* (no television sets permitted in motor vehicles forward of back of driver's seat or visible to driver when operating vehicle).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawBroadcastingGeneral OverviewCommunications LawCable SystemsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawVideo TechnologiesSubscription TelevisionEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.11

§ 484.11 Federal Regulation of Radio and Television

[1] In General

The federal government controls all channels of interstate and foreign radio transmissions. In addition, the federal government may grant licenses to individuals to use these channels to transmit radio communications for limited periods of time. The licenses granted to these persons do not create in them ownership rights in the radio channel. Rather, a license provides only for the use and operation of the channel by the licensee under the terms and conditions of the license [*47 U.S.C. § 301*]. Although not referring specifically to television, the federal regulation of radio applies equally to television [*Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 296, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246]* .

The federal statute controlling radio and television evidences a comprehensive federal scheme of regulation of the communications industry [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663, 112 Cal. Rptr. 585]* . Insofar as the federal government fully occupies the field of radio and television regulation, that field is no longer open to the states [*see City of Rancho Palos Verdes v. Abrams (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 367, 370, 376 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80* (FCC license to amateur radio operator preempted injunction obtained by city to prohibit use of frequency); *Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 300, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246]* . Similarly, because a state may not do indirectly by judicial decree what it cannot do directly by legislation [*Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 300, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246]* and because the federal scheme of radio and television regulation necessitates uniform enforcement across thecountry [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663, 112 Cal. Rptr. 585]* , a state court cannot enjoin television advertisements originating in, and transmitted from, another state but containing information contrary to local restrictions on advertisements [*People v. Eller Telecasting Co. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 296, 302-303, 91 Cal. Rptr. 468* (overturning injunction that restrained Arizona television station from broadcasting advertisements giving prices for optical work contrary to California law prohibiting quotation of optical prices)].

A state antitrust law claim based on the Cartwright Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720 et seq.*, prohibiting "anticompetitive 'tying' practices"), which is brought by a customer of a cable television service against the cable television operator, is not preempted by provisions of federal statutes (*47 U.S.C. §§ 521 et. seq., 541* et. seq.) regulating the cable television

industry [*Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1517-1518, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544]* .

[2] Restrictions on Antennas

Federal regulation preempts state and local restrictions, including zoning, land-use, or building regulations, to the extent they are unreasonable (as defined), that impair the installation, maintenance, or use of an antenna designed to receive any of the following [*47 C.F.R. § 1.4000(a)*]:

- Direct broadcast satellite service (if one meter or less in diameter).
- Video programming services via multipoint distribution services (if one meter or less in diameter).
- Broadcast television.

This preemption extends to private covenants, contract provisions, lease provisions, homeowners' association rules, or similar restrictions on property within the exclusive use or control of the antenna user if the antenna user has a direct or indirect ownership or leasehold interest in the property [*47 C.F.R. § 1.4000(a)*].

Narrowly drawn exceptions to the preemption allow some regulation for safety and in the case of prehistoric or historic districts, buildings, sites, structures, or objects included on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places [*see 47 C.F.R. § 1.4000(b)*].

A similar, somewhat less expansive, preemption applies to state or local zoning, land-use, building, or similar regulations that materially limit the transmission or reception by satellite earth station antennas [*see 47 C.F.R. § 25.104*; *see also Hunter v. City of Whittier (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 588, 598-599, 257 Cal. Rptr. 559* (ordinance held invalid)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawBroadcastingGeneral OverviewCommunications LawBroadcastingLicensingGeneral OverviewCommunications LawBroadcastingLicensingAllocation MethodsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawFederal ActsCommunications ActFederal PreemptionCommunications LawSatellite ServicesDirect Broadcast Satellites

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.12

§ 484.12 Contracts for Sale of Advertising Time

[1] Enforcement

Advertising time on radio and television is ordinarily an object of sale [*see Barron v. Board of Dental Examiners (1930) 109 Cal. App. 382, 384-385, 293 P. 144* (radio advertisements by dentist not prohibited so long as advertisements not untrue)]. Because advertising time is an object of sale, actions may be brought by buyers and sellers of advertising time to recover money due under contracts for advertising time [*see R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 184-188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703* (action brought by seller of advertising time against sponsors and sponsor's advertising agent)]. For example, an owner of television and radio stations may recover the money due for the broadcast of advertising on his or her stations based on a modified written agreement with the sponsor's agent where the owner and the sponsor's agent had discussed each purchase of radio or television time and the sponsor had taken an active role in obtaining the advertisements [*R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 189, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703]* . For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an action to recover money, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*; Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts* ; Ch. 121, *Common Counts* ; and Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Unilateral Cancellation of Advertising Contracts

By canceling an advertising contract, a buyer or seller of advertising time subjects himself or herself to the damages that will compensate the other party for the breach [*see Richardson v. Davis (1931) 116 Cal. App. 388, 390, 2 P.2d 860]* . Furthermore, when an advertising contract has been unilaterally canceled, a radio or television station cannot continue to run the advertisement and thus increase the damages [*see Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 371, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212* (finding, however, that buyer had not unilaterally canceled)]. In addition a buyer of advertising time may bring an action to restrain the broadcast of advertisements after having unilaterally canceled the contract [*see Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212* (action by advertising agency to restrain radio and television stations from broadcasting advertisements under purportedly canceled contract between advertising agency and owner of stations)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Communications LawBroadcastingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.13

§ 484.13 Breach of Employment Contract

Employment contracts providing for fees or commissions have been found to be breached when an employer fails to pay a performer for reuse of videotape recordings [*Bupp v. Great W. Broadcasting Corp. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 580, 584, 20 Cal. Rptr. 106* (reuse of commercial advertisements and announcements by staff television announcer) or televisionfilms [*Brecher v. Gleason (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 496, 502-503, 103 Cal. Rptr. 831* (reuse of television series featuring comedian)]. A breach of employment contract is also found where an employer fails to pay its authorized agents any commissions or fees for services rendered [*Brea v. McGlashan (1934) 3 Cal. App. 2d 454, 461-467, 39 P.2d 877* (refusal of radio station to pay commissions on advertising contracts that sales representative secured pursuant to oral agreement between the sales representative and the station's advertising manager); *see Taylor v. Educational Broadcasting Corp. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 680, 682-683, 94 P.2d 377* (no breach of agreement to pay commissions to radio advertising sales agent when agreement for commissions terminates and employer fails to renew based on agent's unsatisfactory performance)]. In addition, an employment contract is breached when an employer wrongfully discharges an employee [*Mason v. Lyl Prod. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 83-84, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193* (child actress wrongfully discharged when employer terminated employment after child disobeyed unreasonable order to remain on set of television series during lunch hour)].

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an action for breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* . For discussion and forms for use in an action for breach of an employment contract, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsBreachLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationBreach of ContractGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.14

§ 484.14 Remedies for Breach of Employment Contract

[1] Right to Accounting

Ordinarily, an accounting is unnecessary between an employer and an employee. However, where the agreed payment to the employee consists of certain percentages of money that the employer receives and the employee does not know what moneys the employer has been paid as a result of the employee's efforts, an action for accounting is proper [*Brea v. McGlashan (1934) 3 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 39 P.2d 877* (action for accounting to determine commissions due radio advertising sales agent for radio advertising contracts she procured)]. On the other hand, an action for accounting is improper when the amount sought by an employee is certain to his or her knowledge [*Tostevin v. Douglas (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 321, 329-330, 325 P.2d 130* (contract to solicit and procure personnel and material for travelog television shows at fixed salary)].

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in an accounting action, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*.

[2] Compensation After Wrongful Discharge

If an employee is wrongfully discharged, his or her remedy is an action for damages [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *see Mason v. Lyl Prod. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 84-85, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193* (wrongful discharge of child actress compensated for in monetary damages)]. However, when an employer has not discharged an employee but merely has prevented the employee from working, the employee need not treat the employment contract as broken. Rather, he or she may sue on the contract and recover the agreed compensation, provided he or she stands ready, able, and willing to perform under the contract [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171]* . Thus, when an employer breaches a contract of employment, the employee has the right to declare the contract terminated but may not recover damages accruing after declaring the contract terminated [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171* (actor quitting employment on television series after receiving notice of suspension of salary entitled to no more than salary due at time of his quitting)].

[3] Restoration to Position From Which Discharged

Ordinarily, an employer does not have the duty to provide work for his or her employee but is free to utilize the employee's services when and however he or she chooses so long as he or she pays the employee's salary. However, this rule does not apply where the employee's reputation will suffer if the employee is not allowed to practice his or her profession. In the latter situation, the parties to the employment contract are deemed to have contracted with the assumption that the employee would be given opportunities to exercise his or her abilities during a reasonable portion of the period of the contract [*Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 66-67, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473]* . For example, a radio announcer is considered, under his or her contract, to have bargained for the acquisition of a reputation in the public eye, a reputation that appearing through the medium of radio would enhance and failing to appear would diminish [*Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 68, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473]* . For this reason, a radio announcer wrongfully discharged is not only entitled to restoration of his or her position at the renumeration provided for that position but also is entitled to restoration of the duties and functions of the position of radio announcer [*Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 65, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsBreachLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationBreach of ContractGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationRemediesGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationRemediesCompensatory Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.15

§ 484.15 Restrictions on Employment of Minors

The Labor Commissioner must consent in writing to the employment of any minor under 16 years of age in any radio broadcasting or television studio [*Lab. Code § 1308.5(a)(1)*]. In addition, the Labor Commissioner must give written consent for any minor between the ages of eight and 18, already permitted employment by any state law as an actor, actress, or performer in a presentation in a radio broadcasting or television studio before 10:00 P.M., to continue his or her part in the presentation betweenthe hours of 10:00 and 12:00 P.M. [*Lab. Code § 1308.5(a)(4)*]. Any person, his or her agent, manager, superintendent, or officer, or any parent or guardian of a minor who employs, or permits the employment of, a minor in violation of the consent requirements outlined above is guilty of a misdemeanor. Failure to produce the written consent of the Labor Commissioner [*see Lab. Code § 1308.6* (prerequisites for Labor Commissioner's consent)] is prima facie evidence of the illegal employment of any minor [*Lab. Code § 1308.5(b)*]. For discussion and forms for use in petitioning for approval of a minor's employment contract for artistic services, see Ch. 365, *Minors: Contract Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsChild Labor

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.16

§ 484.16 Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law

[1] In General

The Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9800-9874*] is designed to protect the public from fraudulent, incompetent, and elusive service dealers who in the past, by unprincipled operations, have imposed upon and swindled the public [*see Packard-Bell Electronics Corp. v. Department of Professional & Vocational Standards (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 387, 389, 51 Cal. Rptr. 432]* . The Law generally empowers the Director of Consumer Affairs to investigate, regulate, and discipline "service dealers" through the Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair, Home Furnishings, and Thermal Insulation, a bureau within the Department of Consumer Affairs, and the Chief of the bureau [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9801(b)-(e), 9810*; *Packard-Bell Electronics Corp. v. Department of Professional & Vocational Standards (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 387, 389-390, 51 Cal. Rptr. 432* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1793.03* (manufacturer's duty to supply replacement parts)].

[2] Regulation of "Service Dealers"

Insofar as the Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9800 et seq.*) affects television and radio repair dealers, "service dealers" are persons who, for compensation, engage in, or hold themselves out to the public as offering services in, the following businesses:

(1) Repairing, servicing, or maintaining an electronic set normally used or sold for personal, family, household, or home office use [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(f)(1)*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(g), (n)* ("equipment" and "video game" defined)];

(2) Installing, repairing, servicing, or maintaining equipment or a burglar alarm system for use in private motor vehicles [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(f)(2)*];

(3) Installing, repairing, servicing, or maintaining television or radio receiver antennas, rotators, and accessories or direct satellite signal receiving equipment located on or adjacent to a residence and not involving a function that is subject to and regulated under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(f)(3)*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(j), (k), (l), (o)* ("antenna," "rotator,"

"accessories" and "direct satellite signal receiving equipment" defined)]; or

(4) Repairing, servicing, or maintaining major appliances [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(f)(4)*].

These dealers are required, with certain specific exceptions [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9802-9805*], to register with the Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair and to pay the required fee for each place of business [*16 Cal. Code Reg. § 2710*] operated by them in the state [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9830*]. Thus, it is unlawful for a person to act as an electronic repair dealer without being first registered and in possession of a currently valid registration [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9840*]. Electronic repair dealers also are required to do the following:

(1) Record invoices describing all the work they do [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9842*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2723-2725*];

(2) Return replaced parts to their customers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9843*; *see People v. Regan (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 1, 5-6, 157 Cal. Rptr. 62* (strict liability as imposed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9843*)];

(3) Prepare written estimates of work required for a specific job [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9844*; *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 2722*];

(4) Advise their customers in writing of the amount of the fee for determining the nature of the malfunction prior to a repair made in the residence, before removal of the consumer goods from the customer's residence, or on acceptance of the goods at the repair facility or registered location [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9844*]; and

(5) Maintain records open to inspection by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or other law enforcement officers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9847*].

The charge for installation of any equipment subject to the requirements of the Repair Dealer Law must be given to the customer in writing prior to making the installation. Whenever the installation charge is included in the sale price of the item and is not separately stated or whenever the charge for installation is reduced as an incentive to effectuate the purchase and sale, the Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair may determine the reasonable charge attributable to the installation, for purposes of enforcement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9844.1*].

In addition, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may refuse to validate, or may invalidate, the registration of any dealer for the following acts or omissions of the dealer or of any employee, partner, officer, or member of the service dealer and related to the conduct of the dealer's business [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9841*]:

(1) Making or authorizing an untrue or misleading statement or advertising [*see 16 Cal. Code Reg. § 2720*];

(2) Making a false promise likely to induce a customer to authorize repair, installation, service, or maintenance of a television or radio;

(3) Fraudulent or dishonest conduct;

(4) Incompetent or negligent conduct;

(5) Failure to comply with the Electronic Repair Dealer Registration Law;

(6) Willful departure from, or disregard of, accepted trade standards for good and workmanlike

installation or repair;

(7) Conviction of a crime that has a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions, and duties of the registrant;

(8) Commission of acts or crimes constituting grounds for denial of licensure under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 480*; and

(9) Holding, currently or in future, registration for the benefit of a former registrant whose registration has been suspended or revoked and who will continue to have some involvement in the business.

The Bureau of Electronic and Appliance Repair is instructed to design a sign which all service dealers must place conspicuously in their places of business. The sign must give notice to the public of mandated service standards and provide the telephone number of the bureau for inquiries or complaints [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9854*].

[3] Regulation of "Service Contractors"

[a] In General

In 1993, the legislature adopted provisions that extended the Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealers Registration Law to service contractors as well as to service dealers [*see* Stats. 1993, ch. 1265, § 7]. These provisions were subject to repeal on January 1, 2003, but the legislature extended that date to January 1, 2008 [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.9*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9830.5, 9832.5(f), 9847.5, 9849, 9851* (related sections subject to repeal on January 1, 2008)]. It is unlawful for any person to act as a service contractor in California unless that person first registers with the Bureau of Repair Services in accordance with the provisions of the Repair Dealer Law and maintains a valid registration [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.1*]. The service contract form to be issued by the service contractor must be filed with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs by the service contractor before its use [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.3(a)*].

"Service contractor" means either a service contract administrator or a service contract seller [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(e)*].

"Service contract seller" means a person who sells or offers to sell a service contract to a service contract holder [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(c)*; *see* discussion in *§ 48.16[b]*].

"Service contract" means a contract in writing to perform, over a fixed period or for a specified duration, services relating to the maintenance or repair of a set or appliance as defined by the Repair Dealer Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(a)*].

"Service contract holder" means a person who purchases or receives a service contract from a service contract seller [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(d)*].

"Service contract administrator" means a person, other than a service contract seller or an insurer admitted to do business in California, who performs or arranges, or has an affiliate who performs or arranges, the collection, maintenance, or disbursement of money to compensate any party for claims or repairs pursuant to a service contract and who also performs or arranges, or has an affiliate who performs or arranges, any of the following activities on behalf of service contract sellers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(b)*; *see discussion under § 484.16[2][d]*]:

(1) Providing service contract sellers with service contract forms;

(2) Participating in the adjustment of claims arising from service contracts; or

(3) Arranging on behalf of service contract sellers the insurance required by law [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.2*; discussion under *§ 484.16[2][c]*].

Each service contractor must maintain records as required by the regulations adopted to carry out the provisions of the Repair Dealer Law for at least three years. The records must be open for reasonable inspection by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or other law enforcement officials [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9847.5*].

A service contractor must comply with the provisions of the Civil Code governing (1) the making of a service contract in addition to or in lieu of an express warranty and (2) the requirements for home appliance or home electronic product service contracts [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.5*; *see Civ. Code §§ 1794.4, 1794.41*]. For discussion of those provisions, see Ch. 500, *Sales and Secured Transactions* , Pt. III. When a service contract holder cancels a service contract in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Code governing the requirements for home appliance or home electronic product service contracts [*see Civ. Code § 1794.41*], and the refund due is not paid to the service contract holder or credited to his or her account within 30 days after the service contractor receives written notice of cancellation, the amount of the required refund or credit must bear interest, payable to the service contract holder, at the rate of 10 percent a year for each additional 30-day period or part of a 30-day period [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.6*].

The Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may refuse to validate, or may temporarily or permanently invalidate, the registration of a service contractor for any act, omission, or crime by the service contractoror any employee, partner, officer, or agent of the service contractor for any of the following reasons [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.7*]:

(1) Any conduct that constitutes fraud or dishonest dealing;

(2) Conviction of a crime that has a substantial relationship to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a registrant under the Repair Dealer Law, in which event the record of conviction is conclusive evidence of it; or

(3) Assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate, any provision of, or any regulation adopted under, the service contractors law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.7*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855 et seq.*].

The Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may issue a citation to the service contractor for any of the following reasons [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(a)*]:

(1) Failure to file a service contract form with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs before its use [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.3(a)*] or failure to comply with applicable provisions of the Civil Code concerning service contracts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.5*; *Civ. Code §§ 1794.4, 1794.41*].

(2) On a determination by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs that the service contractor has committed a violation by either (a) making or authorizing statements or advertisements that are untrue or misleading or (b) making false promises of a character likely to influence, persuade, or induce a customer to purchase a service contract as provided by the Repair Dealer Law. A violation consists of a single publication or single course of conduct that is determined by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs to be untrue or misleading.

The citation may contain an order of abatement and an order to pay an administrative fine assessed by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)*].

Each citation must be in writing and must describe with particularity the nature of the violation, including a specific reference to the provision of law determined to have been violated [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(1)*]. When appropriate, the citation must contain an order of abatement fixing a reasonable time for abatement of the violation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(2)*].

A citation or fine assessment issued pursuant to a citation must inform the service contractor that if he or she desires a hearing to contest the finding of a violation, that hearing must be requested by written notice to the Bureau of Repair Services within 30 days after the date of issuance of the citation or assessment. If a hearing is not duly requested, payment of any fine does not constitute an admission of the violation charged. Hearings must be held pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(3)*; *see Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*]. For discussion of applicable hearing procedures, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* et seq.

In addition to requesting a hearing, the service contractor may request a citation review conference with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or his or her designee regarding the acts charged in the citation. A citation review conference must be requested by written notice to the Bureau of Repair Services within 20 days after the date of the issuance of the citation or assessment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(4)(A)*].

The Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or his or her designee must hold a citation review conference within 60 days from the receipt of the request. At the conclusion of the citation review conference, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or his or her designee must state, in writing, the reasons for his or her action and transmit a copy of his or her findings and decision to the service contractor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(4)(B)*].

The failure of a service contractor to pay a fine within 30 days after the date of assessment, unless the citation is being appealed, may result in disciplinary action being taken by the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs. When a citation is not contested and a fine is not paid, the full amount of the assessed fine must be added to the fee for renewal of the registration. A registration may not be renewed without payment of the renewal fee and fine [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(b)(5)*].

When a citation includes an administrative fine, it must be issued in accordance with the following procedures. For the first, second, or third citation, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may assess an administrative fine [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(c)(1)-(3)*]. For the fourth failure to file a service contract form with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs before its use [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.3(a)*] or failure to comply with applicable provisions of the Civil Code concerning service contracts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.5*; *Civ. Code §§ 1794.4, 1794.41*], during any two-year period, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may either assess an administrative fine or invalidate temporarily or permanently the registration of the service contractor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.8(c)(4)*].

The expiration of a valid registration does not deprive the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs of jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation or hearing on a cease and desist order against a service dealer or service contractor or to render a decision invalidating a registration temporarily or permanently [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9849*].

[b] Contract Sellers

Every service contract seller must file with his or her application for registration, and thereafter with his or her application for registration renewal, one of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.3(c)*]:

(1) A service contract reimbursement insurance policy [*see discussion under § 484.16[2][c]*];

(2) Evidence that his or her service contracts are administered by a service contract administrator who

has obtained a service contract reimbursement insurance policy covering the seller's service contracts;

(3) Evidence of a funded account held in escrow equal to a minimum of 25 percent of the deferred revenues from the service contracts in force; or

(4) The most recent annual report on Form 10-K required by the Securities and Exchange Commission, reflecting a net worth greater than the sum of the deferred revenues from service contracts in force. (If the service contractor is a foreign corporation that files a comparable audited financial statement with its home government, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may deem that statement an acceptable substitute for Form 10-K.)

A service contract seller must not issue, sell, or offer for sale a service contract unless he or she complies with one of the following requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.2(a)*]:

(1) Obtains a service contract reimbursement insurance policy [*see discussion under § 484.16[2][c]*];

(2) Sells service contracts that are administered by a service contract administrator who has obtained a service contract reimbursement insurance policy covering the seller's service contracts;

(3) Maintains and annually verifies to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs a funded account held in escrow equal to a minimum of 25 percent of the deferred revenues from the service contracts in force; or

(4) Files with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs either: (A) The most recent annual report on Form 10-K required by the Securities and Exchange Commission, reflecting a net worth greater than the sum of the deferred revenues from service contracts in force. (If the service contractor is a foreign corporation that files a comparable audited financial statement with its home government or with the United States government, the director may deem that statement an acceptable substitute for Form 10-K); or (B) The most recent audited financial statement reflecting a net worth of not less than $100,000,000. The financial statement must be certified by a certified public accountant who is licensed in the state where the service contract seller maintains its principal place of business or the seller's state of domestic incorporation.

Nothing in the California Public Records Act requires disclosure of either (a) financial data contained in applications for registration, or registration renewal, as a service contractor filed with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs for the purpose of establishing the service contractor's net worth or (b) financial data regarding the funded accounts held in escrow for service contracts held in force in California by a service contractor [*Gov. Code § 6254(x)*; *but see Gov. Code § 6254.7* (general exceptions)].

[c] Reimbursement Insurance

"Service contract reimbursement insurance policy" means a policy of insurance issued by an insurer admitted to do business in California providing coverage for all obligations and liabilities incurred by a service contract seller under the terms of the service contracts sold in California by the service contract seller to a service contract holder [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(f)*].

The policy must cover the obligations of the service contract seller under the service contracts sold during the period the policy is in force [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.4(a)*]. The policy must either cover all service contracts sold or specifically cover all contracts sold to residents of California [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9855(f), 9855.4(a)*].

The policy must contain a provision under which the insurer must notify the Bureau of Repair Services in writing of the termination or nonrenewal of the policy [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.4(b)*].

On the effective date of the termination or cancellation of a service contractor's policy, the registrations of the service contractors whose service contracts are covered by the policy are automatically suspended, unless the affected service contractors, before the date of the termination or cancellation of the policy, have either filed a new policy with the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs or otherwise met one of the requirements for dealing in service contracts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.2*; *discussion under § 484.16[2][b]*]. On receipt of a written request from the service contractor, the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs may delay the suspension of registration for no more than 60 days. Following the automatic suspension, an administrative hearing must be provided on written request to the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.4(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*]. For discussion of applicable hearing procedures, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* et seq.

[d] Contract Administrators

Every service contract administrator must file with the application for registration, and thereafter, with the application for registration renewal, a service contract reimbursement insurance policy [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.3(b)*].

A service contract administrator must not administer service contracts sold in California unless a service contract reimbursement insurancepolicy covering the service contracts has been obtained [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855.2(b)*].

A service contract administrator must not be an obligor on a service contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9855(b)*].

[4] Remedies Under Law

On the application of the Director of the Department of Consumer Affairs, a superior court in the county in which a service dealer or contractor carries on business may issue an injunction or other order restraining the dealer or contractor's conduct that is in violation of the Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9851*]. Furthermore, the Director accepts complaints from consumers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9860*] and either disposes of a complaint as not stating any violations by the dealer or contractor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9861*] or advises the dealer or contractor of the complaint, allowing the dealer or contractor a reasonable opportunity to reply to the complaint before investigating the facts [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 9862, 9862.5*]. If the Director, after investigating the facts, determines that a violation is likely to have occurred, he or she may suggest measures to compensate the complainant for the damages suffered as a result of the violation. If the dealer or contractor is unwilling to abide by the Director's suggestion, the Director may investigate further and may institute disciplinary proceedings against the dealer or contractor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9863*]. Finally, any person who fails to comply with these provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor and punishable by a statutory fine or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9850*].

For discussion and forms for use when goods are unsolicited or services not performed, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsGeneral OverviewAntitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationAntitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingState RegulationAntitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionMagnuson-Moss Warranty ActGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary &

Temporary InjunctionsInsurance LawBusiness InsuranceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.17

§ 484.17 Customer Service Standards of Cable Television Operators and Other Video Providers

[1] Adoption

The Cable Television and Video Provider Customer Service and Information Act (*Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.*) governs the establishment of customer service standards by cable television and video providers. Under the act, each cable television operator or video provider in the state is required to establish customer service standards [*see Gov. Code § 53055*].

The Video Customer Service Act (*Gov. Code § 53088 et seq.*) statutorily establishes customer service standards that cable television operators and other video providers are required to adopt [*see Gov. Code § 53088.2*]. Nevertheless, nothing in that act limits any power of a city, county, city and county, or video provider to adopt and enforce service standards andconsumer protection standards that exceed those established by the act [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(q)*].

The view of the Legislature in enacting customer service standards legislation is that the establishment and dissemination of customer service standards is one way to ensure that, in an unregulated environment, customers of cable and video providers get their money's worth for the services to which they subscribe [*Gov. Code § 53054.1(a)*].

For the purposes of *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.*, a "cable television operator" is the person or entity providing cable television services through a cable television system [*Gov. Code § 53054.2(a)*]. A "cable television system" is a community antenna television system, under common ownership and control, serving a franchise area or two or more contiguous or electronically connected franchise areas [*Gov. Code § 53054.2(b)*].

For the purposes of both *Gov. Code §§ 53054 et seq.* and *53088 et seq.*, a "video provider" is, with two exceptions, any person, company, or service that provides one or more channels of video programming to a residence, including a home, condominium, apartment, or mobilehome, when some fee is paid, either directly or as included in dues or rental charges, for that service, whether or not public rights-of-way are used in the delivery of the programming. A "video provider" includes, but is not limited to, a provider of cable television, master antenna television, satellite master antenna television, direct broadcast satellite, multipoint distribution service, and any other provider of video programming, whatever its technology [*Gov. Code §§ 53054.2(c), 53088.1(a)*]. The first exception is that, under the

Video Customer Service Act, a mobilehome is not expressly listed as a residence to which a video provider provides channels of programming [*see Gov. Code § 53088.1(a)*]. The second exception is that, under the Video Customer Service Act, a video provider does not include a landlord providing only broadcast video programming to a single-family home or other residential dwelling consisting of four units or less [*Gov. Code § 53088.1(a)*].

[2] Installation, Disconnection, Service, and Repair

[a] In General

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding installation, disconnection, service, and repair obligations, as well as service call response time and scheduling [*Gov. Code § 53055(a)*].

Every video provider is required to render reasonably efficient service, to make repairs promptly, and to interrupt service only as necessary [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(a)*].

In the event of a complete outage in a customer's service, the provider isrequired to respond promptly. The response must occur within 24 hours of the reporting of the outage to the provider, except in situations beyondthe provider's reasonable control. The provider is deemed to have responded to a complete outage when a company representative arrives at the outage location with 24 hours and begins to resolve the problem [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(g)*].

[a1] Access to Property Owned by Party Other Than Occupant

Cable television companies do not have a *First Amendment* right to deliver their product to customers residing in property owned by third parties, because delivery is so intrusive as to constitute permanent physical trespass. Accordingly, connection of cable equipment amounts to a private taking in violation of the *Fifth Amendment*, for which a private entity has no power of eminent domain [*Cox Cable San Diego, Inc. v. Bookspan (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 22, 26-32, 240 Cal. Rptr. 407* (preliminary injunction requiring access to property denied)]. There are no statutes granting cable companies a power of eminent domain nor can such a grant be implied from the statutes regulating cable television systems [*Cox Cable San Diego, Inc. v. Bookspan (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 22, 27, 240 Cal. Rptr. 407]* .

The legislative bodies of cities and counties (not cable television companies) are authorized to require developers, as a condition of a *new* subdivision map approval, to provide one or more appropriate cable television systems an opportunity to construct, install, and maintain equipment necessary to extend cable television services to each residential parcel in the subdivision [*Gov. Code § 66473.3*].

[b] Employee Identification

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding employee identification [*Gov. Code § 53055(a)*].

All video provider personnel contacting subscribers or potential subscribers outside the office of the provider are to be clearly identified as associated with the video provider [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(b)*].

[c] Telephone Availability

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding customer telephone and office hours [*Gov. Code § 53055(b)*].

All video providers are required to have knowledgeable, qualified company representatives available to respond to customer telephone inquiries Monday through Friday, excluding holidays, during normal business hours [*Gov. Code §*

53088.2(d)]. Additionally, all video providers must provide to customers a toll-free or local telephone number for installation, service, and complaint calls. These calls must be answered promptly by the video providers. The city, county, or city and county may establish standards for what constitutes promptness [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(e)*].

[d] Complaints

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding complaint procedures [*Gov. Code § 53055(e)*; *see Gov. Code § 53088.2(e)* (phone numbers for complaint calls), discussed in *§ 484.17[2][b]*].

[e] Billing

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding procedures for billings, charges, and credits, together with procedures for resolving billing disputes [*Gov. Code § 53055(b),(e)*].

All video providers must render bills that are accurate and understandable [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(f)*].

Every video provider must allow every residential customer who pays his or her bill directly to the video provider at least 15 days from the date the bill for services is mailed to the customer to pay the listed charges, unless otherwise agreed to under a residential rental agreement establishingtenancy. Customer payments are to be posted promptly [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(i)*].

In order to be able to charge fees for delinquent payment, a cable television operator must provide the consumer with written notice at or before the time the consumer enters into the initial agreement for services stating that it is the policy of the seller to impose a fee on delinquent accounts [*Gov. Code § 53088.6(a)*]. At least 10 days prior to the date a fee is imposed, the consumer must be warned on the face of a written notice of the late fee that will be imposed if a consumer's delinquency is not paid by a specified date certain [*Gov. Code § 53088.6(b)*]. The consumer's invoice must specify a due date that is not earlier than the tenth day of the service period for which the invoice is issued [*Gov. Code § 53088.6(c)*]. A fee may only be assessed no earlier than 27 days after the due date specified in the invoice [*Gov. Code § 53088.6(d)*] and on a balance due of at least $10 [*Gov. Code § 53088.6(e)*].

A delinquent account fee charged by a cable television operator generally may not exceed $4.75 [*Gov. Code § 53088.7*]. A fee to which the limitation applies is one "imposed upon a consumer's failure to make full and timely payment of periodic charges for those services," which must include any franchise fee paid by the operator on the delinquent account fee [*Manibog v. MediaOne of Los Angeles, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1366, 1372, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297* (operator's billing of $4.75 delinquent account fee and $0.24 franchise fee added to it to be paid to municipality violated delinquent account fee cap)].

[f] Refunds

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding refund procedures [*Gov. Code § 53055(b)*].

All video providers must issue requested refund checks promptly, but no later than 45 days following the resolution of any dispute and following the return of the equipment supplied by the provider, if service is terminated [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(m)*].

[g] Rate Increases and Channel or Programming Changes or Deletions

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding notice of the deletion of a programming service, the changing of channel assignments, or an increase in rates [*Gov. Code § 53055(d)*

].

All video providers must provide a minimum of 30 days' written notice before increasing rates or deleting channels. All providers must make every reasonable effort to submit the notice to the city, county, or city and county in advance of distribution of the notice to customers. The 30 days' notice is waived if the rate increases or channel deletions are outside the provider's control. In those cases, however, the provider must make reasonable efforts to provide customers with as much notice as possible [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(h)*].

[h] Termination of Service

Each cable television operator or video provider must establish customer service standards regarding procedures for termination of service [*Gov. Code § 53055(c)*].

No provider may terminate residential service for nonpayment of a delinquent account unless the provider furnishes notice of the delinquency and impending termination at least 15 days prior to the proposed termination. The notice must be mailed, postage prepaid, to the customer to whom the service is billed. Notice shall not be mailed until the sixteenth day after the date the bill for services was mailed to the customer. The notice of delinquency and impending termination may be part of a billing statement [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(i)*].

Every notice of termination of residential service for nonpayment of a delinquent account must include all of the following information [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(j)*]:

(1) The name and address of the customer whose account is delinquent;

(2) The amount of the delinquency;

(3) The date by which payment is required in order to avoid termination of service; and

(4) The telephone number of a representative of the provider who can provide additional information and handle complaints or initiate an investigation concerning the service and charges in question.

Service can only be terminated on days when the customer can reach a representative of the provider either in person or by telephone [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(j)*].

Any service terminated without good cause must be restored without charge for the service restoration. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, failure to pay, payment by check for which there are insufficient funds, theft of service, abuse of equipment or system personnel, or other similar subscriber actions [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(k)*].

[i] Disclosure of Customer Information

Video providers may not disclose the name or address of a subscriber for commercial purposes unrelated to the conduct of the business of the video provider (such as a commercial mailing list), without first notifying the customer. The notice, which may be separate or included in any other customer mailing, must clearly describe the customer's right to prohibit disclosure of personal information and the procedure for doing so [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(o)*].

[3] Annual Notice Describing Standards

[a] To Employees, Customers, and Local Governments

Each cable television operator or video provider must annually distribute to employees, to each customer, and to the city, county, or city and county in which the operator or provider furnishes service to customers a notice describing the

customer service standards adopted under *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.* New customers are required to be provided with this notice when service is initiated [*Gov. Code § 53055.1(a)*].

Additionally, at the time of installation, and annually thereafter, all video providers must provide to all customers a written notice of the programming offered; the prices for that programming; the provider's installation and customer service policies; and the name, address, and telephone number of the local franchising authority [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(c)*].

[b] To New Customers

The notice given to new customers under *Gov. Code § 53055.1(a)* must include, first, the operator's or provider's customer standards as adopted under *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.* Second, the notice must include a listing of the services offered by the operator or provider that clearly describes all levels of service, including the rates for each level of service. Nevertheless, if this information is otherwise distributed to new customers on installation by the operator or provider, the information need not be included in the notice [*Gov. Code § 53055.1(b)(1)*]. Third, the notice must include the telephone number(s) through which customers may subscribe to, change, or terminate service; request customer service; or seek general or billing information [*Gov. Code § 53055.1(b)(2)*]. Finally, the notice must include a description of the rights and remedies that the operator or provider may make available to its customers if the operator or provider does not materially meet its customer service standards [*Gov. Code § 53055.1(b)(3)*].

[4] Annual Report on Meeting Standards

After the standards established under *Gov. Code § 53054* have been in effect for one year, each cable television operator and video provider must report annually on its performance in meeting its customer service standards. This report must be included in the operator's or provider's annual notice distributed to employees, customers, and local governments [*Gov. Code § 53055.2*].

[5] Effect of Standards on Franchise or License Provisions

Nothing in *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.* is to be construed to preempt the prerogative of a city, county, or city and county to enforce customer protection standards contained in a franchise or license granted to a cable television operator or video provider under *Gov. Code § 53066.1* or that are otherwise authorized by law for other cable television operators or video providers [*Gov. Code § 53055.3*].

[6] Dispute Resolution

Disputes concerning the provisions of *Gov. Code § 53088 et seq.* are to be resolved by the city, county, or city and county in which the customer resides. For video providers under *Gov. Code § 53066* (cable television systems to whom a franchise or license has been awarded by a city, county, or city and county), the franchising authority (that is, the city, county, or city and county that has awarded the franchise or license to the provider) must resolve disputes. All other video providers must register with the city in which they provide service or, if the customers reside in an unincorporated area, in the county in which they provide service. The registration must include the name of the company and its address, officers, telephone numbers, and customer service and complaint procedures. Counties and cities may charge these other providers operating in the state a fee to cover the reasonable cost of administering *Gov. Code § 53088 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(p)*].There appears to be no statutorily specified method that acity, county, or city and county must use in resolving disputes.

[7] Cumulative Remedies for Violation

Regardless of the availability of a dispute resolution mechanism on the part of the franchising authority for video providers governed by *Gov. Code § 53066*, or on the part of the city or county of service for video providers governed

by *Gov. Code § 53088.2(p)*, or of any other provision of law, *Gov. Code § 53088.2* does not preclude a party affected by the statute from using any judicial remedy available to that party without regard to *Gov. Code § 53088.2*. Actions taken by a local legislative body, including a franchising authority, under *Gov. Code § 53088.2* are not binding on a court of law. For this purpose, a court may conduct de novo review of any issues presented [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(t)*].

[8] Civil Penalty

[a] Failure to Distribute Notice Annually

The legislative body of the city, county, or city and county in which the cable television operator or video provider furnishes service to customers may, by ordinance, provide a schedule of penalties for the failure of the operator or provider annually to distribute notice describing its customer service standards to employees, customers, and local governments. The penalty is not to exceed $500 for each year in which the notice is not distributed to all customers [*Gov. Code § 53056(a)*].

The city, county, or city and county must give the operator or provider written notice of any alleged failure to distribute to all customers the annual notice before imposing any penalty. If the operator or provider distributes the notice to all customers within 60 days after receipt of notice from the local government, no penalty is to be imposed [*Gov. Code § 53056(b)*].

[b] Failure to Meet Standards

[i] Assessment Procedure

The legislative body of the city, county, or city and county may, by ordinance, provide a schedule of penalties for a video provider's material breach of any of the customer service requirements of *Gov. Code § 53088.2* [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(r)*; *see Gov. Code § 53088.2(a)-(o)* (customer service requirements, all discussed in foregoing sections)]. Nevertheless, no monetary penalties can be assessed for a material breach when the breach is out of the reasonable control of the provider [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(r)*]. A "material breach" is any substantial and repeated failure to comply with the consumer service requirements of *Gov. Code § 53088.2* [*Gov. Code § 53088.1(b)*].

If the legislative body adopts a schedule of monetary penalties, prior to imposing a penalty, the city, county, or city and county must give the video provider written notice of any alleged material breaches of the consumer service requirements and allow the provider at least 30 days from receipt of the notice to remedy the specified breach [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(s)(1)*]. A material breach for the purposes of assessing penalties is deemed to have occurred for each day, following expiration of the time granted the provider in which to remedy the breach, that any material breach has not been remedied by the provider, irrespective of the number of customers affected [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(s)(2)*].

[ii] Payment

The penalty schedule is set forth in *Gov. Code § 53088.2(r)*.

With respect to video providers subject to a franchise or license, any monetary penalties assessed will be reduced dollar for dollar to the extent any liquidated damage or penalty provision of a current cable television ordinance, franchise contract, or license agreement imposes a monetary obligation on the provider for the same customer service failures. In these cases, no other monetary damages can be assessed. Nevertheless, *Gov. Code § 53088.2(r)* does not affect the right of franchising authorities concerning assessment or renewal of a cable television franchise under the provisions of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 (*47 U.S.C. § 521 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 53088.2(r)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawCable SystemsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawCable SystemsFranchisesAuthoritiesCommunications LawCable SystemsRate RegulationCommunications LawIntrastate CommunicationsState RegulationGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.18

§ 484.18 Liability of Cable Television Company for Service Delay

[1] Subscriber Notification Requirements

Cable television companies are required to inform their subscribers of the right to service connection or repair within a four-hour period if the presence of the subscriber is required. The company must inform the subscribers of this right by offering the four-hour period at the time the subscriber calls for service connection or repair. Whenever a subscriber contracts with a cable television company for a service connection or repair which is to take place at a later date, and the parties have agreed that the subscriber's presence is required, the cable company and the subscriber are required to agree, prior to the date of service connection or repair, on the time for the commencement of the four-hour period for the service connection or repair [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(1)*].

[2] Small Claims Action for Damages

If the service connection or repair is not commenced within the specified four-hour period, except for delays caused by unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences beyond the control of the company, the subscriber may bring an action in small claims court against the company for lost wages,expenses actually incurred, or other actual damages not exceeding a total of $600 [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(2)*].

Prima facie evidence of the time period specified for the commencement of the service connection or repair, as well as the time that the company or its agents attempted to make the service connection or repair, consists of logs and other business records maintained by the company or its agents in the ordinary course of business. These records are also prima facie evidence of a diligent attempt by the company to notify the subscriber in person or by telephone of a delay caused by unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(4)*].

[3] Defenses

No action will be considered valid if the subscriber was not present at the time, within the specified period, that the company attempted to make the service connection or repair or made a diligent attempt to notify the subscriber by telephone or in person of its inability to do so because of unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences beyond its control. If notification is by telephone, the cable television company or its agent must leave a telephone number for a return

telephone call by the subscriber to the company or its agent, to enable the consumer to arrange a new two-hour period for service connection or repair [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(3)*].

Other defenses to liability are as follows: (1) a diligent attempt was made to notify the subscriber of delay caused by unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences beyond the control of the company or its agents, and the company commenced service or repairs within a newly agreed upon two-hour period; or (2) the company or its agents was unable to notify the subscriber because of the subscriber's absence or unavailability during the four-hour period, and the company commenced service or repairs within a newly agreed upon two-hour period [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(5)*].

Finally, no action will be considered valid against a cable television company pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1722* if the franchise or any local ordinance provides the subscriber with a remedy for a delay in commencement of a service connection or repair and the subscriber has elected to pursue that remedy. If a subscriber elects to pursue his or her remedies against a cable television company under *Civ. Code § 1722*, the franchising, state, or local licensing authority will be barred from imposing any fine, penalty, or other sanction against the company, arising out of the same incident [*Civ. Code § 1722(b)(6)*].

[4] Waiver Void

Any provision of a delivery, service, or repair contract in which the consumer or subscriber agrees to modify or waive any of the rights afforded under *Civ. Code § 1722* is void as contrary to public policy [*Civ. Code § 1722(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawCable SystemsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesPublic Policy ViolationsGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.19

§ 484.19 Liability for Unauthorized Reception of Subscription Television Signals

Both state and federal law create civil and criminal liability for unauthorized interception of subscription television signals and for manufacturing, selling, or distributing devices to assist, or otherwise assisting, in unauthorized interception [*47 U.S.C. § 605*; *Penal Code § 593e*]. In the case of importation, manufacture and sale of devices, California law specifies that only products designed to decode, to descramble, to intercept, or otherwise to make intelligible any encoded, scrambled, or nonstandard signal are within the statutory prohibition [*Penal Code § 593e(b),(g)*]. Both California and federal law provide for injunctive relief [*47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(B)*; *Penal Code § 593e(e)*]. The civil remedies created by the federal statute may be enforced in California state courts [*47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(A)*; *California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Nichols (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 56, 66, 216 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *see California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Benvenuti (9th Cir. 1985) 767 F.2d 1364, 1365* ; *People v. Babylon (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 719, 723-724, 216 Cal. Rptr. 123, 702 P.2d 205* (describing method of transmitting subscription television programming)].

The California provisions do not apply to interception, or devices to aid in the interception, of unscrambled or unencoded microwave transmissions from a multipoint distribution service (hereinafter MDS) [*People v. Babylon (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 719, 725-727, 216 Cal. Rptr. 123, 702 P.2d 205]* . Civil liability for unauthorized use is the amount of the value of the connection and subscription service fees actually charged by the subscription television system for the period of unauthorized use [*Penal Code § 593e(c)*]. One of two statutory formulas may be elected by the subscription television system in an action for civil liability for importation, manufacture, sale, and distribution of decoding and descrambling devices; the damages may be increased by the court if the manufacturer's, importer's, or seller's violations were committed knowingly and willingly for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain [*see Penal Code § 593e(c)*]. In addition, the prevailing party is entitled to costs and attorney's fees [*Penal Code § 593e(d)*].

47 U.S.C. § 605 protects unscrambled and uncoded MDS transmissions [*California Satellite Systems, Inc. v Benvenuti (9th Cir. 1985) 767 F.2d 1364, 1367* ; *California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Nichols (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 56, 65-69, 216 Cal. Rptr. 180* (1984 federal amendment did not delete this protection)]. Nevertheless, an exception to liability exists for interception or assisting with interception of satellite cable programming for private viewing if the programming is not encrypted and no marketing system is established under which agents have been lawfully designated to authorize private viewing by individuals and under which authorization is available to the individual

involved, or the individual involved has obtained authorization [*47 U.S.C. § 605(b)*; *see 47 U.S.C. § 605(d)(1),(3)*].Alternative formulas for calculating civil liability are provided in the federal provisions; the formulas are the same for the importer, distributor, manufacturer, or seller as for the individual user [*see 47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(C)(i),(4)*]. If the violation was committed willingly and for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain, the court may increase the award of damages to a specified maximum [*47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(C)(ii)*]. If the violator was not aware and had no reason to believe his or her acts constituted a violation, damages may be reduced by the court [*47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(C)(iii)*]. In addition, the prevailing party is entitled to costs and attorney's fees [*47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(B)(iii)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCommunications LawTheft of ServicesCable ServicesGeneral OverviewCommunications LawTheft of ServicesCable ServicesCivil RemediesCommunications LawTheft of ServicesCable ServicesCriminal SanctionsCommunications LawVideo TechnologiesMultipoint Distribution Service

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.20

§ 484.20 Liability for Damaging Cable Television Corporation Property

Any person who willfully and maliciously injures any property of a cable television corporation is liable to the corporation for three times the amount of actual damages sutained thereby, to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction [*Corp. Code § 14400*; *Pub. Util. Code § 215.5* (defining "cable television corporation")]. The property damage giving rise to a cause of action on the part of the corporation may also subject the defendant to criminal penalties [*see Penal Code § 591*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesCommunications LawCable SystemsGeneral Overview

61 of 143 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 484.21-484.39

[Reserved]

§§ 484.21[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.40

§ 484.40 Federal Statutes

Federal regulation and control of all radio channels; licensing of individuals to use radio channels. *47 U.S.C. § 301*

Cable television regulation and consumer protection. *47 U.S.C. § 531 et seq.*

Limitation on liability of cable franchising authority under federal, state, or local law. *47 U.S.C. § 555A*

Civil and criminal liability for unauthorized interception of subscription television signal; civil remedies as enforceable in state or federal court. *47 U.S.C. § 605*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawBroadcastingLicensingGeneral OverviewCommunications LawCable SystemsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawCable SystemsFranchisesGeneral OverviewCommunications LawTheft of ServicesCable ServicesCivil RemediesCommunications LawTheft of ServicesCable ServicesCriminal Sanctions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.41

§ 484.41 State Statutes

Licensing provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* (Contractors State License Law) as inapplicable to person licensed under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9800 et seq.* (Electronic & Appliance Repair Dealers) if that person's activities consist only of installing satellite antenna systems on residential structures or property. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7054.5*

Persons employed to render specified services in radio and television production as exempt from barbering and cosmetology licensing requirements. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7319*

Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealer Registration Law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9800 et seq.*

Filing of affidavit of authorship of radio script, radio program, or motion picture scenario with Secretary of State. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14700*

Injunctive relief by state against manufacturer, processor, or distributor of falsely labeled television picture tubes. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17531.6 et seq.*

Radio and television repair. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22250 et seq.*

Defamation by means of visual or sound radio broadcasts. *Civ. Code § 48.5*

Single publication of libel or slander in broadcast over radio or television. *Civ. Code § 3425.3*

Treble damages for injury to cable television corporation's property. *Corp. Code § 14400*

Use of instructional television broadcasts or closed-circuit television programs in schools. *Educ. Code §§ 33120, 41920, 71035, 78310, 78311*

Leasing of state property for radio or television purposes when in state's best interest. *Gov. Code § 14671*

Conditions under which boards of supervisors may authorize contributions to nonprofit educational radio and television stations. *Gov. Code § 26155*

Cable Television and Video Provider Customer Service and Information Act. *Gov. Code § 53054 et seq.*

Franchise or license to construct community antenna television systems. *Gov. Code § 53066 et seq.*

Lockbox available to cable television system subscribers. *Gov. Code § 53066.4*

Video Customer Service Act. *Gov. Code § 53088 et seq.*

Deposit of funds sufficient to pay wages of individuals employed in radio or television broadcasting enterprise. *Lab. Code § 271*

Consent of Labor Commissioner as required for employment of certain minors in radio broadcasting or television studio. *Lab. Code § 1308.5*

Prerequisites for Labor Commissioner's consent to employment of minor. *Lab. Code § 1308.6*

Limited volunteer appearance of minor in radio or television exhibition. *Lab. Code § 1310(c)*

False report of planting of bomb to radio or television station as punishable by imprisonment not exceeding one year. *Penal Code § 148.1(a)*

Criminal penalties for damage to cable television corporation's property. *Penal Code § 591*

Unauthorized connection to franchise cable television system or television set as punishable by fine and/or imprisonment and as creating liability for civil damages. *Penal Code § 593d*

Unauthorized manufacture, distribution, sale, possession, attachment, or other provision of device for decoding or intercepting transmission and unauthorized interception of subscription television service as punishable by fine and/or

imprisonment and as creating liability for civil damages. *Penal Code § 593e*

Cable television corporation defined. *Pub. Util. Code § 215.5*

Authority of Public Utilities Commission to require health and safety mesures of cable television corporations. *Pub. Util. Code § 768.5*

Television sets and video monitors as prohibited in motor vehicles forward of back of driver's seat or operating and visible to driver when operating vehicle. *Veh. Code § 27602*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawCable SystemsFranchisesAuthoritiesCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesCopyrightCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesDefamationCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesLibelCommunications LawTheft of ServicesRadio CommunicationsCommunications LawVideo TechnologiesSatellite Master Antenna TelevisionGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.42

§ 484.42 Administrative Regulations

Regulation implementing Electronic and Appliance Repair Dealers Registration Law (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9800 et seq.*). *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 2700 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.43

§ 484.43 Decisions

[1] Breach of Employment Contract

Employment contract as breached when employer wrongfully discharges employee. *Mason v. Lyl Prod. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 83-84, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193*

Employment contract for fees or commissions as breached when employer fails to pay performer for reuse of television films. *Brecher v. Gleason (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 496, 502-503, 103 Cal. Rptr. 831*

Employment contract for fees or commissions as breached when employer fails to pay performer for reuse of videotape recordings. *Bupp v. Great W. Broadcasting Corp. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 580, 584, 20 Cal. Rptr. 106*

No breach of agreement to pay commissions to radio advertising sales agent as found when agreement for commissions terminates and employer fails to renew based on agent's unsatisfactory performance. *Taylor v. Educational Broadcasting Corp. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 680, 682-683, 94 P.2d 377*

Breach of employment contract as found when employer fails to pay its authorized agents any commissions or fees for services rendered. *Brea v. McGlashan (1934) 3 Cal. App. 2d 454, 461-467, 39 P.2d 877*

[2] Contracts for Sale of Advertising Time

Action brought by buyer of advertising time to restrain broadcast of advertisements after buyer's unilateral cancellation of contract. *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212*

When advertising contract unilaterally canceled, radio or television station as not permitted to increase damages by continuing to run advertisements. *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 371, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212*

Action brought by seller of advertising time against sponsors and sponsor's advertising agent. *R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 184-188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Owner of television and radio stations as recovering money due for broadcast of advertising on stations based on modified written agreement with sponsor's agent when owner and sponsor's agent had discussed each purchase of radio or television time and sponsor had taken active role in obtaining advertisements. *R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 189, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703*

In canceling advertising contract, buyer or seller of advertising time as subject to damages compensating other party for breach. *Richardson v. Davis (1931) 116 Cal. App. 388, 390, 2 P.2d 860*

Advertising time on radio and television as an object of sale. *Barron v. Board of Dental Examiners (1930) 109 Cal. App. 382, 384-385, 293 P. 144*

[3] Covenants Against Antennas

FCC regulation preempting local regulation of amateur radio antennas, *47 C.F.R. § 97.15* does not preempt judicial enforcement of private restrictive covenant forbidding construction of antenna. *Hotz v. Rich (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1048, 1052-1056, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 219* (remanding for further equitable proceedings in which trial court could find covenant so unreasonable as to render it unenforceable)

Deed restriction in real estate subdivision prohibiting installation of outside television or radio antennas or other device for transmission or reception of television or radio signals does not unconstitutionally limit freedom of speech and is enforceable with respect to Citizens' Band Radio (CB) antenna. *Conrad v. Dunn (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 236, 237-238, 154 Cal. Rptr. 726*

[4] Electronic Repair Dealer Registration Law

Purpose of Electronic Repair Dealer Registration Law as protection of public from fraudulent, incompetent, and elusive service dealers and theirunprincipled operations. *Packard-Bell Electronics Corp. v. Department of Professional & Vocational Standards (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 387, 389, 51 Cal. Rptr. 432*

[5] Federal Regulation of Radio and Television Channels

Penal Code § 593e (regulating interception of over-the-air transmission by subscription television system made pursuant to authority granted by FCC, as does *47 U.S.C.S. § 605*) held constitutional because it does not conflict with or stand as obstacle to accomplishment and execution of full purposes and objectives of Congress but merely prohibits same activity. *People v. Patton (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 1, 8 , 147 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 1, 194 Cal. Rptr. 759*

Federal statute controlling radio and television as evidencing comprehensive federal scheme of regulation of communications industry. *R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663, 112 Cal. Rptr. 585*

Federal scheme of radio and television regulation as necessitating uniform enforcement across country. *R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663, 112 Cal. Rptr. 585*

State court as acting improperly in enjoining television advertisements originating in, and transmitted from, another state but containing information contrary to local restrictions on advertisements. *People v. Eller Telecasting Co. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 296, 302-303, 91 Cal. Rptr. 468*

Federal regulation of radio as equally applicable to television. *Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 296, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246*

Field of radio and television regulation as no longer open to states as result of federal government fully occupying field. *Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 300, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246*

State as unable to do indirectly by judicial decree what it cannot do directly by legislation. *Standard Radio & Television Co. v. Chronicle Pub. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 293, 300, 6 Cal. Rptr. 246*

[6] Remedies for Breach of Employment Contract

Wrongful discharge of child actress as compensated for in damages. *Mason v. Lyl Prod. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 84-85, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193*

Accounting as unnecessary between employer and employee except where agreed payment to employee consists of certain percentages of money employer received and employee is without knowledge of what moneys employer has been paid as result of employee's efforts. *Brea v. McGlashan (1934) 3 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 39 P.2d 877*

Where employee's reputation is likely to suffer if employee is not allowed to practice profession, employment contract as deemed to be formed with assumption that employee to be given opportunities to exercise abilities during reasonable portion of contract period. *Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 66-67, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473*

Radio announcer as deemed to have bargained for acquisition of reputation in public eye in employment contract with radio station. *Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 68, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473*

Wrongfully discharged radio announcer as entitled to restoration of position at renumeration provided for position and restoration of duties and functions of position of radio announcer. *Colvig v. RKO General, Inc. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 56, 65, 42 Cal. Rptr. 473*

Wrongfully discharged employee as having remedy in action for damages. *Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171*

Employee prevented from working as able to sue on contract and recover agreed compensation if employee stands ready, able, and willing to perform under contract. *Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171*

When employment contract breached by employer, employee as having right to declare contract terminated but as unable to then recover damages accruing after declaring contract ter minated. *Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171*

Action for accounting as improper when amount employee seeks is certain to that employee's knowledge. *Tostevin v. Douglas (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 321, 329-330, 325 P.2d 130*

[7] Satellite Antennas

FCC regulation, *47 C.F.R. § 25.104*, preempts local regulation of satellite television receiving antennas; local ordinance that did not take into account owner's rights to receive signals and did not enact specific screening or placement requirements for antennas, gives unduly broad discretion to local administrative officials. *Hunter v. City of Whittier (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 588, 598-599, 257 Cal. Rptr. 559*

[8] Subscription Television

[a] In General

Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 (*47 U.S.C.S. § 521 et seq.*) authorizes Federal Communications Commission to preempt state regulation of quality of cable television signals by prohibiting enactment of local regulations that would establish complementary or additional technical standards, even when it is clearly possible for cable operator to comply with these standards in addition to federal standards. *City of New York v. FCC (1988) 486 U.S. 57, 64-69, 108 S. Ct. 1637, 100 L. Ed. 2d 48*

Cable television company denied franchise by city for lease of space on utility poles stated cause of action for violation of *First Amendment* rights if refusal to grant franchise to more than one cable company occurred when space on poles and economics of market demand would support more than one cable company in city. *Los Angeles v. Preferred Communications, Inc. (1986) 476 U.S. 488, 106 S. Ct. 2034, 90 L. Ed. 2d 480, 487-488*

New York statute requiring property owners to allow cable television hookups provided for taking of property without compensation and thus violated *Fifth* and *Fourteenth Amendment* rights when cable connection was permanent trespass. *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp. (1982) 458 U.S.419, 425-426, 435-436 , 458 U.S. 419, 102 S. Ct. 3164, 73 L. Ed. 2d 868* (remand to determine if fee payable by cable company to owner equaled value of property taken)

City and county are not required to grant cable franchise to every cable television company that applies. *Pacific West Cable Co. v. City of Sacramento, Cal. (9th Cir. 1986) 798 F.2d 353, 355 on remand (E.D. Cal. 1987) 672 F. Supp. 1322*

Penal Code § 593e as not applicable to unscrambled or unencoded microwave transmissions from multipoint distribution service. *People v. Babylon (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 719, 725-727, 216 Cal. Rptr. 123, 702 P.2d 205*

Gov. Code § 53088.7 prevents cable television operator from charging delinquency fee in excess of $4.75, irrespective of whether cable television operator designates part of that sum delinquency fee and part franchise fee. *Manibog v. MediaOne of Los Angeles, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1366, 1372, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297*

A phrase in *Penal Code § 593d* (unauthorized connection to cable television system), stating "person who violates," may not be construed to presuppose criminal conviction; civil liability is not conditioned on criminal liability. *Heritage Cablevision of Cal., Inc. v. Pusateri (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 517, 522-523, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 191*

Cable television company has no *First Amendment* right to deliver its product to customers because delivery is so intrusive, requiring permanent physical trespass; connection of equipment amounts to private taking, for which private entity has no power of eminent domain. *Cox Cable San Diego, Inc. v. Bookspan (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 22, 26-32, 240 Cal. Rptr. 407*

Denial of preliminary injunction to cable television company to allow it to reconnect subscribers at apartment complex, who had been disconnected by complex owner in breach of contract, was proper when money damages would be adequate, cable company had no *First Amendment* right to connect equipment, and intrusion would be more harmful to owner and competing cable company than exclusion would be to plaintiff. *Cox Cable San Diego, Inc. v. Bookspan (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 22, 25-32, 240 Cal. Rptr. 407*

Landowner's consent was not required before cable company installs equipment on telephone pole under lease from telephone company of portion of its easement; cable company's use was within scope of phone company's easement, which was apportionable. *Salvaty v. Falcon Cable Television (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 798, 799, 212 Cal. Rptr. 31*

[b] Taxation

Disseminators and subscribers of cable television service are engaged in protected *First Amendment* "speech" and therefore are entitled to protection, but tax that is not differentially burdensome is permissible. *Leathers v. Medlock (1991) 499 U.S. 439, 111 S. Ct. 1438, 113 L. Ed. 2d 494, 502, 506-508* (upholding gross receipts tax on cable television even though satellite broadcast services were exempted); *Sacramento Cable Television v. City of Sacramento (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 232, 237, 286 Cal. Rptr. 470* (upholding city utility users tax on cable television transmissions taxed in same category as telephone, gas, and electric utilities, even though other television and cable systems were not taxed)

[c] Unauthorized Reception of Signals

Injunction preventing members of general public from using microwave antennas and related equipment (which equipment can be used to unlawfully receive subscription television signals) must be tailored, if possible, so as not to infringe on legitimate uses of equipment. *Premier Communications Network, Inc. v. Fuentes (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 1096, 1101*

Unauthorized reception of unscrambled multipoint distribution service transmissions of subscription home television entertainment violated *47 U.S.C.S. § 605*. *Premier Communications Network, Inc. v. Fuentes (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d*

1096, 1099-1100

Prior to 1984 amendments, former *47 U.S.C.S. § 605* protected unscrambled and uncoded transmissions from multipoint distribution service. *California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Benvenuti (9th Cir. 1985) 767 F.2d 1364, 1367*

Civil remedies created by *47 U.S.C.S. § 605* are enforceable in California state court. *California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Nichols (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 56, 66, 216 Cal. Rptr. 180*

1984 amendments to *47 U.S.C.S. § 605* continue protection for unscrambled and uncoded multipoint distribution service transmissions. *California Satellite Systems, Inc. v. Nichols (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 56, 65-69, 216 Cal. Rptr. 180*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationCommunications LawContent RegulationAdvertisingCommunications LawFederal ActsCommunications ActGeneral OverviewCommunications LawFederal ActsCommunications ActFederal PreemptionCommunications LawVideo TechnologiesSubscription TelevisionLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationBreach of ContractGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationRemediesCompensatory DamagesLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationRemediesReinstatementReal Property LawRestrictive CovenantsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.44

§ 484.44 Attorney General Opinions

Use of satellite dish to receive regularly broadcast television programs for viewing by Youth Authority wards and employees residing in state-owned housing on Youth Authority institution grounds does not violate law. *71 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 16 (1988)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.45

§ 484.45 Law Reviews

Public Use or Public Abuse, 68 U.M.K.C. L. Rev. 49 (1999)

A City Guide to Developing, Using, and Regulating Regional Telecommunication Networks Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 21 Nova L. Rev. 515 (1997)

Note: *Residential Associations as State Actors: Regulating the Impact of Gated Communities on Nonmembers, 105 Yale L.J. 761 (1995)*

Note, *To Air or Not to Err: The Threat of Conditioned Federal Funds for Indecent Programming on Public Broadcasting, 42 Hastings L.J. 635 (1991)*

Comment, *Alcoholic Beverage Advertising on the Airwaves: Alternatives to a Ban or Counteradvertising, 34 UCLA L. Rev. 1139 (1987)*

Comment, *The Constitutionality of Pole Attachments Legislation: Not a Taking, But a Valid Regulation of Cable Television, 17 Sw. U.L. Rev. 321 (1987)*

Sylvester, *How the States Govern the News Media--A Survey of Selected Jurisdictions, 16 Sw. U.L. Rev. 723 (1986)*

Comment, *Who Owns the Air? Unscrambling the Satellite Viewing Rights Dilemma, 20 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 145 (1986)*

Note, *Quincy Cable TV, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission: Should the FCC Revive Cable Television's Must Carry Requirement? 19 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1369 (1986)*

Note, *The Sun Sets on Must Carry: Quincy Cable TV Inc. v. FCC, 20 U.S.F. L. Rev. 757 (1986)*

Note, *The Supreme Court Strikes Down the Public Broadcasting Editorial Ban: Federal Communications Commission v. League of Women Voters, 12 Pepperdine L. Rev. 699 (1985)*

Mininberg, *Circumstances Within Our Control: Promoting Freedom of Expression Through Cable Television, 11 Hastings Const. L.Q. 551 (1984)*

Trice, *Cable Wars*, 4(7) Cal. Law. 54 (1984)

Warner, *SMATV (Satellite Master Antenna Television-- Private Cable*), 18 Bev. Hills B.J. 254 (1984)

Comment, *Cable Television: The Constitutional Limitations of Local Government Control, 15 Sw. U.L. Rev. 181 (1984)*

Comment, *Low Power Television and the Doctrine of Localism: The Need to Reconcile a Medium With Its Message, 18 U.S.F. L. Rev. 505 (1984)*

Comment, *New Wave Policy: Protection of Direct Broadcast Satellite Transmissions Under Section 605, 14 Sw. U.L. Rev. 590 (1984)*

Drysdale, *Indecency and the First Amendment: Special Problems of the Broadcast Industry, 13 Lincoln L. Rev. 101 (1982)*

Comment, *Access to Cable Television: A Critique of the Affirmative Duty Theory of the First Amendment , 70 Cal. L. Rev. 1393 (1982)*

Comment, *Public Access to Cable Television, 33 Hastings L.J. 1009 (1982)*

Comment, *Subscription Television Decoders: Can California Prohibit Their Manufacture and Sale? 22 Santa Clara L. Rev. 839 (1982)*

Comment, *Subscription Television: Should the Government Prohibit Unauthorized Reception, 18 Cal. W.L. Rev. 291 (1982)*

Note, *The End of the Format Doctrine--Public Hearings on Changes in Entertainment Formats Need Be Held in Conjunction With Applications to Transfer or Renew Radio Broadcast Licenses-- FCC v WNCN Listeners Guild, 450 U.S. 582, 101 S. Ct. 1266, 67 L. Ed. 2d 521 (1981) , 22 Santa Clara L. Rev. 569 (1982)*

Kreiss, *Deregulation of Cable Television and the Problem of Access Under the First Amendment* , *54 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1001 (1981)*

Schuessler, *Structural Barriers to the Entry of Additional Television Networks: The Federal Communications Commission's Spectrum Management Policies*, *54 S. Cal. L. Rev. 875 (1981)*

Student Symposium, *Communications Regulations*, *69 Cal. L. Rev. 442 (1981)*

Kelso, *The Personal Attack Rule and Professional Occupations: Consistency in FCC Decision-Making*, *16 Cal. W.L. Rev. 399 (1980)*

Davis, "Freedom to Choose," 51 L.A. Bar J. 550 (1976)

Finkel, "Protection or Censorship," 51 L.A. Bar J. 534 (1976)

Price, "The First Amendment and Television Broadcasting by Satellite," *23 UCLA L. Rev. 879 (1976)*

Note, "Reconciling Red Lion and Tornillo: A Consistent Theory of Media Regulation," *28 Stan. L. Rev. 563 (1976)*

Note, "Ring Around the Collar--Chain Around Her Neck: A Proposal to Monitor Sex Role Stereotyping in Television Advertising," *28 Hastings L. J. 149 (1976)*

Note, "The Antitrust Implications of Network Television Programming," *27 Hastings L. J. 1207 (1976)*

Barrow, "The Fairness Doctrine: A Double Standard for Electronic and Print Media," *26 Hastings L. J. 659 (1975)*

Comment, "Chaos on the Citizens Band--Regulatory Solutions for Spectrum Pollution," *26 Hastings L. J. 797 (1975)*

Note, "King's Garden Inc. v. FCC: Loosening the Political Hands of Caesar," *2 Hastings Const LQ 619 (1975)*

Note, "The Limits of Broadcast Self-Regulation Under the *First Amendment*," *27 Stan. L. Rev. 1527 (1975)*

Mueth, "Copyright Infringement and Community Antenna Television--The Supreme Court's Re-Run," 8 Bev Hills BJ 20 (1974)

Case Development, "Teleprompter v. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.--An Exemption for CATV from the Copyright Laws?" *6 UWLA L. Rev. 152 (1974)*

Comment, "Right of Access to the Broadcast Media for Paid Editorial Advertising--A Plea to Congress," *22 UCLA L. Rev. 258 (1974)*

Comment, "The FCiv. Code as Fairy Godmother: Improving Children's Television," *21 UCLA L. Rev. 1290 (1974)*

Note, "Cable Television and Copyright Royalties," *83 Yale L. J. 554 (1974)*

Note, "The Rights of the Public and the Press to Gather Information," *87 Harv L. Rev. 1505 (1974)*

Note, "Toward Community Ownership of Cable Television," *83 Yale L. J. 1708 (1974)*

Berman and Rosenthal, "Enforcement of Personal Service Contracts in the Entertainment Industry, Part 2: Measure of Damages and Enforceability Issues," 7 Bev Hills BJ 24 (1973)

Rosen, "Arbitration in the Entertainment Industry--Selected Problems and Suggestions," 7 Bev Hills BJ 32 (1973)

Sobel, "Television Sports Blackouts: Private Rights v. Public Policy," 48 L.A. Bar B. 169 (1973)

Canby, "The First Amendment Right to Persuade: Access to Radio and Television," *19 UCLA L. Rev. 723 (1972)*

Comment, "A Constitutional Remedy for the High Cost of Broadcast and Newspaper Advertising in Political Campaigns," *60 Cal. L. Rev. 1371 (1972)*

Comment, "And Now a Word Against Our Sponsor: Extending the FCC's Fairness Doctrine to Advertising," *60 Cal. L. Rev. 1416 (1972)*

Comment, "Drug Lyrics, the FCiv. Code and the First Amendment," *5 Loyola L. Rev. 329 (1972)*

Anawalt, "Radio, Television and the Community," *11 Santa Clara Lawyer 229 (1971)*

Anthony, "Towards Simplicity and Rationality in Comparative Broadcast Licensing Proceedings," *24 Stan. L. Rev. 1 (1971)*

Danielson & Wheeler, "The Status of the Cable Antenna Television Industry in California and a Proposal for State Regulation," *2 Pacific L. J. 528 (1971)*

Pember, "The Broadcaster and the Public Interest: A Proposal to Replace an Unfaithful Servant," *4 Loyola L. Rev. 83*

(1971)

Stanley, "Federal Communications Law and Women's Rights: Women in the Wasteland Fight Back," *23 Hastings L. J. 15 (1971)*

Comment, "Television Formats--The Search for Protection," *58 Cal. L. Rev. 1169 (1971)*

Comment, "The Applicability of the Compulsory License Provision to Radio and Television Advertisements," *18 UCLA L. Rev. 1126 (1971)*

Note, "Power to Some People: The FCC's Channel Allocation Policy," *44 So. Cal. L. Rev. 811 (1971)*

Barnett, "Cable Television and Media Concentration, Part I: Control of Cable Systems by Local Broadcasters," *22 Stan. L. Rev. 221 (1970)*

Comment, "We Pick'Em, You Watch'Em: Network Challenge To TV Viewers' First Amendment Rights," *43 So. Cal. L. Rev. 826 (1970)*

Note, "The Listener's Right to Hear in Broadcasting," *22 Stan. L. Rev. 863 (1970)*

Note, "The Public Domain and a Right of Access: Effect Upon the Broadcast Media," *3 Loyola L. Rev. 451 (1970)*

De Vany, Eckert, Meyers, O'Hara, and Scott, "A Property System for Market Allocation of the Electromagnetic Spectrum: A Legal-Economic-Engineering Study," *21 Stan. L. Rev. 1499 (1969)*

Note, "The FCC's Proposed CATV Regulations," *21 Stan. L. Rev. 1685 (1969)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawCable SystemsPole AttachmentsCommunications LawCable SystemsPublic AccessCommunications LawContent RegulationGeneral OverviewCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesIndecency & ObscenityCommunications LawSatellite ServicesDirect Broadcast SatellitesCommunications LawU.S. Federal Communications CommissionGeneral OverviewCommunications LawVideo TechnologiesSatellite Master Antenna TelevisionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechCommercial SpeechAdvertising

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 484.46-484.59

[Reserved]

§§ 484.46[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART IV FORMS

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.60

§ 484.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302] by Radio or Television Station for Breach of Contract by Advertising Sponsor

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302] by Radio or Television Station for Breach of Contract by Advertising Sponsor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
[a corporation,]	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	(Breach of Contract)
Defendant(s).	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California [, in the _____ (*name*) _____ (Municipal Court *or* Judicial) District] [*or allege other capacity and residence*].
2. [Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]
3. [At all times herein mentioned each of the defendants, named as DOES I- _____ inclusive agent and employee of defendant _____ (*name*) and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the scope of such agency.]

4. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, doing business as a _____ [radio *or* television] broadcaster and was, and now is, broadcasting _____ [radio *or* television] programs in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. The programs are broadcast over _____ [station _____ (*letter designation e.g.*, KMEL) at _____ (*number*) _____ (AM *or* FM) *or* Channel _____ (*number*)].
5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff and defendant _____ [*name*] entered into a written agreement by which plaintiff agreed to _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] the following: _____ [*describe material to be broadcast or telecast, e.g.*, 60-second commercial announcements advertising _____ (*specify name of defendant's product*) for defendant commencing _____ (*date*), and ending _____ (*date*)]. In return, defendant agreed to pay plaintiff $ _____ for advertising time on plaintiff's _____ [station *or* channel]. A copy of the agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.
6. [_____ (*Describe any modifications of advertising contract, e.g.*, On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff and defendant modified the agreement of _____ (*date*), as to the periods of time to be covered by the _____ (radio *or* television) advertisements and as to the schedules and amounts to be paid to the advertisements. A copy of the modification is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.)]
7. By _____ [*date*], plaintiff had rendered all the _____ [radio *or* television] services for defendant which it had agreed to render under the agreement of _____ [*date*] [, or under the modifications thereto of _____ (*date*)].
8. The standard charges for the advertisements _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] by plaintiff pursuant to the written contract [and the modifications thereto] amount to a total of $_____.
9. Neither the whole nor any part of the above sum has been paid [, except the sum of $_____,] and there is now due and unpaid from defendant to plaintiff the sum of $_____, together with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:
1. For damages in the sum of $_____;
2. For interest on the sum of $_____ at _____ percent per annum from and after _____ [*date*].

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Source of Form

This form of complaint is based on the findings in *R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 187-188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703* . In an action for damages for breach of written contract, the court found that a radio and television station owner had contracted with an advertising sponsor for commercial announcements on radio and television programs, that the contract had been modified in writing by both parties, that the radio and television station owner had rendered the service bargained for, and that the advertising sponsor had failed to pay the money due under the contract and modified contract [*R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 184-188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

[3] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a radio or television broadcaster in attempting to recover money due from an advertising sponsor for commercial announcements broadcast for the sponsor pursuant to a written contract. The complaint prays for monetary damages [*Civ. Code § 3300*] with interest [*Civ. Code § 3302*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Capacities, residence, fictitious names, and agency of defendants (Paragraphs 1-3).
- Capacity of plaintiff as radio or television broadcaster (Paragraph 4).
- Formation of written contract for advertisements between plaintiff and defendant (Paragraph 5) [*R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 187-188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .
- An optional allegation of subsequent modification of contract by plaintiff and defendant (Paragraph 6) [*R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .
- Plaintiff's full performance of its obligations under the contract and any modifications to the contract (Paragraph 7) [*R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .
- The total amount due under the contract and any modifications to the contract (Paragraph 8).
- The amount due and unpaid by defendant with interest (Paragraph 9) [*Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302*].

[5] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action unless it is a limited civil case (amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less) and there is a municipal court in the county in which the action is brought [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases the caption must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000. When a limited civil case is brought in the superior court, the caption must also identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(8), (9)*].

[6] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (section repealed January 1, 2006, unless a later-enacted statute deletes or extends repeal date)], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[7] California Constitution

Residual jurisdiction of superior courts. *Cal. Const., art VI, § 10*

[8] State Statutes

Measure of damages in contract action. *Civ. Code § 3300*

Interest as damages in contract action. *Civ. Code § 3302*

Jurisdictional classification of cases demanding monetary damages. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 32.5, 86(a)(1)*

Required contents of complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*

[9] Decisions

Judgment for recovery of money due on written contracts between owner-operator of radio and television stations and advertising sponsor for advertising time. *R.H. Macy & Co. v. Robinson (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 182, 184, 188, 6 Cal. Rptr. 703*

[10] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 476-482, 488-501 (4th ed, 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts* (10th ed. 2005)

[11] Cross References

For discussion, procedures, and forms for seeking an accounting, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*

For discussion and forms for seeking recovery of money due on a stated account, see Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts*

For discussion and forms concerning advertising regulations, see Ch. 14, *Advertising*

For alternative forms of fictitious name allegations and alternative forms of capacity, residence, and agency of parties allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For discussion and forms for use in seeking recovery of money on an open book account, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts*

For discussion, procedure, and forms for use in an action for breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For alternative forms for use as prayers and verifcations, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* ; and Ch. 572, *Verification* , respectively

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART IV FORMS

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.61

§ 484.61 Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527], and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526] Injunction--By Advertising Sponsor Against Radio or Television Station--To Terminate Commercial Announcements for Sponsor

[1] FORM Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527], and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526] Injunction--By Advertising Sponsor Against Radio or Television Station--To Terminate Commercial Announcements for Sponsor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
vs.	)	ORDER, PRE
	)	LIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND PERMANENT
_____ [*name*],	)	INJUNCTION
Defendant.	)	[*Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc.§§ 526, 527*]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 484.60, Paragraph 1.*]
2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 484.60, Paragraph 2.*
]

3. [*Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 484.60, Paragraph 3.*]

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was, and now is, doing business as a _____ [radio *or* television] broadcaster and was, and now is, broadcasting _____ [radio *or* television] programs in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. The programs are broadcast over _____ [station _____ (*letter designation, e.g.*, KMEL) at _____ (*number*) _____ (AM *or* FM) *or* Channel _____ (*number*)].
5. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, an advertising sponsor of _____ [*name of product*] placing orders for commercial announcements for _____ [*name of product*] to be _____ [broadcast *or* telecast].
6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff placed an order with defendant for _____ [*describe material to be broadcast or telecast at plaintiff's request, e.g.*, 60-second commercial announcements advertising _____ (*name of plaintiff's product*) for plaintiff, _____ (*number*) of commercial announcements to be _____ (broadcast *or* telecast) each _____ (*indicate time period, e.g.*, week), at the rate of $_____ per commercial announcement].
7. [_____ (*Describe any modifications of advertising contract, e.g.*, on or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff advised defendant to modify the order as follows: _____ (*describe changes requested by plaintiff, e.g.*, to reduce the number of commercial announcements advertising _____ (*name of plaintiff's product*) from _____ (*number*) to _____ (*number*) for the _____ (*indicate time period, e.g.*, month of August) after which the original schedule to resume). Defendant accepted the terms of plaintiff's modification.)]
8. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff advised defendant that the order placed on _____ [*date*] [, and modified on _____ (*date*)] was canceled by plaintiff and that this cancellation was complete and effective immediately.
9. After _____ [*date*], defendant continued to _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] commercial announcements advertising _____ [*name of plaintiff's product*] and so continues to the date of this complaint.
10. After _____ [*date*], defendant continued to charge plaintiff for each commercial announcement advertising _____ [*name of plaintiff's product*] _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] by defendant and so continues to the date of this complaint.
11. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff again requested defendant to cease _____ [broadcasting *or* telecasting] commercial announcements advertising _____ [*name of plaintiff's product*] and to cease charging plaintiff for any announcements made after plaintiff's cancellation of the order.
12. The defendant threatens to, and will, unless enjoined and restrained by order of this court, continue to _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] these commercial announcements advertising _____ [*name of plaintiff's product*] and to charge plaintiff for each commercial announcement _____ [broadcast *or* telecast].

13. Plaintiff has no adequate and available remedy at law because the continuing nature of defendant's conduct would require plaintiff to file numerous civil actions, leading to a multiplicity of judicial proceedings.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any why it should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth during the pendency of the action;
2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant from continuing to _____ [broadcast *or* telecast] commercial announcements advertising _____ [*name of plaintiff's product*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

CAUTION:
Verification [Code Civ. Proc. *§ 446 Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5 Code Civ. Proc.* § 527

[2] Source of Form

This form of complaint is based on the factual situation presented in *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369-370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212* . In that case, an advertising business entered into a contract with a radio station for commercials to be broadcast on the station over a specified period of time. When the advertising business canceled this contract, the radio station continued to broadcast the commercials and to charge the advertising business for the commercials broadcast in spite of the advertising business's requests that the broadcasts cease [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369-370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* . The trial court granted a preliminary injunction to the advertising business and the radio station immediately ceased broadcasting the commercials. Because it thought the radio station unlikely to recommence the broadcasts enjoined, the trial court denied the advertising business a permanent injunction [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 372-373, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

[3] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an advertising sponsor to enjoin a radio or television station from continuing to broadcast or televise commercial announcements for the sponsor after the sponsor cancels its order for advertising. The complaint prays for a temporary restraining order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527*], a preliminary injunction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527*], and a permanent injunction [*Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Capacities, residence, fictitious names, and agency of defendants (Paragraphs 1-3).

- Capacity of defendant as radio or television broadcaster and plaintiff as advertising sponsor (Paragraphs 4, 5).

- An order plaintiff placed with defendant for commercials to be run on defendant's radio or television programs (Paragraph 6) [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Optional allegation of a modification in the order that plaintiff placed and defendant's acceptance of the modification (Paragraph 7) [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369-370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Plaintiff's notification to defendant of complete and immediate cancellation of plaintiff's order (Paragraph 8) [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Defendant's continuing to broadcast or telecast plaintiff's commercials and to charge plaintiff for

such broadcasts or telecasts (Paragraphs 9, 10) [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Plaintiff's request that defendant cease broadcasting or telecasting the commercials and cease charging plaintiff for the broadcasts or telecasts after the date of cancellation of the order (Paragraph 11) [*Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212]* .

- Defendant's refusal to cease broadcasting or telecasting of plaintiff's commercials unless enjoined (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 527*].

- Plaintiff's lack of an adequate or available legal remedy (Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 527*].

[5] Verification

Verification [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527*].

If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] State Statutes

Preventative relief by means of injunction. *Civ. Code § 3420*

Provisional injunctions as regulated by Code of Civil Procedure. *Civ. Code § 3421*

Grounds for issuance of injunction. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

When an injunction cannot be granted. *Civ. Code § 3423*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Jurisdiction of municipal court to issue temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*

Injunction defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Procedure by which to obtain temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 527*

[7] Decisions

Action to enjoin commercial announcements broadcast after notification of cancellation of contract for such announcements. *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369-370, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212*

On notice of cancellation of contract, party as not permitted to continue performance and recover damages for full performance. *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 371, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212*

Permanent injunction as not granted where no reasonable probability that party ceasing acts complained of under preliminary injunction will resume performing such acts. *Early v. Santa Clara Broadcasting Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 367, 372-373, 27 Cal. Rptr. 212*

In canceling advertising contract, buyer of advertising time as subjecting himself or herself to damages that will compensate other party for breach. *Richardson v. Davis (1931) 116 Cal. App. 388, 390, 2 P.2d 860*

[8] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 778-788 (4th ed, 1997)

[9] Cross References

For discussion, procedures, and forms for use in obtaining injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms for use in enjoining plagiarism, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright*

For discussion and forms for use by a third party against principals and their agents, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* , Pt. III

See also Comments and References to § 484.60

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 484 RADIO AND TELEVISION
PART IV FORMS

42-484 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 484.62

§ 484.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302]--By Television Actor Against Television Producer for Breach of Contract

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] and Interest [Civ. Code § 3302]--By Television Actor Against Television Producer for Breach of Contract
[*Caption. See § 484.60.*]
1. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence*].

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 484.60, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 484.60, Paragraph 3.*]

4. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a producer of television films.
5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a[n] _____ [written *or* oral] agreement for defendant's employment of plaintiff as _____ [*describe position for which plaintiff hired, e.g.*, an actor on defendant's television series _____ (*name of series*)]. The terms of the agreement were as follows: _____ [*set out terms of agreement, e.g.*, defendant agreed to pay plaintiff the sum of $_____ per _____ (*indicate time period, e.g.*, week) for his/her services as an actor on defendant's television series _____ (*name of series*), defendant to suspend payment of such salary to plaintiff in the event that causes beyond the control of defendant materially hampered, interrupted, or prevented production of the television series]. [A copy of the agreement between plaintiff and defendant is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

6. Plaintiff entered upon the employment and duly performed all of the conditions of the agreement to be performed on his/her part until defendant notified plaintiff of the suspension of his/her salary. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff has been ready, willing, and able to perform, and has offered to perform, all of the conditions of the agreement to be performed on his/her part.
7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant notified plaintiff of the suspension of plaintiff's salary for the reason that _____ [*describe cause alleged by defendant, e.g.*, a strike by television script writers

producing television scripts for defendant] materially hampered, interrupted, or prevented production of defendant's television series _____ [*name of series*]. In fact, _____ [*decribe cause alleged by defendant, e.g.*, the strike by television script writers] did not materially hamper, interrupt, or prevent production of defendant's television series.
8. Thereafter, defendant failed to pay plaintiff the amount of $_____ per _____ [*indicate time period, e.g.*, week] as required by the agreement between defendant and plaintiff.
9. Defendant has paid plaintiff a total sum of $_____ and has not paid any part of the balance of the total sum due under the agreement, to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of complaint is for use by a television actor against a television producer for breach of the employment contract between them. The complaint prays for damages for the agreed compensation under the agreement [*see Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171* (television actor as unable to recover agreed compensation under agreement with producer as a result of declaring the contract terminated after the producer's breach)].

[3] Allegations

The foregoing complaint alleges: (1) capacity and residence, fictitious name, and agency of defendant (Paragraphs I-III); (2) capacity of defendant as producer of television films (Paragraph IV); (3) formation of contract between producer and actor for actor to work in television series (Paragraph V) [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 334, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171]* ; (4) actor's performance of all terms under agreement and willingness to stand ready to perform under agreement (Paragraph VI) [*see Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171]* ; (5) suspension of agreed compensation under agreement without good reason (Paragraph VII) [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 344, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; see *Mason v. Lyl Productions (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 84-85, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193]* ; and (6) amount due actor as a result of producer's breach (Paragraphs VIII, IX) [*see Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171]* .

[4] Decisions

Wrongful discharge of child actress by production company of television series as found when child actress's employment terminated as result of her disobedience of producer's unreason able demand that she remain on set. *Mason v. Lyl Productions (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 79, 84-85, 69 Cal. Rptr. 769, 443 P.2d 193*

Breach of employment contract with television actor by producer suspending payment of salary when production on series in which actor regularly appeared not materially hampered, interrupted, or prevented. *Warner Bros. Pictures Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 344, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171*

Where television actor treated employment contract as terminated after producer's suspension of salary to actor, actor as unable to sue on contract to recover agreed compensation; in order to recover agreed compensation, actor as required to be ready, able and willing to perform. *Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 351, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171*

[5] Text References

2 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Actors*, §§ 5-10

32 Cal. Jur. 2d, *Master and Servant*, §§ 14-80

[6] Cross References

For discussion, procedures, and forms of allegation for use in complaints for breach of employment contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms for use by an employee in actions for wrongful discharge, for unpaid compensation, or for an accounting, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* and Ch. 250, *Employment Law: Wage and Hour Disputes*

For other discussions and forms related to actions arising from, based on, or concerning the relationship of employer and employee, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*; Ch. 118, *Civil Service* ; Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances* ; Ch. 276, *Garnishment* ; Ch. 303, *Injunctions* ; Ch. 307, *Insolvency* ; Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* ; Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* ; Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance* ; Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* ; and Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation*

See also Comments and References to *§ 484.60*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 485.syn

§ 485.syn Synopsis to Chapter 485: RAILROADS

§ 485.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 485.02 Cross References

§§ 485.03-485.09 [Reserved]

§ 485.10 Regulation of Railroads

§§ 485.11-485.29 [Reserved]

§ 485.30 Governing Law

§ 485.31 California Law

§ 485.32 Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)

[1] Basis of Liability

[2] Enactment and Purpose

[3] Rule of Liberal Construction

[4] Exclusivity of Remedy

[5] California's Workers' Compensation Law Compared

§ 485.33 Determining Employer-Employee Status

§ 485.34 Duty of Care Under FELA

[1] Employee

[2] Employer

[3] Assumption That Employees Will Exercise Care

§ 485.35 Requirements for Recovery in FELA Action

[1] Employment in Interstate Commerce

[2] Negligence (Breach of Duty)

[3] Injuries Covered

[4] Causation

§ 485.36 Survival of FELA Action

§ 485.37 Concurrent Jurisdiction of Federal and State Courts Over FELA Actions

§ 485.38 Law Applicable in State Court Actions

§ 485.39 Proper Court for Trial (Venue) of FELA Actions

§ 485.40 Applicability of Doctrine of Forum Non Conveniens (Inconvenient Forum) in State Court Actions

§ 485.41 Statute of Limitations on FELA Actions

§ 485.42 Defenses to FELA Action

[1] Disclaimer of Liability and Setoff

[2] Contributory Negligence

[3] Assumption of Risk

[4] Preemption Regarding "Maritime Employment"

§ 485.43 Damages Recoverable

§ 485.44 Measure of Damages

§ 485.45 Safety Provisions Supplementing FELA

[1] Safety Appliance Act

[2] Boiler Inspection Act

[3] "Railroad" Defined

[4] Employer's Absolute Liability for Violation of Safety Provision

[5] Violation of Safety Provision as Basis for FELA Claim

[6] Liberal Construction of Safety Provisions

§ 485.46 Railway Labor Act (RLA)

§ 485.47 Railroad's Right to Indemnity From Third-Party Tortfeasor

[1] Applicable Law

[2] Contractual Indemnity

[3] Implied Equitable Indemnity

[4] Statute of Limitations on Indemnity Actions

§ 485.48 Penalty for Suppression of Voluntary Information Relating to FELA Claim

§§ 485.49-485.59 [Reserved]

§ 485.60 Governing Law

§ 485.60A Scope of Federal Preemption

§ 485.61 Negligence Action Against Railroad

§ 485.62 Railroad's Duty of Care

[1] Duty to Passengers as Common Carrier

[a] Generally

[b] At Railroad Stations

[c] Additional Statutory Duties to Passengers

[2] Duty to Nonpassengers

[a] Generally

[b] Trespassers

[3] Duty to Construct and Maintain Safe Premises

[a] Tracks

[b] Crossings

[c] Signalling Devices and Warnings

[d] Cattle Guards and Fences

[4] Duty to Operate Trains Safely

[a] Approaching Crossings

[b] Blocking Crossing

[c] Avoidance of Persons or Objects on Track

[d] Backing Up of Train

[e] Failure to Sound Train Whistle or Signal

[f] Excessive Speed

§ 485.63 Vicarious Liability of Railroad Owners

[1] Negligence of Employees

[2] Negligence of Lessee

§ 485.64 Effect of Safety Statute, Ordinance, or Regulation

[1] Violation Creates Presumption of Negligence

[2] Compliance Does Not Per Se Negate Negligence

[3] Violation of Company Rule Compared

§ 485.65 Evidence of Prior Accidents or Safeguards

§ 485.66 Punitive Damages

§ 485.67 Affirmative Defense of Comparative Negligence

[1] Generally

[2] Stop, Look, and Listen Rule

§ 485.68 Statutory Action Against Public Utility

§§ 485.69-485.79 [Reserved]

§ 485.80 Federal Statutes

§ 485.81 State Statutes

§ 485.82 Federal Administrative Regulations

§ 485.83 Decisions

[1] Boiler Inspection Act

[2] Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)

[a] Generally

[b] Appellate Review

[c] Arising out of and in Course of Employment

[d] Assumption of Risk

[e] Contributory Negligence

[f] Damages

[g] Employee Status

[h] Employer's Duties

[i] Evidence

[j] Exclusivity of Remedy

[k] Forum Non Conveniens

[l] Indemnity Action by Railroad

[m] Injury

[n] Interest

[o] Negligence of Employer

[p] Preemption Regarding Maritime Employment

[q] Res Ipsa Loquitur

[r] Scope of Employment

[s] Status of Particular Companies

[i] Pullman Company

[ii] Railway Express Agency

[iii] Refrigerator Car Companies

[t] Statute of Limitations

[u] Summary Judgment

[v] Tortious Conduct of Fellow Employee

[3] Juries and Verdicts

[4] Jury Instructions

[5] Safety Appliance Act

§ 485.84 Law Reviews

§ 485.85 Text References

§§ 485.86-485.99 [Reserved]

§ 485.100 California Points and Authorities

§ 485.101 Forms of Discovery

§ 485.102 California Torts

§ 485.103 State Constitution

§ 485.104 State Statutes

[1] Animals

[2] Crossings

[3] Equipment

[4] Liability

[5] Passengers

[6] Schools

§ 485.105 Decisions

[1] Automobile Passengers

[2] Comparative Negligence

[3] Crossings

[4] Fences

[5] Passengers

[6] Presumption of Negligence

[a] Presumption Is Rebuttable

[b] Violation of Company Rule

[c] Violation of PUC Regulation or Order

[d] Violation of Statute or Ordinance

[7] Trespassers

§ 485.106 Attorney General Opinions

§ 485.107 Text References

§§ 485.108-485.119 [Reserved]

§ 485.120 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7-11] Filed in United States District Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56] for Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Official Fed. R. Civ. P. Form No. 14

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Content and Format of Complaint in Federal Court

[4] Allegations

[5] Prayer

[6] Signature and Verification

[7] Violation of Safety Acts

[8] Pleading Separate Theories

[9] Joinder of Parties and Actions

[10] Federal Statutes

[11] Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

[12] Text References

§ 485.121 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specification of Damages

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Inconvenient Forum

[8] Alternative Theories of Recovery

[9] Compared With Federal Complaint

[10] Cross References

[11] Federal Statutes

[12] Decisions

§ 485.122 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Wrongful Death Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Death Caused by Exacerbation of Existing Illness or Condition

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Liability of Railroad for Worker's Death

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

[6] Decisions

§ 485.123 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Train Dispatcher Suffered Nervous Breakdown Caused by Unusually Stressful Working Conditions

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross References

§ 485.124 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Plater Contracted Skin Infection From Plating Solution

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 485.125 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Oiler Injured by Strain of Lifting Barrels Because of Defendant's Failure to Provide Sufficient Equipment and Assistance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross References

§ 485.126 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Conductor Injured on Sudden Release of Brake [49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(B)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Federal Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 485.127 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Switchman Injured in Fall From Car Caused by Car's Being Negligently Jerked With Unusual Force and by Loose Grab Iron [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Federal Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 485.128 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Boiler Inspection Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Engineer Injured in Fall From Greasy Ladder on Side of Locomotive [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20701]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Federal Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 485.129 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defenses [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Accident Caused by Plaintiff's Sole Negligence, Plaintiff's Contributory Negligence, Sole Negligence of Third Person, or Combined Negligence of Plaintiff and Third Person [45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 53]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Negligence and Contributory Negligence

§ 485.130 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Preemption by Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.)

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] "Maritime Employment"

[4] Cross References

§§ 485.131-485.149 [Reserved]

§ 485.150 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Passenger for Personal Injury [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Specification of Damages

[6] Cross References

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[9] Text References

§ 485.151 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Automobile Driver for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

[6] Text References

§ 485.152 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint for Wrongful Death of Automobile Driver by Entitled Person(s) [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Wrongful Death Actions

[5] Venue

[6] Cross References

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 485.153 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Failure to Repair Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 485.154 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Use of Excessive Speed at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 485.155 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Comparative Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)] of Automobile Driver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

[5] Text References

§ 485.156 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Trespasser Injured While Riding or Getting on or off Moving Train [Civ. Code § 1714.7]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART I. SCOPE

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.01

§ 485.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions for damages for the personal injury or death of a railroad worker under the Federal Employers' Liability Act, and includes a form of complaint for use in a United States District Court [*see § 485.120*], forms of complaints for use in a California state court [§§ *485.121*, *485.122*], forms of allegations for use in conjunction with the complaints [*see §§ 485.123 -485.128*], and forms of affirmative defenses for use in an answer to the complaint [§§ *485.129*, *485.130*].

This chapter also discusses actions arising under state law against railroads for injuries to passengers and other persons, such as automobile occupants and railroad trespassers, who are not railroad employees. It includes a form of complaint for use by a passenger to recover for injuries suffered in boarding or alighting from a train [*see § 485.150*], a form of complaint and forms of complaint allegations for use by an automobile driver in an action arising from a collision with a train [§§ *485.151*, *485.153*-34], and a form of complaint for use by entitled persons in a wrongful death action involving a driver killed in a crossing collision [*see § 485.152*]. This part also includes forms of affirmative defense allegations based on comparative negligence [*see § 485.155*] and the plaintiff's status as a trespasser [*see § 485.156*].

For discussion and forms relating to actions against carriage of persons and freight generally, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* . For discussion and forms relating to actions against other types of particular carriers, see Ch. 16, *Airplanes and Airports* ; Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars* ; Ch. 522, *Ships and Shipping* ; Ch. 544, *Taxicabs* ; and Ch. 553, *Trucks* . For discussion and forms relating to actions based on general premises liability, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART I. SCOPE

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.02

§ 485.02 Cross References

For a form of complaint for use by an owner whose cattle have been injured or killed by a railroad's failure to maintain a proper fence, see Ch. 23, *Animals: Civil Liability*

For a form of complaint to bring an action by a passenger for assault and battery against a carrier of persons for reward, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

For a form of complaint to bring an action by a passenger for assault and battery against an agent of a common carrier, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For discussion of common carriers generally, see *Ch. 109, Carriers, § 109.10 et seq. and § 109.30* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to the capacity of foreign corporations to be sued, see Ch. 160, *Corporations: Capacity*

For discussion and forms relating to federal diversity jurisdiction and removal of state actions to federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For discussion and forms relating to state court jurisdiction over foreign corporations, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and forms relating to negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

For discussion and forms relating to the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons on foreign corporations, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesCrimes Against PersonsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionSubject Matter JurisdictionTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART I. SCOPE

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.03-485.09

[Reserved]

§§ 485.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.10

§ 485.10 Regulation of Railroads

Railroads are extensively regulated under federal and state law. Under federal law, the Surface Transportation Board [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 701 et seq.* (provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act establishing the Surface Transportation Board); *see also 49 U.S.C.S. §§ 10101-10102* (general provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act)] has exclusive jurisdiction over interstate rail transportation, as well as rail transportation between a state and a territory or possession or foreign country [*49 U.S.C.S. § 10501(a)*]. The Board has jurisdiction over intrastate transportation by rail when transportation is between two points in the same state, but part of the interstate rail network [*49 U.S.C.S. § 10501(a)(2)(A)*] and limited jurisdiction over intrastate rail transportation by common carriers [*49 U.S.C.S. § 10501(b)*]. Railroads are further regulated by railroad safety provisions of Title 49 [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20101 et seq.*].

Under state law, railroads that provide transportation of people or property and that are owned, operated, controlled, or managed by private corporations and persons, are public utilities subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission [*Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 1, 3, 4, 6*; *see, e.g., Pub. Util. Code §§ 451-632* (rights and obligations of public utilities), 701-880 (regulation of public utilities), 1201-1220 (railroad crossings), 2115 (violations regarding safety or condition of railroad cars or tracks), 7501-7705 (railroad corporations), 7801-7818 (street railroads)]. For discussion of public utilities in general and forms for use in proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawInterstate CommerceFederal PowersTransportation LawInterstate CommerceState PowersTransportation LawIntrastate CommerceTransportation LawRail TransportationState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.11-485.29

[Reserved]

§§ 485.11[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.30

§ 485.30 Governing Law

The liability of a railroad employer engaged in interstate or foreign commerce for injuries sustained by its employees employed in that commerce is governed by the Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA) (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*). Specific duties are imposed on these railroads by the Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. §§ 20301-20306*], the Boiler Inspection Act [*49 U.S.C.S. §§ 20701-20703*], and the Hours of Service Act [*49 U.S.C.S. §§ 21101-21108*; *see also Temple v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 988, 990-991, 164 Cal. Rptr. 780]* . Railroad workers' duties that are categorized as "maritime employment" for purposes of application of the exclusive remedies of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act are governed by *33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.* and *Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 45-48, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.31

§ 485.31 California Law

California has enacted a number of statutes relating to employee injuries establishing various rights and obligations between employers and employees. The two major laws relating to such matters are the Workers' Compensation Law [*Lab. Code §§ 3200-6002*], and the Safety in Employment Law [*Lab. Code §§ 6300-9061*]. *Lab. Code §§ 6800-7000* specifically regulate the working conditions and safety devices in state railway operations [*see Lab. Code §§ 6302(d), 6800* (administration of safety laws enacted for protection of railroad employees delegated to Division of Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Industrial Relations)]. Other state regulation includes *Lab. Code §§ 600-607* (work hours of train workers) and *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7676-7681* (acts with respect to railroad operations constituting crimes).

The Workers' Compensation Law and the Safety in Employment Law do not apply, however, to employers or employments that are so engaged in interstate commerce as not to be subject to the legislative power of California, or to employees injured while they are so engaged, except insofar as they are permitted to apply under the Constitution or laws of the United States [*Lab. Code § 3203*]. Rather, the rights and obligations of these employers and employees are governed by the Federal Employers' Liability Act [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] and related statutes. To the extent the federal laws apply, they provide the exclusive remedy for the injury or death of a railroad employee [*see § 485.83[2][j]*]. In such cases, California's workers' compensation law does not apply, and the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board has no jurisdiction over a claim against the employer arising from the injury or death of the employee. This is so, even though the railroad is engaged in both interstate and intrastate commerce, because, if interstate business is clearly a part of the subject to be legislated, the fact that intrastate commerce may be interwoven with it does not prevent Congress from exercising its powers [*see Southern Pac. Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm'n (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 271, 279-281, 120 P.2d 880* ; *Northwestern Pac. R.R. Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm'n (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 367, 370-377, 166 P.2d 334]* .

To the extent the federal laws do not apply, as for example if the railroad is wholly intrastate, the rights of railroad employees or their dependents for injury or death arising out of and in the course of the employment are governed by the California Workers' Compensation Law [*see Lab. Code §§ 3200-6002*]. For procedure and forms for use by an injured worker or by a deceased worker's dependents in claiming compensation benefits under California's Workers'Compensation Law, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* . Insofar as an employee of an interstate railroad is

concerned, however, the situations in which the Federal Employers' Liability Act would not apply are rare [*see § 485.33*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawOccupational Safety & HealthDuties & RightsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawInterstate CommerceFederal PowersTransportation LawIntrastate CommerceTransportation LawRail TransportationState & Local RegulationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.32

§ 485.32 Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)

[1] Basis of Liability

The Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA) [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] provides that a common carrier by railroad engaged in interstate or foreign commerce is liable in damages for an employee injured or killed while employed by the carrier in such commerce as a result in whole or in part of the negligence of the railroad or its employees or by reason of any defect or insufficiency in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, works, boats, wharves, or other equipment due to its negligence [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]. The term "common carrier by railroad" means one who operates a railroad as a means of carrying persons or property for the public, that is, a railroad company acting as a common carrier [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. Taylor (1920) 254 U.S. 175, 187, 41 S. Ct. 93, 65 L. Ed. 205* ; *Aguirre v. Southern Pac. Co. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 636, 644, 43 Cal. Rptr. 73]* . The term "common carrier," as used in the FELA, includes a receiver or other person or corporation charged with the management and operation of the carrier's business [*45 U.S.C.S. § 57*; *see Eddings v. Collins Pine Co. (N.D. Cal. 1956) 140 F. Supp. 622, 626]* .

Under the FELA, liability for negligence attaches if the railroad knew or by the exercise of due care should have known of the danger or risk to an employee [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 178, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *Erskine v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (6th Cir. 1987) 814 F.2d 266, 273]* . The employer's liability is determined in a civil action filed in a trial court [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 56*; *see also §§ 485.37, 485.39, 485.120 -485.122*]. The FELA contains no provision subrogating a railroad employer to the employee's rights as against any allegedly negligent third party. An employer found liable under the FELA and the third party are joint tortfeasors [*Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 237, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63* ; *see § 485.47*].

[2] Enactment and Purpose

The FELA was enacted in 1906 to create a tort remedy for railroad workers injured on the job. Its main purpose was to enable injured railroad workers to overcome a number of traditional defenses to tort liability that had previously operated to bar their actions, including contributory negligence, contractual waiver of liability, the fellow-servant rule, and assumption of the risk [*Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1287* ; *see § 485.42*; *see also Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 561, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563]* . The

act "was designed to put on the railroad industry some of the cost for the legs, eyes, arms, and lives which it consumed in its operations" [*Wilkerson v. McCarthy (1949) 336 U.S. 53, 68, 69 S. Ct. 413, 93 L. Ed. 497* (Douglas, J., concurring); *see Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 186]* .

[3] Rule of Liberal Construction

The FELA was passed in response to the special needs of railroad workers and must be construed liberally for their protection [*Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1287-1288* ; *see Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 182 n. 20, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282*); *Temple v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 988, 992, 164 Cal. Rptr. 780]* . Thus, to read into the all-inclusive wording of the act a restriction as to the kinds of employees covered, the degree of negligence required, or the particular sorts of harms inflicted, would contradict the wording, the remedial and humanitarian purpose, and the constant and established course of liberal construction of the act followed by the Supreme Court of the United States [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 181-182, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *see Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1288* ; *McMillan v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 841, 843-844, 9 Cal. Rptr. 361, 357 P.2d 449]* .

[4] Exclusivity of Remedy

The FELA provides a uniform rule of liability throughout all the states and supersedes state law relating to the liability of carriers by rail engaged in interstate or foreign commerce [*Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co. v. Coogan (1926) 271 U.S. 472, 474, 46 S. Ct. 564, 70 L. Ed. 1041* ; *Davee v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 25 Cal. Rptr. 445, 375 P.2d 293]* . When a railroad employee [*see § 485.33*] is injured or killed in such commerce, the FELA provides the only remedy for that employee, or, in the event of the employee's death, for his or her personal representative, and this is true even though the employer may not be liable under the FELA because the injury or death did not result from the employer's negligence [*New York Cent. R.R. Co. v. Winfield (1917) 244 U.S. 147, 148-154, 37 S. Ct. 546, 61 L. Ed. 1045* ; *see Erie R.R. Co. v. Winfield (1917) 244 U.S. 170, 172-174, 37 S. Ct. 556, 61 L. Ed. 1057]* .

[5] California's Workers' Compensation Law Compared

Under state workers' compensation law [*see § 485.31*], an injured employee, or the employee's dependents in the event of the employee's death, is entitled to recover workers' compensation benefits for a work-related injury without regard to the negligence of any person [*see Lab. Code § 3600*]; hence, fault is not an issue in the determination of the employer's liability. There is no right to a trial by jury, and proceedings to establish rights to benefits are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, a tribunal established for that purpose, subject to judicial review [*see Lab. Code §§ 111, 3600,5300*-5305, 5950]. Moreover, an employer who pays compensation benefits is subrogated to the employee's cause of action against any third-party tortfeasor to the extent of the payment made, subject to the rules of comparative negligence [*see Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsJoint & Several LiabilityTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsJurisdictionWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsFederal Employers' Liability ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.33

§ 485.33 Determining Employer-Employee Status

Liability under the FELA is premised on the injured person's status as one who is an "employee" of a railroad engaged in interstate commerce and who is injured while "employed" in such commerce [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51 see also §§ 485.32[1], 485.35*]. The words "employee" and "employed" are used in *45 U.S.C.S. § 51* in their natural sense and are intended to describe the conventional relation of employer and employee, and do not include, for example, everyone who may work on or around a train. At the time the FELA was enacted, it was well known that on interstate trains there were persons engaged in various services for employers other than the railroad, and Congress, familiar with this situation, did not use any appropriate expression which could be taken to indicate a purpose to include such persons among those to whom the railroad company was to be liable under the act [*Robinson v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co. (1915) 237 U.S. 84, 94, 35 S. Ct. 491, 59 L. Ed. 849* ; *Aguirre v. Southern Pac. Co. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 636, 644, 43 Cal. Rptr. 73]* .

Thus, the question of employment is to be determined by reference to common law principles [*Kelley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 323, 95 S. Ct. 472, 42 L. Ed. 2d 498]* . In this connection, Restatement (Second) of Agency §§ 5(2), 220, 226, and 227, concerning the general master-servant relationship and the borrowed-servant doctrine, have been used as a guideline for analysis and proper jury instructions [*Kelley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 323-324, 95 S. Ct. 472, 42 L. Ed. 2d 498]* .

In the case of a three-way relationship between two employers, one of which is a railroad, and a worker, there are, under common law principles, basically three ways a worker can establish "employment" with a rail carrier for FELA purposes even while nominally employed by the other employer. In such a case, the worker may show that he or she was (1) serving as the borrowed servant of the railroad at the time of injury [*see* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 227]; (2) acting for the two employers simultaneously [*see* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 226)]; or (3) acting as a subservant of a company that was in turn a servant of the railroad [*Kelley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 324, 95 S. Ct. 472, 42 L. Ed. 2d 498* ; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Agency § 5(2)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAgents DistinguishedGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAgents DistinguishedIndependent Contractors, Masters & ServantsMasters & ServantsCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsBorrowed EmployeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsDual Employees

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.34

§ 485.34 Duty of Care Under FELA

[1] Employee

An employee subject to the FELA has a duty to use reasonable care in the workplace [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 267]* .

[2] Employer

The FELA does not contain any specific standards of care. Nevertheless, certain employer duties have become integral parts of the act. For example, a railroad has a duty to use reasonable care in furnishing its employees with a safe place to work [*Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 568, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; *Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 266 n. 5*]. Other duties include (1) the duty to provide reasonably safe tools and equipment, (2) the duty to promulgate and enforce safety rules, (3) the duty to assign workers to jobs for which they are qualified and to avoid placing workers in jobs beyond their physical capacity, (4) the duty to warn employees of unsafe working conditions, (5) the duty to protect an employee from intentional torts committed by another employee, and (6) the duty to guard against conditions in the workplace that cause emotional harm [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 266 n. 5*]. The duties are nondelegable and become more imperative as the risk to the employee increases [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 267]* . Thus negligence may be proved by showing that the railroad's act violated, for example, its duty to use reasonable care in furnishing its employees with a safe place to work and safe tools and appliances with which to work [*Spencer v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 490, 494, 207 P.2d 126]* .

An employer's duty of care in a FELA action turns in a general sense on the reasonable foreseeability of harm. The employer's conduct is measured by the degree of care that persons of ordinary, reasonable prudence would use under similar circumstances and by what these same persons would anticipate as resulting from a particular condition. The continuous duty to provide a reasonably safe place to work, however, while measured by foreseeability standards, is broader under the FELA than a general duty of due care [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 267]* .

[3] Assumption That Employees Will Exercise Care

The right to assume that others will exercise ordinary care derives from the corresponding duty of care imposed by law on every person. Thus, as a general proposition, one may assume that others will act lawfully and carefully. But the right to assume another's lawful or careful behavior sometimes reflects neither reality nor the facts in a case. It does not, for example, when the facts in a specificcase would show to a reasonable person in the actor's position that another person will probably disobey the law this time. Moreover, because the assumption has often been applied rather mechanically, without any real regard to the factual probabilities of the situation, the trend has been the increasing liberalization in allowing the wrongs of other persons to be regarded as foreseeable. As the risk of harm to such other persons becomes more foreseeable, the duty to foresee that risk increases and the right to assume that the other persons will exercise due care correspondingly decreases [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 267-268]* . For example, a railroad has the duty to promulgate and enforce safety rules, and evidence of its failure to do so may be considered by the jury in assessing the employer's negligence; conversely, an employee's failure to obey safety rules may be considered by the jury in assessing contributory negligence. Consequently, a jury instruction in a FELA case that defendant railroad "has a right to assume that its employees will exercise reasonable care for their own safety and that they will not disobey safety rules and practices" is prejudicial error when it negates the railroad's duty reasonably to foresee that an employee would perform his or her work under unsafe conditions. This is particularly true when the railroad has knowledge that its employees are violating a safety regulation, does nothing to remedy a potentially unsafe working condition, and could reasonably foresee that the regulation would continue to be violated by the employee who was injured by the violation [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 268-269* (reversing judgment for the railroad because of the prejudicially erroneous instruction and remanding the cause for a new trial)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDutyForeseeability of InjuryTortsNegligenceDutyForeseeability of InjuryTortsNegligenceProofGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.35

§ 485.35 Requirements for Recovery in FELA Action

[1] Employment in Interstate Commerce

Under the FELA, any employee of a carrier engaged in interstate or foreign commerce is considered to be employed by the carrier and entitled to the benefits of the act if any part of the employee's duties is the furtherance of that commerce or in any way directly or closely and substantially affects that commerce [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *see Aranda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 543, 544-545, 282 P.2d 875 , aff'd, 351 U.S. 493, 76 S. Ct. 952 (1956)]* . Hence, the claimant will need to show that at least a part of the employee's duties was in the furtherance of that commerce or that the employee's duties directly or closely and substantially affected that commerce. When more than one inference can be drawn from the evidence, the question whether an employee was engaged in interstate commerce at the time of the injury sued for is a question for the jury [*Sullivan v. Matt (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 134, 139, 278 P.2d 499]* .

[2] Negligence (Breach of Duty)

Under the FELA, the employer is liable for the injury or death of an employee resulting in whole or in part from the employer's negligence, and proof of this negligence is essential to recovery [*Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co. v. Coogan (1926) 271 U.S. 472, 474, 46 S. Ct. 564, 70 L. Ed. 1041* ; *Davee v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 25 Cal. Rptr. 445, 375 P.2d 293]* . The employer is not an insurer of the employee's welfare; in an action under the FELA, the claimant has the burden of proving the employer's negligence and the railroad is not required to produce evidence to show that it was free from negligence [*see Lewis v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 273 P.2d 706* ; *Spencer v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 490, 494, 207 P.2d 126]* . In order to recover, the claimant must prove that the employee's injury was caused at least in part as a result of the employer's negligence, although that degree of negligence may be slight [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 237, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63* ; *Baez v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 714, 717, 26 Cal. Rptr. 899]* .

The fact that a third person's negligence was a contributing cause is immaterial so long as the injury was caused in part by the railroad's negligence [*see Farnsworth v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 476, 482, 50 Cal. Rptr. 646]* . The test of the employer's liability is whether the employer used ordinary care in regard to the risk to the

employee [*Baez v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 714, 717, 26 Cal. Rptr. 899]* . In the absence of negligence, there is no liability [*Baez v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 714, 717, 26 Cal. Rptr. 899]* .

Notwithstanding these rules, an employer may be liable apart from negligence when the injury resulted from its breach of a statutory duty. That is, under federal decisional law, negligence under the FELA has been equated with "fault," which may consist of a breach of either the duty of care (negligence), analogous but by no means identical to the general common-law duty, or of a statutory duty (resulting in absolute liability) [*see Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 432, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382* ; *see also § 485.45*].

Moreover, the FELA has been construed to cover at least some intentional torts as well as negligent acts [*see Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 562 n.8, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* , citing cases; *Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1288]* .

Whether an act was performed, or tort committed in the scope of one's employment will depend on all the facts and circumstances of the case and on the reasonable inferences that may be drawn from them [*Temple v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 988, 995, 164 Cal. Rptr. 780]* . Whether theact was or was not within the employment's scope is ordinarily a question of fact for the jury's determination [*Temple v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 988, 995, 164 Cal. Rptr. 780* ; *Sullivan v. Matt (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 134, 139, 278 P.2d 499]* .

[3] Injuries Covered

When the FELA was enacted, Congress's attention was focused primarily on injuries and death resulting from accidents on interstate railroads [*see §§ 485.120, 485.121*]. Nevertheless, the FELA, on its face, is not limited to accidents, but covers every injury suffered by an employee while employed by reason of the carrier's negligence [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 181, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *see Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1288* ; *McMillan v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 841, 843, 9 Cal. Rptr. 361, 357 P.2d 449]* . Thus, the concept of "injury" under the FELA is extremely broad and encompasses all reasonably foreseeable injuries that result from a railroad's failure to exercise due care with respect to its employees [*Buell v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 771 F.2d 1320, 1322* , vacated on another point in *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; *see §§ 485.122, 485.123 -485.126*].

In *Urie*, the Supreme Court held that the FELA covered industrial, or occupational, disease (silicosis) as well as accidental injuries [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 180, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *see § 485.124* (skin infection)]. In *McMillan*, coverage was extended to a worker's nervous breakdown caused by the employer's negligently requiring him to work under conditions (of severe stress) likely to bring about harmful consequences [*McMillan v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 841, 844, 9 Cal. Rptr. 361, 357 P.2d 449* ; *see § 485.123*].

The United States Supreme Court has not yet ruled, however, on the question of whether the FELA imposes liability on a railroad for purely mental or emotional injuries to a worker. In *Buell v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 771 F.2d 1320, 1322-1323* , relying in part on *McMillan v. Western P. R. Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 841, 9 Cal. Rptr. 361, 357 P.2d 449* , the Ninth Circuit answered this question in the affirmative, but the Supreme Court vacated the *Buell* decision on this point on the ground that the record was insufficient to express an opinion on the worker's ultimate chance of recovery under the FELA on his emotional injury claim. The Supreme Court did suggest that the question whether one can recover for emotional injury may not be susceptible to an all-inclusive yes or no answer and that broad pronouncements in this area may have to bow to the precise application of developing legal principles to particular fact situations [*see Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 568-570, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563]* .

[4] Causation

The claimant has the burden of proving that the employer's negligence was the proximate cause of the employee's injury or death [*Spencer v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 490, 494, 207 P.2d 126]* . However, the employee need not prove that the employer's negligence was the sole proximate cause; the railroad is liable for an injury to an employee even though its negligence was only a contributing proximate cause [*Lewis v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283-284, 273 P.2d 706]* . Thus, liability under the FELA does not depend on the common law concept of proximate cause, that is, a cause that produces injury in a natural and continuous sequence unbroken by any efficient intervening cause, without which the result would not have occurred. In FELA cases, causation exists even if there is a plurality of causes, including the negligence of the defendant or of a third person. The negligence of the employer need not be the sole cause or even a substantial cause of the ensuing injury [*Parker v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 675, 678, 70 Cal. Rptr. 8* (involving proper jury instruction on proximate causation in FELA case); *see Torres v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 757, 764, 67 Cal. Rptr. 428]* . With respect to causation, the test of a jury case under the FELA is simply whether the proofs justify with reason the conclusion that employer negligence played even the slightest part in producing the injury or death for which damages are sought [*Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 562 n.8, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; *Rogers v. Missouri Pac. R.R.Co. (1957) 352 U.S. 500, 506, 77 S. Ct. 443, 1 L. Ed. 2d 493]* . If they do, the judge must find that a jury case exists despite the possibility that from the evidence the jury may also reasonably attribute the results to other causes on grounds of probability, including the employee's contributory negligence [*Rogers v. Missouri Pac. R.R.Co. (1957) 352 U.S. 500, 507, 77 S. Ct. 443, 1 L. Ed. 2d 493* ; *see Parker v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 675, 677, 70 Cal. Rptr. 8* ; *Waller v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 201, 212-213, 57 Cal. Rptr. 353, 424 P.2d 937]* .

The question as to whether the railroad's negligence was the proximate cause of the injuries sustained is for the jury's determination [*Qualls v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1931) 112 Cal. App. 7, 13, 296 P. 645]* . The trier of fact may not, however, resort to conjecture as to what might have happened. If the accident might have been caused by one of two or more causes and the employer is responsible for only one, the burden is on the employee to show the accident was produced, at least in part, by the cause for which the employer was responsible [*see Lewis v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283-284, 273 P.2d 706]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsProvince of Court & JuryTortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofBurdens of ProofTortsNegligenceStandards of CareGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.36

§ 485.36 Survival of FELA Action

An action under the FELA survives the injured employee's death and passes to the employee's personal representative for the benefit of the employee's surviving spouse and children and, if none, the employee's parents and, if none, the employee's next of kin who were dependent on the employee. However, there can be only one recovery for the same injury [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 59*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawProbatePersonal RepresentativesClaims By & AgainstTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.37

§ 485.37 Concurrent Jurisdiction of Federal and State Courts Over FELA Actions

The jurisdiction of the federal courts and of the state courts over FELA actions is concurrent [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*]. Hence, an action under the FELA may be brought in either a federal district court or a state trial court [*see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1331* (United States District Courts have original jurisdiction over all civil actions arising under laws of United States); *see also § 485.121[6]* regarding subject matter jurisdiction in state trial courts].

Nevertheless, because Congress has not expressed in FELA in unmistakably clear language an intent that federal courts shall have jurisdiction over FELA actions by railroad employees against state-owned or state-operated railroads, federal courts lack such jurisdiction [*see Welch v. Department of Highways & Public Transp. (1987) 483 U.S. 468, 472-478, 107 S. Ct. 2941, 97 L. Ed. 2d 389* (involving Jones Act, former *46 U.S.C.S. § 688* (now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*), which incorporates remedial provisions of FELA; four justices found that action was barred by *U.S. Const. amend. XI*, with fifth justice stating that regardless of whether states are immune under *U.S. Const. amend. XI*, FELA does not apply to states); overruling *Parden v. Terminal Ry. of Ala. State Docks Dep't (1964) 377 U.S. 184, 84 S. Ct. 1207, 12 L. Ed. 2d 233* , to extent that *Parden* is inconsistent with requirement that abrogation by Congress of states' *Eleventh Amendment* immunity must be expressed in unmistakably clear language]. Following *Welch*, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey ruled that because Congress has not in unmistakably clear language authorized suits under the FELA against the states, federal courts lack subject matter jurisdiction of FELA actions against a state-owned railroad if the state has not waived its immunity under *U.S. Const. amend. XI* [*Rockwell v. New Jersey Transit Rail Operations (D.N.J. 1988) 682 F. Supp. 280, 282-285]* . Although *U.S. Const. amend. XI*, expressly provides only that "[t]he Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State," it has been construed also as barring actions in federal court against a state by its own citizens [*Welch v. Department of Highways & Pub. Transp. (1987) 483 U.S. 468, 472, 107 S. Ct. 2941, 97 L. Ed. 2d 389* ; *Rockwell v. New Jersey Transit Rail Operations (D.N.J. 1988) 682 F. Supp. 280, 281]* .

In a subsequent case in which an injured employee of a state-owned railroad brought suit in a state court alleging negligence by his employer, the U.S. Supreme Court placed great emphasis on the strong considerations favoring adherence to stare decisis and decided that FELA does create a cause of action enforceable in state court against a

state-owned railroad [*Hilton v. South Carolina Pub. Rys. Comm'n (1991) 502 U.S. 197, 112 S. Ct. 560, 116 L. Ed. 2d 560, 567* (reaffirming, in part, *Parden v. Terminal Ry. of Ala. State Docks Dep't (1964) 377 U.S. 184, 84 S. Ct. 1207, 12 L. Ed. 2d 233*)]. Furthermore, the statutory construction holding of *Parden*, which held that FELA authorizes suits for damages against state-owned railroads, was undisturbed by *Welch* [*see* *Welch v. Department of Highways & Pub. Transp. (1987) 483 U.S. 468, 472, 107 S. Ct. 2941, 97 L. Ed. 2d 389* ; *Parden v. Terminal Ry. of Ala. State Docks Dep't (1964) 377 U.S. 184, 84 S. Ct. 1207, 12 L. Ed. 2d 233]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionConstitutional LawState AutonomyGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawState AutonomyWaiverInterstate CommerceTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawIntrastate Commerce

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.38

§ 485.38 Law Applicable in State Court Actions

The United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the FELA is the supreme law to be applied by all courts, federal and state [*Chesapeake & Ohio R.R. Co. v. Kuhn (1931) 284 U.S. 44, 47, 52 S. Ct. 45, 76 L. Ed. 157* ; *Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 135, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577]* . FELA cases adjudicated in state courts are as a general matter subject to state procedural rules, but the substantive law governing the cases is federal [*St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. v. Dickerson (1985) 470 U.S. 409, 411, 105 S. Ct. 1347, 84 L. Ed. 2d 303* ; *Najera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 634, 641, 13 Cal. Rptr. 146]* . Thus, when an action is properly brought in a state court, the law of the state, in the absence of contrary provisions in the federal statute, is controlling in all matters of practice and procedure [*Bohme v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 291, 297, 87 Cal. Rptr. 286]* .

The terms "practice" and "procedure" include the mode of procedure by which a legal right is enforced, as distinguished from the substantive law that gives or declares the right [*Bohme v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 291, 298, 87 Cal. Rptr. 286]* . Hence, the process of determining on appeal from a California trial court whether the trial court committed error during the trial of the cause and, if so, whether the error was prejudicial and therefore constitutes a ground for reversal, is a matter of state practice and procedure [*Bohme v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 291, 297-298, 87 Cal. Rptr. 286]* . Discovery in FELA actions brought in state court is also governed by state discovery statutes [*see, e.g., Pratt v. Union Pacific Railroad Co. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 165, 180, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 321*].

On the other hand, state laws are not controlling in determining the incidents of an employee's right to recover damages under the FELA or in determining the validity of releases and other defenses designed to liquidate or defeat employees' claims. If the rule were otherwise, federal rights affording relief to injured railroad employees under a federally declared standard could be defeated by state law, andthe FELA would not be given that uniform application throughout the country essential to effect its purposes [*Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 135-136, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577]* .

Any matter of state procedural law that would alter the substantive rights of the parties under federal law is inapplicable to cases under the FELA. Otherwise, the FELA would be frustrated by state substantive limitations that are couched in procedural language. For example, although the admissibility of evidence is normally considered a procedural question,

federal, not state, law governs the admissibility of evidence relating to payments from collateral sources in an FELA case in a state court [*Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 136-137, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577* (admissibility of disability payments under Railroad Retirement Act); *see also* *Lund v. San Joaquin Valley R.R. (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1, 7-11, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 412, 71 P.3d 770* (without ruling on whether state or federal law controls, under either law, if FELA action is brought in state court, jury should not generally be told that employee is ineligible for state workers' compensation benefits or other collateral benefits)]. Under federal law, this evidence is inadmissible [*Eichel v. New York Cent. R.R. Co. (1963) 375 U.S. 253, 254-256, 84 S. Ct. 316, 11 L. Ed. 2d 307* (evidence proffered to impeach worker's testimony as to his motive for not returning to work and as to permanency of his injuries); *Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 137, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577]* .

The sufficiency of the evidence in a state court action under the FELA is also governed by federal law [*Waller v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 201, 206, 57 Cal. Rptr. 353, 424 P.2d 937]* . For example, whether the evidence is sufficient to go to the jury or whether a nonsuit should be granted is clearly a matter of substance and governed by federal rather than state law [*McGuigan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 704, 714, 247 P.2d 415]* . Issues relating to the measure of damages are also matters of substance and governed by federal law [*Chesapeake & Ohio R.R. Co. v. Kelly (1916) 241 U.S. 485, 491, 36 S. Ct. 630, 60 L. Ed. 1117* ; *Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 137, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceSufficiency of EvidenceConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseSupreme Law of the LandGovernmentsCourtsJudicial PrecedentsTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.39

§ 485.39 Proper Court for Trial (Venue) of FELA Actions

An action under the FELA may be brought in a United States District Court in the district of the defendant's residence or in which the cause of action arose or in which the defendant is doing business at the time the action is commenced [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*]. Change of venue from one federal district court to another federal district court in which the action might have been brought is provided for in *28 U.S.C.S. § 1404*.

The venue of a state court action is dependent on state law. The provisions applicable to actions for personal injury or wrongful death are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*, and those applicable to actions against corporations in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*. Change of venue is covered in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397* and *398-400*. For further discussion and forms relating to venue in actions brought in a state court, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueFederal Venue TransfersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionVenueTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.40

§ 485.40 Applicability of Doctrine of Forum Non Conveniens (Inconvenient Forum) in State Court Actions

California courts accept jurisdiction of FELA cases both as to causes of action that arise in California and as to those that arise outside California in favor of nonresident, noncitizen plaintiffs against a foreign corporation doing business in California [*Price v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 577, 583, 268 P.2d 457]* . However, the doctrine of forum non conveniens (inconvenient forum) applies in California [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 410.30, 418.10(a)(2)*], and, in a proper case, will apply in an action under the FELA [*Price v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 577, 579, 268 P.2d 457* ; *Great N. Ry. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 105, 109-110, 90 Cal. Rptr. 461* ; *see Missouri v. Mayfield (1950) 340 U.S. 1, 2-5, 71 S. Ct. 1, 95 L. Ed. 3* (disclaiming any intent to deny states right to apply doctrine in FELA cases)].

The basis of the doctrine is that although the court in which the action was filed has jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the parties and although that venue has been properly laid, the court is nevertheless an inconvenient forum and the action should, therefore, be tried in the court of some other state or country [*Great N. Ry. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 105, 108-109, 90 Cal. Rptr. 461]* . For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueForum Non ConveniensTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionVenueTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.41

§ 485.41 Statute of Limitations on FELA Actions

An action under the FELA must be commenced within three years from the day the cause of action accrued [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*; *see Great N. Ry. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 105, 108, 90 Cal. Rptr. 461]* , that is, from the date of injury. In the case of an occupational disease contracted as a result of the employer's negligence, the "injury" occurs when the accumulated effects of the deleterious substance causing the illness manifest themselves [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 170, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* (involving silicosis and case in which manifestation of disease and disability were almost simultaneous); *see Coots v. Southern Pac. Co. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 805, 810, 322 P.2d 460* (under facts of case, statute of limitations held not to commence running until date disease (dermatitis caused by continuous exposure to silver cyanide solution) produced substantial harm or disability)]. That is, the statute of limitations on a claim based on occupational illness begins to run when the employee possesses sufficient critical facts to put him or her on notice that a wrong has been committed and that he or she needs to investigate to determine whether he or sheis entitled to redress [*Kichline v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (3d Cir. 1986) 800 F.2d 356, 359]* . Should the worker delay suing until three years after that time, the cause of action on the primary illness would be barred and the worker's recovery for any aggravation caused by continued exposure to the deleterious substance would be limited to that occurring within three years immediately prior to the filing of the lawsuit. The fact that the worker was aware of the harmful effects of the exposure to pollutants would go to the issue of his or her contributory negligence under *45 U.S.C.S. § 53* [*see § 485.83[2][e]*], but might not bar the claim for aggravation during that period [*Kichline v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (3d Cir. 1986) 800 F.2d 356, 361* (worker failed to file suit within three years after learning his pulmonary disease had been aggravated by exposure to diesel fumes at his work place, and he continued to work even though he was aware of harmful effects of fumes)].

In FELA cases the running of the statute of limitations affects not only the remedy but eliminates the cause of action itself [*Kichline v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (3d Cir. 1986) 800 F.2d 356, 360-361]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureStatutes of

LimitationsAccrual of ActionsDiscovery RuleTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.42

§ 485.42 Defenses to FELA Action

[1] Disclaimer of Liability and Setoff

Any contract, rule, regulation, or device whatsoever, intended to enable the carrier to exempt itself from the liability created by the FELA, is to that extent void [*45 U.S.C.S. § 55*; *see Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 561, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; *Aguirre v. Southern Pac. Co. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 636, 643, 43 Cal. Rptr. 73]* . For *45 U.S.C.S. § 55* to apply, the contract or device exempting the employer from liability must be with a person who is an employee of the carrier within the meaning of the FELA [*Robinson v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co. (1915) 237 U.S. 84, 91, 35 S. Ct. 491, 59 L. Ed. 849]* .

The carrier may, however, in an action against it under the provisions of the act, set off against any recovery the sum it has contributed or paid to any insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity that may have been paid to the injured employee or person entitled to it on account of the injury or death for which the action was brought [*45 U.S.C.S. § 55*; *see Folkestad v. Burlington N., Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 1377, 1379-1384* (setoff allowed of amounts received by injured employee through railroad industry's health and welfare plan to which railroad was party, when under collective bargaining agreement parties so agreed)].

[2] Contributory Negligence

The fact that the employee may have been guilty of contributory negligence does not bar recovery, but the damages are diminished in proportion to the amount of negligence attributable to the employee [*45 U.S.C.S. § 53*]. Thus, any contributory negligence on the worker's part would mitigate, not eliminate, the worker's damages [*Ackley v. Chicago & N. W. Transp. Co. (8th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 263, 265]* . The burden of proving the worker's contributory negligence is on the railroad [*Torres v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 757, 763, 67 Cal. Rptr. 428]* . The same standard of causation applies to the employee's contributory negligence as applies to the railroad's negligence [*Norfolk Southern Railway Co. v. Sorrell (2007) 549 U.S.158, 127 S. Ct. 799, 166 L. Ed. 2d 638, 650-651* ; *see § 485.35[4]*]. For the manner of pleading the contributory negligence of the worker as an affirmative defense, *see § 485.129*.

Both the employer's negligence and the worker's contributory negligence are matters to be determined by the jury [

Carter v. Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 430, 436-437, 70 S. Ct. 226, 94 L. Ed. 236] . The apportionment of damages under the comparative negligence rule is also a matter to be determined by the jury, subject to review if it is excessive as a matter of law [*Bohme v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 291, 299, 87 Cal. Rptr. 286]* .

The doctrine of assumption of risk has been abolished under the FELA [*see § 485.83[2][d]*], and an act of alleged contributory negligence does not constitute a defense if it is but the practical counterpart of assumption of risk. When an employee carries out a supervisor's direct order to perform a task in a specific manner, although knowing and appreciating that to do so involves risk, the employee ordinarily is not contributorily negligent. However, when an employee is given a general order to perform a task, but not in a particular manner, leaving to the employee the manner of carrying out the task, the employee must use ordinary care in its execution, and may be held to have been contributorily negligent for failing to do so [*Jenkins v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (9th Cir. 1994) 22 F.3d 206, 210-212]* .

No employee can be held contributorily negligent if the employer's violation of any statute enacted or regulation adopted for the safety of employees contributed to the employee's injury or death [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 53, 54a*; *see Qualls v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1931) 112 Cal. App. 7, 14-15, 296 P. 645* ; *see also § 485.45*].

[3] Assumption of Risk

In any action under FELA, the employee shall not be held to have assumed the risks of his or her employment in any case in which the injury or death resulted in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the officers, agents, or employees of the carrier or in any case in which the railroad's violation of any statute enacted or regulation adopted for the safety of employees contributed to the employee's injury or death [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 54, 54a*; *see also 49 U.S.C.S. § 20304*]. *45 U.S.C.S. § 54* has in effect abolished the doctrine of assumption of the risk by the employee as a defense in FELA cases [*see Tiller v. Atlantic Coast Line R.R. Co.(1943) 318 U.S. 54, 58, 63 S. Ct. 444, 87 L. Ed. 610* ; *Texas & Pac. Ry. Co. v. Buckles (5th Cir. 1956) 232 F.2d 257, 261]* .

[4] Preemption Regarding "Maritime Employment"

The Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) (*33U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*) provides the exclusive remedy of a railroad employee against the railroad if (1) he or she was injured in the course of employment; (2) the employer has employees who are employed in maritime employment; (3) the injury occurred on the navigable waters of the United States (including specified adjoining areas, such as piers or other adjoining areas used for loading or unloading); and (4) he or she is engaged in maritime employment [*Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 286-288* ; *see 33 U.S.C.S. §§ 902(2)* (defining "injury" under act), *(3)* (defining "employee"), *(4)* (defining "employer"), *903* (limiting remedies under the act to injuries occurring on navigable waters, including specified adjoining areas)]. Consequently, a railroad employee who suffers an employment-related injury governed by the LHWCA is precluded from bringing a cause of action in negligence against the employer, a remedy that would be available under the FELA [*Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 284-288]* .

Although LHWCA lists categories of employees engaged in maritime employment, additional occupations have been included pursuant to case law. The United States Supreme Court has held that "employees engaged in maritime employment" include those injured while performing a task integral to loading a ship, such as a railroad worker whose job includes removing fallen coal from beneath conveyor belts used for loading, despite the fact that the employee may have additional duties not integrally connected with the loading or unloading process. LHWCA also covers employees who are injured while maintaining or repairing equipment essential to the maritime loading or unloading process, such as a railroad machinist injured while repairing an aparatus integral to the loading process [*Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 287* (railroad machinist injured while repairing mechanical "retarder" used in connection with loading coal onto ship)]. In determining whether a position constitutes

"maritime employment," it is irrelevant that the particular function performed might be considered traditional railroad work, or might be done by railroad employees wherever railroad cars are unloaded. The determinative consideration is whether the function is crucial to the performance of the maritime task [*Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 287-288]* . For a form of affirmative defense to a complaint against a railroad seeking relief under the FELA, based on preemption under LHWCA, *see § 485.130*.

For discussion and forms relating to LHWCA generally, see *Ch. 522, Ships and Shipping, § 522.30* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActTortsDamagesCollateral Source RuleGovernment BenefitsTortsDamagesCollateral Source RuleInsurance PaymentsTortsNegligenceDefensesAssumption of RiskGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceProcedureTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceProcedureProvince of Court & JuryTortsNegligenceDefensesExculpatory ClausesGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.43

§ 485.43 Damages Recoverable

The damages recoverable in an action under FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) are limited to compensatory damages. Punitive damages are not recoverable [*Wildman v. Burlington N. R.R. Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1392, 1395* ; *Kozar v. Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. (6th Cir. 1971) 449 F.2d 1238, 1240]* .

A railroad's liability under the FELA is joint and several. Therefore, once the railroad is found liable for an injury, the injured employee may recover all damages stemming from the compensable injury from the railroad, and it is up to the railroad to seek contribution from other alleged tortfeasors [*Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Ayers (2003) 538 U.S. 135, 149-156, 123 S. Ct. 1210, 155 L. Ed. 2d 261]* .

An employee may recover for negligently-inflicted emotional distress if the employee was within the "zone of danger" of physical impact. Therefore, an employee may recover for physical or emotional injuries caused by employer negligence that threatens the employee with imminent physical impact [*Consolidated Rail Corp. v. Gottshall (1994) 512 U.S. 532, 556, 114 S. Ct. 2396, 129 L. Ed. 2d 427]* . However, employers are not the insurers of the emotional well-being and mental health of their employees, and therefore they are not liable for emotional distress caused by ordinary work-related stress, such as that caused by having been given too much work [*Consolidated Rail Corp. v. Gottshall (1994) 512 U.S. 532, 544, 114 S. Ct. 2396, 129 L. Ed. 2d 427]* .

An employee who has been exposed to asbestos at work, but has not yet contracted any disease because of this exposure, is not entitled to recover for emotional distress caused by the fear of contracting cancer, because exposure to asbestos alone is insufficient to meet the "zone of danger" test [*Metro-N. Commuter R.R. Co. v. Buckley (1997) 521 U.S. 424, 430, 117 S. Ct. 2113, 138 L. Ed. 2d 560]* . However, an employee exposed to asbestos at work who has already contracted asbestosis, an actionable injury, may recover as an element of his or damages for the mental anguish resulting from the fear of developing cancer, so long as the alleged fear is shown to be genuine and serious [*Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Ayers (2003) 538 U.S. 135, 157, 123 S. Ct. 1210, 155 L. Ed. 2d 261, 271]* . Claims for pain and suffering are generally compensable if they stem from an actual physical injury and if there is an undisputed relationship between exposure to asbestos sufficient to cause asbestosis and asbestos-related cancer [*Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Ayers (2003) 538 U.S. 135, 149-153, 123 S. Ct. 1210, 155 L. Ed. 2d 261]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesPain & SufferingGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceActionsNegligent Infliction of Emotional DistressGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsJoint & Several LiabilityTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.44

§ 485.44 Measure of Damages

The measure of damages in a FELA action is an issue of "substance" to be determined by federal law [*St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. v. Dickerson (1985) 470 U.S. 409, 411-412, 105 S. Ct. 1347, 84 L. Ed. 2d 303* (discussing propriety of jury instructions on this issue); *see also § 485.38*]. That is, the proper measure of damages under the FELA is inseparably connected with the right of action, and therefore is an issue of substance that must be settled according to generalprinciples of law as administered in the federal courts [*Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 335, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349]* . For example, prejudgment interest is not available pursuant to federal law in actions under the FELA and therefore may not properly be awarded by a state court even though such an award would be proper under state law [*Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 335-336, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349* , applying Pennsylvania law; *Lund v. San Joaquin Valley R.R. (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 412, 71 P.3d 770* (prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291* not proper in FELA action brought in state court)]. For similar reasons, expert witness fees cannot be awarded under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* when a plaintiff receives a more favorable outcome at trial than the amount of a rejected settlement offer, as such fees are not recoverable under federal law [*Miller v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 451, 458-459, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 893]* . Federal law also provides no authority for an award of postjudgment costs, including expert witness fees, to a prevailing defendant whose offer to settle was rejected by the plaintiff [*Kinsey v. Union Pacific Railroad Co. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 201, 207, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 253]* .

Under federal law, if future payments or other pecuniary benefits are anticipated, the verdict should be made up on the basis of their present value only. Although no single method for determining present value is mandated under federal law, the method of calculating present value should take into account inflation and other sources of wage increases as well as the rate of interest [*St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. v. Dickerson (1985) 470 U.S. 409, 411-412, 105 S. Ct. 1347, 84 L. Ed. 2d 303]* . The jury has the task of making the present value determination. The judge may, however, recommend to the jury one or more methods of calculating present value so long as the judge does not in effect preempt the jury's function. A trial judge's instructions to the jury with regard to discount methods, provided they do not subject the jury's estimate to rigid mathematical limitation, are entitled to substantial deference on appellate review [*Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 341-342, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349, 361-362]* . On the other hand, it is error to instruct the jury that, under the state law, future inflation would be conclusively presumed to equal future

interest rates, that is, that a zero discount rate was to be applied as a matter of law to future damages [*Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 339-342, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349* (trial court had based the instruction on state law under which awards of future damages were not to be discounted)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesAward CalculationsTortsDamagesInterestPrejudgment InterestTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.45

§ 485.45 Safety Provisions Supplementing FELA

[1] Safety Appliance Act

The Safety Appliances Act [*49 U.S.C.S. §§ 20301-20306*] requires the installation of various safety appliances on locomotives and cars and provides for penalties to be imposed for noncompliance [*49 U.S.C.S. § 21302*].

Specifically, the Act requires that cars in use on railroad lines have the following:

- Couplers coupling automatically by impact, and capable of being uncoupled, without the necessity of persons going between the ends of the cars [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(A)*; *see O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 389, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187* (the Act also requires couplers that, after a secure coupling is effected, will remain coupled until set free by some purposeful act of control)];

- Secure sill steps and efficient hand brakes [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301(a)(1)(B)*];

- Secure ladders and running boards when required by the Secretary of Transportation, and, if ladders are required, secure handholds or grab irons on its roof at the top of each ladder [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301(a)(1)(C)*]; and

- Except as otherwise ordered by the Secretary of Transportation, secure grab irons or handholds in the ends and sides of each car for greater security to persons in coupling and uncoupling cars [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(2)*].

Further, cars must comply with the standard height of drawbars required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(3)*].

The Act requires that locomotive engines have a power-driving wheel brake and appliances for operating the train-brake

system [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(4)*]. Further, sufficient cars in trains must have power or train brakes so that the engineer on the locomotive hauling the train can control the train's speed without the necessity of brake operators using the common hand brakes for that purpose [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(5)(A)*]. At least 50 percent of the cars in a train must be equipped with power or train brakes and the engineer must be using the power ortrain brakes on those cars and on all other cars equipped with them that are associated with those cars in the train [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(5)(B)*].

The Safety Appliances Act occupies the field of safety devices for freight cars and preempts state products liability actions for design defects related to those safety devices, or to the lack of those devices if the particular device is not expressly required by the Act [*Carrillo v. ACF Indus., Inc. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1158, 1165, 1168, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 832, 980 P.2d 386* (preempting state action for failure to incorporate guardrail)].

[2] Boiler Inspection Act

The Boiler Inspection Act requires railroads in interstate commerce to maintain the entire locomotive in a safe condition. It also provides for periodic inspection, and specifies the penalty to be imposed for noncompliance [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*].

Specifically, the Boiler Inspection Act makes it unlawful for any railroad to use or permit the use on its line of any locomotive unless the locomotive, tender, and all parts and appurtenances thereof are in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which they are put. They must be in a condition such that they may be employed in active service of the railroad without unnecessary danger of personal injury, and the locomotive, tender, and all parts and appurtenances thereof must be inspected from time to time in accordance with the provisions of *49 U.S.C.S. § 20702* and must be able to withstand the test or tests as may be prescribed in the rules and regulations provided for by the act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701*; *see Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 189-191, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282]* .

The Boiler Inspection Act preempts state law causes of action against locomotive manufacturers for defective design of their products, because Congress intended to occupy the field of locomotive equipment and safety [*Scheiding v. General Motors Corp. (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 471, 474, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 342, 993 P.2d 996]* . Therefore, the Act preempts state tort claims brought by railway workers based on injuries caused by exposure to asbestos used in the manufacture of locomotives [*Scheiding v. General Motors Corp. (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 471, 476-477, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 342, 993 P.2d 996]* . These claims against a locomotive manufacturer for defective design are preempted regardless of whether the relevant locomotive is in use on the railroad line or off line in a roundhouse or repair shop during the period of exposure [*Frastaci v. Vapor Corp. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1389, 1393, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 402*].

[3] "Railroad" Defined

As used in the Safety Appliance Act and the Boiler Inspection Act, the term "railroad" has the same meaning as when used in the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (*49 U.S.C.S. § 20103*) [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20102*]. The Federal Railroad Safety Act defines railroad as meaning all forms of nonhighway ground transportation that run on rails or electro-magnetic guideways, including (1) commuter or other short-haul rail passenger service in a metropolitan or suburban area, as well as any commuter rail service that was operated by the Consolidated Rail Corporation as of January 1, 1979, and (2) high speed ground transportation systems that connect metropolitan areas, without regard to whether they use new technologies not associated with traditional railroads, but that the term does not include rapid transit operations within an urban area that are not connected to the general railroad system of transportation [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20102(1)(A), (B)*].

[4] Employer's Absolute Liability for Violation of Safety Provision

The Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] and the Boiler Inspection Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*] have been construed to impose absolute liability without regard to negligence on railroads for the injury or death of an

employee caused by the railroad's failure to comply with the requirements of either act [*see* *Carter v. Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 430, 433-434, 70 S. Ct. 226, 94 L. Ed. 236 (Safety Appliance Act)* ; *O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 390-394, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187* (same); *Finley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 424, 428-429, 3 Cal. Rptr. 895* (same); *Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 485, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* (Boiler Inspection Act); *see also* *Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 430-431, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382* (action under Jones Act that, by reason of former *46 U.S.C.S. § 688* (now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*), incorporates FELA)]. Neither contributory negligence [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 53*; *Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 186 (Safety Appliance Act)]* , nor assumption of the risk is a defense to a Boiler Inspection Act violation that has contributed to the cause of an injury [*Fontaine v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1519, 1525, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644]* .

The acts apply whether or not the injury involved was of a type that the particular act or statute was designed to prevent [*Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 432-433, 438, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382]* . Liability is imposed whenever a violation of either act is the proximate cause of injury to a railroad employee when engaged in the discharge of his or her duties [*Louisville & Nashville R.R. Co. v. Layton (1917) 243 U.S. 617, 621, 37 S. Ct. 456, 61 L. Ed. 931* (violation of *45 U.S.C.S. § 2*, relating to couplers); *see* *Coray v. Southern Pac. Co. (1948) 335 U.S. 520, 522-523, 69 S. Ct. 275, 93 L. Ed. 208* (faulty brakes)]. However, the worker is not obliged to prove common-law proximate causation, but only that the injury resulted in whole or in part from the violation [*Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 186* ; *see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *see also § 485.35[4]*].

An employer is also liable for the violation of a rule or regulation that either implements standards of safety required under *49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)* (Safety Appliance Act) or *49 U.S.C.S. § 20701* (Boiler Inspection Act), or implements standards of railroad safety under *49 U.S.C.S. § 20103* [*see* 49 C.F.R. pts. 212-236 (setting forth rules and standards adopted by Secretary of Transportation)]. These rules acquire the force of law and become an integral part of the act under which they are adopted; hence a violation of a rule constitutes a violation of the statute [*see* *Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 191, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* (rule adopted under Boiler Inspection Act); *Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 488, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* (same); *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Scarlett (1937) 300 U.S. 471, 474, 57 S. Ct. 541, 81 L. Ed. 748* (rule adopted under Safety Appliance Act); *Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 186-187* (rule regulating switch positions (*49 C.F.R. § 213.135(g)*) adopted under *45 U.S.C.S. § 431*); *see also* 42 U.S.C.S. § 54a (regulations and rules deemed statutes for purposes of 42 U.S.C.S. §§ 53, 54)].

[5] Violation of Safety Provision as Basis for FELA Claim

The Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] and the Boiler Inspection Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*] have been construed to be in pari materia with the FELA [*see* *Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 188-189, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282]* . Neither act purports to confer any right of action on injured employees. They merely make violation of their requirements unlawful. Nevertheless, they supplement the FELA by imposing on interstate railroads an absolute and continuing duty to provide safe equipment. This conclusion stems not from any express language in the statutes but by implication from *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 53* and *54*, which bar pleading of contributory negligence and assumption of risk in any FELA case in which the common carrier's violation of any statute enacted or regulation or rule adopted for the safety of employees contributed to the employee's injury or death [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 188, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *see also 45 U.S.C.S. § 54*].

However, it is *45 U.S.C.S. § 51* [*see § 485.32[1]*], and not *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 53* and *54*, which expressly creates a cause of action and, by the same token, is the basis of an employee's suit for violation of either the Safety Appliance or the Boiler Inspection Act [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 188-189, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; see *Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 437, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382]* . *45 U.S.C.S. § 51* imposes liability on the employer for injury or death resulting in whole or in part "by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence, in its cars, engines, appliances, machinery, track, roadbed, works, boats, wharves, or other equipment." The

cases hold that under this clause a defect resulting from a violation of either act that causes the injury or death of an employee creates liability without regard to negligence [*Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 430-431, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382]* . The FELA imposes on the employer the duty of paying damages when injury to the worker is caused in whole or in part by the employer's fault. This fault may consist of a breach of the duty of care (negligence) or a statutory duty, such as that imposed by the Safety Appliance and Boiler Inspection Acts (absolute liability) [*see Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 432, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382]* .

Thus, the Safety Appliance Act and the Boiler Inspection Act are substantively, if not in form, amendments to the FELA. They dispense, for the purposes of an employee's suit, with the necessity of proving that violations of the safety statutes constituted negligence, making proof of such violations effective to show negligence as a matter of law. Thus taken, the Safety Appliance Act and the Boiler Inspection Act cannot be regarded as statutes wholly separate from and independent of the FELA. They are rather supplemental to it, having the purpose and effect of facilitating employee recovery [*Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 189, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* ; *see Finley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 424, 428-429, 3 Cal. Rptr. 895* (holding that failure of equipment to perform as required by Safety Appliance Act is in itself actionable, in no way dependent on negligence, and for which there is liability that clearly cannot be escaped by proof of care or diligence); *Qualls v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1931) 112 Cal. App. 7, 13-14, 296 P. 645* (when negligence consists of failure to comply with Safety Appliance Act, violation of act as not required to be sole efficient cause of injury in order for action under FELA to lie)].

In short, the Safety Appliance Act and the Boiler Inspection Act provide the basis for a claim, but the FELA provides the remedy [*see Eckert v. Aliquippa & Southern R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 187* ; *Beissel v. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 143, 145]* .

[6] Liberal Construction of Safety Provisions

Both the Safety Appliance Act and the Boiler Inspection Act are to be liberally construed in the light of their prime purpose, the protection of employees and others by the use of safe equipment [*see Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 486, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* ; *Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 182 n. 20, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesAssumption of RiskGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.46

§ 485.46 Railway Labor Act (RLA)

The Railway Labor Act (RLA) [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 151-188*] provides a comprehensive framework for the resolution of labor disputes in the railroad industry and establishes elaborate administrative procedures for the resolution of both "major" and "minor" disputes [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 153*]. The RLA was intended to promote stability in labor-management relations by providing effective and efficient remedies for the resolution of railroad-employee disputes arising out of the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements. Under the RLA, minor disputes, defined in the act as those concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, are intended to be kept within the National Railroad Adjustment Board or a Public Law Board and out of the courts [Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co.v. *Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 563-564, 563 n.9, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563]* . The remedy of binding arbitration under the RLA for the resolution of minor disputes is exclusive in at least some situations [*Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 558-559, 565-566, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563]* .

However, the fact that an injury otherwise compensable under the FELA was caused by conduct that may have been subject to arbitration under the RLA does not deprive an employee of the opportunity to bring a FELA action for damages. Presumably a host of personal injuries suffered by railroad employees are caused by negligent practices and conditions that might have been cured or avoided by the timely invocation of the grievance machinery of the RLA, but the Supreme Court of the United States has never considered that possibility a bar to an employee's bringing a claim for personal injuries under other federal statutes and has declined to do so in FELA cases [*Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 558-559, 564-565, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; see *Welby v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (M.D. Pa. 1987) 671 F. Supp. 1015, 1017* (if employee can establish physical injury caused by railroad's negligence, employee is entitled to damages under FELA)].

For a form relating to preemption by the RLA of a railroad employee's common law wrongful discharge action against an employer, see *Ch. 249, Employment Law: Termination and Discipline, § 249.68*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Labor & Employment LawCollective Bargaining & Labor RelationsArbitrationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawCollective Bargaining & Labor RelationsInterpretation of AgreementsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.47

§ 485.47 Railroad's Right to Indemnity From Third-Party Tortfeasor

[1] Applicable Law

A railroad's right to indemnity in whole or in part from a third party for liability incurred under the FELA depends entirely on state law [*Brenham v. Southern Pac. Co. (W.D. La. 1971) 328 F. Supp. 119, 123 , aff'd, 469 F.2d 1095 (5th Cir. 1972)* ; *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 236, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63]* . A right to indemnity can arise from, among other things, an express contract, an implied contract, some special relationship legally sufficient to raise an obligation to indemnify, or, as between two tortfeasors, when the fault of one is active and the other passive [*Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 238, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

[2] Contractual Indemnity

A railroad that pays a FELA claim may be entitled to recover from a third party the amount paid pursuant to a written contract of indemnity, even if the worker's injury resulted from the railroad's negligence, provided the indemnity contract so provides and the provision is not in violation of state law [*see Illinois Cent. Gulf R. Co.v International Paper Co. (5th Cir. 1987) 824 F.2d 403, 404-408* ; *see also Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.30* et seq. regarding California law governing express and implied contractual indemnity].

[3] Implied Equitable Indemnity

California has adopted the rule that allows a railroad employer to seek implied indemnification from a third party tortfeasor for amounts paid to an injured employee under the FELA when the railroad's negligence is secondary to the third party's primary negligence [*see Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 238, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63]* . For a discussion and forms relating to California law governing implied equitable indemnity and comparative equitable indemnity, the effect of the comparative equitable indemnity doctrine on the concept of primary and secondary negligence, and the effect of the Fair Responsibility Act of 1986 (Proposition 51 [*Civ. Code §§ 1431, 1432*]) on the doctrine of joint and several liability of tortfeasors as they affect the liability of joint tortfeasors among themselves, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.150* et seq.

[4] Statute of Limitations on Indemnity Actions

The statutory period limiting an action by a railroad for indemnity against a third party is that which would apply under the law of the state where the accident occurred, and is not the statutory period applicable to FELA actions [*Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 236, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63* ; *see 45 U.S.C.S. § 56*; *see also § 485.41*]. The state statutory period limiting a particular indemnity action depends on the basis for the claim [*Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 238, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63]* . Thus, for example, a claim based on an express contract would be subject to the state limitation periods applicable to actions on a contract [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 337(1)* (four-year period applicable to action on written contract), *339(1)* (two-year period applicable to actions on oral contract)].

Under California law, an action for damages for personal injury or wrongful death must normally be brought within two years (one year, prior to January 1, 2003) after the date that the cause of action accrues [*Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*; Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions, § 345.14*]. Usually this period runs from the date of injury. In an action for indemnity based on tort, however, the cause of action accrues not on the date of injury, but on the date the indemnity claimant suffers loss or damage by paying the underlying claim. Thus, when the basis of a complaint for equitable indemnity was liability for personal injury, and when the complaint was filed within one year from the time the personal injury claim was paid, it was timely even though it was filed more than one year after the date of injury [*Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 238-239, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63* (distinguishing *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* , which held that employer who had paid workers'compensation benefits had one year after date of employee's injury, and not after date it paid benefits, in which to sue third-party tortfeasor for indemnity, on grounds that railroad's liability under FELA is fundamentally different from employer's liability for workers' compensation and that employer's statutory rights to subrogation under *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864* have no parallels under FELA)].

For further discussion relating to the limitations periods applicable in actions for express or implied contractual indemnity, and for equitable or comparative equitable indemnity, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.30 et seq. and § 300.150* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsExpress ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsOral AgreementsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsIndemnityGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsIndemnityContractual IndemnityTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsIndemnityNoncontractual IndemnityTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersIndemnityTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsDefensesStatutes of Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.48

§ 485.48 Penalty for Suppression of Voluntary Information Relating to FELA Claim

Any contract, rule, regulation, or device whatsoever, the purpose, intent, or effect of which is to prevent a carrier's employees from voluntarily furnishing information to a person in interest as to the facts incident to the injury or death of any employee, is void [*45 U.S.C.S. § 60*].

Moreover, anyone who by threat, intimidation, order, rule, contract, regulation, or any device whatsoever, attempts to prevent any persons from voluntarily furnishing such information to a person in interest, or whoever discharges or otherwise disciplines or attempts to discipline any employee for voluntarily furnishing such information to a person in interest, is subject to a fine of up to a $1,000, imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, on conviction of each offense [*45 U.S.C.S. § 60*]. This applies, however, only to railroad employees discharged or disciplined for furnishing information to others and does not encompass employees who are discharged or disciplined because they themselves initiate FELA actions. Consequently, a claim for emotional distress damages caused by the asserted wrongful discharge of an employee who had sustained physical and emotional distress injuries in a railroad collision is not cognizable under the FELA [*Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1293* (employee's remedy, if any, was under Railway Labor Act, *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 151-188*)].

45 U.S.C.S. § 60 is not to be construed as voiding any contract, rule, or regulation with respect to any information contained in the carrier's files, or other privileged or confidential reports [*45 U.S.C.S. § 60*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsCriminal Law & ProcedureSentencingFinesCriminal Law & ProcedurePostconviction ProceedingsImprisonmentTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Injuries to Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.49-485.59

[Reserved]

§§ 485.49[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.60

§ 485.60 Governing Law

The regulation of public utilities generally is governed by *Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 1-9*. The duties of common carriers are set out in *Civ. Code §§ 2100-2104*. A railroad's qualified immunities from liability are set out in *Civ. Code § 1714.7* (trespassers) and *Pub. Util. Code § 7654* (passengers). A common carrier's liability for losses and injuries resulting from violation of a statute or Public Utilities Commission decision or order is governed by *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*. Safety requirements for railroad signal devices and warnings are set out in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7601-7614*, and rules concerning operation of railroad trains are set out in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7653-7660*. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7626-7627* governs a railroad's liability for injury to animals on tracks caused by failure to maintain fences. Duties of motorists in approaching railroad crossings are governed by *Veh. Code §§ 22450-22452*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawRail TransportationState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.60A

§ 485.60A Scope of Federal Preemption

Under federal law, a state may adopt or continue in force a law, regulation, or order related to railroad safety or security until the Secretary of Transportation, with respect to railroad safety matters, or the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to railroad security matters, prescribes a regulation or issues an order covering the subject matter of the state requirement [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20106(a)(2)*]. In order for a federal regulation to "cover" the same subject matter as a state law, the regulation must do more than "touch upon" or "relate to" the subject matter. Preemption is appropriate only if the federal regulation substantially subsumes the subject matter of the relevant state law [*CSX Transp. Inc. v. Easterwood (1993) 507 U.S. 658, 664, 113 S. Ct. 1732, 123 L. Ed. 2d 387*].

In one case, for example, plaintiffs brought a common-law negligence suit against a commuter railroad after a derailing that occurred when a man intentionally drove his sports utility vehicle in front of a train that was operating in push mode, that is, with the locomotive at the back of the train and an occupied cab car in the lead. Plaintiffs argued that the railway company was negligent by running in push mode without using a converted locomotive car with baggage or other ballast in the lead position, or an unoccupied cab car, or using a scout vehicle or track surveillance. Agreeing that federal regulations addressed the construction and design of cab cars used in the lead position of a commuter train, plaintiffs argued nonetheless that the regulations did not address the operation of a cab car. However, the California court of appeal held that the negligence claim was preempted, after concluding that the regulations addressed not just the design, but also the actual use, of cab cars in the lead position. The court noted that the regulations contemplated the use of an occupied cab car in the lead position if the cab satisfied increased strength requirements for collision posts, and the regulations specifically took into account the operating environment in which rail passenger service occurs. As such, plaintiffs' claims based on safety concerns with this use of cab cars were preempted [*Southern California Regional Rail Authority v. Superior Court (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 712, 732-733, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 765*].

The court of appeal in that case also concluded that the absence of a specific federal regulation on push mode was not determinative, but was only one factor to consider when determining whether the matter has been substantially subsumed. In concluding that the issue had been substantially subsumed, the court noted that Congress had directed the Federal Railroad Administration to issue rules and regulations addressing passenger safety, and in response the FRA conducted extensive regulatory proceedings and promulgated regulations related to the operation of a cab car in push

mode, albeit in the form of design requirements [*Southern California Regional Rail Authority v. Superior Court (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 712, 734-735, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 765*].

A state may adopt or continue in force an additional or more stringent law, regulation, or order related to railroad safety or security if the law, regulation, or order(1) is necessary to eliminate or reduce an essentially local safety or security hazard, (2) is not incompatible with a federal law, regulation, or order, and (3) does not unreasonably burden interstate commerce [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20106(a)(2)*].

For all state law causes of action arising from events or activities occurring on or after January 18, 2002, a state law cause of action seeking damages for personal injury, death, or property damage is not preempted by federal law if the cause of action alleges that a party has done any of the following [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20106(b)*]:

- Failed to comply with the federal standard of care established by a regulation or order on railroad safety issued by the Secretary of Transportation, or a regulation or order on railroad security issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security, covering the subject matter as provided in *49 U.S.C.S. § 20106(a)*;

- Failed to comply with its own plan, rule, or standard created pursuant to a regulation or order issued by either of the federal Secretaries; or

- Failed to comply with a state law, regulation, or order that is not incompatible with *49 U.S.C.S. § 20106(a)(2)*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.61

§ 485.61 Negligence Action Against Railroad

Most commonly, a cause of action against a railroad for damages for injuries to person or property will be based on common law negligence, as codified under *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*. The elements of an action for negligence are essentially (1) a legal duty to use due care, (2) the breach of that duty, and (3) the breach as a proximate cause of plaintiff's injury and damages [*see United States Liab. Ins. Co. v. Haidinger-Hayes, Inc. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 586, 594, 83 Cal. Rptr. 418, 463 P.2d 770* ; *see also Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282, 3333*].

For discussion relating to negligence actions generally, including discussion of legal duty, breach of duty, proximate cause, and injury, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For discussion of particular duties imposed on railroads, see *§ 485.62*. For discussion relating to a railroad's violation of a statutory duty as negligence per se, see *§ 485.64*. For discussion relating to a separate action for damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, for violation of a safety statute or regulation, see *§ 485.68*.

For forms of complaint for use in a negligence action against a railroad, *see §§ 485.150 -485.152*. For additional forms of complaint for use in a negligence action generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofElementsTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral Overview

101 of 143 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.62

§ 485.62 Railroad's Duty of Care

[1] Duty to Passengers as Common Carrier

[a] Generally

Every "railroad corporation" is a common carrier [*Pub. Util. Code § 211(a)*; *Civ. Code § 2168*; *see* Ch. 109, *Carriers*]. The term "railroad corporation" includes every corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any railroad for compensation within California [*Pub. Util. Code § 230*].

As a carrier of persons for reward, a railroad must use the utmost care and diligence for the safe carriage of its passengers [*Civ. Code § 2100*]. The duty to exercise the utmost care and diligence to prevent injuries begins when the relationship of carrier and passenger is established [*Lagomarsino v. Market St. Ry. Co. (1945) 69 Cal. App. 2d 388, 395-396, 158 P.2d 982]* . The relation of passenger and carrier commences when the intending passenger enters the station premises [*MacGregor v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 596, 600, 59 P.2d 123]* . If a person intends to board a train as a passenger and so indicates by the act of standing alongside, and the person in charge of the train indicates an intention to receive the prospective passenger, and stops the car and prepares to receive the person immediately, the relationship of passenger to the carrier is established, even if no fare has yet been paid [*Lagomarsino v. Market St. Ry. Co. (1945) 69 Cal. App. 2d 388, 395, 397, 158 P.2d 982]* .

The carrier is under a duty to provide adequate safeguards to prevent injuries to passengers when boarding or alighting from a train [*see* *MacGregor v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 596, 600, 59 P.2d 123]* . This includes the duty to prevent sudden jarring or jolting when starting or stopping [*Dempsey v. Market St. Ry. Co. (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 110, 112, 142 P.2d 929]* . For a form of complaint for use by a passenger to recover for injuries suffered in boarding or alighting from a train, see *§ 485.150*.

A railroad owes a duty to its passengers to deliver them safely to their destinations [*Miller v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 107, 110, 145 P. 1023]* . The relationship of the railroad to its passengers does not terminate until the passenger has had a reasonable opportunity to leave the carrier's premises [*Miller v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 107, 110, 145 P. 1023]* . Thus, when a passenger is carried beyond his or her station and is directed by the

conductor to alight, the railroad owes that person a duty to provide him or her a safe means of return to the station [*Miller v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 107, 110, 145 P. 1023]* .

A railroad is also under a contractual duty to transport passengers safely, and has the duty to protect them against acts of personal violence by agents or employees of the railroad [*see Berger v. Southern Pac. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 1, 6-7, 300 P.2d 170]* . While some litigants in carrier-passenger cases have attempted to state causes of action for breach of contract as well as in tort, it appears that when the complaint sets out a breach of duty and consequent injury as the gravamen of the action, the carrier's violation of its obligation safely to carry arises out of tort and not contract [*see Basler v. Sacramento Elec., Gas & Ry. Co. (1913) 166 Cal. 33, 36, 134 P. 993]* .

For discussion of the duties of common carriers to passengers generally and a form of complaint for damages for assault and battery for use by a passenger against an agent of a common carrier, see *Ch. 109, Carriers, § 109.30* et seq.

[b] At Railroad Stations

Because a railroad that maintains stations or regular stopping places along its line thereby invites the public to patronize its line, the railroad must, in the exercise of ordinary care, afford protection to the public commensurate with the risk involved [*Wilkinson v. United R.Rs. (1924) 195 Cal. 185, 198, 232 P. 131]* . Thus, for the safety of intended passengers, railroads have a duty to use a greater degree of care to maintain their property at stations or regular stopping places along the line than at other places along the line [*Aydlott v. Key Sys. Transit Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 621, 626, 286 P. 456]* . It makes no difference whether the stopping place is patronized by a few or by many passengers [*Wilkinson v. United R.Rs. (1924) 195 Cal. 185, 198, 232 P. 131]* . A railroad is not, however, an insurer of the safety of its station premises [*Robson v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1945) 70 Cal.App. 2d 759, 761, 161 P.2d 821]* . The care required of the railroad involves the duty to exercise reasonable care to construct and maintain safe and adequate stations, platforms, walks, steps, and landings [*Robson v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 759, 761, 161 P.2d 821]* . The railroad also has a duty to keep the portion of its tracks that is near the station in a safe condition for intended passengers [*Aydlott v. Key Sys. Transit Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 621, 626-627, 286 P. 456]* .

The railroad's duty to provide safe approaches to its stations extends to the duty to take care that any trains that are moving on intervening tracks will not injure passengers who must cross those tracks to board or alight from a train [*Wilkinson v. United R.Rs. (1924) 195 Cal. 185, 199-200, 232 P. 131]* . The passenger has the right to presume that the intervening tracks he or she must cross will be kept safe while he or she is crossing [*Wilkinson v. United R.Rs. (1924) 195 Cal. 185, 200, 232 P. 131]* . The passenger has no duty to look and listen before crossing those tracks [*Wilkinson v. United R.Rs. (1924) 195 Cal. 185, 199-200, 232 P. 131]* . However, the intending passenger is not absolved from the exercise of any care; whether or not the passenger has exercised ordinary care under the circumstances and whether or not the railroad has fulfilled its duty are questions for the jury [*Ferran v. Southern Pac. Co. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 350, 355, 44 P.2d 533]* .

Railroads have a duty to provide sufficient lighting at stations to aid passengers transported at night in alighting at stations [*Teale v. Southern Pac. Co. (1912) 20 Cal. App. 570, 575-576, 129 P. 949]* . Railroads also owe a duty, at least, to make a reasonable inspection of waiting rooms at stations [*Hamilton v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 598, 600, 86 P.2d 829]* .

For discussion of the liability of carriers generally for injuries at stations, see. For general discussion of the liability of owners and occupiers of premises, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[c] Additional Statutory Duties to Passengers

Private corporations and persons that own, operate, control, or manage a line plant, or system for the transportation of people or property, directly or indirectly to or for the public, and common carriers, are public utilities subject to control

by the legislature [*Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3*].

In addition to the duties of care generally owed by carriers to passengers, the Public Utilities Code imposes additional duties on railroads [*see Pub. Util. Code §§ 7653-7657*]. Every railroad must provide sufficient room and accommodations for all passengers to whom tickets are sold for any one trip and for all persons presenting tickets for that trip [*Pub. Util. Code § 7653*]. Railroads are also required to post in a conspicuous place on the inside of their passenger cars rules and regulations regarding fares and the conduct of passengers [*Pub. Util. Code § 7654*].

If a passenger is injured on or from the platform of a car or on any baggage, wood, gravel, or freight car while violating either the written rules or verbal instructions by an employee of a railroad, the carrier is relieved of liability for the injuries, unless the railroad has failed to provide adequate accommodations for all passengers as required in *Pub. Util. Code § 7653* [*Pub. Util. Code § 7654*].

[2] Duty to Nonpassengers

[a] Generally

A railroad company has a very wide discretion in the proper operation of its business and the movement and management of its trains [*Matoza v. Southern Pac. Co. (1922) 59 Cal. App. 636, 640, 211 P. 252]* . However, when a court finds from the evidence that that discretion has been abused, the railroad company may properly be called on to respond in damages to a person suffering from its arbitrary action [*Matoza v. Southern Pac. Co. (1922) 59 Cal. App. 636, 638, 640-641, 211 P. 252* (obstruction of crossing by stationary train prevented farmer from removing cows overgrazing in alfalfa field)].

The same standard of care is applied to railroads as to other defendants [*Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1012, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . The fact that carelessness in the handling of a train wreaks a far greater quantum of havoc than carelessness in doing other things does not change a railroad's negligence into recklessness [*Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1012, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . The law imposes on a railroad company and its train crew the duty to use reasonable care, corresponding to the circumstances constituting the probable danger, to avoid injury to persons traveling on the public highway crossed by the company's tracks [*Romo v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 909, 916, 139 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; for discussion of railroad's liability for negligent operation of trains at crossings, see *§ 485.02[5][a]*]. The duty to use reasonable care applies both to the manner of operating the train and to the maintenance of the crossing [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 137 P.2d 441* ; *see § 485.105[3]* regarding railroad's liability for negligent maintenance of crossings].

[b] Trespassers

Generally, an injured person's status as a trespasser or invitee on a defendant's premises is not determinative of liability, and liability will be imposed on those whose want of ordinary care occasions injury to a person regardless of that person's status [*see Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 113-114, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561]* . Therefore, the distinction between the status of a person injured by a train as a trespasser or as an invitee is not determinative of the duty owed by the railroad to that person [*Beard v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 129, 136, 84 Cal. Rptr. 449* ; *see generally* Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*].

Civ. Code § 1714.7, however, creates a valid exception to the general rule of liability for injuries to trespassers [*see Durham v. City of Los Angeles (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 567, 572-574, 154 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . Under the statute, a person who is injured while getting on, or attempting to get on, a moving locomotive or railroad car, without authority from the operator of the railroad, or who, having gotten on, is injured while riding on or getting off of a locomotive or railroad car while in motion without such authority, cannot recover any damages from the owner or operator for those injuries

unless they are proximately caused by an intentional act of the owner or operator, with knowledge that serious injury will probably result from the act, or with a wanton and reckless disregard of the probable result of the act [*Civ. Code § 1714.7*].

One court has noted that the statute was apparently enacted as a direct response to the general rules of premises liability established by case law [*Perez v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 462, 467, 267 Cal. Rptr. 100* ; *see Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* ; *see also* Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*]. Consequently, a train-jumper may recover damages from a railroad only if the railroad expressly authorized the conduct or the railway committed willful misconduct. The statute therefore provides immunity to a railroad for an alleged "implied invitation" to engage in train-jumping by reason of the railroad's failure to erect barriers at locations where that activity is common [*Perez v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 462, 467-469, 267 Cal. Rptr. 100]* . *Civ. Code § 1714.7* does not provide immunity to the railroad if the train was stationary when the person climbed onto it [*Wiley v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 177, 191, 269 Cal. Rptr. 240]* .

For a form of affirmative defense for use in an answer to a complaint based on negligence when plaintiff was a trespasser injured while getting on, riding on, or getting off a moving train, see *§ 485.156*.

Even in cases not covered by *Civ. Code § 1714.7*, a plaintiff's status as a trespasser may have a bearing on the question of liability when, for example, it is evidence that plaintiff's conduct was negligent under the circumstances [*Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 253, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29* ; *see Wiley v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 177, 269 Cal. Rptr. 240* (*Civ. Code § 1714.7* inapplicable, and plaintiff trespasser found to be 75 percent at fault, but defendant's motion for new trial granted on ground of jury misconduct); *see also § 485.67[1]*].

[3] Duty to Construct and Maintain Safe Premises

[a] Tracks

A railroad has a duty to keep the portion of its tracks ordinarily crossed by intending passengers in a safe condition [*Aydlott v. Key Sys. Transit Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 621, 627, 286 P. 456]* . For example, a railroad may be liable for injuries to a person who falls under a train due to the failure of the railroad to keep the ground beneath its tracks paved and free of holes and depressions [*see Aydlott v. Key Sys. Transit Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 621, 626-627, 286 P. 456* ; *see also § 485.62[1][a]* regarding the duty of care owed to passengers].

An unsafe condition of the rails alone is not enough to support a cause of action against the railroad, however. The plaintiff must prove that the condition was a cause of the accident [*Dull v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1938) 27 Cal. App. 2d 473, 476, 81 P.2d 158]* . For example, evidence that rails of a track protruded over the fill-in between the rails, which was rough and broken near both rails, has been held insufficient as a matter of law to prove that the condition of the rails had proximately contributed to the accident in which a person was struck by a train while attempting to drive over a crossing [*Dull v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1938) 27 Cal. App. 2d 473, 475-476, 81 P.2d 158]* . For discussion of a railroad's duty to construct and maintain crossings over tracks generally, see *§ 485.105[3]*. For discussion of negligence in the operation of a railroad at a crossing generally, see *§ 485.62[5]*.

[b] Crossings

Every railroad company has the duty to construct and maintain crossings in good condition and to keep that part of its right-of-way at a public crossing reasonably safe for use by members of the general public [*City of Oakland v. Schenck (1925) 197 Cal. 456, 463, 241 P. 545* ; *Pitcher v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 712, 716, 34 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . The crossing may include not only that part within the intersecting roadway, but also that part within an adjoining sidewalk [*Pitcher v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 712,*

716, 34 Cal. Rptr. 614] . The rule applies to crossings laid out after construction of the railway as well as to those in existence at the time of the construction of the railway [*City of Oakland v. Schenck (1925) 197 Cal. 456, 463, 241 P. 545]* . The duty of a railroad company to maintain safely the crossing over its tracks where they occupy a portion of the highway rests not only on the corporation that originally constructed the tracks, but also on whatever railroad company thereafter exercises the franchise [*County of Alameda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 479, 484, 11 Cal. Rptr. 751, 360 P.2d 327]* . The duty of the railroad company is to exercise reasonable or ordinary care with regard to the maintenance of the crossing [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 137 P.2d 441]* . A railroad company may be liable for failing to maintain crossing in safe condition when ruts, holes, and depressions immediately adjacent to track cause a driver's truck to be thrown out of control and damaged [*see* *County of Alameda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 479, 485, 11 Cal. Rptr. 751, 360 P.2d 327]* .

No railroad crossing may be constructed without first obtaining the permission of the Public Utilities Commission [*see Pub. Util. Code § 1201*]. The PublicUtilities Commission has the power to prescribe the manner and terms of operation, and the maintenance, use, and protection of public railroad crossings [*Pub. Util. Code § 1202*]. When the Commission imposes an obligation on a railroad company to maintain its crossing in a certain way, the obligation is for the benefit, protection, and safety of the members of the public who use the crossing [*see* *Pitcher v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 712, 716, 34 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . For discussion of violation of Commission regulations as negligence per se, see *§ 485.64[1]*. For discussion of a railroad's negligent operation at a crossing, see *§ 485.62[4][a]*.

[c] Signalling Devices and Warnings

A railroad company has a duty to install crossing signals, or to upgrade existing signals, when the peculiar characteristics of a crossing call for such protection [*Romo v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 909, 916, 139 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . When, for example, a driver's view of approaching trains is obstructed by buildings near to a well-traveled crossing, a jury may find that the lack of a wigwag or warning bell at the crossing constitutes a failure to use reasonable care in warning traffic of the danger [*Downey v. Santa Fe Transp. Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 720, 726-727, 286 P.2d 40]* . Evidence of custom or business practice of furnishing warning devices under circumstances similar to the case at bar is admissible for the consideration of the jury as it relates to the feasibility of installing and maintain gates at crossings such as the one in the case [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 74, 276 P.2d 703* , *disapproved on other grounds,* *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . Evidence of the use by the defendant railroad company of gates at other grade crossings is admissible as long as all the crossings are substantially similar, taking into account the amount of vehicular and pedestrian traffic going over the crossings [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 74, 276 P.2d 703* , *disapproved on other grounds, Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . For a form of complaint for use in an action to recover for personal injury and property damage caused by a railroad's failure to install a signal or sound warning at a grade crossing, *see § 485.151*. For a form of complaint for use in a wrongful death action based on a railroad's failure to install a signal or sound warning at a grade crossing, *see § 485.152*.

A railroad company has a duty to keep signalling devices at crossings in proper condition and repair, if the railroad had actual or constructive notice of the failure of the device to operate properly [*Will v. Southern Pac. Co. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 468, 476, 116 P.2d 44]* . The degree of care required of the railroad in this regard is the degree of care that a prudent person would use under like circumstances [*Will v. Southern Pac. Co. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 468, 476, 116 P.2d 44]* . When a crossing is equipped with a signal that does not operate uniformly and causes a person to rely on the fact that the signal will operate if it is dangerous to cross, the failure of the signal to operate creates a trap that lures travelers into a dangerous situation, and the railroad may be liable for the injuries caused by this situation [*Startup v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 866, 869, 180 P.2d 896* ; *Mallett v. Southern Pac. Co. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 500, 507, 510, 68 P.2d 281]* . If a railroad maintains signals at a crossing, even if it is not required by law to install them, the public has a right to rely on the exercise of reasonable care on the part of the railroad company to keep them in good repair and efficient working condition [*Mallett v. Southern Pac. Co. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 500, 507, 510, 68 P.2d 281]* .

The fact that a warning bell does not ring when a train approaches does not necessarily give rise to an inference that the railroad company was negligent in maintaining the bell [*Vaca v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 91 Cal. App. 470, 480-481, 267 P. 346]* . The plaintiff has the burden of submitting evidence to show that the bell did not ring, and that the failure to ring was due to the railroad's negligence [*Vaca v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 91 Cal. App. 470, 480, 267 P. 346]* . The mere fact that the plaintiff proves that the bell did not ring does not permit the inference that its failure to do so was caused by defendant's negligence because it may have been due, instead, to some cause for which the defendant was not responsible [*Vaca v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 91 Cal. App. 470, 480-481, 267 P. 346]* . If there is no evidence that the defendant railroad had actual or constructive notice of the malfunction of the bell, that the railroad had failed to inspect the bell, or that in the exercise of ordinary care the railroad should have done anything more than it did to insure that the bell would ring when trains approached, the railroad cannot be found liable for negligence [*Vaca v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 91 Cal. App. 470, 481, 267 P. 346]* .

The continuous operation of a wigwag signal at a crossing when no train is in the vicinity has been held to create a dangerous situation in which motorists crossing the tracks would assume that no train is approaching [*Rice v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 701, 706-708, 55 Cal. Rptr. 840* (for over an hour at a time)]. The operation of a wigwag system that allows the wigwag signal to cease operating when a train clears the crossing, even if it is immediately followed by another train, will support a finding of negligence on the part of the railroad [*Startup v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 866, 869, 870, 180 P.2d 896]* .

At points along a railroad track other than a road crossing or a train station, a railroad is under no duty to warn of the hazards of walking along a track while a train is passing. Recognizing that the danger of standing next to a moving train is common knowledge, the courts have concluded that the presence of railroad tracks themselves serve as a warning of an open and obvious danger that requires no further warning sign [*Christoff v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 118, 126-127, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6]* .

Gov. Code § 14036.8 provides that, as part of a railroad public safetyawareness program, the Department of Transportation must provide appropriate warning signs to be posted on or adjacent to railroad property within 1,000 feet of schools where upgrading of railroad lines has resulted in an increase of operating speeds of passenger trains on those lines by 20 mph or more on or after December 1, 1991 [*Gov. Code § 14036.8(a), (b)*]. For the purposes of *Gov. Code § 14036.8*, a "school" is any public school that maintains classes in kindergarten or of grades 1 to 12, inclusive [*Gov. Code § 14036.8(c)*]. The signs must be posted on the school side of the railroad property at a site to be determined by school officials and railroad representatives. At the request of the department, a railroad that owns the property involved must install and maintain the signs. The signs must be designed to communicate both in words in pictures, using internationally recognized symbols, to warn of train-related hazards [*Gov. Code § 14036.8(b)*]. The installation and maintenance of these warning signs does not in any way affect the liability of the state or any of its agencies, officers, or employees, or of the owner of the railroad right-of-way, on account of personal injury or property damage alleged to have been caused, in whole or in part, by a sign, or the installation or maintenance of a sign, installed and maintained pursuant to *Gov. Code § 14036.8* [*Gov. Code § 14036.8(d)*].

For a discussion of a railroad's negligence in operation at crossings generally, see *§ 485.62[4][a]*. For a discussion of the award of punitive damages for failure to provide sufficient signals and warnings at a crossing, see *§ 485.66*. For a form of allegation for use in a personal injury or wrongful death action based on a railroad's failure to repair a signal or sound warning at a grade crossing, see *§ 485.153*.

[d] Cattle Guards and Fences

Every railroad must make and maintain good and sufficient fences on both sides of its tracks and property [*Pub. Util. Code § 7626*]. If the railroad does not do so, and if its engine or cars kill or maim any cattle or other domestic animal on its line of road, except where the road runs through or on public land, the railroad must pay a fair market price for the animal to the animal's owner, unless the killing or maiming occurred through the fault or neglect of the animal's owner [

Pub. Util. Code § 7626; *see Pub. Util. Code § 7631*]. For a form of complaint for use by an owner whose cattle have been injured or killed by a railroad's failure to maintain a proper fence, see Ch. 23, *Animals: Civil Liability* .

Pub. Util. Code § 7626 may also raise a jury question as to whether or not a fence was required in an area where it was known that children played on and around the railroad tracks. Although there is no provision made for a small child to recover for his or her personal injuries for the railroad's failure to provide a fence, there is nothing in the statute that limits the railroad's responsibility for such injuries, as long as a jury determines that ordinary care required the railroad to fence its right-of-way and that the absence of a fence, either alone or in connection with other negligence of the railroad, proximately caused injuries to a child [*see Staggs v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 492, 505, 287 P.2d 817]* .

A railroad company is bound to use reasonable diligence in keeping its right-of-way fences in repair, but it need not resort to extraordinary means, such as the maintenance of a special patrol, to insure that its fences will not be broken or that they are promptly repaired if they are broken [*Jesus Maria Rancho v. Southern Pac. Co. (1918) 36 Cal. App. 375, 379, 172 P. 183]* .

If a railroad enters into an agreement with the owner of land over which the the railway is located by which the owner agrees, for an agreed price, to construct and maintain a good and sufficient fence, and if the owner fails to construct and maintain the fence, the railroad is relieved and exonerated from all claims for damages arising out of the killing or maiming of any animals belonging to the owner [*Pub. Util. Code § 7627*]. In such a case, the owners of the animals are responsible for any damages or loss that may accrue to the railroad corporation from the animals being on the track because of the fence not being constructed, unless it is shown that the loss or damage occurred through the negligence or fault of the corporation, its officers, agents, or employees [*Pub. Util. Code § 7627*].

[4] Duty to Operate Trains Safely

[a] Approaching Crossings

A railroad grade crossing is a place of danger, and a train has the right of way at the crossing [*Akers v. City of Palo Alto (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 109, 120-121, 14 Cal. Rptr. 767* ; *Nemer v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1957) 156 Cal. App. 2d 445, 451, 319 P.2d 770]* . However, the operator of a railroad train has the duty to exercise reasonable or ordinary care at crossings towards persons traveling on the highway and over the crossing [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 137 P.2d 441* ; *Romo v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 909, 916, 139 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . A train crew cannot assume that a highway in the middle of a city will be clear. They must keep a reasonable lookout for the presence of intersecting traffic [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 785, 318 P.2d 784]* . The railroad is not relieved of the duty to maintain such a lookout by the installation of automatic signals at a crossing [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 786, 318 P.2d 784]* . The duty to keep a lookout for traffic at a crossing implies as a corollary the further obligation to have the train under such control as may be reasonably necessary to deal with situations that an ordinarily prudent operator would anticipate [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 785, 318 P.2d 784]* .

The standard of care imposed on the railroad operator at a crossing is that of an ordinarily prudent person under the circumstances [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 137 P.2d 441]* . The question of the negligence ofthe railroad operator is ordinarily one of fact in crossing cases, as it is in other negligence cases [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 137 P.2d 441]* . Trains must also take special care at dangerous crossings to pass at a slower rate of speed in proportion to the dangerous character of the crossing [*Young v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 208 Cal. 568, 572-573, 283 P. 61]* .

For discussion of railroad's liability with regard to excessive speed of train, see *§ 485.62[4][f]*. For a form of allegation for use in a personal injury or wrongful death action based on a railroad's use of excessive speed at a grade crossing, see

§ 485.154. For discussion of a railroad's duty to maintain adequate warnings and signals at railroad crossings, see *§ 485.62[3][b]*.

[b] Blocking Crossing

The unexplained blockading of a street crossing by a railroad train mayconstitute negligence on the part of the railroad company [*Hanlon Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 92 Cal. App. 230, 234, 268 P. 385]* . A railroad cannot unnecessarily and arbitrarily block a railroad crossing without incurring liability for damage proximately resulting from the obstruction [*Matoza v. Southern Pac. Co. (1922) 59 Cal. App. 636, 640, 211 P. 252]* . A railroad company may be liable for injuries to animals caused by their overgrazing in a field from which their removal was blocked by a train [*see Matoza v. Southern Pac. Co. (1922) 59 Cal. App. 636, 641, 211 P. 252]* . Plaintiffs can make out a prima facie case of negligence when their property burns to the ground because defendant's train blocked the access of the fire department to the fire [*Hanlon Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 92 Cal. App. 230, 234, 268 P. 385]* .

[c] Avoidance of Persons or Objects on Track

A railroad has a duty to exercise ordinary care towards persons whom the company should expect may be on or near the right-of-way [*Smithwick v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 206 Cal. 291, 303-304, 274 P. 980]* . The railroad has a duty to keep a lookout for and discover persons on the tracks if it has knowledge that people walk on or cross the tracks regularly in a certain area [*Smithwick v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 206 Cal. 291, 303-304, 274 P. 980* ; *see Essick v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 456, 461, 6 Cal. Rptr. 208]* . When a 21-month old child was struck by a train on a railroad right-of-way, for example, and the railroad's employees were aware that members of the public, including both adults and children, were likely to be on the railroad's right-of-way, it was a proper question for a jury whether the exercise of ordinary care or skill included a watchfulness for children in places of danger on or near the tracks [*see Staggs v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 492, 501-502, 287 P.2d 817]* . For discussion of the duty to keep a lookout in the area of urban crossings, see *§ 485.62[5]*.

[d] Backing Up of Train

A railroad may be liable for injuries caused by improper backing procedures. The backing up of a train engine increases the possibility of danger to the public and thereby increases the burden on the train crew to proceed with an awareness of the special dangers involved [*Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1012, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . A backing up maneuver by which the engine pushes a boxcar and caboose, conducted at night outside of the railroad yard limits, has been recognized as potentially dangerous [*Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1013, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . Factors such as the speed of the maneuver, use of required lights, bells, or whistles, and knowledge on the part of the train crew that pedestrians frequented the area will all be taken into account in determining whether a backing up maneuver was negligently conducted [*see Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014-1015, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . Sufficient evidence of negligence has been found when a train, after switching tracks and picking up empty cars, propelled the cars ahead of the engine, without giving warning by bell or whistle, when the engineer had known or should have had known that workers were on the track and would thereby be endangered [*see Barboza v. Pacific Portland Cement Co. (1912) 162 Cal. 36, 39-40, 120 P. 767]* . The sounding of warning bells is not sufficient to relieve a railroad of liability for a backing up maneuver if the evidence is not clear as to whether or not the person struck by the train was then in a position to have heard the signal, or whether or not the person would have known what the signal meant, if he or she had heard it [*Miller v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 107, 111, 145 P. 1023]* .

[e] Failure to Sound Train Whistle or Signal

Those in charge of a train have the duty to give notice of the approach of the engine when the train is approaching and traveling over a roadway by all warnings reasonably necessary under the conditions existing at the time and place of the

accident [*Downey v. Santa Fe Transp. Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 720, 727, 286 P.2d 40]* . Whether the railroad has complied with that requirement is a question of fact for the jury [*Downey v. Santa Fe Transp. Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 720, 727, 286 P.2d 40]* .

A railroad must sound a bell, siren, horn, whistle, or similar audible warning device at any public railroad crossing in accordance with federal regulations, except in those areas established as quiet zones [*Pub. Util. Code § 7604(a)(1)-(3)*]. Under applicable federal regulations, the locomotive horn on the lead locomotive of a train, lite locomotive consist, individual locomotive or lead cab car must be sounded when that locomotive or lead cab car is approaching a public highway-rail grade crossing. Sounding of the locomotive horn with two long blasts, one short blast, and one long blast, must be initiated at a location in accordance with *49 C.F.R. § 222.21(b)* and must be repeated or prolonged untilthe locomotive occupies the crossing. This pattern may be varied as necessary if crossings are spaced closely together [*49 C.F.R. § 222.21(a)*].

Generally, the locomotive horn must begin to be sounded at least 15 seconds, but not more than 20 seconds, before the locomotive enters the crossing, although this requirement does not apply if the horn is defective and the locomotive is being moved for repairs. In addition, if the engineer in good faith is unable to precisely estimate the time of arrival at the crossing, the horn may begin sounding up to 25 seconds before the locomotive enters the crossing [*49 C.F.R. § 222.21(b)(2)*]. Trains, locomotive consists, and individual locomotives traveling at speeds in excess of 60 miles per hour must not begin sounding the horn more than one-quarter mile in advance of the nearest public highway-rail grade crossing, even if the advance warning provided by the locomotive horn will beless than 15 seconds in duration [*49 C.F.R. § 222.21(b)(3)*].

Trains, locomotive consists, and individual locomotives that have stopped in close proximity to a public highway-rail grade crossing may approach the crossing and sound the locomotive horn for less than 15 seconds before the locomotive enters the crossing, if the locomotive engineer is able to determine that the crossing is not obstructed and either [*49 C.F.R. § 222.21(d)*]:

- The crossing is equipped with automatic flashing lights and gates and the gates are fully lowered; or
- There are no conflicting highway movements approaching the crossing.

These rules do not restrict the use of a bell, siren, horn, whistle, or similar audible warning device during an emergency or other similar situation authorized in *49 C.F.R. § 222.23* [*Pub. Util. Code § 7604(a)(4)*].

For a discussion of when the violation of a railroad safety statute constitutes negligence per se, see *§ 485.64[1]*.

In order for liability to attach to the railroad for failure to comply with the whistle blowing requirements of *Pub. Util. Code § 7604*, the failure to comply must have been the proximate cause of the accident [*DeArmond v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 648, 655, 61 Cal. Rptr. 844* ; for general discussion of proximate cause, *see* Ch. 380, *Negligence*]. Evidence that a plaintiff was in a position to hear a whistle, if it had been sounded, justifies a finding that if such warning would have been given, a collision would have been avoided [*Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 126, 137 P.2d 441]* . Generally, the absence of a signal from an approaching train becomes inconsequential when its approach is seen, but if a warning could have been given soon enough for a driver crossing the tracks to avoid the collision, the jury is justified in concluding that the railroad was negligent [*Marquis v. St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 335, 345, 44 Cal. Rptr. 367]* .

For forms of complaint and complaint allegations including allegations of negligence based on a failure to sound a proper warning at a railroad crossing, see *§§ 485.151 -485.153*.

[f] Excessive Speed

A railroad operator is free, in the exercise of reasonable care, to travel at high speeds, especially when traveling through sparsely settled areas, and to assume that cars approaching the tracks will exercise reasonable care to stop or cross safely, unless the driver's conduct reasonably alerts the engineer to the fact that the driver is not exercising or will not exercise ordinary care [*Marquis v. St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 335, 346-347, 44 Cal. Rptr. 367]* . However, in cities and towns and other well-populated areas, trains may not be run at any rate of speed that the railroad desires [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 787, 318 P.2d 784]* . While no particular rate of speed is negligence per se in the absence of a statute or ordinance, a railroad cannot run its trains under all conditions at any rate of speed it chooses. It must regulate its speed with regard for the safety of people and property, and a rate of speed that may be allowable in a thinly settled part of the country where few people cross the tracks may be so dangerous as to constitute negligence on the part of the railroad when driving a train through a city or village where many people are likely to cross the tracks [*Young v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 208 Cal. 568, 573, 283 P. 61* ; *see also § 485.64[1]*]. As the standard of duty shifts with the circumstances developed in a case, the question whether or not a rate of speed is excessive is one of fact for the jury [*Young v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 208 Cal. 568, 572-574, 283 P. 61]* .

One of the circumstances to be considered in determining whether or not the rate of speed of the train at that time and place was negligent is the visibility of the train to the person crossing the tracks. It may be negligent to propel a train through a crossing if the view of one approaching it is obstructed [*Stout v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 491, 502, 274 P.2d 194]* . When the view of the track is obstructed, for example, by another set of tracks where two trains may pass at the same time, and the noise of one train may obscure the warning noise made by the other train, the situation would call for a reduced speed commensurate with the danger of the situation [*see Stout v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 491, 502, 274 P.2d 194]* .

Although a rate of speed imposed by the railroad itself does not have the force of law, it is an admission on the part of the railroad that a higher speed would be improper in that locality [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 788, 318 P.2d 784* ; *see § 485.64[3]*]. It is also a question for the jury whether or not the company-imposed maximum rate of speed is appropriate at the particular place at which the accident occurred [*Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 788, 318 P.2d 784]* . Sometimes the issue of thespeed of the train is combined with other factors, such as the failure to sound a train whistle or obstruction of the view of the train, and all the combined factors must be examined to determine whether under the circumstances the speed of the train was reasonable [*see Rice v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 701, 708-709, 55 Cal. Rptr. 840]* .

A railroad company's violation of a speed ordinance raises a rebuttable presumption of negligence [*see Evid. Code § 669(a)*; *see also Lininger v. San Francisco, Vallejo & Napa Valley R.R. Co. (1912) 18 Cal. App. 411, 418, 123 P. 235* ; *see generally § 485.64[1]* regarding the presumption of negligence arising from a railroad's violation of safety statutes generally]. The speed violation alone does not, however, create liability [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649]* . For a plaintiff to recover, the negligence must also have been a proximate cause of the accident and the injuries to plaintiff [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649* ; *see Evid. Code § 669(a)(2)*]. If, however, the uncontroverted facts establish that the violation of the ordinance was the proximate cause of the accident, and no other deduction or inference may reasonably be drawn from these facts, then the violation of the ordinance is a proximate cause as a matter of law [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128, 85 Cal Rptr 649]* . The issue ofproximate cause becomes a question of law, not fact, when the jury cannot reasonably find that the collision would have occurred without the violation of the speed ordinance [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128-129, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649]* .

For a form of allegation for use in a personal injury or wrongful death action based on a railroad's use of excessive speed at a grade crossing, see *§ 485.154*. For a form of complaint containing a count for use in recovering damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* if the defendant railroad violated a Public Utilities Commission order, see *§ 485.151*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDutyGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawRail TransportationRates & Tariffs

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.63

§ 485.63 Vicarious Liability of Railroad Owners

[1] Negligence of Employees

If the employees of the railroad are found to be negligent in their operation of a train, the company is responsible for the negligence under the doctrine of respondeat superior [*McNulty v. Southern Pac. Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 841, 852, 216 P.2d 534]* . If the charge of negligence against the railroad company rests solely on respondeat superior and not on the company's own independent tort, exoneration of the train crew will exonerate the company [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 69, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . However, if concurrent negligence of the train crew and the company is charged, or if the company has been negligent independently of its employees, then exoneration of the employees will not exonerate the company [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 69-70, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . If the negligent act is done without the express direction of the railroad company, then its negligence will be predicated on respondeat superior only. If, however, the negligent act was predicated on the express direction of the company, for example, by directing the maintenance of a certain speed, the liability of the company and the employee is joint [*Benson v. Southern Pac. Co. (1918) 177 Cal. 777, 779, 171 P. 948* ; *Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 69-70, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . When the liability of the railroad company and an employee is joint, the company is not prejudiced by a failure to find against the employee [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 70, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . For a general discussion of employer's liability based on respondeat superior, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* .

[2] Negligence of Lessee

A corporation that is the owner of a railroad is presumed to be controlling and in possession of the operation of it [*Johnson v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1908) 154 Cal. 285, 289, 97 P. 520]* . That presumption is not rebutted by proof that some other company was operating cars over the railroad at the time of the accident [*Johnson v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1908) 154 Cal. 285, 293-294, 97 P. 520]* . Under the presumption, the burden is on the owner to show, when the question of liability for injury by moving cars arises, that the cars that inflicted the injury were under the control and

operation of another company because of a lease of the railroad [*Johnson v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1908) 154 Cal. 285, 293-294, 97 P. 520]* . However, when it is shown that a lease was executed under which the lessee agreed to maintain the property and operate the railroad with suitable protection to the public, the lessee is liable as if it were operating the road as owner [*Barrett v. Southern Pac. Co. (1929) 207 Cal. 154, 161-162, 277 P. 481]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsLiabilities of LessorsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsLiability of LesseesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersActivities & ConditionsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.64

§ 485.64 Effect of Safety Statute, Ordinance, or Regulation

[1] Violation Creates Presumption of Negligence

It is presumed that a person has failed to exercise due care if he or she has violated a statute, ordinance, or regulation, the violation proximately caused death or injury to person or property, the death or injury resulted from an occurrence of the nature that the statute or regulation was designed to prevent, and the plaintiff was one of a class of persons that the statute was meant to protect [*Evid. Code § 669(a)*]. The presumption may be rebutted by proof that the one who violated the statute did what an ordinarily prudent person, who desired to comply with the law, would have done under the circumstances [*Evid. Code § 669(b)(1)*]. If the presumption is not rebutted, a plaintiff is entitled to have the jury instructed that the railroad is negligent [*see Wilcox v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 548, 551, 12 Cal. Rptr. 207]* . For a general discussion of the presumption of negligence arising from a statutory violation, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

A statutory violation alone creates no liability unless the negligence was also the proximate cause of the accident and plaintiff's injuries [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649* ; see *Evid. Code § 669(a)(2)*]. However, the question of proximate cause becomes one of law when the facts are uncontroverted and only one deduction or inference may reasonably be drawn therefrom [*Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649]* . The negligence of a railroad in violating a speed ordinance, for example, is the proximate cause of a collision as a matter of law when the collision that was meant to be prevented by the ordinance was the very thing that did occur, and when the accident would not have occurred but for the violation of the ordinance [*see Whinery v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 126, 128-132, 85 Cal. Rptr. 649]* .

For a discussion of a separate theory of recovery based on Civ. Code § 2106, which provides that a public utility is liable for damages caused by a violation ofa Constitutional provision, a statute, or an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission, see *§ 485.68*.

[2] Compliance Does Not Per Se Negate Negligence

Statutory regulations constitute only the minimum measure of care required by a railroad, and it is usually a matter for

the jury to determine whether or not something more than the minimum was required under the circumstances of the case [*Hogue v. Southern Pac. Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 253, 258, 81 Cal. Rptr. 765, 460 P.2d 965* ; *Dragash v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 233, 241, 326 P.2d 649]* . In prescribing safety regulations, whether by legislative enactment expressed in a statute or by action of the Public Utilities Commission expressed in an order, the state has never stated that compliance with those statutes or regulations constitutes a complete discharge of the railroad's duties toward the public [*Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 72, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897]* . Therefore, a railroad company will not necessarily be held free from negligence even though it may have literally complied with safety statutes or rules. The circumstances may require it to do more [*Hogue v. Southern Pac. Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 253, 258, 81 Cal. Rptr. 765, 460 P.2d 965* ; *Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 126, 137 P2d 441]* . If, for example, the peculiar characteristics of a crossing call for the installation of automatic protection or the upgrading of existing automatic protection, the railroad may be guilty of negligence in failing to provide such protection even if it has complied with existing safety regulations [*Hinkle v. Southern Pac. Co. (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 691, 701-702, 87 P.2d 349* ; see *Romo v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 909, 916, 139 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *see generally §§ 485.62[3][c]* and *485.62[4][e]* regarding arailroad's failure properly to maintain and construct signals and the negligent operation of signals].

It is error to deny a jury instruction stating that compliance with Public Utilities Commission regulations regarding protective devices at railroad crossings is merely the minimum measure of care [*Dragash v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 233, 241-242, 326 P.2d 649]* . A jury instruction is proper if it states that if an ordinarily prudent person in the exercise of ordinary care would have supplied additional warning and safety devices over those that were present at the time of the accident, the defendant railroad would have been required to supply them and would have been negligent for failing to do so [*Lloyd v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 626, 637-638, 245 P.2d 583]* .

[3] Violation of Company Rule Compared

The violation of a railroad's own internal operating rule is not negligence per se, but it is a circumstance for the jury to consider on the issue of the railroad's negligence [*Powell v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 40, 46, 216 P.2d 448]* . For example, a railroad's rule requiring a reduction in speed well in advance of a highway crossing is admissible in evidence as bearing on the standard of care the railroad thought appropriate to insure the safety of others at its track crossings, but it does not establish plaintiff's right to recover [*see* *Powell v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 40, 46, 216 P.2d 448]* .

Company rules do not establish the standard of care of the railroad. That standard is always that of the person of ordinary prudence under the circumstances [*Davis v. Johnson (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 466, 473, 275 P.2d 563]* . Thus, although an instruction is proper that states that the violation of the railroad's rule is not negligence per se but is a circumstance that the jury may consider in determining the question of negligence, the failure to give it is merely an omission of an instruction on the evidence rather than an omission of an instruction on matter of law [*Davis v. Johnson (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 466, 472-473, 275 P.2d 563]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsTortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsTortsNegligenceProofEvidenceProvince of Court & JuryTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawOrdinancesTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawRules & RegulationsTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.65

§ 485.65 Evidence of Prior Accidents or Safeguards

Evidence of a prior railroad accident that occurred under substantially the same general circumstances as the accident in question, and that is not too remote in time, is admissible to prove the existence of a dangerous condition and notice thereof to the railroad [*Dragash v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 233, 242, 326 P.2d 649]* . Evidence of collisions at other crossings can be excluded, however, if the plaintiff fails to establish that the conditions of traffic, the types of signals, and other physical characteristics were similar at the other crossings [*Nemer v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1957) 156 Cal. App. 2d 445, 454, 319 P.2d 770]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsAdmissibility of EvidenceGeneral OverviewTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.66

§ 485.66 Punitive Damages

Three essential elements must be present to raise a negligent act to the level of willful misconduct: (1) actual or constructive knowledge of the peril to be apprehended; (2) actual or constructive knowledge that injury is a probable, as opposed to a possible, result of the danger; and (3) conscious failure to act to avoid the peril [*Morgan v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1012, 112 Cal. Rptr. 695]* . Punitive damages may be awarded if the defendant railroad's actions show a state of mind of conscious disregard for the safety of others [*Seimon v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 600, 608-609, 136 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; see *Civ. Code § 3294(a), (c)(1)* (definition of "malice" for purposes of awarding punitive damages as including willful and conscious disregard for rights or safety of others].

A railroad company acts with "conscious disregard of safety" if it is aware of a highly dangerous condition and, in spite of that knowledge, fails to take any corrective action [*Seimon v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977)136 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . For example, the failure to provide warning signs or lights at a dangerous blind crossing has been held to show a conscious and callous indifference to or disregard of probable harm to motorists, rather than merely benign neglect on the part of the railroad, and so constitute a basis for an award of punitive damages [*see Seimon v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 600, 608-609, 136 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . If, however, there is nothing suggesting that the crossing itself was particularly unusual or that vision of oncoming trains was obstructed, the failure to place warning lights or barriers on the crossing is not sufficient to constitute malice [*see Schreefel v. Okuly (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 818, 828, 192 Cal. Rptr. 402]* .

A railroad company's procedure of not applying brakes unless a collision appeared imminent, as opposed to unavoidable, is not by itself a basis for a finding of willful misconduct [*Bains v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 902, 906-907, 128 Cal. Rptr. 778]* . The fact that the railroad installed an automatic gate after the accident and had been aware of automobile-train collisions at other railroad crossings in the area is germane to the question of negligence but does not itself show wilful misconduct [*Bains v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 902, 907, 128 Cal. Rptr. 778]* .

For general discussion and forms relating to punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294*, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesPunitive DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyForeseeability of InjuryTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.67

§ 485.67 Affirmative Defense of Comparative Negligence

[1] Generally

When, in an action for negligence, the plaintiff's injuries resulted from negligence on his or her own part as well as on the defendant's part, the plaintiff's total recovery is reduced by an amount proportionate to his or her own fault [*see Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 828-829, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226]* . For general discussion and forms relating to the defense of comparative negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For a form of affirmative defense based on the comparative negligence of the plaintiff in action against a railroad, see *§ 485.155*.

In a negligence action against a railroad, it is ordinarily a question of fact whether the plaintiff took reasonable and sufficient precautions for his or her safety under the circumstances [*Will v. Southern Pac. Co. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 468, 475, 116 P.2d 44]* , as is the question whether the plaintiff's comparative negligence, if any, was a proximate cause of the claimed injuries [*see Toschi v. Christian (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 354, 362, 149 P.2d 848]* .

If a plaintiff was a passenger, and incurred his or her injury violating either the railroad's written rules or verbal instructions, his or her conduct may, in addition to constituting comparative negligence, relieve the railroad from all liability under *Pub. Util. Code § 7654* [*see § 485.62[2][a]*]. If a plaintiff was a trespasser, his or her conduct on a moving train may similarly relieve relieve the railroad from all liability under Civ. Code § 1715.7 [*see § 485.105[7]*]. A plaintiff's status as a trespasser on railroad property may also be relevant to the issue of his or her comparative negligence [*Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 253, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29* ; *see also § 485.62[b]*].

[2] Stop, Look, and Listen Rule

Because railroad tracks themselves are a warning of danger, a person must take precautions for his or her own safety when attempting to cross them, even if the railroad has installed some system to warn of approaching trains [*Startup v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 866, 871, 180 P.2d 896]* . A plaintiff's duty in approaching railroad tracks is to use every reasonable opportunity, depending on all the surrounding circumstances, to look and listen for the approach of the train in order to avoid hazard [*see Anello v. Southern Pac. Co. (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 317, 321-322, 344 P.2d*

843 .

Under the "stop, look, and listen" rule, a driver whose view of the tracks is obstructed is not required as a matter of law to stop before crossing the tracks [*Pokora v. Wabash Ry. Co. (1934) 292 U.S. 98, 104-106, 54 S. Ct. 580, 78 L. Ed. 1149* ; *see Marquis v. St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 335, 345, 44 Cal. Rptr. 367]* . A driver's failure to stop when his or her view is obstructed does not constitute negligence as a matter of law, although it may constitute negligence in fact if a reasonably prudent person would not have acted as plaintiff did under the circumstances [*Lucas v. Southern Pac. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 124, 139, 96 Cal. Rptr. 356]* . For example, a driver might not be negligent for failure to stop, look, and listen, if he or she reasonably relied on the absence of a signal or flagman at the crossing to assume that it would be safe to cross [*see Crawford v. Southern Pac. Co. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 427, 434, 439-440, 45 P.2d 183* ; *Green v. Key Sys. Transit Lines (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 512, 519, 253 P.2d 780]* . For further discussion of a driver's duty of care at a railroad crossing, see, *§ 485.62[5]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceProcedureTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.68

§ 485.68 Statutory Action Against Public Utility

A railroad, as a public utility, is liable for all loss, damages, or injury that is caused or that results when the railroad does, causes to be done, or permits any act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared unlawful or that omits to do any act, matter, or thing required to be done by the Constitution, a state law, or an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*; *see Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3* (public utility defined)]. An action to recover for such loss, damage, or injury may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any corporation or person [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]. For example, a cause of action for monetary damages is stated under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* when the plaintiffalleges he or she was injured by defendant's violation of an explicit statutory provision of the Public Utilities Code [*see Gay Law Students Assn. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 458, 475, 486, 156 Cal. Rptr. 14, 595 P.2d 592* (violation of *Pub. Util. Code § 453*).

Pub. Util. Code § 2106 appears to authorize a separate theory of recovery of damages, in addition to negligence, when the defendant railroad has violated a constitutional provision, statute, or Commission order or decision. Therefore, the basis for an action under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, such as defendant's violation of a safety statute, should be distinguished from the evidentiary presumption of negligence that may arise under *Evid. Code 669* in a negligence action when plaintiff can show at trial that an applicable statute created a duty of care [*see § 485.64*]. When a cause of action is predicated on defendant's negligence only, plaintiff need not plead or refer to a statute even if relied on as creating a duty. The statute is merely evidentiary, and may be introduced at trial without being pleaded [*Jackson v. Hardy (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 6, 12, 160 P.2d 161* (statute)].

If the court finds in an action brought under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* that the defendant's unlawful act or omission was wilful, it may, in addition to actual damages, award exemplary damages [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]. One court has stated in dictum that punitive damages are available under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* for violation of a safety statute only if the violation was authorized by the railroad [*Seimon v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 600, 609, n. 3, 136 Cal. Rptr. 787* (dictum)]. For a comparison with a court's award of punitive damages in a negligence action, see *§ 485.66*.

For a discussion of the procedures regarding orders and decisions of the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480,

Public Utilities . For a form of complaint containing a count based on *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* for use by persons injured in an automobile-train collision, see *§ 485.151*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesConduct Supporting AwardsTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawRules & RegulationsTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.69-485.79

[Reserved]

§§ 485.69[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.80

§ 485.80 Federal Statutes

Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA). *33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*

Liability of railroads engaged in interstate commerce for injury or death of employees (Federal Employers' Liability Act). *45 U.S.C.S. § 51 et seq.*

Working hours for employees of trains used in interstate commerce. *45 U.S.C.S. § 61 et seq.*

Definition of "railroad," as used in Safety Appliance Act and Boiler Inspection Act. *49 U.S.C.S. §§ 20102, 20103*

Rules to be adopted by Secretary of Transportation. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20103*

Safety Appliance Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*

Safety appliances and equipment to be used by railroads in interstate commerce. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.81

§ 485.81 State Statutes

Working hours for train workers. *Lab. Code §§ 600-607*

Employer's duty to furnish safe and healthful employment and place of employment. *Lab. Code §§ 6400-6413.5*

Safeguards on railroads. *Lab. Code §§ 6800-7000*

Acts with respect to railroads constituting crimes. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7676-7681*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.82

§ 485.82 Federal Administrative Regulations

Regulations relating to railroad safety. 49 C.F.R. Parts 212-236

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.83

§ 485.83 Decisions

[1] Boiler Inspection Act

Boiler Inspection Act (*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*) imposes absolute liability on employer without regard to negligence when violation of act results in injury to worker. *Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 485, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* .

Jury instructions on Boiler Inspection Act (BIA) (*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*) were reversible error for allowing jury to find violation merely because engineer's seat was not in proper condition, rather than requiring showing that seat defect created safety hazard; evidence of failure to furnish proper and safe seat and evidence ofinjury due to attempt to replace seat was sufficient evidence of causation on BIA claim for denial of motion for directed verdict; refusal to instruct jury that BIA violation was proximate or direct cause of injury was not prejudicial error. *Oglesby v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 603, 606-610*

Under former *45 U.S.C.S. § 23* [*now see 49 U.S.C.S. § 20701*], carrier by railroad is charged with absolute duty not to use any locomotive in improper or unsafe condition for use in service to which it was assigned. *Minehart v. Southern Pac. Co. (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 486, 488, 288 P.2d 999*

[2] Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA)

[a] Generally

In most FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) cases, finding of nonemployment as doing no more than depriving plaintiff of various procedural and proof advantages of FELA, since common-law negligence action against nonemployer is generally available in alternative. *Kelley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 321 n.3, 95 S. Ct. 472, 42 L. Ed. 2d 498*

Railroad employee's claim for aggravation of emotional condition and anxiety resulting from discharge, when condition originated from railroad collision, as not cognizable under FELA but only under Railway Labor Act (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 151-188*) and, hence, evidence relating to discharge as properly excluded in employee's action under *FELA. Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1283-1286, 1289-1292*

FELA's reference to "negligence" in its main liability provision (*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*) as not to be read so restrictively as to exclude all intentional torts from coverage. *Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1288*

[b] Appellate Review

On appeal of FELA case, Court of Appeals as examining (1) de novo any question relating to district court's subject matter jurisdiction under FELA or relating to statutory interpretation of that act; (2) trial court's rulings under *Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 403,* which provides basis for excluding relevant evidence, for abuse of discretion; and (3) jury instructions as a whole, in context of entire case, to determine whether they were misleading or inadequate to guide jury's deliberations. *Lewy v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1281, 1286-1287*

[c] Arising out of and in Course of Employment

Employee as general rule as deemed to be in course of employment while following only practicable route of immediate ingress and egress from employer's premises. *Sullivan v. Matt (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 134, 139, 278 P.2d 499*

Both federal and California courts as applying rule that if employer furnishes transportation under control of employer to employee, not as independent act of courtesy, but as actual incident appertaining to employment, and if injury is sustained during transportation, injury arises out of and in course of employment. *Northwestern Pac. R.R. Co. v. Industrial Accident Comm'n (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 367, 369, 166 P.2d 334*

[d] Assumption of Risk

Common law doctrine of assumption of risk as abolished in FELA actions by *45 U.S.C.S. § 54*. *Minehart v. Southern Pac. Co. (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 486, 489, 288 P.2d 999* ; *McGuigan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 704, 714, 247 P.2d 415*

[e] Contributory Negligence

When there is some employer negligence proximately causing accident, violation of rule or instruction by employee as constituting only contributory negligence, to be evaluated on comparative negligence basis under FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*). *Cordova v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 18 Cal. Rptr. 144*

Contributory negligence as no defense to liability but as considered in mitigation of damages on comparative negligence basis. *Cordova v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 18 Cal. Rptr. 144*

[f] Damages

Although jury has task of determining present value of future damages, trial judge may recommend to jury one or more methods of calculating present value so long as judge does not in effect preempt jury's function; trial judge's instructions

to jury with regard to discount methods, provided they do not subject jury's estimate to rigid mathematical limitation, are entitled to substantial deference on appellate review. *Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 341-342, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349*

In FELA cases, award of future damages as to be based on present value. *St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. v. Dickerson (1985) 470 U.S. 409, 412, 105 S. Ct. 1347, 84 L. Ed. 2d 303*

In action for injuries sustained by 50-year-old switchman as result of fall from top of freight car during switching operation, trier of fact as able to find that in view of worker's age and impaired performance and agility, he was reasonably certain to have suffered loss of future earnings as result of inability to continue work in future for as long as he might have done had he not sustained injury. *Robison v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287-288, 27 Cal. Rptr. 260*

In wrongful death action under FELA for benefit of decedent's widow and children, plantiff as entitled to recover for loss of decedent's care, attention, instruction, training, advice, and guidance of children, and evidence of decedent's ability and interest in training and guiding children as proper and significant to show value of that loss. *Miller v. Southern Pac. Co. (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 492, 508, 256 P.2d 603*

[g] Employee Status

In FELA action, finding that plaintiff was agent of defendant employer as not tantamount to finding that plaintiff was defendant's employee and as not sufficientto meet "employed" requirement of FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*). *Kelley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 419 U.S. 318, 325, 95 S. Ct. 472, 42 L. Ed. 2d 498*

Railroad employee working on train engaged in interstate commerce at time of death as engaged in interstate commerce within purview of *FELA. McGuigan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 704, 714-716, 247 P.2d 415*

[h] Employer's Duties

Under FELA, railroad as having duty to use reasonable care in furnishing its employees with safe place to work. *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Buell (1987) 480 U.S. 557, 558, 107 S. Ct. 1410, 94 L. Ed. 2d 563* ; *Cordova v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 18 Cal. Rptr. 144*

Degree of care required under FELA as that which person of ordinary prudence would have exercised under similar circumstances. *Aranda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 543, 546, 282 P.2d 875 , aff'd, 351 U.S. 493, 76 S. Ct. 952, 100 L. Ed. 1357 (1956)*

Duty of employer to warn employee of any dangers connected with work of which employer knew, or which employer might have discovered with proper care, and of which employee might reasonably be expected to remain in ignorance. *Baez v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 714, 717, 26 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Under FELA, duty resting on railroad as same as at common law, namely, to use reasonable care in furnishing its employees with safe place to work and safe tools and appliances. *Cordova v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 18 Cal. Rptr. 144*

Railroad company as owing substantially same duty with regard to cars of another company used on its road as it does to its own cars. *Lewis v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 273 P.2d 706*

[i] Evidence

Evidence that plaintiff worker was receiving monthly disability pension payments under Railroad Retirement Act as inadmissible as matter of law, either in mitigation of damages or as bearing on question of malingering. *Morse v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 128, 133, 135, 133 Cal. Rptr. 577*

[j] Exclusivity of Remedy

FELA as providing uniform rule of liability throughout all the states and as superseding state law relating to liability of carriers by rail engaged in interstate or foreign commerce. *Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co. v. Coogan (1926) 271 U.S. 472, 474, 46 S. Ct. 564, 70 L. Ed. 1041* ; *Davee v. Southern Pac. Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 25 Cal. Rptr. 445, 375 P.2d 293]*

FELA as only remedy railroad employee, or in event of worker's death, worker's personal representative, has against employer for injury or death sustained in interstate commerce. *New York Cent. R.R. Co. v. Winfield (1917) 244 U.S. 147, 148-154, 37 S. Ct. 546, 61 L. Ed. 1045* ; *Wildman v. Burlington N. R.R. Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1392, 1395*

FELA preempted action under state law brought by injured railroad employee for fraudulent concealment. *Monarch v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1197, 1211, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 247*

When FELA applies, federal remedies provided as exclusive. *McGuigan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 704, 714, 247 P.2d 415*

[k] Forum Non Conveniens

Doctrine of forum non conveniens applies in action under *FELA. Price v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 577, 579, 268 P.2d 457* ; *Great N. Ry. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 105, 109-110, 90 Cal. Rptr. 461*

[l] Indemnity Action by Railroad

Railroad employer as allowed to seek indemnification from third party tortfeasor for amounts paid to injured employee under FELA when railroad's negligence was secondary to third party's primary negligence; cause of action for indemnity as accruing when payment to injured employee is made. *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 237-239, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63*

[m] Injury

Allegation by railroad employee that he suffered myocardial infraction resulting from improper and unsafe working conditions in violation of FELA and Hours of Service Act (*45 U.S.C.S. § 61-66*) as alleging sufficient injury to take claim from under mandatory provisions of Railway Labor Act (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 151-163*) and to support action under *FELA. Welby v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (M.D. Pa. 1987) 671 F. Supp. 1015, 1016-1021*

[n] Interest

Prejudgment interest is not available in actions under FELA and was not properly awarded by state court even if it would be proper under state's rules of civil procedure. *Monessen Sw. Ry. Co. v. Morgan (1988) 486 U.S. 330, 335-336, 108 S. Ct. 1837, 100 L. Ed. 2d 349*

Award of interest in action arising under federal statute as governed by federal law and not by law of forum state. *Poleto v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (3d Cir. 1987) 826 F.2d 1270, 1274*

[o] Negligence of Employer

Negligence, as used in FELA, as act of employer in violation of its duty to use reasonable care in furnishing its employees with safe place to work and safe tools and appliances. *Cordova v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 18 Cal. Rptr. 144*

Employee as not required to prove negligence of employer or of its servants was sole proximate cause of injury, since railroad is liable for injury to employee even though its negligence was only a contributing proximate cause. *Torres v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 757, 764, 67 Cal. Rptr. 428*

[p] Preemption Regarding Maritime Employment

Railroad employee who suffers injury governed by Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) [*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 901-950*], regarding duties constituting "maritime employment," was limited to exclusive remedies of LHWCA, to exclusion of *FELA. Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 284-288*

[q] Res Ipsa Loquitur

Applicability of res ipsa loquitur doctrine in FELA cases. *Jesionowski v. Boston & Me. R.R. (1947) 329 U.S. 452, 456, 67 S. Ct. 401, 91 L. Ed. 416* ; *Beissel v. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 143, 149-150*

[r] Scope of Employment

Whether employee was injured in scope of employment as triable issue of fact when brakeman was injured while returning to work in private car of fellow employee who was on compulsory standby and return to work was in response to work call following layover period. *Temple v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 988, 994, 995, 164 Cal. Rptr. 780*

[s] Status of Particular Companies

[i] Pullman Company

Pullman Company, which operates sleeping cars for common carriers by railroad, as not itself a common carrier by railroad under FELA and its employees on pullman cars as not accorded relationship of employees of railroad to whose train Pullman cars are attached in absence of coownership of cars by railroad. *Robinson v. Baltimore & Ohio R.R. Co. (1915) 237 U.S. 84, 91-94, 35 S. Ct. 491, 59 L. Ed. 849*

When pullman car is jointly owned by railroad company and Pullman Company, employee of latter on Pullman car as also employee of railroad company. *Oliver v. Northern Pac. Ry. Co. (E.D. Wash. 1912) 196 F. 432, 435-436 , aff'd, 301 F.2d 305*

[ii] Railway Express Agency

Railway Express Agency, Inc., organized to carry express transportation business of numerous railroad companies as a common carrier but not a common carrier by railroad under provisions of *FELA or Safety Appliance Act. Jones v. New York Cent. R.R. Co. (6th Cir. 1950), 182 F.2d 326, 327-328* ; *Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Hall (4th Cir. 1931) 49 F.2d 692, 696*

Where cars of Railway Express Agency, Inc. were attached to train of railroad company, employee of express agency as employee of railroad company for purposes of FELA where express agency had no supervision over its cars or work being done. *Norfolk & W Ry. Co. v. Hall (4th Cir. 1931) 49 F.2d 692, 696-697*

[iii] Refrigerator Car Companies

Company engaged in renting refrigerator cars to railroads or shippers for transportation of perishable commodities and servicing them as not a common carrier by railroad within *FELA. Gaulden v. Southern Pac. Co. (N.D. Cal. 1948) 78 F. Supp. 651, 654 , aff'd, 174 F.2d 1022 (9th Cir. 1949)* ; *Aguirre v. Southern Pac. Co. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 636, 643-648, 43 Cal. Rptr. 73*

[t] Statute of Limitations

Railroad brakeman's action for injuries not filed within statutory period was barred when brakeman was fully aware of fact of injury when he fell and landed on his elbow, knew cause of injury, and failed timely to file because he was not aware of extent of injury due to poor medical advice from doctors who were not agents of railroad; when railroad may be estopped to plead statute. *Gregory v. Union Pac. R.R. Co. (D. Nev. 1987) 673 F. Supp. 1544, 1547*

In FELA action, "definite knowledge" that injury is work-related was not necessary to begin running of statute of limitations; duty to investigate is imposed once plaintiff believes or suspects that potential cause of injury is work-related. *Monarch v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1197, 1203, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 247*

Provision under FELA as to time when action under act may be commenced as affecting substantive right and as prevailing over limitations provision of state. *Hosman v. Southern Pac. Co. (1938) 28 Cal. App. 2d 621, 635, 83 P.2d 88 , cert. denied, 306 U.S. 656, 59 S. Ct. 645, 83 L. Ed. 1054 (1939)*

[u] Summary Judgment

Summary judgment, in appropriate case, as available in action under *FELA. Aguirre v. Southern Pac. Co. (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 636, 639, 642, 43 Cal. Rptr. 73*

[v] Tortious Conduct of Fellow Employee

Railroad employer as liable under FELA to injured employee for injuries proximately caused by employer's negligent employment and retention in employment of person of violent and dangerous propensities. *Najera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 634, 635, 13 Cal. Rptr. 146*

[3] Juries and Verdicts

One of Congress's primary concerns in adopting FELA as being that issues of whether there was employer fault and whether fault played any part in injury or death of employee should be decided by jury; jury's right to pass on questions

of fault and causation as liberally viewed and its power to engage in inferences as significantly broader than in common law negligence actions. *Pierce v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 1366, 1370*

Jury's special verdict awarding damages to worker's dependents under FELA as not internally inconsistent in having found that employer was not negligent with respect to accident causing employee's injuries but that employer was negligent in its post-accident treatment of worker with respect to making him fill out accident report, falsely accusing him of having been drinking prior to accident, and temporarily suspending him from his job, all of which caused worker to suffer severe mental anguish leading to his death two days later from heart attack broughton by stress-related aggravation of congenital heart disease of which worker was unaware. *Pierce v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 1366, 1368-1370*

[4] Jury Instructions

Propriety of jury instructions concerning measure of damages in action under FELA as issue of "substance" to be determined by federal law; under federal law, defendant as entitled to have jury instructed that when future payments or other pecuniary benefits are to be anticipated, verdict is to be made up on basis of present value only. *St. Louis Sw. Ry. Co. v. Dickerson (1985) 470 U.S. 409, 411-412, 105 S. Ct. 1347, 84 L. Ed. 2d 303*

In action based on Safety Appliance Act, plaintiff as entitled to peremptory instruction that to equip car with coupler which broke in course of switching operations is violation of Safety Appliance Act, rendering defendant railroad liable for injuries proximately resulting therefrom and that neither evidence of negligence nor evidence of diligence and care are to be considered on question of this liability. *O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 394, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187*

Trial court's instruction as proper under FELA in stating that "injury" may include sickness and that it is negligence for railroad to assign sick employee, of whose illness it knew or should have known, to tasks for which employee is, by reason of employee's condition, unfitted, and that employee may recover damages from railroad if assignment played any part in proximately worsening or aggravating worker's condition. *Waller v. Southern Pac. Co. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 201, 214, 57 Cal. Rptr. 353, 424 P.2d 937*

Trial court's instruction to jury in FELA action as nonprejudicial in stating that employee is not protected by California's Workers' Compensation Act, that he receives no benefit under state law, and that his sole remedy for damages, when his injury is sustained in course of his employment in interstate transportation by rail, lies in action brought in court of law as distinguished from claim made against employer and adjudicated before Industrial Accident Commission [now Workers' Compensation Appeals Board]. *Bohme v. Southern Pac. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 291, 298-299, 87 Cal. Rptr. 286*

[5] Safety Appliance Act

Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] as not creating federal cause of action for either employees or nonemployees seeking damages for injuries resulting from railroad's violation of act, although subsequently enacted FELA [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] provides cause of action for employees and embraces claims of employee based on violations of Safety Appliance Act in which employee is required to prove only statutory violation and that injury resulted in whole or in part from violation; worker's contributory negligence as no defense to employer. *Crane v. Cedar Rapids & Iowa City Ry. Co. (1969) 395 U.S. 164, 166, 89 S. Ct. 1706, 23 L. Ed. 2d 176*

Nonemployee injured by railroad's violation of *49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(A)* (failure to maintain cars with couplers coupling automatically by impact) as required to look to his or her remedy to common law action in tort, which is to say he or she must sue in state court in absence of diversity to implement state cause of action. *Crane v. Cedar Rapids &*

Iowa City Ry. Co. (1969) 395 U.S. 164, 166, 89 S. Ct. 1706, 23 L. Ed. 2d 176

State as permitted to make defense of contributory negligence available to railroad sued by nonemployee for damages for personal injuries caused by railroad's failure to maintain its freight cars with couplers coupling automatically by impact, as required by *49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(A)*. *Crane v. Cedar Rapids & Iowa City Ry. Co. (1969) 395 U.S. 164, 165-167, 89 S. Ct. 1706, 23 L. Ed. 2d 176*

Duty imposed on railroad engaged in interstate commerce by to equip cars with couplers coupling automatically by impact, as not based on negligence of carrier, but as absolute duty requiring performance, and normal efficiency of coupler in question at other times as immaterial. *Affolder v. New York, Chicago & St. Louis R.R. Co. (1950) 339 U.S. 96, 98, 70 S. Ct. 509, 94 L. Ed. 683*

Railroad sued under FELA for violation of Safety Appliance Act by failing to use cars equipped with safe couplers as not escaping liability for coupler's inadequacy by showing that too much was demanded of it, or that while coupler broke it had been properly manufactured, diligently inspected, and showed no visible defects, or merely by showing that railroad was not guilty of negligence. *O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 393-394, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187*

Failure of equipment to perform as required by Safety Appliance Act as in itself actionable wrong, in no way dependent on negligence, and for proximate results of which there is liability that cannot be escaped by proof of care or diligence. *O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 390, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187*

Duty imposed by Safety Appliance Act as not based on negligence on part of railroad but as absolute duty; equipment failure as constituting actionable wrong and negligence as not in issue. *Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 185*

Railroad as strictly liable under FELA for injury caused by violation of *Safety Appliance Act. Illinois Cent. Gulf R.R. Co. v. International Paper Co. (5th Cir. 1987) 824 F.2d 403, 405*

Air brake provisions of Safety Appliance Act are designed to cover defects that prevent brakes from effectively controlling movement of train over main line tracks and are inapplicable to switching operations. *Erskine v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (6th Cir. 1987) 814 F.2d 266, 270-271*

Plaintiff worker as entitled to recover damages if violation of Safety Appliance Act was contributory proximate cause of plaintiff's injury. *Erskine v. Consolidated Rail Corp. (6th Cir. 1987) 814 F.2d 266, 269*

Safety Appliance Act [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] and pertinent regulations [*49 C.F.R. §§ 231.18, 231.25(c)*] requiring that uncoupled high/rail vehicle be equipped with secure sill steps as applying to motor van that had been converted for use on both highway and rails when injury occurred when van was in use on highway. *Beissel v. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 143, 145-148*

One of few defenses available to railroad in action involving application of Automatic Couplers Act arises out of failure of device to couple on impact because it had not been properly opened. *Finley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 424, 429, 3 Cal. Rptr. 895*

Failure of equipment to perform as required by Safety Appliance Act is itself an actionable wrong, in no way dependent on negligence, and for proximate results of which there is liability that cannot be escaped by proof of care or diligence. *Finley v. Southern Pac. Co. (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 424, 428-429, 3 Cal. Rptr. 895*

Under Safety Appliance Act [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*], interstate railroad company as having absolute duty to

equip and maintain efficient brakes on cars so as to securely hold them under ordinary circumstances. *Qualls v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1931) 112 Cal. App. 7, 12, 296 P. 645*

When plaintiff argued that injury was caused by presence of vertical handholds on railcar, directed verdict in favor of railroad upheld when implementing regulations of Safety Appliance Act did not prohibit use of vertical handholds in conjunction with horizontal handholds on type of railcar on which plaintiff was injured. *Woods v. Union Pacific Railroad Co. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 571, 579-580, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 748*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesAssumption of RiskGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceLimits on ApplicationGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsStrict LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.84

§ 485.84 Law Reviews

Comment, *DeTomaso v. Pan American World Airways, Inc.: Preemption of State Tort Claims By The Railway Labor Act, 19 Pac. L.J. 905 (1988)*

Note, *Tort Liability--The Safety Appliance Act and the Non-FELA Plaintiff. Crane v. Cedar Rapids & Iowa City Railway Co. (U.S. 1969), 58 Cal. L. Rev. 730 (1970)*

Note, *Acts of Fellow Servants: Employers' Liability Under the FELA, 35 S. Cal. L. Rev. 368 (1962)*

Notes and Recent Decisions, *Torts: Statutory Violation by the Employer and a FELA Law of Torts, 46 Cal. L. Rev. 847 (1958)*

Ennis, *The Federal Employers' Liability Act, 4 Hastings L.J. 23 (1952)*

Comment, *Master and Servant--Railroad's Liability to Servant--Federal Safety Appliance Act and Federal Employers' Liability Act, 23 S. Cal. L. Rev. 363 (1950)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.85

§ 485.85 Text References

Moore's Federal Practice, Ch. 7, Pleadings Allowed; Form of Motions, § 7.02; *Ch. 8, General Rules of Pleading, §§ 8.02, 8.03, 8.05, 8.07, 8.08*; *Ch. 9, Pleading Special Matters, § 9.08*; *Ch. 10, Form of Pleadings, §§ 10.02*, 10.06; *Ch. 11, Signing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers; Representations to Court; Sanctions, § 11.02*; *Ch. 12, Defenses and Objections--When and How Presented--By Pleading or Motion--Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, §§ 12.02 -12.03*; Ch. 17, *Parties Plaintiff and Defendant; Capacity*, §§ 17.14, 17.19 (Matthew Bender 3d ed.)

Personal Injury: Actions, Defenses, Damages, Vol. 13, *Federal Employers' Liability Act*, (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsJudgment on the PleadingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.86-485.99

[Reserved]

§§ 485.86[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.100

§ 485.100 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving carriers generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 33, *Carriers* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in negligence actions generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTransportation LawRail TransportationState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.101

§ 485.101 Forms of Discovery

For forms of interrogatories for use in actions involving carriers generally, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Ch. 34, *Carriers* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTransportation LawRail TransportationState & Local Regulation

118 of 143 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.102

§ 485.102 California Torts

For discussion of tort actions against railroads, see California Torts, Ch. 23 (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.103

§ 485.103 State Constitution

Regulation of public utilities generally. *Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 1-9*

Classification of public utilities subject to control by legislature. *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.104

§ 485.104 State Statutes

[1] Animals

Railroad's liability for injury to animals on tracks caused by failure to maintain fences. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7626, 7627*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 7631*

[2] Crossings

Regulation of public railroad crossings by Public Utilities Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1201, 1202*; *see Pub. Util. Code § 768*

Railroad's liability for failure to sound signal at crossing. *Pub. Util. Code § 7604*

Failure to sound signal at specified distance from crossing as misdemeanor. *Pub. Util. Code § 7678*

Duty of local authorities to erect crossing warning signs. *Veh. Code § 21362*

Duty of motorists in approaching railroad crossings. *Veh. Code §§ 22450-22452*

[3] Equipment

Derail sign requirements. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7601-7603*

Steam locomotives as required to be equipped with automatic bellringers. *Pub. Util. Code § 7605*

Headlight requirements. *Pub. Util. Code § 7607*

[4] Liability

Qualified immunity of railroad for injuries to trespassers riding or jumping on or off moving train. *Civ. Code § 1714.7*

Carrier's duty of care towards passengers. *Civ. Code § 2100*

Criminal liability for gross negligence in placing obstruction on or near railroad track that results in damage or derailment. *Penal Code § 218.1*

Public utility's liability for injuries resulting from violation of constitution, state statute, or Public Utilities Commission order or decision. *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*

Railroad's liability for failure to sound signal at crossing. *Pub. Util. Code § 7604*

[5] Passengers

Requirement that paying passengers be accommodated. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7653*

Immunity of railroad from liability for injury incurred by passenger while disobeying verbal or printed rules. *Pub. Util. Code § 7654*

Liability for refusal to give baggage check. *Pub. Util. Code § 7655*

Railroad's authority to eject passenger who refuses to pay fare. *Pub. Util. Code § 7656*

[6] Schools

Requirement for railroad warning signs on or adjacent to railroad property within 1,000 feet of schools where upgrading of railroad lines has resulted in specified increase in passenger train speeds. *Gov. Code § 14036.8*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDutyGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawRules & RegulationsTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.105

§ 485.105 Decisions

[1] Automobile Passengers

Negligence of automobile driver in collision with train as not properly imputed to plaintiffs who were guest passengers in automobile. *Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 127, 137 P.2d 441*

Concurrent liability to passenger as imposed on railroad and automobile driver involved in collision if both defendants are at fault. *Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 226, 231, 300 P.2d 910*

[2] Comparative Negligence

Failure in operation of automatic signal as not absolving driver from the duty to exercise ordinary care for his or her own protection, and to that end, looking and listening for approach of train. *Lucas v. Southern Pac. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 124, 142 n. 7, 96 Cal. Rptr. 356*

Driver's failure to stop when his or her vision is somewhat obstructed as not constituting contributory negligence as matter of law unless jury determines that reasonably prudent person would not have acted as plaintiff did. *Lucas v. Southern Pac. Co. (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 124, 139, 96 Cal. Rptr. 356*

Plaintiff in wrongful death action as entitled to presumption that decedent exercised due care when no one witnessed decedent being struck and killed by train. *Greene v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 135, 139, 260 P.2d 834*

[3] Crossings

Duty to safely maintain crossing over tracks where railroad occupies portion of highway as resting not only with

corporation that originally constructed tracks but with whatever railroad company later exercises franchise. *County of Alameda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 479, 484, 11 Cal. Rptr. 751, 360 P.2d 327*

Railroad as under duty to use reasonable care in maintaining wigwag signal so that appearance of safety does not trap person relying on signal for their protection. *Startup v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 866, 869, 180 P.2d 896*

Operator of railroad as required to exercise care commensurate with circumstances when conditions existing at crossing create unusual hazard or danger. *Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 120, 123, 137 P.2d 441*

[4] Fences

Nothing in *Pub. Util. Code § 7626* as limiting railroad's responsibility for injuries to small child when jury determines that ordinary care requires railroad to fence right-of-way and that absence of fence proximately caused injuries to small child. *Staggs v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 492, 505, 287 P.2d 817*

[5] Passengers

Quantum of care required of plaintiff who is on railroad tracks with intention of becoming passenger as less than that required of nonpassengers; intending passenger as entitled to assume railroad company will regulate movement of its trains so that he or she can cross in safety. *Ferran v. Southern Pac. Co. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 350, 355, 44 P.2d 533*

When complaint alleges breach of carrier's duty to carry passenger safely and consequent injury as gravamen of action, action arises out of tort and not contract and is subject to one-year statute of limitations. *Basler v. Sacramento Elec., Gas & Ry. Co. (1913) 166 Cal. 33, 36, 134 P. 993*

[6] Presumption of Negligence

[a] Presumption Is Rebuttable

Presumption of negligence arising from violation of statute as rebuttable by evidence that defendant did what might reasonably be expected of person of ordinary prudence acting under similar circumstances who desired to comply with statute. *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 621-622, 327 P.2d 897*

[b] Violation of Company Rule

Company-imposed maximum speed as admission on part of defendant that any higher speed would be improper at locality; whether company maximum was too high under circumstances, whether obstructions at crossing demanded substantial reduction below maximum, and whether accident would not have occurred if train had traveled at lower speed as questions for jury. *Herrera v. Southern Pac. Co. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 781, 788, 318 P.2d 784*

[c] Violation of PUC Regulation or Order

PUC regulation as only constituting minimum measure of care required by railroad. *Hogue v. Southern Pac. Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 253, 258, 81 Cal. Rptr. 765, 460 P.2d 965*

[d] Violation of Statute or Ordinance

Although plaintiff's violation of traffic law is negligence per se, whether violation was proximate cause of collision as question of fact for jury. *Toschi v. Christian (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 354, 362, 149 P.2d 848*

Former Civ. Code § 5486, which only required that bell or whistle be sounded until engine crossed highway, as minimum of care required; jury as justified in concluding that railroad was negligent for failing to sound bell or whistle continuously while crossing. *Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 125-126, 137 P.2d 441*

While no rate of speed is negligence per se in absence of statute or ordinance, railroad company as having duty to run its train over dangerous crossings at rate of speed proportionate to danger. *Young v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1929) 208 Cal. 568, 572, 283 P. 61*

[7] Trespassers

Civ. Code § 1714.7 barred action for personal injuries brought against railroad by person who surreptitiously climbed onto railroad car that momentarily stopped while slowing to switch tracks. *Rivera v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 294, 300-301, 266 Cal. Rptr. 11*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceMultiple PartiesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesContributory NegligenceImputed Contributory NegligenceTortsNegligenceProofEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationRailroad CrossingsTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationTrespassersTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral OverviewTransportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.106

§ 485.106 Attorney General Opinions

Pub. Util. Code § 7604 as preempting city from adopting ordinance that prohibits sounding of train whistles at city street crossings. *69 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 203 (1986)*

County Board of Supervisors as authorized to regulate by ordinance the blocking of crossings by railroad trains and cars, when Public Utilities Commission has not chosen to act. *18 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 125 (1951)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawRail TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.107

§ 485.107 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 6, *Torts*, §§ 907, 922-929 (10th ed. 2005)

124 of 143 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.108-485.119

[Reserved]

§§ 485.108[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.120

§ 485.120 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7-11] Filed in United States District Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56] for Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Official Fed. R. Civ. P. Form No. 14

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7-11] Filed in United States District Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56] for Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Official Fed. R. Civ. P. Form No. 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
[_____ DIVISION]

Civil Action File No. _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
a corporation,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

1. This action arises under the Federal Employers' Liability Act, *United States Code, Title 45, Sections 51*-60.

2. During all the times herein mentioned defendant owned and operated in interstate commerce a railroad that passed through a tunnel located at _____, and known as Tunnel No. _____.

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant was repairing and enlarging the tunnel in order to protect interstate trains and passengers and freight from injury and in order to make the tunnel more conveniently usable for interstate commerce.

4. In the course of thus repairing and enlarging the tunnel on that day, defendant employed plaintiff as one of its workers and negligently put plaintiff to work in a portion of the tunnel that defendant had left unprotected and unsupported.

5. By reason of defendant's negligence in thus putting plaintiff to work in that portion of the tunnel, plaintiff was, while so working pursuant to defendant's orders, struck and crushed by a rock, which fell from the unsupported portion of the tunnel, and was _____ [*describe plaintiff's injuries*].

6. Prior to these injuries, plaintiff was a strong, able-bodied person, capable of earning and actually earning $ _____ per day. By these injuries plaintiff has been made incapable of any gainful activity, has suffered great physical and mental pain, and has incurred expense in the amount of $ _____ for medicine, medical attendance, and hospitalization.

Wherefore plaintiff demands judgment against defendant in the sum of $ _____ and costs.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an injured employee of an interstate railroad to sue the railroad under the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) in a United States District Court for damages for injuries sustained in the course and scope of the employment as a result of the railroad's negligence. For forms of complaint for use in a California state court, see *§§ 485.121* and *485.122*.

This form is adapted from Fed. R. Civ. P., Appendix of Forms, Form 14. It is a verbatim reproduction of that form, except for several nonsubstantive format changes and a modification of Paragraph 1, which in this form specifies FELA as the basis for jurisdiction [*see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1331* (federal question jurisdiction)]. Official Fed. R. Civ. P. Form 14 is sufficient under the Fed. R. Civ. P. and is intended to indicate the simplicity and brevity of statement that these rules contemplate [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 84*].

With appropriate modifications, this form may also be used when the action is by a deceased worker's personal representative [*see 45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 59*; *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 9(a), 17*]. For discussion concerning modification of this form for use when the action is based on the violation of a safety provision, as distinguished from negligence, see *§ 485.120[7]*.

For discussion relating to venue, see *§ 485.39*.

[3] Content and Format of Complaint in Federal Court

A complaint in federal court must contain the following [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*]:

- A short and plain statement of the grounds on which the court'sjurisdiction depends.
- A short and plain statement of the claim showing that the plaintiff is entitled to relief.
- A demand for judgment for the relief the plaintiff seeks.

For the required caption and format of a pleading, see *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 8(e)* and *10*.

[4] Allegations

This complaint contains the following:

- A jurisdictional allegation--that is, a statement of the court's jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action (Paragraph 1) [*see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1331* (federal question jurisdiction); *45 U.S.C.S. § 56* (concurrent federal jurisdiction in FELA actions); *see also § 485.37*];
- Defendant's ownership and operation of a railroad engaged in interstate commerce (Paragraph 2) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*];
- The location where the accident subsequently occurred (Paragraph 2);
- Defendant's activity at the place where the accident subsequently occurred and how it affected interstate commerce (Paragraph 3);
- Plaintiff's employment by defendant to do work affecting that commerce, giving rise to the employer's duties to its employees imposed by federal statutes, rules, and regulations (Paragraph 4) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*];
- Defendant's creation of an unsafe work place and its negligent assignment of plaintiff to work there, that is, defendant's breach of duty (Paragraph 4);
- The accidental event and plaintiff's involvement in it (Paragraph 5);
- A description of plaintiff's injuries, that is, plaintiff's detriment (Paragraph 5); and
- The damages sustained by plaintiff as a result of his or her injuries (Paragraph 6).

[5] Prayer

This complaint also contains a demand for judgment (prayer) in a specified dollar amount plus costs [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*].

[6] Signature and Verification

Every pleading of a party represented by an attorney must be signed by at least one attorney of record in his or her own name, and must state the attorney's address. If unrepresented, the party must sign the pleading and state his or her

address [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*].

Except when otherwise specifically provided by rule or statute, pleadings in federal courts need not be verified [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*]. There is no rule or statute requiring that a complaint for damages under the FELA be verified.

[7] Violation of Safety Acts

If the accident was caused by the employer's violation of the Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*; *see § 485.45[1]*]or the Boiler Inspection Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*; *see § 485.45[2]*], counsel should add allegations to that effect and omit the allegations of negligence. The liability of the employer in such case is absolute and negligence is not an issue [*see Carter v. Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 430, 433-434, 70 S. Ct. 226, 94 L. Ed. 236 (Safety Appliance Act)* ; *Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 485, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* (Boiler Inspection Act); *see also §§ 485.45[4], 485.121*].

Even if the action is based on the railroad's negligence, however, if there is a possibility that the accident may have been the result of the employer's violation of a safety provision in either of the above acts, counsel should include allegations to that effect. The importance of this is that while the amount of any damages awarded the employee for the employer's negligence is diminished by the amount of the employee's contributory negligence, neither negligence nor contributory negligence is in issue when the basis of the claim is a violation of a safety act or adopted regulation or rule, and there is thus no offset against the damages awarded [*see* 42 U.S.C.S. § 54a; *45 U.S.C.S. § 53*; *see also § 485.45[4]*].

[8] Pleading Separate Theories

While it is not legally necessary to allege violation of the safety acts separately from the allegations of negligence under the FELA when both theories of liability are alleged in the same complaint, the better practice would be to set them forth in a separate count in order to keep the issues of negligence and absolute liability separate [*see § 485.121*]. Thus, it has been said that in an action under the FELA in which liability is also predicated on a violation by the employer of the Safety Appliance Act[(*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*], pleadings will serve the purpose of sharpening and limiting the issues only if the claims based on negligence are set forth separately from those based on violation of the appliance acts [*O'Donnell v. Elgin, Joliet & E. Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 384, 392, 70 S. Ct. 200, 94 L. Ed. 187]* .

Nevertheless, even though violation of the Safety Appliance or Boiler Inspection Act may provide the basis of the claim, it is the FELA that provides the remedy [*Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 187* ; *Beissel v. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 143, 145]* .

[9] Joinder of Parties and Actions

The FELA makes no mention of parties other than the railroad and its employees or the employees' personal representatives. However, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorize the joinder of parties as defendants if there is asserted against them jointly, severally, or in the alternative, any right to relief in respect of or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences and if any question of law or fact common to all defendants will arise in the action [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 20*]. The rules further provide that misjoinder is not a ground for dismissal, and that parties may be dropped or added by order of the court at any stage of the action [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 21*]. The rules also authorize the filing of counterclaims and cross claims among the original parties or to bring in new parties [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 13*]. Under these rules, the joinder of parties and claims in an FELA action is authorized [*see Blair v. Cleveland Twist Drill Co. (7th Cir. 1952) 197 F.2d 842* (action by railroad employee against railroad under FELA and third-party supplier of defective tool for negligence in which railroad cross claimed against tool company)].

Nevertheless, it is only the employee's claim against the employer that is determined under the FELA, and any action

the injured employee may have against a third-party tortfeasor arising out of the same occurrence that gave rise to the FELA claim and whatever claim the railroad may have against a third-party tortfeasor for contribution or indemnity, or vice versa, depends on state law. If such actions are permitted under the law of the state in which the accident occurred, such claims may be joined with the FELA claim in the same lawsuit or filed as a separate action [*see Alabama Great S. R.R. Co. v. Chicago & N. W. Ry. Co. (8th Cir. 1974) 493 F.2d 979, 983* ; *Missouri Pac. R.R. Co. v. Star City Gravel Co. (E.D. Ark. 1978) 452 F. Supp. 480, 482 , aff'd, 592 F.2d 455 (8th Cir. 1979)* ; *Brenham v. Southern Pac. Co. (W.D. La. 1971) 328 F. Supp. 119, 123 , aff'd, 469 F.2d 1095 (5th Cir. 1972)* ; *see generally* Personal Injury: Actions, Defenses, Damages, Vol. 13, *Federal Employers' Liability Act*].

[10] Federal Statutes

Jurisdiction of federal district courts over civil actions arising under federal law. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1331*

Change of venue from one federal district court to another. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1404*

Federal Employers' Liability Act. *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*

Federal court venue of FELA action. *45 U.S.C.S. § 56*

Safety Appliance Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*

Boiler Inspection Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*

[11] Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Form and content of complaints. *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 8-11*

[12] Text References

Moore's Federal Practice, Ch. 8, *General Rules of Pleading* ; Ch. 10, *Form of Pleadings* ; Ch. 11, *Signing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers Representations to Court; Sanctions , § 11.02*; Ch. 17, *Parties Plaintiff and Defendant* , §§ *17.20- 17.28* (Matthew Bender 3d ed.)

13 Personal Injury: Actions, Defenses, Damages, Vol. 13, *Federal Employers' Liability Act (Matthew Bender)*

126 of 143 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.121

§ 485.121 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence or Breach of Statutory Duty [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Federal Employers' Liability Act [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*])
a corporation,	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Negligence)

1. This action arises, and is brought, under and pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Employers' Liability Act, *United States Code, Title 45, Sections 51*-60.

2. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of _____, authorized to transact, and transacting, business in the State of California, and having its principal place of business in this State in _____ County.

3. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a common carrier by railroad engaged in interstate commerce, doing business as such in California and other states.

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*specify place where accident occurred, e.g.,* owned and operated a switchyard (hereinafter "the switchyard"), consisting of numerous tracks, at _____ California through which interstate trains moved and where interstate trains were put together].

5. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was employed by defendant as a _____ [*e.g.,* switchman at the switchyard], and at the time of the accident hereinafter alleged was engaged in work that _____ [was in furtherance of *or* closely and substantially affected] interstate commerce.

6. On or about _____ [*date of accident*] at about _____ [*time*], plaintiff was working _____ [*e.g.,* at the switchyard on a cut of cars in connection with a switching operation] in the regular course and scope of plaintiff's duties.

7. At that time and place, defendant, in breach of its duty to provide plaintiff with a reasonably safe place to work, so negligently _____ [*specify, e.g.,* managed, controlled, maintained, and operated a railroad locomotive and certain railroad cars as to cause the locomotive and cars to strike the cut of cars on which plaintiff was working].

8. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence and of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the locomotive and cars hitting the cut of cars on which plaintiff was working, plaintiff was thrown to the ground] and sustained the injuries hereinafter alleged.

9. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence and of plaintiff's _____ [*e.g.,* being thrown to the ground], plaintiff sustained _____ [*describe injuries, e.g.,* severe physical injuries (hereinafter "the injuries"), both internal and external, consisting in part of abrasions, contusions, lacerations, a dislocated shoulder, a fractured right arm and leg, a fractured pelvis, and internal hemorrhaging, and has endured severe pain and suffering], all to plaintiff's general damage.

10. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence and plaintiff's injuries, plaintiff _____ [*specify any medical treatment received, e.g.,* was hospitalized for a period of _____ (*number*) _____ (days *or* weeks *or* months) (, and continues to be hospitalized,) and was (and continues to be) required to employ physicians and surgeons to treat the injuries, as a result of which plaintiff has incurred (and is incurring) hospital, doctor, and related medical expenses, and will be compelled to incur further hospital, doctor, and medical expenses for the continued treatment of the injuries], all to plaintiff's special damage.

11. At the time of the accident, plaintiff was _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a well and able-bodied person]. As a proximate result of the injuries herein described, plaintiff _____ [was unable to work for a period of _____ (*number*) _____ (days *or* weeks *or* months) *or* has been unable to work since the date of the accident] and has lost wages as a result thereof[; plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff has sustained a permanent loss of earning capacity], all to plaintiff's further damage.

SECOND COUNT
(Violation of Safety Statute)

12. Plaintiff repeats and realleges Paragraphs 1 through 6 and Paragraph 11 of his/her First Count.

13. At all times herein mentioned there was in full force and effect _____ [*specify statute breached, e.g.,* the statute commonly known as United States Code Service, Title 49, Section 20302, which provides as follows:

(A) railroad carrier may use or allow to be used on any of its railroad lines ... a vehicle only if it is equipped with ... couplers coupling automatically by impact, and capable of being uncoupled, without the necessity of [workers] going between the ends of the vehicles].

14. At the time and place mentioned in Paragraph 6, the _____ [railroad cars involved in the switching operation were not equipped with couplers coupling automatically on impact and did not couple on impact].

15. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of _____ [*specify statute breached, e.g.,* United States Code Service, Title 49, Section 20302] _____ [the locomotive and cars struck the cut of cars on which plaintiff was working without coupling, causing plaintiff to be, and plaintiff was, thrown to the ground], suffering the injuries hereinafter alleged.

16. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of _____ [*specify statute breached, e.g.,* United States Code Service, Title 49, Section 20302] and of plaintiff's _____ [*e.g.,* being thrown to the ground], plaintiff sustained _____ [*describe injuries, e.g.,* severe physical injuries (hereinafter " 'the injuries' "), both internal and external, consisting in part of abrasions, contusions, lacerations, a dislocated shoulder, a fractured right arm and leg, a fractured pelvis, and internal hemorrhaging, and has endured severe pain and suffering], all to plaintiff's general damage.

17. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of _____ [*specify statute breached, e.g.,* United States Code Service, Title 49, Section 20302] and plaintiff's injuries, plaintiff _____ [*specify any medical treatment, e.g.,* was hospitalized for a period of _____ (*number*) _____ (days *or* weeks *or* months) (, and continues to be hospitalized,) and was (and continues to be) required to employ physicians and surgeons to treat the injuries, as a result of which plaintiff has incurred (and is incurring) hospital, doctor, and related medical expenses, and will be compelled to incur further hospital, doctor, and medical expenses for the continued treatment of the injuries], all to plaintiff's special damage.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant for:

1. General damages according to proof.

2. Special damages for hospital, physician and surgeon, and related medical expenses according to proof.

3. Loss of income and earnings and impairment of earning capacity according to proof.

4. Costs of suit herein incurred.

5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an injured employee of an interstate railroad to sue the railroad under the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) in a California state court for damages for injuries sustained in the course and scope of the employment as a result of the railroad's negligence. With appropriate modifications, this form may also be used when the action is brought by a deceased worker's personal representative [*see 45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 59*; *see also § 485.122*].

The jurisdiction of the federal district courts and the California state courts over FELA actions is concurrent [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*]. For a form of complaint for use in a federal district court, see *§ 485.120*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The jurisdiction of the court to entertain the federally created action (Paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 12) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 56*];

- Defendant's corporate capacity and principal place of business (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*];

- That the activity involved was interstate commerce (Paragraphs 3, 12) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*];

- Plaintiff's employment by defendant, thus giving rise to the employer's duty to provide plaintiff with a reasonably safe workplace and duty to comply with the federal safety acts (Paragraphs 5, 12, 13) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *Civ. Code § 3333*];

- The plaintiff's presence at the time of the accident at the work place to carry out his or her duties (Paragraphs 5, 6, 12);

- Defendant's breach of duty (Paragraphs 7, 14) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *Civ. Code § 3333*];

- The breach as the proximate cause of the accident (Paragraphs 8, 15) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*];

- The detriment, or harm, sustained by plaintiff (Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3282, 3333*]; and

- Plaintiff's damages (Paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3333*].

The complaint alleges the five essential elements of every cause of action for tort damages as identified in *Civ. Code § 3333*: (1) duty or obligation, (2) breach of duty, (3) proximate cause, (4) detriment (harm or injury), and (5) damages (money claimed) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281* (detriment), *3282* (money claimed)].

[4] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case or whether it is a limited civil case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq., and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 72055*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

The proper county for trial of an action for personal injuries or wrongful death is the county in which the injury or injury causing death occurred or the county in which the defendant's principal office or place of business is situated [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), (c), 395.2, 395.5*]. This complaint includes an allegation laying venue in the county of the defendant's principal place of business (Paragraph 2) if that county is other than the one in which the accident occurred (Paragraph 4) and counsel wishes to sue in the county of the defendant's principal office or place of business, rather than

in the county where the accident occurred.

[7] Inconvenient Forum

Although the form of complaint alleges that the accident giving rise to the cause of action occurred in California, a cause of action for damages for personal injuries is transitory and may be maintained in a California state court even though the accident happened elsewhere. However, a complaint based on an out-of-state accident may be subject to dismissal on the ground of inconvenient forum [*see § 485.40*].

[8] Alternative Theories of Recovery

The complaint sets forth two counts--that is, two separate theories of liability. The first theory of liability is based on the employer's negligent failure to provide the employee with a reasonably safe place to work [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]. The second theory of recovery is absolute liability imposed on a railroad if the injury is caused by the employer's failure to comply with a federal safety statute [*see, e.g., 49 U.S.C.S. § 20302*], or to comply with a rule or regulation adoptedpursuant to that statute. If recovery is obtained on the first theory (negligence),then the damages are diminished by the jury in proportion to the amount of negligence attributable to the employee [*45 U.S.C.S. § 53*]. If recovery is obtained on the second theory (violation of a safety statute or rule), neither the employer's negligence nor the employee's contributory negligence is an issue, the employer's liability is absolute, and there is thus no setoff because of any contributory negligence on the part of the employee [*see § 485.45[4]*]. Although the statute alleged to have been violated is in the Safety Appliance Act and not in the Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA), the Safety Appliance Act provides the basis of the claim, but the FELA provides the remedy [*Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 187* ; *Beissel v. Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 143, 145]* .

[9] Compared With Federal Complaint

The rules of pleading in federal court are generally different from the rules of pleading in California state courts, because the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (see *Fed. R. Civ. P. Rules 8-11*) recognize a form of "notice pleading," usually designed simply to put a defendant on notice of the nature of the claim, whereas California requires the pleading of facts pursuant to its system of "code pleading" [*Bach v. County of Butte (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 554, 561, 195 Cal. Rptr. 268* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(a)*].

The general assumption is that California pleading law is applied to test the adequacy of a complaint brought under the FELA in a California state court. However, this assumption may not be entirely correct [*Bach v. County of Butte (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 554, 561, 195 Cal. Rptr. 268]* . For example, a state court may not, under its own rules of practice and procedure, properly dismiss a complaint under the FELA on the ground that it fails to state a cause of action under state law when the same complaint would be held sufficient under the federal rules of pleading were it filed in a federal court [*see Brown v. Western Ry. of Ala. (1949) 338 U.S. 294, 295-297, 70 S. Ct. 105, 94 L. Ed. 100]* .

[10] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.120*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages generally, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to removal of an action from state to federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and alternative forms of complaints for damages for negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

[11] Federal Statutes

Federal Employers' Liability Act. *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*

Safety Appliance Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*

Boiler Inspection Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*

[12] Decisions

Violation of Safety Appliance Act (*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*) or Boiler Inspection Act (*49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.*) as imposing absolute liability on railroads for injury or death of employee caused by railroad's failure to comply with act. *Carter v. Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Ry. Co. (1949) 338 U.S. 430, 433-434, 70 S. Ct. 226, 94 L. Ed. 236 (Safety Appliance Act)* ; *Lilly v. Grand Trunk W. R.R. Co. (1943) 317 U.S. 481, 485, 63 S. Ct. 347, 87 L. Ed. 411* (Boiler Inspection Act)

Jury instructions on Boiler Inspection Act (BIA) were reversible error because they allowed jury to find violation merely because engineer's seat was not in proper condition, rather than requiring showing that seat defect created safety hazard; evidence of failure to furnish proper and safe seat and evidence of injury due to attempt to replace seat was sufficient evidence of causation on BIA claim for denial of motion for directed verdict; refusal to instruct jury that BIA violation was proximate or direct cause of injury was not prejudicial error. *Oglesby v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 603, 606-610*

Liability as imposed against railroad when violation was of rule adopted by Secretary of Transportation pursuant to statute. *Urie v. Thompson (1949) 337 U.S. 163, 191, 69 S. Ct. 1018, 93 L. Ed. 1282* (rule adopted under *Boiler Inspection Act); Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Scarlett (1937) 300 U.S. 471, 474, 57 S. Ct. 541, 81 L. Ed. 748* (rule adopted under *Safety Appliance Act); Eckert v. Aliquippa & S. R.R. Co. (3d Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 183, 186-187* (rule regulating switch positions adopted under *45 U.S.C.S. § 431*)

Liability as imposed whether or not injury involved was of type particular act orstatute was designed to prevent. *Davis v. Wolfe (1923) 263 U.S. 239, 243, 44 S. Ct. 64, 68 L. Ed. 284* (violation of Safety Appliance Act); *see also Kernan v. American Dredging Co. (1958) 355 U.S. 426, 432-433, 438, 78 S. Ct. 394, 2 L. Ed. 2d 382* (action on behalf of dependents of deceased seaman under Jones Act, which incorporates FELA)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.122

§ 485.122 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Wrongful Death Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Death Caused by Exacerbation of Existing Illness or Condition

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Complaint Filed in California State Court [45 U.S.C.S. § 56]--For Damages for Wrongful Death Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Death Caused by Exacerbation of Existing Illness or Condition

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
as _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,*	)	NO. _____
Administrator of the Estate] of	)	COMPLAINT FOR WRONGFUL DEATH
_____ [*name*],	)	(Federal Employers' Liability
Deceased, Plaintiff,	)	Act [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*])
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. This action arises, and is brought, under and pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Employers' Liability Act, *United States Code, Title 45, Sections 51*-60.

2. Plaintiff is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.*, administrator of the estate of] _____ [*name*], deceased, who died on _____ [*date*] as the result of the injuries sustained as herein alleged.

[3. *Defendant's capacity and principal place of business in California. See § 485.121, Paragraph 2.*]

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was the owner and operator of certain railroad lines on and over which it owned, operated, and maintained railroad beds, ties, rails, switches, locomotives, cars, and trains in transporting passengers, freight, and mail through the State of California and other states in the United States of America as a common carrier by railroad engaged in interstate commerce.

5. At the time of his/her injuries and death, decedent was in the defendant's employ as _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a switchman] _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* in its railroad yards] at _____, California, engaged in his/her duties as such, and aiding and assisting the defendant in carrying on its business of interstate commerce by railroad. [The switch engine, cars, tracks, railroad yards, and switches with which decedent was working in performinghis/her duties as a switchman in the course of his/her employment at the time of his/her injuries and death, as hereinafter alleged, were then being, had been, and were to be used by the defendant in carrying on its business of interstate commerce by railroad.]

6. On _____ [*date*], and prior thereto, decedent was suffering from _____ [*specify illness or condition, e.g.,* a cardiovascular disease], which fact defendant, its officers, agents, employees, and physicians well knew, or were duty bound to know, in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* from on or about _____ (*date*), decedent, with defendant's knowledge, had been and was being treated for the _____ (*e.g.,* illness) by defendant's physicians at defendant's hospital department in _____, California, as both an in and an outpatient, and, further, that decedent, with defendant's knowledge and consent, was then and thereafter on sick leave from his/her employment from _____ (*date*) to _____ (*date*). The decedent was at no time made aware of the seriousness and extent of his/her condition, and the defendant, its agents, officers, employees, and physicians knew of decedent's ignorance in that regard and carelessly and negligently failed to warn him/her of the seriousness and extent of his/her condition or of any limitations he/she should put on his/her physical activities because of it.]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, its officers, agents, servants, employees, and physicians carelessly and negligently advised, encouraged, induced, and permitted decedent to accept employment as _____ [*e.g.,* a switchman] _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* in its railroad yards at _____, California], then and there knowing and being bound to know that decedent, because of his/her _____ [*e.g.,* damaged heart], was not in physical condition to engage in that employment and for him/her to do so would be to place decedent in a very dangerous, hazardous, and unsafe situation for which he/she was physically unsuited and incapable, in that the activities required of a _____ [*e.g.,* switchman] _____ [*e.g.,* including the uncovering and throwing of "cellar type" switches and riding on, climbing on, and jumping off moving equipment] would greatly endanger his/her life and impair his/her physical health.

8. Pursuant to the instructions of the defendant, its agents, and employees, decedent, on _____ [*date of death*], _____ [*specify activities, e.g.,* engaged in switching activities in defendant's yards at _____, California, including uncoupling a locomotive from cars, opening the cover of, and throwing, a "celler type" switch, and climbing on, riding, and jumping off moving equipment].

9. As a proximate result of the negligence of the defendant and its agents, employees, and physicians in failing to warn decedent of the seriousness of his/her condition, and in advising, encouraging, inducing, and permitting him/her to undertake the duties as _____ [*e.g.,* a switchman], as herein alleged, decedent at that time and place suffered _____ [*e.g.,* an acute coronary thrombosis] and died.

10. At the time of his/her death, the decedent was _____ years of age and left surviving him/her at the time of death _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a _____ (wife *or* husband) *and/or* _____

child(ren) of the age of _____ (and _____, respectively)][, who _____ (were *or* was) dependent on the deceased and his/her earnings for support].

11. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, and the decedent's death, _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the _____ (husband *or* wife) and child(ren)] have suffered and sustained pecuniary loss, all to their damage.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For general damages.

2. For costs of suit herein incurred.

3. For such other and further relief as the Court may seem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 485.121.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the personal representative of a deceased worker, on behalf of the worker's surviving spouse and children [*see § 485.122[3]*], to sue the worker's interstate railroad employer for having negligently caused the decedent's death by exacerbating an existing illness or condition. For forms of complaint based on negligently caused accidental injury, which may be modified to state a cause of action for wrongful death, see *§§ 485.120, 485.121*.

[3] Liability of Railroad for Worker's Death

A common carrier by railroad engaged in interstate or foreign commerce is, in the event of the worker's death, liable in damages to the deceased worker's personal representative for the benefit of the worker's surviving widow or husband and children, and, if none, the worker's parents, and, if none, the next of kin dependent on the employee, for death resulting in whole or in part from the negligence of the carrier's agents, officers, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, due to its negligence, in its cars, engines, appliances, and similar items [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *see also 45 U.S.C.S. § 59*].

[4] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following: (1) plaintiff's capacity to maintain theaction as the deceased worker's personal representative (Paragraph 2) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]; (2) defendant's capacity as a carrier by railroad engaged in interstate commerce (Paragraph 4) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]; (3) the decedent's employment by defendant (Paragraph 5) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]; (4) the condition that rendered the decedent unsuited to arduous work and defendant's knowledge of that condition (Paragraph 6); (5) defendant's assigning the deceased to a job requiring extreme physical exertion (Paragraph 7); (6) the decedent's performance of the work (Paragraph 8); (7) the decedent's death as a result of the work (Paragraph 9); (8) the identity of the worker's surviving spouse and children (or other dependents) (Paragraph 10); and (9) the damages sustained by them as a result of the worker's death (Paragraph 11).

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*.

For alternative paragraphs for death actions brought in California state courts, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

[6] Decisions

Liability of railroad for death of worker assigned duties too strenuous for his heart. *McGuigan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 704, 716-717, 247 P.2d 415*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.123

§ 485.123 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Train Dispatcher Suffered Nervous Breakdown Caused by Unusually Stressful Working Conditions

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Train Dispatcher Suffered Nervous Breakdown Caused by Unusually Stressful Working Conditions

1. From on or about _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], plaintiff was employed by defendant as a train dispatcher at its _____ [*e.g.*, switchyard].

2. During all of this time, defendant negligently and carelessly required plaintiff to be subjected, as train dispatcher, to working conditions of unusual responsibility, stress, and tension in order for plaintiff to perform his/her duties as a train dispatcher, in that plaintiff was required to operate a system of central traffic control of defendant's railroad, which system involved multitudinous and complex mechanical factors and mental decisions, extreme responsibility, constant but shifting attention, and numerous clerical functions which altogether, under the circumstances, imposed an unusual stress and burden on plaintiff's physical and nervous systems.

3. As a proximate result of that negligence and carelessness, plaintiff was caused to, and did, suffer a severe nervous collapse and the injuries hereinafter described.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use for insertion in a complaint by an injured employee against an interstate railroad employer under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) for damages for personal injuries when the basis of the claim is a nervous breakdown caused by severe job stress as a result of the employer's negligence. The allegations may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 5-9 of that form. If so used, the second count of that form should be deleted. For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*.

[3] Decisions

Effect of working conditions that subject employee to unusual stress and tension as stating cause of action under FELA [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*]. *McMillan v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 841, 843, 9 Cal. Rptr. 361, 357 P.2d 449*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.124

§ 485.124 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Plater Contracted Skin Infection From Plating Solution

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Plater Contracted Skin Infection From Plating Solution

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant owned and operated a plating department in [conjunction with its _____ (*e.g.*, switchyard) in] _____, California where metal parts used on its locomotives and cars in interstate commerce were replated.

2. From _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], plaintiff was employed as a plater by defendant in its plating department. Plaintiff's duties required him/her to work with a solution of _____ [*specify*, *e.g.*, silver cyanide], a harmful solution that the defendant negligently provided without any precautionary measures to protect plaintiff from its harm, and in the course of which use the solution would get on plaintiff's hands.

3. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence in assigning plaintiff to work in this solution, plaintiff was caused to sustain a skin infection on his/her hands, which condition on or about _____ [*date*], was diagnosed at defendant's hospital as dermatitis, attributed to _____ [*e.g.*, filtering a cyanide solution that gets on hands] and treated with a lotion. A copy of the hospital's report was furnished to the defendant. At no time prior to the date ofplaintiff's total disability was plaintiff advised that he/she should not work with the plating solution or that it would produce any serious or lasting results. The affliction nevertheless continued to worsen, got really bad on or about _____ [*date*], spread to other parts of plaintiff's body, and on or about _____ [*date*], resulted in plaintiff's total inability to work.

[*ADD, if first treatment referred to above was more than three years before action was filed*]

4. Although plaintiff first became aware of the cause of the skin condition on _____ [*date beyond*

three-year period] when it was first diagnosed and treated at defendant employer's hospital, it was not until _____ [*date within three-year period*] that the first manifestation of substantial harm to the plaintiff occurred when the affliction got really bad, began spreading to other parts of plaintiff's body, and subsequently resulted in plaintiff's total disability.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for insertion in a complaint by an injured employee against an interstate railroad employer under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) for damages for personal injury (a skin affliction) that was caused by a plating solution with which the plaintiff was required to work as a result of the railroad's breach of its duty to provide plaintiff with a reasonably safe place to work. The allegations may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 4-9 of that form. If so used, the second count of that form should be deleted. For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*. For discussion relating to when an action based on occupational disease accrues for purposes of triggering the statutory limitations period, see *§ 485.41*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.125

§ 485.125 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Oiler Injured by Strain of Lifting Barrels Because of Defendant's Failure to Provide Sufficient Equipment and Assistance

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Oiler Injured by Strain of Lifting Barrels Because of Defendant's Failure to Provide Sufficient Equipment and Assistance

1. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was employed by defendant as an oiler, and at the time of the accident hereinafter alleged was engaged in work that _____ [was in furtherance of *or* closely and substantially affected] interstate commerce.

2. On or about _____ [*date of accident*], plaintiff, acting in the regular course and scope of his/her duties, was required to be and was engaged in moving barrels of oil from a flat car onto the oil dispensing rack in the railroad yards.

3. In breach of its duty to exercise ordinary care to provide plaintiff with reasonably safe equipment with which to work and a reasonably sufficient force of assistants to do the work, including _____ [*specify, e.g.,* skids or other mechanical devices to assist plaintiff, and at least two workers, in addition to plaintiff, to assist in lifting the barrels], defendant negligently failed to provide _____ [*specify, e.g.,* any skids or other mechanical devices and further required plaintiff to move the barrels with only one other employee].

4. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff [and his/her fellow worker] _____ [was *or* were] required to exert great and unusual force to move one of the barrels, as a proximate result of which plaintiff was caused to receive a severe strain to his/her body and to suffer the injuries hereinafter alleged.

5. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence and of the severe strain placed on plaintiff's body, plaintiff sustained _____ [*specify injuries, e.g.,* severe strain and injury to the muscles, tissues, nerves, and ligaments of his/her back, spine, neck, and head; plaintiff's back, spine, neck, and head movement have been seriously impaired and

injured and his/her muscles, nerves, and ligaments seriously scarred; plaintiff suffers headaches, dizzy spells, sleeplessness, extreme nervousness and irritability, and traumatic neuritis].

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use for insertion in a complaint by an injured employee against an interstate railroad employer under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) for damages for personal injuries caused by the railroad's failure to provide plaintiff with reasonably safe equipment with which to work and a reasonably sufficient force of assistants to do the work. The allegations may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 5-9 of that form. If so used, the second count of that form should be deleted. For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*.

[3] Decisions

Liability of railroad for failure to furnish adequate number of helpers to do heavy work. *Masiglowa v. New York, Chicago & St. Louis R.R. Co. (N.D. Ohio 1955) 135 F. Supp. 816, 816-817 , aff'd, 237 F.2d 917 (6th Cir. 1956)*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.126

§ 485.126 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Conductor Injured on Sudden Release of Brake [49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(B)]

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Conductor Injured on Sudden Release of Brake [49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(B)]

1. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was employed by defendant as a conductor and was engaged in work that was in furtherance of interstate commerce.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], at about _____ [*time*], defendant was working as a conductor on one of defendant's _____ [*e.g.,* freight] trains traveling from _____ [*point of origin*] to _____ [*point of destination*] and was _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* passing through defendant's freight yards located at _____, California].

3. At that time and place, plaintiff, in the course of his/her employment, was applying a hand brake on a _____ [*e.g.,* flat] car, which brake had been so negligently inspected, maintained, and repaired by the defendant and its employees other than plaintiff that it became stuck or caught. While plaintiff was using extra force to move the brake, the brake suddenly released.

4. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence as herein alleged, the sticking or catching of the brake, and its sudden release, plaintiff was thrown to the ground, thereby receiving the injuries hereinafter described.

5. At all times herein mentioned there was in full force and effect certain federal statutes commonly known as the Safety Appliance Act and, particularly, there was in full force and effect the safety provision set forth in formerUnited States Code, Title 49, Section 20302, which provides in part as follows:

[A] railroad carrier may use or allow to be used on any of its railroad lines ... a vehicle only if it is equipped with ...

efficient hand brakes.

6. At the time and place mentioned in Paragraph 2, the _____ [*e.g.*, flat] car was not equipped with an efficient hand brake.

7. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of the Safety Appliance Act in failing to have the _____ [*e.g.*, flat] car equipped with efficient hand brakes, the hand brake became stuck or caught while plaintiff was applying it and, while plaintiff was using extra force to move the brake, it suddenly released.

8. As a proximate result of the defective brake and its sudden release, plaintiff was thrown to the ground, thereby receiving the injuries hereinafter described.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use for insertion in a complaint by an injured employee against an interstate railroad employer under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) for damages for personal injuries resulting from a fall from a train caused by the railroad's failure to have the car on which plaintiff was working equipped with an efficient hand brake.

The allegations of Paragraphs 1-4 may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 4-9 of the first count of that form, and the allegations of Paragraphs 5-8 may be inserted in lieu of Paragraphs 13-15 of the second count of that form. For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*. A violation of the Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] results in the railroad's absolute liability, and neither the negligence of the railroad nor the contributory negligence of the employee is an issue in the case [*see § 485.45[4]*].

[3] Federal Statutes

Requirement that railroad equip its cars with efficient hand brakes. Former *49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(1)(B)*

[4] Decisions

Duty owed to employee by railroad engaged in interstate commerce to maintain cars with efficient hand brakes. *Hosman v. Southern Pac. Co. (1938) 28 Cal. App. 2d 621, 626-629, 83 P.2d 88*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.127

§ 485.127 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Switchman Injured in Fall From Car Caused by Car's Being Negligently Jerked With Unusual Force and by Loose Grab Iron [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(2)]

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Safety Appliance Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Switchman Injured in Fall From Car Caused by Car's Being Negligently Jerked With Unusual Force and by Loose Grab Iron [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(2)]

1. At that time and place, plaintiff, in the regular course and scope of his/her employment by defendant as a switchman, was required to, and did, climb _____ [*e.g.*, to the top] of a certain _____ [*specify type, e.g.*, box] car, and to hold on to a certain grab iron attached to it, for the purpose of putting himself/herself in position to give stop signals to the engineer of the switch engine.

2. At that time and place, defendant, acting by and through its agents, servants, and employees, other than plaintiff, so carelessly and negligently operated and controlled the switch engine as to cause the car on which plaintiff was working tobe suddenly, violently, and unusually jerked.

3. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence as herein alleged, plaintiff was caused to be, and was, thrown with such force and violence that the grab iron pl aintiff was holding came loose from the car, thereby causing plaintiff to be thrown to the ground and to sustain the injuries hereinafter described.

4. At all times herein mentioned there was in full force and effect certain federal statutes commonly known as the Safety Appliance Act and particularly there was in full force and effect the safety provision set forth in *United States Code, Title 49, Section 20302(a)(2)*, which provides as follows:

Except as otherwise ordered by the Secretary, a vehicle [may be used on railroad lines] only if it is equipped with secure grab irons or handholds on its ends and sides for greater security to individuals in coupling and uncoupling vehicles.

5. At the time and place mentioned in Paragraph 6, the _____ [*e.g.* box] car was not equipped with secure grabirons.

6. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of the Safety Appliance Act in failing to have the _____ [*e.g.,* box] car equipped with secure grabirons, the grabiron to which plaintiff was holding came loose with such suddenness when the switch engine was suddenly, violently, and unusually jerked that plaintiff was caused to be thrown to the ground and to sustain the injuries hereinafter described.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use for insertion in a complaint by an injured employee against an interstate railroad employer under the FELA [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] for damages for personal injuries resulting from a fall from a train caused by a combination of the employer's negligence in causing the car on which plaintiff was working to be jerked with unusual force and an insecure grab iron that came loose. Both theories of liability may be pleaded, but if they are they should be clearly distinguished [*see § 485.121*]. The allegations of Paragraphs 1-3 may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the first count of that form, and the allegations of Paragraphs 4-6 may be inserted in lieu of Paragraphs 13-15 of the second count of that form.

For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*. A violation of the Safety Appliance Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 20301 et seq.*] results in the railroad's absolute liability, and neither the negligence of the railroad nor the contributory negligence of the employee is an issue in the case [*see § 485.45[4]*].

[3] Federal Statutes

Requirements for safe grab irons and hand holds on railway cars. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20302(a)(2)*

[4] Decisions

Liability of railroad to employee injured in fall from freight car insufficiently equipped and shunted with unusual force. *Phillips v. Southern Pac. Co. (1936) 14 Cal. App. 2d 454, 455-456, 58 P.2d 688*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.128

§ 485.128 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Boiler Inspection Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Engineer Injured in Fall From Greasy Ladder on Side of Locomotive [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20701]

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Allegation in Complaint Based on Negligence and Violation of Boiler Inspection Act (49 U.S.C.S. § 20701 et seq.) [45 U.S.C.S. § 51]--Engineer Injured in Fall From Greasy Ladder on Side of Locomotive [45 U.S.C.S. § 51; 49 U.S.C.S. § 20701]

1. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was employed by defendant as a locomotive engineer and at the time of the accident hereinafter alleged was engaged in work that was in furtherance of interstate commerce.

2. On or about _____ [*date of accident*], plaintiff had reported to work in response to a call to duty to take a _____ [*e.g.*, freight] train from _____, California to _____ [*city and state*].

3. At that time and place, plaintiff, in the regular course and scope of his/her employment, was required, at night, to inspect the locomotive, which involved descending the tank ladder of the locomotive while it was on the turn-out track of the roundhouse.

4. The locomotive was not in proper condition or safe for operation in that defendant's roundhouse employees had negligently permitted large quantities of grease to remain on the steps and grab irons of the ladder where plaintiff was required to step in descending the ladder.

5. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence in permitting large quantities of grease to remain on the steps and grab irons of the ladder, plaintiff, in attempting to descend, was caused to, and did, slip on the grease and fall to the ground, and thereby received the personal injuries hereinafter alleged.

6. At all times herein mentioned there was in full force and effect certain statutes commonly known as the Boiler Inspection Act, and particularly there was in full force and effect the safety provision set forth in *United States Code,*

Title 49, Section 20701, which provides in relevant part as follows:

A railroad carrier may use or allow to be used a locomotive or tender on its railroad line only when the locomotive or tender and its parts and appurtenancesare in proper condition and safe to operate without unnecessary danger of personal injury ...

7. At the time and place mentioned in Paragraph 2, the locomotive was not in proper condition and safe to operate in the service to which it was put so as to be em ployed in active service without unnecessary peril to life or limb, in that defendant's roundhouse employees had permitted large quantities of grease to remain on the steps and grab irons of the tank ladder on the side of the locomotive where plaintiff was required to step in descending the ladder.

8. As a proximate result of defendant's permitting large quantities of grease to remain on the steps and grab irons of the ladder and the unsafe and defective condition of the ladder and grab irons, plaintiff, in attempting to descend, was caused to, and he/she did, slip on the grease and fall to the ground and thereby received the personal injuries hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use for insertion in a complaint by an injured railroad employee against his or her interstate railroad employer under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) for damages for personal injuries resulting from a fall from a locomotive ladder caused by an accumulation of grease on the steps of the ladder which the roundhouse employees had failed to remove before returning the locomotive to service.

The allegations of Paragraphs 1-5 may be inserted in the *form in § 485.121* in lieu of Paragraphs 5 and 8 of the first count of that form, and Paragraphs 6-8 may be inserted in lieu of Paragraphs 13-15 of the second count of that form.

For the kinds of injuries covered by FELA, see *§ 485.35[3]*.

If the locomotive was "in service" within the meaning of the Boiler Inspection Act [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 20701*], then the employer's liability would be absolute and negligence would not be in issue. If the locomotive was not in service, and hence not within the provisions of the Boiler Inspection Act, plaintiff's cause of action would be based on negligence and any contributory negligence of the engineer would be set off against the judgment [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 53*]. Both theories of liability may be pleaded, but if they are they should be clearly distinguished [*see § 485.121*].

[3] Federal Statutes

Requirement that locomotive or tender and its parts and appurtenances be in proper condition and safe to operate without unnecessary danger of personal injury. *49 U.S.C.S. § 20701*

[4] Decisions

Duty of carrier to not place in service locomotive in improper or unsafe condition. *Minehart v. Southern Pac. Co. (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 486, 488, 288 P.2d 999*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 485.121*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.129

§ 485.129 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defenses [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Accident Caused by Plaintiff's Sole Negligence, Plaintiff's Contributory Negligence, Sole Negligence of Third Person, or Combined Negligence of Plaintiff and Third Person [45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 53]

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defenses [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Accident Caused by Plaintiff's Sole Negligence, Plaintiff's Contributory Negligence, Sole Negligence of Third Person, or Combined Negligence of Plaintiff and Third Person [45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 53]

[*EITHER, if accident was caused by plaintiff's sole negligence*]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one count or cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* FIRST) _____ (COUNT *or* CAUSE OF ACTION)], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that if the plaintiff was injured in the manner set forth in the complaint, defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the injuries and damages were proximately caused by the sole negligence of the plaintiff.

[*AND/OR if plaintiff's negligence contributed to accident*]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* SECOND)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one count or cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* FIRST) _____ (COUNT *or* CAUSE OF ACTION)], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that if the plaintiff was injured in the manner set forth in the complaint, defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that plaintiff was himself/herself negligent with respect to the occurrence alleged in the complaint and that plaintiff's negligence proximately contributed to plaintiff's injuries and damages.

[*AND/OR if accident solely caused by negligence of third person or by combined negligence of third person and plaintiff*]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* THIRD)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one count or cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* FIRST) _____ (COUNT *or* CAUSE OF ACTION)], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that if the plaintiff was injured in the manner set forth in the complaint, defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the plaintiff's injuries and damages were caused by the sole negligence of _____ [*name of third party*] [and by the negligence of the plaintiff] in that _____ [*specify actscausing plaintiff's injury and that they were negligently done*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by an interstate railroad employer, sued under the FELA (*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*) by an employee for damages for personal injuries sustained as a result of the employer's alleged negligence, to plead the negligence of the employee and/or third person and the employee's contributory negligence as the cause of the accident [*see 45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51, 53*]. The defenses are for inclusion in the railroad's answer to the employee's complaint.

For a discussion of answers generally, including general forms into which these affirmative defenses may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

Each of the affirmative defenses set forth in the form may be used separately or in any combination with the others, inasmuch as pleading inconsistent defenses is allowed under both federal and state law [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(e)(2)* (federal action); *Oppenheimer v. Deutchman (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 450, 453, 259 P.2d 457 (California action)]* .

The defenses based on negligence would not, however, be used in an answer to a complaint, count, or cause of action in which liability is predicated on the employer's alleged violation of a safety provision [*see* 42 U.S.C.S. §§ 53, 54a; *see also § 485.129[3]*]. In such a case, the employer's liability is absolute and negligence is not in issue [*see § 485.45[4]*].

[3] Negligence and Contributory Negligence

The employer's liability under the FELA [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] is predicated on the employer's negligence [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51*; *see also § 485.35[2]*].

The contributory negligence of the employee in an action under the FELA does not bar recovery, but the damages are diminished by the jury in proportion to the amount of negligence attributable to the employee. However, no employee can be found guilty of contributory negligence in any case in which the employee's injury or death was contributed to in any part by the railroad's violation of a statute enacted or regulation or rule adopted for the safety of employees [*49 U.S.C.S. §§ 53,* 54a; *see § 485.45[4]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.130

§ 485.130 Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Preemption by Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.)

[1] FORM Action Under Federal Employers' Liability Act (45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60)--Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Preemption by Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.)

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one count or cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* FIRST) _____ (COUNT *or* CAUSE OF ACTION)], defendant alleges that the action is governed by the exclusive remedies provided under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, pursuant to Title *33 of the United States Code, sections 901*-950, because plaintiff was engaged in maritime employment within the meaning of those statutes at the time that the alleged incident occurred, in that plaintiff _____ [*specify, e.g.,* was operating a conveyor belt used in the loading of coal onto a ship].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a railroad employer sued under the FELA [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51-60*] by an employee for damages for personal injuries sustained as a result of the employer's negligence, to plead application of the exclusive remedies under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) [*33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*], on the ground that, at the time the alleged incident occurred, the employee was engaged in "maritime employment" within the meaning of LHWCA [*see Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 286-288]* .

[3] "Maritime Employment"

The United States Supreme Court has defined "maritime employment" as used in the LHWCA to encompass certain railroad workers engaged in maritime-related activities, such as the loading and unloading of cargo between a ship and railroad car, regardless whether the railroad employee's job also includes nonmaritime-related activities [*see*

Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co. v. Schwalb (1989) 493 U.S. 40, 110 S. Ct. 381, 107 L. Ed. 2d 278, 286-288] . For discussion of the LHWCA generally, see *Ch. 522, Ships and Shipping, § 522.30* et seq.

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.129*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Injuries To Employees

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 485.131-485.149

[Reserved]

§§ 485.131[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.150

§ 485.150 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Passenger for Personal Injury [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Passenger for Personal Injury [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Negligence of Carrier)
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [*Allege identity and capacity of defendant railroad company, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name of railroad*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly incorporated and existing under the laws of the state of California, with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), _____County, California].

[2. _____ [*Allege identity, capacity, and/or residence of defendant railroad employees, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ (*city*), _____ County, California.]

[3. Defendants DOES 1 through _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by such defendants].

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendants _____ [*names of railroad employees*] were the agents and employees of defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] and, and in doing the things herein alleged, were acting within the scope of their authority as agents and employees, and with the consent and permission of _____ [*name of railroad*].

5. Defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a common carrier of passengers for reward, and as such offered the use of railroad cars owned by defendant, with operators employed by defendant, to the public for hire in and between various points in _____ County and _____ County, California. Defendant owned, operated, and maintained a depot or station in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, for the use of its passengers in boarding or alighting from trains operated by defendant.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants received plaintiff as a fare-paying passenger on a certain train known as _____ [*specify*] for the purpose of transporting plaintiff from _____ [*city*], California to _____ [*city*], California.

7. _____ [*Allege negligent act of defendant(s) proximately causing plaintiff's injury, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), at or about _____ (*time*), the train on which plaintiff was a passenger arrived at the station maintained by defendant _____ (*name of railroad*), at _____ (*city*), California. At that time and place, plaintiff proceeded to the platform of the passenger car on which he/she had been riding and prepared to alight. Defendants negligently and carelessly operated, repaired, maintained, and controlled the train so as to cause it to violently jerk and move forward as plaintiff was descending the steps of the car, thereby precipitating plaintiff off the passenger car and injuring plaintiff as hereinafter alleged].

8. As a proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendant[(s), and each of them], plaintiff was injured as follows: _____ [*specify injuries incurred by plaintiff*]. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of these injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

9. As a further proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendant[(s), and each of them], plaintiff has sustained [and will continue to sustain] special damages, consisting of reasonable hospital and medical and related expenses.

10. As a further proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendant[(s), and each of them], plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and in the present.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. For damages for loss of income and earnings and impairment of earning ability according to proof;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 485.121.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a passenger against a railroad company and its employees for injuries caused by the operators' negligence while the passenger was boarding, riding, or alighting from a train [*see Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100*].

For general forms of complaint for use by a passenger for wrongful ejection by a common carrier, and for assault and battery by a carrier's agent, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* . For general forms of complaint for use by persons injured by dangerous conditions on property, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint first alleges the corporate capacity of the defendant railroad (Paragraph 1) and includes initial, optional paragraphs that state the identity and residence of any defendant railroad employees (Paragraph 2), and that add fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 3). It then alleges (1) that the employee operators of the train named as defendants were agents of the railroad company, acting within the course of their employment, for purposes of applying vicarious liability to the railroad company (Paragraph 4) [*see* Ch. 380, *Negligence*]; (2) the status of defendant railroad as common carrier in order to establish the highest duty of care (Paragraph 5) [*Civ. Code §§ 2100, 2168*; (3) the status of plaintiff as a person carried for reward (paying passenger) at the time of injury (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2100*; *Lagomarsino v. Market St. Ry. Co. (1945) 69 Cal. App. 2d 388, 395-396, 158 P.2d 982]* ; (4) that defendant railroad and its employees breached their duty to plaintiff by negligently operating or maintaining the train, proximately causing injury to plaintiff (Paragraph 7) [*see McNulty v. Southern Pac. Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 841, 855-856, 216 P.2d 534]* ; and (5) that defendant's negligence was the proximate cause of injuries suffered by plaintiff (Paragraphs 8-10) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 3333*].

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

In an action for injury to person or personal property, either the county in which the injury occurs or the county in

which the defendants, or some of them, reside at the commencement of the action is a proper county for the trial of the action (see Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[5] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.121*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For a form of complaint to bring an action by a passenger for assault and battery against a carrier of persons for reward, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For a form of complaint to bring an action by a passenger for assault and battery against an agent of a common carrier, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For discussion of common carriers generally, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to the capacity of foreign corporations to be sued, see Ch. 160, *Corporations: Capacity*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to federal diversity jurisdiction and removal of state actions to federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For discussion and forms relating to state court jurisdiction over foreign corporations, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and forms relating to negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

[7] State Statutes

Persons as liable for negligent injury to another except so far as injured party brings injury on himself or herself. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Carriers of passengers for reward as owing highest degree of care to passengers. *Civ. Code § 2100*

Everyone who offers to public to carry persons, property, or messages except for telegraphic messages as common carrier. *Civ. Code § 2168*

Principal as responsible for agent's negligence. *Civ. Code § 2338*

Agent as personally liable for own wrongful acts. *Civ. Code § 2343*

Measure of damages for tort. *Civ. Code § 3333*

Two-year statute of limitations for action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death. *Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* (one-year period prior to 2003)

[8] Decisions

When complaint alleges breach of carrier's duty to safely carry passenger and consequent injury as gravamen of action, action arises out of tort and not contract and is subject to one-year statute of limitations. *Basler v. Sacramento Elec., Gas & Ry. Co. (1913) 166 Cal. 33, 36, 134 P. 993*

[9] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, (9th ed. 1988), Vol. 6, *Torts*, §§ 922-929

53 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Railroads*, § 106

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.151

§ 485.151 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Automobile Driver for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint by Automobile Driver for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Negligence)
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 3333*; *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Negligence)

[1. *Identity and capacity of defendant railroad company. See § 485.150, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Identity, capacity, and/or residence of defendant railroad employees. See § 485.150, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 485.150, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation. See § 485.150, Paragraph 4* .]

5. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of railroad company*] owned, managed, operated, and controlled a railroad, and a portion of the tracks and right-of-way of the railroad extended in a general _____ [*specify, e.g.,* north-south] direction over, on, and across _____ [*street*], which is a duly dedicated street and public highway extending in a general _____ [*specify, e.g.,* east-west] direction in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at approximately _____ [*time*], plaintiff was driving a _____ [*describe vehicle, e.g.,* 1988 Dodge pick-up truck] _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* westbound] on _____ [*street*]. At that same time, defendants were operating a _____ [*specify, e.g.,* train consisting of one locomotive, five flatcars, and a caboose] _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* northbound] along the railroad track described above. On or about the time alleged above, at the grade crossing described above, defendants negligently and carelessly operated, repaired, maintained, and controlled the train, so that it ran into and against plaintiff's vehicle, inflicting personal injury [and property damage] as hereinafter alleged.

7. At the time and place referred to herein, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] negligently and carelessly failed to maintain a person with a flag or lantern, to furnish an automatic signaling device, or to require its employees to sound a horn or other device at or near the crossing, to warn motorists of the approach of the train to the crossing. Defendant _____ [*name of railroad*], through its agents and employees acting in the discharge of their duties and within the scope of their authority, did not furnish and maintain these and, as a result, plaintiff was injured.

8. At the time and place referred to herein, defendant(s) _____ [*name of railroad employee(s*)], negligently and careless operated the _____ [locomotive *or* railroad car] in that he/she/they failed to sound a horn or other device at or near the crossing, to warn motorists of the approach of the train to the crossing and, as a result, plaintiff was injured.

[9. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ (*name of railroad*) knew of the existence of a highly dangerous condition in that _____ (*allege knowledge by defendant of danger to plaintiff, e.g.,* at the crossing described herein traffic was normally heavy, no visual warning of oncoming trains was provided, vision was obstructed in two directions by buildings, and the angle of the train's approach to the intersection made it difficult to assess the speed of an oncoming train). Notwithstanding this knowledge, defendant _____ (*specify action or omission, e.g.,* failed to install crossing gates, flashing lights, or any other effective warning signal). (Defendant's failure to take corrective action displayed a conscious and callous indifference to, or disregard of, probable harm to _____ (*describe persons in plaintiff's position, e.g.,* motorists using the crossing described herein], including plaintiff.)]

[10. At all times herein mentioned, defendant(s) _____ (*railroad employee(s*)) knew of the existence of a highly dangerous condition in that _____ (*specify*). Notwithstanding this knowledge, defendant(s) _____ (*specify action or omission, e.g.,* failed to sound a horn or other device at or near the crossing, to warn plaintiff of the approach of the train). (Defendants' failure to warn plaintiff displayed a conscious and callous indifference to, or disregard of, probable harm to plaintiff.)]

[11. *Allegation of personal injuries. See § 485.150, Paragraphs 8- 10* .]

[12. As a further proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendant[(s), and each of them], plaintiff's _____ (*describe personal property, e.g.,* 1988 Dodge pick-up truck) was _____ (damaged *or* destroyed), all to plaintiff's damages in the sum of $ _____.]

SECOND COUNT
(Liability under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*)

13. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-12, inclusive, of the First Count.

14. At the times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] was a public utility owning, operating, controlling, or managing a railroad line and system for the transportation of people or property, directly or indirectly to or for the public.

15. At the times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] _____ [did, caused to be done, or permitted an act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared unlawful *or* omitted to do an act, matter, or thing required to be done] by the Constitution, a state law, or an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission, in that: _____ [*specify acts or omissions in violation of Constitution, state statute, or order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission, e.g.,* defendant failed to locate its crossing signals in a conspicuous position at both corners of the crossing intersection on the right-hand side of highway traffic flow and in advance of the railroad track and arranged to face the highway travel].

16. The foregoing _____ [act(s) *or* omission(s)] committed by defendant constituted a violation of _____ [*specify constitutional provision, statute, or Public Utilities Commission order or decision*]. [This Public Utilities Commission _____ (order *or* decision), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and is incorporated herein, was at all times herein in full force and effect.]

[17. Plaintiff requests that judicial notice be taken of the _____ (order *or* decision) of the California Public Utilities Commission herein described and incorporated.]

18. As a proximate result of the foregoing _____ [act(s) *or* omission(s)] committed by defendant, plaintiff suffered the injury described above.

[19. Defendant's _____ (act *or* omission) was wilful and resulted in the loss, damages, and injury to plaintiff described above.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. For damages for loss of income and earnings and impairment of earning ability according to proof;

[4. For damage to personal property (according to proof *or* in the sum of $ _____),]

[5. For punitive damages,]

6. For costs of suit herein incurred, and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 485.121.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an automobile driver to bring an action for personal injuries and, if appropriate, property damage against a railroad company and its train operators for injuries sustained in a collision between the automobile and a train. The complaint includes two counts: the first count is for general use when recovery is based on negligence [*see Civ. Code § 1714(a)*; *see also § 485.61*]; the second count should be used only when recovery may also be based on liability under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, which provides that a public utility is liable for all loss, damage, or injury caused by its violation of a Constitutional provision, a statute, or an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission [*see § 485.68*].

The form may be modified for use by an motor vehicle passenger injured in a crossing collision to allege a cause of action against the railroad and its employees. A passenger may also have separate causes of action against the driver and owner of the vehicle [*see Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 226, 231, 300 P.2d 910]* . For further discussion and forms relating to an action by an motor vehicle passenger against the driver or owner generally, see Ch. 83, *Automobiles: Bringing the Action* .

[3] Allegations

The first count of the form alleges the corporate capacity of the defendant railroad (Paragraph 1) and includes initial, optional paragraphs that state the identity and residence of any defendant railroad employees (Paragraph 2), and that add fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 3). It then alleges that (1) the train involved was in the possession of defendant railroad and operated by it at time ofaccident (Paragraph 5) [*see Johnson v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1908) 154 Cal. 285, 288-289, 97 P. 520]* ; (2) defendant railroad company had a duty to maintain signals or warnings at the crossing under the circumstances (Paragraph 7) [*see Downey v. Santa Fe Transp. Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 720, 726-727, 286 P.2d 40]* ; (3) defendant operators had a duty to sound a warning at the crossing under the circumstances (Paragraph 8) [*see Downey v. Santa Fe Transp. Co. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 720, 727, 286 P.2d 40]* ; (4) defendants breached their duty to plaintiff by failing to maintain signals or sound warnings and, as a result, defendants' train collided with plaintiff's automobile (Paragraphs 6-8); and (5) defendant's negligence was the proximate cause of personal injuries suffered by plaintiff (Paragraph 11) [*Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 3333*]. The first count also includes optional paragraphs alleging that defendant's negligence was the proximate cause of property damage incurred by plaintiff (Paragraph 12) [*Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 3333*], and that defendants' conduct constitutes a willful and conscious disregard of probable harm to plaintiff sufficient to support an award of punitive damages (Paragraphs 9, 10) [*Civ. Code § 3294*; *see Seimon v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 600, 608-609, 136 Cal. Rptr. 787]* .

The second count of this form, based on liability under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, alleges that (1) defendant railroad company was a public utility (Paragraph 14) [*see Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3*; *Pub. Util. Code § 216*; (2) defendant railroad

company violated a provision of the Constitution, a statute, or an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission (Paragraphs 15, 16) [*see Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]; and (3) defendant railroad's violation was a proximate cause of loss, damages, or injury to plaintiff (Paragraph 18) [*see Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]. The second count includes an optional paragraph alleging that defendant railroad's acts or omissions were wilful and thus are sufficient to support an award of exemplary damages (Paragraph 19) [*see Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]. It also includes an optional paragraph requesting that judicial notice be taken of an order or decision of the Public Utilities Commission order or decision, for use when a violation of that order or decision is the basis for liability (Paragraph 17) [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*; *see Evid. Code § 453* (court shall take judicial notice of matters subject to permissive judicial notice under *Evid. Code § 452* if party so requests, gives adverse party sufficient notice of that request through pleadings or otherwise, and furnishes court with sufficient information to take judicial notice)].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 485.121, 485.150*

For discussion and forms relating to actions by automobile drivers and passengers generally, see Ch. 83, *Automobiles: Bringing the Action*

[5] State Statutes

Persons as liable for negligent injury to another except so far as injured party brings injury on himself or herself. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Principal as responsible for agent's negligence. *Civ. Code § 2338*

Agent as personally liable for own wrongful acts. *Civ. Code § 2343*

Measure of damages for tort. *Civ. Code § 3333*

Public utility as liable for violation of statute or PUC order; exemplary damages. *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*

Action to recover for damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* as permitted to be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any corporation or person. *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*

[6] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 2, *Insurance, §§ 113*, 242, 312, 314; , Vol. 6, *Torts*, §§ 831-870, 897-907, 910-929, 1545-1677 (10th ed. 2005)

37 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Railroads*, §§ 96-98, 113, 132-133

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.152

§ 485.152 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint for Wrongful Death of Automobile Driver by Entitled Person(s) [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Complaint for Wrongful Death of Automobile Driver by Entitled Person(s) [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure to Install Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	(Wrongful Death)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [Plaintiff(s) *or* The person(s) listed below] is/are entitled to bring an action for the wrongful death of _____ [*name of decedent*] (hereinafter "decedent") pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.60*, based on his/her/their relationship to decedent, as follows:

Name(s)	Relationship(s) to Decedent
_____	_____

_____
_____ _____
_____
_____ _____
_____

[_____ (*If one or more persons are required to establish additional facts, such as that there is no surviving spouse, domestic partner, child, or issue of deceased child, or that the person was dependent on decedent, in order to be entitled to bring a wrongful death action under Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60, specify facts that satisfy applicable requirement*).]

[*ADD, if decedent's personal representative is maintaining action on behalf of one or more entitled persons*]

Plaintiff _____ [*name*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting personal representative of the estate of decedent, and brings this action on behalf of _____ [all of the above-listed persons entitled to bring a cause of action for the wrongful death of decedent *or* the following person(s) entitled to bring an action for the wrongful death of decedent: _____ (*specify person(s) on whose behalf personal representative is maintaining action*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. *Identity and capacity of defendant railroad company. See § 485.150, Paragraph 1.*]

[3. *Identity, capacity, and/or residence of defendant railroad employees. See § 485.150, Paragraph 2.*]

[4. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 485.150, Paragraph 3.*]

[5. *Agency allegation for individual defendants. See § 485.150, Paragraph 4.*]

[6. *Allegation of railroad company's ownership of train. See § 485.150, Paragraph 5.*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], at approximately _____ [*time*], decedent was driving a _____ [*describe vehicle, e.g,* 1988 Dodge pick-up truck] _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* westbound] on _____ [*street*]. At that same time, defendants were operating a _____ [*specify, e.g.,* train consisting of one locomotive, five flatcars, and a caboose] _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* northbound] along the railroad track described above. On or about the time alleged above, at the grade crossing described above, defendants ran the train into and against decedent's vehicle, and decedent sustained severe injuries from which he/she thereafter died.

[8. *Allegations of defendants' negligent acts or omissions. See § 485.151, Paragraphs 7, 8.*]

[9. *Allegation of basis for award of punitive damages, if appropriate. See § 485.151, Paragraphs 9, 10.*]

10. As a proximate result of the negligence [and conscious disregard] of defendant[(s), and each of them], decedent died on _____ [*date*].

11. As a proximate result of the negligence [and conscious disregard] of defendant((s), and each of them,) and the death of decedent, _____ [plaintiff(s) *or* the person(s) specified in Paragraph 1] has/have sustained loss resulting from the loss of the society, comfort, attention, services, and support of decedent.

12. As a further proximate result of the negligence [and conscious disregard] of defendant((s), and each of them,) and the death of decedent, plaintiff _____ [*name of plaintiff who incurred expenses*] has incurred funeral and burial expenses.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For funeral and burial expenses for according to proof;

3. For loss of earnings according to proof;

[4. For punitive damages;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 485.121.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the person(s) entitled by statute to bring a wrongful death action based on the death of a decedent who had been the driver in an automobile against a railroad company and its employees for the wrongful death of the decedent caused by a collision between the train and the automobile [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*].

For a general form of complaint and allegations to establish plaintiffs' entitlement to bring a wrongful death action, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[3] Allegations

This form of complaint alleges the following:

- The identity of persons entitled under the statute to bring a wrongful death cause of action and their

relationship to the decedent and, if the action is brought by the personal representative of the decedent's estate on behalf of these entitled persons, the capacity of the personal representative to do so (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*].

- That defendants proximately caused the death of decedent by their negligence (Paragraphs 7, 8, 10) [*Civ. Code § 1714(a)*].

- That plaintiff(s) sustained a loss of the society, comfort, attention, services, and support of decedent (Paragraph 11) [*Krouse v. Graham (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 59, 67, 137 Cal. Rptr. 863, 562 P.2d 1022]* .

- That plaintiff(s) incurred expenses for decedent's burial (Paragraph 12) [*Francis v. Sauve (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 102, 124, 34 Cal. Rptr. 754]* . If the plaintiff is a minor, a guardian ad litem must be appointed for the purposes of the action, unless the minor already has a guardian [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 372*].

[4] Wrongful Death Actions

When the death of a person is caused by the wrongful act or negligence of another, certain persons, or the decedent's personal representative on their behalf, may bring an action for damages against the person causing the death and any other person responsible (or against personal representatives of such persons) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60* permits decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, and issue of deceased children to bring a wrongful death action without qualification, and permits others to bring an action under specified circumstances. For forms of allegations establishing that specific classes of persons are entitled to bring a wrongful death action, including allegations that are required of plaintiffs who are not the decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, or issue of deceased children, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* . If a plaintiff is a minor, a guardian ad litem must be appointed for the purposes of the action, unless the minor already has a guardian [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 372*]. For discussion and forms relating to appointment of a guardian ad litem generally, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* .

In a wrongful death action, damages may be awarded that, under all the circumstances of the case, may be just, but may not include damages recoverable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.34* (survival actions). The court must determine the respective rights in an award of the persons entitled to assert the cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.61*]. An action under *Code Civ. Proc § 377.30* (survival actions) may be joined with a wrongful death action arising out of the same wrongful act or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.62(a)*]. In addition, a wrongful death action and a survival action under *Code Civ. Proc § 377.31* (survival of pending action) arising out of the same wrongful act or neglect may be consolidated for trial as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* (consolidation of actions) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.62(b)*].

For further discussion of actions for wrongful death and survival actions generally, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[5] Venue

In an action for death from a wrongful act or negligence, either the county in which the injury occurs or the county in which the defendants, or some of them, reside at the commencement of the action is a proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 485.121*, *485.150*, and *485.151*.

For alternative complaints and allegations for use in wrongful death actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to appointment of a guardian ad litem generally, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*

[7] State Statutes

Two-year statute of limitations for action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death. *Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* (one-year period prior to 2003)

Who may bring wrongful death action. Code Civ. Proc. § 337.60

[8] Decisions

Plaintiff in wrongful death action as entitled to presumption that decedent exercised due care when no one witnessed decedent being struck and killed by train. *Greene v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 135, 139, 260 P.2d 834*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.153

§ 485.153 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Failure to Repair Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Failure to Repair Signal or Sound Warning at Grade Crossing

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] _____ [*allege facts showing defendant's possession and control of location at which the accident occurred, e.g.,* owned, maintained, controlled, managed, and operated a crossing where its railroad tracks intersect and occupy a portion of _____ (*street name*) in _____ (*city*), California]. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] installed _____ [*specify defective warning device, e.g.,* a wigwag signal at the southwest corner of the crossing], the purpose of which was to warn motorists of the approach of its trains, and on which the public was thereby encouraged to rely.

2. At the times and place herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] negligently and carelessly failed to inspect and to maintain _____ [*specify defective warning device, e.g.,* the wigwag signal]. By reason of defendant's lack of inspection and maintenance, _____ [*specify defective warning device, e.g.,* the wigwag signal] failed to operate properly, in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* it did not activate on the approach and passing of trains traveling on the northbound track].

3. Defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] had actual or constructive notice that _____ [*specify defective warning device, e.g.,* the wigwag signal] failed to operate properly in that _____ [*allege facts indicating actual or constructive notice, e.g.,* several motorists had reported the signal's malfunction to defendant's regional office at _____ (*address*), in the month preceding the accident described below]. Notwithstanding this notice, defendant _____ [*railroad company*], through its agents and employees acting in the discharge of their duties and within the scope of their authority, negligently and carelessly failed to make necessary repairs.

4. Defendants _____ [*names of railroad employees*] had actual or constructive notice that _____ [*specify defective warning device, e.g.*, the wigwag signal] failed to operate properly in that _____ [*allege facts indicating actual or constructive notice, e.g.*, during the month preceding the accident described below, defendants passed through the crossing many times and observed or should have observed the signal's malfunction]. Notwithstanding this notice, defendants _____ [*names of railroad employees*] _____ negligently and carelessly failed to ring a bell, or sound a whistle, or either one or more thereof, at or near the crossing, to warn plaintiff of the approach of the train.

5. _____ [*Describe accident caused by defective warning device, e.g.*, On _____ (*date*), at approximately _____ (*time*), plaintiff, as the driver of a motor vehicle, approached the crossing and signal described above, driving eastbound on _____ (*street*). Plaintiff heard no horn or other sound warning of an approaching train, and, in further reliance on the fact that the wigwag signal was not activated, proceeded to drive his/her motor vehicle through the crossing. There it was struck by a passing northbound train, resulting in plaintiff's injuries described below].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint by an automobile driver who has been injured in a collision as a result of a railroad company's failure to inspect and repair defective signal equipment at a crossing [*see § 485.62[3][b]*]. They may be inserted in lieu of Paragraphs 6-8 in the *form in § 485.151*. In an action involving wrongful death, the allegations may be adapted for insertion in lieu of Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the *form in § 485.152*.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges that (1) defendant occupied and controlled the crossing (Paragraph 1) [*see County of Alameda v. Southern Pac. Co. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 479, 484, 11 Cal. Rptr. 751, 360 P.2d 327* ; *see also* Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*]; (2) defendant installed a signal on which the public was encouraged to rely (Paragraph 1) [*see Will v. Southern Pac. Co. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 468, 473-474, 116 P.2d 44]* ; and (3) defendants breached their respective duties to plaintiff, despite actual or constructive notice of the danger, to inspect and maintain the signal andto sound a warning on approaching the crossing, resulting in the collision that caused plaintiff's injuries (Paragraphs 2-5) [*Civ. Code § 1714(a)*; *see Peri v. Los Angeles Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 128, 130-131, 137 P.2d 441* ; *Vaca v. Southern Pac. Co. (1928) 91 Cal. App. 470, 481, 267 P. 346]* .

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.151*

For discussion and forms relating to liability for dangerous conditions on land, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.154

§ 485.154 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Use of Excessive Speed at Grade Crossing

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Allegation in Complaint by Automobile Driver--Use of Excessive Speed at Grade Crossing

[*EITHER*]

1. At the time and place referred to herein, defendants _____ [*names*], as agents or employees of defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] acting in the discharge of their duties and within the scope of their authority, negligently and carelessly controlled, maintained, and operated the _____ [locomotive *or* railroad car] by causing the train to be propelled at an excessive and dangerous rate of speed, above that which would have been safe or prudent under the circumstances existing at the time and place referred to herein, including the fact that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, parked vehicles, adjacent to the crossing, obscured the vision and view of the engineer and the plaintiff at the crossing].

[*AND/OR*]

2. At the time and place referred to herein, defendant _____ [*name of railroad*] negligently and carelessly directed its employees to operate the [locomotive *or* railroad car] at an excessive and dangerous rate of speed, which rate of speed was maintained by defendant employees _____ [*names*] at the express direction of defendant _____ [*name of railroad*].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint by an automobile driver who has been injured in a collision caused by the failure of train operators to drive a train at a reasonable speed under the circumstances [*see § 485.02[5][f]*]. Liability may be based on excessive speed whether or not signals were provided at the crossing [*see Peri v. Los Angeles*

Junction Ry. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 111, 126, 137 P.2d 441] . The allegations may be inserted either in addition to or in lieu of Paragraphs 6-8 in the *form in § 485.151*. In a wrongful death action, they may be adapted for insertion in Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the *form in § 485.152*.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges that the railroad operators were negligent in using excessive speed in operating the train, given the circumstances existing at the crossing (Paragraph 1) [*see Stout v. Southern Pac. R.R. Co. (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 491, 502, 274 P.2d 194]* . An alternate or additional paragraph alleges that the railroad company was negligent in directing its employees to maintain an excessive rate of speed, for use when there is an independent basis for liability on the part of the company (Paragraph 2) [*see Benson v. Southern Pacific Co. (1918) 177 Cal. 777, 779-880, 171 P. 948]* .

[4] Decisions

Evidence that railroad company regulated speed of trains at crossing, through use of "speed boards" and prescribed time schedule, as supporting jury finding that company was independently negligent, apart from respondeat superior. *Jensen v. Southern Pac. Co. (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 67, 69-71, 276 P.2d 703* , disapproved on other grounds in *Alarid v. Vanier (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 617, 623-624, 327 P.2d 897*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 485.150*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.155

§ 485.155 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Comparative Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)] of Automobile Driver

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Comparative Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)] of Automobile Driver

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. Plaintiff failed to exercise reasonable and ordinary care, caution, or prudence for his/her own safety in order to avoid the alleged accident in that _____ [*set out acts or omissions of plaintiff constituting negligence, e.g.,* plaintiff could not obtain a reasonably safe view of the tracks in both directions before entering the dangerous track area unless plaintiff stopped his/her automobile. Nevertheless, plaintiff negligently and carelessly failed to stop, to look, and to listen for the approach of defendant's train and instead proceeded without stopping onto the tracks into the path of the oncoming train].

2. The resulting injuries and damages, if any, sustained by plaintiff wereproximately caused by the negligence of plaintiff.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense allegation is for insertion in an answer to a complaint based on negligence brought against a railroad by an automobile driver injured in a collision. The defense alleges that plaintiff's own negligent conduct was the sole or contributing cause of the alleged injury. For discussion of the defense of comparative negligence in negligence actions against railroads, see *§ 485.67*. For more general discussion, additional forms of affirmative defense allegation, and a form of Judicial Council answer into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which this

affirmative defense allegation may also be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the format of affirmative defense allegations and answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[4] State Statutes

Persons as liable for negligent injury to another except so far as injured party brings injury on himself or herself. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Duty of motorist in approaching railroad crossing. *Veh. Code §§ 22450-22452*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 6, *Torts*, § 1280 et seq. (10th ed. 2005)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 42: Public Utilities thru Railroads-Chs. 480-485
Chapter 485 RAILROADS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Injuries to Passengers and Other Persons

42-485 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 485.156

§ 485.156 Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Trespasser Injured While Riding or Getting on or off Moving Train [Civ. Code § 1714.7]

[1] FORM Action for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Against Railroad [Civ. Code § 2338] and Employees [Civ. Code § 2343]--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Trespasser Injured While Riding or Getting on or off Moving Train [Civ. Code § 1714.7]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that plaintiff was injured, if at all, while _____ [getting on *or* attempting to get on *or* riding on *or* getting off of] a moving locomotive or railroad car, without authority from the operator of the railroad. Plaintiff's injuries and damages, if any, were not proximately caused by any intentional act of the owner or operator of the railroad, done either with knowledge that serious injury would probably result from the act, or with a wanton and reckless disregard of the probable result of the act.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense allegation is for insertion in an answer to a complaint based on negligence brought against a railroad by a plaintiff injured while gettingon, riding on, or getting off a moving train. The defense alleges that plaintiff's injury occurred as a result of his or her unauthorized act as a trespasser [*Civ. Code § 1714.7*; *see § 485.62[2][b]*]. For a form of Judicial Council answer into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which this affirmative defense allegation may also be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] State Statutes

Qualified immunity of railroad for injuries to trespassers riding on or jumping on or off moving train. *Civ. Code § 1714.7*

[4] Decisions

Defendant did not waive right to rely on immunity under *Civ. Code § 1714.7* in summary judgment motion by failing to raise it as affirmative defense in its answer, because plaintiff was aware of potential applicability of statute some four years prior to motion in five-year-old case. *Perez v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 462, 471, 267 Cal. Rptr. 100*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 6, *Torts*, § 1097, 1098 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 486.syn

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.syn Synopsis to Chapter 486: RECEIVERS

§ 486.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 486.02 Cross References

§§ 486.03-486.09 [Reserved]

§ 486.10 Nature of Receivership

§ 486.11 Nature of Receiver

[1] Classes

[2] Receiver Pendente Lite

[3] Receiver After Judgment

§ 486.12 Limitations on Appointment of Receiver

[1] Statutory Ground Required

[2] Effect of Existence of Alternative Remedies

§ 486.13 Grounds for Appointment

[1] Generally

[2] Statutory Grounds Enumerated

[a] Property in Danger of Being Lost, Removed, or Materially Injured

[b] Inspection of Property for Hazardous Substances

[c] Dissolution, Insolvency, or Mismanagement of Corporation

[i] Appointment of Receiver

[ii] Action by Private Person

[iii] Application of Creditor or Stockholder

[iv] Application of Minority Shareholder

[d] In Connection With an Arbitrable Controversy

[e] Water or Sewer System Corporation

[f] Household Goods Carrier

[g] Unlawful Detainer

[h] Potential Default Under Health Facilities Loan Program

[i] Action for Specified Performance of Assignment of Rents Provision

[j] Action By Assignee Under Assignment of Leases, Rents, Issues, or Profits

[k] Equity

[l] After Judgment

[3] In Limited Civil Case

[4] Cases Involving Attachment

§ 486.14 Who May or May Not Be Appointed

§ 486.15 Appointment Procedures

[1] Manners of Seeking

[2] Supporting Papers and Evidence

[3] Ex Parte Application

[a] Additional Showing Required

[b] Undertaking or Bond

[c] Order to Show Cause

[d] Service of Papers

[e] Failure to Proceed or Serve Adverse Party

[f] Continuances

[4] Noticed Motion

[a] Generally

[b] Service of Notice of Motion and Papers

[c] Service and Filing of Opposing Papers

[d] Local Court Rules

[5] Hearing

[a] Evidence

[b] Nomination of Receiver

§ 486.16 Receiver's Oath and Bond

§ 486.17 Appellate Review

[1] Order or Judgment Appointing Receiver

[2] Order Denying Appointment of Receiver

[3] Order Granting or Denying Motion to Vacate Appointment of Receiver

[4] Order Appointing Successor Receiver

§ 486.18 Collateral Attack on Order of Appointment

§ 486.19 Appointment of Receiver in Enforcement of Judgment Proceedings

[1] In General

[2] To Enforce Judgment

[a] Showing Required

[b] Discretion and Control of Court

[c] Notice Motion

[3] To Preserve Value of Property Levied on

§§ 486.20-486.29 [Reserved]

§ 486.30 Powers of Receivers

[1] Generally

[2] To Take Possession of and Manage Property

[3] To Bring and Defend Actions

[4] To Employ Attorney

[5] To Deposit Securities

[6] To Deposit Receivership Funds

[7] To Sell Receivership Property

[8] To Borrow Money

[9] Assumption and Rejection of Contracts

[10] Impact of Bankruptcy Filing

§ 486.31 Duties of Receiver

[1] To Act Faithfully

[2] To File Inventories

[3] To Publish Notice of Unclaimed Funds and Report to Court

[4] To File Reports and Accounts

[5] To Petition For Instructions

[6] To Notify Court Regarding Substandard Rental Property

§ 486.32 Sale of Receivership Property

[1] Statutory Authority

[2] Nature of Receiver's Sale

[3] Analysis Required of Court in Ordering Sale

[4] Selling Price

[5] Court's Considerations in Confirming Sale

§ 486.33 Termination of Receivership

§ 486.34 Prior Removal of Receiver

§ 486.35 Wages Owed to Pre-Receivership Employees

§ 486.36 Receiver's Accounts and Reports

[1] Generally

[2] Objections and Claims

[3] Surcharge for Losses

[4] Claim for Fees

[5] Real Property Taxes

[6] Lien Claims

[7] Effect of Approval of Account

[8] Discharge of Receiver

[9] Appeal

§ 486.37 Foreign Receiverships

§§ 486.38-486.49 [Reserved]

§ 486.50 Actions by Receiver

§ 486.51 Actions Against Receiver

[1] Court Permission Required

[2] Independent Suit or Intervention

[3] Tort Liability

[4] Garnishment and Attachment

§ 486.52 Employment of Attorney

§ 486.53 Actions on Receiver's Bond

§§ 486.54-486.59 [Reserved]

§ 486.60 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 486.61 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

[2] Appointment

[3] Attachment

[4] Attorneys

[5] Bonds and Undertakings

[6] Continuances and Extensions of Time

[7] Corporations

[8] Escheat Proceedings

[9] Execution and Enforcement of Judgments

[10] Foreclosure Actions

[11] Fraudulent Transactions

[12] Hazardous Substance Inspection

[13] Interest in Property or Fund

[14] Jurisdiction of Courts

[15] Leases

[16] Public Utilities

[17] Receivers

[18] Rents, Issues, or Profits

[19] Unlawful Detainer

§ 486.62 California Rules of Court

§ 486.63 Local Court Rules

[1] Alameda County

[2] Contra Costa County

[3] Los Angeles County

[4] San Bernardino County

[5] San Diego County

[6] San Francisco County

§ 486.64 Decisions

[1] Affidavits and Declarations

[2] Abuse of Process

[3] Appeal

[4] Appellate Review

[5] Appointment of Receivers

[a] In General

[b] Crops, Cases Involving

[c] Dissolution of Partnership Cases

[d] Equitable Cases

[e] Execution, in Aid of

[f] Foreclosure Cases

[g] Fraud Cases

[h] On Court's Own Motion

[i] On Ex Parte Application

[j] Attachment

[k] Complaint

[l] Corporations

[m] Discretion of Court

[n] Enforcement of Judgments and Orders

[o] Hearing

[p] Jurisdiction

[q] Order

[r] Prohibition and Mandate

[s] Property Subject to Receivership

[t] Rents, Issues, and Profits

[u] Wrongful Procurement of Receivership

[6] Nature of Receiver

[7] Nature of Receivership

§ 486.65 Text References

§§ 486.66-486.69 [Reserved]

§ 486.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 486.71 State Statutes

[1] Powers and Duties of Receiver

[2] Preferences

[3] Real Estate Law

§ 486.72 California Rules of Court

§ 486.73 Decisions

[1] Appeal

[2] Contempt of Court

[3] Costs of Receivership

[4] Court Control of Receiver and Property

[5] Dismissal of Action, Effect on Receivership

[6] Fees and Expenses

[7] Final Account and Discharge

[8] Hearings

[9] Orders

[a] Generally

[b] Shortening Time

[10] Powers and Duties of Receiver

[a] Generally

[b] Power to Contract

[11] Ratification of Receiver's Acts by Subsequent Court Order

[12] Receivership Estate

[13] Res Judicata

[14] Sale of Property

§ 486.74 Text References

§§ 486.75-486.79 [Reserved]

§ 486.80 State Statutes

§ 486.81 Decisions

[1] Attachment or Garnishment of Property in Receivership

[2] Court Permission for Receiver to Sue

[3] Attorney Fees

[4] Court Permission to Sue Receiver

[5] Encumbrances, Liens, and Other Priority Interests

[6] Liability of Receivers

[7] Liability of Surety

[8] Setoffs

§§ 486.82-486.89 [Reserved]

§ 486.90 Applicant's Checklist

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Ex Parte Application for Appointment of Receiver and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment Should Not Be Confirmed

[3] Ex Parte Application for Order to Show Cause and Order to Show Cause Why Receiver Should Not Be Appointed

[4] Notice of Motion for Appointment of Receiver

§ 486.91 Opposing Party's Checklist

[1] Ex Parte Hearing

[2] Continuance of Confirmation Hearing

[3] Preliminary Determinations

[4] Response to Order to Show Cause or Notice of Motion

[5] Hearing

[6] Sufficiency of Undertaking or Surety

[7] Notice of Court's Ruling

§§ 486.92-486.99 [Reserved]

§ 486.100 General Matters

[1] Determine Duties and Powers

[2] Keep Records

[3] Take Possession of Property

§ 486.101 Inventory Property

[1] Extension of Time

[2] Draft Inventory

[3] Serve Copies on Parties

[4] Supplementary Inventory

§ 486.102 Notices to Public Entities

[1] Employment Development Department

[2] Licensing Agencies

[3] Taxing Agencies

§ 486.103 Order Naming Bank Depository

[1] Procedure

§ 486.104 Employment of Attorney

[1] Draft Petition for Authority to Employ Attorney

[2] Present Petition and Order to Court

[3] Serve Papers

§ 486.105 Petition for Authorization to Perform Specific Act Not Otherwise Authorized by Statute or by Court's Order of Appointment

[1] Draft Petition for Authority

[2] Present Papers to Court

[3] Serve Papers

§ 486.106 Petition for Instructions

[1] Draft Petition for Instructions

[2] File Petition and Secure Hearing Date

[3] Draft Notice of Hearing

[4] Service of Papers

[5] Hearing

§ 486.107 Unclaimed Funds in Possession of Receiver

[1] Draft Notice of Unclaimed Funds

[2] Delivery to Newspaper

[3] Proof of Publication

[4] Payment

[5] Report to Court

§ 486.108 Receiver's Final Account and Report

[1] Draft Final Account and Report

[2] Draft Notice of Presentation of Account and Report

[3] Service on Parties

[4] Hearing

§§ 486.109-486.119 [Reserved]

§ 486.120 Lawsuits By Receiver

[1] Petition to Sue Third Party

[2] Order Granting Petition

[3] Present Petition and Order to Court

[4] Service of Order

[5] Complaint Against Third Party

§ 486.121 Lawsuits Against Receiver

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Application for Leave to Sue Receiver

§§ 486.122-486.129 [Reserved]

§ 486.130 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--To Take Possession of Property or Fund in Which Parties Have Joint Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 486.131 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint For Appointment of Receiver--Action to Foreclose Mortgage or Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[4] Verification

[5] Cross Reference

§ 486.132 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint to Enforce Assignment of Leases, Rents, Issues, or Profits [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 486.133 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver in Aid of Arbitration [Code Civ. Proc. § 1218.8]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 486.134 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action for Involuntary Dissolution of Corporation [Corp. Code § 1803]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Grounds and Procedure

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[5] Verification

[6] Cross Reference

§ 486.135 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Creditor Against Insolvent Debtor and Debtor's Transferee to Set Aside Transfer of Property in Fraud of Creditors [Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(3)(B); Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[4] Verification

[5] Cross References

§ 486.136 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

[4] Verification

[5] Cross References

§ 486.137 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice to Opposing Party

[4] Nature of Ex Parte Appointment

[5] Showing Required

[a] Mandatory Requirements

[b] Unknown Matters

[c] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 486.138 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Appoint Receiver to Inspect for Hazardous Substances [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 486.139 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration and Ex Parte Application for Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment Should Not Be Confirmed [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 2009, 2015.5; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice to Opposing Party

[4] Nature of Ex Parte Appointment

[5] Showing Required

[a] Mandatory Requirements

[b] Unknown Matters

[c] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 486.140 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Fixing Amount of Undertaking to Be Filed by Ex Parte Applicant for Appointment of Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Form and Content of Undertaking

[4] Amount of Undertaking

[5] Cross References

§ 486.141 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Appointing Receiver and Fixing Amounts of Undertakings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 567(b)], and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment of Receiver Should Not Be Confirmed [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Order Appointing Receiver

[4] Undertakings

[5] Service of Papers

§ 486.142 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.143 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Notice of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Noticed Motion Procedure

[4] Memorandum of Points and Authorities

[5] Cross References

§ 486.144 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.145 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Granting Motion and Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 486.146-486.149 [Reserved]

§ 486.150 Receiver's Original or Supplementary Inventory of Property [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.151 Application by Receiver for Court Order and Order--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Terminology

§ 486.152 Petition by Receiver for Leave to Employ Attorney [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180] and Order

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time of Application

§ 486.153 Notice of Unclaimed Funds [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Notice

[4] Period of Publication

[5] Costs of Publication

[6] Cross References

§ 486.154 Order Directing Payment of Unclaimed Funds Into State Treasury [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.155 Application by Receiver for Authority to Borrow Money and to Issue Receivership Certificate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.156 Receivership Certificate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.157 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Final Account and Report and Petition for Discharge

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Duty to Keep and File Accounts

[4] Contents of Account and Report

[5] Verification

§ 486.158 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Notice of Hearing

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.159 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Order Settling and Approving Final Account and Report, Discharging Receiver, and Exonerating Bond

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Costs of Receivership

[4] Approval of Account and Report

§ 486.160 Stipulation to Approve Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.161 Motion for Order Excusing Turnover in a Bankruptcy Case [11 U.S.C. § 543(d)].

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 486.162-486.169 [Reserved]

§ 486.170 Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Third Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.171 Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Third Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.172 Allegations in Receiver's Complaint Against Third Party of Capacity and Authorization to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.173 Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Receiver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.174 Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Receiver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 486.175 Allegations in Third Party's Complaint Against Receiver of Authorization to Sue

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Form and Contents of Complaint

[4] Cross Reference

Robert B. Kaplan n*
Editorial Consultant

FOOTNOTES:
(n93)Footnote *. Robert Kaplan is a shareholder at Frandzel, Share, Robins, Kaplan & Bloom, L.C., in San Francisco, California, and specializes in receivership law and creditors' rights.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART I. SCOPE

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.01

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the remedy of receivership both pendente lite and after judgment. The Legal Background and Forms are subdivided into three subparts. Subpart A discusses the appointment of receivers [*see § 486.10* et seq.] and contains the following forms:

- Forms of allegations and prayers for the appointment of a receiver for inclusion in complaints [*see §§ 486.130 -486.138*].
- A form of declaration and ex parte application for appointment of a receiver [*see § 486.139*].
- A form of order fixing the amount of the ex parte applicant's bond [*see § 486.140*].
- A combined form of order on ex parte application appointing a receiver, fixing the amount of the applicant's and the receiver's bonds, and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed [*see § 486.141*].
- A form of order confirming the appointment [*see § 486.142*].
- A form of notice of motion for an order appointing a receiver, a form of supporting declaration, and a form of order granting the motion [*see §§ 486.143 -486.145*].

Subpart B discusses the administration and termination of a receivership [*see § 486.30* et seq.] and contains the following forms:

- A skeletal form of inventory [*see § 486.150*].
- A general form of application by the receiver for an order [*see § 486.151*].

- A form of petition for leave to employ an attorney [*see § 486.152*].

- Forms of notice of unclaimed funds in the hands of a receiver [*see § 486.153*] and of order directing their payment into the California State Treasury [*see § 486.154*].

- A form of application by the receiver for authority to issue receivership certificates [*see § 486.155*] and a form of receivership certificate [*see § 486.156*].

- Forms of the receiver's final account, notice of hearing, and order approving account [*see §§ 486.157 -486.159*].

- A form of stipulation to approve the receiver's final account and report [*see § 486.60*].

- A form of motion for an order excusing turnover in a bankruptcy case [*see § 486.61*].

Subpart C discusses civil actions by and against receivers [*see § 486.50* et seq.] and contains the following forms:

- A form of petition by a receiver for permission to sue a third party [*see § 486.170*].

- A form of order granting the petition [*see § 486.171*].

- A form of allegations of the receiver's authority to sue for inclusion in the complaint subsequently filed [*see § 486.172*].

- A form of petition by a third party for leave to sue the receiver in the receiver's official capacity [*see § 486.173*].

- A form of order granting the motion [*see § 486.174*].

- A form of allegations of the receiver's status and of the appointing court's permission to sue for inclusion in the complaint filed by the third party [*see § 486.175*].

The Research Guide [*see § 486.60* et seq.] is similarly divided.

Procedural Checklists are provided for seeking [*see § 486.90*] and opposing [*see § 486.91*] appointment of a receiver, for administering and terminating a receivership [*see § 486.100* et seq.], and for actions by [*see § 486.120*] and against [*see § 486.121*] a receiver.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowersCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART I. SCOPE

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.02

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.02 Cross References

- For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

- For procedure and forms for use in actions involving unclaimed property, see Ch. 252, *Escheat (Unclaimed Property).*

- For discussion of receivership as a basis for quasi-in-rem jurisdiction, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

- For procedural checklist and forms for use in ex parte applications, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

- For discussion and forms for use in intervening in an existing action, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

- For discussion and forms for use in enforcing liability on a bond or undertaking, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsQuasi in Rem ActionsCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART I. SCOPE

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.03-486.09

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.10

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.10 Nature of Receivership

Receivership is a provisional remedy authorized by statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-570*; *Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 422, 50 P. 549* ; *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 698, 303 P.2d 80]* . Thus, the appointment of a receiver is ancillary to or in aid of the action brought [*La Societe Francaise d'Epargnes et de Prevoyance Mutuelle v. District Court of Fifteenth Judicial Dist. (1879) 53 Cal. 495, 553]* . Because it is a remedy incidental to the main objects of the complaint, there is no such thing as an action brought for the mere appointment of a receiver [*La Societe Francaise d'Epargnes et de Prevoyance Mutuelle v. District Court of Fifteenth Judicial Dist. (1879) 53 Cal. 495, 553* ; *Starbird v. Lane (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 247, 261, 21 Cal. Rptr. 280]* .

Receivership is, however, an extraordinary remedy, to be applied with caution, and only in cases of apparent necessity, and when other remedies would be inadequate [*Rogers v. Smith (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 16, 21, 172 P.2d 365* ; *see Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281]* . It is not a substitute for attachment and may not be resorted to for the reason that an attachment would be more expensive [*Rogers v. Smith (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 16, 21, 172 P.2d 365]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.11

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.11 Nature of Receiver

[1] Classes

There are two classes of receivers: (1) those appointed before judgment during the course of the litigation (pendente lite) and (2) those appointed after judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)* (appointment of receiver in limited civil case); *see also North v. Cecil B. DeMille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 57-58, 39 P.2d 199* (appointment pendente lite); *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 349-350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* (appointment after judgment)].

The receiver is the agent of the court and not of any party, and as such [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(a)*]:

- Is neutral,
- Acts for the benefit of all who may have an interest in the receivership property, and
- Holds assets for the court and not for the plaintiff or the defendant.

[2] Receiver Pendente Lite

A receiver pendente lite is a person appointed by the court to take the charge and management of property that is the subject of the litigationbefore the court to preserve and ultimately dispose of it according to the final judgment in the case [*Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 422, 50 P. 549* ; *Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598* ; *see North v. Cecil B. DeMille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 57-58, 39 P.2d 199* (receiver pendente lite is person appointed to take charge of fund or property while case remains undecided)].

A receiver neither occupies the status of an assignee [*Wright v. Standard Engineering Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 244, 248, 104 Cal. Rptr. 539* ; *H.D. Roosen Co. v. Pacific Radio Pub. Co. (1932) 123 Cal. App. 525, 534, 11 P.2d 873]*

nor is an agent of any party to the action or proceeding [*Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 712, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . Rather, a receiver is an officer or representative of the court [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 930, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027* ; *North v. Cecil B. DeMille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 58, 39 P.2d 199* ; *Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 422, 50 P. 549]* and a custodian of the property committed to his or her charge [*Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598]* . Being an officer or representative of the court, the receiver is subject to the court's direction [*Highland Secur. Co. v. Superior Court (1931) 119 Cal. App. 107, 112, 6 P.2d 116]* , and the property in receivership is under the control and continuous supervision of the court [*McClenny v. Superior Court (1964) 60 Cal. 2d 677, 688 n.21, 36 Cal. Rptr. 459, 388 P.2d 691* ; *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 699, 303 P.2d 80]* .

Trial courts have broad discretion in the appointment of the receiver to take over the operation of a business. [*Barber v. Lewis & Kaufman, Inc. (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 95, 99, 269 P.2d 929]* . The receiver can be utilized to preserve property of an ongoing business [*Sachs v. Killeen (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 205, 215, 331 P.2d 735]* . If the receiver is authorized to operate a business, the receiver is normally given the power to incur obligations for supplies and materials incident to the business. In the event a receiver is operating a business and determines that the business is operating at a loss, the receiver should request instructions from the court as to whether or not the operation of the business should be continued [*United States v. Johnson (8th Cir. 1938) 98 F.2d 462]* . If a creditor wishes to take action against receivership property, it is required to obtain leave of court to do so [*Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347, 351]* .

[3] Receiver After Judgment

A receiver may be appointed after judgment to preserve the property during the pendency of an appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*]. Because the judgment is not final and the lawsuit is continuing, the receiver is a receiver pendente lite [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 917.5*; for discussion of the nature of such a receiver, *see* [2], *above*].

A receiver may also be appointed after judgment to take charge of property for specified purposes with respect to the enforcement of the judgment whether or not the case is a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 86(a)(8), 564(b)(3),(4), 699.070, 708.610-708.630, 712.060*, discussed in *§§ 486.13[2][l], [3], 486.19*]. When the purpose of the receivership is to reach property of a judgment debtor which cannot be reached by the ordinary levy of execution, that is, when the receivership is supplementary to or in aid of execution, the receivership is a statutory creation and not an equitable remedy; in this situation, the receiver is not, except in a technical sense, an officer of the court, but, rather, represents and is an agent of the judgment debtor, the judgment creditor at whose instance he or she was appointed, and such other judgment creditors as may have caused the receivership to be extended to their claims. The receiver is nevertheless subject to the continued direction and control of the court [*Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 349-350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

The functions of a receiver appointed after judgment, either for the purpose of carrying the judgment into effect, or for its preservation until the judgment is executed, are limited to the property described in the judgment [*Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 423, 50 P. 549]* . Moreover, unlike a receiver appointed pendente lite, the functions of a receiver appointed after judgment for the purpose of carrying the judgment into effect (*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3)*) or of otherwise enforcing a judgment (*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*) are suspended by an appeal on which an undertaking is given in a sum fixed by the trial court to stay proceedings on the judgment, and a receiver cannot be appointed to carry the judgment into effect after a stay bond has been given [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 917.5*; *Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 380-384, 24 P. 121]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil

ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.12

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.12 Limitations on Appointment of Receiver

[1] Statutory Ground Required

A receiver may be appointed only in the classes of cases expressly set forth in the statutes [*Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475* ; *see In re Stein (1936) 14 Cal. App. 2d 303, 305-306, 58 P.2d 175]* . The basic statute governing the appointment of receivers is *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*, discussed in *§ 486.13[1], [2]*. The requirements of this statute are jurisdictional, and without a showing bringing the receiver within one of the subdivisions of that section the court's order appointing a receiver is void [*Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475* ; *Rondos v. Superior Court (1957) 151 Cal. App. 2d 190, 195, 311 P.2d 113* ; *contra, John H. Spohn Co. v. Bender (1937) 18 Cal. App. 2d 447, 451, 64 P.2d 152* (party who procured appointment of receiver in improper case was estopped from relying on invalidity to recover fees paid to receiver because erroneous appointment is not jurisdictional)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 564 is, in effect, augmented by a variety of special statutes throughout the codes specifying precise actions or situations in which a receiver may be appointed [*see Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475]* . Many of these statutes are cited in § 486.61.

The appointment of receivers in limited civil cases pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*, discussed in *§ 486.13[3]*.

[2] Effect of Existence of Alternative Remedies

A receiver should not be appointed when a remedy less drastic in its nature and scope is available and which will insure to the litigants adequate protection [*A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P. 926* (involving receivership of going corporation); *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75* (same)]. For example, a receiver pendente lite should not be appointed when the rights of the applicant may be as well secured by injunction or other statutory remedies [*A. G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P.*

926] . However, receivership will not be denied when other available remedies have been pursued to no avail [*see Alderson v. Alderson (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 450, 468, 225 Cal. Rptr. 610]* . Moreover, the mere possession of other remedies does not preclude the appointment of a receiver in a proper case [*Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 651, 279 P.2d 598* ; *see City and County of San Francisco v. Daley (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 734, 745, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256* (receiver appointed following judgment to abate public nuisance)]. Query whether the change in *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(9)* [formerly *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*], by Stats. 2001, ch. 44, replacing the language "[i]n all other cases where receivers have heretofore been appointed by the usages of courts of equity," with "where necessary to preserve the property or rights of any party" will decrease the availability of receiverships when other remedies are available. Under the former broad language, a court's determination that under detailed circumstances injunctive relief would be inadequate, and that resort should be made to receivership, was not disturbed on appeal in the absence of a clear showing of abuse of discretion [*McNeil v. Graner (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 371, 374, 206 P.2d 1120]* .

Available alternative remedies might, in any given case, include, among others, one or more of the other provisional remedies, that is: pendente lite injunctive relief (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-534*), attachment (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 481.010-493.060*), claim and delivery (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 511.010-516.050*), and deposit in court (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 572-574*). See Ch. 303, *Injunctions* , Ch. 62, *Attachment* , 119, *Claim and Delivery* , and Ch. 211, *Deposit in Court* , respectively.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.13

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.13 Grounds for Appointment

[1] Generally

A receiver may be appointed by the court in which the action or proceeding is pending in any case in which the court is empowered by law to appoint a receiver [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(a)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564* and *565* (discussed under [2], *below*) are the most important of the statutes with respect to grounds for appointment of a receiver. Other commonly used statutes for appointment of a receiver are *Code Civ. Proc. § 1422* (escheat proceedings) and *Fam. Code § 290* (enforcement of family law judgments and orders).

[2] Statutory Grounds Enumerated

[a] Property in Danger of Being Lost, Removed, or Materially Injured

The court may appoint a receiver in an action by a vendor to vacate a fraudulent purchase of property, or by a creditor to subject any property or fund to the creditor's claim, or between partners or others jointly owning or interested in any property or fund, on application of the plaintiff, or of any party whose right to or interest in the property or fund, or its proceeds, is probable, and when it is shown that the property or fund is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*; *see Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 130-131, 285 P.2d 351* ; *Snidow v. Hill (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 702, 705-706, 191 P.2d 513* ; *Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 275-276, 171 P.2d 75]* . On a motion for receivership under this provision, the trial court is not required to determine the ultimate issues involving the precise relationship of the parties; rather, at this stage of the proceedings, nothing more than a probable joint or common interest in the property concerned need be shown [*Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 711, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787]* .

The court may also appoint a receiver in an action by a secured lender for the foreclosure of the deed of trust or mortgage and sale of the property on which there is a lien under a deed of trust or mortgage, when it appears that the property is in danger of loss, removal, or material injury, or that the condition of the deed of trust or mortgage has not

been performed and that the property is probably insufficient to discharge the deed of trust or mortgage debt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*; *see Title etc. Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1912) 164 Cal. 58, 61-62, 127 P. 502* ; *Bank of Woodland v. Stephens (1904) 144 Cal. 659, 660-661, 79 P. 379* ; *see also Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 813-816, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475]* .

For discussion of the appointment of a receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)* in connection with specific performance of an assignment of rents provision of a deed of trust, mortgage, or separate assignment document and thereafer pending nonjudicial foreclosure, see [i], *below*.

For a discussion of ex parte motions and the filing fee required in superior court cases, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[b] Inspection of Property for Hazardous Substances

The superior court, other than in a limited civil case, may appoint a receiver in an action brought under *Civ. Code § 2929.5* by a secured lender, including a mortgagee or a beneficiary under a deed of trust, to enable the lender to enter and inspect the real property security for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature, and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the real property security [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(e)(5)* (secured lender defined)]. For discussion relating to an action under *Civ. Code § 2929.5*, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* . For a form of allegations for appointment of a receiver for this purpose, see *§ 486.138*.

[c] Dissolution, Insolvency, or Mismanagement of Corporation

[i] Appointment of Receiver

The court may appoint a receiver in cases when a corporation has been dissolved, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 565*, discussed at [iii], *below* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(5)*].

The court may also appoint a receiver when a corporation is insolvent, is in imminent danger of insolvency, or has forfeited its corporate rights [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(6)*]. Under this provision, a receiver may be appointed to take charge and preserve the property of a corporation that is insolvent or in imminent danger of insolvency [*see A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 614, 238 P. 926* (showing required on ex parte application for appointment of receiver on ground corporation is in imminent danger of insolvency)].

[ii] Action by Private Person

Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(6) does not authorize an action by a private person, either as a stockholder or creditor, to dissolve a corporation on the ground that it is insolvent or to obtain relief by seizing the corporation's property out of the hands of its constituted management and placing it in a receiver's hands [*Sunset Farms, Inc. v. Superior Court (1935) 9 Cal. App. 2d 389, 401, 50 P.2d 106* (applying exception to rule when corporate entity is used by individual debtor to defraud creditor)]. Under the express provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(6)*, a receiver may be appointed to take charge and preserve the property of a corporation that has forfeited its corporate rights [*see Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 374, 24 P. 121]* .

[iii] Application of Creditor or Stockholder

In addition, on the dissolution of any corporation, the superior court of the county in which the corporation carries on its business or has its principal place of business may, on the application of any creditor or of any stockholder or member of the corporation, appoint one or more persons to be receivers or trustees of the corporation to do the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 565*; *see Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 365-366, 369, 24 P. 121]* :

- Take charge of the corporation's estate and effects.
- Collect the debts and property due and belonging to the corporation.
- Pay the corporation's outstanding debts.
- Divide the remaining moneys and other property among its stockholders or members.

[iv] Application of Minority Shareholder

A receiver may also be appointed on the application of a minority shareholder or director to take charge of a going corporation on the ground that the corporation is being injured by fraud or mismanagement. The appointment of a receiver on this ground is made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(9)*, discussed under [k], *below*. The proceeding is not directed toward closing the affairs of the corporation or toward an attempt to dissolve it, but merely to place the assets of the corporation in safe hands [*Boyle v. Superior Court (1917) 176 Cal. 671, 673-674, 170 P. 1140* (action for removal of directors and appointment of receiver to take charge of corporation's assets and property); *see Misita v. Distillers Corp., Ltd. (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 244, 252, 128 P.2d 888]* .

[d] In Connection With an Arbitrable Controversy

A receiver may also be appointed on the application of a party to an arbitration agreement on the ground that any arbitration award to which the applicant may be entitled may be rendered ineffectual without the appointment of a receiver. The appointment of a receiver on this ground is made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(b)* [*Jordan-Lyon Productions, Ltd. v. Cineplex Odeon Corp. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1459, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200* ; *see also Baron v. Fire Insurance Exchange (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1191, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 502]* . This provisional remedy only may be made by the court, and appointment of a receiver by an arbitrator is void [*Marsch v. Williams (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 238, 246, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 402]* .

Any application to appoint a receiver on this ground must be accompanied by a complaint or by copies of the demand for arbitration and any response thereto. If accompanied by a complaint, the application should also be accompanied by a statement stating whether the party is or is not reserving that party's right to arbitration. Since many commercial contracts contain arbitration clauses, utilizing a receiver as a provisional remedy in connection with an arbitrable controversy should always be considered. In the event any application is filed to appoint a receiver in connection with an arbitrable controversy, the applicant must also present to the court an application to stay all other proceedings pending the arbitration of any issue, question, or dispute which is claimed to be arbitrable under the agreement and which is relevant to the action pursuant to which the provisional remedy is sought to avoid waiving the right to arbitration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(d)*].

[e] Water or Sewer System Corporation

The court may appoint a receiver at the request of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 855* (receivership of water or sewer system corporation that is unable or unwilling to adequately serve its ratepayers, or has been abandoned by its owners, or is unresponsive to rules or orders of Public Utilities Commission) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*].

[f] Household Goods Carrier

The court may appoint a receiver at the request of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 5259.5* (appointment of a receiver whenever the commission determines that any household goods carrier or any officer, director, or agent of a household goods carrier has abandoned, or is abandoning stored household goods or property of

any shippers under contract with the carrier or carriers) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*].

[g] Unlawful Detainer

The court may appoint a receiver in an unlawful detainer proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(7)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1159 et seq.*]. For discussion of unlawful detainer proceedings, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[h] Potential Default Under Health Facilities Loan Program

The court may appoint a receiver at the request of the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development ("Office"), or the Attorney General, pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 129173* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)*]. Section 129173 is a part of the California Health Facility Construction Loan Insurance Law [*Health & Safety Code § 129000 et seq.*], which provides an insurance program for health facility construction, improvement, and expansion loans [*Health & Safety Code § 129005*; *see Health & Safety Code § 129015* (program is administered by the Office)].

Under *Health & Safety Code § 129173*, upon making a determination that a borrower may be unable to fulfill its obligations under an insured loan transaction, the Office may assume or direct managerial or financial control of the borrower by, among other things, instituting (or requesting the Attorney General to institute) an action or proceeding to obtain injunctive or other equitable relief, including the appointment of a receiver for the borrower or the borrower's assets. The action or proceeding must be brought in the superior court in and for the county in which all or a substantial portion of the borrower's assets are located. On a proper showing, the court must grant the relief provided by law and requested by the Office or the Attorney General. The receiver may be appointed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-570* and must be approved by the Office. The receiver may, with the court's approval, exercise all of the powers of the officers and directors of the borrower, including the filing of a petition for bankruptcy. No action at law or in equity may be maintained against the Office, the Attorney General, or the receiver because of the exercise by any of them of the powers of the borrower's officers and directors pursuant to the order of, or with the approval of, the superior court [*Health & Safety Code § 129173(a)(4)*].

[i] Action for Specified Performance of Assignment of Rents Provision

The court may appoint a receiver in an action by a secured lender for specified performance of an assignment of rents provision in a trust deed or mortgage, or in a separate assignment document [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*]. The appointment may be continued after entry of a judgment for specific performance, if it is appropriate in order to protect, operate, or maintain real property encumbered by trust deed or mortgage, or in order to collect rents, pending the completion of a nonjudicial foreclosure under the power of sale in trust deed or mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*; *see also* [k], *below*; for detailed discussion and forms relating to an action to enforce an assignment of rents provisions in trust deed or mortgage, *see* Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*].

[j] Action By Assignee Under Assignment of Leases, Rents, Issues, or Profits

The court may appoint a receiver in a case brought by an assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*]. The appointment of a receiver is one of the steps which a real property secured creditor may take in order to enforce an assignment of rents clause which appears in a deed of trust. [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Because of issues which may arise under the California one-action rule set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, it is normally prudent to have any order appointing a receiver to enforce an assignment of rents clause which appears in a mortgage or deed of trust to hold any rents collected until the real property secured creditor who obtained appointment of the receiver has completed its foreclosure. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(d)* provides that any action by a secured lender to appoint a receiver pursuant to *Code*

Civ. Proc. § 564 does not constitute an action within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*, having such a provision in an order appointing a receiver will avoid litigation about whether the receiver's payment of rents to the real property secured creditor prior to the foreclosure sale is a violation of the one-action rule.

[k] Equity

A court may appoint a receiver when necessary to preserve the property or rights of any party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(9)*]. This provision, formerly *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*, was amended by Stats. 2001, ch. 44, by deleting the language "[i]n all other cases where receivers have heretofore been appointed by the usages of courts of equity," and substituting "where necessary to preserve the property or rights of any party." It is not clear whether this change will decrease the availability of receiverships, especially when other remedies are available. Under the former broad language, appointment of a receiver has been approved to preserve the community estate of spouses in a proceeding under the Family Code, even though *Fam. Code § 290* expressly authorizes the appointment of a receiver only for the purposes of enforcing a judgment, order, or decree made in a proceeding under that code [*see Nichols v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 589, 596-597, 36 P.2d 380* (discussing former *Civ. Code § 140*, the predecessor to *Fam. Code § 290*); *Rosenthal v. Rosenthal (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 927, 934, 50 Cal. Rptr. 385]* . Even under the former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*, receivership under that subdivision could not be invoked when the facts alleged brought the case within one of the other subdivisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* [*Dabney Oil Co. v. Providence Oil Co. (1913) 22 Cal. App. 233, 237, 133 P. 1155]* .

[l] After Judgment

The court may appoint a receiver after judgment, to carry the judgment into effect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3)*]. For example, the trial court has the discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3)* to appoint a receiver to carry into effect a judgment to abate a public nuisance [*City and County of San Francisco v. Daley (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 734, 742-744, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256]* . However, the functions of a receiver appointed after judgment for the purpose of carrying the judgment into effect are suspended by an appeal on which a sufficient undertaking is given to stay the proceedings on the judgment; moreover, a receiver cannot be appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3)* after a stay bond has been given [*Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 380-384, 24 P. 121]* .

The court may also appoint a receiver after judgment (a) to dispose of the property according to the judgment, or (b) to preserve it during the pendency of an appeal, or (c) pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.* (enforcement of judgments, *discussed under § 486.19*), or (d) after sale of real property pursuant to a decree of foreclosure, during the redemption period, to collect, expend, and disburse rents as directed by the court or otherwise provided by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*].

A receiver may also be appointed after judgment in aid of execution in order to collect a judgment [*Olsan v. Comora (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 642, 140 Cal. Rptr. 835]* . This remedy should be especially considered in a circumstance where a judgment creditor has obtained a judgment against an individual who is employed by his or her own professional corporation and is receiving payments of salary and other earnings from the professional corporation. In this circumstance, a receiver may be appointed to prevent the judgment debtor from taking his or her earnings out of the corporation for his or her own benefit without applying them to the judgment [*Crocker National Bank v. O'Donnell (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 264, 171 Cal. Rptr. 225]* .

[3] In Limited Civil Case

In limited civil cases, the court has jurisdiction to appoint receivers pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*; for grounds for appointment, *see* [2], *above*]. The actions and proceedings that constitute limited civil cases are primarily set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85* and *86*. For discussion of what cases are limited civil cases, see Ch.

323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

The court in a limited civil case also has jurisdiction to make any order or perform any act pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.* (enforcement of judgments, *discussed under § 486.19*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*].

[4] Cases Involving Attachment

Any court in which an action is pending in which property has been or is sought to be attached may appoint a receiver in specified circumstances to take any action the court orders that is necessary to preserve the value of the property, including its sale [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 488.700*]. A receiver can be appointed in this situation to, among other things, sell the property, if the court determines that the property is perishable or will greatly deteriorate or depreciate in value or for some other reason the interest of plaintiff will be best served by the appointment of a receiver. Thus, the appointment of a receiver should be considered where the property attached is, for example, inventory which consists of food products which will greatly depreciate in value unless it is sold immediately.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipReceivershipsAppointment of ReceiversBusiness & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipTermination & Winding UpDistribution of AssetsShareholder RightsCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful Detainer

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.14

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.14 Who May or May Not Be Appointed

No party, attorney of a party, or person interested in the action or related to any judge of the court by consanguinity or affinity within the third degree, can be appointed receiver without the written consent of the parties filed with the court clerk [*Code Civ. Proc. § 566(a)*; *see A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 618-621, 238 P. 926]* . The party seeking the appointment of the receiver may not, directly or indirectly, require any contract, agreement, arrangement, or understanding with any receiver whom it intends to nominate or recommend to the court, nor may the receiver enter into any such contract, arrangement, agreement, or understanding concerning the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)*]:

- The receiver's role with respect to the property following a trustee's sale or termination of a receivership, without specific court permission;

- How the receiver will administer the receivership or how much the receiver will charge for services or pay for services to appropriate or approved third parties hired to provide services;

- Who the receiver will hire, or seek approval to hire, to perform necessary services; or

- What capital expenditures will be made on the property.

Except as so limited, any person may serve as receiver, subject to being challenged if unqualified.

In certain cases in which the appointment of a receiver is necessary to enable the court to discharge its equitable duties, for example, to compel execution of a charitable trust, and no one can be found who is willing to serve as trustee or as receiver, the court may select a public officer or court official, such as the court administrator, the court investigator, or the public administrator to act as receiver [*McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1220 n.3, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.15

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.15 Appointment Procedures

[1] Manners of Seeking

There are three ways of securing the pendente lite appointment of a receiver on application [*see generally Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175-3.1177*]. They are as follows:

- By ex parte application, appointment on the ex parte application, and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1176*; *Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 132, 285 P.2d 351* ; *People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 859, 181 P.2d 49]* .

- By ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed and appointment following a hearing on the order to show cause [*see Nichols v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 589, 592, 36 P.2d 380* ; *see also Olsan v. Comora (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 642, 644, 140 Cal. Rptr. 835* (involving application for appointment of receiver in aid of execution on judgment)].

- By noticed motion for appointment of a receiver and appointment after hearing on the motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)*; *see also, e.g., Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 274-275, 171 P.2d 75]* .

The first procedure is used to obtain the appointment of a receiver pendente lite when the facts presented establish an emergency justifying the appointment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*]. The second procedure is an alternative to the third procedure and is normally used when the opposing party has not yet appeared in the case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1014* (appearance)]. In the first and second procedures, the order to show cause substitutes for a notice of motion and operates both as notice and as a citation to appear [*see, e.g., Sarracino v. Superior Court (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 1, 8 n. 6, 118 Cal. Rptr. 21, 529 P.2d 53* ; *Difani v. Riverside County Oil Co. (1927) 201 Cal. 210, 213-214, 256 P. 210* ; and

discussion in Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*]. The third procedure (notice of motion), which is the most common way of applying for the appointment of a receiver, is for use when the opposing party has appeared in the action or proceeding and the facts do not justify, or counsel does not wish to obtain, the immediate appointment of a receiver before hearing.

[2] Supporting Papers and Evidence

An application for the appointment of a receiver, either ex parte or by noticed motion, may be supported by facts alleged in a verified complaint or declaration [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175(a), 3.1176(b)*; *Bank of Woodland v. Stephens (1904) 144 Cal. 659, 660-661, 79 P. 379]* . The application or motion must also be supported by a memorandum [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1113(a), 3.1176(b)*] and may be supported by testimony produced at the hearing [*see Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 132, 285 P.2d 351* ; *Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 274, 171 P.2d 75]* . For restrictions on the use of oral testimony at law and motion hearings, see *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306*, discussed in [5][a], *below*.

[3] Ex Parte Application

[a] Additional Showing Required

The procedure for appointment of a receiver on ex parte application and order to show cause confirming the appointment is a drastic remedy andseldom warranted [*see, e.g., Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75* (involving appointment of receiver under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(7)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(9)*, where necessary to preserve property or rights of party))]. From the standpoint of the business welfare of a defendant corporation, the appointment of a receiver on ex parte application is so dangerous an expedient that it should be done only in cases of the greatest emergency and when, without the appointment, irreparable injury will unquestionably result [*Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Court (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75* ; *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Ct. (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P. 926]* . Appointment of a receiver will be made on ex parte application and without notice, however, when imperative necessity or emergency is shown in the application or supporting declarations [*People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 862, 181 P.2d 49]* .

Thus, in addition to the matters establishing the ground for the appointment of a receiver, an ex parte applicant for the immediate appointment of a receiver must show in detail by verified complaint or declaration the matters specified in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175* (discussed in *§ 486.139[5]*), including the nature of the emergency. The application must also include a declaration of affidavit detailing notice given to the adverse parties or attempts to notify them, a memorandum of points and authorities, and other papers required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*, discussed at *§ 486.137[3]*. For a procedural checklist and additional forms, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[b] Undertaking or Bond

If a receiver is appointed on ex parte application, the court, before making the order, must require from the applicant an undertaking in an amount to be fixed by the court, to the effect that the applicant will pay to the defendant all damages that the defendant may sustain by reason of the appointment and the entry by the receiver on his or her duties, in case the applicant shall have procured the appointment wrongfully, maliciously, or without sufficient cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.140, 995.190* (defining "bond" and "undertaking")]. In the case of two or more defendants, the undertaking should run in favor of each defendant in the action and should be in such form that any defendant would have a right of action on it if he or she is damaged by the appointment [*Title etc. Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1912) 164 Cal. 58, 65, 127 P. 502]* . Liability on the bond, being contractual, is limited to the amount of the bond [*Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 385, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49]* .

The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b), above*, are mandatory and an order appointing the receiver is void if the applicant's bond is not fixed and filed [*Sweins v. Superior Court (1936) 16 Cal. App. 2d 336, 336, 60 P.2d 313]* . Consequently, the court or courtroom clerk may hold the signedorder appointing receiver and the order to show cause

until the applicant's undertaking or bond, the receiver's undertaking or bond, and the receiver's oath are filed.

At the hearing to appoint a receiver, the applicant must, and other parties may, propose and state the reasons for the specific amounts of the undertakings required from the applicant for any injunction that is ordered in or with the order appointing a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1178*].

A right of action against a party who wrongfully procures the appointment of a receiver accrues on the adjudication that the appointment was improper [*Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 386, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49]* .

[c] Order to Show Cause

Whenever a receiver is appointed without notice, the matter must be made returnable on an order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed. The order to show cause must be made returnable on the earliest date that the business of the court will admit, but not later than 15 days from the date of the order or, if good cause appears to the court, 22 days from the date the order is issued [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)*].

[d] Service of Papers

After the order to show cause has been issued, the applicant must serve the following on each of the adverse parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*]:

- A copy of the complaint if not previously served;
- The order to show cause stating the date, time, and place of the hearing;
- Any declarations supporting the application; and
- A memorandum supporting the application.

Service must be made as soon as reasonably practical, but no later than 5 days after the date on which the order to show cause is issued, unless the court orders another time for service [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*].

[e] Failure to Proceed or Serve Adverse Party

When the matter first comes on for hearing, the party who obtained the appointment must be ready to proceed. If that party is not ready to proceed or has failed to exercise diligence to effect service on the adverse parties as provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b), above*, the court may discharge the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(c)*].

[f] Continuances

The adverse parties are entitled to one continuance to enable them to oppose the confirmation [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(d)*]. If a continuanceis granted under Rule 3.1176(d), the order to show cause remains in effect until the date of the continued hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(d)*].

[4] Noticed Motion

[a] Generally

The usual procedure for obtaining appointment of a receiver is by noticed motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*; for a form of notice of motion, *see § 486.143*], supported by an affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*] (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [for a form of declaration, *see § 486.144*], and by points and authorities [*Cal. Rules of*

Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a), 3.113(a)], followed by a hearing of the motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1304-3.1306*; *Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 274-275, 171 P.2d 75]* . For general discussion of noticed motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

The noticed motion procedure eliminates the necessity of plaintiff's filing an indemnity bond in favor of the defendant as is required when a receiver is appointed on an ex parte application [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*] and must be used unless the delay occasioned by notice will result in irreparable injury [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P. 926]* .

[b] Service of Notice of Motion and Papers

Unless otherwise ordered by the court, the notice of motion accompanied by all the supporting points and authorities, declarations, and other supporting material must be served and filed at least 16 court days before the hearing. The copy served must be a copy of the papers filed or to be filed with the court. Time is extended for a specified number of days, depending on the place of address or place of mailing, or both, when service is by mail. Time is extended two calendar days if service is by facsimile transmission or by express mail or another method of overnight delivery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* (two court day extension in case of electronic service that may apply in that section 1005(b) does not expressly excludes extensions under section 1010.6)].

[c] Service and Filing of Opposing Papers

All papers opposing a noticed motion must be filed with the court and a copy served on each party at least 9 court days before the time appointed for the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*; *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* (two court day extension in case of electronic service that may apply in that section 1005(b) does not expressly excludes extensions under section 1010.6)].

[d] Local Court Rules

In the large metropolitan courts, application for appointment of a receiver pendente lite is commonly made in the law and motion, or writs and receivers, department of the court [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.5(i) (writs and receivers departments); San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.12 (writs and receivers department)].

[5] Hearing

[a] Evidence

The Civil Law and Motion Rules (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1110 et seq.*) expressly apply to applications for an order regarding the appointment of a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*]. Consequently, whether the hearing is on an order to show cause or a noticed motion, evidence received at the hearing must be by declaration or request for judicial notice without testimony or cross examination, unless the court orders otherwise for good cause shown [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)*].

Procedure which must be followed before the hearing in order to seek permission to introduce oral testimony at the hearing is set forth in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)*. Matters of which the court must or may take judicial notice are set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 451* and *452*. Procedure for requesting the court to take judicial notice of matter is specified in *Evid. Code § 453* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(b)* and matters that may be considered by the court in determining the propriety of taking judicial notice is specified in *Evid. Code § 454*.

[b] Nomination of Receiver

On the hearing of an application for appointment of a receiver on notice or on the hearing for confirmation of an

appointment on ex parte application, each party appearing may, at the time of the hearing, suggest in writing one or more persons for appointment or substitution as receiver, stating the reasons [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*]. The written suggestion should set forth the nominee's qualifications, business experience, financial rating, and other relevant matters, and show that the nominee is not disqualified under *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(a), discussed under § 486.14*. Some courts or departments maintain lists of qualified receivers from which appointments are normally made.

The suggestion is without prejudice to any objections the party may make to the appointment or confirmation of the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.16

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.16 Receiver's Oath and Bond

Before entering on the duties of a receiver, the receiver must be sworn to perform the duties faithfully [*Code Civ. Proc. § 567(a)*].

The receiver shall give an undertaking to the State of California in such sum as the court or judge may direct to the effect that the receiver will faithfully discharge the duties of receiver in the action and obey the orders of the court therein [*Code Civ. Proc. § 567(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.810-995.850*]. The receiver shall be allowed the cost of the undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 567(b)*]. Any party for whose benefit the bond or undertaking is given may object to it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.840(b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.140, 995.190*, defining "bond" and "undertaking"]. Objections to bonds are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960*, discussed in Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

At the hearing to appoint a receiver, the applicant must, and other parties may, propose and state the reasons for the specific amounts of the undertakings required from the applicant for any injunction that is ordered in or with the order appointing a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1178*].

Because a receiver may not enter on the duties of receiver until he or she has taken and filed the required oath and undertaking (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567*), some courts will hold the signed order of appointment until the oath and undertaking are filed and then endorse on the order the fact of filing.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDuties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.17

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.17 Appellate Review

[1] Order or Judgment Appointing Receiver

An order or judgment appointing a receiver is appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(7)* (appeal other than in limited civil case), 904.2(h) (appeal in limited civil case)]. However, if the appointment is made on ex parte application, the order appointing the receiver is not appealable; the appeal, if any, is taken from the subsequent order confirming the appointment [*Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 133, 285 P.2d 351* ; *People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 861-862, 181 P.2d 49]* .

The perfecting of an appeal does not stay enforcement of the order or judgment unless an undertaking in a sum fixed by the trial court is given on condition that if the order or judgment is affirmed or the appeal is withdrawn or dismissed, the appellant will pay all damages which the respondent may sustain by reason of the stay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 917.5*].

[2] Order Denying Appointment of Receiver

An order denying appointment of a receiver may, however, be reviewed on a writ of mandate [*Conklin v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 601, 603-604, 36 P.2d 386* ; *see Barclays Bank of California v. Superior Court (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 593, 597, 602, 137 Cal. Rptr. 743* (writ of mandate issued directing superior court to set aside order denying application for appointment of receiver and take further proceedings not inconsistent with the court of appeal's opinion); *see also City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1836, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57* (dicta that order denying appointment is not appealable)]. However, because the appointment of a receiver is a matter largely within the trial court's discretion, the appellate court will not compel the trial court to act in a particular manner unless the case is one in which the court can exerciseits discretion in only one way [*Conklin v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 601, 603-604, 36 P.2d 386* (trial court erred in refusing to make appointment on ground that it lacked jurisdiction to do so; remanded with direction to assume jurisdiction and to rule on the matter as may seem just and proper)].

[3] Order Granting or Denying Motion to Vacate Appointment of Receiver

An order setting aside and vacating an order appointing a receiver that in effect amounts to a discharge of the receiver is of such finality as to be appealable as a final judgment [*Hibernia S. & L. Soc. v. Ellis Estate Co. (1932) 216 Cal. 280, 281-282, 13 P.2d 929* ; *see City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1836, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57]* .

An order denying a request to vacate appointment of a receiver ordinarily is not appealable [*Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Calif. etc. Co. (1911) 159 Cal. 484, 486-487, 114 P. 838* ; *see City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1836, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57* (quoting Witkin, Cal. Procedure, vol. 9. Appeal, § 99, p. 119 (3d ed. 1985))].

[4] Order Appointing Successor Receiver

An order appointing a successor receiver has been held not to be appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(7)* [*City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1839, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57* (case of first impression)]. However, an order appointing a successor receiver is appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)*, if the order was made after an appealable judgment and meets the following two requirements [*City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1836, 1838-1839, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57]* :

- The issues raised by the appeal from the order must be different from those arising from an appeal from the judgment.

- The order must either affect the judgment or relate to it by enforcing it or staying its execution.

Thus, for example, when property owners had municipal code violations on their property, three judgments against them had been obtained ordering compliance, the superior court granted the city's motion to appoint a receiver to complete the necessary work, the order appointing the receiver was affirmed on appeal, the receiver then resigned, and thereafter the city's motion to appoint a successor receiver was granted, an appeal from the order appointing the successor receiver to bring the property into compliance with the municipal code met the above two requirements and was appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)*. The first requirement was met in that the trial court's decision to appoint the successor receiver doesnot raise the same issues as the underlying judgment in that the underlying judgment concerns the property's condition in relation to the municipal code whereas the order appointing a successor receiver is merely concerned with the person's identity who enforces the judgment. The second requirement, that the order either affect the judgment or relate to its enforcement, was also met in that the order appointing a successor receiver relates to the enforcement of the underlying judgment by deciding who will administer the receivership [*City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1838-1839, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57]* .

Appealability of an order appointing a successor receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)* is limited to those issues that the order being appealed from specifically encompasses and does not extend to anything entirely subsumed in earlier orders [*City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1839-1840, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57* (earlier order appointing receiver subsumed issues of appropriateness of receivership or anything related thereto; substantive issue that may be raised on appeal limited to question of successor receiver's qualifications)]. Moreover, appealability of an order appointing a successor receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)* is limited to those cases in which the order being appealed from is postjudgment [*City and County of San Francisco v. Shers (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1831, 1840, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending

AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.18

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.18 Collateral Attack on Order of Appointment

If the appointment of a receiver is made in a case that does not come within the class of cases in which appointment of a receiver is authorized, or if the trial court's order is for any other reason in excess of jurisdiction, the order is void and subject to collateral attack [*see, e.g., Baker v. Varney (1900) 129 Cal. 564, 565, 62 P. 100* (defense that appointment of receiver in mortgage foreclosure action was void sustained in action by receiver to recover possession of cattle claimed to be rents and profits of mortgaged property); *In re Stein (1936) 14 Cal. App. 2d 303, 305-306, 58 P.2d 175* (person convicted of conducting sale in violation of statute as unable, in seeking release from incarceration by habeas corpus, to rely on court order appointing him receiver to conduct sale when order of appointment was void); *In re Carroll (1933) 135 Cal. App. 672, 676-677, 28 P.2d 84* (order of appointment of receiver held void in habeas corpus proceeding by contemnor to secure release from commitment for disobedience of order not to interfere with receiver in selling property)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.19

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.19 Appointment of Receiver in Enforcement of Judgment Proceedings

[1] In General

A receiver may be appointed in enforcement of judgment proceedings either to enforce a judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 708.620, 712.060*] or to preserve the value of property levied on [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070*].

Appointment of a receiver to enforce a court order applying a franchise to the satisfaction of a money judgment is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.920(b)* [for discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*]. Appointment of a receiver to enforce a judgment, order, or decree made in a proceeding under the Family Code is authorized by *Fam. Code § 290* [for discussion, *see* Ch. 258, *Family Law Enforcement: General Enforcement Principles and Remedies*].

[2] To Enforce Judgment

[a] Showing Required

The court may appoint a receiver to enforce a money judgment when the judgment creditor shows that, considering the interests of both the judgment creditor and the judgment debtor, the appointment of a receiver is a reasonable method to obtain the fair and orderly satisfaction of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 708.620*].

The California Law Revision Commission has pointed out that under Code Civ. Proc. § 708.620, *above* , a receiver may be appointed in the following situations [15 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 2525-2526 (1980); 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 2100 (1982) (Assembly Report); *see Evans v. Galardi (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 291, 294, 155 Cal. Rptr. 505]* :

- When a writ of execution would not reach certain property and other remedies appear inadequate.

- In examination proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 708.110-708.205* when the requisite showing is made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.620*.

- To enforce a charging order (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 708.310*) against a partnership under former *Corp. Code § 15028* (*now see Corp. Code § 16504*, which replaced former *Corp. Code § 15028* on Jan. 1, 1999) or against a limited partnership under *Corp. Code § 15522* (*now see Corp. Code § 15907.03*, [charging order under Uniform Limited Partnership Act of 2008]).

The application of a debtor's interest in an alcoholic beverage license to the satisfaction of a money judgment, including the appointment of a receiver to transfer the judgment debtor's interest in a transferable license, is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.630*. Pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. §§ 708.620 and 708.630, *above* , and Code Civ. Proc. § 708.610, *below* , the court may also appoint a receiver to enforce a judgment for possession or sale of property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 712.060*].

The appointment, qualifications, powers, rights, and duties of a receiver appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.620* are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-570* (receivers) and by *Code Civ. Proc. § 571* (undertaking required of a court referee or commissioner whose duties will involve custody of personal property or receipt or disbursement of money) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 708.610*].

[b] Discretion and Control of Court

The appointment of a receiver in aid of execution rests wholly within the discretion of the court and, on appointment, the receiver is subject to the continued direction and control of the court. However, the power to appoint a receiver is a delicate one that is exercised sparingly and with caution, and only in an extreme case under such circumstances as demand or require summary relief, and never in a doubtful case or when there is no necessity or occasion for the appointment [*Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281]* . The appointment may be made when there are reasonable grounds to believe that the judgment debtor, or third parties, have control of property which rightfully should be subject to execution. However, the receiver has no greater rights against others than the judgment creditor would have [*Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281]* . For example, a judgment creditor seeking to sell an occupied dwelling to collect on a money judgment may not bypass *Code Civ. Proc. § 704.740* (regarding homestead exemptions) when the sale is conducted by a receiver rather than by a sheriff [*Wells Fargo Financial Leasing, Inc. v. D & M Cabinets, 177 Cal. App. 4th 59, 67-69, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 97]* .

[c] Notice Motion

Although the appointment of a receiver to enforce a money judgment is normally made in conjunction with statutory proceedings supplemental to execution [former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 714-723*], now referred to as examination proceedings and covered in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 708.110-708.205*, the court may, in a proper case, appoint a receiver on noticed motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)* [or *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*] without the necessity of supplemental, or examination, proceedings [*Olsan v. Comora (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 642, 647-649, 140 Cal. Rptr. 835]* .

[3] To Preserve Value of Property Levied on

On the application of the judgment creditor, the judgment debtor, or a person who has filed a third-party claim pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 720.010-720.800* (third-party claims and related procedures), a receiver may be appointed by the court to take any action necessary to preserve the value of property levied on, including without limitation the selling of the property if the court determines that the property is perishable or will greatly deteriorate or greatly depreciate in value or that for some other reason the interests of the parties will be best served by the order. The application for appointment of a receiver must be by noticed motion if the court so directs or a court rule so provides; otherwise it may

be made ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070(a)*].

The appointment, qualifications, powers, rights, and duties of the receiver are, except as otherwise provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070*, governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-570* (receivers) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 571* (undertaking required of a court referee or commissioner whose duties will involve custody of personal property or receipt or disbursement of money) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070(d)*].

The daily fee of the receiver is fixed by the court, which may order the judgment creditor to pay the receiver's fees and expenses in advance or may direct that the whole or any part of the fees and expenses be paid from the proceeds of any sale of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070(d)*].

Except as otherwise provided by order of the court, any sale of the property must be made in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 701.510-701.680* and the proceeds applied to the satisfaction of the judgment in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 701.810-701.830* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070(c)*]. Notice of sale must be posted and served at a reasonable time before the sale, considering the character and condition of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

15 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.20-486.29

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.20[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.30

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.30 Powers of Receivers

[1] Generally

A receiver is an officer of the court subject to its continuing control, and has only those powers granted by statute, by the order of appointment, and by subsequent court orders [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568*; *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 930, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027* ; *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703* ; *Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347]* . After appointment a receiver may petition for additional authority or instructions as the need arises [*see Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 696, 699-700, 303 P.2d 80* ; *Free Gold Mining Co. v. Spiers (1901) 135 Cal. 130, 131-132, 67 P. 61* ; *In re Executive Life Ins. Co. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 344, 399-400, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453]* .

[2] To Take Possession of and Manage Property

A receiver has power, under the control of the court, to take and keep possession of the property, to receive rents, collect debts, to compound for and compromise the same, to make transfers, and generally to do such acts respecting the property as the court may authorize [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568*].

The receiver acquires no title to the property, however, but only the right of possession as the officer of the court. Title remains in those in whom it was vested when the appointment was made [*North v. Cecil B. DeMille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 58, 39 P.2d 199]* . The receiver also takes the property in the condition in which it exists and subject to all liens and equities of others in it [*H.D. Roosen Co. v. Pacific Radio Pub. Co. (1932) 123 Cal. App. 525, 534, 11 P.2d 873]* . Because a receiver acquires no greater interest in an estate than the one from whom he or she takes, it follows that choses in action pass to the receiver subject to any right of setoff existing at the time of the receiver's appointment [*People v. California etc. Trust Co. (1914) 168 Cal. 241, 246, 141 P. 1181* ; *Downey v. Humphreys (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 323, 336, 227 P.2d 484]* . In sum, the receiver, as a custodian of the property subject to the orders of the court, becomes clothed with the title of the debtor and takes the property cum onere, that is, in the plight

and condition existing at the time of his or her appointment, subject to all liens and equities, including the right of set-off, and impressed with the legal and equitable rights and claims of creditors, and no lien or contract is disturbed or altered by the court's intervention [*Wright v. Standard Engineering Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 244, 248, 104 Cal. Rptr. 539]* .

In the event a party to an action refuses to comply with the demand made by receiver for turnover of property which is part of the receivership estate or a party interferes with the receiver's rights to take possession of that property, the receiver has a right to seek to have that party to be found in contempt of the receivership order, by initiating contempt proceedings before the court that appointed the receiver [*Crouse v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1915) 28 Cal. App. 625, 153 P. 723]* .

[3] To Bring and Defend Actions

Under the control of the court, a receiver has power to bring and defend actions in his or her own name, as receiver [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568*; for further discussion, *see § 486.50* et seq.].

[4] To Employ Attorney

A receiver must not employ an attorney without the approval of the court. The application for approval must be in writing and state the necessity for the employment, the name of the attorney whom the receiver proposes to employ, and that the attorney is not attorney for, associated with, nor employed by an attorney for any party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*; *see also § 486.152*, (form of petition)].

If a receiver retains an attorney to assist in the discharge of his or her duties, the attorney-client privilege applies to communications between the receiver and the attorney [*Shannon v. Superior Court (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 986, 993-994, 266 Cal. Rptr. 242]* . The court cannot compel disclosure of the communications, even if disclosure is in the best interests of the proceeding or the parties, unless there is evidence of a waiver, lack of confidential intent, or some exception to the privilege [*Shannon v. Superior Court (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 986, 994-995, 996-997, 266 Cal. Rptr. 242]* . For discussion of the attorney-client privilege generally, see Ch. 190, *Depositions and Discovery* .

[5] To Deposit Securities

Under the control of the court, a receiver may deposit any securities he or she holds in a securities depository, as defined in *Fin. Code § 30004*, which is licensed under *Fin. Code § 30200* or exempted from licensing by *Fin. Code § 30005* or *30006*, and such securities may be held by the securities depository in the manner authorized by *Fin. Code § 775* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.1*].

[6] To Deposit Receivership Funds

Funds in the hands of a receiver may be deposited in one or more interest bearing accounts in the name and for the benefit of the receivership estate with one or more financial institutions, provided that all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 569*]:

- The deposits are fully guaranteed or insured under federal law.

- The financial institution in which the funds are deposited is not a party to the action in which the receiver is appointed.

- The receiver does not own 1 percent or more in value of the outstanding stock of the financial institution, is not an officer, director, or employee of the financial institution, and is not a sibling, whether by the whole or half-blood, spouse, aunt, uncle, nephew, niece, ancestor, or lineal descendant of

an owner, officer, employee, or director.

[7] To Sell Receivership Property

A receiver may sell real or personal property in receivership pursuant to court order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*; for further discussion, *see § 486.32*].

[8] To Borrow Money

In the event a receivership estate is insolvent, a receiver has the power to borrow money and, as security for loans made to the receiver, to issue receivership certificates which become first liens on the property which is the subject of the receivership estate when issued under the direction and control of the court that appointed the receiver [*see Title Insurance etc. Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1915) 171 Cal. 173, 152 P. 542]* .

[9] Assumption and Rejection of Contracts

Once a receiver is appointed, a receiver has a reasonable opportunity to either affirm and assume pre-receivership contracts or to reject those contracts. A receiver is normally allowed a reasonable time to decide whether or not to assume or reject a pre-receivership contract [*Ross Lumber & Mill Co. v. Muscupiabe Land & Water Co. (1898) 120 Cal. 521, 52 P. 995* ; *H.D. Roosen Co. v. Pacific Radio Publishing Co. (1932) 123 Cal. App. 525* , *11 P.2d 873]* . Once a pre-receivership contract is assumed, it becomes a liability of the receivership estate. Therefore, a receiver should exercise caution before assuming or rejecting such contracts and should determine whether or not the receivership estate will have sufficient assets to make it possible to pay the assumed contract.

[10] Impact of Bankruptcy Filing

Normally if a receiver is appointed over property in an action and the defendant files bankruptcy, the provisions of the automatic stay set forth in *11 U.S.C. § 362* will require the receiver to turn over possession of the property over which he or she has been appointed back to the defendant. However, under *11 U.S.C. § 543(d)* the creditor who is responsible for appointment of the receiver can file a motion in the Bankruptcy Court requesting an order that the receiver be excused from turning over the assets over which he or she was appointed to the Chapter 11 debtor. In considering this motion, the Bankruptcy Court must determine whether or not it would be in the "interest of creditors" for the receiver to remain in possession of the property over which he or she was appointed [*11 U.S.C. § 543(d)*]. A motion of this type should be made promptly after any bankruptcy filing by a defendant, so as to avoid any contention which may be made by the defendant that the receiver's maintaining possession of the property over which he or she was appointed violates the automatic stay.

For further discussion of the stay, see *Ch. 94, Bankruptcy, § 94.30* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDeposits in CourtCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowersEvidencePrivilegesAttorney-Client PrivilegeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.31

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.31 Duties of Receiver

[1] To Act Faithfully

A receiver takes an oath to perform his or her duties faithfully and gives a bond to the effect that he or she will faithfully discharge the duties of receiver in the action and obey the orders of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 567*; *see § 486.10* et seq.]. A receiver stands in the position of a court-appointed fiduciary [*see Stewart v. State of California (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 345, 348, 77 Cal. Rptr. 418* ; *see also Seccombe v. Dionne (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 731, 734, 40 P.2d 299]* and must refrain from entering into any of the contracts, arrangements, agreements, or understandings prohibited by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)*, discussed at *§ 486.14*.

[2] To File Inventories

A receiver must, within 30 days after appointment, or within such other time as the court may order, file an inventory containing a complete and detailed list of all property of which the receiver has taken possession by virtue of the appointment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*]. The receiver must promptly file a supplementary inventory of all subsequently obtained property [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*]. For a form of inventory, see *§ 486.150*.

[3] To Publish Notice of Unclaimed Funds and Report to Court

A receiver having any funds belonging to a person whose whereabouts are unknown, shall, before receiving his or her discharge as receiver, publish a notice in one or more newspapers published in the county, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks, setting forth the owner's name, last known place of residence or post office address, and the amount of the unclaimed funds [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*; *see § 486.153* (form of notice)].

Any funds unclaimed for 30 days after the date of the last publication shall be reported to the court and, on order of the court, paid into the State Treasury accompanied by a copy of the order, which must set forth the facts required in the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*; *see § 486.154* (form of order)]. The funds shall be deemed to have been received by the

State under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1500-1582*, the Unclaimed Property Law, and may be recovered in the manner prescribed in those sections [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*; *see* Ch. 252, *Escheat (Unclaimed Funds)*].

[4] To File Reports and Accounts

The receiver must provide monthly reports to the parties and, if requested, to nonparty client lien holders. These reports must include [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*]:

- A narrative report of events;
- A financial report; and
- A statement of all fees paid to the receiver, employees, and professionals showing:
  - Itemized services;
  - A breakdown of the services by 1/10 hour increments;
  - If the fees are hourly, the hourly fees; and
  - If the fees are on another basis, that basis.

The monthly reports are not to be filed with the court unless the court so orders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*]. Interim fees are subject to final review and approval by the court. The court retains jurisdiction to award a greater or lesser amount as the full, fair, and final value of the services received [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*].

A party may object to a receiver's interim report. Unless good cause is shown, objections to a receiver's interim report and accounting must be made within 10 days of notice of the report and accounting. The objections must be specific and must be delivered to the receiver and all partiesentitled to service of the interim report and accounting [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*; *see also* discussion at *§ 486.36*].

Before a receiver may be discharged, he or she must file a final report and account [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184*; *see also, e.g., Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232-233, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; for further discussion, *see § 486.35*].

[5] To Petition For Instructions

Since a receiver is an officer of the court, he or she is subject to its continuing control and instructions. Therefore, in the event a receiver is uncertain about how to proceed in a case with respect to taking or not taking a particular action, he or she may apply to the court for instructions [*Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

[6] To Notify Court Regarding Substandard Rental Property

A receiver of real property containing rental housing must notify the court of the existence of any order or notice to correct any substandard or unsafe condition, as defined in *Health and Safety Code § 17920.3* or § 17920.10, with which the receiver cannot comply within the time provided by the order or notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(a)*]. The notice must be filed within 30 days after the receiver's appointment or, if the substandard condition occurs subsequently, within 15 days of its occurrence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(b)*]. The notice must inform the court of all of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(c)*]:

- The substandard conditions that exist.

- The threat or danger that the substandard conditions pose to any occupant of the property or the public.

- The approximate cost and time involved in abating the conditions. If more time is needed to approximate the cost, then the notice must provide the date on which the approximate cost will be filed with the court and that date must be within 10 days of the filing.

- Whether the receivership estate is likely to contain sufficient funds to abate the conditions.

If the receivership estate does not contain sufficient funds to abate the conditions, the receiver must request further instructions or orders from the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(d)*]. The court, on receiving notice pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(d)*, must consider appropriate orders or instructions to enable the receiver to correct the substandard conditions or to terminate or limit the period of receivership [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2(e)*].

If, with respect to real property subject to a receivership, (a) substandard conditions exist, as defined by *Health and Safety Code § 17920.10*, or *(b)*a dispute or controversy exists concerning the powers or duties of the receiver affecting a tenant or the public, any of the following may file a motion in a receivership action for the purpose of seeking further instructions or orders from the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.3*]:

- Any tenant of real property that is subject to receivership,

- A tenant association or organization, or

- Any federal, state, or local enforcement agency.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesReal Property LawLandlord & TenantDuty to Repair

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.32

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.32 Sale of Receivership Property

[1] Statutory Authority

Pursuant to a court order, a receiver may sell real or personal property in his or her possession on the notice and in the manner prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 701.510-701.680* (relating to sale of property levied on). The sale is not final, however, until confirmed by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*]. In a proper case, the action of a receiver in equity in selling receivership property, though taken without prior court authorization, may be ratified by subsequent court approval. Thus, when a receiver has acted in good faith and when what the receiver has done has been beneficial to the interested parties, his or her acts, though taken without court authorization, should be subsequently approved [*People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 582, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68]* .

[2] Nature of Receiver's Sale

A receiver's sale is a judicial sale as distinguished from a sale under execution, and in the absence of a statute otherwise providing, the court may authorize a receiver to sell property at either a private or public sale [*People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 583, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*, providing that the receiver may sell property on the notice and in the manner prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 701.510-701.680* (relating to sale of property levied on in enforcing a judgment), does not compel a different result; it means merely that unless the court prescribes a different mode of sale, a receiver, when authorized, must sell property in the manner provided for sales on execution. When the receiver sells receivership property in a private sale made without prior court authorization, the court, having had power to authorize a private sale in the first instance, possesses the power to subsequently approve the sale [*People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 585, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68]* .

[3] Analysis Required of Court in Ordering Sale

In determining whether to order a sale, a court must engage in a two-level analysis, first deciding whether a sale is required and then determining when the sale should take place. In some cases the court may decide asale is necessary

but leave time for the receiver to obtain a favorable price rather than accede to a single offer discounted to reflect the alleged emergency nature of the transaction. Naturally, a court will focus on the same factors at both analytical stages, but it will likely allocate different weights to these factors at each step. For example, evidence that improved real property is not generating capital and could in the future suffer a substantial deficit or be subject to an adverse judgment or foreclosure might be adequate to order a sale but might not be sufficient to order an immediate sale. On the other hand, evidence the property is faced with imminent destruction or substantial devaluation could justify an immediate sale to any available purchaser [*Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 275 n.7, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

[4] Selling Price

If a court orders the sale of receivership property, the receiver has the affirmative duty to endeavor to realize the largest amount from the sale. A court confirming the sale of property should also attempt to obtain the best bargain possible under the circumstances [*Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 276 n.8, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

[5] Court's Considerations in Confirming Sale

Judicial confirmation of a receiver's sale rests on the appointing court's sound discretion exercised in view of all the surrounding facts and circumstances and in the interest of fairness, justice, and the rights of the respective parties. The proper exercise of discretion requires the court to consider all material facts and evidence and to apply legal principles essential to an informed, intelligent, and just decision [*Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 274, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703]* . The status of the litigation and the effect a sale would have on the parties are both facts and circumstances the court must consider before confirming a sale [*Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 276, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.33

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.33 Termination of Receivership

The functions of a receiver appointed pendente lite terminate on entry of judgment. Completion of the duties for which the receiver was appointed also terminates the receiver's functions. In addition, the receiver's functions may be terminated by a prior order of court, such as an order to deliver possession of property held to a designated person or firm. The order may be made on ex parte application on a sworn showing that thepurpose of the receivership has ceased. The order may direct the receiver to file an account within a specified number of days.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.34

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.34 Prior Removal of Receiver

The power of a court of equity to remove or discharge a receiver is a necessary adjunct of the power of appointment and may be exercised at any stage of the litigation [*Hozz v. Varga (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 539, 544, 333 P.2d 113]* . Hence, a receiver may be removed by the court prior to the termination of the receivership, in which event the receiver will be directed to file an account with the court [*see, e.g., Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* (receiver relieved on motion of party and substitute receiver appointed); *see also Hanno v. Superior Court (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 639, 641, 87 P.2d 50]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.35

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.35 Wages Owed to Pre-Receivership Employees

Normally, when a receiver is appointed, the receiver is under no obligation to pay the defendant or any of its employees wages or vacation pay for amounts which are owed prior to the time the receiver was appointed, unless the receiver has specifically affirmed and assumed the pre-receivership contracts of the defendant. [*Pacific Western Oil Co. v. McDuffie (9th Cir. 1934) 69 F.2d 208]* . Therefore, to avoid liability for such claims, the receiver should not assume pre-petition contracts of this type unless there are funds available in the receivership estate to pay for wages and vacation pay which are owed to the defendant's employees for pre-receivership services.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.36

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.36 Receiver's Accounts and Reports

[1] Generally

A receiver's monthly reports need not to be filed with the court unless the court so orders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*; *see § 486.31[4]*], but a party may object to a receiver's interim report [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*, discussed at [2], *below*, and at § 486.31[4]].

A receiver must present a final account and report by noticed motion or stipulation of all parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(a)*]. If any allowance of compensation for the receiver or for an attorney employed by the receiver is claimed in an account, it must state in detail what services have been performed by the receiver or the attorney, and whether previous allowances have been made to the receiver or attorney and the amounts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*]. For forms of final report and account and notice of final account and report, see 486.147, *486.158*.

[2] Objections and Claims

Any party may file objections to the account or claims against the receivership estate [*see Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 388, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49]* . This applies also to nonparties who are creditors of the receivership estate [*Kirk v. Kirk (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 580, 582, 52 Cal. Rptr. 725* (involving objections to account by and claims of United States Government and State of California for taxes and unemployment insurance contributions)]. A party may object to a receiver's interim report, and unless good cause is shown, objections to a receiver's interim report and accounting must be made within 10 days of notice of the report and accounting, must be specific, and must be delivered to the receiver and all parties entitled to service of the interim report and accounting [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*]. Any objections filed or claims made against the receivership will be determined by the court on the hearing of the receiver's report [*see, e.g., Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766]* .

[3] Surcharge for Losses

The receiver may, on the final account and report, be personally surcharged for any losses to the receivership estate based on his or her misconduct or mismanagement [*Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 233-234, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766]* .

[4] Claim for Fees

If any allowance of compensation for the receiver or for an attorney or other professional employed by the receiver is claimed on a report, the report must itemize the services, break the services down into 1/10 of an hour increments, if the fees are hourly, state the hourly fees, and if the fees are on another basis, state that basis [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*]. Interim fees are subject to final review and approval by the court. The court retains jurisdiction to award a greater or lesser amount as the full, fair, and final value of the services received [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*; *see § 486.157* (form)].

The amount of the receiver's fee or compensation and expenses and attorney fees properly chargeable against the receivership property is within the sound discretion of the trial court [*see Melikian v. Aquila, Ltd. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1364, 1368, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 739* ; *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 587, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68* ; *Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 713, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787]* .

[5] Real Property Taxes

Receivers are obligated to pay all taxes on real property in their possession which fall due during the time they are in possession as receiverswithout any prorating based on the proportion between the period of possession and the period covered by the taxes. Taxes falling due during the period of receivership are regarded as ordinary expenses of operating the property, and the full amount of such taxes paid are properly allowed as an operating expense of the receivership [*Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 680-681, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633]* . The rule is different, however, if the taxes accrued before the receiver took possession. For example, a receiver is not entitled to credits for taxes paid to redeem from a tax sale the real property subject to receivership when such taxes are paid for the benefit of the owner of the trust deed on the property [*Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 680 n. 3, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633* , citing *United States v. Giragossiantz (9th Cir. 1973) 488 F.2d 358*)].

[6] Lien Claims

Expenditures incurred by a receiver with the consent of lienholders may be paid ahead of the lien. Accordingly, when a receiver is lawfully appointed at the instance and for the benefit of lien creditors, all proper charges, expenses, and liabilities incurred as incident to duly conferred receivership powers and duties are a charge on the earnings and corpus of the property superior to the lien creditors who take part in, or expressly or impliedly consent to or acquiesce in, the receivership proceedings. Similarly, the expenses of the operation of a business are prior to the claims of lienors who have acquiesced in, agreed to, and consented to, the appointment of a receiver and operation of the business by the receiver, although they have not actively procured the appointment, or who, while not the applicants on whose petition the receiver was appointed, are privy to the action which results in the appointment [*Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 679, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633]* .

[7] Effect of Approval of Account

The court's approval of the receiver's final report and account is res judicata not only as to the matters actually litigated at the time the account was settled but as to matters that could or should have been litigated at that time [*Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 234, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766]* . Because the receiver in his or her personal capacity may be surcharged for losses to the receivership estate based on his or her misconduct or mismanagement, such matters include any claim for damages resulting from the receiver's failure to have properly discharged the duties of receiver [*Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 234, 183 Cal.*

Rptr. 766] .

PRACTICE TIP:

Because of the res judicata effect of the court's approval of the receiver's final accounting, it is normally good practice for the receiverand/or his or her counsel to serve a motion to approve of the receiver's final report and account on all parties who may have claims against the receiver and/or the receivership estate. In the event that a party having a potential claim against the receivership estate receives a copy of the receiver's final report and account and does not object to the report, that party has probably waived any claims it may have against the receiver and/or the receivership estate because of the res judicata effect of the final report and account.

[8] Discharge of Receiver

The court has power to discharge the receiver at any time before termination of the receivership [*see Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *see also §§ 486.33, 486.34*].

The termination of a lawsuit gives cause for the discharge of a receiver, but it does not in and of itself effect the discharge. A receiver can be discharged only by order of the court after the receiver has had the time and opportunity to prepare and present his or her account. This is true even if the plaintiff dismisses the action before any appearance is made in the case by the defendant [*Hanno v. Superior Court (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 639, 641, 87 P.2d 50]* .

On approval of the receiver's report and account, the receiver will be ordered discharged and the bond exonerated on completion of the disbursements and other requirements in accordance with the order settling and approving the receiver's final report and account [*see Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *see § 486.159* (form of order)].

In the event the receivership estate is insolvent upon discharge of a receiver, the mere fact that a party was responsible for appointing receiver does not mean that party is responsible for payment of all fees and expenses of the receivership estate [*see* 2 Clark, A Treatise on the Law and Practice of Receivers, § 641(i) (1959 3d Ed.)].

[9] Appeal

The order settling the account of the receiver is a final appealable order [*Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 233, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 677 n.1, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633]* .

For discussion of when an order setting aside and vacating an order appointing a receiver may be appealable, see discussion under *§ 486.17*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilitiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminationsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionInterlocutory Orders

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.37

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.37 Foreign Receiverships

Normally, a receiver appointed by a court in a state outside of California has no authority to exercise its powers over property in California [*Melvin v. Carl (1931) 118 Cal. App. 249, 4 P.2d 954]* . Moreover, where a creditor in California and a receiver appointed outside of California both claim an interest in property located in California, the foreign receiver will normally not be permitted to prevail on his or claim to the property located in California. [*Lackmann v. Supreme Council of Order of Chosen Friends (1904) 142 Cal. 22, 75 P. 583]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

24 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.38-486.49

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.38[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.50

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.50 Actions by Receiver

A receiver has, under the control of the court, power to bring actions in his or her own name, as receiver [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568*; *see Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 352-353, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* (special or express permission required as to whether and against whom to commence action)]. However, a distinction may be made between an action by a receiver to recover funds which have come into his or her possession and an action to recover funds which were never in his or her possession, or which were in his or her possession, subject to a prior lien. In such cases the general authority conferred on the receiver by the order of appointment may not be sufficient to enable him or her to bring the action and specific authority must be obtained from the appointing court [*Bishop v. McKillican (1899) 124 Cal. 321, 325-327, 57 P. 76]* . Thus, on leave of the appointing court, a receiver for a corporation which does not own funds but has an assertable interest in the funds as conditional or contingent owner, has the right to bring an action for the recovery of the funds [*Holzman v. United California Bank (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 833, 835, 839, 57 Cal. Rptr. 33]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.51

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.51 Actions Against Receiver

[1] Court Permission Required

A receiver has, under the control of the court, power to defend actions in his or her own name, as receiver [*Code Civ. Proc. § 568*]. However, a receiver is a court appointed official and may not be sued without the permission of the appointing court [*McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375* ; *Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790]* . The rule was established to protect receivers from unnecessary litigation [*Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 83, 84, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790]* . The rule does not apply, however, to proceedings to enforce a judgment lien against property in receivership inasmuch as a receiver takes property subject to all prior liens and encumbrances against it. Because creditors' rights are conferred by statuteand cannot be denied by the court appointing a receiver, that court's permission to enforce the lien is not required [*Petaluma S. Bank v. Superior Court (1896) 111 Cal. 488, 495-496, 502, 44 P. 177]* .

The failure to secure prior court permission is not jurisdictional but a mere irregularity, a plea in abatement, which can be raised by demurrer or answer to the third party's complaint; the defect can be cured by securing subsequent court approval and is waived by the receiver's failure to object [*Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 82-84, 86, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790]* . Should a person sue the receiver without having obtained prior leave of court to do so, and the court appointing the receiver subsequently refuses to give its consent, the receiver's demurrer to the complaint should be sustained without leave to amend, but not "with prejudice" [*see* *Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 85-87, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790]* .

A motion to sue and a motion to intervene are timely even if the primary action has been dismissed, as long as they are made before the receiver's final accounting and discharge [*Jun v. Myers (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 117, 124, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 537]* . If the receiver has already been discharged, a plaintiff who has an action pending against the receiver may still obtain the court's permission to sue if the plaintiff was not a party to the receivership and had no notice of the discharge, and if the receiver was aware of the plaintiff's claim and should have included it in the receiver's final

account to the court before obtaining the discharge [*Vitug v. Griffin (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 488, 495-497, 262 Cal. Rptr. 588]* .

[2] Independent Suit or Intervention

On application for leave to sue, the appointing court may grant leave to sue the receiver in an independent action, or it may deny leave and require the claimant to assert its claim by intervening in the receivership proceedings [*Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790* ; *Garris v. Mitchell (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 430, 433-434, 46 P.2d 225]* .

Although in a proper case leave to sue the receiver in another court will not be denied, and under some situations the denial of leave may amount to an abuse of discretion, ordinarily the court has a wide discretion in the matter. It may not properly refuse leave to sue when it cannot afford the same relief in intervention as the applicant is entitled to in an independent action or when, by virtue of a statute or constitutional provision, a particular kind of action must be brought in a jurisdiction other than that in which the receivership proceeding is pending. But permission may be denied when full relief can be granted by intervention in the receivership proceeding. The more common practice, and the one generally recommended, is to hear and determine all right of action and demands against a receiver by petition in the cause in which he or she was appointed [*Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790* ; *see De Forrest v. Coffey (1908) 154 Cal. 444, 449-453, 98 P. 27]* . The trial court does not have discretionto assess the merits of the proposed lawsuit or action in intervention. Denial of both the motion to intervene and the motion to file a separate action implicates due process. Thus, it is improper for a trial court to deny both the request to intervene and the request for leave to file a separate action [*Jun v. Myers (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 117, 125, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 537]* .

Should the court deny a petition to sue the receiver in an independent action when the petition discloses a case where it should be granted, mandate will lie to compel the court to grant the petition [*De Forrest v. Coffey (1908) 154 Cal. 444, 454, 98 P. 27* ; *see Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 199, 172 P.2d 763]* .

[3] Tort Liability

A receiver is not personally liable for torts committed in the performance of his or her receivership duties; liability is in the receiver's official capacity only to be satisfied from the receivership estate [*McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375* (quoting Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, Provisional Remedies, § 364 (3d ed.)); *see Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 201,172 P.2d 763]* . Hence, an application for permission to sue a receiver for damages for personal injuries resulting from the receiver's negligent maintenance and management of the property in receivership should be granted when the proposed complaint states a cause of action against the receiver in the receiver's official capacity and shows no duty owed to the injured person by the receiver in his or her individual capacity [*Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 200, 202, 172 P.2d 763* (involving receivership of apartment house)].

[4] Garnishment and Attachment

Property in the custody of a receiver is generally not subject to garnishment or attachment without the court's consent. Because the receiver is appointed by the court, he or she becomes an officer of the court; thus the receiver's custody is actually the custody of the court. But when there has been a final determination that a party has a right to a certain share of the funds held by a receiver, the receiver is subject to garnishment by a creditor of the party so entitled after the court has ordered the receiver to pay it [*Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84-85, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil

ProcedurePartiesInterventionMotions to InterveneCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGarnishmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilitiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.52

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.52 Employment of Attorney

A receiver may not employ an attorney without the approval of the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*; *discussed under § 486.30* et seq.]. Consequently, whether the receiver sues or is sued, application for leave to employ an attorney may be necessary [*see § 486.152* (petition)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.53

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.53 Actions on Receiver's Bond

A receiver's undertaking must be given to the State of California [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 567(b), 995.810-995.850*]. An undertaking given to the State of California may be enforced by or for the benefit of, and in the name of, any and all persons for whose benefit the bond was given who are damaged by breach of the condition of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(a)*]. Any such person may, in addition to any other remedy he or she has, enforce the liability on the bond in his or her own name, without assignment of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(b)*]. The manner of enforcing liability is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410-996.495*. For further discussion and forms for use in actions to enforce the liability on a bond, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.54-486.59

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.54[Reserved]

30 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.60

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.60 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to forms in this chapter, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.61

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.61 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

Order appointing receiver as appealable. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(7)* (in other than limited civil case), 904.2(h) (in limited civil case)

Undertaking required to stay on appeal judgment or order appointing receiver. *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.5*

[2] Appointment

Authority for appointment in limited civil case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)*

Grounds for appointment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*

[3] Attachment

Appointment of receiver of attached property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 488.700*

[4] Attorneys

Appointment of receiver to take possession and control of bank accounts relating to attorney's law practice after attorney has stopped practicing law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180.5(g)*

[5] Bonds and Undertakings

Undertaking required of applicant when receiver is appointed on ex parte application. *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*

Undertaking required of receiver. *Code Civ. Proc. § 567(b)*

Undertaking required to stay on appeal judgment appointing receiver. *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.5*

Bond and Undertaking Law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*

Bond required of receiver as inapplicable to specified public officers and entities. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.220*

Appointment of receiver at request of Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, or Attorney General, pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 129173* (receiver for borrower or borrower's assets when borrower may be unable to fulfill its obligations under insured loan transaction subjectto California Health Facility Construction Loan Insurance Law). *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)*

[6] Continuances and Extensions of Time

Continuances under *Code Civ. Proc. § 595* (when party, attorney of record, or principal witness is member of California State Legislature) as not to be granted if continuance would defeat or abridge right to invoke remedy of receivership of failing business. *Code Civ. Proc. § 595*

Extensions of time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1(a)* (when attorney for moving party is member of California State Legislature) as not to be granted if extension would defeat or abridge right to invoke remedy of receivership of failing business. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1(b)*

[7] Corporations

Appointment of receiver when corporation has been dissolved, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 565*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(5)*

Appointment of receiver when corporation is insolvent, is in imminent danger of insolvency, or has forfeited its corporate rights. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(6)*

Appointment of receiver at request of Public Utilities Commissioner pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 855* (receivership of water or sewer system corporation). *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*

Appointment of receiver by superior court on dissolution of corporation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 565*

Appointment of receiver in action for involuntary dissolution of corporation. *Corp. Code § 1803*

[8] Escheat Proceedings

Appointment of receiver to take charge of estate pending settlement of title. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1422*

[9] Execution and Enforcement of Judgments

Judgment or order to sell real property as enforceable by appointment of receiver. *Fam. Code § 290*

Judgment, order, or decree made or entered under Family Code as enforceable by appointment of receiver. Fam. Code § 90

Appointment of receiver after judgment to carry judgment into effect. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3)*

Appointment of receiver after judgment to dispose of property according to judgment, or to preserve it during pendency of appeal, or pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.* (enforcement of judgments), or after sale of real property pursuant to decree of foreclosure, during redemption period, to collect, expend, and disburse rents as directed by court or otherwise provided by law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-570 (receivers) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 571* (court commissioners and referees) as law applicable to appointment, qualifications,powers, rights, and duties of receiver appointed to enforce judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.610*

Appointment of receiver to preserve value of property levied on. *Code Civ. Proc. § 699.070*

Appointment of receiver as authorized when it is shown that appointment is reasonable method to obtain fair and orderly satisfaction of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.620*

Appointment of receiver to transfer judgment debtor's interest in transferable alcoholic beverage license to be applied to satisfaction of money judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.630*

Appointment of receiver to enforce judgment for possession or sale of property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 712.060*

Enforcement of support orders in guardianship, conservatorship, and other protective proceedings by appointment of receiver. *Prob. Code § 3090*

[10] Foreclosure Actions

Appointment of receiver in action by secured lender for foreclosure of deed of trust or mortgage. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*

[11] Fraudulent Transactions

Appointment of receiver to take charge of fraudulently transferred asset or its proceeds. *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(3)(B)*

Appointment of receiver in action by vendor to vacate fraudulent purchase of property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*

[12] Hazardous Substance Inspection

Appointment of receiver in action by secured lender to inspect real property for past, present, or threatened release of hazardous substances. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)*

Appointment of receiver at request of Public Utilities Commission pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 5259.5* (appointment whenever Commission determines that household goods carrier or its officer, director, or agent has abandoned, or is abandoning stored property). *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*

[13] Interest in Property or Fund

Appointment of receiver in action by creditor to subject any property or fund to creditor's claim, or between partners or others jointly owning or interested in property or fund, or of any party whose right to or interest in property or fund, or its proceeds, is probable, and when it is shown that property or fund is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*

[14] Jurisdiction of Courts

Jurisdiction of superior court in limited civil case to appoint receiver. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*

Jurisdiction of court to appoint receiver. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564, 565*

[15] Leases

Appointment of receiver in case other than limited civil case brought by assignee of leases pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g). Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*

Appointment of receiver on lessor's initiative to protect lessor's interest under lease as not constituting termination of lessee's right to possession of real property abandoned by lessee when lease provides for continuation of lease so long as lessor does not terminate lessee's right to possession. *Civ. Code § 1951.4(c)(2)*

[16] Public Utilities

Receivership of water or sewer system corporation. *Pub. Util. Code § 855*

[17] Receivers

Qualifications. *Code Civ. Proc. § 566*

Bond or undertaking requirement. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 567(b)*

Oath requirement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 567(a)*

Duty of receiver of real property containing rental units to inform court of order or notice to correct substandard or unsafe condition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2*

[18] Rents, Issues, or Profits

Appointment of receiver in action other than limited civil case by secured lender for specified performance of an assignment of rents provision in deed of trust, mortgage, or separate assignment document. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*

Appointment of receiver in case other than limited civil case brought by assignee of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g). Code. Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*

[19] Unlawful Detainer

Appointment of receiver in unlawful detainer proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(7)*

Service of copy of receiver's deed on tenant in unlawful detainer proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1162a*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipReceivershipsAppointment of ReceiversCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsSupersedeas BondsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionInterlocutory OrdersCivil ProcedureEminent Domain ProceedingsCommissionersAppointmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleFraudulent Transfers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.62

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.62 California Rules of Court

Applicability of Civil Law and Motions Rules (*Cal. Rule of Ct., Rules 3.1100 et seq.*) to appointment of receiver proceeding. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*

California Rules of Court preempt local rules with respect to provisional remedies. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.20*

Requirements of ex parte application for appointment of receiver. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*

Confirmation of appointment of receiver on ex parte application. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176*

Nomination of person to serve as receiver. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*

Amount of undertaking. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1178*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.63

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.63 Local Court Rules

[1] Alameda County

Appointment of Receivers. Alameda Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.11

[2] Contra Costa County

Appointment of Receivers. Contra Costa Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 17

[3] Los Angeles County

Departments to which applications for appointment of receiver are assigned. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.5(i)

[4] San Bernardino County

Ex parte application for appointment of receiver to be presented to law and motion judge to whom case is assigned. San Bernardino Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 540

[5] San Diego County

Appointment of receiver. San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.47

[6] San Francisco County

Departments to which applications for appointment of receiver are assigned. San Francisco Uniform Trial Ct. Rules, Rules 8.1, 8.12

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.64

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.64 Decisions

[1] Affidavits and Declarations

Facts allegedly supporting conclusions of affiant in affidavit in support of motion for appointment of receiver as required to be based on affiant's knowledge. *McCaslin v. Kenney (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 87, 94, 223 P.2d 94*

[2] Abuse of Process

Cause of action for abuse of process in having receiver appointed as not stated when request for appointment of receiver was proper. *Spira v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 536, 539-540, 116 Cal. Rptr. 93*

[3] Appeal

Order denying motion to vacate order appointing receiver and terminate receivership as nonappealable. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273 n.4, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Order appointing receiver to disburse funds from defendant's paycheck in accordance with court order as appealable. *Sheridan v. Sheridan (1972) 33 Cal. App. 3d 917, 918, 918 n.1, 109 Cal. Rptr. 466*

Order appointing receiver as appealable. *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 875, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Order appointing receiver on ex parte application as not appealable; order confirming appointment as appealable. *Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 133, 285 P.2d 351*

[4] Appellate Review

An order authorizing a receiver to contract for demolition rests upon the court's sound discretion exercised in view of all the surrounding facts and circumstances and in the interest of fairness, justice and the rights of the respective parties. The proper exercise of discretion requires the court to consider all material facts and evidence and to apply legal principles essential to an informed, intelligent, and just decision. An appellate court's view of the facts must be in the light most favorable to the order and the court must refrain from exercising its judgment retrospectively. *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 931, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*

Trial court's order based on facts as to which reasonable minds might differ with respect to necessity for receivership as not reversed on appeal; conclusion of appellate court as not substituted for that of trial court made on sufficient evidence; to justify appellate interference, showing that order was arbitrary exercise of power as required. *Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 275-276, 171 P.2d 75*

[5] Appointment of Receivers

[a] In General

Appointment of receiver as drastic remedy; courts as carefully weighing propriety of appointment in exercising discretion to appoint receiver, particularly if there is alternative remedy. *Hoover v. Galbraith (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 519, 528, 102 Cal. Rptr. 733, 498 P.2d 981* ; *Barclays Bank of California v. Superior Court (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 593, 597, 137 Cal. Rptr. 743*

Party forfeited its challenge to the validity of receiver's appointment during arbitration by failing to raise it below. *Baron v. Fire Insurance Exchange (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1191, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 502*

Effect of receivership on going business. *In re Jamison Steel Corp. (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 27, 35, 322 P.2d 246*

If there is any other remedy less severe in its results than receivership that will adequately protect rights of parties, court as ordinarily not taking property out of hands of its owners by appointing receiver. *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75*

Rule as well established that receiver should not be appointed if remedy less drastic in its nature and scope is available that will insure to litigants adequate protection. *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P. 926*

Receiver as not appointed when writ of injunction or other statutory remedies will protect all rights of party applying for appointment of receiver. *A. G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 614, 238 P. 926*

Party to action as not, against his or her will, to be subjected to onerous expense of receiver, except when one may be lawfully appointed and appointment is obviously necessary to protection of opposite party. *DeLeonis v. Walsh (1905) 148 Cal. 254, 255, 82 P. 1047* ; *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

Appointment of conservator as not precluding appointment of receiver. *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 875-876, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Receivers as often legal luxuries, frequently representing extravagant cost to losing litigant; when it appears that no reasonably certain benefit will result to one litigant and distinct disadvantage will result to another, courts as weighing carefully propriety of appointing receiver. *Elson v. Nyhan (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5, 113 P.2d 474*

Arbitration panel as exceeding its powers when it appointed receiver without benefit of any statutory authority

empowering it to make such an appointment. *Marsch v. Williams (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 238, 245-247, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 402*

[b] Crops, Cases Involving

Appointment of receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)* as authorized in appropriate proceeding when crops are planted by trespasser who wrongfully assumes to hold possession and threatens to harvest and market crops for his or her own benefit. *Barnes v. Morrison (1929) 102 Cal. App. 152, 159, 282 P. 986*

[c] Dissolution of Partnership Cases

Appointment of receiver in action for dissolution of partnership. *Galich v. Brkich (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 187, 190-191, 229 P.2d 89*

[d] Equitable Cases

Party could not invoke provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)* when facts alleged would bring situation within another subdivision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*. *Alhambra-Shumway Mines. Inc. v. Alhambra Gold Mine Corp. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 869, 874, 254 P.2d 599* ; *Dabney Oil Co. v. Providence Oil Co. (1913) 22 Cal. App. 233, 237, 133 P. 1155*

Broad provision granting court power, under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(8)*, to appoint receiver in all cases in which receivers had been appointed by usages of courts of equity, gave court all discretion formerly utilized by chancellor in equity, and exercise of that discretion would not be disturbed on appeal absent clear showing of abuse of discretion. *McNeil v. Graner (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 371, 374, 206 P.2d 1120*

[e] Execution, in Aid of

Order reinstating receiver to collect attorney's fees and sanctions against party to settlement agreement is not void with respect to party merely because there is superior competing claim to party's income; assertion by superior claim holder does not excuse payment of undisputed income to receiver or obligation to supply financial information. *Alioto Fish Co. v. Alioto (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1669, 1688, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 244*

Order appointing receiver in aid of execution against doctor and medical corporation of which doctor was sole shareholder as not giving overly broad powers to receiver by permitting him to take possession of all records of corporation when receivership was not to take assets of corporation and apply them to doctor's debt but rather was simply to prevent doctor from effectively withdrawing his earnings from corporation without applying them to judgment. *Crocker National Bank v. O'Donnell (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 264, 267-268, 171 Cal. Rptr. 225*

Charging order receivership as not strictly speaking in aid of execution but as serving same function as writ of execution. *Evans v. Galardi (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 291, 294, 155 Cal. Rptr. 505*

Appointment of receiver to collect simple money judgment as proper in appropriate circumstances. *Olsan v. Comora (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 642, 646-647, 140 Cal. Rptr. 835* (involving former statutes relating to proceedings supplemental to execution and former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(4)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*) prior to its 1982 amendment to conform with Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 680.010-724.260*))

Appointment of receiver in aid of execution as resting wholly within judicial discretion, but power to appoint receiver as delicate one that is exercised sparingly and with caution, and only in extreme cases under circumstances as demand or require summary relief, and never in doubtful case or when there is no necessity or occasion for appointment; appointment as properly made when there are reasonable grounds to believe that judgment debtor, or third parties, have control of property that rightfully should be subject to execution. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350-351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(4)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*) prior to its 1982 amendment to conform with Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 680.010-724.260*))

California court as properly ordering defendant federal government employee to endorse and deliver federal wages to receiver to enforce judgment; although sovereign immunity precludes ordering federal government or agency to pay directly to receiver, that immunity as not extending to employee once federal funds are in his or her possession. *Sheridan v. Sheridan (1972) 33 Cal. App. 3d 917, 919-922, 109 Cal. Rptr. 466*

[f] Foreclosure Cases

Stipulation in mortgage that, on filing of complaint to foreclose, mortgagee would be entitled to have receiver appointed to take possession of premises as not conferring jurisdiction on court to appoint receiver in absence of showing that property is insufficient to pay debt (*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*). *Bank of Woodland v. Stephens (1904) 144 Cal. 659, 661-662, 79 P. 379*

When one's entitlement to receiver is not otherwise established, mortgagee or beneficiary of trust deed as unable by stipulation or consent, however manifested, to confer jurisdiction on superior court to appoint receiver. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 812, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

In California, receiver as appointed only as permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*; when entitlement of mortgagee or beneficiary of trust deed on default of mortgagor or trustor is not established pursuant to that statute, stipulation or consent of parties to appointment of receiver as not conferring jurisdiction on superior court to appoint receiver. *Barclays Bank of California v. Superior Court (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 593, 597, 600, 137 Cal. Rptr. 743*

Discretion of court to appoint receiver in foreclosure proceeding. *Reidy v. Young (1931) 119 Cal. App. 322, 325, 6 P.2d 112*

[g] Fraud Cases

Appointment of receivers in actions by creditors to set aside property transferred with intent to defraud creditors. *Burrows v. Jorgensen (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 644, 647-652, 323 P.2d 150* (involving transfer of leasehold interests)

When basis of action is alleged fraudulent misappropriation of money belonging to plaintiff, addition of another cause of action for money had and received as not changing nature of action or depriving plaintiff of right to have receiver appointed to protect its interest in property that was allegedly purchased with misappropriated funds. *Republic of China v. Chang (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 124, 131, 285 P.2d 351*

In action to set aside transfer of property as fraudulent, trial court as properly appointing receiver to preserve property under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(1),(7)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1), (9)*) and *Civ. Code § 3439.11* (*now see Civ. Code §§ 3439.07(a)(3)(B), 3439.10*). *Heffernan v. Bennett & Armour (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 564, 588-589, 243 P.2d 846*

[h] On Court's Own Motion

Court as able to appoint receiver whenever proper case is made even though neither party has asked for it. *Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598* ; *Venza v. Venza (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 878, 884, 211 P.2d 913* (stressing, however, that parties had consented to appointment)

[i] On Ex Parte Application

From standpoint of business welfare of defendant corporation, appointment of receiver on ex parte application as so dangerous an expedient that it should be done only in cases of greatest emergency and when, without such appointment, irreparable injury will unquestionably result. *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75* ; *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 614-615, 238 P. 926*

Appointment of receiver on ex parte application as resting in sound discretion of trial court, in exercise of which it must be governed necessarily by situation as it is presented and appears to court at time order is made. *People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 861, 181 P.2d 49*

[j] Attachment

Use of provisional remedy of attachment in lieu of receivership. *Samuels v. Superior Court (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 264, 270, 81 Cal. Rptr. 216* (allowed but criticized)

Receivership as not a substitute for attachment and as not to be resorted to for reason that attachment would have been more expensive. *Rogers v. Smith (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 16, 21, 172 P.2d 365*

[k] Complaint

Complaint based largely on generalities and conclusions of plaintiff and on information and belief as insufficient basis on which to appoint receiver. *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 396, 90 P.2d 75*

Allegation in complaint to impose trust and for accounting that defendant corporation is in imminent danger of insolvency (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(6)*) without alleging facts on which conclusion is based as insufficient to justify appointment of receiver. *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 613, 238 P. 926*

Allegation in complaint to foreclose mortgage that security is insufficient (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*) without stating facts on which such allegation is based as insufficient to justify appointment of receiver of mortgaged property. *Title etc. Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1912) 164 Cal. 58, 60-61, 127 P. 502* ; *Bank of Woodland v. Stephens (1904) 144 Cal. 659, 660-661, 79 P. 379*

When order appointing receiver on ex parte application was based entirely on verified complaint, that pleading as properly examined by reviewing court in prohibition proceeding to determine whether trial court exceeded its jurisdiction in making order. *Sunset Farms, Inc. v. Superior Court (1935) 9 Cal. App. 2d 389, 396, 50 P.2d 106*

[l] Corporations

Court of equity as having power to appoint receiver of going corporation on showing that there are such dissensions in its governing body as to create virtual suspension of its business; but even if there is dissension in corporate management receiver should not be appointed when no actual or threatened cessation or diminution of business

operations is shown. *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393-394, 90 P.2d 75*

In action for involuntary dissolution of corporation, intervenor, whether shareholder or creditor, as able to seek any relief court has jurisdiction to grant that affects or protects his or her underlying interest in corporation or its assets during pendency of proceeding, and court as having power to appoint receiver. *Hagan v. Superior Court (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 498, 504, 2 Cal. Rptr. 288, 348 P.2d 896* (citing former Corp. Code § 4656; now *Corp. Code § 1803*).

Power to appoint receiver for going corporation as exercised sparingly; receivership as drastic remedy which should not be invoked unless there is threatened injury to corporation of serious nature. *Starbird v. Lane (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 247, 261, 21 Cal. Rptr. 280*

In action for involuntary dissolution of corporation, trial court as having discretion to appoint receiver under former Civ. Code § 404(E) (*now see Corp. Code §§ 1800(b)(3), 1803*) when complaint alleged that plaintiffs and defendants, husbands and wives, each owned 50 percent of stock, that two families constituted two factions, that defendants on board of directors perpetuated themselves in office by refusing to call an election, that there was internal dissension, deadlock, and inability to agree on board of three directors and to conduct business with advantage to shareholders, that unless receiver was appointed interest of corporation and plaintiff faction would suffer and be damaged pending hearing and determination of action, and answer and affidavit denying foregoing were general and did not attempt to set forth actual situation with respect to affairs of corporation. *Merlino v. Fesno Macaroni Mfg. Co. (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 462, 466-467, 148 P.2d 884*

[m] Discretion of Court

Appointment of receiver as resting largely in discretion of trial court whose action in appointing or refusing to appoint receiver will not be disturbed on appeal absent showing that discretion was abused. *Alderson v. Alderson (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 450, 467, 225 Cal. Rptr. 610*

Appointment of receiver in aid of execution as resting wholly within judicial discretion. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

Appointment of receiver as resting largely in discretion of trial court; discretion of trial court as so broad that order based on facts as to which reasonable minds might differ with respect to necessity for receiver as not reversed on appeal. *Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 710-711, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787*

In absence of clear showing of abuse of discretion, trial court's order either appointing or refusing to appoint receiver as upheld on appeal. *Starbird v. Lane (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 247, 261, 21 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Appointment of receiver as resting largely in discretion of trial court whose order will not be disturbed on appeal absent showing of abuse of discretion. *Venza v. Venza (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 878, 883, 211 P.2d 913*

Appointment of receiver as matter within sound discretion of trial court. *Galich v. Brkich (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 187, 191-192, 229 P.2d 89* ; *Armbrust v. Armbrust (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 272, 276, 171 P.2d 75*

[n] Enforcement of Judgments and Orders

Trial court as not abusing its discretion under facts of case in appointing receiver under former *Civ. Code § 4380* (*now see Fam. Code § 290*), relating to enforcement of family law orders, to enforce judgment awarding child support to woman who had custody of parties' three children born during 12-year period of unmarried cohabitation in which parties held themselves out as being husband and wife. *Alderson v. Alderson (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 450, 467, 225*

Cal. Rptr. 610

[o] Hearing

So serious a matter as appointment of receiver as not made without full and complete hearing unless due administration of justice clearly requires it. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273 n.3, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

[p] Jurisdiction

Requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*, setting forth when receiver may be appointed in superior court case, as jurisdictional, and without showing bringing receiver within one of subdivisions of that section, court's order appointing receiver as void. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Courts of equity as having inherent power to appoint receivers in exercise of their equity jurisdiction. *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 875, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Superior court's appointment of receiver in improper case as mere error in exercise of jurisdiction. *John H. Spohn Co. v. Bender (1937) 18 Cal. App. 2d 447, 450-451, 64 P.2d 152*

[q] Order

To preserve property that is subject of litigation, pending its disposition according to judgment entered, court as permitted to direct receiver to take and keep possession of it. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 698, 303 P.2d 80*

Court as able to direct delivery to receiver of specific property which is involved in litigation. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 682, 686, 278 P.2d 22*

[r] Prohibition and Mandate

Prohibition as appropriate remedy to restrain enforcement of trial court's order appointing receiver when, under circumstances of case, appeal from order would be inadequate remedy. *Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 388-389, 90 P.2d 75* ; *A.G. Col Co. v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 604, 621-622, 238 P. 926*

Prohibition as appropriate remedy to prohibit receiver from attempting to enforce order seizing and holding property in hands of person who is not a party to action and who claims to be bona fide purchaser of it. *Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 389-408, 24 P. 121*

[s] Property Subject to Receivership

Receiver as taking property subject to all prior liens and encumbrances. *Petaluma S. Bank v. Superior Court (1896) 111 Cal. 488, 495-496, 44 P. 177*

Court as without power to authorize receiver to reach out and latch onto appropriate property to use of receivership which is not properly part of receivership estate. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 813, 140 Cal.*

Rptr. 475

Interest of plaintiff partner in property being clear and danger of removal or loss at hands of defendant partner as presenting typical case for receivership. *Spira v. Superior Court (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 536, 540, 116 Cal. Rptr. 93*

[t] Rents, Issues, and Profits

If rents, issues, and profits are not part of security for mortgage debt, not having been contractually assigned for that purpose, court as having no power under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* in foreclosure action to authorize receiver to take possession of rents, issues, and profits and apply them to mortgage debt. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 812, 815, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Trial court as exceeding its jurisdiction insofar as it may purport to authorize rents and profits receiver to take into his or her possession, without consent of those entitled to give or withhold consent, property which is not hypothecated in deed of trust. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 816, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Authority of receiver to collect rent as vested by *Code Civ. Proc. § 568*; whether authority should be exercised as discretionary matter with court. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 699, 303 P.2d 80*

Main purpose of receivership as being to receive rents, issues, and profits of land or other thing pending suit when it does not seem reasonable to court to entrust either party with such right. *Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 649-650, 279 P.2d 598*

[u] Wrongful Procurement of Receivership

Liability of applicant for appointment of receiver on bond given under *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)* as arising when applicant procured appointment of receiver wrongfully, maliciously, or without probable cause, but such liability, being contractual, as limited to amount of bond. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 385, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Person who secures appointment of receiver maliciously and without probable cause as liable for malicious prosecution independent of statutory liability under *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 386, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Cause of action on bond under *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)* or for malicious prosecution as not accruing until determination of action in which receiver was appointed. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 386, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Under certain circumstances, receiver may be held to be agent of one or more parties to action; and under proper circumstances, vicarious liability for conduct of receiver might be placed on party who secured appointment of receiver as cause of action distinct from action on applicant's bond under *Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)* or for malicious prosecution. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 386, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49*

[6] Nature of Receiver

Receiver as officer of court. *North v. Cecil B. DeMille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 58, 39 P.2d 199* ; *McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375* ; *H.D. Roosen Co. v. Pacific Radio Pub. Co. (1932) 123 Cal. App. 525, 534, 11 P.2d 873*

Receiver as officer or representative of court appointed on behalf of all parties who may establish rights in cause to take charge and management of property which is subject of litigation before it, for purpose of its preservation and ultimate disposition according to final judgment entered. *Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 422, 50 P. 549* ; *Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598* ; *Highland Secur. Co. v. Superior Court (1931) 119 Cal. App. 107, 112, 6 P.2d 116* .

As an officer of the court, a receiver is not an agent of any particular party to the action, but represents all persons interested in the property. *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 930, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*

Receiver as agent of court, not of parties, and receivership estate consisting of property which is properly in receiver's hands as under control and continuous supervision of court. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 813, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Receiver as not occupying status of assignee; receiver's function as being that of minister of court in possession of property to end of conserving rights of everybody having any interest. *Wright v. Standard Engineering Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 244, 248, 104 Cal. Rptr. 539* ; *Burrows v. Jorgensen (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 644, 649, 323 P.2d 150*

Receiver as neutral court official. *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 875, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Receiver as not an agent of either party to action but as representing all persons interested in property involved. *Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 712, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787*

Receiver as custodian of property committed to his or her charge. *Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598*

Receiver as holding property as representative of, and under control of court, but for benefit of its owners, their creditors, and others in whose favor claims might exist or arise against estate in receivership. *Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 200-201, 172 P.2d 763*

[7] Nature of Receivership

Purpose of receivership as being to preserve property which is subject of litigation pending its disposition according to judgment subsequently entered. *Kreling v. Kreling (1897) 118 Cal. 421, 422, 50 P. 549* ; *La Societe Francaise d'Epargnes et de Prevoyance Mutuelle v. District Court of Fifteenth Judicial Dist. (1879) 53 Cal. 495, 553* ; *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 698, 303 P.2d 80*

Appointment of receiver as ancillary proceeding concerned with preservation of property subject to litigation pending its ultimate disposition pursuant to final judgment. *Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 711-712, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipInvoluntary DissolutionBusiness & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipReceivershipsAppointment of ReceiversBusiness & Corporate LawGeneral PartnershipsDissolution & Winding UpDissolutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil

ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionInterlocutory OrdersReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleFraudulent Transfers

35 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.65

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.65 Text References

California Civil Procedure Before Trial, vol. 1, ch. 40, Receivership (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1990)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, Provisional Remedies, §§ 416-456 (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.66-486.69

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.66[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.70

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memorandum of points and authorities supporting and opposing contentions that receivership is being properly administered, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.71

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.71 State Statutes

[1] Powers and Duties of Receiver

Power to bring and defend actions under control of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568*

Power to take and keep possession of property, receive rents, collect debts, to compound for and compromise same, to make transfers, and generally to do such acts respecting property as court may authorize. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568*

Duty of receiver of real property containing rental housing in substandard or unsafe condition, to report to court if receiver cannot comply with orders to correct conditions within time provided by order or notice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.2*

Power to sell property pursuant to court order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*

Power to deposit funds. *Code Civ. Proc. § 569*

Duty to publish notice of unclaimed funds when whereabouts of owner are unknown. *Code Civ. Proc. § 570*

[2] Preferences

Preference as given to wage salary, or commission claims when receiver is appointed for benefit of creditors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1204*

[3] Real Estate Law

Receiver as not subject to licensing provision of real estate law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10133(a)(4)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.72

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.72 California Rules of Court

Contracts, arrangements, agreements, and understandings which receiver may not enter. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179*

Employment of attorney by receiver. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*

Receiver's duty to file inventory. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*

California Rules of Court preempt local rules with respect to provisional remedies. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.20*

Receiver's monthly reports. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182*

Interim fees and objections. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183*

Receiver's final account. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.73

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.73 Decisions

[1] Appeal

Order denying motion to terminate receivership as nonappealable. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273 n.4, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Order confirming sale of property in receivership as appealable. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273-274, 273 n.4, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Approval of final report and accounting as final appealable order fixing personal liability of receiver. *Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 234-235, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766* ; *Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 677 n.1, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633*

Order awarding surplus receivership funds on deposit with court made subsequent to discharge of receiver as appealable as order on collateral matter made subsequent to judgment. *United Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Hoffman (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 306, 308, 106 Cal. Rptr. 275* (citing former *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(b)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)*)

Orders on requests relating to preserving or managing property are not appealable except on review of final judgment. *Free Gold Mining Co. v. Spiers (1901) 135 Cal. 130, 131-132, 67 P. 61* ; *see In re Executive Life Ins. Co. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 344, 399-400, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453* (applying *Free Gold Mining Co.* by analogy to orders for payment of professional fees in proceedings for settlement of claims against insolvent insurer)

[2] Contempt of Court

Interference with receiver in carrying out his or her duties as contempt of appointing court. *Petaluma S. Bank v. Superior Court (1896) 111 Cal. 488, 494, 44 P. 177*

[3] Costs of Receivership

Compensation of receiver as normally payable out of receivership estate or funds. *Andrade v. Andrade (1932) 216 Cal. 108, 110, 13 P.2d 676*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)* (repealed, *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*), allowing costs to prevailing party in action to recover money or damages, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032.6* (repealed), providing judgment creditor is entitled to costs in aid of execution on any judgments, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.7(f)* (repealed), providing for inclusion by judgment creditor in bill of costs incurred in connection with proceedings supplementary to execution, costs of charging order receivership as allowable "of course" to prevailing plaintiff. *Evans v. Galardi (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 291, 295, 155 Cal. Rptr. 505*

Cost of defending against unfounded challenge to receiver's account as regarded as necessary expense incurred in course of receiver's official duties for which receiver is entitled to reimbursement out of receivership estate. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 587, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Liability for expenses and fees of receivership as properly placed on one of parties to litigation, although not on plaintiff who has properly obtained appointment of receiver and has established his or her cause of action; conversely, costs of receivership and any compensation for receiver as required to be borne by plaintiff who trial court finds wrongfully obtained unnecessary receivership. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 387, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Discretionary power to make allowance for compensation of receiver. *Murphy v. Cosentino (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 614, 615-616, 22 Cal. Rptr. 441*

Court as having power to order reimbursement of receiver for expenditures if proper and approved by court; proper expenditures as including those made for necessary repairs on property in receivership and for purchase of furniture necessary for conducting business on property, when receiver was directed by order of appointment to take charge of, use, operate, manage, and control property and to conduct business thereof, to collect rents, issues, profits, and income thereof, and to apply same to payment of all usual and necessary expenses of the property, including taxes, mortgage payments, management costs, and all other regular and necessary costs of operation of business operated on premises. *Hozz v. Varga (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 539, 542-543, 333 P.2d 113*

Costs of receivership as properly assessed against defendant in equitable action between joint venturers for accounting when trial court was justified in finding that defendant was guilty of reprehensible conduct. *Neider v. Dardi (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 156, 165, 313 P.2d 72*

Court as having power to assess costs of receivership against fund or property in receivership or against applicant for receivership, or to apportion costs among parties, depending on circumstances. *Baldwin v. Baldwin (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 851, 856, 187 P.2d 429*

Trial court as having power to determine value of receiver's services without aid of expert testimony. *John H. Spohn Co. v. Bender (1937) 18 Cal. App. 2d 447, 450, 64 P.2d 152*

[4] Court Control of Receiver and Property

Receiver as under control of court, as is property of which receiver is custodian. *De Forrest v. Coffey (1908) 154 Cal.*

444, 449, 98 P. 27

Receiver as officer of court possessing property for court. *McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375* ;

Receivership estate consisting of property properly in receiver's hands as under control and continuous supervision of court. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 813, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Receiver appointed in aid of execution as subject to continued direction and control of court. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

Receiver appointed by court as officer of court and property in receiver's custody as in custody of court. *Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Property subjected to receivership as under control and continuous supervision of court. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 699, 303 P.2d 80*

[5] Dismissal of Action, Effect on Receivership

Entry of final judgment or abatement of action as not in itself effecting discharge of receiver, and receiver as remaining subject to court's orders in relation to receivership property until discharged by court; hence, entry of judgment of dismissal by clerk at plaintiff's request before summons is issued or appearance of any defendant as not depriving court of jurisdiction to settle account of receiver appointed at plaintiff's request to take possession of property described in complaint. *Pacific Bank v. Madera Fruit etc. Co. (1899) 124 Cal. 525, 526, 57 P. 462*

Court as not losing jurisdiction of receivership on filing of written notice of dismissal of action by plaintiff, but as having jurisdiction to settle receiver's accounts, to direct disposition of assets in receiver's hands, and to provide for payment of receivership costs and expenses. *Hanno v. Superior Court (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 639, 640-641, 87 P.2d 50*

[6] Fees and Expenses

Fees are awarded to receiver in sound discretion of trial court and appellate court is not justified in setting aside order setting fees in absence of clear showing of abuse; award of hourly fee plus 4 per cent commission on sale of property in partition action upheld when parties had previously agreed to method for calculating fees and receiver had earned through efforts to sell property; although appellate court may award fees for services of receiver's counsel rendered on appeal, court declined to do so because receiver had already been awarded total fee substantially in excess of ordinary fee. *Melikian v. Aquila, Ltd. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1364, 1368, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 739*

Appellate court as having power to award fees for services of receiver's counsel rendered on appeal. *Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 681, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633* (declining to award fees under circumstances of case)

Fees as awarded to receivers in sound discretion of trial court and appellate court as not justified in setting aside order setting fees in absence of clear showing of abuse of discretion. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 587, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Cost of defending against unfounded challenge to receiver's account as regarded as necessary expense incurred in course of receiver's official duties for which receiver is entitled to reimbursement out of receivership estate. *People v.*

Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 587, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68

Party procuring improper appointment of receiver as estopped to recover fees paid receiver pursuant to court order settling receiver's account. *John H. Spohn Co. v. Bender (1937) 18 Cal. App. 2d 447, 451-452, 64 P.2d 152*

[7] Final Account and Discharge

Approval of receiver's final report and accounting as res judicata to future actions against receiver for mismanagement or misconduct of receivership estate. *Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 234, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766*

When loss has been sustained through receiver's misconduct in connection with sale of receivership property and it is impracticable for court to set aside sale, proper procedure as being to confirm sale and surcharge receiver rather than to grant receiver conditional discharge. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 583 n. 6, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

[8] Hearings

Criticism of unnecessary limitation on oral argument at hearing to confirm receiver's sale of property in receivership. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273 n.3, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703* (trial court at first limited each party to 60 seconds and relented to allow five minutes; property involved was multi-million dollar shopping center and office complex)

[9] Orders

[a] Generally

In action for foreclosure of trust deed, trial court's order purporting to imbue rents and profits receiver with authority to take possession of property not hypothecated under deed of trust without consent of those entitled to give or withhold consent as beyond its power. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 815-816, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

In action for foreclosure of trust deed, trial court as without power to authorize receiver to sell property that is not part of security without consent of all persons having an interest in it. *Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 816-819, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Court order requiring return of equipment in defendant partner's possession to receiver appointed in action for dissolution of partnership as legal exercise of court's discretion when over six years had transpired since defendant was given permission to use property and no rental had been paid to receiver during that time; depreciation of property while in use as factor to be considered by those charged with its preservation. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 698, 303 P.2d 80*

On hearing of petition by receiver, appointed in action for dissolution of partnership and accounting, for instructions with respect to equipment, supplies, and rental collected by defendant partner from subtenant, and lease of defendant's office, order requiring defendant to pay receiver rental due on equipment and market value of supplies consumed was supported by protracted trend of litigation, depreciating nature of equipment, ever-present hazard of individual's insolvency, and allegations in defendant's answer that partnership funds were used to pay for equipment and expenses of his office; fact that order gave defendant option of paying market value of equipment in lieu of returning property and paying rental found due was something about which defendant could not complain. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145*

Cal. App. 2d 692, 696-699, 303 P.2d 80

[b] Shortening Time

Professional courtesy and basic fairness militate against use of orders shortening time or similar techniques which create unnecessary handicap for lawyer representing adverse party; whether couched in terms of professional courtesy, the golden rule, or due process, cases should be decided on merits and not on strategy of paper war which denies party reasonable time within which to respond. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 272 n.2, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

[10] Powers and Duties of Receiver

[a] Generally

Receiver's functions and powers are controlled by statute, by order appointing receiver, and by court's subsequent orders. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703* ; *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* ; *Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347* ; *Nulaid Farmers Assn. v. LaTorre (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 788, 791, 60 Cal. Rptr. 821*

Receiver in aid of execution have no powers beyond those conferred. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

In ordinary receivership over private business concerns, receiver, in absence of specific authority, has only very limited powers and in doubtful or important matters is required to apply to court for instruction and advice; however, when receiver is appointed to take possession of and operate quasi-public corporation obligated to render continued service to public (such as public utility), receiver is in first instance vested with broad authority to "do anything the corporation might have done to make the most out of the assets in his hands." *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 580, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Trial court has broad discretion in its directions and approvals given to receiver in respect to management of property. *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 876, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Receiver's powers and duties not directly prescribed by statute depends on court's order of appointment. *Nulaid Farmers Assn. v. LaTorre (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 788, 791, 60 Cal. Rptr. 821*

[b] Power to Contract

General rule is that receiver has no power to make contract binding property or fund in his or her custody without authority or approval of court; unauthorized agreement of receiver is not binding court in charge of receivership, is not recognized as contract of receivership, and is treated as receiver's own contract. *Nulaid Farmers Assn. v. LaTorre (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 788, 793, 60 Cal. Rptr. 821*

Order appointing receiver and investing him with usual powers to manage, preserve, and repair property, which is subject of receivership, under control and subject to order of court does not authorize receiver to enter into contracts. *Nulaid Farmers Assn. v. LaTorre (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 788, 793, 60 Cal. Rptr. 821*

[11] Ratification of Receiver's Acts by Subsequent Court Order

Action of receiver in equity, though taken without prior court authorization, is in proper case subject to ratification by subsequent court approval. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 582, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

[12] Receivership Estate

In action for dissolution of partnership and accounting in which receiver was appointed, rentals collected by partner from subtenant before receiver took possession of property were not proceeds from receivership property, but were subject of accounting between partners. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 700, 303 P.2d 80*

[13] Res Judicata

Demurrer to complaint against receiver seeking damages from receiver and insurer who provided receiver's bond for receiver's alleged mismanagement of receivership estate was properly sustained without leave to amend on ground of res judicata when matters sought to be litigated could or should have been litigated at hearing on receiver's final report and account which was approved. *Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 234, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766*

[14] Sale of Property

Secured party was exempted from requirement of giving notice of sale under former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* (*now see Com. Code §§ 9611-9614*) if sale of collateral was conducted by court-appointed receiver, because receiver, not secured party, controlled time and place of sale; creditor was required to account to debtor for any proceeds of sale received by it after discharge of receiver. *Security Pacific National Bank v. Geernaert (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1425, 1431, 1431, 245 Cal. Rptr. 712* (noting that same rule would apply to sale by trustee in bankruptcy)

Receiver appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564-576* is required to give notice of sale of collateral under *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*, and debtor is entitled to seek to surcharge receiver and to make objections regarding appointment of receiver, defects in receiver's notice of sale, receiver's mismanagement of property, or receiver's final accounting; debtor is not entitled to attack sale if he or she fails to object. *Security Pacific National Bank v. Geernaert (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1425, 1431-1433, 245 Cal. Rptr. 712*

Judicial confirmation of receiver's sale rests on appointing court's sound discretion exercised in view of all surrounding facts and circumstances and in interest of fairness, justice, and rights of respective parties; proper exercise of discretion requires court to consider all material facts and evidence and to apply legal principles essential to an informed, intelligent, and just decision; reversal is warranted only if appellate court concludes that trial court abused its discretion by confirming fraudulent, unfair, or oppressive sale. *Cal-American Income Property Fund VII v. Brown Development Corp. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 268, 274, 187 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Absent statute providing otherwise, court is empowered to authorize receiver to sell property at either private or public sale. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 583, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Trial court is not precluded by *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5* from confirming sale of receivership property made in mode different from that provided for execution sales; *Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5* means that unless court prescribes different mode of sale, receiver, when authorized, must sell property in manner provided for sales on execution; trial court is empowered to prescribe or ratify unconditionally different mode of sale than that provided for execution sales; receiver's sale and sale under execution distinguished. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 583-585, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Having power to authorize private sales of receivership property in first instance, trial court possesses power to approve private sales made without prior authorization *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 585, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Effect of judicial confirmation of receiver's sale of property in receivership. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 582, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Order of appointment of receiver of educational institution with instructions to keep it operating and to do all things and incur risks and obligations ordinarily incurred by owners, managers, and operators of similar educational institutions and providing that no risk or obligation so incurred shall be personal risk or obligation of receiver, but risk and obligation of receivership estate, implicitly authorized receiver to sell unneeded furniture and equipment in order to provide funds for current operating expenses. *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 580-581, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Court, in action for dissolution of partnership, accounting, appointment of receiver, and damages, as having authority to direct receiver to sell assets of partnership, including lease, if such action is necessary to preserve assets for disposition under judgment on merits. *Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 700, 303 P.2d 80*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowersCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminationsCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionInterlocutory Orders

41 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.74

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.74 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, Provisional Remedies, §§ 447-456 (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.75-486.79

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.75[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.80

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.80 State Statutes

Power of receiver to bring and defend actions in receiver's own name. *Code Civ. Proc. § 568*

Enforcement of liability on bond. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.850, 996.410-996.495*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.81

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.81 Decisions

[1] Attachment or Garnishment of Property in Receivership

When property in receiver's custody may be subject to garnishment or attachment. *Robbins v. Bueno (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84-85, 68 Cal. Rptr. 347*

[2] Court Permission for Receiver to Sue

When receiver must obtain leave of court before instituting action to recover property. *Bishop v. McKillican (1899) 124 Cal. 321, 325-326, 57 P. 76*

Receiver in aid of execution as permitted to maintain action to effect purpose of receivership only by authority of statute or special or express permission of appointing court. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

Court order authorizing receiver to sue one person as not authorizing receiver to sue others. *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 352-353, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

Scant reasons as existing for trial court in exercise of its judicial discretion, to authorize receiver in aid of execution to commence action which could and should have been brought by judgment creditor under *Code Civ. Proc. § 720* (repealed, *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 708.210*). *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 352, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281*

PRACTICE TIP:
Frequently, when a third party files a motion to obtain leave of court to sue a receiver, the third party

seeks to obtain consent to sue the receiver in a court other than the one in which the receiver has been appointed. Any efforts made by the third party to sue the receiver in a forum other than the one in which the receiver has been appointed should be opposed by the receiver. While any litigation brought against the receiver will compel the receiver to expend assets of the receivership estate to defend against the action, it is normally in the receiver's best interest to have any action which is filed against him or her to be venued in the court which originally appointed the receiver, so that this court can minimize the litigation expenses which will be incurred by the receivership estate in defending against such third party litigation and can exercise ultimate control over all aspects of the receivership estate. Any application made by third party to sue the receiver in a court other than the one in which the receiver was appointed should be opposed on this ground.

[3] Attorney Fees

Trial court as properly denying to receiver attorney fees incurred or paid by receiver for services rendered after receiver's appointment when attorney was also attorney for party procuring appointment, although allowance of fees to such attorney for services rendered in obtaining appointment of receiver is proper. *Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 387, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49* ; *Hozz v. Varga (1958) 166 Cal. App. 2d 539, 543, 333 P.2d 113*

[4] Court Permission to Sue Receiver

Discretion of court that appointed receiver to grant or refuse leave to other parties to sue receiver in another court. *Petaluma S. Bank v. Superior Court (1896) 111 Cal. 488, 497, 44 P. 177*

Demurrer as proper method of raising issue of failure to obtain leave of court to sue receiver. *Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 85-86, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790*

[5] Encumbrances, Liens, and Other Priority Interests

Intervenor bank, which had acquiesced in appointment of receiver, as not entitled to sue receiver for disregarding priority of bank's security interest; consent to appointment of receiver as implied consent that operating expenses thereof be given priority over security interests of party giving consent. *Schreiber v. Ditch Road Investors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 675, 680, 164 Cal. Rptr. 633*

Right of successor of second trust deed beneficiaries to rents previously collected by receiver to extent of deficiency. *United Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Hoffman (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 306, 311-314, 106 Cal. Rptr. 275*

[6] Liability of Receivers

Receiver as liable for torts committed in performance of receiver's duties solely in official and not personal capacity and liability as to be satisfied from receivership funds. *McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375*

Receiver who undertakes to carry on business of apartment operation as liable, in capacity as receiver, to all persons employed by him or her in conduct of apartment house operation as their employer. *Pacific Indem. Co. v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 35, 41, 65 Cal. Rptr. 429*

Under federal law (former *31 U.S.C. §§ 191*, 192; *now see 31 U.S.C. § 3713(b)*), receiver as personally liable to United

States to extent receiver pays other creditors when there are debts owing to United States or fails to give priority to federal tax liens. *Kirk v. Kirk (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 580, 582-583, 52 Cal. Rptr. 725*

Receiver as liable to persons not beneficially interested in receivership in receiver's official capacity only. *Sealite, Inc. v. Finster (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 612, 618, 309 P.2d 51*

Receiver as liable for negligence in performance of his or her authorized duties to those not interested in receivership estate only in his or her official capacity; any recovery as charge against estate in receivership. *Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 201-202, 172 P.2d 763*

Deposit of receivership funds by receiver in bank of receiver's choice without prior court authorization as constituting breach of duty to take and keep possession of receivership property and as rendering receiver liable on his or her bond if bank subsequently fails and refuses to repay deposit even though receiver was not negligent in selecting bank. *Miller v. Fidelity etc. Co. of Maryland (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 580, 582-586, 40 P.2d 951*

Receiver, such as commissioner of banks, building and loan commissioner, or insurance commissioner, who is guilty of fraud, as not above law but as amenable to process of law and subject to suit by stockholder or creditor to conserve or repossess assets of receivership; receiver liquidating business of bank as amenable to law and subject to suit by creditors if he or she exceeds powers, or wastes estate, or fails to act to recover property of receivership. *Garris v. Mitchell (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 430, 434, 46 P.2d 225*

[7] Liability of Surety

Surety on receiver's bond as liable for receiver's breach of duty during period bond was in effect; thus, action against surety to recover money on bond as not barred by order exonerating surety made in action in which receiver was appointed when plaintiff had obtained judgment antedating order of exoneration in independent action finding that receiver had failed to faithfully execute his duties. *Administrative Management Services, Inc. v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 532, 535-536, 152 Cal. Rptr. 620* (quoting former *Gov. Code § 1612*; repealed, *now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410-996.495*)

[8] Setoffs

Right of setoff against receiver. *People v. California etc. Trust Co. (1914) 168 Cal. 241, 245-251, 141 P. 1181* ; *Downey v. Humphreys (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 323, 331-332, 227 P.2d 484*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGarnishmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilitiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.82-486.89

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.82[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.90

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.90 Applicant's Checklist

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Availability of receivership.

☐ Is the nature of the action or proceeding one in which a receiver might be appointed?

☐ If so, do grounds for appointment exist? [*see* discussion in *§ 486.13*].

☐ Alternative remedies.

☐ Do alternative remedies exist that would be less drastic than receivership.

☐ If so, consider using them [*see § 486.12[2]*].

☐ Costs of receivership.

☐ What are the costs of a receivership (which at a minimum would include the receiver's fee and the cost of the receiver's bond or undertaking [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567(b)*])?

☐ Does the amount in controversy would justify the expense?

☐ Procedure.

☐ Determine whether to proceed by noticed motion or by ex parte application for order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed (*e.g.*, if the appointment is sought by plaintiff and defendant has not yet appeared in the case).

☐ Do facts exist which establish the kind of emergency that would necessitate the immediate appointment on ex parte application and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed [*see* discussion in *§ 486.15*].

☐ Weigh the additional costs involved against the amount in controversy and what might be lost by delaying the appointment until after hearing on a notice of motion or order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed.

☐ The additional costs would include at a minimum the cost of the undertaking which the applicant would be required to post [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*].

☐ Local Court Rules.

☐ Check any local rules and practices of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending or will be filed that apply to receivers and receiverships [*see § 486.15[4][d]*].

[2] Ex Parte Application for Appointment of Receiver and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment Should Not Be Confirmed

☐ Draft the declaration and ex parte application for appointment of a receiver [*see form in § 486.139*], in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for the adverse party.

☐ One copy for client, if desired.

☐ Office copy.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Draft any additional affidavits or declarations setting forth any facts in addition to those set forth in the Declaration and Ex Parte Application that are required to be shown in order to support the appointment and which are not within the personal knowledge of the person signing the Declaration and

Ex Parte Application but which are within the personal knowledge of the person who will sign the affidavit or declaration.

☐ Set forth the following facts in a verified complaint, affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury, or any combination of these:

☐ The action is one in which a receiver may be appointed.

☐ The facts justifying the appointment of a receiver.

☐ The additional facts required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175* [*see § 486.139[2]* et seq.].

☐ Draft a memorandum showing that the appointment of the receiver is authorized and should be confirmed in the same number of copies for the same distribution as the Declaration and Ex Parte Application [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*]. For memoranda of points and authorities that may be used for this purpose, *see* California Points and Authorities , Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender).

☐ Draft the order fixing the amount of the applicant's undertaking (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*) [*see form in § 486.140*].

☐ If desired, combine the order fixing the undertaking with the order appointing the receiver and fixing the amount of the receiver's undertaking and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed.

☐ Draft the order appointing the receiver and fixing the amount of the receiver's undertaking and the order to show cause [§ 486.141] in the same number of copies for the same distribution as the Declaration and Ex Parte Application.

☐ Sign the Declaration and Ex Parte Application.

☐ Have any additional declarations signed by the person making the declaration.

☐ Notify the adverse party when and where the application will be presented, unless excused from doing so.

☐ Draft the affidavit or declaration of notification or excuse from notification in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the ex parte application for appointment of receiver [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*, discussed at *§ 486.137[3]* and in Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

☐ If not already done, present the complaint to the court clerk for filing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 411.10*] together with the summons for issuance [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10, 412.20(a)*].

☐ Present the following to the proper judge for consideration and signing of the orders:

☐ Declaration and Ex Parte Application, with any additional affidavits or declarations.

☐ Points and authorities.

☐ The court's file containing the verified complaint.

☐ The court orders.

☐ If not known, ascertain from the court clerk the procedure to be followed in presenting the ex parte application, papers, and orders to a judge for reading, ex parte hearing if required, and signature [*see also § 486.90[1]*].

☐ Draft the applicant's undertaking in the amount fixed by the court in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the Declaration and Ex Parte Application.

☐ Have it executed by the surety or sureties or secure a bond in the amount fixed from an admitted surety insurer [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 995.120, 995.210, 995.330*; *see also* discussion in *§ 486.15[3][b]*].

☐ If the orders are signed, notify the receiver that the appointment has been made.

☐ Draft the receiver's undertaking in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the Declaration and Ex Parte Application or secure a bond from an admitted surety insurer [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 567(b), 995.120, 995.210, 995.330*; *see also* discussion in *§ 486.16*].

☐ Draft the receiver's oath and have the receiver take the oath [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567(a)*] before a person authorized to administer oaths [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2093* (authorized persons)]. For discussion and a form of oath, *see* Ch. 392, *Oath and Affirmation* .

☐ Present the oath, the applicant's undertaking or bond and the receiver's undertaking or bond, with proof of service attached, to the court clerk for filing.

☐ Serve a copy of the order appointing receiver and order to show cause on the adverse party.

☐ Draft a proof of service.

☐ File the proof of service with the court.

☐ If not served with the order appointing receiver and order to show cause, do the following [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*]:

☐ Serve a copy of the Declaration and Ex Parte Application, a copy of each additional declaration if any, and a copy of the supporting memorandum, as well as a copy of the complaint if not already served,

on the attorney for the adverse party or on the adverse party if he or she has no attorney. For a procedural guide for use in serving papers, *see* Ch. 518, *Service Of Summons and Papers* .

☐ Prepare the proof of service of the papers served and file the original of the proof of service with the court clerk.

☐ If the adverse party's response is not timely served and time is needed to prepare to respond to it, seek a continuance by stipulation or by court order.

☐ Examine any affidavits or declarations submitted by the adverse party to determine whether they controvert any of the facts set forth in the supporting papers or state additional facts that counsel was unaware of it.

☐ Check the adverse party's points and authorities to determine whether they are correct and, if correct, whether they apply to the facts of the case.

☐ Be prepared to respond to the matter presented in these papers by the adverse party at the hearing.

☐ Nominate a substitute receiver, if desired, by securing the name, address, phone number, and qualifications of any person counsel desires to have substituted for the receiver appointed.

☐ Draft a suggestion that that person be substituted, stating the reasons [*see § 486.15[5][b]*].

☐ Attend the hearing on the order to show cause.

☐ At the hearing, submit the written suggestion, if any, for substitution of receiver.

☐ Present any new evidence that has surfaced since the filing and service of the papers or new case law handed down in the interim.

☐ Be prepared to answer any questions posed by the judge and argue the case.

☐ Draft the order confirming the appointment of the receiver [*see form in § 486.142*], or discharging the receiver, in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the order appointing receiver set forth *above*.

☐ Give notice of the court's ruling [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5*].

☐ Prepare the notice of the court's ruling, one copy for the adverse party, an office copy, and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Serve a copy, with a conformed copy of the order, on the adverse party's attorney or, if none, the adverse party.

☐ Prepare the proof of service in an original and one copy.

☐ File with the court the original of the notice of ruling with the original of the proof of service attached.

[3] Ex Parte Application for Order to Show Cause and Order to Show Cause Why Receiver Should Not Be Appointed

☐ Draft the ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed and the order to show cause in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for the adverse party.

☐ One copy for client, if desired.

☐ One office copy.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Draft in the same number of copies for the same distribution as the ex parte application any affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury necessary to present the facts required to establish the ground or grounds for the appointment that are not contained in the ex parte application or verified complaint.

☐ Draft the supporting memorandum in the same number of copies for the same distribution as the ex parte application and order to show cause [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113*]. For points and authorities that may be used in support of an application for appointment of a receiver, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender).

☐ Notify the adverse party when and where the application will be presented, unless excused from doing so.

For a general discussion of notice, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ Present the following to the proper judge:

☐ The ex parte application.

☐ Any affidavits or declarations.

- ☐ The memorandum of points and authorities.
- ☐ The court's file containing the verified complaint.
- ☐ The court orders.

☐ If the judge signs the order to show cause, leave the original with the courtroom clerk for filing and have the copies conformed.

☐ Serve the following on the adverse party:

- ☐ A conformed copy of the order to show cause.
- ☐ Ex parte application.
- ☐ Supporting affidavits or declarations, if any.
- ☐ Points and authorities.

☐ Prepare a proof of service and have it signed by the person who made service.

- ☐ File the original of the proof of service with the court. Proof of service of the moving papers must be filed no later than five court days before the time appointed for the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(c)*]. For a procedural guide for use in serving papers, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

☐ On receipt of the adverse party's opposition papers, examine any affidavits or declarations submitted by the adverse party to determine whether they controvert any of the facts set forth in the supporting papers or state additional facts that counsel was unaware of.

☐ Check the adverse party's points and authorities to determine whether they are correct and, if correct, whether they apply to the facts of the case.

☐ Be prepared to respond to the matter presented in these papers by the adverse party at the hearing.

☐ Nominate a person to serve as receiver, if desired, by doing the following:

- ☐ Securing the name, address, phone number, and qualifications of any person counsel desires to have appointed as receiver.
- ☐ Draft a suggestion that such person be appointed, stating the reasons [*see §*

486.142[2]].

☐ Attend the hearing on the order to show cause.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ If the court appoints a receiver, draft the order of appointment in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the ex parte application and order to show cause as set forth *above*.

☐ Prepare notice of the court's ruling on the motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5*].

For further discussion of notice, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ If the order appoints a receiver, notify the receiver that the appointment has been made.

☐ Draft receiver's undertaking.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ Draft receiver's oath.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ File oath and undertaking.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

[4] Notice of Motion for Appointment of Receiver

☐ Draft moving papers [*see forms in §§ 486.143* and *486.144*]. For the procedure to follow in preparing, serving, and filing a notice of motion and supporting papers, and the filing fee required in superior court cases, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

☐ Nominate a person to serve as receiver, if desired.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[3]*.

☐ Attend the hearing on the motion.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ Draft the order granting the motion appointing a receiver, and fixing the amount of the receiver's undertaking or bond [*see form in § 486.145*] in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

- ☐ One copy for the adverse party's attorney or, if none, for the adverse party.
- ☐ One copy for receiver.
- ☐ One copy for client, if desired.
- ☐ One office copy.
- ☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Present the original and copies of the orders to the judge who granted the motion, or to the judge's courtroom clerk to present to the judge, for signature, and conform, or have the clerk conform, the copies.

☐ Prepare the notice of the court's ruling on the motion.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ If the order appoints a receiver, notify the receiver that the appointment has been made.

☐ Draft receiver's undertaking.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ Draft receiver's oath.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

☐ File oath and undertaking.

For further discussion, *see § 486.90[2]*.

PRACTICE TIP:

To increase the possibility that your application to appoint a receiver will be granted, it is important to demonstrate to the court that theproperty over which the appointment of a receiver is sought is subject to being harmed in some manner and that the appointment of a receiver is the *only* remedy available to prevent harm from occurring to the property. In many instances, the court will not appoint a receiver on an ex parte basis, but will instead issue injunctive relief pending a hearing on the appointment of a receiver. Therefore, it is normally good practice to have an alternative proposed form of temporary restraining order prepared in connection with any ex parte application made to appoint a receiver, so that in the event that a receiver is not appointed, the court will issue a temporary restraining order.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.91

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.91 Opposing Party's Checklist

[1] Ex Parte Hearing

☐ If notified in advance of the place and time when the ex parte application for appointment of a receiver and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed or when the ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed will be presented to a judge, the opposing party's counsel or, if none, the opposing party, may appear if he or she wishes to oppose the appointment at that time [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1207*].

[2] Continuance of Confirmation Hearing

☐ If a receiver is appointed on ex parte application and a continuance is required to prepare a response showing that the appointment should not be confirmed, then, on receipt of the applicant's papers, apply for a continuance.

☐ By stipulation of counsel.

☐ Secure the consent of the attorney of the ex parte applicant or, if none, of the ex parte applicant, to a continuance.

☐ Draft the stipulation for a continuance with an order granting the continuance appended.

☐ Have the stipulation for a continuance signed by the ex parte applicant's attorney

or, if none, the ex parte applicant.

☐ Present the stipulation to the judge for signing, or

☐ By ex parte application.

☐ Prepare an ex parte application for a continuance with an order granting the continuance appended in an original, one copy for the adverse party's attorney or, if none, the adverse party, an office copy, and such additional copies as may be desired;

☐ Notify the adverse party's attorney or, if none, the adverse party when and where the application will be presented to the court for signature and draft and sign the declaration of notification [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*];

☐ Present the original and copies of the application for a continuance and order and of the declaration of notification to the courtroom clerk of the judge who signed the order to show cause for delivery to the judge for signature;

☐ Leave the signed original of the application and order with the courtroom clerk for filing and have the clerk conform the copies;

☐ Serve a conformed copy of the application and order on the adverse party's attorney [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*] or, if none, on the adverse party; and

☐ Prepare and file a proof of service.

[3] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Examine the complaint to determine whether the case is one in which a receiver may be appointed.

☐ Examine the supporting affidavits or declarations, as well as the complaint if verified to determine whether the facts relied on by the applicant support the appointment of a receiver.

☐ If they do, check out the facts stated to ascertain whether they are in fact true.

☐ Ascertain whether any additional facts exist which would militate against confirmation of the appointment.

[4] Response to Order to Show Cause or Notice of Motion

For general discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

☐ Draft any affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury denying the existence of any facts

stated by the applicant which are not true and stating the true facts and/or stating other facts that would militate against confirmation of the appointment of a receiver.

☐ Have each affidavit made or declaration executed by a person having personal knowledge of the facts stated in it.

☐ Check the applicant's points and authorities to determine whether the points are correctly stated and the authorities cited support them, and, if they do, whether they apply to the facts of the case.

☐ Draft the points and authorities in opposition to the confirmation or appointment.

☐ Serve the opposing papers on the applicant's counsel or, if none, the applicant [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

☐ File the originals.

☐ Prepare and file a proof of service. For procedure, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

☐ Secure the name, address, and phone number of any person desired to be nominated to serve as a substitute receiver (appointment made on ex parte application) or as receiver (order to show cause why receiver should not be appointed or notice of motion for appointment of receiver).

☐ Draft suggestion that that person be appointed or substituted, stating the reasons.

[5] Hearing

☐ Attend the hearing.

☐ Submit the written suggestion, if any, nominating a person to act as receiver or as a substitute receiver.

☐ Present any new evidence that has surfaced since the filing and service of the papers or new case law handed down in the interim.

☐ Be prepared to answer any questions posed by the judge and argue the case.

[6] Sufficiency of Undertaking or Surety

☐ Counsel may wish to object to the sufficiency of the undertakings filed by the applicant or receiver or to the sufficiency of the sureties [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920*].

☐ Objection is made by noticed motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(a)*] and the proceeding is

governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960*. For procedure and forms for use in objecting to bonds and undertakings, *see Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq.

PRACTICE TIP:

In attempting to defeat the appointment of the receiver, defendant should argue that there is equity in the property over which the appointment of a receiver is sought. In addition, defendant should also argue that the appointment of receiver is expensive, will disrupt defendant's operation of its business and/or management of the property in question and that there are alternative equitable remedies available to the plaintiff such as injunctive relief, rather than the drastic remedy of the appointment of a receiver. Defendant's counsel should also carefully review declarations filedby the plaintiff in support of the application to appointment of a receiver and should file evidentiary objections to those declarations to the extent that they contain hearsay or other inadmissible evidence. The defendant can also argue the receiver is not qualified. Finally, defendant should attempt to present evidence to the court that defendant has attempted to work with plaintiff regarding the problems which have given rise to plaintiff's request for the appointment of a receiver and therefore a receiver is not necessary.

[7] Notice of Court's Ruling

☐ If the opposing party prevails at the hearing, prepare the notice of the court's ruling in an original for filing, one copy for the moving party, an office copy, and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Serve a copy on the moving party's attorney or, if none, the moving party, prepare the proof of service in an original and one copy, and file the original of the notice of ruling with the original of the proof of service attached with the court.

☐ The notice of ruling may be served with a conformed copy of the court's order [*see § 486.90[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointments

48 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.92-486.99

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.92[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.100

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.100 General Matters

[1] Determine Duties and Powers

☐ Carefully read order of appointment to determine what duties have been imposed and what powers have been granted [*see § 486.30*].

[2] Keep Records

☐ Keep detailed record of services performed as receiver and of each expenditure made on behalf of receivership in anticipation of obtaining court approval of payment for them [*see § 486.157*].

[3] Take Possession of Property

☐ Take possession of the real and/or personal property described in the order of appointment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDutiesCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowersCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsTerminations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.101

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.101 Inventory Property

[1] Extension of Time

☐ If more than 30 days is required to prepare the inventory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*].

☐ Draft an application, or petition, for an order extending time with the order appended in an original and one copy for the receiver and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Present the original of the application and order and copies to the courtroom clerk of the judge supervising the receivership.

☐ If the order is signed, the receiver will have the additional time allowed to file the inventory.

[2] Draft Inventory

☐ Make a list of all property received and draft the inventory [*see form in § 486.150*] in the following number of copies, then sign the original and conform the copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for each attorney of record and for each party appearing without an attorney.

☐ One copy for receiver.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

[3] Serve Copies on Parties

☐ Serve a copy of the inventory on the attorney for each party or if none on the party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

☐ Prepare and execute a proof of service.

☐ Present the original of the inventory and proof of service to the court clerk for filing.

[4] Supplementary Inventory

☐ If the receiver subsequently takes possession of any additional property, draft the supplementary inventory [§ 486.150] and follow the same procedure as for the initial inventory ([1]-[3], *above*).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDuties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.102

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.102 Notices to Public Entities

[1] Employment Development Department

☐ If the property consists of an insolvent employing unit, draft the notice to be sent to the California Employment Development Department in an original and a file copy.

☐ Sign the original, and mail it to the department.

[2] Licensing Agencies

☐ If the receivership property consists of a licensed business, notify the agency that issued the license and determine whether the business may be operated under the existing license or whether the receiver must secure a temporary license.

☐ If a temporary license is required, apply for it.

[3] Taxing Agencies

☐ Draft, sign, and deliver any appropriate notices to the applicable taxing agencies.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.103

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.103 Order Naming Bank Depository

[1] Procedure

☐ If the receivership will involve the receipt of money and the order of appointment does not designate a bank into which money coming into the receiver's hands may be deposited:

☐ Prepare an application, or petition, for such order, specifying the money that the receiver has received or will receive and its source, with the order of approval, or designation, appended in an original for filing and at least one copy for the receiver and one copy for the designated bank [*see form in § 486.151*].

☐ The receiver should sign the application and present it to the courtroom clerk of the judge supervising the receivership.

☐ If the order is signed, the original will be retained for filing and the copies will be conformed and returned to the receiver.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.104

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.104 Employment of Attorney

[1] Draft Petition for Authority to Employ Attorney

☐ If the receiver requires legal counsel in carrying out his or her duties as receiver [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*]:

☐ Draft the petition for authority to employ attorney with an order granting the petition appended [*see form in § 486.152*], or:

☐ If the court requires, draft a separate formal order, in an original for filing, one copy for each party's attorney of record and for each party who is unrepresented by counsel, one copy for the attorney nominated for employment, one copy for the receiver, and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original and conform the copies.

[2] Present Petition and Order to Court

☐ Present the original and copies of the petition and order to the courtroom clerk of the judge supervising the receivership.

☐ If the order is signed, the original will be retained for filing and the copies will be conformed and returned to the receiver.

[3] Serve Papers

☐ Serve a copy of the petition and order on each party's attorney or, if none, on the party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

☐ Prepare a proof of service in an original and at least one office copy.

☐ File the original of the proof of service with the court clerk.

☐ Have the copy conformed.

☐ Deliver a conformed copy of the petition and order to the attorney to be employed. For manners of serving papers and a form of proof of service by mail, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.105

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.105 Petition for Authorization to Perform Specific Act Not Otherwise Authorized by Statute or by Court's Order of Appointment

[1] Draft Petition for Authority

☐ Draft the petition for authority to do the particular act, explaining the need for it, with an order approving, or granting, the petition, appended, or a separate formal order if the court requires it, in an original for filing and the following copies:

☐ One copy for each party's attorney of record and for each party who is unrepresented by counsel.

☐ One copy for the receiver.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original of the petition.

☐ Conform the copies.

[2] Present Papers to Court

☐ Present the original and copies of the petition and order to the courtroom clerk of the judge supervising the receivership.

☐ If the order is signed, the original will be retained for filing and the copies will be conformed and returned to the receiver.

[3] Serve Papers

☐ Serve a copy of the petition and order on each party's attorney or, if none, on the party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

☐ Prepare a proof of service in an original and at least one office copy.

☐ File the original of the proof of service with the court clerk.

☐ Have the copy conformed. For manners of serving papers and a form of proof of service by mail, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.106

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.106 Petition for Instructions

[1] Draft Petition for Instructions

☐ If the receiver is uncertain with respect to any aspect of his or her duties, prepare a petition for instructions.

☐ Set forth the facts and request instructions from the court in an original for filing, one copy for each party's attorney of record and for each party who is unrepresented, one copy for the receiver, and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original and conform the copies.

[2] File Petition and Secure Hearing Date

☐ File the original of the petition with the court.

☐ Have the copies conformed.

☐ Secure a hearing date, if a hearing is required [*see, e.g., Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 696-697, 303 P.2d 80]* .

[3] Draft Notice of Hearing

☐ If a hearing is required, secure a hearing date from the court.

☐ Draft a notice of hearing in an original and the same number of copies as the petition, sign the original, and conform the copies.

[4] Service of Papers

☐ Serve a copy of the notice of hearing with a copy of the petition attached on each party's attorney of record or, if none, on the party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

☐ Draft a proof of service in an original and at least one copy.

☐ File the original of the proof of service with the court and have the copy conformed.

[5] Hearing

☐ Attend the hearing [*see Steinberg v. Goldstein (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 692, 696-697, 303 P.2d 80* (who may attend the hearing)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDuties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.107

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.107 Unclaimed Funds in Possession of Receiver

[1] Draft Notice of Unclaimed Funds

☐ Draft the notice of unclaimed funds [*see form in § 486.153*] in the following number of copies [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 570*; *see also* discussion in *§ 486.31[3]*]:

☐ Original and one copy for delivery to the newspaper publisher.

☐ Copy for receiver.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original and conform the copies

[2] Delivery to Newspaper

☐ Deliver original and one copy of the notice to the newspaper with the request that the notice be published [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 570* (publication requirements)].

[3] Proof of Publication

☐ At the same time notice is delivered to the newspaper, request that on completion of publication the newspaper execute a proof of publication and file it with the court clerk [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2010*].

[4] Payment

☐ Pay the publisher, or secure an order from the court supervising the receivership authorizing the receiver to pay the publisher, the cost of the publication [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 570* (payment of funds)].

☐ The order may be contained in the court's order directing payment of the funds into the state treasury [*see § 486.154*].

[5] Report to Court

☐ Report to the court any funds remaining in the receiver's hands for 30 days after the date of the last publication of the notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 570* (report requirement)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPublicationCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDuties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.108

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.108 Receiver's Final Account and Report

[1] Draft Final Account and Report

☐ Draft the receiver's final account and report [*see form in § 486.157*; *see* discussion in *§§ 486.33 -486.34*] in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for attorney of record of each party and for each party unrepresented by counsel.

☐ One copy for receiver.

☐ Office copy.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original and conform the copies

[2] Draft Notice of Presentation of Account and Report

☐ Draft a notice of presentation of the account and report for settlement in the same number of copies

and for the same distribution as the account and report.

[3] Service on Parties

☐ Serve a copy of the notice of presentation with a copy of the account and report attached on each party's attorney of record or, if none, on the party.

☐ Draft the proof of service in an original and at least one office copy.

☐ File the original of the proof of service with the court clerk, and have the copy conformed. For manners of serving papers and a form of proof of service by mail, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[4] Hearing

☐ Attend the hearing.

☐ File objections to the account and report, if desired [*see, e.g.,* *Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresRemediesReceivershipsReceiversDuties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.109-486.119

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.109[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Actions By Receiver

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.120

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.120 Lawsuits By Receiver

[1] Petition to Sue Third Party

☐ If it becomes necessary for the receiver to file suit against a third party and leave of court is required, draft the petition for permission to sue [*see form in § 486.170*], specifying the nature of the action to be brought, facts justifying its need, and its probable outcome, in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for each party's attorney or party if unrepresented by counsel.

☐ Copy for receiver.

☐ Office copy.

☐ Such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the petition and conform the copies.

☐ The petition to sue may be combined with the petition for authority to employ an attorney to prosecute the lawsuit [*see § 486.104* (employment of attorney)].

[2] Order Granting Petition

☐ Draft the order authorizing the receiver to file suit [*see form in § 486.171*] in the same number of copies as the petition.

[3] Present Petition and Order to Court

☐ Present the originals and copies of the petition and order to the courtroom clerk of the judge supervising the receivership for consideration and signature.

☐ If the order is signed, have the copies of the order conformed.

[4] Service of Order

☐ Serve a copy of the petition and a conformed copy of the order on the attorney for each party, and on any nonrepresented parties, in the receivership action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

[5] Complaint Against Third Party

☐ Allege in the complaint against the third party that court permission to sue has been obtained [*see form in § 486.172*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversPowers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Actions By Receiver

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.121

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.121 Lawsuits Against Receiver

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Determine nature of action against receiver and whether receiver's liability is based on an act or omission of the receiver in his or her official capacity which will be satisfied, if at all, from receivership funds [*see McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375]* or arises from the receiver's failure to faithfully discharge the duties of receiver in the action or obey the orders of the court in which event the receiver's liability is on his or her official bond [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567(b)*].

☐ If the action is based on a liability imposed on the receiver in his or her official capacity, determine whether relief should and can be sought by intervention in the same action or proceeding in which the receiver was appointed or a separate action should be filed.

[2] Application for Leave to Sue Receiver

☐ Draft application or petition for leave to sue receiver [*see form in § 486.173*] in an original for filing, one copy for the receiver, one copy for client if desired, office copy, and such additional copies as may be desired.

☐ Sign the original.

☐ Conform the copies.

☐ Draft complaint against receiver [*see form in § 486.175* for allegations of authority to sue to be

included in the complaint] which will be filed if permission to sue is granted.

☐ Attach to the application or petition a copy of the proposed complaint [*see Chiesur v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 198, 199, 172 P.2d 763]* .

☐ Draft order granting leave to sue [§ 486.174] in the same number of copies and for the same distribution as the application.

☐ Give receiver advance notification of when and where application or petition will be presented to judge.

☐ Present original and copies of application and order to courtroom clerk of judge supervising receivership.

☐ If the receiver receives advance notification that a person will apply at a specified time and place for an order granting leave to sue, the receiver may wish to do the following:

☐ File a written response or pleading and/or:

☐ Appear at the time and place specified to present any opposition he or she may have to the granting of the application or to respond to any questions the court may want to ask.

☐ If the receiver is sued as receiver, the receiver should apply to the court for permission to employ an attorney to represent the receiver in the lawsuit. For procedure, see *§ 486.104*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversLiabilities

61 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Actions By Receiver

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.122-486.129

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.122[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.130

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.130 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--To Take Possession of Property or Fund in Which Parties Have Joint Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--To Take Possession of Property or Fund in Which Parties Have Joint Interest [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

1. _____ [*Allege parties' joint interest in property or fund, e.g.,* Plaintiff and defendant are the sole co-owners of an apartment house, located at _____ (*address*)], hereinafter "the property"].

2. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was, and is, in complete control and management of the _____[property *or* fund].

[*EITHER, if fund is in danger of loss or removal*]

3. _____ [*Allege facts showing fund is in danger of loss or removal, e.g.,* Contrary to _____ (*specify law or contract governing parties' relationship, e.g.,* the agreement between plaintiff and defendant has excluded plaintiff from participating in the management of the property or sharing in its proceeds and was, and is, using the rents, issues, and profits of the property for his/her own exclusive benefit in that _____ (*specify facts showing that defendant has been using proceeds of property and partnership funds for his or her own exclusive benefit*)].

[*AND/OR, if property is in danger of being materially injured*]

3. _____ [*Allege facts showing that property is in danger of being materially injured, e.g.,* The property is in immediate need of substantial repair in that, as shown by the reports of _____ (*names*), who are duly licensed termite exterminators and building con tractors, which are attached hereto as Exhibits

"_____" and "_____," respectively, and made a part hereof, the apartment building is infested with dry rot and termites requiring immediate correction to avoid extensive and permanent structural damage to the building; in addition, the roof leaks, which condition, if not immediately repaired, will allow water to enter the building when it rains; the reports further show the repairs that must be made forthwith if substantial and permanent damage to the apartment building is to be avoided].

[4. _____ (*Allege any efforts made by plaintiff to have defendant protect the property from material injury, e.g.,* On numerous occasions, plaintiff has requested defendant to apply the proceeds of the property to the repair of the foregoing conditions, but defendant has failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to do so or to apply any part of the proceeds, or any other moneys, to the repair and maintenance of the building or to take any other steps to properly repair or maintain the building).]

[*CONTINUE*]

[5. Unless a receiver is appointed and instructed to take possession of the _____ (property *or* fund) and to _____ (*specify duties to be given to receiver, e.g.,* receive rents as they fall due, and immediately apply the rents to the repair of the property), the _____ (property or fund) will be _____ (materially injured or lost or removed), as herein alleged (and, in addition, the parties hereto may be subjected to serious personal civil liability to third parties for any injury or damage sustained by them as a result of the defects, as well as to liability for maintaining a habitation in an uninhabitable condition).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession of the _____[*specify property or fund, e.g.,* apartment house], to _____ [*specify general powers to be given to receiver, e.g.,* manage, control, care for, preserve, maintain, and incur the expenses necessary for the management, control, care, preservation, and maintenance of, the _____ (*specify property or fund, e.g.,* apartment house and personalty located in it), and, specifically, to _____ (*state specific powers, e.g.,* collect the rents, issues, and profits therefrom and apply the same to the immediate repair of the aforementioned infestations and dilapidations and thereafter to maintain the property in a good and habitable condition pending the determination of this lawsuit, to pay any taxes or assessments falling due during the period of receivership, and to otherwise employ labor as may be necessary, purchase supplies, and incur the risks and obligations ordinarily incurred by owners, managers, and operators of similar apartment houses)].

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above,* are for insertion in a verified complaint in an action by a person jointly owning or interested in any property or fund involved in the lawsuit to show that appointment of a receiver is justified because the property or fund is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*]. If the complaint alleges facts sufficient to establish the above ground, it may be used to support in whole or in part either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver pending the hearing and determination of the complaint [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175, 3.1176*; for forms, *see §§ 486.139, 486.143*]. For the additional showing required when the application for appointment of a receiver is made ex parte, *see § 486.139[5]*.

The allegations in [1], *above,* with appropriate modifications, may be incorporated in an ex parte application and declaration for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*].Alternatively, they may be incorporated in an affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*] or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a noticed motion for appointment of a receiver [*see § 486.144*] or in support of an ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct.,*

Rules 3.1177 (referring to appointment of receiver "on notice," which would include both notice of motion and order to show cause why receiver should not be appointed)].

[3] Allegations

The form in [1], *above,* alleges the existence of a joint interest in property, showing that the action is one in which a receiver may be appointed (Paragraph 1) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*], and that the property is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured, showing the ground for the appointment (alternative Paragraphs 3 or 3 and 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*]. It also includes an allegation of what will happen if a receiver is not appointed for use when the complaint will be used to support an ex parte application for an immediate order appointing a receiver or for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed (Paragraph 5).

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[5] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is be to based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[6] Cross References

For other forms of complaints for use in actions in which a receiver might be appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1),* see the appropriate chapter, e.g., Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for;* Ch. 170 *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*; Ch. 303, *Injunctions;* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions;* and Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For an overview of the procedure in a civil action, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For forms of captions for use in pleadings, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion of the general requirements and skeletal forms of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For a form of complaint for dissolution of a partnership, accounting, and appointment of receiver and a form of complaint for appointment of areceiver to wind up partnership affairs and for an accounting, see Ch. 406, *Partnerships: Dissolution*

For discussion of service of the summons and complaint and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For discussion and alternative forms of verifications, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.131

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.131 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint For Appointment of Receiver--Action to Foreclose Mortgage or Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint For Appointment of Receiver--Action to Foreclose Mortgage or Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)]

[*EITHER*]

1. The condition of the _____[deed of trust *or* mortgage] has not been performed, in that _____ [*specify facts showing breach of obligation for which deed of trust or mortgage is security, e.g.,* defendant has failed, and continues to fail, to make timely installment payments of principal and interest due for the months of _____ through _____ (*dates*)].

[*AND/OR*]

1. The _____[mortgaged *or* trust] property is in danger of being _____[lost *or* removed *or* materially injured] in that _____[*specify facts showing danger of loss, removal or material injury, e.g.,* defendant has abandoned the property and there is no one now on the property to occupy, care for, or maintain it].

[*AND*]

2. The _____[mortgaged *or* trust] property is insufficient to discharge the debt secured by the _____[mortgage or trust deed] in that the unpaid balance due on the note so secured is $_____, whereas the fair market value of the property is $_____.

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession of the _____[mortgaged *or* trust] property and to care for, control, manage, and preserve it pending further order of the court.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in a complaint for foreclosure and sale by the mortgagee named in a mortgage or the trustee or beneficiary under a trust deed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a-730.5* (foreclosure)] as a basis for securing the appointment of a receiver to take charge of the mortgaged or trust property when the property is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured, or the condition of the mortgage or trust deed has not been performed, and the property is probably insufficient to discharge the mortgage or trust debt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*]. A complaint alleging facts sufficient to establish either of the grounds in this form in whole or in part may be used to support in whole or in part either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver pending the hearing and determination of thecomplaint for dissolution [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.1175, 8.1177; for forms, *see §§ 486.139, 486.140*]. For the additional showing required when the application is made ex parte, see *§ 486.139[5]*. The allegations and prayer, when inserted in a complaint for foreclosure and sale, should be renumbered as appropriate.

The allegations, with appropriate modifications, may be incorporated in an ex parte application and declaration for appointment of receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.1175; for a form, *see § 486.139*]. Alternatively, they may be incorporated in an affidavit (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*) or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a noticed motion for appointment of a receiver or in support of an ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.1177].

For a form of allegations relating to appointment of a receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)* in connection with specific performance of an assignment of rents provision of a deed of trust, mortgage, or separate assignment document and thereafer pending nonjudicial foreclosure, see *§ 486.132*.

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or declaration [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.1175; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[4] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is be to based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[5] Cross Reference

For discussion and forms of complaints for use in foreclosure actions, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.132

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.132 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint to Enforce Assignment of Leases, Rents, Issues, or Profits [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint to Enforce Assignment of Leases, Rents, Issues, or Profits [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

1. _____[*Allege that defendant executed a deed of trust or mortgage in favor of plaintiff on certain property containing an assignment of leases, rents, issues, and profits*].

2. On _____[*date*], the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust containing an assignment of lease, rents, issues, and profits*] was duly recorded in the Official Records of the Office of the County Recorder of _____[*specify county of recording*] County, State of California.

3. _____[*Allege defaults that have occurred under the terms of the mortgage or deed of trust containing an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits*].

4. Prior to the filing of this action, plaintiff notified the defendant of its default under the terms of the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust that is in default*]; however, the defendant has failed and refused to take any steps to remedy that default.

5. In accordance with the terms of the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust that is in default*], plaintiff has declared the following sums to be delinquent, and they are now due and payable to plaintiff from the defendant:

(a) _____[*Specify amounts owed to plaintiff as a result of default in mortgage or deed of trust*];

6. Plaintiff has duly performed all of the conditions precedent on its part required to be performed.

7. There is no adequate remedy at law to enforce the provisions of the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust that is in default*], and it is necessary that a receiver be appointed to take possession and charge of the property and to conserve and manage it pending the sale under the terms of the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust that is in default*], and to collect any and all rents, issues, income, interests, and leases, and/or profits thereof pending the sale.

8. As a result of the default by defendant under the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust that is in default*], plaintiff is entitled to enter upon and take possession of the property to collect the rents, issues and profits thereof, as provided for therein.

9. Unless a receiver is appointed by this Court to take possession of, care for, and manage and operate the property, plaintiff will be materially prejudiced.

10. By reason of these facts, plaintiff prays that this Court appoint a receiver in accordance with the law to take control of and manage the property.

11. For the foregoing reasons, and in aid of the receiver, plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order and preliminary and permanent injunctions, restraining and enjoining the defendants and Does 1 through 30, inclusive (sometimes collectively referred to as "defendants"), and their agents, servants and employees, and all those acting in concert with them, and each of them, from engaging in or performing, directly or indirectly, any of the following acts:

(a) Demanding, collecting, receiving, or in any other way diverting or using any of the profits, income, issues, rents, or lease payments emanating from the property, including, without limitation, rents or lease payments due or hereafter to become due under any rental or lease agreements;

(b) Interfering with or hindering, in any way whatsoever, the receiver in the performance of the receiver's duties herein described and in the performance of any duties incident thereto;

(c) Interfering in any manner with the property or its possessions;

(d) Transferring, concealing, destroying, defacing, or altering any of the instruments, documents, ledger cards, books, records, printouts, or other writings relating to the property, or any portion thereof; and

(e) Transferring, conveying, assigning, pledging, deeding, selling, renting, leasing, encumbering, changing ownership, vesting of title to, or otherwise disposing of, the property.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession and charge of the property, and to conserve and manage the property pending sale under the terms of the _____[*specify mortgage or deed of trust which is in default*];

2. That the defendants, and anyone holding under said defendants, be ordered to deliver possession of the property to the receiver forthwith;

3. That the receiver, after taking possession of the property, be permitted to do the following:

(a) Exclude the defendants, or anyone claiming under or through said defendants who does not have a valid lease or rental agreement for possession of the property, or any portion thereof, from possession of the property, or any portion thereof;

(b) Use, operate, manage, and control the property;

(c) Care for, preserve, and maintain the property;

(d) Incur all expenses necessary for the care, preservation, and maintenance of the property;

(e) Demand, collect and receive any rents, issues, income, profits and lease payments due from the date of defendants' default or hereafter coming due from tenants or lessees of the property, or any portion thereof;

(f) To rent or lease from time to time any part of the property and to keep the buildings thereon insured and in good repair, and to pay the taxes and assessments on the property incurred during the receivership;

(g) Bring and prosecute all proper actions for collection of rent or lease payments due on the property, as well as all necessary actions and proceedings for the removal of tenants or lessees in default of any rental or lease agreement, or any other persons, from the property, and to bring and prosecute all proper actions for the protection of the property or to recover possession thereof;

(h) To employ agents or employees to collect said rents, manage the property, and keep the same insured and in good repair, if the receiver shall deem the same necessary, and to pay the reasonable value of said services out of the rent receipts;

(i) To open up bank accounts as deemed necessary by the receiver in connection with the above-referenced duties; and

(j) All other powers and duties referred to in this complaint, together with all other powers reasonably necessary to carry out the receiver's duties and responsibilities.

4. For a temporary restraining order and for preliminary and permanent injunctions restraining and enjoining the defendants, and their servants, agents and employees, and all those acting in concert with them, and each of them, from engaging in, or performing, directly or indirectly, any or all of the following acts:

(a) Interfering with or hindering, in any manner whatsoever, the receiver in the performance of the receiver's duties;

(b) Demanding, collecting, receiving or in any other way diverting and using any of the profits, income, issues, rents, payments, and/or lease payments emanating from the property, including, without limitation, rents or lease payments due or hereafter to become due under any rental or lease agreements;

(c) Interfering in any manner with the property or its possessions;

(d) Transferring, concealing, destroying, defacing or altering any of the instruments, documents, ledger cards, books, records, printouts, or other writings relating to the property or any portion thereof; or

(e) Transferring, conveying, assigning, pledging, deeding, selling, renting, leasing, encumbering, changing ownership, vesting of title to, or otherwise disposing of, the property.

5. For costs and expenses incurred by the receiver in the performance of the receiver's duties, and including without limitation, receiver's fees and charges and attorneys' fees.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above,* are for insertion in a verified complaint to enforce the assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits clause in a mortgage or deed of trust in the lawsuit to seek appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)*]. If the complaint alleges facts sufficient to establish the above grounds, it may be used to support in whole or in part either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver pending the hearing and determination of the complaint [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a), 3.1177(a)*; for forms, *see §§ 486.139, 486.143*]. For discussion of the additional showing required when the application for appointment of a receiver is made ex parte, see *§ 486.139[5]*.

The allegations in [1], *above,* with appropriate modifications, may be incorporated in an ex parte application and declaration for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)*; for a form, *see § 486.139*]. Alternatively, they may be incorporated in an affidavit (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*) or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a noticed motion for appointment of a receiver [for a form, *see § 486.144*] or in support of an ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1177(a)* (referring to appointment of receiver "on notice," which would include both notice of motion and order to show cause why receiver should not be appointed)].

For forms of notice of motion, declaration, and order appointing a receiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

[3] Allegations

The form in [1], *above,* alleges that the defendant has executed a deed of trust or mortgage on certain real property containing an assignment of leases, rents, issues or profits (Paragraphs 1 and 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)*], and that a default has occurred under the terms of that mortgage or deed of trust (Paragraph 3). It also includes an allegation of what will happen if a receiver is not appointed when the complaint will be used to support an ex parte application for an immediate order appointing a receiver or for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed (Paragraph 9).

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[5] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is to be based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[6] Cross References

For other forms of complaints for use in actions in which a receiver might be appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*, see the appropriate chapter, e.g., Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*, Ch. 160, *Corporations*, Ch. 303, *Injunctions*, Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*, and Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For an overview of the procedure in a civil action, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For forms of captions for use in pleadings, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion of the general requirements and skeletal forms of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For a form of complaint for dissolution of a partnership, accounting, and appointment of receiver and a form of complaint for appointment of a receiver to wind up partnership affairs and for an accounting, see Ch. 406, *Partnerships: Dissolution*

For discussion of service of the summons and complaint and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For discussion and alternative forms of verifications, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.133

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.133 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver in Aid of Arbitration [Code Civ. Proc. § 1218.8]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver in Aid of Arbitration [Code Civ. Proc. § 1218.8]

1. On or about _____[*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a written agreement in which _____ [*allege terms of arbitration clause, e.g.,* at Paragraph _____, the parties agreed that any controversy or claim arising out of the agreement between or among the parties thereto shall be determined by arbitration. The agreement further provides that no provision of the arbitration agreement shall limit the right of any party to exercise or obtain any provisional or ancillary remedies during or after the pendency of any arbitration and that the institution and maintenance of an action for judicial relief or a provisional remedy shall not constitute a waiver of the right of any party to submit the controversy to arbitration].

2. _____[*Allege existence of dispute and whether a complaint has been filed and/or arbitration demanded or pending*]

3. This complaint is being filed against the defendants pursuant to the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure Section 1218.8 on the grounds that any award which the plaintiff may obtain pursuant to the mandatory arbitration provisions contained in the agreement may be rendered ineffectual without provisional relief in the form of the appointment of a receiver. The plaintiff reserves its right to arbitration of the claims under the agreement.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for entry of orders granting the provisional relief requested by the plaintiff in the applications and pleadings accompanying this complaint against defendants as follows:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession of the _____[specify property *or* fund] to _____[*list powers to be given to receiver to insure that any arbitration award which may be obtained*

will not be rendered ineffectual].

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in application for a provisional remedy in connection with an arbitrable controversy which is filed on the ground that the arbitration award to which the applicant may be entitled may be rendered ineffectual without provisional relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(b)*]. The application must be accompanied by a complaint or by copies of the demand for arbitration and any response thereto. If the application is accompanied by a complaint, the application must also be accompanied by a statement stating whether the party is or is not reserving the party's right to arbitration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(b)*].

An application for a provisional remedy under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(b)* does not operate to waive any right of arbitration which the applicant may have if, at the same time as the application for provisional remedy is presented, the applicant also presents to the court an application that all other proceedings in the action shall be stayed pending the arbitration of any issue, question, or dispute which is claimed to be arbitrable under the agreement and which is relevant to the action pursuant to which the provisional remedy is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(d)*].

[3] Allegations

The form in [1], *above*, alleges the existence of an arbitration agreement (Paragraph 1) and of an arbitrable dispute (Paragraph 2), the current status of the dispute with respect to pending litigation or arbitration (Paragraph 2), and that a receiver should be appointed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* in connection with the arbitrable controversy on the ground that the award to which the applicant may be entitled may be rendered ineffectual without provisional relief [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(a)(4), (b)*].

The form also includes a statement that the plaintiff is or is not reserving the right to arbitration. This statement is mandatory if the application is accompanied by a complaint (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8(d)*].

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[5] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is to be based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to arbitration, including the availability of provisional remedies, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration*

For additional cross references relating to complaints generally and to actions in which receivers might be appointed, see *§ 486.130[6]*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.134

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.134 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action for Involuntary Dissolution of Corporation [Corp. Code § 1803]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action for Involuntary Dissolution of Corporation [Corp. Code § 1803]

1. Unless a receiver is appointed to take over and manage the business and affairs of the corporation and to preserve its property during the pendency of this action, the interests of both the corporation and its shareholders will suffer in that _____ [*specify facts showing that unless a receiver is appointed the interests of the corporation and its shareholders will suffer pending the determination of the action, e.g.,* because the corporation has an even number of directors equally divided who cannot agree as to the management of its affairs, the entire management of the corporation, as shown by the declaration of _____ (*name*) attached hereto as Exhibit "_____" and made a part hereof, has broken down with the following results]:

[*LIST corporate problems in successive subparagraphs as in the example below*]

a. Key middle managers and supervisors have terminated their employment with the corporation because of the prevailing chaos and lack of direction.

b. Morale of remaining employees is low and deteriorating.

c. No records are being maintained of employee attendance.

d. Records of accounts receivable have been misfiled, destroyed, or lost and cannot be found.

e. Records of current accounts payable were inadvertently mixed with the retired files (files more than 10 years old) and all of them shredded.

f. Inventories of corporate property have disappeared.

g. Office equipment and supplies have also disappeared.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take over and manage the business and affairs of the corporation and to preserve its property pending the hearing and determination of this complaint for dissolution of the corporation.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in a verified complaint for involuntary dissolution of a corporation [*see Corp. Code § 1800* (specifying who may bring action, grounds for involuntary dissolution, and corporations to which statute does not apply)] as a basis for securing the appointment of a receiver to take over and manage the business and affairs of the corporation and to preserve its property when the interests of the corporation and its shareholders will suffer pending the hearing and determination of the complaint [*see Corp. Code § 1803*, discussed under [3], *below*]. If the complaint alleges facts sufficient to establish the ground for appointment, the complaint may be used to support either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1177(a)*]. For discussion of the additional showing required when the application is made ex parte, see *§ 486.139[5]*. The allegations and prayer when inserted in a complaint for involuntary dissolution should be renumbered as appropriate.

Alternatively, the declarations attached to the complaint may be attached to a notice of motion for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177(a)*; for a form, *see § 486.143*] or to an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; for a form, *see § 486.139*].

Other grounds for appointing a receiver of a corporation are discussed in *§ 486.13[2]*.

[3] Grounds and Procedure

If, at the time the complaint for involuntary dissolution is filed or at any time thereafter, the court has reasonable grounds to believe that unless a receiver of the corporation is appointed the interests of the corporation and its shareholders will suffer pending the hearing and determination of the complaint, the court may, on the application of the plaintiff and after a hearing on such notice to the corporation as the court may direct and on the giving of security pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566* and *567*, appoint a receiver to take over and manage the business and affairs of the corporation and to preserve its property pending the hearing and determination of the complaint for dissolution [*Corp. Code § 1803*].

However, subject to any contrary provision in the corporation's articles, in any suit for involuntary dissolution initiated by the vote of shareholders representing only 50 percent of the voting power, the corporation, or, if it does not elect to do so, the holders of 50 percent or more of the voting power of the corporation, may avoid the dissolution and the appointment of a receiver by purchasing for cash the shares owned by the plaintiffs or by the shareholders initiating the proceedings at their fair value [*Corp. Code § 2000(a)*]. If the parties can't agree on the fair value and the parties electing to purchase give a bond to protect the plaintiffs or shareholders initiating the proceeding, the court on application of the purchasing parties must stay the action and proceed to ascertain and fix the fair value of the shares [*Corp. Code § 2000(b)*]. These provisions are mandatory and when the prescribed conditions are met the court must stay the proceedings and proceed to ascertain and fix the value of the shares owned by plaintiffs [*Merlino v. Fesno Macaroni Mfg. Co. (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 462, 464, 148 P.2d 884* (construing predecessor statute)].

[4] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[5] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is be to based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[6] Cross Reference

For a form of complaint for involuntary dissolution of a corporation under *Corp. Code § 1800*, see Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*

For additional cross references relating to complaints generally and to actions in which receivers might be appointed, see *§ 486.130[6]*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.135

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.135 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Creditor Against Insolvent Debtor and Debtor's Transferee to Set Aside Transfer of Property in Fraud of Creditors [Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(3)(B); Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Creditor Against Insolvent Debtor and Debtor's Transferee to Set Aside Transfer of Property in Fraud of Creditors [Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(3)(B); Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

1. Defendant _____[*name*], ever since the transfer of the property as herein alleged, has been, and is now, in the receipt of and appropriating to his/her own use the income and profits of the property without the consent and against the will of plaintiff, and has failed, refused, and neglected, and continues to fail, refuse, and neglect, to account for them.

2. To prevent defendant _____[*name*] from continuing to misuse and misappropriate the profits and income of the property, it is necessary that a receiver be appointed to take possession of the property and to receive the profits and income therefrom pending the outcome of this action.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession of the property, together with its profits and income, and to preserve the same during the pendency of this action.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in a verified complaint by a creditor against a debtor and the debtor's transferee to set aside a transfer of property made in fraud of creditors [*see Civ. Code § 3439.07*] as a basis for securing the appointment of a receiver to take charge of the asset transferred or its proceeds pending the outcome of the litigation [*see Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(3)(B)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*]. If the complaint alleges facts sufficient to

establish the fraudulent transfer and the ground for appointment, the complaint may be used to support either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1177*]. For the additional showing required when the application is made ex parte, see *§ 486.139[5]*. The allegations and prayer when inserted in a complaint to set aside the fraudulent transfer should be renumbered as appropriate.

The above allegations, with appropriate modifications, may be incorporated in an ex parte application and declaration for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; for a form, *see § 486.139*]. Alternatively, they may be incorporated in an affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*] or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a noticed motion for appointment of a receiver or in support of an ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*].

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see § 486.139[5]*].

[4] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is be to based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[5] Cross References

For forms of complaints for use in actions to set aside a fraudulent transfer, see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*

For additional cross references relating to complaints generally and to actions in which receivers might be appointed, see *§ 486.130[6]*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.136

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.136 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)]

1. On or about _____[*date*], defendant executed _____[*describe contract containing a personal property security agreement in favor of plaintiff with description of property in which plaintiff was granted a security interest*].

2. _____[*Allege facts showing that defendant breached the terms of the personal property security agreement*].

3. _____[*Allege facts showing that property in which plaintiff was granted a security interest is in danger of being lost, removed, or materially injured and that defendant is taking actions to deprive and deny plaintiff of the property in which it holds a security interest*].

4. Although plaintiff has demanded possession from defendant of the property in which it holds a security interest, and the proceeds thereof, defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse to affirmatively respond to such demands, preferring instead to engage in the conduct herein alleged.

5. It is critical that a receiver be appointed at this time to marshal and safeguard the remaining property in which plaintiff holds a security interest to realize the remaining proceeds thereof, to open mail and recover all payments and sums for the benefit of plaintiff, and do all the acts necessary to protect the property.

6. Unless a receiver is appointed, defendant will continue to misappropriate, secrete, and wrongfully liquidate property in which plaintiff holds a security interest, all to the detriment and irreparable loss of the plaintiff.

7. Plaintiff has no speedy or adequate remedy at law and will suffer irreparable damage, injury and harm unless appropriate equitable relief is granted.

8. In accordance with the _____[*specify personal property security agreement*] plaintiff is entitled to enter the business premises of defendant and take possession of the property in which plaintiff holds a security interest and the records pertaining thereto and exercise all remedies under the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Commercial Code. Such remedies are consistent with plaintiff's request for a receiver, who in the natural course of carrying out his or her duties would protect the plaintiff from further injury while making certain that defendant receives credit to which it might be entitled.

9. For all the foregoing reasons, and in aid of the receiver, plaintiff also seeks a temporary restraining order, and preliminary and permanentinjunction, restraining and enjoining defendant from engaging in, or performing, directly or indirectly, any or all of the following acts:

a. Demanding, collecting, receiving, spending or in any other way converting or using any of the proceeds of the property in which plaintiff holds a security interest; and

b. Hiding, secreting, transferring, selling, pledging, granting a security interest in, or in any other manner disposing or hypothecating any of that property; and

c. Transferring, concealing, destroying, defacing or altering any of the instruments, documents, ledger cards, books, records, printouts or any other writings relating to the business of defendant; and

d. Transferring directly or indirectly any interest by sale, shipment of goods, pledge or grant of security interest, assignment, invoice or encumbering in any manner the property in which plaintiff holds a security interest more specifically described in the documents attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, and any and all proceeds or products thereof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as to all causes of action, as follows:

A. By reason of plaintiff's cause of action for appointment of receiver:

1. For an appointment of a receiver *pendente lite* to manage, receive and collect the property in which plaintiff holds a security interest to the extent that the same is not in plaintiff's possession, including, without limitation, the proceeds therefrom; and

2. For the receiver to apply the same to the payment of principal and interest owing from defendant to plaintiff in accordance with orders of this Court and the parties' agreements; and

3. To uphold and carry into effect the terms of plaintiff's security interest; and

4. That the receiver have all other powers and duties referred to in the complaint, together with all other powers reasonably necessary to carry out his other duties and responsibilities, including, without limitation, authority, pursuant to orders of this Court, to sell the assets of defendant as a going concern or otherwise; and

5. For a temporary restraining order, and preliminary and permanent injunctions restraining and enjoining defendants from engaging in, or performing directly or indirectly, any or all of the following acts:

a. Demanding, collecting, receiving, spending or in any other way converting or using any of the property;

b. Transferring, selling, pledging, granting a security interest in or in any other manner disposing or hypothecating any of the property;

c. Transferring, concealing, destroying, defacing or altering any of the instruments, documents, ledger cards, books, records, printouts or any other writings relating to the business of defendant;

d. Transferring directly or indirectly any interest by sale, shipment of goods, pledge or grant of security interest, assignment, invoice or encumbering in any manner the property in which plaintiff holds a security interest specifically described in the documents attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, and any and all proceeds or products thereof.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in a complaint to appoint a receiver to enforce a personal property security interest. The complaint alleges that the plaintiff has an interest in certain personal property by virtue of the defendant having executed a security agreement and that the plaintiff's security is in danger of being lost, removed or materially injured (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)*].

[3] Ex Parte Appointment of Receiver

If ex parte appointment of a receiver is sought, additional facts must be shown in the verified complaint or declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; for a form, *see § 486.139[5]*].

[4] Verification

If the application for appointment of the receiver is be to based in any part on the complaint, then the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code §§ 702, 710*].

[5] Cross References

For forms of complaints for use in litigation involving a security interest in personal property, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions*

For additional cross references relating to complaints generally and to actions in which receivers might be appointed, see *§ 486.130[6]*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.137

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.137 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver to Enforce Personal Property Security Agreement

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION AND EX PARTE APPLICATION
Plaintiff,	)	FOR ORDER APPOINTING RECEIVER AND OR-
vs.	)	DER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY APPOINTMENT
_____ [*name*],	)	SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____[*identify declarant, e.g.,* employed as an account manager by the plaintiff in the above-entitled action].

2. I am one of the custodians of the books, records, files and credit records of plaintiff as those books, records, files and credit records pertain to loans or extensions of credit made by plaintiff to defendant. I personally have worked on those books, records, files and credit records and, as to the following facts, I know them to be true of my own knowledge or have gained knowledge of them from the business records of plaintiff, records which are maintained in the ordinary course of plaintiff's business. I could and would testify competently to the facts set forth in this declaration if called as a witness since those facts are personally known by me to be true.

3. The records of plaintiff as they pertain to the loans and extensions of credit which are the subject of this case are kept in the regular course of plaintiff's business, and the records are carefully prepared to reflect all acts, conditions and events at or near the time those acts, conditions and events occurred. Based upon my personal knowledge and experience with plaintiff, I know that these records are accurate and trustworthy.

4. I have personally reviewed the complaint filed in this case, verified the same, and hereby adopt that verified complaint, which is incorporated herein by this reference, as though set forth in full.

5. _____[*Describe general nature of defendant's business and its operations and set forth the principal place of business of defendant*].

6. _____[*Set forth facts showing defendant's execution of a personal property security agreement in favor of plaintiff and property in which plaintiff was granted a security interest*].

7. _____[*Set forth facts showing defaults that have occurred under the terms of the personal property security agreement*].

8. Plaintiff will be irreparably harmed unless a receiver is immediately appointed to take possession of the property of defendant in which plaintiff holds a security interest. Unless an ex parte receiver is appointed immediately, defendant will continue to utilize and unlawfully dispose of property in which plaintiff holds a security interest. Once this property is disposed of, it will be forever lost and available to plaintiff as a source of repayment of the obligations owed by defendant to plaintiff.

9. _____[*Set forth additional dangers to property in which plaintiff holds a security interest, e.g.,* the immediate appointment of a receiver is necessary to protect the personal property of defendant in which plaintiff holds a security interest because the property is small in size, and can be easily disposed of and/or secreted].

10. In view of all the foregoing circumstances, plaintiff contends that it is appropriate that a receiver be appointed over defendant on an ex parte basis. Alternatively, in the event that the Court is not inclined to appoint a receiver immediately, it should issue a restraining order prohibiting defendant from disposing of any property of defendant in which plaintiff holds a security interest pending a hearing on an order to show cause re appointment of receiver.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration and ex parte application in [1], *above,* is for use to obtain an order appointing a receiver to take immediate possession of property in which the plaintiff has a security interest and order to show cause why appointment should not be confirmed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see also* discussion in *§ 486.15*;

for the number of copies to prepare and procedures to follow, *see § 486.90[2]*]. The form must be accompanied by a declaration regardingnotice to the other parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*] and by a supporting memorandum [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1112(a), 3.1113(a)*].

[3] Notice to Opposing Party

The application must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing one of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]:

- Within a reasonable time before the application the party informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney when and where the application would be made, including the date, time, manner, and name of the party informed, any response, and whether any opposition is expected.

- The party in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party and the opposing party's attorney but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform them.

- For reasons specified the party should not be required to inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney.

The declaration or affidavit must also state the name, address, and telephone number of any attorney known to the applicant to be an attorney for any party or, if no such attorney is known, the name, address, and telephone number of such party if known to the applicant [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1202(b)*]. The party seeking the ex parte order must notify all parties no later than 10:00 a.m. the court day before the ex parte appearance, absent a showing of exceptional circumstances [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1203*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204* (contents of notice)].

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204 does not require that the notification be given in writing, and, therefore, it would appear that the notification may be written or oral.

For further discussion, a procedural checklist of other documents that must accompany the application, and forms of declaration in support of ex parte applications, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[4] Nature of Ex Parte Appointment

The appointment of a receiver on ex parte application is a drastic remedy and is seldom warranted [*see Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75]* . Such an order should be made only in cases of emergency which make it imperatively necessary to act at once without notice [*Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 810 n.2, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475]* . On the other hand, when such necessity or emergency is shown, a receiver may be appointed [*see People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 862, 181 P.2d 49* ; *Misita v. Distillers Corp., Ltd. (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 244, 250, 128 P.2d 888]* . But even in an extreme case, the appointment of a receiver on ex parte application willbe made only if less onerous remedies would be inadequate or are unavailable [*see § 486.12[2]*].

[5] Showing Required

[a] Mandatory Requirements

In addition to showing that the action or proceeding is one in which a receiver may properly be appointed and the facts establishing the ground of the motion (*see generally Code Civ. Proc. § 564*, and discussion in *§ 486.13*), an ex parte applicant for appointment of a receiver must show in detail the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)*]:

- The nature of the emergency and the reasons irreparable injury would be suffered by the applicant

during the time necessary for a hearing.

- The names, addresses, and phone numbers of the persons in actual possession of the property for which a receiver is requested, or of the president, manager, or principal agent of any corporation in possession of the property.

- The use being made of the property by the persons in possession.

- If the property is a part of the plant, equipment, or stock in trade of any business, the nature and approximate size or extent of the business, and facts sufficient to show whether the taking of the property by a receiver would stop or seriously interfere with the operation of the business.

The requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175* are mandatory and must be met before a receiver is appointed on ex parte application [*see Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 810 n.2, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475* (citing former Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule 238, the predecessor of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*)].

[b] Unknown Matters

If any of these matters are unknown to the applicant and cannot be ascertained by the exercise of due diligence, the applicant's declaration or verified complaint must fully state the matters unknown and the efforts made to acquire the information [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*].

[c] Verification

The showing required to have a receiver appointed on ex parte application may be made by verified complaint or declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*]. For sample forms of allegations and prayers that may be included in a complaint alleging the ground or grounds for the appointment, see *§§ 486.130 -486.133*.

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms of noticed and ex parte motions and orders on a motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.138

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.138 Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Appoint Receiver to Inspect for Hazardous Substances [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)]

[1] FORM Allegations and Prayer of Complaint for Appointment of Receiver--Action by Secured Creditor to Appoint Receiver to Inspect for Hazardous Substances [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)]

1. On or about _____[*date*] _____[*allege that defendant executed a deed of trust or mortgage in favor of plaintiff granting plaintiff a security interest in real property*].

[*EITHER*]

2. On or about _____[*date*] plaintiff commenced _____[judicial *or* non-judicial] foreclosure proceedings against the real property security.

[*OR*]

2. On or about _____[*date*] plaintiff became aware that _____[*allege facts showing that plaintiff has a reasonable belief as to the existence of a past or present release or threatened release of a hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the real property* S]. This _____[release *or* threatened release] was not previously disclosed in writing to the plaintiff in conjunction with the _____[making *or* renewal *or* modification *or* any combination of these] of the loan alleged above.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. On or about _____[*date*] plaintiff _____[*allege plaintiff's attempts to inspect the*

real property]. Defendant, in contravention of plaintiff's rights as a secured lender in *Civ. Code § 2929.5*, refused plaintiff the right to inspect the real property which is the subject of the _____[deed of trust *or* mortgage].

4. _____[*Allege that receiver should be appointed to enable plaintiff as the secured lender to enter and inspect the real property which is the subject of the deed of trust or mortgage for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath or from the real property security*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. That a receiver be appointed, enter upon and inspect the real property for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath or from the real property security.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation and prayer in [1], *above*, are for insertion in a verified complaint to enforce inspection rights given to a real property securedlender set forth in *Civ. Code § 2929.5*. A complaint to appoint a receiver may be filed in the event the defendant refuses the secured lender its right to inspect its real property security to determine the existence, location, nature and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of hazardous substances into, onto, beneath or from the real property security. The real property secured lender's inspection demand may be made after the commencement of non-judicial or judicial foreclosure proceedings on the real property security or upon the real property secured lender having a reasonable belief as to the existence of a past or present release or threatened release of a hazardous substance into, onto, beneath or from the real property security not previously disclosed in writing to the secured lender in conjunction with the making, renewal or modification of a loan involving the defendant borrower [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(a)*].

If the complaint alleges facts sufficient to establish the above grounds, it may be used to support in whole or in part either a noticed motion or an ex parte application for appointment of a receiver pending the hearing and determination of the complaint [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175(a), 3.1177*; for forms, *see §§ 486.139, 486.143*]. For discussion of the additional showing required when the application for appointment of a receiver is made ex parte, see *§ 486.139[5]*.

The allegations in [1] *above*, with appropriate modifications, may be incorporated in an ex parte application and declaration for appointment of a receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*]. Alternatively, they may be incorporated in an affidavit (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*) or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a noticed motion for appointment of a receiver [*see § 486.144*] or in support of an ex parte application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2009, 2015.5*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177* (referring to appointment of receiver "on notice," which would include both notice of motion and order to show cause why receiver should not be appointed)].

[3] Allegations

The form in [1], *above*, alleges that the defendant has executed a real property security instrument in favor of the plaintiff (Paragraph 1), and that the real property secured lender has previously commenced non-judicial or judicial foreclosure proceedings or has a reasonable belief as to the existence of a past or present release or threatened release of hazardous substance into, onto, beneath or from the real property security not previously disclosed in writing to the real property secured lender in connection with the making, renewal or modification of a loan, letter of credit, guaranty or other obligation involving the defendant (alternative Paragraphs 2). It then alleges that the plaintiff has sought to inspect the property for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature and magnitude or any past or present release

or threatened release of anyhazardous substance into, onto, beneath or from the real property security as authorized by *Civ. Code § 2929.5*, but that the defendant has refused the plaintiff access to inspect the real property security (Paragraph 3).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.139

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.139 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration and Ex Parte Application for Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment Should Not Be Confirmed [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 2009, 2015.5; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration and Ex Parte Application for Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment Should Not Be Confirmed [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 2009, 2015.5; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1175, 3.1176(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION AND EX PARTE APPLICATION
vs.	)	FOR ORDER APPOINTING RECEIVER AND OR-
_____ [*name*],	)	DER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY APPOINTMENT
Defendant.	)	SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED [AND DECLAR-
	)	ATION(S) OF _____ (name(s))]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date:_____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am the [attorney of record for the] _____[*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] herein.

2. _____ [*Specify facts showing that action is one in which appointment of a receiver is authorized, e.g.,* As shown by the verified complaint herein, this is an action to dissolve a partnership and for an accounting. As further shown by that complaint, (a) the partnership was formed by written agreement between the parties on _____ (*date*) to own and operate a business known as _____ (*name*) to buy and market gold and silver bullion; (b) defendant was the managing partner and he/she alone was authorized to draw checks on partnership accounts; (c) the business was enormously successful grossing in excess of $_____ for the fiscal year _____; and (d) since on or about _____ (*date*), defendant has excluded plaintiff from in any way participating in the management or conduct of the business and has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to account to plaintiff for either any or all of the profits)].

3. _____[*State nature of emergency, e.g.,* As further shown by the verified complaint, defendant, contrary to his/her agreement with, and without any notice to, plaintiff, has left the country and has expressed an intent not to return; before leaving, he/she ceased operating the business and withdrew all balances from the accounts held by him/her in both his/her personal name and under the firm's name; the remaining assets of the partnership consist of specified personal property, including art objects purchased with partnership funds, and of a stock of gold and silver bullion, all of which is in immediate danger of being removed from the jurisdiction of this court and will be removed if a receiver is not immediately appointed to take possession of them].

4. _____[*State reasons why irreparable injury would be suffered by applicant during time necessary for hearing on notice, e.g.,* If the appointment of a receiver is delayed until after defendant is given notice, defendant will accelerate his/her plans for removal of the property out of the country where it will be dispersed and difficult, if not impossible, to trace and recover, and plaintiff will thereby be deprived of any source from which to receive payment of his/her share of the partnership profits as subsequently determined by the judgment of this court, all to plaintiff's irreparable injury].

5. _____ [*State name(s), address(es), and phone number(s) of person(s) in actual possession of property for which receiver is requested, or of president, manager, or principal agent of any corporation in possession of property, e.g.,* As shown by the declaration of _____ (*name*), attached hereto, the specified personal property, including the art objects, and gold and silver bullion, are in that declarant's possession under instructions from the defendant to make all arrangements for their shipment to _____ (him/her *or other designated consignee*) on further notice from defendant but no later than _____ (*date*). The address and telephone number of _____ (*name of declarant in possession*) are _____].

6. _____ [*Specify use being made of property by person(s) in possession, e.g.,* As shown by the declaration of _____ (*name*), attached hereto, _____ (*name of declarant in possession*) is making no use of the property; he/she has had the property and bullion boxed and crated and is holding it until arrangements are completed for their shipment out of the country].

[7. _____ (*If property is part of the plant, equipment, or stock in trade of any business, specify the nature and approximate size or extent of the business and facts sufficient to show whether receiver's taking of property would stop or seriously interfere with operation of the business, e.g.,* Although the specified items of personal property, other than the art objects, described in the verified complaint are part of the equipment of the partnership business and the gold and silver bullion are its stock in trade, the partnership has ceased doing any business and will be dissolved onthe judgment of this court; consequently, the taking of the property by a receiver would in no way stop or seriously interfere with the operation of the business.]

[8. _____ (*If any of the matters enumerated in paragraphs 3-7, above, are unknown to the applicant*

and cannot be ascertained with due diligence, state fully matters unknown and efforts made to acquire information).]

WHEREFORE, _____[*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*] requests an order appointing a receiver to take immediate possession of _____ [*describe property, e.g.,* the gold and silver bullion and all other property placed by _____ (*name of partner*) in the custody of _____ (*name*) for shipment abroad] and to _____[*specify powers to be given to receiver, e.g.,* preserve and care for the property] pending further order of this Court and for an order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration and ex parte application in [1], *above,* is for use to obtain an order appointing a receiver to take immediate possession or charge of property involved in litigation and for an order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *see also* discussion in *§ 486.15*].

The form must be accompanied by a declaration regarding notice to the other parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*] and by a supporting memorandum [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1112(a), 3.1113(a), 3.1176(b)*].

For the number of copies to prepare and procedure to follow, see *§ 486.90[2]*.

[3] Notice to Opposing Party

An application for ex parte relief must be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing that notice has been given, attempted to be given, or stating reasons why notice should not be required [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*]. For discussion, see *§ 486.137[3]*.

[4] Nature of Ex Parte Appointment

The appointment of a receiver on ex parte application is a drastic remedy and is seldom warranted [*see Golden State Glass Corp. v. Superior Ct. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 384, 393, 90 P.2d 75]* . Such an order should be made only in cases of emergency which make it imperatively necessary to act at once without notice [*Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 810 n.2, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475]* . On the other hand, when necessity or emergency is shown, a receiver may be appointed [*see People v. Christ's Church (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 858, 862, 181 P.2d 49* ; *Misita v. Distillers Corp., Ltd. (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 244, 250, 128 P.2d 888]* . But even in an extreme case, the appointment of a receiver on ex parte application will be made only if less onerous remedies would be inadequate or are unavailable [*see § 486.12[2]*].

[5] Showing Required

[a] Mandatory Requirements

In addition to showing that the action or proceeding is one in which a receiver may properly be appointed and the facts establishing the ground of the motion (*see, generally, Code Civ. Proc. § 564*, and discussion in *§ 486.13*), an ex parte applicant for appointment of a receiver must show in detail the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)*]:

- The nature of the emergency and the reasons irreparable injury would be suffered by the applicant during the time necessary for a hearing.

- The names, addresses, and phone numbers of the persons in actual possession of the property for which a receiver is requested, or of the president, manager, or principal agent of any corporation in possession of the property.

- The use being made of the property by the persons in possession.

- If the property is a part of the plant, equipment, or stock in trade of any business, the nature and approximate size or extent of the business, and facts sufficient to show whether the taking of the property by a receiver would stop or seriously interfere with the operation of the business.

The requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175* are mandatory and must be met before a receiver is appointed on ex parte application [*see Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 810 n.2, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475* (citing former Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule 238, the predecessor of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*)].

[b] Unknown Matters

If any of these matters are unknown to the applicant and cannot be ascertained by the exercise of due diligence, the applicant's declaration or verified complaint must fully state the matters unknown and the efforts made to acquire the information [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*].

[c] Verification

The showing required to have a receiver appointed on ex parte application may be made by verified complaint or declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)*]. For sample forms of allegations and prayers that may be included in a complaint alleging the ground or grounds for the appointment, see *§§ 486.130 -486.133*.

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms of noticed and ex parte motions and orders on a motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For points and authorities supporting and opposing the appointment or confirmation of a receiver, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.140

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.140 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Fixing Amount of Undertaking to Be Filed by Ex Parte Applicant for Appointment of Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Fixing Amount of Undertaking to Be Filed by Ex Parte Applicant for Appointment of Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

WHEREAS *Section 566(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure* provides that before a receiver is appointed on ex parte application the Court must require from the applicant an undertaking in an amount fixed by the Court for the defendant's protection,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff file an undertaking, or bond, in the amount of $_____.
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The order in [1], *above*, is for use to fix the amount of the undertaking required to be filed by the ex parte applicant for the appointment of a receiver before the court makes the order of appointment. An order appointing a receiver on ex parte application is void unless the applicant's undertaking is fixed and filed [*Sweins v. Superior Court (1936) 16 Cal. App. 2d 336, 60 P.2d 313* ; *Westphal v. Superior Court (1932) 120 Cal. App. 263, 264, 7 P.2d 711* ; *Ryan v. Murphy (1919) 39 Cal. App. 640, 643, 179 P. 517]* . For a combined form of order appointing a receiver, orders setting the amounts of the applicant's and the receiver's undertakings, and order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed, see *§ 486.141*.

In the case of a receivership to take charge of rents, issues, and profits under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*, counsel may prefer to use optionalJudicial Council Form RC-200, which provides for plaintiff's ex parte bond at Item 8. RC-200 is illustrated in Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*.

[3] Form and Content of Undertaking

The undertaking must be to the effect that the applicant will pay to the defendant all damages the defendant may sustain by reason of the appointment of the receiver and the entry by the receiver on his or her duties, in case the applicant shall have procured the appointment wrongfully, maliciously, or without sufficient cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; *see Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 366, 24 P. 121]* . In the case of multiple defendants, the undertaking should run in favor of each defendant in the action and should be in such form that any defendant would have a right of action on it if he or she is damaged by the appointment [*Title etc. Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1912) 164 Cal. 58, 65, 127 P. 502]* .

The undertaking may be in the form of an undertaking given by personal sureties or of a bond issued by an admitted surety insurer [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.210(b), 995.310, 995.610(a)*]. A form of bond or undertaking is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.330*. The bond or undertaking must be filed with the court, preserved in the office of the clerk of the court, and appropriate entries made in the court's register of actions [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.340, 995.350*].

[4] Amount of Undertaking

The amount of the undertaking would normally be the amount that would cover the value of transferable personal property and cash which the receiver may possess at any point in time during the expected period of the receivership.

At the hearing to appoint a receiver, the applicant must, and other parties may, propose and state the reasons for the specific amounts of the undertakings required from the applicant for any injunction that is ordered in or with the order appointing a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1178*].

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms of bonds and undertakings, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.141

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.141 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Appointing Receiver and Fixing Amounts of Undertakings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 567(b)], and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment of Receiver Should Not Be Confirmed [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Appointing Receiver and Fixing Amounts of Undertakings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 566(b), 567(b)], and Order to Show Cause Why Appointment of Receiver Should Not Be Confirmed [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

Having considered the declaration and ex parte application of _____[*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*] for an order appointing a receiver [and the verified complaint herein *or* the affidavit(s) of _____ (*name(s)*) *or* the declaration(s) of _____ (*name(s)*) *or any combination of the foregoing*], and the Court having determined that (1) good cause exists for the appointment of a

receiver; (2) _____[*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] would suffer irreparable injury during the time necessary for a hearing on notice; (3) _____[*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] must execute and file an undertaking in the amount of $_____ to the effect that the _____[*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will pay to the _____[*identify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] all damages the _____[*identify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] may sustain by reason of the appointment of the receiver and the entry by the receiver on his/her duties, in case the _____[*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] shall have procured the appointment wrongfully, maliciously, or without sufficient cause; and (4) _____[*name of proposed receiver*] is qualified to act as a receiver in this case,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. _____[*Name of proposed receiver*] is appointed receiver in this _____[*action or proceeding*].

2. On qualifying to act as receiver herein by the taking and filing of an oath to perform his/her duties as receiver faithfully and securing and filing an undertaking or bond to the State of California in the amount of$_____ to the effect that _____[*name of receiver*] will faithfully discharge the duties of receiver in the action and obey the orders of the Court, _____[*name of receiver*], as receiver, shall take possession of _____[*describe property*] and _____[manage *or* operate *or* preserve *or* maintain *or other or any combination of the foregoing*] the property pending further order of this Court [and, in exercising the foregoing functions, the receiver shall have the following powers in addition to those specified by law: _____ (*specify*)].

3. The receiver shall take possession of all the books and records pertaining to the property of the defendant, wherever located, as the receiver deems necessary for the proper administration, management and/or control of the estate, but the books and records shall be made available to defendant as is reasonably necessary;

4. To execute and prepare all documents and to perform all acts, either in the name of the defendant or in the receiver's own name, which are necessary or incidental to preserving, protecting, managing and/or controlling the property of the receivership estate;

5. To employ agents, servants, employees, guards, clerks, accountants, on-site managers and management consultants to administer the receivership estate, manage the property and keep the same insured and in good repair, if the receiver shall deem the same necessary, and to pay the reasonable value of those services out of the rents received;

6. The defendant shall notify the receiver upon the receiver's taking possession of the property whether or not there is sufficient insurance coverage on the property. If sufficient insurance coverage does exist, the defendant shall be responsible for naming, and is hereby ordered to name, the receiver as an additional insured on the insurance policy or policies for the period that the receiver shall be in possession of the property. If there is insufficient insurance coverage, it is hereby ordered that the receiver shall have thirty (30) working days to procure insurance on the property, providing that the receiver has funds available to do so, and during that period the receiver shall not be personally responsible for claims arising or for the procurement of insurance;

7. The monies coming into possession of the receiver pursuant to his or her operation of the business thereto, and not expended for any of the purposes herein authorized, shall be held by the receiver for the payment of the Defendants' obligation to plaintiff sued upon in the complaint, subject to such orders as this Court may hereinafter issue as to their disposition;

8. To establish bank accounts for the deposit of monies and funds collected and received in connection with his or her administration of the receivership estate, at any financial institution the receiver deems appropriate, provided that any

funds on deposit at the financial institution are fully insured by an agency of the United States government;

9. To institute ancillary proceedings in this state or other states and countries as are necessary to preserve and protect the receivership estate, and the receiver may engage the services of legal counsel, if necessary, upon further application to the Court. The receiver may pay for such services from the funds of the receivership estate;

10. To the extent feasible, the receiver shall, within thirty (30) days of his or her qualification hereunder, file in this action an inventory of all property of which he shall have taken possession pursuant to this order and shall conduct periodic accountings thereafter;

11. To prepare periodic interim statements reflecting the receiver's fees and administrative costs and expenses incurred for that interim period in the operation and administration of the receivership estate. Upon completion of an interim statement, and the mailing of the statement to the parties' respective attorneys of record, or any other designated person or agent, the receiver shall pay from the estate funds, if any, the amount of that statement based upon the fee schedule set forth in the declaration of the receiver filed in support of plaintiff's motion for appointment of a receiver. Despite the periodic statement of receiver's fees and administrative expenses, such fees and expenses shall be submitted to the Court for its approval and confirmation, in the form of a notice of an interim request for fees, an agreement among the parties, or the receiver's final accounting and report;

12. The receiver shall take possession of all the books and records of defendant wherever located, as the receiver deems necessary for the proper administration, management, and/or control of the estate;

13. The receiver, or any party to this action, may, from time to time and on due notice to all parties, make application to this Court for further orders instructing the receiver.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the defendant, and all persons and entities now in possession of any part of the Subject Property and not holding under valid leases or rental agreements, shall forthwith surrender their possession thereof to the receiver, and that all tenants or lessees in possession of any part of the Subject Property, and any other persons or entities as may be lawfully in possession thereof, are hereby directed, until further order of this Court, to pay over to the receiver all rents of the Subject Property now due and unpaid or that may hereafter become due, and all persons and entities liable for such rents are hereby enjoined and restrained from paying any rents for the Subject Property to the defendant, its agents, servants or attorneys.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____[*identify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] _____[*name*] appear in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ (*number*) of] this Court, located at _____[*street address and city*], California, on _____[*date*] at _____[*time*] and show cause, if any he/she has, why the appointment of the receiver should not be confirmed.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use when the court grants an ex parte application for the appointment of a receiver and an order to show cause. The order to show cause must be made returnable on the earliest date that the business of the court will admit, but not later than 15 days from the date of the order or, if good cause appears to the court, 22 days from the date the order is issued [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)*].

In the case of a receivership to take charge of rents, issues, and profits under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*, counsel may prefer to use Judicial Council Form RC-200, an ex parte order appointing receiver and order to show cause. RC-200 is illustrated in Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*.

[3] Order Appointing Receiver

An order appointing a receiver is erroneous if it fails to define the scope of the receivership or to describe the property to be affected by it. The property must be sufficiently described so that the receiver can take possession of it [*Ryan v. Murphy (1919) 39 Cal. App. 640, 642, 179 P. 517]* . Thus, the order must describe the property of which the receiver is to take possession with sufficient certainty, although in certain cases the order may require the receiver to take possession of "all the property" of the party affected [*Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 387, 24 P. 121]* .

The court may order not only the party, but the party's agents and employees, to deliver property to the receiver, but the fact that the order describes specific property does not give the receiver a right to take the property from the possession of a stranger to the action who claims to be a good-faith purchaser of it [*Havemeyer v. Superior Court (1890) 84 Cal. 327, 387, 24 P. 121]* .

For a discussion of the receiver's duties, see *§ 486.30* et seq.

[4] Undertakings

The order of appointment is not effective until the applicant's undertaking in the amount specified by the court is filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*] and the receiver cannot embark on his or her duties until he or she has taken the required oath and filed the required undertaking in the sum specified by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 567*].

At the hearing to appoint a receiver, the applicant must, and other parties may, propose and state the reasons for the specific amounts of theundertakings required from the applicant for any injunction that is ordered in or with the order appointing a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1178*].

[5] Service of Papers

As soon as reasonably practical, but no later than 5 days after the date on which the order to show cause is issued, unless the court orders another time for service, the applicant must serve the following on each of the adverse parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*]:

- A copy of the complaint if not previously served;
- The order to show cause stating the date, time, and place of the hearing;
- Any declarations supporting the application; and
- A memorandum supporting the application.

For further discussion, see *§ 486.90[2]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.142

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.142 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

On _____[*date*], this Court, on the ex parte application of _____[*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*], appointed _____[*name*] as receiver of _____[*describe property*] and ordered _____[*identify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] to appear and show cause if any he/she had why the appointment should not be confirmed.

The matter on the order to show cause came on for hearing before this Court, the Honorable _____[

name] presiding, on _____[*date*] at _____[*time*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]. Defendant appeared by counsel _____[*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the Court that the appointment should be confirmed,

IT IS ORDERED that the appointment by this Court of _____[*name of receiver*] as receiver be and is hereby confirmed.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the undertakings filed by _____ (*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) and the receiver in the amounts of $_____ and $_____, respectively, remain in effect.]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use when the court, on the hearing of an order to show cause, confirms its earlier order appointing a receiver on ex parte application. At the hearing each party may suggest in writing one or more persons for substitution as receiver, stating the reasons [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*]. If the court orders a substitution, the order relieving the original receiver, and the order appointing the new receiver and fixingthe amount of his or her undertaking, should be included in the order, as well as any orders as to when the original receiver's final report and account [for procedural checklist, *see § 486.91*] should be filed.

In the case of a receivership to take charge of rents, issues, and profits under *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*, counsel may prefer to use Judicial Council Form RC-210, an order confirming appointment of receiver and preliminary injunction. RC-210 is illustrated in Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.143

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.143 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Notice of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Notice of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR AP-
Plaintiff,	)	POINTMENT OF RECEIVER [AND MEMOR-
vs.	)	ANDUM]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____[*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____[*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____

of] this Court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____[*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 564* appointing a receiver to take possession of _____[*describe property*] (hereinafter "the property") and, pending the determination of this action, to _____[*specify what receiver is to do with property, e.g.,* manage, control, care for, preserve, maintain, and incur the expenses necessary for the management, control, care, preservation, and maintenance of, the property, and, specifically, to collect the rents, issues, and profits therefrom, to pay any taxes or assessments falling due during the period of receivership, and to otherwise employ labor as may be necessary, purchase supplies, and incur the risks and obligations ordinarily incurred by owners, managers, and operators of similar businesses]. The motion will be made on the grounds that _____[*specify grounds, e.g.,* the property which is the subject to this action is in danger of being lost or materially injured and that the appointment of a receiver is necessary to preserve it pending determination of this lawsuit].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____[*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, [and] on the records and file herein [, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[*Add memorandum of points and authorities supporting motion.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above,* is for use to apply for an order appointing a receiver. The form assumes that the motion will be made on one of the grounds specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 564,* which apply whether or not the action is a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(8)* (in limited civil cases, receiver may be appointed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 564*)]. The form may, however, be used to apply for appointment of a receiver in other cases. If the motion is made on a ground provided by some statute other than *Code Civ. Proc. § 564,* citation to that other statute should be substituted for *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* in this form.

Motions for the appointment of a receiver without notice are authorized in limited situations and subject to a number of conditions to meet procedural due process requirements [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*; for a form of ex parte application, *see § 486.139*].

[3] Noticed Motion Procedure

Neither *Code Civ. Proc. § 564* nor any other statute authorizing the appointment of a receiver specifies the procedure to be followed to secure the appointment [*see, e.g., Neider v. Dardi (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 646, 650, 279 P.2d 598]* . Consequently, the general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure apply. Under those provisions, an "order" is a direction of a court or judge, made or entered in writing, and not included in a judgment, and an application for an order is a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1003*]. Thus, the court's appointment of a receiver is an "order" and the application for the order is a "motion." For an outline of the procedure, *see § 486.90[1]*. For further discussion and general forms of motions and orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[4] Memorandum of Points and Authorities

A memorandum of points and authorities must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1112(a),* 3.1113(a); *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and general forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[5] Cross References

For full discussion of noticed motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For discussion of the service of notices of motion and supporting papers and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For points and authorities for use on a motion for appointment of a receiver, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 200, *Receivers* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.144

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.144 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Appointing Receiver

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____
Plaintiff,	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR APPOINT-
vs.	)	MENT OF RECEIVER
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am the _____[*identify declarant, e.g.,* plaintiff in the above-entitled action].

2. _____ [*Specify nature of action, showing that it is one in which appointment of receiver is*

authorized, e.g., As shown by the verified complaint herein, this is an action to foreclose a mortgage on a 10-unit apartment house located at _____ (*street address and city*), California, after defendant's default in making installment payments on the mortgage note and for the sale of the property].

3. _____ [*Set forth conditions justifying the appointment of a receiver pendente lite, e.g.,* The apartment building has been cited several times in the past year for building code violations, none of which has been corrected either in whole or in part. The costs of correcting these violations and bringing the building up to code are in excess of $_____. As shown by the Current Income/Expense Sheet attached hereto and made a part hereof, only four of the units are rented, producing a total monthly income of $_____, and the current operating expenses of the building amount to $_____ per month. It is unlikely, because of the building code violations, that any or all of the remaining six units will be rented within the foreseeable future. The total amount of the balance due on the mortgage debt is $_____. As shown by the declaration of _____ (*name*), a licensed real estate appraiser, attached hereto and made a part hereof, the property's present value is $_____. This is insufficient to discharge the mortgage debt].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration in [1], *above,* is for use to support a motion for the appointment of a receiver to take possession of property during the pendency of the action. In the fact situation illustrated, the motion is by the plaintiff mortgagee in an action to foreclose the mortgage and for the sale of the property because the mortgagor has defaulted in his or her installment payments and the present value of the property is probably insufficient to discharge the mortgage debt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*].

For further discussion, see also *§ 486.131[2] et seq. and § 486.143[2]* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.145

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.145 Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Granting Motion and Appointing Receiver

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Receiver Pendente Lite--Order Granting Motion and Appointing Receiver

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____[*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____[*name*] for the appointment of a receiver in the above-entitled action came on regularly for hearing before the Court, the Honorable _____[*name*] presiding, on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]. _____ [Defendant appeared by counsel _____ (*name*) or No appearance was made by defendant or by anyone on his/her behalf].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the Court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The motion be and is granted;

2. _____[*Name*], whose address is _____[*specify*], is appointed receiver;

3. Before entering on his/her duties as receiver, _____[*name*] take an oath to perform the duties of receiver faithfully, that he/she execute an undertaking, or secure a bond, in the amount of $_____ to the State of California for the faithful performance of those duties subject to the orders of this Court, and that the oath and undertaking, or bond, be filed with the Clerk of the Court;

4. On the filing of the executed oath and undertaking, or bond, _____[*name*], as receiver, shall take possession of the following described property (hereinafter "the property"): _____[*description*]; [and]

5. Pending further order of this Court, _____[*name*], as receiver, is instructed to _____[*specify receiver's duties, e.g.,* manage, control,care for, preserve, maintain, and incur the expenses necessary for the management, control, care, preservation, and maintenance of, the property, and, specifically, to collect the rents, issues, and profits therefrom, to pay any taxes or assessments falling due during the period of receivership, and to otherwise employ labor as may be necessary, purchase supplies, and incur the risks and obligations ordinarily incurred by owners, managers, and operators of similar businesses] [; and]

[6. _____ (*Name*), as receiver, is further instructed to _____ (*specify any further instructions*).]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT _____[*party, e.g.,* defendant] _____[*name*] [and any of his/her agents or employees], on request and exhibition of a conformed copy of this order, immediately deliver possession of any property herein described to _____[*name of receiver*].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above,* is for use in granting a motion for the appointment of a receiver, appointing a receiver, fixing the amount of the receiver's undertaking, and specifying the receiver's duties and powers. The specific duties and powers given must, of course, be responsive to the precise situation involved. With appropriate modifications, the foregoing form may also be used to appoint a receiver after judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3),(4)*].

For some examples of orders appointing a receiver and specifying their duties in specific actions, see *Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 351, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* (receiver appointed in aid of execution; authority held not to extend to certain litigation); *People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 577-581, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68* (receiver appointed in action by attorney general to operate university; receiver of quasi-public corporation impliedly had power to sell unneeded furniture and equipment to obtain funds for current operating expenses); *Venza v. Venza (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 878, 881-882, 211 P.2d 913* (receiver appointed to take charge of going business in action to set aside property settlement agreement).

For general discussion and additional cross references, see *§ 486.141[2] et seq. and § 486.143[2]* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Appointment of Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.146-486.149

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.146[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.150

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.150 Receiver's Original or Supplementary Inventory of Property [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181]

[1] FORM Receiver's Original or Supplementary Inventory of Property [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	RECEIVER'S [SUPPLEMENTARY] INVENTORY
Defendant.	)	OF PROPERTY
	)	
	)	

_____

[*EITHER, if original inventory*]

The undersigned, as receiver, renders the following inventory of property and assets which have come into his/her possession since his/her appointment herein on _____[*date*]:

[*OR, if supplementary inventory*]

The undersigned, as receiver, has, since the filing of the original inventory herein on _____[*date*], obtained possession of the following described property as a part of the receiver's inventory:

[*CONTINUE*]

1. _____[*Set forth in this and subsequent paragraphs a detailed list of all property of which the receiver has taken possession by virtue of the appointment either from the date of appointment, if an original inventory, or from the date of the prior inventory, if a supplementary inventory*].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Receiver

[2] Use of Form

The skeletal form in [1], *above*, is for use by a receiver to render his or her original or supplementary inventory of property taken into receivership. To complete the form, a complete and detailed list of the property must be compiled below the introductory paragraph [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*]. If any of the property consists of money and the court has notdesignated a bank in which it may be deposited, the receiver may wish concurrently to apply for an order designating a depository bank [*see § 486.103*; *see § 486.151* (form of application for order)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.151

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.151 Application by Receiver for Court Order and Order--General Form

[1] FORM Application by Receiver for Court Order and Order--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	APPLICATION FOR _____ [*specify order sought*]
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

Applicant hereby requests an order _____[*specify order sought, e.g.,* specifying a bank into which receivership funds should be deposited], and in support of this application represents:

1. Applicant was appointed receiver herein by order of this Court made and entered on _____[*date*] and thereafter qualified by filing the required bond and oath.

2. Under the order of appointment, applicant was granted the following powers [and no others]: _____[*specify*, to receive, preserve, care for, and maintain the receivership property].

3. _____ [*State facts necessitating order, e.g.,* Applicant has come into possession of certain moneys, totalling the sum of $_____, as part of the receivership estate and wishes to deposit this sum, and any other moneys received, in a bank account pending further order of the Court. The receivership estate has no existing bank account].

WHEREFORE, applicant prays that this Court make and enter its order _____[*specify, e.g.,* designating a bank into which the moneys may be deposited].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

ORDER

_____ [So ordered *or if all terms of the order do not appear above* It is hereby ordered that _____ (*specify terms of order, e.g.,* the moneys referred to and any other sums received by the applicant as part of the receivership estate be deposited in the _____ (*name of bank*))].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of application in [1], *above,* is for use by a receiver to apply without prior notice to the parties to the action for an order permitting him or her to do an act or exercise a power that is not expressly authorized by the order of appointment. With appropriate modifications, the form may also be used by a receiver to petition the court for instructions, in which event the title of the paper should be changed to "PETITION FOR INSTRUCTIONS" and the applicant referred to as "Petitioner." In addition, the matters giving rise to the need for instructions should be clearly and fully stated.

If the order sought is one that will affect the rights or liabilities of any party to the action, then notice to that party or to all parties would normally be required to meet the procedural due process requirements of notice and opportunity to be heard of *U.S. Const., amend. XIV* and *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*. In that event, the receiver should seek the order by petition filed with the court with a copy of the petition and a notice of hearing served on all parties to the action or by noticed motion to the parties, supported by an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth the facts necessitating the order. For a form of petition, see *§ 486.152*. For an example of the format for a notice of motion, supporting declaration, and order granting a noticed motion, see *§§ 486.143 -486.145*.

[3] Terminology

Applications by a receiver for a court order have been variously referred to in the cases as an "application," a "motion,"or a "petition" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (defining an "application" for an order as a "motion")]. The term "application" is, however, normally used in connection with an oral or written motion made without notice to the adverse party, usually referred to as an ex parte application or motion. The application of a receiver is not technically speaking an ex parte application even if made without notice to the parties to the action, however, because the receiver is not a party to the action, but, rather, an officer of the court [*see Miller v. Fidelity etc. Co. of Maryland (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 580, 584, 40 P.2d 951* ; *see* discussion in *§ 486.11[2]*]. Hence, if the word "application" is used it should not be

called an "ex parte" application.

Use of the term petition also finds support in the codes when a hearing on the application is or may be required. The term "petition" is frequently used to mean a written motion which is filed with the court with a conformed copy of the petition, together with a notice of the time and place of the hearing, served on each party to the action. For a form of notice of hearing that may be adapted for use in such case, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.152

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.152 Petition by Receiver for Leave to Employ Attorney [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180] and Order

[1] FORM Petition by Receiver for Leave to Employ Attorney [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180] and Order

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR LEAVE TO EMPLOY ATTOR-
Plaintiff,	)	NEY
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner was appointed receiver herein by order of this Court made and entered on _____[*date*].

2. Petitioner requires the aid of legal counsel to _____[*specify nature of legal services to be performed, e.g.,* advise petitioner with respect to the terms and conditions of contracts authorized by the Court to be entered into by the receiver on behalf of the receivership estate].

3. _____[*Name*] is an attorney, duly licensed to practice law in California, with offices at _____[*address*], and is not attorney for, or associated with or employed by an attorney for, any party to this _____[action *or* proceeding].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that this Court make and enter its order authorizing petitioner to employ _____[*name*], as attorney for the purposes herein set forth.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

ORDER

So ordered.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The petition in [1], *above*, is for use by a receiver to apply for an order permitting him or her to employ an attorney on behalf of the receivership estate with a short form of order appended [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*; for discussion, *see § 486.30[4]*, for a procedural checklist, *see § 486.104*]. Local practice may require a separate order. For a general form of order, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[3] Time of Application

Application for leave to employ an attorney should normally be made and approval secured before the attorney is employed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*]. However, because the court has power to approve the receiver's employment of an attorney beforehand, it may subsequently ratify an employment made without prior court authorization. This rule has been said to be one of common sense necessitated by the fact that often a receiver is required to act in an emergency when no prior approval is possible [*Maggiora v. Palo Alto Inn, Inc. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 706, 713, 57 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *see People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 582, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . But if prior court approval is not obtained, the receiver may be personally liable for the attorney's fee if the court does not subsequently ratify the employment.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.153

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.153 Notice of Unclaimed Funds [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

[1] FORM Notice of Unclaimed Funds [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF UNCLAIMED FUNDS
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the undersigned, as receiver appointed by the Court in the above-entitled action, has taken possession of funds in the amount of $_____ belonging to _____[*name*] whose whereabouts are unknown to the undersigned.

The last known _____[place of residence *or* post office address] of _____[*name of owner*] is _____[*address*].

NOTICE IS ALSO GIVEN that if the funds are not claimed within 30 days from _____[*date of last publication of notice*], the undersigned will report them to the Court and, on its order, the funds will be paid into the State Treasury. Any claim on the funds should be made to the undersigned at _____[*address*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Receiver

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a receiver having funds belonging to a person whose whereabouts are unknown to give public notice of the unclaimed funds in his or her possession. Publication of the notice is required before the receiver may receive his or her discharge as receiver [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 570*; for a procedural checklist, *see § 486.107*].

[3] Contents of Notice

The notice must set forth the name of the owner of the unclaimed funds, the last known place of residence or post office address of the owner, and the amount of the unclaimed funds [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*]. By implication, the notice should also specify the receiver's address at which any claim to the funds may be made.

[4] Period of Publication

The notice must be published in one or more newspapers published in the county at least once a week for four consecutive weeks [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*].

[5] Costs of Publication

All costs and expenses connected with the advertising are to be paid out of the unclaimed funds of the owner whose whereabouts are unknown [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*].

[6] Cross References

For a form of order directing payment of the funds to the state treasury, see *§ 486.154*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.154

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.154 Order Directing Payment of Unclaimed Funds Into State Treasury [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

[1] FORM Order Directing Payment of Unclaimed Funds Into State Treasury [Code Civ. Proc. § 570]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

_____[*Name*], as receiver in the above-entitled action, having in his/her possession funds in the amount of $_____, belonging to _____[*name*] whose whereabouts are unknown to him/her, and having caused notice of such fact and of the name of the owner of the funds, the owner's last known _____[place of residence *or* post office address], which is _____[*specify*], and the amount of the unclaimed funds to be published for at least four consecutive weeks in the _____[*name of newspaper*], which is published in this county, and 30 days having passed since the last publication without the owner or anyone on his/her behalf having appeared to claim the funds,

IT IS ORDERED that the receiver first pay out of the unclaimed funds the costs of the publication in the amount of $_____ and then pay the balance of those funds in the amount of $_____ into the State Treasury.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this order accompany the payment of the funds into the State Treasury.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use to direct the receiver to pay into the State Treasury the unclaimed funds of an owner whose whereabouts are unknown and who has not responded to a published notice within 30 days after the final publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*]. The order must set forth the facts required in the notice [*see § 486.153*], and a copy of the order must accompany the payment of the funds into the State Treasury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 570*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.155

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.155 Application by Receiver for Authority to Borrow Money and to Issue Receivership Certificate

[1] FORM Application by Receiver for Authority to Borrow Money and to Issue Receivership Certificate
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	APPLICATION FOR ORDER GRANTING RE-
Plaintiff,	)	CEIVER AUTHORITY TO BORROW MONEY
vs.	)	AND ISSUE RECEIVERSHIP CERTIFICATE
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

Applicant hereby requests an order _____[*specify order sought, e.g.,* authorizing him/her as receiver the authority to borrow money and to issue a receivership certificate], and in support of this application represents:

1. Applicant was appointed receiver herein by order of this Court made and entered on _____ [*date*], and thereafter qualified by filing the required bond and oath.

2. Under the order of appointment, applicant was granted the following powers [and no others]:

_____[*specify*, to receive, preserve, care for, and maintain the receivership property].

3. _____[*State facts which make it necessary for receiver to apply for an order enabling the receivership estate to borrow money, e.g.*, Applicant needs to borrow money to cover the cost of the administration of the receivership estate since the receivership estate is insolvent.]

4. _____[*State name of party who is going to lend money to receivership estate, amount of money to be lent, and terms of repayment*].

5. Receiver requests authority from the Court to execute a loan agreement and to issue a receiver's certificate of indebtedness to the proposed lender which certificate of indebtedness shall constitute a first priority lien on the assets of the receivership estate.

WHEREFORE, applicant requests that this Court make and enter itsorder allowing the receiver to borrow money from _____[*specify name of lender*] and that the Court grant the receiver authority to issue a receiver's certificate of indebtedness.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

ORDER

_____ [So ordered, *or if all terms of the order do not appear above*, It is hereby ordered that _____ (*specify terms of order, e.g.*, receiver may issue a receivership certificate which certificate shall constitute a first priority lien on assets of the receivership estate)].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The petition in [1], *above*, is for use for receiver to apply for an order permitting him or her to obtain a receivership certificate on behalf of the receivership estate in order to borrow money to fund the operations of the receivership estate with a short form of order appended [*see Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1915) 171 Cal. 173, 152 P. 542* ; for discussion, *see § 486.30[8]*]. Local practice may require a separate order. For a general form of order, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* . For a form of certificate, see *§ 486.156*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.156

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.156 Receivership Certificate

[1] FORM Receivership Certificate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	RECEIVERSHIP CERTIFICATE
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

CERTIFICATE OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE RECEIVER

Certificate No. _____

Issue of _____ Dollars

1. This certificate of indebtedness is issued by _____[*name*] ("the Receiver"), not individually, but in his/her other capacity as Receiver of the real property, personal property, fixtures, and other materials located on the

real property and located elsewhere if designated for the real property commonly known as _____[*address*] (the "Property"). A legal description of the real property is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

2. This certifies that there is due to _____[*name of lender*] from the Receiver the principal sum of $_____, together with interest thereon as provided in Paragraph 3 below, payable (a) upon the sale (by foreclosure or otherwise) or refinance of the Property, from the proceeds thereof, or (b) upon the date of the final distribution of the receivership's assets, from liquid assets over and above those necessary to pay debts incurred by the Receiver by reason of his appointment. If the indebtedness evidenced hereby has not been paid in full before or pursuant to final distribution of the receivership's assets, this certificate shall continue to be a lien on all property, real and personal, of the receivership estate distributed in the final distribution of the Receiver's assets, with such priority as provided in Paragraph 4, below, and the indebtedness evidenced hereby shall be payable from any proceeds generated (a) upon the sale or refinance of the Property, from the proceeds thereof, or (b) upon collection of rental or other income from the Property, from the monies collected thereby, until such indebtedness is paid in full. All payments hereunder shall be applied first to the payment of any accrued and unpaid interest, fees, and costs, and then to the payment of principal. Payment due hereunder shall be made at such place as the holder shall direct and upon such payment, the holder hereof shall surrender this certificate to the person making such payment,marking the same "paid in full," and shall deliver to the person making such payment an instrument in recordable form executed by the obligee hereof, such obligee's successor in interest or such obligee's assign (in which case written assignment hereof in recordable form shall also be delivered), releasing the lien of this certificate on all property encumbered hereby. In addition to and not in derogation of the foregoing provisions of this Paragraph 2, the obligee hereof (or such obligee's successor in interest or assign) shall have the right at any time following the recordation hereof in the Official Records of _____[*name of county*], to release the lien of this certificate on all property encumbered hereby by executing an instrument in recordable form releasing such lien, and such lien shall be released upon the recordation of such instrument in the Official Records of _____[*name of county*].

3. Interest on the principal sum of this certificate shall accrue from the date hereof at the rate of _____[*specify interest rate*]. Interest will be computed on a three hundred sixty-five (365) day basis and the actual number of days elapsed, and shall be compounded annually.

4. This certificate shall constitute a lien on all of the Property, have priority over all other liens encumbering the Property, whether previously existing or hereafter created; provided, however, that with respect to the certificates of indebtedness issued by the Receiver, this certificate shall have priority all other certificates of indebtedness of a larger certificate number which will be executed subsequent to the time hereof and shall be subordinated to all certificates of indebtedness of a smaller certificate number which were executed prior to the time hereof.

5. This certificate is issued under the authority of, and in accordance with, the orders of this Court in the receivership proceeding.

6. This certificate is declared to be a debt of the Receiver, and his/her successors as Receiver, and the Receiver shall have no personal liability with respect to any of the obligations referred to herein.

7. This certificate shall not be obligatory for any purpose until signed by the Receiver.

In witness whereof, the Receiver, has executed this certificate as Receiver, but not personally, on _____[*date*], at _____[*city*], California.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The receivership certificate in [1], *above,* is for use when a receiver appointed over real property obtains an order from a court permitting him or her to issue a receivership certificate on behalf of the receivership estate in order to borrow money to fund the operations of the receivership estate. For discussion, see *§ 486.14*. For a form of application for authority to issue a receivership certificate, see *§ 486.155*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.157

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.157 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Final Account and Report and Petition for Discharge

[1] FORM Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Final Account and Report and Petition for Discharge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	RECEIVER'S FINAL ACCOUNT AND REPORT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

_____[*Name*], the duly appointed, qualified, and acting receiver herein, renders his/her final account and report of his/her administration as follows:

CHARGES

The receiver charges himself/herself as follows:

1.	Assets as per inventory [and supplementary inventory] heretofore filed	$_____ _____

2.	Income from _____ [*specify source of income, e.g.,* rentals *or* operation of business] as per Schedule "A"	$_____
3.	Other cash received as per Schedule "B"	$_____
	Total cash received	$_____
	Total charges	$_____

CREDITS

The receiver takes credit for the following:

Date	Expenditure	Voucher No.	Amount
_____	_____	_____	$_____
_____	_____	_____	$_____
Property remaining in hands of receiver			$_____
Cash remaining in hands of receiver			$_____
	Total Credits		$_____

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATION

_____[*Name*] was appointed receiver herein by an order of this Court duly made and entered on _____[*date*]. Immediately thereafter,he/she qualified to act as receiver by executing the oath required by law and filing a bond in the amount of $_____ as fixed by the Court.

_____ [*Continue recitals of acts performed by receiver in the course of his/her duties, e.g.,* Pursuant to the Court's order receiver took over the business known as _____ and operated and ran the business from _____ (*date*) until _____ (*date*), on which date the business was _____ (sold *or* liquidated). Receiver actively managed the business and was present during all business hours and has been paid the sum of $_____ per _____ (*e.g.,* week) for such services for a total of $_____].

In addition to the services mentioned above, receiver performed additional services consisting of _____[*describe services*] and the sum of $_____ is a reasonable and fair amount to be allowed him/her as additional compensation for his/her services as receiver.

Pursuant to the order of this Court, receiver employed _____[*name*] of _____[*address*] as his/her attorney to represent him/her in matters pertaining to the administration of the receivership estate; the attorney performed the services and has submitted to receiver an itemized statement, a copy of which is attached hereto, for services rendered in the amount of $_____; receiver is informed and believes that the amount stated represents the reasonable value of the services rendered; _____ [no previous payments or allowances for attorney fees have been made *or* the attorney has previously been allowed and paid the sum of $_____].

WHEREFORE, receiver prays as follows:

1. After due notice is given and proceedings had, this Court make its order settling and approving this Final Account and Report;

2. Receiver be authorized and directed to pay the sum of $_____ to attorney _____[*name*];

3. Receiver be allowed the further sum of $_____ as additional compensation for his/her services as receiver;

4. This Court order and direct the manner in which the funds and assets remaining in receiver's hands are to be distributed; and

5. On distribution of the funds and assets in accordance with the Court's order, receiver be discharged and that his/her bond be exonerated.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a receiver to render a final account and report. The form is illustrative only, and the actual contents will depend on the nature of the receivership property, the services performed by the receiver with respect to it, whether income was received or expenditures made, whether the receiver had to employ an attorney to counsel him or her on the receivership property or to prosecute or defend a lawsuit,and the nature of the receivership property remaining in his or her possession.

The form is for use either when the receiver's functions have been terminated by termination of the lawsuit or in response to a court order to file the report and account. For a form of notice of hearing on the final account and report, see *§ 486.158*. As an alternative procedure, the receiver may serve and file a notice of motion for termination of the receivership, approval of the final account (which would be attached to the notice of motion), and an award of attorney fees (if incurred), receiver's fee, and costs [*see, e.g., Administrative Management Services, Inc. v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 532, 534, 152 Cal. Rptr. 620]* . For a form of notice of motion which may be adapted for such use, see *§ 486.143*.

[3] Duty to Keep and File Accounts

A receiver, like any other fiduciary, has the duty to keep accurate accounts and may in a proper case be held liable for failure to do so [*Seccombe v. Dionne (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 731, 734, 40 P.2d 299]* . A receiver must make monthly reports to the parties, and if requested to nonparty client lien holders, as discussed at *§ 486.31[4]*. However, these

reports need not be filed with the court unless the court so orders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182*]. A receiver has the further duty to file his or her accounts when required by the court. If the receiver fails to do so, the court, on its own motion or on the motion of a party in interest, may order the receiver to do so [*Adams v. Woods (1857) 8 Cal. 306, 316]* . The filing and approval of the receiver's account is necessary for the receiver to be discharged and his or her bond exonerated [*see Seccombe v. Dionne (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 731, 733, 40 P.2d 299]* .

[4] Contents of Account and Report

The account and report should contain the following:

- A description of the property received by the receiver (generally stated by reference to the inventory and any supplementary inventories filed).
- A statement of the income, if any, received from the property or business taken over by the receiver.
- A description of other property and income received.
- A statement of the disposition of any property by sale [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568.5*] or otherwise and the amounts received.
- A statement of the expenditures made by the receiver.
- A statement or description of the property and cash remaining in the hands of the receiver.
- If any allowance of compensation for the receiver is claimed, a detailed statement of the services performed by the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*].
- If any allowance of compensation for an attorney employed by the receiver is claimed, a detailed statement of the services performed by the attorney [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*].
- A statement as to whether previous allowances have been made to the receiver or attorney and, if so, the amounts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*].

[5] Verification

There is no express statutory requirement that the receiver's account and report must be verified. However, the factual contents of the account and report must be presented to the court; this may be accomplished by calling the receiver to testify, having him or her sworn, and asking him or her if the contents of the report and account are true, or it may be accomplished by verifying the account and report [*see, e.g., People v. Riverside University (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 572, 586, 111 Cal. Rptr. 68]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.158

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.158 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Notice of Hearing

[1] FORM Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Notice of Hearing

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF HEARING ON RECEIVER'S FINAL
vs.	)	ACCOUNT AND REPORT
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To all parties herein and their attorneys of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that _____[*name*], has filed his/her Final Account and Report of the administration of his/her receivership with the Clerk of the above-entitled Court and that _____[*date*], at _____[*time*] has been set as the time for hearing the Account and Report. The hearing will be held

in _____ [_____ (Department *or* Division *or* Room) No. _____ *or* the courtroom] of the above-entitled Court located in _____[*name of building*] at _____[*street address and city*], California, at which time and place the receiver will move the Court for an order settling and approving the Final Account and Report, discharging the receiver from any further duties or liabilities herein, and exonerating the receiver's bond.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Receiver

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a receiver to give the parties notice of the hearing on his or her final account and report [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184*].

For a form of account and report and further discussion, see *§ 486.157*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.159

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.159 Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Order Settling and Approving Final Account and Report, Discharging Receiver, and Exonerating Bond

[1] FORM Proceedings on Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]--Order Settling and Approving Final Account and Report, Discharging Receiver, and Exonerating Bond

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The Final Account and Report of _____[*name*], receiver, having been filed with the Court and notice of hearing having been served on all parties who have appeared in this _____[action *or* proceeding], the Account and Report came on regularly for hearing before the Court on _____[*date*]. _____[*Name*] appeared as attorney for plaintiff; _____[*name*] appeared as attorney for defendant; and [_____ (*name*) appeared as attorney for the receiver and] the receiver appeared in

person. Having read and considered the Account and Report[, the objections filed by _____ (*identify any objecting party or parties, e.g.,* defendant) _____ (*name(s)*), and the points and authorities filed by _____ (*specify, e.g,* both parties),] having heard the argument of counsel, and being fully advised in the premises, the Court finds that _____[*specify findings as to accuracy and completeness of report, e.g.,* the Account and Report is true and correct and that the receiver has duly accounted for all moneys and other property coming into his/her hands].

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

[1. The objections to the report are overruled.]

2. The Final Account and Report be and is approved.

3. The receiver be and is allowed the [further] sum of $_____ as and for his/her compensation for services rendered as receiver herein and that such sum be paid

[4. The receiver pay the sum of $_____ to _____ (*name*), whose address is _____, for legal services rendered herein on behalf of the receiver.]

5. After payment of the foregoing amounts, the receiver pay the balance of the funds remaining in his/her hands [and deliver _____ (*describe assets remaining in receiver's possession*)] to _____ [*identify party or parties to receive assets, e.g.,* plaintiff, _____ (*name*)].

6. On receipt of the funds [and property], _____[*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*] file with this Court an acknowledgment of receipt.

[*EITHER*]

7. On the filing of the acknowledgment of receipt, _____[*name of receiver*] is discharged from all further duties, liabilities, and responsibilities as receiver herein and his/her bond is exonerated.

[*OR*]

7. On the filing of the acknowledgment of receipt, the Court will, by further order, order the receiver discharged and the bond of _____[*name of receiver*] exonerated.

[*CONTINUE*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use when the court grants an order settling and approving the receiver's final account and report. In the situation illustrated, any objections to the account are overruled, the account is approved, and the receiver is not surcharged for any loss. With appropriate modifications it may be used when objections are sustained or the receiver is surcharged.

[3] Costs of Receivership

Normally, the costs of a receivership are payable out of the estate or funds of the receivership [*Andrade v. Andrade (1932) 216 Cal. 108, 110, 13 P.2d 676* ; *McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219 n.3, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375]* . However, if the appointment of the receiver was void or wrongfully obtained on a false or unsubstantiated showing, the party who obtained the appointment may be personally liable [*see Smith v. Hill (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 374, 387, 47 Cal. Rptr. 49* ; *Baldwin v. Baldwin (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 851, 854-856, 187 P.2d 429]* . It has also been held that the costs of receivership were properly assessed against the defendant in an equitable action between joint venturers for an accounting when the trial court was justified in finding that the defendant was guilty of reprehensible conduct [*Neider v. Dardi (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 156, 165, 313 P.2d 72]* .

[4] Approval of Account and Report

On approval of the account and report, the receiver will be ordered discharged and the bond exonerated on completion of disbursements and other requirements in accordance with the order settling and approving the final account and report [*see, e.g., Aviation Brake Systems, Ltd. v. Voorhis (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 230, 232, 183 Cal. Rptr. 766]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.160

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.160 Stipulation to Approve Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]

[1] FORM Stipulation to Approve Receiver's Final Account and Report [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION TO APPROVE RECEIVER'S FI-
Defendant.	)	NAL ACCOUNT AND REPORT AND ORDER
	)	THEREON
	)	

Plaintiff _____[*name*] ("Plaintiff") and Defendant _____[*name*] ("Defendant") hereby stipulate and agree as follows:

1. On _____[*date*], this Court entered its order appointing _____[*name*] as receiver ("Receiver") over the Subject Property. The Receiver took possession of the Subject Property pursuant to the Court's Order, and filed an undertaking in the amount of $_____. On or about _____[*date*], Plaintiff's undertaking in the amount of $_____ was filed in the above-entitled action.

2. On or about _____[*date*], in compliance with the terms of the order of appointment, the Receiver carried out his duties by taking possession of the Subject Property.

3. On or about _____[*date*], this Court entered its order confirming the appointment of the Receiver.

4. Pursuant to the request of Plaintiff and the Defendant, the Receiver has prepared and submitted his/her final accounting for the receivership estate. A true and correct copy of the Receiver's final accounting is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein by this reference.

5. As set forth in the final accounting, the Receiver represents that $_____ were collected during the course of the receivership. The Receiver incurred operating expenses in the amount of $_____, leaving a cash balance in the receivership account of $_____.

6. The parties hereto wish to terminate the receivership estate. Accordingly, the parties hereto agree and stipulate that:

A. The final accounting, attached as Exhibit 1 hereto, be approved;

B. The Receiver's fees and costs are approved;

C. The Court ratify all actions taken by the Receiver during the course of the receivership;

D. _____[*Name*] be discharged as Receiver;

E. The undertaking filed by the Receiver be exonerated;

F. The undertaking filed by Plaintiff be exonerated; and

G. The remaining balance of monies in the receivership estate of $_____ shall be paid to Plaintiff.

7. This Stipulation may be executed in one or more counterparts, but all of the counterparts together shall constitute one agreement.

8. All parties to this Stipulation, at all times material hereto, have had the opportunity to consult with legal counsel of their own choosing concerning the rights affected by this Stipulation, the form and content of this Stipulation, and the advisability of executing it.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

ORDER

Good cause appearing therefor:

IT IS SO ORDERED.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use when the parties to an action have agreed to stipulate to enter into an order settling and approving the receiver's final account and report [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(a)*]. In this situation, the party should obtain a court order approving of the stipulation since, in part, any undertakings filed by the receiver and/or the plaintiff in the action should be discharged through a court order.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.161

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.161 Motion for Order Excusing Turnover in a Bankruptcy Case [11 U.S.C. § 543(d)].

[1] FORM Motion for Order Excusing Turnover in a Bankruptcy Case [11 U.S.C. § 543(d)].

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF _____

	)	
	)	Bk. No. _____ [*case number*]
In re	)	[Chapter 11]
_____	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
[*Name of Chapter 11 debtor*],	)	DER EXCUSING TURNOVER OF PROPERTY BY
Debtor.	)	RECEIVER
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Place: _____

_____

TO: DEBTOR HEREIN AND TO ALL OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that at the above-stated time and place a hearing will be held on the motion of secured creditor _____[*name of secured creditor*] for an order excusing turnover of the _____[*describe property*] (the "Property") by the state court appointed Receiver, pursuant to the provisions of *11 U.S.C. section 543(d)*.

This motion will be made on the grounds that the interests of creditors would be better served, within the meaning and application of *Bankruptcy Code section 543(d)(1)*, by permitting the receiver, _____[*name*] ("Receiver"), to remain in possession, custody and control of the Property over which the Receiver was appointed because _____[*state reasons why it would be in the best interest of creditors to have the receiver remain in possession of the property over which the receiver was appointed, e.g.,* because the Chapter 11 Debtor improperly diverted property in which the secured creditor held a security interest prior to the filing of its Chapter 11 bankruptcy case].

This motion will be based on this notice, on the memorandum of points and authorities, on the Declarations of _____[*names of declarants*], and the exhibits attached thereto, submitted pursuant to requests for judicial notice; all served and filed herewith, as well as on all papers and files herein, matters of which this Court is also requested to take judicial notice, and on the oral argument of counsel to be presented at the time of hearing.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use when a receiver has previously been appointed and when the party who has appointed a receiver wishes the receiver to remain in possession of the assets over which the receiver was appointed after the defendant has filed a voluntary Chapter 11 petition under the Bankruptcy Code. The moving party must demonstrate under *11 U.S.C. Section 543(d)* that it would be in the "interest of creditors" for the receiver to remain in possession over the property over which he or she was appointed. The motion should be supported by a memorandum of points and authorities and by declarations of the receiver and/or the appointing secured creditor to attempt to convince the Bankruptcy Court that the "interest of creditors" test set forth in section 543(d) has been satisfied.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Administration and Termination of Receivership

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 486.162-486.169

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 486.162[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.170

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.170 Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Third Party

[1] FORM Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Third Party

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	RECEIVER'S PETITION FOR LEAVE TO SUE
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

Petitioner _____[*name*] alleges:

1. By order of this Court duly made and entered on _____[*date*], petitioner was appointed receiver of the _____ [property which is the subject of the this litigation *or describe receivership property related to action, e.g.*, the apartment house at _____ (*address*)].

2. Petitioner is entitled, as receiver, to possession of the following described property which is now in the possession of _____[*name of third party*]: _____[*describe property*].

3. Petitioner's claim to the property is based on the following: _____[*specify facts on which receiver bases claim*].

4. Petitioner has several times, both orally and in writing, requested _____[*name of third party*] to deliver possession of the above-described property to the receiver, but _____[*name of third party*] has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to do so.

5. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that _____[*name of third party*] is at the present time solvent and that the probabilities of recovering the property or its value are favorable.

6. Petitioner, as receiver, has the financial ability to prosecute this lawsuit.
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Receiver

[2] Use of Form

The form of petition in [1], *above*, is for use by a receiver to request permission to sue a third party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568*]. A receiver must obtain leave of court before instituting action to recover property of which he or she was never in possession [*Bishop v. McKillican (1899) 124 Cal. 321, 325-326, 57 P. 76* ; *see Morand v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 347, 350, 353, 113 Cal. Rptr. 281* ; for discussion, *see § 486.50*]. Under the fact situation illustrated, the purpose of the lawsuit is to recover property belonging to the receivership estate. If the employment of an attorney will be necessary to prosecute the lawsuit, a request for leave to employ an attorney [for a form, *see § 486.152*] may be combined with the foregoing petition for leave to file suit.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.171

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.171 Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Third Party

[1] FORM Proceedings by Receiver for Permission to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Third Party

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

Having read and considered the petition of _____[*name*], as receiver herein, for an order granting leave to sue _____[*name*] to recover property belonging to the receivership estate which is in the possession of _____[*name*] who refuses to deliver it to receiver, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that _____[*name*], as receiver, is hereby authorized to sue _____[

name] to recover the following described property and that the action may be maintained by the receiver in his/her own name: _____[*describe property*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants the receiver's petition for leave to sue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568*; for a form of petition, *see § 486.170*]. For a procedural checklist, *see § 486.120[2]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.172

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.172 Allegations in Receiver's Complaint Against Third Party of Capacity and Authorization to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]

[1] FORM Allegations in Receiver's Complaint Against Third Party of Capacity and Authorization to Sue [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]

1. By order of the above-entitled Court made and entered on _____[*date*], plaintiff was duly appointed receiver of the _____[*specify, e.g.*, property, funds, rents, and profits] of _____[*name of business or party for whose property receiver was appointed*] [located at _____ (*street address and city*), California].

2. By further order of the above-entitled Court made and entered on _____[*date*], plaintiff, as receiver, was authorized to sue _____[*name*], defendant, for the recovery of the following described property (hereinafter "the property") now in the defendant's possession and which, as herein shown, rightfully belongs to the receivership estate: _____[*describe property*].

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for inclusion in a complaint by a receiver against a third party who has possession of receivership property and refuses to deliver it to the receiver.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.173

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.173 Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Receiver

[1] FORM Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Petition for Leave to Sue Receiver

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	PETITION FOR LEAVE TO SUE RECEIVER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

Petitioner _____[*name*] hereby applies for an order permitting him/her to sue _____[*name*], as receiver, [by filing the proposed complaint attached hereto and made a part hereof,] and in support of this request declares:

1. By order of this Court dated _____[*date*], _____[*name*] was duly appointed

receiver in the above-entitled action to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* take full charge and possession of a ten-unit apartment house (hereinafter "the apartment house"), located at _____ (*street address and city*), California, and to manage, control, operate, and maintain it and to collect the rents therefrom] until further order of the Court; _____[*name*] thereafter duly qualified to act as receiver and on or about _____[*date*], entered on his/her duties by taking possession and control of _____[*specify, e.g.,* the apartment house and thereafter managing and collecting the rents therefrom].

2. On or about _____[*date*], _____[*name*], as receiver, _____[*specify act or omission, e.g.,* by personal notice requested the tenants of the apartment house to enter and leave by the rear door because the front of the apartment house was being treated for termites, notwithstanding the fact that he/she had both actual and constructive knowledge that the rear door was defective in that its hinges had been damaged and were loose].

3. Petitioner is _____[*specify relationship to property in receivership, e.g.,* is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a tenant of the apartment house].

4. On or about _____[*date*], _____ [*specify injury, e.g.,* while petitioner in compliance with the foregoing notice was attempting to leave the apartment house by the rear door, the door came off its hinges and fell on petitioner as a proximate result of which petitioner sustained damages in excess of $_____].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays leave of Court to sue _____[*name*], as receiver, for _____[*specify, e.g.,* damages] [as alleged in the attached proposed complaint].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form of petition in [1], *above,* is for use by a third party to seek permission to sue a receiver in the receiver's official capacity [*see McCarthy v. Poulsen (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1219, 219 Cal. Rptr. 375* ; *Ostrowski v. Miller (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 79, 84, 37 Cal. Rptr. 790]* . The petition is filed in the court that appointed the receiver. For further discussion, see *§ 486.51[1]* and for a procedural checklist, see *§ 486.121[2]*. For the related form of order, see *§ 486.173*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.174

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.174 Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Receiver

[1] FORM Proceedings to Secure Court Permission to Sue Receiver [Code Civ. Proc. § 568]--Order Granting Petition to Sue Receiver

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

Having read and considered the petition of _____[*name of applicant*] for an order granting him/her leave to sue _____[*name*], as receiver, heretofore duly appointed herein, and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that _____[*name of petitioner*] be, and is, granted leave to sue _____[*name*], as receiver, for _____[*specify, e.g.,* damages for injuries sustained on

the premises of the apartment house under receivership].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants permission to sue the receiver in an independent action [for discussion, *see § 486.51*, for a procedural checklist, *see § 486.121[2]*, and for the related form of petition, *see § 486.173*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 486 RECEIVERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Actions By and Against Receivers

43-486 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 486.175

AUTHOR: Robert B. Kaplan Editorial Consultant

§ 486.175 Allegations in Third Party's Complaint Against Receiver of Authorization to Sue

[1] FORM Allegations in Third Party's Complaint Against Receiver of Authorization to Sue

1. By order of the _____ [above-entitled court *or* Court of _____] made and entered on _____[*date*], defendant was duly appointed receiver of the _____[*specify, e.g.,* property, funds, rents, and profits] (hereinafter "the property") of _____[*name of business or party for whose property receiver was appointed*] [located at _____ (*street address and city*), California], thereafter duly qualified to undertake the duties of receiver, and, at all times hereinafter mentioned, was in possession of the property as receiver.

2. By further order of the _____ [above-entitled court *or* _____ Court of _____] made and entered on _____[*date*], plaintiff _____[*name*] was authorized to sue _____[*name of defendant*], as receiver, in his/her official capacity for _____[*specify relief sought, e.g.,* damages] as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above,* is for inclusion in the third party's complaint to allege the third party's authority to sue the receiver. The balance of the complaint will allege the ultimate facts establishing plaintiff's cause of action against the receiver. The matters alleged will depend on the nature of the tort involved. For forms of complaints which may be adapted for use in an action against a receiver, see the appropriate chapter, for example, Ch. 150, *Conversion,* Ch. 380, *Negligence,* and Ch. 421, *Premises Liability.*

[3] Form and Contents of Complaint

The caption of a complaint against a receiver in his or her official capacity should identify the defendant, "as Receiver"; the body of the complaint should allege the due appointment of the defendant as receiver, that permission to sue the

receiver has been granted, and that the receiver is being sued in his or her official capacity [*see Sealite, Inc. v. Finster (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 612, 615-618, 309 P.2d 51]* . However, the objection of one sued individually that he or she should have been sued in a representative capacity or also in a representative capacity can be waived; furthermore, if one is sued in an individual capacity when the true liability, if any, is in a representative capacity, amendment of the complaint to that effect may be permitted [*see Sealite, Inc. v. Finster (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 612, 618, 309 P.2d 51]* .

[4] Cross Reference

For a form describing a receiver for use in a caption, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 487 [Reserved]

43-487 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 487.syn

§ 487.syn Synopsis to Chapter 487: [Reserved]

§ 0 Scope

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 487 [Reserved]
PART 0.

43-487 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 0

§ 0

NOTE:

Ch. 487, *Reference*, has been completely revised and moved to the alternative dispute resolution volume, which covers reference and other forms of alternative dispute resolution. The subject matter formerly covered here now appears in Ch. 38, ***Reference***.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 488.syn

§ 488.syn Synopsis to Chapter 488: REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS

§ 488.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 488.02 Cross References

§§ 488.03through 488.09 [Reserved]

§ 488.10 Governing Statutes

§ 488.11 Reformation Defined

§ 488.12 Nature and Purpose of Reformation

§ 488.13 Scope of Reformation

[1] In General

[2] Rights of Bona Fide Purchaser Protected

[3] Agreement Must Be Valid

[4] Standing to Seek Reformation

[5] Effect of Statute of Frauds

[6] Effect of Parol Evidence Rule

[7] Particular Instruments Subject to Reformation

[a] In General

[b] Contracts

[c] Other Instruments

§ 488.14 Establishing Entitlement to Reformation

[1] In General

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Underlying Cause of Defect

[a] Mutual Mistake of Fact

[b] Unilateral Mistake of Fact

[c] Mistake of Law

[d] Fraud

[e] Unconscionable Conduct

§ 488.15 Defenses to Reformation Action

[1] In General

[2] Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period

[3] Res Judicata

[4] Unclean Hands

[5] Waiver and Ratification

[6] Laches

[7] Negligence

§ 488.16 Right to Jury Trial

§ 488.17 Presumption of Parties' Intent to Make Equitable Agreement

§ 488.18 Scope of Court's Inquiry Into True Intent

§ 488.19 Specific Performance of Reformed Instrument and Other Additional Relief

§§ 488.20through 488.39 [Reserved]

§ 488.40 State Statutes

§ 488.41 Decisions

[1] Action for Reformation

[a] Establishing Elements of Action

[b] Grounds for Relief

[i] Fraud

[ii] Mistake of Law

[iii] Mutual Mistake of Fact

[iv] Unilateral Mistake of Fact

[c] Valid Instrument Required

[2] Defenses

[a] Equitable Estoppel

[b] Illegality or Statutory Noncompliance

[c] Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period and Laches

[d] Negligence

[e] Res Judicata

[f] Unclean Hands

[g] Waiver or Ratification

[3] Nature and Scope of Reformation

[4] Reformable Instruments

[5] Rights of Third Parties

§ 488.42 Text References

§§ 488.43through 488.59 [Reserved]

§ 488.60 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Complaint Based on Unilateral Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Pleading With Particularity Required

[5] Anticipating Defenses Based on Lapse of Time

[6] Verification

[7] Jurisdiction

[8] Venue

[9] Cross References

[10] State Constitution

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Text References

§ 488.61 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mistake of Law [Civ. Code §§ 1578, 1640]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 488.62 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1571-1573, 1640]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 488.63 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mutual Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 488.64 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Waiver and Ratification of Mistake by Plaintiff

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross References

§ 488.65 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Laches

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 488.66 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period [Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 488.67 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Intervening Rights of Bona Fide Purchaser

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.01

§ 488.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the equitable remedy of reformation. It includes forms of complaints for reformation of a written instrument on the grounds of the following:

- Unilateral mistake of fact [*see § 488.60*].
- Mistake of law [*see § 488.61*].
- Fraud [*see § 488.62*].
- Mutual mistake of fact [*see § 488.63*].

It also includes forms for affirmative defenses based on the following:

- Waiver and ratification [*see § 488.64*].
- Laches [*see § 488.65*].
- Lapse of the statute of limitations [*see § 488.66*].
- Intervening rights of a bona fide purchaser [*see § 488.67*].

For a discussion and forms regarding related remedies, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* , Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* , and Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* . For a discussion concerning reformation as an alternative to a cause of action for breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* . For a discussion of reformation of a contract for the sale of real property by a broker, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* . For discussion and a form of complaint for use in reforming a deed to correct boundary descriptions, see Ch. 101, *Boundaries* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawRemediesRatificationContracts LawRemediesReformationInsurance LawClaims & ContractsContract FormationReformationReal Property LawDeedsRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.02

§ 488.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

For discussion and form of complaint relating to reformation of a deed to correct property descriptions, see Ch. 101, *Boundaries* .

For discussion relating to the reformation of a real estate contract by a broker, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and forms relating to the cancellation of written instruments, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* .

For discussion and forms relating to contract remedies generally, including reformation, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and general form of complaint to cancel a deed and to quiet title to real property, see Ch. 184, *Deeds* .

For discussion and forms for defenses to contract actions based on mistake or fraud, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

For discussion and forms relating to tort actions for fraud and deceit generally, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

For discussion relating to reformation of insurance contracts, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For discussion and forms relating to the amendment, correction and modification of judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

For discussion and forms relating to quieting title, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission and restitution, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

For discussion and forms relating to deeds of trust and mortgages generally, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

For discussion and forms of complaint relating to the establishment of constructive trusts over real property acquired through fraud, mistake, or undue influence, see Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* .

For discussion and forms for use in actions to recover usurious interest payments, see Ch. 568, *Usury* .

For discussion of the availability of reformation to vendors and purchasers of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsProperty DescriptionsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 488.03through 488.09

[Reserved]

§§ 488.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.10

§ 488.10 Governing Statutes

The codified equitable principles governing the reformation of instruments are set out in *Civ. Code §§ 3399-3402*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.11

§ 488.11 Reformation Defined

Reformation is an equitable remedy used to reframe a written instrument to express accurately the parties' true agreement when, through fraud, mutual mistake, or unilateral mistake in limited instances, the writing does not embody their agreement [*see* Black's Law Dictionary 1281 (6th ed.); *see also Civ. Code § 3399*; *Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10]* . This remedy has been codified under *Civ. Code § 3399*, which provides that a written contract may be revised to reflect the true intent of the parties. Because of the use of the word "revised" in *Civ. Code § 3399*, the terms "reformation" and "revision" are used interchangeably in this chapter.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.12

§ 488.12 Nature and Purpose of Reformation

Civ. Code § 3399 codifies the equitable remedy of reformation of written instruments. This section provides that a written contract may be revised on application of the party aggrieved, when, through fraud, mutual mistake, or mistake of one party that the other party knew of or suspected at the time, a written contract does not express the true intention of the parties. A written contract may be revised so as to express the intention of the aggrieved party, so far as is possible without prejudice to the rights acquired by third persons, in good faith, and for value [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. In determining the propriety of granting reformation, a court of equity exercises broad powers [*Jones v. First American Title Insurance Company (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 381, 383, 388-390, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859* (reformation may validate foreclosure sale when former trustee mistakenly conducts sale after new trustee has been substituted); *Cardoza v. Millington (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 26, 32, 297 P.2d 778* (preincorporation agreement reformed to provide for equal control of corporation and distribution of stock)].

The purpose of reformation is to effectuate the common intention of the parties, when that intention was incorrectly reduced to writing [*Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10]* . The "intention of the parties" under *Civ. Code § 3399* refers to a single intention that is entertained by both of the parties [*Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10* (judgment reforming deed to include residential use restriction reversed because buyer, though intending to use property for residential purposes only, never expressly agreed to that limitation)].

Although reformation is sometimes referred to as a "cause of action," it is actually a remedy, usually sought in conjunction with other remedies appropriate for that particular cause of action [*Landis v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 548, 555, 42 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *see § 488.19*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawRemediesReformation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.13

§ 488.13 Scope of Reformation

[1] In General

Reformation requires that the parties to the transaction share a complete and mutual understanding on all essential terms. In the absence of a common understanding among the parties, the written instrument would have no standard to which it could be reformed [*Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10]* .

Conversely, a written instrument that already accurately reflects the common understanding of the parties is not subject to reformation. Even if the understanding of the parties is based on a mistaken assumption of fact, a court cannot, through reformation of the written instrument, improve the parties' understanding. To do so would be to create a new contract, based on terms to which the parties never agreed [*Lemoge Electric v. County of San Mateo (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 659, 663-664, 297 P.2d 638* (contract arising out of contractor's bid not subject to reformation even though bid contained a clerical error, because party accepting bid never agreed to pay more than that sum designated in bid); *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1178, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603* (trust not subject to reformation when it accurately reflected trustor's intent, even though that intent was based on mistaken assumption that one beneficiary would receive a separate inheritance)]. In sum, the remedy of reformation arises on failure to reduce accurately to writing a definite understanding of the parties [*Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10]* .

Although a written instrument that accurately reflects a common intent based on a mistake of fact cannot be reformed, the mistake may be ground for rescission [*White v. Berrenda Mesa Water Dist. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 894, 900-908, 87 Cal. Rptr. 338* (contractor entitled to rescind construction contract for a mistake in calculating the bid)]. For further discussion and forms relating to rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

Reformation may also be raised as a defense to enforcement of a contract [*Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18 n.8, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716* (considering reformation claim apparently first raised by plaintiff in products liability action in response to defendants' motion for summary judgment seeking to enforce disclaimer and hold harmless clauses in written contract); *see also California Packing Corp. v. Larsen (1921) 187 Cal. 610, 612, 203 P. 102]* .

[2] Rights of Bona Fide Purchaser Protected

Reformation is permitted only to the extent that it can be done without prejudice to the "rights acquired by third persons in good faith and for value" [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. These rights have been defined as those acquired, after execution of the written instrument, by a bona fide purchaser for value, from a party to the instrument [*Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491, 191 P.2d 67]* .

Rights acquired bona fide or in good faith are those acquired without notice of the defect in the instrument sought to be reformed [*Arp v. Ferguson (1917) 175 Cal. 646, 648, 166 P. 803]* . Thus, "third persons" protected under *Civ. Code § 3399* do not include those who acquire their rights with either actual or constructive notice of the rights of other persons whose interests are defectively described in the instrument [*Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 698, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352]* .

Third parties include corporate entities. The surviving entity of a corporate merger, however, cannot claim third-party status in an action for reformation of a written instrument to which it has succeeded [*Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 199, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341]* . This is because, in the context of a corporate merger, the surviving corporation is charged with constructive notice of the claims of the extinct corporation's creditors, and is therefore not a "good faith" purchaser within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 3399* [*Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 199, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341* ; *see also Corp. Code § 1107* (pertaining to the rights and liabilities of a surviving corporation in a merger or consolidation)]. Additionally, in a merger, the acquisition is not "for value" if the only consideration given to the shareholders of the extinct corporation is shares of stock in the surviving corporate entity and its parent company [*Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 200, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341]* .

For an affirmative defense based on the intervening rights of bona fide purchasers, see *§ 488.67*.

[3] Agreement Must Be Valid

A void agreement has no standing in the law and cannot be reformed [*see, e.g.,* *Ainsworth v. Morrill (1916) 31 Cal. App. 509, 511, 160 P. 1089* (reformation denied when agreement sought to be reformed violated statute)]. In other words, a court will not make a new contract from a void one, at least when it appears that the parties never intended to make a legal and valid agreement. Reformation is available, however, to reform an otherwise valid instrument by removing an illegal term that was never intended by the parties but was erroneously included [*see* *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598* (note reformed to delete unintended and inadvertently included usurious provision)]. For discussion of reformation of an agreement that is void for an erroneous noncompliance with the statute of frauds, see *§ 488.13[5]*.

[4] Standing to Seek Reformation

A written instrument may be revised on application of a party aggrieved [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. A "party aggrieved" includes not only those who are the original parties to the transaction that is memorialized by the instrument, but also any third party who has suffered prejudice or pecuniary loss [*Orcutt v. Ferranini (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 216, 224, 46 Cal. Rptr. 715* (third-party beneficiary deemed aggrieved party entitled to seek reformation of insurance contract)].

If reformation is sought by a party to the written instrument for a mistake that is material to the parties' agreement, that party is entitled to reformation despite the absence of actual injury [*Siem v. Cooper (1926) 79 Cal. App. 748, 755, 250 P. 1106]* .

[5] Effect of Statute of Frauds

Under *Civ Code § 1624(a)*, the general statute of frauds, certain categories of contracts are required to be in writing or

evidenced by a written note or memorandum and subscribed by the party to be charged or by the party's agent in order to be valid [*see also Civ. Code § 2309* (agent's authorization to enter into contract subject to "equal dignities rule"); *Fam. Code § 1611* (premarital agreement)]. An agreement or contract that is valid in other respects and is otherwise enforceable, however, is not invalid for lack of a writing if it is a "qualified financial contract" and there is sufficient evidence to show that a contract has been made or the parties have agreed to be bound by the terms of the contract [*see Civ. Code § 1624(b)*; *see also* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*]. The statute of frauds is designed to prevent the commission of fraud and perjury with respect to certain agreements by ensuring that they are reliably evidenced in writing [*Sherwood v. Lowell (1917) 34 Cal. App. 365, 375, 167 P. 554* ; *see also Lockwood v. Smigel (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 800, 803, 96 Cal. Rptr. 289* ; for discussion and forms relating to the statute of frauds generally, *see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

Whether a contract that is void under the statute of frauds may be reformed depends on the manner in which it fails to satisfy the statute. If, for example, an essential term has been omitted because the parties never in fact came to any agreement on that term, the intended contract is void and cannot be reformed. On the other hand, a court will reform a contract that is void only because of a technical failure to satisfy the requirements of the statute due to a mistake in the preparation of the instrument. In the latter situation, the true agreement of the parties is validexcept for the error in writing [*see Oatman v. Niemeyer (1929) 207 Cal. 424, 426-427, 278 P. 1043* (deed reformed to supply omitted property description); *Merkle v. Merkle (1927) 85 Cal. App. 87, 111, 258 P. 969]* . For discussion of reformation of void agreements generally,*§ 488.13[3]*.

The statute of frauds does not bar an action seeking reformation brought on the ground of fraud. Barring relief on this ground would only undermine a primary object of the statute, that is, the prevention of fraud [*see Merkle v. Merkle (1927) 85 Cal. App. 87, 110-111, 258 P. 969]* .

[6] Effect of Parol Evidence Rule

The parol evidence rule prohibits the introduction of extrinsic evidence, oral or written, to contradict the terms of a writing intended by the parties as a final expression of their agreement [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1856*]. Reformation actions, however, fall within a major exception to the application of this rule. Extrinsic evidence is admissible to show that the writing does not express the true intention of the parties in an action to reform a written instrument on the ground of mistake or fraud [*Berendsen v. McIver (1954) 126 Cal. App. 2d 347, 356, 272 P.2d 76]* .

A court will not admit extrinsic evidence to reform the written instrument in the absence of clear and convincing proof that the language sought to be reformed resulted from fraud, mutual mistake, or a unilateral mistake when the other party knew of the mistake or suspected it [*Moore v. Vandermast, Inc. (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 94, 96-97, 119 P.2d 129]* .

[7] Particular Instruments Subject to Reformation

[a] In General

Although *Civ. Code § 3401*, pertaining to the scope of judicial inquiry in an action for reformation, refers to the reformation of a "written instrument," the remaining code provisions relating to the law of reformation (*Civ. Code §§ 3399, 3400*, and *3402*) appear solely to address reformation of a "contract." Despite the limiting language employed in the code sections, courts have uniformly granted reformation of written instruments, other than contracts, which are designed to create legal rights and obligations in the parties. An exception to this broad judicial outlook concerns wills, which are not reformable [*Estate of Callaghan (1898) 119 Cal. 571, 575, 51 P. 860* ; *Kobus v. San Diego Trust & Savings Bank (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 574, 580, 342 P.2d 468* (invalid will, claimed to have been executed to carry out oral agreement to leave property to plaintiff in return for services rendered but containing no reference to agreement, as not reformable under reformation statutes)].

[b] Contracts

Contracts generally are subject to the remedy of reformation [*Lemoge Electric v. County of San Mateo (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 659, 663, 297 P.2d 638* (contract arising out of electrical contractor's bid); *Meyerstein v. Burke (1924) 193 Cal. 105, 108-109, 222 P. 810* (executory contract for purchase and sale of house and lot); *McClure v. Cerati (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 74, 82-83, 194 P.2d 46* (written employment contract)]. An executed contract, however, may not be reformed if the aggrieved party, with knowledge of the facts, accepts performance in accordance with the terms of the contract as written [*Vantress Farms, Inc. v. Sydenstricker (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 943, 950, 90 Cal. Rptr. 251* (reformation of land sale contract by grantee to include specific assignment of oil and gas rights disallowed because grantee accepted delivery of deed and payment of purchase price with knowledge that grantor was relying on contract as written); *see also* discussion in *§ 488.15[5]*].

Contracts subject to reformation include contracts for insurance coverage, which generally may be reformed to show, among other things: (1) the premises to be covered [*Maier Brewing Co. v. Pacific Nat. Fire Ins. Co. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 869, 874, 33 Cal. Rptr. 67]* ; (2) the persons to be covered [*Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 222, 224-225, 206 P.2d 877]* ; (3) the name and capacity of the insured [*Bankers Indem. Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 89, 93-94, 47 P.2d 719]* ; (4) the nature of the coverage [*Cantlay v. Olds & Stoller Inter-Exch. (1932) 119 Cal. App. 605, 614, 7 P.2d 395]* ; and (5) the amount payable under the policy [*Modica v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 588, 595-596, 46 Cal. Rptr. 158]* .

An insurance policy may be reformed, in accordance with the parties' common intention, to limit or exclude coverage even if the rights of third-party claimants under the policy are adversely affected [*Truck Ins. Exch. v. Wilshire Ins. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 553, 559, 87 Cal. Rptr. 604* (car dealer permitted to reform insurance policy to limit coverage as to permissive users of loaner cars after occurrence of accident in which innocent third party was killed by permissive user)].

Other types of reformable contracts include (1) leases [*Moore v. Vandermast, Inc. (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 94, 96-97, 119 P.2d 129* ; *Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 196-197, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341]* , (2) property settlement agreements [*Stare v. Tate (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 432, 436-437, 98 Cal. Rptr. 264]* , and (3) promissory notes [*First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645* (action to delete inadvertently included usurious interest provision from promissory note)].

[c] Other Instruments

In addition to contracts, courts have permitted reformation of the following types of written instruments:

- Deeds [*Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708-709, 227 P.2d 10* ; *MacFarlane v. Peters (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631, 163 Cal. Rptr. 655]* .

- Trusts [*Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1172-1175, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603]* ; and substitutions of trustees [*Jones v. First American Title Insurance Company (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 381, 390, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859* (trial court abused its discretion by denying reformation of defective substitution of trustee)].

- Trust deeds and mortgages [*San Jose Ranch Co. v. San Jose L. & W. Co. (1901) 132 Cal. 582, 583-584, 64 P. 1097* (reformation of mortgage); *San Fernando Valley C. of C. v. Thomas (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 348, 350-351, 266 P.2d 891* (reformation of trust deed)].

Some courts have also stated that the remedy of reformation is available to correct mistakes in judgments [*Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 538, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; *Douglass v. Dahm (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 125, 128, 224 P.2d 914]* . More commonly, however, a party seeking correction of a clerical error after entry of final judgment may

simply invoke the inherent power of the court to correct its own mistakes [*Zisk v. Roseville (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 41, 47, 127 Cal. Rptr. 896]* . For further discussion and forms relating to the correction or modification of judgments under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* or under a court's inherent powers, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* . For discussion and forms relating to a separate action in equity to set aside or modify a judgment that has been obtained through extrinsic fraud or mistake, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesReformationContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsWritingsContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsContract FormationReformationReal Property LawDeedsRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.14

§ 488.14 Establishing Entitlement to Reformation

[1] In General

To obtain reformation of a written instrument, a party must generally allege and show the following:

- The true intention of the parties [*see Civ. Code § 3399*; *American Home Ins. Co. v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 951, 961, 175 Cal. Rptr. 826]* . The party seeking relief must show the instrument as it was truly intended to be [*Auerbach v. Healy (1916) 174 Cal. 60, 62, 161 P. 1157* ; *Totten v. Underwriters At Lloyd's London (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 440, 448, 1 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *see Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 20-21, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716* (fact that parties intended to comply with interparty waivers that would be required in related services agreement with others not sufficient to establish intent to limit scope of waiver in their contract to that in related agreement)]. The parties' agreement must be shown to have been valid prior to its erroneous reduction to writing [*see Paterson v. Board of Trustees (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 811, 815, 321 P.2d 825* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 488.13[3]*].

- The agreement as it was, in fact, written [*see Civ. Code § 3399*; *Holmes v. Anderson (1928) 90 Cal. App. 276, 282, 265 P. 1010* (agreement as executed incorporated into complaint); *Johnson v. Sun Realty Co. (1934) 138 Cal. App. 296, 299-301, 32 P.2d 393* (agreement as executed set forth according to its legal effect)].

- That the failure of the writing to reflect the true agreement resulted from (1) mutual mistake of fact, (2) unilateral mistake of fact when the other party knew of the mistake or suspected it at the time, or (3) fraud [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. Unconscionable conduct may also be proper cause for which a court may grant reformation, although it is not so enumerated under *Civ. Code § 3399* [*see MacFarlane v. Peters (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631, 163 Cal. Rptr. 655]* . For further discussion,*§ 488.14[3]*.

The party seeking reformation must also show his or her standing as an aggrieved party [*see Civ. Code § 3399*; *American Home Ins. Co. v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 951, 961, 175 Cal. Rptr. 826]* . For further

discussion, see *§ 488.13[4]*.

If there has been considerable delay between the occurrence of the fraud or mistake justifying reformation and the filing of the action, defenses based on lapse of time may be raised. The party seeking reformation may anticipate these defenses by alleging recent discovery of the underlying fraud or mistake and diligence sufficient to excuse the long delay [*see Miller v. Lantz (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 544, 548, 71 P.2d 585* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*; *Wilson v. Wilson (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 542, 545, 18 Cal. Rptr. 768]* . For further discussion, see *§ 488.15[2], [3], below*.

For a complaint for reformation of a written instrument based on unilateral mistake of fact, see *§ 488.60*. For allegations of additional grounds for reformation, see *§§ 488.61 -488.63*.

[2] Burden of Proof

To reform a written instrument, the party seeking relief must establish by clear and convincing evidence the true intent of the parties and the fact that the defect in the writing resulted from fraud or mistake [*see Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 700, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352* ; *Perry v. Bedford (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 6, 11, 47 Cal. Rptr. 461]* . For further discussion, see *§ 488.13[6]*.

[3] Underlying Cause of Defect

[a] Mutual Mistake of Fact

When the failure of the written instrument to express the true intention of the parties is due to the inadvertence of both of them, the mistake is mutual and the instrument may be reformed on application of the party aggrieved [*Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 700, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352]* . It makes no difference who wrote the instrument to be reformed so long as both parties were in common mistake concerning the instrument's contents [*Renshaw v. Happy Valley Water Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 521, 524-525, 250 P.2d 612]* . For discussion and forms relating to mutual mistake of fact as a defense to a contract action, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

Reformation on the ground of mutual mistake presupposes (1) actual agreement among the parties concerning their true intention, and (2) a mutual but mistaken belief that the written instrument reflects that intention [*Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 197, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341]* .

Commonly, the mistake of a third person, acting on behalf of the parties, accounts for the failure of a written instrument to express the true intent of the parties. Courts uniformly hold that a mistake attributable to a third person in reducing the commmon intent of the parties to writing is a ground for reformation [*Breen v. Donnelly (1887) 74 Cal. 301, 304, 15 P. 845* (mistake of surveyor in running a boundary line); *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645* (mistake of scrivener); *Mills v. Schulba (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 559, 561-562, 213 P.2d 408* (mistake of attorney jointly employed to effect transfer of title)].

For a form for an allegation of mutual mistake of fact as a basis for reformation, see *§ 488.63*.

[b] Unilateral Mistake of Fact

Reformation is available when, through the unilateral mistake of one party, known to or suspected by the other party, the written instrument does not express accurately the true intention of the parties [*City of Cypress v. New Amsterdam Cas. Co. (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 219, 225, 66 Cal. Rptr. 357]* . The innocent party is led to believe, by the other party's failure to identify the mistake, that the parties share a common intent. A court of equity will not make a new contract, for example, when the parties' intent has been accurately recorded but is based on a mutual misunderstanding [*see* discussion § 488.13]. In the context of a unilateral mistake, however, equity precludes the nonmistaken party from capitalizing on his or her own inequitable conduct by claiming an intent different from that which he or she has led the

innocent party to believe [*Stare v. Tate (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 432, 438-439, 98 Cal. Rptr. 264* (reformation of property settlement agreement on ground of unilateral mistake allowed because husband's attorney knew that wife's proposal reflected a $100,000 undervaluation of which she was unaware at time of execution)].

Because the nonmistaken party is barred from asserting a different intent, the instrument that was intended by the party acting under the unilateral mistake becomes, as a matter of law, the binding agreement of the parties. Accordingly, in an action for reformation on the ground of unilateral mistake, the court reframes the written instrument to reflect the innocent party's view [*Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (1949) 206 P.2d 877]* . This position is supported by the presumption that all parties to a transaction intend an equitable and conscientious agreement [*Civ. Code § 3400*; *see* discussion in *§ 488.17*].

A unilateral mistake is ground for reformation only when the other party knows of or suspects the mistake [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. Constructive notice of a unilateral mistake is not equivalent to knowledge or suspicion. In the context of a unilateral mistake, the non-mistaken party's inequitable conduct invokes an estoppel to bar that party's assertion of a contrary intent. In the absence of actual knowledge or suspicion, there is no blameworthy conduct on which to base an estoppel. Constructive notice of a unilateral mistake, therefore, is insufficient ground for reformation [*La Mancha Dev. Corp. v. Sheegog (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 9, 16-17, 144 Cal. Rptr. 59* (reformation of deed to insert land use restriction on ground of unilateral mistake improper because defendant grantees had no actual knowledge or suspicion of the mistake, only constructive notice, at best)].

Notwithstanding the general rule that constructive notice of a unilateral mistake is insufficient to justify reformation, a court may permit reformation when a duly authorized agent of the non-mistaken party knows of or suspects the mistake. The knowledge or suspicion of a duly authorized agent is imputed to the party against whom reformation is sought [*Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 222, 225-226, 206 P.2d 877* (knowledge of insurance agent concerning insured's mistake concerning coverage of worker's compensation insurance policy imputed to insurer even though knowledge was acquired before that agent was appointed to execute policy); *see Stare v. Tate (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 432, 436, 436, n. 5, 98 Cal. Rptr. 264* (in action to reform property settlement agreement, knowledge of husband's attorney concerning wife's mistaken undervaluation of certain real property imputed to husband)].

For a form for a complaint for reformation based on a unilateral mistake of fact, see *§ 488.60*. For discussion and forms relating to unilateral mistake of fact as a defense in a contract action, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[c] Mistake of Law

Equity will reform a written instrument that fails to express the parties' true intention on account of a mistake of law [*Tyler v. Larson (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 317, 319-320, 235 P.2d 39* (reformation of voluntary conveyance to describe grantee's interest as tenancy in common, instead of joint tenancy, proper because grantor only intended to give grantee undivided half interest and mistakenly believed that joint tenancy designation effectuated transfer as intended); *see Civ. Code § 1578* (mistake of law in contract cases)]. For discussion and forms relating to mistake of law as a defense to an action for breach of contract, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

Parties to a transaction may execute an instrument with the intention that it produce a certain legal effect. If, by mistake, the instrument, as written, fails to honor the parties' intention, the instrument may be reformed to accord with its intended effect [*Stafford v. California C.P. Growers (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 212, 218-219, 78 P.2d 1150* (peach growers and marketing association signed contract calling for payment to growers at certain price, intending, however, that legal effect of contract would be to entitle growers to a different price contained in resolution of association that parties mistakenly believed was incorporated in contract; mistake regarding legal effect of instrument constituted mistake of law, entitling aggrieved party to reformation)].

For a form for an allegation of mutual mistake of law as a basis for reformation, see *§ 488.61*.

[d] Fraud

Fraud, as a basis for reformation, consists of (1) a false representation by one party and (2) justifiable reliance on the false representation by the other party. Specifically, when one party justifiably relies on the other party's false representation that the written instrument either already conforms or will conform to the parties' true intent, reformation or rescission is appropriate [*Security-First Nat. Bank v. Earp (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 774, 777-778, 122 P.2d 900* (upholding rescission of trust deed on showing that defendants justifiably relied on false representation that it was renewal of prior mortgage); *Lane v. Davis (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 302, 307, 342 P.2d 267]* . For discussion and forms relating to fraud as a defense in a contract action, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* . For discussion and forms relating to a cause of action in tort for fraud, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

If the aggrieved party is justified in relying on the fraudulent misrepresentations of the other party, negligence in failing to read the instrument is no bar to reformation [*Security-First Nat. Bank v. Earp (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 774, 777, 122 P.2d 900* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 488.41[2][d]*].

The misrepresentation must be fraudulent and not merely an inaccurate statement of opinion [*Kneer v. Baruch Corp. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 601, 603-604, 118 P.2d 488* (subcontracter who executed building contract in reliance on general contractor's erroneous estimate held not entitled to reformation on ground of fraud)].

Fraud as a basis for reformation is limited to misrepresentations regarding the contents of the writing; the instrument is revised to conform with the intent of the defrauded party or parties. Fraudulent inducement to enter into a written agreement is not a proper basis for reformation, because in this situation the writing, though fraudulently induced, does in fact reflect the intent of the parties [*Lane v. Davis (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 302, 307-308, 342 P.2d 267* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 488.13*].

For a form of allegation of fraud as a basis for reformation, see *§ 488.62*.

[e] Unconscionable Conduct

Civ. Code § 3399 provides that reformation is available to correct a defect based on fraud, mutual mistake, or the mistake of one party that is known or suspected by the other. Nevertheless, one appellate court has stated that reformation is also available to correct a defect in a deed resulting from the unconscionable conduct of one party that is neither fraudulent nor illegal [*MacFarlane v. Peters (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631, 163 Cal. Rptr. 655]* . In that case, a quiet title action involving multiple interests in the same parcel of land, plaintiff had obtained his interest at an improvement bond assessment delinquency sale, at which time the majority property owner had been legally incompetent. The deed conveyed to plaintiff a divided interest in the form of narrow strips running completely around and through the parcel, and plaintiff admitted that his design in the execution of this deed had been to deny the majority owner access to the property. The court of appeal affirmed reformation of the deed to grant plaintiff an undivided interest in the same amount, stating that such unconscionable advantage over a legally incompetent landowner falls within the area to which a court may address its equitable powers [*MacFarlane v. Peters (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631-633, 163 Cal. Rptr. 655]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUnconscionabilityGeneral OverviewContracts

LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawRemediesReformationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing Proof

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.15

§ 488.15 Defenses to Reformation Action

[1] In General

The party against whom reformation is sought may, in addition to raising affirmative defenses, simply rebut one or more of the essential elements that must be proven. For example, the defending party may show that the writing does reflect the true intent of the parties [*see Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1178, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603* (trust reflected trustors' intent, even though intent was based on mistaken understanding); *see* discussion *§ 488.13*], or that she or he did not know of or suspect the other party's mistake [*see La Mancha Dev. Corp. v. Sheegog (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 9, 16-17, 144 Cal. Rptr. 59* (constructive knowledge is not equivalent to knowledge or suspicion and therefore does not support reformation on ground of unilateral mistake); *see* discussion *§ 488.41[1][b][iv]*]. Similarly, a defense to reformation may be based on prejudice to the legitimate rights of a bona fide third-party purchaser for value [*see Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491, 191 P.2d 67* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 488.13[2]*], or the invalidity of the parties' agreement [*Ainsworth v. Morrill (1916) 31 Cal. App. 509, 511, 160 P. 1089* ; *see* discussion in *§ 488.13[3]*].

For further discussion relating to each essential element, see *§ 488.14*. For general forms denying allegations of a complaint, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[2] Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period

An action for relief on the ground of fraud or mistake is generally required to be brought within three years of the time the cause of action arises [*see Code Civ. Proc. 338(d)*].

A cause of action for reformation based on fraud or mistake is not deemed to accrue until the discovery, by the aggrieved party, of the facts constituting the fraud or mistake [*see Code Civ. Proc. 338(d)*; *Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141]* .

When there has been considerable delay between the occurrence of fraud or mistake and its discovery by the aggrieved party, the court uses a reasonable diligence standard to determine the point at which the aggrieved party should be charged with constructive notice of the facts [*Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 820, 53*

Cal. Rptr. 681 ; *Western Title Guar. Co. v. Sacramento & San Joaquin Drainage Dist. (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 815, 825, 45 Cal. Rptr. 578]* .

In an action to reform a deed, the inclusion of a cause of action to quiet title does not necessarily extend the limitations period. If, in order to quiet title, a deed must first be reformed, the three-year limitation period for actions based on fraud or mistake applies [*Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 139-140, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141* (limitations period governing actions quieting title not applicable to action seeking reformation of deed and quiet title because court could not quiet title before first striking reservations of easement and surface entry; three-year period applicable); *see* Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*].

For a form for an affirmative defense based on lapse of statutory limitation period, see *§ 488.66*. For discussion and forms relating to limitation periods generally, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* . For discussion of the equitable defense of laches, see *§ 488.15[6]*.

[3] Res Judicata

An action for reformation may be barred by the doctrine of res judicata. For example, a court's prior approval of a trustee's accounting is a bar to a subsequent action for reformation seeking to alter the income distribution provisions of the trust [*Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1174-1175, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603]* . Res judicata, however, will not bar reformation of a judgment itself [*see* *Douglass v. Dahm (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 125, 128, 224 P.2d 914]* .

[4] Unclean Hands

Reformation, an equitable remedy, is subject to the equitable defense of unclean hands. Under this maxim of equitable jurisprudence, a party who has acted wrongfully, dishonestly, or unfairly in bringing an action to court is precluded from obtaining equitable relief [*Seymour v. Cariker (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 300, 305, 33 Cal. Rptr. 727]* .

The party asserting the defense of unclean hands must plead it or otherwise call it to the attention of the trial court. Only in cases involving "flagrantly unconscionable" conduct will the court, on its own initiative, apply the doctrine of unclean hands even though it was not raised initially by the parties [*Behm v. Fireside Thrift Co. (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 15, 21, 76 Cal. Rptr. 849]* .

[5] Waiver and Ratification

Reformation is subject to the equitable defenses of waiver and ratification. These defenses must be pleaded affirmatively in order to be considered by the court [*San Fernando Valley C. of C. v. Thomas (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 348, 350-351, 266 P.2d 891]* . For a form for an affirmative defense based on waiver, see *§ 488.64*.

[6] Laches

Reformation is subject to the equitable defense of laches [*Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1170-171, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603* (39-year delay between time trust beneficiary could be charged with knowledge of facts on which reformation action was based and time action was brought and prejudice resulting from death of important witnesses as constituting laches)]. The essential elements of laches are the following [*Stafford v. Ballinger (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 289, 296, 18 Cal. Rptr. 568]* :

- An omission to assert a right.
- A delay in the assertion of the right for some appreciable period.
- Circumstances that would cause prejudice to an adverse party if assertion of the right is permitted.

Courts decide what period of time constitutes a bar to reformation on the ground of laches on a case-by-case basis [*Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 542, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87]* .

Laches is an affirmative defense. The party asserting the defense of laches must show both delay and prejudice proximately caused thereby [*Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 821, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681]* . Unless laches is disclosed on the face of the complaint, the party asserting laches bears the burden of pleading and proving it [*Utica Mut. Ins. Co. v. Monarch Ins. Co. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 538, 543, 58 Cal. Rptr. 639* (laches no defense when complaint bore no evidence of prejudice and delay was less than the analogous statutory limitation period)]. If laches does appear on the face of the complaint, it is susceptible to a general demurrer [*Kleinclaus v. Dutard (1905) 147 Cal. 245, 250, 81 P. 516]* .

For a form for an affirmative defense based on laches, see *§ 488.65*. For discussion of related defense of lapse of statutory limitation period, see *§ 488.15[2]*.

[7] Negligence

As a general equitable rule, inexcusable negligence in failing to discover the mistake for which a remedy is sought bars the granting of equitable relief [*Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 539, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87]* . Negligence is not, however, a blanket bar to reformation. Instead, the court analyzes the circumstances of the individual case and determines the extent to which the aggrieved party has been negligent. Courts will excuse that negligence of which a person of ordinary prudence might have been guilty [*Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 539, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87]* . Conversely, negligence that is so gross as to constitute a neglect of legal duty will bar the granting of relief [*Los Angeles & Redondo R.R. Co. v. New Liverpool Salt Co. (1906) 150 Cal. 21, 28, 87 P. 1029* ; see also *Civ. Code § 1577*(regarding neglect of legal duty in context of a mistake of fact)].

Negligence in failing to read a written instrument sought to be reformed is not necessarily a bar to relief [*see Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491, 191 P.2d 67* (negligence in failing to read instrument before signing it as not bar to reformation)]. Whether a court will grant reformation turns on the underlying cause of the party's failure to read the instrument. Reformation will be denied when the party seeking reformation fails to read the contents of the writing and this failure is due solely to the party's own carelessness or negligence [*Miller v. Lantz (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 544, 548, 71 P.2d 585]* . On the other hand, failure to read the instrument will not bar an action for reformation when the failure is attributable to fraud and false representations by the other party concerning the contents of the writing [*California Trust Co. v. Cohn (1932) 214 Cal. 619, 627, 7 P.2d 297]* . Also, if the other party knows of or suspects the mistake of the aggrieved party, negligence in failing to read the written instrument is no defense [*Ramseier v. Oakley Sanitary Dist. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 722, 726-727, 17 Cal. Rptr. 464* (failure to read final version of contract held not to bar reformation when plaintiff knew of or suspected defendant's mistake in omitting a term of their agreement)].

Conversely, a party who has read the instrument but fails to detect an error in its contents is nevertheless entitled to bring an action for reformation [*Mills v. Schulba (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 559, 565, 213 P.2d 408* (reformation of deed not barred by failure of ordinary businessperson to detect a defect in the property description)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefUnclean HandsContracts LawRemediesRatificationContracts LawRemediesReformationContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of

LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.16

§ 488.16 Right to Jury Trial

An action seeking the reformation of a written instrument is a proceeding in equity [*Martinez v. Martinez (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 425, 428*], and therefore there is generally no right to a jury trial [*Loftus v. Fischer (1896) 113 Cal. 286, 288, 45 P. 328]* . When legal and equitable issues are joined in the same action, however, as when a party seeks reformation of contract and damages for breach of the contract as reformed, the parties may demand a jury trial on the legal issues [*Abbott v. City of Los Angeles (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 438, 462, 326 P.2d 484* ; *Robinson v. Puls (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 664, 665-666, 171 P.2d 430]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsActions in EquityCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury DemandsContracts LawRemediesReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.17

§ 488.17 Presumption of Parties' Intent to Make Equitable Agreement

The law presumes that all parties to a transaction intend to make an equitable and conscientious agreement [*Civ. Code § 3400*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.18

§ 488.18 Scope of Court's Inquiry Into True Intent

In reforming a written instrument, the court must ascertain the true intent of the parties [*First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645]* . To this end, the court may inquire into (1) the intended meaning of the instrument, (2) the intended legal consequences of the instrument, as well as (3) the intended language of the instrument [*Civ. Code § 3401*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.19

§ 488.19 Specific Performance of Reformed Instrument and Other Additional Relief

Although sometimes referred to as a "cause of action," reformation is merely one of several remedies for a single wrong. When the cause of action is based on failure to perform the intended agreement, the plaintiff may seek reformation and other forms of relief [*Landis v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 548, 555, 42 Cal. Rptr. 893]* . For example, *Civ. Code § 3402* expressly provides for specific enforcement of a written instrument once it has been reformed. Reformation and specific enforcement can be sought in the same action [*Tomas v. Vaughn (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 188, 192, 146 P.2d 499]* . For discussion and forms relating to specific enforcement generally, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

A general equitable principle dictates that a court of equity administer a full measure of relief, so as to avoid circuity of action and to promote the ends of justice [*Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 538, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87]* . Accordingly, a court, having first obtained equitable jurisdiction over the subject matter, may award any additional relief incidental to the equitable relief being sought [*Tomas v. Vaughn (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 188, 192, 146 P.2d 499]* . For example, a court of equity may award damages if they are purely incidental to the relief of reformation. The award of monetary relief does not change the equitable nature of the action into an action at law. It merely enables a court of equity to settle all disputesbetween the parties in one action [*Tomas v. Vaughn (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 188, 192, 146 P.2d 499]* .

For discussion and forms relating to contract remedies generally, including reformation, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* . For discussion and forms relating to the cancellation of written instruments as an alternative remedy to reformation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* . For discussion and forms relating to the alternative remedies of rescission and restitution, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureEquityReliefContracts LawRemediesReformationContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 488.20through 488.39

[Reserved]

§§ 488.20[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.40

§ 488.40 State Statutes

Action to correct defective certificate of execution of instrument. *Civ. Code §§ 1202, 1204*

Fraud defined. *Civ. Code §§ 1571-1573*

Mistake defined. *Civ. Code §§ 1576-1579*

General statute of frauds. *Civ. Code § 1624*

Effect of fraud or mistake on contract. *Civ. Code § 1640*

Statute of frauds regarding agent's authority to contract. *Civ. Code § 2309*

Reformation available after mistake or fraud. *Civ. Code § 3399*

Presumption of parties' equitable intentions for purpose of revision of contract. *Civ. Code § 3400*

Scope of inquiry in reformation action. *Civ. Code § 3401*

Specific enforcement of reformed contract. *Civ. Code § 3402*

Statute of limitations in an action for relief on the ground of fraud or mistake. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*

Parol evidence rule. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1856*

Statute of frauds regarding premarital agreement. *Fam. Code § 1611*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesReformationContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.41

§ 488.41 Decisions

[1] Action for Reformation

[a] Establishing Elements of Action

Reformation of insurance policy to cover additional party requires objective manifestation of mutual intent to so cover. *American Home Ins. Co. v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 951, 965, 175 Cal. Rptr. 826*

Court correctly admitted evidence of parties' lack of intent to violate usury law in action to reform note by deleting usurious provision. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Clear and convincing proof is proper evidentiary standard in action seeking reformation. *Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 488, 191 P.2d 67*

[b] Grounds for Relief

[i] Fraud

Reformation on ground of fraud is proper to remedy fraud in execution. *Lane v. Davis (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 302, 307-308, 342 P.2d 267*

[ii] Mistake of Law

Reformation on ground of mistake of law is proper to delete joint tenancy designation from voluntary conveyance because grantor mistakenly believed it meant she would retain undivided one half interest. *Tyler v. Larson (1951) 106*

Cal. App. 2d 317, 319-320, 235 P.2d 39

[iii] Mutual Mistake of Fact

Reformation on ground of mutual mistake presupposes actual agreement among parties as to their true intention, and the parties' mutual yet mistaken belief that written instrument reflects that intention. *Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 197, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341*

Mistake by insurer and insured employer in writing group disability policy that is not known to or suspected by employee covered under policy is not ground for reformation. *Insurance Co. of North America v. Bechtel (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 310, 316-318, 111 Cal. Rptr. 507*

Mistake of scrivener in reducing the commmon intent of the parties to writing is ground for reformation. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Mutual mistake is failure of written instrument to express true intent of parties due to inadvertence of both of them. *Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 700, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352*

[iv] Unilateral Mistake of Fact

No mistake of fact or failure of consideration, only error in judgment, was established when contract became unprofitable for party who knew that its value could be affected by particular future event and made no provision in contract with respect to that risk; risk is borne by that party, who is not entitled to avoid, rescind, or reform contract. *Mosher v. Mayacamas Corp. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1, 5-6, 263 Cal. Rptr. 373*

Constructive notice of unilateral mistake is insufficient ground for reformation. *La Mancha Dev. Corp. v. Sheegog (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 9, 16-17, 144 Cal. Rptr. 59*

Operation of estoppel in context of unilateral mistake prevents non-mistaken party from claiming different intent. *Stare v. Tate (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 432, 438-439, 98 Cal. Rptr. 264*

Agreement was intended by party acting under unilateral mistake as contract of parties. *Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acc. Com. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 222, 229, 206 P.2d 877*

Knowledge or suspicion of duly authorized agent is sufficient to support reformation on ground of unilateral mistake. *Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 222, 225-226, 206 P.2d 877*

[c] Valid Instrument Required

Valid agreement between the parties is prerequisite to granting of reformation. *Paterson v. Board of Trustees (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 811, 815, 321 P.2d 825*

Written contract for employment alleged by employee to be "illegal, void, false and erroneous" was void agreement not subject to reformation. *McClure v. Cerati (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 74, 85, 194 P.2d 46*

Agreement void for illegality is not subject to reformation. *Ainsworth v. Morrill (1916) 31 Cal. App. 509, 511, 160 P. 1089*

[2] Defenses

[a] Equitable Estoppel

Equitable estoppel is not to be applied against one who is blameless; trust beneficiaries as not in privity with alleged promisor for purpose of avoiding general rule of inapplicability. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1185, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

[b] Illegality or Statutory Noncompliance

Attempted reformation of insurance policy to reflect mutual intent of parties was void when policy as reformed would not comply with statute relating to retained limit of self insurance. *Alderson v. Insurance Co. of North America (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 397, 411-413, 273 Cal. Rptr. 7*

[c] Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period and Laches

Representation is estoppel effecting bar to laches only when made by party against whom reformation is sought. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1171-1172, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603* (upholding trial court's refusal to reform trust)

Limitation period for reformation based on fraud and mistake is three years from date fraud or mistake was or should have been discovered. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1168, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Thirty-nine-year delay between time trust beneficiary could be charged with knowledge of facts on which reformation action was based and time action was brought, and prejudice resulting from death of important witnesses, was laches. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1170-1171, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Three-year statute of limitations (former *Code Civ. Proc. 338(4)* (*now Code Civ. Proc. 338(d)*) is applicable to action for reformation of deed or contract on ground of fraud or mistake. *Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141*

Action on cross complaint for reformation of automobile insurance contract is not barred by laches because not barred by applicable limitations period and, also, cross defendant failed to show how it suffered prejudice by delay. *Utica Mut. Ins. Co. v. Monarch Ins. Co. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 538, 543-544, 58 Cal. Rptr. 639*

Defense of laches in action to reform insurance contract requires showing of delay and prejudice proximately caused thereby. *Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 821, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681*

Laches appearing on face of complaint is susceptible to general demurrer. *Kleinclaus v. Dutard (1905) 147 Cal. 245, 249-250, 81 P. 516*

[d] Negligence

Negligence of attorney in evaluating worth of equity in real property is no bar to reformation of property settlement agreement. *Stare v. Tate (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 432, 437, 98 Cal. Rptr. 264*

Failure to read insurance policy is no absolute bar to reformation. *Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 819, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681*

Negligence in not reading instrument before signing is no bar to reformation. *Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491, 191 P.2d 67*

Failure to read instrument with sufficient attention to detect error is no bar to reformation. *Strauss v. Bruce (1934) 139 Cal. App. 62, 66, 33 P.2d 71*

[e] Res Judicata

Res judicata is defense to action for reformation; action seeking to reform income distribution provisions of trust is barred by prior judgments that affirmed validity of trust's terms and approved trustees' accountings. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1172-1175, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

[f] Unclean Hands

Doctrine of unclean hands is defense to action for reformation of subordination agreement of chattel mortgage. *Behm v. Fireside Thrift Co. (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 15, 21-22, 76 Cal. Rptr. 849* .

[g] Waiver or Ratification

Defenses of waiver and ratification is required to be raised affirmatively. *San Fernando Valley C. of C. v. Thomas (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 348, 350-351, 266 P.2d 891*

[3] Nature and Scope of Reformation

Court is not permitted to create new contract for the parties. *Lemoge Electric v. County of San Mateo (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 659, 663-664, 297 P.2d 638*

Purpose of reformation is to correct written instrument in order to effectuate common intention of parties which was incorrectly reduced to writing. *Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 703, 708, 227 P.2d 10*

Intention of parties is defined as single intention entertained by both parties. *Bailard v. Marden (1951) 36 Cal. 2d*

703, 708, 227 P.2d 10

Action seeking reformation is equitable proceeding with no right to trial by jury. *Loftus v. Fischer (1896) 113 Cal. 286, 288, 45 P. 328*

Sole purpose of reformation is to correct written instrument to conform to underlying agreement of parties which was incorrectly reduced to writing; when instrument reflects agreement based on mutual mistake of fact, reformation as unavailable. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1178, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Purpose of reformation is to permit court to do equity. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1180, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Reformation is based on some underlying agreement of parties; if alleged mistake was failure of parties to agree what to do in event of certain contingency, which did in fact occur, reformation is unavailable. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1178-1180, 1181-1182, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Executed contract is not subject to reformation if aggrieved party, with knowledge of facts, accepts performance in accordance with terms of contract as written. *Vantress Farms, Inc. v. Sydenstricker (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 943, 950, 90 Cal. Rptr. 251*

Reformation requires prior agreement among the parties on all essential terms. *Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 699-700, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352*

Reformation is merely one of several remedies for single wrong. *Landis v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 548, 555, 42 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Reformation of judgments and decrees is proper given equitable nature of remedy. *Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 538-539, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87*

[4] Reformable Instruments

Reformation of promissory note to delete usurious provision is proper when inclusion of provision contravened parties' true intent to execute note with legal interest rate. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645* *Strauss v. Bruce (1934) 139 Cal. App. 62, 66, 33 P.2d 71*

Reformation of major medical expense insurance policy to delete exclusionary provisions is proper. *Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 817-821, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681*

[5] Rights of Third Parties

Reformation is not limited to parties to original transaction but as available to one who has suffered prejudice or

pecuniary loss, such as trust beneficiary; aggrieved party as not required to have paid consideration in order to obtain reformation. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1180-1181, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

General principles of third-party beneficiary law are applicable to insurance contracts and therefore bar incidental beneficiary from reforming policy to expand coverage. *American Home Ins. Co. v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 951, 967-968, 175 Cal. Rptr. 826*

Surviving entity of corporate merger is not bona fide purchaser for value in action to reform lease to which it has succeeded. *Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 199-200, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341*

Insurance policy is reformable to limit or exclude coverage if that was parties' intention, even when rights of third-party claimants, not parties to the insurance contract, are adversely affected. *Truck Ins. Exch. v. Wilshire Ins. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 553, 559, 87 Cal. Rptr. 604*

Party "aggrieved," and therefore entitled to seek reformation, is one who has suffered prejudice or pecuniary loss as well as original parties to transaction. *Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 698, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352*

Landowner is not bona fide purchaser for value in action by adjoining landowner to reform misdescription in landowner's deed because had landowner made thorough examination of property before purchase, she would have noticed defect in deed. *Saxon v. Du Bois (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 713, 717-718, 26 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Original lessor is not bona fide purchaser for value in action between lessee and sublessee. *Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491-492, 191 P.2d 67*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefUnclean HandsContracts LawRemediesRatificationContracts LawRemediesReformationGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsContract FormationReformation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.42

§ 488.42 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 762-774 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 276-284, 298; vol. 2 *Insurance*, §§ 216, 217 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 488.43through 488.59

[Reserved]

§§ 488.43[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.60

§ 488.60 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Complaint Based on Unilateral Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Complaint Based on Unilateral Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR REFORMATION
_____ [*name(s)*] [and DOES I through _____,] Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. _____ (*Allege identity and capacity of plaintiff, e.g.,* Plaintiff _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a partnership with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California, and it has filed and published the fictitious name statement required under *Business and Professions Code Sections 17910 through 17917*).]

[2. _____ (*Allege identity, capacity, and residence of defendant(s), e.g.,* Defendant _____(*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California).]

[3. Defendants DOES I through _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants has, or claims to have, an interest in the _____ (*specify written instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement) herein described, the exact nature of which is unknown to plaintiff.)]

[4. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafteralleged, was acting within the course and scope of that agency and employment.]

5. _____ [*Allege facts leading to the formation of a valid agreement, e.g.,* On or about _____(*date*), in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California, plaintiff _____ (*name*) and defendant _____(*name*) negotiated for and mutually agreed to the lease, by plaintiff from defendant, of commercial property located at _____ (*address*). The purpose of this agreement was to enable plaintiff to open and operate a second business location].

6. _____ [*Allege the terms of the agreement reflecting the true intent of the parties, e.g.,* The oral agreement of plaintiff and defendant consisted, in pertinent part, of the following terms. Defendant agreed to lease the premises to plaintiff for a fixed term of five years, commencing on _____ (*date*). Plaintiff agreed to pay defendant, as the monthly rent for the premises, a sum equal to 10 percent of the gross income for that month from plaintiff's second place of business located on the leased premises].

7. _____ [*Allege the terms of the agreement as they were actually reduced to writing, e.g.,* On _____(*date*), in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant executed a written lease to carry out their intended agreement, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit "A" and is incorporated by reference].

8. The above-described written _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement], fails to reflect the true intent of the parties in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* it provides that the monthly rent equal 10 percent of the gross income for that month from plaintiff's principal place of business and plaintiff's second place of business]. To reflect the true intent of the parties, it should instead provide that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the monthly rent shall be a sum equal to 10 percent of the gross income for that month from plaintiff's second place of business only, that is, the place of business located on the premises].

9. The above-described failure of the written _____[*specify written instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement] to reflect the true intent of the parties resulted from a unilateral mistake on the part of _____ [*specify party to agreement, e.g.,* plaintiff], in that _____ [*specify nature of mistake, e.g.,* plaintiff made a clerical error in drafting the rental clause of the lease agreement, but mistakenly believed, in presenting the lease agreement to defendant for execution, that the clause correctly expressed the terms for rental intended by the parties].

10. Defendant _____ [knew of *or* suspected] the above-described mistake at the time of execution of the written _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement], in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant, prior to signing the agreement, specifically asked to review the rental clause of the agreement, in view of the parties' extensive negotiations with respect to the calculation of rent].

[11. Plaintiff, although not a named party to the above-described written _____ (*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement) may nonetheless suffer _____ [prejudice *and/or* pecuniary loss unless the _____ (*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement) is reformed, in that _____ (*specify*)].

12. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff discovered the error in the written _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement] when _____ [*allege manner in which plaintiff discovered the mistake*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the reformation of the written _____[*specify instrument, e.g.,* lease agreement] to reflect the true intent of the parties, as follows: _____ [*specify the revision sought*];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a plaintiff to seek reformation of a written instrument on the ground of plaintiff's unilateral mistake of fact if the other party knew of the mistake or suspected it [*see Civ. Code § 3399*].

This form may be combined with other causes for relief when additional or alternative relief is requested. For further discussion, see the Introduction § 488.19.

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes initial, optional paragraphs that allege the following:

- The identity and capacity of the plaintiff (Paragraph 1).
- The identity, capacity, and residence of the defendant (Paragraph 2).
- Fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 3).

- Agency of the defendants (Paragraph 4).

- Facts describing the formation of a valid agreement (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3399* (reformation after fraud or mistake), 3400 (presumption of equitable and conscientious agreement)].

- The terms of the agreement as they were intended by the parties (Paragraph 6).

- The terms of the agreement as they were reduced to writing (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3399, 3400*; *see also Auerbach v. Healy (1916) 174 Cal. 60, 62-63, 161 P. 1157]* .

- The manner in which the written instrument should be corrected to express the true intent of the parties (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3399, 3401*].

- The existence of a unilateral mistake causing failure of the written instrument to embody the true intent of the parties and nature of that mistake (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1577* (mistake of fact defined), *3399* (reformation after fraud or mistake)].

- Facts describing defendant's knowledge or suspicion of the mistake (Paragraph 10) [*see Miller v. Lantz (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 544, 548, 71 P.2d 585]* .

- The date and manner of plaintiff's discovery of the mistake (Paragraph 12) [*see Auerbach v. Healy (1916) 174 Cal. 60, 62-63, 161 P. 1157]* .

Optional Paragraph 11 alleges plaintiff's status as an aggrieved party, for use when plaintiff is not a named party and his or her status is not otherwise apparent from the preceding allegations [*see Civ. Code § 3399* (standing in reformation action); *see also Orcutt v. Ferranini (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 216, 224, 46 Cal. Rptr. 715]* .

[4] Pleading With Particularity Required

The party seeking reformation of a written instrument should take great care in pleading the ultimate facts constituting the basis for the action. Lack of particularity in pleading could result in the sustaining of an interposed demurrer [*Girard v. Miller (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 266, 273, 29 Cal. Rptr. 359]* .

[5] Anticipating Defenses Based on Lapse of Time

The three-year statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* does not commence to run against an action for reformation until discovery of the underlying fraud or mistake. Although the party against whom reformation is sought has the burden of raising the statute of limitations defense, the complaint, nonetheless, must allege facts showing the date and manner in which the fraud or mistake was discovered [*see Wilson v. Wilson (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 542, 545, 18 Cal. Rptr. 768]* .

If there has been considerable delay between the occurrence of the fraud or mistake on which the action for reformation is based and the filing of the action, defenses based on lapse of time may be raised. The party seeking reformation should anticipate the raising of these defenses by alleging recent discovery of the underlying fraud or mistake and diligence sufficient to excuse the long delay [*see Miller v. Lantz (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 544, 548, 71 P.2d 585]* . For further discussion, see *§§ 488.15[2], [6], 488.65, 488.66.*

[6] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any

answer to be verified also, if the action is an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[7] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action. Because relief under *Civ. Code § 3399* is equitable, actions for reformation of an instrument will be classified as unlimited civil cases unless they fall within one of the specific categories of actions in equity that are designated as limited civil cases [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(3),(b), 88*].

Actions to revise a contract are limited civil cases when the relief is sought in an action upon the contract if the action otherwise is a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(3)*]. In this connection, an action normally is classified as a limited civil case if the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85(a), 86(a)(1)*].

In addition, the following cases in equity are designated as limited civil cases, and an action seeking reformation of an instrument presumably would be a limited civil case if it came within one of these categories [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.
- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.
- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[8] Venue

In an action for reformation, the proper county for the trial of the action depends on the nature of the instrument sought to be reformed. An action to reform a contract may generally be brought in the county in which any defendant resides at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (action against corporation or association properly brought in county of defendant's principal place of business)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, which allows an action founded on a contractual obligation to be brought in the county where the obligation is to be performed or in the county in which the contract in fact was entered into, as well as in the county of defendant's residence, does not apply to an action for reformation of contract. An action to reform a contract is not considered to be an action on the obligation itself. It is essentially a personal action in equity [*Mettler v. Hedley (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 277, 280-281, 338 P.2d 489]* .

The proper venue of an action for the reformation of a deed or other instrument that would affect a right or interest in real property is the county in which all or part of the subject property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*; *see also Franklin v. Dutton (1889) 79 Cal. 605, 606, 21 P. 964* ; *Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 535-539, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527* (action to reform deed of trust to delete power of sale was properly brought in county in

which real property was situated because action had direct impact on real property right or interest)].

[9] Cross References

For alternative allegations with respect to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For discussion and forms relating to cancellation of written instruments as an alternative to reformation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to remedies for breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and a general form for a complaint to cancel a deed and to quiet title, see Ch. 184, *Deeds*

For discussion and forms relating to the amendment, correction, and modification of judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission and restitution as an alternative to reformation, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

For discussion and forms relating to the remedy of specific performance that may be sought in conjunction with reformation, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For discussion and forms relating to actions to establish an equitable mortgage, when an instrument, intended as real property security, is invalid, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*

For discussion and complaints relating to actions to establish a constructive trust over real property acquired through fraud, mistake, or undue influence, see Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[10] State Constitution

Jurisdiction of superior court. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

[11] State Statutes

Mistake defined. *Civ. Code §§ 1576-1579*

Effect of fraud or mistake on contract. *Civ. Code § 1640*

Reformation of written instruments. *Civ. Code § 3399 et seq.*

Jurisdiction in "limited civil cases." *Code Civ. Proc. § 85 et seq.*

Jurisdiction of small claims courts. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*

Venue. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392, 395, 395.5*

[12] Decisions

Reformation on ground of unilateral mistake requires allegation that nonmistaken party knew of or suspected mistake at time of execution of the instrument. *Miller v. Lantz (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 544, 548, 71 P.2d 585* ; *City of Cypress v. New Amsterdam Cas. Co. (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 219, 225, 66 Cal. Rptr. 357*

Necessary allegations to action for reformation include real agreement; agreement reduced to writing; how writing fails to embody agreement; and facts showing how mistake was made, whose mistake it was, and how it came about. *Auerbach v. Healy (1916) 174 Cal. 60, 62-63, 161 P. 1157* ; *Landis v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 548, 555, 42 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Johnson v. Sun Realty Co. (1934) 138 Cal. App. 296, 300, 32 P.2d 393*

Party who seeks reformation of instrument if drafted is required to show some excuse for its mistake. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 21, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Constructive notice of unilateral mistake is insufficient ground for reformation. *La Mancha Dev. Corp. v. Sheegog (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 9, 16-17, 144 Cal. Rptr. 59*

Knowledge or suspicion of duly authorized agent is sufficient ground for reformation. *Eagle Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 222, 225-226, 206 P.2d 877*

Failure to plead ultimate facts constituting mutual or unilateral mistake results in sustaining of general and special demurrer. *McClure v. Cerati (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 74, 83, 194 P.2d 46*

Allegation of consideration in action to reform deed is not required because burden to allege insufficient consideraton rests on party against whom reformation is sought. *Belletich v. Belletich (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 732, 735, 105 P.2d 954*

[13] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 762-774 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 276-284; vol. 2, *Insurance*, §§ 216, 217 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.61

§ 488.61 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mistake of Law [Civ. Code §§ 1578, 1640]

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mistake of Law [Civ. Code §§ 1578, 1640]

[*EITHER, if alleging mutual mistake of law*]

The above-described failure of the written _____ [*specify written instrument, e.g.,* conveyance contract] to reflect the true intent of the parties resulted from a mutual mistake of law by plaintiff and defendant in that _____ [*specify nature of mistake, e.g.,* both parties believed that the effect of describing their interest in the conveyance contract as a joint tenancy was to allow each party to retain an undivided one-half interest in the property].

[*OR, if alleging unilateral mistake of law by one party known or suspected by other*]

The above-described failure of the written _____ [*specify written instrument, e.g.,* conveyance contract] to reflect the true intent of the parties resulted from a mistake of law on the part of _____ [*specify party to agreement, e.g.,* plaintiff], which _____ [*specify party to agreement, e.g.,* defendant] knew or suspected at the time of execution of the agreement in that _____ [*specify nature of mistake, e.g.,* plaintiff believed that the effect of holding title in joint tenancy was to allow each party to retain an undivided one-half interest in the property. After completion of the transaction and execution of the contract, defendant told plaintiff that he knew that in order for each party to retain an undivided one-half interest in the property, they would have had to describe their interest as a tenancy in common and not as a joint tenancy, in the conveyance contract].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by a plaintiff to seek reformation of a written instrument on the ground of mistake of law [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. The first alternative paragraph alleges facts describing a mutual mistake in law [*see Civ. Code § 1578(1)*

(defining mutual mistake of law)], whereas the second alternative paragraph alleges facts describing a unilateral mistake in law by the plaintiff, known or suspected by the defendant [*see Civ. Code § 1578(2)* (defining unilateral mistake of law)]. Either allegation may be inserted in § 488.60 in place of Paragraphs 9 and 10 of that form.

[3] State Statutes

Mistake of law defined. *Civ. Code § 1578*

Effect of fraud or mistake on contract. *Civ. Code § 1640*

Reformation of written instruments. *Civ. Code §§ 3399-3402*

[4] Decisions

Mistake as to legal effect of instrument is subject to reformation. *Stafford v. California C.P. Growers (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 212, 219, 78 P.2d 1150*

Reformation on ground of mistake of law is proper for deleting joint tenancy designation from voluntary conveyance because grantor mistakenly believed it meant she would retain undivided one half interest. *Tyler v. Larson (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 317, 319-320, 235 P.2d 39*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to § 488.60

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.62

§ 488.62 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1571-1573, 1640]

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1571-1573, 1640]

1. The above-described failure of the written _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* conditional sales contract] to reflect the true intent of the parties resulted from defendant's false representation to plaintiff that the above-mentioned written instrument embodied their real agreement.

2. Without knowledge of the true facts and in reliance on defendant's false representations, plaintiff was deceived and misled into signing a writing that differed materially from the prior oral understanding of the parties. Plaintiff's reliance on defendant's false representations that the written _____ [*identify instrument, e.g.,* conditional sales contract] conformed to the parties' intended agreement was reasonable and justified in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant had previously shown plaintiff a writing that contained the parties' intended agreement and plaintiff believed that it was this writing that she was asked to sign and did, in fact, sign].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by a plaintiff to seek reformation of a written instrument on the ground of fraud [*see Civ. Code § 3399*]. It alleges (1) the fact that the defendant's false representation resulted in the failure of the instrument to embody the intent of the parties (Paragraph 1); and (2) the fact that the instrument was materially altered due to defendant's fraud, and justifiable reliance by plaintiff (Paragraph 2) [*see Civ. Code § 1572* (actual fraud defined); *see also Vasquez v. Superior Court of San Joaquin County (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 811, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964* (elements of fraud)]. The allegation may be inserted in *see § 488.60* in place of Paragraphs 9 and 10.

[3] State Statutes

Fraud defined. *Civ. Code §§ 1571-1573*

Effect of fraud or mistake on contract. *Civ. Code § 1640*

Reformation of written instruments. *Civ. Code §§ 3399-3402*

[4] Decisions

Negligence in not reading instrument is no bar to reformation if party aggrieved is justified in relying on fraudulent misrepresentations of other party. *Security-First Nat. Bank v. Earp (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 774, 777, 122 P.2d 900*

Reformation on ground of fraud is proper to remedy fraud in execution of written instrument. *Lane v. Davis (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 302, 307-308, 342 P.2d 267*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to § 488.60

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.63

§ 488.63 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mutual Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Allegation of Ground for Reformation--Based on Mutual Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code §§ 1577, 1640]

1. The above-described failure of the written _____ [*specify written instrument, e.g.,* promissory note] to reflect the true intent of the parties resulted from a mutual mistake of both parties in that _____[*specify nature of mistake, e.g.,* the escrow agent employed by the parties to arrange the loan inadvertently used a standard printed form of note containing a provision that in the event the note was not paid when due, interest would be compounded; the parties did not request inclusion of the compound interest provision, which had the effect of rendering the note usurious on its face, and did not believe that the written instrument that they signed contained such a provision].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by a plaintiff to seek reformation of a written instrument on the ground of mutual mistake of fact [*Civ. Code § 3399*; *see also Civ. Code § 1577* (mistake of fact)]. The allegation may be inserted in *see § 488.60* in place of Paragraphs 9 and 10 of that form.

[3] State Statutes

Mistake defined. *Civ. Code §§ 1576-1579*

Effect of fraud or mistake on contract. *Civ. Code § 1640*

Reformation of written instruments. *Civ. Code §§ 3399-3402*

[4] Decisions

Mistake of surveyor in running boundary line is subject to reformation. *Breen v. Donnelly (1887) 74 Cal. 301, 304, 15 P. 845*

Reformation on ground of mutual mistake presupposes actual agreement among parties as to their true intention, and the parties' mutual yet mistaken belief that written instrument reflects that intention. *Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 197, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341*

Mutual mistake is failure of written instrument to express true intent of parties due to inadvertence of both of them. *Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 700, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352*

Mistake of attorney jointly employed to effect transfer of title is subject to reformation. *Mills v. Schulba (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 559, 561-562, 213 P.2d 408*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to § 488.60

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.64

§ 488.64 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Waiver and Ratification of Mistake by Plaintiff

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Waiver and Ratification of Mistake by Plaintiff

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff discovered the _____ [mistake *or* fraud] and communicated his/her discovery to defendant. At that time, plaintiff informed defendant that he/she would abide by the instrument "as is," notwithstanding the _____ [mistake *or* fraud] and that the instrument as written was satisfactory.

2. Plaintiff's communication to defendant of his/her discovery of the _____ [mistake *or* fraud] constituted a waiver of plaintiff's right to reformation and a ratification of the instrument as written.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for reformation of a written instrument [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. The affirmative defense alleged is that the plaintiff has waived his or her right to relief by acts or statements that, in effect, ratify the written instrument as is. For further discussion of this defense, see the Introduction § 488.41[2][g]. For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Decisions

Waiver and ratification as affirmative defense that must be raised in pleading. *San Fernando Valley C. of C. v. Thomas (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 348, 350-351, 266 P.2d 891*

[4] Cross References

See also References to § 488.60

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.65

§ 488.65 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Laches

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Laches

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. Plaintiff has delayed an unreasonable period of time in bringing this action in that _____ [*specify length of delay, indicating when the mistake/fraud occurred and when plaintiff brought suit*].

2. Plaintiff's delay in bringing this action has prejudiced defendant in that _____ [*describe how the delay has prejudiced the defendant*].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for reformation of a written instrument [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. The affirmative defense alleged is that the plaintiff is barred from asserting his or her claim for reformation by operation of the equitable doctrine of laches. For further discussion of this defense, see the Introduction *§ 488.15[6]*. For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

Laches is an affirmative defense that usually must be raised by way of allegation in the answer. It may be considered as a ground for demurrer only when it is apparent on the face of the complaint [*Kleinclaus v. Dutard (1905) 147 Cal. 245, 250, 81 P. 516]* . For further discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[4] Decisions

Reformation is subject to the equitable defense of laches. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1170-1171, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Thirty-nine-year delay in bringing action and undue prejudice caused by death of important witnesses constitutes laches. *Getty v. Getty (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1170-1171, 232 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Delay without prejudice caused thereby is insufficient to support defense of laches. *Utica Mut. Ins. Co. v. Monarch Ins. Co. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 538, 543-544, 58 Cal. Rptr. 639* ; *Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 821, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681*

Laches is decided by court on case-by-case bases. *Voge, Inc. v. Rose (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 534, 542, 23 Cal. Rptr. 87*

Essential elements of laches are omission to assert right, delay in assertion of right for some appreciable period, and circumstances that would cause prejudice to an adverse party if assertion of right is permitted. *Stafford v. Ballinger (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 289, 296, 18 Cal. Rptr. 568*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 488.60 and 488.64

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.66

§ 488.66 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period [Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)]

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Lapse of Statutory Limitation Period [Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that the action is barred by the provisions of *Code of Civil Procedure Section 338(d).*

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by defendant in an action for reformation to raise the bar of the statute of limitations by way of an affirmative defense allegation in her or his answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*]. For further discussion, see Introduction *§ 488.15[2]*. For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

If the defense of the statute of limitations is apparent from the face of the complaint or from matter of which the court may take judicial notice, the objection may be raised by general demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(a)*; *see Evid. Code §§ 451, 452* (judicial notice)]. The specific grounds must be pleaded (an exception to the general rule that general demurrers need only state that the complaint fails to state a cause of action). The defense of the statute of limitations, however, is not waived for failure to demur, and may be asserted as an affirmative defense in the answer [*California Safe etc. Co. v. Sierra etc. Co. (1910) 158 Cal. 690, 697-698, 112 P. 274]* . For further discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[4] State Statutes

Statute of Limitations in an action for relief on the ground of fraud or mistake. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*

[5] Decisions

Cause of action for reformation accrues on discovery of actual conflict between written terms of agreement and alleged mutual intent of parties; when contract became ambiguous because of change in law, party seeking reformation, who was familiar with copyright law, was charged with discovery of conflict on date new law came into effect. *Hal Roach Studios v. Richard Feiner and Co. (9th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 1542, 1547-1550* (applying California law)

Three-year statute of limitations (former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(4)*; *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*) is applicable to action for reformation of deed or contract on ground of fraud or mistake. *Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141*

Cause of action for reformation is not deemed to accrue until discovery, by aggrieved party, of facts constituting underlying fraud or mistake. *Welsher v. Glickman (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140, 77 Cal. Rptr. 141*

Action on cross complaint for reformation of automobile insurance contract was not barred by laches because action was not barred by applicable limitations period and cross defendant also failed to show how it suffered prejudice by delay. *Utica Mut. Ins. Co. v. Monarch Ins. Co. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 538, 543-544, 58 Cal. Rptr. 639*

Reasonable diligence standard is used to determine point at which aggrieved party should be charged with constructive notice of facts constituting fraud or mistake for purposes of calculating when statutory limitation period commences to run. *Laing v. Occidental Life Ins. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 811, 820, 53 Cal. Rptr. 681*

[6] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 488.60 and 488.64

126 of 126 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 488 REFORMATION OF INSTRUMENTS
PART IV. FORMS

43-488 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 488.67

§ 488.67 Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Intervening Rights of Bona Fide Purchaser

[1] FORM Reformation of Written Instrument [Civ. Code § 3399]--Affirmative Defense Allegation--Intervening Rights of Bona Fide Purchaser

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. On _____ [*date*], after execution of the _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* deed], _____ [*name of bona fide third-party purchaser*] acquired rights under the _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* deed] from _____ [*name*], a party to the agreement, as follows: _____ [*specify rights acquired and manner of their acquisition*].

2. _____ [*Name of bona fide third-party purchaser*] acquired his/her rights under the _____[*specify instrument, e.g.,* deed] in good faith, without notice of the rights of plaintiff _____ [*name*], whose interests have been described defectively in the instrument.

3. The above-described rights of _____ [*name of bona fide third-party purchaser*] were acquired for valuable consideration, to wit, $_____.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by defendant in an action for reformation to raise the defense of the intervening rights of a bona fide purchaser by way of an affirmative defense allegation in her or his answer [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. For further discussion, see Introduction *§ 488.13[2]*. For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] State Statutes

Intervening rights of bona fide purchasers under reformation statute. *Civ. Code § 3399*

[4] Decisions

Rights acquired bona fide or in good faith are those acquired without notice of defect in instrument sought to be reformed. *Arp v. Ferguson (1917) 175 Cal. 646, 648, 166 P. 803*

Surviving entity of corporate merger is not bona fide purchaser for value in action to reform lease to which it has succeeded. *Treadaway v. Camellia Convalescent Hospitals, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 189, 199-200, 118 Cal. Rptr. 341*

Insurance policy is reformable to limit or exclude coverage if that was parties' intention, even when rights of third-party claimants, not parties to theinsurance contract, are adversely affected. *Truck Ins. Exch. v. Wilshire Ins. Co. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 553, 559, 87 Cal. Rptr. 604*

Protected third parties do not include those who acquire rights with actual or constructive notice of rights of others whose interests have been described defectively in instrument sought to be reformed. *Shupe v. Nelson (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 693, 698, 62 Cal. Rptr. 352*

Landowner was not a bona fide purchaser for value in action by adjoining landowner to reform misdescription in landowner's deed because, had landowner made thorough examination of property before purchase, she would have noticed defect in deed. *Saxon v. Du Bois (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 713, 717-718, 26 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Original lessor is not bona fide purchaser for value in action between lessee and sublessee. *Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491-492, 191 P.2d 67*

Rights of third party are those acquired, after execution of written instrument, by bona fide purchaser for value from party to agreement. *Baines v. Zuieback (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 483, 491, 191 P.2d 67*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ *488.60* and *488.64*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 489.syn

§ 489.syn Synopsis to Chapter 489: RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS

§ 489.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 489.02 Cross References

§ 489.03 Governing Law

§§ 489.04-489.09 [Reserved]

§ 489.10 Inherent and Statutory Powers of Courts

§ 489.11 Manners of Attacking Judgments and Orders

§ 489.12 When Extrinsic Evidence Is Admissible

§ 489.13 Direct Attack

[1] Defined

[2] Grounds for Direct Attack

§ 489.14 Collateral Attack

[1] Defined

[2] Grounds for Collateral Attack

[a] Lack of Jurisdiction

[b] Excess of Jurisdiction

[c] Judgment or Order Within Jurisdiction

[d] Default Judgment

[3] How Collateral Attack Is Made

[4] Presumption of Jurisdiction on Collateral Attack

[a] Rule

[b] Exception for Criminal Judgment

§ 489.15 Time Limitations

[1] Depends on Ground for Relief

[2] Time Limits for Relief at Law

[a] Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[b] Court Assumed Jurisdiction Over Party's Attorney's Practice

[c] Service of Summons Did Not Give Actual Notice in Time to Defend

[d] Default Taken After Violation of Consumer Protection Venue Statutes

[e] Relief Based on Military Service

[f] Judgments Void in Fact But Not on Face

[g] Judgment Void on Its Face

[3] Time Limits for Relief at Equity

§ 489.16 Seeking Relief on Multiple Grounds

[1] In General

[2] When Attack Is Based on Lack of Jurisdiction Over Defendant

§ 489.17 Affidavits and Declarations

[1] When Authorized

[2] Effect on Appeal of Trial on Motion by Affidavits or Declarations

§ 489.18 Appeal

[1] Who Can Appeal

[2] From Void Judgment or Order

[3] From Order Granting or Denying Motion to Vacate Default and Motion to Reconsider

[4] From Default Judgment

[5] From Order Granting Relief From Judgment or Order

[a] Appealability Generally

[b] Conditional vs. Unconditional Orders

[c] Relief Granted on Ground of Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[d] Relief Granted on Other Grounds

[e] Effect of Appeal on Judgment

[6] From Order Denying Relief From Judgment or Order

[a] Relief Sought on Ground of Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[b] Relief Sought on Other Grounds

§ 489.19 Effect of Appeal on Jurisdiction of Trial Court

§ 489.20 General Policies

[1] Policy Favoring Trial on Merits

[2] Countervailing Policies

§ 489.21 Considerations on Appeal

[1] Disposition of Appellate Courts

[2] Conflicts in Evidence

[3] Abuse of Discretion

[a] As Required for Reversal

[b] Applicability to Motions for Relief From Default Judgments

[c] Discretion Is That of Trial Court

[d] Burden of Proof

[e] Ruling on Appeal

§ 489.22 Review by Mandate

[1] Order Granting Relief

[2] Order Denying Relief

§§ 489.23-489.29 [Reserved]

§ 489.30 Default Defined

§ 489.31 Default Judgment and Related Judgments Distinguished

§ 489.32 Relief Grounded on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

§ 489.33 Equitable Relief

§ 489.34 Relief on Other Grounds

[1] Additional Grounds Available

[2] Combining Relief in Case of Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake

§ 489.35 Imputation of Attorney's Fault to Client

§ 489.36 Nature of Application for Relief

§ 489.37 Rule of Liberal Construction

§ 489.38 Discretion of Trial Court

[1] Ruling on Motion for Relief

[2] When Exercise of Discretion Is Required

[3] Default Judgments

[4] Limitations on Court's Discretion

§ 489.39 Limitations on When Relief Must Be Sought

[1] Six-Month Limitation

[2] Six Months Defined

[3] When Time Commences to Run

[4] When Motion Is Deemed Made

[5] Reasonable Time Requirement

[6] Diligence Requirement

[7] Effect of Unexplained Delay in Applying for Relief

[8] Effect of Six-Month Period on Equitable Relief

[9] Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Proceeding Determining Ownership or Right to Possession of Property

§ 489.40 Relief Based on Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

[1] When Relief Is Authorized

[a] Relief Is Mandatory on Proper Application and Affidavit

[b] Proceedings in Which Relief Is Not Authorized

[c] Causation in Fact Required

[2] Time Limitation

[3] Award of Fees and Costs to Opposing Counsel or Parties

[4] Relief to Be Nonconditional

[5] Attorney Acting in Pro Per

§ 489.41 Relief From Involuntary Dismissals

§ 489.42 Terms and Penalties Imposed When Relief Is Granted

[1] Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Nonmonetary Conditions

[2] Penalty on Relief From Default Judgment

[3] Penalty for Bad Faith Actions or Tactics

[4] Court's Statement of Reasons

§ 489.43 Treating Motion for Relief as Motion for New Trial

§ 489.44 Grounds for Relief

[1] Mistake

[a] Kinds of Mistakes

[b] Mistake of Fact

[i] General Examples

[ii] Examples Regarding Defaults and Default Judgments

[c] Attorney's Mistake of Fact

[d] Mistake of Law

[e] Mistake of Court

[2] Inadvertence

[3] Surprise

[a] In General

[b] Surprise Defined

[c] Examples of Surprise

[4] Excusable Neglect

[a] In General

[b] What Constitutes Excusable Neglect

[c] Examples of Excusable Neglect

[i] Attorney Illness

[ii] Reliance on Third Party

[iii] Misinformation

[iv] Multiple Factors

§ 489.45 Inexcusable Neglect

[1] As Preventing Relief

[2] Examples of Inexcusable Neglect

[a] In General

[b] Clerical Errors

[c] Press of Business

§ 489.46 Attorney Abandonment

[1] Rule

[2] Example

[3] Motion for Relief

§ 489.47 Who May Seek Relief

[1] Party to Action or Legal Representative

[2] Nonparty to Action

§ 489.48 Relief on Court's Own Motion Prohibited

§ 489.49 Showing Required on Motion for Relief

[1] Basis for Relief

[2] Timeliness of Motion

[3] Diligence in Seeking Relief

[4] Effect of Absence of Prejudice to Adverse Party

§ 489.50 Burden of Proof

§ 489.51 Application for Relief

[1] Procedure

[2] Specification of Grounds

§ 489.52 Supporting Papers

[1] Affidavits, Declarations, and Points and Authorities

[2] Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

[3] No Affidavit of Merits Required

§ 489.53 Pleading Proposed to Be Filed

[1] When Pleading Is at Issue

[2] When Pleading Is Not at Issue

[3] Purpose of Requirement

[4] When Proposed Pleading Must Be Filed

[5] Possible Constitutional Exception to Requirement

§ 489.54 Order Granting or Denying Relief

§ 489.55 Motions to Reconsider

§ 489.56 Renewed Motions

§§ 489.57-489.69 [Reserved]

§ 489.70 Relief From Default or Default Judgment if Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

§ 489.71 "Actual Notice" Defined

§ 489.72 Burden of Proof

§ 489.73 Accompanying Papers

§ 489.74 Showing Meritorious Defense

[1] Requirement

[2] Due Process Limitation

§ 489.75 When Motion Must Be Filed

§ 489.76 Limited Inquiry as to Proposed Pleading

§ 489.77 Ruling on Motion

§§ 489.78-489.89 [Reserved]

§ 489.90 Relief From Default or Default Judgment for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

§ 489.91 Accompanying Papers

§ 489.92 When Motion Must Be Filed

§ 489.93 Ruling on Motion

§ 489.94 Damages, Costs, and Attorney's Fees

§§ 489.95-489.99 [Reserved]

§ 489.100 Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Practice of Party's Attorney

§ 489.101 When Application Must Be Filed

§ 489.102 Affidavit of Merits Not Required

§§ 489.103-489.109 [Reserved]

§ 489.110 Protection From Judgments When Defendant Is Prejudiced by Military Service

§ 489.111 Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act to Be Liberally Construed

§ 489.112 Persons Protected by Act

§ 489.113 Grounds and Application for Relief

§ 489.114 Applicability of Act to Orders and to "Interested Persons"

§ 489.115 Time Limitation on Relief

§ 489.116 Stay of Proceedings

§ 489.117 State Protections

§ 489.118 Definitions

§ 489.119 Certificate Evidencing Service

§§ 489.120-489.129 [Reserved]

§ 489.130 Terminology

§ 489.131 Statutory and Inherent Powers of Courts

§ 489.132 Void Judgment Defined

§ 489.133 Judgment Procured by Fraud

§ 489.134 Void on Face and Void in Fact Distinguished

§ 489.135 Impeachment of Judicial Record

§ 489.136 Judgment Roll in Civil Actions

§ 489.137 Attacking Void Judgment or Order

§ 489.138 Direct Attack

§ 489.139 Collateral Attack

[1] Defined

[2] On Domestic Judgment

[3] On Foreign Judgment

[4] Partial Invalidity

[5] Denial of Collateral Attack for Change of Position

[6] Nonjurisdictional Errors

§ 489.140 Who May Attack Judgment

§ 489.141 Time Limitations When Judgment or Order Is Facially Void

§ 489.142 Time Limitations When Void Judgment Is Not Facially Void

[1] Reasonable Time

[2] Statutory Periods That Apply by Analogy

[3] Statutory Periods

[a] Code Civ. Proc. § 473

[b] Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5

[4] Failure of Cases to Consider Interim Statutory Amendments

[5] Summary of Amendments of Time Limitations

[6] Application of Statutory Periods That Apply by Analogy

[a] Rule

[b] Exception to Rule

[7] Effect of Motion Not Made Within Reasonable Time

[8] Alternative Relief in Equity

§ 489.143 Affidavit of Merits Not Required

§ 489.144 Showing of Meritorious Defense or Case

§§ 489.145-489.159 [Reserved]

§ 489.160 Types of Void Judgments and Orders Generally

§ 489.161 No Subject Matter Jurisdiction

§ 489.162 No Personal Jurisdiction

[1] Improper Service of Summons

[2] Nonresident Defendant

[3] Effect of Failure to File Summons and Proof of Service

§ 489.163 Service of Papers on Suspended Attorney

§ 489.164 Judgment After Trial Without Notice to Nonappearing Party

§ 489.165 Judgment Against Dissolved Corporation

§ 489.166 Judgment by Disqualified Judge

[1] For Financial Interest or Bias

[2] Showing Required

[3] Time Limitation

§ 489.167 Judgment Rendered by Commissioner Acting as Temporary Judge Without Stipulation of Parties

§§ 489.168-489.179 [Reserved]

§ 489.180 Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments Generally

§ 489.181 Premature Entry

§ 489.182 Unauthorized Entry of Default Judgment by Clerk

§ 489.183 Responsive Pleading on File

§ 489.184 Defendant's Failure to Appear at Trial

§ 489.185 Removal and Remand of Case

§ 489.186 Judgment Based on Void Order for Publication of Summons or Substituted Service

§ 489.187 Failure to Serve Amended Complaint Increasing Damages or Relief Sought

§ 489.188 Failure to Respond to Amended Complaint

§ 489.189 Failure to Give Notice of Damages Claimed

[1] Statement of Damages

[2] Punitive Damages

§ 489.190 [Reserved]

§ 489.191 Award in Excess of Demand or For Relief Not Requested

[1] When No Answer Was Filed

[2] Applicability to Cases in Which Amount Claimed Is Not Normally Alleged in Complaint

[3] Applicability to Default After Answer Filed

§§ 489.192-489.199 [Reserved]

§ 489.200 Motion for Relief

[1] From Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

[2] From Judgment Void in Fact But Not on Face

§ 489.201 Notice of Motion

[1] Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

[2] Judgment or Order Not Void on Its Face

§ 489.202 Supporting Papers

[1] Affidavits or Declarations

[2] Supporting Memorandum

§ 489.203 Service and Filing of Moving Papers

§ 489.204 Service and Filing of Opposing and Reply Papers

§ 489.205 Who Must Be Served

§§ 489.206-489.219 [Reserved]

§ 489.220 Nature of Attack in Equity

§ 489.221 Judgments Subject to Equitable Attack

§ 489.222 Partial Invalidity

§ 489.223 Doctrine of Res Judicata

§ 489.224 Scope of Relief

§ 489.225 Who May Seek Relief and Manner in Which Relief May Be Sought

§ 489.226 Admissibility of Extrinsic Evidence

§ 489.227 Equitable Jurisdiction

§ 489.228 Competing Public Policies

§ 489.229 Basis of Equity Jurisdiction

§§ 489.230-489.239 [Reserved]

§ 489.240 Grounds for Relief

§ 489.241 Extrinsic Defined

§ 489.242 Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake Generally

§ 489.243 Extrinsic Fraud

[1] Defined

[2] Examples of Extrinsic Fraud

[a] In General

[b] Fraudulent or Negligent Failure to Give Notice

[c] Reliance on Fraudulent Representations of Other Party

[d] Fraudulent Change in Property Settlement Agreement

[e] Concealment From Party by Fiduciary or Person in Confidential Relationship

[f] Concealment From Court or Party of Party's Rights

[g] Concealment From Court of Defendant's Incompetency

[h] Concealment From Court of Reason for Party's Absence

§ 489.244 Extrinsic Mistake

[1] Defined

[2] Test to Qualify for Relief

[3] Examples of Extrinsic Mistake

[a] In General

[b] Disability of Aggrieved Defendant

[c] Death or Illness of Counsel

[d] Attorney's Excusable Mistake or Neglect

[e] Acts Not Amounting to Actual Fraud

§ 489.245 Duress Defined

§ 489.246 Intrinsic Fraud or Mistake

[1] Statement of Rule

[2] Public Policy

[3] Reason for Rule

[4] Application of Rule

[5] Determining Nature of Fraud or Mistake

[6] What Constitutes Intrinsic Fraud or Mistake

[7] Mutual Mistake

[8] Attorney's Mistake of Law

§§ 489.247-489.259 [Reserved]

§ 489.260 Time Limitations on Relief From Void Judgments or Orders

§ 489.261 Time Limitations on Actions in Equity

[1] Three-Year Statute of Limitations

[a] Fraud or Mistake

[b] When Action Accrues

[c] Duty to Investigate

[2] Four-Year Statute of Limitations

[3] Inapplicability of Reasonable Time Requirement

[4] Defense of Laches

§ 489.262 Time Limitations on Motions in Equity

[1] Reasonable Time Requirement

[2] Diligence Requirement

[3] Effect of Prejudice to Opposing Party

§ 489.263 Relationship to Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) and (d)

[1] Distinct and Cumulative to Proceeding in Equity

[2] Limitation on Equitable Relief

[3] Relief From Forfeiture

[4] Six-Month or Other Statutory Limitation as Not Barring Equitable Relief That Overlaps Statutory Relief

[5] Treating Statutory Motion as Equitable Motion

[6] Effect on Equitable Remedy of Denial of Relief Under Statute

[7] Authority in Equity of Cases Decided Under Statute

§ 489.264 Meritorious Case Requirement

[1] Equitable Action or Motion for Relief

[2] Showing Required

[3] Defective Service or Nonservice of Summons

§ 489.265 Burden of Proof

§ 489.266 Action for Equitable Relief

[1] In General

[2] When Motion May Preclude Independent Action

§ 489.267 Denial of Relief

§§ 489.268-489.279 [Reserved]

§ 489.280 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 489.281 Federal Statutes

§ 489.282 State Statutes

§ 489.283 Decisions

[1] Policy Favoring Trial on Merits

[2] Discretion of Trial Court

[a] In General

[b] Abuse of Discretion

[3] Collateral Attack on Judgments and Orders

[4] Appeal

[a] In General

[b] Appealable Judgments and Orders

[c] Nonappealable Judgments and Orders

[d] Untimely Appeal

[e] Considerations on Appeal

[f] Trial on Affidavits (Declarations)

[g] Power of Trial Court After Appeal

[5] Cross Appeal

§§ 489.284-489.289 [Reserved]

§ 489.290 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 489.291 State Statutes

§ 489.292 Decisions

[1] Liberal Construction

[2] Default

[a] In General

[b] Default Judgments

[3] Dismissal of Action

[4] Claims Against Public Entities

[5] Settlements

[6] Grounds for Relief

[a] In General

[b] Mistake

[c] Inadvertence

[d] Surprise

[e] Excusable Neglect

[f] Failure to Notify Opposing Counsel of Intent to Take Default

[g] Insurer's Neglect

[h] Attorney's Error or Omission

[i] Attorney Abandonment

[j] Lack of Actual Notice

[7] Attorneys's Act or Omission as Imputed to Client

[8] Constructive Knowledge

[9] Timeliness of Motion

[a] In General

[b] Diligence Requirement

[c] Reasonable Time Requirement

[d] Unexplained Delays

[e] Six-Month Limitation

[10] Proposed Pleading

[11] Burden of Proof

[12] Prejudice to Opposing Party

[13] Hearing on Motion

[14] Discretion of Trial Court

[a] In General

[b] Abuse of Discretion

[15] Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions

§ 489.293 Text References

§§ 489.294-489.299 [Reserved]

§ 489.300 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 489.301 Federal Statutes

§ 489.302 State Statutes

§ 489.303 Decisions

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5

[2] Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

[a] In General

[b] Liberal Construction of Act

[c] Prejudice

§ 489.304 Text References

§§ 489.305-489.309 [Reserved]

§ 489.310 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 489.311 State Statutes

§ 489.312 Decisions

[1] Void Judgments Generally

[2] Void on Face Judgments

[3] Service of Summons

[4] Constructive Service of Process

[5] Excess of Jurisdiction

[6] Partial Invalidity

[7] Corporate Defendants

[8] Void Judgments by Default

[a] In General

[b] Defective Service or Nonservice of Summons

[c] Default to Amended Complaint

[d] Cross Complaints

[e] Answer or Other Responsive Pleading Filed

[f] Amendment of Complaint After Entry of Default

[g] Failure to Serve Statement of Damages

[h] Discovery Proceedings

[i] Judgment Entered by Court Clerk

[j] Premature Default Judgments

[k] Judgment Exceeds Demand or Gives Unrequested Relief

[l] Damages

[m] Review on Appeal

[9] Void Orders

[10] Writ of Execution

[11] Timeliness of Motion for Relief

[12] Inherent Power of Court to Vacate Void Judgment

[13] Attacks on Void Judgments

[a] In General

[b] Collateral Attack

[c] Direct Attack

[14] Presumptions

§§ 489.313-489.319 [Reserved]

§ 489.320 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 489.321 Decisions

[1] In General

[2] When Equitable Relief Is Available

[a] Alternative to Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473

[b] Basis of Equitable Jurisdiction

[c] Court's Equity Power Is Inherent

[d] Public Policy

[3] Meritorious Claim or Defense Is Essential

[4] Grounds for Relief

[a] In General

[b] Extrinsic Fraud

[c] Extrinsic Mistake

[5] Insufficient Grounds

[a] Inexcusable Neglect

[b] Attorney's Act or Omission

[c] Intrinsic Fraud

[d] Mutual Mistake

[e] Unjust Judgment or Order

[6] Defenses to Equitable Relief

[a] Laches

[b] Estoppel

[7] Proceedings Subject to Equitable Relief

[a] Default and Default Judgment

[b] Void Judgments

[c] Satisfaction of Judgment

[d] Foreign Judgments

[8] Substantive Areas in Which Equitable Relief Is Available

[a] Family Law Cases

[b] Probate Cases

[9] Invoking Equity

[10] Timeliness of Motion

[a] In General

[b] Delay in Seeking Relief

[11] Discretion of Court

[12] Extrinsic Evidence

[13] Denial of Relief

§ 489.322 Text References

§§ 489.323.489.329 [Reserved]

§ 489.330 Planning and Procedures

[1] Ascertain Facts

[2] Make Preliminary Determinations

[3] Review Time Limits

[4] Consider Combining Motions

[5] Prepare Notice of Motion

[6] Serve and File Papers

[7] Prepare for Hearing

[8] Call for Tentative Ruling

[9] Attend Hearing

[10] Prepare and Serve Order

§ 489.331 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Valid Judgment and Order

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) Based on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

[2] Relief From Default, Default and Default Judgment, or Dismissal Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

[3] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5 Based on Lack of Notice in Time to Defend

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

[4] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment in Certain Consumer Actions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5 Based on Filing of Action in Wrong Court

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

[5] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1 Based on California Court's Having Assumed Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Law Practice

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

[6] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Consider Effect of Other Limitations

[f] Has Time to File Motion Expired?

[g] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[h] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[i] Prepare Moving Papers

[7] Relief From Judgment Under State Law Based on Military Service

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Consider Effect of Other Limitations

[f] Has Time to File Motion Expired?

[g] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[h] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[i] Prepare Moving Papers

§ 489.332 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Void Judgment and Order

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d) From Judgment or Order that Is Void on Its Face

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] No Time Limits Apply

[f] What Manner of Attack Is Preferred?

[g] Prepare Papers

[2] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d) From Judgment or Order That Is Void in Fact Although Not Void on Its Face

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

§ 489.333 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Equitable Relief From Valid or Void Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Is Client Proper Party?

[2] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

[3] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

[4] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

[5] Which Proceedings Are Preferred?

[6] Which Court Is Proper Court to Seek Relief?

[7] Motion for Equitable Relief

[8] Independent Action in Equity

§§ 489.334-489.339 [Reserved]

§ 489.340 Response to Request for Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

[2] Prepare Papers

[3] Serve and File Papers

[4] Prepare for Hearing

[5] Attend Hearing

[6] Prepare and Serve Order, if Required

[7] Prepare Notice of Order

§ 489.341 Defenses to Relief From Valid Judgment and Order From Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Relief Based on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[2] Relief From Default, Default and Default Judgment, or Dismissal Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

[3] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Lack of Notice in Time to Defend

[4] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment in Certain Consumer Actions Based on Filing of Action in Wrong Court

[5] Relief Based on California Court's Having Assumed Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Law Practice

[6] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

§ 489.342 Defenses to Relief From Void Judgment and Order

[1] Relief From Judgment or Order That Is Void on Its Face

[2] Relief From Judgment or Order That Is Void in Fact Although Not Void on Its Face

§ 489.343 Defenses to Relief From Valid or Void Judgment, Dismissal, or Order In Equity

[1] Motion for Equitable Relief:

[2] Independent Action in Equity Filed in Superior Court

§§ 489.344-489.359 [Reserved]

§ 489.360 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration--General Form

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Proceeding Taken by Party

[d] Relief From Default Judgment

[e] Notice Requirement

[f] Amount of Notice Required

[g] Supporting Declaration

[i] Requirement

[ii] Content and Form

[h] Other Accompanying Papers

[i] Supporting Memorandum

[ii] Pleading Proposed to Be Filed

[i] Affidavit of Merits

[j] Service of Notice of Motion

[k] Parties to Be Served

[l] Cross References

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Findings

[d] Conditions of Relief

[i] On Any Terms That May Be Just

[ii] Relief Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

[iii] Penalties

[e] Statement of Reasons

[f] Cross References

§ 489.361 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Supporting Declaration--Statement in Supporting Declaration

[1] Default Was Due to Defendant's Excusable Mistake of Fact

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[2] Default Was Due to Defendant's Excusable Neglect in Reasonably Relying on Promise of Codefendant or Employer to Defend

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Reliance on Third Party to Defend

[d] Reliance on Insurer to Defend

[3] Default Was Due to Attorney's Excusable Neglect Resulting From Press of Business Coupled With Unusual Circumstances

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[4] Default Resulted From Attorney Abandonment

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[5] Dismissal of Action Resulted From Defendant's Reliance on Erroneous Information Given by Court Officer

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

§ 489.362 Relief From Default, Resulting Default Judgment, or Dismissal Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault--Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)] Attesting to Attorney's Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Neglect--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Effect of Affidavit or Declaration

[4] Cross References

§§ 489.363-489.369 [Reserved]

§ 489.370 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Opposing Declaration--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Counterdeclaration

[4] Legal Argument

[5] Service of Opposing Papers

§ 489.371 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect--Order Denying Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Motion Based on Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

[4] Cross References

§§ 489.372-489.379 [Reserved]

§ 489.380 Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment When Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice to Defendant in Time to Defend [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Supporting Memorandum

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Findings

[d] Terms on Granting Relief

[e] Sanctions

§§ 489.381-489.389 [Reserved]

§ 489.390 Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment for Improper Venue Under Civ. Code § 1812.10 or 2984.4 or Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)][Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Declaration Required

[d] Cross References

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Findings

[d] Award of Damages, Costs, and Attorney's Fee

§§ 489.391-489.399 [Reserved]

§ 489.400 Motion for Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Against Party When California Court Has Assumed Jurisdiction Over Law Practice of Party's Attorney Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180 or 6190 [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Supporting Memorandum

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Terms

§§ 489.401-489.409 [Reserved]

§ 489.410 Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment Under Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.) [50 U.S.C. App. § 521]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents of Declaration

[d] Supporting Memorandum

[e] Cross References

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

§ 489.411 Motion for Relief From Judgment Taken Against Party During Period of Military Service [Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Supporting Memorandum

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

§§ 489.412-489.419 [Reserved]

§ 489.420 Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment or Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Alternative Use for Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

[d] Extrinsic Evidence

[e] Alternative Remedies

[f] Nonservice or Defective Service of Summons and Motion to Quash

[g] Supporting Memorandum

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

§§ 489.421-489.429 [Reserved]

§ 489.430 Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Determining Whether Grounds for Relief Exist

[d] Alternative Remedies

[e] Showing Required

[f] Supporting Memorandum

[g] Action in Equity

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Ruling on Motion for Relief

[d] Discretion of Trial Court

[e] Findings

[f] Award of Costs

§ 489.431 Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Supporting Declaration

[1] Default Due to Disability of Party

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Examples of Party Disability

[d] Plaintiff's Concealment Is Extrinsic Fraud

[e] Related Uses

[f] Alternative Statutory Relief

[2] Default Due to Disability of Defendant's Attorney

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Related Use

[d] Alternative Statutory Relief

[3] Default Due to Defendant's Reliance on Representations of Adverse Party's Attorney

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Related Use

[d] Alternative Statutory Relief

§§ 489.432-489.439 [Reserved]

§ 489.440 Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Venue

[4] Allegations

[5] Prayer

[6] No Jury Trial

[7] Cross References

§ 489.441 Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Default and Default Judgment Rendered by Court Lacking Jurisdiction Over Defendant

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Motion at Law

[4] Judgment Void on Its Face for Lack of Jurisdiction

[5] Meritorious Defense

§ 489.442 Judgment Setting Aside Judgment--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
I. SCOPE

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.01

§ 489.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter covers direct attacks on valid and void judgments, dismissals, orders, and proceedings in the trial court by various statutory motions at law and by motions and actions in equity. It begins by comparing the methods of relief from judgments, including the distinction between direct and collateral attacks, and which of the orders dealt with in the chapter are appealable as well as the considerations on appeal [*see § 489.10* et seq.].

The chapter discusses and provides forms [for discussion, *see § 489.30* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.360* et seq.] relating to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding, including a default judgment, taken through a party's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. It also discusses and includes forms relating to motions for relief from defaults and default judgments on other statutory grounds:

- California court has assumed jurisdiction over the party's attorney's law practice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*; for discussion, *see § 489.100* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.400*];

- Service of summons did not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*; for discussion, *see § 489.70* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.380*];

- Default or default judgment was entered without compliance with certain consumer venue statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*; for discussion, *see § 489.90* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.390*]; and

- Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*; for discussion, *see § 489.110* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.410*].

The chapter also discusses and includes forms relating to direct and collateral attacks on void judgments and orders, including motions for relief from void judgments and orders under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, and the court's inherent jurisdiction at law [for discussion, *see § 489.130* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.420* et seq.].

In addition, the chapter discusses and provides forms relating to direct attacks in equity on judgments and orders. It includes discussion of motions and actions in equity for relief from valid and void judgments and orders, including

defaults and default judgments, on the equitable grounds of extrinsic fraud or mistake [for discussion, *see § 489.220* et seq.; for forms, *see § 489.430* et seq.].

The chapter also includes a Research Guide [*see § 489.280* et seq.] of related Matthew Bender publications, federal and state statutes, decisions, and text references relating to relief from judgments.

The chapter also provides Procedural Checklists for moving [*see § 489.330* et seq.] and opposing [*see § 489.340* et seq.] parties in proceedings for relief from judgment, dismissal, or order.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
I. SCOPE

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.02

§ 489.02 Cross References

For discussion and the form of declaration re military status that must be submitted with a request to enter default [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*], see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

For discussion of the procedure on appeal and forms for use in filing an appeal, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* , and Ch. 345A, *Limited Civil Cases* .

For discussion of other manners of directly attacking judgments in the trial court, such as motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, a motion for new trial, and a motion to vacate and enter a different judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

For discussion of relief from a judgment of dissolution of marriage, see Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureTrialsJudgment as Matter of LawJudgments Notwithstanding VerdictsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportDissolution & DivorceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
I. SCOPE

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.03

§ 489.03 Governing Law

The manners of attacking judgments and orders are governed by statutory and case law, the California Rules of Court, and local court rules.

Statutory motions for relief from judgments, dismissals, orders, or other proceedings taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), (c)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.).

Statutory motions for relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding, including the dismissal of an action for failure to prosecute, taken against a party when a California court has assumed jurisdiction over the law practice of the party's attorney pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180* or *6190* are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1* (discussed in *§ 489.100* et seq.).

Statutory motions for relief from a default and default judgment when service of the summons did not result in actual notice to the party in time to defend are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* (discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.) and statutory motions for relief from a default or default judgment entered without full compliance with certain consumer statutes are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5* (discussed in *§ 489.90* et seq.).

Motions for relief from a default or default judgment against a defendant whose active military service prejudiced his or her ability to defend the action are authorized by *50 U.S.C. App. § 521* (discussed in *§ 489.110* et seq.).

Motions for relief from judgment under the protections provided to military service members under state law are authorized by *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)* (discussed in *§ 489.118*).

Motions for relief from judgment of dissolution of marriage are governed by *Fam. Code § 2120 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* .

Motions to reconsider and renewed motions are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*, which is discussed in Ch. 374, *Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions* .

Relief from void judgments and orders is governed by case law and by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*. Relief in equity in unlimited civil cases to set aside a void judgment is governed by case law, and relief by a motion in equity in limited civil cases is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)*.

Relief in equity is governed primarily by case law. The general jurisdiction of superior courts is set forth in *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*. The power of the state Legislature to prescribe the jurisdiction of the municipal courts is set forth in *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 5(a)*. The equitable jurisdiction of unlimited and limited civil cases prescribed by the Legislature is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsNunc Pro Tunc ReliefCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
I. SCOPE

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.04-489.09

[Reserved]

§§ 489.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.10

§ 489.10 Inherent and Statutory Powers of Courts

Apart from statutory authority, all courts have inherent power to correct their records to make them accurate, and under this power courts have frequently corrected their final judgments when, because of clerical errors or omissions, the judgments actually rendered were not the judgments intended to be rendered [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 574, 122 P.2d 564*]. Thus, a trial court has inherent power to set aside a judgment entered through its own inadvertence or improvidence, such as a judgment that does not express the court's true intention or when the court acted in ignorance of some material fact of record [*Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 703, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*]. However, when the error is inherently judicial rather than clerical or inadvertent, the court does not have power to amend its decision [*Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 703, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

Similarly, a court has inherent power, apart from statute, to correct its records by vacating a judgment that is void on its face, for the judgment is a nullity and may be ignored [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 574, 122 P.2d 564*].

The inherent power to correct clerical errors and to set aside void judgments and orders is confirmed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (*see § 489.130* et seq.). In addition, superior courts have inherent equitable jurisdiction in unlimited civil cases to relieve a party from a judgment or order resulting from extrinsic fraud or mistake, and statutory jurisdiction under *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)* to do the same in limited civil cases (*see § 489.227*).

In addition to the court's inherent and statutory powers discussed above, courts have statutory power to relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding under a variety of circumstances, the most common of which is when the judgment, order, or proceeding was taken through a party's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.]. Other statutory grounds for relief are discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From

JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.11

§ 489.11 Manners of Attacking Judgments and Orders

A judgment or order may be attacked directly or, depending on its nature and the specific ground relied on, collaterally [*see, e.g., Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 415, 77 P. 1007* ; *People ex rel. Mosk v. City of SantaBarbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*]. Although not all judgments and orders subject to direct attack are subject to collateral attack, all judgments and orders subject to collateral attack are subject to a direct attack if the direct attack is timely made [*see, e.g., Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 415, 77 P. 1007*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.12

§ 489.12 When Extrinsic Evidence Is Admissible

On a direct attack extrinsic evidence may normally be introduced to establish the ground or grounds for relief from the order, judgment, or proceeding. On a collateral attack extrinsic evidence may not be introduced and the court is confined to an inspection of the judgment roll (discussed in *§ 489.136*), or record, that is conclusively presumed to be correct [*see, e.g., Milstein v. Turner (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 296, 298, 200 P.2d 799* ; *County of Fresno v. Roberson, M. & Co. (1954) 269 P.2d 252*]. However, if a direct attack on a judgment, order, or proceeding that is void in fact, but not on its face, is not timely made (*see* discussion in *§ 489.15[2][a]*), it is subject to the rules of collateral attack, and extrinsic evidence may not be introduced to show the true facts [*see Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625* ; *see also* discussions in *§§ 489.17* and *489.138*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.13

§ 489.13 Direct Attack

[1] Defined

A direct attack on a judgment or order is normally made by motion in the trial court to vacate it or to set it aside or for a new trial, or by an appeal from the judgment or order to a higher court [*Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 415, 77 P. 1007* ; *Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 340, 344, 27 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *Rico v. Nasser Bros. Realty Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 878, 882, 137 P.2d 861* ; *County of Fresno v. Roberson, M. & Co. (1954) 124 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 888, 891* , *269 P.2d 252*].

Direct attacks may also be made in other ways. For example, a direct attack on a prior judgment or order may be made by an action in quo warranto or by certiorari and other writs [*People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423* (direct attack by action in quo warranto to test validity of annexation of uninhabited territory to city)]. In a direct attack, the proceeding is brought specifically to nullify the judgment or order as it pertains to the immediate issue under consideration [*People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*]. Thus, an action in equity to vacate a judgment on the grounds of extrinsic fraud or mistake is a direct attack (*see* discussion in *§ 489.220*).

Direct attacks discussed in this chapter are as follows:

- Motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, or based on an attorney's affidavit of fault (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.);

- Motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*, for relief from a judgment, order, or proceeding when a court has assumed jurisdiction over the law practice of the party's attorney; and motions for relief from default under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473.5, 585.5*, and *50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.* (discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.);

- Motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, or directed to a court's inherent power at law, to set aside a void judgment or order (discussed in *§ 489.130* et seq.); and

- Motions and actions in equity for relief from a judgment or order (discussed in *§ 489.220* et seq.).

Although any one or more of these direct attacks may be proper to attack a particular judgment or order, each attack is subject to its own rules and requirements, that are discussed in this chapter. For discussion and forms for use in other types of procedures that may be used for direct attacks of judgments or orders, see the chapter dealing with that procedure, such as:

- Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition,*

- Ch. 371, *Motions after Trial,*

- Ch. 483, *Quo Warranto,* or

- Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

[2] Grounds for Direct Attack

A direct attack may generally be used with respect to any type of material error that is properly preserved [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 657* (grounds for new trial), *906* (power of reviewing court on appeal)]. This includes attacks based on the judgment or order being in excess of jurisdiction [*People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 122-123, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246* ; for discussion of the limited collateral attack available on this ground, *see § 489.14[2][b*]]. Direct attack may also address lack of jurisdiction [*see Unruh v. Truck Insurance Exchange (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 616, 622, 102 Cal. Rptr. 815, 498 P.2d 1063* (lack of jurisdiction is not waived and may be asserted for first time on appeal); for discussion of lack of jurisdiction as a basis of collateral attack, *see § 489.14[2][a*]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsQuo WarrantoCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.14

§ 489.14 Collateral Attack

[1] Defined

Any procedural challenge that does not constitute a direct attack is collateral [*People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*]. Thus, a collateral attack on a judgment or order is an indirect attack [*People ex rel. Mosk v. City of Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423*]. A collateral attack attempts to avoid the effect of a judgment or order made in some other proceeding, and for the attack to succeed, the invalidity of the former judgment or order must appear on the face of the record [*see* discussion under [2], *below*; *see also § 489.139[1]*].

[2] Grounds for Collateral Attack

[a] Lack of Jurisdiction

Collateral attack is proper to contest lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction [*Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941*]. That is, a collateral attack is proper when the court that rendered the judgment or made the order lacked either jurisdiction of the subject matter of the action or personal jurisdiction over the parties. In these cases, the court is said to lack jurisdiction in the fundamental sense [*see* *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288, 109 P.2d 942* ; *§ 489.130 et seq.*]. For a discussion and forms relating to subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter* .

There is a difference between lack of jurisdiction in the fundamental sense, which ordinarily is essential for collateral attack, and the broader meaning of the term "lack of jurisdiction" (discussed under [b], *below*) when used in determining the availability of restraint by prohibition or review by certiorari (direct attacks) of an order or judgment [*see* *Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 725, 285 P.2d 636* (noting that some cases involving collateral attacks have unfortunately failed to recognize this distinction); *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288, 109 P.2d 942*].

[b] Excess of Jurisdiction

Excess of jurisdiction exists when the court, though having jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties in the fundamental sense, has no jurisdiction, or power, to act except in a particular manner, or to give certain kinds of relief, or to act without the occurrence of certain procedural prerequisites. Speaking generally, any acts that exceed the defined power of a court in any instance, whether that power is defined by constitutional provision, express statutory declaration, or rules developed by the courts and followed under the doctrine of stare decisis, are in excess of jurisdiction, insofar as that term is used to indicate that those acts may be restrained by prohibition or annulled on certiorari [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 290-291, 109 P.2d 942* ; *see also* *Barquis v. Merchants Collection Asso. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 120, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817*].

A final judgment or order of a court having jurisdiction in the fundamental sense, that is, jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and the parties, is, as a general rule, res judicata, even though contrary to statute [*Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 725, 285 P.2d 636* ; *Frank v. Frank (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 717, 722, 80 Cal. Rptr. 141*].

In such a case, the one who complains of an act is normally before the court and has an opportunity to object, or to have the judgment or order reviewed by the usual methods of direct attack, such as by a motion for new trial or appeal [*see* discussion in *§ 489.13*]. Hence, acts in excess of jurisdiction by a court having jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties are not normally subject to collateral attack [*Frank v. Frank (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 717, 722, 80 Cal. Rptr. 141* ; *see also* *Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 951, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* ; *Farley v. Farley (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 1, 8, 38 Cal. Rptr. 357*].

When unusual or exceptional circumstances prevented an earlier and more appropriate attack, however, a judgment or order in excess of jurisdiction may be subject to collateral attack [*Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 727, 285 P.2d 636*]. For example, a collateral attack might be made when a judgment or order granted relief that the court had no *power*, that is, jurisdiction, to grant [*see* *Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950-951, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941*]. An example is a judgment or order that grants relief in violation of a statute [*see, e.g.,* *Burtnett v. King (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 805, 807-809, 205 P.2d 657* (default judgment granting relief exceeding that demanded in complaint in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580*); *311 South Spring Street Co. v. Department of General Services (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1009, 1015-1018, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 176* (collateral attack permitted when court granted excess interest); *Vershbow v. Reiner (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 879, 883, 282 Cal. Rptr. 684* (writ of attachment issued by court clerk prior to posting of an undertaking by the creditor in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 489.210*)].

Excess of jurisdiction must be distinguished from mere errors in the exercise of jurisdiction, which are not subject to collateral attack [*see* discussion in *§ 489.139[6]*].

[c] Judgment or Order Within Jurisdiction

A judgment rendered within the court's jurisdiction can be reviewed and corrected only by one of the established methods of direct attack [*see* *Estate of Wemyss (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 53, 58, 122 Cal. Rptr. 134*].

[d] Default Judgment

A default judgment that awards relief in excess of that requested in the complaint or, if it is a superior court personal injury action, in excess of that set forth in the statement of damages, is in excess of jurisdiction [*Swycaffer v. Swycaffer (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 689, 693, 285 P.2d 1* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 580* (relief on default limited to amount demanded in complaint, *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* statement or *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115* statement)], and may be attacked directly [*see* *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 703, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*]. The judgment may also be

attacked collaterally because it is void on its face to the extent of the excess [*see Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* ; and discussion under [2], *above*; *see also § 489.191*].

However, a default judgment that merely awards damages that are excessive as a matter of law in that they are not supported by the evidence, but that do not exceed the amount claimed in the complaint, is not a jurisdictional error, but a judicial error, which the trial court may not amend. The defendant's remedy in that case is to move for a new trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 657(5)*, that is, for a new judgment hearing, or to raise the issue on appeal from the default judgment [*Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 703-704, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*], that is, by direct attack [*see § 489.13[1]*].

[3] How Collateral Attack Is Made

A collateral attack on a final judgment or order may be made in a variety of ways. Examples of collateral attack include the following:

- If an action has been dismissed with prejudice and judgment entered, bringing a second action on the same grounds is a collateral attack on the judgment [*Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 340, 343-344, 27 Cal. Rptr. 756*].

- An action to quiet title to property awarded to another by a partially void judgment is a collateral attack on the judgment [*Vasquez v. Vasquez (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 280, 282-283, 285, 240 P.2d 319*].

- A proceeding in prohibition to prevent a threatened punishment for contempt for violating an order appointing a receiver in an accounting action is a collateral attack on the order appointing the receiver [*Lieberman v. Superior Court (1925) 72 Cal. App. 18, 35, 236 P. 570*].

- An action brought on a claim previously settled with court approval on petition to the court constitutes a collateral attack on that settlement [*Rico v. Nasser Bros. Realty Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 878, 881-882, 137 P.2d 861*].

- An action to quiet title to land that has been sold under execution is a collateral attack on the prior judgment [*Milstein v. Turner (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 296, 298, 200 P.2d 799*].

- A proceeding in mandate to compel a trial court to strike from its records a portion of an appealable order that reduced the judgment is a collateral attack on the order [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 372, 217 P.2d 951*].

- In an action on a judgment, an attack on the judgment is a collateral attack [*Cradduck v. Financial Indem. Co. (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 850, 852, 855, 52 Cal. Rptr. 90*].

- When orders are independently appealable and become final by lapse of time, a subsequent attack on them in an appeal from a later order or judgment is collateral [*Estate of Wemyss (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 53, 58, 122 Cal. Rptr. 134*].

However, the courts have not always been precise in their classification or terminology. For example, in *Swain v. Swain (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 58 Cal. Rptr. 83* , the appellate court referred to a motion to vacate a portion of a decree on the ground the decree was in excess of jurisdiction as a collateral attack on the decree, which had been entered more than two years earlier. More accurately, the motion was a direct attack that, because it was untimely, was subject to the rules of collateral attack [*see discussion under § 489.12*].

[4] Presumption of Jurisdiction on Collateral Attack

[a] Rule

The judgment or order of any California court, United States court, or court of general jurisdiction in any other state or nation, is presumed on collateral attack to have been made in the lawful exercise of the court's jurisdiction [*Evid. Code § 666*; *see also Evid. Code § 664* (official duty is presumed to have been regularly performed); *Thomas v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 335, 337, 90 Cal. Rptr. 586, 475 P.2d 858* (ordinarily a judgment is presumed valid if collaterally attacked, unless it is void on its face); *Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 373-374, 217 P.2d 951* ; *In re Marriage of Steiner (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 363, 370, 152 Cal. Rptr. 612* ; *Frazier v. Wasserman (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 120, 124, 69 Cal. Rptr. 510*]. Thus, on collateral attack every presumption is in favor of the validity of the judgment or order of a court of general jurisdiction, and any condition of facts consistent with its validity and notaffirmatively contradicted by the judgment roll will be presumed to have existed, and, under this rule, it will be presumed when necessary that the parties consented to the court's action or waived objection to it [*Gagnon Co., Inc. v. Nevada Desert Inn (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 448, 456, 289 P.2d 466* ; *Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 373-374, 217 P.2d 951*].

For example, if the record is silent, it will be presumed that process and pleadings were properly served and that due proof of service was presented to the court. Similarly, notice, or facts rendering it unnecessary, are presumed unless the record shows the contrary, and, when the court may shorten time or dispense with notice, it will be presumed that the court did so if the order is silent on the point [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 373-374, 217 P.2d 951* , citing additional examples].

The presumption of jurisdiction is overcome, however, when the defects that make the judgment void may be shown without going outside the record, or judgment roll, that is, when the judgment is void on its face [*see* *Swain v. Swain (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 58 Cal. Rptr. 83* ; *see also § 489.130* et seq.].

[b] Exception for Criminal Judgment

An exception to the foregoing rule applies to a judgment of prior conviction of a crime; such a judgment, even though valid on its face, may be attacked at any time on constitutional grounds in a proceeding in which by reason of the prior conviction increased sanctions may be imposed against the person suffering it [*Thomas v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 335, 337-338, 90 Cal. Rptr. 586, 475 P.2d 858* (but holding that the invalidity of the prior judgment must be raised in the subsequent action in which increased sanctions may be imposed and that the judgment in the second action, in which the issue as to the invalidity of the prior judgment was neither raised nor adjudicated, could not be collaterally attacked in a mandate proceeding against the DMV to cause it to set aside its administrative act of suspending the defendant's driver's license based on the two convictions); *De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 607, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289* (collateral attack permitted in proceeding in which real estate salesman's license was revoked for failure to reveal constitutionally void prior conviction in license application)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesStatutory SourcesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExtraordinary CircumstancesCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.15

§ 489.15 Time Limitations

[1] Depends on Ground for Relief

The time within which a party may seek relief from a judgment, including a default judgment, depends on the particular ground or grounds on which the party relies. In any given case, relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding may be available on alternative grounds, each having its own limitation period. Consequently, if counsel discovers that relief is time barred on a particular ground, he or she should examine alternative grounds that may not be barred.

[2] Time Limits for Relief at Law

[a] Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

A motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect must be filed within a reasonable time not exceeding six months after the judgment, order, or proceeding was taken, or, if relief is sought from a default judgment based on an attorney's affidavit (declaration) of fault, within six months from the date the judgment was entered (without the reasonable time limitation) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.)].

[b] Court Assumed Jurisdiction Over Party's Attorney's Practice

A motion for relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding, including a dismissal, taken against a party when a court has assumed jurisdiction over the law practice of the party's attorney, must be made within a reasonable period of time, in no case exceeding six months after the court took jurisdiction over the attorney's practice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1* (discussed in *§ 489.100* et seq.)].

[c] Service of Summons Did Not Give Actual Notice in Time to Defend

A motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* from a default judgment entered when the service of the summons did not result in actual notice to the party in time to defend must be made within a reasonable time not exceeding the

earlier of two years after entry of the default judgment or 180 days after service on the party of a written notice that the default or default judgment was entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)* (discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.)].

[d] Default Taken After Violation of Consumer Protection Venue Statutes

A motion for relief from a default judgment entered without full compliance with certain venue statutes and for leave to defend the action must be made within 60 days after the defendant received notice of a levy under a writ of execution or notice of any other procedure for enforcing the judgment. The venue statutes, designed for consumer protection, are Civ.Code §§ *1812.10* (Unruh Act) and *2984.4* (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (actions arising from offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or credit for personal, household, or family use) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.90* et seq.)].

[e] Relief Based on Military Service

A motion for relief under the federal Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act by a defendant who did not appear and who was prejudiced in making a defense by reason of his or her military service may be filed at any time the person is in active military service or not later than 90 days thereafter [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)(2)* (discussed in *§ 489.110* et seq.)].

A motion to vacate or set aside a judgment entered during a period of protected military service by a defendant who was prejudiced in making defense and who can assert a meritorious or legal defense to all or part of the action must be made not later than 90 days after termination of the service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*; for discussion, *see § 489.117* et seq.].

[f] Judgments Void in Fact But Not on Face

The time limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473(b)* and *473.5, above,* apply by analogy to motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d),* and to motions directed to the court's inherent jurisdiction at law, for relief from judgments that are void in fact but not void on their face [*see, e.g., Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 571-572, 107 P.2d 36* (applying six-month limitation in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*); *Johnson v. E-Z Ins. Brokerage, Inc. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 86, 98-99, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782* ; *Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1120-1126, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* (applying time limitation set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*); *see also § 489.142[6*]].

[g] Judgment Void on Its Face

There is no time limitation on seeking relief from a judgment that is void on its face for lack of subject matter or personal jurisdiction [*see, e.g., Forbes v. Hyde (1866) 31 Cal. 342, 347* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*; and *§ 489.141*].

[3] Time Limits for Relief at Equity

There is no time limit per se on a motion in equity for relief from a judgment or order, but the motion must be made within a reasonable time after the moving party discovered the facts and, after discovering the facts, the moving party must have acted diligently in seeking relief [*see §§ 489.39[6]* and *489.262[1]*].

On the other hand, an action in equity for relief from a judgment or order is subject to the applicable statute of limitations and to the defense of laches [*see § 489.261[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief

From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.16

§ 489.16 Seeking Relief on Multiple Grounds

[1] In General

Occasionally, a party will seek relief on multiple grounds in one motion. For example, a party may seek relief on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], on the ground that the judgment is void [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*], and on the further equitable ground that the judgment was obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see, e.g., Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 698-699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

[2] When Attack Is Based on Lack of Jurisdiction Over Defendant

When the motion for relief from a judgment is made on the ground that the judgment is void for lack of jurisdiction over the person of the moving defendant, counsel should be careful in mixing the grounds of relief. This is important to avoid inadvertently making a general appearance and, in so doing, waiving the lack of jurisdiction objection by voluntarily submitting to the in personam jurisdiction of the court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(a)*]. A motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* or *473.5*, if joined with a motion to quash service of summons for lack of personal jurisdiction (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)*) or to dismiss an action for inconvenient forum (*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(2)*), or a motion to dismiss for delay in prosecution (*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(3)*), does not constitute a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*].

A motion that incorporates any other ground, particularly if it seeks relief that may be granted only on the ground that the court has jurisdiction over the defendant, may be deemed a general appearance and subject the defendant to the court's in personam jurisdiction in subsequent proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50*].

For further discussion of personal jurisdiction, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* . For discussion of motions to dismiss for delay in prosecution without making a general appearance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(3)*, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsChallengesCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsMotionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.17

§ 489.17 Affidavits and Declarations

[1] When Authorized

Affidavits [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2002*] and/or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] may normally be submitted in support of and in opposition to a timely filed motion attacking a judgment or order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*], that is, on a direct attack. A motion not made within the time prescribed in the applicable statute is untimely and subject to the rules of collateral attack. Under these rules, extrinsic evidence is not admissible, and, therefore, the use of affidavits or declarations on those motions is forbidden [*see § 489.12*].

[2] Effect on Appeal of Trial on Motion by Affidavits or Declarations

When a motion for relief is tried on affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]), the rule on appeal is that those affidavits (or declarations) favoring the prevailing party's contention establish not only the facts stated in them but also all facts that reasonably may be inferred from them, and if there is a substantial conflict in the facts stated, a determination of the controverted facts by the trial court will not be disturbed [*Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 259, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* ; *Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr 593* ; *Baratti v. Baratti (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 917, 922, 242 P.2d 22* ; *see also Stevens v. Stevens (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 426, 429, 74 Cal. Rptr. 54* ; *Kooper v. King (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 626, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848*]. The rule applies to orders made on motions for relief from a judgment, order, or proceeding at law [*see, e.g., Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 259, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* (affirming order granting motion to vacate summary judgment for plaintiff on grounds of inadvertence and excusable neglect); *Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr 593* (affirming order granting motion to vacate default and default judgment on ground of excusable neglect)], and on motions for relief in equity [*In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149-150, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583* (affirming order vacating and setting aside for extrinsic fraud or mistake portion of judgment relating to distribution of community property, rendered after uncontested hearing on default of wife)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.18

§ 489.18 Appeal

[1] Who Can Appeal

Only an aggrieved party can appeal, and a party cannot normally appeal from a judgment or order in his or her favor [*Hensley v. Hensley (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 895, 898, 235 Cal. Rptr. 684*]. Subject to limited qualifications, an aggrieved party is one whose rights or interests are injuriously affected by the judgment or order [*Hensley v. Hensley (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 895, 899, 235 Cal. Rptr. 684*].

[2] From Void Judgment or Order

When the law allows an appeal from a judgment or order, it is appealable even though void, and a special order after final judgment is appealable regardless of whether it is void and regardless of whether it is provided for by any of the prescribed methods of procedure [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366, 370-371, 217 P.2d 951* (overruling *Stanton v. Superior Court (1927) 202 Cal. 478, 261 P. 1001* , and the cases following it, as well as *Kahn v. Smith (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 12, 142 P.2d 13* ; *Payne v. Hunt (1932) 214 Cal. 605, 7 P.2d 302* ; and *Kraft v. Lampton (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 596, 57 P.2d 171*); *see also* *Hensley v. Hensley (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 895, 898, 235 Cal. Rptr. 684* (order setting aside final judgment is appealable and rule is the same if the order after final judgment is void)].

[3] From Order Granting or Denying Motion to Vacate Default and Motion to Reconsider

An order granting a motion to vacate the entry of a default on which no judgment has been entered is not appealable, although the propriety of the order may be raised on appeal from a judgment adverse to the party resisting the motion [*see* *Leo v. Dunlap (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 24, 25, 66 Cal. Rptr. 888*]. On the other hand, an order vacating default and default judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* is appealable as an order after final judgment [*see* [5], *below*].

Likewise, an order denying a motion to vacate the entry of default is not appealable, although the propriety of the order can be reviewed on appeal from the subsequent default judgment (discussed under [4], *below*) [*see* *Gudarov v. Hadjieff (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 412, 418, 240 P.2d 621* ; *Lopez v. Fancelli (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1305, 1307 n.2, 271 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581* ; *Stevenson v. Turner (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d*

315, 317, 156 Cal. Rptr. 499 ; *Uva v. Evans (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 356, 360, 147 Cal. Rptr. 795*]. However, an appeal from an order denying relief from default may be construed as an appeal from the default judgment if one has been entered [*see Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

Moreover, because an order denying a motion to vacate a default is not an appealable order, an order denying reconsideration of the order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008* is, likewise, not appealable [*Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1466, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (criticized in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887* , for its apparent approval of postjudgment motions for reconsideration)].

[4] From Default Judgment

A default judgment, being a final judgment, is appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(1), 904.2(a)* [*see Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 59 n.2, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289*]. Hence, a defendant has a right to appeal from a default judgment, although the scope of the appeal is limited to jurisdictional considerations and fundamental pleading defects [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 294, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* ; *see also Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 323, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615* ; *Bristol Convalescent Hosp. v. Stone (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 848, 858-859, 66 Cal. Rptr. 404*]. That is, if the defaulting party has taken no step in the trial court to set aside the default judgment, an appeal from the judgment presents for review only the questions of jurisdiction and the sufficiency of the pleadings [*Corona v. Lundigan (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 764, 766-767, 204 Cal. Rptr. 846*]. Thus, on appeal, an objection that the complaint failed to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action may be considered, as well as the question as to whether or not the default was properly entered [*Bristol Convalescent Hosp. v. Stone (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 848, 859, 66 Cal. Rptr. 404* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 686, 308 P.2d 770* ; *see also Martin v. Lawrence (1909) 156 Cal. 191, 193, 103 P. 913* ; *see* Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*].

Moreover, on a timely appeal from a default judgment, the court may determine the propriety of the trial court's order denying defendant's motion to set aside and vacate a default and default judgment (*see* [5][c], *below*), even though the order was appealable itself as an order after judgment, and the time for appeal from it had passed [*see Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 319, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615*].

[5] From Order Granting Relief From Judgment or Order

[a] Appealability Generally

An order granting relief from an appealable judgment or order is normally appealable as a special order made after a final judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(2), 904.2(b)*; for exceptions, *see* [b], *below*]. Thus, an order vacating a default and setting aside a default judgment is appealable [*see, e.g., Moghaddam v. Bone (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 283, 287, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 602* ; *Jones v. Interstate Recovery Service (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 925, 928, 206 Cal. Rptr. 924*], as is an order granting relief from a void judgment [*Zirbes v. Stratton (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1411, 232 Cal. Rptr. 653* (court lacked jurisdiction to render judgment against defendant who was never served with summons and whose appearance in action was solely by an attorney not authorized to represent her)].

[b] Conditional vs. Unconditional Orders

To be appealable, the order granting relief must be unconditional or, if it is conditional, it must be self-executing. If the order is conditional and not self-executing, that is, it requires a second order setting aside the judgment, it is interlocutory and nonappealable [*Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 613-614, 301 P.2d 426* (involving conditional self-executing order granting relief from default and judgment); *see also Jacuzzi v. Jacuzzi Bros., Inc. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 1, 25-26, 52 Cal. Rptr. 147*].

[c] Relief Granted on Ground of Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

An order granting relief from an order or judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect) is an appealable order [*see, e.g., Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 895, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (order vacating and setting aside judgment of dismissal entered on failure to comply with discovery orders); *Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 256, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* (order vacating summary judgment for plaintiff on grounds of inadvertence and excusable neglect); *Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 524, 190 P.2d 593* (order setting aside default and default judgment based on defendant's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect); *Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 253 n.1, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (order granting relief from dismissal for failure to file amended pleading after demurrer was sustained)].

In addition, such an order may, in unusual circumstances, be reviewed by a petition for a writ of mandate [*see Gardner v. Superior Court (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 335, 336, 227 Cal. Rptr. 78* (discussed in *§ 489.22[1*]].

[d] Relief Granted on Other Grounds

The following orders are also appealable:

- An order granting relief, based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, from an involuntary dismissal following plaintiff's failure to amend the complaint after a demurrer to it was sustained [*Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 253 n.1, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80*] (the further holding of *Billings* that the affidavit of fault provision does not apply to dismissal, but to defaults and default judgments only, was abrogated by 1992 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* to expressly include dismissal);

- An order granting relief from a default and default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* (service of summons did not result in actual notice to defendant in time to defend) [*see Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 34 n.1, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271* ; *Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 894, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300*];

- An order granting relief from a default judgment for plaintiffs' failure to have served the defendant with the statement of damages required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* [*see Jones v. Interstate Recovery Service (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 925, 928, 206 Cal. Rptr. 924*]; and

- An order granting relief from a judgment obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 851, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (order granting relief from default, based on excusable extrinsic mistake); *In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 73, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* (order granting motion to set aside property and support provisions of dissolution of marriage judgment on grounds of duress and extrinsic fraud or mistake); *Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 289 n.1, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* (order granting relief from default and default judgment, based on extrinsic fraud); *Slusher v. Durrer (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 747, 750, 138 Cal. Rptr. 265* (order granting relief from default and default judgment, based on extrinsic fraud or excusable mistake)].

[e] Effect of Appeal on Judgment

An appeal from an order vacating a judgment reinstates the judgment for the limited purpose of allowing the party against whom the judgment was entered to cross appeal from the judgment [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 289 n.1, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* ; *Conrad v. Superior Court (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1365, 247 Cal. Rptr. 712* ; *see also, e.g., Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 256, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* (appeal from order

vacating summary judgment on ground of inadvertence or excusable neglect of attorneys and cross appeal from summary judgment); *§ 489.19*]. However, any postjudgment orders that affect the judgment by enforcing it are not reviewable on the cross appeal. Those orders are directly appealable [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 295, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*].

[6] From Order Denying Relief From Judgment or Order

[a] Relief Sought on Ground of Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

Although an order denying a motion to vacate an appealable judgment or order is not ordinarily appealable because it would merely take the place of an appeal from the original judgment or order [*see Spellens v. Spellens (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 210, 228-229, 317 P.2d 613* ; *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 603, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* ; *see also Daley v. County of Butte (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 380, 388-389, 38 Cal. Rptr. 693*], a motion for relief on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect is expressly authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and an order denying relief is, therefore, treated as a special order made after final judgment and is appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(2)* and 904.2(b) [*Spellens v. Spellens (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 210, 229, 317 P.2d 613* (appeal from order denying relief, based on mistake of fact, from an order taxing costs); *Brown v. Williams (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 182, 185 n.2, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634* (appeal from order denying relief from judgment on arbitration award based on attorney's failure to timely request trial de novo); *Sunseri v. Camperos Del Valle Stables, Inc. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 559, 561 n.2, 230 Cal. Rptr. 23* (appeal from order denying insurer's motion for relief from stipulated judgment between third-party plaintiff and defendant insured); *Cochran v. Linn (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 245, 249, 205 Cal. Rptr. 550* (appeal by plaintiff from order denying relief, based on excusable neglect, from a summary judgment)].

In the case of a dismissal for delay in prosecution (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 583.110 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 212, *Dismissal*), the order of dismissal is directly appealable. But a plaintiff whose case has been dismissed may also, in an appropriate case, seek redress through a motion to vacate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (*see* discussion in *§ 489.41*). However, the denial of the motion to vacate is as a general rule not appealable unless a direct appeal from the dismissal order would be relatively ineffectual. An appeal from a dismissal order would be ineffectual when the plaintiff has failed to present any opposition, when hitherto unknown facts have come to light, or when due to other unforeseen circumstances the record of the dismissal hearing is deficient in that it presents an inadequate factual record for appeal purposes. In such a situation, when subsequent information has been brought forth during the motion to vacate, the denial of that motion is appealable [*City of Los Angeles v. Gleneagle Dev. Co. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 543, 553, 133 Cal. Rptr. 212* (treating motion to reconsider motion to dismiss as motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and allowing appeal from denial of motion)].

[b] Relief Sought on Other Grounds

The following orders are also appealable:

- An order denying a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* on the ground that the service of summons did not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend [*Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1074-1075, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; *Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 894, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300*];

- An order denying a motion for relief on the ground that the judgment or order is void [*Sanford v. Smith (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 991, 998, 90 Cal. Rptr. 256* (appeal from order denying motion to set aside void default and default judgment); *see also Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1116, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* (appeal from trial court's order vacating its previous order granting relief from void default judgment, and reinstating default and default judgment)]; and

- An order denying a motion for relief on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake *Orange Empire Nat. Bank v. Kirk (1968) 66 Cal. Rptr. 240* (reversing order denying motion to vacate default and set aside default judgment, directed to court's inherent equitable power to grant relief in case of extrinsic fraud or mistake)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Alter & AmendCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityAdverse Determinations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.19

§ 489.19 Effect of Appeal on Jurisdiction of Trial Court

An appeal removes from the trial court's jurisdiction the subject matter of the judgment or order appealed from, including all issues going to the validity orcorrectness of the judgment or order. The trial court has no power thereafter to amend or correct its judgment or order, or to vacate or set it aside. That power cannot be reinvested in the trial court even by consent of the parties [*Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 912, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328*]. The purpose of the rule is to protect the appellate court's jurisdiction by preserving the status quo until the appeal is decided. The rule prevents the trial court from rendering an appeal futile by altering the appealed judgment or order by conducting other proceedings that may affect it [*Elsea v. Saberi (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 625, 629*]. For further discussion of stay of proceedings in the trial court pending appeal, see Ch. 43, *Appeal: Stay of Proceedings* .

However, when the trial court grants a motion to vacate and set aside a default judgment, and plaintiff appeals, the trial court retains jurisdiction, on motion, to order the return of property collected by the plaintiff in partial satisfaction of the judgment during the pendency of the judgment, unless the plaintiff posts a bond to secure a stay pending the appeal of the order granting relief from the judgment [*Conrad v. Superior Court (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1365, 247 Cal. Rptr. 712*].

The trial court also retains jurisdiction over ancillary or collateral matters that do not affect the judgment on appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 916(a)*; *Hennessy v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 368, 371-372, 228 P. 862* (motion to tax costs); *Silver v. Gold (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 17, 26, 259 Cal. Rptr. 185* (imposition of sanctions for frivolous motion); *see also Betz v. Pankow (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 931, 938, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (dicta)].

The general rule that a pending appeal deprives the trial court of jurisdiction of the cause does not apply to a judgment or order that is void on its face because a court may set it aside at any time [*Andrisani v. Saugus Colony Limited (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 517, 523* ; *see Morgan v. Clapp (1927) 207 Cal. 221, 224, 277 P. 490*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsSupersedeas BondsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionLower Court Jurisdiction

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.20

§ 489.20 General Policies

[1] Policy Favoring Trial on Merits

The policy of the law is to have every litigated case tried on its merits, and disfavors a party who, regardless of the merits of the case, attempts to take advantage of the mistake, surprise, inadvertence, or neglect of his or her adversary [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (affirming order setting aside default judgment on ground of excusable extrinsic mistake); *Berri v. Rogero (1914) 168 Cal. 736, 740, 145 P. 95*] (affirming order setting aside default and vacating judgment based on inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect); *see also Laguna Village, Inc. v. Laborers' Internat. Union of North America (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 174, 178, 181-182, 197 Cal. Rptr. 99, 672 P.2d 882* (reversing order denying relief from default, holding that clerk's entry of default was "voidable" under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*] on ground of defendant's motion to dismiss in federal court before remand to state court was equivalent to demurrer in state court and prevented entry of default)].

When the trial court denies a motion for relief from default, the strong policy in favor of trial on the merits conflicts with the general rule of deference to the trial court's exercise of discretion (discussed under in § 489.21[3]). Unless inexcusable neglect is clear, the policy favoring trial on the merits prevails [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 235, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (reversing summary judgment for defendants entered after plaintiffs' motion to set aside admissions, which were deemed admitted for failure to respond, on the ground of excusable neglect had been denied by trial court); *Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1473, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (dismissing as untimely defendant's appeal from default judgment and, finding insurer intervener's appeal timely, reversing order denying intervener's motion to vacate default judgment against defendant; criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)]. That is, the policy behind the statutes relating to time limits and other procedural matters is less powerful than the policy that seeks to dispose of litigation on the merits rather than on procedural grounds [*Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1172, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119*].

[2] Countervailing Policies

Although the policy of the law favors deciding cases on their merits, other policies favor getting cases to trial on time,

avoiding unnecessary and prejudicial delay, and preventing litigants from playing fast and loose with the pertinent legal rules and procedures [*Gardner v. Superior Court (1986)182 Cal. App. 3d 335, 339, 227 Cal. Rptr. 78]* . Thus, the policy favoring trying all cases and controversies on their merits should not be prostituted to permit the slovenly practice of law or to relieve courts of the duty of scrutinizing carefully the affidavits or declarations filed in support of motions for relief to ascertain whether they set forth, with adequate particularity, grounds for relief. When inexcusable neglect is condoned even tacitly by the courts, they themselves unwittingly become instruments undermining the orderly process of the law [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 900, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (quoting *Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 282, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848*); *see also* *Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 301, 232 Cal. Rptr. 758* (quoting *Carroll*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.21

§ 489.21 Considerations on Appeal

[1] Disposition of Appellate Courts

It has been said that appellate courts are much more disposed to affirm an order when the result is to compel a trial on the merits than they are when a judgment by default is allowed to stand and it appears that a substantial defense could have been made in the action [*see, e.g.,* *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 854, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (affirming order setting aside default judgment); *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 555-556, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838* (reversing order denying motion to set aside default judgment)]. Default judgments that include punitive damages are looked on with special disfavor [*Nicholson v. Rose (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 457, 462-463, 165 Cal. Rptr. 156* (conditionally reversing order denying defendants' motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on excusable neglect of defendants' counsel, to vacate judgment, awarding both compensatory and punitive damages, that had been entered on defendants' failure to appear at trial)].

Consequently, an order denying relief from default is subject to closer appellatescrutiny than one granting relief, and doubts will be resolved in favor of the party attempting to get to trial [*Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 696, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351* ; *Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1473, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)]. Reversal is particularly appropriate when relieving the default will not seriously prejudice the opposing party [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 235, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713*].

[2] Conflicts in Evidence

Any conflicts in the testimony or affidavits or declarations on the motion for relief are for the trial court to determine, and, if there is a conflict, the trial court's determination is conclusive on appeal [*Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 62, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289*].

[3] Abuse of Discretion

[a] As Required for Reversal

Absent an abuse of discretion, the ruling of the trial court on a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect will not be disturbed on appeal [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 232-233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* ; *see Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 257, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* (affirming order granting relief from summary judgment for plaintiff on grounds of inadvertence and excusable neglect); *Gudarov v. Hadjieff (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 412, 418, 240 P.2d 621* (modifying default judgment and affirming it as modified); *Coyne v. Krempels (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 257, 263, 223 P.2d 244* (affirming summary judgment for plaintiff and order denying defendant's motion to vacate it under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*); *Cochran v. Linn (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 245, 249, 251, 205 Cal. Rptr. 550* (affirming summary judgment for defendant and order denying motion to set it aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*); *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 604, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* (affirming order denying plaintiff's motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to set aside summary judgment)].

Conversely stated, if the trial court abused its discretion, its order on a motion for relief will be reversed [*see Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 238, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (reversing summary judgment for defendants entered after trial court denied plaintiffs' motion to set aside deemed admissions on ground of excusable neglect); *Martin v. Cook (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 809-810, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434* (reversing order granting relief)]. Abuse of discretion is established, for example, if the moving party's affidavit or declaration fails to set forth facts sufficient to constitute grounds for relief, or, when the motion must be made within a reasonable time, if the supporting affidavit or declaration is devoid of any explanation for a failure to move for relief within a reasonable time [*Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 280, 281, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848* ; *see also Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 292, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* ; and discussion in *§ 489.39[5*]].

[b] Applicability to Motions for Relief From Default Judgments

The same rules apply to a motion for relief from a default and/or default judgment, whether relief is sought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or on the equitable grounds of extrinsic fraud or mistake; the trial court's ruling on a motion for relief will not be disturbed on appeal absent a clear showing of abuse of discretion [*Monsan Homes, Inc. v. Pogrebneak (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 826, 829, 258 Cal. Rptr. 676* (affirming order denying motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for relief from default and default judgment on ground of attorney abandonment; criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*); *Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 301, 232 Cal. Rptr. 758* (appeal from default judgment after trial court had denied defendant's motion to set aside default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; appellate court modified judgment in part, reversed in part, and remanded for trial court to redetermine specified issue); *Ford v. Herndon (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 492, 494-495, 133 Cal. Rptr. 111* , *rev'd on other grounds, Salas v. Cortez (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 22, 34 n.10, 154 Cal. Rptr. 529, 593 P.2d 226* (affirming order denying motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to vacate and set aside default and default judgment on ground of excusable neglect or mistake); *Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593* (affirming order granting motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to vacate default and default judgment on ground of excusable neglect); *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801* (affirming order setting aside, on ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake, default and default judgment entered on defendant's failure to answer interrogatories)].

[c] Discretion Is That of Trial Court

The discretion to be exercised is that of the trial court and not that of the reviewing court. Thus, even if the reviewing court might have ruled otherwise in the first instance, the trial court's order will not be reversed unless, as a matter of law, it is not supported by the record [*Cochran v. Linn (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 245, 251, 205 Cal. Rptr. 550* ; *Guenter v. Lomas & Nettleton Co. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 460, 467, 189 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 604, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* ; for restrictions on the trial court's exercise of discretion, *see § 489.38[4*]].

[d] Burden of Proof

All presumptions on appeal will be made in favor of the correctness of the order appealed from, and the burden of showing abuse of discretion rests with the party seeking appellate relief [*Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314* (burden is on defendant on appeal from order denying motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to vacate default judgment); *see also Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 278, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848* (burden is on plaintiff on appeal from order granting motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to set aside entry of default and default judgment)].

[e] Ruling on Appeal

If there is any reasonable ground on which the lower court's action may be upheld, the reviewing court must uphold it [*A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co.(1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 619-620, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592*]. Thus, if there is any doubt as to whether the excuse offered is or is not sufficient to justify relief, or whether, in the case of a default judgment, the defense set up is with or without merit when examined under those rules of law by which judges are guided to a conclusion, the judgment of the trial court will not be disturbed. If, however, the appellate court is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the trial court has come to an erroneous conclusion, the order will be reversed [*see Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526, 190 P.2d 593* (quoting *Bailey v. Taaffe (1866) 29 Cal. 422, 424* , and reversing order setting aside default and default judgment on grounds of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect); *Martin v. Cook (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 807, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434* (also quoting *Bailey*; reversing order granting relief, on grounds of inadvertence and mistake, from mandatory dismissal for failure to bring action to trial within five years [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310, 583.360*])].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of Discretion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.22

§ 489.22 Review by Mandate

[1] Order Granting Relief

Mandate has been used to review an order granting relief from a default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when the trial court, in ruling on the motion for relief, failed to exercise its discretion, deferring to what it conceived to be the appellate courts' predisposition in such matters [*Gardner v. Superior Court (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 335, 336, 227 Cal. Rptr. 78*]. In *Gardner*, the court of appeal issued a writ of mandate directing the superior court (1) to vacate its order setting aside the default judgment entered on defendants' failure to appear at a trial setting conference or at trial, and (2) to exercise its informed discretion in deciding the matter.

[2] Order Denying Relief

Despite the availability of an appeal (*see § 489.18[6]*), mandate has been used in unusual circumstances to review an order denying relief. Thus, in *Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633* , the court of appeal allowed use of a petition for mandate to review an order denying motion to set aside default and default judgment on the ground that the default was void on the face of the record when both the petitioner and real party in interest had assumed the order was not appealable. In *Brown*, the petition was filed and an alternative writ of mandate issued less than a month after the trial court denied the motion to vacate. If the court had rejected the petition, a notice of appeal could have been filed forthwith, and would have involved questions identical to those fully debated in the mandate proceeding. Under these circumstances the court held it appropriate to grant relief by mandate if relief were otherwise warranted [*Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 522, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*].

In equally unusual circumstances, an appeal from an order denying relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, has been treated as a petition for writ of mandate [*In re Marriage of Fuller (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1070, 210 Cal. Rptr. 73*]. In this case, the trial court imposed a monetary sanction against both a client and her attorney for failing to comply with discovery orders. The attorney moved for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, on the grounds of mistake, inadvertence, and excusable neglect, and appealed from the trial court's denial of his motion. After ruling that the appeal was authorized but declining to disturb the trial court's ruling, the court of appeal pointed out that the many contentions raised by the attorney on appeal included his contention, made for the first time, that he'd received no prior notice that

the trial court intended to impose sanctions against him as well as against the client. The court said this argument could not be considered on appeal from the order denying relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, but that, under the circumstances, it would treat the appeal as a petition for writ of mandate to consider the notice issue, that had been briefed by both parties [*In re Marriage of Fuller (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1070, 1072 n.1, 1076, 210 Cal. Rptr. 73*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Comparison of Methods of Relief From Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.23-489.29

[Reserved]

§§ 489.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.30

§ 489.30 Default Defined

"Default" is most commonly used to describe the entry made in the court's records by the clerk when the defendant fails to file a responsive pleading or other authorized paper in response to a complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585*]. The term is also used to describe a party's failure to respond to certain discovery proceedings [*see, e.g., Janetsky v. Avis (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 799, 803, 804, 222 Cal. Rptr. 342* (affirming order denying relief under former statute from notice of default for failure to respond to request for admissions, and the subsequent summary judgment); *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 137, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801* (affirming order granting relief when defendant failed to answer interrogatories)]. A default judgment entered by the court after striking the defendant's answer as a terminating sanction is a "default judgment" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Matera v. McLeod (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 44, 62-68, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 331]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.31

§ 489.31 Default Judgment and Related Judgments Distinguished

Strictly speaking, a default judgment is one rendered against a party who has failed to file a responsive pleading to a complaint or cross complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585*; *see also Mosler v. Parrington (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 354, 356, 101 Cal. Rptr. 829* ; *Wilson v Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 576, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309*]. However, the judgment entered when a defendant's answer is stricken for failure to respond to discovery motions is also referred to as a default judgment [*see, e.g., Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 137, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801*]. Moreover, it has been held that an order of dismissal entered for failure to comply with an order compelling answers to interrogatories (although the judgment is entered against a plaintiff rather than a defendant) is the practical equivalent of a default judgment [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

On the other hand, a judgment rendered for plaintiff when the defendant failed to appear at trial after proper notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*] is not a defaultjudgment, but rather a judgment entered after an uncontested trial or hearing [*see, e.g., Merrifield v. Edmonds (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 336, 341, 194 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 577, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309*]. Nevertheless, courts sometimes refer to a judgment rendered after any uncontested proceeding as a default judgment [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 87, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* (uncontested hearing on petition for dissolution of marriage)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.32

§ 489.32 Relief Grounded on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

A court, on any terms as may be just (*see* discussions in *§ 489.33* and *§ 489.42*), may, on application, relieve a party or his or her legal representative from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against the party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. Each of these grounds is separately discussed in *§ 489.44*. Although "excusable" appears only before the word "neglect," relief on the other stated grounds can be granted only when the mistake, inadvertence, or surprise is excusable [*Conway v. Municipal Court (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1017, 166 Cal. Rptr. 246* ; *see also, e.g.,* *Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (mistake, inadvertence, or general neglect); *Beeman v. Burling (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1586, 1602, 265 Cal. Rptr. 719* (same); *Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1173, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119* (surprise)]. Code *Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is directed to setting aside valid judgments [*People v. One 1941 Chrysler 6 Touring Sedan, 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 183 P.2d 368*].

On its face, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, provides for relief taken "against" a party. However, relief is also available under the statute to a party in whose favor the judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding was taken [*see § 489.47*].

The existence of a defense is irrelevant to the critical question of whether the moving party showed his or her failure to act was caused by mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Lipson v. Jordache Enterprises, Inc. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 151, 161, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271* ; *Uva v. Evans (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 356, 362, 147 Cal. Rptr. 795*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.33

§ 489.33 Equitable Relief

The purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is to enable courts to relieve a party from the consequences of enforcing the strict and technical rules of procedure, by applying equitable rules in any individual case so as to do justice between the litigants [*Melde v. Reynolds (1900) 129 Cal. 308, 312, 61 P. 932*]. Thus, it has been said that in empowering courts to grant relief upon any terms as may be just, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* authorizes courts to exercise their equitable powers in considering applications for relief under that statute [*see Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.34

§ 489.34 Relief on Other Grounds

[1] Additional Grounds Available

In an appropriate case, when *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* relief is available for mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect, relief may also be available on other grounds. Relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding also may be available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1* (California court has assumed jurisdiction over party's attorney's law practice), or from a default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* (service of summons did not result in actual notice in sufficient time to defend), or 585.5 (default taken after failure to comply with certain consumer venue statutes), or *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)* (default judgment against defendant who was prejudiced in making a defense by reason of his or her military service), all discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.

Relief from an order or judgment, including a default judgment may be available on the ground that the judgment or order is void [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*; *§ 489.130 et seq.*] or that it was obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake (*see* [2], *below*, and *§ 489.220 et seq.*).

[2] Combining Relief in Case of Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake

If the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect on which a *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* motion for relief is based may have resulted from extrinsic fraud or mistake, relief also may be available in equity. In that event, counsel may wish to combine motions for equitable and statutory relief in one notice of motion. While such a motion would be proper, counsel should keep in mind the separate requirements and limitations that apply to each motion. For discussion of the requirements and limitations applicable to motions for equitable relief, see *§ 489.260* et seq; see also *§ 489.39[8]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable

Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.35

§ 489.35 Imputation of Attorney's Fault to Client

The mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect of the party's attorney is normally imputed to the party [*see, e.g., Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* ; *Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 626, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*]. However, two situations exist in which the attorney's conduct is not ascribed to the client and relief may be granted when the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect is that of the attorney and is inexcusable.

The first exception is when the motion is supported by the errant attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, discussed in *§ 489.40[1*]].

The second exception is when the attorney's neglect is so extreme that it amounts to positive misconduct by which the moving party was effectually and unknowingly deprived of representation, and is relatively free from negligence. This exception was first announced in *Daley v. County of Butte (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 380, 391, 38 Cal. Rptr. 693* (reversing order denying relief from discretionary dismissal of case for failure to prosecute and directing trial court to vacate order of dismissal), and the cases following it are referred to as the "*Daley* line of cases" [*see e.g., Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*].

Relief on this ground may be given in the action in which the judgment was entered either under the authority statutorily conferred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or in the exercise of the court's equitable jurisdiction [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* ; *see § 489.46[1*]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable

Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.36

§ 489.36 Nature of Application for Relief

A motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is a direct attack on the judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding from which relief is sought [*Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 340, 344, 27 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *see § 489.11*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.37

§ 489.37 Rule of Liberal Construction

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), is remedial and is to be liberally construed to bring about a trial on the merits whenever possible [*Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 868, 894, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 140* ; *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 904, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* ; *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 619, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592*]. Thus, the statute is often applied liberally in the case of default when the defaulting party moves promptly to seek relief, and the party opposing the motion will not suffer prejudice if relief is granted. In these situations, very slight evidence will be required to justify a court in setting aside a default. Moreover, because the law strongly favors trial and disposition on the merits, any doubts in applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, must be resolved in favor of the party seeking relief from default [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* ; *Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 696, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351* ; *see also § 489.50*].

Despite the rule of liberal construction, relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* cannot be granted for failure to take a jurisdictional step, such as filing a timely notice of motion for new trial [*Advanced Building Maintenance v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1393, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 310* (section does not apply to untimely motion to vacate judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 663, 663a*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsGovernmentsLegislationInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.38

§ 489.38 Discretion of Trial Court

[1] Ruling on Motion for Relief

A motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is addressed to the trial court's sound discretion [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside deemed admissions on ground of excusable neglect); *Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 257, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* (affirming order vacating summary judgment on grounds of inadvertence or excusable neglect of attorneys)]. Thus, the task of whether to grant relief is committed in the first instance to the trial court's discretion; it is the trial judge's responsibility to consider and weigh all the evidence and argument and make a reasoned choice [*Gardner v. Superior Court (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 335, 338-339, 227 Cal. Rptr. 78* ; for the effect of the court's exercise of discretion on the issues on appeal, *see § 489.21[3*]].

[2] When Exercise of Discretion Is Required

In a plain case discretion plays no part. Rather, its exercise is limited to doubtful cases, when an impartial mind hesitates [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526, 190 P.2d 593* (quoting *Bailey v. Taaffe (1866) 29 Cal. 422, 424)*]. Consequently, it has been said that *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, both grants and circumscribes trial court discretion. If a party shows that a judgment has been taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect the court may grant relief or not, in its discretion. However, if a party fails to show that a judgment has been taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, the court has no discretion and may not grant relief [*Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 528, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635*].

[3] Default Judgments

The same rules apply to defaults and default judgments. A motion to set aside and vacate a default and default judgment, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial court [*Monsan Homes, Inc. v. Pogrebneak (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 826, 829, 258 Cal. Rptr. 676* (affirming order denying motion to set aside

default and default judgment on ground that neglect of attorney who had not abandoned client was imputed to client; criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*); *Ford v. Herndon (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 492, 494, 133 Cal. Rptr. 111 , rev'd on other grounds, Salas v. Cortez (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 22, 34 n.10, 154 Cal. Rptr. 529, 593 P.2d 226* (affirming order denying motion to vacate entry of default and to set aside default judgment on ground that defendant failed to demonstrate excusable neglect or mistake that would warrant relief); *Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593* (affirming order granting motion to vacate default and default judgment on ground of excusable neglect)]. For the limited exception to this rule when relief is sought based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see discussion in *§ 489.40[1]*.

[4] Limitations on Court's Discretion

The trial court's discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is not unlimited and must be exercised in conformity with the spirit of the law and in a manner to subserve and not to impede or defeat the ends of substantial justice [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* ; McCormick v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 352, 359-360, 243 Cal. Rptr. 617]. Otherwise stated, the discretion intended under the statute is not capricious or arbitrary, but an impartial discretion, guided and controlled by fixed legal principles. It is not a mental discretion, to be exercised as a favor or indulgence, but a legal discretion, to be exercised in conformity with the spirit of the law and in a manner to subserve and not to impede or defeat the ends of substantial justice [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (reversing order granting relief from judgment of dismissal entered on failure to comply with discovery orders); *Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526, 190 P.2d 593* (reversing order setting aside default and default judgment); *Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 695-696, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351* (court abused discretion by failing to grant relief from default)].

Thus, while a large amount of discretion is vested in the trial court, the ensuing decision must rest on sound considerations consistent with the showing made for the relief sought [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 525-526, 190 P.2d 593*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.39

§ 489.39 Limitations on When Relief Must Be Sought

[1] Six-Month Limitation

An application for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, must be made within a reasonable time [discussed under [2], *below*], in no case exceeding six months, after the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. The six-month period is jurisdictional, and the court may not consider any motion made after expiration of that period [*Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 42, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522* ; *Arambula v. Union Carbide Corp. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 333, 344-345, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 854* ; *Puryear v. Stanley (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 291, 293, 218 Cal. Rptr. 196* ; *Stevenson v. Turner (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 315, 318, 156 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; *see also Jackson v. Bank of America (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 55, 59, 190 Cal. Rptr. 78* (in the absence of extrinsic fraud [discussed in *§ 489.243*], the six-month limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is jurisdictional); *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 84, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274* (reversing judgment correcting and confirming arbitration award)].

However, after relief is no longer available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, relief might still be available under some other statute (*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, discussed in *§ 489.70*) or on the ground that the judgment or order is void (*see § 489.130* et seq.). Equitable relief from an otherwise valid judgment also may still be available if the judgment was obtained through extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Alexander (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 677, 684, 261 Cal. Rptr. 9* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300* ; *see also § 489.220* et seq.].

[2] Six Months Defined

As used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, "six months" is the equivalent of half a year, that, under *Gov. Code § 6803* (defining "half year"), is the equivalent of 182 days [*Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 903, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328*].

[3] When Time Commences to Run

The time commences to run when the judgment, dismissal, or order was entered or the proceeding taken. If a default was entered and relief is sought from both the default and the default judgment, the six-month period runs from the date the default was entered, rather than from the date the default judgment was entered, because, for relief to be effective, the default must normally be set aside as well as the judgment [*Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 970, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* (criticized on another ground in *Canadian Commercial Bank v. Ascher Findley Co. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1152, 280 Cal. Rptr. 521*); *Weiss v. Blumencranc (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 536, 541, 131 Cal. Rptr. 298* ; *Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109* ; *see also Howard Greer etc. Originals v. Capritti (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 886, 888-889, 221 P.2d 937* ; exceptions are discussed in *§§ 489.39[9]* and *489.40*].

However, the default and default judgment are separate procedures. The latter does not necessarily have any bearing on, and may be set aside without disturbing, the former [*Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 970, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* (criticized on another ground in *Canadian Commercial Bank v. Ascher Findley Co. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1152, 280 Cal. Rptr. 521*)]. Thus, if it is merely the default judgment that the moving party wants corrected, for example, it awards relief not requested in the complaint, a motion to vacate the default judgment would be sufficient and it would be unnecessary to move to set aside the default as well (*see* discussion in *§ 489.191*).

When relief is sought from a judgment other than a default judgment, for example, when the defendant, after answering, failed to appear at trial and the matter proceeded as an uncontested hearing, the period commences to run from the date the judgment was entered [*Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 908, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417* (period started running from date the court's formal written judgment was entered, rather than from date of the minute order, because the minute order directed counsel to prepare the judgment in accordance with the minute order's terms for the judge's signature and therefore was not appealable)].

[4] When Motion Is Deemed Made

A motion is deemed to have been made and to be pending before the court when the notice of motion has been duly served and filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*; *see also Arambula v. Union Carbide Corp. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 333, 340-342, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 854* ; *Puryear v. Stanley (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 291, 294, 218 Cal. Rptr. 196* ; *First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 648, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Estate of Parks (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 623, 629, 24 Cal. Rptr. 250*], and continuance of the hearing to a date beyond the six-month limit specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, does not affect the motion's timeliness [*Estate of Parks (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 623, 629, 24 Cal. Rptr. 250*].

[5] Reasonable Time Requirement

The statutory six-month limitation in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is a limitation on the power of the court to grant any relief under the statute. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, also requires that the application for relief be made within a reasonable time within that six-month period [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 528, 530, 190 P.2d 593* ; *see also Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 824, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109* ; *Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 657, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435* ; *Baratti v. Baratti (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 917, 921, 242 P.2d 22* ; for exception when motion is for relief from a default and default judgment based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, *see* discussion in *§ 489.40*].

Thus, the "reasonable time" requirement is an independent consideration, whether or not the other party suffered any prejudice from the delay, although if the plaintiff makes no showing of prejudice or that injustice will result from trying the case on its merits, very slight evidence will be required to justify the court in setting aside a default [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 530, 530-531, 190 P.2d 593* ; *see also Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside deemed

admissions on ground of excusable neglect); *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 856-857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (equitable motion in which court discussed *Benjamin*, discussed *above*)].

The trial court's determination as to what constitutes a reasonable time in any given situation, within the maximum six-month period, depends on the circumstances of the particular case [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 530, 190 P.2d 593*]. That is, what constitutes "a reasonable time" under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is a question of fact for the trial court to determine unless the circumstances demonstrate unreasonable delay as a matter of law [*Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 523, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *see also Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 909, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417*]. However, the "busy attorney" reason for delay ("press of business" or "unusual press of business") has been almost uniformly rejected by the courts as a ground for failure to seek relief from a default within a reasonable time [*Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 117, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847*].

In determining whether relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* from an order denying the original relief because of untimeliness was sought within a reasonable time, the court may take into account the fact that a valid untimeliness argument was raised in opposition papers. When the law governing a deadline is clear, a party would be "well advised" to withdraw the belated motion and move immediately for *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief or seek to combine the request for relief from missing a deadline under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief with the hearing on the belated motion [*Lee v. Wells Fargo Bank (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 1200, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*].

The determination of whether a moving party filed for *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief with reasonable alacrity is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial court, whose discretion will not be overturned on appeal absent a clear showing of abuse of discretion [*Lee v. Wells Fargo Bank (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 1200, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*].

[6] Diligence Requirement

Because the motion for relief must be made within a reasonable time within the six-month period (*see* discussion under [5], *above*), diligence is an essential ingredient of a motion for relief [*Caldwell v. Methodist Hospital (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1521, 1524-1525, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894* ; *Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 255, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (both involving motion for relief based on attorney's affidavit of fault; for discussion of application of the diligence requirement to such motions, *see § 489.40[2]*); *Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 321, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615* ; *Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 523, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 685, 308 P.2d 770*].

Thus, a party seeking relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, ordinarily has the double burden of showing [*Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 255, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (mistake or inadvertence); *Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 625, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42* (neglect)]:

- Diligence in making the motion after discovering its own mistake, and
- A satisfactory excuse for the occurrence of that mistake.

The court must generally consider the facts and circumstances of the case to determine whether the party was diligent in seeking relief, and whether the reasons given for the party's mistake are satisfactory [*Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 255, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80*]. As a result, even if a proper ground for relief might be made out, a motion for relief may still be denied if the moving party failed to exercise diligence in seeking relief [*see Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 528, 190 P.2d 593* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 685, 308 P.2d 770*].

In the case of a default judgment, the diligence requirement applies to the defendant taking timely and adequate steps to

retain counsel or to personally act to avoid an undesirable judgment. Unless the defendant shows that, in arranging for a defense, he or she has exercised the reasonable diligence that a person of ordinary prudence usually bestows on important business, the court will deny a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 907, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* ; *see also Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 685,308 P.2d 770* ; for exception when motion is based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, *see* discussion in *§ 489.40[1*]].

Although diligence is an essential ingredient of a motion for relief, it is just an ingredient and its existence does not compel relief [*Uva v. Evans (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 356, 362, 147 Cal. Rptr. 795*].

[7] Effect of Unexplained Delay in Applying for Relief

An unexplained delay within the six-month period may result in denial of relief [*see Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 528-533, 190 P.2d 593* (reversing order setting aside default and default judgment because of unexplained 104-day delay in seeking relief, even though motion for relief was served and filed approximately three and one-half months after the default and default judgment were entered and no counteraffidavit was filed in opposition to the motion); *Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 254-255, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (in reversing order setting aside dismissal of complaint for failure to file amended pleading, court pointed out that plaintiff failed to explain five-month delay in filing the motion for relief; involving motion for relief based on attorney's affidavit of fault; for discussion of application of the diligence requirement to such motions, *see § 489.40[2]*); *A & B Metal Products v. MacArthur Properties, Inc. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 642, 649, 89 Cal. Rptr. 873* (affirming order denying relief from default and default judgment on ground that motion for relief was not made within reasonable time when default was entered December 26, 1967, judgment was filed January 9, 1968, notice of motion for relief was filed May 7, 1968, and no explanation for delay was given); *see also Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 321-322, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615* (three-month unexplained delay in making motion as precluding relief on two of three causes of action; judgment on third cause of action reversed for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580* limitation of relief on default to amount demanded in complaint, discussed in *§ 489.191*)].

On the other hand, an unexplained delay in moving for relief within the six-month period may not result in a denial of relief if the denial would result in the enforcement of a judgment that is against public policy [*see Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 909-910, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417* (affirming order granting relief from a default judgment, despite 93-day unexplained delay, when to allow the judgment to stand might result in usury law violation)].

[8] Effect of Six-Month Period on Equitable Relief

The six-month period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, does not act as a statute of limitations as to the grounds of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 663, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*]. Thus, after the six-month period has passed, a defendant may still be able to obtain equitable relief based on extrinsic fraud or mistake from a default judgment [*see, e.g., Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 981, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* ; *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 578, 122 P.2d 564*]. Although the grounds on which equitable relief may be granted are somewhat narrower, the procedure is essentially the same [*In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 148-149, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*].

Hence, it has been held that a motion in a superior court action for relief from a default judgment made more than six months after the default was entered is not directed to the court's statutory power to grant relief for mistake or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, but rather to the court's inherent equity power under which the court has the power to grant relief from a default judgment when there has been extrinsic fraud or mistake [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *see also Slusher v. Durrer (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 747, 754, 138 Cal. Rptr. 265* ; *see § 489.227* (equitable jurisdiction)]. This is true even though the party seeking relief from default, for example, bases his or her motion solely on *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal.*

App. 3d 892, 910, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328 (nevertheless finding equitable relief singularly inappropriate because of defendants' negligence in failing to take any meaningful action to protect themselves after being served with summons and complaint and notice requesting entry of their default)].

In addition, when relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is denied on procedural or jurisdictional grounds, for example, on the ground it was made more than six months after the judgment, order, or proceeding was taken, the order denying relief is not res judicata, and a subsequent action in equity, or motion filed in the same case, based on equitable grounds, may lie [*Sternbeck v. Buck (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 829, 831, 307 P.2d 970* ; *see also Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 663, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*]. But to the extent that the grounds were litigated on the merits in the *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, motion, the ruling is res judicata in the subsequent equity proceeding [*Darlington v. Basalt Rock Co. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 706, 709-710, 10 Cal. Rptr. 556* (involving denial of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to vacate and set aside order approving compromise of minor's claim for damages for personal injuries)]. For further discussion of equitable relief and the relationship between the statutory motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and equitable motions, see *§ 489.263[2]*.

[9] Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Proceeding Determining Ownership or Right to Possession of Property

A shorter period than six months may apply in the case of a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding determining the ownership or rightto possession of real or personal property. Without extending the six-month period, if a written notice is personally served in California on both the party against whom the judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding was taken, and on the party's attorney of record, if any, notifying the party and the attorney that the order, judgment, or other proceeding was taken against the party and that any rights the party has to apply for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* expires 90 days after service of the notice, then the application for relief must be made within 90 days after service of the notice on the defaulting party or the party's attorney of record, whichever is later [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.40

§ 489.40 Relief Based on Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

[1] When Relief Is Authorized

[a] Relief Is Mandatory on Proper Application and Affidavit

Notwithstanding any other requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, if an application for relief is made no more than six months after entry of judgment, is in proper form, and is accompanied by an attorney's sworn affidavit attesting to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, the court must vacate the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]:

- Any resulting default entered by the clerk against the attorney's client that will result in entry of a default judgment, or

- Any resulting default judgment or dismissal entered against the client.

Relief under the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is available only if the application is accompanied by an attorney's sworn affidavit of mistake, inadvertence, surprise or neglect, which resulted in dismissal or default being taken against the client. Admission by counsel that his or her error resulted in the entry of default or dismissal from which relief is sought is indispensable and is commonly referred to as an "attorney affidavit of fault" [*State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 600, 608-609, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256* (trial court not required to grant relief where no such affidavit filed by counsel)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 473 does not require California licensure on the part of the affiant in order to invoke the mandatory provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. An affidavit attesting that the default was the product of the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect entitles the defaulting party to mandatory relief if it is executed by an attorney not licensed to practice in California, but licensed in another jurisdiction [*Rodrigues v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1027, 1033-1037, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 194* (attorney licensed in Portugal)].

An attorney affidavit of fault is competent if signed by an attorney representing the client in another action. Thus, for

example, an affidavit of fault signed by an attorney who represents a party in a bankruptcy proceeding but not in the civil action is competent to support a party's motion in the civil action for mandatory relief under *Code of Civil Procedure § 473(b)* [*see SJP Limited Partnership v. City of Los Angeles (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 511, 516-520, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 55]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 473 is mandatory and requires the court to grant relief whether the attorney's neglect is excusable or not [*Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 868, 896, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 140* ; *Metropolitan Service Corp. v. Casa De Palms, Ltd. (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1481, 1488, 37 Cal.Rptr. 2d 575* (reversing order denying relief); *Beeman v. Burling (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1586, 1604-1606, 265 Cal. Rptr. 719* (involving provision prior to its 1991 amendment, but involving identical language)]. Thus, the rule requiring relief based on an attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault is a limited exception to the court's discretionary powers (discussed in *§ 489.38*) [*Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 255, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80*].

Despite the express language of the statute permitting relief from a default "entered by the clerk," relief may be extended to defaults entered by a *court* when entry of the default does not involve the exercise of discretion [*Lorenz v. Commercial Acceptance Ins. Co. (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 981, 990, 995, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362* (term "clerk" is word of description rather than word of limitation)].

For discussion regarding relief from a judgment or order *other* than a default, default judgment, or dismissal, when that judgment or order is the functional equivalent of a default, see [b], *below*.

For a form for a statement that may be used in a declaration fault that may be used in support of a motion for "mandatory" relief based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see *§ 489.362*.

[b] Proceedings in Which Relief Is Not Authorized

The "mandatory" provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* permits relief only from a "default," "default judgment," or "dismissal" entered "against the client" [*see* discussion in [a], *above*].

With respect to dismissals, the mandatory provision affords relief only from those dismissals that are functionally equivalent to a default. That is, mandatory relief is generally limited to set aside only those dismissals in which the client's attorney's has failed, excusably or inexcusably, to respond to a motion to dismiss, and the resulting dismissal therefore deprives the client of his or her "day in court" to adjudicate the matter on the merits [*see Huens v. Tatum (1997) 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438*]. For example, relief is not available to set aside the following types of dismissals:

- A dismissal entered after a motion to dismiss, pursuant to an order granting the motion after it was fully litigated by the parties. In particular,relief is not available to set aside a discretionary dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.410 et seq.* for delay in prosecution, since all such motions are generally the result of attorney neglect and the court, in hearing the motion to dismiss, has already considered and rejected any mitigating reasons for the delay [*Peltier v. McCloud River R.R. Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1809, 1824, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* ; *Graham v. Beers (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1656, 1661, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 765*]. It is similarly not available to set aside a mandatory dismissal for delay in prosecution [*Bernasconi Commercial Real Estate v. St.Joseph's Regional Healthcare System (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1078, 1080, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475* (dismissal for failure to serve complaint within three years under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210*)]. For further discussion of the relationship of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief and involuntary dismissal, see *§ 489.41*.

- A dismissal based on a failure to file within the applicable statute of limitations. This, too, usually involves inexcusable neglect either by the client or counsel, and neither the mandatory nor discretionary provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* were intended to allow circumvention of the policy

considerations that require rigid enforcement of the limitations statutes [*Castro v. Sacramento County Fire Protection Dist. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 927, 929, 934, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 193* ; *see Huens v. Tatum (1997) 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438*].

- A dismissal based on failure to serve process within a statutorily required period [*Sprague v. County of San Diego (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 119, 133-135, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 517* (failure to serve summons within 90-day period required by *Gov. Code § 66499.37*)].

- A voluntary dismissal (that is, a dismissal that is not even "against the client" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*) entered pursuant to a settlement between the parties, that was reached after full negotiation proceedings had been conducted [*Huens v. Tatum (1997) 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438* (party was simply attempting to cure counsel's inexcusable neglect in failing to ascertain correct amount of insurance coverage during settlement negotiations)].

- A dismissal after the granting of terminating sanctions for failure to respond to discovery requests or oppose motions to compel discovery, based on an intentional strategic decision [*Jerry's Shell v. Equilon Enterprises, LLC (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1058, 1069-1074, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 637]* .

The mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* has thus been construed to be limited to defaults, default judgment, and dismissals that are equivalent to a default [*see, e.g.,* *Vandermoon v. Sanwong (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 315, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772* (mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not apply to judgment entered after uncontested trial in defendant's absence because judgment is not "default," "default judgment," or "dismissal" within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*); *English v. IKON Business Solutions, Inc. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 130, 136-149, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93* (mandatory provision of *§ 473(b)* inapplicable to granting of summary judgment)].

Note that some courts have applied the mandatory relief provision in other proceedings in which the functional equivalent of a default has occurred, depriving the client of any opportunity to litigate on the merits. For example, in one case the appellate court held that the mandatory provision was available to set aside a summary adjudication, when it had resulted from a failure of the opposing party's counsel to file any timely response to the motion. This court deemed this situation to be equivalent to a default because the trial court, as a result, determined the summary adjudication motion solely on the basis of the moving party's papers and there was no litigation on the merits [*Avila v. Chua (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 860, 868, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373* ; *see also* *In re Marriage of Hock & Gordon-Hock (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1438, 1443-1444, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* (failure of attorney formally retained a week prior to appear at trial because he was not advised of trial date by former counsel); *Yeap v Leake (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 591, 600-601, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* (mandatory relief applied to plaintiff whose opportunity to participate in arbitration was lost due to negligence of counsel and award became final due to attorney misfeasance)]. Other courts have taken issue with these decisions and construe the word "dismissal" in the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* not to encompass a judgment to which a court had determined the defendant is entitled as a matter of law based on undisputed facts before the court, so that a summary judgment is not a "dismissal" within the meaning of section *473(b)* [*English v. IKON Business Solutions, Inc. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 130, 136-149, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93* (mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* inapplicable to granting of summary judgment; expressly disagreeing with *Avila, Yeap,* and *In re Marriage of Hock & Gordon-Hock*)]. The same court also held that the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not apply to a judgment entered after an uncontested trial in a defendant's absence, because the judgment is not a "default," "default judgment," or "dismissal" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Vandermoon v. Sanwong (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 315, 319-321, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772* (defendants whose attorney did not inform them of trial date were not entitled to have amended judgment issued after uncontested trial set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; expressing disagreeing with *In re Marriage of Hock & Gordon-Hock*)].

Otherwise, the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not apply to set aside other types of judgments or orders. In particular, the mandatory provision is not intended to be used as an "escape hatch," by which a party

maycorrect inexcusably negligent acts or mistakes made by his or her counsel in the course of litigating a matter on the merits. The client's remedy is these situations is an action against his or her counsel for malpractice. Neither mandatory nor discretionary relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is available, for example, to set aside a summary judgment that was entered after the opposing party's counsel did in fact oppose the motion, but the opposition papers submitted were inexcusably insufficient. This is "not a default but rather a motion lost, on its merits, after opposition was filed" [*Garcia v. Hejmadi (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 674, 681-685, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228* ; *see also In re Marriage of Hock & Gordon-Hock (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1438, 1444, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* ; *see Brown v. Williams (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 182, 189, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634* (plaintiff's counsel failed to timely request trial de novo after plaintiff appeared and participated in arbitration hearing); *Bernasconi Commercial Real Estate v. St. Joseph's Regional Healthcare System (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1078, 1080, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475* (dismissal for delay in service of summons); *Huens v. Tatum (1997) 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438* (mandatory provision does not apply to set aside a summary judgment or a judgment after trial)]. Similarly, the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not apply to a judgment entered after an uncontested trial in a defendant's absence because such a judgment is not a "default," "default judgment," or "dismissal" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Vandermoon v. Sanwong (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 315, 319-321, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772* (defendants whose attorney did not inform them of trial date were not entitled to have amended judgment issued after uncontested trial set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*)].

The mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* also does not apply to an attorney's failure to timely file opposition and a cross-motion to a motion to enforce a settlement [*Hossain v. Hossain (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 454, 457-459, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 356*].

For forms statements that may be used in declarations opposing a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see *§ 489.370*.

[c] Causation in Fact Required

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), which mandates the court to grant relief unless it finds that the default was not in fact caused by lawyer error, is not only a credibility testing device but also "a causation testing device" [*Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 868, 900-901, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 140* ; *Milton v. Perceptual Development Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 861, 867, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 98*]. Therefore, the court is not required to vacate the default, default judgment, or dismissal if it finds that the default was not in fact caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see, e.g., Cisneros v. Vueve (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 906, 909, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682* (section does not afford relief to client who, after inexcusably allowing his or default to be entered, hires attorney whose neglect results in default judgment)]. However, mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not require that the attorney be solely responsible for the entry of default; relief can be granted when default is entered as a result of a combination of attorney and client fault. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* merely requires that the attorney's conduct be a cause in fact of the entry of default when the client's conduct contributing to entry of default is not intentional [*Benedict v. Danner Press (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 923, 923-932, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 896*].

The appellate court will affirm the trial court's finding on the causation issue so long as it is supported by substantial evidence [*Benedict v. Danner Press (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 923, 928, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 896*].

A lawyer's negligence need not be the only proximate cause of a client's injury so long as there is causation in fact [*Milton v. Perceptual Development Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 861, 867* & n.5, *62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 98* (applying rule from legal malpractice context; rejecting contention that client represented by more than one lawyer cannot obtain relief unless all counsel submit affidavit of fault)].

[2] Time Limitation

Prior to the 1991 amendment of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], which added a specific six-month limitation, the provision required that the motion be "timely." Under the former language, it was held that the "reasonable time" requirement, as well as the "in no case exceeding six months" requirement set forth earlier in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, applied to a motion based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, and, therefore, did not alter the diligence requirement applied to other *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* motions. Thus, the court could still refuse to entertain the matter if the motion itself was not "timely," that is, not diligently made within the six-month period [*Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 258, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* ; *see § 489.39[6*]].

In 1991, after *Billings* was decided, the legislature amended *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* to replace the word "timely" with the phrase "made no more than six months after entry of judgment" in the sentence dealing with relief based on an attorney affidavit. The argument might be made that the Legislature intended to override *Billings* and to eliminate the diligence requirement by adding this phrase without using the "reasonable time" phrase that appears earlier in the same paragraph. However, the court in *Caldwell v. Methodist Hospital (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1521, 1524-1525, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894* , relied on *Billings* in rejecting a motion for relief based on an attorney's affidavit of fault filed three months after the action was dismissed. The *Caldwell* opinion did not address this change in the language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*.

The six-month period starts to run when the judgment is entered. If that time limit is met and the court grants relief based on the attorney's affidavit of fault, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* requires the court to set aside the default as well as the default judgment [*Sugasawara v. Newland (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 294, 297, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 484*].

[3] Award of Fees and Costs to Opposing Counsel or Parties

Whenever relief is granted on an attorney's affidavit (or declaration) of fault, the court must direct the attorney to pay reasonable compensatory legal fees and costs to the opposing counsel or parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.42*].

[4] Relief to Be Nonconditional

When a court grants relief from a default or default judgment pursuant to *Code Civ.Proc. § 473(b)*, based on the affidavit (or declaration) of the defaulting party's attorney attesting to the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, the relief is not to be made conditional on the attorney's payment of compensatory legal fees or costs or monetary penalties imposed by the court or on compliance with other sanctions ordered by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(2)*].

[5] Attorney Acting in Pro Per

The mandatory relief provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, requiring a court to vacate a default when an application for relief is accompanied by an attorney's sworn affidavit attesting to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, applies only in the case of an attorney representing a client. The discretionary provision applies to a party, including a party appearing in propria persona, and an attorney representing a party, whereas the mandatory provision applies only to an attorney representing a party. An attorney who brings an action both on the attorney's own behalf and on behalf of others, such as a taxpayer in a representative capacity, similarly is not entitled to mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. In this case, if the attorney binds other taxpayers by the action, the attorney does so as a fellow taxpayer, not as an attorney for the taxpayers [*Esther B. v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1099-1100, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 596*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to DismissCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil

ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.41

§ 489.41 Relief From Involuntary Dismissals

With respect to involuntary dismissals for failure to prosecute (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581, 583.110 et seq.*), *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* enables a plaintiff to file belated opposition to the motion to dismiss after having failed, through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, to oppose the motion to dismiss, or failed to make the showing he or she could have made at the hearing on the motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not provide grounds to oppose a motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute; it merely allows the belated contest on the dismissal motion on its merits [*Peltier v. McCloud River R.R. Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1809, 1821, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* (dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.410*); *Graham v. Beers (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1656, 1661, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 765* (dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.410*); *Tustin Plaza Partnership v. Wehage (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1557, 1565-1566* , 33 Cal. Rtpr. 2d 366; *Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 253, 256, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(f)(2)*); *Wilcox v. Ford (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176-1178, 254 Cal. Rptr. 138* (dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.310*)].

This result is not changed by the 1992 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, adding the word "dismissal" to the list of matters from which relief is available [*Peltier v. McCloud River R.R. Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1809, 1824, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* ; *Graham v. Beers (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1656, 1661, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 765* ; *see Tustin Plaza Partnership v. Wehage (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1557, 1564* , 33 Cal. Rtpr. 2d 366 (dicta)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 473, as amended, does not lengthen the time, however, within which an action may be brought to trial pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.310* (mandatory dismissal for failure to bring action to trial within five years) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

Although the Court of Appeal of the Third Appellate District has said that a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* may be filed in opposition to a motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution and may be heard and considered contemporaneously with it [*Martin v. Cook (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 804 n.3, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434*], this statement was characterized in *Wilcox* as dictum and rejected as an erroneous statement of the law [*Wilcox v. Ford (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1178-1179, 254 Cal. Rptr. 138* (Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Four)].

For procedure and forms for use on a motion to dismiss for lack of prosecution, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.42

§ 489.42 Terms and Penalties Imposed When Relief Is Granted

[1] Costs, Attorney's Fees, and Nonmonetary Conditions

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), permits the court to grant relief "upon any terms as may be just." This phrase has been construed to allow an award of costs or attorney's fees to the adverse party to compensate that party for any losses or expenses occasioned by the motion [*Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1474, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (holding that as a condition to relief from default, intervener was to pay plaintiff reasonable costs and attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by superior court; criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*); *Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385*]. For discussion of when a written statement of reasons is required, see [4], *below*. For the effect of conditions on the appealability of the order, see *§ 489.18[5][b]*. For the award of fees and costs that may be imposed on granting relief from a default or default judgment based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see *§ 489.40[3]*.

Nonmonetary conditions on the granting of relief may also be imposed when dictated by fairness [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Helsel (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 332, 340-341 n.7, 243 Cal. Rptr 657* (on setting aside stipulated order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, trial court as properly considering whether fairness required relieving opposing party from other parts of stipulation)].

[2] Penalty on Relief From Default Judgment

Whenever the court grants relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal based on any of the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, the court may also do any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(1)*; *see also* discussion under [4], *below*]:

- Impose a penalty of no greater than $1,000 on an offending attorney or party.

- Direct that the offending attorney pay an amount no greater than $1,000 to the State Bar Client Security Fund.

- Grant any other appropriate relief.

[3] Penalty for Bad Faith Actions or Tactics

Apart from *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(1)*, a trial court may order a party, the party'sattorney, or both to pay any reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred by another party as a result of bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(a)*; *see Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385*]. The term "actions or tactics" includes the making or opposing of motions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(b)(1)*].

Sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* apply only to actions or proceedings pending as of December 31, 1994. Actions or proceedings filed after that date are subject to sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128.5(b)(1), 128.7(i)*]. For discussion of *Section 128.5* and *128.7* sanctions, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

[4] Court's Statement of Reasons

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, empowers the trial court to award attorney's fees, due process requires that the court provide a written statement of reasons for the award when the fees are imposed as sanctions. This requirement affords a safeguard against an abuse of the trial court's discretion and permits appellate review of that decision [*Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385*].

By statute, an order imposing expenses under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* (*see* [3], *above*) must be in writing and recite in detail the conduct or circumstances justifying the order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(c)*]. An order lacking this statement cannot stand [*Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385* ; *see also County of Imperial v. Farmer (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 479, 486, 252 Cal. Rptr. 382*].

When imposing *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* sanctions, the court is required to describe the conduct determined to have violated *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* and explain the basis for the sanction imposed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsBad Faith Motions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.43

§ 489.43 Treating Motion for Relief as Motion for New Trial

An order setting aside a default judgment may, in an appropriate case, be treated as a proper exercise of the trial court's authority to grant a newtrial (or more precisely, in the context of a default judgment, a new judgment hearing) if the damages awarded are excessive as a matter of law [*see Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699, 702-706, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.44

§ 489.44 Grounds for Relief

[1] Mistake

[a] Kinds of Mistakes

Mistakes are of two kinds: mistakes of fact and mistakes of law.

A mistake of fact occurs when a person understands the facts to be other than they are. A mistake of law occurs when a person knows the facts as they really are but has a mistaken belief as to the legal consequences of those facts [*Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 656, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435* ; *Baratti v. Baratti (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 917, 921, 242 P.2d 22*].

Mere mistake does not warrant relief unless, on a consideration of all the evidence, it is found to be excusable [*Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 113, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847*]. Thus, a party who seeks relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, on the basis of mistake must generally demonstrate that the mistake was excusable [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*].

Frequently, a motion for relief will be based both on mistake and on one or more of the other grounds listed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, that is, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*see, e.g.,* *Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 253, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (mistake or inadvertence); *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 605, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* (mistake and inadvertence); *Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300-302, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* (mistake and surprise); *Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 115, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847* (mistake and excusable neglect)].

[b] Mistake of Fact

[i] General Examples

Generally, relief may be had from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding resulting from reasonable mistakes of fact [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Vacation of Order Striking Cost From Plaintiff's Cost Bill. A trial court issued an order striking the cost of a transcript from the plaintiff's cost bill on the ground that the item was not allowable because the transcript had not been ordered by the court. The plaintiff moved to vacate the order after it was later discovered that the court did order the transcript. May the plaintiff's motion be granted? Yes. A *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* motion is proper to vacate an order striking a cost when the court's order results from a reasonable mistake of fact [*see Spellens v. Spellens (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 210, 226* (reversing order denying motion to vacate)].

ILLUSTRATION: Vacation of Voluntary Dismissal. Plaintiff dismissed her lawsuit regarding a portion of real property, intending to forclose on a deed of trust that she held. She later learned, however, that a prior trust deed on the property had foreclosed, rendering the security valueless. Plaintiff moved to vacate the judgment, should her motion be granted? Yes. The trial court granted the motion to vacate the judgment of dismissal for mistake of fact, and the court of appeal affirmed [*see Salazar v. Steelman (1937) 22 Cal. App. 2d 402, 409-410, 71 P.2d 79*].

For a statement that may be used in a declaration supporting a motion for relief under Section 473(b), based on excusable mistake of fact, see *§ 489.361[1]*.

[ii] Examples Regarding Defaults and Default Judgments

In the case of default, relief based on mistake of fact has been granted when the defendant or his or her attorney was reasonably mistaken as to:

- The fact of service [*see Riskin v. Towers (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 274, 278-279, 148 P.2d 611* (reversing order denying relief)], or

- The date of service [*see, e.g., Miller v. Carr (1897) 116 Cal. 378, 381, 48 P. 324* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 684-687, 308 P.2d 770*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Default Entered Because of Client's Mistake Regarding Date Summons Was Served. Defendant's counsel filed a demurrer on what the attorney believed was the last day to file the demurrer. Counsel discovered, however, that defendant mistakenly wrote the wrong date on the summons. The summons was served on June 24th instead of June 25th. A default was entered and defendant's counsel moved for relief. The court denied the motion. Was the court's order denying relief proper? No. Relief from default is proper when an attorney's mistake as to date of service is result of "inadvertence or negligence" on his or her client's part as to the date of service [*see Miller v. Carr (1897) 116 Cal. 378, 381, 48 P. 324* ; *see also Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 684-687, 308 P.2d 770* (actual date was May 7 instead of May 17, and complaint failed to state facts sufficient to constitute cause of action)].

Other examples of cases in which relief from a default or default judgment has been granted for mistake of fact include the following:

- Because of a misunderstanding between the defendant and his or her secretary [*see Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526-528, 190 P.2d 593* (order granting relief reversed on because moving party lacked diligence)];

ILLUSTRATION:

Defendant's Secretary Filed Papers in Office File Instead of Forwarding Them to Counsel. A summons and a complaint was served on defendant's secretary. The secretary placed the documents in defendant's office file instead of forwarding them defendant's attorney. After a default was entered, defendant sought relief from the default. Should relief be granted? Yes. The court ordered that the default be set aside based on defendant's mistake of fact permitting relief [*see* *Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526-528, 190 P.2d 593* (although mistake was established, order granting relief was reversed for lack of diligence in seeking relief [*see* discussion in *§ 489.39[6]*])].

- The defendant mistakenly believed that the papers served on him related to a lien claim not requiring immediate attention, put them away for later attention, and then misplaced them [*Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 657-658, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435* (affirming order setting aside default and default judgment)]; and

- The defendants did not realize they had a meritorious defense to the action because the complaint was misleading [*Brill v. Fox (1931) 211 Cal. 739, 743, 297 P. 25* (reversing order denying relief from default in mortgage foreclosure action)].

For discussion of the client's mistake in relying on an attorney who has abandoned him or her, see *§ 489.46*.

[c] Attorney's Mistake of Fact

When the mistake is not that of the party but that of his or her attorney, it appears that there is greater tolerance in granting relief, as the courts are somewhat loath to penalize a litigant on account of some omission on the attorney's part, particularly if the party has acted promptly and has relied on the attorney to protect his or her rights [*Dingwall v. Vangas, Inc. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 108, 113, 32 Cal. Rptr. 351* (order granting relief from default and default judgment affirmed when failure to answer complaint was principally due to failure of liaison between attorney fully familiar with case in turning it over to another attorney, and mistake was of type that reasonably prudent attorneys make); *see also* *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 604, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* (nevertheless finding attorney's mistake in filing affidavits containing hearsay in opposition to summary judgment motion not excusable)].

However, the client is charged with the acts of his or her attorney, and thus, to secure relief, the client must show that the attorney's mistake or neglect was excusable [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (reversing order setting aside dismissal for failure to comply with discovery order); *Martin v. Cook (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 809, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434* (criticized on another ground in *Wilcox v. Ford (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1178, 254 Cal. Rptr. 138*)]. In *Martin* the court of appeal held that counsel's mistake in believing that a stipulation waiving the provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(a)* (providing for dismissal when action is not brought to trial within two years [*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.410, 583.420(a)(2)(B)*]) waived the provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(b)* (providing for mandatory dismissal when action is not brought to trial within five years [*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310, 583.360*]) was inexcusable and, hence, no ground for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for failure to bring the action to trial within five years [*Martin v. Cook (1979) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 810, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434* (reversing order granting relief on grounds of inadvertence and mistake)].

The mistake of a paralegal who is on the attorney's staff is attributable to the attorney for purposes of relief from a default judgment [*Hu v. Fang (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 61, 64-66, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756* (paralegal's calendaring mistake was attributable to attorney)].

For discussion of relief from a default judgment that may be granted when the attorney files an affidavit or declaration

under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* attesting to his or her mistake [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[d] Mistake of Law

Relief may be had from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding resulting from reasonable mistakes of law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], but they present a more difficult issue than mistakes of fact. Although mistakes of law may warrant relief in proper cases, a mistake as to the law does not require relief as a matter of law [*City of Ontario v. Superior Court (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 335, 346, 85 Cal. Rptr. 149, 466 P.2d 693* ; *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 620, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592*].

The line between a mistake of law and ignorance of the law is somewhat tenuous [*Security Truck Line v. Monterey (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 441, 445, 257 P.2d 755*]. Mere ignorance of the law coupled with negligence in ascertaining it will not justify relief, and will sustain an order denying relief [*Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 605, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* (affirming order denying motion to set aside summary judgment on grounds of inadvertence and mistake in filing affidavits based on hearsay in response to summary judgment motion); *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 620, 7 Cal. Rptr.592* (affirming order denying relief from a default judgment on the ground that defendants' attorney believed that the award of attorney's fees in default matters were the same in county in which action was filed as in county in which defendants and attorney lived, when in fact they were higher); *Security Truck Line v. Monterey (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 441, 445, 257 P.2d 755* (affirming order denying relief from default based on city attorney's mistaken belief that an appeal from an order granting a preliminary injunction operated as a stay of all proceedings in the main action)].

To warrant relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, the attorney's mistake of law must be of a type that prevented a party from presenting his or her case in court [*see Guenter v. Lomas & Nettleton Co. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 460, 466, 189 Cal. Rptr. 470* (trial court did not err in denying relief from order striking unauthorized pleading)], or resulted from an honest and reasonable mistake of law on a complex and debatable issue that resulted in the judgment, order, or proceeding against the client [*see City of Ontario v. Superior Court (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 335, 346, 85 Cal. Rptr. 149, 466 P.2d 693*] (trial court did not abuse its discretion in relieving plaintiffs from their mistake of law resulting in failure to comply with certain statutory requirements for publication of summons in action against city); *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 600, 611-615, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256* (complexity of whether to assert cross claims in interpleader action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 386, 426.30(a)* or separate action); *Miller v. City of Hermosa Beach (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1118, 1136, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 408* ; McCormick v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 352, 360, 362, 243 Cal. Rptr. 617] (in mandate proceeding under California Environmental Quality Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*] reversing order denying relief from dismissal for noncompliance with *Pub. Res. Code § 21167.4* [failure to request hearing within 90 days of filing petition] resulting from attorney's reasonable mistake of law); *Brochtrup v. INTEP (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 323, 329, 235 Cal. Rptr. 390* (reversing summary judgment for plaintiff, based primarily on matters deemed admitted arising from improper response to plaintiff's request for admissions, with directions to trial court to vacate its order denying motion forrelief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on mistake of law, from default resulting from improper response, to grant motion, and to file defendants' responses that were attached to motion for reconsideration, subsequently filed by substituted attorney, and properly verified)].

The issue as to whether a mistake of law is excusable presents a fact question, the determining factors of which are the reasonableness of the misconception and the justifiability of the attorney's failure to determine the correct law [*City of Ontario v. Superior Court (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 335, 346, 85 Cal. Rptr. 149, 466 P.2d 693* ; *Miller v. City of Hermosa Beach (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1118, 1136, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 408* ; McCormick v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 352, 360, 243 Cal. Rptr. 617 ; *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 620, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592* (affirming order denying relief)].

There is, of course, no requirement that the mistake of law be mutual [*A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co.*

(1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 620, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592]. Moreover, a mistake of law may be excusable when made by a layperson but not when made by an attorney [*Tammen v. County of San Diego (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 468, 479, 58 Cal. Rptr. 249, 426 P.2d 753*].

For discussion of relief from a default judgment that may be granted when the attorney files an affidavit or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* attesting to his or her mistake [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[e] Mistake of Court

Relief cannot be granted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for mistakes of the court, or of the court and the adverse party, in issuing erroneous orders [*Consolidated Const. Co. v. Pacific E. Ry. Co. (1920) 184 Cal. 244, 247, 193 P. 238*]. That is, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, has no application to judicial mistakes, but only to mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect of the moving party [*Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 702, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

Nevertheless, a court has power, independently of statute, to set aside a judgment entered through the court's mistake or inadvertence; that is, when the court is deceived or is laboring under a mistake or misapprehension as to the state of the record or as to the existence of extrinsic facts on which it is predicated, it has inherent power to vacate a judgment that would not otherwise have been rendered [*Key System Transit Lines v. Superior Court (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 184, 187-188, 222 P.2d 867* ; *see* *Badella v. Miller (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 81, 87, 279 P.2d 729* (discussing when notice and hearing are necessary); *see also* discussion in *§ 489.10*].

[2] Inadvertence

Relief may be had from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding resulting from inadvertence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. Inadvertence is a lack of heedfulness or attentiveness, inattention, or fault from negligence [*Dingwall v. Vangas, Inc. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 108, 113, 32 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *Kooper v. King (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 626, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848* ; *Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 656, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435* ; *Baratti v. Baratti (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 917, 921, 242 P.2d 22*]. Mere inadvertence does not warrant relief, however, unless, on a consideration of all the evidence, it is found to be excusable [*Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 113, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847*]. Thus, the reasons, the causes, and the excuses for the inadvertence are matters that concern the court. Inadvertence in the abstract is no plea on which to set aside a default. The moving party must acquaint the court with the reasons for the inadvertence and, if satisfactory, the court will act on them and relieve the party from the burdens caused by them. If the inadvertence is wholly inexcusable, however, as when it arises from gross negligence, the court will not look on it kindly, and will have none of it [*Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42* (quoting *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 905, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* , which in turn was quoting *Shearman v. Jorgensen (1895) 106 Cal. 483, 485, 39 P. 863*)].

Rather than treating inadvertence as a distinct ground for relief, courts most often consider it in conjunction with the grounds of excusable neglect [*see, e.g.,* *Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 258, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* ; *Kooper v. King (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 626, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 685, 308 P.2d 770*], mistake [*see. e.g.,* *Martin v. Johnson (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 595, 605, 151 Cal. Rptr. 816* (mistake of law); *Martin v. Cook (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 799, 802, 137 Cal. Rptr. 434* (mistake of fact)], or surprise [*see, e.g.,* *Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 613, 301 P.2d 426* (inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect)]. Thus, unless it is shown that there were circumstances that would render the mistake, surprise, or negligence excusable, relief will be denied. For example, mere forgetfulness, such as misfiling or mislaying of plaintiff's complaint and summons, is not a sufficient ground for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Kooper v. King (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 627, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848*].

For discussion of relief from a default judgment that may be granted when the attorney files an affidavit or declaration attesting to his or her inadvertence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[3] Surprise

[a] In General

Relief may be had from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding resulting from surprise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. Surprise is often coupled with excusable neglect as grounds for relief [*see, e.g., Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314* (surprise and excusable neglect); *Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 612-613, 301 P.2d 426* (inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect)] or with mistake [*see Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 302, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*].

For discussion of relief from a default judgment that may be granted when the attorney files an affidavit or declaration attesting to his or her surprise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[b] Surprise Defined

"Surprise" means some condition or situation in which a party is unexpectedly placed to his or her injury, without any fault or negligence of his or her own, that ordinary prudence could not have guarded against [*see Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1173, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119* ; *Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314*].

[c] Examples of Surprise

Examples of surprise include the following:

- In an action by an assignee for the benefit of creditors for breach of contract between the defendant and the assignor, the assignee was taken by surprise when the defendant filed a cross complaint against the assignor and took the assignor's default with no notice to the assignee [*Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1172-1173, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119* (reversing orders denying plaintiff's motion for relief from the default and default judgment and to be substituted in place of the assignor and to defend against the cross complaint)].

- When settlement negotiations are pending between counsel and there is an oral or implied understanding that notice would be given before a default would be taken, the plaintiff's taking of a default without prior notice to the defaulting party or to his or her attorney may constitute excusable neglect or surprise that will support relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*see Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 616, 301 P.2d 426* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 587* (regarding notice of request for entry of default, but also providing that nonreceipt of notice does not invalidate or constitute ground for setting aside any judgment)].

Failure to receive a notice will not always constitute surprise from which relief will be available. For example, neither surprise nor excusable neglect was established when the defendant's failure to receive notice of trial, which resulted in a judgment for plaintiff, was caused by the defendant's failure to notify the court of a change of address or otherwise arrange for the forwarding of mail [*Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314* (trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying motion to vacate default and set aside default judgment entered on defendant's failure to appear at trial)].

[4] Excusable Neglect

[a] In General

Relief may be had from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding resulting from "excusable neglect" [*Code*

Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]. The statute itself expressly requires that the person who seeks relief on this ground show that the neglect was "excusable" [*Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 279, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848*]. Thus, mere neglect does not warrant relief unless, on a consideration of all the evidence, it is found to be excusable [*Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 113, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847*]. In seeking relief, counsel will often couple excusable neglect with one or more of the other grounds set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, as a basis for granting relief (that is, mistake, inadvertence, or surprise, discussed under [1] through [3], *above*).

In considering whether attorney error constitutes excusable neglect, the court must consider the attorney's overall diligence in prosecuting the case [McCormick v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 352, 361, 243 Cal. Rptr. 617 (citing *Bettencourt v. Los Rios Community College Dist. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 270, 278, 228 Cal. Rptr. 190, 721 P.2d 71*); *see also Cabamongan v. City of Long Beach (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 946, 950-951, 256 Cal. Rptr. 621*].

For discussion of relief that may be granted a party based on attorney abandonment, see *§ 489.46[1]*. For discussion of relief from a default judgment that may be granted when the attorney files an affidavit or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* attesting to his or her "neglect" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], see *§ 489.40[1]*.

For statements that may be used in a declaration supporting a motion for relief under *Section 473(b)*, based on excusable neglect, see *§ 489.361[2], [5]*.

[b] What Constitutes Excusable Neglect

To be excusable, the neglect must have been the act or omission of a reasonably prudent person under the same circumstances [*Beeman v. Burling (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1586, 1602-1603, 265 Cal. Rptr. 719* (quoting *Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 279, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848*); *see also Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314* (omitting "or omission" from the statement of the rule)].

[c] Examples of Excusable Neglect

[i] Attorney Illness

Illness of the attorney that actually disables him or her from timely compliance with the statutory rules of procedure constitutes excusable neglect if he or she moves promptly for relief as soon as the disability terminates or attenuates to the extent that a reasonable person under similar conditions would take action for relief [*Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 280, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848* (reversing order setting aside default and default judgment)]. In such case, the court will examine the nature of the illness as described and then consider if the illness was so disabling that the neglect consisted only of acts or omissions of a kind that a reasonably prudent practitioner in similar circumstances would commit. If the neglect consisted of both excusable and inexcusable acts or omissions, the court will consider which part caused the default [*Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 286-287, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848*].

[ii] Reliance on Third Party

Generally, neglect to act to prevent entry of a default or to seek relief from a default judgment, may constitute excusable neglect when it was due to the defendant's reasonable reliance on a third party to defend [*see, e.g., Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (involving relief in equity on ground of extrinsic mistake; *see § 489.220* et seq. for further discussion of relief in equity); *Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 696-701, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351* (relief granted when insurer failed to act to prevent default); *see also § 489.361[2]* (form of statement in supporting declaration that default was due to defendant's excusable neglect in reasonably relying on promise of codefendant or employer to defend)]. Thus, a defendant who relied on a codefendant or employer to defend the action need show only that his or her reliance was reasonable without inquiring into the conduct of the codefendant

or employer [*Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 700, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

However, the neglect of the defendant's insurer to defend after the defendant notified the insurer of the action and service of process is imputed to the defendant who must show not only reasonable reliance on the carrier to defend, but justification for the carrier's inaction as well, that is, that the insurer's failure was excusable [*see Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 701, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

[iii] Misinformation

Neglect to act to prevent entry of a default or to seek relief from a default judgment may constitute excusable neglect when it was due to the defendant's reasonable reliance on misrepresentations made by the opposing party or his or her attorney [*see Nelson v. Southerland (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 140, 141-142, 9 Cal. Rptr. 735* (affirming order granting relief from default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, without specifying ground for relief)].

Relief may also be granted on the ground of excusable neglect when a party's failure to appear at trial was due to reliance on misinformation provided by a court officer [*see* Lynch v. de *Boom (1915) 26 Cal. App. 311, 314, 146 P. 908* (reversing order denying motion to vacate judgment of dismissal on ground that plaintiff's failure to appear at trial resulted from excusable neglect in relying on misinformation given to him by courtroom clerk); *see also § 489.361[5]*].

[iv] Multiple Factors

Excusable neglect may result from a combination of several factors. For example, in a case involving multiple plaintiffs, numerous causes of action, and a complex and developing field of law, plaintiffs' attorney submitted a detailed declaration, in support of a motion for relief from dismissal for failure to have timely filed an amended complaint, listing the following factors which the court held sufficient to establish excusable neglect [*see Contreras v. Blue Cross of California (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 945, 951, 245 Cal. Rptr. 258* (rejecting defendant's claim that defendant should have been allowed to depose plaintiffs' counsel and subpoena her files to impeach her claim of workload)]:

- Counsel was the sole counsel from her firm assigned to the case.
- Fifty-eight individual plaintiffs remained active members of the lawsuit;
- Her firm broke up the month before the amended complaint was due, leaving three attorneys with the work of five.
- In the same month, she received an appellate opinion that required her to prepare a petition for hearing to the Supreme Court.
- She conferred with 40 of the plaintiffs to prepare answers to interrogatories due the same day the amended complaint was due.
- The issues raised by the case and the prior demurrer were very complex.
- 10 days before the amended complaint was due, she fractured her right elbow and wrist, leaving her in a sling and substantially impairing her mobility and writing ability.
- On the day the amended complaint was due she tried to obtain an extension of time from a court commissioner but he refused to entertain it.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Vacate

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.45

§ 489.45 Inexcusable Neglect

[1] As Preventing Relief

Inexcusable neglect prevents relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on excusable neglect, and, as a general rule, an attorney's inexcusable neglect is chargeable to the client, whose remedy is an action against the attorney for malpractice[*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 895, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* ; *Beeman v. Burling (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1586, 1602, 265 Cal. Rptr. 719* ; *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 700, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*]. For discussion of relief based on neglect, whether excusable or inexcusable, when the party's attorney files an affidavit or declaration attesting to his or her fault, see *§ 489.40[1]*. For discussion of relief on the ground of attorney abandonment, see *§ 489.46[1]*.

If the neglect is inexcusable, a judgment may not be set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* on the ground that the other side has not been prejudiced [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 900, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*].

[2] Examples of Inexcusable Neglect

[a] In General

Examples of inexcusable neglect include the following:

- A mere showing, in an effort to set aside a summary judgment, that the opposing party's attorney had negligently failed to present a particular argument in the papers which the attorney filed in opposition to the motion for summary judgment. The advancement of arguments by counsel is the very essence of the attorney's professional responsibilities and the failure to do so appropriately is not excusable [*Garcia v. Hejmadi (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 674, 684-685, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228*].

- A mere showing that defendant, after being served, mislaid the summons and complaint and did not

find them until after default had been entered, at which time he consulted an attorney [*Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 615, 301 P.2d 426* (reversing order granting relief; noting that a trial court does not have legal power to set aside a default simply because the defendant did not realize the legal effect of failing to file an answer); additional facts may make the case eligible for relief as a mistake (*see, e.g.,* *Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526-528, 190 P.2d 593* , and other cases discussed in *§ 489.44[1][b][ii]*)].

- Defendant's attorney assumed opposing counsel had granted extensions of time to file an answer because, in an effort to request such extensions, the attorney had placed telephone calls to, but did not speak with, and had written letters to, but did not receive any answers from, opposing counsel [*Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 531, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635* (reversing order granting relief)].

- Failure to file an answer because of an erroneous assumption that the case was moot [*Jackson v. Bank of America (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 55, 58, 190 Cal. Rptr. 78* (reversing order granting relief from default on grounds that no excusable neglect was shown and that motion was untimely)].

- After having been given an extension of time to file, failure to file an answer because the attorney's office was disrupted by his having to seek new offices and the defendants had decided not to file the answer as they were considering filing a petition for bankruptcy [*Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 823-824, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109* (affirming order denying relief)].

- Defendant's declaration that, after he was served with the summons and complaint, he forgot about the matter because of Christmas season business pressures, the serious illness of his father, who subsequently died, and the recent death of his mother [*Bellm v. Bellia (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 1036, 1038, 198 Cal. Rptr. 389*].

[b] Clerical Errors

The courts may show a willingness to excuse an attorney's neglect caused by clerical errors of the attorney's office staff. However, the existence of other factors may result in the denial of relief. Thus, in *Davis v. Kay (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 680, 682-684, 110 Cal. Rptr. 198* , the appellate court reversed an order granting a motion to vacate a summary judgment for plaintiff based on the neglect of defendants' attorney's secretary to calendar the date of the hearing on the summary judgment motion, because [*Davis v. Kay (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 680, 682-684, 110 Cal. Rptr. 198* (noting that the "tactics of counsel for respondents was to proceed with all deliberate delay" and that the court would "not tolerate such tactics")]:

- A default judgment in the same action had been set aside for excusable neglect attributable to the same secretary's mistake in recording the date for the answer to be filed;

- The secretary's declaration supporting the motion to vacate the summary judgment implicitly admitted that the attorney handling the case had examined the summary judgment motion and its contents whenit was received, knew or could have known without effort that it was to be heard in just 10 days, and that the points and authorities and exhaustive declarations with extensive exhibits attached to the motion would require substantial time for preparation of answers; and

- Defendants' attorneys were notified of the court's adverse ruling on the summary judgment motion two days after it was made and took no action to vacate it for another 23 days.

[c] Press of Business

Generally, the attorney's neglect caused merely by the press of other business or similar procrastination will not support the client's motion for relief based on excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, absent some further showing of excuse [*Bellm v. Bellia (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 1036, 1038, 198 Cal. Rptr. 389* (affirming default judgment and order denying motion to set it aside); *Martin v. Taylor (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 112, 117, 72 Cal. Rptr. 847* (affirming order denying motion to set aside default and default judgment on grounds of excusable neglect and mistake)]. Conversely, press of business coupled with unusual circumstances may justify relief [*see § 489.361[3]* (form of statement in supporting declaration that default ws due to attorney's excusable neglect resulting from press of business coupled with unusual circumstances)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExtraordinary CircumstancesTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityAttorneys

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.46

§ 489.46 Attorney Abandonment

[1] Rule

As a general rule, the mistake authorizing relief may not be predicated on the neglect of a party's attorney unless shown to be excusable, because the attorney's negligence is imputed to the client and may not be offered by the latter as a basis for relief [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* ; *see also Freedman v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 696, 705, 242 Cal. Rptr. 8* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*]. However, as an exception to that rule, relief is available if the attorney's neglect is of that extreme degree amounting to positive misconduct by which the moving party was effectually and unknowingly deprived of representation, and the person seeking relief is relatively free from negligence [*see Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* (reversing order granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*); *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1078, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389* (reversing order denying *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* relief [discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.] and equitable grounds [discussed in *§ 489.220* et seq.] from default and default judgment); *see also People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 584, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* (affirming order granting equitable relief on ground of attorney abandonment)].

This exception to the normal rule that the attorney's conduct is imputed to the client was first announced in *Daley v. County of Butte (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 380, 391, 38 Cal. Rptr. 693* , and the cases following it are referred to as the "Daley line of cases" [*see Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*]. The exception is premised on the concept that the attorney's conduct, in effect, obliterates the existence of the attorney-client relationship, and for this reason the attorney's negligence should not be imputed to the client [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* ; *Monsan Homes, Inc. v. Pogrebneak (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 826, 829, 258 Cal. Rptr. 676*) (criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)].

Positive misconduct is found if there is a total failure on the part of counsel to represent his or her client [*Aldrich v.*

San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 739, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300 (affirming order granting relief from dismissal on equitable grounds)]. However, the client's own negligence in following up and pursuing his or her case is scrutinized [*see Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

This exception is to be narrowly applied to guard against negligent attorneys finding that the simplest way to rescue clients from defaults and themselves from malpractice liability is to rise to ever greater heights of incompetence and professional irresponsibility while, nonetheless, maintaining a beatific attorney-client relationship [*Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 900, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*].

[2] Example

As an example, a motion for relief from a judgment against plaintiffs and cross defendants entered after they failed to appear at trial has been held to have been properly set aside on the grounds of mistake and surprise when it was shown that the attorney failed to notify the plaintiffs of the trial date, did not himself appear, regarded the attorney-client relationship as nonexistent, was not representing plaintiffs as their attorney, although he purported to do so, and plaintiffs had no reason to believe he would not represent them, believed he was representing them, were free from any negligence in failing to appear, and acted diligently to have the judgment vacated after learning from the defendant and cross complainant that it had been entered [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301-302, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*]. In such a case, the fact that the attorney's neglect in failing to notify plaintiffs of the trial date was inexcusable is irrelevant tothe issue [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 302, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*].

[3] Motion for Relief

Relief from the client's mistake in believing the attorney was properly representing the client may be had either by a timely motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or by a court in the exercise of its equitable jurisdiction (discussed in *§ 489.220* et seq.) [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* (equitable grounds of extrinsic surprise or mistake); *see also Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300* (equitable ground of extrinsic mistake); *Orange Empire Nat. Bank v. Kirk (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 347, 352-353, 66 Cal. Rptr. 240* (reversing order denying motion to vacate default and set aside default judgment; noting that motion made more than six months after entry of default was not directed to court's power to grant relief for mistake or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, but to court's inherent equitable power to grant relief); *Daley v. County of Butte (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 380, 391, 38 Cal. Rptr. 693* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* motion)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistake

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.47

§ 489.47 Who May Seek Relief

[1] Party to Action or Legal Representative

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), by its express terms, is intended to benefit the party against whom a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken and his or her legal representative. However, a party in whose favor an order or judgment was taken, as well as the party against whom it was taken, is entitled under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to seek relief from it in an appropriate case [*Olson v. Olson (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 479, 482-483, 306 P.2d 1036* ; *see also Stevens v. Stevens (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 426, 429, 74 Cal. Rptr. 54*].

The term "legal representative," has been interpreted with considerable liberality to permit one who would not normally be considered a "representative" of a party but has a sufficient interest in the action to bring a motion for relief [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 885, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098*]. *Clemmer*, which involved the defendant's liability insurer, cited cases permitting the following persons to bring a motion [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 885, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098*]:

- A trustee in bankruptcy as successor of the bankrupt party;
- A successor in interest to property;
- A person who obtained a bond to release an attachment of defendant's property in which he had contractual rights; and
- A person contesting the appointment of another as guardian and seeking appointment himself.

The term includes, for example, the assignee or grantee of a defaulting party in regard to the thing assigned or granted [*see Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1171-1172, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119* (in a breach of contract action, plaintiff, an assignee for the benefit of creditors, had standing to move for relief

from default and default judgment taken against the assignor, without notice to the plaintiff, on a cross complaint filed by the defendant after the assignment had become effective)].

[2] Nonparty to Action

An interested nonparty may intervene [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387*] in an action after judgment and move for relief from the judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* when the judgment was taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*see, e.g., Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1468, 1470, 1473-1474, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (intervention by defendant's insurer to move to vacate default judgment against defendant; criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)].

Though preferable, moving to intervene may not be essential. Prior to its 1977 amendment to allow intervention on "timely application," *Code Civ. Proc. § 387* allowed intervention only before trial. Nonetheless, some cases allowed a nonparty adversely affected by a judgment to become a party to an action by moving to vacate the judgment without first moving to intervene [*see Elliott v. Superior Court (1904) 144 Cal. 501, 509, 77 P. 1109* ; *Skolsky v. Electronovision Productions, Inc. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 246, 249-250, 62 Cal. Rptr. 91* ; *but see Drinnon v. Oliver (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 571, 585, 101 Cal. Rptr. 120* , disapproved on other grounds in *Johnson & Johnson v. Superior Court (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 243, 255 n.7, 211 Cal. Rptr. 517* (intervention not proper after trial had been concluded and judgment rendered)]. Both the trial and appellate courts in at least one more recent reported case reached the merits of a *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, motion to vacate a judgment made by a nonparty who did not move to intervene [*see Sunseri v. Camperos Del Valle Stables, Inc. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 559, 561, 230 Cal. Rptr. 23* (appellate court pointed out that the trial court had not ruled on standing to set aside the judgment, but had rejected the motion on its merits; appellate court, likewise, did not rule on standing and affirmed the order on the merits)]. Formally moving to intervene under Section 387 would appear to be the prudent procedure, however.

For further discussion of intervention and forms for use to seek intervention, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesRepresentativesCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionMotions to InterveneCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionPermissive InterventionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.48

§ 489.48 Relief on Court's Own Motion Prohibited

A court cannot of its own motion grant relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, because its jurisdiction to do so depends on the filing of an application for such relief, and a showing made of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Remainders, Inc. v. Superior Court (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 411, 412, 13 Cal. Rptr. 221*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.49

§ 489.49 Showing Required on Motion for Relief

[1] Basis for Relief

To secure relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, the moving party must show that the default judgment or dismissal resulted from the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see § 489.40[1*]].

To secure relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal not based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, or from any other judgment, order, or proceeding, the party must present to the court a reasonable excuse, based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*see § 489.44*], that prevented the party from presenting his or her case to the court or from making the showing he or she could have made [*see Wilcox v. Ford (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 254 Cal. Rptr. 138* ; *Guenter v. Lomas & Nettleton Co. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 460, 466, 189 Cal. Rptr. 470*]. If relief is sought from a default or default judgment the moving party must show that the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect was the actual cause of the party's failure to appear [*Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 657, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435* ; *Baratti v. Baratti (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 917, 921-922, 242 P.2d 22*]; that is, the party must show good cause for the default [*see Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 256, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636* ; *see also Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 234, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (moving party must submit affidavits or testimony demonstrating a reasonable cause for default)].

The moving party must also show that if granted relief, he or she has a meritorious defense to the plaintiff's cause of action on the merits (*see* discussion in *§ 489.53*) or to the other proceeding leading to the judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought [*see Lynch v. Spilman (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 251, 256, 62 Cal. Rptr. 12, 431 P.2d 636*].

[2] Timeliness of Motion

The moving party must show that the motion for relief is timely, that is, the motion was not only made within the

six-month period, but also that it was made within a reasonable time within that period [*see* discussion in *§ 489.39[5]*; *see also* *Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713]* . For discussion of the time requirement regarding motions for relief from a default or default judgment based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[3] Diligence in Seeking Relief

For the motion to be filed within a reasonable time within the six-month period, the moving party must have acted diligently in seeking the relief (*see* discussion in *§ 489.39[6]*). Thus, the circumstances of any delay in applying for relief after receiving notice of the entry of the order or judgment should be explained in an affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2003, 2009*] or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] supporting the motion for relief or by testimony presented at the hearing, if allowed [*see* *Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 529, 190 P.2d 593* ; *A & B Metal Products v. MacArthur Properties, Inc. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 642, 649, 89 Cal. Rptr. 873* ; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1306*]. However, this rule apparently does not apply to motions for relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal based on an attorney's affidavit of fault (*see § 489.40[1]*).

[4] Effect of Absence of Prejudice to Adverse Party

On a motion for relief from a default judgment, when there is no showing that the party opposing the motion will suffer any prejudice if relief is granted, very slight evidence will be required to justify a court in setting aside the default [*Elston v. City of Turlock (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 227, 233, 211 Cal. Rptr. 416, 695 P.2d 713* (holding trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to set aside deemed admissions on ground of excusable neglect); *Berri v. Rogero (1914) 168 Cal. 736, 740, 145 P. 95* (affirming order setting aside default and vacating judgment based on inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect); *see also* *Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1473, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (reversing order denying intervener's motion for relief, based on excusable neglect, from default judgment against defendant; *Viguri* was criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*); *Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 302-303, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* (affirming order setting aside judgment on ground of attorney abandonment)]. However, the required showing of compliance with the reasonable time requirement (discussed under [2], *above*) is not obviated by the rule that very slight evidence is required to justify a court's granting relief from a default judgment when the plaintiff files no counteraffidavits or counterdeclarations and makes no showing that he or she has suffered any prejudice or that injustice will result fromthe trial of the case on its merits [*Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 531, 190 P.2d 593*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.50

§ 489.50 Burden of Proof

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is remedial and liberally construed (*see* discussion in *§ 489.37*), the moving party has the burden of showing that the judgment, dismissal, or order was entered through the party's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, as the case may be [*see* *Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 62, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289* ; *Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 528, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635* ; *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 904, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328*]. That is, the moving party must affirmatively show that the situation clearly falls within one of the foregoing categories [*Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 623-624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*]. The moving party's burden is to establish his or her position by a preponderance of the evidence [*Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 62, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289* ; *Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 279, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848*]. This applies to the party moving for relief from a default and default judgment taken against the party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42* (initial burden is on moving party to prove excusable neglect by a preponderance of the evidence); *Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 300, 232 Cal. Rptr. 758* (burden is on moving party to show good cause for relief)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofInitial Burden of PersuasionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of EvidenceGovernmentsLegislationInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.51

§ 489.51 Application for Relief

[1] Procedure

Relief is obtained by application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see § 489.360[1]* (form of notice of motion and supporting declaration in proceedings for relief based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect or attorney's affidavit of fault)], that is, by the service and filing of a noticed motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005(a)(12), (13), 1010*]. Thus, the party seeking relief must cause to be served on the adverse party's attorney, or on the adverse party if he or she has no attorney, and file with the court, a notice of motion stating the order sought, the grounds for its issuance, and the papers on which the motion is based [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010-1013, 1015*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1113(a), 3.1300*; *see also, e.g., Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970)7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593*]. For the requirements of a motion for relief from a default judgment based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, see the discussion in *§ 489.40[1]*.

[2] Specification of Grounds

Although relief may be granted on any one of the four grounds set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, the grounds often overlap (*see* discussion in *§ 489.44[1]*). Consequently, it is not uncommon for a party, in applying for relief under that statute, to base his or her motion on two or more of the grounds [*see, e.g., Kooper v. King (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 625, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848* (inadvertence and excusable neglect); *Yarbrough v. Yarbrough (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 610, 613, 301 P.2d 426* (inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect); *see also discussion under § 489.44*], or on all of the listed grounds [*see, e.g., Riskin v. Towers (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 274, 275, 148 P.2d 611* ; *Brill v. Fox (1931) 211 Cal. 739, 740, 297 P. 25* ; *Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 822, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109* ; *Dingwall v. Vangas, Inc. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 108, 110, 32 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 619, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592* ; *Gore v. Witt (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 681, 683, 308 P.2d 770* ; *Security Truck Line v. Monterey (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 441, 444, 257 P.2d 755*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.52

§ 489.52 Supporting Papers

[1] Affidavits, Declarations, and Points and Authorities

The notice of motion must be accompanied by affidavits [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002, 2003, 2009*] or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] or both setting forth the facts necessary to establish the grounds of the motion and showing that the motion is timely [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1115, 3.1306*; *see, e.g., Benjamin v. Dalmo Mfg. Co. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 523, 526-528, 190 P.2d 593*]. If subject to the civil law and motion rules [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)*] or if required by local court rule, it must also be accompanied by a memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*; *see also, e.g., Outdoor Imports, Inc. v. Stanoff (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 518, 522, 86 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *Skolsky v. Electronovision Productions, Inc. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 62 Cal. Rptr. 91*]. For discussion and forms relating to memoranda generally, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

If the motion is for relief from a default or a default and a default judgment and is based on an attorney's affidavit of fault (*see Code Civ. Proc.§ 473(b)*, and discussion in *§ 489.40[1]*), the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of fault must accompany the notice of motion [*see Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 256, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80*].

[3] No Affidavit of Merits Required

No affidavit, or declaration, of merits is to be required of the moving party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. Case law long held that the motion must be accompanied by an affidavit, or declaration, of merits [*see Woodward v. Backus (1862) 20 Cal. 137, 140-141* ; *see also First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 649, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798*], but with respect to motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, this requirement was abrogated by a 1981 amendment (Stats. 1981, ch. 122) of Section 473 expressly to provide that no affidavit or declaration of merits shall be required of the moving party.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.53

§ 489.53 Pleading Proposed to Be Filed

[1] When Pleading Is at Issue

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), requires that the application for relief be accompanied by a copy of the answer or other pleading proposed to be filed (*but see* discussion under [4], *below*) or the application will not be granted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. However, at the hearing on the motion for relief the court's inquiry is limited to whether the pleading contains a statement of facts sufficient to constitute a meritorious case, that is, a meritorious claim or defense, and the truth concerning the meritorious case is not at issue [*Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 323, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615*].

[2] When Pleading Is Not at Issue

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), on its face, authorizes relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding. Thus, it has been held that:

- A motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is not limited to cases in which a pleading is the issue, but authorizes relief from other matters as well, such as the effect of a delay in taking procedural steps that do not involve pleadings, for example, to relieve a party from a failure to file a timely cost bill or to relieve a party from an order taxing costs [*Spellens v. Spellens (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 210, 227-228, 317 P.2d 613*]; and

- When the judgment resulted from the failure to file a paper other than a pleading, or the filing of a defective paper, a copy of the paper or corrected paper must accompany the notice of motion [*see, e.g., Brochtrup v. INTEP (1987) 190 Cal App. 3d 323, 333, 235 Cal. Rptr. 390* (properly verified responses to request for admissions); *Estate of Parks (1962) 206 Cal App. 2d 623, 632, 24 Cal. Rptr. 250* (order granting relief in probate case affirmed, although proposed objection to report of inheritance tax appraiser was not filed until after trial court had granted relief but was specified in verified application for relief and in supporting declaration)].

[3] Purpose of Requirement

The plain object of the *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, requirement that a copy of the pleading accompany the application for relief is simply to require the delinquent party seeking leave to contest on the merits, to show his or her good faith and readiness to file the answer at once if leave is granted by producing a copy of the proposed answer for the adversary and the court to inspect [*Job v. Farrington (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 338, 341, 257 Cal. Rptr. 210* , quoting *County of Los Angeles v. Lewis (1918) 179 Cal. 398, 400, 177 P. 154*].

[4] When Proposed Pleading Must Be Filed

The courts of appeal appear to agree that the proposed pleading need not be filed with the notice of motion for relief, but are in conflict as to whether the pleading must be filed within the six-month period.

Thus, the Court of Appeal of the Third Appellate District has ruled that, although a motion for relief from default and a default judgment is timely filed, the trial court is without jurisdiction to grant relief when the defendant fails to serve and file the proposed answer or other responsive pleading with the motion for relief or within the six-month period prescribed by the statute [*Puryear v. Stanley (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 291, 293-295, 218 Cal. Rptr. 196* (distinguishing *County of Los Angeles v. Lewis (1918) 179 Cal. 398, 399, 177 P. 154* , and *Sousa v. Capital Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 744, 759-761, 34 Cal. Rptr. 71* (both involving substantial compliance with the statute)]. In *Puryear*, the court affirmed the order denying relief from default and default judgment on the ground that, although the motion was timely filed, the proposed answer was not filed until after the six-month limitation period had passed.

However, the Court of Appeal of the Second Appellate District, Division Six, relying on the cases distinguished by *Puryear*, rejected *Puryear* and ruled to the contrary in a case involving substantially similar circumstances [*Job v. Farrington (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 338, 340-341, 257 Cal. Rptr. 210*]. In *Job v. Farrington*, the court reversed the order denying relief from default and default judgment when the motion for relief was timely filed within six months of entry of the default, but the proposed answerwas not filed until after the six-month period had passed, although it was filed before the scheduled hearing on motion [*Job v. Farrington (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 338, 340-341, 257 Cal. Rptr. 210*].

Citing *Job*, the Fifth District held that a party substantially complies with the "accompanied by" requirement by filing the proposed answer sufficiently in advance of the hearing to permit the other party to prepare for the hearing [*County of Stanislaus v. Johnson (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 73*]

[5] Possible Constitutional Exception to Requirement

It has been held that to require showing a meritorious defense on a defendant's motion for relief from a default judgment in an action in which the trial court never acquired personal jurisdiction over the defendant, that is, when the judgment is void for lack of personal jurisdiction, would violate procedural due process and cannot constitutionally be required [*see* *Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 86, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*]. Although a motion for relief from such a judgment, which although void in fact is not void on its face, would more appropriately be made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, that does not require the submission of a proposed answer or other pleading, or by a motion directed to the court's equity jurisdiction based on extrinsic fraud or mistake [for a discussion of attacks on void judgments and orders, *see § 489.130* et seq., and for discussion of attacks in equity, *see § 489.220* et seq.], it would nevertheless appear that such a motion could also be made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on surprise or excusable neglect.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.54

§ 489.54 Order Granting or Denying Relief

The judge may grant or deny relief by minute order [*see, e.g., Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581* (order denying relief from default and granting relief from default judgment)] or may require that a formal written order be prepared [*see, e.g., Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 908, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417* (order granting relief from judgment entered on defendant's failure to appear at trial)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.55

§ 489.55 Motions to Reconsider

Motions to reconsider are authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*. Section 1008 provides that when an application for an order has been refused in whole or in part, or granted, or granted conditionally, or on terms, any party affected by the order may, within 10 days after knowledge of the order and based on an alleged new or different state of facts, circumstances, or law, apply to the same judge who made the order to reconsider the matter and modify, amend, or revoke the prior order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(a)*]. The motion must be supported by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing what application was made before, when and to what judge, what order or decision was made on it, and what new or different facts, circumstances or law are claimed to be shown [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(a)*]. It would appear that if the conditions of the statute are met a party could move to reconsider an order granting or denying relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, although it would also appear that the motion would have to be made within the six-month limitation specified in Section 473(b) as well as within the 10-day limitation of *Section 1008(a)* [*see discussion under § 489.56*]. For further discussion and a form of motion to reconsider, see Ch. 374, *Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Alter & AmendGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.56

§ 489.56 Renewed Motions

When a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is denied and a different state of facts, circumstances, or law exists that would support the granting of the motion, a party may renew his or her motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(b)*. Section 1008(b) provides that, when the party who originally applied for an order that was refused in whole or in part, or granted conditionally or on terms, makes a subsequent application for the same order on an alleged different state of facts, circumstances, or law, it shall be shown by affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) what application was made before, when and to what judge, what order or decision was made on it, and what new facts, circumstances, or law are claimed to be shown [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(b)*].

This provision for renewal of an earlier motion is not subject to the 10-day limitation governing motions to reconsider under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(a)*, discussed in *§ 489.55* [*Monsan Homes, Inc. v. Pogrebneak (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 826, 831, 258 Cal. Rptr. 676* (criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)]. However, the renewed motion is subject to the six-month limitation provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* and hence must be made within that period [*Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109* (treating motion to reconsider as renewed motion)].

For further discussion and forms relating to renewed motions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(b)*, see Ch. 374, *Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.57-489.69

[Reserved]

§§ 489.57[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.70

§ 489.70 Relief From Default or Default Judgment if Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

When service of the summons did not result in "actual notice" to a party in time to defend, and a default or default judgment was entered against the party, the party may move to set aside the default and any resulting default judgment and for leave to defend the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*; *see § 489.380[1]* (form of notice of motion for use in proceedings to set aside default and default judgment when service of summons did not result in actual notice to defendant in time to defend)]. A noticed motion is expressly required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a), (b)*]. Notice of the motion must be served and filed at least 16 court days before the time appointed for the hearing, but if service is by mail, the required 16-day period of notice is increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and place of address are in California, 10 calendar days if either the place of mailing or place of address is outside California but in the United States, and 20 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside the United States. If notice is served by fax, express mail, or other overnight delivery method, the 16-day period is extended by two calendar days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(10), (b)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5 is directed to setting aside valid judgments [*People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 183 P.2d 368* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a*, predecessor to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*)]. It does not apply to a motion to set aside a default founded on a fraudulent return of service [*In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 545, 555, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411*], that is void in fact but not on its face. Such a judgment may, however, be attacked under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (discussed in *§ 489.130* et seq.), in which case the time limitation imposed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* would apply by analogy (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142[2], [6]*). Such a judgment may also be attacked by a motion or action in equity (discussed in *§ 489.220* et seq.).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid

JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.71

§ 489.71 "Actual Notice" Defined

"Actual notice," as used in the statute, does not mean constructive notice, but, rather, genuine knowledge of a party litigant. Thus, "actual notice" does not include imputed notice, such as the notice imputed to a client from his or her attorney's actual notice [*Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 895, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300* ; *see also Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1077, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*]. Moreover, it has been held that if a court has acquired jurisdiction, that is, summons has been served, but service of summons has not resulted in actual notice to a defendant, the fact that the defendant has acquired actual knowledge of the lawsuit from another source does not necessarily preclude the defendant from seeking relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* [*Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 40, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271*]. On the other hand, knowledge from a source other than service of summons does not require the trial court to grant relief under all circumstances. Thus, for example, if the trial court can reasonably conclude the defendant had actual notice in time to defend, the court need not grant relief [*see, e.g., Ellard v. Conway (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 540, 547-548, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399*].

Obvious examples of a kind of service that may not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend would include the following:

- Service of summons by publication [*see, e.g., Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 35-36, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271* ; *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1074, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; *Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 894, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300*];

- Service on a domestic corporation, whose designated agent for service cannot be found, by delivery of the summons to the California Secretary of State pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1702* [*see, e.g., Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1073, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*];

- Service on an out-of-state motorist involved in an vehicular accident in California by delivery of the summons to the California Director of Motor Vehicles [*see Veh. Code §§ 17450-17456*]; or

- Misdirected combined substituted and mail service pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20* [*see, e.g., Kodiak Films, Inc. v. Jensen (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1261-1262, 281 Cal. Rptr. 728*].

For additional examples of service on a defendant by delivery of the summons to a state official, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPublicationCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsService Upon AgentsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.72

§ 489.72 Burden of Proof

The party moving for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* has the burden of showing good cause for relief from the default or default judgment [*Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1080, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.73

§ 489.73 Accompanying Papers

The notice of motion must be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing under oath that the party's lack of actual notice in time to defend was not caused by his or her avoidance of service or inexcusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b)*; *see § 489.380[1]* (form of supporting declaration)]. A copy of the answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b)* ; *see Sakaguchi v. Sakaguchi (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 852, 861-862, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 717* (motion failed to include answer, motion, or other pleading)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.74

§ 489.74 Showing Meritorious Defense

[1] Requirement

In addition to the statutory requirements, it has been held that the defendant must also show that he or she has a meritorious defense and that this may be shown by a verified answer denying essential allegations of the complaint [*see, e.g., Goya v. P.E.R.U. Enterprises (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 886, 890-891, 151 Cal. Rptr. 258* ; *Brockman v. Wagenbach (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 603, 612, 313 P.2d 659* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a*); *Thompson v. Sutton (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 272, 277-279, 122 P.2d 975* (same); *see also Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 898, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300* (a proposed verified answer denying each cause of action and an affirmative defense as sufficient to show a meritorious defense)]. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* does not by its terms require that the proposed answer be verified, although, if the complaint is verified, or is filed by a specified public entity, the answer would have to be verified under *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*.

Moreover, in at least one case relief was granted without the defendant's showing a meritorious defense or submitting an answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed [*see Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 41, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271*]. In *Olvera*, the summons was served by publication, the defendant did not answer, a default and default judgment were entered, and the defendant moved for relief on the ground that the judgment was void because of improper service and that it was obtained through extrinsic fraud. She did not submit a proposed answer or other proposed pleading with her motion. The trial court granted the motion as one falling squarely within the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*. The appellate court affirmed on alternative grounds that (1) the motion was properly granted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*; and (2) the affidavit for publication was deficient on its face and materially misleading, and the judgment based on service by publication was therefore void and subject to direct or collateral attack [*Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 37-42, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271*].

Nevertheless, prudent counsel would be well advised to have the proposed answer verified until an appellate court might categorically state that the requirement is not necessary in a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*.

[2] Due Process Limitation

The United States Supreme Court, in a case arising under Texas law, has held that to require the showing of a meritorious defense on a defendant's motion for relief from a default judgment in an action in which the trial court never acquired personal jurisdiction over the defendant (service was effected but under Texas law was untimely and did not constitute service), violates procedural due process and cannot constitutionally be required [*see Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 84-87, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*].

The applicability of *Peralta* to a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* is unclear: *Peralta* involved a void judgment, whereas the default judgment involved in a *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* motion is a valid judgment, and what the statute authorizes is an order vacating and setting aside the default and default judgment *and* granting leave to defend. Nevertheless, in *Peralta* the defendant did have notice that an action had been filed by service of the citation, that, because of its untimeliness, was ineffective to confer jurisdiction over him; whereas, in the situation contemplated by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, the service is valid but of a kind that in fact gives the defendant no notice of the action before it is too late to defend.

Until an appellate court rules on the applicability of *Peralta* to a *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* motion, if the defendant has a meritorious defense, the better practice would be to present it to avoid the costs of an appeal and possibly an adverse appellate decision. A defendant who has no meritorious defense may wish to consider the resemblances, if any, between his or her case and the U.S. Supreme Court case, and, if they are substantial, argue that *Peralta* should apply.

For further discussion of *Peralta*, see *§ 489.264[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.75

§ 489.75 When Motion Must Be Filed

The notice of motion must be served and filed within a reasonable time, but in no event exceeding the earlier of [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*]:

- Two years after entry of the default judgment, or

- One hundred eighty days after service on the defaulting party of a written notice that the default or default judgment has been entered.

A purported service of the written notice on the defendant at an address at which the defendant did not reside and at which plaintiff knew the defendant did not reside, however, does not constitute notice sufficient to trigger the shorter period [*Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 39 n.8, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.76

§ 489.76 Limited Inquiry as to Proposed Pleading

The hearing on the motion for relief is not the occasion to try the merits of the action. Hence, the court's inquiry at the hearing with respect to the pleading proposed to be filed is limited to whether the pleading contains a statement of facts sufficient to constitute a meritorious case, and the truth concerning the meritorious defense is not at issue [*Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1080, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.77

§ 489.77 Ruling on Motion

The court may set aside the default or default judgment on any just terms and allow the party to defend the action, if it finds that [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(c)*]:

- The motion was timely made, and

- The lack of actual notice in time to defend was not caused by the party's avoidance of service or inexcusable neglect.

For a form of order granting a *Section 473.5* motion, see *§ 489.380[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
a. Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice in Time to Defend

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.78-489.89

[Reserved]

§§ 489.78[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.90

§ 489.90 Relief From Default or Default Judgment for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

Relief from a default or default judgment is authorized when it is subject to, but entered without full compliance with the following venue statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*]:

- *Civ. Code § 1812.10*, governing venue under the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*);

- *Civ. Code § 2984.4*, governing venue under Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*); or

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*, governing venue of actions arising from the offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use, other than an obligation described in *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4*, or actions arising from transaction consummated as proximate result of unsolicited telephone calls made by sellers engaged in the business of consummating transactions of that kind.

When a default or default judgment has been taken without compliance with these statutes, the defendant may serve and file a notice of motion to set aside the default or default judgment and for leave to defend the action in the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*; *see § 489.390[1]* (form of notice of motion for relief under improper venue statute)]. A noticed motion is expressly required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*]. Notice must be served and filed at least 16 court days before the time appointed for the hearing, but if service is by mail, the required 16-day period of notice is increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and place of address are in California, 10 calendar days if either the place of mailing or place of address is outside California but in the United States, and 20 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside the United States. If notice is served by fax, Express Mail, or other overnight delivery method, the 16-day period is extended by two calendar days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(12), (b)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From Default

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.91

§ 489.91 Accompanying Papers

The notice of motion must be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing under oath that the action was not commenced in the proper court according to *Civ. Code § 1812* or *2984.4* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*, as the case may be [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(c)*; *see § 489.390[1]* (form of supporting declaration for relief under improper venue statute)]. A copy of the answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed must accompany the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From Default

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.92

§ 489.92 When Motion Must Be Filed

The notice of motion must be served and filed within 60 days after the defendant first receives notice of levy under a writ of execution, or notice of any other procedure for enforcing, the default judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.93

§ 489.93 Ruling on Motion

The court is required to set aside the default or default judgment on such terms as may be just and allow the party to defend the action, if it finds that [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(d)*]:

- The motion was timely; and
- The action was not commenced in the proper court.

For a form of order granting a motion under *Section 585.5*, see *§ 489.390[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesReasonable FeesCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.94

§ 489.94 Damages, Costs, and Attorney's Fees

The court, on finding that the action was commenced in an improper court, is required to award the defendant actual damages and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, unless the plaintiff can show that he or she used reasonable diligence to avoid filing the action in the improper court, [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
b. Relief for Failure to Comply With Consumer Venue Statutes

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.95-489.99

[Reserved]

§§ 489.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
c. Relief if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Practice

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.100

§ 489.100 Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Practice of Party's Attorney

A California state court may assume jurisdiction over an attorney's practice when the attorney ceases practice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180*] or is unable to practice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6190*]. If this happens to a party's attorney's practice, a court, on such terms as may be just, may relieve the party from a judgment, order, or other proceeding, including dismissal of an action pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581, 581a*, or *583* [*sic*, repealed; *now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581, 583.110 et seq.*], taken against the party after the application for the court to assume jurisdiction over the practice was filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
c. Relief if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Practice

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.101

§ 489.101 When Application Must Be Filed

Except as noted below, the application for relief [*see § 489.400[1]* (form of notice of motion and supporting declaration for relief when court assumes jurisdiction over attorney's law practice)] must be made within a reasonable period of time, in no case exceeding six months, after the court took jurisdiction over the attorney's practice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*].

However, the application for relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding determining the ownership or right to possession of real or personal property, must, without extending the six-month period, be made within 90 days after personal service in California of a written notice on both the party against whom the judgment, order, or other proceeding was taken, and on the attorney appointed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180.5* to act under the court's direction, whichever service is later, notifying them that the order, judgment or other proceeding was taken and that any rights the party has to apply for relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180.5* shall expire 90 days after service of the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
c. Relief if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Practice

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.102

§ 489.102 Affidavit of Merits Not Required

No affidavit or declaration of merits shall be required of the moving party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
c. Relief if Court Assumes Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Practice

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.103-489.109

[Reserved]

§§ 489.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.110

§ 489.110 Protection From Judgments When Defendant Is Prejudiced by Military Service

Relief from a judgment when the defendant failed to appear and was prejudiced in making a defense by reason of his or her military service is governed by the Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*) [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 501*].

Federal statute, *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(1)*, requires a plaintiff to file an affidavit of a defendant's military status before a person's default can be entered [for discussion, *see* Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*]. Under *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(2)*, the court in which an action or proceeding is pending may appoint an attorney to represent a party in military service who does not personally appear in the action or proceeding. In an action covered by the Act, if it appears the defendant is in military service, the court may not enter a judgment until after the court appoints an attorney to represent the defendant [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationInterpretationMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.111

§ 489.111 Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act to Be Liberally Construed

The Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act is to be liberally construed to protect those who have been obliged to drop their own affairs to take up the burdens of the nation. The discretion that is vested in trial courts to that end is not to be withheld on nice calculations as to whether the prejudice suffered results from the absence (discussed in *§ 489.113*), or whether the absence results from the service. Absence when one's rights or liabilities are being adjudged is usually prima facie prejudicial. But in some few cases absence may be a policy, instead of the result of military service, and discretion is vested in the courts to see that the immunities of the act are not put to such an unworthy use [*Boone v. Lightner (1943) 319 U.S. 561, 575, 63 S. Ct. 1223, 87 L. Ed. 1587* ; *In re Marriage of Lopez (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783, 173 Cal. Rptr. 718*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.112

§ 489.112 Persons Protected by Act

The Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act protects members of the uniformed services, as "uniformed services" is defined in *10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(1)*]. *10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* defines "uniformed services" to include the following:

(A) The armed forces.

(B) The commissioned corps of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(C) The commissioned corps of the Public Health Service.

The Act provides protection to a servicemember for the period beginning on the date on which a servicemember enters military service and ending on the date on which the servicemember is released from military service or dies while in military service [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(3)*; *see also 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 515* (notice of benefits to military persons), 516 (extension of benefits to persons ordered to report for induction or military service); *Syzemore v. County of Sacramento (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 517, 521, 127 Cal. Rptr. 741* (citing former *50 U.S.C. App. § 464*; *50 U.S.C. App. § 466(c)* [Military Selective Service Act of 1967])]. United States citizens serving with the forces of war allies may also be protected [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 514*].

If a judgment is vacated or set aside as to a service member, the court has discretion to set it aside or vacate it as to other persons who may be primarily or secondarily liable on the contract or liability of the person in the military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 513(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.113

§ 489.113 Grounds and Application for Relief

If a default judgment is entered in an action covered by *50 U.S.C. App. § 521* against a servicemember during the servicemember's period of military service, or within 60 days after termination of or release from such military service, the court entering the judgment must, on application by or on behalf of the servicemember, reopen the judgment for the purpose of allowing the servicemember to defend the action if both of the following appear [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)(1)*; *see In re Marriage of Lopez (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 776, 781-782, 783, 173 Cal. Rptr. 718* ; *see also § 489.410[1]* (form of notice of motion and supporting declaration for relief under Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act), and discussion in *§ 489.74[2*]]:

> (A) The servicemember was materially affected by reason of the military service in making a defense to the action.
>
> (B) The servicemember has a meritorious or legal defense to the action or some part of it.

The vacating, setting aside, or reversing of any judgment does not impair any right or title acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value under the judgment [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(h)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.114

§ 489.114 Applicability of Act to Orders and to "Interested Persons"

The protection of the Act extends to persons in the military service who are "interested parties" in relation to orders and decrees in probate and equity matters [*Winslow v. Harold G. Ferguson Corp. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 274, 280-281, 153 P.2d 714* (attorney's objection to an order made during his absence in military service, subordinating his previous allowance of counsel fees for preserving a trust fund to the claims of creditors, comes within the statute)]. This is also true of special proceedings. Thus, the act has been held to apply to a judgment changing the name of a minor child on the mother's petition while the father was in the military and absent from the country. Although not a necessary party to the proceeding, the father was "an interested party" with the status of "defendant" under the federal statute, and entitled to attack the validity of the proceedings *In re Larson (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 258, 261-262, 183 P.2d 688* (disapproved in *In re Marriage of Schiffman (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 640, 647, 169 Cal. Rptr. 918, 620 P.2d 579* , to the extent it gave father, as against mother, a primary right to have a child bear his surname)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbateGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.115

§ 489.115 Time Limitation on Relief

The party against whom the judgment was rendered, or his or her personal representative, must apply to open the default not later than 90 days after the military service terminates [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)(2)*]. Consequently, relief may be available under *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)* even though relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), would be barred [*see In re Marriage of Lopez (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783-784, 173 Cal. Rptr. 718*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
i. Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.116

§ 489.116 Stay of Proceedings

In an action for which the Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act provides protection of servicemembers against default judgments [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*], the court must grant a stay of proceedings for a minimum period of 90 days upon application of counsel, or on the court's own motion, if the court determines either of the following [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(d)*; *see also 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 522* (stay or proceedings when servicemember has notice), 524 (stay or vacation of execution of judgments, attachments and garnishments), 531(b) (stay of execution of eviction), 532(c)(2) (stay of proceedings based on breach of contract for purchase or real or personal property or for lease or bailment of such property), 537(b) (stay of proceedings to enforce or foreclose storage lien)]:

> (1) There may be a defense to the action and a defense cannot be presented without the presence of the defendant.
>
> (2) After due diligence, counsel has been unable to contact the defendant or otherwise determine if a meritorious defense exists.

A stay of proceedings under these provisions is not be controlled by procedures or requirements under *50 U.S.C. App. § 522* [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(e)*], which governs a stay of proceedings when the servicemember has notice of the action or proceeding. If a servicemember who is a defendant in an action covered by *50 U.S.C. App. § 521* receives actual notice of the action, the servicemember may request a stay of proceeding under 50 U.S.C. App. § 50 *U.S.C. App. § 522* [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(f)*].

If a court stays an action for compliance with a contract under the Act, no fine or penalty may accrue during the stay [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 523(a)*].

A court may also vacate or stay any prejudgment or postjudgment attachment or garnishment of property, money, or

debts in the hands of another when the military defendant's ability to comply with the judgment entered or order sought is materially affected by reason of his or her military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 524*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGarnishmentsContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
ii. State Law

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.117

§ 489.117 State Protections

Effective June 21, 2002, if any judgment is rendered in any action or proceeding against a service member during the period of his or her service or within 30 days thereafter, and it appears that the service member was prejudiced by reason of the military service in making a defense to the judgment, on application by the service member or his or her legal representative, the judgment may be opened by the court rendering it and the defendant or his or her legal representative allowed to defend. Application to reopen must be made by the service member or his or her legal representative not later than 90 days after termination of military service and must state a meritorious or legal defense to the action or some part of it [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*]. However, the vacating, setting aside or reversal of a judgment for this reason will not impair any right or title acquired by a bona fide purchaser for value under the judgment [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
ii. State Law

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.118

§ 489.118 Definitions

A "service member" is defined for these purposes as either of the following [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)*]:

- Officers and enlisted members of the National Guard called or ordered into active state service by the Governor pursuant to *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 143* or *146* or into active federal service by the President pursuant to Title 10 or 32 of the United States Code.

- Reservists of the United States Military Reserve who have been called to full-time active duty.

"Military service" means full-time active state or federal service as defined in *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)(1)* or full-time active of a reservist as defined in *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)(2)*, for a period in excess of seven days in any 14-day period. Days of service for a service member called to active service or duty since September 11, 2001, to engage in homeland defense against terrorism are credited toward the seven-day period [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersU.S. National Guard

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
ii. State Law

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.119

§ 489.119 Certificate Evidencing Service

A certificate signed by an appropriately authorized officer of the military department, branch, or unit in which a service member is serving is prima facie evidence as to any of the following facts as stated in the certificate [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.8(a)*]:

- That a person named has not been, or is, or has been in the military service.
- The time when and the place where the person entered military service.
- The person's residence at that time, and the rank, branch, and unit of the service the person entered.
- The dates within which the person was in the military service.
- The monthly pay received by the person at the date of issuing the certificate.
- The time when and the place where the person died in or was discharged from the service.

The authorized officer must furnish the certificate on application. Any certificate purporting to be signed by an officer purporting on the face of the certificate to have been authorized to sign it, is prima facie evidence of its contents and of the authority of the signer to issue it [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.8(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds
d. Relief Based on Military Service
ii. State Law

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.120-489.129

[Reserved]

§§ 489.120[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.130

§ 489.130 Terminology

Terminology in court opinions regarding judgments is sometimes confusing. For example, a judgment is either void or it is valid. A judgment is void, for example, when the court that rendered it lacked jurisdiction of thedefendant's person or of the subject matter of the action. A void judgment may be either void on its face or void in fact but valid on its face [*see* discussion in *§ 489.134*]. In dealing with void judgments, courts have used the terms "void," "invalid," "in excess of jurisdiction," and "without authority" somewhat interchangeably [*see Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366 n. 2, 217 P.2d 951*] to mean void.

However, some courts have used the term "voidable" to describe a judgment that is valid on its face but void in fact [*see, e.g., Laguna Village, Inc. v. Laborers' Internat. Union of North America (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 174, 182, 197 Cal. Rptr. 99, 672 P.2d 882* ; *Lee v. An (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 558, 565, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620* (if court lacks fundamental authority, judgment is void; if court acts in excess of jurisdiction or defined power, judgment is voidable); *Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 526, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*]. The term "voidable" has also been applied to certain void-in-fact judgments whose invalidity resulted from some defect in the proceedings, for example, to a judgment rendered by a judge who was disqualified from acting in the case by reason of a concealed financial interest in one of the parties [*see Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy (1932) 214 Cal. 562, 568, 6 P.2d 944* (discussed in *§ 489.166*)].

Nevertheless, the term "voidable" is a contract term and is not normally applied to judgments. With respect to judgments, a judgment that is not void on its face is, more accurately, described as a judgment that is valid on its face but void in fact. It is simply a judgment that will be enforced as a valid judgment unless its invalidity is properly made to appear in a manner authorized by law [*see, e.g., Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 570, 127 P.2d 909*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsFinancial InterestsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.131

§ 489.131 Statutory and Inherent Powers of Courts

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, a court may, on motion of either party, after notice to the other party, set aside any void judgment or order. This provision applies in all courts [*see People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 22, 183 P.2d 368*].

Apart from *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, courts of record (which today include all California state courts [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 1*]) historically have inherent power at law to set aside a void judgment on the motion of a party, whether or not it is void on its face [*People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 25, 183 P.2d 368*]. Hence, it has been said that *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, is merely a legislative recognition of the inherent power of the courts to set aside void judgments and orders [*see, e.g., Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1121-1122, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 22, 183 P.2d 368* ; *see also Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 571-572, 107 P.2d 36*].

It has also been said that the language that is now the *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* codified the court's inherent power to set aside an order or judgment void on its face at any time [*National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 414, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*]. However, a judgment that is void on its face is not necessarily governed by that statute, inasmuch as the judgment may be vacated by the court on its own motion, as well as on a motion of a party [*see Eveleth v. American Brass & Iron Foundry (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 41, 47, 21 Cal. Rptr. 95* ; *Montgomery v. Norman (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 855, 858, 262 P.2d 360*]. Moreover, in dealing with relief from a judgment that is void on its face, many courts continue to point out that a trial court has the inherent power to set aside such a judgment at any time [*see, e.g., Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1588, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.201[1*]].

The superior court also has inherent power in equity to vacate void judgments obtained through extrinsic fraud or mistake. This power may be exercised either by a motion made in the original action or by an independent action in equity [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 574, 122 P.2d 564* ; *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 554, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838* ; *see also Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20*

; *Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 571-572, 107 P.2d 36* ; *In re Marriage of Mansell (1989) 217 Cal. App. 3d. 219, 225, 265 Cal. Rptr. 227* , *cert. denied, (1990), 498 U.S. 806*]. In limited civil cases, courts, by statute, have equitable power to vacate judgments or orders rendered or made by the court from which relief is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)*]. For a discussion of motions and actions in equity, see *§ 489.220* et seq.

Because courts have power both at law and in equity to vacate and set aside void judgments, although the rules applicable to relief at law and relief in equity differ, cases in equity may be cited in cases at law, and vice versa, to the extent that they identify or define what constitutes a void judgment.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to Adjudicate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.132

§ 489.132 Void Judgment Defined

To render a valid judgment, a court must be lawfully organized, it must have jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties, and it must have the power to grant the judgment [*Vasquez v. Vasquez (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 240 P.2d 319* ; *see also Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1917*]. Thus, a judgment rendered by a court that lacked jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or the person of the defendant or that granted relief the court had no power to grant is void [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 752, 766-767, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 641* ; *311 South Spring Street Co. v. Department of General Services (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1009, 1015-1018, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 176* (judgment granting excess interest deemed void); *Lee v. An (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 558, 565, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620* (if court lacks fundamental authority, judgment is void; if court acts in excess of jurisdiction or defined power, judgment is voidable); *Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1588, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112* ; *see also Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 493, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915* , quoting *Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* (collateral attack is proper to contest judgment void on its face for lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or granting of relief that court has no power to grant)]. A judgment may also be void if it was rendered in violation of a party's due process rights [*see County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 112, 183 Cal. Rptr. 741*].

Conversely, a mere erroneous decision on a question of law, even though the error appears on the face of the record, does not make the judgment void, if the court had jurisdiction of the subject matter and of the person of the defendant [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625* ; *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 844, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*]. Nor does the failure of the complaint to state a cause of action render a subsequent default judgment void so long as the court had jurisdiction of the parties and the subject matter and the complaint was sufficient to apprise the defendant of the nature of plaintiff's demand [*Thorson v. Western Development Corp. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 206, 215, 59 Cal. Rptr. 299* , quoting *Trans-Pacific Trading Co. v. Patsy Frock & Romper Co. (1922) 189 Cal. 509, 513-514, 209 P. 357*].

Nevertheless, a judgment may be partially void and subject to direct or collateral attack (*see* discussions in *§§ 489.138*

and *489.139*) as to the invalid portion, even when the court does have jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties [*see, e.g., Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 844-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674* ; *Vasquez v. Vasquez (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 240 P.2d 319* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.139[4*]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to AdjudicateGovernmentsCourtsCreation & Organization

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.133

§ 489.133 Judgment Procured by Fraud

A judgment may be void because it was procured by fraud. Thus, it has been said that fraud practiced on the court is always ground for voiding the judgment, as when the court is deceived or misled as to material circumstances, or its process is abused, resulting in the rendition of a judgment that would not have been given if the whole conduct of the case had been fair [*Swallow v. Tungsten Products Co. (1928) 205 Cal. 207, 211-212, 270 P. 366* ; *see also Steiner v. Flournoy (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 1051, 1055, 100 Cal. Rptr. 680* (every court may treat as a nullity any judgment that can be shown to have been obtained by manifest fraud); *Batchelor v. Finn (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 410, 417, 346 P.2d 795*]. If the motion for relief from such a judgment is timely (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142*), it is immaterial whether the fraud was intrinsic or extrinsic [*see Batchelor v. Finn (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 410, 417, 346 P.2d 795*] (declining to rule on whether the six-month period in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or the one-year period in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)* (discussed under in *§ 489.142[6]*) applied by analogy, as the motion was made within the shorter period)]. If the motion is not timely, relief may still be had in equity if the fraud was extrinsic (*see* discussion and *forms in § 489.220* et seq.).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.134

§ 489.134 Void on Face and Void in Fact Distinguished

A judgment is void on its face when its invalidity appears from:

- Inspection of the judgment roll [*see, e.g., Morgan v. Clapp (1929) 207 Cal. 221, 224, 277 P. 490* ; *Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 414-415, 77 P. 1007*] as defined in the statute in force at the time the judgment was entered [*People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 677, 77 P. 651*], or

- Inspection of certain other papers on file in the case [*see, e.g., Swain v. Swain (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10-11, 58 Cal. Rptr. 83* (facts stated in domestic relations officer's report that had been filed in case)].

For what constitutes the judgment roll in a civil action, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 670* (discussed in *§ 489.136*). Because the invalidity must appear from the face of the record, no extrinsic evidence is required or permitted to show its invalidity.

Conversely, a judgment that is void in fact but not void on its face requires the presentation of extrinsic evidence to show that it is void. Such evidence is normally set out in one or more affidavits (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003, 2009*) or declarations under penalty of perjury (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) submitted with the notice of motion for relief [*see, e.g., People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 25-27, 183 P.2d 368* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.138*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.135

§ 489.135 Impeachment of Judicial Record

Code Civ. Proc.§ 1916 provides that "[a]ny judicial record may be impeached by evidence of a want of jurisdiction in the court or judicial officer... in respect to the proceedings." This simply means, however, that evidence is admissible to impeach a judgment in the cases allowed by law and not in all cases whatsoever. This rule does not mean that a void judgment will be enforced as though valid. It does mean that a judgment may only be shown to be void in certain ways [*Hill v. City Cab etc. Co. (1889) 79 Cal. 188, 191, 21 P. 728*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCourt RecordsGovernmentsCourtsJudges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.136

§ 489.136 Judgment Roll in Civil Actions

If no defendant filed an answer, the judgment roll in a civil action consists of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 670(a)*]:

- The summons, with the affidavit (or declaration) of proof of service;
- The complaint;
- The request for entry of default with a memorandum endorsed on it that the defendant's default was entered, and a copy of the judgment;
- If the defendant appeared by a demurrer that was overruled, the notice of the overruling served on defendant's attorney, together with proof of service; and
- If service was by publication, the affidavit (or declaration) for publication of summons, and the order directing publication of summons.

In all other cases, the judgment roll in a civil action consists of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 670(b)*]:

- The pleadings;
- All orders striking out any pleading in whole or in part;
- A copy of the jury verdict;
- The court's statement of decision or referee's finding;
- A copy of any order made on demurrer, or relating to a change of parties;

- A copy of the judgment;

- If there are multiple defendants in the action, and any one of them has allowed judgment against him or her by default, the summons, with proof of its service, on the defendant, and if the service on the defaulting defendant was by publication, the affidavit (or declaration) for publication, and the order directing the publication of summons.

Thus, motions, notices of motions, and affidavits of service of notices of motion are not part of the judgment roll [*see Johnson v. Hayes Cal Builders, Inc. (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 572, 576-577, 35 Cal. Rptr. 618, 387 P.2d 394*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.137

§ 489.137 Attacking Void Judgment or Order

An order or judgment that is void on its face is a nullity and may be attacked directly or collaterally [*see, e.g., Traub Co. v. Coffee Break Service, Inc. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 368, 370, 57 Cal. Rptr. 846, 425 P.2d 790* ; *Andrews v. Superior Court (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 208, 214-215, 174 P.2d 313* ; *People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675, 77 P. 651* ; *see also Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 493, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915*]. In granting relief from the order or judgment, the court is exercising its jurisdiction at law (*see* discussion in *§ 489.131*).

A judgment that is not void on its face but is void in fact may be attacked only by one of the established methods of direct attack [*see, e.g., Estate of Wemyss (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 53, 58, 122 Cal. Rptr. 134*]. Thus, it may be attacked by a motion at law or by a motion or action in equity (for a discussion of relief in equity, *see § 489.220* et seq.).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.138

§ 489.138 Direct Attack

A direct attack on a judgment or order is usually one made in the same action or proceeding, as by appeal or by a motion to vacate the judgment. However, a motion in equity or a separate suit in equity to set aside a judgment or order on equitable grounds is also a direct attack [*Rico v. Nasser Bros. Realty Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 878, 882, 137 P.2d 861* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.13[1]*; for direct attacks in equity, *see § 489.220* et seq.].

Thus, a motion at law to vacate a judgment or order on the ground that it is void on its face or that it is void in fact although not void on its face is a direct attack. A judgment or order that is void on its face, as already pointed out, requires no extrinsic evidence to show the invalidity (*see* discussion § 489.134). If the judgment or order is not void on its face but is void in fact, and the motion is timely (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142*), any facts showing the invalidity of the judgment or order may be presented, including facts outside the record as well as facts appearing on the face of the judgment roll or record [*Norton v. Atchison, T., & S. F. R. Co. (1893) 97 Cal. 388, 392-393, 32 P. 452* ; *In re Dahnke (1923) 64 Cal. App. 555, 561, 222 P. 381* (criticized on another point in *Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1122-1123, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286*); *see also* *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*].

Nevertheless, an untimely, and therefore impermissible, direct attack by motion (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142*) is often referred to as a collateral attack [*see, e.g.,* *Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1588, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112* ; *National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 416, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113* ; *Swain v. Swain (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 58 Cal. Rptr. 83*]. More precisely, the motion is a direct attack [*see* *Norton v. Atchison, T., & S. F. R. Co. (1893) 97 Cal. 388, 392, 32 P. 452* (a motion to vacate a judgment is a direct and not a collateral attack)] but, because of its untimeliness, it is subject to the rules that apply to collateral attacks (discussed in *§ 489.139*) [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625* ; *see also* *Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 492-493, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915* (applying to rules that govern collateral attacks on judgments because motion to vacate was not timely)]. This means that extrinsic evidence cannot be presented on an untimely motion to show the invalidity of the judgment. Thus, a judgment so attacked cannot be set aside at law unless it is void on its face [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625*

]. However, reliefmay still be available in equity after the time for relief at law has expired (*see § 489.220* et seq.).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.139

§ 489.139 Collateral Attack

[1] Defined

A collateral attack is an attempt to avoid the effect of a judgment or order made in some other proceeding. For the attack to succeed, the invalidity of the former judgment or order must appear on the face of the record [*Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 340, 344, 27 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *Milstein v. Turner (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 296, 298, 200 P.2d 799* ; *Rico v. Nasser Bros. Realty Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 878, 882, 137 P.2d 861* ; *County of Fresno v. Roberson, M. & Co. (1954) 269 P.2d 252* ; *see also People ex rel. Mosk v. Santa Barbara (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 342, 356, 13 Cal. Rptr. 423* ; and discussion in *§ 489.14*]. Collateral attack is proper to contest lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or the granting of relief that the court has no power to grant [*Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* ; *In re Marriage of Maxfield (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 755, 761*]. However, absent unusual circumstances, a collateral attack will not be allowed when there was fundamental jurisdiction, that is, jurisdiction of the party and the subject matter, even though the judgment is contrary to statute [*Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 951, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* ; *In re Marriage of Maxfield (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 755, 761*].

[2] On Domestic Judgment

When a California judgment is collaterally attacked, the court may review only matters that appear in the judgment roll or that are admitted by the parties [*Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 372-373, 217 P.2d 951* ; for discussion of the judgment roll, *see § 489.136*; for discussion of the effect of admissions by the parties, *see § 489.142[6][b*]], or that appear from certain other papers filed in the case [*see Swain v. Swain (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10, 58 Cal. Rptr. 83* (untimely postjudgment motion treated as collateral attack; trial court relied on domestic relations officer's report filed in case in vacating portion of judgment); *see also Lopez v. Fancelli (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1305, 1310, 271 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; and *Plotitsa v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 755, 760* (both holding void on the face of the record a default entered without defendant's having been personally served with a statement of damages as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11*; for discussion of statement of damages, *see* discussion in *§ 489.189*)].

[3] On Foreign Judgment

When the judgment is one of either a sister state or a foreign nation, extrinsic evidence is normally admissible to show lack of jurisdiction [*De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 607 n.6, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289*], provided the foreign court did not find that the facts necessary to establish personal or subject matter jurisdiction existed [*see Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 570, 107 P.2d 36*]. That is, the judgment of the court of a sister state need not be given full faith and credit in California as to parties or property not subject to the jurisdiction of that court, unless the jurisdiction issue was fully and fairly litigated in, and finally decided by, the sister-state court. Thus, a defendant or unnamed party who was never served with summons and who never appeared in the proceedings in the sister state (the laws of which, like California, requires the service of summons and the complaint, or a voluntary appearance, for the court to acquire jurisdiction over a defendant), but whose rights were directly adjudicated therein, may attack the judgment either directly or collaterally as void for failure to obtain jurisdiction over his or her person [*St. Sava Mission Corp. v. Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1364, 1374, 273 Cal. Rptr. 340* ; *see also Estate of Pusey (1919) 180 Cal. 368, 374, 181 P. 648* (neither the doctrine of laches nor the statute of limitations applies to a collateral attack on a foreign judgment that is void for lack of jurisdiction over the defendant)]. Moreover, a foreign judgment that is void on its face is subject to collateral attack in California, as well as elsewhere, regardless of the participation of the parties in the foreign action [*Airlines Reporting Corp. v. Renda (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 14, 20-21, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66* (sister state judgment void when state did not have jurisdiction over defendant); *Aldabe v. Aldabe (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 453, 470-471, 26 Cal. Rptr. 208* (involving invalid Nevada divorce decree obtained while California divorce action was pending)].

For discussion of additional rules applicable to collateral attacks, see *§ 489.14*. For further discussion of attacks on foreign judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[4] Partial Invalidity

A judgment granting relief that the court under no circumstances had any authority to grant is to that extent void [*Vasquez v. Vasquez (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 280, 284, 240 P.2d 319*]. A judgment that appears on its face to be partially void may be properly challenged collaterally with respect to the void portion only when it can be readily severed from the valid portion as surplusage [*Harwell v. Harwell (1938) 26 Cal. App. 2d 143, 144-145, 78 P.2d 1167*]. When a default judgment is partially void for being excessive (*see* discussion in *§ 489.191*), the appellate court may strike the excess and affirm the valid portion [*National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 419, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*]. An example of a partially void judgment is a judgment based on the stipulationof the parties that awards interest in excess of that agreed to in the stipulation, although the remainder of the judgment is valid [*see Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 844-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*]. For other examples, see discussion in *§ 489.160*.

[5] Denial of Collateral Attack for Change of Position

When some parties have relied on, or changed their position in accordance with, a former judgment granting relief the court was without power to grant, a court may deny a collateral attack on the judgment [*Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 951, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941* (action by children of divorced parents against father for past child support and misappropriation of income from testamentary trust established by paternal grandfather); *In re Marriage of Maxfield (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 755, 761, 191 Cal. Rptr. 267* (contempt proceeding arising out of modification of spousal support proceeding)]. The reasoning is that if the court has jurisdiction of the subject matter and the parties, one who complains of the act is usually before the court and has the opportunity to object, or to have the judgment or order reviewed by the usual manners of direct attack. Because these methods of direct attack, such as a motion for new trial or appeal, are adequate, the aggrieved party who fails to seek them and later raises the objection by collateral attack is almost presumed to have been negligent [*Frank v. Frank (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 717, 722, 80 Cal. Rptr. 141* ; *see also Moffat v. Moffat (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 645, 657-658, 165 Cal. Rptr. 877, 612 P.2d 967*].

[6] Nonjurisdictional Errors

Nonjurisdictional errors are not subject to collateral attack. Thus, failure to state a cause of action, insufficiency of evidence, abuse of discretion, and mistake, or misapplication, of law are nonjurisdictional errors for which a collateral attack will not lie [*Armstrong v. Armstrong (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 942, 950-951, 126 Cal. Rptr. 805, 544 P.2d 941*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsFull Faith & CreditGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsCourt RecordsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.140

§ 489.140 Who May Attack Judgment

A judgment that is void on its face may be attacked either by the parties or strangers [*Forbes v. Hyde (1866) 31 Cal. 342, 347* ; *see also Ivory v. Superior Court (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 455, 461, 85 P.2d 894* ; *People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675, 77 P. 651* ; *Nagel v. P & M Distributors, Inc. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 176, 180, 78 Cal. Rptr. 65*]. It can be attacked by the parties without any showing of prejudice and by strangers to the record when the judgment, if given full effect, would injuriously affect their rights [*Mitchell v. Automobile Owners Indem. Underwriters (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 1, 7, 118 P.2d 815* ; *see also Ryerson v. Riverside Cement Co. (1968) 266 Cal.App. 2d 789, 795, 72 Cal. Rptr. 595* ; *Mumma v. Mumma (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 133, 136, 194 P.2d 24*].

Moreover, an aggrieved person may intervene (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 387*) after judgment for the purpose of vacating a void default judgment [*Johnson v. Hayes Cal Builders, Inc., 60 Cal. 2d 572, 575-576, 35 Cal. Rptr. 618, 387 P.2d 394* ; *Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 846-847, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706*]. For a discussion and forms for use in seeking intervention, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesInterventionPermissive InterventionsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.141

§ 489.141 Time Limitations When Judgment or Order Is Facially Void

A judgment that is void on its face may be attacked at any time it presents itself. It is simply a nullity, and can be neither the basis nor evidence of any right whatever [*Andrews v. Superior Court (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 208, 214-215, 174 P.2d 313* ; *Forbes v. Hyde (1866) 31 Cal. 342, 347* ; *see Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 43, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522* (judgment naming incorrect defendant void on its face and subject to attack at any time); *see also Wettstein v. Cameto (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 838, 840, 40 Cal. Rptr. 705, 395 P.2d 665* (judgment void on its face is subject to collateral attack at any time); *Ivory v. Superior Court (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 455, 461, 85 P.2d 894* (order void on its face is a nullity, assailable wherever and whenever it may be produced, and whether attack on it is direct or collateral); *Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 415, 77 P. 1007* (if it affirmatively appears on the face of the record that the court did not have jurisdiction of the defendant, its judgment is at all times open to either a direct or a collateral attack); *People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675, 77 P. 651* (holding rule also applies to void orders); *see also* discussion in *§ 489.10*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.142

§ 489.142 Time Limitations When Void Judgment Is Not Facially Void

[1] Reasonable Time

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, imposes no time limit on when a motion for relief from a void judgment or order must be made, an attack on a judgment that is void in fact, but not on its face, must be made within a reasonable time, whether the attack is made under the statute or pursuant to the court's inherent power at law to set aside void judgments and orders [*see, e.g.,* *Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 569, 571, 107 P.2d 36* ; *Morgan v. Clapp (1929) 207 Cal. 221, 224, 277 P. 490* ; *Smith v. Jones (1917) 174 Cal. 513, 515-516, 163 P. 890* ; *People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 183 P.2d 368* ; *Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 317, 112 P.2d 306*].

A motion for relief not made within a reasonable time (and not coming within the exception discussed [6][b], *below*) is subject to the rules applicable to collateral attack, which means that extrinsic evidence cannot beintroduced to show the invalidity (*see* discussion under in §§ *489.134*, and *489.14*; *see also § 489.420[1]* (form)). Any order vacating such a judgment on motion made after a reasonable time has expired is itself void on its face and is assailable wherever and whenever it may be produced, whether the attack on it is direct or collateral; and it may be set aside by the court that rendered it of its own motion at any time [*People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675-676, 77 P. 651*]. For discussion of what constitutes a reasonable time, *see* discussion under [2] and [6], *below*.

[2] Statutory Periods That Apply by Analogy

A "reasonable time" is the statutory periods set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473* and *473.5*, which apply by analogy (*see* discussion under [6], *below*).

[3] Statutory Periods

[a] Code Civ. Proc. § 473

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d), provides for correction of clerical errors and relief from void judgments and orders. No time limitation is contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*. The only time period mentioned in the statute is the six-month limitation set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, relating to relief from judgments, orders, and proceedings taken against a person through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect and to relief based on an attorney's affidavit of fault. That subdivision deals with valid judgments, orders, and proceedings [*see People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 183 P.2d 368*] and is discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq. When this limitation applies by analogy, the motion for relief must be made within six months from the date the judgment or order was entered (*see* discussion under [6], *below*).

[b] Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5

Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5 (discussed in *§ 489.70* et seq.) provides for relief from a default or default judgment entered against a party when the service of summons did not result in actual notice to the party in time to defend. This statute, like *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, deals with valid judgments [*see People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 183 P.2d 368* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a*); *see also In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 546, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* does not govern a default or default judgment obtained through fraudulent return of service of summons)].

The time limitation specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* is "a reasonable time, but in no event exceeding the earlier of [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*]:

- Two years after entry of a default judgment against him or her; or

- One hundred eighty days after service on him or her of a written notice that the default or default judgment has been entered."

Thus, when this period applies by analogy, the motion must be made within the earlier of two years or 180 days after defendant was served with notice of default or, if a default judgment has been entered, notice of the default judgment [*see* discussion under [6], *below*].

[4] Failure of Cases to Consider Interim Statutory Amendments

Since 1872, literally hundreds of cases have applied by analogy the time limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, and its statutory spinoffs, to proceedings seeking relief from void judgments and orders. However, the statute has been amended numerous times, and the cases have not always kept abreast of the changes. To avoid the confusion that has plagued the profession in the determining the applicable time limitations, counsel should be alert, in reading a case, to the wording of the statute as it existed at the time the case was decided, keeping in mind that often an appellate court, in applying the statute, cites prior case authority as support for its holding without discussing interim changes in the statutes. Moreover, from its inception and through its version as amended in 1917, courts often failed to specify which of the two periods then contained in the statute was being applied by analogy to void judgments, particularly in cases in which relief was sought more than one year after the judgment was entered.

[5] Summary of Amendments of Time Limitations

The following summary of the amendments of the time limitations imposed in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473* and *473.5* is provided to assist counsel in determining what time periods older case law is referring to when applying these statutes by analogy.

The original statute was derived from Section 68 of the Practice Act (Stats. 1851, ch. 5), that was codified in 1872 [*see First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 649, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798*]. As codified in 1872,

Code Civ. Proc. § 473 contained two time provisions:

- A reasonable time not exceeding five months after adjournment of the term for relief from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect; and

- Six months after the rendition of any judgment for relief when the summons and complaint were not "personally served on the defendant."

Subsequent amendments affecting time limits stated in Section 473 are as follows:

- In 1873-1874 legislation the five-month period relating to relief for mistake, etc. was extended to six months, and the six-month period relating to relief for lack of personal service was extended to one year.

- In 1880, the six-month period for relief for mistake, etc. was amended to be six months following the judgment, order, or proceeding, instead of six months after the adjournment of the court's term.

- As amended in 1933, and since then, *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* has contained only one time limitation, the six-month limitation governing relief from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, and excusable neglect. The one-year limitation relating to relief for failure to have personally served the defendant was moved to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*). Nevertheless, some courts continued to cite the time limitation in *Section 473*, whether applying the six-month or the one-year limitation.

- In 1969, former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a* was repealed and replaced by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, which contains a single time limitation (the shorter of two periods, discussed under [3][b], *above*).

[6] Application of Statutory Periods That Apply by Analogy

[a] Rule

What constitutes a reasonable time for seeking relief at law from an order or judgment void in fact but not void on its face is either:

- The time limitation specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, which applies by analogy when the invalidity of the judgment or order resulted from the improper service or nonservice of summons, or other required notice [*Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1123-1124, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 183 P.2d 368* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a*, the predecessor to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*); *Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 317, 112 P.2d 306* (same); *see also, e.g.,* *Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 571, 107 P.2d 36* (involving predecessor statute); *Morgan v. Clapp (1929) 207 Cal. 221, 224, 277 P. 490* (same); *Smith v. Jones (1917) 174 Cal. 513, 516, 163 P. 890* (same)]. The period specified is a reasonable time not exceeding the earlier of two years after entry of the default judgment or 180 days after the defendant was served with a written notice that the default or default judgment has been entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*]. The period starts running from the date the judgment, rather than the default, was entered [*Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1126, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *see also, e.g.,* *Morgan v. Clapp (1929) 207 Cal. 221, 224, 277 P. 490* (involving predecessor statute)]. The "reasonable time" requirement is separate from the two-year limit set forth in Code*Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, and thus, although the court has jurisdiction to set aside the judgment within the two year period, a party bringing the motion within that period must demonstrate a satisfactory excuse for the default and diligence in making the motion after discovery of the default [*see* *Schenkel v. Resnik (1994) 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 60*]. Neither the actual notice provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)* nor the affidavit

requirement set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b)* applies to a motion for relief from a void judgment [*see In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 546, 554-555, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411* and *Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1124, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* , respectively]; or,

- In all other cases, the six-month limitation set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, which applies by analogy [*see, e.g., Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 569, 127 P.2d 909* ; *Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 571, 107 P.2d 36* ; *Consolidated Const. Co. v. Pacific E. Ry. Co. (1920) 184 Cal. 244, 247-248, 193 P. 238* ; *see also, e.g., Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625* (default judgment claimed to have been entered by trial court in excess of its jurisdiction)]. The six-month period, that is, the 182 days allowed, in the case of a default judgment, is calculated from the time the default, and not the judgment, was entered [*National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 416, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*], unless, of course, the attack is limited simply to vacating the default judgment.

[b] Exception to Rule

The rule that relief must be sought within a reasonable time does not apply to an untimely motion when the party in whose favor the judgment or order runs admits facts showing the invalidity of the judgment or order, or, without objection on his or her part, evidence is admitted that clearly shows the existence of those facts. The situation is the same as when the judgment is void on its face, and it is the duty of the court to declare the judgment or order void [*Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 569-570, 127 P.2d 909* ; *see also Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 372-373, 217 P.2d 951*].

For example, a judgment that is valid on its face cannot be impeached on an untimely motion by evidence showing that the summons was not served if the evidence is objected to, but if evidence to that effect is admitted without objection, or the parties stipulate or admit that in fact summons was not served, it is the court's duty to declare the judgment void as a matter of law on the admitted facts [*Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 570, 127 P.2d 909*].

[7] Effect of Motion Not Made Within Reasonable Time

A motion made after expiration of a reasonable time is governed by the rules applicable to collateral attack, which means that the motion must be determined on the judgment roll alone; extrinsic evidence cannot be produced to show the invalidity, and without extrinsic evidence, the invalidity cannot be shown [*see Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 40, 152 P.2d 625* ; *Borenstein v. Borenstein (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 379, 381, 125 P.2d 465* ; *see also Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1588, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112*]. The rule is not that a void judgment will be enforced as though valid, but, rather, that it cannot be shown to be void except in certain ways [*Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 570, 127 P.2d 909*].

[8] Alternative Relief in Equity

Although relief from a void judgment that is not void on its face may be barred at law because not timely sought within the specified periods, relief might still be available either by an equitable motion in the same action or by an independent action in equity to have the judgment or order declared void on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake if those grounds exist [*see Smith v. Jones (1917) 174 Cal. 513, 517-518, 163 P. 890* ; *People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675, 77 P. 651* ; *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 180-181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563* ; *Olivia v. Suglio (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 7, 9, 293 P.2d 63* ; *see also People v. One 1941 Chrysler Sedan (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21-22, 183 P.2d 368* (when motion is not made within reasonable time, party is relegated to action in equity)]. Resort to equity requires that the moving party establish a meritorious defense to the action in which the allegedly void judgment was entered [*see, e.g., Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554, 305 P.2d 20* ; *Cromwell v. Heward (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 88, 90, 337 P.2d 151*]. For further discussion of equitable relief, see *§ 489.220* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to AdjudicateGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.143

§ 489.143 Affidavit of Merits Not Required

No affidavit or declaration of merits is required to support a motion for relief at law from a judgment on the ground that it is void on its face [*Montgomery v. Norman (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 855, 858, 262 P.2d 360*] or from a judgment that is void in fact, although not void on its face [*Norton v. Atchison, T., & S. F. R. Co. (1893) 97 Cal. 388, 390-392, 32 P. 452* (false return of service filed); *see also County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 112 . 183 Cal. Rptr. 741* (if judgment is void, it must be set aside and no affidavit of merits or other showing of a defense is required); *Mattison v. Lichlyter (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 60, 62, 327 P.2d 599* (no affidavit of merits required on motion for relief from default judgment rendered in action in which defendant was immune to service when summons was served); *Shelley v. Casa De Oro, Ltd. (1933) 133 Cal. App. 720, 722, 24 P.2d 900* (no affidavit of merits required on motion for relief from default judgment when defendant was never served with process and purported appearance on its behalf by attorney was unauthorized); *Steuri v. Junkin (1931) 113 Cal. App. 553, 556, 298 P. 828* (default prematurely entered after defendant had been granted extension of time to plead)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.144

§ 489.144 Showing of Meritorious Defense or Case

If the judgment is void on its face, no showing of a meritorious case, that is, a good claim or defense, by the party moving for relief is required because the judgment may be attacked collaterally [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554, 305 P.2d 20*], and may be set aside by the court on its own motion [*see, e.g., Montgomery v. Norman (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 855, 858, 262 P.2d 360*]. Nor is a meritorious defense required to be shown on a motion to set aside a judgment that is valid on its face but void in fact [*see County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 112, 183 Cal. Rptr. 741* ; *Mattison v. Lichlyter (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 60, 65, 327 P.2d 599* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (authorizing relief from void judgments and orders and, unlike *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b),* imposing no requirement that a proposed pleading accompany the motion)].

Moreover, the United States Supreme Court has held that to require the showing of a meritorious defense on a defendant's motion for relief from a default judgment in an action in which the trial court never acquired personal jurisdiction over the defendant, that is, when the judgment is void for lack of personal jurisdiction, would violate procedural due process and cannot constitutionally be required [*see Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 84-87, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*].

For discussion of the rule that applies when relief is sought in equity and the impact of *Peralta* on that rule, see *§ 489.264*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
1. Attacking Void Judgments and Orders Generally

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.145-489.159

[Reserved]

§§ 489.145[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.160

§ 489.160 Types of Void Judgments and Orders Generally

Examples of void judgments are listed below. The defects illustrated may apply to any type of judgment, including defaults and default judgments. Defects unique to defaults and default judgments are illustrated under *§ 489.180 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.161

§ 489.161 No Subject Matter Jurisdiction

A judgment of a court lacking subject matter jurisdiction of the action is void (*see discussion under § 489.132*). A court is without subject matter jurisdiction when it lacks power to adjudicate the matter in question. For discussion of the subject matter jurisdiction of the California courts, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

However, a court may not, after the time for appeal has passed, set aside a judgment or order on the ground that the court lacked jurisdiction, when the facts establishing such jurisdiction were found by the court in the original proceedings, and all adverse parties were properly served with notice and had the opportunity to present their objections [*Estate of Estrem (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 563, 569-570, 572, 107 P.2d 36* (probate court had found that facts establishing subject matter jurisdiction existed)]. Thus, a determination of subject matter jurisdiction by the trial court may become res judicata [*Perry v. Farley Bros. Moving & Storage, Inc. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 884, 888, 86 Cal. Rptr. 397*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.162

§ 489.162 No Personal Jurisdiction

[1] Improper Service of Summons

Unless the defendant makes a general appearance [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(a)*], proper service of the summons is a requirement for a court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over the defendant [*Caldwell v. Coppola (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 859, 863, 268 Cal. Rptr. 453* ; *Slaughter v. Legal Process & Courier Service (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1236, 1251, 209 Cal. Rptr. 189*]. Absent such jurisdiction, a court's judgment is void [*see Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667-668, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* (judgment rendered without legal service of process or legal notice to defendant is properly challenged in equity, and divorce secured some 46 years prior to husband's death through husband's extrinsic fraud was void for lack of notice to wife); *Sternbeck v. Buck (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 829, 832, 834, 307 P.2d 970* (involving attack on judgment by independent action in equity); *see also In re Abrams (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 685, 693, 166 Cal. Rptr. 749*]. Thus, a judgment rendered in a case in which the summons was served by plaintiff, in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 414.10*, and a false return of service was filed, is void [*see In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 545-546, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411*]. The same is true of an order directed against a defendant over whom the court has not acquired jurisdiction [*Caldwell v. Coppola (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 859, 863, 268 Cal. Rptr. 453* (noting that under *Code Civ. Proc. § 414.10*, a party to an action is prohibited from personally serving the defendant)].

Moreover, service of a substantially defective summons does not confer jurisdiction over a party and will not support a default judgment [*MJS Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 555, 557, 200 Cal. Rptr. 286* , citing *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.30*, which prohibits entry of default when statutorily required notices are not contained in summons served)].

[2] Nonresident Defendant

Personal jurisdiction is lacking with respect to a nonresident defendant who does not appear in the case and lacks sufficient contacts with California to permit the state's exercise of in personam jurisdiction over him or her, even if a summons was properly served on him or her [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Merideth (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 356,*

361-363, 180 Cal. Rptr. 909 ; *see also Great-West Life Assurance Co. v. Guarantee Co. of North America (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 199, 205, 252 Cal. Rptr. 363* ; for a discussion of the bases for in personam jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant, *see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*].

[3] Effect of Failure to File Summons and Proof of Service

The summons, together with its proof of service (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10, 417.20, 417.40*), must be returned to the court (that is, returned for filing) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30(a)*], and they form a part of the judgment roll [*Code Civ. Proc. § 670*, discussed in *§ 489.136*]. Historically, the absence from the judgment roll of the summons with its proof of service rendered the judgment void on its face [*see, e.g., Pearson v. Superior Court (1932) 122 Cal. App. 571, 574-575, 10 P.2d 489*].

However, a default judgment, at least one entered by the court (as opposed to the clerk) under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(b)*, is valid if based on actual service of summons on the defendant, even though no proof of service is filed prior to the entry of judgment. The modern rule is that a judgment based on a late return of summons is irregular, but is not void [*National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 416, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113* ; *see also Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1589, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112*]. Thus, contrary to former case law, a default judgment is not void on its face when the judgment roll contains no proof of service of summons and, consequently, is not subject to collateral attack [*National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 415-416, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsLegal EthicsSanctionsSuspensions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.163

§ 489.163 Service of Papers on Suspended Attorney

The service of interrogatories or discovery motions on a party's attorney who has been suspended from practice may render any subsequent dismissal or default judgment entered for failure to respond void. For example,it has been held that the dismissal of an action because plaintiff failed to answer interrogatories is void, and may be set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, when, unknown to plaintiff, plaintiff's attorney had been suspended from practice and no longer represented plaintiff at the time the interrogatories were mailed to him, the attorney failed to notify the client of them, and defendants failed, before moving for dismissal, to give plaintiff written notice to appoint another attorney or to appear in person, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 286* [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 742, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

Likewise, it has been held that a default judgment taken against a defendant for failure to respond to interrogatories and discovery motions, of which defendant had neither actual nor constructive notice, is void under the due process clause of the federal constitution (*U.S. Const., amend. XIV*) when the interrogatories and discovery motions were served on defendant's attorney after he had been suspended from the practice of law and the attorney failed to notify defendant of them [*Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 553-554, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsLegal EthicsSanctionsSuspensions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.164

§ 489.164 Judgment After Trial Without Notice to Nonappearing Party

A judgment made after a trial held without giving the five-day (now 15-day) notice prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(1)* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*], is not merely error, it is an act in excess of the court's jurisdiction (*see* discussion in *§ 489.130*), and is not only subject to attack under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, but is subject to collateral attack at any time [*Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 577-578, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309* (referring to what was then fourth paragraph of Section 473)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.165

§ 489.165 Judgment Against Dissolved Corporation

A judgment rendered against a corporation that was dissolved before the action was filed is void [*Traub Co. v. Coffee Break Service, Inc. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 368, 370, 57 Cal. Rptr. 846, 425 P.2d 790*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.166

§ 489.166 Judgment by Disqualified Judge

[1] For Financial Interest or Bias

A judgment rendered by a judge in a case in which he or she is disqualified under *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1 et seq.* (relating to disqualification of judges, court commissioners, and referees, generally on the ground of a financial interest in the case or bias) from sitting is absolutely void, whether or not it correctly decided the case [*Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy (1932) 6 P.2d 944* (equitable action attacking judgment; decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 170*); *see also Giometti v. Etienne (1934) 219 Cal. 687, 689, 28 P.2d 913* (order granting hearing in Supreme Court signed by four of seven justices held void when one of the justices signing the order was related to petitioners' counsel and thereby disqualified); *Lindsay-Strathmore I. Dist. v. Superior Court (1920) 182 Cal. 315, 333-336, 187 P. 1056* (issuing writ of prohibition to restrain judge who had slight interest in matter in litigation from proceeding to try matter)].

Although courts applying the former disqualification statutes generally held that a judgment or order rendered by a disqualified judge is void whenever brought into question, it has been said that the theory on which the rule rests is not clearly stated in the decisions and that the proposition itself is not uniformly accepted in its broadest form by all of them [*Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 415, 423-424, 285 Cal. Rptr. 659* (citing Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Courts*, § 74 (3d ed. 1985))]. In *Urias*, the court said the problem was really one of excess of jurisdiction and that the actions of a disqualified judge are not void in any fundamental sense but at most voidable if properly raised by an interested party [*Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 415, 424, 285 Cal. Rptr. 659* (citing Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Courts*, §§ 75, 76 (3d ed. 1985))].

For discussion and forms for use in having a judge disqualified for cause from hearing a case, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[2] Showing Required

A party seeking to have a judgment declared void on the ground that the judge was disqualified must allege and prove facts that clearly show that the disqualification existed [*Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 415, 424, 285 Cal. Rptr. 659* (citing *Wickoff v. James (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 664, 670, 324 P.2d 661* , and holding that a

summary judgment granted by a disqualified judge before the judge's disqualification was discovered by the affected party is "voidable" if the unsuccessful party properly raises the disqualification issue and alleges facts that show the judge was disqualified to hear the case)].

[3] Time Limitation

The time within which a judgment rendered by a judge in a case in which he or she is disqualified may be challenged is not clear under the case law.

In *Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy (1932) 214 Cal. 562, 6 P.2d 944* , the Supreme Court said the objection to the disqualification of a trial judge by reason of his or her interest in the subject matter of the suit may be made at any time before the judgment becomes final [*Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy (1932) 214 Cal. 562, 569, 6 P.2d 944* ; *see also Caminetti v. Pac.Mutual L. Ins. Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 386, 390-392, 139 P.2d 930* (requirement that disqualification be raised at earliest practicable opportunity after discovery lest it be deemed waived)]. The Court expressed no opinion, however, as to whether an action to vacate the judgment would lie after judgment became final [*Cadenasso v. Bank of Italy (1932) 214 Cal. 562, 569, 6 P.2d 944*]. In *T.P.B. v. Superior Court (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 881, 136 Cal. Rptr. 311* , a prohibition proceeding in which a juvenile unsuccessfully attempted to prevent a new trial on the ground of double jeopardy after the trial judge had declared a mistrial because of the judge's bias in the case, the appellate court, citing *Cadenasso* among other cases, said, in support of its conclusion that declaring the mistrial was a matter of legal necessity and therefore did not prevent a new trial, that any act of a disqualified judge in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 170* (repealed; *now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 170-170.8*) is absolutely void whenever brought into question and a judgment rendered by such a judge is open to attack at any time [*T.P.B. v. Superior Court (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 881, 885-886, 136 Cal. Rptr. 311* ; *see also Lindsay-Strathmore I. Dist. v. Superior Court (1920) 182 Cal. 315, 333, 187 P. 1056*].

However, in *Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 415, 285 Cal. Rptr. 659* , an action for wrongful termination in which the newly appointed judge who granted the defendant's motion for summary judgment had been a member of the law firm that for many years had handled the defendant employer's legal business (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(2)(A)*), which fact the plaintiff did not discover until after the judgment was entered, the appellate court, in reversing the summary judgment, said: (1) the rule that applies when the facts constituting disqualification are discovered before a case is submitted for decision is that the matter of disqualification should be raised when the facts constituting the grounds for disqualification are first discovered and, in any event, before the matter involved is submitted for decision; and (2) when the grounds for disqualification are not discovered until after judgment is entered, a statement of the disqualification is timely if submitted at the earliest practicable opportunity after the disqualifying facts are discovered [*Urias v. Harris Farms, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 415, 424-425, 285 Cal. Rptr. 659*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsFinancial InterestsCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsPersonal BiasCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.167

§ 489.167 Judgment Rendered by Commissioner Acting as Temporary Judge Without Stipulation of Parties

The order or judgment of a commissioner acting as a temporary judge is void when the defendant refused to stipulate to the commissioner's deciding the matter [*Reisman v. Shahverdian (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1074, 1087, 1094-1097, 201 Cal. Rptr. 194* ; *see also* *Rooney v. Vermont Investment Corp. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 351, 359-360, 372, 110 Cal. Rptr. 353, 515 P.2d 297*]. In *Reisman*, the appellate court upheld the commissioner's judgment for the plaintiff when the plaintiff had stipulated to the commissioner's acting as a temporary judge on the plaintiff's petition for confirmation of an arbitration award. The defendant failed to file any response to the petition or to appear at the hearing. Consequently, the commissioner could properly hear the matter as an uncontested one (*see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 259(7)*) even though the defendant did not stipulate to the commissioner's hearing the matter. However, the court held that the subsequent order by the commissioner denying the defendant's motion under what is now *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, to vacate that allegedly void judgment, although not an ancillary proceeding, was void because the defendant refused to stipulate to the commissioner's hearing the motion and had not stipulated to his hearing the petition for confirmation of the arbitration award [*Reisman v. Shahverdian (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 1074, 1097, 201 Cal. Rptr. 194*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsSpecial Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
2. Types of Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.168-489.179

[Reserved]

§§ 489.168[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.180

§ 489.180 Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments Generally

The defects noted above *in § 489.160* et seq. can apply to any type of judgment, including defaults and default judgments. Some defects are unique to defaults and default judgments, however, and these are discussed below.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.181

§ 489.181 Premature Entry

A court clerk is not authorized to enter a default or a default judgment (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a)*) until the time for appearance has expired, and if the clerk enters such a judgment prematurely, the judgment is void [*Bristol Convalescent Hosp. v. Stone (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 848, 862, 66 Cal. Rptr. 404* ; *Montgomery v. Norman (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 855, 858, 262 P.2d 360*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.182

§ 489.182 Unauthorized Entry of Default Judgment by Clerk

Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a) authorizes the clerk to enter a default judgment only in an action based on a contract or judgment for money or damages in which the amount appears in or may be mathematically calculated from the contract or judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a)* (may also deduct admitted credits, and add attorney's fees according to court schedule); *Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 524, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*]. The clerk has no power to enter the judgment if the determinationof damages involves any discretion or the taking of any evidence [*Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 524, 526, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*]. A default judgment entered by a court clerk who lacks power under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a)* to enter the judgment is void on the face of the record and subject to being set aside at any time, although the invalidity of the judgment does not affect the preceding default [*Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 524, 526, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633* (applying former *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(1)*; clerk-entered judgment void when action required determination of reasonable value of services)].

While a default judgment will not normally be set aside when the default cannot be set aside because the plaintiff could immediately have a judgment of like effect entered, this does not apply to a default judgment that is void on the face of the record because of its unauthorized entry by the clerk; in that case, when the judgment is set aside, the plaintiff must apply to the court for a judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(b)* in the amount justified by the complaint [*Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 526, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.183

§ 489.183 Responsive Pleading on File

A default judgment entered when an answer or demurrer is on file is void [*Johns v. Mongan (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 94, 97, 11 Cal. Rptr. 673* ; *see also* *Stevens v. Torregano (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 105, 112, 13 Cal. Rptr. 604* ; *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 45, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* (judgment void when clerk entered default despite presence of letters to court in file that were, in substance, an answer to plaintiff's petition)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.184

§ 489.184 Defendant's Failure to Appear at Trial

When a defendant has filed an answer, neither the clerk nor the court has the power to enter a default based on the defendant's failure to appear at trial. A default entered under those circumstances is void and is subject to expungement at any time either by motion made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, or by virtue of the court's inherent power to vacate a judgment or order void on its face [*Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 577, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to AdjudicateGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.185

§ 489.185 Removal and Remand of Case

The entry of a defendant's default by a court clerk for failure to file a responsive pleading is "voidable" under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, if, after the action was removed to federal court, the defendant filed a motion to dismiss, and the federal court remanded the case to the state court. Entry of default is improper because a motion to dismiss in federal court is equivalent to a demurrer in state court, and a demurrer is a pleading that prevents the clerk's entry of default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585* [*Laguna Village, Inc. v. Laborers' Internat. Union of North America (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 174, 182, 197 Cal. Rptr. 99, 672 P.2d 882* (applying former Section 473)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemovalPostremoval RemandsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to DismissCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.186

§ 489.186 Judgment Based on Void Order for Publication of Summons or Substituted Service

When an order for publication of the summons is void because the affidavit on which it is based is insufficient, the default and default judgment entered and rendered on the basis of the service made pursuant to that order are likewise void on their face, are subject to direct or collateral attack, and should be set aside [*see Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 41, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271* ; *Sanford v. Smith (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 991, 999, 90 Cal. Rptr. 256*]. The same rule applies to a default and default judgment based on substituted service made pursuant to an insufficient affidavit and a void order for substituted service [*Sanford v. Smith (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 991, 999, 90 Cal. Rptr. 256*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPublicationCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultEntry of Default JudgmentsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.187

§ 489.187 Failure to Serve Amended Complaint Increasing Damages or Relief Sought

When a defendant has failed to appear in an action, service of an amended complaint to increase the amount of damages or relief sought, in the manner provided for service of summons, while not necessarily a requirement for personal jurisdiction, is an essential prerequisite to a valid default judgment for the increased amount [*Engebretson & Co. v. Harrison (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 436, 443, 178 Cal. Rptr. 77* (involving attack on default and default judgment by independent action in equity in which appellate court affirmed judgment setting aside default judgment but not default); *see also Leo v. Dunlap (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 24, 27, 66 Cal. Rptr. 888*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From Default

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.188

§ 489.188 Failure to Respond to Amended Complaint

A default judgment entered for failure to answer an amended complaint when an answer to the original complaint was filed, is void if the amendment was in regard to mere formal or immaterial matters and did not change the cause of action [*Gray v. Hall (1928) 203 Cal. 306, 310-311, 265 P. 246* (nevertheless holding default judgment before it was not void on its face and not subject to collateral attack in mandate proceeding brought to enforce compliance with judgment); *see also Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 808-811, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.189

§ 489.189 Failure to Give Notice of Damages Claimed

[1] Statement of Damages

A complaint brought in superior court to recover actual or punitive damages for personal injury or wrongful death is not to state the amount of damages sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*]. Before taking default, the plaintiff must serve a statement of damages on the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11(c)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 580* (if there is no answer, relief is limited to that demanded in complaint, Section 425.11 statement of damages, or *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115* statement regarding punitive damages)].

Any default or subsequent default judgment entered without the statement of damages having been given is in excess of the court's jurisdiction [*see Petty v. Manpower, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 794, 797-798, 156 Cal. Rptr. 622* ; *see also Jones v. Interstate Recovery Service (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 925, 929-930, 206 Cal. Rptr. 924*] and void [*Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 303, 232 Cal. Rptr. 758* ; *see also Stevenson v. Turner (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 315, 318-320, 156 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; and discussion in *§ 489.130*].

For discussion of the sufficiency of a *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* statement of damages and service of the statement prior to taking a default, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* . For the procedure and a form of statement, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

[2] Punitive Damages

No claim for exemplary, or punitive, damages may state the amount [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*]. Under *Section 3295(e)*, neither the body nor the prayer of a complaint for damages may state the amount of punitive damages claimed in any action in any court [*Wiley v. Rhodes (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1470, 1472, 273 Cal. Rptr. 279*]. However, a default judgment greater than the amount specifically demanded is void as beyond the court's jurisdiction [*see Greenup v. Rodman (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 822, 826, 231 Cal. Rptr. 220, 726 P.2d 1295* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 580* (if there is no answer, relief is limited to that demanded in complaint, Section 425.11 statement of damages, or Section 425.115 statement regarding punitive damages); for further discussion, *see § 489.191*]. A general allegation of entitlement to

punitive damages in a complaint does not apprise the defendant of his or her potential financial liability for those damages if judgment is taken by default, and an award of punitive damages without prior notice of the amount claimed contravenes due process and is, in effect, void [*Wiley v. Rhodes (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1470, 1472, 273 Cal. Rptr. 279* (reversing judgment to extent it awarded punitive damages)].

If the plaintiff wishes to obtain punitive damages as part of a default judgment, the plaintiff, before taking the default, must serve a statement preserving the right to seek punitive damages in a stated amount [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115*]. For discussion and a form of statement, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsRemediesAward CalculationsTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsRemediesPunitive Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.190

[Reserved]

§ 489.190[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.191

§ 489.191 Award in Excess of Demand or For Relief Not Requested

[1] When No Answer Was Filed

The relief granted to a plaintiff when the defendant does not answer cannot exceed the relief the plaintiff demanded in the complaint, in the *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* statement of damages, or in the *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115* statement preserving the right to punitive damages [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 580* deprives a trial court of jurisdiction to enter a judgment against a defaulting defendant that awards greater relief than that sought in the plaintiff's complaint [*In re Marriage of Lippel (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1160, 1167, 276 Cal. Rptr. 290, 801 P.2d 1041* ; for discussionof the statement of damages, *see § 489.189*; *see also Damele v. Mack Trucks, Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 29, 39-41, 267 Cal. Rptr. 197*].

A default judgment in excess of the amount prayed for is void [*Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 322, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615* ; *see also Ely v. Gray (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1257, 1260, 274 Cal. Rptr. 536* (noting that issue may be raised for first time on appeal from judgment)]. The judgment is subject to collateral, as well as to direct, attack [*see Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 492-493, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915* ; *In re Marriage of Lippel (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1160, 1163, 276 Cal. Rptr. 290, 801 P.2d 1041*]. The same is true with respect to a default judgment on a cross complaint [*see Swycaffer v. Swycaffer (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 689, 692-693, 285 P.2d 1*].

A default judgment is in excess of the court's jurisdiction and void if it grants relief of a kind essentially different from that which a defaulting defendant would reasonably anticipate from reading the complaint [*Gudarov v. Hadjieff (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 412, 417, 240 P.2d 621*], or that exceeds the demand of the complaint (or the statement of damages when the amount of damages cannot be alleged), or gives relief when no demand for it was made [*Burtnett v. King (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 805, 807, 205 P.2d 657* ; *Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 848, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706*].

The judgment is void only as to the excess amount or relief granted [*see Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27*

Cal. 3d 489, 495, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915 (default judgment awarding damages void only to extent of amount in excess of that stated in prayer); *see also Greenup v. Rodman (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 822, 829-830, 231 Cal. Rptr. 220, 726 P.2d 1295* (default judgment reduced to amount claimed in complaint); *Wiley v. Rhodes (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1470, 1473-1475, 273 Cal. Rptr. 279* (reversing portions of default judgment awarding punitive damages when defendant was not given notice of amount claimed and awarding attorney's fees as costs when complaint did not demand those costs and complaint did not allege any contract authorizing them); *Brown v. McAdoo (1987) 242 Cal. Rptr. 473* (default judgment proper in municipal court action when prayer sought damages according to proof but remitted sums exceeding court's jurisdiction)].

A default judgment that exceeds the demand for compensatory damages cannot be justified by a demand for punitive damages that remains unexhausted [*Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 494-495, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915* ; *see also Olvera v. Olvera (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 32, 36 n.4, 283 Cal. Rptr. 271*]. A prayer for compensatory damages in an amount less than that alleged in the body of the complaint will control [*Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 305,232 Cal. Rptr. 758* (reducing amount awarded in default judgment for compensatory damages to amount claimed in the prayer although the amount of general damages alleged in the body of the complaint far exceeded that amount)].

[2] Applicability to Cases in Which Amount Claimed Is Not Normally Alleged in Complaint

The restriction of relief granted to that demanded in the complaint applies even to cases in which an amount claimed is not normally, by the nature of the action, specified in the complaint. For example, in an action for dissolution of partnerships and an accounting when the amount due is unliquidated and unascertained, it has been held that a default judgment awarding a sum of money of which no prior notice as to the amount was given to the defendant was in excess of the trial court's jurisdiction [*Ely v. Gray (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1257, 1260-1261, 274 Cal. Rptr. 536*]. By analogy to personal injury or wrongful death cases in which the amount claimed cannot be stated in the complaint but must be stated in a statement of damages served personally on the defendant before his or her default can be entered, the court held that the plaintiff who seeks an accounting has the solution of a postcomplaint and predefault notice to the defendant of the amount plaintiff will seek to prove due if the defendant defaults, and that, as with the statement of damages required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11*, the notice must be given with adequate time for the defendant to respond before a default is entered [*Ely v. Gray (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1257, 1263-1264, 274 Cal. Rptr. 536* (affirming portion of judgment dissolving partnerships and reversing that portion awarding a specified sum on the accounting); decided before *Section 425.11* was amended by Stats. 1993, ch. 456, to provide specific notice period); for discussion of *Section 425.11, see § 489.189*].

[3] Applicability to Default After Answer Filed

The restriction of relief granted to that demanded in the complaint applies whether the default occurred before or after an answer is filed [*see Greenup v. Rodman (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 822, 826-829, 231 Cal. Rptr. 220, 726 P.2d 1295* (answer stricken for refusal to comply with discovery orders and matter continued as default proceeding); *see also Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 847-848, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706* (involving motion by plaintiff's and cross defendant's surety to intervene after judgment to vacate judgment when plaintiff failed to appear at trial and judgment was entered against it on complaint and cross complaint)]. That is, the principles apply to defaultsand uncontested proceedings other than to those consisting of the failure of a defendant to file a responsive pleading.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid

JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
3. Types of Void Defaults and Default Judgments

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.192-489.199

[Reserved]

§§ 489.192[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.200

§ 489.200 Motion for Relief

[1] From Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

A judgment that is void on its face may be attacked anywhere, anytime, in any action or proceeding (*see* discussions in *§§ 489.137* and *489.141*). Hence, such a judgment may be attacked directly, as by motion in the court that rendered the judgment, or collaterally in any court. The actions and proceedings in which collateral attacks have been made are varied and not susceptible to being reduced to a standard form. For examples of actions and proceedings in which collateral attacks have been made, see discussion in *§ 489.14[3]*.

[2] From Judgment Void in Fact But Not on Face

A judgment or order that is void in fact but not on its face may be attacked directly only (*see* discussion in *§ 489.137*). Relief may thus be obtained by a motion in the court that rendered the judgment pursuant either to the court's inherent power at law, or pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (*see* discussion in *§ 489.131*).

If a judgment or order is void in fact but not on its face because it was obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake, it may also be attacked by an equitable motion or independent action in equity. For relief in equity, *see § 489.220* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.201

§ 489.201 Notice of Motion

[1] Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

The power of a court to vacate a judgment or order void on its face is not extinguished by a lapse of time, but may be exercised whenever the matter is brought to the court's attention [*see Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 43-47, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522* (judgment naming incorrect defendant void on its face and subject to attack at any time)]. While a motion to vacate is entirely appropriate, neither a motion nor notice to an adverse party is essential. The court has full power to take such action on its own motion and without any application having been made on the part of anyone [*People v. Davis (1904) 143 Cal. 673, 675-676, 77 P. 651* (affirming order, made apparently on ex parte application, vacating prior void-on-its-face order made on untimely motion that vacated and set aside default and default judgment that were not void on their face); *see also People v. Glimps (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 315, 325, 155 Cal. Rptr. 230* (quoting *Davis, above*)]. *Glimps* involved appeals from denial of the People's motions, notice of which was served on one but not the other of two defendants, to vacate orders sealing records on the ground the court lacked jurisdiction to make the orders and that the orders were therefore void. The appellate court said that a sealing order made without legislative authority is in excess of the court's jurisdiction. When this fact appears from the record, it is void (on its face) and the court that made the order must set it aside on motion at any time after its entry. Therefore, the order denying the motion (with respect to the defendant who was served with a notice of the motion) must be reversed. The same result must be reached (as to the defendant who was not served with notice) since, though a motion with notice is appropriate in the case of a void judgment, notice to the adverse party is not essential; the court has full power to vacate a void order without any application on the part of anyone [*People v. Glimps (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 315, 321, 155 Cal. Rptr. 230* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.131*].

[2] Judgment or Order Not Void on Its Face

A motion to set aside a void judgment or order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, is expressly required by that statute to be noticed.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to Adjudicate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.202

§ 489.202 Supporting Papers

[1] Affidavits or Declarations

The invalidity of a judgment or order that is void on its face must appear from the judgment roll or from some other document filed or of record in the case, and, hence, extrinsic evidence is not required, or permitted, to show its invalidity (*see* discussion in *§ 489.134*). If extrinsic evidence is required, then the judgment or order is not void on its face. Therefore, on a motion to set aside or vacate a judgment or order that is void on its face, no supporting affidavit or declaration is prepared. However, counsel should request that the court take judicial notice of the judgment or order and the judgment roll, or, if the invalidity is disclosed by some other paper or report filed in the action, that particular paper or report. For matters subject to judicial notice and the manner of requesting it, *see Evid. Code §§ 452(d), 453*.

If the judgment or order is not void on its face but is void in fact, extrinsic evidence is required to show the invalidity. This evidence is normally set out in one or more supporting affidavits (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2009* (affidavits authorized on motions)) or declarations under penalty of perjury (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) swearing to or signed by the person having personal knowledge of the particular facts [*see § 489.420[1]* (form ofdeclaration supporting motion to set aside void judgment or order); *see also* discussions in *§ 489.360[1]* (form of declaration in support of motion for relief based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable nelgect) and in §§ *489.134*, *489.138*, and *489.139*].

[2] Supporting Memorandum

Whether the judgment or order is void on its face or void in fact but not on its face, a memorandum should be prepared. It must be prepared and submitted if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motions Rules [*Cal. Rules of Ct., 3.1100 et seq.*], as is a motion, for example, to set aside a default judgment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*], or if local court rule so requires.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.203

§ 489.203 Service and Filing of Moving Papers

On a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, all moving and supporting papers must be served and filed at least 16 court days before the time appointed for the hearing, but if service is by mail, the required 16-day period of notice is increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and place of address are in California, 10 calendar days if either the place of mailing or place of address is outside California but in the United States, and 20 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside the United States. If notice is served by fax, Express Mail, or other overnight delivery method, the 16-day period is extended by two calendar days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(13), (b)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.204

§ 489.204 Service and Filing of Opposing and Reply Papers

Opposing papers must be filed and served at least 9 court days, and all reply papers at least five court days, before the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(13), (b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.205

§ 489.205 Who Must Be Served

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d), requires that notice be given to "the other party," that is, to the adverse party. This includes all persons who may be affected by the order sought, including any codefendants [*Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 319, 112 P.2d 306*]. Hence, the notice of motion and its supporting papers must be served on all parties who may be adversely affected by the granting of the relief sought. The failure to serve any such party will render void as to that party any order granting the relief sought [*see Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 319, 112 P.2d 306*].

Service of papers must be made on the party's attorney in the action, if any, or, if none, on the party [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011, 1012, 1015*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders
4. Motion for Relief From Void Judgment or Order

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.206-489.219

[Reserved]

§§ 489.206[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.220

§ 489.220 Nature of Attack in Equity

An equitable attack on a judgment or order, whether by motion in the same action or by a separate action in equity, is a direct attack on the judgment or order [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20* (action in equity); *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 122 P.2d 564* (same); *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal App. 2d 178, 183, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563* (equitable motion); *see also Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 415, 77 P. 1007* (action in equity to quiet nonresident plaintiff's title to real property as against resident defendant and to set aside former judgment in favor of defendant quieting his title against, among others, plaintiff, in which it was shown that judgment rendered in prior action was fraudulently procured as to plaintiff); *People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 123, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246* (action in equity to vacate collusive judgment); and *§ 489.11*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.221

§ 489.221 Judgments Subject to Equitable Attack

In the exercise of its equity jurisdiction, a court can in a proper case set aside or modify any otherwise valid final judgment on the ground of extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake (*defined in § 489.241* et seq.), or a void judgment [*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 470-471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Melone (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 757, 762, 238 Cal. Rptr. 510* ; *Stiles v. Wallis (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1147, 195 Cal. Rptr. 377*]. A court may also grant relief from a default judgment forfeiting real property on which drug trafficking had occurred [*People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 582-583, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* ; *see § 489.263[3*]]. For discussion and examples of void judgments, see *§ 489.130* et seq.

In addition, a court always retains the inherent power at law or in equity to vacate a judgment obtained through fraud [*In re Olivia A. (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 237, 242-243, 226 Cal. Rptr. 382* ; *Holt v. Parmer (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 329, 331, 235 P.2d 43*]. For when a judgment procured by a fraud on the court may be attacked, see discussion in *§§ 489.133* and *489.223*. Because courts have power both at law and in equity to vacateand set aside void judgments, cases in equity may be cited in cases at law, and vice versa, to the extent that they identify or define what constitutes a void judgment, even though the rules applicable to relief in law and equity differ.

Extrinsic fraud may also be used as a defense against the enforcement of a judgment of a sister state [*see Holt v. Parmer (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 329, 330-331, 235 P.2d 43*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to Adjudicate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.222

§ 489.222 Partial Invalidity

When a showing of extrinsic fraud or mistake relates solely to a portion of the judgment, only that portion will be set aside and the remainder of the judgment left intact [*see In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 910, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* (relief granted from only property division and spousal support provisions of divorce decree)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraud

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.223

§ 489.223 Doctrine of Res Judicata

Res judicata precludes parties or their privies from relitigating a cause of action that has been finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction [*see Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 18, 193 P.2d 728* ; *Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 329, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10* ; *see also* Ch. 491, *Res Judicata*]. Under the doctrine, a judgment on the merits that is not void on its face (discussed in *§ 489.130* et seq.) is normally conclusive after the time for appeal has expired [*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 470-471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*]. However, under certain circumstances involving extrinsic fraud or mistake that prevented a fair adversary hearing, the doctrine of res judicata may be suspended and the judgment modified or nullified by a court of equity [*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 470, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Melone (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 757, 762, 238 Cal. Rptr. 510* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.228*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

127 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.224

§ 489.224 Scope of Relief

Relief normally consists of the setting aside or vacating of the judgment under attack, or modifying it, but relief is not limited to that. Any appropriate, and otherwise proper, relief may be given. For example, a court may impose a constructive trust [*see Caldwell v. Taylor (1933) 218 Cal. 471, 475, 23 P.2d 758* (action in equity)]. However, relief will not be granted against a bona fide purchaser [*Marlenee v. Brown (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 668, 675, 134 P.2d 770* (action to set aside order confirming executrix's sale of real property, to have conveyances declared void, and to quiet title)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.225

§ 489.225 Who May Seek Relief and Manner in Which Relief May Be Sought

A party or one in privity with a party who has been prevented from obtaining a fair adversary hearing through extrinsic fraud or mistake (defined below) may bring an equitable action to vacate the judgment [*Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 847, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706* ; *People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*]. Relief is available either by a motion in the action in which the judgment was rendered or in an independent action in equity [*see* *Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 847, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706* ; *Villarruel v. Arreola (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 309, 318, 136 Cal. Rptr. 19* ; *see also* *Swallow v. Tungsten Products Co. (1928) 205 Cal. 207, 214-220, 270 P. 366* ; *In re Olivia A. (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 237, 243, 226 Cal. Rptr. 382* ; *People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*].

A stranger to the proceedings may maintain such an action if his or her interests have been adversely affected by the judgment [*Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 847, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706* ; *People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246* ; *see also Villarruel v. Arreola (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 309, 318, 136 Cal. Rptr. 19*]. The right of a third party to set aside a judgment may depend on extrinsic mistake as well as extrinsic fraud [*Villarruel v. Arreola (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 309, 318, 136 Cal. Rptr. 19*].

Relief by a stranger to the proceedings may also be sought by intervention [*Villarruel v. Arreola (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 309, 318, 136 Cal. Rptr. 19*]. The interest necessary for intervention must involve such an immediate and direct claim on the very subject matter of the litigation that the intervener will either gain or lose by the direct operation of the judgment that may be rendered [*People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*]. While the interest of the intervener is normally pecuniary, that is not an indispensable element [*People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 119, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*]. For the procedure for seeking to intervene, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 387*. For further discussion and forms for use in seeking to intervene, *see* Ch. 395, *Parties* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingThird Party StandingCivil ProcedurePartiesInterventionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Vacate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.226

§ 489.226 Admissibility of Extrinsic Evidence

Extrinsic evidence is admissible on a direct attack in equity to set aside a judgment on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake (defined in §§ *489.243[1]* and *489.244[1]*) [*Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660,667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* ; *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 183-184, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsAdmissibility of EvidenceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.227

§ 489.227 Equitable Jurisdiction

Superior courts are courts of general jurisdiction [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. As such, in unlimited civil cases, they have general jurisdiction to grant equitable relief from a judgment entered through extrinsic fraud or mistake (*defined in §§ 489.243[1]* and *489.244[1]*). This authority to grant equitable relief does not derive from statute but is a power inherent in those courts [*see Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 43-44, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* ; *see also In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*]. The equitable power of a superior court may be invoked by either a motion in the original action or by a separate independent action [*see, e.g., Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 576, 122 P.2d 564* ; *In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 81, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* ; *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583* ; *Neubrand v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 311, 318-319, 88 Cal. Rptr. 586*].

In limited civil cases, courts are granted equitable jurisdiction to vacate a judgment or order rendered by the court from which relief is sought if the judgment or order was obtained through *extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)*; for the meaning of the italicized words, *see* discussion in *§§ 489.243[1]* and *489.244[1*]]. Thus, this jurisdiction is invoked by a motion for relief addressed to the court that rendered the judgment or made the order.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral JurisdictionCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent

ActionsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to Adjudicate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.228

§ 489.228 Competing Public Policies

The public policy underlying the principle of res judicata (discussed in *§ 489.223*), which requires that the issues involved in a case be set at rest by a final judgment, even when a party has persuaded the court or the jury by false allegations supported by perjured testimony, must be considered together with the policy that a party shall not be deprived of a fair adversary proceeding in which fully to present his or her case [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 18, 193 P.2d 728*].

The terms "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" fraud or mistake are used to describe the two different categories of cases to which these polices of law apply. They do not, however, constitute a simple and infallible formula to determine whether in a given case the facts surrounding the fraud or mistake warrant equitable relief from a judgment [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 19, 193 P.2d 728* ; *Kachig v. Boothe (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 626, 632-634, 99 Cal. Rptr. 393* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.246*].

In accord with the competing public policies, a final judgment may be set aside by a court if it is established that extrinsic factors prevented one party to the litigation from presenting his or her case [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 342, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.229

§ 489.229 Basis of Equity Jurisdiction

The basis of equitable relief is that a party has been deprived of his or her day in court, that is, of a hearing or trial, through no fault of his or her own or of any person whose fault will be attributed to the party, such as his or her attorney or insurance carrier. A condition or event that caused such a deprivation is referred to as extrinsic fraud or mistake (*defined in §§ 489.243[1]* and *489.244[1]*). Conversely, if the deprivation resulted from, for example, the party's negligence, a court will not find extrinsic fraud or mistake, but at most intrinsic fraud or mistake, and will deny relief.

Thus, it has been said that the basis of equitable jurisdiction to interfere with final judgments is the absence of a fair adversary hearing or trial in the original action [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 577, 122 P.2d 564* ; *Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 499, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

Typical of the situations in which equity has interfered with final judgments are the cases in which the lack of a fair adversary hearing in the original action is attributable to matters outside the issues adjudicated that prevented one party from presenting his or her case to the court because of extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564* ; *see also De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*]. Thus, a court may grant equitable relief from a judgment only if, due to the fraud of the opponent or the aggrieved party's own mistake, the aggrieved party was deprived of a fair adversary hearing and was prevented from presenting his or her claim or defense to the court [*De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*]. The mistake, however, need not be that of the aggrieved party [*see Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 18, 193 P.2d 728* (fraud or mistake of the other party); *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 44, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* (mistake of court clerk)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect &

MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
1. Attack in Equity in General

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.230-489.239

[Reserved]

§§ 489.230[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.240

§ 489.240 Grounds for Relief

In unlimited civil cases, courts may grant equitable relief from a judgment or order on the grounds of extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake(*defined in §§ 489.243[1]* and *489.244[1]*) [*see, e.g., Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 578, 122 P.2d 564* ; *Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 662-663, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*].

It has also been said that this relief may be granted on the ground of duress (defined in *§ 489.245*) [*In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 83-84, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403*]. In *Marriage of Baltins*, the appellate court acknowledged, however, that it had found no case stating that it was granting relief solely on the ground of duress, "but this is probably because duress is often characterized as fraud" [*In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 83, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403*]. Moreover, the court affirmed the trial court's order setting aside the property and support provisions of the interlocutory and final judgments of dissolution of marriage on the grounds of duress *and* extrinsic fraud or mistake.

Other grounds mentioned in conjunction with extrinsic fraud or mistake include:

- Excusable neglect [*see, e.g., Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 911, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* ; *see also* definition in *§ 489.44[4*]];

- Accident or extrinsic accident [*see, e.g., Hallett v. Slaughter (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 552, 557, 140 P.2d 3* (*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472 n.2, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* , noting that *Hallett* has been criticized by Witkin on other grounds); *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 122 P.2d 564* ; *In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 80, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* ; *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 43, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 87, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883* ; *Turner v. Allen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 753, 757, 11 Cal. Rptr. 630*]; and

- Extrinsic surprise [*Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300, 302, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*].

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)* (discussed in *§ 489.227[2]*) grants courts jurisdiction in limited civil cases, to vacate judgments or orders obtained "through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect," this jurisdiction to grant equitable relief is coextensive with, and no greater, than that of courts in unlimited civil cases. That is, the jurisdiction is to grant relief in equity on the grounds of extrinsic fraud or mistake only [*Marianos v. Tutunjian (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 61, 65, 138 Cal. Rptr. 529*].

The sufficiency of the grounds on which equitable relief is sought is determined according to the same standard, regardless of whether equity is invoked by motion or by an independent action. Therefore, in determining whether a complaint or motion states adequate grounds for equitable relief, the court may properly consider those cases in which equitable relief was sought, either by motion or by independent action [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 576, 122 P.2d 564*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.241

§ 489.241 Extrinsic Defined

The term "extrinsic" refers to matters outside the issues framed by the pleadings, or the issues adjudicated [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.242

§ 489.242 Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake Generally

Equity will grant relief against a judgment when extrinsic fraud or mistake deprived the unsuccessful party of an opportunity to fully present his or her case or prevented a fair adversary hearing [*Larrabee v. Tracy (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 645, 649, 134 P.2d 265* ; *see also Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535-536, 310 P.2d 423*], that is, when because of the fraud or mistake, the aggrieved party was prevented from presenting his or her claim or defense to the court [*see Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 291, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* ; *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*].

The terms "extrinsic fraud" and "extrinsic mistake" are given a broad meaning and tend to encompass almost any set of extrinsic circumstances that deprive a party of a fair adversary hearing, and it does not matter if the particular circumstances qualify as fraudulent or mistaken in the strict sense [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 342, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* ; *see also, e.g., Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607,614, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232* ; *In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 905, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558-559, 305 P.2d 20*].

It has been said that in a classic case in equity that seeks to set aside a judgment, two essential conditions are found [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 291, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* (quoting *Otani v. Kisling (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 438, 442, 33 Cal. Rptr. 239*)]:

- The judgment is one entered against a party by default under circumstances that prevented him or her from presenting his or her case, and

- These circumstances result from extrinsic fraud practiced by the other party or the other party's attorney.

The vital question in such a case is whether the successful party by inequitable conduct, either direct or insidious in nature, lulled the other party into a state of false security, thus causing the latter to refrain from appearing in court or

asserting legal rights [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 291, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* (citing *Colich v. United Concrete Pipe Corp. (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 102, 107, 302 P.2d 445*)]. However, relief is not limited to those cases. Whether or not the aggrieved party has shown grounds such that equity ought to afford relief must depend on all the facts in each case [*Larrabee v. Tracy (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 645, 649, 134 P.2d 265*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.243

§ 489.243 Extrinsic Fraud

[1] Defined

Extrinsic fraud as a ground for vacating a judgment is a broad concept that tends to encompass almost any set of extrinsic circumstances that deprive a party of a fair adversary hearing [*In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 905, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 342, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882*]. Thus, fraud is extrinsic when it deprives the unsuccessful party of an opportunity to present his or her claim or defense to the court, as, for example, if he or she was kept in ignorance of the action or was fraudulently prevented from fully participating in the proceeding in some manner, other than by his or her own negligence or other fault [*see* *In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 905, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *see also* *Lopez v. Lopez (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 735, 738, 48 Cal. Rptr. 136, 408 P.2d 744* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 577, 122 P.2d 564*].

However, actual fraud is not required. Extrinsic fraud that deprives the adversary of a fair hearing may exist though only the result of mistake [*Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*]. Moreover, when the fraud consists of misrepresentations, there is no requirement that the misrepresentations be made to the party defrauded [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 537, 310 P.2d 423*].

On the other hand, extrinsic fraud or mistake is not established, for example, by the inclusion of patently ambiguous language for division of property in a dissolution judgment, that was based on a marital termination agreement drafted by the attorney for the party claiming equitable relief [*In re Marriage of Dorris (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1208, 1213, 207 Cal. Rptr. 160* (provision that each party will receive "a share" of personal property)].

For when fraud is intrinsic and not a ground for equitable relief, see discussion in *§ 489.246*.

[2] Examples of Extrinsic Fraud

[a] In General

Examples of extrinsic fraud include:

- The opponent's preventing the unsuccessful party by fraud or deception from exhibiting fully his or her case, as by keeping the party away from court, or by a false promise of a compromise; or

- When the defendant never had knowledge of the suit, being kept in ignorance by the acts of the plaintiff; or

- When an attorney fraudulently or without authority assumes to represent a party and connives at the party's defeat; or

- When the attorney regularly employed by a party corruptly sells out the client's interest to the other side.

These and similar cases show that there has never really been a real contest in the trial or hearing of the case and are reasons for which a new suit may be sustained to set aside and annul the former judgment and open the case for a new and fair hearing [*United States v. Throckmorton (1878) 98 U.S. 61, 65-66, 25 L. Ed. 93* ; *Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 614, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232* ; *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *see also Estudillo v. Security Loan etc. Co. (1906) 149 Cal. 556, 563-564, 87 P. 19* ; *Pico v. Cohn (1891) 91 Cal. 129, 133-134, 27 P. 537* ; *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 554-555, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838* ; *Kachig v. Boothe (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 626, 633, 99 Cal. Rptr. 393* (quoting *Pico v. Cohn (1891) 91 Cal. 129, 133-134, 27 P. 537*)].

[b] Fraudulent or Negligent Failure to Give Notice

An equitable attack on a final judgment may be made on the ground of extrinsic fraud when it appears that there was a willful failure to give therequired service or that willfully false affidavits of service were filed. Similarly, an independent suit in equity has been allowed when there has been a failure to exercise the degree of diligence required by law in connection with personal service and when false recitals of service were the result of fraud, negligence, or mistake [*Carney v. Simmonds (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 84, 94, 315 P.2d 305* ; *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20* ; *see also Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* (judgment rendered without legal service of process or legal notice); *Sternbeck v. Buck (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 829, 834, 307 P.2d 970* (false return of service filed; improper service of summons renders judgment void)].

With respect to a false return, the rule is the same whether the false return of service resulted from fraud or mistake, because, in either event, the court never acquires jurisdiction over the person of the defendant, who, not being present in court, is not able to combat any intrinsic fraud that may be practiced against him or her [*Swallow v. Tungsten Products Co. (1928) 205 Cal. 207, 212, 219-220, 270 P. 366*].

In cases involving a false return of service, the judgment rendered is void in fact but not void on its face, and relief may be obtained by a timely motion at law directed to the court's inherent power or under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*. If relief at law is not timely sought, the defendant's only remedy is in equity. For further discussion and examples of void judgments, *see § 489.130* et seq.

[c] Reliance on Fraudulent Representations of Other Party

When one party has willfully misled the other with respect to the other party's need to appear and protect his or her rights and the other party has reasonably relied on that representation, equitable relief from the subsequent judgment will be granted if the other conditions for equitable relief exist [*see Davi v. Belfiore (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 325, 327,*

314 P.2d 596 (equitable action for relief from a default judgment)].

[d] Fraudulent Change in Property Settlement Agreement

In some cases, a court will grant equitable relief from a property settlement incorporated in a dissolution of marriage judgment when it is shown that one party fraudulently changed the terms of the oral agreement in reducing it to a written document under circumstances that would excuse the other party from recognizing and contesting the change. For example, when after having agreed orally to pay a particular sum for alimony and child support for an indeterminate period of time, the husband changed the written settlement to provide for the termination of those payments on his remarriage, the court set aside the property settlement on grounds of extrinsic fraud when the evidence revealed that the wife, relying on her attorney and not fully understanding the terms of the agreement, did not have notice of the change in the written document prior to its incorporation in the divorce judgment [*Lopez v. Lopez (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 735, 736-737, 48 Cal. Rptr. 136, 408 P.2d 744*].

[e] Concealment From Party by Fiduciary or Person in Confidential Relationship

When a relationship of trust and confidence exists, the one in whom confidence is reposed is under a duty to make full disclosure of all material facts within his or her knowledge relating to the transaction in question. The disclosure must be full and complete. Any material concealment or misrepresentation will amount to fraud sufficient to entitle the party injured by it to an action [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 616, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232*].

For example, the personal representative of an estate is an officer of the court and occupies a fiduciary relationship toward all parties having an interest in the estate [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 616, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232*]. A personal representative who is also a residuary legatee has a clear duty to refrain from taking unfair advantage of those with whom he or she deals in the administration of the estate. Thus, if the personal representative leads a beneficiary to believe that a particular distribution will be made in his or her behalf and later changes the proposed distribution, failure to inform the beneficiary of that change in a manner that will allow the beneficiary to appear and contest it constitutes extrinsic fraud that would allow the court to vacate the subsequent distribution decree. Even though notice of the proceedings was properly posted, the personal representative's action would constitute extrinsic fraud, when the personal representative knew that the notice would not alert the beneficiary to the actual need to appear and contest the issue [*Larrabee v. Tracy (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 645, 646-652, 134 P.2d 265*].

The same is true of a party standing in a confidential relationship [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 615 n.7, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232*]. A confidential relationship exists when one party gains the confidence of the other and purports to act or advise with the other's interests in mind; it may exist although there is no fiduciary relationship, and is particularly likely to exist when there is a family relationship or one of friendship. Or, put another way, a confidential relationship exists when trust and confidence are reposed by one person in the integrity and fidelity of another. It is not necessary that there be an extended period of business or accommodation transactions or dealings between persons for a confidential relationship to be established between them [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 615, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232*].

Thus, the policy permitting a party to seek relief from a judgment applies when the party's adversary, in violation of a duty arising from a trust or confidential relationship, concealed from the party facts essential to the protection of the party's rights. This is so even though such facts concerned issues involved in the case in which the judgment was entered [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 19, 193 P.2d 728*]. The failure to speak or make disclosures that rests on one because of the trust or confidential relationship is obviously a fraud for which equity may afford relief from a judgment thereby obtained, even though the breach of duty occurs during a judicial proceeding and involves false testimony. This is true whether the fraud is regarded as extrinsic or as an exception to the extrinsic fraud rule [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 615 n.7, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232* (reversing order denying motion to set aside court's previous orders admitting will to probate and ordering final distribution); *see also Jorgensen v.*

Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 19, 193 P.2d 728].

Thus, equitable relief has been granted from final judgments settling the accounts of guardians, administrators, or executors who withheld information that would have enabled the beneficiaries to attack the accounts and to decrees distributing a decedent's estate adversely to the rights of beneficiaries who have been precluded from pursuing their rights by the fiduciary's concealment of facts [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 19-20, 193 P.2d 728* (holding rule inapplicable to case before it); *see also Kachig v. Boothe (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 626, 634, 99 Cal. Rptr. 393*].

However, when in a probate proceeding there is no allegation or showing that the complaining party did not receive notice of the proceeding or that some attempt was made to prevent his or her full participation in it, the concealment of the complaining party's interest in the estate to be distributed will not serve as a basis for equitable relief. In that case, the complaining party has every opportunity to present his or her case, and it follows that there is no extrinsic fraud or mistake sufficient to constitute the basis for an attack on the decree in equity [*Westphal v. Westphal (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 393, 397, 126 P.2d 105*].

[f] Concealment From Court or Party of Party's Rights

In some instances, equitable relief from a judgment has been granted when the evidence establishes that the rights and interests of certain parties have been concealed from the court and from the interested party. For example, the invocation of equity on the ground of extrinsic fraud is warranted when an heir or legatee fails to notify the court of the existence of other heirs of whom he or she has knowledge and files false petitions with the court representing that there are no such heirs [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535, 310 P.2d 423*]. Actual or positive fraud, however, is not required, because a mistake made by the distributee that keeps a legatee in ignorance of the true facts or deprives him or her of fair notice of the probate proceedings constitutes a type of extrinsic fraud [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535, 310 P.2d 423*].

Similarly, a final divorce decree may properly be vacated in equity if one spouse proves that the other had secretly obtained the decree after reconciliation and resumption of marital relations [*McGuinness v. Superior Court (1925) 196 Cal. 222, 228-229, 237 P. 42* (parties were cohabiting when decree, which made no division of community property, was entered and continued to cohabit until death of spouse who procured decree); *see also Gale v. Witt (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 362, 365, 188 P.2d 755*]. Moreover, when the parties to a lawsuit fraudulently conceal the existence of an indispensable party in an attempt to obtain a judgment that cuts off the legal rights of that party, the judgment may be vacated [*In re Olivia A. (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 237, 241-243, 226 Cal. Rptr. 382* (relief in equity)].

However, when the loss of rights results from the party's failure to investigate and pursue them rather than from the adverse party's active concealment, the courts will deny relief. For example, although a spouse may secure relief from a property settlement agreement obtained through the other spouse's concealment of assets in violation of his or her duty to disclose them, when the ground for relief is merely the mistaken reliance on the other spouse's classification of the fully disclosed assets as either community or separate property, the complaining spouse is barred from obtaining equitable relief by an admission that he or she and his or her attorney did not investigate the facts having had full opportunity to do so [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 22-23, 193 P.2d 728*].

[g] Concealment From Court of Defendant's Incompetency

Incompetency that is alleged to render a defendant wholly devoid of understanding and incapable of transacting business of any nature is a condition that exists independently of a judicial determination of that fact. When the defendant is under such a legal disability and the plaintiff has knowledge of that condition, a duty rests on the plaintiff to disclose those matters to the court and to have a guardian appointed for the purpose of the proceeding. If the plaintiff knows of the defendant's incompetency, conceals the information from the court, and, to prevent a true adversary

hearing, proceeds to a default judgment by taking advantage of the defendant's condition, that conduct constitutes a fraud on the court as well as on the incompetent defendant. Because the direct effect of the concealment is to prevent the incompetent from presenting whatever defense he or she has to the court, the fraud is extrinsic in nature. If other requirements for equitable relief are present, allegation of such facts is sufficient to state a cause of action in equity to set aside the judgment on behalf of theincompetent [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577, 122 P.2d 564* (equitable action to set aside default judgment)]. In *Olivera*, the Court added that fraud on the plaintiff's part in the former action is not essential in such cases, and that when an adversary hearing has in fact been held, a cause of action for relief in equity can be stated on the ground that extrinsic fraud prevented a fair adversary proceeding [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577, 122 P.2d 564*]. If the plaintiff was not aware of the incompetency and no adversary hearing was had, relief from the judgment might still be had based on extrinsic mistake (*see* discussion in *§ 489.244[3][b]*).

[h] Concealment From Court of Reason for Party's Absence

When a defendant is prevented by forces beyond his or her control from appearing in the action, coupled with the plaintiff's concealment from the court of the facts causing the absence and/or the misrepresentation of those facts to the court, relief in equity may be obtained from the subsequent judgment whether the fraud is characterized as extrinsic or a fraud on the court, if the court's action might have been different had the true facts been properly disclosed.

For example, relief from a divorce judgment was granted to a husband who was unable to appear in his wife's divorce action because he was, while on a business trip, taken prisoner by the Japanese when war broke out between Japan and the United States. The wife, knowing what had happened to her husband, concealed those facts from the court and made positive misstatements of fact in an affidavit to the court concerning the reason for her husband's absence [*Landon v. Landon (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 954, 955-958, 169 P.2d 980* (wife's concealment of facts and positive misrepresentations constituted extrinsic fraud on the trial court and a ground for relief from the judgment)].

Similarly, in *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* , the Supreme Court reversed an order denying the wife's motion to vacate a judgment granting the husband a dissolution of marriage and awarding him substantially all of the community property and custody of the children when it was shown that, after an earlier show cause hearing in which the wife was awarded custody of the children, child support, and exclusive possession of the family home, the wife was arrested and summarily deported to Korea, the husband was well aware of the facts and of the wife's inability to be present but concealed this information from the trial court. The Supreme Court held that the husband had a duty to inform the court of the extrinsic facts that prevented his wife's attendance, and that by concealing those facts, the husband breached his duty of disclosure and perpetrated a fraud on the court as well as on the wife [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 343, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882]* .

Although not entirely clear, it would appear that relief in equity might also be available in the same circumstances based on extrinsic mistake on the ground that the defendant was denied a fair hearing when plaintiff was ignorant of the reason for the defendant's absence and did not make any misrepresentations to the court [*see* *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564* ; *see also* *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 343 n.4, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* , *above*, stating that equitable relief could also be given based solely on the wife's deportation and her attorney's appointment as a court commissioner, but that it was not necessary to address this alternative theory for relief in light of the clear presence of extrinsic fraud)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect &

MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.244

§ 489.244 Extrinsic Mistake

[1] Defined

Like extrinsic fraud, extrinsic mistake deprives the unsuccessful party of an opportunity to present his or her case to the court [*Westphal v. Westphal (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 393, 397, 126 P.2d 105* ; *Lopez v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 925, 934, 223 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 44 n.3, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*]. The extrinsic mistake may be that of any of the following:

- The aggrieved party [*see, e.g., Lopez v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 925, 934-935, 223 Cal. Rptr. 798*],

- The adverse party [*see, e.g., Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 18, 193 P.2d 728* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564*], or

- A third person [*see, e.g., Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 44, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794*].

"Mistake" has been defined as the doing of an act under an erroneous conviction, which act, but for such conviction, would not have been done. The same reasoning applies to a failure to act, that is, to an omission [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

For when mistake is intrinsic and not a ground for equitable relief, see discussions in *§ 489.246*.

[2] Test to Qualify for Relief

The following stringent three-part test applies to determine whether the court should grant a request for equitable relief from a default judgmenton the grounds of extrinsic mistake [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 982, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* ; *see Lee v. An (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 558, 566, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620* (delay of several years in seeking relief did not demonstrate diligence)]:

- First, the defaulting party must demonstrate that it has a meritorious case.

- Second, it must articulate a satisfactory excuse for not presenting a defense to the original action.

- Third, it must demonstrate diligence in seeking to set aside the default once discovered [*see also* discussion in *§ 489.262*].

For example, in *Rappleyea v. Campbell*, the California Supreme Court reversed a default judgment, finding that the out-of-state in propria persona defendants reasonably relied on the mistake of the court clerk regarding the amount of the filing fee, which ultimately resulted in a default judgment, their defense had merit, and plaintiff's counsel misinformed defendants regarding the law so that it would not be prejudiced by the judgment being set aside [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 983-984, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126*]. The court stressed that its decision was narrowly drawn, based on the clerk's error and the plaintiff's incorrect statement of the law, and not on defendants' self-representation.

It also left open the question of the appropriate test applicable to requests for equitable relief when a default judgment has not been entered.

[3] Examples of Extrinsic Mistake

[a] In General

Extrinsic mistake has been found in the following situations:

- When a party becomes incompetent but no guardian ad litem is appointed (*see* discussion in [b], *below*).

- When one party relies on another to defend (*see §§ 489.361[2]* and *489.430[1]* (form for notice of motion to set aside judgment or order and supporting declaration).

- When there is reliance on an attorney who becomes incapacitated to act (*see* discussion in [c], *below*).

- When a mistake led a court to do what it never intended.

- When a mistaken belief of one party prevented proper notice of the action.

- When the complaining party was disabled at the time the judgment was entered [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 471-472, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* (citing cases for each example); *see also Stiles v. Wallis (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1147, 195 Cal. Rptr. 377*].

- When the defendant was incarcerated and unable to attend or to secure an attorney and so notified the court and asked for a continuance [*see Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 499-500, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186*].

Other examples include the apparent loss in the mail of an answer on its way to court; the act of the defendant's secretary in placing the summons and complaint in defendant's file, having misunderstood his instruction to send them to his attorney; and the inadvertent failure of an attorney, representing both an individual and a corporation and intending to answer for both, to put the corporation's name on the answer [*see Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d*

849, 856, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700 (citing cases for each example); *see also* [d], *below*].

In addition, relief in equity on the ground of extrinsic mistake might be obtained when the mistake is that of the court clerk [*Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 44, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* (clerk failed to file letters from elderly defendant as responsive pleading and entered defendant's default for failure to answer)].

Extrinsic mistake may entail an aggrieved party's *excusable neglect* in failing to present his or her claim or defense, thereby resulting in an unjust judgment against him or her without a fair adversary hearing [*Lopez v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 925, 934-935, 223 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *see also* *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 83, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* ; *Jackson v. Bank of America (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 375, 386, 233 Cal. Rptr. 162*].

For discussion of when a party may secure relief, based on mistake or extrinsic mistake, from a judgment entered as a result of attorney abandonment, *see § 489.46*.

[b] Disability of Aggrieved Defendant

When the defendant is an unadjudicated mentally incompetent person and there has been no adversary proceeding at all, the right of the incompetent to equitable relief from a default judgment may be established when the plaintiff's ignorance of defendant's legal disability prevented a true adversary hearing as well as when the plaintiff's fraud prevented such a hearing (*see § 489.243[2][g]*). In that case, the ground for relief is extrinsic mistake [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564*].

Relief is not limited, however, to cases in which the aggrieved party is actually incompetent. Relief from a default and default judgment may be available when they resulted from a party's inexperience with the legal system and inability to understand the nature of the documents served[*Berri v. Rogero (1914) 168 Cal. 736, 739, 145 P. 95*]. For example, when the defendant in an equitable motion to set aside a default and interlocutory judgment in a divorce action was a newly arrived immigrant with few friends or relatives and with little or no command of English, the court found extrinsic mistake sufficient to set aside the judgment when these factors resulted in the defendant's having been taken advantage of insofar as the she had not fully understood the legal effect of the summons in the previous action, and thereby forfeited valuable property rights in the default judgment [*Watson v. Watson (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 35, 36-39, 325 P.2d 1011*].

The disability of imprisonment has also been found to constitute extrinsic mistake [*Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 499, 500, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186*].

[c] Death or Illness of Counsel

The general rule is to charge the client with his or her attorney's negligence. However, if, without the client's knowledge or fault, the attorney becomes physically or mentally incapacitated leading to a damaging result in pending litigation, equity may intervene to set aside the judgment, at least in a situation in which the circumstances could not reasonably have been anticipated or avoided by the exercise of due diligence [*McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 45, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188* (equitable relief from default judgment denied); *Smith v. Busniewski (1952) 115 Cal. App. 2d 124, 127, 251 P.2d 697*].

[d] Attorney's Excusable Mistake or Neglect

The principle that an attorney's neglect is usually not grounds for equitable relief from a judgment applies rigidly to a matter heard on the merits [*Tuck v. Tuck (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 743, 746, 70 Cal. Rptr. 822*]. Equity will not grant relief against a judgment at law, when the judgment was obtained in consequence of the attorney's neglect, inattention,

mistake, or incompetency, unless caused by the opposite party [*Tuck v. Tuck (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 743, 746, 70 Cal. Rptr. 822* , quoting *Lennefelt v. Cranston (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 171, 175, 41 Cal. Rptr. 598*]. Similarly, an attorney's negligence in failing to timely file for new trial or appeal does not constitute extrinsic fraud or mistake that would allow a final judgment rendered after a full adversarial hearing to be set aside in equity [*Tuck v. Tuck (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 743, 745, 70 Cal. Rptr. 822*].

Relief may be granted when a default is the result of excusable mistake or neglect on the part of the party's attorney or the attorney's total failure to represent the client, but relief will not be granted when the attorney has not totally failed to represent the client and has been guilty of inexcusable neglect [*Lopez v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 925, 935, 223 Cal. Rptr. 798*]. Likewise, relief should not be granted when the aggrieved party was guilty of inexcusable neglect [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 293, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*].

When a clerical or ministerial mistake on the part of the attorney or the attorney's staff has resulted in a default judgment being entered, equity may set the judgment aside if the circumstances surrounding the mistake are deemed excusable. For example, if a default judgment was entered because a properly mailed document failed to reach the clerk's office, the party may be entitled to equitable relief from the judgment [*Hallett v. Slaughter (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 552, 557, 140 P.2d 3* (equitable relief from default judgment; *see* *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472 n.2, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* , noting that *Hallett* has been criticized by Witkin); *see also* *Turner v. Allen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 753, 759, 11 Cal. Rptr. 630* (equitable relief from default judgment)].

[e] Acts Not Amounting to Actual Fraud

Acts of a party that do not amount to actual or intentional fraud may constitute extrinsic mistake. It is well established that in cases in which the aggrieved party is unable to make out a case of intentional fraud, the courts will extend a liberal interpretation to relieve him or her from a judgment taken without a fair adversary hearing. The basis for equitable relief in these cases, whether referred to as "extrinsic fraud" or "extrinsic mistake," is a situation that has resulted in a judgment taken under circumstances of unfairness and injustice without affording a party the opportunity to participate in the proceedings [*Aldabe v. Aldabe (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 453, 475, 26 Cal. Rptr. 208* (collateral attack on foreign divorce judgment in which notices were served on wife's discharged attorney who failed to notify wife, husband's attorney knew of discharge, and both husband and his attorney knew where wife was)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportGeneral OverviewTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.245

§ 489.245 Duress Defined

Duress includes whatever destroys one's free agency and constrains a person to do what is against the person's will. Duress may be exercised by threat, importunity, or any species of mental coercion. It is shown when a party intentionally used threats or pressure to induce action or inaction to the other party's detriment. The coercion must induce the assent of the coerced party, who has no reasonable alternative to succumbing [*In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 84, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403*].

To determine whether a default judgment, for example, was the product of duress, the courts look not so much to the nature of the threats, but to their effect on the threatened person's state of mind [In re Marriage ofBaltins *(1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 84, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* (wife, through extrinsic factor of duress, had been denied fair adversary hearing in dissolution of marriage proceeding by husband's causing her to sign papers providing cause could be tried as uncontested matter without notice)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.246

§ 489.246 Intrinsic Fraud or Mistake

[1] Statement of Rule

Courts distinguish between extrinsic and intrinsic fraud or mistake, and the general rule is that only extrinsic fraud or mistake provides a basis for equitable relief [*see Buesa v. City of Los Angeles (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1537, 1545-1547, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 86* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 88, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883* ; *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*]. Hence, equitable relief is normally denied when the fraud or mistake is intrinsic [*see, e.g., Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472-473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; for discussion of relief from a judgment procured by fraud, *see § 489.133*].

[2] Public Policy

The principles of res judicata (discussed in *§ 489.223*) demand that the parties present their entire case in one proceeding. Public policy requires that pressure be brought on litigants to use great care in preparing cases for trial and in ascertaining all the facts. A rule that would permit previously decided cases to be reopened because of error or ignorance during the progress of the trial would in large measure vitiate the effects of the rules of res judicata. Courts deny relief, therefore, when the fraud or mistake is intrinsic, that is, when it goes to the merits of the prior proceedings, that should have been guarded against by the party at that time [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472-473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*].

[3] Reason for Rule

The reason for denying relief when fraud is intrinsic is classically stated as follows [*Kachig v. Boothe (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 626, 633, 99 Cal. Rptr. 393* , quoting *Pico v. Cohn (1891) 91 Cal. 129, 133-134, 27 P. 537*]:

> That a former judgment or decree may be set aside, and annulled for some frauds there can be no question; but it must be a fraud extrinsic or collateral to the question examined and determined in the action. And we think it is settled beyond controversy that a decree will not be vacated merely because it

was obtained by forged documents or perjured testimony. The reason of this rule is, that there must be an end of litigation; and when parties have once submitted a matter, or have had the opportunity of submitting it, for investigation and determination, and when they have exhausted every means for reviewing such determination in the same proceeding, it must be regarded as final and conclusive, unless it can be shown that the jurisdiction of the court has been imposed upon, or that the prevailing party, by some extrinsic or collateral fraud, has prevented a fair submission of the controversy...

In all such instances the unsuccessful party is really prevented, by the fraudulent contrivance of his adversary, from having a trial; but when he has a trial, he must be prepared to meet and expose perjury then and there. He knows that a false claim or defense can be supported in no other way; that the very object of the trial is, if possible, to ascertain the truth from the conflict of the evidence, and that, necessarily, the truth or falsity of the testimony must be determined in deciding the issue. The trial is his opportunity for making the truth appear. If, unfortunately, he fails, being overborne by perjured testimony, and if he likewise fails to show the injustice that has been done him on motion for a new trial, and the judgment is affirmed on appeal, he is without remedy. The wrong in such case, is of course a most grievous one, and no doubt the legislature and the courts would be glad to redress it if a rule could be devised that would remedy the evil without producing mischiefs far worse than the evil to be remedied. Endless litigation in which nothing was ever finally determined, would be worse than occasional miscarriages of justice; and so the rule is, that a final judgment cannot be annulled merely because it can be shown to have been based on perjured testimony; for if this could be done once, it could be done again and again *ad infinitum*.

[4] Application of Rule

Application of the rule, however, is not always clear, particularly when the fraud may be classified as either intrinsic or extrinsic, depending on how it is viewed. For example, a false return of service may be considered as intrinsic fraud on the court in that it is a misrepresentation made directly to the court, but extrinsic fraud on the defendant in that it prevents the defendant's participation in the action [*see, e.g., Swallow v. Tungsten Products Co. (1928) 205 Cal. 207, 211-212, 270 P. 366* (suggesting it would be extrinsic); *see also Carney v. Simmonds (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 84, 92-95, 315 P.2d 305* (action for equitable relief from probate decree in which plaintiff was not given special notice, as requested, and did not appear, and administrator represented to court that notice had been given; would be extrinsic fraud)]. Furthermore, the concealment of facts from the court may be both a fraud on the court and a fraud on a nonappearing party [*see,e.g., Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 536, 310 P.2d 423* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.243[2][h*]].

[5] Determining Nature of Fraud or Mistake

Whether a case involves intrinsic or extrinsic fraud or mistake is not determined abstractly. Rather, it is necessary to examine the facts in the light of the policy that a party who failed to assemble all his or her evidence at the trial should not be privileged to relitigate a case, as well as the policy permitting a party to seek relief from a judgment entered in a proceeding in which he or she was deprived of a fair opportunity fully to present his or her case [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 89, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*].

[6] What Constitutes Intrinsic Fraud or Mistake

Fraud or mistake is intrinsic and not a ground for relief if a party has been given notice of the action and has not been prevented from participating in it; that is, if he or she had the opportunity to present his or her case and to protect himself or herself from any mistake or fraud of his or her adversary, but unreasonably neglected to do so [*Westphal v. Westphal (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 393, 397, 126 P.2d 105* ; *In re Marriage of Baltins (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 66, 81-82, 260 Cal. Rptr. 403* ; *In re Marriage of Melone (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 757, 762, 238 Cal. Rptr. 510* ; *McCreadie v.*

Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 44 n.3, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188 ; *see also Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Umphrey (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 647, 656, 267 Cal. Rptr. 218*].

Having had an opportunity to protect his or her interest, that party cannot attack the judgment once the time for appeal or other direct attack at law has passed [*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *Gale v. Witt (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 362, 367, 188 P.2d 755*]. Thus, a judgment normally will not be set aside because of perjured evidence, whether the judgment was obtained by default or after a contested trial [*Buesa v. City of Los Angeles (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1537, 1545-1548, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 86* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 89, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*] or because of the use of forged documents [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 19-20, 193 P.2d 728* ; *Gale v. Witt (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 362, 366, 188 P.2d 755*]. Equitable relief will also be denied when it is sought to relitigate an issue involved in a former action on the ground that allegations or proof of either party was fraudulent or based on mistake. Equitable relief may be granted, however, if the party seeking it was precluded by fraud or the mistake of the other party from participating in the proceeding or from fully presenting his or her case [*Jorgensen v. Jorgensen (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 13, 18, 193 P.2d 728*].

[7] Mutual Mistake

A mutual mistake that might be sufficient to set aside a contract is not sufficient to set aside a final judgment [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472-473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*]. For example, in an equitable motion by the husband to modify a divorce decree on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake to relieve him of any liability for certain taxes on the assertion that both spouses were unaware of the repercussions of tax liability with respect to certain properties, the trial court committed reversible error in granting relief when it was established by the evidence that both parties were aware of the assets, full disclosure of the assets had been made during the proceedings, but the complaining party chose not to investigate the taxability of the assets [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472-473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*].

[8] Attorney's Mistake of Law

When a party's attorney knows the facts but mistakenly interprets their legal significance, the mistake is intrinsic and will not warrant relief. An attorney's mistake will not provide the basis for relief unless it was caused by the party's adversary [*Janetsky v. Avis (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 799, 811, 222 Cal. Rptr. 342*].

Thus, mistaken legal advice from one's own attorney constitutes intrinsic, rather than extrinsic, mistake and does not justify setting aside a final judgment [*see In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 93-94, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883* ; *Westinghouse Credit Corp. v. Wolfer (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 63, 70, 88 Cal. Rptr. 654* ; *see also Lennefelt v. Cranston (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 171, 175, 41 Cal. Rptr. 598* (equitable proceeding to set aside order fixing inheritance tax)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
2. Grounds for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.247-489.259

[Reserved]

§§ 489.247[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.260

§ 489.260 Time Limitations on Relief From Void Judgments or Orders

No statute of limitations, or any other time limitation, applies to attacks on judgments or orders that are void on their face; they may be attacked anywhere, anytime, directly or collaterally (*see* discussion in *§ 489.141*). Hence, relief is fully available at law and there is no need to resort to equity for relief from such judgments or orders.

Equitable relief is available, however, from a judgment or order that is void in fact but not void on its face. The time within which relief must be sought depends on whether it is sought by an independent action in equity or by equitable motion, as discussed in *§ 489.261*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.261

§ 489.261 Time Limitations on Actions in Equity

[1] Three-Year Statute of Limitations

[a] Fraud or Mistake

When extrinsic fraud or mistake is the gravamen of a suit in equity to vacate, or to secure relief from, a judgment that is not void on its face, the action is governed by the three-year period of limitation set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*, governing actions for fraud or mistake [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 560, 305 P.2d 20* (action timely); *Estudillo v. Security Loan etc. Co. (1906) 149 Cal. 556, 565, 87 P. 19* (action timely); *Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 538, 310 P.2d 423* (action timely); *see also Zastrow v. Zastrow (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 710, 714, 132 Cal. Rptr. 536* (stating rule but holding case governed by four-year statute, discussed under [2], *below*)].

[b] When Action Accrues

Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d) further states that the cause of action is not deemed to have accrued until the aggrieved party discovers the facts constituting the fraud or mistake [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 560, 305 P.2d 20*]. However, the courts have construed this provision to mean that the cause of action accrues when the aggrieved party discovers, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered, the facts constituting the fraud or mistake [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559, 305 P.2d 20*].

[c] Duty to Investigate

As indicated [b], *above*, the aggrieved party must exercise reasonable diligence in discovering the facts constituting the fraud or mistake. However, a party's right to proceed on the theory of fraud is not destroyed merely because opportunities for examination or means of knowledge were open to him or her when no legal duty devolved on the party to employ those means of knowledge. When there is an improper concealment of facts at the time of the transaction and thereafter that causes a party to forego an investigation, the statute of limitations does not commence to run until the party discovers the fraud thereby worked on him or her. In addition, when by reason of representations made to a

defrauded party, the party is dissuaded from making inquiry, he or she is not charged with constructive notice of the contents of public records [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 538, 310 P.2d 423* (involving attack on prior probate decree distributing estate)].

Moreover, the existence of a fiduciary relationship between the parties may lessen the plaintiff's duty to make an earlier discovery of the facts [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559-563, 305 P.2d 20* (action timely)]. The same is true when there is a confidential relationship between the parties [*Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 615, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232* (involving motion, rather than action, in equity); *see also* discussion in *§ 489.243[2][e*]].

But even absent a fiduciary or confidential relationship, one who speaks is not only obligated to tell the truth but is equally bound not to suppress or conceal any facts within his or her knowledge that materially qualify those stated [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 537, 310 P.2d 423*].

In the final analysis, it is a question for the trier of fact to determine whether the delay in the investigation and discovery of the true facts was reasonable and excusable, as the acts of a person of ordinary care and prudence, under the same circumstances [*Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 539, 310 P.2d 423*].

[2] Four-Year Statute of Limitations

When the vacation of a judgment is sought in equity on grounds distinct from fraud or mistake, for example, when it seeks to set aside a marital dissolution judgment and a property settlement agreement incorporated in it on the ground that the defaulting wife was mentally incompetent when she signed the agreement and the appearance, stipulation, and waiver filed in her husband's marital dissolution action, it is subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 343*, which provides that an action for relief not otherwise provided for must be commenced within four years after the cause of action accrues [*Zastrow v. Zastrow (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 710, 714-717, 132 Cal. Rptr. 536* (reversing trial court's ruling that action was barred by three-year statute, and holding that four-year statute applied, and fact that wife delayed suit for almost three and one-half years after regaining her competency did not bar action)].

In holding that mental incompetence was a ground for relief separate from fraud or mistake, the court in *Zastrow* relied on *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 122 P.2d 564* . *Olivera* distinguished three situations in which relief in equity from a judgment might be granted to an unadjudicated incompetent defendant:

- On the ground of extrinsic fraud when the plaintiff in the prior case knew the defendant was an unadjudicated mentally incompetent person, concealed that information from the court, and, to prevent a true adversary hearing, took a default judgment [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577, 122 P.2d 564* (discussed in *§ 489.243[2][g]*)];

- On the ground of extrinsic fraud, when, under the same facts, an unfair adversary hearing was held [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577, 122 P.2d 564* (discussed in *§ 489.243[2][g]*)]; and

- To the point involved in *Zastrow*, on the ground of extrinsic mistake when there has been no adversary proceeding at all, as in the case before it, and it was plaintiff's ignorance of defendant's legal disability that prevented a true adversary hearing [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564* (discussed in *§ 489.244[3][b]*)].

The court in *Zastrow* failed to explain how this "mistake" is different from the mistake referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*, discussed in *§ 489.261[1][a]*. Consequently, it is not clear whether, or to what extent, the four-year statute will be held to apply to cases based on extrinsic mistake, arising from some fact other than mental incompetency.

In addition, it should be noted that, unlike *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d), Code Civ. Proc. § 343* does not contain a delayed discovery rule. Nevertheless, *Zastrow* apparently applied a similar rule by pointing out that the parties agreed that the four-year period commenced to run not from the date the judgment was entered but, rather, from the date the wife regained her competency some two years after the final judgment was entered, and so treating the case. Although the court did not mention it, incompetency that amounts to insanity does toll the statute of limitations [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 328, 352*; for a discussion of the several meanings of the term "insanity," *see* Ch. 304, *Insane and Other Incompetent Persons*].

[3] Inapplicability of Reasonable Time Requirement

In *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149, 133 Cal. Rptr 583* , the appellate court, quoting *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563* , said: "The time limit for the filing of such a motion [equitable motion] or separate suit [in equity] is a reasonable time from discovery of the default judgment irrespective of when it may actually have been entered" (*citing Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700]* ; *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank 47 Cal. 2d 540, 305 P.2d 20* ; *Hayes v. Risk 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36* ; *Fidelity Bank v. Kettler 264 Cal. App. 2d 481, 70 Cal. Rptr. 500]* .

Neither *Coffin* nor *Munoz* discussed the statutes of limitation applicable to equitable actions and both involved equitable motions. The rule quoted is a correct statement insofar as equitable motions are concerned (*see* discussion in *§ 489.262*), but to the extent that it includes equitable actions, it is dictum at most, and its applicability to equitable actions, which are governed by statutes of limitations, is questionable at best [*see, e.g., Zastrow v. Zastrow (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 710, 714, 132 Cal. Rptr. 536* (action for equitable relief from marital dissolution decree incorporating property settlement agreement based on mental incompetency held timely when filed almost three and one-half years after plaintiff had been restored to mental competency, during which period there is nothing in the decision to indicate that she did anything to seek relief from the judgment)].

Moreover, the cases cited in *Munoz* and quoted in *Coffin* do not support the rule insofar as it would apply to equitable actions. Both the first and fourth cases cited, *Weitz* and *Fidelity Bank*, involved motions. In *Weitz*, the Court said that "One moving in equity to set aside a default judgment must act diligently in making his motion after he learns of the default judgment" [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 856-857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700*]. *Fidelity Bank* involved a motion to quash an order for appearance of a judgment debtor for lack of service; the court treated the motion as one attacking a void order, and, by applying by analogy the time limitation in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, found the motion untimely [*Fidelity Bank v. Kettler (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 481, 486, 70 Cal. Rptr. 500* (criticized in *Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1122, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286* , on the ground that it improperly applied the six-month period in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], instead of the time limitation in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 473a* [*now Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*]); for discussion of attacks on void judgments and orders, *see § 489.130* et seq.]. In summarily dismissing equity as a ground for relief, the *Fidelity* court said that the mere use of an affidavit of personal service not in fact true, through some honest mistake of identity or for some reason compatible with good faith, is not extrinsic fraud, nor fraud at all, and that the 13-month delay in seeking relief was "a distinct badge of laches" and barred defendant's right to have the order quashed [*Fidelity Bank v. Kettler (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 481, 486-487, 70 Cal. Rptr. 500*]. With respect to a false return of service, the court, apparently, was thinking only of intentional fraud, since a negligently false return of service, insofar as equity is concerned, also constitutes extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20* (stating that a direct attack on a judgment is allowed in an independent action in equity when false recitals of service were the result of fraud, negligence, or mistake); *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563* (stating that a false recital of service, although not deliberate, is treated as extrinsic fraud or mistake); with respect to the court's use of the term "laches" for diligence, *see* discussion in *§ 489.262[3*]].

The third case cited in *Munoz and Coffin, Hayes v. Risk (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36* , which was an action in equity to vacate and set aside a default judgment and for other relief in a prior action in which summons on a

first amended complaint had been served by publication, does not discuss at all the issue of when an action for equitable relief must be filed, other than to state that the default judgment was entered on July 2, 1963 [*Hayes v. Risk (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 620, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36*], the complaint in equity was filed March 19, 1965 [*Hayes v. Risk (1967)255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 621, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36]* , and the complaint alleged that plaintiff first had knowledge that summons on the first amended complaint had been served by publication and the entry of the default judgment on February 19, 1965 [*Hayes v. Risk (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 620, 621, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36*].

The second case cited in *Munoz and Coffin, Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 305 P.2d 20* , was a declaratory relief action involving an attack on a prior judgment, in which the Supreme Court reversed the judgment of dismissal entered after the trial court sustained a general demurrer to the complaint. The Court held that equitable relief from the prior judgment was available and that the action, which had been timely filed, was not barred by the three-year statute of limitations [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559-560, 305 P.2d 20*]. Neither *Coffin* nor *Munoz* gave point pages for the cases they cited. Nevertheless, there appears to be no discussion in *Bennett* (a 26-page opinion) to the effect that an equitable action for relief must be filed within a reasonable time from discovery of the judgment or that the aggrieved party must act diligently in filing an action for equitable relief. The case merely states, as already pointed out (*see § 489.261[1][a]*), that the statute of limitation for fraud or mistake commences to run when the aggrieved party discovers he or she has a cause of action, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have discovered it, and discusses when the aggrieved party is and is not under a duty to make inquiry [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559, 563-564, 305 P.2d 20* (holding at p. 561 that the same delayed discovery rule applies to an action for fraudulent conversion)]. *Bennett* mentions diligence in two other situations: (1) relating to the duty imposed on a fiduciary (bank corporation) to discover the identity of a beneficiary (successor in interest to deceased member of bank corporation) [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 556, 557, 559, 305 P.2d 20*]; and (2) relating to when a direct attack in equity may be made; the Court said: "A direct attck has also been allowed in an independent action in equity when there has been a failure to exercise the degree of diligence required by law in connection with personal service" [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20*]. In support of this statement, the Court cited *Stern v. Judson (1912) 163 Cal. 726, 728* et seq., *127 P. 38* , and a Washington case. *Stern* was talking about the diligence required of a plaintiff to locate the defendant before having summons served by publication, the lack of which diligence could render a judgment void, and it is clear that *Bennett* understood it as such. Consequently, *Bennett* does not support the proposition that an action in equity must be filed within a reasonable time after the fraud or mistake is discovered or that the aggrieved party must act diligently in seeking relief after discovering the judgment.

Notwithstanding that the reasonable time and diligence requirements may not apply to an action in equity, the aggrieved party should nevertheless act diligently in seeking relief once he or she discovers the judgment to avoid the possible defense of laches, discussed under [4], *below.*

[4] Defense of Laches

Laches is prejudice to the adverse party resulting from any delay in seeking relief, and it may be a valid defense to an action for equitable relief. However, one is not barred by alleged laches in failing to discover sooner that his or her rights have been injured by the fraud of another [*Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667-669, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* (vacating divorce judgment entered some 46 years before on the ground that it was void for lack of valid service of the summons and complaint on the wife)]. Nor is a plaintiff seeking equitable relief barred by laches when, on learning the facts leading him or her to suspect the fraud or mistake, plaintiff exercised reasonable diligence in the commencement and prosecution of the action [*see In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 908-910, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *Sullivan v. Lumsden (1897) 118 Cal. 664, 670, 50 P. 777*].

Moreover, it has been held that a plaintiff was not guilty of neglect, laches, and want of diligence precluding relief from a default judgment, although some degree of negligence might be charged to her attorney in failing to discover that an answer had not been filed in the prior action, when her delay in discovering the entry of default was due in part to

defendants' apparently designed and deliberate failure to take earlier action to enforce their judgment, the suit was commenced within a few weeks after plaintiff learned of the extrinsic mistake and was diligently prosecuted by her, and defendants failed to show that they had suffered injury as a result of the delay before plaintiff knew of the mistake [*Hallett v. Slaughter (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 552, 557, 140 P.2d 3* (*see* *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472 n.2, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* , noting that *Hallett* has been criticized by Witkin)]. *Hallett* has been construed to mean that if the aggrieved party makes a strong showing of diligence in seeking relief after discovery of the facts, and the other party is unable to show prejudice from the delay, the original negligence in allowing the default to be taken will be excused on a weak showing [*Turner v. Allen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 753, 759, 11 Cal. Rptr. 630*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsIncorporation in JudgmentsCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsProvince of Court & JuryCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsTortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsDiscovery Rule

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.262

§ 489.262 Time Limitations on Motions in Equity

[1] Reasonable Time Requirement

A motion for relief in equity must be filed within a reasonable time from the date the judgment, or the extrinsic fraud or mistake, was discovered,irrespective of when the judgment was entered [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 981, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* (equitable motion granted when filed one year from date of default judgment but two months from date defendants discovered correct legal consequences of default); *see also In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583* (equitable motion granted when it was filed approximately two months after entry of final judgment of dissolution and about eight and one-half months after interlocutory judgment was entered); *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563* (equitable motion to vacate default and default judgment for lack of jurisdiction over defendant granted when service of summons was by publication and motion was made more than four years after entry of judgment)]. The same rule applies to statutory motions for equitable relief filed in a municipal court [*Marianos v. Tutunjian (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 61, 65, 138 Cal. Rptr. 529*].

Consequently, a judgment is not entitled to the usual conclusive effect when statutory time periods for direct attack have expired. Equitable relief is allowed long after the time for appeal, new trial, or other statutory means of review have expired if the judgment was obtained under circumstances of fraud or mistake that prevented a fair adversary hearing, and the aggrieved party did not have a reasonable opportunity to litigate his or her claim or defense [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300* (equitable motion to vacate order setting aside previous order of dismissal for failure to answer interrogatories when motion was filed almost three years after order was entered); *see also In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 88, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*].

[2] Diligence Requirement

The granting of equitable relief on a motion requires not only a showing of the aggrieved party's satisfactory excuse for not having made his or her claim or defense in the original action, but also a showing of his or her diligence in seeking relief after discovery of the facts [*Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 48, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*

(incorrectly named defendant acted diligently in setting aside void judgment); *Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 294, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*]. Thus, one moving in equity for relief from a judgment or order must act diligently in making the motion after learning of the judgment or order [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 981, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* ; *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 856-857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Lee v. An (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 558, 566, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620* (delay of several years in seeking relief did not demonstrate diligence)]. The same rule applies to a party seeking equitable relief from an arbitrator's award by opposing the proceeding to confirm the award [*see Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 500* (award by Labor Commissioner); *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85-86, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274* (arbitrator's award)].

In determining whether due diligence has been exercised a court must examine both the time factor and the possible prejudice that might result from setting aside the judgment [*McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 47, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188* ; *see* discussion in [3], *below*].

The failure to show due diligence after discovery of the fraud or mistake, by itself, is fatal and constitutes a bar to the granting of equitable relief [*De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 86, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274* (reversing judgment correcting and confirming arbitration award that had been made a year earlier and was claimed, in response to petition for confirmation, to have been erroneously determined and contrary to the stipulation of the parties); *see also Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 318, 112 P.2d 306* (party seeking equitable relief by motion as not permitted to wait until more than a year after he admittedly had actual notice of judgment before attacking it)].

However, the primary requirement for granting equitable relief is a satisfactory excuse for not presenting a defense in the original action; diligence is merely a further requirement, not an alternative to the first requirement. If the moving party fails to show extrinsic fraud or mistake, relief will be denied on that ground, and the fact he or she acted diligently in seeking the relief is irrelevant [*see Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 294, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*].

[3] Effect of Prejudice to Opposing Party

Although the requirement that a party act diligently in moving for relief from a judgment or order is sometimes put in terms of laches [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 908, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 345, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882*], this is not the appropriate doctrine. Laches requires a finding of prejudice to the adverse party caused by the delay, whereas the failure to act diligently in seeking relief is an independent consideration that may defeat the motion for equitable relief, whether or not the other party was prejudiced by any delay [*see Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 856-857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700*].

Thus, just as lack of prejudice to the other party will not automatically enable one to succeed when moving for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, which includes a reasonable time requirement (*see § 489.39[5]*), lack of prejudice will not automatically enable one who failed to timely move for relief under the statute to have the judgment set aside by appealing to the equity powers of the court [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Gribin Von Dyl & Associates, Inc. v. Kovalsky (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 653, 660-661, 230 Cal. Rptr. 50*]. Accordingly, the adverse party' failure to show any prejudice resulting from the moving party's claimed lack of diligence, although important, is not decisive.

Lack of prejudice is one of the factors the trial court may properly consider in determining whether defendant acted diligently [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 983-984, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* ; *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *see also Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 740, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*]. That is, in determining whether the moving party exercised diligence in seeking relief, the court must look to the extent of prejudice to the opposing party and to the reasonableness of the moving party in not filing the motion to vacate earlier [*Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal.*

4th 975, 983-984, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126 ; *In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 908, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 345, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882*]. The greater the prejudice, the more timely must be the relief sought [*In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 908, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187* ; *McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 47, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraud

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.263

§ 489.263 Relationship to Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) and (d)

[1] Distinct and Cumulative to Proceeding in Equity

Remedies under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, and a proceeding in equity for relief based on extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake are entirely distinct and cumulative [*Otani v. Kisling (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 438, 442, 33 Cal. Rptr. 239* (action in equity); *Rose v. Fuqua (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 719, 724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 634* (action in equity); *Wilson v. Wilson (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 421, 426, 130 P.2d 782* (action in equity)].

However, the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect that provides a ground for relief under the statute might also constitute, or have been the result of, extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake, which would provide a ground for relief in equity. Thus, in discussing motions to vacate defaults and default judgments, for example, the courts often speak of cases under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and those in equity interchangeably, distinguishing between the two primarily on the ground of the six-month time limitation under the statute [*see, e.g.,* *Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*]. The primary difference in the grounds for the two motions is that equitable relief is not as a rule available for mistakes of law (*see* discussion in *§ 489.246[8]*).

In addition, a party who seeks relief in equity must normally make a stronger showing than is necessary for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. During the period when the statutory relief is available, there is a strong public policy in favor of granting relief and allowing the requesting party his or her day in court. Beyond this period, there is a strong public policy in favor of the finality of judgments and only in exceptional circumstance should relief be granted [*Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 291, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*].

[2] Limitation on Equitable Relief

To the extent that the court's equity power to grant relief differs from its power under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.33*), the court's equity power is narrower than its power under the statute [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 857, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Jackson v. Bank of America (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d*

375, 386, 233 Cal. Rptr. 162 ; *Gribin Von Dyl & Associates, Inc. v. Kovalsky (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 653, 660, 230 Cal. Rptr. 50*].

[3] Relief From Forfeiture

The superior court has inherent equitable jurisdiction to set aside a default judgment taken under *Health & Safety Code § 11470 et seq.*, forfeiting real property at which drug trafficking had occurred [*see People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 582, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* (so holding even though the forfeiture law then included a provision, since removed, that *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* did not apply to it)].

[4] Six-Month or Other Statutory Limitation as Not Barring Equitable Relief That Overlaps Statutory Relief

The six-month limitation set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), does not bar a subsequent equitable motion for relief on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake merely because that fraud or mistake might also constitute mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect within the meaning of the statute [*see Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 662-663, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*]. Thus, equitable relief may be available when a defendant fails to seek relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and the six-month period prescribed by that statute has expired [*see, e.g., Rappleyea v. Campbell (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 975, 981, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669, 884 P.2d 126* ; *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 578, 122 P.2d 564* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.39[8*]].

This is also true when the time that applies by analogy to a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, or to a nonstatutory motion directed to the court'sinherent power at law, to set aside a judgment or order that is void in fact but not void on its face, has expired. That is, equitable relief may still be available (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142[8]*).

[5] Treating Statutory Motion as Equitable Motion

When a party moves for relief solely on the basis of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, a court may treat the motion as one for equitable relief [*Billings v. Edwards (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 238, 245, 174 Cal. Rptr. 722* ; *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 910, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* ; *see also People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 582-583, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* (motion made under statute but counsel urged court's inherent equitable authority as alternative ground in written reply to People's opposition and at hearing on motion, and trial court granted relief on ground that it was required by "both justice and equity")].

Moreover, a motion for relief under the statute that was not filed within the prescribed six-month period may be treated as a motion addressed to the court's equitable powers when there has been extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see, e.g., Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 290, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300* ; *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 698-699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581* ; *see also Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 856, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700*]. This is also true of motions for relief filed in a municipal court [*see Marianos v. Tutunjian (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 61, 64, 138 Cal. Rptr. 529* (motion to vacate default judgment made approximately seven months after judgment was entered)].

[6] Effect on Equitable Remedy of Denial of Relief Under Statute

When relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is denied on procedural or jurisdictional grounds, for example, on the ground that the motion was made more than six months after the judgment, order, or proceeding was entered, made, or taken, the order denying relief is not res judicata, and a subsequent action in equity, or motion for equitable relief filed in the same case, may lie [*Sternbeck v. Buck (1957), 148 Cal. App. 2d 829, 831, 307 P.2d 970* ; *see also Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 663, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*]. This is also true when the aggrieved party at the hearing on the statutory motion did not make a detailed presentation of the issues and oral testimony was not taken [*Rose v.*

Fuqua (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 719, 724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 634].

However, to the extent that the grounds were litigated on the merits in the statutory motion, the ruling is res judicata in the subsequent equity proceeding [*Darlington v. Basalt Rock Co. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 706, 10 Cal. Rptr. 556* (involving denial of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to vacate order approving compromise of minor's claim for damages for personal injuries)]. For example, in an action in which the defendant moved for relief from a default judgment on equitable grounds after the court of appeal had already reversed an order granting relief from the judgment, the holding of the appellate court on the prior appeal that the defendant was inexcusably negligent under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, was determinative of the negligence issue and thus precluded equitable relief on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake [*Jackson v. Bank of America (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 375, 386, 233 Cal. Rptr. 162*].

[7] Authority in Equity of Cases Decided Under Statute

Because *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, empowers courts to grant relief under that statute on such terms as may be just, thereby authorizing the courts to exercise their equitable powers in considering applications for relief under the statute, the reasoning of appellate courts in determining causes based on the statute may be considered, when germane, in determining causes addressed to the court's inherent equity power to vacate or set aside a judgment or order entered because of extrinsic fraud or mistake [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesStatutory SourcesCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.264

§ 489.264 Meritorious Case Requirement

[1] Equitable Action or Motion for Relief

As a general rule, equity will not interfere with a judgment that is unjust unless it appears that the one whose interests were infringed can present a meritorious case; that is, a good claim or defense, as the case may be. Thus, in an action for equitable relief the plaintiff must plead and prove facts from which it appears, at least prima facie, that if the judgment were set aside and the proceedings reopened, a different result would probably follow [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554, 305 P.2d 20* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 579, 122 P.2d 564* ; *New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. v. Siegel (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 684, 688-689, 154 Cal. Rptr. 200*].

The same rule applies to a party seeking equitable relief from a judgment by a motion [*see* *Bailey v. Roberts (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 282, 286, 76 Cal. Rptr. 572*] or by opposing a proceeding to confirm an arbitrator's award [*see* *Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 500, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186* (involving award by Labor Commissioner)].

For an exception from the meritorious case requirement when the judgment was rendered by a judge who was disqualified from hearing inthe case by reason of a financial interest in it or bias (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 170.1-170.5*), see discussion in *§ 489.166*. For discussion of the rules that apply when the aggrieved defendant was never served with summons or the service was defective, see [3], *below*.

[2] Showing Required

The requirement of presenting a meritorious case does not require an absolute guarantee of victory. For example, in an action for equitable relief it is enough if the complaint presents facts from which it can be ascertained that the plaintiff has a sufficiently meritorious claim to entitle him or her to a trial of the issue at a proper adversary proceeding [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 578-579, 122 P.2d 564*]. For example, if the judgment from which relief is sought is a default judgment entered against an incompetent, the requirement of showing a meritorious defense is satisfied when the complaint for equitable relief alleges that but for the conduct of the present defendant the court in the

former action would have considered testimony of additional witnesses concerning the matter in litigation and would have reached a different conclusion [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 580, 122 P.2d 564*].

By the same token, on a motion for equitable relief from a judgment, the moving party does not have to demonstrate with a certainty that a different result would obtain on retrial, but must merely show facts indicating a sufficiently meritorious claim or defense to entitle him or her to a fair adversary hearing [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 346, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* ; *Crane v. Kampe (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 200, 208, 37 Cal. Rptr. 220*]. If the motion seeks relief from a default judgment, a meritorious defense may be shown by either filing with the notice of motion a proposed verified answer negating essential allegations of the complaint or alleging valid affirmative defenses [*see* *Stiles v. Wallis (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1148, 195 Cal. Rptr. 377*], or by filing a proposed unverified answer and supporting declarations under penalty of perjury showing a meritorious defense [*see* *Bailey v. Roberts (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 282, 285-287, 76 Cal. Rptr. 572*], or simply by filing one or more supporting declarations under penalty of perjury showing a meritorious defense [*see* *People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 582, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739*].

If relief is sought from some other kind of default, for example, one resulting from a failure to answer discovery proceedings, one might show a meritorious claim or defense by completing and submitting with the notice of motion a verified copy of the response to the discovery motion showing that a good cause of action or defense, as the case may be, exists.

[3] Defective Service or Nonservice of Summons

The requirement of showing a meritorious defense as a condition for equitable relief has been held to apply to cases in which the court never acquired jurisdiction over the defendant's person by reason of a defective service of summons or failure to serve the summons at all [*see* *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554-555, 305 P.2d 20* (and cases there cited); *see also* *New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. v. Siegel (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 684, 689, 154 Cal. Rptr. 200*].

However, the United States Supreme Court has held that to require the showing of a meritorious defense on a defendant's motion for relief from a default judgment in an action in which the trial court never acquired personal jurisdiction over the defendant, that is, when the judgment is void for lack of personal jurisdiction, violates procedural due process and cannot constitutionally be required [*see* *Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 84-87, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*].

Peralta arose out of a Texas action to recover a sum allegedly due under the defendant's guarantee of a hospital debt incurred by one of his employees, in which a default judgment was rendered for the amount claimed and attorney's fees. Because defendant had not been timely served with summons, the judgment was void under Texas law. The defendant alleged that an abstract of the judgment had been recorded creating a cloud on the title of his real property, and that, unknown to him, a writ of attachment was issued and his real property sold for much less than its true value to satisfy the judgment. Relief was denied in the state court because defendant did not plead a meritorious defense, and he admittedly had none. The Supreme Court explained that an elementary and fundamental requirement of due process in any proceeding which is to be accorded finality is notice reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them the opportunity to present their objections, and that failure to give notice violates the most rudimentary demands of due process of law [*Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 84, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*]. The Supreme Court found untenable the claim that without a defense the same judgment would again be entered on retrial. The Court said that, as defendant asserts, had he notice of the suit he might have impleaded the employee whose debt had been guaranteed, worked out a settlement, or paid the debt, and that he would have preferred to sell his property himself in order to raise funds rather than to suffer it sold at a constable's auction on execution of the judgment [*Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 85-87, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsConstitutional LimitsCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.265

§ 489.265 Burden of Proof

The aggrieved party has the burden of showing good cause for relief from the judgment or order [*see, e.g., Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 293, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369* (burden not sustained)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.266

§ 489.266 Action for Equitable Relief

[1] In General

To maintain an independent action in equity to set aside a judgment, it is not necessary to have first made a motion for that relief in the action in which the judgment was rendered, under either *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* or *(d)* or by an equitable motion; rather, the aggrieved party may seek relief directly by an independent action in equity [*Baker v. Baker (1933) 217 Cal. 216, 217, 18 P.2d 61*]. Sound reasons may exist for filing an action rather than a motion. For example, a party proceeding by motion may be limited to the ex parte affidavits of voluntary witnesses in support of the motion, whereas in a separate action the same party would be entitled to bring unwilling witnesses to court by subpoena and to take their depositions. In light of these differences, the courts have ruled that equity must allow the separate action regardless of any earlier opportunity to move for the same relief in the action in which the judgment was rendered [*Estudillo v. Security Loan etc. Co. (1906) 149 Cal. 556, 564, 87 P. 19*]. If relief in addition to vacating the prior judgment is sought, for example, the imposition of a constructive trust, an action, rather than a motion, would be necessary. An action would also be necessary whenever relief is sought from a court other than that which rendered the judgment.

For forms of complaint in equity to set aside a judgment or order, see *§§ 489.440* and *489.441*.

[2] When Motion May Preclude Independent Action

Moreover, the making of a prior motion for relief may not bar a subsequent action in equity. The mere fact that issues might have been raised on a prior motion to set aside a judgment does not bar presentation of those issues in a later action if, in fact, they were not presented on the motion. But a detailed presentation of the issues of fraud and mistake on a motion to vacate, with full opportunity at the hearing to develop the issues by oral testimony, may bar a subsequent action to set aside the order attacked by the earlier motion [*Darlington v. Basalt Rock Co. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 706, 709-710, 10 Cal. Rptr. 556* (adding that such a bar would not apply when the opportunity to present evidence was withheld in the discretion of the trial court)]. Conversely, there is no bar to an independent action when the motion is heard on affidavits only, thus precluding a full opportunity to develop the issue by oral testimony [*Huff v. Mendoza*

(1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 677, 681, 167 Cal. Rptr. 348].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.267

§ 489.267 Denial of Relief

Equitable relief will ordinarily be denied if the court determines that the fraud or mistake is intrinsic and not extrinsic (*see* discussions in *§ 489.246*; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.133*). Relief will also be denied if the complaining party contributed to the fraud or mistake giving rise to the judgment, that is, if the party seeking relief was guilty of negligence in permitting the fraud to be practiced or the mistake to occur [*Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *see also* *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 911, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328* (equitable relief as inappropriate when defaulting defendants were negligent in failing to take any meaningful action to protect themselves after being served with summons and complaint and notice requesting entry of default)].

Relief will also be denied if the aggrieved party fails to present a meritorious case (*see* discussion in *§ 489.264*). In the case of an equitable motion, relief will be denied if the aggrieved party failed to exercise diligence in seeking relief after discovery of the judgment (*see* discussion in *§ 489.262[2]*), and in the case of an equitable action, the action may be barred by the statute of limitations or under the doctrine of laches (*see* in § 489.261), both being affirmative defenses.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity
3. Proceedings for Equitable Relief

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.268-489.279

[Reserved]

§§ 489.268[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. General Considerations

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.280

§ 489.280 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing proceedings discussed in this chapter, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. General Considerations

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.281

§ 489.281 Federal Statutes

Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. General Considerations

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.282

§ 489.282 State Statutes

Relief from judgments, dismissals, orders, or other proceedings on ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*

Relief from void judgments and orders. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*

Relief from judgment, order, or other proceeding taken against party when court has assumed jurisdiction over law practice of party's attorney. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*

Relief from default or default judgment when service of summons did not result in actual notice to party in time to defend. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*

Relief from a default or default judgment entered without full compliance with certain consumer venue statutes. *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*

Appealable judgments and orders. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1, 904.2*

Relief from judgments entered during period of military service. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors

Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. General Considerations

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.283

§ 489.283 Decisions

[1] Policy Favoring Trial on Merits

Policy of law favoring finality of judgments does not control when judgment or order set aside was in exercise of discretionary power of court not based on merits of action; recognized policy in such cases requires trial on merits whenever possible, and this policy is basis for enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*; in giving effect to that policy, appellate courts generally refrain from interfering on jurisdictional grounds with court's reconsideration of discretionary order not based on merits of litigation. *Key System Transit Lines v. Superior Court (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 184, 187, 222 P.2d 867*

When trial court denies motion for relief from default, strong policy in favor of trial on merits conflicts with general rule of deference to trial court's exercise of discretion; unless inexcusable neglect is clear, policy favoring trial on merits prevails; doubts are resolved in favor of application for relief from default, and reversal of order denying relief results. *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1079, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*

Policy of law is to have every litigated case tried on its merits and looks with disfavor on party who, regardless of merits of his or her case, attempts to take advantage of mistake, surprise, inadvertence, or neglect of his or her adversary; appellate courts are much more disposed to affirm order when result is to compel trial on merits than it is when judgment by default is allowed to stand, and it appears that substantial defense can be made. *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801*

[2] Discretion of Trial Court

[a] In General

Right to set aside default judgment within six months of entry for inadvertence, mistake, and excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is matter largely within trial court's discretion and is not disturbed on appeal absent clear

showing that discretion has been abused. *Beard v. Beard (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 645, 647, 107 P.2d 385* ; *Monsan Homes, Inc. v. Pogrebneak (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 826, 829, 258 Cal. Rptr. 676* (criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*)

Trial court's ruling on motion to vacate judgment will only be disturbed on appeal where there is clear showing of abuse of discretion and manifest miscarriage of justice. *Gamet v. Blanchard (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1276, 1283, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 439*

Standard of review on appeal of denial of motion for relief from judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* is abuse of discretion, and court of appeal will not reverse in absence of clear showing of abuse of discretion resulting in injury sufficiently grave as to amount to manifest miscarriage of justice; when two or more inferences can reasonably be deduced from facts, reviewing court has no authority to substitute its decision for that of trial court; burden is on complaining party to establish abuse of discretion, and showing on appeal is insufficient if it presents state of facts which simply affords opportunity for difference of opinion. *In re Marriage of Eben-King & King (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 92, 118, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 113*

Motion seeking relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* lies within sound discretion of trial court, whose decision will not be overturned absent abuse of discretion. *Khourie, Crew & Jaeger v. Sabek, Inc. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1012, 269 Cal. Rptr. 687* ; McCormick v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 352, 359, 243 Cal. Rptr. 617 ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

Use of equitable powers to provide relief from default is within trial court's sound discretion and burden on review rests heavily on appellant to show abuse of discretion or error. *Janetsky v. Avis (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 799, 811, 222 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Motion (in equity) to set aside default judgment is addressed to sound discretion of trial court and is not disturbed on appeal absent clear showing of abuse of discretion. *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 87, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883* ; *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801*

[b] Abuse of Discretion

Granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from dismissal of case is abuse of discretion when trial court characterized attorney's continuous failure to provide court-ordered discovery is grossly negligent and attorney's conduct was not within inexcusable negligence exception, which requires attorney's conduct to be of such extreme degree it amounts to positive misconduct so as to obliterate existence of attorney client relationship. *Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*

Trial court abuses discretion in denying relief from default judgment when defendant failed to answer complaint because he believed he had not legally been served with summons, he diligently attacked service by motion to quash it and set aside entry of default, and, being unsuccessful on that motion, diligently sought relief from default judgment by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Riskin v. Towers (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 274, 277, 148 P.2d 611*

Trial court's exercise of discretion in denying motion to vacate judgment is subject to reversal on appeal where no reasonable basis for trial court's action is shown. *Gamet v. Blanchard (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1276, 1283, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 439*

Motion to set aside judgment is addressed to trial court's discretion and is not reversed without clear showing of abuse of that discretion. *Philippine Export & Foreign Loan Guarantee Corp. v. Chuidian (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1058, 1077, 267 Cal. Rptr. 457*

On appeal from denial of motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, on ground of mistake, abuse of discretion is not established in absence of clear showing that injury resulted from wrong sufficiently grave is to amount to manifest miscarriage of justice. *Berris & Seaton v. Meyers (1984) 210 Cal. Rptr. 444*

Burden of proof on appeal of showing abuse of discretion in denying motion for equitable relief from default judgment is on appellant. *McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 48, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*

[3] Collateral Attack on Judgments and Orders

Proceedings to prohibit or annul judgments of contempt for violation of injunctions and other equitable orders made contrary to statute constitutes permissible forms of collateral attack. *Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 727, 285 P.2d 636*

[4] Appeal

[a] In General

On judgment roll appeal, validity of default judgment is determined only by consideration of matters constituting part of judgment roll. *Johnson v. Hayes Cal Builders, Inc. (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 35 Cal. Rptr. 618, 387 P.2d 394*

When notice of motion to set aside default, though ambiguous, was treated in trial court applies both to entry of default and to entry of judgment, Supreme Court does same on appeal. *Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 61, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289*

[b] Appealable Judgments and Orders

Appeal from order refusing to vacate judgment lies when record available to appellate court on appeal raises issues that are not disclosed or could not be disposed of on appeal from judgment itself. *Rooney v. Vermont Investment Corp. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 351, 359, 110 Cal. Rptr. 353, 515 P.2d 297*

When law allows appeal from judgment or order, judgment or order is appealable even though void; special order after final judgment is appealable regardless of whether it is void and regardless of whether it is provided for by any of prescribed methods of procedure. *Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366, 370-371, 217 P.2d 951* (overruling *Stanton v. Superior Court (1927) 202 Cal. 478, 261 P. 1001* , cases following it, and *Kahn v. Smith (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 12, 142 P.2d 13* ; *Payne v. Hunt (1932) 214 Cal. 605, 7 P.2d 302*); *see also* *Hensley v. Hensley (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 895, 898, 235 Cal. Rptr. 684*

Order denying relief from judgment on arbitration award pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, based on attorney's failure to timely request trial de novo, is appealable. *Brown v. Williams (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 182, 185 n.2, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634*

Order denying motion to vacate void judgment is itself void and appealable because it gives effect to void judgment. *Carlson v. Eassa (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 684, 691, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 884*

Order setting aside void judgment is appealable order. *Jones v. Interstate Recovery Service (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 925, 928, 206 Cal. Rptr. 924*

Order granting or denying motion to vacate or set aside void judgment is special order made after entry of judgment and directly appealable. *County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 110, 183 Cal. Rptr. 741*

Order vacating judgment and setting aside default is special order after judgment and appealable. *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 43, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794* (motion in equity); *Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 902 n.1, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417* (involving judgment entered after noncontested hearing when defendant failed to appear for trial)

Under principle that postjudgment order that affects judgment in some manner or its enforcement, whether it favors judgment creditor or debtor, is appealable, order denying defendant's motion made after judgment to vacate and quash levy of execution and to vacate judgment on ground itwas void is appealable order. *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 839, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*

Order denying relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from default and default judgment is appealable. *First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 648, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798*

Order denying relief from judgment on ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake is appealable. *Cope v. Cope (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 218, 228-229, 40 Cal. Rptr. 917*

Order vacating defendants' default before any judgment had been rendered against them is not separately appealable, since it is neither final judgment nor order made after final judgment, but is reviewable on appeal from judgment subsequently entered. *Smith v. Los Angeles Bookbinders Union (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 486, 498, 284 P.2d 194* , disapproved on other grounds in *Macleod v. Tribune Publishing Co. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 536, 551, 343 P.2d 36*

[c] Nonappealable Judgments and Orders

Order denying motion to vacate appealable judgment is generally not appealable if appeal raises only matters reviewable on appeal from judgment. *Rooney v. Vermont Investment Corp. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 351, 358, 110 Cal. Rptr. 353, 515 P.2d 297*

Order amending order vacating default judgment by striking provision in vacating order setting date for determining value of condemned property is not appealable as special order after final judgment because there is no longer any final judgment in action, and amending order does not affect default judgment but merely recognizes its vacation. *City of San Diego v. Superior Court (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 483, 486, 224 P.2d 685*

Order denying reconsideration of order setting aside default judgment is nonappealable when issues are same as on original motion. *Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 902 n.1, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417*

[d] Untimely Appeal

Person who failed to file timely notice of appeal is not always without remedy; for example, when, after rendition of judgment, person entitled to take proceeding looking to reversal or modification of judgment is prevented from doing so by fraud or duress of other party until it is too late, or who is prevented from taking appeal by circumstances over which person has no control is entitled to equitable relief from judgment; such relief is invoked in unusual case of fraud or hardship without interfering with rules governing jurisdiction of appeal. *Hollister Convalescent Hosp., Inc. v. Rico (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 660, 675, 125 Cal. Rptr. 757, 542 P.2d 1349*

[e] Considerations on Appeal

Policy of law favors hearing on merits whenever possible; appellate court is much more disposed to affirm order that compels trial on merits than to allow default judgment to stand. *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 854, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (equitable proceeding); *Aldrich v. SanFernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300* (same); *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801* (same)

Standard of review of trial court order refusing to vacate judgment is if any applicable ground will sustain order, ruling will not be disturbed on appeal; any factual conflicts in evidence are resolved in favor of party who prevailed in trial court. *Philippine Export & Foreign Loan Guarantee Corp. v. Chuidian (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1058, 1076-1077, 267 Cal. Rptr. 457*

Lower court decision is not overturned merely because it was given for wrong reason; if right on any theory of law applicable to case, lower court decision is required to be sustained regardless of considerations that may have moved trial court to its conclusion. *Aheroni v. Maxwell (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 284, 292, 252 Cal. Rptr. 369*

In reviewing evidence in support of motion for relief from default and default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, appellate court extends all legitimate and reasonable inferences to uphold judgment; disposition of motion is largely within trial court's discretion, and is not disturbed on appeal absent abuse of discretion; appropriate test of abuse of discretion, although precise definition is difficult, is whether trial court exceeded bounds of reason, all circumstances before it being considered. *Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 803, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*

Order denying relief from default is subject to closer appellate scrutiny than one granting relief, and doubts are resolved in favor of party attempting to get to trial; policy of law favors hearing on merits and law looks with disfavor on party who, regardless of merits of case, attempts to take advantage of mistake, surprise, inadvertence, or neglect of adversary. *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 554, 555-556, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838*

Appellate courts are favorably disposed toward orders excusing defaults and permitting controversies to be adjudicated on their merits; such orders are rarely reversed and never unless abuse of discretion clearly appears. *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 148, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*

[f] Trial on Affidavits (Declarations)

Trial court's resolution of disputed fact issues on basis of affidavits of parties has same standing on appeal is findings based on oral testimony; if affidavits conflict, those favoring prevailing party are accepted as true; because all intendments are in favor of action taken by trial court, affidavits in behalf of successful party are deemed not only to establish facts directly stated therein but all facts reasonably to be inferred from those stated. *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149-150, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*

Rule on appeal when issue is tried on affidavits is that those affidavits favoring contention of prevailing party establish not only facts stated in them but also facts that reasonably may be inferred from them, and if stated facts are in substantial conflict, determination of controverted facts by trial court is not disturbed on appeal. *Wilson v. Eddy (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 613, 617-618, 82 Cal. Rptr. 826*

[g] Power of Trial Court After Appeal

Appeal removes from trial court's jurisdiction subject matter of judgment or order appealed from; trial court has no power thereafter to amend or correct its judgment or order, or to vacate it or set it aside. *Takahashi v. Fish and Game Com. (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 719, 725, 185 P.2d 805*

[5] Cross Appeal

Plaintiff's appeal from order vacating default judgment permits defendant to cross appeal from judgment under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3(c) [*now see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.108(f)*]; order in which appeals are heard. *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699-700, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

155 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. General Considerations

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.284-489.289

[Reserved]

§§ 489.284[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.290

§ 489.290 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda supporting and opposing motions for relief on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeOpposing MemorandaCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeSupporting MemorandaCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.291

§ 489.291 State Statutes

Relief from judgments, dismissals, orders, or other proceedings on ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*

Relief from default or default, default judgment, or dismissal based on attorney's affidavit of fault. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), (c)*

Penalties and conditions that may be imposed on granting relief from default or default judgment based on any provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurprise

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.292

§ 489.292 Decisions

[1] Liberal Construction

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) is a remedial statute and is to be construed liberally to favor its object that cases be adjudicated on the merits rather than determined by default. *Standard Microsystems Corp. v. Winbond Electronics Corp. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 868, 894, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 140*

Because the law favors disposing of cases on their merits, any doubts in applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* must be resolved in favor of the party seeking relief from default. *Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 696, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), is liberally construed because law strongly favors trial and disposition on merits; any doubts in applying statute are required to be resolved in favor of party seeking relief. *Brochtrup v. INTEP (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 323, 329, 235 Cal. Rptr. 390*

[2] Default

[a] In General

Plaintiff's quiet speed in having default entered, though perhaps constituting breach of professional courtesy, does not take away trial court's discretion to grant or deny motion for relief from default, but as merely factor to be considered by trial court in ruling on motion. *Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 807, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*

Taking default quietly on beginning of first day on which defendant's answer was delinquent without prior notice to defendant's counsel is professional discourtesy that justifies vacating default. *Robinson v. Varela (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 611, 616, 136 Cal. Rptr. 783*

[b] Default Judgments

In personal injury action, trial court properly denied defendant's motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* to vacate default judgment because defendant made no showing that default or judgment was taken against it through its mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. Defendant's insurers were unable to retain counsel to defend it until *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19719*, prohibiting any person from attempting or purporting to exercise powers, rights, and privileges of corporation suspended pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23301*, was ruled to provide defense for suspended corporation in civil action was amended. Defendant failed to explain why its insurers waited over two and one-half years to retain counsel to defend it or why its insurers never intervened in action. Evidence showed that defendant and its insurers were aware of claims but neither appeared until the trial court was about to enter default judgments against defendant. *Schwab v. So. Calif. Gas Co. (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1308, 1319-1320, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 627*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) did not bar cross-defendants' motion to vacate default judgment entered on cross-complaint for failure to seek relief within six months of entry of judgment, when entry of default was not based on cross-defendants' mistake, but because plaintiff neglected to inform cross-defendants of trial date, court improperly ordered their default for failing to appear at trial apparently without confirming they were notified; plaintiff sought type and amount of damages not specified in their cross-complaint, and court granted request. Motion was governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, which allows court to set aside void judgment at any time. *Heidary v. Yadollahi, 99 Cal. App. 4th 857, 862, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 695*

Trial court abused its discretion under facts of case in striking defendants' pleading and entering default judgment against them for general and compensatory damages for their failure to attend court-ordered deposition pertaining to inquiry into their financial condition pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3295*. *McArthur v. Bockman (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1080-1081, 256 Cal. Rptr. 522*

Judgment rendered for failure to appear at trial after notice (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*) is not default judgment but rather a judgment entered after uncontested trial. *Merrifield v. Edmonds (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 336, 341, 194 Cal. Rptr. 104*

When defendant has filed answer, neither clerk nor court has power to enter default based on defendant's failure to appear at trial. *Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 577, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309*

[3] Dismissal of Action

Order granting unopposed motion for summary judgment did not come within mandatory provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; mandatory provision applies only to relief sought in response to defaults, default judgments or dismissals, and summary judgments thus are not within purview of mandatory relief provision. *Huh v. Wang (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1406, 1414-1418, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*

Order granting unopposed motion for summary judgment was not default judgment or dismissal so as to entitle party to mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on attorney error. Further, counsel's flat assertion that he did not receive motion for summary judgment was simply a statement of fact, not an acknowledgment that counsel was at fault in not opposing motion for summary judgment. *Prieto v. LoyolaMarymount University (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 290, 294-297, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 639*

Extension of mandatory relief for dismissals resulting from attorney error under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is not available when judgment of dismissal is for failure to comply with 90-day limitations provisions for commencement of suit and service of summons set forth in *Gov. Code § 66499.37*. *Sprague v. County of San Diego (2003) 106 Cal. App.*

4th 119, 135, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 517

"Dismissal" in mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not encompass judgment to which court had determined defendant is entitled as matter of law based on undisputed facts before court, so that summary judgment is not "dismissal" within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *English v. IKON Business Solutions, Inc. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 130, 136-149, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93*

Trial court abused its discretion in dismissing action when court failed to give consideration to plaintiff's personal and family traumas and court's comments about wanting to "keep heat on" plaintiff and dismissing action shortly thereafter seemed arbitrary and created appearance of substantial unfairness, when plaintiff had received information that was plainly inaccurate as she was not informed that plaintiff's counsel's motion to withdraw had been granted and she needed to retain other counsel immediately, and dismissal continued to list her counsel; although in pro per litigants are not entitled to special exemptions from rules of procedure, they are entitled to equal treatment, and confusing and misleading nature of various orders and communications plaintiff received from trial court was particularly important in light of her involuntary in pro per status. *Gamet v. Blanchard (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1276, 1283, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 439*

Mandatory relief provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* did not apply when counsel's declaration concerning his inexcusable neglect in filing fourth amended complaint presented no answer to issues posed by plaintiff's motion for leave to amend or by defendants' motion to strike fourth amended complaint and dismiss, since plaintiffs could only use counsel's declaration of fault as basis for vacating entered dismissal, while court could not enter dismissal until it had exercised its informed discretion on basis of showings made in support of pending motions; further, court could not say that plaintiffs' attorney's conduct deprived them of their day in court since proposed amendment, which did not address all issues previously raised by trial court, would not necessarily have allowed plaintiffs to proceed to trial. *Leader v. Health Industries of America, Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 603, 615-621, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 489*

"Dismissal" within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* does not include judgment of dismissal for failure of plaintiff to comply with statute of limitations, hence, relief is unavailable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* in those circumstances. *Castro v. Sacramento County Fire Protection Dist. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 927, 929, 934, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 193*

Trial court has jurisdiction, even after voluntary dismissal with prejudice is filed, to vacate judgment of dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when it was entered is result of plaintiff's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. *Basinger v. Rogers & Wells (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 16, 21, 269 Cal. Rptr. 332*

[4] Claims Against Public Entities

Showing required for relief from failure to file timely claim against public entity (*Gov. Code §§ 911.4, 911.6*) on grounds of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect is same as that required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Torbitt v. State of California (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 860, 864, 208 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[5] Settlements

No rule of law gives appellate court carte blanche to set aside "unjust" settlement; motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* to vacate stipulated judgment based on settlement agreement is not governed by same standards applicable to judgments incurred through excusable neglect; when parties by their own agreement, while represented by counsel, and after protracted negotiation, settled litigation, policies of law of contract, which favors enforcement of valid bargains between private parties, and of settlements, which favors private resolution of disputes, and of finality of judgments prevail. *Philippine Export & Foreign Loan Guarantee Corp. v. Chuidian (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1058, 1075-1076, 267 Cal. Rptr. 457*

[6] Grounds for Relief

[a] In General

In action against medical providers based on plaintiffs' mother's death in nursing home, trial court properly denied relief under discretionary portion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* to set aside order dismissing complaint for failure to timely amend on basis of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, when plaintiff's mistake of law was unreasonable, and where plaintiffs' inaction after remand appeared to trial court to be intentional conduct rather than mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect. Trial court also properly denied relief under mandatory portion, when trial court did not believe failure to timely file amended complaint was due to mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, but was instead knowing and intentional conduct. *Pagarigan v. Aetna U.S. Healthcare of California, Inc. (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 38, 43-46, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 627*

Personal injury plaintiff's self-representation was not grounds for relief from judgment against him when mistake was not mistake of law but mistake of judgment; there is no authority for relieving litigant from consequences of mistake in judgment when choosing to act as his or her own attorney. *Burnete v. La Casa Dana Apartments (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1262, 1267-1268, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 437*

Trial court correctly concluded that defendants' Portuguese lawyer was attorney whose affidavit of fault entitled his clients to relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Rodrigues v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1027, 1033-1037, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 194*

Trial court was not required to grant relief from dismissal of interpleader action under mandatory portion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on client's failure to file claims in interpleader action due to attorney neglect, when counsel did not file affidavit of fault, but rather attorney's first declaration chiefly authenticated documents filed in support of motion for relief from dismissal and second declaration stated only that counsel lacked authority to dismiss on client's behalf affirmative claims not then on file in instant proceeding, and neither declaration contained any sworn admission of mistake, inadvertence, surprise or error resulting in dismissal of claims. Attorney's affirmation of contents of legal memorandum were not adequate to satisfy requirement of attorney's sworn affidavit attesting to fault within meaning of *Code Civ. Pro. § 473(b)*, when it contained no concession of error on attorney's part. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 600, 608-610, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256*

Although attorney affidavit of fault makes relief mandatory under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* from default judgment or dismissal, it does not mandate relief from judgment entered on arbitration award unless the client was denied hearing; in this case, attorney negligence consisted of failing to timely request trial de novo after arbitration award in defendants' favor, so relief was not mandated; further, award resulted from arbitration hearing in which plaintiff and her attorney actually participated, and denial ofdiscretionary relief was not error. *Brown v. Williams (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 182, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634*

Mandatory language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, requiring that default judgment be set aside when application for relief is accompanied by attorney's affidavit attesting to his or her error, was not applicable to attorney's failure to make timely request for trial de novo after judgment was entered on arbitrator's award; rather, judgment was governed by discretionary provisions of section. *Ayala v. Southwest Leasing & Rental, Inc. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 40, 44, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 637*

Relief is granted when default is result of excusable mistake or neglect on part of party's attorney or attorney's total failure to represent client; relief is not granted if attorney has not totally failed to represent client, but has been guilty of inexcusable neglect. *Lopez v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 925, 935, 223 Cal. Rptr. 798*

When defendant, with full knowledge of proceedings, obtained extension of time within which to answer, but failed to answer because it was considering filing petition in bankruptcy, trial court's refusal to vacate default taken against defendant is proper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 824, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109*

When answer was mailed on last day before time to answer expired and default was taken before answer reached clerk, defense attorney's unexplained delay in discussing settlement with client and preparing answer until next to last day is insufficient showing to entitle defendant to relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *A & B Metal Products v. MacArthur Properties, Inc. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 642, 648, 89 Cal. Rptr. 873*

[b] Mistake

Trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for relief from default based on paralegal's mistake in calendaring order to show cause hearing so that attorney failed to appear and trial court ordered attorney's client's answer stricken; attorney is responsible for supervising work of legal assistants and paralegal's error was attributable to attorney for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Hu v. Fang (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 61, 64-66, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in vacating plaintiff's voluntary dismissal of action against county based on plaintiff's mistaken belief that on dismissal county would cooperate with development of real property under ground lease, when trial court could have inferred that plaintiff was mistaken as to county's general intent to cooperate and acted under erroneous conviction that county wanted plaintiff to proceed with development. *H. D. Arnaiz, Ltd. v. County of San Joaquin (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1357, 1368-1369, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 71*

Trial court abused its discretion in denying motion for relief from dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* of interpleader action brought by insurer against insured and bank, when insured's failure to file cross-complaint in interpleader action and instead filing independent action in federal court was attributable to attorney's reasonable misinterpretation of interpleader statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 386*] that led attorney to conclusion that filing cross-complaint was not compulsory under *Code Civ. Proc. § 426.30*, even though counsel failed to consult compulsory cross-complaint statute. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 600, 611-615, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), has no application to judicial mistakes, but only to mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect of moving party; in that defendant cannot participate in default judgment hearing, any action taken at that hearing cannot possibly result from any mistake by defendant, thus, award of excessive damages in default judgment is "mistake" by court. *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 702, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Defendants' attorney's mistaken belief as to rules governing attorney's fees on default matters in county in which plaintiff brought action does not require that defendants' default be vacated. *A & S Air Conditioning v. John J. Moore Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 617, 620, 7 Cal. Rptr. 592*

[c] Inadvertence

Inadvertence presupposes mistake or negligence of one degree or another, either excusable or inexcusable under particular facts of case. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 95, 108-109, 191 Cal. Rptr. 549*

When defendant placed summons and complaint in general file and inadvertently failed to make notation of it and there was no indication that he did not understand nature of papers or any indication that acts of any third person intervened, contributing to inadvertence, such inadvertence is mere forgetfulness not entitling defendant to relief. *Kooper v. King*

(1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 621, 627, 15 Cal. Rptr. 848

[d] Surprise

Surprise was not grounds for relief from dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* in interpleader action brought by insurer against insured and bank, when, after insured stipulated to disbursement of deposited funds, he received copy of letter by insurer to clerk of court requesting filing of enclosed request for dismissal as soon as funds had actually been disbursed, and insured made no objection, so that it could be inferred that trial court concluded insured anticipated insurer would dismiss interpleader once deposited funds had been disbursed so that dismissal was not unexpected, which was reasonable inference. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Pietak (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 600, 611, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, surprise is some condition or situation in which a party is unexpectedly placed to his or her injury, without any fault or negligence of his or her own, which ordinary prudence could not have guarded against. *Credit Managers Ass'n v. National Indep. Bus. Alliance (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1173, 209 Cal. Rptr. 119* ; *Lint v. Chisholm (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 615, 620, 177 Cal. Rptr. 314* ; *Hodge Sheet Metal Products v. Palm Springs Riviera Hotel (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 653, 656-657, 11 Cal. Rptr. 435*

[e] Excusable Neglect

"Excusable neglect," in context of ruling on motion for relief from default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, encompasses mistake, inadvertence, and surprise. *Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 528 n.8, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635*

Defendant's neglect in failing to file answer is not ground for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when failure was based on defendant's wrongful belief that case was moot and that it was under no obligation to answer. *Jackson v. Bank of America (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 55, 58, 190 Cal. Rptr. 78*

[f] Failure to Notify Opposing Counsel of Intent to Take Default

If a plaintiff's counsel knows the identity of the lawyer representing a defendant, he or she owes an ethical obligation to warn before requesting entry of the defendant's default. *Fasuyi v. Permatex, Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 681, 696, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351*

Plaintiff's counsel is under no legal obligation to give notice of impending default toattorney who represented defendant in another case in which the two attorneys were adversaries, although counsel should have done so as matter of professional courtesy; failure to give notice does not require court to set aside default, although, by taking default without notice, counsel takes risk that court would grant relief. *Bellm v. Bellia (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 1036, 1038, 198 Cal. Rptr. 389*

While no statute or rule requires plaintiff's attorney to notify defendant's attorney that he or she intends to take default, failure to do so usually is sufficient ground for setting default aside on motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. *Nelson v. Southerland (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 140, 142, 9 Cal. Rptr. 735*

[g] Insurer's Neglect

Unexcused neglect of insurance carrier in failing to defend insured defendant is imputed to defendant. *Don v. Cruz*

(1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 699, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581

[h] Attorney's Error or Omission

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying discretionary relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on plaintiff's failure to appear at all in opposition to summary judgment motion on grounds of unexplained delay or inexcusable neglect, when plaintiff did not act diligently in seeking relief based on length of delay in seeking relief since triggering event for seeking relief from judgment was notice of its entry, and plaintiff waited to file his motion until more than three months later and plaintiff offered no evidence explaining delay in seeking relief; and when plaintiff failed to carry burden of establishing entitlement to relief from judgment since counsel being overwhelmed and disorganized, misfiling summary judgment motion among completed items and not calendaring hearing date or due date of opposition was not excusable neglect because there was no clerical mistake or extraordinary circumstance. *Huh v. Wang (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1406, 1420-1425, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*

Attorney who brought action on attorney's own behalf in pro per and on behalf of others as taxpayer in representative capacity was not entitled to mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when mandatory relief provision of that section applied only in case of attorney representing client, and where, as to aspect of bringing action on behalf of other taxpayers, if attorney bound other taxpayers by action, attorney did so as fellow taxpayer, not as attorney for taxpayers. *Esther B. v. City of Los Angeles (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1099-1100, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 596*

In dispute over termination of partnership for operation of hotel, trial court properly denied plaintiff relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on attorney's failure to file timely opposition to motion to enforce settlement agreement, and plaintiff's tardiness in filing his own motion to enforce, which trial court declined to consider; attorney fault provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* did not apply to attorney's failure to timely file opposition and cross-motion to motion to enforce settlement. *Hossain v. Hossain (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 454, 457-459, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 356*

In action on sublease, defendants were entitled under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* to mandatory relief from defaults entered by court after striking defendants' answer as sanction for failure to comply with discovery order and from resulting default judgment, based on attorney's affidavit of fault, when default judgment was "default judgment" within meaning of statute, and when defendant's attorney's declaration stated that, due to his own neglect, he had failed to file opposition to discovery motions, failed to attend hearing on those motions, failed to inform defendants of discovery order against them, failed to file opposition to motion for terminating sanction, and failed to attend hearing on that motion, and attorney's neglect was sole cause of defendants' failure to comply with discovery order resulting in terminating sanction. Plaintiffs or their counsel were entitled to recover from attorney reasonable compensatory legal fees and costs necessitated by his neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], and trial court on remand could impose sanctions and grant other relief provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(1)*. *Matera v. McLeod (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 44, 62-68, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 331*

Defendants whose attorney did not inform them of trial date were not entitled to have amended judgment issued after uncontested trial set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, because judgment was not "default," "default judgment," or "dismissal" within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and uncontested trial in their absence and resulting judgment were not procedural equivalent of default. *Vandermoon v. Sanwong (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 315, 319-321, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 772*

Affidavit of fault signed by attorney who represented partnership in bankruptcy proceeding but not in civil action against city was competent to support partnership's motion in civil action for mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when attorney's declaration made clear his fault lay in not appearing at order to show cause hearing in spite of fact that he had not been retained to represent partnership in civil action because of his belief that court could take no action in civil action based on stay obtained in bankruptcy proceeding. *SJP Limited Partnership v. City of Los Angeles*

(2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 511, 516-520, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 55

Trial court properly refused to grant plaintiffs mandatory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* from dismissal based on granting of motion for terminating sanctions based on plaintiffs' failure to respond to discovery requests or oppose motions to compel discovery or terminating sanctions, when plaintiffs' attorneys regularly failed to respond to discovery when due without informing other side or seeking extension, attempts by opposing counsel to discuss or "meet and confer" were ignored, giving opposing counsel no choice but to go to trouble and expense of preparing and filing motion to compel, which still did not engender response, and, while plaintiffs' counsel did not oppose such motions, neither did they concede, drawing court into conflict, wasting judicial resources and, in case of appointed referee, leading to further expense, and when order issued compelling responses, plaintiffs' counsel defied that too, leading to second go round of each step; and when ultimate sanction of dismissal reared its head, plaintiffs' counsel's obvious plan was to claim attorney fault and revive claims through Section 473(b) motion for relief. *Jerry's Shell v. Equilon Enterprises, LLC (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1058, 1069-1074, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 637*

In action by California Attorney General against attorney to make attorney stop filing shakedown lawsuits against small businesses under the unfair competition law, trial court was within its discretion to enter default judgment against attorney and to conclude that attorney had not shown excusable neglect or genuine surprise, mistake or inadvertence to justify relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* and excuse his failure to answer after his demurrer was overruled based on his answer being stolen out of his home mailbox; claim of lost mail is not grounds for automatic relief from a default judgment, and, although attorney provided trial court with series of anecdotes suggesting mail theft from his home mailbox and other mailboxes in his neighborhood, he failed to specify dates, and trial court was justified in concluding that attorney knew of risks of putting mail out for collection in his neighborhood prior to putting his answer in theft-prone mailbox, and proceeded without due regard for known risk; alternatively, given vagueness of attorney's declaration, trial court could reasonably conclude he was being untruthful in asserting story that could not be disproved; and even assuming attorney was truthful in his declaration, absence of conformed copy of his answer should have put him on notice something was wrong and needed correction. *People ex rel. Lockyer v. Brar (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 659, 662-664, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 272*

Trial court erred in denying motion for relief from entry of default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* and showing of attorney fault was sufficient, when attorney's declarations explicitly absolved his clients from any responsibility for failure to answer complaint, and although attorney admitted that failure to answer was not accidental or inadvertent, but was calculated result of his mistaken suppositions about settlement possibilities, statute did not require unintentional failure to act, and client was entitled to relief when attorney admitted inaction was his responsibility. *Solv-All v. Superior Court (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1003, 1008-1012, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 202*

Trial court properly concluded that counsel's mistake or neglect caused entry of default and granted relief from default and default judgment, when record did not contain disclaimer of attorney fault, and it would have been difficult to accept full disclaimer of responsibility from counsel since before entry of default, counsel learned that court file included declaration of service from process server setting up possible credibility dispute between process server and agent for service of process, who was also defendant, and, even if counsel believed agent accurately described attempted service, counsel should not have presumed court would believe agent's description over process server's; and when although entry of default was not solely caused by defendants or by their counsel, but was caused by both defendants and their counsel, defendants' conduct contributing to default was mistake and not intentional. *Benedict v. Danner Press (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 923, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 896*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473 applied to circumstances under which judgment was entered after trial on reserved issues arising from marital dissolution, at which neither former wife nor her attorney appeared, when circumstances were akin to procedural equivalent of default judgment as there was no litigation on merits, and attorney had been formally retained one week prior to trial and former attorney did not advise him of trial date so that both counsel and former wife failed to appear, trial was had and former wife did not have her day in court; further, trial court should have granted motion to set

aside judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when attorney attested in affidavit one of reasons in § 473(b) existed as to why no appearance was made to defend former wife at trial, i.e., attorney's negligence in not inquiring of former attorney about status of case, when attorney's negligence was proximate cause of default, and when former wife had not contributed to default. *In re Marriage of Hock & Gordon-Hock (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1438, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546*

Attorney's failure to effectuate proper service of notice of intent to commence medical malpractice action against physicians pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 364(d)* does not constitute excusable mistake of law; *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* is not available to toll statute of limitations. *Hanooka v. Pivko (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1553, 1562-1563* ,

Attorney, who assumes that opposing counsel has granted him extensions of time to file answer because he placed phone calls and wrote letter to opposing counsel in effort to request extension but received no response, is guilty of inexcusable neglect within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; trial court's granting of relief on such showing is abuse of discretion. *Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 531, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635*

Existence of excusable neglect for purposes of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on attorney's mistake of law is determined by reasonableness of misconception and justifiability of lack of determination of correct law. *Brochtrup v. INTEP (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 323, 329, 235 Cal. Rptr. 390* (default under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 2033* for failure to respond to requests for admissions)

Attorney's inexcusable neglect in failing to research law is chargeable to client, whose remedy is action for malpractice against attorney. *Torbitt v. State of California (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 860, 866, 208 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, for attorney's neglect or mistake requires excusable neglect or mistake of counsel; mere neglect or negligence is insufficient basis for relief. *Cochran v. Linn (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 245, 252, 205 Cal. Rptr. 550* ; *Robinson v. Varela (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 611, 615-616, 136 Cal. Rptr. 783*

Evaluation of attorney's neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* involves consideration of reasonableness of defaulting attorney's conduct and conduct of attorney in taking default. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 95, 109, 191 Cal. Rptr. 549*

When party's failure to appear is result of neglect of his or her attorney, party is charged with neglect. *Conway v. Municipal Court (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1017, 166 Cal. Rptr. 246*

[i] Attorney Abandonment

Record showing that former attorney was served with complaint, written request for responsive pleading, and notice of request to enter default, but failed to file answer and then withdrew from case, was not sufficient to support relief from default under exception for attorney neglect of extreme degree amounting to positive misconduct. *Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 626, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*

Default judgment of dissolution of marriage was properly set aside when amended petition was not properly served on husband, husband's attorney failed to represent him and lied to conceal that failure, and wife's attorney took unfair advantage of husband. *In re Marriage of Rhoades (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 169, 172-173, 211 Cal. Rptr. 531*

[j] Lack of Actual Notice

Error to deny relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, when presumption arising from proof of service was overcome by defendant's detailed, credible, and unimpeached evidence that it received no actual notice of hearing. *Bonzer v. City of Huntington Park (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1479-1481, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 278*

[7] Attorneys's Act or Omission as Imputed to Client

When defaulting defendant has relied on attorney retained for purpose of defending action, general rule is that attorney's inexcusable negligence is charged to client who is relegated to action against attorney for malpractice. *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 700, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Negligence of attorney is imputed to client and may not be offered by latter is basis for relief from judgment. *Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61*

[8] Constructive Knowledge

Even though knowledge of lawyer is knowledge of client, client ordinarily is charged with constructive notice only when knowledge of attorney has been gained in course of particular transaction in which he or she has been employed by principal. *Zirbes v. Stratton (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1413, 232 Cal. Rptr. 653*

[9] Timeliness of Motion

[a] In General

When attorney affidavit of fault is filed under 1991 amendment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*,six month period commences from date default judgment is entered, not date of entry of default. *Sugasawara v. Newland (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 294, 297, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 484*

Court was unable to say as matter of law that delay of 21 days after entry of default and 12 days from time default judgment was taken was unreasonable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b).* *Robinson v. Varela (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 611, 617, 136 Cal. Rptr. 783*

Delay of nearly six months in filing motion to set aside default after discovery of its entry is unreasonable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b).* *Northridge Financial Corp. v. Hamblin (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 819, 824, 122 Cal. Rptr. 109*

When strong possibility existed that default judgment, if allowed to stand, would affirm transactions in violation of usury law, court was unable to say as matter of law that unexplained delay of 93 days in filing motion to set aside default should compel trial court, in exercise of discretion, to deprive defendant of trial on merits. *Berman v. Klassman (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 900, 910, 95 Cal. Rptr. 417*

When defendant's attorney was informed that plaintiff's attorney was seeking to have default entered and motion to vacate default was not made until one day before expiration of six months after entry of default, court was warranted in determining that defendant's motion to set aside default was not timely made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b).* *Cannon v. American Hydrocarbon Corp. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 639, 651, 84 Cal. Rptr. 575*

[b] Diligence Requirement

Every party desiring to resist an action or participate in a judicial proceeding has duty to take timely and adequate steps to retain counsel or act personally to avoid undesirable judgment; motion for relief from default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is denied unless defendant shows that, in arranging for his or her defense, he or she has exercised that reasonable diligence that person of ordinary prudence usually bestows on important business. *Luz v. Lopes (1960) 55 Cal. 2d 54, 62, 10 Cal. Rptr. 161, 358 P.2d 289*

Delay of several years in seeking relief did not demonstrate diligence. *Lee v. An (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 558, 566, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620*

In action by county to impose child support obligation on biological father, county timely moved to set aside voluntary declaration of paternity signed by another man under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, and county and mother met diligence requirement, when biological father took child into his house, held her out as his own, and supported her for three years, so that it was perfectly reasonable that mother, who did not understand legal effect of voluntary declaration, did not attempt to rescind declaration, and she acted promptly once biological father refused to continue to support his daughter. *County of Los Angeles v. Sheldon P. (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 1346-1347, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 350*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), motion for relief from default is properly denied when events raised as excuse each occurred after entry of default and related only to counsel's diligence in seeking relief. *Barragan v. Banco BCH (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 283, 301, 232 Cal. Rptr. 758*

Showing of due diligence is as much of a prerequisite to granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, as it is under inherent equitable power of court; party failing to show due diligence or reasonable excuse for failing to file timely response is not entitled to relief under statute. *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 86, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*

[c] Reasonable Time Requirement

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in finding that moving party filed *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* motion within reasonable time in filing motion only a few days short of six months after court issued order denying attorney's fees and costs, even though moving party apparently obtained declaration from former counsel in support of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief on the very day the order was issued, when although former attorney, after refusing to communicate with client for protracted period and eventually abandoning him, advised him on September 30, 1999, that he had six months to pursue *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief, between September 30th and March 4, 2000, moving party sought to retain counsel to represent him in bringing motion, but because of financial difficulties caused in part by underlying lawsuit, could not obtain counsel until he arranged for personal loan to provide necessary financial retainer in February 2000, and during same period was occupied by loss of his business. *Lee v. Wells Fargo Bank (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 1200-1201, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*

Lack of funds to obtain counsel does not require default to be set aside as matter of law, but trial court properly considers this matter in determining whether motion to set aside default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, was brought within reasonable time; trial court does not abuse its discretion in determining under facts of case that excuse did not tip scales in favor of granting relief. *Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 805-806, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*

When plaintiff claimed without contradiction that defendant's attorney was informed of entry of default within two days of entry, defendant's four-month delay in applying for relief from default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, was unreasonable. *A & B Metal Products v. MacArthur Properties, Inc. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 642, 749, 89 Cal. Rptr. 873*

[d] Unexplained Delays

Unexplained delays of more than three months in seeking relief from default after knowledge of its entry generally results in denial of relief. *Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 625, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*

[e] Six-Month Limitation

Trial court erred in vacating summary judgment in favor of defendant on plaintiff's motion to set aside summary judgment based on procedural default resulting from counsel's excusable neglect, when, although plaintiff filed first motion for relief within six months of entry of judgment, plaintiff failed to serve defendant within six months and second motion for relief was both filed and served after six-month period had expired, so motions were untimely and court had no authority to grant requested relief; when defendant did not waive six-month limit by appearing at hearing on motion and opposing motion on merits; and when trial court had no authority under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* to excuse plaintiff's noncompliance with six-month time limit. *Arambula v. Union Carbide Corp. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 333, 340-345, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 854*

Trial court did not err in granting motion for *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* relief from order denying attorney's fees and costs which was filed more than six months after opposing party raised issue of untimeliness of original motion but within six months of date trial court issued final order denying fees and costs, where six-month deadline in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* ran from date trial court issued its final order, not date opposing party raised issue. *Lee v. Wells Fargo Bank (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*

Six-month time limit for granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is jurisdictional and relief is not granted under statute if application for relief is instituted more than six months after entry of judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought. *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 735 n.3, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

[10] Proposed Pleading

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), requirement that application for relief be accompanied by copy of pleading proposed to be filed is not satisfied by motion for order continuing time within which to plead. *Sousa v. Capital Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 744, 759-760, 34 Cal. Rptr. 71*

[11] Burden of Proof

In motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, initial burden is on moving party to prove excusable neglect by preponderance of evidence. *Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 528, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635* ; *Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*

Moving party has burden of proving he or she is entitled to relief. *Conway v. Municipal Court (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1017, 166 Cal. Rptr. 246*

[12] Prejudice to Opposing Party

Judgment is not permitted to be set aside under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, in spite of inexcusable neglect, simply because other side has not been prejudiced. *Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 900, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*

If conduct of defendant's attorney was excusable, prejudice to plaintiff does not make it inexcusable; and if conduct was inexcusable, absence of prejudice to plaintiff does not make it excusable. *Iott v. Franklin (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 521, 531, 253 Cal. Rptr. 635*

Lack of prejudice to party opposing motion for relief does not permit relief from default if moving party fails to establish sufficient grounds for relief. *Gribin Von Dyl & Associates, Inc. v. Kovalsky (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 653,*

660, 230 Cal. Rptr. 50

Although in determining whether defendant acted diligently in filing delayed application for relief from default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, court may properly consider plaintiff's inability to assert any prejudice suffered from delay of trial on merits and very slight evidence is required to justify court in setting aside default, plaintiff's failure to show any prejudice resulting from defendant's claimed lack of diligence is not decisive. *Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 806, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*

[13] Hearing on Motion

In hearing on motion, trial court has discretion to refuse oral testimony and decide issues raised on declarations alone. *Robinson v. Varela (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 611, 618, 136 Cal. Rptr. 783*

[14] Discretion of Trial Court

[a] In General

Default judgment entered after defendant did not appear at trial is proper exercise of court discretion even though court clerk did not comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* (relating to service by mail) in giving defendant notice of trial date, when jurisdictional requirements in case of nonappearance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* were met. *Isherwood v. Hydrosen Properties, Inc. (1987) 240 Cal. Rptr. 157*

[b] Abuse of Discretion

Granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from dismissal of case is abuse of discretion when trial court characterized attorney's continuous failure to provide court-ordered discovery was grossly negligent and attorney's conduct was not within inexcusable negligence exception (attorney abandonment). *Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 898-900, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in setting aside default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, on basis of assertion that continued negotiations between parties had lulled defendant's attorney into sense of security. *Beard v. Beard (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 645, 648, 107 P.2d 385*

Trial court abused its discretion as matter of law in denying *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, motion for relief from waiver of right to jury trial for failure to post jury fees when failure resulted from confusion over amount required to be posted and there was no showing that adverse party would suffer any prejudice if relief from waiver were granted. *Wharton v. Superior Court (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 100, 104, 282 Cal. Rptr. 349*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying motion to vacate default, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or court's equitable powers, when defendant averred reasonable reliance on an insurance carrier to defend action but failed to make any showing that carrier's inaction was excusable. *Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 702, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Trial court, in action arising out of defendants' alleged wrongful eviction of tenant, did not abuse its discretion in denying defendants' motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, to set aside default when defendants unreasonably relied on insurance company to defend them, where they were placed on notice that some action was required of them when plaintiff's counsel informed them that their default would be taken and that insurance company was not protecting their position. *Cyrus v. Haveson (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 306, 315, 135 Cal. Rptr. 246*

[15] Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions

Trial court erred in denying plaintiff's motion for order setting aside default judgment, which court properly characterized as motion for reconsideration of its original granting of defendants' motion to set aside default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, when plaintiff was not given notice of defendants' motion because plaintiff's addresses to which it was sent contained wrong zip codes, and when trial court erred in placing burden of proof as to certain elements on plaintiff, rather than on defendants. *Moghaddam v. Bone (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 283, 288-292, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 283*

Trial court has jurisdiction to entertain second motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, after denial of first such motion, even if no new evidence is presented to support second motion; in that case, motion is considered to be renewal of first motion. *Rambush v. Rambush (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 734, 740, 73 Cal. Rptr. 268*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseGovernmentsLegislationInterpretationGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.293

§ 489.293 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Attack on Judgment in Trial Court*, §§ 176-187 (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.294-489.299

[Reserved]

§§ 489.294[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.300

§ 489.300 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda supporting and opposing motions for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473.5, 473.1, 585.5,* and *50 U.S.C. App. 521*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeOpposing MemorandaCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeSupporting MemorandaCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.301

§ 489.301 Federal Statutes

Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*

Purpose of act and suspension of enforcement of civil liabilities. *50 U.S.C. App. § 502*

Definitions under Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 511*

Jurisdiction and applicability of Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 512*

Protection of persons secondarily liable. *50 U.S.C. App. § 513*

Extension of benefits to citizens serving with allied forces. *50 U.S.C. App. § 514*

Notification of benefits to persons in or entering military service. *50 U.S.C. App. § 515*

Extension of rights and protections to reserves ordered to report for military service and to persons ordered to report for induction. *50 U.S.C. App. § 516*

Waiver of rights pursuant to written agreement. *50 U.S.C. App. § 517*

Protection of servicemembers against default judgments. *50 U.S.C. App. § 521*

Stay of proceedings when servicemember has notice. *50 U.S.C. App. § 522*

Fines and penalties in contracts sued on. *50 U.S.C. App. § 523*

Stay or vacation of execution of judgments, attachments and garnishments. *50 U.S.C. App. § 524*

Duration and term of stays, and codefendants not in military service. *50 U.S.C. App. § 525*

Protection relating to rent, installment contracts, mortgages, liens, assignments, and leases. *50 U.S.C. App. §§ 531 et seq., 591*

Protection relating to life insurance. *50 U.S.C. App. § 541 et seq.*

Protection relating to taxes and public lands. *50 U.S.C. App. §§ 561 et seq., 591*

Transfers with intent to use Act to delay proceedings. *50 U.S.C. App. § 581*

Proof of military service status. *50 U.S.C. App. § 582*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGarnishmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.302

§ 489.302 State Statutes

Relief from judgment, order, or other proceeding taken against party when court has assumed jurisdiction over law practice of party's attorney. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*

Relief from default and any subsequent default judgment when service of summons did not result in actual notice to defendant in time to defend. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*

Relief from default and default judgment when plaintiff failed to comply with venue provisions of *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b). Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)-(e)*

Relief from judgments entered during period of military service. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.303

§ 489.303 Decisions

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying defendants' motion to vacate default judgment and reasonably concluded that defendants had actual notice in time to defend when, after substituted service on defendants at their private post office box, defendant called plaintiffs' counsel to discuss lawsuit and faxed document to counsel proposing to waive/toll deadline to answer complaint, which referenced case number, and then called to settle case, so that it was reasonable to find actual notice; and when defendants had actual knowledge of lawsuit two weeks before answer was due, and plaintiffs' counsel warned defendant default would be taken if they did not answer, so that failure to answer was result of inexcusable neglect. *Ellard v. Conway (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 540, 547-548, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399*

Party is required to show that lack of actual notice was not due to inexcusable neglect; although inexcusable neglect of party's attorney is normally imputed to party, exception exists when attorney's neglect is so extreme as to amount to positive misconduct that obliterates attorney-client relationship. *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1077-1078, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389*

Service of summons on attorney who represented defendant in previous action between parties does not constitute actual notice for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*. *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1077, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; *Rosenthal v. Garner (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 891, 897, 191 Cal. Rptr. 300*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5 is not applicable to set aside default when jurisdiction was acquired by fraud, but is available only to persons on whom service was made or attempted and who did not have actual notice of pendency of action. *In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 554-555, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411*

[2] Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

[a] In General

Denial of motion to vacate default judgment modifying support order is error when service was made on attorney who represented serviceman in divorce, but not on serviceman, and no attorney was appointed to represent his interests. *Allen v. Allen (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 433, 435-437, 182 P.2d 551*

Denial of motion to vacate default judgment modifying spousal support award is error when court entering default knew defendant was stationed abroad in military service, but no affidavit of military status was filed, no attorney was appointed to represent serviceman's interests, and service was made only on his former attorney of record. *In re Marriage of Lopez (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 776, 782-784, 173 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Denial of motion to set aside default judgment is not error despite erroneous affidavit of nonmilitary status and failure to appoint attorney, when defendant actively sought uncontested divorce and property settlement. *Wilterdink v. Wilterdink (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 526, 532-535, 184 P.2d 527*

Denial of motion to vacate decree changing minor's name is error when notice was not given to father in military service who was prisoner of war at time of proceedings, no affidavit of military status was made, and no attorney was appointed to represent his interests. *In re Larson (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 258, 260-263, 183 P.2d 688*

Granting motion to vacate judgment under former *50 U.S.C. App. § 520* (*now see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*) is error when plaintiff fully complied with Act's requirements and defendant made no showing that military service prejudiced him in making defense orthat he had meritorious or legal defense and refused advice and services of appointed attorney. *Reeh v. Reeh (1945) 69 Cal. App. 2d 200, 203-206, 158 P.2d 751*

[b] Liberal Construction of Act

Former *50 U.S.C. App. § 520* (*now see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*) is liberally construed to extend to persons who are interested parties in probate and equity proceedings. *Winslow v. Harold G. Ferguson Corp. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 274, 280-281, 153 P.2d 714*

Former *50 U.S.C. App. § 520* (*now see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*) is liberally construed "defendant" to include "interested party," and "judgment" to decree changing child's name. *In re Larson (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 258, 261-262, 183 P.2d 688*

[c] Prejudice

Absence when rights or liabilities are being adjudicated is prima facie prejudicial except in few cases when absence is matter of policy rather than result of military service. *In re Marriage of Lopez (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783, 173 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionGovernmentsLegislationInterpretationMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.304

§ 489.304 Text References

6 C.J.S. Armed Services §§ 143-146

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.305-489.309

[Reserved]

§§ 489.305[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.310

§ 489.310 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing a motion to set aside or vacate a void judgment or order, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeOpposing MemorandaCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeSupporting MemorandaCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.311

§ 489.311 State Statutes

Court is authorized on motion of either party after notice to other to set aside void judgment or order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.312

§ 489.312 Decisions

[1] Void Judgments Generally

Judgment entered in plaintiff's favor following ex parte trial at which defendant corporation failed to appear was void, despite plaintiff's service on defendant of notice of trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*, when defendant had previously received inadequate notice of withdrawal of its counsel thus rendering notice of trial ineffective. *Urethane Foam Experts, Inc. v. Latimer (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 763, 767, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 404*

Stipulated judgment secured by county from unrepresented welfare recipient in action by county for reimbursement of welfare funds is void when record showed that defendant did not voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waive right to counsel and to trial. *County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 112-113, 183 Cal. Rptr. 741*

Any judgment entered either for or against person who is not party to proceeding is void as to that person. *Fazzi v. Peters (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 590, 594, 68 Cal. Rptr. 170, 440 P.2d 242* (disapproving *Calimpco, Inc. v. Warden (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 429, 224 P.2d 421*)

[2] Void on Face Judgments

Validity of judgment on its face is determined only by consideration of matters constituting part of judgment roll. *Johnson v. Hayes Cal Builders, Inc. (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 35 Cal. Rptr. 618, 387 P.2d 394*

Cross-defendants were entitled to relief at any time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* from default judgment entered on cross-complaint on their failure to appear at trial as judgment void on its face, where although cross-defendants had answered cross-complaint, plaintiff neglected to inform them of trial date, court improperly ordered their default for failing to appear apparently without confirming they were notified, plaintiff sought type and amount of damages not specified in cross-complaint, and court granted request. Plaintiff's sole remedy was to move court to proceed with trial and introduce evidence to sustain plaintiff's cause of action. Further, damages awarded clearly exceeded what was pled,

both because amount was higher and because each cross-defendant was held jointly liable for damages alleged against the other, and none of damages were alleged to be jointly owed by them. *Heidary v. Yadollahi, 99 Cal. App. 4th 857, 862-867, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 695*

[3] Service of Summons

California's Jurisdiction and Service of Process Act of 1969 (*Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10 et seq.*) clearly rejects common law rule that defendant's general appearance after entry of default judgment against him or her based on void service of summons retroactively makes that service valid. *In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 546, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411*

Court is without jurisdiction when summons is served on defendant in manner other than that specified by statute. *Wilson v. Eddy (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 613, 616, 82 Cal. Rptr. 826* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 411(8)*, requiring delivery of summons when not otherwise specified to defendant personally [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90*, authorizing delivery of summons when not otherwise specified to person or to person authorized by him or her to receive service])

[4] Constructive Service of Process

Compliance with statutory conditions for constructive service of process is jurisdictional, and person not designated by his or her name is not proper party to action. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*

[5] Excess of Jurisdiction

When statute requires court to exercise its jurisdiction in particular manner, follow particular procedure, or subject to certain limitations, act beyond those limits are in excess of jurisdiction and void. *Vershbow v. Reiner (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 879, 883, 282 Cal. Rptr. 684*

[6] Partial Invalidity

Interest on judgment provision in judgment entered pursuant to stipulation of parties, but that was contrary to stipulation by providing for interest on judgment "as provided by law" from date some 16 months prior to rendition or entry of judgment, was contrary to law, beyond jurisdiction of court, void, and subject to collateral attack by motion to quash execution and vacate levy of execution, although remainder of judgment, which was in accord with stipulation, was valid and not subject to collateral attack. *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 840, 844-848, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*

[7] Corporate Defendants

Suspension of corporate powers at time corporation filed action does not affect jurisdiction of court to proceed; suspension after filing of action but before rendition of judgment in favor of corporation does not deprive court of jurisdiction or rendering judgment void and subject to collateral attack after it has become final. *Traub Co. v. Coffee Break Service, Inc. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 368, 371, 57 Cal. Rptr. 846, 425 P.2d 790*

Judgment against corporation is nullity and subject to collateral attack when lack of jurisdiction over corporation is disclosed on face of judgment roll. *Traub Co. v. Coffee Break Service, Inc. (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 368, 370, 57 Cal. Rptr. 846, 425 P.2d 790*

Default judgment against foreign corporation is void for lack of jurisdiction when service of process was made in manner not authorized by statute. *Nagel v. P & M Distributors, Inc. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 176, 180-181, 78 Cal. Rptr. 65*

[8] Void Judgments by Default

[a] In General

When action for accounting, declaratory relief, and damages was brought against three defendants, but complaint named first defendant alone as one who had received money belonging to parties and who had failed to account for it and complaint specifically stated that only purpose for joining second defendant was to name all parties in interest, portion of default judgment imposing liability on second defendant is void on face of record and vulnerable to collateral attack. *Nemeth v. Trumbull (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 788, 790-791, 792, 34 Cal. Rptr. 127*

[b] Defective Service or Nonservice of Summons

Failure to designate and serve corporation in its corporate capacity as requiring reversal of default judgment entered against corporation since it was not possible for individual to have been served in his or her representative capacity for unnamed corporation. *Earl W. Schott, Inc. v. Kalar (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 943, 946-947, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 580*

Service of substantially defective summons does not confer jurisdiction over party; hence, default judgment against defendant corporation was void for lack of personal jurisdiction when summons was fatally defective in that it failed to notify recipient that he was being served on behalf of defendant corporation was required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.30*. *MJS Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 555, 557-558, 200 Cal. Rptr. 286*

[c] Default to Amended Complaint

When defendant answered original complaint, default judgment entered after failure to answer amended complaint when amendments consisted only of minor corrections not affecting cause of action was void. *Carrasco v. Craft (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 796, 808-811, 210 Cal. Rptr. 599*

Judgment awarding relief requested in amended complaint that was served in incorrect manner after default was taken was void for granting relief in excess of that requested in original complaint when amended complaint increased amount of relief requested. *Engebretson & Co. v. Harrison (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 436, 444, 178 Cal. Rptr. 77* (attack by independent action in equity)

[d] Cross Complaints

Code Civ. Proc. § 580, declaring that relief granted to plaintiff, if there is no answer, cannot exceed that which he or she demanded in his or her complaint, is applicable to relief granted on cross complaint. *Swycaffer v. Swycaffer (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 689, 692-693, 285 P.2d 1*

[e] Answer or Other Responsive Pleading Filed

Code Civ. Proc. § 585 does not authorize entry of any default in case in which answer is on file, whether or not defendant appears when action is called for hearing, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 594*, relating to procedure when party fails

to appear at trial, does not authorize entry of default if defendant fails to appear; default entered after answer has been filed is void. *Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 576-577, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309*

Default entered by court clerk when demurrer was on file was void and properly set aside on motion. *Stevens v. Torregano (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 105, 112, 13 Cal. Rptr. 604*

[f] Amendment of Complaint After Entry of Default

When, after defendant's default has been entered, complaint is amended in matter of substance is distinguished from mere matter of form, that amendment opens default, and, unless amended complaint has been served on defendant in manner provided for service of summons, no judgment can properly be entered on default. *Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 564, 568, 127 P.2d 909* ; *Engebretson & Co. v. Harrison (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 436, 440, 178 Cal. Rptr. 77*

Substantive amendment to complaint effectively opens default, which permits defaulting defendant to answer; purpose of rule is to insure that defendant has opportunity to reassess action in light of changes made in complaint; but rule was inapplicable when amendment did not result in any substantive changes and did not expose defendant to any greater or different liabilitythan was presented by complaint on file. *Beeman v. Burling (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1586, 1594-1595, 265 Cal. Rptr. 719*

General rule that when plaintiff amends declaration or complaint so as to change cause of action or add new one, judgment by default may be taken against defendant if he or she fails to file new or amended answer or plea, is without application when amendment is merely as to formal or immaterial matters or when original plea or answer set forth sufficient defense to declaration or complaint is amended. *Smith v. Los Angeles Bookbinders Union (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 486, 500-501, 284 P.2d 194* , disapproved on other grounds in *Macleod v. Tribune Publishing Co. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 536, 551, 343 P.2d 36*

[g] Failure to Serve Statement of Damages

Default judgment not void under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* when statement of damages properly served in same manner as summons. *Sakaguchi v. Sakaguchi (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 852, 860-861, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 717*

Default judgment taken by plaintiff against one defendant in personal injury action was not void under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, where plaintiffs complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* by personally serving statement of damages on defendant. Statement set forth amounts of general and special damages each plaintiff was seeking, default was entered 15 days after statement was served, and more than three years later, default judgment was entered in aggregate amount less than amounts set forth in statement of damage. Default judgment was also properly entered on another defendant's cross-complaint for indemnity and contribution against same defendant, where cross-complainant personally served defendant with statement of damages setting forth property and other damages, including detailed declaration stating that amounts were paid in settlement of various claims in action, including plaintiffs' claims, identifying persons to whom each amount was paid, sufficiently specific to allow defendant to make informed decision whether to appear and defend cross-complaint, and default was entered more than six weeks after cross-complainant's statement of damages was properly served, allowing defendant reasonable time to determine whether to appear and defend the action. However, default judgments taken by two other cross-complainants for indemnity against same defendant were void, where neither statement of damages served by cross-complainants on defendant was served in same manner as summons as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11(d)*, and cross-complainants failed to give formal notice of amount of money damages sought within reasonable time before defaults were entered because defendant had no time to respond to cross-complaints after it was finally given formal notice of amount of damages, and where although defendant had actual notice of amount of damages cross-complainant sought, actual notice does not satisfy formal notice requirements

of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.10 et seq., 585*. *Schwab v. So. Cal. Gas Co. (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1308, 1320-1326, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 627*

Default judgment for trespass, assault, conversion, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and wrongful repossession was properly set aside when plaintiff had failed to inform defendant of amount of damages sought as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11*; nonpersonal injury claims alleged is so closely tied to personal injury claims as to require *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* disclosure for all causes of action. *Jones v. Interstate Recovery Service (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 925, 929-930, 206 Cal. Rptr. 924*

[h] Discovery Proceedings

Default judgment entered after defendant's answer was stricken for failure to answer interrogatories or comply with discovery motions is void under due process clause of federal constitution when defendant had neither actual nor constructive notice of interrogatories and motions; relief from such a judgment is available either on motion at law under court's inherent power or by motion in equity on ground of extrinsic fraud. *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 553-555, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838*

[i] Judgment Entered by Court Clerk

Clerk's authority under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(1)* [*now Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a)*] to enter default judgment is limited to actions on contracts in which proper amount appears in contract is alleged in complaint or follows therefrom by mathematical computation; if determination of damages involves discretion or taking of evidence, clerk is without power to enter judgment, and clerk's action in doing so is void on face of record. *Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 525-526, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*

[j] Premature Default Judgments

Premature default judgment is merely irregular or erroneous and not void; as against collateral attack in proceeding in which it has been pleaded is res judicata, it is res judicata, even though erroneous. *Guardianship of Jacobson (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 326, 334, 182 P.2d 545*

[k] Judgment Exceeds Demand or Gives Unrequested Relief

Default judgment that exceeds demand of complaint or gives relief that has not been demanded is in excess of court's jurisdiction and void. *Swycaffer v. Swycaffer (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 689, 693, 285 P.2d 1*

In legal malpractice action, trial court properly set aside $2.5 million superior court default judgment as void because it was greater than amount demanded in first amended complaint, when first amended complaint was for legal malpractice and sought damages based on contract and tort theories according to proof, and filing of statement of damages under *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* before default was entered based on sixteenth cause of action for emotional distress based on same professional negligence did not make action one for personal injury or wrongful death within meaning of § 425.11, and plaintiff suing for legal malpractice may not, as general rule, recover emotional distress damages. *Levine v. Smith (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1136-1137, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 197*

Marital dissolution petition provided adequate notice to husband who defaulted that wife sought division of property and liabilities. *In re Marriage of Andresen (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 873, 878-880, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 147*

When complaint alleged $50,000 actual damages plus statutory entitlement to treble damages, default judgment awarding $150,000 actual damages was properly vacated; trial court erred in setting aside entry of default, however, and should have entered default judgment for $50,000 actual damages, doubled under statute that authorized treble, but mandated double damages for malicious injury to trees on another's land. *Ostling v. Loring (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1731, 1742, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391*

In cause of action involving defendant corporation's failure to allow plaintiff to exercise option to purchase shares of stock in two corporations, default judgment awarding plaintiff $17,500 was void when adequate notice to defendant of amount of plaintiff's claim as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580* was not given in complaint that alleged damages "in sum equal to the present market value" of the shares, less the option price, and praying for damages "according to proof." *Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 322-323, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615*

Allegation in complaint that "by reason of said facts plaintiffs have been damaged in sum of $10,000" combined with prayer for "damages according to proof" gives defendant sufficient notice that plaintiff sought damages in addition to restitutional relief to sustain award of damages. *Thorson v. Western Development Corp. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 206, 213, 59 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Portion of judgment granting relief in excess of that demanded in complaint is void on face of record and subject to collateral attack. *Nemeth v. Trumbull (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 34 Cal. Rptr. 127*

[l] Damages

Award of punitive damages in default judgment that had been prayed for was not void because no award of compensatory damages was made or requested when defendant's fraudulent acts and actual damages caused were alleged and proved, because *Civ. Code § 3294* requirement of "actual damages" is simply requirement that tortious act be proved if punitive damages are to be assessed. *Weiss v. Blumencranc (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 536, 542-543, 131 Cal. Rptr. 298*

[m] Review on Appeal

Default judgment is void when it is clear from "face of the appellate record" that default should not have been entered, and relief from default on which it rests may be sought at any time; thus, when it appears from appellate record that default judgment was entered without giving defendant notice of special and general damages sought to be recovered, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11* when damages cannot be alleged under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(a)* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*], default judgment is void. *Stevenson v. Turner (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 315, 318-320, 156 Cal. Rptr. 499*

[9] Void Orders

Trial court erred in denying motion to set aside order dismissing case that had been stayed based on defendant's petition in bankruptcy, where petition created automatic stay of all judicial proceedings against bankruptcy debtor [*11 U.S.C. § 362 (a)*], and judicial proceedings in violation of automatic stay are void [*In re Shamblin (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 123, 125*], so that trial court had no power to dismiss case based on statement on preprinted form that unless plaintiff filed declaration before stated hearing date indicating why case should not be dismissed at that time, stayed action would be dismissed on court's own motion and dismissal was void. *Sindler v. Brennan (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888*

Order made on motion requiring notice of which no notice was given was void. *Thompson v. Cook (1942) 20 Cal. 2d*

564, 569, 127 P.2d 909

[10] Writ of Execution

Trial court has power and duty to vacate or recall writ of execution improvidently issued, such as one issued to enforce void judgment. *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 840, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*

[11] Timeliness of Motion for Relief

Judgment or order that is in fact void for want of jurisdiction, but invalidity of which does not appear from judgment roll or record, is subject to beingset aside on motion within a reasonable time after its entry, not exceeding time limit prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473(b), 473.5(a)*], and independent suit in equity to set aside judgment or order is not necessary. *Norton v. Atchison, T., & S. F. R. Co. (1893) 97 Cal. 388, 393, 32 P. 452* ; *In re Dahnke (1923) 64 Cal. App. 555, 560, 222 P. 381* (criticized on another point in *Rogers v. Silverman (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1122-1123, 265 Cal. Rptr. 286*)

Judgment naming incorrect defendant void on its face and subject to attack at any time. *Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 43-47, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*

Judgment void for lack of due process notice or extrinsic fraud is subject to attack at any time in proceeding or action initiated for that purpose; judgment that is proven void due to lack of due process notice suffers from fatal jurisdictional defect. *Ansley v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 477, 488, 490, 229 Cal. Rptr. 771*

Judgment that is void on its face is subject to attack at any time, and six-month limit (set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*) to make other motions to vacate judgment does not apply. *National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 414, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*

Judgment or order that is void on face of record is subject to being set aside at any time by court that made it. *Daudert v. People (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 580, 585, 156 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Judgment or order that is void on its face and that requires only inspection of judgment roll or record to show its invalidity is subject to being set aside on motion at any time after its entry by court that rendered judgment or made order. *Neubrand v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 311, 317, 88 Cal. Rptr. 586* ; *Thorson v. Western Development Corp. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 206, 210, 59 Cal. Rptr. 299*

That portion of judgment giving greater relief than that demanded in complaint is void on face of record and is vulnerable to collateral attack on motion independent of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, that is, with no limit on time within which motion must be made. *Nemeth v. Trumbull (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 34 Cal. Rptr. 127*

[12] Inherent Power of Court to Vacate Void Judgment

Trial court has inherent power to set aside judgment void on its face at any time. *Connelly v. Castillo (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1583, 1588, 236 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Code Civ. Proc. § 473 [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*] codifies inherent power of court to set aside order or judgment void on its face at any time. *National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 414, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*

Court has inherent power to set aside judgment obtained by fraud on it, such as filing false return of service. *In re Marriage of Smith (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 543, 555, 185 Cal. Rptr. 411*

[13] Attacks on Void Judgments

[a] In General

Judgment absolutely void on its face is subject to attack anywhere, directly or collaterally, whenever it presents itself, either by parties or strangers; judgment is simply a nullity and neither basis nor evidence of any right whatever; when judgment on face of judgment roll is void for lack of jurisdiction, it may be attacked at any time. *Nagel v. P & M Distributors, Inc. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 176, 180, 78 Cal. Rptr. 65*

Wrong decision made within limits of court's power is error correctable on appeal or other direct review, but decision that oversteps jurisdiction and power of court is void and subject to being set aside directly or collaterally. *Vasquez v. Vasquez (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 240 P.2d 319*

[b] Collateral Attack

Collateral attack is proper to contest judgment void on its face for lack of personal or subject matter jurisdiction or granting relief that court has no power to grant. *Becker v. S.P.V. Construction Co. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 489, 493, 165 Cal. Rptr. 825, 612 P.2d 915*

On collateral attack on order or judgment of court of general jurisdiction only evidence that may be considered in determining whether order or judgment is void is record in proceeding in which it was entered, and, if record is silent as to existence of jurisdictional fact, that fact is presumed; but if proceeding is wholly statutory and unknown to common law, court, even though ordinarily one of general jurisdiction, is a court of special jurisdiction for that proceeding, and if jurisdictional facts do not appear of record in such proceeding, no presumption of regularity exists; however, failure of record to recite jurisdictional fact does not make judgment void, because extrinsic evidence is admissible to prove that fact, unless applicable statute makes record exclusive mode of proof. *Burge v. City & County of San Francisco (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 608, 612-613, 262 P.2d 6*

Judgment, in action to recover taxes paid under protest, erroneously awarding aggrieved taxpayer interest calculated from wrong date is not open to collateral attack on ground that scope of relief granted exceeds relief to which taxpayer is entitled under law applicable to its cause of action; and judgment awarding costs against city and county is not subject to collateral attack, costs being incident of judgment, but is conclusive after judgment becomes final when court had jurisdiction of person and subject matter. *Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 44, 152 P.2d 625*

Judgment of any court against party over whose person court has not acquired jurisdiction is void for want of jurisdiction and is subject to collateral attack when lack of jurisdiction appears from record. *Forbes v. Hyde (1866) 31 Cal. 342, 347-348*

Fact that defendant was not served and return of service was not filed within three years of commencement of action (former *Code Civ. Proc. § 581a*; *nowsee Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210*) does not render resulting default judgment subject to collateral attack for being void on its face. *National Diversified Services, Inc. v. Bernstein (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 410, 413-416, 214 Cal. Rptr. 113*

Judgment that is void on its face is subject to collateral attack. *County of Ventura v. Tillett (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 105, 110, 183 Cal. Rptr. 741*

Judgment that is simply erroneous but not void, even though error appears on face of judgment or record, is not subject to collateral attack. *Jones v. World Life Research Institute (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 836, 840, 131 Cal. Rptr. 674*

Judgment of prior conviction, even though valid on its face, is subject to attack on constitutional grounds at any time in proceeding in which, by reason of prior conviction, increased sanctions may be imposed against person suffering it; similarly, collateral attack on conviction on constitutional grounds is permitted in proceeding in which license is revoked is result of that conviction. *De Rasmo v. Smith (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 601, 607-608, 93 Cal. Rptr. 289* (proceeding to revoke real estate salesman's license by reason of past conviction of crime in sister state)

One rule on collateral attack is that hearsay in affidavit for publication of summons may be considered and supports judgment thereafter made. *Cradduck v. Financial Indem. Co. (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 850, 855, 52 Cal. Rptr. 90*

Failure of complaint to state cause of action does not expose default judgment to collateral attack so long as complaint apprises defendant of nature of demand. *Brown v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 519, 524, 51 Cal. Rptr. 633*

[c] Direct Attack

Rule is settled that judgment or order that is void on its face, and that requires only inspection of judgment-roll or record to show its invalidity, may be set aside on motion at any time after its entry by court that rendered judgment or made order. *Hayashi v. Lorenz (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 848, 851, 271 P.2d 18* ; *Neubrand v. Superior Court (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 311, 317, 88 Cal. Rptr. 586* ; *Nagel v. P & M Distributors, Inc. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 176, 179, 78 Cal. Rptr. 65*

[14] Presumptions

When it does not appear affirmatively that jurisdictional defect was present, absence of recital that jurisdictional requisites were met does not make judgment void on its face; all presumptions favors judgment, and if invalidity does not appear from face of record, presumption is that which ought to have been done was not only done but rightly done. *Olivia v. Suglio (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 7, 8-9, 293 P.2d 63*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to AdjudicateGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.313-489.319

[Reserved]

§§ 489.313[Reserved]

171 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.320

§ 489.320 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing motions on various grounds for relief in equity, and supporting and opposing demurrers and motions for summary judgment in actions in equity seeking relief from judgments, as well as points and authorities supporting grounds for granting or denying equitable relief, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.321

§ 489.321 Decisions

[1] In General

First duty of equity is to be equitable; court of equity is bound to consider substance over form (*see Civ. Code § 3528*). *In re Marriage of Umphrey (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 647, 657, 267 Cal. Rptr. 218*

[2] When Equitable Relief Is Available

[a] Alternative to Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473

Once relief is no longer available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, public policy favoring finality of judgments predominates and power to set aside final judgments and marital settlement agreements incorporated in them is to be exercised only when exceptional circumstances require that consequences of res judicata be denied; exceptional circumstances that are only basis for overturning judgment in equity is commonly referred to is extrinsic fraud or mistake. *In re Marriage of Umphrey (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 647, 655, 267 Cal. Rptr. 218* ; *see also In re Marriage of Alexander (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 677, 681, 261 Cal. Rptr. 9*

Court of equity in independent action has authority to grant relief respecting default judgment when defendant was prevented by extrinsic mistake from presenting meritorious defense in original proceedings, even though motion to vacate default had previously been denied. *Huff v. Mendoza (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 677, 680, 167 Cal. Rptr. 348*

[b] Basis of Equitable Jurisdiction

Court of equity interferes in suit when legal judgment was obtained or entered through fraud, mistake, or accident, or when defendant in action, having valid legal defense on merits, was prevented from maintaining it by fraud, mistake, or accident, without negligence, laches, or other fault on his, her, or his or her agents' part; ground for exercise of jurisdiction was that there has been no fair adversary trial at law. *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 575, 122*

P.2d 564 ; *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 44,177 Cal. Rptr. 794* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 87, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*

Basis of equitable relief from judgment, whether denominated extrinsic fraud or extrinsic mistake, is that which results in judgment taken under circumstances of unfairness and injustice without affording party opportunity to participate in proceedings. *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 140-141, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801*

[c] Court's Equity Power Is Inherent

Equity is empowered to grant relief from orders and decrees in probate proceedings for extrinsic fraud. *Carney v. Simmonds (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 84, 94, 315 P.2d 305*

Superior court has inherent equity power under which, apart from statutory authority, it may grant relief from default judgment obtained through extrinsic fraud or mistake. *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563*

[d] Public Policy

Policy of law is to favor hearing on merits whenever possible, and appellate courts are much more disposed to affirm order that compels trial on merits than to allow default judgment to stand; policy is to disapprove of party who attempts to take advantage of mistake, surprise, inadvertence, or neglect of adversary. *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 854-855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

[3] Meritorious Claim or Defense Is Essential

Court does not set aside valid judgment merely because it was obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake in order to give barren right to adversary hearing; plaintiff is required to plead and prove that he or she has meritorious case, i.e., good claim or defense that, if asserted in new trial, would be likely to result in judgment favorable to him or her; party seeking to vacate judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1710.40* (vacating judgment entered on sister state money judgment) is required to allege facts establishing meritorious defense to action in which judgment was entered. *New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. v. Siegel (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 684, 688-689, 154 Cal. Rptr. 200*

In husband's prior divorce action, based on foreign wife's alleged refusal to come to him in America, in which a judgment of divorce was entered, that he did not send for her or provide funds for her transportation was sufficient meritorious defense. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 664, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*

Moving party ordinarily has burden of demonstrating to court that move favorable result might be obtained if matter were to be heard on merits. *McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 45, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*

Equity does not overturn judgment unless it appears that like judgment would not follow; hence, complainant is required to plead and prove that result in main action would have been different had fraud or mistake not occurred. *Wilson v. Wilson (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 421, 427, 130 P.2d 782*

[4] Grounds for Relief

[a] In General

Attack on order or judgment by motion in equity on ground of extrinsic fraud is permitted when there was willful failure to give required notice or willfully false affidavits of service were filed; direct attack by independent action in equity is also allowed when there has been a failure to exercise degree of diligence required by law in connection with personal service, when false recitals of service were result of fraud, negligence, or mistake, and when failure to name person as party was result of mistake; extrinsic mistake is ground to vacate judgment by independent action in equity when there has been no fair adversary trial. *Carney v. Simmonds (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 84, 95-96, 315 P.2d 305*

Final judgment of court having jurisdiction over persons and subject matter is subject to attack in equity after expiration of time for direct attack at law only if alleged fraud or mistake is extrinsic. *Westphal v. Westphal (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 393, 397, 126 P.2d 105*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to grant personal injury plaintiff who represented himself equitable relief from judgment against him, when plaintiff had his day in court and lost his case due to his own inability to present his case as a licensed attorney would have; self-represented litigants generally are entitled to no special treatment. *Burnete v. La Casa Dana Apartments (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1262, 1268-1270, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 437*

While grounds for equitable action to set aside default judgment are commonly stated as being those of extrinsic fraud or mistake, terms are given very broad meaning that tends to encompass all circumstances that deprive adversary of fair notice of hearing whether or not those circumstances would qualify as fraudulent or mistaken in strict sense. *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 149, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*

Terms "extrinsic fraud or mistake" are given very broad meaning that tends to encompass all circumstances that deprive adversary of fair notice of hearing whether or not those circumstances would qualify are fraudulent or mistaken in strict sense; thus, false recital of service of summons although not deliberate was treated as extrinsic fraud or mistake in context of equitable action to set aside default judgment. *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563*

Extrinsic accident and mistake of fact, as well as extrinsic fraud, is, in some situations, proper basis for exercise of court's equitable jurisdiction to vacate default judgment; ground for exercise of that jurisdiction is that there has been no fair adversary trial at law. *Turner v. Allen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 753, 757, 11 Cal. Rptr. 630*

Rule is established that, in cases in which aggrieved party is unable to make out case of intentional fraud, courts on motion will extend liberal interpretation to relieve party from judgment taken without fair adversary hearing; basis for equitable relief in these cases, whether denominated "extrinsic fraud" or "extrinsic mistake," is that which has resulted in judgment taken under circumstances of unfairness and injustice without affording party opportunity to participate in proceedings. *Davisv. Davis (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 788, 794, 8 Cal. Rptr. 874*

Suppression of fact by one who gives information of other facts likely to mislead for want of communication of fact concealed is deceit [*Civ. Code § 1710*], and any other act intended to deceive is actual fraud [*Civ. Code § 1572*]. *Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 536, 310 P.2d 423*

Fraud or mistake is extrinsic when it deprives unsuccessful party of opportunity to present his or her case. *Cardozo v. Bank of America (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 833, 838, 254 P.2d 949*

Equity relieves injured party from effect of judgment procured by extrinsic fraud, mistake, or excusable neglect that was not result of complaint's negligence or laches. *Wilson v. Wilson (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 421, 426, 130 P.2d 782*

[b] Extrinsic Fraud

Fraud that will justify setting aside final judgment by court of equity is required to be of such character as to prevent trial of issues presented to court for determination. *Gale v. Witt (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 362, 365, 188 P.2d 755*

Taking default judgment against defendant known by plaintiff to be incompetent without having a general guardian or guardian ad litem appointed, thereby preventing defendant from presenting whatever defense he or she has, constitutes fraud on court and extrinsic fraud as to defendant; relief is warranted whenever extrinsic fraud prevents fair adversary proceeding. *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 576-577, 122 P.2d 564*

To qualify for equitable relief on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake, moving party must demonstrate diligence in seeking to set aside default once it was discovered. *Manson, Iver & York v. Black (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 36, 48, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*

Though plaintiff did not receive notice of entry, judgment could not be set aside on grounds of extrinsic fraud, when plaintiff failed to establish essential elements of extrinsic fraud because there was neither misrepresentation by defendant nor reliance by plaintiff. *Kimball Avenue v. Franco (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1229-1230* , 78 Cal. Rtpr. 3d 352

No extrinsic fraud in settlement of earlier action based on defendant-former joint venturer's alleged misrepresentations about profitability of franchisee loans and financial condition of company, because plaintiff conducted no formal discovery to obtain financial documents relating to those issues, and there was no evidence of elaborate conspiracy to keep those records or information from him. Any alleged fraud in securing dismissal of earlier action through misleading statements about value of company or loan servicing rights was intrinsic, because plaintiff settled action on reviewing single 10-page financial statement, conducted no formal discovery and undertook no review of financial records of company he claimed to have interest in. *Heyman v. Franchise Mortgage Acceptance Corp. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 921, 926-928, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465*

No extrinsic fraud shown when both parties in marital dissolution action were represented by counsel and wife's attorney could have conducted discovery on pension plan, even though husband mispresented estimate of present value of future pension benefits. *In re Marriage of Melton (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 931, 936, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 761*

Confession of judgment was fraudulently entered and properly set aside when, despite attorney's declaration in support of judgment, attorney was found to have represented opposing parties to dispute and was, therefore, not acting independently in representing party. *Rivercourt Co. Ltd. v. Dyna-Tel, Inc. (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1477, 1481-1482, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 279*

No extrinsic fraud is shown when party is given notice of action and is not prevented from participating in action and thus had opportunity to protect against fraud or mistake of adversary but unreasonably neglected to do so. *In re Marriage of Melone (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 757, 762, 238 Cal. Rptr. 510*

Defaulting party was entitled to relief for extrinsic fraud when default was due to positive misconduct of his or her former attorney, who purported to continue representing him or her without authority and failed to notify defaulting party of, or respond to, papers served on him by opposing party, and when defaulting party was relatively free from personal neglect and opposing party did not sufficiently show prejudice resulting from grant of relief. *Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 554-555, 198 Cal. Rptr. 838*

Collusive judgment adversely affecting rights of third persons may be set aside on ground of extrinsic fraud. *People ex rel. Public Util. Com. v. Ryerson (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 115, 121, 50 Cal. Rptr. 246*

Actual fraud is not required to grant relief from judgment; extrinsic fraud that deprives adversary of fair notice of hearing exists even though it was accomplished by mistake. *Davis v. Davis (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 788, 793, 8 Cal.*

Rptr. 874

Fraud or mistake is extrinsic when it deprives unsuccessful party of opportunity to present his or her case to court; if unsuccessful party to action has been kept in ignorance of action, or has been prevented from fully participating in it, there has been no true adversary proceeding, and judgment is open to attack at any time. *Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535-536, 310 P.2d 423*

[c] Extrinsic Mistake

Reasonable reliance on insurer to defend action on defendant's behalf and insurer's failure to do so, resulting in entry of default and default judgment against defendant, constitutes extrinsic mistake. *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 857-858, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700*

Three elements are required to set aside judgment based on extrinsic mistake: (1) defaulted party must show it has meritorious case; (2) it must articulate satisfactory excuse for not presenting defense to original action; and (3) it must demonstrate that it was diligent in seeking to set aside default once it had been discovered; same rule applies when motion is to vacate order of dismissal. *People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 583-584, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* ; *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

Doctrine of permitting relief in equity from judgment entered as result of extrinsic mistake is applicable to court clerk's mistakes; hence, when elderly defendant wrote letters to court clerk requesting that clerk do "what was needed" to answer complaint, stating that defendant would pay any necessary fees, and sufficiently alleging meritorious defense, failure of clerk to file letters was responsive pleading was ministerial mistake entitling defendant to equitable relief. *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 44-45, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794*

Cases that grant equitable relief from final judgments are without exception being those in which aggrieved party or court has been victim of factual misrepresentations rather than legal misrepresentations. *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 92, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*

Reasonable reliance on codefendant to defend action on defendant's behalf and his failure to do so, resulting in entry of default and default judgment against defendant, constitutes extrinsic mistake. *Bailey v. Roberts (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 282, 285-286, 76 Cal. Rptr. 572*

Reasonable reliance by defendant former owners of property on assurances of present owner codefendants to protect their rights in action arising out of interference by present owners with plaintiff's easement right over the property constitutes mistake of fact or accident. *Crane v. Kampe (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 200, 205-206, 37 Cal. Rptr. 220*

[5] Insufficient Grounds

[a] Inexcusable Neglect

Inexcusable neglect bars equitable relief on grounds of extrinsic fraud or mistake. *Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 892, 901-902 n.8, 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* ; *In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 345, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* ; *Jackson v. Bank of America (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 375, 386, 386 n.6, 233 Cal. Rptr. 162*

[b] Attorney's Act or Omission

On motion for relief in equity, plaintiff was required to plead that his or her attorney's neglect or omission was excusable, because inexcusable neglect is ordinarily imputed to client whose redress is malpractice action; however, when attorney's neglect is of extreme degree amounting to positive misconduct and client is relatively free from negligence, attorney's conduct obliterates existence of attorney-client relationship. *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

[c] Intrinsic Fraud

Use of forged documents or perjured testimony to secure judgment constitutes intrinsic fraud and is no basis for attack on judgment in equity. *Gale v. Witt (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 362, 366, 188 P.2d 755*

Party who has been given proper notice of action, and who has not been prevented from full participation in it, has had opportunity to present case to court and to protect self from any fraud attempted by adversary; fraud perpetrated under those circumstances is intrinsic, even though unsuccessful party does not avail himself or herself of opportunity to appear before court; having had opportunity to protect his or her interest, he or she cannot attack judgment once time has elapsed for appeal or other direct attack. *Westphal v. Westphal (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 393, 397, 126 P.2d 105* ; *Janetsky v. Avis (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 799, 811, 222 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Introduction of perjured testimony is a classic example of intrinsic fraud and may not be used to overturn a judgment. *Buesa v. City of Los Angeles (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1537, 1545-1548, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 86*

Ordinarily, if aggrieved party is aware of proceeding and is not prevented from appearing, any fraud is intrinsic and not basis for equitable relief, although rule is sometimes relaxed when, by fraud, aggrieved party's claim or defense is concealed from him or her; perjured evidence is not ground for setting aside judgment, particularly when perjury involved is that of person seeking to set aside judgment; rule is same in case of default judgment or a judgment after contested trial. *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 88-89, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*

[d] Mutual Mistake

Mutual mistake that might be sufficient to set aside contract is not sufficient to set aside final judgment on equitable grounds. *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 472, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*

[e] Unjust Judgment or Order

Unjust judgment or order by itself is not enough to grant relief under equitable principles. *De Mello v. Souza (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 79, 85, 111 Cal. Rptr. 274*

[6] Defenses to Equitable Relief

[a] Laches

Facts set forth in wife's declaration, in proceeding to set aside interlocutory judgment of dissolution of marriage disposing of community property rendered after uncontested hearing on wife's default, does not establish laches on her part as matter of law when wife stated that she first consulted an attorney in March 1975, after entering into marital settlement agreement in 1974 without benefit of counsel, from which it may be inferred that she did not appreciate her rights until that time, and reason for delay from April to August of 1975 before filing notice of motion for relief was to avoid interfering with child's marriage; husband's claim of prejudice that it will be time consuming and cause great expense to relitigate whole issue of dissolution of marriage and community property rights was not prejudice arising out

of delay; such prejudice results whenever decree was set aside. *In re Marriage of Coffin (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 139, 155, 133 Cal. Rptr. 583*

One is not barred by alleged laches in negligence in failing to discover sooner that his or her rights have been injured by fraud of another. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 668, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*

[b] Estoppel

Estoppel arises in context of court's exercise of equitable powers; estoppel is enforced to prevent person from asserting right when person's conduct or silence makes it unconscionable for person to assert it; elements of estoppel is (1) representation or promise; (2) made with knowledge of facts; (3) to party ignorant of truth; (4) with intent that other party act on it; (5) when other party has, in fact, been induced to rely on it. *In re Marriage of Umphrey (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 647, 658, 267 Cal. Rptr. 218*

[7] Proceedings Subject to Equitable Relief

[a] Default and Default Judgment

In creditor's action on promissory note to obtain possession of property securing note against debtor and guarantor of note in which defendants'default was entered, trial court granted plaintiff possession of property but continued default judgment hearing until after sale, and then entered deficiency judgment against defendants, defect in notice, required by former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* (*now see Com. Code §§ 9611-9614*) before selling collateral, which occurred after default was entered, provides no equitable grounds for vacating default. *Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 970, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381*

[b] Void Judgments

While diligence is enjoined on those who seek to avoid default judgments, what is initially void is always void and life is not breathed into it by lapse of time. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 668, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* (relief from invalid divorce decree entered some 46 years before)

[c] Satisfaction of Judgment

Satisfaction of judgment is subject to being vacated and judgment revived in appropriate circumstances. *Kachig v. Boothe (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 626, 632, 99 Cal. Rptr. 393*

[d] Foreign Judgments

Full faith and credit clause does not bar aggrieved party's right to pursue equitable relief in California from sister-state judgment when sister state authorizes such relief under its laws. *Huff v. Mendoza (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 677, 680, 167 Cal. Rptr. 348*

[8] Substantive Areas in Which Equitable Relief Is Available

[a] Family Law Cases

Law is well settled that extrinsic fraud is proper ground for setting aside alimony award and property settlement

incorporated in divorce decree; failure of one spouse to disclose existence of community property assets constitutes fraud and warrants equitable relief from judgment dividing community property between parties. *In re Marriage of Modnick (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 897, 904-906, 191 Cal. Rptr. 629, 663 P.2d 187*

When property settlement is incorporated in divorce decree, settlement was merged with decree and becoming the final judicial determination of parties' property rights; thus, rules governing extrinsic fraud and mistake applies to alimony awards and property settlements incorporated in divorce decrees. *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 470-471, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*

Deliberate concealment by one spouse of existence of community assets constitutes extrinsic fraud; however, when party has had opportunity to protect self from any mistake or fraud on part of his or her adversary but unreasonably fails to do so, equitable relief is unavailable. *In re Marriage of Umphrey (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 647, 655, 267 Cal. Rptr. 218*

Trial court errs, in setting aside judgment and marital settlement agreement on motion for relief on ground of extrinsic fraud, when court found that moving party had failed to establish extrinsic fraud and there was, therefore, no basis for relief in equity. *In re Marriage of Alexander (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 677, 681, 261 Cal. Rptr. 9*

[b] Probate Cases

Even absent timely will contest, court may exercise its equitable jurisdiction to set aside orders and decree of probate proceedings in cases of fraud or mistake. *Estate of Sanders (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 607, 613-614, 221 Cal. Rptr. 432, 710 P.2d 232*

When sole basis for motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* is that party did not receive actual notice of the probate action, relief from the judgment is not available. *Parage v. Couedel (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1043-1044, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671*

Former rule that probate court lacked equitable jurisdiction to set aside its own orders and decree on ground of extrinsic fraud was eroded by subsequent case authorities. *Goldberg v. Frye (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1258, 1265, 266 Cal. Rptr. 483*

When decree of distribution has been procured from probate court by fraud in matters outside issues to be adjudicated, as when distributee has prevented party who has interest in estate from making appearance to protect his or her interest, equity intervenes to rectify wrong perpetrated by that extrinsic fraud; while there are many varieties, facets, and shadings of extrinsic fraud, familiar example consists of deceptive conduct on part of distributee of estate that has kept other interested parties away from court by some fraudulent artifice or wilful suppression of material facts; invocation of equity on grounds of extrinsic fraud is warranted when heir or legatee fails to notify court of existence of other heirs of whose existence he or she has knowledge and files false petitions with court representing nonexistence of such heirs; actual or positive fraud is not required as element of extrinsic fraud, since mistake on part of distributee that kept legatee in ignorance of true facts or deprives him or her of fair notice of probate proceedings constitutes type of extrinsic fraud; extrinsic mistake that has foreclosed party from presenting his or her case in court also furnishes ground for equitable intervention. *Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 534-535, 310 P.2d 423*

[9] Invoking Equity

Equitable power of court is invoked either by motion or by independent action in equity. *Baske v. Burke (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 38, 45, 177 Cal. Rptr. 794*

Equitable power is invoked by party seeking to set aside default judgment either by filing separate suit for that purpose or by motion made in action in which default was taken. *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 181, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563*

After a lapse of six months [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*], attack on default judgment may be made by separate action in equity or by motion based on equitable grounds in same action. *Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 662, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*

Action in equity to vacate and set aside default judgment on ground of lack of jurisdiction over defendant's person based on nonservice of summons is direct attack on judgment. *Hayes v. Risk (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 623, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36*

[10] Timeliness of Motion

[a] In General

Judgment obtained through extrinsic fraud, though long since final, was subject to being set aside by independent suit in equity. *Lazzarone v. Bank of America (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 581, 595, 226 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Rule that invalidity of default judgment or order that is in fact void for want of jurisdiction over defendant that is not apparent from judgment roll or record may be set aside in motion at law only within time limit specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*], which applies by analogy, is inapplicable to proceeding in equity to set aside judgment. *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 182-183, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563*

Application for relief from default based on extrinsic fraud is not subject to six-month time limit contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (relief from judgment, order, or proceeding taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect), but is required to be made within reasonable time, determination of which is within trial court's discretion. *Davis v. Davis (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 8 Cal. Rptr. 874*

[b] Delay in Seeking Relief

Participation of plaintiff's counsel in defendant's delay in seeking relief from default and default judgment by indicating willingness to discuss setting aside default on conditions affecting codefendant, which were met, and then after receiving full satisfaction of codefendant's obligation refusing to set aside default, renders defendant's inaction during that period reasonable. *Bailey v. Roberts (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 282, 287, 76 Cal. Rptr. 572*

[11] Discretion of Court

Equitable motion to set aside default judgment is addressed to trial court's sound discretion. *Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 854, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 584, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739* ; *Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *Roussey v. Ernest W. Hahn, Inc. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 251, 255, 59 Cal. Rptr. 399* ; *McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 44-45, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*

Use of equitable powers to provide relief from default is within trial court's sound discretion. *Janetsky v. Avis (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 799, 811, 222 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Order of dismissal for failure to comply with order compelling answers to interrogatories, signed by court and filed in

action, is practical equivalent of default judgment; motion to set aside order is addressed to trial court's sound discretion. *Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*

Equitable motion for relief from default judgment is addressed to trial court's sound discretion. *Slusher v. Durrer (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 747, 753, 138 Cal. Rptr. 265*

Like motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, relating to judgment, order, or proceeding taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, motion for relief from default based on extrinsic fraud is addressed to trial court's sound discretion. *Davis v. Davis (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 8 Cal. Rptr. 874*

[12] Extrinsic Evidence

Extrinsic evidence is admissible on equitable motion for relief from judgment void in fact but not void on its face to show invalidity of judgment. *Munoz v. Lopez (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 178, 183, 79 Cal. Rptr. 563*

Fraud, like any other fact, may be proved by circumstantial evidence. *Harkins v. Fielder (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 528, 536, 310 P.2d 423*

[13] Denial of Relief

Equity denies relief from judgment when complaining party has contributed to fraud or mistake giving rise to judgment thus obtained or if complainant was guilty of negligence in permitting fraud to be practiced or mistake to occur. *Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17* ; *In re Marriage of Guardino (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 77, 89-90, 156 Cal. Rptr. 883*

Equitable relief from default and default judgment is singularly inappropriate when defendant was negligent in failing to take any meaningful action to protect self after being served with summons and complaint and notices requesting entry of default. *Davis v. Thayer (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 892, 911, 170 Cal. Rptr. 328*

Equitable relief from judgment is denied when complainant is chargeable with fault, as when complainant was guilty of negligence in permitting fraud to be practiced or mistake to occur; not every mistake justifies equity's setting aside final judgment. *Wilson v. Wilson (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 421, 427, 130 P.2d 782*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExtraordinary CircumstancesCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.322

§ 489.322 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Attack on Judgment in Trial Court*, §§ 219-221 (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.323.489.329

[Reserved]

§§ 489.323[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Moving Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.330

§ 489.330 Planning and Procedures

[1] Ascertain Facts

☐ Identify judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding from which relief is sought.

☐ Ascertain circumstances leading to entry of the judgment or order, including timing of relevant events.

☐ Ascertain which facts appear of record and which do not.

☐ For all persons who have personal knowledge of facts that do not appear of record, obtain:

- ☐ Names.
- ☐ Addresses.
- ☐ Phone numbers.

☐ If relief is available on facts that do not appear of record [*see* [2], *below*], determine whether persons with personal knowledge are willing to:

- ☐ Testify.

☐ Give affidavit or make declaration under penalty of perjury.

[2] Make Preliminary Determinations

☐ Determine whether judgment or order from which relief is sought is:

☐ Valid or

☐ Void.

☐ If valid, for available relief, see *§§ 489.331* and *489.333*.

☐ If void, determine whether it is [*see § 489.134*]:

☐ Void on its face or

☐ Void in fact but not on its face.

☐ For available relief, see *§§ 489.332* and *489.333*.

☐ Determine whether there are any defenses to relief [*see §§ 489.341 489.343*].

[3] Review Time Limits

☐ Consider any time limitations that apply to ground on which relief will be sought [*see §§ 489.331 -489.333*; *see also § 489.15*].

[4] Consider Combining Motions

☐ If several grounds for relief exist, consider combining those that are not time barred in one motion for relief.

☐ Review the following alternative grounds and determine which apply to judgment, order, or other proceeding at issue.

☐ Relief from judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding based mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see § 489.331[1]*; *see also § 489.30* et seq.].

☐ Relief from default, default and default judgment, or dismissal based on attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see § 489.331[2]*; *see also § 489.40*].

☐ Relief from default, default and default judgment, or dismissal when service did not result in actual notice in time to defend [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*; *see § 489.331[3]*; *see also § 489.70* et seq.].

☐ Relief from default and default judgment under consumer venue statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*; *see § 489.331[4]*; *see also § 489.90* et seq.].

☐ Relief based on California court's having assumed jurisdiction over attorney's law practice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*; *see § 489.331[5]*; *see also § 489.100* et seq.].

☐ Relief from default or default and default judgment based on Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)*; *see § 489.331[6]*; *see also § 489.110* et seq.].

☐ Relief from void judgment and order that is void on its face [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 574, 122 P.2d 564* (court's inherent power); *see § 489.332[1]*; *see also § 489.130* et seq.].

☐ Relief from void judgment and order that is void in fact although not void on its face [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 574, 122 P.2d 564* (court's inherent power); *see § 489.332[1]*; *see also § 489.130* et seq.].

☐ Relief from valid or void judgment, dismissal, or order in equity [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10* (general jurisdiction of superior court); *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)(3)* (limited civil case); *see § 489.333*; *see also § 489.220* et seq.].

NOTE:

Consider Separate Conditions for Relief. If counsel desires to combine grounds, he or she should keep in mind the separate requirements of each form of relief and, generally, the respects in which the preconditions for relief on the several grounds might differ. Counsel should be aware of the terms, conditions, and penalties that might be imposed either on the makingof the motion or the granting of relief [*see §§ 489.331 489.333*]. In addition, if counsel is attacking a judgment on the ground that the court lacked personal jurisdiction, care should be taken to avoid inadvertently making a general appearance and, in so doing, waiving the lack of jurisdiction objection by voluntarily submitting to the in personam jurisdiction of the court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(a)*; *see also § 489.16[2*]].

[5] Prepare Notice of Motion

☐ Select or reserve hearing date according to local practice.

☐ Calendar:

☐ Hearing date and reminder to call for tentative ruling.

☐ Last day to serve opposing party's attorney (or opposing party who is not represented by attorney) with copy of notice of motion and accompanying papers.

☐ Last day to file papers; calendar at least 16 court days before time appointed for the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

NOTE:
Time for Service. Service must be made at least 16 court days, plus specified extended periods when service is by mail, fax, or overnight delivery, before the time appointed for the hearing, unless an order shortening time is obtained [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(a)(10), (12), (13), (b), 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

☐ Prepare papers for relief selected as indicated in §§ *489.331 489.333*.

☐ Prepare proof of service [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

☐ If required, prepare applicable for order shortening time [for a form of ex parte application for an order shortening time, *see* Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time*].

[6] Serve and File Papers

☐ Serve copy of notice of motion and accompanying papers, as discussed under [5] and [6], *above.* For an outline of the procedure for serving a notice of motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

☐ Determine required filing fee.

☐ Deliver the originals of the notice of motion and accompanying papers to the court clerk for filing and pay the required fee [*see Gov. Code §§ 70611, 70613*] at least 16 court days before time appointed for the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

NOTE:
Comply With Local Practice Regarding Proof of Service. Normal practice is to attach the original of the proof of service to the original notice of motion, to file them together, and to attach a copy of the proof of service to each copy of the notice of motion. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a* (relating to service by mail) does not require this, and unless otherwise required by local court rule, the proof of service can be filed after the notice of motion is filed. If the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules, which applies to most pretrial motions and to motions to set aside a default judgment, proof of service must be filed no later than five calendar days before the time appointed for the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1300(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103* (proceedings to which rules apply)].

[7] Prepare for Hearing

☐ If counsel intends to present oral evidence at hearing and motion is subject to Civil Law and Motion Rules:

☐ Prepare written statement setting forth nature and extent of evidence proposed to be introduced and reasonable time estimate for hearing.

☐ Deliver statement to the court for filing no later than three court days before the hearing.

☐ If statement is filed less than five court days before hearing, prepare additional copy and serve it on adverse party in manner to assure delivery to that party no later than two days before hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)*].

NOTE:
Civil Law and Motion Rules. Evidence received at a motion hearing subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules (*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*) must be by declaration and affidavit and by request for judicial notice (*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(b)*) without testimony or cross-examination, except as allowed in the court's discretion for good cause shown or as permitted by local rule. A party seeking permission to introduce oral evidence, except in rebuttal to oral evidence presented by the other party, must file, no later than three court days before the hearing, a written statement setting forth the nature and extent of the evidence proposed to be introduced and a reasonable time estimate for the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(b), 3.1306(a)*].

☐ Advise persons who will offer supporting testimony at hearing of time, date, and place of the hearing, and instruct them to attend.

NOTE:
Consider Issuing Subpoena. Counsel may wish to consider the advisability of issuing, or having issued, a subpoena [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*] and serving it on the witnesses to secure their attendance in court [*see generally, Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.* and Ch. 535, *Subpoena*].

[8] Call for Tentative Ruling

☐ Call for tentative ruling, if available. If counsel wishes to appear at hearing and argue motion, contact clerk of court within time specified in tentative ruling message.

[9] Attend Hearing

☐ Attend the hearing, if necessary or desired.

☐ Have witnesses testify, if applicable.

☐ Argue motion.

[10] Prepare and Serve Order

☐ If the motion is granted, present order for signature:

- [ ] If counsel previously prepared order granting motion:
- [ ] Present original of order to courtroom clerk for judge's signature.
- [ ] Deliver copies to be conformed to courtroom clerk.
- [ ] If counsel has not prepared order, or order is different from one prepared:
- [ ] Prepare order and deliver it to courtroom clerk for delivery to judge for signature.
- [ ] Deliver copies to be conformed to courtroom clerk.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Moving Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.331

§ 489.331 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Valid Judgment and Order

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) Based on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is any of the following:

☐ Aggrieved party in favor of or against whom judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken;

☐ Party's legal representative; or

☐ Stranger whose rights have been adversely affected by judgment, order, or proceeding.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party seeks relief against any of following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]:

☐ Judgment.

☐ Dismissal.

☐ Order.

☐ Proceeding, including default and default judgment.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether any of following grounds exist:

☐ Mistake (*see § 489.44[1]*).

☐ Inadvertence (*see § 489.44[2]*).

☐ Surprise (*see § 489.44[3]*).

☐ Excusable neglect (*see § 489.44[4]*).

NOTE:

Attorney's Affidavit of Mistake, Etc. In the case of a default, default judgment, or dismissal only, if the attorney will give an affidavit or declaration attesting to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, the defendant may move for relief under a different provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*see* [2], *below*].

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Determine what kind of relief is desired; that is, order:

☐ Setting aside or vacating judgment, dismissal, or order, or

☐ Nullifying proceeding and allowing moving party to file pleading or paper if appropriate.

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired:

☐ The motion must be made within reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months from the date the judgment or dismissal was entered, order was made, or proceeding was taken [for discussion, *see § 489.39*].

NOTE:

Shorter Time for Determination of Ownership or Possession Right. A potentially shorter period applies to a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding determining the ownership or right to possession of property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for discussion, *see § 489.39[9*]].

☐ If time to file notice of motion has *not* expired, determine whether moving party has at all times exercised diligence in seeking relief [for discussion, *see § 489.39[6]*].

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether relief might still be a vailable under one of other statutory proceedings [*see* [2]-[6], *below*] or in equitable proceedings [*see § 489.333*; for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion; motion must be made in court in which judgment or dismissal was entered, order was made, or proceeding was taken.

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.360[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see §§ 489.360[1], 489.361* (forms of declaration)].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare papers to be filed if motion is granted:

☐ If relief is sought from default or default and default judgment, copy of proposed verified answer showing meritorious defense to action; or

☐ In other cases, a copy of the pleading or other paper, if any, proposed to be filed.

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.360[2]* (form)].

[2] Relief From Default, Default and Default Judgment, or Dismissal Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is either of the following:

☐ Defendant or

☐ Cross defendant.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party seeks relief against any of following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]:

☐ Default.

☐ Default and default judgment.

☐ Dismissal.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether any of following exist [for discussion, *see § 489.40[1]*]:

☐ Mistake.

☐ Inadvertence.

☐ Surprise.

☐ Neglect of attorney whether excusable or not.

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* is order setting aside and vacating default, default and default judgment, or dismissal and permitting defendant to answer.

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired; the motion must be made within six months from the date the judgment was entered.

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ There appears to be no alternative relief available, other than:

☐ Appeal.

☐ Client may have claim against attorney that can be pursued in independent action for malpractice (*see* Ch. 76, *Attorney Professional Liability*).

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion; motion must be made in court in which default, default and default judgment, or dismissal was entered.

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.360[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see §§ 489.360[1], 489.361[3]* (forms of declaration)].

NOTE:
Facts May Be Combined With Affidavit of Fault. If the affidavit or declaration is made by the party's attorney, these facts may, instead of being set forth in a separate affidavit or declaration, be combined with the attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault (discussed below;).

☐ Prepare attorney's affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury attesting to his or her fault, that is, to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect and that the default, default and default judgment, or dismissal was entered because of it [*see § 489.362* (form)].

☐ Prepare copy of the answer showing a meritorious defense proposed to be filed [*see* Ch. 26, *Answers*].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* . (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.360[2]* (form)].

[3] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5 Based on Lack of Notice in Time to Defend

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is either of the following:

☐ Defendant or

☐ Cross defendant.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party seeks relief against either of following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*; *see § 489.70*]:

☐ Default.

☐ Default and default judgment.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether service of summons did not result in actual notice in time to defend [for discussion, *see §§ 489.70, 489.71*].

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* is order setting aside or vacating default and default judgment and granting leave to defend the action.

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired. The motion for relief must be filed within reasonable time in no case exceeding the earlier of [for discussion, *see § 489.75*]:

☐ Two years after entry of default judgment, or

☐ One hundred eighty days after service on moving party of written notice that default or default judgment has been entered.

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether relief might still be available in equitable proceedings [*§ 489.333* (checklist); for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion. Motion made in court in which default or default and default judgment were entered.

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.380[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see § 489.360[1]* (form)], setting forth evidentiary facts showing:

☐ How summons was served.

☐ That service did not result in actual notice to defendant until specified date.

☐ That date of service was too late to file responsive pleading or motion.

NOTE:
Facts May Be Combined With Declaration of No Fault of Defendant. If the affidavit or declaration is made by the defendant or cross defendant, these facts may, instead of being set forth in a separate affidavit or declaration, be combined with the affidavit or declaration discussed below.

☐ Prepare moving party's affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury showing that the lack of actual notice in time to defend was not caused by the defendant's or cross defendant's avoidance of service or inexcusable neglect [*see § 489.380[1]*].

☐ Prepare copy of the answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed in the action [*see § 489.73*; *see also* Ch. 26, *Answers* , Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* , Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* , and Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings* , Ch. 376, *Motions to Strike: Anti-SLAPP* , and Ch. 389, *Nonsuit and Motions for Judgment*].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.380[2]* (form)].

[4] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment in Certain Consumer Actions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5 Based on Filing of Action in Wrong Court

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is either of the following [*see § 489.90*]:

☐ Defendant or

☐ Cross defendant.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party seeks relief against either of following:

☐ Default.

☐ Default and default judgment.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether action was filed in wrong court under one of following venue provisions [*see § 489.90*]:

☐ Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1812.10*).

☐ Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2984.4*).

☐ *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (venue of actions relating to goods, services, loans, or credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use).

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5* is order setting aside or vacating default and default judgment and granting leave to defend action in proper court [*see § 489.93*].

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired; the motion for relief must be served and filed within 60 days after defendant first receives notice of levy under writ of execution, or notice of any other procedure for enforcing the default judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*; *see § 489.93*].

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether any of following relief is available:

☐ Claim against plaintiff for securing judgment in wrong court that can be pursued in independent action for abuse of process.

☐ Claim against plaintiff for unlawful business practice [*see Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 103-113, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817*] if plaintiff habitually files actions in wrong county.

☐ Potentially, relief in equitable proceedings [*see § 489.333*; for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

NOTE:

Question of Whether Equitable Relief Available Not Resolved. Prior to the 1970 enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*, a default judgment entered in an action filed in an improper court under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* was subject to attack by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*see Barquis v. Merchants Collection Asso. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 119 n.22, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817*], and, inferentially, to an attack in equity if the statutory motion would have been untimely [*see § 489.220*]. However, no case has been found holding that equitable relief from a default and default judgment subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5* is or is not available.

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion; motion is made in court in which default or default and default judgment were entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(d)*].

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.390[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury sworn to or signed by person having personal knowledge of facts, setting forth evidentiary facts showing that action was not commenced in proper court [*see § 489.390[1]* (form of declaration)].

☐ Prepare copy of the answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed in the action [*see § 489.91*; *see also* Ch. 26, *Answers* , Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* , Ch. 206, *Demurrers, Motions to Strike, Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings, and Motions for Nonsuit and Judgment* , and Ch. 372, *Motions and Order* Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings* , Ch. 376, *Motions to Strike: Anti-SLAPP* , and Ch. 389, *Nonsuit and Motions for Judgment*].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.390[2]* (form)].

[5] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1 Based on California Court's Having Assumed Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Law Practice

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is aggrieved party in favor of or against whom judgment, order, or proceeding was taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*; *see § 489.100*].

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party seeks relief against any of following [for discussion, *see § 489.100*]:

☐ Judgment.

☐ Order.

☐ Proceeding, including dismissal or default and default judgment.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether California court has assumed jurisdiction pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180* or *6190* over law practice of party's attorney who is unable to practice because of incapacity, death, disbarment, etc. [for discussion, *see § 489.100*].

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1* is order setting aside or vacating judgment or order, or nullifying proceeding [for discussion, *see § 489.100*].

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired [*see § 489.101*]:

☐ The motion must be made within reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months from date court took jurisdiction over attorney's law practice.

NOTE:
Shorter Time for Determination of Ownership or Possession Right. A shorter period may apply if the judgment, order, or proceeding is one determining the ownership or right to possession of real or personal property.

☐ Because motion must be made within reasonable time, moving party must, apparently, exercise diligence in seeking relief within six-month period after discovery of the court's assumption of jurisdiction.

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ If time in which relief may be sought expires before aggrieved party discovers that jurisdiction over his or her attorney's practice has been assumed by California court, determine whether relief might still be available in equitable proceedings discussed in *§ 489.333* [for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion. Motion must be made in court in which judgment was entered, order was made, or proceeding was taken [for discussion, *see § 489.100*].

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.400[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see § 489.400[1]*].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.400[2]* (form)].

[6] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is either [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 511*; for discussion, *see § 489.112*]:

☐ Member of:

☐ Army.

☐ Navy.

☐ Marine Corps.

☐ Air Force.

☐ Coast Guard.

☐ Public Health Service officer detailed by proper authority for duty with Army or Navy.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Relief is sought against either of following [for discussion, *see § 489.110*]:

☐ Default.

☐ Default and default judgment.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether there was the following [for discussion, *see § 489.113*]:

☐ Prejudice in making defense by reason of military service.

☐ Defendant has meritorious or legal defense to action or to some part of it.

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)* is order vacating and setting aside default or default and default judgment and granting defendant leave to defend.

[e] Consider Effect of Other Limitations

☐ Vacating, setting aside, or reversing of any judgment under Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act will not impair any right or title acquired by bona fide purchaser for value under judgment.

[f] Has Time to File Motion Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired. The motion must be filed either [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)(2)*; for discussion, *see § 489.113*]:

☐ While defendant is in military service, or

☐ Ninety days after military service terminates.

[g] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether relief might still be available under one of other statutory proceedings [*see* [1]-[5], *above*] or in equitable proceedings [*see § 489.333*; for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[h] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion; motion is made in court in which judgment was entered, order was made, or proceeding was taken.

[i] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.410[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth evidentiary facts showing that [*see § 489.410[1]* (form of declaration)]:

☐ Moving party was prejudiced in making defense by reason of his or her military service.

☐ He or she has meritorious defense to action or to some part of it.

NOTE:
Copy of Proposed Verified Answer Sufficient. Similar to a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, a copy of the verified answer proposed to be filed containing a meritorious defense would appear to be sufficient to show the defense.

☐ Motion is timely.

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70,

Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or orders [*see § 489.410[2]* (form)].

[7] Relief From Judgment Under State Law Based on Military Service

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

- Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is one of the following [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)*; for discussion, *see § 489.118*]:

  ☐ Officer or enlisted member of National Guard called or ordered into active state service by Governor pursuant to *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 143* or *146*.

  ☐ Officer or enlisted member of National Guard called or ordered into active federal service by President pursuant to Title 10 or 12 of United States Code.

  ☐ Reservist of United States Military Reserve called to full-time active duty.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Relief is sought against a judgment [for discussion, *see § 489.117*].

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine the following [for discussion, *see § 489.117*]:

  ☐ Was there prejudice in making defense by reason of military service.

  ☐ Does the defendant has meritorious or legal defense to action or to some part of it.

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)* is order vacating and setting aside judgment and granting defendant leave to defend.

[e] Consider Effect of Other Limitations

☐ Vacating, setting aside, or reversing of any judgment will not impair any right or title acquired by bona fide purchaser for value under judgment.

[f] Has Time to File Motion Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired. The motion must be filed within ninety days after military service terminates [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*].

[g] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether relief might still be available under one of other statutory proceedings [*see* [1]-[5], *above*] or in equitable proceedings [*see § 489.333*; for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[h] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Motion is made in court in which judgment was entered, order was made, or proceeding was taken.

[i] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [see *§ 489.411[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth evidentiary facts showing that [*see § 489.411[1]* (form of declaration)]:

☐ Moving party was prejudiced in making defense by reason of his or her military service.

☐ He or she has meritorious defense to action or to some part of it.

NOTE:
Copy of Proposed Verified Answer Sufficient. Similar to a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, a copy of the verified answer proposed to be filed containing a meritorious defense would appear to be sufficient to show the defense.

☐ Motion is timely.

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or orders [*see § 489.411[2]* (form)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersU.S. National Guard

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Moving Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.332

§ 489.332 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Void Judgment and Order

[1] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d) From Judgment or Order that Is Void on Its Face

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party:

☐ Party to action.

☐ Third person prejudiced by judgment or order.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Person is seeking relief from:

☐ Judgment.

☐ Order.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether judgment or order is void on its face [for discussion, *see §§ 489.134, 489.136*].

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available is order setting aside or vacating judgment or order or declaring it void [for discussion, *see § 489.131*].

[e] No Time Limits Apply

☐ Judgment or order void on its face is always subject to attack [for discussion, *see § 489.141*]

[f] What Manner of Attack Is Preferred?

☐ Direct attack [*see § 489.138*]; may be commenced in action in which judgment or order was entered by:

☐ Motion.

☐ Ex Parte Application.

NOTE:
Ex Parte Application Permitted. Party's motion may be made ex parte because the court can vacate or set aside a void judgment on its own motion, a party's motion may be made ex parte.

☐ Collateral attack [*see § 489.139*]; may be made in many different procedural contexts, for example [for discussion, *see § 489.14[3]*]:

☐ Second action on same grounds as action dismissed with prejudice and judgment entered.

☐ Action to quiet title to property awarded to another by partially void judgment.

☐ Proceeding in prohibition to prevent threatened punishment for contempt for violating order appointing receiver in accounting action.

☐ Action on claim previously settled with court approval on petition to court.

☐ Action to quiet title to land sold under execution.

☐ Proceeding in mandate to compel trial court to strike from its records portion of appealable order that reduced judgment.

☐ Action on judgment.

☐ Subsequent attack on orders independently appealable and final by lapse of time by appeal from later order or judgment.

[g] Prepare Papers

☐ Prepare papers as appropriate in procedural context in which issue is raised.

[2] Relief Under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d) From Judgment or Order That Is Void in Fact Although Not Void on Its Face

[a] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that party seeking relief is aggrieved party.

[b] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Moving party is seeking relief from:

☐ Judgment.

☐ Order.

[c] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether judgment or order is void in fact although it is not void on its face any of following exist [for discussion, *see § 489.134*].

[d] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

☐ Relief available is order setting aside or vacating judgment or order.

[e] Has Time to File Motion for Relief Expired?

☐ Determine whether time to file notice of motion has expired [for discussion, *see § 489.142*].

☐ Motion to set aside judgment that is void because defendant was never served in action and return of service filed is false must be made within time specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*, which applies by analogy, namely, within earlier of:

☐ Two years from the date the judgment was entered, or

☐ One hundred eighty days after service on the moving party of a written notice that judgment has been entered.

☐ Motion for relief from any other judgment or order must be made within six-month period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, which applies by analogy.

[f] If Time Has Expired, Is Alternative Remedy Available?

☐ Determine whether relief might still be available in equitable proceedings [*see § 489.333*; for discussion, *see § 489.220*].

[g] What Is Proper Court for Motion?

☐ Ascertain proper court for motion. Motion made in court in which judgment or order was entered.

[h] Prepare Moving Papers

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.420[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth evidentiary facts showing that [*see § 489.420[1]* (form of declaration)]:

☐ Judgment or order is void.

☐ Motion is timely.

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.420[2]* (form)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProceduresJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Moving Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.333

§ 489.333 Consideration of Alternative Remedies for Relief: Equitable Relief From Valid or Void Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Is Client Proper Party?

☐ Determine whether party seeking relief is proper party. Confirm that moving party is any of the following [for discussion, *see § 489.225*]:

- ☐ Aggrieved party.
- ☐ Person in privity with party.
- ☐ Stranger whose rights have been adversely affected by judgment or order.

[2] Is Judgment or Order Proper Target of Relief?

☐ Determine whether judgment or order at issue is final [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1*, *904.2*; *see also* Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal*].

[3] Does Basis for Relief Exist?

☐ Determine whether judgment or order is either:

- ☐ Void [for discussion, *see § 489.132*], or
- ☐ Obtained through extrinsic:

- ☐ Fraud [for discussion, *see §§ 489.241 -489.243*].
- ☐ Mistake [for discussion, *see §§ 489.241 -489.242*, *489.244*].
- ☐ Duress [for discussion, *see § 489.245*].

[4] Is Relief Appropriate to Client's Case?

- ☐ Consider whether equitable relief is appropriate in client's case [*see § 489.220* et seq.].
- ☐ Determine what manner of relief is desired; that is, order or judgment:
  - ☐ Modifying, setting aside, or nullifying judgment or order.
  - ☐ Permitting defendant in default case to defend against action.
  - ☐ Permitting aggrieved party to file pleading or paper.
  - ☐ Granting, or other appropriate relief.

[5] Which Proceedings Are Preferred?

- ☐ Consider the advantages and disadvantages of equitable motion compared to independent action in equity [for discussion, *see § 489.266*]:
  - ☐ Time limits: Applicable time limit or statute of limitations [*see* [7] and [8], *below*].
  - ☐ Speed of relief: Moving party may obtain hearing on equitable motion sooner than trial.
  - ☐ Expense: Equitable motion is less expensive than independent action in equity.
  - ☐ Need for discovery: Independent action in equity permits formal discovery, such as deposition of witnesses.
  - ☐ Willingness of witnesses to testify at trial: Hearing on equitable motion is normally based on affidavits or declarations.
  - ☐ Credibility of witnesses: In independent action, counsel may cross examine witnesses.

☐ Judge to determine case: Desirability of disposition by law and motion judge versus trial judge.

☐ Claim and issue preclusion: Collateral estoppel and res judicata effect of full opportunity to litigate when witnesses testify in court [for discussion, *see § 489.266[2]*].

[6] Which Court Is Proper Court to Seek Relief?

☐ Equitable motion: relief may be sought in court that rendered judgment [for discussion, *see § 489.225*].

☐ Independent action in equity: may be filed in superior court only [for discussion, *see § 489.266*].

[7] Motion for Equitable Relief

☐ Determine whether time to file motion has expired:

☐ Motion must be made within reasonable time after discovery of judgment or facts constituting extrinsic fraud or mistake [for discussion, *see § 489.262[1]*].

NOTE:
No Other Time Limit. No specific time limitation is otherwise imposed for a motion for relief from judgment or order in equity.

☐ Moving party must act diligently in seeking relief after discovering the facts [for discussion, *see § 489.262[2]*].

☐ Prepare moving papers.

☐ Prepare notice of motion [*see § 489.430[1]* (form of notice of motion)].

☐ Prepare one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see §§ 489.430[1], 489.431* (forms)], setting forth evidentiary facts showing:

☐ If relief is sought on ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake, that judgment or order resulted from extrinsic fraud or mistake, and stating that judgment or order was entered because of that extrinsic fraud or mistake.

☐ If relief is sought on ground that judgment or order is void, that judgment or order is void (and, in case of judgment that is void on its face, including appropriate reference to judgment roll).

☐ Moving party has meritorious case [for discussion, *see § 489.264*].

☐ Motion is timely [*see above*].

☐ Prepare supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see* s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proposed order, if desired or required [*see § 489.430[2]* (form)].

[8] Independent Action in Equity

☐ Determine whether statute of limitations has expired. A complaint for relief in equity must be filed within either [for discussion, *see § 489.261*]:

☐ Three years, subject to a delayed discovery rule [*see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 560, 305 P.2d 20* (applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* limitation period governing actions for fraud or mistake)] or

☐ Four years [*Zastrow v. Zastrow (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 710, 717, 132 Cal. Rptr. 536* (applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* limitation period for when no other period is provided)].

☐ Determine court in which plaintiff prefers to file action.

NOTE:
Independent Action May Be Filed in Different Court. Independent action need not be filed in the court that rendered the judgment or made the order [for discussion, *see § 489.266[1]*].

☐ Prepare complaint for equitable relief to vacate or set aside the judgment or order [*see §§ 489.440, 489.441* (forms)].

☐ Commence action by filing complaint for equitable relief, and paying appropriate filing fee.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

179 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. Moving Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.334-489.339

[Reserved]

§§ 489.334[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Opposing Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.340

§ 489.340 Response to Request for Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

☐ Read reading notice of motion and supporting papers, determine:

☐ Whether notice of motion was properly served.

☐ Whether motion is timely.

☐ If diligence is requirement of relief sought, whether moving party has acted diligently in seeking relief.

☐ Whether notice of motion sets forth legal grounds for relief [*see §§ 489.331 -489.333*].

☐ Whether any supporting affidavits or declarations contain facts within affiant's or declarant's personal knowledge or contain inadmissible hearsay.

☐ Determine whether to oppose or stipulate to motion.

NOTE:
Stipulation to Terms of Relief. If the moving papers support the relief requested and there is no defense to the motion, counsel may wish to stipulate that the motion be granted (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128.5(a), (b), 128.7* (relating to sanctions imposed for bad faith actions or tactics), discussed in *§ 489.42*. If counsel believes that the court could go either way on the motion, he or she may still wish to negotiate

a stipulation granting the motion on the best terms obtainable for his or her client [*see* discussion in *§ 489.42*].

[2] Prepare Papers

☐ Prepare one or more counter affidavits or counter declarations under penalty of perjury [*see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* (for general requirements for affidavits and declarations)].

☐ Prepare opposing memorandum of points and authorities [*see* s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From Judgments and Orders* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Prepare proof of service [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[3] Serve and File Papers

☐ Serve opposing papers on other party's attorney (or on other party if he or she has no attorney) at least 9 court days before the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(a)(10), (12), (13), (b), 1010*; *see also* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

☐ Deliver the originals of all opposition papers to court clerk for filing at least 9 court days before the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*].

[4] Prepare for Hearing

☐ Advise persons who will be offering testimony at hearing in opposition to the motion of the time, date, and place of the hearing, and instruct them to attend the hearing.

[5] Attend Hearing

☐ Attend the hearing and argue against the motion.

[6] Prepare and Serve Order, if Required

☐ If motion is denied and court requires preparation of formal order, draft order in compliance with court's instructions [*see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

☐ Prepare sufficient copies of order to provide copies to:

- ☐ Court (with original as well).
- ☐ Opposing counsel (if the court so requires).
- ☐ Office copy.

☐ Prevailing party.

☐ Deliver copies to courtroom clerk to deliver original to judge for signing and to conform copies.

NOTE:

Ruling. The judge may rule on the motion from the bench or take the matter under submission and render his or her decision at a later date.

[7] Prepare Notice of Order

☐ Prepare the notice of order [*see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*]:

☐ Set forth verbatim language of order, or notice of order.

☐ Attach conformed copy of order attached.

☐ Serve notice of order, or have it served, on attorney for moving party (or on party if he or she has no attorney).

NOTE:

Prevailing Party to Give Notice of Order. Unless otherwise ordered by the court or notice is waived by all parties in open court and is entered in the minutes, notice of the court's order granting or denying the motion must be given by the prevailing party to all other parties or their attorneys [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeOpposing MemorandaCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Opposing Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.341

§ 489.341 Defenses to Relief From Valid Judgment and Order From Judgment, Dismissal, or Order

[1] Relief Based on Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for discussion, *see § 489.39*; *see also § 489.331[1][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

NOTE:
Court May Treat Motion as Equitable Motion. The court may on its own motion treat an untimely motion for relief as a motion in equity and therefore timely.

☐ Judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding did not result from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect claimed [for discussion, *see § 489.44*].

☐ Mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect is not excusable [for discussion, *see § 489.45*].

☐ Moving party failed to act diligently in seeking relief, and/or there are substantial periods of total inactivity in seeking relief [for discussion, *see § 489.39[6]*].

[2] Relief From Default, Default and Default Judgment, or Dismissal Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for discussion, *see § 489.40[2]*; *see also § 489.331[2][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Default, default and default, or dismissal judgment did not result from attorney's mistake,

inadvertence, surprise, or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for discussion, *see §§ 489.40[1], 489.44*].

[3] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Lack of Notice in Time to Defend

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*; for discussion, *see § 489.75*; *see also § 489.331[3][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Defendant or cross defendant received actual notice of action in time to defend.

[4] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment in Certain Consumer Actions Based on Filing of Action in Wrong Court

☐ The motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*; for discussion, *see § 489.92*; *see also § 489.331[4][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ The action was filed in proper court, if that is true.

[5] Relief Based on California Court's Having Assumed Jurisdiction Over Attorney's Law Practice

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*; for discussion, *see § 489.101*; *see also § 489.331[5][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Moving party failed to act diligently in seeking relief, and/or there are substantial periods of total inactivity in seeking relief.

[6] Relief From Default or Default and Default Judgment Based on Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)(2)*; for discussion, *see § 489.115*; *see also § 489.331[6][f]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Defendant was not prejudiced in making his or her defense by reason of military service [for discussion, *see § 489.110*].

☐ Facts relied on do not constitute prejudice.

☐ Facts relied on as establishing prejudice were not cause of party's failure to file answer.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesExcusable NeglectCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesInadvertenceCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesSurpriseGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsMilitary & Veterans

LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Opposing Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.342

§ 489.342 Defenses to Relief From Void Judgment and Order

[1] Relief From Judgment or Order That Is Void on Its Face

☐ There are no defenses.

[2] Relief From Judgment or Order That Is Void in Fact Although Not Void on Its Face

☐ Motion is not timely and relief is therefore barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*; for discussion, *see § 489.142*; *see also § 489.332[2][e]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Judgment or order is not void [for discussion, *see § 489.132*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Opposing Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.343

§ 489.343 Defenses to Relief From Valid or Void Judgment, Dismissal, or Order In Equity

[1] Motion for Equitable Relief:

☐ Facts relied do not constitute extrinsic fraud or mistake [for discussion, *see § 489.241* et seq.].

☐ Extrinsic fraud or mistake did not result in judgment or order from which relief is sought.

☐ Fraud or mistake was intrinsic [for discussion, *see § 489.246*].

☐ Moving party failed to act diligently in seeking relief after discovery of judgment or order or facts constituting extrinsic fraud or mistake, and opposing party was prejudiced by delay [for discussion, *see § 489.262[2]*].

[2] Independent Action in Equity Filed in Superior Court

☐ Facts relied on do not constitute extrinsic fraud or mistake.

☐ Extrinsic fraud or mistake did not result in judgment or order from which relief is sought.

☐ Fraud or mistake was intrinsic.

☐ Action is barred by statute of limitations [for discussion, *see § 489.261*; *see also § 489.333[8]* (moving party's checklist)].

☐ Plaintiff is guilty of laches; that is, plaintiff's unnecessary delay in seeking relief after learning facts prejudiced defendant's rights [for discussion, *see § 489.261[4]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentFraudCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentIndependent ActionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Opposing Party's Checklist

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.344-489.359

[Reserved]

§§ 489.344[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.360

§ 489.360 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration--General Form

[a] FORM Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MO-
_____ [*name*]	)	TION_____ [*specify, e.g.,* FOR OR-
Defendant.	)	DER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE DE-
	)	FAULT (AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT)], DE-
	)	CLARATION(S) OF _____
	)	[*name(s)*], AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
	)	AND AUTHORITIES
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of

record:

[*EITHER, if motion is for relief from default, default judgment, or dismissal and based on attorney's affidavit or declaration attesting to his/her fault*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at_____ [*address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move _____ [*specify, e.g.,* to vacate and set aside] the _____ [*specify judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, e.g.,* default (and default judgment) entered against defendant] on _____ [*date*]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that the _____ [default (and resulting default judgment) *or* dismissal was/were] taken against _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] as the result of the _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* neglect *or all or any combination of these*] of his/her attorney, _____ [*name*], who has _____ [given an affidavit *or* executed a declaration under penalty of perjury] attesting to this fault.

[*OR, if motion is for relief from default, default judgment, or dismissal without attorney's affidavit or declaration attesting to fault, or is for relief from any other judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move _____ [*specify, e.g.,* to vacate and set aside] the _____ [*specify judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, e.g.,* default (and default judgment) entered against defendant] on _____ [*date*]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that the _____ [judgment *or* dismissal *or* order *or* proceeding] was taken _____ [by *or* against] _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] through his/her _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*].

[*CONTINUE*]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, the accompanying _____ [affidavit(s) *and/or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] [, the _____ (*specify pleading proposed to be filed, e.g.,* proposed answer to the complaint herein], and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM _____ [*specify, e.g.,* THE DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT ENTERED HEREIN]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant] in this action and make this declaration in support of my motion for an order _____ [*specify relief sought, e.g.,* vacating and setting aside] the _____ [*specify judgment, order, or proceedings from which relief is sought, e.g.,* default (and default judgment) taken against me] in this action.

2. As shown by the records herein, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the _____ [*specify judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, e.g.,* default (and default judgment) was/were] _____ [entered *or* taken] through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*] in that _____ [*set forth all facts establishing the ground(s) of the motion*].

3. I have at all times acted diligently in seeking this relief as shown by the following facts: _____ [*state how and when party discovered the entry or taking of the judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, set forth the steps taken to secure relief, and explain with good reason each and every delay between the date of discovery and the date this notice of motion will be filed*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM
[*Add memorandum supporting motion*]

[b] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion and supporting declaration for use by a party or his or her legal representative (discussed in *§ 489.47[1]*) to obtain relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from any judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding, including a default or default judgment, taken by or against the party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.

The first alternative paragraph in the notice of motion is to be used when relief is sought under the mandatory relief provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from a default and any resulting default judgment or dismissal entered as a result of the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect of the moving party's attorney to which the attorney has attested in an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see § 489.362[1]* (form of declaration); *see also § 489.40* (legal background)].

The second alternative paragraph of the notice of motion is to be used when relief is sought under the discretionary provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, if the motion is for relief from:

- A default, default judgment, or dismissal without an attorney's affidavit or declaration attesting to fault or

- Any other judgment, order, or proceeding whether or not the attorney attests to his or her fault.

For statements that may be inserted in Paragraph 2 of the declaration, see *§ 489.361*. For additional statements that may be modified for use in Paragraph 2, see *§ 489.431*.

The form in [a], *above*, may also be used by a party's legal representative, such as an assignee [*see § 489.47[1]*].

For discussion of the time within which the motion must be filed, see *§ 489.39*. For discussion of alternative relief that may be available when the time for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, has expired, see *§ 489.39[8]*.

[c] Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Proceeding Taken by Party

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, on its face, authorizes relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken *against* a party or his or her legal representative, the statute has been construed to authorize relief when the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding, was taken *by* a party as well [*Olson v. Olson (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 479, 482-483, 306 P.2d 1036* ; *see § 489.47*]. However, relief based on an attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault is limited to relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal taken against a party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for discussion of relief based on attorney's affidavit, *see § 489.40*].

[d] Relief From Default Judgment

The time for moving for relief from a default and default judgment commences to run when the default was entered [*Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 970, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* ; *see also § 489.39[3*]].

Normally, if relief is sought from a default judgment the default must also be set aside; otherwise, the vacated judgment would leave the prior default intact and, on application, the court would be required to render immediately a judgmentof like effect, which defendant, being still in default, could not oppose [*Howard Greer etc. Originals v. Capritti (1950)35 Cal. 2d 886, 888-889, 221 P.2d 937* (affirming order denying motion to set aside default judgment); *see also Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 970, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* (affirming order granting relief from default judgment as to one defendant and reversing as to other defendant and reversing orders vacating default of both defendants as untimely; criticized on another ground in *Canadian Commercial Bank v. Ascher Findley Co. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1152, 280 Cal. Rptr. 521*)].

Consequently, the notice of motion should request that both the default and default judgment be vacated and set aside. However, a motion in equity, made after the time for attacking a judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, had expired, to set aside the default without mentioning the default judgment, entered for failure to answer interrogatories, and to reinstate the answer has been treated as a matter of "common sense" as one to set aside both the default and the default judgment [*Palmer v. Moore (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 134, 137, 71 Cal. Rptr. 801* (affirming order granting relief); for further discussion of equitable relief, *see § 489.220* et seq.]. Although the rule on this point would apparently be the same whether the motion is based on the court's equitable powers or on the statutory motion, the better practice on all motions is to specify in the notice of motion all the relief sought.

If equitable, as well as statutory, grounds exist for vacating the judgment, counsel may wish to move for relief under both *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, and alternatively on the grounds of extrinsic fraud and mistake [*see Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 974, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* ; for a discussion of equitable motions and relief in equity, *see § 489.220* et seq.].

The foregoing rules would not apply when the attack is solely on the default judgment as, for example, when the judgment makes an award different from or in excess of that requested in the complaint, or statement of damages [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.10(b), 425.11, 580*]. For a discussion and forms for use in attacking a void or partially void default judgment, see *§§ 489.130 et seq. and 489.220* et seq., respectively.

[e] Notice Requirement

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), unlike *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (relating to void judgments, discussed in *§ 489.130* et seq.), does not expressly require that the application for relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding, be made on notice or served on the adverse party. Nor does *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)* (specifying motions of which notice is required) expressly require that a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, unlike a motion for relief from default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* or *585.5* (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(10), (12)*, respectively), discussed in *§§ 489.70 et seq. and 489.90* et seq., respectively, be made on notice [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* ("an application for an order is a motion")].

Nevertheless, the general rule is that notice of a motion must be given whenever the order sought may affect the rights of the adverse party [*see McDonald v. Severy (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 629, 631, 59 P.2d 98* ; *Bohn v. Bohn (1913) 164 Cal. 532, 536, 129 P. 981* ; *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 82, 85, 202 Cal. Rptr. 571* ; *People ex rel. Dept. Public Wks. v. Loop (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 466, 474, 326 P.2d 902*]. Since an order granting relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, will affect the right of the party in whose favor the judgment, order, or proceeding was taken, the motion is one that, under the general rule, requires notice. Consequently, the motion would be governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*, which, in addition to specified motions, requires written notice of a motion in "[a]ny other proceeding under this code in which notice is required and no other time or method is prescribed by law or by court or judge" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(13)*].

[f] Amount of Notice Required

Because the motion is one that falls within the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(13)* [*see* discussion under [e], *above*], the provisions for service and filing under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* apply. Consequently, unless otherwise ordered by the court, all moving and supporting papers are required to be served and filed at least 16 court days before the time appointed for the hearing, provided that, if the notice is served by mail, the required 16-day period of notice before the time appointed for the hearing is increased by five calendar days if the place of mailing and the place of address are within California, 10 calendar days if either the place of mailing or place of address is outside California but in the United States, and 20 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside the United States. If notice is served by fax, express mail, or other overnight delivery method, the 16-day period is extended by two calendar days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*].

Opposing papers must be filed and served at least nine court days and all reply papers at least five court days before the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*].

[g] Supporting Declaration

[i] Requirement

In addition to the memorandum of points and authorities, the notice of motion for relief based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect of a party or the party's attorney must be accompanied by one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003, 2009, 2015.5*] setting forth the facts establishing the ground or grounds of the motion. A generalform for a supporting declaration is included in the form in [1], *above*. For other forms for supporting declarations, see *§ 489.361*. If the motion will be based on the attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault, that affidavit or declaration must accompany the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see § 489.361*].

[ii] Content and Form

Absent statutory authority to the contrary, an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to be used as evidence of facts must normally be positive, direct, and not based on hearsay [*see Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721*]. A statement made without personal knowledge and solely on information and belief is hearsay and does not prove the facts contained in it [*Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42* ; *see also Magnolia Square Homeowners Assn. v Safeco Ins. Co. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1057, 271 Cal. Rptr. 1* (allegation on information and belief is hearsay)]. However, facts averred on information and belief are proper when, for example, the facts to be established are incapable of positive averment [*see City of Santa Cruz v. Municipal Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 74, 87, 260 Cal. Rptr. 520, 776 P.2d 222*]. Moreover, unobjected-to hearsay may be considered by the court in ruling on a motion [*see Slusher v. Durrer (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 747, 753, 138 Cal. Rptr. 265*].

An affidavit or declaration setting forth only conclusions, opinions, or ultimate facts is also insufficient [*Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42*]. The declaration should be carefully drafted to avoid these, and it should set forth evidentiary, or probative, facts sufficient to show the following:

- One or more grounds for relief [*see § 489.44*; and cases cited in *§ 489.292[10]*].

- That the motion is filed within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months, after the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

- That the moving party exercised diligence in seeking relief [*see, e.g., Kendall v. Barker (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 619, 623-624, 243 Cal. Rptr. 42* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.39[6*]].

Explanations should be clear and detailed. For example, it will be insufficient to merely indicate that one was ill, without stating the dates of the illness [*see, e.g., Gudarov v. Hadjieff (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 412, 417-418, 240 P.2d 621*].

Inexcusable carelessness on the part of the defendant or his or her attorney can be disclosed by silence as well as by facts affirmatively set out [*Transit Ads, Inc. v. Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 275, 281, 75 Cal. Rptr. 848* (nonproduction of evidence that would naturally be produced by moving party allows inference that it is unfavorable)].

A declaration attached or appended to the notice of motion, which in its caption refers to the declaration, normally need not have a separate caption. But if it does not have a separate caption, it should nevertheless be titled.

For further discussion of the form and content of affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

[h] Other Accompanying Papers

[i] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with the notice of motion [a], *above,* if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1100 et seq.*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103* (motions subject to rules)] or if required by local court rule. A motion to set aside a default judgment is subject to the Civil Law and Motions Rules [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*]. The better practice is to prepare, serve, and file memorandum in support of any noticed motion, unless excluded expressly or by implication from the Civil Law and Motion Rules or by local court rule.

[ii] Pleading Proposed to Be Filed

A copy of the answer or other pleading, if any, proposed to be filed must also be submitted and is normally served and filed with the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; for further discussion of this requirement, including a discussion of a conflict among the courts of appeal as to when the proposed pleading must be filed, *see § 489.53*].

[i] Affidavit of Merits

No affidavit of merits is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*; *see* discussion in *§ 489.52[3*]].

[j] Service of Notice of Motion

The notice of motion must be served on the adverse party's attorney if any or, if none, on the adverse party [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011, 1012, 1015*].

[k] Parties to Be Served

The person entitled to notice is, of course, the adverse party. Moreover, in the case of multiple parties, notwithstanding the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014* that service of notice or papers need not be made on a defendant who has not appeared in the action, "adverse party" would include all parties who may be adversely affected by the order sought, whether or not they have appeared in the action [*see McDonald v. Severy (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 629, 631, 59 P.2d 98* (involving motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (then fourth paragraph) [*see § 489.130* et seq.], which expressly requires notice, to set aside dismissal with prejudice based on fraud)], including, in the case of a motion by defendant, any codefendants whose rights would be adversely affected by the granting of relief [*see Washko v. Stewart (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 311, 319, 112 P.2d 306* (involving motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)* (then fifth), to set aside default and default judgment, void in fact but not void on its face, for lack of personal jurisdiction over the defaulting defendant [*see § 489.130* et seq.])].

[l] Cross References

For alternative statements for use in supporting declarations, see *§ 489.361*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the entry of default and default judgment, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*

For additional discussion and forms relating to written motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For general discussion and form of a memorandum of points and authorities, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____

Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*]	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

[*EITHER*]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

[*OR*]

The court, having considered [the evidence presented at the hearing, and] the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s) *or* affidavit(s) and declaration(s) *or* _____ (affidavit *or* declaration) of fault of defendant's attorney], submitted in support of and in opposition to the motion, and being fully advised in the premises, finds that the _____ [*specify, judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding, e.g.,* default and default judgment] was/were taken _____ [against *or* by] _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] through _____ [his/her *or* his/her attorney's] _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*].

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] heretofore entered in this action _____ [*e.g.,* against defendant][, this judgment having been _____ (*specify, e.g.,* entered on _____ [*date*] in Volume _____, Page _____, of the Judgment Book),] be hereby set aside and vacated.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*name of party or party's attorney*) pay to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff) legal fees and costs in the sum of $_____.]

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*name*), the attorney for _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) pay to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff) legal fees and costs in the sum of $_____.]

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify any monetary penalties imposed, e.g.,* defendant's attorney, _____ [*name*], pay the amount of $_____ [*not exceeding $1,000*] to the State Bar Client Security Fund)].

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) be permitted to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* file) the _____ (answer *or other pleading or paper*) _____ (proposed to be filed *or* accompanying the notice of motion)].

[*Add, if sanctions are imposed*]

STATEMENT OF REASONS

The above _____ [*identify sanctions*] are imposed for the following reasons:

1. _____ [*Set forth in this and subsequent paragraphs each fact that support the sanctions, including the award of attorney fees and costs*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

The form in [a], *above*, is an order for use when the court grants a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect of a party or a party's attorney, or a motion for relief based on an attorney's affidavit (declaration) of fault [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. For legal background relating to orders granting or denying relief, see *§ 489.54*.

The order should be submitted to the judge for signature in accordance with the local court's rules and practice.

For discussion of the appealability of the order, see *§ 489.18[5]*.

[c] Findings

Unless a specific finding is required by statute or case law, findings of fact are not required and, in fact, have no place in the court's ruling on a motion [*Waller v. Weston (1899) 125 Cal. 201, 204, 57 P. 892* ; *see also Allstate Ins. Co. v. Orlando (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 858, 867, 69 Cal. Rptr. 702* ; *Skouland v. Skouland (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 677, 679, 20 Cal. Rptr. 185*]. The only express finding required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, is in the requirement that relief be granted from a default, default judgment, or dismissal based on an attorney's affidavit of fault, "unless the court finds the default or dismissal was not in fact caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect." Nevertheless, one court has stated that to grant relief on this basis, the court must find that the default (or dismissal) was actually caused by the attorney's fault [*see Billings v. Health Plan of America (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 250, 256, 275 Cal. Rptr. 80* (to extent *Billings* held that relief is limited to relief from default judgments, this holding has been abrogated by 1992 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, which expressly allows for relief from dismissals)]. If the court meant that the order must set forth that express finding, it is not supported by the statute. However, so long as the *Billings* dictum remains unrepudiated, counsel may wish to include in the proposed order granting relief an express finding that the default (or dismissal) was caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect. Because the same rule would seem equally applicable to a motion for relief under the first part of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, counsel for the moving party may also wish to include findings if the motion under that provision is granted to avoid an unnecessary appeal or one that might result in an adverse judgment.

[d] Conditions of Relief

[i] On Any Terms That May Be Just

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b), permits the court to relieve a party from a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding "upon any terms as may be just." This phrase has been interpreted as authorizing the court to order payment of costs or attorney's fees to the adverse party as compensation for loss or expense occasioned by the granting of the motion [*Jade K. v. Viguri (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1459, 1474, 258 Cal. Rptr. 907* (criticized on other grounds in *Passavanti v. Williams (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1602, 1608 n.5, 275 Cal. Rptr. 887*); *Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385* ; *see also* *Kodiak Films, Inc. v. Jensen (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1264, 281 Cal. Rptr. 728*].

For further legal background, see *§ 489.42*.

[ii] Relief Based on Attorney's Affidavit or Declaration of Fault

Whenever relief is granted based on an attorney's affidavit (or declaration) of fault, the court is required to direct the attorney to pay reasonablecompensatory legal fees and costs to opposing counsel or parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. Therefore, if the motion for relief is accompanied by an attorney's sworn affidavit attesting to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, the second bracketed order in the form in [a], *above*, limited to directing the attorney to pay legal fees and costs, should be included in the order. The relief cannot, however, be made conditional on the attorney's payment of compensatory legal fees or costs or monetary penalties (discussed under [iii], *below*) imposed by the court or on compliance with other sanctions ordered by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(2)*].

[iii] Penalties

Whenever the court grants relief from a default, default judgment, or dismissal based on any of the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, the court may [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(c)(1)*]:

- Impose a penalty of no greater than $1,000 on an offending attorney or party,
- Direct that an offending attorney pay an amount no greater than $1,000 to the State Bar Client Security Fund, or
- Grant other appropriate relief.

For discussion of the imposition of penalties under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(a)*, see *§ 489.42[3]*. If penalties are imposed, the third optional order in the form in [a], *above*, should be included.

[e] Statement of Reasons

If attorney's fees are awarded as a sanction or other sanctions are imposed, the order must also contain a written statement of the reasons [*see* *Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.42[4*]].

[f] Cross References

For additional discussion and forms relating to orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.361

§ 489.361 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--
Supporting Declaration--Statement in Supporting Declaration

[1] Default Was Due to Defendant's Excusable Mistake of Fact

[a] FORM Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect or Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Supporting Declaration--Statement in Supporting Declaration--Default Was Due to Defendant's Excusable Mistake of Fact

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) in § 489.360[1][a].*]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to defendant's excusable mistake of fact, e.g.:*]

2. As shown by the records herein, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the default [and default judgment] was/were entered through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*].

3. I was served with the summons and complaint in this action by a process server. At that time, I wrote at the top of the papers the date I received them, _____ [*specify date, e.g.,* June 24, 1992].

4. I read the summons which said that I had 30 days from the date of service in which to answer, and believed that I, therefore, had through _____ [*e.g.,* July 24] in which to do so. I read the complaint and believed that I

had a good and substantial defense to the action, and continue to believe so, as shown by my proposed answer to the complaint.

5. Sometime within the next day or two, I phoned the office of my attorney, _____ [*name*], and learned that he/she was out of town on a trial and would not be back in his/her office until _____ [*e.g.*, July 20]. I explained to the secretary that I had received the summons and complaint and, in response to his/her question, said that I had received them on _____ [*e.g.*, June 24]. The secretary told me that he/she believed that Mr./Ms. _____ [*name of attorney*] would be able to handle my defense and file a timely pleading, but that Mr./Ms. _____ would be checking in with him/her on _____ [*e.g.*, July 1], he/she would then confirm it with the attorney and call me back.

6. On _____ [*e.g.*, July 1], Mr./Ms. _____ [*name of attorney*] phoned me personally and we discussed the case. He/she suggested that I obtain copies of certain papers that he/she believed would support my defense and that I leave them, together with the summons and complaint,with the secretary at his/her office no later than _____ [*e.g.*, July 17], and I did so.

7. In the evening of _____ [*e.g.*, July 23], I went to my attorney's office where I read and signed the answer he/she had prepared.

8. On _____ [*e.g.*, July 24] my attorney phoned to tell me that when he/she attempted to file the answer that morning, the court clerk rejected it on the ground my default had been entered the day before, that he/she then checked the file of the case and learned that I had been served on _____ [*e.g.*, June 23].

9. If in fact I was served on _____ [*e.g.*, June 23], I honestly believed in good faith that it was _____ [*e.g.*, June 24] and do not understand how I could have been mistaken as to the date of the day service was made. Ever since reading the complaint I have had every intention of answering it and at no time would have intentionally misled my attorney as to the date I was served. If I did, in fact, err in the date I wrote on the papers, it was an honest mistake made in the utmost good faith.

[b] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [a], *above*, is for use to support a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the supporting declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*. In the statement, the defendant is seeking relief from a default that resulted from his or her reasonable mistake of fact as to the date of service, and the mistake led to an untimely presentation of the answer for filing. In this situation, a declaration by the secretary setting forth his/her statement of the facts should also be prepared and submitted. The attorney should also make a declaration verifying what he/she did prior to the default, the plaintiff's refusal to stipulate to setting aside the default, and the prompt steps the attorney took in making the motion to set aside.

For additional examples of mistakes of fact, see *§ 489.44[1][b]*.

The general requirements for drafting a declaration in support of a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting relief from default based on the defendant's reasonable mistake of fact as to service, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults, Default Judgments, and Relief From*

Judgments and Orders (Matthew Bender).

[2] Default Was Due to Defendant's Excusable Neglect in Reasonably Relying on Promise of Codefendant or Employer to Defend

[a] FORM

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) in § 489.360[1][a]* .]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to defendant's excusable neglect in reasonably relying on a codefendant's or employer's promise to defend, e.g.:*]

2. The default [and default judgment] was/were entered through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*].

3. On _____ [*date*], immediately after being served with the summons and complaint in this action, defendant notified _____ [*name*], his/her _____ [codefendant *or* employer] of the service. _____ [*Name of codefendant or employer*] advised defendant _____ [*state substance of representations made to defendant*] [and instructed defendant to forward the summons and complaint to him/her.

4. Thereafter, on _____ (*date*), defendant forwarded the summons and complaint by mail to _____ (*name of codefendant or employer*)].

5. As a result of these representations [and instructions] and because the cause of action arose out of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a debt for which _____ (*name of codefendant*) was primarily liable *or* defendant's employment] defendant reasonably relied on _____ [*name of codefendant or employer*] to defend the action on behalf of defendant and defendant took no further action in the matter. However, without defendant's knowledge or fault, _____ [*name of codefendant or employer*] failed to answer or otherwise plead to the complaint [within the proper time].

6. Defendant's default was taken on _____ [*date*] [and a default judgment subsequently entered on _____ (*date*)].

[b] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [a], *above*, is for use to support a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the supporting declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*. In the statement, the defendant is seeking relief from a default (and default judgment) that resulted from his or her reasonable reliance on a codefendant or employer to defend the action on defendant's behalf. If the time for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, has expired, relief may still be available by a motion in equity [*see, e.g., Desper v. King (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 659, 662, 59 Cal. Rptr. 657*].

The general requirements for drafting a declaration in support of a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

With appropriate modifications to substitute equitable for statutory grounds, that is, to substitute extrinsic mistake for excusable neglect, the statement in [a], *above*, may be included in a declaration in support of the equitable motion. For a form of declaration in support of a motion for equitable relief, see *§ 489.430[1]*. For discussion of equitable relief, see *§ 489.260* et seq..

For additional examples of excusable neglect, see *§ 489.44[4]*.

[c] Reliance on Third Party to Defend

When a default is entered because the defendant has relied on a codefendant or other interested party to defend, the question is whether the defendant was reasonably justified under the circumstances in his or her reliance or whether his or her neglect to attend to the matter was inexcusable [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (treating motion for relief filed more than six months after default was entered as motion for relief in equity based on extrinsic mistake in relying on insurer to defend after following mailing summons and complaint to insurer pursuant to instructions in policy, but insurer never received them); *Roussey v. Ernest W. Hahn, Inc. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 251, 256, 59 Cal. Rptr. 399* ; *see* discussion in *§ 489.39[8]*)].

[d] Reliance on Insurer to Defend

The inexcusable neglect of the insurer, who is, in effect if not in law, the real party in interest, like that of the defendant's attorney, is imputed to the defendant [*see Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 700-701, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*]. Thus, a defendant seeking to vacate a default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, or under the court's equitable powers, who alleges reasonable reliance on an insurance carrier to defend, must also establish justification for the carrier's inaction in failing to file an answer [*see Don v. Cruz (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 695, 702, 182 Cal. Rptr. 581*].

[3] Default Was Due to Attorney's Excusable Neglect Resulting From Press of Business Coupled With Unusual Circumstances

[a] FORM

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) in § 489.360[1][a]* .]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to attorney's excusable neglect resulting from press of business coupled with unusual circumstances, e.g.:*]

2. The default [and default judgment] was/were entered through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*].

3. _____ [*State nature of proceeding and time within which answer must be filed if less than the normal 30 day period, e.g.,* This is an unlawful detainer proceeding arising out of a complex commercial transaction in which the defendant had only five days to answer the complaint].

4. _____ [*Specify when the action was commenced and the summons was served, e.g.,* As shown by the court's file herein, the complaint was filed on _____ (*specify day of week, e.g.,* Friday) _____ (*date*) and served on the defendant late the same day]. _____ [*Specify circumstances in which counsel undertook to represent defendant, e.g.,* The summons and complaint were delivered to my office the following Monday.]

5. _____ [*Describe office situation, e.g.,* Normally, an attorney would have been available to handle the manner forthwith. However, the office's Chief Trial attorney had become seriously ill the week before and has not

yet returned, and his cases had been reassigned between myself and the office's other attorney. At the time the defendant's papers arrived both of us were out of town on other trials.]

6. _____ [*Specify additional circumstances, e.g.,* Moreover, the papers arrived during Christmas week. I arrived back in the office on Wednesday, the day before Christmas, and the day the answer was due. The other attorney in the office had not yet returned. After reading the papers, I phoned the office of the attorneys representing the plaintiff to request an extension of time and was informed that the attorney handling the matter had left town for the Christmas holiday and would not be back until Monday, and that there was no one else in the office who could grant me an extension of time. I also tried several times to reach the defendant by phone, but there as no answer. The following Monday I phoned the office of plaintiff's attorney and was informed that the defendant's default hadbeen entered the preceding Friday, although neither I nor the defendant, as shown by his/her declaration submitted herewith, had received any advance notice at all of plaintiff's intention to have the default entered].

[b] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [a], *above*, is for use to support a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The form in [a], *above,* is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the supporting declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*. In the statement, the defendant is seeking relief from a default (and default judgment) that resulted from the failure of the defendant's attorney to file an answer on behalf of a client within the limited time allotted. The ground of the motion would be excusable neglect [*see § 489.44[4]*, for discussion of what constitutes excusable neglect]. The fact situation illustrated is adapted from the one described in *Robinson v. Varela (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 611, 614-615, 616, 136 Cal. Rptr. 783* , in which relief was granted.

Note, however, that press of business alone is not normally a valid ground for relief from a default judgment entered as the result of an attorney's failure to file an answer [*see* discussion *§ 489.45[2][c]*].

The general requirements for drafting a declaration in support of a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

[4] Default Resulted From Attorney Abandonment

[a] FORM

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) in § 489.360[1][a]* .]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to abandonment by the declarant's attorney, e.g.:*]

2. On being served with the summons and complaint in this action on or about _____ [*date*], I immediately phoned the plaintiff, who told me that he/she would not talk with me and that I should contact his/her attorney, whose name and phone number he/she gave me.

3. I immediately phoned the attorney who informed me that if I intended to contest the complaint I should consult with my own attorney.

4. I had no attorney, but immediately, on the same day phoned _____ [*name*], an attorney duly

licensed to practice law in this state, whose name I got from the yellow pages of the phone book. The attorney said he could see me that day and that I should come in. I did. The attorney said that he/she would take my case, and that I should "leave everything" to him/her. He/she further instructed me to have no further communication with either the plaintiff or his/her attorney and that any contact with them should be made solely by himself/herself.

5. At that time I paid him/her the sum of $_____, as a retainer, and he/she gave me a receipt, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], the attorney phoned to tell me that he/she had talked with plaintiff's attorney and told plaintiff's attorney that he/she was representing me. The attorney subsequently drafted an answer to the complaint, which he/she had me read and sign on _____ [*date*] at his/her office, at which time he/she told me the answer would be filed forthwith. Unknown to me the answer was not filed "forthwith" or at all.

7. Not hearing from the attorney for about two weeks, I phoned him/her and asked the status of the matter. He/She told me the answer had been filed, that he/she was preparing papers to send to the plaintiff to obtain certain admissions, and that he/she would contact me at such time it became necessary to do so, and that it could take over a year before the case was brought to trial. At the same time, he/she asked that I send him/her an additional payment in the amount of $_____, which I sent by check. A copy of the canceled check is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

8. Approximately five weeks later, over a period of several days, I again phoned the attorney several times and was informed each time by the man/woman who answered the phone, who I assumed was the attorney's secretary, that the attorney was "in trial" or "on a trial out of town" or "on a business trip" and that he/she would have the attorney call when the attorney "got in" or "got back."

9. Receiving no return call, again, on or about _____ [date], I phoned, and this time the attorney answered. He/she seemed flustered and upset and told me the case had been dismissed, that I had nothing more to worry about, that he/she would send me a copy of the judgment. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*], I received what purported to be, but was not, a valid judgment of the court, which had stamped over the signature line the name of a judge. A copy of this document is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

10. Subsequently, on or about _____ [*date*], I was notified by my bank that my savings account had been levied on by the plaintiff pursuant to a judgment that had been rendered against me. I immediately tried to phone my attorney, but was told by the operator that the number had beendisconnected. I immediately went to the attorney's office and found that it was vacant. I went to the building manager who told me that the attorney's lease had run out, the attorney had moved, and that the manager did not know the attorney's new address. I phoned information and asked for the attorney's current phone number and was told that there was no listing for him/her.

11. I then retrieved the copy of the judgment my attorney had sent me and went to the courthouse where I spoke to a clerk and showed him/her the judgment. The clerk said he/she had no record of any such judgment in his/her records, that his/her records showed an answer was mailed to the court for filing, but that it was returned to the attorney for failure to pay the filing fee.

12. The clerk further got the court file of my case and went through it in my presence. There was no judgment in my favor in the file. Rather, both the court's records and the file showed that the clerk had entered my default for failure to file an answer and that a judgment was entered against me on _____ [*date*].

13. The clerk further suggested that I might locate the attorney's present address by phoning the State Bar, which I did, but the only address it had was the one for the now vacated office.

14. Pursuant to the suggestion of the person at the State Bar, I phoned the local bar association and secured the names of

three attorneys any one of which they felt could help me. I phoned the first name on the list and was given an appointment for the following day, which appointment I kept.

15. I explained the facts as set forth herein to the attorney, who agreed to represent me. That same day, while I remained in the office, the attorney drafted a motion to vacate and set aside the default and default judgment, and this declaration, which I signed in his/her presence.

[b] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [a], *above*, is for use to support a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the supporting declaration in § 489.360[1]. In the statement, the defendant is seeking relief from a default (and default judgment) that resulted from the defendant's employment of, and reliance on the assurances of, his or her attorney, to represent the defendant when, with no notice to the defendant, the attorney, through positive misconduct, of which the defendant had no knowledge, abandoned the defendant [*see Carroll v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 187 Cal. Rptr. 592, 654 P.2d 775* ; *Tunis v. Barrow (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1078, 229 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; for discussion, *see § 489.46*].

The same facts would support either a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on mistake, or a motion for relief in equity based on extrinsic mistake [*see Buckert v. Briggs (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 93 Cal. Rptr. 61* ; *see also § 489.430[g*]]. Diligence in seeking relief is required whether the motion is made pursuant to the statute [*see* discussion in *§ 489.39[6]*], or is directed to the equitable powers of the court [*see § 489.262[2]*]. A motion under the statute cannot be made more than six months after the default was entered, whereas the only limitation on a motion for equitable relief is that the motion be made within a reasonable time after discovery of the entry of the default and judgment. Both forms of relief may be sought in the same motion, but if more than six months have passed since the judgment was entered, the motion should be limited to a request for equitable relief based on extrinsic mistake.

The general requirements for drafting a declaration in support of a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

[5] Dismissal of Action Resulted From Defendant's Reliance on Erroneous Information Given by Court Officer

[a] FORM

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding under Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b) in § 489.360[1][a]* .]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to defendant's excusable neglect in reasonably relying on a codefendant's or employer's promise to defend, e.g.:*]

2. As shown by the records herein, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the judgment dismissing plaintiff's action was entered through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* excusable neglect *or all or any combination of these*] arising from erroneous information I received from _____ [*specify court officer, e.g.,* the courtroom clerk].

3. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*specify what was done, e.g.,* the date scheduled for trial

of this action, as attorney for the plaintiff, I arrived early with my client in the courtroom of Judge _____, who was scheduled to try the case]. At that time I was advised by the _____ [*specify court officer, e.g.,* courtroom clerk] _____ [*set forth statement(s), e.g.,* that the trial had been postponed, that it would be reset, and that I would be notified at a later time of the new trial date].

4. _____ [*Specify action taken in reliance on statement, e.g.,* So notified, the plaintiff and I left the courtroom].

5. The _____ [*e.g.,* clerk's] statement was erroneous in that _____ [*specify true facts, e.g.,* the trial had not been postponed, and it was called for trial as scheduled]. As a result of the clerk's erroneous advice, _____ [*specify, e.g.,* no one appeared for the plaintiff when the case was called, and the action was dismissed on defendant's motion].

[b] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [a], *above,* is for use to support a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken by or against a party through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The form in [a], *above,* is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the supporting declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*. In the statement, the defendant is seeking relief from a judgment of dismissal resulting from justifiable reliance on statements of a court officer on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, and excusable neglect.

For additional examples of these grounds, see discussion in *§ 489.44[1][a]*. The general requirements for drafting a declaration in support of a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.362

§ 489.362 Relief From Default, Resulting Default Judgment, or Dismissal Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault--Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)] Attesting to Attorney's Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Neglect--General Form

[1] FORM Relief From Default, Resulting Default Judgment, or Dismissal Based on Attorney's Affidavit (Declaration) of Fault--Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)] Attesting to Attorney's Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Neglect--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*], Defendant.	)))))))))	NO. _____ DECLARATION OF _____ [*name of attorney*] ATTESTING TO FAULT IN SUPPORT OF _____ [PLAINTIFF'S *or* DEFENDANT'S] MOTION FOR ORDER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE _____ [DEFAULT (AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT) *or* DISMISSAL] Date: _____ Time: _____ Dept: _____ Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice in the State of California and _____ [attorney *or* attorney of record *or* former attorney of record] for the _____ [*specify moving party*] herein and make this declaration in support of _____'s [*specify moving party*] motion for an order setting aside and vacating the _____ [default (and default judgment) *or* dismissal] taken against _____ [*specify moving party*].

2. The _____ [default (and default judgment) *or* dismissal] was/were entered through my _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* neglect *or all or any combination of these*] in that _____ [*set forth all facts establishing the attorney's fault and showing that the default (and resulting default judgment) or dismissal were caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [2], *above*, is a declaration for use by a party's attorney to attest to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, which resulted in the entry of a default, default judgment, or dismissal entered against his or her client. The declaration should be attached or appended to, and submitted with, the notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The general requirements for drafting a declaration are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

[3] Effect of Affidavit or Declaration

If the motion is made no more than six months after entry of judgment, is in proper form, and is accompanied by the attorney's sworn affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) attesting to his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect, the court is required to vacate any resulting default, default judgment, or dismissal entered against the attorney's client, unless the court finds that the default or dismissal was not in fact caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*]. The statute does not require the moving party to act diligently in filing the motion.

For further discussion, as well as the conditions and penalties that may be imposed on the granting of relief, see *§ 489.40[1]*.

[4] Cross References

For discussion of format, contents, and other requirements, as well as forms, of affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.363-489.369

[Reserved]

§§ 489.363[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.370

§ 489.370 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Opposing Declaration--General Form

[1] FORM Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)]--Opposing Declaration--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF
	)	_____ [*name*] IN
	)	OPPOSITION TO MOTION
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	_____ [*specify, e.g.,* FOR
vs.	)	ORDER VACATING AND SETTING
_____ [*name*], Defendant.	)	ASIDE DEFAULT (AND
	)	DEFAULT JUDGMENT)]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: None
	)	
_____		

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the plaintiff in the above-entitled action *or* an attorney at law duly

admitted to practice in all California state courts and the attorney of record for the _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff)] and make this declaration in opposition to _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant's] motion _____ [*specify relief sought, e.g.,* to set aside and vacate] _____ [*specify judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding, e.g.,* the default and default judgment] entered in this action against _____ [*party, e.g.,* the defendant].

2. As shown by the records of this court, the _____ [*specify when judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding was taken, e.g.,* default was entered on _____ (*date*) and the default judgment was entered on _____ (*date*)].

[*EITHER*]

3. As further shown by the records herein, of which this court is requested to take judicial notice, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant's] motion was filed on _____ [*date*], and is therefore untimely in that it was not filed within six months from the date _____ [*specifyjudgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding moving party seeks to set aside, e.g.,* the default was entered *or, if relief is sought only from a default judgment or other judgment,* the (default) judgment was entered].

[*OR*]

3. As further shown by the proof of service filed in this action, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] was served with notice of _____ [*specify judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding moving party seeks to set aside, e.g.,* entry of the default and default judgment] on _____ [*date*], yet failed to take any steps to seek relief from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default] until _____ [*date*], when _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant's] motion was filed. The declaration of _____ [*name*] submitted in support of the motion shows not only that _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] failed to act diligently in seeking relief from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default], but that he/she failed to take any action at all for a period of _____ [*e.g.,* four months] after receiving notice that the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default and default judgment were entered].

[*AND/OR*]

4. There is no showing that the _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* neglect *or any combination of these*] relied on by _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] is excusable.

5. [*Specify any defects, omissions, or statements in moving party's supporting declaration that admit or imply inexcusability, or are disputed, e.g.,* Defendant makes no claim that at the time he/she was served with the summons and complaint in this action that he/she did not have full possession of his/her faculties, that he/she was ill or incapacitated, or that he/she could not read or write the English language or did not understand the summons, but states in sum only that on receipt of the papers he/she "didn't really understand what the fuss was all about," mislaid the papers, and forgot about them until he/she received a copy of plaintiff's request to enter default. Plaintiff knew, or was bound to know, the meaning of the contents of the summons and complaint served, and knew, or was bound to know, from a simple reading of the summons, that action on his/her part was required within 30 days of service, and knew, or was bound to know, that a judgment would be taken against him/her in the amount stated in the complaint in the event that he/she failed to file a responsive pleading].

6. _____ [*Set forth facts within declarant's personal knowledge negating any claims in moving party's*

supporting declaration, e.g., Defendant is _____ (*specify business or occupation*). Over a period beginning almost two months before the complaint was filed, I attempted unsuccessfully to negotiate a settlement of the dispute with the defendant. These negotiations terminated on _____ (*date*), at which time, I told the defendant that I was going to hire an attorney and file an action against him/her to recover the money he/she owed me. His/Her reply to me was that I could do what I wanted, but that, if I did sue, he/she would keep the case tied up in the trial and appellate courts for years and I'd never receive a cent. Consequently, defendant knew in advance that I was going to sue him/her, had my statement confirmed when he/she received the summons and complaint, and his/her statement about tying up the case in the courts implies familiarity with court proceedings].

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a declaration to oppose a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken through a party's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.

For discussion of the requirement that any mistake, inadvertence, or surprise, as well as neglect, be excusable, see *§ 489.32*. For discussion of when the motion must be filed, see *§ 489.39*. For discussion of what constitutes mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, see *§ 489.44[1]*.

The general requirements for drafting a declaration are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

[3] Contents of Counterdeclaration

Counterdeclarations should be limited to showing that the motion is not timely, or that the moving party was not diligent in seeking relief, or that the mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect was not excusable, or, if it is excusable, that it was not the cause of the judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding [*see, e.g.*, *First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 651, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798*]. It would also appear to be proper, if the motion is for relief from a default judgment and the moving party's claimed meritorious defense consists of an affirmative defense alleged in the proposed answer, to show that the defense, if true, would be no defense to the cause of action alleged in the complaint.

Otherwise, counterdeclarations going to the merits of the case are irrelevant and improper, because a hearing on the motion is not theoccasion to try the merits of the case. Hence, on a motion for relief from a default and default judgment, for example, facts stated in the defendant's supporting affidavit or declaration or in the proposed answer showing a sufficient defense to the action may not be rebutted in the counteraffidavits or counterdeclarations of the opposing party [*see* *Douglass v. Todd (1892) 96 Cal. 655, 657-658, 31 P. 623* ; *First Small Business Inv. Co. v. Sistim, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 645, 651, 90 Cal. Rptr. 798* (noting that *H.A. Pulaski, Inc. v. Abbey Contr. Specialties, Inc. (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 883, 74 Cal. Rptr. 590* , apparently holding to the contrary, was out of line with the Supreme Court cases); *see also* *Beard v. Beard (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 645, 649, 107 P.2d 385* (proposed answer denying allegations clearly raised issue of fact and law that trial court was justified in holding a meritorious defense);

Rauer's Law etc. Co. v. Gilleran (1903) 138 Cal. 352, 353-354, 71 P. 445 (trial court erred in denying motion to vacate default judgment because defendant refused to appear to be examined under oath as to defense's nature when court doubted its merits)].

[4] Legal Argument

Legal argument is normally set forth in the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, rather than in an opposing declaration. However, there appears to be no prohibition against legal argument in the declaration when it helps to give legal meaning to the probative facts averred or summarizes the basis of the result sought. Nevertheless, the memorandum of points and authorities should set forth any statement of law supporting a legal argument in the declaration, as well as the statutory, case, or other authority for the statement.

[5] Service of Opposing Papers

Opposing papers must be filed and served at least 9 court days before the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)(13), (b)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.371

§ 489.371 Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect--Order Denying Motion

[1] FORM Relief From Judgment, Dismissal, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Through Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect--Order Denying Motion
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

[*EITHER, if motion was based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect*]

The court being fully advised in the premises, and good cause appearing therefore,

[*OR, if motion was based on attorney's affidavit of fault*]

Being fully advised in the premises, the court finds that the default was not in fact caused by the _____ [mistake *or* inadvertence *or* surprise *or* neglect *or any combination of these*] of defendant's counsel, _____ [*name*], and, therefore,

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS ORDERED that the motion of _____ [*party*, *e.g.*, defendant] be, and it hereby is, denied.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an order denying a motion for relief from a judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding allegedly taken through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect or a motion for relief from default based on an attorney's affidavit or declaration of fault is for use when the motion is denied and a formal order denying the motion is required by the court or by statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

The order should be submitted to the judge for signature in accordance with the local court's rules and practice, which should be checked if counsel is unfamiliar with them.

The general requirements for drafting an order, including conditions for relief, are discussed in *§ 489.360[2]* in the context of an order granting a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b).*

For discussion of the appealability of an order denying relief, see *§ 489.18[6][a]*.

[3] Motion Based on Attorney's Affidavit of Fault

A motion for relief from a default and any resulting default judgment, or dismissal, based on an attorney's affidavit (or declaration) of fault meeting the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, must be granted unless the court finds that the default, or dismissal, was not in fact caused by the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*].

[4] Cross References

For a general form of notice of motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, coupled with a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10*, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
1. Mistake, Inadvertence, Surprise, or Excusable Neglect

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.372-489.379

[Reserved]

§§ 489.372[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.380

§ 489.380 Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment When Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice to Defendant in Time to Defend [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment When Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice to Defendant in Time to Defend [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
vs.	)	DER SETTING ASIDE AND VACATING DE-
_____ [*name*],	)	FAULT [AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT] AND
Defendant.	)	GRANTING DEFENDANT LEAVE TO DEFEND,
	)	DECLARATION(S) OF _____
	)	[*name(s)*], AND MEMORANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], defendant will, and hereby does, move for an order setting aside and vacating the default [and default judgment] entered against defendant on _____ [*date*] and granting defendant leave to defend the action. The motion will be made on the ground that the service of summons in this case did not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*], the proposed _____ [answer to the complaint herein *or other pleading or motion proposed to be filed*] and the memorandumserved and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Defendant

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING ASIDE AND VACATING DEFAULT [AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT] AND GRANTING DEFENDANT LEAVE TO DEFEND

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the defendant in the above-entitled matter.

2. As shown by the records in this action, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the summons was served _____ [*specify, e.g.,* by publication from _____ (*date*) to _____ (*date*) in the _____ (*name*) newspaper, which is published in _____, California].

[*SET FORTH in as many paragraphs as necessary facts showing why personal service may have been difficult, e.g.:*]

3. My permanent residence is _____ [*address*], but the business in which I am engaged often requires my absence from my home for extended periods, during which time I have the utilities turned off and close up my house.

4. I am an unmarried self-employed entrepreneur affiliated with over 200 business establishments, including a number of the largest jewelry houses, department stores, and other stores and shops throughout California. I am engaged in the business of searching out unique merchandise ranging from trinkets and novelties to fine furniture, porcelain, jewelry, and dry goods, which I will buy and then resell to one or more of the businesses with which I am affiliated. My search for unique merchandise frequently takes me to faraway places.

5. During the entire period the summons was being published, and for several months thereafter, I was traveling about in Central America, and eventually to a small village where the villagers are engaged in the manufacture of unique porcelain pottery. After lengthy negotiations, I managed to purchase and receive a guarantee of a continued supply of a substantial amount of this pottery. I then negotiated for, and supervised, the shipment of this pottery to California.

6. I returned to _____ [*city*], California on _____ [*date*]. The following day a neighbor informed me that she had read in a legal newspaper that I was being sued and asked me what it was all about. She told me the name of the newspaper and its location. I immediately went to the newspaper office where I was shown a copy of the summons that had been published with the name of the court and a case number on it; I then went to the court clerk's office where I was told that my default for failing to file an answer had been entered on _____ [*date*] and that a default judgment in the sum of $_____ had been entered against me on _____ [*date*]. I explained that I knew nothing of the lawsuit and asked whether the judgment were legal. The clerk said it was and suggested that I see a lawyer.

7. It was too late to phone a lawyer that day, but the next day I phoned and made an appointment with my present lawyer, _____ [*name*]. After learning the above facts from me, the lawyer said he would draw up the necessary papers to try to have the default and judgment set aside and that I should return the following morning to sign them, which I did.

8. My failure to obtain actual notice of the service of summons in time to defend in no way resulted from any attempt on my part to avoid service or by any inexcusable neglect on my part. Rather, my absence from the country was normal to the business in which I am engaged and of which plaintiff was fully aware. Moreover, in talking to the court clerk, I learned that the complaint, of which until that day I'd known nothing, had been filed almost a year before I left on my trip to Central America.

9. At no time during that almost one-year period did I have any inkling that an action had been filed against me, and all during that period, except for a one-week period in July when I went to Arizona to purchase some Indian art work, I was living at my home where I was available for service of process. After my departure for Central America, any reasonable inquiry of any of my neighbors, all of whom watch my house when I am on a trip, would have revealed where I was, the approximate time I would return, and how I could be reached. My neighbors have assured me that no such inquiries were made.

10. Further, I have a good and meritorious defense to the complaint _____ [*specify, e.g.,* as shown by the proposed answer which I have this day signed (and verified) *or specify facts showing a meritorious defense*].

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion and supporting declaration for use by a defendant to move for an order vacating and setting aside defendant's default and,if entered, the default judgment, when service of the summons did not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)*]. With appropriate modifications, the notice of motion may be used by a cross defendant for the same purpose.

The declaration contained in the form in [a], *above,* illustrates the type of detailed statement a defendant should provide in a declaration in support of his or her motion for relief. As required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b),* the declaration shows that the defendant's lack of actual notice in time to defend was not caused by any attempt by him or her to avoid

service of summons and was not the result of any inexcusable neglect on the defendant's part.

For discussion of the papers that must accompany the motion, the time the motion must be filed, the required notice, and other matters, see *§ 489.70* et seq.

The general requirements for drafting a declaration are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]*.

[c] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with the notice of motion in [a], *above* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1103(a)*; for discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*]. The notice must also be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) showing that the party's lack of actual notice in time to defend was not caused by his or her avoidance of service or inexcusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b)*]. A copy of the answer, motion, or other pleading proposed to be filed in the action must also accompany the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(b)*].

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment When Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice to Defendant in Time to Defend [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*]	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

The court, having considered _____ [*describe all types of evidence presented, e.g.,* the evidence presented at the hearing and the declarations submitted in support of and in opposition to the motion], having heard the argument of counsel, and being fully advised in the premises, finds as follows:

1. The service of the summons did not result in actual notice to the defendant in time to defend;

2. The motion for relief was timely filed; and

3. The defendant's lack of actual notice in time to defend the action was not caused by his/her avoidance of service or inexcusable neglect.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the default [and default judgment] heretofore entered in this action against defendant _____ [*name*] be, and hereby is/are vacated and set aside and defendant is granted leave to file his/her proposed answer and to defend the action.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*name of party or party's attorney*) pay to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff) legal fees and costs in the sum of $_____.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This is for use when a motion for relief from default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* is granted.

For legal background relating to the court's ruling on a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5*, see *§ 489.77*. The general requirements for drafting an order are discussed in *§ 489.360[2]*. For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in [a], *above*, when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*.

[c] Findings

The court may set aside the default and any subsequent default judgment on whatever terms as may be just and allow the party to defend the action, if it finds that the motion for relief was made within the period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(a)* (discussed in *§ 489.75*), and that the party's lack of actual notice in time to defend the action was not caused by his or her avoidance of service orinexcusable neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5(c)*].

[d] Terms on Granting Relief

Any terms imposed should be included in the order. For example, in granting the motion, the court may make a monetary award to plaintiff in a proper case, as, for example, when the defendant's lack of notice resulted from the defendant's excusable neglect, mistake, or inadvertence, or when the service was entirely proper but for some reason the defendant did not receive actual notice in time to defend [*Kodiak Films, Inc. v. Jensen (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1264, 281 Cal. Rptr. 728*]. However, when a defendant is free from fault and nothing more is at issue than the legal expense the plaintiff has incurred, it is error to condition relief from a default and default judgment on the payment of a monetary award to plaintiff [*Kodiak Films, Inc. v. Jensen (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1265, 281 Cal. Rptr. 728*].

[e] Sanctions

Unlike Code Civ. Proc. *§ 473(c), Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5* does not authorize the court, in granting relief from the default and default judgment, to impose sanctions on the defendant, and none may be imposed under that statute [*see Kodiak Films, Inc. v. Jensen (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1263, 281 Cal. Rptr. 728*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.381-489.389

[Reserved]

§§ 489.381[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.390

§ 489.390 Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment for Improper Venue Under Civ. Code § 1812.10 or 2984.4 or Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)][Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment for Improper Venue Under Civ. Code § 1812.10 or 2984.4 or Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)][Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
vs.	)	_____ [*specify, e.g.*, FOR ORDER
_____ [*name*]	)	VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE DEFAULT
Defendant.	)	(AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT)], DECLARA-
	)	TION(S) OF _____ [*name(s)*], AND
	)	MEMORANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: None

_____

To defendant _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon

thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], defendant will, and hereby does, move for an order vacating and setting aside the default [and default judgment] entered against him/her on _____ [*date*] and granting defendant leave to defend the action in the proper court, and awarding him/her damages, attorney's fees, and costs. The motion will be made on the ground that this action is subject to _____ [Civil Code Section _____ (1812.10 *or* 2984.4) *or Code of Civil Procedure Section 395(b)*], that the action was not commenced in the proper court, and that plaintiff did not use reasonable diligence to avoid filing the action in an improper court.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the accompanying declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*], the memorandum, the copy of the _____ [answer *or* motion *or other pleading*] proposed to be filed, on therecords and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Defendant

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE DEFAULT [AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [the defendant in this action *or* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney for the defendant].

[*EITHER, if action is subject to Unruh Act*]

2. This action arises out of a retail installment sales contract between plaintiff and me, which _____ [*specify fact or facts fixing venue, e.g.,* I signed in _____ County, California], whereby plaintiff sold me _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a set of living room-dining room furniture for my home].

[*OR, if action is subject to Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act*]

2. This action arises out of a conditional sales contract between plaintiff and me, which _____ [*specify fact or facts fixing venue, e.g.,* I signed in _____ County, California], whereby plaintiff _____ [sold *or* leased] me a _____ [*specify make, model, and year of car*].

[*OR, if action is subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*]

2. This action arises out of an agreement under which I _____ [*describe offer or provision of goods, services, a loan, or extension of credit on which action is based*], _____ [primarily *or* only] for _____ [personal *or* family *or* household use], which _____ [*specify fact or facts fixing venue, e.g.,* I signed in _____ County, California].

[*CONTINUE*]

3. I signed the contract in _____ County, California, at which time I resided in _____ County, California. At the time the complaint in this action was filed, I [still] resided in _____ County, California. [*If under Unruh Act, add:* The goods purchased under the contract have _____ (not been affixed to any real property *or* have been affixed to real property in _____ County, California).] [*If under Rees-Levering Act, add:* The vehicle that is the subject of the contract is permanently garaged in _____ County, California).]

4. Rather than filing this action in the proper court in _____ [that county *or* one of those counties], plaintiff has filed the action in this court.

5. Plaintiff has failed to exercise reasonable, or any, diligence to avoid filing suit in the wrong court, as a result of which defendant has incurred actual damages and costs, including attorney's fees, in the following amounts: _____ [*specify nature and value of damages, costs, and attorney's fees*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion may be used by a defendant to move for relief from a default and, if entered, a default judgment in an action that is subject to any of the following venue provisions:

- *Civ. Code § 1812.10* (Unruh Act).
- *Civ. Code § 2984.4* (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (contract action arising from offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use or from transaction consummated as proximate result of unsolicited phone call made by seller engaged in business of consummating transactions of that kind).

The ground of the motion is that the applicable statute has not been fully complied with [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)*].

The form of declaration in [a], *above,* may be used by a defendant to support his or her motion to set aside a default and, if entered, default judgment, and for leave to defend and for an award of damages, costs, and attorney's fees when the plaintiff fails to show that he or she used reasonable diligence to avoid filing the action in the improper court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(c), (e)*]. The general requirements for drafting a declaration are discussed in *§ 489.360[1][g]* in the context of a declaration supporting a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*.

For further discussion, including the time the motion must be filed, accompa nying papers, the amount of notice required, and the availability of damages, costs, and attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(e)*, see *§ 489.90* et

seq. [*see also § 489.360[1]*].

[c] Declaration Required

A notice of motion to set aside a default and, if entered, default judgment, and for leave to defend the action must be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) showing under oath (or penalty of perjury) that the action was not commenced in the proper court according to *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*, as the case may be [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(c)*].

[d] Cross References

For discussion of venue under the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act*

For discussion of venue under the Unruh Act, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales*

For a discussion of venue generally and the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* specifically, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion to Set Aside Default and Default Judgment When Service of Summons Did Not Result in Actual Notice to Defendant in Time to Defend [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.5]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*]	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: None
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

The court, having considered _____ [*describe all types of evidence presented, e.g.,* the evidence presented at the hearing and the declarations submitted in support of and in opposition to the motion], having heard the argument of counsel, and being fully advised in the premises, finds as follows:

1. The motion for relief was timely filed.

2. This action was not filed in the proper court.

[3. The plaintiff failed to show that he/she exercised reasonable diligence to avoid filing the action in an improper

court.]

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED THAT the default [and default judgment] heretofore entered in this action against defendant _____ [*name*] be,and hereby is/are, vacated and set aside and defendant is granted leave to defend the action when it is filed in the proper court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff pay to defendant damages in the sum of $_____, a reasonable attorney's fee in the further sum of $_____, and costs in the sum of $_____.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This form is for use when a motion for relief from default under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5* is granted. Any terms on the granting of relief imposed by the court should also be set out in the order. For legal background regarding the court's ruling on a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5*, see *§ 489.93*.

For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in [a], *above*, when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*.

[c] Findings

If the court finds that the motion for relief was made within the period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.92*), and that the action was not commenced in the proper court, the court must set aside the default and default judgment on such terms as may be just and allow the party to defend the action in the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(d)*].

[d] Award of Damages, Costs, and Attorney's Fee

If the court finds that the action was commenced in an improper court, the court must award the defendant actual damages and costs, including reasonable attorney's fees, unless the plaintiff showed that he or she used reasonable diligence to avoid filing the action in the improper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 585.5(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.391-489.399

[Reserved]

§§ 489.391[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.400

§ 489.400 Motion for Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Against Party When California Court Has Assumed Jurisdiction Over Law Practice of Party's Attorney Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180 or 6190 [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Against Party When California Court Has Assumed Jurisdiction Over Law Practice of Party's Attorney Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180 or 6190 [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
vs.	)	DER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [*e.g.*, DEFAULT (AND DE-
Defendant.	)	FAULT JUDGMENT)], DECLARATION(S) OF
	)	_____ [*name(s)*], AND MEMOR-
	)	ANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of

record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order vacating and setting aside the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] entered against _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] on _____ [*date*] and granting _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] leave to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defend] the action. The motion will be made on the ground that the Superior Court of California, County of _____, pursuant to the provisions of Business and Professions Code Section _____ [6180 *or* 6190]. has assumed jurisdiction over the law practice of the _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant's] attorney and that the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] was/were entered after the application for the court to assume jurisdiction over the attorney's practice was filed.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [*party, e.g.,* Defendant]

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE _____ [*e.g.,* DEFAULT (AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT)]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record for the _____ (*moving party, e.g.,* defendant)].

2. As shown by the records of this court, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, this action was filed on _____ [*date*], and _____ [*specify proceeding leading to judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, e.g.,* the summons was served on _____ (date), and defendant's default was entered on _____ (*date*), and a default judgment against the defendant was entered on _____ (*date*)].

3. As shown by the declaration of _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] submitted herewith, on _____ [*date*], _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] employed _____ [*name*] (hereinafter, the attorney) as his/her attorney [of record] to file a responsive pleading and otherwise represent him/her in this action.

4. Thereafter, on the application of _____ [*name*], filed in the Superior Court of California, County of _____, in a proceeding entitled _____, File Number _____, _____ [that *or* this] court, by order dated _____, assumed jurisdiction over the attorney's law practice on the ground the attorney _____ [*specify reason for cessation of practice or*

incapacity, e.g., had been disbarred], and the court continues to exercise jurisdiction. This court is requested to take judicial notice of the court records and file in the foregoing described proceeding.

5. As further shown by the _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant's] declaration submitted herewith, _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] did not receive notice of his/her attorney's _____ [*specify, e.g.,* disbarment] until _____ [*date*].

6. As shown by Paragraphs 2 and 4, above, the _____ [*specify judgment, order, or proceeding from which relief is sought, e.g.,* defendant's default was entered] after the application to assume jurisdiction had been filed.

[7. On _____ (*date*), I was appointed by the Superior Court of California, County of _____, in the above-described matter, to file, with the consent of the client, notices, motions, and pleadings on behalf of the attorney's clients when jurisdictional time limits are involved and other legal counsel has not yet been obtained. Pursuant to this authority, I am appearing, with the consent of the _____ (*moving party, e.g.,* defendant) in this action on his/her behalf.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use by a party seeking relief from a judgment, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her when a California court has assumed jurisdiction over the law practice of the party's attorney and the judgment, order, or other proceeding was taken against the party after the application for the court to assume jurisdiction over the practice was filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*].

As indicated in the form, an additional declaration by the party should be drafted and submitted setting forth those relevant facts within the party's personal knowledge, but not within the personal knowledge of the attorney.

For discussion of when the application must be filed, and the amount of notice that must be given, see *§ 489.100* et seq.

Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1 does not require the moving party to attach to the notice of motion a copy of the answer or other pleading proposed to be filed if relief is granted.

[c] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for motions subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules, *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*], or if required by local court rule. The better practice is to prepare, serve, and file memoranda in support of any noticed motion, unless excluded expressly or by implication from the Civil Law and Motion Rules or by local court rule. For discussion and forms relating to memoranda, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Judgment, Order, or Other Proceeding Taken Against Party When California Court Has Assumed Jurisdiction Over Law Practice of Party's Attorney Pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 6180 or 6190 [Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept:_____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the _____ [default (and default judgment)] heretofore entered in this action be, and hereby is/are, vacated and set aside.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*set forth any terms or conditions on the grant of relief*).]
Date: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when the court grants a motion for relief from a judgment, order, or proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*. For discussion of general requirements relating to orders granting motions for relief, see *§ 489.360[2]*.

For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in[a], *above*, when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*.

[c] Terms

The court may grant relief from a judgment, order, or proceeding on such terms as may be just [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473.1*]. Any such terms should be set forth in the order.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.401-489.409

[Reserved]

§§ 489.401[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.410

§ 489.410 Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment Under Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.) [50 U.S.C. App. § 521]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment Under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.) [50 U.S.C. App. § 520(4)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
vs.	)	DER SETTING ASIDE AND VACATING DE-
_____ [*name*],	)	FAULT [AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT] AND
Defendant.	)	GRANTING DEFENDANT LEAVE TO DEFEND,
	)	DECLARATION(S) OF _____
	)	[*name(s)*], AND MEMORANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], defendant will, and hereby does, move for an order vacating and setting aside the default [and default judgment] entered against him/her on _____ [*date*] and granting defendant leave to defend the action. The motion will be made under the Servicemembers' Civil Relief Act, Section 521 of the Appendix to Tile 50 of the United States Code, on the grounds that the default [and default judgment] were taken against defendant _____ [while he/she was in *or* within 60 days of his/her discharge from] _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Army], that he/she was prejudiced in making his/her defense by reason of that military service, and that he/she has a _____ [meritorious *or* legal] defense.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Defendant

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING ASIDE AND VACATING DEFAULT [AND
DEFAULT JUDGMENT] AND GRANTING DEFENDANT LEAVE TO DEFEND

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the defendant in the above-entitled matter.

2. As shown by the court's records, the default [and default judgment] was/were entered against me in this action on _____ [*date*] [and _____ (*date*), respectively].

[*EITHER*]

3. At the time the default [and default judgment] was/were entered, I was on active military service in the _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* United States Army]. I entered active service on _____ [*date*], and _____ [have been in active service at all times since then *or* was discharged on _____ (*date*)].

[*OR*]

3. I served on active duty in the _____ [*branch of service, e.g.,* United States Army] from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], on which latter date I received my discharge. As shown by Paragraph 2, above, the default [and default judgment] was/were entered within 30 days from the date of my discharge.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. My default [and the judgment based thereon] resulted from _____ [*specify reasons why moving party's military service prejudiced him or her in making a defense, e.g.,* my confinement to a military hospital in Germany as a result of serious injuries I sustained in a jeep accident while on military police duty. I was hospitalized and bedridden from _____ (*date*) to _____ (*date*)].

5. I have a _____ [meritorious *or* legal] defense to the action in that _____ [*specify in detail the facts constituting a meritorious or legal defense*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and supporting declaration may be used by a party to set aside a default and default judgment pursuant to *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)* on the ground that he or she did not appear and was prejudiced in making a defense by reason of his or her military service. To obtain relief the defendant must show that he or she has a meritorious or legal defense to the action or to a part of it [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)*]. For further discussion, including the time in which the motion must be filed, and the amount of notice that must be given, see *§ 489.110* et seq.

[c] Contents of Declaration

The affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) in support of the motion to vacate must show:

- That the servicemember was materially affected by reason of military service in making a defense to the action (Declaration, Paragraph 4) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)*; *Kromm v. Kromm (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 523, 530, 191 P.2d 115* (nothing in supporting affidavit showing that defendant's being in the military service prevented him from being represented in the case or from being present at trial)].

- The affidavit or declaration must also show that there is a meritorious or legal defense to the action or proceeding or to some part of it (Declaration, Paragraph 5) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)*]. Although no California appellate court has apparently ruled on this requirement, an Arizona case has held that this requirement is not satisfied by a mere declaration that there is such a defense, but that the affidavit or declaration must set out what that defense is [*La Mar v. La Mar (1973) 19 Ariz. App. 128, 505 P.2d 566, 569*].

[d] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with the form of notice of motion in [a], *above* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1103(a)*; for discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

[e] Cross References

For a form of declaration of military status that must be filed before a default can be entered, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Default and Default Judgment Under Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.) [50 U.S.C. App. § 520(4)]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

The court, having considered _____ [*describe all types of evidence presented, e.g.,* the evidence presented at the hearing and the declarations submitted in support of and in opposition to the motion], having heard the argument of counsel, and being fully advised in the premises, and it appearing therefrom that the defendant's military service prejudiced him/her in making a defense to the action and that he/she has a _____ [meritorious *or* legal] defense to the action,

IT IS ORDERED THAT the default [and default judgment] heretofore entered in this action against defendant _____ [*name*] be, and hereby is/are, vacated and set aside and defendant is granted leave to defend the action.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This form is for use when a motion for relief from default under *50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)* is granted.

For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in [a], *above,* when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.411

§ 489.411 Motion for Relief From Judgment Taken Against Party During Period of Military Service [Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Judgment Taken Against Party During Period of Military Service [Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR RE-
Plaintiff,	)	LIEF FROM JUDGMENT TAKEN AGAINST DE-
vs.	)	FENDANT DURING PERIOD OF MILITARY SER-
_____ [*name*], Defendant.	)	VICE
	)	[*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her/its attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon

thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order vacating and setting aside the judgment entered against _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] on _____ [*date*] and granting _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] leave to defend the action. The motion will be made pursuant to *Section 402(d) of the Military and Veterans Code* on the ground that the judgment entered against _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] by this court on _____ [*date*] was entered against a service member as defined by *Section 400(a) of the Military and Veterans Code* _____ [*specify either* during a period of military service as defined by *Section 400(b) of the Military and Veterans Code or* within 30 days after a period of military service as defined by *Section 400(b) of the Military and Veterans Code*], and that _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] was prejudiced by reason of military service in making a defense to the action and has a _____ [*specify* meritorious *or* legal] defense to _____ [*specify* all *or* part] of the action. The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing on this motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____

[*party, e.g.,* Defendant]

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER VACATING AND SETTING ASIDE JUDGMENT

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the defendant named in this action].

2. As shown by the records of this court, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, this action was filed on _____ [*date*], and _____ [*specify proceeding leading to judgment from which relief is sought, e.g.,* the summons was served on _____ (*date*), and defendant's default was entered on _____ (*date*), and a default judgment against the defendant was entered on _____ (*date*)].

[*EITHER*]

3. On _____ [*date*], I was called to active _____ [*specify* state *or* federal] military service as _____ [*specify, e.g.,* an enlisted member of the National Guard] by the _____ [*specify* Governor of the State of California pursuant to the provisions of Section _____ (*specify* 143 *or* 146) of the Military and Veterans Code *or* the President of the United States of America pursuant to Title _____ (*specify* 10 *or* 12) of the United States Code].

[*OR*]

3. On _____ [*date*], I was called to full-time active duty as a reservists of the United States Military Reserve.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. As shown by the attached certificate, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], I was in full-time active _____ [*specify* state *or* federal] service as defined in *Section 400(b) of the Military and Veterans Code*.

5. As shown by Paragraphs 2 through 4, above, the judgment from which relief is sought was entered during a period of military service governed by *Section 402(d) of the Military and Veterans Code*.

6. I was prejudiced by reason by military service in making my defense to this action because _____ [*specify facts showing prejudice*].

7. I have a _____ [*specify* meritorious *or* legal] defense to _____ [*specify* all *or* part] of the action, which is _____ [*specify*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use by a party seeking relief from a judgment taken against him or her during or within 30 days after a period of military service after being called or ordered into active state service as an officer or enlisted member of the National Guard by the Governor pursuant *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 143* or *146* or into active federal service by the President pursuant to Title 10 or 12 of the United States Code or as a reservist of the United States Military Reserve called to full-time active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 400(a), (b), 402(d)*], who was prejudiced by reason of military service in making a defense to the action.

For discussion of when the application must be filed, and the requirement that the application state a meritorious or legal defense to the action or a part of it, *see § 489.117*.

[c] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with the notice of motion if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for motions subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules, see *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*], or if required by local court rule. The better practice is to prepare, serve, and file a memorandum in support of any noticed motion, unless excluded expressly or by implication from the Civil Law and Motion Rules or by local court rule. For discussion and forms relating to points and authorities, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion for Relief From Judgment Taken Against Party During Period of Military Service [Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*]	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.*, setting aside and vacating the judgment heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion should be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the judgment heretofore entered in this action be, and hereby is, vacated and set aside.
Date: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when the court grants a motion for relief from a judgment under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*. For discussion, see *§ 489.117*.

16 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
A. Statutory Relief From Valid Judgments and Orders
2. Relief on Other Grounds

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.412-489.419

[Reserved]

§§ 489.412[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
B. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.420

§ 489.420 Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment or Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)]

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment or Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO SET
vs.	)	ASIDE VOID [*specify judgment or order, e.g.,* DE-
_____ [*name*],	)	FAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT], DECLAR-
Defendant.	)	ATION(S) OF [*name(s)*], AND MEMORANDUM
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order setting aside the _____ [*specify*

judgment or order, e.g., default (and default judgment)] entered against _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] on _____ [date]. The motion will be made on the ground that the _____ [*specify judgment or order, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] is/are void _____ [*specify defect, e.g.,* for lack of jurisdiction over the person of the defendant].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER TO SET ASIDE VOID _____ [*specify judgment or order, e.g.,* DEFAULT AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ the _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] herein, and I make this declaration in support of my motion _____ [*specify relief sought, e.g.,* to set aside and vacate the default and default judgment heretofore entered against me].

[*SET FORTH facts showing that the judgment or order is void in fact, e.g.:*]
[*EITHER*]

2. At no time have I ever been served with or received a copy of the summons and of the complaint filed in this action. I reside, and since _____ [*date*] have resided, at _____ [*address*] in the city of _____. I am, and for the past _____ years have been, listed by my full and correct name in that city's directory and in the phone directory for that city.

3. At no time have I ever lived or resided in the city of _____ [*city where summons was served*]. As shown by the return of service in this action, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the summons purportedly was served on me by delivering a copy of the summons and complaint to some unnamed person in the city of _____ [*name*] at the following residential address: _____ [*specify*], and thereafter mailing a copy of the summons and complaint to me at the same address. I do not now, and have never, resided at or visited the address specified, or in the city specified, nor have I ever represented to anyone at any time that I did so.

4. I do not know the unnamed person to whom the summons and complaint were delivered, or anyone else who might be a resident of or a visitor to that address.

5. I have never received the copy of the summons and complaint delivered to the unnamed person or the copy of the summons and complaint thereafter mailed to that address, nor was I in any other way notified of them.

6. Rather, I discovered their existence and the default judgment that was entered against me on _____ [*date*], _____ [*specify circumstances of discovery, e.g.,* when, in the course of trying to secure a loan on my home, I was informed that a "lis pendens" had been recorded in the county recorder's office and that it constituted

a lien on my property to secure payment of a judgment entered against me by this court. Immediately went to the court clerk's office and was shown my "file" and specifically the above-mentioned so-called proof of sevice].

[*OR*]

2. As shown by the record herein, of which the court is requested to take judicial notice, the complaint was filed on _____ [*date*] by my then attorney of record, _____ [*name*] and dismissed on _____ [*date*] as a sanction for my having "repeatedly" failed to respond to discovery motions or to answer written interrogatories.

3. At no time was I ever informed by anyone that I had been ordered to appear at depositions or to answer interrogatories. When I employed my attorney, he/she told me it could take a year or two before the matter would get to trial and there would be periods of noticeable inaction.

4. On _____ [*date*], I signed and verified the complaint. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*] my attorney mailed me a conformed copy of the filed complaint, and on _____ [*date*] I received in the mail a file stamped copy of the summons and proof of service.

5. Several times over the next few weeks, I phoned my attorney and each time was assured that everything was proceeding normally. I phoned again on _____ [*date*] and was told by the man/woman who answered the phone that my attorney had "closed his/her office the day before and moved away." I immediately phoned the court clerk's office to learn the status of my case and was told that my complaint had been dismissed on _____ [*date*] for the reasons stated above. This was the first and only notice I had that my case had been dismissed or that I was supposed to have appeared at depositions and answer interrogatories. Had I been informed that I was supposed to attend depositions or to answer interrogatories I would have done so.

6. The same day I consulted another attorney, _____ [*name*] who, in my presence, phoned the State Bar of California and was told that my attorney, _____ [*name*], had been disbarred on _____ [*date*], which was the day I received the file-stamped copy of the summons and proof of service. This was the very first I had heard of his/her disbarment. At no time did he/she tell me he/she had been disbarred or was being investigated by the State Bar, and I have never received any letter or notice from him/her informing me of this fact. Nor have I at any time received any notice, written or oral, from the defendant herein or his/her counsel advising me of the disbarment of my attorney.

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use to move for an order setting aside a void judgment or order that is not void on its face but is void in fact. For discussion of what constitutes a void judgment, see *§ 489.132*. For discussion of the court's power to grant relief, when the motion must be filed, and requirements relating to the

notice of motion, see *§§ 489.131, 489.141 et seq., and 489.200* et seq., respectively. For discussion of relief in equity if the motion at law is untimely, see *489.220* et seq.

For further discussion of requirements for notice of motion for relief from judgment or order generally, including accompanying papers and service, see *§ 489.430[1]*.

The alternative paragraphs in the supporting declaration are illustrative only. The first set of alternative paragraphs supports a motion by a defendant to set aside and vacate a default and default judgment, and the second set of alternative paragraphs supports a motion by plaintiff to vacate an order dismissing the complaint.

No affidavit of merits is required (*see* discussion in *§ 489.143*).

[c] Alternative Use for Judgment or Order Void on Its Face

No notice is required to set aside a judgment or order that is void on its face (*see* discussion in *§ 489.200[1]*). However, to avoid any possible due process objections, the better practice might be to proceed by noticed motion. The form in [a], *above*, of notice of motion may be used for this purpose, in which case "on its face" should be inserted after "void" in the first paragraph and the nature of the invalidity should be added, for example, "in that the default judgment grants relief entirely different from that prayed for in the complaint." A judgment that is void on its face requires no extrinsic evidence to show its invalidity, and, hence, any reference to affidavits or declarations or to evidence in the second paragraph should be omitted.

[d] Extrinsic Evidence

A judgment that is not void on its face but is void in fact requires extrinsic evidence to show its invalidity; it is subject to direct attack only and to time limitations (*see* discussions *§ 489.140*). Consequently, one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth the facts showing the invalidity will be required.

[e] Alternative Remedies

A void judgment may be set aside on the ground of invalidity (that is, at law) or in equity on the ground of extrinsic fraud or mistake [*see Lovato v. Santa Fe Internat. Corp. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 549, 554, 198 Cal. Rptr.838]* . Thus, if the time for an attack at law by motion on a void judgment or order has expired, relief in equity may still be available. For a discussion and requirements for relief in equity, see *§ 489.220* et seq.

[f] Nonservice or Defective Service of Summons and Motion to Quash

A judgment against a party who was not served with summons (and a false return of service was filed) or who was defectively served is void for lack of personal jurisdiction (*see* discussion in *§ 489.132*). In such a case, the moving party may also want to have service of the summons quashed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)*, particularly if the defendant would not be subject to the in personam jurisdiction of the California courts, or the quashing of the summons might subject the action to the mandatory dismissal statutes (*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.110 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 212, *Dismissal*) or to some affirmative defense such as the bar of the statute of limitations.

A motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, when combined with a motion to quash service of summons under *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)*, does not constitute a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*]. For the distinction between general and special appearances, as well as a combined form of notice of motion to set aside and vacate a default and default judgment and quash service of summons, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* .

[g] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100 et seq.*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for motions subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules, *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*], or if required by local court rule. A motion to set aside a default judgment, for example, is subject to the Civil Law and Motions Rules [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*]. The better practice is to prepare, serve, and file a memorandum in support of any noticed motion, unless excluded expressly or by implication from the Civil Law and Motion Rules or by local court rule. For discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment or Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____ [*Specify party, e.g.,* Defendant's] motion for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing before this court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name*] appeared as attorney for plaintiff, and _____ [*name*] appeared as attorney for defendant.

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the _____ [*specify judgment, order, or proceeding, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] be, and hereby is/are, vacated and set aside.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

The form in [a], *above,* is for use when a motion to vacate and set aside a void judgment or order is granted.

For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in [a], *above,* when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
B. Relief From Void Judgments and Orders

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.421-489.429

[Reserved]

§§ 489.421[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.430

§ 489.430 Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake

[1] Notice of Motion and Motion and Supporting Declaration

[a] FORM Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
vs.	)	_____ [*specify, e.g.,* ORDER SET-
_____ [*name*],	)	TING ASIDE AND VACATING DEFAULT (AND
Defendant.	)	DEFAULT JUDGMENT)], DECLARATION(S) OF
	)	_____ [*name(s)*], AND MEMOR-
	)	ANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of]

this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for _____ [*specify relief sought, e.g.,* an order setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment)] entered _____ [*specify, e.g.,* against defendant] on _____ [*date*]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that the _____ [judgment *or* order] [is void and] was taken against _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] through the _____ [extrinsic _____ (fraud *and/or* mistake [*and/or* accident *and/or* duress])] of _____ [*party, e.g.,* plaintiff], which prevented _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant] from presenting his/her case to the court, thereby denying him/herof a fair adversary hearing[, and that defendant has a meritorious defense to the action].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, the accompanying _____ [affidavit(s) *and/or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] [, the _____ (*specify pleading or other paper proposed to be filed, e.g.,* proposed verified answer to the complaint herein,] and memorandum, [and] on the records and file herein[, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing on this motion].
Date: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] IN SUPPORT OF _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* DEFENDANT'S] MOTION _____ [*specify, e.g.,* FOR ORDER SETTING ASIDE AND VACATING DEFAULT (AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT)]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the _____ [*party, e.g.,* defendant in this action *or other person having personal knowledge of the facts*] and make this declaration in support of _____ [my *or* _____ (*party, e.g.,* defendant's)] motion for an order _____ [*specify relief sought, e.g.,* setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment)] taken against _____ [me *or* the _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant)] herein.

2. _____ [*Set forth facts within declarant's personal knowledge showing that the judgment, order, or proceeding was rendered, made, or taken as a result of extrinsic fraud or mistake, e.g.:* The _____ (*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment) was/were entered as a result of _____ (my extrinsic mistake *or* extrinsic fraud or mistake on the part of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff]) in that _____ (*set forth the facts establishing the ground(s) of the motion, e.g.,* at no time did I ever receive any notice of the action, by the service of a summons and complaint or otherwise, and had absolutely no knowledge of the fact that I was being sued until _____ [*date*] when my home, located at _____ [*street address and city*], and in which I have lived all my life, was levied on in satisfaction of the judgment and, at which time, I was given a copy of the writ of execution)].

3. _____ [*Set forth facts showing moving party has acted diligently in seeking relief, e.g.:* Immediately on being given a copy of the writ of execution, I phoned my attorney, _____ (*name*), explained the situation, and, together, later that same day, we went to the courthouse and checked the file of the case. In the file was a proof of service that stated the summons and complaint had been served on me at _____ (*street address and city*) by leaving a copy of the complaint and summons with a "a man" apparently in charge of the place and thereafter mailing a copy of the summons and complaint addressed to me at the same address. Priorto my reading the

proof of service, I had never heard of the address mentioned and have never resided at, worked or done business in, or visited that address and know no one at that address, and, as already stated, I never, at any time, received the copy of the summons and complaint, or either of them, left with "the man" or mailed to that address, or any other copy of them].

4. _____ [*State facts showing that the moving party has either a good claim or defense, as the case may be, e.g.:* When my attorney and I went through the court file of the case as stated in Paragraph 2, we also read the complaint on file and made photocopies of it. As shown by _____ (the proposed verified _____ (answer or other pleading)) to the _____ (complaint *or other pleading*) attached to the notice of motion *and/or* the following facts, the _____ (*specify, e.g.*, judgment) would not have been _____ (*e.g.*, rendered) had there been a _____ (hearing *or* trial) on the merits (: _____ [*set forth facts within declarant's personal knowledge supporting the moving party's claim or defense, as the case may be*])].

5. _____ [*State facts showing that moving party acted diligently in seeking relief, e.g.:* As shown by the court's records herein, the _____ (*specify, e.g.*, default was entered on _____ [*date*] and the default judgment was entered on _____ [*date*]). Immediately after learning of the judgment, and phoning and then going with my attorney to the courthouse to examine the court file of the case, as stated in Paragraph 2, I directed my attorney to do whatever was necessary to get the matter straightened out and the judgment set aside. He said he would prepare the necessary papers that same day and that I should come to his office the following morning, namely, on _____ (*date*), to sign the declaration, which I did].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[b] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use by a party to obtain equitable relief from a judgment or order (including a default or default judgment) taken through extrinsic fraud or mistake.

If the judgment is void, the optional phrase "is void and" in the first paragraph of the notice should be included. The optional statement at the end of thatparagraph, relating to a meritorious defense, should be included unless the judgment is void for lack of jurisdiction (*see* discussion in *§ 489.264[3]*. For further discussion of void judgments and orders, see *§ 489.130* et seq.

For other statements that may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 2 of the declaration, see *§ 489.431*. For additional statements that may be modified and substituted for Paragraph 2, see *§ 489.361*; and in particular, see *§ 489.361[2]* and *[4]*. The statement in *§ 489.361[2]* may be used when the extrinsic mistake consists of the defendant's reasonable reliance on the representation of a codefendant or the defendant's employer that the codefendant or employer would defend on behalf of defendant [*see Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Roussey v. Ernest W. Hahn, Inc. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 251, 256, 59 Cal. Rptr. 399*]. The statement in § 489.361[4] may be used when the extrinsic mistake consists of the defendant's reliance on his or her attorney and the attorney abandoned the defendant [*see People v. One Parcel of Land (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 579, 584, 286 Cal. Rptr. 739*].

For discussion of the jurisdiction of courts to grant equitable relief, see *§ 489.227*. For when relief may be obtained by an action in equity, see [g], *below*.

When relief from a default judgment is based on nonservice of summons (a false return having been filed), the motion for equitable relief may be joined with a motion to quash service of summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*], or, if knowledge of the defective or nonservice of summons is discovered before default is entered, by a simple motion to quash service of summons [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)*]. For forms of notices of motion to quash service of summons for lack of jurisdiction, as well as a combined notice of motion to quash service of summons and to vacate and set aside a default judgment, and related forms, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* .

For further discussion of requirements for notice of motion for relief from judgment or order generally, including accompanying papers and service, see *§ 489.360[1]*.

[c] Determining Whether Grounds for Relief Exist

The starting point in determining whether equitable grounds for relief exist is to determine whether the aggrieved party was deprived of a fair opportunity to fully present his or her case. If so, the second step is to determine why. The third step is to classify the reason; if the reason is because of some act or omission (when a duty to act existed) of the adverse party or that party's attorney, does that act come within any of the broad definitions of extrinsic fraud or mistake. If the reason is because of some act or omission of a third person or the aggrieved party, does the act or omission come within any of the broad definitions of extrinsic mistake, and, if the act or omission was of the aggrieved party did it involve excusable or inexcusable neglect.

If it is determined that the party was deprived of a fair opportunity to fully present his or her case either because of some act or omission of the adverse party or of that party's attorney or because of some act or omission of a third party or of the aggrieved party, and, if of the aggrieved party, that the party was not inexcusably negligent, relief should be granted if the fraud or mistake may properly be classified as extrinsic and the other requirements for equitable relief are met.

[d] Alternative Remedies

If the judgment attacked is a valid judgment and relief is sought within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months after the judgment was entered, a motion for relief at law on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), may be available. If both statutory and equitable grounds exist for setting the judgment aside, a single notice of motion combining both statutory and equitable grounds may be made.

If the judgment attacked is a void judgment and relief is sought within the time periods that apply by analogy to attacking such judgments (discussed in *§ 489.130* et seq.), counsel may move for relief at law directed to the court's inherent power to set aside void judgments or under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*.

[e] Showing Required

The moving party must show that the judgment or order was entered as a result of extrinsic fraud or mistake and that the moving party has been diligent in seeking relief after discovery of the judgment or order. This is normally done by having the moving party, or other person, give an affidavit (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(a), 2003, 2009*) or execute a declaration under penalty of perjury (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*), illustrated in the form in [a], *above*, stating the facts within the affiant's or declarant's personal knowledge that establish the ground for relief and the diligence of the moving party.

The moving party must also show that he or she has a meritorious claim or defense, as the case may be (for an exception, *see § 489.264[3]*). If the motion seeks relief from a default judgment, this may be done by attaching a copy of a proposed verified answer either denying essential allegations of the complaint or setting forth an affirmative

defense, or both. In seeking relief from some other judgment or order, the facts showing that the result would probably have been different had the extrinsic fraud or mistake not occurred may be contained in the supporting affidavits or declarations.

[f] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum of points and authorities must be served and filed with the foregoing notice of motion if the motion is subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100 et. seq.*) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for motions subject to the Civil Law and Motion Rules, *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103*], or if required by local court rule. The better practice is to prepare, serve, and file a memorandum in support of any noticed motion, unless excluded expressly or by implication from the Civil Law and Motion Rules or by local court rule. For discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[g] Action in Equity

If any probative facts must be established by the affidavit or declaration of a person other than the moving party who is unwilling to give an affidavit or make a declaration, counsel may wish to file a separate action in equity [*see § 489.440[1]*] rather than use the noticed motion procedure. In a separate action, counsel could subpoena witnesses to testify and take depositions, and may secure ancillary relief by a provisional remedy or otherwise [*see, e.g., Hayes v. Risk (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 613, 64 Cal. Rptr. 36*].

[2] Order Granting Motion

[a] FORM Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.*, setting aside and vacating the default (and default judgment) heretofore entered] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

[*EITHER*]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

[*OR*]

The court being fully advised in the premises, and it satisfactorily appearing from the evidence and the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* proposed verified answer] that the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] was/were entered against _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] by reason of the extrinsic _____ [fraud *and/or* mistake] of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff], that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] was diligent in filing the motion, and that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] has a meritorious _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defense to the action],

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS ORDERED that the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* default (and default judgment)] [entered on _____ (*date*) in Volume _____, Page _____ of the Judgment Book] be, and hereby is/are, vacated and set aside [and that defendant's proposed verified answer be filed].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when the court grants the motion for equitable relief from a judgment or order.

For a form of formal order that may be adapted for use in lieu of the form in [a], *above,* when relief is denied and a formal order is required, see *§ 489.371[1]*. For the appealability of the order, see discussions *§ 489.18[5]*.

[C] Ruling on Motion for Relief

To set aside a default judgment on a motion based on equitable grounds, three elements must be satisfied [*see Stiles v. Wallis (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1143, 1147-1148, 195 Cal. Rptr. 377* (holding that ignorance of the law is not a proper excuse); *see also Bailey v. Roberts (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 282, 285, 76 Cal. Rptr. 572*]:

- The defaulted party must show that it has a meritorious case (for an exception when relief is granted on the ground that the court never acquired jurisdiction over the person of the defendant, see discussion in *§ 489.264[3]*;

- It must articulate a satisfactory excuse for not presenting a defense to the original action; and

- It must demonstrate that it was diligent in seeking to set aside the default once it was discovered.

The rule applies equally when the motion is to vacate an order of dismissal [*Aldrich v. San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 738, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300*].

[d] Discretion of Trial Court

As in the case of a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), a motion for equitable relief is addressed to the trial court's sound discretion and absent a clear showing of abuse in its exercise will not be disturbed by an appellate court [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 854, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* ; *Aldrich v.*

San Fernando Valley Lumber Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 725, 736, 216 Cal. Rptr. 300 ; *Crane v. Kampe (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 200, 204-205, 37 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; for discussion, *see § 489.21[3]*, and *§ 489.38*].

[e] Findings

Unless statute or case law requires a specific finding, the general rule is that findings of fact are not required, and, in fact, have no place in the court's ruling on a motion [*Waller v. Weston (1899) 125 Cal. 201, 204, 57 P. 892* ; *see also Allstate Ins. Co. v. Orlando (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 858, 867, 69 Cal. Rptr. 702* ; *Skouland v. Skouland (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 677, 679, 20 Cal. Rptr. 185*]. Consequently, the first alternative in the form in [a], *above*, should be sufficient [*see* *Sullivan v. Sullivan (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 301, 306, 64 Cal. Rptr. 82* (findings are not required to support orders made after motions)]. However, if counsel wishes to include findings, because equitable relief may be granted only when the judgment or order resulted from extrinsic fraud or mistake and the moving party diligently sought relief and has a meritorious claim or defense, the second alternative may be used.

[f] Award of Costs

Whether or not costs incurred in connection with the default judgment are awarded to plaintiff on an equitable motion for relief from a default judgment is within the trial court's discretion [*Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 859, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700* (trial court did not abuse discretion in denying costs)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.431

§ 489.431 Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Supporting Declaration

[1] Default Due to Disability of Party

[a] FORM Motion in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Procured by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Supporting Declaration--Default Due to Disability of Party

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief in equity provided in § 489.430[1].*]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to party's disability, e.g.:*]

2. At the time the summons and complaint in this action were served, I _____ [did not understand the nature and purpose of the documents served on me *and/or* was not familiar with the requirements of the California legal system *and/or* was unable to arrange to defend the action] because _____ [*state facts showing defendant's disability, for example, mental or physical illness or inability to comprehend the English language*].

3. By reason of my _____ [disability *or* inability], I failed to answer or otherwise plead to the complaint and as a result plaintiff obtained entry of the default and default judgment.

[4. Plaintiff at all times was well aware of my inability in that _____ (*specify*) and concealed such fact(s) from the court.]

[b] Use of Form

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the

declaration in § 489.430[1]. The statement in [a], *above*, may be used to support a motion for relief from a default or default judgment entered against the defendant as a result of his or her disability. That is, the right to equitable relief from a judgment, based on extrinsic mistake, extends to cases in which the complaining party was disabled at the time the judgment was entered [*Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 499, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186*].

[c] Examples of Party Disability

The disability might consist of any of the following:

- Mental incompetency [*Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564*];

- Physical illness of a serious nature [*McCreadie v. Arques (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 39, 45, 56 Cal. Rptr. 188*];

- Unfamiliarity with the English language or the American legal system [*Berri v. Rogero (1914) 168 Cal. 736, 739, 145 P. 95*];

- In certain circumstances, imprisonment [*Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 499, 500, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186*]; or

- Deportation to or detention in another country [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 343, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882*].

[d] Plaintiff's Concealment Is Extrinsic Fraud

If the plaintiff was aware of defendant's inability and concealed that information from the court in order to obtain the default judgment, the ground of defendant's motion would be extrinsic fraud [*In re Marriage of Park (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 337, 343, 165 Cal. Rptr. 792, 612 P.2d 882* ; *Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal.2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564*]. If the plaintiff lacked that knowledge, the ground of the motion would be extrinsic mistake [*see Olivera v. Grace (1942) 19 Cal.2d 570, 577-578, 122 P.2d 564*].

For further discussion, see *§ 489.243*.

[e] Related Uses

With appropriate modifications, the statement in [a], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraph 5 in the complaint for equitable relief *set out in § 489.440[1]*.

[f] Alternative Statutory Relief

If relief is sought within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months from the date the default was entered, relief may be sought by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), on the ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. In that case, the form in [a], *above*, omitting the optional statement regarding plaintiff's knowledge and concealment from the court, may be adapted for use in to fill in the blank at the end of Paragraph 2 of the declaration in § 489.360[1].

[2] Default Due to Disability of Defendant's Attorney

[a] FORM

**[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion*

***for relief in equity provided in § 489.430[1].*]**

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to disability of defendant's attorney, e.g.:*]

2. On _____ [*date*], I was served with the summons and complaint herein and immediately thereafter, on _____ [*date*], I obtained the services of _____ [*name*], an attorney, to represent me in this action.

3. Thereafter, and without my knowledge, the attorney became seriously ill and disabled and was away from, and unable to attend to matters then pending in, his/her office, including the preparation and filing of my answer to the complaint.

4. At all times I reasonably believed that the attorney was properly handling the matter on my behalf and I was unaware of his/her condition until _____ [*date*], when I _____ [*specify manner of discovery including nature and extent of illness and disability and from whom information was obtained*].

5. Subsequently, on _____ [*date*], I secured the services of my present counsel who discovered that my default, as shown by the records of this court, was entered on _____ [*date*] and the default judgment was entered on _____ [*date*].

6. By reason of the illness and disability of my attorney and my ignorance of it, plaintiff obtained entry of the default and default judgment against me.

[b] Use of Form

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the declaration in § 489.430[1]. The statement in [a], *above*, may be used to support a motion for relief from a default and default judgment entered against the defendant as a result of the sudden illness and disability of his or her counsel. The ground of the motion is the defendant's extrinsic mistake (akin to excusable neglect) in failing to learn of the illness and disability and secure new counsel in time to file an answer to prevent the entry of default.

To be fully prepared at the hearing on the motion, and to avoid any delay that might result from an objection that the foregoing statement contains hearsay, counsel should obtain an additional supporting affidavit ordeclaration from the treating doctor or other individual having personal knowledge of the facts regarding the attorney's death or illness.

[c] Related Use

With appropriate modifications, the foregoing statement may be substituted for Paragraph 5 in the complaint for equitable relief *set out in § 489.440[1]*.

[d] Alternative Statutory Relief

If relief is sought within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months after the default was entered, relief may be sought by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), in which event the ground of the motion would be mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. The form in [a], *above*, by deleting the last two sentences and substituting a statement of the manner in which the defendant and his or her counsel learned of the entry of the default and judgment, may be adapted for use in the blank space at the end of Paragraph 2 of the declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*.

[3] Default Due to Defendant's Reliance on Representations of Adverse Party's Attorney

[a] FORM

[*The following may be substituted for the factual statement in Paragraph 2 of the declaration in support of motion for relief in equity provided in § 489.430[1].*]

[*SET FORTH facts showing that entry of default (and default judgment, if applicable) was due to defendant's reliance on representations of adverse party's attorney, e.g.:*]

2. As shown by the return of service herein on file, the summons and complaint were served on the defendant on _____ [*date*].

3. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], the defendant retained me to represent him/her in this action. After discussing the matter with my client, I was of the opinion that the case might be settled.

4. On _____ [*date*], I phoned plaintiff's attorney, _____ [*name*], to explore the possibility. In that conversation, _____ [*name of plaintiff's attorney*] told me that so long as there was a possibility of settlement, I need not file an answer on behalf of my client, and that, should negotiations not prove satisfactory, he/she would give me _____ days written notice to file the answer.

5. Negotiations between me and plaintiff's attorney continued on and off over a period of _____ weeks, and at no time were the negotiations ever expressly terminated by either of us.

6. Notwithstanding the representation of plaintiff's counsel that he/she would give me notice before taking a default, and while negotiations were continuing, plaintiff on _____ [*date*] had defendant's default entered. At no time did I ever receive from plaintiff's counsel or anyone else notice, written or oral, that the defendant's answer would have to be filed in _____ days or at all.

7. Moreover, no Request to Enter Default was ever served on me, and the copy on file states that the request was mailed to the defendant on _____ [*date*]. As shown by the accompanying declaration of the defendant, no notice to file an answer and no Request to Enter Default were ever received by him/her.

8. Thereafter, according to the records herein, a default judgment was rendered against defendant on _____ [*date*].

9. No attempt to enforce the judgment was made at that time. But, as shown by the statement from _____ Bank, a copy of which is attached hereto, on _____ [*date*], more than six months after the default had been entered, plaintiff attached defendant's bank account. This was the first notice defendant or I had that a default and judgment had been entered].

[b] Use of Form

The form in [a], *above*, is an illustration of the type of detailed statement that may be substituted for Paragraph 2 of the declaration in *§ 489.430[1]*. The statement in [a], *above*, may be used to support a motion for relief from a default and default judgment entered against the defendant as a result of the failure of plaintiff's counsel to comply with his or her express representations. The ground of the motion is the extrinsic fraud (negligent or intentional) of plaintiff's counsel or the extrinsic mistake (akin to excusable neglect) of defendant's counsel in relying on the attorney's promise.

[c] Related Use

With appropriate modifications, the foregoing statement may be substituted for Paragraph 5 in the complaint for

equitable relief *set out in § 489.440[1]*.

[d] Alternative Statutory Relief

If relief is sought within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months after the default was entered, relief may be sought by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (discussed in *§ 489.30* et seq.), in which event the ground of the motion would be mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. The form in [a], *above*, by deleting the last two sentences and substituting a statement of the manner in which the defendant and his or her counsel learned of the entry of the default and judgment, may be adapted for use in the blank at the end of Paragraph 2 of the declaration in *§ 489.360[1]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 489.432-489.439

[Reserved]

§§ 489.432[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.440

§ 489.440 Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*]	)	COMPLAINT TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [*Allege capacity, residence, and/or agency of plaintiff:* Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was a corporation, organized and existing under the laws of California)].

2. _____ [*Allege capacity if other than an individual and principal place of business or residence, and/or agency of defendant, e.g.:* Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a California corporation with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California].

3. _____ [*Identify action or proceeding in which judgment or order under attack was entered, e.g.:* On _____ (*date*) the defendant, as plaintiff, filed in _____ (this court *or* the

_____ [Superior *or* Municipal] Court [of the _____ Judicial District], County of _____), against plaintiff, as defendant, a complaint entitled _____ (*specify, e.g.,*, _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*], Defendant), Case No. _____, in which defendant herein sought _____ (*specify, e.g.,* damages for an alleged breach of contract) against plaintiff herein. The court is hereby requested to take judicial notice of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the complaint and answer therein filed), a copy of each of which is attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively, and made a part hereof)].

4. _____ [*Identify judgment or order under attack, e.g.:* As shown by the records of _____ (this court *or* the _____ [Superior *or* Municipal] Court [of the _____ Judicial District], County of _____) in the case referred to in Paragraph 3, a judgment against plaintiff herein was entered on _____ (*date*) in _____ (*specify, e.g.,* Vol. _____ of the Judgment Book, page _____)]. The court is hereby requested to take judicial notice of the judgment, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

5. _____ [*Allege grounds on which judgment or order is sought to be set aside, e.g.,* Defendant herein obtained the entry of the judgment through extrinsic _____ (fraud *and/or* mistake) in that _____ (*specify facts showing the fraud or mistake and how it occurred*)].

6. _____ [*Allege how and when plaintiff learned of the judgment or order and any facts showing good cause for any failure to have discovered the facts sooner, and plaintiff's freedom from any contributory fault in the entry of the judgment*].

[7. _____ (*Allege any facts showing that plaintiff was diligent in seeking relief after discovering the facts if any delay between the time plaintiff discovered the facts and the commencement of this action would be prejudicial to the defendant*).]

8. _____ [*Allege meritorious case, e.g.,* At all times herein mentioned plaintiff herein had, and continues to have, a meritorious defense to the prior action in that _____ (*specify facts showing the existence of a valid claim or defense to the action in whole or in part*)].

[*EITHER*]

9. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law in that, through no fault of his/her own, he/she did not discover the _____ [fraud *and/or* mistake] herein alleged until after the time had expired for appeal, seeking a new trial, or seeking relief under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 473(b)* or *(d)*, for the reasons hereinabove alleged.

[*OR*]

9. Plaintiff's motion for relief under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 473* _____ [(b) *or* (d)] paragraph, was denied by the court on _____ [*date*] _____ [*specify reason for denial, e.g.,* as untimely *or* without a full hearing of the merits of plaintiff's claim, in that _____ (*set forth facts showing that issues raised in this action were not considered or adjudicated by the court in the statutory motion and any reasons for the failure to raise or consider them*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That _____ [the default and default judgment entered in the prior action be vacated and set aside (and leave granted to plaintiff herein to file an answer to the complaint therein) *or* the judgment entered against plaintiff herein in the prior action be declared null and void *or* defendant be declared a constructive trustee for the benefit of the plaintiff of all funds it received as a result of the prior _____ (judgment *or* order) *or specify other relief sought*].

2. For costs of suit herein incurred.

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and, as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a party seeking relief in equity from a prior judgment or order entered against the plaintiff. The grounds of relief are extrinsic fraud or mistake. Alternatively, relief may be sought by a motion on the same grounds in the court in which the judgment or order was entered [*see § 489.430[1]*]. For discussion of trial court's equitable jurisdiction, see *§ 489.227*. For matters of which a court may take judicial notice and the manner of requesting it to do so, see *Evid. Code §§ 452(d), 453*.

For a form of complaint for use when relief is sought from a default judgment on the ground of lack of personal jurisdiction, see *§ 489.441*.

For discussion of when an action as opposed to a motion should be used to set aside a judgment or order, see *§ 489.266*. For discussion of the statute of limitations that apply to the action, see *§ 489.261*.

[3] Venue

An action in equity to set aside the judgment of a court is transitory and, under the general rule that a defendant is

entitled to have transitory actions tried in the county of his or her residence (*see* Code Civ. Proc.§ 395(a)), the proper county for trial is the county in which the defendant or some of the defendants reside at the commencement of the action [*Brown v. Happy Valley Fruit Growers (1929) 206 Cal. 515, 523-524, 274 P. 977* (reversing order denying motion to change venue to county in which defendants resided and judgment was entered); *Deas v. Lido Lumber Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 402, 404-407, 282 P.2d 90* (explaining apparently contrary dictum in *Brown* and reversing order denying motion to change venue from county in which judgment was entered to defendant's county of residence)].

[4] Allegations

The complaint identifies the judgment or order from which relief is sought and requests that the court take appropriate judicial notice [*see Evid. Code §§ 452(d), 453*] (Paragraphs 3, 4). The complaint then alleges [*see, e.g., Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559, 305 P.2d 20* ; *Turner v. Allen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 753, 758-759, 11 Cal. Rptr. 630*]:

- The grounds for relief (the fraud or mistake must be specifically pleaded) (Paragraph 5);

- Plaintiff's discovery of the fraud or mistake, which normally starts the running of the statute of limitations [*see* discussion in *§ 489.261[1]*], and if it was not promptly discovered after entry of the judgment, the reason for failure to discover it earlier, and plaintiff's freedom from fault in the entry of the judgment or order [*see Kulchar v. Kulchar (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 467, 470-473, 82 Cal. Rptr. 489, 462 P.2d 17*], (Paragraph 6);

- Plaintiff's diligence in seeking relief if there is any delay between the time plaintiff discovered the facts constituting the fraud or mistake and the filing of the present action, anticipating the defense of laches [*see* discussion in *§ 489.261[4]*] (Paragraph 7);

- That plaintiff has a meritorious claim or defense with respect to the prior judgment [*see* discussion in *§ 489.264*] (Paragraph 8); and

- The absence of any remedy at law, either because the time for relief by appeal or by motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* or *(d)* or any other remedy at law, expired before plaintiff was aware of the judgment [*see Parsons v. Weis (1904) 144 Cal. 410, 421, 77 P. 1007* ; *see also Weitz v. Yankosky (1966) 63 Cal. 2d 849, 855, 48 Cal. Rptr. 620, 409 P.2d 700*], or because the plaintiff's earlier motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* or *(d)* was denied without a full hearing of the issues [*see Rose v. Fuqua (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 719, 724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 634*] (alternative Paragraphs 9).

Allegations for use in declarations supporting motions for relief are contained §§ *489.430* and *489.431*. With appropriate modifications as to parties and grounds relied on, these averments may be used to describe the particular extrinsic fraud or mistake in Paragraph 5 of the form in [1], *above*.

[5] Prayer

The prayer should request the precise relief sought. Paragraph 1 of the prayer in the form in [1], *above*, illustrates three possibilities:

- Plaintiff seeks relief from a default and default judgment with leave to answer;

- Plaintiff seeks to have declared null and void a judgment procured by extrinsic fraud or mistake, for example, a judgment quieting the defendant's title to real property owned by plaintiff; and

- Plaintiff seeks to have the defendant declared to be a constructive trustee of property for the plaintiff's benefit, as, for example, when the judgment attacked is one in probate distributing to another property that, but for the extrinsic fraud or mistake, would have been distributed to plaintiff, and the property has been distributed in accordance with the judgment.

[6] No Jury Trial

Being an action in equity, there is no right to a jury trial [*see Holt v. Parmer (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 329, 331-332, 235 P.2d 43*].

[7] Cross References

For a discussion and forms of common allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For a discussion of the form and format and general forms of complaints and answers, see Chs. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* , and 26, *Answers* , respectively

For a discussion of judicial jurisdiction and appearances, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*

For a discussion of the manners of serving a complaint and summons, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For a general discussion of venue and forms for use in securing a change of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.441

§ 489.441 Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Default and Default Judgment Rendered by Court Lacking Jurisdiction Over Defendant

[1] FORM Complaint in Equity to Set Aside Judgment or Order Obtained by Extrinsic Fraud or Mistake--Default and Default Judgment Rendered by Court Lacking Jurisdiction Over Defendant

[*Caption. See § 489.440[1]*.]

1. [*Capacity, residence, and/or agency of plaintiff. See § 489.440[1] , Paragraph 1*.]

2. [*Capacity, residence, and/or agency of defendant. See § 489.440[1] , Paragraph 2*.]

3. [*Identify action and court in which judgment or order was entered. See § 489.440[1] , Paragraph 3*.]

4. [*Allege entry of judgment sought to be set aside. See § 489.440[1] , Paragraph 4*.]

5. The judgment referred to in Paragraph 4 is void for lack of jurisdiction over the person of the defendant (plaintiff herein), in that _____ [*specify why judgment or order is void, e.g.*, at no time was the plaintiff herein (defendant in the prior action) ever served with a copy of the summons and/or complaint in that action in person, by mail, or in any other manner, and had no notice whatsoever of this proceeding until on or about _____ (*date*) when execution of that judgment was levied on my account in the _____ Bank, located in _____ (*city*)].

6. The judgment was entered as the result of the extrinsic fraud or mistake of the defendant (plaintiff in prior action) in that the proof of service filed in the prior action, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit _____, and made a part hereof, and of which the court is hereby requested to take judicial notice, _____ [*specify what proof of service states and state facts showing that it is false*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That the default and default judgment entered against plaintiff herein in the prior action be _____ [vacated and set aside (and plaintiff be granted leave to file an answer) *or* declared null and void].

2. For costs of suit herein incurred.

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 489.440[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use to secure relief from a judgment that is valid on its face but void in fact for lack of jurisdiction over the defendant's person because [*see, e.g., In re Marriage of Merideth (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 356, 363, 180 Cal. Rptr. 909* ; *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 489.134* et seq.]:

- The defendant (plaintiff herein) was never served with a copy of the summons and complaint and the return of service filed was false; or

- The service of the summons or the summons was defective and the defect does not appear from the judgment roll; or

- Defendant (plaintiff herein) is a nonresident and lacks sufficient contacts with California to permit the exercise of judicial jurisdiction over him or her.

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use either when relief is sought from a court other than the one that rendered the judgment or, if filed in the same court, when an equitable motion, or a motion at law (discussed in [3], *below*), might not provide adequate relief, or, in the case of a motion at law, is time barred [*see* discussion in *§ 489.266*].

For further discussion relating to a complaint commencing an independent action in equity, such as venue, and unavailability of jury trial, see *§ 489.440[1]*.

[3] Motion at Law

A judgment rendered in an action in which the court did not acquire jurisdiction over the person of the defendant is void [*see, e.g., Fazzi v. Peters (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 590, 594, 68 Cal. Rptr. 170, 440 P.2d 242*]. A judgment that is not void on its face but is void in fact may be attacked by a motion at law, either under the court's inherent jurisdiction at law or under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*, codifying that inherent power (*see* discussion in *§ 489.10*). However, if not sought within a reasonable time, relief at law is time barred and the aggrieved party's only remedy is in equity, either by a motion or by an independent action (*see* discussion in *§ 489.142*).

[4] Judgment Void on Its Face for Lack of Jurisdiction

A judgment that is void on its face for lack of jurisdiction is subject to an attack at law, not only in the court that rendered it, but anywhere, anytime, directly or collaterally, and there is no need to resort to equityto have it declared void (*see §§ 489.137 -489.141*). The most expedient method of directly attacking it is by a motion at law in the court that rendered the judgment.

[5] Meritorious Defense

To require the showing of a meritorious defense on a defendant's motion for relief from a default judgment in an action in which the trial court never acquired personal jurisdiction over the defendant, that is, when the judgment is void for lack of personal jurisdiction, violates procedural due process and cannot constitutionally be required [*see Peralta v. Heights Medical Center, Inc. (1988) 485 U.S. 80, 84-87, 108 S. Ct. 896, 99 L. Ed. 2d 75*]. For further discussion of *Peralta*, see discussion in *§ 489.264[3]*. California cases that have pointed out that the meritorious defense requirement applies to a judgment that is void in fact, but not on its face, because the summons had not been served or the service was in some manner defective [*see, e.g., Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554, 305 P.2d 20* ; (and cases there cited); *see also New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. v. Siegel (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 684, 689, 154 Cal. Rptr. 200* ; *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485]* do not appear to be viable in light of *Peralta*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 489 RELIEF FROM JUDGMENTS AND ORDERS
V. FORMS
C. Relief From Valid or Void Judgment or Order in Equity

43-489 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 489.442

§ 489.442 Judgment Setting Aside Judgment--General Form

[1] FORM Judgment Setting Aside Judgment--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	JUDGMENT SETTING ASIDE JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
_____		

This cause came on regularly for trial before the Honorable _____ [*name*], sitting without a jury on _____ [*date*] in [Department _____ of] the above-entitled court, _____ [*name*], appearing as attorney for the plaintiff, and _____ [*name*], appearing as attorney for the defendant. Evidence, both oral and documentary, having been presented by both parties, the cause having been argued and submitted for decision, and _____ [the court (, on _____ (plaintiff's *or* defendant's) request), having caused to be made and filed herein its written statement of decision *or* a statement of decision not having been requested],

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the [default and default] judgment entered against the plaintiff herein as defendant in Action No. _____ in _____ [this court *or* the _____ (Superior *or* Municipal) Court (of the _____ Judicial District), State of California], entitled _____ [*specify, e.g.*, _____ (*name*), plaintiff vs. _____ (*name*), defendant], and entered on or about _____ [*date*], is null and void and is set aside and vacated, and

_____ [*specify any additional relief requested and granted, e.g.,* that defendant therein is granted until _____ days after this judgment becomes final to file his/her answer to the complaint in that action].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff recover from the defendant his/her costs of suit in the sum of $_____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* of judgment may be used in the action to vacate or set aside a judgment obtained by extrinsic fraud or mistake, and in the case of a default judgment, to allow the filing of an answer. The judgment is normally prepared by counsel for the prevailing party for the judge's signature.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 490.syn

§ 490.syn Synopsis to Chapter 490: RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION

§ 490.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 490.02 Cross References

§§ 490.03-490.09 [Reserved]

§ 490.10 Governing Law

§ 490.11 Rescission and Cancellation

[1] Distinguished

[2] Terminology of Parties Not Controlling

[3] Under the Commercial Code

§ 490.12 Rescission and Abandonment of Contract Distinguished

§ 490.13 Determining Whether Contract Was Formed or Is Void or Voidable

§ 490.14 Contract Provision for Unilateral Termination

§ 490.15 Rescission by Mutual Agreement

[1] Requirements

[2] Implied Mutual Rescission

[3] Oral Rescission of Written Agreement

§ 490.16 Unilateral Rescission for Cause

[1] Grounds

[2] Failure of Consent

[3] Failure of Consideration

[a] In General

[b] Failure to Pay Money

[i] Delay in Performance

[ii] Impossibility or Commercial Frustration

[c] Contract Unlawful or Prejudicial to Public Interest

[d] Rescission of Participation in Chain Scheme

[e] Contract Made Before Adjudication of Incompetency

[f] Creditor's Right to Rescind Novation

[g] Repudiation

[h] Bailments

[i] Principal's Rescission of Ratification

[j] Insurance Contracts

[k] Contracts for Sale of Goods

[i] Applicable Law

[ii] Commercial Code Rights and Remedies

[l] Transfer of Corporation Share Certificates

§ 490.17 Partial Rescission

§ 490.18 Rescission of Gifts

§ 490.19 Rescission of Third-Party Beneficiary Contracts

§ 490.20 Defenses to Rescission

[1] Executed Contract

[2] "Rescinding" Party in Default

[3] Waiver of Right to Rescind

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] Prejudicial Delay

[6] Substantive Statute or Policy Precludes Rescission

[a] Judicial Privilege

[b] Health Care Service Plan Contracts

[c] Insurance Contracts: Post-Claim Underwriting

§ 490.21 Notice of Rescission and Offer to Restore Consideration

[1] Requirements

[2] Restoration or Offer to Restore Excused

§ 490.22 Judicial Enforcement of Rescission

[1] By Action or as Defense

[2] Nature of Action

[3] Form of Action

§ 490.23 Recovery by Rescinding Party

[1] In General

[2] Restitution and Consequential Damages

[a] Recoverable

[b] Examples of Consequential Damages

[3] Emotional Distress

[4] Interest

[5] Punitive Damages

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Attachment Available

§ 490.24 Damages or Offsets Allowed to Defendant

§ 490.25 Election of Remedies

[1] What Constitutes Election

[2] Asserting Election of Remedies as Defense

§ 490.26 Right to Jury Trial

§ 490.27 Restitution to Avoid Unjust Enrichment

[1] Equitable Principle

[2] When Contract Is Forfeited

[3] Pleading Doctrine as Common Count

§§ 490.28-490.39 [Reserved]

§ 490.40 Federal Statutes

§ 490.41 State Statutes

[1] Rescission

[2] Restitution

§ 490.42 Decisions

[1] Alternative Remedies and Procedures

[2] Election of Remedies

[3] Defendant's Right to Offsets

[4] Delay in Performance

[5] Dismissal of Prior Action for Rescissionary Relief

[6] Judgments

[7] Mistake of Fact

[8] Mistake of Law

[9] Nature of Rescission

[10] Rescission Unavailable

[11] Restitution Based on Repudiation

[12] Restitution Based on Undue Influence

[13] Restitution to Avoid Unjust Enrichment

[14] Restoration Excused

§ 490.43 Law Reviews

§ 490.44 Text References

§§ 490.45-490.59 [Reserved]

§ 490.60 Notice of Rescission of Contract--General Form [Civ. Code § 1691]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Notice

[a] Grounds

[b] Offer to Restore

[c] Setoffs or Credits

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Text References

§ 490.61 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1709, 3343]--Fraudulent Misrepresentation [Civ. Code §§ 1572, 1689(b)(1), 1710]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Other Possible Remedies

[4] Parties

[5] Relief Based on Rescission

[a] General Allegations

[b] Fraudulent Misrepresentation

[6] Damages for Fraud

[7] Common Count for Money Had and Received

[8] Verification

[9] Jurisdiction and Venue

[a] In General

[b] Actions Under Unruh or Rees-Levering Act

[c] Other Goods or Services for Personal or Family Use; Telephone or Electronic Solicitation

[10] Lis Pendens

[11] Cross References

[12] State Statutes

[13] Decisions

[a] Acts of Third Persons as Grounds for Rescission

[b] Attorney's Fees

[c] Damages

[d] Notice

[e] Fraudulent Misrepresentation

[i] Damages

[ii] Reliance

[f] Injury

[g] Pleading

[h] Text References

[i] Cross Reference

§ 490.62 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract--Failure of Consideration [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)-(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Preliminary Allegations

[b] Failure of Consideration

[c] Other Allegations

[d] Damages for Breach of Contract

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Cross References

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[a] Common Count

[b] Consequential Damages

[c] Failure of Consideration

[d] Pleading

[e] Repudiation

[8] Text References

[9] Cross Reference

§ 490.63 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Incompetency Prior to Adjudication [Civ. Code §§ 39, 1689(b)(7)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Cross References

[6] California Points and Authorities

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[a] Incompetency as Ground for Rescission

[b] Lack of Understanding

[c] Limitations and Laches

[d] Party Plaintiff

[e] Restoration or Offer to Restore

[9] Text References

[10] Cross Reference

§ 490.64 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Contract Unlawful or Prejudicial to Public Policy [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5), (6)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[a] Attorney's Ethical Duties

[b] Change in Law

[c] Cohabitation

[d] Collusive Bidding

[e] Corruption of Public Officials

[f] Defraud Creditors

[g] Drugs and Drug Paraphernalia

[h] Failure to Obtain License

[i] Gambling

[j] Inequality of Fault

[k] Laches

[l] Parties

[m] Persons Accused of Crime

[n] Ratification

[o] Renunciation During Locus Penitentiae

[p] Restoration by Plaintiff

[q] Silence

[r] Spouses

[s] Subdivided Lands

[t] Tax Evasion

[7] Text References

[8] Cross Reference

§ 490.65 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

[6] Cross Reference

§ 490.66 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--Prejudicial Delay [Civ. Code § 1693]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

[6] Cross Reference

§ 490.67 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Election of Another Remedy

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] Decisions

[a] Acts Constituting Election

[b] Acts Not Constituting Election

[5] Text References

[6] Cross Reference

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART I. SCOPE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.01

§ 490.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the procedural and general aspects of rescission of contract, restitution based on rescission, and defenses to those actions. It contains the following:

- A general form for giving notice of unilateral rescission [*see § 490.60*].
- Forms of complaints for relief based on rescission [*see § 490.61 -490.64*].
- Forms of defenses to complaints for rescission [*see § 490.65 -490.67*].

Rescission as a remedy in particular contexts is considered in this chapter only by way of example. For a listing of chapters that discuss or contain forms relating to rescission of particular contracts or transactions, see the Research Guide under Cross References.

Discussion and forms relating to general contract requirements and factors negating formation of contract or providing grounds for avoidance of contract are discussed in Ch. 140, *Contracts* , and Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* . Requirements for rescission of contracts for the sale of goods governed by *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.* are discussed in Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitution

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART I. SCOPE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.02

§ 490.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the right of restitution of a good faith improver of another's property, see Ch. 279, *Good Faith Improver of Real Property* .

For discussion and forms relating to a parent's right to rescind his or her relinquishment of parental rights or consent to his or her child's adoption, see *Ch. 12B, Adoptions: Unmarried Minors, §§ 12B.96, 12B.174*.

For a complaint for relief based on rescission of a sale of a business because the Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control did not approve transfer of the business' liquor license, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* .

For a form of affirmative defense based on rescission on the ground of incapacity to contract due to intoxication, see Ch. 19, *Alcoholic Beverages: Civil Liability* .

For a form of affirmative defense based on rescission for use in response to a petition to compel arbitration, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

For a complaint for relief based on rescission of a sale of art work, see Ch. 57, *Art* .

For a complaint for relief based on rescission of auction sales, see Ch. 77, *Auctions and Auctioneers* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of automobile sales contracts, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of automobile leases, see Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act* .

For discussion of the Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990 (*Civ. Code § 1799.200 et seq.*) as applied to financial services, including safe deposit rentals and personal property safekeeping and storage agreements, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

For a form of affirmative defense based on rescission for use in response to a complaint by a real estate broker for commission, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of building and construction contracts, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to cancellation of instruments, including allegation of rescission of underlying transaction, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* .

For discussion and forms relating to cancellation of dating service and weight loss contracts, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of home solicitation or seminar sales solicitation contracts, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of discount buying service organization memberships, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

For discussion of unconscionable contracts and unenforceable exculpatory clauses, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For forms of affirmative defense based on rescission of a contract by mutual consent or for failure of consideration, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to cancellation of deeds, see *Ch. 184, Deeds, § 184.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of property settlement agreements, see Ch. 222, *Dissolution of Marriage: Property Division and Valuation* .

For discussion and forms concerning contracts relating to gambling transactions, see Ch. 272, *Gambling* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of gifts, see Ch. 278, *Gifts* .

For discussion and forms relating to restitution of medical, housing, or other expenses in an order enjoining domestic violence, see Ch. 293, *Harassment and Domestic Violence* .

For forms for affirmative defense based on rescission of an insurance policy, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For discussion and forms for judgments see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

For discussion and forms relating to imposition of equitable liens to effect restitution and to avoid unjust enrichment, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences* .

For discussion of rescission of emancipation of a minor, see Ch. 245, *Emancipation of Minors* .

For a form of complaint for relief based on wrongful rescission of an agency by the principal, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

For discussion of rescission of contracts for the sale of goods governed by *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*, see Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* , and Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of consumer contracts governed by Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*)

and federal Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*), see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of securities transactions governed by the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968 (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*), see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of franchises governed by the California Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*), see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of sale or lease of seller assisted marketing plan, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

For discussion of the Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990 (*Civ. Code § 1799.200 et seq.*) as applied to consumer contract guaranties, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

For discussion of rescission rights after unsconscionable transfer of residential real property in foreclosure, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of real estate sales and exchanges, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsArbitration ClausesContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & Restitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499

Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION

PART I. SCOPE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 490.03-490.09

[Reserved]

§§ 490.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.10

§ 490.10 Governing Law

Rescission of contract in general is governed by *Civ. Code § 1688 et seq.* Many statutes provide a right of rescission in particular situations that are beyond the scope of this chapter. For a listing of the more frequently invoked of these statutes, see *§ 490.40*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.11

§ 490.11 Rescission and Cancellation

[1] Distinguished

One of the difficulties in distinguishing between rescission and cancellation is that the term cancellation has several meanings. One meaning refers to a specific statutory remedy relating to written instruments [*see Civ. Code §§ 3412-3414*]. A written instrument, in respect to which there is a reasonable apprehension that, if left outstanding it may cause serious injury to a person against whom it is void or voidable, may, on that person's application, be so adjudged and ordered to be delivered up or canceled [*Civ. Code § 3412*]. In this context, the distinction must be made between rescission of the underlying contract and cancellation of the instrument. After a fraudulently induced real estate transaction, for example, the contract may be rescinded and the deed cancelled [*see, e.g., Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . Another aspect of this distinction concerns the requirement of restitution. Both rescission of contracts and cancellation of voidable instruments require restitution, but cancellation of a void instrument, such as a deed of trust one was tricked into signing, does not require restitution [*Fleming v. Kagan (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 791, 796-799, 11 Cal. Rptr. 737]* . For discussion and forms relating to cancellation of instruments, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* .

The term cancellation is also used to refer to termination of contracts. In this context, the distinction between rescission and cancellation is that cancellation is prospective [*see, e.g., Welles v. Turner Entm't Co. (9th Cir. 2007) 488 F.3d 1178, 1187* (contract was not rescinded but was canceled, with only prospective effect, when parties made subsequent agreement expressing "the mutual desire of the parties to terminate and cancel" their prior contract)], whereas rescission is retroactive. Cancellation terminates further performance under the contract and operates as of the time of cancellation, whereas rescission operates to restore the parties to the *status quo ante* as of the time the contract was formed [*Fireman's Fund American Ins. Co. v. Escobedo (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 610, 619, 145 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *Mamula v. McCulloch (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 184, 197, 79 Cal. Rptr. 571]* . After termination or cancellation the parties retain their right to damages for breaches occurring prior to termination [*B.L. Metcalf General Contractor, Inc. v. Earl Erne, Inc. (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 689, 694, 28 Cal. Rptr. 382]* . In contrast, rescission is an alternative to damagesfor breach and amounts to renunciation and waiver of any claim for damages. Except in the case of a mutual rescission agreement that affirmatively reserves the right, rescission extinguishes the contract so that thereafter, neither party can maintain an action for its breach [*Imperial Cas. and Indem. Co. v. Sogomonian (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d*

169, 184-185, 243 Cal. Rptr. 639 ; *Larsen v. Johannes (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 491, 502, 86 Cal. Rptr. 744]* . In this context, confusion often results from the the parties' use of the terms rescission, termination, and cancellation without any regard to the legal distinctions [*see, e.g., Pico Citizens Bank v. Tafco Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 131, 136, 19 Cal. Rptr. 905]* .

[2] Terminology of Parties Not Controlling

The question of whether a contract has been cancelled, rescinded, or abandoned is a mixed question of law and fact. The terminology used is not controlling. Generally, the use of the term rescission does not amount to renunciation of claims for prior damages unless such an intention clearly appears [*Pico Citizens Bank v. Tafco Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 131, 136, 19 Cal. Rptr. 905* ("notice of rescission" as actually notice of cancellation pursuant to contract provision); *Grant v. The Aerodraulics Co. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 68, 72-74, 204 P.2d 683* (cancellation only; parties intended that liability for accrued royalties remain)].

[3] Under the Commercial Code

The distinctions between rescission, cancellation, and termination have been codified in Division 2 of the Commercial Code, which governs contracts for the sale of goods. Termination occurs when either party pursuant to a power created by agreement or law puts an end to a contract otherwise than for its breach. On termination, all obligations that are still executory on both sides are discharged, but any right based on prior breach or performance survives [*Com. Code § 2106(3)*]. Cancellation occurs when either party puts an end to the contract for breach by the other party. On cancellation, all executory obligations are discharged, except that the cancelling party retains any remedy for breach of the whole contract or any unperformed balance [*Com. Code § 2106(4)*]. Unless the contrary intention clearly appears, the terms cancellation and rescission are not to be construed as a renunciation or discharge of any claim in damages for an antecedent breach [*Com. Code § 2720*]. Under Division 2, unless otherwise provided by the specific agreeement of the parties, rejection [*Com. Code §§ 2601, 2602*] or revocation of acceptance of nonconforming goods [*Com. Code § 2608*], which are akin to rescission, or rescission itself, does not bar and is not inconsistent with, a claim for damages or any other remedy [*Com. Code §§ 2703, 2711, 2720, 2721*; *Seely v. White Motor Co. (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 9, 14, 45 Cal. Rptr. 17, 403 P.2d 145* ; Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2608*; *see* Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Breach, Repudiation & ExcuseGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Breach, Repudiation & ExcuseAcceptance of GoodsRevocation of AcceptanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawSales of GoodsTermination NoticesContracts LawTypes of ContractsExecutory Contracts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.12

§ 490.12 Rescission and Abandonment of Contract Distinguished

Abandonment is another term that has several meanings, one of which is implied mutual rescission. Abandonment by one party is likely to be a form of breach of contract [*C. Norman Peterson Co. v. Container Corp. of America (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 628, 640-644, 218 Cal. Rptr. 592]* . Once one party has abandoned the contract, the other party is not required to tender his or her performance [*Sausalito Bay Land Co. v. Sausalito Improv. Co. (1913) 166 Cal. 302, 308, 136 P. 57* ; *United California Bank v. Maltzman (1974) 44 Cal. App. 3d 41, 52, 118 Cal. Rptr. 299]* . If the other party acquiesces or concurs in the unilateral abandonment, a mutual abandonment amounting to implied mutual rescission results [*C. Norman Peterson Co. v. Container Corp. of America (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 628, 640-643, 218 Cal. Rptr. 592* ; *see § 490.15[2]*].

Whether called mutual abandonment or implied rescission, the conduct of the parties relied on to establish it must be positive, unequivocal, and inconsistent with the contract [*Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see § 490.15[2]*]. Mutual abandonment is a question of intent to be determined from the facts and circumstances surrounding the transaction and out of which the abandonment is claimed to have resulted. It may be implied from the acts of the parties, often from their negotiating a new and different contract concerning the same subject matter [*Busch v. Globe Industries (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 315, 320, 19 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *Honda v. Reed (1958) 156 Cal. App. 2d 536, 539, 319 P.2d 728]* .

Like cancellation or termination, mutual abandonment has been described as abrogating so much of the contract as remains unperformed [*Honda v. Reed (1958) 319 P.2d728* ; *Grant v. Aerodraulics Co. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 68, 75, 204 P.2d 683]* . However, it is not always clear whether the parties intended to reserve any rights after abandonment [*see* *Busch v. Globe Industries (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 315, 320, 19 Cal. Rptr. 441* (noting there was no evidence of any such intention); *Kane v. Sklar (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 480, 481-483, 265 P.2d 29* (employment contract for salary and share of profits mutually abandoned; employee awarded accrued unpaid salary to date of abandonment but held to have no right to share of profits)]. Sometimes, often in the context of a construction contract, after abandoning the original contract the parties continue with the project on a quantum meruit basis [*see* *C. Norman Peterson Co. v. Container Corp. of America (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 628, 644-646, 218 Cal. Rptr. 592* (maximum price contract abandoned by owner's excessive design changes; contractor entitled to recover for work on quantum meruit basis); *Daugherty Co. v. Kimberly-Clark Corp. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 151, 156-159, 92 Cal. Rptr. 120* (same)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachNonperformanceContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.13

§ 490.13 Determining Whether Contract Was Formed or Is Void or Voidable

Whether a contract in fact exists, and if so, whether it is void, or merely voidable, will determine the remedies available. If a contract is voidable, usually notice of rescission and an offer to restore will be necessary to recover what one has parted with [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6)* (illegality as grounds for rescission) (*see § 490.16[3][c]*); *Civ. Code § 1691* (offer to restore), (*see § 490.21*)]. If the contract is void, it may be disregarded without necessity of rescission, and one can proceed on other theories [*Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1015, 1028, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895* (contract described as void for lack of voluntary assent; negligence, conversion, breach of fiduciary duty, conspiracy to commit fraud); for discussion of voidable contracts and contracts that are void based on lack of assent or illegality, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. If there is no contract and plaintiff has not suffered any tort damages, for instance when plaintiff's loss amounts only to that with which he or she has parted, the equitable theory of restitution allows recovery under an implied-in-law contract [*Ward v. Taggart (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 736, 741-743, 336 P.2d 534* ; *Desny v. Wilder (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 715, 734-740, 744, 750, 299 P.2d 257* ; *see § 490.27*].

In determining whether or not a contract was ever formed, a distinction is made between consent that is not free because it was obtained by duress, menace, fraud, undue influence, or mistake [*Civ. Code §§ 1565, 1567*] and consent that is not mutual because the parties did not agree on the same thing in the same sense. If the consent is not free, the contract is not absolutely void, but may be rescinded by the parties [*Civ. Code § 1566*]. If consent is not mutual, no contract is formed [*Chakmak v. H. J. Lucas Masonry, Inc. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 124, 129, 127 Cal. Rptr. 404* (newspaper printed wrong name of contractor for construction of student health center when centers were being bid for Fresno and Hayward campuses; subcontractor's bid intended to be submitted to Hayward contractor was submitted to and accepted by Fresno contractor); *German Sav. and Loan Soc. v. McLellan (1908) 154 Cal. 710, 716, 99 P. 194* ; *Carlson, Collins, Gordon & Bold v. Banducci (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 212, 222, 64 Cal. Rptr. 915]* .

In the context of mistake, when an offer is made on terms that the offeree misunderstands, and the offeree accepts it in terms that the offeror understands as an assent to the offer that he or she meant to make, each party is mistaken about the meaning of the other and no contract exists unless one of the parties so negligently expressed himself or herself that the other was caused to reasonably believe that agreement existed [*Chakmak v. H. J. Lucas Masonry, Inc. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 124, 129, 127 Cal. Rptr. 404]* . In the context of fraud, when the promisor knows what he or she is signing, but the signature is induced by fraud, a voidable contract is formed and notice of rescission and an offer to restore are

necessary. However, when the fraud goes to the inception or execution so that the promisor is deceived as to nature of the act and does not know what he or she is signing or did not intend to enter a contract, mutual assent is lacking, no contract is formed, and rescission is not necessary [*Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895]* . Defenses to formation of contract based on lack of free and mutual assent are discussed in Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawFormationMeeting of MindsContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsImplied-in-Law Contracts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.14

§ 490.14 Contract Provision for Unilateral Termination

A contract provision purporting to give one party the unconditional and unilateral right to terminate the contract at his or her pleasure will cause the entire contract to be unenforceable for lack of mutuality of obligation and want of consideration [*Kowal v. Day (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 720, 723-725, 98 Cal. Rptr. 118]* . The validity of such a provision, and thus the entire contract, is saved if the option is exerciseable only within a certain time or on specified conditions, such as on notice or for cause. Courts do not favor arbitrary termination clauses and tend to interpret even a slight restriction on the exercise of the right as constituting a legal detriment to satisfy the requirement of sufficient consideration [*R. J. Cardinal Co. v. Ritchie (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 124, 143-144, 32 Cal. Rptr. 545]* . Nevertheless, a clause in a contract other than one between employer and employee, which gives one party the right to terminate without cause on notice, is valid and allows that party to terminate on account of the other party's refusal to participate in or condone practices that are contrary to public policy [*Abrahamson v. NME Hospitals, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1325, 1328-1330, 241 Cal. Rptr. 396]* .

A contract that would otherwise fail because of a provision giving one party the unconditional and unilateral right to terminate the contract is saved if at least one party has partially performed [*The Money Store v. Southern California Bank (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 722, 728-729, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58* (lender's performance-providing loan money necessary to complete sale- cured any illusory aspect of agreement); *Kowal v. Day (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 720, 725-728, 98 Cal Rptr 118* (part performance by party who had right to rescind as creating irrevocable option); *Burgermeister Brewing Corp. v. Bowman (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 274, 280, 38 Cal. Rptr. 597* (performance by both parties)].

When a provision allowing one party to unilaterally terminate the contract is valid, unless the contract specifies otherwise, termination of the contract by exercise of the right discharges all liability for further transactions, but obligations that have accrued prior to termination remain enforceable [*Merrill v. Continental Assurance Co. (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 663, 670, 19 Cal. Rptr. 432]* . This is to be distinguished from the ordinarysituation in which there is no termination provision in the contract, but one party unilaterally rescinds for cause. Then, although no liability remains for obligations or breaches that accrued prior to rescission, the compensation and adjustments provided for by *Civ. Code § 1692* (*see § 490.23*) should be taken into account [*see, e.g., Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 308 n. 3, 318-319, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682* ; *see § 490.23[2][b]*].

For discussion of unilateral termination, Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationMutual ObligationContracts LawConsiderationSufficient ConsiderationContracts LawPerformanceDischarges & TerminationsContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.15

§ 490.15 Rescission by Mutual Agreement

[1] Requirements

A contract may be rescinded if all the parties to the contract consent [*Civ. Code § 1689(a)*]. The formalities required for mutual rescission of a contract are the same as those required for formation of a contract--namely a meeting of the minds evidenced by an offer, acceptance, and consideration [*Harriman v. Tetik (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 805, 810, 17 Cal. Rptr. 134, 366 P.2d 486* ; *Tuso v. Green (1924) 194 Cal. 574, 582, 229 P. 327]* . The mutual promises to waive all rights under the contract being rescinded constitute consideration for the rescission [*Schertzinger v. Williams (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 242, 246, 17 Cal. Rptr. 719* ; *Sass v. Hank (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 207, 215, 238 P.2d 652]* . An offer of rescission can be withdrawn at any time before it is accepted [*Sanders Construction Co. v. San Joaquin First Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 387, 397, 186 Cal. Rptr. 218]* . Mutual rescission is sometimes referred to as mutual abandonment [*see, e.g., Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 508, 250 P.2d 283* ; for discussion of mutual abandonment, *see § 490.12*].

[2] Implied Mutual Rescission

A mutual rescission need not be express, but the intent to mutually rescind may be implied from the conduct of the parties [*Unger v. Isaacs (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 533, 535, 266 P.2d 869* ; *see § 490.12*]. The intent of the parties may be determined from the facts and circumstances surrounding the transaction and out of which the mutual abandonment or rescission is claimed to have resulted. It may be implied from the acts of the parties, often from their negotiating a new and different contract concerning the same subject matter [*Busch v. Globe Industries (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 315, 320, 19 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *Honda v. Reed (1958) 156 Cal. App. 2d 536, 539, 319 P.2d 728]* . The conduct of the parties relied on to establish mutual rescission must be positive, unequivocal, and inconsistent with the continued assertion of rights under the contract. For example, conduct equally consistent with illness, as claimed by one party, will not establish an intent to rescind or abandon the contract [*Pennel v. PondUnion School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *Ross v. Tabor (1921) 53 Cal. App. 605, 615, 200 P. 971]* . Commencement of a quiet title action can constitute both a repudiation and an offer of rescission. A cross complaint in that action for reasonable value of services performed amounts to an acceptance [*Mayo v. Pacific Project Consultants, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1018, 82 Cal. Rptr. 117]* .

[3] Oral Rescission of Written Agreement

Unless the contract being rescinded is one for the sale of goods governed by *Com. Code §§ 2101-2801*, and provides that it can only be rescinded in writing, an oral agreement to rescind is sufficient [*Sass v. Hank (1951) 108 Cal. App. 2d 207, 215, 238 P.2d 652* ; *Com. Code § 2209(2)*; *but see Com. Code § 2209(4)* (oral rescission agreement may operate as waiver)]. An oral agreement for rescission of a written contract is sufficient even when the underlying contract is within the statute of frauds [*Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 837, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . An oral agreement for mutual rescission may be specifically enforced [*see Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-842, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856* : for a complaint for specific performance, *see* Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationOffersGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceFailure of ConsiderationContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.16

§ 490.16 Unilateral Rescission for Cause

[1] Grounds

The grounds for rescission are set forth in *Civ. Code § 1689*, discussed *below*.

[2] Failure of Consent

A contract requires that the consent of the parties be free, mutual, and communicated by each to the other [*Civ. Code § 1565*]. Consent that is not free is nevertheless not absolutely void, but provides a basis for rescission [*Civ. Code §§ 1566, 1689(b)(7)*]. Thus, a party to a contract may rescind the contract if his or her consent, or that of any party jointly contracting with him or her, was given by mistake, or obtained through duress, menace, fraud, or undue influence, exercised by or with the connivance of the party as to whom he or she rescinds, or of any party jointly interested with that party [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)*; *see, e.g., Harris v. Rudin, Richman & Appel (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1339, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552* (reversing summary judgment for plaintiff because defendants raised triable issues of fact as to whether they were entitled to rescind settlement agreement based on mutual mistake of fact or law)]. Acts and omissions constituting duress, menace, fraud, undue influence, and mistake that vitiate consent are defined by *Civ. Code §§ 1567-1584*, and are discussed in Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* . Forms for allegations regarding the various bases for failureof consent are contained in that chapter, and may be used in conjunction with § 490.61 of this chapter.

[3] Failure of Consideration

[a] In General

A party to a contract may rescind the contract if the consideration for his or her obligation:

- Fails, in whole or in part, through the fault of the party against whom he or she rescinds [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)*];

- Becomes entirely void from any cause [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(3)*]; or

- Before it is rendered to him or her, fails in a material respect from any cause [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(4)*].

Partial failure of consideration under *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)* must be material in order to provide the basis for rescission [*Wyler v. Feuer (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 392, 403-404, 149 Cal. Rptr. 626* ; *Crofoot Lumber, Inc. v. Thompson (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 324, 332-333, 329 P.2d 302]* . Breach by nonperformance without repudiation supports rescission only if it is so material that it goes to the essence of the contract. It must be a breach that would discharge the rescinding party from any further obligations on his or her part. Failure of consideration is material if it will render it impossible for the rescinding party to perform or will frus trate the whole purpose of the contract. Failure of consideration is immaterial if it is only of minor importance, does not go to the root of the matter, and can be readily compensated for by damages [*Fountain v. Semi-Tropic L. & W. Co. (1893) 99 Cal. 677, 680-681, 34 P. 497* ; *Crofoot Lumber, Inc. v. Thompson (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 324, 332-333, 329 P.2d 302]* . A willful default may be a material failure even though no economic loss ensues [*Coleman v. Mora (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 137, 150, 69 Cal. Rptr. 166* ; *Wilson v. Corrugated Kraft Containers (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 691, 697, 256 P.2d 1012]* . Breach of a requirements contract by purchasing from outside sources is an example of such a willful, material breach that is not vitiated by the ability of the injured party to sell the excess elsewhere [*Wilson v. Corrugated Kraft Containers (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696-697, 256 P.2d 1012]* .

The party against whom the contract is rescinded need not have been the cause of the failure of consideration contemplated by *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(4)* in order for rescission to be available. Failure of consideration from any cause includes failure of consideration on account of acts of third parties. Even though a defendant in such a situation is totally without fault, he or she will still have to return any consideration received from the plaintiff [*Nelson v. Sperling (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 194, 195, 76 Cal. Rptr. 481* (manufacturer failed to deliver home defendant sold to plaintiff)].

If a party gets all the consideration he or she bargained for, the fact that it proves worthless or of little value because of an unexpected occurrence, does not constitute a failure of consideration or ground for rescission [*Fox v. Ehrmantraut (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 127, 137, 167 Cal. Rptr. 595, 615 P.2d 1383* ; *Schultz v. County of Contra Costa (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 242, 247-248, 203 Cal. Rptr. 760* (conveyance of undevelopable property); *Konecko v. Konecko (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 249, 253, 330 P.2d 393* (death of wife as not ground for rescission of property settlement agreement)].

For a form of complaint for relief based on rescission on the ground of failure of consideration, see *§ 490.62*. For further discussion of failure of consideration, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[b] Failure to Pay Money

Failure to pay money is often a breach that will not justify rescission, especially failure to make installment payments, be cause it is a breach that can be compensated by damages [see *Walker v. Harbor Business Blocks Co. (1919) 181 Cal. 773, 780, 186 P. 356* ; *Murphy v. Sheftel (1932) 121 Cal. App. 533, 540, 9 P.2d 568]* . For failure to pay to justify rescission, it must amount to a breach that is material enough to discharge the injured party from further performance. Thus, failure of a producer to pay an actor the weekly salary stipulated by their contract was material enough to give the actor the election to terminate the contract under *Lab. Code § 2925*, as well as to recover accrued salary to the date he elected to declare the termination [*Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Bumgarner (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 331, 350, 17 Cal. Rptr. 171* (willful failure and refusal)]. Similarly, failure of an owner to make progress payments under a contruction contract is material enough to warrant rescission if it involves an extended or unreasonable delay, imposition of new and onerous conditions to payment, outright refusal, or total repudiation [*Porter v. Arrowhead Reservoir Co. (1893) 100 Cal. 500, 504, 35 P. 146* ; *Integrated, Inc. v. Alec Fergusson Electrical Contractor (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 287, 296-297, 58 Cal. Rptr. 503]* . In construction contracts, a material failure to make progress payments, in addition to entitling the contractor to rescind, entitles the contractor to recovery in quantum meruit for the reasonable value of services performed to the date of rescission [*Porter v. Arrowhead Reservoir Co. (1893) 100 Cal.*

500, 502, 35 P. 146 ; *Integrated, Inc. v. Alec Fergusson Electrical Contractor (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 287, 296, 58 Cal. Rptr. 503]* .

[i] Delay in Performance

Delay in performance is another failure of consideration that is often not material. Unless the contract declares time to be of the essence, performance within a reasonable time is sufficient and rescission cannot be granted for a slight delay. What is a reasonable time in any given situation is a question of fact [*Civ. Code § 1657*; *Baypoint Mortgage Corp. v. Crest Premium Real Estate etc. Trust (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 818, 825-826* al. Rptr. 531; *Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 322, 330-331, 27 Cal. Rptr. 744* (dismissal of action 11 days after settlement agreement as reasonable); but see *Fowler v. Ross (1982) 142 Cal. App. 3d 472, 478-478, 191 Cal. Rptr. 183* (no time of the essence clause; rescission upheld on notice given 52 days after date specified for verification of financing)]. Even if the time-essence provision gives a unilateral right of terminiation for failure to perform on time, if the parties by their conduct have waived it, the party seeking to rescind must first make demand for performance, notify the other party that the time provision is being reinstated, and allow a reasonable time after demand for performance [*Major-Blakeney Corp. v. Jenkins (1953) 121 Cal. App. 2d 325, 335-337, 263 P.2d 655* (termination pursuant to time-essence provision giving unilateral right of cancellation held proper after demand on June 29, when performance was seven weeks overdue, for performance by July 5)]. Even when time is declared to be of the essence, a slight delay will not support rescission if rescission would work a forfeiture, the default is not willful, grossly negligent, or a fraudulent breach of duty, and the injured party can be compensated by money [*Civ. Code § 3275* (relief from forfeiture); *Holiday Inns of America v. Knight (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 327, 329, 74 Cal. Rptr. 722, 450 P.2d 42* ; *Williams Plumbing Co. v. Sinsley (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1027, 1031-1035, 126 Cal. Rptr. 345]* .

For further discussion of the time for performance, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[ii] Impossibility or Commercial Frustration

The doctrine of commercial frustration is a species of failure of consideration, akin to the doctrine of impossibility. It operates when a not reasonably foreseeable supervening event totally or nearly totally destroys the value of counterperformance in a contract or lease [*Lloyd v. Murphy (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 48, 53-54, 153 P.2d 47* ; *Federal Leasing Consultants, Inc. v. Mitchell Lipsett Co. (1978) 150 Cal. Rptr. 82* (leased burglar alarm system forced to be rendered inoperable by federal injunction)]. For a form of complaint for relief based on rescission on the ground of failure of consideration, see *§ 490.62*. For discussion of impossibility and commercial frustation, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[c] Contract Unlawful or Prejudicial to Public Interest

The ordinary rule is that a party to an illegal contract can neither recover damages for its breach nor, by rescinding the contract, recover the performance he or she rendered under the contract or its value [*Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 453-454, 296 P.2d 554* ; *Fong v. Miller (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 411, 413, 233 P.2d 606* ; *Rest Contracts 2d § 197*; for forms of affirmative defense based on illegality and conflict with public policy, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. This rule is, however, subject to many exceptions.

A contract contrary to public policy is not always void, nor is it universally true that it cannot be subject to rescission [*People ex rel Mosk v. Barenfeld (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 166, 181, 21 Cal. Rptr. 501]* . The extent of enforceability and the kind of remedy granted depend on factors including the particular policy of law transgressed, the kind of illegality and particular facts, whether the party claiming illegality would be unjustly enriched if the other party were denied recovery, and whether any forfeiture resulting from refusal to permit recovery would be harsh in proportion to the character and extent of the illegality. Relief may also involve restitution of money to either party under the contract or enforcement of an election to rescind by the party to be protected if he or she restores whatever he or she received under

the contract. Generally, all the consequences that attend a contract that is *malum in se* or contrary to public morals do not attend one that is only *malum prohibitum* [*Asdourian v. Araj (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 276, 291-294, 211 Cal. Rptr. 703, 696 P.2d 95* (allowing recovery to contractor under oral contract for home improvement despite statutory requirement that contract be in writing); *South Tahoe Gas Co. v. Hofmann Land Improvement Co. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 750, 758-761, 102 Cal. Rptr. 286* (allowing recovery at reasonable rate under utility contract written at illegal rate); for further discussion, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

A party to a contract may rescind the contract (1) if the contract is unlawful for causes which do not appear in its terms or conditions, and the parties are not equally at fault [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5)*] or (2) if the public interest would be prejudiced by permitting the contract to stand [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(6)*]. A contract is unlawful if its consideration or object is (1) contrary to an express provision of law, (2) contrary to the policy of express law, though not expressly prohibited, or (3) otherwise contrary to good morals [*Civ. Code § 1667*]. Whether a contract is illegal or contrary to public policy is a question of law to be determined from the circumstances of each particular case [*Jackson v. Rogers & Wells (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 336, 349-350, 258 Cal. Rptr. 454* ; *Kallen v. Delug (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 940, 951, 203 Cal. Rptr. 879* ; *Russell v. Soldinger (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 633, 642, 131 Cal. Rptr. 145]* . Although the cases rarely mention *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6),* two rules relating to rescission and restitution reflect application of the rules set forth in *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6)*. Under one rule, similar to *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),* rescission is granted merely because the parties are not equally at fault (*in pari delicto*) [*Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 454-455, 296 P.2d 554* ; *Smith v. Turner (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 141, 145-151, 47 Cal. Rptr. 582* (rescission and restitution of money paid for shares under unlawful preincorporation agreement); *Restatement (2d) of Contracts, § 198*]. Sometimes when this exception is applied, the additional factor of whether or not the contract is executed is taken into consideration. Rescission is allowed under this rationale when the contract is not fully executed and the party rescinding is less at fault. In such a case, it is considered the duty of the court in furtherance of justice to aid one not *in pari delicto,* though to someextent involved in the illegality, and to permit him or her to recover money paid on a contract as the circumstances of the case may require [*Murphy v. San Gabriel Mfg. Co. (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 365, 368-369, 222 P.2d 85* (seller rescinded sale of real property in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11012*)].Whether or not the parties are equally at fault is a question of fact. While even the innocent party is chargeable with knowledge of the law, if he or she has no duty to perform under the applicable law, he or she may assume the other party complied with the law [*Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 454-455, 296 P.2d 554]* .

A second exception provides that even when the parties are equally at fault, there is a period of time referred to as the *locus penitentiae* prior to performance or the accomplishment of the illegal object, during which either party may repent and have rescission [*Wassermann v. Sloss (1897) 117 Cal. 425, 428, 49 P. 566* ; *Glos v. McBride (1920) 47 Cal. App. 688, 690-691, 191 P. 67* (but restitution not allowed for value during portion of lease term prior to renunciation); *Restatement (2d) of Contracts, § 199*].

Another ground for rescission and restitution not addressed by *Civ. Code § 1689(b)* allows recovery when the parties were ignorant of the illegality at the time they entered into the contract [*Adams v. Heinsch (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 300, 302-305, 200 P.2d 796* (also on ground of mistake); *Brashears v. Giannini (1933) 131 Cal. App. 706, 709-711, 22 P.2d 47* ; *Restatement (2d) of Contracts, § 198*].

For a form of complaint for relief after rescission based on these grounds, see *§ 490.64*.

[d] Rescission of Participation in Chain Scheme

A participant in an endless chain scheme, as defined in *Penal Code § 327,* may rescind the contract on which the scheme is based, and may recover all consideration he or she paid pursuant to the scheme, less any amounts paid or consideration provided to him or her pursuant to the scheme [*Civ. Code § 1689.2*]. In such an action, the court may, on motion, award reasonable attorney's fees to a prevailing plaintiff [*Civ. Code § 1689.2*]. *§ 490.64* may be used with appropriate modifications to obtain relief after rescission based on these grounds.

[e] Contract Made Before Adjudication of Incompetency

A contract of a person who is of unsound mind but not totally without understanding, made before his or her incapacity has been judicially determined, may be rescinded [*Civ. Code §§ 39(a), 1689(b)(7)*]. It is not necessary that one be incompetent to enter any kind of contract; the test is whether or not the person could deal with the subject matter of the contract sought to be rescinded with a full understanding of his or her rights and the nature, purpose, and effect of what he or she did with respect to the particular transaction [*Walton v. Bank of California (1963) 218 Cal. App.2d 527, 541, 32 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *Smalley v. Baker (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 824, 832, 69 Cal. Rptr. 521]* . Thus, the test of understanding varies from one contract to the next [*Smalley v. Baker (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 824, 832, 69 Cal. Rptr. 521]* . However, for purposes of rescission, there exists a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that a person is of unsound mind if the person is substantially unable to manage his or her own financial resources or resist fraud or undue influence [*Civ. Code § 39(b)*]. Substantial inability may not be proved solely by isolated incidents of negligence or imprudence [*Civ. Code § 39(b)*]. For further discussion and a form of affirmative defense based on *Civ. Code § 39*, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* . For a form of complaint for relief based on rescission on this ground, see *§ 490.63*.

[f] Creditor's Right to Rescind Novation

When a creditor has accepted the obligation of a third person, or an order on that person in satisfaction, the creditor may rescind the acceptance if the debtor prevents the third person from complying with the order or from fulfulling the obligation; or if, at the time the obligation or order is received, the third person is insolvent, and the fact of insolvency is unknown to the creditor, or if, before the creditor can with reasonable diligence present the order to the person on whom it is given, the third person becomes insolvent [*Civ. Code §§ 1533, 1689(b)(7)*]. This is an exception to the general rule that a novation extinguishes the original obligation, whether or not the obligation of the novation is performed [*see Alexander v. Angel (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 856, 862, 236 P.2d 561* (failure to perform novation did not revive original agreement)].

[g] Repudiation

A party to a contract may rescind the contract if the other party repudiates the contract with respect to a performance not yet due, the loss of which will substantially impair the value of the contract to the rescinding party [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(7)*, referring to former *Civ. Code § 1785* (repealed; *now see Com. Code § 2610*) as a ground for rescission]. The refusal of one party to perform an obligation that is a condition precedent or concurrent will not justify rescission if it is of minor importance or does not go to the root of the matter. A party injured by a refusal of minor importance cannot rescind, but must perform his or her obligations under the contract and seek compensation in damages [*Fountain v. Semi-Tropic L. & W. Co. (1893) 99 Cal. 677, 680, 34 P. 497* ; *see also § 490.62* and *§ 490.62[10]*]. Repudiation gives the injured party the election to treat the contract as rescinded and to recover on a quantum meruit basis the value of any services rendered as partial performance [*Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 302, 273 P.2d 15]* .

A notice of rescission given without legal cause amounts to a repudiation [*Mayo v. Pacific Project Consultants, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1013,1017-1018, 82 Cal. Rptr. 117]* . Likewise, if one is bound to perform, conditioning an offer to perform on an unwarranted condition constitutes a repudiation [*Woody v. Bennett (1891) 88 Cal. 241, 243-244, 26 P. 117* ; *Loop Bldg. Co. v. DeCoo (1929) 97 Cal. App. 354, 364, 275 P. 881]* . An obligor's statement to the obligee indicating that the obligor would breach an important contractual promise, thereby substantially impairing the value of the contract, constitutes repudiation of the contract [*Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc. v. United States (2000) 530 U.S. 604, 120 S. Ct. 2423, 147 L.Ed. 2d 528, 534* (holding that plaintiffs were entitled to restitution whether or not repudiated contracts would have ultimately produced financial gain); *see Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 373*].

[h] Bailments

When a thing is let for a particular purpose and the hirer uses it for any other purpose, the hirer is liable to the letter for all damages resulting from the unauthorized use, or the letter may treat the contract as rescinded [*Civ. Code §§ 1689(b)(7), 1930*]. This type of bailment is discussed in *Ch. 93, Bailments, § 93.60* et seq.

[i] Principal's Rescission of Ratification

A principal may rescind a ratification made without such consent as is required for a contract, or with an imperfect knowledge of the material facts of the transaction ratified, but not otherwise [*Civ. Code §§ 1689(b)(7), 2314*; *see Civ. Code §§ 1565-1590* (consent to contract); *see generally* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*]. However, *Civ. Code § 2314* does not grant the right of rescission to a principal who has deliberately remained ignorant of certain material facts regarding the transaction ratified [*Hutchinson Co. v. Gould (1919) 180 Cal. 356, 358, 181 P. 651]* .

[j] Insurance Contracts

Civ. Code § 1689(b)(7) specifically incorporates the right of rescission granted by the following sections of the Insurance Code [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(7)*]:

- Any party injured by a concealment, whether intentional or unintentional, is entitled to rescind insurance [*Ins. Code § 331*, discussed in Ch. 308, *Insurance* ,];

- An intentional and fraudulent omission, on the part of an insured, to communicate information of matters proving or tending to prove the falsity of a warranty, entitles the insurer to rescind [*Ins. Code § 338*, discussed in Ch. 308, *Insurance* ,];

- Any party injured by a representation that is false in a material point, whether affirmative or promissory, is entitled to rescind the insurance contract from the time the representation becomes false [*Ins. Code § 359*, discussed in Ch. 308, *Insurance* ,];

- The violation of a material warranty or other material provision of a policy, on the part of either party thereto, entitles the other party to rescind [*Ins. Code § 447*, discussed in Ch. 308, *Insurance* ,];

- In marine insurance, if a representation by the insured is intentionally false in any respect, whether material or immaterial, the insurer may rescind the entire contract [*Ins. Code § 1904*; for discussion of marine insurance generally, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* ; *see also California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 44, Marine Insurance, § 44.06[2]* (Matthew Bender)];

- An insurer is entitled to rescind a contract of fire insurance on an alteration in the use or condition of the subject matter insured from that to which it is limited by the policy when the alteration is made without the consent of the insurer by means within the control of the insured, and increases the risk [*Ins. Code § 2030*; *see also California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 35, Property Insurance In General, § 35.12* (Matthew Bender)].

For a general form of affirmative defense based on rescission of an insurance contract, see *Ch. 308, Insurance, § 308.10* et seq. For more detailed coverage of rescission in the context of insurance policies, see *California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 8, The Insurance Contract, §§ 8.08, 8.09, 8.10[1]* (Matthew Bender).

[k] Contracts for Sale of Goods

[i] Applicable Law

Since 1931, *Civ. Code § 1689* has provided that a party to a contract may rescind it under the circumstances provided

for in former *Civ. Code § 1785* and *Civ. Code § 1789* [*see* Stats. 1931, ch. 1070, § 10, p 2260]. Former *Civ. Code § 1789* gave a buyer of goods the election to rescind in the event of the seller's breach of warranty [former *Civ. Code § 1789(1)(d)*]. Former *Civ. Code § 1785* gave a seller of goods the right to rescind when the goods had not been delivered and the buyer had repudiated the contract, manifested an inability to perform, or committed a material breach [former *Civ. Code § 1785*]. Both of those sections were repealed in 1963 and replaced by the California Commercial Code [*see* Stats. 1963, ch. 819].

Under the Commercial Code, the remedies of *Com. Code §§ 2101-2801* will be available if the transaction involves "goods" as defined in *Com. Code § 2105(1)*, which are all things (including specially manufactured goods) that are movable at the time of identification to the contract for sale other than the money in which the price is to be paid, investment securities [*see Com. Code §§ 8101-8603*], and things in action. Goods also includes theunborn young of animals and growing crops and other identified things attached to realty as described in *Com. Code § 2107* [*Com. Code § 2105(1)*]. Unless the context otherwise requires, Division 2 applies to transactions in goods; those sections do not apply to any transaction which, although in the form of an unconditional contract to sell or a present sale, is intended to operate only as a security transaction.

Division 2 does not "impair or repeal" any statute regulating sales to consumers, farmers, or other specified classes of buyers [*Com. Code § 2102*]. This language in *Com. Code § 2102* does not actually exclude particular transactions from the coverage of Division 2. Thus, for example, the sale of an automobile from one dealer to another and the sale of that vehicle by the "buyer" dealer to a consumer are both subject to Division 2, although certain sections of the Vehicle Code and the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) also apply to the transactions [*English v. Ralph Williams Ford (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1046, 95 Cal. Rptr. 501]* .

[ii] Commercial Code Rights and Remedies

In place of the right to rescind for breach of warranty, the Commercial Code established the right of revocation of acceptance of nonconforming goods if the nonconformance substantially impairs the value to the buyer [*Com. Code § 2608*]. Under *Com. Code § 2608*, the buyer need not elect between "revocation of acceptance" and damages, but may have both [*Seely v. White Motor Co. (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 9, 14, 45 Cal. Rptr. 17, 403 P.2d 145* ; *see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2608*; *see also Com. Code §§ 2601-2607* (buyer's rights and duties regarding rejection of delivered goods prior to acceptance; definition and effect of acceptance)].

The rights of either party in the event of a repudiation with respect to a performance not yet due are governed by *Com. Code § 2610*, which allows resort to any remedy for breach [*see also Com. Code §§ 2703-2710* (seller's remedies); *Com. Code §§ 2711-2717* (buyer's remedies)]. The specific manifestation of inability to perform created by the buyer's insolvency is governed by *Com. Code § 2702*. Rights of the buyer in the event of the seller's insolvency are governed by *Com. Code § 2502*.

Under the Commerical Code, specific types of material breach or failure of consideration require that specific steps be taken by the injured party. For example, a buyer who rejects nonconforming goods on inspection before acceptance is required to follow the seller's instructions regarding those goods or to resell them [*Com. Code § 2603*]. The remedies provided are equally specific and generally include consequential damages [*see, e.g., Com. Code §§ 2711-2717* (buyer's remedies)]. In most instances, however, unlike the Civil Code rescission provisions applicable to other contracts, the Commercial Code remedies are cumulative and allow the equivalent of rescission, albeit sometimes under other names, as well as recovery of damages [*see Com. Code § 2721* (rescission as not barring, nor as inconsistent with, other remedies for fraud); *Seely v. White Motor Co. (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 9, 14, 45 Cal. Rptr. 17, 403 P.2d 145* (no election between rescission and damages required on breach of warranty); *see also* U.C.C. and Cal. Code Comments to *Com. Code § 2703*].

If the transaction is governed by Division 2, remedies for material misrepresentation or fraud include all remedies

available under Division 2 for nonfraudulent breach, and neither rescission or a claim for rescission of the contract for sale nor rejection or return of the goods bars, or is to be deemed inconsistent with, a claim for damages or other remedy [*Com. Code § 2721*]. Since *Com. Code § 2714(2),(3)* provides that the measure of damages for breach of warranty is the difference at the time and place of acceptance between the value of the goods accepted and the value they would have had if they had been as warranted, unless special circumstances show proximate damages of a different amount, and also provides for recovery of incidental and consequential damages in a proper case, the effect of *Com. Code § 2721* may be to change the "out-of-pocket" measure of damages for fraud set forth in *Civ. Code § 3343* to substitute or permit the "loss of bargain" rule under which the defrauded party is permitted to obtain the benefits he or she would have received if the representations had been true [*see Civ. Code § 3343*; *Com. Code §§ 2714, 2721*; *see also Com. Code § 2721*, Cal. Code Comment]. Unless the contrary intention clearly appears, expressions of "cancellation" or "rescission" of a contract or the like will not be construed as a renunciation or discharge of any claim in damages for an antecedent breach [*Com. Code § 2720*].

Although punitive damages ordinarily are not recoverable under the Commercial Code, they may be recovered if provided for by another statute [*Com. Code § 1305(a)*; *see Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 336-337, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599* (class action seeking punitive damages and stating causes of action for fraud and Commercial Code warranty claims)].

The remedies available under Division 2, other than those for breach of warranty, are discussed in Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* . Remedies for breach of warranty under *Com. Code §§ 2321(2), 2607, 2714, 2715, 2800, 2801*, and *8301 et seq.* are discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .

[l] Transfer of Corporation Share Certificates

Since 1961, *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(7)* has provided that a party to a contract may rescind it under the circumstances provided for in former Corp. Code § 2470 [*see* Stats. 1961, ch. 589, § 1]. Former Corp. Code § 2470 was repealed in 1963 [*see* Stats. 1963, ch. 819, § 34]. It established grounds for rescission of transfer ofshare certificates.

Currently, various statutory provisions specifically provide a right of rescission to purchasers of corporate securities under specified circumstances. These statutes include *Corp. Code § 25501*, which authorizes rescission for violation of *Corp. Code § 25401*, which generally prohibits material misrepresentations in connection with the purchase or sale of securities, and *Com. Code § 8307*, which permits a purchaser of investment securities to rescind a transaction if the transferor refuses, within a reasonable time, to comply with the transferee's demand for proof of the transferor's authority to transfer the security or with any other requisite necessary to obtain registration of the transfer.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsExpress ConditionsTime LimitationsContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceFailure of ConsiderationContracts LawPerformanceImpossibility of PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceImpossibility of PerformanceImpracticabilityContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefQuantum MeruitContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsConstruction Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.17

§ 490.17 Partial Rescission

Generally one must rescind all of the contract and cannot retain the rights under it that he or she deems desirable to have and rescind the remainder [*IMO Development Corp. v. Dow Corning Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 451, 458, 185 Cal. Rptr. 341]* . However, this rule is not controlling in the case of a severable or divisible contract. If the consideration for a contract is entire, the contract is entire and not divisible. If the consideration is apportioned, the contract may be regarded as severable. A contract may be severable as to some of its terms, or for certain purposes, but indivisible as to others [*Simmons v. California Institute of Technology (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 264, 275, 209 P.2d 581* (rescission of royalty agreement as to licensee but not as to manufacturer); *Merced County Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. State of California (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 765, 775-776, 284 Cal. Rptr. 680* (additional insured endorsement severable from main policy and could be separately rescinded); *Howell v. Courtesy Chevrolet, Inc. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 391, 404, 94 Cal. Rptr. 33* (rescission of garbage truck sales as to rubbish bodies that were to have been furnished by another company but were never mounted on trucks)]. If there is a showing that the parties intended to treat the contract as entire and that they would not have entered into it except on a clear understanding that the full object of the contract would be performed, the contract is not divisible [*IMO Development Corp. v. Dow Corning Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 451, 458-459, 185 Cal. Rptr. 341]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsDivisible Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.18

§ 490.18 Rescission of Gifts

A gift can be rescinded if it was induced by fraud or material misrepresentation, whether committed by the donee or a third person, or by mistake as to a basic fact. The failure of the donee to reveal material facts when he or she knows that the donor is mistaken as to those facts is fraudulent nondisclosure. A mistake as to the identity or essential character of the gift or one that entails a frustration of the donor's purpose entitles the donor to restitution [*Earl v. Saks & Co (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 602, 609, 226 P.2d 340* ; *see also Restatement Restitution, §§ 26, 39* and Comments]. In one case, it was held that when the retailer and the donee both lied to a purchaser/donor about the price of a gift and the fact that the donee paid part of the price, the purchaser/donor was entitled to rescind both the purchase and the gift although no economic injury was suffered. The injury is in the alteration of the essential character of the transaction and to the donor's interest in making a free choice and exercising his or her own judgment in the transaction [*Earl v. Saks & Co (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 602, 609-613, 226 P.2d 340]* .

A gift may also be rescinded on the ground of undue influence [*see Estate of Bliss (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 630, 639-640, 18 Cal. Rptr. 821* (elements leading to presumption of undue influence); *McDonald v. Hewlett (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 680, 686, 228 P.2d 83]* .

For further discussion and forms relating to rescission of gifts, see Ch. 278, *Gifts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawPersonal GiftsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawWill ContestsUndue InfluenceElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.19

§ 490.19 Rescission of Third-Party Beneficiary Contracts

A third-party beneficiary contract may be rescinded by the parties just like any other contract at any time before the third-party beneficiary has accepted it, or a benefit under it, or changed his or her position in reliance on it [*see Civ. Code § 1559*; *R. J. Cardinal Co. v. Ritchie (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 124, 149-150, 32 Cal. Rptr. 545* ; *Griffin v. Williamson (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 308, 317-318, 290 P.2d 361* (no acceptance found)]. Even if the third-party beneficiary has accepted the contract for his or her benefit, rescission is still permissible if the third-party beneficiary had knowledge of the facts that provide the ground for rescission at the time he or she accepted the property. A third-party beneficiary who has notice of the possible defect in the underlying contract at the time he or she received the benefit must make restitution [*see Holmes v. Steele (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 675, 678-679, 75 Cal. Rptr. 216* (broker as third-party creditor beneficiary of real estate sales contract)]. However, a third-party beneficiary has no standing to rescind a contract [*Schauer v. Mandarin Gems of California, Inc. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 949, 957-958, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawThird PartiesBeneficiariesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.20

§ 490.20 Defenses to Rescission

[1] Executed Contract

Rescission is unavailable to one who has fully performed under the contract when the counterperformance owing is only money; however, full performance does not bar rescission if at least some of the return consideration is other than a liquidated debt [*Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 306-307, 273 P.2d 15]* .

[2] "Rescinding" Party in Default

A party cannot unilaterally rescind if he or she is in material default of performance of a covenant or obligation on which the obligation the other party has failed to perform is dependent or that is concurrent to the obligation the other party has failed to perform or that affects the other party's performance or duty to perform [*Nelson v. Spence (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 493, 499, 6 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *Joshua Tree T. Co. v. Joshua Tree L. Co. (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 590, 596, 224 P.2d 85]* . This rule will not prevent rescission if the default of the rescinding party is unrelated to the other party's obligation on which the asserted right of rescission is based [*American-Hawaiian Engineering & Constr. Co. v. Butler (1913) 165 Cal. 497, 516, 133 P. 280* ; *Integrated, Inc. v. Alec Fergusson Electrical Contractor (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 287, 298, 58 Cal. Rptr. 503]* . California's presumption against construing covenants is dependent, especially when the "rescinding" party's default is partial and can be fully compensated. If the party in default is entitled to rescind, its obligation to perform will be expunged by the rescission [*FDIC v. Air Florida System, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 822 F.2d 833, 841]* .

Moreover, a purchaser who has been defrauded may have rescission even though he or she is in default, because such a purchaser has a right to withhold payments once he or she learns of the grounds for rescission [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 783, 128 P.2d 868* ; *Warfield v. Richey (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 93, 97-98, 334 P.2d 101]* .

[3] Waiver of Right to Rescind

When a party has full knowledge of the facts that would warrant rescission but nevertheless accepts and receives benefits under a contract, waiver of his or her right to rescind will be presumed [*Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 458, 154 P.2d 854* ; *Whitney Inv. Co. v. Westview Dev. Co. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 594, 603, 78 Cal. Rptr. 302]* .

To support a claim of waiver, the conduct must be so inconsistent with an intent to enforce the contract as to induce a reasonable belief that the right to rescind has been relinquished [*Soon v. Beckman (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 33, 36, 44 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *Howard J. White, Inc. v. Varian Associates (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 348, 355, 2 Cal. Rptr. 871]* . Waiver is a question of fact to be determined after consideration of all the circumstances of the particular case. Acceptance of rent accruing after a known default is a common example of waiver [*Soon v. Beckman (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 33, 36, 44 Cal. Rptr. 190]* . A spouse could not rescind a property settlement agreement on the ground that the other spouse delayed unreasonably in dismissing a separate maintenance action because, before the attempted rescission and after the dismissal had been filed, he continued to reap the benefits of that agreement by not making support payments as called for by an order in the action dismissed [*Palmquist v. Palmquist (1963) 27 Cal. Rptr. 744]* . Acceptance of later performance waives the right to rescind for failure of compliance with a time provision [*Leiter v. Eltinge (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 306, 317, 54 Cal. Rptr. 703]* . For discussion of waiver by delay, see *§ 490.20[5]*.

Acts by which the rescinding party preserves the subject matter in order to be able to restore it to the party against whom he or she rescinds will not amount to waiver. For instance, one can make payments on a note or mortgage after giving notice of rescission without waiving the right to rescind [*Hefferan v. Freebairn (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 715, 723, 214 P.2d 386* (payments made with intent to avoid default); *see Cameron v. Evans Securities Corp. (1931) 119 Cal. App. 164, 171, 6 P.2d 272* (payments made after discovery of fraud but before giving of notice, offer to restore)]. Payment of stock assessments does not necessarily waive the right to rescind a stock purchase [*Munson v. Fishburn (1920) 183 Cal. 206, 215, 190 P. 808]* .

Waiver is an affirmative defense that must be pleaded [*Calabrese v. Rexall Drug & Chemical Co. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 774, 785, 32 Cal. Rptr. 665* ; for a form of affirmative defense of waiver, *see § 490.65*].

[4] Statute of Limitations

An action based on the rescission of a contract in writing is subject to a four-year limitation period that commences on the date on which the facts that entitle the aggrieved party to rescind occurred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337(3)*; *Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 873, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* (referred to as limitation for rescission of written contract); *see Luna Records Corp., Inc. v. Alvarado (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1026, 283 Cal. Rptr. 865* (parties had consented in writing to rescission; court and parties considered statute as beginning to run on date of written consent to rescission)].

If the ground for rescission is fraud or mistake, the time does not begin to run until the discovery by the aggrieved party of the facts constituting the fraud or mistake [*but see Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 873, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* (action commenced in 1978 for rescission of marital settlement agreement based on misrepresentation of value of stock; statute commenced when spouse first had constructive notice and thus duty to inquire arose in 1971-1972, not with spouse's sale of stock in 1977); *Keidatz v. Albany (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 826, 829, 249 P.2d 264* (action for rescission for fraud filed one year after discovery as barred by laches)].

If the ground for rescission is misrepresentation under *Ins. Code § 359*, the time does not begin to run until the representation becomes false [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337(3)*].

If the claim for rescission is brought as a cross complaint in an action for breach of contract, the limitation period "relates back" to the time thecomplaint was filed; but, if no cross complaint is filed, the limitation period is not considered tolled or suspended while the breach of contract action is pending [*Luna Records Corp. v. Alvarado (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1028-1031, 283 Cal. Rptr. 865]* . In *Luna Records*, plaintiff notified defendants that it had rescinded the contract for failure of consideration. Defendants consented to the rescission in writing on June 1, 1981. Defendants, however, never returned the consideration furnished by plaintiff, and commenced a breach of contract action against plaintiff on August 7, 1981. Plaintiff never filed an answer or a cross complaint in that action, which was dismissed on August 1, 1985, on the court's own motion for lack of prosecution. Plaintiff commenced an action for

rescission in July 1988, claiming that the statute of limitations was tolled during the pendency of the breach of contract action. The court of appeal held otherwise, making the distinction described above between "tolling" and relating back: it is the fact that the action is pending that triggers the relation-back doctrine and allows a defendant to file in that action a cross complaint that was viable when the complaint was filed. If the defendant makes no appearance and offers no defense or cross claim, there is simply nothing to relate back [*Luna Records Corp. v. Alvarado (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1028, 283 Cal. Rptr. 865]* .

[5] Prejudicial Delay

Since September 15, 1961, a delay in giving notice of rescission or tendering restoration of benefits received does not bar relief based on rescission unless the delay has substantially prejudiced the other party [*Civ. Code § 1693*]. This is a reversal of prior case law that held that no prejudice had to be shown in order for laches to bar rescission [*Wilke v. Coinway, Inc. (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 126, 140, 64 Cal. Rptr. 845]* . Ordinarily, the defense of laches does not rest entirely on the lapse of time, as does a statute of limitations. Laches can be applied, even if any applicable limitation period has not run, if, in addition to mere showing of passive neglect or acquiescence in the acts complained of, other circumstances make the granting of relief inequitable [*Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 460, 154 P.2d 854* (acceptance of royalties under transfer of mining interests sought to be rescinded and fluctuations in value of mining interests in general as rendering rescission inequitable); *Joshua Tree T. Co. v. Joshua Tree L. Co. (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 590, 596-597, 224 P.2d 85* (plaintiff's own defaults that prevented defendant from doing anything with land that was the subject of the contract as providing equitable grounds for application of laches)].

Under prior law, a complaint was demurrable if it showed an unexplained delay between the discovery of the ground for rescission and the notice of rescission [*Williams v. Smith (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 607, 612, 274 P.2d 204]* . Since adoption of *Civ. Code § 1693*, however, a plaintiff seeking relief based on rescission need not establish promptness. The defendant must establish that he or she has been prejudiced by any delay. Prejudice is a question of fact to be determined from the particular circumstances of each case [*see Saret-Cook v. Gilbert, Kelly, Crowley & Jennett (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1225-1227, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732* (employee's delay in giving notice of rescission of settlement agreement resulted in substantial prejudice to employer); *In re Consol. Pretrial Proceedings in Air West (N.D. Cal. 1977) 436 F. Supp. 1281, 1290* (applying California law)]. Laches and waiver are sometimes pleaded or established together [*see, e.g., Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 458-461, 154 P.2d 854]* as are laches, waiver, and estoppel [*see, e.g., Wilson v. Beazley (1921) 186 Cal. 437, 441-442, 199 P. 772]* . Forms for affirmative defenses based on waiver, prejudicial delay, and estoppel by election of another remedy are *set forth in § 490.65 -490.67*, respectively.

[6] Substantive Statute or Policy Precludes Rescission

[a] Judicial Privilege

The judicial privilege of *Civ. Code § 47(b)* precludes rescission. In a federal diversity action turning on California law, one court concluded that participation in a government investigation was within the privilege and denied the purchaser of a $762,240 computer system rescission after it paid for the system and received a "dummy" system [*Caesar Electronics Inc. v. Andrews (9th Cir. 1990) 905 F.2d 287, 289-290]* . The manufacturer suspected that the system, which could be converted to military use and was therefore subject to strict export regulations, was going to be diverted to a purchaser other than the ostensible purchaser and notified the United States Customs Service of its suspicions. After receiving written assurances from the United States Departments of Justice and Commerce that it was acting with the consent of those departments, the manufacturer aided in the government's investigation, including giving false information to the purchaser. It manufactured a "dummy" system, which the government substituted for the functioning one immediately before its shipment to France. The purchaser had opened a letter of credit in a Swiss bank. On presentation of the shipping documents, the purchaser authorized transfer of the funds to the manufacturer. The purchaser, its agent, and key officers of each were charged with violations of United States export laws and French customs laws. The purchaser sued for rescission and damages for fraud and breach of fiduciary duty. All relief was

denied on the basis of *Civ. Code § 47(b)*. For further discussion of *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, see *Ch. 340, Libel and Slander, § 340.50* et seq.

[b] Health Care Service Plan Contracts

Health & Safety Code § 1389.3 proscribes post-claim underwriting [*see* [c], *below*] by a health care service plan and has the effect of precluding a health care service plan's rescission of a subscriber's contract because of the subscriber's material misrepresentation or omission, unless the health care service plan can demonstrate that the misrepresentation or omission was willful or that the health care service plan made reasonable efforts, as part of the pre-contract underwriting process, to ensure that the subscriber's application was accurate and complete [*Hailey v. California Physicians' Service (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 452, 459, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789*].

[c] Insurance Contracts: Post-Claim Underwriting

Health & Safety Code § 1389.3 [*see* [b], *above*] proscribes a practice, common in the insurance business generally, known as post-claim underwriting. It is the practice, by an insurer, of waiting until a claim has been filed before diligently obtaining the relevant information and making the underwriting decision--something that should be done when the application for insurance is made and before the policy is issued. Inother words, the insurer postpones doing significant underwriting research (such as investigating a health care service plan subscriber's pre-contract health) until after a claim is made, so as to determine then whether to rescind the insurance contract on the ground of misrepresentations or omissions in the application. It is not clear whether post-claim underwriting would preclude rescission of an insurance contract in circumstances in which a statute like *Health & Safety Code § 1389.3* did not exist or could not be invoked [*cf.* *Hailey v. California Physicians' Service (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 452, 467-469, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789* (discussing reasons to support that result in absence of applicable statute; but in this case, section 1389.3 did apply and provided sufficient basis for decision)].

It appears that *Ins. Code § 331* ("Concealment, whether intentional or unintentional, entitles the injured party to rescind insurance.") and considerations of public policy can support the imposition of a no-rescission rule on an automobile insurer that engaged in post-claim underwriting in a particular case [*see* *Barrera v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 659, 79 Cal. Rptr. 106, 456 P. 2d 674* ; *Hailey v. California Physicians' Service (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 452, 469-471, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789* (effect of *Barrera* explained)].

If an insurance contract were wrongly rescinded by the insurer, in a case of post-claim underwriting, the insured probably would have a bad faith claim against the insurer [*see* *Hailey v. California Physicians' Service (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 452, 472-473, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789*]. For discussion of bad faith claims against insurers, see *Ch. 308, Insurance, § 308.24*. The insured might also have a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress [*see* *Hailey v. California Physicians' Service (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 452, 473-476, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789*]. For discussion of that cause of action, see *Ch. 362, Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress, § 362.10*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsExpress ConditionsTime LimitationsContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.21

§ 490.21 Notice of Rescission and Offer to Restore Consideration

[1] Requirements

Subject to *Civ. Code § 1693, see § 490.20[5]*, a party seeking rescission must, promptly on discovering the facts that entitle him or her to rescind if he or she is free from duress, menace, undue influence, or disability andis aware of his or her right to rescind, give notice of rescission to the party as to whom he or she rescinds and restore to the other party everything of value that he or she has received from that party under the contract or offer to restore everything received on condition that the other party do the same, unless the other party is unable to do so or positively refuses to do so [*Civ. Code § 1691*]. When notice of rescission has not otherwise been given or an offer to restore the benefits received under the contract has not otherwise been made, service of a pleading in an action or proceeding that seeks relief based on rescission is deemed notice or an offer to restore or both [*Civ. Code § 1691*].

It is not necessary that the notice of rescission be formal and explicit; a notice is sufficient if it clearly shows the intention of the person rescinding to consider the contract at an end [*Hull v. Ray (1930) 211 Cal. 164, 167-168, 294 P. 700* ; *Wilson v. Lewis (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 802, 809, 165 Cal. Rptr. 396]* . Thus, notice of rescission need not state the grounds relied on. One may even justify an asserted rescission by proving that at the time there was adequate cause although it did not become known to the rescinding party until after the asserted rescission [*Earl v. Saks & Co. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 602, 609, 226 P.2d 340* ; *Wilson v. Lewis (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 802, 809, 165 Cal. Rptr. 396]* . For example, a seller's oral rescission of a contract for the sale of real property was effective although she did not learn of the failure of consideration providing the ground for rescission until later [*see Wilson v. Lewis (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 802, 809-810, 165 Cal. Rptr. 396]* .

[2] Restoration or Offer to Restore Excused

If the rescinding party has not received anything of value, no offer to restore is necessary [*Orton v. Privett (1927) 202 Cal. 754, 757, 262 P. 713* (total failure of consideration); *Realty Co. of America v. Burton (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 178, 195-196, 325 P.2d 171]* . For example, when plaintiffs, owners of an oil and gas lease, hired defendants to drill a well to a depth of 5,000 feet, and defendants abandoned the work after drilling a crooked well to a depth of 2,111 feet, leaving their equipment cemented to the well and over it, making other drilling operations impossible, plaintiffs had received nothing of value and were not required to make restoration [*Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling*

etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 873-874, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508] . No offer of restoration is necessary when the plaintiff would be entitled to whatever would be restored in any event. This rule applies after rescission based on breach of contract when plaintiff has rendered services in part performance. Because such a plaintiff would be entitled to the reasonable value of those services, payments made under the contract before breach need not be restored [*Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 306, 273 P.2d 15* ; *Hil-Mac Corp. v. Mendo Wood Products, Inc. (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530, 45 Cal. Rptr. 396]* . Nor is an offer to restore necessary when the transactions between the parties are so complicated that full judicial action or an accounting is necessary to determine their respective rights [*California etc. Co. v. Schiappa-Pietra (1907) 151 Cal. 732, 739-742, 91 P. 593* ; *Klein v. Farmer (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 51, 61-62, 160 P.2d 30]* .

No offer to restore is necessary when, because of no fault of the rescinding party, restoration cannot be made [*Carruth v. Fritch (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 426, 430-431, 224 P.2d 702* (defendant's fraud); *Stegeman v. Vandeventer (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 753, 760-762, 135 P.2d 186* (same)]. When the rescinding party seeks return of the specific thing with which he or she has parted, as opposed to the value of it, no offer to restore need be made prior to commencement of the action. In an action for relief based on rescission, the court can condition return of the specific property on return of the consideration received by the rescinding party [*see Civ. Code § 1692* (rescinding party may recover thing parted with); *Alder v. Drudis (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 372, 384, 182 P.2d 195* (rescinding party sought return of models of invention)]. Failure to make an offer of restoration does not bar recovery if the court can fashion a decree that adjusts the equities between parties [*Alder v. Drudis (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 372, 384-385, 182 P.2d 195* ; *Lobdell v. Miller (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 328, 344, 250 P.2d 357* (status quo as not required to be exactly reproduced)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformanceFailure of ConsiderationContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitution

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.22

§ 490.22 Judicial Enforcement of Rescission

[1] By Action or as Defense

The party seeking rescission may begin either by giving notice of rescission and, if necessary, restoring or offering to restore any benefits he or she received under the contract, or by instituting an action for relief based on rescission [*see Civ. Code § 1691* (service of pleading in action for relief based on rescission deemed notice and offer to restore)]. If the rescinding party has not restored or offered to restore anything he or she received under the contract before commencing suit, he or she will have to preserve anything received by him or her during the pendency of the action so that it can be returned [*see Prichard v. Reitz (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 465, 467-469, 223 Cal. Rptr. 734* (rescission of real property sale as unavailable after purchasers demolished house with defective foundation, believing that was only way to correct defect)]. A rescinding party who gives notice of rescission and restores or offers to restore benefits does not have to commence an action for additional relief based on rescission, but may wait to see if the other party insists on performance. If the party against whom the contract was rescinded insists on performance and sues the rescinding party, the rescinding party then can assert the rescission and seek relief based on the rescission by way of defense and/or cross complaint [*Civ. Code § 1692*; for forms of affirmative defense based on rescission, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

[2] Nature of Action

Prior to 1961, a party seeking to rescind a contract had two options. He or she could invoke the power of a court of equity to effect a rescission that had not previously been made [*see* former *Civ. Code §§ 3406-3408*]; or, he or she could effect "unilateral" rescission as provided in *Civ. Code §§ 1688-1691*, going into court based on a prior out-of-court rescission if met with a reluctant response from the party as to whom the contract was rescinded. Since 1961, the rescinding party has been able to seek any form of relief warranted by the situation, whether legal or equitable in nature in an action or cross action. The fusing of the procedures available under prior law did not eradicate the substantial differences in the underlying procedures. Now, the right to a jury trial and the court in which the action must be brought are determined by the nature of the substantive relief requested [*Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 311-313, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682]* .

Under prior law, if a party sought the legal remedy (court enforcement of an out-of-court rescission), the court could not award any consequential damages, but was limited to restoration of the consideration received by the defendant [

Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 314, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682 ; *Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 518, 36 P.2d 635]* . The present statute, like the former equitable remedy, authorizes the court to provide the aggrieved party complete relief and to otherwise adjust the equities between the parties [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 314-318, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682]* .

[3] Form of Action

Relief based on rescission may seek only money, or it may take the form of an action for declaratory relief or one for claim and delivery [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *see, e.g., City of Torrance v. Castner (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 76, 77-78, 83, 120 Cal. Rptr. 23* (setting aside sale by purchaser at execution sale; judgment debtor did not own property on which levy was made); *but see Alder v. Drudis (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 372, 384-385, 182 P.2d 195* (judgment for plaintiff in action for claim and delivery as not proper unless conditioned on plaintiff's restoration of benefits received under rescinded contracts); *see* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery*].

Imposition of a constructive trust on the consideration paid by the plaintiff is another possible way of implementing relief following rescission. It is especially useful when the consideration paid by plaintiff has reaped profits or dividends or secondary rights and is often coupled with a request for an accounting of those profits [*see Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 455, 461-468, 154 P.2d 854* (reversing sustaining of demurrer); *see* Chs. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* and 562, *Resulting Trusts*].

A common count for money had and received is also appropriate, based on the implied promise of restitution arising after rescission [*Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 312, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682* ; *Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 523-526, 36 P.2d 635* ; *see* Ch. 121, *Common Counts*].

Quiet title may be a proper procedural alternative in some instances. For instance if a vendee fails to make any payments, the vendor is entitled to rescission on the ground of failure of consideration. If such a vendee refuses to comply with a demand by the vendor for rescission and return of the deed, the vendor is entitled to have his or her title quieted [*J. R. Garrett Co. v. States (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 379, 383-384, 44 P.2d 538]* . Commencement of a quiet title action after sending notice of rescission may amount to an offer of rescission. In that instance, a cross complaint for the reasonable value of services rendered amounts to an acceptance of the offer [*Mayo v. Pacific Project Consultants, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1018, 82 Cal. Rptr. 117* ; *see* Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*]. A vendor's retaking possession and commencing a quiet title action without offering to restore excess payments to the purchaser does not amount to rescission or an offer of rescission [*Gantner v. Johnson (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 869, 875, 79 Cal. Rptr. 381]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityReliefCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionMoney Had & ReceivedContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.23

§ 490.23 Recovery by Rescinding Party

[1] In General

When a contract has been rescinded in whole or in part, any party to the contract may seek relief based on rescission by bringing an action to recover any money or thing owing to him or her by the other party to the contract as a consequence of the rescission or for any other relief to which he or she may be entitled under the circumstances [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *see Alder v. Drudis (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 372, 384-385, 182 P.2d 195* (recovery of specific property)]. Rescission may also be asserted as an affirmative defense to an action on the contract [*Civ. Code § 1692*; for a form of affirmative defense based on rescission, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

If the relief sought by a plaintiff based on rescission cannot be awarded because rescission has not in fact occurred, the court may grant any party to the action any relief to which he or she is entitled under the circumstances [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *see, e.g., Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* .

[2] Restitution and Consequential Damages

[a] Recoverable

A claim for damages is not inconsistent with a claim for relief based on rescission. The aggrieved party is entitled to complete relief, includingrestitution of any benefits conferred by him or her as a result of the transaction and any consequential damages to which he or she is entitled. However, duplicate recovery or inconsistent items of recovery are not permitted [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *see, e.g., Jahn v. Brickey (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406, 214 Cal. Rptr. 119* (seller's loss on sale seller rescinded disallowed by trial court as duplicative; not contested on appeal)]. Some courts have used *Civ. Code § 1692* to allow damages for fraud as well as consequential damages required to make the rescinding party whole [*Jahn v. Brickey (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406-407, 214 Cal. Rptr. 119* (consequential damages after rescission and emotional distress damages for fraud and breach of fiduciary duty relating to rescinded contract as not inconsistent)], whereas others have adhered to the rule applicable under prior law, requiring the rescinding party to elect between damages for fraud and rescissionary relief [*Whistler v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 108, 118, 91 Cal. Rptr. 879]* .

Restitution is discretionary with the court and is not required even when rescission is ordered. Before restitution can be ordered, it must be determined that the party seeking restitution has conferred a benefit or something of economic value on the other party [*Ogden Martin Systems v. San Bernardino County (9th Cir. 1991) 932 F.2d 1284, 1287* (applying California law and finding that environmental impact report compiled by contractor at cost of $3.5 million amounted to benefit conferred on county)]. In a case in which plaintiffs sought restitution after the federal government repudiated their contracts, the United States Supreme Court held that plaintiffs were entitled to restitution whether or not the repudiated contracts would have ultimately produced financial gain to plaintiffs [*Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc. v. United States (2000) 530 U.S. 604, 120 S. Ct. 2423, 147 L.Ed. 2d 528, 543-544]* .

[b] Examples of Consequential Damages

The consequential damages recoverable vary widely from case to case. For example, a vendee of real property can recover any portion of the purchase price paid, plus the value of any improvements he or she made to the property, less the reasonable rental value of the land while he or she had possession [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 785-786, 128 P.2d 868* ; *see Whistler v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 108, 115, 91 Cal. Rptr. 879* (calculation in findings included improvements, loan payments, moving costs, downpayment, less offset for use of house)]. A rescinding vendee can also recover any payments made on a mortgage placed on the property by the vendor [*Arthur v. Graham (1923) 64 Cal. App. 608, 612, 222 P. 371]* . A seller who rescinds a sale of personal property may recover the reasonable value of the use of the property during the time the purchaser had possession [*Vice v. Thacker (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 84, 92, 180 P.2d 4* ; *see Gentry v. Kelley Kar Co. (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 324, 337, 14 Cal. Rptr. 121* (seller cannot omit evidence of value of use and base award on depreciation during time purchaser had possession); *see also Berge v. International Harvester Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 152, 163, 190 Cal. Rptr. 815* (buyer's award of restitution and lost profits were offset by reasonable rental value of item purchased prior to repossession by seller)].

The purchaser of a franchise who gave up his former employment to operate the franchise and later rescinded that transaction was entitled, in addition to the return of the franchise fee, to consequential damages including loss of income from the date the service area contract was signed to the date of the notice of rescission at the rate of his former salary, plus his training and operating expenses, less the gross income from the franchise operation [*Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 308 n. 3, 318-319, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682]* . Consequential damages recoverable by a lender on rescission of a fraudulently induced loan secured by a second deed of trust include amounts advanced for payments on the first deed of trust and for maintenance of the property taken back in foreclosure, as well as costs and attorney's fees expended for the appointment of a receiver in accordance with a trust deed provision, net of deductions for rentals received [*Kass v. Weber (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 417, 420 n.2, 423-424, 67 Cal. Rptr. 876]* .

Towing charges and rental expense for a substitute vehicle are proper elements of consequential damages on rescission of a vehicle conditional sale contract [*Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 376, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749]* .

After rescission of an insurance contract, the insured is entitled to recover the premiums paid and whatever else may be required to restore the insured to the *status quo ante* as though the insurance contract had never existed [*Akin v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 291, 298, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 284]* .

[3] Emotional Distress

The case law is inconsistent with respect to whether damages for emotional distress can be recovered as a form of consequential damages under *Civ. Code § 1692*. They have been denied under both *Civ. Code § 1692* and *Civ. Code § 3343* if rescission was granted on the ground of undue influence or fraud [*In re Marriage of McNeill (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 548, 559, 206 Cal. Rptr. 641* ; *O'Neil v. Spillane (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 147, 158-159, 119 Cal. Rptr. 245]* . Damages for emotional distress have been sustained on the theory that plaintiff had also prevailed on tort theories [*Jahn v. Brickey (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406-407, 214 Cal. Rptr. 119* (court's finding that rescission was available did not require plaintiff to elect between rescisssionary relief and tort remedies); *see Erlich v. Menezes (1999) 21 Cal.*

4th 543, 551-554, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886, 981 P.2d 978 (discussing when breach of contract allows recovery of tort damagesincluding emotional distress); *see also* discussion § 490.42[2]].

Damages for emotional distress are not recoverable as consequential damages for breach of contract, subject to a narrow exception when emotional tranquility is the contract's essence [*see Erlich v. Menezes (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 543, 558-560, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886, 981 P.2d 978* (recognizing exception, but declining to extend it to action regarding home constructiondefect)]. For further discussion of the availability of damages for emotional distress, see Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress* .

[4] Interest

In an action for relief based on rescission of contract, since right to the repayment of moneys paid under the contract is fixed by the rescission, interest on those moneys is recoverable from the date of rescission [*Potter v. Contra Costa Realty Co. (1934) 220 Cal. 31, 34, 29 P.2d 189* ; *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 376, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749]* . When the elements of consequential damages are certain, interest on them is also recoverable from the date of rescission. When the party against whom the rescission is made is entitled to an offset, for example, the reasonable value of the use of the subject matter of the contract, interest is calculated on the rescinding party's net recovery [*Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 376-377, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749]* .

[5] Punitive Damages

When defendant's conduct meets the requirements of *Civ. Code § 3294(a)*--that is, when plaintiff has established by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant acted with malice, fraud, or oppression--punitive damages are awardable in a rescission action. Punitive damages cannot be awarded under *Civ. Code § 3294(a)* except in addition to actual damages. This actual damage requirement is satisfied in a rescission action by plaintiff's recovery in the form of specific restitution [*see Douglas v. Ostermeier (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 729, 750, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 594* (although plaintiffs recovered $10,000 on related fraud cause of action, substantial portion of money returned to them on rescission count was net monetary award to them)]. Recovery of money damages is not necessary [*In re Marriage of McNeill (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 548, 561, 206 Cal. Rptr. 641* ; *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* .

[6] Attorney's Fees

Although a contract is extinguished by its rescission, an action for relief based on rescission involves the contract within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1717*. Thus, if the contract rescinded contained a provision for attorney's fees that did not limit its operation to particular types of actions on the contract, attorney's fees are recoverable in an action for relief based on rescission [*Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-842, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-379, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749]* . In addition, if the contract rescinded is governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), *Civ. Code § 1811.1* or *Civ. Code § 2983.4* provides the basis for recovery of attorney's fees in an action for relief based on rescission [*see Morgan v. Reasor Corp.(1968) 69 Cal. 2d 881, 896-897, 73 Cal. Rptr. 398, 447 P.2d 638 (Unruh)* ; *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 378-379, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749 (Rees-Levering)* ; for discussion and forms relating to rescission of installment sales contracts governed by the Unruh Act, *see* Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* ; for discussion and forms relating to rescission of motor vehicle conditional sales contracts, *see* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs*].

Also, as discussed in *§ 490.23[2][b]*, attorney's fees in other litigation reasonably required to protect the party's interests may be recovered as consequential damages [*Kass v. Weber (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 417, 423-424, 67 Cal. Rptr. 876]* .

[7] Attachment Available

Attachment is available to one seeking restitution based on rescission because the basis of recovery is the implied contract for repayment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 483.010(a)* (attachment available in action on implied contract when more than $500 is involved); *Landry v. Marshall (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 170, 177-178, 52 Cal. Rptr. 119* ; *Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508]* . Attachment is a positive act in pursuit of a contractual right inconsistent with the right to pursue an action for tort damages, but it does not amount to an election to pursue damages for breach of contract, which would bar rescission [*Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 874-875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508]* . For further discussion and forms relating to attachment procedures, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesConsequential DamagesContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesInterestContracts LawRemediesPunitive DamagesContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionTortsNegligenceActionsNegligent Infliction of Emotional DistressGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.24

§ 490.24 Damages or Offsets Allowed to Defendant

In an action for relief based on rescission, the court may require the party to whom relief is granted to make any compensation to the other that justice may require and may otherwise adjust the equities between the parties [*Civ. Code § 1692*]. Thus, when a purchaser rescinds a sale of real or personal property, the seller is ordinarily entitled to payment or credit for the value of the property during the time the purchaser had possession [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 785-786, 128 P.2d 868* (real property)]. The burden of proof as to the value of use or rental value is on the seller [*McCoy v. West (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 295, 302, 138 Cal. Rptr. 660* ; *Gentry v. Kelley Kar Co. (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 324, 337, 14 Cal. Rptr. 121* (no recovery for depreciation of vehicle during plaintiffs' use when no evidence of value of use was introduced)]. In a transaction involving the sale of a business, recovery by the seller against whom the sale is rescinded is limited to the lesser of the reasonable rental value of the property involved or the profits, if any, generated by the purchaser from the subject matter. Applying this rule to the burden of proof, a seller who does notintroduce evidence of both rental value and profits is not entitled to recover based on either [*McCoy v. West (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 295, 303, 138 Cal. Rptr. 660* ; *see* comments to *Restatement of Restitution § 157*; *but see* *Heintzsch v. La France (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 180, 183, 44 P.2d 358* (defendant seller allowed rental value although plaintiffs contended no profits were made)].

A defendant is not allowed a setoff to compensatory damages in the form of a deduction or credit for income tax benefits that the plaintiff may have derived from the rescinded contract [*DePalma v. Westland Software House (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1534, 1539-1546, 276 Cal. Rptr. 214* ; for further discussion, *see* Ch. 177, *Damages*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.25

§ 490.25 Election of Remedies

[1] What Constitutes Election

Whenever a party entitled to enforce two remedies institutes an action on one of them or performs any act in pursuit of one remedy whereby he or she gains an advantage over the other party, he or she will be held to have made an election of that remedy and will not be entitled to pursue any other remedy for the enforcement of his or her rights [*Steiner v. Rowley (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 713, 720, 221 P.2d 9* ; *Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 874-875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508]* . The doctrine of election of remedies is a specific application of the doctrine of estoppel. Thus, mere pursuit by the injured party of a different or additional remedy does not amount to an election unless it involves a prejudice to the opposing party [*Warfield v. Richey (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 93, 99, 334 P.2d 101]* . Simply giving notice of rescission does not amount to an election. Notice of rescission is revocable until everything with which plaintiff has parted has been restored to him or her [*Mackenzie v. Voelker (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 538, 541, 266 P.2d 867* ; *Karapetian v. Carolan (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 344, 355, 188 P.2d 809]* . However, an agreement for rescission will generally bar any claims for fraud arising out of the same transaction unless the release or mutual rescission agreement specifically provides otherwise [*Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 508-509, 250 P.2d 283]* .

It is permissible for plaintiff to plead inconsistent remedies [*Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* . When all the evidence is in, the court will determine which remedies the plaintiff may have [*Mackenzie v. Voelker (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 538, 541, 266 P.2d 867]* . Pleading inconsistent remedies allows a plaintiff to recover on another theory, without having to bring a second action, if rescission is for some reason unavailable [*Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655* ; *Karapetian v. Carolan (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 344, 352, 188 P.2d 809]* . The general rule is that no election need be made before the case goes to the jury. If the jury or the court finds that plaintiff is entitled to rescission and damages, the plaintiff must then elect, and may recover, compensatory damages consistent with rescission so long as there is no double recovery [*Jahn v. Brickey (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 399, 406, 214 Cal. Rptr. 119* ; *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* .

It is not always clear what constitutes an election. For example, in *Whistler v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 108, 91 Cal. Rptr. 879* , in which the trial was bifurcated, the court did not clearly indicate whether it was

the determination of the rescission issue in the first part of the trial or later correspondence by counsel that constituted the election [*Whistler v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 108, 116, 118, 91 Cal. Rptr. 879]* . Some cases that have not required an election between tort and rescissionary remedies can be explained as ones in which the defendant did not require clear findings or special verdicts regarding damages. In those cases, the damages that the opinion refers to as being awarded under the fraud cause of action might properly have been awarded as consequential or punitive damages under the rescissionary relief provisions of *Civ. Code § 1692* [*see, e.g.,* *Campbell v. McClure (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 806, 808, 810, 227 Cal. Rptr. 450* (compensatory damages not separated under causes of action for fraud, rescission of sale of business, and cancellation of assumption of obligations of business); *Cobian v. Ordonez (1980) 163 Cal. Rptr. 126* (no showing of duplication of damages); *see also* *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 484-485, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871* (punitive damages as proper even when restitution is only relief awarded after rescission)].

[2] Asserting Election of Remedies as Defense

The defendant can waive its right to require an election by failing to assert it [*Bank of America N.T. & S. Assn v. Hill (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 495, 500, 71 P.2d 258* ; *City Bank of San Diego v. Ramage (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 570, 588, 72 Cal. Rptr. 273]* . If the facts giving rise to the alleged election occurred prior to commencement of the action, election of remedies must be specifically pleaded as an affirmative defense, unless it appears on the face of the complaint [*Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508* (dicta); *Karapetian v. Carolan (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 344, 346-347, 188 P.2d 809* (dicta); *see § 490.67* for a form of affirmative defense]. If the facts giving rise to the alleged election occurred after commencement of the action, the election must be raised at the earliest possible time [*Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508* (dicta, election claimed to arise from plaintiff's filing attachment asserted for first time on appeal as too late)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.26

§ 490.26 Right to Jury Trial

The right to a jury trial is determined by the nature of the substantive relief requested [*Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 312-313, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682]* . When restitution or damages are sought and there is a question of fact to be resolved regarding the amount of damages or restitution, a party is entitled to a jury trial in an action for relief based on rescission [*Paularena v. Superior Court (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 906, 911-913, 42 Cal. Rptr. 366]* . When one is not seeking restitution or damages, but only relief of an equitable nature, there is no right to a jury trial [*Porter v. Superior Court (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 793, 798-801, 141 Cal. Rptr. 59* (cancellation of deed)].

When a party to a contract, after rescinding the contract on a ground allowed in *Civ. Code § 1689(b)*, sues for relief under *Civ. Code § 1692* and, in lieu of asking for the return of consideration, demands the value of the consideration given (because, for instance, it would be impracticable to return the consideration), that demand for a money judgment does not make the action one "at law" in which the party may have a jury trial. The action is equitable in nature, and no party is entitled to have a jury trial [*NMSBPCSLDHB v. County of Fresno (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 954, 956, 962-963, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 425]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury Trial

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.27

§ 490.27 Restitution to Avoid Unjust Enrichment

[1] Equitable Principle

When no contract exists between the parties, equity sometimes will imply a contract in order to prevent the unjust enrichment of the party who has received some benefit [*Kossian v. American Nat'l Ins. Co. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 647, 650-651, 62 Cal. Rptr. 225* ; *County of Santa Clara v. Robbiano (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 845, 848-849, 5 Cal. Rptr. 19]* . To some extent, recovery is premised on the equitable maxim of *Civ. Code § 3521* that one who takes a benefit must bear the burden [*Civ. Code § 3521*; *Halperin v. Raville (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 765, 771-774, 222 Cal. Rptr. 350]* . Similar principles allow recovery to one who has made payments under a void contract [*Page v. Preuss (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 494, 496-497, 38 Cal. Rptr. 221* ; *see §§ 490.13, 490.16[3][c]*].

Unjust enrichment is synonymous with the term "restitution" [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1314, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Restitution includes not only the restoration or giving back of something to its rightful owner, but also compensation, reimbursement, indemnification, or reparation for benefits derived from, or for loss or injury caused to, another. The phrase "unjust enrichment" is used to characterize the result or effect of a failure to make restitution of or for property or benefits received under circumstances that give rise to a legal or equitable obligation to account for them [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1315, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Lucky Auto Supply v. Turner (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 872, 885, 53 Cal. Rptr. 628]* . It is not enough that one has conferred a benefit on another. To be entitled to restitution, one must confer the benefit by mistake, fraud, coercion, or request [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1315-1316, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *Nibbi Brothers, Inc. v. Home Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422, 253 Cal. Rptr. 289* ; *see* Restatement of Restitution §§ 2, 106].

This principle allows recovery of money paid by mistake, no matter how negligent the paying party may have been in making the mistake, providedthe party who received the money has not changed his or her postion in reliance [*National Bank of California v. Miner (1914) 167 Cal. 532, 537, 140 P. 27* ; *Doyle v. Matheron (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 521, 522-523, 306 P.2d 913* ; *see First Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Bank of America (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 393, 396, 84 Cal. Rptr. 532* (no detrimental change of position found)]. A request coupled with assurances of payment, however, may not invoke sufficient reliance or change of position to allow recovery of the value of the benefit conferred unless

the party making the request promises to make payment itself. For example, a promise of payment that amounts to an optimistic and nonactionable opinion that another person will pay for the benefit conferred will not support restitution [*Nibbi Brothers, Inc. v. Home Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422-1423, 253 Cal. Rptr. 289]* . Similarly, a request by the owner of landlocked property to a local government agency not to approve an adjacent owner's development plans unless the plans required the developer to provide access to the landlocked parcel does not constitute either request or coercion for purposes of entitling the developer to restitution from the benefited owner [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1316, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Nor, in that situation, does the agency's action constitute coercion [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1318, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . The cost of rerouting and extending its planned access road to service the adjoining parcel and the benefit to the landlocked owner were merely indirect and incidental consequences of the developer's decision to build the project [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1316, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

Equitable restitution generally is not available to provide recovery of money paid voluntarily with knowledge of the facts. One situtation in which restitution is not available arises when an insurer denies coverage, but provides a defense to the insured under a reservation of rights. The insurer cannot recover defense costs under the theory of equitable restitution because the primary reason for the expenditure is usually the insurer's desire to protect itself from a subsequent claim that it breached its agreement with the insured [*Insurance Co. of the West v. Haralambos Beverage Co. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1308, 1323, 241 Cal. Rptr. 427]* .

A health insurer could mistakenly pay benefits to a health care provider under the usual assignment of benefits by the insured patient. The insurer could, for example, pay for treatment that is not covered by the policy or pay for treatment that the insured received after the policy expired. In that case, if the health care provider disclosed all material facts in connection with presenting the claim to the insurer and received payment without knowledge of the insurer's mistake, the insurer has no claim for equitable restitution [*City of Hope Nat. Medical Center v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 633, 636-637, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465]* .

[2] When Contract Is Forfeited

When a contract has a forfeiture clause or one party is allowed to cancel it because of the other party's breach or nonperformance, the party in default is entitled to restitution of any benefits he or she bestowed on the other party that are in excess of the damages suffered by that party [*Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 20-23, 230 P.2d 629* ; *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 118, 208 P.2d 367]* . For instance, if a contract for the purchase and sale of real estate is canceled by the seller after the purchaser has made substantial improvements or expended time and money in obtaining subdivision approval, the seller would be unjustly enriched if he or she were allowed to keep the land at its enhanced value without any compensation to the purchaser. In that case, the purchaser's restitution is measured by the reasonable value of services rendered by it that benefited the land owner, not the increase in value of the property attributable to those services. The purpose of this type of restitution is to make the defaulting party whole, not to bestow a benefit [*Lesny Development Co. v. Kendall (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1022-1025, 210 Cal. Rptr. 890]* .

[3] Pleading Doctrine as Common Count

No particular form of pleading is necessary to invoke the doctrine of restitution [*Dinosaur Development, Inc. v. White (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1310, 1316, 265 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Nevertheless, a common count is often the proper form of action [*see* *Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 520-526, 36 P.2d 635* ; *Doyle v. Matheron (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 521, 522-523, 306 P.2d 913]* .

A cause of action for unjust enrichment has been described as a quasi-contractual form of common count for money had and received to recover money paid by fraud or mistake. As such, it is governed by the three-year limitation period applicable to fraud actions. That period commences not at the time of the mistake but when the defendant realizes a

windfall from the mistake [*First Nationwide Savings v. Perry (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1670, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 173]* . For discussion and forms for various types of common counts, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForfeiture ClausesContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawTypes of ContractsImplied-in-Law ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 490.28-490.39

[Reserved]

§§ 490.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.40

§ 490.40 Federal Statutes

Rescission of consumer contracts governed by Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq*). *15 U.S.C. § 1635*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawConsumer ProtectionTruth in LendingGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.41

§ 490.41 State Statutes

[1] Rescission

Rescission of fraudulently induced membership in, or right to damages from, nonprofit retailers' cooperative. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20001(d)(3)(J)*; *Civ. Code § 3343.7*; *Corp. Code § 31005(d)*

Rescission of contract or conveyance by person of unsound mind prior to incapacity decree. *Civ. Code § 39*

Rescission of offer to purchase 1 to 4 unit residential property. *Civ. Code § 1102.3*

Rescission by creditor of acceptance in satisfaction of obligations or orders drawn on third parties. *Civ. Code § 1533*

Rescission for failure to provide foreign language translation of specified contracts negotiated primarily in foreign. *Civ. Code § 1632*

Rescission of contracts in general. *Civ. Code § 1688 et seq.*

Rescission of participation in endless chain scheme, as defined in *Penal Code § 327*. *Civ. Code § 1689.2*

Right to rescind dental service contract. *Civ. Code § 1689.3*

Cancellation of contract with dating service. *Civ. Code § 1694.1*

Cancellation of contract with weight loss program or center. *Civ. Code § 1694.6*

Rescission of sale of residential real property in foreclosure. *Civ. Code § 1695 et seq.*

Rescission of grey market goods for failure to give required disclosures. *Civ. Code § 1797.86*

Failure to comply with Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990 (*Civ. Code § 1799.200 et seq.*) does not create independent basis for rescission but is admissible to establish basis for rescission of consumer contract or consumer contract guaranty otherwise authorized by law. *Civ. Code §§ 1799.205(b), 1799.206(d)* (consumer contact; consumer contract guaranty)

Rescission of consumer retail installment contract governed by Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) for failure of consumer to obtain financing. *Civ. Code § 1803.9*

Rescission of contract for discount buying services. *Civ. Code § 1812.121*

Rescission of sale or lease of seller assisted marketing plan. *Civ. Code § 1812.215*

Rescission of membership camping contract. *Civ. Code § 1812.306*

Right to rescind contract with employment counseling service. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.511, 1812.523(d)-(h)*

Right to rescind contract with job listing service. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.516, 1812.523(d)-(h)*

When principal may rescind ratification. *Civ. Code § 2314*

Rescission of motor vehicle conditional sale contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 2982.5, 2982.9-2983.1*

Rescission of motor vehicle lease. *Civ. Code § 2988.7*

Even if contract for sale of goods governed by *Com. Code §§ 2101-2801* requires writing to rescind, oral attempted rescission is possible waiver. *Com. Code § 2209(2), (4)*

Rescission of emancipation of minor. *Fam. Code § 7130 et seq.*

[2] Restitution

Restitution of downpayment under motor vehicle conditional sale contracts. *Civ. Code § 2982.7(a)*

Restitution order in domestic violence action. *Fam. Code § 6342*

Restitution of decedent's property paid or transferred through small estate administration. *Prob. Code §§ 13111, 13206*

If contract made by corporation when its powers are suspended or forfeited for failure to pay taxes or file returns is voided at instance of other party, court so ordering must provide that suspended corporation receive full restitution of benefits provided by it under contract. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23304.5*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRatificationContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.42

§ 490.42 Decisions

[1] Alternative Remedies and Procedures

Question of California courts' jurisdiction to grant equitable relief under civil remedies provision of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (herainafter "RICO"), specifically order requiring divestiture of interests sold to defendants (*18 U.S.C. § 1964(a)*), is open; trial court properly refused summary judgment to defendant; court of appeal was reluctant to decide emerging question of law without full evidentiary record. *Nakash v. Superior Court (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 59, 71, 241 Cal. Rptr. 578*

[2] Election of Remedies

Rescission is not cause of action, but is remedy; thus continuing conduct is basis for series of actions based on rescission. *Nakash v. Superior Court (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 59, 70, 241 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Superior court action was not election of remedy barring petition to Labor Commission to avoid contract because remedies were not inconsistent; court action was based on execution of agreement; Commission proceeding was based on conduct after execution. *Humes v. MarGil Ventures, Inc. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 486, 493-494, 220 Cal. Rptr. 186*

Choice of remedy is that of wronged party, not of court. *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655*

[3] Defendant's Right to Offsets

On rescission of partnership agreement for fraud and franchise law violations, plaintiff was entitled to continue to use partnership name, but defendant was entitled to compensation for contributions that enhanced value of name. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1245-1246, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Failure to award defendant rental value of car, misrepresented to be new but that was used, was not error when defendant produced no evidence of rental value of used car, but only of new car. *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 483, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871*

[4] Delay in Performance

Unless contract declares time to be of essence, performance within reasonable time is sufficient and rescission cannot be granted for slight delay. Hofland v. Gustafson (1955) 132 Cal. App. 907, 282 P.2d 1039 (8 days)

[5] Dismissal of Prior Action for Rescissionary Relief

State court action for rescission of sale of business, breach of fiduciary duty, and other relief was not barred by plaintiffs' dismissal and settlement of prior federal court action for rescission be cause breaches of contract, fiduciary duties, and tortious conduct were continuing, and second action alleged transactional nucleus of facts that occurred after first judgment. *Nakash v. Superior Court (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 59, 67-70, 241 Cal. Rptr. 578*

[6] Judgments

When plaintiff proved two grounds for rescission (fraud and violation of *Corp. Code § 31300*, relating to franchises), judge's failure to articulate one ground in oral announcement of decision did not preclude finding or judgment on that ground. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1245, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Judgment against both principals and agents was proper for restitution after rescission of sale for fraud and mistake; agents allowed their default to be taken. *Heintzsch v. La France (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 180, 183-184, 44 P.2d 358*

[7] Mistake of Fact

Principle that valid contract may be rescinded for unilateral mistake of fact by one party if other party should have known about mistake required reversal of summary judgment for trial of factual question whether attorney should have known from demand letter that opposing counsel miscalculated amount of interest claimed. *Bldg. Serv. Emp. Pension Tr. v. Amer. Bldg. Maint. (9th Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 576, 578*

Rescission was justified because of both parties' mistake of fact regarding one party's ability to qualify for status that was essential to achieving contract's purpose. *Habitat Trust for Wildlife, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1343, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 813*

Life annuity contract cannot be rescinded for buyer's benefit on ground of mistake of fact when alleged mistake is that, at time of making contract, buyer was ignorant of preexisting condition leading inexorably to unexpectedly early death. *Grenall v. United of Omaha Life Ins. Co. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 188, 193-196, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 609*

[8] Mistake of Law

Summary judgment for plaintiff reversed because defendants raised triable issues of fact as to whether they were entitled to rescind settlement agreement based on mutual mistake of fact or law; parties' mutual mistake regarding amendment to Probate Code, which would diminish plaintiff's damages from trust which exposed trustees to tax

liability, went to heart of agreement settling action for legal malpractice in drafting trust. *Harris v. Rudin, Richman & Appel (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1339-1341, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552*

[9] Nature of Rescission

Rescission voided contract *ab initio* and extinguished all rights of either party undercontract, including right to bring action for tortious breach of that contract; each party was entitled to recover payments made to other party under rescinded contract. *Imperial Cas. and Indem. Co. v. Sogomonian (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 169, 184-185, 243 Cal. Rptr. 639*

[10] Rescission Unavailable

Rescission under Truth in Lending Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1635*] is personal remedy not suitable for class-action treatment. *LaLiberte v. Pacific Mercantile Bank (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 745*

Rescission of former member's gift to religious organization made on basis of religious beliefs no longer held was not permitted; challenge to validity of former beliefs is prohibited by constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. *Estate of Supple (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 410, 414-415, 55 Cal. Rptr. 542*

[11] Restitution Based on Repudiation

Obligor's statement to obligee indicating that obligor will breach important contractual promise, thereby substantially impairing value of contract, constitutes repudiation of the contract, entitling obligee to restitution. *Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc. v. United States (2000) 530 U.S. 604, 120 S. Ct. 2423, 147 L.Ed. 2d 528, 534*

[12] Restitution Based on Undue Influence

Undue influence occurs when one party uses its dominant psychological position in unfair manner to induce subservient party to consent to agreement to which he or she would not otherwise have consented; claim for restitution alleging subservient party had been deceived by church into submitting unknowingly to coercive persuasion was not direct attack on truth or falsity of religious beliefs prohibited by *First Amendment*. *Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1124-1125, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46*

[13] Restitution to Avoid Unjust Enrichment

Cause of action for unjust enrichment could be stated by beneficiary of first deed of trust which was mistakenly reconveyed against purchaser at foreclosure sale of junior deed of trust when facts would support amendmentto allege that purchaser knew of mistake; statute barring deficiency judgments [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*] was inapplicable. *First Nationwide Savings v. Perry (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1662-1665, 1669-1670, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 173*

Restitution may be required when person benefitting from another's mistake knew about mistake and circumstances surrounding unjust enrichment. *First Nationwide Savings v. Perry (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1664, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 173*

One who has been unjustly enriched at another's expense is required to make restitution if benefit was conferred by

mistake, fraud, coercion or request; claim for restitution was properly stated when lessor's lack of knowledge that defendant had taken possession of equipment and was making lease payments prevented it from asserting its rights regarding assignment of lease. *Enterprise Leasing Corp. v. Shugart Corp. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 737, 748-749, 282 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Restitution of money paid by plaintiff as guarantor of restaurant equipment lease when money was paid under material mistake as to lessor's title. *Bridges v. Cal-Pacific Leasing Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 118, 124-127, 93 Cal. Rptr. 796*

[14] Restoration Excused

On dissolution of partnership formed by franchisor and franchisee under agreement that did not grant, assign, or sell any name to partnership, franchisee was permitted to continue using partnership name; unregistered name was not thing of value bestowed by franchisor, but franchisor was entitled to money compensation for contributions that enhanced name. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1245-1246, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeUnilateral MistakeContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.43

§ 490.43 Law Reviews

Kull, *Restitution as a Remedy for Breach of Contract, 67 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1465 (1994)*

Comment, *Restitutionary Recovery for Rescuers of Human Life, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 85 (1986)*

Comment, *Beyond Repatriation: A Proposal for the Equitable Restitution of Cultural Property, 33 UCLA L. Rev. 642 (1985)*

Comment, *In Defense of Restitution: A Comment on Mather, Restitution as a Remedy for Breach of Contract: The Case of the Partially Performing Seller, 57 S. Cal. L. Rev. 723 (1984)*

H. Mather, *Restitution as a Remedy for Breach of Contract: The Case of the Partially Performing Seller, 92 Yale L. J. 14 (1982)*

Note, *Garnishing Graft: A Strategy for Recovering the Proceeds of Bribery, 92 Yale L. J. 128 (1982)*

Note, *Judicial Protection for the Consumer: Vasquez v. Superior Court, 23 Hastings L. J. 513 (1972)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.44

§ 490.44 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 101, 154-156, 186; vol. 4, *Pleading*, §§ 490-503; Vol. 7, *Judgments*, § 22 (4th ed.)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 257-684, 930-945, 1013-1042; vol. 2, *Insurance*, *§§ 28*, 68, 71, 75-80, *100-103*, *105-109*, *111-113*, *127-130*, 146-147, 216-217, 224-229, 231-232, 277-280 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 490.45-490.59

[Reserved]

§§ 490.45[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.60

§ 490.60 Notice of Rescission of Contract--General Form [Civ. Code § 1691]

[1] FORM Notice of Rescission of Contract--General Form [Civ. Code § 1691]

TO: _____

You are hereby notified that _____ [*name or* the undersigned] hereby rescinds that certain _____ [*describe the contract or lease in terms of parties, date, and purpose, mentioning all documents comprising it, e.g.,* three-year lease of an ABC Co. type 275 burglar alarm system by and between you as lessor and _____ (*name or* the undersigned), as lessee dated _____ (*date*), _____ (*specify purpose/relevant terms of contract, e.g.,* under the terms of which title to the system remained in you and the undersigned was to have possession and use of the system for the protection of its retail outlet at 359 Main Street, Anytown, California)].

[This rescission is made on the ground that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* The United States District Court issued an injunction requiring the burglar alarm system to be rendered inoperable because it interfered with secret government radio frequencies. The system has therefore been rendered useless.]

[_____ (*Name or* The undersigned) hereby _____ (offers to restore *or* restores) and tenders to you all consideration and benefits received by him/her/it pursuant to the _____ (lease *or* contract), specifically _____ (*specify, e.g.,* all removable parts of the alarm system). (This offer is conditioned on your restoring the consideration you recieved as demanded below).]

_____ [*Name or* The undersigned] hereby demands that you restore to him/her/it all consideration furnished to you by him/her/it, specifically _____ [*specify consideration to be returned, taking into account any offsets the rescinding party agrees to allow, e.g.,* $1,000, less the sum of $250 that was the reasonable value to the undersigned of the use of the system for the three weeks it operated before the undersigned was notified of the injunction, for a total of $750].

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of rescission is for use by a rescinding party to give notice of rescission and to tender restoration to the party against whom he or she rescinds [*see Civ. Code § 1691*]. It can be used as is, as a formal notice, or the pertinent paragraphs can be incorporated into a letter. The factualexample is based in part on the facts in *Federal Leasing Consultants, Inc. v. Mitchell Lipsett Co. (1978) 150 Cal. Rptr. 82* .

When notice of rescission has not otherwise been given or an offer to restore the benefits received under the contract has not otherwise been made, service of a pleading in an action or proceeding that seeks relief based on rescission is deemed notice or an offer to restore or both [*Civ. Code § 1691*].

[3] Contents of Notice

[a] Grounds

The grounds for rescission need not be stated, as long as the intent to rescind is clear [*Hull v. Ray (1930) 211 Cal. 164, 167-168, 294 P. 700]* . One may even justify an asserted rescission by proving that at the time there was adequate cause even though the rescinding party did not learn of it until after he or she had given notice of rescission [*Earl v. Saks & Co. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 602, 609, 226 P.2d 340* ; *Wilson v. Lewis (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 802, 809, 165 Cal. Rptr. 396* (both cases involved oral notice of rescission)]. If grounds other than those set forth in the notice are the basis of the complaint and the defendant is not prejudiced by the change or addition, as when he or she knew of the grounds relied on in the complaint before suit was filed, the notice is sufficient [*Hull v. Ray (1930) 211 Cal. 164, 167-168, 294 P. 700]* .

[b] Offer to Restore

Unless the other party is unable to do so or positively refuses to do so, a party seeking rescission ordinarily must restore to the other party everything of value that he or she has received from that party or offer to restore everything received on condition that the other party do the same [*Civ. Code § 1691*]. If the rescinding party has not received anything of value, no offer to restore is necessary [*Realty Co. of America v. Burton (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 178, 195-196, 325 P.2d 171* ; *Esau v. Briggs (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 427, 436, 201 P.2d 25]* . Nor is an offer to restore necessary when the transactions between the parties are so complicated that full judicial action or an accounting is necessary to determine their respective rights [*California etc. Co. v. Schiappa-Pietra (1907) 151 Cal. 732, 739-742, 91 P. 593* ; *Klein v. Farmer (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 51, 61-62, 160 P.2d 30]* . In addition, no offer to restore is necessary when, due to no fault of the rescinding party, restoration cannot be made [*Carruth v. Fritch (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 426, 430-431, 224 P.2d 702* (defendant's fraud); *Stegeman v. Vandeventer (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 753, 760-762, 135 P.2d 186* (same); *see § 490.21[2]*].

[c] Setoffs or Credits

The party against whom a contract is rescinded must restore anything of value that he or she has received, but he or she is also entitled to credit for anything of value furnished to the rescinding party [*see Civ. Code § 1692*]. In rescinding a real property contract or lease, the rescinding party ordinarily must pay or allow credit for the value of the use of the property during the time he or she had possession [*Heintzsch v. La France (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 180, 183, 44 P.2d 358* (sale of auto camp and lease); *Bush v. Vernon (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 33, 39, 286 P.2d 903]* . When a construction contract is voided, the contractor is entitled to be compensated for the value of labor done and materials delivered to the site prior to the owner's avoidance of the contract [*Sullivan v. California Realty Co. (1904) 142 Cal. 201, 204, 75 P. 767]* .

[4] State Statutes

Grounds for unilateral rescission. *Civ. Code § 1689(b)*

Effect of stipulation regarding errors of description. *Civ. Code § 1690*

Notice of rescission and offer to restore. *Civ. Code § 1691*

Relief based on rescission; damages; compensation to party against whom rescission is made. *Civ. Code § 1692*

Effect of delay in giving notice of rescission. *Civ. Code § 1693*

[5] Decisions

Broker who was party to related commission agreement, but not party to purchase and sale contract, and was named defendant in action to rescind purchase and sale contract, was not entitled to attorney's fees for successfully defending that claim; rescission was based on tort of fraud, not on contract. *Super 7 Motel Assocs. v. Wang (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 541, 547-550, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 193*

Until express contract is voided, relief based on implied contract or common count is unavailable. *McCall v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 527, 533, 538, 36 P.2d 642* ; *Lloyd v. Williams (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 646, 649, 38 Cal. Rptr. 849*

Party who cannot restore consideration cannot rescind and therefore cannot maintain action for money had and received; such party's remedy is tort action for damages. *Lloyd v. Williams (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 646, 649, 38 Cal. Rptr. 849*

Notice of rescission is not required to be served on party whose interest in contract has been assigned; notice to assignee as sufficient. *Drips v. Moore (1918) 179 Cal. 249, 252, 176 P. 159*

When nothing of value has been received by rescinding party, institution of suit is sufficient notice of rescission. *Realty Co. of America v. Burton (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 178, 195-196, 325 P.2d 171*

To rescind sale of business including leasehold and goodwill, sublessee is not required to give notice of rescission to seller/sublessor who acquiesced insublessee's payment of rent to primary lessor after primary lessor exercised option to terminate primary lease. *Esau v. Briggs (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 427, 435-436, 201 P.2d 25*

Offer to restore is unnecessary when rescinding party has not received anything of value. *Esau v. Briggs (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 427, 436, 201 P.2d 25*

Notice of rescission of fraudulently induced transaction is properly addressed to joint tortfeasors. *McDevitt v. Butte City Ranch (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 252, 256, 46 P.2d 290*

[6] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 4, *Pleading*, §§ 575-576 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 930-944 (10th ed. 2005)

55 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.61

§ 490.61 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1709, 3343]--Fraudulent Misrepresentation [Civ. Code §§ 1572, 1689(b)(1), 1710]

[1] FORM Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Fraud [Civ. Code §§ 1709, 3343]--Fraudulent Misrepresentation [Civ. Code §§ 1572, 1689(b)(1), 1710]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF BASED ON RESCIS-
_____ [*name*],	)	SION; FOR MONEY HAD AND RECEIVED; [AND
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FOR DAMAGES FOR FRAUD]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Relief Based on Rescission)

[1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California (*or other*

allegations of capacity or residence as necessary).]

2. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of California with its principal place of business at _____ (*street address, including city and county*), California].

[3. Defendants Doe I through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants.)]

[4. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) at all times herein mentioned, defendants DOE I through DOE _____ were agents, servants, and employees of their codefendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged were acting in the scope of their authority as agents,servants, and employees, and with the permission and consent of their codefendants.]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into _____ [a written *or* an oral] _____ [contract *or* lease] whereby _____ [*describe relevant terms of the contract, attaching a copy if desired, e.g.,* plaintiff was to purchase from defendant and defendant was to sell to plaintiff defendant's 1984 Mercedes 500 SEL automobile, California registration number _____, for the sum of $_____. A copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated by reference].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____, California, defendant, knowing the representations to be false and with the intent to deceive plaintiff and to induce him/her to enter into the contract, falsely and fraudulently represented to plaintiff that _____ [*allege in exact language or as close to exact language as possible the statements of material fact claimed by plaintiff to be false, e.g.,* the odometer correctly indicated that the automobile had only been driven approximately 25,000 miles and that no repairs to the automobile other than normal maintenance had ever been necessary or made].

7. The representations made by defendant were in fact false. The true facts were _____ [*set forth true facts, e.g.,* the odometer had been turned back and the automobile had in fact been driven approximately 125,000 miles by the date the parties made their contract. Further, the automobile had been involved in a collision and although major repairs were made to it on account of the collision, it was never thereafter properly alignable].

8. At the time the representations were made, at the time plaintiff entered into the _____ [contract *or* lease], and at the time plaintiff rendered his/her performance under the _____ [contract *or* lease], plaintiff did not know the representations were false, but believed them to be true and reasonably relied on them. _____ [*Specify facts making reliance reasonable, e.g,* Plaintiff drove the automobile before entering into the contract. During that test drive, it handled well, even at high speeds, and plaintiff noticed no abnormalities. Plaintiff would have taken the car to be checked by his/her mechanic, but when plaintiff expressed a desire to do so, defendant said he/she had another offer for $_____, which he/she was bound to accept at 5 P.M. that evening unless he/she and plainfiff had come to an agreement by that time]. Had plaintiff known the true facts, he/she would not have entered into the _____ [contract *or* lease] and would not have rendered or accepted performance thereunder.

9. Under the terms of the _____ [contract *or* lease], on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*describe plaintiff's performance, excuse for nonperformance, or impossibility of*

performance, e.g., personally delivered to defendant cashier's check number _____ drawn on _____ (*name of bank*) and payable to defendant in the amount of $_____, the full purchase price].

10. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*describe defendant's performance or nonperformance, e.g.,* delivered possession of the automobile to plaintiff, along with the registration and certificate of ownership that he/she had properly endorsed].

11. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff discovered the true facts to be those alleged in Paragraph 7. _____ [*Describe circumstances of discovery, e.g.,* The automobile overheated often in traffic and after plaintiff had owned it for a few weeks, it pulled to the right when the brakes were applied. In addition, the tires were wearing unevenly. In the course of having these problems repaired, plaintiff discovered the true facts].

12. Plaintiff would/will suffer substantial harm and injury under the _____ [contract *or* lease] if it were/is not rescinded in that [as a result of defendant's conduct,] plaintiff _____ [*specify, e.g.,* would/will be deprived of his/her bargain and would/will have an automobile substantially different from and inferior to the one he/she bargained and paid for and intended to purchase].

[*EITHER, if notice of rescission has not been given and plaintiff has not received anything of value*]

13. Plaintiff intends service of the summons and complaint in this action to serve as notice of rescission of the _____ [contract *or* lease], and hereby demands that defendant restore to him/her the consideration furnished by plaintiff, specifically _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the sum of $_____ (plus $_____ representing _____ (*describe any consequential damages, or in the case of real property, the value of any improvements made by plaintiff, e.g.,* the amount expended by plaintiff in attempted repairs before discovering that the representations made by defendant were false))][, _____ (*specify any offsets which plaintiff agrees to allow, e.g.,* less the reasonable value to the plaintiff of the use of the automobile for the two months before the misrepresentations were discovered)].

[*OR, if notice of rescission has not been given and plaintiff has received something of value*]

13. Plaintiff intends service of the summons and complaint in this action to serve as notice of rescission of the _____ [contract *or* lease], and hereby offers to restore all consideration furnished by defendant under the _____ [contract *or* lease], on condition that defendant restore to him/her the consideration furnished by plaintiff, specifically _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the sum of $_____ (plus $_____ representing _____ (*describe any consequential damages, or in the case of real property, the value of any improvements made by plaintiff, e.g.,* the amount expended by plaintiff in attempted repairs before discovering that the representations made by defendant were false))][, _____ (*specify any offsets which plaintiff agrees to allow, e.g.,* less the reasonable value to the plaintiff of the useof the automobile for the two months before the misrepresentations were discovered)].

[*OR, if a notice of rescission and, when necessary, an offer to restore, which sufficiently set forth all claims and demands, has already been given*]

13. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant in writing that plaintiff had rescinded the

_____ [contract *or* lease] [on the ground of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* fraudulent misrepresentation)]. A copy of that notice is attached hereto marked Exhibit "_____" and made a part hereof. Defendant refused, and continues to refuse, to restore to plaintiff, in whole or in part, the consideration paid by plaintiff [or to recognize that the _____ (contract *or* lease) has been rescinded].

[*CONTINUE*]

[14. As a result of entering into the _____ (contract *or* lease) with defendant, plaintiff has incurred expenses in addition to those alleged above. Additional expenses include, without limitation, _____ (*specify additional items plaintiff will have to recover in order to be placed in the position he or she was in prior to the execution of the contract being rescinded, e. g.,* registration fees, insurance, and storage costs). Plaintiff has paid a total of $_____ for those expenses to the date of this complaint (and will continue to incur them in an amount unknown to him/her at this time. Plaintiff prays leave of this court to amend this complaint to insert the true amount of those expenses when they are ascertained).]

[15. In performing the acts herein alleged, defendant intentionally _____ (misrepresented to *or* concealed from) plaintiff material facts known to defendant, specifically _____ (*specify substance of misrepresentations or nondisclosures, e.g.,* the automobile's mileage and the fact that the automobile had suffered irreparable damage in a collision), with the intention on the part of defendant of depriving plaintiff of his/her money and property, thereby justifying an award of punitive damages against defendant.]

SECOND COUNT
(Damages for Fraud)

16. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-11 (and Paragraph(s) 14 *and/or* 15) of the First Count.

17. As a proximate result of defendant's fraud and deceit and the facts herein alleged, plaintiff was _____ [*allege facts showing specific items of damage recoverable for fraud, e.g.,* damages in the sum of $_____, which is the difference between the purchase price paid by plaintiff for the automobile and its true value, which is $_____].

THIRD COUNT
(Common Count for Money Had and Received)

18. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-4 of the First Count.

19. _____ [Within the last _____ (two *or* four) years *or* On or about _____ (*date*)], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant became indebted to plaintiff in the sum of $_____ for money had and received by defendant for the use and benefit of plaintiff.

20. Neither the whole nor any part of this sum has been paid [except the sum of $_____ (, which is acknowledged as an offset owing from plaintiff to defendant),] although demand therefor has been made, and there is now due, owing, and unpaid the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ [*date*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

On the first COUNT:

1. That this Court declare that the _____ [contract *or* lease] has been rescinded;

2. That defendant be ordered to pay plaintiff the following sums:

[*Use any or all of the following subparagraphs as applicable*]

(a) The consideration paid by plaintiff in the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

(b) The sums paid, or which will be paid, by plaintiff for _____ [*enumerate other items for which plaintiff will have to be reimbursed to be placed in the position he or she was in prior to the execution of the contract being rescinded, e.g.,* registration fees, insurance, repairs, and storage] _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof], with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

(c) Exemplary damages.

3. That plaintiff be ordered to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* transfer title and possession of the automobile to defendant] on condition that defendant pay to plaintiff the sums as ordered by the judgment of this Court;

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees as _____ (provided for in the contract *or* authorized by _____ (*specify any applicable statute that provides for attorney's fees, e.g., Civil Code Section 2983.4*)) according to proof.]

On the second COUNT:

5. For general damages _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

6. For special damages _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

7. For exemplary damages.

On the third COUNT:

8. For the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*].

On all COUNTS:

9. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

10. For such other relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a person to whom material false representations have been made to bring an action for restitution after rescission or, in the alternative, for damages for fraud or deceit [*see Civ. Code §§ 1692, 1709, 3333, 3343*]. The common count for money had and received is an additional alternative ground for recovery of sums paid by plaintiff under the rescinded contract [*see Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 518, 36 P.2d 635* (propriety of pleading express count and common count based on same facts); *Lloyd v. Williams (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 646, 649, 38 Cal. Rptr. 849* (common count not applicable until voidable contract has been rescinded)]. Because recovery under the common count is limited to the value of what defendant actually received, counsel may wish to consult Ch. 121, *Common Counts,* before deciding to include the third count [*see Pollak v. Staunton (1930) 210 Cal. 656, 665-666, 293 P. 26* (money had and received based on false representations)].

Allegations from Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake,* can be used in place of Paragraphs 6-8 in the first count of the foregoing complaint to modify that count for use when the failure of assent is based on a ground other than intentional misrepresentation. In most of those situations, Paragraph 11 of the foregoing form, alleging discovery of the true facts, will also be unnecessary. Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake,* contains the following forms of allegations:

- Duress and menace by threats of or actual confinement of, or injury to, a person or property [*see § 215.120*].

- Duress by depriving one of the ability to exercise free will but without confining a person or detaining property [*see § 215.121*].

- Duress in the form of threats to economic, business, or property interests [*see § 215.122*].

- Undue influence or constructive fraud arising from a confidential relationship [*see § 215.130*].

- Undue influence in the form of taking unfair advantage of another's trust, confidence, or weakness [*see § 215.131*].

- Undue influence in the form of taking unfair advantage of another's distress or weakness [*see § 215.132*].

- Mutual mistake of fact [*see § 215.140*].

- Unilateral mistake of fact [*see § 215.141*].
- Mistake of law [*see § 215.142*].
- Innocent misrepresentation [*see § 215.143*].
- Intentional misrepresentation of fact [*see § 215.144*].

[3] Other Possible Remedies

If the transaction being rescinded involves goods, see the discussion of the possibly broader remedies available under *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.* [*see Com. Code § 2105* (defining goods as all movable things except money, investment securities, and things in action)].

If the transaction being rescinded involves a manufacturer or a retailer and a consumer, additional remedies may be provided by the following laws:

- The Consumers Legal Remedies Act (*Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.*) [*see, e.g., Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 817-820, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964* (Act held not to apply retroactively to transactions at issue)], discussed in Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* .
- The Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) [*see, e.g., Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 806, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964]* , discussed in Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* .
- The Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*), discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* . and as applied to new motor vehicles, discussed in Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .
- The federal Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*), discussed in Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* .
- The federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty--Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*), discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .
- The Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (Civ. Code § 2981et seq.), discussed in Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* .

If the transaction involved a deed or other instrument that may cause plaintiff harm if left outstanding, a count for cancellation can be added. For complaints for cancellation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* . For complaints containing causes of action for both rescission and cancellation of real property transactions and the instruments created by them. see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* . See the Research Guide, Cross References, for additional particular types of contracts, such as home solicitation contracts, that may be governed by specific statutes discussed in other chapters.

[4] Parties

This complaint alleges the residences and capacities of the parties (Paragraphs 1, 2) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.10, 2984.4*; *see also § 490.61[9]*, regarding certain contracts that may require additional allegations to establish proper venue]. Every party to the rescinded contract or lease is an indispensible party to an action for relief based on rescission, and must therefore be joined as a plaintiff or defendant [*see Hartman Ranch Co. v. Associated Oil Co (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 232, 262-265, 73 P.2d 1163* (lessor of master lease indispensible to action based on rescission of sublease); *Holder v.*

Home Sav. & Loan Assn. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 91, 107, 72 Cal. Rptr. 704] .

As long as the court can devise a decree granting relief without infringing the rights of a third-party lender from whom the plaintiff obtained a loan in order to finance his or her performance of the rescinded contract, the third-party lender is not an indispensible party to an action based on rescission of the primary contract. Such a lender is a necessary party, and difficulties are alleviated by making the lender a party [*Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 254-255, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800]* . If there are grounds for rescission of such a loan and plaintiff seeks to rescind the loan as well as the transaction that the loan financed, the third-party lender would have to be named as a party. Whether or not such a loan can be rescinded by requiring the defendant to pay the remaining balance is determined by each situation. For instance, when the lender is not a party, the defendant cannot be made to pay a loan secured by a purchase money deed of trust but can be required to assume it and to hold plaintiff harmless on any claims arising under it [*Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 254-258, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800]* .

In addition, the complaint includes optional allegations for alleging fictitious defendants (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see also* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*] and the agency relationship of the defendants (Paragraph 4) [*see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* , Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

[5] Relief Based on Rescission

[a] General Allegations

To establish the basis for relief based on rescission, the complaint alleges the following:

- The formation and relevant terms of the contract (Paragraph 5).

- Facts showing the existence of a ground for rescission. In this case, the ground alleged is fraudulent misrepresentation (Paragraphs 6-8) [*see § 490.61[18]*].

- Plaintiff's performance or excuse for nonperformance (Paragraph 9).

- The extent of defendant's performance and nonperformance (Paragraph 10) [*see Conslolidated Concessions Co. v. McConnell (1919) 40 Cal. App. 443, 444-445, 180 P. 842* (complaint insufficient for failure to specify whether note and stock certificates sought to be cancelled were executed/issued)].

- Plaintiff's discovery of the basis for rescission, in the example of misrepresentation, being discovery of the true facts (Paragraph 11).

- The injury or harm suffered by plaintiff (Paragraph 12) [*see Engalla v. Permanente Medical Group (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 951, 979-980, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 843, 938 P.2d 903* (defrauded party does not have to show pecuniary damages in order to defeat petition to compel arbitration); *Earl v. Saks & Co. (1951) 36 Cal.2d 602, 611-613, 226 P.2d 340* (pecuniary loss not necessary; alteration of essential character of transaction is sufficient injury); *Guthrie v. Times-Mirror Co. (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 879, 886, 124 Cal. Rptr. 577* (complaint that fails to set forth facts showing plaintiff was harmed was fatally defective)].

- Plaintiff's giving of notice of rescission and offer of restoration or facts showing restoration is not necessary or statement that service of summons and complaint are to serve as notice of rescission and/or offer of restoration (Alternative Paragraphs 13) [*see Civ. Code § 1691*; *Walsh v. Majors (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 384, 396, 49 P.2d 598* (plaintiff is not required to restore or offer to restore when action is based on theory of constructive trust or when plaintiff received nothing of value to which he or she would not have been entitled independently of the transations sought to be rescinded)].

- Optional allegations to assert any additional or consequential damages (Paragraph 14) [*Civ. Code § 1692*; *see, e.g., De La Hoya v. Slim's Gun Shop (1978) 146 Cal. Rptr. 68]* .

- Optional allegations of the basis for punitive damages (Paragraph 15) [*see Civ. Code § 3294, 3295(e)*; *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 484, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871* ; *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* .

[b] Fraudulent Misrepresentation

As noted in the preceding discussion, this complaint alleges fraudulent misrepresentation as the basis for rescission. To establish fraudulent misrepresentation as the grounds for rescission, the complaint alleges the following [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)*; *Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 811, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964* (rescinding party must establish that defendant made false representations, with knowledge of their falsity and with intent to induce reliance, that plaintiff's reliance was reasonable, and resultant injury); *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 482-483, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871* (elements are fraud by concealment or misrepresentation, materiality, intent, reliance; materiality and reliance as questions of fact; intent to deceive as often proved by inference)]:

- Misrepresentations made knowingly by defendant to induce plaintiff to enter the contract (Paragraph 6).

- The true facts (Paragraph 7).

- Plaintiff's ignorance of the true facts and reliance on the misrepresentations at all relevant times, together with facts showing that the misrepresentations were material (Paragraph 8).

[6] Damages for Fraud

The second count incorporates all allegations of the first and adds only the measure of damages (Paragraph 17). Because the hypothetical situation that is used for illustration in the complaint involves fraudulent misrepresentation, the form alleges the measure of damages for fraud in the sale, purchase, or exchange of property [*see Civ. Code § 3343*].

If the transaction involves goods as defined by *Com. Code § 2105*, the measure of damages established by *Com. Code §§ 2101-2801* will be available. If no sale or exchange was involved, damages would be governed by *Civ. Code § 3333* [*see Civ. Code §§ 1709, 3333*; *Sprague v. Frank J. Sanders Lincoln Mercury, Inc. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 412, 419, 174 Cal. Rptr. 608* (distinguishing fraud in sale and fraud occurring after sale)].

[7] Common Count for Money Had and Received

The third count is the common count for money had and received. It is based on the right to restitution arising from the rescission of the contract [*see Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bank v. Kuchman (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 490, 496-497, 36 Cal. Rptr. 806]* . The necessary allegations are a statement of indebtedness in a sum certain and nonpayment [*Allen v. Powell (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 502, 510, 56 Cal. Rptr. 715]* .

A common count is demurrable if the specifically pleaded cause of action on which it necessarily rests is insufficient [*Zumbrun v. University of Southern California (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1, 14, 101 Cal. Rptr. 499]* . One may plead a cause of action based on contract and one based on tort along with a common count [*see Weitzenkorn v. Lesser (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 778, 793-795, 256 P.2d 947* (demurrer sustained as to tort cause of action on grounds unrelated to inconsistency of remedies); *Zumbrun v. University of Southern California (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11-14, 101 Cal. Rptr. 499* (same)].

For additional discussion, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts* .

[8] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

If the rescinded contract is governed by the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] or the Rees-Levering Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*], either the complaint must be verified and show that the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* (Unruh Act) or 2984.4 (Rees-Levering Act), or an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action [*see § 490.61[9]*] must be filed concurrently with the complaint [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see also § 490.61[9][b]*].

[9] Jurisdiction and Venue

[a] In General

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

If the gravamen of an action for relief based on rescission is fraud, the action is considered transitory, and the proper venue is the county of defendant'sresidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 149-150, 151 P.2d 887]* .

[b] Actions Under Unruh or Rees-Levering Act

An action on a contract or installment account governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or on a contract or purchase order governed by the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) must be tried in the county in which (1) the contract was signed by the buyer, (2) the buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into or at the time of the commencement of the action, or (3) the goods purchased have become affixed to realty (Unruh Act) or the vehicle purchased is permanently garaged (Rees-Levering Act) [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(a), 2984.4(a)*; *see Morgan v. Reasor Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 881, 896-897, 73 Cal. Rptr. 398, 447 P.2d 638* (action for relief based on rescission as "on contract" for purposes of attorney's fee award under *Civ. Code § 1811.1*); *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-379, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749* (action for relief based on rescission as "on contract" for purposes of attorney's fee award under *Civ. Code § 2983.4*)].

If the contract that was rescinded was governed by the Unruh Act or the Rees-Levering Act, either the complaint must be verified and allege facts showing that the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4*, or, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, the plaintiff must file an affadavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial [

Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c); *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*]. For a declaration under the Unruh Act, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* ; for a declaration under the Rees-Levering Act, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* .

[c] Other Goods or Services for Personal or Family Use; Telephone or Electronic Solicitation

In an action arising from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use (other than obligations under the Unruh Act or Rees-Levering Act [*see § 490.61[9][b]*]), or an action arising from a transaction consummated as a proximate result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller whose business is consummating that type of transaction, or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller, the superior court in the county where the buyer or lessee in fact signed the contract, or where the buyer or lessee resided at the time the contract was entered into, or where the buyer or lessee resides at the commencement of the action, is the proper court for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*; *Fontaine v. Superior Court (CashCall, Inc.) (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 830, 838-840, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607* (statute applies to action by consumer plaintiff, as well as to action against consumer, and if any defendant in consumer's action is individual, that is irrelevant to application of statute)].

If the action is a limited civil case, either the complaint must be verified and state facts showing that the action is subject to the requirements noted in the preceding paragraph and has been commenced in the proper court for trial, or those facts must be shown in an affidavit of the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney filed with the complaint. If an affidavit is used, it must be served with the summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[10] Lis Pendens

If the property plaintiff is seeking to regain as a result of rescission is real property, plaintiff should record a notice of pendency of the action in order to put third parties on notice and prevent their acquisition of a right to the property superior to plaintiff's [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*; *Mason v. Superior Court (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 989, 994-995, 210 Cal. Rptr. 63* (lis pendens improperly expunged in action to set aside deed, for cancellation, and declaratory relief); *Joshua Tree T. Co. v. Joshua Tree L. Co. (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 590, 596, 224 P.2d 85* (rescission unavailable as to parcels conveyed to third persons); *see* Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*]. The recording of a lis pendens may amount to an election of remedies, foreclosing damages, if defendant is prejudiced [*but see* *Brandolino v. Lindsay (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 319, 325, 75 Cal. Rptr. 56* (recordation of lis pendens in action for specific performance or damages for breach of contract does not constitute election; damages as proper when specific performance was not available)]. For discussion of election of remedies, § 490.42[2]. For an affirmative defense based on election of remedies, see *§ 490.67*.

[11] Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of automobile leases and conditional sales contracts, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Leasing Under the Rees-Levering Act*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of gifts, see Ch. 278, *Gifts*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to remedies available under *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*, see Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of securities transactions governed by the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968 (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*), see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of franchises governed by the California Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*), see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.50* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of sale or lease of seller assisted marketing plan, see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.50* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission of real estate sales and exchanges for fraud, see *Ch. 569, Vendor and Purchaser, § 569.10* et seq.

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[12] State Statutes

Actual fraud defined. *Civ. Code § 1572*

Actual fraud as question of fact. *Civ. Code § 1574*

Rescission for failure of consent. *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)*

Relief based on rescission. *Civ. Code § 1692*

Liability for deceit. *Civ. Code § 1709*

Exemplary damages. *Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3295(e)*

Measure of damages not arising from contract. *Civ. Code § 3333*

Measure of damages for fraud in purchase, sale, or exchange of property. *Civ. Code § 3343*

Offenses involving odometer tampering. *Veh. Code §§ 28050-28053*

[13] Decisions

[a] Acts of Third Persons as Grounds for Rescission

Duress or fraud of third party renders transaction voidable only if other party has reason to know of fraud or duress before giving or promising in good faith something of value or materially changing position by reason of transaction. *Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 206, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12* ; *Hall v. Department of Adoptions (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 898, 903, 121 Cal. Rptr. 223*

[b] Attorney's Fees

If rescinded contract is governed by Unruh Act (*Civ. Code §§ 1801-1812.20*), *Civ. Code § 1811.1* is basis for recovery of attorney's fees in action for relief based on rescission. See *Morgan v. Reasor Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 881, 896-897, 73 Cal. Rptr. 398, 447 P.2d 638*

If rescinded contract contains provision for attorney's fees that does not limit its operation to particular types of actions, attorney's fees are recoverable under *Civ. Code § 1717* in action for relief based on rescission. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-842, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-379, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749*

If rescinded contract is governed by Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code §§ 2981-2984.4*), *Civ. Code § 2983.4* is basis for recovery of attorney's fees in action for relief based on rescission. *Leaf v. Phil Rauch, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 371, 378-379, 120 Cal. Rptr. 749*

[c] Damages

Price of gun, costs, and attorney's fees for defense after arrest were properly awarded to innocent buyer of stolen gun under *Com. Code §§ 2714, 2715* for breach of warranty of title. *De La Hoya v. Slim's Gun Shop (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 6, 8-12 , 146 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Exemplary damages are proper in action for relief based on rescission. *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 484, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871* ; *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335*

[d] Notice

Requirement of notice of breach set forth in *Com. Code § 2607* is applicable even when breach of warranty is framed according to tort theory. *Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 339, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599*

[e] Fraudulent Misrepresentation

[i] Damages

$80,000 punitive damage award (27 times compensatory damages) was proper against dealer who defrauded elderly couple in connection with sale of vehicle whose odometer had been turned back. *Devlin v. Kearny Mesa AMC/Jeep/Renault, Inc. (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 381, 389-392, 202 Cal. Rptr. 204*

Proper measure of damages is that set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1709, 3333,* not *Civ. Code § 3343,* when gravamen of complaint was not fraud inducing purchase contract but later misrepresentations as to defects and repairs. *Sprague v. Frank J. Sanders Lincoln Mercury, Inc. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 412, 419, 174 Cal. Rptr. 608*

Storage charges are proper element of damages for deceit. *Sprague v. Frank J. Sanders Lincoln Mercury, Inc. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 412, 419-420, 174 Cal. Rptr. 608*

[ii] Reliance

Direct evidence is not required to show reliance; circumstances of case as basis for inferring reliance. *Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 814, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964*

Independent investigation of property does not preclude reliance on representation when falsity of statement would not be apparent from inspection or when person making misrepresentation has superior knowledge. *Bagdasarian v. Gragnon (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 744, 748, 192 P.2d 935* ; *Arthur L. Sachs, Inc. v. City of Oceanside (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 315, 323, 198 Cal. Rptr. 483* ; *Horn v. Guaranty Chevrolet Motors (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 477, 482, 75 Cal. Rptr. 871*

Buyer ordinarily does not have duty to investigate. *Arthur L. Sachs, Inc. v. City of Oceanside (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 315, 323, 198 Cal. Rptr. 483*

[f] Injury

Pecuniary loss is not necessary; gift and sale of gift item are rescindable for fraud or donee and retailer; alteration of essential character of transaction is sufficient injury. *Earl v. Saks & Co (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 602, 611-613, 226 P.2d 340*

Pecuniary loss is not required to be pleaded or proved to justify rescission for fraud so long as some injury is shown. *Hefferan v. Freebairn (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 715, 721-722, 214 P.2d 386* (misrepresentation regarding earnings of business sold)

[g] Pleading

Complaint that fails to set forth facts showing plaintiff was harmed is fatally defective. *Guthrie v. Times-Mirror Co. (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 879, 886-889, 124 Cal. Rptr. 577* (mistake of law)

Fraud is required to be specifically pleaded. *Hall v. Department of Adoptions (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 898, 904-905, 121 Cal. Rptr. 223*

Unsupported allegations of fraud are insufficient; rescinding party as required to have actually been deceived by misrepresentation of material fact, by which other party intended to deceive, and to have relied to his or her injury. Contra *Costa County Title Co. v. Waloff (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 59, 65, 7 Cal. Rptr. 358* (party attempting rescission found to have breached contract)

[h] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vols. 4, 5, *Pleading*, §§ 345, 502-512, 667-687 (4th ed. 1997)

[i] Cross Reference

For related form, *see § 490.60*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.62

§ 490.62 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract--Failure of Consideration [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)-(4)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692], or in the Alternative, for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract--Failure of Consideration [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)-(4)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF BASED ON RESCIS-
_____ [*name*],	)	SION; FOR MONEY HAD AND RECIEVED; [AND
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff allege(s):

FIRST COUNT
(Relief Based on Rescission)

1. [*Capacity and residence of parties. See § 490.61[1], Paragraphs 1. and 2.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 4.*]

4. [*Formation and terms of contract or lease. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 5.*]

5. [*Plaintiff's performance or excuse for performance. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 9.*]

[6. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*describe the occurrence, satisfaction, or waiver of any condition precedent to defendant's performance, e.g.,* the Board of Directors of the defendant corporation approved and ratified the contract as written).]

[*EITHER, if failure of consideration is total*]

7. _____ [Despite plaintiff's demand that he/she/it do so, defendant *or* Defendant] has failed and refused _____ [*describe defendant's failure to perform and if failure to perform was not accompanied by a specific repudiation, indicate that failure has continued either for more than a reasonable time or, if time has been specified by the contract to be of theessence, beyond the time specified in the contract, e.g.,* execute and deliver to plaintiff its note for two months after the time called for by the contract].

[*OR, if failure of consideration is material*]

7. Defendant _____ [*describe defendant's performance and manner and extent of failure of consideration, e.g.,* delivered and installed the security system on plaintiff's premises. When the system had been operating for only two weeks, plaintiff was served an injunction issued by the United States District Court requiring the system to be rendered inoperable because it interfered with secret government radio frequencies. The system has therefore been rendered useless].

[*OR, if failure of consideration is based on repudiation*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*if defendant expressly repudiated contract:*, by _____ (*specify form of notice, e.g.,* a letter to plaintiff) gave notice that defendant would not perform the contract, and defendant totally repudiated it *or, if repudiation was implied by defendant's conduct, allege facts showing that defendant put it out of defendant's power to perform, e.g.,* dissolved the partnership, liquidated its assets, and voluntarily went out of business despite defendant's promise to pay plaintiff's note from the profits of the partnership]. [*If appropriate, add:* A copy of defendant's _____ (*e.g.,* letter) is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.] Defendant's repudiation of the contract by this _____ [notice *or* action] has not been retracted. At the time of defendant's repudiation, plaintiff had performed all of the conditions and things on his/her/its part to be done and performed, and was ready, able, and willing to _____ [perform those terms and conditions on his/her/its part to be performed or complete performance on his/her/its part].

[*CONTINUE*]

8. [*Plaintiff's injury. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 12.*]

9. [*Notice of rescission and offer to restore or allegation that service of complaint is to serve as notice and offer. See §*

490.61[1], Alternative Paragraphs 13.]

[10. *Consequential damages, if any. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 14.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Damages for Breach of Contract)

11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-7 [and Paragraph 10] of the First Count.

12. As a result of _____ [defendant's breach of *or* the failure of the consideration to be received by plaintiff under] the contract, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____, which is the amount that plaintiff _____ [*specify items of damage, e.g.,* expended on a totally useless burglar alarm system (*if any offsets or credits are to be acknowledged, add them here, e.g.,* less the sum of $_____ which plaintiff acknowledges to be the reasonable value of the use of the system for the two weeks it operated before the plaintiff was notified of the injunction)].

THIRD COUNT
(Common Count for Money Had and Received)

13. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-3 of the First Count.

14. [*Defendant's indebtedness. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 19.*]

15. [*Nonpayment. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 20.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

On the first COUNT:

1. That this Court declare that the _____ [contract *or* lease] has been rescinded;

2. That defendant be ordered to pay plaintiff the following sums:

[*Use any or all of the following subparagraphs as applicable*]

(a) The consideration paid by plaintiff in the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

(b) The sums paid, or which will be paid, by plaintiff for _____ [*enumerate other items for which plaintiff will have to be reimbursed to be placed in the position he or she was in prior to execution of the contract being rescinded, e.g.,* costs of installing and dismantling the alarm system on plaintiff's premises] _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof], with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

3. That plaintiff be ordered to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* return possession of the alarm system to defendant] on condition that defendant pay to plaintiff the sums as ordered by the judgment of this Court;

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees as _____ (provided for in the contract *or* authorized by _____ (*specify any applicable statute that provides for attorney's fees, e.g., Civ. Code § 2983.4*)) according to proof.]

On the second COUNT:

5. For compensatory damages _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof], with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

On the third COUNT:

6. For the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*].

On all COUNTS:

7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

8. For such other relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 490.61.*]

CAUTION:
If the rescinded contract is governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), an affadavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*), showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action, must be filed concurrently with the complaint, unless the complaint is verified and shows the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4* [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see* *§ 490.61[9]*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action to seek restitution after rescission or, in the alternative, damages for breach of contract, when the consideration he or she was to receive under a contract or lease failed in whole or in material part [*see Civ. Code §§ 1689(b)(2), (4), 1692, 3300*]. The common count for money had and received is an additional alternative ground for recovery of sums paid by plaintiff under the rescinded contract [*see Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 518, 36 P.2d 635* (propriety of pleading express count and common count based on same facts); *Bray v. Lowery (1912) 163 Cal. 256, 260, 124 P. 1004* (failure of consideration as proper basis for action for money had and received)]. If plaintiff's performance, or part performance, took the form of work, labor, or services rather than money, then quantum meruit is the appropriate common count, not money had and received as set forth in the foregoing form [*Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 304, 273 P.2d 15* (after employer's repudiation by wrongful discharge, employee may recover reasonable value of services rendered on quantum meruit even if reasonable value exceeds contract rate); *Mayo v. Pacific Project Consultants, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1018-1019, 82 Cal. Rptr. 117* ; for a form of complaint based on quantum meruit, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts*].

If the transaction involved a deed or other instrument that may cause plaintiff harm if left outstanding, a count for cancellation may be added. For forms of complaint for cancellation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* . For forms of complaint containing causes of action for both rescission and cancellation of real property transactions and the instrument created by them, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Preliminary Allegations

The first count of this complaint incorporates the allegations from *§ 490.61* regarding the capacity and residence of the parties (Paragraphs 1-3), the formation of the contract or lease being rescinded (Paragraph 4), and the extent of plaintiff's performance or excuse for nonperformance (Paragraph 5). For discussion of those allegations, see *§ 490.61*.

[b] Failure of Consideration

Optional Paragraph 6 is for use when defendant's performance was conditioned on the occurrence of an event or performance of some act to allege the performance, happening, or waiver of the condition precedent or concurrent [*see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

Alternative Paragraphs 7 allege failure of consideration based on one of the following:

- Defendant's total failure to perform the contract [Paragraph 7, first alternative provision].

- Defendant's material breach of the contract [Paragraph 7, second alternative provision].

- Defendant's repudiation of the contract [Paragraph 7, third alternative provision; *see Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 302, 273 P.2d 15]* . For discussion of repudiation of a contract, see *§ 490.16[3][g]*. For a complaint for damages based on anticipatory repudiation, see *Ch. 140, Contracts, § 140.105*.

All of the above alternatives allege facts establishing that the breach or failure is total or material [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)-(4)*; *see also Fountain v. Semi-Tropic L. & W. Co. (1893) 99 Cal. 677, 680-681, 34 P. 497* (what constitutes material breach or failure); *Wyler v. Feuer (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 392, 403-404, 149 Cal. Rptr. 626* (partial failure of consideration under *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)* must be material to provide basis for rescission)]. For additional discussion of these grounds for rescission, see *§ 490.16[3][b][ii]*

Under *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(3)* and*(b)(4)*, rescission is available even if the defendant was not the cause of the failure of consideration [*see Nelson v. Sperling (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 194, 195-196, 76 Cal. Rptr. 481* (*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(4)*)].

[c] Other Allegations

The first count of this complaint incorporates allegations from § 490.61 regarding the following:

- Plaintiff's injury [Paragraph 8; *see Coleman v. Mora (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 137, 150, 69 Cal. Rptr. 166* ; *Wilson v. Corrugated KraftContainers (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 691, 697, 256 P.2d 1012* (willful default may be material failure justifying rescission even though no economic loss ensues)].

- That plaintiff gave notice of rescission and offered to restore, or facts showing that restoration is not necessary, or allegations that service of the summons and complaint are to serve as notice of rescission

and/or offer of restoration [Alternative Paragraphs 9; *see Civ. Code § 1691*; *Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 306, 273 P.2d 15* (plaintiff need not restore reasonable value of services he or she performed before defendant's breach)].

- Optional allegations regarding plaintiff's additional or consequential damages [Paragraph 10; *see Civ. Code § 1692*; *see, e.g.,* *Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 308 n.3, 310-313, 318-319, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682* (rescission of franchise agreement, loss of former salary, training, and net operating expenses)].

These allegations are discussed in *§ 490.61*. The essential allegations for money had and received are discussed in *§ 490.61*.

[d] Damages for Breach of Contract

The allegations in the count for damages for breach of contract differ from those in the count for relief based on rescission only in that plaintiff's injury is assigned a money value in the count for damages (Paragraph 12), while allegation in the count for relief based on rescission did not necessarily do so [*see* *Coleman v. Mora (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 137, 150, 69 Cal. Rptr. 166* ; *Wilson v. Corrugated Kraft Containers (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 691, 697, 256 P.2d 1012* (willful default may be material failure justifying rescission even though no economic loss ensues)].

A vendor who rescinds a contract for the sale of personal property is entitled to the cost of replacement if the specific property cannot be returned [*Gardiner Solder v. SupAlloy Corp. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1537, 1544, 284 Cal. Rptr. 206* (seller of solder sought rescission and restitution after solder had been shipped and buyer had failed to pay)].

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless it is a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 85*]. Actions to cancel or rescind a contract when the relief is sought in connection with an action to recover money not exceeding $25,000 or property of a value not exceeding $25,000, paid or delivered under or in consideration of the contract, are limited civil cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(3)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

If the gravamen of an action for relief based on rescission is deemed to be quasi-contractual arising from the implied contract for restitution, the proper venue is the county in which the obligation is to be performed, in which the contract was entered into, or in which the defendant resides at the commencement of the action. If no place is specified as the place of performance, performance is due where the liability was incurred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see* *Philpott v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 512, 517-518, 524-526, 36 P.2d 635* (considering jurisdiction under former law, not venue; when tort is waived action for money had and received or quantum meruit as ex contractu)]. The implied contract is formed when and where the notice of rescission is served, which will usually be the defendant's residence or principal place of business [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Fitzhugh v. University Realty Co. (1920) 46 Cal. App. 198, 201, 188 P. 1023* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (venue for action against corporation or association, same as venue for contract action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* with additional option of county of principal place of business)].

If the rescinded contract is governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), or arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a

solicitation by the seller [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*], special venue requirements apply [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10, 2984.4*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*]. Those requirements are discussed in *§ 490.61*.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

[6] State Statutes

Rescission for failure of consideration to be received by rescinding party, in whole or in part, through fault of party against whom he or she rescinds. *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)*

Rescission for failure of consideration to be received by rescinding party, before it is rendered to him or her, in material respect from any cause. *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(4)*

[7] Decisions

[a] Common Count

After breach of contract by employer that is material enough to warrant rescission by employee, employee is entitled to recover reasonable value of services rendered on quantum meruit even if reasonable value exceeds contract rate. *Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 304, 273 P.2d 15*

Cross complaint to recover reasonable value of services and moneys advanced in part performance was acceptance of offer of rescission manifested by plaintiff's repudiation and commencement of quiet title action. *Mayo v. Pacific Project Consultants, Inc. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1018-1019, 82 Cal. Rptr. 117*

[b] Consequential Damages

After rescission for failure of defendant's performance, plaintiff is entitled to recover loss of income from date service-area contract was signed to date of notice of rescission at rate of former salary, training, and operating expenses, less gross income from franchise operation. *Runyan v. Pacific Air Industries, Inc. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 304, 308 n.3, 310-313, 318-319, 85 Cal. Rptr. 138, 466 P.2d 682*

[c] Failure of Consideration

When agreement for sale of block of stock required purchaser to make tender offer for outstanding shares held by other minority interests at price no less than price paid to seller, and, if purchaser acquired 80 percent of shares, to adjust price paid to seller to reflect price paid to other offerees, purchaser's failure to make tender offer was breach of contract and failure of consideration; whether failure of consideration was sufficiently material to allow seller to rescind was question of fact. *FDIC v. Air Florida System, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 822 F.2d 833, 839-840*

No mistake of fact or failure of consideration, only error in judgment, was established when contract became unprofitable for party who knew that its value could be effected by particular future event and made no provision in contract with respect to that risk; risk is borne by that party, who is not entitled to avoid, rescind, or reform contract. *Mosher v. Mayacamas Corp. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1, 5-6, 263 Cal. Rptr. 373*

Partial failure of consideration under *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)* required to be material to justify rescission. *Wyler v. Feuer (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 392, 403-404, 149 Cal. Rptr. 626* ; *Crofoot Lumber, Inc. v. Thompson (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 324, 332-333, 329 P.2d 302*

Materiality of failure of consideration is question of fact; failure to endorse notes without recourse and deliver them to plaintiff held material failure affording plaintiff ground for rescission. *Calabrese v. Rexall Drug & Chemical Co. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 774, 782, 785, 32 Cal. Rptr. 665*

Failure of goods to conform to warranty permits rescission for failure of consideration. *Hot-N-Kold Corp. v. Todd (1930) 105 Cal. App. 718, 723, 288 P. 687*

When goods are of no use for purpose for which they were purchased, failure of consideration is total, and restoration need not be made prior to suit. *Hot-N-Kold Corp. v. Todd (1930) 105 Cal. App. 718, 723, 288 P. 687*

Failure to use money loaned for agreed purpose is failure of consideration. *Richards v. Tavares (1930) 105 Cal. App. 261, 269, 287 P. 552*

[d] Pleading

Service of complaint for money had and received equivalent to notice of unilateral rescission. *Nelson v. Sperling (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 194, 195 n. 1, 76 Cal. Rptr. 481*

[e] Repudiation

Obligor's statement to obligee indicating that obligor will breach important contractual promise, thereby substantially impairing value of contract, constitutes repudiation of contract, entitling obligee to restitution; restitution is appropriate whether or not contracts ultimately would have produced financial gain to plaintiff. *Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc. v. United States (2000) 530 U.S. 604, 120 S. Ct. 2423, 147 L. Ed. 2d 528, 534, 543-544*

Repudiation gives other party election to rescind. *Oliver v. Campbell (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 298, 302, 273 P.2d 15* ; *Loop Bldg. Co. v. DeCoo (1929) 97 Cal. App. 354, 364, 275 P. 881*

Offer of obligor that includes demand for performance of unwarranted condition is refusal to perform *Woody v. Bennett (1891) 88 Cal. 241, 243-244, 26 P. 117* ; *Loop Bldg. Co. v. DeCoo (1929) 97 Cal. App. 354, 364, 275 P. 881*

[8] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vols. 4, 5, *Pleading*, §§ 483-504, 513, 896-848 (4th ed. 1997)

[9] Cross Reference

For a related form, *see § 490.61*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.63

§ 490.63 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Incompetency Prior to Adjudication
[Civ. Code §§ 39, 1689(b)(7)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Incompetency Prior to Adjudication
[Civ. Code §§ 39, 1689(b)(7)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], [_____ (an incompetent person *or* a person for whom a conservator has been appointed), by _____ (*name*) his/her _____ (guardian ad litem *or* conservator)], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*], [and DOES I through _____,] Defendant(s).	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF BASED ON RESCISSION [Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000] [LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff [_____ (*name*), _____ (an incompetent person *or* a person for whom a conservator has been appointed), through his/her _____ (guardian ad litem *or* conservator)] alleges:

[*EITHER, if conservator has been appointed*]

1. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name*] was appointed conservator of the [person and] estate of plaintiff _____ [*name*] by the _____ Court of _____; and on _____ [*date*], letters of conservatorship were issued. [A certified copy of those letters is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated by reference.]

[*OR, if suit is by guardian ad litem*]

1. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name*] was appointed guardian ad litem of plaintiff _____ [*name*], an incompetent person, by the _____ [above-entitled *or specify other*] Court for purposes of this action.

[*OR use neither of the above paragraphs if plaintiff is suing in his or her own behalf*]

[*CONTINUE*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Formation and terms of contract or lease. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 5.*]

6. [*Plaintiff's performance or excuse for performance. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 9.*]

7. [*Defendant's performance. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 10.*]

8. At the time plaintiff and defendant entered into the _____ [contract *or* lease] [and at the time plaintiff rendered his/her performance (and accepted defendant's performance) thereunder], plaintiff was a person of unsound mind, but not entirely without understanding, and was wholly and absolutely incompetent and unable to understand the nature, purpose, and affect of the transaction.

[9. At the time plaintiff and defendant entered into the _____ (contract *or* lease) (, and at the time plaintiff rendered his/her performance [and accepted defendant's performance] thereunder), plaintiff was a person of unsound mind, substantially unable _____ (to manage his/her own financial resources *and/or* to resist fraud or undue influence).]

[10. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff was adjudicated incompetent by order of the _____ (above-entitled *or specify other*) Court in Case No. _____.]

[11. Plaintiff has been damaged in that _____ (*set forth any facts showing harm from bargain, e.g.*, in that he parted with property worth approximately $33,000, which then represented approximately two-thirds of his entire net worth, in return for an unprofitable orchard, on real property worth only $12,000).]

12. [*Notice of rescission and offer to restore or allegation that service of complaint is to serve as notice and offer. See § 490.61[1], Alternative Paragraphs 13.*]

[13. *Consequential damages, if any. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 14.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That this Court declare that the _____ [contract *or* lease] has been rescinded;

2. That defendant be ordered to pay plaintiff the following sums:

[*Use any or all of the following subparagraphs as applicable*]

a. The consideration paid by plaintiff in the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annumfrom _____ [*date of rescission*];

b. The sums paid, or which will be paid, by plaintiff for _____ [*enumerate other items for which plaintiff will have to be reimbursed to be placed in the position he or she was in prior to the execution of the contract being rescinded, e.g.,* losses incurred in operating the orchard]_____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof], with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

3. That plaintiff be ordered to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* return title and possession of the real and personal property to the defendant] on condition that defendant pay to plaintiff the sums as ordered by the judgment of this Court;

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees as _____ (provided for in the contract *or* authorized by _____ [*specify any applicable statute that provides for attorney's fees, e.g., Civ. Code § 2983.4*]) according to proof.]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 490.61[1].*]

CAUTION:

If the rescinded contract is governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), an affadavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*), showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action, must be filed concurrently with the foregoing complaint, unless the complaint is verified and shows the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4* [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c),*

2984.4(c); *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see § 490.61[9]*]. In a limited civil case that arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*], the complaint must be accompanied by an affidavit of plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney showing that the action is being commenced in the proper court, unless the complaint is verified and shows that the action and showsthat the action is being commenced in the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by an adult plaintiff, appearing alone, or by his or her conservator or guardian ad litem if one has been appointed, to bring an action for restitution after rescission on the ground that plaintiff had no understanding of the nature, purpose, and effect of the contract or conveyance rescinded [*see Civ. Code §§ 39(a), 1689(b)(7)*]. If the plaintiff is incompetent at the time of the commencement of the action and no conservator of the estate has been appointed, a guardian ad litem will have to be appointed to represent the incompetent in the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 372(a), 373* (party who is incompetent is required to appear by conservator or guardian ad litem); for a petition for appointment of a guardian ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*].

When using this form, an attorney should consider whether other grounds for rescission, such as unsound mind, undue influence, or mistake, exist in the particular situation and should be alleged [*see Odorizzi v. Bloomfield School Dist. (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 123, 131, 54 Cal. Rptr. 533* (continuum of undue susceptibility in which weakness that provides sufficient ground to rescind for undue influence is lesser degree of weakness than lack of capacity to make contract under *Civ. Code § 39*)]. Allegations setting forth those grounds are in Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*.

If the transaction involved a deed or other instrument that may cause plaintiff harm if left outstanding, a count for cancellation may be added. For complaints for cancellation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* . For complaints containing causes of action for both rescission and cancellation of real property transactions and the instrument created by them, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint provides allegations for three alternatives as to plaintiff's appearance (Introduction and Alternative Paragraphs 1). If the plaintiff is competent at the time the action is commenced, he or she may appear alone [*Code Civ. Proc. § 367*]. If a conservator of the estate has been appointed, plaintiff may appear by the conservator of his or her estate [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 372(a), 373*; *see In re Marriage of Higgason (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 476, 484, 110 Cal. Rptr. 897, 516 P.2d 289* , *overruled on other grounds* (when conservator has been appointed, conservatee should not appear in action except by conservator or guardian ad litem)]. A guardian ad litem can be appointed even if there is a conservator of the estate if the conservator has not acted or has a conflict of interest or if it is otherwise appropriate [*Boyd v. Lancaster (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 103, 108-109, 132 P.2d 214* (inaction)].

Paragraphs are incorporated from other forms to allege:

- Defendants' capacities and residences, if necessary to establish venue or for any other reason (Paragraphs 2-4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), 395.5*; *see also § 490.62[4]*].

- Formation of the contract, and the extent to which either or both parties have performed under it (Paragraphs 5-7).

- The giving notice of rescission and the making of an offer to restore (alternative Paragraphs 12) [*Civ. Code § 1691*; *Burgess v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 808, 818-821, 113 P.2d 298]* .

Paragraph 8 of this form alleges plaintiff's incompetence with regard to the particular transaction at issue [*Civ. Code § 39*; *see Guidici v. Guidici (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 497, 502, 41 P.2d 932* (incapacity may arise from intoxication of such a degree as to deprive person of reason and understanding; *Drum v. Bummer (1946) 77 Cal. App. 2d 453, 460, 175 P.2d 879]* .

This complaint includes optional paragraphs for use to allege the following:

- That the plaintiff was of unsound mind because he or she was substantially unable to manage his or her own financial resources or to resist fraud or undue influence (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 39(b)* (rebuttable presumption affecting burden of proof that person is of unsound mind)].

- That the plaintiff has been adjudicated incompetent since the contract was made (Paragraph 9) [*see Prob. Code § 1872(a)* (appointment of conservator as adjudication of conservatee's lack of capacity to enter into contracts except as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 1872(b)-1876*); *but see In re Marriage of Higgason (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 476, 484, 110 Cal. Rptr. 897, 516 P.2d 289* (decided before enactment of *Prob. Code § 1872*) (overruled on other grounds in *In re Marriage of Dawley (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 342, 352, 131 Cal. Rptr. 3, 551 P.2d 323*)].

- That the plaintiff entered into the transaction for less than adequate consideration or any other facts tending to establish the inequity of the transaction or incompetence of plaintiff in entering into it (Paragraph 11) [*see, e.g., Guidici v. Guidici (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 497, 499-501, 41 P.2d 932* ; *Philbrook v. Howard (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 210, 213, 320 P.2d 609]* .

- Any damages sustained by plaintiff as a result of the transaction (Paragraph 13) [*Civ. Code § 1692* (providing for complete relief); *Weseman v. Latham (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 841, 845-846, 315 P.2d 364* (defendant's profit and expenses deducted from amount plaintiff was required to restore)].

[4] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[5] Cross References

For discussion of and affirmative defenses based on the various degrees of contractual incapacity, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms for appointment of conservators, see Ch. 281, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Appointment of Conservators*

For discussion and forms relating to the powers of a conservator, see Ch. 287, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: General Management Powers* , through Ch. 290A, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Asset Management and Investment*

[6] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda supporting and opposing a general demurrer to a complaint and to an answer for rescission or cancellation of a voidable contract or conveyance and opposing a motion for summary judgment in such an acton, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 117, *Insane and Incompetent Persons* (Matthew Bender)

[7] State Statutes

Person entirely without understanding is unable to contract, but is liable for necessities. *Civ. Code § 38*

Conveyance or contract by person of unsound mind but not entirely without understanding is rescindable. *Civ. Code § 39(a)*

Rebuttable presumption affecting burden of proof that person is of unsound mind exists if person is substantially unable to manage his or her own financial resources or to resist fraud or undue influence. *Civ. Code § 39(b)*

After adjuciation of incapacity, person of unsound mind is unable to contract. *Civ. Code § 40*

Party who is incompetent as required to appear by conservator or guardian ad litem. *Code Civ. Proc. § 372(a)*

Appointment of guardian ad litem. *Code Civ. Proc. § 373*

Appointment of conservator as adjudication of conservatee's lack of capacity to enter into contracts; exceptions. *Prob. Code § 1872(a)*

Authority of conservator to initiate and maintain action on behalf of conservatee. *Prob.Code § 2462*

Payment of conservator's attorney's fees. *Prob. Code § 2640 et seq.*

[8] Decisions

[a] Incompetency as Ground for Rescission

Right of incompetent under *Civ. Code § 39* to rescind is entirely predicated on his or her incompetency; defendant's fraud or knowledge of plaintiff's incompetency is not required. *Weseman v. Latham (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 841, 846, 315 P.2d 364* ; *Neale v. Sterling (1931) 117 Cal. App. 507, 509, 4 P.2d 250*

Right of incompetent under *Civ. Code § 39* is supported by finding of incompetency; overreaching by defendant is not required. *Stratton v. Grant (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 814, 816-817, 294 P.2d 500*

Right of incompetent under *Civ. Code § 39* to rescind does not require that he or she have been adjudicated incompetent prior to transaction. *Neale v. Sterling (1931) 117 Cal. App. 507, 509, 4 P.2d 250*

[b] Lack of Understanding

Intoxication that deprives person of reason and understanding is basis for incapacity. *Guidici v. Guidici (1932) 2 Cal. 2d 497, 502, 41 P.2d 932* ; *Walton v. Bank of California (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 527, 541, 32 Cal. Rptr. 856* (plaintiff found competent); *Mundorff v. Ramm (1924) 66 Cal. App. 553, 565, 226 P. 820*

To rescind under *Civ. Code § 39*, test is whether or not person could deal with subject matter of contract with full understanding of his or her rights and nature, purpose, and effect of what he or she did with respect to particular transaction; incompetency to enter any kind of contract is not required. *Smalley v. Baker (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 824, 832, 69 Cal. Rptr. 521* (plaintiff found competent); *Walton v. Bank of California (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 527, 541, 32 Cal. Rptr. 856* (plaintiff found competent); *Peterson v. Ellebrecht (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 718, 721, 23 Cal. Rptr. 349* ; *Philbrook v. Howard (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 210, 214, 320 P.2d 609* ; *Stratton v. Grant (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 814, 817, 294 P.2d 500* ; *Drum v. Bummer (1946) 77 Cal. App. 2d 453, 460, 175 P.2d 879*

Test of understanding varies from one contract to next; test is cognitive rather than motivational; imprudent tendencies of manic phase of manic depression is example of motivational test applied in some jurisdictions; California test is narrower, focusing only on impaired understanding. *Smalley v. Baker (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 824, 832-835, 69 Cal. Rptr. 521*

Incompetency is question of fact to be determined by jury or trial court; findings supported by evidence will not be disturbed on appeal. *Peterson v. Ellebrecht (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 718, 721, 23 Cal. Rptr. 349*

Evidence that one's mental capacity is limited to simple, everyday situations, and that one is unable to deal with abstractions, such as concept of title to property, supports finding that one is unable to competently deal with subject matter with full understanding of his or her rights. *Peterson v. Ellebrecht (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 718, 722, 23 Cal. Rptr. 349*

One lacking enough mental vigor to protect him or herself against imposition is entitled to protection even though mental weakness is not such as to justify one being regarded as totally incompetent. *Philbrook v. Howard (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 210, 214, 320 P.2d 609*

Evidence of incompetence before and after transaction is admissible and will support finding of incompetence despite existence of some evidence of competence at time of transaction. *Mundorff v. Ramm (1924) 66 Cal. App. 553, 565-566, 226 P. 820*

[c] Limitations and Laches

If based on fraud or mistake, complaint is required to allege discovery within three years prior to commencement of action to avoid bar of former Code Civ. Prov. § 338.4 (*now see Code. Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*); laches not applicable when statute of limitation for fraud applies. *Castro v. Geil (1895) 110 Cal. 292, 295-296, 42 P. 804*

Laches does not bar rescission when guardian acted as soon as she discovered facts. *Philbrook v. Howard (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 210, 215, 320 P.2d 609*

Four-year limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* did not bar rescission of deed when plaintiff never recovered his mental powers sufficiently to comprehend situations and guardian ad litem first learned of facts one month before action was brought *Boyd v. Lancaster (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 103, 111, 132 P.2d 214*

[d] Party Plaintiff

When conservator has been appointed, *Code Civ. Proc. § 372* requires conservatee to appear in action by conservator or guardian ad litem; other party can raise defect; guardian ad litem is only representative, not party. *In re Marriage of Higgason (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 476, 484, 110 Cal. Rptr. 897, 516 P.2d 289* (overruled on other grounds in *In re Marriage of Dawley (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 342, 352, 131 Cal. Rptr. 3, 551 P.2d 323*)

Suit should be brought in name of incompetent by guardian; cause of action is ward's not guardian's; complaint in name of guardian is demurrable for want of plaintiff. *Dixon v. Gries (1895) 106 Cal. 506, 507, 39 P. 857* ; *Fox v. Minor (1867) 32 Cal. 111, 117-119*

[e] Restoration or Offer to Restore

Failure of plaintiff to make offer to restore is not fatal since decree could be conditioned on payment or restoration. *Weseman v. Latham (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 841, 846-847, 315 P.2d 364*

Offer to restore made during trial is sufficient. *Boyd v. Lancaster (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 103, 109-111, 132 P.2d 214*

If offer to restore was made prior to suit, allegation or finding that parties can be restored to status quo is not necessary. *Neale v. Sterling (1931) 117 Cal. App. 507, 509-510, 4 P.2d 250*

Right of incompetent under *Civ. Code § 39* to rescind held barred for failure to offer to restore value with which other party had parted in reliance on contract. *Burgess v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 808, 818-821, 113 P.2d 298*

[9] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 4, *Pleading*, §§ 502-504, 512 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 50-57 (10th ed. 2005)

[10] Cross Reference

For related forms, *see §§ 490.61* and *490.62*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.64

§ 490.64 Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Contract Unlawful or Prejudicial to Public Policy [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5), (6)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692]--Contract Unlawful or Prejudicial to Public Policy [Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5), (6)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF BASED ON RESCIS-
_____ [*name*],	)	SION [FOR MONEY HAD AND RECEIVED]
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
Defendant(s).	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Relief Based on Rescission)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 4.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____, California, [*if circumstances in which agreement was made bear on its unlawfulness, set forth those circumstance, e.g.,* plaintiff was a stockholder in a corporation of which defendant was president and which held certain logging permits relating to land owned by the United States. The permits were subject to cancellation or renewal. Defendant told plaintiff that certain persons of authority and influence would require financial renumeration to successfully negotiate the renewal of the logging rights. In response to this specific request of defendant plaintiff and defendant entered into _____ [a written *or* an oral] _____ [contract *or* lease] whereby _____ [*describe the contract or lease, setting forth the purpose or consideration that renders it and/or its enforcement unlawful and/or prejudicial to public policy, attaching a copy if desired, e.g.,* plaintiff was to make $35,000 in cash or gold bars available to defendant. Defendant promised plaintiff that the cash or gold would be used to influence the course of the negotiations for the renewal of the logging permits].

[*EITHER*]

5. The _____ [contract *or* lease] is unlawful because it is contrary to _____ [an express provision of law *and/or* the policy of express law, though not expressly prohibited *and/or* good morals] in that _____ [*specify, statute or policy that is offended by purpose or consideration provided for by contract or lease rescinded, e.g., Section 201 of Title 18 of the United States Code* prohibits, and provides criminal penalties for, making a payment or gift to a public official for the purpose of influencing an official act. The object of the contract that plaintiff _____ (rescinded *or* seeks to rescind) is to pay a public official to influence an official act].

[*AND/OR*]

5. The public interest will be prejudiced if the _____ [contract *or* lease] is permitted to stand in that _____ [*specify public interest that is offended by purpose of the contract or lease rescinded, e.g.,* public confidence in public officials requires that any contract by a public officer that could give the appearance of interefering with the unbiased discharge of his or her duty to the public in the exercise of his or her office be voided. If completed, the contract that plaintiff _____ (rescinded *or* seeks to rescind) would interfere with a public official's unbiased performance of his or her duty to the public].

[*CONTINUE*]

6. [*Plaintiff's performance or excuse for performance. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 9.*]

7. Defendant _____ [*describe the extent of defendant's performance, e.g.,* has done nothing in furtherance of the contract and has rendered no performance thereunder].

8. [*Notice of rescission and offer to restore or allegation that service of complaint is to serve as notice and offer. See § 490.61[1], Alternative Paragraphs 13.*]

[9. *Damages in addition to restitution, if any, required to make plaintiff whole. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 14.*]

[10. *Punitive damage allegations. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 15.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Common Count for Money Had and Received)

11. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-7 of the First Count.

12. [*Defendant's indebtedness. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 19.*]

13. [*Nonpayment. See § 490.61[1], Paragraph 20.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

On the first COUNT:

1. That this Court declare that the _____ [contract *or* lease] has been rescinded;

2. That defendant be ordered to pay plaintiff the following sums:

[*Use any or all of the following subparagrphs as applicable*]

(a) The consideration paid by plaintiff in the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

(b) The sums paid, or which will be paid, by plaintiff for _____ [*enumerate other items for which plaintiff will have to be reimbursed to be placed in the position he or she was in prior to the execution of the contract being rescinded, e.g.,* courier fees, and brokerage commissions] _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof], with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*];

[(c) Exemplary damages.]

[3. For reasonable attorney's fees as _____ (provided for in the contract *or* authorized by _____ (*specify any applicable statute that provides for attorney's fees, e.g., Civ. Code § 2983.4*)) according to proof.]

On the second COUNT:

4. For the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at _____ [*specify legal or agreed rate*] percent per annum from _____ [*date of rescission*].

On all COUNTS:

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 490.61[1].*]

CAUTION:

If the rescinded contract is governed by the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*), showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action, must be filed concurrently with the complaint, unless the complaint is verified and shows the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4* [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see § 490.61*]. In a limited civil case that arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller [***see*** *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*], the complaint must be accompanied by an affidavit of plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney showing that the action is being commenced in the proper court, unless the complaint is verified and shows that the action and shows that the action is being commenced in the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action for restitution after rescission of a contract or lease that is unlawful or that would prejudice the public interest if allowed to stand [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6), see also § 490.16[3][c]*]. If the transaction rescinded concerns an interest in real property, an additional count for quiet title may be necessary to prevent a cloud on plaintiff's title [*see, e.g., Harper v. Raya (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 908, 913, 201 Cal. Rptr. 563* (suggesting quiet title or forcible detainer as proper remedy to terminate possession and claimed life estate of former mistress); *see* Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , and Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*]. If a written instrument must be cancelled to give the plaintiff complete relief, a count for cancellation should be added [see *Civ. Code § 3412*; *see* Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*]. Other complaints for relief based on rescission on the ground of noncompliance with particular statutes, mostly licensing statutes and consumer protection statutes, may be found in the chapters listed under References, Cross References.

[3] Allegations

In addition to allegations incorporated from previous forms, this complaint alleges the following:

- The formation and relevant terms of the contract (Paragraph 4).

- The particular statute or public policy or interest that is offended by the contract or lease (alternative Paragraphs 5) [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6), see also § 490.16[3][c]*].

- The extent of plaintiff's performance (Paragraph 6).

- The extent of defendant's performance (Paragraph 7).

Note that the theory that provides the basis for the factual allegations used as examples requires the plaintiff to withdraw from the illegal bargain while the contract is still executory [*see, e.g., Wassermann v. Sloss (1897) 117 Cal. 425, 428, 49 P. 566* (imposition of constructive trust on stock to be used as bribe); *cf. Tognazzi v. Wilhelm (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 123, 125-126, 56 P.2d 1227* (agreement to defraud creditor was complete when property is transferred, even if creditor does not yet have judgment)].

If plaintiff is proceeding under *Civ. Code § 1689.2* [for discussion, *see § 490.16[3][d]*], he or she does not have to withdraw while the contract is executory, but can only recover net losses, that is, amounts paid pursuant to the scheme, less any amounts or consideration received [*Civ. Code § 1689.2*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms for complaints for restitution based on violation of statutes prohibiting false or deceptive advertising, see Ch. 14, *Advertising*

For discussion and forms for complaints for restitution based on rescission for violation of statutes pertaining to automobile leases and sales contracts, see Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act*

For discussion of remedies available to or against unlicensed real estate brokers, see Ch. 103, *Brokers*

For discussion of remedies availale to or against unlicensed building contractors, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*

For discussion and an alternative form of complaint for restitution based on rescission and cancellation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*

For discussion and a form of complaint for restitution based on rescission of a noncomplying home solicitation contract, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts*

For discussion and a form of complaint for restitution based on rescission of a noncomplying contract for discount buyer services, see Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts*

For discussion and a form of complaint to recover illegal corporate distributions, see Ch. 164, *Corporations: Dividends and Reacquisitions of Shares*

For discussion and a form of complaint for restitution based on rescission and cancellation of a transaction because of corporate director's prohibited interest, see Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management*

For discussion and complaints to set aside transfers in fraud of creditors, see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*

For discussion and forms concerning contracts relating to gambling transactions, see Ch. 272, *Gambling*

For discussion and complaints for restitution based on rescission of contracts for noncompliance with the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) and federal Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*), see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales*

For discussion and complaints for restitution based on rescission of securities transactions for noncompliance with the

California Corporate Securities Law of 1968 (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*), see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.10* et seq.

For discussion and complaints for restitution based on rescission of a noncomplying franchise offer or agreement, see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.50* et seq.

For discussion of cancellation rights and a form relating to rescission of sale or lease of a seller assisted marketing plan, see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulation, § 515.50* et seq.

For discussion and forms for complaints for relief based on rescission of a contract for the sale and purchase of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser*

For discussion and forms for complaints for recovery of usurious interest, see Ch. 568, *Usury*

For discussion of requirements for subdividing land, see Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning*

[5] State Statutes

Unlawful contracts defined. *Civ. Code § 1667 et seq.*

Rescission of unlawful contracts and contracts that prejudice public policy. *Civ. Code § 1689(b)(5),(6)*

Rescission of participation in endless chain scheme; attorney's fees to prevailing plaintiff. *Civ. Code § 1689.2*

[6] Decisions

[a] Attorney's Ethical Duties

Attorney's fee agreement coerced from client in violation of attorney's ethical duties is clearly contrary to public policy; enforcement of agreement denied. *Kallen v. Delug (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 940, 951, 203 Cal. Rptr. 879*

[b] Change in Law

In determining whether subject of contract violates public policy, courts are required to rely on state of law as it existed at time contract was made. *Bovard v. American Horse Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 832, 840 n.3, 247 Cal. Rptr. 340* ; *Moran v. Harris (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 913, 918, 182 Cal. Rptr. 519*

[c] Cohabitation

Lease in consideration of cohabitation is illegal, against public policy; lessor who renounces as entitled to have title quieted against lease, but not to relief for use of leasehold during expired portion of term. *Glos v. McBride (1920) 47 Cal. App. 688, 690-691, 191 P. 67*

[d] Collusive Bidding

Agreement for collusive bidding at probate sale as void and unenforceable as against public policy; party who stopped bidding so other party could acquire at lower price was not entitled to recover interest in property. *Russell v. Soldinger (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 633, 641-642, 131 Cal. Rptr. 145*

[e] Corruption of Public Officials

Lease and sale of property to public entity obtained by gifts to and entertainment of public official was illegal and contrary to public policy. *People ex rel Mosk v. Barenfeld (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 166, 172, 181-182, 21 Cal. Rptr. 501*

[f] Defraud Creditors

Contract made to defraud creditors was void and unenforceable by colluding vendee. *Severance v. Knight-Counihan Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 561, 567-569, 177 P.2d 4*

[g] Drugs and Drug Paraphernalia

Court may refuse to enforce alleged settlement agreement for sums owed as purchase price for company that manufactured jewelry and drug paraphernalia; fact that law making manufacture of paraphernalia illegal was enacted after sale was irrelevant; statute prohibiting possession, use, or transfer of marijuana was basis for public policy against manufacture of paraphernalia when company was sold. *Bovard v. American Horse Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838-841, 247 Cal. Rptr. 340*

[h] Failure to Obtain License

Rescission and restitution of sums paid under life care contract with unlicensed party was required to protect class of persons from unlicensed and unsupervised activities of another; no unjust enrichment or forfeiture was found. *Stenger v. Anderson (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 970, 978-979, 59 Cal. Rptr. 844, 429 P.2d 164*

When illegality consists of failure to secure license, and performance has already been rendered to parties designed to be protected by licensing statute, culpable party was unable to rely on licensing statute to retain proceeds of transaction and avoid payment to innocent party. *Holland v. Morgan & Peacock Properties (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 206, 211, 335 P.2d 769*

[i] Gambling

Public policy is best served by court's refusal to aid recovery of amounts lost on wager, even rigged wager. *Bradley v. Doherty (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 991, 997-998, 106 Cal. Rptr. 725* ; *Schmitt v. Gibson (1910) 12 Cal. App. 407, 412-413, 415-416, 107 P. 571*

Gambling debt is not supported by consideration and is therefore unenforceable, unlawful; payment of gambling debt is transfer of community funds without consent of other spouse; nongambler spouse is entitled to avoid transfer. *Novo v.*

Hotel Del Rio (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 304, 307-308, 295 P.2d 576

Restaurant lease given in partial consideration of percentage of profits earned from illegal gambling on premises is illegal and unenforceable; consideration not severable; waiver of claim for gambling profits does not entitle lessee to recover value of improvements to premises. *Fong v. Miller (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 411, 413-415, 233 P.2d 606*

[j] Inequality of Fault

When parties to executed illegal contract are not equally at fault, recovery by party whose fault is slight is permitted. *Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 454, 296 P.2d 554* ; *Severance v. Knight-Counihan Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 561, 569, 177 P.2d 4* (dicta)

Whether or not parties are equally at fault is question of fact. *Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 455, 296 P.2d 554*

Relatively innocent party is chargeable with knowledge of law; if he or she has no duty to perform under applicable law, he or she is entitled to assume other party complied with law. *Tiedje v. Aluminum Taper Milling Co. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 450, 455, 296 P.2d 554*

If parties are not in pari delicto, party who is only slightly at fault is entitled to recover money paid under executory contract. *Severance v. Knight-Counihan Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 561, 569, 177 P.2d 4* (dicta); *McAllister v. Drapeau (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 102, 112, 92 P.2d 911*

Party not equally at fault is entitled to repudiate contract any time before it is executed and reclaim consideration furnished thereunder. *Smith v. Bach (1920) 183 Cal. 259, 263-264, 191 P. 14*

[k] Laches

Laches, estoppel not applicable to illegal contract. *Colby v. Title Ins. and Trust Co. (1911) 160 Cal. 632, 638-644, 117 P. 913*

[l] Parties

Third party whose interests are affected by contract is entitled to invoke its illegality. *River Garden Farms, Inc. v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 986, 1000, 103 Cal. Rptr. 498* (nonsettling tortfeasor attacking settlements)

[m] Persons Accused of Crime

Party who committed no crime and whose consent was obtained in return for promise not to prosecute is not in pari delicto and is entitled to defeat enforcement of contract and have cancellation and restoration; such consideration is void. *Colby v. Title Ins. and Trust Co. (1911) 160 Cal. 632, 638-644, 117 P. 913* ; *Woodham v. Allen (1900) 130 Cal. 194, 198-199, 62 P. 398*

Police officer's entering into any transaction with prisoner in his or her custody is against public policy; public confidence in law enforcement official requires avoidance of such contract; any contract by officer that interferes with unbiased discharge of his or her duty to public in exercise of office is against public policy. *Grimes v. Allen (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 653, 656-657, 209 P.2d 651*

[n] Ratification

One is never estopped to deny validity of illegal contract because he or she accepted receipts under it; illegal contract is not subject to ratification. *Fewel & Dawes, Inc. v. Pratt (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 85, 91, 109 P.2d 650* ; *Russell v. Soldinger (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 633, 646, 131 Cal. Rptr. 145*

Payment on note given for illegal consideration is not ratification of transaction. *Woodham v. Allen (1900) 130 Cal. 194, 199, 62 P. 398*

[o] Renunciation During Locus Penitentiae

Recovery of what one paid under illegal contract is allowed even to party equally at fault if he or she repudiates contract before illegal part of bargain is executed. *Severance v. Knight-Counihan Co. (1947) 29 Cal. 2d 561, 569,177 P.2d 4* (dicta); *Wassermann v. Sloss (1897) 117 Cal. 425, 428, 49 P. 566* (imposition of constructive trust on stock to be used as bribe)

[p] Restoration by Plaintiff

Necessity of restoration to wrongdoer in order for innocent party to rescind illegal transaction. *People ex rel Mosk v. Barenfeld (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 166, 181-182, 21 Cal. Rptr. 501*

[q] Silence

Although it is illegal and against public policy for one who has duty to reveal material fact to court to agree to conceal that fact, provision in settlement agreement requiring parties to keep agreement private did not amount to agreement to suppress evidence and therefore was not illegal or against public policy. *Philippine Export & Foreign Loan Guarantee Corp. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1058, 1082-1083, 267 Cal. Rptr. 457*

[r] Spouses

Contract of married woman to perform domestic services that are incidental to her marital status is void as against public policy because it would breed discord within and mischief to marital relation; husband not in pari delicto entitled to recover sums paid thereunder. *Brooks v. Brooks (1941) 48 Cal. App. 2d 347, 349-351, 119 P.2d 970*

[s] Subdivided Lands

Innocent purchaser is entitled to rescind purchase of real property for seller's failure to comply with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11012* and to recover money paid on contract. *Murphy v. San Gabriel Mfg. Co. (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 365, 368-369, 222 P.2d 85*

[t] Tax Evasion

Court may refuse to enforce oral agreement for payment of interest when note stated that it did not bear interest and purpose of secret oral agreement was to allow payee not to have to report interest as income on tax returns. *Homami v. Iranzadi (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1104, 1112, 260 Cal. Rptr. 6*

[7] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 419-684; vol. 2, *Insurance* §§ 75-80, *100-109*, *111-113*, 146, 147, 226-229, 277, 279, *280* (10th ed. 2005)

[8] Cross Reference

For related forms, *see §§ 490.61* and *490.62*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.65

§ 490.65 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--General Form

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--General Form

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff had full knowledge _____ [*specify facts giving rise to plaintiff's right to rescind, e.g.,* of the wave damage and erosion thatconstitute the alleged failure on consideration referred to in the complaint. The damage occurred in January and February, 1992. Plaintiff had possession of the property from and after October 14, 1991. Plaintiff and defendant discussed the damage in March, 1992].

2. Plaintiff waived his/her/its right to rescind the _____[contract *or* lease] by _____ [*specify actions of plaintiff which constitute waiver, e.g.,* making payments due to this defendant under the contract for a period of 18 months after learning of the alleged failure of consideration. This continuation of payments] was consistent with an intention to treat the _____ [contract *or* lease] as still valid, viable, and binding.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action for relief based on rescission when the plaintiff has waived his or her right to rescind the contract or lease [*see Civ. Code § 1691*]. The form is based in part on the facts in *Carpenter v. First Trust etc. Bank (1936) 11 Cal. App. 2d 668, 54 P.2d 495* . For forms of affirmative defenses based on prejudicial delay and on plaintiff's election of another remedy, see *§ 490.66* and *490.67*, respectively.

[3] State Statutes

Notice of rescission is required to be given promptly on learning of facts justifying rescission. *Civ. Code § 1691*

[4] Decisions

Waiver is question of fact to be determined after consideration of all circumstances of particular case. *Hefferan v. Freebairn (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 715, 722, 214 P.2d 386* (no waiver found); *Howell v. Courtesy Chevrolet, Inc. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 391, 405, 94 Cal. Rptr. 33*

Acceptance of benefits, even when stipulated to be "without prejudice," i waiver, which bars rescission. *Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 458-460, 154 P.2d 854*

Waiver of one breach or ground for rescission is not waiver of subsequent or other breach or ground. *Hunt v. L. M. Field, Inc. (1927) 202 Cal. 701, 705-706, 262 P. 730* ; *Bowman v. Santa Clara County (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 707, 713, 315 P.2d 67*

By joining in grant of supplemental easement to same party, vendee waives right to rescind on ground of defect in title due to existence of easement; delay in claiming rescission and payment of balance of purchase price is election to affirm contract. *Wilson v. Beazley (1921) 186 Cal. 437, 441-442, 199 P. 772*

Estoppel, but not waiver, requires detrimental reliance by other party. *Rubin v. Los Angeles Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 292, 298, 205 Cal. Rptr. 455*

Commencement and continuation of action for damages for two and one-half years by party who has notice of facts allowing rescission is election of remedies and waiver of right to rescind. *Doctor v. Lakeridge Constr. Co. (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 715, 720-721, 60 Cal. Rptr. 824*

Acceptance of late performance is waiver of right to rescind. *Leiter v. Eltinge (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 306, 317, 54 Cal. Rptr. 703*

Waiver of right to rescind is affirmative defense to action for relief based on rescission, which must be pleaded. *Calabrese v. Rexall Drug & Chemical Co. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 774, 782, 785, 32 Cal. Rptr. 665*

Under both Commercial Code and Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, reasonable continued use of motorized vehicle that does not conform to express warranty did not, as matter of law, amount to waiver of right to rescind or to revoke acceptance. *Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 897-898, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, § 939 (10th ed. 2005)

[6] Cross Reference

For related forms, *see §§ 490.66* and *490.67*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.66

§ 490.66 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--Prejudicial Delay [Civ. Code § 1693]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action for Relief Based on Rescission of Contract--Waiver of Right to Rescind [Civ. Code § 1691]--Prejudicial Delay [Civ. Code § 1693]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On or before _____ [*date*], plaintiff had full knowledge _____ [*specify facts giving rise to plaintiff's right to rescind, e.g.,* that the 1996 crop and the gross receipts from it were not as large as those of the three previous years. Plaintiff and defendant discussed this in March, 1997].

[*EITHER, if no notice of rescission was given prior to service of complaint*]

2. Plaintiff inexcusably and unreasonably delayed the filing of this action and gave no prior notice of rescission, causing substantial prejudice to plaintiff in that _____ [*set forth facts showing prejudice, e.g.,* during the 18 months after learning of the alleged failure of consideration during which plaintiff continued to operate the business before commencing this action, several large accounts became dissatisfied with plaintiff's service and found other suppliers to meet their needs. The goodwill of the business, its value, and its competitive position in the industry have been so substantially eroded by plaintiff that defendant could not be made whole by its return. Plaintiff's continuation of the business was consistent with an intention to treat the contract of sale as still valid, viable, and binding].

[*OR, if notice of rescission and offer to restore were given before commencement of the action*]

2. Plaintiff inexcusably and unreasonably delayed providing defendant with notice of rescission and tender of restoration, causing substantial prejudice to plaintiff in that _____ [*set forth facts showing prejudice, e.g.*, during the 18 months after learning of the alleged failure of consideration during which plaintiff continued to operate the business before commencing this action, several large accounts became dissatisfied with plaintiff's service and found other suppliers to meet their needs. The goodwill of the business, its value, and its competitive position in the industry have been so substantially eroded by plaintiff that defendant could not be made whole by its return. Plaintiff's continuation of the business was consistent with an intention to treat the contract of sale as still valid, viable, and binding].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action for relief based on rescission when plaintiff's delay in giving notice of rescission or commencing the action has substantially prejudiced defendant [*see Civ. Code § 1693*]. For forms raising the affirmative defenses of waiver, plaintiff's election of another remedy, see *§§ 490.65* and *490.67*, respectively.

[3] State Statutes

Relief based on rescission is not to be denied for delay in giving notice of rescission unless delay has been substantially prejudicial to other party. *Civ. Code § 1693*

[4] Decisions

Laches requires more than delay or passive acquiescence in acts complained of, and requires other facts making relief inequitable. *Neet v. Holmes (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 447, 460, 154 P.2d 854*

Employee's delay in giving notice of rescission of settlement agreement resulted in substantial prejudice to employer. *Saret-Cook v. Gilbert, Kelly, Crowley & Jennett (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1225-1227, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732*

Defrauded buyer entitled to reasonable time to investigate, and time thus consumed was not unreasonable delay. *Howell v. Courtesy Chevrolet, Inc. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 391, 405-406, 94 Cal. Rptr. 33*

Rescission was impracticable or inequitable because of intervening rights of third parties to whom defendant had sold land. *Shumaker v. Foster (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 216, 221, 276 P.2d 876*

Plaintiff's own defaults that prevented defendant from doing anything with land and sale or option by plaintiff of land to third parties provided equitable grounds for denial of rescission. *Joshua Tree T. Co. v. Joshua Tree L. Co. (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 590, 596-597, 224 P.2d 85*

Plaintiff's silence after learning of forged loan documents and endorsement on check for proceeds until lapse of limitation period on lender's action against bank for payment on forged endorsement barred rescission on basis of laches. *Merry v. Garibaldi (1941) 48 Cal. App. 2d 397, 401, 119 P.2d 768*

Making payments under contract for two years after discovering facts, during which time value of land depreciated to

defendant's prejudice barred rescission. *McCray v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 537, 540-541, 55 P.2d 1234*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, § 945 (10th ed. 2005)

[6] Cross Reference

For related forms, *see §§ 490.65* and *490.67*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 490 RESCISSION AND RESTITUTION
PART IV. FORMS

43-490 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 490.67

§ 490.67 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Election of Another Remedy

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Election of Another Remedy

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. [*Plaintiff's knowledge of grounds for remedy being defended against. See § 490.65[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. By _____ [*set forth plaintiff's acts and time during which they occurred, e.g.,* commencing an action for specific performance on June 17, 1998, and pursuing that action to judgment] plaintiff has _____ [*describe injury or prejudice to defendant, e.g.,* required defendant to keep the property off the market and to expend attorney's fees and defense costs for three years], all to defendant's injury and prejudice and is thereby estopped to now seek _____ [*specify remedy, e.g.,* rescission].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer to any type of action based on rescission when earlier actions or conduct of plaintiff amounted to an election of another remedy [*see Steiner v. Rowley (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 713, 720, 221 P.2d 9* ; *Modoc Mineral & Oil Co. v. Cal-Vada Drilling etc. Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 868, 874-875, 46 Cal. Rptr. 508* ; *see § 490.42[2]*]. For instance, the form may be used to claim that plaintiff's own alteration or destruction of the property that would have to be restored on rescission constituted an election to seek only damages [*see, e.g., Prichard v. Reitz (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 465, 467-469, 223 Cal. Rptr. 734]* .

Conversely, the form may also be used to claim that damages for fraud were barred by a mutual rescission agreement of the parties [*see, e.g., Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 507, 250 P.2d 283]* .

For forms of affirmative defenses based on waiver and prejudicial delay, see *§§ 490.65* and *490.66*, respectively.

[3] Cross References

Election of remedies is also discussed in Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*

[4] Decisions

[a] Acts Constituting Election

Attachment obtained in pursuit of contract remedy estops recovery under tort theory. *Estrada v. Alvarez (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 386, 391, 240 P.2d 278*

Plaintiff's destruction of house after learning of defects in foundation and believing condition could only be corrected by rebuilding barred relief based on restitution. *Prichard v. Reitz (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 465, 467-469, 223 Cal. Rptr. 734*

Appeal of judgment for defendant in specific performance action manifested election to pursue one of two inconsistent remedies; because amendment to seek relief based on rescission would prejudice defendant, relief was barred. *Lawrence v. Shutt (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 749, 766-767, 75 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Foreclosure was election to affirm agreement inconsistent with rescission for fraud inducing loan transaction. *City Bank of San Diego v. Ramage (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 570, 587, 72 Cal. Rptr. 273*

[b] Acts Not Constituting Election

Filing claim in bankruptcy was not election of remedy absent evidence that dividends had been received on claim. *Kraus v. Willow Park Public Golf Course (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 354, 370-371, 140 Cal. Rptr. 744* (action to impose constructive trust on property conveyed due to fraud)

Dismissal of action for relief based on rescission and damages for fraud did not amount to election of remedy barring second action for same remedies arising from same facts when no disadvantages were caused to defendant. *Warfield v. Richey (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 93, 99, 334 P.2d 101*

When plaintiff pleaded damages for fraud and rescission, defendant's offer to restore only part of what plaintiff was entitled to did not bar recovery of fraud damages on theory of election. *Mackenzie v. Voelker (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 538, 541, 266 P.2d 867*

Plaintiff was entitled to seek rescission even after judgment in her favor for specific performance when defendant had conveyed property to third party and could not comply with specific performance judgment. *Timm v. McCartney (1938) 30 Cal. App. 2d 241, 247-248, 85 P.2d 920*

[5] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 174-197 (4th ed. 1996)

[6] Cross Reference

For related forms, *see §§ 490.65* and *490.66*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 491.syn

§ 491.syn Synopsis to Chapter 491: RES JUDICATA

§ 491.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 491.02 Cross References

§§ 491.03-491.09 [Reserved]

§ 491.10 Governing Law

§ 491.11 Terminology

[1] Res Judicata

[2] Merger and Bar as Claim Preclusion

[3] Collateral Estoppel as Issue Preclusion

[4] Direct Estoppel as Issue Preclusion

§ 491.12 Effects of Claim and Issue Preclusion Compared

§ 491.13 Purpose of Res Judicata

§ 491.14 Claim Preclusion

[1] General Requirements

[2] Former Judgment Final

[a] Generally

[b] Judgment Free From Direct Attack

[c] Invalid Judgment Distinguished

[d] Cases on Appeal

[e] Interlocutory Orders

[f] Simultaneous Actions

[g] Prior Conflicting Judgments

[3] Former Judgment on Merits

[a] Generally

[b] Stipulated Judgment

[c] Default Judgment

[d] Judgment on Demurrer

[i] General Demurrer

[ii] Special Demurrer

[e] Judgment of Dismissal

[f] Denial of Writ Petition

[g] Arbitration Award

[h] Small Claims Court Judgment

[i] Retraxit

[4] Same Cause of Action

[a] Generally

[b] Compulsory Cross Complaint

[c] Special Proceeding Distinguished

[5] Same Parties or Privies

[a] Generally

[b] Effect of Party Acting in Different Capacities

[c] Persons in Privity

[d] Party Who Controlled Prior Action

[e] Representative Actions Under the Unfair Competition Law

[6] Public Interest Exception to Res Judicata

[7] Prior Action Was in Federal Court

[8] Effect of Change of Law After Final Judgment on the Merits

§ 491.15 Issue Preclusion

[1] General Requirements

[2] Final Judgment on Merits

[a] Less Strict Requirement Than for Claim Preclusion

[b] Denial of Extraordinary Writ

[3] Identity of Issues

[a] Generally

[b] Multiple Issues

[c] Binding Even Though Facts or Arguments That Could Have Been Presented Were Not

[d] Effect of New Facts or Different Substantive Law

[e] Determining What Issues Have Been Adjudicated

[f] Issue Decided in Prior Criminal Action

[i] Conviction

[ii] Acquittal

[iii] Guilty Plea

[iv] Ruling on Habeas Corpus

[v] Ruling At Preliminary Hearing

[vi] Mental Health Determination

[g] Issue Decided in Prior Administrative Action

[h] Issue Decided in Prior Arbitration Proceeding

[i] Issue Decided in Prior Small Claims Proceeding

[j] Issue Decided in Prior Bastardy Proceeding--Application to Probate Action

[k] Issue Decided in Prior Bankruptcy Proceeding

[4] Identity of Parties or Privies

[a] Generally

[b] Use of Issue Preclusion by Stranger

[c] When Coparties Use of Issue Preclusion May Be Appropriate

[5] Constitutional and Public Policy Restrictions on Issue Preclusion

[6] Public Interest Exception to Issue Preclusion

§ 491.16 Judgments of Federal or Sister-State Courts

§ 491.17 Asserting Defense of Res Judicata

[1] Pleading Judgment

[2] By Demurrer

[3] By Answer

[4] By Motion for Summary Judgment

[5] By Motion to Dismiss

[6] Invoking Defense on Appeal

§ 491.18 Waiver of Defense

§ 491.19 Proof of Defense

§ 491.20 Special Trial of Defense of Res Judicata

§ 491.21 Judicial Estoppel

[1] Preclusion of Inconsistent Positions

[2] When Doctrine Applies

[a] Equitable Doctrine Vague in Application

[b] Successful Assertion of Earlier Position

[c] Not Applicable When Prior Position Was Taken as Result of Ignorance or Mistake

[d] Final Judgment Not Required

[e] In Court's Discretion

[3] Raises Factual Issues

[4] Application in Multiple Proceedings

[5] Equitable Estoppel Distinguished

[6] Distinguished From Pleading Inconsistent or Alternative Theories

[7] Distinguished From Election of Remedies

[8] Application of State Versus Federal Law

§§ 491.22-491.39 [Reserved]

§ 491.40 Related Titles From Matthew Bender

§ 491.41 State Statutes

[1] Conclusiveness and Effect of Judgment

[2] Pleading and Proving Judgment

[3] Res Judicata Effect of Particular Types of Judgments and Orders

[4] Special Trial of Defense of Res Judicata

§ 491.42 Decisions

[1] Administrative Agencies

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Claim Preclusion

[a] Claims That Could Have Been Raised

[b] Final Judgment on Merits

[c] Policy Considerations

[d] Same Cause of Action in Prior Action

[e] Claims Decided In Prior Arbitration Proceeding

[f] Public Interest Exception

[4] Extraordinary Writs

[5] Issue Preclusion

[a] Constitutional and Public Policy Restrictions

[b] Final Judgment on Merits

[c] Identical Issue Litigated in Previous Suit

[d] Issue Decided in Prior Administrative Action

[e] Issue Decided in Prior Criminal Action

[f] Use of Issue Preclusion by Stranger

[6] Judgments of Federal or Sister-State Courts

[7] Judicial Estoppel

[8] Merger of Cause of Action in Judgment

[9] Nature and Effect of Res Judicata Doctrine

[10] Pleading

[11] Privity

[a] Considerations

[b] No Privity Found

[c] Privity Found

[12] Proof of Defense

[13] Requirement of Final Judgment

[a] Demurrer

[b] Dismissal

[b.1] Retraxit

[c] Stipulation

[d] Summary Judgment

[14] Small Claims Courts

[15] Summary Judgment Motion

[16] Waiver of Defense

§ 491.43 Law Reviews

§ 491.44 Text References

§§ 491.45-491.49 [Reserved]

§ 491.50 Demurrer to Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(a), 430.40(a)]--On Ground That No Cause of Action Is Stated [Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)] Because Action Is Precluded by Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Specification of Ground of Objection

[4] Cross References

§ 491.51 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Cause of Action Was Merged in Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Merger

[4] Contents

[5] Pleading Prior Judgment

[6] Cross References

§ 491.52 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Prior Judgment for Defendant [or Defendant's Privy] Bars Present Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Bar

[4] Contents

[5] Cross References

§ 491.53 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Judgment for Employee Defendant in

Prior Action Bars Present Action Against Employer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 491.54 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Basic Issue Between Parties Was Determined in Former Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Issue Preclusion

[4] Contents

[5] Cross References

§ 491.55 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Plaintiff's Asserted Remedy and Cause of Action Barred by Previous Judgment--Attempt to Split Single Cause of Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 491.56 Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 491.57 Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 491.58 Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 491.59 Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decision or Verdict After Special Trial

[4] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART I. SCOPE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.01

§ 491.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the preclusion of civil claims or issues by a prior adjudication, including the terminology used in this field [*see § 491.11*], claim preclusion, traditionally known as res judicata [*see § 491.14*], issue preclusion, traditionally known as collateral estoppel [*see § 491.15*], and the assertion and waiver of the defense [*see § 491.17 -491.20*]. The discussion also covers the relationship of claim and issue preclusion and their purpose [*see § 491.12 -491.13*] and federal and sister-state judgments [*see § 491.16*].

The chapter also discusses the doctrine of judicial estoppel, or preclusion of inconsistent positions [*see § 491.21*].

The chapter includes a Research Guide [*see § 491.40* et seq.] the following forms:

- Demurrer on the ground the action is barred by a prior judgment [*see § 491.50*].

- Allegations raising the affirmative defense that an action or issue is barred by a prior adjudication [*see §§ 491.51 -491.55*].

- Notice of motion, declaration, and order for a judicial determination that a judgment is conclusive as to a nonparty [*see §§ 491.56, 491.57*].

- Notice of motion and order for a separate trial of the special defense of res judicata [*see §§ 491.58, 491.59*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsWaiver & PreservationCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelJudicial

EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsFull Faith & CreditGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART I. SCOPE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.02

§ 491.02 Cross References

For discussion of the res judicata effect of a default judgment, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

For discussion and forms relating to separate trial of the defense of res judicata before trial on the merits, see Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions*

The application of res judicata in particular actions is discussed in relation to those actions, as indicated in the following list:

- For discussion of res judicata in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

- For discussion of the preclusive effect of a final judgment under the federal Fair Credit Reporting Act [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1681n, 1681o*], see Ch. 129, *Consumer Credit Reporting*

- For discussion and a form of affirmative defense to an action for wrongful death based on res judicata, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

- For discussion of the res judicata effect of a default judgment, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*

- For discussion of the res judicata effect of interspousal property settlement agreements, see Ch. 220, *Dissolution of Marriage: Property Division and Valuation*

- For discussion of res judicata in proceedings to obtain a writ of habeas corpus, see Ch. 292, *Habeas Corpus*

- For discussion of the effect of a judgment based on stipulation, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

- For discussion of the applicablity of res judicata to judgments in mandate and prohibition proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

- For discussion of res judicata in proceedings for administrative mandamus, see *Ch. 473F, Agency Adjudication Hearings, § 473F.41*

- For discussion of the conclusive effect of a judgment in a quiet title action, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For extensive coverage of the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel as applied in federal courts, see s Moore' s S s Federal Practice, Ch.131, Ch. 132 (3d ed. Matthew Bender). For discussion of the application of these doctrines in criminal actions, and, in particular, the constitutional double jeopardy protection against successive prosecutions, see s California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 63 (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessDouble Jeopardy

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART I. SCOPE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 491.03-491.09

[Reserved]

§§ 491.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.10

§ 491.10 Governing Law

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908-1917 govern the conclusiveness and effect of judgments and orders.

The pleading of a judgment is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 456*. The admissibility of a judgment is governed by *Evid. Code §§ 1300-1302*. *Evid. Code § 639* sets forth presumptions applicable to nonconclusive judgments.

Various statutes set forth additional rules concerning the effect of particular types of judgments. For example, *Fam. Code § 2212(b)* governs the conclusive effect of a judgment annulling marriage and Veh. Code § 40384 governs the effect of a judgment of conviction for violation of Vehicle Code provisions. For a listing of other provisions concerning the conclusive effect of particular types of judgments, see *§ 491.41[3]*.

Res judicata and collateral estoppel principles have also been extensively developed by decisional law. In fact, most courts continue to discuss and to apply these principles as a matter of common law, without reference to the their codification under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908-1917* [*see, e.g., Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 972-976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Lockwood v. Superior Court (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 667, 671-672, 206 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *see also Lazzarone v. Bank of America (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 581, 591, 226 Cal. Rptr. 855* (stating that ordinarily, res judicata is a "judicially created" doctrine)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataEvidenceHearsayExceptionsJudgmentsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.11

§ 491.11 Terminology

[1] Res Judicata

In traditional usage, "res judicata" (literally "a thing adjudged") referred to the doctrine precluding relitigation of a previously adjudicated *claim*, while "collateral estoppel" referred to the doctrine precluding relitigation of a previously adjudicated *issue* [*see* Restatement (Second) of Judgments Ch. 1, Introduction]. California courts, however, typically use "res judicata" to include both doctrines [*see Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 329, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10* ; *see also Kahn v. Pelissetti (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 832, 833, 67 Cal. Rptr. 517* ; *O'Connor v. O'Leary (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 646, 648, 56 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . In accordance with the latter usage, "res judicata" is used in this chapter when referring to both doctrines collectively. For separate definition of the two doctrines, see [2] and [3], *below*.

[2] Merger and Bar as Claim Preclusion

The traditional or primary aspect of res judicata operates to preclude parties or their privies from relitigating a cause of action that has been finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction [*see Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 329, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10* ; *Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 972, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 734, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110* ; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Judgments §§ 17-20]. The term "claim preclusion" is used in this chapter to refer to this aspect of res judicata, to distinguish it from the separate aspect of "issue preclusion" (discussed under [3], *below*), and also to distinguish it from the broader doctrine of res judicata (discussed under [1], *above*). "Claim preclusion" is the term adopted by the American Law Institute [*see* Restatement (Second) of Judgments Ch. 1, Introduction].

Claim preclusion consists of the rules of merger and bar, both of which operate to preclude a second action between the same parties or their privies on the same cause [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 972-973, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* . Under the rule of merger, a valid, final judgment for the plaintiff merges his or her cause of action in the judgment [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 973, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* . The merged cause of action is extinguished, and the plaintiff cannot thereafter bring another action on that same cause [*Sukut Construction, Inc. v. Cabot, Cabot & Forbes Land Trust (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530, 157 Cal. Rptr. 289* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Judgments §§ 17(1), 18]. The plaintiff's remedies, or those of the person claiming under the plaintiff, are limited to satisfaction of the judgment [*Panos v. Great Western*

Packing Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 636, 638-639, 134 P.2d 242 ; *Wick v. Wick Tool Co. (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 677, 685, 1 Cal. Rptr. 531]* . For a form of affirmative defense allegation based on the rule of merger, see *§ 491.51*.

Under the rule of bar, a valid, final judgment for the defendant extinguishes the plaintiff's cause of action and bars any subsequent action by the plaintiff on that same cause [*Panos v. Great Western Packing Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 636, 639-640, 134 P.2d 242* ; *Louie Queriolo Trucking, Inc. v. Superior Court (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 194, 200, 60 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; Restatement (Second) of Judgments §§ 17(2), 19]. For forms of affirmative defense allegation based on the rule of bar, see *§§ 491.52* and *491.53*.

[3] Collateral Estoppel as Issue Preclusion

The second aspect of res judicata operates, in the second of two actions that do not involve identical causes of action, to preclude the relitigation of any issue that was decided in the first action, when the second action involves the same parties or their privies, and when the first action was finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction [*see Lockwood v. Superior Court (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 667, 671, 206 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *O'Connor v. O'Leary (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 646, 648, 56 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . In other words, the parties or their privies are precluded from relitigating in a new proceeding on a different cause of action issues litigated in a prior proceeding [*In re Russell (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 115 Cal. Rptr. 511, 524 P.2d 1295* ; *see also Professional Engineers v. Department of Transportation (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 543, 568, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 936 P.2d 473]* . This aspect of res judicata is commonly termed "collateral estoppel" [*see, e.g., Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 828, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229* ; *Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 329-330, 330 n.4, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10* ; *see also Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 330 n.4, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10* ("judgment by estoppel"); *Ion Equipment Corp. v. Nelson (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 868, 881, 168 Cal. Rptr. 361* ("estoppel by judgment")]. The term "issue preclusion" has also been used [*see, e.g., Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1051, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* ; *see also Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 734, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110]* , and is so used in this chapter to distinguish this aspect of res judicata from the separate aspect of "claim preclusion" (discussed under [2], *above*), and also to distinguish it from the broader doctrine of res judicata (discussed under [1], *above*). "Issue preclusion" is the term adopted by the American Law Institute [*see* Restatement (Second) of Judgments, Ch. 1, Introduction].

For a form of affirmative defense allegation based on the doctrine of issue preclusion, see *§ 491.54*.

[4] Direct Estoppel as Issue Preclusion

Most commonly, issue preclusion arises from successive suits on different claims and is referred to as collateral estoppel. If, however, the second action is on the same claim, issue preclusion based on the earlier determination is described as direct estoppel. Both collateral estoppel and direct estoppel, like the related doctrine of res judicata have the dual purpose of protecting litigants from the burden of relitigating an identical issue with the same party or his or her privy and of promoting judicial economy by preventing needless litigation [*Plumley v. Mockett (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1031, 1050, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 822* ; *Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882* (after orders quashing service for lack of personal jurisdiction, plaintiff's failure to seek reconsideration or appellate review barred plaintiff from relitigating issue by direct estoppel); *see also People v. Mitchell (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 132, 136, 154-156, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401* (direct estoppel and law of case applied to preclude relitigation of defendant's prior serious felony conviction allegations for purpose of both five-year enhancement and a strike under three strikes law)].

In either of its forms, issue preclusion should be determined according to the same threshold requirements [*see Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882* ; for discussion of threshold requirements, *§ 491.15, below*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.12

§ 491.12 Effects of Claim and Issue Preclusion Compared

The preclusive effect of claim preclusion is substantially broader than that of issue preclusion. When successfully asserted as a defense, claim preclusion prevents not only the relitigation of issues that were decided in the former action, but also the relitigation of issues that might have been litigated in the former action [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 975, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Duffy v. City of Long Beach (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1352, 1357-1358, 247 Cal. Rptr. 715* ; *see also § 491.14[4], below*]. In contrast, issue preclusion only precludes relitigation of issues actually litigated and determined in the prior action [*Taylor v. Hawkinson (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 893, 895-896, 306 P.2d 797* ; *Corral v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1010, 155 Cal. Rptr. 342* ; *see also § 491.15[3], below*]. When the issue is a question of law rather than one of fact, however, the prior determination is not conclusive either if injustice would result or if the public interest requires that relitigation not be foreclosed [*City of Sacramento v. State of California (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 51, 64, 266 Cal. Rptr. 139, 785 P.2d 522]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.13

§ 491.13 Purpose of Res Judicata

The doctrine of res judicata rests on the ground that a party who has litigated a matter or had an opportunity to do so should not be permitted to litigate it again to the harassment and vexation of his or her opponent. Public policy and the interests of litigants alike require that there be an end to litigation [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 972, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *see also* *Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1144, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (whether applied as total bar to further litigation or as collateral estoppel, doctrine rests on sound policy of limiting litigation by preventing party that had one fair adversary hearing on issue from drawing it into controversy again and subjecting other party to further expense in its reexamination); *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 556, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469* (purpose of res judicata doctrine is to preserve integrity of judicial system, promote judicial economy, and protect litigants from harassment by vexatious litigation)]. The rule of res judicata is to prevent vexatious litigation and to require the parties to rest on one decision in their controversy; res judicata bars not only the reopening of the original controversy, but also subsequent litigation of all issues that were or could have been raised in the original suit [*Torrey Pines Bank v. Superior Court (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 813, 821, 265 Cal. Rptr. 217* ; *see* *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* (rule against plaintiff splitting single cause of action so as to make it the basis of several suits is, in part, application of doctrine of res judicata); for provisions relating to vexatious litigants, *see* *Weikel v. TCW Realty Fund II Holding Co. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1245, 1249-1250, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25* (res judicata precludes piecemeal litigation by splitting a single cause of action, i.e., dividing a primary right, or relitigation of the same cause of action on a different legal theory or for different relief); *see also* Ch. 573, *Vexatious Litigants*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.14

§ 491.14 Claim Preclusion

[1] General Requirements

For the claim preclusion aspect of res judicata to apply as an affirmative defense to an action [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* :

- The prior action relied on must have been a final judgment on the merits;
- The present action must be on the same cause of action as the prior action; and
- There must be privity between the parties to the prior action and the present action.

[2] Former Judgment Final

[a] Generally

It is an elementary principle that the doctrine of res judicata applies when the prior judgment is final [*People ex rel. Gow v. Mitchell Brothers' Santa Ana Theater (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 296, 306, 161 Cal. Rptr. 562* ; *see also Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Boccardo v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1041, 184 Cal. Rptr. 903]* . A judgment should not be the basis for application of res judicata if anything is left to conjecture as to what was necessarily involved and decided [*Irwin v. Irwin (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 317, 322, 138 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

[b] Judgment Free From Direct Attack

Only judgments that are free from direct attack are final and may not be relitigated [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 486, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* ; *but see Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 558, 305 P.2d 20* (under certain circumstances, direct attack of final judgment possible through suit in equity to set aside judgment)]. Once a judgment is free from direct attack on appeal, it is final and conclusive even if it is erroneous rather than correct [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 975, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *see also*

Castro v. Higaki (1994) 31 Cal. App. 4th 350, 359, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 84 ; *Smith v. Smith (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 203, 209, 179 Cal. Rptr. 492]* . A final judgment or order is res judicata even if it is wrong or unjust, so long as the merits of the claim have been tried and determined [*Hight v. Hight (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 498, 502-503, 136 Cal. Rptr. 685* ; *see Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1515, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33* (erroneous final judgments bar to further proceedings based on same cause of action)].

Consistent application of the traditional principle that final judgments, even erroneous ones, are a bar to further proceedings based on the same cause of action is necessary to the well-ordered functioning of the judicial process. It should not be impaired for the benefit of particular plaintiffs, regardless of the sympathy their plight might arouse in an individual case [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 797, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593* ; *Robert J. v. Leslie M. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1642, 1647, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905]* . A judgment is final even if its factual underpinning is erroneous [*Robert J. v. Leslie M. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1642, 1648, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905]* . Similarly, a final judgment or order is res judicata even though it is contrary to statute, when the court has jurisdiction over subject matter and parties [*People v. Silva (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 538, 549-550, 170 Cal. Rptr. 713* ; *see Law Offices of Stanley J. Bell v. Shine, Browne & Diamond (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1011, 1019-1026, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 717* (order was res judicata when court had jurisdiction over subject matter and parties, but acted contrary to case law in excess of jurisdiction)].

A judgment based on a statute that is later ruled unconstitutional is nevertheless res judicata in a subsequent suit [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 797, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593]* .

For discussion of the federal rule concerning finality of a judgment for purposes of res judicata, which differs from the state rule, see [d], *below*.

[c] Invalid Judgment Distinguished

Res judicata may apply only when the prior judgment is valid; void judgments cannot be res judicata [*see Balaam v. Perazzo (1931) 211 Cal. 375, 380-381, 295 P. 330* (holding that judgment in favor of defendant quieting title against plaintiff and co-defendant was void as against co-defendant who defaulted and was never served with defendant's answer); *California Nat. Supply Co. v. Flack (1920) 183 Cal. 124, 126, 190 P. 634* (holding that judgment rendered against defunct corporation was void in action brought after forfeiture of corporation's charter)]. If a judgment is void only in part, the judgment is res judicata to the extent that it is not void [*see Lang v. Lang (1920) 182 Cal. 765, 769, 190 P. 181* (holding that in default judgment, any relief exceeding prayer is not entitled to res judicata effect); *Ludwig v. Murphy (1904) 143 Cal. 473, 476, 77 P. 150* (prior judgment was void to the extent it decreed a foreclosure, notwithstanding its other possible conclusive effect)].

Thus, even when a judgment is final in the sense that it is free from direct attack, it may be void and subject to collateral attack, and thus not conclusive for purposes of res judicata [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1916* (judicial record may be impeached by evidence of want of jurisdiction in court or judicial officer, of collusion between parties, or of fraud in party offering record); *see also* Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders*].

[d] Cases on Appeal

A judgment is not final for purposes of res judicata during the pendency of and until the resolution of the appeal [*Agarwal v. Johnson (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 932, 954 n.11, 160 Cal. Rptr. 141, 603 P.2d 58]* ; Franklin & Franklin v. 7-*Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1168, 1171, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 770* (finality required to invoke preclusive bar of res judicata is not achieved until appeal from trial court judgment has been exhausted or time to appeal has expired)]. A technically pending appeal does not preclude the application of res judicata when the appeal is abandoned and is subject to dismissal on the motion of the appellate court [*see Wood v. Herson (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 737, 748, 114 Cal. Rptr. 365]* .

Moreover, the dismissal of an appeal is with prejudice to the right to file another appeal within the time permitted, unless the dismissal is expressly made without prejudice to another appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 913*; *Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1017, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174]* . Thus, when an appeal was dismissed for mootness, the dismissal was not made without prejudice, and approximately one year elapsed from the date of filing the judgment to a remittitur being issued, it was held that the underlying judgment become final, absent the appeal, when the period for filing the appeal had expired and principles of res judicata applied [*Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1017, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *but see Chamberlin v. City of Palo Alto (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 181, 187, 230 Cal. Rptr. 454* (decided in context of collateral estoppel; when party to judgment cannot obtain decision of appellate court because matter determined against party is moot, judgment is not conclusive against party in subsequent action on different cause of action)].

When a former federal judgment is involved, the federal rule concerning finality of a judgment on appeal for purposes of res judicata differs from the state rule. Under the federal rule, a judgment or order, once rendered, is final for purposes of res judicata until it is reversed on appeal, or modified or set aside in the court of rendition [*Calhoun v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 881, 887, 143 Cal. Rptr. 692, 574 P.2d 763* , *cert. denied, 439 U.S. 872* ; *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* ; *see, e.g. Abdallah v. United Savings Bank (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1101, 1110, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286* , *cert. denied, 519 U.S. 1081 (1997)* (plaintiffs' cause of action untenable in state court action in light of earlier action that had been dismissed with prejudice in federal district court; although appeal from that judgment was pending, judgment is final for res judicata purposes until reversed and doctrine of res judicata precludes litigation of any claim that could have been raised in federal action)]. For discussion of the full faith and credit requirement, see *§ 491.16*.

[e] Interlocutory Orders

As a general rule, res judicata applies to interlocutory judgments and decrees that are appealable by law [*see Rebco Development, Inc. v. Superior Court (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 13, 16-17, 136 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *see also Acuna v. Regents of University of California (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 639, 649-650, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388* (summary judgment in federal court on two of several claims involved in action barred their relitigation in state court)]. For example, an interlocutory decree in a divorce case is conclusive with respect to all proper or necessary issues determined thereby [*Green v. Green (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 50, 61, 151 P.2d 679* (disapproved on other grounds in *Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. McConnell (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 715, 725, 285 P.2d 636*); *see Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1515, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33* (interlocutory and final judgments of dissolution of marriage entitled to res judicata as to all questions determined by them)].

[f] Simultaneous Actions

When two actions involving the same issue are pending at the same time, it is not the final judgment in the first suit, but the first final judgment, although it may be rendered in the second suit, that renders the issue res judicata in the other court [*Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. v. ExxonMobil Corp. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 675, 684, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 39* ; *Domestic & Foreign Pet. Co., Ltd. v. Long (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 547, 562, 51 P.2d 73]* .

When the judgment in one suit becomes final through lapse of time or affirmance on appeal while an appeal is still pending in another court from judgment in the other action, the first final judgment may be brought to the attention of the court in which an appeal is still pending and relied on as res judicata [*Domestic & Foreign Pet. Co., Ltd. v. Long (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 547, 562, 51 P.2d 73]* .

[g] Prior Conflicting Judgments

If the res judicata effect of a prior judgment is not raised or established in a subsequent action in which it could have

been raised or established, and the litigated matter arises again in a third action, it is the final judgment in the second of the first two actions that controls and determines the rights of the parties in the third action [*California Bank v. Traeger (1932) 215 Cal. 346, 351, 10 P.2d 51]* . As a general rule, when there are successive and conflicting judgments in different proceedings between the same parties on the same issues, the last judgment is conclusive [*Maloney v. Mass. Bonding & Ins. Co. (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 1, 6, 123 P.2d 449]* .

[3] Former Judgment on Merits

[a] Generally

A final judgment is res judicata only if it is based on the merits [*Hasson v. Cozens (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 576, 580, 83 Cal. Rptr. 161, 463 P.2d 385]* . A judgment is on the merits for purposes of res judicata if the substance of the claim is tried and determined [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 77, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316* (quoting Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 7, *Judgment*, § 313 (4th ed. 1997)]; *see also Burdette v. Carrier Corp. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1668, 1682, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 185* (claim tried and determined by summary judgment was determined on the merits). For example, the defense of laches has nothing to do with the merits of the cause against which it is asserted, and a judgment denying a petition for writ of administrative mandate because of the defense of laches is not a judgment on the merits for purposes of res judicata [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 76-77, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316* (for discussion of laches, see *Ch. 345, Limitation of Actions, §§ 345.40 -345.43*)]. Similarly, a determination by a court that it has no jurisdiction is not a decision on the merits, and cannot be res judicata [*Maddern v. Superior Court (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 998, 1004, 99 Cal. Rptr. 832]* .

[b] Stipulated Judgment

A stipulated judgment may be given res judicata effect [*see Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1064-1069, 1073, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* ; *Robert J. v. Leslie M. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1642, 1647-1648, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905]* .

For example, when a district attorney child support division filed a complaint in 1990 to establish paternity against a party, and the party stipulated to paternity and entry of judgment requiring payment of child support without asking for appointment of counsel or demanding a blood test with full knowledge of his rights and without coercion, that judgment was held to bar, based on res judicata, that party's action in 1995 to establish nonpaternity, even though a 1994 blood test excluded him as the biological father [*Robert J. v. Leslie M. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1642, 1647-1648, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905]* .

Although parties may stipulate to a judgment binding between them, it will not necessarily bind third parties [*Xebec Development Partners, Ltd. v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 501, 540-544, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* ; *see Knowles v. Tehachapi Valley Hospital Dist. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1091, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192]* . For example, a judgment based on stipulation by an insured and third parties in which the insurer did not join should not be regarded as a binding adjudication of the insurer's interests, particularly when the stipulation was given for a covenant not to execute [*Xebec Development Partners, Ltd. v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 501, 540-544, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (judgment based on stipulation might be entitled to presumptive weight, but should bind the insurer only to the extent it represents a true independent adjudication of the insured's liability)]. Similarly, a stipulated judgment between a plaintiff and a defendant doctor in which the doctor admitted negligence was not res judicata and thus not binding on the codefendant hospital district, which had no contractual or statutory right to control the doctor's defense in the action and did not in fact control the defense. The trial court did not err, however, in treating stipulated judgment as presumptive evidence of doctor's liability [*Knowles v. Tehachapi Valley Hospital Dist. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1089-1092, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192]* .

Nonetheless, in some instances third parties may be bound by judgments entered in earlier actions in accordance with a

settlement agreement and rendered through consent and stipulation. For example, when authority to pursue public rights or interests in litigation is given to a public entity by statute, a stipulated judgment rendered in an action involving the agency is res judicata as to all members of the class represented. Thus, when issues in the current and earlier actions are identical, the plaintiff is bound by its terms when found to be in privity with the state agencies who pursued public rights in the earlier actions even though plaintiff was not a party to the settlement agreement [*Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1064-1069, 1073, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* ; *see also Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. v. ExxonMobil Corp. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 675, 694, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 39* (settlement of prior lawsuit plaintiff filed against ExxonMobil on behalf of public operated as final judgment on merits for res judicata purposes although second suit brought by different public interest plaintiff)].

For a settlement and dismissal with prejudice of an action constituting a retraxit invoking the principles of res judicata, *see* [e], *below*.

[c] Default Judgment

In general, a prior default judgment may have collateral estoppel effect [*see, e.g.,* *English v. English (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 358, 363-364, 70 P.2d 625]* . In a subsequent proceeding between the parties on a different cause of action, a default judgment conclusively establishes the truth of all material allegations contained in the complaint in the first action, and every fact necessary to uphold the default judgment [*Four Star Electric, Inc. v. F & H Construction (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1375, 1380, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1]* . However, a default judgment is not conclusive as to any defense or issue that was not raised and is not necessary to uphold the judgment [*Four Star Electric, Inc. v. F & H Construction (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1375, 1380, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (reversing dismissal when default judgments not entitled to collateral estoppel effect)].

[d] Judgment on Demurrer

[i] General Demurrer

A judgment following the sustaining of a general demurrer may be on the merits and provide the basis for res judicata[Pollock v. University of Southern *California (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1416, 1427-1428, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 122* ; *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1996) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 383-384, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803]* . Whether a judgment based on the sustaining of a general demurrer is a judgment on the merits depends on the facts of the specific case and the reason for the ruling [*Kanarek v. Bugliosi (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 327, 334, 166 Cal. Rptr. 526]* .

It is generally held that a demurrer sustained for failure of the facts alleged to establish a cause of action is a judgment on the merits [*Kanarek v. Bugliosi (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 327, 334, 166 Cal. Rptr. 526* ; *see* *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1996) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 383-384* and n.8, *62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803]* . However, this is true only if the same facts are pleaded in the complaint in the second action, or if complaint in the second action, although pleading different facts, contains the same defects as the former complaint [*Kanarek v. Bugliosi (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 327, 334, 166 Cal. Rptr. 526]* . The causes of action need not be identical [*Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1996) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 384, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* (rulings on former appeal after general demurrer was sustained held binding when crux former and present appeals dealt with enforceability of deed restrictions as to plaintiffs)].

When a judgment is entered after a general demurrer has been sustained with leave to amend and plaintiff has failed to amend within the time allowed, the judgment is a judgment on the merits to the extent that it adjudicates that the facts alleged do not constitute a cause of action, and will, accordingly be a bar to a subsequent action alleging the same facts. Moreover, even though different facts may be alleged in the second action, if the demurrer was sustained in the first action on a ground equally applicable to the second, the judgment will also be a bar. If, on the other hand, new or

additional facts are alleged that cure the defects in the original pleading, the judgment is not a bar to the subsequent action whether or not plaintiff had an opportunity to amend his or her complaint [*Keidatz v. Albany (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 826, 828, 249 P.2d 264* ; *see also* *Wells v. Marina City Properties, Inc. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 781, 789, 176 Cal. Rptr. 104, 632 P.2d 217* ; for related discussion, *see* [e], *below*].

[ii] Special Demurrer

A judgment based on the sustaining of a special demurrer for technical or formal defect is not on the merits and is not a bar to the filing of a new action [*Goddard v. Security Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 47, 52, 92 P.2d 804* ; *see* *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1996) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 384, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* (dicta)].

[e] Judgment of Dismissal

Dismissal is a judgment on the merits to the extent that it adjudicates that the facts alleged do not constitute a new cause of action. [*see* *Wells v. Marina City Properties, Inc. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 781, 789, 176 Cal. Rptr. 104, 632 P.2d 217* (dismissal with prejudice under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 581* subdivision 3 (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 581(f)(2)*) following sustaining of general demurrer with leave to amend and plaintiff failed to amend within time allowed)].

A common law "retraxit" has a similar effect. At common law, a retraxit was an open and voluntary renunciation of a suit in open court. The primary features of a common law retraxit were that it was made by the plaintiff in person and in open court. A dismissal with prejudice is the modern name for a common law retraxit. A retraxit invokes the principles of res judicata and is a judgment on the merits preventing a subsequent action on the dismissed claim. Because it invokes the principles of res judicata, however, a retraxit only bars claims dismissed with prejudice between the same parties or their privies [*Deleon v. Verizon Wireless (2008) 170 Cal. App. 4th 519, 528, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 29* (dismissal with prejudice of class action suit following settlement was final judgment on the merits); *see also* *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 733-736, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110* (settlement and dismissal with prejudice of action operated as retraxit)].

On the other hand, if the plaintiff voluntarily dismisses the entire action without prejudice, the dismissal is not a final judgment on the merits [*Syufy Enterprises, L.P. v. City of Oakland (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 869, 879, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808* (not final judgment when appellate division reversed and remanded, then plaintiff voluntarily dismissed without prejudice)].

[f] Denial of Writ Petition

Denial without opinion of a petition for a writ of mandate or prohibition is not res judicata [*Hoversten v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 636, 640, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197* (noting summary denial of previous writ petition was not decision on merits); *see* *Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 196, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194* (court of appeal's denial of petition does not mean it made decision on merits)]. Moreover, unless there is a written opinion following the issuance of an alternative writ, the denial of a writ petition does not have issue preclusive effect [*Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 196, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194* ; for discussion of issue preclusion generally, *see § 491.15, below*)].

Hoversten and *Gammoh* relied on *Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P. 2d 250* as authority for the above stated rules. In *Kowis*, the court held the summary denial of a writ petition does not establish the law of the case whether or not that denial is intended to be on the merits or is based on some other reason [*Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 899, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P. 2d 250]* . The *Kowis* court in part stated that "[w]hen the court denies a writ petition without issuing an alternative writ, *it does not take jurisdiction over the case*; it does not give the legal issue full plenary review" [*Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 897, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P. 2d 250* (italics added)]. More recently, the Supreme Court, distinguished *Kowis* in a case in which the issue was whether

the court of appeal had failed to exercise its appellate jurisdiction to review an administrative decision as it was required to do by statute when the court summarily denied an extraordinary writ petition [*Leone v. Medical Board (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 660, 669-670, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 995 P.2d 191]* . In *Leone*, the Court noted that *Kowis* was addressed to writ petitions challenging pretrial superior court rulings that could also be reviewed on appeal from the judgment ultimately entered in the action; it was not addressed to situations in which a writ petition was the only authorized mode of appellate review. In the latter situation, an appellate court must judge the petition on its procedural and substantive merits, and a summary denial of the petition is necessarily on the merits [*Leone v. Medical Board (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 660, 669-670, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 995 P.2d 191]* .

From *Leone* it may be reasoned that there is a distinction for res judicata purposes between summary denial of writ petitions that are the exclusive means of judicial review versus summary denial of writ petitions challenging pretrial superior court rulings that could also be reviewed on appeal from a later judgment. Thus, later courts may ultimately limit the rule stated by *Hoversten* and *Gammoh* to the latter situation.

[g] Arbitration Award

The doctrine of res judicata applies not only to judicial proceedings but also to arbitration proceedings [*Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1015, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *Thibodeau v. Crum (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 749, 755, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27* ; *see also Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1335, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763* (citing cases concerning res judicata or collateral estoppel effect)]. Further, depending on the circumstances, an unconfirmed arbitration award may or may not have res judicata effect [*Thibodeau v. Crum (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 749, 761, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27* (plaintiffs precluded from litigating tort and contract claims against contractor after arbitration on specific construction defects); *Kahn v. Pelissetti (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 832, 834-835, 67 Cal. Rptr. 517* (unconfirmed award finding third-party uninsured motorist not liable had no res judicata effect because third-party was not a third-party beneficiary of unconfirmed award as contract)].

Res judicata can even operate to bar a plaintiff from litigating a claim against a non-arbitrating party where an arbitration award eliminated the basis for that party's liability [*Richard B. LeVine, Inc. v. Higashi (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 566, 579, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 244]* . In *LeVine*, plaintiff initiated an arbitration proceeding against his medical partners for breach of fiduciary duty. The arbitrator ruled that the partners had not committed such a breach. Plaintiff subsequently sued the partnership's accounting firm for civil conspiracy and aiding and abetting the partners. The trial court held that the arbitration proceedings operated to preclude plaintiff's claim against the accounting firm despite the fact that the accounting firm had not been a party to the arbitration. The court of appeals agreed. Prior cases such as *Thibodeau and Sartor v. Superior Court (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 322, 187 Cal. Rptr. 247* held a res judicata defense was available in such a circumstance, where the liability of the party in the second proceeding was strictly derivative. The court noted that liability based on conspiracy or aiding and abetting is also derivative. If the arbitrator had found no underlying tort had been committed, it would be anomalous for the court to then find the accounting firm had conspired to commit a tort or aided and abetted the commission of a tort [*Richard B. LeVine, Inc. v. Higashi (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 566, 579, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 244]* .

Res judicata only applies to issues which were or could have been litigated in the arbitration [*Truck Ins. Exchange v. Superior Court (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 985, 998-999, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 529* (when insurer reserves it rights to contest coverage and provides defense by independent counsel, arbitration award under *Civ. Code § 2860(c)*, relating to attorney's fees incurred by independent counsel, is not res judicata of coverage issues; absent an agreement, arbitrator could not decide coverage issues, and in this case parties specifically agreed that arbitrator would not have power to decide coverage issues)]. Moreover, a court may not give preclusive effect to a decision in a prior arbitration proceeding if doing so is contrary to the legislative body's intent that established the proceeding in which res judicata is urged [*Liska v. Arns Law Firm (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 275, 283, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 21* (arbitration under Mandatory Fee Arbitration statute did not preclude subsequent lawsuit by plaintiff against his former attorneys for breach of contract, negligence, and fraud as the only binding determination made in the arbitration was as to the amount of fees awarded

the attorneys); *Brosterhous v. State Bar (1995) 12 Cal. 4th 315, 326, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 87, 906 P.2d 1242* (arbitration decision concerning State Bar members' objections to manner in which State Bar calculates portion of annual dues used for political and ideological purposes not entitled to res judicata effect at demurrer stage to preclude plaintiffs' action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*)].

An arbitration award will not be given preclusive effect unless the arbitration agreement "clearly and unmistakably" provides for arbitration of the issues to be precluded and the arbitration record shows that the procedures followed allowed for full and fair adjudication of those issues [*Camargo v. California Portland Cement Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1018, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (arbitration of sex discrimination and sexual harassment claims under collective bargaining agreement did not bar state court action for sex discrimination and sexual harassment under the Fair Employment and Housing Act)].

For further discussion of the res judicata effect of arbitration awards, see Ch. 34, *Contractual Arbitration: Judicial Review* , and Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* .

[h] Small Claims Court Judgment

Generally speaking, a valid final judgment in plaintiff's favor merges any claim of the same cause of action in the judgment, and precludes the plaintiff from maintaining any later suit on the same cause of action. This aspect of res judicata applies to judgments rendered by the small claims court. The rule against a plaintiff splitting a single cause of action so as to make it the basis of several suits is, in part, an application of the doctrine of res judicata [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151]* .

Thus, when (1) a person whose car was damaged by the negligence of a car dealer tendered the claim to her insurance company, (2) the company paid off, but the policy did not cover all the damages, (3) the policyholder thereafter filed a small claims action against the car dealer tortfeasor to recover the uninsured loses and obtained a small claims court judgment, and (4) after the small claims court judgment was obtained, the insurance company brought a municipal court subrogation action against the tortfeasor to recover what the insurance company had paid to its policyholder to cover losses she suffered as a result of the tortfeasor's negligence, it was held that the small claims judgment against the tortfeasor barred the insurance company from pursuing its subrogation action because the latter action was precluded by the res judicata effect of the rule against splitting a cause of action. Although the insurer may bring a separate action against the tortfeasor, the rule against splitting a cause of action is violated when both the insurer and insured pursue separate actions. This is so because the general rule of subrogation provides that an insurer stands in the shoes of its insured; if a second action by the insured is barred, so is the action by the insurer [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 905-909, 913-914, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* (when tortfeasor's single act causes plaintiff to suffer both personal injury and property damage, however, there two separate causes of action exist; for what constitute single cause of action for purposes of rule, *see* discussion under [4], *below*)]. For discussion of issue preclusion and small claims court judgments, see *§ 491.15[3][i]*.

[i] Retraxit

A retraxit is a judgment on the merits [*Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 733, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110]* . For discussion, see § 419.14[3][e].

[4] Same Cause of Action

[a] Generally

Whenever a judgment in one action is raised as a bar to a later action under the doctrine of claim preclusion, the key issue is whether the same cause of action is involved in both suits [*Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1174, 197 Cal. Rptr. 612]* .

Although claim preclusion will bar relitigation of the same cause of action by the same parties, the question of whether a cause of action is identical for purposes of claim preclusion depends not on the legal theory or label used, but on the primary right sought to be protected in the two actions. The invasion of one primary right gives rise to a single cause of action [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 795, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593* ; *Frommhagen v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1292, 1299-1300, 243 Cal. Rptr. 390* ; *accord Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 557, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469]* . That is, a cause of action consists of [*Gamble v. General Foods Corp. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 893, 898, 899, 280 Cal. Rptr. 457]* :

- A primary right possessed by the plaintiff;
- A corresponding primary duty devolving on the defendant; and
- A delict or wrong done by the defendant consisting of a breach of the primary right and duty.

Each invasion of a primary right gives rise to a separate cause of action [*Gamble v. General Foods Corp. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 893, 898, 899, 280 Cal. Rptr. 457]* .

Thus, a single cause of action is based on the substantive right violated or the harm suffered, rather than on the particular legal theory asserted or relief sought by plaintiff [*Deleon v. Verizon Wireless (2008) 170 Cal. App. 4th 519, 528, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 29* ; *Burdette v. Carrier Corp. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1668, 1682, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 185* ; *Gamble v. General Foods Corp. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 893, 899, 280 Cal. Rptr. 457* ; *see also Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953]* . For example, when a defendant's negligence causes injury both to the property and person of the plaintiff, there are two causes of action under the primary right theory, one for harm to the property and one for harm to the person [*see Holmes v. David H. Bricker (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 786, 788-789, 76 Cal. Rptr. 431, 452 P.2d 647]* . Conversely, two actions constitute a single cause of action if they both affect the same primary right [*Weikel v. TCW Realty Fund II Holding Co. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1246, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25]* .

The distinction is between the violation of one primary right giving rise to multiple legal theories of recovery and the violation of different primary rights by the same wrongful conduct. When there are multiple legal theories on which recovery might be predicated, one injury gives rise to only one claim for relief [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 795, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593* ; *see Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1067, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* (for invasion of one primary right there is single cause of action, even if multiple theories of recovery asserted); *Weikel v. TCW Realty Fund II Holding Co. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1246-1247, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25* (a cause of action is to be distinguished from the remedy or relief sought, for a plaintiff may frequently be entitled to several species of remedy for the enforcement of a single right); *Henry v. Clifford (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 315, 321, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116* (when two actions involve same injury to plaintiff and same wrong by defendant, same primary right at stake even if plaintiff in second suit pleads different theories of recovery, seeks different forms of relief and/or adds new facts supporting recovery)]. For example, one breach of a nonseverable contract can only give rise to one cause of action for legal and equitable relief; a plaintiff cannot bring successive actions for specific performance and damages based on the same breach [*see Abbott v. The 76 Land and Water Co. (1911) 161 Cal. 42, 47-48, 118 P. 425]* .

When different primary rights are violated by the same wrongful conduct, a final adjudication of one of the plaintiff's rights does not necessarily bar a second action [*Agarwal v. Johnson (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 932, 954, 160 Cal. Rptr. 141, 603 P.2d 58]* . For example, a judgment in defendant's favor in a civil rights action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq.*, does not have res judicata effect over a subsequent action brought in state court for common law claims arising out of the same employment dispute since Title VII vests employees with independent federal statutory rights against discriminatory employment practices and does not supplant state remedies [*Agarwal v. Johnson (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 932, 954, 160 Cal. Rptr. 141, 603 P.2d 58* ; *see also Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App.*

4th 171, 182, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44 (action for breach of contract did not assert same primary right as plaintiff's prior action in family law court to establish paternity); *Branson v. Sun-Diamond Growers (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 327, 343-345, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314* (primary right to seek authorization for indemnity under *Corp. Code § 317* is not the same cause of action as one for breach of a contract for indemnity or for equitable estoppel since *Corp. Code § 317(g)* expressly provides no preclusive effect on other legal rights for indemnity)].

However, if plaintiff has two mutually exclusive remedies, and judgment is rendered in the plaintiff's favor giving the plaintiff one of the remedies, the plaintiff cannot thereafter maintain an action for the other *[Mycogen Corporation v. Monsanto Company (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 888, 904-909* (company that sued another company seeking the equitable remedy of specific performance of a license agreement was precluded from bringing a subsequent suit for the legal remedy of monetary damages); *see also Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 973, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* (employee, who suffered injuries inflicted by her employer and successfully brought tort action against employer's estate, as precluded from bringing separate worker's compensation action based on same injuries)].

Because res judicata only applies between the same parties or their privies, when defendants are neither it makes no difference that the claims in the underlying action and current action arose from the same primary right. Such defendants cannot invoke res judicata on their behalf [*Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 736, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110]* . For discussion of same parties or privies requirement, see *§ 491.14[5]*.

The primary right theory has been criticized on the grounds that the term "primary right" is not of fixed meaning, but may be broadly or narrowly interpreted [*see* Witkin, California Procedure (3d ed), Vol. 4, *Pleading*, § 24; *see also Sawyer v. First City Financial Corp. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 390, 399-400* (discussing application of primary right theory)]. The trend in other jurisdictions has been to reject primary right analysis and to adopt the "transaction" approach taken by the Second Restatement of Judgments, under which a cause of action (or "claim") is defined for res judicata purposes to include all rights of the plaintiff to remedies against the defendant arising out of the same transaction or series of connected transactions [*see* Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 24(1) cmt. a; s Moore's Federal Practice § 130.10[3] (3rd ed. Matthew Bender)].

[b] Compulsory Cross Complaint

An effect analogous to claim preclusion can occur when, in a prior action, a party has failed to plead in a cross complaint a related cause of action against the plaintiff. In such a case, the party may be precluded from reasserting that unpleaded cause of action in a later action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 426.30*]. For general discussion of compulsory cross complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* . For a form for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege a plaintiff's failure in a prior action to allege a related cause of action in a compulsory cross complaint, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[c] Special Proceeding Distinguished

A judgment rendered in a special proceeding, such as in a mandamus proceeding, does not give rise to claim preclusion in a cause of action [*see Mata v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 141, 149, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314* (holding that *42 U.S.C. § 1983* civil rights action for damages was not barred by earlier mandate proceeding that directed city to reinstate plaintiff as a police officer)]. Nonetheless, the judgment in the mandate proceeding is not to be ignored, and may result in issue preclusion [*see Mata v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 141, 149, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314]* .

[5] Same Parties or Privies

[a] Generally

For claim preclusion to be available as a defense, the same parties or their privies must be involved in both the prior and

present actions [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 734, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908, 1910*; *but see Law Offices of Stanley J. Bell v. Shine, Browne & Diamond (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1011, 1019-1026, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 717* (when court issued order in earlier minor's personal injury action denying plaintiff's quantum meruit lien, plaintiff in subsequent declaratory relief action with respect to entitlement to those fees was barred by res judicata from proceeding against defendant attorneys who represented minor in earlier action who were not technically parties to that action)].

[b] Effect of Party Acting in Different Capacities

The identity of parties necessary to establish the defense of res judicata must be identity of parties in the same capacity [*Meldrim v. Board of Supervisors (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 341, 346, 127 Cal. Rptr. 52* (res judicata inapplicable when first action against county, second action against county board of supervisors in their capacity as public officers); *see Finnerty v. Cummings (1933) 132 Cal. App. 48, 50-51, 22 P.2d 37* (res judicata inapplicable when first action by mother as guardian ad litem for injuries suffered by child, second action by mother in her own right for medical expenses and loss of earnings)].

[c] Persons in Privity

The requirement of identity of parties or privies is a requirement of due process of law [*Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 491.15[5], below*].

Traditionally, courts considered a person to be in privity with a party when he or she was so identified in interest with that party that he or she represented the same legal right [*Zaragosa v. Craven (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 315, 318, 202 P.2d 73* ; *see Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1069, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* . The concept of privity was expanded from rights acquired after judgment through or under inheritance, succession, or purchase to include a mutual or successive relationship to the same rights of property, or to such an identification in interest of one person with another as to represent the same legal rights, and, more recently, to a relationship between the party to be estopped and the unsuccessful party in the prior litigation that is sufficiently close so as to justify application of the doctrine of collateral estoppel [*Dyson v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 711, 723, 262 Cal. Rptr. 112* ; *see Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1069-1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* .

Thus, under the modern approach, privity denotes that the plaintiffs in the succeeding action have an identity or community of interest with, and adequate representation by, the losing party in the first action as well as that the circumstances must have been such that the party to be estopped should reasonably have expected to be bound by the prior adjudication [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 875, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098* ; *Helfand v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 869, 902, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 295* ; *Ceresino v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 814, 820, 264 Cal. Rptr. 30* ; *White Motor Corp. v. Teresinski (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 754, 761, 263 Cal. Rptr. 26* ; *see Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* ; *see also Dyson v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 711, 724-725, 262 Cal. Rptr. 112]* .

Privity, however, is not susceptible of a neat definition, and determination of whether it exists is not a cut-and-dried exercise. In the final analysis, the determination of privity depends on the fairness of binding one with the results obtained in earlier proceedings in which it did not participate [*Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* . Thus, with respect to the issue of privity, in deciding whether to apply collateral estoppel, the court must balance the rights of the party to be estopped against the need for applying collateral estoppel in the particular case, in order to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive

litigation, to prevent inconsistent judgments which undermine the integrity of the judicial system, or to protect against vexatious litigation [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 875, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098* ; *Martin v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 688, 701, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* ; *see Zapata v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 108, 115, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855* (DMV in privity with prosecution for purposes of municipal court hearing on lawfulness of driving under the influence arrest)].

A person who is not a party to an action but who is represented by a party is bound by and entitled to the benefits of the judgment as though he or she were a party [*Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 891, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . For example, a five-year-old child ordinarily has no cognizable independent interest in relitigating a liability claim that has been determined adversely to his parents; sufficient privity exists to invoke the doctrine of collateral estoppel [*Garcia v. Rehrig Internat., Inc. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 869, 878, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 723]* .

In certain actions, courts have found that California governmental entities brought suit as the representative of individual claimants and were thus in privity with the individuals [*see, e.g., Rynsburger v. Dairymen's Fertilizer Coop., Inc. (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 269, 277-278, 72 Cal. Rptr. 102* (plaintiffs in private nuisance action held to have been represented by cities that had earlier brought public nuisance actions on plaintiff's request); *Trujillo v. County of Santa Clara (9th Cir. 1985) 775 F. 2d 1359, 1366* (California Fair Employment & Housing Commission brought administrative proceeding at claimant's request and thus, represented him for purposes of claimant's federal civil rights action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*); *see also Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* (plaintiff, a nonprofit public interest group, who brought action for implied dedication of a public recreational easement, held to be in privity with state agencies that pursued rights of public concerning same property in earlier actions)]. However, the courts will examine the particular facts of each case to determine whether the action was brought on the individual's behalf [*see Victa v. Merle Norman Cosmetics, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 454, 463-468, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117* (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's action, although initially prompted by plaintiff's discrimination charge against employer for age discrimination under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act *29 U.S.C. § 261 et seq.*, did not bar plaintiff's action against employer for state-based age discrimination since EEOC pursued action on behalf of all of defendant's employees)]. Successors in interest to the original parties and persons who control the prior action may also be privies for purposes of res judicata [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)(2), (b)*]. For further discussion of how parties who control an action may be bound, see [d], *below*.

[d] Party Who Controlled Prior Action

A person who is not a party but who controls an action, individually or in cooperation with others, is bound by the adjudications of litigated matters as if he or she were a party if he or she has a proprietary or financial interest in the judgment or in the determination of a question of fact or of a question of law with reference to the same subject matter or transaction; if the other party has notice of his or her participation, the other party is equally bound [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*].

At any time prior to a final judgment, as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 577*, a determination of whether the judgment, verdict on which it was entered, or a finding on which it was entered is to be binding on a nonparty pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)* or whether such nonparty is entitled to the benefit of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)* may, on the noticed motion of any party or any nonparty that may be affected by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*, be made in the court in which the action was tried or in which the action is pending on appeal. If no such motion is made before the judgment becomes final, the determination may be made in a separate action. If appropriate, a judgment may be entered or ordered to be entered pursuant to such a determination [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*]. For a form of notice of motion and order that may be used in proceedings to determine whether a judgment is binding on a nonparty pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*, see *§§ 491.56* and *491.57*.

[e] Representative Actions Under the Unfair Competition Law

Traditional res judicata principles do not apply to a judgment obtained by the Attorney General or a district attorney under the Unfair Competition Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*] because an action brought pursuant to those sections by a prosecutor is fundamentally different from a class action or other representative litigation; it is fundamentally a law enforcement action and seeks primarily injunctive relief [*Payne v. National Collection Systems (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1045-1047, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260]* . Any request for restitution is ancillary. Moreover, in such an action brought by a prosecutor, there is no occasion to give notice to the persons directly affected by the action. Therefore, res judicata effect is not accorded to a judgment in an unlawful competition law lawsuit commenced by a prosecutor in a subsequent lawsuit by persons defrauded by a defendant [*Payne v. National Collection Systems (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1045-1047, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260]* .

[6] Public Interest Exception to Res Judicata

When the issue is a question of law rather than of fact, the prior legal determination is not conclusive either if injustice would result or if the public interest requires that relitigation not be foreclosed [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 622-623, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)]. Application of the public interest exception is not conditioned on a finding that the initial determination of an issue was erroneous [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 622-623 n.16, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting].

In *Kopp*, several Government Code sections enacted by Proposition 73, which was designed to reform financing of statewide and local political campaigns, were declared unconstitutional by a federal district court, and their enforcement was enjoined. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment of the district court. Thereafter, an original mandate proceeding was brought in the California Supreme Court. The issue before the Court was one of state law, that is, assuming enforcement of the challenged sections as enacted would violate the federal constitution, may the statutes be judicially reformed in a manner that avoids its unconstitutionality, and if so, should they be reformed [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 614, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248]* . The Court assumed that the principles of res judicata or collateral estoppel applied, but held that they should entertain and resolve the litigation under the public interest exception to those doctrines [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 621, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)]. The Court noted that a state supreme court is not constrained by principles of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or comity, to keep silent on a state law statutory reformation issue, when the question is presented to it in litigation such as the one before the court. The court's sovereign duty as a state court of last resort, consistent with principles of federalism and comity, requires that the court not automatically accept the federal court's ruling on this important state law issue, but consider the reformation question afresh and reach a different conclusion if state law leads the court to that result [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 625-626, 675, 679, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)]. The court further held, however, that reformation was inappropriate in the particular case [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 671, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Mosk, J. (based on lack of authority to do so), and Werdegar, J., concurring; Kennard, J., concurring and dissenting (based on full faith and credit reasons); *see also Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1065, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77* (even if thresholdrequirements for application of res judicata are established, that is, issues adjudicated in earlier action are identical with those in later action, final judgment on merits was rendered in earlier action, and party against whom plea is raised was party or in privity with party to earlier adjudication, res judicata will not be applied if injustice would result or if public interest requires relitigation not be foreclosed)].

A statutory scheme may also create an exception to res judicata [*see Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1144, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (statutory scheme under *Fam. Code § 2120 et seq.*, dealing with setting aside a

dissolution judgment, creates exception to res judicata based on recognition that public policy of assuring finality of judgments must be balanced against public interest in ensuring proper division of marital property, in ensuring sufficient support awards, and in deterring misconduct)].

For further discussion of the public interest exception to the doctrine of res judicata or collateral estoppel, see *§ 491.15[6], below*.

[7] Prior Action Was in Federal Court

Although it is established that the doctrine of res judicata precludes parties or their privies from relitigating a cause of action that has been finally determined by a court of competent jurisdiction, the ways in which the federal courts define "cause of action" and the way California courts define the term differs. The federal courts utilize a transactional analysis; that is, two suits constitute a single cause of action if they both arise from the same "transactional nucleus of facts" or a single "core of operative facts." California on the other hand, follows the primary right theory of Pomeroy [for discussion, *see* [4], *above*]. Thus, two actions constitute a single cause of action if they both affect the same primary right. When an action is filed in a California state court and the defendant claims the suit is barred by a final federal judgment, California law will determine the res judicata effect of the prior federal court judgment on the basis of whether the federal and state actions involve the same primary right [*Gamble v. General Foods Corp. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 893, 898, 280 Cal. Rptr. 457* ; *see also* Acu na v. *Regents of University of California (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 639, 648, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388]* .

Also following a federal judgment, the state court is not bound by federal law when determining whether an exception to the doctrine of res judicata applies [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 622 n.16, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting); for discussion of public interest exception to res judicata doctrine, *see* [6], *above*].

The state court, however, will apply the federal rule as to when a judgment is considered final for purposes of res judicata [*Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230-1231, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* ; *see also* *Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1452-1455, 1460, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521* (California follows rule that preclusive effect of prior federal court judgment is determined by federal law, at least where prior judgment was based on federal question jurisdiction; on question of finality federal law is controlling)]. For discussion of the federal rule concerning finality of a judgment for purposes of res judicata, see [2][d], *above*.

The courts of appeal are split over whether res judicata should apply to bar a state law claim that is dismissed out of a federal lawsuit that has resulted in a final judgment. The Fourth Appellate District, Division Two, held that once it is known that the federal court will not exercise pendent jurisdiction over the state claim and it is dismissed out of the lawsuit, if the plaintiff then elects to proceed to trial and judgment in the federal court, the plaintiff's entire cause of action is either merged in or barred by the federal court judgment so that the plaintiff may not thereafter maintain a second suit on the same cause of action in a state court [*Mattson v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 441, 445-446, 164 Cal. Rptr. 913]* . However, the Second Appellate District, Division Eight, is of the opposite view, finding that despite *Mattson*'s concerns, a contrary rule would not invite manipulation, thus the plaintiff is not barred by res judicata from going forth with the state claim after the federal claim has resulted in a final judgment [*Harris v. Grimes (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 180, 188-189, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 791]* .

For discussion of the full faith and credit requirement, see *§ 491.16, below*.

[8] Effect of Change of Law After Final Judgment on the Merits

When a cause of action has been adjudicated under the law in effect at that time resulting in a final judgment on the

merits, the judgment is res judicata and bars relitigation between the same parties on the same cause of action despite a subsequent change of law. A change in statute or law does not entitle a litigant to escape an earlier ruling by filing a new action [*Slater v. Blackwood (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 791, 796-797, 126 Cal. Rptr. 225, 543 P.2d 593* ; *Castro v. Higaki (1994) 31 Cal. App. 4th 350, 359, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 84]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentVoid JudgmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsDismissals of AppealsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.15

§ 491.15 Issue Preclusion

[1] General Requirements

The doctrine of issue preclusion precludes relitigation of an issue previously adjudicated when the following requirements are satisfied [*Hernandez v. City of Pomona (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 501, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1, 207 P.3d 506* ; *Lucido v. Superior Court (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 335, 341, 795 P.2d 1223* ; *Silver v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 338, 357, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287* ; *Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1339, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763* ; *see Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* ; :

- The issue sought to be precluded must be identical to that decided in a prior proceeding;
- The issue must have been actually litigated in the prior proceeding;
- The issue must have been necessarily decided in the prior proceeding;
- The decision in the former proceeding must be final and on the merits; and
- The party against whom issue preclusion is asserted must be the same as or in privity with the party to the prior proceeding.

These same threshold requirements apply to both collateral estoppel and direct estoppel [*see Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997-998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882]* .

The burden is on the party asserting collateral estoppel to establish these requirements [*Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* ; *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* .

[2] Final Judgment on Merits

[a] Less Strict Requirement Than for Claim Preclusion

For issue preclusion to apply, there must ordinarily be a final judgment on the merits in the previous suit [*Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920]* . However, the requirement of finality of judgment is interpreted less strictly for the purpose of issue preclusion than for the purpose of claim preclusion [*Sandoval v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 932, 936, 190 Cal. Rptr. 29* ; *see Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 911, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* ; *see also Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997-998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882* (involving direct estoppel; issue preclusion may be appropriate even though stage of litigation for merger and bar requirement for claim preclusion has not been reached; thus, issue preclusion may apply when underlying cause of action itself is not barred)].

For example, settlement of a prior adjudication during the pendency of an appeal may render a prior judgment sufficiently final to support the doctrine of issue preclusion, provided other factors of certainty and finality are satisfied [*see Sandoval v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 932, 936-937, 190 Cal. Rptr. 29]* . The final determination on the merits can be a judgment, a motion, or an order that determines a substantial matter of right on issues of fact or law [*People v. Howie (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 729, 736-737, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 505* (court determination that prior felony conviction is constitutionally invalid collaterally estops subsequent court proceeding that seeks to impose sentence based on invalid prior); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 577* (a judgment is final determination of rights of parties in action or proceeding)].

When the prior action was in a California state court, the judgment is not final for the purposes of collateral estoppel while it is open to direct attack, for example, by appeal [*Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1231 n.5, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* .

When, however, the prior action was in federal court, a federal judgment has the same effect in the California courts as it would have in federal court [*Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* ; *see* discussion in *§ 491.16, below*]. Under the federal rule, an order or judgment, once rendered, is final for res judicata purposes until it is reversed on appeal, or modified or set aside in the court of rendition [*Calhoun v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 881, 887, 143 Cal. Rptr. 692, 574 P. 2d 763 , cert. denied, 439 U.S. 872* ; *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* . Thus, for collateral estoppel purposes, a federal court's ruling on a summary judgment, even though appealed, must be considered final, that is, if the federal court's ruling on the summary judgment has not been reversed or modified, the decision is final [*Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230-1231, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* .

For further discussion of the requirement that the former judgment be final and on the merits, see *§ 491.14[2]* and *[3], above.*

[b] Denial of Extraordinary Writ

Just because the court of appeal denies a petition for a writ of mandate does not mean it made a decision on the merits having res judicata effect. The proper rule is that unless there is a written opinion following the issuance of an alternative writ, the denial of a writ petition does not have issue preclusive effect [*Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 196, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194]* .

For discussion of *Leone v. Medical Board (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 660, 669-670, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 995 P.2d 191* , concerning when a summary denial of a writ petition is necessarily on the merits and its potential impact on res judicata/collateral estoppel issues, *see § 491.14[3][f], above*].

[3] Identity of Issues

[a] Generally

For issue preclusion to apply, the issue decided in the prior adjudication must be identical with the issue presented in the instant action [*Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* ; *Plumley v. Mockett (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1031, 1049, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 822* ; *Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight Etc. Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1516, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612]* . The doctrine of collateral estoppel depends on what issues were adjudicated, not the nature of the proceeding or the relief requested [*Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1231, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* . For example, a 1941 Ohio bastardy proceeding was found to have presented an identical issue to that presented in a probate proceeding for intestate distribution: whether the relationship of natural parent and child existed [*Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 922, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191]* .

The issue must have been actually litigated and determined in the first action [*Taylor v. Hawkinson (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 893, 895-896, 306 P.2d 797* (collateral estoppel not found); *Nash v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1793, 1812-1813, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 454* (collateral estoppel not found); *Corral v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Ins. Co. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1010, 155 Cal. Rptr. 342* (collateral estoppel not found); *see Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1232, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* (collateral estoppel found)]. An issue is actually litigated when it is properly raised by the pleadings or otherwise, is submitted for determination and is actually determined. A determination may be based on a failure of proof [*Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 407, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103* (citing *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 484, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* which quoted from Restatement (Second) of Judgments § 27, comment d (1982))].

The issue must have been necessarily decided in former proceeding [*Townsel v. San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Bd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 940, 951, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231* (collateral estoppel not found); *see McMillin Development, Inc. v. Home Buyers Warranty (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 896, 906, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611* (determination of issue must have been necessary to judgment; collateral estoppel not found)]. This requirement prevents the incidental or collateral determination of a nonessential issue from precluding reconsideration of that issue in later litigation [*McMillin Development, Inc. v. Home Buyers Warranty (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 896, 906-907, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611]* . No aspect of what was decided in the previous proceeding can be left to conjecture on the record, and if it is left to conjecture, estoppel is inapplicable [*Silver v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 338, 357, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287* ; *see Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181-182, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (it must appear precise question was raised and determined in former suit)].

A settlement that avoids trial generally does not constitute actually litigating any issues and thus prevents application of collateral estoppel. There is a line of cases, however, holding that a consent or stipulated judgment may properly be given collateral estoppel effect. This principle, however, has been tempered by the rule that a consent judgment is not usually given preclusive effect in subsequent litigation on a different cause of action, unless the parties manifest an intent in the consent judgment to give it preclusive effect [*Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 736, 737 n.15, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110]* .

[b] Multiple Issues

If the questions involved in a suit are tried and decided, no matter how numerous they may be, issue preclusion will apply to each point so settled, in the same degree as if it were the sole issue in the case [*Bank of America v. McLaughlin etc. Co. (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 620, 628, 105 P.2d 607]* .

[c] Binding Even Though Facts or Arguments That Could Have Been Presented Were Not

Issue preclusion will apply with respect to all issues that were involved in the prior case, even though some factual matters or legal arguments that could have been presented in the prior case in support of those issues were not

presented. Thus, when two lawsuits are brought and they arise out of the same alleged factual situation, and although the causes of action or forms of relief may be different, the prior determination of an issue in the first lawsuit becomes conclusive in the subsequent lawsuit between the same parties with respect to that issue and also with respect to every matter that might have been urged to sustain or defeat its determination [*Frommhagen v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1292, 1301, 243 Cal. Rptr. 390* ; *see also Interinsurance Exchange of the Auto. Club v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 177, 181-182, 257 Cal. Rptr. 37]* . However, when determination of an issue was entirely unnecessary to the former judgment, it will not have issue preclusion effect [*Estate of Simmons (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 217, 222-223, 49 Cal. Rptr. 369, 411 P.2d 97* ; *Berry v. City of Santa Barbara (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 438, 444-445, 56 Cal. Rptr. 553* ; *see Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 234, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922]* .

[d] Effect of New Facts or Different Substantive Law

Collateral estoppel does not apply when there are changed conditions or new facts which did not exist at the time of the prior judgment, or where the previous decision was based on different substantive law [*United States Golf Ass'n v. Arroyo Software Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 607, 616-619, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708]* .

[e] Determining What Issues Have Been Adjudicated

What has been adjudicated is to be determined not from the opinion rendered but from a consideration of the judgment actually entered in reference to the issues presented for decision [*Ball v. Rodgers (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 442, 448, 9 Cal. Rptr. 666]* . Whatever issue was actually and necessarily included in a former judgment will be deemed to have been adjudged thereby [*Branson v. Sun-Diamond Growers (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 327, 348, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314* (no collateral estoppel found); *Strickland v. Calancorporation, Ltd. (1957) 156 Cal. App. 2d 488, 495, 319 P.2d 737* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1911*].

To determine what issues were actually litigated in the underlying action the court in the subsequent action cannot rely exclusively on the findings in the underlying action, but must carefully scrutinize the pleadings and proof. This scrutiny includes looking behind the findings at the evidence presented to determine what was actually decided [*Hernandez v. City of Pomona (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 501, 514, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1, 207 P.3d 506* (court must look at entire record from prior proceeding, including pleadings, evidence, jury instructions and any special jury findings or verdicts); *Schaefer/Karpf Productions v. CNA Ins. Companies (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1314, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *see also Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 182, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (reference must be made to pleadings and proof in each case)].

Making the distinction between "issues" and "legal theories" is not always easy; reference must be made to the pleadings and proof in each case [*see United States Golf Ass'n v. Arroyo Software Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 607, 617, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708* ; *Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight Etc. Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1517, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612]* . Evidence extrinsic to the judgment roll, such as a reporter's trial transcript, may be used to ascertain what issues were determined in the former action [*Southwell v. Mallery, Stern & Warford (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 140, 144, 239 Cal. Rptr. 371]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

Identifying Issue That Was Litigated. Residents of California sign franchise agreements under which they agree that any action against the franchisor will be brought in a Virginia court. They sue the franchisor on claims relating to the agreement in federal district court in California based on diversity jurisdiction. The judge, applying federal procedural law, grants the franchisor's motion to dismiss for lack of proper venue based on the forum selection clause. Plaintiffs bring suit in a California state court. Can the case be dismissed on the ground that the issue of the "validity and enforceabiltiy" of the forum selection clause has been fully and fairly litigated in federal court? No [*Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight*

Etc. Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1517-1524, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612] . The *Wimsatt* court noted that the case turned on what the exact issue was that was decided in the federal diversity action. The court held that framing the issue as the validity and enforceability of the forum selection clause was unreasonably broad [*Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight Etc. Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1517, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612]* . Looking at the factual and legal foundation of the prior decision, the court found that it really decided only whether plaintiff had the right to sue in federal court in California as a matter of federal procedural law, and held that this did not and by definition could not reach the question of the validity of the forum selection clause as a matter of California substantive law [*Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight Etc. Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1517-1520, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612]* .

If a court of first instance makes its judgment on alternative grounds and a reviewing court affirms on only one of those grounds, declining to consider the other, the second ground is no longer conclusively established [*Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1460, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521* (court declining to follow *Bank of America v. McLaughlin etc. Co. (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 620, 105 P.2d 607* , which held that judgment is conclusive on both grounds); *see also Newport Beach Country Club v. Founding Members of the Newport Beach Country Club (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1130, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 207* (adopting *Butcher* court's reasoning and declining to follow *Bank of America* case); *Zevnik v. Superior Court (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 76, 86, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 817* (also adopting *Butcher* court's reasoning)].

If an issue such as that of attorney's fees is raised in two separate appeals, and the appellate court defers determination of it in the first appeal, then dismisses the second appeal, the issue has not been conclusively resolved and may be raised in a third appeal [*McAdams v. Aiello (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1226, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 742]* .

[f] Issue Decided in Prior Criminal Action

[i] Conviction

When successive proceedings are different in nature, one criminal and one civil, issue preclusion may still prevent relitigation of issues decided in the first action [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 482, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* . For example, the doctrine of issue preclusion may be applicable when a civil action follows a criminal prosecution; any issue necessarily decided in a prior criminal trial resulting in conviction is conclusively determined as to the parties if it is involved in a subsequent civil action [*Teitelbaum Furs, Inc. v. Dominion Ins. Co., Ltd. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 601, 607, 25 Cal. Rptr. 559, 375 P.2d 439* ; *see, e.g., Higginbotham v. King (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 114* ; *People ex rel. State of Cal. v. Drinkhouse (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 931, 935, 84 Cal. Rptr. 773* ; *see also Leader v. State of California (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 1079, 1083-1089, 226 Cal. Rptr. 207* (misdemeanor conviction as having issue preclusion effect in subsequent civil action)].

If a criminal conviction is subject to a successful collateral attack, for example because it was obtained through the knowing use of perjured testimony or the suppression of evidence, it has no issue preclusion effect in a subsequent action [*see Teitelbaum Furs, Inc. v. Dominion Ins. Co., Ltd. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 601, 607, 25 Cal. Rptr. 559, 375 P.2d 439* (recognizing, but declining to apply rule)]. This does not require the exhaustion of every conceivable collateral attack. Rather, a judgment is "subject to collateral attack" only when the party actually advances meritorious grounds that would sustain such an attack [*Mueller v. J.C. Penney Co. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 713, 719-720, 219 Cal. Rptr. 272* (statements that conviction resulted from perjury and suppression of evidence insufficient when already considered and found meritless by several courts)].

[ii] Acquittal

Because of the difference in the degree of proof required in the two proceedings, an acquittal in a prior criminal case is

not res judicata of the issue in a subsequent civil case [*People ex rel. Gow v. Mitchell Brothers' Santa Ana Theater (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 296, 306, 161 Cal. Rptr. 562* ; *see also* *Holt v. Department of Food & Agriculture (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 427, 433, 218 Cal. Rptr. 1* (similar rule applies when subsequent proceeding is administrative hearing)].

[iii] Guilty Plea

A criminal judgment arising from a guilty plea does not draw any issues into controversy and has no issue preclusion effect [*see* *Teitelbaum Furs, Inc. v. Dominion Ins. Co., Ltd. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 601, 605-606, 25 Cal. Rptr. 559, 375 P.2d 439* (dictum); *People v. Camp (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 651, 654, 89 Cal. Rptr. 242* (issue preclusion denied in subsequent criminal action); *but see* *Olson v. Meacham (1933) 129 Cal. App. 670, 675, 19 P.2d 527* (guilty plea may be used in evidence in subsequent civil trial as admission against interest)].

[iv] Ruling on Habeas Corpus

Although a final judgment granting habeas corpus relief is res judicata and a decision denying habeas corpus relief is not res judicata, under appropriate circumstances a decision denying a request for habeas corpus relief may, for all intents and purposes, be final as to the facts adjudicated and may be given collateral estoppel effect [*Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 410-412, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* . This turns on the burden of proof, because collateral estoppel ordinarily will not apply if the party sought to be bound by a previous factual determination faced a higher burden of proof in the first proceeding than is required by the later proceeding [*Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 409 n.4, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* . Thus, for example, because the threshold determination on a habeas corpus petition regarding ineffective assistance of counsel is whether or not counsel's performance was deficient, based on a preponderance of the evidence, the same burden as in a civil trial, collateral estoppel may apply to bar relitigation of the issue of the attorney's competence in a later malpractice action [*Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 408-414, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* . The result might well be different if the issue were lack of prejudice, the other element of habeas relief based on ineffective assistance of counsel, since a habeas petitioner must do more than show harm by a preponderance of the evidence, but must instead show that it is reasonably probable that trial counsel's poor representation prejudiced petitioner [*Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 409 n.4, 414 n.7, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* .

[v] Ruling At Preliminary Hearing

A prior judicial determination at a preliminary hearing that there was sufficient evidence to hold the plaintiff over for trial may, in some situations, preclude the plaintiff from relitigating the issue of probable cause to arrest in a subsequent civil suit [*McCutchen v. City of Montclair (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1138, 1147, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95* (court, however, concluded that finding of probable cause at preliminary hearing did not have collateral estoppel effect because evidence presented at preliminary hearing was not same as evidence available to officer at time of plaintiff's arrest)].

On the other hand, if a defendant in a criminal case has a tactical reason not to litigate the probable cause issue, in that situation collateral estoppel might not apply. Unless, however, the plaintiff in a civil suit can demonstrate that the issue of probable cause was not litigated at the preliminary hearing for tactical reasons, an appellate court will presume that the plaintiff had a full and fair opportunity to litigate the issue of probable cause [*McCutchen v. City of Montclair (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1138, 1147, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95]* .

[vi] Mental Health Determination

In light of the changeable nature of a person's mental health and dangerousness, it is inconsistent with the legislative intent under the Sexually Violent Predators Act to give conclusive effect to a 20-year-old finding that defendant was a not a mentally disordered sex offender [*People v. Carmony (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 317, 325-326, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 896* (the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel are not generally considered to be constitutional rules, and the Legislature may abrogate them in appropriate circumstances, such as in the facts of this case)].

[g] Issue Decided in Prior Administrative Action

Issue preclusion applies to a final adjudication of an administrative agency of statutory creation so as to preclude relitigation of the same issues in a subsequent case, if the following apply [*People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* ; *Marie Y. v. General Star Indemnity Company (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 928, 954-955, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 135* ; *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1083, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1538, 1544, 263 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *Carmel Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. State of California (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 535, 234 Cal. Rptr. 795]* :

- The administrative agency acted in a judicial capacity;
- It resolved disputed issues properly before it; and
- All parties were provided with the opportunity to fully and fairly litigate their claims.

This general rule may not apply if the statutory scheme that is involved specifically addresses the collateral estoppel effect of the type of adjudication in issue [*see* *Gikas v. Zolin (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 841, 851-852, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 500, 863 P.2d 745* (recognizing that, by statute, DMV administrative proceedings to suspend drivers' licenses for driving under the influence have no collateral estoppel effect on criminal prosecution for driving under the influence)].

In determining whether an agency acted in a judicial capacity, the court must consider the presence of factors indicating that the administrative proceedings and determination possessed a judicial character [*Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906-907, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* . These factors include the following [*Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 907, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* :

- Whether the administrative hearing was conducted in a judicial-like adversary proceeding;
- Whether the proceedings required witnesses to testify under oath;
- Whether the agency determination involved the adjudicatory application of rules to a single set of facts;
- Whether the proceedings were conducted before an impartial hearing officer;
- Whether the parties had the right to subpoena witnesses and present documentary evidence; and
- Whether the administrative agency maintained a verbatim record of the proceedings.

Additional factors include whether the hearing officer's decision was adjudicatory and in writing and contained a statement of reasons and whether the decision was adopted by the director of the agency with the potential for later judicial review [*Imen v. Glassford (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 898, 907, 247 Cal. Rptr. 514]* .

When a statutory scheme of remedies contemplates proceedings in different tribunals affording different remedies which are cumulative, not mutually exclusive, res judicata has been held inapplicable because the first proceeding was an administrative proceeding at which the second remedy (statutorily decreed to be a cumulative remedy) could not be sought [*People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 967-974, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504* (People's civil action alleging unfair business practices in defendant's operation of automotive repair dealership, pursuant to Automotive Repair Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9880 et seq.*), not barred by res judicata following administrative proceeding by Department of Consumer Affairs for violations of Automotive Repair Act; civil statutes do not authorize any action to be taken against

registration whereas administrative statutes do not authorize imposition of civil penalty for unfair business practices)]. The court in *Damon*, in holding res judicata inapplicable, noted that there was no prior judgment but only an administrative decision. Res judicata principles sometimes, but not always, apply to administration decisions. The cases typically deal with the secondary aspect of res judicata, that is, collateral estoppel [*People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 969, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504]* . The court further noted that administrative decisions should not be given res judicata effect if the statutory scheme explicitly or implicitly shows a contrary intent, citing as one authority *Gikas v. Zolin (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 841, 851-852, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 500, 863 P. 2d 745* , which addressed the issue in the context of collateral estoppel [*see People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 970, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504]* . The court specifically stated, however, that it was expressing no view on whether collateral estoppel should be applied in the circumstances of the case [*People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 968 n.10, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504]* .

[h] Issue Decided in Prior Arbitration Proceeding

An arbitration award in an private arbitration governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1280 et seq.*, is not entitled to collateral estoppel effect in favor of a nonparty to the arbitration unless the parties to the arbitration agreed to that effect in the particular case [*Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 824, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229]* .

In so holding in *Vandenberg*, the Supreme Court noted that it was making a very narrow holding, and listed a number of issues it was not addressing [*Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 824 n.2, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229]* :

- The strict res judicata ("claim preclusion") effect of a private arbitration award [citing *Thibodeau v. Crum (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 749, 756-761, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27* (award between homeowner and general contractor barred homeowner action against subcontractor); *Sartor v. Superior Court (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 322, 327-328, 187 Cal. Rptr. 247* (award between homeowner and architectural firm barred homeowner's identical action against firm's employees)].

- The circumstances, if any, in which a private arbitration award would have collateral estoppel effect in subsequent litigation between the same parties on a different cause of action.

- Whether the Federal Arbitration Act (*9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.*) would alter the ruling.

- The application of collateral estoppel to arbitrations under collective bargaining agreements within the purview of federal or state labor relations laws [citing *Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1339-1341, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763* (arbitration between union and employer bound employees on similar issues in later litigation with employer) and *Lehto v. Underground Constr. Co. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 933, 939-944, 138 Cal. Rptr. 419* (union-employer arbitration not preclusive against union member's subsequent unfair representation claim)].

- The collateral estoppel effect of arbitrations under various other California statutory schemes, including:

  - Mandatory judicial arbitration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.10 et seq.*

  - Statutory arbitration of uninsured motorist claims under *Ins. Code §§ 11580.2(f), 11580.5*.

  - Statutory arbitration of attorney-client fee disputes under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6204*.

In other contexts, collateral estoppel may apply to findings made in an arbitration award [*see Liska v. Arns Law Firm*

(2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 275, 284, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 21 (in suit where former client sued his attorneys for breach of contract and fraud following a binding attorney-client fee dispute, court held that only the arbitrator's award of attorney fees was to be given collateral estoppel effect in the subsequent lawsuit and therefore reversed the trial court's sustaining of the law firm's demurrer; plaintiff was permitted to maintain his action in so far as he was seeking affirmative relief relating to the prior lawsuit and not merely to recover the fees awarded to the law firm in the fee arbitration)].

Findings made during arbitration may have collateral estoppel effect so long as the arbitration had the elements of an adjudicatory procedure. Parties to an arbitration, like parties to an administration hearing, are often afforded the opportunity for a hearing before an impartial and qualified officer, at which they may give formal recorded testimony under oath, cross-examine and compel the testimony of witnesses, and obtain a written decision. It is not unjust to bind the parties to determinations made during the proceedings when the arbitration has these attributes [*Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1336-1337, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763* (labor arbitration; distinguishing *Flynn v. Gorton (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1550* , which holds that findings made during judicial arbitration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.10* et seq. not entitled to collateral estoppel effect, and cases which hold that findings made during labor arbitration are not binding in employee lawsuit asserting federal statutory causes of action); *see also* *State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 5, 12-14, 259 Cal. Rptr. 50* (judgment based on judicial arbitration can have collateral estoppel effect; *Flynn* distinguished and rationale rejected)].

Two conditions must be satisfied before an arbitration award of a Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) claim under a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) can be given collateral estoppel effect [*Camargo v. California Portland Cement Company (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1018-1019, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841]* :

(1) The agreement to resolve the claims by arbitration in the CBA must be clear and unmistakable; and

(2) the procedures of the arbitration must allow for the full litigation and fair adjudication of the FEHA claim.

The court distinguished *Kelly*, on the basis that it held only that the arbitration of common law claims under a CBA collaterally estops a subsequent attempt to litigate those claims [*Camargo v. California Portland Cement Company (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1019, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841]* .

In *Taylor v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 380, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 358* , the second appellate district applied the reasoning of *Camargo* to claims for retaliatory discharge under *Lab. Code § 6310(b)*. The court held that a labor arbitration can only have a collateral estoppel effect on a subsequent statutory claim under *Lab. Code § 6310(b)* if the collective bargaining agreement contained a clear and unmistakable waiver of the employee's right to file a lawsuit on the statutory claim; and distinguished *Kelly* on the ground that *Kelly* did not involve a statutory discrimination claim but rather a common law tort claim [*Taylor v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 380, 386-387, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 358]* .

[i] Issue Decided in Prior Small Claims Proceeding

Issue preclusion does not generally apply to a small claims court judgment or superior court judgment after a hearing de novo in an action arising under the Small Claims Act, *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.* [*Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1050-1053, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* (rejecting *Perez v. City of San Bruno (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 875, 168 Cal. Rptr. 114, 616 P.2d 1287* , on ground it is no longer sound due to repeal of former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 155, and enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*)]. Because a superior court judgment in a de novo small claims proceeding is final and not appealable (*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*), the proceeding is not ordinarily transcribed as there is no need to do so, and also because the superior court provides no statement of decision in a small claims matter (*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*), it will be ordinarily impossible to reliably determine whether particular issues were actually litigated and decided which must be established to accord a prior judgment issue preclusion effect [

Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1052, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680] .

However, issue preclusion may be applied to prevent a plaintiff from relitigating an issue litigated and expressly decided against the plaintiff in a small claims action [*Pitzen v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1374, 1381, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628]* . In *Pitzen*, the small claims court had issued a memorandum of decision stating that plaintiffs had failed to meet their burden of proving that defendant had caused the accident. Accordingly, the small claims court entered judgment against plaintiffs. One of the plaintiffs subsequently filed a superior court action against defendant based on the same accident. The court of appeals reversed the trial court's order overruling defendant's demurrer and held that issue preclusion prevented plaintiff from relitigating the matter against defendant. The court noted that its holding was limited to cases in which it was the small claims plaintiff who sought to relitigate the matter. The court further stated that its holding was further based on the fact that the record from the small claims proceeding adequately reflected that the issue was litigated and decided in the proceeding.

[j] Issue Decided in Prior Bastardy Proceeding--Application to Probate Action

Issue preclusion applied to a probate proceeding after a 1941 Ohio judgment in a bastardy proceeding where the father admitted paternity [*Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 923, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191]* . The California Supreme Court rejected the argument that res judicata should not apply because, even assuming the bastardy proceeding was quasi-criminal, the circumstances did not call for application of the rule that a trial court in a civil proceeding may not give collateral estoppel effect to a criminal conviction involving the same issues if the conviction resulted from a guilty plea because the paternity judgment was not being challenged by the father nor those claiming a right to inherit through him and the record failed to support any claim that the father's confession merely reflected a compromise [*Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 923, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191]* .

[k] Issue Decided in Prior Bankruptcy Proceeding

Issue preclusion applies to a bankruptcy court's factual findings in a wrongful death case in which plaintiffs' sons were killed in an automobile accident caused by defendant [*Roos v. Red (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 870, 886, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 446]* . After a one-day trial, the bankruptcy court ruled that plaintiffs' claims were not discharged because the claims were a result of defendant's willful and malicious conduct. The court of appeals held that the trial court correctly gave collateral estoppel effect to the bankruptcy court findings and that defendant could not contest liability in the state court proceedings. The court rejected defendant's contention that he had not had a full and fair opportunity to litigate the issue of liability because he had not had a jury trial on the issue. Defendant's right to a jury trial was not denied simply because the court had given collateral estoppel effect to the bankruptcy court's findings on the issue of liability [*Roos v. Red (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 870, 881-886, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 446]* .

[4] Identity of Parties or Privies

[a] Generally

The party against whom issue preclusion is asserted must have been a party or in privity with a party to the prior adjudication [*see* *Bernhard v. Bank of America (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 807, 813, 122 P.2d 892* ; *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 159-160, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790]* .

The term "privity" refers to some relationship or connection with the party that makes it proper to hold privies bound with the actual party. Whether privity exists is determined by analyzing the circumstances that are involved in each case. The courts have abandoned application of rigid categories in favor of a practical approach that addresses the question of whether the nonparty is sufficiently close to the original case so that issue preclusion may be applied [*Martin v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 688, 700, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303* ; *see* *Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1515, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33* (privity arising from representing same legal right)]. Thus, for purposes of issue preclusion, privity is a relationship between the party to be estopped and the unsuccessful party in the

prior litigation that is sufficiently close so as to justify application of issue preclusion [*Shopoff & Cavallo LLP v. Hyon (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1516, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 268* ; *Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 875, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098]* .

Three factors may favor the application of issue preclusion in a given case even though precise identity of parties and issues may be lacking. Issue preclusion may be invoked to protect against vexatious litigation, to further the finality of litigation in which public interests are involved, or to promote the stability of adjudications in prior criminal actions [*Lynch v. Glass (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 943, 947, 119 Cal. Rptr. 139]* .

Issue preclusion may be applied against nonparties who had a proprietary or financial interest in and control of a prior action [*see Zingheim v. Marshall (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 736, 745, 57 Cal. Rptr. 809]* . It may also be applied against a nonparty for whom the unsuccessful party in the first action acted in a representative capacity [*see Rynsburger v. Dairymen's Fertilizer Coop., Inc. (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 269, 277-278, 72 Cal. Rptr. 102* ; *see also Alvarez v. May Department Stores Co. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1238, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 892* (plaintiffs in prior attempt to obtain class certification were "virtual representatives" of plaintiffs as the parties, claims, and counsel were all the same; denial of class certification in prior case therefore had collateral estoppel effect); *but see Johnson v. GlaxoSmithKline, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1497, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607* (prior class certification determinations were litigated before effective date of a proposition that significantly changed standing requirements for actions under *Bus.& Prof. Code § 17200* and therefore the element of identity of the issue to be precluded from relitigation was missing); *Bufil v. Dollar Financial Group, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 804* (trial court's judgment on the pleadings in favor of class-action defendant on collateral estoppel grounds reversed; class asserted in second action was distinct subclass restricted to certain employees and therefore the issues surrounding class certification were different)].

However, whatever may be the scope of expanded notions of privity, it is clear that collateral estoppel may only be applied when due process requirements are met [*Nein v. HostPro, Inc. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 833, 846-847, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34* ; *Rodgers v. Sargent Controls & Aerospace (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 82, 92-93, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 528* (fact that plaintiff was represented by same counsel as plaintiffs in prior cases was not sufficient to extend doctrine of privity to plaintiff's case; plaintiff had no proprietary interest in prior cases and could not be charged with notice that he "avoided the prior proceedings at his peril"); *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 154-155, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (insurers held not bound by earlier judicial determination requiring coverage by another insurer because they were neither parties nor privies to prior coverage action in that they were not named in that action as parties, they did not have a financial or proprietary interest in the outcome of the coverage action, nor could it be fairly said that insurer in earlier action was in any way acting as their representative; they had no control over, or impact on, the earlier coverage action)].

For further discussion of privity, see *§ 491.14[5]*. For discussion of the due process limitations on privity and the due process requirement that the litigant in the prior proceeding must have had an adequate opportunity to litigate, see [5] and [6], *below*.

[b] Use of Issue Preclusion by Stranger

For issue preclusion to be applicable, the person asserting issue preclusion need not be in privity with parties to the prior action [*see Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* (party against whom issue preclusion asserted as only party required to be in privity); *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1083, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738* (it is the party against whom collateral estoppel is sought to be invoked that must be the same as or in privity with the party in the earlier proceeding)]. Issue preclusion may be asserted by a stranger to the prior judgment [*see, e.g., Bernhard v. Bank of America (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 807, 813, 122 P.2d 892]* .

Issue preclusion may be asserted by a stranger to a prior judgment either offensively, as a plaintiff, or defensively, as a

defendant [*see Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 329, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552* ; *see also Burdette v. Carrier Corp. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1668, 1688, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 185*]. Defensive use of issue preclusion occurs when a defendant argues that an issue in the present suit was previously litigated in his or her favor in a prior suit in which the same plaintiff lost against another defendant. This type of issue preclusion is clearly authorized under California law [*see Bernhard v. Bank of America (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 807, 813, 122 P.2d 892]* . A party, however, cannot assert collateral estoppel if that party's negligence led to the adjudication sought to be used defensively [*Ruffalo v. Patterson (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 341, 344, 285 Cal. Rptr. 647* (issue decided in underlying action not given collateral estoppel effect in malpractice action against attorney); *see Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1335, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (recognizing rule)].

Offensive use of issue preclusion occurs when a plaintiff is seeking to prevent a defendant from relitigating issues that a defendant litigated and lost against another plaintiff [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 329, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552]* . Courts have denied the offensive assertion of issue preclusion when, under the circumstances, it would be unfair to the defendant or otherwise against public policy [*see, e.g., Kelly v. Trans Globe Travel Bureau, Inc. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 195, 202, 131 Cal. Rptr. 488* ; *O'Connor v. O'Leary (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 646, 649-650, 56 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . The most common area in which offensive assertion of issue preclusion has been denied for unfairness to the defendant is when the plaintiff's suit is one of a set of cases maintained by different persons in separate negligence actions for personal injuries against a single defendant [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 419, 430, 156 Cal. Rptr. 738 , cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1076 (1980)* ; *see Nevarov v. Caldwell (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 762, 774-775, 327 P.2d 111]* . Issue preclusion may also be denied in successive products liability actions involving the same defendant when inconsistent verdicts are extant on the issue of liability [*see Sandoval v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 932, 941-944, 190 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

Although the United States Supreme Court has expressly approved the offensive use of issue preclusion, the Court also stated that judges should deny issue preclusion when the plaintiff could easily have joined in the earlier action or when the application of preclusion would be unfair to the defendant [*Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 331, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552]* . Moreover, the court has held that nonmutual offensive collateral estoppel does not extend against the United States [*United States v. Mendoza (1984) 464 U.S. 154, 157-158, 104 S. Ct. 568, 78 L. Ed. 2d 379]* .

[c] When Coparties Use of Issue Preclusion May Be Appropriate

Ordinarily, when the plaintiff and defendant in a subsequent action were merely codefendants in the original action, the prior judgment cannot be used by one against the other as an estoppel since they were not adversary parties in the original action and no issues were raised or adjudicated between them in the original action. Coparties to an action, however, may in some situations have adverse interests even when no issue is framed between them by the pleadings. Coparties who were not adversaries may be bound by a judgment in a subsequent controversy between each other when they, in fact, occupied, in the prior trial an attitude of adversaries. The formal arrangement of parties on the record is unimportant, so that if coparties on the record were, in fact, adversaries on an issue, and the issue was actually litigated, and they had full opportunity to contest it with each other, coparties are concluded by adjudication of that issue in a subsequent controversy between each other [*Pleasant Valley Canal Co. v. Borror (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 742, 769, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* ; *see also Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155]* .

[5] Constitutional and Public Policy Restrictions on Issue Preclusion

Issue preclusion may be applied only if due process requirements are satisfied [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 875, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098* ; *Bernhard v. Bank of America (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 807, 811-812, 122 P.2d 892* ; *White Motor Corp. v. Teresinski (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 754, 761, 263 Cal. Rptr. 26]* . The requirement of identity of parties or privity is a due process requirement [*Children's Hospital v. Sedgwick (1996) 45*

Cal. App. 4th 1780, 1788, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 725] . Due process requires that the party to be estopped must have had an identity or community of interest with, and adequate representation by, the losing party in the first action. Furthermore, the circumstances of the case should reflect that the party to be estopped should reasonably have expected to be bound by the prior adjudication [*Lynch v. Glass (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 943, 948, 119 Cal. Rptr. 139* ; *accord Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155* ; *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 154, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* ; *Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* . Due process also requires that the party sought to be estopped must have had a fair opportunity to pursue his or her claim the first time [*Blonder-Tongue Lab. v. University of Illinois Found. (1971) 402 U.S. 313, 333, 91 S. Ct. 1434, 28 L. Ed. 2d 788* ; *accord Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 154, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642]* .

A party is adequately represented for purposes of the privity rule if his or her interests are so similar to a party's interest that the latter was the former's virtual representative in the earlier action. If the party's motive for asserting a common interest is relatively weak, however, one does not infer adequate representation and there is no privity [*Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1070-1071, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77]* .

Collateral estoppel is not mechanically applied. In each case the court must determine whether its application will advance the public policies that underlie the doctrine [*Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1191, 1193, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334* (issues resolved on routine sanction motion are not entitled to preclusive effect in later action for malicious prosecution)]. Those public policies are [*Lucido v. Superior Court (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 335, 343, 795 P.2d 1223* ; *AmericanContinental Ins. Co. v. American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 945, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632]* :

- Preservation of the integrity of the judicial system,
- Promotion of judicial economy,
- Protection of litigants from harassment by vexatious litigation.

Thus, in deciding whether to apply issue preclusion, the court must balance the rights of the party to be estopped against the need for applying issue preclusion in the particular case, in order to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation, to prevent inconsistent judgments that undermine the integrity of the judicial system, or to protect against vexatious litigation [*Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 875, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098* ; *accord Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155* ; *White Motor Corp. v. Teresinski (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 754, 761-762, 263 Cal. Rptr. 26* ; *see Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 407, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103]* .

Even when the minimal prerequisites for invocation of the doctrine are present, collateral estoppel is not an inflexible, universally applicable principle. Policy considerations may limit its use when underpinnings of the doctrine are outweighed by other factors. Whether collateral estoppel is fair and consistent with public policy in a particular case depends in part on the character of the forum that first decided issue later sought to be foreclosed. In this regard, courts consider the judicial nature of the prior forum, i.e., its legal formality, the scope of its jurisdiction, and its procedural safeguards, particularly including the opportunity for judicial review of adverse rulings. Moreover, particular danger of injustice arises when collateral estoppel is invoked by a nonparty to the prior litigation. Such cases require close examination to determine whether nonmutual use of the doctrine is fair and appropriate [*Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 829-830, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229]* .

Ultimately, determination of privity may depend on whether it is fair to reach that conclusion [*see Children's Hospital v. Sedgwick (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1780, 1788, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 725* (fair to bind hospital with earlier judgment in medical malpractice action in which it was dismissed as party before trial so as to bar hospital's action for equitable

indemnity against anesthesiologist, who had prevailed in first action, after award of damages against hospital in second suit by same plaintiff; in earlier action hospital had opportunity to prove anesthesiologist caused plaintiff's injuries and had community of interest with plaintiff in seeking to hold anesthesiologist liable for plaintiff's injuries)].

When injustice would result either because of the effect on third persons or because the public interest requires full litigation, issue preclusion may not be applied [*Moore v. Panish (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 535, 540 n.5, 186 Cal. Rptr. 475, 652 P.2d 32* ; *City of Los Angeles v. City of San Fernando (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 199, 230, 123 Cal. Rptr. 1, 537 P.2d 1250* ; *Gutierrez v. Superior Court (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 153, 169-170, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 376* , *cert. denied, 514 U.S. 1049 (1995)* (collateral estoppel inappropriate against criminal defendant in successive criminal proceedings; would vitiate right to fair trial); *People v. Casa Blanca Convalescent Homes, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 509, 532, 206 Cal. Rptr. 164* ; *see also Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1191, 1193, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334]* .

For example, collateral estoppel cannot be used to bind a California litigant to a principle of law adopted in prior out-of-state litigation that is contrary to California law, or to preclude a party from litigating a novel issue of law in California [*American Continental Ins. Co. v. American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 945, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632]* . In this situation, none of the policies underlying the doctrine of issue preclusion would be advanced because determining an issue of first impression (1) could not degrade public confidence in judicial system, which is threatened when two or more courts render inconsistent decisions, (2) could not be waste of judicial resources, and (3) could not be seen as baseless or unjustified litigation that might harass a party [*American Continental Ins. Co. v. American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 945-946, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632]* .

In deciding whether to apply collateral estoppel, a court must balance the need to limit litigation against the right of a fair adversary proceeding in which a party may fully present his or her case. Thus, collateral estoppel should not be applied if there was no opportunity for a full presentation of the issue in the first proceeding [*Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1193, 1194 n.4, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334* (mere showing that affidavits were submitted may not be sufficient to carry burden of proving issue was actually litigated)].

At least one court has also declined to apply collateral estoppel for equitable reasons after determining that the party against whom the doctrine was to be invoked had not, through no fault of its own, had a "full and fair opportunity" to litigate the claim in the prior litigation. In a case where defendant's expert was unable to testify at the last minute due to his daughter's death in a car accident, the court held it was not equitable to apply collateral estoppel on the issue of defendant's liability in a subsequent lawsuit involving the same issues. The court noted that the unavailability of a crucial witness at the prior proceeding might render the use of collateral estoppel inappropriate and, in the "unusual and compelling" circumstance presented in that case, collateral estoppel should not have been applied [*Smith v. Exxon Mobile Oil Corp. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1407, 1417, 1420, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 69]* .

Issue preclusion is not applicable when the party against whom preclusion is sought could not, as a matter of law, have obtained review of the judgment in the initial action [*Long Beach Grand Prix Assn. v. Hunt (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1195, 1203, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 70* ; *Anderson-Cottonwood Disposal Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 326, 332, 185 Cal. Rptr. 336]* .

[6] Public Interest Exception to Issue Preclusion

A public interest exception to issue preclusion may apply in certain cases involving public entities [*see Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 257, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438]* . In these cases, when the issue is a question of law rather than of fact, the prior determination is not conclusive either if injustice would result or if the public interest requires that relitigation not be foreclosed [*Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 257, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438* (applying exception); City of Sacramento v. *State of California (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 51, 64, 266 Cal. Rptr. 139, 785 P.2d 522* (applying exception); *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1402 n.3, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (applying exception);

Pleasant Valley Canal Co. v. Borror (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 742, 771, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1 (exception not applicable); *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1084-1086, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738* (exception not applicable)].

In *Arcadia Unified*, taxpayers in a prior action in which the opinion was depublished, had successfully challenged the constitutionality of a statute permitting school districts to charge fees for pupil transportation. The primary defendant, the State Board of Education, then issued an advisory that the stature authorizing the fee was unconstitutional, but many school districts that were not parties to the taxpayer suit continued to charge the fee, and ultimately brought a subsequent action to determine the validity of the statute [*Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 255-256, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438]* . In upholding the statute, the Court first ruled that the plaintiff school districts were not bound by the prior decision because the public interest exception to the collateral estoppel rule applied. The Court determined it would be detrimental to the public interest to foreclose relitigation of the issue, since there had been a continuing and demonstrable uncertainty about the validity of the statute [*Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 256-257, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438* ; *see Connell v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 382, 394-397, 402, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231* (public interest exception applied; Water Control Board's decision did not constitute final adjudication precluding further consideration; issue presented was not limited to validity of any finally adjudicated individual claim, but encompassed question of subvention obligations in general under regulatory amendment of wastewater purification standards; if Board's decision were wrong but unimpeachable, taxpayers statewide would suffer unjustly consequences of a continuing obligation to fund costs of local water districts); *Millan v. Restaurant Enterprises Group, Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 477, 490-491, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (finding no estoppel against public agency)].

Application of the public interest exception to issue preclusion may also apply in certain cases that do not involve public entities. The California Supreme Court, discussing *Arcadia Unified School Dist. and City of Sacramento v. State of California (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 51, 64-65, 266 Cal. Rptr. 139, 785 P.2d 522* , has noted in a matter involving a public agency that no authority confines application of the public interest exception to cases concerning public agencies [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 622-623 n.16, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J., Werdegar, J., concurring, Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)].

Some cases suggest that court may have discretionary power to relax res judicata and collateral estoppel rules somewhat, in rare instances when the inability to raise a constitutional argument would work a serious injustice and harm the public interest [*Littoral Development Co. v. San Francisco Bay Conservation Com. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 211, 217, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266* (rule inapplicable to case before court)]. The public interest exception, however, is a very narrow one [Acu na v. *Regents of University of California (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 639, 652, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsIncorporation in JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCriminal Law & ProcedurePreliminary ProceedingsPreliminary HearingsProcedure & ScopeCriminal Law & ProcedureDouble JeopardyCollateral EstoppelCriminal Law & ProcedureDouble JeopardyRes JudicataCriminal Law & ProcedureHabeas CorpusProcedureGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.16

§ 491.16 Judgments of Federal or Sister-State Courts

As a general rule, full faith and credit must be given to the final orders and judgments of federal and sister state courts [*Levy v. Cohen (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 165, 172, 137 Cal. Rptr. 162, 561 P.2d 252 , cert. denied, 434 U.S. 833* ; *Hicks v. Corbett (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 87, 90-91, 278 P.2d 77 , cert. denied, 349 U.S. 965* ; *see* U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 1*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908(a), 1913*]. Such an order or judgment must be given the same effect in the courts of California as it would have been given in the federal or sister state court in which it was made [*Levy v. Cohen (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 165, 173, 137 Cal. Rptr. 162, 561 P.2d 252 , cert. denied, 434 U.S. 833* ; *Hood v. Hood (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 332, 337-338, 27 Cal. Rptr. 47* ; for discussion of the distinction between the federal and California rule concerning finality of a judgment for purposes of res judicata, *see § 491.14[2][d]*]. Likewise, a final judgment entered in an action filed in California will be given res judicata effect in federal court [*Palomar Mobilehome Park v. City of San Marcos (9th Cir. 1993) 989 F.2d 362, 364]* .

California follows the rule that the preclusive effect of a prior federal court judgment is determined by federal law, at least where the prior judgment was based on federal question jurisdiction [*Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1452-1455, 1460, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521]* . In *Butcher*, the court noted that the *California Supreme Court in Levy v. Cohen (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 165, 172-173, 137 Cal. Rptr. 162, 561 P.2d 252* and *Martin v. Martin (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 752, 761, 470 P.2d 662* , did not give any indication that the rule it was announcing (i.e., the preclusive effect of a prior judgment of a federal court is determined by federal law) would differ depending on whether federal court's jurisdiction was based on diversity or federal question. *Butcher* involved diversity jurisdiction and did not resolve the issue of whether the res judicata law of the state whose law the federal court applyied in the action leading to the judgment in the federal action or federal law would apply to determine the effect of the judgment, because in either case, California law would apply [*Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1455, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521]* .

However, following a federal judgment, a state court is not bound by federal law when determining whether an exception to the doctrines of res judicata or collateral estoppel applies, such as the public interest exception [*Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 620-626, 622 n.16, 675, 685, 693, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P.2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)]. For discussion of public interest exception to res judicata and collateral estoppel, see *§§ 491.14[6]* and

491.15[6].

In making its determination as to whether a sister state or federal court judgment is res judicata, a California court may take judicial notice of the judgment [*see Evid. Code § 452(d)*].

A judgment or order of another state must be given full faith and credit if final and rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with constitutional procedural requirements and the forum state's laws. The court that rendered the judgment must have had proper jurisdiction over both the subject matter and the parties [*In re Marriage of Hanley (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1109, 1119, 245 Cal. Rptr. 441* (disavowed on other grounds, *Leadford v. Leadford (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 571, 575 n.5, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 9*)].

However, the doctrine of collateral estoppel cannot be utilized to bind a California litigant to a principle of law adopted in prior litigation in a foreign state court which is contrary to the law of California; nor can it be utilized to preclude a party from litigating a novel issue of law in California [*American Continental Insurance Co. v. American Casualty Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 945, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632]* .

If the forum court lacked jurisdiction, the judgment may be collaterally attacked in a California court, and extrinsic evidence is admissible to support the attack. However, a collateral attack for jurisdictional defect is not available if the attacking party litigated or could have litigated the jurisdictional issue in the forum court. In such a case, the judgment is res judicata as to the forum court's jurisdiction and cannot be challenged by collateral attack in a later proceeding [*In re Marriage of Hanley (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1109, 1120, 245 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *see also* *Bank of America v. Jennett (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 104, 113-114, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (judgment may be challenged on jurisdictional grounds only if issue of jurisdiction was not litigated in foreign state; if question was expressly litigated, determination is res judicata and is protected by full faith and credit clause)].

The courts of appeal are split over whether res judicata should apply to bar a state law claim that is dismissed out of a federal lawsuit that has resulted in a final judgment. The Fourth Appellate District, Division Two, held that once it is known that the federal court will not exercise pendent jurisdiction over the state claim and it is dismissed out of the lawsuit, if the plaintiff then elects to proceed to trial and judgment in the federal court, the plaintiff's entire cause of action is either merged in or barred by the federal court judgment so that the plaintiff may not thereafter maintain a second suit on the same cause of action in a state court [*Mattson v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 441, 445-446, 164 Cal.Rptr. 913]* . However, the Second Appellate District, Division Eight, is of the opposite view, finding that despite *Mattson*'s concerns, a contrary rule would not invite manipulation, thus the plaintiff is not barred by res judicata from going forth with the state claim after the federal claim has resulted in a final judgment [*Harris v. Grimes (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 180, 188-189, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 791]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsErie DoctrineCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsFull Faith & CreditGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataConstitutional LawRelations Among GovernmentsFull Faith & Credit

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.17

§ 491.17 Asserting Defense of Res Judicata

[1] Pleading Judgment

When a judgment or order of a court is conclusive, the judgment or order must be alleged in the pleadings if there be an opportunity to do so; if there be no such opportunity, the judgment or order may be used as evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908.5*].

In pleading a judgment, it is not necessary to state the facts conferring jurisdiction, but such judgment or determination may be stated to have been duly given or made and to have become final. If such allegation is controverted, the party pleading must establish on the trial the facts conferring jurisdiction and creating finality [*Code Civ. Proc. § 456*].

[2] By Demurrer

If the defense of res judicata appears from the face of the complaint, or from matter of which the court must or may take judicial notice [*see Evid. Code §§ 451, 452*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*], the complaint is subject to a general demurrer (or a motion for judgment on the pleadings) on the ground that the complaint does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action in that it appears the action is res judicata, unless facts are alleged that will justify setting the prior judgment aside [*Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 554, 305 P.2d 20* ; *Henry v. Clifford (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 315, 320, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116* ; *Frommhagen v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1292, 1299-1300, 243 Cal. Rptr. 390* ; for a form of demurrer, *see § 491.50*]. For discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

A trial court may take judicial notice of a prior judgment in deciding whether to sustain a demurrer based on res judicata, regardless of whether the prior judgment was pleaded, provided that the court has been correctly apprised of the judgment and the party responding to the demurrer is given adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard as to the effect of the judgment [*Pease v. Pease (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 29, 32, 246 Cal. Rptr. 762]* .

[3] By Answer

When the defense of res judicata exists but does not appear from the face of the complaint or from judicially noticed

matter, the objection may be raised by answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(b), 431.30(b)(2)*] and separate trial of that issue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 597*; for discussion of special trial of the defense, *see § 491.20, below*].

[4] By Motion for Summary Judgment

The defense of res judicata is properly raised by a motion for summary judgment, and is a proper ground on which to grant a summary judgment [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* ; *Seltzer v. Seltzer (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 137, 141-142, 80 Cal. Rptr. 688]* .

Summary judgment is an appropriate remedy when the doctrine of issue preclusion refutes all triable issues of fact suggested by the pleadings and supporting documents [*Southwell v. Mallery, Stern & Warford (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 140, 144, 239 Cal. Rptr. 371* ; *County of Alameda v. Sampson (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 584, 589-590, 163 Cal. Rptr. 915]* .

For forms and discussion relating to summary judgment, see Ch. 537, *Summary Judgment* .

[5] By Motion to Dismiss

Although there is no statutory procedure to move for dismissal on res judicata grounds, earlier decisions permitted that defense to be raised by a motion to dismiss supported by affidavits, citing the inherent power of the courts to dismiss sham or fictitious complaints [*see High v. Cavanaugh (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 495, 497, 23 Cal. Rptr. 121* ; *McKenna v. Elliott & Horne Co. (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 551, 554-555, 258 P.2d 528]* . More recently, however, the Supreme Court has stated that nonstatutory speaking motions (that is, motions that are supported by facts outside the pleadings) have been superseded by the procedure governing motions for summary judgment contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 167-168, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* ; *see also McKinney v. County of Santa Clara (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 787, 793, 168 Cal. Rptr. 89* (speaking motion to dismiss treated as motion for summary judgment in order to preserve safeguards provided by summary judgment statute)]. It appears that a motion to dismiss on the ground of res judicata constitutes a speaking motion of the type contemplated by the court in *Vesely*, and consequently this motion would be deemed to be one for summary judgment, subject to the procedural requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*.

[6] Invoking Defense on Appeal

Normally, the res judicata effect of a prior judgment must be pleaded and proven at trial. However, when the prior judgment becomes final during the pendency of an appeal in another action, the first final judgment may be brought to the attention of the appellate court in which the appeal is pending and may be there relied on as a bar [*Palm Springs Paint Co. v. Arenas (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 682, 688, 51 Cal. Rptr. 747]* . Similarly, issue preclusion may be raised for the first time on appeal when a judgment in a prior action becomes final pending appeal and there was no opportunity to raise the issue in the trial court [*First N.B.S. Corp. v. Gabrielsen (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1189, 1195, 225 Cal. Rptr. 254]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to DismissCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataEvidenceHearsayExceptionsJudgmentsGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.18

§ 491.18 Waiver of Defense

Res judicata is merely a defense. It is not jurisdictional, and as such, it may be waived if not properly raised by pleading or evidence [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 977, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 638, 198 P.2d 1* (overruled on other grounds in *Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 497, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263*); *see People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 160, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790* (collateral estoppel argument waived when not raised in trial court by timely objection)]. Otherwise stated, because the prohibition against splitting a cause of action exists for the defendant's benefit, the defendant may waive it and if he or she fails to object, will be deemed to have acquiesced in plaintiff's splitting a cause of action [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 909, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151]* .

The defense of res judicata is not waived for failure to assert a claim if the facts forming the basis of that cause of action are not known by the plaintiff at the time of the earlier action [*see Allied Fire Protection v. Diede Const. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 150, 154-155, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsWaiver & PreservationCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.19

§ 491.19 Proof of Defense

Generally, the burden of establishing the defense of res judicata is on the party asserting it [*Erlich v. Superior Court (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 551, 556-557, 47 Cal. Rptr. 473, 407 P.2d 649* ; *Casad v. Qualls (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 921, 927, 139 Cal. Rptr. 243* ; *see also Vella v. Hudgins (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 251, 257, 142 Cal. Rptr. 414, 572 P.2d 28* (requiring party asserting issue preclusion to prove that each of the elements of the doctrine have been met)]. In carrying this burden of proof, the party may resort to the judgment, the record of the entire proceedings, and extrinsic evidence [*Casad v. Qualls (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 921, 927, 139 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

A party asserting issue preclusion must prove that the issue was raised, actually submitted for determination, and determined, and that contrary evidence on issue was not restricted [*Schaefer/Karpf Productions v. CNA Ins. Companies (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1314, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *Barker v. Hull (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 221, 226, 236 Cal. Rptr. 285]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.20

§ 491.20 Special Trial of Defense of Res Judicata

When an answer raises the affirmative defense that the action is barred by a prior judgment, the court may, either on its own motion or on the motion of any party, proceed to trial of that defense before trial of any other issue in the case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 597*; *Ball v. Citizens Casualty Co. (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 590, 591, 339 P.2d 241]* . When the defense of res judicata is tried separately and first, there is no right to a jury trial of the res judicata defense even if plaintiff's action is an action at law. Therefore, the facts underlying the applicability of the res judicata defense are tried to the court and not a jury [*Windsor Square Homeowners Assn. v. Citation Homes (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 547, 557-558, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 818]* .

For a form of notice of motion and order that may be used in proceedings to obtain a separate trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*, see *§§ 491.58* and *491.59*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersSeparate TrialsCivil ProceduresTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialCivil ProceduresJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.21

§ 491.21 Judicial Estoppel

[1] Preclusion of Inconsistent Positions

Judicial estoppel is an equitable doctrine that prevents a party from asserting a position in a legal proceeding that is contrary to a position previously taken in the same or some earlier proceeding [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181-183, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* ; *see Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 955-958, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864]* .

Judicial estoppel is sometimes referred to as the doctrine of preclusion of inconsistent positions, and its purpose is to protect the integrity of the judicial process [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* ; *see Cloud v. Northrop Grumman Corp. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1015-1016, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (doctrine intended to protect court rather than litigants; under majority view privity not required for its application); *International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 351, 354, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* (reliance or prejudice not required before doctrine may be invoked); *Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1092, 1096 n.8, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 119* (federal doctrine of judicial estoppel does not require reliance or prejudice before party may invoke it; its primary purpose is not to protect litigants, but to protect integrity of judiciary); *but see In re Marriage of Dekker (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 842, 850, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (purpose is to prevent injury to innocent party); *see also California Coastal Com. v. Tahmassebi (1998) 69 Cal. App. 4th 255, 259, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 321* (under doctrine of judicial estoppel, party who has taken particular position in litigation, may under some circumstances, be estopped from taking inconsistent position to detriment of other party)].

[2] When Doctrine Applies

[a] Equitable Doctrine Vague in Application

California courts have not established a clear set of principles for applying judicial estoppel [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181-182, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96]* , and the doctrine is vague in its application [*Associated Creditors' Agency v. Wong (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 61, 67, 30 Cal. Rptr. 705* ; *Coleman v. Southern Pacific Co. (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 121, 128, 296 P.2d 386* ; *see International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* (equitable doctrine with some vagueness in its application); *Ng*

v. Hudson (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 250, 258, 142 Cal. Rptr. 69 (proper application of doctrine at best uncertain); *see also Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 956, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (doctrine of judicial estoppel not uniformly defined or applied by federal courts; federal and state law discussed)].

Judicial estoppel should be applied with caution. It is an extraordinary remedy to be invoked when a party's inconsistent behavior will otherwise result in a miscarriage of justice [*Haley v. Dow Lewis Motors, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 497, 511, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352]* .

The doctrine of judicial estoppel should apply when [*Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 957, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864* ; *International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* ; *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 183, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96]* :

- The same party has taken two positions;
- The positions were taken in judicial or quasi-judicial administrative proceedings;
- The party was successful in asserting the first position (i.e., the tribunal adopted the position or accepted it as true) [*see* [b], *below*];
- The two positions are totally inconsistent; and
- The first position was not taken as a result of ignorance, fraud, or mistake.

[b] Successful Assertion of Earlier Position

California courts have recognized that there is no hard and fast rule that limits application of the doctrine of judicial estoppel to those situations where the litigant was successful in asserting the contradictory position [*Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 118, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28]* . In *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* , the court noted that under the "majority view," the party sought to be estopped must have been successful in asserting the earlier position because if the earlier position was not adopted by the tribunal, there is no danger of inconsistent results and thus no impairment of the judicial process. However, because judicial estoppel is an equitable doctrine, the *Jackson* court recognized the possibility that in a future case circumstances might warrant application of the doctrine even if the earlier position was not adopted by the tribunal [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 183 n.8, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* ; *accord Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 118, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* ; *Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 958, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864* (in a suit for racial harassment and wrongful termination, when plaintiff had earlier received a workers' compensation award through a compromise and settlement approved by a workers' compensation referee, judicial estoppel was applied even though the referee's approval of the parties' compromise and release did not incorporate any factual findings)]. Under the "minority view," judicial estoppel may be applied even if the party was unsuccessful in asserting the inconsistent position if by the party's change of position, the party is playing "fast and loose" with the court [*see Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 119, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28]* . For example, in *Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* , the court found that the case before it warranted application of the doctrine even absent proof of success in the earlier litigation, given the party's egregious attempt to manipulate the legal system [*Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 119, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* (plaintiff's action was predicated on an interest in assets she had previously transferred to keep out of the hands of credits and had failed to list in bankruptcy proceedings; alternatively, the court found that although her bankruptcy petitions were dismissed, plaintiff had derived a benefit from automatic stay of creditors' actions adequate to satisfy the successful assertion factor)]. However, courts have since made clear that such situations are "rare" and that only "egregious misconduct" warranted an exception to the successful assertion of earlier position doctrine [*Gottlieb v. Kest (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 110, 142, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 7* (judicial estoppel doctrine not applicable because bankruptcy court in prior proceeding had not

accepted plaintiff's position by confirming a plan of reorganization).]

Similarly, a party's claim of entitlement to attorney fees based on breach of a contract containing a fees provision judicially estops that party from contending that the provision does not authorize an award of attorney fees against himself or herself. Consistent with the purposes of *Civ. Code § 1717*, a pleader should not be permitted to threaten a litigant with the prospect of an adverse attorney fees award and avoid the same fate if unsuccessful [*International Billing Services, Inc. v. Emigh (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1186-1192, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532* (recognizing that some jurisdictions require prior success on the fact asserted, but stating that the doctrine may also apply to prevent a party from changing its position over the course of a proceeding)].

[c] Not Applicable When Prior Position Was Taken as Result of Ignorance or Mistake

Asserting inconsistent positions does not trigger application of judicial estoppel unless intentional self-contradiction is used as a means of obtaining unfair advantage. An inconsistent argument sufficient to invoke judicial estoppel must be attributable to intentional wrongdoing [*Haley v. Dow Lewis Motors, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 497, 509-510, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352]* . Thus, the doctrine cannot be invoked when the position was taken as a result of ignorance or mistake in the first proceeding [*Coleman v. Southern Pacific Co. (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 121, 128, 296 P.2d 386* ; *accord Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 182-183, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* ; *see also Haley v. Dow Lewis Motors, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 497, 509* (doctrine does not apply when position taken because of good faith mistake rather than as part of scheme to mislead court); *Cloud v. Northrop Grumman Corp. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1016-1018, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (doctrine only applies to deliberate inconsistencies that are tantamount to a knowing misrepresentation to or even fraud on court); *cf. Michelson v. Camp (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 955, 959-961, 970-971, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539* (when plaintiffs sought and obtained leave of bankruptcy court for relief from stay to allow them to foreclose on property, in later action plaintiffs estopped to deny knowledge of appraisal report submitted by their counsel on their behalf in bankruptcy court to convince court there was no equity to protect on behalf of debtor's estate and gain advantage for them in court of law; possibility plaintiffs might not have been aware of their counsel's specific arguments to court does not make them innocent bystanders; they accepted benefits of their counsel's representations to court and went ahead with foreclosure and resale; for purposes of judicial estoppel, their actual knowledge irrelevant)].

[d] Final Judgment Not Required

Unlike collateral estoppel, judicial estoppel does not require a final judgment [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 189 n.12, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (when workers' compensation judge accepted parties' stipulations with request for award and approved work restrictions as part of award, judicial estoppel barred plaintiff's claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (*42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*) because of position plaintiff took in workers' compensation proceeding with respect to work restrictions although award did not become final until five years after plaintiff's injury)].

[e] In Court's Discretion

The doctrine is invoked by the courts in their discretion [*International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178]* .

[3] Raises Factual Issues

A defense of judicial estoppel raises factual issues. Cases concerning judicial estoppel have generally been decided after a fact-finding or evidence-reviewing proceeding of some sort [*Cloud v. Northrop Grumman Corp. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1000, 1018-1020, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (factual determinations necessary to support judicial estoppel could not be decided solely by reviewing plaintiff's complaint and matters that could be judicially noticed, and thus could not be decided on motion for judgment on pleadings); *see also Haley v. Dow Lewis Motors, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal.*

App. 4th 497, 510 (whether judicial estoppel should be applied is factual question; determination of existence of judicial estoppel is factual finding that will be upheld if supported by substantial evidence)]. Whether or not to apply judicial estoppel, however, is a question of law for the trial court which can be made in the context of a summary judgment motion where none of the facts material to the court's decision to apply judicial estoppel are disputed [*Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 959 n.8, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864]* .

[4] Application in Multiple Proceedings

Judicial estoppel is especially appropriate when a party has taken inconsistent positions in separate proceedings [*International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 350-351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* ; *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96]* . In the context of multiple proceedings, the doctrine of judicial estoppel precludes a party who has assumed a particular position in a judicial proceeding to assume an inconsistant position to the prejudice of an adverse party in a later proceeding involving the same parties and questions. For such an estoppel to apply, the position taken in the first proceeding must be so clearly inconsistent with the position taken in the later proceeding that the one necessarily excludes the other [*Coleman v. Southern Pacific Co. (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 121, 128, 296 P.2d 386* ; *see Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 182, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (inconsistency must be clear so that one necessarily excludes other); *Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 960-963, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (following *Coleman*; plaintiff's assertion of disability for purpose of obtaining Social Security benefits did not constitute judicial estoppel that precluded plaintiff from arguing in Fair Employment and Housing Act case that plaintiff was capable of performing an alternative position with employer); *Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1091-1096, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 119* (doctrine precludes party from asserting position in judicial proceeding that is inconsistent with position party previously successfully asserted in earlier proceeding; doctrine's essential function and justification is to prevent use of intentional self-contradiction as means of obtaining unfair advantage in forum provided for suitors seeking justice); *see also International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 350, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* (judicial estoppel most commonly applied to bar party from making factual assertion in legal proceeding that directly contradicts earlier assertion made in same proceeding or a prior one); *cf. Loube v. Loube (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 421, 428, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 906* (position taken by attorneys on behalf of their clients not binding on attorneys when later sued by same clients; judicial estoppel inapplicable because attorneys were not parties to earlier proceeding)].

Thus, for example, when parties to a pending action have been properly shown to have been less than sufficiently forthcoming in another tribunal, the doctrine is available to maintain the integrity of the judicial system [*International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 354, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* (judicial estoppel applied to bar plaintiffs' action against defendant when plaintiffs had failed to disclose potential action against defendant in bankruptcy proceeding)].

[5] Equitable Estoppel Distinguished

Unlike equitable estoppel, judicial estoppel looks to the connection between the litigant and the judicial system while equitable estoppel focuses on the relationship between the parties to the prior litigation [*International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 350-351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178]* .

Equitable estoppel entails detrimental reliance by one party, judicial estoppel does not. Judicial estoppel may apply to prevent a party from changing its position over the course of a judicial proceeding when the positional change has an adverse impact on the judicial process [*International Billing Services, Inc. v. Emigh (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1190-1191, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532* (claim of entitlement to attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* in complaint estopped plaintiff from denying contract contained fee clause)]. Unlike equitable estoppel, judicial estoppel may be applied even if detrimental reliance or privity does not exist [*International Billing Services, Inc. v. Emigh (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1190, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532* , citing *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 70 Cal.*

Rptr. 2d 96] .

[6] Distinguished From Pleading Inconsistent or Alternative Theories

The doctrine of judicial estoppel should be distinguished from the permissible practice of allowing a plaintiff to plead inconsistent or alternative theories in a complaint [*see Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* ; for discussion of pleading inconsistent or alternative theories in a complaint, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 71, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* , Form 27 (Matthew Bender)].

[7] Distinguished From Election of Remedies

Similarly, the doctrine should be distinguished from an election of remedies that occurs in two ways, under the doctrine of res judicata or under the doctrine of estoppel [*see Kirkpatrick v. Westamerica Bank (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 982, 990-991, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 876]* .

[8] Application of State Versus Federal Law

State law governs the issue of whether plaintiff is judicially estopped from proceeding with a claim when the state law supplies the rule of decision on the claim [*Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 959-960, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (state law governs issue of judicial estoppel concerning plaintiff's Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) claim brought in state court; distinguishing federal decision dealing with FEHA claim which held that federal law governs application of judicial estoppel in federal courts)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsChoice of LawGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelJudicial Estoppel

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 491.22-491.39

[Reserved]

§§ 491.22[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.40

§ 491.40 Related Titles From Matthew Bender

For memoranda of points and authorities opposing a motion for summary judgment in a wrongful death action on the ground that the plaintiff is not collaterally estopped from maintaining the action, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 66, *Death and Survival Actions* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting a motion for summary judgment in a personal injury action by an employee against an employer on the ground that a Workers' Compensation Appeals Board determination is res judicata, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100, *Employer and Employee* , Pt. III (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities opposing a petition for a writ of mandate or prohibition on the ground that a ruling on a prior petition is res judicata, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting an obligor's contention that a partial subrogee suing on a split cause of action is barred by the doctrine of res judicata, see s California Points and Authorities, Ch. 220, *Subrogation* (Matthew Bender)

For extensive coverage of the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel as applied in federal courts, see s Moore' s S s Federal Practice, Ch.131, Ch. 132 (3d ed. Matthew Bender)

For discussion of the application of these doctrines in criminal actions, and, in particular, the constitutional double jeopardy protection against successive prosecutions, see s California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 63 (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary

JudgmentOppositionMemoranda in OppositionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessDouble Jeopardy

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.41

§ 491.41 State Statutes

[1] Conclusiveness and Effect of Judgment

Effect of failure by party against whom complaint has been filed and served to allege in cross complaint any related cause of action that he or she has against plaintiff. *Code Civ. Proc. § 426.30(a)*

Conclusiveness and effect of judgment or final order on party. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)*

Conclusiveness and effect of judgment or final order on nonparty; procedure to establish judgment as binding on nonparty. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*

Effect of orders other than judgments or final orders. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1909*

When parties deemed same for purposes of determining conclusiveness of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1910*

Matters deemed to have been adjudged in former judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1911*

When principal bound by judgment against surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*.

Effect of judicial record of sister state. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1913*

Effect of judicial record of admiralty court of foreign country. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1914*

Grounds for impeaching judicial record. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1916*

Jurisdiction sufficient to sustain record. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1917*

[2] Pleading and Proving Judgment

Necessity of pleading jurisdiction in support of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 456*

Pleading and use in evidence of conclusive judgment or order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908.5*

Judgment, when not conclusive, as presumed correctly to determine rights of parties, but no presumption as created that facts essential to judgment have been correctly determined. *Evid. Code § 639*

Judgment as evidence. *Evid. Code §§ 1300-1302*

Proving judgment as official recorded writing. *Evid. Code § 1530-1532*

[3] Res Judicata Effect of Particular Types of Judgments and Orders

Entry of final judgment against consumer credit reporting agency under *15 U.S.C. § 1681n* or *1681o* as barring subsequent action for damages under Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act (*Civ. Code § 1785.1 et seq.*) or Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act (*Civ. Code § 1786 et seq.*). *Civ. Code §§ 1785.34, 1786.52*

Determination in summary proceedings involving release of stop notice for public work as entitled to limited res judicata effect. *Civ. Code § 3205*

Conclusive effect of judgment annulling marriage. *Fam. Code § 2212*

Validity or interpretation of gift, devise, bequest, or trust under will as conclusively established by action to quiet title. *Code Civ. Proc. § 764.020(a)(2), (3)*

Conclusive effect of judgment in validation proceeding brought by public agency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 870*

When principal bound by judgment against surety. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1055, 1912*

Conclusive effect of foreign money judgments. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1713 et seq.*

Binding and conclusive effect of judgment determining validity of bonds and plans concerning Capitol area redevelopment. *Gov. Code § 8189*

In arbitration of uninsured motorist disputes, award or judgment confirming award as having limited conclusive effect. *Ins. Code § 11580.2(f)*

Effect of judgment in favor of claimant in action establishing liability of decedent for which decedent was protected by liability insurance. *Prob. Code § 554*

Conclusive effect of order admitting will to probate or appointing personal representative. *Prob. Code § 8007*

Application of res judicata in determination of case involving *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6001 et seq.* (sales and use tax laws). *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7176*

Limited res judicata effect of administrative determinations under Personal Income Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 17001 et seq.*), Bank and Corporation Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*), and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18401 et seq.* (administration of franchise and income tax laws). *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19801, 19802*

Limited application of res judicata in determination of case arising under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 38101 et seq.* (timber yield tax laws). *Rev. & Tax. Code § 38805*

Conclusive effect of decision by Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*

Certain factual determinations of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board have no collateral estoppel effect in criminal proceedings. *Lab. Code §§ 5006, 5413, 5816*

Judgment of conviction for violation of Vehicle Code provision as having no res judicata or collateral estopel effect in any subsequent civil action. *Veh. Code § 40834*

Conclusiveness of factual or legal determinations made pursuant to cease and desist order in private litigation involving water rights. *Water Code § 1850*

[4] Special Trial of Defense of Res Judicata

Trial of defense of res judicata preceding trial of defense on merits. *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSeparate TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsFull Faith & CreditGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataEvidenceHearsayExceptionsJudgmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.42

§ 491.42 Decisions

[1] Administrative Agencies

Enforcement of res judicata rules relating to administrative orders is permitted to be more flexible than judicial orders; recognition that traditional principle of res judicata as developed in judicial system should be fully applicable to some administrative action but not applicable to other administrative action and that much administrative action should be subject to relaxed set of rules concerning res judicata. *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1279, 1290, 265 Cal. Rptr. 162, 783 P.2d 749*

Res judicata did not bar employee's action against California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board under Fair Employment and Housing Act for retaliation, based on impropriety of discipline imposed in administrative proceedings, where primary right protected by the state civil service system was right to continued employment, while primary right protected by FEHA was right to be free from invidious discrimination and from retaliation for opposing discrimination, and doctrine of res judicata did not act as complete bar to FEHA action when employee sought review through alternative administrative remedy available as consequence of employee's civil servant status. Doctrine of collateral estoppel did not act to preclude employee from recovering on her FEHA claim, where, although Board's decisions established that some reasons given for suspensions were legitimate and it upheld two suspensions, and these findings were binding on employee in her FEHA action under doctrine of collateral estoppel, findings did not preclude entire retaliation cause of action, because employee was not simply challenging adverse action on ground it was discriminatory, she alleged agency accumulated number of minor incidents and used them collectively to support suspensions with retaliatory animus, and board's findings did not resolve these issues in favor of agency so as to completely defeat retaliation cause of action. *George v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1475, 1482-1488, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 431*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel applies to administrative determination when made by administrative agency that is acting in judicial capacity and resolving disputed issues which parties have had adequate opportunity to litigate; opinion and order of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board qualifies as such administrative determination. *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1083, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738*

Although jurisdiction of agency in particular proceeding ordinarily lapses when it renders its decision, decision must be on merits in order to be entitled to res judicata effect. *Hunt v. County of Shasta (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 432, 442 n.8, 275 Cal. Rptr. 113*

Finality for purposes of administrative collateral estoppel is two-step process: (1) decision is final with respect to action by administrative agency; and (2) decision has conclusive effect, that is, it must be free from direct attack; because direct attack on administrative decision may be made by appeal to superior court for review by petition for administrative mandamus, decision is not given collateral estoppel effect if such appeal has been taken or if time for such appeal has not lapsed. *Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 168-169, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449*

No privity exists between city and county retirement board and Workers' Compensation Appeals Board because former is designated by city and county to administer workers' compensation benefits and allegedly has proprietary interest in Appeals Board's award; hence, retirement board was not collaterally estopped to deny Appeals Board finding that plaintiff's heart trouble was due to industrial cause. *Geoghegan v. Retirement Board (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1525, 1531, 272 Cal. Rptr. 419*

Collateral estoppel applies to prior administrative adjudications when (1) administrative agency acted in judicial capacity, (2) agency resolved disputed issues properly before it, and (3) all parties were provided with opportunity to litigate their claims fully and fairly. *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1538, 1544, 263 Cal. Rptr. 351*

[2] Burden of Proof

Party asserting collateral estoppel bears burden of establishing requirements for its application. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Defendant bore burden of demonstrating that waiver issue was actually determined by federal district court when that court, on defendant's motion, issued order compelling arbitration and thereafter in state court action between parties defendant moved to compel arbitration and plaintiff in opposition argued, among other things, that defendant waived its right to arbitrate; defendant did not meet its burden, and trial court did not err in reaching merits of plaintiff's waiver argument because nothing in district court's ruling or pleadings suggested that district court decided waiver issue. *McMillin Development, Inc. v. Home Buyers Warranty (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 896, 906-907, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

Party asserting collateral estoppel must prove issue was raised, actually submitted for determination, and determined, and that contrary evidence on issue was not restricted. *Schaefer/Karpf Productions v. CNA Ins. Companies (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1314, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42*

Burden of proving collateral estoppel as resting with party asserting doctrine. *Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 708, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899*

[3] Claim Preclusion

[a] Claims That Could Have Been Raised

Res judicata is not a bar to claims that arise after the initial complaint is filed. Although the parties litigated a breach of contract action in federal court, res judicata did not bar plaintiff from later suing defendant on a fraud theory in state court where plaintiff was unaware of the facts forming the basis for the fraud suit until after the federal complaint was filed. *Allied Fire Protection v. Diede Const. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 150, 154-155, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195* .

Order settling account is entitled to res judicata effect and is conclusive as to all matter passed on notwithstanding some theory that might have been advanced, and probate court approving account necessarily passes on trustee's veracity and exercise of due care. *Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 862, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

Res judicata only applies to issues which were or could have been litigated in arbitration; when insurance carrier is providing defense under reservation of rights and has agreed to use of independent counsel, *Civ. Code § 2860* arbitration is appropriate to resolve attorneys fee disputes before legal determination of coverage issues; carrier was not precluded by res judicata from litigating coverage issues when parties specifically agreed that the arbitrator would not have power to decide any coverage issues and the only issues resolved by arbitrator were those relating to attorney fees. *Truck Ins. Exchange v. Superior Court (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 985, 998-999, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 529*

With regard to bankruptcy court's order granting defendants relief from automatic stay, res judicata bars plaintiffs from thereafter asserting in state court action that rules of procedure in connection with motion for relief from stay were violated, including rules requiring advance notice of specific relief sought and submission of proposed order, when order was not appealed, modified, or set aside in bankruptcy court; res judicata bars relitigation of issues that could have been raised in prior action. *Abdallah v. United Savings Bank (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1101, 1106-1107, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286*

Valid final judgment on merits in favor of defendant as barring future litigation on same cause of action; bar as including matters that were relevant and within scope of first action, which thus could have been raised by first suit. *Craig v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1294, 1299, 271 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Res judicata as applying to claims actually litigated in prior proceeding and to those that could have been litigated as part of that cause of action; fact that plaintiff requests different type of relief, or even presents different legal theory, as not negating or lessening binding effect of previous state court judgment. *California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1499, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567*

[b] Final Judgment on Merits

Defense of laches has nothing to do with merits of cause against which it is asserted and thus, judgment denying petition for writ of administrative mandate because of defense of laches is not judgment on merits for purposes of res judicata. *Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 76-77, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316*

Termination of an action by statute of limitations is a technical rather than a substantive termination and does not operate as a final determination on the merits; therefore, a statute reviving claims arising out of the Northridge earthquake revived claimant's case against his insurance company because his prior lawsuit, dismissed after the court sustained a demurrer, was not litigated to finality in the res judicata sense. *Mid-Century Insurance Co. v. Superior Court (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 769, 776-777, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 883*

Defendant's dismissal of cross-complaint with prejudice was a judgment on the merits and operated to bar defendant from asserting affirmative defenses involving the same primary rights as those asserted in the cross-complaint. *Alpha Mechanical, Heating & Air Conditioning, Inc. v. Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. of America (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1319, 1327-1329, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 496*

Final judgment on merits not found when appellate division reversed and remanded, then plaintiff voluntarily dismissed without prejudice. *Syufy Enterprises, L.P. v. City of Oakland (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 869, 879, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808*

Denial without opinion of writ of mandate or prohibition is not res judicata; court's summary denial of previous writ petition was not decision on merits. *Hoversten v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 636, 640, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197*

Partial summary judgment, not entered as judgment, is not final; election of remedies occurs in two ways, under doctrine of res judicata or under doctrine of estoppel. *Kirkpatrick v. Westamerica Bank (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 982, 990-991, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 876*

Judgments entered in earlier actions in accordance with settlement agreement and rendered through consent and stipulation, qualified as final on the merits for purposes of res judicata. *Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1067-1069, 1073, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77*

When party stipulated to paternity and entry of judgment requiring payment of child support without asking for appointment of counsel or demanding blood test with full knowledge of his rights and without coercion, judgment barred party's later action to establish nonpaternity, even though blood test taken after judgment excluded him as biological father. *Robert J. v. Leslie M. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1642, 1647-1648, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905*

Res judicata principles sometimes, but not always, apply to administration decisions; cases typically deal with the secondary aspect of res judicata, *i.e.*, collateral estoppel; administrative decisions should not be given res judicata effect if the statutory scheme explicitly or implicitly shows contrary intent; when statutory scheme of remedies contemplates proceedings in different tribunals affording different remedies that are cumulative, not mutually exclusive, res judicata held inapplicable because first proceeding was an administrative proceeding at which the second remedy (statutorily decreed to be a cumulative remedy) could not be sought. *People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 967-974, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504*

Trial judge's ruling on issue of substantial justification in awarding costs and attorney fees after trial in taxpayers refund action was not binding on later motion following appeal and remittitur filed by taxpayers in superior court seeking litigation expenses incurred in appellate proceeding; doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel inapplicable because first ruling was not in a former action, but was earlier ruling in same action; prior appealable order becomes res judicata in sense that it becomes binding in same case if not appealed; law of case doctrine inapplicable because no appellate court in the litigation ever actually determined question. *Lennane v. Franchise Tax Board (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1185-1186, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602*

Under federal rule, order or judgment, once rendered, is final for res judicata purposes until it is reversed on appeal, or modified or set aside in the court of rendition. *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 913*, when dismissal of appeal was not expressly made without prejudice to another appeal, dismissal does not mean that underlying judgment is not final; res judicata applied. *Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1017, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*

Order denying petition for leave to file complaint alleging civil conspiracy between attorneys under *Civ. Code § 1714.10* on merits is res judicata barring new action based on same primary right; amendment of Section 1714.10 not relevant because change in statute or law does not entitle litigant to escape earlier ruling by filing new action. *Castro v. Higaki (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 350, 359, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 84*

Doctrine of res judicata as precluding parties or their privities from relitigating cause of action that has been finally determined by court of competent jurisdiction; but judgment not rendered on merits as not operating as a bar; termination of action by statute of limitations as deemed technical or procedural, rather than substantive, termination; hence, summary judgment granted on ground that action is barred by statute of limitations as not precluding subsequent

action on new theory on which statute of limitations has not yet run. *Koch v. Rodlin Enterprises (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1591, 1595-1597, 273 Cal. Rptr. 438*

Fact that judgment is based in part on granting of a nonsuit as not making it any less a judgment on merits for purposes of res judicata. *Aronow v. LaCroix (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1047, 268 Cal. Rptr. 866*

Although admission by party may be admissible as evidence of liability under *Evid. Code § 1220*, such evidence as not conclusively establishing liability as matter of law for purposes of res judicata. *Aronow v. LaCroix (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1053, 268 Cal. Rptr. 866*

Final judgment or order as having res judicata effect, even if it is incorrect, if merits of claim are tried and determined or might have been urged, but were not, by one of parties; order as deemed final if it is directly appealable. *Peck v. Hagen (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 602, 607-608, 263 Cal. Rptr. 198*

Prior judgment on question of law as conclusive in subsequent action between parties or their privities when both causes of action arose out of same subject matter or transaction and when conclusive reach of that judgment to present action will not result in injustice. *City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 606, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723*

Single adverse intermediate appellate decision, although binding trial court, as not excusing party's failure to pursue available judicial remedies on theory it would have been futile to do so; final judgment on merits of action as precluding parties or their privities from relitigating issues that were or could have been raised in that action; res judicata consequences of final, unappealed judgment on merits as not altered by fact that judgment may have been wrong or rested on legal principle subsequently overruled in another case; change in controlling law as not providing exception to res judicata. *California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1498, 1498 n.6, 1499, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567*

Order denying motion for summary judgment as not a final judgment and not res judicata. *De La Pena v. Wolfe (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 481, 485, 223 Cal. Rptr. 325*

Fraud by party as not undermining conclusiveness of judgment unless fraud was extrinsic, that is, unless it deprived opposing party of opportunity to appear and present its case. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 197 Cal. Rptr. 612*

[c] Policy Considerations

Doctrine of res judicata rests on ground that party to be affected, or some other with whom he or she is in privity, has litigated, or had opportunity to litigate same matter in a former action in a court of competent jurisdiction, and should not be permitted to litigate it again to harassment and vexation of his or her opponent; public policy and interests of litigants alike require that there be end to litigation. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Purpose of res judicata doctrine is to preserve integrity of judicial system, promote judicial economy, and protect litigants from harassment by vexatious litigation. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 556, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

Doctrine of res judicata, whether applied as total bar to further litigation or as collateral estoppel, rests on sound policy of limiting litigation by preventing party that had one fair adversary hearing on issue from drawing it into controversy again and subjecting other party to further expense in its reexamination; thus, spouse who conceals existence of

community assets, thereby depriving other spouse of opportunity fully to present his or her case in dissolution proceeding, cannot claim judgment of dissolution bars subsequent tort action based on that failure. *Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1144, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707*

Application of res judicata based on policy of preventing party who has had one fair adversary hearing on an issue from relitigating it; res judicata as not barring claim that husband in prior dissolution proceedings violated fiduciary duty to account to wife for community property, including excess assets. *Worton v. Worton (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1638, 1648-1649, 286 Cal. Rptr. 410*

[d] Same Cause of Action in Prior Action

Res judicata did not bar disabled plaintiff's state court action for damages against defendant for alleged violation of California's Disabled Persons Act although federal court had entered a consent decree resolving federal class action for violation of ADA; consent decree was limited to injunctive relief, declaratory relief and attorney fees. *Louie v. BFS Retail and Commercial Operations, LLC (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1544, 1553, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 441*

In a case where a company first sought specific performance of a license agreement and in a second suit sought monetary damages based on the same agreement, both suits sought to vindicate the same primary right and therefore the second suit seeking monetary damages was barred under the res judicata doctrine. *Mycogen Corporation v. Monsanto Company (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 888, 904-909, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432*

Plaintiff could not bring action against insurer for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing where court had already entered judgment on prior cross-complaint for breach of the duty to defend and indemnify; the two causes of action involved the same primary right and could not be split. *Lincoln Property Co., N.C., Inc. v. The Travelers Indemnity Co. (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 905, 913, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 39*

When federal court does not exercise pendent jurisdiction over the state claim and it is dismissed out of lawsuit, and plaintiff elects to proceed to trial and judgment in federal court, res judicata does not bar plaintiff from thereafter maintaining second suit on same cause of action in state court. *Harris v. Grimes (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 180, 188-189, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 791*

To define cause of action California follows primary right theory; two actions constitute single cause of action if they both affect same primary right; there is only single cause of action for invasion of one primary right, even if multiple theories of recovery are asserted. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 182, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Rule against plaintiff splitting single cause of action so as to make it basis of several suits is, in part, application of doctrine of res judicata; in determining whether cause of action has been split, relief sought by injured party should not be confused with cause of action; violation of one primary gives rise to single cause of action although many forms of relief may be available; thus, when an insured obtained small claims court judgment against tortfeasor to recover uninsured part of loss, that judment barred insurance company's subrogation action against the tortfeasor to recover amount insurance company had paid to its policyholder to cover losses she suffered as a result of the tortfeasor's negligence; although insurer may bring separate action against the tortfeasor, rule against splitting a cause of action is violated when both insurer and insured pursue separate actions because in subrogation insurer stands in shoes of its insured, and if second action by insured is barred, so is action by insurer; when tortfeasor's single act causes plaintiff to suffer both personal injury and property damage, however, two separate causes of action exist. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 905-909, 913-914, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*

California employs primary rights theory to determine if two successive proceedings involve same cause of action; under primary rights theory, invasion of one primary right gives rise to single cause of action; when court confirmed

private arbitration award against plaintiff, plaintiff barred by doctrine of res judicata from proceeding with subsequent lawsuit when both arbitration and later lawsuit were based on alleged violations of same primary right. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 557, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

Unless cause of action in two actions is identical, first judgment does not bar second suit; to define cause of action, California follows primary rights theory, under which cause of action consists of primary right belonging to plaintiff, defendant's corresponding primary duty and defendant's breach of primary right or duty; thus, two actions constitute single cause of action if they both affect same primary right; there is only single cause of action for invasion of one primary right, even if multiple theories of recovery are asserted; court must compare actions, looking at rights which are sought to be vindicated and harm for which redress is claimed; reference must also be made to pleadings and proof in each case. *Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1067, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77*

Under primary rights theory, invasion of one primary right gives rise to a single cause of action; two actions constitute single cause of action if they both affect same primary right; cause of action is based on harm suffered rather than particular theory asserted by litigant; cause of action is to be distinguished from remedy or relief sought; when there is only one primary right adverse judgment on merits in first suit is bar even though second suit is based on different theory, or seeks different remedy; thus, when plaintiff splits cause of action, i.e., divides a primary right, into more than one lawsuit and judgment on merits is entered in one of them, defendant in second suit may set up judgment as bar under principles of res judicata. *Weikel v. TCW Realty Fund II Holding Co. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1246-1250, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25*

Whether res judicata doctrine applies does not depend on whether the causes of action in present action are identical to causes of action in prior action; although causes of action in first lawsuit may differ from those in second lawsuit, prior determination of an issue in first lawsuit becomes conclusive in subsequent lawsuit between same parties with respect to that issue and also with respect to every matter that might have been urged to sustain or defeat its determination. *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1996) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 384, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803*

Change in statute or law after final judgment on merits does not entitle litigant to escape earlier ruling by filing new action based on same primary right as adjudicated in earlier action. *Castro v. Higaki (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 350, 359, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 84*

Doctrine of res judicata does not apply when primary right to seek authorization for indemnity under *Corp. Code § 317* was not same cause of action as one for breach of contract for indemnity or for equitable estoppel since *Corp. Code § 317(g)* expressly provided no preclusive effect on other legal rights for indemnity. *Branson v. Sun-Diamond Growers (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 327, 343-345, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314*

California courts as employing "primary rights" theory to determine scope of causes of action; under this theory, only single cause of action exists for invasion of one primary right; involvement of same facts in both suits as not conclusive. *Gill v. Hughes (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1299, 1305, 278 Cal. Rptr. 306*

If second action involves different cause of action, rather than different legal theory, doctrine of res judicata as not applying. *Craig v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1294, 1299, 271 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Under "primary rights" theory, underlying right sought to be enforced as determinative as to whether cause of action is barred by res judicata principles; in determining primary right, significant factor as being harm suffered. *Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1474, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Mere fact that plaintiff requested injunctive relief in first suit and monetary relief in second suit as not distinguishing two law suits sufficiently to avoid bar of res judicata in second suit. *Duffy v. City of Long Beach (1988) 201 Cal. App.*

3d 1352, 1358, 247 Cal. Rptr. 715

"Primary right" theory as applied to suits brought to attack similar governmental charges or taxes levied in different years. *Frommhagen v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1292, 1300, 243 Cal. Rptr. 390*

Doctrine of res judicata as not applying when there are changed conditions and new facts that were not in existence at time of prior judgment, and on which prior judgment was based. *Neil Norman, Ltd. v. William Kasper & Co. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 942, 947, 197 Cal. Rptr. 198*

[e] Claims Decided In Prior Arbitration Proceeding

Arbitration determination of claims against driver and owner of vehicle in which plaintiff was a passenger in which arbitrator assigned one percent of liability to the driver of the other vehicle involved in the accident did not preclude the litigation of the other driver's liability as that defendant was not involved in the arbitration. *Cuevas v. Truline Corp. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 56, 62, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 706*

No collateral estoppel effect would be given to arbitration award when on record, two conditions necessary to be satisfied before arbitration award of Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) claim under a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) can be given collateral estoppel effect were not met: (1) agreement to resolve claims by arbitration in CBA must be clear and unmistakable; and (2) arbitration procedures must allow for full litigation and fair adjudication of FEHA claim. *Camargo v. California Portland Cement Company (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1018-1019, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841*

In light of *Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229* , no collateral estoppel effect given to private arbitration award; nothing in *Vanderberg* decision, however, imposes or implies any limitation on strict res judicata, or claim preclusive, effect of California law private arbitration award; prior judgment confirming private arbitration award that denied plaintiff's claims was subject to res judicata doctrine's claim preclusion rule thus barring plaintiff's subsequent lawsuit that sought recovery for same injury against defendant whose liability was merely derivative of one of parties in whose favor arbitration award was rendered. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 556-558, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

[f] Public Interest Exception

Issue in prior litigation of whether peace officer personnel records may be disclosed at public disciplinary appeal hearings is subject to the public interest exception to the res judicata doctrine. *San Diego Police Officers' Assn. v. City of San Diego Civil Service Commission (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 275, 280, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 248*

[4] Extraordinary Writs

Summary denial of writ does not establish law of the case whether or not denial is intended to be on merits or is based on some other reason. *Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 899, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P. 2d 250*

Denial without opinion of petition for writ of mandate or prohibition is not res judicata; summary denial of previous writ petition in case was not decision on merits. *Hoversten v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 636, 640, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197*

Just because court of appeal denies petition for writ of mandate does not mean it made decision on merits having res judicata effect; proper rule is that unless there is written opinion following issuance of alternative writ, denial of writ

petition does not have issue preclusive effect. *Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 196, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194*

Terminated police officer, who obtained writ of mandate directing city and its chief of police to reinstate him, was not barred from seeking compensatory damages for violation of his civil rights pursuant to *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, as mandamus proceeding was special proceeding. *Mata v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 141, 149, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 314*

[5] Issue Preclusion

[a] Constitutional and Public Policy Restrictions

Sound judicial policy against applying collateral estoppel in cases that concern matters of important public interest, such as certain banking practices. *Chern v. Bank of America (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 866, 872, 127 Cal. Rptr. 110, 544 P.2d 1310*

Public policies underlying collateral estoppel include preservation of integrity of judicial system, promotion of judicial economy, and protection of litigants from harassment by vexatious litigation, and these factors can strongly influence whether application of collateral estoppel in particular circumstance would be fair to parties and constitutes sound judicial policy; determination of issue not previously addressed by California court [whether insurer of nurse not named in malpractice complaint was liable for equitable contribution to insurer of hospital and its employees for its "fair share" of indemnity and defense costs incurred in settling malpractice claim] would not undermine any of fundamental public policies and counsels against application of collateral estoppel doctrine, despite contention that previous Arizona court judgment had held under identical facts presented and involving same insurers that insurer was liable for equitable contribution regardless of whether nurse was named as defendant in underlying action; because issue was one of first impression in California; none of policies underlying doctrine of issue preclusion would be advanced in this case where (1) determining issue could not degrade public confidence in judicial system which is threatened when two or more courts render inconsistent decisions, (2) directly addressing issue in California could not be waste of judicial resources, and (3) addressing novel issue could not be seen as baseless or unjustified litigation that might harass party. *American Continental Ins. Co. v. American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 942-946, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632*

Even if threshold requirements for collateral estoppel are established, res judicata will not be applied if injustice would result or if public interest requires that relitigation not be foreclosed. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 181, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel, similar to res judicata, is based on sound public policy of limiting litigation by preventing party who has had one fair trial on an issue from again drawing it into controversy; purposes of both are to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation, to prevent inconsistent judgments that undermine integrity of judicial system, and to provide repose by preventing person from being harassed by vexatious litigation; generally, court in deciding whether res judicata is applicable in particular case must balance need to limit litigation against right of fair adversary proceeding in which party may fully present his or her case. *People v. Mitchell (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 132, 146, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401*

Collateral estoppel may be applied only if due process requirements are satisfied; due process requires that party to be estopped must have had identity or community of interest with, and adequate representation by, losing party in first action as well as that circumstances must have been such that party to be estopped should reasonably have been expected to be bound by the prior adjudication; court must balance rights of party to be estopped against need for applying collateral estoppel in particular case, in order to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation,

to prevent inconsistent judgments which undermine integrity of judicial system, or to protect against vexatious litigation. *Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155* (quoting *Clemmer v. Hartford Insurance Co. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 865, 874, 151 Cal. Rptr. 285, 587 P.2d 1098*)

Collateral estoppel is not mechanically applied; in each case court must determine whether its application will advance public policies which underlie doctrine; those policies are to (1) promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation, (2) prevent inconsistent judgments that undermine integrity of judicial system, and (3) provide repose by preventing person from being harassed by vexatious litigation; court concluded that issues resolved on routine sanction motion are not entitled to preclusive effect in later action for malicious prosecution. *Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1193, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334*

Court's inquiry does not end when threshold requirements for collateral estoppel are met; court must also consider whether application of collateral estoppel in particular case will advance public policies that underlie doctrine; purposes of doctrine are to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation, prevent inconsistent judgments that undermine integrity of judicial system and to protect against vexatious litigation. *Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 407, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103*

Court of appeal decision affirming that portion of San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission jurisdictional decision which asserted jurisdiction over landowner's property, based on administrative decision that property was "marshland" subject to Commission's jurisdiction under *Gov. Code § 66610* barred landowner who on later appeal contended that property did not meet statutory definition of "marshland," and who should have produced evidence on this issue in earlier proceeding, from producing such evidence due to res judicata and collateral estoppel; although some cases suggest that court may have discretionary power to relax these rules somewhat in rare instances when inability to raise constitutional argument would work serious injustice and harm public interest, case before court not such an exceptional case. *Littoral Development Co. v. San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 211, 215-221, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266*

When plaintiff voluntarily dismisses with prejudice one defendant against whom other defendant has cross complained for indemnity, cross defendant cannot use dismissal entered by plaintiff to bar cross complainant from litigating question of cross defendant's negligence in relation to plaintiff. *Long Beach Grand Prix Assn. v. Hunt (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1195, 1203, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 70*

Public interest requires full litigation of issue involving public agency's ongoing obligation to administer statutes and regulations enacted for public benefit; application of collateral estoppel against Department of Health Services in action involving limitations period was therefore unjust. *Palmdale Hospital Medical Center v. Department of Health Services (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1311, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 926*

Even if collateral estoppel were otherwise applicable, public interest exception as permitting zoning authority to pass zoning ordinance again; considerations as including changed circumstances, language, or goals. *Ewing v. City of Carmel-by-the-Sea (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1579, 1586, 286 Cal. Rptr. 382*

Doctrine of res judicata as intended to prevent multiple litigation causing vexation and expense to parties and wasted effort and expense in judicial administration by precluding parties from relitigating issues they could have raised in prior action concerning same controversy; most important criterion in determining that two suits concern same controversy is whether they both arose from same transactional nucleus of facts. *Hulsey v. Koehler (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1150, 1157, 267 Cal. Rptr. 523*

Collateral estoppel as not barring separate equitable action for relief from default judgment on grounds of extrinsic fraud even though motion to vacate judgment, denied in earlier action, was made on same grounds, because party

seeking relief did not have opportunity for detailed presentation on issue of extrinsic fraud on earlier motion but was limited to affidavits. *Rohrbasser v. Lederer (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 290, 297-300, 224 Cal. Rptr. 791*

[b] Final Judgment on Merits

Litigation of a claim for rent and property damages in a bankruptcy proceeding rendered subsequent proceedings in a superior court for breach of a lease agreement res judicata notwithstanding the fact that the bankruptcy proceeding was dismissed before confirmation of a reorganization plan. *Hecker v. Nathanson (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 1158, 1163-1165, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 773*

For purposes of issue preclusion, final determination by Workers' Compensation Appeals Board as final judgment. *Traub v. Board of Retirement (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 793, 798, 195 Cal. Rptr. 681, 670 P.2d 335*

Finality for purposes of issue preclusion is not same as finality essential to claim preclusion; issue preclusion may be appropriate even when litigation has not reached stage of merger and bar required for claim preclusion; thus, when underlying cause of action itself is not barred, issue preclusion may nevertheless apply to final order in which personal jurisdiction was found lacking; after previous orders quashing service on ground of lack of personal jurisdiction, plaintiff's failure to seek reconsideration or appellate review barred plaintiff from relitigating issue by direct estoppel. *Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997-998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882* (court distinguishing and disagreeing with *GMS Properties, Inc. v. Superior Court of Fresno County (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 407, 33 Cal. Rptr. 163*)

Jury verdict determining comparative fault in wrongful death action was entitled to collateral estoppel effect in action on cross-complaint for equitable indemnity when cross complaint was severed for later trial to the court alone; judgment in wrongful death action would become final when appeal process in that action was completed, allowing application of collateral estoppel principles. *Martin v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 688, 699-701, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303*

While final judgment granting habeas corpus relief is res judicata and decision denying habeas corpus relief is not, under appropriate circumstances decision denying request for habeas corpus relief may, for all intents and purposes, be final as to facts adjudicated and may be given collateral estoppel effect. *Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 410-412, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103*

Under federal rule, order or judgment, once rendered, is final for res judicata purposes until it is reversed on appeal, or modified or set aside in court of rendition; for collateral estoppel purposes, federal court's ruling on summary judgment, even though appealed, must be considered final, i.e., if federal court's ruling on summary judgment has not been reversed or modified, decision is final; when prior action was in California state court, however, rule is that judgment is not final for purposes of collateral estoppel while it is open to direct attack, e.g., by appeal. *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230-1231, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303*

First judgment as not precluding second action between same parties on different cause of action, but first judgment as operating as estoppel or conclusive adjudication as to such issues in second action as having been actually litigated or determined in first action; trial court's adjudication, which is interlocutory and nonappealable, as having no res judicata effect and as not constituting estoppel. *Casella v. City of Morgan Hill (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 43, 48-49, 280 Cal. Rptr. 876*

Traditional elements of collateral estoppel as including requirement that prior judgment be final. *Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. v. State of California (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 155, 168, 275 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Term "final judgment" as defined less strictly for purposes of issue preclusion through collateral estoppel than for purposes of merger or bar through res judicata; term as including any prior adjudication of issue in another action that is determined to be sufficiently firm to be accorded conclusive effect. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1181, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

In action to determine insurer's duty to defend insured in wrongful-death action, doctrine of collateral estoppel regarding issue of willfulness of insured's act (relating to exclusion in policy) as inapplicable when insured was granted writ of habeas corpus in criminal action that provided basis for collateral estoppel; collateral estoppel doctrine as requiring final judgment on merits. *Grain Dealers Mutual Ins. Co. v. Marino (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1083, 1088-1089, 246 Cal. Rptr. 410*

Doctrine of issue preclusion as not encompassing informal evidentiary ruling that is not binding on judge or parties and that is unnecessary to judgment. *Reed v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1979) 102 Cal. App. 3d 662, 667, 164 Cal. Rptr. 373*

[c] Identical Issue Litigated in Previous Suit

Collateral estoppel doctrine precludes relitigation of issue of parentage previously adjudicated in bastardy proceeding. *Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 922, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191*

Collateral estoppel doctrine precludes relitigation of issue previously adjudicated by final judgment between the parties; later legislation provided insufficient basis for modifying final injunction. *Professional Engineers v. Department of Transportation (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 543, 568, 574, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 936 P.2d 473*

Failure to appeal trial court judgment in prior proceeding in which statement of decision contained dicta unnecessary to judgment did not collaterally estop county from raising different issue. *County of Santa Clara v. Deputy Sheriffs' Ass'n (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 873, 878 n.7, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53, 838 P.2d 781*

Insurer that timely and adequately reserves its right to assert noncoverage defense later and that does not subsequently intentionally waive its reservation of rights as not collaterally estopped by judgment in favor of third party against its insured to assert that insured's conduct was intentional rather than negligent in later action by third party or insured against insurer or by insurer for declaratory relief. *J.C. Penney Casualty Ins. Co. v. M.K. (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1009, 1017-1018, 278 Cal. Rptr. 64, 804 P.2d 689*

Under collateral estoppel or issue preclusion effect of res judicata, party as barred from raising issue of fact or law if issue was actually litigated and determined by valid and final judgment in previous proceeding and determination was essential to judgment. *George Arakelian Farms, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1279, 1289-1290, 265 Cal. Rptr. 162, 783 P.2d 749*

For identity of issues purposes when asserting res judicata or collateral estoppel, the issue of whether an appeal is frivolous is not identical to the issue of whether an attorney who pursues an appeal that is ultimately adjudged to be frivolous has committed malpractice. *Dawson v. Toledano (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 387, 398, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 689*

When issue of attorney's fees is raised in two separate appeals of a litigation, and appellate court defers determination of it in the first appeal, then dismisses the second appeal, issue has not been conclusively resolved and may be raised in a third appeal. *McAdams v. Aiello (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1226, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 742*

Denial of event promoter's motion to intervene in action by district agriculture association to declare municipal ordinance imposing certain license fees and admission taxes invalid did not necessarily decide issue of promoter's

entitlement to reimbursement of license fees and admission taxes paid by him, and therefore action for reimbursement of such fees and taxes was not barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel principles. *Bame v. City of Del Mar (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1363-1365, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 183*

Under doctrine of res judicata, parties to prior proceeding are precluded from relitigating issues determined in prior proceeding; prior judgment operates as estoppel to issues actually litigated and determined in first action; unless issue or cause of action in two actions is identical, first judgment does not bar second suit; if anything is left to conjecture as to what was necessarily involved and decided, there can be no collateral estoppel; it must appear precise question was raised and determined in former suit; there is only a single cause of action for invasion of one primary right, even if multiple theories of recovery are asserted; court focused on identity-of-issues requirement to resolve defendant's claim of res judicata and held prior judgment against plaintiff did not bar plaintiff's current action in that plaintiff's present action for breach of contract did not assert same primary right as plaintiff's prior action in family law court to establish paternity; resolution of issue of enforceability of contract was unnecessary to court's judgment in family law dispute that plaintiff lacked standing to bring paternity action, and neither issue of plaintiff's standing to request paternity nor plaintiff's paternity rights must necessarily be adjudicated to resolve plaintiff's claim for damages for defendant's breach of contract. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 180-182, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Settlement that avoids trial generally does not constitute actually litigating any issues and thus prevents application of collateral estoppel; there is line of cases, however, holding that consent or stipulated judgment may properly be given collateral estoppel effect; this principle, however, has been tempered by rule that consent judgment is not usually given preclusive effect in subsequent litigation on different cause of action, unless parties manifest intent in consent judgment to give it preclusive effect. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 736, 737 n.15, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*

No aspect of what was decided in previous proceeding can be left to conjecture on the record and if it is left to conjecture estoppel is inapplicable. *Silver v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 338, 357, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287*

Issues before family law court and juvenile court can never, in fact, be identical, even if some or all of facts of abuse or neglect adduced in two proceedings are same, because of important differences between purposes and operations of two courts, and state's overriding concern for protection of children. *In re Carissa G. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 731, 736, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 561*

Collateral estoppel does not apply when there are changed conditions or new facts which did not exist at time of prior judgment, or where previous decision based on different substantive law; because both underlying factual conditions and substantive law at issue changed from time of earlier decision, issues before court in earlier case and present case were not identical. *United States Golf Ass'n v. Arroyo Software Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 607, 616-619, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*

For determination of issue to be given preclusive effect, it must have been necessary to judgment. *McMillin Development, Inc. v. Home Buyers Warranty (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 896, 906, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

Issues resolved on routine sanction motion are not entitled to preclusive effect in later action for malicious prosecution. *Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1193, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334*

Employee who was terminated was not collaterally estopped from litigating issue of whether he was entitled to posttermination evidentiary hearing by federal district court's earlier ruling that he was not entitled to postdisciplinary hearing following three weeks' suspension; because suspension and termination trigger significantly different due process protections, employee's federal court case did not involve identical issues; also, employee's posttermination rights were not necessarily decided in federal court action because employee had not been terminated when he brought that action. *Townsel v. San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Bd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 940, 951-952, 77*

Cal. Rptr. 2d 231

Insurer on notice of action against its insured, but who refuses to defend on ground alleged claim not within policy coverage, is bound by judgment in action, absent fraud or collusion, as to all material findings of fact essential to judgment of liability; insurer not bound, however, as to issues not necessarily adjudicated in prior action and can still present any defenses not inconsistent with judgment against insured; generally speaking, in injured party's action against party alleged to have caused injury, court does not adjudicate issue of insurance coverage; rather only questions litigated are defendant's liability and amount of damages; plaintiff not concerned with theory of liability that produces victory but only with procuring largest possible judgment; similarly, defendant concerned only with avoiding, or at least minimizing, judgment for plaintiff; whether plaintiff's loss covered by defendant's insurance is not germane to action and evidence on that issue would be excluded as irrelevant. *Schaefer/Karpf Productions v. CNA Ins. Companies (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1313, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42*

When on trustor's death, trust assets were to be distributed to trustor's children, or if they predeceased trustor, to their issue, and trustor's son (decedent) predeceased trustor leaving issue, and trustee filed petition to ascertain beneficiaries and determine entitlement to trust distribution pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)*, asking whether respondent was an issue of decedent, other son of decedent who opposed trustee's petition held barred from relitigating parent-child relationship between respondent and decedent by interlocutory judgment of dissolution of marriage that made express finding that respondent was one of decedent's four children; although California court's have held child who is not party to divorce action is not bound by determination of his or her status made in that proceeding, those cases did not support decedent's son; those cases might support action by respondent attacking finding of parentage as to her, but she did not make that claim; neither did decedent's son attack finding as to himself; instead, decedent's son challenged finding as to respondent only. *Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1514-1517, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33*

In criminal prosecution for making false or fraudulent statements for purpose of obtaining workers' compensation benefits and for perjury, court rejected defendant's contention that because workers' compensation judge concluded defendant did suffer work-related injury, prosecution was collaterally estopped from relitigating whether defendant was injured and if so how injury occurred; element of collateral estoppel is that issue sought to be precluded from relitigation is identical to that decided in former proceeding; issue identity absent in case because issue in criminal trial was whether defendant made material false statements in obtaining workers' compensation benefits, not whether defendant suffered compensable injury. *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 159, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Trial judge's ruling on issue of substantial justification in awarding costs and attorney fees after trial was not binding on later motion, following appeal and remittitur, filed in superior court seeking litigation expenses incurred in appellate proceeding; res judicata inapplicable in that trial judge's ruling on issue after trial necessarily was made on facts as they then appeared; following remittitur, judge limited decision to question of litigation costs in appellate proceedings in court of appeal and Supreme Court; rulings concerned two different temporal assessments. *Lennane v. Franchise Tax Board (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1185-1186, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602*

State of California Department of Industrial Relations (DLSE) was not collaterally estopped from litigating proper limitation period in action by it on behalf of workers on public works project for prevailing wages against surety furnishing required payment bond by virtue of DLSE having been losing party in unpublished court of appeal decision of another district of same division when in current case DLSE argued limitation period is governed by *Civ. Code § 3249* and earlier unpublished decision did not address that contention; since identical issue was not necessarily decided in earlier unpublished decision first element for applying collateral estoppel missing. *Division of Labor Standards Enforcement v. Seaboard Sur. Co. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1501, 1512-1515, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532*

Previously dismissed federal action based on diversity of citizenship that only decided issue of whether plaintiffs had right to sue in federal court and ruled on validity and enforceability of forum selection clause as matter of federal procedural law, did not estop plaintiffs from raising issue of validity and enforceability of clause in later state court

action governed by state substantive law, which involved different considerations. *Wimsatt v. Beverly Hills Weight Loss Clinics Internat., Inc. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1511, 1516-1524, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612*

Issue adjudicated in prior workers' compensation proceeding was not identical to subsequent proceeding for purposes of collateral estoppel, despite applicant's status as injured worker with substantial percentage of permanent disability in same body parts. *Nash v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1793, 1812-1813, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 454*

Factual issue of application of fair return formulas in rent control ordinance was not resolved by earlier cases that challenged only the facial validity of formulas in ordinance; dismissal based on res judicata defense as reversed. *Kirkpatrick v. City of Oceanside (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 267, 282, 283 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Collateral estoppel as depending on several preconditions, including (1) issue must have been actually litigated in previous action, which is to say it must have been properly raised by pleadings or otherwise, submitted for determination, and determined; and (2) issue thus litigated must be identical to issue to which estoppel is to apply. *Briggs v. Lawrence (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 605, 611, 281 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Request for temporary equitable relief pending determination of case on its merits as entreaty to court to exercise its discretion, and ruling thereon as not determination of merits of case; such pretrial ruling as not subject to issue preclusive effect with respect to merits of action. *People ex rel. Bender v. Wind River Mining Project (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1390, 1395, 269 Cal. Rptr. 106*

Collateral estoppel as precluding parties from litigating issue previously determined in another cause of action between them or their privities; as prerequisite for asserting this doctrine, that issue was in fact litigated and decided in prior action as required to be shown. *Hulsey v. Koehler (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1150, 1156, 1158, 267 Cal. Rptr. 523*

Matrix for determining whether collateral estoppel doctrine may be invoked as being that second action between same parties on different cause of action is not precluded by former judgment, but that first judgment operates as an estoppel or conclusive adjudication as to such issues in second action that were actually litigated and determined in first action. *McClain v. Rush (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 18, 28-29, 264 Cal. Rptr. 563*

Issue as "actually litigated" only when it is raised by pleadings and factually resolved either by proof or failure of proof. *In re Pedro C. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 174, 181, 263 Cal. Rptr. 428*

In new action on different cause of action, former judgment as not complete merger or bar, but as effective as collateral estoppel, that is, as conclusive on issues actually litigated between parties in former action; former judgment as not collateral estoppel on issues that might have been raised but were not; just as clearly, former judgment as collateral estoppel on issues that were raised, even though some factual matters or legal arguments that could have been presented were not. *Interinsurance Exchange of the Auto. Club v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 177, 181, 257 Cal. Rptr. 37*

Collateral estoppel as preventing parties from relitigating any issue that was actually litigated and finally decided in earlier action; issue decided in earlier proceeding as required to be identical to one presented in subsequent action. *Flynn v. Gorton (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1550, 1554, 255 Cal. Rptr. 768*

Summary judgment on plaintiff's complaint in favor of one defendant, against whom another defendant had cross complained for comparative indemnity, as not barring cross complaint under principles of collateral estoppel when plaintiff and cross complainant have asserted different theories of liability. *Frank v. State of California (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 488, 491-495, 252 Cal. Rptr. 410*

After plaintiff has lost personal injury suit and then dies, heirs as precluded by issue preclusion from bringing

wrongful-death suit based on same injury. *Evans v. Celotex Corp. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 741, 744-745* , 238 Cal. Rtpr. 259

Issue as not finally determined for purposes of issue preclusion if appellate court would not rule on the decision of the trial court on the issue because the issue was moot. *Chamberlin v. City of Palo Alto (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 181, 187, 230 Cal. Rptr. 454*

Principles of collateral estoppel as barring cross complaint against first defendant by second defendant for comparative indemnity when summary judgment has been entered on plaintiff's complaint in favor of first defendant on ground that first defendant is not concurrent tortfeasor responsible for plaintiff's injuries. *Columbus Line, Inc. v. Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated, Inc. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 622, 628-631, 174 Cal. Rptr. 527*

[d] Issue Decided in Prior Administrative Action

At administrative hearing at which government seeks recoupment from welfare recipient for overpayments, recipient may in appropriate circumstances assert equitable estoppel as defense; application of equitable estoppel by administrative agency does not violate either separation of powers doctrine set forth in *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*, or proscription against exercise of judicial power, as that term is used in *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 1*. *Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 396, 405-406, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83*

Los Angeles Housing Authority was collaterally estopped from denying that respondent was entitled to benefits of *Lab. Code § 4850* because issue had been resolved against Housing Authority in previous workers' compensation case. *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1083-1084, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738*

When statutory scheme contemplates proceedings in different tribunals affording different remedies which are cumulative, not mutually exclusive, res judicata held inapplicable because first proceeding was administrative proceeding at which second remedy could not be sought; administrative decisions should not be given res judicata effect if statutory scheme explicitly or implicitly shows contrary intent; People's civil action alleging unfair business practices in defendant's operation of automotive repair dealership, pursuant to Automotive Repair Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9880 et seq.*), was not barred by res judicata following administrative proceeding by Department of Consumer Affairs for violations of Automotive Repair Act; civil statutes did not authorize any action be taken against registration whereas administrative statutes did not authorize imposition of civil penalty for unfair business practices. *People v. Damon (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 958, 967-974, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel does not apply when fundamental nature of proceedings before administrative agency and trial court are significantly different, as when primary issue in administrative hearings is to determine whether to revoke license and primary issue in civil action is to determine amount necessary to compensate injured party fully for licensee's breach of contract. *Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 710-712, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Failure of probationary teaching employee to seek judicial review by writ under *Gov. Code § 11523* of State Personnel Board determination that he could not reasonably be accommodated because of aggravation of epilepsy collaterally estopped employee from pursuing claim in civil action under *Fair Employment and Housing Act. Oquendo v. California Institution for Women (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 520, 522-523, 260 Cal. Rptr. 688*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel applies to final decisions of administrative agencies acting in judicial or quasi-judicial capacity; administrative agency acts in judicial capacity when it resolves disputed issues of fact properly before it and provides parties with opportunity to present evidence and to litigate issues fully. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1178-1179, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Term "jurisdiction," for purposes of applying narrow res judicata exception permitting collateral attack of agency's action taken without jurisdiction, is limited to jurisdiction of most fundamental kind; if tribunal has jurisdiction of parties and of subject matter, decision by it as res judicata notwithstanding that decision is incorrect. *California Coastal Com. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1488, 1501, 258 Cal. Rptr. 567*

Decision of quasi-judicial administrative agency is entitled to res judicata effect when agency's function is reviewing another agency's decision to determine whether the decision conforms to the law and is supported by substantial evidence. *City and County of San Francisco v. Ang (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 673, 678-679, 159 Cal. Rptr. 56*

[e] Issue Decided in Prior Criminal Action

Applicability of doctrine of collateral estoppel (issue preclusion) in criminal proceedings. *Lucido v. Superior Court (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 335, 341-351, 272 Cal. Rptr. 767, 795 P.2d 1223*

Issue preclusion as applicable in civil case to issues determined in previous criminal prosecution. *Teitelbaum Furs, Inc. v. Dominion Ins. Co., Ltd. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 601, 604-607, 25 Cal. Rptr. 559, 375 P.2d 439*

Applicability of collateral estoppel in later action for attorney malpractice when civil malpractice complaint is based on same factual allegations of attorney neglect which were actually determined after full evidentiary hearing in earlier habeas corpus proceeding in which relief sought was based on ineffective assistance of counsel. *Younan v. Caruso (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 401, 408-414, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 103*

Collateral estoppel properly applied to preclude relitigation, in civil declaratory relief action, of issue determined in juvenile court proceeding. *Western Mutual Ins. Co. v. Yamamoto (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1483, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698*

Purposes of collateral estoppel as being (1) to promote judicial economy by minimizing repetitive litigation; (2) to prevent inconsistent judgments that undermine integrity of judicial system; and (3) to provide repose by preventing person from being harassed by vexatious litigation; in deciding whether doctrine is applicable in particular criminal trial, court as required to balance need to limit litigation against right of fair adversary proceeding in which party may fully present his or her case; pursuit of judicial economy and efficiency as never to be used to deny defendant right to fair trial. *People v. Hogue (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1500, 1506, 279 Cal. Rptr. 647*

Department of Social Services, in administrative proceeding to recover entire amount of welfare funds wrongfully received by petitioner as not collaterally estopped to claim portion of amount by criminal proceeding in which petitioner had pleaded guilty to welfare fraud and, as condition of probation, has been ordered to pay that portion in restitution, since issue necessarily decided in criminal proceeding (appropriate amount of restitution) was not same as issue litigated in administrative proceeding (amount of overpayment). *Shor v. Department of Social Services (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 70, 73-74, 272 Cal. Rptr. 632*

In administrative disciplinary proceeding before State Personnel Board resulting in discharge of youth counselor for theft of property from youth facility, board erred in failing to exclude as evidence property improperly seized at employee's home under doctrine of res judicata when property seized was excluded as evidence in criminal prosecution, criminal prosecution was dismissed, and subsequent administrative hearing was initiated by facility. *Dyson v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 711, 715-728, 262 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel as applicable in civil case to issues determined in prior criminal proceeding by court in ruling on motion to suppress evidence under Code Civ. Proc. § 1538.5, provided necessary criteria are met: (1) prior

conviction must have been for serious offense so that defendant was motivated to litigate charges fully; (2) there must have been full and fair trial to prevent convictions of doubtful validity from being used; (3) issue on which prior conviction is offered must of necessity have been decided at criminal trial; and (4) party against whom collateral estoppel is asserted was party or in privity with party at prior trial. *McGowan v. City of San Diego (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 890, 895, 256 Cal. Rptr. 537*

Any doubt as to what was decided by prior criminal proceeding as to be resolved against using it as estoppel in civil action, as litigant invoking doctrine will still have opportunity to establish its contentions at trial. *McGowan v. City of San Diego (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 890, 897, 256 Cal. Rptr. 537*

Application of doctrine of collateral estoppel to bar civil action after prior adjudication in criminal prosecution of issues raised in it as not violating plaintiff's right to jury trial under *U.S. Const., amend. VII*, which was designed to preserve basic institution of jury trial in only its most fundamental elements. *McGowan v. City of San Diego (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 890, 897-898, 256 Cal. Rptr. 537*

[f] Use of Issue Preclusion by Stranger

Offensive use of issue preclusion does not violate right to jury trial under *U.S. Const., amend. VII*. *Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore (1979) 439 U.S. 322, 337, 99 S. Ct. 645, 58 L. Ed. 2d 552*

Defendant is not precluded by lack of privity or of mutuality of estoppel from asserting issue preclusion against plaintiff. *Bernhard v. Bank of America (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 807, 813, 122 P.2d 892*

By abrogating requirement of mutuality, different parties, not party to or in privity with party to prior action, may assert collateral estoppel defensively as shield against one who was party to prior action to prevent party to prior action from relitigating issue it already actually litigated. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 736, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*

It is party against whom collateral estoppel is sought to be invoked that must be same as or in privity with party in earlier proceeding. *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1083, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738*

Collateral estoppel is equitable concept based on fundamental principles of fairness; offensive use of collateral estoppel is more closely scrutinized than defensive use of doctrine. *White Motor Corp. v. Teresinski (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 754, 763, 263 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Consent judgment against trustors in lender's foreclosure action in which they had raised lender's fraud in inducement as affirmative defense barred trustors' cross complaint for fraud against lender's parent corporation by collateral estoppel, because fraud alleged in cross complaint was related only to inducing loan and could have been fully litigated in foreclosure action. *Wittman v. Chrysler Corp (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 586, 591-593, 245 Cal. Rptr. 20*

[6] Judgments of Federal or Sister-State Courts

Final judgment in 1941 Ohio bastardy proceeding is res judicata in probate action in California court. *Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 922-923, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191*

Final judgment entered in action filed in California is res judicata in federal court action. *Palomar Mobilehome Park Ass'n v. San Marcos (9th Cir. 1993) 989 F.2d 362, 364*

After federal court found some sections of Proposition 73 unconstitutional, relitigation of state law issue, i.e., whether

sections that were declared unconstitutional could be reformed so as to avoid their unconstitutionality, was not precluded in later state court proceeding under public interest exception to doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel; following federal judgment, state court not bound by federal law when determining whether exception to the doctrines of res judicata or collateral estoppel applies; application of public interest exception is not conditioned on finding that initial determination of issue was erroneous. *Kopp v. Fair Pol. Practices Com. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 607, 620-626* and n.16, 675, 685, 693, *47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108, 905 P 2d 1248* (Lucus, C.J.; Werdegar, J., concurring; Baxter, J., joined by Arabian, J., and George, J., concurring and dissenting)

Because Florida federal district court class action alleging defendant's facilities denied equal access to disabled persons in violation of Americans with Disabilities Act was resolved by consent decree expressly reserving damage claims, res judicata did not bar plaintiff's action for alleged violation of California's Disabled Persons Act [*Civ. Code § 54 et seq.*] because countertops in defendant's business establishments were allegedly too high to allow wheelchair access, where federal court was not required to decide whether to dismiss state law claims, because those claims were reserved by the consent of parties reserving any issue of damages. *Louie v. BFS Retail & Commercial Operations, LLC (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1544, 1553-1560, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 441*

Insurer was not collaterally estopped from relitigating issue of its liability for equitable contribution, despite contention that Arizona court had held in different case, but under identical fact situation involving same insurance companies, that insurer of nurse under professional liability policy was liable for equitable contribution to insurer of hospital and its employees who had settled medical malpractice action, even though nurse was not named as defendant in underlying action; Arizona court was applying Arizona law, and to extent it may have relied on California law, Arizona court wrongly applied it; doctrine of collateral estoppel cannot be used to bind California litigant to principle of law adopted in prior foreign court litigation that is contrary to California law, nor can it be utilized to preclude party from litigating novel issue of law in California merely because that party had failed to persuade court of another state on wisdom of its position, particularly where it appeared that foreign court based its decision, at least in part, on its interpretation of California authority; insurer seeking equitable contribution failed to establish that "same issue" was actually litigated and resolved in prior litigation since Arizona court reached its decision under Arizona law. *American Continental Ins. Co. v. American Casualty Co. of Reading, Pa. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 929, 942-946, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632*

Preclusive effect of prior federal court judgment is determined by federal law, at least when prior judgment was on bases of federal question jurisdiction; *California Supreme Court in Levy v. Cohen (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 165, 172-173, 137 Cal. Rptr. 162, 561 P.2d 252* and *Martin v. Martin (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 752, 761, 470 P.2d 662* , did not give any indication that rule would differ depending on whether federal court jurisdiction was based on diversity or federal question; whether California Supreme Court, in a diversity situation, would apply res judicata law of state whose law federal court was applying, or would apply federal law under rule of *Levy* and *Martin*, result would be to look to California law. *Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1452-1455, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521*

Judgment of court of one state is conclusive on merits in court in another state only if court in first state had jurisdiction to render judgment; thus, before court is bound by judgment rendered in another state, it may inquire into jurisdictional basis of foreign court's decree; if that court did not have jurisdiction over subject matter or relevant parties, full faith and credit need not be given; judgment may be challenged only if issue of jurisdiction was not litigated in foreign state; if that question was expressly litigated, determination is res judicata and is itself protected by full faith and credit clause. *Bank of America v. Jennett (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 104, 113-114, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*

When federal court granted summary judgment to defendant concerning plaintiff's employment discrimination claim brought under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* and declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction on plaintiff's cause of action under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) barring discrimination in employment decisions on the basis of religion (*Gov. Code § 12940*) and dismissed the FEHA claims without prejudice to refiling in state court, state court held to have properly sustained defendant's demurrer to plaintiff's complaint in that issues raised in plaintiff's complaint had been fully litigated in prior federal action and plaintiff was collaterally estopped from relitigating them. *Lumpkin*

v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1229-1234, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303

Federal judgment has same effect in California state courts as it would have in federal court; under federal rule, federal order or judgment, once rendered, is final for res judicata purposes until it is reversed on appeal, or modified or set aside in court of rendition. *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230-1231, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303*

Plaintiffs' cause of action for violation of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO) was untenable in state court action in light of plaintiffs' RICO claim against defendants having been earlier dismissed with prejudice in federal district court; although appeal from district court's judgment was pending before Ninth Circuit, federal judgment is final for res judicata purposes until reversed, and doctrine of res judicata precludes litigation of any claim that could have been raised in federal action. *Abdallah v. United Savings Bank (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1101, 1110, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286*

Failure of a debtor to disclose its lender-liability lawsuit cause of action in bankruptcy proceeding barred debtor under one or another form of issue preclusion from thereafter proceeding with state court action against lender alleging that lender was catalyst for bankruptcy when in bankruptcy proceeding the lender obtained final bankruptcy orders liquidating its claims against debtor and giving lender all of debtors tangible and intangible property. *Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1096, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 119*

Federal court's summary adjudication of federal claim and dismissal of plaintiffs' pendent claims without prejudice to their being refiled in state court, all of which claims arose out of alleged fraudulent acquisition, subdivision, and resale of Arizona property to plaintiffs, as not res judicata on plaintiffs' state law claims and as not barring action in California state court on those claims. *Koch v. Hankins (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1599, 1602, 1605, 273 Cal. Rptr. 442* (distinguishing *Mattson v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 441, 164 Cal. Rptr. 913*)

Prior judgment rendered by federal court as required to be given same effect by state courts that it would have in federal court; in addition, principles governing federal court's power over nonfederal claims as coming into play in determining preclusive effect of judgment in subsequent state court action on state claims. *Koch v. Hankins (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1599, 1603, 273 Cal. Rptr. 442*

Full faith and credit clause (U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 1*) as generally requiring every state to give to judgment of court of another state at least res judicata effect that judgment would be accorded in state rendering it; state court judgment as not to be given full faith and credit by other states as to parties or property not subject to jurisdiction of court that rendered it unless that state fully and fairly litigated its jurisdiction and finally decided question in favor of jurisdiction, in which case second state is not permitted to reexamine question but must give judgment of first state full faith and credit; burden of showing invalidity of judgment as on party attacking it, and, in absence of violation of federal constitutional rights, validity and effect of judgment of sister state as governed by law of state where judgment was rendered. *St. Sava Mission Corp. v. Serbian Eastern Orthodox Diocese (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1364, 273 Cal. Rptr. 340*

Trial court as erring in sustaining defendant's demurrer to complaint for employment discrimination on ground of res judicata based on prior federal civil rights action because federal court had dismissed state actions without consideration when they were pendent to federal civil rights causes of action that had been summarily dismissed; federal court left resolution of pendent state claims to state court by noting that statute of limitations on those claims was equitably tolled by federal court's decision not to exercise pendent jurisdiction. *Craig v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1294, 1299, 1301, 271 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Judgment in federal court action against plaintiff as res judicata of simultaneously filed state court action containing virtually identical allegations; although state court had concurrent jurisdiction over matter and plaintiff could theoretically initiate simultaneous actions in both forums, final judgment deciding matter by one court as barring action

in other court under basic res judicata principles. *Weber v. Willard (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1009, 255 Cal. Rptr. 165*

Final judgment in sister-state action as res judicata in California action involving same issues even though California action filed first. *Baughman v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 621, 624-625, 196 Cal. Rptr. 35*

If federal court declines to exercise pendent jurisdiction over state claim that would be barred by res judicata principles from being prosecuted if federal claim is fully litigated and plaintiff then elects to proceed to trial and judgment in federal court, entire cause of action, including state claim, as either merged or barred by federal court judgment so that plaintiff may not thereafter maintain second suit on same cause of action in state court. *Mattson v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 441, 455, 164 Cal. Rptr. 913*

[7] Judicial Estoppel

Doctrine of judicial estoppel prevents party from taking two inconsistent positions in the same proceeding, including in the same document. Plaintiffs sued hospital contending that hospital's policy of terminating medical care for patients who file lawsuits is illegal. In opposition to the hospital's motion for summary judgment, plaintiffs contended that the hospital's actions violated the professional duty of care. Elsewhere in the same document, the plaintiffs asserted that the hospital's actions were administrative, not professional decisions. This latter assertion was made by plaintiffs in an attempt to avoid summary adjudication of the punitive damages claim. The court held that plaintiffs were judicially estopped from asserting the latter position. Each of the elements of the test for judicial estoppel set forth in *Jackson v. Cty. of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 183, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* were met. *Scripps Clinic v. Superior Court (Thompson) (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 917, 943, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101*

Principles stated in *Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* (some courts not limiting judicial estoppel where litigant successfully asserted contradictory position) did not apply in case in which defendant's position in prior proceeding was not adopted by the trial court in that proceeding and defendant had not gained any advantage by virtue of the inconsistent position taken in the prior matter; exception stated in *Thomas* limited to "rare situation" where litigant has made an egregious attempt to manipulate the legal system. *Tuchscher Development Enterprises, Inc. v. San Diego Unified Port District (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1219, 1244-1247, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 57*

In plaintiff's suit against accountant and accountancy corporation for fraud or breach of a duty of care for failing to inform her of financial condition of corporations to which she had transferred assets to keep those assets out of her creditors' hands, plaintiff was estopped from claiming any equitable interest in those corporations; plaintiff had declared under oath in multiple unrelated bankruptcy proceedings that she had no interest in assets of those corporations, and court held that, assuming that doctrine of judicial estoppel should be applied to unsuccessful litigant only in rare situation where litigant had made egregious attempt to manipulate legal system, this was situation that warranted application of judicial estoppel even absent proof of success in earlier litigation; also, trial court properly inferred that position taken in earlier litigation was not taken as result of ignorance, fraud, or mistake given plaintiff's admission that she formed corporations to hide assets from creditors and her failure to list corporations in bankruptcy petition two years later; alleged failure to read bankruptcy petitions or schedules before signing them and reliance on advice of professionals as to which assets to list was not type of ignorance that permits party to avoid impact of signing legal document. *Thomas v. Gordon (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 113, 118-121, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28*

When former employees prevailed in action brought against them by their former employer for, among other things, misappropriation of trade secrets, unfair competition, and breach of confidentiality agreements, and sought attorney's fees award under *Civ. Code § 1717*, employer was judicially estopped from denying that the contract authorized award of attorney fees when employer's complaint had included request for attorney fees incurred in action and had copy of

agreement that included fees provision attached. *International Billing Services, Inc. v. Emigh (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1186-1192, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532*

Doctrine of judicial estoppel precludes party from asserting position in judicial proceeding that is inconsistent with position previously successfully asserted in prior proceeding and prevents use of intentional self-contradiction as means of obtaining unfair advantage in forum provided for suitors seeking justice; when plaintiffs sought and obtained leave of bankruptcy court for relief from stay to allow them to foreclose on property, in later action plaintiffs were estopped to deny knowledge of appraisal report submitted through their counsel on their behalf in bankruptcy court; plaintiffs cannot be permitted to obtain right to foreclose on piece of property by assuring bankruptcy court that it is worth less than its liens, and then complain in later suit that they were surprised by their inability to make huge windfall profit on it; possibility plaintiffs might not have been aware of their counsel's specific arguments to court does not make them innocent bystanders; they accepted benefits of their counsel's representations to court and went ahead with foreclosure and resale; for purposes of judicial estoppel, their actual knowledge irrelevant. *Michelson v. Camp (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 955, 959, 970-971, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539*

Judicial estoppel (doctrine against assertion of inconsistent positions) is judge made doctrine that seeks to prevent litigant from asserting position inconsistent with one that litigant previously asserted in same or previous proceeding; it is designed to prevent litigants from playing fast and loose with courts; asserting inconsistent positions does not trigger application of judicial estoppel unless intentional self-contradiction is used as means of obtaining unfair advantage; doctrine does not apply when position taken because of good faith mistake rather than as part of scheme to mislead court; inconsistent argument sufficient to invoke judicial estoppel must be attributable to intentional wrongdoing; whether judicial estoppel should apply is factual question; determination of existence of judicial estoppel is factual finding that will be upheld if supported by substantial evidence; judicial estoppel should be applied with caution; it is extraordinary remedy to be invoked when party's inconsistent behavior will otherwise result in miscarriage of justice; judicial estoppel rarely appropriate in chapter 7 context in case in which debtor failed to schedule claim. *Haley v. Dow Lewis Motors, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 497, 509-511, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352*

In suit claiming racial harassment and wrongful termination, evidence of inconsistency in positions taken in disability proceeding and current lawsuit supported trial court's application of judicial estoppel doctrine; doctrine of judicial estoppel has had particular significance in cases involving Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (*42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*); significant number of federal courts have decided that person who characterizes himself or herself as "totally disabled" to receive state, federal, or even insurance benefits will normally be estopped from proving that he or she is qualified individual with disability within meaning of ADA or similar state laws; although phrased in terms of racial discrimination, instant case analogous to an ADA claim; because judicial estoppel is equitable doctrine, circumstance may warrant application of doctrine even if earlier position was not adopted by tribunal; thus, when plaintiff earlier sought workers' compensation benefits and received award through compromise and settlement, approved by workers' compensation referee, although no factual findings were incorporated in referee's approval of parties' compromise and release, that held not fatal to applying judicial estoppel under facts of case. *Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 956-960, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864* (distinguishing *Bell v. Wells Fargo Bank (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1382, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 354* , as not involving totally inconsistent position in the two proceedings, and *Prilliman v. United Airlines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* , as not involving two clearly inconsistent positions)

Doctrine of judicial estoppel applied to bar defendant from successfully opposing California Coastal Commission's motion to enforce previously entered stipulated judgment in its favor when defendant's defense against motion was that "Calvo exclusion" applied, but merits of that defense had been resolved when defendant earlier stipulated to judgment thereby agreeing that Commission had authority to require defendant to restore property; under doctrine of judicial estoppel, party who has taken particular position in litigation, may under some circumstances, be estopped from taking inconsistent position to detriment of other party; here defendant took inconsistent positions in litigation, first waiving right to further litigate exclusion and agreeing to obey any Commission order regarding restoration of property, and

later asserting exclusion and denying obligation to obey Commission orders; detriment to other party clear. *California Coastal Com. v. Tahmassebi (1998) 69 Cal. App. 4th 255, 259, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 321*

Cases such as *Ryan Operations G.P. v. Santiam-Midwest Lumber Co (3d Cir 1996) 81 F.3d 355, 359-360* and *International Engine Parts, Inc. v. Feddersen & Co. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 345, 350-351, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178* , can be cited as authority for proposition that (1) judicial estoppel can be applied to bar claim beyond reaches of res judicata and can preclude suit even against party whose legal liabilities have never previously been determined, (2) doctrine is intended to protect judiciary without regard to litigant's rights, (3) doctrine may be invoked in court's discretion, (4) it requires neither reliance nor prejudice, and (5) it may bar claim without regard to rights of creditors of bankruptcy estate involved; trial court should not have attempted to decide issue on motion for judgment on pleadings. *Cloud v. Northrop Grumman Corp. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1016, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544*

[8] Merger of Cause of Action in Judgment

Under doctrine of res judicata, once plaintiff prevails on his or her claim, cause of action as merged into judgment and plaintiff's only remaining right as on judgment; merger as prohibiting plaintiff from splitting single cause of action into successive suits. *Craig v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1294, 1301, 271 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Doctrine of res judicata as giving conclusive effect to former judgment in subsequent litigation between same parties involving same cause of action; prior judgment for plaintiff as resulting in merger and superseding new action by right of action on judgment, and prior judgment for defendant on same cause of action as complete bar to new action. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1178, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

[9] Nature and Effect of Res Judicata Doctrine

Collateral estoppel is one of two aspects of doctrine of res judicata; in its narrowest form, res judicata precludes parties or their privies from relitigating cause of action finally resolved in prior proceeding; res judicata also includes broader principle, collateral estoppel, under which issue necessarily decided in prior litigation may be conclusively determined against parties thereto or their privies; thus, res judicata does not merely bar relitigation of identical claims or causes of action; in its collateral estoppel aspect, doctrine may preclude party to prior litigation from redisputing issues decided against him or her, even when those issues bear on different claims raised in later case. *Vandenberg v. Superior Court (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 815, 828, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366, 982 P.2d 229*

Under doctrine of res judicata, parties to prior proceeding are precluded from relitigating issues determined in prior proceeding; prior judgment operates as estoppel to issues actually litigated and determined in first action; unless issue or cause of action in two actions is identical, first judgment does not stand as bar to second suit; prior determination by tribunal will be given collateral estoppel effect when (1) issue is identical to that decided in former proceeding, (2) issue is actually litigated and (3) necessarily decided, (4) doctrine is asserted against party to former action or one in privity with such party, and (5) former decision is final and made on merits; if anything is left to conjecture as to what was necessarily involved and decided, there can be no collateral estoppel; it must appear the precise question was raised and determined in former suit. *Dunkin v. Boskey (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 171, 180-181, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Doctrine of res judicata consists of two different aspects; first, it precludes parties or their privies from relitigating cause of action that has been finally determined by court of competent jurisdiction; this is traditionally referred to as "res judicata" or "claim preclusion"; second, any issue necessarily decided in such litigation is conclusively determined as to parties or their privies if it is involved in subsequent lawsuit as to parties on different cause of action; this is known as "collateral estoppel" or "issue preclusion"; res judicata is applicable only to same causes of action between same parties or their privies; collateral estoppel is applicable to bar relitigation of issues previously litigated between same parties on different cause of action if issues for which collateral estoppel is sought in second action (1) are identical to

those litigated in first action, (2) were actually litigated and necessarily decided in determining first action, (3) are asserted against a participant in first action or one in privity with that party, and (4) former decision was final on merits. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 734-735, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*

Prior determination will be given collateral estoppel effect when (1) issue is identical to that decided in a former proceeding, (2) issue was actually litigated and (3) necessarily decided, (4) doctrine is asserted against party to former action or one who was in privity with such a party, and (5) former decision is final and was made on merits; no aspect of what was decided in previous proceeding can be left to conjecture on the record and if it is left to conjecture estoppel is inapplicable. *Silver v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 338, 357, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel precludes relitigation of issue previously adjudicated if (1) the issue necessarily decided in previous suit is identical to issue sought to be relitigated, (2) there is final judgment on merits of previous suit, and (3) party against whom plea is asserted was party, or in privity with party, to previous suit, stranger to prior judgment may assert defensive issue preclusion. *Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1334-1335, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635*

Generally speaking, valid final judgment in plaintiff's favor merges any claim of same cause of action in judgment, and precludes plaintiff from maintaining any later suit on same cause of action; rule against plaintiff splitting single cause of action so as to make it basis of several suits is, in part, an application of doctrine of res judicata. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*

Doctrine of res judicata has two aspects; it applies to both a previously litigated cause of action, referred to as claim preclusion, and to an issue necessarily decided in prior action, referred to as issue preclusion; prerequisite elements for applying doctrine to either entire cause of action or one or more issues are same: (1) claim or issue raised in present action is identical to claim or issue litigated in prior proceeding, (2) prior proceeding resulted in final judgment on the merits, and (3) party against whom doctrine is asserted was party or in privity with party to prior proceeding. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 556, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

Doctrine of collateral estoppel or issue preclusion is secondary form of res judicata; it prevents party who had full and fair opportunity to litigate particular issue in prior proceeding from relitigating it in subsequent proceeding; prior determination by tribunal will be given collateral estoppel effect when (1) issue is identical to that decided in former proceeding, (2) issue was actually litigated and (3) necessarily decided, (4) doctrine is asserted against party to former action or one in privity with such party, and (5) former decision is final and was made on merits. *McCutchen v. City of Montclair (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1138, 1144, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95*

Under collateral estoppel aspect of res judicata, relitigation of issue previously adjudicated is generally precluded if certain criteria met: (1) issue necessarily decided in previous suit identical to issue sought to be relitigated, (2) there was final judgment on merits of previous suit, and (3) party against whom plea asserted was party, or in privity with party, to previous suit. *Gregory v. State Bd. of Control (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 584, 592, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575*

Collateral estoppel bars party to action, or one in privity, from subsequently relitigating issues actually litigated and finally decided against that party in earlier action; nonparty may invoke collateral estoppel against party to earlier action only if three conditions met: (1) issue necessarily decided in earlier action is identical to issue sought to be relitigated in current action, (2) there was final judgment on merits in earlier action, and (3) party against whom collateral estoppel asserted was party, or in privity with party, to previous suit. *United States Golf Ass'n v. Arroyo Software Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 607, 616, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*

Party will be collaterally estopped from relitigating issue only if (1) issue decided in prior adjudication identical with that presented in action in question, (2) there was final judgment on merits, and (3) party against whom plea asserted

was party or in privity with party to prior adjudication. *Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155*

Collateral estoppel or issue preclusion aspect of res judicata does not operate as complete bar to subsequent relitigation; rather, under collateral estoppel, issues that have been fully and fairly litigated and determined between parties are regarded as conclusively determined in subsequent litigation; resolved issues may or may not be determinative in subsequent litigation, depending on its importance to cause of action, but when collateral estoppel applies parties will not be permitted to relitigate previously determined issue; threshold requirements for application of collateral estoppel are (1) issue sought to be precluded must be identical to that decided in prior litigation, (2) issue must have been actually litigated in prior litigation, (3) issue must have been necessarily decided in prior litigation, (4) decision in prior litigation must be final and on merits, and (5) party against whom issue preclusion sought must be same as or in privity with party to prior litigation. *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 151, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642*

Collateral estoppel, or issue preclusion, is form of res judicata; collateral estoppel precludes party to action from relitigating in second proceeding matters litigated and determined in prior proceeding. *Wright v. Ripley (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1193, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334*

Most commonly, issue preclusion arises from successive suits on different claims and is referred to as collateral estoppel; if, however, second action is on same claim, issue preclusion based on the earlier determination is described as direct estoppel; both collateral and direct estoppel, like res judicata, have dual purpose of protecting litigants from burden of relitigating identical issue with same party or his or her privy and of promoting judicial economy by preventing needless litigation; in either form, issue preclusion should be determined according to threshold requirements: (1) issue sought to be precluded from relitigation must be identical to that decided in former proceeding, (2) issue must have been actually litigated in former proceeding, (3) it must have been necessarily decided in former proceeding, (4) decision in former proceeding must be final and on merits, and (5) party against whom preclusion sought must be same, or in privity with, party to former proceeding. *Sabek, Inc. v. Engelhard Corp. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997-998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 882*

Collateral estoppel, as aspect of res judicata, precludes relitigation of issues decided in prior proceeding; traditionally, collateral estoppel applies only if following requirements satisfied: (1) issue sought to be precluded from relitigation must be identical to that decided in former proceeding, (2) issue must have been actually litigated in former proceeding, (3) it must have been necessarily decided in former proceeding, (4) decision in former proceeding must be final and on merits, and (5) party against whom preclusion sought must be same, or in privity with, party to former proceeding. *Townsel v. San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Bd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 940, 951, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231*

Elements of collateral estoppel are (1) issue sought to be precluded from relitigation is identical to that decided in former proceeding, (2) issue was actually litigated and necessarily decided in former proceeding, and (3) party against whom preclusion sought was party, or in privity with party, to former proceeding. *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 159, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Res judicata precludes piecemeal litigation by splitting single cause of action or relitigation of the same cause of action on different legal theory or for different relief; res judicata operates as bar to maintaining second suit between same parties or parties in privity with them on same cause of action; doctrine of res judicata gives conclusive effect to final judgment rendered on merits by court having jurisdiction of cause. *Weikel v. TCW Realty Fund II Holding Co. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1245, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25*

Doctrine of res judicata precludes parties or their privies from relitigating cause of action that has been finally determined by court of competent jurisdiction; any issue necessarily decided in such litigation is conclusively determined as to parties or their privies if it is involved in later lawsuit on different cause of action; prior judgment is res

judicata on matters that were raised, or could have been raised, on matters litigated or litigable; in determining validity of plea of res judicata there are three pertinent questions: (1) were issues decided in former adjudication identical with those in later litigation; (2) was there final judgment on the merits; and (3) was party against whom plea asserted party or in privity with party to prior adjudication? *Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1015, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*

Three prerequisites to applying doctrine of collateral estoppel as being (1) issue in second action must be identical to issue adjudicated in first action; (2) first action must have proceeded to final judgment on merits; and (3) party against whom collateral estoppel is to be asserted must have been party, or in privity with party, to first action. *Brown v. Rahman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1461, 282 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *People v. Hogue (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1500, 1504, 279 Cal. Rptr. 647* ; *Gill v. Hughes (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1299, 1304, 278 Cal. Rptr. 306* ; *People v. Henderson (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1129, 1150, 275 Cal. Rptr. 837* ; *Oro Fino Gold Mining Corp. v. County of El Dorado (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 872, 878, 274 Cal. Rptr. 720*

Res judicata effect of final judgment on merits as having two aspects: (1) judgment bars parties (or those in privity with them) from litigating same cause of action in subsequent proceeding; and (2) parties (or those in privity with them) are collaterally estopped from litigating in subsequent proceeding on different cause of action any issue actually litigated and determined in former proceeding; res judicata aspect that bars relitigation on same cause of action as precluding piecemeal litigation by splitting single cause of action and as also precluding relitigation of same cause of action on different legal theory or for different relief; prior final judgment on merits as settling issues that were not only actually litigated but every issue that might have been raised and litigated in first action. *Koch v. Hankins (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1599, 1602, 273 Cal. Rptr. 442*

Doctrine of res judicata as providing that final judgment on merits bars parties or those in privity with them from litigating same cause of action in subsequent proceeding, and collaterally estops parties or those in privity with them from litigating in subsequent proceeding on different cause of action any issue actually litigated or determined in former proceeding; for purposes of res judicata, erroneous judgment as being as conclusive as correct one. *White Motor Corp. v. Teresinski (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 754, 761, 763, 263 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel as serving two public policies: (1) preventing party who already has had fair trial on issue from again drawing it into controversy; and (2) protecting parties from being twice vexed for same cause; preventing relitigation of same issue as also fostering important public policy of judicial economy. *Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 708, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Collateral estoppel as distinct aspect of res judicata and as involving second action between same parties on different cause of action; in such case, first action as not operating as complete merger or bar, but as operating as an estoppel or conclusive adjudication of issues in second action that were actually litigated and determined in first action. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1178, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Doctrine of res judicata as composed of two parts, claim preclusion and issue preclusion; claim preclusion as prohibiting party from relitigating previously adjudicated cause of action; thus, new lawsuit on same cause of action as entirely barred; issue preclusion, or collateral estoppel, as applying to subsequent suit between parties on different cause of action. *Flynn v. Gorton (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1550, 1554, 255 Cal. Rptr. 768*

Res judicata and collateral estoppel as sharing common goals; both prevent inconsistent results and promote finality and judicial economy by bringing an end to litigation. *Flynn v. Gorton (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1550, 1554, 255 Cal. Rptr. 768*

[10] Pleading

Although normally res judicata effect of prior judgment must be pleaded and proven at trial, when judgment becomes final during pendency of appeal in another action, first final judgment may be brought to attention of appellate court in which appeal is pending and may there be relied on as res judicata. *Aronow v. LaCroix (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1046, 268 Cal. Rptr. 866*

Collateral estoppel as not required to be specially alleged as defense; in contrast, objection based on doctrine of res judicata as required to be specially pleaded or it is waived. *Hulsey v. Koehler (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1150, 1156, 1158, 267 Cal. Rptr. 523*

[11] Privity

[a] Considerations

A five-year-old child ordinarily has no cognizable independent interest in relitigating a liability claim that has been determined adversely to his parents; sufficient privity exists to invoke the doctrine of collateral estoppel. *Garcia v. Rehrig Internat., Inc. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 869, 878, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 723*

Party is one with direct interest in subject matter who has right to raise defense, or to control action, and to appeal; privy is one who, after rendition of judgment, has acquired interest in subject matter affected by judgment through or under one of parties, as by inheritance, succession, or purchase. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 735, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*

Ordinarily, collateral estoppel does not apply against parties who were codefendants in former action; this rule does not apply, however, when codefendants were adversaries who opposed and litigated issues adversely to each other. *Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155*

Findings made during labor arbitration are only binding in subsequent employee lawsuit if employee was party to arbitration or in privity with union during proceeding; privity requires identity of interest, or relationship which is sufficiently close to justify application of of collateral estoppel; person in privity with party to former proceeding bound by that proceeding only when his or her interests were adequately represented; when employee does not participate directly in labor arbitration and union's position was contrary to his or her interests, employee can successfully assert lack of privity or fair representation as bar to collateral estoppel. *Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1338, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763*

Whatever scope of expanded notions of privity may be, it is clear that collateral estoppel may only be applied when due process requirements are met; in context of collateral estoppel, due process requires that party to be estopped must have had identity or community of interest with, and adequate representation by, losing party in first action as well as that circumstances must have been such that party to be estopped should reasonably have expected to be bound by prior adjudication; reasonable expectation requirement is satisfied if party to be estopped had propriety interest in and control of prior action, or if unsuccessful party in first action might fairly be treated as acting in representative capacity for party to be estopped; moreover, due process requires that party to be estopped must have had fair opportunity to pursue his or her claim first time. *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 154, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642*

Privity for purposes of res judicata or collateral estoppel refers to mutual or successive relationship to same property rights, to identification in interest of one person with another as to represent the same legal rights, or to relationship between party to be estopped and unsuccessful party in prior litigation that is sufficiently close so as to justify application of collateral estoppel; due process requires that nonparty have had identity or community of interest with,

and adequate representation by party in first action; nonparty should reasonably have expected to be bound by prior adjudication; privity is not susceptible of neat definition and determination of whether it exists is not cut-and-dried exercise; in final analysis, determination of privity depends on fairness of binding one with result obtained in earlier proceedings in which it did not participate; whether someone is in privity with actual parties requires examination of facts and circumstances of case; party is adequately represented for purposes of privity if his or her interests are so similar to party's interest that latter was former's virtual representative in earlier action; adequacy of representation is inferred from whether party in suit asserted to have preclusive effect had same interest as party to be precluded and whether party had strong motive to assert that interest; if interests are divergent or party's motive for asserting common interest is relatively weak, one does not infer adequate representation and there is no privity. *Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc.v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1069-1071, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77*

Close examination of circumstances of case required to determine whether someone is in privity with party; in general, privity involves person being so identified in interest with another as to represent same legal right. *Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal.App. 4th 1509, 1522, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33*

"Privity" as relationship between party to be estopped and unsuccessful party in prior litigation that is sufficiently close so as to justify application of doctrine of collateral estoppel; historically, parties as not deemed to be in privity unless they shared same legal interests; under more contemporary approach in context of collateral estoppel, due process as requiring that party to be estopped had identity or community of interest with, and adequate representation by, losing party in first action, as well as that circumstances must have been such that party to be estopped should reasonably have expected to be bound by prior adjudication. *Brown v. Rahman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1462, 282 Cal. Rptr. 815*

Whether someone is in privity with actual parties as requiring close examination of circumstances of each case; privity as involving person so identified in interest with another that he or she represents same legal right. *People v. Henderson (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1129, 1150-1151, 275 Cal. Rptr. 837*

Concept of privity as operating as safety valve to defeat preclusive effect of prior decision in circumstances in which such result would be unfair; "privity" as representing legal conclusion that relationship between one who is party on record and nonparty is sufficiently close to afford application of principle of preclusion. *City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 606, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723*

[b] No Privity Found

A dismissal with prejudice is a judgment on the merits between the plaintiff and the dismissed defendant. It is not, however, a judgment on the merits between the plaintiff and other defendants in the action. *Johnson v. County of Fresno (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1087,1096, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475*

Plaintiff who settled and dismissed with prejudice legal malpractice action against counsel who represented plaintiff in underlying action that was still pending was not barred from going forward with underlying action because defendants in underlying action were not parties to malpractice action, nor in privity with them; moreover, since malpractice action was settled and not tried, collateral estoppel did not bar litigating any issue in underlying action. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 736-740, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110* (declining to follow *Arciniega v. Bank of San Bernardino (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 213, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 495*)

When plaintiff and defendant in present case had been codefendants in earlier action, record failed to support requirement of privity between parties because plaintiff did not have incentive to litigate issue in earlier action despite plaintiff and defendant having been adversaries in that action by virtue of a cross complaint; in earlier action, plaintiff was not represented by present counsel, but by plaintiff's insurer who had no interest in pursuing any claim against

codefendant in that action and hence did not oppose codefendant's summary judgment motion and did not appear at oral argument on motion; plaintiff's counsel in present action not served with that summary judgment motion; under circumstances, it would violate due process to preclude plaintiff from litigating same issue decided in previous motion; plaintiff was not adequately represented on issue in earlier case, had no incentive to litigate issue in earlier case and could not have reasonably been expected to be bound by that adjudication. *Sutton v. Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1149, 1155-1157, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155*

When insurer in earlier declaratory relief action was found liable to provide defense and indemnify its insureds under coverage provisions of its policy and other insurers not named in earlier action also issued liability policies to same insureds containing substantially same language, but denied coverage and refused to participate in defense, and insurer thereafter brought suit against those other insurers, other insurers were held not bound by earlier judicial determination requiring coverage because they were neither parties nor privies to prior action in that they were not named in that action as parties, did not have financial or proprietary interest in its outcome, and it could not be fairly said that insurer in earlier action was in any way acting as their representative. *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 134-135, 154-155, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642*

In criminal prosecution for making false or fraudulent statements for purpose of obtaining workers' compensation benefits and for perjury, workers' compensation judge's conclusion that defendant suffered work-related injury did not collaterally estop prosecution from relitigating whether, and if so, how, defendant was injured; party identity element was absent because defendant's adversary in Workers' Compensation Appeals Board proceeding was defendant's employer, state agency that was not part of executive branch, whereas defendant's adversary in criminal proceeding was county district attorney's office, which is part of executive branch. *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 159-160, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Action for attorney malpractice arising out of terms of probate court settlement order as not barred by res judicata when parties did not have adversarial interests in prior probate action and thus, lacked privity. *Schultz v. Harney (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1611, 1620, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 276*

Due to nature of principal/surety relationship, rule as that when one party to judgment has unity of interest with another party whose rights are not determined by judgment, no appeal lies until rights or duties of interested party have been resolved by final judgment. *T&R Painting Construction, Inc. v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 738, 743, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 199*

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission prosecuting federal discrimination action brought under Age Discrimination in Employment Act, *29 U.S.C. § 261, et seq.*, against defendant employer, eventually entering into injunctive consent judgment, did not stand in privity with plaintiff in subsequent action against employer for state-based age discrimination since EEOC had dispensed with plaintiff's particular interest during prosecution of its action. *Victa v. Merle Norman Cosmetics, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 454, 463-468, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117*

Person who is neither party to action nor in privity with party as not bound by judgment; fact that person may have been vitally interested in and directly affected by outcome of action as immaterial; due process as requiring that that person have his or her own day in court. *County of Fresno v. Lehman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 340, 347, 280 Cal. Rptr. 310*

Fact that individual appears as witness in action as not in and of itself supporting finding of privity with party in that action for purposes of application of collateral estoppel in subsequent proceeding. *Dyson v. State Personnel Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 711, 727 n.6, 262 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Judgment against principal as not binding in separate action against surety. *All Bay Mill & Lumber Co. v. Surety Co. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 11, 17, 255 Cal. Rptr. 790*

Department of Motor Vehicles, in role of controlling licensing of drivers, as not in privity with prosecutor in criminal proceeding arising from driving of motor vehicle. *Pawlowski v. Pierce (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 692, 698, 249 Cal. Rptr. 49* (noting that courts of appeal are split on this issue)

[c] Privity Found

Plaintiff nonprofit public interest group that brought action for implied dedication of public recreational easement, held to be in privity with state agencies that were responsible for representation of public interest who pursued rights of public concerning same property in earlier state and federal actions; when authority to pursue public rights or interests in litigation is given to public entity by statute, judgment rendered is res judicata as to all members of class represented; similarly, when one governmental agency represents interests of State of California in prior litigation and another seeks to pursue same issue, agents of same government are in privity with each other, since they represent not their own rights but rights of government. *Citizens for Open Access Etc. Tide, Inc. v. Seadrift Assn. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1073, 1073 n.12, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77*

In proceeding on trustee's petition to ascertain beneficiaries and determine entitlement to trust distribution, determination of parent-child relationship in interlocutory judgment of dissolution of marriage barred one child from relitigating parent-child relationship of another child to their deceased parent when sole interest of decedent's child in trust was as member of class of remaindermen defined by their relationship to decedent; because point in dispute, i.e., whether other party was decedent's child, was same point adjudicated in dissolution action, and because its determination was binding on decedent, it should likewise be binding on those claiming through decedent. *Weir v. Ferreira (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1514-1517, 1521-1522, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33*

Hospital bound by earlier judgment in medical malpractice action in which it was dismissed as party before trial in which anesthesiologist prevailed so as to bar hospital's action for equitable indemnity against anesthesiologist after award of damages against hospital in second suit by same plaintiff; in earlier action hospital had opportunity to prove anesthesiologist caused plaintiff's injuries and had community of interest with plaintiff in seeking to hold anesthesiologist liable for plaintiff's injuries. *Children's Hospital v. Sedgwick (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1780, 1788, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 725*

Plaintiff barred by res judicata from collaterally attacking order made in earlier minor's personal injury action that denied plaintiff's quantum meruit lien claim for attorney fees in that action when defendant attorneys represented minor in that action and were not technically parties to it and plaintiff became party to that action by filing purported lien; fact that defendants were not technically parties in that action was not significant for res judicata purposes as long as issue presented was same, there was final judgment on merits, and party against whom res judicata asserted is same. *Law Offices of Stanley J. Bell v. Shine, Browne & Diamond (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1011, 1026, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 717*

Liability insurance carrier, who significantly participated in uncontested proceeding against its insured resulting in nondisclosure agreement and covenant not to execute, and who stood to gain financially from agreement, as collaterally estopped from relitigating issues of liability and damages in separate action. *National Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Lynette C. (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1452-1453, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 496*

Privity for collateral estoppel purposes found between Department of Motor Vehicles and prosecution in prior criminal action on issue of lawfulness of arrest when both represented government's interest in protecting public from persons driving under influence. *Zapata v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 108, 115, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855*

Nonparty should reasonably be expected to be bound if he or she had in reality contested prior action even if he or she did not make formal appearance; thus, collateral estoppel as having been applied against nonparties who had a

proprietary or financial interest in, and control of, prior action and as applicable when nonparty has such an interest in determination of question of fact or law with reference to same subject matter or transaction. *Ceresino v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 814, 820, 264 Cal. Rptr. 30*

When probate litigation between son of decedent and son's creditor over disposition of estate assets results in judgment adjudicating creditor's rights, son's children (decedent's grandchildren) as bound by adjudication, notwithstanding their status as beneficiaries of trust created by decedent's will; rights of grandchildren as accruing solely through estate, which was party to first action and consequently bound. *Estate of Baumann (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 927, 935, 247 Cal. Rptr. 532*

Agents and officials of same government as in privity with one another. *Carmel Valley Fire Protection Dist. v. State of California (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 521, 535-536, 234 Cal. Rptr. 795*

Spouse of party to prior action as in privity with that party for purposes of issue preclusion when prior litigation was community in nature. *Mueller v. J.C. Penney Co. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 713, 723-724, 219 Cal. Rptr. 272*

[12] Proof of Defense

Action as not barred by res judicata when defendant did not present any evidence to support its contention that factual issues in case at bench were finally litigated in earlier action. *Santa Clara County Environmental Health Assn. v. County of Santa Clara (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 74, 83-84, 218 Cal. Rptr. 678*

[13] Requirement of Final Judgment

[a] Demurrer

Judgment on general demurrer as having effect of bar in new action in which complaint states same facts that were held not to constitute cause of action on former demurrer or, notwithstanding differences in facts alleged, when ground on which demurrer in former action was sustained is equally applicable to second action. *McKinney v. County of Santa Clara (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 787, 794, 168 Cal. Rptr. 89*

[b] Dismissal

Plaintiffs' voluntary dismissal with prejudice of municipal court complaint after they had filed virtually identical complaint in superior court as constituting determination on merits and as res judicata, thus barring superior court action; request for dismissal with prejudice as not depending on consideration and as operating as retraxit, barring new action on same subject matter. *Roybal v. University Ford (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1080, 1085-1087, 255 Cal. Rptr. 469*

Dismissal of action on court's own motion under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310* and *583.360* as dismissal without prejudice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 581(b)(4), (g)* and, hence, as not barring subsequent action under doctrine of res judicata or collateral estoppel. *Ashworth v. Memorial Hospital (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1046, 1063 ns.2, 3, 1063-1064, 254 Cal. Rptr. 104*

For res judicata pruposes, dismissal for failure to obey court's discovery orders as having effect of judgment on merits against plaintiff. *Bernstein v. Allstate Insurance Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 449, 451, 173 Cal. Rptr. 841 , cert. denied, 454 U.S. 966, 102 S. Ct. 508, 70 L. Ed. 2d 382*

Order of dismissal based on plaintiff's failure to amend complaint within specified time as not judgment on merits, therefore as not res judicata. *Kanarek v. Bugliosi (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333-334, 166 Cal. Rptr. 526*

[b.1] Retraxit

At common law, "retraxit" was open and voluntary renunciation of suit in open court; primary features of common law retraxit were that it was made by plaintiff in person and in open court; dismissal with prejudice is modern name for common law retraxit; retraxit invokes principles of res judicata; retraxit is judgment on merits preventing subsequent action on dismissed claim; because it invokes principles of res judicata, however, retraxit only bars claims dismissed with prejudice between same parties or their privies; settlement and dismissal with prejudice of action operated as retraxit so as to invoke doctrine of res judicata. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 733-736, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*

[c] Stipulation

When parties have consented or stipulated to dismissal of previous action after compromise or settlement of case, issue and scope of settlement agreement as required to be determined before application of res judicata doctrine. *Nakash v. Superior Court (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 59, 67, 241 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Dismissal, when filed in return for consideration from defendant, as complete bar to any future actions on same controversy and as having same legal effect as common law retraxit. *Gates v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 301, 311, 223 Cal. Rptr. 678*

Judgment by stipulation as equivalent to judgment after trial for purpose of applying bar of res judicata. *De Weese v. Unick (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 100, 105, 162 Cal. Rptr. 259*

[d] Summary Judgment

Partial summary judgment, not entered as judgment, is not final. *Kirkpatrick v. Westamerica Bank (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 982, 990-991, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 876*

Summary judgment on complaint is judgment on merits. *Lumpkin v. Jordan (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1230, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303*

Judgment entered on motion for summary judgment as determination that there is no factual dispute and one party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; such judgment as final and conclusive a determination of merits as judgment after trial and, once final, as res judicata. *Stuart v. Lilves (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1215, 1219, 258 Cal. Rptr. 780*

Order denying motion for summary judgment as not final judgment and not res judicata. *De La Pena v. Wolfe (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 481, 485, 223 Cal. Rptr. 325*

[14] Small Claims Courts

Although small claims judgment may not be given issue preclusion effect with regard to common questions arising in subsequent proceeding on different cause of action, when losing defendant in small claims action invokes his or her right of appeal to superior court and when superior court conducts a trial de novo and enters judgment against appealing defendant, doctrine of issue preclusion as precluding defendant from raising issues decided in such trial de novo in

subsequent proceeding. *Perez v. City of San Bruno (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 875, 884-885, 168 Cal. Rptr. 114, 616 P.2d 1287*

Under rule against splitting cause of action, which is application of doctrine of res judicata, judgment of small claims court held to bar subsequent suit on same cause of action. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 914, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*

Issue preclusion does not apply to small claims court judgment or superior court judgment after a hearing de novo in an action arising under the Small Claims Act (*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.*); holding of *Perez v. City of San Bruno (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 875, 168 Cal. Rptr. 114, 616 P.2d 1287* , that collateral estoppel applies to superior court judgment entered after trial de novo on appeal from small claims judgment, is no longer sound due to enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b).* *Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Company (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1050-1053, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*

Small claims judgment does not invoke issue preclusion as to later actions. *Foothills Townhome Assn. v. Christiansen (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516*

Small claims decisions as having only limited collateral estoppel effect as to issues actually litigated and as not res judicata. *Jellinek v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 652, 659, 279 Cal. Rptr. 6*

[15] Summary Judgment Motion

Defense of res judicata is properly raised by motion for summary judgment and is ground on which to grant summary judgment. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 914, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*

Summary judgment is appropriate remedy when doctrine of res judicata in its subsidiary form of collateral estoppel refutes all triable issues of fact suggested by pleadings. *Gill v. Hughes (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1299, 1304, 278 Cal. Rptr. 306*

Plea of res judicata is properly raised by motion for summary judgment. *Roybal v. University Ford (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1080, 1088, 255 Cal. Rptr. 469*

[16] Waiver of Defense

Rule against splitting single cause of action so as to make it basis of several suits is, in part, application of doctrine of res judicata; because prohibition against splitting cause of action exists for defendant's benefit, defendant may waive it; under facts, however, waiver not found. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 909, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*

Plaintiff's failure to raise res judicata as defense in plaintiff's pleadings or at trial resulted in waiver of defense. *Parker v. Walker (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 1173, 1191, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 908* (defense based on order of final distribution of decedent's estate waived when not raised in subsequent *Prob. Code § 9860* petition claiming estate property or at trial)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelJudicial EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsFull Faith

& CreditGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionCriminal Law & ProcedureDouble JeopardyCollateral Estoppel

82 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.43

§ 491.43 Law Reviews

Heiser, *California's Confusing Collateral Estoppel (Issue Preclusion) Doctrine, 35 San Diego L. Rev. 509 (1998)*

Heiser, *California's Unpredictable Res Judicata (Claim Preclusion) Doctrine, 35 San Diego L. Rev. 559 (1998)*

Richards, *Richards v. Jefferson County: The Supreme Court Stems the Crimson Tide of Res Judicata, 38 Santa Clara L. Rev. 645 (1998)*

Crosby, *Administrative Collateral Estoppel in California: A Critical Evaluation of People v. Sims, 40 Hastings L.J. 907 (1989)*

Kamp, *The History Behind Hansberry v. Lee, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 481 (1987)*

Note, *Avoiding Issue Preclusion by Settlement Conditioned Upon the Vacatur of Entered Judgments, 96 Yale L.J. 860 (1987)*

Note, *The Impact of Collateral Estoppel on Postjudgment Settlements, 15 Sw. L. Rev. 343 (1985)*

Comment, *Alternative Grounds in Collateral Estoppel, 17 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 1085 (1984)*

Note, *Collateral Estoppel Effect of Administrative Agency Decisions on Subsequent Criminal Proceedings: People v. Sims, 10 Pepperdine L. Rev. 875 (1983)*

Note, *Preclusion of Nonparties: A Due Process Violation? 13 Sw. L. Rev. 169 (1982)*

Callen and Kadue, *To Bury Mutuality, Not to Praise It: An Analysis of Collateral Estoppel After Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore, 31 Hastings L.J. 755 (1980)*

George, *Sweet Uses of Adversity: Parklane Hosiery and the Collateral Class Action, 32 Stan. L. Rev. 655 (1980)*

Note, *Offensive Assertion of Collateral Estoppel by Persons Opting Out of a Class Action, 31 Hastings L.J. 1189 (1980)*

Comment, *Res Judicata and Section 1983: The Effect of State Court Judgments on Federal Civil Rights Actions, 27 UCLA L. Rev. 177 (1979)*

Comment, *Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel Beneath the Corporate Veil, 66 Cal. L. Rev. 1093 (1978)*

Note, *Res Judicata: New Standards for Evaluating the Effect of a Change in Law After Judgment, 30 Hastings L.J. 191 (1978)*

Note, *The Collateral Estoppel Effect of Prior State Court Findings in Cases Within Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction, 91 Harv. L. Rev. 1281 (1978)*

McCoid, *A Single Package for Multiparty Disputes, 28 Stan. L. Rev. 707 (1976)*

Note, *Section 5(a) of the Clayton Act and Offensive Collateral Estoppel in Antitrust Damage Actions, 85 Yale L.J. 541 (1976)*

Note *Use of the Bifurcated Trial to Avoid Collateral Estoppel and the Expanding Concept of Final Judgment, 7 Sw. L. Rev. 161 (1975)*

Note, *The Res Judicata Effect of Declaratory Relief in the Federal Courts, 46 S. Cal. L. Rev. 803 (1973)*

Nellis, *Avoiding Collateral Estoppel in California Multiple Party Tort Litigation, 9 Cal. W.L. Rev. 115 (1972)*

Hazard *Res Nova in Res Judicata, 44 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1036 (1971)*

Comment, *Nonparties and Preclusion by Judgment: The Privity Rule Reconsidered, 56 Calif. L. Rev. 1098 (1968)*

Comment, *Res Judicata and the Bifurcated Negligence Trial, 16 UCLA L. Rev. 203 (1968)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsCollateral EstoppelAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsFederal JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes Judicata

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.44

§ 491.44 Text References

Restatement (Second) of Judgments, §§ 13-33

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 918, 1053, 1054, vol. 7, *Judgment*, § 280 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 491.45-491.49

[Reserved]

§§ 491.45[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.50

§ 491.50 Demurrer to Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(a), 430.40(a)]--On Ground That No Cause of Action Is Stated [Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)] Because Action Is Precluded by Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM Demurrer to Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(a), 430.40(a)]--On Ground That No Cause of Action Is Stated [Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)] Because Action Is Precluded by Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DEMURRER OF _____ [*name*] TO
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT OF _____ [*name*]
vs.	)	AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

[*EITHER, if merger is defense*]

Defendant demurs to the complaint herein on the ground that it does not state facts sufficient to state a cause of action, in that it appears on the face thereof that _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)] [, with whom plaintiff is in privity,] obtained a final judgment on the merits in the action referred to in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Paragraph 3] of the complaint, and that the cause of action asserted in the action was merged in the judgment and is the same cause of action asserted in this action, and that plaintiff may not therefore maintain this action.

[*OR, if bar is defense*]

Defendant demurs to the complaint herein on the ground that it does not state facts sufficient to state a cause of action, in that it appears on the face thereof that _____ [defendant *or* _____(*specify other party in privity with defendant*)] [, with whom defendant is in privity,] obtained a final judgment on the merits against _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)] [, with whom plaintiff is in privity,] in the action referred to in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Paragraph 3] of the complaint and that the cause of action asserted in this action is the same as that asserted in the former action, and that the judgment rendered in the former action is a bar to the maintenance of this action.

[*OR, if collateral estoppel is defense*]

Defendant demurs to the complaint herein on the ground that it does not state facts sufficient to state a cause of action in that it appears on the face thereof that this action involves only the issue(s) of _____ [*specify issue or issues involved in present action*]; and that the issue(s) _____ [was *or* were] actually and necessarily determined in the former action referred to in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Paragraph 3] of the complaint, in favor of _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*specify other party*)] [, with whom defendant is in privity,] and against _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)] [, with whom plaintiff is in privity,] and final judgment on the merits was rendered therein so that such issue(s) cannot therefore be relitigated in this action.

[WHEREFORE, defendant prays that this demurrer be sustained without leave to amend, that plaintiff take nothing by his/her complaint, that defendant have judgment for his/her costs, and for all other proper relief.]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting demurrer*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of general demurrer in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant to object to a complaint on the ground that it does not state a cause of action in that the cause of action is precluded by a prior judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e),*

1908(a)].

The demurrer must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum in support of each ground thereof [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(c)*; for discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*]. It must also be accompanied by a notice of hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320(c)*; for a form of notice of hearing, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadngs*].

Counsel should select one of the three alternative paragraphs in the body of the form, depending on whether the demurrer is based on (1) merger, (2) bar, or (3) collateral estoppel [for discussion of these terms, *see § 491.11*]. The form contains an optional prayer; a prayer to a demurrer is not required but is frequently included.

This form should only be used if the facts giving rise to the defense of res judicata appear on the face of the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*]. Reference by the plaintiff to the prior judgment in the complaint, aided by judicial notice, sufficiently raises the issue of res judicata, justifying an order sustaining a demurrer [*Legg v. United Benefit Life Ins. Co. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 573, 580-581, 6 Cal. Rptr. 73]* . The court can consider a prior judgment by judicial notice on defendant's general demurrer to determine whether the prior judgment bars the action [*Lazzarone v. Bank of America (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 581, 590, 226 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Otherwise, the defendant may raise the res judicata issue by way of affirmative defense in the answer [for forms of affirmative defense, *see §§ 491.51 -491.55*].

[3] Specification of Ground of Objection

A demurrer must distinctly specify the grounds on which any of the objections to the complaint are taken and unless it does so, it may be disregarded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.60*]. Nevertheless, a general demurrer expressed in the words of *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)* need not specify particulars in which the complaint fails to state facts constituting a cause of action [*Burke v. Maguire (1908) 154 Cal. 456, 462-463, 98 P. 21* ; *Patton v. Board of Harbor Commissioners (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 536, 544 n.7, 91 Cal. Rptr. 832]* . Therefore, as an alternative to form of demurrer in [1], *above*, stating specific res judicata grounds, the defendant may simply demur on the ground that the complaint does not state a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*; for further discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to demurrers, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*

For a memorandum supporting a demurrer to a complaint for wrongful death on the ground that a wrongful death action is barred by a previous action, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 66, *Death and Survival Actions*

For a memorandum supporting a demurrer to a complaint based on res judicata in a declaratory relief action, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 67, *Declaratory Relief*

For a memorandum supporting a demurrer to a complaint on the ground that the action is barred by a prior judgment, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 71, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*

For a memorandum opposing a demurrer to a complaint on the ground that an action on a state claim is not barred by a prior judgment when a federal court in a prior action declined to exercise pendent jurisdiction over the claim, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 71, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*

For a memorandum supporting a demurrer to a complaint against a guardian for money not accounted for by the guardian on the ground that an approved final accounting is res judicata, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 106,

Guardianship and Conservatorship

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 918 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.51

§ 491.51 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Cause of Action Was Merged in Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Cause of Action Was Merged in Prior Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], an action was commenced by _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)] [, with whom plaintiff is in privity,] against _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with defendant*)] [, with whom defendant is in privity,] in an action entitled _____ [*specify title of prior action*] in the Superior Court of California, _____ County, Case number _____.

2. Judgment in the action was duly rendered on the merits in favor of _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)], [with whom plaintiff is in privity,] the Court having jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter; the judgment became final on _____ [*date*], prior to the filing of this action. _____ [*Specify whether defendant in prior action appealed from judgment, and if defendant appealed, note the disposition of the appeal, e.g.,* The judgment has never been appealed from and the time for appealing has expired]. The judgment has never been vacated or modified. A certified copy of the judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.

3. The cause of action asserted in this action involves the same cause of action as that decided in the former action.

4. By reason of the aforesaid, the cause of action asserted by plaintiff in this action has been merged in the judgment and the judgment is res judicata of this action.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege that the cause of action has merged with a prior action. For further discussion relating to an swers generally, including general forms of answer into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Merger

Merger is the concept that a cause of action that has been reduced to judgment has merged in the judgment, so that another action based on the same cause cannot be asserted. The doctrine serves to protect a defendant who has been unsuccessful in litigating a cause of action; the successful plaintiff is precluded from bringing successive lawsuits against the defendant based on the same cause [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 973, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* .

[4] Contents

This form of affirmative defense alleges the existence of a prior action against the defendant or another party in privity with the defendant (Paragraph 1); that such action was final (Paragraph 2); that the cause of action asserted in the present action involves the same cause of action as that decided in the former action (Paragraph 3); and that the former judgment is res judicata (Paragraph 4) [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* (stating that only a final judgment on merits between same parties or their privies and on the same cause of action is entitled to res judicata effect of merger)].

[5] Pleading Prior Judgment

When a judgment or order of a court is conclusive, the judgment or order must be alleged in the pleadings if there is an opportunity to do so. If there is no such opportunity, the judgment or order may be used in evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908.5*].

In pleading a judgment, it is not necessary to state the facts conferring jurisdiction, but such judgment or determination may be stated to have been duly given or made and to have become final (*see* Paragraph 2). If such allegation is controverted, the party pleading must establish on the trial the facts conferring jurisdiction and creating finality [*Code Civ. Proc. § 456*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the format of answers, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading,* § 1053, 1054; Vol. 7, *Judgment,* § 342 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.52

§ 491.52 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Prior Judgment for Defendant [or Defendant's Privy] Bars Present Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Prior Judgment for Defendant [or Defendant's Privy] Bars Present Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], an action was commenced by _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with plaintiff*)] [, with whom plaintiff is in privity,] against _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with defendan* t)] [, with whom defendant is in privity,] in an action entitled _____ [*specify title of prior action*] in the Superior Court of California, _____ County, Case number _____.

2. Judgment in the action was duly rendered on the merits in favor of _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*specify other party in privity with defendant*)] [, with whom defendant is in privity], the Court having jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter; the judgment became final on _____ [*date*], prior to the filing of this action. _____ [*State whether plaintiff in prior action appealed from judgment, and if plaintiff appealed, note the disposition of the appeal, e.g.,* The judgment has never been appealed from and the time for appealing has expired]. The judgment has never been vacated or modified. A certified copy of the judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.

3. The cause of action asserted in this action involves the same cause of action as that decided in the former action.

4. By reason of the aforesaid, the cause of action asserted by plaintiff in this action is barred by the judgment rendered in the prior action, and the judgment is res judicata of the cause of action asserted herein.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege that the cause of action is barred by a prior action. For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Bar

Bar occurs when one who has maintained a cause of action has been unsuccessful and judgment has been rendered for the defendant in that action. The judgment operates as a bar to the later assertion of the same cause of action [*Panos v. Great Western Packing Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 636, 639-640, 134 P.2d 242* ; *Louie Queriolo Trucking, Inc. v. Superior Court (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 194, 200, 60 Cal. Rptr. 389]* .

[4] Contents

This form of affirmative defense alleges the existence of a prior action against the defendant or another party in privity with the defendant (Paragraph 1); that such action was final (Paragraph 2); that the cause of action asserted in the present action involves the same cause of action as the former action (Paragraph 3); and that the former judgment is res judicata (Paragraph 4) [*see* *Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* (stating that only a final judgment on merits between same parties or their privies and on the same cause of action is entitled to res judicata effect of merger)].

[5] Cross References

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.51[2]* et seq.

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 1053, 1054; Vol. 7, *Judgment*, § 348 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.53

§ 491.53 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Judgment for Employee Defendant in Prior Action Bars Present Action Against Employer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Judgment for Employee Defendant in Prior Action Bars Present Action Against Employer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], a complaint in a previous cause of action was filed by plaintiff against _____ [*name of defendant's employee*], the action being filed in the _____[*specify court*] and numbered _____ in the files and records thereof.

2. _____ [*Recite allegations of prior complaint and specify any denials and affirmative defenses offered by employee, e.g.,* In the complaint, plaintiff alleged negligence by _____ (*name of defendant's employee*), proximately causing damage to plaintiff. In an answer to this complaint, which was duly filed by _____ (*name of defendant's employee*), he/she denied his/her own negligence, and, by affirmative defense, alleged contributory negligence on the part of plaintiff].

3. Trial was duly had in the previous action, the Court having jurisdiction of the persons and subject matter thereof, and judgment against plaintiff and in favor of defendant therein, on the merits thereof, was duly rendered in favor of the defendant, on findings that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* there was no negligence on the part of defendant and that there was contributory negligence on the part of plaintiff].

4. Judgment in the action became final on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*State whether plaintiff in prior action appealed from judgment, and if plaintiff appealed, note the disposition of the appeal, e.g.,* The judgment has never been appealed from and the time for appealing has expired]. The judgment has never been vacated or modified.

5. A certified copy of judgment roll in the prior action is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.

6. Defendant admits that at the time of _____ [*specify incident at issue, e.g.,* the accident] as alleged in the complaint, _____ [*name of defendant's employee*] was acting as an employee of defendant.

7. By reason of the aforesaid, plaintiff cannot assert the purported cause of action herein; the judgment is res judicata.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege that the cause of action is barred by a prior action against the defendant's employee [*see City of Los Angeles v. Superior Court (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 143, 154, 149 Cal. Rptr. 320* ; *Barrabee v. Crescenta Mutual Water Co. (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 192, 195-196, 198 P.2d 558* (judgment in favor of defendant for whom another party is vicariously liable is res judicata as to other party if judgment was based on merits)]. For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Cross References

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.51[2] et seq. and § 491.52* et seq.

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 7, *Judgment,* § 409 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.54

§ 491.54 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Basic Issue Between Parties Was Determined in Former Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Basic Issue Between Parties Was Determined in Former Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], and prior to the filing of the within action, an action was commenced against _____, [*name*] [the defendant in the present action,] in the _____ [*specify court*], the prior action being numbered _____ in the files and records of the Court.

2. The prior action was brought by _____, [*name*] [_____ the plaintiff in the present action,] and was based on _____ [*specify, e.g.,* personal injuries sustained in a motor vehicle accident in which _____ (*name of plaintiff in prior action*) was the operator of one of the vehicles involved and defendant the operator of the other].

3. One of the issues necessarily determined in the prior action was _____ [*specify issue in present action that was determined in prior action, e.g.,* whether defendant was negligent in the operation of his/her motor vehicle].

[4. Although the plaintiff in this action was not a party to the former action, the plaintiff in this action controlled the former action and had a _____ (proprietary *and/o* r financial) interest in the _____ (judgment *or* determination of a question of _____ (law *or* fact) with reference to _____ (*specify matter or transaction in prior action that is also at issue in the present action*)).]

[5. Although the defendant in this action was not a party to the former action, the defendant controlled the prior action and had a _____ (proprietary *and/or* financial) interest in the _____ (judgment *or*

determination of a question of _____ (law *or* fact) with reference to _____ (*specify matter or transaction in prior action that is also at issue in the present action*)). Plaintiff had notice of the defendant's participation in the prior action.]

6. In the prior action, the Court having jurisdiction of the parties and subject matter, judgment was rendered on the merits for _____, [*name*] [the defendant in the present action,] on findings that [_____ *specify, e.g.,* defendant was not negligent in the operation of his/her motor vehicle]. A certified copy of the judgment roll in the action is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof. Judgment in the action became final on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*State whether losing party in prior action appealed from judgment, and if losing party appealed, note the disposition of the appeal, e.g.,* The judgment has never been appealed from and the time for appealing has expired]. The judgment has never been vacated or modified.

7. The instant action is one for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* wrongful death of the plaintiff in prior action] and liability of defendant is predicated on and depends on _____ [*specify, e.g.,* his/her asserted negligence in the accident].

8. By reason of the aforesaid, and the determination in the prior action that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant was not negligent in the operation of his vehicle in the accident], plaintiff is estopped to assert _____ [*specify, e.g.,* negligence] and to maintain this action.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege that an issue or issues in the action have already been adjudicated in a prior action based on a different cause of action. For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Issue Preclusion

Issue preclusion, also known as collateral estoppel, bars parties or their privies from relitigating in a new proceeding on a different cause of action issues litigated in a prior proceeding [*In re Russell (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 115 Cal. Rptr. 511, 524 P.2d 1295]* . Under issue preclusion, the prior judgment is not a complete bar, but it operates against the party against whom it was obtained as an estoppel or conclusive adjudication as to such issues in the second action as were actually litigated and determined in the first action [*Henn v. Henn (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 323, 329-330, 161 Cal. Rptr. 502, 605 P.2d 10]* .

Three requirements must be met before issue preclusion can be applied [*Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* ; :

- The issue necessarily decided at the previous proceeding must be identical to the one that is sought to be relitigated.

- The previous proceeding must have resulted in a final judgment on the merits.

- The party against whom collateral estoppel is asserted must be party or in privity with a party at the prior proceeding.

The person asserting issue preclusion has the burden of proof that each of the requirements for application of the doctrine have been met [*Vella v. Hudgins (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 251, 257, 142 Cal. Rptr. 414, 572 P.2d 28]* .

For additional discussion, see *§ 491.15*.

[4] Contents

The form of affirmative defense alleges, in part, the existence of a prior action in which final judgment was rendered on the merits (Paragraphs 1, 2 and 6); the issue necessarily determined in the prior action (Paragraph 3); the issue in the present action that was adjudicated in the prior action (Paragraph 7); and the applicability of estoppel (Paragraph 8) [*see Producers Dairy Delivery Co. v. Sentry Ins. Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 903, 910, 226 Cal. Rptr. 558, 718 P.2d 920* (listing requirements for collateral estoppel)].

The form also includes two optional paragraphs that should be used if the plaintiff (Paragraph 4) or defendant (Paragraph 5) were not parties to the previous action but controlled the action. A person who is not a party but who controls an action, individually or in cooperation with others, is bound by the adjudications of litigated matters as if he or she were a party if he or she has a proprietary or financial interest in the judgment or in the determination of a question of fact or law with reference to the same subject matter or transaction. If the other party has notice of his or her participation, the other party is equally bound [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*; for a form of notice of motion to bind a nonparty on a judgment, *see § 491.56*].

[5] Cross References

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.51[2]* et seq.

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 7, *Judgment,* § 354 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.55

§ 491.55 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Plaintiff's Asserted Remedy and Cause of Action Barred by Previous Judgment--Attempt to Split Single Cause of Action

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Plaintiff's Asserted Remedy and Cause of Action Barred by Previous Judgment--Attempt to Split Single Cause of Action

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff filed an action against defendant, in the _____ [*specify court*], which action was numbered _____ in the files and records of the Court.

2. The purported cause of action in the previous suit was, and is, identical to the cause of action asserted by plaintiff in the complaint on file herein.

3. In the previous suit, plaintiff _____ [*state relief sought by plaintiff in prior action, e.g.,* sought to have a deed to certain real property located in _____ County set aside on the ground of fraud].

4. Reference is hereby made to the judgment roll of the former action, including the pleadings and judgment therein, a certified copy of which roll is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.

5. The remedy plaintiff seeks in this action, that is, _____ [*specify, e.g.,* setting aside of the deed on the ground of undue influence], is a remedy arising out of the identical purported cause of action between plaintiff and defendant in the former action and one that plaintiff could have sought in the action.

6. The judgment rendered in the previous suit has, prior to the filing of the within pleading, become final. _____ [*State whether losing party in prior action appealed from judgment, and if losing party appealed, note the disposition of the appeal, e.g.,* The judgment has never been appealed from and the time for appealing has expired]. The judgment has never been vacated or modified.

7. By reason of the aforesaid, plaintiff is estopped from seeking the relief he/she seeks in this action.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer, to allege that plaintiff's asserted cause of action is identical to a cause of action asserted by plaintiff against defendant in a previous suit. The form is designed for the specific situation in which a plaintiff attempts to split a single cause of action into separate causes of action [*see Wulfjen v. Dolton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 891, 894, 151 P.2d 846* (party prohibited from splitting up single cause of action and making it the basis of separate suits); *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 914, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* (rule against plaintiff splitting single cause of action is, in part, an application of doctrine of res judicata; judgment of small claims court held to bar subsequent suit on same cause of action)].

[3] Cross References

For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms of answer into which the this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.51[2] et seq. and § 491.52* et seq.

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 4, *Pleading,* § 35 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.56

§ 491.56 Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER DETERMINING THAT NONPARTY BE BOUND BY JUDGMENT, DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], and SUPPPORTING MEMORANDUM
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order that the judgment _____ [entered *or* to be entered] in the above-entitled action be entered as a binding judgment on _____ [*identify party to be bound*]. The motion will be made on the ground that _____ [*identify party to be bound*] has a financial or proprietary interest in the judgment _____ [rendered *or* to be rendered] and, although not a party thereto, controls or participates in the control of such action.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

1. I, _____ [*name*], declare:

2. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the attorney of record for defendant in the above-entitled action *or other statement as appropriate*].

3. _____ [*State evidentiary facts with particularity, to establish that nonparty sought to be bound controls or participates in the control of the above-entitled action*].

4. _____ [*State evidentiary facts with particularity, to establish that the declarant has personal knowledge of the foregoing facts and is competent to testify to such facts under oath*].

[5. I have personal knowledge of the foregoing facts, and if called as a witness can and will competently testify to them under oath.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion and supporting declaration in [1], *above*, are for use to obtain a determination that a judgment is binding on a nonparty who controls or participates in the control of the action. The motion must be brought before the judgment becomes final. If not, the determination may be made in a separate action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 491.14[5][d]*.

A memorandum must be filed and a copy served with this form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of procedures and additional forms for use in making motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.57

§ 491.57 Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order That Nonparty Be Bound by Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order that _____ [*identify party to be bound*] be bound by the judgment _____ [entered *or* to be entered] in the above-entitled

action came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that the judgment entered in the case of _____ [*identify case by name, court, and docket number*] be binding on _____ [*identify party to be bound*].

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the judgment in the above-entitled action be entered in accordance with this order.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use in proceedings to establish that a judgment is conclusive on a nonparty who controls an action. It includes an optional paragraph for use, when appropriate, to direct that judgment be entered pursuant to such determination [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1908(b)*].

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.56[2] et seq. and § 491.52* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.58

§ 491.58 Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SEP-
Plaintiff,	)	ARATE TRIAL OF SPECIAL DEFENSE, DE-
vs.	)	CLARATION OF _____ [*name*],
_____ [*name*],	)	and
Defendant.	)	SUPPPORTING MEMORANDUM
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff]] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 597* for the separate trial of the special defense pleaded in defendant's answer that plaintiff's action is barred by res judicata. The motion will be made on the ground that the special defense of res judicata constitutes a complete bar to the action, and a separate trial thereof will eliminate the need, time, and expense of a regular trial of the action.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use when a defendant or cross defendant seeks a separate, prior trial of the defense of bar of a prior judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 597*]. When the answer pleads any of several special defenses, among them that the action is barred by a prior judgment, the court may, either on the court's own motion or on the motion of any party, proceed to the trial of that special defense before the trial of any other issue in the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 597*].

A memorandum of points and authorities must be filed and a copy served with this form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Cross References

For a related form of order, see *§ 491.59*

For further discussion and forms relating to separate trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 597* generally, see *Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions, § 3.110* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to motions and orders generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 491 RES JUDICATA
PART IV. FORMS

43-491 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 491.59

§ 491.59 Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Requiring Separate Trial of Special Defense of Res Judicata [Code Civ. Proc. § 597]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order for a separate trial of the special defense of res judicata came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared

by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and the separate trial of the special defense of res judicata be had before trial of other issues herein.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, may be used when the court grants a motion for separate trial of the special defense that an action is barred by res judicata [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 597*; for the related form of notice of motion, *see § 491.58*].

[3] Decision or Verdict After Special Trial

If, on separate trial of the special defense, the decision or verdict is in favor of the defendant pleading it, then judgment for that defendant must thereupon be entered; and no trial of other issues in the case may be had againt that defendant unless the judgment is reversed on appeal or is set aside or otherwise vacated. If, however, this decision or verdict is in the plaintiff's favor, then trial of the other issues must thereafter be had, either on the court's own motion or on the motion of any party; and judgment must thereafter be entered thereon in the same manner and with the same effect as if all of the issues in the case had been tried at one time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 597*]. In the event of a decision or verdict in the plaintiff's favor, any and all decisions and verdicts on the special defense and all rulings on the trial of it are deemed excepted to, and they may be reviewed on a motion for a new trial or on appeal from the final judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 597*].

[4] Cross References

For forms of judgment for use after a separate trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*, see *Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions, § 3.110* et seq.

For additional discussion and references, see *§ 491.51[2] et seq. and § 491.58* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 492.syn

§ 492.syn Synopsis to Chapter 492: REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF

§ 492.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 492.02 Cross References

§§ 492.03-492.09 [Reserved]

§ 492.10 Governing Law

§ 492.11 Definitions

§ 492.12 Nature and Purpose of Writ of Review

§ 492.13 Other Writs Compared

[1] Writ of Prohibition

[2] Writ of Mandate or Administrative Mandate

[3] Writ of Habeas Corpus

§ 492.14 Alternative or Mislabeled Petitions

§ 492.15 Parties to Proceeding for Writ of Review

§ 492.16 Original Jurisdiction to Issue Writ

§ 492.17 Refusal to Exercise Original Jurisdiction

[1] When Lower Court Has Concurrent Jurisdiction

[2] For Unreasonable Delay in Bringing Petition

§ 492.18 Grounds for Issuance of Writ of Review

[1] In General

[2] Judicial Function

[a] Act Must Be Completed

[b] Act Must Be in Exercise of Constitutionally Conferred Judicial Power

[c] Acts of Most Administrative Agencies Excluded

[3] No Appeal

[a] In General

[b] Lack of Appeal Not Shown

[i] Interlocutory Orders

[ii] Lapse of Time for Appeal

[c] Lack of Appeal Shown

[i] Decision of Superior Court Appellate Department

[ii] Nonappealable Arbitration Orders

[iii] Contempt Orders

[iv] Small Claims Judgments

[v] Particular Probate Orders

[4] No Other Plain, Speedy, and Adequate Remedy

[5] Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

[a] Jurisdiction Defined

[b] Errors in Exercise of Jurisdiction Distinguished

[c] Failure to Follow Statutory Procedure

[d] Refusal to Follow Stare Decisis

[e] Nonexistence of Jurisdictional Facts

[6] Beneficial Interest of Petitioner

§ 492.19 Stay of Proceedings Pending Disposition of Writ

§ 492.20 Petition for Writ of Review

[1] General Rules of Pleading Apply

[2] Contents

[3] Verification

[4] Accompanying Papers

[a] Points and Authorities

[b] Record of Proceedings Below

[c] Proof of Service of Petition

[d] Proposed Order and Writ

[e] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

§ 492.21 Ex Parte Petition for Writ of Review

§ 492.22 Service of Petition

§ 492.23 Initial Opposition to Petition

§ 492.24 Summary Denial of Petition

§ 492.25 Grant of Petition

[1] Issuance of Writ

[2] Form and Contents of Writ

[3] Service of Writ

§ 492.26 Return of Writ With Required Transcript

[1] By Respondent

[2] Burden on Petitioner to Insure Timely Return

[3] Proceedings for Further Return of Transcript

§ 492.27 Return by Demurrer or Answer to Writ

[1] By Respondent or Real Party in Interest

[2] Time for Return

[3] Return by Demurrer

[4] Return by Answer

§ 492.28 Scope of Review

[1] In General

[2] Existence of Jurisdictional Facts

[3] Petitioner's Burden on Review

[4] Contempt Orders

§ 492.29 Judgment

§ 492.30 Finality of Writ or Order Issued by Reviewing Court

§ 492.31 Costs

[1] Generally Allowed

[2] No Award on Summary Denial

[3] Not Charged to Respondent Court

§ 492.32 Subsequent Review of Writ Proceedings

§§ 492.33-492.49 [Reserved]

§ 492.50 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 492.51 State Constitution

§ 492.52 State Statutes

§ 492.53 California Rules of Court

§ 492.54 Local Rules of the Courts of Appeal

§ 492.55 Local Rules of Court

[1] Los Angeles County

[2] Sacramento County

§ 492.56 Decisions

[1] Burden of Insuring Adequate Return to Writ

[2] Grounds for Issuance of Writ of Review

[a] Beneficial Interest

[b] Exercise of Judicial Function

[c] Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

[i] Burden of Establishing Jurisdiction

[ii] Error in Exercise of Jurisdiction Distinguished

[iii] Examples of Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

[iv] Jurisdiction Defined

[v] Nonexistence of Jurisdictional Facts Supporting Contempt Order

[d] No Appeal

[i] In General

[ii] Lack of Appeal Not Shown

[iii] Lack of Appeal Shown

[e] No Other Plain, Speedy, and Adequate Remedy

§ 492.57 Mislabeled Petitions

§ 492.58 Original Jurisdiction to Issue Writ

[1] In General

[2] Refusal to Exercise Jurisdiction for Delay

§ 492.59 Scope of Review

[1] In General

[2] Contempt Orders

§ 492.60 Summary Denial of Writ

§ 492.61 Law Reviews

§ 492.62 Text References

§§ 492.63-492.79 [Reserved]

§ 492.80 Petitioner's Checklist

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

[3] Prepare Petition for Writ of Review

[4] Prepare Proposed Order and Writ for Superior Court

[5] Prepare Points and Authorities

[5a] Prepare Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

[6] Serve Petition

[7] Prepare Proof of Service of Petition

[8] File Original Petition

[9] Consideration and Ruling on Petition

[10] Serve Writ of Review

[11] Insure Return of Certified Record

§ 492.81 Guide for Real Party in Interest

[1] Prepare Opposition to Petition

[2] Serve and File Opposition to Petition

[3] Return to Writ of Review: Answer or Demurrer

§ 492.82 Hearing and Posthearing Procedure

[1] Attend Hearing and Present Oral Argument, if Appropriate

[2] Prepare and Serve Proposed Judgment (Superior Court Only)

[3] Prepare Notice of Entry of Judgment (Superior Court Only)

[4] Prepare Costs Memorandum or Motion to Tax Costs

§ 492.83 Postjudgment Procedure

[1] Superior Court

[2] Appellate Court

§§ 492.84-492.99 [Reserved]

§ 492.100 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct.,

Rule 8.486]--Cover of Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Format

[4] Request for Stay

[5] Related Appeal Pending

[6] Proceeding Involving Unfair Competition Case

[7] California Rules of Court

[8] Local Rules of Courts of Appeal

§ 492.101 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486]--Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] General Rules of Pleading Apply

[5] Naming Respondent

[6] Request for Stay

[a] Pending Disposition of Writ

[b] Pending Disposition of Petition

[7] Verification

[8] Format of Petition

[a] Generally Subject to Requirements for Appellate Briefs

[b] Headings, References, Index, and Tables

[c] Format Requirements

[d] Word or Page Limit

[e] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

[9] Copies

[10] Attaching Complete Record

[11] Ex Parte Petition

[12] Service Requirements

[a] Methods of Service

[b] Proof of Service

[13] Petition for Writ of Review in the Alternative

[14] State Constitution

[15] State Statutes

[16] California Rules of Court

[17] Local Rules of the Courts of Appeal

[18] Decisions

[19] Law Reviews

[20] Text References

[21] Cross References

§ 492.102 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Petition

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Number of Copies

[4] Points and Authorities

[5] Service Requirements

[a] Prior Service Usually Required

[b] Applications Ex Parte

[6] State Statutes

[7] California Rules of Court

[8] Local Rules of Court

[a] Los Angeles County

[b] Sacramento County

[9] Cross Reference

§ 492.103 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Order Directing Issuance of Writ

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Number of Copies

[4] Notice of Order

[5] Cross Reference

§ 492.104 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071, 1072]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Stay of Proceedings

[4] Service of Writ

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 492.105 Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 492.106 Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross Reference

§ 492.107 Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)]--Demurrer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Effect of Demurrer

[4] Time for Making Return by Demurrer

[5] State Statutes

[6] California Rules of Court

[7] Cross References

§ 492.108 Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)]--Verified Answer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] California Rules of Court

[5] Cross References

§ 492.109 Judgment on Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Preparation of Written Judgment

[4] Notice of Entry of Judgment

[5] State Statutes

[6] California Rules of Court

[7] Cross References

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART I. SCOPE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.01

§ 492.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the special proceeding in state superior and appellate courts known as writ of review or writ of certiorari. It includes a procedural guide and the following forms:

- Petitions for the writ [*see §§ 492.100 -492.102*].
- Order granting a petition and directing issuance of the writ [*see § 492.103*].
- The writ [*see § 492.104*].
- Notice of motion and order for use in obtaining further return to the writ [*see §§ 492.105 -492.106*].
- Demurrer to the writ [*see § 492.107*].
- Verified answer to the writ [*see § 492.108*].
- Judgment affirming, modifying, or annulling the decision below following review on the writ [*see § 492.109*].

Specialized writs of review, used to review decisions of various administrative agencies, are discussed in the chapters pertaining to the particular agency. Thus, for discussion and forms relating to writs of review under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23090* and *23090.1* to review decisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* . For discussion and forms relating to writs of review under *Pub. Util. Code § 1756* to review decisions of the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* . For discussion and forms relating to writs of review under *Lab. Code § 5950* to review decisions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* . For discussion and forms relating to a similar proceeding for review of disciplinary actions by the State Bar, see Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* .

Petitions for review in the California Supreme Court and petitions for writ of certiorari in the United States Supreme

Court are both distinct from petitions for writ of review discussed in this chapter. For discussion and forms relating to these proceedings, see Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewLegal EthicsSanctionsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppealsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART I. SCOPE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.02

§ 492.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to writs of review to review decisions of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Board, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* .

For discussion and forms relating to appeals in civil actions generally, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* .

For discussion and a form relating to writs of review to review disciplinary actions by the State Bar, see Ch. 71, *Attorney Discipline* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of review, habeas corpus, and prohibition for review of contempt orders, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of habeas corpus, see Ch. 292, *Habeas Corpus* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of administrative mandamus to review decisions of public administrative agencies, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

For discussion and a form relating to writs of review to review decisions of the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* .

For discussion and forms relating to writs of review to review decisions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesProhibitionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewLegal EthicsSanctionsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppealsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART I. SCOPE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 492.03-492.09

[Reserved]

§§ 492.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.10

§ 492.10 Governing Law

Writs of review (certiorari) are governed generally by Cal. Const., art. VI, *§ 10, Code Civ. Proc.* §§ *1027, 1067-1077, 1107, 1108*, and, in appellate courts, by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.485-8.493*. Local appellate or superior court rules may also affect writ proceedings [*see, e.g.*, Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 1st App. Dist., Policy Statement A].

To the extent that they are consistent, the general provisions governing civil actions (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.10*) also apply to writ of review proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1109, 1110*]. Similarly, the civil law and motion rules for trial courts (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100-3.1390*) apply to writ of review proceedings in superior courts [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.11

§ 492.11 Definitions

A writ of "review" is synonymous with the common law writ of "certiorari" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1067*]. In conformity with code usage, this chapter uses the term "review," although the term "certiorari" is also in common use [*see, e.g., Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.485*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.12

§ 492.12 Nature and Purpose of Writ of Review

A writ of review is the method by which a superior or appellate court may examine a decision or other action by a lower court, a board, or an officer exercising judicial functions, when the latter has exceeded its jurisdiction and there is no right to appeal or any plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*]. The writ commands the respondent to certify fully to the reviewing court the transcript of the record and proceedings to be reviewed, and may, in addition, require the respondent to desist in the meantime from further proceedings in the matter to be reviewed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1070* (respondent is inferior tribunal, board, or officer, or any other person having custody of record or proceeding to be certified); *see also § 492.19*]. On full return of the writ, the court reviews the certified record and renders judgment affirming, annulling, or modifying the proceedings below [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*].

A writ of review proceeding constitutes a direct, and not a collateral, attack on the challenged judgment or order [*Great Western Power Co. v. Pillsbury (1915) 170 Cal. 180, 185, 149 P. 35]* .

Use of the writ of review proceeding is extremely limited in comparison with other writ proceedings, particularly writ of mandate proceedings [*see § 492.13[2]*]. This is because review is limited to jurisdictional issues involving a judicial action concerning which there is no right to appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1074*; *see § 492.18[2], [3], [5]*]. The circumstances under which a writ of review may be granted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1068* has been summarized by one court of appeal as "not very often" [*see Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1107, 231 Cal. Rptr. 189]* . Its most common use is to challenge a contempt order [*see § 492.18[3][c][iii]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.13

§ 492.13 Other Writs Compared

[1] Writ of Prohibition

A writ of prohibition arrests the proceedings of a tribunal, board, or person exercising judicial functions when such proceedings are in excess of jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1102*]. It will issue only to enjoin threatened judicial action and will not lie after judgment is entered where there are no further judicial acts to be performed [*Chodos v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 703, 714, 38 Cal. Rptr. 301]* . While a writ of review issues only when there is no appeal and no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*], prohibition may issue when there is a remedy by appeal, so long as the appellate remedy is inadequate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1103(a)*]. When a petitioner seeks to annul a judgment or order and, at the same time, to stop any further proceedings in the case, the court may issue both writs of review and of prohibition [*County of Marin v. Superior Court (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 633, 642-643, 2 Cal. Rptr. 758, 349 P.2d 526]* . For discussion and forms relating to proceedings seeking a writ of prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[2] Writ of Mandate or Administrative Mandate

A writ of mandate compels an inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person to perform a legal duty, or to extend to a party a right or office to which that party is entitled, when no other speedy or adequate remedy exists at law [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]. The writ may be used to challenge any action of a court or of a nonjudicial body that constitutes an abuse of discretion, even when that action lies within the jurisdiction of the court or other body [*see Simmons v. Superior Court (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 119, 132, 214 P.2d 844* ; *see also* discussion *§ 492.56[2][c]*]. For discussion and forms relating to proceedings seeking a writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

A special type of writ of mandate, administrative mandate, is available to review decisions resulting from administrative hearings held by either governmental or nongovernmental bodies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Anton v. San Antonio Community Hospital (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 802, 815-817, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442, 567 P.2d 1162]* . The scope of review under this writ goes beyond the issue of jurisdiction and includes a determination of whether the administrative body held a fair trial or committed any prejudicial abuse of discretion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]. For a discussion, procedural guide, and forms relating to proceedings seeking a writ of administrative mandamus, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

[3] Writ of Habeas Corpus

A writ of habeas corpus generally reviews the legality of custody when a person is incarcerated [*Penal Code § 1473(a)*]. In contempt cases, when both a fine and prison sentence have been imposed, it is appropriate to petition a higher court for a writ of habeas corpus or, alternatively, for a writ of review [*In re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237, 240 n.1, 110 Cal. Rptr. 121, 514 P.2d 1201]* . The scope of review for both writs is the same [*In re Karpf (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 355, 364, 88 Cal. Rptr. 895* ; *In re Circosta (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 777, 784-785, 33 Cal. Rptr. 514]* . For discussion and forms relating to proceedings seeking a writ of habeas corpus, see Ch. 292, *Habeas Corpus* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCriminal ContemptCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCriminal Law & ProcedureHabeas CorpusCustody RequirementNoncustody DeterminationsFines & Restitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.14

§ 492.14 Alternative or Mislabeled Petitions

Superior and appellate courts are authorized to grant extraordinary relief "in the nature of mandamus, certiorari, and prohibition" [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. Under modern principles of pleading, neither a mislabeled petition nor a defective prayer bars the relief justified by proper allegations and proof [*Peck's Liquors, Inc. v. Superior Court (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 772, 775, 34 Cal. Rptr. 735]* . A petitioner who is in doubt as to the type of writ he or she should seek can petition, in an alternative form, for a writ of review, prohibition, or mandate [*Peck's Liquors, Inc. v. Superior Court (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 772, 775, 34 Cal. Rptr. 735]* . Should a party petition for the wrong writ, the reviewing court will treat the petition as one for the appropriate writ [*Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 170-171, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167* (petition for review treated as petition for mandate); *Chase v. Superior Court (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 872, 878, 27 Cal. Rptr. 383* (petition for prohibition treated as petition for review); *Thomasian v. Superior Court (1953) 122 Cal. App. 2d 322, 324, 265 P.2d 165* (petition for prohibition treated as petition for review or mandate)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.15

§ 492.15 Parties to Proceeding for Writ of Review

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 1063* provides that the party bringing a writ may be known as the "plaintiff" and the adverse party as the "defendant," the party seeking the writ files a "petition" rather than a complaint and so the parties are usually referred to as the "petitioner" and the "respondent" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*].

A proceeding for a writ of review is normally a three-party proceeding when a court is named as the respondent. In this situation the "real party in interest," the party whose interest will be directly affected by issuance of the writ, must be named and identified as a party in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(2)*; *Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc. v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 700, 704-705, 238 Cal. Rptr. 422]* . When the petition seeks review of the decision of a municipal, superior, or appellate court, normally the real party in interest will be the opposing party in the action below. The respondent court is a neutral party with no interest in the controversy [*Hupp v. Superior Court (1913) 22 Cal. App. 162, 133 P. 987]* . Because a respondent court will not usually file any opposition to the writ proceedings, opposition to the petition and to the writ must ordinarily be made solely by the real party in interest.

When the writ seeks to review action by a court, the respondent is the court as such, not the judge as a person [*Lois R. v. Superior Court (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 895, 903, 97 Cal. Rptr. 158* (prohibition); *Lawson v. Superior Court (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 755, 761, 318 P.2d 812]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.16

§ 492.16 Original Jurisdiction to Issue Writ

The Supreme Court, courts of appeal, superior courts, and their judges have original jurisdiction in proceedings for extraordinary relief in the nature of certiorari [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. In other words, any court may issue a writ of review to any inferior tribunal, board, or officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*].

The appellate division of the superior court has original jurisdiction in proceedings for extraordinary relief in the nature of certiorari directed to the superior court in causes subject to its appellate jurisdiction [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. In other words, the appellate division of the superior court has original jurisdiction to issue a writ or review to the superior court in a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.2* (appeal of ruling by superior court judge or other judicial officer in limited civil case is to appellate division of superior court)]. When the appellate division of the superior court issues a writ of review to the superior court, the superior court is an inferior tribunal for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077*, the provisions governing review or certiorari generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.17

§ 492.17 Refusal to Exercise Original Jurisdiction

[1] When Lower Court Has Concurrent Jurisdiction

Absent exceptional circumstances, the courts of appeal and the Supreme Court normally refuse to exercise their original jurisdiction when a petition for an extraordinary writ could have been made first to a lower court [*Funeral Dir. Assn. v. Bd. of Funeral Dirs. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 104, 110, 136 P.2d 785* (mandate); *Cohen v. Superior Court (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 268, 270, 274, 72 Cal. Rptr. 814* (mandate)]. Therefore, a petitioner for a writ of review should usually file in the superior court to challenge the act of a municipal or justice court, or of aconstitutionally created administrative agency, in a court of appeal to challenge the act of a superior court, and in the California Supreme Court to challenge the act of a court of appeal.

If the petition could lawfully be made to a lower court in the first instance, it must set forth the circumstances that, in the opinion of the petitioner, render it proper that the writ should issue originally from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)*]. A court of appeal will take jurisdiction without a prior petition to a lower court to resolve issues of great public import whose prompt resolution is necessary [*Aden v. Younger (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 662, 670, 129 Cal. Rptr. 535]* . The Supreme Court will consider an original petition only when some emergency exists or the public welfare is involved, and even then usually only in a mandate case [*Jolicoeur v. Mihaly (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 565, 570 n.1, 96 Cal. Rptr. 697, 488 P.2d 1* (mandate to compel registration of voters 18 and older); *County of Sacramento v. Hickman (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 841, 845, 59 Cal. Rptr. 609, 428 P.2d 593* (mandate to compel proper county tax assessments); *cf. Sacramento v. Superior Court (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 479, 481, 481, 105 Cal. Rptr. 374, 503 P.2d 1382* (prohibition to restrain private wrongful death action in light of sovereign immunity defense)].

Absent a showing sufficient to justify the court's exercise of its original jurisdiction, the court may deny the petition, and the petitioner's right to reapply for the writ in the proper lower tribunal will not be prejudiced [*Funeral Dir. Assn. v. Bd. of Funeral Dirs. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 104, 110, 136 P.2d 785]* . Alternatively, the Supreme Court has the power to transfer the case to the appropriate court of appeal [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 12*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.1000(a)*].

[2] For Unreasonable Delay in Bringing Petition

There is no statutory time limit in which a petition for a writ of review must be filed. When there has been an unreasonable, unexplained delay in seeking the writ, however, the courts may refuse to consider the petition [*Bernstein v. Superior Court (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 568, 569, 116 P.2d 172]* . The court's refusal to exercise jurisdiction because of excessive delay differs from the defense of laches. One appellate court has explained that the doctrine of laches, which requires a showing of prejudice to opposing parties, might bar those writs, such as administrative mandamus, for which review is essentially a matter of right. Review of an action of a court, however, is a matter of discretion, and delay in seeking a writ of review is a sufficient reason for the higher court to refuse the writ unless the delay is satisfactorily explained [*Scott v. Municipal Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 995, 997, 115 Cal. Rptr. 620]* .

The time allowed by law within which to appeal from a final judgment has been held, by analogy, to be a reasonable time in which to file a petition for a writ of review, and the writ may be barred by the unexcused lapse of the same length of time [*Reynolds v. Superior Court (1883) 64 Cal. 372, 373, 28 P. 121* ; *Bryant v. Superior Court (1936) 16 Cal. App. 2d 556, 561, 61 P.2d 483* (dictum)]. Usually an appeal must be filed on or before 60 days after the date the court serves a notice of entry of judgment or appealable order, or 60 days after service of a notice of entry of judgment or appealable order, or 180 days after the date of entry of the judgment, whichever is earliest [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.104(a)*]. Applying this guideline and examining the particular facts of a case, a court may refuse to consider a writ petition once a comparable length of time has elapsed [*Donovan v. Board of Police Commrs. (1916) 32 Cal. App. 392, 399, 163 P. 69* (14-month delay); *Estate of Glassgold (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 859, 863-864, 218 P.2d 1016* (nine-month delay); *Scott v. Municipal Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 995, 996, 115 Cal. Rptr. 620* (six-month delay); *Krueger v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 934, 938, 152 Cal. Rptr. 870* (six-month delay)]. Denial of a petition in these cases is not an abuse of the reviewing court's discretion [*Scott v. Municipal Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 995, 997, 115 Cal. Rptr. 620]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsCase TransfersCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.18

§ 492.18 Grounds for Issuance of Writ of Review

[1] In General

A writ of review may be granted only when a petitioner shows all of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*; *People v. Cimarusti (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 314, 319, 146 Cal. Rptr. 421* ; *Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 347, 353, 62 Cal. Rptr. 364]* :

- An inferior tribunal, board, or officer exercised judicial functions.

- The petitioner has no remedy by appeal, nor, in the judgment of the court, does any plain, speedy, and adequate remedy exist.

- The challenged judicial act exceeded the jurisdiction of the tribunal, board, or officer.

In addition, the petitioner must show that he or she has a beneficial interest in the writ of review proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *see Taylor v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 244, 247, 125 P.2d 1]* .

For discussion of additional facts that an appellate court requires to be shown when the petition could have been brought in a lower court, see *§ 492.17[1]*. For discussion of the time requirement for filing a petition, see *§ 492.17[2]*.

[2] Judicial Function

[a] Act Must Be Completed

Courts employ writ of review proceedings to scrutinize the acts of an inferior tribunal, board, or officer "exercising judicial functions" [*Code Civ. Proc.§ 1068(a)*]. A judicial act cannot be challenged by a writ of reviewunless that act has been completed [*Holabird v. Railroad Commission (1916) 171 Cal. 691, 694, 154 P. 831]* . If a court has only threatened to act in excess of its jurisdiction, a writ of prohibition may lie [*see § 492.13*]. Conversely, if a party petitions for a writ of prohibition, and before the petition can be heard, the lower court completes its decision, the reviewing court will deem the petition as one for a writ of review [*Chase v. Superior Court (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 872, 878, 27*

Cal. Rptr. 383] .

[b] Act Must Be in Exercise of Constitutionally Conferred Judicial Power

Only a constitutional grant of judicial power, like that resting in the state's courts, authorizes an inferior tribunal, board, or officer to exercise judicial functions [*Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 562-563, 59 P.2d 119* ; *see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 1*]. For example, a writ of review will not lie to review an adjudication by a nongovernmental body [*Hill-Tellman v. Musicians' Union (1924) 67 Cal. App. 279, 280-281, 227 P. 646* (writ of review held to be improper to review action of voluntary unincorporated association)]. On the other hand, the writ may issue to review a quasi-judicial action by the state governor in the exercise of a constitutionally conferred power to hold a hearing and remove prison directors from office [*O'Brien v. Olson (1941) 42 Cal. App. 2d 449, 453, 109 P.2d 8]* .

A ministerial act of a court, such as the issuance of a writ of execution, does not constitute a judicial action subject to writ of review [*Duke v. Justice's Court of Berkeley (1940) 42 Cal. App. 2d 178-179, 180, 108 P.2d 707* ; *Community Nat. Bank v. Superior Court (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 770, 771, 773, 51 Cal. Rptr. 782]* .

[c] Acts of Most Administrative Agencies Excluded

The decisions of statewide administrative agencies, entities that the state constitution prohibits from exercising judicial functions, are not subject to a writ of review [*Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 559-564, 59 P.2d 119]* . More recently the courts have recognized that local agencies, too, are without constitutional authority to exercise judicial functions [*Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 42-44, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29]* . Examples of such local agencies no longer subject to a writ of review are city councils, school boards, planning commissions, and civil service and merit systems boards and commissions [*see Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 46 n.1, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* (Burke, J., dissenting)]. The sole type of administrative agency whose acts are judicial for purposes of a writ of review is one that derives its adjudicating powers from the constitution itself [*Boren v. State Personnel Board (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 634, 637-638, 234 P.2d 981* (StatePersonnel Board)]. For a discussion of those agencies authorized to perform judicial functions, see *Ch. 470, Overview of Public Administrative Law, § 470.12*.

Adjudicatory decisions of state constitutional agencies can also be challenged by writs of administrative mandate [*Boren v. State Personnel Board (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 634, 637-638, 234 P.2d 981* ; *People v. County of Tulare (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 317, 319, 289 P.2d 11]* . Because the scope of review allowed in a writ of mandate proceeding extends beyond the question of jurisdiction, and reaches to whether or not there is evidentiary support for the decision, the writ of review is, for all practical purposes, a seldom-used tool for review of administrative adjudications [*see § 492.13[2]*].

[3] No Appeal

[a] In General

A writ of review will not lie when the aggrieved party has a remedy by appeal from the order or judgment [*Stoddard v. Superior Court of Stanislaus County (1895) 108 Cal. 303, 305* ; *Stoner v. Superior Court (1945) 67 Cal. App. 2d 760, 761, 155 P.2d 697* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*]. This distinguishes a writ of review from a writ of mandate or prohibition; the latter writs will issue even when there is a remedy of appeal, so long as that remedy is inadequate [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1103*]. The writ of review is not available to a petitioner who has a right of appeal, whether or not such appeal affords a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Monterey Club v. Superior Court (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 351, 355, 112 P.2d 321]* .

For further discussion of appealable judgments and orders under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1* (unlimited civil cases in superior court) and 904.2 (ruling by superior court judge or other judicial officer in limited civil cases in superior or municipal court), see *Ch. 42, Appeal: Notice of Appeal, § 42.12*, and see *Ch. 345A, Limited Civil Cases, § 345A.34*.

[b] Lack of Appeal Not Shown

[i] Interlocutory Orders

In general, there is no appeal from orders that are interlocutory, with the exception of certain orders in probate or real property actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a), 904.2(a)*].

Nevertheless, a writ of review normally is not available so long as the petitioner has an adequate remedy by appeal from an eventual final judgment, even though the challenged order itself is interlocutory and not appealable [*Bank of America v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 697, 703, 128 P.2d 357]* . The analysis used by some courts is that the opportunity for review of an interlocutory ruling by an eventual appeal affords a "plain, speedy, and adequate remedy" for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1068* [*see De Lao v. Superior Court (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 711, 712-713, 234 P.2d 961* ; *see also § 492.18[4]*].

If an appeal from a final judgment is arguably not an adequate remedy a writ of review may lie, for example, to annul an interlocutory order that is void for lack of jurisdiction [*see Howard v. Superior Court (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 784, 787, 154 P.2d 849* (dictum)]. In *Estate of Bodger (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 710, 715, 276 P.2d 83* , for example, a probate court made an ex parte appointment of an attorney to represent trust beneficiaries, over the objection of one of the beneficiaries who then petitioned for a writ of review to annul the probate order. The court of appeal, holding the order void and violative of due process, stated that the petitioner should not have to wait and appeal from the order for the appointed attorney's fees to challenge the appointment and, therefore, the order was annulled on a writ of review.

[ii] Lapse of Time for Appeal

Generally, if a petitioner loses an existing right of appeal for failure to file a timely notice of appeal, this fact will not support issuance of a writ of review on the ground that there is no remedy of appeal [*Simmons v. Superior Court (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 373, 375, 341 P.2d 13* ; *see also O'Kuna v. Small Claims Court, etc. (1927) 81 Cal. App. 588, 589-590, 254 P. 291]* . This is particularly true when the petitioner's loss of the right of appeal is attributable to neglect or laches [*see Hochheimer & Co. v. Superior Court (1924) 65 Cal. App. 206, 211, 223 P. 564]* .

A petitioner's loss of the right of appeal will, however, support the issuance of a writ of review if the loss is not the petitioner's fault, but is due to the fact that he or she received no notice and had no knowledge of the entry of the judgment or order until after the time for appeal had expired [*Lee v. Small Claims Court (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4, 92 P.2d 937* ; *O'Kuna v. Small Claims Court, etc. (1927) 81 Cal. App. 588, 590, 254 P. 291* ; *see also Grinbaum v. Superior Court (1923) 192 Cal. 528, 556, 221 P. 635]* . This exception does not apply if notice was not required to be given to the petitioner [*Simmons v. Superior Court (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 373, 376, 341 P.2d 13* ; *Arens v. Superior Court (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 623, 625, 290 P.2d 257]* .

The writ may also be available if there is uncertainty in the law concerning whether the challenged order or judgment is appealable. If the court considering the writ petition determines that the remedy of appeal was available, the court may nevertheless go on to decide the merits of the petition even though the time to appeal has lapsed [*see Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 371-372, 217 P.2d 951* (overruling prior decisions holding there was no right to appeal)].

[c] Lack of Appeal Shown

[i] Decision of Superior Court Appellate Department

Generally, a ruling by a superior court judge or other judicial officer in a limited civil case may be appealed to the appellate division of the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 77(e), 904.2(a)*; *see Whittaker v. Superior Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 357, 363-364, 66 Cal. Rptr. 710, 438 P.2d 358]* . Once the superior court has decided the appeal, there is no

further right of appeal from the judgment of the appellate division, although the aggrieved party may move the superior court to transfer on certification to the court of appeal, or alternatively, may request the court of appeal to exercise its discretion to take certification [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a), 911*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.1002-8.1008*]. Even when certified by the superior court, the court of appeal has discretion to refuse to transfer the case, and this refusal ordinarily terminates appellate review [*see Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363]* .

A writ of review will issue from a court of appeal when the appellate division of the superior court exceeded its jurisdiction in a judgment on appeal from the municipal court, and when the superior court refused certification [*see, e.g., East Bay Municipal Utility Dist. v. Appellate Department (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 839, 842, 153 Cal. Rptr. 597, 591 P.2d 1249* ; *Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363* ; *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 456, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937]* .

[ii] Nonappealable Arbitration Orders

Although an order denying a petition to compel arbitration is appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1294(a)*], an order compelling arbitration is nonappealable [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1294*]. If the arbitration order has exceeded the court's jurisdiction and the party compelled to arbitrate has no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy, a writ of review is an appropriate method of challenging the order [*Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 347, 353, 62 Cal. Rptr. 364]* . An order compelling arbitration has been held to exceed a court's jurisdiction when provisions of the Labor Code conferred exclusive jurisdiction of the dispute on the state Labor Commissioner [*Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 347, 358, 62 Cal. Rptr. 364]* . Another court reviewing an arbitration order on appeal from a subsequent judgment has suggested that a jurisdictional fact is missing when the parties did not voluntarily and fairly enter into the arbitration agreement [*Ramirez v. Superior Court (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 746, 752, 163 Cal. Rptr. 223* (dictum)].

A party compelled to arbitrate may have the validity of the order reviewed on an appeal from a judgment confirming an arbitration award [*Wheeler v. St. Joseph Hospital (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 345, 353, 133 Cal. Rptr. 775* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1294(d)* (arbitration judgment appealable)]. Some cases have described orders to compel arbitration as interlocutory in nature, noting that the rationale behind the rule making such orders nonappealable is that the party who objects to arbitration may win at the arbitration hearing and, if not, the issue is still reviewable on appeal from the order of confirmation [*see Wheeler v. St. Joseph Hospital (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 345, 353, 133 Cal. Rptr. 775* ; *Maddy v. Castle (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 716, 719-720, 130 Cal. Rptr. 160]* . Courts recognize, however, that the extraordinary writs of mandate or prohibition are available to review orders to arbitrate if the matters ordered arbitrated fall clearly outside the scope of the arbitration agreement, or if the arbitration would appear to be unduly time consuming or expensive [*Atlas Plastering, Inc. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 63, 68, 140 Cal. Rptr. 59* (writ of mandate or prohibition); see *Unimart v. Superior Court (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1041, 82 Cal. Rptr. 249* (writ of mandate)]. A petitioner for a writ of review may argue, by analogy, that the court's order was in excess of its jurisdiction and, due to the expense to the parties of participating in and seeking review of the arbitration award, appeal from a subsequent judgment confirming the award does not constitute a plain, speedy, or adequate remedy [*see Atlas Plastering, Inc. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 63, 68, 140 Cal. Rptr. 59* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*; *see also § 492.56[2][d][ii]*]. For discussion of appeal and review of orders to arbitrate, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

[iii] Contempt Orders

All judgments and orders relating to contempt proceedings are final and conclusive, and no appeal may be taken [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(1)(B), 904.2(a), 1222*; *Moffat v. Moffat (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 645, 656, 165 Cal. Rptr. 877, 612 P.2d 967]* . Thus, when a sentence of contempt has been imposed, the appropriate petition is for a writ of habeas corpus or for a writ of review [*In re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237, 240 n.1, 110 Cal. Rptr. 121, 514 P.2d 1201* (habeas

petition denied)]. In current practice, in fact, writs of review are used predominantly in the area of contempt adjudications.

Although a judgment of contempt is not appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(1)(B)*, the denial by a superior court of a writ of review from a judgment of contempt in a municipal court is appealable to the court of appeal [*Bermudez v. Municipal Court (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 855, 861-864, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 609, 823 P. 2d 1210]* .

For further discussion of the scope of review applicable to contempt orders, see *§ 492.59[2]*. For forms and discussion relating to review of contempt proceedings, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

[iv] Small Claims Judgments

Generally, a small claims judgment is conclusive on the plaintiff, who chose the special forum, but the defendant may appeal to the superior court, which then tries the cause de novo [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710*]. The superior court's judgment on that trial is not appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*], so a writ of review will lie to attack it for lack of jurisdiction [*see Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 170, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167* (jurisdiction exceeded); *Yoakum v. Small Claims Court (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 398, 403, 404, 125 Cal. Rptr. 882* (jurisdiction not exceeded); *Cook v. Superior Court (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 675, 676, 679, 79 Cal. Rptr. 282* (jurisdiction exceeded)]. For discussion and forms relating to proceedings in small claims courts, see Ch. 526, *Small Claims* .

[v] Particular Probate Orders

A writ of review lies to examine and annul certain unappealable probate orders [*see Lilienkamp v. Superior Court (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 293, 295, 297, 93 P.2d 1008* (order vacating order for partial distribution); *Fredrickson v. Superior Court (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 593, 597, 241 P.2d 541* (order vacating decree settling final account, ordering distribution, and discharging administratrix)]. For a discussion of nonappealable probate orders, see Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal* .

[4] No Other Plain, Speedy, and Adequate Remedy

A petitioner for a writ of review must show that there is not only no appeal from the lower court's order or judgment but also that there is no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*]. The language of this requirement parallels the language in the statutes governing issuance of writs of mandate and prohibition, where it refers to a discretionary determination, made by the reviewing court, that the delay involved in an appeal might result in injury to the petitioner [*W.A. Rose Co. v. Municipal Court (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 67, 74-75, 1 Cal. Rptr. 49* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1103*]. With respect to writs of review, one court has stated that for a legal remedy to be adequate, it must afford relief on the very matter that is the subject of the petition and must be as convenient and efficacious as the extraordinary remedy demanded [*Estate of Bodger (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 710, 715, 276 P.2d 83* (appeal from eventual attorney's fees award inadequate remedy when probate court made unauthorized appointment of attorney for petitioner), citing *Dufton v. Daniels (1923) 190 Cal. 577, 582, 213 P. 949* (mandate proceeding); *but see Monterey Club v. Superior Court (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 351, 354-355, 112 P.2d 321* (writ of review not available to petitioner who has a right of appeal, whether or not such appeal affords a plain, speedy and adequate remedy)].

[5] Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

[a] Jurisdiction Defined

The meaning of "jurisdiction" for purposes of the writ of review is different and broader than the fundamental meaning of a court's jurisdiction over the parties and over the subject matter of the cause of action [*Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 454-455, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937* ; *Mitchell v. Superior Court (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 759, 762, 104 Cal. Rptr. 921]* . Any acts that exceed the power of a court, whether that power is defined by constitutional provision, express statutory declaration, or rules developed by the courts and followed under the

doctrine of stare decisis, are in excess of the court's jurisdiction [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291, 109 P.2d 942]* .

[b] Errors in Exercise of Jurisdiction Distinguished

In contrast to the remedy of appeal, a writ of review cannot reach errors of law or fact [*Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 C2d 280, 287, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Brown Co. v. Appellate Department (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 891, 904, 196 Cal. Rptr. 258]* . Once the reviewing court finds that the lower court had jurisdiction to make the challenged order, the reviewing court must deny the writ notwithstanding its view that the ruling was erroneous [*Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1105, 231 Cal. Rptr. 189* (writ of review granted in original appellate proceeding and then discharged on rehearing)].

For example, when the appellate department of a superior court overturned a judgment on a mechanic's lien, finding as a matter of fact and law that the materialman's preliminary notice was defective, there was no basis for a court of appeal to annul the reversal on a writ of review [*Brown Co. v. Appellate Department (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 891, 896, 904, 196 Cal. Rptr. 258]* . A superior court's refusal to disclose the amount of appointed criminal counsel's earned fees to the press under the California Public Records Act also was affirmed on a writ of review, even though the majority of the appellate panel disagreed with the superior court's factual conclusion that disclosure would prejudice the indigent defendant's right to a fair trial [*Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1106-1107, 231 Cal. Rptr. 189* , on petition for rehearing].

[c] Failure to Follow Statutory Procedure

When a statute authorizes a prescribed procedure and a court acts contrary to this authority, it has exceeded its jurisdiction and a writ of review will lie to correct such excess [*Mitchell v. Superior Court (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 759, 762, 104 Cal. Rptr. 921* (trial court exceeded its jurisdiction in appointing receiver and instructing him)]. For example, an appellate court acts in excess of its jurisdiction when, in reversing a summary judgment, it orders that judgment be entered for the opposing party even though that party never made a motion for summary judgment [*Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363]* . It is beyond the jurisdiction of a court to make an order extending time to plead beyond limits that have been set by statute [*Thelander v. Superior Court of Placer County (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 811, 813 n.3, 26 Cal. Rptr. 643* (interpreting *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*)]. A court has no power to allow a district attorney, absent any statutory authority, to bring civil proceedings for contempt on behalf of one party to a private lawsuit [*Safer v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 230, 233, 124 Cal. Rptr. 174, 540 P.2d 14]* .

[d] Refusal to Follow Stare Decisis

The scope of review for lack or excess of jurisdiction was greatly expanded in the leading case of *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 454, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937* , in which the court, issuing a writ of review, held that the appellate department of a superior court exceeded its jurisdiction by failing to follow a clear, binding precedent laid down by a higher court. The court stated that the rule of stare decisis is a rule of jurisdiction for the purposes of a writ of review [*Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 456, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937]* . In Auto Equity, the appellate department of the superior court had explicitly refused to follow a case that it admitted was directly on point, holding that the case had been wrongly decided [*Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 454, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937]* . In a subsequent case, the Supreme Court found that a lower court exceeded its jurisdiction by failing to follow the rule of stare decisis even when the applicable law, according to the lower court, was unclear [*see* *East Bay Municipal Utility Dist. v. Appellate Department (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 839, 842-843, 153 Cal. Rptr. 597, 591 P.2d 1249* (holding that language in single case interpreting applicable statute as on point and not dicta)]. If, on the other hand, there is statutory authority for the outcome and the lower court attempted conscientiously to follow the law, the decision below will not be be overturned on a writ of

review [*Brown Co. v. Appellate Department (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 891, 896, 904, 196 Cal. Rptr. 258]* .

[e] Nonexistence of Jurisdictional Facts

When an inferior board or tribunal has power to act only on certain facts, and there is no evidence whatever to show the existence of those jurisdictional facts, the court will annul the decision or judgment below [*Great Western Power Co. v. Pillsbury (1915) 170 Cal. 180, 185-186, 191, 149 P. 35* ; *see also* discussion *§ 492.28[2]*].

In the case of contempt orders, the factual question of whether petitioner's acts constituted contempt is jurisdictional [*In re Ciraolo (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 389, 394, 74 Cal. Rptr. 865, 450 P.2d 241]* . The order of contempt must recite on its face particular facts showing that petitioner's conduct constituted contempt; if not, the order is void and should be annulled for lack of jurisdiction [*Arthur v. Superior Court (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 404, 409, 42 Cal. Rptr. 441, 398 P.2d 777* ; *see Chula v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 199, 203, 18 Cal. Rptr. 507, 368 P.2d 107]* . Although the power to weigh evidence and to determine the credibility of witnesses rests with the trial court, the role of the reviewing court is to ascertain whether any substantial evidence exists in support of the trial court's finding that a contempt was committed and, in the absence of sufficient evidence, the contempt order will be annulled [*In re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237, 247, 110 Cal. Rptr. 121, 514 P.2d 1201* ; *Coursey v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 147, 154, 239 Cal. Rptr. 365]* . For discussion of the elements constituting contempt, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

[6] Beneficial Interest of Petitioner

A writ of review can only issue on the verified petition of "the party beneficially interested" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1061*]. This standing requirement is generally common to petitions for all the extraordinary writs [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086* (mandate), *1103* (prohibition)].

To be a beneficially interested party for purposes of a writ of review, the petitioner need not be a party in the action below but need only demonstrate that he or she was directly and prejudicially affected by the challenged order [*Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 75, 33 P.2d 669]* . Early cases emphasized that the writ was available to a stranger to the record only when the matter sought to be reviewed grew out of a collateral proceeding and was not an order or judgment made between the parties [*Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 75, 33 P.2d 669* (dictum); *Elliott v. Superior Court (1904) 144 Cal. 501, 508, 77 P. 1109]* . Since then courts have recognized various situations in which a nonparty petitioner for a writ of review has the requisite beneficial interest. For instance, buyers who acquire title to property that is the subject of pending litigation may be sufficiently interested in a motion to expunge a lis pendens that they can challenge the court's ruling by writ of review even though they were not parties to the motion [*Peery v. Superior Court (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 837, 841, 176 Cal. Rptr. 533, 633 P.2d 198 , superseded by statute* (dictum)]. When a court refuses to hold a party in contempt for disobeying an injunction, the person for whose benefit the injunction was issued can successfully challenge the dismissal of contempt proceedings by writ of review [*Goodall v. Superior Court (1918) 37 Cal. App. 723, 726-727, 174 P. 924]* . While the person who presents a charging declaration is not, strictly speaking, a party to the contempt proceeding, he or she is beneficially interested in the discharge ruling for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* [*Taylor v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 244, 247, 125 P.2d 1]* . On the other hand, a default in an heirship proceeding will not be annulled on a writ of review when the petitioners are too far removed in relationship from the decedent to be beneficially interested in the estate [*Marlow v. Superior Court (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 393, 395, 110 P.2d 11* (petitioner's grandfather was uncle of the decedent)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsAuthority to AdjudicateGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionJudicial ReviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law

WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionInterlocutory OrdersCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewDe Novo ReviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.19

§ 492.19 Stay of Proceedings Pending Disposition of Writ

A writ of review may provide for a temporary stay ordering the respondent court to desist from further proceedings in the matter to be reviewed, pending entry of judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*]. The decision to stay proceedings rests with the sound discretion of the reviewing court. To be effective, the words of the stay must be inserted explicitly into the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1072*].

There is no statutory requirement that the petitioner put up a bond as a condition for the stay. Nor is any express procedure prescribed for requesting that a stay order be included in the writ. The usual practice, however, is to ask for the stay in the verified petition, setting out the reasons for urgency as well as the relevant time constraints [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(7)* (appellate courts)].

There appear to be no decisions that are specifically concerned with the propriety of a stay pending determination of a writ of review. By analogy, however, denial of a motion to stay execution of a judgment pending appeal has been held to be an abuse of discretion when the appellant has demonstrated that he or she is raising a substantial question on the appeal, that he or she will suffer irreparable injury if the stay is not granted, and that the respondent would not be sorely prejudiced by the stay [*Mehr v. Superior Court (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1050, 189 Cal. Rptr. 138* (motion to stay execution pending appeal of unlawful detainer judgment)]. It is arguable that similar allegations in a petition for a writ of review are sufficient to support the inclusion of a stay order in the writ.

For a form of petition including allegations supporting a request for a stay order, see *§ 492.101*. For a form of writ including a stay order, see *§ 492.104*. For discussion relating to a request for an immediate stay of the proceedings below, as distinguished from a request for a stay in a petition filed after prior service, see *§ 492.21*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.20

§ 492.20 Petition for Writ of Review

[1] General Rules of Pleading Apply

Writ of review proceedings are subject to the general rules of procedure (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.10*) to the extent that these provisions are consistent with directly applicable provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1063-1110b* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. Accordingly, a petition for a writ of review is subject to the general rules of pleading (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 420-475*) governing complaints [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*]. For discussion of these general rules of pleading, *see* Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

[2] Contents

A petition for a writ of review must be verified and must set forth all the allegations required by law to support its issuance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a), (b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; for discussion of the showing necessary for issuance of the writ, see *§ 492.18*]. The petition must not only name the respondent court or other tribunal, but must also name the real party in interest [*see § 492.15*].

If the petition might lawfully have been made to a lower court in the first instance, it must also set forth the circumstances which, in the petitioner's opinion, justify issuance of the writ originally from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)*]. For discussion of these circumstances, see *§ 492.17[1]*.

If the petitioner seeks a stay of the proceedings below until such time as the judgment or order below is affirmed or an nulled, the petition should include factual allegations showing the need for the stay [*see § 492.19*]. If the petitioner seeks an immediate stay, but the reviewing court, as a matter of local practice, does not normally grant a petition without prior service, the petition should allege reasons for the urgency of the stay and request that the court exercise its discretion to grant the petition ex parte [*see §§ 492.21, 492.22*].

For forms of petition for writ of review, see *§§ 492.100 -492.102*.

[3] Verification

A petition for a writ of review must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(4)*]. The allegations in the petition must not be verified on information and belief because such hearsay cannot support issuance of an extraordinary writ [*see Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* (petition for writ of mandate verified wholly on information and belief by petitioner's attorney)]. If, however, a petition made on information and belief otherwise supplies a sufficient record of the underlying facts and trial court proceedings, enabling the appellate court to review the judgment or order below, the petition is not fatally defective [*Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Superior Court (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 253, 255 n.1, 193 Cal. Rptr. 336* ; *Ansley v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 477, 489, 229 Cal. Rptr. 771* (writ of mandate)].

Failure to verify the original petition is a procedural defect readily cured by amendment of the petition [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Municipal Court (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 377, 383-384, 119 Cal. Rptr. 552* (mandate)]. One court, reviewing the issuance of a writ of prohibition on appeal, has held that a petitioner should have the opportunity to amend an improperly verified petition even though the real party in interest raised an objection by demurrer in response to the alternative writ [*see Perlman v. Municipal Court (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 568, 574-575, 160 Cal. Rptr. 567* (suggesting that the proper objection is a motion to strike)].

[4] Accompanying Papers

[a] Points and Authorities

A petition for a writ of review filed in an appellate court must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)*]. Although there is no correspondingly explicit requirement applicable to petitions for writ of review filed in superior courts, *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)* provides that a party filing a notice of motion must serve and file with it a supporting memorandum [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (any written direction of a court not included in a judgment is denominated an order, and any application for an order is a motion)]. Writ of review proceedings are subject to this rule as well as to all other general law and motion rules applicable in superior courts (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1110 et seq.* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)(2)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1100*].

For forms of memoranda of points and authorities for use in support of petitions for writs of review, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Record of Proceedings Below

In the Supreme Court or a court of appeal, the verified petition must be accompanied by a transcript of the proceedings leading to the order or judgment below [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(1)*]. If a transcript is unavailable, counsel must make and file a declaration that either (1) explains why a transcript is unavailable and fairly summarizes the proceedings, including arguments by counsel and the basis of the trial court's decision, if stated; or (2) states that the transcript has been ordered, the date it was ordered, and the date it is expected to be filed, which must be a date prior to any action requested of the reviewing court other than issuance of a stay supported by other parts of the record [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(2)*]. The writ petition must also be accompanied by (1) a copy of the order or judgment from which relief is sought, (2) copies of all documents and exhibits submitted to the trial court supporting and opposing petitioner's position, and (3) copies of all other documents submitted to the trial court that are necessary for a complete understanding of the case and the ruling. In exigent circumstances, a petition may be filed without these documents if a declaration by counsel explains the urgency and the circumstances making the documents unavailable and fairly summarizes their substance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(4)*]. If a petitioner does not submit the required record and explanations or does not present facts sufficient to excuse the failure to submit them, the court may summarily deny the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(5)*].

If a party seeks to seal or unseal all or a portion of the record supporting the petition, that party must follow the procedures of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.46* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(d)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.46(e), (f)*

(motions to seal, unseal records in reviewing court)]. Rule 8.46 also sets out other requirements relating to sealed records in appeals or writ proceedings in reviewing courts, including the manner of filing a sealed record in a reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.46(e)*], and the requirement that publically filed documents, including writ petitions and supporting and opposing papers, not disclose material contained in a sealed record or a record proposed to be sealed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.155(g)*]. For detailed discussion and forms relating to sealed records and proceedings in the reviewing court to seal or unseal records under Rule 8.46, see *Ch. 44, Appeal: Preparing and Filing the Record, § 44.100 et seq. and § 44.300* et seq.

In a superior court, there is no rule requiring that such a full record be filed, and a petition that simply incorporated the order or judgment to be reviewed will probably be sufficient to withstand a demurrer, as long as all required allegations are otherwise adequately pleaded [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*; *see also § 492.27*]. The better practice, however, is to provide the court with a transcript of the relevant proceedings, as well as copies of all relevant documents that were submitted to the trial court. As a matter of decisional law, the burden is on the petitioner to allege a prima facie case of entitlement to an extraordinary writ, and courts require that the petition not only plead facts supporting the writ sought but also incorporate enough documentation filed in the trial court so that the reviewing court can intelligently consider the the petition [*see Krueger v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 934, 936-938, 152 Cal. Rptr. 870]* .

[c] Proof of Service of Petition

The petition normally must be accompanied by proof of service of a copy on the respondent and the real party or parties in interest at the time it is submitted for filing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(c)*]. The usual sequence of service and filing for a writ of review is, therefore, the reverse of the order of filing and service of a complaint in an ordinary civil action. For a discussion of ex parte petitions, which may be filed and granted without prior service, see *§ 492.21*. For further discussion of service requirements, see *§ 492.22*.

[d] Proposed Order and Writ

Appellate courts draft their own orders and writs. When the petition is filed in a superior court, in which counsel is expected to draft orders for the court's signature, a proposed order and writ may accompany the petition at the time of filing. For forms of order directing issuance of the writ and writ of review, see *§§ 492.103* and *492.104*.

[e] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

Each party to an appeal must serve and file a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons at the time it files its first document in the Court of Appeal [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.280(c)] and must include a copy of the certificate in its principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*]. The petitioner's certificate must be included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(1)*]. The certificates of the respondent and real party in interest must be included in their preliminary opposition or, if no such opposition is filed, in their return, if any. The certificate must appear after the cover and before the tables [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(3)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsPrelitigation NoticesCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.21

§ 492.21 Ex Parte Petition for Writ of Review

A court may grant a petition for a writ of review ex parte, without prior notice or service of the petition, on a showing of good cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* (writ may be granted without notice); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)(6)* (court in its discretion may allow filing of petition without prior service)]. This constitutes an exception to the general rule that the petition must be accompanied by proof of prior service on the respondent and each real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)(1)*; *see §§ 492.20[4][c], § 492.22*]. The construction given to this exception varies among local courts, and counsel should therefore consult local practice to determine the circumstances under which a particular court will grant a petition ex parte.

A superior court may, in general, grant an application for an order ex parte only if it is supported by an affidavit or declaration showing that (1) within a reasonable time before the application the party informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney when and where the application would be made; (2) the party in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party and the opposing party's attorney but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform them; or (3) for reasons specified the party should not be required to inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)* (law and motion rules made applicable to writs of review)]. For further discussion and a general form of declaration supporting an ex parte application, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Circumstances may arise in which a petitioner may desire an immediate stay of the proceedings below, such as one involving direct contempt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1211*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1209* (attorney under sentence of contempt entitled to three-day stay of execution during which to file petition)]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071* and *1072* provide for inclusion of a stay order in the writ of review, there is no express provision for obtaining an immediate stay pending issuance of the writ [*cf. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.112* (ex parte stay pending disposition of petition for writ of supersedeas)]. Because courts do, however, have express authority to grant a petition for a writ of review without notice to the adverse party, a petitioner seeking an immediate stay of proceedings may simply combine a request for a stay with a request that the petition be granted immediately, without notice or opposition. For further discussion of a temporary stay, see *§ 492.19*.

For a form of petition for writ of review that may be used in an ex parte application, including a request for stay and a

proposed order directing the clerk to permit filing without proof of prior service, see *§ 492.101*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.22

§ 492.22 Service of Petition

Normally a copy of the petition for writ of review must be served before filing, because at the time of filing it usually must be accompanied by proofof service of a copy on the respondent and the real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; *see discussion under § 492.20[4][c]*]. For discussion of circumstances under which a petition might be filed without proof of prior service, see *§ 492.21*.

The petition must be served pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*, which govern service of papers generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see also § 492.101*]. For discussion and forms relating to methods of service of papers and pleadings generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.23

§ 492.23 Initial Opposition to Petition

If the court has required the petitioner to give notice of the petition by serving copies on the respondent and the real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069, 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; *see §§ 492.21, 492.22*], within 10 days after the petition is filed, the respondent or any real party in interest, separately or jointly, may serve and file a preliminary opposition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)*]. The opposition must contain points and authorities and a statement of any material fact not included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)(2)*]. This initial opposition is not an opposing pleading or return but rather is a legal argument for the benefit of the court, designed to prevent issuance of the writ where the real party in interest or the respondent can show the petition has no merit [*see Patterson v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 670, 671-672, 180 P.2d 945* ; *Peter v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 515, 521, 178 P.2d 73]* .

For discussion of subsequent opposition by return, see *§ 492.27*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.24

§ 492.24 Summary Denial of Petition

An appellate court is entitled to deny summarily an application for a writ of review, either before or after entertaining preliminary opposition, without a hearing on the merits [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)(4)*; *see Tex-Cal Land Management, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 335, 350, 156 Cal. Rptr. 1, 595 P.2d 579* ; *Wine v. Council of City of Los Angeles (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 157, 164, 2 Cal. Rptr. 94]* . Appellate courts also have the authority to deny a petition summarily if the petitioner fails to submit the transcript and other documents that are required to support the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)(4)*; *see discussion under § 492.20[4][b]*].

An order summarily denying a petition for an extraordinary writ does not have res judicata effect in subsequent proceedings [*see People v. Medina (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 484, 490-492, 99 Cal. Rptr. 630, 492 P.2d 686* (prohibition proceeding); *Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982* (mandate proceeding); *De Bottari v. Melendez (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 910, 914 n.3, 119 Cal. Rptr. 256* (mandate proceeding)], regardless of whether the denial is intended to be on the merits or is based on some other reason [*Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 899, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P.2d 250* (discrediting and rejecting long-standing "sole possible ground" exception, and disapproving the one case that applied the rule and the many cases that contain dicta implying the existence of the exception, including *Hagan v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 767, 770, 22 Cal. Rptr. 206, 371 P.2d 982*)].

Summary denial of a petition for a writ of review by a superior court may be reviewed on appeal to a court of appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1*]. When a court of appeal denies a petition without issuance of the writ, the order is final immediately on filing and petitioner may therefore petition the Supreme Court for a hearing without waiting the normal 30-day period prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)(2)*]. For forms and discussion of appeal and petition for review, see Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate

JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.25

§ 492.25 Grant of Petition

[1] Issuance of Writ

The reviewing court grants a petition by signing an order that directs the clerk to issue a writ of review. The court may grant the petition and issue the writ, or may grant an order to show cause why it should not be issued, with or without notice to the respondent and real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)(4)*; *see also* discussion *§ 492.21*]. For a form of order directing that the writ issue for use in a superior court, see *§ 492.103*.

[2] Form and Contents of Writ

The writ is directed to the respondent or to any other person having the custody of the record or proceedings to be certified, and commands the respondent or custodian to certify to the reviewing court a transcript of the proceedings below [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1070*]. It may also require the respondent to desist in the meantime from further proceedings in the matter to be reviewed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*; *see also § 492.19*]. For a form of a writ of review, including an optional stay order, see *§ 492.104*.

[3] Service of Writ

The writ must be served in the same manner as a summons in a civil action unless otherwise expressly directed by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1073*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40* (governing service of summons generally); *see also § 492.104*]. For discussion and forms relating to methods of service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

If the writ is issued by an appellate court, the clerk of that court is required to promptly transmit a certified copy of the writ to the respondent to whom it is directed. If, in addition, this writ includes an order that stays proceedings that are scheduled to occur within seven days of its issuance, the clerk of that court is required to make a reasonable effort to give telephone notice to the respondent to whom it is directed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.489*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.26

§ 492.26 Return of Writ With Required Transcript

[1] By Respondent

When the writ of review is directed to a court, the clerk of court must return the writ with the required transcript [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1070*]. The return must be made on the date for the return of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*].

[2] Burden on Petitioner to Insure Timely Return

The burden is on the petitioner, not the real party in interest, to see that the return is filed and, in the absence of a return, the writ will be discharged and the proceeding will be dismissed [*Middlebrook v. Superior Court (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 579, 580, 134 P.2d 241]* . The petitioner must pay the fees charged by the clerk to make a return of the record [*see Gov. Code §§ 26831-26837, 72054* (clerks' transcript fees); *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.130(b), 8.753(c)* (reporter's transcript fees)]. Even though a writ of review has issued, the respondent court's compliance with the writ cannot be compelled unless the petitioner has paid for preparation of the clerk's transcript [*I.X.L. Lime Co. v. Superior Court (1904) 143 Cal. 170, 175, 76 P. 973]* .

[3] Proceedings for Further Return of Transcript

If the return of the writ is defective or incomplete, the reviewing court may order that a further return be made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. For a form for notice of motion and order for further return, see *§§ 492.105* and *492.106*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.27

§ 492.27 Return by Demurrer or Answer to Writ

[1] By Respondent or Real Party in Interest

In addition to the return by the respondent with the certified transcript of the proceedings to be reviewed [*discussed under § 492.26*], either the respondent or the real party in interest may make a return by demurrer, verified answer, or both [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(1)*]. For a form of return by demurrer, see *§ 492.107*. For a form of return by answer, see *§ 492.108*.

[2] Time for Return

If the petition is before a superior court, the return must be made on the date for the return of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*]. If the petition is before an appellate court, the return or opposition must be served and filed within 30 days after the court issues the alternative writ or order to show cause or notifies the parties that it is considering issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(2)*].

If the return is by demurrer only, but the demurrer is not sustained, the court may or may not allow a further return by verified answer within a time that it may designate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(4)* (when return to alternative writ is by demurrer only and is not sustained, court may issue peremptory writ without leave to answer)].

[3] Return by Demurrer

The effect of a return by demurrer is to adopt all the facts alleged in the petition as the return to the writ [*Estrin v. Superior Court (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 670, 672, 96 P.2d 340]* .

The grounds enumerated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10* for demurrers in ordinary civil actions apply to proceedings for writs of review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. The most commonly asserted ground is the failure of the petition to state facts that constitute a cause of action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*], by which the real party in interest argues that one or more of the grounds for issuance of the writ has not been adequately alleged [*see discussion under § 492.56[2]*]. In addition, the demurrer may argue that the court should not exercise its original jurisdiction to entertain the writ petition,

either when the petitioner could have filed for the writ of review in a lower tribunal, or when the petitioner filed later than the period allowed for an appeal, with no explanation for the delay [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)*; *Scott v. Municipal Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 995, 997, 115 Cal. Rptr. 620* ; *see § 492.17*]. For discussion of a demurrer on the ground of defective verification of the petition, see *§ 492.20[3]*].

If a return is made by demurrer only, but the demurrer is not sustained, the courtmay allow an answer to be filed within such time as it may designate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*; *but see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(4)* (when return to alternative writ is by demurrer only and is not sustained, court may issue peremptory writ without leave to answer)].

For forms and discussion of demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* . For a form of return by demurrer, see *§ 492.107*.

[4] Return by Answer

The statutes governing an answer to a complaint in a civil action apply to the answer to a petititon for a writ of review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. Thus the answer must generally contain a general or specific denial of each of the material allegations in the petition, as well as any statement of new matter constituting a defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30*]. The answer must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(1)*].

Leave of court is required to file a return by answer when an initial return was made by demurrer only and the demurrer was not sustained [*see § 492.27[3]*].

For forms and discussion of answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers* . For a form of answer to a petition for writ of review, see *§ 492.108*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.28

§ 492.28 Scope of Review

[1] In General

Review in a writ of review proceeding is limited to the determination of whether the lower court or tribunal has regularly pursued its authority; that is, whether it has exceeded its jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1074*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; for further discussion, see *§ 492.56[2][c]*]. In making this determination, the reviewing court is not limited to examination of the clerk's transcript, but may also look to the transcript of the oral proceedings and even to the evidence offered below [*Little v. Superior Court (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 311, 317, 67 Cal. Rptr. 77]* . The court may not, however, consider facts that do not appear in record as it is transmitted. No evidence outside the record is admissible for any purpose, and the reviewing court may not try any factual issue [*see Rinaldo v. Superior Court (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 585, 593, 59 P.2d 868* ; *but see Wilde v. Superior Court (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 168, 176, 127 P.2d 560* (testimony allowed in contempt review)].

[2] Existence of Jurisdictional Facts

When the jurisdiction of the lower court or tribunal exists only on given facts, a review of its action in a writ proceeding extends to the whole of the record below and the reviewing court may examine the evidence itself [*Great Western Power Co. v. Pillsbury (1915) 170 Cal. 180, 185, 191, 149 P. 35* ; *People v. Board of Delegates (1860) 14 Cal. 479, 500]* . If there is no evidence whatever to show the existence of the necessary jurisdictional facts, the reviewing court will annul the decision or judgment below [*Great Western Power Co. v. Pillsbury (1915) 170 Cal. 180, 185, 149 P. 35]* .

This principle now applies mainly to the review of contempt orders, which includes an examination of the entire record below to ascertain whethersubstantial evidence existed to support the finding of contempt [*Chula v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 199, 204-205, 18 Cal. Rptr. 507, 368 P.2d 107* ; *see also § 492.18[5][e]*].

[3] Petitioner's Burden on Review

In usual writ proceedings, all intendments and presumptions are indulged to support the judgment on matters as to which the record is silent, and error must be affirmatively shown [*Lemelle v. Superior Court (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d*

148, 156, 143 Cal. Rptr. 450 (mandate)].

Initially, a petitioner on writ of review has the burden of ensuring a proper return of the transcript to be reviewed, much as an appellant must perfect the record on appeal [*see Middlebrook v. Superior Court (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 579, 134 P.2d 241* ; *North Side etc. Assn. v. County of L.A. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 598, 608, 161 P.2d 613* ; *see § 492.26[2]*]. This burden is particularly important when the petition challenges the sufficiency of the evidence [*see Landtbom v. Board of Fire Commrs. (1929) 98 Cal. App. 629, 631, 632, 277 P. 369* (annulment by writ of review not proper when return showed on its face that it did not include all the evidence and showed some competent evidence in support of board's decision)].

On the question of whether the lower court acted without or in excess of its jurisdiction, a reviewing court, faced with no record of how the lower court reached its findings and seeing that conflicting inferences could be made from the evidence, is compelled to resolve all conflicts in favor of the respondent court and to indulge in all reasonable inferences to uphold the findings [*Tomlinson v. Superior Court (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 640, 643, 152 P.2d 517* (prohibition)].

[4] Contempt Orders

On a writ of review a contempt order is to be construed strictly in favor of the accused and no presumption of the sufficiency of the evidence applies [*see Bennett v. Superior Court of San Diego County (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 585, 593, 222 P.2d 276* ; *Andrews v. Superior Court (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 756, 759, 7 Cal. Rptr. 194]* . Even in a contempt review, however, the court will not annul the judgment unless the record is devoid of competent evidence in support of the trial court's findings. If the reviewing court can find a conflict in the evidence, it will defer to the lower court's resolution of the conflict [*see Freeman v. Superior Court (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 533, 538-539*]. For a discussion relating to review of contempt orders generally, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumption of RegularityEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.29

§ 492.29 Judgment

After a full return is filed, the court must hear those parties who attend for that purpose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. After the hearing, the courtrenders a judgment either affirming, annulling, or modifying the proceedings reviewed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. A copy of the judgment, signed by the clerk, is then transmitted to the lower court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1076*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1077* (copy of judgment, writ, and return constitute judgment-roll)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.30

§ 492.30 Finality of Writ or Order Issued by Reviewing Court

A decision in an original writ proceeding in a reviewing court is filed with the clerk, who then transmits copies of the decision to the lower court or tribunal and to the parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(a)(1)*].

A decision of a court of appeal becomes final as to that court 30 days after filing. The decision becomes final as to that court immediately after filing upon the denial of a petition for a writ of supersedeas [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)(2)*].

A decision of the Supreme Court becomes final 30 days after filing unless the court orders a shorter time or, prior to the expiration of the 30-day period or any extension, orders one or more additional periods not to exceed a total of 60 additional days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)(1)*].

For further discussion of the rules relating to finality of decisions in reviewing courts generally, and related discussion and forms regarding rehearing or modification, see respectively Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision* , and Ch. 52, *Appeal: Rehearing* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.31

§ 492.31 Costs

[1] Generally Allowed

When the decision of a court of inferior jurisdiction is brought before a higher court in any other way than by appeal, the same costs must be allowed as in cases on appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1027, 1109*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.278* (costs in appellate court), 8.764 (costs in superior court)]. For discussion and forms relating to costs on appeal in appellate courts generally, see *Ch. 51, Appeal: Hearing and Decision, § 51.18*. For discussion and forms relating to costs on appeals to the appellate division of superior courts generally, see Ch. 345A, *Limited Civil Cases* .

[2] No Award on Summary Denial

An appellate court normally awards costs through the issuance of a remittitur [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.272(b)*]. In writ proceedings, however, a remittitur cannot be issued when an original petition is summarily denied and the court never determined on the merits whether the decision of the lower court, board, or tribunal was valid [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.272(b)*]. Apparently no mechanism exists for an appellate court to award costs to the prevailing respondent when it summarily denies a petition for writ of review [*see* Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984)] .

[3] Not Charged to Respondent Court

Although a party prevailing on the merits in writ proceedings can recover costs from the real party or parties in interest, the reviewing court will not charge such costs against a respondent court, a neutral party with no interest in the controversy [*Hupp v. Superior Court (1913) 22 Cal. App. 162, 166-167, 133 P. 987* (contempt review); *Platnauer v. Superior Court (1917) 33 Cal. App. 394, 395, 165 P. 41* ; *Oksner v. Superior Court (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 672, 690-691, 40 Cal. Rptr. 621]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentAdditurs & RemittitursRemittitursCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.32

§ 492.32 Subsequent Review of Writ Proceedings

A superior court judgment on a writ of review can be appealed to a court of appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a), 1110*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1064* states that a judgment in a special proceeding is the final determination of the rights of the parties therein. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1110* makes the statutes on appeal applicable to writ actions except where they are inconsistent with writ statutes. Thus, because an appeal is the regular and adequate remedy, a reviewing court will usually decline to consider a new and independent application of the same writ [*L.A. Surety Co., Inc. v. Municipal Court (1931) 111 Cal. App. 133, 135, 295 P. 591* ; *City of South Gate v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1416, 1421 n.2, 229 Cal. Rptr. 568* (writ of mandate denied because an adequate remedy available in right of appeal)].

When writ of review proceedings are initiated in the court of appeal, review from that court's judgment may be had by a petition for review by the state Supreme Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.500(a)(1)*]. This is not a refiling of a writ petition but rather a request for a hearing. The Supreme Court will grant review only when it appears necessary to secure uniformity of decisions of the courts of appeal or to the settlement of important questions of law, when the court of appeal was without jurisdiction to hear the writ of review proceedings, or when the court of appeal decision lacked the concurrences of the required majority of qualified judges [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.500(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 492.33-492.49

[Reserved]

§§ 492.33[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.50

§ 492.50 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of and in opposition to petitions for writs of review in contempt proceedings, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 47, *Contempt* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to writ of review proceedings generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender)

124 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.51

§ 492.51 State Constitution

Supreme Court, courts of appeal, superior court, and their judges as having original jurisdiction in writ of review proceedings. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.52

§ 492.52 State Statutes

Appealable judgments and orders. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1, 904.2*

Costs allowed in writ of review proceedings as in cases on appeal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1027*

Writ of certiorari may be denominated writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1067*

Courts are authorized to grant writ of review when inferior tribunal, board, or officer, exercising judicial functions, has exceeded its jurisdiction, and there is no appeal, nor any plain, speedy, and adequate remedy. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*

Application for writ of review as required to be made on verified petition of party beneficially interested. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*

Court as authorized to require notice of petition for writ of review to be given to adverse party, or as authorized to grant order to show cause why writ should not be allowed, or as authorized to grant writ without notice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*

Return of writ of review by demurrer, verified answer, or both. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*

Return of writ by respondent with required transcript. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1070*

Form and content of writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*

Stay of proceeding pending disposition by reviewing court on writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1072*

Service of writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1073*

Scope of review on writ or review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1074*

Further return of transcript; hearing and decision on writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*

Transmittal of judgment; judgment roll. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1076, 1077*

Service of application for extraordinary writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*

Return and hearing on extraordinary writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1108*

General procedural rules as applicable to extraordinary writs to extent consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1110b*. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1109, 1110*

Fee for filing original petition for writ of review is $655 for petition filed in Court of Appeal and $590 for petition filed in Supreme Court. *Gov. Code §§ 68926, 68926.1(b)* (requires additional $170 for deposit in appellate court trust fund), *68927*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProceduresAppealsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.53

§ 492.53 California Rules of Court

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*

Cover of petition for writ or answer to writ filed in appellate court as required to be red. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*

Petitions to reviewing courts for writ. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486*

Opposition and attorney general amicus briefs. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488*

Notice to trial court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.489*

Filing, finality, and modification of decisions; remittitur. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490*

Sanctions. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.492*

Costs. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.493*

Civil law and motion rules as applicable to petitions for writs of review filed in a superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

127 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.54

§ 492.54 Local Rules of the Courts of Appeal

Assignment of writ petitions. Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 1st App. Dist., Policy Statement A

Requirements for writ petitions; petitions for extraordinary writs, other than habeas corpus, as required to be accompanied by properly completed Appellate Court Writ Petition Information Sheet, which is available from court clerk. Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 5th App. Dist., Rule 3 and Local Court Form

Assignment of, and procedures for, extraordinary writ proceedings. First App. Dist., Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, §§ 25, 26, 29; Second App. Dist., Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, Assignment of Cases; Fourth App. Dist., Div. One, Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, § V; Fourth App. Dist., Div. Three, Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, § III(B); Sixth App. Dist., Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, § II(D)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.55

§ 492.55 Local Rules of Court

[1] Los Angeles County

Writs of review. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 2.5(i), 9.31

[2] Sacramento County

Writs of review or certiorari; presentment to judge. Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.01

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.56

§ 492.56 Decisions

[1] Burden of Insuring Adequate Return to Writ

Burden as on petitioner to see to it that return is filed and that complete record is made. *North Side etc. Assn. v. County of L.A. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 598* , 608, *161 P.2d 613* ; *Goodrich v. Superior Court (1928) 92 Cal. App. 695, 696, 268 P. 669*

[2] Grounds for Issuance of Writ of Review

[a] Beneficial Interest

Beneficiary of injunction that has been disobeyed as party beneficially interested under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* and so as able to bring writ of review to challenge court's order refusing to hold person enjoined in contempt. *Taylor v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 244, 247, 125 P.2d 1* ; *Goodall v. Superior Court (1918) 37 Cal. App. 723, 726, 174 P. 924*

Order of default in heirship proceeding as not subject to writ of review when petitioners were too far removed in relationship from decedent to be beneficially interested in estate. *Marlow v. Superior Court (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 393, 395, 110 P.2d 11* (petitioner's grandfather was uncle of the decedent)

Beneficially interested party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* as person directly and prejudicially affected by challenged order but not necessarily party to action below. *Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 75, 33 P.2d 669*

Writ of review as not granted to stranger to record when matter sought to be reviewed is judgment or order made in cause litigated inter partes. *Elliott v. Superior Court (1904) 144 Cal. 501, 508-509, 77 P. 1109*

[b] Exercise of Judicial Function

Local agencies as without constitutional authority to exercise judicial functions. *Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 36, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29*

State Personnel Board as deriving its adjudicating power directly from the *Constitution. Boren v. State Personnel Board (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 634, 637-638, 234 P.2d 981*

Statewide administrative agencies as not authorized by Constitution to exercise judicial functions. *Standard Oil Co. v. State Board of Equal. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 559, 59 P.2d 119*

State Personnel Board derives its adjudicating power from the *Constitution. Alameida v. State Personnel Board (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 46, 52-53, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 383*

[c] Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

[i] Burden of Establishing Jurisdiction

In writ of review proceeding to review decision of subordinate tribunal created by statute, respondent tribunal as required to establish jurisdiction and as not entitled to presumption of regularity. *Petersen v. Civil Service Board (1924) 67 Cal. App. 70, 78* (decision of civil service commission)

[ii] Error in Exercise of Jurisdiction Distinguished

Court that allows action to proceed in spite of plaintiff's failure to file statutorily mandated government claim as acting, at most, in error and not in excess of jurisdiction. *County of Santa Clara v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 545, 549, 94 Cal. Rptr. 158, 483 P.2d 774* ; *Redlands etc. Sch. Dist. v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 348, 360, 125 P.2d 490*

Court's refusal to disclose payments made to court-appointed defense counsel pursuant to California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code §§ 6250-6265*) as based on error of fact but not exceeding court's jurisdiction. *Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1106-1107, 231 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Appellate court's reversal of judgment on mechanic's lien on ground that materialman's preliminary notice was defective as mere error of law or fact, not excess of jurisdiction. *Brown Co. v. Appellate Department (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 891, 896, 904, 196 Cal. Rptr. 258*

[iii] Examples of Lack or Excess of Jurisdiction

Order extending time to plead beyond 30-day limit in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* as excess of jurisdiction. *Thelander v. Superior Court of Placer County (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 811, 813-814, 26 Cal. Rptr. 643, 376 P.2d 571*

Refusal to follow binding precedent, under doctrine of stare decisis, as excess of jurisdiction. *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 450, 454, 20 Cal. Rptr. 321, 369 P.2d 937*

Orders made by trial court after appeal has been perfected and court was divested of jurisdiction as annullable by writ of review. *Hollaway v. Scripps Memorial Hospital (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 719, 722, 168 Cal. Rptr. 782*

Court's attempt to compel particular settlement of case, by refusing to sign parties' stipulation and ordering plaintiff to reduce proposed judgment, as beyond court's jurisdiction; court's absolute refusal to proceed, in absence of any grounds for dismissal of action, as beyond court's jurisdiction. *People v. Cimarusti (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 314, 324, 146 Cal.*

Rptr. 421

Trial court's appointment of receiver to take possession of judgment debtor's property, absent statutory authorization, as excess of jurisdiction. *Mitchell v. Superior Court (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 759, 762-763, 104 Cal. Rptr. 921*

Entertaining motion of nonparties as beyond court's jurisdiction. *Chase v. Superior Court (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 872, 876-878, 27 Cal. Rptr. 383*

Court's refusal to award costs when statute makes award mandatory as excess of jurisdiction that may be corrected by writ of review. *Bue v. Superior Court (1928) 93 Cal. App. 147, 150, 269 P. 553*

[iv] Jurisdiction Defined

Meaning of "jurisdiction" for purposes of writ of review as different from and broader than meaning of same term when used in connection with "jurisdiction" over person and subject matter; acts that exceeds court's power, whether conferred by constitutional provision, statute, or rules developed and followed under doctrine of stare decisis, as in excess of jurisdiction. *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288, 109 P.2d 942* ; *Mitchell v. Superior Court (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 759, 762, 104 Cal. Rptr. 921*

[v] Nonexistence of Jurisdictional Facts Supporting Contempt Order

Contempt order as annullable by writ of review when based on failure to obey improperly served subpoena. *Chapman v. Superior Court (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 194, 200-201, 67 Cal. Rptr. 842*

Contempt order as annullable by writ of review when based on unverified charging affidavit. *Palm Springs Alpine Estates, Inc. v. Superior Court (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 883, 888, 63 Cal. Rptr. 618*

[d] No Appeal

[i] In General

Writ of review as not lying when petitioner has remedy by appeal. *Stoddard v. Superior Court of Stanislaus County (1895) 108 Cal. 303, 305* ; *Stoner v. Superior Court (1945) 67 Cal. App. 2d 760, 761, 155 P.2d 697*

Writ of review as available to review judgment in criminal case when no right of appeal or other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy exists, nor any threat of trial or retrial. *People v. Gonter (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 333, 338, 178 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Writ of review as unavailable to petitioner who has right to appeal, whether or not such appeal affords a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy. *Monterey Club v. Superior Court (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 351, 354-355, 112 P.2d 321*

[ii] Lack of Appeal Not Shown

Loss of right of appeal by failure to file timely notice of appeal as not supporting issuance of writ of review on grounds that there exists no remedy of appeal. *Simmons v. Superior Court (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 373, 375, 341 P.2d 13*

Probate order setting aside attorney's fees award on grounds of mistake as unappealable under former *Prob. Code § 1240* but as reviewable on appeal from subsequent order granting or denying attorney's fees, thereby precluding writ of

review. *Howard v. Superior Court (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 784, 787-788, 154 P.2d 849*

Order granting leave to amend complaint as not directly appealable but as subject to review on appeal from final judgment, thereby precluding writ of review; writ of review as unavailable as long as petitioner has adequate remedy by appeal from final judgment, even though challenged order itself is not appealable. *Bank of America v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 697, 703, 128 P.2d 357*

Loss of right of appeal by failure to file timely notice of appeal as supporting issuance of writ of review when loss is not petitioner's fault but instead due to fact that petitioner received no notice and had no knowledge of entry of judgment or order until after time for appeal had expired. *Lee v. Small ClaimsCourt (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4, 92 P.2d 937* ; *O'Kuna v. Small Claims Court, etc. (1927) 81 Cal. App. 588, 590, 254 P. 291*

[iii] Lack of Appeal Shown

Nonparty substituted for debtor misnamed in complaint as having no remedy by appeal and substitution order as therefore reviewable by writ of review. *Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 73-74, 33 P.2d 669*

Court order under California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code §§ 6250-6265*) as not a final judgment or order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1* and as therefore subject to writ of review. *Freedom Newspapers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 231 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Conditional probation order deferring judgment and sentencing as unappealable order after judgment and as therefore subject to writ of review. *People v. Gonter (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 333, 337, 178 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Order denying motion to set case for trial as unappealable and as therefore subject to writ of review. *People v. Cimarusti (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 314, 318, 319, 146 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Order compelling arbitration as unappealable and as therefore subject to writ of review. *Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 347, 353, 62 Cal. Rptr. 364*

Writ of review as available to review judgments by appellate departments of superior courts, from which there is no right of appeal. *Redlands, etc. Sch. Dist. v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 348, 351, 125 P.2d 490* (trial de novo in superior court)

[e] No Other Plain, Speedy, and Adequate Remedy

Order setting aside judgment as appealable special order after final judgment and so not reviewable by writ of review. *De Lao v. Superior Court (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 711, 712, 234 P.2d 961*

Writ of review as not available as long as petitioner has adequate remedy by appeal from final judgment, even though challenged order itself is not appealable. *Bank of America v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 697, 703, 128 P.2d 357*

Writ of review as not available to review decision of County Board of Equalization when petitioner had plain, speedy, and adequate remedy that permitted petitioner to pay taxes under protest and subsequently to file action to recover taxes. *Jillson v. Board of Supervisors (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 192, 195, 34 Cal. Rptr. 419*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Administrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsAuthority to AdjudicateGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.57

§ 492.57 Mislabeled Petitions

Petition for writ of review as deemed petition for writ of mandate when petitioner presented full record of lower court proceedings. *Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 170-171, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167*

Mislabeled petition as no bar to relief justified by proper allegations and proof. *Peck's Liquors, Inc. v. Superior Court (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 772, 775, 34 Cal. Rptr. 735*

Petition for writ of prohibition as deemed petition for writ of review when lower court completes threatened decision before petition heard. *Chase v. Superior Court (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 872, 878, 27 Cal. Rptr. 383*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsProhibitionCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.58

§ 492.58 Original Jurisdiction to Issue Writ

[1] In General

Appellate department of superior court as without jurisdiction to issue writ of review. *Thomasian v. Superior Court (1953) 122 Cal. App. 2d 322, 329, 265 P.2d 165*

[2] Refusal to Exercise Jurisdiction for Delay

Reasonable time in which to file petition for writ of review as same time allowed by law for appeal. *Reynolds v. Superior Court (1883) 64 Cal. 372, 373, 28 P. 121* ; *Bryant v. Superior Court (1936) 16 Cal. App. 2d 556, 561, 61 P.2d 483* (dictum)

Unexcused delay in seeking writ of review as sufficient reason for court to deny petition for writ, even absent showing of laches. *Scott v. Municipal Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 995, 997, 115 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.59

§ 492.59 Scope of Review

[1] In General

When jurisdiction of lower court or tribunal exists only on given facts, a review in writ proceeding as extending to whole of record below. *Great Western Power Co. v. Pillsbury (1915) 170 Cal. 180, 185, 191, 149 P. 35*

When conflicting inferences could be made from the evidence, and absent record showing how lower court reached its findings, re viewing court as compelled to resolve all conflicts in favor of the respondent court and indulge in all reasonable inferences to uphold the findings. *Tomlinson v. Superior Court (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 640, 643, 152 P.2d 517* (prohibition)

Evidence outside record as beyond scope of review in proceedings on writ of review. *Rinaldo v. Superior Court (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 585, 593, 59 P.2d 868* ; contra *Wilde v. Superior Court (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 168, 176, 127 P.2d 560* (testimony allowed in contempt review)

Annulment by writ of review as not proper when return showed on its face that it did not include all the evidence and showed some competent evidence in support of board's decision. *Landtbom v. Board of Fire Commrs. (1929) 98 Cal. App. 629, 631, 632, 277 P. 369*

[2] Contempt Orders

Examination of trial record on review of contempt order as extending to whether any substantial evidence was before trial court to sustain its jurisdiction. *In re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237, 247, 259, 110 Cal. Rptr. 121, 514 P.2d 1201* (writ of habeas corpus); *Chula v. Superior Court (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 199, 204, 18 Cal. Rptr. 507, 368 P.2d 107* (writ of review)

Power to weigh evidence in review of contempt proceeding as beyond scope of review. *In re Ciraolo (1969) 70 Cal.*

2d 389, 394, 74 Cal. Rptr. 865, 450 P.2d 241 (writ of habeas corpus)

In proceeding on application for writ of writ of review, question whether acts constituted contempt as jurisdictional and, in absence of evidence showing contempt, order of commitment as required to be annulled. *Arthur v. Superior Court (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 404, 409, 42 Cal. Rptr. 441, 398 P.2d 777*

Court, on writ of review, as indulging no presumption of validity in support of judgment of contempt. *Freeman v. Superior Court (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 533, 536, 282 P.2d 857*

Scope of review on application for writ of habeas corpus as identical to that by way of writ of review, namely, whether act or omission charged against alleged contemnor confers jurisdiction to adjudicate contempt and whether jurisdictional act or omission is supported by evidence. *In re Karpf (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 355, 364, 88 Cal. Rptr. 895* ; *In re Circosta (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 777, 785, 33 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Evidence outside record as within scope of review in proceedings on writ of review. *Wilde v. Superior Court (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 168, 176, 127 P.2d 560* ; contra *Rinaldo v. Superior Court (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 585, 593, 59 P.2d 868*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.60

§ 492.60 Summary Denial of Writ

Summary denial of petition for extraordinary writ as not res judicata in subsequent proceedings, regardless of whether denial is intended to be on merits or is based on some other ground. *Kowis v. Howard (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 888, 899, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728, 838 P.2d 250* (rejecting "sole possible ground" exception)

Court as capable of summarily denying petition for writ of review without any statement of reasons. *Tex-Cal Land Management, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 335, 350, 156 Cal. Rptr. 1, 595 P.2d 579*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.61

§ 492.61 Law Reviews

Chernoff and Watson, *Writ Lore*, 56 State B.J. 12 (1981)

Note, *Extraordinary Writs--Discretion or* Matter of Right? *15 Hastings L.J. 218 (1963)*

Witkin, *The Extraordinary Writ-- Friend or Enemy*, 29 Cal. State B.J. 467 (1954)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.62

§ 492.62 Text References

California Civil Writ Practice (Cal. CEB 3d ed. 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Jurisdiction*, § 276 et seq., vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 1-45, 134 et seq., (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 492.63-492.79

[Reserved]

§§ 492.63[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.80

§ 492.80 Petitioner's Checklist

[1] Preliminary Determinations

1. Review all papers relating to the case to determine whether facts support issuance of writ of review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; *see § 492.18*].

a. Petitioner must have no right to review by appeal, including review of interlocutory order on appeal from final order or judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1, 904.2*].

b. Petitioner must have no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*].

c. The act sought to be reviewed must be the exercise of a judicial function by a lower court, board, or officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*].

d. The act sought to be reviewed must be one made in excess of jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*].

e. Petitioner must have a beneficial interest in the challenged decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*].

2. Determine proper court in which to file petition.

NOTE:
All appellate courts and superior courts have original jurisdiction to issue a writ of review [*see Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*]. Usually, however, a petition is filed in the superior court to challenge the act of a or constitutionally created administrative agency within its district; in the appellate division of the superior court to challenge the act of the superior court in a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(b)*]; in a court of appeal to challenge the act of a superior court within its district; and in the

California Supreme Court to challenge the act of a court of appeal. If the petition is filed in an appellate court, and might lawfully be made to a lower court in the first instance, it must set forth the circumstances which, in the opinion of the petitioner, render it proper that the writ should issue originally from the reviewing court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)*].

3. Determine whether it is desirable to petition, in the alternative, for another type of extraordinary writ [*see §§ 492.13, 492.14*].

[2] Documents to Be Obtained

Obtain certified copies of the judgment or order sought to be reviewed. Obtain certified transcripts of relevant portions of the record as necessary to make a prima facie showing that writ should issue. For review of a contempt order, obtain at least a copy of the order violated, a transcript of the contempt hearing, and if appropriate, the process by which the court acquired jurisdiction over the contemner, such as proof of service of a subpoena or court order.

NOTE:

When filed in the Supreme Court or in a court of appeal, the verified petition must be accompanied by (1) a copy of the order or judgment from which relief is sought, (2) copies of all documents and exhibits submitted to the trial court supporting and opposing petitioner's position, and (3) copies of all other documents submitted to the trial court that are necessary for a complete understanding of the case and the ruling. In exigent circumstances, a petition may be filed without these documents if a declaration by counsel explains the urgency and the circumstances making the documents unavailable and fairly summarizes their substance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(1)-(3)*]. In addition, a transcript of the proceedings leading to the order or judgment below must accompany the writ petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(1)(D)*]. If a transcript is unavailable, counsel must make and file a declaration that either (1) explains why a transcript is unavailable and fairly summarizes the proceedings, including arguments by counsel and the basis of the trial court's decision, if stated; or (2) states that the transcript has been ordered, the date it was ordered, and the date it is expected to be filed, which must be a date prior to any action requested of the reviewing court other than issuance of a stay supported by other parts of the record [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(2)*].

Although the statutes and rules of court governing writ of review proceedings do not expressly require that a petition filed in superior court be supported by portions of the record, the inclusion of these exhibits may be required by local practice and, in any event, may be necessary to preclude summary denial of the petition [*see § 492.20[4][b]*]

Follow local practice regarding the preparation of documentary exhibits to be submitted with the petition. In appellate court proceedings, counsel need only lodge one set of any separately bound supporting documents, in contrast with the greater number of copies of the petition that are required to be filed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(b)(5)*].

Clerks' fees for preparing copies of the court's record are set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 26831-26837*. Court reporters' fees for preparation of transcripts are set forth in *Gov. Code § 69950*.

[3] Prepare Petition for Writ of Review

1. Review essential allegations. See generally *§§ 492.101* and *492.102*.

2. Draft petition.

For discussion of the required number of copies of the petition and format requirements, see *§ 492.101[8], [9]*. For a cover for use in filing a petition in an appellate court, see *§ 492.100*.

3. Sign petition.

The petition must be signed by the petitioner or his or her attorney [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 1109*; *see also §§ 492.101*, 492.102].

4. Verify petition.

The petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(4)*; §§ 492.101, 492.102]. For discussion of verification in superior and appellate courts, see *§§ 492.101[7]* and *492.102*.

[4] Prepare Proposed Order and Writ for Superior Court

For a proceeding in a superior court, prepare an order for the judge's signature and the writ of review for issuance by the clerk of court. Counsel should draft the writ of review and order either separately [*see §§ 492.103* and *492.104*] or as one document [*see § 492.104*], depending on what the local practice requires. The Supreme Court and courts of appeal prepare their own orders and writs.

[5] Prepare Points and Authorities

Draft a supporting memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(5)* (appellate courts); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2), 3.1113* (superior courts)]. Prepare the same number of copies as were prepared for the petition and attach a copy to each copy of the petition. For forms of memoranda for use in supporting a petition for writ of review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

[5a] Prepare Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

If a party files a motion, an application, or an opposition to a motion or application before filing its principal brief, the party must serve and file a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons at the time it files the first such motion, application, or opposition and must include a copy of this certificate in the party's principal brief. If no motion, application, or opposition to such motion or application is filed before the parties file their principal briefs, each party must include a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons in its principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*]. If the identity of any party or any entity or person subject to disclosure has not been publicly disclosed in the proceedings and a party wants to keep that identity confidential, the party may serve and file an application for permission to file its certificate under seal separately from its principal brief, motion, application, or opposition. If the application is granted, the party must file the certificate under seal and without service within 10 days of the court's order granting the application [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)(2)*]. The petitioner's certificate must be included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(1)*]. The certificates of the respondent and real party in interest must be included in their preliminary opposition or, if no such opposition is filed, in their return, if any. The certificate must appear after the cover and before the tables [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(3)*].

For a form of the Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons--Judicial Council Form APP-008, see *Ch. 50, Appeal: Briefs, § 50.83*.

[6] Serve Petition

Serve copy of petition and accompanying papers on respondent and real party in interest. The general service

requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* apply [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for further discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* ; *see also § 492.101[12]*].

NOTE:

Usually the petition must be filed with proof that it has been served on both the respondent and the real party in interest, unless the court exercises its discretion power to permit filing without service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*]. Consult local practice with respect to this requirement. For further discussion of ex parte applications, see *§ 492.102[5][b]*.

[7] Prepare Proof of Service of Petition

When the petition is served on the respondent and real party in interest before filing [*see § 492.80[6]*], prepare a proof of service in as many copies as the petition, and append the original and copies of the proof of service to the original and copies of the petition.

Proof of service is made in the same manner as proof of service of summons and complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; *see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10, 1013a, 2009, 2015.3, 2015.5*]. Thus, for example, the mandatory Judicial Council form of proof of service of summons [Cal. Judicial Council Form 982(a)(23); *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div., III] may be adapted for use as proof of service of the petition. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge. For further discussion and forms of proof of service, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

NOTE:

If the petition is to be filed in an appellate court, in addition to complying *Cal. Rules of Ct. Rule 8.25*, the proof of service must give the telephone number of each attorney served; an appellate court may strike a petition accompanied by a defective proof of service, or may impose a lesser sanction, unless a proper proof of service is filed within five days after the clerk gives notice of the defect [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)(5)*].

[8] File Original Petition

File, with the clerk of the proper court, the original petition and the required number of copies [*see, e.g., Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44*; *see also § 492.101[9]*]. Aside from incorporated exhibits, if any [*see § 492.80[2]*], the original and each copy must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum of points and authorities [§ 492.80[5]] and by a proof of service, if prior service was required [*§ 492.80[6], [7]*]. Counsel should consult local practice for additional requirements [*see, e.g.*, Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 5th App. Dist., Rule 3 (requiring writ petition to be accompanied with completed fact sheet available from court clerk)].

NOTE:

A filing fee of $655, payable to the clerk of the court, must accompany the filing of a petition for a writ of review in the Court of Appeal (or $590 in the Supreme Court) [*Gov. Code §§ 68926, 68926.1(b)* (requires additional $170 for deposit in appellate court trust fund), *68927*]. The filing fee required in superior courts varies [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 411.20, 1109*; *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6321-6324*], and counsel should check with the clerk of the court to determine the applicable amount. For a form of waiver of filing fees in proceedings *in forma pauperis*, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

[9] Consideration and Ruling on Petition

1. Hearing of petition

A superior court judge may hear and dispose of the writ petition in chambers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 166(a)(1)*]. Appellate courts usually determine in conference whether to grant the petition and issue the writ of review or to deny the petition.

2. Review of summary denial

If the petition is denied summarily, determine whether to seek review of the denial. The usual method of review of an order denying a petition for a writ of review is by appeal. When a court of appeal denies a petition without issuance of the writ, the order is final immediately on filing and petitioner may therefore petition the Supreme Court for a hearing without waiting the normal 30-day period prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.264(b)(2)*].

3. Granting of petition and issuance of writ of review.

If the superior court grants an order commanding a writ of review to issue [*see §§ 492.103* and *492.104*], the clerk then issues the writ. In a superior court proceeding, counsel will have drafted the writ and order [*see § 492.80[4], [5],* and *§§ 492.103,* 104]. Appellate courts draft their own writs and orders.

The date for hearing on the writ of review is supplied by the judge or the clerk. A hearing date may be set at any time [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1108*].

[10] Serve Writ of Review

Serve a copy of the writ on the respondent and each real party in interest in the same manner as a summons would be served in a civil action, unless the court expressly directs otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1073*]. If they were not served before filing, a copy of the petition and the memorandum of points and authorities should accompany the writ when served [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.40* (service of complaint with summons); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1073* and *§ 492.104[4]*]. When the respondent is a court, consult local procedure to determine if service should be made on the presiding judge or on the clerk of the court.

If the writ is issued by an appellate court, the clerk of that court is required to promptly transmit a certified copy of the writ to the respondent to whom it is directed. If, in addition, this writ includes an order that stays proceedings scheduled to occur within seven days of its issuance, the clerk of that court is required to make a reasonable effort to give telephone notice to the respondent to whom it is directed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.489*].

[11] Insure Return of Certified Record

Insure that a certified record of the proceedings below is filed and that therecord provided to the reviewing court is complete [*see also § 492.26[2]*].

1. Pay the fees charged by the clerk to make a return of the record.

Clerks' fees for preparing copies of the court's record are set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 26831-26837* (superior court) and *72054* (appellate division). If a transcript of some or all of the proceedings below will be necessary to meet the burden on review, deposit with the court the estimated cost of preparing court a reporter's transcript as required by *Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 8.130(b)* (superior court) and *Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 8.753(c)* (appellate division).

2. See that the certified record of the proceedings below has been properly prepared and filed by the date set for the return in the writ of review.

The burden is on the petitioner to ensure that the record is filed and, in the absence of a return, the writ can be discharged and the proceeding dismissed.

3. If the record filed by the respondent is incomplete, file a motion in the reviewing court to compel a further return of record [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1075* and §§ *492.105, 492.106*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProceduresAppealsRecords on AppealGovernmentsCourtsCourt PersonnelGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.81

§ 492.81 Guide for Real Party in Interest

NOTE:

When the circumstances or local practice permit, the petitioner may be able to obtain issuance of a writ of review without prior service of the petition on the real party in interest [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)(6)*; *§ 492.80[6]*]. In this situation the first step for the real party in interest will be a return to the writ by demurrer or verified answer [*see § 492.81[3]*].

[1] Prepare Opposition to Petition

1. Draft opposing memorandum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)*].

For forms of memoranda of points and authorities for use in opposing a petition for writ of review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

2. If proceeding is in an appellate court, prepare, in the same number of copies as the opposing memorandum, a statement of any material fact that was not included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)*].

3. If proceeding is in appellate court, serve and file a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons in the first document filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*] and include a copy of the certificate in the principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*].

For a form of the Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons--Judicial Council Form APP-008, see *Ch. 50, Appeal: Briefs, § 50.83*.

[2] Serve and File Opposition to Petition

Within 10 days after the petition is filed, serve a copy of the opposing memorandum on the petitioner, and file the original and any required copies, together with proof of service, with the clerk of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*;

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)]. The general requirements for service of papers under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* apply [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; for further discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[3] Return to Writ of Review: Answer or Demurrer

1. Preliminary determinations

Determine whether grounds exist to challenge the petition and support a judgment discharging the writ, either by demurrer or by answer filed as a return to the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)*].

a. Is the petition properly verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *see § 492.20[3]*], timely filed [*see § 492.17[2]*], or unjustifiably filed in higher court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)*; *see § 492.17[1]*].

b. Does petition disclose, or do facts otherwise indicate, the absence of any necessary ground for issuance of the writ, that is, beneficial interest on part of petitioner, judicial action lacking or in excess of jurisdiction, and no right to appeal or other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; see *§ 492.18*].

2. Prepare demurrer or verified answer, or both.

NOTE:
If demurrer alone is filed but is not sustained, the reviewing court may or may not permit subsequent filing of a verified answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)(4)*; *see also § 492.26*].

If grounds for an objection appear on the face of the petition, draft a demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *see § 492.107*], showing why the petition does not state facts sufficient to support annulment of the challenged order or judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*].

If grounds for objection do not appear on the face of the petition but can be raised by denial of the petition's material allegations or by a statement of new matters, draft an answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *see § 492.108*] showing why, given the denials or allegations in the verified answer, petitioner is not entitled to annulment of the challenged order or judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(b), 431.30(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*].

Prepare enough copies to file the original and required number of court copies, to serve all other parties to the action, and to retain one office copy.

3. Sign demurrer or answer.

The demurrer or answer must be signed by the petitioner or his or her attorney [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 1109*].

4. Verify answer.

A return by answer must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule*

8.486(b)(1); *see §§ 492.101[7]* and *492.102*].

5. Prepare an opposing memorandum.

Draft a memorandum in support of the demurrer, if filing in superior court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320(a)*]. In other situations, a memorandum of points and authorities is not expressly required, although they may be desirable, particularly if a previous opposing memorandum has not been filed [§ 492.81[1]].

Prepare the same number of copies as the demurrer (or answer) and attach. For forms of memoranda for use in supporting a petition for writ of review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

6. Serve and file answer or demurrer.

Serve a copy of the demurrer or answer, or both, together with the supporting memorandum, if any, on the petitioner, and file the original and any required copies, together with proof of service, with the clerk of the court. The general requirements for service of papers under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* apply [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; for further discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. Service and filing must be completed on the date specified for the return if the proceeding is in a superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1171* (writ specifies date for return)], if in the appellate court, within 30 days after the court issues the alternative writ or order to show cause or notifies the parties that it is considering issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.409(h)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.82

§ 492.82 Hearing and Posthearing Procedure

[1] Attend Hearing and Present Oral Argument, if Appropriate

When a full return has been made, the court will hear those parties who attend for that purpose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. This does not mean, however, that oral argument may not be waived. Appellate procedures, in particular, may deem argument waived unless requested [*see, e.g.,* Cal. Cts. of Appeal Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, 1st Dist., Part III(A), § 20].

[2] Prepare and Serve Proposed Judgment (Superior Court Only)

If the judge of the superior court orders counsel to prepare a proposed judgment, or if local practice so requires, draft the appropriate judgment affirming, modifying, or annulling the order or judgment below, serve it on all other parties, and submit it to the court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)-(h)*]. In a proceeding in an appellate court, the written opinion of the court constitutes its judgment and therefore counsel does not prepare a form of judgment.

For a form of judgment for use in superior court, see *§ 492.104*.

[3] Prepare Notice of Entry of Judgment (Superior Court Only)

The party submitting the proposed judgment for entry must also prepare and mail a copy of the notice of entry of judgment to all parties who have appeared in the proceeding and then file with the court the original notice of entry of judgment, together with the proof of service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a), (c)*].

[4] Prepare Costs Memorandum or Motion to Tax Costs

The party in whose favor the court has awarded costs should prepare a verified memorandum of costs to be served and filed in the trial court within 40 days after the remittitur is filed with the trial court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.278(c)* (appellate court), 8.764(d); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1027*]. The party against whom the court awards costs may move to tax costs by a notice of motion served and filed 15 days after service of the cost memorandum, or 20 days after service if the service was by mail [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1700(b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*, applicable by *Cal. Rules*

of Ct., Rule 8.278(c)(2) (appellate court), Rule 8.764(d); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1027*]. For forms and discussion of the memorandum of costs, or the motion to tax costs, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.83

§ 492.83 Postjudgment Procedure

[1] Superior Court

If aggrieved by the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 902, 904.1, 1110*], file a timely notice of appeal [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.104(a)*; for further discussion and forms, see Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal*].

[2] Appellate Court

1. Petition for rehearing

If aggrieved by the judgment, file a petition for rehearing within 15 days after the filing of the decision [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.268(b)(1)*; for further discussion and forms, see Ch. 52, *Appeal: Rehearing*].

2. Petition for review (court of appeal only)

Serve and file in the Supreme Court a petition for review within 10 days after the decision of the court of appeal becomes final as to that court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.500(d)(1)*; for further discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRehearingsCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 492.84-492.99

[Reserved]

§§ 492.84[Reserved]

142 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.100

§ 492.100 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486]--Cover of Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204]

[1] FORM Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490]--Cover of Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204]

[CIVIL NO.
_____]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[*OR*]

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, _____ APPELLATE DISTRICT

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	[CIVIL NO. _____]
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW AND SUP-
Respondent,	)	PORTING MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
_____ [*name*],	)	AUTHORITIES
Real Party in Interest.	)	[STAY REQUESTED]
	)	
	)	

_____

The Honorable _____ [*name of trial judge*], Judge
[Case No. _____ [*specify case number in trial court, if any*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*typed name*]
_____ [*address*]
_____ [*telephone number*]
California State Bar No. _____
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form illustrates the format of a cover for a petition for a writ of review to be filed in the Supreme Court or in a court of appeal. For a form of petition, see *§ 492.101*.

[3] Format

A petition for review filed in an appellate court must, on its cover, designate the title of the case, the name, address, and telephone numberof the attorney filing the petition, the name of the trial judge, and the number of the case in the trial court, if any [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204*].

The cover must also contain the California State Bar membership number of the attorney filing the petition and of every attorney who joins in the petition. California State Bar membership numbers of the supervisors in a law firm or public law office of the attorney responsible for the case need not be stated [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204*].

So far as practicable, the cover of any petition for an original writ should be red in color [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*]. The court will accept a petition with the wrong color cover for filing but, in case of repeated violations by an attorney or a party, may order the petition returned or stricken until corrected within a specified time [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.204(e), 8.40(b)*].

The use of recycled paper for the cover is encouraged [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)*].

[4] Request for Stay

This form includes, in the title, optional language indicating that a stay is requested. Whenever a petition for a writ filed in an appellate court includes a request for a temporary stay [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1071* (temporary stay in writ of review proceeding)], the cover of the petition must bear the conspicuous notation "STAY REQUESTED," and identify the nature and date of the proceeding or act sought to be stayed.

[5] Related Appeal Pending

When the petition seeks review of trial court proceedings that are also the subject of a pending appeal, the title of the petition must include the notation "Related Appeal Pending." In such a case this form should be modified accordingly [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(3)*; *see also § 492.101*].

[6] Proceeding Involving Unfair Competition Case

For discussion of service requirements in an unfair competition case under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq., see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17209*.

[7] California Rules of Court

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*

Cover of petition for original writ filed in appellate court as required to be red. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*

Cover of petition for writ filed in appellate court that includes request for stay as required to bear conspicuous notation that stay is requested and identify the nature and date of the proceeding or act sought to be stayed. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.116*

Information required to be included on cover of petition for writ filed in appellate court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204*

[8] Local Rules of Courts of Appeal

Requirements for covers on documents filed with court. Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 4th App. Dist., Rule 2

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.101

§ 492.101 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486]--Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)]

[1] FORM Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Appellate Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490]--Petition [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(b)]

[CIVIL NO.
_____]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

[OR]

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, _____ APPELLATE DISTRICT

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	[CIVIL NO. _____]
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW AND SUP-
Respondent,	)	PORTING MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
_____ [*name*],	)	AUTHORITIES
Real Party in Interest.	)	[STAY REQUESTED]
	)	
	)	

_____

TO THE HONORABLE _____ [CHIEF *or* PRESIDING] JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE _____ [SUPREME COURT *or* COURT OF APPEAL OF THE _____ (*number*) APPELLATE DISTRICT] OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is _____ [*identify petitioner and describe capacity, if other than as an individual, in which the proceeding is being brought, e.g.,* and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California].

2. Respondent is _____ [*identify respondent, e.g.,* the Superior Court of the _____ County, California, in which the above entitled action is pending].

3. Real party in interest is _____ [*name*], and has an interest that is directly affected by this proceeding in that _____ [*specify facts that make person the real party in interest, e.g.,* he/she is the _____ (plaintiff *or* defendant) in the action entitled _____ (*case name*), Civil Action No. _____, now pending before respondent court].

4. Petitioner is a person beneficially interested in the issuance of a writ of review by virtue of the fact that _____ [*specify facts that demonstrate petitioner's beneficial interest in the issuance of a writ, e.g.,* he/she is_____ (plaintiff *or* defendant) in the action entitled _____ (*case name*), Civil Action No. _____, now pending before respondent court].

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing that challenged action of respondent constitutes exercise of a judicial function, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), in respondent court, the Honorable _____ (*name*), Judge, made an order directing petitioner to _____ (*specify*). A copy of this order is attached and incorporated as Exhibit A. On _____ (*date*), in respondent court, the Honorable _____ (*name*), Judge, issued an order to show cause directing petitioner to appear at a hearing to determine whether or not he/she should be held in contempt of court for allegedly violating the order attached as Exhibit A. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Honorable _____ (*name*), Judge, ordered that petitioner be held in contempt of court for failure to comply with the order attached as Exhibit A. A copy of the order of contempt is attached and incorporated as Exhibit B. A transcript of the contempt hearing, held on _____ (*date*), is attached and incorporated as Exhibit C].

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing that the challenged action of respondent was made without or in excess of jurisdiction, e.g.,* Respondent, in making _____ (*specify challenged action, e.g.,* the contempt order attached as Exhibit B), _____ (acted without *or* exceeded its) jurisdiction in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the order contains a finding, unsupported by substantial evidence, that petitioner was able to comply with the allegedly disobeyed order attached as Exhibit A)].

7. Petitioner has no right of appeal from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the above-described order of respondent attached as Exhibit A], and he/she has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy other than the relief sought in this petition.

[8. This petition is made to this court in the first instance rather than to the _____ (*specify lower court in which petition might lawfully have been made, e.g.,* Superior Court of _____ County, California), for the following reason(s): _____ (*specify circumstances, as required under Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1),* which, in petitioner's opinion, render it proper that the writ should issue originally from the reviewing court).]

[9. Unless the proceedings before respondent are stayed by order of this Court, petitioner will sustain immediate and irreparable damage in that _____ (a *llege facts showing that the challenged order or judgment caused serious detriment to petitioner and set forth the relevant time constraints justifying the inclusion in the writ of a stay of the proceedings below, e.g.,* as a result of the above-described order of respondent attached as Exhibit A, petitioner has been held in criminal contempt and will be required to pay monetary sanctions in the amount of $_____ by _____ (*date*) unless said requirement is stayed by order of this Court).]

[10. As a result of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the above-described order of respondent attached as Exhibit A), petitioner will sustain irreparableinjury before this matter can be heard on notice in that _____ (*allege facts showing urgency of need for relief and justifying the court's grant of the petition ex parte, if local practice requires that good cause be shown, e.g.,* as a result of the above-described order of respondent attached as Exhibit A, petitioner has been sentenced for criminal contempt and ordered to serve 30 days in the county jail, which order may be executed immediately), and the serious and imminent injury to petitioner constitutes good cause for this Court to consider and grant this petition ex parte without notice or service to or on respondent or real party in interest named in this action.]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays,

1. That a writ of review issue under the seal of this Court commanding respondent to certify fully to this court, at a specified time and place, a transcript of the record and proceedings described above.

2. That the foregoing cause be heard and fully considered by this court and that the _____ [*specify challenged action, e.g.,* order of contempt made on _____ (*date*), by the Honorable _____ (*name*), Judge of respondent court], be annulled and set aside;

[3. That this court issue an order requiring respondent to desist and refrain from further proceedings in the above-described matter during the pendency of this proceeding;]

4. For recovery of costs incurred in this proceeding; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know its contents. The facts stated therein are true and are within my personal knowledge.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[*Add, if seeking to file petition without proof of prior service*]

ORDER

TO THE CLERK OF COURT:

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING from the verified petition set forth above,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the aforesaid petition be accepted and filed, without proof that copies of the petition have been served on respondent and real party or parties in interest named in this action.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
[Chief Justice *or* Presiding Justice]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[*Add supporting memorandum of points and authorities*]

CAUTION:
The petition for writ or review filed in an appellate court must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(4)*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition at the time of filing, except when the court has exercised its discretion to permit filing without notice or service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition for a writ of review is for use in the Supreme Court or in a court of appeal. Because the reviewing court may deny the petition summarily, counsel should insure, when adapting this form to particular fact situations, that no essential allegations are omitted inadvertently.

The form of petition must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)*].

For a form of cover to be used with this petition, see *§ 492.100*. For a form of petition for writ of review for use in superior courts, see *§ 492.102*.

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges (1) the identity and capacity of the petitioner (Paragraph 1); (2) the identity and capacity of the respondent (Paragraph 2); (3) the identity and capacity of the real party or parties in interest (Paragraph 3) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)*; *see Inland Counties Regional Center, Inc. v. Office of Administrative Hearings (1987) 193 Cal.*

App. 3d 700, 704-705, 238 Cal. Rptr. 422] ; (4) the beneficial interest of the petitioner [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *see Burlingame v. Justice's Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 71, 75, 33 P.2d 669]* ; (5) respondent's exercise of judicial functions (Paragraph 5) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; *see Standard Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 557, 559, 59 P.2d 119]* ; (6) lack or excess of jurisdiction (Paragraph 6) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; *see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 288, 291, 109 P.2d 942]* ; and (7) petitioner'slack of appeal or any other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy (Paragraph 7) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068*; *see De Lao v. Superior Court (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 711, 712, 234 P.2d 961]* . Optional Paragraph 8 is included for use when the petition is filed in an appellate court but could have been properly filed in a lower court, alleging the circumstances that render it appropriate for the appellate court to exercise its original jurisdiction in the first instance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(1)*]. Optional Paragraph 9 is included for use when the petitioner seeks to allege facts supporting his or her request for a stay of the proceedings below pending disposition of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(7)*]. Optional Paragraph 10 is included for use when the petitioner seeks to allege facts showing good cause for allowing the petition to be filed without proof of prior service on the respondent and real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069, 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)(6)*].

[4] General Rules of Pleading Apply

A petition for a writ of review is subject to the general rules of pleading (*Code Civ. Proc. § 420 et seq.*) governing complaints to the extent that these provisions are consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1063-1110* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*; for discussion of general rules of pleading, *see* Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*].

[5] Naming Respondent

When identifying the respondent (Paragraph 2), a petition should name the court, board, or other body, as distinguished from an individual judge, board member, or other person [*see Lois R. v. Superior Court (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 895, 903, 97 Cal. Rptr. 158* (prohibition); *Sperry & Hutchinson Co. v. Cal. State Bd. of Pharmacy (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 229, 236, 50 Cal. Rptr. 489]* .

[6] Request for Stay

[a] Pending Disposition of Writ

There are no express requirements for requesting that the court include a stay order in the writ of review. However, a petitioner who requests a stay of the proceedings below should explain in the petition the reasons for the urgency and set forth all relevant time constraints [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a)(7)*]. The showing necessary to obtain a temporary stay order, at least in an appellate court proceeding, may be inferred from that required to stay a lower court's proceeding pending appeal [*see Mehr v. Superior Court (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1050, 189 Cal. Rptr. 138* (writ of mandate issued to compel lower court to stay proceedings pending appeal when appeal raised substantial question and stay appeared proper in view of potential irreparable injury to petitioner absent stay order andlack of prejudice to respondent); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.112* (procedure for writ of supersedeas to stay lower proceeding pending appeal)]. For further discussion and forms relating to stays pending appeal, see Ch. 43, *Appeal: Stay of Proceedings* . For a form of writ including a stay order, see *§ 492.104*.

If the petition includes a request for a stay, the cover must include a notation to that effect and identify the nature and date of the proceeding or act sought to be stayed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.116* and *§ 492.100[4]*].

[b] Pending Disposition of Petition

Although *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071* and *1072* provide for inclusion of a stay order in the writ of review, there is no express provision for obtaining an immediate stay before the court grants or denies the petition for the writ [*cf. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.112* (ex parte stay pending disposition of petition for writ of supersedeas)]. Courts do, however,

have express authority to grant a petition for a writ of review without notice to the adverse party, and thus a petitioner seeking an immediate stay of proceedings may simply combine a request for a stay with a request that the petition be granted immediately, without notice or opposition [*see § 492.101[11]*].

In a jurisdiction where filing of the petition without a proof of service is allowed as a matter of course, counsel simply should include in the prayer of the petition the allegations necessary to support a stay of the proceedings below [Optional Paragraph 9]. In a court that normally requires proof of service before accepting the petition for filing, counsel should request a stay in the petition and also allege facts showing good cause for issuance of the writ without proof of prior service [Optional Paragraph 10; *see also § 492.101[11], [12]*]. To facilitate filing without proof of prior service in a court in which this is not routinely permitted, counsel may append to the petition the optional order in the foregoing form, for the court's endorsement, directing the clerk to permit filing of the petition without proof of prior service. After filing, the court may then sign an order for immediate issuance of the writ. For forms to use in preparing an order and writ in a superior court, see *§§ 492.103* and *492.104*.

[7] Verification

The requirement that the petition be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*] may be satisfied by affidavit or by declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 1109, 2015.5*]. The usual method of verification, and that used in the foregoing form, is by declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. The declaration is executed by the petitioner if an individual is involved. It is executed by counsel if petitioner is out of the county in which counsel has his or her office, if for some reason petitioner is unable to verify it, or when the facts are within the attorney'sknowledge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. If petitioner is a corporation, the declaration is executed by an officer of that corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*].

The verification in the form omits standard language by which matters in the petition are verified on information and belief as well as on personal knowledge, because verification on information and belief is a form of hearsay that will not support the issuance of a writ for extraordinary relief [*see Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* (petition for writ of mandate verified wholly on information and belief by petitioner's attorney); *see also § 492.20[3]*].

For further discussion of the general requirements for verification and for alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[8] Format of Petition

[a] Generally Subject to Requirements for Appellate Briefs

Except as otherwise provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.485-8.493*, a petition must, insofar as practicable, comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.485(a)*]. Rule 8.204 sets out the format requirements governing appellate briefs. Accordingly, in the following discussion of the requirements of Rule 8.212, the term "petition" has been substituted for the term "brief."

[b] Headings, References, Index, and Tables

Each point in a petition must appear separately under an appropriate heading, with subheadings if desired. Such headings should be concise headings which are generally descriptive of the subject matter covered [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(a)(1)(B)*].

The statement of any matter in the record must be supported by appropriate reference to the record [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(a)(1)(C)*].

A petition must be prefaced by a topical index of its contents and a table of authorities, separately listing cases, statutes, court rules, constitutional provisions, and other authorities [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(a)(1)(A)*].

For a form of appellate brief illustrating compliance with the heading, index, and tables requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(a)(1)*, see Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs* .

[c] Format Requirements

A petition may be reproduced by any process that produces a clear, black image of letter quality. The paper must be white or unbleached, recycled, 81/2 by 11 inches, and of at least 20-pound weight [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(1)*]. Any conventional typeface may be used. The typeface may be either proportionally spaced or monospaced [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(2)*]. The type style must be roman; but for emphasis, italics or boldface may be used, or the text may be underscored. Case names must be italicized or underscored. Headings may be in uppercase letters [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(3)*]. The type size, including footnotes, must not be smaller than 13-point, and both sides of the paper may be used [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(4)*]. The lines of text must be unnumbered and at least one-and-a-half spaced. Headings and footnotes may be single-spaced. Quotations may be block-indented and single-spaced. Single-spaced means six lines to a vertical inch [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(5)*]. The margins must be at least 11/2 inches on the left and right and 1 inch on the top and bottom [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(6)*]. The pages must be consecutively numbered. The tables and the body of the petition may have different numbering systems [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(7)*].

A typewritten original and carbon copies may be filed only with the presiding justice's permission, which will ordinarily be given only to unrepresented parties proceeding in forma pauperis. All other typewritten petitions must be filed as photocopies [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(11)(A)*]. Both sides of the paper may be used if a photocopy is filed; only one side may be used if a typewritten original and carbon copies are filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(11)(B)*]. The type size, including footnotes, must not be smaller than standard pica, 10 characters per inch. Unrepresented incarcerated litigants may use elite type, 12 characters per inch, if they lack access to a typewriter with larger characters [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(11)(C)*]. In all other respects, the typewritten motion must conform to the requirements for all other papers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)*; *see § 492.101[8][a]*].

[d] Word or Page Limit

A petition produced on a computer must not exceed 14,000 words, including footnotes. Such a petition must include a certificate by appellate counsel or an unrepresented party stating the number of words in the petition. The person certifying may rely on the word count of the computer program used to prepare the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(c)(1)*]. A petition produced on a typewriter must not exceed 50 pages [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(c)(2)*].

The following items are not included in the word or page limit [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(c)(3)*]:

- The tables.
- The certificate stating the number of words in the petition.
- Any attachment, not to exceed 10 pages, except with permission from the presiding justice, consisting of copies of exhibits or other materials in the appellate record [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(d)*].

[e] Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons

If a party files a motion, an application, or an opposition to a motion or application before filing its principal brief, the

party must serve and file a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons at the time it files the first such motion, application, or opposition and must include a copy of this certificate in the party's principal brief. If no motion, application, or opposition to such motion or application is filed before the parties file their principal briefs, each party must include a Certificate of Interested Entitites or Persons in its principal brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)*]. If the identity of any party or any entity or person subject to disclosure has not been publicly disclosed in the proceedings and a party wants to keep that identity confidential, the party may serve and file an application for permission to file its certificate under seal separately from its principal brief, motion, application, or opposition. If the application is granted, the party must file the certificate under seal and without service within 10 days of the court's order granting the application [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208(d)(2)*]. The petitioner's certificate must be included in the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(1)*]. The certificates of the respondent and real party in interest must be included in their preliminary opposition or, if no such opposition is filed, in their return, if any. The certificate must appear after the cover and before the tables [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488(c)(3)*].

For a form of the Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons--Judicial Council Form APP-008, see *Ch. 50, Appeal: Briefs, § 50.83*.

[9] Copies

Format requirements applicable generally to appellate papers, include the requirement that copies be clear and legible [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(1)* (the clerk or the court may reject for filing or strike any petition that is not clearly legible, or that appears to be printed with the characters artificially close to each other)].

The petition must be drafted in the following number of copies:

(1) Original and 13 copies for filing if petition is filed in Supreme Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(a)(1)*]; original and four copies for filing if petition is filed in Court of Appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(b)(1)*].

(2) Copy for service on respondent.

(3) Copy for service on real party in interest. When there are two or more respondents or two or more real parties in interest, a copy for service on each such party will be prepared.

(4) Office copy.

(5) Copy for petitioner, if desired.

(6) Additional copies as desired.

[10] Attaching Complete Record

Whenever a petition for a writ of mandate in an appellate court seeks review of a trial court ruling, it must be accompanied by a record adequate to permit the review, including the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)*]:

(1) A copy of the ruling from which relief is sought;

(2) Copies of all documents and exhibits submitted to the trial court supporting and opposing the petitioner's position;

(3) Copies of all other documents submitted to the trial court that are necessary for a complete understanding of the case and the ruling; and

(4) A transcript of the proceedings leading to the order or judgment below or, if a transcript is unavailable, a declaration by counsel explaining why a transcript is unavailable and fairly summarizing the proceedings, including arguments by counsel and the basis of the trial court's decision, if stated; or a declaration by counsel stating that the transcript has been ordered, the date it was ordered, and the date it is expected to be filed, which must be a date prior to any action requested of the reviewing court other than issuance of a stay supported by other parts of the record.

In exigent circumstances, a petition may be filed without a copy of the order, judgment, or relevant documents, other than the transcript, if a declaration by counsel explains the urgency and the circumstances making the documents unavailable and fairly summarizes their substance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(b)*].

All copies of documents must be legible [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)*].

Documents submitted in support of a petition must comply with the following requirements [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(c)*]:

- They must be bound together at the end of the petition or in separate volumes not to exceed 300 pages each, with consecutive pagination throughout.

- They must be index-tabbed by number or letter.

- They must begin with a table of contents listing each document by title and its index-tab number or letter.

The appellate court clerk is required to accept for filing petitions and supporting documents not in compliance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(c)*, but the court may give the petitioner notice requiring that the petition and documents be brought into compliance within a stated reasonable time of not less than five days, or the petition may be stricken or denied summarily [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(c)*].

Unless the court orders otherwise by local rule or in the specific case, only one set of any separately bound supporting documents accompanying a petition need be filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(b)(5)*].

For detailed discussion and forms relating to requirements for preparing a record to be filed in a reviewing court, see Ch. 44, *Appeal: Preparing and Filing the Record* .

[11] Ex Parte Petition

The court in which a petition for a writ of review is filed is authorized to grant the petition ex parte, without notice or service of the petition, on a showing of good cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* (writ may be granted without notice); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(a)(4)* (court in its discretion may issue alternative writ without service or filing of opposition)]. This constitutes an exception to the general rule that the petition must be accompanied by proof of service on the respondent and each real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; *see § 492.102[5]*; *see also § 492.21*]. As a practical matter, appellate courts are usually reluctant to grant an ex parte writ of review and usually request an opposing memorandum of points and authorities, which helps the courts to weed out those petitions with no merit.

When seeking to file a petition without prior notice, counsel may append to the petition the optional order set out in this form, for the court's endorsement, directing the clerk to permit filing of the petition without proof of prior service. Local procedure should be consulted to determine whom counsel should approach to sign the order [*cf. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.50* (Chief Justice or Presiding Justice for applications on routine matters)]. Once the petition has been filed, the court may rule on it in conference and order the clerk to issue the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 165* (ex parte writ cannot be

granted in chambers)].

[12] Service Requirements

[a] Methods of Service

The petition must be served pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*, which governs service of papers generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. Therefore, service of a copy of the petition and memorandum of points and authorities on respondent and each real party in interest may be made by delivering a copy to each person personally or by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011-1013a, 1107*]. Local rules may provide that service on a respondent court should be made on the presiding judge, or on the court clerk if he or she is authorized to accept service for the court. If a real party in interest is a board or commission, proper service can be made on the presiding officer, on the secretary, or on a majority of the members of the board or commission [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*].

For discussion and forms relating to methods of service of papers and pleadings generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[b] Proof of Service

The petition normally must be accompanied by proof of service of a copy on the respondent and the real party or parties in interest at the time it is submitted for filing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*; for exception to normal procedure, *see § 492.101[11]*]. In addition to complying with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.25*, the proof of service must give the telephone number of each attorney served [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*]. A petition accompanied by a defective proof of service will be filed, but if a proper proof of service is not filed within five days after the clerk gives notice of the defect the court may strike the petition or impose a lesser sanction [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(e)*]. Although it is not expressly required, the proof of service should also show that copies of petitioner's memorandum of points and authorities, as well as of any exhibits incorporated into the petition, were properly served on the opposing parties.

For discussion and forms relating to a declaration of proof of service of papers and pleadings generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[13] Petition for Writ of Review in the Alternative

This form of petition may be adapted and combined with requests for other writs in the alternative, such as prohibition, habeas corpus, and mandate [Lankton v. Superior Court (9136) *5 Cal. 2d 694, 697, 55 P.2d 1170* (prohibition); *In re Smith (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 291, 296, 135 Cal. Rptr. 5* (habeas corpus); *Oksner v. Superior Court (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 672, 691, 40 Cal. Rptr. 621* (mandate)]. A petitioner who is in doubt as to the type of writ he or she should seek can petition, in the alternative form, for a writ of review, prohibition, or mandate [*Peck's Liquors, Inc. v. Superior Court (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 772, 775, 34 Cal. Rptr. 735]* . For discussion and forms of petition for writs of habeas corpus, mandate, or prohibition, see respectively Ch. 292, *Habeas Corpus* , and Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[14] State Constitution

Supreme Court, courts of appeal, superior court, and their judges as having original jurisdiction in writ of review proceedings. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

[15] State Statutes

Appealable judgments and orders. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1, 904.2*

Costs allowed in writ of review proceedings as in cases on appeal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1027*

Application for writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1069*

Stay of proceeding pending disposition by reviewing court on writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1072*

Service of application for writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*

General rules governing civil actions (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.10*) as applicable to writs of review to extent consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1063-1110b*. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1109, 1110*

Fee for filing original petition for writ of review with court of appeal and Supreme Court. *Gov. Code § 68926*

[16] California Rules of Court

Form and filing of record in appellate court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.144*

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*

Recovery of costs on review in appellate courts. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.272*

Form and filing of papers in appellate court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40*

Petitions to reviewing courts for writ. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486*

Opposition and attorney general amicus briefs. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.488*

Notice to trial court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.489*

[17] Local Rules of the Courts of Appeal

Assignment of writ petitions. Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 1st App. Dist., Policy Statement A

Requirements for writ petitions; petitions for extraordinary writs, other than habeas corpus, as required to be accompanied by properly completed Appellate Court Writ Petition Information Sheet, which is available from court clerk. Cal. Rules of Ct., Supp., Local Rules of Cts. of Appeal, 5th App. Dist., Rule 3 and Local Court Form

Internal procedures for writ petitions. Cal. Cts. of Appeal, 1st App. Dist. Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, Part III(B), § 25 et seq.; Cal. Cts. of Appeal, 4th App. Dist., Div. One, Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, Part V; Cal. Cts. of Appeal, 4th App. Dist., Div. Three, Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, Part III(B); Cal. Cts. of Appeal, 6th App. Dist. Internal Operating Practices and Procedures, Part II(D)

[18] Decisions

Beneficiary of injunction that has been disobeyed as party beneficially interested under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069* and so as able to bring writ of review to challenge court's order refusing to hold person enjoined in contempt. *Taylor v. Superior Court (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 244, 247, 125 P.2d 1* ; *Goodall v. Superior Court (1918) 37 Cal. App. 723, 726, 174 P. 924*

Petition for writ of review as deemed petition for writ of mandate when petitioner presented full record of lower court proceedings. *Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 170-171, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167*

Petitioner for prerogative writ as required to plead prima facie case for relief and to support allegations of trial court action by appropriate exhibits to extent necessary to understand proceedings; petition as also required to be properly verified. *Krueger v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 934, 936-938, 152 Cal. Rptr. 870*

Verification as inadequate when all allegations of writ application verified under penalty of perjury upon information and belief. *Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 203-205, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721*

Mislabeled petition as no bar to relief justified by proper allegations and proof. *Peck's Liquors, Inc. v. Superior Court (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 772, 775, 34 Cal. Rptr. 735*

Petition for writ of prohibition as deemed petition for writ of review when lower court completes threatened decision before petition heard. Chase v. Superior Court *(1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 872, 878, 27 Cal. Rptr. 383*

[19] Law Reviews

Chernoff and Watson, "Writ Lore," 56 State B.J. 12 (1981)

[20] Text References

California Civil Writ Practice (Cal. CEB 3d ed. 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Jurisdiction*, § 276 et seq., vol. 8., *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 1-45, 134 et seq., (4th ed. 1997)

[21] Cross References

See also *§ 492.100*.

For alternative allegations as to capacity of parties, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion of general pleading requirements, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms of petition for writ of habeas corpus, see Ch. 292, *Habeas Corpus*

For discussion and forms of petition for writ of mandate or prohibition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms of petition for writ of administrative mandate, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to service of papers generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms and discussion relating to verification of pleadings, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of a petition for writ of review, in general and in certain specific situations, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender)

144 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.102

§ 492.102 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Petition

[1] FORM Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Petition

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW [, REQUEST
_____ [*name*],	)	FOR TEMPORARY STAY,] AND SUPPORTING
Real Party in Interest	)	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORIT-
	)	IES
	)	

Petitioner alleges:

1-7. [*Allege, as in § 492.101[1], Paragraphs 1 through 7, all matters necessary to support issuance of the writ*.]

8. [*Allege, as in § 492.101[1], Paragraph 9, all matters necessary to support grant of temporary stay order, if desired*.]

9. [*Allege, as in § 492.101[1], Paragraph 10, all matters necessary to support grant of petition ex parte, if desired*.]

[*Prayer. See § 492.101[1]*.]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 492.101[1].*]
[*Optional Order Permitting Filing Without Service*. See *§ 492.101[1]*.]

MEMORANDUM
[*Add supporting memorandum*]

CAUTION:
A petition for a writ of review filed in superior court must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition at the time of filing, except when the court has exercised its discretion to permit filing without notice or service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition is for use when filing an original petition for a writ of review in a superior court. For a form of petition for use in an appellate court, see *§ 492.101*.

It appears that this form of petition must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum of points and authorities [*see § 492.102[4]*].

[3] Number of Copies

The original petition and copies should be prepared as follows: (1) original for filing; (2) copies as needed to serve on respondent and on each real party in interest [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]; (3) one office copy; (4) one copy for petitioner, if desired; (5) additional copies, if desired.

[4] Points and Authorities

The general rules governing law and motion proceedings (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100 et seq.*) apply to proceedings for writ of review in the superior court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)*]. Thus, it appears that the foregoing form of petition must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113* (notice of motion required to be supported by memorandum); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (motion is any application for order); for further discussion, *see § 492.20[4]*]. For forms of points and authorities for use in support of petitions for writs of review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

[5] Service Requirements

[a] Prior Service Usually Required

A petition for a writ of review generally must be accompanied by proof of service of a copy of the petition on the respondent and on each real party in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. For further discussion of methods of service and proof of service, see *§ 492.101[12]*.

[b] Applications Ex Parte

A court may, in its discretion and for good cause, grant a petition ex parte without the notice or service usually required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. Construction of this exception varies among local courts, and counsel should therefore consult local practice to deter mine the circumstances under which a particular court will grant a petition ex parte. As a general rule, a court may not grant an application ex parte unless it appears by affidavit or declaration that (1) within a reasonable time before the application the party informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney when and where the applications would be made;(2) the party in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party and the opposing party's attorney but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform them; or (3) for reasons specified the party should not be required to inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)*; *see also* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 9.31(e)(1), (2)].

When a court does grant a petition ex parte, counsel may then simultaneously serve the petition, memorandum of points and authorities, and the writ of review, thereby avoiding the cost of double service.

[6] State Statutes

Application for writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1069*

Service of application for writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*

[7] California Rules of Court

Form and filing of record in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.758*

Recovery of costs on review in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.764*

Civil law and motion rules as applicable to petitions for writs of review filed in a superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(a)(2)*

Notification requirements for ex parte application in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204*

[8] Local Rules of Court

[a] Los Angeles County

Writ of review. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 2.5(i), 9.31

[b] Sacramento County

Writs of review or certiorari; presentment to judge. Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.01

[9] Cross Reference

See also *§ 492.101*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.103

§ 492.103 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Order Directing Issuance of Writ

[1] FORM Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Order Directing Issuance of Writ

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent,	)	ORDER DIRECTING ISSUANCE OF WRIT OF
_____ [*name*],	)	REVIEW
Real Party in Interest.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING from the verified petition on file in this action,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a writ of review issue under the seal of this Court directing respondent _____ [*name of court*] to certify to this Court a full, true, and complete transcript of the record and proceedings in the matter of _____ [*case name*], No. _____[*number*], including _____ [*describe with particularity the transcript that respondent is ordered to prepare as a return*], so

that the same may be reviewed by this Court; and to show cause before this Court why the _____ [order *or* judgment *or other action to be reviewed*] described in the petition should not be annulled.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the writ command respondent to desist from further proceedings in the matter to be reviewed, pending further order of this Court.]

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the writ (and a copy of the petition and this order) be served at least _____ (*number*) days before hearing on the return to the writ of review.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in a superior court when local practice requires the writ and order to be prepared separately. The order directing issuance of the writ of review is drafted for the judge's signature, in contrast to the writ itself, which requires the signature of the clerk of the court [*see § 492.104*]. The proposed order and writ may both be submitted to the court at the same time the writ petition is filed.

[3] Number of Copies

The original order and copies may be prepared as follows: (1) original and copies for respondent and each real party in interest who will be served with the writ, all delivered to the clerk for the judge's signature; (2) one copy for petitioner, if desired; (3) additional copies, if desired.

[4] Notice of Order

Notice of the order should be given to all other parties or to their attorneys [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5* (notice after ruling on motions); *see also* San Francisco City & Co. Uniform Local Rules of Ct., Rule 8.6(c) (endorsed copies of all written orders to be served on all parties)]. For further discussion and a forms of notice and proof of service, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[5] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 492.102* and *492.104*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.104

§ 492.104 Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071, 1072]

[1] FORM Special Proceeding for Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069]--Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071, 1072]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent,	)	WRIT OF REVIEW
_____ [*name*],	)	
Real Party in Interest.	)	
	)	
	)	

To _____ [*name*], Respondent:

WHEREAS it is alleged by the verified petition of _____[*name of petitioner*] that _____ [*state briefly facts giving rise to petition for writ*]; and

WHEREAS it appears from the same verified petition that petitioner is a party beneficially interested in this proceeding

and has no right of appeal nor any other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy;

THEREFORE, you are commanded to certify and return to this court on or before _____ [*leave blank for the Clerk of Court to insert a date*] a full, true, and complete transcript of the record and proceedings in the action entitled _____ [*specify*], including _____ [*describe with particularity the transcript that respondent is ordered to prepare as a return*], so that the same may be reviewed by this Court; and to appear in this court [in _____ (*Department number*),] at _____ [*address*], on _____ [*leave blank for the Clerk of Court to insert date*] at _____ [*time*] to show cause why the _____ [order *or* judgment *or specify other action to be reviewed*] described above should not be annulled.

[YOU ARE FURTHER COMMANDED, in the meantime, to desist from further proceedings in the matter to be reviewed.]

Witness the Honorable _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify title of judge*].
Dated: _____.

_____, Clerk
By _____ [*signature*],
Deputy Clerk

ORDER

Let the foregoing writ issue.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this writ (and a copy of the petition) be served at least _____ (*number*) days before the hearing set in the above order.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of writ of review is for use by a successful petitioner in a superior court proceeding. Appellate courts usually draft their own writs. The relevant parts of the record to be returned for review must be described in the writ with convenient certainty [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1071*]. The writ is to be drafted for signature by the court clerk, as it is the clerk who issues the writ on order of the court. The attached court order, directing issuance of the writ, should be used only when local practice permits or requires that the order be combined with the writ. For a form of separate order, see *§ 492.103*.

[3] Stay of Proceedings

This form includes optional language to be used when the court has exercised its discretion to stay the proceedings in the lower court pending disposition of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071, 1072*]. If the words requiring the stay are omitted from the writ, the power of the inferior court is not suspended or the proceedings stayed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1072*]. For discussion of the court's power to stay the proceedings below, see *§ 492.19*. For a form of allegations and prayer to be used in a petition requesting a stay, see *§ 492.101*.

[4] Service of Writ

The writ must be served on any real party in interest [*see Lee v. Small Claims Court (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5-6, 92 P.2d 937]* , and, of course, on the respondent to whom it is directed [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1070, 1071*]. Counsel should consult local practice to determine the individual to be served on a respondent court, such as the presiding judge or the court clerk.

The writ must be served in the same manner as a summons in a civil action, unless the court expressly directs otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1073*]. Service of a summons is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* permits service by mail, courts prefer personal service because of the certainty that notice of the hearing has been received by the respondent and the real party in interest. Personal service may be made by counsel, provided that he or she is not a party to the action, or by any other person over the age of 18 years who is not a party to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 414.10, 1073*]. For further discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

For further discussion concerning notice of the writ to be given by the clerk when it is issued by an appellate court, see *§ 492.25[3]*.

[5] State Statutes

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*

Form, content, and service of writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1071-1073*

[6] Cross References

See also *§§ 492.102* and *492.103*

For forms and discussion relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.105

§ 492.105 Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR FURTHER RETURN TO WRIT OF REVIEW, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND MEMORANDUM
_____ [*name*],	)	
Respondent,	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Real Party in Interest.	)	
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____

_____

To _____ [*names and titles of respondent and real parties in interest*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*] or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], petitioner will, and hereby does, move for an order requiring respondent to make further return to the writ of review of this court issued on _____ [*date*], as follows: _____ [*specify additional pleadings, transcript, or other portions of proceeding below for which further return of writ is sought*]. The motion will be made on the grounds that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the foregoing items were described with reasonable certainty in the above-described writ of review, but respondent failed to include these items in its return of the writ dated _____].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record for petitioner in the above-entitled special proceeding].

2. _____ [*Set forth facts from declarant's personal knowledge establishing the grounds for the motion, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), petitioner made a payment in the amount of $_____ to respondent court, as required by *Gov. Code §§ 26831-26837,* for copying and certification of the parts of the record that respondent was commanded to certify to this Court in the writ of review issued on _____ (*date*). On _____ (*date*), respondent _____ (*name*) made its return to the writ, but failed to include the following items: _____ (*specify*). The writ issued by this Court, a true of copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, described these items with reasonable particularity as follows: _____ (*specify*). Respondent failed to include those parts of the record described above].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

MEMORANDUM
[*Add supporting memorandum*]

CAUTION:

Although notice of the motion is not expressly required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*, a notice of motion, if given, is required to be supported by a memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.54*, 3.113].

[2] Use of Form

This form of motion and supporting declaration is for use by a petitioner in a proceeding on writ of review, to obtain a further return of the record when the respondent has failed to make a full return [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. For discussion relating to motions and declarations generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* . For discussion and forms relating to service of this form, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] State Statutes

Reviewing court as authorized to order further return of writ of review if initial return of writ is defective. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*

Clerk's fees for preparation of record. *Gov. Code §§ 26831-26837* (superior court; made applicable to municipal court by *Gov. Code § 72054*)

[4] Decisions

In absence of return, reviewing court as able to discharge writ and dismiss proceeding. *Middlebrook v. Superior Court (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 579, 580, 134 P.2d 241*

Compliance with writ of review as not compelled unless petitioner pays for preparation of return. *I.X.L. Lime Co. v. Superior Court (1904) 143 Cal. 170, 175, 76 P. 973*

Burden as on petitioner to see to it that return is filed and that complete record is made. *North Side etc. Assn. v. County of L.A. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 598, 608, 161 P.2d 613* ; *Goodrich v. Superior Court (1928) 92 Cal. App. 695, 696, 268 P. 669* (review of contempt order)

When conflicting inferences could be made from the evidence, and absent record showing how lower court reached its findings, reviewing court as compelled to resolve all conflicts in favor of the respondent court and to indulge in all reasonable inferences to uphold the findings. *Tomlinson v. Superior Court (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 640, 643, 152 P.2d 517* (prohibition)

148 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.106

§ 492.106 Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings to Obtain Further Return to Writ of Review [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION AND REQUIRING
_____ [*name*],	)	FUTHER RETURN TO WRIT OF REVIEW
Respondent,	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Real Party in Interest.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*name*], petitioner, for an order for a further return to the writ of review issued by this Court on _____ [*date*], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*]. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; [respondent appeared by counsel _____ (*name*);] real party in interest appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted, and that respondent file further return to the writ of review on or before _____ [*date*], by including therein the following: _____ [*specify*].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use in a superior court when counsel prepares the order granting the motion for further return of the record [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*]. Appellate courts usually prepare their own orders.

The petitioner who prevails on a motion for further return to the writ must serve notice of the order on the respondent and all real parties in interest, unless the court orders otherwise [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5*]. For further discussion and forms of such notice and proof of service, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* ; and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] Cross Reference

See also *§ 492.105*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.107

§ 492.107 Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)]--Demurrer

[1] FORM Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(h)]--Demurrer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	DEMURRER OF _____ [*name*] TO
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW OF
Respondent,	)	_____ [*name*], AND SUPPORTING
_____ [*name*],	)	MEMORANDUM
Real Party in Interest.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____

_____

Real party in interest _____ [*name*], by way of return to the writ of review issued, demurs to the

petition for the writ on (each of) the following ground(s):

1. The petition fails on its face to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action for issuance of a writ of review in that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, respondent court did not act without or in excess of its jurisdiction].

2. [*State any additional grounds in separate paragraphs*].

WHEREFORE, real party in interest prays:

1. That this demurrer be sustained [without leave to amend],

2. That the petition be dismissed,

3. That the writ of review be discharged,

4. That real party in interest recover his/her costs of suit incurred herein, and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____ [*real party in interest*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Add supporting memorandum*]

CAUTION:
A memorandum in support of each ground of the demurrer must accompany a demurrer filed in a superior court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*]. There is no express requirement for a points and authorities in support of a demurrer in an appellate court but this would seem indispensable in arguing the legal merits of the demurrer [*cf. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.54(a)* (motion shall be accompanied by memorandum)]. A demurrer filed in superior court must be served and filed with a notice of hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320(c)*; for further discussion and a form of notice, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of demurrer is for use in either a superior or an appellate court by the real party in interest who wishes to demur to a petition for a writ of review [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)*]. The form may adapted for use by a respondent as well, in those situations in which the respondent is not a court that is, in effect, a neutral party [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)*]. For discussion of the grounds for a demurrer to a petition for a writ of review, see *§ 492.27[3]*.

[3] Effect of Demurrer

The effect of a demurrer is to adopt all the facts alleged in the petition as the return to the writ [*Estrin v. Superior Court (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 670, 672, 96 P.2d 340]* . If a return is made by demurrer only, but the demurrer is not

sustained, the court may allow an answer to be filed within such time as it may designate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*; *but see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(4)* (when return to alternative writ is by demurrer only and is not sustained, court may issue peremptory writ without leave to answer)]. For a form of return by answer, see *§ 492.108*.

[4] Time for Making Return by Demurrer

When the proceeding is in the superior court, the demurrer must be filed no later than the date, as set forth in the writ, for making a return to the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1089, see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1069.1*]. If the proceeding is in an appellate court, the demurrer must be served and filed within 30 days after the court issues the alternative writ or order to show cause or notifies the parties that it is considering issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(2)*].

[5] State Statutes

Grounds for demurrer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10*

Demurrer as proper when ground for objection appears on face of pleading. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*

Statement of grounds required. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.60*

Return to petition by demurrer, verified answer, or both. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*

[6] California Rules of Court

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*

Making, opposing, and disposing of motions in reviewing court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.54*

Return by demurrer; time for return. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*

Demurrer filed in superior court as required to be supported by memorandum. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*

Format, contents, and notice of demurrer in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1320*

[7] Cross References

See also *§ 492.108*.

For discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

For discussion and forms relating to service of papers generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

For forms of memoranda of points and authorities in support of demurrer to a petition for writ of review, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 205, *Review* (Matthew Bender).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.108

§ 492.108 Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)]--Verified Answer

[1] FORM Return to Writ of Review by Demurrer or Verified Answer [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.490(h)]--Verified Answer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent,	)	ANSWER OF _____ [*name*] TO
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW OF
Real Party in Interest.	)	_____ [*name*]
	)	
	)	

_____

Real party in interest _____ [*name*], by way of return to the writ issued, answers the petition for a writ of review as follows:

1. Real party in interest admits that _____ [*set forth admission*].

2. Real party in interest denies each and every allegation in the petition not heretofore expressly admitted.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

_____ [*Set forth factual allegations showing first ground for objection to petition, e.g.,* Although petitioner was not served with the order made by respondent court on _____ [*date*], a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, real party in interest gave petitioner actual notice of the attached order in a phone conversation on _____ [*date*], in which real party in interest stated to petitioner that _____ (*specify*)].

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

_____ [*Set forth factual allegations showing second ground for objection to petition*].

WHEREFORE, real party in interest prays:

1. That the petition be dismissed,

2. That the writ of review be discharged,

3. That real party in interest recover his/her costs of suit incurred herein, and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Real Party in Interest

[*Verification. See § 492.101*.]

CAUTION:
An answer filed as a return to a writ of review must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487(b)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of verified answer is for use by the real party in interest in a proceeding on writ of review before either a superior or an appellate court [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*]. The form may adapted for use by a respondent as well, in those situations in which the respondent is not a court that is, in effect, a neutral party [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*].

The statutes governing an answer to a complaint in a civil action apply to the answer to a petition for a writ of review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1109*]. Thus the answer must generally contain a general or specific denial of each of the material allegations in the petition, as well as any statement of new matter constituting a defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30*].

Leave of court is required to file a return by answer when a initial return was made by demurrer only and the demurrer was not sustained [*see §§ 492.27[3], 492.107[3]*].

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] State Statutes

Grounds for objection by answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10*

Answer as appropriate when grounds for objection to pleading does not appear on face of pleading. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(b)*

Return to petition by demurrer, verified answer, or both. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1069.1, 1089*

General rules of procedure as applicable to writs of review to extent consistent with provisions specifically governing special proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1109, 1110*

[4] California Rules of Court

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*

Cover of petition for writ of review or answer to writ of review filed in appellate court as required to be red. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*

Return by answer; time for return. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.487*

[5] Cross References

See also *§ 492.107*.

For forms and discussion of answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 492 REVIEW (CERTIORARI), WRIT OF
PART V. FORMS

43-492 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 492.109

§ 492.109 Judgment on Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]

[1] FORM Judgment on Writ of Review in Superior Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1075]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Respondent,	)	JUDGMENT ON WRIT OF REVIEW
_____ [*name*],	)	
Real Party in Interest.	)	
	)	
	)	

The return to the writ of review issued by this Court on _____ [*date*], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*]. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; [respondent appeared by counsel _____ (*name*);] real party in interest appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]. On consideration by the Court of the verified petition, all documents filed in support of or in opposition to the petition, the return of the transcript filed by respondent, and arguments of counsel, it appears that petitioner is [not] entitled to the relief prayed for, and therefore:

[*EITHER*]

IT IS ORDERED that the _____ [*describe challenged order, judgment, or other action, e.g.* order of contempt] made in the matter described above on _____ [*date*], be _____ [annulled *or* modified in that _____ (*specify modification*)].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petitioner recover costs in the sum of $_____ from _____ [*name*(*s*)], real _____ [party *or* parties] in interest.

[*OR*]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The writ of review issued in this matter on _____ [*date*], be discharged; and

2. The _____ [*describe challenged order, judgment, or other action, e.g.* order of contempt] made in the matter described above on _____ [*date*], be affirmed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the real _____ [party *or* parties] in interest, _____ [*name*(*s*)], recover costs in the sum of $_____ from the petitioner.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of judgment is for use by a petitioner in superior court once the cause has been heard and decided in the petitioner's favor. A copy of the judgment, signed by the clerk, must be transmitted to the court or board having custody of the record [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1076*]. A proposed judgment is not required in a writ proceeding in an appellate court.

[3] Preparation of Written Judgment

In the superior courts of most counties, it is customary for the judge to order counsel for one of the parties to prepare, serve on the others, and submit to the court a proposed judgment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)-(f)*]. Local practice may require that the prevailing party always prepare the judgment, whether the judge requests it or not. If any of the parties requests a statement of decision, the court may prepare the statement of decision and proposed judgment or may order a party to do so [see *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*]. Any party may object to the proposed statement of decision and the proposed judgment, or both [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g), (j)*]. For discussion and forms relating to a statement of decision, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

[4] Notice of Entry of Judgment

The party submitting an appealable judgment for entry must also prepare and mail a copy of a notice of entry of judgment to all parties who have appeared in the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a), 1110* (judgment on writ of review as appealable)]. For discussion and forms for notice of entry of judgment, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[5] State Statutes

Judgment after hearing on writ of review. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1075*

Transmittal of judgment on writ of review; contents of judgment roll. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1076, 1077*

[6] California Rules of Court

Preparation and service of proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)-(i)*

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to claiming costs, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

For discussion and forms relating to judgments generally, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 493.syn

§ 493.syn Synopsis to Chapter 493: REWARDS

§ 493.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 493.02 Governing Law

§§ 493.03-493.09 [Reserved]

§ 493.10 Reward as Unilateral Contract

§ 493.11 Cause of Action for Breach of Reward Contract

[1] Private Reward

[2] Public Reward

§ 493.12 Defenses

[1] Controverting Matter

[2] Revocation of Offer

[3] Other Compensation for Performance

[4] Public Reward

§ 493.13 Restrictions on Rewards Offered by Public Entities, Officers, or Employees

[1] Statutory Authorization Required

[2] Rewards Offered by Governor

[3] Rewards Offered by Local Agency

[a] Willful Misconduct Resulting in Injury or Death

[b] Willful Damage to or Destruction of Property

[c] Aiding Peace Officer

[4] Rewards Offered by Board of Supervisors

[5] Rewards to Be Paid by Local Court

[6] Rewards Offered by Department of Forestry

[7] Rewards Offered by State Department of Health Services

[8] Rewards Offered by South Coast Air Quality Management District

[9] Establishment of Reward Program by Tax Board

[10] Performing Official Act

[11] Person Employed to Return Fugitive

§§ 493.14-493.29 [Reserved]

§ 493.30 State Statutes

[1] Reward From Public Entities at Local Level

[2] Reward From Public Entities at State Level

[3] Prohibited Rewards

§ 493.31 Decisions

§ 493.32 Attorney General Opinions

§ 493.33 Law Reviews

§ 493.34 Text References

§§ 493.35-493.49 [Reserved]

§ 493.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Private Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Cross References

§ 493.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Public Entity, Officer, or Employee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Venue

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 493.52 Affirmative Defense to Action for Breach of Contract for Reward--Withdrawal of Offer of Reward Before Performance of Act

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART I. SCOPE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.01

§ 493.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter concerns actions to recover a reward offered by either a public entity or a private person or entity. It includes forms for complaints for damages for breach of a unilateral reward contract [*see §§ 493.50, 493.51*], and a form for an affirmative defense to such a complaint [*see § 493.52*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART I. SCOPE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.02

§ 493.02 Governing Law

Private rewards are generally governed by case law.

Rewards by various public entities are governed by a variety of statutes:

- Rewards offered by the governor of California are governed by *Penal Code § 1547*.
- Rewards offered by local agencies are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 53069.5* and *53069.7*.
- Rewards offered by boards of supervisors are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 26207-26209*.
- Rewards offered by certain state agencies are governed by *Health & Safety Code § 25191.7*, *Pub. Res. Code § 4417*, and *Rev. & Tax Code § 19525*.
- Certain rewards to be paid by local courts are governed by *Penal Code § 374a*.

Prohibitions against certain awards are set out under *Penal Code §§ 70*, *94*, and *1558*.

155 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART I. SCOPE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 493.03-493.09

[Reserved]

§§ 493.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.10

§ 493.10 Reward as Unilateral Contract

A reward is an offer, made to no person in particular, of payment for the performance of some particular act. When the act is performed, the offer and the act combined make a complete contract between the person making the offer and the person who performs the act [*County of San Luis Obispo v. Gage (1903) 139 Cal. 398, 407, 73 P. 174]* . An offer of a reward is an offer of a unilateral contract that may be accepted only by performance, not by a promise to perform [*Davis v. Jacoby (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 370, 378, 34 P.2d 1026]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawFormationAcceptanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.11

§ 493.11 Cause of Action for Breach of Reward Contract

[1] Private Reward

A cause of action for damages for breach of a reward contract must allege an offer of reward, performance by the plaintiff of the requested act in reliance on the offer, a demand for the reward, and the defendant's refusal to pay [*see, e.g., Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 257-258, 37 P. 151]* .

As a contract action, a cause of action based on reward is subject to defenses applicable to such actions generally, such as the incompetency of the offeror [*see Civ. Code §§ 38-40*]. For discussion and forms relating to contract actions generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Public Reward

An action for damages based on a reward offered by a public entity or official differs from one based on a private offer of reward, in that publicly offered rewards must be authorized by statute, and before a complaint may be filed in court to recover this type of reward, the plaintiff must first exhaust his or her administrative remedies by presenting a claim in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4*. For further discussion, see *§ 493.13, below*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative RemediesContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationCapacity of PartiesMental CapacityContracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewardsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.12

§ 493.12 Defenses

[1] Controverting Matter

A defendant in an action based on reward may, in addition to other general defenses, simply rebut one or more of the essential elements that plaintiff must prove. For example, a plaintiff cannot claim a reward if he or she has only promised to perform the act for which the reward is offered; the offer can be accepted only by actual performance of the act [*Davis v. Jacoby (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 370, 378, 34 P.2d 1026]* . Similarly, a plaintiff also cannot claim a reward if he or she has performed the act for which the reward is offered, but has not done so with the intent of obtaining the reward or a part of it [*Hewitt v. Anderson (1880) 56 Cal. 476, 477-478]* .

[2] Revocation of Offer

Revocation of the offer of reward, before the plaintiff has performed the act for which the reward is offered, is an affirmative defense [*see, e.g., Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 257-258, 37 P. 151* ; for a form for such an affirmative defense, *see § 493.52*].

[3] Other Compensation for Performance

A plaintiff cannot claim the reward if he or she was already otherwise being compensated for performing the act for which the reward is separately offered [*Van Horn v. Ricks Water Co. (1896) 115 Cal. 448, 452, 47 P. 361]* .

[4] Public Reward

Because a public offer of reward must be authorized by statute, an action based on such a reward may be subject to statutory restrictions that may be raised in defense. For further discussion of the various statutes and restrictions regarding public rewards, see *§ 493.13, below*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationOffersRevocable OffersContracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewards

159 of 170 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.13

§ 493.13 Restrictions on Rewards Offered by Public Entities, Officers, or Employees

[1] Statutory Authorization Required

Rewards offered by public entities, officers, or employees must be authorized by statute. For example, early case law held that absent other legislation, *Penal Code § 1547* (discussed under [2], *below*) precludes local public entities from offering rewards for the apprehension of persons charged with offenses against the people of the state, because *Penal Code § 1547* grants that power exclusively to the governor [*Brite v. Board of Supervisors (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 233, 236-237, 68 P.2d 1007]* . Thus, a city has no inherent power to offer a reward for the apprehension and conviction of a felon, and a city's charter cannot vest a municipality with that authority [*City of Los Angeles v. Gurdane (1932) 59 F.2d 161, 164-165]* . However, an exception might be made if the need for protection of the public interest is peculiarly local and municipal [*Griffin v. City of Los Angeles (1933) 134 Cal. App. 763, 773-774, 26 P.2d 655]* .

Various legislation has been passed over the years authorizing certain public entities, officers, or employees, under certain circumstances as discussed *below*, to offer rewards. To claim a reward offered by a public entity, officer, or employee, a claim must be presented in accordance with *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.* [*see § 493.51[2]* and Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*].

For a complaint for breach of a reward contract by a public entity, officer, or employee, see *§ 493.51*.

[2] Rewards Offered by Governor

The governor of California may offer a reward of not more than $50,000, payable out of the General Fund, for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any of the following [*Penal Code § 1547(a)*]:

- Any convict who has escaped from a state prison, prison camp, prison farm, or the custody of any prison officer or employee, or as provided in *Penal Code § 4530*, or any paroled prisoner who has left the state without permission [*see Penal Code § 3059*].

- Any person who has committed or is charged with the commission of an offense punishable with death.

- Any person engaged in the robbery or hijacking of, or any attempt to rob or hijack, any person on, or in charge of, in whole or in part, any public conveyance engaged at the time in carrying passengers within California [*see Penal Code § 1547(a)(3)(B)* (defining "hijacking")].

- Any person who attempts to murder, assails with a deadly weapon, or inflicts serious bodily harm on, a peace officer or firefighter who is acting in the line of duty.

- Any person who has committed a crime involving the burning or bombing of public or private property, including any public hospital housed in a privately owned facility.

- Any person who has committed a crime involving the burning or bombing of any private hospital, only if a reward in conjunction with the same crime is offered by the hospital or other public or private donor on its behalf; however, the reward offered by the Governor may not exceed the aggregate amount offered privately or $50,000, whichever is less.

- Any person who explodes, ignites, or attempts to explode or ignite any destructive device or any explosive, or who commits arson, in or about any health facility, place where medical care is provided by a licensed health care professional, church, temple, synagogue, mosque, or other place of worship, abortion-counseling facilities, bookstores, public or private libraries, buildings, facilities designated as a courthouse, homes or offices, of judicial officers, buildings or facilities regularly occupied by county probation department personnel in which the employees perform official duties of the probation department, private property which was targeted in whole or in part because of any of the actual or perceived characteristics of the owner or occupant of the property listed in *Penal Code § 422.55(a)* (disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or association with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics), or any public or private school providing instruction in kindergarten or grades 1 through 12, for the purpose of terrorizing another or in reckless disregard of terrorizing another [*see Penal Code § 11413*].

- Any person who commits a violation of *Penal Code § 207* (kidnapping).

- Any person who has committed a crime involving the burning or bombing of any bookstore or public or private library not subject to *Penal Code § 11413*, if a reward in conjunction with the same crime is offered by the bookstore or library, or any other public or private donor on its behalf, provided that the reward offered by the Governor may not exceed the aggregate amount offered privately or $50,000, whichever is less.

- Any person who commits a violation of *Penal Code § 454* (arson-related offenses committed during a state of emergency or local emergency resulting from specified disasters) or *Penal Code § 463* (second-degree burglary during an emergency).

- Any person who willfully and maliciously sets fire to, or willfully and maliciously attempts to set fire to, any property that is included in a hazardous fire area designated by the Department of Forestry [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 4252, 4253*], if the fire, or attempt to set the fire, results in death or great bodily injury to anyone, including fire protection personnel, of if the fire causes substantial structural damage.

- Any person who has committed, or is charged with the commission of, a felony that is punishable under *Penal Code § 422.75*(felonies against persons or property of public agency or private institution because of class membership) and that resulted in serious bodily injury or in property damage of more than $10,000.

- Any person who commits an act that violates *Penal Code § 11411* (placing marks or desecrating religious symbols on private property to terrorize owner or occupant), if the governor determines that the act is one in a series of similar or related acts committed in violation of that statute by the same person or group.

In addition, the Governor may offer a reward of not more than $100,000 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person who kills a peace officer or firefighter acting in the line of duty [*Penal Code § 1547(b)*]. The Governor also may offer a reward of not more than $100,000 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person who commits arson upon a place of worship [*Penal Code § 1547(c)*].

The reward must be paid to the person giving the information, promptly on the conviction of the person so arrested, after a recommendation from the United States attorney, or the California Attorney General, or the district attorney and the chief law enforcement officer, or his or her designate, in the jurisdiction where the crime occurred. Rewards may be paid to the person only if the information is given voluntarily, at the person's own initiative. Rewards may not be paid as part of any plea bargain [*Penal Code § 1547(d)*].

The reward may also be paid to the person giving the information if both of the following requirements are met [*Penal Code § 1547(e)*]:

- The arrest or conviction of the person for an offense described in *Penal Code § 1547(a)-(c)* is rendered impossible by an intervening event, including, but not limited to, the death of the person during a pursuit by law enforcement, or while in custody.

- The appropriate law enforcement officials, after reviewing the evidence related to the crime or crimes, determine that the person is the individual responsible for the crime or crimes for which the reward was offered, and that the information would have reasonably led to the arrest and conviction of that person.

If more than one claimant is eligible for any reward issued pursuant to *Penal Code § 1547*, the governor may apportion the reward money in a manner the governor deems appropriate [*Penal Code § 1547(f)*].

[3] Rewards Offered by Local Agency

[a] Willful Misconduct Resulting in Injury or Death

A local agency may offer and pay a reward for information leading to the determination of the identity of, and the apprehension of, any person whose willful misconduct results in injury or death to any person. The amount of the reward is to be determined by the local agency [*Gov. Code § 53069.5*; *see Gov. Code § 54951* (defining "local agency")].

The person who committed the willful misconduct is liable for the amount of the reward paid, if the person's willful misconduct resulted in injury or death to any student or any person employed by or performing volunteer services for a local agency. If the person is an unemancipated minor, his or her parent or guardian is also liable for the amount of the reward paid [*Gov. Code § 53069.5*].

[b] Willful Damage to or Destruction of Property

A local agency may offer and pay a reward for information leading to the determination of the identity of, and the apprehension of, any person who willfully damages or destroys any property. The amount of the reward is to be

determined by the local agency [*Gov. Code § 53069.5*; *see Gov. Code § 54951* (defining "local agency")].

The person who committed the willful damage or destruction is liable for the amount of the reward paid, if the person willfully damaged or destroyed any property of a local agency, or any property of any other local agency or state or federal agency located within the boundaries of the local agency. If the person is an unemancipated minor, his or her parent or guardian is also liable for the amount of the reward paid [*Gov. Code § 53069.5*].

[c] Aiding Peace Officer

A local agency may offer and pay a reward to any person who comes to the aid of any peace officer of the local agency or who furnishes information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person or persons killing or assaulting with a deadly weapon or inflicting serious bodily harm on a peace officer of the local agency while the officer is acting in the line of duty. The amount of the reward is to be determined by the local agency [*Gov. Code § 53069.7*; *see Gov. Code § 54951* (defining "local agency")].

[4] Rewards Offered by Board of Supervisors

The board of supervisors of a county may offer and pay rewards, payable from county funds, for the furnishing of information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons who willfully destroy or damage property of the county [*Gov. Code § 26207*].

The board of supervisors may also offer and pay rewards, payable from county funds, for the furnishing of information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons who commit within the county criminal acts against the person or residence of a public officer or employee [*Gov. Code § 26207*].

The board of supervisors may establish a uniform procedure for the payment of rewards, payable from county funds, for ideas or suggestions made by members of the public, which the board determines, in its discretion, would reasonably result in financial savings to the county [*Gov. Code § 26208*; *see Gov. Code § 26209* (authorizing board of supervisor of Humboldt County to establish reward procedure for ideas and suggestions of county employees as well as members of public)].

[5] Rewards to Be Paid by Local Court

Every person giving information leading to the arrest and conviction of any person for refuse dumping in violation of *Penal Code § 374.3*, or for shooting a firearm from or on a public road or highway in violation of *Penal Code § 374c*, is entitled to a reward equal to half of the fine levied against and collected from the offender. The reward is to be paid by the court. If the reward is payable to two or more persons, it is to be divided equally [*Penal Code § 374a*].

[6] Rewards Offered by Department of Forestry

A person who gives information leading to the arrest and conviction, or commitment to a public facility, of any person who willfully and maliciously sets fire to any property in a state responsibility area [*see Pub. Res. Code § 4125 et. seq.*], is eligible for a reward of up to $10,000 out of state funds that are made available to the Department of Forestry for fire protection [*Pub. Res. Code § 4417(a)*; *see Pub. Res. Code § 4003* ("department" defined)]. If the fire results in death or great bodily injury to anyone, including fire protection personnel, or if the fire causes substantial structural damage, the person is eligible for an enhanced reward of up to $25,000 [*Pub. Res. Code § 4417(b), (c)*]. The reward may be paid on the initiative of the Department or on application by the person eligible for the reward. If more than one person is eligible for the reward, the Department will determine how the reward should be divided, taking into consideration the significance of the information contributed by each of the eligible persons [*Pub. Res. Code § 4417(d)*].

[7] Rewards Offered by State Department of Health Services

Any person who provides information that materially contributes to the imposition of a civil penalty or criminal fine against any person violating the hazardous waste control laws shall be paid a reward pursuant to the regulations adopted by the State Department of Health Services [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(a)*; *see Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(f)* (adoption of regulations; determination of "materially contributed"); *see also Health & Safety Code § 25100 et seq.* (hazardous waste control)]. If more than one person provides information about a single violation, the first notification received by the Department is eligible for the reward, unless the notifications are postmarked on the same day or telephone notifications are received on the same day, in which case the reward is to be equally divided among the informants [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(c)*].

The reward is required to be equal to 10 percent of the amount of the civil penalty or criminal fine that is collected, not to exceed $5000 [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(a)*].

If the information results in an imposition of a civil penalty, the reward is paid by the State Department of Health Services. If the information results in an imposition of a criminal fine, the reward is paid by the county [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(a)*].

No public officer or employee is eligible for the reward, unless the reporting of the violation does not relate in any manner to his or her responsibilities as a public officer or employee [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(d)*].

If an informant has provided information that the business in which he or she is employed has committed a violation, the informant is not eligible for the reward if the employee intentionally or negligently caused the violation or if the employee's primary and regular responsibilities included investigating the violation, unless the business knowingly caused the violation [*Health & Safety Code § 25191.7(e)*].

[8] Rewards Offered by South Coast Air Quality Management District

Any person who provides information that materially contributes to the imposition of a civil penalty or criminal fine against any person for violating any provision of *Health & Safety Code § 41500 et seq.* or any rule, regulation, or order of a district pertaining to mobile source emission regulations or limitations must be paid a reward in accordance with regulations adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District under *Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(f)* [*Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(a),(h)*]. The reward may not exceed 10 percent of the amount of the civil penalty or criminal fine collected by the district, district attorney, or city attorney, and may not exceed $5,000 [*Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(a)*].

If there is more than one informant for a single violation, the first to notify the district is eligible for the reward. If notifications are postmarked or telephoned on the same day, the reward must be divided equally among the informants [*Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(c)*].

Federal, state, and local public officers and employees are not eligible for the reward, unless the reporting of the violations is not related to their responsibilities as public officers or employees [*Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(d)*].

No employee who reports a violation by the business in which he or she is employed is eligible for the reward, if the employee intentionally or negligently caused the violation or if the employee's primary and regular responsibilities include investigating the violation, unless the business knowingly caused the violation [*Health & Safety Code § 42405.1(e)*].

[9] Establishment of Reward Program by Tax Board

The State Board of Equalization, under its regulations, may establish a reward program for information resulting in the

identification of underreported or unreported sales and use taxes. The reward may not exceed 10 percent of the taxes collected as a result of the information provided [*Rev. & Tax Code § 7060(a)*]. However, any person employed by or under contract with any state or federal tax collection agency is not eligible for the reward [*Rev. & Tax Code § 7060(a)*].

The Franchise Tax Board, under its regulations, may establish a reward program for information resulting in the identification of underreported or unreported bank and corporation income subject to taxes. The reward may not exceed 10 percent of the taxes collected as a result of the information provided [*Rev. & Tax Code § 19525*]. Persons employed by or under contract to state or federal tax collection agencies are not eligible for awards under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19525*.

[10] Performing Official Act

It is against sound public policy to allow a public officer who is under a duty to arrest criminals to receive a reward for the performance of that duty [*see, e.g., Lees v. Colgan (1898) 120 Cal. 262, 265-270, 52 P. 502* (even though Legislature gave governor authority to offer reward under *Penal Code § 1547*, authority does not include offering reward to public officer performing his or her duties)]. Further, every executive or ministerial officer, employee, or appointee of the State of California or any county, city, or other political subdivision, who knowingly asks, receives, or agrees to receive, and every judicial officer who asks for or receives, any emolument, gratuity, or reward, or any promise of the same, except such as may be authorized by law, for doing any official act, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Penal Code §§ 70(a), 94*]. These provisions abrogate earlier decisions holding that an officer could accept a reward from a private party if his or her superiors consented [*see, e.g., Lees v. Colgan (1898) 120 Cal. 262, 265-270, 52 P. 502]* . They do not, however, appear to abrogate other early decisions holding that a public officer may accept a reward for services rendered that do not fall within the scope of his or her official duties [*see 2 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 301, 301-302 (1943)]* .

[11] Person Employed to Return Fugitive

When the governor of California has demanded the surrender of a fugitive from justice from the executive authority of another state or foreign government, either the state or a local government may employ a person to travel to the foreign jurisdiction for the express purpose of returning the fugitive to California. The state controller on approval of the governor will pay the employed person for the services rendered [*Penal Code § 1557*]. It is a misdemeanor for a public officer or other person to pay or receive any other reward for this service [*Penal Code § 1558*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewardsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsDuties & PowersGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 493.14-493.29

[Reserved]

§§ 493.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.30

§ 493.30 State Statutes

[1] Reward From Public Entities at Local Level

Reward offered by board of supervisors for information concerning person who willfully destroys or damages county property. *Gov. Code § 26207*

Reward offered by board of supervisors for information concerning person who commits criminal acts against person or residence of public officer or employee. *Gov. Code § 26207*

Reward for public suggestions resulting in savings to county. *Gov. Code §§ 26208, 26209*

Reward offered by local agency for information concerning person whose willful misconduct results in injury or death. *Gov. Code § 53069.5*

Reward offered by local agency for information concerning person who willfully damages or destroys property. *Gov. Code § 53069.5*

Reward offered by local agency to person who aids peace officer or who gives information concerning killing of or assault on peace officer. *Gov. Code § 53069.7*

Reward for information concerning refuse dumping or shooting firearm from or on public highway. *Penal Code § 374a*

[2] Reward From Public Entities at State Level

Reward for giving information concerning hazardous waste control violations. *Health & Safety Code § 25191.7*

Reward for giving information concerning violations of mobile source emissions regulations or limitations. *Health & Safety Code § 42405.1*

Permissible reward of up to $50,000 (or $100,000 in case of any person killing peace officer or firefighter acting in line of duty) by Governor for information leading to arrest and conviction of person for specified crimes. *Penal Code § 1547*

Reward for giving information concerning arson in state responsibility area. *Pub. Res. Code § 4417*

Reward for information concerning underreported or unreported sales and use taxes. *Rev. & Tax Code § 7060(a)*

Reward for information concerning underreported or unreported bank and corporation income subject to taxes. *Rev. & Tax Code § 19525*

[3] Prohibited Rewards

Public officer asking for or receiving reward for performing official act is misdemeanor. *Penal Code §§ 70, 94*

Receipt of reward for delivering fugitive from justice, except as provided for in *Penal Code § 1557*, is misdemeanor. *Penal Code § 1558*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.31

§ 493.31 Decisions

Reward is not available when claimant was already being compensated for performing act for which reward is posted; plaintiff not eligible for reward because he had been requested to keep lookout for acts or sources of pollution, and request had been accompanied by offer of compensation; immaterial whether or not plaintiff had actually agreed to keep lookout for compensation. *Van Horn v. Ricks Water Co. (1896) 115 Cal. 448, 452, 47 P. 361*

"Bounty" distinguished from "reward," although both close in meaning; "bounty" refers to offer of gratuity for performance of many persons, each of whom on performance will be entitled to gratuity without prejudice from or to claims of others, while "reward" applies to single service that can only be performed once, and is earned only by person or cooperating persons who succeed while others fail. *Ingram v. Colgan (1895) 106 Cal. 113, 124, 39 P. 437*

When offer for reward is not expressly limited in time, presumption is that it remained open on fifth day after it was made; revocation of offer is matter of defense. *Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 258, 37 P. 151*

Offer and promise to pay reward is only proposal or conditional promise and not consummated contract; however, when person relies on offer and performs service before offer is revoked, valid contract is consummated. *Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 257, 37 P. 151*

To recover reward that is advertised, claimant must prove that he or she substantially performed service as proposed in advertisement. *Burke v. Wells, Fargo & Co. (1875) 50 Cal. 218, 221*

Offer of reward or compensation, either to particular person or class of persons, or to any and all persons, is conditional promise that becomes legal and binding contract if any one to whom offer is made performs service before offer is revoked; offer may be revoked at any time by offeror. *Ryer v. Stockwell (1859) 14 Cal. 134, 137*

When grant of award was by its own terms discretionary by private company, employee reading about award could not have reasonably concluded that he or she would be entitled to reward by submitting suggestion, but should have understood that submission was only gratuity and did not create binding contract. *Lisec v. United Air Lines, Inc.*

(1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 969, 978, 149 Cal. Rptr. 847

Valid contract is formed when person returns property to another who has made express promise of reward, either to particular person or in general terms to any one who will return property to him or her, or even by publication of advertisement offering reward; offer may be revoked before being acted on. *Berthiaume v. John Doe (1913) 22 Cal. App. 78, 79-80, 133 P. 515*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawFormationOffersRevocable OffersContracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.32

§ 493.32 Attorney General Opinions

Governing board of junior college district is without authority to offer reward for information leading to apprehension and conviction of person who committed arson on school building. *52 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 35, 35-36 (1969)*

Power to offer rewards for apprehension and conviction of offender against people of state is not conferred on county board of supervisors, but remains state function; thus county cannot offer reward for cattle rustling which is grand theft; some authorities make exception for arson, which is local affair. *2 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 509, 509-510 (1943)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative Boards

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.33

§ 493.33 Law Reviews

Note, *Municipal Corporations--Power to Offer Rewards Under General Welfare Clause, 6 S. Cal. L. Rev. 248 (1933)*

Note, *Contracts --Rewards-- Substantial Performance--Meaning of Word 'Conviction' in Offer, 5 S. Cal. L. Rev. 247 (1931)*

Comment, *Contracts: Offer of Reward for Return of Lost Property: Consideration, 1 Cal. L. Rev. 470 (1913)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsUnilateral ContractsRewardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.34

§ 493.34 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, § 182 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 493.35-493.49

[Reserved]

§§ 493.35[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART IV. FORMS

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.50

§ 493.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Private Party

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Private Party

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Breach of Contract)
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. _____ (*Allege basis for venue, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.]

[2. Defendants Doe I through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that

plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants.)]

[3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned defendant _____ (*name*) was the agent of defendant _____ (*name*), and in doing the things hereinafter alleged was acting in the scope of that agency and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendant.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe circumstances over which offer of reward arose, e.g.,* a pet collie dog, Fido, belonging to _____ (*name*), disappeared from the residence of _____ (*name*)].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe offer of reward, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*) placed an advertisement in the _____ (*name of publication*), a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, offering a reward of $30,000 for the safe return of Fido to him/her].

6. Plaintiff, on or about _____ [*date*], after _____ [reading *or* learning of *or other as appropriate*] the above-described offer of reward and in reliance on that offer, _____ [*describe performance of offer, e.g.,* discovered the whereabouts of Fido, and safely returned the dog to defendant _____ (*name*).]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff by _____ [*form of demand, e.g.,* telephone], made demand on defendant _____ [*name*] at _____, California, for payment of the promised reward, which defendant _____ [*name*] refused and continues to refuse to pay.

8. As a result of the breach of the contract by defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*] for payment of reward, plaintiff has suffered damages in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above,* is for use in an action for damages for breach of contract for a reward offered by private party [*see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 337, 339* (statute of limitations)].

[3] Allegations

The complaint includes initial, optional paragraphs that allege:

- A basis for venue (Paragraph 1).
- Fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 2).
- Agency (Paragraph 3).

It then alleges the elements of a cause of action for breach of contract for reward:

- Defendant's offer of a reward (Paragraphs 4, 5).
- The performance of the act for which the reward was offered (Paragraph 6).
- The demand for payment of reward (Paragraph 7) [*see Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 257, 37 P. 151]* .
- The amount of damages to which plaintiff is entitled (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302*].

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

If the plaintiff prevails in the action, he or she is entitled to costs [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021, 1032-1033.5*]. Attorney's fees, however, are generally available in a contract action only when specifically provided for in the contract itself [*see Civ. Code § 1717*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1021*; for general discussion and forms relating to costs and attorney's fees, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*].

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

When a defendant has contracted to perform an obligation in a particular county, venue is proper either in the county in which the obligation is to be performed or in which the contract in fact was entered into, or in the county in which the defendant or any defendant resides at the commencement of the action [*see* Paragraph 1]. The county in which the obligation is incurred is deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed, unless there is a special contract in writing to the contrary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. For further discussion, including alternative bases for venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading a complaint for breach of contract generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART IV. FORMS

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.51

§ 493.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Public Entity, Officer, or Employee

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Contract for Reward--Breach by Public Entity, Officer, or Employee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (Breach of Con-
_____ [*name*],	)	tract)
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. Defendant _____ [City *or* County] of _____ is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a _____ [municipal corporation *or* chartered city *or* county], duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California [and situated in the County of _____].

[*OR*]

1. Defendant State of California is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a sovereign state of the United States of America.

[*OR*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times mentioned herein was, _____ [*specify, e.g.,* an agency] of the State of California, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

[*AND/OR*]

1. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*] is/are, and at all times herein mentioned was/were, _____ [governor of the state of California *or* the director of _____ (*name of local agency*) *or* members of the Board of Supervisors of the City of _____ (*name*) *or* the Director of the Department of Forestry *or other as appropriate*].

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 493.50, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 493.50, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe circumstances over which offer of reward arose, e.g.,* John Doe, a convicted murderer serving a life sentence in California, escaped from the correctional facility at San Quentin, California].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____, pursuant to his/her/its authority under _____ [*specify statute, e.g., Penal Code Section 1547(a)*], defendant _____ offered a reward for _____ [*describe, e.g.,* information leading to the arrest and conviction of John Doe]. The amount of the reward offered was $_____.

6. Plaintiff, on or about _____ [*date*], after _____ [reading *or* learning of *or other as appropriate*] the above-described offer of reward and in reliance on that offer, _____ [*describe performance of offer, e.g.,* discovered the whereabouts of John Doe, and relayed that information to _____ (*name and capacity*), who immediately went to the location and arrested John Doe. On or about _____ (*date*), John Doe was convicted of escape from a correctional facility].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff presented a claim for the reward that was offered to _____[*name of public entity*] by _____ [delivering *or* mailing] it to the _____ [clerk *or* secretary *or* auditor], all in compliance with the requirements of Section _____ [905 *or* 905.2] of the Government Code. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

8. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of public entity*] _____[rejected the claim in its entirety *or* allowed the claim in the amount of

$_____ and rejected it as to the remainder *or* failed to act on the claim within the period of 45 days after its presentation, and the claim was thus deemed rejected, under the provisions of *Government Code Section 912.4*, at the expiration of the 45-day period, to wit, on _____ (date)].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See Form 1.*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action for damages for breach of contract for a reward offered by a public entity, officer, or employee, as authorized by statute, after a claim for the reward has been rejected.

To claim a reward offered by a public entity, officer, or employee, a claim must be presented in accordance with *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.* within one year after the accrual of the cause of action [*see Gov. Code §§ 905* (claims against local public entities), 905.2 (claims against state), 911.2 (statute of limitations), 950.2 (claim against public employee)]. The claim requirement is a condition precedent to an action against the public entity, officer, or employee [*Gov. Code §§ 945.4, 950.2*; *see also Gov. Code §§ 945.6, 950.6* (statutes of limitations)]. For further discussion of and forms for use as claims against public entities, officers, and employees, *see* Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes initial, optional paragraphs that allege:

- A basis for venue (Paragraph 1),
- Fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 2), and
- Agency (Paragraph 3).

It then alleges the elements of a cause of action for breach of contract for reward:

- The circumstances over which the offer for reward arose (Paragraph 4),
- The offer of reward (Paragraph 5),
- The performance of the act for which the reward was offered (Paragraph 6),
- The claim for payment of reward (Paragraph 7) [*see Gov. Code §§ 905, 905.2*], and the rejection of the claim for reward (Paragraph 8) [*see Gov. Code § 912.4*].

[4] Venue

If the action is against a county, city and county, city, or local agency, the action is properly brought in the county in which the public entity is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]. If the action is against a public officer, the action is brought in the county in which the cause of action arose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*]. If, however, the action is brought against the state or a state agency or officer, the action may be brought in any county in which the Attorney General has an office, although the Attorney General may request a change of venue to Sacramento County [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401*; *Gov. Code § 955*].

[5] Verification

A public entity need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. The verification of a complaint against a public entity does, however, preclude a general denial in superior court and in some limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to claims and actions against public entities and officers, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For additional cross references relating to complaints generally, see *§ 493.50[7]*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapter 493 REWARDS
PART IV. FORMS

43-493 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 493.52

§ 493.52 Affirmative Defense to Action for Breach of Contract for Reward--Withdrawal of Offer of Reward Before Performance of Act

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Action for Breach of Contract for Reward--Withdrawal of Offer of Reward Before Performance of Act

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that on or about _____ [*date*], before plaintiff acted on the offer of reward stated in the complaint, defendant withdrew the offer by _____ [*describe withdrawal, e.g.,* publicly announcing on the evening news programs of the American Broadcasting Company, the National Broadcasting Company, and the Columbia Broadcasting Company, that the offer of reward was thereby withdrawn].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer in an action for damages for breach of contract for a reward. The affirmative defense alleged is that the defendant withdrew the offer [*Wilson v. Stump (1894) 103 Cal. 255, 258, 37 P. 151* ; *Ryer v. Stockwell (1859) 14 Cal. 134, 137]* of reward before the plaintiff performed the act for which the reward was offered [*Berthiaume v. John Doe (1913) 22 Cal. App. 78, 79-80, 133 P. 515]* . For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which the affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 43: Receivers thru Rewards-Chs. 486-499
Chapters 494through 499 RESERVED

43-494 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 494through 499

RESERVED

Chapters 494RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 500.syn

§ 500.syn Synopsis to Chapter 500: SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE

§ 500.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 500.02 Cross References

§§ 500.03-500.09 [Reserved]

§ 500.10 Governing Statutes

[1] Division 2 of the Commercial Code

[2] Applicability of Division 9 to Sales Covered by Division 2

§ 500.11 Definitions

[1] Buyer

[2] Goods

[3] Merchant; Between Merchants

[4] Sale

[5] Seller

§§ 500.12-500.19 [Reserved]

§ 500.20 Formation

[1] Generally

[2] Offer and Acceptance

[3] Firm Offers

[4] Additional Terms

§ 500.21 Unconscionability

§ 500.22 Modification, Rescission, and Waiver

[1] No Consideration Required

[2] Satisfying Requirement of Writing

[3] Waiver

§§ 500.23-500.29 [Reserved]

§ 500.30 General Obligations

§ 500.31 Parol Evidence

§ 500.32 Performance

[1] Course of Performance

[2] Specification of Particulars of Performance

[3] Right to Assurance

[4] Substituted Performance When Agreed Performance Impracticable

§ 500.33 Price

[1] Manner of Payment

[2] Open Price Term

§ 500.34 Quantity

[1] When Quantity Must Be in Writing

[2] Output and Requirements Contracts

§ 500.35 Delivery

[1] General Rule

[2] Place

[3] Tender of Delivery and Payment

[a] Two Senses in Which "Tender" Is Used

[b] General Requirements for Tender

[c] Tender of Goods in Possession of Bailee

[4] Tender of Deliver and Payment as Conditions

[5] Shipment

[6] Shipment Under Reservation

[7] Rights of Financing Agency

[8] Improper Delivery and Cure by Seller

§ 500.36 Time

§ 500.37 When Payment Is Due

[1] If No Time for Payment Is Specified

[2] Buyer's Right of Inspection

§ 500.38 Sale on Approval and Sale or Return

§ 500.39 Consignments of Consumer Goods

§§ 500.40-500.49 [Reserved]

§ 500.50 General Rules for Allocation of Risk

§ 500.51 Insurable Interest in Goods

§ 500.52 Risk of Loss in Absence of Breach

[1] General Rule

[2] Shipment by Carrier

[3] Goods Held by Bailee

[4] Other Situations

[5] UCC Rules Governing Shipment

[a] F.O.B. and F.A.S.

[b] C.I.F. and C. & F.

[c] Ex-Ship

[d] Overseas

[6] Casualty to Identified Goods

§ 500.53 Effect of Breach

§§ 500.54-500.59 [Reserved]

§ 500.60 Buyer's Options Concerning Nonconforming Goods

[1] Rejection

[a] In Whole or in Part

[b] Failure to Particularize

[c] Obligations Respecting Rejected Goods

[2] Acceptance

[a] Defined

[b] Effect of Acceptance

[c] Revocation of Acceptance

§ 500.61 Anticipatory Repudiation

[1] Requires Overt Communication or Action

[2] May Be Retracted

§ 500.62 Installment Contracts

§ 500.63 Impossibility

[1] Excuses Seller's Performance

[2] Buyer's Rights

§§ 500.64-500.69 [Reserved]

§ 500.70 Remedies Generally

§ 500.71 Liquidated Damages

§ 500.72 Contractual Limitation on Remedies

§ 500.73 Remedies Against Third Parties

§ 500.74 Effect of Insolvency

[1] Insolvency Defined

[2] Buyer's Insolvency

[3] Seller's Insolvency

§ 500.75 Seller's Remedies

[1] Generally

[2] Person in Position of Seller

[3] Right to Identify Goods Which Are Subject of Breach

[4] Withhold Delivery

[5] Stop Delivery

[6] Resale

[a] Seller's Right to Resell; Measure of Damages After Resale

[b] Approved Methods of Resale

[c] Notification of Sale

[d] Purchaser Takes Free

[7] Recovery of Damages

[a] Measure of Damages

[b] Price

[c] Incidentals

§ 500.76 Buyer's Remedies

[1] Buyer's Options

[2] Buyer's Security Interest

[3] Cover

[4] Damages

[a] Measure of Damages for Nondelivery

[b] Measure of Damages for Nonconforming Goods

[c] Buyer's Incidental and Consequential Damages

[5] Specific Performance

[6] Replevin

§ 500.77 Proof of Price

[1] Time as of Which Price is Determined

[2] Market Quotations

§ 500.78 Statute of Limitations

§ 500.79 Goods Bought Through Web Site--Personal Jurisdiction of Seller

§§ 500.80-500.89 [Reserved]

§ 500.90 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 500.91 State Statutes

[1] Allocation of Risk

[2] Attorney's Fees

[3] Breach

[4] Buyer's Rights and Remedies

[5] Damages

[6] Definitions

[7] Formation of Contract

[8] Goods

[9] Interpretation of Contracts

[10] Payment

[11] Performance

[12] Procedure

[13] Sales Generally

[14] Seller's Rights and Remedies

[15] Shipment and Delivery

[16] Third Parties

§ 500.92 Decisions

[1] Contractual Limitations on Damages

[2] Definitions

[3] Formation of Contract

[4] Good Faith Purchaser; Entrustment; Power to Transfer

[5] Liquidated Damages

[6] Revocation of Acceptance

[7] Sale or Service

[8] Statute of Limitations

[9] Strict Liability

[10] Unconscionability

§ 500.93 Law Reviews

§ 500.94 Text References

§§ 500.95-500.99 [Reserved]

§ 500.100 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2704, 2706, 2708-2710]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Recovery of Interest

[5] Attorney's Fees

[6] Verification

[7] Jurisdiction

[8] Venue

[9] Statute of Limitations

[10] Parties

[11] Cross References

§ 500.101 Complaint to Recover Price of Goods as Damages for Breach of Written Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2709]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 500.102 Complaint for Damages or Price for Breach of Requirements Contract [Com. Code §§ 2306, 2703(e), 2709]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§§ 500.103-500.109 [Reserved]

§ 500.110 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Seller's Revocation of Firm Offer [Com. Code § 2205]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 500.111 Complaint for Specific Performance [Civ. Code § 3384] After Seller's Breach of Contract [Com. Code § 2716]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

§ 500.112 Complaint for Damages [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Buyer's Rightful Rejection of Defective Goods [Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§§ 500.113-500.119 [Reserved]

§ 500.120 Defense Based on Custom and Usage [Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 500.121 Defense Based Lack of Intent to Be Bound While Price Term Remained Open [Com. Code § 2305(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 500.122 Defense Based on Fact That Defendant Is Not a Merchant [Com. Code § 2104(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 500.123 Defense Based on Buyer's Failure to Effectively Revoke Acceptance [Com. Code § 2608]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART I. SCOPE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.01

§ 500.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions available to sellers and buyers arising from sales or contracts to sell goods under Division 2 of the Uniform Commercial Code as adopted in California [*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*].

It contains forms for breach of contract actions by sellers against buyers [*see § 500.100* et seq.] and by buyers against sellers [*see § 500.110* et seq.], as well as forms for affirmative defenses [*see § 500.120*] for use in those actions.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART I. SCOPE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.02

§ 500.02 Cross References

- Assignment and delegation of rights and obligations subject to Division 2 under *Com. Code § 2210* is discussed in Ch. 60, *Assignments* .

- Sale by auction under *Com. Code § 2328* is discussed in Ch. 77, *Auctions and Auctioneers* .

- For discussion and forms for use in contract actions other than those covered by Division 2, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* , Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* , Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* , and Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

- For discussion of the measure of damages for unlawful motor vehicle subleasing, see Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act* .

- For discussion and forms relating to damages generally, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

- For further discussions of, and forms for use in, actions involving contracts for the sale of timber and the extraction of minerals, see Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber* , Ch. 363, *Mining* , and Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas* .

- The statute of frauds contained in *Com. Code § 2201* is discussed in Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART I. SCOPE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.03-500.09

[Reserved]

§§ 500.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.10

§ 500.10 Governing Statutes

[1] Division 2 of the Commercial Code

Statutes governing sales or contracts to sell goods under Division 2 of the Commercial Code are contained in *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.* Unless the context otherwise requires, Division 2 applies to transactions in goods; it does not apply to any transaction that, although in the form of an unconditional contract to sell or present sale, is intended to operate only as a security transaction [*see* Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions*]. Nor does Division 2 impair or repeal any statute regulating sales to consumers, farmers, or other specified classes of buyers [*Com. Code § 2102*]. For instance, vehicles, although goods, are excluded from the scope of Division 2 because sales of vehicles are regulated by the Vehicle Code [*Quartz of S. Cal., Inc. v. Mullen Bros., Inc. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907-908, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 54*].

[2] Applicability of Division 9 to Sales Covered by Division 2

Division 9 (Secured Transactions, *Com. Code § 9101 et seq.*), discussed in Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* , governs particular security interests arising under Division 2 as follows [*Com. Code § 9109(a)*]:

- Interests arising under *Com. Code § 2401* (identification of goods), discussed in *§ 500.11[4]*.
- Interests arising under *Com. Code § 2505* (shipment under reservation), discussed in *§ 500.35[6]*.
- The buyer's special interest under *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, which arises on buyer's indentifying the goods to the contract, discussed in *§ 500.76[2]*.

However, until the debtor obtains possession of the goods, all of the following rules apply [*Com. Code § 9110*]:

- The security interest is enforceable, even if *Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)* has not been satisfied.
- Filing is not required to perfect the security interest.

- The rights of the secured party after default by the debtor are governed by Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*) or Division 10 (*Com. Code § 10101 et seq.*), in the case of personal property leases.

- The security interest has priority over a conflicting security interest created by the debtor.

Security interests arising under *Com. Code § 2401* or *2505*, a buyer's security interest under *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, or a lessee's security interest under *Com. Code § 10508(e)*, until the debtor obtains possession of the collateral, are perfected when they attach [*Com. Code § 9309(6)*].

The general rule [*Com. Code § 9322(a)-(e)*] governing priority of security interests is subject to *Com. Code § 9110* (discussed *above*) with respect to a security interest arising under Division 2 [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.11

§ 500.11 Definitions

[1] Buyer

In Division 2, unless the context otherwise requires, "buyer" means a person who buys or contracts to buy goods [*Com. Code § 2103(1)(a)*].

[2] Goods

"Goods" means all things (including specially manufactured goods) which are movable at the time of identification to the contract for sale other than the money in which the price is to be paid, investment securities (Division 8) and things in action. "Goods" also includes the unborn young of animals, growing crops, and other identified things attached to realty as described in *Com. Code § 2107*, governing goods to be severed from realty, and discussed in [5], *below* [*Com. Code § 2105(1)*].

Goods must be both existing and identified before any interest in them can pass. Goods which are not both existing and identified are "future" goods. A purported present sale of future goods or of any interest them operates as a contract to sell [*Com. Code § 2105(2)*]. There may be a sale of a part interest in existing identified goods [*Com. Code § 2105(3)*]. An undivided share in an identified bulk of fungible goods is sufficiently identified to be sold although the quantity of the bulk is not determined. Any agreed proportion of that bulk or any quantity of it agreed on by number, weight or other measure may to the extent of the seller's interest in the bulk be sold to the buyer who then becomes an owner in common [*Com. Code § 2105(4)*].

"Lot" means a parcel or a single article which is the subject matter of a separate sale or delivery, whether or not it is sufficient to perform the contract [*Com. Code § 2105(5)*].

"Commercial unit" means a unit of goods which by commercial usage is a single whole for purposes of sale and division of which materially impairs its character or value on the market or in use. A commercial unit may be a single article (as a machine) or a set of articles (as a suite of furniture or an assortment of sizes) or a quantity (as a bale, gross, or carload) or any other unit treated in use or in the relevant market as a single whole [*Com. Code § 2105(6)*].

[3] Merchant; Between Merchants

"Merchant" means a person who deals in goods of the kind, or otherwise by his or her occupation holds himself or herself out as having knowledge or skill peculiar to the practices or goods, involved in the transaction or to whom that knowledge or skill may be attributed by his or her employment of an agent or broker or other intermediary who by his or her occupation holds himself or herself out as having that knowledge or skill [*Com. Code § 2104(1)*]. "Between merchants" means in any transaction with respect to which both parties are chargeable with the knowledge or skill of merchants [*Com. Code § 2104(3)*].

[4] Sale

The term "sale" as used in this chapter and in Division 2 means the passing of title from the seller to the buyer for a price [*Com. Code § 2106(1)*; *see* Imperial NH3 v. *Central Valley Feed Yards, Inc. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 513, 520, 139 Cal. Rptr. 8]* . In determining when a "sale" occurs, therefore, the passage of title is critical. Each provision of Division 2 with regard to the rights, obligations, and remedies of the seller, the buyer, purchasers, or other third parties applies irrespective of title to the goods except when the provision refers to title. Insofar as situations are not covered by the other provisions of Division 2 and matters concerning title become material, the following rules apply [*Com. Code § 2401*]:

- Title to goods may not pass under a contract for sale prior to their identification to the contract (discussed in *§ 500.51*), and, unless otherwise explicitly agreed to, the buyer acquires by their identification a special property as limited by the Commercial Code. Any retention or reservation by the seller of the title (property) in goods shipped or delivered to the buyer is limited in effect to a reservation of a security interest. Subject to these provisions and to the provisions of Division 9 (secured transactions, discussed in Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions*), title to goods passes from the seller to the buyer in any manner and on any conditions explicitly agreed on by the parties [*Com. Code § 2401(1)*].

- Unless otherwise explicitly agreed, title passes to the buyer at the time and place at which the seller completes its performance regarding the physical delivery of the goods, despite any reservation of a security interest and even though a document of title is to be delivered at a different time or place. In particular, despite any reservation of a security interest by the bill of lading, if the contract requires or authorizes the seller to send the goods to the buyer but does not require him or her to deliver them at destination, title passes to the buyer at the time and place of shipment. If the contract requires delivery at destination, title passes on tender there [Com. Code. § 2401(2)].

- Unless otherwise explicitly agreed, when delivery is to be made without moving the goods:

  - If the seller is to deliver a tangible document of title, title passes at the time when and the place where the seller delivers that document [*Com. Code § 2401(3)(a)*].

  - If the seller is to deliver an electronic document of title, title passes when the seller delivers the document [*Com. Code § 2401(3)(a)*].

  - If the goods are already identified at the time of contracting and no documents of title are to be delivered, title passes at the time and place of contracting [*Com. Code § 2401(3)(b)*].

- A rejection or other refusal by the buyer to receive or retain the goods, whether or not justified, or a justified revocation of acceptance reverts title to the goods in the seller. This revesting occurs by

operation of law and is not a "sale" [*Com. Code § 2401(4)*].

A contract for the sale, apart from the land, of growing crops or other things attached to realty and capable of severance without material harm thereto, or of timber to be cut, is a contract for the sale of goods regardless of whether the subject matter is to be severed by the buyer or by the seller, even though it forms a part of the realty at the time of contracting, and the parties can by identification effect a present sale before severance [*Com. Code § 2107(2)*]. In addition, a contract for the sale of minerals or the like (including oil and gas) or a structure or its material to be removed from realty is a contract for the sale of goods if they are to be severed by the seller. Until severance, however, a purported interest in land is effective only as a contract to sell [*Com. Code § 2107(1)*].

[5] Seller

In Division 2 unless the context otherwise requires, "seller" means a person who sells or contracts to sell goods [*Com. Code § 2103(1)(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.12-500.19

[Reserved]

§§ 500.12[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Formation of Contracts

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.20

§ 500.20 Formation

[1] Generally

A contract for sale of goods may be made in any manner sufficient to show agreement [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)*], including conduct by both parties [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(26)*] that recognizes the existence of the contract [*Com. Code § 2204(1)*]. An agreement sufficient to constitute a contract for sale may be found even though the moment of its making is undetermined [*Com. Code § 2204(2)*] and one or more terms [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(40)*] are left open, if the parties have intended to make a contract and there is a reasonably certain basis for giving an appropriate remedy [*Com. Code §§ 1201(b)(32), 2204(3)*]. A party includes a person [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(27)*] acting through an agent [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(26)*].

If terms are left open, commercial standards on the point of "indefiniteness" are intended to be applied [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2204*]. Some of these standards are supplied by the Code itself, including provisions for certain missing terms, such as the provisions in *Com. Code § 2305* fixing the price when the contract contains an open price term [*see § 500.33[2]*], and in *Com. Code § 2311* permitting the parties to supply missing terms in the course of their performance [*see § 500.32[2]*].

The more terms the parties leave open, the less it is likely the parties intend to conclude a binding contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2204*]. Even the failure to agree on one term that is essential to the contract and that cannot be added by recourse to commercial standards may indicate that the parties did not reach an agreement. For example, an open price term that is to be fixed by a third person is deemed to be the price at the time of delivery if the person fails to fix the price [*see Com. Code § 2305(1)(c)*]. But if the third person was chosen not merely as a barometer or index of a fair price but as an essential condition to entering into a contract, the failure to set the price may show that no contract was formed [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2305*].

Even if the parties' writings [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(43)*] are insufficient to establish a contract for sale, conduct by both parties that recognizes the existence of a contract, such as shipping the goods, accepting the goods, and paying for the goods, is sufficient. In those cases, the terms of the contract consist of those on which the writings of the parties agree,

together with any supplementary terms incorporated under the provisions of the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 2207(3)*; *see Steiny & Co. v. California Elec. Supply Co. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 285, 294-296* (when conduct by contractor and seller showed that contract had been formed despite materially differing terms of purchase order and invoice, trial court's failure to instruct the jury on *Com. Code § 2207* was prejudicial error); *Textile Unlimited, Inc. v. A.BMH and Co. Inc. (9th Cir. 2001) 240 F.3d 781, 787-788* (because under *Com. Code § 2207(3)* disputed additional terms on which parties do not agree drop out from contract, disputed arbitration clause did not become part of contract; UCC does not contain "gap-filler" provision providing for arbitration)].

[2] Offer and Acceptance

Unless otherwise unambiguously indicated by the language or circumstances of the agreement, an offer to make a contract is construed as inviting acceptance in any manner and by any medium reasonable in the circumstances [*Com. Code § 2206(1)(a)*]. However, if the beginning of a requested performance is a reasonable mode of acceptance, an offeror who is not notified of acceptance within a reasonable time may treat the offer as having lapsed before acceptance [*Com. Code § 2206(2)*].

An order or other offer to buy goods for prompt or current shipment is construed as inviting acceptance either by a prompt promise to ship or by the prompt or current shipment of conforming [*Com. Code § 2106(2)*] or nonconforming goods, unless the seller seasonably [*Com. Code § 1205(c)*] notifies the buyer that the shipment of nonconforming goods is offered only as an accommodation to the buyer [*Com. Code § 2206(1)(b)*; *see Com. Code § 2504*]. "Shipment" for the purpose of acceptance under *Com. Code § 2206(b)* does not include the beginning of delivery by the seller's own truck or by messenger, although loading on the seller's own truck might be construed as the beginning of performance under *Com. Code § 2206(2)*[*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2206*].

[3] Firm Offers

A merchant's [*Com. Code § 2104(1)*] offer to buy or sell goods in a signed [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(37)*] writing which by its terms gives assurance that it will be held open is not revocable, for lack of consideration, during the time stated or, if no time is stated, for a reasonable time [*Com. Code § 1205*], although the period of irrevocability may never exceed three months [*Com. Code § 2205(a)*]. For the purpose of this provision, almost every person in business would be deemed to be a merchant [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2104*]. Any term of assurance on a form supplied by the offeree must be separately signed by the offeror [*Com. Code § 2205(a)*]. For the purpose of this statute, "signed" includes authentication [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2205*]. An assurance under *Com. Code § 2205* which is made for a period longer than three months will bind the offeror only for the first three months, unless it is renewed or supported by consideration [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2205*].

In any case, an oral or written offer to supply goods to a contractor made by a merchant who has actual or imputed knowledge that the contractor (1) is licensed under California law or a similar law of another state and (2) will rely on the offer in submitting its bid for a construction contract with a third party is irrevocable for 10 days after the awarding of the contract to the prime contractor but in no event for more than 90 days after the date the bid or offer was made, unless the merchant provides that the offer will be held open for less than these prescribed times. A merchant is released from an oral bid or offer of $2,500 or more unless the contractor or his or her agent confirms the offer within 48 hours after it was rendered [*Com. Code § 2205(b)*]. For a further discussion and a form for use in an action on a firm offer, see *§ 500.110*.

[4] Additional Terms

A definite and seasonable expression of acceptance or a written confirmation which is sent within a reasonable time operates as an acceptance even though it states terms additional to or different from those offered or agreed on, unless acceptance is expressly made conditional on assent to the additional or different terms [*Com. Code § 2207(1)*; *see, e.g.,*

PMC Inc. v. Porthole Yachts Ltd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 882, 888-889, 76 Cal.Rptr. 2d 832 (there was no acceptance under *Com. Code § 2207(1)* because addendum to agreement was sent on last day to accept, contents of addendum included new term, and cover letter emphasized conditional nature of acceptance); *Textile Unlimited v. A..BMH & Co. (9th Cir. 2001) 240 F.3d 781, 787-788* (contract containing new terms, including arbitration clause, not formed under *Com. Code § 2207(1)* when no specific and unequivocal assent was given to supplemental conditions)]. Any additional terms are construed as proposals for addition to the contract and, between merchants, become part of the contract, unless (1) the offer expressly limits acceptance to the terms of the offer, (2) the terms materially alter the contract, or (3) notification [*Com. Code § 1202(d)*] of objection to the terms has already been given or is given within a reasonable time after notice of them is received [*Com. Code § 2207(2)*; *Boyd v. Oscar Fisher Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 368, 379, 258 Cal. Rptr. 473* (attorney's fees provision in invoices was additional term of dealership agreement between parties); *see National Controls, Inc. v. Commodore Bus. Machines, Inc. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 688, 693-695, 209 Cal. Rptr. 636* (oral contract complete in phone conversation, thus purchase order adding materially different term had no effect)].

If clauses on confirming forms sent by both parties conflict, each party is assumed to object to the other party's conflicting clause; thus, the requirement that there be notice of objection [*Com. Code § 2207(2)*] is satisfied and the conflicting terms do not become a part of the contract. The contract then consists of the terms originally expressly agreed to, the terms on which the confirmations agree, and the terms supplied by the provisions of the Code [*Com. Code § 2207(3)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2207*; *see also Transwestern Pipeline Co. v. Monsanto (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 502, 514-515, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Formation of Contracts

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.21

§ 500.21 Unconscionability

Section 2-302 of the Uniform Commercial Code dealing with unconscionable contracts or clauses has not been enacted in California based, in part, on the belief that giving courts unqualified power to strike down terms they might consider "unconscionable" could result in the renegotiation of contracts in every case of disagreement with the fairness of provisions the parties had accepted [*see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2302*].

In 1979, however, California enacted a general unconscionability statute, *Civ. Code § 1670.5*, governing all contracts, including contracts for the sale of goods under Division 2 [Stats. 1979, Ch 819, § 3; *see Civ. Code § 1670.5*]. *Civ. Code § 1670.5* provides that if the court as a matter of law finds the contract or any clause of the contract to have been unconscionable at the time it was made, the court may refuse to enforce the contract, enforce the remainder of the contract without the unconscionable clause, or so limit the application of that clause as to avoid any unconscionable result [*Civ. Code § 1670.5(a)*]. When it is claimed or appears to the court that the contract or any clause thereof may be unconscionable, the parties are afforded a reasonable opportunity to present evidence as to its commercial setting, purpose, and effect in order to aid the court in its determination [*Civ. Code § 1670.5(b)*].

The basic test of unconscionability under *Civ. Code § 1670.5* is whether, in the light of the general background and the needs of the particular case, the clauses involved are so one-sided as to be unconscionable under the circumstances existing at the time of the making of the contract [*see* Legislative Committee Comment to *Civ. Code § 1670.5*-Assembly 1979 Addition]. For a form and further discussion relating to unconscionability as an affirmative defense to a breach of contract action, see *Ch. 140, Contracts, § 140.146*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Formation of Contracts

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.22

§ 500.22 Modification, Rescission, and Waiver

[1] No Consideration Required

An agreement modifying a contract within Division 2 needs no consideration to be binding [*Com. Code § 2209(1)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1697*]. This rule also applies to oral modifications of oral contracts [*see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2209*]. Modifications nevertheless must be made in good faith, which may, as between merchants or against merchants in some situations, require an objectively demonstrable reason for seeking a modification. In any case the use of bad faith to escape performance on the original contract is barred, and the extortion of a modification without legitimate commercial reason is ineffective as a violation of the duty of good faith. A mere technical consideration also may not be used to support a modification made in bad faith [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2209*].

[2] Satisfying Requirement of Writing

A signed agreement which excludes modification or rescission except by a signed writing cannot be otherwise modified or rescinded. Except as between merchants, such a requirement on a form supplied by a merchant must be separately signed by the other party [*Com. Code § 2209(2)*]. Modification or rescission includes abandonment or other change by mutual consent but does not include unilateral termination or cancellation [*Com. Code § 2106(3),(4)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2209*]. In addition, the requirements of the statute of frauds [*Com. Code § 2201*] must be satisfied if the contract, as modified, is within the statute's provisions [*Com. Code § 2209(3)*; *see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

[3] Waiver

When an attempt at modification or rescission does not satisfy the writing requirements of *Com. Code § 2209(2)* or *(3)*, it nevertheless can operate as a waiver [*Com. Code § 2209(4)*]. A party who has made a waiver affecting an executory portion of the contract may retract the waiver by reasonable notification, received by the other party, indicating that strict performance will be required of any term waived, unless the retraction would be unjust in view of a material change of position in reliance on the waiver [*Com. Code § 2209(5)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Formation of Contracts

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.23-500.29

[Reserved]

§§ 500.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.30

§ 500.30 General Obligations

The obligation of the seller is to transfer and deliver and the buyer's obligation is to accept [*Com. Code § 2606*] and pay in accordance with the contract [*Com. Code § 2301*]. To determine what is "in accordance with the contract," usage of trade, course of dealing and performance, and the general background of circumstances must be given due consideration in conjunction with the lay meaning of the words used to define the scope of the conditions and duties [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2301*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.31

§ 500.31 Parol Evidence

Terms with respect to which the confirmatory memoranda of the parties agree or which are otherwise set forth in a writing intended by the parties as a final expression of their agreement with respect to the terms included in that writing may not be contradicted by evidence of any prior agreement or of a contemporaneous oral agreement but may be explained or supplemented by course of dealing or usage of trade [*Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)*] or by course of performance [*Com. Code §§ 1303(a), 2202(a)*; *see § 500.32[1]*], and by evidence of consistent additional terms, unless the court finds the writing to have been intended also as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the agreement [*Com. Code § 2202(b)*; *see Com. Code § 2207*].

The Commercial Code alters the parol evidence rule by rejecting both the premise that the language used in the agreement or contract has the meaning attributable to it by rules of legal construction rather than the meaning which arises out of the commercial context in which it was used and the requirement that as a condition precedent to the admissibility of evidence of course of dealing, usage of trade, or course of performance the court determine that the language used in the writing be ambiguous [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2202*]. More fundamentally, the Code alters the rule by assuming that the contract does not express the full agreement of the parties unless the court expressly so finds [*see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2202*; *see also Civ. Code §§ 1625, 1647*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1856, 1857*]. Moreover, if the court determines that the additional terms are such that, if agreed on, they would certainly have been included in the document, then evidence of their alleged making must not be considered by the trier of fact [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2202*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.32

§ 500.32 Performance

[1] Course of Performance

A course of performance is a sequence of conduct between the parties to a particular transaction that exists if (1) the agreement of the parties with respect to the transaction involves repeated occasions for performance by a party and (2) the other party, with knowledge of the nature of the performance and opportunity for objection to it, accepts the performance or acquiesces in it without objection [*Com. Code § 1303(a)*]. The express terms of the agreement and any course of performance, as well as any course of dealing and usage of trade, are construed whenever reasonable as consistent with each other; but when that construction is unreasonable, express terms control course of performance and course of performance controls both course of dealing and usage of trade [*Com. Code § 1303(e)*]. Subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2209*[*see* discussion in *§ 500.22*], course of performance is relevant to show a waiver or modification of any term inconsistent with that course of performance [*Com. Code § 1303(f)*].

[2] Specification of Particulars of Performance

An agreement for sale which is otherwise sufficiently definite [*Com. Code § 2204(3)*] to be a contract is not made invalid because it leaves particulars of performance to be specified by one of the parties, although any specification must be made in good faith and within limits set by commercial reasonableness [*Com. Code § 2311(1)*]. The agreement which permits one party to specify certain particulars of performance may be found in a course of dealing, usage of trade, or by implication from circumstances, as well as in the explicit language used by the parties [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2311*].

Specifications or arrangements relating to shipment are at the seller's option, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 2319(1)(c),(3)* (F.O.B. and F.A.S. terms) [*see* discussion in *§ 500.52[5][a]*], and specifications relating to assortment of the goods are at the buyer's option, unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 2311(2)*], not only under the parties' express terms but in the light of the background and circumstances in which they entered into the agreement [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2311*].

If specifications relating to assortment of the goods or to shipment which would materially affect the other party's

performance are not seasonably made, or if one party's cooperation which is necessary to the agreed performance of the other is not seasonably forthcoming, the other party, in addition to all other remedies, is excused for any resulting delay in his or her own performance [*Com. Code § 2311(3)(a)*] and in addition, may either proceed to perform in any reasonable manner or, after the time for a material part of his or her own performance, treat the failure to specify or to cooperate as a breach by failure to deliver or accept the goods [*Com. Code § 2311(3)*]. These remedies are not available to the party adhering to the terms of the contract, however, if the situation falls within the scope of *Com. Code § 2614*, discussed in *§ 500.32[4]*.

[3] Right to Assurance

A contract for sale imposes an obligation on each party that the other's expectation of receiving due performance will not be impaired. When reasonable grounds for insecurity arise with respect to the performance of either party, the other may, in writing, demand adequate assurance of due performance. Until receiving that assurance, the other party may, if commercially reasonable, suspend any performance for which he or she has not already received the agreed return by holding up performance pending the outcome of the demand, including holding up any preparatory action [*see Com. Code § 2609(1)*; UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2609*]. Between merchants the reasonableness of grounds for insecurity and the adequacy of any assurance offered is determined according to commercial standards [*Com. Code § 2609(2)*]. Under commercial standards and in accordance with commercial practice, a ground for insecurity need not arise from or be directly related to the contract in question, because the law as to "dependence" or "independence" of promises within a single contract does not control the application of *Com. Code § 2609* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2609*]. In any case, acceptance of any improper delivery or payment does not prejudice the aggrieved party's right [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(34)*] to demand adequate assurance of future performance [*Com. Code § 2609(3)*].

After receipt of a justified demand, failure to provide, within a reasonable time not exceeding 30 days, reasonable assurance of due performance which is adequate under the circumstances of the particular case is a repudiation of the contract [*Com. Code § 2609(4)*]. A party who fails to provide that assurance may retract the repudiation, unless the aggrieved party has acted on the breach in some manner [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2609*; *Com. Code § 2611*].

In addition to the protection given by statute when a ground for insecurity arises, a party may be given wide powers to cancel or readjust the contract when a ground for insecurity arises. This contract protection, however, must be read in light of the good faith obligation which is not subject to modification by agreement [*Com. Code § 1302(b)*], and any clause seeking to set up arbitrary standards for action is ineffective [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2609*].

[4] Substituted Performance When Agreed Performance Impracticable

If, without fault [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(17)*] of either party, the agreed berthing, loading, or unloading facilities fail, an agreed type of carrier becomes unavailable, or the agreed manner of delivery otherwise becomes commercially impracticable but a commercially reasonable substitute is available, that substitute performance must be tendered and accepted [*Com. Code § 2614(1)*].

If the agreed means or manner of payment fails because of domestic or foreign governmental regulation, the seller may withhold or stop delivery, unless the buyer provides a means or manner of payment which is commercially a substantial equivalent. If delivery has already been taken, payment by the means or in the manner provided by the regulation discharges the buyer's obligation unless the regulation is discriminatory, oppressive, or predatory [*Com. Code § 2614(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.33

§ 500.33 Price

[1] Manner of Payment

The price can be made payable in money or otherwise. If it is payable in whole or in part in goods, each party is a seller of the goods which he or she is to transfer [*Com. Code § 2304(1)*]. When all or part of the price is payable in an interest in realty, the transfer of the goods and the seller's obligations with reference to them are subject to Division 2, but not the transfer of the interest in realty or the transferor's obligations in connection with realty [*Com. Code § 2304(2)*; *see also* discussions in *§ 500.35[3]* and *[4]*].

[2] Open Price Term

The parties, if they so intend, can conclude a contract for sale even though the price is not settled. In that case, the price is a reasonable price at the time for delivery if any of the following is true [*Com. Code § 2305(1)*]:

- Nothing is said as to price.
- The price is left to be agreed by the parties and they fail to agree.
- The price is to be fixed in terms of some agreed market or other standard as set or recorded by a third person or agency and it is not so set or recorded.

Thus, an agreement is not unenforceable on the ground of indefiniteness because the price term is left open if the parties intend a binding agreement [*see also* discussion in *§ 500.20[1]*; for a form for use in an action on a contract with an open price term, *see § 500.101*].

A price to be fixed by the seller or buyer means a price to be fixed in good faith [*Com. Code § 2305(2)*; *see Com. Code § 1201(b)(20)*]. But in the normal case, a "posted price" or a future seller's or buyer's "given price," "price in effect," "market price," or the like satisfies the good faith requirement [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2305*]. When a price left to be fixed in a way other than by agreement of the parties fails to be fixed through fault of one party, the other

party has the option to treat the contract as canceled or to fix a reasonable price [*Com. Code § 2305(3)*].

If, however, the parties intend not to be bound unless the price is fixed or agreed, and it is not fixed or agreed, there is no contract [*see § 500.121*(form for affirmative defense)]. In that case the buyer must return any goods already received or if unable to do so, must pay their reasonable value at the time of delivery, and the seller must return any portion of the price paid on account [*Com. Code § 2305(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.34

§ 500.34 Quantity

[1] When Quantity Must Be in Writing

The UCC makes no specific provision for supplying the quantity term in an agreement when none has been agreed to by the parties, except in the case of output and requirements contracts [*see Com. Code § 2306* and discussion in [2], *below*; *but see* also *Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)* and the discussion in *§ 500.20[1]*]. In any case, a contract for the sale of goods for the price of $500 or more is not enforceable under the statute of frauds beyond the quantity of goods shown in a writing [*Com. Code § 2201(1)*] or admitted [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)*]. Thus, while it need not be accurately stated, the quantity term is the only term which must appear in the writing [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2201*].

[2] Output and Requirements Contracts

A term which measures the quantity by the output of the seller or the requirements of the buyer means the actual output or requirements that may occur in good faith, except that no quantity unreasonably disproportionate to any stated estimate or, in the absence of a stated estimate, to any normal or otherwise comparable prior output or requirements, may be tendered or demanded [*Com. Code § 2306(1)*; *see also Shea-Kaiser-Lockheed-Healy v. Department of Water & Power (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 679, 687-688, 140 Cal. Rptr. 884]* . For further discussion and a form for use in an action on a requirements contract, see *§ 500.102*.

A lawful agreement by either the seller or the buyer for exclusive dealing in the kind of goods concerned imposes, unless otherwise agreed, an obligation by the seller to use best efforts to supply the goods and by the buyer to use best efforts to promote their sale [*Com. Code § 2306(2)*]. Parties to these contracts are held to have impliedly, even when not expressly, bound themselves to use reasonable diligence as well as good faith in their performance [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2306*]. In the case of a seller's breach of an output and requirements contract involving a limited source or market, specific performance is the typical remedy [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2716* and discussion in *§ 500.76[5]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.35

§ 500.35 Delivery

[1] General Rule

Unless otherwise agreed, all goods called for by a contract for sale must be tendered in a single delivery, and payment is due only on tender. However, if the circumstances give either party the right to make or demand delivery in lots [*see Com. Code § 2105(5)*, discussed in *§ 500.11[2]*], the price, if it can be apportioned, may be demanded for each lot [*Com. Code § 2307*]. A partial delivery under circumstances when it is not commercially feasible to deliver or to receive the goods in a single lot is not subject to rejection for a defect in quantity alone, unless the circumstances indicate a repudiation or default by the seller as to the expected balance or do not give the buyer ground for suspending his or her performance because of insecurity [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2307*].

[2] Place

Unless otherwise agreed, the place for delivery of goods is the seller's place of business, or if the seller has none, the seller's residence [*Com. Code § 2308(a)*]. But, in a contract for sale of identified goods which to the knowledge of the parties at the time of contracting are in some other place, that place is the place for their delivery [*Com. Code § 2308(b)*]. Documents of title [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(16)*] may be delivered through customary banking channels [*Com. Code § 2308(c)*].

[3] Tender of Delivery and Payment

[a] Two Senses in Which "Tender" Is Used

"Tender" may be used in Division 2 in two different senses. Unless the context indicates otherwise, it refers to "due tender," which contemplates an offer coupled with a present ability to fulfill all the conditions resting on the tendering party and must be followed by actual performance if the other party shows himself or herself ready to proceed. At other times it is used to refer to an offer of goods or documents under a contract as if in fulfillment of its conditions, even though there is a defect when measured against the contract obligation. Used in either sense, however, "tender" connotes performance by the tendering party which puts the other party in default by failing to proceed in some manner

[*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2503*].

[b] General Requirements for Tender

Tender of delivery requires that the seller put and hold conforming goods at the buyer's disposition and give the buyer any notification reasonably necessary to enable the buyer to take delivery. The manner, time, and place for tender are determined by the agreement and by *Com. Code § 2501 et seq.* (performance) [*Com. Code § 2503(1)*]. In particular, tender must be at a reasonable hour, and if it is of goods, they must be kept available for the period reasonably necessary to enable the buyer to take possession [*Com. Code § 2503(1)(a)*], but unless otherwise agreed, the buyer must furnish facilities reasonably suited to the receipt of the goods [*Com. Code § 2503(1)(b)*]. Usage of the trade and the circumstances of the particular case determine what is a reasonable hour for tender and what constitutes a reasonable period of holding the goods available [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2503*].

If the case is within *Com. Code § 2504* respecting shipment by the seller [*see* discussion in [5], *below*], tender requires that the seller comply with its provisions [*Com. Code § 2503(2)*]. If the seller is required to deliver at a particular destination, tender requires that the seller comply with *Com. Code § 2503(1), above*, and also, in any appropriate case, tender documents as described in *Com. Code § 2503(4),(5)* [*Com. Code § 2503(3)*]. However, the seller is not obligated to deliver at a named destination and bear the concurrent risk of loss until arrival, unless he or she has specifically agreed to so deliver or the commercial understanding of the terms used by the parties contemplates such delivery [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2503*].

[c] Tender of Goods in Possession of Bailee

If goods are in the possession of a bailee [*see Com. Code § 7102(a)(1)*] and are to be delivered without being moved, tender requires that the seller either tender a negotiable document of title covering those goods or procure acknowledgment by the bailee of the buyer's right to possession of the goods [*Com. Code § 2503(4)(a)*]. However, tender to the buyer of a nonnegotiable document of title or of a record directing to the bailee to deliver is sufficient tender unless the buyer seasonably objects, receipt by the bailee of notification of the buyer's rights fixes those rights as against the bailee and all third persons. Risk of loss of the goods and of any failure by the bailee to honor the nonnegotiable document of title or to obey the direction remains on the seller until the buyer has had a reasonable time to present the document or direction, and a refusal by the bailee to honor the document or to obey the direction defeats the tender [*Com. Code § 2503(4)(b)*].

If the contract requires the seller to deliver documents [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(15)*], the seller must tender all documents in correct form, except as provided in *Com. Code § 2323(2)* with respect to bills of lading [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(6)*] in a set [*Com. Code § 2503(5)(a)*]. Tender through customary banking channels is sufficient. Dishonor of a draft [*Com. Code §§ 3104, 3502*] accompanying or associated with the documents constitutes nonacceptance or rejection [*Com. Code § 2503(5)(b)*].

[4] Tender of Deliver and Payment as Conditions

Tender of delivery is a condition to the buyer's duty to accept the goods and, unless otherwise agreed (as when payment in advance has been promised or a letter of credit term included), to the buyer's duty to pay for them. Tender entitles the seller to acceptance of the goods and to payment according to the contract [*Com. Code § 2507(1)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2507*]. If payment is due and demanded on the delivery to the buyer of goods or documents of title, the buyer's right as against the seller to retain or dispose of them is conditional on his or her making the payment due [*Com. Code § 2507(2)*].

Unless otherwise agreed, tender of payment is a condition to the seller's duty to tender and complete any delivery [*Com. Code § 2511(1)*]. This requirement is applicable to noncommercial sales generally, to ordinary sales at retail, to

documentary contracts in general, and to contracts which anticipate shipment by the seller but contain no term on time and manner of payment. It has no application, however, to the great body of commercial contracts which carry credit terms [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2511*]. Tender of payment is sufficient when made by any means or in any manner current in the ordinary course of business unless the seller demands payment in legal tender and gives any extension of time reasonably necessary to procure it [*Com. Code § 2511(2)*].

Subject to the provisions of the Commercial Code on the effect of an instrument on an obligation [*Com. Code § 3310*], payment by check [*Com. Code § 3104*] is conditional and is defeated as between the parties by dishonor of the check on due presentment [*Com. Code § 2511(3)*].

[5] Shipment

If the seller is required or authorized to send the goods to the buyer and the contract does not require delivery at a particular destination, then unless otherwise agreed, the seller must put the goods in the possession of a carrier and make a contract for their transportation that is reasonable with regard to the nature of the goods and other circumstances of the case [*Com. Code § 2504(a)*]. The seller must also obtain and promptly deliver or tender in due form any document necessary to enable the buyer to obtain possession of the goods or otherwise required by the agreement or by usage of trade [*Com. Code § 2504(b)*]. In addition, the seller must promptly notify the buyer of the shipment [*Com. Code § 2504(c)*].

Failure to notify the buyer, however, or to make a proper contract for transportation is a ground for rejection only if material delay or loss ensues [*Com. Code § 2504(c)*]. A standard and acceptable manner of notification in open credit shipments is the sending of an invoice and, in the case of documentary contracts, is the prompt forwarding of the documents as provided under *Com. Code § 2504(b), above* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2504*].

[6] Shipment Under Reservation

If the seller has identified goods to the contract by or before shipment, the seller's procurement of a negotiable bill of lading to his or her own order or otherwise reserves in him or her a security interest [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*] in the goods; the seller's procurement of the bill to the order of a financing agency or of the buyer indicates in addition only the seller's expectation of transferring that interest to the person named [*Com. Code § 2505(1)(a)*]. A nonnegotiable bill of lading to the seller or his or her nominee reserves possession of the goods as security, but except in a case of conditional delivery [*Com. Code § 2507(2)*], a nonnegotiable bill of lading naming the buyer as consignee [*see Com. Code § 7102(a)(3)*] reserves no security interest even though the seller retains possession or control of the bill of lading [*Com. Code § 2505(1)(b)*]. When shipment by the seller with reservation of a security interest is in violation of the contract for sale, it constitutes an improper contract for transportation within *Com. Code § 2505(1)* but impairs neither the rights given to the buyer by shipment and identification of the goods to the contract nor the seller's powers as a holder [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(21)*] of a negotiable document of title [*Com. Code § 2505(2)*].

[7] Rights of Financing Agency

A financing agency, by paying or purchasing for value [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(29), 1204*] a draft which relates to a shipment of goods, acquires, to the extent of the payment or purchase and in addition to its own rights under the draft and document of title securing it, any rights of the shipper in the goods, including the right to stop delivery and the shipper's right to have the draft honored by the buyer [*Com. Code § 2506(1)*]. A draft which "relates to a shipment of goods" is a broad term which particularly covers the case of a draft against an invoice or against a delivery order. It is unnecessary that there be an explicit assignment of the invoice attached to the draft to bring the transaction within the reason of *Com. Code § 2506(1)*. The rights of the shipper of the goods which are acquired by the financing agency are merely security rights and are subject to the buyer's right to force delivery on tender of the price [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2506*].

The right to reimbursement of a financing agency which has in good faith honored or purchased the draft under commitment to or authority from the buyer is not impaired by subsequent discovery of defects with reference to any relevant document which was apparently regular [*Com. Code § 2506(2)*].

"Financing agency" means a bank, finance company or other person who in the ordinary course of business makes advances against goods or documents of title or who by arrangement with either the seller or the buyer intervenes in ordinary course to make or collect payment due or claimed under the contract for sale, as by purchasing or paying the seller's draft or making advances against it or by merely taking it for collection whether or not documents of title accompany or are associated with the draft. "Financing agency" includes also a bank or other person who similarly intervenes between persons who are in the position of seller [*see Com. Code § 2707*] and buyer in respect to the goods [*Com. Code § 2104(2)*].

[8] Improper Delivery and Cure by Seller

When any tender or delivery by the seller is rejected because it is nonconforming, and the time for performance has not yet expired, the seller may seasonably notify the buyer of his or her intention to cure and may then, within the contract time, make a conforming delivery [*Com. Code § 2508(1)*]. Even a seller who has taken back the nonconforming goods and refunded the purchase price may still make a good tender within the contract period [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2508*].

When the buyer rejects a nonconforming tender which the seller had reasonable grounds to believe would be acceptable with or without money allowance [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(24)*], the seller may, by seasonally notifying the buyer, have a further reasonable time to substitute a conforming tender [*Com. Code § 2508(2)*]. Reasonable grounds can lie in prior course of dealing, course of performance, or usage of trade, as well as in the particular circumstances surrounding the making of the contract. However, the seller is charged with commercial knowledge of any factors in a particular sales situation, including implicit or express notice given by the buyer, which require the seller to comply strictly with his or her obligations under the contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2508*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.36

§ 500.36 Time

The time for shipment or delivery or any other action under a contract, if not provided in Division 2 or agreed on, is a reasonable time [*Com. Code § 2309(1)*]. What is a "reasonable time" [*Com. Code § 1205*] depends on what constitutes acceptable, commercial conduct in view of the nature, purpose, and circumstances of the action to be taken; the time for payment, if not agreed on, is related to the time for delivery [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2309* and the discussion in *§ 500.35[3]* and *[4]*].

If the contract provides for successive performances but is indefinite in duration it is valid for a reasonable time but, unless otherwise agreed, may be terminated at any time by either party [*Com. Code § 2309(2)*]. Termination of a contract by one party, except on the happening of an agreed event, requires that reasonable notification be received by the other party, and an agreement dispensing with notification is invalid if its operation would be unconscionable [*Com. Code § 2309(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.37

§ 500.37 When Payment Is Due

[1] If No Time for Payment Is Specified

Payment is due at the time and place at which the buyer is to receive the goods even though the place of shipment is the place of delivery [*Com. Code § 2310(a)*]. Because the receipt of goods rather than delivery is a concurrent condition with payment, the buyer has an opportunity to inspect the goods before making payment, even though under the delivery term the risk of loss may have previously passed to the buyer or the running of the credit period has already started [*see* Cal. Code Comment and UCC Comments to *Com. Code § 2310*].

Although a seller who is authorized to send the goods may ship them under reservation and may tender the documents of title, the buyer may inspect the goods after their arrival [*Com. Code § 2513*] and before payment is due, unless inspection is inconsistent with the terms of the contract [*Com. Code § 2310(b)*]. If delivery is authorized and made by way of documents of title otherwise than by *Com. Code § 2310(b)*, then payment is due, regardless of where the goods are to be received [*Com. Code § 2310(c)*]:

- At the time and place at which the buyer is to receive delivery of tangible documents.
- At the time the buyer is to receive delivery of electronic documents
- At the seller's place of business or, if none, the seller's residence.

If the seller is required or authorized to ship the goods on credit, the credit period runs from the time of shipment, but postdating the invoice or delaying its dispatch will correspondingly delay the starting of the credit period [*Com. Code § 2310(d)*].

For discussion of the rights of a buyer who has made partial or complete payment and has a special property interest under *Com. Code § 2501* (identification of goods to the contract, discussed in *§ 500.51*) if the seller becomes insolvent, or in the case of consumer goods, repudiates or fails to deliver as required by the contract, see *Com. Code § 2502*,

discussed in *§ 500.74[3]*.

[2] Buyer's Right of Inspection

Unless otherwise agreed, and subject to *Com. Code § 2513(3)*, the buyer has a right, before payment or acceptance, to inspect goods at any reasonable place and time and in any reasonable manner, where they are tendered, delivered, or identified to the contract for sale. When the seller is required or authorized to send the goods to the buyer, the inspection may be after their arrival [*Com. Code § 2513(1)*]. Expenses of inspection must be borne by the buyer but may be recovered from the seller if the goods do not conform and are rejected [*Com. Code § 2513(2)*]. Unless otherwise agreed, and subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2321(3)* on C.I.F. contracts [*see* discussion in *§ 500.52[5][b]*], the buyer is not entitled to inspect the goods before payment of the price when the contract provides for delivery "C.O.D." or on other like terms [*Com. Code § 2513(3)(a)*] or for payment against documents of title, except when that payment is due only after the goods are to become available for inspection [*Com. Code § 2513(3)(b)*].

A place or method of inspection fixed by the parties is presumed to be exclusive, but unless otherwise expressly agreed, it does not postpone identification or shift the place for delivery or for passing the risk of loss. If compliance becomes impossible, inspection is as provided in *Com. Code § 2513*, discussed above, unless the place or method fixed was clearly intended as an indispensable condition, failure of which avoids the contract [*Com. Code § 2513(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.38

§ 500.38 Sale on Approval and Sale or Return

A transaction is a "sale on approval" if the goods are delivered primarily for use, and unless otherwise agreed, they may be returned by the buyer even though they conform to the contract [*Com. Code § 2326(1)(a)*]. Although the goods are delivered to the proposed purchaser, they remain the property of the seller until the buyer accepts them. The buyer's willingness to receive and test the goods is the consideration for the seller's engagement to deliver and sell [*see* UCC Comment 1 to *Com. Code § 2326*]. Goods held on approval are not subject to the claims of the buyer's creditors until acceptance [*Com. Code § 2326(2)*].

An ordinary retail sale, in which the seller gives the buyer a privilege to return the goods and get a refund, is not a "sale on approval" of the kind contemplated by *Com. Code § 2326*. In order for a sale to be a sale on approval under that code section, there must be some provision or objective fact demonstrating the parties' intent that, whether or not the buyer has paid any amount before the goods are shipped or delivered, the goods do not belong to the buyer until the buyer approves them. In such a case, the seller's rights in the goods are superior to the rights of the buyer's creditors until the approval period has passed. On the other hand, a retailer's practice of permitting a customer to return goods for a refund is merely a benefit to the customer. That does not in and of itself suggest that the parties intended the seller to retain an interest in the goods until some time after they have been delivered to the customer, and does not convert a routine sale with a right to return into a sale on approval [*Wilson v. Brawn of Cal., Inc. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 549, 559-560, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 769]* .

A transaction is a "sale or return" if the goods are delivered primarily for resale, and unless otherwise agreed, they may be returned by the buyer even though they conform to the contract [*Com. Code § 2326(1)(b)*]. Goods held on sale or return are subject to the claims of the buyer's creditors while in the buyer's possession [*Com. Code § 2326(2)*]. Any "or return" term of a contract for sale is to be treated as a separate contract for sale within the statute of frauds section of Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2201*) and as contradicting the sale aspect of the contract within the provisions of Division 2 on parol or extrinsic evidence (*Com. Code § 2202*) [*Com. Code § 2326(3)*]. A "sale or return" typically is a sale to a merchant whose unwillingness to buy is overcome by the seller's engagement to take back the goods (or any commercial unit of the goods) in lieu of payment if they fail to be resold. "Sale on approval" and "sale or return" are so strongly delineated in practice and in general understanding that every presumption runs against delivery to a consumer

being a "sale or return" and against a delivery to a merchant for resale being a "sale on approval" [*see* UCC Comment 1 to *Com. Code § 2326*].

Although the goods are identified to the contract under a sale on approval, the risk of loss and the title do not pass to the buyer until acceptance, unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 2327(1)(a)*]. Unless otherwise agreed, use of the goods consistent with the purpose of trial is not acceptance, but failure to notify the seller seasonably of election to return the goods is acceptance. If the goods conform to the contract, acceptance of any part is acceptance of the whole [*Com. Code § 2327(1)(b)*]. After due notification of election to return, the return is at the seller's risk and expense, but a merchant must follow any reasonable instructions, unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 2327(1)(c)*].

Unless otherwise agreed, under a sale or return the option to return extends to the whole or any commercial unit [*Com. Code § 2105(6)*] of the goods while in substantially their original condition, but the option must be exercised seasonably, and the return is at the buyer's risk and expense [*Com. Code § 2327(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.39

§ 500.39 Consignments of Consumer Goods

Certain true consignments were governed by former *Com. Code § 2326(3)* and *(5)*. Consignments to merchants are now governed by revised Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9109(a)(4)*], are defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)*, and are discussed in *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, §§ 503.11[7]* and *503.46*. Consignments of goods that were consumer goods immediately before delivery to the consignee are now governed by *Com. Code § 2326(4)*, which provides that if a person delivers or consigns for sale goods which the person used or bought for use for personal, family, or household purposes, these goods do not become the property of the consignee unless the consignee purchases and fully pays for the goods [*Com. Code § 2326(4)*]. Nothing in *Com. Code § 2326(4)* prevents the consignee from acting as the deliverer's agent to transfer title to these goods to a buyer who pays the full purchase price. Any payment received by the consignee from a buyer of these goods, less any amount which the deliverer expressly agreed could be deducted from the payment for commissions, fees, or expenses, is the property of the deliverer and is not subject to the claims of the consignee's creditors [*Com. Code § 2326(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Construction and Interpretation of Contract

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.40-500.49

[Reserved]

§§ 500.40[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Allocation of Risk

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.50

§ 500.50 General Rules for Allocation of Risk

The rules governing allocation of risk under Division 2 are controlled by the issues that arise between seller and buyer in terms of performance or nonperformance under the contract for sale and not in terms of whether or not title to the goods has passed [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2401*]. The concept of title, which is governed by *Com. Code §§ 2401-2403*, is significant only as it affects the definition of a sale [*Com. Code § 2106(1)*; see discussion in *§ 500.11[4]*], which determines the issue of which transactions are covered by Division 2 [*see Com. Code § 2102*].

If Division 2 allocates a risk or a burden as between the parties "unless otherwise agreed," the agreement may not only shift the allocation but may also divide the risk or burden [*Com. Code § 2303*]. The risk or burden may be divided by the express terms of the agreement or by the attending circumstances, because the circumstances surrounding a transaction, as well as the express language used by the parties, enter into the meaning and substance of the agreement [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2303*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Allocation of Risk

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.51

§ 500.51 Insurable Interest in Goods

The buyer obtains a special property and an insurable interest in goods identified as goods to which the contract refers, even if the identified goods are nonconforming. In the absence of an explicit agreement, identification occurs in existing and identified goods when the contract is made and in future goods when the goods are designated by the seller as goods to which the contract refers, except for unborn young and future crops in which case identification occurs when the crops become growing crops or the young are conceived [*Com. Code § 2501(1)(a),(b)*]. There is no requirement, however, that the goods be in a deliverable state or that all of the seller's duties with respect to the processing of the goods be completed in order that identification occur. For example, despite identification, the risk of loss remains on the seller under the risk of loss provisions until completion of his or her duties as to the goods, and all of the seller's remedies remain dependent on not defaulting under the contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2501*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Allocation of Risk

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.52

§ 500.52 Risk of Loss in Absence of Breach

[1] General Rule

Risk of loss in the absence of breach by either party is governed by contract rather than by the use of title passage or property passage [*see* Cal. Code Comment and UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2509*]. Unless the parties agree otherwise, *Com. Code § 2509* provides the rules to be applied to the issue of risk of loss depending on the type of delivery anticipated by the contract [*Com. Code § 2509(4)*; see [2]-[4], *below*].

[2] Shipment by Carrier

If the contract requires or authorizes the seller to ship the goods by carrier and does not require the seller to deliver them at a particular destination, the risk of loss passes to the buyer when the goods are duly delivered to the carrier, even though the shipment is under reservation [*Com. Code § 2509(1)(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.35[6]*].

If the contract does require the seller to deliver the goods at a particular destination and the goods are duly tendered there while in the possession of the carrier, the risk of loss passes to the buyer when the goods are tendered there so as to enable the buyer to take delivery [*Com. Code § 2509(1)(b)*].

[3] Goods Held by Bailee

If the goods are held by a bailee to be delivered without being moved, the risk of loss passes to the buyer on receipt of possession or control of a negotiable document of title covering the goods; on acknowledgment by the bailee of the buyer's right to possession of the goods; or after the buyer's receipt of possession or control of a nonnegotiable document of title or other direction to deliver in a record, as provided in *Com. Code § 2503(4)(b)* [*Com. Code § 2509(2)(a)-(c)*].

[4] Other Situations

In any case in which the contract does not require or authorize the seller to ship the goods by carrier or in which the

goods are not held by a bailee to be delivered without being moved, the risk of loss passes to the buyer on receipt of the goods if the seller is a merchant; otherwise, the risk passes to the buyer on tender of delivery [*Com. Code § 2509(3)*].

[5] UCC Rules Governing Shipment

[a] F.O.B. and F.A.S.

The general rules set out in *Com. Code § 2509* for allocating the risk of loss in the absence of breach are subject to the parties' agreement and special terms governing shipment that the parties may use which are set out in Division 2 and discussed below.

"F.O.B." (free on board) and "F.A.S." (free alongside) are delivery terms commonly used in sales contracts, the use of which affect a variety of rights and obligations. *Com. Code § 2319* specifies the duties of a seller who engages to deliver F.O.B. or F.A.S. When delivery is F.O.B. seller's city [*Com. Code § 2319(1)(a)*], the obligation is a shipment contract and the allocation of risk is governed by *Com. Code § 2509(1)(a)*, discussed in *§ 500.52[2]* when it is F.O.B. buyer's city [*Com. Code § 2319(1)(b)*] the obligation creates a destination contract, under which risk is governed by *Com. Code § 2509(1)(b)*, also discussed in [2], *above*.

[b] C.I.F. and C. & F.

Com. Code § 2320 governs the obligations of buyers and sellers under "C.I.F." and "C. & F." contracts. "C.I.F." means that the price includes in a lump sum the cost of the goods and the insurance and freight to the named destination. The term "C. & F." (or C.F.) means that the price so includes cost and freight to the named destination [*Com. Code § 2320(1)*]. The C.I.F. contract is not a destination but a shipment contract with risk of subsequent loss or damage to the goods passing to the buyer on shipment if the seller has properly performed all obligations with respect to the goods. Delivery to the carrier is delivery to the buyer for purposes of risk and title [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2320*].

"C.I.F." is a term usually found in contracts between merchants. While "C.I.F." is not commonly used in consumer mail-order or Internet sales, the same result as under a standard C.I.F. contract--the buyer bears the risk of loss in transit even though the cost of insurance is rolled into the purchase price and is in fact paid by the seller--would follow from the practice of expressly requiring the buyer to pay for transit insurance as part of the total price for the sale [*Wilson v. Brawn of Cal., Inc. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 549, 556-557, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 769]* .

[c] Ex-Ship

The delivery term "ex-ship" (from the carrying vessel) [*Com. Code § 2322(1)*], as between seller and buyer, is the reverse of the term F.A.S. [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2322* and the discussion under [a], *above*]. Under an "ex-ship" term, unless otherwise agreed, the risk of loss does not pass to the buyer until the goods leave the ship's tackle or are otherwise properly unloaded [*Com. Code § 2322(2)(b)*].

[d] Overseas

A shipment by water or by air or a contract contemplating a shipment by water or air is "overseas" insofar as by usage of trade or agreement it is subject to the commercial, financing, or shipping practices characteristic of international deep-water commerce [*Com. Code § 2323(3)*]. The parties' obligations with respect to documents in "overseas" shipments, if they have not agreed otherwise, are set out in *Com. Code § 2323*.

[6] Casualty to Identified Goods

When the contract requires for its performance goods identified when the contract is made, and the goods suffer casualty without fault of either party before the risk of loss passes to the buyer, the contract is avoided if loss is total. If

loss is partial or the goods no longer conform to the contract, the buyer is relieved from his or her obligation but may demand inspection and has the option of taking the surviving goods at a fair adjustment without further right against the seller or treating the contract as avoided [*Com. Code § 2613*]. Fault includes negligence as well as willful wrong and *Com. Code § 2613* applies if the goods were already destroyed at the time of contracting without the knowledge of either party or are destroyed subsequently but before the risk of loss passes to the buyer [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2613*]. The rights of the buyer under *Com. Code § 2613* also apply in a proper case under a "no arrival, no sale" term [*Com. Code § 2324*] if the goods arrive after the time provided in the contract.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Allocation of Risk

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.53

§ 500.53 Effect of Breach

If the seller breaches the contract by tendering or delivering goods which do not conform to the contract, the risk of loss remains on the seller until cure or acceptance [*Com. Code § 2510(1)*]. If there has been a breach and the aggrieved party is in control of the goods, the extent of any deficiency in the effective insurance coverage of the aggrieved party falls on the breaching party [*Com. Code § 2510(2),(3)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2510*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Allocation of Risk

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.54-500.59

[Reserved]

§§ 500.54[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Breach

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.60

§ 500.60 Buyer's Options Concerning Nonconforming Goods

[1] Rejection

[a] In Whole or in Part

If the goods or the tender of delivery fail in any respect to conform to the contract, the buyer may either reject the whole [*Com. Code § 2601(a)*; *see § 500.112* (form)], accept the whole [*Com. Code § 2601(b)*], or accept any commercial unit or units and reject the rest [*Com. Code § 2601(c)*], subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2612* (breach in installment contracts) and unless otherwise agreed under *Com. Code §§ 2718, 2719* (contractual limitations of remedy) [*Com. Code § 2601*]. The buyer is not penalized by the loss of any remedy otherwise open to him or her by accepting a nonconforming tender [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2601*].

Rejection of goods must be within a reasonable time after their delivery or tender and is ineffective unless the buyer seasonably notifies the seller [*Com. Code § 2602(1)*]. What constitutes a reasonable time must be viewed in light of the provisions of Division 2 dealing with the right to inspection of the goods [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2602*; *§ 500.37*].

Subject to the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 2603, 2604* (rejected goods), any exercise of ownership by the buyer after rejection with respect to any commercial unit is wrongful as against the seller [*Com. Code § 2602(2)(a)*]. A buyer who has, before rejection, taken physical possession of goods in which he or she does not have a security interest under *Com. Code § 2711(3)* is required after rejection to hold them with reasonable care at the seller's disposition for a time sufficient to permit the seller to remove them [*Com. Code § 2602(2)(b)*]. Otherwise, the buyer has no further obligations with regard to goods rightfully rejected [*Com. Code § 2602(2)(c)*].

If the seller has made a tender which in all respects conforms to the contract, the buyer has a positive duty to accept, and failure to do so constitutes a wrongful rejection, which gives the seller the immediate remedies for breach set out in *Com. Code § 2703* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2602*; *§ 500.75[1]*].

[b] Failure to Particularize

The buyer's failure to state, in connection with rejection, a particular defect which is ascertainable by reasonable inspection, precludes him or her from relying on the unstated defect to justify rejection or to establish breach if the seller could have cured it if stated seasonably [*Com. Code § 2605(1)(a)*; *see Lockheed Electronics Co. v. Keronix, Inc. (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 304, 314-315, 170 Cal. Rptr. 591* (failure to object precluded on defect)]. A failure to justify rejection or to establish breach is also precluded between merchants when the seller has, after rejection, made a request in writing for a full and final written statement of all defects on which the buyer proposes to rely [*Com. Code § 2605(1)(b)*; *see § 500.112[2] -[3]*].

Payment against documents made without reservation of rights precludes recovery of the payment for defects apparent in the documents [*Com. Code § 2605(2)*]. When payment is required against the documents, they must be in inspected before payment, and the payment then constitutes acceptance of the documents [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2605*].

[c] Obligations Respecting Rejected Goods

Subject to any security interest in the buyer under *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, when the seller has no agent or place of business at the market of rejection, a merchant buyer is under a duty, after rejection of goods in his or her possession or control, to follow any reasonable instructions received from the seller with respect to the goods, and in the absence of such instructions, to make reasonable efforts to sell them for the seller's account if they are perishable or threaten to decline in value speedily. Instructions are not reasonable if, on demand, indemnity for expenses is not forthcoming [*Com. Code § 2603(1)*]. The limitations on the buyer's duty to resell are to be liberally construed, and in effect, the measure of the buyer's control is whether or not he or she can practicably effect control without undue commercial burden. A buyer who fails to make a salvage sale when under a duty to do so has arisen is subject to a claim for damages [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2603*].

A buyer who sells goods under *Com. Code § 2603(1)* is entitled to reimbursement from the seller or out of the proceeds for reasonable expenses of caring for and selling them, and if the expenses include no selling commission, to a commission that is usual in the trade or if there is none, to a reasonable sum not exceeding 10 percent on the gross proceeds [*Com. Code § 2603(2)*]. In complying with *Com. Code § 2603*, such as in determining if the value of the goods is sufficiently threatened to justify a quick resale, or the buyer has waited a sufficient length of time for instructions, or what a reasonable means and place of resale is, the buyer is held only to good faith, and good faith conduct under that statute is neither acceptance, conversion, nor the basis of an action for damages [*Com. Code § 2603(3)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2603*].

Subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2603(1)* on perishables, if the seller gives no instructions within a reasonable time after notification of rejection, the buyer may store the rejected goods for the seller's account, reship them to the seller, or resell them for the seller's account with reimbursement as provided in *Com. Code § 2603(2)*. That action is not acceptance or conversion [*Com. Code § 2604*]. These options are conditioned on nonconformity of the goods and due notification of rejection to the seller under *Com. Code § 2602*. They are available to merchant and non-merchant buyers alike. The merchant-buyer may in some instances, however, be under a duty, rather than an option, to resell under the provisions of *Com. Code § 2603*[*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2604*].

[2] Acceptance

[a] Defined

Acceptance of goods occurs when the buyer, after a reasonable opportunity to inspect the goods, signifies to the seller that the goods are conforming or that he or she will take or retain them in spite of their nonconformity [*Com. Code § 2606(1)(a)*]. Payment made after tender is one circumstance tending to signify acceptance of the goods, but it is not

conclusive [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2606*].

Acceptance also occurs when the buyer fails to make an effective rejection [*Com. Code § 2602(1)*] after having had a reasonable opportunity to inspect the goods [*Com. Code § 2606(1)(b)*]. When the buyer does any act inconsistent with the seller's ownership, it constitutes acceptance; if the act is wrongful as against the seller however, it is an acceptance only if the seller ratifies it [*Com. Code § 2606(1)(c)*]. Acceptance of a part of any commercial unit is acceptance of that entire unit [*Com. Code § 2606(2)*].

Under Division 2, acceptance of goods is always acceptance of identified goods which have been appropriated to the contract or are appropriated by the contract. There is no provision for acceptance of title apart from acceptance in general, because acceptance of title is not material to the detailed rights and duties of the parties [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2606* and discussion in *§ 500.50* et seq.].

[b] Effect of Acceptance

A buyer who accepts a tender must pay at the contract rate for any goods accepted [*Com. Code § 2607(1)*]. In cases of partial acceptance, the price of any part accepted is, if possible, to be reasonably apportioned, to be determined in terms of the contract rate, which is the rate determined from the bargain in fact (the agreement) after the rules and policies of Division 2 have been applied [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2607*].

The buyer's acceptance of goods precludes rejection of the goods accepted and, if made with knowledge of a nonconformity, cannot be revoked because of it unless the acceptance was on the reasonable assumption that the nonconformity would be seasonably cured; acceptance, however, does not of itself impair any other remedy provided by Division 2 for nonconformity, including the buyer's rights with respect to future installments despite acceptance of any earlier nonconforming installment [*Com. Code § 2607(2)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2607*].

When a tender has been accepted, the buyer must notify the seller of any breach within a reasonable time after the buyer discovers or should have discovered the breach, or be barred from any remedy [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*; for discussion of the notification requirements when the seller is sued for a breach of the warranty of infringement, *see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*, discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties*]. While the time of notification is to be determined by applying commercial standards to a merchant buyer, what constitutes a reasonable time for notification from a retail consumer is judged by the good faith standard [*see Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 339, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599]* . To preserve the buyer's rights, the notification need only inform the seller that the transaction is claimed to involve a breach. It need not include a clear statement of all the objections that will be relied on by the buyer nor contain a claim for damages, threat of litigation, or other resort to a remedy [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2607*]. The buyer has the burden of proving reasonable notice. The question whether notice was properly given must be determined from the particular circumstances, and when but one inference can be drawn from undisputed facts, the issue may be determined as a matter of law [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 135-136, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

Under the provision which codifies the practice known as "vouching in" [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*], a dealer (buyer), who is being sued in connection with a product furnished to him or her by a manufacturer (seller), may "vouch in" the manufacturer by giving the manufacturer written notice of the litigation. If the notice states that the seller may come in and defend or otherwise be bound in any action the buyer brought against him or her by any determination of fact common to the two litigations, then unless the seller, after seasonable receipt of the notice, does come in and defend, the seller is so bound [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*]. This "vouching in" procedure has a collateral estoppel effect against the manufacturer if the dealer and manufacturer are both liable but the manufacturer is not joined as a defendant, as when the manufacturer is in a different jurisdiction and thus, is not able to be joined [*see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2607*].

In most cases, one letter from the buyer to the seller cannot double as both a breach of warranty letter under *Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)* and a "vouching in" letter under *Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*; the vouching in letter must meet far more stringent statutory requirements. If a litigant is to be bound by application of *Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*, due process demands that the literal requirements be strictly obeyed [*Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co. v. Swan Rubber Co. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 256, 261-262, 127 Cal. Rptr. 571]* . If the buyer is sued for breach of a warranty or other obligation for which his or her seller is answerable over and the claim is one for infringement or the like [*Com. Code § 2312(3)*], the original seller may demand in writing that his or her buyer turn over to the original seller control of the litigation, including settlement, or else be barred from any remedy over, and if the original seller also agrees to bear all expense and to satisfy any adverse judgment, then unless the buyer, after seasonable receipt of the demand, does turn over control, the buyer is so barred [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*].

[c] Revocation of Acceptance

A buyer may revoke acceptance of a lot or commercial unit whose nonconformity substantially impairs its value to the buyer if he or she has accepted it (1) on the reasonable assumption that its nonconformity would be cured and it has not been seasonably cured or (2) without discovery of the nonconformity, if acceptance was reasonably induced either by the difficulty of discovery before acceptance or by the seller's assurances [*Com. Code § 2608(1)*]. A lot is a parcel or a single article that is the subject matter of a separate sale or delivery, whether or not it is sufficient to perform the contract [*Com. Code § 2105(5)*]. Thus, when the goods are shipped in a single lot, the right of revocation extends to the entirety [*S & R Metals, Inc. v. C. Itoh & Co. (America) (9th Cir. 1988) 859 F.2d 814, 817* (diversity action applying California law)].

ILLUSTRATION:

Entire Shipment Constituted Lot. A shipment of steel was warranted to be of commercial quality and thus was required to pass a "bend test" according to industry custom. The shipment consisted of steel of several gauges, including 14-gauge steel, which comprised approximately 25 percent, by weight, of the shipment. Usually, a buyer will not perform the bend test on receipt of a delivery because the test, as well as being expensive, destroys or substantially harms the coil being tested. The buyer, which was in the business of selling steel in smaller lots, did not learn of the defect until one of its customers reported that the 14-gauge steel was not of commercial quality. Limited tests were run on other gauges. The buyer revoked as to the entire shipment. The seller argued that the buyer could only revoke acceptance of the "commercial lot" consisting of the 14-gauge steel, half of which was defective. Was revocation as to the entire shipment proper? Yes. The court found that the requirements of *Com. Code § 2608* were satisfied because performing the bend test would substantially reduce the value of the steel, yet without performing the test, the buyer could not be confident that it was of sufficient quality for resale. The purpose of the commercial unit provision is to protect a seller against return of components that make up less than a commercial unit and therefore have a severely reduced market value [*S & R Metals, Inc. v. C. Itoh & Co. (America) (9th Cir. 1988) 859 F.2d 814, 817]* .

Revocation of acceptance must occur within a reasonable time after the buyer discovers or should have discovered the ground for it and before any substantial change in condition of the goods which is not caused by their own defects; revocation is not effective until the buyer notifies the seller [*Com. Code § 2608(2)*]. Because revocation will generally be resorted to only after attempts at adjustment have failed, the reasonable time period should extend in most cases beyond the time (1) in which notification of breach must be given, (2) for discovery of nonconformity after acceptance, and (3) for rejection after tender, although the parties may limit the time for notification by agreement. The content of the notice of the revocation of acceptance should be determined by considerations of good faith, prevention of surprise, and reasonable adjustment, although more will generally be necessary than the mere notification of breach required under *Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*, and the content requirements are less stringent in the case of a nonmerchant buyer [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2608*; *see, e.g.,* *S & R Metals, Inc. v. C. Itoh & Co. (America) (9th Cir. 1988) 859 F.2d 814, 817* (revocation given five months after delivery and nine days after buyer learned of defect held to have been

made within reasonable time after discovery of latent defect)]. In the case of a nonconforming motor vehicle, because the practical reality often requires purchasers of unsatisfactory vehicles to continue using them in view of the financial burdens of securing alternative means of transportation for a substantial period of time, reasonable continued use of the vehicle does not, as a matter of law, prevent the buyer from asserting revocation of acceptance [*Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 897-898, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . A buyer who revokes has the same rights and duties with regard to the goods involved as if he or she had rejected them [*Com. Code § 2608(3)*]. For further discussion and a form for use as an affirmative defense in an action involving revocation of acceptance, see *§ 500.123*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Breach

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.61

§ 500.61 Anticipatory Repudiation

[1] Requires Overt Communication or Action

Anticipatory repudiation centers on an overt communication of an intention or an action that renders performance impossible or demonstrates a clear determination not to continue with performance. Performance need not be made literally and utterly impossible, but may result from action which reasonably indicates a rejection of the continuing obligation [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2610*].

When either party repudiates the contract with respect to a performance not yet due, the loss of which will substantially impair the value of the contract to the other, the aggrieved party may await performance by the repudiating party for a commercially reasonable time [*Com. Code § 2610(a)*] or resort to any remedy for breach (*Com. Code §§ 2703, 2711*), even though the aggrieved party has notified the repudiating party that he or she would await the latter's performance and has urged retraction [*Com. Code § 2610(b)*]. If the aggrieved party awaits performance beyond a commercially reasonable time however, he or she cannot recover resulting damages which should have been avoided [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2610*]. In either case, the aggrieved party may suspend his or her own performance or proceed in accordance with the provisions of Division 2 on the seller's right to identify goods to the contract notwithstanding breach or to salvage unfinished goods as provided in *Com. Code § 2704* [*Com. Code § 2610(c)*].

The test of substantial impairment of value under *Com. Code § 2610* is the determination whether material inconvenience or injustice will result if the aggrieved party is forced to wait and receive an ultimate tender minus the part or aspect repudiated [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2610*].

[2] May Be Retracted

Until the repudiating party's next performance is due, he or she can retract the repudiation, unless the aggrieved party, since the repudiation, has canceled or materially changed his or her position or otherwise indicated that the repudiation is final [*Com. Code § 2611(1)*]. Retraction may be by any method which clearly indicates to the aggrieved party that the repudiating party intends to perform, but must include any assurance justifiably demanded under *Com. Code § 2609* [*Com. Code § 2611(2)*], because repudiation is sufficient to give reasonable ground for insecurity and to warrant a

request for assurance as an essential condition of the retraction [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2611*]. Retraction reinstates the repudiating party's rights under the contract with due excuse and allowance to the aggrieved party for any delay occasioned by the repudiation [*Com. Code § 2611(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Breach

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.62

§ 500.62 Installment Contracts

A contract that requires or authorizes the delivery of goods in separate lots to be separately accepted is an "installment contract," even if it contains a clause providing that "each delivery is a separate contract" or its equivalent [*Com. Code § 2612(1)*]. Such clauses nonetheless call for installment deliveries [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2612*].

The buyer may reject any installment which is nonconforming if the nonconformity substantially impairs the value of that installment and cannot be cured or if the nonconformity is a defect in the required documents. If the nonconformity does not fall within *Com. Code § 2612(3)*, as discussed below, and the seller gives adequate assurance of its cure, the buyer must accept that installment [*Com. Code § 2612(2)*]. However, an installment contract may require accurate conformity in quality as a condition to the right to acceptance if the need for conformity is made clear either by express provision or by the circumstances. In such a case, the agreement, in effect, defines explicitly what amounts to substantial impairment of value impossible to cure [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2612*].

Whenever nonconformity or default with respect to one or more installments substantially impairs the value of the whole contract, there is a breach of the whole. But the aggrieved party reinstates the contract by accepting a nonconforming installment without seasonable notification of cancellation [*see Gantry Constr. Co. v. American Pipe & Constr. Co. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 186, 193-194, 122 Cal. Rptr. 834]* , bringing an action with respect only to past installments, or demanding performance as to future installments [*Com. Code § 2612(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Breach

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.63

§ 500.63 Impossibility

[1] Excuses Seller's Performance

Subject to *Com. Code § 2614*, on substituted performance and except so far as a seller may have assumed a greater obligation, delay in delivery or nondelivery in whole or in part by a seller who complies with *Com. Code § 2615(b)* and *(c)*, as discussed below, is not a breach of his or her duty under a contract for sale if performance as agreed has been made impracticable by the occurrence of a contingency, the nonoccurrence of which was a basic assumption on which the contract was made or by compliance in good faith with any applicable foreign or domestic governmental regulation or order, whether or not it later proves to be invalid [*Com. Code § 2615(a)*]. The failure of conditions which go to convenience or collateral values rather than to the commercial practicability of the main performance does not amount to a complete excuse. In regard to compliance with a governmental regulation or order, the seller's good faith belief in the validity of the regulation is the test, and the best evidence of good faith is the general commercial acceptance of the regulation. However, government interference is not an excuse unless it truly supervenes in such a manner as to be beyond the seller's assumption of risk [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2615*].

If the causes of impracticability or nonperformance affect only a part of the seller's capacity to perform, the seller must allocate production and deliveries among his or her customers but has the option of including regular customers not then under contract, as well as his or her own requirements for further manufacture; the seller may so allocate in any manner which is fair and reasonable [*Com. Code § 2615(b)*]. The statutory demand for a "fair and reasonable" allocation of short supplies denotes a collective quality characterizing the supplier's treatment of his or her customers as a group. An individualized approach, geared solely to the needs of particular customers, may provide adequacy to some, insufficiency to others. A fair and reasonable allocation distributes benefit and hardship equally. The seller, however, is no longer obligated to adopt a proration plan applicable to the entire group of customers, as the cases required prior to the adoption of the Commercial Code in California [*Terry v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 962, 968-969, 140 Cal. Rptr. 510]* .

The seller must notify the buyer seasonably that there will be delay or nondelivery and, when allocation is required under *Com. Code § 2615(b)*, of the estimated quota thus made available for the buyer [*Com. Code § 2615(c)*].

[2] Buyer's Rights

If the buyer receives notification of a material or indefinite delay or an allocation justified under *Com. Code § 2615*, the buyer may by written notification to the seller as to any delivery concerned, and if the prospective deficiency substantially impairs the value of the whole contract under *Com. Code § 2612*, relating to breach of installment contracts, then also as to the whole, terminate and thereby discharge any unexecuted portion of the contract or modify the contract by agreeing to take his or her available quota in substitution [*Com. Code § 2616(1)*]. No consideration is necessary in such a case to support a modification [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2616*].

If, after receipt of the seller's notification the buyer fails so to modify the contract within a reasonable time not exceeding 30 days, the contract lapses with respect to any deliveries affected [*Com. Code § 2616(2)*]. The buyer's silence, after receiving the seller's claim of excuse, operates as a termination of the contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2616*]. The provisions of *Com. Code § 2616* may not be negated by agreement, except insofar as the seller has assumed a greater obligation under *Com. Code § 2615* [*Com. Code § 2616(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Breach

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.64-500.69

[Reserved]

§§ 500.64[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.70

§ 500.70 Remedies Generally

An agreement may provide for remedies in addition to or in substitution for those provided in Division 2 and may limit or alter the measure of damages recoverable thereunder, within certain limitations [*Com. Code § 2719(1)(a)*]. However, it is of the very essence of a sales contract that at least minimum adequate remedies be available. Thus, if parties intend to conclude a contract for sale within Division 2, they must accept the legal consequence that there be at least a fair quantum of remedy for breach of the obligations or duties outlined in the contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2719*].

Division 2 rejects any doctrine of election of remedy as a fundamental policy; thus, the remedies are essentially cumulative in nature. Whether the pursuit of one remedy bars another depends entirely on the facts of the individual case [*see B.K.K. Co. v. Schultz (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 786, 793-794, 86 Cal. Rptr. 760]* . It should also be noted that the Commercial Code requires its remedies to be liberally administered and provides that any right or obligation which it declares is enforceable by action unless a different effect is specifically prescribed (*Com. Code § 1305*) [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2703*]. For a more detailed discussion of the specific remedies available to both parties, see *§§ 500.75 -500.78*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.71

§ 500.71 Liquidated Damages

Damages for breach by either party may be liquidated in the agreement subject to and in compliance with *Civ. Code § 1671* (reasonable at time made), which is discussed in *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.140* et seq. [*Com. Code § 2718(1)*]. If the agreement provides for liquidated damages, but the liquidated damage provision does not comply with *Civ. Code § 1671*, damages may be had as provided in *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.* [*Com. Code § 2718(1)*].

If the seller justifiably withholds delivery of goods because of the buyer's breach, the buyer is entitled to restitution of any amount by which the sum of its payments to the seller exceeds the amount to which the seller is entitled by virtue of terms liquidating the seller's damages in accordance with *Com. Code § 2718(1)* [*Com. Code § 2718(2)(a)*] or, in the absence of terms, 20 percent of the value of the total performance for which the buyer is obligated under the contract or $500, whichever is smaller [*Com. Code § 2718(2)(b)*]. No distinction is made between cases in which the buyer's payment was to be applied on the price of the goods and those cases in which it was intended as security for performance [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2718*].

The buyer's right to restitution under *Com. Code § 2718(2)* is subject to offset to the extent that the seller establishes a right to recover damages under *Com. Code § 2701 et seq.*, other than under *Com. Code § 2718(1)*, and establishes the amount or value of any benefits received by the buyer directly or indirectly by reason of the contract [*Com. Code § 2718(3)*]. If a seller has received payment in goods, their reasonable value or the proceeds of their resale are treated as payments for the purposes of *Com. Code § 2718(2)*, but if the seller has notice of the buyer's breach before reselling goods received in part performance, the resale is subject to the conditions laid down in *Com. Code § 2706* on resale by an aggrieved seller [*Com. Code § 2718(4)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.75[6]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.72

§ 500.72 Contractual Limitation on Remedies

Subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2718*, discussed in *§ 500.71*, and *Com. Code § 2719(2),(3)*, discussed *below*, the agreement may provide for remedies in addition to or in substitution for those provided in Division 2, and may limit or alter the measure of damages recoverable under Division 2, as by limiting the buyer's remedies to return of the goods and repayment of the price or to repair and replacement of nonconforming goods or parts [*Com. Code § 2719(1)(a)*]. Resort to a remedy as provided is optional unless the remedy is expressly agreed to be exclusive, in which case it is the sole remedy [*Com. Code § 2719(1)(b)*]. Thus, parties are left free to shape their remedies to their particular requirements and reasonable agreements limiting or modifying remedies are to be given effect. However, there is a presumption that clauses prescribing remedies are cumulative with those provided by the code rather than exclusive, unless the parties expressly agree otherwise [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2719*].

If circumstances cause an exclusive or limited remedy to fail in its essential purpose, remedy may be had as provided in the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 2719(2)*]. For example, a purchaser of machinery, on failure of the limited repair remedy to serve its essential purpose because of the seller's inability to repair, is entitled to recover the difference between the value of what he should have received and the value of what the buyer received under *Com. Code § 2714(2)* (measure of damages for breach of warranty) [*S.M. Wilson & Co. v. Smith Int'l, Inc. (9th Cir. 1978) 587 F.2d 1363, 1375* ; *see* discussion in *§ 500.76[4][b]*].

Consequential damages may be limited or excluded unless the limitation or exclusion is unconscionable. Limitation of consequential damages for injury to the person in the case of consumer goods is invalid unless it is proved that the limitation is not unconscionable. Limitation of consequential damages when the loss is commercial is valid unless it is proved that the limitation is unconscionable [*Com. Code § 2719(3)*; *see Dorman v. International Harvester Co. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 11, 19-20, 120 Cal. Rptr. 516]* . However, a contractual provision barring consequential damages may not be enforceable against the buyer after a limited repair remedy has failed of its essential purpose [*Com. Code § 2719(2)*]; whether the consequential damage limitation will be expunged from the contract depends on the facts of the individual case [*S.M. Wilson & Co. v. Smith Int'l, Inc. (9th Cir. 1978) 587 F.2d 1363, 1375-1376]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.73

§ 500.73 Remedies Against Third Parties

If a third party so deals with goods which have been identified to a contract for sale as to cause actionable injury to a party to that contract, a right of action against the third party belongs to either party to the contract for sale who has title to, a security interest, a special property, or an insurable interest in the goods. If the goods have been destroyed or converted, a right of action also belongs to the party who either bore the risk of loss under the contract for sale or has since the injury assumed that risk as against the other [*Com. Code § 2722(a)*].

If at the time of the injury, the party plaintiff did not bear the risk of loss as against the other party to the contract for sale, and there is no arrangement between them for disposition of the recovery, the party's suit or settlement is, subject the party's own interest, as a fiduciary for the other party to the contract [*Com. Code § 2722(b)*]. Either party may, with the consent of the other, sue for the benefit of whom it may concern [*Com. Code § 2722(c)*].

Prior to the time the goods have been identified to a contract for sale only the seller has a right of action. During the period between identification and final acceptance (except in the case of revocation of acceptance) it is possible for both parties to have the right of action. Even after final acceptance, both parties may have the right of action if the seller retains possession or otherwise retains an interest [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2722*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.74

§ 500.74 Effect of Insolvency

[1] Insolvency Defined

Division 2 provides special remedies to a party to a sales contract if the other party to the contract becomes insolvent. For the purpose of these provisions, a person is "insolvent" who either has ceased to pay his or her debts in the ordinary course of business or cannot pay his or her debts as they become due or is insolvent within the meaning of the federal bankruptcy law [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(23)*; for a discussion of the definition of an insolvent person under federal bankruptcy law, *see* Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy*].

[2] Buyer's Insolvency

If the seller discovers the buyer to be insolvent, the seller may refuse delivery except for cash including payment for all goods already delivered under the contract, and stop delivery as provided in *Com. Code § 2705* [*Com. Code § 2702(1)*]. The seller may exercise these rights regardless of the passage of title [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2702* and the discussion of title in *§ 500.50* et seq.].

A seller who discovers that the buyer has received goods on credit while insolvent may reclaim the goods on demand made within 10 days after the receipt, but if a misrepresentation of solvency has been made to the particular seller in writing within three months before delivery, the 10-day limitation does not apply. Except as so provided, the seller may not base a right to reclaim goods on the buyer's fraudulent or innocent misrepresentation of solvency or of intent to pay [*Com. Code § 2702(2)*]. Misrepresentation of solvency is considered to have been "made" at the time it is presented to the seller, not as of the date that the written misrepresentation is prepared or dated [*see In re Bel Air Carpets, Inc. (9th Cir. 1971) 452 F.2d 1210, 1211-1212]* .

The seller's right to reclaim under *Com. Code § 2702(2)*, however, is subject to the rights of a buyer in ordinary course or other good faith purchaser under *Com. Code § 2403*. Successful reclamation of goods excludes all other remedies with respect to them [*Com. Code § 2702(3)*; *see In re Daylin, Inc. (9th Cir. 1979) 596 F.2d 853, 856]* .

[3] Seller's Insolvency

Even though the goods have not been shipped, and subject to *Com. Code § 2502(2)* and *(3)*, discussed *below*, a buyer who has paid a part or all of the price of goods in which the buyer has a special property under the provisions of *Com. Code § 2501*[*see* discussion in *§ 500.51*], may, on making and keeping good a tender of any unpaid portion of their price, recover them from the seller if either of the following occurs:

- In the case of goods bought for personal, family, or household purposes, the seller repudiates or fails to deliver as required by the contract [*Com. Code § 2502(1)(a)*].

- In all cases, if the seller becomes insolvent within 10 days after receipt of the first installment on their price [*Com. Code § 2502(1)(b)*].

The buyer's right to recover the goods under *Com. Code § 2502(1)(a)* vests on acquisition of a special property, even if the seller had not then repudiated or failed to deliver [*Com. Code § 2502(2)*]. Inasmuch as a secured party normally acquires no greater rights than its debtor had or had power to convey [*see Com. Code § 2403(1)*], a buyer who acquires a right to recover under this section will take free of a security interest created by the seller if it attaches to the goods after the goods have been identified to the contract. The buyer will take free even if the buyer does not buy in the ordinary course and even if the security interest is perfected. Of course, to the extent that the buyer pays the price after the security interest attaches, the payments will constitute proceeds of the security interest [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2502*]. Whether or not the buyer also acquires a security interest in identified goods and has rights to the goods when insolvency takes place after the 10-day period depends on compliance with the provisions of Division 9 of the Commercial Code on secured transactions [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 2502* and discussion in *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.20* et seq.].

A buyer who has made the identification creating special property acquires the right to recover the goods only if they conform to the contract for sale [*Com. Code § 2502(3)*]. This provision precludes the possibility of unjust enrichment which exists if the buyer were permitted to recover goods even though they were greatly superior in quality or quantity to that called for by the contract for sale [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 2502*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.75

§ 500.75 Seller's Remedies

[1] Generally

If the buyer wrongfully rejects or revokes acceptance of goods, fails to make a payment due on or before delivery, or repudiates with respect to a part or the whole, then with respect to any goods directly affected, and with respect to the whole undelivered balance if the breach is of the whole contract [*see Com. Code § 2612*], the aggrieved seller may do the following:

- Withhold delivery of the goods [*Com. Code § 2703(a)*];
- Stop delivery by any bailee as provided in *Com. Code § 2705* [*Com. Code § 2703(b)*];
- Proceed under *Com. Code § 2704* respecting goods still unidentified to the contract [*Com. Code § 2703(c)*];
- Resell and recover damages as provided in *Com. Code § 2706* [*Com. Code § 2703(d)*];
- Recover damages for nonacceptance [*Com. Code § 2708*] or in a proper case, the price (*Com. Code § 2709*) [*Com. Code § 2703(e)*]; and
- Cancel [*Com. Code § 2703(f)*].

The buyer's action in failing to make a payment due, which would make the foregoing remedies available to the seller, includes the dishonor of a check on due presentment, the nonacceptance of a draft, and the failure to furnish an agreed letter of credit, in addition to the typical case of refusal to pay or default in payment. The buyer's breach which gives rise to these statutory remedies may involve only one lot or delivery of goods, or may involve all of the goods which are the subject matter of the particular contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2703*].

[2] Person in Position of Seller

A person in the position of a seller may withhold or stop delivery under *Com. Code § 2705* and resell under *Com. Code § 2706* and recover incidental damages under *Com. Code § 2710* [*Com. Code § 2707(2)*]. A "person in the position of a seller" includes, as against a principal, an agent who has paid or become responsible for the price of goods on behalf of the principal, such as a financing agency which has acquired documents by honoring a letter of credit for the buyer or by discounting a draft for the seller, or anyone who otherwise holds a security interest or other right in goods similar to that of a seller [*Com. Code § 2707(1)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2707*].

[3] Right to Identify Goods Which Are Subject of Breach

Under *Com. Code § 2703*, an aggrieved seller may do either of the following:

- Identify to the contract [*Com. Code § 2501*] conforming goods not already identified if, when the seller learns of the breach, those goods are in its possession or control [*Com. Code § 2704(1)(a)*], or

- Treat as the subject of resale goods which have demonstrably been intended for the particular contract, even though those goods are unfinished [*Com. Code § 2704(1)(b)*].

If the goods are unfinished, an aggrieved seller, in the exercise of reasonable commercial judgment for the purposes of avoiding loss and of effective realization, may either complete the manufacture and wholly identify the goods to the contract, cease manufacture and resell for scrap or salvage value, or proceed in any other reasonable manner [*Com. Code § 2704(2)*]. "Any other reasonable manner" includes an action for the price to give the seller the value of its contract in the special case in which resale is not practicable [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2704*]. The seller's right to identify certain unfinished and finished goods to the contract and proceed to dispose of them in a commercially reasonable fashion in order to mitigate damages only applies to raw materials which are the property of the aggrieved seller. This remedy is distinguishable from a possessory lien and does not permit the seller to appropriate material furnished by the buyer on which no work has been performed [*Morton Regent Enterprises, Inc. v. Leadtec California, Inc. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 842, 849, 141 Cal. Rptr. 706]* .

[4] Withhold Delivery

One of the remedies available to an aggrieved seller on the buyer's breach is the withholding of delivery of goods directly affected by the breach, whether they are the subject of the whole or only a part of the contract [*Com. Code § 2703(a)*].

[5] Stop Delivery

The seller may stop delivery of goods in the possession of a carrier or other bailee on discovering the buyer to be insolvent [*Com. Code § 2702*] and may stop delivery of carload, truckload, planeload, or larger shipments of express or freight when the buyer repudiates or fails to make a payment due before delivery or if for any other reason the seller has a right to withhold or reclaim the goods [*Com. Code § 2705(1)*]. These rights are also given to a "person in the position of a seller" under *Com. Code § 2707*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Seller May Want to Ship C.O.D. The right to stoppage is limited to carload, truckload, planeload, or larger shipments to avoid the burden on carriers if it covered all small shipments in these situations. Thus, a seller shipping to a buyer of doubtful credit can always be protected by shipping C.O.D. [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2705*].

As against the buyer, the seller may stop delivery until any of the following occurs [*Com. Code § 2705(2)*]:

- Receipt of the goods by the buyer, including receipt by the buyer's designated representative, the subpurchaser, when shipment is made directly to the subpurchaser and the buyer never receives the goods [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2705*];

- Acknowledgment to the buyer, by any bailee of the goods except a carrier, that the bailee holds the goods for the buyer;

- Acknowledgment to the buyer that a carrier, by reshipment or as a warehouse, holds the goods for the buyer; or

- Negotiation to the buyer of any negotiable document of title covering the goods.

To stop delivery, the seller must so notify the bailee by reasonable diligence to prevent delivery of the goods [*Com. Code § 2705(3)(a)*]. After it receives notification, the bailee must hold and deliver the goods according to the directions of the seller. The seller is liable to the bailee for any ensuing charges or damages [*Com. Code § 2705(3)(b)*].

If a negotiable document of title has been issued for goods, the bailee is not obliged to obey a notification to stop until surrender of possession or control of the document [*Com. Code § 2705(3)(c)*]. A carrier who has issued a nonnegotiable bill of lading is not obliged to obey a notification to stop received from a person other than the consignor [*Com. Code § 2705(3)(d)*]. In effect, the carrier is under no duty to recognize the stop order of a person who is a stranger to the carrier's contract, but the seller's right as against the buyer to stop delivery remains, whether or not the carrier is obligated to recognize the stop order. If the carrier does obey it, the seller becomes obligated under *Com. Code § 2705(3)(b)* to pay the carrier any ensuing damages or charges [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2705*].

[6] Resale

[a] Seller's Right to Resell; Measure of Damages After Resale

On the buyer's breach, the aggrieved seller may resell and recover damages [*Com. Code § 2703(d)*; *see § 500.100*]. If the buyer wrongfully rejects or revokes acceptance of goods, fails to make a payment due on or before delivery, or repudiates with respect to a part or the whole, the seller may resell the goods concerned or the undelivered balance [*Com. Code § 2703*].

Com. Code § 2706 governs resales. Under this section, if the resale is made in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner, the seller may recover the difference between the resale price and the contract price, together with any incidental damages allowed under the provisions of *Com. Code § 2710*, but less expenses saved in consequence of the buyer's breach [*Com. Code §§ 2703, 2706(1)*]. The permissible methods of resale under *Com. Code § 2706* are discussed in [b], *below*.

Com. Code § 2706 and the official comments do not prohibit resale to affiliates, nor do they say that these sales are per se commercially unreasonable. Of course, resale to an affiliated entity may be a sham, for example, if it is conducted when there is an actual market for the goods being resold [*Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 445-446, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872]* . On the other hand, if there is such a glut that there is no market for the goods, the seller makes unsuccessful attempts to resell to others, and the resale to the affiliate is an attempt to mitigate losses, resale to an affiliate is commercially reasonable and executed in good faith [*Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 447, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

[b] Approved Methods of Resale

Unless otherwise agreed, or except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 2706(3)*, resale may be at public (auction) or

private sale (directly or through a broker), including sale by way of one or more contracts to sell or of identification to an existing contract of the seller. Sale may be as a unit or in parcels, at any time and place, and on any terms, but every aspect of the sale, including the method, manner, time, place and terms, must be commercially reasonable [*Com. Code § 2706(2)*]. If the sale does not meet this standard, the seller is not entitled to the measure of damages set forth in *Com. Code § 2706(1)*, but is relegated to that provided in *Com. Code § 2708*, discussed in [7][a], *below*. Division 2 rejects the theory that the seller is required to resell at the agreed place for delivery and that a resale elsewhere can be permitted only in exceptional cases [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*].

The resale must be reasonably identified as referring to the broken contract, but except in the case of a public sale (as discussed *below*), it is not necessary that the goods be in existence or that any or all of them have been identified to the contract before the breach [*Com. Code § 2706(2)*; *but see Com. Code § 2706(4)(a)*]. This provision applies when the buyer is guilty of anticipatory repudiation of a contract for future goods before the goods, or some of them, have come into existence. The seller may then exercise the right of resale and fix damages by "one or more contracts to sell" the quantity of conforming future goods affected by the repudiation. If the goods have come into existence, but have not been identified prior to the breach, their resale will fix the seller's damages [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*].

If the resale is at public sale, only identified goods can be sold except when there is a recognized market for a public sale of futures in goods of the kind [*Com. Code § 2706(4)(a)*; *see Com. Code § 2706(2)*]. The sale must be made at a usual place or market for public sale if one is reasonably available, and except in the case of goods that are perishable or threaten to decline in value speedily, the seller must give the buyer reasonable notice of the time and place of the resale [*Com. Code § 2706(4)(b)*]. One of the purposes of requiring notice is to give the buyer the opportunity to bid at the sale or to secure the attendance of other bidders. A "usual place or market for public sale" is one which prospective bidders may reasonably be expected to attend. When a market is "reasonably available," even though it is at a considerable distance from the location of the goods, the expense of transporting the goods for resale is recoverable by the seller from the buyer as incidental damages under *Com. Code § 2706(1)* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*].

The seller may buy at the public resale [*Com. Code § 2706(4)(d)*], which benefits the buyer by tending to increase the resale price, thus decreasing the damages for which the latter might be liable [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*].

[c] Notification of Sale

If the resale is at private sale, the seller must give the buyer reasonable notification of the intention to resell [*Com. Code § 2706(3)*]. The length of notification depends on the urgency of the matter. However, notice of the time and place of the resale is not necessary [*see* Cal. Comment and UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*]. A seller's attorney's declaration in support of a motion for partial summary judgment was sufficient notice under *Com. Code § 2706(3)* when it described attempts to resell the crop of which defendant refused to take delivery and was served before the sale [*Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 448, 448 n.12, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

If the resale is at public sale, except in the case of goods which are perishable or threaten to decline in value speedily, the seller must give the buyer reasonable notice of the time and place of the resale [*Com. Code § 2706(4)(b)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*, discussed in [b], *above*, purposes of giving notice]. If the goods are not to be within the view of those attending the public resale, the notification of sale must state the place where the goods are located and provide for their reasonable inspection by prospective bidders [*Com. Code § 2706(4)(c)*].

[d] Purchaser Takes Free

A purchaser who buys in good faith at a resale takes the goods free of any rights of the original buyer, even though the seller fails to comply with one or more of the requirements of *Com. Code § 2706* [*Com. Code § 2706(5)*]. The seller is not accountable to the buyer for any profit made on any resale [*Com. Code § 2706(6)*].

However, if resale is made by "a person in the position of a seller" [*Com. Code § 2707*] or a buyer who has rightfully rejected or justifiably revoked acceptance [*Com. Code § 2711(3)*], that person or buyer must account to the seller for any excess of the resale price over its security interest as defined in *Com. Code § 2711(3)* [*Com. Code § 2706(6)*]. In that situation, the person or buyer exercises the right of resale only for the limited purpose of obtaining cash for its security interest in the goods [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2706*].

[7] Recovery of Damages

[a] Measure of Damages

On the buyer's breach, the seller may recover damages for nonacceptance or in a proper case, the price [*Com. Code § 2703(e)*; *see §§ 500.100, 500.101* (forms)].

The measure of damages for nonacceptance or repudiation by the buyer, subject to *Com. Code §§ 2708(2), 2723* (proof of market price), is the difference between the market price at the time and place for tender and the unpaid contract price together with any incidental damages provided in *Com. Code § 2710(1)*, but less expenses saved in consequence of the buyer's breach [*Com. Code § 2708(1)*]. The time and place of tender is determined by reference to *Com. Code §§ 2503, 2319, 2320, 2322, 2324* [*see* discussions in *§§ 500.35 -500.38*]. In the event that there is no evidence available of the current market price at the time and place of tender, proof of a substitute market may be made under *Com. Code §§ 2723, 2724* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2708* and discussion in *§ 500.77*].

If the measure of damages provided in *Com. Code § 2708(1)* is inadequate to put the seller in as good a position as performance would have done, then the measure of damages is the profit, including reasonable overhead, which the seller would have made from full performance by the buyer, together with any incidental damages provided in *Com. Code § 2710*, due allowance for costs reasonably incurred, and due credit for payments or proceeds of resale [*Com. Code § 2708(2)*]. This measure of damages should be applied when, due to special circumstances, the measure of damages as the difference between the market price and the contract price under *Com. Code § 2708(1)* is not a true representation of the seller's damages, such as in a sale to a buyer by an intermediate dealer or "middleman" whose relationship with a producer enables him or her to supply all obtainable customers. In that case, the buyer's breach does not make possible a new sale in which the profit lost by the breach would be replaced but, instead, results in an irreplaceable loss of profits, because every new sale by the seller would bring in a new profit [*see Distribu-Dor, Inc. v. Karadanis (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 463, 469-470, 90 Cal. Rptr. 231]* . Nor will the *Com. Code § 2708(1)* measure of damages be adequate when a so-called lost-volume seller is involved. A lost-volume seller is one who proves that, even though it resold the contract goods, the sale to the third party would have been made regardless of the buyer's breach. Put another way, the lost-volume seller must establish that had the breaching buyer performed, the seller would have realized profits from both sales. A lost-volume seller is entitled to the *Com. Code § 2708(2)*measure of damages, except that no credit is to be given for the proceeds of the resale [*National Controls, Inc. v. Commodore Bus. Machines, Inc. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 688, 696-699, 209 Cal. Rptr. 636]* .

[b] Price

When the buyer fails to pay the price as it becomes due, the seller may recover, together with any incidental damages under *Com. Code § 2710* (*see* discussion in [b], *below*), both of the following:

- The price of goods accepted or of conforming goods lost or damaged within a commercially reasonable time after risk of their loss has passed to the buyer [*Com. Code § 2709(1)(a)*; *see Com. Code § 2510(3)*].

- The price of goods identified to the contract [*see Com. Code §§ 2501, 2704*], if the seller is unable,

after reasonable effort, to resell them at a reasonable price or the circumstances reasonably indicate that a reasonable effort to resell will be unavailing [*Com. Code § 2709(1)*].

Goods accepted by the buyer under *Com. Code § 2709(1)(a)* include only goods as to which there has been no justified revocation of acceptance, for a justifiable revocation would mean that there has been a default by the seller which would bar that seller's right to maintain an action for the price [UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*]. The test of whether or not a seller may maintain an action for the price of goods identified to the contract under *Com. Code § 2709(1)(b)* is an objective one based on whether or not the seller has made a reasonable effort to resell the goods at a reasonable price or the circumstances indicate that the seller's efforts to do so would be unavailing [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*].

Com. Code § 2709 is intended to be exhaustive in its enumeration of the situations when an action for the price by the seller lies. Neither the passing of title to the goods [*see* discussion in *§ 500.50* et seq.] nor the appointment of a day certain for payment is now material to a price action [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*]. Acceptance of goods without payment allows the seller to sue at once, not only for past due payments, but for the price of all goods then delivered and accepted [*see Gantry Constr. Co. v. American Pipe & Constr. Co. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 186, 192, 122 Cal. Rptr. 834]* .

A seller who sues for the price must hold for the buyer any goods which have been identified to the contract and are still in that seller's control, except that if resale becomes possible, the seller may resell them at any time prior to the collection of the judgment; the net proceeds of any resale must be credited to the buyer and payment of the judgment entitles the buyer to any goods not resold [*Com. Code § 2709(2)*]. This prevents an action for the price from being construed as an election of a remedy which would prevent the resale of goods [*see* Cal. Code Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*].

After the buyer has wrongfully rejected or revoked acceptance of the goods, has failed to make a payment due, or has repudiated [*Com. Code § 2610*], a seller who is held not entitled to the price under *Com. Code § 2709* nevertheless should be awarded damages for nonacceptance under *Com. Code § 2708* [*Com. Code § 2709(3)*].

[c] Incidentals

Incidental damages to an aggrieved seller or to a "person in the position of a seller" [*Com. Code § 2707*], which are recoverable on the seller's resale under *Com. Code § 2706* [*see* discussion in *§ 500.75[6]*] and on the buyer's repudiation under *§ 2708* [*see* discussion in *§ 500.75[7][a]*], include any commercially reasonable charges, expenses, or commissions incurred in stopping delivery, in the transportation, care, and custody of goods after the buyer's breach, in connection with return or resale of the goods, or otherwise resulting from the breach [*Com. Code § 2710*]. While this provision only sets forth the principal normal and necessary additional elements of damage flowing from the breach, it intends to allow all commercially reasonable expenditures the seller has made [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2710*; *see § 500.100[3]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.76

§ 500.76 Buyer's Remedies

[1] Buyer's Options

If the seller fails to make delivery or repudiates, or the buyer rightfully rejects or justifiably revokes acceptance, then the buyer has the following options:

- The buyer may cancel with respect to any goods involved and with respect to the whole if the breach goes to the whole contract as provided in *Com. Code § 2612* [*Com. Code § 2711(1)*].

- Whether or not the buyer has canceled, the buyer may recover as much of the price as has been paid [*see Com. Code § 2711(1)*; *Green Wood Indus. Co. v. Forceman Int'l Dev. Group, Inc. (2008) 156 Cal. App. 4th 766, 772, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 624*]. The buyer's right to recover entire amount paid is not affected by the fact that part of that amount was paid, at the buyer's request, directly to the seller by a person with whom the buyer had made a resale contract [*Green Wood Indus. Co. v. Forceman Int'l Dev. Group, Inc. (2008) 156 Cal. App. 4th 766, 772, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 624*].

- In addition to recovering as much of the price as has been paid, the buyer may either:

  - "Cover" and have damages under *Com. Code § 2712* as to all goods affected, whether or not they have been identified to the contract [*Com. Code § 2711(1)(a)*; *see § 500.76[3]*; *see also § 500.110* (form)]; or

  - Recover damages for nondelivery as provided in *Com. Code § 2713* [*Com. Code § 2711(1)(b)*; *see § 500.76[4][a]*].

The buyer's right to "cover" or to have damages for nondelivery is not impaired by exercise of the right of resale under *Com. Code § 2711(3)* [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2711*].

If the seller fails to deliver or repudiates, the buyer also may recover the goods as provided in *Com. Code § 2502* if they have been identified [*Com. Code § 2711(2)(a)*] or, in a proper case, may obtain specific performance or replevy the goods as provided in *Com. Code § 2716* [*Com. Code § 2711(2)(b)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.76[5], [6]*].

In a case of fraudulent nondelivery--for example, when the seller never had the goods and did not intend to obtain them for delivery, yet nevertheless promised to deliver the goods and required a prepayment of the price--the buyer's remedies for the seller's fraud include all remedies available under Division 2 for nonfraudulent breach [*Com. Code § 2721*]. This rule is an exception to the general rule in California [*see Civ. Code § 3343*] that a plaintiff defrauded in the purchase or sale of property may recover only out-of-pocket loss [*Green Wood Indus. Co. v. Forceman Int'l Dev. Group, Inc. (2008) 156 Cal. App. 4th 766, 773-774, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 624* (buyer that did not "cover" could recover lost profits as consequential damages, pursuant to *Com. Code §§ 2713* and *2715*); *see* discussion of consequential damages in [4][c], *below*)].

[2] Buyer's Security Interest

On rightful rejection or justifiable revocation of acceptance, a buyer has a security interest in goods in his or her possession or control for any payments made on their price and any expenses reasonably incurred in their inspection, receipt, transportation, care and custody, and may hold those goods and resell them in the same manner as an aggrieved seller under *Com. Code § 2706* [*Com. Code § 2711(3)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.10[2]* (extent to which Divisions 2 and 9 govern)]. However, the buyer may not keep any profit resulting from the resale and is limited to retaining only the amount of the price paid and the costs involved in the inspection and handling of the goods. The security interest in the goods is limited to the items specifically listed in *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, and the buyer is not permitted to retain any amount of those funds he or she might believe adequate as damages [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2711*]. A buyer's payments on the price of goods under *Com. Code § 2711(3)* includes acceptance of a draft or other time negotiable instrument or the signing of a negotiable note [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2711*].

[3] Cover

After a seller fails to make delivery or repudiates or the buyer rightfully rejects or justifiably revokes acceptance within *Com. Code § 2711*, the buyer may "cover" by making, in good faith and without any unreasonable delay, any reasonable purchase of, or contract to purchase, goods in substitution for those due from the seller [*Com. Code § 2712(1)*]. This remedy is the buyer's equivalent of the seller's right to resell and envisages: (1) a series of contracts or sales, as well as a single contract or sale; (2) goods not identical with those contracted for but commercially usable as reasonable substitutes; and (3) contracts on credit or delivery terms differing from the breached contract but reasonable under the circumstances. The test of proper cover is whether the buyer acted in good faith and in a reasonable manner at the time and place of cover, not in hindsight [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2712*].

The buyer may recover as damages from the seller the difference between the cost of cover and the contract price, together with any incidental or consequential damages as defined in *Com. Code § 2715* [*see* discussion in [c], *below*], but less expenses saved in consequence of the seller's breach [*Com. Code § 2712(2)*]. One court has held that this contract-cover differential is appropriate even when the aggrieved buyer ultimately is able to pass on its additional costs to other parties [*KGM Harvesting Co. v. Fresh Network (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 376, 384, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286* , *criticizing Allied Canners & Packers, Inc. v. Victor Packing Co. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 905, 209 Cal. Rptr. 60* (discussed in [4][a], *below*)]. Failure of the buyer to effect cover within *Com. Code § 2712* does not bar any other remedy [*Com. Code § 2712(3)*]. However, the recovery of consequential damages is limited to those which could not reasonably be prevented by cover or otherwise [*see Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)*]. Thus, in order to recover consequential damages other than those which could not have been avoided by cover or otherwise, the buyer must have made a good faith attempt to mitigate his or her losses by "cover" [*see § 500.110[2] -[3]*].

The concept of "cover" thus serves two purposes: it enables the buyer to make reasonable substitute purchases and to

recover the cost of those purchases rather than the difference between market value and contract price and, at the same time, protects the seller from consequential damages which could have been mitigated by the purchase of substitute goods [*Gerwin v. Southeastern Cal. Assn. of Seventh Day Adventists (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 209, 219, 92 Cal. Rptr. 111]* . It should be noted that *Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)* applies the reasonable standard to a buyer's attempts to cover. Thus, for example, a buyer who fails to purchase substitute items because of their unavailability at prices within the buyer's financial ability nevertheless may be entitled to recover consequential damages [*Gerwin v. Southeastern Cal. Assn. of Seventh Day Adventists (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 209, 219-220, 92 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

[4] Damages

[a] Measure of Damages for Nondelivery

On the seller's breach, another remedy available to the aggrieved buyer is to recover damages for nondelivery [*Com. Code § 2711(1)(b)*]. This remedy is a complete alternative to cover under *Com. Code § 2712*, discussed in *§ 500.76[3]*, and applies only when, and to the extent that, the buyer has not covered [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2713* and *§ 500.111* (form)]. The measure of damages for nondelivery or repudiation by the seller, subject to the provisions of *Com. Code § 2723* (discussed in *§ 500.77[1]*) with respect to proof of market price, is the difference between the market price at the time when the buyer learned of the breach and the contract price, together with any incidental and consequential damages provided in *Com. Code § 2715* [*see § 500.76[3]*, and *§ 500.76[4][c]*], but less expenses saved in consequence of the seller's breach [*Com. Code § 2713(1)*]. One appellate court, construing former *Com. Code § 1106* (now see *Com. Code § 1305*) and Com. Code § *2713* together, adopted a rule limiting this market price measure of damages for the noncovering buyer, in the absence of any bad faith on seller's part, to the actual profit the buyer would have made on resale. Thus, when the seller knows the buyer has a resale contract but does not act in bad faith and the buyer does not show that it will be liable in damages to the buyer on its forward contract, the buyer's damages are limited to the actual amount it expected to make on the transaction [*Allied Canners & Packers, Inc. v. Victor Packing Co. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 905, 914-915, 209 Cal. Rptr. 60* ; *contra KGM Harvesting Co. v. Fresh Network (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 376, 384, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286]* .

The use of the market price at the time of knowledge of the breach as the standard of comparison with the contract price is intended to be measured by the market in which the buyer would have obtained cover had he or she sought that relief, so the place for measuring damages is the place of tender or the place of arrival if the goods are rejected or their acceptance is revoked after reaching their destination [*Com. Code § 2713(2)*]. The price is for goods in the same branch of trade. When the market price is difficult to prove, *Com. Code § 2723* may be used to permit a showing of a comparable market price; if no market price is available, evidence of spot sale prices is proper. It should be noted that, if the unavailability of a market price is caused by a scarcity of goods of the type involved, a good case may be made for specific performance (*Com. Code §§ 2711(2)(b), 2716*, and discussion in *§ 500.76[5], below*) [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2713*].

[b] Measure of Damages for Nonconforming Goods

If the buyer has accepted goods and given notification of breach pursuant to *Com. Code § 2607(3)* [*see* discussion in *§ 500.60[2][b]*], the buyer may recover as damages for any nonconformity of tender the loss resulting in the ordinary course of events from the seller's breach, as determined in any manner which is reasonable [*Com. Code § 2714(1)*]. Nonconformity includes not only breaches of warranties but also any failure of the seller to perform according to the seller's obligations under the contract [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2714*]. Incidental and consequential damages under *Com. Code § 2715* may also be recovered in a proper case [*Com. Code § 2714(3)*; *see § 500.76[4][c]*].

The buyer, on notifying the seller of his or her intention to do so, may deduct all or any part of the damages resulting from any breach of the contract from any part of the price still due under the same contract [*Com. Code § 2717* ; *see AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist West, Inc. (9th Cir. 2006) 445 F.3d 1132, 1135-1136* (construing Arizona statute

identical to *Com. Code § 2717*; buyer may not set off contractual claim against debt on separate contract; statute preempts common law right of equitable setoff in situations in which statute applies)]. The buyer must give this notice to avoid a default within the meaning of *Com. Code § 2609* on insecurity and right to assurances [*see* discussion in *§ 500.32[4]*]. However, no formality of notice is required, and any language which reasonably indicates the buyer's reason for withholding payment is sufficient [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2717*].

[c] Buyer's Incidental and Consequential Damages

Incidental damages [*Com. Code § 2714(3)*] resulting from the seller's breach include expenses reasonably incurred in inspection, receipt, transportation, care and custody of goods rightfully rejected, any commercially reasonable charges, expenses or commissions in connection with effecting cover, and any other reasonable expense incident to the delay or other breach [*Com. Code § 2715(1)*]. These specific damages enumerated are not intended to be an exhaustive list but are merely illustrative [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2715*].

Consequential damages resulting from the seller's breach [*Com. Code § 2714(3)*; *see § 500.110* (form)] include any loss resulting from general or particular requirements and needs of which the seller at the time of contracting had reason to know and which could not reasonably be prevented by cover or otherwise [*Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)*; *see Sun Maid Raisin Growers v. Victor Packing Co. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 787, 791, 194 Cal. Rptr. 612]* and injury to person or property proximately resulting from any breach of warranty [*Com. Code § 2715(2)(b)*]. To charge the seller with knowledge, particular needs of the buyer must generally be made known, while general needs must rarely be made known [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2715*]. Under *Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)*, the injured buyer has the burden of proving the extent of its consequential damages. The allegedly breaching seller has the burden of proving the inadequacy of buyer's efforts to mitigate its consequential damages [*Carnation Co. v. Olivet Egg Ranch (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 809, 818, 229 Cal. Rptr. 261]* .

When loss of anticipated profits is an element of consequential damages, the evidence must show, with reasonable certainty, both their occurrence and the extent of the damages, and the loss is measured by net, not gross, profits [*see Gerwin v. Southeastern Cal. Assn. of Seventh Day Adventists (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 209, 221-223, 92 Cal. Rptr. 111]* . If the seller knows that the buyer is in the business of reselling the goods, the seller is charged with knowledge that the buyer will be selling the goods in anticipation of a profit. Absent a contractual provision against consequential damages, a seller breaching in bad faith therefore will be liable for the buyer's resulting loss of profit [*Sun Maid Raisin Growers v. Victor Packing Co. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 787, 791, 194 Cal. Rptr. 612]* .

Financing costs, such as amounts paid or owed to the buyer's financier, were held to be a proper element of the buyer's consequential damages when the seller knew of the loan. In the case of a finance lease in which the financing lessor validly disclaimed all warranties and the lessor was entitled to revoke acceptance as to the manufacturer for defects [*see Com. Code §§ 2608, 2711*], the lessor was entitled to recover from the manufacturer the amount of the deficiency it owed to the financing lessor after the financing lessor repossessed the equipment and sold it [*U. S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1454, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533]* .

[5] Specific Performance

Specific performance may be decreed if the goods are unique or in other proper circumstances [*Com. Code § 2716(1)*]. However, specific performance is no longer limited to goods which are already specific or ascertained at the time of contracting; the test of uniqueness must be made in terms of the total situation which characterizes the contract. For example, output and requirements contracts [*see* discussion in *§ 500.34[2]*] involving a particular or peculiarly available source or market present a typical, commercial specific performance situation. If the goods are not unique, inability to cover is strong evidence of "other proper circumstances" justifying specific performance [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2716* and *Copylease Corp. of America v. Memorex Corp. (S.D.N.Y. 1976) 408 F. Supp. 758, 759-760]* . When a seller refuses to perform and the buyer shows threatened irreparable injury as a result, the latter may be entitled to a

preliminary injunction to restrain the seller from failing to perform under the contract pending the outcome of an action for specific performance and damages [*see Kaiser Trading Co. v. Associated Metals & Minerals Corp. (N.D. Cal. 1970) 321 F. Supp. 923, 933]* . The decree for specific performance may include such terms and conditions as to payment of price, damages, or other relief as the court may deem just [*Com. Code § 2716(2)*].

[6] Replevin

The buyer has a right of replevin for goods identified to the contract if, after reasonable effort, the buyer is unable to effect cover for the goods, the circumstances reasonably indicate that the effort will be unavailing, or the goods have been shipped under reservation and satisfaction of the (seller's) security interest in them has been made or tendered [*Com. Code §§ 2711(2)(b), 2716(3)*]. This remedy is in addition to the buyer's right to recover identified goods under *Com. Code § 2502*, discussed in *§ 500.74* [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2716*].

In the case of goods bought for personal, family, or household purposes, the buyer's right of replevin vests when the buyer acquires his or her special property [*see Com. Code § 2501*, discussed in *§ 500.51*], even if the seller had not then repudiated or failed to deliver [*Com. Code § 2716(3)*].

Inasmuch as a secured party normally acquires no greater rights in its collateral than its debtor had or had power to convey [*see Com. Code § 2403(1)*], a buyer who acquires a right of replevin under *Com. Code § 2716(3)* will take free of a security interest created by the seller if it attaches to the goods after the goods have been identified to the contract. The buyer will take free even if the buyer does not buy in the ordinary course and even if the security interest is perfected. Of course, to the extent that the buyer pays the price after the security interest attaches, the payments will constitute proceeds of the security interest [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2716*; *see Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.20* et seq. for discussion of when security interests attach].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.77

§ 500.77 Proof of Price

[1] Time as of Which Price is Determined

If an action based on anticipatory repudiation [*see* the discussion in *§ 500.61*] comes to trial before the time for performance with respect to some or all of the goods, any damages based on market price [*Com. Code §§ 2708, 2713*] are determined according to the price of those goods prevailing at the time when the aggrieved party learned of the repudiation [*Com. Code § 2723(1)*].

If evidence of a price prevailing at the times or places described in Division 2 is not readily available, the price prevailing within any reasonable time before or after the time described or at any other place which in commercial judgment or under usage of trade would serve as a reasonable substitute for the one described may be used, making any proper allowance for the cost of transporting the goods to or from that other place [*Com. Code § 2723(2)*].

Evidence of a relevant price prevailing at a time or place other than the one described in Division 2 offered by one party is not admissible unless and until the party has given the other party such notice as the court finds sufficient to prevent unfair surprise [*Com. Code § 2723(3)*]. The provisions of *Com. Code § 2723*, however, are not intended to exclude the use of any other reasonable method of determining market price or of measuring damages if the circumstances of the case make this necessary [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2723*].

[2] Market Quotations

Whenever the prevailing price or value of any goods regularly bought and sold in any established commodity market is in issue, reports in official publications or trade journals or in newspapers or periodicals of general circulation published as the reports of that market are admissible in evidence [*Com. Code § 2724*]. "Any established commodity market" is one in which transactions in the commodity are frequent and open enough to make a market established by usage in which one price can be expected to affect another and in which an informed report of the range and trend of prices can be assumed to be reasonably accurate [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2724*]. The circumstances of the preparation of the report may be shown to affect its weight but not its admissibility [*Com. Code § 2724*]. Although *Com. Code § 2724* does not explicitly provide for the weight to be given to market quotations, such quotations, in the absence of

compelling challenge, offer an adequate basis for a verdict [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2724*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.78

§ 500.78 Statute of Limitations

An action for breach of any contract for sale must be commenced within four years after the cause of action has accrued. By their original agreement, the parties may reduce the period of limitation to not less than one year but may not extend it [*Com. Code § 2725(1)*; *see Therma-Coustics Manufacturing, Inc. v. Borden, Inc. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 282, 296, 213 Cal. Rptr. 611* (upholding one-year limitation inserted under *Com. Code § 2207*)]. The period of limitation prescribed by *Com. Code § 2725(1)* applies to both oral and written contracts. It also applies to implied-in-law sales contracts, as when the plaintiff waives a claim in conversion and elects to treat the action as a purchase and sale of the converted property [*see H. Russell Taylor's Fire Prevention Service, Inc. v. Coca Cola Bottling Corp. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 711, 719-725, 160 Cal. Rptr. 411]* . A cause of action accrues for the breach of any contract of sale when the breach occurs, regardless of the aggrieved party's lack of knowledge of the breach [*Com. Code § 2725(2)*]. A breach of warranty occurs when tender of delivery is made, except that when a warranty explicitly extends to future performance of the goods and discovery of the breach of the breach must await the time of that performance, the cause of action accrues when the breach is or should have been discovered [*Com. Code § 2725(2)*; *see Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 131-133, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5* (seller's promise that product would work for 50,000 cycles did not fall within future-performance exception in *Com. Code § 2725(2)* because it did not specify date or time in future, nor did it pertain to time period that could be determined by reference to external source, and buyer could have discovered defect at any time without waiting for completion of 50,000 cycles; additionally, both parties were large and sophisticated companies and could have drafted their agreement to explicitly state duration of warranty so as to ensure that limitation period would extend beyond four years, if that had been their intent); *Carrau v. Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 281, 290-292, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* (generalized assertions in advertisements and literature do not rise to level of warranty explicitly extending to "future performance"; plaintiff thus did not meet exception to four-year limitation period)]. The future performance exception in *Com. Code § 2725(2)* cannot apply with respect to an implied warranty, however. Because an implied warranty is one that arises by operation of law rather than by an express agreement of the parties, it is not a warranty that "explicitly" extends to future performance of the goods, as that code section requires [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 134, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

When an action commenced within the time provided in *Com. Code § 2725(1)* is so terminated as to leave available a

remedy by another action for the same breach, the other action may be commenced after the expiration of the time limit and within six months after the termination of the first action, unless the termination resulted from voluntary discontinuance or from dismissal for failure or neglect to prosecute [*Com. Code § 2725(3)*].

The provisions contained in *Com. Code § 2725* governing the period of limitations for the commencement of an action for the breach of any contract for sale do not alter the law on tolling the statute of limitations [*Com. Code § 2725(4)*; *see generally* Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.79

§ 500.79 Goods Bought Through Web Site--Personal Jurisdiction of Seller

While it is possible that Internet activity alone could create the necessary minimum contacts to expose a nonresident defendant to personal jurisdiction in California courts, that issue must be determined by examining the level of interactivity and commercial nature of the exchange of information that occurs on the defendant's web site [*Pavlovich v. Superior Court (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 262, 274, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 58 P.3d 2* ; *see Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances, § 323.14[4][b]*]. A disgruntled California consumer will not necessarily be able to sue a nonresident seller in a California court. In one case, for instance, a Florida seller's web site merely advertised a consumer product (a car) for sale, which a California resident bought after initiating contact with the seller. There was no evidence that files were exchanged through the web site or that any business was actually conducted through the web site, nor any evidence that anything about the web site specifically targeted California residents, and the seller had none of the traditionally sufficient ties with California to establish minimum contact. Therefore, the seller's maintenance of the web site alone was insufficient to establish personal jurisdiction when the California consumer sued the seller in a California court for rescission or damages [*Shisler v. Sanfer Sports Cars, Inc. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1260-1262, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 335]* .

The Ninth Circuit has said that when a seller uses the eBay web site as a means for "establishing regular business with" persons in a state other than the seller's state, that may be properly taken into account for purposes of determining whether asserting personal jurisdiction of the seller in that other state would comport with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice [*Boschetto v. Hansing (9th Cir. 2008) 539 F.3d 1011, 1019* (in this case involving one-time transaction by Wisconsin seller and California buyer, "the use of eBay as the conduit for that transaction does not have any dispositive effect on jurisdiction" in California)]. Relevant evidence could include [*Boschetto v. Hansing (9th Cir. 2008) 539 F.3d 1011, 1018-1019, 1019 n.6*]:

- The seller's overall eBay statistics, experience, or any marketing directed at potential customers and designed to welcome bids from residents in the buyer's state.

- That the seller engaged in other transactions, even if only a few transactions, with the buyer or other residents of the buyer's state, either through the eBay web site or otherwise.

- That the seller was a commercial seller, and the eBay web site was the seller's primary marketing vehicle, or that the seller's use of the eBay web site was regular.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Remedies

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.80-500.89

[Reserved]

§§ 500.80[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.90

§ 500.90 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For interrogatories used in actions involving sales, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Ch. 169, *Sales* (Matthew Bender)

California Legal Forms (Matthew Bender)

Ch. 17, *Buying and Selling a Business or Professional Practice* (California bulk sales laws)

Ch. 52, *Sale of Goods Under the Uniform Commercial Code*

Ch. 54, *Shipment of Property*

Ch. 54A, *Storage of Goods*

Ch. 55, *Negotiable Instruments*

Ch. 56, *Letters of Credit and Electronic Fund Transfers*

Ch. 75, *Formation of Contracts and Standard Contractual Provisions*

Ch. 76, *Assignments of Rights and Obligations*

Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations*

Duesenberg & King, Sales and Bulk Transfers Under The Uniform Commercial Code (Matthew Bender)

Hart & Willier, Forms and Procedures Under The UCC, Article 2, *Sales* (Matthew Bender)

Commercial Damages: A Guide to Remedies in Business Litigation (Matthew Bender)

Commercial Law and Practice Guide (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.91

§ 500.91 State Statutes

[1] Allocation of Risk

Allocation or division of risks. *Com. Code § 2303*

Warranty of title and against infringement; buyer's obligation against infringement. *Com. Code § 2312*

Risk of loss in the absence of breach. *Com. Code § 2509*

Effect of breach on risk of loss. *Com. Code § 2510*

[2] Attorney's Fees

Contingency fee contract between attorney and merchant who employs 10 or more individuals for recovery of claim against another merchant is not required to be in writing if fee within specified limits. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6147.5*

[3] Breach

Cure by seller of improper tender or delivery; replacement. *Com. Code § 2508*

Anticipatory repudiation. *Com. Code § 2610*

Retraction of anticipatory repudiation. *Com. Code § 2611*

"Installment contract"; breach. *Com. Code § 2612*

[4] Buyer's Rights and Remedies

Buyer's right to goods on seller's insolvency. *Com. Code § 2502*

Buyer's right to inspection of goods. *Com. Code § 2513*

Buyer's rights on improper delivery; buyer's right of rejection. *Com. Code § 2601*

Manner and effect of rightful rejection. *Com. Code § 2602*

Merchant buyer's duties as to rightfully rejected goods. *Com. Code § 2603*

Buyer's options as to salvage of rightfully rejected goods. *Com. Code § 2604*

Waiver of buyer's objections by failure to particularize. *Com. Code § 2605*

Effect of acceptance; notice of breach; burden of establishing breach after acceptance; notice of claim or litigation to person answerable over. *Com. Code § 2607*

Revocation of acceptance in whole or in part. *Com. Code § 2608*

Buyer's remedies in general; buyer's security interest in rejected goods. *Com. Code § 2711*

"Cover"; buyer's procurement of substitute goods. *Com. Code § 2712*

Buyer's right to specific performance or replevin. *Com. Code § 2716*

[5] Damages

Seller's damages for nonacceptance or repudiation. *Com. Code § 2708*

Seller's incidental damages. *Com. Code § 2710*

Buyer's damages for nondelivery or repudiation. *Com. Code § 2713*

Buyer's damages for breach in regard to accepted goods. *Com. Code § 2714*

Buyer's incidental and consequential damages. *Com. Code § 2715*

Deduction of damages from the price. *Com. Code § 2717*

Liquidation or limitation of damages; deposits. *Com. Code § 2718*

Proof of market price: time and place. *Com. Code § 2723*

Admissibility of market quotations. *Com. Code § 2724*

[6] Definitions

"Agreement" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)*

"Document of title" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(16)*

"Fault" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(17)*

"Good faith" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(20)*

"Insolvent" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(23)*

"Notification" defined. *Com. Code § 1202(d)*

"Party" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(26)*

"Person" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(27)*

"Purchaser" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(30)*

"Remedy" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(32)*

"Rights" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(34)*

"Security interest" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*

"Send" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(36)*

"Signed" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(37)*

"Term" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(40)*

"Writing" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(43)*

Reasonable time. *Com. Code § 1205(a),(2)*

"Seasonably" defined. *Com. Code § 1205(b)*

"Buyer" defined. *Com. Code § 2103(1)(a)*

"Seller" defined. *Com. Code § 2103(1)(d)*

"Merchant" defined. *Com. Code § 2104(1)*

"Between merchants" defined. *Com. Code § 2104(3)*

"Lot" defined. *Com. Code § 2105(5)*

"Commercial unit" defined. *Com. Code § 2105(6)*

"Termination" defined. *Com. Code § 2106(3)*

"Cancellation" defined. *Com. Code § 2106(4)*

"Insolvent" defined. *Civ. Code § 3450*

[7] Formation of Contract

Consideration for contract. *Civ. Code § 1605*

Written instrument is presumptive evidence of consideration. *Civ. Code § 1614*

Modification of contract not in writing. *Civ. Code § 1697*

Variation of Com. Code terms by agreement. *Com. Code § 1302(a)*

Formal requirements for contract for sale of goods: statute of frauds. *Com. Code § 2201*

Formation of contract generally. *Com. Code § 2204*

Firm offers. *Com. Code § 2205*

Offer and acceptance in formation of contract. *Com. Code § 2206*

Additional terms in acceptance or confirmation. *Com. Code § 2207*

Modification, rescission and waiver. *Com. Code § 2209*

Contractual modification or limitation of remedy. *Com. Code § 2719*

[8] Goods

"Goods" defined. *Com. Code § 2105(1)*

"Conforming" goods defined. *Com. Code § 2106(2)*

Insurable interest in goods; manner of identification of goods. *Com. Code § 2501*

Casualty to identified goods. *Com. Code § 2613*

[9] Interpretation of Contracts

Manner of creating and interpreting contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 1625, 1647*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1856, 1857*

Meaning of words in contract. *Civ. Code § 1644*

Court action regarding unconscionable contract or clause of contract. *Civ. Code § 1670.5*

Course of performance, course of dealing, and usage of trade. *Com. Code § 1303*

Final written expression: parol or extrinsic evidence. *Com. Code § 2202*

Open price term. *Com. Code § 2305*

Output, requirements and exclusive dealings. *Com. Code § 2306*

Absence of specific time provisions; notice of termination. *Com. Code § 2309*

Special incidents of sale on approval and sale or return. *Com. Code § 2327*

[10] Payment

"Money" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(24)*

"Value" defined. *Com. Code § 1204*

Price payable in money, goods, realty, or otherwise. *Com. Code § 2304*

Open time for payment or running of credit; authority to ship under reservation. *Com. Code § 2310*

Tender of payment by buyer; payment by check. *Com. Code § 2511*

Form of negotiable instruments; "Draft;" "Check;" "Certificate of Deposit;" "Note." *Com. Code § 3104*

Effect of instrument on obligation for which it is given. *Com. Code § 3310*

Dishonor of negotiable instrument. *Com. Code §§ 3503-3505*

[11] Performance

General obligations of parties. *Com. Code § 2301*

Options and cooperation respecting performance. *Com. Code § 2311*

What constitutes acceptance of goods. *Com. Code § 2606*

Right to adequate assurance of performance. *Com. Code § 2609*

Substituted performance. *Com. Code § 2614*

Excuse by failure of presupposed conditions. *Com. Code § 2615*

Procedure on notice claiming excuse. *Com. Code § 2616*

[12] Procedure

Burden of proving lack of consideration. *Civ. Code § 1615*

Original jurisdiction in limited civil cases. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*

Statute of limitations on actions on written contracts. *Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)*

Statute of limitations on actions on oral contracts. *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*

Venue of contract action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue for corporations or associations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*

Contents of complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*

Lack of capacity as ground for demurrer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(b)*

Failure to allege whether contract is written or oral or implied by conduct as ground for demurrer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*

Form and content of answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

[13] Sales Generally

Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act. *Civ. Code § 3439 et seq.*

Remedies to be liberally administered. *Com. Code § 1305*

Scope of Division 2. *Com. Code § 2102*

"Sale" defined. *Com. Code § 2106(1)*

[14] Seller's Rights and Remedies

Seller's remedies on discovery of buyer's insolvency. *Com. Code § 2702*

Seller's remedies in general. *Com. Code § 2703*

Seller's remedy of resale. *Com. Code § 2703(d)*

Seller's remedy of recovery of damages for nonacceptance. *Com. Code § 2703(e)*

Seller's right to identify goods to the contract notwithstanding breach or to salvage unfinished goods. *Com. Code § 2704*

Seller's stoppage of delivery in transit or otherwise. *Com. Code § 2705*

Seller's resale including contract for resale. *Com. Code § 2706*

"Person in the position of a seller." *Com. Code § 2707*

Seller's damages for nonacceptance or repudiation. *Com. Code § 2708*

Action for the price. *Com. Code § 2709*

Seller's incidental damages. *Com. Code § 2710*

[15] Shipment and Delivery

"Bill of lading" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(6)*

"Delivery" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(15)*

Delivery in single lot or several lots. *Com. Code § 2307*

Absence of specified place for delivery. *Com. Code § 2308*

F.O.B. and F.A.S. terms. *Com. Code § 2319*

C.I.F. and C. & F. terms. *Com. Code § 2320*

C.I.F. or C. & F.: "net landed weights"; "payment on arrival;" warrant of condition of arrival. *Com. Code § 2321*

Delivery "ex-ship." *Com. Code § 2322*

Form of bill of lading required in overseas shipment; "Overseas" defined. *Com. Code § 2323*

"No arrival, no sale" term. *Com. Code § 2324*

Manner of seller's tender of delivery. *Com. Code § 2503*

Shipment by seller. *Com. Code § 2504*

Seller's shipment under reservation. *Com. Code § 2505*

Effect of seller's tender; delivery on condition. *Com. Code § 2507*

"Bailee" defined. *Com. Code § 7102(a)(1)*

"Consignee" defined. *Com. Code § 7102(a)(3)*

[16] Third Parties

"Holder" defined. *Com. Code § 1201(b)(21)*

"Financing agency" defined. *Com. Code § 2104(2)*

Sale on approval and sale or return; consignment sales and rights of creditors. *Com. Code § 2326*

Title, creditors and good faith purchasers. *Com. Code § 2401 et seq.*

Rights of financing agency. *Com. Code § 2506*

"Person in the position of a seller." *Com. Code § 2707*

Who can sue third parties for injury to goods. *Com. Code § 2722*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.92

§ 500.92 Decisions

[1] Contractual Limitations on Damages

Carrier who delivers goods into consignee's possession in breach of C.O.D. contract and who allows consignee to dispose of them may not dispute market value of goods because of alleged defects. *Cermetek, Inc. v. Butler Avpak, Inc. (9th Cir. 1978) 573 F.2d 1370, 1379*

Criteria established by *Tunkl v. Regents of University of California (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 92, 32 Cal. Rptr. 33, 383 P.2d 441* , for determining whether exculpatory clause is unenforceable on grounds of public interest, are not applicable to commercial transaction between large sophisticated companies. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 27-32, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Total disclaimer of all warranties and requirement that buyer purchase insurance to cover all losses and hold seller and all seller's contractors and subcontractors harmless was reasonable allocation of risk between large sophisticated commercial entities in specially manufactured, specialized high technology, high-risk product (rocket for launching communications satellite). *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 27, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

When warranty disclaimer and hold-harmless provisions are clear and unambiguous in precluding suit by purchaser against manufacturer's subcontractors, intent of drafters of related service contract between different parties and covering different subject matter was not relevant. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

[2] Definitions

Car dealership's name in printed newspaper advertisement was "signature" within meaning of *Com. Code § 1201(b)(37)* sufficient to satisfy statute of frauds; when advertisement reasonably justifies recipient's understanding that communication was intended as offer; offeror's intent to authenticate his or her name as signature can be established

from face of advertisement. *Donovan v. RRL Corp. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 261, 276- 278, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 807, 27 P.3d 702*

Exporter with resale contract was "buyer" under *Com. Code § 2103(1)(a)* when it contracted with seller in its own name; thus, damages for seller's breach were not limited to commission but were established by *Com. Code § 2713*. *Allied Canners & Packers, Inc. v. Victor Packing Co. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 905, 910-911, 209 Cal. Rptr. 60*

Funds held by bank as result of money orders remaining uncashed more than seven years were not "goods" under *Com. Code § 2105(1)*. *Cory v. Golden State Bank (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 360, 368, 157 Cal. Rptr. 538*

[3] Formation of Contract

When buyer's purchase order stated that it could only be accepted on its own terms unless additional terms were agreed to in writing, fact that seller's acceptance specified different terms did not impose different terms because acceptance was not made conditional on acceptance of different terms; fact that parties had used same forms on earlier orders did not impose seller's terms by custom because those terms and conditions were not utilized. *Lockheed Electronics Co. v. Keronix, Inc. (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 304, 310-313, 170 Cal. Rptr. 591*

[4] Good Faith Purchaser; Entrustment; Power to Transfer

"Full title" scheme of vehicle registration [*see Veh. Code § 6300 et seq.*] relates only to security interests, not title, and does not defeat *Com. Code § 2403(1)*; good faith purchaser who relied on facially valid certificate of title "laundered" through another state acquired no title as against true owner. *Suburban Motors, Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1361-1364, 268 Cal. Rptr. 16*

Com. Code § 2403 is applicable to sale of automobiles; good faith purchaser from thief acquires no title; thief's title is void, not just voidable, and thief has no power to transfer; voidable title under *Com. Code § 2403(1)* only arises from voluntary transfer or delivery by true owner. *Suburban Motors, Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1359-1361, 268 Cal. Rptr. 16*

Entrusting goods so that person with possession has power to transfer all rights of entruster to buyer in ordinary course of business [*Com. Code § 2403(2)*] requires entruster's acquiescence in retention of possession for purpose of sale, obtaining offers to purchase, locating buyer, or the like under *Com. Code § 2403(3)*. *Budget Rent-A-Car of So. Cal. v. Bergman (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 256, 262, 263, 175 Cal. Rptr. 286*

[5] Liquidated Damages

Defendant having failed to prove that interest of 1.5 percent per month on balance due for assembly work and remaining unpaid after 30 days was unreasonable, interest provision was validated liquidated damages provision under *Civ. Code § 1671(b)* and *Com. Code § 2718*; in addition, parties were merchants and bound to provision under *Com. Code § 2718*. *O'Connor v. Televideo System, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 709, 718-719, 267 Cal. Rptr. 237*

[6] Revocation of Acceptance

When financing lessor validly disclaimed all warranties and goods conform to lease, lessee could not revoke acceptance as to lessor, but could as to manufacturer. *U.S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1445, 1450-1453, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533*

[7] Sale or Service

Film processing is service, not goods; contract relating to those services was not governed by Division 2. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 149, 165*

Oral contract to make release prints of motion picture from other party's negatives was not contract for sale of goods within meaning of *Com. Code § 2105(1)*, but contract for services; action for breach of contract was governed by two-year limitation period, not *Com. Code § 2725*. *Filmservice Laboratories, Inc. v. Harvey Bernhard Enterprises, Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1297, 1305-1306, 256 Cal. Rptr. 735* ; *accord U.S. ex rel. Bartec Ind. v. United Pacific (9th Cir. 1992) 976 F.2d 1274, 1277-1278* (essence test applied to steel painting and fabricating, which were incidental to sale of goods)

When transaction has elements of sale and of service, essence or predominant element of transaction is determinative. *Filmservice Laboratories, Inc. v. Harvey Bernhard Enterprises, Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1297, 1305, 256 Cal. Rptr. 735*

[8] Statute of Limitations

Although action for breach of oral contract of sale is governed by four-year limitation of *Com. Code § 2725*, oral contract for services is subject to two-year limitation. *Filmservice Laboratories, Inc. v. Harvey Bernhard Enterprises, Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1297, 1304-1305, 256 Cal. Rptr. 735*

Action seeking deficiency judgment on sales contract but not seeking recovery for any penalty or forfeiture is governed by four-year limitations period set out in *Com. Code § 2725*. *Jack Heskett Lincoln-Mercury, Inc. v. Metcalf (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 38, 42-43, 204 Cal. Rptr. 355*

[9] Strict Liability

Strict liability is not applicable to defective product in commercial setting when only business loss is involved; thus, disclaimer of strict liability in commercial transaction was effective. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 33, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

[10] Unconscionability

Disclaimer of warranties by financing lessor was not per se unconscionable, but was to be tested under *Com. Code § 2316*. *U. S. Roofing, Inc. v. CreditAlliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1450-1453, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Fact that manufacturer is better able than buyer to detect defects was not relevant in evaluating claimed unconscionability of exculpatory clauses when item was not mass produced but was specialized high technology, high-risk product and contract was not preprinted but was negotiated by parties. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 25-26, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Purchaser that drafted one of two exculpatory clauses in contract and had dealt with similar provisions in previous contracts between parties was unable to claim surprise at scope of provisions claimed to be unconscionable. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 24-25, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Between large sophisticated companies no procedural element of unconscionability was established with respect to

exculpatory provisions by alleged total monopoly on manufacture of upper-stage rockets used to launch communications satellites when French company, with which purchaser had originally contracted, provided alternative launch capability. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 23, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

When parties had 20-year-long commercial relationship, unconscionability of seller's limitation on consequential damages was tested under *Com. Code § 2719(3)* rather than under *Civ. Code § 1668*; limitation was not unconscionable, but was material part of bargain; each case is determined on its particular facts. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1538-1539, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Unconscionability is common law doctrine applicable in absence of statutory authorization; although UCC § 2-302 has not been adopted by Legislature, *Civ. Code § 1670.5* incorporates identical language and applies to all contracts, not just sales transactions. *A & M Produce Co. v. FMC Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 473, 484-485, 186 Cal. Rptr. 114*

Disclaimer of warranties and exclusion of consequential damages appearing on reverse side of standard contract was unconscionable and unenforceable because (1) seller made no attempt to provide buyer with knowledge of disclaimer or exclusion, even though warranty was conspicuous and buyer could have read back of contract; (2) seller was much larger company and terms of seller's contract were standard; (3) disclaimer was commercially unreasonable because it attempted to disclaim all warranties; (4) buyer was forced to rely on seller's expertise due to lack of experience with product; (5) consequential damages were obvious; and (6) seller was only party reasonably able to prevent loss. *A & M Produce Co. v. FMC Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 473, 489-493, 186 Cal. Rptr. 114*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.93

§ 500.93 Law Reviews

Uniform Commercial Code Law Journal

Al-Rushoud, *The Right to Cure Defects in Goods and Documents*, pt 4 Lloyd's Mar. & Com. L. Q. 456 (1999)

Carroll, *A Little Essay in Partial Defense of the Contract-Market Differential as a Remedy for Buyers, 57 S. Cal. L. Rev. 667 (1984)*

Cerny, *A Shield Against Arbitration: U.C.C. Section 2-207's Role in the Enforceability of Arbitration Agreements Included With Delivery of Products, 51 Ala. L. Rev. 821 (2000)*

Frisch & Wladis, *General Provisions, Sales, Bulk Transfers, and Documents of Title, 46 Bus. Law. 1455 (1991)*

Henson, *Warranties and Remedies for their Breach under the Uniform Commercial Code*, 31(5) Prac. Law. 31 (1985)

Krinich, *U.C.C. Commentary: May a Bank Demand That a Borrower Provide "Adequate Assurance" Under U.C.C. Section 2-609 When the Government Threatens Forfeiture of the Bank's Collateral*, 116 no. *3 Banking L. J. 278 (1999)*

Lee & Kim, *A Carrier's Liability for Commercial Default and Default in Navigation or Management of the Vessel*, 27 no. *2 Transp. L. J. 205 (2000)*

Loomis, *Crestwood Lumber Company v. Citizens Savings & Loan Association: The Usury Law and Liquidated Damages in Sale of Goods Transactions, 10 Golden Gate U.L. Rev. 553 (1980)*

Phillips, *The Commercial Culpability Scale, 92 Yale L.J. 228 (1982)*

Timbie, *Necessary Limitations on Rule Invalidating Oral Modification of Written Contracts*, 23 Hast. L.J. (1972)

Comment, *RRX Industries, Inc. v. Lab-Con, Inc.: Is the Ninth Circuit's Inconsequential Treatment of Consequential Damages Limitations Under UCC § 2-719 Unconscionable? 20 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 181 (1986)*

Comment, *Unconscionability and the Enforcement of Standardized Contracts in Commercial Transactions, 16 Pac. L.J. 247 (1984)*

Note, *How Appellate Opinion Should Justify Decisions Made Under the UCC, 29 Stan. L. Rev. 1245 (1977)*

Note, *Lost-Profits Damage Awards Under Uniform Commercial Code Section 2-708(2) , 37 Stan. L. Rev. 1109 (1985)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.94

§ 500.94 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial,* § 489 et seq. (4th ed. 1996)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity* §§ 24-70 (10th 3d. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.95-500.99

[Reserved]

§§ 500.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Complaints by Sellers

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.100

§ 500.100 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2704, 2706, 2708-2710]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2704, 2706, 2708-2710]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*names*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant.	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was a corporation, organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business in _____ County [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff, if appropriate*].

2. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____[*name*], was doing business under the fictitious name of _____ [*name*] with its principal office in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity of defendant and basis of venue as appropriate*].

3. _____ [*Allege that plaintiff is a merchant, if appropriate, e.g.,* Plaintiff is a merchant engaged in the retail sale of _____ (*describe goods, wares, or merchandise*)].

4. _____ [*Allege that defendant is a merchant, if appropriate, e.g.,* Defendant is a merchant engaged in the wholesale _____ (*type of business*) business.]

[*EITHER, if agreement is evidenced by written contract*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing execution and terms of contract, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), defendant (, acting by and through its duly authorized agent,) executed and delivered to plaintiff a contract for the purchase of goods. The contract, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, provides for the sale by plaintiff to defendant of _____ (*in general terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*), and obligates defendant to make payment in the sum of $ _____, on delivery of the goods].

[*OR, if no written contract is in existence*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing making and substance of agreement, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), at the special instance and request of defendant, and in consideration of defendant's promise to pay the purchase price, plaintiff shipped and delivered to defendant the goods, wares and merchandise shown on the attached Exhibit B, which is incorporated by reference].

[*CONTINUE*]

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing performance by plaintiff under contract, e.g.,* Plaintiff fully and in all things performed his/her/its part of the agreement described in Paragraph 5, in that on _____ (*date*), plaintiff _____ (delivered *or* tendered delivery of), the goods to defendant in the time and manner and at the place required by the agreement].

7. _____ [*Allege defendant's breach of contract, e.g.,* In violation of its promises and obligations under the agreement described in Paragraph 5, defendant _____ (wrongfully refused to accept delivery of the goods *or* wrongfully revoked acceptance of the goods *or* wrongfully fails and refuses to make payment due for the goods)].

[*EITHER, if resale was at public sale*]

8. _____ [*Set forth plaintiff's actions in response to defendant's breach, e.g.,* Following defendant's breach of the contract as described in Paragraph 7, plaintiff attempted to locate another party willing to purchase the goods. After giving defendant reasonable notice of the time and place of the resale of the goods, plaintiff sold the goods to the highest bidder for cash in a public sale conducted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner.]

[*OR, if resale was at private sale*]

8. _____ [*Set forth plaintiff's actions in response to defendant's breach, e.g.,* Following defendant's breach of the contract as described in Paragraph 7, plaintiff attempted to locate another party willing to purchase the goods. After giving defendant reasonable notification of his/her intention to resell the goods, plaintiff sold the goods in a commercially reasonable manner and in good faith to _____ (*name*). The resale contract, a true copy

of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference, provides for the sale by plaintiff to third party _____(*name*) on the following terms: _____ (*in general terms, state contract price, delivery terms, etc., of resale contract*).]

[*CONTINUE*]

[*EITHER, if damages are based on resale*]

9. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages, e.g.,* The price received by plaintiff from the resale of the goods described in Paragraph 8 is $_____. The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for these goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $ _____. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages _____ (in the sum of $_____)].

[*OR, if resale damages are not sought, and claim is for lost profits for completed goods*]

9. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages for lost profits, e.g.,* The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $ _____. Plaintiff's costs directly attributable to the manufacture of these goods are _____ (*specify variable costs only, not fixed costs*). The damages specified in *Commercial Code Section 2708(1)* would be inadequate to put plaintiff in as good a position as performance would have done, because plaintiff was operating at less than full capacity at the time of defendant's breach, and plaintiff's volume of sales was decreased by defendant's breach. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages _____ (in the sum of $ _____)].

[*OR, if resale damages are not sought, and claim is for lost profits as "lost volume seller"*]

9. _____ [_____. Plaintiff's costs directly attributable to the manufacture of these goods are _____ (*specify variable costs only, not fixed costs*). The damages specified in *Commercial Code Section 2708(1)* would be inadequate to put plaintiff in as good a position as performance would have done, because plaintiff was operating at less than full capacity at the time of defendant's breach, and plaintiff would have made the sale referred to in Paragraph 8, even if defendant had not breached the contract described in Paragraph 5. If defendant had not breached the contract described in Paragraph 5, plaintiff would have earned the profits from both sales. The damages specified in *Commercial Code Section 2708(1)*would only compensate plaintiff for the loss of profits on one sale. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages _____ (in the sum of $ _____)].

[*OR, if resale damages are not sought, claim for lost profit for incomplete goods*]

9. _____ [*If goods were incomplete at time of breach and manufacture of goods was not completed following breach, set forth claim for lost profits, e.g.,* The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $ _____. Plaintiff's costs incurred in the manufacture of the goods up to the time of defendant's breach, including fixed expenses attributable to the contract, are $ _____. However, plaintiff saved expenses in the amount of $_____ by not being required to complete manufacture because of defendant's breach, and plaintiff was able to recoup $ _____ of the expenses incurred by selling the partially manufactured goods. It not being commercially reasonable to complete manufacture of

the goods under the contract, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of _____].

[*CONTINUE*]

[*EITHER, if the contract included liquidated damages provision*]

10. The parties agreed in Paragraph _____ of the contract that _____ [*specify conditions under which liquidated damages provision would apply, e.g.,* in the event of a breach by either party] plaintiff would be entitled to recover _____ [*specify amount of damages and/or formula for determining amount*].

[*OR, if defendant has made a deposit which the contract stipulates will be liquidated damages in the event of a breach*]

10. On entering into the contract with plaintiff, defendant provided a deposit of $ _____ as security for the performance of his/her contractual obligations. The contract provided that this deposit would be liquidated damages in the event of a breach of the contract. Since defendant has breached the contract as herein alleged, plaintiff is entitled to the sum of $_____ as damages.

[*CONTINUE*]

11. _____ [*Set forth claim for incidental damages, if sought, e.g.,* As a further direct result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff was caused to incur the following commercially reasonable charges, expenses, and commissions: _____ (*list, e.g.:*)

Transportation costs to and from defendant's warehouse	$ _____
Storage for 14 days	$ _____
Auctioneer's commission	$ _____
Total	$ _____]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

[*EITHER*]

1. For actual damages in the sum of $ _____ and liquidated damages according to the agreement of the parties in the amount of $ _____;

[*OR, if agreement provides for liquidated damages*]

1. For liquidated damages according to the agreement of the parties in the sum of $_____;

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. For incidental damages in the sum of $ _____;]

3. For interest on the sum of $ _____ from and after _____ [*date on which amount of damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred [including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*]; and

5. For such other further relief as the court may deem proper.

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint for damages [*Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2704, 2706, 2708-2710*] in [1], *above*, is for use by an aggrieved seller of goods whose buyer has wrongfully rejected [*Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602*] or revoked acceptance of goods [*Com. Code § 2608*] or failed to make a payment due on or before delivery [*Com. Code § 2301*; *see § 500.75[1], [3], [6][a], [7]* (seller's options, measure of damages)].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- Plaintiff's capacity to sue (Paragraph 1). This need not be alleged if plaintiff is a natural person, but if plaintiff is a legal entity, failure to allege capacity to sue may be grounds for demurrer to the complaint under *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(b)*.

- Defendant's capacity to be sued and basis of venue (Paragraph 2) [*see* [8], *below*].

- Plaintiff's and/or defendant's status as a merchant (Paragraphs 3 and 4). The complaint should allege that the parties are merchants [*Com. Code § 2104(1)*] if appropriate, because any transaction between

merchants impliedly charges the parties with the knowledge or skill of merchants [*Com. Code § 2104(3)*]. That knowledge may be specialized knowledge as to the goods, specialized knowledge as to business practices, or both, depending on the provisions of Division 2 involved in the transaction [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2104*].

- Facts showing the existence of a contract between plaintiff as seller and defendant as buyer (alternative Paragraphs 5) [*see § 500.11[1]* and *[5]* (definitions of buyer and seller). The form contains alternative allegations of a written contract (first alternative Paragraph 5) and of a sale of goods on open account or by verbal order (second alternative Paragraph 5). A complaint on a contract is subject to demurrer if it does not allege whether the contract sued on was oral or in writing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*]. Consideration to support the contract should be pleaded, as it is here, whenever the claim is not founded on a written contract, because consideration is a necessary element of executory contracts [*see Civ. Code § 1605*; *see also Ch. 140, Contracts, § 140.23*]. However, because a written instrument is presumptive evidence of consideration [*Civ. Code § 1614*], the plaintiff does not need to plead the existence and character of the consideration if the pleading states that the contract was in writing. The burden of pleading and proving lack of consideration sufficient to support a written instrument is on the party seeking to avoid it or invalidate it [*Civ. Code § 1615*; *but see Rancho Santa Fe Pharmacy, Inc. v. Seyfert (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 875, 884, 883, 268 Cal. Rptr. 505* (*Civ. Code § 1614* is presumption affecting burden of producing evidence and not burden of proof; once evidence is admitted sufficient to call existence of consideration into question, proponent of written instrument retains burden of proving consideration); *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. A contract not evidenced by a written instrument is not enforceable by way of action if the price of the goods is $500 or more [*Com. Code § 2201(1)*] unless it comes within one of the exceptions to the Statute of Frauds under *Com. Code § 2201(3)*, but pleading facts raising the statute is the defendant's burden as an affirmative defense [*see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

- The terms of the contract (alternative Paragraphs 5) [*see §§ 500.20* et seq., *500.30* et seq.].

- Plaintiff's performance under the contract (Paragraph 6) [*see § 500.32*].

- Defendant's breach (Paragraph 7) [*see § 500.60* et seq.]. When particular contract terms or additional verbal agreements are pertinent to plaintiff's cause of action those terms should be added to the allegations [*see § 500.20[4]*]. Additional allegations may also be necessary to outline the complete history of the dispute following the seller's tender of delivery, such as the buyer's attempt to revoke acceptance of delivery [*Com. Code § 2608*; *see § 500.60[2][c]*] and any relevant actions by plaintiff-seller in response to defendant's breach.

- If plaintiff seller has resorted to the remedy of resale [*Com. Code § 2703(d)*], that should be alleged (alternative Paragraphs 8), in addition to facts showing compliance with the conditions governing resale, whether public or private, under *Com. Code § 2706*[*see § 500.75[6][b] -[c]*]. The seller is entitled to incidental damages resulting from the resale [*Com. Code §§ 2706(1), 2710*], which should be alleged (Paragraph 11) and included in the prayer for incidental damages.

- Four alternative claims for damages (alternative Paragraphs 9), depending on whether the claim is based on resale or lost profits and whether the goods were completed and/or identified to the contract at the time of breach. The plaintiff-seller will usually prefer to claim damages based on lost profits, because that measure of damages should fully compensate the plaintiff. However, if the seller is operating at full capacity so that it had more customers than it could supply, making the resale contract a true substitute contract in the sense that the seller could not have made it in addition to the one with the defendant, then resale damages should entitle the seller to a more advantageous recovery. If lost profits are claimed under

Com. Code § 2708(2), plaintiff must allege that damages based on the difference between the market price and the contract price under *Com. Code § 2708(1)* are inadequate to put the seller in as good a position as performance would have done [*Com. Code § 2708(2)*; *see* Paragraphs 9; *see also § 500.75[3], [6][a], [7][a]*]. The alternative damage allegations are based on the following:

- Resale, in which case the plaintiff is entitled to the difference between the resale price and the contract price, together with any incidental damages under *Com. Code § 2710*, but less expenses saved in consequence of the breach (first alternative Paragraph 9) [*Com. Code § 2706(1)*; *§ 500.75[6][a]*] or

- Lost profits. If the goods were complete at the time of the breach, and plaintiff, due to its excess capacity, does not think the *Com. Code § 2708(1)* measure of damages is adequate but cannot prove that the specific resale would have taken place in addition to the sale to the defendant, the second alternative Paragraph 9 should be used. In that case, plaintiff is entitled to damages equal to the profit it would have made from full performance (including reasonable overhead or fixed costs) together with consequential damages [*Com. Code § 2710*] and costs, less credit for payments or proceeds of resale [*Com. Code § 2708(2)*; *see § 500.75[7][a]*].

- If the goods were complete at the time of the breach and plaintiff can qualify for the "lost volume seller" measure of damages by proving that the specific resale would have taken place in addition to the sale to the defendant, the third alternative Paragraph 9 should be used. In that case, plaintiff is entitled to damages equal to its lost profit on defendant's contract but without deduction for proceeds of the resale [*National Controls, Inc. v. Commodore Bus. Machines, Inc. (l985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 688, 696-699, 209 Cal. Rptr. 636]* .

- If the goods were incomplete at the time of breach, the fourth alternative Paragraph 9 should be used [*Com. Code § 2704*; *see § 500.75[3]*].

- If the contract included a liquidated damages provision, its existence and terms should be alleged (Paragraph 10); it should be kept in mind that there is a presumption that clauses prescribing remedies are cumulative with those provided by the code rather than exclusive, unless otherwise agreed by the parties; thus plaintiff may be entitled to liquidated as well as actual damages [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2719* and discussion in *§ 500.71*]. If plaintiff is claiming that the liquidated damages provision is unreasonable, unconscionable, or void for any other reason, that must also be alleged [*see Com. Code § 2718* and discussion in *§ 500.71*].

- A claim for incidental damages (Paragraph 11) [*see Com. Code § 2710*; *see also § 500.75[7][c]*].

If the claim is payable in a foreign currency, or computable by conversion to or from a foreign currency, allegations should be added setting forth that fact. Otherwise, the claim is made in U.S. dollars [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676.6(a)*]. For discussion and a form for a judgment under the Uniform Foreign-Money Claims Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676 et seq.*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[4] Recovery of Interest

The prayer includes a request for interest on awarded damages, although failure to include it does not preclude interest from being awarded [*Sanders v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 252, 263, 90 Cal. Rptr. 169, 475 P.2d 201]* . The date from which the interest is calculated depends on whether the amount of damages was capable of being made

certain (liquidated) prior to the filing of the action [*see Civ. Code § 3287*; *see also Ch. 140, Contracts, § 140.56[3]*].

[5] Attorney's Fees

In an action on a contract, when the contract specifically provides that attorney's fees and costs that are incurred to enforce the provisions of the contract will be awarded to one of the parties, the prevailing party may recover reasonable attorney's fees as an element of the costs of suit, not as damages [*Civ. Code § 1717*; *see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq.]. For discussion of attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717.5* in certain contract actions based on a book account as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 337a*, see Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts* .

[6] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*], and will also preclude a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[7] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[8] Venue

When a defendant has contracted to perform an obligation in a particular county, the proper county for the trial of an action founded on that obligation is in either the county in which the obligation is to be performed or in which the contract in fact was entered into or in the county in which the defendant or any defendant resides at the commencement of the action; the county in which the obligation is incurred will be deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed unless there is a special contract in writing to the contrary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

A corporation or association may be sued in the county where the contract is made or is to be performed, where the obligation or liability arises or the breach occurs, or in the county where the principal place of business of the corporation is situated, subject to the power of the court to change the place of trial as in other cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*]. The last act necessary to the validity of a contract, usually the act constituting acceptance, or the place where the obligation arises is the place the contract is made for the purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* [*Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192]* .

[9] Statute of Limitations

An action for breach of any contract for sale must be commenced within four years after the cause of action has accrued [*Com. Code § 2725(1)*]. A cause of action accrues when the breach occurs, regardless of the aggrieved party's lack of knowledge of the breach [*Com. Code § 2725(2)*]. A breach of warranty occurs when tender of delivery is made, except that when a warranty explicitly extends to future performance of the goods and discovery of the breach of the breach must await the time of that performance, the cause of action accrues when the breach is or should have been discovered [*Com. Code § 2725(2)*; *see Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 131-133, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5* (seller's promise that product would work for 50,000 cycles did not fall within future performance exception in *Com. Code § 2725(2)* because it did not specify date or time in future, nor did it pertain to

time period that could be determined by reference to external source, and buyer could have discovered defect at any time without waiting for completion of 50,000 cycles; additionally, both parties were large and sophisticated companies and could have drafted their agreement to explicitly state duration of warranty so as to ensure that limitation period would extend beyond four years, if that had been their intent); *Carrau v. Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 281, 290-292, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* (generalized assertions in advertisements and literature do not rise to level of warranty explicitly extending to "future performance"; plaintiff thus did not meet exception to four-year limitation period)]. However, by their original agreement, the parties may reduce the period of limitation to not less than one year but may not extend it [*Com. Code § 2725(1)*]. For further discussion of the period of limitation in an action for breach of a contract for sale, see *§ 500.78*.

The future performance exception in *Com. Code § 2725(2)* cannot apply with respect to an implied warranty. Because an implied warranty is one that arises by operation of law rather than by an express agreement of the parties, it is not a warranty that "explicitly" extends to future performance of the goods, as that code section requires [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 134, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

[10] Parties

In addition to the buyer and seller maintaining actions for breach, a "person in the position of a seller" [*Com. Code § 2707(1)*; *see § 500.75[2]*] may resell and recover incidental damages [*Com. Code § 2707(2)*].

[11] Cross References

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For a discussion of and forms for use in breach of contract actions, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For alternative forms for prayers and verifications, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* , and Ch. 572, *Verification*

For a discussion of and forms for use in actions on oral contracts, see Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Complaints by Sellers

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.101

§ 500.101 Complaint to Recover Price of Goods as Damages for Breach of Written Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2709]

[1] FORM Complaint to Recover Price of Goods as Damages for Breach of Written Contract [Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2709]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR PRICE OF GOODS
_____ [*names*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*),	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant.	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Price)

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity of defendant and basis of venue. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Plaintiff's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1] 1, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Defendant's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing execution and terms of contract, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], defendant[, acting by and through its duly authorized agent,] executed and delivered to plaintiff a contract for the purchase of goods. The contract, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, provides for the sale by plaintiff to defendant of _____ [*in general terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*], and obligates defendant to pay on delivery of the goods _____ [the sum of $_____ *or* a reasonable price, as determined by the parties at the time of delivery *or* a reasonable price to be fixed in terms of _____ (*set forth agreed market or other standard by which price was to be fixed*)].

6. [*Plaintiff's performance under contract. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Defendant's breach of contract. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 7.*]

[*If contract had open price term, add if appropriate, EITHER*]

8. Plaintiff and defendant have been unable to agree on the price of the goods delivered.

[*OR*]

8. The price of the goods delivered has not been fixed in terms of _____ [*set forth agreed market or other standard by which price was to be fixed*] because _____ [*allege reason why price has not been fixed as provided for in contract*].

[*CONTINUE*]

9. _____ [*If defendant has not accepted delivery of goods, add either* Plaintiff has made a reasonable effort to resell the goods described in Paragraph 5 at a reasonable price but has been unable to do so *or* Circumstances reasonably indicate at all times herein alleged that any effort by plaintiff to resell the goods described in Paragraph 5 would be impracticable].

10. _____ [*Set forth claim for price, e.g.,* The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is _____ ($_____ *or* a reasonable price, as determined by the parties at the time of delivery *or* a reasonable price to be fixed in terms of _____ [*set forth agreed market or other standard by which price was to be fixed*]. The reasonable price of the goods described in Paragraph 5 is $_____ per unit, and a total of $_____ for the units delivered and accepted by the defendant). Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____ (*set forth either the contract price or the reasonable price of the goods described in Paragraph 5*)].

[11. *Claim for incidental damages. See § 500.100[1], 11.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Damages)

1. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-9, inclusive, of the First Count.

2-5. [*Allegations supplying claim for damages. See § 500.100[1], Paragraphs 8-10.*]

6. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraph 11 of the First Count.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

On The FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. For the price of the goods described in Paragraph 3 in the sum of $_____ [*set forth either the contract price or if the contract had open price term, the reasonable price of the goods*];

[2. For incidental damages in the sum of $_____;]

3. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date on which amount of damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*];

On the SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

[*EITHER*]

4. For actual damages in the sum of $_____ and liquidated damages according to the agreement of the parties in the amount of $_____;

[*OR, if the agreement provides that liquidated damages agreed to are the exclusive remedy*]

4. For liquidated damages according to the agreement of the parties in the sum of $_____;

[*CONTINUE*]

[5. For incidental damages in the sum of $_____;]

6. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date on which amount of damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*];

On BOTH CAUSES OF ACTION:

7. For costs of suit herein incurred [including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civ. Code § 1717*]; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See § 500.100[1]* .]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by an aggrieved seller whose buyer has wrongfully rejected [*Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602*] or revoked acceptance of goods [*see Com. Code § 2608*] or failed to make a payment due on delivery [*Com. Code § 2301*], to recover the contract price of goods [*see Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2709*; *see also § 500.100[4] -[11]*]. An action for the price is generally limited to those cases in which resale of the goods is impracticable, except when the buyer has accepted the goods or when they have been destroyed after risk of loss has passed to the buyer. A defaulting seller cannot maintain an action for the price. Thus, if the buyer's rejection or revocation of acceptance was justifiable, this complaint should not be used, or at least counsel should be prepared to resist a demurrer [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*; *see also §§ 500.33, 500.75[7][b], 500.77* and *[3], below*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, sets forth two counts as a basis for recovery of damages for breach. The first count alleges in pertinent part:

- Facts showing the existence of a written contract between plaintiff as seller and defendant as buyer, and the terms of the contract (Paragraph 5). The form contains alternative allegations for the price term (Paragraph 5), one being a specifically stated price and the others, a reasonable price to be determined by the parties or by an agreed market or standard, or an open price term [*Com. Code § 2305*; *see § 500.33[2]*].

- Optional allegations, to be included when appropriate to the facts, that the parties have been unable to agree on the price of the goods or that the price has not been fixed by the agreed standard, and the reason why the price has not been so fixed (Paragraph 8). The reason for the failure of the price to be fixed is significant, because when a price is left to be fixed (other than by agreement of the parties) and fails to be fixed through fault of one party, the other has the option of treating the contract as cancelled or fixing a reasonable price [*Com. Code § 2305(3)*]. This complaint does *not* allege the intent of the parties to be bound to the agreement unless the price be fixed or agreed, which is an essential element of the contract [*see Com. Code § 2305(4)*], because that appears to be an affirmative defense involving the defendant's burden of pleading and proof [*see § 500.121*].

- Another optional allegation, to be used if defendant has not accepted delivery of the goods, that either plaintiff has made a reasonable but unsuccessful effort to resell the goods or that an effort to do so would be impracticable (Paragraph 9). An action for the price is generally limited to cases in which resale of the goods is impracticable, except when the buyer has accepted the goods [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*].

- Alternative terms to be used in the claim for price, depending on whether the contract stated a price term or left it open (Paragraph 10). In the latter situation, the complaint alleges what amount constitutes a reasonable price for the goods delivered and accepted by the defendant, because if the parties fail to agree to a price, the contract is interpreted so as to provide for a reasonable price [*Com. Code § 2305(1)(b)*]. This also enables the plaintiff to request a specific dollar amount in damages, in order to satisfy the jurisdictional requirements of the appropriate court [*see § 500.33[1]*].

The second count alleges in pertinent part a claim for damages pursuant to *Com. Code § 2708* (Paragraphs 2-5) [*see § 500.100[3]*]. If the buyer has wrongfully rejected or revoked acceptance of the goods, failed to make a payment due, or repudiated, and the seller is not successful in its action on the price, that seller may nevertheless be awarded damages for nonacceptance in the same action [*Com. Code § 2709(3)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Complaints by Sellers

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.102

§ 500.102 Complaint for Damages or Price for Breach of Requirements Contract [Com. Code §§ 2306, 2703(e), 2709]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages or Price for Breach of Requirements Contract [Com. Code §§ 2306, 2703(e), 2709]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR _____
_____ [*names*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*),	)	[DAMAGES *or* PRICE OF GOODS
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant.	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Price)

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity of defendant and basis of venue. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Plaintiff's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Defendant's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing execution and terms of contract, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), defendant (, acting by and through its duly authorized agent,) executed and delivered to plaintiff a contract for the purchase of goods. The contract, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, provides that plaintiff agrees to specially manufacture for defendant and defendant agrees to purchase _____ (*in general terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*), and obligates defendant to purchase these _____ (*describe goods*) in such quantity as defendant, in good faith, requires for its manufacturing needs. (Defendant agreed to pay $_____ per unit with certain discounts which would depend on the size of orders placed from time to time.) The contract also provides that delivery will be made from time to time as ordered and required by defendant].

6. _____ [*Allege defendant's estimation of its anticipated requirements, if any, e.g.,* Defendant's requirements were estimated by the defendant to be at least 10,000 units, and further units would be required depending on the demand for the goods by defendant's dealers.]

7. _____ [*Allege facts showing performance by plaintiff under contract, e.g.,* Plaintiff fully and in all things performed his/her/its part of the agreement described in Paragraph 5, in that he/she/it proceeded to specially manufacture for defendant _____ (*number*) units of the goods described in Paragraph 5 and notified defendant that at all times he/she/it was ready and able to deliver those goods].

8. _____ [*Allege any additional facts relevant to the history of dealings between the parties, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff delivered _____ (*number of units*) of the goods described in Paragraph 5 to the defendant at $_____each, for which defendant paid the sum of $_____).]

9. _____ [*Allege defendant's breach of contract, e.g.,* Defendant was obligated under its agreement with plaintiff to make the subject goods available to its dealers and in good faith to ascertain from all of its dealers in the United States which of those dealers desired to distribute the subject goods. Defendant, in violation of its promises and obligations described in Paragraph 5, failed to acquaint all of its dealers with plaintiff's goods, did not request its division managers to make the subject goods available to its dealers, and did not give all of its dealers an opportunity to order the subject goods. Defendant advised plaintiff on _____ (*date*), that defendant rejected any further purchase of the goods described in Paragraph 5, because the majority of its divisions did not feel that they could distribute them to its dealers in sufficient quantities].

10. _____ [*Set forth claim for price, e.g.,* The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $_____ per unit. Defendant was obligated to purchase its good faith requirements for the goods described in Paragraph 5 from plaintiff under the subject agreement. The number of units of goods which the defendant would have required in good faith was easily ascertainable by defendant and would not have been less than _____(*number*) units. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____ (*set forth the price of the number of units of goods which the defendant would have required in good faith*)].

[11. *Claim for incidental damages. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 11.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Damages)

1. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-9, inclusive, of the First Count.

2. [*Allegation supplying claim for liquidated damages, if applicable. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 10.*]

3. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages for lost profit, e.g.,* Defendant was obligated to purchase its good faith requirements for the goods described in Paragraph 5 from plaintiff under the subject agreement. The number of units of goods which the defendant would have required in good faith was easily ascertainable by defendant and would not have been less than _____ (*number*) units. The price defendant contracted and agreed to pay for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $_____ per unit. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____].

4. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraph 11 of the First Count.

[*Prayer. See § 500.101[1].*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 500.100[1]* .]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, for the contract price of goods [*Com. Code §§ 2703(e), 2709*] is for use by an aggrieved seller-supplier whose buyer-user under a requirements contract [*Com. Code § 2306*] has failed to demand and pay for the amount of specially manufactured goods which in good faith the buyer estimated to be required under the contract. Good faith and reasonableness are required, in addition to other obligations of parties to a requirements contract and may not be disclaimed by agreement [*see Shea-Kaiser-Lockheed-Healy v. Department of Water & Power (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 679, 689, 140 Cal. Rptr. 884* ; discussion in *§ 500.34[2]*]. Although two counts are alleged, one for price and one for damages, the action for the price, rather than damages, would be more appropriate, because when goods are specially manufactured to fit the needs of the buyer, it may be unreasonable to resell them to anyone else [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2709*; *see also §§ 500.75[7][b], 500.100[4] -[11], 500.101[2] -[3]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, sets forth two counts as a basis for recovery of damages for breach. The first count alleges in pertinent part:

- Facts showing the existence of a requirements contract for specially manufactured goods between plaintiff and defendant (Paragraph 5).

- Plaintiff's and defendant's respective statuses as seller-supplier and buyer-user (Paragraphs 3 and 4).

- The terms of the contract (Paragraph 5). A term which measures the contract quantity by the requirements of the buyer means actual requirements as would occur in good faith [*Com. Code § 2306(1)*; *see § 500.34[2]*].

- That the contract contained an estimation of the buyer's requirements which should be alleged (Paragraph 6), because the estimate will be regarded as a measure of the variation or elasticity which the parties intended to allow within the good faith standard [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2306*].

- Defendant's breach, by failing to acquaint its dealers with the goods contracted for, thereby denying

them the opportunity to order them and resulting in defendant's failure to order the amount of goods estimated as required in the contract (Paragraph 9). Defendant, as a merchant, has a duty to conduct his or her business not only in good faith, but according to commercial standards of fair dealing in the trade, which implies that the buyer's requirements approximate a reasonably foreseeable figure [*see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2306*].

- The amount of goods that the defendant would have required in good faith was easily ascertainable (Paragraph 10). If a contract term, such as quantity, is left open, the contract may fail for indefiniteness unless there is a reasonably certain basis for giving an appropriate remedy [*Com. Code § 2204*; *see § 500.20* et seq.].

The second count alleges in pertinent part a claim for damages pursuant to *Com. Code § 2708* (Paragraph 3) [*see §§ 500.75[7][a], 500.100[3]*] as an alternative to the claim for price, as authorized by *Com. Code § 2709(3)* [*see § 500.101[2]* and *[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Complaints by Sellers

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.103-500.109

[Reserved]

§§ 500.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
B Complaints by Buyer

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.110

§ 500.110 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Seller's Revocation of Firm Offer [Com. Code § 2205]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Contract [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Seller's Revocation of Firm Offer [Com. Code § 2205]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity of defendant and basis of venue. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Plaintiff's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Defendant's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing course of conduct between plaintiff and defendant leading to making of firm offer by defendant, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff requested defendant to submit an offer to supply _____ (*in general terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of firm offer*), for purchase by plaintiff].

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing making and substance of firm offer, e.g.,* By a writing dated _____, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, defendant offered to supply the goods described in Paragraph 5 to plaintiff for the total amount of $_____].

7. _____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's acceptance of defendant's firm offer and any facts relevant to plaintiff's requirements made known to defendant, e.g.,* Plaintiff advised defendant that he/she would accept his/her offer, provided he/she received orders from his/her distributors within two weeks from the date of the offer for the goods described in Paragraph 5].

8. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's assurance to hold offer open, e.g.,* Defendant assured plaintiff he would hold his/her offer open for a period of _____ (*number*) days and, at plaintiff's request, defendant reduced that assurance to a separate writing dated _____, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference].

9. _____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's reliance on defendant's firm offer, e.g.,* Relying on defendant's firm offer described in Paragraph 6, plaintiff quoted a firm price to his/her distributors for the goods described in Paragraph 5, which was accepted by them on _____ (*date*)].

10. _____ [*Allege defendant's revocation of offer, e.g.,* Subsequent to plaintiff's acts in reliance on defendant's firm offer, as described in Paragraph 9, on _____ (*date*), and prior to _____ (*date on which firm offer became revocable under terms of writing described in Paragraph 8*), defendant withdrew his/her firm offer to supply the goods described in Paragraph 5, which were necessary for plaintiff to complete his/her contract with his/her distributors, as described in Paragraph 9].

11. _____ [*Set forth plaintiff's actions in response to defendant's breach, e.g.,* On _____(*date*), in good faith and without unreasonable delay, plaintiff entered into another contract with a third party a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference, for the purchase of an equal quantity of the goods described in Paragraph 5).]

[*EITHER, if damages are based on cover*]

12. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages, e.g.,* The cover price plaintiff paid for the goods sold to him/her by the third party, as described in Paragraph 11, was $_____ per unit, or a total of $_____. The price for which defendant offered to sell these goods to plaintiff, as described in Paragraph 6, is $_____. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's revocation of his/her firm offer, plaintiff has been compelled to expend an additional $_____ to obtain substitute goods and has suffered damages in the sum of $_____. Defendant's breach of contract did not result in any saving of expenses to plaintiff].

[*OR, if damages based on cover are not sought*]

12. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages for repudiation, e.g.,* The price for which the defendant made a firm offer to sell the goods, as described in Paragraph 6, is $_____. The market price of the goods

described in Paragraph 5 on _____ (*date on which plaintiff learned of defendant's revocation of firm offer*) was $_____. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's revocation of his/her firm offer, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____. Defendant's breach of contract did not result in any saving of expenses to plaintiff].

[*CONTINUE*]

[13. *Claim for incidental damages. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 11.*]

[14. _____ (*Set forth claim for consequential damages, if sought, e.g.,* As a further result of defendant's revocation of his firm offer, plaintiff suffered the following consequential loss and damage in the sum of $_____. This sum is the discount which plaintiff was required to give to its distributors when plaintiff was unable to deliver the goods described in Paragraph 5 on the date promised. Defendant knew of plaintiff's commitment to furnish these goods to plaintiff's distributors at the time of the making of the contract between plaintiff and defendant).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For actual damages in the sum of $_____;

[2. For incidental damages in the sum of $_____;]

[3. For consequential damages in the sum of $_____;]

4. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date on which amount of damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*];

5. For costs of suit herein incurred[, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See § 500.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer whose seller has wrongfully repudiated by revoking a firm offer [*Com. Code § 2205*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.20[3]*] to recover damages [*Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713*; *see* discussions in *§ 500.76[3]* and *[4]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The status of the parties as merchants (Paragraphs 3, 4). Although plaintiff's merchant status is an optional allegation, defendant's is mandatory, because *Com. Code § 2205* governing firm offers only applies to offers by a merchant [*see* discussion in *§ 500.20[3]*].

- The conduct of the parties leading to the making of the offer and a description of the goods (Paragraph 5)

- The making and substance of a firm offer (Paragraph 6). A firm offer must be made in a signed writing [*Com. Code § 2205*].

- Plaintiff's acceptance of the offer, together with any facts relevant to his or her requirements made known to defendant at the time of contracting which might affect defendant's liability for consequential damages (Paragraph 7) [*see Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.76[4][c]*].

- Defendant's written signed assurance to plaintiff to hold the offer open for a certain period of time (Paragraph 8). This assurance must be in a signed writing and the period for which it is kept open may not exceed three months [*Com. Code § 2205*].

- Plaintiff's detrimental reliance on the offer (Paragraph 9).

- Defendant's revocation of the firm offer prior to the expiration of the period during which defendant assured plaintiff it would remain open (Paragraph 10).

- Plaintiff's actions in response to defendant's breach (Paragraph 11), such as procuring substitute goods or "cover" [*Com. Code §§ 2711(1)(a), 2712*; *see § 500.76[3]*]. The allegation that plaintiff "covered" in good faith and without unreasonable delay is necessary to claim damages under *Com. Code § 2712*.

- Alternative claims for plaintiff buyer's damages (alternative Paragraphs 12), the first based on "cover," being the difference between the cost of "cover" and the firm offer price, less any expenses saved in consequence of the seller's breach [*Com. Code § 2712(2)*], and the second based on damages for repudiation, being the difference between the market price at the time when the buyer learned of the breach and the contract price, less expenses saved in consequence of the seller's breach [*Com. Code § 2713*]. Both measures of damages may include incidental (Paragraph 13) and consequential damages (Paragraph 14) [*Com. Code § 2715*; *see § 500.76[4][c]*]. Consequential damages are recoverable only if they could not reasonably be prevented by cover [*Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)*]. Under *Com. Code § 2715(2)(a)* (damages after cover), the burden of proving the extent of the loss incurred is on the injured buyer, but the burden of proving the inadequacy of efforts to mitigate consequential damages is on allegedly breaching seller [*Carnation Co. v. Olivet Egg Ranch (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 809, 818, 229 Cal. Rptr. 261]* .

Any allegation that plaintiff procured "cover" and any claim for damages based thereon is optional. Failure of the buyer to effect "cover" does not bar any other remedy [*Com. Code § 2712(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
B Complaints by Buyer

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.111

§ 500.111 Complaint for Specific Performance [Civ. Code § 3384] After Seller's Breach of Contract [Com. Code § 2716]

[1] FORM Complaint for Specific Performance [Civ. Code § 3384] After Seller's Breach of Contract [Com. Code § 2716]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*names*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)], Defendant.	)	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity of defendant and basis of venue. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Plaintiff's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Defendant's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing execution and terms of contract, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff (, acting by and through its duly authorized agent,) executed and delivered to defendant a contract for the purchase of goods. The contract, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, provides for the sale by defendant to plaintiff of _____(*in specific terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*), and obligates defendant to make payment in the sum of $_____, on delivery of the goods].

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's performance or willingness to perform under contract, e.g.,* Plaintiff fully and in all things performed his/her part of the agreement described in Paragraph 5, in that on _____ (*date*), plaintiff _____ (paid *or* tendered payment of) the purchase price set forth in the agreement to defendant and requested defendant to deliver the goods as described in Paragraph 5].

7. _____ [*Allege defendant's breach of contract, e.g.,* In violation of its promises and obligations under the agreement described in Paragraph 5, defendant _____ (wrongfully refused to accept plaintiff's tender of payment of the purchase price *or* has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse to make delivery of the goods described in Paragraph 5, and has repudiated the agreement described therein)].

8. _____ [*Allege defendant's ability to perform, e.g.,* At all times referred to herein, defendant was, and now is, the owner and in possession of the goods described in Paragraph 5].

9. _____ [*Allege unique nature of goods or other circumstances warranting specific performance and inadequacy of remedy at law, e.g.,* The goods described in Paragraph 5 are unique in character in that _____ (*describe why goods are unique*). Therefore, plaintiff has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, and damages, if awarded, cannot be properly ascertained and would be inadequate to compensate plaintiff for the detriment suffered as a result of defendant's breach].

10. At the time the agreement described in Paragraph 5 was entered into, on _____ [*date*] the goods described therein were reasonably worth $_____; accordingly, that agreement is just, fair, and reasonable as to the defendant, and the consideration therefor accruing to the defendant is adequate.

11. _____ [*Set forth claim for consequential damages, if sought, e.g.,* As a further result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff suffered the following consequential loss and damage in the sum of $_____. This sum is the penalty plaintiff was required to pay to _____ (*third party*) when plaintiff was unable to forward to that third party on schedule the goods defendant failed to deliver to plaintiff. Defendant knew of plaintiff's commitment to furnish these unique goods to _____ (*third party*) at the time of the making of the contract between plaintiff and defendant. This consequential loss to plaintiff could not reasonably be prevented by cover or otherwise.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That the court decree specific performance of the agreement described in Paragraph 5;

2. That defendant be specifically ordered to deliver to plaintiff the goods described in Paragraph 5;

[3. For consequential damages in the sum of $_____;]

[4. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ (*date on which amount of consequential damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*);]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See § 500.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint for specific performance [*Civ. Code § 3384*] in [1], *above*, is for use by an aggrieved buyer whose seller has wrongfully repudiated or failed to deliver unique goods [*Com. Code § 2716*]. An action for specific performance under the Commercial Code is generally limited to those cases in which the goods involved are unique, although the remedy may be decreed in other proper circumstances [*Com. Code § 2716(1)*; *see § 500.76[5]* and *[3], below*; *see also §§ 500.100[4] -[11], 500.110[3]*]. A decree for specific performance may include such terms and conditions as to payment of the price, damages, or other relief as the court may deem just [*Com. Code § 2716(2)*].

For additional discussion and forms for use in actions for specific performance, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- Facts showing the execution and terms of the contract (Paragraph 5), including a specific description of the goods in order to support the allegation of their unique nature.

- Facts showing the plaintiff's performance or tender of performance (Paragraph 6), because performance by the plaintiff is generally a condition precedent to a decree of specific performance [*see Civ. Code § 3392*].

- Facts showing the defendant's breach and refusal to perform (Paragraph 7) and the plaintiff's demand for the defendant's performance (Paragraph 6), because both are essential to a cause of action for specific performance [*see Crocker v. Grandi (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 431, 435, 11 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

- The defendant's ability to perform (Paragraph 8) [*Civ. Code § 3394*].

- The unique nature of the subject goods or other proper circumstances warranting specific performance (Paragraph 9) [*Com. Code § 2716(1)*].

- The inadequacy of the remedy at law (Paragraph 9) [*Korabek v. Weaver Aircraft Corp. (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40, 149 P.2d 876]* .

- That the consideration to be received by the defendant is adequate, and the contract as to the defendant is just and reasonable (Paragraph 10) [*Civ. Code § 3391*].

Even when the contract provides for liquidated damages or a penalty in the event of breach, which the defendant is willing to pay, the contract may be specifically enforced if the case satisfies all other requirements for that remedy [*Civ. Code § 3389*].

[4] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of actions for specific performance. Specific performance is an equitable remedy [

Schaefer v. United Bank & Trust Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 635, 641, 286 P. 723 ; *see* discussion of the elements of specific performance in Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*]. It is not one of the types of equitable remedies that are limited civil cases under *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*, nor do *Civ. Code §§ 3384-3402*, which govern specific performance, authorize such an action to be brought as a limited civil case. It appears, therefore, that an action for specific performance cannot be brought as a limited civil case, regardless of the amount in controversy [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 85(c)* (relief sought must be exclusively of a type described in one or more statutes that classify action or proceeding as limited civil case)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
B Complaints by Buyer

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.112

§ 500.112 Complaint for Damages [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Buyer's Rightful Rejection of Defective Goods [Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713] After Buyer's Rightful Rejection of Defective Goods [Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] [, a California Corporation], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*] [, individually and doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)], Defendant.	)))))))	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES [LIMITED CIVIL CASE] [Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity of defendant and basis of venue. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Plaintiff's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Defendant's status as merchant. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing execution and terms of contract, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff (, acting by and through its duly authorized agent,) executed and delivered to defendant a contract for the purchase of goods. The contract, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, provides for the sale by defendant to plaintiff of _____(*in general terms describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*), and obligated plaintiff to make payment in the sum of $_____, on delivery of the goods and that there would be no acceptance of the goods unless they remained free of defects for _____ months].

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's performance under contract, e.g.,* Plaintiff fully and in all things performed his/her part of the agreement described in Paragraph 5, in that on _____(*date*), plaintiff paid the purchase price set forth in the agreement to defendant on delivery of the goods).]

7. _____ [*Allege facts showing grounds for plaintiff's rightful rejection of goods, e.g.,* Approximately _____months after delivery of the goods described in Paragraph 5, on _____ (*date*), plaintiff discovered substantial defects in those goods in that _____ (*describe all defects*), which resulted in plaintiff's inability to use those goods for the purpose for which they were purchased].

8. _____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's seasonable notification of defendant of grounds for rejection, e.g.,* Plaintiff notified defendant that he had discovered the defects described in Paragraph 7 in a letter dated _____ (*date*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference].

9. _____ [*Allege defendant's breach of contract, e.g.,* Defendant acknowledged that the defects described in Paragraph 7 existed but failed to cure them or to make any attempt to cure them within a reasonable time].

10. _____ [*Allege plaintiff's seasonable notification to defendant of plaintiff's rightful rejection, within a reasonable time, e.g.,* By letter dated _____ (*date*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference, plaintiff notified defendant that plaintiff was invoking his/her right to reject the goods described in Paragraph 5 on the basis of the defects described in Paragraph 7 and defendant's failure to cure those defects, as alleged in Paragraph 9].

11. _____ [*If plaintiff buyer is merchant, allege plaintiff's compliance with duties as to rightfully rejected goods pursuant to Com. Code § 2603(1), e.g.,* Plaintiff received no instructions from defendant with respect to the rejected goods in plaintiff's possession and plaintiff had no good faith duty to attempt resale of those goods for defendant's account because those goods are not perishable and do not threaten to decline in value speedily).]

[12. *Plaintiff's cover. See § 500.110[1], Paragraph 11.*]

13. _____ [*Set forth claim for price, e.g.,* The price plaintiff contracted and paid for the goods, as described in Paragraph 5, is $_____].

[*EITHER, if damages are based on cover*]

14. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages, e.g.,* The cover price paid by plaintiff for the goods sold to him by the third party, as described in Paragraph 12, was $_____ per unit or a total of $_____. The price for which defendant sold these goods to plaintiff, as described in Paragraph 5, was $_____. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach, plaintiff has been compelled to expend an additional $_____ to obtain substitute goods and has suffered damages in the sum of $_____. Defendant's breach of contract did not result in any saving of expenses to plaintiff].

[*OR, if damages based on cover are not sought*]

14. _____ [*Set forth claim for damages for repudiation, e.g.,* The price for which the defendant sold the goods to plaintiff, as described in Paragraph 5, is $_____. The market price of the goods described in Paragraph 5 on _____ (*date on which plaintiff learned of breach*), was $_____. Thus, as a direct and proximate result of defendant's breach, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____. Defendant's breach of contract did not result in any saving of expenses to plaintiff].

[*CONTINUE*]

[15. *Claim for incidental damages. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 11.*]

16. _____ [*Set forth claim for consequential damages, if sought, e.g.,* As a further result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff suffered the following consequential loss and damage in the sum of $_____. This sum is the commission which plaintiff would have collected from _____ (*third party*) for supplying the nondefective goods which defendant failed to deliver to plaintiff. Defendant knew of plaintiff's commitment to furnish these goods to _____ (*third party*) at the time of the making of the contract between plaintiff and defendant. This consequential loss to plaintiff could not reasonably be prevented by cover or otherwise.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the price of the goods described in Paragraph 5 in the sum of $_____ [*price paid by plaintiff*];

2. For actual damages in the sum of $_____;

[3. For incidental damages in the sum of $_____;]

[4. For consequential damages in the sum of $_____;]

5. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date on which amount of damages was capable of being made certain or date on which action was filed, whichever is appropriate*];

6. For costs of suit herein incurred[, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*]; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See § 500.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint for damages in [1], *above*, is for use by an aggrieved buyer who has rightfully rejected [*Com. Code §§ 2601(a), 2602*] defective goods and is seeking recovery of the price paid [*Com. Code § 2711(1)*], as well as damages for repudiation [*Com. Code §§ 2711(1), 2712, 2713*]. This complaint is only applicable if the buyer has not yet accepted the goods [*Com. Code § 2606*] at the time of discovering their defects, and, therefore, the provisions governing buyer's damages in regard to accepted goods [*Com. Code § 2714*] and the burden of proving breach with respect to accepted goods [*Com. Code § 2607(4)*; *see* UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2607*] do not apply [*see* discussion in [3], *below*].

Acceptance of goods by the buyer precludes resort to the remedy of rejection with regard to the accepted goods, unless the acceptance was on the reasonable assumption that any nonconformity would be seasonably cured [*Com. Code § 2607(2)*]. For discussion of buyers' remedies with respect to accepted goods, see *§ 500.60[2][b]* and *[c]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The status of the parties as merchants (Paragraphs 3, 4) which in the case of the plaintiff buyer affects his or her duties as to the rejected goods [*Com. Code § 2603*] and as to notification to the seller (*Com. Code § 2605(1)(b)*) [*see* discussion in *§ 500.60[1][b]* and *[c]*].

- The execution and terms of the contract, including a provision that there would be no acceptance of the goods unless they remained defect-free for a specified period of time (Paragraph 5) [*see* discussion in [2], *above*].

- Plaintiff's performance under the contract (Paragraph 6). Plaintiff need not have already performed or paid for the goods to be entitled to maintain an action based on rightful rejection; however, if the buyer has already performed, he or she may recover any part of the price that has been paid, in addition to damages [*Com. Code § 2711(1)*].

- The grounds for plaintiff's rejection of the goods and the date on which they were discovered (Paragraph 7).

- Plaintiff's seasonable notification to defendant of discovery of the defects (Paragraph 8). The buyer's failure to seasonably state a particular defect that is ascertainable by reasonable inspection precludes that buyer from relying on that defect to justify rejection or to establish defendant's breach if the seller could have cured it [*Com. Code § 2605(1)(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.60[1][b]*].

- Defendant's breach (Paragraph 9), such as failure to cure or make an attempt to cure within a reasonable time [*Com. Code § 2508*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.35[8]*].

- Plaintiff's seasonable notification of rejection after defendant's failure to cure (Paragraph 10), which must be made within a reasonable time after delivery of the goods [*Com. Code § 2602(1)*; *see* the discussion in *§ 500.60[1]*].

- If plaintiff is a merchant, plaintiff's compliance with *Com. Code § 2603(1)* regarding duties with respect to the rejected goods (Paragraph 11).

- Plaintiff's "cover" [*Com. Code § 2712*], if any (Paragraph 12).

- An optional claim for price (Paragraph 13), which is applicable if plaintiff paid any portion of the purchase price prior to rejection [*Com. Code § 2711(1)*].

- Alternative claims for damages (Paragraph 14), the first based on "cover" [*Com. Code § 2712(2)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.76[3]*], and the second based on damages for repudiation including incidental and consequential damages, if appropriate [*Com. Code § 2713*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.76[4][b]* and *[c]*]. If the seller repudiates, as in this case, the buyer's claims for price and damages are cumulative, not alternative [*see Com. Code § 2711(1)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
B Complaints by Buyer

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 500.113-500.119

[Reserved]

§§ 500.113[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.120

§ 500.120 Defense Based on Custom and Usage [Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)]

[1] FORM Defense Based on Custom and Usage [Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

1. At all times mentioned in plaintiff's complaint herein, there existed and still exists, in the _____ [*describe type of business in which parties are engaged*] business, a well-established and well-understood custom and usage in _____ [*set out locality, e.g.,* the State of California] to the effect that _____ [*describe custom and usage*]. Plaintiff had notice of that custom and usage, and the contract referred to in plaintiff's complaint herein was made by the parties with reference to, and with knowledge of, that custom and usage.

2. In accordance with custom and usage, defendant _____ [*set forth defendant's actions under the custom and usage that he or she relies on to constitute a defense*].

[2] Use of Form

The defense of custom and usage is appropriate in any action on an agreement [*Com. Code § 1303(d)*] unless the parties have specifically agreed that usage of trade should not be construed as a part of the agreement [*Heggblade-Marguleas-Tenneco, Inc. v. Sunshine Biscuit, Inc. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 948, 955, 131 Cal. Rptr. 183* ; *see Com. Code § 1303(e)*], because an agreement, by definition, is the bargain of the parties as found in their language or by implication from circumstances including usage of trade [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)*]. Some sections of Division 2, such as the following, specifically incorporate usage of trade into their provisions:

- *Com. Code § 2314(3)* (warranties implied from usage of trade), discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .

- *Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)* (modification of implied warranty by usage of trade), discussed in Ch. 502,

Sales: Warranties .

- *Com. Code § 2323(3)* ("overseas" shipment), discussed in *§ 500.52[5][d]*.
- *Com. Code § 2504(b)* (shipment by seller), discussed in *§ 500.35[5]*.

The admission of trade usage evidence does not violate the parol evidence rule [*Com. Code § 2202(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.31*]. However, evidence of a relevant usage of trade offered by one party is not admissible unless and until that party has given the other party notice which the court finds sufficient to prevent unfair surprise to the latter [*Com. Code § 1303(g)*].

[3] Allegations

The existence and scope of trade usage must be proven as facts [*Com. Code § 1303(c)*] and therefore, must be specifically pleaded (Paragraph 1). Defendant may allege in the alternative either that the usage of trade exists, that the parties are aware of it, or that they should be aware of it (Paragraph 1) [*see Com. Code § 1303(d)*]. The knowledge of persons carrying on a particular trade as to prominent trade customs may be actual or constructive [*Heggblade-Marguleas-Tenneco, Inc. v. Sunshine Biscuit, Inc. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 948, 956, 131 Cal. Rptr. 183]* . The affirmative defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*] in [1], *above*, also alleges the particular conduct of the answering defendant that is in accordance with the custom and usage alleged in the first paragraph (Paragraph 2.).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.121

§ 500.121 Defense Based Lack of Intent to Be Bound While Price Term Remained Open [Com. Code § 2305(4)]

[1] FORM Defense Based Lack of Intent to Be Bound While Price Term Remained Open [Com. Code § 2305(4)]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

1. The terms of the transaction described in Paragraph _____ of the complaint herein provided that the price of the subject _____ [*describe in general terms goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of agreement*] was to be determined [by mutual agreement of the parties *or* by _____ (*set forth agreed market or other standard by which price was to be fixed*)] no later than _____ [*date*].

2. Plaintiff and defendant did not intend to be bound to the agreement described in Paragraph _____ of the complaint herein unless a price for the subject goods was _____ [agreed on by mutual consent of the parties *or* fixed according to the method described in Paragraph 1].

3. _____ [Plaintiff and defendant were unable to agree on a price for the subject goods prior to _____(*date*), and _____ (have never agreed on a price *or* a price has never been set according to the method set forth in Paragraph 1) prior to the service of the complaint herein, on _____ (*date*)].

4. The transaction described in Paragraph _____ of the complaint herein did not, therefore, result in a binding agreement, and defendant has no further duties thereunder.

[2] Use of Form

The defense of no intention to be bound unless price term agreed on is appropriate in an action on an agreement which contains an open price term if either (1) the parties have failed to agree on a price or (2) a price has not been fixed as agreed on [*see § 500.101*], and the parties did not intend to be bound unless the price was set according to the terms of the agreement [*Com. Code § 2305(4)*; *see* discussion in *§§ 500.33[2], 500.101[3]*].

[3] Allegations

The defendant should specifically allege that the parties did not intend to be bound by the agreement unless and until the price term was agreed on or fixed. In the absence of that intent, the agreement will be considered binding in spite of the absent price term, and a reasonable price will be fixed (Paragraph 2) [*Com. Code § 2305(1)*]. In addition, if defendant successfully proves this defense of no intent to be bound, there is no contract (Paragraph 4), and the defendant buyer is liable only for returning goods already received or paying their reasonable value at the time of delivery [*Com. Code § 2305(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.122

§ 500.122 Defense Based on Fact That Defendant Is Not a Merchant [Com. Code § 2104(1)]

[1] FORM Defense Based on Fact That Defendant Is Not a Merchant [Com. Code § 2104(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. Defendant is an inexperienced _____ [buyer *or* seller] of _____ [*describe goods, wares or merchandise involved in the subject contract*].

2. Defendant is not a merchant of _____[*describe goods, wares, or merchandise made subject of contract*] as defined by *Commercial Code Section 2104(1)* and has no knowledge of the customs and practices peculiar to the _____ [selling *or* marketing] of those goods.

3. Defendant is a _____ [*describe defendant's business or profession*].

[2] Use of Form

This form sets forth the affirmative defence that the defendant is not a "merchant" within the meaning of the Commercial Code. The defense of not being a merchant is available in any action in which the defendant is inappropriately being charged with having knowledge or skill peculiar to the practices or goods involved in the transaction [*Com. Code § 2104(1),* discussed in *§ 500.11[3]*] or is being incorrectly held to a standard of performance required of merchants in certain situations, such as those involving firm offers [*Com. Code § 2205*; *see §§ 500.20[3], 500.110[3]*] and rejected goods [*Com. Code §§ 2603, 2605(1)(b)*; *see §§ 500.60[1][b]* and *[c], 500.112[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 500 SALES: SALES UNDER THE COMMERCIAL CODE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

44-500 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 500.123

§ 500.123 Defense Based on Buyer's Failure to Effectively Revoke Acceptance [Com. Code § 2608]

[1] FORM Defense Based on Buyer's Failure to Effectively Revoke Acceptance [Com. Code § 2608]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

[1. *Plaintiff's status as merchant, if appropriate. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[2. *Defendant's status as merchant, if appropriate. See § 500.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], defendant delivered _____ (*describe goods, wares or merchandise made subject of agreement*) to plaintiff (in accordance with the specifications contained in the contract between plaintiff and defendant, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference)].

4. _____ [*Set forth facts showing plaintiff's alleged revocation, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant by letter, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference, that he/she was dissatisfied with the subject goods and was placing them in storage. That notification was not made within a reasonable time after plaintiff should have discovered any defects in the subject goods].

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's response to plaintiff's alleged revocation, e.g.,* By letter dated _____ [*date*], a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference, defendant requested that plaintiff particularize his/her dissatisfaction with the accepted goods, but defendant received no further communication from plaintiff until the service of the complaint in this action on _____ [*date*].

[6. Prior to the filing of the complaint herein, plaintiff never asserted to defendant that the alleged nonconformity in _____ (*describe subject goods*) substantially impaired the value of those goods.]

7. _____ [*Allege grounds for defense of ineffective revocation, e.g.,* Plaintiff's failure to particularize any alleged defects in the subject goods, and thus, to allow defendant an opportunity to cure them, and plaintiff's failure to notify defendant of any alleged nonconformity in the subject goods within a reasonable time after he/she should have discovered any defects, precludes plaintiff from recovering from defendant any damages resulting from any alleged breach by defendant].

[2] Use of Form

The defense that the buyer has failed to effectively revoke acceptance of the goods is available to a defendant seller if the buyer has failed to comply with the requirements of proper revocation [*see Com. Code § 2608*, discussed in *§ 500.60[2][c]*] or has failed to particularize defects on which the revocation is based [*Com. Code § 2605(1)*; *see* discussions in *§§ 500.60[1][b], 500.112[2] -[3]*].

[3] Allegations

If both parties are merchants, that status should be alleged (Paragraphs 1, 2), because between merchants, the buyer's failure to particularize any defect which is ascertainable by reasonable inspection after rejection, when so requested in writing by the seller (Paragraph 5), precludes the buyer from relying on the unstated defect to justify the rejection [*Com. Code § 2605(1)(b)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.60[1][b]*].

Defendant may allege, depending on the facts, that plaintiff's revocation of acceptance was improper because defendant's performance was in total conformity with the contract requirements (Paragraph 3), plaintiff's revocation was not made within a reasonable time after plaintiff should have discovered any defects in the goods (Paragraph 4) [*Com. Code § 2608(2)*; *see* discussion in *§ 500.60[2][c]*], or plaintiff failed to particularize the alleged defects on which plaintiff based the revocation (Paragraph 5). If the seller could have cured the defect if it had been stated seasonably, the failure to particularize precludes plaintiff from relying on the unstated defect to justify revocation [*Com. Code § 2605(1)(a)*]. The affirmative defense may also allege that plaintiff never asserted that the alleged nonconformity substantially impaired the value of the goods (Paragraph 6), which is a prerequisite to the right of revocation [*see Com. Code § 2608(1)*] and, finally, the basis for defendant's claim that plaintiff's revocation was ineffective (Paragraph 7).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 501.syn

§ 501.syn Synopsis to Chapter 501: SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES

§ 501.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 501.02 Cross References

§§ 501.03through 501.09 [Reserved]

§ 501.10 Governing Law

[1] State Statutes

[2] Truth in Lending Act (TILA)

[3] Federal Regulations; Regulation Z

[4] Effect of Federal Requirements on State Law

[a] TILA Supersedes Inconsistent State Law

[b] When TILA Disclosures Satisfy RISA

[5] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Similar California Legislation

§ 501.11 Retail Installment Sales Act Definitions

[1] Goods

[2] Retail Buyer

[3] Retail Installment Sale

[4] Retail Seller

[5] Services

§ 501.12 Truth In Lending Act Definitions

[1] Consumer Credit

[2] Credit

[3] Creditor

[4] Credit Sale

§§ 501.13 through 501.19 [Reserved]

§ 501.20 Purpose of Credit Disclosure Laws

[1] To Aid Consumer in Making Comparisons

[2] RISA Waiver Is Void

§ 501.21 Transactions and Persons Governed by Credit Disclosure Laws

[1] Retail Installment Sales Act

[a] Transactions to Which RISA Applies

[b] Transactions to Which RISA Does Not Apply

[i] Sales of Vehicles

[ii] Construction

[iii] Sales of Vessels or Aircraft

[iv] Transactions by Supervised Financial Institutions

[v] Transactions by Other Licensed Lenders

[2] Truth In Lending Act

[a] Transactions to Which TILA Applies

[b] Transactions to Which TILA Does Not Apply

§ 501.22 Classification of Credit Plans

[1] In General

[2] RISA

[a] Retail Installment Contract

[b] Add-on Sales

[c] Retail Installment Account

[3] TILA

[a] Closed-end Credit Plan

[b] Open-end Credit Plan

§§ 501.23through 501.29 [Reserved]

§ 501.30 Disclosures to Cosigners Required for Various Types of Credit

[1] Types of Credit Included

[2] Notice Requirement

[3] Exceptions

[4] Size, Placement, and Content of Notice

[5] Other Documents That Must Be Given

[6] Effect of Noncompliance

§ 501.31 Required Formalities and Disclosures for Retail Installment Contracts

[1] In General

[2] Dated and Written Document Required

[3] Translation of Contract Negotiated in Language Other than English

[4] Printing and Notice Requirements

[5] Required Disclosures

[a] In General

[b] Identification of Parties and Subject Matter

[c] Regulation Z Disclosures

[d] Itemization of Amount Financed

[e] Description of Trade-In Property

[f] Information Concerning Prepayment

[g] Itemization of Insurance

[h] Disclosures Regarding Insurance

[6] Single-Document Rule

[7] Execution and Delivery of Documents

[8] Effect of Nondelivery

[9] Acknowledgment of Delivery

[10] Presumption of Delivery

[11] Catalog Sales

§ 501.32 Formalities and Disclosures Required by TILA

[1] Time and Form of Disclosures

[2] Disclosures Required by TILA

[3] Model TILA Forms and Clauses

§ 501.33 RISA Restrictions on Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Prohibited Terms Are Void

[2] Inducing Contract Contingent on Happening of Future Event Proscribed

[3] Requiring Buyer to Obtain Financing From Particular Source

[4] Acceleration Clauses

[5] Agency Appointments by Buyer

[6] Change of County of Trial

[7] Confession of Judgment or Assignment of Wages

[8] Lien Provisions

[9] Rescission or Avoidance of Contract

[10] Security Interest

[11] Unlawful Acts

[12] Waivers

§ 501.34 Finance Charges in Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Components of Finance Charge Under RISA

[2] Components of Finance Charge Under TILA

[a] Includable Charges

[b] Excludable Charges

[c] Prohibited Offsets

[d] Tolerances for Accuracy

[3] Annual Percentage Rate Under TILA

[4] Methods for Computing Finance Charges Under RISA

[a] Options

[b] Simple-Interest Basis

[c] Precomputed Basis

[5] Maximum Amount of Finance Charge Under RISA

[6] When Finance Charge May Be Assessed Under RISA

§ 501.35 Payments on Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Schedule of Installments

[2] Payment to Last Known Holder

[3] Statement of Unpaid Balance

[4] Prepayment; Refund Credit

[5] Delivery of Instruments Indicating Payment in Full

[6] Delinquency and Collection Charges Permitted

§ 501.36 Refinancing and Consolidation of Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Extension of Payment Dates

[2] Refinancing Agreement

[3] New Payment Schedule After Default on "Balloon Payment"

[4] Refinancing by California Finance Lenders

§ 501.37 Add-on Sales Provisions

[1] In General

[2] Subsequent Purchases Added to Prior Contract

[a] Terms

[b] Allocation of Installment Payments After Subsequent Purchase

[c] Security Interest in Goods Previously Purchased

[d] Time and Contents of Disclosures

[3] Series of Credit Sale Transactions

[a] In General

[b] Delay of Disclosures Permitted

[c] Contents of Disclosure Memorandum

[4] Consequences of Failure to Make Disclosures

§ 501.38 Retail Installment Accounts

[1] In General

[2] Acceptance by Buyer

[3] Disclosure Requirements Under RISA

[a] Disclosure in Credit Card Application

[b] Initial Disclosure

[c] Statement Regarding Insurance

[d] Change in Terms of Account

[e] Periodic Statement of Account; Required Contents

[4] Disclosure Requirements Under TILA

[a] In General

[b] Initial Disclosures

[c] Periodic Statement

[5] Refund of Credit Balance on Retail Installment Account

[6] Security Interest Until Goods Paid For

[7] Notes Cutting off Buyer's Defenses Prohibited

[8] Delinquency Charges

[9] Finance Charge Limits on Retail Installment Accounts

[10] Payments on Account

§§ 501.39through 501.49 [Reserved]

§ 501.50 Buyer Remedies Under RISA

[1] Rescission of Retail Installment Contract

[2] Civil Liability for Violations of RISA

[3] Statutory Penalty for Willful Violation on Consolidated Contracts

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] Assignee Liability Under RISA

§ 501.51 Buyer's Remedies Under TILA

[1] Rescission of Contract Creating Security Interest in Principal Dwelling

[a] Availability

[b] Disclosure of Right to Rescind Required

[c] Form of Notice to Creditor

[d] Return of Money or Property

[e] Action for Restitution of Money or Property

[f] Time Limit

[i] Three-day Optional Rescission Period

[ii] Use as Affirmative Defense

[iii] In Action by Agency Empowered to Enforce TILA

[g] Election of Remedies Not Required

[h] Right to Rescind as Against Assignee

[i] Attorney's Fees

[2] Civil Liability for Violations of TILA

[a] Individual Action for Damages and Statutory Penalties

[b] Class Action Under TILA

[c] Applicability of Statutory Penalty

[3] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[4] Multiple Violations in Single Transaction

[5] Penalties Inapplicable to Government Agencies

[6] Assignee Liability Under TILA

[a] In General

[b] Consumer Credit Transactions Secured by Real Property

§ 501.52 Action for Declaratory Relief

§ 501.53 Procedural Considerations

[1] Jurisdiction of TILA Action

[2] Removal of Actions

[3] Venue in Action on Contract or Account Subject to RISA

[4] Limitation of Actions

[a] TILA

[b] RISA

[5] Joinder With Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[6] TILA Claims Are Arbitrable

§ 501.54 Statutory Defenses to Liability

[1] Correction of RISA Violation Within 30 Days of Execution Date

[2] Correction of TILA Error Within 60 Days of Discovery

[3] Bona Fide Error Under TILA

[4] Good Faith Compliance With TILA Rule, Regulation, or Interpretation

§ 501.55 Seller's Remedies Under RISA

[1] Repossession and Resale

[2] Application of Resale Proceeds

[3] No Deficiency Judgment

§§ 501.56through 501.59 [Reserved]

§ 501.60 Governing Law

[1] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act

[2] California Statutes

[3] Available Relief

§ 501.61 Persons Who May Invoke Relief Provisions

[1] Under Federal Statute

[2] Under California Statute

[3] Dependents

§ 501.62 Actions or Proceedings Involving Military Service Members

[1] Tolling of Statutes of Limitation

[2] Court-Ordered Stays in Civil Actions and Proceedings

[a] Stay of Action or Proceeding

[b] Automatic Suspension of Contractual Penalties

[c] Stay of Attachment or Garnishment and Stay of Execution of Judgment or Order

[d] Extended Duration of Stay

[3] Defaults and Default Judgments

[a] Declaration Regarding Defendant's Military Service

[b] Plaintiff's Bond

[c] Appointment of Attorney for Defendant

[d] Relief From Judgment

§ 501.63 Contracts and Obligations

[1] Interest Rate Ceiling

[2] Rescission or Termination of Installment Contract; Repossession

[3] Enforcement of Security Interests

[4] General Relief from Contracts and Obligations

[a] Availability of Relief

[b] Court's Discretion

[c] Relief from Mortgages or Installment Contracts for Purchase of Real Estate

[d] Relief From Other Obligations

§ 501.64 Transfers to Take Advantage of Statutes

§ 501.65 Retaliation by Lender, Creditor, or Other Person

§ 501.66 Temporary Debt Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

[1] Service Members Who Qualify for Relief

[2] Option to Defer Payments on Debts

[a] Debts Eligible for Deferred-Payment Option

[b] Procedure to Obtain Deferment

[c] Relief During Deferment Period

[d] Effect on Holder in Due Course

[e] No Adverse Effect on Creditworthiness

[3] Continuation of Credit Disability Insurance

§ 501.67 Additional Relief for Service Members and Families

[1] Who Qualifies for Relief

[2] Relief Under Retail Installment Contracts

[a] Termination of Cell Phone Contract Without Penalty

[b] Equal-Payments Plan for Debt Remaining After Termination of Vehicle Lease

§§ 501.68through 501.69 [Reserved]

§ 501.70 California Legal Forms

§ 501.71 Federal Statutes

[1] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act

[2] Truth In Lending Act

§ 501.72 Federal Regulations

§ 501.73 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

[2] Disclosures and Notices

[3] Remedies

[4] Requirements and Restrictions

§ 501.74 Decisions

[1] Disclosures

[2] Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

[a] Purpose

[b] Transactions Covered

[c] Transactions Not Covered

[3] Remedies

[a] In General

[b] Rescission Under Truth in Lending Act

§ 501.75 Law Reviews

§§ 501.76through 501.99 [Reserved]

§ 501.100 Complaint for Recovery of Finance Charges Paid on Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code § 1812.7]

After Seller's Violation of RISA--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

[4] Allegations

[5] Right to Recover Finance Charges Paid Under Contract Violating RISA

[6] Venue in Action Brought Under RISA

[7] Verification

[8] Cross References

§ 501.101 Complaint for Recovery of Statutory Penalty [Civ. Code § 1812.9] After Seller's Willful Violation of RISA Provisions Concerning Finance Charges on Consolidated Contracts

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

§ 501.102 Declaration of Proper Venue for Action on Retail Installment Sale [Civ. Code § 1812.10; Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Venue

[4] Requirement That Affidavit Be Filed

[5] Late Filing of Affidavit

§ 501.103 [Reserved]

§ 501.104 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Seller Violated Single Document Rule [Civ. Code § 1803.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 501.105 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Disclose All Required Information [Civ. Code §§ 1803.2, 1803.3, 1807.2, 1808.3, 1810.1, 1810.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Disclosure Requirements of RISA

§ 501.106 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Fill in Blanks Prior to Obtaining Buyer's Signature [Civ. Code § 1803.4]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 501.107 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Provide Buyer With Copy of Contract [Civ. Code § 1803.7]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Seller's Obligation to Provide Buyer With Copy of Contract

§ 501.108 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Inclusion of Prohibited Provision in Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1804.1, 1804.4]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Prohibited Contractual Provisions

§ 501.109 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Excessive Finance Charge Imposed [Civ. Code §§ 1805.1, 1810.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 501.110through 501.119 [Reserved]

§ 501.120 Affirmative Defense to Creditor's Action Against Cosigner on Consumer Credit Contract-Failure to Comply With Cosigner Liability Notice Requirements [Civ. Code § 1799.95; see Civ. Code §§ 1799.90-1799.99]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 501.121through 501.129 [Reserved]

§ 501.130 Complaint for Balance Due on Buyer's Default Under Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1812.2, 1810.10]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

[4] Allegations

[5] Interest

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Limitation of Action

[8] Verification

[9] Cross References

§§ 501.131-501.139 [Reserved]

§ 501.140 Affirmative Defense to Buyer's Action Based on Seller's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [Civ. Code § 1812.8]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 501.141through 501.199 [Reserved]

§ 501.200 Complaint for Damages, Statutory Penalty, Costs, and Attorney's Fees Based on Violation of TILA [15 U.S.C. §§ 1638, 1640]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Applicability of Statutory Penalty

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Cross References

§ 501.201 Complaint for Restitution After Rescission of Credit Transaction Creating Security Interest in Buyer's Residence [15 U.S.C. § 1635]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Right to Rescind Certain Transactions

[4] Exempted Transactions

[5] Time Limit on Right to Rescind

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Cross References

§§ 501.202-501.209 [Reserved]

§ 501.210 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [15 U.S.C. § 1640(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 501.211 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Unintentional and Bona Fide Error [15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 501.212 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Good Faith Compliance and Conformity With Written Opinion of Approval of Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System [15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 501.213through 501.299 [Reserved]

§ 501.300 Application for Stay of Enforcement of Pre-Existing Obligation During Period of Military Service [15 U.S.C. § 591, Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Governing Law

[4] Who May Invoke Relief Provisions

[a] Federal Statute

[b] California Statute

[c] Dependents

[5] Stay of Obligation or Liability

[a] Application for Relief

[b] Notice and Hearing

[c] Discretion of Court to Grant or Deny Relief

[d] Relief from Mortgages or Installment Contracts for Purchase of Real Estate

[e] Relief From Other Obligations

[f] Other Effects of Relief

[g] Limitations with Respect to Child Support Obligations

[6] Contents of Form

[7] Cross References

§ 501.301 Defense to Action on Obligation or Liability--Application (Motion) for Temporary Relief From Obligation on Ground Person Is or Was In Active Military Service After Entering Into Obligation [50 U.S.C. App. § 591; Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Governing Law and Eligibility for Relief

[4] Stay of Pre-Existing Obligation

[5] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

[6] Cross References

§ 501.302 Affirmative Defense to Action on Interest-Bearing Obligation--Annual Rate of Interest May Not Exceed 6 Percent per Year During Period of Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 527; Mil. & Vet. Code § 405]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Governing Law

[4] Enforcement

[5] Cross References

§ 501.303 Defense to Action on Contract for Purchase of Personal Property--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532; Mil. & Vet. Code § 407]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Governing Law

[4] Rescission or Termination of Installment Contract; Repossession

[5] Stay of Proceeding

[6] Who May Request Stay

[7] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

[8] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART I. SCOPE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.01

§ 501.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter focuses on credit disclosure requirements as they apply to retail installment sales of personal property, and services for other than commercial or business use. It discusses the requirements of the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801*], also known as the Retail Installment Sales Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*; hereinafter referred to as RISA) and similar or parallel provisions of the federal Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*; referred to as TILA), insofar as that act affects retail installment sales, as well as certain notice requirements to cosigners of retail installment contracts or accounts [*Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.*]. Rights and remedies of consumer litigants as well as the defenses available to creditors are treated. Discussion and forms relating to the special protections available under California and federal law with respect to pre-existing obligations incurred by military personnel serving on active duty [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] are also discussed [*see §§ 501.60 et seq., 501.300* et seq.].

Included are forms for complaints by a buyer to recover the following:

- Statutory penalties from a seller for violations of RISA [*see § 501.100*].
- Statutory penalties based on a willful violation by a seller of the provisions of RISA pertaining to finance charges on a consolidated total of two or more contracts [*see § 501.101*].
- Damages and statutory penalties for violations of TILA [*see § 501.200*].
- The consideration paid under a contract rescinded pursuant to TILA [*see § 501.201*].

This chapter also contains the following forms:

- Allegations of violations of a number of specific provisions of RISA [*see §§ 501.104 -501.109*].
- A seller's affirmative defenses based on the provisions of RISA [*see § 501.140*] and TILA [*see §§ 501.210 -501.212*].

- A declaration of proper venue which must be filed with the complaint in any action on a contract or account subject to RISA [*see § 501.102*].

- A complaint by a seller against a buyer who defaults on a contract that is subject to RISA [*see § 501.130*].

- A buyer cosigner's affirmative defense based on the creditor's failure to comply with liability notice requirements [*see § 501.120*].

- An application for stay of enforcement of pre-existing obligation during the period of the applicant's military service [*see § 501.300*].

- An application (motion) for temporary relief from an obligation on the ground that the person is or was in active military service after entering into the obligation [*see § 501.301*].

- An affirmative defense to an action on an interest-bearing obligation on the ground that the annual rate of interest may not exceed 6 percent per year during the period of the defendant's military service [*see § 501.302*].

- An application (motion) in an action on a contract for the purchase of personal property for a stay of proceedings on the ground that the defendant is on active military service [*see § 501.303*].

This chapter does not discuss automotive sales and leases, credit advertising, credit reporting, credit transactions under credit cards issued by persons other than retail sellers, discrimination in the extension of credit, home solicitation sales, unsolicited goods or services, discount buying services, open-end credit accounts with financing institutions unless those accounts come within the terms of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1801.6*], installment loans of financing institutions, service contracts other than those related to a sale of goods regulated by RISA, or real estate sales purchased with federally related mortgage loans.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART I. SCOPE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.02

§ 501.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to credit advertising, *see* Ch. 14, *Advertising* , and Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

- For discussion and forms relating to actions involving leases and conditional sales of motor vehicles, *see* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* and Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act* .

- For discussion and forms relating to actions involving warranty and tort liability of automobile manufacturers, dealers, and repairers, *see* Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .

- For discussion and forms relating to class actions, *see* Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

- For discussion and forms relating to credit reporting, credit cards, credit transactions regarding women, dance and health studio contracts, home solicitation contracts, unsolicited goods or services, and discount buying services, *see* Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* and Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

- For discussion and forms relating to declaratory relief, *see* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

- For sales governed by the Commercial Code, *see* Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales under the Commercial Code* .

- For actions by persons, whether buyers or others, who have been injured by defective products, against sellers, manufacturers, and others, *see* Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* (addressing the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*]), and Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

- For discussion and forms regarding the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (*Civ. Code § 1770 et seq.*), *see* Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* .

- For discussion and legal forms relating to credit cards, open-end credit accounts with financing institutions, revolving charge accounts, installments, leases, and the Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act (*Civ. Code § 1785.1*), see California Legal Forms, Ch. 45, *Consumer Installment Loans and Credit Sales* ; Ch. 46, *Credit Card and Other Open-End Credit Transactions*; Ch. 92, *Service Contracts* (Matthew Bender).

- For transaction guides and forms covering credit transactions involving security interests in real property, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25, *Real Estate Loans* ; Ch. 25A, *Security Instruments for Real Estate Financing* (Matthew Bender).

- For a notice of rescission of transactions involving real property security interests, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 45, *Consumer Installment Loans and Credit Sales* (Matthew Bender); *see also 15 U.S.C. §§ 1635* (right of rescission), *1640(d)* (liability of subsequent assignees), and *1641* (written acknowledgment of receipt of disclosures required by *15 U.S.C. § 1635* as proof of receipt).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART I. SCOPE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.03through 501.09

[Reserved]

§§ 501.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.10

§ 501.10 Governing Law

[1] State Statutes

The provisions of the Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA) are set out in *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*

- *Civ. Code §§ 1801-1801.7* set forth general provisions applicable to all retail installment sales transactions entered into in California, whether made under a retail installment contract or an installment account.

- Definitions applicable to retail installment sales are set forth in *Civ. Code § 1803.1 et seq.* and *§ 1802.21 et seq.*

- Provisions governing the retail installment contract, including restrictions, finance charge limitations, payments, refinancing and consolidation, and treatment of add-on sales, are set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1803.1-1808.6*.

- Purchase by a financing agency of a retail installment contract or an installment account is governed by *Civ. Code § 1809.1*.

- Provisions governing retail installment accounts are set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1810.1-1810.11*.

- Attorney's fees and court costs in actions on both retail installment contracts and installment accounts are set forth in *Civ. Code § 1811.1*.

- Procedures for repossession and resale after a default in payment under a retail installment contract or an installment account are set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1812.2-1812.5*.

- Statutory penalties and buyer remedies for seller violations of RISA are provided in *Civ. Code §§*

1812.6-1812.9.

- The proper place for trial of an action on a retail installment contract or an installment account is determined by *Civ. Code § 1812.10*.

- *Civ. Code § 1812.20* prohibits any person from requiring a purchaser of goods or services to obtain financing from any particular source.

- Criminal liability for violation of RISA is proscribed by *Civ. Code § 1812.6*.

Disclosure and notice requirements, applicable when consumer credit contracts involve cosigners who are not married to each other are governed by *Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.* Confidentiality of information obtained from a federal or state income tax return submitted by a consumer in connection with a financial or other business-related transaction is governed by *Civ. Code § 1799.1a*.

[2] Truth in Lending Act (TILA)

Federal credit disclosure requirements as prescribed by the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) are set out in *15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.* and are in addition to the requirements of RISA.

For a description of how TILA is organized and what topics are covered by the provisions in each part, see *Ch. 127, Consumer Contracts and Loans, § 127.21*.

[3] Federal Regulations; Regulation Z

Regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in compliance with TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1604(a)*] for the purpose of implementing and enforcing TILA are contained in Regulation Z, *12 C.F.R. § 226.1 et seq.*

Regulation Z refers to any rule, regulation, or interpretation promulgated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under TILA, and any interpretation or approval issued by an official or employee of the Federal Reserve System duly authorized by the board under TILA to issue interpretations or approvals [*Civ. Code § 1802.18*].

[4] Effect of Federal Requirements on State Law

[a] TILA Supersedes Inconsistent State Law

TILA does not annul, alter or affect, or exempt any creditor from complying with the laws of California relating to the disclosure of information in credit transactions, except to the extent that the California law is inconsistent with the provisions of TILA or Regulation Z, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1610(a)*]. A state law is inconsistent if it requires a creditor to make disclosures or take actions that contradict the requirements of federal law. A state law is contradictory if it requires the use of the same term to represent a different amount or a different meaning than the federal law, or if it requires the use of a term different from that required in the federal law to describe the same term [*12 C.F.R. § 226.28(a)(1)*]. A creditor, state, or other interested party may request the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to determine whether a state law requirement is inconsistent with TILA. If the board determines that the state requirement is inconsistent, creditors located in that state may not make disclosures using the inconsistent term or form, and will incur no liability for failure to use the term or form, notwithstanding that the board's determination is subsequently amended, rescinded, or determined to be invalid by judicial or other authority for any reason [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1610(a)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.28(a)(1)*].

Any creditor, state, or other interested party may request the board to determine whether any state-required disclosure is

substantially the same in meaning as a disclosure required by TILA or Regulation Z. If the board determines that the state-required disclosure is substantially the same in meaning as that required by TILA or Regulation Z, creditors located in that state may make the state-required disclosure in lieu of the federally required disclosure, except that the annual percentage rate and finance charge must be disclosed as required by *15 U.S.C. § 1632*, and the disclosure applicable to certain mortgages must be made as required by *15 U.S.C. § 1639* [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1610(a)(2)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.28(b)*].

[b] When TILA Disclosures Satisfy RISA

Notwithstanding any provision of RISA to the contrary, any information required to be disclosed in a retail installment contract or other document under RISA may be disclosed in any manner, method, or terminology required or permitted under Regulation Z, as in effect at the time the disclosure is made, except that permitted by *12 C.F.R. § 226.18(c)(2)* (relating to itemization of amount financed), provided that all of the requirements and limitations set forth in *Civ. Code § 1803.3(b)* are satisfied. Nothing contained in RISA may be deemed to prohibit the disclosure in the contract or other document of additional information required or permitted under Regulation Z, as in effect at the time the disclosure is made [*Civ. Code § 1801.5*; *see Civ. Code § 1802.18* ("Regulation Z" defined, discussed in [3], *above*)].

[5] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Similar California Legislation

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, obligations, and liabilities, including pre-existing installment obligations, for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The latter statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. For detailed discussion of the relief available under these statutes, the manner in which such relief can be requested, and the persons who qualify for this relief, see *§§ 501.60 et seq., 501.300*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.11

§ 501.11 Retail Installment Sales Act Definitions

[1] Goods

RISA defines "goods" as tangible chattels bought for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, including certificates or coupons exchangeable for those goods, and including goods which, at the time of sale or subsequently, are to be so affixed to real property as to become a part of it, whether or not severable from it. The term does not include any vehicle required to be registered under the Vehicle Code, nor any goods sold or leased with the vehicle if sold under a contract governed by *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.* (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act) or leased under a contract governed by *Civ. Code § 2985.7* (vehicle leasing act). "Goods" also includes a trailer that is sold in conjunction with a vessel, as defined in *Veh. Code § 9840(a)*, unless the sales transaction is exempted under *Civ. Code § 1801.4*. As used in this definition, "trailer" means a vehicle designed solely for carrying vessels [*Civ. Code § 1802.1*]. The purchaser's intent at the time the contract is entered into determines whether the goods are for personal, family, or household purposes [*Cessna Finance Corp. v. Pivo (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 281, 287, 129 Cal. Rptr. 888]* .

[2] Retail Buyer

A "retail buyer" or "buyer" is a person who buys goods or obtains services from a retail seller in a retail installment sale and not principally for the purpose of resale [*Civ. Code § 1802.4*].

[3] Retail Installment Sale

A "retail installment sale" is defined as the sale of goods or furnishing of services by a retail seller to a retail buyer for a deferred payment price which is payable in installments [*Civ. Code § 1802.5*]. Retail installment sales are divided by RISA into two types of transactions: retail installment contracts and retail installment accounts [*see* discussion in *§ 501.22*].

[4] Retail Seller

A "retail seller" is any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other group, however organized, which is engaged in the business of selling goods or furnishing services [as defined in [5], *below*] to retail buyers [*Civ. Code § 1802.3*; *see Civ. Code § 1802.15* (definition of "person")].

The provisions of RISA may also apply to assignees in certain instances [*see Civ. Code § 1804.2*; *see also* discussion in *§ 501.50[5]*].

[5] Services

"Services" means work, labor, and services, for other than commercial or business use, including services furnished in connection with the sale or repair of goods as defined in *Civ. Code § 1802.1* or furnished in connection with the repair of motor vehicles (except for service contracts defined by *Civ. Code § 2981(p)* which are sold in conjunction with the sale or lease of a vehicle required to be registered under the Vehicle Code) or furnished in connection with the improvement of real property or the providing of insurance. The term does not include the services of physicians or dentists, nor services for which the tariffs, rates, charges, costs, or expenses, including in each instance the deferred payment price, are required by law to be filed with and approved by the federal government or any official, department, division, commission, or agency of the United States [*Civ. Code § 1802.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.12

§ 501.12 Truth In Lending Act Definitions

[1] Consumer Credit

Under TILA, consumer credit is credit that is offered or extended to a natural person, primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(h)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(11), (12)*].

[2] Credit

Under TILA the term "credit" means the right granted by a creditor to a debtor to defer payment of a debt or to incur a debt and defer its payment [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(e)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(14)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.2(b)(2)* ("obligation" and "transaction" in Regulation Z refer to consumer credit obligation or transaction, depending on context, and "credit" means consumer credit unless context clearly indicates otherwise)].

[3] Creditor

A "creditor" within the meaning of TILA is any person or organization who both (1) regularly extends consumer credit that is subject to a finance charge or is payable by agreement in more than four installments (not including a downpayment), and (2) is the person to whom the debt arising from the consumer credit transaction is initially payable, either on the face of the evidence of indebtedness, or, if there is no evidence of indebtedness, by agreement [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(17)(i)*]. The term "creditor" includes certain persons who issue credit cards and those who honor the credit cards, under certain circumstances [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(17)(ii)-(iv)*]. The term "creditor" also includes persons who originate certain mortgages [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*; *see also 15 U.S.C. § 1602(aa)* ("mortgage" defined as consumer credit transaction secured by consumer's principal dwelling, other than residential mortgage transaction, reverse mortgage transaction, or transaction under open end credit plan, if certain conditions are met)].

[4] Credit Sale

A "credit sale" is any sale in which the seller is a creditor. "Credit sale" includes contracts in the form of a bailment or

lease if the bailee or lessee agrees to pay, as compensation for use, a sum substantially equivalent to, or in excess of, the value of the property or services involved for use thereof, and it is agreed that the bailee or lessee will become, or has the option of becoming, for no added cost or for nominal consideration, the owner of the property on full compliance with his or her obligations under the contract [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(g)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.13 through 501.19

[Reserved]

§§ 501.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.20

§ 501.20 Purpose of Credit Disclosure Laws

[1] To Aid Consumer in Making Comparisons

RISA (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) and TILA (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*) are designed to regulate retail installment sales of consumer goods and services, and assure meaningful disclosure of credit terms so that consumers may compare the various forms of credit available and avoid the uninformed use of credit [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1601(a)* (purpose of *TILA); Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 823, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964 (RISA to be liberally construed to protect consumers)]* . The provisions of TILA apply to a broader range of transactions, but only those provisions applicable to retail installment sales of consumer goods and services are addressed in this chapter.

[2] RISA Waiver Is Void

Any waiver by the buyer of the provisions of RISA is unenforceable and void as contrary to public policy [*Civ. Code § 1801.1*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.21

§ 501.21 Transactions and Persons Governed by Credit Disclosure Laws

[1] Retail Installment Sales Act

[a] Transactions to Which RISA Applies

RISA applies to all retail installment sales transacted in California [*see Civ. Code § 1802.5* ("retail installment sale" defined, discussed in *§ 501.11[3]*]. Any of the following occurrences is deemed to have been made within California state, thereby triggering the operation of RISA:

- An offer or agreement by a seller in California, to sell to a buyer who is a California resident, or an offer or acceptance of a buyer in California, regardless of the situs of the contract as specified therein [*Civ. Code § 1802.19(a)*];

- Any oral or written solicitation or communication to sell, originating outside California, but forwarded to, and received in California by, a buyer who is a California resident [*Civ. Code § 1802.19(b)*]; or

- Any oral or written solicitation or communication to buy, originating within California, from a buyer who is a California resident, but forwarded to, and received by, a retail seller outside of California [*Civ. Code § 1802.19(c)*].

The provisions of RISA may also apply to assignees in certain instances [*see Civ. Code § 1804.2*; *see also* discussion in *§ 501.50[5]*].

[b] Transactions to Which RISA Does Not Apply

[i] Sales of Vehicles

RISA does not apply to contracts for the sale of a vehicle required to be registered under the Vehicle Code, or to goods

sold or leased with that vehicle, if the sale is subject to the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) or if the lease is governed by the Vehicle Leasing Act (*Civ. Code § 2985.7 et seq.*). A trailer sold in conjunction with a vessel, as defined in *Veh. Code § 9840(a)*, is subject to RISA unless the transaction is exempted under *Civ. Code § 1801.4* [*Civ. Code § 1802.1*].

[ii] Construction

RISA does not apply to any contract for either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1801.4*]:

- The construction and/or sale of an entire residence or all or part of a structure designed for commercial or industrial occupancy, with or without a parcel of real property or an interest in one.

- The sale of a lot or parcel of real property, including any site preparation incidental to the sale.

[iii] Sales of Vessels or Aircraft

RISA also does not apply to any contract for either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1801.4*]:

- The sale of any aircraft required to be registered under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

- The sale of any vessel as defined in *Veh. Code § 9840(a)* if the cash price of the vessel, including accessories and equipment sold in conjunction with it, exceeds $25,000.

[iv] Transactions by Supervised Financial Institutions

The provisions of RISA are also inapplicable to any transaction in the form of a loan made by a "supervised financial organization" to a buyer of goods or services if all or a portion of the loan proceeds are used to purchase those goods or services, regardless of whether the seller arranges the loan or participates in the preparation of loan documents. RISA does apply, however, if the seller and the supervised financial organization (1) are related by common ownership and control and the relationship was a material factor in the loan transaction, or (2) share in the profits and losses of either or both the sale and the loan [*Civ. Code § 1801.6(b)*].

Receipt of a loan commission, brokerage, or referral fee by a seller from a supervised financial organization does not constitute a sharing of profits of the supervised financial organization, provided that the payment (1) is reasonable under the circumstances existing at the time the loan is consummated, and (2) is not refundable or is wholly or partly refundable only if the loan is voluntarily paid in full prior to its scheduled maturity. A loan commission, brokerage, or referral fee not exceeding the greater of one percent of the amount financed (as that term is defined by Regulation Z with respect to loans), or $20, is deemed reasonable under the circumstances existing at the time the loan is consummated, for purposes of this provision [*Civ. Code § 1801.6(c)(2)*]. Likewise, payment of money by a seller to a supervised financial organization pursuant to an actual or alleged contractual or statutory obligation to indemnify a supervised financial organization for losses incurred as a result of the assertion by a buyer of claims or defenses with respect to the goods or services purchased with loan proceeds does not constitute participation in or sharing of loan losses by the seller [*Civ. Code § 1801.6(c)(3)*].

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 1801.6*, the term "supervised financial organization" means a person [*see Civ. Code § 1802.15* (definition of "person" under RISA)] organized, chartered, or holding a license or authorization to make loans pursuant to the laws of California or the United States, who is subject to supervision by an official or agency of California or the United States [*Civ. Code § 1801.6(c)(1)*].

[v] Transactions by Other Licensed Lenders

The California Finance Lenders Law (*Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*), which supplanted the Personal Property Brokers Law (*Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*) and the Consumer Finance Lenders Law (former *Fin. Code § 24000 et seq.*), effective July 1, 1995 [Stats. 1994, ch. 1115], provides that RISA does not apply to loans made to refinance a retail installment contract by any finance lender or broker licensed under the California Finance Lenders Law. For a discussion of refinancing retail installment contracts under RISA, including brief discussions of the refinancing provisions, which were operative until July 1, 1995, that applied to loans made under the Personal Property Brokers Law and the Consumer Finance Lenders Law and of the comparable refinancing provisions that apply to loans made under the California Finance Lenders Law, which became operative on July 1, 1995, see *§ 501.36*.

[2] Truth In Lending Act

[a] Transactions to Which TILA Applies

Any creditor within the meaning of TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*, discussed in *§ 501.12[3]*], must comply with TILA, regardless of whether credit is extended in connection with loans, sales of property or services, or otherwise [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(17)(i)*]. TILA applies to any credit sale to a consumer [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(g)*; *see* definition of "credit sale" in § 501.12[4]].

With regard to consumer loans and leases, TILA is broader in scope than RISA. TILA is not limited to governing only loans made by a supervised financial organization under circumstances as described in *Civ. Code § 1801.6* [*see* discussion in [1][b][iv], *above*]. Rather, TILA governs all consumer loans offered or extended by lenders which do not constitute a consumer credit sale [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)* (definition of "creditor" applicable to persons who regularly extend consumer credit in connection with loans)]. In addition to the leases governed by *15 U.S.C. § 1602(g)*, discussed in *§ 501.12[4]*, for which RISA contains a parallel provision [*see Civ. Code § 1802.6*; *see also* discussion in [1], *above*], TILA governs all other consumer leases, as well [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1667-1667e* (consumer lease provisions)]. For discussions and forms respecting loans and leases outside the scope of RISA, see the discussion in *§ 501.01*.

Unlike RISA, however, TILA is solely a disclosure statute. TILA does not contain substantive limitations on the types of provisions that may be included in consumer credit contracts, nor does it limit the amount of finance charges which may be made, as does RISA.

[b] Transactions to Which TILA Does Not Apply

TILA does not apply to the following transactions [*12 C.F.R. § 226.3*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1603*]:

- An extension of credit primarily for a business, commercial, or agricultural purpose.

- An extension of credit to other than a natural person, including credit to government agencies or instrumentalities.

- An extension of credit in which the amount financed exceeds $25,000 or in which there is an express written commitment to extend credit in excess of $25,000, except that TILA does apply, regardless of the amount of credit, to extensions of credit in which a security interest is or will be acquired in real property, or in personal property used or expected to be used as the principal dwelling, of the consumer [*12 C.F.R. § 226.3(b)*] and to private education loans subject to *15 U.S.C. § 1650* [*15 U.S.C. § 1603(3)*].

- An extension of credit that involves public utility services provided through pipe, wire, other connected facilities, or radio or similar transmission (including extensions of those facilities), if the charges for service, delayed payment, or any discounts for prompt payment are filed with or regulated by any government unit. The financing of durable goods or home improvements by a public utility is not

exempt from the provisions of TILA.

- Transactions in securities or commodities accounts in which credit is extended by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

- An installment agreement for the purchase of home fuels in which no finance charge is imposed.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.22

§ 501.22 Classification of Credit Plans

[1] In General

Both RISA and TILA divide credit transactions into two types. Each type of transaction is subject to a separate set of statutory regulations.

[2] RISA

[a] Retail Installment Contract

A retail installment contract is any contract for a retail installment sale [*see Civ. Code § 1802.5* (defining "retail installment sale")], between a buyer and seller, entered into in California [*see* discussion in *§ 501.21[1][a]*], which provides for [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*]:

- Repayment in installments, whether or not the contract contains a title retention provision, and in which the buyer (a) agrees to pay a finance charge; or (b) does not agree to pay a finance charge, but the goods or services are available at a lesser price if paid for by cash or credit card; or (c) would have received additional or higher quality goods or services at no added cost above the total amount payable in installments had the sale been for cash; or

- Payment in more than four installments.

When taken in connection with a retail installment sale, a retail installment contract includes but is not limited to a security agreement. It also includes a contract for the bailment or leasing of goods by which the bailee or lessee contracts to pay as compensation for their use a sum substantially equivalent to or in excess of their value and by which is agreed that the bailee or lessee will become, or has the option of becoming, for no other or nominal consideration, the owner of the goods on full compliance with the terms of the contract [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*].

[b] Add-on Sales

A retail installment contract [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*] made in compliance with RISA may contain a provision allowing the buyer to make subsequent purchases under the contract, thereby increasing the amount due on the contract by the price of the additional purchases. The provision may provide that all finance charges and installments, may, at the seller's option, be increased proportionately, and that all terms and conditions of the contract apply equally to the additional purchases. The provision may also provide that add-on purchases be secured by the goods purchased under the previous contract, but only until all payments thereunder are paid [*Civ. Code § 1808.1*; *compare 15 U.S.C. § 1638(d)* discussed in [3][a], *below*]. For a further discussion of the add-on sales provisions of RISA, see *§ 501.37*.

[c] Retail Installment Account

Retail installment accounts, also known as installment accounts or revolving accounts, are defined as accounts established by an agreement entered into in California [*see* discussion in *§ 501.21[1][a]*] by which a buyer promises to make installment payments to the retail seller with whom the buyer has contracted for the purpose of liquidating the outstanding balance the buyer has incurred in making retail installment purchases, and which provides for payment of a finance charge. The retail installment account is distinguished from the retail installment contract [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*; *see* discussion in [a], *above*] by the fact that the retail installment account finance charge is expressed as a percentage of the periodic balance rather than as a stated dollar amount or capitalized item [*Civ. Code § 1802.7*].

[3] TILA

[a] Closed-end Credit Plan

The TILA counterpart to the RISA retail installment contract [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*; *see* discussion in [2][a], *above*] is the closed-end credit plan, which refers to any extension of consumer credit other than open-end credit [*12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(10)*; *see* discussion at [b], *below*; *see also 15 U.S.C. § 1638*; *12 C.F.R. §§ 226.17, 226.18* (setting forth specific disclosures required)]. Like RISA, TILA contains provisions for add-on sales under a closed-end credit plan contract [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1638(d)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(h)*].

[b] Open-end Credit Plan

The counterpart to the RISA retail installment account [*Civ. Code § 1802.7*] is the TILA open-end credit plan. Open-end credit is consumer credit extended by a creditor under a plan in which all of the following are true [*12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(20)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(i)*]:

- The creditor reasonably contemplates repeated transactions.
- The creditor may impose a finance charge from time to time on an outstanding unpaid balance.
- The amount of credit that may be extended to the consumer during the term of the plan (up to any limit set by the creditor) is generally made available to the extent that any outstanding balance is repaid.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.23through 501.29

[Reserved]

§§ 501.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.30

§ 501.30 Disclosures to Cosigners Required for Various Types of Credit

[1] Types of Credit Included

The requirements and penalties of *Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.* apply to the following types of credit [*Civ. Code § 1799.90*; *see also Civ. Code § 1799.99* discussed in [6], *below*]:

- Retail installment contracts, as defined in *Civ. Code § 1802.6*.

- Retail installment accounts, as defined in *Civ. Code § 1802.7*.

- Conditional sales contracts as defined in *Civ. Code § 2981* (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act).

- Loans or extension of credit secured by other than real property, or unsecured, for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

- Loans or extension of credit for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes if the loan or extension of credit is subject to the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.* (loans negotiated by real estate licensees), *Fin. Code § 18000 et seq.* (industrial loan companies), or *Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.* (finance lenders), whether secured by real property or otherwise.

- Lease contracts as defined in *Civ. Code § 2985.7(d)*.

[2] Notice Requirement

Unless the borrowers are married to each other, whenever a creditor obtains the signature of more than one person on a consumer credit contract, the notice must be delivered to each person who does not in fact receive any money, property, or services which are the subject matter of the contract. The notice must be given prior to the time that person becomes obligated on the contract, and it must be given in Spanish and English [*Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)*]. If the consumer credit

contract is written in a language other than Spanish or English, the notice must be given in English and in the language in which the contract is written [*Civ. Code § 1799.91(b)*]. The creditor may not obtain the signature of any person entitled to notice if the consumer credit contract contains blank spaces to be filled in after the person's signature has been obtained [*Civ. Code § 1799.93(a)*].

In the case of a motor vehicle lease contract on which the lessor obtains the signature of more than one person, unless the persons are married to each other, the lessor must deliver to each person who does not in fact receive the vehicle that is the subject of the lease contract, before that person becomes liable on the lease contract, a prescribed notice in English and Spanish or possibly another language [*see Civ. Code § 1799.91(b)*], in lieu of the notice prescribed in *Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)* [*Civ. Code § 1799.91(d)*].

[3] Exceptions

The notice requirements of *Civ. Code § 1799.91(a), (b)* do not apply to open-end credit as defined in Regulation Z or extended to joint applicants if both of the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 1799.91(c)*; *see Civ. Code § 1799.91(e)* (Regulation Z has same meaning as set forth in *Civ. Code § 1802.18*, discussed in *§ 501.10[3*])]:

- The application or agreement signed by each applicant clearly and conspicuously discloses that after credit approval each applicant shall have the right to use the open-end credit plan to the extent of any limit set by the creditor and may be liable for all amounts extended under the plan to any joint applicant; and

- After credit approval, the creditor issues for the use of each applicant any credit device, such as a credit card, which may be used to obtain credit under the open-end credit plan and sends the credit device to the address specified in the application or otherwise delivers the credit device in a manner specified in the application or agreement signed by each applicant. This requirement does not apply to a creditor who does not issue a credit card or other credit device to obtain credit under the creditor's open-end credit plan.

If federal law or regulations require or permit the use of a notice substantially similar to the *Civ. Code § 1799.91* notice, the use of the federally sanctioned notice and an accurate Spanish translation of that notice constitutes compliance with *Civ. Code § 1799.91*, but the other provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 1799.90-1799.99* remain unaffected [*Civ. Code § 1799.96*; *see Civ. Code § 1799.99* discussed in [6], *below*].

[4] Size, Placement, and Content of Notice

The notice is entitled NOTICE TO COSIGNER and AVISO PARA EL FIADOR. The form of notice is prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)* and informs the cosigner, in English and in Spanish, that, among other things, he or she may be held liable for the full amount, plus collection costs, and late fees, if the borrower does not pay, and that default may become part of his or her credit record.

The notice must be set forth in both languages in at least 10-point type [*Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)*]. If the notice is included in the consumer credit contract or other document establishing liability, it must appear either directly above the space for signature or above or adjacent to any other notices legally required to be placed immediately above the signature space. It must be contained in a box formed by a heavy line [*Civ. Code § 1799.92(a)*]. If the notice is not included in the contract, it must be on a separate sheet which must not contain any other text except as necessary to identify the creditor and the consumer credit contract to which it refers and to provide for the date and the person's acknowledgment of receipt [*Civ. Code § 1799.92(b)*].

[5] Other Documents That Must Be Given

In addition to the notice, each person entitled to the notice must receive a copy of the debt instrument and security agreement or deed of trust, if any, evidencing the consumer credit contract, as well as a copy of the document evidencing that person's obligation and a copy of the notice [*Civ. Code § 1799.93(b)*].

[6] Effect of Noncompliance

A creditor who fails to comply with *Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.*, or any assignee of that creditor, cannot bring an action or enforce a security interest against any person, however designated, who is entitled to notice under *Civ. Code § 1799.91* and who does not in fact receive any of the money, property, or services that are the subject matter of the consumer credit contract [*Civ. Code § 1799.95*; *see Engstrom v. Kallins (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 773, 778-779, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842]* . However, this does not affect the rights of a bona fide purchaser for value of property sold pursuant to the enforcement of a security interest if the purchase was made without notice of any facts constituting a violation of *Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1799.95*; for a form for an affirmative defense, *see § 501.120*].

Additionally, if a transaction is not one of the consumer credit contracts described in *Civ. Code § 1799.90* but is subject to the provisions of *12 C.F.R. § 227.14* (consumer credit extended by bank or subsidiary that is not member of Federal Home Loan Bank Board), *12 C.F.R. § 535.3* (consumer credit extended by member institutions of Federal Home Loan Bank Board), or *16 C.F.R. § 444.3* (credit regulated by Federal Trade Commission), unless the persons who are obligated under the transaction are married to each other, no action may be brought, and no security interest enforced, against the persons entitled to receive notice under *12 C.F.R. §§ 227.14* or *535.3* or *16 C.F.R. § 444.3*, whichever is applicable, if that person did not receive the notice in the manner prescribed by the applicable regulation and an accurate Spanish translation [*Civ. Code § 1799.99*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.31

§ 501.31 Required Formalities and Disclosures for Retail Installment Contracts

[1] In General

The disclosure requirements discussed in [2]-[11], *below*, are those prescribed by RISA. Applicable TILA disclosure requirements are discussed in *§ 501.32*.

[2] Dated and Written Document Required

Every retail installment contract must be dated and in writing [*Civ. Code § 1803.1*].

[3] Translation of Contract Negotiated in Language Other than English

If a language other than English is the primary language used for negotiations with a consumer, the consumer may have to be provided with a translation of the contract in that other language. For contracts entered into prior to July 1, 2004, this requirement is applicable only to contracts negotiated primarily in Spanish. On and after July 1, 2004, it is applicable to contracts negotiated primarily in Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese, or Korean [*see Civ. Code § 1632*].

Generally, any person engaged in a trade or business who negotiates primarily in the other language, orally or in writing, in the course of entering into a contract or agreement subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act, must deliver to the lessee, before he or she executes the contract or agreement, a translation of the contract or agreement in the other language, which includes a translation of every term and condition in that contract or agreement [*Civ. Code § 1632(b)(1)*]. At the time and place for entering into the contract or agreement, a notice in the other language must be conspicuously displayed, to the effect that the seller is required to provide a contract or agreement in the other language in which the contract or agreement was negotiated [*Civ. Code § 1632(f)*]. However, these requirements do not apply if the buyer negotiates using his or her own interpreter who is fluent and literate in both English and the other language and who is not employed or furnished by the seller [*Civ. Code § 1632(h)*]. Noncompliance with the foreign-language requirements is a ground for rescission of the contract or agreement by the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1632(k)*].

For a more detailed discussion of *Civ. Code § 1632*, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* . For a discussion of, and forms for use in, an action to rescind a contract, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

[4] Printing and Notice Requirements

The printed portion of a retail installment contract must be in at least 8-point type [*Civ. Code § 1803.1*]. If a security interest in the goods purchased is retained or a lien on other goods or realty is obtained by the seller as security for the purchase, the contract must be labeled, in at least 12-point bold type: "Security Agreement." When the seller does not retain a security interest or lien, the contract must be clearly labeled, in at least 12-point bold type: "Retail Installment Contract" [*Civ. Code § 1803.2(b)(1), (2)*]. The buyer must also be alerted not to sign the contract before he or she has read it or if it contains any blank spaces, and must be notified of his or her right to a completely filled-in copy of the agreement [*see Civ. Code § 1803.2(c)-(e)*].

The contract must also contain a notice, in at least 10-point boldface, alerting the buyer of his or her right to prepay the full amount due on the contract and, depending on the method of computation of the finance charge, his or her entitlement to a partial refund of the finance charge [*Civ. Code § 1803.2*]. The exact language required is specified in *Civ. Code § 1803.2(c)-(e)*, and the choice of language depends on whether the finance charge is determined on a precomputed or simple-interest basis and also on whether the refund of the unearned finance charge is computed on the actuarial basis or some other basis.

Any contract for goods or services that provides for a security interest in real property must also provide notice in the form and content prescribed by RISA, alerting the buyer that on signing the contract his or her property will be put up as security. A security interest in any contract that does not provide the required notice is void and unenforceable [*Civ. Code § 1803.2(b)(3)*].

[5] Required Disclosures

[a] In General

Except as provided in *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.* (governing add-on sales provisions), every retail installment contract is required by RISA to contain the information at [b]-[h], *below*.

[b] Identification of Parties and Subject Matter

The contract must disclose the names of the seller and the buyer, the place of business of the seller, the residence or place of business of the buyer as specified by the buyer, and a description of the goods or services sufficient to identify them. Services or multiple items of goods may be described in general terms and may be described in detail sufficient to identify them in a separate writing [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(a)*].

[c] Regulation Z Disclosures

Every contract subject to RISA must contain the disclosures required by Regulation Z [*see § 501.32[2]*], whether or not Regulation Z applies to the transaction. In addition, to the extent applicable, the contract must contain the other disclosures and notices required by, and must satisfy the requirements and limitations of, *Civ. Code § 1803.3*. Except for the disclosures required by *Civ. Code § 1803.3(c)* [*see* discussion in [d], *below*], the disclosures and notices required by *Civ. Code § 1803.3* may appear in the contract in any location or sequence and may be combined or interspersed with other provisions of the contract [*see Civ. Code § 1803.3(b)*].

[d] Itemization of Amount Financed

The retail installment contract must contain the following disclosures, as applicable, which must be labeled "itemization

of the amount financed" [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(c)*]:

- The cash price [*see Civ. Code § 1802.8* (definition of cash price)], exclusive of taxes imposed on the sale;
- Taxes imposed on the sale;
- The total of first and second items;
- An itemization of the amount to be paid to any public officer for official fees;
- The aggregate amount of premiums agreed, on execution of the contract, to be paid for policies of insurance included in the contract, excluding the amount of any insurance premium included in the finance charge;
- A subtotal representing the sum of the third through the fifth items;
- The amount of the buyer's downpayment (not including any administrative finance charge charged, received, or collected by the seller pursuant to former *Civ. Code § 1805.1(c)* and disclosed under the next item), itemized to show (1) the net agreed value of the property being traded in, (2) the amount of any portion of downpayment to be deferred until not later than the due date of the second regularly scheduled installment under the contract and which is not subject to a finance charge, (3) the amount of any manufacturer's rebate applied or to be applied to the downpayment, and (4) the remaining amount paid or to be paid by the buyer as a downpayment;
- The amount of any administrative finance charge, labeled as prepaid finance charge; and
- The difference between the sixth item above and the sum of the seventh and eighth items above, labeled as amount financed.

The disclosures required by *Civ. Code § 1803.3(c)* may be itemized or subtotaled to a greater extent than set forth above; however, the disclosures must be made together and in the sequence set forth above. No particular terminology is required to disclose the above items, except as expressly indicated [*see Civ. Code § 1803.3(b)*].

If the payment of all or a portion of the downpayment is to be deferred, the deferred payment must be reflected in the payment schedule disclosed pursuant to Regulation Z [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(d)*].

[e] Description of Trade-In Property

If the downpayment includes property being traded in, the contract must contain a brief description of that property [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(e)*].

[f] Information Concerning Prepayment

If the contract includes a finance charge determined on the precomputed basis, the contract must identify the method of computing the unearned portion of the finance charge in the event of prepayment in full of the buyer's obligation and contain a statement of the amount or method of computation of any charge that may be deducted from the amount of any unearned finance charge in computing the amount that will be credited to the obligation or refunded to the buyer. Reference to the Rule of 78's, the sum of the digits, the sum of the periodic time balances, or the actuarial method constitutes a sufficient identification of the method of computing the unearned portion of the finance charge [*Civ. Code*

§ 1803.3(f)(1)].

If the contract includes a finance charge determined on the simple-interest basis, but provides for a minimum finance charge in the event of prepayment in full, the contract must contain a statement of that fact and the amount of the minimum finance charge or its method of calculation [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(f)(2)*].

[g] Itemization of Insurance

The contract must contain an itemization of any insurance included as part of the amount financed (disclosed pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1803.3(c)(3)*) and of any insurance included as part of the finance charge. The itemization must identify the type of insurance coverage and the premium charged, and, if the insurance expires before the date of the last scheduled installment included in the repayment schedule, the term of the insurance must be stated [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(g)*].

[h] Disclosures Regarding Insurance

If the cost of any insurance is included in the retail installment contract and a separate charge is made to the buyer for that insurance, then the seller must comply with the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1803.5*. Under *Civ. Code § 1803.5*, the contract must state if the insurance is to be procured by the buyer or the seller. The amount included in the contract for insurance must not exceed the premiums chargeable in accordance with the rate fixed for that insurance by the insurer. If the insurance is procured by the seller or holder, he or she must deliver or mail to the buyer, at the address specified in the contract, notice of the seller's or holder's procurement of insurance or a copy of the insurance policies or certificates procured. These must be mailed or delivered to the buyer within 45 days after delivery of the goods or furnishing of the services under the contract [*Civ. Code § 1803.5*].

[6] Single-Document Rule

Except as provided in *Civ. Code § 1808.3*, every retail installment contract must consist of a single document containing the entire agreement between the parties as to the cost and terms of payment, including any promissory notes or other evidence of indebtedness [*Civ. Code § 1803.2*].

Certain add-on sales transactions which conform to the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1808.3* are excepted from the single-document rule of *Civ. Code § 1803.2*. For a further discussion of the add-on sales provisions of RISA, see *§ 501.37*.

[7] Execution and Delivery of Documents

Except with regard to catalog sales [*see* discussion in [11], *below*], a seller must not obtain the signature of the buyer to a contract when the contract contains blank spaces to be filled in after it has been signed [*Civ. Code § 1803.4*]. At the time the buyer signs the contract, the seller must deliver to the buyer a legible copy of the contract or any other document which the seller has required or requested the buyer to sign, and which the buyer has signed, during the contract negotiation [*Civ. Code § 1803.7*].

[8] Effect of Nondelivery

In addition to the statutory penalties provided in *Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.50*], until the seller delivers the required documents to the buyer, the buyer is obligated to pay only the cash price [*Civ. Code § 1803.7*].

[9] Acknowledgment of Delivery

Any acknowledgment by the buyer of delivery of a copy of the contract or other document must be printed or written in at least 10-point bold type, and if contained in the contract itself, must also appear directly above the space reserved for the buyer's signature [*Civ. Code § 1803.7*].

[10] Presumption of Delivery

The buyer's written acknowledgment of delivery of a copy of the contract or other document raises a rebuttable presumption of delivery under *Civ. Code § 1803.7* and of compliance with *Civ. Code § 1803.4* (prohibition against obtaining buyer's signature if contract contains blank spaces). This presumption applies in any action or proceeding by or against an assignee of the contract who has no knowledge to the contrary, when he or she purchases the contract. Moreover, a conclusive presumption of delivery under *Civ. Code § 1803.7* and of compliance with *Civ. Code § 1803.4* is raised if either (1) the holder furnishes the buyer a copy of the contract or other document, or (2) the buyer fails to respond within 30 days to a notice containing the items required by *Civ. Code § 1803.3* (required contents of RISA contract) and stating that the buyer must give the holder 30 days written notice that he or she was not furnished a copy of the contract or any other document signed by the buyer at the seller's request during the contract negotiation [*Civ. Code § 1803.7*].

[11] Catalog Sales

When a retail installment sale is negotiated and entered into by mail or telephone, without personal solicitation by a salesperson or other representative of the seller, and the seller's cash and deferred payment prices and other terms are clearly set forth in a catalog or other printed solicitation of business which is generally available to the public, the seller is not required to deliver a copy of the contract to the buyer as provided in *Civ. Code § 1803.7* [*see* discussion in [7], *above*]. Moreover, if when the proposed retail installment contract is received by the seller from the buyer, there are blank spaces to be filled in, the seller may insert in the appropriate blank spaces the amounts of money and other terms which are set forth in the seller's catalog then in effect. In lieu of a copy of the contract provided for in *Civ. Code § 1803.7* the seller, within 15 days from the date of shipment of the goods, must furnish the buyer with a written statement of the items inserted in those blank spaces [*Civ. Code § 1803.8*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.32

§ 501.32 Formalities and Disclosures Required by TILA

[1] Time and Form of Disclosures

Retail installment contracts under RISA are also subject to the disclosure requirements of TILA for closed-end credit transactions [*see* discussions in *§§ 501.21, 501.22[2][a]*]. Except in the case of certain transactions involving residential mortgages, mail or telephone orders, or variable-rate transactions add-on sales, for which TILA has provisions similar to those of RISA [*see* discussion at *§ 501.37*], these disclosures must be made before credit is extended [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1638(b)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(b)*]. The disclosures required by TILA must be made clearly, conspicuously, and in writing, in a form that the consumer may keep. The disclosures must be grouped together and segregated from all other terms, data, or information provided in connection with the transaction, including any computations or itemization [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1638(b)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(a)(1)*].

[2] Disclosures Required by TILA

For each closed-end credit transaction, the creditor must disclose the following information as applicable [*12 C.F.R. § 226.18*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)*]:

- The identity of the creditor making the disclosure.

- The "amount financed," using that term, and a brief description, such as "the amount of credit provided to you or on your behalf." The amount financed is calculated by (1) determining the principal loan amount or cash price (subtracting any downpayment), (2) adding any other amounts that are financed by the creditor and are not part of the finance charge, and (3) subtracting any prepaid finance charge.

- A separate written itemization of the amount financed, including (1) the amount of any proceeds distributed directly to the consumer, (2) the amount credited to the consumer's account with the creditor, (3) any amount paid to other persons by the creditor on the consumer's behalf and the identity of those persons, and (4) the prepaid finance charge. The creditor need not provide the foregoing itemization if

the creditor provides a statement that the consumer has the right to receive a written itemization of the amount financed, together with a space for the consumer to indicate whether or not he or she desires such an itemization, and the consumer does not request it. The itemization of the amount financed must be separate from the other required disclosures [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.17(a)(1)*].

- The "finance charge," using that term, and a brief description such as "the dollar amount the credit will cost you."

- The "annual percentage rate," using that term, and a brief description such as "the cost of your credit as a yearly rate." The creditor need not disclose the annual percentage rate if the transaction involves a finance charge of $5 or less on an amount financed of $75 or less, or a finance charge of $7.50 or less on an amount financed of more than $75.

- If the annual percentage rate may increase after consummation, a statement of (1) the circumstances under which the rate may increase, (2) any limitations on the increase, (3) the effect of an increase, and (4) an example of the payment terms that would result from an increase.

- The number, amounts, and timing of payments scheduled to repay the obligation.

- The "total of payments," using that term and descriptive explanation such as "the amount you will have paid when you have made all scheduled payments."

- If the obligation has a demand feature, that fact must be disclosed.

- In a credit sale, the "total sale price," using that term, and a descriptive explanation (including the amount of any down payment) such as "the total price of your purchase on credit, including your downpayment of $_____." The total sale price is the sum of the cash price, any other amounts that are financed by the creditor, and the finance charge.

- A statement indicating whether a penalty may be imposed if the obligation is prepaid in full, or whether the consumer is entitled to a rebate of any finance charge if the obligation is prepaid in full. It should be noted that under RISA, no such penalty may be charged, and a consumer is entitled to a rebate of unearned finance charges in the event of prepayment in full [*see* discussion in *§ 501.35[4]*].

- Any dollar or percentage charge that may be imposed before maturity due to a late payment, other than a deferral or extension charge.

- The fact that the creditor has or will acquire a security interest in the property purchased as part of the transaction, or in other property identified by item or type.

- Any items required by *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(d)* in order to exclude certain insurance premiums from the finance charge.

- Disclosures required by *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(e)* in order to exclude from the finance charge certain fees prescribed by law or certain premiums for insurance in lieu of perfecting a security interest.

- A statement that the consumer should refer to the appropriate contract document for information about nonpayment, default, the right to accelerate the maturity of the obligation, and prepayment rebates and penalties. At the creditor's option, the statement may also include a reference to the contract for further information about security interests.

- In a residential mortgage transaction, a statement of whether or not a subsequent purchaser of the dwelling from the consumer may be permitted to assume the remaining obligation on its original terms.

- If the creditor requires the consumer to maintain a deposit as a condition of the specific transaction, a statement that the annual percentage rate does not reflect the effect of the required deposit.

In the case of any variable interest rate residential mortgage transaction, in disclosures provided at the time of application as prescribed by regulations for a variable rate transaction secured by the consumer's principal dwelling, at the option of the creditor, the creditor must state that the periodic payments may increase or decrease substantially, and the maximum interest rate and payment for a $10,000 loan originated at a recent interest rate, as determined by regulations, assuming the maximum periodic increases in rates and payments under the program, or a historical example illustrating the effects of interest-rate changes implemented according to the loan program [*15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)(14)*].

In the case of a consumer credit transaction that is secured by the principal dwelling of the consumer, in which the extension of credit may exceed the fair market value of the dwelling, the creditor must provide, at the time of application, a clear and conspicuous statement that the interest on the portion of the credit extension that is greater than the fair market value of the dwelling is not tax deductible for Federal income tax purposes, and the consumer should consult a tax adviser for further information regarding the deductibility of interest and charges [*15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)(15), (b)(3)*].

[3] Model TILA Forms and Clauses

Pursuant to TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1604(b)*], the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has published model disclosure forms and clauses for common transactions to facilitate compliance with TILA [*see* 12 C.F.R., Part 226, Appendices G, H]. Creditors are not required to use these forms and clauses; however, a creditor who uses an appropriate model clause or form is deemed to be in compliance with TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1604(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.33

§ 501.33 RISA Restrictions on Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Prohibited Terms Are Void

Certain types of provisions contained in retail installment contracts are either unenforceable or prohibited. Any contract provision proscribed by RISA is void but does not otherwise affect the validity of the contract [*Civ. Code § 1804.4*].

[2] Inducing Contract Contingent on Happening of Future Event Proscribed

It is unlawful for a seller to induce or attempt to induce a person to enter into a retail installment contract by offering a rebate, discount, commission, or other consideration, contingent on the happening of a future event, on condition that the person either sell or assist in the sale of the same or related goods [*Civ. Code § 1803.10*].

[3] Requiring Buyer to Obtain Financing From Particular Source

RISA provides that, notwithstanding *Civ. Code § 1801.6* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.20[1][b][iv]* and *[v]*] which exempts certain third-party loan transactions, no person may require a purchaser of goods or services to obtain financing from a particular source, and violation of this provision subjects the violator to the penalties provided in *Civ. Code § 1812.6* (criminal penalties) [*Civ. Code § 1812.20*].

[4] Acceleration Clauses

A retail installment contract must not contain a provision by which the holder, in the absence of the buyer's default in performing his or her obligations, may accelerate the maturity of any part or all of the amount owing thereunder [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(b)*].

[5] Agency Appointments by Buyer

A retail installment contract must not provide for the buyer's execution of a power of attorney appointing the seller or holder of the contract, or other person acting on his or her behalf, as the buyer's agent in the collection of payments

under the contract or in the repossession of goods [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(f)*].

[6] Change of County of Trial

A retail installment contract must not provide that the seller or holder of the contract is given the right to commence an action on the contract in a county other than (1) the county in which the contract was in fact signed by the buyer, (2) the county in which the buyer resides at the commencement of the action, (3) the county in which the buyer resided at the time that the contract was entered into, or (4) the county in which the goods purchased pursuant to that contract have been so affixed to real property as to become a part thereof [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(i)*]. For a discussion of the venue provisions of RISA, see *§ 501.102[3]*.

[7] Confession of Judgment or Assignment of Wages

A retail installment contract must not provide for a power of attorney to confess judgment in California, or for an assignment of wages. However, the giving of an assignment of wages contained in a separate instrument, executed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 300*, is not prohibited [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(c)*].

[8] Lien Provisions

No retail installment contract other than one for services may provide for a security interest on any goods theretofore fully paid for or which have not been sold by the seller [*Civ. Code § 1804.3(a)*].

Any contract for goods that provides for a lien on real property if the goods sold are not to be attached to the real property is a violation of RISA and subject to the statutory penalties thereof [*Civ. Code § 1804.3(b)*; *see Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9* (penalty provisions of RISA)].

[9] Rescission or Avoidance of Contract

A retail installment contract must not provide that the buyer agrees to the payment of any charge by reason of the exercise of his or her right to rescind or avoid the contract [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(h)*].

[10] Security Interest

A retail installment contract must not provide that the seller takes a security interest, other than a mechanic's lien, in the buyer's real property that is the buyer's primary residence, when the buyer is 65 years of age or older and the contract is for a home improvement as defined in Bus. & Prof. Code § 7151.1 [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(j)*].

[11] Unlawful Acts

A retail installment contract must not provide that the seller or holder of the contract or other person on his or her behalf is given authority to enter on the buyer's premises unlawfully or to commit any breach of the peace in the repossession of goods [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(d)*].

[12] Waivers

In addition to the general rule that a waiver by the buyer of any RISA provision is contrary to public policy and is unenforceable and void [*Civ. Code § 1801.1*], a retail installment contract must not contain the following:

- A provision by which the buyer agrees not to assert against a seller a claim or defense arising out of the sale or agrees not to assert against an assignee such a claim or defense, other than as provided in *Civ. Code § 1804.2*, which subjects the assignee to all the buyer's equities and defenses against the seller

arising out of the sale, notwithstanding an agreement to the contrary [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(a)*]. *Civ. Code § 1804.1(a)* only precludes waiver of defenses arising out of a sale and does not apply to a defense such as the statute of limitations, which the buyer may waive in the contract [*Mysel v. Gross (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 10, 138 Cal. Rptr. 873]* .

- A provision by which the buyer waives any right of action against the seller or holder of the contract, or other person acting on his or her behalf, for any illegal act committed in the collection of payments under the contract or in the repossession of goods [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(e)*].

- A provision by which the buyer relieves the seller from liability for any legal remedies which the buyer may have against the seller under the contract or any separate instrument executed in connection with the contract [*Civ. Code § 1804.1(g)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.34

§ 501.34 Finance Charges in Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Components of Finance Charge Under RISA

The finance charge constitutes the amount charged to the buyer for the privilege of purchasing goods or services on an installment basis [*see Civ. Code § 1802.10* (defining "finance charges")]. Under RISA, the charge must include all charges incident to investigating and making the contract and for the extension of the credit provided for in the contract, and no fee, expense, or other charge can be taken, received, reserved, or contracted for except as otherwise provided by RISA [*Civ. Code § 1805.4*]. Charges for insurance premiums, delinquency charges, attorney's fees, court costs, collection expenses, official fees, extension or deferral agreement charges as provided for in *Civ. Code § 1807.1*, or amounts for insurance, repairs to or preservation of goods, or preservation of the holder's security interest therein advanced by the holder subsequent to the execution of the contract are not considered finance charges under RISA [*Civ. Code § 1802.10*; *compare 15 U.S.C. § 1605(d)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(c)-(e)* (items that may be excluded from finance charge under TILA); *see* discussions in [2][a] and [b], *below*]. The seller or holder of a retail installment contract may charge and collect a $15 fee for the return by a depository institution of a dishonored check, negotiable order of withdrawal, or share draft issued in connection with the retail installment contract. This fee also is not considered a finance charge under RISA [*Civ. Code § 1805.4*].

[2] Components of Finance Charge Under TILA

[a] Includable Charges

Under TILA, the finance charge is the cost of consumer credit as a dollar amount. It includes any charge payable directly or indirectly by the consumer and imposed directly or indirectly by the creditor as an incident to or condition of the extension of credit. It does not include any charge of a type payable in a comparable cash transaction [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(a)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)*]. The finance charge also does not include fees and amounts imposed by third party closing agents, including settlement agents, attorneys, and escrow and title companies, if the creditor does not require the imposition of the charges or the services provided and does not retain the charges [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)*]. The finance charge includes the following types of charges, except for charges specifically excluded by *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(c)-(e)* [*see* discussion, *below*]:

- Interest, time price differential, and any amount payable under an add-on or discount system of additional charges [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(1)*].

- Service, transaction, activity, and carrying charges, including any charge imposed on a checking or other transaction account to the extent that the charge exceeds the charge for a similar account without a credit feature [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(2)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(2)*].

- Points, loan fees, assumption fees, finder's fees, and similar charges [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(3)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(3)*].

- Appraisal, investigation, and credit report fees [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(4)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(4)*].

- Premiums or other charges for any guarantee or insurance protecting the creditor against the consumer's default or other credit loss [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(5)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(5)*].

- Charges imposed on a creditor by another person for purchasing or accepting a consumer's obligation, if the consumer is required to pay the charges in cash, as an addition to the obligation, or as a deduction from the proceeds of the obligation [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(6)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(6)*].

- Premiums or other charges for credit life, accident, health, or loss-of-income insurance, written in connection with a credit transaction [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(7)*] unless (1) the coverage of the debtor by the insurance is not a factor in the approval by the creditor of the extension of credit, and this fact is clearly disclosed in writing to the person applying for or obtaining the extension of credit, and (2) in order to obtain the insurance in connection with the extension of credit, the person to whom the credit is extended must give specific affirmative written indication of his or her desire to do so after written disclosure of the cost [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(b)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.4(d)* (exclusion of premiums or other charges for voluntary credit life, accident, health, or loss-of-income insurance)].

- Premiums or other charges for insurance against loss of or damage to property, or against liability arising out of the ownership or use of property, written in connection with a credit transaction [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(8)*] unless a clear and specific statement in writing is furnished by the creditor to the person to whom the credit is extended, setting forth the cost of the insurance if obtained from or through the creditor, and stating that the person to whom the credit is extended may choose the person through which the insurance is to be obtained [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(c)*].

- Discounts for the purpose of inducing payment by a means other than the use of credit [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(9)*; *see Virachack v. University Ford (9th Cir. 2005) 410 F.3d 579, 581-582* (rebate available to cash buyer after completion of sale transaction is not discount, since price to be paid is not reduced, nor is it "charge" of any kind--charge is request for payment; rebate is reduction of amount paid--and it need not be accounted for, either in computing finance charge or in making related disclosures)].

- Charges or premiums paid for debt cancellation or debt suspension coverage written in connection with a credit transaction, whether or not the coverage is insurance under applicable law [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(b)(10)*].

[b] Excludable Charges

If itemized and disclosed to the customer, the following types of charges need not be included in the finance charge under TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(d)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(e)*]:

- Fees and charges prescribed by law that actually are or will be paid to public officials for determining the existence of, or for perfecting, releasing, or satisfying, any security interest related to the credit transaction.

- The premium payable for any insurance in lieu of perfecting any security interest otherwise required by the creditor in connection with the transaction, if the premium does not exceed the fees and charges described immediately above, which otherwise would be payable.

- Any tax levied on security instruments or on documents evidencing indebtedness, if the payment of those taxes is a precondition for recording the instrument securing the evidence of indebtedness.

The following charges may also be excluded from the finance charge [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(c)*]:

- Application fees charged to all applicants for credit, whether or not credit is actually extended.

- Charges for actual unanticipated late payments, or for exceeding a credit limit [*see Household Credit Servs., Inc. v. Pfennig (2004) 541 U.S. 232, 235, 124 S. Ct. 1741, 158 L. Ed. 2d 450* (regulatory exclusion of over-limit fees from definition of "finance charge" is not unreasonable interpretation of TILA)], or for a delinquency, default, or similar occurrence.

- Charges imposed by a financial institution for paying items that overdraw an account, unless the payment of such items and imposition of the charge were previously agreed on in writing.

- Fees charged for participation in a credit plan, whether assessed on an annual or other periodic basis.

- Seller's points.

- Interest forfeited as a result of an interest reduction required by law on a time deposit used as security for an extension of credit.

- Discounts offered to induce payment for a purchase by cash, check, or other means, as provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1666f(b)*.

In a transaction secured by real property, or in a residential mortgage transaction, the following fees may also be excluded from the finance charge, if bona fide and reasonable in amount [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(c)(7)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1605(e)*]:

- Fees for title examination, abstract of title, title insurance, property survey, and similar purposes.

- Fees for preparation of loan-related documents.

- Notary fees, appraisal fees, (including fees related to any pest infestation or flood hazard inspections conducted prior to closing [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(e)(5)*; *but see 15 U.S.C. § 1649(a)(1)(B)* (no liability for transactions occurring prior to Sept. 30, 1995)]), and credit report.

- Property appraisal fees or fees for inspections to assess the value or condition of the property if the service is performed before closing, including fees related to pest infestation or flood hazard determinations.

- Amounts required to be paid into escrow or trustee accounts, if the amounts would not otherwise be included in the finance charge.

[c] Prohibited Offsets

Interest, dividends, or other income received or to be received by the consumer on deposits or investments may not be deducted in computing the finance charge [*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(f)*].

[d] Tolerances for Accuracy

The disclosure of finance charges in connection with an open end credit plan secured by real property or a dwelling will be treated as being accurate for purposes of the TILA if the amount disclosed in the finance charge does not vary from the actual finance charge by more than $100, or is greater than the amount required to be disclosed by the TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(f)(1)*]. For purposes of the obligor's right of rescission under *15 U.S.C. § 1635* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.51[1][a]*], the disclosure will be treated as accurate if either [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(f)(2)*]:

- The amount disclosed as the finance charge does not vary from the actual finance charge by more than an amount equal to one-half of one percent to the total amount of credit extended [*15 U.S.C. § 1605(f)(2)(A)*]; or

- In the case of a transaction that is a refinancing of the principal balance then due and any unpaid finance charges of a residential mortgage transaction [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1502(w)*], or any subsequent refinancing of such a transaction, and that does not provide any new consolidation or new advance, if the amount disclosed as the finance charge does not vary from the actual finance charge by more than an amount equal to one percent of the total amount of credit extended [*but see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1605(f)(2)(B), 1602(aa)* (standard specified in this subparagraph (2) inapplicable to certain specified mortgages)].

These tolerance requirements do not apply to transactions after the initiation of any judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure process on the primary dwelling of an obligor securing an extension of credit. In the latter situation, the disclosures of any finance charge and other disclosures affected by any finance charge will be treated as accurate if the amount disclosed as the finance charge does not vary from the actual finance charge by more than $35 or is greater than the amount required to be disclosed by the TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(i)(2)*].

These tolerances are also inapplicable to disclosures made before the passage of 1995 TILA amendments [*15 U.S.C. § 1649(a)(3)*; Pub. L. No. 104-29, § 4 (Sept. 30, 1995)]. The latter disclosures may be treated as accurate for TILA purposes if the amount disclosed as the finance charge does not vary from the actual finance charge by more that $200, or if they satisfy the requirements of *15 U.S.C. § 1605(f)(2)*, or if the amount disclosed is greater than the amount or percentage required to be disclosed by the TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1649(a)(3)*].

[3] Annual Percentage Rate Under TILA

The annual percentage rate (commonly referred to as APR) is a measure of the cost of credit, expressed as a yearly rate [*12 C.F.R. § 226.22(a)(1)*]. It relates the finance charge to the amount financed over a specified period of time. In the case of closed-end credit transactions, such as retail installment contracts, the APR must be determined by either the actuarial method or the United States rule, and the APR disclosed must be accurate to within 1/8 of 1 percentage point of the true rate as determined under either method [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.22(a)(1), (2)*]. Because the mathematical formulas used to calculate the APR under both methods are quite complex, the Federal Reserve Board has published tables which may be used by creditors to determine the APR on any particular transaction. Any rate determined from these tables in accordance with the instructions therein will comply with the requirements of TILA [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.22(b)(1)*].

The APR, as defined by Regulation Z, must be included in all retail installment contracts [*Civ. Code § 1803.3(b)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.18(e)*]. It should also be noted that although RISA has omitted any reference to the appearance of the annual percentage rate on the periodic statement of a RISA installment account, it is still required by virtue of the federal provisions [*12 C.F.R. § 226.7(g)*; *see Civ. Code § 1801.5* (stating that notwithstanding any provision of RISA, disclosures required by Regulation Z must be provided in a RISA contract or other document required by RISA)]. For additional discussion of the annual percentage rate, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 45, *Consumer Installment Loans and Credit Sales* (Matthew Bender)

[4] Methods for Computing Finance Charges Under RISA

[a] Options

Finance charges on retail installment contracts may be determined on the simple-interest basis [*Civ. Code § 1802.20*] or on the precomputed basis [*see Civ. Code § 1802.21*]. However, no RISA contract or obligation may provide for a finance charge that is determined in part by the precomputed basis and in part by the simple-interest basis, except for a finance charge permitted by *Civ. Code § 1805.8* (finance charge on certain amounts advanced by holder subsequent to execution of contract) [*Civ. Code § 1805.9*].

Finance charges on contracts entered into on or after January 1, 1983, must be calculated as provided for in *Civ. Code § 1805.1(a)(1)* [*see* discussion in [5], *below*] on the simple-interest basis if, according to the original contract terms, the due date of the final installment is more than 62 months from the date of the contract [*Civ. Code § 1805.7*].

[b] Simple-Interest Basis

Under the simple-interest method for determining finance charges, a constant rate is applied to the unpaid balance as it changes from time to time, either (1) calculated on the basis of a 365-day year and actual days elapsed, or (2) for contracts entered into prior to January 1, 1988, calculated on the basis of a 360-day year consisting of 12 months of 30 days each and on the assumption that all payments will be received by the seller on their respective due dates [*Civ. Code § 1802.20*].

[c] Precomputed Basis

Under the precomputed basis, the finance charge is determined by multiplying the original unpaid balance of the contract by a periodic rate and multiplying that product by the number of payment periods elapsing between the date on which the finance charge begins to be assessed and the date of the last scheduled payment [*Civ. Code § 1802.21*].

[5] Maximum Amount of Finance Charge Under RISA

There is no limit on the interest rate that may be charged, received, or collected on a retail installment contract, although no annual fee may be charged. The only limitation is that the holder of the contract shall not charge, collect, or receive any finance charge in excess of that shown on the disclosure required by *Civ. Code § 1803.3(b)*, discussed in *§ 501.31[5][c]* [*Civ. Code § 1805.1*]. There are three exceptions. One exception is that the holder may retain any excess finance charge that it received because one or more payments under a contract that determined the finance charge on a 365-day basis were made at a time or times other than as originally scheduled. This exception applies whether or not the parties enter into a refinancing agreement under *Civ. Code § 1807.1* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.36[2]*]. The holder may also retain any excess finance charge that is permitted by *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(c)(2)-(4)* (estimates, payments at unscheduled times, unequal billing periods) or by *Civ. Code § 1805.8* (finance charge on amounts advanced by holder after execution of contract) [*Civ. Code § 1805.1*].

[6] When Finance Charge May Be Assessed Under RISA

Notwithstanding the provision of any contract to the contrary, except as provided in *Civ. Code § 1805.6(b)* or *(c)*, no retail seller is to assess any finance charge for goods purchased under a retail installment contract until the goods are in the buyer's possession [*Civ. Code § 1805.6(a)*]. A finance charge may be assessed for undelivered goods (1) from the date when the goods are available for pickup by the buyer and the buyer is notified of their availability or (2) from the date of purchase when the goods are delivered or available for pickup by the buyer within 10 days of the date of purchase [*Civ. Code § 1805.6(b)*]. In the case of a home improvement contract as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7151.2*, a finance charge may be assessed from the approximate date of commencement of the work as set forth in the home improvement contract [*Civ. Code § 1805.6(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.35

§ 501.35 Payments on Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Schedule of Installments

Contracts may be payable in successive monthly, semimonthly, or weekly installments [*Civ. Code § 1805.2*].

[2] Payment to Last Known Holder

Unless the buyer has notice of actual or intended assignment of a contract or installment account, payment thereunder made by the buyer to the last known holder of the contract discharges the buyer's obligation to the extent of the payment [*Civ. Code § 1806.1*].

[3] Statement of Unpaid Balance

At any time after the execution of a retail installment contract, but not later than one year after the last payment thereunder, the holder of the contract must, on written request of the buyer made in good faith, promptly give or forward to the buyer a detailed written statement that states with accuracy the total amount, if any, unpaid thereunder. This statement must be supplied by the holder once each year without charge. If any additional statement is requested by the buyer, the holder must supply the statement to the buyer at a charge not exceeding $1 for each additional statement supplied to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1806.2*]. The provisions of *Civ. Code § 1806.2* apply only to those transactions wherein, instead of periodic statements of account, the buyer is provided with a passbook or payment book in which all payments, credits, charges, and the unpaid balance are entered [*Civ. Code § 1806.2*].

[4] Prepayment; Refund Credit

Notwithstanding any provision of a contract to the contrary, the buyer may pay at any time before maturity the entire indebtedness evidenced by the contract without penalty [*Civ. Code § 1806.3(a)*]. When prepayment in full occurs, the amount required to repay or prepay the contract depends on whether the finance charge was determined on a precomputed or simple-interest basis and the formula for computing the amount is provided by the statute [*see Civ. Code § 1806.3(a)*]. These computations also apply in determining the buyer's outstanding obligation, notwithstanding

any provision of a contract to the contrary, when the indebtedness in a retail installment contract is satisfied prior to maturity through surrender of the collateral, repossession of the collateral, redemption of the collateral after repossession, or judgment, provided that the buyer's obligation is computed by the holder as of the date the holder recovers the value of the collateral or the date judgment is entered or, if the holder elects to keep the collateral, the date the holder takes possession of the collateral [*Civ. Code § 1806.3(b)*]. Nothing in *Civ. Code § 1806.3* precludes the collection or retention by the holder of any delinquency charge made pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1803.6* [*Civ. Code § 1806.3(c)*; *see* discussion in [6], *below*].

[5] Delivery of Instruments Indicating Payment in Full

After payment of all sums for which the buyer is obligated under a contract and on demand made by the buyer, the holder must deliver, or mail to the buyer at his or her last known address, good and sufficient documentation to acknowledge payment in full and to release all security in the goods under contract [*Civ. Code § 1806.4*].

[6] Delinquency and Collection Charges Permitted

A retail installment buyer may be obligated to pay delinquency charges. A delinquency charge may not exceed $10 for a period in default of not less than 10 days or $15 for a period in default of not less than 15 days [*Civ. Code § 1803.6(a)*]. Only one charge may be collected on any installment, regardless of how long it remains in default. The buyer also may be obligated to pay actual and reasonable collection costs occasioned by (1) the removal of the goods from the state without the written permission of the holder of the installment contract, (2) the buyer's failure to notify the holder of any change in residence, or (3) the buyer's failure to communicate with the holder for 45 days after the buyer's default in making payments under the contract [*Civ. Code § 1803.6(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.36

§ 501.36 Refinancing and Consolidation of Retail Installment Contracts

[1] Extension of Payment Dates

On agreement between the parties, the holder of a retail installment contract may extend the scheduled due date or defer the scheduled payment of all or part of any installment payments under the contract. If the agreement is in writing and signed by the parties, the holder can charge a fee for the extension or deferral, in an amount and for a period as prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1807.1*. The agreement may also provide that the buyer pay any additional insurance premiums if insurance coverage is provided for in the contract [*Civ. Code § 1807.1(d)*; *see Civ. Code § 1803.5*].

[2] Refinancing Agreement

On a written agreement signed by the parties, the holder of a retail installment contract may refinance the remaining amount owing on the contract by providing for a new schedule of installment payments. The holder may charge a fee for refinancing, in an amount prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1807.2*. The agreement may also provide that the buyer pay any additional insurance premiums if insurance coverage is provided for in the refinanced contract. The items required to be disclosed in the refinancing agreement are prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1807.2(a)-(g)* [*Civ. Code § 1807.2(d)*; *Civ. Code § 1803.5*].

[3] New Payment Schedule After Default on "Balloon Payment"

If any payment under a contract or refinancing agreement, other than a deferred downpayment, is more than twice the amount of an otherwise regularly scheduled equal payment, the contract or refinancing agreement must contain a provision notifying the buyer of the fact [*Civ. Code § 1807.3(a)*]. The exact wording of the required provision is set forth in *Civ. Code § 1807.3(a)*. If the buyer defaults in the payment of any such balloon payment, he or she must be given an absolute right to obtain a new payment schedule. Unless agreed to by the buyer, the periodic payments under the new schedule must not be substantially greater than the average of the preceding installments [*Civ. Code § 1807.3(b)*].

[4] Refinancing by California Finance Lenders

In 1994 the Legislature repealed the Personal Property Brokers Law (former *Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*), which regulated certain persons making loans secured by personal property, and the Consumer Financial Lender's Law (former *Fin. Code § 24000 et seq.*), which regulated certain consumer lenders [Stats. 1994, ch. 1115]. Effective July 1, 1995, those laws and the Commercial Finance Lenders Law (*Fin. Code § 26000 et seq.*), regulating certain commercial lenders, are consolidated in the California Finance Lenders Law [*Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*].

No licensee under the California Finance Lenders Law [*see Fin. Code § 22007*] may make a loan to refinance a retail installment contract subject to RISA (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) that is held by the licensee, or subsidiaries or affiliates of the licensee, unless specified conditions are satisfied [*see Fin. Code § 22341(a)*]. These conditions are substantially similar to comparable provisions under the superseded laws. For example, the loan may not be made unless (1) the buyer has been making installment payments for at least 90 days, and (2) the contract has a term of at least 180 days and does not provide for any scheduled installment that is more than twice the amount of any other scheduled installment [*Fin. Code § 22341(a)(1)*]. In addition, the licensee may not take a security interest in real property that is the borrower's principal residence unless the principal amount of the loan is $5,000 or more and the licensee furnishes a written notice as provided by statute that warns the borrower of the consequences of accepting the loan [*see Fin. Code § 22341(a)(3)*].

The requirements of the Finance Lenders Law are matters of fundamental public policy and cannot be waived by agreement between the parties. For example, the Finance Lenders Law may not be circumvented by a choice-of-law provision in a loan agreement of a type regulated by the law, by which another state's law is chosen as the governing law. In determining whether such a provision should be enforced in California, a court will consider which state, under the circumstances presented, would suffer greater impairment of its policies if the other state's law were applied [*Brack v. Omni Loan Co., Ltd. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1312, 1326, 1329, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275* (choice of Nevada law, in consumer loan contract of adhesion, was not enforceable)].

Loans made under the California Finance Lenders Law to refinance retail installment contracts are subject to that law and are not governed by RISA [*Fin. Code § 22341(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.37

§ 501.37 Add-on Sales Provisions

[1] In General

RISA contains special provisions for retail installment contracts that contemplate the incorporation of a number of retail installment sales into a single contract. RISA divides add-on sales transactions into two types, as discussed in [2] and [3], *below*.

[2] Subsequent Purchases Added to Prior Contract

[a] Terms

The first type of add-on sales transaction permitted by RISA is one that gives the seller the option of adding subsequent purchases made by the buyer to the existing contract. That contract may provide that the total price of the goods or services covered by the contract will be increased by the price of the additional goods or services purchased, that all finance charges and installment payments may be increased proportionately, and that all terms and conditions of the original contract will apply equally to the subsequent sale [*Civ. Code § 1808.1*].

[b] Allocation of Installment Payments After Subsequent Purchase

When a subsequent purchase is added to an existing contract, the entire amount of all payments previously made must be deemed to have been applied toward the deferred payment price(s) of any goods or services previously purchased. Each payment received thereafter must be allocated to all of the various deferred payment prices in the same proportion or ratio as the original cash prices of the various purchases bear to one another. If the amount of each installment payment is increased with the subsequent purchase, the seller may elect to allocate the subsequent payments as follows: (1) an amount equal to the original installment payment to the previous deferred payment price; and (2) an amount equal to the increase to the subsequent deferred payment price. Any downpayment on the subsequent purchase must, however, be allocated in its entirety to that purchase [*Civ. Code § 1808.2*].

[c] Security Interest in Goods Previously Purchased

The contract, the terms of which apply to subsequent purchases, may provide that previously purchased goods will be security for goods subsequently purchased, but only until the total of payments under previous purchases is fully paid [*Civ. Code § 1808.1*].

[d] Time and Contents of Disclosures

When a subsequent purchase is added to an existing contract, the seller must deliver a memorandum to the buyer prior to the due date of the first installment that sets forth information similar to that required in an ordinary retail installment contract under *Civ. Code § 1803.3* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.31[5]*]. In addition, the seller also must disclose the following:

- The amount of the existing outstanding balance to be consolidated, which consists of the unpaid time balance(s) of the prior contract(s) to be consolidated;

- The amount of any unearned finance charge, determined by deducting from the amount of item (1) *above*, any unearned finance charge in an amount not less than the refund credit provided for by *Civ. Code § 1806.3* (providing for refund of unearned finance charges in the event of prepayment in full of a retail installment contract); in computing this amount, no minimum finance charge is allowed; and

- The difference between these two items, *above*, which is the net outstanding balance to be consolidated [*see Civ. Code § 1808.2*].

[3] Series of Credit Sale Transactions

[a] In General

The second type of add-on sale transaction under RISA is one that is part of a series of credit sales made pursuant to an agreement providing for the addition of the amount financed plus the finance charge for the current sale to an existing outstanding balance [*see Civ. Code § 1808.3*]. Those transactions differ from the transactions governed by *Civ. Code §§ 1808.1* and *1808.2* [*see* discussion in [2], *above*] in that, under the latter type of transaction, the outstanding balance, less a refund credit for any unearned finance charge, is added to the unpaid balance of the cash price of the subsequent purchase, and the finance charge is recomputed on the basis of the consolidated total of the previous and subsequent purchases [*see Civ. Code § 1808.2(e)-(g), (j)*]. By contrast, in a transaction governed by *Civ. Code § 1808.3*, the amount financed plus the finance charge for the current sale are simply added to the existing outstanding balance from prior sales, with no recomputation of the finance charge on the prior sale transactions [*see Civ. Code § 1808.3(g)-(j)*].

[b] Delay of Disclosures Permitted

Both RISA and TILA provide that, in the case of subsequent purchases under both types of provisions [*see* discussion in [a], *above*], the disclosures required to be made for the current sale may be made at any time prior to the date that the first installment for that sale is due, provided that (1) the customer has approved in writing both the annual percentage rate(s) and the method of treating any unearned finance charge on an existing outstanding balance in computing the new finance charge, and (2) the creditor retains no security interest in any property as to which he or she has received payments aggregating the amount of the sale price, including any finance charges attributable thereto [*15 U.S.C. § 1638(d)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(h)*; *see Civ. Code § 1808.3*]. *Civ. Code § 1808.3* is worded differently than the comparable federal provisions, and its meaning is unclear. The Legislature apparently intended, however, that *Civ. Code § 1808.3* conform to the requirements of TILA and Regulation Z [*see* Stats. 1969, ch. 626, § 24].

For purposes of the above provisions, when items are purchased on different dates, the first purchased must be deemed the first paid for. When several items are purchased on the same date, the lowest priced must be deemed the first paid

for [*15 U.S.C. § 1638(d)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.17(h)*; *Civ. Code § 1808.3*].

[c] Contents of Disclosure Memorandum

The contents of the memorandum that the seller must deliver to the buyer prior to the due date of the first installment for a particular credit sale are set forth in *Civ. Code § 1808.3* and are similar to the items required to be disclosed in an ordinary retail installment contract under *Civ. Code § 1803.3* [*see* discussion in *§ 501.31[5]*].

[4] Consequences of Failure to Make Disclosures

Until the seller delivers to the buyer the memoranda required by *Civ. Code § 1808.2* or *1808.3* [*see* discussions in [2][d] and [3][b], *above*], the buyer is obligated only to pay the cash price of the subsequent purchase [*Civ. Code § 1808.4*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.38

§ 501.38 Retail Installment Accounts

[1] In General

As discussed above [*see* discussion in *§ 501.22[2][c]*], a retail installment account [*Civ. Code § 1802.7*] differs from a retail installment contract [*Civ. Code § 1802.6*] in that the former provides for the extension of credit on a revolving basis, whereas the latter provides for a single credit transaction pursuant to a contract. Retail installment accounts are subject to regulations that differ from those applicable to retail installment contracts.

[2] Acceptance by Buyer

A retail installment account agreement is considered to be accepted by the buyer if (1) the buyer signs the agreement, including signing the application containing the agreement's terms, or (2) the buyer, or a person authorized by the buyer, uses the account, and the buyer has been notified in writing that the use of the credit card will mean that the agreement has been accepted by the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1810*]. The agreement will not become effective, however, unless and until the buyer has been given the disclosures required by *Civ. Code § 1810.1* [*see* [3][b], *below*] and has accepted the agreement as required [*Civ. Code § 1810*]. A change in any term of the agreement will not become effective until the seller has been given notice of the change and complies with the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1810.3* [*see* [3][d], *below*].

[3] Disclosure Requirements Under RISA

[a] Disclosure in Credit Card Application

State law requirements relating to the disclosure of credit information in credit or charge card applications or solicitations that are subject to *15 U.S.C. § 1637(c)* (the section of TILA that governs these disclosures) are preempted by the federal law [*15 U.S.C. § 1610(e)*]. Therefore, *Civ. Code § 1810.21*, which sets forth the disclosures that must appear in an application form or preapproved written solicitation for a credit card issued in connection with a retail installment account that is mailed on or after October 1, 1987, is preempted. Nevertheless, a disclosure that satisfies the initial disclosure statement requirements of Regulation Z (*12 C.F.R. § 226.6*) is sufficient for purposes of *Civ. Code § 1810.21(a)* [*Civ. Code § 1810.21(a)(2)*]. In addition, if a retail seller is required under federal law to make any

disclosure of the terms applicable to a retail installment account in connection with application forms or solicitations, the retail seller is deemed to have complied with the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1810.21(a)(1)* with respect to those application forms or solicitations if the retail seller complies with the federal disclosure requirement [*Civ. Code § 1810.21(f)*].

The TILA disclosure requirements apply to certain direct mail, telephone, and other applications and solicitations offering a credit or charge card, whether the card is connected to a retail installment account or not [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1637(c)*]. For discussion of the TILA requirements, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

[b] Initial Disclosure

Before the first transaction is made on any retail installment account, the seller must disclose to the buyer, in a single written statement, information regarding the following [*Civ. Code § 1810.1*]:

- Conditions under which a finance charge may be imposed, including an explanation of the time period, if any, within which any credit extended may be paid without incurring a finance charge;

- The method of determining the balance on which the finance charge may be imposed;

- The method of determining the amount of the finance charge, including the method of determining any minimum charge that may be imposed as a finance charge;

- When one or more periodic rates may be used to compute the finance charge, each such rate, the range of balances to which it is applicable, and the corresponding annual percentage rate determined by multiplying the periodic rate by the number of periods in the year;

- The conditions under which any other charges may be imposed, and the method by which they will be determined;

- The conditions under which the creditor may retain or acquire any security interest in any property to secure the payment of any credit extended on the account, and a description or identification of the type of interest that may be retained or acquired; and

- The minimum periodic payment required.

Until the single written statement is delivered to the buyer, the buyer is obligated to pay only the cash price of the goods or services purchased under the account [*Civ. Code § 1810.1*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.7* (setting out similar requirements under TILA that must be disclosed to the consumer prior to the first transaction on an open-end credit account)].

[c] Statement Regarding Insurance

If the cost of any insurance is to be separately charged to the buyer, there must be a written agreement signed by both buyer and seller, and the buyer must be provided with a copy of the agreement. The agreement must state if the insurance is to be procured by the buyer or by the seller or holder. If the insurance is to be procured by the seller or holder, the seller or holder must comply with *Civ. Code § 1803.5* [*Civ. Code § 1810.5*; *see Civ. Code § 1803.5* (required disclosures when insurance included in price and charged to buyer) and discussion in *§ 501.31[5][h]*].

[d] Change in Terms of Account

If any change is to be made in terms of a retail installment account previously disclosed to the buyer, the seller must

mail or deliver to the buyer written disclosure of such proposed change not less than 30 days prior to the effective date of the change or 30 days prior to the beginning of the billing cycle within which the change will become effective, whichever is the earlier date [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)*; *cf. 12 C.F.R. § 226.9(c)* (providing that, except in certain circumstances, creditor must mail or deliver to consumer written notice of change in any term required to be disclosed under *12 C.F.R. § 226.6* at least 15 days prior to effective date of change)].

If the change only involves the reduction of any component of a finance or other charge, then a notice of the change that appears on the periodic statement or accompanies it is sufficient [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)*].

If a change involves any of the following, it will be effective only with respect to purchases made on or after the effective date of the change [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)*]:

- An increase in any component of a finance charge [*see Civ. Code 1802.10* (finance charge defined)];
- A change in a charge permitted by *Civ. Code 1810.4* [*see* [9], *below*]; or
- A change in the attorney's fee provision of the agreement [*see Civ. Code 1802.4*].

[e] Periodic Statement of Account; Required Contents

Except in the case of an account that the seller deems to be uncollectible or with respect to which delinquency collection procedures have been instituted, the seller must provide the buyer with a statement of account in the format prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(b)* and *(c)* for each billing cycle [*see Civ. Code § 1802.17* ("billing cycle" defined)] at the end of which there is a balance due in excess of one dollar, setting out the following to the extent applicable [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.7(b)* (similar requirements for periodic billing statements)]:

- The previous balance on the account;
- The amount and date of each extension of credit and, unless previously furnished, a brief identification of any goods or services purchased or other extension of credit;
- All amounts credited to the account during the billing cycle, including payments, returns, rebates of finance charges, and adjustments, and, unless previously furnished, a brief identification of each of the items;
- The amount and itemization of finance charges debited to the account during the billing cycle, using appropriate descriptive terminology;
- Each periodic rate, using the term "periodic rate" or "periodic rates," that may be used to compute the finance charge (whether or not applied during the billing cycle), and the range of balances to which it applies;
- The balance on which the finance charge was computed and a statement of how it was determined; if any balance is determined without first deducting all credits during the billing cycle, that fact and the amount of such credits must also be disclosed; and
- The closing date of the billing cycle and the outstanding balance on that date, using the term "new balance," accompanied by the statement of the date that, or the period, if any, within which, payment must be made to avoid additional finance charges.

The seller must mail or deliver the statements required by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)* at least 14 days prior to any date or the end of any time period required to be disclosed under *Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)(7)* for the consumer to avoid an additional or other finance charge. A seller that fails to meet this requirement may not collect any finance or other charges imposed as a result of that failure [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(b)*].

[4] Disclosure Requirements Under TILA

[a] In General

As noted previously [*see* discussions in *501.22*[1and [2][b]]], retail installment accounts are also subject to the TILA disclosure requirements for open-end credit plans. Like RISA, TILA requires certain disclosures to be made before an account is opened, and periodically thereafter.

TILA also requires that certain disclosures be made in applications or solicitations offering a credit or charge card, whether the card is connected to a retail installment account or not [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1637(c)*]. These disclosure requirements preempt state law disclosure requirements relating to credit card applications and solicitations [*15 U.S.C. § 1610(e)*]. For discussion of the TILA requirements, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

[b] Initial Disclosures

Before opening any account under an open-end consumer credit plan, the creditor is required to disclose a number of items to the person to whom credit is to be extended. These items are substantially the same as those required by RISA [*compare Civ. Code § 1810.2 with 15 U.S.C. § 1637(a)*]. In addition to these items, TILA requires the creditor to disclose to the obligor his or her rights with respect to billing errors under *15 U.S.C. § 1666 et seq.* [*15 U.S.C. § 1637(a)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 226.7(a)(9)* for the exact wording of the required notice].

[c] Periodic Statement

Like RISA, TILA requires that the creditor of any open-end account mail or deliver a statement to the customer for each billing cycle at the end of which there is an outstanding credit or debit balance in excess of $1, or on which a finance charge has been imposed [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.5(b)(2)(i)*]. The items required to be disclosed on the periodic statement are basically the same as those required by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)* [*see* discussion in [3][e], *above*]. The requirements of TILA, as implemented by Regulation Z, differ from those of *Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)* in that TILA requires that the amounts and dates of any credits made to an account during the billing cycle be disclosed on the statement, whereas RISA requires disclosure of only the total amounts credited for payments and for other credits [*compare 12 C.F.R. § 226.7(c) with Civ. Code § 1810.3(a)(3)*]. In addition to the items required to be disclosed by RISA under *Civ. Code § 1810.3*, TILA also requires disclosure of the annual percentage rate when a finance charge is imposed during the billing cycle [*15 U.S.C. § 1637(b)(5)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.7(g)*]. In addition, the periodic statement must include an address to be used by the creditor for the purpose of receiving billing inquiries from customers [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1637(b)(10)*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.7(k)*].

[5] Refund of Credit Balance on Retail Installment Account

If any outstanding credit balance in excess of $1 exists in a retail installment account, the seller must either refund to the buyer the amount of the credit balance or notify the buyer of the credit balance [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(e)(1)*].

If the credit balance exists for 90 days, the seller must either (1) notify the buyer, as prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(e)(2)(A)*, of his or her right to receive a cash refund, or (2) refund to the buyer the outstanding credit balance at any time after the credit balance is created and prior to the date by which the first notice of the outstanding balance would have been sent had the seller elected to proceed under *Civ. Code § 1810.3(e)(2)(A)* [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(e)(2)*].

If the account with an outstanding balance is dormant for 180 days after the credit balance is created, the seller must proceed as prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(f)*. If, after three years, the seller is unable to refund the credit balance, the balance escheats to the state [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(g)*].

For the purposes of *Civ. Code § 1810.3*, an outstanding credit balance is created at the end of the billing cycle in which the credit balance is first recorded on a buyer's account and is created anew at the end of the billing cycle in which the recorded amount of an existing credit balance is changed because of the buyer's use of the account [*Civ. Code § 1810.3(h)*].

[6] Security Interest Until Goods Paid For

The buyer and seller may execute an agreement under which the seller retains a security interest in the goods sold until full payment has been made. For purposes of release of the security interests, in the case of goods or services purchased on different dates, the first purchase is deemed first paid for. In the case of goods or services purchased on the same date, the lowest priced is deemed first paid for. All amounts allocated to payment for these goods and services must be applied to accomplish the above result. However, any downpayment on a specific purchase must be deemed to be allocated in its entirety to that purchase [*Civ. Code § 1810.6*].

[7] Notes Cutting off Buyer's Defenses Prohibited

No installment account may require or entail the execution of any note or series of notes by the buyer that, when separately negotiated, will cut off as to third parties any right of action or defense that the buyer may have against the seller [*Civ. Code § 1810.7*].

[8] Delinquency Charges

Notwithstanding the restrictions on charges set forth in *Civ. Code § 1810.4*, a seller or holder of a retail installment account may, subject to the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)* [*see* discussion in [3][d], *above*], provide that, for each installment in default, the buyer must pay a delinquency charge not to exceed $10 for a period in default of not less than 10 days or not to exceed $15 for a period in default of not less than 15 days [*Civ. Code § 1810.12(a)*]. Only one delinquency charge may be collected on any installment regardless of the period during which it remains in default. No delinquency charge may be imposed for any default of payment due prior to the mailing or delivery to the buyer of the written disclosure concerning a change in the delinquency charge required by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)* [*see* discussion in [3][d], *above*]. Payments received by the seller in a timely manner under a written extension or deferral agreement shall not be subject to any delinquency charge [*Civ. Code § 1810.12(b)*].

The agreement may also provide for payment of any actual and reasonable costs of collection occasioned (a) by the removal of goods from the state without written permission of the holder, (b) by the failure of the buyer to notify the holder of any change of residence, or (c) by the failure of the buyer to communicate with the holder for a period of 45 days after any default in making payments due under the agreement [*Civ. Code § 1810.12(b)*].

Notwithstanding the time period for statements set forth in *Civ. Code § 1810.3(b)* [*see* discussion in [3][e], *above*], the seller or holder of a retail installment account must provide a minimum of 20 days between the monthly billing date and the date on which the minimum payment is due, exclusive of the applicable grace period [*Civ. Code § 1810.12(c)*].

[9] Finance Charge Limits on Retail Installment Accounts

There is no limit on the interest rate that may be charged, received, or collected by the seller or holder of a retail installment account, as long as the finance charge has been disclosed to the buyer as required by *Civ. Code § 1810.3* [*Civ. Code § 1810.2*; *see* [3][e], *above*].

The seller or holder of a retail installment account may charge and collect a fee not to exceed $15 for the return by a depository institution of a dishonored check, negotiable order of withdrawal, or share draft issued in connection with the retail installment account. This fee is not considered to be part of the finance charge under RISA [*Civ. Code § 1810.4*]. In addition, when credit cards are issued in connection with a retail installment account, the seller, either in the agreement or after giving the notice required by *Civ. Code § 1810.3(d)* (*see* discussion in [3][e], *above*), may require an annual payment of not more than $15 for membership in the credit card plan. This fee is also not considered part of the finance charge under RISA [*Civ. Code § 1810.4*].

[10] Payments on Account

The payment provisions set out in *Civ. Code §§ 1806.1* and *1806.4* with regard to retail installment contracts govern payment on retail installment accounts [*Civ. Code § 1810.8*; *see § 501.35*, *above*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Disclosures, Requirements, and Prohibitions

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.39through 501.49

[Reserved]

§§ 501.39[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.50

§ 501.50 Buyer Remedies Under RISA

[1] Rescission of Retail Installment Contract

If there is an explicit understanding between the seller and the buyer that all or any part of the cash price will be paid from the proceeds of a loan to be obtained by the buyer from a third party, the contract or purchase order can be rescinded at the buyer's election, and all considerations will be returned to the respective parties without further demand, if the buyer is unable to obtain the loan on reasonable terms after having made a reasonable effort to do so, and the buyer notifies the seller of the rescission within three business days [*Civ. Code § 1803.9*].

[2] Civil Liability for Violations of RISA

Both RISA and TILA impose specific duties on creditors to disclose information to debtors and subject any creditor in breach of those duties to statutory damages [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.7, 1812.9*; *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*]. There apparently is no rule in California regarding whether or not federal and state remedies are cumulative. It appears that, absent a case or statute providing that recovery under one act is in lieu of recovery under the other when based substantially on the same violation, both RISA and TILA remedies would be available.

If any person fails to comply with the provisions of RISA, that person, or any person who acquires a contract or installment account with knowledge of the noncompliance, is barred from recovery of any finance charge or of any delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, or refinance charge imposed in connection with the contract or installment account. The buyer has the right to recover from that person an amount equal to any charges he or she has paid [*Civ. Code § 1812.7*].

[3] Statutory Penalty for Willful Violation on Consolidated Contracts

In any case in which a person willfully violates any provision of RISA in connection with the imposition, computation, or disclosures of or relating to a finance charge on a consolidated total of two or more contracts under the provisions of RISA governing add-on sales [*see Civ. Code §§ 1801.1-1808.5*], the buyer may recover from that person an amount equal to three times the total of the finance charges and any delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, or refinance

charges imposed, contracted for, or received on all contracts included in the consolidated total. In addition, the seller is barred from the recovery of any such charges [*Civ. Code § 1812.9*].

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

RISA provides that reasonable attorney's fees and costs must be awarded to the prevailing party in an action on a retail installment contract or installment account, regardless of whether the action is instituted by the seller, holder, or buyer. If the defendant alleges in his or her answer that he or she has tendered to the plaintiff the full amount to which the plaintiff is entitled, and deposits that amount in court for the plaintiff, and the allegation is found to be true, then the defendant is deemed to be the prevailing party within the meaning of RISA [*Civ. Code § 1811.1*]. However, the tender must be made prior to commencement of the litigation [*Joseph Magnin Co. v. Schmidt (1978) 89 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 7, 13 , 152 Cal. Rptr. 523]* .

[5] Assignee Liability Under RISA

An assignee of the seller's rights is subject to all equities and defenses of the buyer against the seller arising out of the sale, notwithstanding an agreement to the contrary; however, the assignee's liability cannot exceed the amount of the debt owing to the assignee at the time of the assignment [*Civ. Code § 1804.2(a)*].

The assignee has recourse against the seller to the extent of any liability incurred by the assignee pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1804.2*, regardless of whether the assignment was with or without recourse [*Civ. Code § 1804.2(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.51

§ 501.51 Buyer's Remedies Under TILA

[1] Rescission of Contract Creating Security Interest in Principal Dwelling

[a] Availability

In any consumer credit transaction in which a security interest, including any security interest arising by operation of law, is or will be retained or acquired in any property that is used as the principal dwelling of the obligor, the obligor has the right to rescind the transaction until midnight of the third business day following the consummation of the transaction or the delivery of the information and forms required under *15 U.S.C. § 1635* together with a statement containing the material disclosures required by TILA, whichever is later, by notifying the creditor of his or her intention to do so [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(u)* (definition of "material disclosures"); *see also 15 U.S.C. § 1605(f)(2)* (criteria for determining whether amount disclosed as finance charge is accurate for purposes of determining when period for exercise of rescission rights begins to run), discussed in *§ 501.34[2][d]*]. The transaction is "consummated" at the time the consumer becomes contractually obligated, which is determined by looking to California contract law [*Jackson v. Grant (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 118, 120]* . For example, if an essential element of the contract is reserved for future agreement of the parties, no legal obligation is created and the transaction is consummated only when the parties agree to the missing term [*Jackson v. Grant (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 118, 120-121* (mortgage contract with real estate loan broker did not bind borrower until eventual lender was identified)].

It should be noted that RISA contains no provision for rescission in this situation. RISA does, however, require notice when a security interest is granted or retained [*see Civ. Code § 1803.2*, discussed in *§ 501.31[4]*]. RISA also provides that any contract for the sale of goods that provides for a security interest in real property if the primary goods sold are not to be attached to the real property is a violation of RISA and subject to the penalties provided in *Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9* [*Civ. Code § 1804.3(b)*].

In addition to the general right to rescind, after the initiation of any judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure process on the primary dwelling of an obligor securing an extention of credit, the obligor has a right to rescind the transaction, equivalent to the other rights provided by *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, if (1) a mortgage broker fee is not included in the finance charge in accordance with the applicable statutes and regulations; or (2) the notice of rescission for the transaction is not

the appropriate form of written notice published and adopted by the Federal Reserve Board, or a comparable written notice complying with all applicable notice requirements [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(i)(1)*]. Special tolerances for the required disclosures apply in the latter situation [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1635(i)(2)*].

Rescission under *15 U.S.C. § 1635* is a personal remedy not suitable for class-action treatment [*LaLiberte v. Pacific Mercantile Bank (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 745]* .

[b] Disclosure of Right to Rescind Required

The creditor must clearly and conspicuously disclose, in accordance with regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, to any obligor in a transaction in which a security interest is created, the rights of the obligor to rescind the transaction under the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1635* [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*]. The contents of the required notice are prescribed by *12 C.F.R. §§ 226.15(b)* (open-end credit) and *226.23(b)* (closed-end credit). Suggested model forms for notice of the right to rescind are contained in 12 C.F.R. Part 226, Appendices G and H.

The obligor has no rescission rights arising solely from the form of the written notice the creditor uses to inform the obligor of the obligor's rights under *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, as long as the creditor provided the obligor with the appropriate form of written notice published and adopted by the Federal Reserve Board, or a comparable written notice of the obligor's rights that was properly completed by the creditor and otherwise complied with all other requirements of *15 U.S.C. § 1635* regarding notice [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(h)*].

[c] Form of Notice to Creditor

The consumer must notify the creditor of his or her intent to rescind the transaction by mail, telegram, or other writing. Notification by mail is deemed given at the time the notice is mailed; notification by telegram is deemed given at the time the notice is filed for transmission; notification by other writing is deemed given at the time the writing is delivered to the creditor's designated place of business [*12 C.F.R. §§ 226.15(a)(2)* (open-end credit), *226.23(a)(2)* (closed-end credit)].

[d] Return of Money or Property

When an obligor exercises his or her right to rescind, he or she is not liable for any finance or other charge, and any security interest given by the obligor, including any security interest arising by operation of law, becomes void on rescission. Within 20 days after receipt of a notice of rescission, the creditor must return to the obligor any money or property given as earnest money, downpayment, or otherwise, and must take any action necessary or appropriate to reflect the termination of the security interest created. If the creditor has delivered any property to the obligor, the obligor must return that property to the creditor only when the creditor has performed all obligations with regard to the rescission. If the return of the property in kind would be impracticable or inequitable, the obligor must tender its reasonable value. If the creditor does not take possession of the property within 20 days after tender by the obligor, ownership of the property vests in the obligor without obligation on his or her part to pay for it [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)*].

The Tenth Circuit has held that even though an obligor who exercises the right to rescind is not liable by statute for finance or other charges, a court may apply equitable principles, for example, to impose interest charges if the borrower had the benefit of the use of loan proceeds [*see Rachbach v. Cogswell (10th Cir. 1977) 547 F.2d 502, 505* (involving rescission of mortgage contract)]. However, the latter position has been rejected by the Ninth Circuit on the ground that it contravenes *15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)*, which states that a borrower is not liable for any finance charge, and *15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)*, which lists interest as an example of a finance charge [*Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 706]* .

[e] Action for Restitution of Money or Property

If the consumer exercises his or her right to rescind a transaction under *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, but the creditor fails to return to the consumer any money or property given by the consumer under the agreement, the consumer's remedy is to bring an action for restitution of the money or property based on the rescission of the agreement [*see Civ. Code §§ 1689(b)(7), 1692*]. For a complaint for use by the consumer in seeking restitution, see *§ 501.201*.

[f] Time Limit

[i] Three-day Optional Rescission Period

If the transaction has been consummated and the required disclosures, forms, and information have not been delivered, the obligor has the right to rescind the transaction at any time until midnight of the third business day following delivery of the disclosures, forms, and information [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*]. If there are two or more obligors, one court has held that the time period for rescinding the transaction does not begin to run until a disclosure statement has been delivered to each obligor [*Gerasta v. Hibernia Nat. Bank (E.D. La. 1975) 411 F. Supp. 176, 188 , rev'd in part on other grounds, (5th Cir. 1978) 575 F.2d 580, 583* ; *see 12 C.F.R. §§ 226.5(d), 226.17(d)*; *see also* former 12 C.F.R. § 226.603 (interpretation of the board regarding transactions involving multiple customers)].

If the disclosures are delivered before consummation of the transaction and, because of the timing of the delivery, notify the consumer of the wrong expiration date on his or her right to rescind, one court has held that this is equivalent to making no disclosure at all [*see Jackson v. Grant (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 118, 120-122]* .

If no disclosure has been delivered, the right to rescind expires three years after the date of the consummation of the transaction or on the sale of the property, which ever occurs first [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)*; *see Pacific Shore Funding v. Lozo (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1347, 1355, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 283* (borrowers not precluded from rescinding consumer loan that is secured by their residence and subject to TILA merely because they already refinanced that loan, provided they rescind within three years after original loan date)].

[ii] Use as Affirmative Defense

The United States Supreme Court has held that a borrower may not assert the right to rescind as an affirmative defense in a collection action brought by the lender more than three years after the consummation of the transaction. Because *15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)* completely extinguishes the right of rescission at the end of the three-year period, it is not a statute of limitations and the mortgagors cannot assert the right to rescind as a recoupment defense beyond the expiration period [*Beach v. Ocwen Federal Bank (1998) 523 U.S. 410, 417-419, 118 S. Ct. 1408, 140 L. Ed. 2d 566]* .

[iii] In Action by Agency Empowered to Enforce TILA

If an agency empowered to enforce the provisions of TILA, institutes an action, the obligor's right of rescission expires three years after the date of consummation of the transaction or earlier sale of the property, or one year following the conclusion of the proceeding or any judicial review or period for judicial review, whichever is later [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)*]. The foregoing applies when all of the following occur:

- The agency instituted a proceeding to enforce the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1635* within three years after the date of consummation of the transaction.

- The agency found a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1635*.

- The obligor's right to rescind is based in whole or in part on any matter involved in the proceeding.

[g] Election of Remedies Not Required

In addition to rescission, the court may award relief under *15 U.S.C. § 1640* for violations of TILA not related to the right to rescind [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(g)*; *see* discussion in *§ 501.51[2]*]. Thus, a debtor can successfully pursue damages under the statutory penalty provisions of TILA, as well as seeking rescission [*Ljepava v. M.L.S.C. Properties, Inc. (9th Cir. 1975) 511 F.2d 935, 945* ; *Eby v. Reb Realty, Inc. (9th Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 646, 651* ; *see § 501.200* (complaint for statutory damages and penalties)]. Accordingly, failure to state the obligor's right to rescind coupled with failure to make other required disclosures entitles an obligor to rescission as well as statutory penalties provided for under the federal act [*see Palmer v. Wilson (9th Cir. 1974) 502 F.2d 860, 861]* .

[h] Right to Rescind as Against Assignee

Any consumer who has the right to rescind a transaction under *15 U.S.C. § 1635* may rescind the transaction as against any assignee of the obligation [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(c)*].

[i] Attorney's Fees

Reasonable attorney's fees may also be awarded to the successful consumer-litigant in any action in which he or she is found to have a right of rescission under *15 U.S.C. § 1635* [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (3); *see also § 501.201[6]* and *[3]*, respectively].

[2] Civil Liability for Violations of TILA

[a] Individual Action for Damages and Statutory Penalties

Except as otherwise provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1640*, a creditor is liable for the recovery of any actual damages sustained by a consumer that are the result of the creditor's failure to meet the disclosure requirements of TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (1)]. The creditor also may be liable for a statutory penalty in an amount equal to twice the amount of any finance charge imposed in connection with the transaction [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (2)(A)(i)]; or, if the transaction was under an open end consumer credit plan that is not secured by real property or a dwelling, the penalty is twice the amount of any finance charge in connection with the transaction, with a minimum of $500 and a maximum of $5,000, or such higher amount as may be appropriate in the case of an established pattern or practice of such failures [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (2)(A)(iii)]; or, if the transaction was not under an open end credit plan and was secured by real property or a dwelling, the penalty is not less than $400 or more than $4,000 [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (2)(A)(iv)]. Liability for a penalty can be based only on a violation of any of the following [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 5th sentence]:

- *15 U.S.C. § 1635* (concerning the consumer's right to rescind);
- *15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)(2)* insofar as it requires a disclosure of the amount financed;
- A disclosure requirement in *15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)(3)-(6)* or *(9)*;
- The variable-rate disclosure requirement in *15 U.S.C. § 1638(b)(2)(C)(ii)*.
- Certain requirements applicable to private educational loans [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1638(e)(2)(A), (B), (D), (F), (J), (4)(c), (6)-(8)*; for discussion, see *Ch. 127, Consumer Contracts and Loans, § 127.34*]; or
- *15 U.S.C. § 1641(f)* or *(g)* (requirements regarding treatment of a servicer or notice of a new creditor).

The statutory penalty may be recovered without proving actual damages [*Demando v. Morris (9th Cir. 2000) 206 F.3d 1300, 1303]* .

TILA imposes a statutory penalty in "twice the amount of the finance charge" [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (2)(A)(i)]. It is not clear whether these words refer to the amount of the finance charge as disclosed to the buyer at the time of the sale or refer to the amount of the finance charge actually owing as determined under the provisions of TILA and Regulation Z [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1605*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.4(a)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 501.34*].

When there are multiple obligors in a consumer credit transaction, there may be only one recovery of the statutory penalty under *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* for violation of TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(d)*].

[b] Class Action Under TILA

In the case of a class action the creditor is liable for the recovery of any actual damages sustained by class members which resulted from the creditor's failure to meet the disclosure requirements. In addition, the court may award an additional amount as a penalty, but this additional amount may not exceed the lesser of $500,000 or one percent of the net worth of the creditor in any class action or series of class actions arising out of the same failure to comply [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (2)(B).]. In a class action, a lender liable for a TILA violation is subject to statutory damages even in the absence of any actual damages [*Demando v. Morris (9th Cir. 2000) 206 F.3d 1300, 1303]* .

In determining the amount of award in any class action, the court must consider, among other relevant factors, the following [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (4)]:

- The amount of any actual damages awarded.
- The frequency and persistence of failures of compliance by the creditor.
- The resources of the creditor.
- The number of persons adversely affected.
- The extent to which the creditor's failure to comply was intentional.

[c] Applicability of Statutory Penalty

Creditor liability for the statutory penalty provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* is limited to violations of TILA provisions specified in *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* [*see McDonald v. Checks-N-Advance, Inc. (In re Ferrell) (9th Cir. BAP 2006) 358 B.R. 777, 785* (list in *15 U.S.C. § 1640* of specified TILA provisions for violation of which statutory penalty may be claimed is exclusive, since list is introduced with qualifier "only")].

[3] Costs and Attorney's Fees

In the case of any successful action to enforce creditor liability under TILA, the individual plaintiff or the class may recover the costs of the action, together with reasonable attorney's fees, as determined by the court [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (3); *see 15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (4) (amounts recoverable for failure to comply with requirements for certain mortgages under *15 U.S.C. § 1639*)].

[4] Multiple Violations in Single Transaction

TILA limits an obligor to a single recovery for multiple failures to disclose with regard to a single credit transaction [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(g)*]. However, continued failure to disclose after a recovery has been granted gives rise to the right to additional recoveries [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(g)*].

[5] Penalties Inapplicable to Government Agencies

No civil or criminal penalty provided under TILA for any violation may be imposed on the United States, any state or political subdivision, or any government agency [*15 U.S.C. § 1612*].

[6] Assignee Liability Under TILA

[a] In General

Except as otherwise specifically provided by TILA, any civil action for a violation of TILA that may be brought against a creditor may be maintained against any assignee of the creditor only if the violation for which the action or proceeding is brought is apparent on the face of the disclosure statement, except when the assignment was involuntary [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(a)*].

For purposes of *15 U.S.C. § 1641*, a violation apparent on the face of the disclosure statement includes, but is not limited to the following [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(a)*]:

- A disclosure that can be determined to be incomplete or inaccurate from the face of the disclosure statement or other documents assigned; or

- A disclosure that does not use the terms required to be used by TILA.

Except as provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1635(c)* pertaining to rescission of certain transactions, in any proceeding or action by or against any subsequent assignee of the original creditor, written acknowledgment of receipt by a person to whom a statement is required to be given pursuant to TILA, absent contrary knowledge by the assignee at the time of the assignment, constitutes conclusive proof of the delivery of the statement and of compliance with the requirements of TILA, except if violations are apparent on the face of the disclosure statement, as discussed above. The foregoing provisions do not affect the rights of the obligor in any action against the original creditor [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(b)*].

A servicer of consumer credit obligations is not treated as the assignee of those obligations unless it is or was the owner of the obligations [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)*].

In addition to other disclosures required by TILA, not later than 30 days after the date on which any consumer credit transaction that is secured by the principal dwelling of a consumer (that is, a mortgage loan) is sold or otherwise transferred or assigned to a third party, the creditor that is the new owner or assignee of the debt must give the borrower written notice of the transfer, including the identity, address, telephone number of the new creditor, the date of transfer, how to reach an agent or party having authority to act on behalf of the new creditor, the location of the place where transfer of ownership of the debt is recorded, and any other relevant information regarding the new creditor [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(g)*].

[b] Consumer Credit Transactions Secured by Real Property

A civil action for a TILA violation may be maintained against the assignee of a creditor with respect to a consumer credit transaction secured by real property only if (1) the violation is apparent on the face of the disclosure statement provided in connection with the transaction, and (2) the assignment to the assignee was voluntary [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(e)(1)*]. For purposes of this requirement, a violation is apparent on the face of the disclosure statement if the disclosure can be determined to be complete or inaccurate by a comparison among the disclosure statement, any itemization of the amount financed, the note, or any other disclosure of disbursement, or if the disclosure does not use the terms or format required by the TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1641(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.52

§ 501.52 Action for Declaratory Relief

When a controversy exists between a buyer and a seller in a retail installment transaction as to whether or not the transaction is one governed by the provisions of either RISA or TILA, the remedy of declaratory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* should be considered. For discussion and forms involving actions for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.53

§ 501.53 Procedural Considerations

[1] Jurisdiction of TILA Action

Any action based on a violation of TILA may be brought in any United States district court, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*]. Although the federal act does not specifically provide that federal district courts have jurisdiction over actions for rescission, that jurisdiction has been upheld on the basis of a federal statute [*28 U.S.C. § 1337*] conferring original jurisdiction on federal district courts in any civil action arising under any act of Congress regulating commerce [*Sosa v. Fite (5th Cir. 1972) 465 F.2d 1227, 1229* ; *28 U.S.C. § 1337*; *but see Wachtel v. West (6th Cir. 1973) 476 F.2d 1062, 1065 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 874* ; *see § 501.51[1]*]. If violations of both TILA and RISA arise out of a common nucleus of operative facts, an action under RISA may be joined with an action under TILA in federal court under the doctrine of pendant jurisdiction. For a further discussion of pendant jurisdiction, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

[2] Removal of Actions

When a plaintiff relying on federal law brings an action in state court, a defendant may be able to remove the case to federal court [*28 U.S.C. §§ 1441-1445*]. However, actions for violation of disclosure laws are frequently brought defensively by an obligor who is being sued for payment of a credit contract. In that instance, an obligor who sets up a defense based on the plaintiff's violation of TILA cannot remove the action to a federal court if the plaintiff's claim is based solely on California law. The state court provides the defendant with "a court of competent jurisdiction" to try the issues involving the federal act [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*]. For further discussion and forms for use in removing cases to federal courts, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

[3] Venue in Action on Contract or Account Subject to RISA

An action on a contract or installment account subject to RISA must be tried in one of the following counties [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(a)*]:

- The county in which the contract was in fact signed by the buyer.

- The county in which buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into.
- The county in which the buyer resides at the commencement of the action.
- The county in which the goods purchased pursuant to the contract have been so affixed to real property as to become a part of the real property.

In any action subject to the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1812.10*, the plaintiff must file an affidavit, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper county. These facts may be stated in a verified complaint and may not be stated on information and belief. If a plaintiff fails to file such an affidavit or allege such facts in a verified complaint, no further proceedings may be had, and the court must dismiss the action without prejudice, on its own motion or on the motion of any party [*see Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*]. For a further discussion of the venue provisions of *Civ. Code § 1812.10, see § 501.102[3] -[5]*.

[4] Limitation of Actions

[a] TILA

An action for violation of TILA must be brought within one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*]. It appears that a violation involving a failure to disclose in an open-end credit plan occurs at the time the account is opened, or, at the latest, sometime before the first credit transaction takes place [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.5(b)(1)*]. On the other hand, a violation by an incomplete, inaccurate, or misleading disclosure of credit terms in connection with an open-end credit plan occurs, and limitation commences, on the date on which a finance charge was first imposed [*Goldman v. First Nat'l Bank of Chicago (7th Cir. 1976) 532 F.2d 10, 20-21 , cert. denied, 429 U.S. 870]* .

If the credit transaction is other than an open-end account, the transaction is completed when the creditor and obligor contract for the extension of credit. Accordingly, if the proper disclosure is not made, violation of the act occurs, at the latest, when the parties perform their contract [*Wachtel v. West (6th Cir. 1973) 476 F.2d 1062, 1065 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 874]* .

The one-year statute of limitations does not bar a person from asserting a violation of TILA in an action to collect the debt that was brought more than one year from the date of the occurrence of the violation as a matter of defense by recoupment or set-off in an such action, except as otherwise provided by state law [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*]. An action to enforce a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1639* (disclosure requirements for certain mortgages) may also be brought by the state attorney general not later than three years after the date on which the violation occurs [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*].

[b] RISA

Because RISA itself contains no specific time limit for bringing actions under *Civ. Code §§ 1812.7* and *1812.9*, the-one year statute of limitations for statutory penalties or forfeitures would appear to be applicable [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 340(a)*].

[5] Joinder With Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

If an action under TILA or RISA involves deceptive practices that are unlawful under *Civ. Code § 1770*, as well as in violation of the disclosure requirements of RISA or TILA, counsel should consider the possibility of joining the action with one under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act [*Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.*]. For procedures and forms involving the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, see Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* .

One possible advantage of joinder with an action under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act is that the act contains specific provisions [*see Civ. Code § 1781*] authorizing the bringing of a class action in which the unlawful method, act, or practice has caused damage to consumers similarly situated with the plaintiff.

[6] TILA Claims Are Arbitrable

A provision in a contract subject to TILA that requires the parties to arbitrate any disputes arising regarding the agreement is enforceable. There is nothing in the Truth in Lending Act to indicate that Congress evinced an intention to preclude a waiver of judicial remedies for the statutory rights under the Act [*Green Tree Financial Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph (2000) 531 U.S. 79, 121 S. Ct. 513, 148 L. Ed. 2d 373, 383]* . Nor does the fact that the agreement is silent with respect to costs and fees create a risk that the consumer will be required to bear prohibitive arbitration costs if he or she pursues a TILA claim in an arbitral forum, in effect rendering it impossible for the consumer to vindicate his or her statutory rights. The party seeking to resist arbitration bears the burden of showing the likelihood of incurring costs that would be prohibitively expensive [*Green Tree Financial Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph (2000) 531 U.S. 79, 148 L. Ed 2d 373, 383-384, 121 S. Ct. 513]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.54

§ 501.54 Statutory Defenses to Liability

[1] Correction of RISA Violation Within 30 Days of Execution Date

Any failure to comply with any provision of RISA may be corrected by the holder [*see Civ. Code § 1802.13* (defining "holder")] in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1812.8*, provided that a willful violation may not be corrected, and a correction that will increase the amount owed by the buyer or the amount of any payment will not be effective unless the buyer agrees to the correction in writing. If a violation is corrected by the holder in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1812.8*, neither the seller nor the holder will be subject to any penalty under RISA. The correction must be made by delivery to the buyer of a corrected copy of the contract within 30 days from the execution of the original contract by the buyer. Any amount that was improperly collected from the buyer must be credited against the indebtedness evidenced by the contract [*Civ. Code § 1812.8*].

[2] Correction of TILA Error Within 60 Days of Discovery

A creditor or assignee is not liable under *15 U.S.C. § 1607*, *1611*, or *1640* for any violation of TILA if within 60 days after discovering an error, whether pursuant to a final written examination report or notice issued under *15 U.S.C. § 1607(e)(1)* or through the creditor's or assignee's own procedures, and prior to the institution of an action under *15 U.S.C. § 1640* or the receipt of written notice of the error from the obligor, the creditor or assignee notifies the person concerned of the error and makes whatever adjustments in the appropriate account are necessary to assure that the person will not be required to pay an amount in excess of the charge actually disclosed, or the dollar equivalent of the annual percentage rate actually disclosed, whichever is lower [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(b)*].

It should be emphasized that TILA permits correction of errors within 60 days after discovery of an error, whenever that may occur, whereas RISA permits the avoidance of penalties only if the error is corrected within 30 days after execution of the contract [*see Civ. Code § 1812.8*; *see also* [1], *above*].

[3] Bona Fide Error Under TILA

The federal act provides that a creditor may not be held liable in any action brought for violation of disclosure

requirements if he or she shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the violation was not intentional but resulted from a bona fide error, notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid that type of error [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)*]. The creditor has the burden of pleading and proving both that the error was not intentional [*Turner v. Firestone (5th Cir. 1976) 537 F.2d 1296, 1298]* , and that it constituted a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid those errors [*Demando v. Morris (9th Cir. 2000) 206 F.3d 1300, 1303* (reversing summary judgment because creditor's affidavit not did explain what procedures it employed that were reasonably adapted to avoid the error)]. Apparently, the bona fide error defense is available only for clerical errors that occur despite the creditor's system for correction of those errors and is not available for mistakes of law [*see Ives v. W.T. Grant (2d Cir. 1975) 522 F.2d 749, 757-758]* . This rule appears to have been codified in an amendment to *15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)*, effective April 1, 1982, which states that examples of "bona fide errors" include, but are not limited to clerical, calculation, computer malfunction, programming, and printing errors. Errors of legal judgment with respect to a person's obligations under TILA are specifically excluded from the category of "bona fide errors." RISA contains no comparable provision for defense based on bona fide error.

[4] Good Faith Compliance With TILA Rule, Regulation, or Interpretation

Acts or omissions done in Good Faith conformity with the rules, regulations, and interpretations of the Federal Reserve System Board [*15 U.S.C. § 1602(b)*], or interpretations or approvals of its employees or officials, preclude liability under *15 U.S.C. §§ 1611* (criminal liability), or 1640, notwithstanding that after the occurrence of the act or omission, the rule, regulation, interpretation, or approval is amended, rescinded, or determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)*]. Under RISA, there is no comparable good faith compliance defense.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.55

§ 501.55 Seller's Remedies Under RISA

[1] Repossession and Resale

If the buyer defaults in the performance of his or her contract or installment account obligations, the holder, pursuant to any rights granted therein, may either retake the goods or proceed to recover judgment for the balance due without retaking the goods. If the seller retakes the goods, he or she must, within 10 days, notify the buyer in the manner prescribed by *Civ. Code § 1812.3*, of his or her intention either to sell the goods at public sale or to retain the goods in satisfaction of the balance due. The notice must state the amount of the overdue payments that the buyer must pay within 10 days of the notice in order to redeem the goods. In either case, the buyer has an absolute right to redeem the goods within 10 days after the notice is given by paying the amount owing under the contract. If the holder gives notice of election to sell the goods, the buyer also has the absolute right to redeem the goods at any time before the sale by paying the amount specified by the holder, as well as any expense reasonably incurred in good faith by the seller or holder for repairing or reconditioning the goods or preparing them for sale. If the holder gives notice of his or her intention to retain the goods in satisfaction of the indebtedness, he or she is deemed to have done so at the end of the 10-day period if the goods are not redeemed [*Civ. Code § 1812.2*].

At the time the notice is given, the holder must furnish the buyer with a written statement of the sum due under the contract and of any expenses incurred by the holder for repairing or reconditioning the goods or preparing them for sale. If the holder fails to render such a statement, he or she must forfeit $10 to the buyer and is also liable to the buyer for all damages suffered because of that failure [*Civ. Code § 1812.2*].

[2] Application of Resale Proceeds

The proceeds of a resale must be applied to the following [*Civ. Code § 1812.4*]:

- Payment of the expenses of the resale.

- Payment of any expenses of retaking, including reasonable attorney's fees actually incurred, and of any expenses of keeping, storing, repairing, reconditioning, or preparing the goods for sale to which the

holder may be entitled.

- Satisfaction of the balance due under the contract.

Any sum remaining after satisfaction of these claims must be paid to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1812.4*].

[3] No Deficiency Judgment

If the proceeds of the resale are not sufficient to cover the items set forth in *Civ. Code § 1812.4*, the holder may not recover the deficiency from the buyer or from anyone who has succeeded to the obligations of the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1812.5*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Remedies

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.56through 501.59

[Reserved]

§§ 501.56[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.60

§ 501.60 Governing Law

[1] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act of 1940 [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, and relief from contracts and obligations, for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. Although the Act is a federal statute, it is specifically made enforceable in state courts. Any application required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has already been commenced with respect to the matter may be made in any court [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*]. For these purposes, "court" includes any court of competent jurisdiction of the United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*].

[2] California Statutes

The California counterpart to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. This statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. Because the federal and California statutes are so similar in content, language, and purpose, decisions of California and federal courts under the federal act can provide guidance in construing and applying the California law.

[3] Available Relief

The federal and California statutes provide specific relief to qualifying military personnel in a variety of areas, including default judgments [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*], pending judicial proceedings [*50 U.S.C. App. § 522*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(a)*], fines or penalties on contracts and similar obligations [*50 U.S.C. App. § 523*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(b)*], execution of judgments, attachments, and similar matters [*50 U.S.C. App. § 524*; *Mil. & Vet. Code*

§ 403(c)], statutes of limitations [*50 U.S.C. App. § 526*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 404*], interest rates [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*], rent and eviction [*50 U.S.C. App. § 531*], leases [*50 U.S.C. App. § 535*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409*], installment contracts [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407*], mortgages [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408*], insurance [*50 U.S.C. App. §§ 536, 541* et seq.; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.1*], and taxes [*50 U.S.C. App. §§ 561 et seq.*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2*]. In addition to these specific types of relief, the federal and California statutes contain "catch-all" type provisions that allow qualifying service members to initiate proceedings to seek relief.

Any interlocutory order made by any court under these statutes may, on the court's own motion or otherwise, be revoked, modified, or extended by it, on notice to the parties affected as the court may require [*50 U.S.C. App. § 583*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.9*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.61

§ 501.61 Persons Who May Invoke Relief Provisions

[1] Under Federal Statute

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act applies to members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. A servicemember who has been reported missing is presumed to continue in service until accounted for [*50 U.S.C. § 582(c)*].

[2] Under California Statute

The California counterpart to the Servicemebers Civil Relief Act generally applies to the following persons [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)*]:

- Members of the National Guard called or ordered into active state service by the Governor under *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 143* or *146*, or by the President of the United States under Titles 10 or 32 of the United States Code.

- Reservists of the United States Military Reserve who have been called to full-time active duty.

For these purposes, "military service" means full time active service, as described above, for a period in excess of seven days in any 14-day period. For any service member who has been called to active service or duty since September 11, 2001, to engage in homeland defense against terrorism, his or her days of service since that time will be credited toward that seven-day period, even if they precede the effective date of the California statute [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(b)*; *see also Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.8(c)* (persons missing in action considered to be on active service)].

[3] Dependents

Dependents of service members are entitled to many (but not all) of the key benefits of the federal and California statutes. Dependents are entitled to these benefits upon application to a court, unless in the opinion of the court the

ability of the dependents to comply with the terms of the obligation, contract, lease, or bailment has not been materially impaired by reason of the military service of the person upon whom the applications are dependent [*50 U.S.C. App. § 538*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.5*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.62

§ 501.62 Actions or Proceedings Involving Military Service Members

[1] Tolling of Statutes of Limitation

Statutes of limitation are tolled for personnel on military service. Specifically, the period of military service is not to be included in computing any period to be limited by any law, regulation, or order for the bringing of any action or proceeding in any court, board, bureau, commission, department, or other agency of government by or against any service member or by or against his or her heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, whether the cause of action or the right or privilege to institute the action or proceeding accrued before or during the period of service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 526(a)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 404(a)* (from June 21, 2002, forward)]. For further discussion, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Under California law, any person violating any provision of *Mil. & Vet. Code § 404* is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 404(c)*]. Federal law does not contain a specific comparable provision.

[2] Court-Ordered Stays in Civil Actions and Proceedings

[a] Stay of Action or Proceeding

At any stage in any action or proceeding in which a service member is involved, either as plaintiff or defendant, during the period of military service or within 90 days after that period, the court may, in its discretion on its own motion, and must on application to it by the service member or some person on his or her behalf, stay the action or proceeding unless, in the opinion of the court, the ability of the service member as plaintiff to prosecute the action or as defendant to conduct his or her defense is not materially affected by reason of his or her military service [*50 U.S.C. App. § 522*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(a)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 136, *Continuances* .

[b] Automatic Suspension of Contractual Penalties

When an action for compliance with the terms of any contract is stayed, no fine or penalty can accrue by reason of failure to comply with the terms of the contract during the period of the stay. In any case in which a person fails to

perform any obligation, if a fine or penalty for the nonperformance is incurred, a court, on terms that are just, may provide relief against the enforcement of that fine or penalty if it appears that the person who would suffer by that fine or penalty was in the military service when the penalty was incurred and that by reason of military service the ability of the person to pay or perform was materially impaired [*50 U.S.C. App. § 523*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(b)*].

[c] Stay of Attachment or Garnishment and Stay of Execution of Judgment or Order

In any action or proceeding against a service member, before or during the period of the service, or within 90 days after that period, the court may, in its discretion on its own motion, or must on application to it by the service member or some person on his or her behalf, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the defendant to comply with the judgment or order entered or sought is not materially affected by reason of his or her military service, (1) vacate or stay any attachment or garnishment of property, money, or debts in the hands of another, whether before or after judgment, and (2) stay the execution of any judgment or order entered against a service member [*50 U.S.C. App. § 524*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(c)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , Ch. 276, *Garnishment* , and Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

[d] Extended Duration of Stay

Any stay of any action, proceeding, attachment, or execution ordered by any court may, except as otherwise provided, be ordered for the period of military service and 90 days after that period or any part of that period, and subject to terms that are just, including terms with respect to payment in installments of whatever amounts at whatever times the court may fix. If the service member is a codefendant with others, the plaintiff may nevertheless, by leave of court, proceed against the others [*50 U.S.C. App. § 525*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(d)*].

[3] Defaults and Default Judgments

[a] Declaration Regarding Defendant's Military Service

In any action or proceeding commenced in any court, if any defendant defaults in any appearance, the plaintiff, before entering judgment, must file in the court a declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth facts showing that the defendant is not in the military service. If unable to file that declaration, the plaintiff must instead file a declaration setting forth either that the defendant is in the service or that the plaintiff is not able to determine whether the defendant is in the service. If a declaration is not filed showing that the defendant is not in the military service, no judgment may be entered without first obtaining an order of court directing that entry, and no order may be made if the defendant is in the military service until after the court appoints an attorney to represent the defendant and protect his or her interest [*see* [c], *below*]. The court, on application, must make that appointment [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(2)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[b] Plaintiff's Bond

Unless it appears that the defendant is not in the military service, the court may require, as a condition before judgment is entered, that the plaintiff file a bond approved by the court conditioned to indemnify the defendant, if in the military service, against any loss or damage that he or she may suffer by reason of any judgment, should the judgment be later set aside in whole or in part. The court may make such other and further order or enter that judgment as in its opinion may be necessary to protect these rights of the defendant [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(3)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*].

[c] Appointment of Attorney for Defendant

In any action or proceeding in which a service member is a party, if the service member does not personally appear or is not represented by an authorized attorney, the court may appoint an attorney to represent the service member. In that case a bond may be required and an order made to protect the rights of the service member. However, no attorney

appointed under an order to protect a service member has the power to waive any right of the person for whom he or she is appointed or to bind him or her by the attorney's acts [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)(2),(3)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(c)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide to Civil Actions* , and Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* .

[d] Relief From Judgment

If any judgment is rendered against any service member in any action or proceeding governed by the federal or California statutes discussed in this section during the period of that member's service or within 30 days (or 60 days, under the federal statute) after that period, and it appears that the service member was prejudiced (or "materially affected," under the federal statute) by reason of his or her military service in making his or her defense, the judgment, on application made by the service member or his or her legal representative not later than 90 days after the termination of the service, may be opened by the court that rendered it, and the defendant or his or her legal representative may be let in to defend, provided the application states a meritorious or legal defense to the action or some part of it. Vacating, setting aside, or reversing any judgment in this manner will not impair any right or title acquired by any bona fide purchaser for value under that judgment [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g),(h)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.63

§ 501.63 Contracts and Obligations

[1] Interest Rate Ceiling

No obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year incurred by a service member before that person's entry into service can bear interest during any part of the period of military service at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year unless, in the opinion of the court, on application by the obligee, the ability of the service member to pay interest on that obligation or liability at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year is not materially affected by reason of that service, in which case the court may make whatever order is in its opinion just. "Interest" includes service charges, renewal charges, fees, or any other charges, except bona fide charges for insurance, in respect of any obligation or liability [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527(d)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*]. For additional discussion, and an affirmative defense against enforcement of an obligation bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent, see *§ 501.302*.

[2] Rescission or Termination of Installment Contract; Repossession

Under both the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and the comparable California legislation, after a service member enters military service, a contract by the service member for either the purchase of real or personal property (including a motor vehicle) or the lease or bailment of such property may not be rescinded or terminated for a breach of terms of the contract occurring before or during that person's military service, nor may the property be repossessed for such a breach without a court order [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(a)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)*]. This relief applies only to a contract for which a deposit or installment has been paid by the servicemember before the servicemember enters military service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532(b), Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)]. This provision is designed to protect military service members against repossession, forfeiture of deposits and payments, and termination of installment contracts while they are in active military service. It compels the holder of the obligation to institute a court proceeding before any of these actions can be taken. In such an action, the court may order the repayment of all or part of any prior installments or deposits as a condition of terminating the contract and resuming possession. Instead the court may, on its own motion, or must on application by the service member when the service member's ability to comply with the contract is materially affected by military service, stay the proceedings for a period of time as, in the opinion of the court, justice and equity require; or the court may make other disposition as is equitable to preserve the interests of all parties [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*].

There are penalties for repossessing or attempting to repossess property in violation of these requirements. Violators are guilty of a misdemeanor [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(b)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(c)*].

For additional discussion of these requirements and a form for an application (motion) for a stay of proceedings on the ground that a person is on active military service, see *§ 501.303*.

[3] Enforcement of Security Interests

The Servicemembers Relief Act and the comparable California law provisions limit the enforcement of security interests in real or personal property. These protections are available only with respect to an obligation on real or personal property owned by a service member (1) that originated before the period of the service member's military service and (2) for which the service member is still obligated and (3) that is secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(a)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(a)*]. Security agreements covering goods (such as motor vehicles) under Division 9 of the Commercial Code apparently are "in the nature of a mortgage" in this context.

A sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for a breach of an obligation described above is not valid if made during, or within 90 days after, the period of the service member's military service, except if made either on a court order granted before the sale, foreclosure, or seizure, with a return made and approved by the court, or pursuant to an enforceable waiver agreement [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)* ("pursuant to an agreement between the parties"); *see also 50 U.S.C. § 517* (waiver agreement)]. Violators are guilty of a misdemeanor [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(d)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(d)*].

In an action filed during, or within 90 days after, a service member's period of military service to enforce an obligation described above, the court may, after a hearing and on its own motion, or must, on application by a service member, when the service member's ability to comply with the obligation is materially affected by military service, either stay the proceedings for a period of time as justice and equity require or adjust the obligation to preserve the interests of all parties [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*].

Secured transactions are discussed in detail in Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* . For additional discussion of these requirements and a form for an application (motion) for a stay of enforcement of a security interest on the ground that a person is on active military service, see *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.113*.

[4] General Relief from Contracts and Obligations

[a] Availability of Relief

In addition to the specific types of relief discussed in [1]-[3], *above*, additional relief of a more general nature also may be available under *50 U.S.C. App. § 591* or *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*, the general relief provisions of the federal and California statutes. These statutes basically authorize courts to grant an extension of any obligation for a period equal to the period of military service or, in the case of installment obligations for the purchase of real property or secured by a real property mortgage or similar instrument, for a period equal to the period of the military service plus a period equal to the remaining installments, or any part of that combined period [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. Relief under this provision is available only for pre-existing obligations, not those entered into during the period of military service. When a court has granted a stay of the obligation, no fine or penalty may accrue during the period the terms and conditions of the stay are complied with by reason of failure to comply with the terms or conditions of the obligation in respect of which the stay was granted [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(b)*].

The court is required to hold a hearing on the application prior to granting any relief. For more detailed discussion, and a form for an application requesting relief under these provisions, see *§ 501.300*. For a form asserting these statutes in a pending action or proceeding, see *§ 501.301*.

[b] Court's Discretion

The court has a measure of discretion on whether to grant relief. If, in the opinion of the court, the applicant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation in question has not been materially affected by reason of the applicant's military service, the court may deny relief [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. The court also is empowered to deny relief if it demonstrated to the court's satisfaction that the obligation in question was transferred or acquired with the intent to delay its enforcement by taking advantages of these provisions. In such a case, the court is required to enter such a judgment or make such an order as might otherwise lawfully have been entered or made, without regard to the provisions authorizing relief [*50 U.S.C. App. § 581*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.7*].

[c] Relief from Mortgages or Installment Contracts for Purchase of Real Estate

If the obligation is payable under its terms in installments under a contract for the purchase of real estate, or if it is secured by a mortgage (or other instrument in the nature of a mortgage) on real estate, the court may grant a stay of the enforcement of the obligation during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of the period of military service, or from the date of the application if the application is made after the termination of that service, for a period equal to the period of the remaining life of the installment contract or other instrument plus a period of time equal to the period of military service or any part of that combined period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of the period of military service (or from the date of application, as the case may be), in equal installments during that combined period at the rate of interest on the unpaid balance that is prescribed in the contract or other instrument evidencing the obligation, for installments paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)(1)*].

[d] Relief From Other Obligations

In the case of any obligation or liability other than those covered under [c], *above*, the court may grant a stay of the enforcement during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of the period of military service, or from the date of the application if the application is made after the termination of that service, for a period of time equal to the period of military service or any part of that period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of the period of military service (or the date of the application, as the case may be), in equal periodic installments during the extended period at such a rate of interest as may be prescribed for the obligation, liability, tax, or assessment, if paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)(2)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.64

§ 501.64 Transfers to Take Advantage of Statutes

When in any proceeding to enforce a civil right in any court, it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court that any interest, property, or contract has been transferred or acquired with the intent to delay the just enforcement of that right by taking advantage of the benefits provided under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act or the comparable California statutes, the court has power to enter any judgment or make any order that might lawfully be entered or made, notwithstanding any contrary provision in the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act or the comparable California statutes [*50 U.S.C. App. § 581*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.7*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.65

§ 501.65 Retaliation by Lender, Creditor, or Other Person

It is unlawful for any lender, creditor, credit reporting agency, or other person to take specified retaliatory actions relating to the extension or denial of credit, or the creditworthiness of a service member solely because the service member applied for or received a stay, postponement, or suspension in the payment of any tax, fine, penalty, insurance premium, or other civil obligation or liability [*50 U.S.C. App. § 518*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(a)*].

The California statute expressly creates a cause of action for violation of the prohibitions discussed above. Any person violating any of these prohibitions is liable for actual damages and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the injured party [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(b)*]. The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, unlike its California counterpart, does not expressly provide for a private right of action for violation of these prohibitions [*compare 50 U.S.C. App. § 518 with Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(b)*].

In addition to the civil cause of action, the California statute also provides that any person violating the above prohibitions is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(c)*].

For more detailed discussion of the anti-retaliation provisions of these statutes, and a form for a complaint against a party who has violated these prohibitions, see *Ch. 129, Consumer Credit Reporting, § 129.150*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.66

§ 501.66 Temporary Debt Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

[1] Service Members Who Qualify for Relief

Relief under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* is available to a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard called to active duty as a result of the Iraq conflict pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 [Pub. L. No. 107-243] or the Afghanistan conflict pursuant to Presidential Order No. 13239. Such a service member is called a "reservist" in the statutes [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 803*].

Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq. will not apply to any active duty voluntarily served after the close of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts or to any reservist on active duty as part of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts before January 1, 2006 [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 809*].

[2] Option to Defer Payments on Debts

[a] Debts Eligible for Deferred-Payment Option

In addition to any other benefits provided by law and to the extent permitted by federal law, any member of the U.S. military reserve or the California national guard who is called to active duty after February 9, 2005, as a part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts may defer payments on any of the following obligations while serving on active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(a)*; *see* [c], *below* (relief during deferment period)]:

- An obligation secured by a mortgage or deed of trust.
- Credit-card debt [*see Civ. Code § 1747.02* (definition); Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans*].
- Retail installment contract debt [*see Civ. Code § 1802.6* (definition); § 501.22[2][a]].
- Retail installment account or revolving account debt [*see Civ. Code § 1802.7* (definition); § 501.22[2][c]].

- Up to two loans subject to the Rees-Levering Automobile Sales and Finance Act [*see Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*; Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act*].

- Any payment of property tax or any special assessment of in-lieu property tax imposed on real property [*see* Ch. 540, *Taxes and Assessments*] that is assessed on residential property owned by the reservist and used as that reservist's primary place of residence on the date the reservist was ordered to active duty.

During the deferment period, the reservist also may defer payments for leased vehicles without breach of the lease or the foreclosure or repossession of the vehicle [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 808*; *see Veh. Code § 670* (definition of vehicle); Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act*].

Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq. apply only to an obligation that was incurred prior to the date a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard was called to active duty as part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 811*].

[b] Procedure to Obtain Deferment

In order for an obligation or liability of a reservist to be subject to the provisions of *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.*, the reservist or the reservist's designee must deliver to the lender both of the following [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(b)*]:

- A letter signed by the reservist, under penalty of perjury, requesting a deferment of financial obligations.

- If required by a financial institution, proof that the reservist's employer does not provide continuing income to the reservist while the reservist is on active military duty, including the reservist's military pay, of more than 90 percent of the reservist's monthly salary and wage income earned before the call to active duty.

On request of the reservist or the reservist's dependent or designee and within five working days of that request, if applicable, the employer of a reservist must furnish the letter or other comparable evidence showing that the employer's compensation policy does not provide continuing income to the reservist, including the reservist's military pay, of more than 90 percent of the reservist's monthly salary and wage income earned before the call to active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(c)*].

[c] Relief During Deferment Period

The deferment period on financial obligations will be the lesser of 180 days or the period of active duty plus 60 calendar days and will apply only to those payments due subsequent to the notice provided to a lender by the reservist or reservist's designee [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(d)*].

If a lender defers payments on an open-end credit obligation [*see § 501.22[3][b]*], the lender may restrict the availability of additional credit with respect to that obligation during the term of the deferment [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(f)*].

If a lender defers payments on a closed-end credit obligation [*see § 501.22[3][a]*] or an open-end credit obligation with a maturity date, the lender must extend the term of the obligation by the number of months the obligation was deferred [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(e)*]. If a lender defers payments for a leased vehicle, the lender must extend the term of the lease by the number of months the lease was deferred [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 808*].

During the deferment period, the reservist may defer the payment of principal and interest on the specified obligations. No penalties may be imposed on the nonpayment of principal or interest during this period. No interest may be charged or accumulated on the principal or interest on which the payment was delayed. No foreclosure or repossession of property on which payment has been deferred may take place during the period [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 804*].

[d] Effect on Holder in Due Course

When a financial obligation covered by *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* is sold, any requirement to defer payments as specified in those code sections is transferred to the purchaser of the obligation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 810*].

[e] No Adverse Effect on Creditworthiness

A stay, postponement, or suspension under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* of the payment of any tax, fine, penalty, insurance premium, or other civil obligation or liability of a person in military service may not provide the basis for affecting credit ratings, denial or revocation of credit, or a change by the lender in the terms of an existing credit arrangement [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 805*].

[3] Continuation of Credit Disability Insurance

The holder of a loan or retail installment sales contract with respect to which the debtor has purchased prepaid credit disability insurance [*see* Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans*] must give notice to the debtor, not less than 30 days before the expiration date of the insurance, that the debtor will not be protected during the period between that expiration date and the deferred maturity date of the loan or contract unless the insurance is extended. The debtor, at the debtor's option, may direct the holder to add the amount of the additional premium to the unpaid balance of the loan or contract [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 807(a)*].

The holder of an open-ended loan or retail installment account with respect to which the debtor has purchased credit disability insurance with premiums payable monthly together with the installment payments on the loan or the account must give notice to the debtor that the debtor will not be protected by the insurance during the deferment period specified in [2], *above*, unless the debtor elects to continue payment of premiums during that period. The debtor, at the debtor's option, may direct the holder to add the amount of those premiums to the unpaid balance of the account [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 807(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.67

§ 501.67 Additional Relief for Service Members and Families

[1] Who Qualifies for Relief

The California Military Families Financial Relief Act of 2005 [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 820 et seq.*] provides various kinds of relief for members of the militia called or ordered into active state service by the Governor under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 143* or § 146, or into active federal service by the President under *10 U.S.C. § 32*, as well as for reservists of the U.S. military reserve who have been called to full-time active duty [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 820(a)*].

The relief will relate to a service member's period of "military service," meaning full-time active state service or full-time active federal service, or full-time active duty of a reservist, for a period of 30 consecutive days [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 820(a)*].

[2] Relief Under Retail Installment Contracts

[a] Termination of Cell Phone Contract Without Penalty

Any service member who is in military service [*see* [1], *above*], or any spouse or legal dependent of that service member, may terminate, without penalty, a mobile telephony services contract (that is, a cell phone contract) that meets both of the following requirements [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 823(a)*]:

- It was entered into on or after January 1, 2006.

- It was executed by or on behalf of the service member, or by any spouse or legal dependent of the service member.

Termination of the contract will not be effective until both of the following occur [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 823(b)*]:

- Thirty days have passed after the service member or the spouse or legal dependent gave notice by certified mail, return receipt requested, of the intention to terminate the contract, and provided a copy of

the service member's activation or deployment order and any other information that substantiates the duration of the service member's military service.

- The cell phone has been returned to the custody or control of the company that provides service under the contract, or the service member or the spouse or legal dependent has agreed in writing to return the cell phone as soon as practicable after the military service is completed. This requirement does not apply if the service member, or the spouse or legal dependent of the service member, owns the cell phone.

[b] Equal-Payments Plan for Debt Remaining After Termination of Vehicle Lease

Beginning January 1, 2006, any service member who terminates a motor vehicle lease pursuant to the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act must be allowed by the lessor to make payment of any arrearages and other obligations that are due and unpaid at the time of termination of the lease in equal installments over a period equal to at least the period of military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 826*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Credit Protection for Military Personnel

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.68through 501.69

[Reserved]

§§ 501.68[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.70

§ 501.70 California Legal Forms

For transactional forms relating to leases, installment loans, credit cards, and the Consumer Credit Reporting Act, see the following chapters of California Legal Forms (Matthew Bender):

Ch. 45, *Consumer Installment Loans and Credit Sales*

Ch. 46, *Credit Card and Other Open-End Credit Transactions*

Ch. 47, *Automotive Financing and Vehicle Leasing*

Ch. 53, *Personal Property Leasing*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.71

§ 501.71 Federal Statutes

[1] Servicemembers Civil Relief Act

Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*

[2] Truth In Lending Act

Consumer credit transaction disclosures under federal Truth in Lending Act. *15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*

Definitions. *15 U.S.C. § 1602*

Determination of finance charge. *15 U.S.C. § 1605*

Determination of annual percentage rate. *15 U.S.C. § 1606*

General disclosure requirements. *15 U.S.C. § 1631*

Form of disclosure. *15 U.S.C. § 1632*

Inaccuracy of required disclosures resulting from subsequent occurrence does not violate TILA. *15 U.S.C. § 1634*

Rescission rights in certain transactions. *15 U.S.C. § 1635*

Required disclosure when sale is not under open-end credit plan. *15 U.S.C. § 1638*

Civil liability for failure to disclose. *15 U.S.C. § 1640*

Assignee liability. *15 U.S.C. § 1641*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.72

§ 501.72 Federal Regulations

Truth in Lending regulations. *12 C.F.R. § 226.1 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.73

§ 501.73 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

RISA definitions. *Civ. Code §§ 1802.1-1802.21*

[2] Disclosures and Notices

Notice must be given to cosigners of specified types of credit; action against cosigner or security barred for noncompliance. *Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.*

Disclosure of information required by RISA may be set forth in manner required or permitted under Regulation Z (12 C.F.R. Part 226). *Civ. Code § 1801.5*

Disclosures required in retail installment contracts. *Civ. Code § 1803.1-1803.11*

Disclosure of periodic rate required in advertisements. *Civ. Code § 1803.11*

[3] Remedies

Attorney's fees and court costs in retail installment sales actions. *Civ. Code § 1811.1*

Repossession and resale in retail installment sales actions. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.2-1812.5*

Penalties and liabilities for violation of Retail Installment Sales Act. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9*

Place for trial of actions on contracts or accounts subject to RISA. *Civ. Code § 1812.10*

Creditor remedies against debtor with credit disability insurance. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.400-1812.410*

If contract entered into after January 1, 1986, does not specify legal rate of interest chargeable after breach, obligation bears interest at 10 percent per annum, except for note secured by deed of trust on real property. *Civ. Code § 3289(b)*

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 3289*, in contract subject to *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*, contracted finance charge is legal rate of interest. *Civ. Code § 3289.5*

[4] Requirements and Restrictions

Confidentiality of information obtained from a federal or state income tax return submitted by a consumer in connection with a financial or other business-related transaction is governed by *Civ. Code § 1799.1a*

Restrictions on retail installment contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 1804.1-1804.4*

Finance charges; schedule of installments. *Civ. Code §§ 1805.1-1805.9*

Payments. *Civ. Code §§ 1806.1-1806.4*

Refinancing and consolidation of retail installment contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 1807.1-1807.3*

Add-on sales. *Civ. Code §§ 1808.1-1808.5*

Terms of purchase of retail installment contract or retail installment account by financing agency. *Civ. Code § 1809.1*

Retail installment accounts. *Civ. Code §§ 1810.1-1810.21*

Areias Retail Installment Account Full Disclosure Act of 1986 governs disclosures on applications or solicitations for credit card issued in connection with retail installment account. *Civ. Code §§ 1810.20, 1810.21*

Seller is prohibited from requiring a purchaser of goods or services to obtain financing from any particular source. *Civ. Code § 1812.20*

Suspension of certain civil obligations and liabilities of National Guard and military reserve members during qualifying periods of military service after September 11, 2001. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.74

§ 501.74 Decisions

[1] Disclosures

Over-limit fees were not required to be classified as "finance charge" in disclosure under Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1605(a)*); Regulation Z (*12 C.F.R. § 226.4(c)(2)*), which specifically excludes over-limit fees from definition of "finance charge," is not unreasonable interpretation of § 1605(a). *Household Credit Servs. v. Pfennig (2004) 541 U.S. 232, 235, 124 S. Ct. 1741, 158 L. Ed. 2d 450*

Assignment to seller of unearned premiums on insurance policy covering automobile purchased under retail installment contract does not constitute "security interest" required to be disclosed under *15 U.S.C. § 1638(a)*. *Anderson Bros. Ford v. Valencia (1981) 452 U.S. 205, 211-222, 101 S. Ct. 2266, 68 L. Ed. 2d 783*

Creditor's undisclosed intent to act inconsistently with its disclosures is irrelevant in determining sufficiency of those disclosures under Regulation Z sections mandating general disclosure requirements, content of initial disclosure statement, and subsequent disclosure requirements [*see 12 C.F.R. §§ 226.5, 226.6, 226.9*]. *Hauk v. JP Morgan Chase Bank USA (9th Cir. 2009) 552 F.3d 1114, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 1285, at *18*

Purchase price of insurance is not required to be disclosed under Truth in Lending Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*) when neither car dealer nor bank financed insurance purchase even though purchase of insurance was a prerequisite for buyer to take possession of car. *Boncyk v. Cavanaugh Motors (9th Cir. 1982) 673 F.2d 256, 260-261*

[2] Purpose and Application of Credit Disclosure Laws

[a] Purpose

Retail Installment Sales Act, constituting a broad legislative approval of the credit sale principle, is an exception to the usury laws and a recognition that, whatever the rational weakness of the distinction on which it is based, significant practical considerations justify the regulation of credit sales by a means more flexible than that provided by the usury

laws. *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 46, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200*

RISA is to be construed liberally to protect consumers, with a view toward expanding, rather than limiting, its coverage. *Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 823, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964*

[b] Transactions Covered

Finance charges on retail installment accounts are subject to time-price doctrine and not subject to usury laws; RISA limits on finance charges were not a violation of usury limits of *California Constitution. Fox v. Federated Dep't Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 880-882, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

[c] Transactions Not Covered

Automobile insurance payment plan that was actually policy for one-month term renewable for successive terms on payment of monthly premium plus service charge did not constitute consumer credit transaction and, therefore, was not subject to either RISA or TILA. Crawford v. Framers Group, Inc. (l984) *160 Cal. App. 3d 1164, 1168-1170, 207 Cal. Rptr. 155*

[3] Remedies

[a] In General

TILA claims are arbitrable; nothing in TILA evinces a Congressional intention to preclude waiver of judicial remedies for the statutory rights under the Act. *Green Tree Financial Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph (2000) 531 U.S. 79*

Fact that arbitration agreement which is silent with respect to costs and fees may require consumer to bear prohibitive arbitration costs to pursues a TILA claim in arbitral forum, in effect rendering it impossible for the consumer to vindicate his or her statutory rights, does not prohibit arbitration; party seeking to resist arbitraiton bears the burden of showing likelihood of incurring costs that would be prohibitively expensive. *Green Tree Financial Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph (2000) 531 U.S. 79, 148 L. Ed.2d 373, 383-384, 121 S. Ct. 513*

Civ. Code § 1804.3(b) requires deeds of trust taken by carpet seller to be voided when carpets were not attached to purchasers' real property; when those deeds of trust had been sold to finance companies, trial court's failure to require carpet seller to make restitution to purchasers, to repurchase contracts, or to pay any delinquencies necessary to avoid foreclosure was abuse of discretion. *People v. Custom Craft Carpets, Inc. (l984)159 Cal. App. 3d 676, 685-686, 206 Cal. Rptr. 12*

Civ. Code § 1811.1, which deems a defendant who tenders the amount due on a contract or installment account to be the prevailing party in any action on a contract or installment account governed by RISA, requires defendant to tender amount due prior to commencement of litigation. *Joseph Magnin Co. v. Schmidt (1978) 89 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 7, 152 Cal. Rptr. 523*

[b] Rescission Under Truth in Lending Act

Borrower may not assert right to rescind under *15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)* as affirmative defense in collection action brought by lender more than three years after consummation of transaction; because statute expressly extinguishes right of rescission at end of three-year period, it is not a statute of limitations and right to rescind cannot be asserted as recoupment defense beyond expiration period. *Beach v. Ocwen Federal Bank (1998) 523 U.S. 410, 417-419, 118 S.*

Ct. 1408, 140 L. Ed. 2d 566

Technical violation (failure to specify date of expiration of three-day rescission period, for example) allows borrowers to rescind entire transaction within three years after date of loan. *Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n. (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 703*

Court is not permitted to deny rescission to unsympathetic borrowers or borrowers who do not need protection of TILA and is not permitted to weigh equities; lender is entitled to require weighing of equities only by assertion of defense under *15 U.S.C. § 1604(c)*. *Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n. (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 704-705*

If only 10 percent of loan proceeds were used for business capital and lender had treated loan as primarily for personal purposes by issuing TILA disclosures, finding that loan was primarily for personal purposes was not clearly erroneous. *Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n. (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 704 n.11*

On rescission in accordance with *15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)*, borrower is required to return loan amount less sum of (1) all payments previously made on loan, (2) loan expenses (closing charges), (3) civil penalty ($1,000), and (4) any attorney's fees awarded; lender is not entitled to finance charge; court is not empowered to require borrower to pay finance charge in contravention of *15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)*. *Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n. (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 704-705*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.75

§ 501.75 Law Reviews

Levine, *The Installment Sales Revision Act of 1980*, 27(2) Prac. Law. 11 (1981)

Willenzik & Schmelzer, *Truth in Lending Activities During 1980, 36 Bus. Law. 1161 (1981)*

O'Connor, *Truth in Lending Simplification, 35 Bus. Law. 1221 (1980)*

Landers, *Open End Credit Disclosure Requirements Under the Truth in Lending Act, 52 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1005 (1979)*

Landers & Rohner, *A Functional Analysis of Truth in Lending, 26 UCLA L. Rev. 711 (1979)*

Landers, *Truth in Lending: Open End Credit, 24 Prac. Law. No. 6, p. 13*; No. 7, p. 35; No. 8, p. 45 (1978)

Comment, *Confession of Judgment in California, 8 Pac. L.J. 99 (1977)*

Recent Cases, *Retail Installment Sales-Unruh Act Permits Use of Previous Balance Method in Computing Finance Charges on Revolving Credit Accounts-Seibert v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 16 Santa Clara L. Rev. 416 (1976)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.76through 501.99

[Reserved]

§§ 501.76[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.100

§ 501.100 Complaint for Recovery of Finance Charges Paid on Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code § 1812.7] After Seller's Violation of RISA--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Finance Charges Paid on Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code § 1812.7] After Seller's Violation of RISA--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY PENALTY, COSTS, AND ATTORNEY'S FEES
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Defendant(s).	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*].

2. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal office for the transaction of business located in _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant(s)*], _____ [authorized *or* licensed] to engage in, and engaging in, business as a retail seller, within the meaning of *Civil Code Section 1802.3*, of _____ [*describe defendant's business, e.g.*, household goods

and appliances].

[3. *If one of defendants is an assignee of the original seller, add:* Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that on or about _____ (*date*), defendant _____ (*name of seller*) assigned his/her/its rights under the above-described retail installment contract to defendant _____ (*name of assignee*).]

[*EITHER*]

4. On or about _____, [*date*], in _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] entered into a written retail installment contract by the terms of which defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] agreed to sell and plaintiff agreed to buy the following _____ [goods *or* services]: _____ [*describe goods or services*] for a price payable in installments. A copy of the contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of it by this reference.

[*OR*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant _____ [*name of lender*] entered into a written agreement by the terms of which defendant _____ [*name of lender*] agreed to lend to plaintiff the sum of $_____, and plaintiff agreed to repay this sum with interest. Plaintiff entered into the loan agreement for the purpose of financing the purchase of the following _____ [goods *or* services] from defendant _____ [*name of seller*]: _____ [*describe goods or services purchased*]. A copy of the loan agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant _____ [*name of lender*] and defendant _____ [*name of seller*] _____ [*either* are related by common ownership and control and the relationship was a material factor in the loan transaction (in that _____ (*specify*)) *or* share in the profits and losses of either or both the sale of the above-described _____ (goods *or* services) and the loan agreement *or both*].

[CONTINUE]

5. The _____ [goods *or* services] described above were bought by plaintiff primarily for _____ [personal *or* family *or* household] purposes. The retail installment contract described above and attached as Exhibit A was, and is, subject to the requirements of the Retail Installment Sales Act, *Civil Code Section 1801 et seq.*

6. Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [has *or* have] failed to comply with the provisions of _____ [*specify Civil Code section*(*s*) *which defendant has allegedly violated*], in connection with the above-mentioned retail installment contract, in that: _____ [*set forth facts showing that defendant*(*s*) *failed to comply with the specified provision*(*s*) *of RISA. For examples of allegations of violations of specific provisions, see §§ 501.104 -501.109*].

7. By reason of the above-described violation(s) of _____ [*specify Civil Code section*(*s*) *allegedly violated by defendant*(*s*)], defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [is *or* are] barred from recovering any _____ [finance charges *or* delinquency charges *or other as appropriate*] whatsoever from plaintiff in connection with the above-described retail installment contract, and plaintiff is entitled to recover from defendant(s) _____[*name*(*s*)] the sum of $_____, which is the total amount of _____ [finance charges *or* delinquency charges *or other as appropriate*] heretofore

imposed on and paid by plaintiff to defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] in connection with the above-described retail installment contract.

8. Under *Civil Code Section 1811.1*, plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred, and to be incurred, in this action, in an amount to be determined by the court.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, which is the total of all _____ [finance charges *or* delinquency charges *or other as appropriate*] paid by plaintiff to defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] in connection with the above-described retail installment contract.

2. For a declaration that defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] [, and each of them,] _____ [is *or other as appropriate* are] barred from any recovery of any _____ [finance charges *or other as appropriate* delinquency charges *or other as appropriate*];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is a general form for use by a buyer under a retail installment contract [*see Civ. Code § 1802.6*; *see also Civ. Code § 1802.5* ("retail installment sale")] to recover the amount of finance, delinquency,

collection, extension, deferral, or refinance charges he or she paid in connection with that contract, when the seller violated one or more of the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*, discussed in *§ 501.50[2*]; *see also § 501.53[4][b]* (statue of limitation)]. For examples of allegations of violations of specific provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104 -501.109*.

When the violation alleged is a willful violation of a provision of RISA in connection with the imposition, computation, or disclosure of a finance charge on a consolidated total of two or more contracts, counsel will want to combine the complaint with the one set forth in *§ 501.101[1]*, to recover three times the amount of the finance or other charges contracted for or received [*see Civ. Code § 1812.9*].

This form may also be used, with appropriate modifications, as a cross complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*] filed by the buyer in a seller's action to recover money allegedly due under the contract.

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

Unless a complaint for RISA remedies is verified and shows that the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10*, counsel must file concurrently with the complaint an affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see § 501.102* (form of affidavit) and discussions in [6] and [7], *below*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint at [1], *above* alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity and residence (Paragraph 1).
- Defendant's capacity and residence, and status as a retail seller [*see Civ. Code § 1802.3*] (Paragraph 2).
- Any assignment of the contract (Optional Paragraph 3).
- Execution of a retail installment contract (alternative Paragraphs 4), for the purchase of goods or services primarily for personal, family, or household purposes (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1801.6, 1802.1, 1802.2, 1802.5, 1802.6*].
- A violation of one of the provisions of RISA (Paragraph 6), which bars defendant from recovering finance charges or delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, or refinance charges under the contract.
- Plaintiff's entitlement to recover from defendant the total amount of any charges previously paid by plaintiff [*Civ. Code § 1812.7*] (Paragraph 7).
- Plaintiff's entitlement to reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing the action [*Civ. Code § 1811.1*] (Paragraph 8).

[5] Right to Recover Finance Charges Paid Under Contract Violating RISA

When a seller fails to comply with the provisions of RISA, the seller, and any person who acquires a contract or installment account with knowledge of the noncompliance, is barred from recovering any finance charge or any delinquency, collecting, extending, deferring, or refinancing any charge imposed in connection with that contract or

installment account. In addition, the buyer has a right to recover from the seller an amount equal to any charges paid by the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1812.7*].

[6] Venue in Action Brought Under RISA

In any action brought on a contract or installment account subject to RISA, the plaintiff must, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, file an affidavit stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper place for trial of the action under *Civ. Code § 1812.10*. In lieu of an affidavit, those facts may be stated in a verified complaint [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*] or in a declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. For a further discussion of the venue requirements of RISA and a form of declaration of proper venue, see *§ 501.102*.

[7] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

Moreover, if the plaintiff states in his or her complaint facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper place for trial of the action, and no affidavit or declaration is filed stating those facts, the complaint must be verified [*see Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[8] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.101

§ 501.101 Complaint for Recovery of Statutory Penalty [Civ. Code § 1812.9] After Seller's Willful Violation of RISA Provisions Concerning Finance Charges on Consolidated Contracts

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Statutory Penalty [Civ. Code § 1812.9] After Seller's Willful Violation of RISA Provisions Concerning Finance Charges on Consolidated Contracts

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR STATUTORY PENALTY,
_____ [*name*(*s*)], Defendant(s).	)	COSTS, AND ATTORNEY'S FEES
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or other as appropriate* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Plaintiff's capacity and residence. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Defendant's capacity and residence. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Allegation of execution of retail installment contract, and description thereof. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 4.*]

4. The _____ [goods *or other as appropriate* services] purchased pursuant to the above-described retail installment contract and all _____ [goods *or other as appropriate* services] subsequently

purchased by plaintiff from defendant(s) were bought primarily for plaintiff's _____ [personal *or other as appropriate* family *or other as appropriate* household] purposes [, thereby subjecting the contract to the requirements of the Retail Installment Sales Act, *Civil Code Section 1801 et seq.*].

5. The above-described retail installment contract provided in part that _____ [*show that contract is within the provisions of Civ. Code § 1808.1 et seq., e.g.,* the seller, defendant _____ (*name*) herein, may, at his/her/its option, add subsequent purchases made by the buyer, plaintiff, to the contract, and that the total price of the _____ (goods *or other as appropriate* services) covered by the contract is to be increased by the price of such additional _____ (goods *or other as appropriate* services), and that all finance charges and installment payments may, at the seller's option, be increased proportionately, and that all terms and conditions of the contract apply equally to such subsequent purchases].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff made a subsequent purchase from defendant(s) _____[*name*(*s*)] of the following _____ [goods *or other as appropriate* services], all of which were purchased by plaintiff primarily for _____ [personal *or other as appropriate* family *or other as appropriate* household] purposes: _____ [*list goods and/or services purchased*].

7. _____ [*Set forth defendant's (defendants') violation(s) of RISA in connection with imposing, computing, or disclosing finance charge on consolidated total of two or more contracts under Civ. Code § 1808.1 et seq., e.g.,* Defendant(s) _____ (*name*(*s*)) has/have violated the provisions of *Civil Code Section 1808.2* with respect to the subsequent purchase described above in that he/she/they/it has/have failed to provide plaintiff with a memorandum disclosing the amount of the finance charge and other information pertinent to the transaction prior to the due date of the first installment(, or at any time thereafter,) as required by that section].

8. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the violation(s) of _____ [*specify Civil Code section(s) violated*] by defendant(s) as alleged in this complaint was/were willful.

9. By reason of the above-described willful violation[s] of Civil Code Section[s] _____ [*specify*], plaintiff is entitled to recover from defendant(s) three times the sum of $_____, which is the total amount of finance charges and delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, and refinance charges imposed, contracted for, or received on the consolidated total of the above-described retail installment contract(s).

10. By reason of the above-described willful violation(s) of Civil Code Section[s] _____ [*specify*], defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] is/are barred from recovering any finance, delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, or refinance charges in connection with the above-described retail installment contract(s)[, and any subsequent purchases made by plaintiff under that contract].

11. [*Allegation of plaintiff's right to attorney's fees and costs. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, which is three times the total of all _____ [finance charges *and/or* finance *and/or* delinquency *and/or* collection *and/or* extension *and/or* deferral *and/or* refinance charges] imposed, contracted for, or received by defendant[s] in connection with the above-described retail installment contract(s)[, and all subsequent purchases thereunder];

2. For a declaration that defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] is/are barred from any recovery of those charges;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court;

4. For costs of suit incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*] _____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 501.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer to recover the statutory penalty for the seller's willful violations of the provisions of RISA in connection with the imposition, computation, or disclosure of or relating to finance charges on a consolidated total of two or more retail installment contracts [*see Civ. Code § 1812.9*, discussed in *§§ 501.50[2], [3], 501.51[1][a]*; *see also § 501.53[4][b]* (statue of limitation)].

Willful violations of other provisions of RISA are not subject to the statutory penalty imposed by *Civ. Code § 1812.9* (three times the amount of the finance charge), but do subject the seller or holder to liability under *Civ. Code § 1812.7* [*see § 501.100*]. This form may be combined with the complaint *set forth in § 501.100* if there are additional or nonwillful violations of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*].

The complaint at [1], *above*, also may be used, with appropriate modifications, as a cross complaint [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*] in an action brought by the seller to recover amounts allegedly due under the contract.

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

Unless a complaint for RISA remedies is verified and shows that the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10*, counsel must file concurrently with the complaint an affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see § 501.102* (form of affidavit)].

[4] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- That the goods or services purchased under a retail installment contract were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes (Paragraph 4) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1802.1, 1802.2, 1802.5, 1802.6*].

- The terms of the contract that make it subject to *Civ. Code § 1808.1 et seq.* (Paragraph 5) [*Civ. Code § 1812.9*].

- A subsequent purchase of additional goods or services by plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1808.1-1808.3* (add-on sales provisions, discussed in *§§ 501.22[2][b], 501.37*)].

- The defendant's violation of the provisions of RISA in connection with the imposition, computation, or disclosure of or relating to a finance charge on the consolidated total of two or more contracts under the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1808.1 et seq.* (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 1812.9, § 501.50[3]*].

- That the violation was willful (Paragraph 8) [*Civ. Code § 1812.9*];

- That the plaintiff is entitled to recover the statutory penalty equal to three times the amount of all finance, delinquency, collection, extension, deferral, and refinance charges imposed, contracted for, or received by the defendant on the consolidated total (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 1812.9*].

- That the defendant is barred from recovering any of those charges (Paragraph 10) [*Civ. Code § 1812.9*].

- That the plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing the action (Paragraph 11) [*Civ. Code § 1811.1*].

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.102

§ 501.102 Declaration of Proper Venue for Action on Retail Installment Sale [Civ. Code § 1812.10; Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

[1] FORM Declaration of Proper Venue for Action on Retail Installment Sale [Civ. Code § 1812.10; Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

I _____ [*name*], declare:

I am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action which is based on a retail installment _____ [contract *or other as appropriate* account] subject to the provisions of *Civil Code Section 1812.10*. _____ [*Set forth facts showing that the action is being commenced in a county in which the contract was in fact signed by the buyer, in which the buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into, in which the buyer resides at the commencement of the action, or in which the goods purchased have been so affixed to real property as to become a part thereof*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration in [1], *above*, satisfies *Civ. Code § 1812.10* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*, which require a plaintiff in an action under RISA at the time the complaint is filed, if that complaint is not verified and does not allege compliance with the venue provisions of *Civ. Code § 1812.10* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*. The declaration must set forth facts showing that the action is commenced in the proper court [*see* discussion at [3], *below*]. Those facts also may be set forth in an affidavit, as opposed to a declaration under penalty of perjury, or in the verified complaint [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

For an affidavit, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For alternative forms for captions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

[3] Venue

An action on a contract or account subject to the provisions of RISA must be tried in one of the following counties [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(a)*]:

- The county where the contract was in fact signed by the buyer.
- The county where the buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into.
- The county where the buyer resides at the commencement of the action.
- The county in which the goods purchased have been so affixed to real property as to become a part thereof.

[4] Requirement That Affidavit Be Filed

Concurrently with the filing of the complaint the plaintiff must file an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper county [*see* discussion in [3], *above*]. In addition, a copy of the declaration must be served on the defendant at the time the summons is served. The facts establishing proper venue may be stated in a verified complaint, but cannot be stated on information or belief. If the plaintiff fails to file the affidavit or state facts in a verified complaint (or declaration) as required, there can be no further proceedings and the court must, on its own motion or on the motion of any party, dismiss the action without prejudice. However, on any terms that are just, the court has discretion to permit late filing of the affidavit (or declaration) [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see* [5], *below*].

[5] Late Filing of Affidavit

On any terms that are just, the court may permit the affidavit (or declaration) to be filed subsequent to the filing of the complaint. A copy of the affidavit must be served on the defendant. Then, the time to answer or otherwise plead dates from that service [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.103

[Reserved]

§ 501.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.104

§ 501.104 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Seller Violated Single Document Rule [Civ. Code § 1803.2]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Seller Violated Single Document Rule [Civ. Code § 1803.2]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] failed to comply with the provisions of *Civil Code Section 1803.2* in connection with the above-described retail installment contract, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, in that defendant(s) failed to include within a single document all of the terms of the agreement between plaintiff and defendant(s) with respect to the cost and terms of payment for the _____ [goods *or other as appropriate* services] purchased according to the contract, as required by that section. [The following terms were omitted from the agreement: _____ (*specify*)].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed and paid in connection with a retail installment contract when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. The allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the complaint at § 501.100[1]. It alleges that defendant(s) failed to include all of the terms of the agreement between the parties with respect to the cost and terms of payment for goods and services within a single document, as is required by RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1803.2*, discussed in *§ 501.31[6]*].

With appropriate modifications, this form the form may also be used as an affirmative defense in a seller's action against the buyer to recover finance or other charges imposed pursuant to the contract.

For allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.105 -501.109*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.105

§ 501.105 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Disclose All Required Information [Civ. Code §§ 1803.2, 1803.3, 1807.2, 1808.3, 1810.1, 1810.3]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Disclose All Required Information [Civ. Code §§ 1803.2, 1803.3, 1807.2, 1808.3, 1810.1, 1810.3]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] failed to comply with the provisions of _____ [*specify the appropriate disclosure provision of the Civil Code which defendant*(*s*) *have violated, e.g., Civil Code Section 1803.2(c)*] in connection with the above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* retail installment account *or other as appropriate* refinancing agreement *or other as appropriate*], a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, in that _____ [*set forth specific facts showing a violation of the specified disclosure provision, e.g.,* the contract contains a finance charge which is computed on the precomputed basis, as defined by *Civil Code Section 1802.21*, and defendant(s) failed to include in the contract a notice concerning plaintiff's right to prepay the amount due under the contract, as required by *Civil Code Section 1803.2(c)*].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an allegation for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed and paid in connection with a retail installment contract or account when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. The allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the form of complaint in § 501.100[1]. It alleges that defendant(s) failed to disclose information required by RISA.

The allegation may also be used, with appropriate modifications, as an affirmative defense by the buyer to a seller's action to recover finance or other charges imposed under the contract.

For examples of allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104, 501.106 -501.109*.

[3] Disclosure Requirements of RISA

RISA contains detailed provisions setting forth the information that must be disclosed in various types of retail installment sales transactions. This allegation contains only one of many possible violations of these provisions. The act has separate disclosure provisions for retail installment contracts [*Civ. Code §§ 1803.2-1803.8*, discussed in *§ 501.31*], refinancing agreements [*Civ. Code § 1807.2*, discussed in *§ 501.36*], and add-on sales contracts [*Civ. Code §§ 1810.1-1810.3*, discussed in *§ 501.37*]. For discussion of other restrictions and disclosure requirements, see *§§ 501.33 -501.35* (restrictions and rules regarding payment) and § 501.38 (retail installment accounts).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.106

§ 501.106 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Fill in Blanks Prior to Obtaining Buyer's Signature [Civ. Code § 1803.4]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Fill in Blanks Prior to Obtaining Buyer's Signature [Civ. Code § 1803.4]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(s)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] failed to comply with the provisions of *Civil Code Section 1803.4* in connection with the above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*], a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, in that defendant(s) obtained plaintiff's signature to the contract when it contained blank spaces to be filled in after the contract was signed. [The following portions of the contract were left blank at the time defendant(s) obtained plaintiff's signature thereto: _____ (*specify*).]

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed and paid in connection with a retail installment contract when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. The allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the complaint in § 501.100[1]. It alleges that defendant(s) obtained plaintiff's signature to the contract when it contained blank spaces to be filled in after it was signed, in violation of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1803.4*; *see* discussions in *§ 501.31[7]* and *[10]*].

The buyer may also use the allegation, with appropriate modifications, as an affirmative defense to a seller's action for recovery of finance charges or other charges imposed pursuant to the contract.

For examples of allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104, 501.105, 501.107 -501.109*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.107

§ 501.107 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Provide Buyer With Copy of Contract [Civ. Code § 1803.7]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Failure to Provide Buyer With Copy of Contract [Civ. Code § 1803.7]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(s)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] failed to comply with the provisions of *Civil Code Section 1803.7* in connection with the above-described retail installment contract in that defendant(s) failed to deliver to plaintiff a legible copy of the contract [*or of any other document which the defendant(s) requested plaintiff to sign*] at the time plaintiff signed the contract [*or at any time thereafter*].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed on and paid by the buyer in connection with a retail installment contract when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. The allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the form of complaint at § 501.100[1]. It alleges that defendant(s) failed to deliver to plaintiff a legible copy of the contract at the time of obtaining the plaintiff's signature, as required by RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1803.7*, discussed in *§ 501.31[7]*].

The buyer may also use this allegation, with appropriate modifications, as an affirmative defense to a seller's action for recovery of finance charges or other charges imposed pursuant to the contract.

For examples of allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104*, *501.106*, *501.108 -501.109*.

[3] Seller's Obligation to Provide Buyer With Copy of Contract

The seller must deliver to the buyer at the time the buyer signs the contract a legible copy of the contract or of any other document which the seller has requested or required the buyer to sign, and which the buyer has signed, during the contract negotiation. In addition to the civil and criminal penalties provided for in *Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9*, a buyer

is obligated to pay only the cash price of the contract until the seller delivers these documents to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1803.7, see* discussions in *§ 501.31[7]* and *[8]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.108

§ 501.108 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Inclusion of Prohibited Provision in Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1804.1, 1804.4]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Inclusion of Prohibited Provision in Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1804.1, 1804.4]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] violated the provisions of _____ [*specify applicable subdivision which has been violated, e.g.,* Subdivision (b) of *Civil Code Section 1804.1*] in connection with the above-described retail installment contract, a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, in that the contract provides that _____ [*describe the contractual provision which violates Civ. Code § 1804.1, e.g.,* in the absence of plaintiff's default in the performance of any of his/her contractual obligations, the defendant(s) may accelerate the maturity of any part or all of the amount owing under the contract]. [In accordance with *Civil Code Section 1804.4*, the above-described contractual provision is void and unenforceable.]

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed on and paid by the buyer in connection with a retail installment contract when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. The allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the form of complaint at § 501.100[1]. It alleges that defendant(s) inserted into the contract a provision which is prohibited by RISA [see discussion in [3], *below*].

The buyer may also use this allegation, with appropriate modifications, as an affirmative defense to an action by the seller to enforce the illegal contractual provision or to recover finance charges or other charges imposed pursuant to the contract.

For examples of allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104 -501.107, 501.109.*

[3] Prohibited Contractual Provisions

RISA prohibits sellers from inserting certain types of provisions into retail installment contracts. The provision contained in this allegation is only one of many types of contractual provisions prohibited by RISA. The types of provisions prohibited by RISA are set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1803.10, 1804.1-1804.3,* and *1812.20*, and discussed in *§ 501.33*. A contract provision proscribed by RISA is void but does not otherwise affect the validity of the contract [*Civ. Code § 1804.4*]. Inclusion of a prohibited provision in a contract constitutes a failure to comply with RISA, thus subjecting the seller or holder to liability under the penalty provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.6-1812.9*, discussed in *§ 501.51[2], [3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.109

§ 501.109 Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Excessive Finance Charge Imposed [Civ. Code §§ 1805.1, 1810.2]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in RISA Complaint--Excessive Finance Charge Imposed [Civ. Code §§ 1805.1, 1810.2]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)] _____ [has *or other as appropriate* have] violated the provisions of Civil Code Section _____ [1805.1 *or other as appropriate* 1810.2] in connection with the above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* retail installment account *or other as appropriate* refinancing agreement *or other as appropriate*], a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, in that the _____ [contract *or other as appropriate* account *or other as appropriate* agreement] provides for the payment by plaintiff of a finance charge in the sum of $_____, over a period extending from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*]. [This finance charge exceeds the maximum amount permitted to be charged in a _____ (retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* retail installment account *or other as appropriate* refinancing agreement *or other as appropriate*) under Civil Code Section _____ (1805.1 *or other as appropriate* 1810.2).]

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, for use in a complaint or cross complaint to recover the amount of finance or other charges imposed on and paid by the buyer in connection with a retail installment contract or account when the seller has violated the provisions of RISA [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. This allegation may be inserted in lieu of Paragraph 6 of the form of complaint at § 501.100[1]. It alleges that the contract or account provides for payment by the buyer of a finance charge which exceeds the maximum amount permissible under RISA [*see Civ. Code §§ 1805.1, 1810.2*].

A provision in a retail installment contract or account for a finance charge which exceeds the maximum amount permitted by *Civ. Code § 1805.1* or *1810.2* is a failure to comply with RISA which bars the seller or holder from recovering any finance charge whatsoever in connection with the contract or account [*see Civ. Code § 1812.7*]. For a

more detailed discussion of finance charge limitations under RISA, see *§§ 501.34* (retail installment contracts) and 501.38[9] (retail installment accounts).

The buyer may use this allegation, with appropriate modifications, as an affirmative defense to the seller's action to collect finance charges imposed pursuant to the contract or account.

For examples of allegations of violations of other provisions of RISA, see *§§ 501.104 -501.108*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
1. Buyer's Forms

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.110through 501.119

[Reserved]

§§ 501.110[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
2. Cosignors' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.120

§ 501.120 Affirmative Defense to Creditor's Action Against Cosigner on Consumer Credit Contract-Failure to Comply With Cosigner Liability Notice Requirements [Civ. Code § 1799.95; *see* Civ. Code §§ 1799.90-1799.99]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Creditor's Action Against Cosigner on Consumer Credit Contract-Failure to Comply With Cosigner Liability Notice Requirements [Civ. Code § 1799.95; *see* Civ. Code §§ 1799.90-1799.99]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. The consumer credit contract on which this action is based is _____ [*specify type of account described at Civ. Code § 1799.90 or account that does not qualify for exceptions of Civ. Code § 1799.91(c) or Civ. Code § 1799.99, e.g.,* a retail installment account as defined in *Civil Code Section 1802.7*] [and is written in _____ (*specify language other than English or Spanish*)].

2. Defendant is not now and was not at the time he/she signed the _____ [application *or other as appropriate* agreement] married to _____ [*name*], the primary obligor. Defendant did not in fact receive any money, property, or services which are the subject matter of the consumer credit contract.

[*EITHER, if transaction is not one which could qualify for any of the exceptions set forth in Civ. Code § 1799.91(c)*]

3. Defendant did not receive [a _____ (*specify language other than English or Spanish*) translation of] the notice required by *Civil Code Section 1799.91* [prior to becoming obligated on the consumer credit contract].

[*OR, if action is on open-end credit subject to Regulation Z or to allegedly joint applicants but notices or issuance of a credit device did not comply with Civ. Code § 1799.91(c), use as many of the sentences below as are applicable*]

3. [Defendant was not a joint applicant, but only provided credit information to plaintiff and signed the _____ (application *or other as appropriate* agreement) after _____ (*name*), the original sole applicant and primary obligor, failed to qualify for credit in his/her name alone.] [Plaintiff's _____ (application *or other as appropriate* agreement) did not contain the clear and conspicuous statement required by *Section 1799.91(c) of the Civil Code* to the effect that each applicant would have the right to use the open-end credit plan to the extent of the credit limit established by plaintiff and would be liable for all amounts extended under the plan to any joint applicant.] [Although plaintiff normally issues a credit _____ (card *or other as appropriate* device) to its borrowers in order to allow them to obtain credit under this open-end credit plan, plaintiff did not issue any credit _____ (card *or other as appropriate* device) to this defendant.]

[*OR, if action is on credit subject to 12 C.F.R. § 227.14, 12 C.F.R. § 535.3, or 16 C.F.R. § 444.3 but notice did not comply with applicable regulation*]

3. Plaintiff did not provide defendant with the notice required by _____ *[Section 227.14 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations or other as appropriate Section 535.3 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations or other as appropriate Section 444.3 of Title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations*] [or with an accurate Spanish translation of that notice] [in the manner required by that regulation].

[*CONTINUE*]

4. For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's action [against this defendant] is precluded by Section _____ [1799.95 *or other as appropriate* 1799.99] of the Civil Code.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a cosigner who did not receive the notice required by *Civ. Code § 1799.91* or the notice required by any of the federal regulations set forth in *Civ. Code § 1799.99* in action by the creditor against that cosigner or to enforce any security. The types of accounts for which the cosigner notice is required are discussed in *§ 501.30[1]*. The form in [1], *above*, may be modified to allege the failure to deliver to the cosigner copies of any of the documents evidencing the obligation or any security interest taken [*see Civ. Code § 1799.93(a)*]. If the complaint does not allege that the cosigner actually received money, property, or services which were the subject of the contract or that the cosigner is married to the person who did receive the consideration, the foregoing form may be used as a demurrer [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30*; see Ch. 206, *Demurrersn and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

[3] Allegations

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- That the credit transaction was of the type governed by *Civ. Code §§ 1799.90-1799.99* (Paragraph 1) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1799.90, 1799.99*].

- That the defendant was not married to the primary obligor and did not receive any of the subject matter of the transaction (Paragraph 2) [*see Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)*].

- If appropriate, that the plaintiff was required to comply with *Civ. Code § 1799.91(a)* and *(b)* (first alternative Paragraph 3).

- If appropriate, that the plaintiff failed to bring itself within the exceptions of *Civ. Code § 1799.91(c)* by selecting allegations which describe the noncompliance involved (second alternative Paragraph 3.).

- If true, that the plaintiff failed to comply with whichever of the federal regulations applied to it by selecting allegations which describe the particular noncompliance involved (third alternative Paragraph 3.) [see *Civ. Code § 1799.99(b)*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
2. Cosignors' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.121through 501.129

[Reserved]

§§ 501.121[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
3. Seller's Complaints

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.130

§ 501.130 Complaint for Balance Due on Buyer's Default Under Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1812.2, 1810.10]

[1] FORM Complaint for Balance Due on Buyer's Default Under Retail Installment Contract [Civ. Code §§ 1812.2, 1810.10]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], a Corporation,	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Breach of Contract)
_____ [*name*], Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or other as appropriate* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal office for the transaction of business located in _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*], _____ [authorized *or other as appropriate* licensed] to engage, and engaging in, business as a _____ [*state, e.g.,* department store for retail sales].

2. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant*].

[*EITHER*]

3. _____ [*Allege filing of declaration regarding venue, e.g.,* In compliance with *Civil Code Section 1812.10*, plaintiff will file, concurrently with the filing of this complaint, a declaration showing that the action has been commenced in the county described by that section as a proper place for the trial of the action].

[*OR*]

3. _____ [*Allege facts showing that action has been commenced in a proper place under Civ. Code § 1812.10. If this is done in lieu of an affidavit or declaration, the complaint must be verified*].

4. _____ [*Allege occurrence of retail installment sale transaction, e.g.,* On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into a _____ (written retail installment contract under which plaintiff agreed to sell and defendant agreed to buy *or other as appropriate*) for a deferred payment price _____ (payable in installments *or other as appropriate* payable on a revolving charge account basis) the following described goods: _____ (*describe goods purchased or services rendered and, if purchases made pursuant to retail installment account, include dates of all such purchases*). A copy of the _____ (*either* retail installment contract *or where an installment account is involved, identify the appropriate document or documents establishing the installment account*) is/are attached to this complaint as Exhibit(s) A (_____) and incorporated by reference].

5. Plaintiff has performed each and every obligation on his/her/its part to be performed under the _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* agreement establishing the retail installment account *or other as appropriate*] and on _____ [*date*], _____ [delivered the goods *or other as appropriate* rendered the services] to defendant [, who took possession thereof and ever since has retained possession thereof].

6. Defendant failed to pay the installment of $_____ due on _____ [*date*], under the _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* agreement establishing the retail installment account *or other as appropriate*] and thereby became indebted to the plaintiff in the sum of $_____.

7. Plaintiff has demanded that defendant pay the sum due under the _____ [contract *or other as appropriate* agreement *or other as appropriate*] but defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to pay all or any part of that sum. [*When appropriate, add:* As a result of that failure, plaintiff has exercised his/her right under the _____ (retail installment contract *or other as appropriate* agreement establishing the retail installment account) to declare the _____ (amount unpaid on the deferred payment price *or other as appropriate* outstanding balance *as appropriate*) immediately due and payable, which _____ (amount unpaid *or other as appropriate* outstanding balance *as appropriate*) is the sum of $_____.]

[8. *When contract allows seller to declare entire indebtedness immediately due and payable if buyer defaults, add:* By reason of defendant's default as alleged above and plaintiff's declaring the _____ (amount unpaid on the deferred payment price *or other as appropriate* outstanding balance *as appropriate*) immediately due and payable, defendant is indebted to plaintiff in the sum of $_____, which sum is computed after extending to defendant all credits to which he/she is entitled.]

9. The retail installment _____ [contract *or other as appropriate* account] involved herein is subject to

the provisions of the Retail Installment Sales Act, *Civil Code Section 1801 et seq.* Under *Civil Code Section 1801 et seq.*, plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred, and to be incurred, in this action on the _____ [contract *or other as appropriate* account], in an amount to be determined by the court.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, with interest thereon from _____ [*date*], at _____ percent per year;

2. For attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 501.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a seller in an action to recover the balance due under a retail installment contract or account subject to the provisions of RISA when the buyer has defaulted in making payments under the contract or account [*see Civ. Code § 1812.2*, discussed in *§ 501.55[1]*].

[3] Accompanying Affidavit

Plaintiff must either file, concurrently with the complaint, an affidavit, or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], showing that the action is being commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action [*see § 501.102* for a form of declaration] or verify the complaint, which must show that the action is commenced in a proper place for trial under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* [*Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*]. The second alterative of Paragraph 3 may be used to allege those facts, which are set forth in *Civ. Code § 1812.10*, discussed in *§ 501.102[4]* and *[5]*. In some cases, Paragraph 2 will, or could be modified to, set forth the facts showing proper court [*see also* [8], *below*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- Capacity and residence of plaintiff and defendant (Paragraphs 1, 2);

- Facts showing the action was commenced in a proper place, or the filing of a declaration so stating [*Civ. Code § 1812.10*] (Paragraph 3);

- Execution of a retail installment contract [*see Civ. Code § 1812.6*, discussed in *§ 501.22[2][a]*] or an

agreement establishing a retail installment account [*Civ. Code § 1812.7*, discussed in *§ 501.22[2][c]*] (Paragraph 4);

- Plaintiff's performance of all conditions precedent under the contract or the agreement establishing the account (Paragraph 5);

- Defendant's default, plaintiff's demand for payment, and, if appropriate, plaintiff's exercise of a contractual right to declare the entire indebtedness immediately due and payable [*cf. Civ. Code § 1804.1(b)*, discussed in *§ 501.33[4*] (acceleration under retail installment contract is not permitted in absence of buyer's default)] (Paragraphs 6-8); and

- Plaintiff's right to recover attorney's fees and costs [*Civ. Code § 1811.1*] (Paragraph 9).

[5] Interest

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 3289*, which allows interest at "any legal rate" specified in a contract from the time of breach until the contract is superseded by a verdict or another new obligation, the contracted finance charge is the legal rate of interest stipulated by a retail installment contract governed by RISA [*Civ. Code § 3289.5*]. In the unlikely event that a contract entered into after January 1, 1986, does not stipulate a legal rate of interest, the obligation bears interest at 10 percent a year after a breach [*Civ. Code § 3289(b)*]. For purposes of *Civ. Code § 3289(b)*, the term "contract" does not include a note secured by a deed of trust on real property [*Civ. Code § 3289(b)*].

[6] Attorney's Fees

Civ. Code § 1811.1 provides that: "[r]easonable attorney's fees and costs shall be awarded to the prevailing party in any action on a contract or installment account subject to the provisions of this chapter [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] regardless of whether such action is instituted by the seller, holder or buyer." The statutory language appears to authorize a court to award attorney's fees to a seller suing for the balance due on a contract or account which is subject to the provisions of RISA, regardless of whether any violation of RISA is alleged by any party to the action.

[7] Limitation of Action

RISA contains no specific statute pertaining to a limitation of action. Therefore, the four-year limitation period applicable to contracts and accounts applies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337*].

[8] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

Also, if the plaintiff states his or her complaint facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper place for trial of the action, and no affidavit or declaration is filed stating those facts, the complaint must be verified [*see Civ. Code § 1812.10(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see also* [3], *above*].

For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[9] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
3. Seller's Complaints

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.131-501.139

[Reserved]

§§ 501.131[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
4. Seller's Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.140

§ 501.140 Affirmative Defense to Buyer's Action Based on Seller's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [Civ. Code § 1812.8]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Buyer's Action Based on Seller's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [Civ. Code § 1812.8]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

Plaintiff's action has been precluded by defendant's correction of the violation complained of by the plaintiff, within the statutory time provided by *Civil Code Section 1812.8*, in that _____ [*allege facts showing correction in compliance with statutory provisions, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), the day after the plaintiff and defendant executed the retail installment credit contract, defendant discovered the error. Defendant immediately notified the plaintiff in writing, informing plaintiff of the error, and on the same day mailed by registered mail a corrected copy of the contract including all required information. The correction of the error did not increase the amount owed to defendant by the plaintiff]. The error complained of was not willful.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for inclusion with the defendant's answer to an action filed against him or her for violation of RISA [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*]. The defense is statutory [*Civ. Code § 1812.8*] and provides that if a defendant corrects a nonwillful error within 30 days of the execution of the contract, there will be no liability under the penalty provisions of RISA, provided that the correction does not result in increasing the amount owed by the buyer, unless the buyer agrees to that increase in writing [*Civ. Code § 1812.8*; *see* discussion at *§ 501.54[1]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Retail Installment Sales Act
4. Seller's Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.141through 501.199

[Reserved]

§§ 501.141[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
1. Buyers' Complaints

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.200

§ 501.200 Complaint for Damages, Statutory Penalty, Costs, and Attorney's Fees Based on Violation of TILA [15 U.S.C. §§ 1638, 1640]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages, Statutory Penalty, Costs, and Attorney's Fees Based on Violation of TILA [15 U.S.C. §§ 1638, 1640]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____,

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, STATUTORY
_____ [*name*(*s*)], Defendant(s).	)	PENALTY, COSTS, AND ATTORNEY'S FEES
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or other as appropriate* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Plaintiff's capacity and residence. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Defendants' capacity and residence. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. Defendant _____ [*name of seller*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ [person *or other as appropriate* corporation *or other as appropriate*] who/which regularly extends, or arranges for the extension of, credit which is payable by agreement in more than four installments or for which the payment of a finance charge is or may be required, and is a creditor subject to the provisions of the federal

Truth in Lending Act, *15 United States Code Section 1601 et seq.*

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant _____ [*name of seller*] entered into a written retail installment contract by the terms of which defendant agreed to sell and plaintiff agreed to buy the following-described goods: _____ [*describe goods*]. A copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

5. The above-described goods were bought by plaintiff primarily for _____ [personal *or other as appropriate* family *or other as appropriate* household] purposes. The above-mentioned retail installment contract _____ [*allege facts showing that transaction is subject to federal Truth in Lending Act, e.g.,* provided for payment by plaintiff of a finance charge *or other as appropriate* provided for payment of the purchase price in more than four installments], and is a consumer credit sale subject to the disclosure requirements of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code* [and to *Section 226.18 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations*].

6. Defendant _____ [*name of seller*] violated the provisions of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code* [and *Section 226.18 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations*] in connection with the above-described retail installment contract in that _____ [*specify violation of disclosure requirements of federal Truth in Lending Act or Regulation Z, e.g.,* defendant failed to disclose in the contract the amount of any default, delinquency, or similar charges payable in the event of late payments as required by that section].

[7. *If one of defendants is an assignee of original seller, add:* (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (O)n or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ (*name of seller*) voluntarily assigned the above-mentioned retail installment contract to defendant _____ (*name of assignee*). The above-mentioned violation(s) of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code* were apparent on the face of _____ (*specify appropriate document, e.g.,* the contract *or other as appropriate* the disclosure statement issued in connection with the contract) in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the disclosure could be determined to be incomplete and inaccurate from the face of the disclosure statement *or other as appropriate* the disclosure statement does not use the terms required to be used under the federal Truth in Lending Act).]

[8. *If plaintiff has served defendant with written notice of the federal Truth in Lending Act violations prior to the institution of the action, counsel may add the following:* On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff served on defendant(s) _____ (*name(s) of seller and/or assignee*) a written notice, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference, of the above-mentioned violation of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code*.]

9. By reason of the above-mentioned violation of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code* [and of *Section 226.18 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations*] by defendant(s), plaintiff is entitled to recover from defendant(s), pursuant to Subparagraph (A) of Paragraph (2) of Subsection (a) of *Section 1640 of Title 15 of the United States Code*, the sum of $_____, which is twice the amount of the finance charge imposed in connection with the above-mentioned retail installment contract, computed as follows: _____ [*describe method of computing finance charge*].

10. By reason of the above-mentioned violation of *Section 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code* [and *Section 226.18 of Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations*] by defendant(s), plaintiff has suffered actual damages in the amount of $_____ in that _____ [*specify nature of plaintiff's damages*].

11. Under Paragraph (3) of Subsection (a) of *Section 1640 of Title 15 of the United States Code*, plaintiff is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this action in an amount to be determined by the court.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For actual damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For the sum of $_____, which is twice the amount of the finance charges imposed under the contract;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 501.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action by a buyer under *15 U.S.C. § 1640* to enforce the civil liability of a seller or assignee for violations of the disclosure provisions of TILA and Regulation Z relating to credit sales [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1638*; *12 C.F.R. § 226.18*]. Because a single retail installment contract may give rise to violations of both TILA and RISA, counsel should consider combining this complaint with the complaints *set forth in §§ 501.100[1]* and *501.101[1]*, alleging each as a separate cause of action.

The complaint in [1], *above*, also may be used, with appropriate modifications, as a cross complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*] in an action brought by the seller to recover money allegedly due under the contract.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- Capacity and residence of plaintiff and defendant (Paragraphs 1, 2).
- Defendant's status as creditor [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1602(f)*] subject to the provisions of TILA (Paragraph 3).
- Execution of a retail installment contract (Paragraph 4).
- That the goods were purchased primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, making the transaction a consumer credit sale subject to TILA [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1602(g), (h), 1638*] (Paragraph 5).
- That defendant violated the disclosure provisions of TILA (Paragraph 6).
- When appropriate, assignment of the contract by the seller to a third party [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1641(a)*] (Paragraph 7).
- That plaintiff served written notice on defendant of the violations (optional) (Paragraph 8).

- That plaintiff is thus entitled to damages, statutory penalties, attorney's fees, and costs [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*] (Paragraphs 9-11).

[4] Applicability of Statutory Penalty

A creditor is liable for the statutory penalty provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* only for violations of specified TILA provisions. For example, on the question of liability for a statutory penalty in connection with the disclosures referred to in *15 U.S.C. § 1638*, the Ninth Circuit held that a creditor cannot be liable for a penalty except for failing to comply with any of the provisions of that section mentioned in the fifth sentence of *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* [*see § 501.51[2][a]*]. Therefore, a consumer could not recover the statutory penalty for a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1638(b)(l)* because that subsection is not one of the provisions specified in the fifth sentence of *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* [*McDonald v. Checks-N-Advance, Inc. (In re Ferrell) (9th Cir. 2008) 539 F.3d 1186, 1190-1191]* .

[5] Statute of Limitations

Any action under *15 U.S.C. § 1640* brought in any U.S. District Court, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, must be brought within one year after the date of the occurrence of the violation [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*]. An action to enforce a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1639* (disclosure requirements for certain mortgages) may also be brought by the state attorney general not later than three years after the date the violation occurred [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(e)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
1. Buyers' Complaints

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.201

§ 501.201 Complaint for Restitution After Rescission of Credit Transaction Creating Security Interest in Buyer's Residence [15 U.S.C. § 1635]

[1] FORM Complaint for Restitution after Rescission of Credit Transaction Creating Security Interest in Buyer's Residence [15 U.S.C. § 1635]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR RESTITUTION
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded
	)	_____(exceeds *or* does not exceed)
	)	$10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 501.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Defendant's status as creditor subject to requirements of TILA. See § 501.200[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into _____ [*describe transaction, e.g.*, a written retail

installment contract by the terms of which defendant agreed to sell and plaintiff agreed to buy the following-described goods and services: _____ (*describe*)]. A copy of the _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. Pursuant to the above-described contract, plaintiff paid to defendant _____ [*name*] the sum of $_____ as _____ [a downpayment *or other as appropriate* earnest money *or other as appropriate*].

5. The above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] provided for the acquisition by defendant _____ [*name*] of a security interest in the following real property which is used as dwelling of plaintiff: _____ [*describe property*].

[*EITHER*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], prior to midnight on the third business day following the consummation of the above-mentioned _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*], plaintiff exercised his/her right under *Section 1635(a) of Title 15 of the United States Code* to rescind this transaction by _____ [*specify manner of notification, e.g.,* mailing a letter by registered mail, return receipt requested, to defendant _____ (*name*) at his/her/its principal place of business, notifying defendant of plaintiff's intention to rescind the above-described transaction. A copy of the letter and return receipt are attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference].

[*OR*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name*] furnished plaintiff with the disclosures required by Sections 1635 and 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], prior to midnight on the third business day following the delivery of the above-mentioned disclosures, plaintiff exercised his/her right under *Section 1635(a) of Title 15 of the United States Code* to rescind the above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] by _____ [*specify manner of notification, as above*].

[*OR*]

6. Defendant _____ [*name*] has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to deliver to plaintiff the disclosures required by Sections 1635 and 1638 of Title 15 of the United States Code. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff exercised his/her right under *Section 1635(a) of Title 15 of the United States Code* to rescind the above-described _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] by _____ [*specify manner of notification, as above*].

[*CONTINUE*]

7. By reason of plaintiff's rescission of the above-mentioned _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*], plaintiff is entitled under *Section 1635(b) of Title 15 of the United States Code* to recover from defendant _____ [*name*] the sum of $_____, which is the total amount paid by plaintiff to defendant pursuant to the above-mentioned _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] as _____ [a downpayment *or other as appropriate* earnest money *or other as appropriate*].

8. On or about _____ [*date*], [and on numerous occasions thereafter,] plaintiff requested defendant _____ [*name*] to return to plaintiff the above-mentioned sum of money. Defendant _____ [*name*] has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to refund this sum, or any part thereof, to plaintiff.

[9. *If plaintiff has received property from defendant pursuant to the contract, add:* Plaintiff is ready, willing, and able to restore to defendant all property received by plaintiff pursuant to the above-mentioned _____ (retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*), or its reasonable value, on the performance by defendant of his/her/its obligations under *Section 1635 of Title 15 of the United States Code or other as appropriate* On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff tendered all property received by him/her under the above-mentioned _____ (retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*) to defendant. Defendant has failed to take possession within 20 days of that tender, and ownership of this property has vested in plaintiff under *Section 1635 of Title 15 of the United States Code*, without any obligation on the part of plaintiff to pay for that property.]

10. [*Plaintiff's right to reasonable attorney's fees and costs. See § 501.200[1], Paragraph 11.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For a determination by the court that the above-mentioned _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*] has been rescinded and that the security interests created thereby are void;

2. For the sum of $_____, which is the total amount paid by plaintiff to defendant under the above-mentioned _____ [retail installment contract *or other as appropriate*], with interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ [*date*];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 501.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer in an action to recover the amount of any downpayment or other consideration paid to the seller pursuant to a retail installment contract which the seller has rescinded in accordance with *15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)* [*see* discussions in *§ 501.51[1][a]* and in [3], *below*]. No election of remedy is required: if the creditor has violated TILA, a plaintiff may have rescission, restitution, and statutory damages and penalties under *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(g)*; *see* discussion in *§ 501.51[1][g]*]. Thus, the complaint in [1], *above*, may be combined with the one in § 501.100[1].

The allegations of the complaint may be adopted for use in an answer and cross complaint in an action brought by the seller to recover from the buyer amounts allegedly due under the contract.

[3] Right to Rescind Certain Transactions

Under TILA, a consumer may rescind a consumer credit transaction (including opening or increasing the credit line for an open-end credit plan) in which a security interest is or will be retained or acquired in any property which is used as the principal dwelling of the obligor. The consumer must rescind the contract prior to midnight of the third business day following the consummation of the transaction or the delivery of the disclosures and forms required by TILA, whichever is later, by notifying the creditor, in accordance with *12 C.F.R. §§ 226.15(a)(2), 226.23(a)(2)*, of his or her intention to rescind [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*].

When a consumer exercises his or her right to rescind under *15 U.S.C. § 1635(a)*, he or she is not liable for any finance or other charge, and any security interest given by the consumer becomes void. Within 20 days after receipt of a notice of rescission, the creditor must return to the obligor any money or property given as earnest money, downpayment or otherwise, and must take any action necessary or appropriate to the termination of the security interest created by the transaction. If the creditor has delivered any property to the consumer, the consumer may retain possession of it until the creditor has performed its obligations under *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, at which time the consumer must tender the property, or its reasonable value, if return of the property in kind would be impracticable or inequitable, to the creditor. Tender may be made at the location of the property or the residence of the consumer, at the consumer's option. If, after tender by the consumer, the creditor does not take possession of the property within 20 days, ownership vests in the consumer without any obligation on his or her part to pay for it [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(b)*; *see § 501.51[1][d]*]. A court cannot apply equitable principles, for example, to impose interest charges if the borrower had the benefit of the use of loan proceeds [*see Semar v. Platte Valley Federal S. & L. Ass'n (9th Cir. 1986) 791 F.2d 699, 706* (rejecting Tenth Circuit position, held in *Rachbach v. Cogswell (10th Cir. 1977) 547 F.2d 502, 505* (involving rescission of mortgage contract)].

[4] Exempted Transactions

The right of rescission provided in *15 U.S.C. § 1635* does not apply to the following [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(e)*]:

- A residential mortgage transaction, as defined in *15 U.S.C. § 1602(w)*.

- A transaction which constitutes a refinancing or consolidation (with no new advances) of the principal balance then due and any accrued and unpaid finance charges of an existing extension of credit by the same creditor secured by an interest in the same property.

- A transaction in which an agency of a state is the creditor.

- Advances under a preexisting open-end credit plan if a security interest has already been retained or acquired and the advances are in accordance with a previously established credit limit for the plan.

[5] Time Limit on Right to Rescind

A consumer's right of rescission expires three years after the date of the consummation of the transaction or on the date of the sale of the property, whichever occurs earlier, notwithstanding the fact that the disclosures required by TILA have not been delivered to the consumer [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)*; *see Pacific Shore Funding v. Lozo (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1347, 1355, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 283* (borrowers not precluded from rescinding consumer loan that is secured by their residence and subject to TILA merely because they already refinanced that loan, provided they rescind within three years after original loan date); *see also* discussion in *§ 501.51[1][f][i]*]. The United States Supreme Court has held that a borrower may not assert the right to rescind as an affirmative defense in a collection action brought by the lender more than three years after the consummation of the transaction. Because *15 U.S.C. § 1635(f)* completely extinguishes the right of rescission at the end of the three-year period, it is not a statute of limitations and the mortgagors cannot assert the right to rescind as a recoupment defense beyond the expiration period [*Beach v. Ocwen Federal Bank (1998) 523*

U.S. 410, 417-419, 118 S. Ct. 1408, 140 L. Ed. 2d 566] .

If an agency empowered to enforce the provisions of TILA institutes a proceeding to enforce the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1635* within three years after the date of consummation of the transaction and finds a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, and if the obligor's right to rescind is based in whole or in part on any matter involved in the proceeding, then the obligor's right of rescission expires three years after the date of consummation of the transaction or earlier sale of the property, or one year following the conclusion of the proceeding or any judicial review or period for judicial review of the proceeding, whichever is later [*15 U.S.C. § 1635(f), see § 501.51[1][f][iii]*].

[6] Attorney's Fees

In any action in which a consumer is found to have a right of rescission under *15 U.S.C. § 1635*, the creditor is liable to the consumer for reasonable attorney's fees in an amount to be determined by the court [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)*, 1st sentence, cl. (3)].

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations of agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
1. Buyers' Complaints

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.202-501.209

[Reserved]

§§ 501.202[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
2. Sellers' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.210

§ 501.210 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [15 U.S.C. § 1640(b)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Correction of Error Within Statutory Time Allowed [15 U.S.C. § 1640(b)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

Plaintiff's action has been precluded by defendant's correction of the violation, in compliance with *United States Code, Title 15, Section 1640(b)* in that: _____ [*describe acts taken to correct error, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], defendant discovered the error in plaintiff's _____ (contract *or other as appropriate* account agreement) on which plaintiff bases his/her cause of action. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], within 60 days of the date the error was discovered by the defendant, defendant notified the plaintiff of the error, by registered mail, informing plaintiff that the error had been corrected, that no additional charges would accrue against plaintiff therefor, and enclosing a corrected copy of the _____ (contract *or other as appropriate* account agreement). A copy of the return receipt signed by the plaintiff on receipt of the registered mail is attached to this document as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference]. The error complained of was corrected, and the above-described notification was given to plaintiff prior to the commencement of this action [, and prior to receipt by defendant of any written notice of the error].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for incorporation into defendant's answer to an action filed against him or her for violation of TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*]. TILA provides a statutory defense to liability if a creditor or assignee discovers an error which constitutes a violation of TILA, and within 60 days thereafter notifies the buyer of the error and makes whatever adjustments in the appropriate account are necessary to assure that the buyer will not be required to pay an amount in excess of the charge actually disclosed, or the dollar equivalent of the annual percentage rate actually

disclosed, whichever is lower. It should be noted, however, that the defense is only available if the creditor corrects the error and notifies the buyer before the receipt of a written notice from the buyer or the institution of an action by the buyer to impose liability for the error [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(b)*; *see also § 501.54[2]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
2. Sellers' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.211

§ 501.211 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Unintentional and Bona Fide Error [15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Unintentional and Bona Fide Error [15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. Defendant's failure to _____ [*describe violation, e.g.,* include the amount of the finance charge in the retail installment contract] was the result of an unintentional and bona fide error. _____ [*Specify reason for error, e.g.,* Defendant's computer is programmed to include all disclosures required by law. On or about _____ [*date*], the day plaintiff's contract was executed, the computer repair agency of _____ (*name of agency*) had just completed a general maintenance check of the computer. It was not until the following morning that defendant discovered that all of the contracts prepared by the computer after the time of the maintenance check failed to reflect the amount of the finance charge].

2. _____ [*Describe system for preventing errors, e.g.,* Defendant retains a full-time employee whose job is to recheck all retail installment credit transactions, and it was on the day following the maintenance check, in rechecking plaintiff's contract, that the error was discovered by defendant. Never before in defendant's six years of use of the same computer has this type of omission occurred].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*] in [1], *above*, may be included in a defendant's answer to a complaint filed against him or her for violation of the disclosure requirements of TILA [*15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.*]. TILA provides a defense to liability when the creditor's error is unintentional and results from a bona fide error, notwithstanding the maintenance of reasonable procedures for avoiding errors of that type [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(c)*]. The

creditor has the burden of pleading and proving by a preponderance of the evidence both that the error was not intentional and that it constituted a bona fide error notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid those errors [*Demando v. Morris (9th Cir. 2000) 206 F.3d 1300, 1303* (reversing summary judgment because creditor's affidavit not did explain what procedures it employed that were reasonably adapted to avoid the error)]. For a discussion of what constitutes a "bona fide error," see *§ 501.54[3]*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
2. Sellers' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.212

§ 501.212 Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Good Faith Compliance and Conformity With Written Opinion of Approval of Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System [15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense for Use by Seller in TILA Action Based on Defendant's Good Faith Compliance and Conformity With Written Opinion of Approval of Board fo Governors of Federal reserve System of Authorized official or Employee Thereof [15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. The matters complained of by plaintiff and attributed to defendant as allegedly wrongful _____ [acts *or other as appropriate* omissions] were _____ [performed *or other as appropriate* abstained from] in good faith by the defendant in conformity with the opinions, rules, regulations, interpretations, and approval of the Federal Reserve System Board of Governors for the reason that _____ [*state facts showing reliance by defendant on interpretation or other information provided by the Federal Reserve Board, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], defendant contacted the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and requested an interpretation regarding the _____ (statutory provision(s) *or other as appropriate* Regulation Z provisions) on which plaintiff bases his/her claim. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], _____ (the Board *or other as appropriate* an official of the Board *or other as appropriate* an employee of the Board authorized to issue interpretations) issued a written _____ (opinion *or other as appropriate* interpretation *or other as appropriate* approval of defendant's method of compliance), a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a creditor in an action brought by a consumer against the creditor for alleged violations of TILA. Under TILA, a creditor has a complete defense to any liability based on an act done or

omitted in good faith in conformity with any rule, regulation, or interpretation of by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or its authorized officials or employees, notwithstanding that subsequent to the commission of the act or omission, the rule, regulation, or interpretation relied on by the creditor is amended, rescinded, or determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason [*15 U.S.C. § 1640(f)*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Truth in Lending Act
2. Sellers' Affirmative Defenses

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 501.213through 501.299

[Reserved]

§§ 501.213[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Related California Statutes

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.300

§ 501.300 Application for Stay of Enforcement of Pre-Existing Obligation During Period of Military Service [15 U.S.C. § 591, Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3]

[1] FORM Application for Stay of Enforcement of Pre-Existing Obligation During Period of Military Service [15 U.S.C. § 590, Mil. & Vet. Code § 412]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In re _____ [*name of applicant*], Applicant,	))))	NO. _____ APPLICATION FOR RELIEF FROM OBLIGATION DURING MILITARY SERVICE

Applicant respectfully represents:

1. Applicant, _____ [*name*], is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], Applicant entered into _____ [*describe obligation, e.g.,* a home improvement loan secured by a second mortgage on Applicant's principal residence located at _____ (*address*)], under the terms of which Applicant was required to _____ [*describe relevant terms of obligation, e.g.,* make _____ monthly payments of $_____ until the balance of principal and interest on the loan was paid in full]. [A copy of the contract evidencing that obligation is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

3. At the time this Application was filed, the remaining balance owed by Applicant under this obligation was approximately $_____ [*or describe other liability or obligation incurred by applicant that remains*

outstanding].

[*For members of regular armed forces*]

4. On _____ [*date*], which date is subsequent to the date Applicant entered into the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, Applicant entered military service (within the meaning of Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2)*) with the United States _____ [*list branch of military service, e.g.,* Army *or* Navy *or* Marine Corps *or* Air Force *or* Coast Guard]. Applicant _____ [is currently in military service *or* was released from active military service on _____ (*date not more than 180 days prior to date application is filed*)].

[*OR, for members of United States Military Reserve or the National Guard*]

4. Applicant is a member of _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Air Force Reserve *or* the California National Guard]. On _____ [*date subsequent to Sept. 11, 2001*], which date is subsequent to the date Applicant entered into the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, Applicant was called to active military service (within the meaning of *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*) for a period in excess of seven days in a 14-day period. Applicant _____ [is currently on active military service *or* was released from active military service on _____ (*date not more than six months prior to date application is filed*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

5. By virtue of Applicant's military service as described in Paragraph 4, above, Applicant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, has been materially affected in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* applicant is self-employed as a _____ (*e.g.,* lawyer) and has been unable to work at _____ (his *or* her) regular occupation during the terms of Applicant's military service as described in Paragraph 4, above, as a result of which Applicant has been unable to generate enough income to meet Applicant's financial obligations, including the obligation referred to in Paragraph 2, above].

WHEREFORE, applicant prays the court for the following relief as permitted by law:

[*For an obligation payable under its terms in installments under a contract for the purchase of real estate, or secured by a mortgage or other instrument in the nature of a mortgage upon real estate, use the following:*]

1. For a stay of the enforcement of the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, as permitted by _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 591(b)(1) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 409.3(a)(1)*], _____ [during Applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of Applicant's period of military service *or, if application is made after termination of applicant's military service:* from the date of this application], for a period equal to the period of the remaining life of the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, plus a period of time equal to the period of military service of the Applicant or any part of the combined period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of _____ [termination of Applicant's period of military service *or* this application], in equal installments during the combined period at the rate of interest on the unpaid balance as is prescribed in the _____ [contract *or other instrument*] evidencing the obligation, for installments paid when due, and subject to any other terms as may be just.

[*OR, for any other obligation:*]

1. For a stay of the enforcement of the obligation described in Paragraph 2, above, as permitted by _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 590(b)(2) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 409.3(a)(2)*] _____ [during Applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of Applicant's period of military service *or, if application is made after termination of applicant's military service:* from the date of this application], for a period of time equal to the period of Applicant's military service or any part of that period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of _____ [termination of Applicant's period of military service *or* this application], in equal periodic installments during the extended period at the rate of interest prescribed for the obligation, if paid when due, and subject to any other terms as may be just.

[*CONTINUE*]

2. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Applicant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an application by a person in active military service, or who has been in active military service within six months preceding the date of the application, requesting a stay of the enforcement of a pre-existing obligation for the duration of the applicant's military service and a specified period thereafter, as permitted by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act of 1940 [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] and comparable provisions of California law [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*].

Many, possibly even most instances involving claims for relief under these statutes, can be expected to arise when a military service member is the defendant in a pending action for a matter such as breach of contract, foreclosure, eviction, attachment, garnishment, or other creditor's action, or in connection with the entry of a default judgment or execution of a judgment previously entered. In these situations, the federal and state statutes granting relief to military personnel will be raised by the defendant in response to some other action by another party. For cross references to forms for use in these situations, see [7], *below*. However, the governing statutes also permit military service members to initiate proceedings on their own, in anticipation of or prior to the commencement of any action against them, to obtain temporary relief from obligations before any suit is commenced against them. The form in [1], *above*, is for use in the latter type of proceeding.

[3] Governing Law

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings and transactions for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of

military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. Although the Act is a federal statute, it is specifically made enforceable in state courts. Any application required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has already been commenced with respect to the matter may be made in any court [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*]. For these purposes, "court" includes any court of competent jurisdiction of the United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*].

The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. This statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*].

The federal and California statutes provide specific relief to qualifying military personnel in a variety of areas, including default judgments [*50 U.S.C. App. § 521*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*], pending judicial proceedings [*50 U.S.C. App. § 522*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(a)*], fines or penalties on contracts and similar obligations [*50 U.S.C. App. § 523*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(b)*], execution of judgments, attachments, and similar matters [*50 U.S.C. App. § 524*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 403(c)*], statutes of limitations [*50 U.S.C. App. § 526*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 404*], interest rates [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*], rent and eviction [*50 U.S.C. App. § 531*], leases [*50 U.S.C. App. § 535*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409*], installment contracts [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407*], mortgages [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408*], insurance [*50 U.S.C. App. §§ 536, 541* et seq.; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.1*], and taxes [*50 U.S.C. App. §§ 561 et seq.*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2*]. For discussion of some of these specific types of relief, see *§ 501.60* et seq. and the cross-references to other chapters of this publication cited in [7], *below*. In addition to these specific types of relief, the federal and California statutes contain "catch-all" type provisions that allow qualifying service members to initiate proceedings to seek relief. These general provisions, discussed in greater detail in [5], *below*, provide the statutory basis for this form.

[4] Who May Invoke Relief Provisions

[a] Federal Statute

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act applies to members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. A servicemember who has been reported missing is presumed to continue in service until accounted for [*50 U.S.C. § 582(c)*].

[b] California Statute

The California counterpart to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act generally applies to the following persons [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)*]:

- Members of the National Guard called or ordered into active state service by the Governor under *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 143* or *146*, or by the President of the United States under Titles 10 or 32 of the United States Code.

- Reservists of the United States Military Reserve who have been called to full-time active duty.

For these purposes, "military service" means full time active service, as described above, for a period in excess of seven days in any 14-day period. For any service member who has been called to active service or duty since September 11, 2001, to engage in homeland defense against terrorism, his or her days of service since that time will be credited toward that seven-day period, even if they precede the effective date of the California statute [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(b)*; *see*

also Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.8(c) (persons missing in action considered to be on active service)].

[c] Dependents

Dependents of service members are entitled to many of the key benefits of the federal and California statutes, including those covered by this form. Dependents are entitled to these benefits upon application to a court, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the dependents to comply with the terms of the obligation, contract, lease, or bailment has not been materially impaired by reason of the military service of the person upon whom the applications are dependent [*50 U.S.C. App. § 538*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.5*].

This form is drafted for the situation in which the applicant is the service member. If the applicant is one of the service member's dependents, an additional statement to that affect should be added to the form, and the form modified accordingly.

[5] Stay of Obligation or Liability

[a] Application for Relief

A service member [*see* [4], *above*] may apply to a court for relief with respect to any obligation or liability incurred by the service member *prior to his or her period of military service* [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. Note that relief under this provision is available only for pre-existing obligations, not those entered into during the period of military service].

[b] Notice and Hearing

The court is required to hold a hearing on the application prior to granting any relief. "Appropriate notice" must be given [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. The statutes do not specify any more detailed requirements for the notice.

[c] Discretion of Court to Grant or Deny Relief

The federal and California statutes confer discretion on the court on whether or not to grant relief. If, in the opinion of the court, the applicant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation in question has not been materially affected by reason of the applicant's military service, the court may deny relief [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. In other cases, the court may grant the relief discussed in [d] and [e], *below*.

The court also is empowered to deny relief if it demonstrated to the court's satisfaction that the obligation in question was transferred or acquired with the intent to delay its enforcement by taking advantages of these provisions. In such a case, the court is required to enter such a judgment or make such an order as might otherwise lawfully have been entered or made, without regard to the provisions authorizing relief [*50 U.S.C. App. § 581*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.7*].

[d] Relief from Mortgages or Installment Contracts for Purchase of Real Estate

If the obligation is payable under its terms in installments under a contract for the purchase of real estate, or if it is secured by a mortgage (or other instrument in the nature of a mortgage) on real estate, the court may grant a stay of the enforcement of the obligation during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of the period of military service, or from the date of the application if the application is made after the termination of that service, for a period equal to the period of the remaining life of the installment contract or other instrument plus a period of time equal to the period of military service or any part of that combined period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of the period of military service (or from the date of application, as the case may be), in equal installments during that combined period at the rate of interest on

the unpaid balance that is prescribed in the contract or other instrument evidencing the obligation, for installments paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)(1)*].

[e] Relief From Other Obligations

In the case of any obligation or liability other than those covered under [d], *above*, the court may grant a stay of the enforcement during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of the period of military service, or from the date of the application if the application is made after the termination of that service, for a period of time equal to the period of military service or any part of that period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of the period of military service (or the date of the application, as the case may be), in equal periodic installments during the extended period at such a rate of interest as may be prescribed for the obligation, liability, tax, or assessment, if paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)(2)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)(2)*].

[f] Other Effects of Relief

When a court has granted a stay, no fine or penalty may accrue during the period the terms and conditions of the stay are complied with by reason of failure to comply with the terms or conditions of the obligation in respect of which the stay was granted [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(b)*].

A stay has other ancillary consequences. Specifically, application for or receipt of a stay may not, without other considerations, provide the basis for any of the following [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 518*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(a)*]:

- A determination by any lender or other person that the service member is unable to pay any civil obligation or liability in accordance with its terms.

- With respect to a credit transaction between a creditor and the service member, any denial or revocation of credit by the creditor, change by the creditor in the terms of an existing credit arrangement, or refusal by the creditor to grant credit to the service member in substantially the amount or on substantially the terms requested.

- An adverse report relating to the creditworthiness of the service member by or to any person or entity engaged in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information.

- A refusal by an insurer to insure the service member.

- An annotation in a service member's record by a creditor or a person engaged in the practice of assembling or evaluating consumer credit information, identifying the service member as a member of the National Guard or a reserve component.

- A change in the terms offered or conditions required for the issuance of insurance.

The California statute provides that any person violating the above provisions is liable for actual damages and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the injured party [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 401(b)*]. The California statute also provides that any person violating the above prohibitions is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(c)*].

For additional discussion and a complaint for violation of the above provisions, see *Ch. 129, Consumer Credit Reporting, § 129.150*.

[g] Limitations with Respect to Child Support Obligations

Under the California provisions, service members may not use the provisions discussed above to obtain a delay, deferment, or stay on an obligation to pay child support. However, this does not preclude a service member ordered to military service from seeking a modification of an order to pay child support due to a reduction in income resulting from the order to service, or from seeking the imposition of the maximum 6-percent interest rate under the statute [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 405* (maximum rate of interest limited to 6 percent)] on arrearages in child support payments existing prior to the order to service. [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(c)*]. The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act has no analogous provision; nevertheless, the California Supreme Court set aside, under the general provision for relief from default judgments under the federal act [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521(g)*], an order for increased spousal and child support against an absent serviceman who was unable to appear and defend the proceeding due to his military service [*Allen v. Allen (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 433, 435, 182 P.2d 551* (applying antecedent provision in former *50 U.S.C. § 520(1)*)].

[6] Contents of Form

The application in [1], *above*, states the following:

- The applicant's California residence [Paragraph1].

- The date applicant entered into the obligation in question, and the nature of the obligation [Paragraph 2].

- The approximate remaining balance due on the obligation, or other portion of the obligation remaining outstanding [Paragraph 3].

- The fact that the applicant subsequently entered or was called up to active military service, and the dates of that service [Paragraph 4]. Alternative versions are presented, depending on whether the applicant's service was as a member of the regular armed forces and therefore subject to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, or alternatively as a member of the member of the military reserve of National Guard called to active duty, and as such subject to the California statute.

- The fact that the applicant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation has been materially affected by virtue of the applicant's military service [Paragraph 5]. For the significance of this statement, see [5][c], *above*.

The application in [1], *above*, contains alternative prayers for relief, depending on whether the obligation in question is (1) an installment contract for the purchase of real estate, or another obligation secured by a mortgage (or other instrument in the nature of a mortgage) on real estate (first alternative); or (2) any other kind of obligation (second alternative). For discussion of the nature of the relief that may be granted in each of these cases, see [5][d], [e], *below*.

[7] Cross References

For discussion of how a party's military service may affect family law proceedings and declaration requirements, see Ch. 12A, *Adoptions: Termination of Parental Rights* ; Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* and Ch. 258, *Family Law Enforcement: General Enforcement Principles and Remedies* .

For an application for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

For a declaration for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , Form 19.

For a complaint for unlawful retaliation by a lender, creditor, or other person against a person who received a stay or postponement because of military service, see *Ch. 129, Consumer Credit Reporting, § 129.150*.

For discussion and an application for a stay of a pending action or proceeding based on military service, see *Ch. 136, Continuances, §§ 136.20[2], 136.78A.*

For discussion and a plaintiff's declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth facts showing that the defendant is not in the military service prior to entry of default judgment, see *Ch. 205, Defaults and Default Judgments, §§ 205.25[5], 205.92 -205.94*.

For an application for a stay of execution of a judgment or order involving a person in military service, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

For an application for a stay of garnishment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 276, *Garnishment* .

For a defendant's notice of admitting service of summons and complaint, waiving further notice, and waiving rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and similar state statutes, see *Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances, and Ch. 324, Jurisdiction: Subject Matter Jurisdiction* .

For a lessee's notice of termination of a lease due to the lessee's military service, see *Ch. 332, Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy, § 332.71A.*

For a stay of eviction in an unlawful detainer proceeding during a period of military service, see *Ch. 333, Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions, § 333.111*.

For an application for relief against the enforcement of a fine or penalty against a person in military service when the penalty was incurred, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgment or Order* .

For a service member's application for relief from judgment, supporting declaration and order, see *Ch. 489, Relief From Judgments and Orders, § 489.411*

For an application for a stay during military service in an action to enforce a security interest in real or personal property, see *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.113*.

For discussion of ascertaining a defendant's military status at the time of service of summons and its benefits and effect on subsequent proceedings, see *Ch. 518, Service of Summons and Papers, § 518.19.*

For a petition for a stay of foreclosure proceedings and relief from an installment contract, mortgage, or trust deed for the purchase of real property by an active member of the military service, see *Ch 555, Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages, § 555.139A.*

For an application for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments by an active member of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139B.

For an order staying foreclosure proceedings in relation to an obligation secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property for an active member of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139C.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Related California Statutes

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.301

§ 501.301 Defense to Action on Obligation or Liability--Application (Motion) for Temporary Relief From Obligation on Ground Person Is or Was In Active Military Service After Entering Into Obligation [50 U.S.C. App. § 591; Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3]

[1] FORM Defense to Action on Obligation or Liability--Application (Motion) for Temporary Relief From Obligation on Ground Person Is or Was In Active Military Service After Entering Into Obligation [50 U.S.C. App. § 591; Mil. & Vet. Code § 412]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO STAY ENFORCEMENT OF OBLIGATION [*or* LIABILITY] [, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*), AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To plaintiff _____ [*name*] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order granting Defendant a stay of enforcement of the _____ [obligation *or* liability] on which Plaintiff's complaint is based. The motion will be made on the grounds that Defendant _____ [is currently *or* was] in military service (within the meaning of _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*] [during a portion of the term of this obligation]) and therefore is entitled under _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, specifically Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 591 or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 409.3*] to such a stay.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s*)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name of defendant or person making application on defendant's behalf*]

I, _____ [*name of defendant of person making application on defendant's behalf*], declare:

1. I am [*if someone other than defendant is making application, include the following:* acting on behalf of _____ (*name of defendant*), who is] the Defendant in this action.

[*For members of regular armed forces*]

2. On _____ [*date*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant _____ [entered into *or* incurred] the _____ [obligation *or* liability] described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant entered military service (within the meaning of Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2)*) with the United States _____ [*list branch of military service, e.g.,* Army *or* Navy *or* Marine Corps *or* Air Force *or* Coast Guard]. Defendant _____ [is currently in military service *or* was released from active military service on _____ (*date not more than 180 days prior to date application is filed*)].

[*OR, for members of United States Military Reserve or the National Guard*]

2. Defendant is a member of _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Air Force Reserve *or* the California National Guard]. On _____ [*date subsequent to Sept. 11, 2001*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant _____ [entered into *or* incurred] the _____ [obligation *or* liability] described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant was called to active military service (within the meaning of *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*) for a period in excess of seven days in a 14-day period. Defendant _____ [is currently on active military service *or* was released from active military service on _____ (*date not more than six months prior to date application is filed*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

3. By virtue of Defendant's military service, Defendant's ability to comply with the terms of the _____ [obligation *or* liability] described in Plaintiff's complaint has been materially affected in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* Defendant is self-employed as a _____ (*e.g.,* lawyer) and has been unable to work at _____ (his *or* her) regular occupation while on active military service, as a result of which Defendant has been unable to generate enough income to meet Defendant's financial obligations, including the obligation referred to in Plaintiff's complaint].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[Add memorandum of points and authorities supporting motion]

Respectfully Submitted,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [moving party]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an application by a defendant, or a person acting on the defendant's behalf, for an order granting a stay in an action to enforce an obligation or liability that was entered into by a defendant who was subsequently called to active military service. The application requests a stay of the enforcement of the underlying obligation for the duration of the applicant's military service and a specified period thereafter, as permitted by the general relief provisions [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*] of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act of 1940 [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] and comparable provisions of California law [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*].

As explained in the discussion below, under the circumstances this application functions in effect as a temporary defense to the underlying action.

Many, possibly even most instances involving claims for relief under these statutes, can be expected to arise when a military service member is the defendant in a pending action for a matter such as breach of contract, foreclosure, eviction, attachment, garnishment, or other creditor's action, or in connection with the entry of a default judgment or execution of a judgment previously entered. In these situations, the federal and state statutes granting relief to military personnel will be raised by the defendant in response to some other action by another party. This form is for use when requesting a stay in a pending proceeding against the service member on the underlying liability or obligation. In addition, however, the governing statutes also permit military service members to initiate proceedings on their own, in anticipation of or prior to the commencement of any action against them, to obtain temporary relief from obligations before any suit is commenced against them [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*]. For an application to use when there is no proceeding pending to collect on the underlying liability of obligation, see *§ 501.300*.

[3] Governing Law and Eligibility for Relief

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, obligations, and liabilities for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The latter statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. For detailed discussion of the relief available under these statutes, the manner in which such relief can be requested, and the persons who qualify for this relief, see *§ 501.300[4], [5]*.

[4] Stay of Pre-Existing Obligation

Under the general relief provisions of the federal and California statutes, an eligible service member or dependent [for discussion of who is eligible, *see § 501.300[4]*] may apply to a court for relief in for relief with respect to any obligation or liability incurred by the service member *prior to his or her period of military service* [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(a), (b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. Relief under this provision is available only for pre-existing obligations; those entered into during the period of military service].

The court is required to hold a hearing on the application prior to granting any relief. "Appropriate notice" must be given [*50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*].

For a detailed discussion of the nature of relief available under these general relief provisions of these statutes, see *§ 501.300*.

[5] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

The statute states that the service member may "apply" to the court for a stay of the type discussed in this statute [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591(a)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. For purposes of the applicable procedural requirements, an application in this context is deemed a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (any application for order is deemed a motion)]. Accordingly, the application in this form is in the form of a motion, although the term "application" is retained in deference to the statutory language.

A notice of motion is normally accompanied by one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth the evidentiary facts required to establish the grounds of the motion [*see Ch. 372, Motions and Orders, §§ 372.21[5][b], [17], 372.61[2]* et seq.; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)* (evidence received at a law and motion

hearing must be by declaration and affidavit); *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003* (affidavit defined), 2009, (use of affidavit in support of motion), 2015.5].

A supporting memorandum must be filed and a copy served with this notice of motion [*Cal Rules of Ct, Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*].

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and general forms relating to law and motion practice, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[6] Cross References

See the cross references in § 501.300[7].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Related California Statutes

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.302

§ 501.302 Affirmative Defense to Action on Interest-Bearing Obligation--Annual Rate of Interest May Not Exceed 6 Percent per Year During Period of Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 527; Mil. & Vet. Code § 405]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Action on Interest-Bearing Obligation--Annual Rate of Interest May Not Exceed 6 Percent per Year During Period of Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 526; Mil. & Vet. Code § 405]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], Defendant alleges:

1. The obligation forming the basis for Plaintiff's complaint bears interest at the annual rate of _____ percent, including all applicable service charges, renewal charges, fees, or other charges with respect to that obligation.

[*For members of regular armed forces*]

2. On _____ [*date*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation forming the basis for Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant entered military service (within the meaning of Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2)*) with the United States _____ [*list branch of military service, e.g.,* Army *or* Navy *or* Marine Corps *or* Air Force *or* Coast Guard]. Defendant _____ [is currently in military service *or* was released from active military service on _____ (*date*)].

[*OR, for members of United States Military Reserve or the National Guard*]

2. Defendant is a member of _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Air Force Reserve *or* the California National Guard]. On _____ [*date subsequent to Sept. 11, 2001*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation forming the basis for Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant was called to active military service (within the meaning of *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*) for a period in

excess of seven days in a 14-day period. Defendant _____ [is currently on active military service *or* was released from active military service on _____(*date*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

3. The ability of Defendant to pay interest on the obligation forming the basis for Plaintiff's complaint has been materially affected by Defendant's military service in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* Defendant is self-employed as a _____ (*e.g.,* lawyer) and has been unable to work at _____ (his *or* her) regular occupation during the terms of Defendant's military service as described in Paragraph 2, above, as a result of which Defendant has been unable to generate enough income to meet Defendant's financial obligations, including the obligation forming the basis for Plaintiff's complaint].

4. The rate of interest on the obligation referred to in Plaintiff's complaint exceeds the maximum rate of 6 percent per year for pre-existing obligations incurred by individuals in active military service as specified in _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 527(a) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 405*]. Defendant therefore is not liable to pay any interest (as defined in _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 527(d) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 405*]) on the obligation referred to in Plaintiff's complaint during the period of Defendant's active military service beginning _____ [*date*] and continuing without interruption _____ [until _____ *(ending date of service*) *or, if defendant remains on active military service*: through this date and until further notice]. Plaintiff is not entitled to any interest on the obligation in excess of the 6 percent limitation during the period of Defendant's active military service. [Defendant asserts that the amount of the difference between the rate of interest specified in Paragraph 1, above, and the maximum 6 percent rate imposed by law on the obligation during Defendant's period of military service, amounts to $ _____.]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an affirmative defense to an action on an interest-bearing obligation bearing interest at an annual rate in excess of 6 percent. In this defense, the defendant asserts that he or she entered active military service after entering into the interest-bearing obligation, and that under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act of 1940 [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] and comparable provisions of California law [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*], the annual interest rate on the obligation during the period of defendant's active military service may not exceed 6 percent [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527(a)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*] and the defendant is not liable for interest in excess of that amount.

[3] Governing Law

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, obligations, and liabilities for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The latter statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. For general discussion of the relief available under these statutes, the manner in which such relief can be requested, and the persons who qualify for this relief, see *§§ 501.60 et seq., 501.300*.

With respect to interest-bearing obligations, the California and federal statutes provide that no obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year incurred by a service member before that person's entry into service may, during any part of the period of military service, bear interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year unless, in the opinion of the court, upon application by the obligee, the ability of the service member to pay interest on the obligation or liability at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year is not materially affected by reason of that service. For this purpose, "interest" also includes service charges, renewal charges, fees, or any other charges, except bona fide insurance, with respect to any obligation or liability [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527(d)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*].

[4] Enforcement

The statutes do not specify exactly how a claim of relief based on an interest-bearing obligation should be asserted. However, it is likely that this issue would frequently arise in the context of an action against a present or former service member who has defaulted on an interest-bearing obligation. For this reason, this form is set forth as an affirmative defense for use in an answer to a complaint seeking unpaid principal and interest on such an obligation. The statutes do not specifically authorize the service member to institute an affirmative action for relief under the provisions governing the maximum rate of interest, as they do in the case of stays of obligations or liabilities [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*; *see also § 501.300* (application for stay of enforcement of pre-existing obligation during period of military service)], but if an appropriate situation arose, it may be that such an action would be permitted under the general enforcement powers available to courts under these statutes.

Although the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act is a federal statute, it is enforceable in state courts. Any application required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has already been commenced with respect to the matter may be made in any court [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*]. For these purposes, "court" includes any court of competent jurisdiction of the United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*].

[5] Cross References

See the cross references in § 501.300[7].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 501 SALES: RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and Related California Statutes

44-501 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 501.303

§ 501.303 Defense to Action on Contract for Purchase of Personal Property--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532; Mil. & Vet. Code § 407]

[1] FORM Defense to Action on Contract for Purchase of Personal Property--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 531; Mil. & Vet. Code § 407]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO STAY PROCEEDING [, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*), AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To plaintiff _____ [*name*] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of]

this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order granting a stay of these proceedings. The motion will be made on the grounds that Defendant is currently in military service (within the meaning of _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*]) and therefore is entitled under _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, specifically Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 532 or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 407*] to such a stay as a matter of right.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name of defendant or person making application on defendant's behalf*]

I, _____ [*name of defendant or person making application on defendant's behalf*], declare:

1. I am [*if someone other than defendant is making application, include the following:* acting on behalf of _____ (*name of defendant*), who is] the Defendant in this action.

[*For members of regular armed forces*]

2. On _____ [*date*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant entered military service (within the meaning of Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2)*) with the United States _____ [*list branch of military service, e.g.,* Army *or* Navy *or* Marine Corps *or* Air Force *or* Coast Guard], and remains in military service as of the date of this application.

[*OR, for members of United States Military Reserve or the National Guard*]

2. Defendant is a member of _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Air Force Reserve *or* the California National Guard]. On _____ [*date subsequent to Sept. 11, 2001*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant was called to active military service (within the meaning of *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*) for a period in excess of seven days in a 14-day period, and remains on active military service as of the date of this application.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. By virtue of Defendant's military service, Defendant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint has been materially affected in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* Defendant is self-employed as a _____ (*e.g.,* lawyer) and has been unable to work at _____ (his *or* her) regular occupation while on active military service, as a result of which Defendant has been unable to generate enough income to meet Defendant's financial obligations, including the obligation referred to in Plaintiff's complaint].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[Add memorandum of points and authorities supporting motion]

Respectfully Submitted,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [moving party]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an application by a defendant, or a person acting on the defendant's behalf, for an order granting a stay in an action under an installment contract for the purchase of real or personal property in which the plaintiff is seeking to exercise a right or option to rescind or terminate the contract, or resume possession of the property, due to the defendant's alleged nonpayment of an installment or other breach of the contract. The application seeks the stay on the ground that the nonpayment or breach occurred while the defendant was on active military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(a)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*].

As illustrated in the discussion below, under the circumstances, this application functions in effect as a temporary defense to the underlying action.

[3] Governing Law

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, obligations, and liabilities for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The latter

statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. For detailed discussion of the relief available under these statutes, the manner in which such relief can be requested, and the persons who qualify for this relief, see *§§ 501.60* et seq., *501.300*.

[4] Rescission or Termination of Installment Contract; Repossession

Under both the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and the comparable California legislation, after a service member enters military service, a contract by the service member for either the purchase of real or personal property (including a motor vehicle) or the lease or bailment of such property may not be rescinded or terminated for a breach of terms of the contract occurring before or during that person's military service, nor may the property be repossessed for such a breach without a court order [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(a)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)*]. This relief applies only to a contract for which a deposit or installment has been paid by the servicemember before the servicemember enters military service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532(b), *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)*]. This provision is designed to protect military service members against repossession, forfeiture of deposits and payments, and termination of installment contracts while they are in active military service. It compels the holder of the obligation to institute a court proceeding before any of these actions can be taken. In such an action, the court may order the repayment of all or part of any prior installments or deposits as a condition of terminating the contract and resuming possession. Instead the court may, on its own motion, or must on application by the service member when the service member's ability to comply with the contract is materially affected by military service, stay the proceedings for a period of time as, in the opinion of the court, justice and equity require; or the court may make other disposition as is equitable to preserve the interests of all parties [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*].

There are penalties for repossessing or attempting to repossess property in violation of these requirements. Violators are guilty of a misdemeanor [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(b)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(c)*].

[5] Stay of Proceeding

The governing statutes do not specify the length of time for which a stay of the proceeding may be granted. Rather, it is simply left to the discretion of the court [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*]. This raises some interesting practical issues regarding the time period of the stay. If the stay is granted for a period of indefinite duration, such as the period of the defendant's military service or a specified amount of time (for example, six months) thereafter, it may be difficult for the plaintiff to determine when the action can resume, as it might be expected that in the ordinary case the plaintiff would not know, and could not determine without difficulty, when the defendant's period of military service is over. On the other hand, if the stay is set for a finite period of time, such as six months, and the defendant either (1) is released from military service earlier than the time period specified in the stay, or (2) conversely, is still in military service when the period of the stay ends, the defendant presumably would have to seek an additional stay at that point. It appears that the court would have discretion to grant either type of stay under its general authority to order a stay for a period of time as, in the opinion of the court, justice and equity require [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)* (stay of proceedings "as the court deems just")]. This form does not request a specific length of time for the stay, but the party filing the application may wish to consider whether inclusion of such language is desirable or whether the length of the stay would be better left to the discretion of the court. The form may be modified to add a specific length of time for the stay if desired.

Additional relief of a more general nature also may be available *50 U.S.C. App. § 591* or *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*, the general relief provisions of the federal and California statutes. These statutes basically grant an extension of the underlying installment obligation for a period equal to the period of military service or, in the case of installment obligations for the purchase of real property or secured by a real property mortgage or similar instrument, for a period equal to the period of the military service plus a period equal to the remaining installments, or any part of that combined

period [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 591(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. For more detailed discussion of these provisions, see *§ 501.300*.

[6] Who May Request Stay

The statutes are extremely broad as to who may request a stay of the proceeding. Under California law, application for a stay may be made by the person in military service or by "some person on the service member's behalf" [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*]. There are no statutory restrictions on who that "some person" may be. Presumably in many cases the service member will be absent due to the military service, and the request will have to be made by someone else on the service member's behalf. Under federal law, the stay may be requested by an attorney acting on the behalf of the service member, or by an individual possessing a power of attorney from the service member [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 519*; *see also 50 U.S.C. § 592* (automatic extension of power of attorney while service member is missing)].

[7] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

The statute states that a request for a stay of the type discussed in this statute is to be made by "application" to the court [*50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*]. For purposes of the applicable procedural requirements, an application in this context is deemed a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (any application for order is deemed a motion)]. Accordingly, the application in this form is in the form of a motion, although the term "application" is retained in deference to the statutory language.

A notice of motion is normally accompanied by one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth the evidentiary facts required to establish the grounds of the motion [*see Ch. 372, Motions and Orders, §§ 372.21[5][b], [17], 372.61[2]* et seq.; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)* (evidence received at a law and motion hearing must be by declaration and affidavit); *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003* (affidavit defined), *2009*, (use of affidavit in support of motion), *2015.5*].

A supporting memorandum must be filed and a copy served with this notice of motion [*Cal Rules of Ct, Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*].

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and general forms relating to law and motion practice, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[8] Cross References

See the cross references in *§ 501.300[7]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 502.syn

§ 502.syn Synopsis to Chapter 502: SALES: WARRANTIES

§ 502.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 502.02 Cross References

§§ 502.03-502.09 [Reserved]

§ 502.10 Governing Law

[1] State Statutes

[2] Federal Statutes and Regulations

§ 502.11 Definitions

[1] Warranty

[2] Express Warranty

[3] Implied Warranty

§ 502.12 Nature of Action for Breach of Warranty

[1] Hybrid of Tort and Contract

[2] Breach of Warranty as Alternative to Breach of Contract

§§ 502.13-502.19 [Reserved]

§ 502.20 Warranties Applicable to Sales of Goods Only

§ 502.21 Warranty of Title

[1] Scope of Warranty of Title

[2] Exclusion or Modification

§ 502.22 Warranty Against Infringement

§ 502.23 Express Warranties

[1] Creation by Seller

[2] By Description

[3] By Sample

[4] Puffery Excluded

[5] Elimination of Privity

[6] Limitation, Modification, and Disclaimer

§ 502.24 Implied Warranties

[1] Origin in Law

[2] Merchantability

[3] Merchant Defined

[4] Fitness for Particular Purpose

[5] When "Fitness" Controls Over Other Warranties

[6] Other Implied Warranties

[7] Requirement of Privity

[8] Exclusion Generally

[9] Exclusion or Modification of Warranty of Merchantability

[10] Exclusion of Warranty of Fitness

§ 502.25 Warranties Affecting Delivery

§ 502.26 Restrictions on Disclaimers

§ 502.27 Rules for Determining Compatibility Among Warranties

§ 502.28 Commercial Code Action for Breach of Warranty

[1] Elements

[2] Damages

[3] Recovery for Personal Injuries or Property Damage

[4] Notification of Breach of Warranty

[a] In General

[b] Notification of Breach of Warranty of Infringement

[5] "Vouching in" Seller by Buyer

[6] Statute of Limitations

[a] Parties May Reduce Four-Year Period to One Year

[b] Tolling for Repairs

§§ 502.29-502.39 [Reserved]

§ 502.40 Song-Beverly Act Definitions

[1] Buyer

[2] Consumer Goods; Exclusions

[3] Leasing

[4] Mercantile Parties

[5] Sales

[6] Service Factors

§ 502.41 Effect on Other State Law

§ 502.42 Express Warranty Generally

[1] Coverage

[2] By Particular Words

[3] Puffery Excluded

[4] Requirements of Marketing Parties

[5] Duty to Supply Appliance Parts

§ 502.43 Manufacturer Must Provide Service and Repair Facilities in California

[1] In General

[2] Informing Buyer of Location of Service and Repair Facilities

[3] Duty of Timely Service or Repair

[4] Buyer's Obligation to Deliver Goods or Give Notification

[5] Procedure on Failure of Service or Repair

[a] Other Than New Motor Vehicles

[b] New Motor Vehicles

[6] Buyer's Recourse If State Service and Repair Facilities Are Not Maintained

[7] Manufacturer's Duty to Inform Buyer of Right to Recourse

[8] Liability of Manufacturer to Retailer

[9] Buyers' Recourse If Manufacturer or Retailer Fail to Remedy

§ 502.44 Liability of Manufacturer to Service and Repair Facilities

§ 502.45 Express Warranty's Compatibility With Service Contract

[1] In General

[2] Service Contracts for Home Appliances and Home Electric Products

[a] Definitions

[b] Provisions Required in Appliance Service Contracts

[c] Disclosures Required Before Sale of Service Contract

§ 502.46 Express Warranties as to Clothing and Consumables

§ 502.47 Express Warranties as to Used Goods

§ 502.48 Express Warranties on Assistive Devices

[1] Coverage

[2] Used Assistive Devices

[3] Remedy Is Cumulative and Not Waivable

§ 502.49 Express Warranties on Motorized Wheelchairs

§ 502.50 Express Warranties on Housecars

§ 502.51 Implied Warranties

[1] Warranty of Merchantability Is Required

[2] Fitness for Particular Purposes

[3] Fitness as to Assistive Devices

[4] Fitness as to Used Goods

[5] Duration as to New Goods

[6] Duration as to Used Goods

[7] General Prohibition Against Waiver and Disclaimer

[8] Exception for Sale Made "As Is" or "With All Faults"

[9] Disclaimer as to Drapery Fabrics

§ 502.52 Warranty Period for Servicing of Product

[1] Tolling of Period

[2] Extension of Period

[3] Notifying Buyer of Extension When Repairs Are Ordered

[4] Duty to Provide Purchase and Service Date Documentation to Consumer

[5] Tolling of Period of Manufacturer's Liability

§ 502.53 Actions Under the Song-Beverly Act

[1] Consumer Remedy of Special Recovery

[a] Damages and Other Relief Available

[b] Civil Penalty

[c] Limitation Period

[d] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[e] Class Action Excluded

[f] Clothing and Consumables Not Expressly Included

[2] Recovery for Breach of Implied Warranty Only

[3] Special Remedy for Seller or Independent Service Person

[4] Defenses

§ 502.54 Manufacturer's Warranty on Service Member's Vehicle

§§ 502.55-502.59 [Reserved]

§ 502.60 Magnuson-Moss Act Definitions

[1] Consumer

[2] Consumer Product

[3] Marketing Parties

[4] Remedies

[5] Service Contact

§ 502.61 Jurisdiction, Preemptive Effects, and Federal Trade Commission Regulation

§ 502.62 Written Warranty Generally

[1] Coverage

[2] Meaning of "Basis of the Bargain" Requirement

[3] Disclosure Requirements of Warranties

[a] Purpose of Warranty Disclosures

[b] Required Elements of Disclosures

[c] Applicability to Components and Replacements

[4] Designation as Full or Limited Warranty

[5] Minimum Standards on Full Warranty

[a] In General

[b] When Service Is "Without Charge"

[c] Imposition of Other Duties on Consumer

[d] Full Duties Owed to Transferees

[e] Duties Are Not Required on Showing of Consumer's Abuse

[f] Prohibition Against Unreasonable Duties to Secure Remedy

[6] Meaning of Minimum Price Requirements

[7] Puffery Excluded

[8] Service Contract Distinguished

§ 502.63 Written Warranty Presale Availability Requirements

[1] Seller's Responsibilities

[2] Warrantor's Responsibilities

§ 502.64 Implied Warranty

[1] Reference to State Law

[2] Disclaimer or Modification

§ 502.65 Prohibited Terms in Warranties and Service Contracts

§ 502.66 Contracts With Service Personnel

§ 502.67 True Insurance Contracts Are Unregulated

§ 502.68 Actions Under the Magnuson-Moss Act

[1] Provision for Informal Dispute Settlements

[2] Alternative Requirement for Affording Opportunity to Correct

[3] Consumer Remedy

[4] Recovery of Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] Available Forums

[6] Defendants

[7] Effect on Other Kinds of Recovery

[8] Punishable Offenses Under the Act

§§ 502.69-502.79 [Reserved]

§ 502.80 Other Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Forms of Discovery

[2] California Legal Forms

[3] Legal Forms With Tax Analysis

§ 502.81 Federal Statutes

§ 502.82 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code (Sales)

§ 502.83 Federal Regulations

§ 502.84 Decisions

[1] Actions for Breach of Warranty

[a] Attorney's Fees

[b] Costs

[c] Damages

[d] Penalty

[2] Express Warranty

[a] Labels

[b] Particular Promise

[c] Limitation, Modification, and Disclaimer

[d] Privity

[e] Single Cause of Action

[3] Implied Warranty

[a] Fitness for Particular Purpose

[b] Merchantability

[c] Privity

[4] Jury Instructions

[5] Notice to Seller

[6] Rescission; Revocation of Acceptance

[7] Restrictions on Disclaimers

[8] Strict Liability

[9] Waiver of Warranty

[10] Warranty of Title

§ 502.85 Law Reviews

§ 502.86 Text Reference

§§ 502.87-502.99 [Reserved]

§ 502.100 Notice of Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Requirement of Notification of Breach of Warranty

§ 502.101 Notice to Warrantor Affording Opportunity to Cure Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice Requirements Under Magnuson-Moss Act

§ 502.102 Notice to Seller That Buyer Has Been Sued for Breach of Warranty for Which Seller Is Answerable Over [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notification to Seller of Suit Against Buyer

§ 502.103 Complaint by Buyer Against Seller After Buyer's Loss of Action Against It for Breach of Warranty (Remedy Over) for Which Seller Is Answerable [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Claims Payable in Foreign Currency

[5] Verification

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Cross References

§ 502.104 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Warranty--Damages for Personal Injuries and Property Damage [Com. Code § 2714(3), 2715(2)(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.105-502.119 [Reserved]

§ 502.120 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Under the Commercial Code Based on Agreement to Limit Remedies for Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

[4] Cross References

§ 502.121 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Claiming Defect in Consumer Good Was Caused by Unauthorized or Unreasonable use After Sale [Civ. Code § 1794.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Applicability of Defense to Federal Actions

[4] Cross References

§§ 502.122-502.139 [Reserved]

§ 502.140 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Express Warranty Made by Promise or Affirmation of Fact [Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Form May Be Used in Consumer Litigation

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

§ 502.141 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Description of Goods [Com. Code § 2313(1)(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 502.142 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Sample or Model [Com. Code § 2313(1)(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Use in Action Under Song-Beverly Act

§§ 502.143-502.149 [Reserved]

§ 502.150 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Negation or Limitation of Express Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.151-502.159 [Reserved]

§ 502.160 Complaint by Retail Buyer for Damages (and Civil Penalty) for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act and Willful Breach of Express Warranty by Manufacturer (Or Person in That Position) Maintaining Local Service and Repair Facilities [Civ. Code § 1794; Com. Code §§ 2711-2715]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Failure to Supply Parts and Repair Literature

[4] Allegations

[5] Remedies Under Song-Beverly Act

[6] Alternative Remedy Under Magnuson-Moss Act

[7] Installment or Auto Sales Actions

[a] Filing of Affidavit or Declaration of Proper Venue Required

[b] Consequences of Failure to File Affidavit or Declaration

[8] Cross References

§ 502.161 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act for Failure to Repair to Conform to Express Warranty [Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d), 1794]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross Reference

§ 502.162 Complaint by Retail Seller or Independent Service and Repair Facility Acting on Manufacturer's Express Warranty for Treble Damages for Manufacturer's Failure to Provide Repair Facilities [Civ. Code §§ 1793.3, 1793.5, 1793.6, 1794.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Bases of Remedies for Retail Sellers or Service Facilities Against Manufacturer's Violation of Song-Beverly Act

[5] Failure to Supply Parts and Repair Literature

[6] Cross References

§§ 502.163-502.179 [Reserved]

§ 502.180 Complaint by Consumer Against Warrantor Manufacturer for Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Remedies Under Magnuson-Moss Act for Consumers and Transferees

[5] Cross References

§ 502.181 Allegations for Use in Class or Representative Action Complaint for Violation of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act Based on Failure to Comply With Written Warranty [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Class Actions Under the Magnuson-Moss Act

[4] Compliance With Certain Class Action Requirements

§§ 502.182-502.199 [Reserved]

§ 502.200 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

§ 502.201 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability of Food or Drink Served for Consumption [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Use in Consumer Litigation

§ 502.202 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1792, 1794]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Rights Under Implied Warranty of Merchantability

[a] Song-Beverly Act

[b] Magnuson-Moss Act

[5] Cross References

§§ 502.203-502.209 [Reserved]

§ 502.210 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Useable in Consumer Litigation

[4] Cross References

§ 502.211 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Based on Consumer's Waiver of Implied Warranties [Civ. Code § 1792.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Demurrer to Answer

[4] Disclaimer or Waiver of Implied Warranties

[a] Song-Beverly Act

[b] Magnuson-Moss Act

[5] Cross References

§ 502.212 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion of All Implied Warranties by Language Such as "As Is" or "With All Faults" [Com. Code § 2316(3)(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

[4] Cross References

§ 502.213 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion or Modification of That Implied Warranty by Course of Dealing or Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 502.214 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code

Based on Buyer's Opportunity to Examine Goods [Com. Code § 2316(3)(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.215-502.219 [Reserved]

§ 502.220 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2; Com. Code § 2315]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Distinctions Between Implied Warranty of Fitness in Consumer Cases and in Commercial Cases

[5] Cross References

§§ 502.221-502.229 [Reserved]

§ 502.230 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness Based on Exclusion or Modification of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.231-502.239 [Reserved]

§ 502.240 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising From Course of Dealing and Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2314(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 502.241-502.259 [Reserved]

§ 502.260 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Give Good Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 502.261 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Lack of Authority to Transfer Third Person's Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 502.262 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Deliver Free From Encumbrances [Com. Code § 2312(1)(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 502.263-502.269 [Reserved]

§ 502.270 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty by Specific Language [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Demurrer in Lieu of Answer

[4] Warranty of Title Is Not Excluded Necessarily With Other Warranties

[5] Cross References

§ 502.271 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Fact That Buyer Had Reason to Know of Lack or Limitation of Title [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.272-502.279 [Reserved]

§ 502.280 Notice to Seller of Breach of Warranty Against Infringement for Which Buyer Has Been Sued [Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Requirement of Notification

§ 502.281 Notice to Buyer to Hold Seller Harmless Against Claim Arising Out of Compliance With Specifications of Goods Sold [Com. Code § 2607]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Seller's Notice of Infringement When Buyer Furnished Specifications for Goods

[4] Ability of Buyer to Demand Control Over Litigation

§ 502.282 Demand by Seller That Buyer Turn Over Control of Litigation Resulting From Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Seller's Right to Demand Control

§ 502.283 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Attorney's Fees as Consequential Damages

[5] Cross References

§§ 502.284-502.289 [Reserved]

§ 502.290 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Agreement Excluding Infringement Protection [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 502.291 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Buyer's

Having Furnished Specifications [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 502.292-502.299 [Reserved]

§ 502.300 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Quality or Condition of Goods on Arrival [Com. Code § 2321(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART I. SCOPE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.01

§ 502.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the basic warranty laws applicable to the sale of goods generally, as well as the special warranty provisions that apply to consumer purchases under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*) and the federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*). This chapter primarily addresses breaches of warranties that result in commercial losses. Losses in the nature of personal injuries and related consequential damages are covered in Ch. 460, *Products Liability* . Remedies connected with warranties on mobilehomes are treated in Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks* .

Three different types of statutory bases for actions for breach of warranty are discussed.

- The large variety of express and implied warranties as well as other statutory warranties that are found in Division 2 of the Commercial Code for basic sales transactions [*see § 502.20* et seq.].

- The Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*; hereinafter referred to as the "Song-Beverly Act"), which recognizes particular kinds of express warranties made to consumers--those in writing which undertake to make good on the product, and those resulting from employing demonstration wares [*see § 502.40* et seq.]. The act sets up a system whereby the manufacturers must provide, in connection with the creation of an express warranty, service facilities or substitutions for those facilities if they are not available [*see §§ 502.43, 502.44*]. Special causes of action are made available in the case of express warranties [*see §§ 502.45 -502.50*]. The act also mandates the presence of certain implied warranties somewhat more streamlined than under the Commercial Code in consumer sales [*see § 502.51*]. An action on an implied warranty action may be simpler than that provided in the Commercial Code, with broader remedies and a fuller range of possible defendants, and fewer defenses available [*see § 502.53*].

- The federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*; hereinafter referred to as the "Magnuson-Moss Act"), which recognizes a broader type of written warranty made to consumers than that made under the Song-Beverly Act, but requires more elements to be present [*see § 502.60* et seq.]. It imposes certain disclosure requirements on warrantors [

see §§ 502.62, 502.63]. It recognizes any implied warranties arising under state law and ties them to written warranties [*see § 502.64*]. It provides a broad cause of action in state as well as federal courts for a range of plaintiffs broader than that available under state law and against a full range of defendants with few defenses available to defendants in the action [*see § 502.68*].

Forms in this chapter include the following:

- Notices of breach of warranty under the Commercial Code [*see § 502.100*] and under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [*see § 502.101*].

- A notice to take over defense of a suit given by a defendant to a third party who is answerable over [*see § 502.102*].

- A complaint by a former defendant against a third party answerable over for the claim established in the earlier suit [*see § 502.103*].

- An allegation for consequential damages arising out of personal or property injuries for use in a breach of warranty action under the Commercial Code [*see § 502.104*].

- Forms for defense against breaches of warranty generally [*see §§ 502.120* and *502.121*].

- Forms of complaint and allegations for, and defense to, a breach of an express warranty under the Commercial Code [*see §§ 502.140 -502.142, 502.150*].

- A complaint and an allegation, for use by a retail buyer, for violation of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act applicable to express warranty [*see §§ 502.160 -502.161*], as well as a complaint by a seller or service agent against a manufacturer for willful or repeated violations of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [*see § 502.162*].

- Complaints and allegations for use in a class action under the Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [*see §§ 502.180* and *502.181*].

- A complaint and allegations for, and a form for defense to, a breach of the implied warranty of merchantability under the Commercial Code [*see §§ 502.200, 502.201*, and *502.210*].

- A complaint for a breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, and a form for defense to breaches of implied warranty, under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [*see §§ 502.202* and *502.211*].

- A complaint for, and a form for defense to, a breach of the implied warranty of fitness under the Commercial Code [*see §§ 502.220* and *502.230*].

- A complaint for breach of an implied warranty through course of dealing or usage of trade [*see § 502.240*].

- Forms for defenses to breaches of implied warranties under the Commercial Code [*see §§ 502.212 -502.214*].

- Forms for a complaint and allegations for, and defense to, a breach of the warranty of title [*see § 502.260* et seq.].

- Forms for notice and demand, a complaint for, and defenses to, a breach of the warranty against infringement [*see § 502.280* et seq.].

- A complaint for breach of warranty as to quality or condition of goods on arrival [*see § 502.300*].

Remedies for violation of *Civ. Code §§ 1770(a)(21)* and *1797.8 et seq.* (required advertising disclosures regarding trademark consumer goods normally accompanied by manufacturer's warranty that are imported into this country through unauthorized channels and do not have manufacturer's express warranty) are discussed in Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART I. SCOPE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.02

§ 502.02 Cross References

- For discussion and complaints for remedies for false advertising, including failure to disclose lack of accompanying warranty on "grey market goods," see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

- For a complaint for breach of warranty against an auctioneer, see Ch. 77, *Auctions and Auctioneers* .

- For discussion and forms for recovery for breach of automobile warranties, see Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .

- For discussion and complaints for breach of warranty against contractors and developers, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

- For discussion and forms for use in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

- For discussion and complaints involving consumer credit transaction remedies, see Ch.127, *Consumer Protection* .

- For discussion and forms relating to breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to costs and attorney's fees generally, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, §§ 174.10 et seq. and 174.50* et seq.

- For discussion and forms dealing with damages in contract actions, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

- For discussion and forms relating to warranties on packaged or served food, see Ch. 268, *Food* .

- For a complaint against an electrical contractor for breach of warranty, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .

- For discussion and complaints based on a right to indemnification, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

- For discussion of warranty in insurance contracts, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

- For discussion of mobilehome warranties, see Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks* .

- For discussion and forms for complaints concerning patent infringement, see Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions* .

- For discussion and forms for complaints for injuries caused by defective products and design, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

- For discussion and forms dealing with infringement of trademark, see Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART I. SCOPE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.03-502.09

[Reserved]

§§ 502.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.10

§ 502.10 Governing Law

[1] State Statutes

Warranties for the sale of goods is basically and most broadly covered in Division 2 of the Commercial Code known as "Uniform Commercial Code--Sales" (*Com. Code § 2101*), in *Com. Code §§ 2312-2317, 2321(2), 2607(3)(B), (5), (6), 2714(2), 2715(2)(b), 2800,* and *2801*. This law is amplified in certain substantive ways as to consumer sales only (and related wholesale transactions) by the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act in *Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*

As a complement to consumer warranty legislation, a statutory standard of performance by service personnel has been adopted with respect to labor involving consumer goods brought in for repair under warranty, or otherwise. Any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity that engages in the business of installing new or used consumer goods has a duty to the buyer to install them in a "good and workmanlike" manner [*Civ. Code § 1796*]. If the entity engages in the business of providing service or repair to new or used consumer goods, it has a duty to the purchaser to perform those services in "good and workmanlike" manner [*Civ. Code § 1796.5*]. These provisions, however, do not provide a specific remedy for their violation.

[2] Federal Statutes and Regulations

Consumer protection with respect to warranties in the sale of goods is further extended, primarily through disclosure requirements, and otherwise given support concurrent with or residual to the state scheme, through the federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*), with implementing regulations found in *16 C.F.R. §§ 700.1-703.8*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.11

§ 502.11 Definitions

[1] Warranty

A warranty is not a technical term for legal purposes in the area of sales transactions in the absence of some added qualification, such as "express" or "implied." It was defined in the sales context in an early statute, former Civ. Code § 1763, as an engagement by which a seller assures to a buyer the existence of some fact affecting the transaction [*see Harley v. Golden State & M.I.W. (1884) 66 Cal. 238, 239, 5 P. 160]* . A warranty may involve title, character, quantity, quality, identity, or condition of goods [*A.A. Baxter Corp. v. Colt Indus., Inc. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 144, 153, 88 Cal. Rptr. 842]* .

[2] Express Warranty

An "express warranty" is sometimes described as an affirmation of fact or a promise [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*; *15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(A)*], or as a written undertaking [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)*; *15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(B)*] concerning the goods. In some instances it may take the form of a description of goods [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(b)*] or a sample or model of the goods [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(c)*; *Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(2)*]. To be enforceable, an express warranty may be required to be part of the basis of the bargain between the parties [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)*; *15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*].

[3] Implied Warranty

An "implied warranty" is a warranty that is implied in a contract for sale of the goods involved [*see Com. Code § 2314*], or exists at the time of contracting for a sale of goods under particular circumstances [*see Com. Code § 2315*], or accompanies in certain situations a sale of particular goods [*see Civ. Code §§ 1792-1792.2*]. An implied warranty is normally, and under certain legislation, exclusively, one for merchantability or for fitness for certain purposes [*see Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)*; *Civ. Code § 1791.1*], but other implied warranties may be present from time to time through course of dealing or usage of trade [*see Com. Code § 2314(3)*]. An implied warranty has been described as one "arising under" or "imposed by" [*see* U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 2314*] "State law" [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(7)*]; however, certain other nonexpress warranties also may be imposed by law without being designated or treated as "implied" [*see* U.C.C.

Comment to *Com. Code § 2312*; *Com. Code § 2312(1)(B)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.12

§ 502.12 Nature of Action for Breach of Warranty

[1] Hybrid of Tort and Contract

The seller's warranty has been referred to as "a curious hybrid" of tort and contract and as unique in the law [Prosser on Torts (4th ed), § 95]. Liability for a breach of a warranty originally was considered a tort, but eventually it became identified as being governed by contract principles in the area of sales. Nevertheless, it is regarded as having essentially retained its substantive tort character, and recovery for breach of warranty is seen as a form of strict liability [*see* Prosser on Torts (4th ed), § 95; Frumer & Friedman, Products Liability, Ch. 3, *Introduction to Strict Liability* , Ch. 3A, *Manufacturer's Strict Liability in Warranty* (Matthew Bender)]. The basis for recovery is the failure of a promise or representation [*see* Corbin on Contracts, Vol. I, § 14], or of an engagement or assurance [*see § 502.11[1], above*], by the seller to the buyer in association with a sale. Thus, while a warranty arises in connection with a sale, it is independent of the contract for sale (although the agreement may refer directly or implicitly to the warranty as well), and an action on the warranty is not in the nature of a formal proceeding on the breach of a contract.

This analysis of the nature of the action for a breach of a warranty would not appear to be affected by the requirement that express warranties governed by Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*see § 502.20* et seq., *below*] must have become or been made "part of the basis of the bargain" [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)*], a requirement that is also part of the description of a written warranty under the Magnuson-Moss Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)* and § 502.60 et seq., *below*]. The requirement is not given a definitive meaning in the Uniform Commercial Code [*see* U.C.C. Comments 1-8 to *Com. Code § 2313*; *see also* Comment, *The Meaning of 'Part of the Basis of the Bargain,' 19 Santa Clara L. Rev. 447, 448 (1979)*], but the Supreme Court has made it clear that it imposes a less onerous burden on the plaintiff in proving the existence of an express warranty than was imposed prior to the adoption of the Commercial Code, because a plaintiff is no longer required to prove his or her reliance on the seller's affirmation or promise [*see Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 115-116, 116 n.13, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* ; *see also § 502.23[1]*]. Thus, it appears that the "basis of the bargain" requirement for express warranties under the Magnuson-Moss Act does not require that the representation constituting the warranty be part of the bargain proper or that it be a consideration for the agreement.

A distinction remains between damages recoverable for breach of warranty and those recoverable in product liability

cases. The difference between price paid and value received, and deviations from standards of quality that have not resulted in property damage or personal injury, are primarily the domain of contract and warranty law or the law of fraud, rather than of negligence. In actions for negligence, a manufacturer's liability is limited to damages for physical injuries; no recovery is allowed for economic loss alone, under a general principle, referred to as the economic loss rule [*see* *Aas v. Superior Court (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 627, 636, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718, 12 P.3d 1125]* .

[2] Breach of Warranty as Alternative to Breach of Contract

There may be instances when an expression appearing in, or intended to be incorporated into, a contract may be capable of being interpreted as a warranty or as an integral element or condition of the primary contract of sale itself. It would seem that in those instances the plaintiff has a cause of action for breach of warranty and for breach of the sales contract. Normally, the plaintiff suing for breach of warranty may expect the contract to remain in force, and the usual elements of a cause of action for breach of contract will not be required to be shown [*see* discussion in [1], *above*]. On the other hand, the plaintiff in an action for breach of contract must plead all the necessary elements to state a cause of action, such as plaintiff's compliance with all conditions of the contract, but presumably may be able to invoke other remedies provided in the Commercial Code [*see* Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.13-502.19

[Reserved]

§§ 502.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.20

§ 502.20 Warranties Applicable to Sales of Goods Only

Warranties arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code (which is also referred to as the Uniform Commercial Code--Sales, and which is the general sales law) are generally restricted to sales of goods only [*see Com. Code §§ 2102, 2105(1)*; *see also Com. Code §§ 2312-2316*]. Although general sales warranty law extends to other transactions by reasoning which is analogous to the law of sales, the law typically has been considered unavailable in the area of services, including professional services [*see Allied Props. v. John A. Blume & Associates (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 848, 855-856, 102 Cal. Rptr. 259* (relying principally on *Gagne v. Bertran (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 481, 487-490, 275 P.2d 15*)]. The Commercial Code, however, does provide that the serving for value of food or drink to be consumed either on the premises or elsewhere is a sale for purposes of the implied warranty of merchantability [*Com. Code § 2314(1)*]. Thus, generally, if a transaction is treated as a service rather than as a sale of a good, such as transactions in blood and its by-products for purposes of injecting or transfusing into humans [*see Health & Safety Code § 1606*; *Shepard v. Alexian Brothers Hosp. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 606, 609-610, 614, 109 Cal. Rptr. 132* ; *see also Fogo v. Cutter Laboratories, Inc. (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 744, 750-754, 758-761, 137 Cal. Rptr. 417]* , Division 2 does not apply.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.21

§ 502.21 Warranty of Title

[1] Scope of Warranty of Title

In every contract for sale (unless excluded or modified in a permissible fashion, as discussed *below*), the seller warrants both knowledge [*Com. Code § 2312(1)*]:

- That the title conveyed is good, and its transfer rightful.

- That the goods are delivered free from any security interest, or other lien or encumbrance, of which the buyer at the time of contracting has no knowledge.

This warranty is intended to make provisions for a buyer's basic needs regarding a title that he or she expects in good faith to acquire--a good, clean title transferred in a rightful manner so that the buyer will not be exposed to a lawsuit in order to protect it. This warranty is extended whether or not the seller was in possession of the goods at the time the sale or contract to sell was made. The "knowledge" which the buyer might have of title deficiencies that could delimit the warranty is "actual" [*see Com. Code § 1202(a)(b)*] knowledge as distinct from broader notice. The warranty has not been designated an "implied" one and thus is not subject to restrictions applicable to implied warranties per se [U.C.C. Comments 1, 6 to *Com. Code § 2312*].

[2] Exclusion or Modification

The warranty of title may be excluded or modified, but only by specific language or by circumstances that give the buyer reason to know that the seller is not personally claiming title or is purporting to sell only whatever right the seller or a third person may have [*Com. Code § 2312(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.22

§ 502.22 Warranty Against Infringement

A seller who is a merchant regularly dealing in goods of the kind automatically gives a warranty against infringement, unless there is an agreement otherwise. The parties' agreement "otherwise" can be an agreement that expands, rather than limits or excludes, the statutory warranty against a "rightful claim" of infringement [*Linear Tech. Corp. v. Applied Materials, Inc. (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 115, 127, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 221* ("[h]ere the parties' contracts ... were expansive in embracing a warranty that the use of the purchased equipment would not result in *any* claim of infringement"; original emphasis)]. The warranty is that the goods will be delivered free of the rightful claim of any third person by way of infringement or the like. However, if the buyer furnishes specifications to the seller, the buyer must hold the seller harmless against any claim that arises out of compliance with the specifications [*Com. Code § 2312(3)*].

A "rightful claim" under *Com. Code § 2312(3)* is not synonymous with a claim that ultimately will prove successful in litigation. Rather, it is a nonfrivolous claim of infringement that has any significant and adverse effect on the buyer's ability to make use of the goods [*Pacific Sunwear of Cal., Inc. v. Olaes Enters., Inc. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 466, 470, 481, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 182*].

Special examples of sellers who are not merchants are sheriffs, executors, foreclosing lienors and persons similarly situated, and sellers who are so out of the ordinary commercial course that their peculiar character is immediately apparent to the buyer. No personal obligation is imposed on such a seller who is purporting to sell only an unknown or limited right [U.C.C. Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 2312*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.23

§ 502.23 Express Warranties

[1] Creation by Seller

A seller creates express warranties as follows [*Com. Code § 2313(1)*]:

- Any affirmation of fact or promise made by the seller to the buyer, which relates to the goods and becomes part of the basis of the bargain, creates an express warranty that the goods will conform to the affirmation or promise.

- Any description of the goods that is made part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the goods will conform to the description.

- Any sample or model which is made a part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the whole of the goods will conform to the sample or model.

When the seller makes "[a]ny affirmation of fact or [any] promise ... to the buyer which relates to the goods" [*Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*], there is a presumption that it "is intended to become a basis of the bargain" [*see* U.C.C. Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 2313*]. Therefore, unless the presumption is rebutted, the affirmation or promise "becomes part of the basis of the bargain" [*Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 23, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392]* , and thus the seller "creates an express warranty that the goods shall conform to the affirmation or promise" [*Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*]. Rebuttal of the presumption "requires clear affirmative proof" of "any fact which is [relied on] to take such affirmations, once made, out of the agreement" [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 115, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* ; *Weinstat v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc. (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1213, 1229, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614* ; U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2313*].

The express warranty in that case is presumptively created solely by the seller's making an "affirmation of fact or [a] promise" that "relates to the goods" and is "made to the buyer" [*Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*]. In that event, once the sale is concluded, the warranty exists (unless and until the presumption is rebutted), whether or not any of the following facts

can be shown:

- The seller did not use the word "warrant" or a similar word, or the seller did not intend to make a warranty [*Com. Code § 2313(2)*; U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2313*].

- The seller's affirmation of fact or promise did not come to the buyer's attention until after the sale was concluded [*Weinstat v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc. (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1213, 1230-1231, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614* ("affirmations, promises and descriptions about the goods contained in product manuals and other materials that are given to the buyer at the time of delivery can become part of the basis of the bargain, ... notwithstanding that delivery occurs after the purchase price has been paid. ... Even before purchasing a product, a buyer would reasonably expect any statement or description of the product appearing in a user manual or similar publication to be true, regardless of when the manual was received or read. A seller's defense based solely on the postsale timing of receipt or awareness of the manual arguably would fall short of good faith."); U.C.C. Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 2313*].

- The buyer did not rely on that affirmation of fact or promise when deciding to buy [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 114, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* (*Com. Code § 2313* embodies change from pre-U.C.C. law on reliance issue); *Weinstat v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc. (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1213, 1227, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614* (reliance is not required); U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2313* ("In actual practice affirmations of fact made by the seller about the goods during a bargain are regarded as part of the description of those goods; hence no particular reliance on such statements need be shown in order to weave them into the fabric of the agreement.")].

- The seller purported to disclaim "all warranties, expressed or implied" in such or similar general terms [U.C.C. Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 2313*; *see § 502.23[6]*].

The buyer's inspection of the goods before purchase does not necessarily waive the express warranties. For instance, warranties based on statements in advertising brochures that a boat was "a picture of sure-footed seaworthiness" and "a carefully equipped and very seaworthy vessel" were not waived by the buyer's, and buyer's expert's, inspection of the boat before it was placed in the water [*Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 23-24, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392]* .

Whether a seller has created an express warranty or merely made nonactionable statements of opinion is for the trier of fact to determine from all of the circumstances of the transaction [*Schauer v. Mandarin Gems of California, Inc. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 949, 959, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233]* .

Com. Code § 2313 applies only to the sale of goods. Thus, a representation made in connection with the sale of a business, regarding the volume of gross and net profits, is not governed by *Com. Code § 2313* [*Kazerouni v. De Satnick (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 871, 873-874, 279 Cal. Rptr. 74]* .

[2] By Description

A description need not be by words. Technical specifications, blueprints, and the like can afford more exact description than mere language; if these descriptions are made part of the basis of the bargain, goods must conform with them. Past deliveries may set the description of quality, either expressly, impliedly, or by course of dealing. All descriptions by merchants must be read against applicable trade usages, with the general rules as to merchantability resolving any doubts [U.C.C. Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 2313*].

[3] By Sample

Samples include both those drawn from the bulk of goods that is the subject matter of the sale, and from models that are

offered for inspection when the subject matter is not available and which has not been drawn from the bulk of the goods. There may be a question of fact, however, as to when something has been shown merely as illustrative, that is, demonstrated only to suggest, rather than as constituting the character of the subject matter of the contract. A sample drawn from the bulk should be regarded as describing values of the goods contracted for unless accompanied by an unmistakable denial of that responsibility. A model of merchandise not on hand is not as strong an indicator that it is a literal description of the sales subject matter, particularly if the buyer's modification of the model impairs any feature of the model [U.C.C. Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 2313*].

[4] Puffery Excluded

An affirmation merely of the value of goods, or a statement purporting to be merely the seller's opinion or commendation of the goods, does not create a warranty [*Com. Code § 2313(2)*]. Statements in advertising brochures that a boat was "a picture of sure-footed seaworthiness" and "a carefully equipped and very seaworthy vessel" were specific and unequivocal enough to create express warranties under *Com. Code § 2313* [*Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 20-22, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392* (but no express warranties were created under *Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)* because there was no undertaking by seller to preserve or maintain utility or performance of vessel)].

[5] Elimination of Privity

Privity is not required for an action based on express warranty [*Rodrigues v. Campbell Industries (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 494, 500-501, 151 Cal. Rptr. 90* ; *see* *Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 114 n.8, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* ; *Schauer v. Mandarin Gems of California, Inc. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 949, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233* (third-party beneficiary plaintiff)].

[6] Limitation, Modification, and Disclaimer

Words or conduct relevant to the creation of an express warranty and words or conduct tending to negate or limit a warranty are construed whenever reasonable as consistent with each other. Negation or limitation is inoperative, however, to the extent that a limited construction is unreasonable, subject to the provisions of Division 2 of the Commercial Code on parol or extrinsic evidence [*Com. Code § 2316(1)*; *see Com. Code § 2202*].

Because a disclaimer or modification is inconsistent with an express warranty, words of disclaimer or modification give way to words of warranty unless some clear agreement between the parties dictates the contrary [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 119, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* ; *see also* U.C.C. Comment 1 to *Com. Code § 2313*]. For example, the scope of an express warranty that a golfer training device is completely safe has been held to be not limited by reference to a picture in an instruction manual showing the correct use of the device or the general understanding that golf is a dangerous game [*see* *Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 118, 120, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377]* .

A purchaser cannot claim the benefit of an express warranty of which it had no knowledge at the time of contracting. Thus, a disclaimer in the primary contract is effective to bar a claim by the purchaser based on an express warranty in a contract between the seller and one of the seller's subcontractors that the purchaser discovers after the primary contract is executed [*Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 34, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716* (purchaser claimed to be third-party beneficiary of contract between seller and subcontractor)].

When an express warranty is limited to a specified period (for example, the typical time-or-miles warranty on a new car), generally the warranty does not cover repairs made after the warranty period has expired. Furthermore, a latent defect discovered after expiration of the warranty period does not form the basis for a valid claim under the warranty, even if the warrantor knew of the defect at the time of sale. To hold that all latent defects are covered under a limited-period express warranty, whether they become apparent to the customer before or after expiration of the

warranty period, would place an undue burden on the warrantor, who under such a rule would, in effect, be obliged to ensure that the product is defect free for its entire life [*Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 824, 830-831, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.24

§ 502.24 Implied Warranties

[1] Origin in Law

The implied warranty, unlike the basically contractual express warranty, arises by operation of law. The defendant's liability therefor does not depend on his or her specific conduct or promises. It turns instead on whether defendant's product is merchantable or fit as required under the Commercial Code [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 117, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377]* .

[2] Merchantability

A warranty that the goods are merchantable is implied in a contract for their sale if (1) the seller is a merchant of goods of that kind, and (2) the warranty has not otherwise been excluded or modified. The serving for value of food or drink to the consumer, either on the premises or elsewhere, is a sale for warranty purposes. To be merchantable, goods must do at least all of the following [*Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)*]:

- Pass without objection in the trade under the contract description.

- Be of fair average quality within the description, if fungible goods [*see* U.C.C. Comment to *Com. Code § 2314*].

- Be fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used [*Burr v. Sherwin Williams Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 682, 694, 268 P.2d 1041* (if goods contain impurity of such nature as to render them unusable, and therefore unsalable, for general uses and purposes of goods of that kind, those goods are not merchantable); *see, e.g.,* *Garlock Sealing Techs., LLC v. NAK Sealing Techs. Corp. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 937, 953-954, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177* (substantial evidence supported trial court's conclusion that seller breached implied warranty of merchantability because goods contained impurity)].

- Run of even kind, quality, and quantity (within the variations permitted by the agreement) within each unit and among all units involved.

- Be adequately contained, packaged, and labeled as the agreement may require.
- Conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label, if any.

[3] Merchant Defined

A person making an isolated sale of goods is not a "merchant" within the meaning of the full scope of the implied warranty of merchantability provision. Thus, no warranty of merchantability applies. In keeping with the underlying reason for the implied warranty and the provision on good faith, a person who is not a merchant but who knows of defects that were not apparent on inspection fully must disclose any known material but hidden defects, even in the absence of an express agreement. If a seller states generally that the goods are "guaranteed," the implied warranty provisions may furnish a guide to the content of the resulting express warranty. This consequence has particular significance in the case of secondhand sales, and has further significance in limiting the effect of fine print disclaimer clauses if their effect would be inconsistent with large print assertions of guarantee [U.C.C. Comments 3, 4 to *Com. Code § 2314*].

[4] Fitness for Particular Purpose

A sale carries an implied warranty that the goods will be fit for a particular purpose if the seller at the time of contracting has reason to know any particular purpose for which the goods are required and the buyer is relying on the seller's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods. This warranty may be excluded or modified [*Com. Code § 2315*; *see Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 25-26, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392* (no implied warranty because buyer made own selection rather than relying on seller's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods)].

A "particular" purpose differs from an "ordinary" one in that it envisages a specific use by the buyer which is peculiar to the nature of his or her needs. The ordinary purposes of the uses of goods are those encompassed by the concept of merchantability and serve uses that are customarily made of the goods. The ordinary purpose of shoes is walking on ordinary surfaces, but the seller may know that a particular pair is being selected for use in mountain climbing [U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 2315*].

It is basically a question of fact as to whether the warranty of special fitness arises in any individual case. The seller need not have actual knowledge of the particular purpose or of the buyer's reliance if the circumstances are such that the seller should realize either of these. The buyer's reliance must be actual. For example, a buyer who insists on a particular brand or trade name is not relying on the seller's skill and judgment and there is no warranty of particular fitness. However, the mere fact that the article purchased has a special patent or trade name is not sufficient to indicate nonreliance [U.C.C. Comments 1, 5 to *Com. Code § 2315*].

[5] When "Fitness" Controls Over Other Warranties

Any question of fact as to which warranty was intended by the parties to apply is resolved in favor of the warranty of fitness for a particular purpose as against all other warranties. If, however, the purpose for which the goods are to be used combines the buyer's requirements as to quality of the goods as well as compliance with certain laws or regulations, the provisions of Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*see Com. Code §§ 2509, 2510*] on allocation or division of risks may apply. Division of the risks may be handled by express agreement or by surrounding circumstances or matters of custom [*see* U.C.C. Comments 2, 3 to *Com. Code § 2315*; *see also* discussion in *§ 502.27*].

[6] Other Implied Warranties

Implied warranties, other than merchantability, may arise from course of dealing or usage of trade unless excluded or modified [*Com. Code § 2314(3)*; *see Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)* ("course of dealing" and "usage of trade" defined)], such

as in the sale of an animal in which the seller must deliver certification of the animal's pedigree or blooded character [U.C.C. Comment 12 to *Com. Code § 2314*].

[7] Requirement of Privity

Privity between the plaintiff and defendant is a requirement for actions based on the implied warranty of merchantability or the implied warranty of fitness [*Burr v. Sherwin Williams Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 682, 695-696, 268 P.2d 1041* ; *All-West Electronics, Inc. v. M-B-W, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 717, 725-727, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 509* ; *U.S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1441, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533* ; *Osborne v. Subaru of America, Inc. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 646, 656, 243 Cal. Rptr. 815*]. A buyer and a seller stand in privity if they are in adjoining links of the distribution chain; therefore, a consumer who buys from a retailer is not in privity with the manufacturer, for example [*Osborne v. Subaru of America, Inc. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 646, 656 n.6, 243 Cal. Rptr. 815*]. The Ninth Circuit has noted that the privity requirement may be an archaism in the modern consumer marketplace [*Clemens v. Daimlerchrysler Corp. (9th Cir. 2008) 530 F.3d 852, 858*].

Some exceptions to the normal privity rule have been developed. One can arise when the plaintiff relies on written labels or advertisements of the manufacturer [*see Burr v. Sherwin Williams Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 682, 696, 268 P.2d 1041*]. Other exceptions can arise in special cases involving foodstuffs, pesticides, and pharmaceuticals, or where the plaintiff is an employee of the buyer [*see Burr v. Sherwin Williams Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 682, 695, 268 P.2d 1041* ; *Windham at Carmel Mountain Ranch Assn. v. Superior Court (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1162, 1169, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834* ; *Fieldstone Co. v. Briggs Plumbing Prods. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 357, 369, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701* ; *Gottsdanker v. Cutter Labs. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 602, 608, 6 Cal. Rptr. 320]* . An exception also may exist when the plaintiff is a member of the buyer's family [*Rodrigues v. Campbell Industries (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 494, 500, 151 Cal. Rptr. 90* ; *see Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 114 n.8, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377]* .

If the manufacturer or supplier of goods affirmatively engages in conduct directly with the ultimate buyer, so that functionally the manufacturer or supplier is in the position of the direct seller, then it is fair and appropriate to hold that manufacturer or supplier to an implied warranty that the goods will be fit for the buyer's purposes, if all other elements of the buyer's claim have been established [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 144, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5* ; *see, e.g., U.S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1441-1442, 1445, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533* (roofing contractor negotiated with equipment supplier for specific item at agreed price; unrelated finance lessor then bought that item from supplier and leased it to contractor, because lease was financially advantageous for contractor; court held that implied warranty of fitness ran from supplier to contractor, in spite of lack of actual privity between them, because of their direct dealings; participation of finance lessor as accommodation party was disregarded)].

[8] Exclusion Generally

All implied warranties are excluded by expressions such as "as is," "with all faults," or other language which in common understanding calls the buyer's attention to the exclusion of warranties and makes plain that there is no implied warranty. However, the exclusion does not operate if the circumstances indicate otherwise [*Com. Code § 2316(3)(a)*].

When the buyer, before entering into the contract, has examined the goods, or the sample or model, as fully as he or she desired, or has refused to examine them, there is no implied warranty with regard to defects which an examination ought in the circumstances to have revealed [*Com. Code § 2316(3)(b)*; *see, e.g., Garlock Sealing Techs., LLC v. NAK Sealing Techs. Corp. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 937, 953-954, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177* (substantial evidence supported trial court's finding that abrasiveness of oil seal lips was not defect that buyer ought to have discovered)]. Examination by the buyer is not synonymous with inspection before acceptance or at any other time after the contract has been made. Rather, examination signifies the nature of the responsibility assumed by the seller at the time of making the contract. Thus, if the buyer discovers the defect and uses the goods anyway, or if such person unreasonably fails to examine the

goods before using them, any injuries that occur may be found to result from the buyer's own action rather than proximately from a breach of warranty [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 2316*]. A buyer is deemed to have refused to examine goods only if the seller demands that the buyer examine the goods fully, thereby putting the buyer on notice that he or she assumes the risk of defects which the examination ought to reveal [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 2316*].

The particular buyer's skill and the normal method of examining goods under the circumstances determine which defects are excluded by the examination. A failure to notice defects that are obvious cannot excuse the buyer. However, an examination under circumstances that do not permit chemical or other testing of the goods would not exclude defects which could be ascertained only by that testing. Latent defects are not excluded by a simple examination. A professional buyer examining a product in his or her field of expertise is held to have assumed the risk as to all defects that a professional ought to observe. A nonprofessional buyer is held only to the standard of what a layperson might have found to be defects [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 2316*].

If the offer of examination by the seller is accompanied by words concerning the merchantability of specific attributes of the goods, and the buyer clearly indicates reliance on those words rather than on the examination, the words give rise to an "express" warranty. The question then is whether or not a warranty of merchantability has been expressly incorporated in the agreement [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 2316*].

An implied warranty also can be excluded or modified by course of dealing or course of performance or by usage of trade. These rules take precedence over the special provisions for exclusion of the individual types of implied warranties [*Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)*].

[9] Exclusion or Modification of Warranty of Merchantability

To exclude or modify the implied warranty of merchantability, or any part thereof (apart from the general rules for altering implied warranties) [*see § 502.24[8]*], the language must mention merchantability. In the case of a writing, that language must be conspicuous [*Com. Code § 2316(2)*]. Thus, for example, a contract for the sale of secondhand goods involves only the obligation that is appropriate to secondhand goods, because that is their contract description [U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2314*]. However, even if the word "merchantability" is not used, a seller apparently may limit the scope of the implied warranty by specifying that the product should b e used with caution or in a certain prescribed manner. For example, there was no breach of the implied warranty of merchantability when a customer developed a skin irritation after the application of a product which advertised itself as appropriate for use on the skin but cautioned that certain skin might be sensitive to the product and that sample testing should be tried and its use discontinued if any irritation developed [*see Harris v. Belton (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 595, 605-607, 65 Cal. Rptr. 808]* .

If the buyer gives precise and complete specifications to the seller, the warranty of merchantability must be considered in connection with the provisions governing the cumulation and conflict of warranties and would be expected to be displaced by the express warranty that the goods will comply with the specifications [UCC Comment 9 to *Com. Code § 2316*; *see § 502.27*].

[10] Exclusion of Warranty of Fitness

Other than as discussed in analysis of general exclusions [*see § 502.24[8]*], an implied warranty of fitness may be excluded only by a writing in a conspicuous fashion. Language to exclude all implied warranties of fitness is sufficient if it states, for example, that "there are no warranties which extend beyond the description on the face hereof" [*Com. Code § 2316(2)*].

The warranty of fitness for a particular purpose normally would not arise in a situation in which the buyer gives precise

and complete specifications to the seller, because the buyer in that case is not usually relying on the seller [UCC Comment 9 to *Com. Code § 2316*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.25

§ 502.25 Warranties Affecting Delivery

Any warranty of quality or condition of goods on their arrival on shipment places on the seller the risk of ordinary deterioration, shrinkage, and the like in transportation. It has no effect, however, on the place or time of identification to the contract for sale or delivery or on the passing of the risk of loss [*Com. Code § 2321(2)*; *see Ch. 500, Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code, § 500.75[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.26

§ 502.26 Restrictions on Disclaimers

No warranty, express or implied, can be modified or disclaimed, according to the purpose of *Com. Code § 2316*, unless a seller clearly limits his or her liability. At the very least, the statute allows limitation on warranties only through words that clearly communicate that a particular risk falls on the buyer. Furthermore, any disclaimer or modification must be strictly construed against the seller. The purchaser must be placed on fair notice of any disclaimer or modification of a warranty and must freely agree to the seller's terms [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 119-120, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377]* . The disclaimer should be in clear and distinct language prominently set forth in large, bold print in such a position as to compel notice [*Dorman v. International Harvester Co. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 11, 18-19, 120 Cal. Rptr. 516* (disclaimer provision was unenforceable which only slightly contrasted with rest of contract, failed to have a heading, was not accompanied by the express warranty provided by the seller, and emphasized words which implied that the excluded, implied warranties might actually be available)].

If a contract has been completed containing a warranty, a unilateral nonwarranty cannot thereafter be given [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 119-120, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* ; *see* *Dorman v. International Harvester Co. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 11, 19-20, 120 Cal. Rptr. 516* (disclaimer of consequential damages, not specifically bargained for, given to buyer after signing contract as not binding)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.27

§ 502.27 Rules for Determining Compatibility Among Warranties

Warranties, whether express or implied, are construed as consistent with each other and as cumulative. However, if this construction is unreasonable, the parties' intention determines which warranty is dominant. Certain rules are applicable in ascertaining that intention [*Com. Code § 2317*]:

- Exact or technical specifications displace an inconsistent sample or model or general language of description.

- A sample from an existing bulk displaces inconsistent general language of description.

- Express warranties displace inconsistent implied warranties other than an implied warranty of fitness for a particular purpose [*see Garlock Sealing Techs., LLC v. NAK Sealing Techs. Corp. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 937, 950 n.7, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177* (when buyer specifies standard component with no knowledge of its ingredients and no reason to know of any potential flaws in those ingredients, its specification of standard component is not inconsistent with implied warranty of merchantability by seller of that component)].

The foregoing rules are not absolute and may be changed by evidence showing that the conditions which existed during the contractual period make those rules of construction inconsistent or unreasonable. For example, a seller who has led the buyer to believe that all warranties can be performed is estopped from setting up any essential inconsistency as a defense [UCC Comments 2, 3 to *Com. Code § 2317*; *see § 502.24[5]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.28

§ 502.28 Commercial Code Action for Breach of Warranty

[1] Elements

In an action for breach of warranty it is necessary to show not only the existence of the warranty but the fact that it was broken and that its breach was the proximate cause of the loss sustained. An affirmative showing by the seller that the loss resulted from some action or event following the seller's delivery of the goods can operate as a defense. Evidence indicating that the seller exercised care in the manufacture, processing, or selection of the goods is relevant to the issue of whether or not the warranty was in fact broken. Action by the buyer following an examination of the goods which ought to have indicated the defect complained of can be shown as a matter bearing on whether or not the breach itself was the cause of the injury [UCC Comment 13 to *Com. Code § 2314*].

To establish causation on a warranty claim, the evidence need only afford a reasonable basis for the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the defect caused the harm [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 146, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

[2] Damages

The measure of damages for breach of warranty is the difference, at the time and place of acceptance, between the value of the goods accepted and the value they would have had if they had been as warranted, unless special circumstances show proximate damages of a different amount [*Com. Code § 2714(2)*]. This measure is not exclusive. If the nonconformity of the goods would have justified revocation of acceptance, the time and place of acceptance is determined as of the buyer's decision not to revoke [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 2714*].

Consequential damages resulting from the seller's breach include injury to person or property proximately resulting from any breach of warranty [*Com. Code § 2715(2)(b)*]. If the injury involved follows the use of goods without discovery of the defect causing the damage, liability arises only if it was reasonable for the buyer to use the goods without an inspection which would have revealed the defects [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 2715*].

Remedies for breach of warranty can be limited in accordance with the provisions of Division 2 of the Commercial

Code on liquidation or limitation of damages, and on contractual modification of remedy [*Com. Code § 2316(4)*; *see Com. Code §§ 2718, 2719*; *see also Ch. 500, Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code, § 500.72*].

[3] Recovery for Personal Injuries or Property Damage

A plaintiff who is seeking damages for personal injuries or injuries to property based on a defective product has the possible, alternative remedies of a cause of action for breach of warranty and one for strict liability in tort. However, the doctrine of strict products liability has virtually displaced the law of warranty. Proof of a contractual relationship or of particular representations, such as those found in an accompanying brochure or made by the seller to the buyer or based on the product's appearance of excellence is not required [*Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 114-115, 117-118, 120-121, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377]* . Thus, with the introduction of the doctrine of strict liability in tort for injuries resulting from defective products in the Supreme Court case of *Greenman v. Yuba Power Products, Inc. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 57, 63, 27 Cal. Rptr. 697, 377 P.2d 897* , warranty law was relegated to governing the consensual economic relationship between the parties while strict liability governs both personal injury and physical injury to property based on duties imposed by law [*see* *Seely v. White Motor Co. (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 9, 15-16, 18-19, 45 Cal. Rptr. 17, 403 P.2d 145* ; *see generally* Ch. 460, *Products Liability*].

[4] Notification of Breach of Warranty

[a] In General

The Commercial Code requires generally that if a tender has been accepted, the buyer must, within a reasonable time after he or she discovers or should have discovered any breach, notify the seller of the breach or be barred from any remedy [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*]. Prior to bringing an action for breach of warranty under a sale of goods, notification of the breach of warranty must be given.

The time of notification is to be determined by applying commercial standards to a merchant buyer. A reasonable time for notification from a retail consumer is to be judged by different standards, and may be extended. The rule of requiring notification is designed to defeat commercial bad faith, not to deprive a good-faith consumer of a remedy. The content of the notification of breach of warranty need merely be sufficient to let the seller know that the transaction is still troublesome and must be watched. There appears to be no reason to require that the notification saving the buyer's rights must include a clear statement of all the objections that will be relied on by the buyer; nor should it be a claim for damages or of any threatened litigation or other resort to remedy. It must merely inform the seller that the transaction is claimed to involve a breach, thus opening the way for normal settlement through negotiation [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 2607*].

The buyer has the burden of proving reasonable notice. The question whether notice was properly given must be determined from the particular circumstances, and when but one inference can be drawn from undisputed facts, the issue may be determined as a matter of law [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 135-136, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

[b] Notification of Breach of Warranty of Infringement

If, after tender of the goods has been accepted, the buyer develops a claim of breach of warranty against infringement or the like through being sued by a third party as a result of the breach, the buyer must notify the seller of that suit within a reasonable time after receiving notice of the litigation. Otherwise, the buyer is barred from any remedy over for liability established thereby [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*]. The seller then has the right to demand in writing that the buyer turn over control of the litigation, including settlement, or else be barred from any remedy. If the seller also agrees to bear all expenses and to satisfy adverse judgment, the buyer is barred unless he or she turns over control after seasonable receipt of the demand [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*; *see also § 502.28[5]*].

These provisions also apply if a buyer has supplied the seller with specifications for the goods being sold. The seller who then has furnished the goods in compliance with those specifications, and who is thereby entitled to be held harmless by the buyer in the event of any infringement, must give the buyer the same kind of notices as above. The buyer has the same right to demand control of the defense in any infringement suit [*Com. Code § 2607(6)*].

[5] "Vouching in" Seller by Buyer

If the buyer is sued for breach of a warranty for which the buyer's seller is answerable over, the buyer may give the seller written notice of the litigation. The notice may state that the seller may come in and defend and that, if the seller does not do so, the seller will be bound in any action brought against the seller by the buyer by any determination of fact common to the two litigations. Then, unless the seller after seasonable receipt of the notice does come in and defend, the seller is so bound [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*; for further discussion of "vouching in," *see Ch. 500, Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code, § 500.60[2][b]*].

[6] Statute of Limitations

[a] Parties May Reduce Four-Year Period to One Year

An action for breach of any contract for sale governed by Division 2 of the Commercial Code must be commenced within four years after the cause of action has accrued, although by their original agreement the parties may reduce the period to as little as one year [*Com. Code § 2725(1)*; *see Therma-Coustics Manufacturing, Inc. v. Borden, Inc. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 282, 296, 213 Cal. Rptr. 611* (upholding one-year limitation under *Com. Code § 2207*)]. A breach of warranty occurs when tender of delivery is made; however, when a warranty explicitly extends to future performance of the goods, and discovery of the breach must await the time of that performance, the cause of action accrues when the breach is, or should have been, discovered [*Com. Code § 2725(2)*; *see Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 215-219, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717* (cause of action for breach of express warranty under Song-Beverly Act)]. Generalized assertions in advertisements and literature, however, do not rise to the level of a warranty explicitly extending to "future performance" [*Carrau v. Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 281, 290-292, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* (plaintiff who failed to file suit within four years of delivery of allegedly defective windows did not meet exception to limitation period based on generalized assertions made in seller's advertisements)]. Furthermore, a seller's promise expressed merely in terms of a product's durability (such as that the product will work for "50,000 cycles") does not fall within the future performance exception because it does not specify a date or time in the future, nor does it pertain to a time period that can be determined by reference to an external source, and the buyer would not necessarily have to wait for the durability promise to fail before having opportunities to discover defects [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 131-133, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5* (additionally in this case, both parties were large and sophisticated companies and could have drafted their agreement to explicitly state duration of warranty so as to ensure that limitation period would extend beyond four years, if that had been their intent)].

The future performance exception in *Com. Code § 2725(2)* cannot apply with respect to an implied warranty. Because an implied warranty is one that arises by operation of law rather than by an express agreement of the parties, it is not a warranty that "explicitly" extends to future performance of the goods, as that code section requires [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 134, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

The limitation period of *Com. Code § 2725* applies only when a contract of sale exists between a disgruntled buyer and the one he or she seeks to hold liable. It does not apply to actions brought by the buyer against the manufacturer of the unsatisfactory product [*Fundin v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 951, 960, 199 Cal. Rptr. 789]* .

[b] Tolling for Repairs

The statute of limitations adopted for sales contracts and breaches of warranty does not alter the law on the tolling of the statute [*Com. Code § 2725(4)*]. Whenever one who has breached a warranty claims that the defect can be repaired, then the limitation period is tolled while he or she attempts to make repairs [*Aced v. Hobbs-Sesack Plumbing Co. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 573, 585, 12 Cal. Rptr. 257, 360 P.2d 897* ; *see Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 218-219, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717* (accrual after last of several repair attempts)].

18 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.29-502.39

[Reserved]

§§ 502.29[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.40

§ 502.40 Song-Beverly Act Definitions

[1] Buyer

The "buyer" or "retail buyer" is an individual who buys consumer goods from a person engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing, or selling consumer goods at retail. This person may be an individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, association, or other legal entity which engages in any of these businesses [*Civ. Code § 1791(b)*].

[2] Consumer Goods; Exclusions

"Consumer goods" means any new product or part of a product that is used or bought or leased for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. The term includes new and used "assistive devices," but does not include "clothing" or "consumables" [*Civ. Code § 1791(a)*; *see Atkinson v. Elk Corporation (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 739, 757, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433* (analyzing statutory definition of "consumer goods" under *Civ. Code § 1794(a)* and holding that roof shingles are not consumer goods under the Act)].

An "assistive device" is any instrument, apparatus, or contrivance (including any component, part, or accessory) used or intended to be used to assist an individual with a disability in the mitigation or treatment of an injury or disease, or to assist, affect, or replace the structure or any function of that person's body [*Civ. Code § 1791(p)*]. An "assistive device" does not, however, include prescriptive lenses and other ophthalmic goods unless they are sold or dispensed to a blind person, as defined in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 19153*, and unless they are intended to assist the limited vision of the person so disabled [*Civ. Code § 1791(p)*].

"Clothing" consists of any wearing apparel, worn for any purpose. It includes under and outer garments, shoes, and accessories composed primarily of woven material, natural or synthetic yarn, fiber, leather, or similar fabric [*Civ. Code § 1791(c)*]. "Consumables" refers to any product intended for consumption by individuals or use by individuals for purposes of personal care or in the performance of services ordinarily rendered within the household and which usually is consumed or expended in the course of that consumption or use [*Civ. Code § 1791(d)*].

The Song-Beverly Act applies to any equipment or mechanical, electrical, or thermal component of a system designed to heat, cool, or otherwise condition air. However, it is inapplicable to the system as a whole if the latter becomes a fixed part of a structure [*Civ. Code § 1795.1*].

[3] Leasing

"Lease" means any contract for the lease, or for the bailment for use, of consumer goods by an individual, for a term exceeding four months, primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, whether or not it is agreed that the lessee bears the risk of the consumer goods' depreciation [*Civ. Code § 1791(g)*]. "Lessee" means an individual who leases consumer goods under a lease [*Civ. Code § 1791(h)*]. "Lessor"means a person who regularly leases consumer goods under a lease [*Civ. Code § 1791(i)*].

[4] Mercantile Parties

The chain of mercantile participants under consumer warranty legislation may consist of the following individuals, partnerships, corporations, associations, or other legal entities:

- The "manufacturer" manufactures, assembles, or produces consumer goods [*Civ. Code § 1791(j)*].

- The "distributor" stands between the manufacturer and the retail seller in purchases, consignments, or contracts for sale of consumer goods [*Civ. Code § 1791(e)*].

- The "retail seller," also known as the "seller" or the "retailer," engages in the business of selling consumer goods to retail buyers [*Civ. Code § 1791(l)*].

[5] Sales

A "sale" means either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1791(n)*]:

- The passing of title from the seller to the buyer for a price.

- A consignment for sale.

A "catalog or similar sale" is one in which neither the seller nor any employee or agent of the seller, nor anyone related to any such person, nor anyone with a financial interest in the sale, participates in the diagnosis of the buyer's condition or in the selection or fitting of the device [*Civ. Code § 1791(q)*]. The "place of business," for the purposes of any retail seller that sells consumer goods by catalog or mail order, is the distribution point for those goods [*Civ. Code § 1791(k)*]. A "return to the retail seller" in that context refers to that place of business [*Civ. Code § 1791(m)*].

[6] Service Factors

A "service contract" is a contract in writing to perform, over a fixed period of time or for a specified duration, services relating to the maintenance, replacement, or repair of a consumer product, except that the term does not include a policy of automobile insurance as defined in *Ins. Code § 116* [*Civ. Code § 1791(o)*].

An "independent repair or service facility" or "independent service dealer" is an individual or legal entity that engages in the business of servicing and repairing consumer goods. Neither phrase includes an employee or subsidiary of a manufacturer or distributor [*Civ. Code § 1791(f)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.41

§ 502.41 Effect on Other State Law

The provisions of the Song-Beverly Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*) do not affect the rights and obligations of parties determined by reference to the Commercial Code [*see Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 212-215, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717* (adopting limitation of *Com. Code § 2725* for actions under Song-Beverly Act, which was intended to supplement existing remedies)]. However, if the provisions of the Commercial Code conflict with the rights guaranteed to buyers of consumer goods under the Song-Beverly Act, the provisions of the latter prevail [*Civ. Code § 1790.3*].

The remedies provided by the Song-Beverly Act are cumulative and are not to be construed as restricting any remedy that is otherwise available. In particular, the act does not supplant the provisions of the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*], which is designed to assure competition among merchants by prohibiting unjustifiably low prices [*Civ. Code § 1790.4*; for discussion of unfair trade practices, *see* Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.42

§ 502.42 Express Warranty Generally

[1] Coverage

An "express warranty" is either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(2)*]:

- A written statement arising out of a sale to the "consumer" of a consumer good, pursuant to which the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer undertakes to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the consumer good or provide compensation if there is a failure in utility or performance (the act uses the word "consumer" here although the word is not defined in the act, the closest related technical term being "buyer" or "retail buyer" [*see § 502.40[1]*]).

- In the case of any sample or model, that the whole of the good conforms to this sample or model.

The act compares with the general law of sales in that the act's express warranty is confined to a single type of representation, that in which the appropriate utility or performance of the good is guaranteed [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)*]. The act's definition does not support every kind of relevant promise, affirmation, or description [*cf. Com. Code § 2313(1)(a), (b)*; *see Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 20-22, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392* (express warranties under *Com. Code § 2313* but none under *Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)* because no undertaking by seller to preserve or maintain utility or performance)]. However, if a sample or model is used in selling, the act's definition applies to all representations made thereby [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(2)*], as does that of the sales law [*Com. Code § 2313(1)(c)*]. The act is broader in protection than the sales law by not requiring that the express warranty be made the "basis of the bargain" between the parties [*cf. Com. Code § 2313(1)*] and by providing that the warranty may be made by the manufacturer or distributor and not just by the seller [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*; *cf. Com. Code § 2313*].

[2] By Particular Words

It is not necessary to the creation of an express warranty that formal words such as "warrant" or "guarantee" be used. If those words are used, however, then an express warranty is created [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(b)*]. Thus, unlike the general sales law, which simply states that no formal words are required for warranty [*see Com. Code § 2313(2)*], the

Song-Beverly Act assures that those words will create an express warranty [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*].

[3] Puffery Excluded

A mere affirmation of the value of the consumer goods or a statement purporting to be a mere opinion or commendation of the goods does not create a warranty, nor do statements or representations such as expressions of general policy concerning customer satisfaction that are not subject to any limitation [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(b), (c)*]. In this respect the act conforms to the sales law but adds the category of policy of satisfaction [*see Com. Code § 2313(2)*].

[4] Requirements of Marketing Parties

Nothing in the Song-Beverly Act affects the right of the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer to make express warranties with respect to consumer goods, except for special provisions affecting the sale of assistive devices [*Civ. Code § 1793*; *see Civ. Code § 1793.02*]. Every marketing party making express warranties with respect to consumer goods must set forth fully the warranties in simple and readily understood language, must clearly identify the party making the warranties, and must conform to the federal standards for disclosure of warranty terms and conditions set forth in the federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*), and in the regulations of the Federal Trade Commission adopted pursuant to the provisions of that act [*Civ. Code § 1793.1(a)(1)*; *see also § 502.60* et seq. (discussion of warranties under Magnuson-Moss Act)]. The act does not preclude a manufacturer making express warranties from suggesting methods of effecting service and repair, in accordance with the terms and conditions of these warranties, other than those the act requires [*Civ. Code § 1794.5*]. If express warranties are made by anyone other than the manufacturer of the goods, the obligation of that person becomes the same as that imposed on the manufacturer under the act [*Civ. Code § 1795*].

After 2003, if the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer provides a warranty or product registration card or form, or an electronic online warranty or product registration form, to be completed and returned by the consumer, the card or form must contain statements, each displayed in a clear and conspicuous manner, that inform the consumer that the card or form is for product registration and that failure to complete and return the card or form does not diminish his or her warranty rights [*Civ. Code § 1793.1(a)(1), (c)*; *but see Civ. Code § 1793.1(d)* (requirement not applicable to any warranty or product registration card or form that was printed before January 1, 2004, and was shipped or included with product that was placed in stream of commerce before January 1, 2004)].

No warranty or product registration card or form, nor any electronic online warranty or product registration form, may be labeled as a warranty registration or a warranty confirmation [*Civ. Code § 1793.1(b)*].

[5] Duty to Supply Appliance Parts

Every manufacturer making an express warranty with respect to an electronic or appliance product described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(h)-(k)* (listed below) with a wholesale price to the retailer of between $50.00 and $99.99 has to make available to service and repair facilities sufficient service literature and functional parts to effect repairs of the product for at least three years after the date a product model or type was manufactured, regardless of whether the three-year period exceeds the warranty period for the product [*Civ. Code § 1793.03(a)*]. Similarly, every manufacturer making an express warranty with respect to a product described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(h)-(k)* with a wholesale price to the retailer of $100.00 or more has to make available to service and repair facilities sufficient service literature and functional parts to effect repairs of the product for at least seven years after the date a product model or type was manufactured, regardless of whether the seven-year period exceeds the warranty period for the product [*Civ. Code § 1793.03(b)*].

The listed products are:

- Antennae [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(j)*].
- Appliances and major home appliances [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(i)*].
- Electronic sets [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(h)*].
- Rotators [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 9801(k)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.43

§ 502.43 Manufacturer Must Provide Service and Repair Facilities in California

[1] In General

Every manufacturer of consumer goods sold in California, and for which it has made an express warranty, must maintain in California sufficient service and repair facilities, reasonably close to all areas where its consumer goods are sold, to carry out the terms of those warranties. Alternatively, it may designate and authorize in California as service and repair facilities independent repair or service facilities reasonably close to those areas for the same purposes. It may enter into warranty service contracts with these facilities at rates in conformity with the requirements of the act fixing liability amounts and limits [*see Civ. Code § 1793.3(c)*].

The warranty service contracts may not be executed to cover a period of time longer than one year, renewable only by a separate, new contract or letter of agreement. In the event of noncompliance with the obligation to assure service and repair facilities, the manufacturer is specially liable under the act [*see Civ. Code § 1793.5*] to retail sellers [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(a)*; *but see California State Electronics Assn. v. Zeos Int'l (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1276-1277, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (personal computers sold by Minnesota manufacturer by mail order to California residents were not "sold in this state" for purposes of Act's local repair facilities requirement)].

[2] Informing Buyer of Location of Service and Repair Facilities

The marketing party making express warranties who elects to maintain service and repair facilities in California under provisions of the act must select one of three prescribed methods of informing the buyer of the facilities. At the time of sale, the marketing party may provide the buyer with the name and address of each service and repair facility within California. Alternatively, at the time of sale, the marketing party may provide the buyer with the name, address, and telephone number of a service and repair facility central directory within the state, or the toll-free telephone number of a facility directory outside the state. In the latter instance, the central directory is to provide, on inquiry, the name and address of the authorized service and repair facility nearest the buyer. As a last choice, the marketing party may maintain at the premises of retail sellers of the warrantor's consumer goods a current listing of the warrantor's authorized service and repair facilities, or retail sellers to whom the consumer goods are to be returned for service and repair, whichever is applicable, within the state. In this last case, it is the duty of every retail seller provided with a listing to

provide, on inquiry, the name, address, and telephone number of the nearest authorized service and repair facility, or the retail seller to whom the consumer goods are to be returned for service and repair, whichever is applicable [*Civ. Code § 1793.1(e)*].

[3] Duty of Timely Service or Repair

When service and repair facilities are maintained in California and service or repair of the goods is necessary because they do not conform to the applicable express warranties, service and repair must be commenced within a reasonable time by the manufacturer or its representative in the state. The goods must be serviced or repaired to conform to the applicable warranties within 30 days unless the buyer agrees in writing to the contrary. Delay caused by conditions beyond the control of the manufacturer or its representatives serve to extend the time requirement, in which case conforming goods are to be tendered as soon as possible following termination of the delaying condition [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(b)*].

[4] Buyer's Obligation to Deliver Goods or Give Notification

The buyer has the duty to deliver nonconforming goods to the manufacturer's service and repair facility in California unless, because of size and weight, method of attachment or installation, or nature of the nonconformity, delivery cannot be reasonably accomplished. If the buyer is unable to effect return of the goods for these reasons, the party is to notify the manufacturer or its nearest service and repair facility within the state. Written notice of nonconformity to the manufacturer or the facility constitutes return of the goods. On receipt of the notice, the manufacturer may, at its option, service or repair the goods at the buyer's residence, pick up the goods for service and repair, or arrange for transporting them to its service and repair facility. All reasonable costs of transporting the goods in such an instance are at the manufacturer's expense, as are the costs after delivery of the goods to the service and repair facility until their return to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(c)*].

The buyer's delivery requirement is satisfied when the manufacturer or its authorized repair facility voluntarily makes a service call to the consumer's residence and thereby obtains from the buyer a reasonable opportunity to repair the product [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 809-810, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* .

[5] Procedure on Failure of Service or Repair

[a] Other Than New Motor Vehicles

If the manufacturer or its representative in California is unable to service or repair the goods, other than new motor vehicles, to conform to the applicable express warranties after a reasonable number of attempts, the manufacturer must either replace the goods or reimburse the buyer. Reimbursement is in an amount equal to the purchase price paid by the buyer, less an amount directly attributable to use by the buyer prior to the discovery of the nonconformity [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(1)*]. For purposes of the reimbursement remedy under *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(1)*, the term "purchase price paid" includes finance charges incurred in conjunction with the purchase [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 814, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* .

Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(1) does not appear to require the manufacturer to offer to reimburse the buyer within a specified time. In addition, when the buyer demands reimbursement or replacement after some not-unreasonable number of failed attempts to have the problem fixed, and the manufacturer responds that it has been unable to replicate the alleged problem and requests the consumer to submit the item to an authorized dealer to have a technical service manager inspect and repair it, that response does not amount to a refusal to comply with the Song-Beverly Act [*Dominguez v. American Suzuki Motor Corp. (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 53, 59-60, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 354*].

If the goods cannot practicably be serviced or repaired by the manufacturer or its representative to conform to the

applicable express warranties because of the method of installation or because the goods have become so affixed to real property as to become a part of the real property, the manufacturer must either replace and install the goods or reimburse the buyer in an amount equal to the purchase price paid by the buyer, including installation costs, less the amount directly attributable to use by the buyer before the discovery of the nonconformity [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(e)(1)*]. However, with respect to claims arising out of deficiencies in the construction of a new residential dwelling, this requirement does not apply to either (1) a product that is not a manufactured product, as defined in *Civ. Code § 896(g)* (concerning standards for determining when post-2002 construction is defective) [*see Ch. 104, Building Contracts, § 104.40* et seq.], or (2) a claim against a person or entity that is not the manufacturer that originally made the express warranty for that manufactured product [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(e)(2)*].

Although *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(1)* does not provide a definition of the term "nonconformity," in light of the remedial nature of the statute the term is broad enough to encompass the entirety of a problem, such as a plumbing leak in a travel trailer and ensuing water damage. Accordingly, a jury could appropriately find that a manufacturer's merely repairing the proximate cause (the plumbing leak) did not cure the entirety of the nonconformity (if the resulting water damage still remained) [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 801, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* . In a related provision applicable to new motor vehicles, a "nonconformity" is defined broadly as "a nonconformity which substantially impairs the use, value, or safety of the new motor vehicle" [*Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(1)*; *see Ch. 91, Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs, § 91.12[2]*]. This definition generally is synonymous with what the average person would understand to be a defect [*Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 887, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . In view of the latitude inherent in these provisions, there is no reason that a "nonconformity" may not include an entire complex of related conditions (such as a cracked pipe and resulting water damage) [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 801, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* .

[b] New Motor Vehicles

Special rules and presumptions apply to express warranties regarding new motor vehicles and to the manufacturer's inability to service or repair them to conform to the express warranties after a reasonable number of attempts [*see Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d)(2), 1793.22, 1794(e)*; *see also Silvio v. Ford Motor Company (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1205, 1207-1208, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 846* (because phrase "reasonable number of attempts" in *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)* is written in plural, statute does not require manufacturer to make restitution or replacement after only one opportunity to repair)]. These provisions are discussed Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* . Forms for complaints under the Song-Beverly Act [*see §§ 502.160, 502.161*] also may be used by a buyer of a new motor vehicle to seek restitution or replacement of the nonconforming vehicle.

Insofar as the Song-Beverly Act applies to new motor vehicles [*see Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d)(2), 1793.22*], the Act is limited in application to vehicles that were bought in California [*Cummins, Inc. v. Superior Court (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 478, 483, 493, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 823, 115 P.3d 98* (Act did not apply to new vehicle that California resident had bought in Idaho and that could not be repaired after repeated attempts at manufacturer's authorized repair facility in California)].

In addition, any person in the business of selling used motor vehicles in California who knows or should know that a vehicle was required by law to be replaced or accepted for restitution due to the inability of the manufacturer to conform the vehicle to the applicable warranties pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)* or pursuant to warranties required by any other applicable law of California, any other state, or federal law must disclose that fact to the buyer in writing prior to the purchase [*Civ. Code § 1793.23(c)*; *see Veh. Code § 4453(b)(7)* (similar notice on vehicle registration card)]. For more discussion, Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .

For purposes of *Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d), 1793.22(e)(2),* and *1794(e),* "new motor vehicle" means a new motor vehicle that is bought or used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. New motor vehicle includes the chassis,

chassis cab, and that portion of a motorhome devoted to its propulsion, but does not include any portion designed, used, or maintained primarily for human habitation. New motor vehicle includes a dealer-owned vehicle and a demonstrator or other motor vehicle sold with a manufacturer's new car warranty, but does not include a motorcycle or motor vehicle that is not registered under the Vehicle Code because it is to be operated or used exclusively off the highways. A "demonstrator" is a vehicle assigned by a dealer for the purpose of demonstrating the qualities and characteristics common to vehicles of the same or similar model and type [*Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(2)*]. "New motor vehicle" also includes a new motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight under 10,000 pounds that is bought or used primarily for business purposes by a person,including a partnership, limited liability company, corporation, association, or any other legal entity, to which not more than five motor vehicles are registered in California [*Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(2)*], provided that at least one motor vehicle must be registered to that person in California [*Park City Services, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 295, 306-309, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373]* .

[6] Buyer's Recourse If State Service and Repair Facilities Are Not Maintained

If the manufacturer of consumer goods sold in California, for which the manufacturer has made an express warranty, does not provide service and repair facilities within the state pursuant to the act, or does maintain the required facilities but fails to supply them with adequate replacement parts and service literature [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2*], the buyer of nonconforming goods may follow either of two courses of action. The buyer may return the goods to their retail seller, who then must do one of the following [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(a)*]:

- Service or repair them to conform to the applicable warranty;
- Direct the buyer to a reasonably close independent repair or service facility willing to accept service or repair as prescribed by the act;
- Replace the goods with those identical or reasonably equivalent to the warranted goods; or
- Refund to the buyer the original purchase price less an amount directly attributable to use by the buyer prior to discovery of the nonconformity.

The buyer instead may choose to return the goods to some other retail seller of like goods of the same manufacturer in the state who, if willing to accommodate the buyer, has the same options described above as the original retail seller [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(b)*].

If the retailer decides to handle the service and repair of the nonconforming goods presented by the buyer, that work must be commenced and tendered within 30 days unless otherwise agreed in writing, and may be delayed for the permissible period, in the same manner as when the manufacturer maintains service and repair facilities in the state [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2(b)*] and receives nonconforming goods [*Civ. Code § 1793.4*; *see also* [3], *above*]. If the retailer instead chooses to direct the buyer to a nearby cooperative repair or service facility, the manufacturer is liable for the reasonable cost of repair services in the same manner as when the buyer separately seeks out the facility as a follow-up remedy if a retailer offered no relief [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(c), (d)*].

If the buyer is unable to return nonconforming goods to the retailer because of size and weight, method of attachment or installation, or nature of the nonconformity, the buyer may give notice of nonconformity to the retailer. On receipt of the notice, the retailer has the same options available to the manufacturer in that situation when the latter maintains service and repair facilities in this state [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2(c)*; *see also* [4], *above*]. The retailer is likewise responsible for the reasonable costs of transporting the goods but is entitled to recover all such costs from the manufacturer under the statutory liability of the latter to the retailer for failing to maintain service or repair facilities [*see Civ. Code § 1793.5*]. If the retailer incurs costs of transporting the goods after their receipt and until their return to the buyer, the seller may recover the reasonable costs from the manufacturer on the same basis of liability. Written notice of

nonconformity to the retailer constitutes return of the goods with respect to the buyer's obligation of delivery [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(e)*].

[7] Manufacturer's Duty to Inform Buyer of Right to Recourse

The manufacturer of consumer goods with a wholesale price to the retailer of at least $50, for which the manufacturer has made express warranties, must provide written notice to the buyer of the course of action available to the buyer for nonconforming goods if the manufacturer does not maintain service or repair facilities in California [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(f)*].

[8] Liability of Manufacturer to Retailer

The manufacturer who makes express warranties but does not provide service and repair facilities in California under the act [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2*] is liable to every retail seller of the manufacturer's consumer goods who incurs obligations in giving effect to the warranties which accompany the goods. In the event of replacement, liability is in an amount equal to the actual cost to the retailer of the replaced goods and any cost of transporting them, plus a reasonable handling charge. If there has been service and repair, liability is an amount equal to that which would be received by the retailer for like service rendered to retail consumers who are not entitled to warranty protection, including actual and reasonable costs of the work and any cost of transporting the goods, plus a reasonable profit. If reimbursement was made [*see Civ. Code § 1793.3*], liability is an amount equal to the buyer's reimbursement plus a reasonable handling charge [*Civ. Code § 1793.5(c)*].

[9] Buyers' Recourse If Manufacturer or Retailer Fail to Remedy

If (and only if) the buyer has pursued any of the above courses and it has not provided appropriate relief, the buyer may secure the services of an independent repair or service facility for the service or repair of the nonconforming consumer goods, when the work can be economically accomplished. In that event, the manufacturer is liable to the buyer, or to the facility on an assignment of the buyer's rights, for the actual and reasonable cost of service and repair, including costs for parts and reasonable costs of transporting the goods or parts, plus a reasonable profit. The amount charged by the independent service dealer for like services or repairs rendered to service or repair customers not entitled to warranty protection is presumed to be the reasonable cost for the purposes of producing evidence, though that factor may be rebutted. Any waiver of the manufacturer's liability is void and unenforceable. This follow-up remedy is unavailable if the goods involved have a wholesale price to the retailer of under $50. In no event, however, is the buyer responsible or liable for service or repair costs charged by the independent facility. Only the latter party is authorized to hold the manufacturer liable for such costs [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.44

§ 502.44 Liability of Manufacturer to Service and Repair Facilities

If the manufacturer maintains service and repair facilities in California and has entered into a warranty service contract with an independent service and repair facility, that contract may list rates for warranty work [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2(a)*]. Otherwise, any manufacturer making express warranties whose consumer goods are sold in the state is liable, as prescribed by the act, to every independent service person who performs services or incurs obligations in giving effect to the warranties accompanying the manufacturer's goods. This applies whether or not the service person is acting as an authorized service and repair facility designated by the manufacturer or as an independent facility [*see Civ. Code § 1793.3(c), (d)*].

Liability is in an amount equal to the actual and reasonable costs of the service and repair, including any cost for parts and reasonable cost of transporting the goods, plus a reasonable profit. The reasonable cost of service or repair is presumed to be an amount equal to that charged by the independent service person for like services or repairs rendered to service or repair customers not entitled to warranty protection, a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence. Any waiver of the manufacturer's liability is void and unenforceable [*Civ. Code § 1793.6*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.45

§ 502.45 Express Warranty's Compatibility With Service Contract

[1] In General

Nothing in the Song-Beverly Act prevents the sale of a service contract to the buyer in addition to or in lieu of an express warranty if that contract fully and conspicuously discloses, in simple and readily understood language, the terms, conditions, and exclusions of that contract [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(a)*], and if other legal requirements are met [*see Civ. Code § 1794.4(b)-(e)*; § 502.45[2]]. A retailer that sells such a service contract must, as long as the service contract is in effect, either (1) maintain contract information that includes a description of the terms and conditions of the service contract, and provide that information to the buyer of the service contract or other beneficiary on request, or (2) on request from the buyer of the service contract or other beneficiary, obtain a copy of the service contract, and provide that copy to the requester within 10 business days after receiving the request [*Civ. Code § 1794.45(a)*].

Civ. Code § 1794.4 does not apply, and therefore *Civ. Code § 1794.45* also does not apply [*see Civ. Code § 1794.45(a)*], to a home protection contract issued by a home protection company [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(a)*; *see Ins. Code § 12740 et seq.* (regulation of home protection contracts)]. Although a vehicle service contract [*see Ins. Code § 12800 et seq.* (regulation of vehicle service contracts)] must comply with *Civ. Code § 1794.4* [*Ins. Code § 12820(b)(3)(c)*], a retailer that sells such a vehicle service contract is not required to comply with *Civ. Code § 1794.45* [*Civ. Code § 1794.45(b)*].

Civ. Code § 1794.41 specially governs any service contract covering a motor vehicle, a home appliance, or a home electronic product, if it is bought for use in California. Such service contracts covering motor vehicles are discussed in *Ch. 91, Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs, § 91.14*, and such service contracts covering home appliances or electronic products are discussed in *§ 502.45[2]*.

[2] Service Contracts for Home Appliances and Home Electric Products

[a] Definitions

As used in the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*), "home appliance" means any

refrigerator, freezer, range, microwave oven, washer, dryer, dishwasher, garbage disposal, trash compactor, or room air conditioner, normally used or sold for personal, family, or household purposes [*Civ. Code § 1791(r)*].

"Home electronic product" means any television, radio, antenna rotator, audio or video recorder or playback equipment, video camera, video game, video monitor, computer equipment, telephone, telecommunications equipment, electronic alarm system, electronic appliance control system, or other kind of electronic product, if it is normally used or sold for personal, family, or household purposes. The term includes any electronic accessory that is normally used or sold with a home electronic product for one of those purposes. The term excludes any single product with a wholesale price to the retail seller of less than $50 [*Civ. Code § 1791(s)*].

[b] Provisions Required in Appliance Service Contracts

Except as otherwise expressly provided in the service contract, every service contract must obligate the service contractor to provide to the buyer of the product all of the services and functional parts that may be necessary to maintain proper operation of the entire product under normal operation and service for the duration of the service contract and without additional charge [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(b)*]. A service contract on a home appliance or home electronic product must contain all of the following items of information [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)*]:

- A clear description and identification of the covered product [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(1)*].

- The point in time or event when the term of the service contract commences, and its duration measured by elapsed time or an objective measure of use [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(2)*].

- If the enforceability of the service contract is limited to the original buyer or is limited to persons other than every consumer owner of the covered product during the term of the service contract, a description of the limits on transfer or assignment of the service contract [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(3)*].

- A statement of the general obligation of the service contractor in the same language set forth in *Civ. Code § 1794.4(b)*, with equally clear and conspicuous statements of the following [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)*]:

  - Any services, parts, characteristics, components, properties, defects, malfunctions, causes, conditions, repairs or remedies that are excluded from the scope of the service contract [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)(A)*].

  - Any other limits on the application of the language in *Civ. Code § 1794.4(b)*, such as a limit on the total number of service calls [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)(B)*].

  - Any additional services that the service contractor will provide [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)(C)*].

  - Whether the obligation of the service contractor includes preventive maintenance and, if so, the nature and frequency of the preventive maintenance that the service contractor will provide [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)(D)*].

  - Whether the buyer has an obligation to provide preventive maintenance or perform any other obligations and, if so, the nature and frequency of the preventive maintenance and of any other obligations, and the consequences of any noncompliance [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(4)(E)*].

- A step-by-step explanation of the procedure that the buyer should follow in order to obtain performance of any obligation under the service contract including the following [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)*]:

  - The full legal and business name of the service contractor [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(A)*].

  - The mailing address of the service contractor [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(B)*].

  - The persons or class of persons that are authorized to perform service [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(C)*].

  - The name or title and address of any agent, employee, or department of the service contractor that is responsible for the performance of any obligations [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(D)*].

  - The method of giving notice to the service contractor of the need for service [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(E)*].

  - Whether in-home service is provided and, if not, whether the costs of transporting the product, for service or repairs will be paid by the service contractor [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(F)*].

  - If the product must be transported to the service contractor, either the place where the product may be delivered for service or repairs or a toll-free telephone number that the buyer may call to obtain that information [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(G)*].

  - All other steps that the buyer must take to obtain service [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(H)*].

  - All fees, charges, and other costs that the buyer must pay to obtain service [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(5)(I)*].

- An explanation of the steps that the service contractor will take to carry out its obligations under the service contract [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(6)*].

- A description of any right to cancel the contract if the buyer returns the product or the product is sold, lost, stolen, or destroyed, or if there is no right to cancel or the right to cancel is limited, a statement of that fact [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(7)*].

- Information respecting the availability of any informal dispute settlement process [*Civ. Code § 1794.4(c)(8)*].

[c] Disclosures Required Before Sale of Service Contract

A service contract covering any home appliance or home electronic product purchased for use in California may not be offered for sale or sold unless all of the following elements exist [*Civ. Code § 1794.41*]:

- The contract must contain the disclosures specified in *Civ. Code § 1794.4* and must disclose in the manner described in that section the buyer's cancellation and refund rights.

- The contract must be available for inspection by the buyer prior to purchase and either the contract, or a brochure that specifically describes the terms, conditions, and exclusions of the contract, and the provisions of this section relating to contract delivery, cancellation, and refund, must be delivered to the buyer at or before the time of purchase of the contract. Within 60 days after the date of purchase, the contract itself must be delivered to the buyer. If a service contract for a home appliance or a home electronic product is sold by means of a telephone solicitation, the seller may elect to satisfy the requirements of this paragraph by mailing or delivering the contract to the buyer not later than 30 days after the date of the sale of the contract.

- The contract is applicable only to items, costs, and time periods not covered by the express warranty. However, a service contract may run concurrently with or overlap an express warranty if the contract covers items or costs not covered by the express warranty or provides relief to the purchaser not available under the express warranty, such as an automatic replacement of a product when the express warranty provides for repair.

- The purchaser must be entitled to cancel the contract on the following conditions:

  - Unless the contract provides for a longer period, within the first 60 days after receipt of the contract, or within the first 30 days after receipt of a contract covering a home appliance or a home electronic product, the full amount paid must be refunded by the seller to the purchaser if the purchaser provides a written notice of cancellation to the person specified in the contract, and if no claims have been made against the contract. If a claim has been made against the contract within the first 60 days after receipt of the contract, or within the first 30 days after receipt of the contract with respect to a home appliance or home electronic product, a pro rata refund based on either elapsed time or an objective measure of use, such as the retail value of any service performed, at the seller's option as indicated in the contract, must be made by the seller to the purchaser if the purchaser provides a written notice of cancellation to the person specified in the contract.

  - Unless the contract provides for a longer period for obtaining a full refund, after the first 60 days after receipt of the contract, or after the first 30 days after receipt of a contract covering a home appliance or a home electronic product, a pro rata refund based on either elapsed time or an objective measure of use, such as the retail value of any service performed, at the seller's option as indicated in the contract, must be made by the seller to the purchaser if the purchaser provides a written notice of cancellation to the person specified in the contract. In addition, the seller may assess a cancellation or administrative fee, not to exceed 10 percent of the price of the service contract or $25, whichever is less.

  - If the purchase of the service contract was financed, the seller may make the refund payable to the purchaser, the assignee, or lender of record, or both.

Nothing in *Civ. Code § 1794.41* applies to a home protection plan that is issued by a home protection company that is subject to *Ins. Code § 12740 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1794.41(b)*].

If any provision of *Civ. Code § 1794.41* conflicts with any provision of *Ins. Code § 12800 et seq.* (concerning vehicle service contracts), the Insurance Code provision applies [*Civ. Code § 1794.41(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.46

§ 502.46 Express Warranties as to Clothing and Consumables

When the retail sale of clothing or consumables is accompanied by an express warranty but the items do not conform with the terms of that warranty, the buyer may return them within 30 days of purchase or any longer period specified in the warranty. The manufacturer, within the warranty, may direct the purchaser to return nonconforming goods to a retail seller of like goods of the same manufacturer for replacement. In the latter instance, the retailer must replace the goods. If the manufacturer has not so directed their replacement in this manner, the retailer may either replace the nonconforming goods or reimburse the buyer in an amount equal to the purchase price paid thereby for the goods. Costs of reimbursement or replacement may be recovered by the retailer from the manufacturer in the same manner as when a manufacturer not having service or repair facilities in California [*see Civ. Code § 1793.5*] is liable to the retailer [*Civ. Code § 1793.35(a), (b)*; *see also § 502.43[8]*].

Because the act's enforcement provisions apply only to "consumer goods," which are not defined to include clothing and consumables [*see § 502.40[2]*], there does not appear to be any particular remedy provided in the act for enforcing a breach of an express warranty relating to clothing or consumables. For further discussion, see *§ 502.53[1][f]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.47

§ 502.47 Express Warranties as to Used Goods

Although consumer goods are defined to mean "new" products or parts [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a)*], the obligation of a distributor or retail seller of used consumer goods is the same as that imposed on manufacturers in a sale in which an express warranty is given, with certain exceptions. The distributor or retailer making an express warranty on used consumer goods is obliged to maintain sufficient service and repair facilities within California to carry out the terms of the warranty [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(a)*]. The original manufacturer, as well as distributors and retail sellers who made express warranties with respect to the goods when new, are specifically exempted from this requirement [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(a)*]. Moreover, *Civ. Code § 1793.5*, which imposes liability on every manufacturer who makes express warranties and does not provide service and repair facilities in California, is inapplicable to the sale of used consumer goods in California [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(b)*]. However, the obligation of the distributor or retail seller who makes express warranties with respect to used goods sold in California extends to the sale of all used goods, regardless of when they may have been manufactured [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(d)*]. It has been held that a written service contract covering a used vehicle, under which the dealer "undertakes to preserve or maintain the utility or performance" of the vehicle, is an express warranty under *Civ. Code § 1795.5*, even though the consumer is required to pay additional consideration for the promised services [*Reveles v. Toyota By the Bay (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1139, 1155-1158, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543* (overruled on other grounds in *Snukal v. Flightways Manufacturing, Inc. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 754, 3 P.3d 286*); *see* Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs*].

The Song-Beverly Act does expressly state whether or not its provisions governing used consumer goods apply to clothing and consumables. However, these two categories are expressly excluded from the act's basic definition of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c), (d)*; *see also § 502.40[2]*], and there is nothing to suggest an intention to expand that definition to classify these two categories as "consumer goods" when the goods in question are used rather than new [*see Civ. Code § 1795.5* (statutory obligations are the same with respect to new and used goods except as otherwise stated in that section)]. On the other hand, the separate statutory definitions of "clothing" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(c)*] and "consumables" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(d)*], unlike the definition of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a)*], are not expressly limited to new goods, and therefore the special statutory provisions governing the return and replacement of clothing and consumables [*see Civ. Code § 1793.35*; *see also § 502.46, above*] appear to apply to used as well as new items in these categories.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.48

§ 502.48 Express Warranties on Assistive Devices

[1] Coverage

The Song-Beverly Consumer Protection Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*) defines "assistive device" as any instrument, apparatus, or contrivance, including any component, part, or accessory, that is used or intended to be used to assist an individual with a disability in the mitigation or treatment of an injury or disease or to assist or affect or replace the structure or any function of the body of a physically disabled person. The term "assistive device" does not include prescription lenses and other ophthalmic goods, unless they are sold or dispensed to a blind person, as defined in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 19153* and unless they are intended to assist the limited vision of the person so disabled [*Civ. Code § 1791(p)*].

All new and used assistive devices sold at retail in California must be accompanied by a specified form of retail seller's express warranty [*see Civ. Code § 1793.02(a), (b)*] that informs the buyer of his or her right to return the device if it does not specifically fit the buyer's needs [*see Civ. Code § 1793.02(a)*]. When the retail sale of an assistive device is made to an individual, organization, or agency known by the seller to be purchasing for the ultimate user of the device, the provisions governing express warranties of assistive devices are construed to require that the device be specifically fit for the particular needs of the ultimate user [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(d)*]. These provisions, however, do not apply to the following [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(e)*]:

- A catalog or similar sale as defined in *Civ. Code § 1791(q)*, except a sale of a hearing aid. A "catalog or similar sale" is a sale in which neither the seller, nor any employee or agent of the seller, nor any person related to the seller, nor any person with a financial interest in the sale, participates in the diagnosis of the buyer's condition or in the selection or fitting of the device.

- A sale that involves a retail sale price of less than $15.

- A surgical implant performed by a physician and surgeon, or a restoration or dental prosthesis provided by a dentist.

If the buyer does return the device within the period specified in *Civ. Code § 1793.02(a)*, the seller, without charge and within a reasonable time, must adjust the device or replace it, if appropriate, with a device that is specifically fit for the buyer's particular needs. Doing neither of these, the seller must instead promptly refund to the buyer the total amount paid, the transaction is deemed rescinded, and the seller is promptly to return to the buyer all payments and any assistive device or other consideration exchanged as part of the transaction. The seller then must also promptly cancel, or cause to be canceled, all contracts, instruments, and security agreements executed by the buyer in connection with the sale. On rescission, no charge, penalty, or other fee may be imposed in connection with the purchase, fitting, financing, or return of the device [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(c)*].

The express warranty of fitness on assistive devices does not impose on manufacturers the obligations imposed on service facilities [*see Civ. Code §§ 1793.2, 1793.3*] applicable to consumer goods [*see Civ. Code § 1793.02(h)*].

[2] Used Assistive Devices

The buyer of a used assistive device has the same rights and remedies as does the buyer of a new one. The provisions of the act as to obligations of sellers with respect to express warranties on used consumer goods [*see Civ. Code § 1795.5*] do not apply to sales of assistive devices [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(g)*].

[3] Remedy Is Cumulative and Not Waivable

The rights and remedies of buyers of new and used assistive devices are not subject to waiver under the act on the basis of "as is" or "with all faults" disclaimers. These rights and remedies are cumulative and are not construed to affect the obligations of the retail seller or any other party, or to supplant the rights and remedies under any other provision of the act or under any other law or instrument [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(f)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.49

§ 502.49 Express Warranties on Motorized Wheelchairs

All new and used wheelchairs, including but not limited to wheelchairs that are motorized or have been otherwise customized to suit the needs of the user, must be accompanied by the manufacturer's or lessor's written express warranty that the wheelchair is free of defects [*Civ. Code § 1793.025(a)*]. The warranty must be at least one year from the date of the first delivery of a new wheelchair to the consumer, or at least 60 days from the date of the first delivery of a used, refurbished, or reconditioned wheelchair to the consumer. If the written express warranty is not furnished to the consumer, the wheelchair nevertheless will be deemed to be covered by the express warranty [*Civ. Code § 1793.025(a)*]. These rules do not apply to wheelchairs manufactured specifically for athletic, competitive, or off-road use [*Civ. Code § 1793.025(a)*].

The provisions in *Civ. Code §§ 1790-1795.8* for express warranties govern the express warranty described above, whether or not those provisions only apply to the sale, and not the lease, of goods [*Civ. Code § 1793.025(b)*]. In addition, a manufacturer or lessor of a motorized wheelchair may not sell or lease a chair that has been returned by the consumer for failure to repair a nonconformity after a reasonable number of attempts unless the reasons for the return are fully disclosed to the prospective buyer or lessee [*Civ. Code § 1793.025(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.50

§ 502.50 Express Warranties on Housecars

Vehicle manufacturers who alter new vehicles into housecars must assume any warranty responsibility of the original vehicle manufacturer for any and all components of the finished product which are, by virtue of any act of the alterer, no longer covered by the warranty issued by the original vehicle manufacturer. This is in addition to any new product warranty offered by the alterer [*Civ. Code § 1793.05*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.51

§ 502.51 Implied Warranties

[1] Warranty of Merchantability Is Required

An "implied warranty of merchantability," or "implied warranty that goods are merchantable," means that the consumer goods meet the following criteria [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(a)*; *see Mocek v. Alfa Leisure, Inc. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 402, 406-408, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (giving overview of implied warranty of merchantability and holding that buyer is not required to give seller opportunity to repair before rescinding when implied warranty is breached)]:

- Pass without objection in the trade under the contract description.
- Are fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used.
- Are adequately contained, packaged, and labeled.
- Conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label.

Every sale of consumer goods sold at retail in California is accompanied by the manufacturer's and the retail seller's implied warranty that the goods are merchantable, unless the warranty has been disclaimed as provided in the act. The retail seller has a right of indemnity against the manufacturer in the amount of any liability under this requirement [*Civ. Code § 1792*].

The Song-Beverly Act compares with the general sales law under Division 2 of the Commercial Code as follows:

- The Song-Beverly Act does not describe the case of fungible goods or that of permissible variations within runs, both of which are usually identified with mercantile rather than consumer agreements [*cf. Com. Code § 2314(2)(b), (d)*].
- The Song-Beverly Act requires adequate containering and labeling rather than merely permitting it in

fact or by agreement [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(a)(3)*; *cf. Com. Code § 2314(2)(e)*].

- It extends the warranty to the manufacturer as well as to the seller [*Civ. Code § 1792*], whereas *Com. Code § 2314(1)* makes only the seller a party to the warranty.

- The Song-Beverly Act does not limit the seller to one who is a merchant in goods of the particular kind as is the case under the general sales law [*see Com. Code § 2314(1)*].

- The Song-Beverly Act indemnifies the seller against the manufacturer [*Civ. Code § 1792*] (although the Commercial Code recognizes situations in which the seller's seller may be "answerable over" [*see Com. Code § 2607(5)*]).

- The Song-Beverly Act does not include sales of food or drink specifically in an implied warranty and then thus could be excluded thereunder, since the warranty here applies to "consumer goods," which does not encompass "consumables," [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (d)*], whereas the sales law does specifically extend merchantability to food and drink [*see Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)*].

- For the same reason, the Song-Beverly Act may exclude clothing from an implied warranty, since, while clothing automatically is absorbed into the meaning of goods under the general sales law [*Com. Code § 2105(1)*], it is excluded from "consumer goods" under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c)*].

[2] Fitness for Particular Purposes

The "implied warranty of fitness," in its more general application, means that if the retailer, distributor, or manufacturer has reason to know any particular purpose for which the consumer goods are required--and further, that the buyer is relying on the skill and judgment of the seller to select and furnish suitable goods--there is an implied warranty that the goods are fit for that purpose [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(b)(1)*]. Every sale of consumer goods sold at retail in California by a manufacturer who has reason to know at the time of the retail sale that the goods are required for a particular purpose and that the buyer is relying on the manufacturer's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods, is accompanied by the manufacturer's implied warranty of fitness [*Civ. Code § 1792.1*]. The same warranty occurs in a sale by a retailer or distributor knowing both the buyer's purpose at the time and that the buyer is so relying on the retailer's or distributor's skill or judgment [*Civ. Code § 1792.2(a)*; *see Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 25-26, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392* (no implied warranty because buyer made own selection rather than relying on seller's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods)].

There is a slight discrepancy between the definition and the requirement of the warranty discussed above, in that the former refers to "skill and judgment" and "select and furnish" in the conjunctive, while the latter refers to "skill or judgment" and "select or furnish" in the disjunctive. In addition, the definition requires that the defendant's awareness be of the buyer's reliance on the seller's skill and judgment only, whereas in the provision for the requirement of the implied warranty, liability apparently may arise against the manufacturer or distributor, in addition to the retailer, whenever any one of these parties is aware of the buyer's reliance on the skill and judgment of that party.

The act compares with the general sales law in that under the act the requisite awareness of the buyer's reliance may apply to the manufacturer or distributor [*see Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2(a)*], not just the seller. The warranty also is not conditioned by the possibility of disclaimer [*see Com. Code § 2315*]. In addition, both clothing and consumables may be excepted from the implied warranty of fitness under the act since the warranty applies to "consumer goods," which excepts those two commodities from its definition [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c), (d)*; *see also § 502.40[1]*].

[3] Fitness as to Assistive Devices

The definition of "implied warranty of fitness" also applies to a sale of an assistive device sold at retail in California; there is an implied warranty by the retailer that the device is specifically fit for the particular needs of the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(b)*]. A sale of an assistive device must be accompanied by this warranty [*Civ. Code § 1792.2(b)*]. There is no requirement either that the retailer know the buyer's purpose or of the buyer's reliance, since the presence of these elements is presumed. Because assistive devices are also included in the term "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a)*; *see also § 502.40[2]*], the more general requirements of the implied warranty of fitness discussed below which pertain to consumer goods still apply to the manufacturer or distributor of assistive devices [*see Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2(a)*].

[4] Fitness as to Used Goods

Because, with certain exceptions, the obligation of a distributor or retail seller of used consumer goods is the same as that imposed on manufacturers in a sale in which an express warranty is given [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(a)*; *see § 502.47*], the obligations a manufacturer has under the act with respect to implied warranties of fitness for particular purposes apply equally to the distributor or retail seller of used consumer goods as well when an express warranty is being made in connection with the sale.

[5] Duration as to New Goods

The duration of the implied warranty of merchantability, and, if present, the implied warranty of fitness, is coextensive with an express warranty that accompanies the consumer goods, provided the duration of the latter is reasonable. In no event, however, may the implied warranty have a duration of less than 60 days nor more than one year following the sale of new consumer goods to a retail buyer. If no duration for an express warranty is stated with respect to consumer goods, or parts of those goods, the duration of the implied warranty is the maximum period of one year [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(c)*; *see Mexia v. Rinker Boat Co. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1297, 1310, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285* (statute merely provides that implied warranty has limited prospective existence beyond date of delivery; it does not impose any requirement for buyer to discover latent defect and report it to seller within specified period of warranty duration)].

[6] Duration as to Used Goods

The duration of an implied warranty on used goods is calculated exactly as is that for an implied warranty on new goods [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(c)*]. However, the minimum time is 30 days and the maximum is three months following the sale of used goods to a retail buyer [*Civ. Code § 1795.5(c)*].

[7] General Prohibition Against Waiver and Disclaimer

No implied warranty of merchantability and, if applicable, no implied warranty of fitness may be waived, except in the case of a sale of consumer goods on an "as is" or "with all faults" basis, when the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act affecting these disclaimers are strictly complied with [*Civ. Code § 1792.3*; *see § 502.51[8]*]. Thus, neither the manufacturer, distributor, nor retailer, in transacting a sale in which express warranties are given, may limit, modify, or disclaim the implied warranties guaranteed by the Song-Beverly Act in the sale of consumer goods [*Civ. Code § 1793*].

In any case, the rights and remedies of the buyer of an assistive device are not subject to waiver, even by the proper employment of the terms "as is" or "with all faults" [*Civ. Code § 1793.02(f)*].

[8] Exception for Sale Made "As Is" or "With All Faults"

A sale made "as is" or "with all faults" means that the manufacturer, distributor, and retailer disclaim all implied warranties that would otherwise attach to the sale of consumer goods under the provisions of the act [*Civ. Code § 1791.3*].

A sale of goods made on an "as is" or "with all faults" basis, in order to be effective, must be made with a conspicuous writing attached to the goods clearly informing the buyer, prior to the sale, in simple and concise language, of each of the following [*Civ. Code § 1792.4*]:

- The goods are being sold on an "as is" or "with all faults" basis.
- The entire risk as to the quality and performance of the goods is with the buyer.
- Should the goods prove defective following their purchase, the buyer and not the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer assumes the entire cost of all necessary servicing or repair.

If the sale is by mail order catalog, the catalog offering the goods must contain the required writing as to each item so offered in lieu of the requirement of notification prior to the sale [*Civ. Code § 1792.4*].

A sale of goods on an "as is" or "with all faults" basis, made in compliance with the act, constitutes a waiver by the buyer of the implied warranty of merchantability and, if applicable, of the implied warranty of fitness [*Civ. Code § 1792.5*].

[9] Disclaimer as to Drapery Fabrics

When the retail sale of draperies is not accompanied by an express warranty and the sale is accompanied by a conspicuous writing disclaiming the retailer's implied warranty of merchantability on the fabric, the retailer's implied warranty of merchantability does not apply to the fabric [*Civ. Code § 1793.35(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.52

§ 502.52 Warranty Period for Servicing of Product

[1] Tolling of Period

Every warranty period relating to an implied or express warranty accompanying a sale or consignment for sale of consumer goods selling for at least $50 is automatically tolled in particular instances. The tolling period begins with the date on which the buyer does either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1795.6(a)*]:

- Delivers nonconforming goods to the manufacturer or seller for warranty repairs or services.
- Notifies the manufacturer or seller, in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1793.2(c)* or *1793.22*, of the nonconformity.

The limitation period remains tolled up to and including the date on which one of the following occurs [*Civ. Code § 1795.6(a)*]:

- The repaired or serviced goods are delivered to the buyer.
- The buyer is notified the goods are repaired or serviced and are available for the buyer's possession.
- The buyer is notified that repairs or service is completed, if the work is done at the buyer's residence.

For purposes of the above, the term "manufacturer" includes the manufacturer's service or repair facility [*Civ. Code § 1795.6(c)*].

[2] Extension of Period

Notwithstanding the date or conditions set for the expiration of the warranty period, the period is not deemed expired if the buyer has satisfied the requirements of delivery or notification as to nonconforming goods [*see Civ. Code § 1795.6(a)*; *see also § 502.52[1]*] and the warranty repairs or service has not been performed owing to delays caused by

circumstances beyond the buyer's control. The period alternatively or additionally is not deemed expired if the repairs or service did not remedy the nonconformity and the buyer has notified the manufacturer or seller of the failure within 60 days after completion of the work. When the warranty work has been performed so as to remedy the nonconformity, the warranty period does expire in accordance with its terms, including any extension of the period for warranty repairs or service [*Civ. Code § 1795.6(b)*].

[3] Notifying Buyer of Extension When Repairs Are Ordered

Every work order or repair invoice for warranty repairs or service must clearly and conspicuously incorporate, in prescribed type size, a statutory statement on the face of the work order or repair invoice, or on the reverse side or on an attachment. The statement informs the buyer of extensions of the warranty period for times connected with the existing defect and for processing repair work, as provided under the act. If the required notice is placed on the reverse side of the work order or repair invoice, the face of the work order or repair invoice must include the following notice in 10-point boldface type: "Notice to Consumer: Please read important information on back." A copy of the work order or repair invoice and any attachment must be presented to the buyer at the time the warranty service is rendered or repairs are made [*Civ. Code § 1793.1(a)(2)*].

[4] Duty to Provide Purchase and Service Date Documentation to Consumer

Every manufacturer or seller of consumer goods selling for at least $50 must provide a receipt to the buyer showing the date of purchase. The marketing party, when performing warranty repairs or service on the goods, also must furnish the buyer with a work order or receipt with the date of return and either the date the buyer was notified that the goods were repaired or serviced, or, if applicable, the date the goods were shipped or delivered to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1795.6(d)*].

[5] Tolling of Period of Manufacturer's Liability

Whenever a warranty is tolled as a result of repairs or service [*see Civ. Code § 1795.6*] performed by any retail seller, the warranty is also extended with regard to the liability of the manufacturer to a retail seller pursuant to law. In that event, the manufacturer is liable, under the liability provisions pertinent to manufacturers who do not maintain service and repair facilities in California [*see Civ. Code § 1793.5*], for the period that an express warranty has been extended [*see Civ. Code § 1795.6*], to every retailer who incurs obligations in giving effect to the express warranty. The manufacturer's liability for implied warranty is similarly extended for the retailer's benefit. If, however, a manufacturer provides for warranty repairs and service through its own service and repair facilities and, through independent repair facilities in California, its exclusive liability under the extension provisions is to those facilities [*Civ. Code § 1795.7*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.53

§ 502.53 Actions Under the Song-Beverly Act

[1] Consumer Remedy of Special Recovery

[a] Damages and Other Relief Available

Any buyer of consumer goods who is damaged by a failure to comply with any obligation under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, or under an implied or express warranty or service contract, may bring an action for the recovery of damages and other legal and equitable relief [*Civ. Code § 1794(a)*; *see Atkinson v. Elk Corporation (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 739, 757, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433* (analyzing statutory definition of "consumer goods" and holding that roof shingles are not consumer goods under the Act)].

The measure of the buyer's damages in an action under *Civ. Code § 1794* includes the rights of replacement or reimbursement as set forth in *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)* [*Civ. Code § 1794(b)*; *see § 502.43[5]*]. When a buyer has rightfully rejected or justifiably revoked acceptance of the goods, or has exercised any right to cancel the sale, the measure of the buyer's damages are the same as those available under *Com. Code §§ 2711-2713* (discussed in Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*). If the buyer has accepted the goods, the buyer's measure of damages is the one applicable under *Com. Code §§ 2714* and *2715* [*see § 502.28[2]*; Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*] and includes the cost of repairs necessary to make the goods conform [*Civ. Code § 1794(b)*].

Nothing in the Song Beverly Consumer Warranty Act bars recovery of prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3287* [*Doppes v. Bentley Motors, Inc. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1004, 1010-1011, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797* ; *see Civ. Code § 1790.4* (remedies under Act "are cumulative and shall not be construed as restricting any remedy that is otherwise available")]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 3287*, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.80[2]*.

[b] Civil Penalty

If the buyer establishes that the failure to comply was willful, the judgment may include, in addition to the amounts recovered under *Civ. Code § 1794(a)*, a civil penalty that may not exceed twice the amount of actual damages [*Civ. Code § 1794(c)*]. "Willful" within meaning of *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* requires only that an illegal act or omission occur

intentionally without regard to motive or ignorance of the act's prohibited character, and does not include a moral component. Thus, jury instructions using words such as "blameworthy" and "reckless disregard of consumer's rights" are error [*Schreidel v. American Honda Motor Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* ; *Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 894, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . A manufacturer's failure to refund or replace a defective automobile has been held not to be "willful" under *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* when the manufacturer reasonably and in good faith believed the facts did not call for a refund or replacement [*Kwan v. Mercedes Benz of North America, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 174, 186, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371*]. Evidence regarding the manufacturer's belief that it could readily repair the defective item, including the nature and details of the prospective repairs, would be relevant to the question of the manufacturer's good faith. For example, the evidence could be relevant to the manufacturer's belief that it had not yet been given a reasonable number of repair attempts [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 815, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* .

A successful plaintiff may not recover both the civil penalty of *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* and punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* because that would amount to double recovery [*Troensegaard v. Silvercrest Industries, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 218, 221, 226-228, 220 Cal. Rptr. 712* (mobilehome)]. Similarly, the fact that there is a specific statutory remedy provided by *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* precludes extension of the tort of bad faith breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing to provide a cause of action on account of seller's wrongful refusal to make repairs or provide replacement under an express warranty [*Gomez v. Volkswagen of America, Inc. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 921, 925-929, 215 Cal. Rptr. 507]* .

Civ. Code § 1794(e), governing attorney's fees, interest, and penalties in the case of a manufacturer's failure to comply with *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)* (restitution or replacement of new motor vehicle that cannot be made to conform to express warranties), provides for the civil penalty, without need to show willfulness, for manufacturer's failure to comply with new motor vehicle warranty obligation [*Suman v. BMW of North America, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10-11, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133]* and is discussed in Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .

[c] Limitation Period

The four-year specific limitation period of *Com. Code § 2725*, rather than the general three-year provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* for liabilities created by statute, governs actions under the Song-Beverly Act. The Act was intended to supplement the provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code, rather than to supersede the rights and obligations created by that statutory scheme [*see Civ. Code § 1790.3*; *Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 215, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717]* . Under *Com. Code § 2725(2)*, when a warranty explicitly extends to future performance of the goods, the discovery rule applies to accrual of the cause of action and commencement of the limitation period [*Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 215-219, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717* ; *see* *Carrau v. Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 281, 290-292, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* (generalized assertions in advertisements and literature do not rise to the level of a warranty explicitly extending to "future performance"; plaintiff thus did not meet exception to four-year limitations period)].

For discussion of *Com. Code § 2725, see § 502.28[6]*.

[d] Costs and Attorney's Fees

A buyer who prevails in any action for recovery of damages under the Song-Beverly Act must be allowed by the court to recover, as part of the judgment, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of costs and expenses (including attorney's fees based on actual time expended) determined by the court to have been reasonably incurred by the plaintiff for, or in connection with, the commencement and prosecution of the action, unless the court in its discretion determines that an award of attorney's fees would be inappropriate [*Civ. Code § 1794(d)*]. If the seller made a settlement offer to which *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* applies [*see Ch. 520, Settlement and Release, § 520.14*], and the buyer did not accept it but then failed to obtain a more favorable judgment or award, the buyer may not recover post-offer costs and must pay the

seller's costs from the time of the offer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(1)*; *Duale v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 880, 889, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 711]* .

The California Supreme Court has held that defendant sellers who are prevailing parties are also entitled to recover their costs and expert witness fees under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. Although *Civ. Code § 1794(d)* refers only to "prevailing buyers," it may be reconciled with *Civ. Code § 1032(b)* under which prevailing defendants are entitled to costs [*Murillo v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 985, 999, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682, 953 P. 2d 858]* .

The lodestar adjustment method is the prevailing rule for statutory attorney's fee awards. It is to be applied in the absence of clear legislative intent to the contrary [*Ketchum v. Moses (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 1122, 1135-1136, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 377, 17 P.3d 735]* and is applicable to attorney's fee awards under *Civ. Code § 1794(d)*. The statute provides that fees must be based on "actual time expended" and must be "determined by the court to have been reasonably incurred." The legislative intent was to ensure that attorney's fee awards would be based on actual time expended, rather than a percentage of the recovery, so that pursuit of consumer warranty cases would be economically feasible. Since the lodestar adjustment method is based on actual, reasonable attorney time expended as the objective starting point of the analysis, it is compatible with this statutory provision. That method can include application of a multiplier, provided the multiplier is based on factors different from those used in determining the lodestar amount [*Robertson v. Fleetwood Travel Trailers of Cal., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 785, 819-823, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731* ; *see Levy v. Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A., Inc. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 807, 813-816, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 770* (court is not required to use multiplier, and use of multiplier could be inappropriate when case does not involve contingent fee)]. For further discussion of the lodestar adjustment method for determining statutory attorney's fees, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, §§ 174.54[14][b], 174.56[12]*.

Further, for purposes of awarding attorney's fees under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*), the plain language of the statute allows for recovery of attorney's fees that have been "reasonably incurred by the buyer" [*see Civ. Code § 1794(d)*]. Attorney's fees were not "incurred" by the prevailing buyer at rates that increased over the years since the case was begun, and, thus, could not be awarded at higher rates, when the buyer was billed and liable only for fees at the hourly rate set at the beginning of the litigation [*Nightingale v. Hyundai Motor America (1994) 31 Cal. App. 4th 99, 104-105]* .

[e] Class Action Excluded

The buyer's right to recover treble damages does not apply to any cause of action commenced or maintained as a class or representative action, either generally [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 382*] or under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act [*Civ. Code § 1794(c)*; *see Civ. Code § 1781*].

[f] Clothing and Consumables Not Expressly Included

An action under the Song-Beverly Act may be brought by "any buyer of consumer goods" injured as described by the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1794(a)*]. Apparently, because neither clothing nor consumables is included within the definition of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c), (d)*; *see also § 502.40[2]*], neither the provision for treble damages nor the authorization of an attorney's fees award applies to either of these commodities, although this would leave consumers without the ability under the act to enforce its special provisions with regard to return or replacement of clothing and consumables [*see Civ. Code § 1793.35*].

[2] Recovery for Breach of Implied Warranty Only

Civ. Code § 1794 authorizes recovery of damages and other legal and equitable relief as well as attorney's fees even when a claim is based solely on a breach of an implied warranty [*see Civ. Code § 1794(a), (b), (d)*; *see also Mocek v.*

Alfa Leisure, Inc. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 402, 406-408, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546 (holding that buyer is not required to give seller opportunity to repair before rescinding when implied warranty of merchantability is breached, and affirming judgment in amount of purchase price plus interest upon return of defective travel trailer)]. However, the civil penalty for a willful breach provided for in *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* for breach of warranty does not apply in an action based solely on a breach of an implied warranty [*Civ. Code § 1794(c)*].

Additionally *Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)* states that any buyer of consumer goods injured by a breach of either the implied warranty of merchantability, or if present, the implied warranty of fitness has the remedies provided in *Com. Code §§ 2601 et seq., 2701 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)*]. *Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)* provides that in any action brought under the Commercial Code for breach of an implied warranty under the Song-Beverly Act, *Civ. Code § 1794* applies. This reference to *Civ. Code § 1794* apparently does not refer to an award of a civil penalty when the buyer establishes a willful failure to comply with the act under *Civ. Code § 1794(c)*, because that subsection specifies that it does not apply in an action based solely on a breach of an implied warranty. Rather, it appears to refer to the right to costs and attorney's fees set out in *Civ. Code § 1794(d)*, thereby giving the buyer the right to recover such fees and costs in any action under the Commercial Code authorized by *Civ. Code § 1791.1(a)*. This analysis is confirmed by the fact that originally the reference in *Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)* to *Civ. Code § 1794* was to *Civ. Code § 1794(b)*, which provided for the recovery of attorney's fees [*see* Stats. 1971, ch. 1523]. Stats. 1978, ch. 991, deleted the subdivisions of *Civ. Code § 1794*, but the legislative intent apparently was not to limit the recovery permitted in an action for breach of an implied warranty under *Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)*. Thus, it appears that the wider scope of the implied warranties under the Song-Beverly Act (with the greater number of persons responsible for these warranties under the act, that is, the manufacturer and distributor, as well as the seller) governs in an action under the Commercial Code when the transaction sued on is otherwise subject to the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act. Likewise, the notice provisions of *Com. Code § 2607*, which a buyer must comply with prior to commencing an action for breach of a warranty under the Commercial Code, also appear to apply, even though the Song-Beverly Act otherwise does not require that notice be given prior to commencing an action for a violation of an express or implied warranty.

[3] Special Remedy for Seller or Independent Service Person

A retail seller of consumer goods injured by the willful or repeated violation of the provisions of the act may bring an action for the recovery of damages. Judgment may be entered for three times the amount at which the actual damages are assessed plus reasonable attorney's fees [*Civ. Code § 1794.1(d)*]. An independent service person also has this identical cause of action and remedy under the act [*Civ. Code § 1794.1(b)*].

[4] Defenses

The act does not apply to any defect or nonconformity in consumer goods caused by the unauthorized or unreasonable use of the goods following sale [*Civ. Code § 1794.3*].

Any waiver of the provisions of the act by the buyer of consumer goods, except as the act expressly provides, is deemed contrary to public policy and remains unenforceable and void [*Civ. Code § 1790.1*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.54

§ 502.54 Manufacturer's Warranty on Service Member's Vehicle

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Song-Beverly Act applies to a purchase in the United States of a new motor vehicle [*see Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(2)* (definition); *see also § 502.43[5][b]*] with a manufacturer's express warranty by a member of the U.S. armed forces [*see Civ. Code § 1791(t)* (definition)], regardless of the state in which the vehicle is purchased or registered, if both the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 1795.8*]:

- The service member purchased the vehicle with the manufacturer's express warranty from a manufacturer that sells motor vehicles in California or from an agent or representative of that manufacturer; and

- The service member was stationed in or a resident of California at the time he or she purchased the vehicle or at the time he or she filed an action pursuant to the Song-Beverly Act.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Warranties Under Song-Beverly Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.55-502.59

[Reserved]

§§ 502.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.60

§ 502.60 Magnuson-Moss Act Definitions

[1] Consumer

A "consumer" is a buyer (other than for purposes of resale or use in the ordinary course of the buyer's business) of any consumer product, any person to whom the product is transferred during the duration of an implied or written warranty (or service contract) applicable to the product, and anyone else who is entitled by the terms of the warranty (or service contract) or under applicable state law to enforce the obligations of the warranty (or service contract) against the warrantor (or service contractor) [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*; 16 C.F.R. § 701.l(h); *but see Najran Co. v. Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. (S.D. Ga. 1986) 659 F. Supp. 1081, 1101* (commercial volume purchaser for resale may invoke protection of Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act; criteria for invocation; determination is made on case-by-case basis)].

[2] Consumer Product

A "consumer product" is any tangible personal property which is distributed in commerce and normally used for personal, family, or household purposes (including that intended to be attached to or installed in any real property, whether or not so attached or installed) [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(1)*]. Ambiguity of purpose is resolved in favor of coverage. Products like automobiles and typewriters that are used for both personal and commercial purposes are covered, while products purchased solely for commercial or industrial use are excluded. Agricultural products used in the occupation of farming are not covered when their use for the listed consumer purposes is uncommon; however, gardening tools used for personal consumption purposes would be covered. The federal definition may include many kinds of appliances and equipment that would be considered fixtures under California law (but not those items which are integral component parts of the structure, like wiring and plumbing). Typically, building materials originally comprising the structure are not consumer products unless they are sold over the counter as hardware and building products [*16 C.F.R. § 700.1(a)-(f)*; *see 16 C.F.R. §§ 701.1(b), 702.1(b)*; *see, e.g., Atkinson v. Elk Corp. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 212, 226, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 247* (roofing shingles, bought by contractor that installed them pursuant to contract to replace homeowner's roof, were consumer products, and homeowner had cause of action for breach of warranty under Magnuson-Moss Act)].

[3] Marketing Parties

A "supplier" is anyone engaged in the business of making a consumer product directly or indirectly available to consumers [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(4)*].

The "warrantor" is any supplier or other person who gives, or offers to give, a written warranty, or who is or may be obligated under an implied warranty [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(5)*].

Additionally, a "seller" is any person who sells or offers for sale, for purposes other than resale or use in the ordinary course of the buyer's business, any consumer product [*16 C.F.R. § 702.1(e)*].

[4] Remedies

A "remedy" refers to whichever corrections or adjustments the warrantor elects to make on a claim under a written warranty, from among the prescribed alternatives of (1) repair, (2) replacement, or (3) refund. The warrantor may not elect refund, however, unless either [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(10)*]:

- The warrantor is unable to provide replacement and repair is not commercially practicable or cannot be timely made; or

- The consumer is willing to accept the refund.

"Replacement" means furnishing a new consumer product which is identical or reasonably equivalent to the warranted consumer product [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(11)*].

"Refund" means refunding the actual purchase price (less reasonable depreciation based on actual use when permitted by implementing regulations) [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(12)*].

[5] Service Contact

A "service contract" is one in writing to perform, over a fixed period of time or for a specified duration, services relating to the maintenance or repair (or both) of a consumer product [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(8)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.61

§ 502.61 Jurisdiction, Preemptive Effects, and Federal Trade Commission Regulation

The federal Magnuson-Moss Act applies to consumer products "distributed in commerce." This means to be sold in commerce, introduced or delivered for introduction into commerce, or held for sale or distribution after introduction into commerce [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(13)*]. "Commerce" itself means trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation between a place in a state and anywhere outside, or that which affects such movement [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(14)*]. "State" includes all states and other specified United States jurisdictions [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(15)*]. The Federal Trade Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "FTC") is charged with implementation of the act by regulations and enforcement thereof [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301(2), 2309*].

The Magnuson-Moss Act does not invalidate or restrict any right of remedy a consumer has under state law or any other federal law. It does not adversely affect the Federal Trade Commission Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 41*] or any antitrust statute therein. In like manner it does not impinge on the Federal Seed Act [*see 7 U.S.C. § 1551*], nor does anything in the Magnuson-Moss Act apply to seed for planting. The act is inapplicable to any written warranty, the making or content of which is otherwise governed by federal law; if only a portion is so governed, however, the remaining portion is subject to the Magnuson-Moss Act [*15 U.S.C. § 2311(a), (b)(1), (d)*].

Any state law relating to labeling or disclosure affecting written warranties or performance thereunder that conflicts with the requirements of the Magnuson-Moss Act as to warranty disclosures, full and limited warranty requirements, and federal minimum standards [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 2302-2304*] is preempted by the federal law. Nevertheless, the FTC can approve state requirements, on a submission by an appropriate state agency, which afford protection to consumers greater than the federal law and which do not unduly burden interstate commerce. Approval may be for a specified time, as long as the state requirements are effectively enforced [*15 U.S.C. § 2311(c)*]. On application by California authority, the FTC has determined that nothing in the Song-Beverly Act was preempted by the provisions of the *Magnuson-Moss Act [42 Fed. Reg. 54004* et seq.].

The Magnuson Moss Act calls for the application of state warranty law. It does not create additional federal warranty law except in specific instances in which it expressly prescribes a regulating rule. Therefore, generally, a plaintiff's failure to allege facts constituting a warranty claim under state law necessarily leads to a failure to state a claim under

the Magnuson Moss Act, if the plaintiff relies on the same set of facts to support each claim [*Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 824, 833, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.62

§ 502.62 Written Warranty Generally

[1] Coverage

A "written warranty" refers in the first instance to a written affirmation of fact or written promise made in connection with the sale of a consumer product by a supplier to a "buyer" (a term not defined but used to define "consumer") [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*]. It relates to the nature of the "material or workmanship" and affirms or promises that the material or workmanship is defect-free or will meet a specified level of performance over a specified period of time. In the second instance a "written warranty" refers to an undertaking in writing in connection with the sale by a supplier of a consumer product to refund, repair, replace, or take other remedial action with respect to the product in the event it fails to meet the specifications set forth in the undertaking. In either case the written affirmation, promise, or undertaking also must become part of the basis of the bargain between a supplier and a buyer for purposes other than resale of the product [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*].

It is recognized under the Magnuson-Moss Act that certain representations--such as energy efficiency ratings for electrical appliances, or care labeling for wearing apparel--may be express warranties under the Uniform Commercial Code. However, they are not written warranties under the federal law because they do not relate to a specified period of time as required under the federal law. Nevertheless, the FTC encourages practices that disclose product information so long as it is not deceptive and which is of benefit to customers. Suppliers should avoid characterization of other kinds of benefits as warranties, however, such as the right to revoke within a certain period or the ability to return goods for credit [*16 C.F.R. § 700.3(a), (b)*].

The Magnuson-Moss Act compares with the Song-Beverly Act and the general sales law under Division 2 of the Commercial Code as follows:

- A federal written warranty may be made by a "supplier," which term includes anyone in the business of making the goods available to consumers [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(4)*], and is a term at least as comprehensive as the group of marketing parties listed under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1791(e), (j),* (*l*)], while the general sales law is confined to the acts of sellers [*see Com. Code §*

2103(1)(d)].

- The federal act's provisions extend to a "written" warranty only [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*] which is similar to the main warranty regulated under the Song-Beverly Act and contained in a written statement arising in a sale [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)*; *see also § 502.42*].

- Although the federal law refers to affirmations of fact and promises as giving rise to one type of warranty subject to the law's provisions, similar to the sales law [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*] but not the Song-Beverly Act, the law restricts covered affirmations to those without inherent faults or which meet a specified level of performance for a specified duration [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(A)*]--neither of which is directly designated under the state consumer warranty law.

- The type of warranty subject to the provision of the federal law when an undertaking is made to carry out some remedial action (including recompense) if the product does not live up to its specifications therein [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(B)*] is similar to, but broader than, the type of warranty under the Song-Beverly Act consisting of an undertaking to keep up utility or performance, or to make payment otherwise.

- The federal law requires that the warranty be part of the basis of the bargain, an element present under the general sales law [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)*] but absent from the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*].

[2] Meaning of "Basis of the Bargain" Requirement

Being part of "the basis of the bargain" means that a written warranty must be conveyed at the time of sale of the consumer product. The consumer must not give any consideration beyond the purchase price in order to benefit from the agreement. The Magnuson-Moss Act does not require that the agreement obligate a supplier of a consumer product to a written warranty, but simply that it be part of the basis of the bargain between a supplier and a consumer. This also contemplates written warranties by third-party nonsuppliers [*16 C.F.R. § 700.11(b)*].

[3] Disclosure Requirements of Warranties

[a] Purpose of Warranty Disclosures

A primary purpose of the Magnuson-Moss Act is to require any warrantor (one who warrants a consumer product to a consumer by means of a written warranty) to fully and conspicuously disclose in simple and readily understood language the terms and conditions of the warranty. This purpose is designed to improve the adequacy of information available to consumers, to prevent deception, and to improve competition in the marketing of consumer products. The FTC is charged to various degrees with effectuating these Congressional purposes through rulemaking. The enabling law specifies that consumer products covered must cost more than $5 [*15 U.S.C. § 2302(e)*], but the FTC has raised the basis for the requirements to $15 [*16 C.F.R. § 701.2*].

[b] Required Elements of Disclosures

A written warranty must disclose in a single document all of the following [*16 C.F.R. § 701.3(a)(1)-(9)*]:

- The identity of the party or parties to whom the written warranty is extended, if enforceability is limited to the original consumer-purchaser or otherwise limited to persons other than every consumer-owner during the warranty term.

- A clear description and identification of products, parts, characteristics, or components or properties

covered by--and, when necessary for clarification, excluded from--the warranty.

- A statement of what the warrantor will do in the event of a defect, malfunction, or failure to conform with the written warranty, including the items or services the warrantor will pay for or provide, and, where necessary for clarification, those which the warrantor will not pay for or provide.

- The time or event on which the warranty term commences, if different from the purchase date, and the time period or other measurement of warranty duration.

- A step-by-step explanation of the procedure the consumer should follow to obtain performance of any warranty obligation, including the persons or class thereof authorized to perform warranty obligations- including names, addresses, parties to be reached, and toll-free information numbers.

- Information respecting the availability of any informal dispute settlement mechanism elected by the warrantor under the law.

- Any limitations on the duration of implied warranties, to be disclosed on the face of the warranty [*see 16 C.F.R. § 701.1(i)*].

- Any exclusions of or limitations on relief, such as incidental or consequential damages.

- A statement concerning the availability of rights under both federal and state law.

These requirements are made less extensive in the case of general policy statements of third parties on seals, emblems, and insignias which promise replacement or refund for defective products if they do not otherwise give assurance as to quality or performance [*see 16 C.F.R. § 701.3(a)(7)-(9), (b)*].

The federal legislation proposes a comprehensive scheme of disclosure. The Song-Beverly Act prescribes a special content for warranties only in the case of most assistive devices [*see Civ. Code § 1793.02*]. Otherwise, the state consumer law generally insists on warranties being in readily understood language, clearly identifying the warranting parties. State law also requires informing buyers in particular ways of the availability of service facilities [*see Civ. Code § 1793.1*].

[c] Applicability to Components and Replacements

While warranties on replacement parts and components used for repair are covered, warranties on services are not. If a written agreement warrants both repair parts and repair work, the warranty must comply with the Magnuson-Moss Act and with FTC regulations [*16 C.F.R. § 700.1(h)*]. In most instances the act does not cover warranties of component parts of consumer products. Warranties on parts are typically given by the component manufacturer to the maker of the assembled product (who, in turn, may directly warrant them to the consumer). The component warranty does not become part of the basis of the bargain of the consumer sale and thus is not covered by the act. However, in some instances a component supplier's warranty is intended to be and is given directly to the consumer, as in the case of a refrigerator installed directly into a recreational vehicle. In such case the written warranty falls under the act [*16 C.F.R. § 700.3(c)*].

[4] Designation as Full or Limited Warranty

The warrantor in the written warranty must clearly and conspicuously designate it either a "full _____ warranty," a statement of duration to be placed in the blank space, or a "limited warranty." The former designation is appropriate if the written warranty meets the "federal minimum standards" for warranty [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2304*];

otherwise, the limited label must be used. The FTC may exempt a written warranty from this requirement. These provisions apply only to warranties pertaining to consumer products actually costing the consumer more than $10 and that are not formally designated as a full warranty [*15 U.S.C. § 2308(d)*]. However, warrantors may include a statement of duration in a limited warranty designation as well. All designations should appear clearly and conspicuously in the form of a caption or prominent title clearly separated from the warranty test. No other designation should be used unless permitted by FTC rule [*16 C.F.R. § 700.6(a)*]. A consumer product may be sold with both types of warranties if they are clearly and conspicuously differentiated [*15 U.S.C. § 2305*].

[5] Minimum Standards on Full Warranty

[a] In General

To meet federal minimum standards under the Magnuson-Moss Act, a warrantor must abide by the following requirements [*15 U.S.C. § 2304*]:

- Remedy the consumer product within a reasonable time and without charge in the case of a defect, malfunction, or failure to conform with the written warranty.

- Not impose any limitation on the duration of an implied warranty on the product (despite the fact that a limitation is permitted in certain other circumstances under the act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2308(b)*].

- Not exclude or limit consequential damages for breach of any written or implied warranty on the product unless the exclusion or limitation conspicuously appears on the face of the warranty.

- Allow the consumer to elect either a refund for, or replacement without charge of, product, or part if the product, or a component part of the product, contains a defect or malfunction after a reasonable number of attempts (as the FTC may prescribe) by the warrantor to remedy the defect or malfunction.

Replacement of a part includes installation without charge [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(a)*]. The FTC may further define duties under these standards [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(b)(3)*].

A warranty designated by a supplier as a full warranty is deemed to incorporate at least the federal minimum requirements for warranty, as amplified by any FTC regulations in any action brought under the Magnuson-Moss Act or under any state law [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(e)*].

[b] When Service Is "Without Charge"

Under the minimum standard, the phrase "without charge" means not to assess the consumer for any costs the warrantor or its representatives incur in connection with the required remedy of a warranted product [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(d)*; *see 15 U.S.C. §§ 2302(c), 2304(a)(1)*]. Remedy without charge does not necessarily require the warrantor to compensate the consumer for incidental expenses. However, if any expenses are incurred because the remedy is not made within a reasonable time or because the warrantor imposed an unreasonable duty on the consumer as a condition of securing remedy, then the consumer is entitled to recover the expenses so incurred in any action against the warrantor [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(d)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(1)*].

[c] Imposition of Other Duties on Consumer

If a warranted product may only be utilized when installed, a full warranty must provide the installation without charge, regardless of whether or not the consumer originally paid therefor. Nevertheless, the warrantor may still impose on the consumer a duty to remove, return, or reinstall if the duty can be demonstrated to be reasonable in some relevant official proceeding [*16 C.F.R. § 700.9*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 2304(b)(1)*].

[d] Full Duties Owed to Transferees

The minimum standard duties extend from the warrantor to anyone who is a consumer with respect to the product involved [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(b)(4)*]. Because a consumer includes transferees [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*], a full warranty may not expressly restrict the warranty rights of a transferee during its stated duration. However, when the duration of a full warranty is defined solely in terms of first purchaser ownership, there can be no violation as to transferees because the warranty duration expires by definition at the time of transfer. The FTC points out that a "first purchaser" type of warranty often is worded in a way to lead the consumer to believe that no proof of purchase is needed. Therefore, it concludes that requirement of documentary proof may not be reasonably imposed on a consumer under that warranty, and the burden of proof that the consumer is not the original purchaser or owner is on the warrantor. Warrantors or their designated agents may nevertheless properly ask consumers to state or affirm that they are the true first purchasers [*16 C.F.R. § 700.6(b)*].

[e] Duties Are Not Required on Showing of Consumer's Abuse

The minimum duties are not required of a warrantor who can show that the defect, malfunction, or failure of any warranted consumer product to conform with a written warranty was caused by damage while in the possession of the consumer. The damage, however, cannot result from the defect or malfunction. The usage exception includes the consumer's failure to provide "reasonable and necessary maintenance" [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(c)*]. This latter requirement consists of operations that the consumer reasonably can be expected to perform or have performed and that are necessary to keep any consumer product performing its intended function and operating at a reasonable level of performance [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(9)*].

[f] Prohibition Against Unreasonable Duties to Secure Remedy

In fulfilling the requirements of the federal minimum standards, the warrantor may not impose any duty on the consumer other than notification as a condition of securing a remedy because of a malfunction or defect of the product or because it does not conform to the written warranty. However, the warrantor may be excepted if he or she is able to demonstrate to the FTC or a court that the duty is reasonable. In any case, a warrantor may require, as a condition to replacement or refund, that the consumer product be made available free and clear of liens and encumbrances, unless the FTC declares that requirement to be unreasonable in the circumstances [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(b)(1), (2)*].

The FTC has concluded that requiring consumers to return "warranty registration cards" after purchase to assure warranty protection is an unreasonable duty under a full warranty; therefore, providing that the warranty is void without return of a card is impermissible, nor may the condition even be implied. The warrantor still may suggest use of the card as one means of showing proof of purchase; but in doing so, the warrantor must give notice that failure to return the card does not affect warranty rights [*16 C.F.R. § 700.7*]. In a somewhat contradictory rule, the FTC provides that if a warranty registration card is made a condition precedent to warranty coverage, that fact must be disclosed in the warranty. If return of the card reasonably appears to be a condition to coverage and performance, but is not, that fact also must be so disclosed [*16 C.F.R. § 701.4*].

[6] Meaning of Minimum Price Requirements

The minimum price restrictions of the Magnuson-Moss Act, whether $10, $15, or otherwise, is exclusive of tax. The minimum also applies to multiple-packaged items that may individually sell for less but which have been packaged to sell only as an ensemble at the minimum or higher price [*16 C.F.R. § 700.1(g)*].

[7] Puffery Excluded

Requirements pertaining to written warranties, full warranties and the federal minimum standards, and limited warranties are inapplicable in the case of statements or representations that are similar to expressions of general policy

concerning customer satisfaction, and that are not subject to any specific limitations [*15 U.S.C. § 2303(b)*]. This exception to warranty law requirements applies only to general policies, not to those that are limited to specific consumer products manufactured or sold by the supplier, nor may a policy be general while at the same time being subject to any specific limitations. Policies that have an express limitation of duration or of amount to be refunded, for instance, are not general and thus are not excepted from warranty law requirements. However, reasonable limitations applied in individual consumer's circumstances will not necessarily remove a policy from the general to the specific context. A warrantor's refusing to honor expression of general policy with reasonable limitations when a consumer has been using the product for a decade without complaint does not amount to imposing a specific limitation and thus invoking the warranty law [*16 C.F.R. § 700.5*].

This limitation is similar to that in the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(c)*], but the exception is not as broad in the federal law because the federal law covers a greater area of representations which give rise to express warranties. The federal law's exception in turn is also not as great as that under the sales law because the latter allows the greatest area of what might constitute an express warranty [*see Com. Code § 2313(2)*].

[8] Service Contract Distinguished

An agreement that would meet the definition of a written warranty but for its failure to satisfy the basis of the bargain test is a service contract--that is, one which requires consideration beyond the purchase price or is entered into after purchase of the product. Agreements that relate only to performance of maintenance or inspection services and that do not otherwise meet the requirements of a written warranty are also service contracts--that is, an agreement to perform periodic cleaning and inspection over a definite time period, even when the agreement is offered at time of sale and for no extra charge [*16 C.F.R. § 700.11(c)*].

A supplier is not prevented from entering into a service contract with the consumer, whether in addition to or in lieu of a written warranty. However, the contract must fully, clearly, and conspicuously disclose (as may be interpreted by the FTC) its terms and conditions in simple and readily understood language [*15 U.S.C. § 2306*]. The right to enter into, and the requirements respecting, service contracts are similar to those with respect to express warranties under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1794.4*; *see also § 502.45*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.63

§ 502.63 Written Warranty Presale Availability Requirements

[1] Seller's Responsibilities

The FTC has promulgated regulations with respect to sellers and warrantors that require that the terms of any written warranty on a consumer product be made available to the consumer prior to sale. These regulations apply to products actually costing the consumer more than $15 [*16 C.F.R. §§ 702.2, 702.3*].

Except as provided in *16 C.F.R. § 702.3(c), (d)*, the seller of a consumer product with a written warranty must make the text of the warranty available for examination by the prospective buyer by doing either of the following [*16 C.F.R. § 702.3(c), (d)*]:

- Displaying it in close proximity to the warranted product.

- Furnishing it on request prior to sale and placing signs reasonably calculated to elicit the prospective buyer's attention in prominent locations in the store or department advising prospective buyers of the availability of the warranties on request.

The seller's responsibilities do not apply to statements of general policy on emblems, seals, or insignias issued by third parties promising replacement or refund for defects. Those statements cannot represent or assure the quality or performance characteristics of the products. However, the required disclosures of a written warranty must be published by the marketing parties in each issue of a publication with a general circulation, to be provided free to any consumer on written request [*16 C.F.R. § 702.3(b)(2)*].

[2] Warrantor's Responsibilities

A warrantor as such also has particular obligations attached to making a written warranty on consumer products retailing in fact for more than $15. Sellers must be provided with warranty materials necessary to enable them to comply with their own warranty requirements. The warrantor may accomplish this by furnishing a copy of the warranty with every such product. Instead, or additionally, a tag, sign, sticker, label, decal, or other attachment may be put on the

product containing the full text of the written warranty. In like manner the warranty may be printed on or attached to the package, carton, or other container of the product if normally used for display purposes. Under this option a copy of the warranty must also accompany the product. Another alternative is that the warrantor may provide a notice, sign, or poster disclosing the warranty text if a copy of the warranty accompanies the product [*16 C.F.R. § 702.3(b)(1)(i)*].

If a sale is door-to-door by catalog or mail order, the warrantor must disclose in a catalog or solicitation or in a reference to an information section clearly and conspicuously placed in close conjunction with the description of the warranted product, either the full text of the written warranty or a statement that the complete text can be obtained free on specific written request at a particular address. The catalog, mail order, or door-to-door seller then must promptly provide a copy on consumer request. In door-to-door sales the seller must disclose the fact that the sales representative has copies of the warranties for warranted products being offered, which may be inspected by the prospective buyer at any time during the sales presentation. The disclosure must be made orally and also must be included in any written materials to be shown [*16 C.F.R. § 703.1(d), (c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.64

§ 502.64 Implied Warranty

[1] Reference to State Law

The term "implied warranty" means an implied warranty that arises under state law in connection with the sale by a supplier of a consumer product [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(7)*]. However, implied warranties arising from state law may be affected by federal provisions [*see* [2], *below*], concerning their limitation, disclaimer, or modification [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 2304(a), 2308*], and accompanied by written warranties or service contracts in certain instances.

The federal implied warranty appears to refer to any warranty implied under California law. Thus, to the extent it applies to a retail sale of consumer goods, the implied warranties of the general sales law and the Song-Beverly Act (that is, merchantability and fitness) appear to be incorporated into the federal provisions.

[2] Disclaimer or Modification

A supplier may not disclaim or modify any implied warranty to a consumer with respect to a consumer product if making any written warranty to the consumer thereon or, either at the time of sale or within 90 days thereafter, entering into a service contract with the consumer applicable to the product. However, the duration of an implied warranty may be limited to that of the duration of a written warranty of reasonable duration, if the limitation is conscionable and is set forth in clear and unmistakable language and is prominently displayed on the face of the warranty. This exception does not apply to a supplier meeting the federal minimum standards [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(2)*]. Any disclaimer, modification, or limitation in violation of this provision is ineffective for purposes of the Magnuson-Moss Act or state law [*15 U.S.C. § 2308*].

The Magnuson-Moss Act compares with the Song-Beverly Act as follows:

- It reinforces the state provision that no modification or disclaimer of an implied warranty may take place in the presence of an express one [*see Civ. Code § 1793*], but adds similar protection in the case of a service contract [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2308(a)*].

- The federal limitation of the duration of an implied warranty to any reasonable duration of the written warranty differs from the state law that requires coextensive durations of express and implied warranties with outside limits [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(c)*; *Atkinson v. Elk Corp. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 212, 231, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 247* (*Civ. Code § 1791.1* "controls the length of the implied warranty of merchantability under Magnuson-Moss"); *see also § 502.51[5]*].

- The federal law adds that the limitation must be conscionable and provides certain disclosure requirements [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2308(b)*].

It should be noted that the FTC has ruled there is no preemption of the state law [*see § 502.61*]. Notwithstanding the above, a full warranty (that is, one meeting the minimum federal standards) may not limit the duration of implied warranties [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.65

§ 502.65 Prohibited Terms in Warranties and Service Contracts

A warrantor is not allowed to indicate in any written warranty or service contract, directly or indirectly, that the decision of itself, a service contractor, or any designated third party is final or binding in any dispute, nor may the warrantor or service contractor state that it alone may determine what is a defect under the agreement. The foregoing statements are deceptive because the Magnuson-Moss Act gives state and federal courts jurisdiction over breach of warranty and service contract controversies [*16 C.F.R. § 700.8*].

A warrantor may not condition any written or implied warranty of a product on the consumer's using, in connection therewith, any article or service identified by brand, trade, or corporate name. Articles or services provided without charge under the terms of the warranty are excepted. The FTC may waive the requirements in instances in which it finds the product will function only with the required article or service and that the requirement serves the public interest [*15 U.S.C. § 2302(c)*].

Thus, under a limited warranty providing only for replacement of defective parts but no labor, the consumer cannot be required to use only designated labor, nor may the warrantor or representative thereof provide parts under the warranty in a manner which impedes or precludes the consumer's choice of person or business to perform the necessary labor. The continued validity of a warranty may not be conditioned on the use of only authorized repair service or replacement parts for nonwarranty service and maintenance, for it violates both the ban on "tying arrangements" and the liability of the warrantor under a written warranty for defects unrelated to consumer use [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)*]. Of course, the warrantor still can expressly exclude liability for defects or damages from "unauthorized" articles or service or can deny liability when able to prove the defect or damage was caused thereby [*16 C.F.R. § 700.10*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.66

§ 502.66 Contracts With Service Personnel

A warrantor may designate representatives to perform duties under the written or implied warranty. However, the warrantor must make reasonable arrangements for compensation of its designated representatives. Furthermore, the designation does not relieve the warrantor of direct responsibility to the consumer, nor does it make the representative a cowarrantor [*15 U.S.C. § 2307*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.67

§ 502.67 True Insurance Contracts Are Unregulated

Certain agreements marketed under state law as insurance contracts may, in certain instances, meet the statutory definitions of warranties under the Magnuson-Moss Act. The McCarran-Ferguson Act (*15 U.S.C. § 1011 et seq.*) precludes federal jurisdiction over the business of insurance to the extent it is regulated by state law. Thus, any insurance agreements that are warranties would fall under coverage of the Magnuson-Moss Act only to the extent they are not regulated in the state as insurance. One example is the automobile breakdown insurance policy sold in many jurisdictions and regulated by the state as a form of casualty insurance [*16 C.F.R. § 700.11*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.68

§ 502.68 Actions Under the Magnuson-Moss Act

[1] Provision for Informal Dispute Settlements

The Magnuson-Moss Act attempts to encourage fair and expeditious private settlements of consumer disputes by allowing warrantors to set up informal dispute settlement procedures that meet FTC requirements and are then incorporated into written warranties as a prerequisite to bringing suit under the act (except in a class action, to any extent necessary to establish the class as under federal rules) [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 23*]) [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a), (d)(1)*]. The FTC has set up elaborate guidelines for warrantors to institute fair and independent informal dispute settlement "mechanisms" and to inform consumers of the existence of these mechanisms [*see 16 C.F.R. §§ 703.1-703.8*]. Although some manufacturers or retailers have devised more complex complaint processing procedures, these do not operate to postpone legal action under the act in the absence of compliance with FTC guidelines [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3)*].

[2] Alternative Requirement for Affording Opportunity to Correct

In the absence of availability of an informal dispute settlement mechanism, no action may be brought under the Magnuson-Moss Act for failure to comply with any obligation thereunder or under any written or implied warranty or service contract unless the person obligated under the warranty or service contract is afforded a reasonable opportunity to cure the failure to comply. A class action may be entertained only to the point of establishing the class (such as in a United States District Court where the procedure of *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 23* is employed), in which case reasonable opportunity must be afforded by the named plaintiff to notify the defendant that the plaintiff is acting on behalf of the class [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)*].

[3] Consumer Remedy

A consumer damaged by the failure of a supplier, warrantor, or service contractor to comply with any obligation of the Magnuson-Moss Act, or under a written warranty, implied warranty, or service contract, may bring suit for damages and other legal and equitable relief. The plaintiff must have complied first with the requirements of any available informal dispute settlement mechanism [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1)*; *see* [1], *above*] or else have afforded a reasonable opportunity

for curing the failure [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)*; *see* [2], *above*].

The Magnuson-Moss Act differs from the Song-Beverly Act in that an action under the federal act is available to buyers, transferees, and others who may be entitled (or not limited) under the warranty or state law [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*], whereas the state action is open only to the retail buyer. The range of possible defendants and the types of warranties or service contracts involved (to the extent they conform to the requirements of the laws in question) are generally equivalent under the federal and state laws. However, the federal law does not provide for treble damages, as does the state law, and requires as a condition to bringing suit the utilization of any available informal dispute settlement mechanism or other opportunity for the defendants to cure the defect [*see Civ. Code § 1794(c)*].

It should also be pointed out that the definitions of the federal act appear to provide broader protection in certain cases that those provided under the Song-Beverly Act. For example, federal law does not exclude clothing and consumables from its definition of consumer products [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(1)*], while the state consumer warranty law does exclude them from its description of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c), (d)*]. Thus, a federal cause of action may be available for these commodities (in conjunction with Division 2 of the Commercial Code) while the state action under the Song-Beverly Act may not be [*see § 502.60[2]*]. Likewise, the federal definition of consumer products refers to products that are "normally" used for personal, family, or household purposes, which includes products (such as automobiles and typewriters) that are commonly used for consumer purposes [*see 16 C.F.R. § 700.1(a)*], whereas the Song-Beverly Act describes consumer goods as "used or bought for use primarily" for consumer purposes without other qualification. The federal law also specifically includes personal property attached to real property [*see 16 C.F.R. § 700.1(e), (f)*], while the state law expressly excludes heating or air conditioning equipment when installed [*see Civ. Code § 1795.1*].

[4] Recovery of Costs and Attorney's Fees

The court may allow a consumer who finally prevails in an action under the Magnuson-Moss Act to recover, as part of the judgment, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of cost and expenses reasonably incurred for, or in connection with, the commencement and prosecution of the action. This includes attorney's fees based on actual time expended unless the court in its discretion determines that such an award would be inappropriate [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(2)*; *Milicevic v. Fetcher Jones Imports, Ltd. (2004) 402 F.3d 912, 919-920* (district court did not abuse its discretion when concluding that attorneys' hourly rate was not reasonable and eliminating hours it considered to be unnecessarily duplicative); *Drouin v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 486, 492-493, 209 Cal. Rptr. 623* (attorney fee award need not be apportioned among causes of action when some do not provide for recovery of attorney's fees)]. Under the Song-Beverly Act, an award of costs and attorney's fees to a prevailing buyer is mandatory [*Civ. Code § 1794(d)*].

[5] Available Forums

Suit may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction in any state or the District of Columbia, or in a appropriate United States District Court. To be brought in the latter forum, the amount in controversy of any individual claim cannot be less than the sum or value of $25; the total claim cannot be less than the sum of $50,000 (exclusive of interest and costs) computed on the basis of any or all claims to be determined in the suit; and if the proceeding is a class action, the number of named plaintiffs cannot be less than 100 [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1), (3)*]. It thus appears that the Magnuson-Moss Act intends suit thereunder to be commenced in state court on most occasions because it seems to require a $50,000 minimum amount in issue in all instances, regardless of whether the action is commenced by an individual plaintiff or is a class action.

[6] Defendants

For purposes of dispute settlements and actions on consumer grievances under the Magnuson-Moss Act, only the warrantor actually making a written affirmation of fact, promise, or undertaking is deemed to have created a written

warranty. Any rights arising under the warranty may be enforced under the act only against that warrantor and no one else [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(f)*]. A supplier who does no more than sell or distribute a consumer product covered by a written warranty offered and identified as being offered by another is not liable for failure of the warranty to comply with the act or rules thereunder. However, other actions and written or oral representations of a supplier in connection with the offer or sale of a warranted product may make the supplier a warrantor under the act and liable for its own breach of warranty or contract. In addition, if under state law the supplier is deemed to have "adopted" the written affirmation of fact, promise, or undertaking, the supplier is also liable under the act [*see 16 C.F.R. § 700.4*].

[7] Effect on Other Kinds of Recovery

The Magnuson-Moss Act does not affect the liability of, or impose liability on, any person for personal injury; nor does it supersede state law regarding consequential damages for injury to the person or other injury [*15 U.S.C. § 2311(b)(2)*].

[8] Punishable Offenses Under the Act

A violation of the Magnuson-Moss Act also constitutes engaging in unfair and deceptive trade practices, subject to enforcement by the FTC [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(c)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 45(a)(1)*]. Either that agency or the Attorney General may seek injunctive relief with respect to warrantors failing to comply with or violating prohibitions of the act or for the making of a "deceptive warranty." The latter is a written warranty which does any of the following [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(c)*]:

- Contains an affirmation, promise, description, or representation which is either false or fraudulent, or which, in light of all the circumstances, would mislead a reasonable individual exercising due care.

- Fails to contain information necessary in light of all of the circumstances, to make the warranty not misleading to a reasonable individual exercising due care.

- Created by the use of such terms as "guaranty" or "warranty" if the terms and conditions thereof so limit its scope and application as to deceive a reasonable individual [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Warranties Under Magnuson-Moss Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.69-502.79

[Reserved]

§§ 502.69[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.80

§ 502.80 Other Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Forms of Discovery

For forms for use in interrogatories involving breach of warranty, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Ch. 169, *Sales*, Form 1; Ch. 211, *Warranties*, Forms 1-4 (Matthew Bender)

[2] California Legal Forms

For legal forms dealing with sales warranties, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 52, *Sales of Goods Under the Uniform Commercial Code* (Matthew Bender)

For a manufacturer's express warranty, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 92, *Service Contracts* (Matthew Bender)

[3] Legal Forms With Tax Analysis

Rabkin & Johnson, Current Legal Forms With Tax Analysis, Ch. 4, *Sale of Goods* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.81

§ 502.81 Federal Statutes

Warranties under Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act. *15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.82

§ 502.82 State Statutes

[1] In General

"Grey market goods" sold without manufacturer's express warranty. *Civ. Code §§ 1770(a)(21), 1797.8 et seq.*

Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. *Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*

Consumer goods services. *Civ. Code §§ 1796, 1796.5*

Mobilehome warranties. *Civ. Code §§ 1797-1797.5*

[2] Warranties Under Division 2 of Commercial Code (Sales)

Existence and construction of warranties. *Com. Code §§ 2312-2317*

Warranty affecting arrival of goods. *Com. Code § 2321(2)*

Notice of breach of warranty. *Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*

Notification by defendant buyer to third-party seller of breach of warranty of infringement for remedy over. *Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*

Notification by defendant buyer to third-party seller for remedy over. *Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*

Seller's demand for control of buyer's defense in action for breach of warranty of infringement. *Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*

Seller's remedies against buyer for breach of obligation to hold harmless after claim for breach of warranty of

infringement. *Com. Code § 2607(6)*

Measure of damages for breach of warranty. *Com. Code § 2714(2)*

Consequential damages. *Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715(2)*

Incidental damages. *Com. Code § 2714(3)*

Statute of limitations. *Com. Code § 2725*

Warranty procedure in retail sales. *Com. Code §§ 2800, 2801*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.83

§ 502.83 Federal Regulations

Interpretations of Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act. *16 C.F.R. §§ 700.1-700.12*

Disclosure requirements under Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act *16 C.F.R. §§ 701.1-701.4*

Presale availability of warranties under Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act. *16 C.F.R. §§ 702.1-702.3*

Informal dispute settlement procedures authorized by Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act *16 C.F.R. §§ 703.1-703.8*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.84

§ 502.84 Decisions

[1] Actions for Breach of Warranty

[a] Attorney's Fees

For purposes of awarding attorney's fees under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act (*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*), plain language of statute allows for recovery of attorney's fees that have been "reasonably incurred by buyer" [*see Civ. Code § 1794(d)*]; attorney's fees were not "incurred" by prevailing buyer at rates that increased over the years since case began, and thus could not be awarded at higher rates, when buyer was billed and liable only for fees at hourly rate set at beginning of litigation. *Nightingale v. Hyundai Motor America (1994) 31 Cal. App. 4th 99, 104-105, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149*

[b] Costs

Defendant sellers are entitled to recover their costs and expert witness fees as prevailing parties under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act; although *Civ. Code § 1794(d)* mentions only "prevailing buyers," it may be reconciled with *Civ. Code § 1032(b)* under which prevailing defendants are entitled to costs. *Murillo v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 985, 999, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682, 953 P.2d 858*

Defendant is responsible only for costs reasonably incurred by plaintiff in commencing and prosecuting suit against them, and cannot be charged for service of process on another defendant that settled. *Levy v. Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A., Inc. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 807, 813, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 770*

[c] Damages

Emotional distress damages and loss of use damages for period when buyer did not have replacement vehicle are not recoverable under Song-Beverly *Consumer Warranty Act. Bishop v. Hyundai Motor Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 750, 757-758, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 134*

Award of lost profits and restitution of sums paid for trucks in breach of warranty action was not per se inconsistent because California Commercial Code has not adopted rule of election of remedies. *Berge v. International Harvester Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 152, 163, 190 Cal. Rptr. 815*

[d] Penalty

"Willful" within meaning of *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* requires only that illegal act or omission occur intentionally without regard to motive or ignorance of act's prohibited character, and does not include moral component; jury instructions using words such as "blameworthy" and "reckless disregard of consumer's rights" are error. *Schreidel v. American Honda Motor Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1249-1250, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* ; *Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 894, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64*

Manufacturer's failure to refund or replace defective automobile is not "willful" under *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* if it reasonably and in good faith believed facts did not call for refund or replacement. *Kwan v. Mercedes Benz of North America, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 174, 186, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371*

Plaintiff is not entitled to recover both civil penalty of *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* and punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* because that would amount to double recovery. *Troensegaard v. Silvercrest Industries, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 218, 221, 226-228, 220 Cal. Rptr. 712*

Existence of specific statutory remedy provided by *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* precludes cause of action for tort of bad faith breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing on account of seller's wrongful refusal to make repairs or provide replacement under an express warranty. *Gomez v. Volkswagen of America, Inc. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 921, 925-929, 215 Cal. Rptr. 507*

[2] Express Warranty

[a] Labels

Failure of goods to conform to label was breach of express warranty. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1532, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Food & Agric. Code § 52252(e) was construed to conform to Federal Seed Act and related regulations; thus, apparent 5-percent tolerance in California provision was overridden; labels "0.00 other crop; 0.00 weed" on perennial ryegrass seed shipments containing 1 percent and 4.25 percent, respectively, of annual or Italian ryegrass, were in violation of California and federal law. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1527-1532, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

[b] Particular Promise

Section 5(b) of Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969 (*15 U.S.C. § 1334(b)*) does not preempt state law damage claims against cigarette manufacturers and sellers for breach of express warranty, even if warranties were made in advertising. *Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 504, 526-527, 112 S. Ct. 2608, 120 L. Ed. 2d 407, 428-429, 432, 440*

Evidence did not show that manufacturer of motors used to propel satellites from space shuttle breached its express warranty under *Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)* to supply motors that were free from defects in labor, material, or manufacture.

McDonnell-Douglas Corp. v. Thiokol Corp. (9th Cir. 1997) 124 F.3d 1173, 1176-1178

Statements in brochure advertising rental bikes and stating that particular trail was safe cycling area amounted to express warranty that bikes were safe and became part of bargain. *Pau v. Yosemite Park and Curry Co. (9th Cir. 1991) 928 F.2d 880, 887*

Defendant manufacturer's and seller's representation on shipping carton and instruction book cover for its golfer training device which plaintiff read and relied on constituted express warranty of safety of product resulted in liability for injuries resulting from breach thereof after defendant failed to present any evidence which could remove those assurances of safety from basis of bargain. *Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 117, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377*

Sales brochure disseminated to public and buyer stating that drill rig would drill to certain depth under particular circumstances was express warranty as to rig's capacity. *Fundin v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 951, 957, 199 Cal. Rptr. 789*

Promise of time of delivery was not warranty and therefore delay in delivery was not breach of warranty. *A.A. Baxter Corp. v. Colt Indus., Inc. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 144, 153, 88 Cal. Rptr. 842*

Representation through advertisements, labels, and pamphlets that product is appropriate for purchaser's skin, but which cautions that some skin may be sensitive to and react against application thereof and advises patch test before full application, which instruction plaintiff purchaser has followed, was not express warranty that product is good for all skin, even though plaintiff performed patch test before application. *Harris v. Belton (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 595, 605-606, 65 Cal. Rptr. 808* (evidence also introduced in action of prior skin irritation and that plaintiff had treated herself with other products when irritation developed after use of seller's product, even though instructions cautioned against mixing)

[c] Limitation, Modification, and Disclaimer

Disclaimer of warranties by financing lessor was not per se unconscionable, but was to be tested under *Com. Code § 2316*; when financing lessor validly disclaimed all warranties and goods conformed to lease, lessee could not revoke acceptance as to lessor, but could look to manufacturer or supplier for its remedy. *U.S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1450-1453, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Commercial entities were entitled to contract to limit liability of one to the other, or otherwise allocate risk of doing business; requirements of agreements excluding liability for one's negligence. *Philippine Airlines, Inc. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 234, 237-238, 234 Cal. Rptr. 423* (citing *Com. Code §§ 2316(2), (4), 2719*)

When product was expressly described by manufacturer as having certain detailed capacities under certain conditions, language in brochure disclaiming warranty of product's suitability for any particular purpose did not negate express warranty. *Fundin v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 951, 958, 199 Cal. Rptr. 789*

[d] Privity

When consumer relied on representations made by manufacturer in labels or advertising material, recovery was allowed on theory of express warranty without showing of privity. *Fundin v. Chicago Pneumatic Tool Co. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 951, 957, 199 Cal. Rptr. 789*

[e] Single Cause of Action

Breach of express warranty did not give rise to two separate causes of action when both injury to person and to property resulted; warranty is essentially contractual in character, created by parties' agreement rather than operation of law, and subject to negotiation and modification at time of agreement; thus, all damages for single breach must be recovered in one action. *Holmes v. David H. Bricker, Inc. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 786, 789-790, 76 Cal. Rptr. 431, 452 P.2d 647*

[3] Implied Warranty

[a] Fitness for Particular Purpose

Class action cannot be predicated on breach of implied warranty for particular purpose because breach consists of elements that could be established only by testimony as to each purchaser's intended purpose and reliance, and defendant seller's awareness of these elements, testimony which could be expected to vary greatly with no common method of proof available to large group of purchasers. *Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 341-342, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599*

[b] Merchantability

In action for breach of implied warranty of merchantability under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act against automobile manufacturer, trial court properly instructed jury by defining fitness-for-ordinary-purpose requirement in terms of vehicle that is "in safe condition and substantially free of defects"; defendant requested instruction that vehicle was unfit only if it did not provide transportation, but that would have been unjustified dilution of implied warranty of merchantability: merely because vehicle provides transportation from point A to point B, it does not necessarily conform to fitness-for-ordinary-purpose requirement of implied warranty of merchantability. *Isip v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 19, 27, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 695* ("[a] vehicle that smells, lurches, clanks, and emits smoke over an extended period of time is not fit for its intended purpose")

Golfer training device, by being conducive to, and actually resulting in, injury to plaintiff, breaches implied warranty of merchantability in two respects: (1) failing to conform to promise or affirmation of fact made on container, which promised completely safe mechanism; and (2) failing to be fit for ordinary purposes for which goods are used. *Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 117-118, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377*

Although different rule may apply when express warranty is breached, under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act there is no requirement that seller be given opportunity to repair when implied warranty of merchantability is breached. *Mocek v. Alfa Leisure, Inc. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 402, 406-408, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546*

[c] Privity

In owners association's construction defect action against developer, trial court erred in concluding that association did not have requisite privity of contract to state cause of action for breach of implied warranty; Civ. Code § 383 provided requisite privity. *Windham at Carmel Mountain Ranch Association v. Superior Court (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1162, 1166, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834*

[4] Jury Instructions

When manufacturer admits existence of warranties, even slight evidence of their breach entitles plaintiff to jury instruction covering warranty. *Bernal v. Richard Wolf Medical Instruments Corp. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1326,*

1337-1338, 272 Cal. Rptr. 41

[5] Notice to Seller

Question of what constitutes reasonable time under *Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)* for giving of notice is usually question of fact for jury. *Los Angeles Nut House v. Holiday Hardware Corp. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1351, 1354* ; *but see Davidson v. Herring-Hall-Marvin Safe Co. (1954) 131 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 874, 280 P.2d 549* (question of law)

Required proof of notice by buyer to seller of breach of warranty within reasonable time, under *Com. Code § 2607*, is not sufficient to defeat class action under claim that timely notice must be separately litigated by each plaintiff when: (1) a number of dissatisfied customers have sued within reasonable time, which might satisfy notice requirement particularly when seller knew or should have discovered failure of merchandise to conform to express warranties; (2) issues otherwise which may be jointly tried, when compared with those requiring separate adjudication, are so numerous or substantial that class action would be advantageous to judicial process and litigants involved; and (3) individual damages sought would make separate recoveries economically infeasible. *Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 339-341, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599* (suggesting that element of timely notice by each plaintiff could be considered after liability is established in order to assess individual's own collectible damages)

[6] Rescission; Revocation of Acceptance

Under both Commercial Code and Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, reasonable continued use of motorized vehicle that does not conform to express warranty did not, as matter of law, prevent buyer from asserting rescission or revocation of acceptance. *Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 897-898, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64*

[7] Restrictions on Disclaimers

Total disclaimer of all warranties and requirement that buyer purchase insurance to cover all losses and hold seller and all seller's contractors and subcontractors harmless was reasonable allocation of risk between large sophisticated commercial entities in specially manufactured, specialized high technology, high-risk product. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 27, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Fact that manufacturer is better able than buyer to detect defects was not relevant in evaluating claimed unconscionability of warranty disclaimer and hold-harmless clauses when item was not mass produced but was specialized high technology, high-risk product and contract was not preprinted but was negotiated by parties. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 25-26, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Purchaser that drafted one of two exculpatory clauses in contract and had dealt with similar provisions in previous contracts between parties was unable to claim surprise at scope of provisions claimed to be unconscionable. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 24-25, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Between large sophisticated companies no procedural element of unconscionability was established with respect to warranty disclaimer and hold-harmless provisions by alleged total monopoly on manufacture of upper-stage rockets used to launch communications satellites when French company, with which purchaser had originally contracted, provided alternative launch capability. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 23, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

When warranty disclaimer and hold-harmless provisions are clear and unambiguous in precluding suit by purchaser against manufacturer's subcontractors, intent of drafters of related service contract between different parties and

covering different subject matter is not relevant. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Unconscionable disclaimer of warranty was unenforceable despite technical compliance with requirements of *Com. Code § 2316* because policing provisions of *Com. Code § 2316* are limited to problems involving visibility of disclaimers and conflicts with express warranties; oppression and unfair surprise are principal targets of unconscionability doctrine, resulting from other types of questionable commercial practices. *A & M Produce Co v. FMC Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 473, 484, 186 Cal. Rptr. 114*

[8] Strict Liability

Strict liability is not applicable to defective product in commercial setting when only business loss is involved; thus, disclaimer of strict liability in commercial transaction was effective. *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 33, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716*

[9] Waiver of Warranty

Waiver of warranty must be pleaded to make it available as defense. *Southern Pac. Co. v. Unarco Industries, Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 142, 151, 116 Cal. Rptr. 847*

Warranty is not waived by mere acceptance of defective goods with knowledge of their defects; buyer's participation in seller's program of replacement and upgrading of product components did not cut off buyer's right of action for breach of express warranty as matter of law. *Southern Pac. Co. v. Unarco Industries, Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 142, 150-151, 116 Cal. Rptr. 847*

[10] Warranty of Title

Seller is liable for buyer's attorney's fees in action for breach of warranty of title involving gun which, unknown to seller and buyer, had been stolen at time of sale, when parties could reasonably foresee that possession of gun could result in plaintiff buyer's arrest and resulting need to engage attorney. *De La Hoya v. Slim's Gun Shop (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 6, 146 Cal. Rptr. 68*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.85

§ 502.85 Law Reviews

Note, *Can Warrantors Make an End Run? The Magnuson-Moss Act and Mandatory Arbitration*, 34 Vol. *3 Ga. L. Rev. 1483 (2000)*

P. A. Alces, *Whither Warranty: The Bloom of Products Liability Theory in Cases of Deficient Software Design*, 87 Vol. *1 Cal. L. Rev. 269 (1999)*

Note, *"Much Ado Leads to Nothing: That Basis of the Bargain" in Section 2-313 of the Uniform Commercial Code Should Be Eliminated Is Still Lost on Drafters*, 24 Vol. *2 J. Corp. L. 453 (1999)*

J. C. Selman, C. S. Chen, *Steering the Titanic Clear of the Iceberg: Saving the Sale of Software from the Perils of Warranties, 31 U.S.F. L. Rev. 531 (1997)*

Donald W. Grantel, *Determining Whether a Nonconformity Substantially Impairs the Value of Goods, 26 U.CC. L. J. 129 (1993)*

Marc M. Schneier, *The Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act: Federalizng Homeowner Construction Defect Cases*, 13-Oct. Construction Law 1 (1993)

Alex Devience, Jr., *Magnuson-Moss Act: Substitute for UCC Warranty Protections? 95 Com. L. J. 323 (1990)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.86

§ 502.86 Text Reference

Witkin, Summary of California Law vol. 3, *Sales*, §§ 51-113, 198-205, 327 (10th ed. 2005)

52 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.87-502.99

[Reserved]

§§ 502.87[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.100

§ 502.100 Notice of Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)]

[1] FORM Notice of Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)]

TO: _____ [*seller at business address*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that you have breached the _____ [express *or* implied *if applicable*] warranty _____ [of _____ (*describe type, e.g.*, title *or* that _____ (*describe, e.g.*, the material is defect-free) *or* against infringement] _____ [made *or* arising] in connection with your sale to _____ [*name and other identifying data of buyer, such as address*] on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*] of goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*].

[Please contact the undersigned at your earliest convenience with regard to resolution of this matter.]

[Sincerely yours,]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*name of buyer*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The notice in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer to notify a seller of a claim for breach of warranty. Notice must be given

by a buyer who, after acceptance of goods, discovers that a particular warranty arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code has been breached by the seller and seeks a remedy for the breach [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*]. Notice of breach of warranty is required in order to prevent stale claims [*see Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 339, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599* (allowing class action on express warranty to proceed despite need to establish notice of breach in each individual plaintiff's instance)].

[3] Requirement of Notification of Breach of Warranty

A buyer who has accepted a tender of goods must, within a reasonable time after he or she discovers or should have discovered any breach, including breach of warranty, notify the seller of the breach or else be barred from any remedy for the breach [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*]. This type of notice should be given with respect to any breach of warranty arising under the provisions of Division 2 of the Commercial Code, the general law of sales. Better practice suggests that the notice be written and given separately and in addition to any other form of notification required, even when the discovery and need for notification arise concurrently.

The buyer has the burden of proving reasonable notice. The question whether notice was properly given must be determined from the particular circumstances, and when but one inference can be drawn from undisputed facts, the issue may be determined as a matter of law [*Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics Corp. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 116, 135-136, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 5]* .

When a buyer is suing for a breach of an implied warranty under the Song-Beverly Act, which incorporates the "remedies" under those portions of the Commercial Code which include *Com. Code § 2607*, it would appear that this notice should also be served before the commencement of the action [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.101

§ 502.101 Notice to Warrantor Affording Opportunity to Cure Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)]

[1] FORM Notice to Warrantor Affording Opportunity to Cure Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)]

TO: _____ [*name of warrantor at business address*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that the undersigned, a [transferee of a] purchaser of your _____ [*describe consumer product*], which carried your written warranty, is hereby affording you a reasonable opportunity to cure your failure to comply with the provisions of [the Magnuson-Moss Act with respect to] the warranty. The product fails to _____ [_____ (be free of defect *or* meet the specified level of performance over the specified period of time) as _____ (affirmed *or* promised) with regard to the material or workmanship therein *or* meet the specifications set forth in the undertaking] and you have failed to take any remedial action with regard thereto although requested to do so by the undersigned. [This matter has been sufficiently brought to your attention for correction heretofore, and] [T]he undersigned intends to file an action against you on or about _____ [*date*], unless you take curative action prior thereto. This notification is provided in lieu of any informal dispute settlement mechanism, which has not been incorporated into the above-mentioned warranty.

[Very truly yours,]

_____ [*signature*]

[Attorney for] _____ [*name of consumer*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The notice in [1], *above*, is for use by a consumer purchaser, or transferee, who contemplates bringing an action under

the Magnuson-Moss Act against a warrantor of a defective product when the warranty does not provide for resort to an informal dispute settlement mechanism as a necessary prelude to instituting the action [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1), (e)*; *§ 502.68[2]* and *[3]*].

[3] Notice Requirements Under Magnuson-Moss Act

A consumer (including a transferee [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*]) who is damaged by the failure of a supplier, warrantor, or service contractor to comply with any obligation under the Magnuson-Moss Act or under a written warranty, implied warranty, or service contract may bring suit for damages and other legal and equitable relief. However, the damaged party must first resort to any informal dispute settlement mechanism incorporated into the warranty and set up by the manufacturer (alone or with others) according to requirements of the FTC [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(a), (d)(1)*; *16 C.F.R. § 703.1 et seq.*]. In the absence of an informal dispute resolution mechanism, the consumer must afford the person obligated under the warranty or service contract a reasonable opportunity to cure the failure to comply with any obligation under the written or implied warranty or service contract before bringing suit [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)*; as to class actions, *see § 502.181* (form of allegations)]. Because this latter requirement does not expressly apply to a failure to comply with an obligation of the act (as opposed to a warranty or service contract obligation), it is conceivable that an action may be brought for damages for the failure without giving prior notice.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.102

§ 502.102 Notice to Seller That Buyer Has Been Sued for Breach of Warranty for Which Seller Is Answerable Over [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

[1] FORM Notice to Seller That Buyer Has Been Sued for Breach of Warranty for Which Seller Is Answerable Over [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

TO: _____ [*seller at business address*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that _____ [*name and other identifying data of buyer, such as address*] has been sued in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, filed on or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*name of court*] at _____ [*specify locale*], for the breach of a warranty _____ [made *or* arising] in connection with the sale of goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*], originally purchased from you by _____ [*buyer*] on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*] for which you are answerable over [by virtue of a[n] _____ (express *or* implied) warranty _____ (of _____ (*describe type*) *or* that _____ (*describe substance*) *or* against infringement)]. You may enter that suit after seasonable receipt of this notice and defend therein; and if you do not do so, you shall be bound in any action _____ [*name of buyer*] brings against you by any determination of fact common to the two litigations.

[Very truly yours,]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*name of buyer*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The notice in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer who has been sued by a customer for breach of warranty with respect to goods sold to the buyer by a third-party seller, and for which breach that seller is answerable over to the buyer when the buyer's rights are protected through this notification [*see Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*].

[3] Notification to Seller of Suit Against Buyer

A buyer who has been sued for a breach of a warranty for which the seller is answerable may gain important rights against the seller by giving the seller written notice of the litigation in accordance with *Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*. Under that section, if the notice states that the seller may defend and that if the seller does not do so, the seller will be bound in any action by the buyer against the seller by any determination of fact common to the two lawsuits, then unless the seller after seasonable receipt of the notice does defend, the seller is so bound [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*]. An ordinary demand for indemnity and that the seller come in and assume the defense is not sufficient to bind the seller. The notice must specifically state that unless the seller assumes the defense (of the action against the buyer) the seller will be bound by any determination of the facts common to the two litigations (the one against the buyer and the buyer's action over against the seller) [*Bendix-Westinghouse Automotive Air Brake Co. v. Swan Rubber Co. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 256, 260-262, 127 Cal. Rptr. 571]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.103

§ 502.103 Complaint by Buyer Against Seller After Buyer's Loss of Action Against It for Breach of Warranty (Remedy Over) for Which Seller Is Answerable [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

[1] FORM Complaint by Buyer Against Seller After Buyer's Loss of Action Against It for Breach of Warranty (Remedy Over) for Which Seller Is Answerable [Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR REMEDY OVER FOR
_____ [*names*],	)	BREACH OF WARRANTY
Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*].

[*OR*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ [California *or other*] [and qualified to transact business in California] with its principal business office located in _____ County, California [*or allege*

other capacity and residence of defendant(s)].

[*OR*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a partnership with its principal business office located in _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant(s)*]. [Defendants _____ (*names*) are, and at all times herein mentioned were, members of the partnership (and are, and at all times mentioned herein were, residents of _____ County, California).]

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

3-4. [*Allegations of sale and of warranty created by that sale. For allegations of sale and warranty imposed by law, see § 502.260[1] or 502.283[1], Paragraphs 3 and 4 and § 502.261[1] or § 502.262[1]; for allegations of express warranty and sale, see § 502.140[1], Paragraphs 3 and 4 and § 502.1411[1] or § 502.142[1]; for allegations of sale and implied warranty, see § 502.200[1], § 502.220[1], § 502.240[1], Paragraphs 3 and 4 and § 502.104[1] or § 502.201[1]* .]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff resold these goods[, as contemplated in the contract of sale with defendant,] to _____ [*name of third party*]. Thereafter, and on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of third party*] notified plaintiff of a breach warranty, in that _____ [*describe complaint, e.g.,* the goods were not of merchantable quality *or other direct expression or indication of breach of warranty*]. Plaintiff thereon, and on or about _____ [*date*], notified defendant of this breach of warranty by _____ [writing, in the form of a _____ (letter *or* telegram *or other*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference *or* personal visit and communication *or* telephone call *or other*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], that _____ [*name of third party*] sued plaintiff for the breach of warranty in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, in _____ [*name of court*] at _____ [*locale*]. [*If claim of infringement involved, and separate notice of suit was deemed necessary or given at earlier time* (*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*)]: On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff gave defendant notice of that litigation by _____ (writing, in the form of a _____ (letter *or* telegram *or other*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference *or* personal visit and communication *or* telephone call *or other*).] On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff sent defendant a [further] notice of that litigation and a request to come in and defend, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference, containing a warning that defendant would otherwise be bound by any common questions determined; but defendant failed and refused to enter that litigation.

7. By the decision and judgment in that action, that breach of warranty was established and plaintiff was held liable therefor in total damages in the amount of $_____. [A certified copy of the judgment is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.] All facts that were determined and which established breach and liability in that case were in common with the transaction in which defendant sold that goods to plaintiff and made a warranty regarding the goods: _____ [*specify which facts are common to the two litigations*]; so that defendant herein is bound thereby and as a result thereof is liable over to plaintiff for damages in the amount of

$_____.

8. Plaintiff has been further damaged as a result of defendant's breach in that plaintiff had to retain the legal services of _____ [*name of attorney*] to defend plaintiff in that action, resulting in reasonable legal fees in the amount of $_____. _____ [*Specify any other incidental or consequential damages*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.*, attorney's fees] the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer who is suing a seller for remedy over after the buyer has been sued by a customer and found liable for breach of warranty concerning goods the buyer procured from the seller [*see Com. Code § 2607(5)(A)*]. In the unlikely event this form is used in connection with a consumer transaction that is subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA; *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicles Sales and Finance Act (Rees-Levering Act; *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), the plaintiff must, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, file the affidavit of proper venue [*see § 502.160[7]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The residence and capacity of the defendant (Paragraph 1).

- Fictitious names of defendants, if any (Paragraph 2).

- The applicable sale and warranty involved in the original sale of the goods from defendant to plaintiff (Paragraphs 3, 4).

- Plaintiff's resale of the goods, discovery of the breach through the customer therein, and separate notice of breach to defendant (Paragraph 5) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].

- Suit against plaintiff by the customer, and notice given by plaintiff to defendant (of any claim for infringement, and, separately [*see § 502.280[3]*) of that suit and request for defendant to come in and defend or be bound thereby (Paragraph 6) [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B), (5)(A)*].

- Establishment of plaintiff's liability in that suit by facts common to present suit, proximately resulting in damages in the amount of that liability (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code §§ 2607(5)(A), 2714(2)*].

- Consequential damages consisting of attorney's fees for defending the suit by the customer, and other incidental or consequential damages (Paragraph 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715*; *see § 502.283[4]*].

[4] Claims Payable in Foreign Currency

If the claim is payable in a foreign currency, or payment requires conversion to or from a foreign currency, additional allegations should be added setting forth that fact. Otherwise, the claim is made in United States dollars [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676.6(a)*]. For discussion of and a form for judgment applicable to the Uniform Foreign-Money Claims Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676 et seq.*], *see* Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Attorney's Fees

In an action on a contract, when the contract specifically provides that attorney's fees and costs incurred to enforce the contract will be awarded to one of the parties, reasonable attorney's fees may be recovered by the prevailing party, but as an element of the costs of suit, not as damages [*Civ. Code § 1717*]. However, the court must award costs and attorney's fees to a prevailing plaintiff in litigation governed by to *Civ. Code § 1780* (consumer suffering damage from any practice deemed unlawful under *Civ. Code § 1770*) [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*]. Reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded to a prevailing defendant on a finding by the court that the plaintiff's prosecution of the action was not in good faith [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*]. In addition, the seller may be liable for attorney's fees as a natural and usual consequence of breach of warranty of title [*see De La Hoya v. Slim's Gun Shop (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 6, 146 Cal. Rptr. 68* (sale of stolen gun in which parties should have reasonably foreseen buyer's arrest and resulting need to engage attorney); *see*

also § 502.283[4]]. For discussion and forms relating to recovery of attorney's fees, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq. For discussion of attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717.5* in certain contract actions based on a book account as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 337a*, see Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts* .

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40 et seq. and 177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.104

§ 502.104 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Warranty--Damages for Personal Injuries and Property Damage [Com. Code § 2714(3), 2715(2)(b)]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Warranty--Damages for Personal Injuries and Property Damage [Com. Code § 2714(3), 2715(2)(b)]

As a further natural and consequential result of defendant's breach of the warranty herein, plaintiff suffered injuries to person and property, in that _____ [*specify, e.g.*, when these goods exploded they caused grave trauma to the body of plaintiff for which injuries plaintiff was hospitalized for a considerable amount of time and required serious medical attention, in _____ (an amount to be determined by this court *or* the amount of $_____); and the explosion caused serious damage to plaintiff's business premises where the explosion occurred, doing injury to the walls, roof, floors, and equipment thereof in the amount of $_____].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, may be added to a complaint, specifically to the paragraph alleging incidental and consequential damages, or may form a new paragraph, in a complaint for any type of breach of warranty, express or implied, which may have naturally resulted in consequential personal injuries or property damage [*see Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715(2)(b)*]. The Magnuson-Moss Act does not affect liability of, or impose liability on, persons for personal injury, nor does it supersede state law regarding consequential damages for injury to person or other injury [*15 U.S.C. § 2311(b)(2)*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to strict liability for injuries caused by defective products and design, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.105-502.119

[Reserved]

§§ 502.105[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.120

§ 502.120 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Under the Commercial Code Based on Agreement to Limit Remedies for Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(4)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Under the Commercial Code Based on Agreement to Limit Remedies for Breach of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(4)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

The contract of sale between plaintiff and defendant limits the remedies that may be obtained by plaintiff for any alleged breach of warranty, in that plaintiff thereunder is entitled to seek only _____ [*describe, e.g.,* liquidated damages in the amount of $_____, which amount is reasonable in the light of the anticipated and alleged actual harm caused by the alleged breach, the difficulties of proof of loss, and the inconvenience or nonfeasibility of otherwise obtaining an adequate remedy *or* the return of the goods and repayment of the price *or* the repayment and replacement of nonconforming goods or parts].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in defending against a claim of breach of warranty of any kind by virtue of an agreement between the parties limiting the available remedies in event of a breach [*see Com. Code § 2316(4)*; *see also Com. Code § 2718(1)* (liquidated damages in contracts for sale of goods); *Com. Code § 2719* (contractual modification or limitation of remedies in sale of goods)].

For additional discussion of affirmative defenses and answers in general, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, may not be used in an action for breach of the implied warranties of merchantability or fitness under the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act because any waiver of remedy of that act by the

buyer is unenforceable and void [*see Civ. Code § 1790.1*; *see also Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1794*]. Under the federal Magnuson-Moss Act any warranty that is not designated a full warranty must be designated a limited warranty [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2303(a)*]. If the warranty is a full one and thereby meets the federal minimum standards, it still may limit or exclude consequential damages for breach of written or implied warranty on the product if it does so conspicuously on the face of the warranty [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(a)(3)*]. A limited warranty is not otherwise defined under the federal legislation and presumably is allowed to limit remedies in any way not otherwise in conflict with the provisions of the act.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.121

§ 502.121 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Claiming Defect in Consumer Good Was Caused by Unauthorized or Unreasonable use After Sale [Civ. Code § 1794.3]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Claiming Defect in Consumer Good Was Caused by Unauthorized or Unreasonable use After Sale [Civ. Code § 1794.3]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Any defect or noncomformity of which the plaintiff complains in this matter was proximately caused by the unauthorized or unreasonable use of the goods by the plaintiff following sale and delivery of those goods by defendant to plaintiff.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, may be used in any action for breach of an express or implied warranty arising under the Song-Beverly Act when the defect or nonconformity complained of was proximately caused by the unauthorized or unreasonable use of the product [*see Civ. Code § 1794.3*, § 502.53[4]].

[3] Applicability of Defense to Federal Actions

Under the Magnuson-Moss Act, a warrantor offering a full warranty must comply with certain federal minimum standards. However, a warrantor is excused from performance of any duties required by these standards if the warrantor shows that the defect, malfunction, or failure of the consumer product to conform with a written warranty was caused by damage (not resulting from a defect or malfunction) while in the possession of the consumer or by unreasonable use (including the failure to provide reasonable and necessary maintenance) [*15 U.S.C. § 2304(c)*; *see § 502.62[5][e]*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Applicable to More Than One Type of Warranty

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.122-502.139

[Reserved]

§§ 502.122[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.140

§ 502.140 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Express Warranty Made by Promise or Affirmation of Fact [Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Express Warranty Made by Promise or Affirmation of Fact [Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF EXPRESS WAR-
_____ [*names*],	)	RANTY
Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff negotiated with defendant for the purchase of certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*]. In the course of the negotiations, defendant _____ [affirmed the fact *or* promised] _____ [orally *or* in writing] that _____ [*describe representation relating to the*

goods, e.g., they were the original of that type of product on the market and not a later imitation thereof]. That _____ [affirmation *or* promise] became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus constituted an express warranty. [A true copy of the writing is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

4. _____ [Thereon *or* Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ (the locale stated in Paragraph 3 of this complaint *or* _____ (*city*), California)] defendant sold the goods to plaintiff, and plaintiff bought the goods from defendant for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*]. [_____ (*Either* That contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference).]

5. However, defendant breached the express warranty in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* the goods were not manufactured by their original producer as _____ (affirmed or promised) but were made by another manufacturer who imitated the style of the original]. As a result of this breach plaintiff in fact did not receive goods as warranted by defendant.

6. Plaintiff discovered the breach of warranty on or about _____ [*date*]. Thereafter, and on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant of this breach by _____ [writing, in the form of a _____ (letter *or* telegram *or other*), a true copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and made a part of it *or* personal visit and communication *or* telephone call *or other*].

7. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by defendant, plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of $_____ [, the difference at the time and place plaintiff accepted the goods between their value then and that which they would have had if they had been as warranted].

[*OR*]

7. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by defendant, plaintiff has been damaged [in the amount of $_____] as a result of special circumstances in which _____ [*describe circumstances, e.g.,* plaintiff transferred a portion of the goods to third-party buyers, who received them in the belief that plaintiff was capable of conveying good title to the goods, and who were commercially embarrassed as a result]. [These damages are not all assessable at this time, but this complaint will be amended to state the damages when plaintiff becomes able to determine them.]

8. Plaintiff has been further damaged as a result of this breach in that _____ [*describe incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* plaintiff was required to transport the goods to _____ (the true owner *or* a new market) for the amount of $_____. Defendant also knew that plaintiff needed the goods as demonstration wares, and plaintiff was forced to arrange to procure replacement goods for these purposes through travel and negotiations, in the total amount of $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer in an action against a seller for breach of express warranty consisting of an affirmation of fact or a promise [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*; *§§ 502.11[2], 502.23, 502.28*].

[3] When Form May Be Used in Consumer Litigation

The complaint in [1], *above*, may be used in a suit by a consumer, but its use normally is limited to those situations not covered by special consumer warranty legislation. Thus, the form would be most appropriate when the warranty was made orally; or when a written warranty was not directed to maintenance or preservation of utility of performance of the product, or to its freedom from defect or specifications as to performance level, or to some form of recompense or replacement on failure of its warranted character [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(1)*; *15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*; *see also §§ 502.160, 502.180* (complaints under Song-Beverly Act and Magnuson-Moss Act, respectively)]. However, even if consumer warranty legislation might otherwise be applicable, certain requirements might not be present in the individual case, so that this form may still be used. If this form is used in connection with a consumer transaction that is subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA; *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicles Sales and Finance Act (Rees-Levering Act; *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), the plaintiff must, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, file the affidavit of proper venue discussed at *§ 502.160[7]*.

[4] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following in pertinent part:

- The seller's affirmation of fact or promise which became a part of the basis of the bargain (Paragraph 3) [*Com. Code § 2313(1)(a)*]. To be a basis of the bargain, a statement constituting an express warranty need be only one factor or consideration in inducing the buyer to enter bargain. A statement constituting an express warranty is presumptively part of the basis of a bargain, and the burden of proof is on the seller to show the bargain does not rest at all on that representation [*Keith v. Buchanan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 13, 23, 220 Cal. Rptr. 392* ; *see also* *Hauter v. Zogarts (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 104, 117, 120 Cal. Rptr. 681, 534 P.2d 377* (representation relied on by plaintiff consisting of assurance of safety was express warranty of safety because defendant could present no evidence removing it from basis of bargain)].

- The sale of goods to which the warranty refers (Paragraph 4) [*Com. Code § 2204*].

- The breach of the express warranty (Paragraph 5).

- Plaintiff's notification of the breach (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].

- Damages from the breach (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code § 2714(2)*].

- Incidental and consequential damages (Paragraph 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715*].

If the claim is payable in a foreign currency, or payment requires conversion to or from a foreign currency, additional allegations should be added setting forth that fact. Otherwise, the claim is made in United States dollars [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676.6(a)*]. For discussion of and a form for judgment applicable to the Uniform Foreign-Money Claims Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676 et seq.*], *see* Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.141

§ 502.141 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Description of Goods [Com. Code § 2313(1)(b)]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Description of Goods [Com. Code § 2313(1)(b)]

On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff negotiated with defendant for the purchase of certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*]. In the course of the negotiations, a particular description of the goods was made part of the basis of the bargain between the parties as a result of _____ [*explain how description was incorporated, e.g.,* plaintiff and defendant examining and reading a statement of the manufacturer available on the defendant's premises *or* a statement printed on the _____ (carton *or* container *or* label *or* package *or* brochure *or* instructions *or* technical specifications *or other*) that accompanied the goods *or* the defendant's verbal response to plaintiff's inquiry of what the goods consisted of *or other*] and, thus, constituted an express warranty. _____ [The description stated _____ (in effect *or* exactly) as follows: _____ *or* A true copy of the description is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the preceding form (*§ 502.140*) for use in an action against a seller for breach of express warranty consisting of a description of the goods [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(b)*; *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1532, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823* (failure of goods to conform to label is breach of express warranty); *see also § 502.23[2]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.142

§ 502.142 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Sample or Model [Com. Code § 2313(1)(c)]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Sample or Model [Com. Code § 2313(1)(c)]

On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff negotiated with defendant for the purchase of certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*]. In the course of the negotiations, a particular _____ [sample *or* model] of the goods was made part of the basis of the bargain between the parties as a result of _____ [*explain how the example was so incorporated, e.g.,* defendant's showing the sample to plaintiff as an example of exactly what plaintiff was purchasing *or* a model of the goods, advertised to be the exact product plaintiff was attempting to buy, being available on the premises, which plaintiff freely consulted *or other*], and thus constituted an express warranty that the whole of the goods plaintiff purchased would conform to the _____ [sample *or* model].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the form at *§ 502.140[1]* in an action against a seller for breach of express warranty consisting of a sample or model of the goods [*see Com. Code § 2313(1)(c), § 502.23[3]*].

[3] Use in Action Under Song-Beverly Act

The Song-Beverly Act defines one type of express warranty, consisting of a sample or model, in a manner virtually identical to that of the general sales law [*compare Com. Code § 2313(1)(c) with Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)(2)*]. Therefore, if the conditions for maintaining an action under the Song-Beverly Act do apply (including the facts that the goods were consumer goods and the breach was willful), plaintiff should include a cause of action under the Song-Beverly Act [*see* form at *§ 502.160*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.143-502.149

[Reserved]

§§ 502.143[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.150

§ 502.150 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Negation or Limitation of Express Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Express Warranty Based on Negation or Limitation of Express Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

At the time of sale, defendant expressly _____ [negated *or* limited] any express warranty on the goods sold to plaintiff in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* defendant explained that if plaintiff purchased the particular item involved in this case, the express warranty printed on the carton could not apply because a previous customer had returned the item after having used it, but that defendant would, and did, charge plaintiff a lesser price than for other items of the same kind *or* defendant stated that the express warranties which defendant was orally making would only apply for 90 days, after which time the product no longer could be so warranted *or* defendant took a large black marker and drew a large "X" through all visible express warranties that appeared on the carton and label of the goods sold to plaintiff. Defendant believed those were the only written warranties accompanying the goods and explained to plaintiff that the goods were a special shipment and the defendant could make no representations regarding them].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in defending against a claim of breach of express warranty when defendant negated or limited any express warranty by words or conduct [*see Com. Code § 2316(1), § 502.23[6]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
1. Commercial Code Actions

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.151-502.159

[Reserved]

§§ 502.151[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
2. Actions Under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.160

§ 502.160 Complaint by Retail Buyer for Damages (and Civil Penalty) for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act and Willful Breach of Express Warranty by Manufacturer (Or Person in That Position) Maintaining Local Service and Repair Facilities [Civ. Code § 1794; Com. Code §§ 2711-2715]

[1] FORM Complaint by Retail Buyer for Damages (and Civil Penalty) for Violation of Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act and Willful Breach of Express Warranty by Manufacturer (Or Person in That Position) Maintaining Local Service and Repair Facilities [Civ. Code § 1794; Com. Code §§ 2711-2715]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF SONG-BEVERLY CONSUMER WARRANTY ACT AND [WILLFUL] BREACH OF EXPRESS WARRANTY
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*], defendant manufactured

_____ [*specify type of consumer goods manufactured by defendant, e.g.,* refrigerators *or* motor vehicles]. Defendant manufactured these goods for purposes of their eventual sale to retail buyers. Defendant appended to the goods an express warranty _____ [undertaking to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the goods and/or provide compensation if there is a failure in utility or performance by means of a written statement designed to accompany the product, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference *or* that the whole of the goods would conform to the _____ (sample *or* model) that defendant provided to the retail seller for demonstration purposes].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, a _____ [*specify type of seller, e.g.,* retail merchant], _____ [*name of seller*], sold _____ [*specify quantity and type of goods, or, if product is a motor vehicle, specify make, model, year, and if available, serial number of vehicle, e.g.,* a side-by-side refrigerator-freezer] to plaintiff, at retail for _____ [*specify price or other consideration*]. [_____ (*Either* This contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.]

5. In connection with the sale, plaintiff received the express warranty of defendant manufacturer in that _____ [the defendant's written statement described above _____ (accompanied the product *or* was separately delivered to plaintiff) *or* plaintiff had occasion to examine the _____ (sample *or* model) used as a demonstrator at the seller's premises].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff discovered that the _____ [*specify goods, e.g.,* refrigerator-freezer] _____ [exhibited a failure in utility or performance *or* failed to conform to the _____ (sample *or* model)] in that _____ [*describe defective character, e.g.,* it entirely failed to operate when its electric cord was plugged into an outlet]. Plaintiff thereon attempted to act on defendant's express warranty, as subject to the requirements of the Song-Beverly Act, under which defendant was required to and did maintain local service and repair facilities.

7. However, defendant [willfully] violated the provisions of the act and breached the express warranty made in the sale to plaintiff in that _____ [*describe violation, e.g.,* because of the size and weight of the goods, plaintiff on or about _____ [*date*], gave written notification to defendant of the nonconformity of the _____ [*specify goods*], with full particulars for purposes of service, a true copy of which notification is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference, but defendant, although receiving that notification, failed to repair the _____ [*specify goods*] or arrange therefor in any way although plaintiff persisted in reminding defendant of its warranty obligations].

[*EITHER, if plaintiff rightfully rejected or justifiably revoked acceptance of the goods use Paragraphs 8 through 10, below*]

8. By letter dated _____, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference, plaintiff notified defendant manufacturer that plaintiff was exercising his/her right to rescind the contract on the basis of the nonconformity and of defendant manufacturer's failure to repair the _____ [*specify goods*] to conform to the express warranty, demanding that defendant manufacturer return to plaintiff the consideration paid by plaintiff under the contract [or replace the _____ (*specify goods*) with _____ (*specify goods*) that conform(s) to the express warranty].

9. Defendant manufacturer refused and failed, and continues to refuse and fail, to return to plaintiff the amount paid by plaintiff under the contract [and refused and failed, and continues to refuse and fail, to replace the

_____ (*specify goods*) with _____ (*specify goods*) that conform(s) to the express warranty].

10. As a proximate result of defendant manufacturer's failure to restore the consideration paid by plaintiff, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____.

[*OR, if plaintiff seeks damages for the difference in value and cost of repairs necessary to make the goods conform, use Paragraphs 8 through 10, below*]

8. At the time of the delivery to plaintiff, the _____ [*specify goods*] had a value of $_____. If the warranty of defendant manufacturer had been true, the _____ [*specify goods*] would have been of a value of $_____.

9. Plaintiff has expended the sum of $_____ to have the _____ [*specify goods*] repaired and serviced to conform to defendant manufacturer's express warranty.

10. As a proximate result of the failure of the _____ [*specify goods*] to conform to defendant manufacturer's express warranty and defendant manufacturer's failure to repair or service the _____ [*specify goods*] to conform to the warranty, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____.

[*CONTINUE, alleging incidental and consequential damages as applicable*]

11. As a further proximate result of defendant manufacturer's [willful] failure to comply with its obligations to plaintiff, plaintiff was damaged in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff was unable to use the _____ (*specify goods*) for a period of _____ months, and was forced to expend sums for (a) replacement _____ (*specify goods*) during that period]. The total amount of these additional damages is $_____.

12. As a further proximate result of defendant manufacturer's [willful] failure to comply with its obligations to plaintiff, plaintiff has been required to incur attorney's fees herein.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For actual damages in the sum of $_____;

[2. *If alleged violation was willful, add:* For a civil penalty of two times the amount of actual damages;]

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in the sum of $_____;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a retail buyer of consumer goods who has been injured by a violation of the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act and the breach of express warranty of the manufacturer [*see Civ. Code § 1794(a)-(d)*; *Com. Code §§ 2711-2715*; *see §§ 502.43* and *503.53*, and, in Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*, §§ 500.60 and 500.76].

[3] Failure to Supply Parts and Repair Literature

The duty to maintain service and repair facilities in California includes the duty to supply them with adequate replacement parts and service literature [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(a)*]. By making appropriate changes to Paragraphs 6 and 7, this complaint can be modified for use when repair and service facilities are maintained in California but not supplied with adequate replacement parts and service literature.

[4] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The manufacture of the goods by defendant and the making of an express warranty in connection therewith (Paragraph 3) [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*].

- The purchase of the goods by plaintiff at retail (Paragraph 4) [*Civ. Code § 1791(a), (b), (l)*; *see California State Electronics Assn. v. Zeos Int'l (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1276-1277, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (consumer goods are not "sold in this state" for purposes of Song-Beverly Consumer Warrant Act's local repair facilities requirement when goods are shipped from another state pursuant to mail order; title passes on shipment, pursuant to *Com. Code § 2401*)].

- The receipt of the warranty during the sale (Paragraph 5). The warranty may be in the form of a service contract [*see Reveles v. Toyota by the Bay (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1139, 1158, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543* , overruled on other grounds in *Snukal v. Flightways Manufacturing, Inc. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 754, 3 P.3d 286* (service contract sold for additional fee in conjunction with sale of used vehicle held to be "express warranty" under *Civ. Code § 1795.5* of Song Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)].

- Breach of the warranty through violation of the requirements of the Song-Beverly Act (Paragraphs 6, 7) [*Civ. Code § 1794(a)*].

- Two alternatives with regard to actual damages based whether or not the buyer retains the goods. If the plaintiff's rightfully rejected or justifiably revoked acceptance of the goods or otherwise rescinded the sale, use the first alternative Paragraphs 8-10 [*see Civ. Code § 1794(b)(1)*; *Com. Code §§ 2711-2713*; *Krotin v. Porsche Cars, North America, Inc. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 294, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10* (to establish breach of warranty obligations under Beverly-Song Consumer Warranty Act, buyer need not reject or revoke acceptance of vehicle at any time; buyer need only provide manufacturer with reasonable opportunity to fix vehicle)]. Note that under both the Commercial Code and the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act, reasonable continued use of a motor vehicle that does not conform to the express warranty does not, as matter of law, prevent the buyer from asserting rescission or revocation of acceptance [*Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 897-898, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . If plaintiff's

retains the goods, actual damages are based on the difference in value and costs to obtain conformance from some entity other than the manufacturer or its repair facility (second alternative Paragraphs 8-10) [*see Civ. Code § 1794(b)(2)*; *Com. Code §§ 2714-2715*].

- Entitlement to other damages or relief (Paragraph 11) [*Civ. Code § 1794(a), (b)*; *Com. Code §§ 2711(1), (3), 2712, 2714(2), (3), 2715*].

- Attorney's fees (Paragraph 12) [*Civ. Code § 1794(d)*], and if appropriate, that defendant's breach was willful, thus entitling plaintiff to the penalty under *Civ. Code § 1794(c)* (Paragraph 12).

[5] Remedies Under Song-Beverly Act

The buyer injured by a violation of the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act, or of an express or implied warranty or of a service contract, may bring an action for the recovery of actual damages, other legal and equitable relief, and reasonable attorney's fees [*Civ. Code § 1794(a), (b), (d)*]. Prejudgment interest [*see Civ. Code § 3287*] may be recovered in an appropriate case [*Doppes v. Bentley Motors, Inc. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1004, 1010-1011, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797* ; *see § 502.53[1][a]*]. If the violation was willful and the claim is not based solely on a breach of an implied warranty, the buyer may also recover a civil penalty of up to two times the amount of actual damages [*Civ. Code § 1794(c)*].

The four-year limitation period of *Com. Code § 2725* governs actions under the Song-Beverly Act. Under *Com. Code § 2725(2)*, when a warranty explicitly extends to future performance of the goods, the discovery rule applies to accrual of the cause of action and commencement of the limitation period [*see Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 215-219, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717 ; see also Carrau v. Marvin Lumber and Cedar Co. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 281, 290-292, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* (generalized assertions in advertisements and literature do not rise to the level of a warranty explicitly extending to "future performance"; plaintiff thus did not meet exception to four-year limitations period)]. For discussion of *Com. Code § 2725*, see *§ 502.28[6]*.

An express warranty as defined in the Song-Beverly Act may be made by a distributor or retail seller, as well a by a manufacturer [*Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*]. If the express warranty is made by anyone other than the manufacturer, that person becomes subject to the same obligations that are imposed on a manufacturer under the Song-Beverly Act [*Civ. Code § 1795*]. Thus, the foregoing form may be modified for use against a retailer or distributor by naming the retailer or distributor as the defendant, by modifying Paragraphs 3 and 4 to allege the retailer's or distributor's business and the manner in which the sale occurred, and by changing the term "defendant manufacturer" to "defendant" in the other paragraphs. However, the plaintiff may wish to join the retail seller otherwise by joining a separate cause of action against the seller for breach of express warranty under Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*see form in § 502.140*].

[6] Alternative Remedy Under Magnuson-Moss Act

The federal Magnuson-Moss Act also provides for enforcement of any written warranty by which a warrantor undertakes, in connection with the sale by a supplier of a consumer product, to refund, repair, replace, or take other remedial action as to the product if it fails to meet the specifications in the undertaking [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)(B)*; *see § 502.180*]. In this instance, a consumer plaintiff may include any transferee of a buyer during the warranty period who is not limited by the warranty [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*]. However, it must be shown that the undertaking was part of the basis of the bargain between the supplier and buyer for purposes other than resale [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*]. The plaintiff must first exhaust any available informal dispute settlement mechanism or, in its absence, give the defendant an opportunity to cure the defect [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3), (d)(1), (e)*]. The federal law makes available only actual damages and other legal and equitable relief, but does afford reasonable attorney's fees [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)*].

[7] Installment or Auto Sales Actions

[a] Filing of Affidavit or Declaration of Proper Venue Required

In any action subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA; *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicles Sales and Finance Act (Rees-Levering Act; *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), the plaintiff must, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, file an affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4*. In lieu of filing a separate affidavit or declaration, the plaintiff may allege these facts in a verified complaint, but not on information and belief [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*]. If an affidavit or declaration is filed with the complaint, a copy of the affidavit or declaration must be served with the summons [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[b] Consequences of Failure to File Affidavit or Declaration

If a plaintiff fails to file the affidavit or declaration or state facts showing proper venue in a verified complaint as required in *Civ. Code § 1810.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4*, no further proceedings may occur, and the court must, on its own motion or the motion of any party, dismiss the action without prejudice [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*]. The court, however, on terms that may be just, may permit the affidavit or declaration to be filed after the filing of the complaint. In this case, a copy of the affidavit or declaration must be served on the defendant, and the time to answer or otherwise plead begins at the time of that service [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

For further discussion of venue requirements for RISA, and a declaration of proper venue, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* . For further discussion of venue requirements for the Rees-Levering Act, and related forms, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* . For venue allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

[8] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
2. Actions Under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.161

§ 502.161 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act for Failure to Repair to Conform to Express Warranty [Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d), 1794]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act for Failure to Repair to Conform to Express Warranty [Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d), 1794]

[1. Plaintiff bought the vehicle in California primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. The vehicle is a new motor vehicle as that term is defined in *Civil Code Section 1793.22(e)(2)*.]

2. Plaintiff delivered the _____ [*specify goods, e.g.,* vehicle] to defendant manufacturer['s repair facility in this state] [and notified defendant manufacturer of the nonconformity in writing, with full particulars for the purposes of service, a true copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference]. Thereafter, _____ [defendant manufacturer *or* the defendant manufacturer's representative in this state] made a reasonable number of attempts [on account of the same nonconformity] to service or repair the _____ [*specify goods*] to conform to the express warranty. Those attempts were unsuccessful, in that the _____ [*specify goods*] still _____ [*describe continuing nonconformity, e.g.,* would not start, or, if it did start, emitted sparks from the starter mechanism, causing fires or threats of fire, approximately one out of every three times it did start]. The dates and duration of the attempts at service or repair are as follows: _____ [*list dates and length of service, e.g.:*

March 3-6, 1995	4 days
April 14-17, 1995	5 days
July 10-24, 1995	13 days
October 6-14, 1995	9 days]

[*EITHER, if product is other than a new motor vehicle*]

3. After the unsuccessful attempts at repair, plaintiff demanded that defendant manufacturer replace the _____ [*specify goods*] or reimburse plaintiff in an amount equal to the purchase price paid less an amount directly attributable to plaintiff's use of the goods prior to the time plaintiff discovered the nonconformity as required by *Civil Code Section 1793.2(d)(1)*. Defendant manufacturer has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to make replacement or reimbursement. As a result of defendant manufacturer's violation of *Civil Code Section 1793.2(d)(1)*, plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of $_____.

[*OR, if product is a new motor vehicle*]

3. After the unsuccessful attempts at repair, plaintiff demanded that defendant manufacturer _____ [replace the vehicle in accordance with *Civil Code Section 1793.2(d)(2)(A) or* make restitution to plaintiff in accordance with *Civil Code Section 1793.2(d)(2)(B)*]. Defendant manufacturer has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to make _____[replacement *or* restitution]. As a result of defendant manufacturer's violation of *Civil Code Section 1793.2(d)(2)*, plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of $_____.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for use in a buyer's action against a manufacturer when the manufacturer's breach of its obligations under the Song-Beverly Act consists of a failure to make replacement or reimbursement (restitution) after having failed for a reasonable number of attempts to conform the product to its express warranties [*see Civ. Code § 1793.2(b)-(d)*; for products other than new motor vehicles, see discussion at *§ 502.43[3]* and *[5]*; for discussion relating to new motor vehicles, *see* Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(2)* (defining new motor vehicle)].

The allegations in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraphs 7-10 of the form of complaint at *§ 502.160[1]*.

[3] Allegations

Paragraph 1 need only be used when the product is a new motor vehicle [*see Civ. Code § 1793.22(e)(2)* (defining new motor vehicle)]. The plaintiff should allege that the vehicle was bought in California, inasmuch as application of the Song-Beverly Act to new motor vehicles is limited to vehicles bought in California [*see Cummins, Inc. v. Superior Court (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 478, 483, 493, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 823, 115 P.3d 98* (Song-Beverly Act did not apply to new vehicle that California resident had bought in Idaho and that could not be repaired after repeated attempts at manufacturer's authorized repair facility in California)].

Paragraph 2 should be used in place of Paragraph 7 of the complaint in *§ 502.160[1]* and describes the reasonable attempts at repair [*see Silvio v. Ford Motor Company (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1205, 1207-1208, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 846* (because phrase "reasonable number of attempts" in *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)* is written in plural, statute does not require manufacturer to make restitution or replacement after only one opportunity to repair)]. For products other than new motor vehicles, there is no definition of or presumption relating to reasonable attempts at repair, although *Civ. Code § 1793.2(b)* (discussed in *§ 502.43[3]*) provides that repair must be made within 30 days. For new motor vehicles, there is a presumption regarding when reasonable attempts have been made [*see Civ. Code § 1793.22(b)*], but, if the manufacturer has made timely notification to the buyer that it maintains a qualified third-party dispute resolution process as defined in *Civ. Code § 1793.22(d)*, the buyer cannot assert the presumption until he or she has first resorted to the qualified third-party dispute resolution process [*Civ. Code § 1793.22(c)*]. For a discussion of the provisions relating to new vehicles, see Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs*. In the context of motor vehicles, it has been held that the manufacturer at its representative are entitled to separate attempts to repair; the repair attempts of the manufacturer's agent (retail dealer) are attributed to manufacturer; and the attempts of both must be

considered in establishing reasonableness [*Ibrahim v. Ford Motor Co. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 878, 890, 263 Cal. Rptr. 64]* .

Alternative Paragraphs 3 are for use in place of Paragraphs 8-10 of the form of complaint in *§ 502.160[1]*. In the case of products other than new motor vehicles, the election of whether to replace or to reimburse is the manufacturer's [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(1)*], whereas in the case of new motor vehicles, the election is the buyer's [*Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)*].

Additional incidental and consequential damages in both situations should be alleged as set forth in Paragraph 11 of the form of complaint at § 502.160[1]. In the case of products other than new motor vehicles, those damages are governed by *Civ. Code § 1794(b)* and *Com. Code §§ 2711-2715* (discussed at *§ 502.53[1]*, and in *Ch. 500, Sales: Sales under the Commerical Code, § 500.70* et seq.). In the case of new motor vehicles, those damages are specified in *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)(A)-(C)* (discussed in Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs*) and include repair, towing, and rental costs. *Civ. Code § 1793.2(d)(2)(C)* contains a formula for determining the value of the use of the vehicle by the buyer prior to discovery of the nonconformity.

[4] Cross Reference

For discussion of special rules, presumptions, and penalties applicable to express warranties regarding new motor vehicles and to the manufacturer's inability to service or repair them to conform to the express warranties after a reasonable number of attempts (*Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(d)(2), 1793.22, 1794(e)*), see Ch. 91, *Automobiles: Actions Involving Defects and Repairs* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
2. Actions Under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.162

§ 502.162 Complaint by Retail Seller or Independent Service and Repair Facility Acting on Manufacturer's Express Warranty for Treble Damages for Manufacturer's Failure to Provide Repair Facilities [Civ. Code §§ 1793.3, 1793.5, 1793.6, 1794.1]

[1] FORM Complaint by Retail Seller or Independent Service and Repair Facility Acting on Manufacturer's Express Warranty for Treble Damages for Manufacturer's Failure to Provide Repair Facilities [Civ. Code §§ 1793.3, 1793.5, 1793.6, 1794.1]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR TREBLE DAMAGES
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act: by
	)	_____ [Retailer *or* Service Facility]
	)	Against Manufacturer)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
		[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Defendant's manufacture of product and attachment of express warranty. See § 502.160[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, _____ [plaintiff, a _____ (*specify type of seller*), _____ (*name*)] sold _____ [*quantity*] of _____ [*describe goods*] to a consumer, _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as the "consumer," and the consumer bought those goods from plaintiff for the amount of $_____ [*or other consideration*].

5. In connection with that sale, the consumer received the express warranty of defendant manufacturer in that _____ [the written statement of the defendant described above _____ (accompanied the product *or* was separately delivered to the consumer) *or* the consumer had occasion to examine the above-described _____ (sample *or* model) of the goods at _____ (*if seller is plaintiff*, plaintiff's *or otherwise*, the seller's) premises].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], the consumer discovered that those goods _____ [exhibited a failure in utility or performance *or* failed to conform to the _____ (sample *or* model)] in that [*describe defective character, e.g.,* it had a nonfunctioning engine]. The consumer, on understanding the defendant improperly did not maintain [sufficient and reasonably convenient official or designated] service and repair facilities in this state, appropriately returned the nonconforming consumer goods to _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*name of seller*)] as _____ [the retail seller *or* a retail seller of like goods of the same manufacturer within this state. _____ [Plaintiff *or* The seller] then _____ [*if plaintiff is original or other seller to whom goods were returned:* _____ (serviced or repaired the nonconforming goods to conform to the applicable warranty *or* replaced the nonconforming goods with goods that were identical or reasonably equivalent to the warranted goods *or* refunded to the consumer the original purchase price less that amount directly attributable to use by the buyer prior to the discovery of nonconformity) *or, if plaintiff is servicer:* _____ (directed the consumer to plaintiff as a reasonably close independent repair or service facility willing to accept service or repair *or* did not furnish the consumer with appropriate relief, so that the consumer secured the services of plaintiff as an independent repair or service facility for the service or repair of the nonconforming consumer goods, since the wholesale price to the retailer of those goods was not less than $50, and plaintiff determined that service or repair of the goods could be economically accomplished]; and plaintiff did so _____ (service *or* repair) the goods and took an assignment of the consumer's rights against the manufacturer for that _____ (service *or* repair), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference].

7. Defendant has violated the provisions of the Song-Beverly Act, namely *Section 1793.2 of the Civil Code*, in manufacturing consumer goods sold in this state for which defendant has made an express warranty while failing and refusing to maintain sufficient service and repair facilities [reasonably close to all areas where its consumer goods are sold] to carry out the terms of those warranties or to designate and authorize in this state as service and repair facilities independent repair or service facilities [so situated]. Plaintiff is entitled to treble damages for defendant's violation in this matter because defendant's violation has been _____

[*EITHER*]

willful, in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* defendant expressly has refused to make any arrangements for repair or services here although plaintiff and retail sellers and service repair facilities in the lines of business carrying or servicing defendant's products have made themselves available to help defendant set up a repair and service system, but defendant has refused to establish a repair and service system or to take advantage of the offers of plaintiff and others although they have demonstrated that defendant's products would have a frequent repair needs experience that would be difficult to accommodate without defendant's cooperation].

[*OR*]

repeated, in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff has had to handle numerous adjustments of the kind involving the consumer in this matter and to have to settle with or sue defendant in order to obtain compensation, but defendant still has not set up a satisfactory service and repair system in this state].

[*EITHER, if plaintiff is original or other seller*]

8. As a result of defendant's acts in this instance, plaintiff has been damaged in fulfilling the requirements and purposes of the Song-Beverly Act and accommodating the needs of the consumer in this matter _____ [*if replacement:* in an amount equal to the actual cost to plaintiff of the replaced goods of $_____, (and cost of transporting the goods of $_____,) plus a reasonable handling charge of $_____ *or, if service or repair:* in an amount equal to that which would be received by plaintiff for like service rendered to retail consumers who are not entitled to warranty protection, including actual and reasonable costs of the service and repair, of $_____, (and the cost of transporting the goods of $_____,) plus a reasonable profit of $_____ *or, if reimbursement, and if plaintiff is original seller* (*other sellers may not be restricted to the following* [*see Civ. Code § 1793.3(a), 1793.5(c)*]): in an amount equal to that reimbursed to the buyer of $_____, plus a reasonable handling charge of $_____].

[*OR, if plaintiff is independent servicer and repairer*]

8. As a result of defendant's acts in this instance, plaintiff has been damaged in fulfilling the requirements and purposes of such legislation and accommodating the needs of the consumer in this matter in an amount equal to the actual and reasonable costs of the service and repair, including any cost for parts, of $_____, [and reasonable costs of transporting the goods and parts of $_____,] plus a reasonable profit of $_____.

9. Plaintiff has incurred reasonable attorney's fees herein in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For treble the amount of actual damages herein, or $_____;

2. For reasonable attorney's fees in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a retail seller or independent service facility that has provided services to a buyer of retail goods as a result of the failure of the goods to conform with the terms of a manufacturer's express warranty when the manufacturer has willfully or repeatedly violated requirements of the Song-Beverly Act by failing to provide service and repair facilities in the state or to compensate the retail seller or independent service facility [*see Civ. Code § 1794.1*; *§ 502.53[3]* and at *[4], below*].

Because express warranties may be made by a person other than the manufacturer of the goods and the obligation of that person is the same as that imposed on the manufacturer under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1795*; *§ 502.42[4]*], the form in [1], *above*, may be used with appropriate modifications in an action against a person other than the manufacturer who made the warranty.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The defendant's identity as manufacturer and express warrantor of the goods (Paragraph 3).
- The purchase of the goods by the consumer (Paragraph 4).
- The extension of the express warranty to the purchaser (Paragraph 5).
- The consumer's discovery of the defect and return of the goods to the plaintiff, if a retailer, or to a retailer and then to the plaintiff if a service and repair business, and plaintiff's appropriate accommodation of the consumer to make good under the warranty (Paragraph 6) [*Civ. Code § 1793.3*; *see § 502.43[1], [6], [8]*].
- Defendant's willful or repeated violation of the Song-Beverly Act by failing to maintain or provide for adequate local service and repair facilities (Paragraph 7); detriment and damages of plaintiffs in various alternatives (Paragraph 8) [*Civ. Code § 1794.1*; *see Civ. Code §§ 1793.4, 1793.6*].
- Reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 9) [*Civ. Code § 1794.1*].

[4] Bases of Remedies for Retail Sellers or Service Facilities Against Manufacturer's Violation of Song-Beverly Act

A retail seller of consumer goods or an independent servicer of consumer goods who is injured by the willful or repeated violation of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act may bring an action for the recovery of three times the amount at which the actual damages are assessed plus reasonable attorney's fees [*Civ. Code § 1794.1*]. Every manufacturer of consumer goods sold in California and for which the manufacturer has made an express warranty must maintain or designate and authorize local facilities to service or repair goods under their accompanying express warranties. The retail seller must, and any other retail seller of like goods of the manufacturer may, accommodate consumers who need service or repair under such warranties when the manufacturer has failed to meet the requirement for those facilities as provided in *Civ. Code § 1793.3*. The manufacturer is subject in that instance to liability for the efforts of the seller or retailer of the manufacturer's goods [*Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(a)(2), 1793.5, 1793.6*].

[5] Failure to Supply Parts and Repair Literature

The duty to maintain service and repair facilities in California includes the duty to supply them with adequate replacement parts and service literature [*Civ. Code §§ 1793.2(a)(3), 1793.3*]. A manufacturer that fails to supply its authorized facilities with adequate replacement parts and service literature is liable to the buyer, or to the independent repair facility whose services were obtained by the retail seller to which the buyer returned the item, for the actual and reasonable cost of service or repair, including the cost of replacement parts, their reasonable transportation costs, and a reasonable profit [*Civ. Code § 1793.3(c)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

71 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
2. Actions Under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.163-502.179

[Reserved]

§§ 502.163[Reserved]

72 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
3. Magnuson-Moss Act Warranties

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.180

§ 502.180 Complaint by Consumer Against Warrantor Manufacturer for Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

[1] FORM Complaint by Consumer Against Warrantor Manufacturer for Failure to Comply With Warranty or Provisions of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, _____ [plaintiff *or* a particular consumer, _____ (*name of buyer*), (purchaser)] negotiated with a particular supplier, _____ [*name of seller*], (supplier) for the purchase of a certain consumer product consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of product*] manufactured by defendant. In the course of negotiations and to the time of sale alleged in this complaint, the product was disclosed to be accompanied by a writing

appended by defendant which contained _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the designation "FULL THREE-YEAR WARRANTY," *or* _____ (an affirmation of fact *or* a promise) that the material and workmanship of the product were free of any defect *or other*]. This writing became part of the basis of the bargain between the parties and thus constituted a written warranty made and given by defendant. A true copy of the warranty is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

4. _____ [Thereon *or* Thereafter, on or about _____ (*date*), at _____ (that locale *or* _____ (*city*), California)] the supplier sold the goods to _____ [plaintiff *or* purchaser], who bought the goods from supplier for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*]. [_____ (*Either* The contract between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference).] [On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff received transfer of the product from the purchaser thereof and has been the true owner of the product ever since.]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff discovered the product was defective in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* its casing did not bear up under temperatures of 100 degrees or more, which a product of the type, in keeping with its ordinary performance, would be required to do]. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff brought this defect to the attention of defendant and demanded the product be remedied within a reasonable time and without charge, but defendant then, and has ever since, failed and refused to correct those defects, replace the product, or refund any amount to plaintiff, or to take any other remedial action with respect thereto.

[*EITHER, if no informal dispute settlement mechanism exists*]

6. The written warranty does not contain references to any informal dispute settlement mechanism. However, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff formally notified defendant that this suit would be commenced unless, within a reasonable period of time [and up to and including _____ (*date*),] defendant cured its failure to comply with the provisions of its written warranty to remedy the defect of its product. A true copy of this notice is attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated by reference. Defendant, from that time to the present, has failed and refused to remedy the product.

[*OR, if informal dispute settlement mechanism exists*]

6. Plaintiff has resorted initially in this matter to the informal dispute settlement procedure established by defendant by notification thereto on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*either* and a decision was rendered on _____ (*date*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference. However, plaintiff is dissatisfied with _____ (the decision *or* defendant's intended actions thereunder *or* defendant's performance thereunder) *or* and all parties to this procedure have completed all their duties thereunder *or if a period of at least 40 days has passed since notification:* but the procedure has not been completed although there is and will be no permissible period of delay in the completion of those duties].

[*CONTINUE*]

7. As a proximate result of defendant's failure to remedy the defective product and to comply with the provisions of its written warranty, plaintiff has been damaged, in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff has been unable to have the benefit of the product and of equipment dependent on the proper functioning of the defective product], in the

amount of $_____.

8. _____ [*Plead any allegation of further legal or equitable relief appropriate in the circumstances. For consequential and incidental damages, see § 502.103[1], Paragraph 8.*]

9. Plaintiff has incurred reasonable attorney's fees herein in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For incidental and consequential damages in the amount of $_____;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of $_____;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a plaintiff whether the original purchaser, or a transferee from the original purchaser, of a consumer product for which the manufacturer-warrantor thereof fails to provide any remedy for the defective condition of the product [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(a)(3)(d)-(f)*; *§ 502.68[3]-[7]*]. If this form is used in connection with a consumer transaction that is subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA; *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicles Sales and Finance Act (Rees-Levering Act; *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), the plaintiff, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, must file the affidavit of proper venue [*see § 502.160[7]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The purchase of the consumer product with a written warranty being part of the basis of the bargain (Paragraph 3) [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*].

- The sale of the product (with any subsequent transfer to plaintiff) (Paragraph 4) [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)*].

- Plaintiff's discovery of the defect and his or her attempt to have defendant remedy it (Paragraph 5).

- Exhaustion of any available informal dispute settlement mechanism, or, in its absence, defendant's reasonable opportunity to cure its failure to comply with the warranty terms (Paragraph 6) [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3), (d)(1), (e)*].

- The damages which resulted from defendant's failure to comply (Paragraph 7); any incidental or consequential damages (Paragraph 8).

- Reasonable attorney's fees as provided by law (Paragraph 9) [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(2)*].

An attorney's fee award need not be apportioned among causes of action when some do not provide for recovery of attorney's fees. An attorney's fee award under *15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(2)* need not be based on the amount recovered but should be based on time spent [*Drouin v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 486, 492-493, 209 Cal. Rptr. 623]* .

[4] Remedies Under Magnuson-Moss Act for Consumers and Transferees

The federal Magnuson-Moss Act makes available the possibility for consumers and transferees from original purchasers of consumer products to obtain relief for defects in the products, for failure of warrantors to comply with the provisions of the written warranties or the act (and regulations thereunder), or for noncompliance by others obligated under the act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3)* ("consumer" is defined to include transferee); *15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)* ("written warranty" defined)]. Damages are awardable (although not necessarily bound by the measure prescribed under Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*see Com. Code § 2714(2)*]), and reasonable attorney's fees are possible [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1), (2)*; *see, e.g., Milicevic v. Fetcher Jones Imports, Ltd. (2004) 402 F.3d 912, 919-920* (district court did not abuse its discretion when concluding that attorneys' hourly rate was not reasonable and eliminating hours it considered to be unnecessarily duplicative); *see also § 502.68[3] -[7]*]. The action normally must be brought in a state forum because there are restrictions as to minimum amount in controversy or numbers of plaintiffs in any class prosecution if a federal court is utilized [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(3)*; *§ 502.68[5]*]. In addition, the act applies to a particular definition of a "written warranty," one which must have become part of the basis of the original buyer's bargain [*15 U.S.C. § 2301(6)*; *§ 502.62[2]*]. Prior to bringing suit, the plaintiff must first take advantage of any informal dispute settlement mechanism incorporated into the warranty, or, in its absence, afford the defendant a reasonable opportunity to cure the failure to comply with the warranty's provisions or those of the Magnuson-Moss Act otherwise [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3), (d)(1), (e)*; *see § 502.101* (form of notice affording opportunity to comply)].

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
3. Magnuson-Moss Act Warranties

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.181

§ 502.181 Allegations for Use in Class or Representative Action Complaint for Violation of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act Based on Failure to Comply With Written Warranty [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Class or Representative Action Complaint for Violation of Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act Based on Failure to Comply with Written Warranty [15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)]

1. This action is brought on behalf of plaintiff and of all other persons similarly situated. The class which plaintiff represents is composed of all consumers who presently own one or more of the consumer products consisting of _____ [*describe product*], manufactured by defendant and accompanied by a written warranty thereof. This class of consumers is still holding this/these product(s) during its/their stated warranty period, and are either the original purchasers thereof or are proper first or subsequent transferees therefrom. The persons in the class are so numerous[, consisting of approximately _____ individuals,] that the joinder of all of them is impracticable and the disposition of their claims in a class action is a benefit to the parties and to the court.

2. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented:

a. Each product as above-described was purchased originally from suppliers at various locations in California and elsewhere on various dates, beginning on or about _____ [*date*], and continuing to the present time.

b. Each product was purchased by a consumer who still owns the product or who has transferred it directly or through one or more intermediate transfers to the transferee consumer who presently owns it, and each and every consumer who still or presently owns that product is a plaintiff in this case.

c. Each product was purchased from a supplier for various prices, ranging from approximately $_____ to $_____, and was sold by that supplier with a writing accompanying the

product and containing _____ [an affirmation of fact *or* a promise] that the material and workmanship of the product were entirely free from defects for a period of _____ [*specify warranty period*] from purchases, which writing became part of the basis of the bargain between the purchasing consumer and the supplier and thus constituted a written warranty. This warranty was made and given in each sale by defendant. The sale contract was oral [in various instances, and written in other instances, as may be established with respect to any individual transaction herein]. A true copy of the written warranty is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

d. Each product is equally and inherently defective in the same manner, and remains so without regard to the type of us age or maintenance performed by any plaintiff, whether or not as authorized by defendant; each plaintiff will be damaged in the same manner, to a greater or lesser degree, as may be established with respect to any individual circumstances.

[3. There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by maintenance of this class action since plaintiff is informed and believes that the damage to each plaintiff is relatively small (in that _____ (*specify damage, e.g.,* the price of each individual product sold was likely no more than $_____ in any circumstance)), making it economically unfeasible to pursue remedies other than a class action. Consequently there would be a failure of justice but for the maintenance of the present class action.]

4. The written warranty does not contain reference to, nor has defendant established a procedure for, any informal dispute settlement mechanism. However, by this complaint and through this paragraph, plaintiff hereby affords defendant a reasonable opportunity to cure its failure to comply with the provisions of the warranty and to make each product defect-free. Defendant, by virtue of this notice within this complaint, is notified that plaintiff is acting on behalf of the class herein-described. If defendant fails and refuses to so cure its failure to comply, plaintiff will continue in the prosecution of this suit.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for use in a class action under the federal Magnuson-Moss Act for failure to comply with provisions of the written warranty under that Act or other provisions of that law [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)*]. Allegations 1-3 of the form may be inserted in the form of complaint at *§ 502.180[1]*, modifying that form appropriately, after the introductory paragraphs which set forth actual and fictitious parties (Paragraphs 1 and 2). Allegation 4 of this form also may be substituted for Paragraph 6 of the form of complaint in *§ 502.180[1]*.

[3] Class Actions Under the Magnuson-Moss Act

The federal Magnuson-Moss Act recognizes that its provisions may be utilized for class action purposes [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2310*]. The prerequisite of compliance with any existing informal dispute settlement mechanism or, in its absence, of giving defendant reasonable opportunity to cure its failure to comply [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3), (d)(1), (e)*], does not apply in a class action, which may be commenced prior to resort to an informal dispute mechanism. However, the class may not proceed in that action except to the extent the court determines necessary to establish the representative capacity of the named plaintiffs, unless the named plaintiffs (on notifying the defendant that they are named plaintiffs in a class action with respect to a warranty obligation) initially resort to that procedure. If the informal dispute settlement mechanism is not available, the reasonable opportunity to be afforded the defendant is to be by the named plaintiffs, who at that time must notify the defendant they are acting on behalf of the class [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(e)*; *see § 502.68[1]*].

It appears that in the absence of an informal dispute settlement mechanism, compliance with the notification requirement after a class action has commenced in a state court may be by including the final allegation in this form (Paragraph 4). Service on the defendant of a copy of the complaint containing this allegation would thus constitute transmission of the noticed opportunity to cure noncompliance. The defendant would still have an opportunity to contest the representative capacity of the named plaintiff in the time for response to the complaint although prior to the period

for reasonable opportunity to cure [*see § 502.68[2]*].

[4] Compliance With Certain Class Action Requirements

Particular precedents for the bringing of a class action in the state court under the Magnuson-Moss Act that may comply with the procedural requirements of a class suit under California law may be found in the case of *Metowski v. Traid Corp. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 332, 104 Cal. Rptr. 599* , a case arising under the Commercial Code sales law and containing two topics of significant concern: (1) the nature of the class, and (2) the requirement for giving notice.

For discussion and forms for class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Express Warranties
3. Magnuson-Moss Act Warranties

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.182-502.199

[Reserved]

§§ 502.182[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.200

§ 502.200 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant sold to plaintiff certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*], and plaintiff bought those goods from defendant for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*].
[_____ (*Either* The contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of it by this

reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference *or allege other compliance with statute of frauds*).]

4. Defendant was a merchant with respect to goods of the kind which were sold to plaintiff, and there was in the sale to plaintiff an implied warranty that those goods were merchantable.

5. However, defendant breached that warranty implied in the contract for the sale of goods in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* those goods could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description *or, if fungible goods:* those goods were not of fair average quality within the description *or* those goods were not fit for the ordinary purposes for which those goods are used (in that _____ (*describe unfitness*)) *or* those goods did not run, within the variations permitted by the agreement, of even kind, quality, and quantity within each unit and among all units involved *or* those goods were not adequately contained, packaged, and labeled as the agreement required *or* those goods did not conform to the _____ (promises *or* affirmations of fact) made on the _____ (container *or* label)]. As a result thereof plaintiff did not receive goods as impliedly warranted by defendant to be merchantable.

6. [*Notification by plaintiff to defendant of breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Damages for breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 7.*]

8. [*Incidental or consequential damages. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action against a seller for breach of implied warranty of merchantability [*see Com. Code § 2314(1), (2); § 502.24[2]*]. The measure of damages is governed by *Com. Code § 2714(2), (3),* discussed in *§ 502.28[2]*. There must be privity between the plaintiff/buyer and defendant/seller showing on the face of a complaint for breach of implied warranty; otherwise a demurrer to the complaint should be sustained [*Anthony v.*

Kelsey-Hayes Co. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 442, 448, 102 Cal. Rptr. 113 ; *see also § 502.24[7]*].

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

The complaint in [1], *above*, is available for use in a suit by a consumer, but its use normally would be limited to any situation not covered by the Song-Beverly Act. That act applies the implied warranty of merchantability to every retail sale of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1792*, discussed at *§ 502.51[1]*], but it is not clear that this reference includes clothing and consumables, which are expressly excepted from the definition of consumer goods under the act [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (c), (d)*]. The act's definition of merchantability also does not expressly include the elements of fungible goods' fair average quality or the run of even kind among units, which in any case are usually references to commercial standards absent from retail sales [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(a)*]. An action under the Song-Beverly Act otherwise may be preferred because the nature of the consumer protective coverage is broader and the range of possible defenses narrower [*see § 502.51[1]*; *see also § 502.202* (Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Act)].

[4] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- That the buyer was a merchant in the kind of goods sold, and that the implied warranty of merchantability arose out of the sale (Paragraph 4) [*Com. Code § 2314(1)*].
- The breach of the implied warranty (Paragraph 5) [*see Com. Code § 2314(2)*].
- Notification of the breach (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].
- Damages (Paragraphs 7, 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715*].

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.201

§ 502.201 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability of Food or Drink Served for Consumption [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability of Food or Drink Served for Consumption [Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*city*], California, defendant sold and served to plaintiff for consumption _____ [on the premises *or* specify other location] _____ [food *or* drink *or both*] consisting of _____ [*describe quantity of servings and nature of food or drink*], and plaintiff purchased that _____ [food *or* drink *or both*] from defendant for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*]. [The contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference).]

2. Defendant was a merchant with respect to the kind of _____ [food *or* drink *or both*] served and sold to plaintiff, and there was in the sale and service to plaintiff an implied warranty that the _____ [food *or* drink *or both*] was/were merchantable.

3. However, defendant breached that warranty implied in the contract for sale and service of the _____ [food *or* drink *or both*] in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* the food could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description (in that it was _____ (*specify, e.g.,* deleterious and inedible)) *or* the food and drink were not fit for the ordinary purposes of human consumption (in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff and others of plaintiff's party could not ingest, swallow, or digest any of the ingredients)) *or* the food was not adequately contained or packaged as the agreement between the parties required (in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff had to transport the food for several miles in an automobile, but the food immediately overran its wrappings, spilled, and became totally inedible and unserviceable)) *or* the drink did not conform to the _____ (promises *or* affirmation of fact) made on the _____ (containers *or* labels) (in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the descriptions read "sausages," but the ingredients were purely vegetable compounds)) *or other*].

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraphs 3-5, respectively, of the form at § 502.200[1] for use in an action against a seller of food or drink for consumption on the premises or elsewhere for damages for breach of the implied warranty of merchantability [*see Com. Code § 2314(1), (2)*].

[3] Use in Consumer Litigation

Apparently, these allegations should be used only in a suit under the Commercial Code because the Song-Beverly Act does not cover "consumables" within its definition of "consumer goods" [*see Civ. Code § 1791(a), (d)*]; *see also § 502.53[1][f]* (definition of implied warranty only covers consumer goods [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(a), (b)*]). The Magnuson-Moss Act does not contain special provisions as to the nature of implied warranties [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(7)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.202

§ 502.202 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1792, 1794]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1792, 1794]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*], defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as the "defendant manufacturer," manufactured certain consumer goods consisting of _____ [*describe nature of goods*] for purposes of their eventual sale to retail buyers.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as the "defendant distributor," acquired the goods from defendant manufacturer and distributed them to defendant _____ [*name of seller*] for eventual retail to consumers. In the process defendant distributor _____ [appended to those goods a written warranty in the form of a written statement pursuant to which it undertook to preserve or maintain the utility or performance of the goods or provide compensation if there was a failure in its utility or performance *or* supplied to _____ (*seller*) a sample or model of the goods for demonstration at retail, thereby making an express warranty that the whole of the goods conformed thereto].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as the "defendant seller," sold _____ [*quantity*] of those goods to plaintiff, at retail, and plaintiff bought those goods from defendant for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*]. _____ [The contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:* a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference].

6. This retail sale to plaintiff was accompanied separately, individually, and respectively by the defendant manufacturer's[, defendant distributor's,] and defendant seller's implied warranties that the goods were merchantable.

7. However, defendants, and each of them, breached their respective warranties implied in the sale in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* the goods could not pass without objection in the trade under the contract description *or* the goods were not fit for the ordinary purposes for which the goods are used *or* the goods were not adequately contained, packaged, and labeled *or* the goods failed to conform to the _____ (promises *or* affirmations of fact) made on the _____ (container *or* label)] because _____ [*describe in what manner goods did not meet description, were not fit, were inadequately contained, packaged, or labeled, or failed to conform*]. As a result thereof plaintiff did not receive merchantable goods as impliedly warranted by defendants, and each of them.

8. [*Notification of breach by plaintiff to each defendant. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6.*]

9. [*Damages for breach by defendants. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 7.*]

10. [*Incidental or consequential damages. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 8.*]

11. Plaintiff has incurred reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[(s) and each of them] as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in action by a retail buyer against a manufacturer, any distributor who has made an express warranty as to the goods, and the retail seller for breach of their respective implied warranties of merchantability [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)* (measure of damages for implied warranty, discussed at *§ 502.53[2]*); *Civ. Code § 1792* (implied warranty of manufacturer and retail seller accompanies all sales unless disclaimed, discussed at *§ 502.51[1]*); *Civ. Code § 1795* (liability of person other than manufacture for express warranty, discussed at *§ 502.42[4]*); *see also* discussion at *§ 502.160[2] -[6]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The manufacture of the consumer goods (Paragraph 3) [*Civ. Code § 1791(a), (j)*].

- The evidence of any distributor who made an express warranty for consumer goods purposes (Paragraph 4) [*Civ. Code § 1791(e)*].

- Sale of the goods to plaintiff by seller (Paragraph 5) [*Civ. Code § 1791(l), (n)*].

- Accompaniment of the sale by the implied warranty of merchantability of each defendant (Paragraph 6) [*Civ. Code § 1792*; *see Civ. Code § 1795*; discussions at *§§ 502.42[4], 502.51[1]*].

- Breach of the consumer warranty (Paragraph 7).

- Notification of breach by plaintiff to each defendant (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(d), Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*; *see also* [4], *below*].

- Damages (Paragraphs 9, 10) [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)*; *Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715*]. *Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715* express the measure of damages for accepted goods and are discussed at *§§ 502.28[2]* and *502.53[1][a], [2]*. The buyer also has the option of rejecting noncomforming goods, in which case the measure of damages would be that set forth in *Com. Code §§ 2711-2713*, the primary discussion of which is in Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

- Attorney's fees (Paragraph 11) [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(d), 1794(d)*].

[4] Rights Under Implied Warranty of Merchantability

[a] Song-Beverly Act

Under the Song-Beverly Act the manufacturer's and retail seller's implied warranty of merchantability [*see Civ. Code § 1791.1(a)*] must accompany every sale of consumer goods as defined in *Civ. Code § 1791(a)* [*Civ. Code § 1792*].

Although a different rule may apply when an express warranty is breached, under the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act there is no requirement that the seller be given an opportunity to repair when the implied warranty of merchantability is breached [*Mocek v. Alfa Leisure, Inc. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 402, 406-408, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (affirming judgment in amount of purchase price plus interest upon return of defective travel trailer)]. In addition, if express warranties [*see Civ. Code § 1791.2(a)*] are made by anyone other than the manufacturer of the goods, the obligation of that person is the same as that imposed on the manufacturer by the act [*Civ. Code § 1795*]. A buyer of consumer goods injured by a breach of warranty has the remedies provided under Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(d)*]. Although it is not clear, this presumably includes the preliminary duty of notifying the defendant of breach of warranty after acceptance of a tender and within a reasonable time of discovery [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*]; it also includes both proximate and incidental or consequential damages [*Com. Code § 2714(2), (3)*]. However, the Song-Beverly Act allows a consumer who prevails in an action for breach of implied warranty to recover reasonable attorney's fees based on actual time expended [*Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1794(d)*].

[b] Magnuson-Moss Act

A consumer who is damaged by the failure of a supplier, warrantor, or service contractor [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2301(3), (4), (5), (8)*] to comply with any obligation under an implied warranty may bring suit under the federal Magnuson-Moss Act [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(1)*]. However, under that Act an implied warranty means one arising under state law, with certain modifications in requirements as to duration of the warranty if a written warranty exists [*15 U.S.C. §§ 2301(7), 2304(a), 2308(a), (b)*]. No greater damages are afforded under the federal legislation; however, reasonable attorney's fees are provided for thereunder [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(d)(2)*] as they are under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1794*]. Under federal law it is necessary to have recourse first to any informal dispute settlement mechanism applicable in the case or, in its absence, to afford the defendants a reasonable opportunity to cure their failure to comply [*15 U.S.C. § 2310(a)(3), (d)(1), (e)*].

However, unlike the Song-Beverly Act, the federal remedy may be available to transferees of consumers who are allowed to bring suit under the Magnuson-Moss Act [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 2301(3), 2310(d)(1)*]. Should it also be the case that the Song-Beverly Act does not cover clothing and consumables by implied warranty [*see Civ. Code §§ 1791(a), (c), (d), 1791.1(a)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 502.53[1][f]*], the federal law may be employed with respect to those commodities through the implied warranty of the general sales law [*see Com. Code § 2314*].

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.203-502.209

[Reserved]

§§ 502.203[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.210

§ 502.210 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Defendant in the sale to plaintiff _____ [excluded *or* modified] any implied warranty of merchantability by _____ [expressly stating to plaintiff *or* delivering to plaintiff a writing, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference, containing a conspicuous statement] that _____ [*recite or summarize statement, e.g.,* "THERE IS NO IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY ON THESE GOODS," *or* the implied warranty of merchantability was limited only to the fact that the goods would conform to the promises or affirmations of fact made on their container].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in defending against a claim of breach of implied warranty of merchantability when defendant has directly excluded or has modified the warranty [*see Com. Code § 2316(2)*]. If the defense appears on the face of the complaint, a demurrer based on this defense may be filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*]. The defense is available only when the exclusion or modification used the word "merchantable" and was conspicuous [*see Com. Code § 2316*; *§ 502.24[9]*; *see also* discussion at *§ 502.200[2] -[4]*].

[3] When Useable in Consumer Litigation

This defense is not available in any action prosecuted under the Song-Beverly Act, which invalidates exclusion or modification of an implied warranty of merchantability except as provided in *Civ. Code § 1792.3* [*see § 502.51[7]*]. Nor may it be utilized if defendant had given either a written warranty covered by the Magnuson-Moss Act or a service

contract subject to that act at the time of sale or within 90 days thereafter, because in either case an implied warranty may not be excluded or modified [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2308(a), (c)*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.211

§ 502.211 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Based on Consumer's Waiver of Implied Warranties [Civ. Code § 1792.5]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability Under Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act Based on Consumer's Waiver of Implied Warranties [Civ. Code § 1792.5]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Prior to and at the time of sale herein, there was attached to the goods a conspicuous writing, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference, which clearly informs the buyer, and did so inform the plaintiff, in simple and concise language that the goods were being sold on a[n] _____ ["as is" *or* "with all faults"] basis; that the entire risk as to the quality and performance of the goods were with the buyer; and that should the goods prove defective following their purchase, the buyer and not the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer assumed the entire cost of all necessary servicing or repair. As a result, defendant effectively disclaimed any implied warranty of _____ [merchantability *or* fitness *or both*], and by that sale plaintiff effectively waived any that warranty.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a manufacturer, distributor, or retail seller defending an action by a retail buyer suing under the Song-Beverly Act for breach of an implied warranty of merchantability or [*see § 502.202* (form of complaint)], if applicable, of fitness for consumer goods [*see Civ. Code § 1792.5*, discussed at *§ 502.51[8]* and at [4][a], *below*; *see also §§ 502.200[2] -[4]* and *502.202[2] -[4]*].

[3] Demurrer to Answer

The affirmative defense set forth in [1], *above*, may be subject to demurrer as failing to state facts sufficient to

constitute a defense [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.20(a)*] if the answer otherwise reveals on its face that the defendant, in transacting the sale, also gave express warranties [*see Civ. Code § 1793*].

[4] Disclaimer or Waiver of Implied Warranties

[a] Song-Beverly Act

Under the Song-Beverly Act, no implied warranty of merchantability or fitness may be waived except in the case of a sale of consumer goods on an "as is" or "with all faults" basis when the provisions of the act are complied with [*Civ. Code §§ 1792.3, 1792.5*]. The act requires particular language of conspicuous warning and disclosure [*see Civ. Code § 1792.4*]. If present, a sale "as is" or "with all faults" constitutes the buyer's waiver of the warranties of merchantability, and if applicable, fitness [*Civ. Code § 1792.5*], unless an express warranty also was given [*Civ. Code § 1793*].

[b] Magnuson-Moss Act

No supplier, under the Magnuson-Moss Act, may disclaim or modify any implied warranty to a consumer as to the consumer product if the supplier makes any written warranty to the consumer person regarding that product. The same is true as to a service contract given at the time of sale or within 90 days thereafter. Implied warranties otherwise may be limited as to duration in compliance with provisions of the act [*15 U.S.C. § 2308*].

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.212

§ 502.212 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion of All Implied Warranties by Language Such as "As Is" or "With All Faults" [Com. Code § 2316(3)(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion of All Implied Warranties by Language Such as "As Is" or "With all Faults" [Com. Code § 2316(3)(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Defendant in the sale to plaintiff excluded any implied warranty of any kind by _____ [expressly stating to plaintiff *or* delivering to plaintiff a writing, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ and made a part hereof, containing the statement that] the goods were being sold _____ ["as is" *or* "with all faults" *or other language which in common understanding called buyer's attention to the exclusion of warranties and made plain there was no implied warranty*].

[2] Use of Form

The form affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in defending against a claim of breach of any implied warranty arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code when the warranty has been excluded by specific language excluding all implied warranties [*see Com. Code § 2316(3)(a)*].

[3] When Usable in Consumer Litigation

The defense in [1], *above*, is not available in the case of implied warranties of merchantability or fitness under the Song-Beverly Act, which requires a written, conspicuous disclaimer that, in addition to stating that the goods are being sold on an "as is" basis, must also state that the entire risk as to quality and performance is on the buyer and that the buyer assumes all cost of repair [*see Civ. Code § 1792.4*]. For an affirmative defense for use when implied warranties

have been properly excluded under the Song-Beverly Act, see *§ 502.211[1]*. In addition, if an express warranty was given which was subject to that act, the implied warranties may not be disclaimed [*see Civ. Code § 1793*]. Likewise, the form of defense in [1], *above*, may not be utilized with regard to any type of implied warranty if a written warranty has been covered by the Magnuson-Moss Act or if a service contract subject to that act was given at the time of sale or within 90 days thereafter [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2308(a), (c)*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.213

§ 502.213 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion or Modification of That Implied Warranty by Course of Dealing or Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Exclusion or Modification of That Implied Warranty by Course of Dealing or Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Any implied warranty of _____ [merchantability (as to _____ [*describe any particular aspect involved, e.g.,* the fungible goods being of fair average quality within the description]) *or* fitness *or other*] with regard to the goods sold to plaintiff was _____ [excluded *or* modified] by _____ [course of dealing *or* usage of trade], in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the parties have dealt between themselves for many years in products of this same type with the express understanding, based on their earliest dealings, that defendant made no representation or guarantee as to the character of the goods *or* it has long been the practice in defendant's industry in dealing with any and all customers to sell all goods without warranting in any manner their character in any respect].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in defending against a claim of breach of any implied warranty arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code when the warranty has been excluded or modified by virtue of a course of dealing between the parties or a usage in the trade as to the kind of goods involved [*Com. Code § 2316(3)(c)*; *see Com. Code § 1303(b), (c)* ("course of dealing" and "usage of trade" defined)]. It is not appropriate for use in a consumer purchase situation [*see § 502.212[3]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.214

§ 502.214 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Buyer's Opportunity to Examine Goods [Com. Code § 2316(3)(b)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising Under Commercial Code Based on Buyer's Opportunity to Examine Goods [Com. Code § 2316(3)(b)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Before entering into the contract for the sale of goods herein, defendant fully made available [a _____ (sample *or* model) of] the goods for plaintiff's examination and expressly invited plaintiff to make an examination of that _____ [sample *or* model], _____ [and plaintiff did so *or* but plaintiff refused to so] examine _____ the [sample *or* model]. The defects alleged by plaintiff to have been present in the goods ought to have been revealed to plaintiff through examination of that _____ [sample *or* model].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in defending against a claim of breach of any implied warranty arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code when the warranty has been excluded based on plaintiff's opportunity to examine the goods or an example thereof prior to entering into alleged contract [*see Com. Code § 2316(3)(b)*]. The defense in [1], *above,* is not available in any action prosecuted under the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code § 1792.3*] or the Magnuson-Moss Act [*15 U.S.C. § 2308(a)*; *see § 502.212[3]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

84 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Implied Warranties of Merchantability

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.215-502.219

[Reserved]

§§ 502.215[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Implied Warranties of Fitness

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.220

§ 502.220 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2; Com. Code § 2315]

[1] FORM Complaint for Amages for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2; Com. Code § 2315]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WAR-
_____ [*names*],	)	RANTY
Defendants.	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff required [a specific quantity of] a certain kind of _____ [*described goods, e.g.,* automobile] for the particular purpose(s) of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* being able to maneuver both on dry land and in bodies of water]. Plaintiff relied on defendant's _____ [skill *or* judgment *or both*] to _____ [select *or* furnish *or both*] suitable goods

for that/those purpose(s), and on or about that time, at _____ [*city*], California, defendant sold to plaintiff certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*], and plaintiff bought those goods from defendant, in reliance of defendant's _____ [skill *or* judgment *or both*], for the amount of $ _____ [*or describe other consideration*]. _____ [This contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference].

4. At the time of _____ [contracting for sale *or, if under Song-Beverly Act,* the retail sale] of the goods, defendant had reason to know the particular purpose(s) for which the goods were required [by virtue of the fact that _____ (*explain why defendant knew, e.g.,* plaintiff expressly communicated these purposes to defendant in requesting the goods)], and that plaintiff was relying on defendant's _____ [skill *or* judgment *or both*] to _____ [select *or* furnish *or both*] suitable goods; so that there was an implied warranty that the goods were fit for this/these purpose(s).

5. However, defendant breached the warranty implied at the time of sale in that defendant did not receive suitable goods, and the goods were not fit for the particular purpose(s) for which they were required [, in that _____ (*describe, e.g.,* the vehicles were incapable of negotiating in water but instead invariably sank on immersion therein)].

6. [*Notification by plaintiff to defendant of breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Damages for breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 7.*]

8. [*Incidental or consequential damages. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 8.*]

9. [*Attorney's fees, if applicable. If action commenced under Song-Beverly Act, see § 502.202[1], Paragraph 11.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[(s) and each of them] as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $ _____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $ _____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action against a seller for breach of the implied warranty of fitness under either the Commercial Code [*see Com. Code § 2315*; *§§ 502.24[4]* and *502.28*] or the Song-Beverly Act [*see Civ. Code §§ 1792.1, 1792.2*, discussed in *§§ 502.51[2]* and *502.53[2]*; *see also* discussion in [4], *below*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- Plaintiff's need for product with special properties and reliance on defendant to select or furnish a product with those properties at time of sale (Paragraph 3) [*Civ. Code § 1791.1(b)(1)*; *Com. Code §§ 2204, 2315*].

- Defendant's awareness of plaintiff's need and reliance, giving rise to the implied warranty of fitness (Paragraph 4) [*Civ. Code § 1792.2(a)*; *Com. Code § 2315*].

- Breach of the implied warranty (Paragraph 5).

- Notification of breach (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].

- The damages (Paragraphs 7, 8) [*Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1794(b)*; *Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715*].

- Any attorney's fees, if applicable (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 1794(d)*].

[4] Distinctions Between Implied Warranty of Fitness in Consumer Cases and in Commercial Cases

A retail buyer of consumer goods from either a manufacturer [*see Civ. Code § 1792.1*] or a distributor or retailer [*see Civ. Code § 1792.2(a)*] subject to the Song-Beverly Act receives an implied warranty of fitness if the marketing party has reason to know at the time of the sale that the goods are required for a particular purpose and that the buyer is relying on the marketing party's skill or judgment to select or furnish suitable goods. Although the same remedy from any kind of seller exists under Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*see Com. Code § 2315*], the retail buyer has two advantages in bringing the action under the Song-Beverly Act:

- The defendant's ability to disclaim or waive the warranty is very limited [*see Civ. Code §§ 1792.5, 1793*].

- The plaintiff may recover reasonable attorney's fees even in the absence of a contractual provision for attorney's fees [*see Civ. Code §§ 1791.1(d), 1794(d)*].

[5] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and

177.140 et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Implied Warranties of Fitness

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.221-502.229

[Reserved]

§§ 502.221[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Implied Warranties of Fitness

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.230

§ 502.230 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness Based on Exclusion or Modification of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness Based on Exclusion or Modification of Implied Warranty of Fitness [Com. Code § 2316(2)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Defendant in the sale to plaintiff _____ [excluded *or* modified] any implied warranty of fitness by delivering to plaintiff a writing, true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ and made a part hereof, containing a conspicuous statement that _____ [*recite or summarize statement, e.g.,* "THERE ARE NO WARRANTIES WHICH EXTEND BEYOND THE DESCRIPTION ON THE FACE OF THIS STATEMENT" *or* any implied warranty of fitness is limited exclusively to personal, family, or household purposes].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in defending against a claim of breach of implied warranty of fitness when the defendant has directly excluded or has modified the warranty [*see Com. Code § 2312(2),* discussed in *§ 502.24[8]* and *[10]*].

For other defenses that may be applicable to an implied warranty of fitness, see *§§ 502.212 -502.214*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

88 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Implied Warranties of Fitness

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.231-502.239

[Reserved]

§§ 502.231[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Warranties Implied by Usage and Trade

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.240

§ 502.240 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising From Course of Dealing and Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2314(3)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Implied Warranty Arising from Course of Dealing and Usage of Trade [Com. Code § 2314(3)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF IMPLIED WAR-
_____ [*names*],	)	RANTY
Defendants.	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1]*, Paragraph 2.]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant sold to plaintiff a[n] _____ [*type of goods or chattels, e.g.*, Irish Wolfhound], which defendant represented in the contract of sale _____ (orally *or* in writing) was of _____ (pedigreed *or* blooded) lineage, in that _____ (*describe particulars of animal's ancestry*)]. Plaintiff made that purchase from

defendant for the amount of $_____ [*or describe other consideration*]. [_____ (That contract of sale between the parties was oral (*if sale price was $500 or more, add:*, a true copy of a memorandum of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference) *or* A true copy of the contract of sale between the parties is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference).

4. At the time of sale to defendant there was an implied warranty, that defendant would [*describe, e.g.,* supply plaintiff with pedigree papers to evidence the animal was as represented in the contract. This warranty arose from _____

[*EITHER, if course of dealing*]

course of dealing, in that there had been a sequence of previous conduct between plaintiff and defendant [in their business of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* buying and selling cattle)], which is fairly to be regarded as establishing as a common basis of understanding for interpreting their expressions and other conduct in the transaction in this action that _____ [*describe basis of warranty, e.g.,* pedigree papers always were to be delivered with any sale of an animal defendant to plaintiff].

[*OR, if usage of trade*]

usage of trade, in that a _____ [practice *or* method of dealing] of _____ [*describe basis of warranty, e.g.,* delivery of pedigree papers by the seller to the buyer in any sale of an animal] had was regularity done in _____ [*specify place, vocation, or trade, e.g.,* the cattle trading business in this county] as to justify an expectation that it would be observed with respect to the transaction in this action.

[*CONTINUE*]

5. However, defendant breached the warranty implied in the contract for sale in that _____ [*explain, e.g.,* defendant did not at time of sale or at any time since supply plaintiff with pedigree papers of any kind for the animal *or* the only pedigree papers defendant supplied to plaintiff for the animal were not in conformity with the lineage thereof as represented to plaintiff in the contract of sale]. As a result plaintiff did not receive [_____ *specify, e.g.,* the animal] as impliedly warranted by defendant.

6. [*Notification by plaintiff to defendant of breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6.*]

7. *Damages for breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 7.*

8. [*Incidental or consequential damages. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $ _____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $ _____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification if desired. See § 502.103[1]*.]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action against a seller of a pedigreed animal for breach of an implied warranty to furnish pedigree papers arising by course of dealing or usage of trade, particularly in the instance of certification of an animal's lineage [*see Com. Code § 2314(3)*; discussed in *§ 502.24[6]*; *see also* U.C.C. Comment 12 to *Com. Code § 2314*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- The sale to plaintiff of a particular pedigreed animal (Paragraph 3) [*Com. Code § 2204*].
- That the implied warranty of providing pedigreed papers arose out of a course of dealing or usage of trade (Paragraph 4) [*see Com. Code § 2314(3)*; *see Com. Code § 1303(b)(c)* ("course of dealing" and "usage of trade" defined)].
- Breach of the implied warranty (Paragraph 5).
- Notification of breach (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].
- Damages (Paragraphs 7, 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715*].

[4] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Warranties Implied by Usage and Trade

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.241-502.259

[Reserved]

§§ 502.241[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.260

§ 502.260 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Give Good Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Give Good Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF WARRANTY OF
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	TITLE
	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Sale of goods by defendant to plaintiff. See § 502.200[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. At the time of that sale defendant warranted to plaintiff that defendant was conveying to plaintiff good title to the goods and making rightful transfer of that title to plaintiff.

5. Defendant breached the warranty in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* a certain _____ (*name of third party*) was actually the true and lawful owner of the goods at the time of their sale to plaintiff, and at the time of the sale the goods were not a lawful part of defendant's inventory for sale and defendant had no true or lawful title to them to rightfully transfer to plaintiff]. As a result, plaintiff in fact did not receive good title to these goods from defendant nor a rightful transfer of title.

6. Plaintiff discovered the breach of warranty on or about _____ [*date*]. Thereafter, and on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant of this breach by _____ [writing, in the form of a _____ (letter *or* telegram *or other*), a true copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and made a part of it *or* personal visit and communication *or* telephone call *or other*].

[*EITHER*]

7. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by defendant, plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of $_____ [, the difference at the time and place plaintiff accepted the goods between their value then and that which they would have had if they had been as warranted].

[*OR*]

7. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by defendant, plaintiff has been damaged [in the amount of $_____] as a result of special circumstances in which _____ [*describe circumstances, e.g.,* plaintiff transferred a portion of the goods to third-party buyers, who received them in the belief that plaintiff was capable of conveying good title to the goods, and who were commercially embarrassed as a result]. [These damages are not all assessable at this time, but this complaint will be amended to state the damages when plaintiff becomes able to determine them.]

[*CONTINUE*]

8. Plaintiff has been further damaged as a result of this breach in that _____ [*describe incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* plaintiff was required to transport the goods to _____ (the true owner *or* a new market) for the amount of $_____. Defendant also knew that plaintiff needed the goods as demonstration wares, and plaintiff was forced to arrange to procure replacement goods for these purposes through travel and negotiations, in the total amount of $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action by any buyer against a seller of goods for breach of warranty of title involving the seller's failure to give a good title [*see Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)*, discussed in *§ 502.21*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- Sale of goods out of which the injury arose (Paragraph 3) [*Com. Code § 2204*].
- Defendant's warranty of title made in the sale by imposition of law (Paragraph 4) [*Com. Code § 2312(1)*].
- Breach by defendant of the warranty (Paragraph 5).
- Plaintiff's notification of the breach to defendant within a reasonable time of discovery of the breach (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].
- Damages owing as a result of the breach (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code § 2714(2)*].
- Incidental and consequential damages (Paragraph 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715*; § 502.283[4]].

[4] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.261

§ 502.261 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Lack of Authority to Transfer Third Person's Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Lack of Authority to Transfer Third Person's Title [Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)]

1. At the time of sale alleged in this complaint, defendant modified the warranty of title imposed by law by conveying to plaintiff goods to which a certain _____ [*name of third person*] held good title and by making rightful transfer thereof to plaintiff.

2. However, defendant breached the modified warranty in that, while _____ [*name of third person*] was in fact the true owner of those goods, defendant did not have that person's authority to transfer those goods to plaintiff by sale. As a result, plaintiff did not receive a rightful transfer of the title to the goods.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraphs 4 and 5, respectively, of the form of complaint in § 502.260[1] for use in an action by a buyer against a seller of goods for breach of warranty of making a rightful transfer of the good title of a third person [*see Com. Code § 2312(1)(a)*, discussed in *§ 502.21[1]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.262

§ 502.262 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Deliver Free From Encumbrances [Com. Code § 2312(1)(b)]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Seller's Failure to Deliver Free From Encumbrances [Com. Code § 2312(1)(b)]

1. At the time of the sale alleged in this complaint, defendant warranted to plaintiff, by imposition of law, that defendant was delivering the goods to plaintiff free from any security interest or other lien or encumbrance of which plaintiff at the time of contracting had no knowledge.

2. However, defendant breached that warranty in that _____ [*describe breach, e.g.,* a certain _____ (*name of third party*) had a security interest in the goods at the time of their sale to plaintiff, representing a debt still outstanding at that time of $_____ owed by defendant to that party, of which encumbrance plaintiff at the time of contracting had no knowledge]. As a result, plaintiff in fact did not receive delivery of the goods free from encumbrance of which plaintiff at time of contracting had no knowledge.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, may be substituted for Paragraphs 4 and 5, respectively, of the form of complaint at *§ 502.260[1]* for use in an action by a buyer against a seller of goods for breach of warranty of good title involving the failure to give a title free from encumbrances [*see Com. Code § 2312(1)(b)*, discussed in *§ 502.21[1]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.263-502.269

[Reserved]

§§ 502.263[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.270

§ 502.270 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty by Specific Language [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Exclusion or Modification of Warranty by Specific Language [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

At the time of the sale alleged in the complaint, defendant expressly and by specific language _____ [excluded *or* modified] any warranty of title in the goods by _____ [*describe, e.g.,* expressly stating to plaintiff that defendant could guarantee good title to the goods only as of _____ [*date*] *or* handing plaintiff a printed statement at the time of closing, a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, explaining that defendant only passed on the title that may have attached to the goods prior to their coming into defendant's possession *or* calling plaintiff's attention to certain signs posted at defendant's closings counter explaining the lack of a warranty of title in these goods, which signs all proclaim as follows: "NO WARRANTY OF TITLE IS CONTAINED IN ANY CONTRACT OF SALE FOR GOODS AT THIS ESTABLISHMENT"].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, may be used by a seller defending against a claim for breach of warranty of title on the ground that the warranty was excluded or modified by specific language [*see Com. Code § 2312(2)*; *§ 502.21[2]*]. *Com. Code § 2312(2)* also provides that the warranty of title may be excluded or modified by circumstances that give the buyer reason to know that the person selling does not claim title in himself or herself in that the seller is purported to sell only that right or title the seller or a third person may have [*see § 502.271*].

[3] Demurrer in Lieu of Answer

If the warranty alleged to have been breached is contained in a written contract of sale that has been appended to the

complaint and that contains specific language excluding or modifying the warranty of title, defendant may demur on the ground that the complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*].

[4] Warranty of Title Is Not Excluded Necessarily With Other Warranties

The warranty of title is not designated by law as an "implied warranty." Thus, it is not excluded in the manner described specifically for implied warranties [UCC Code Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 2312*; *see Com. Code § 2316*]. As a result, it is doubtful that a contract of sale that excludes "all warranties, express or implied" necessarily excludes the warranty of title as well.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.271

§ 502.271 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Fact That Buyer Had Reason to Know of Lack or Limitation of Title [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty of Title Based on Fact That Buyer had Reason to Know of Lack or Limitation of Title [Com. Code § 2312(2)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The circumstances existing at the time of sale gave plaintiff reason to know that defendant _____ [did not claim title personally to *or* was purporting to sell only what right or title defendant or any third person might have in] the goods, in that _____ [*describe circumstances, e.g.,* defendant informed plaintiff that he/she was selling the goods in a private sale in order to foreclose his/her security interest in the goods and collect on an obligation that a third-party debtor owed to defendant].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use by a seller who is defending against a claim for breach of warranty of title on the ground that the circumstances gave the buyer reason to know that the seller did not claim title in himself or herself or was purporting to sell only the title the seller or a third person might have [*see Com. Code § 2312(2),* discussed in *§ 502.21[2]*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
F. Warranties of Title

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.272-502.279

[Reserved]

§§ 502.272[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.280

§ 502.280 Notice to Seller of Breach of Warranty Against Infringement for Which Buyer Has Been Sued [Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)]

[1] FORM Notice to Seller of Breach of Warranty Against Infringement for Which Buyer Has Been Sued [Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)]

TO: _____ [*name of seller at business address*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that you have breached the warranty against infringement arising in connection with your sale to _____ [*name and other identifying data of buyer, such as address*] on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*], of goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*]; and that _____ [*name of buyer*] has been sued, as a result of your breach, in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, filed on or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*name of court*] at _____ [*location*].

[Very truly yours,]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*name of buyer*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The notice in [1], *above*, is for use by a buyer who has been sued by a customer as a result of the seller's breach of the warranty against infringement in a sale of goods to the buyer. The buyer must notify the original seller of the customer's action in order not to be barred from any remedy over that he or she may have against the seller [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*, discussed in *§ 502.28[4][b]*].

[3] Requirement of Notification

If a buyer has a claim for breach of warranty against infringement or the like against the seller, and the buyer is sued as a result of this breach, the buyer must notify the seller of the action within a reasonable time after buyer receives notice of the litigation or be barred from any remedy over for liability established by the litigation [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*, discussed in *§ 502.28[4][b]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.281

§ 502.281 Notice to Buyer to Hold Seller Harmless Against Claim Arising Out of Compliance With Specifications of Goods Sold [Com. Code § 2607]

[1] FORM Notice to Buyer to Hold Seller Harmless Against Claim Arising Out of Compliance With Specifications of Goods Sold [Com. Code § 2607]

TO: _____ [*name of buyer at business address*]

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that there is a claim of infringement [consisting of _____ (*specify claim and name of claimant*). This claim is] [as] a result of the compliance of _____ [*name of seller and identification, such as address*] with specifications furnished thereto by you in connection with your purchase from _____ [*name of seller*] on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*], of goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*]. You are obligated to hold _____ [*name of seller*] harmless against this claim.

[Very truly yours,]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*name of seller*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The notice in [1], *above*, is for use by a seller who, after furnishing goods to the buyer in compliance with the latter's

specifications, discovers that an infringement has resulted and wishes to notify the buyer of that person's obligation to hold the seller harmless [*see Com. Code § 2607(3), (6)*, discussed in *§ 502.28[4][b]* and in [3], *below*].

[3] Seller's Notice of Infringement When Buyer Furnished Specifications for Goods

The requirements applicable to a buyer to protect the buyer's ability to sue the seller for breach of warranty all apply to a seller whom a buyer must hold harmless against claims for infringement if the buyer has furnished the specifications for the goods sold and the claim arises out of the seller's compliance with those specifications [*Com. Code § 2607(6)*; *see Com. Code § 2312(3)*]. Because a buyer who seeks to preserve his or her remedy for a claim of infringement after accepting tender of the goods must notify the seller of any breach within a reasonable time after discovery was or should have been made [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*], a seller who seeks to preserve his or her remedy against the buyer after having delivered goods to the buyer, and having become aware that an infringement may have resulted by complying with specifications for the goods furnished by the buyer, must notify the buyer of the possible claim. The forms dealing with the other applicable requirements of the buyer-notice of being sued for infringement [*see § 502.280[1]*], and notice to come in and defend [*see § 502.102[1]*], may be adapted for purposes of the seller desiring to be held harmless [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(B), (5)(A), (6)*], with reference to the form in [1], *above*, for any special language.

[4] Ability of Buyer to Demand Control Over Litigation

In the same manner as a seller who has been notified or informed that the buyer has been sued as a result of the seller's breach of warranty, a buyer who is obligated to hold a seller harmless for infringement arising out of the seller's compliance with specifications furnished by the buyer may make a demand for control of the action [*see Com. Code § 2607(5)(B), (6)*]. The form in *§ 502.282[1]* (seller's demand for control of litigation commenced against buyer) may be adapted for this purpose.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.282

§ 502.282 Demand by Seller That Buyer Turn Over Control of Litigation Resulting From Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)]

[1] FORM Demand by Seller That Buyer Turn Over Control of Litigation Resulting From Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)]

TO: _____ [*name of buyer at business address*]

DEMAND IS HEREBY MADE ON YOU that, after seasonable receipt hereof, you turn over to _____ [*name and any necessary identification of seller*] control of the litigation entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, filed on or about _____ [*date*] in _____ [*name of court*] at _____ [*location*], including any settlement therein. This litigation allegedly has arisen as a result of breach of warranty against infringement in connection with the sale to you by _____ [*name of seller*] on or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify location*], of goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of goods*], or else you will be barred from any remedy over against _____ [*name of seller*]. In connection with your acceptance of this demand, and only therewith, _____ [*name of seller*] hereby agrees to bear all expense and to satisfy any adverse judgment in this litigation.

[Very truly yours,]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*name of seller*]

Dated: _____.

[2] Use of Form

The demand in [1], *above*, is for use by a seller who has been informed that the buyer has been sued as a result of the seller's breach of warranty against infringement, and who seeks to take control of that litigation [*see Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*, discussed in *§ 502.28[4][b]* and in [3], *below*].

[3] Seller's Right to Demand Control

If the buyer has a claim against the seller for breach of the warranty against infringement or the like, for which the buyer has been sued, the seller may demand in writing that the buyer turn over to the seller control of the litigation, including settlement, or else be barred from any remedy over [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. If the seller also agrees to bear all expense and to satisfy any adverse judgment, the buyer is so barred unless he or she turns over control after seasonable receipt of the demand [*Com. Code § 2607(5)(B)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.283

§ 502.283 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF WARRANTY
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	AGAINST INFRINGEMENT
	)	(Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Sale of goods by defendant to plaintiff. See § 502.200[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. Defendant was a merchant regularly dealing in goods of the kind which were sold to plaintiff and, at the time of that sale, warranted to plaintiff, by imposition of law, that the goods would be delivered free of the rightful claim of any third person by way of infringement or the like.

5. However, defendant breached that warranty in that each of the goods sold actually infringed on a _____ [patent *or* trademark] _____ [owned by *or* licensed to *or* assigned to] _____ [*name of third party*]. As a result of this breach plaintiff did not receive delivery of those goods free of the rightful claim of a third person by way of infringement or the like.

6. [*Notification by plaintiff to defendant of breach. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6*].

[7. *If damages are based, at least in part, on remedy over for liability established in suit against buyer for infringement of the goods in question, add:* In addition plaintiff was sued by the _____ (proprietor *or* assignee *or* licensee) of that _____ (patent *or* trademark) on or about _____ [*date*], in the _____ (*name of court, e.g.,* U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California) at _____ (*location*), in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, notice of which plaintiff first received on or about _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff thereon notified defendant of that suit on or about _____ [*date*] by _____ (writing, in the form of a _____ (letter *or* telegram *or other*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference *or* personal visit and communication *or* telephone call *or other*).]

8. As a proximate result of this breach of warranty by defendant, plaintiff has been damaged in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff had to pay royalties to the owner of the _____ (patent *or* trademark) for all goods sold of the lot purchased from defendant, in the amount of $_____, and turn over all remaining goods unsold of the lot, in the amount of $_____].

9. Plaintiff has been further damaged as a result of this breach in that _____ [*describe incidental and consequential damages, e.g.,* defendant had to retain the legal services of a patent attorney to negotiate a settlement in lieu of full prosecution by the owner of the _____ (patent *or* trademark), resulting in reasonable legal expenses in the amount of $_____. Furthermore, as provided in the contract between plaintiff and defendant, plaintiff purchased the above-described goods from defendant in order to meet its obligation to its customers. Plaintiff incurred additional expenses in traveling and negotiating for substitute goods in the amount of $_____, as a proximate result of plaintiff's inability to deliver those goods which it was required to turn over to _____ (*name of third-party owner, licensee, or assignee*) as alleged in Paragraph 7, and in purchasing replacement goods in the amount of $_____ over what those goods had cost from defendant].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages*] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action by any buyer against a seller of goods for breach of warranty against infringement [*see Com. Code § 2312(3)*, discussed in *§ 502.22*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges the following:

- That defendant was a merchant regularly dealing in the goods sold and thereby warranting their freedom from infringement on delivery (Paragraph 4) [*Com. Code § 2312(3)*].

- Breach of the warranty against infringement (Paragraph 5).

- Notification of the breach to defendant by plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].

- Additional notification to defendant of any suit against plaintiff for infringement which resulted in liability therefor (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code § 2607(3)(B)*].

- Proximate damages for breach of the warranty of infringement (Paragraph 8) [*Com. Code § 2714(2)*].

- Incidental and consequential damages (Paragraph 9) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(3), 2715*].

[4] Attorney's Fees as Consequential Damages

The allegation of consequential damages in Paragraph 9 of the form in [1], *above*, includes an example of a claim for attorneys' fees incurred in litigation commenced by the third party as a result of the seller's infringement. These fees are fees that are a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the seller's breach. Although no California decision has held that attorney's fees in another action may be recovered in a buyer's action for breach of the warranty against infringement, in an analogous action for damages for breach of the warranty of title in the sale of a gun, it was held that attorney's fees incurred in defending against criminal charges brought against the buyer for possessing the gun to which the seller did not have title were reasonably foreseeable damages [*see De La Hoya v. Slim's Gun Shop (1970) 80 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 6, 146 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . For discussion of when attorney's fees may be recovered in an action on a contract, see *§ 502.103[6]*.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to patent infringement, see Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions*

For discussion and forms concerning trademark infringement, see Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.284-502.289

[Reserved]

§§ 502.284[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.290

§ 502.290 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Agreement Excluding Infringement Protection [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Agreement Excluding Infringement Protection [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

At the time of sale and as part of their agreement, defendant and plaintiff agreed that defendant did not guarantee that the goods would be delivered free of the rightful claim of any third person under any _____ [trademark *or* patent] licenses, assignments, or agreements to the contrary because _____ [*describe, e.g.,* defendant was not the manufacturer or designated dealer in the goods and was not aware of the circumstances of their production or distribution].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in defending against a claim of breach of warranty against infringement by a merchant otherwise regularly dealing in goods of the kind in question, when an agreement between the parties precluded a warranty against infringement from arising in the sale [*see Com. Code § 2312(3),* discussed in *§ 502.22*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.291

§ 502.291 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Buyer's Having Furnished Specifications [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Breach of Warranty Against Infringement Based on Buyer's Having Furnished Specifications [Com. Code § 2312(3)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

The goods sold by defendant to plaintiff were furnished only after receipt of, and [exactly] in compliance with, plaintiff's own specifications therefor, and any breach of the warranty against infringement that allegedly may have occurred, proximately resulted from defendant's compliance with plaintiff's specifications. Plaintiff, therefore, is required to hold defendant harmless against any claim for infringement arising from the sale.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in defending against a claim of breach of warranty against infringement by a merchant otherwise regularly dealing in goods of the kind in question, when the claim of infringement arises out of the defendant's compliance with the plaintiff's own specifications [*see Com. Code § 2312(3)*, discussed in *§ 502.22*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
G. Warranties Against Infringement

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 502.292-502.299

[Reserved]

§§ 502.292[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 502 SALES: WARRANTIES
PART IV. FORMS
H. Warranties With Regard to Quality or Condition of Goods on Arrival

44-502 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 502.300

§ 502.300 Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Quality or Condition of Goods on Arrival [Com. Code § 2321(2)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Breach of Warranty of Quality or Condition of Goods on Arrival [Com. Code § 2321(2)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF WARRANTY
_____ [*names*], Defendants.	)	(Condition of Goods on Arrival)
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendants. See § 502.103[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[*EITHER, if express warranty is involved*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff negotiated with defendant for the purchase of certain goods consisting of _____ [*describe quantity and nature of*

goods]. In the course of their negotiations, defendant _____ [affirmed the fact *or* promised] _____ [orally *or* in writing] that the goods on shipment and arrival would be _____ [of the quality *or* in the condition] _____ [*describe, e.g.,* they were in at the time of negotiations and before shipment]. That _____ [affirmation *or* promise] became a part of the basis of the bargain between the parties hereinbelow alleged, and thus constituted an express warranty. [A true copy of the writing is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

4. [*Sale of goods by defendant to plaintiff. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 4.*]

[*OR, if implied warranty is involved*]

3. [*Sale of goods by defendant to plaintiff. See § 502.200[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. At the time of sale to defendant there was an implied warranty, arising from _____ [course of dealing *or* usage of trade], that the goods on shipment and arrival would be _____ [of the quality *or* in the condition] _____ [*describe, e.g.,* they were in at the time of negotiations and before shipment].

[*CONTINUE*]

5. However, defendant breached the warranty in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the goods which arrived at plaintiff's business premises had greatly deteriorated since the time defendant had manufactured and shipped them, and were totally unfit for resale]. As a result thereof plaintiff in fact did not receive goods as _____ [*if express warranty:* expressly warranted *or if implied warranty:* impliedly warranted by defendant through _____ (course of dealing *or* usage of trade)].

6. [*Notification of breach by plaintiff to defendant. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Damages for breach of warranty. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 7.*]

8. [*Incidental or consequential damages. See § 502.140[1], Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For damages for _____ [*specify incidental or consequential damages, e.g.,* transportation of goods, and travel expenses] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification if desired. See § 502.103[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in an action against a seller for breach of an express or implied warranty of quality or condition of goods on arrival after shipment [*see Com. Code § 2321(2)*, discussed in *§ 502.25*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- In the case of an express warranty, the making of the warranty as part of the contract, and the consequent sale; or, in the case of an implied warranty arising from course of dealing or usage of trade, the sale of the goods, and the arising of the implied warranty as a part thereof (Paragraphs 3, 4) [*see Com. Code § 2321(2)*].
- Breach of the warranty (Paragraph 5).
- Notification of the breach [*see Com. Code § 2607(3)(A)*].
- Damages (Paragraphs 7, 8) [*Com. Code §§ 2714(2), (3), 2715*].

[4] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, §§ 177.40* et seq. and *177.140* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 503.syn

§ 503.syn Synopsis to Chapter 503: SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS

§ 503.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 503.02 Cross References

§§ 503.03-503.09 [Reserved]

§ 503.10 Governing Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Transition Provisions Relative to Revised Division 9 Effective July 1, 2000

[a] Application to Pre-effective Date Transactions and Liens

[b] Security Interests Perfected Before Effective Date

[c] Security Interest That Was Enforceable But Not Perfected Before Effective Date

[d] Effect of Action Taken Before July 1, 2001

[i] Action Other Than Filing That Perfects Security Interest

[ii] Financing Statement Filed Before July 1, 2001

[iii] Filing in Jurisdiction or Office Applicable Under Prior Law

[iv] Effect of Continuation Statements

[e] When Initial Financing Statement Suffices to Continue Effectiveness of Financing Statement

[f] Amendment of Pre-Effective Date Financing Statement

[g] Persons Entitled to File Initial Financing Statements or Continuation Statements

[h] Priority

§ 503.11 Definitions

[1] "Account"

[a] Transactions Out of Which Account May Arise

[b] Exclusions

[2] "Account Debtor"

[3] "Agricultural Lien"

[4] "Authenticate"

[5] "Chattel Paper;" "Electronic Chattel Paper"

[6] "Collateral"

[7] "Consignment"

[8] "Consumer Transaction;" "Consumer--goods Transaction"

[9] Debtors and Other Obligors

[a] "Debtor;" "New Debtor;" "Original Debtor"

[b] "Consumer Debtor;" "Consumer Obligor"

[c] "Obligor;" "Secondary Obligor"

[d] Classes and Distinctions

[10] "Deposit Account"

[11] "Document;" "Document of Title"

[12] "General Intangible;" "Payment Intangible"

[13] "Good Faith"

[14] "Goods"

[a] Items Included in Definition of "Goods"

[b] When Software May Be "Goods"

[c] Items Excluded from Definition of "Goods"

[d] Classes of Goods

[15] "Instrument"

[16] "Investment Property;" "Commodity Account;" "Commodity Contract"

[17] "Lien Creditor"

[18] "Proceeds;" "Cash Proceeds;" "Noncash Proceeds"

[19] "Purchase Money Security Interest;" "Purchase Money Collateral;" "Purchase Money Obligation"

[a] In Goods

[b] In Software

[c] Dual Status Rule

[20] "Secured Party"

[21] "Security Agreement"

[22] "Security Interest"

[23] "Software"

[24] "Value," "New Value"

§ 503.12 Applicability of Division 9 of the Commercial Code

[1] In General

[2] When Transaction Is Subject to Consumer-protection Legislation

§ 503.13 When Division 9 Is Inapplicable

[1] In General

[2] Specific Transactions to Which Division 9 Does Not Apply

§§ 503.14-503.19 [Reserved]

§ 503.20 Security Agreement

[1] Formalities

[2] Scope and Effect

[3] Statute of Frauds Exception

§ 503.21 Security Interest in Collateral

[1] Nature

[2] Attachment for Enforceability

[a] In General

[b] When New Debtor Becomes Bound

[c] In Proceeds, Supporting Obligations, Security Interests or Liens

[d] Security Accounts and Commodity Accounts

[3] Interest Unaffected by Debtor's Right to Use Collateral

[4] Effect of Transfer of Collateral

[a] General Rule on Unauthorized Disposition

[b] Proceeds of Collateral Subject to Agricultural Lien

[c] Determining Whether Disposition Was Authorized

[d] Provision Prohibiting Transfer

[5] After-Acquired Collateral

§ 503.22 When Perfection Occurs

[1] In General

[2] Perfection on Attachment

[3] Perfection by Possession

[4] Perfection by Control

[5] Property Requiring Registration or Certificate of Title

[6] Perfection by Filing of Financing Statement

[a] When Filing Is Permitted or Required

[i] Interests for Which Filing Is Permitted or Required

[ii] Who Is Entitled to File

[b] Contents

[i] In General

[ii] Debtor's Name

[iii] Description of Collateral

[iv] Mistakes Allowed Unless Misleading

[c] Place of Filing

[d] Time of Filing

[e] Completion of Filing

[f] Duration of Effectiveness

[g] Amendment

[i] Authority to File Amendment

[ii] Types of Amendments That May Be Filed

[iii] When Amendment Becomes Effective

[h] Correction Statement

[i] Debtor's Name Change or Reorganization; New Debtor

[j] Continuation Statement

[k] Termination Statement

[l] Statement of Release

[m] Assignment of, or Reflected in, Financing Statement

[n] Request for Financing Statement Information

[7] Perfection in Proceeds

[a] When Perfection Occurs and Ceases

[b] Perfection of Security Interest in Proceeds Acquired With Cash Proceeds

[c] Continuation of Perfection in Cash Proceeds

§ 503.23 Conflict of Laws as to Perfection and Priority of Security Interests

[1] General Rules

[a] Nonpossessory Security Interests

[b] Possessory Security Interests

[c] Minerals [As-Extracted Collateral]

[d] Farm Products

[2] Rules Regarding Debtor's Location

[a] In General

[b] Registered Organizations

[c] Federal Government, Banks, and Foreign Air Carriers

[3] Goods Covered by Certificate of Title

[a] General Rule

[b] Perfection When Governing Law Changes

[c] Interest Omitted From Certificate of Title

[4] When Perfection of Security Interest Lapses Following Change in Governing Law

§ 503.24 Determination of Priorities

[1] Unperfected Interests

[2] Perfected Interests

[a] General Priority Rules

[b] Priorities in Supporting Obligations and Proceeds

[c] Purchase Money Security Interests

[d] Future Advances

[e] Priority of Perfected Security Interest in Crops Over Real Estate Encumbrance

[f] Possessory Liens

[3] Favored Position of Certain Buyers and Holders

[a] Buyers in Ordinary Course of Business

[b] Licensees in Ordinary Course of Business

[c] Lessees in Ordinary Course of Business

[d] Holders, Holders in Due Course, and Protected Purchasers

[4] Interest or Lien Perfected by Filing Statement Containing Incorrect Information

[5] Between Transferor's Secured Party and Transferee's Secured Party

[a] Security Interests in Transferred Collateral

[b] New Debtors

§ 503.25 Debtor's Statement of Indebtedness or List of Collateral

[1] Permitted Types of Requests

[2] Required Responses

[3] Procedure if Recipient Claims No Interest In Collateral or Obligation

§ 503.26 Rights and Duties of Parties in Possession

[1] Secured Party

[2] Debtor in Possession

§ 503.27 Secured Party's Rights and Duties on Default

[1] Generally

[2] Taking Possession of Collateral

[3] Collection or Enforcement After Default

[a] In General

[b] Application of Proceeds of Collection or Enforcement

[4] Acceptance of Collateral in Satisfaction of Debt (Strict Foreclosure)

[a] Requirements and Proposal

[b] Debtor's Consent

[c] Who Is Entitled to Notification of Proposal

[d] Notification of Objection to Proposal

[e] Effect of Secured Party's Acceptance of Collateral

[5] Disposition of Collateral

[a] Commercially Reasonable Conduct

[b] Notice of Disposition

[i] Who Must Be Notified

[ii] Time for Notification

[iii] Contents of Notification in Transaction Other Than Consumer-Goods Transaction

[iv] Contents of Notification in Consumer-Goods Transaction

[v] Additional Requirements on Disposition of Motor Vehicle in Consumer-Goods Transaction

[c] Allocation of Proceeds

[d] Calculation of Proceeds on Disposition to Secured Party, Related Entity, or Secondary Obligor

[e] Debtor's Right to Surplus

[f] Creditor's Right to Deficiency

[g] Junior Secured Party's Immunity on Good Faith Retention of Proceeds in Derogation of Another Lien or Secured Interest

[h] Effect of Disposition; Purchaser's Rights

[i] Transfer Statement

[6] Sale Pursuant to Execution; Priority of Execution Lien

[7] Action for Deficiency or Surplus

[a] Transaction Other than Consumer Transaction

[i] When Secured Party Must Prove Compliance

[ii] Limited Deficiency if Secured Party Fails to Prove Compliance

[iii] Debtor's Burden of Proof After Disposition to Secured (or Related) Party

[b] In Consumer Transaction

[i] Secured Party's Burden of Proof

[ii] Other Conditions for Obtaining Deficiency

[iii] Effect of Judgment That Creditor Is Not Entitled to Deficiency

[iv] Debtor's Right to Damages or Proceeds of Subsequent Dispositions

[v] Secured Party Must Account for Surplus

[8] Alternative Rights to Foreclose Mixed Security

[a] Creditor's Options

[b] Limited Application of One Action Rule and Antideficiency Legislation

[c] When Application of Proceeds of Disposition of Personal Property Collateral Does Not Cure of Default

[d] Definition of Monetary Judgment on Debt

[e] Effect of Secured Party's Noncompliance on Purchaser

[9] Rights and Duties of Secondary Obligors

[a] After Assignment of Secured Obligation or Collateral or Subrogation

[b] Before Succeeding to Secured Party's Position

[10] Rights of Owners of Collateral Other Than Primary Obligors

§ 503.28 Debtor's Rights on Default

[1] In General

[2] Waiver, Renunciation, and Modification of Rights

[a] Prohibited Waivers

[b] Permitted Waivers

[3] Defense Against Assignee

[4] Right of Redemption

[5] Bringing Secured Party Into Compliance With Law

§ 503.29 Secured Party's Liability for Noncompliance

[1] In General

[2] Parties Who May Recover Damages

[3] Statutory Damages

[4] Secured Party Must Know of, and How to Communicate With, Debtor or Obligor

§§ 503.30-503.39 [Reserved]

§ 503.40 Goods

[1] Security Interests in Goods Arising Under Sales Law

[2] Perfection of Interest in Goods

[a] Generally

[b] Goods in Possession of Bailee Issuing Nonnegotiable Document

[3] Accessions

[a] Security Interest In Accessions

[b] Remedies on Default Involving Accessions

[4] Commingled Goods

[5] Priority of Security Interests in Goods

[a] When Buyer of Goods Takes Free of Interest That Secures Advance

[b] When Lessee of Goods Takes Free of Interest That Secures Advance

[c] Purchase Money Security Interest in Good Other than Inventory

[d] Purchase Money Interest in Livestock

[e] Purchase Money Security Interest in Software

[6] Rules for Disposition of Goods on Default

§ 503.41 Inventory

[1] Exception to Certificate of Title Statute

[2] Priority of Purchase Money Security Interest in Inventory

§ 503.42 Consumer Goods

[1] Definitions and Issues Discussed Elsewhere

[2] Perfection by Filing of Financing Statement; Purchase Money Security Interest

[3] Buyer May Take Free Before Financing Statement Is Filed

[4] Secured Party in Possession of Consumer Goods

[5] Secured Party's Duty to Dispose of Consumer Goods in Possession After Default

[a] When Disposition Is Required

[b] Enforcement by Suit for Conversion of Consumer Goods

[6] Secured Party's Immunity Based on Reasonable Belief That Transaction Is Not Consumer Goods Transaction

§ 503.43 Perishable Agricultural Commodities

§ 503.44 Timber and Minerals

[1] Extent of Division 9 Applicability to Timber to Be Cut and As Extracted Collateral

[2] Security Agreement as to Timber to Be Cut

[3] Perfecting a Security Interest in Timber to Be Cut or As Extracted Collateral

[4] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Minerals Takes Free of Encumbrance

§ 503.45 Agricultural Liens

[1] Perfection of Agricultural Liens

[2] Statute Creating Agricultural Lien May Give It Priority

[3] Statute Creating Agricultural Lien Determines Time of Default

§ 503.46 Goods on Consignment

[1] Definitions and Parties

[2] Consignor's Goods Subject to Claims of Consignee's Creditors

[3] Filing and Notification Procedure for Protection of Consignments

[4] Form of Financing Statement for Consignments

[5] Ordinary Duties of Secured Party in Possession Do Not Apply to Consignor

[6] Actual Knowledge That Consignee Sells Goods on Consignment

§ 503.47 Fixtures

[1] Relation to Goods for Security Interest Purposes

[2] "Fixtures" and "Trade Fixtures" Defined

[3] Creation of Security Interest in Fixtures

[4] Procedure and Effectiveness of Fixture Filing

[5] Notice to Real Estate Interest

[6] Priorities as to Fixtures

[a] Residual Rule

[b] Perfected Interests in Fixtures

[c] Unperfected Interests in Fixtures

[d] Construction Mortgage

[7] Governing Law When Foreign Goods Affixed to California Property

§ 503.48 Documents

[1] Perfection of Interests in Negotiable Documents

[a] Negotiation

[b] Perfection

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Documents

[3] Secured Party's Rights on Default Involving Documents

[4] Secured Party's Duties When Electronic Document of Title No Longer Secures Any Obligation

§ 503.49 Instruments

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Instruments

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Instruments

[3] Priorities Among Interests in Instruments

[4] Secured Party's Rights and Duties as to Instruments

[5] Right to Make Collection

§ 503.50 Chattel Paper

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Chattel Paper

[a] Tangible Chattel Paper

[b] Electronic Chattel Paper

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Chattel Paper

[3] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

[a] Over Claim of Interest in Chattel Paper as Proceeds of Inventory

[b] Over Interest Claimed Other than as Proceeds

[c] Competing Priorities in Proceeds

[d] While Buyer's Security Interest is Unperfected

[4] Secured Party in Possession of Chattel Paper

[5] Right to Make Collection

[6] Secured Party's Duties When Electronic Chattel Paper No Longer Secures Any Obligation

§ 503.51 Accounts

[1] Expanded Definition Under Revised Division 9

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Interests in Accounts

[3] Perfection of Security Interest in Account

§ 503.52 Sales of Accounts or Chattel Paper, Payment Intangibles, or Promissory Notes

[1] Terminology: "Assignment" and "Transfer"

[2] Extent to Which Division 9 Is Applicable

[a] Those Covered by Division 9

[b] Expansion in Revised Division 9 to Include Payment Intangibles and Promissory Notes

[3] Conflict of Laws as to Sales of Receivables

[4] Buyer as Secured Party; Seller as Debtor

[5] Ineffectiveness of Terms Against Transfer or Assignment

[6] Interest of Buyer of Promissory Note or Payment Intangible Is Perfected on Attachment

[7] Seller's Interest

[8] Priority Accorded Buyer

[9] Special Rules Regarding Surplus and Deficiency

§ 503.53 Insurance Policies

[1] Policy Loans Not Covered by Division 9

[2] Perfection of Security Interest in Insurance Policy

§ 503.54 Health Care Insurance Receivables

[1] Defined

[2] Assignment of Health Care Insurance Receivable

§ 503.55 Financial Assets

[1] Defined

[2] Security Interest of Unpaid Financial Intermediary

§ 503.56 Investment Property

[1] Perfection of Security Interests in Investment Property

[a] Definitions and Descriptions

[b] By Control or Filing

[c] By Possession of Certificated Security

[d] Perfection of Security Interests Created by Broker or Intermediary on Attachment

[e] Perfection Includes Perfection in Entitlements and Commodity Contracts

[2] Choice of Law Governing Perfection and Priority of Security Interests in Investment Property

[a] Perfection Under Law Where Debtor Is Located

[b] Certificated Securities

[c] Uncertificated Securities

[d] Securities Entitlements and Securities Accounts

[e] Commodity Contract or Commodity Account

[3] Priority of Security Interests in Investment Property

[4] Secured Party's Duty When Investment Property No Longer Secures Any Obligation

§ 503.57 Collateral of Transmitting Utilities

[1] "Transmitting Utility" Defined

[2] Financing Statement for Utility's Collateral

[a] Place of Filing

[b] May Be Effective Until Termination Statement Filed

§ 503.58 Bank Deposits

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Deposit Account

[2] Choice of Law Governing Interests in Deposit Accounts

[a] Originally

[b] Change Due to Change of Bank's Jurisdiction

[3] Priorities of Security Interests in Deposit Accounts

[4] Transferee of Money From Deposit Account Takes Free of Security Interest

[5] Bank's Right to Recoupment or Set-off

[6] Bank's Rights and Duties With Respect to Deposit Account

[7] Secured Party's Duties When Deposit No Longer Secures Any Obligation

§ 503.59 Letter-of-Credit Rights

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Letter-of-Credit Rights

[a] In General

[b] As Supporting Obligation

[2] Choice of Law Governing Interests in Letter-of-Credit Rights

[3] Priority of Security Interests in Letter-of-Credit Rights

[4] Secured Party's Duties When Letter-of-Credit Right No Longer Secures Any Obligation

[5] Ineffectiveness of Term Against Assignment of Letter-of-Credit Right

§ 503.60 Assignments of Accounts, Chattel Paper, General Intangibles, and Promissory Notes

[1] Ineffectiveness of Agreement Against Assignment

[2] Security Interest Perfected on Attachment

[3] Assignee's Position Against Account Debtor

[4] Modifications by Original Parties After Assignment

[5] Account Debtor's Payments on Assignment

[6] Secured Party's Right to Collect on Default Under Accounts Collateral

[7] Secured Party's Duty to Release Debtor After Assignment When Obligation Has Been Satisfied

§§ 503.61-503.69 [Reserved]

§ 503.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Bender's Forms of Discovery

[2] California Legal Forms

[3] California Real Estate Law and Practice

[4] Other Matthew Bender Publications

§ 503.71 Federal Statutes

§ 503.72 State Statutes

[1] Applicability of Civil Procedure Laws to Secured Transactions

[2] Applicability of Realty Security Laws to Secured Transactions

[3] Applicability of Other Divisions of Commercial Code

[a] General Definitions

[b] Construction of Code

[c] Sales

[d] Commercial Paper

[e] Bank Deposits and Collections

[f] Letters of Credit

[g] Bulk Sales

[h] Documents of Title

[i] Investment Securities

[j] Personal Property Leases

[4] Division 9 of Commercial Code

[a] General Provisions

[b] Security Agreements and Security Interests; Rights of Parties

[c] Perfection and Priority

[d] Rights of Third Parties

[e] Filing

[f] Default

[g] Transition Provisions

[5] Vehicles

[a] Repossession of Vehicles

[b] Provisions Applicable to Vehicles Held as Security Interests

§ 503.73 Decisions

[1] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business

[2] Duties of Secured Parties

[3] Equitable Principles

[4] Pledges

[5] Priorities

[6] Proceeds

[a] Examples of Proceeds

[b] Need Not Come Into Debtor's Possession

[c] Secured Party's Interest in Proceeds of Disposition

[7] Secured Party in Possession

[8] Secured Party's Remedies

[a] In General

[b] Commercially Reasonable Collection or Disposition

[c] Notice of Disposition

[d] Repossession

[9] Security Interests

[a] Continuing Effectiveness

[b] Creation of Security Interest

[c] Description of Collateral

[d] Disguised as Lease

[e] Perfection of Security Interests

[10] Waiver or Modification of Debtor's Rights

§ 503.74 Attorney General Opinions

§ 503.75 Law Reviews

§ 503.76 Text References

§§ 503.77-503.99 [Reserved]

§ 503.100 Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party to Supply Statement of Information Requested by Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9210, 9625(b)-(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statutory Damages

[5] Verification

[6] Installment or Auto Sales Actions

[a] Filing of Affidavit or Declaration of Proper Venue Required

[b] Consequences of Failure to File Affidavit or Declaration

[7] Attorney's Fees

§ 503.101 Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party in Possession to Preserve Collateral [Com. Code §§ 9207, 9625(b)-(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 503.102 Complaint to Restrain Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law From Dispositions of Collateral [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Refusal to Honor Debtor's Right of Redemption [Com. Code § 9623]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Special Requirements for Injunctive Relief

§ 503.103 Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 503.104 Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross Reference

§ 503.105 Complaint for Accounting and Payment of Surplus After Collection or Disposition of Collateral After Default--By Debtor Against Secured Party [Com. Code § 9608 or 9615]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross Reference

§§ 503.106-503.109 [Reserved]

§ 503.110 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Priority in Fixtures--Trade Fixtures Did Not Become Interest in Real Estate and Were Intended to Remain Free Thereof [Civ. Code § 1019]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 503.111 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Deficiency After Foreclosure--To Place Secured Party's Compliance in Issue [Com. Code § 9626(a)]--Secured Party Did Not Proceed in Commercially Reasonable Manner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 503.112 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Deficiency After Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)]--Proceeds of Disposition to Secured (or Related) Party Were Significantly Less Than What Would Have Been Obtained on Disposition to Unrelated Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 503.113 Defense to Action on Contract for Enforcement of Security Agreement--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 533; Mil. & Vet. Code § 408]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Governing Law

[4] Enforcement of Security Interests

[5] Stay of Proceeding

[6] Who May Request Stay

[7] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

[8] Cross References

§§ 503.114-503.119 [Reserved]

§ 503.120 Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement and for Judicial Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)] or Possession of Collateral [Com. Code § 9609] Thereunder

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Alternative Methods of Judicial Foreclosure

[5] Methods of Enforcing Possession on Judgment

[6] Cross References

§ 503.121 Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement--Failure to Pay Proceeds--By Secured Party Against Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9315, 9601(a)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Rights of Secured Party on Disposition of Collateral

[a] Pursuit of Collateral

[b] Pursuit of Proceeds

§ 503.122 Explanation to Consumer Debtor or Obligor of How Deficiency or Surplus Was Calculated [Com. Code § 9616]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] When Explanation Must Be Sent

[5] Charge for Explanation

[6] Liability for Failure to Provide Explanation

§ 503.123 Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Foreclosure on Collateral After Default Under Security Agreement or Agricultural Lien [Com. Code §§ 9615, 9626]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Disposition Pursuant to Rees-Levering Act

[5] Statute of Limitations

§ 503.124 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Collection by Secured Party of Accounts or Payment Obligations [Com. Code §§ 9607, 9608, 9626]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 503.125-503.129 [Reserved]

§ 503.130 Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priorities Among Security Interests in or Agricultural Liens on Particular Collateral

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Availability of Declaratory Relief

[5] Jurisdiction of Actions for Declaratory Relief

§ 503.131 Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Security Interest or Agricultural Lien Perfected by Filing First [Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in or Agricultural Lien on, and Possession of, Collateral

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Information Concerning and Copies of Current Filings

§ 503.132 Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Perfected Purchase Money Security Interest in Inventory [Com. Code § 9324(b)-(c)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in and Possession of Collateral

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 503.133 Complaint in Intervention by Consignor Who Complied With Filing and Notification Procedure to Protect Ownership in Consigned Goods [Com. Code §§ 2326(1)(b), (2), 9324(b), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Application or Motion to Intervene Must Be Filed

[4] Allegations

[5] Alternative Remedy of Third-Party Claim

§ 503.134 Complaint for Damages and to Quiet Title By Purchaser of Chattel Paper Against Dealer, Buyer, and Secured Party Claiming Security Interest in Chattel Paper [Com. Code § 9330]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

[b] Quiet Title Action

[4] Verification Necessary

[5] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

[6] Quiet Title Action

[a] Jurisdiction and Venue

[b] Service of Summons

§§ 503.135-503.149 [Reserved]

§ 503.150 Affirmative Defense to Complaint Alleging That Secured Party Is Not Proceeding or Did Not Proceed in Accordance With Law Based on Debtor's Authenticated Modification or Waiver of Rights After Default [Com. Code §§ 9624, 9629]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 503.151-503.159 [Reserved]

§ 503.160 Complaint in Intervention by Party Claiming Right in Fixtures Prior to Secured Party or Debtor by Virtue of Real Property Interest [Com. Code § 9334]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 503.161 Complaint by Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priority of Interest in Collateral and Damages--Against Seller and Secured Party Claiming Inventory Interest [Com. Code § 9320(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business Defined

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.01

§ 503.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter covers litigation arising out of transactions (usually sales or loans) secured by (or representing security interests in) personal property or fixtures. The Legal Background is divided into three parts:

- Part A [*see § 503.10* et seq.] gives relevant definitions and discusses the transition provisions applicable to revised Division 9 of the Commercial Code, which becomes operative on July 1, 2001.

- Part B [*see § 503.20* et seq.] discusses the general features of a secured transaction, including creation, perfection, and priorities of security interests.

- Part C [*see § 503.40* et seq.] adds information relative to transactions involving specific classes of collateral.

The chapter includes the following forms for use by debtors [Part IV. A.], secured parties [Part IV. B.], and other persons claiming interests in the collateral [Part IV. C.]:

- Complaints for use by debtors relating to enforcement of duties owed by the secured party to the debtor: to provide information to the debtor [*see § 503.100*]; to preserve collateral in the secured party's possession [*see § 503.101*]; to prevent disposition of the collateral in derogation of the debtor's right of redemption [*see § 503.102*]; to require disposition of the collateral after the debtor's rejection of a proposal that the secured party retain the collateral in full satisfaction of the secured obligation [*see § 503.103*]; for conversion based on the secured party's failure to make timely disposition of collateral that consists of consumer goods [*see § 503.104*]; and for accounting and payment of surplus remaining after the secured party's disposition of the collateral [*see § 503.105*].

- Affirmative defense forms for use by debtors based on debtor's rights to trade fixtures, which did not become collateral [*see § 503.110*]; on the secured party's failure to dispose of the collateral in a commercially reasonable manner, which will prevent the secured party from obtaining a deficiency judgment [*see § 503.111*]; on the fact that a disposition to the secured party or an affiliate or related

entity did not realize an much as disposition to an unrelated party would have realized [*see § 503.112*]; and an application (motion) for a stay of a proceeding to enforce a security interest on the ground that the defendant is on active military service [*see § 503.113*].

- A form for use by a secured party to comply with its obligations under *Com. Code § 9616* by explaining how the secured party calculated any deficiency or surplus [*see § 503.122*].

- Complaints for use by secured parties against debtors for damages and foreclosure or possession of collateral when the debtor has defaulted [*see § 503.120*]; for an accounting and payment of proceeds from the disposition of the collateral to the secured party when the debtor has failed to do so [*see § 503.121*]; and for a deficiency judgment after foreclosure [*see § 503.123*; *see also § 503.124* (optional allegation for use when deficiency remains after collection of collateral that is accounts or instruments)].

- Complaints for use by secured parties against other secured parties for judicial declaration of the order of priorities of competing security interests [*see § 503.130*]; for possession of collateral, asserting the priority of a nonpurchase money security interest perfected by filing first over the nonpurchase money security interest of a secured party in possession of collateral [*see § 503.131*]; for possession of collateral, asserting the priority a purchase money security interest in inventory over the nonpurchase money security interest of a secured party in possession of collateral [*see § 503.132*]; in intervention, for use by a consignor to assert priority to the consigned goods [*see § 503.133*]; and for use by a purchaser of chattel paper to quiet title to competing security interests in that chattel paper [*see § 503.134*].

- An affirmative defense for use by a secured party to raise the debtor's renunciation or modification of rights after default [*see § 503.150*].

- A complaint in intervention asserting the intervenor's rights in fixtures prior to the rights of either the secured party or the debtor [*see § 503.160*].

- A complaint for declaratory relief to determine the priority of a buyer in the ordinary course of business over the interest of a party claiming a security interest in inventory [*see § 503.161*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.02

§ 503.02 Cross References

- For discussion of, and a complaint foreclosing, dairy cattle supply lien (*Food & Agric. Code § 57401 et seq.*), see Ch. 24, *Animals: Liens*

- For discussion of a consignor's rights relative to the consignee's creditors when an artist has consigned the artist's work of fine art to a California dealer for exhibition or sale (*Civ. Code § 1738 et seq.*), see Ch. 57, *Art* .

- For complaints, allegations, and affirmative defenses relating to assignment of secured obligations, see Ch. 60, *Assignments*

- For discussion of the measure of damages for unlawful motor vehicle subleasing, see Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act*

- For writs of possession for use in obtaining delivery of personalty prior to trial, and pleadings for delivery of property (replevin), see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery*

- For discussion and forms dealing with the right of one spouse to transfer marital holdings, see Ch. 122, *Community Property*

- For discussion and complaints concerning disclosures and special procedures for protection of purchasing or borrowing consumers, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans*

- For forms concerning invalid or breached agreements generally (applicable to security agreements), see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

- For forms involving misappropriation of property generally (applicable to security), see Ch. 150, *Conversion*

- For writs to execute on judicially ordered possession or sale of property and notices involved in third-party claims in secured transactions, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

- For false or purported transfer generally (applicable to improper conveyance of security) see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*

- For a discussion and forms concerning a guardian or conservator's ability to transfer property, see Ch. 290A, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Asset Management and Investment*

- For a discussion of the right of a cotenant to transfer property held jointly or in common, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common*

- For a discussion and forms concerning right to fixtures as between lessor and lessee, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy*

- For a discussion and forms concerning minors' rights to contract generally, see Ch. 365, *Minors: Contract Actions*

- For discussion and forms concerning partner's ability to transfer partnership property generally, see *Ch. 402, Partnerships: Actions Between General Partners or Partnership and Third Parties, §§ 402.13, 402.42*

- For discussion and forms concerning the authority of a personal representative or trustee to transfer property, see Ch. 455, *Probate: Sale of Estate Property* , and Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.03-503.09

[Reserved]

§§ 503.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.10

§ 503.10 Governing Statutes

[1] In General

The law governing all transactions secured by personal property (including fixtures and some agricultural liens, but excluding some investment securities to the extent that security interest in those securities are governed by Division 8) and disputes arising from these transactions is almost exclusively contained in Division 9 of the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 9101 et seq.*; *see Com. Code § 9701 et seq.* (for certain transitional provisions, discussed in [2], *below*)], known as the "Uniform Commercial Code-Secured Transactions" [*Com. Code § 9101*]. The former version of Division 9 was repealed effective July 1, 2001, and a new, extensively revised version of Division 9 took effect on that date [*see* Stats. 1999, ch. 991, and discussion of transition provisions in [2], *below*]. In this chapter, the term "revised Division 9" refers to the version of Division 9 that took effect on July 1, 2001. The version of Division 9 that was effective prior to that date is referred to as "former Division 9."

Unless governed by the particular provisions authorizing the issuance of bonds, notes, commercial paper, leases, or other evidences of indebtedness by a public body, *Gov. Code § 5450 et seq.* govern a pledge of collateral by a public body to secure the evidence of indebtedness.

If the buyer or borrower entered military service after the obligation was incurred, the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] will limit the fees charged and the creditor's rights to enforce the obligation [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 511, 514, 516* (definitions and persons protected)]. California law similarly provides temporary protection from creditors for eligible military service members during qualifying periods of military service [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*; Stats. 2002, Ch. 60]. For discussion of both the federal act (applicable to members of the regular armed forces) and the California law (applicable to members of the national guard on active service and members of the military reserve on active duty), see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, §§ 501.60 et seq, 501.300*. For an application under these statutes to stay a proceeding to enforce a security interest while the defendant is on active military service, see *§ 503.113*.

There are special liens in favor of suppliers of perishable agricultural commodities and inventories and proceeds derived

from them [*7 U.S.C. §§ 499a, 499e(c)*].

So-called finance leases first effective between the parties after 1989 may be governed by Division 10 [*Com. Code § 10101 et seq.*], which is discussed in Ch. 413, *Personal Property Leases* . Whether a transaction creates a lease or a security interest is determined by the facts of each case in accordance with the criteria set forth in *Com. Code § 1203*, discussed in *§ 503.11[22]*. Division 9 governs aspects of security interests created under *Com. Code § 10508(e)* [*see Com. Code §§ 9109(a)(5), 9110*, and discussions in *§§ 503.12[1]* and *503.40[1]*].

[2] Transition Provisions Relative to Revised Division 9 Effective July 1, 2000

[a] Application to Pre-effective Date Transactions and Liens

As noted in [1], *above*, a revised version of Division 9 became effective on July 1, 2001 [*see* Stats. 1999, ch. 991]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9701-9709*, revised Division 9 applies to a transaction or lien within its scope, even if the transaction or lien was entered into or created before July 1, 2001 [*Com. Code § 9702(a)*]. With respect to transactions and liens that were validly entered into or created before July 1, 2001, and that were *not* governed by former Division 9, but that would be subject to revised Division 9 if they had been entered into or created after July 1, 2001, the rights, duties, and interests flowing from those transactions and liens remain valid after July 1, 2001, except as otherwise provided with respect to actions, cases, or proceedings commenced before July 2, 2001 [*see Com. Code § 9702(c), below*], and except as provided in *Com. Code §§ 9703-9709* [*Com. Code § 9702(b)(1)*]. Subject to the same exceptions, those transactions and liens may be terminated, completed, consummated, and enforced as required or permitted by revised Division or by the law that otherwise would apply if revised Division 9 had not taken effect [*Com. Code § 9702(b)(2)*].

Revised Division 9 does not affect an action, case, or proceeding commenced before July 1, 2001 [*Com. Code § 9702(c)*].

[b] Security Interests Perfected Before Effective Date

A security interest that is enforceable immediately before July 1, 2001, and would have priority over the rights of a person that becomes a lien creditor at that time, is a perfected security interest under revised Division 9 if, on July 1, 2001, the applicable requirements for enforceability and perfection under revised Division 9 are satisfied without further action [*Com. Code § 9703(a)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9705* (discussed in [d][3], *below*), if, immediately before July 1, 2001, a security interest is enforceable and would have priority over the rights of a person that becomes a lien creditor at that time, but the applicable requirements for enforceability or perfection under revised Division 9 are not satisfied on July 1, 2001, the security interest is a perfected security interest until July 1, 2002. Such a security interest remains enforceable after July 1, 2002, only if the security interest becomes enforceable under *Com. Code § 9203* (discussed in *§ 503.21[2]*) before July 1, 2002, and remains perfected after July 1, 2002, only if the applicable requirements for perfection under revised Division 9 are satisfied before July 1, 2002 [*Com. Code § 9703(b)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Action Required Within One Year for Interest to Remain Perfected. A pre-effective date possessory security interest in instruments was perfected by bailee's receipt of notification under former *Com. Code § 9305*. The bailee did not, however, acknowledge that it holds for the security party's benefit as required by revised *Com. Code § 9313(c)*. Will the security interest remain perfected after July 1, 2002? No. In order for the security interest to remain perfected, the bailee will have to authenticate a record acknowledging that it holds for the secured party (or appropriate steps must be taken to perfect the interest by some other method) within the one-year period following the effective date. Otherwise, the security interest becomes unperfected at the end of that period [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9703*].

[c] Security Interest That Was Enforceable But Not Perfected Before Effective Date

A security interest that is enforceable immediately before July 1, 2001, but which would be subordinate to the rights of a person that becomes a lien creditor at that time, remains an enforceable security interest until July 1, 2002 [*Com. Code § 9704(1)*] and remains enforceable thereafter if the security interest becomes enforceable under *Com. Code § 9203* (discussed in *§ 503.21[2]*) on July 1, 2001, or on July 1, 2002 [*Com. Code § 9704(2)*]. That security interest becomes perfected either (1) without further action, on July 1, 2001, if the applicable requirements for perfection under revised Division 9 are satisfied on or before that time, or (2) when the applicable requirements for perfection are satisfied if the requirements are satisfied after that time [*Com. Code § 9704(3)*].

[d] Effect of Action Taken Before July 1, 2001

[i] Action Other Than Filing That Perfects Security Interest

Com. Code § 9705 primarily addresses situations in which a perfection step is taken under former Division 9 or other applicable law before July 1, 2001, but the security interest does not attach until after that date [*see* UCC Comment 1 to *Com. Code § 9705*]. If action, other than the filing of a financing statement, is taken before July 1, 2001, and the action would have resulted in priority of a security interest over the rights of a person that becomes a lien creditor had the security interest become enforceable before July 1, 2001, the action is effective to perfect a security interest that attaches under revised Division 9 on or before July 1, 2002. An attached security interest becomes unperfected on July 1, 2002, unless the security interest becomes a perfected security interest under revised Division 9 before that date [*Com. Code § 9705(a)*].

[ii] Financing Statement Filed Before July 1, 2001

The filing of a financing statement before July 1, 2001, is effective to perfect a security interest to the extent the filing would satisfy the applicable requirements for perfection under revised Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9705(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9705(b)* deals with financing statements that were not effective under former Division 9, but would perfect a security interest under revised Division 9. Examples include financing statements that do not accurately describe the collateral or were filed in the wrong place [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9705*; *but see Com. Code § 9706*, which determines whether financing statement filed before effective date operates to continue effectiveness of financing statement filed in another officer before effective date].

[iii] Filing in Jurisdiction or Office Applicable Under Prior Law

Revised Division 9 does not render ineffective an effective financing statement that, before July 1, 2001, is filed and satisfies the applicable requirements for perfection under the law of the jurisdiction governing perfection as provided in former *Com. Code § 9103*. However, with limited exceptions [*see Com. Code §§ 9705(d), (e), 9706*], the financing statement ceases to be effective at the earlier of (1) the time the financing statement would have ceased to be effective under the law of the jurisdiction in which it is filed, or (2) June 30, 2006 [*Com. Code § 9705(c)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

The effect of *Com. Code § 9705(c)* is that during the early years of revised Division 9, it may be necessary to search not only in the filing office of the jurisdiction whose law governs perfection under revised Division 9, but also (if different) in the jurisdiction and filing office(s) designated by former Division 9. Further, a financing statement filed before July 1, 2001, may remain effective beyond July 1, 2006 if *Com. Code § 9705(d)* (concerning continuation statements), *Com. Code § 9705(e)* (concerning transmitting utilities), or *Com. Code § 9706* (initial financing statements that operate to continue pre-effective-date financing statements) applies [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9705*].

Com. Code § 9705(c)(2) applies to a financing statement that, before July 1, 2001, is filed against a transmitting utility

and satisfies the applicable requirements for perfection under the law of the jurisdiction governing perfection as provided in former *Com. Code § 9103* only to the extent that revised *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342* provide that the law of a jurisdiction other than the jurisdiction in which the financing statement is filed governs perfection of a security interest in collateral covered by the financing statement [*Com. Code § 9705(e)*].

Com. Code § 9705(c) is an exception to *Com. Code § 9703(b)*. Under the general rule in *Com. Code § 9703(b)* (discussed in [b], *above*), a security interest that is enforceable and perfected on July 1, 2001, remains perfected for a year after that even if the security interest is not enforceable under revised Division 9 and the applicable requirements for perfection under revised Division 9 have not been met. However, in some cases, *Com. Code § 9705(c)* may shorten the one-year period of perfection; in others, if the security interest is enforceable under *Com. Code § 9203*, it may extend the period of perfection [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9705*].

[iv] Effect of Continuation Statements

A financing statement filed before July 1, 2001, may be continued only by filing in the state and office designated by revised Division 9 [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9705*]. The filing of a continuation statement after July 1, 2001, does not continue the effectiveness of the financing statement filed before July 1, 200 [*Com. Code § 9705(d)*]. Instead, an initial financing statement must be filed under *Com. Code § 9706* [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9705*]. However, on the timely filing of a continuation statement after July 1, 2001, and in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction governing perfection as provided in *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*, the effectiveness of a financing statement filed in the same office in that jurisdiction before July 1, 2001, continues for the period provided by the law of that jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9705(d)*].

A financing statement that includes a financing statement filed before July 1, 2001, and a continuation statement filed after July 1, 2001, is effective only to the extent that it satisfies the requirements of *Com. Code §§ 9501-9528* for an initial financing statement [*Com. Code § 9705(f)*].

[e] When Initial Financing Statement Suffices to Continue Effectiveness of Financing Statement

The filing of an initial financing statement in the office specified in *Com. Code § 9501* continues the effectiveness of a financing statement filed before July 1, 2001, if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9706(a)*]:

- The filing of an initial financing statement in that office would be effective to perfect a security interest under revised Division 9.

- The pre-effective-date financing statement was filed in an office in another state or another office in California.

- The initial financing statement satisfies *Com. Code § 9706(c)*, which requires that the initial financing statement do all of the following:

  - Satisfy the requirements of *Com. Code §§ 9501-9528* for an initial financing statement.

  - Identify the pre-effective-date financing statement by indicating the office in which the financing statement was filed and providing the dates of filing and file numbers, if any, of the financing statement and of the most recent continuation statement filed with respect to the financing statement.

  - Indicate that the pre-effective-date financing statement remains effective.

The filing of an initial financing statement under *Com. Code § 9706(a)* before July 1, 2001, continues the effectiveness of the pre-effective-date financing statement for five years [*Com. Code § 9706(b)(1)* (adopting period provided in former *Com. Code § 9403* with respect to financing statement)]. If the initial financing statement under *Com. Code § 9706(a)* is filed after July 1, 2001, the effectiveness of the pre-effective-date financing statement continues for the period provided in *Com. Code § 9515* with respect to an initial financing statement [*Com. Code § 9706(b)(2)*].

[f] Amendment of Pre-Effective Date Financing Statement

A "pre-effective-date financing statement" means a financing statement filed before July 1, 2001 [*Com. Code § 9707(a)*]. After that date, a person may add or delete collateral covered by, continue or terminate the effectiveness of, or otherwise amend the information provided in, a pre-effective-date financing statement only in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction governing perfection as provided in *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*. However, the effectiveness of a pre-effective-date financing statement also may be terminated in accordance with the law of the jurisdiction in which the financing statement is filed [*Com. Code § 9707(b)*].

Except as otherwise provided by *Com. Code § 9706(d)*, if California law governs perfection of a security interest, the information in a pre-effective-date financing statement may be amended after the date this section becomes operative only if any of the following occur [*Com. Code § 9707(c)*]:

- The pre-effective-date financing statement and an amendment are filed in the office specified in *Com. Code § 9501*.

- An amendment is filed in the office specified in *Com. Code § 9501* concurrently with, or after the filing in that office of, an initial financing statement that satisfies *Com. Code § 9706(c)*.

- An initial financing statement that provides the information as amended and satisfies *Com. Code § 9706(c)* is filed in the office specified in *Com. Code § 9501*.

If California law governs perfection of a security interest, the effectiveness of a pre-effective-date financing statement may be continued only under *Com. Code § 9705(d)* and *(f)* or *Com. Code § 9706* [*Com. Code § 9707(d)*]. Whether or not California law governs the perfection of a security interest, the effectiveness of a pre-effective-date financing statement filed in California may be terminated after the date that this section becomes operative by filing a termination statement in the office in which the pre-effective-date financing statement is filed, unless an initial filing statement that satisfies *Com. Code § 9706(c)* has been filed in the office specified by the law of the jurisdiction governing perfection as provided in *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342* as the office in which to file a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9707(e)*].

[g] Persons Entitled to File Initial Financing Statements or Continuation Statements

A person may file an initial financing statement or a continuation statement under *Com. Code §§ 9701-9709* if the secured party of record authorizes the filing and the filing is necessary under *Com. Code §§ 9701-9709* either (1) to continue the effectiveness of a financing statement filed before July 1, 2001, or (2) to perfect or continue the perfection of a security interest [*Com. Code § 9708*].

[h] Priority

Revised Division 9 determines priority of conflicting claims to collateral. However, if the relative priorities of the claims were established before July 1, 2001, former Division 9 determines priority [*Com. Code § 9709(a)*]. For purposes of *Com. Code § 9322(a)*, the priority of a security interest that becomes enforceable under *Com. Code § 9203* dates from July 1, 2001, if the security interest is perfected under revised Division 9 by the filing of a financing

statement before July 1, 2001, which would not have been effective to perfect the security interest under former Division 9. The foregoing does not apply to conflicting security interests each of which is perfected by the filing of such a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9709(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.11

§ 503.11 Definitions

[1] "Account"

[a] Transactions Out of Which Account May Arise

"Account," except as used in "account for," means a right to payment of a monetary obligation, whether or not earned by performance, for any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*]:

- Property that has been or is to be sold, leased, licensed, assigned, or otherwise disposed of.
- Services rendered or to be rendered.
- A policy of insurance issued or to be issued.
- A secondary obligation incurred or to be incurred.
- Energy provided or to be provided.
- The use or hire of a vessel under a charter or other contract.
- Arising out of the use of a credit or charge card or information contained on or for use with the card.
- As winnings in a lottery or other game of chance operated or sponsored by a state, governmental unit of a state, or person licensed or authorized to operate the game by a state or governmental unit of a state.

"Account" includes health care insurance receivables [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*].

[b] Exclusions

"Account" does not include the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*]:

- Rights to payment evidenced by chattel paper or an instrument.
- Commercial tort claims.
- Deposit accounts.
- Investment property.
- Letter-of-credit rights or letters of credit.
- Rights to payment for money or funds advanced or sold, other than rights arising out of the use of a credit or charge card or information contained on or for use with the card.

[2] "Account Debtor"

"Account debtor" means a person obligated on an account, chattel paper, or general intangible. The term does not include persons obligated to pay a negotiable instrument, even if the instrument constitutes part of chattel paper [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(3)*].

[3] "Agricultural Lien"

"Agricultural lien" means an interest in farm products that has all of the following characteristics [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(5)*]:

- It secures payment or performance of an obligation for either goods or services furnished in connection with a debtor's farming operation or rent on property leased by a debtor in connection with its farming operation.
- It is created by statute in favor of a person that either in the ordinary course of its business furnished goods or services to a debtor in connection with a debtor's farming operation or leased real property to a debtor in connection with the debtor's farming operation.
- Its effectiveness does not depend on the person's possession of the personal property.

[4] "Authenticate"

"Authenticate" means to do either of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(7)*]:

- To sign.
- To execute or otherwise adopt a symbol, or encrypt or similarly process a record in whole or in part, with the present intent of the authenticating person to identify the person and adopt or accept a record.

[5] "Chattel Paper;" "Electronic Chattel Paper"

"Chattel paper" means a record or records that evidence both a monetary obligation and a security interest in specific goods, a security interest in specific goods and software used in the goods, a security interest in specific goods and license of software used in the goods, a lease of specific goods, or a lease of specific goods and license of software used in the goods. For this purpose, "monetary obligation" means a monetary obligation secured by the goods or owed under

a lease of the goods and includes a monetary obligation with respect to software used in the goods. The term does not include either of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(11)*]:

- Charters or other contracts involving the use or hire of a vessel

- Records that evidence a right to payment arising out of the use of a credit or charge card or information contained on or for use with the card.

If a transaction is evidenced by records that include an instrument or series of instruments, the group of records taken together constitutes chattel paper [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(11)*].

"Electronic chattel paper" is chattel paper evidenced by a record or records consisting of information stored in an electronic medium [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(31)*].

[6] "Collateral"

"Collateral" means the property subject to a security interest or agricultural lien. The term includes all of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(12)*]:

- Proceeds to which a security interest attaches.

- Accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, and promissory notes that have been sold.

- Goods that are the subject of a consignment.

[7] "Consignment"

For purposes of revised Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9109(a)(4)*], "consignment" means a transaction, regardless of its form, in which a person delivers goods, other than goods that were consumer goods immediately before delivery, to a merchant who is not an auctioneer for the purpose of sale and all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)*; *see Com. Code § 2326* (consignment of consumer goods)]:

- The merchant deals in goods of that kind under a name other than the name of the person making delivery.

- The merchant is not generally known by its creditors to be substantially engaged in selling the goods of others.

- With respect to each delivery, the aggregate value of the goods is $1,000 or more at the time of delivery.

- The transaction does not create a security interest that secures an obligation.

[8] "Consumer Transaction;" "Consumer--goods Transaction"

"Consumer transaction" means a transaction in which [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(26)*]:

- An individual incurs an obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes;

- A security interest secures the obligation; and

- The collateral is held or acquired primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

The term "consumer transaction" includes consumer-goods transactions [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(26)*]. "Consumer-goods transaction" means a consumer transaction in which both of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(24)*]:

- An individual incurs an obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

- A security interest in consumer goods secures the obligation [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(23)* (defining "consumer goods," set forth in [14][d], *below*].

[9] Debtors and Other Obligors

[a] "Debtor;" "New Debtor;" "Original Debtor"

"Debtor" means any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(28)*]:

- A person having an interest, other than a security interest or other lien, in the collateral, whether or not the person is an obligor.

- A seller of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes.

- A consignee.

By including in the definition of "debtor" all persons with a property interest (other than a security interest or other lien on collateral), the definition includes transferees of collateral, whether or not the secured party knows of the transfer or the transferee's identity. Exculpatory provisions [*see Com. Code §§ 9605, 9628*] protect the secured party in that circumstance [U.C.C. Comment 2.a. to *Com. Code § 9102*].

"New debtor" means a person that becomes bound as debtor under *Com. Code § 9203(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.21[2][b]*, by a security agreement previously entered into by another person [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(56)*]. "Original debtor," except as used in *Com. Code § 9310(c)*, means a person that, as debtor, entered into a security agreement to which a new debtor has become bound under *Com. Code § 9203(d)* [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(60)*].

[b] "Consumer Debtor;" "Consumer Obligor"

"Consumer debtor" means a debtor in a consumer transaction [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(22)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(26)* (consumer transaction, set forth in [8], *above*); *Com. Code § 9102(a)(24)* (consumer goods transaction, set forth in [8], *above*)]. "Consumer obligor" means an obligor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation as part of a transaction entered into primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(25)*].

[c] "Obligor;" "Secondary Obligor"

"Obligor" means a person that, with respect to an obligation secured by a security interest in or an agricultural lien on the collateral [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(59)*]:

- Owes payment or other performance of the obligation;

- Has provided property other than the collateral to secure payment or other performance of the obligation; or

- Is otherwise accountable in whole or in part for payment or other performance of the obligation.

The term "obligor" does not include issuers or nominated persons under a letter of credit [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(59)*].

A "secondary obligor" is an obligor to the extent that either of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(71)*]:

- The obligor's obligation is secondary [*see* U.C.C. Comment 2.a. to *Com. Code § 9102* (one must consult the law of suretyship to determine whether an obligation is secondary)].

- The obligor has a right of recourse with respect to an obligation secured by collateral against the debtor, another obligor, or property of either.

[d] Classes and Distinctions

The definitions of "debtor," "obligor," and "secondary obligor" in revised Division 9 distinguish, mostly for purposes of default and enforcement, among three classes of persons [U.C.C. Comment 2.a. to *Com. Code § 9102*]:

- Persons who may have a stake in the proper enforcement of the security interest by virtue of their non-lien property interest (typically ownership interest). These persons are debtors.

- Persons who may have a stake in the proper enforcement of the security interest because of their obligation to pay the secured debt. These persons are secondary obligors if any portion of the obligation is secondary or if the obligor has a right to recourse against the debtor or another obligor with respect to an obligation secured by the collateral.

- Persons who have an obligation to pay the secured debt but have no stake in proper enforcement of the security interest. These persons are neither debtors nor secondary obligors. With one exception (*Com. Code § 9616*, as it relates to consumer obligations), the rights and duties provided by *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* (default), affect non-debtors only if they are "secondary obligors."

[10] "Deposit Account"

"Deposit account" means a demand, time, savings, passbook, or similar account maintained with a bank (or other organization that is engaged in the business of banking, including a savings bank, savings and loan association, credit unions, or trust company). The term does not include investment property or accounts evidenced by an instrument [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(29)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(8)* (defining "bank"].

[11] "Document;" "Document of Title"

"Document" means a document of title or a receipt of the type described in *Com. Code § 7201(b)* (receipt for goods stored under a statute requiring a bond against withdrawal or a license for the issuance of receipts in the nature of warehouse receipts) [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(30)*].

"Document of title" includes a bill of lading, dock warrant, dock receipt, warehouse receipt, gin ticket, or compress receipt, and any other document that, in the regular course of business or financing, is treated as adequately evidencing that the person entitled under the document [*see Com. Code § 7102(a)(9)*] has the right to receive, hold, and dispose of the document and the goods it covers. To be a document of title, a document must purport to be issued by a bailee and purport to cover goods in the bailee's possession that either are identified as or are fungible portions of an identified

mass [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(16)*].

[12] "General Intangible;" "Payment Intangible"

"General intangible" means any personal property, including things in action, other than accounts, chattel paper, commercial tort claims, deposit accounts, documents, goods, instruments, investment property, letter-of-credit rights, letters of credit, money, and oil, gas, or other minerals before extraction. The term includes payment intangibles and software [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(42)*]. "General intangible" is the residual category of personal property, including things in action, that is not included in the other defined types of collateral. Examples are various categories of intellectual property and the right to payment of a loan of funds that is not evidenced by chattel paper or an instrument [UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*]. "Software" is a general intangible for purposes of Division 9. Thus, except as otherwise provided, statutory provisions applicable to general intangibles apply to payment intangibles and software [UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*]. "Things in action" includes rights that arise under a license of intellectual property, such as the right to exploit the property without liability for infringement.

The definition in revised Division 9 excludes commercial tort claims, deposit accounts, and letter of credit rights. Each of the foregoing is a separate type of collateral. One important consequence of this exclusion is that tortfeasors (commercial tort claims), banks (deposit accounts), and persons obligated under letters of credit (letters of credit) are not "account debtors" having the rights and obligations set forth in *Com. Code §§ 9104, 9105*, and *9106*. In particular, tortfeasors, banks, and persons obligated under letters of credit are not obligated to pay an assignee (secured party) on receipt of the notification described in *Com. Code § 9404(a)*. Another important consequence relates to the adequacy of the description in the security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9108*; UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*].

A right to payment of money is often buttressed by ancillary covenants, such as covenants in a purchase agreement or note or mortgage requiring insurance on the collateral or forbidding removal of the collateral, or covenants to preserve the creditworthiness of the promisor, such as covenants restricting dividends and the like. Division 9 does not treat these ancillary rights separately from the rights to payment to which they related. For example, attachment and perfection of an assignment of a right to payment of a monetary obligation, whether it be an account or a payment intangible, also carries these ancillary rights [UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*].

"Payment intangible" means a general intangible under which the account debtor's principal obligation is a monetary obligation [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(61)*]. Every payment intangible is also a general intangible [UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*]. The term "payment intangible" embraces only those intangibles "under which the account debtor's principal obligation is to pay money [UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102*].

[13] "Good Faith"

In "Good faith" means honesty in fact and the observance of reasonable commercial standards of fair dealing [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(20)*].The same concept applies in the context of Division 9 for purposes of the obligation of good faith imposed by *Com. Code § 1304* (every contract or duty within the Commercial Code imposes an obligation of good faith in its performance or enforcement) [UCC Comment 19 to *Com. Code § 9102*].

[14] "Goods"

[a] Items Included in Definition of "Goods"

"Goods" means all things that are movable when a security interest attaches. The term includes the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*]:

- Fixtures.

- Standing timber that is to be cut and removed under a conveyance or contract for sale.
- The unborn young of animals.
- Crops grown, growing, or to be grown, even if the crops are produced on trees, vines, or bushes.
- Manufactured homes.

[b] When Software May Be "Goods"

"Goods" includes a computer program embedded in goods and any supporting information provided in connection with a transaction relating to the program if either [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*]:

- The program is associated with the goods in such a manner that it customarily is considered part of the goods; or
- By becoming the owner of the goods, a person acquires a right to use the program in connection with the goods.

"Goods" does not include a computer program embedded in goods that consist solely of the medium in which the program is embedded [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*].

[c] Items Excluded from Definition of "Goods"

"Goods" does not include any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*]:

- Accounts.
- Chattel paper.
- Commercial tort claims.
- Deposit accounts.
- Documents.
- General intangibles.
- Instruments.
- Investment property.
- Letter-of-credit rights.
- Letters of credit.
- Money [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(24)* (money defined)].
- Oil, gas, or other minerals before extraction.

In addition, Division 9 does not govern--rather, *Veh. Code § 6300* exclusively governs--perfecting a security interest in a vehicle that is not classified as inventory. With respect to determining the rights of competing parties when a security interest is claimed in a non-inventory vehicle, the provisions of Division 9 do not come into play until the security interest is perfected under the Vehicle Code [*Quartz of S. Cal., Inc. v. Mullen Bros., Inc. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 901, 908, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 54*].

[d] Classes of Goods

There are four mutually exclusive classes of goods [U.C.C. Comment 4.a. to *Com. Code § 9102*]:

(1) "Consumer goods," defined as goods that are used or bought for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(23)*].

(2) "Equipment," defined as goods other than inventory, farm products, or consumer goods [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(33)*].

(3) "Farm products," defined as goods, other than standing timber, with respect to which the debtor is engaged in a farming operation and which are any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(34)*]:

- Crops grown, growing, or to be grown, including both of the following:
- Crops produced on trees, vines, and bushes.
- Aquatic goods produced in aquacultural operations.
- Livestock, born or unborn, including aquatic goods produced in aquacultural operations.
- Supplies used or produced in a farming operation.
- Products of crops or livestock in their unmanufactured states.

(4) "Inventory," defined as goods, other than farm products, which are any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(48)*]:

- Leased by a person as lessor.
- Held by a person for sale or lease or to be furnished under a contract of service.
- Furnished by a person under a contract of service.
- Raw materials, work in process, or materials used or consumed in a business.

[15] "Instrument"

"Instrument" means a negotiable instrument or any other writing that evidences a right to the payment of a monetary obligation, is not itself a security agreement or lease, and is of a type that in ordinary course of business is transferred by delivery with any necessary indorsement or assignment [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(47)*]. A promissory note is an instrument, specifically an instrument that evidences a promise to pay a monetary obligation, does not evidence an order to pay, and does not contain an acknowledgment by a bank that the bank has received for deposit a sumof money or funds [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(65)*]. A check may also be an instrument [*see* UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9330(d)*].

"Instrument" does not include (1) investment property, (2) letters of credit, or (3) writings that evidence a right to

payment arising out of the use of a credit or charge card or information contained on or for use with the card [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(47)*].

[16] "Investment Property;" "Commodity Account;" "Commodity Contract"

"Investment property" means a security, whether certificated or uncertificated, security entitlement, securities account, commodity contract, or commodity account [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(49)*].

"Commodity account" means an account maintained by a commodity intermediary in which a commodity contract is carried for a commodity customer [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(14)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(16)* (commodity customer defined); *Com. Code § 9102(a)(17)* (commodity intermediary defined)].

"Commodity contract" means a commodity futures contract, an option on a commodity futures contract, a commodity option, or another contract if the contract or option is either of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(15)*]:

- Traded on or subject to the rules of a board of trade that has been designated as a contract market for such a contract pursuant to federal commodities laws.

- Traded on a foreign commodity board of trade, exchange, or market, and is carried on the books of a commodity intermediary for a commodity customer [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(16)* (commodity customer defined); *Com. Code § 9102(a)(17)* (commodity intermediary defined)].

[17] "Lien Creditor"

"Lien creditor" means any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(52)(A)*]:

- A creditor that has acquired a lien on the property involved by attachment, levy, or the like.

- An assignee for benefit of creditors from the time of assignment.

- A trustee in bankruptcy from the date of the filing of the petition.

- A receiver in equity from the time of appointment.

"Lien creditor" does not include a creditor who by filing a notice with the Secretary of State has acquired only an attachment or judgment lien on personal property, or both [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(52)(B)*].

[18] "Proceeds;" "Cash Proceeds;" "Noncash Proceeds"

"Proceeds," except as used in *Com. Code § 9609(b)* (secured party's rights after default), means any of the following property [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(64)*]:

- Whatever is acquired on the sale, lease, license, exchange, or other disposition of collateral.

- Whatever is collected on, or distributed on account of, collateral [*see* UCC Comment 13a and b to *Com. Code § 9102* (this includes cash or stock dividends distributed on account of securities or other investment property that is original collateral as well as distributions on "supporting obligations"); *see also Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)* (defining "supporting obligation," discussed in *§ 503.24[2][b]*), *Com. Code § 9203(f)* (discussed in *§ 503.21[2]*].

- Rights arising out of collateral.

- To the extent of the value of collateral, claims arising out of the loss, nonconformity, or interference with the use of, defects or infringement of rights in, or damage to, the collateral.

- To the extent of the value of collateral and to the extent payable to the debtor or the secured party, insurance payable by reason of the loss or nonconformity of, defects or infringement of rights in, or damage to, the collateral.

"Cash proceeds" are proceeds that are money, checks, deposit accounts, or the like [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(9)*]. The phrase "or the like" covers property that is the functional equivalent of money, checks, or deposit accounts, such as some money market accounts that are securities or part of securities entitlements [*see* UCC Comment 13e to *Com. Code § 9102*]. Cash proceeds retain their character as cash proceeds while in the possession of a levying officer pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 481.010 et seq.* (Attachment Law) or *Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.* (Enforcement of Judgments Law) [*Com. Code § 9315(f)*]. All other types of proceeds are "noncash proceeds" [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(58)*].

The definition of "proceeds" no longer provides that proceeds of proceeds are themselves proceeds. That idea is expressed in the revised Division 9 definition of collateral [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(12)*, discussed in [6], *above*]. No change in meaning from former *Com. Code § 9306* is intended [*see* UCC Comment 13c to *Com. Code § 9102*; *see also* discussion and examples, at § 503.22[7][b]]. As in California cases decided under former Division 9 [*see, e.g., American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 775-776, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 651, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914]* , revised Division 9 contains no requirement that property be received by the debtor for the property to qualify as proceeds. It is necessary only that the property be traceable, directly or indirectly, to the original obligation [*see* UCC Comment 13d to *Com. Code § 9102*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Examples of Proceeds Never Taken Into Debtor's Possession. Under a security agreement and financing statement, secured party perfected a security interest in debtor's crops and their proceeds. Buyer had notice of that interest, but because of a fraud perpetrated by the debtor and his sons, buyer mistakenly paid crop proceeds to the sons. Secured party sued the buyer for conversion. Were the sums paid to the sons proceeds? Yes. When buyer wrongfully disposed of proceeds to which secured party was entitled, it became liable for conversion [*American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 775-776, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325]* .

Under a security agreement and financing statement, secured party perfected a security interest in debtor's crops and their proceeds. Secured party sent notice to a crop buyer informing it of secured party's interests and stating that no setoff or deductions were to be made. Buyer applied $53,336.35, of the purchase price, including $43,336.35 for harvesting the 1981 crop and $10,000 still owing for the 1980 harvest, to payment of a bill submitted to it by the harvester. Was that $53,336.35 proceeds? Yes [*Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 651, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914]* . However, applying principles of unjust enrichment, because secured party knew of and acquiesced in the expenditure, which was necessary to the development of the crop, and ultimately benefited from that expenditure, secured party was not entitled to retain the $43,336.35 of proceeds expended with regard to the 1981 crop [*Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 658-660, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914]* .

[19] "Purchase Money Security Interest;" "Purchase Money Collateral;" "Purchase Money Obligation"

[a] In Goods

A security interest in goods is a purchase money security interest as follows [*Com. Code § 9103(b)*]:

- To the extent that the goods are purchase money collateral with respect to that security interest.

- If the security interest is in inventory [*see* [14][d], *above*] that is or was purchase money collateral, also to the extent that the security interest secures a purchase money obligation incurred with respect to other inventory in which the secured party holds or held a purchase money security interest.

- Also to the extent that the security interest secures a purchase money obligation incurred with respect to software in which the secured party holds or held a purchase money security interest.

The security interest of a consignor in goods that are the subject of a consignment is a purchase money security interest in inventory [*Com. Code § 9103(d)*].

"Purchase money collateral" means goods or software that secures a purchase money obligation incurred with respect to that collateral [*Com. Code § 9103(a)(1)*]. "Purchase money obligation" is an obligation of an obligor incurred as all or part of the price of the collateral or for value given to enable the debtor to acquire rights in or the use of the collateral if the value is in fact so used [*Com. Code § 9103(a)(2)*].

In a transaction other than a consumer goods transaction, a purchase money security interest does not lose its status as such, even if (1) the purchase money collateral also secures an obligation that is not a purchase money obligation, (2) collateral that is not purchase money collateral also secures the purchase money obligation, or (3) the purchase money obligation has been renewed, refinanced, consolidated, or restructured [*Com. Code § 9103(f)*].

[b] In Software

A security interest in software is a purchase money security interest to the extent that the security interest also secures a purchase money obligation incurred with respect to goods in which the secured party holds or held a purchase money security interest if both of the following conditions are satisfied *see also Com. Code § 9103(b)(3)*, set forth in [a], *above*]:

- The debtor acquired its interest in the software in an integrated transaction in which it acquired an interest in the goods.

- The debtor acquired its interest in the software for the principal purpose of using the software in the goods.

[c] Dual Status Rule

In a transaction other than a consumer goods transaction, if the extent to which a security interest is a purchase money security interest depends on the application of a payment to a particular obligation, the payment must be applied as follows [*Com. Code § 9103(e)*]:

- First, in accordance with any reasonable method of application to which the parties agree.

- Second, in the absence of the parties' agreement to a reasonable method, in accordance with any intention of the obligor manifested at or before the time of payment.

- Third, in the absence of an agreement to a reasonable method and a timely manifestation of the obligor's intention, first, to obligations that are not secured, and if more than one obligation is secured, to

obligations secured by purchase money security interests in the order in which those obligations were incurred.

In a transaction other than a consumer goods transaction, a secured party claiming a purchase money security interest has the burden of establishing the extent to which the security interest is a purchase money security interest [*Com. Code § 9103(g)*].

In consumer goods transactions, the court determines the proper rules for establishing the extent to which a security interest is a purchase money security interest. The court may not infer from the limitations in *Com. Code § 9103(e)-(g)* the nature of the proper rule in consumer-goods transactions and may continue to apply established approaches [*Com. Code § 9103(h)*].

[20] "Secured Party"

"Secured party" means any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(72)*]:

- A person in whose favor a security interest is created or provided for under a security agreement, whether or not any obligation to be secured is outstanding.
- A person that holds an agricultural lien.
- A consignor.
- A person to which accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes have been sold.
- A trustee, indenture trustee, agent, collateral agent, or other representative in whose favor a security interest or agricultural lien is created or provided for.
- A person that holds a security interest arising under *Com. Code § 2401, 2505, 2711(3), 4210, 5118,* or *10508(e)*.

[21] "Security Agreement"

A "security agreement" is an agreement that creates or provides for a security interest [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(73)*].

[22] "Security Interest"

A "security interest" is an interest in personal property or fixtures which secures payment or performance of an obligation. The term includes any interest of a consignor and a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, a payment intangible, or a promissory note in a transaction that is subject to Division 9 [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*].

The retention or reservation of title by a seller of goods notwithstanding shipment or delivery to the buyer [*see Com. Code § 2401*] is limited in effect to a reservation of a "security interest" [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*; *see Com. Code § 2505*]. The special property interest of a buyer of goods on identification of those goods to a contract for sale under *Com. Code § 2401* is not a "security interest," but a buyer may acquire a "security interest" by complying with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 2505*, the right of a seller or lessor of goods under Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*) or Division 10 (*Com. Code § 10101 et seq.*) to retain or acquire possession of the goods is not a "security interest," but a seller or lessor may acquire a"security interest" by complying with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*].

Whether a transaction creates a lease or a security interest is determined by the facts of each case [*Com. Code § 1203(a)*; *see, e.g., Addison v. Burnett (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1288, 1299, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 132* (finding that parties entered into lease rather than security agreement)]. However, the transaction creates a security interest if the consideration that the lessee is to pay the lessor for the right to possession and use of the goods is an obligation for the term of the lease not subject to termination by the lessee and any one of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 1203(b)*]:

- The original term of the lease is equal to or greater than the remaining economic life of the goods.

- The lessee is bound to renew the lease for the remaining economic life of the goods or is bound to become the owner of the goods.

- The lessee has an option to renew the lease for the remaining economic life of the goods for no, or nominal, additional consideration on compliance with the lease agreement.

- The lessee has an option to become the owner of the goods for no, or nominal, additional consideration on compliance with the lease agreement.

A transaction does not create a security interest, however, merely because any of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 1203(c)*]:

- The present value of the consideration that the lessee must pay the lessor for the right to possession and use of the goods is substantially equal to or greater than the fair market value of the goods at the time the lease is entered into.

- The lessee assumes the risk of loss of the goods, or agrees to pay taxes, insurance, filing, recording, or registration fees, or service or maintenance costs, with respect to the goods.

- The lessee has an option to renew the lease or to become the owner of the goods.

- The lessee has an option to renew the lease for a fixed rent that is equal to or greater than the reasonably predictable fair market rent for the use of the goods for the term of the renewal at the time the option is to be performed.

- The lessee has an option to become the owner of the goods for a fixed price that is equal to or greater than the reasonably predictable fair market value of the goods at the time the option is to be performed.

- In the case of a motor vehicle [*see Veh. Code § 415* (definition)] or a trailer [*see Veh. Code § 630* (definition)] that is not used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, the amount of rental payments may be increased or decreased by reference to the amount realized by the lessor on sale or disposition of the vehicle or trailer. However, nothing in this subparagraph affects the application or administration of the Sales and Use Tax Law [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6001 et seq.*].

[23] "Software"

"Software" means a computer program and any supporting information provided in connection with a transaction relating to the program. "Software" does not include a computer program that is included in the definition of goods, as discussed in [14][b], *above* [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(75)*].

[24] "Value," "New Value"

Except as otherwise provided with respect to negotiable instruments and bank collections (*Com. Code §§ 3303, 4210*, and *4211*), a person gives "value" for rights if he or she acquires them in any of the following ways [*Com. Code § 1204*]:

- In return for a binding commitment to extend credit or for the extension of immediately available credit whether or not drawn upon and whether or not a chargeback is provided for in the event of difficulties in collection.
- As security for, or in total or partial satisfaction of, a preexisting claim.
- By accepting delivery pursuant to a preexisting contract for purchase.
- Generally, in return for any consideration sufficient to support a simple contract.

"New value" means (1) money, (2) money's worth in property, services, or new credit, or (3) release by a transferee of an interest in property previously transferred to the transferee. The term does not include an obligation substituted for another obligation [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(57)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.12

§ 503.12 Applicability of Division 9 of the Commercial Code

[1] In General

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9109(c)* and *(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.13*, Division 9 of the Commercial Code applies to each of the following [*Com. Code § 9109(a)*]:

- A transaction, regardless of its form, that creates a security interest in personal property or fixtures by contract.
- An agricultural lien.
- A sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes.
- A consignment.
- A security interest arising under *Com. Code § 2401* (identification of goods), *Com. Code § 2505*, *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, or *Com. Code § 10508(e)* (personal property lease), as provided in *Com. Code § 9110*.
- A security interest arising under *Com. Code § 4210* (collecting bank's security interest in items being collected) or *Com. Code § 5118* (issuer's security interest in document presented under letter of credit).

With respect to security interest arising under Division 2 of the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 9110*], see discussion in *§ 503.40[1]*.

Application of Division 9 to a security interest in a secured obligation is not affected by the fact that the obligation is itself secured by a transaction or interest to which Division 9 does not apply [*Com. Code § 9109(b)*]. For instance, one who holds a promissory note secured by a deed of trust to real property may sell that note or give a security interest in

that not to secure his or her own obligation to another person. The security interest thus created in the note will be subject to Division 9 of the Commercial Code even though the original obligation under the deed of trust is not [*see* U.C.C. Comment 7. to *Com. Code § 9109*].

Division 9 does not extend the application of any the rule of law, statute, or regulation to a transaction not otherwise subject to it [*Com. Code § 9201(d)(2)*].

[2] When Transaction Is Subject to Consumer-protection Legislation

Division 9 does not validate any rate, charge, agreement, or practice that violates a rule of law, statute, or regulation described *Com. Code § 9201(b)*, set forth below [*Com. Code § 9201(d)*; *see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9201* (transaction is subject to both Division 9 and other law)].

A transaction that is subject to Division 9 is subject to any applicable rule of law which establishes a different rule for consumers, to any applicable consumer protection statute, regulation, or law, and to the following [*Com. Code § 9201(b)*]:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* (Chapter 5 of Part 2 of Division 7), relating to unfair competition.
- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.* (Chapter 1 of Part 3 of Division 7), relating to advertising.
- The Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*; *see* Ch. 501, *Sales: Installment Sales*];
- The Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*; *see e.g., Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 209, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133* (discussed in *§ 503.27[5][b][v]*, if collateral is consumer motor vehicle, secured party must give notice of disposition that complies with both Division 9 and Rees-Levering)].
- Obligations arising from the following particular transactions:
  - Consignment of fine arts [*Civ. Code § 1738 et seq.*].
  - Credit cards [*Civ. Code § 1747 et seq.*].
  - Layaway practices [*Civ. Code § 1749 et seq.*].
  - Commercial credit reports [*Civ. Code § 1785.41 et seq.*].
  - Check cashing [*Civ. Code § 1789.30 et seq.*].
  - Precomputed interest [*Civ. Code § 1799.5 et seq.*].
  - Precomputed finance charges [*Civ. Code § 1799.8 et seq.*].
  - Consumer credit contracts [*Civ. Code § 1799.90 et seq.*].
  - Contracts for discount buying services [*Civ. Code § 1812.100 et seq.*].
  - Contracts for seller assisted marketing plans [*Civ. Code § 1812.200 et seq.*].

- Membership camping contracts [*Civ. Code § 1812.300 et seq.*].
- Creditor's remedies relating to credit disability insurance [*Civ. Code § 1812.400 et seq.*].
- Auctions and auctioneers [*Civ. Code § 1812.600 et seq.*].
- Deposits (bailments) [*Civ. Code § 1813 et seq.*].
- Loans for use or bailments [*Civ. Code § 1884 et seq.*].
- Liens [*Civ. Code § 2872 et seq.*].

- The Areias Credit Card Full Disclosure Act of 1986 [*Civ. Code § 1748.10 et seq.*].
- The Areias Charge Card Full Disclosure Act of 1986 [*Civ. Code § 1748.20 et seq.*].
- The Consumers Legal Remedies Act [*Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.*].
- The Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act [*Civ. Code § 1785.1 et seq.*].
- The Investigative Consumer Reporting Agencies Act [*Civ. Code § 1786 et seq.*].
- The Holden Credit Denial Disclosure Act of 1971 [*Civ. Code § 1787.1 et seq.*].
- The Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act [*Civ. Code § 1788 et seq.*].
- The Electronic Commerce Act of 1984 [*Civ. Code § 1789 et seq.*].
- The Credit Services Act of 1984 [*Civ. Code § 1789.10 et seq.*].
- The Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*], discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .
- The Information Practices Act of 1977 [*Civ. Code § 1798 et seq.*].
- The Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990 [*Civ. Code § 1799.200 et seq.*].
- The Dance Studio Act [*Civ. Code § 1812.50 et seq.*].
- The Health Studio Act [*Civ. Code § 1812.80 et seq.*].
- The Karnette Rental-Purchase Act [*Civ. Code § 1812.620 et seq.*].
- The Industrial Loan Law [*Fin. Code § 18000 et seq.*].
- The Pawnbroker Law [*Fin. Code § 21000 et seq.*].
- The California Finance Lenders Law [*Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*].

- The Manufactured Housing Act of 1980 [*Health & Safety Code § 18000 et seq.*].

In case of conflict between Division 9 and a rule of law, statute, or regulation listed above, the rule of law, statute, or regulation controls, although the failure to comply with the applicable statute or regulation has only the effect the statute or regulation specifies [*Com. Code § 9201(c)*]. However, a case decided under former Division 9 held that Division 9 should apply in a case in which the applicable consumer-protection law provides a consumer less protection than is afforded under Division 9 [*see Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 823, 824, 94 Cal Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.13

§ 503.13 When Division 9 Is Inapplicable

[1] In General

Division 9 does not apply to the extent that any of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 9109(c)*]:

- A statute, regulation, or treaty of the United States preempts Division 9.

- Another California statute state expressly governs the creation, perfection, priority, or enforcement of a security interest created by California state or a governmental unit of California. These statutes include statutes that provide for pledges, liens, or security interests to secure bonds or other obligations (including, without limitation, leases) of this state or a governmental unit, whether the statute is of general application like *Gov. Code §§ 5450* and *5451* or is specific to particular types of obligations of the state of California or of governmental units or to particular governmental units.

- A statute of another state, a foreign country, or a governmental unit of another state or a foreign country, other than a statute generally applicable to security interests, expressly governs creation, perfection, priority, or enforcement of a security interest created by the state, country, or governmental unit.

- The rights of a transferee beneficiary or nominated person under a letter of credit are independent and superior under *Com. Code § 5114*.

[2] Specific Transactions to Which Division 9 Does Not Apply

Division 9 does not apply to any of the following [*Com. Code § 9109(d)*]:

- A landlord's lien, other than an agricultural lien.

- A lien, other than an agricultural lien, given by statute or other rule of law for services or materials,

but *Com. Code § 9333* applies with respect to priority of the lien.

- An assignment of a claim for wages, salary, or other compensation of an employee.

- A sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes as part of a sale of the business out of which they arose.

- An assignment of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes which is for the purpose of collection only.

- An assignment of a right to payment under a contract to an assignee that is also obligated to perform under the contract.

- An assignment of a single account, payment intangible, or promissory note to an assignee in full or partial satisfaction of a preexisting indebtedness.

- Any loan made by an insurance company pursuant to the provisions of a policy or contract issued by it and on the sole security of the policy or contract.

- An assignment of a right represented by a judgment, other than a judgment taken on a right to payment that was collateral.

- A right of recoupment or setoff, provided that both *Com. Code § 9340*, with respect to the effectiveness of rights of recoupment or setoff against deposit accounts, and *Com. Code § 9404*, with respect to defenses or claims of an account debtor, apply.

- The creation or transfer of an interest in or lien on real property, including a lease or rents thereunder, except to the extent that provision is made for each of the following:

    - Liens on real property in *Com. Code §§ 9203* and *9308*.

    - Fixtures in *Com. Code § 9334*.

    - Fixture filings in *Com. Code §§ 9501, 9502, 9512, 9516*, and *9519*.

    - Security agreements covering personal and real property in *Com. Code § 9604*.

- An assignment of a claim arising in tort, other than a commercial tort claim, but *Com. Code §§ 9315* and *9322* apply with respect to proceeds and priorities in proceeds.

- An assignment of a deposit account in a consumer transaction, but *Com. Code §§ 9315* and *9322* apply with respect to proceeds and priorities in proceeds.

- Any security interest created by the assignment of the benefits of any public construction contract under the Improvement Act of 1911 (*Streets & Highways Code § 5000 et seq.*).

- Transition property, as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 840*, except to the extent that the provisions of Division 9 are referred to in *Pub. Util. Code § 840 et seq.*, and recovery property, as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 848*, except to the extent that the provisions of Division 9 are referred to in *Pub. Util. Code § 848 et seq.*

- A claim or right of an employee or employee's dependents to receive workers' compensation under Division 1 or Division 4 of the Labor Code (*Lab. Code §§ 50 et seq., 3200 et seq.*).

- A transfer by a government or governmental unit.

115 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction and Definitions

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.14-503.19

[Reserved]

§§ 503.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.20

§ 503.20 Security Agreement

[1] Formalities

No special form is necessary for a security agreement to exist and thus to create or provide for a security interest [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(73)* (definition)]. Whether an agreement creates a security interest depends not on whether the parties intend that the law characterize the transaction as a security interest, but rather on whether the transaction falls within the definition of "security interest" inCom. Code § 1201(b)(35) (set forth in *§ 503.11[22]*). Thus, an agreement that the parties characterize as a "lease" of goods may be a "security agreement" notwithstanding the parties' stated intention that the law treat the transaction as a lease and not as a secured transaction [*see* UCC Comment 3b to *Com. Code § 9102*; *Triple C Leasing, Inc. v. All-American Mobile Wash (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 244, 248, 249, 134 Cal. Rptr. 328]* . The essential terms of a security agreement need not be contained in a single document. For example, even without a separate formal agreement, a financing statement, loan application, promissory note, and other documents, taken together, would be able to establish a security agreement [*New West Fruit Corp. v. Coastal Berry Corp. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 92, 97-98, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 664* ; *Komas v. Future Systems, Inc. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 809, 816, 139 Cal. Rptr. 669]* .

The description of the collateral in a security agreement must reasonably identify what it describes. Except as provided in *Com. Code § 9108(c)-(e)*, a description need not be specific to be sufficient [*Com. Code § 9108(a)*]. Except with respect to investment property [*see Com. Code § 9108(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.56[1][a]*], a description of collateral reasonably identifies the collateral if it identifies the collateral by any of the following [*Com. Code § 9108(b)*]:

- Specific listing.
- Category.
- Except for commercial tort claims, or in a consumer transaction, consumer goods, a security entitlement, a securities account, or a commodity account [*Com. Code § 9108(e)*], a type of collateral defined in the Commercial Code.

- Quantity.
- Computational or allocational formula or procedure.
- Any other method, if the identity of the collateral is objectively determinable, except that a supergeneric description is not permitted in a security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9108(c)*].

A description of collateral as "all the debtor's assets" or "all the debtor's personal property" or using words of similar import does not reasonably identify the collateral in a security agreement [*Com. Code § 9108(c)*]; however, it is sufficient in a financing statement [*see Com. Code § 9504(2)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[6][b]*]. A description only by a type of collateral defined in the Commercial Code is an insufficient description of either (1) a commercial tort claim, or, (2) in a consumer transaction, consumer goods, a security entitlement, a securities account, or a commodity account [*Com. Code § 9108(e)*]. Descriptions of investment property collateral and consumer good collateral also must meet the applicable requirements of *Civ. Code § 1799.103* (investment property) or 1799.100 (consumer goods), respectively [*Com. Code § 9108(f)*]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 1799.100*, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

[2] Scope and Effect

A security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(73)* (definition)] is effective according to its terms between the parties, against purchasers of the collateral, and against creditors, unless particular exception is made by the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 9201(a)*; *see Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805* (*Civ. Code § 2815* also applies to security agreement that secures continuing guaranty)]. The agreement gives the secured party the rights to proceeds [*see Com. Code §§ 9203(f), 9315*] unless the parties have otherwise agreed.

Except with respect to collateral consisting of commercial tort claims or certain consumer goods (as discussed in *§ 503.21[5]*), a security agreement may create or provide for a security interest in after-acquired collateral [*Com. Code § 9204(a), (b)*]. A security agreement may provide that collateral secures, or that accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes are sold in connection with, future advances or other value, whether or not the advances or value are given pursuant to commitment [*Com. Code § 9204(c)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(68)* ("pursuant to commitment")]. Revised Division 9 rejects cases under former Division 9 that tested security interests based on future advances by whether the future advance of other obligation was of the same or a similar type or class as earlier advances [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9204*].

The fact that a security agreement secures a continuing guaranty does not preclude the guarantor's exercise of his or her right to revoke the guaranty as to future transactions under *Civ. Code § 2815* [*Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1032-1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805]* .

[3] Statute of Frauds Exception

The Commercial Code provision that requires a written agreement for enforcement of any contract for the sale of personal property beyond $5,000 [*see Civ. Code § 1624.5(a)*] does not apply to security agreements, nor to the sale of goods [*Civ. Code § 1624.5(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.21

§ 503.21 Security Interest in Collateral

[1] Nature

A security interest is created or provided for by a security agreement [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(73)*]. It attaches when it becomes enforceable against the debtor with respect to the collateral, that is, as soon as certain events specified by the governing law occur, unless an agreement expressly postpones the time of attachment [*Com. Code § 9203(a)*; *see* discussion in*§ 503.21[2]*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9308* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.22[1]*] and in *Com. Code § 9309* (perfection on attachment), a security interest is perfected for purposes of obtaining priority over claims of other creditors in the collateral [*see Com. Code § 9317*] when it has attached and all the applicable requirements for perfection in *Com. Code §§ 9310-9316* have been satisfied [*Com. Code § 9308(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.22*]. A security interest is perfected when it attaches if the applicable requirements are satisfied before the security interest attaches [*Com. Code § 9308(a)*].

[2] Attachment for Enforceability

[a] In General

A security interest attaches to collateral when it becomes enforceable against the debtor with respect to the collateral, unless an agreement expressly postpones the time of attachment [*Com. Code § 9203(a)*]. Generally, a security interest does not become enforceable against the debtor and third parties with respect to the collateral until (1) value has been given [*see Com. Code § 1204* (defining "value," discussed in *§ 503.11[24]*)], (2) the debtor has rights in the collateral or the power to transfer rights in the collateral to a secured party, and (3) one of the following conditions has been met [*Com. Code § 9203(b)*; *see also Com. Code § 9203(c)-(i)* (exceptions)]:

- The debtor has authenticated a security agreement that provides a description of the collateral and, if the security interest covers timber to be cut, a description of the land concerned.

- The collateral is not a certificated security and is in the possession of the secured party under *Com. Code § 9313* pursuant to the debtor's security agreement.

- The collateral is a certificated security in registered form and the security certificate has been delivered to the secured party under *Com. Code § 8301* pursuant to the debtor's security agreement.

- The collateral is deposit accounts, electronic chattel paper, investment property, letter-of-credit rights, or electronic documents, and the secured party has control under *Com. Code § 7106, 9104, 9105, 9106*, or *9107*, respectively, pursuant to the debtor's security agreement.

All of the foregoing are subject to the following [*Com. Code § 9203(c)*]:

- *Com. Code § 4210* in the case of the security interest of a collecting bank.

- *Com. Code § 5118* in the case of the security interest of a letter-of-credit issuer or nominated person.

- *Com. Code § 9110* (discussed in *§ 503.40[1]*) in the case of security interests arising under *Com. Code § 2101 et seq.* (sale of goods) or *Com. Code § 10101 et seq.* (personal property leases).

- *Com. Code § 9206* in the case of security interests in investment property.

[b] When New Debtor Becomes Bound

A person becomes bound as debtor by a security agreement entered into by another person if, by operation of law other than Division 9 or by contract, either the security agreement becomes effective to create a security interest in the person's property, or the person becomes generally obligated for the obligations of the other person, including the obligation secured under the security agreement, and acquires or succeeds to all or substantially all of the assets of the other person [*Com. Code § 9203(d)*]. If a new debtor becomes bound as debtor by a security agreement entered into by another person both of the following apply [*Com. Code § 9203(e)*]:

- The agreement satisfies *Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)* with respect to existing or after-acquired property of the new debtor to the extent the property is described in the agreement.

- Another agreement is not necessary to make a security interest in the property enforceable.

[c] In Proceeds, Supporting Obligations, Security Interests or Liens

The attachment of a security interest in collateral gives the secured party the rights to proceeds provided by *Com. Code § 9315* (discussed in*§ 503.21[4], below* and *§ 503.21[7]*) and is also attachment of a security interest in a supporting obligation for the collateral [*Com. Code § 9203(f)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)*, supporting obligation defined, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][b]*]. The attachment of a security interest in a right to payment or performance secured by a security interest or other lien on personal or real property is also attachment of a security interest in the security interest, mortgage, or other lien [*Com. Code § 9203(g)*].

[d] Security Accounts and Commodity Accounts

The attachment of a security interest in a securities account is also attachment of a security interest in the security entitlements carried in the securities account [*Com. Code § 9203(h)*]. Similarly, the attachment of a security interest in a commodity account is also attachment of a security interest in the commodity contracts carried in the commodity account [*Com. Code § 9203(i)*].

[3] Interest Unaffected by Debtor's Right to Use Collateral

A security interest is not invalid or fraudulent against creditors solely because the debtor has the right or ability to use, commingle, or dispose of all or part of the collateral, including returned or repossessed goods, to collect, compromise, enforce, or otherwise deal with collateral, to accept the return of collateral or make repossessions, to use, commingle, or dispose of proceeds, or because the secured party fails to require the debtor to account for proceeds or replace collateral [*Com. Code § 9205(a)*]. However, the foregoing rule does not relax the requirements of possession if attachment, perfection, or enforcement of a security interest depends on possession of the collateral by the secured party [*Com. Code § 9205(b)*].

The existence of a security interest, agricultural lien, or authority given to a debtor to dispose of or use collateral, without more, does not subject a secured party to liability in contract or tort for the debtor's acts or omissions [*Com. Code § 9402*].

[4] Effect of Transfer of Collateral

[a] General Rule on Unauthorized Disposition

Except as otherwise provided in Division 9 and *Com. Code § 2403(2)*:

- A security interest or agricultural lien continues in collateral notwithstanding sale, lease, license, exchange, or other disposition thereof unless the secured party authorized the disposition free of the security interest or agricultural lien [*Com. Code § 9315(a)(1)*].

- A security interest attaches to any identifiable proceeds of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9315(a)(2); see Com. Code § 9315(b)* (set forth *below*, defining "identifiable proceeds")], including collections on account of the collateral [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(64)(B)* ("proceeds," *set forth in § 503.11[18*], include collections); *American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 774-776, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325* (buyer who paid proceeds to third parties who, with debtor, misrepresented to buyer that they owned crop, was liable to creditor with perfected security interest in crop and proceeds)].

Even if a disposition was authorized, a security interest in or agricultural lien on proceeds may exist as a perfected security interest [*see Com. Code § 9315(c)* discussed in *§ 503.22[7]*] by virtue of the security agreement and financing statement or by virtue of the statute creating the agricultural lien [*see* UCC Comment 9 to *Com. Code § 9315*, discussed in*§ 503.21[4][b]*].

The exception noted in *Com. Code § 2403* refers to a situation in which the secured party entrusts goods collateral to a merchant who deals in goods of that kind and the merchant sells the collateral to a buyer in the ordinary course of business. Even if wrongful as against the secured party, the buyer takes free of the security interest [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9315*; *compare Gordon v. Hamm (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1330-1332, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631* (decided under former *Com. Code § 9306(2)*, debtor/owners' entrustment of used motor home to dealer did not constitute "disposition"; dealer's buyers therefore took motor home subject to original owners' lenders' perfected security interest)].

Division 9 contains several provisions under which a transferee takes free of an unperfected security interest or agricultural lien [*see Com. Code § 9317*] or takes free of a perfected security interest on acquiring goods, general intangibles, chattel paper and instruments, negotiable instruments, negotiable documents, or securities [*see Com. Code §§ 9320, 9321, 9330, 9331*]. Most transferees (including non-purchasers) of funds from a deposit account, and most transferees of money, take free of a perfected security interest in the deposit account or money [*see Com. Code § 9332*]. *Com. Code § 9315(b)* (*see below*), which had no counterpart in former Division 9 and defines "identifiable proceeds," a security interest could attach in proceeds placed in a deposit account [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9315*; *ITT Commercial Fin. Corp. v. Tech. Power Inc. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1551, 1556-1557, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344* (perfected

security interest in inventory and proceeds applies to proceeds of sale, including deposit account to extent that funds are identifiable as sale proceeds)].

Proceeds that are commingled with other property are identifiable proceeds as follows *Com. Code § 9315(b)*]:

- If the proceeds are goods, to the extent provided by *Com. Code § 9336*, discussed in *§ 503.40[4]*.

- If the proceeds are not goods, to the extent that the secured party identifies the proceeds by a method of tracing, including application of equitable principles, that is permitted under law other than Division 9 with respect to commingled property of the type involved.

Among the equitable principles whose use other law may permit for tracing is the "lowest intermediate balance rule" of Restatement 2d, Trusts § 202 [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9315*; *see also ITT Commercial Fin. Corp. v. Tech. Power Inc. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1551, 1558-1559, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344* (description and application of "lowest intermediate balance rule")].

[b] Proceeds of Collateral Subject to Agricultural Lien

Division 9 [*see Com. Code § 9315(a)(2)*, set forth in [a], *above*] does not determine whether a lien extends to proceeds of farm products encumbered by an agricultural lien. If the proceeds are themselves farm products on which an "agricultural lien" arises under other law, then the agricultural lien provisions of Division 9 apply to the agricultural lien on the proceeds in the same way in which they would apply had the farm products not been proceeds [UCC Comment 9 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

[c] Determining Whether Disposition Was Authorized

Com. Code § 9315(a)(1) (set forth in [a], *above*) adopts the view and makes explicit that the authorized disposition to which it refers is an authorized disposition "free of" the security interest or agricultural lien. The secured party's right to proceeds under the express terms of an agreement does not in itself constitute an authorization of disposition. This change in language from former *Com. Code § 9306(2)* is not intended to address the frequently litigated situation in which the effectiveness of the secured party's consent to a disposition is conditioned on the secured party's receipt of the proceeds. In that situation, as in former Division 9, the court makes the determination of whether the disposition was authorized [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

Cases decided under former Division 9 hold that in the face of a security agreement that prohibits sale of the collateral without written consent, evidence sufficient to sustain a finding of implied consent must be clear and convincing. Mere acquiescence to disposition is not enough; however, a prior course of dealing permitting sale may support a finding of implied authorization of sale [*Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 646-647, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914* (third year crop was sold without secured party's express consent); *Central Cal. Equip. Co. v. Dolk Tractor Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 855, 862, 144 Cal. Rptr. 367]* . If the sale is authorized by prior conduct, the secured party no longer has a lien on the collateral after completion of the sale but may have a lien on the proceeds [*Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 647, 652-653, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914]* . When acquiescence and prior conduct are found to have authorized a sale of the collateral conditioned on continuance of the secured party's interest in the proceeds, the buyer takes the collateral free of the security interest but must pay the price (to the extent of the lien on the proceeds) to the secured party [*Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 652-653, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914* ; *but see Bank of Stockton v. Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 144, 156-160, 244 Cal. Rptr. 744* (turned on interpretation of agreement between secured parties with competing claims to proceeds); *see also Com. Code §§ 9320, 9323*; discussion in *§ 503.24[3]*].

[d] Provision Prohibiting Transfer

The debtor's rights in collateral may be voluntarily or involuntarily transferred, such as by way of sale, creation of a security interest, attachment, levy, garnishment, or other judicial process. This can occur notwithstanding a provision in the security agreement prohibiting any transfer. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9401(b)* and in *Com. Code §§ 9406, 9407, 9408,* and *9409,* whether a debtor's rights in collateral maybe voluntarily or involuntarily transferred is governed by law other than Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9401(a)*]. An agreement between the debtor and secured party which prohibits a transfer of the debtor's rights in collateral or makes the transfer a default does not prevent the transfer from taking effect [*Com. Code § 9401(b)*], but the transfer may create a default [*see* UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9401*].

[5] After-Acquired Collateral

Except as provided below [*Com. Code § 9204(b)*], a security agreement may create or provide for a security interest in after-acquired collateral [*Com. Code § 9204(a)*]. However, a security interest does not attach under a term constituting an after-acquired property clause to either (1) consumer goods (other than an accession when given as additional security), unless the debtor acquires rights in them within 10 days after the secured party gives value, or (2) a commercial tort claim [*Com. Code § 9204(b)*]. A security interest in after-acquired property is not merely an equitable interest: no further action by the secured party is required. *Com. Code § 9204* adopts the principle of the "continuing general lien" or "floating lien." It validates a security interest in the debtor's existing and (on acquisition) future assets, even though the debtor has liberty to dispose of collateral without being required to account to proceeds or substitute new collateral [*see Com. Code § 9205,* discussed in [3], *above*]. *Com. Code § 9204(a)* and *(c)* together also validate "cross-collateral" clauses under which collateral acquired at any time secures advances whenever made [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9204*; *Com. Code § 9204(c)* is discussed in *§ 503.20[2]*].

In order for a security interest in a commercia tort claim to attach, the claim must be in existence when the security agreement is authenticated [*Waltrip v. Kimberlin (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 517, 528-529, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 460* (since security interest in commercial tort claim cannot attach unless claim is in existence when security agreement is authenticated, after-acquired *property clause* in agreement antedating claim cannot create such a security interest except by modification of agreement once claim exists)]. In addition, the security agreement must describe the tort claim with greater specificity than just "all tort claims" [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9204*; *see Com. Code § 9108(e),* discussed in *§ 503.20[1]*].

The effect of after-acquired property and future advance clauses as components of a security agreement should not be confused with the requirements applicable to financing statements. The references to after-acquired property clauses and future advance clauses in *Com. Code § 9204* are limited to security agreements. There is no need to refer to after acquired property or future advances in a financing statement [UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9204*; *see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9502*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.22

§ 503.22 When Perfection Occurs

[1] In General

The general rule, except with respect to security interests that are automatically perfected on attachment [*see Com. Code § 9309*, discussed in *§ 503.22[2]*], is that a security interest is perfected when it has attached and when all of the applicable requirements for perfection [*see Com. Code §§ 9310-9316*] have been satisfied. If all applicable requirements are satisfied before the security interest attaches, it is perfected when it attaches [*Com. Code § 9308(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9308(b)*, regarding perfection of agricultural lien, discussed in *§ 503.45[1]*; discussion in *§ 503.21[2]*, regarding attachment of security interest]. A security interest or agricultural lien is perfected continuously if it is originally perfected by one method under Division 9 and is later perfected by another method under Division 9, without an intermediate period when it was unperfected [*Com. Code § 9308(c)*].

Perfection of a security interest in collateral also perfects a security interest in a supporting obligation for the collateral [*Com. Code § 9308(d)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)*, supporting obligation defined, discussed in *§ 503.24[2*][b]; *Com. Code § 9308(f), (g)*, regarding perfection of certain interests in investment property, discussed in *§ 503.56[1][d]*]. Perfection of a security interest in a right to payment or performance also perfects a security interest in a security interest, mortgage, or other lien on personal or real property securing the right [*Com. Code § 9308(e)*].

The same collateral can be different things to different secured parties. For example, when a bank had a security interest in a crop and the proceeds and a marketing cooperative had a security interest in "member proceeds" derived from sale of the crop, the cooperative's interest was in an "account" under former *Com. Code § 9106* [*see now Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*], and filing with the Secretary of State perfected that interest [*Bank of Stockton v. Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 144, 151-152, 244 Cal. Rptr. 744]* . The bank's interest in the proceeds amounted to "proceeds" under former *Com. Code § 9306(1)* [*see* now *Com. Code § 9315*], and its security interest was perfected by filing with the county recorder in the county in which the crop was grown [*Bank of Stockton v. Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 144, 154, 244 Cal. Rptr. 744* ; *but see Com. Code §§ 9501, 9502* (interest in crops is now filed with Secretary of State); *see also* UCC Comment 4a to *Com. Code § 9102*].

[2] Perfection on Attachment

The following security interests are perfected when they attach [*Com. Code § 9309*]:

- A purchase money security interest in consumer goods, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9311(b)* with respect to consumer goods that are subject to a certificate of title statute or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*.

- An assignment of accounts or payment intangibles which does not by itself or in conjunction with other assignments to the same assigneetransfer a significant part of the assignor's outstanding accounts or payment intangibles.

- A sale of a payment intangible.

- A sale of a promissory note.

- A security interest created by the assignment of a health care insurance receivable to the provider of the health care goods or services.

- A security interest arising under *Com. Code § 2401* or *2505*, a buyer's security interest under *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, or a lessee's security interest under *Com. Code § 10508(e)*, until the debtor obtains possession of the collateral.

- A security interest of a collecting bank arising under *Com. Code § 4210*.

- A security interest of an issuer or nominated person arising under *Com. Code § 5118*.

- A security interest arising in the delivery of a financial asset under *Com. Code § 9206(c)*.

- A security interest in investment property created by a broker or securities intermediary.

- A security interest in a commodity contract or a commodity account created by a commodity intermediary.

- An assignment for the benefit of all creditors of the transferor and subsequent transfers by the assignee thereunder.

- A security interest created by an assignment of a beneficial interest in a decedent's estate.

- A sale by an individual of an account that is a right to payment of winnings in a lottery or other game of chance.

[3] Perfection by Possession

Except as otherwise provided with regard to goods covered by a certificate of title [*see Com. Code § 9313(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.23[3][b]*], a secured party may perfect a security interest in tangible negotiable documents, goods, instruments, money, or tangible chattel paper by taking possession of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*]. In fact, as to money, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9315(c)* and *(d)* for proceeds, the only way a security interest in money may be perfected is by the secured party's taking possession under *Com. Code § 9313* [*Com. Code § 9312(b)(3)*]. A secured party may perfect a security interest in certificated securities by taking delivery of the certificated securities under *Com. Code § 8301* [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*; for further discussion of perfection of security interests in certificated

securities, *see § 503.56[1][b], [c]*]. If perfection of a security interest depends on possession of the collateral by a secured party, perfection occurs no earlier than the time the secured party takes possession and continues only while the secured party retains possession [*Com. Code § 9313(d)*; *but see Com. Code § 9313(h), (i)*].

With respect to collateral other than certificated securities and goods covered by a document, a secured party takes possession of collateral in the possession of a person other than the debtor, the secured party, or a lessee of the collateral from the debtor in the ordinary course of the debtor's business, when either of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 9313(c)*]:

- The person in possession authenticates a record acknowledging that it holds possession of the collateral for the secured party's benefit.

- The person takes possession of the collateral after having authenticated a record acknowledging that it will hold possession of collateral for the secured party's benefit.

A person in possession of collateral is not required to acknowledge that it holds possession for a secured party's benefit [*Com. Code § 9313(f)*]. If a person acknowledges that it holds possession for the secured party's benefit both of the following apply [*Com. Code § 9313(g)*]:

- The acknowledgment is effective under *Com. Code § 9313(c)* or under *Com. Code § 8301(a)*, even if the acknowledgment violates the rights of a debtor.

- Unless the person otherwise agrees or law other than Division 9 otherwise provides, the person does not owe any duty to the secured party and is not required to confirm the acknowledgment to another person.

A secured party having possession of collateral does not relinquish possession by delivering the collateral to a person other than the debtor or a lessee of the collateral from the debtor in the ordinary course of the debtor's business if the person was instructed before the delivery or is instructed contemporaneously with the delivery either to hold possession of the collateral for the secured party's benefit, or to redeliver the collateral to the secured party to do either of the following [*Com. Code § 9313(h)*]. A secured party does not relinquish possession, even if a delivery under *Com. Code § 9313(h)* violates the rights of a debtor. A person to which collateral is delivered under *Com. Code § 9313(h)* does not owe any duty to the secured party and is not required to confirm the delivery to another person unless the person otherwise agrees or law other than Division 9 otherwise provides [*Com. Code § 9313(i)*].

[4] Perfection by Control

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9315(c)* and *(d)* for proceeds [*see* [7], *below*], security interests in deposit accounts and letter-of-credit rights (except when the letter-of-credit right is a supporting obligation), may be perfected only by control under *Com. Code § 9314* [*Com. Code § 9312(b)(1)*, (2); *see Com. Code § 9308(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[1*], perfection of security interest in collateral also perfects security interest in a supporting obligation for the collateral)]. "Control" in regard to deposit accounts is defined in *Com. Code § 9104* [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*] and discussed in *§ 503.58[1]*. "Control" in the case of letter-of-credit rights is defined in *Com. Code § 9107* [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*] and discussed in *§ 503.59[1]*.

Security interests in investment property, electronic chattel paper, or electronic documents also may be perfected by control of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*]. "Control" in regard to electronic chattel paper is defined in *Com. Code § 9105* [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*] and discussed in *§ 503.50[1][b]*. In the case of investment property, "control" is defined in *Com. Code § 9106* [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*] and discussed in *§ 503.56[1][b]*.

A security interest in deposit accounts, electronic chattel paper, electronic documents, or letter-of-credit rights is perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9104, 9105,* or *9107* when the secured party obtains control and remains perfected by control only while the secured party retains control [*Com. Code § 9314(b)*; *see Com. Code § 9314(c),* as to investment property, discussed in *§ 503.56[1][b]*].

[5] Property Requiring Registration or Certificate of Title

Although the filing of a financing statement might otherwise be required, filing is not necessary or effective to perfect a security interest in certain types of property calling for registration or certificate of title. One such exception to filing requirements is a vehicle or boat which must be registered under the Vehicle Code [*Com. Code § 9311(a)(2)(A)*]. Excepted also are interests in approved air contaminant emission reduction required to be registered elsewhere [*Com. Code § 9311(a)(2)(C)*; *see Health & Safety Code §§ 40709-40713*] and interests in mobilehomes and commercial coaches required to be registered by the Health & Safety Code, except that during any period in which the mobilehome or commercial coach is inventory, the filing provisions of *Com. Code § 9501 et seq.* apply to a security interest in that collateral [*Com. Code § 9311(a)(2)(B)*]. Similarly, during any period in which any of the previously mentioned types of collateral is inventory held for sale or lease by a person or leased by that person as lessor and that person is in the business of selling goods of that kind, the Division 9 filing provisions do apply to a security interest in that collateral [*Com. Code § 9311(d)*; *Louis & Daturic, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1585-1586, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889* (Commercial Code governed perfection of interest in dealer's inventory)]. Property subject to either of the following is also excepted:

- A certificate of title statute of another jurisdiction which provides for a security interest to be indicated on the certificate as a condition or result of the security interest's obtaining priority over the rights of a lien creditor with respect to the property [*Com. Code § 9311(a)(3)*].

- A federal statute, regulation, or treaty whose requirements for a security interest's obtaining priority over the rights of a lien creditor with respect to the property preempt *Com. Code § 9310* [*Com. Code § 9311(a)(1)*; *but see Moldo v. Matsco, Inc. (In re Cybernetic Servs.) (9th Cir. 2001) 252 F.3d 1039, 1059*, decided under version of Division 9 in effect prior to July 1, 2001 (holder of security interest in patent is not required to record that interest with federal Patent and Trademark Office in order to perfect interest as against subsequent lien creditor; Patent Act does not preempt filing requirements of Article 9)].

Compliance with the requirements of a statute, regulation, or treaty mentioned in the previous paragraph for obtaining priority over the rights of a lien creditor is equivalent to the filing of a financing statement under Division 9. Except as otherwise provided with respect to collateral that is inventory in *Com. Code § 9313* [*see § 503.22[3]*], and in *Com. Code § 9316(d)* and *(e)* for goods covered by a certificate of title [*see § 503.22[6][a][i]*], a security interest in property subject to one of those statutes, regulations, or treaties may be perfected only by compliance with those requirements. A security interest so perfected remains perfected notwithstanding a change in the use or transfer of possession of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9311(b)*]. Similarly, except as otherwise provided with respect to collateral that is inventory [*see § 503.22[3]*], and in *Com. Code § 9316(d)* and *(e)* [*see § 503.22[6][a][i]*], duration and renewal of perfection of a security interest perfected by compliance with one of those, statutes, regulations, or treaties are governed by the statute, regulation, or treaty. In other respects, the security interest is subject to Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9311(c)*].

For discussion of choice of law rules governing goods covered by certificates of title and changes in perfection when that law changes, see *§ 503.23[3]*.

[6] Perfection by Filing of Financing Statement

[a] When Filing Is Permitted or Required

[i] Interests for Which Filing Is Permitted or Required

Perfection is typically accomplished by filing a financing statement (or a fixture filing) [*see* discussion in *§ 503.47[4]*] so as to give third parties notice of the existence of security interests in the collateral [*K.N.C. Wholesale, Inc. v. AWMCO, Inc. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 315, 319, 128 Cal. Rptr. 345]* . The filing of the statement serves the same purpose as the recordation of traditional liens by giving the secured party the same rights of priority as the holders of liens [*see People ex rel. Franchise Tax Bd. v. Credit Managers Assn. (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 344, 351, 142 Cal. Rptr. 777]* .

A security interest in chattel paper, negotiable documents, instruments, or investment property may be perfected by filing [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9312(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[4]*, a financing statement must be filed to perfect all security interests and agricultural liens, except the following [*Com. Code § 9310(a), (b)*]:

- Those that are perfected under *Com. Code § 9308(e)-(g)* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(1)*; *see § 503.22[1]* regarding perfection under *Com. Code § 9308(e)-(g)*; § 503.56[1][d] regarding perfection under *Com. Code § 9308(f), (g)* of certain interests in investment property].

- Those perfected under *Com. Code § 9309* when they attach [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(2)*; *see § 503.22[2]*].

- A security interest in property subject to a certificate of title statute, regulation, or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(3)*; *see § 503.22[5]*].

- A security interest in goods in possession of a bailee which is perfected under *Com. Code § 9312(d)(1)* or *(2)* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(4)*; *see § 503.40[2][b]*].

- Security interests in certificated securities, documents, goods, or instruments which are temporarily perfected without filing or possession under *Com. Code § 9312(e), (f)*, or *(g)* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(5)*; *see §§ 503.40[2][b]* (goods), 503.48[1][b] (documents), 503.49[1] (instruments), § 503.56[1][c] (certificated security)].

- A security interest in collateral in the secured party's possession under *Com. Code § 9313* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(6)*; *see § 503.22[3]*].

- A security interest in a certificated security which is perfected by delivery of the security certificate to the secured party under *Com. Code § 9313* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(7)*; *see § 503.56[1][b]*].

- Security interests in deposit accounts, electronic chattel paper, electronic documents, investment property, or letter-of-credit rights which are perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9314* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(8)*; *see §§ 503.58[1]* (deposit accounts), 503.50[1][b] (electronic chattel paper), 503.48[1] (documents), 503.56[1][b] (investment property), 503.59[1] (letter-of-credit rights)].

- A security interest in proceeds which is perfected under *Com. Code § 9315* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(9)*; *see § 503.22[7]*].

- A security interest perfected under *Com. Code § 9316* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(10)*; *see § 503.23*].

- A security interest in, or claim in or under, any policy of insurance including unearned premiums which is perfected by written notice to the insurer under *Com. Code § 9312(b)(4)* [*Com. Code §*

9310(b)(11); *see § 503.53[2]*].

If a secured party assigns a perfected security interest or agricultural lien, a filing under Division 9 is not required to continue the perfected status of the security interest against creditors of and transferees from the original debtor [*Com. Code § 9310(c)*; *see* discussion in [m], *below*; *see also Com. Code § 9521(a)* (UCC-1 initial financing statement with space to indicate assignee as secured party)].

[ii] Who Is Entitled to File

A person may file an initial financing statement, an amendment that adds collateral covered by a financing statement, or an amendment that adds a debtor to a financing statement, only if the debtor authorizes the filing in an authenticated record or pursuant to *Com. Code § 9509(b)* or *(c)*, or if the person holds an agricultural lien that has become effective at the time of filing and the financing statement covers only collateral in which the person holds an agricultural lien [*Com. Code § 9509(a)*]. By authenticating or becoming bound as debtor by a security agreement, a debtor or new debtor authorizes the filing of an initial financing statement, and an amendment, covering both the collateral described in the security agreement and any property that becomes collateral by virtue of being proceeds of an unauthorized disposition of the original collateral [*see Com. Code § 9315(a)(2)*, discussed in *§ 503.21[4]*], whether or not the security agreement expressly covers proceeds [*Com. Code § 9509(b)*]. By acquiring collateral in which a security interest or agricultural lien continues after an unauthorized disposition of that collateral [*see Com. Code § 9315(a)(1)*, discussed in *§ 503.21[4]*], a debtor authorizes the filing of an initial financing statement, and an amendment, covering the collateral and proceeds of that collateral [*Com. Code § 9509(c)*; *see Com. Code § 9315(a)(2)*].

A filed record is effective only to the extent that it was filed by a person that may file it under *Com. Code § 9509(c)* [*Com. Code § 9510(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9625* (imposing liability for unauthorized filings); UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9502*].

[b] Contents

[i] In General

A financing statement (except one that covers as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut, or which is filed as a fixture filing and covers goods that are or are to become fixtures) is sufficient if it gives the names of the debtor and the secured party, and indicates the collateral covered by the financing statement [*Com. Code § 9502(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9502(b), (c)* (financing statement that covers as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut, or which is filed as a fixture filing, discussed in *§ 503.44[3*]; *Com. Code § 9505* (acceptable terminology for describing parties in financing statement, discussed in *§ 503.46[4]*]. A financing statement may provide the name of more than one debtor and the name of more than one secured party [*Com. Code § 9503(e)*]. The requirement that the debtor's signature or other authorization appear on the financing statement has been dropped to facilitate electronic filing. Instead, *Com. Code § 9509*, discussed in [a][ii], *above*, specifies who is authorized to file a financing statement, and *Com. Code § 9625* imposes liability for unauthorized filings [UCC Comment 3 h to *Com. Code § 9101*; UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9502*]. The standardized universal form of written financing statement is set forth in *Com. Code § 9521(a)*. This form is known as Form UCC-1. A California version of this form has been prepared by the Secretary of State and is illustrated in California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, *Secured Transactions*, § 542.211 (Matthew Bender). The form must be accepted for filing whether it has or lacks a space identified for the disclosure of the social security number of an individual [*Com. Code § 9521(a)*; *but see Com. Code § 9526.5* (requirement for truncation of social security numbers in publicly accessible filed documents)].

[ii] Debtor's Name

A financing statement sufficiently provides the name of the debtor only if it does so in accordance with the following rules [*Com. Code § 9503(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9506(c)*, discussed in [iv], *below*]:

- If the debtor is a registered organization, only if the financing statement provides the name of the debtor indicated on the public record of the debtor's jurisdiction of organization which shows the debtor to have been organized.

- If the debtor is a decedent's estate, only if the financing statement provides the name of the decedent and indicates that the debtor is an estate.

- If the debtor is a trust or a trustee acting with respect to property held in trust, only if the financing statement both (1) provides the name specified for the trust in its organic documents or, if no name is specified, provides the name of the settlor and additional information sufficient to distinguish the debtor from other trusts having one or more of the same settlors and (2) indicates, in the debtor's name or otherwise, that the debtor is a trust or is a trustee acting with respect to property held in trust.

- In other cases, if the debtor has a name, only if it provides the individual or organizational name of the debtor, or, if the debtor does not have a name, only if it provides the names of the partners, members, associates, or other persons comprising the debtor.

A financing statement that provides the name of the debtor in accordance with *Com. Code § 9503(a)* is not rendered ineffective by the absence of either a trade name or other name of the debtor, or, unless otherwise required in the case of a debtor that does not have a name [*see Com. Code § 9503(a)(4)(B)*, last item listed *above*], names of partners, members, associates, or other persons comprising the debtor [*Com. Code § 9503(b)*]. However, a financing statement that provides only the debtor's trade name does not sufficiently provide the name of the debtor [*Com. Code § 9503(c)*]. Failure to indicate the representative capacity of a secured party or representative of a secured party does not affect the sufficiency of a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9503(d)*].

[iii] Description of Collateral

A financing statement sufficiently describes the collateral that it covers if it describes the collateral pursuant to *Com. Code § 9108* (discussed in *§ 503.20[2]*) or indicates that it covers all assets or all personal property [*Com. Code § 9504*]. The sufficiency of the "all assets" or "all personal property" description is an exception applicable only to financing statements. It will not suffice in the security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9108(c)*; UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9108*; UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9504*].

[iv] Mistakes Allowed Unless Misleading

A financing statement substantially satisfying the requirements of *Com. Code §§ 9501-9528* is effective, even if it has minor errors or omissions, unless the errors or omissions make the financing statement seriously misleading [*Com. Code § 9506(a)*]. A financing statement that fails sufficiently to provide the name of the debtor in accordance with *Com. Code § 9503(a)* is seriously misleading [*Com. Code § 9506(b)*; *see, e.g., Corona Fruits & Veggies, Inc. v. Frozsun Foods, Inc. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 319, 323-325, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 868* (debtor's true name was Armando Munoz Juarez, and UCC-1 financing statement was seriously misleading because it showed his name as Armando Munoz; other creditor's subsequently filed UCC-1 statement, showing Juarez name, had priority)], except that if a search of the records of the filing office under the debtor's correct name, using the filing office's standard search logic, if any, fails sufficiently to provide the name of the debtor in accordance with *Com. Code § 9503(a)*, the name provided does not make the financing statement misleading [*Com. Code § 9506(c)*]. For purposes of *Com. Code § 9508(b)* [*see § 503.22[6][i]*], the "debtor's correct name" in *Com. Code § 9506(c)* means the correct name of the new debtor [*Com. Code § 9506(d)*].

The failure of the filing office to index a record correctly does not affect the effectiveness of the filed record [*Com.*

Code § 9517].

[c] Place of Filing

The proper place for filing in order to perfect a security interest in collateral, including a case in which the collateral is goods that are or are to become fixtures and the financing statement is *not* filed as a fixture filing, or agricultural lien on collateral is the office of the Secretary of State, except in the case of collateral consisting of (1) goods that are or are to become fixtures and the financing statement is filed as a fixture filing [*see* discussion in *§ 503.47[3]*]; (2) timber to be cut or minerals (including oil and gas), to be extracted [*Com. Code § 9501(a)*]; *see* discussion in *§ 503.44[3]*; and (3) collateral of a transmitting utility, as discussed in *§ 503.57[2][a]* [*Com. Code § 9501(b)*].

[d] Time of Filing

A financing statement may be filed before a security agreement is made or a security interest otherwise attaches [*Com. Code § 9502(d)*]. Any financing statement also remains effective with respect to collateral sold, exchanged, leased, licensed, or otherwise disposed of by the debtor and in which a security interest or agricultural lien continues, even though the secured party knows of or consents to the disposition [*Com. Code § 9507(a)*]. Normally, a security interest does continue after disposition of the collateral [*see Com. Code § 9315(a)*]. Law other than Division 9 determines whether an agricultural lien survives disposition of the collateral.

As a consequence of the disposition, the collateral may be owned by a person other than the debtor against whom the financing statement was filed. Under *Com. Code § 9507(a)*, the secured party remains perfected even if it does not correct the public record. For this reason, any person seeking to determine whether a debtor owns collateral free of security interest must inquire as to the debtor's source of title, and, if circumstances seem to require it, search in the name of a former owner. *Com. Code § 9507(a)* addresses only the sufficiency of the information contained in the financing statement. A disposition of collateral may result in loss of perfection for other reasons, *see, e.g., Com. Code § 9316* [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9508*].

[e] Completion of Filing

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9516(b), (1)* communication of a record to a filing office and (2) tender of the filing fee or acceptance of the record by the filing office constitutes filing [*Com. Code § 9516(a)*]. A record that is communicated to the filing office with tender of the filing fee, but which the filing office refuses to accept for a reason other than one set forth in *Com. Code § 9516(b)*, is effective as a filed record except as against a purchaser of the collateral which gives value in reasonable reliance upon the absence of the record from the files [*Com. Code § 9516(d)*; *see Com. Code §§ 9519-9523* (duties of filing office)].

Filing does not occur with respect to a record that a filing office refuses to accept because of any of the following [*Com. Code § 9516(b)*]:

- The record is not communicated by a method or medium of communication authorized by the filing office.
- An amount equal to or greater than the applicable filing fee is not tendered.
- The filing office is unable to index the record because of any of the following:
  - In the case of an initial financing statement, the record does not provide a name for the debtor.

- In the case of an amendment or correction statement, either (1) the record does not identify the initial financing statement as required by *Com. Code § 9512* or *9518*, as applicable, or (2) the record identifies an initial financing statement whose effectiveness has lapsed under *Com. Code § 9515*.

- In the case of an initial financing statement that provides the name of a debtor identified as an individual or an amendment that provides a name of a debtor identified as an individual which was not previously provided in the financing statement to which the record relates, the record does not identify the debtor's last name.

- In the case of a record filed or recorded in the filing office described in *Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)*, the record does not provide a sufficient description of the real property to which it relates.

- In the case of an initial financing statement or an amendment that adds a secured party of record, the record does not provide a name and mailing address for the secured party of record.

- In the case of an initial financing statement or an amendment that provides a name of a debtor which was not previously provided in the financing statement to which the amendment relates, the record does not (1) provide a mailing address for the debtor, (2) indicate whether the debtor is an individual or an organization, or (3) if the financing statement indicates that the debtor is an organization, provide either a type of organization for the debtor, a jurisdiction of organization for the debtor, or an organizational identification number for the debtor or indicate that the debtor has none.

- In the case of an assignment reflected in an initial financing statement under *Com. Code § 9514(a)* or an amendment filed under *Com. Code § 9514(b)*, the record does not provide a name and mailing address for the assignee.

- In the case of a continuation statement, the record is not filed within the six-month period prescribed by *Com. Code § 9515(c)*.

For purposes of the foregoing rules [*Com. Code § 9516(b)*], a record does not provide information if the filing office is unable to read or decipher the information and a record that does not indicate that it is an amendment or identify an initial financing statement to which it relates, as required by *Com. Code § 9512, 9514*, or *9518*, is an initial financing statement.

[f] Duration of Effectiveness

Generally, a filed financing statement is effective for a period of five years after the date of filing [*Com. Code § 9515(a)*; *but see Com. Code § 9515(b), (e), (f)* (transmitting utility), and (g) (mortgage as fixture filing)]. An initial financing statement filed in connection with a public finance transaction or manufactured home transaction is effective for a period of 30 years after the date of filing if it indicates that it is filed in connection with a public finance transaction or manufactured home transaction *Com. Code § 9515(b)*; *but see Com. Code § 9515(e), (f)*, and *(g)*].

The effectiveness of a filed financing statement lapses on the expiration of the period of its effectiveness unless before the lapse a continuation statement is filed pursuant to *Com. Code § 9515(d)*, discussed in [j], *below* [*Com. Code § 9515(c)*]. On lapse, a financing statement ceases to be effective and any security interest or agricultural lien that was perfected by the financing statement becomes unperfected, unless the security interest is perfected otherwise. If the security interest or agricultural lien becomes unperfected on lapse, it is deemed never to have been perfected as against a purchaser of the collateral for value [*Com. Code § 9515(c)*].

A filed financing statement remains effective with respect to collateral that is sold, exchanged, leased, licensed, or otherwise disposed of and in which a security interest or agricultural lien continues, even if the secured party knows of or consents to the disposition [*Com. Code § 9507(a)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9507(c)* and in *Com. Code § 9508* [*see* [i], *below*], a financing statement is not rendered ineffective if, after the financing statement is filed, the information provided in the financing statement becomes seriously misleading under *Com. Code § 9506*, discussed in [b][iv], *above* [*Com. Code § 9507(b)*]. If a debtor so changes its name that a filed financing statement becomes seriously misleading under *Com. Code § 9506*, the following rules apply [*Com. Code § 9507(c)*]:

- The financing statement is effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the debtor before, or within four months after, the change.

- The financing statement is not effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the debtor more than four months after the change, unless an amendment to the financing statement which renders the financing statement not seriously misleading is filed within four months after the change.

[g] Amendment

[i] Authority to File Amendment

For general discussion of who may file an amendment, see *Com. Code § 9509(a)-(c)*, discussed in [a][ii], *above*. A person may file an amendment other than an amendment that adds collateral covered by a financing statement or an amendment that adds a debtor to a financing statement only if the secured party of record authorizes the filing or the amendment is a termination statement for a financing statement as to which the secured party of record has failed to file or send a termination statement as required by *Com. Code § 9513(a)* or *(c)*, the debtor authorizes the filing, and the termination statement indicates that the debtor authorized it to be filed [*Com. Code § 9509(d)*]. If there is more than one secured party of record for a financing statement, each secured party of record may authorize the filing of an amendment under *Com. Code § 9509(d)*[*Com. Code § 9509(e)*].

Except with respect to an assignment of record of a security interest in a fixture covered by a fixture filing [*see Com. Code § 9514(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[4]*], an initial financing statement may reflect an assignment of all of the secured party's power to authorize an amendment to the financing statement by providing the name and mailing address of the assignee as the name and address of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9514(a)*]. Except with respect to an assignment of record of a security interest in a fixture covered by a fixture filing [*Com. Code § 9514(c)*], a secured party of record may assign all or part of its power to authorize an amendment to a financing statement by filing in the filing office an amendment of the financing statement which (1) identifies the initial financing statement to which it relates by its file number, (2) provides the name of the assignor, and (3) provides the name and mailing address of the assignee [*Com. Code § 9514(b)*].

[ii] Types of Amendments That May Be Filed

Subject to *Com. Code § 9509* (authority to file amendment), a person may add or delete collateral covered by, continue or terminate the effectiveness of, or, subject to *Com. Code § 9512(e)*, otherwise amend the information provided in, a financing statement by filing an amendment that both (1) identifies, by its file number, the initial financing statement to which the amendment relates, and (2) if the amendment relates to an initial financing statement filed or recorded in the real estate records [*see Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)*], provides the date that the initial financing statement was filed or recorded and the information specified in *Com. Code § 9502(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.44[3]* [*Com. Code § 9512(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9707(b), (c)* (amendment of pre-effective date financing statements), discussed in *§ 503.10[2][f]*].

[iii] When Amendment Becomes Effective

Except as otherwise provided with regard to a continuation statement [*see Com. Code § 9515*, discussed in [j], *below*] the filing of an amendment does not extend the period of effectiveness of the financing statement [*Com. Code § 9512(b)*]. A financing statement that is amended by an amendment that adds collateral is effective as to the added collateral only from the date of the filing of the amendment [*Com. Code § 9512(c)*]. A financing statement that is amended by an amendment that adds a debtor is effective as to the added debtor only from the date of the filing of the amendment [*Com. Code § 9512(d)*]. An amendment is ineffective to the extent that it purports to delete either all debtors or all secured parties of record and fails to provide the name of a debtor to be covered by the financing statement or the name of a new secured party of record, as applicable [*Com. Code § 9512(e)*].

[h] Correction Statement

If the person believes that a filed record indexed under his or her name is inaccurate or was wrongfully filed, that person may file in the filing office a correction statement with respect to the record [*Com. Code § 9518(a)*]. A correction statement must do all of the following [*Com. Code § 9518(b)*]:

- Identify the record to which it relates, by both the file number assigned to the initial financing statement to which the record relates, and, if the correction statement relates to a record filed or recorded in a filing office for real estate records [*see Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)*], the date that the initial financing statement was filed or recorded and the information specified in *Com. Code § 9502(b)*].

- Indicate that it is a correction statement.

- Provide the basis for the person's belief that the record is inaccurate and indicate the manner in which the person believes the record should be amended to cure any inaccuracy or provide the basis for the person's belief that the record was wrongfully filed.

The filing of a correction statement does not affect the effectiveness of an initial financing statement or other filed record [*Com. Code § 9518(c)*].

Com. Code § 9518 was added in revised Division 9 and affords a debtor a nonjudicial means to correct a financing statement or other record that was inaccurate or wrongfully filed. *Com. Code § 9518* does not permit the aggrieved person to change the legal effect of the public record, but the filed correction statement becomes part of the "financing statement" as defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(39)* ("financing statement" means a record or records composed of an initial financing statement and any filed record relating to the initial financing statement). *Com. Code § 9518* does not displace other provisions in Division 9 that impose liability for making unauthorized filings or failing to file or send a termination statement [*see Com. Code § 9625(e)*], nor does it displace any available judicial remedy [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9518*].

[i] Debtor's Name Change or Reorganization; New Debtor

Except with respect to collateral as to which a filed financing statement remains effective against the new debtor [*see Com. Code § 9508(c)*; *see also Com. Code § 9507(a)*, discussed in [d], *above*], a financing statement is not rendered ineffective if, after the financing statement is filed, the information provided in the financing statement becomes seriously misleading under *Com. Code § 9506*, discussed in [b][ii] and [iv], *above* [*Com. Code § 9507(b)*]. If a debtor so changes its name that a filed financing statement becomes seriously misleading under *Com. Code § 9506*, the financing statement is effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the debtor before, or within four months after, the change, but is not effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the debtor more than four months after the change, unless an appropriate amendment is filed within four months after the change *Com. Code § 9507(c)*]. As a general matter, post-filing changes that render a financing statement seriously misleading have no effect on the financing statement. There are two exceptions: a change that involves a new debtor who becomes bound by the

original security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9508*] and a "pure" change, that is one that does not implicate a new debtor but causes the financing statement to become seriously misleading [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9507*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9508*, a filed financing statement naming an original debtor is effective to perfect a security interest in collateral in which a new debtor has or acquires rights to the extent that the financing statement would have been effective had the original debtor acquired rights in the collateral [*Com. Code § 9508(a)*]. If the difference between the name of the original debtor and that of the new debtor causes a filed financing statement that is effective under *Com. Code § 9508(a)* to be seriously misleading under *Com. Code § 9506*, the financing statement is effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the new debtor before, and within four months after, the new debtor becomes bound under *Com. Code § 9203(d)* [*see § 503.21[2][b]*], but the financing statement is not effective to perfect a security interest in collateral acquired by the new debtor more than four months after the new debtor becomes bound under *Com. Code § 9203(d)* unless an initial financing statement providing the name of the new debtor is filed before the expiration of that time [*Com. Code § 9508(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9508* does not apply to collateral as to which a filed financing statement remains effective against the new debtor under *Com. Code § 9507(a)* [*Com. Code § 9508(c)*], that is to say *Com. Code § 9508* does not apply to collateral transferred by the original debtor to the new debtor. Under those circumstances, the filing against the original debtor continues to be effective until it lapses or perfection is lost for another reason [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9508*; *see Com. Code §§ 9316, 9507(a)*].

Com. Code § 9203(d), (e) and *Com. Code § 9508* deal with situations in which a new debtor becomes bound by a security agreement entered into by another person (the original debtor). These situations often arise as a consequence of changes in business structure. For example, the original debtor may be an individual who operates a sole proprietorship and then incorporates. Under both former Division 9 and revised Division 9, collateral that is transferred in the course of an incorporation or merger would normally remain subject to a perfected security interest [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9508*; *see Com. Code §§ 9315(a), 9507(a)*]. *Com. Code § 9203(d),(e)* create exceptions to the general rule of *Com. Code § 9203(b)* by setting forth ways, other than authenticating the security agreement, that a new debtor becomes bound by a security agreement entered into by another person. Under *Com. Code § 9203(d)* 1) a new debtor becomes bound if, by contract or operation of other law, the security agreement becomes effective to create a security interest in the new debtor's property. Applicable corporate law may provide that following a merger, the survivor becomes bound. Even if applicable corporate law does not so provide, *Com. Code § 9203(d)(2)* may cause the new debtor to become bound if, by contract or operation of other law, if becomes obligated not only for the secured obligation but also generally for the obligations of the original debtor and acquires or succeeds to substantially all the assets of the original debtor. The "substantially all of the assets" requirement of *Com. Code § 9203(d)(2)* excludes sureties and other secondary obligors as well as person whom becomes obligated through piercing the corporate veil and other non-successor doctrines. In most cases, it will exclude successors to the assets and liabilities of a division of a debtor [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9508*]. If the original debtor and the new debtor are located in different jurisdictions, a filing against the original debtor will not be effective to perfect a security interest in collateral that the new debtor acquires, or has acquired from a person other than the original debtor [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9508*].

[j] Continuation Statement

A continuation statement may be filed only within six months before the expiration of the five-year period specified in *Com. Code § 9515(a)* [*see* [f], *above*] or the 30-year period specified in *Com. Code § 9515(b)* [*see* [f], *above*], whichever is applicable [*Com. Code § 9515(d)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9510*, on timely filing of a continuation statement, the effectiveness of the initial financing statement continues for a period of five years commencing on the day on which the financing statement would have become ineffective in the absence of the filing. On the expiration of the five-year period, the financing statement lapses in the same manner as provided in *Com. Code § 9515(c)* [*see* [f], *above*], unless, before the lapse, another continuation statement is filed pursuant to *Com. Code § 9515(d)*[*Com. Code § 9515(e)*]. Succeeding continuation statements may be filed in the same manner to continue the effectiveness of the initial financing statement [*Com. Code § 9515(e)*]. Continuation statements need not be filed if the

debtor is a transmitting utility [*see Com. Code § 9515(f)*, discussed in *§ 503.57[2][b]*] or for a mortgage filed as a fixture filing [*see Com. Code § 9515(g)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[4]*].

A continuation statement that is not filed within the six-month period prescribed by *Com. Code § 9515(d)* is ineffective [*Com. Code § 9510(c)*; *see SCT (U.S.A.), Inc. v. Mitsui Manufacturers Bank (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1061, 1066, 202 Cal. Rptr. 547* (decided under former Division 9; continuation statement may be filed at any time on the final day of effectiveness of the financing statement or prior continuation statement)].

[k] Termination Statement

Because most financing statements expire in five years, no compulsion is placed on the secured party to file a termination statement unless demanded by the debtor, except in the case of consumer goods [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9513*]. If a financing statement covers consumer goods and either (1) there is no obligation secured by the collateral covered by the financing statement and no commitment to make an advance, incur an obligation, or otherwise give value, or (2) the debtor did not authorize the filing of the initial financing statement, a secured party must cause the secured party of record for a financing statement to file a termination statement for that financing statement [*Com. Code § 9513(a)*]. To comply with *Com. Code § 9513(a)*, a secured party must cause the secured party of record to file the termination statement either within one month after there is no obligation secured by the collateral covered by the financing statement and no commitment to make an advance, incur an obligation, or otherwise give value, or, if earlier, within 20 days after the secured party receives an authenticated demand from a debtor [*Com. Code § 9513(b)*]. A secured party of record with respect to a financing statement is a person whose name is provided as the name of the secured party, or a representative of the secured party, in an initial financing statement that has been filed. If an initial financing statement is filed to reflect an assignment of all of the secured party's power to authorize an amendment to the financing statement [*see Com. Code § 9514(a)*, discussed in [m], *below*], the assignee named in the initial financing statement is the secured party of record with respect to the financing statement [*Com. Code § 9511(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9511(b), (c)*, discussed in [m], *below*].

Because *Com. Code § 9311(b)* provides that compliance with a certificate of title statute is "equivalent to the filing of a financing statement," *Com. Code § 9513* applies to certificates of title unless the particular certificate of title statute contains a specific superseding rule that addresses a secured party's duty to cause a notation of a security interest to be removed from a certificate of title. In the context of a certificate of title, the secured party could comply with *Com. Code § 9513* by causing the removal of the notation of security interest or by providing the debtor with documentation sufficient to enable the debtor to effect the removal [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9513*].

If a financing statement covers collateral other than consumer goods, within 20 days after a secured party receives an authenticated demand from a debtor, the secured party must cause the secured party of record for a financing statement to send to the debtor a termination statement for the financing statement or file the termination statement in the filing office if any of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 9513(c)*]:

- Except in the case of a financing statement covering accounts or chattel paper that has been sold or goods that are the subject of a consignment, there is no obligation secured by the collateral covered by the financing statement and no commitment to make an advance, incur an obligation, or otherwise give value.

- The financing statement covers accounts or chattel paper that has been sold but as to which the account debtor or other person obligated has discharged its obligation.

- The financing statement covers goods that were the subject of a consignment to the debtor but are not in the debtor's possession.

- The debtor did not authorize the filing of the initial financing statement.

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9510* when only one of several secured parties files the termination statement, on the filing of a termination statement with the filing office, the financing statement to which the termination statement relates ceases to be effective [*Com. Code § 9513(d)*]. A record authorized by one secured party of record does not affect the financing statement with respect to another secured party of record [*Com. Code § 9510(b)*].

[l] Statement of Release

A secured party may release its security interest in all or a part of the collateral covered by a filed financing statement by filing an amendment that deletes collateral. The amendment must identify the initial financing statement by its file number [*see Com. Code § 9512(a)*, discussed in [g][ii], *above*].

[m] Assignment of, or Reflected in, Financing Statement

Com. Code § 9514 provides a permissive device whereby a secured party of record may assign its power to affect a financing statement. It may also be useful for a secured party who has assigned all or part if its security interest or agricultural lien and wishes to have that fact noted of record so that inquiries concerning the transaction would be addressed to the assignee. On the filing of the assignment, the assignee becomes the "secured party of record" [*see Com. Code § 9511(a)*, discussed in [k], *above*] and may authorize the filing of a continuation statement, termination statement, or other amendment. Under *Com. Code § 9310(c)*, discussed in [a][i], *above*, it is not necessary to file an assignment to continue the perfected status of a security interest against creditors and transferees of the original debtor. However, if an assignment is not filed, the assignor remains the secured party of record with the power (even if not the right) to authorize the filing of effective amendments [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9514*].

Except as otherwise provided with respect to fixture fillings [*see Com. Code § 9514(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[4]*], an initial financing statement may reflect an assignment of all of the secured party's power to authorize an amendment to the financing statement by providing the name and mailing address of the assignee as the name and address of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9514(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9521(a)* (universal form of initial financing statement with space to indicate assignee as secured party)].

Except as otherwise provided with respect to fixture fillings [*see Com. Code § 9514(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[4]*], a secured party of record may assign all or part of its power to authorize an amendment to a financing statement by filing in the filing office an amendment of the financing statement which does all of the following [*Com. Code § 9514(b)*]:

- Identifies, by its file number, the initial financing statement to which it relates.
- Provides the name of the assignor.
- Provides the name and mailing address of the assignee.

If an amendment of a financing statement which provides the name of a person as a secured party or a representative of a secured party is filed, the person named in the amendment is a secured party of record. If an amendment is filed under *Com. Code § 9514(b)*, the assignee named in the amendment is a secured party of record [*Com. Code § 9511(b)*]. A person remains a secured party of record until the filing of an amendment of the financing statement which deletes the person [*Com. Code § 9511(c)*].

An assignment of only some of the secured party's power to affect a financing statement, for example, the power to affect the financing statement as it relates to particular items of collateral or as it relates to an undivided interest in a security interest in all the collateral, cannot be done in an initial financing statement; it must be done by an amendment

adding the assignee as a secured party of record [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9514*].

[n] Request for Financing Statement Information

Any person who requests the following information may receive it from the filing office [*Com. Code § 9523(c)*]:

- Whether there is on file on a date and time specified by the filing office, but not a date earlier than three business days before the filing office receives the request, any financing statement that (1) designates a particular debtor or, if the request so states, designates a particular debtor at the address specified in the request, (2) has not lapsed under *Com. Code § 9515* with respect to all secured parties of record, and (3) if the request so states, it has lapsed under *Com. Code § 9515* and a record of which is maintained by the filing office for one year after lapse in accordance the *Com. Code § 9522(a)*.

- The date and time of filing of each financing statement.

- The information provided in each financing statement.

The filing office may communicate the foregoing information in any medium. However, if requested, the filing office must communicate the information by issuing its written certificate [*Com. Code § 9523(d)*]. If requested, the Secretary of State must issue a combined certificate showing the information as to financing statements as specified in *Com. Code § 9523*, the information as to state tax liens as specified in *Gov. Code § 7226*, the information as to attachment liens as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 488.375* and *488.405*, the information as to judgment liens as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.580*, and the information as to federal liens as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2103* [*Com. Code § 9528*].

[7] Perfection in Proceeds

[a] When Perfection Occurs and Ceases

A security interest in proceeds is a perfected security interest if the security interest in the original collateral was perfected [*Com. Code § 9315(c)*; *see Com. Code §§ 9203(f), 9315(a)(2)* (discussed in *§ 503.21[2*] and [4], respectively, when security interest attaches to proceeds); *see also Com. Code § 9102(a)(64)* (definition of "proceeds," discussed in *§ 503.11[18]*)].

A perfected security interest in proceeds becomes unperfected on the 21st day after the security interest attaches to the proceeds unless any of the following conditions is satisfied [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9315* (period of automatic perfection extended form 10 days under former Division 9; loss of perfected status is prospective only, as opposed to retroactive unperfected status under *Com. Code § 9515(c)*)]:

- A filed financing statement covers the original collateral, the proceeds are collateral in which a security interest may be perfected by a filing in the same office where that financing statement has been filed, and the proceeds are not acquired with cash proceeds [*Com. Code § 9315(d)(1)*; *but see*, UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9315*, at [b], *below*].

- The proceeds are identifiable cash proceeds [*Com. Code § 9315(d)(2)*; *see Com. Code § 9315(b)* (discussed in *§ 503.21[4]*, identifiable proceeds)].

- The security interest in the proceeds is perfected other than under *Com. Code § 9315(c)* (*above*) when the security interest attaches to the proceeds or within 20 days thereafter [*Com. Code § 9315(d)(3)*].

If a filed financing statement covers the original collateral, a security interest in proceeds which remains perfected under *Com. Code § 9315(d)(1)* becomes unperfected either (1) when the effectiveness of the filed financing statement lapses under *Com. Code § 9515* (lapse) or is terminated under *Com. Code § 9513* (termination statement), or (2) the 21st day after the security interest attaches to the proceeds, whichever is later [*Com. Code § 9315(e)*].

Revised Division 9 deletes the provision of former *Com. Code § 9306(4)*, regarding restrictions on a secured party's interest in proceeds if insolvency proceedings are instituted by or against a debtor. Except as provided in the Bankruptcy Code, the debtor's act of entering into bankruptcy does not affect a secured party's right to proceeds [*see* UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

[b] Perfection of Security Interest in Proceeds Acquired With Cash Proceeds

Com. Code § 9315(d)(1) and *(3)* reach the same result as former *Com. Code § 9306(3)(a)* with respect to proceeds acquired with cash proceeds--namely, that a security interest in proceeds acquired with cash proceeds remains perfected only if the description of the collateral in the original filed financing statement included the type of property acquired with cash proceeds--but take a different approach. *Com. Code § 9315(d)(1)* makes the general rule of continued perfection inapplicable to proceeds acquired with cash proceeds, leaving perfection of a security interest in those proceeds to the generally applicable perfection rule under *Com. Code § 9315(d)(3)* [*see*, UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Perfection of Security Interest in Proceeds Acquired With Cash Proceeds. Lender perfects a security interest in Debtor's inventory by filing a financing statement covering "inventory." Debtor sells the inventory and deposits the buyer's check in its deposit account. Debtor draws a check on that account and uses it to pay for equipment. Under the "lowest intermediate balance rule," the funds used to pay for the equipment are identifiable cash proceeds of the inventory. Does Lender's security interest remain perfected in the equipment? No. Because the equipment was purchased with cash proceeds, *Com. Code § 9315(d)(1)* does not extend perfection beyond the 20-day automatic period [*see* UCC Comment 5, Example 1, to *Com. Code § 9315*].

Lender perfects a security interest in Debtor's inventory by filing a financing statement covering "all debtor's property." As in the previous example, debtor sells the inventory, deposit buyer's check in its deposit account, and draws a check on that account to pay for equipment. Under the "lowest intermediate balance rule," the funds used to pay for the equipment are identifiable cash proceeds of the inventory. Does Lender's security interest in the equipment remain perfected beyond the 20-day automatic period ? Yes. Because the financing statement was sufficient to perfect a security interest in debtor's equipment, under *Com. Code § 9315(d)(3)*, lender's security interest in the equipment proceeds remains perfected [*see* UCC Comment 5, Example 2, to *Com. Code § 9315*].

[c] Continuation of Perfection in Cash Proceeds

Com. Code § 9315(d)(2) extends the benefits for former *Com Code § 9306(3)(b)* and *(c)* to identifiable cash proceeds of all types of collateral in which a security interest is perfected by any method. Under *Com. Code § 9315(d)(2)*, if the security interest in the original collateral was perfected, a security interest in identifiable cash proceeds will remain perfect indefinitely, regardless of whether the security interest in the original collateral remains perfected. In many cases, however, such as those governed by *Com. Code §§ 9330(d)* (purchaser of instrument), *9331* (holder in due course of check), *9332* (transferee of money or funds from deposit account), a purchaser or other transferee of the cash proceeds will take free of the perfected security interest [*see* UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.23

§ 503.23 Conflict of Laws as to Perfection and Priority of Security Interests

[1] General Rules

[a] Nonpossessory Security Interests

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9303-9306*, inclusive, with respect to the specific types of property mentioned in those sections, and except as otherwise provided in this section, while a debtor is located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in collateral [*Com. Code § 9301(1)*]. *Com. Code § 9301(1)* is intended to simplify prior law and governs both tangible and intangible collateral [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9301*; *but see Com. Code §§ 9705, 9706* (discussed in *§ 503.10[2]*, transition provisions may require refiling)].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9301(4)* [*see § 503.23[1][c]*], while negotiable tangible documents, goods, instruments, money, or tangible chattel paper is located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs all of the following [*Com. Code § 9301(3)*]:

- Perfection of a security interest in the goods by filing a fixture filing.
- Perfection of a security interest in timber to be cut.
- The effect of perfection or nonperfection and the priority of a nonpossessory security interest in the collateral.

Com. Code § 9301(3)(B) governs only timber to be cut, not timber that has been cut. Once the timber is cut, the general rule of *Com. Code § 9301(1)* applies. However, to ensure continued perfection, the secured party should file in both the jurisdiction in which the timber to be cut is located (in the office in which a real property mortgage would be filed) and in the state where the debtor is located (a central filing) [UCC Comment 5c to *Com. Code § 9301*; *see Com. Code § 9501* (filing)].

Com. Code §§ 9303-9306 govern the following types of collateral and are discussed as follows:

- *Com. Code § 9303* governs goods covered by certificates of title and is discussed in*§ 503.23[2]*.
- *Com. Code § 9304* governs deposit accounts and is discussed in *§ 503.58[2]*.
- *Com. Code § 9305* governs investment property and is discussed in *§ 503.56[2]*.
- *Com. Code § 9306* governs letter-of-credit rights and is discussed in *§ 503.59[2]*.

[b] Possessory Security Interests

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9303-9306*, inclusive, with respect to the specific types of property mentioned in those sections [*see § 503.23[1][a]*], while collateral is located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a possessory security interest in that collateral [*Com. Code § 9301(2)*]. *Com. Code § 9301(2)* eliminates the troublesome "last event" test of former law [UCC Comment 5a to *Com. Code § 9301*].

A possessory security interest in collateral, other than goods covered by a certificate of title and as-extracted collateral consisting of goods, remains continuously perfected if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9316(c)*]:

- The collateral is located in one jurisdiction and subject to a security interest perfected under the law of that jurisdiction.
- Thereafter the collateral is brought into another jurisdiction.
- On entry into the other jurisdiction, the security interest is perfected under the law of the other jurisdiction.

[c] Minerals [As-Extracted Collateral]

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9303-9306*, inclusive, with respect to the specific types of property mentioned in those sections [*see* [a], *above*], the local law of the jurisdiction in which the wellhead or minehead is located governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in as-extracted collateral [*Com. Code § 9301(4)*]. A filing with respect to minerals that are as-extracted collateral should be made in the office in which a real property mortgage would be filed [UCC Comment 5 d to *Com. Code § 9301*; *see Com. Code § 9501* (filing)].

[d] Farm Products

While farm products are located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of an agricultural lien on the farm products [*Com. Code § 9302*].

[2] Rules Regarding Debtor's Location

[a] In General

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9307*, the following rules determine a debtor's location [*Com. Code § 9307(b)*; *see Com. Code § 9307(k)* (*Com. Code § 9307* applies only for purposes of *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*)]:

- A debtor who is an individual is located at the individual's principal residence.

- A debtor that is an organization and has only one place of business is located at its place of business [*see Com. Code § 9307(a)* ("place of business" means a place where a debtor conducts its affairs)].

- A debtor that is an organization and has more than one place of business is located at its chief executive office.

However, the foregoing rules of *Com. Code § 9307(b)* apply only if a debtor's residence, place of business, or chief executive office, as applicable, is located in a jurisdiction whose law generally requires information concerning the existence of a nonpossessory security interest to be made generally available in a filing, recording, or registration system as a condition or result of the security interest's obtaining priority over the rights of a lien creditor with respect to the collateral. If *Com. Code § 9307(b)* does not apply, the debtor is located in the District of Columbia [*Com. Code § 9307(c)*].

A person that ceases to exist, have a residence, or have a place of business continues to be located in the jurisdiction specified by *Com. Code § 9307(b)* and *(c)* [*Com. Code § 9307(d)*].

[b] Registered Organizations

"Registered organization" means an organization organized solely under the law of a single state or the United States and as to which the state or the United States must maintain a public record showing the organization to have been organized [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(70)*]. A registered organization that is organized under the law of a state is located in that state [*Com. Code § 9307(e)*; *see Com. Code § 9307(k)* (*Com. Code § 9307* applies only for purposes of this *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*)]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9307(i)*, a registered organization that is organized under the law of the United States and a branch or agency of a bank that is not organized under the law of the United States or a state are located in any of the following jurisdictions [*Com. Code § 9307(f)*]:

- In the state that the law of the United States designates, if the law designates a state of location.

- In the state that the registered organization, branch, or agency designates, if the law of the United States authorizes the registered organization, branch, or agency to designate its state of location.

- In the District of Columbia, if neither of the two preceding rules applies.

A registered organization continues to be located in the jurisdiction specified by *Com. Code § 9307(e)* or *(f)* notwithstanding either (1) the suspension, revocation, forfeiture, or lapse of the registered organization's status as such in its jurisdiction of organ, or (2) the dissolution, winding up, or cancellation of the existence of the registered organization [*Com. Code § 9307(g)*].

[c] Federal Government, Banks, and Foreign Air Carriers

The United States is located in the District of Columbia [*Com. Code § 9307(h)*; *see Com. Code § 9307(k)* (*Com. Code § 9307* applies only for purposes of this *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*)].

A branch or agency of a bank that is not organized under the law of the United States or a state is located in the state in which the branch or agency is licensed, if all branches and agencies of the bank are licensed in only one state [*Com. Code § 9307(i)*].

A foreign air carrier under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, is located at the designated office of the agent

on which service of process may be made on behalf of the carrier [*Com. Code § 9307(j)*].

[3] Goods Covered by Certificate of Title

[a] General Rule

The local law of the jurisdiction under whose certificate of title the goods are covered governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in goods covered by a certificate of title from the time the goods become covered by the certificate of title until the goods cease to be covered by the certificate of title [*Com. Code § 9303(c)*]. Com. Code § 9303applies to goods covered by a certificate of title, even if there is no other relationship between the jurisdiction under whose certificate of title the goods are covered and the goods or the debtor [*Com. Code § 9303(a)*]. Goods become covered by a certificate of title when a valid application for the certificate of title and the applicable fee are delivered to the appropriate authority. Goods cease to be covered by a certificate of title at the earlier of the time the certificate of title ceases to be effective under the law of the issuing jurisdiction or the time the goods become covered subsequently by a certificate of title issued by another jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9303(b)*].

[b] Perfection When Governing Law Changes

With respect to goods covered by a certificate of title issued by California, a secured party may perfect a security interest in those goods by taking possession of the goods only in the circumstances described in *Com. Code § 9316(d)* [*Com. Code § 9313(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9313(b)* is necessary to effect changes to the choice of law rules governing goods covered by certificates of title. It indicates the circumstances under which the secured party's act of taking possession of goods covered by a certificate of title is effective to perfect a security interest in the goods: the goods become covered by a certificate of title issued by California at a time when the security interest is perfected by any method under the law of another jurisdiction [UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9313*].

A security interest in goods covered by a certificate of title which is perfected by any method under the law of another jurisdiction remains perfected until the security interest would have become unperfected under the law of the other jurisdiction had the goods not become covered by the certificate of title from California [*Com. Code § 9316(d)*]. A security interest described in *Com. Code § 9316(d)* becomes unperfected as against a purchaser of the goods for value and is deemed never to have been perfected as against a purchaser of the goods for value if the applicable requirements for perfection under the relevant certificate of title law, regulation, or treaty [*see Com. Code § 9311 (b)*] or under *Com. Code § 9313* (possession) are not satisfied before the earlier of either of the following [*Com. Code § 9316(e*]:

- The time the security interest would have become unperfected under the law of the other jurisdiction had the goods not become covered by a certificate of title from California.

- The expiration of four months after the goods had become covered by a certificate of title from California.

[c] Interest Omitted From Certificate of Title

If, while a security interest in goods is perfected by any method under the law of another jurisdiction, California state issues a certificate of title that does not show that the goods are subject to the security interest or contain a statement that they may be subject to security interests not shown on the certificate, a buyer of the goods, other than a person in the business of selling goods of that kind, takes free of the security interest if the buyer gives value and receives delivery of the goods after issuance of the certificate and without knowledge of the security interest [*Com. Code § 9337(1)*]. In that situation, the omitted security interest also is subordinate to a conflicting security interest in the goods that attaches, and is perfected by compliance with the applicable certificate of title statute [*see Com. Code § 9311(b)*], after issuance of the certificate and without the conflicting secured party's knowledge of the security interest [*Com. Code § 9337(2)*].

[4] When Perfection of Security Interest Lapses Following Change in Governing Law

A security interest perfected pursuant to the law of the jurisdiction designated in *Com. Code § 9301(1)* (discussed in *§ 503.23[1][a]*) or in *Com. Code § 9305(c)* (discussed in *§ 503.56[2][a]*) remains perfected until the earliest of any of the following [*Com. Code § 9316(a)*]:

- The time perfection would have ceased under the law of that jurisdiction.
- The expiration of four months after a change of the debtor's location to another jurisdiction.
- The expiration of one year after a transfer of collateral to a person that thereby becomes a debtor and is located in another jurisdiction.

If a security interest described in *Com. Code § 9316(a)* becomes perfected under the law of the other jurisdiction before the earliest time or event described in that subdivision, it remains perfected thereafter. If the security interest does not become perfected under the law of the other jurisdiction before the earliest time or event, it becomes unperfected and is deemed never to have been perfected as against a purchaser of the collateral for value [*Com. Code § 9316(b)*].

Other rules concerning changes in law governing perfection and priority of security interests are *Com. Code § 9316(c)*, governing possessory security interests, discussed in *§ 503.23[1][b]*, *Com. Code § 9316(d), (e)*, governing goods covered by certificates of title, discussed in *§ 503.23[3][b]*, and *Com. Code § 9316(f), (g)*, governing security interest in deposit accounts, letter-of-credit rights, or investment property, which is discussed in *§ 503.58[2][b]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.24

§ 503.24 Determination of Priorities

[1] Unperfected Interests

An unperfected security interest or agricultural lien normally is subordinate to the rights of persons specifically given priority under *Com. Code § 9322* (discussed at *§ 503.24[2]*) [*see Com. Code § 9317(a)(1)*] and of persons who become lien creditors before the earlier of the following times [*Com. Code § 9317(a)(2)*; *but see Com. Code §§ 9317(e), 9323(b), below; see also, e.g., Full Throttle Films, Inc. v. National Mobile Television, Inc. (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1438, 1442-1445, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 560* (creditor's lien was prior to third-party claim on attached property because evidence failed to prove that claimant had priority under either statutory test)]:

- The time the security interest or agricultural lien is perfected, or

- The time one of the conditions specified in *Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)* (requirements for security interest to become enforceable, discussed in *§ 503.21[2]*) is met and a financing statement covering the collateral is filed.

Additionally, in the case of goods, instruments, tangible documents, and tangible chattel paper, or a security certificate, a buyer takes free of an unperfected security interest or agricultural lien if that buyer is not a secured party, gives value, and receives delivery of the collateral without knowledge of the security interest or agricultural lien before it is perfected [*Com. Code § 9317(b)*; *see Louis & Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1586-1587, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889* (under former *Com. Code § 9301(1)(c)*, knowledge of transferee is actual knowledge, not what reasonable person should have known from circumstances; because California motor vehicle registration system is "full title system," transferee who had no knowledge of defect in title was entitled to rely on information in registration and ownership certificates without further inquiry)]. Similarly, a licensee of a general intangible or a buyer, other than a secured party, of accounts, electronic chattel paper, general intangibles, or investment property other than a certificated security takes free of a security interest if the licensee or buyer gives value without knowledge of the security interest and before it is perfected [*Com. Code § 9317(c)*]. Both of the foregoing (*Com. Code § 9317(b), (c)*) and *Com. Code § 9317(a)(2)*, are subject to *Com. Code § 9317*(e), which, except with respect to certain

persons taking goods in the ordinary course of business [*see Com. Code §§ 9320, 9321*, discussed in *§ 503.24[3]*], gives priority to a person who files a financing statement with respect to a purchase money security interest before or within 20 days after the debtor receives delivery of the collateral. That purchase money security interest takes priority over the rights of a buyer, lessee, or lien creditor which arose between the time the security interest attached and the time of filing [*Com. Code § 9317(e)*].

Except with respect to a security interest held by a secured party that is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor [*Com. Code § 9323(c)*], a security interest is subordinate to the rights of a person who becomes a lien creditor to the extent that the security interest secures an advance made more than 45 days after the person becomes a lien creditor unless (1) the advance was made without knowledge of the lien or (2) the advance was made pursuant to a commitment entered into without knowledge of the lien [*Com. Code § 9323(b)*]. The foregoing does not elevate the priority of a security interest that is subordinate to the rights of a lien creditor under *Com. Code § 9317(a)(2)*; it only subordinates [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9323*]. A secured party's knowledge does not cut short the 45-day period during which future advances can achieve priority over an intervening line creditor's interest. Rather, because of the impact of *Com. Code § 9323(b)* on the question whether a security interest in future advances is "protected" under *I.R.C. § 6323(c)(2)* and *(d)*, the priority of the security interest for future advances over a lien creditor is made absolute for 45 days regardless of the knowledge of the secured party concerning the lien. However, if the advance is made after the 45 days, the advance will not have priority unless it was made or committed without knowledge of the lien [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9323*].

[2] Perfected Interests

[a] General Priority Rules

Generally, conflicting security interests and agricultural liens rank in priority according to time of filing or perfection. Priority dates from the time a filing covering the collateral is first made, or from the time the security interest or agricultural lien is first perfected, whichever is earlier, if there is no period thereafter when there is neither filing nor perfection [*Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)*]. A perfected security interest or agricultural lien has priority over a conflicting unperfected security interest or agricultural lien [*Com. Code § 9322(a)(2)*]. If conflicting security interests and agricultural liens are unperfected, the first to attach or become effective has priority [*Com. Code § 9322(a)(3)*]. The foregoing may be affected by *Com. Code § 9709(b)* (discussed in *§ 503.10[2][h]*) if a filing that occurred before the effective date of revised Division 9 was ineffective to perfect a security interest under former Division 9, but is effective under revised Division 9 [*see* U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9322*].

When there is more than one perfected security interest, the security interests rank according to priority in time of filing or perfection. "Filing" of course refers to the filing of a financing statement. "Perfect" refers to the acquisition of a perfected security interest, that is one that has attached and as to which any required perfection step has been taken [*see* U.C.C. Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9322*; *Com. Code §§ 9308, 9309*]. The rule in *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)* applies to security interests that are perfected by any method, including temporarily (*Com. Code § 9312*) or on attachment (*Com. Code § 9309*) even though there may be no notice to creditors or subsequent purchasers and notwithstanding any common-law rule to the contrary. The form of the claim to priority--filing or perfection--may shift from time to time, and the rank will be based on the first filing or perfection as long as there is no intervening period without filing or perfection [U.C.C. Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9322*; *see Com. Code § 9308(c)*]

ILLUSTRATION:

First to File Has Priority. On February 1, A files a financing statement covering a certain item of Debtor's equipment. On March 1, B files a financing statement covering the same equipment. On April 1, B makes a loan to Debtor and obtains a security interest in the equipment. On May 1, A makes a loan to Debtor and obtains a security interest in the same collateral. Who has priority? A has priority even though B's loan was made earlier and was perfected when made. It makes no difference whether A knew

> of B's security interest when A made its advance. The foregoing problem is particular to a notice-filing system under which filing may occur before the security interest attaches [*see Com. Code § 9502*]. The justification for determining priority by order of filing lies in the necessity of protecting the filing system--that is of allowing the first secured party who has filed to make subsequent advances without each time having to check for subsequent filings as a condition of protection. However, this first-to-file protection is not absolute. For example *Com. Code § 9324* affords priority to certain purchase money security interests, even if a competing secured party was the first to file or perfect [*see* U.C.C. Comment 4, Example 1, to *Com. Code § 9322*].

A perfected agricultural lien on collateral has priority over a conflicting security interest in or agricultural lien on the same collateral if the statute creating the agricultural lien so provides [*Com. Code § 9322(g)*]. If the statute creating the agricultural lien does not grant it priority, *Com. Code § 9322(a)* applies the same priority rules to an agricultural line as to a security interest, regardless of whether the agricultural line conflicts with another agricultural lien or with a security interest [UCC Comment 12 to *Com. Code § 9322*].

Com. Code § 9322 states the general priority rules, which are subject to other rules in *Com. Code 9301 et seq.* and the following exceptions [*Com. Code § 9322(f)*]:

- A perfected agricultural lien on collateral [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(1), (g)*].
- A security interest of a collecting bank [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(2)*; *see Com. Code § 4210*].
- A security interest of an issuer or nominated person [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(3)*; *see Com. Code § 5118*].
- A security interest arising under Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*) or Division 10 (*Com. Code § 10101*) [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(4)*; *see Com. Code § 9110*].

Some of the other rules in *Com. Code 9301 et seq.* that override the general rules of *Com. Code § 9322* are those governing purchase money interests [*Com. Code § 9324*; *see § 503.24[2][c]*] and those allowing special priority in particular types of collateral, such as *Com. Code § 9327* (deposit accounts, discussed in *§ 503.58[3]*), *Com. Code § 9328* (investment property, discussed in *§ 503.56[3]*), *Com. Code § 9329* (letter of credit rights, discussed in *§ 503.59[3]*), *Com. Code § 9330* (chattel paper and instruments, discussed in *§§ 503.49[3], 503.50[2],* and *503.52[8]*), and *Com. Code § 9334* (fixtures, discussed in *§§ 503.24[2][e]* and *503.47[6]*) [see U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9322*].

[b] Priorities in Supporting Obligations and Proceeds

For purposes of *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)* [*see § 503.24[2][a]*], the time of filing or perfection as to a security interest in collateral is also the time of filing or perfection as to a security interest in proceeds of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9322(b)(1)*; *see Com. Code § 9315*, discussed in *§§ 503.21[4], 503.22[7]*]. Similarly, for purposes of *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)*, the time of filing or perfection as to a security interest supported by a supporting obligation is also the time of filing or perfection as to a security interest in the supporting obligation [*Com. Code § 9322(b)(2)*]. A "supporting obligation" is a letter-of-credit right or secondary obligation that supports the payment or performance of an account, chattel paper, document, general intangible, instrument, or investment property [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)*]. Inasmuch as no agricultural lien on proceeds arise under Division 9, *Com. Code § 9322(b)-(e)* do not apply to proceeds of agricultural liens. However, if an agricultural lien has priority under *Com. Code § 9322(g)* (discussed in *§ 503.24[2][a]*), and the statute creating the agricultural lien gives the secured party a line on proceeds of the collateral subject to the lien, a court should apply the principle of *Com. Code § 9322(g)* and award priority in the proceeds to the holder of the perfected agricultural lien [UCC Comment 12 to *Com. Code § 9322*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9322(f)* [*see § 503.24[2][a]*], a security interest in collateral which qualifies for priority over a conflicting security interest under *Com. Code § 9327* (deposit accounts, discussed in *§ 503.58[3]*), *Com. Code § 9328* (investment property, discussed in *§ 503.56[3]*), *Com. Code § 9329* (letter-of-credit rights, discussed in *§ 503.59[3]*), *Com. Code § 9330* (chattel paper and instruments, discussed in §§ 503.49[3], 503.50[2], 503.52[9]), or *Com. Code § 9331* (purchasers of instrument, documents, or securities, discussed in *§ 503.24[3]*), also has priority over a conflicting security interest in both of the following [*Com. Code § 9322(c)*]:

- Any supporting obligation for the collateral.

- Proceeds of the collateral if (1) the security interest in proceeds is perfected, (2) the proceeds are cash proceeds or of the same type as the collateral, and (3) in the case of proceeds that are proceeds of proceeds, all intervening proceeds are cash proceeds, proceeds of the same type as the collateral, or an account relating to the collateral.

Com. Code § 9322(c)(2) provides the baseline priority rule for proceeds of "non-filing" collateral, which applies if the secured party has taken steps required for a non-temporal priority over a conflicting security interest in "non-filing" collateral, such as control in the case of a deposit account. *Com. Code § 9322(c)(2)* determines the priority of proceeds of non-filing collateral whether or not there exists an actual conflicting security interest in the original non-filing collateral. Under *Com. Code § 9322(c)(2)*, the priority in the original collateral continues in proceeds, if the security interest in proceeds is perfected and the proceeds are cash-proceeds or non-filing proceeds of the same type as the original collateral. "Type of collateral" means a type of collateral defined in the Uniform Commercial Code and should be read broadly. For example, a security is "of the same type" as a security entitlement (i.e., investment property) and a promissory note is "of the same type" as a draft (i.e., instrument) [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 9322*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9322(f)* [*see 503.24[2][a]*], if the proceeds of the collateral are not cash proceeds, chattel paper, negotiable documents, instruments, investment property, or letter-of-credit rights, and a security interest was perfected in collateral that is chattel paper, deposit accounts, negotiable documents, instruments, investment property, or letter-of-credit rights by a method other than filing, conflicting perfected security interests in proceeds of the collateral rank according to priority in time of filing [*Com. Code § 9322(d), (e)*].

[c] Purchase Money Security Interests

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9324(g)*, a perfected purchase money security interest [*see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest," discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)], in goods other than inventory or livestock [*see* discussions in *§§ 503.40[5*] (purchase money security interests in goods, livestock, and software), 503.41[2] (purchase money security interest in inventory)] has priority over a conflicting security interest in the same goods, and, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.58[3]*], a perfected security interest in its identifiable proceeds also has priority, if the purchase money security interest is perfected when the debtor receives possession of the collateral or within 20 days thereafter [*Com. Code § 9324(a)*]. The rationale for giving purchase money security interests priority is in part to counteract the fact creditors may tie up all of debtor's assets through after-acquired property clauses [*see T.M. Cobb Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 606, 621, 128 Cal. Rptr. 655, 547 P.2d 431* (discussing former *Com. Code §§ 9312(3)* and *(4)*)].

The secured party may file with respect to a purchase money security interest before or within 20 days after the debtor receives possession of the collateral. In that case, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9320, 9321* (discussed in *§ 503.24[3]*), the purchase money security takes priority over the rights of a buyer, lessee, or lien creditor which arise between the time the security interest attaches and the time of filing [*Com. Code § 9317(e)*].

If more than one security interest qualifies for priority in the same collateral under *Com. Code § 9324(a), (b), (d),* or *(f)*

[*see* discussions in *§§ 503.40[5], 503.41[2]*], the following rules apply [*Com. Code § 9324(g)*]:

- A security interest securing an obligation incurred as all or part of the price of the collateral has priority over a security interest securing an obligation incurred for value given to enable the debtor to acquire rights in, or the use of, collateral.

- In all other cases, *Com. Code § 9322(a)* (discussed in *§ 503.24[2][a]*) applies to the qualifying security interests.

[d] Future Advances

A security agreement may provide that collateral secures futures advances [*see Com. Code § 9204(c)* (discussed in *§ 503.21[5]*)]. Generally, the rule in Code § 9322(a)(l) [*see § 503.24[2][a]*] does not distinguish among various advances made by a secured party. The priority of every advance dates from the earlier of filing or perfection. However, in rare instances, the priority of an advance dates from the time the new advance is made [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9322*]. *Com. Code § 9323* collects all the special rules dealing with the priority of advances made by a secured party after a third party acquires an intervening security interest in the collateral [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9323*]:

- *Com. Code § 9323(b)* (when lien creditor takes subject to advance) is discussed in [1], *above*.

- *Com. Code § 9323(d), (e)* (when buyer, other than in ordinary course of business, takes free of interest securing advance) is discussed in *§ 503.40[5][a]*.

- *Com. Code § 9323(f), (g)* (when lessee, other than in ordinary course of business, takes free of interest securing advance) is discussed in *§ 503.40[5][b]*.

Except with respect to a security interest held by a secured party who is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor [*Com. Code § 9323(c)*], for purposes of determining the priority of a perfected security interest under *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)*, perfection of the security interest dates from the time an advance is made to the extent that the security interest secures an advance that satisfies both of the following conditions [*Com. Code § 9323(a)*]:

- It is made while the security interest is perfected only under *Com. Code § 9309* when it attaches, or temporarily under *Com. Code § 9312 (e), (f),* or *(g)*.

- It is not made pursuant to a commitment entered into before or while the security interest is perfected by a method other than under *Com. Code § 9309* or under *Com. Code § 9312 (e), (f),* or *(g)*.

The only time the first-to-file-or-perfect rule of *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)* does *not* determine priority is when a financing statement was not filed and the advance is the giving of value, which constitutes the last step for attachment of perfection. *Com. Code § 9323(a)* states the only other instance when the time of an advance figures in the priority scheme in *Com. Code § 9322*: when the (other) security interest is perfected only automatically under *Com. Code § 9309*, or temporarily under *Com. Code § 9312 (e), (f),* or *(g),* and the advance was not made pursuant to a commitment entered into while the security interest was perfected by another method [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9323*].

[e] Priority of Perfected Security Interest in Crops Over Real Estate Encumbrance

A perfected security interest in crops growing on real property has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the debtor has an interest of record in, or is in possession of, the real property [*Com. Code § 9334(i)*].

[f] Possessory Liens

A person in the ordinary course of business may furnish services or materials with respect to goods subject to a security interest. A lien on goods that depends on that person's possession, and is given by statute or rule of law for the materials, takes priority over a security interest unless the lien is statutory and the statute expressly provides otherwise [*Com. Code § 9333*]. If the statute creating the possessory lien is silent as to its priority relative to security interests, *Com. Code § 9333* provides a rule of interpretation that the possessory lien takes priority, even if the statue has been construed judicially to make the possessory lien subordinate [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9333*].

[3] Favored Position of Certain Buyers and Holders

[a] Buyers in Ordinary Course of Business

Although, under the Commercial Code generally, a buyer in the ordinary course of business is one who buys in good faith and without knowledge that the sale is in violation of a security interest [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*, discussed in *§ 503.161[4]*], *Com. Code § 9320(a)* specifically provides that, except when the goods are in the possession of the secured party under *Com. Code § 9313* [*Com. Code § 9320(e)*], a buyer in the ordinary course of business takes free of a security interest created by the buyer's seller even if the security interest is perfected and the buyer knows of its existence [*Com. Code § 9320(a)*]. Read together, the general definition of buyer in the ordinary course of business and *Com. Code § 9320(a)* provide that the buyer takes free of the security interest if he or she merely knows there is a security interest that covers the goods, but takes subject to the security interest if he or she knows the sale violates a term in an agreement with the secured party [*see* U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9320*; *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v Amstar Corp (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 653-654, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914* (decided under former *Com. Code § 9307(1)*)]. *Com. Code § 9320(b)*, which relates to consumer goods, is discussed in *§ 503.42[3]*. For a complaint for use by a buyer in the ordinary course of business to seek a declaration that he or she takes free of another interest, see *§ 503.161*.

The limitations of *Com. Code § 9320(a)* and *(b)* on persons who may take free of a security interest apply only to unauthorized sales by the debtor. If the secured party authorized the sale, in an express agreement or otherwise, the buyer takes free under *Com. Code § 9315(a)* without regard to the limitations of *Com. Code § 9320* [*see* U.C.C. Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9320*].

Other requirements for maintenance of a buyer's favored position vis-a-vis the holder of a perfected security interest are inherent in the definition of "buyer in the ordinary course of business," namely, that the sale was made by a person in the business of selling goods of the same kind as the collateral [*American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 772-774, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *see Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*, discussed in *§ 503.161[4]*], and that bulk sales, distress sales at an obvious loss price, or liquidation sales will not qualify as in the ordinary course of business [*American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 772, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325* (dicta)].

[b] Licensees in Ordinary Course of Business

Until January 1, 2013 [*Com. Code § 9321(d)*], a licensee in ordinary course of business takes its rights under a nonexclusive license free of a security interest in the general intangible created by the licensor, even if the security interest is perfected and the licensee knows of its existence [*Com. Code § 9321(b)*].

A "licensee in ordinary course of business" is a person that becomes a licensee of a general intangible in good faith, without knowledge that the license violates the rights of another person in the general intangible, and in the ordinary course from a person in the business of licensing general intangibles of that kind. A person becomes a licensee in the ordinary course if the license to the person comports with the usual or customary practices in the kind of business in which the licensor is engaged or with the licensor's own usual or customary practices [*Com. Code § 9321(a)*].

[c] Lessees in Ordinary Course of Business

A lessee in ordinary course of business takes its leasehold interest free of a security interest in the goods created by the lessor, even if the security interest is perfected and the lessee knows of its existence [*Com. Code § 9321(c)*].

[d] Holders, Holders in Due Course, and Protected Purchasers

Nothing in Division 9 limits the rights of a holder in due course of a negotiable instrument [*see Com. Code § 3302*], a holder to which a negotiable document of title has been duly negotiated [*see Com. Code § 7501*], or a protected purchaser of a security [*see Com. Code § 8303*]. These holders or purchasers take priority over an earlier security interest, even if perfected, to the extent provided in Division 3 (*Com. Code § 3101 et seq.*, Division 7 (*Com. Code § 7101 et seq.*), and Division 8 (*Com. Code § 8101 et seq.*) [*Com. Code § 9331(a)*]. Division 9 does not limit the rights of or impose liability on a person to the extent that the person is protected against the assertion of a claim under Division 8 [*Com. Code § 9331(b)*], nor does filing under Division 9 constitute notice of a claim or defense to the holders, or purchasers, or persons described in *Com. Code § 9331(a)* and *(b)* [*Com. Code § 9331(c)*].

[4] Interest or Lien Perfected by Filing Statement Containing Incorrect Information

If a security interest or agricultural lien is perfected by a filed financing statement providing information described in *Com. Code § 9516(b)(5)* which is incorrect at the time the financing statement is filed, the security interest or agricultural lien is subordinate to a conflicting perfected security interest in the collateral to the extent that the holder of the conflicting security interest gives value in reasonable reliance on the incorrect information [*Com. Code § 9338(1)*]. In addition, in that situation a purchaser of the collateral, other than a secured party, takes free of the security interest or agricultural lien to the extent that, in reasonable reliance on the incorrect information, the purchaser gives value and, in the case of tangible chattel paper, tangible documents, goods, instruments, or a security certificate, receives delivery of the collateral [*Com. Code § 9338(2)*]. A secured party or purchaser who has not made itself aware of the information in the filing office with respect to the debtor cannot act in "reasonable reliance" on the information [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9338*].

Com. Code § 9338 applies to financing statements that contain information that is incorrect at the time of filing and imposes a small risk of subordination on the filer. *Com. Code § 9507* deals with financing statements containing information that is correct at the time of filing but become incorrect later. Except as provided by *Com. Code § 9507(c)* with respect to changes in the debtor's name, an otherwise effective financing statement does not become ineffective if the information contained in it becomes inaccurate [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9338*].

The information described in *Com. Code § 9516(b)(5)* is:

- The debtor's mailing address.
- An indicate whether the debtor is an individual or an organization.
- If the financing statement indicates that the debtor is an organization, one of the following: (1) a type of organization for the debtor, (2) a jurisdiction of organization for the debtor, or (3) an organizational identification number for the debtor or an indication that the debtor has none.

For analogous rules applicable in the case of a certificate of title that omits a security interest, see *Com. Code § 9337*, discussed in *§ 503.23[3][c]*.

[5] Between Transferor's Secured Party and Transferee's Secured Party

[a] Security Interests in Transferred Collateral

Com. Code § 9325 is new in revised Division 9 and addresses the "double debtor" problem that arises when a debtor acquires property that is subject to a security interest created by another debtor [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9325*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9325(b)*, a security interest created by a debtor is subordinate to a security interest in the same collateral created by another person if the acquired the collateral subject to the security interest created by the other person, the security interest created by the other person was perfected when the debtor acquired the collateral, and there is no period thereafter when the security interest is unperfected [*Com. Code § 9325(a)*]. *Com. Code § 9325(a)* subordinates a security interest only if the security interest otherwise would have priority solely under the basic priority rules of *Com. Code § 9322(a)* (discussed in*§ 503.24[2][a]*) or under the purchase money priority rules of *Com. Code § 9324*, or the security interest arose solely under *Com. Code § 2711(3)* (buyer) or *Com. Code § 10508(e)* (lessee) [*Com. Code § 9325(b)*].

The appropriateness of the rule in *Com. Code § 9325(a)* is most apparent when it works to subordinate security interests having priority under the basic priority rules of *Com. Code § 9322(a)* (discussed in [2][a], *above*) or under the purchase money priority rules of *Com. Code § 9324*. The rule also works properly when applied to the security interest of a buyer under *Com. Code § 2711(3)* or a lessee under *Com. Code § 10508(e)*. However, *Com. Code § 9325(a)* may provides an inappropriate resolution of the "double debtor" problem in some of the wide variety of other contexts in which the problem may arise. Although *Com. Code § 9325(b)* limits application of *Com. Code § 9325(a)* to those case in which *Com. Code § 9325(a)* is known to be appropriate, courts should apply the rule in other settings, if necessary to promote underlying purposes and policies of the Uniform Commercial Code [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9325*].

[b] New Debtors

Com. Code § 9326 is new in revised Division 9 and addresses the priority contests that may arise when a new debtor becomes bound by the security agreement of an original debtor and each debtor has a secured creditor [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9326*]. Subject to *Com. Code § 9326(b)*, a security interest created by a new debtor [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(56)* (defining "new debtor," at *§ 503.11[9][a]*] which is perfected by a filed financing statement that is effective solely under *Com. Code § 9508* (discussed in *§ 503.22[5][i]*) in collateral in which a new debtor has or acquires rights is subordinate to a security interest in the same collateral which is perfected other than by a filed financing statement that is effective solely under *Com. Code § 9508*[*Com. Code § 9326(a)*]. "A filed financing statement that is effective solely under *Com. Code § 9508*" refers to a financing statement filing against the original debtor that continues to be effective under *Com. Code § 9508*. It does not encompass a new initial financing statement providing the name of the new debtor even if the initial financing statement is filed to maintain the effectiveness of a financing statement under circumstances described in *Com. Code § 9508*. Nor does it encompass a financing statement filed against the original debtor which remains effective against collateral transferred by the original debtor to a new debtor [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9326*].

The other provisions relating to perfection and priority (*Com. Code § 9301 et seq.*) determine the priority among conflicting security interests in the same collateral perfected by filed financing statements that are effective solely under *Com. Code § 9508*. However, if the security agreements to which a new debtor became bound as debtor were not entered into by the same original debtor, the conflicting security interests rank according to priority in time of the new debtor's having become bound [*Com. Code § 9326(b)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.22[5][i]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.25

§ 503.25 Debtor's Statement of Indebtedness or List of Collateral

[1] Permitted Types of Requests

A debtor, by an authenticated record, may request information from the secured party (other than a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor) regarding the collateral or the obligation. The request can be in any of the following three forms [*Com. Code § 9210(a)*; see *Com. Code § 9210(b)* (exceptions to types of secured parties required to respond)]:

- A "request for an accounting," by which a debtor requests the recipient to provide an accounting of the unpaid obligations secured by collateral and reasonably identifies the transaction or relationship that is the subject of the request.

- A "request regarding a list of collateral," by which a debtor requests the recipient to approve or to correct a list of what the debtor believes to be the collateral securing an obligation and reasonably identifies the transaction or relationship that is the subject of the request.

- A "request regarding a statement of account," by which a debtor requests the recipient to approve or to correct a statement indicating what the debtor believes to be the aggregate amount of unpaid obligations secured by collateral as of a specified date and reasonably identifies the transaction or relationship that is the subject of the request.

A debtor is entitled to one response to a request under this section without charge during any six-month period. The secured party may require payment of a charge not exceeding $25 for each additional response [*Com. Code § 9210(f)*].

For a complaint for damages caused by the secured party's failure to respond to a request for accounting or correction or approval of statement, see *§ 503.100*.

[2] Required Responses

A secured party, other than a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor, must comply with a request within 14 days after receipt. In the case of a request for an accounting, the secured party must authenticate an accounting and send it to the debtor [*Com. Code § 9210(b)(1)*]. In the case of a request regarding a list of collateral or a request regarding a statement of account, the secured party must approve or correct the list or statement, authenticate it, and send the debtor the approval or correction [*Com. Code § 9210(b)(2)*].

Alternatively, with respect to a request regarding a list of collateral, if a secured party claims a security interest in all of a particular type of collateral owned by the debtor, that secured party may comply with by sending the debtor an authenticated record including a statement to the effect that it claims an interest in all of that particular type of collateral within 14 days after receipt [*Com. Code § 9210(c)*].

A secured party who fails to comply with a request regarding a list of collateral or a statement of account under *Com. Code § 9210*, may claim a security interest only as shown in the list or statement included in the request as against a person that is reasonably misled by the failure [*Com. Code § 9625(g)*]. A secured party who fails to comply with the request is also liable for actual and statutory damages ($500), as discussed in *§§ 503.29* and *503.100[4]*.

[3] Procedure if Recipient Claims No Interest In Collateral or Obligation

If the person that receives a request regarding a list of collateral, a request for an accounting, or a request regarding a statement of account, claims no interest in the collateral or in the obligations (depending on which type of request is involved) when it receives the request, but claimed an interest in the collateral or in the obligations at an earlier time must comply with the request within 14 days after receipt by sending to the debtor an authenticated record that disclaims any interest in the collateral or the obligations (depending on the type of request involved) and, if known to the recipient, provides the name and mailing address of any assignee of or successor to the recipient's interest in the collateral or in the obligations [*Com. Code § 9210(d)* (collateral), (e) (obligations)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.26

§ 503.26 Rights and Duties of Parties in Possession

[1] Secured Party

A secured party must use reasonable care in the custody and preservation of collateral in that party's possession, as well as follow various other requirements and procedures discussed below. In the case of chattel paper or an instrument, reasonable care includes taking necessary steps to preserve rights against prior parties unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 9207(a)*]. Except when the secured party in possession is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor [*see Com. Code § 9207(d)*], reasonable expenses (including the cost of any insurance and payment of taxes or other charges) incurred in the custody, preservation, use, or operation of the collateral are chargeable to the debtor and are secured by the collateral. The debtor bears the risk of accidental loss or damage to the extent of any deficiency in any effective insurance coverage [*Com. Code § 9207(b)(1), (2)*]. The secured party must keep the collateral identifiable, but fungible collateral may be commingled [*Com. Code § 9207(b)(3)*]. Except when the secured party in possession is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor [*see Com. Code § 9207(d)*], a secured party having possession of collateral, or control of collateral that is an electronic document of title, a deposit account, electronic chattel paper, investment property or a financial asset, or letter-of-credit rights [*see generally Com. Code §§ 7106, 9104-9107*] (1) may hold as additional security any proceeds, except money or funds, received from the collateral, (2) must apply money or funds received from the collateral to reduce the secured obligation, unless remitted to the debtor, and (3) may create a security interest in the collateral [*Com. Code § 9207(c)*]. *Com. Code § 9207(d)*, applicable when the secured party is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor, is discussed in *§ 503.46[5]*.

A secured party is liable for any loss caused by his or her failure to meet any obligation imposed above [*Com. Code § 9625(b)-(c)*; *see §§ 503.29, 503.101*]. The secured party may use or operate the collateral (1) for the purpose of preserving it or its value, (2) as permitted by an order of a court having competent, or (3) except in the case of consumer goods, in the manner and to the extent agreed by the debtor [*Com. Code § 9207(b)(4)*].

[2] Debtor in Possession

Because the debtor, as the owner of the collateral, is the one originally and normally entitled to its possession, a typical

security agreement expressly provides for the rights and responsibilities of the debtor as to the collateral while it remains subject to the creditor's security interest.

A security agreement that expressly prohibits the debtor's disposition of the collateral without the written consent of the secured party in effect requires an actual prior or subsequent consent in writing by the secured creditor that manifests the creditor's intent to authorize disposition free of the security interest. Mere acquiescence of the creditor is insufficient, and any allowable exception of an implied agreement is limited to the situation of a prior course of dealing with the debtor that would permit such a disposition [*Central Cal. Equip. Co. v. Dolk Tractor Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 855, 862, 144 Cal. Rptr. 367* ; *see Com. Code § 9315(a)(2)*; *see also Gordon v. Hamm (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1330-1332, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631* (owners' entrustment of used motor home to dealer did not constitute "disposition" for purposes of former *Com. Code § 9306(2)*; buyers took motor home subject to original owners' lenders' perfected security interest)].

A secured party may also sue for impairment of the collateral or security interest by the alleged wrongful acts of third parties. The amount of damages for impairment is limited to a sum not greater than the balance due on the indebtedness plus collection costs [*Baldwin v. Marina City Properties, Inc. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 393, 414, 145 Cal. Rptr. 406* (secured party holding limited partnership interest as collateral, however, is not able to sue generally for breach of partnership agreement or breach of fiduciary duty arising out of the impairment)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.27

§ 503.27 Secured Party's Rights and Duties on Default

[1] Generally

After default, a secured party has the rights provided in *Com. Code § 9601 et seq* and, except to the extent that certain waivers by debtors and obligors are prohibited by *Com. Code § 9602* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.28[2][a]*], those rights provided by agreement of the parties [*Com. Code § 9601(a)*]. A secured party in possession of collateral or control of collateral under *Com. Code § 7106* (electronic document of title), 9104 (deposit account), 9105 (electronic chattel paper), 9106 (investment property), or 9107 (letter-of-credit right) has the rights and duties provided in *Com. Code § 9207*, discussed in *§ 503.26[1]* [*Com. Code § 9601(b)*]. The secured party may reduce a claim to judgment, foreclose, or otherwise enforce the claim, security interest, or agricultural lien by any available judicial procedure. If the collateral is documents, the secured party may proceed either as to the documents or as to the goods they cover [*Com. Code § 9601(a)(2)*]. The foregoing rights and remedies are cumulative and may be exercised simultaneously [*Com. Code § 9601(c)*]. The secured party may take possession of the collateral, as discussed in [2], *below* [*Com. Code § 9609(1)(a)*; *see KMAP, Inc. v. Town & Country Broadcasters, Inc. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 544, 546-548, 122 Cal. Rptr. 420* (suit for deficiency after sale of collateral, which collateral was obtained by earlier suit for possession after default of debtor, does not constitute splitting of single cause of action barring subsequent deficiency suit, because two different causes of action are involved: right to improve security on default, and right to satisfaction of remaining debt after exhaustion of collateral)] and may dispose of the collateral, as discussed in [4], *below* [*Com. Code § 9610*]. The secured party may pursue alternative remedies until the obligation is satisfied [*Brunzell Construction Co., Inc. v. Smith (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 617, 622-623, 246 Cal. Rptr. 182]* .

Com. Code § 9601 et seq impose no duties on a secured party that is a consignor or is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes except, as provided by *Com. Code § 9607(c)*, discussed in [3][a], *below* [*Com. Code § 9601(g)*]. As discussed in *§ 503.29[4]*, a secured party owes no duties to debtors or obligors of whom it does not know or who it does know how to contact [*see Com. Code §§ 9605, 9628*].

[2] Taking Possession of Collateral

After default, a secured party has the right to take possession of the collateral unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code §*

9609(a)(1)]. The secured party may proceed pursuant to judicial process in taking possession of the collateral or without judicial process, if it does so without breach of the peace [*Com. Code § 9609(b)*]. For a form for use to obtain possession by judicial process, see *§ 503.120*. If so agreed, and in any event after default, the secured party may require the debtor to assemble the collateral and make it available at a place to be designated by the secured party which is reasonably convenient to both parties [*Com. Code § 9609(c)*]. The provision for self-help repossession has been held constitutional in that, although it allows for the taking of property without prior notice and opportunity for hearing, it is a procedure traditionally recognized at common law and it may be executed without state action [*Kipp v. Cozens (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 709, 713-716, 115 Cal. Rptr. 423* ; *see also Adams v. Southern Cal. First Nat'l Bank (1973) 492 F.2d 324, 329 , cert. denied, 419 U.S. 1006 (1974)]* .

[3] Collection or Enforcement After Default

[a] In General

If so agreed, and in any event after default, a secured party may do all of the following [*Com. Code § 9607(a), (b)*]:

- Notify an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral to make payment or otherwise render performance to or for the benefit of the secured party.

- Take any proceeds to which the secured party is entitled under *Com. Code § 9315*.

- Enforce the obligations of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral and exercise the rights of the debtor with respect to the obligation of the account debtor or other person obligated on collateral to make payment or otherwise render performance to the debtor, and with respect to any property that secures the obligations of the account debtor or other person obligated on the collateral. If necessary to enable a secured party to exercise the right of a debtor to enforce a mortgage nonjudicially, the secured party may record in the office in which a record of the mortgage is recorded both (1) a copy of the security agreement that creates or provides for a security interest in the obligation secured by the mortgage, and (2) the secured party's sworn affidavit in recordable form stating that a default has occurred and that the secured party is entitled to enforce the mortgage nonjudicially.

- If it holds a security interest in a deposit account perfected by control under paragraph *Com. Code § 9104(a)(1)* (bank at which deposit is maintained is secured party, as discussed in *§ 503.58[1]*), apply the balance of the deposit account to the obligation secured by the deposit account.

- If it holds a security interest in a deposit account perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9104(a)(2)* or *(3)* (discussed in *§ 503.58[1]*), instruct the bank to pay the balance of the deposit account to or for the benefit of the secured party.

A secured party must proceed in a commercially reasonable manner if the secured party undertakes to collect from or enforce an obligation of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral and the secured party is entitled to charge back uncollected collateral or otherwise to full or limited recourse against the debtor or a secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9607(c)*]. The fact that a greater amount could have been obtained by a collection or enforcement, disposition, or acceptance at a different time or in a different method from that selected by the secured party is not of itself sufficient to preclude the secured party from establishing that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance was made in a commercially reasonable manner [*Com. Code § 9627(a)*]. A collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance is commercially reasonable if it has been approved in or by (1) a judicial proceeding, (2) a bona fide creditors' committee, (3) a representative of creditors, or (4) an assignee for the benefit of creditors [*Com. Code § 9627(c)*], but approval in one of those ways need not be obtained; and lack of approval does not mean that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance is not commercially reasonable [*Com. Code § 9627(d)*]. A secured

party may deduct from the collections made reasonable expenses of collection and enforcement, including reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses incurred by the secured party [*Com. Code § 9607(d)*]. *Com. Code § 9607(c)* does not determine whether an account debtor, bank, or other person obligated on collateral owes a duty to a secured party [*Com. Code § 9607(e)*].

After application of the proceeds of collection in the order described in [b], *below*, the secured party must account to and pay a debtor for any surplus, and except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9626(b)* (consumer goods transactions), the obligor is liable for any deficiency [*Com. Code § 9608(a)(4)*]. However, if the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, the debtor is not entitled to any surplus, and the obligor is not liable for any deficiency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)* relating to the payment of proceeds applies only if the security agreement provides that the debtor is entitled to any surplus [*Com. Code § 9608(b)*].

[b] Application of Proceeds of Collection or Enforcement

If a security interest or agricultural lien secures payment or performance of an obligation, a secured party must apply or pay over for application the cash proceeds of collection or enforcement under *Com. Code § 9607* in the following order to [*Com. Code § 9608(a)(1), (2)*]:

- First, the reasonable expenses of collection and enforcement and, to the extent provided for by agreement and not prohibited by law, reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses incurred by the secured party.

- Second, the satisfaction of obligations secured by the security interest or agricultural lien under which the collection or enforcement is made.

- Third, the satisfaction of obligations secured by any subordinate security interest in or other lien on the collateral subject to the security interest or agricultural lien under which the collection or enforcement is made if the secured party receives an authenticated demand for proceeds before distribution of the proceeds is completed. If requested by a secured party, a holder of a subordinate security interest or other lien must furnish reasonable proof of the interest or lien within a reasonable time. Unless the holder complies, the secured party need not comply with the holder's demand.

A secured party need not apply or pay over for application noncash proceeds of collection and enforcement under *Com. Code § 9607* unless the failure to do so would be commercially unreasonable. A secured party that applies or pays over for application noncash proceeds must do so in a commercially reasonable manner [*Com. Code § 9608(a)(3)*].

[4] Acceptance of Collateral in Satisfaction of Debt (Strict Foreclosure)

[a] Requirements and Proposal

The secured party may accept the collateral in full or partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures, except when the collateral is consumer goods and the debtor has made a 60 percent payment, in which case the collateral must be disposed of unless the debtor waives the right to require disposition [*Com. Code § 9620(a), (e)*; *see § 503.42[5][a]* (rules applicable to consumer goods collateral)]. The secured party's acceptance of the collateral in satisfaction of the debt is called "strict foreclosure" [*see* UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9620*]. An additional requirement when the collateral is consumer goods is that the collateral is not in the possession of the debtor when the debtor consents to the acceptance [*Com. Code § 9620(a)(3)*]. Other requirements, applicable in all cases, are that the debtor consent to the acceptance under *Com. Code § 9620(c)* and that the secured party not receive, within the time set forth in *Com. Code § 9620(d)* (generally 20 days after notification), discussed in [d], *below*, a notification of objection to the proposal authenticated by either (1) a person to which the secured party was required to send the proposal under *Com. Code §*

9621, or *(2)* any other person, other than the debtor, holding an interest in the collateral subordinate to the security interest that is the subject of the proposal [*Com. Code § 9620(a)(1), (2)*; *see also Com. Code § 9627* (indicia of commercially reasonable acceptance, discussed in [3][a], *above* and [5][a] *below*].

In addition to all of the foregoing, for a purported or apparent acceptance of collateral to be effective, the secured party must consent to the acceptance in an authenticated record or send a proposal to the debtor [*Com. Code § 9620(b)*]. This last requirement expands prior law by allowing the debtor to be the one to propose the acceptance of the collateral in satisfaction of the obligation [*see* UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9620*]. Further, it makes clear that mere delay in collection or disposition of collateral does not constitute a "constructive" strict foreclosure and that a debtor's voluntary surrender of collateral to a secured party and the secured party's acceptance of possession of the collateral does not, of itself, raise the implication that the secured party intends or is proposing to accept the collateral in satisfaction of the secured obligation [*see* UCC Comment 5. to *Com. Code § 9620*].

"Proposal" means a record authenticated by a secured party that includes the terms on which the secured party is willing to accept collateral in full or partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures pursuant to *Com. Code §§ 9620, 9621*, and *9622* [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(66)*]. A proposal need not take any particular form as long as it sets forth the terms on which the secured party is willing to accept the collateral in satisfaction. A proposal to accept collateral should specify that amount of the secured obligation to be satisfied or a means of calculating the amount, such as by including a per diem accrual figure. A proposal should include any conditions under which it may be revoked and describe any other applicable conditions. A conditional proposal generally requires the debtor's agreement under *Com. Code § 9620(c)*[*see* UCC Comment 4. to *Com. Code § 9620*]. For a notice of intention to accept collateral in satisfaction of the obligation it secures, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.246* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Debtor's Consent

A debtor consents to an acceptance of collateral in partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures only if the debtor agrees to the terms of the acceptance in a record authenticated after default [*Com. Code § 9620(c)(1)*; *see Com. Code § 9620(g)*; (partial satisfaction not permitted in consumer transactions)].

There are two ways in which a debtor can consent to acceptance of collateral in full satisfaction of the obligation it secures. A debtor can consent to an acceptance of collateral in full satisfaction of the obligation it secures (1) by agreeing to the terms of the acceptance in a record authenticated after default, or (2) by failing to object to a proposal by the secured party to accept the collateral in full satisfaction of the debt within the time allowed for objection, which requires the secured party to receive notification of the objection, authenticated by the debtor, within 20 days after the secured party sent the proposal [*Com. Code § 9620(c)(2)*]. The alternative of acceptance by silence is only available for unconditional proposals sent by the secured party after default or for proposals that are subject only to a condition that collateral not in the possession of the secured party be preserved or maintained [*Com. Code § 9620(c)(2)(A)*]. As noted in [a], *above*, if the collateral is consumer goods, the collateral cannot be in the debtor's possession when the debtor consents to the acceptance [*Com. Code § 9620(a)(3)*].

[c] Who Is Entitled to Notification of Proposal

A secured party that desires to accept collateral in full or partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures must send its proposal to all of the following persons [*Com. Code § 9621(a)*]:

- Any person from which the secured party has received, before the debtor consented to the acceptance, an authenticated notification of a claim of an interest in the collateral.

- Any other secured party or lienholder that, 10 days before the debtor consented to the acceptance, held a security interest in or other lien on the collateral perfected by the filing of a financing statement

that (1) identified the collateral, (2) was indexed under the debtor's name as of that date, and (3) was filed in the office or offices in which to file a financing statement against the debtor covering the collateral as of that date.

- Any other secured party that, 10 days before the debtor consented to the acceptance, held a security interest in the collateral perfected by compliance with a registration or certificate of title statute, regulation, or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*.

An additional requirement in the case of a secured party that desires to accept collateral in partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures is to send the proposal to any secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9621(b)*].

The foregoing notification requirements are expanded from those under prior law, in part because, unlike the effect under prior law, acceptance of the collateral by the secured party will cut off subordinate liens. The holder of a security interest who is entitled to notification and does not receive it has the right to recover any loss from the enforcing secured party under *Com. Code § 9625(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.29* [*see* UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9621*; discussion in [e], *below*].

[d] Notification of Objection to Proposal

To be effective under *Com. Code § 9620(a)(2)*, a notification of objection by a person to which the proposal was sent pursuant to *Com. Code § 9621* must be received by the secured party within 20 days after notification (of the proposal) was sent to that person [*Com. Code § 9620(d)(1)*]. In other cases, to be effective under *Com. Code § 9620(a)(2)*, a notification of objection must be received by the secured party within 20 days after the last notification was sent pursuant to *Com. Code § 9621*, or, if a notification was not sent, before the debtor consents to the acceptance in accordance with *Com. Code § 9620(c)*[*Com. Code § 9620(d)(2)*].

[e] Effect of Secured Party's Acceptance of Collateral

A secured party's acceptance of collateral in full or partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures does all of the following [*Com. Code § 9622(a)*]:

- Discharges the obligation to the extent consented to by the debtor.

- Transfers all of a debtor's rights in the collateral to the secured party.

- Discharges the security interest or agricultural lien that is the subject of the debtor's consent and any subordinate security interest or other subordinate lien.

- Terminates any other subordinate interest.

A subordinate interest is discharged or terminated under *Com. Code § 9622(a)*, even if the secured party fails to comply with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9622(b)*]. Thus, subordinate interests are discharged regardless of whether a proposal was required to be sent, or, if required, was sent. However, a secured party's failure to send a proposal or otherwise comply with Division 9 may subject the secured party to liability under *Com. Code § 9625*, discussed in *§ 503.29* [*see* UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9622*].

[5] Disposition of Collateral

[a] Commercially Reasonable Conduct

After default, a secured party may sell, lease, license, or otherwise dispose of any or all of the collateral in its present

condition or following any commercially reasonable preparation or processing [*Com. Code § 9610(a)*]. This includes the right of a secured party, without removal, to render equipment unusable and dispose of collateral on the debtor's premises [*Com. Code § 9609(a)(2)*; *see also Com. Code § 9609(c)*, discussed in [2], *above*].

Every aspect of a disposition of collateral, including the method, manner, time, place, and other terms, must be commercially reasonable. If commercially reasonable, a secured party may dispose of collateral by public or private proceedings, by one or more contracts, as a unit or in parcels, and at any time and place and on any terms [*Com. Code § 9610(b)*]. A secured party may purchase collateral at a public disposition [*Com. Code § 9610(c)(1)*], but a secured party may purchase at a private disposition only if the collateral is of a kind that is customarily sold on a recognized market or the subject of widely distributed standard price quotations [*Com. Code § 9610(c)(2)*; *see Aspen Enterprises, Inc. v. Bodge (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1811, 1825* (decided under prior law, indicia of "recognized market")]. The fact that a greater amount could have been obtained by a collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance at a different time or in a different method from that selected by the secured party is not of itself sufficient to preclude the secured party from establishing that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance was made in a commercially reasonable manner [*Com. Code § 9627(a)*]. A collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance is commercially reasonable if it has been approved in or by (1) a judicial proceeding, (2) a bona fide creditors' committee, (3) a representative of creditors, or (4) an assignee for the benefit of creditors [*Com. Code § 9627(c)*], but approval in one of those ways need not be obtained; and lack of approval does not mean that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance is not commercially reasonable [*Com. Code § 9627(d)*]. A disposition of collateral is made in a commercially reasonable manner if the disposition satisfies any of the following conditions [*Com. Code § 9627(b)*]:

- It is made in the usual manner on any recognized market.
- It is made at the price current in any recognized market at the time of the disposition.
- It is made otherwise in conformity with reasonable commercial practices among dealers in the type of property that was the subject of the disposition.

Division 9 does not define the term "public disposition," but it is one at which the price is determined after the public has had a meaningful opportunity for competitive bidding. "Meaningful opportunity" is meant to imply that some form of advertisement or public notice must precede the sale (or other disposition) and that the public must have access to the sale (disposition) [*see* UCC Comment 7. to *Com. Code § 9610*].

A contract for sale, lease, license, or other disposition includes the warranties relating to title, possession, quiet enjoyment, and the like which by operation of law accompany a voluntary disposition of property of the kind subject to the contract [*Com. Code § 9610(d)*]. However, a secured party may disclaim or modify those warranties in a manner that would be effective to disclaim or modify the warranties in a voluntary disposition of property of the kind subject to the contract of disposition or by communicating to the purchaser a record evidencing the contract for disposition and including an express disclaimer or modification of the warranties [*Com. Code § 9610(e)*]. A record is sufficient to disclaim warranties under *Com. Code § 9610(e)* if it indicates "There is no warranty relating to title, possession, quiet enjoyment, or the like in this disposition" or uses words of similar import [*Com. Code § 9610(f)*; *see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest", discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)].

[b] Notice of Disposition

[i] Who Must Be Notified

Except when the collateral is perishable or threatens to decline speedily in value or is of a type customarily sold on a recognized market [*Com. Code § 9611(d)*; *see Aspen Enterprises, Inc. v. Bodge (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1811, 1825* (decided under former Division 9, indicia of "recognized market"; existence of recognized market is usually question of

fact)], a secured party that disposes of collateral under *Com. Code § 9610* must send a reasonable authenticated notification of disposition to all of the following persons *Com. Code § 9611(b), (c)*]:

- The debtor.

- Any secondary obligor [*In re Kirkland (9th Cir. 1990) 915 F.2d 1236, 1239-1242* ; *Hollander v. Cal. Manufacturing Ent., Inc. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 561, 566-567, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 694* ; *Canadian Commercial Bank v. Ascher Findley Co. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1153-1157, 1161, 280 Cal. Rptr. 521* ; *C.I.T. Corp. v. Anwright Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1425-1427, 237 Cal. Rptr. 108* ; *Connolly v. Bank of Sonoma County (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1119, 1123-1125, 229 Cal. Rptr. 396* (guarantor's waiver of right to notification before default is ineffective; all discussed and declined to follow *Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 973, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* , which held otherwise); *see also Com. Code § 9624(a)* (permitted waivers)].

- If the collateral is other than consumer goods, to the following persons:

  - Any other person from which the secured party has received, before the notification date, an authenticated notification of a claim of an interest in the collateral.

  - Any other secured party or lienholder that, 10 days before the notification date, held a security interest in or other lien on the collateral perfected by the filing of a financing statement which (1) identified the collateral, (2) was indexed under the debtor's name as of that date, and (3) was filed in the office in which to file a financing statement against the debtor covering the collateral as of that date.

  - Any other secured party that, 10 days before the notification date, held a security interest in the collateral perfected by compliance with a registration or certificate of title statute, regulation, or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*.

"Send," in connection with a notification, means either (1) to deposit in the mail, deliver for transmission, or transmit by any other usual means of communication, with postage or cost of transmission provided for, addressed to any address reasonable under the circumstances, or (2) to cause the notification to be received within the time that it would have been received if properly sent under (1) [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(74)*]. "Notification date" means the earlier of the date on which (1) a secured party sends to the debtor and any secondary obligor an authenticated notification of disposition or (2) the debtor and any secondary obligor waive the right to notification [*Com. Code § 9611(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9624(a)* (discussed in *§ 503.28[2][b]*, notification may be waived only after default)]. Although revised Division 9 does not retain the requirement found in former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* for advertisement of public sales, and the term "public disposition" is not defined in revised Division 9, the term implies that some sort of advertisement is made to attract the public to bid [*see* UCC Comment 7. to *Com. Code § 9610*, discussed in [a], *above*].

The exception for collateral that threatens to decline speedily in value does not apply when the threat of rapid decline is caused by the secured party's procrastination. For instance, in a situation involving restaurant equipment collateral, which was worth much more if it could be sold in place to someone who intended to operate a restaurant than it would be if it were removed from the premises, the secured party took no action during two months of default, although the landlord had by then acquired the right to regain possession of the premises. The threatened speedy decline in value that occurred when a new tenant was found to take possession immediately did not excuse notice [*Backes v. Village Corner, Inc. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 209, 213-215, 242 Cal. Rptr. 716]* .

A secured party complies with the requirement for notification of lienholders who held perfected interests in the collateral 10 days before the notification date [*Com. Code § 9611(c)(3)(B)*], if the secured party satisfies both of the

following conditions [*Com. Code § 9611(e)*]:

- Not later than 20 days or earlier than 30 days before the notification date, the secured party requests, in a commercially reasonable manner, information concerning financing statements indexed under the debtor's name in the office indicated in *Com. Code § 9611(c)(3)(B)*.

- Before the notification date, the secured party either (1) did not receive a response to the request for information, or (2) received a response to the request for information and sent an authenticated notification of disposition to each secured party or other lienholder named in that response whose financing statement covered the collateral.

[ii] Time for Notification

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9612(b)*, whether a notification is sent within a reasonable time is a question of fact [*Com. Code § 9612(a)*]. In a transaction other than a consumer transaction, a notification of disposition sent after default and 10 days or more before the earliest time of disposition set forth in the notification is sent within a reasonable time before the disposition [*Com. Code § 9612(b)*].

Nothing in Division 9 prevents a secured party from electing not to conduct a disposition after sending notification. Nor does Division 9 prevent a secured party from electing to send a revised notification if its plans for disposition change. This assumes, however, that the secured party acts in good faith, the revised notification is reasonable, and the revised plan for disposition and any attendant delay are commercially reasonable [*see* UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 9611*].

[iii] Contents of Notification in Transaction Other Than Consumer-Goods Transaction

Except in a consumer-goods transaction, the contents of a notification of disposition are sufficient if the notification does all of the following [*Com. Code § 9613(1)*]:

- Describes the debtor and the secured party.

- Describes the collateral that is the subject of the intended disposition.

- States the method of intended disposition.

- States that the debtor is entitled to an accounting of the unpaid indebtedness and states the charge, if any, for an accounting [*see Com. Code § 9210*, discussed in *§ 503.25*].

- States the time and place of a public disposition or the time after which any other disposition is to be made.

A particular phrasing of the notification is not required [*Com. Code § 9613(4)*]. The notification set forth in *Com. Code § 9613(5)*, when completed, provides sufficient information [*Com. Code § 9613(5)*]. For an illustration of that form, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.240* (Matthew Bender).

Whether the contents of a notification that lacks any of the information specified in *Com. Code § 9613(1)* are nevertheless sufficient is a question of fact [*Com. Code § 9613(2)*]. The contents of a notification providing substantially the information specified in *Com. Code § 9613(1)* are sufficient, even if the notification includes information not specified by that paragraph or minor errors that are not seriously misleading [*Com. Code § 9613(3)*].

[iv] Contents of Notification in Consumer-Goods Transaction

In a consumer-goods transaction, the notification of disposition must provide the information specified *Com. Code § 9613(1)*, set forth in [iii], *above*, as well as all of the following information [*Com. Code § 9614(1)*]:

- A description of any liability for a deficiency of the person to which the notification is sent.

- A telephone number from which the amount that must be paid to the secured party to redeem the collateral under *Com. Code § 9623* is available.

- A telephone number or mailing address from which additional information concerning the disposition and the obligation secured is available.

A particular phrasing of the notification is not required [*Com. Code § 9614(2)*]. The form of notification set forth in *Com. Code § 9614(3)*, when completed, each provides sufficient information [*Com. Code § 9614(3)*]. That form of notification is set forth in *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.241* (Matthew Bender).

A notification in the form of *Com. Code § 9614(3)* is sufficient even if additional information appears at the end of the form [*Com. Code § 9614(4)*]. A notification in the form of *Com. Code § 9614(3)* is sufficient even if includes errors in information not required by *Com. Code § 9614(1)*, unless the error is misleading with respect to rights arising under Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9614(5)*]. If a notification under *Com. Code § 9614* is not in the form of *Com. Code § 9614(3)*, law other than Division 9 determines the effect of including information not required by *Com. Code § 9614(1)* [*Com. Code § 9614(6)*]. Nothing in *Com. Code § 9614* will be construed to alter or disturb any right to inspect a consumer good prior to sale under existing law [*Com. Code § 9614(9)*].

[v] Additional Requirements on Disposition of Motor Vehicle in Consumer-Goods Transaction

If the collateral in a consumer-goods transaction is a motor vehicle, a public disposition includes, but is not limited to, the following defined categories [*Com. Code § 9614(7)*]:

- Retail disposition by a retail seller of motor vehicles who offers the collateral for sale or lease to the general public in the same manner as goods that the seller disposes of on the seller's own behalf.

- Retail disposition made subsequent to advertising in a publication with a recognized ability to attract retail motor vehicle buyers and lessees and in a manner designed to reach the retail buying and leasing public for vehicles of that type and condition.

For dispositions of the types set forth in *Com. Code § 9614(7)(A)* and *(B)*, the secured creditor must ensure that the consumer has reasonable access to the motor vehicle in question in order to be able to exercise the right to inspect the motor vehicle [*Com. Code § 9614(8)*].

It had been held under prior law that when the collateral is consumer motor vehicle, to obtain a deficiency judgment, a secured creditor who sells a defaulting debtor's repossessed car must comply with all the provisions of the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*; *see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 47, *Automotive Financing and Vehicle Leasing* (Matthew Bender)], as well as with any relevant provisions in Division 9 of the Commercial Code [*Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 209, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133* ; *see Civ. Code §§ 2983.2(a), 2983.8(b)*; *see also* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* , Form 89.80]. That holding is consistent with *Com. Code § 9201(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.12[3]*. Further, Legislation enacting part of revised Division 9 specifies that nothing will be construed to alter or disturb the holding in *Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203* . The new law does not define "public" and "private" sales and dispositions in general, but describes a limited subset of "public" sales and dispositions when the consumer goods collateral is a

motor vehicle and provides a specific form of notice solely for those sales [*see Com. Code § 9614(3)* (form of notice)]. Nothing will be construed to alter or disturb any applicable requirements contained in the Rees-Levering Automobile Sales Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) [Stats 2000, ch. 188, § 2].

ILLUSTRATION:

Notice Must Comply With Both Division 9 and Rees-Levering. Secured party repossessed debtor's motor vehicle in a consumer transaction, and gave notice of disposition (public auction) that complied with provisions of Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*; *see* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act*] but failed to give debtor proper notice of public sale, including both time and place of sale pursuant to former *Com. Code § 9504(3).* Was that notice sufficient? No. Secured party's failure to comply with Division 9 precluded it from recovering a deficiency judgment [*Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 209, 214-215, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133]* .

[c] Allocation of Proceeds

After default, a secured party, may sell, lease, license, or otherwise dispose of any or all of the collateral in its present condition or following any commercially reasonable preparation or processing [*Com. Code § 9610(a)*]. The secured party must apply or pay over the cash proceeds of disposition under *Com. Code § 9610* in the following order to each of the following [*Com. Code § 9615(a), (b)*]:

- The reasonable expenses of retaking, holding, preparing for disposition, processing, and disposing, and, to the extent provided for by agreement and not prohibited by law, reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses incurred by the secured party.

- The satisfaction of obligations secured by the security interest or agricultural lien under which the disposition is made.

- The satisfaction of obligations secured by any subordinate security interest in or other subordinate lien on the collateral and to the satisfaction of any subordinate attachment or execution lien pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)* if the secured party receives an authenticated demand for proceeds or notice of levy of attachment or execution from the holder of the subordinate security interest or other lien before distribution of the proceeds is completed, and, in a case in which a consignor has an interest in the collateral, the subordinate security interest or other lien is senior to the interest of the consignor. If requested by the secured party, a holder of a subordinate security interest or other lien must furnish reasonable proof of the interest or lien within a reasonable time, and unless the holder does so the secured party need not comply with the holder's demand.

- A secured party that is a consignor of the collateral if the secured party receives from the consignor an authenticated demand for proceeds before distribution of the proceeds is completed.

A secured party need not apply or pay over for application noncash proceeds of disposition under *Com. Code § 9610* unless the failure to do so would be commercially unreasonable. A secured party that applies or pays over for application noncash proceeds must do so in a commercially reasonable manner [*Com. Code § 9615(c)*].

[d] Calculation of Proceeds on Disposition to Secured Party, Related Entity, or Secondary Obligor

If the transferee in the disposition is the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor and the amount of proceeds of the disposition is significantly below the range of proceeds that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought,

any surplus or deficiency following that disposition is calculated based on the amount of proceeds that would have been realized in a disposition complying with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629(c)* to a transferee other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9615(f)*].

[e] Debtor's Right to Surplus

If the security interest under which a disposition is made secures payment or performance of an obligation, after making the payments and applications required by *Com. Code § 9615(a)*, discussed in [c], *above*, and permitted by *Com. Code § 9615(c)*, also discussed in [c], *above*, unless *Com. Code § 9615(a)(4)* requires the secured party to apply or pay over cash proceeds to a consignor, the secured party must account to, and pay a debtor, for any surplus except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040* (payments to judgment lien creditors) [*Com. Code § 9615(d)(1)*]. In a consumer goods transaction, at the time the secured party pays any surplus, or within 14 days of receipt of a request for an explanation, the secured party must provide an explanation of how that surplus was calculated [*Com. Code § 9616(b)*]. For a form illustrating such an explanation and discussion of liability for failure to provide the explanation, see *§ 503.122*.

If the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, the debtor is not entitled to any surplus, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)* relating to the payment of proceeds and the liability of the secured party applies, only if the security agreement provides that the debtor is entitled to any surplus [*Com. Code § 9615(e)(1)(A), (2)*].

[f] Creditor's Right to Deficiency

If the security interest under which a disposition is made secures payment or performance of an obligation, after making the payments and applications required by *Com. Code § 9615(a)*, discussed in [c], *above*, and permitted by *Com. Code § 9615(c)*, also discussed in [c], *above*, subject to *Com. Code § 9626(b)* (consumer transactions), the obligor is liable for any deficiency [*Com. Code § 9615(d)(2)*]. In a consumer goods transaction, at the time the secured party first makes written demand on the obligor for payment of the deficiency, or within 14 days of a request for an explanation, the secured party must provide an explanation of how the deficiency was calculated [*Com. Code § 9616(b)*]. For a form of explanation and discussion of liability for failure to provide the explanation, see *§ 503.122*.

If the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, the obligor is not liable for any deficiency [*Com. Code § 9615(e)(1)(B)*].

[g] Junior Secured Party's Immunity on Good Faith Retention of Proceeds in Derogation of Another Lien or Secured Interest

A secured party that receives cash proceeds of a disposition in good faith and without knowledge that the receipt violates the rights of the holder of a security interest or other lien that is not subordinate to the security interest or agricultural lien under which the disposition is made [*Com. Code § 9615(g)*]:

- Takes the cash proceeds free of the security interest or other lien.

- Is not obligated to apply the proceeds of the disposition to the satisfaction of obligations secured by the security interest or other lien.

- Is not obligated to account to or pay the holder of the security interest or other lien for any surplus.

[h] Effect of Disposition; Purchaser's Rights

A secured party's disposition of collateral after default (1) transfers to a transferee for value all of the debtor's rights in the collateral; (2) discharges the security interest under which the disposition is made; and (3) discharges any

subordinate security interest or other subordinate lien [*Com. Code § 9617(a)*].

A transferee that acts in good faith takes free of the debtor's rights and interests in the collateral, the security interest under which the disposition was made, and any subordinate security interest or other subordinate lien in the collateral, even if the secured party fails to comply with Division 9 or the requirements of any judicial proceeding [*Com. Code § 9617(b)*]. If the secured party fails to comply with Division 9, the aggrieved person (for example the holder of a subordinate security interest to whom notification required by *Com. Code § 9611* was not sent) has a right to recover for any loss under *Com. Code § 9625(b)* [UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9617*]. If a transferee does not take free of the above rights and interests, the transferee takes the collateral subject to all of the following [*Com. Code § 9617(c)*]:

- The debtor's rights in the collateral.
- The security interest or agricultural lien under which the disposition was made.
- Any other security interest or other lien.

[i] Transfer Statement

Potential buyers of collateral that is covered by a certificate of title or subject to a registration system typically require as a condition of their purchase that the certificate or registry reflect their ownership. In many cases, this condition can only be met with the consent of the record owner. If the record owner is the debtor and the debtor refuses to cooperate, the secured party may have great difficulty disposing of the collateral [UCC Comment 2. to *Com. Code § 9619*]. To facilitate transfer, the secured party may give the purchaser a transfer statement, which is a record authenticated by the secured party stating the following [*Com. Code § 9619(a)*]:

- That the debtor has defaulted in connection with an obligation secured by specified collateral.
- That the secured party has exercised its postdefault remedies with respect to the collateral.
- That, by reason of the exercise, a transferee has acquired the rights of the debtor in the collateral.
- The name and mailing address of the secured party, debtor, and transferee.

A transfer statement entitles the transferee to the transfer of record of all rights of the debtor in the collateral specified in the statement in any official filing, recording, registration, or certificate of title system covering the collateral. If a transfer statement is presented with the applicable fee and request form to the official or office responsible for maintaining the system, the official or office must (1) accept the transfer statement; (2) promptly amend its records to reflect the transfer; and (3) if applicable, issue a new appropriate certificate of title in the name of the transferee [*Com. Code § 9619(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9619(b)* contemplates both a transfer of record title to a third party following a secured party's exercise of its disposition or acceptance remedies under *Com. Code §§ 9601-9620* as well as a transfer by the debtor to a secured party prior to the secured party's exercise of those rights. *Com. Code § 9619(c)* specifies that when the transfer is to the secured party prior to the exercise of its remedies, the secured party retains its duties with respect to enforcement of its security interest, and the debtor retains its rights as well [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9619*]. A transfer of the record or legal title to collateral to a secured party under *Com. Code § 9619(b)* or otherwise is not of itself a disposition of collateral under Division 9 and does not of itself relieve the secured party of its duties under Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9619(c)*].

[6] Sale Pursuant to Execution; Priority of Execution Lien

If a secured party has reduced its claim to judgment, the lien of any levy that may be made on the collateral by virtue of

an execution based on the judgment relates back to the earliest of any of the following [*Com. Code § 9601(e)*]:

- The date of perfection of the security interest or agricultural lien in the collateral.
- The date of filing a financing statement covering the collateral.
- Any date specified in a statute under which the agricultural lien was created.

A sale pursuant to an execution is a foreclosure of the security interest or agricultural lien by judicial procedure within the meaning of *Com. Code § 9601*. A secured party may purchase at the sale and thereafter hold the collateral free of any other requirements of Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9601(f)*].

[7] Action for Deficiency or Surplus

[a] Transaction Other than Consumer Transaction

[i] When Secured Party Must Prove Compliance

In an action arising from a transaction, other than a consumer transaction, in which the amount of a deficiency or surplus is in issue, the secured party need not prove compliance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* (default) relating to collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance unless the debtor or a secondary obligor places the secured party's compliance in issue [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1)*]. If the secured party's compliance is placed in issue, the secured party has the burden of establishing that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance was conducted in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(2)*]. Compliance therefore includes the requirements of *Com. Code §§ 9610* and *9627*, discussed in [5][a], *above*, that every aspect of a disposition of collateral, including the method, manner, time, place, and other terms, must be commercially reasonable [*see Com. Code § 9610(a)*]. For an affirmative defense for use by a debtor to impose this burden of proof on the secured party, see *§ 503.111*.

[ii] Limited Deficiency if Secured Party Fails to Prove Compliance

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9628* (discussed in *§ 503.29[4]*), in a transaction other than a consumer transaction, if the debtor or a secondary obligor has placed the secured party's compliance in issue and the secured party fails to prove that the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance was conducted in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* (default) relating to collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance, the liability of a debtor or a secondary obligor for a deficiency is limited to an amount by which the sum of the secured obligation, expenses, and attorney's fees exceeds the greater of either of the following [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(3)*]:

- The proceeds of the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance, or
- The amount of proceeds that would have been realized had the noncomplying secured party proceeded in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* relating to collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance.

For purposes of determining the amount that would have been realized had the secured party proceeded in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*, the amount of proceeds that would have been realized is equal to the sum of the secured obligation, expenses, and attorney's fees unless the secured party proves that the amount is less than that sum [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(4)*].

[iii] Debtor's Burden of Proof After Disposition to Secured (or Related) Party

In a transaction other than a consumer transaction, if a deficiency or surplus is calculated under *Com. Code § 9615(f)* (disposition to secured party, party related to secured party, or secondary obligor, discussed in [5][d], *above*), the debtor or obligor has the burden of establishing that the amount of proceeds of the disposition is significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)*].

[b] In Consumer Transaction

[i] Secured Party's Burden of Proof

In a consumer transaction, in an action in which a deficiency or a surplus is an issue, the secured party has the burden of proving compliance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* (default) relating to collection, enforcement, disposition, and acceptance whether or not the debtor or a secondary obligor places the secured party's compliance in issue *Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(A)*]. Compliance includes the requirements of *Com. Code §§ 9610* and *9627*, discussed in [5][a], *above*, that every aspect of a disposition of collateral, including the method, manner, time, place, and other terms, must be commercially reasonable [*see Com. Code § 9610(a)*]. In addition, if a deficiency or surplus is calculated under *Com. Code § 9615(f)* (disposition to secured party, party related to secured party, or secondary obligor, discussed in [5][d], *above*), the secured party has the burden of establishing that the amount of proceeds of the disposition is not significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(B)*].

[ii] Other Conditions for Obtaining Deficiency

In an action arising out of a consumer transaction, the debtor, or any secondary obligor, is liable for any deficiency only if all of the following condition as are met [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)*]:

- It is not otherwise agreed or otherwise provided in the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*), and in particular *Civ. Code § 1812.5* or any other statute.

- The debtor and obligor were given notice, in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9611, 9612* and *Com. Code § 9613* or 6414, as applicable (discussed in [5][b], *above*), of the disposition of the collateral.

- The collection, enforcement, disposition, and acceptance by the secured party were conducted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner [*see also* discussion in [5][a], *above*].

[iii] Effect of Judgment That Creditor Is Not Entitled to Deficiency

In a action arising out of a consumer transaction, on entry of a final judgment that the debtor or obligor is not liable for a deficiency by reason of *Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)* (discussed in [ii], *above*) or *Com. Code § 9615(f)* (disposition to secured party, party related to secured party, or secondary obligor, discussed in [5][d], *above*), the secured party may neither obtain a deficiency judgment nor retain a security interest in any other collateral of the debtor or obligor that secured the indebtedness for which the debtor or obligor is no longer liable *Com. Code § 9626(b)(3)*].

[iv] Debtor's Right to Damages or Proceeds of Subsequent Dispositions

In a consumer transaction, if, subsequent to a disposition that does not satisfy any one or more of the conditions set forth in *Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)* (discussed in [ii], *above*), or subsequent to a disposition that is subject to *Com. Code § 9615(f)* (proceeds calculated as if disposition were complying disposition to unrelated party, discussed in [4][d], *above*), the secured party disposes of other collateral securing the same indebtedness, the debtor or obligor may, to the extent he or she is no longer liable for a deficiency judgment by reason of *Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)* or *Com. Code § 9615(f)*, recover the proceeds realized from the subsequent dispositions, as well as any damages to which the debtor may be

entitled if the subsequent disposition is itself noncomplying or otherwise wrongful [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(4)*].

Nothing in *Com. Code § 9626* deprives the debtor of any right to recover damages from the secured party under *Com. Code § 9625(b)*, or to offset any damages against any claim by the secured party for a deficiency, or of any right or remedy to which the debtor may be entitled under any other law. A debtor or obligor in a consumer transaction will not have any damages owed to it reduced by the amount of any deficiency that would have resulted had the disposition of the collateral by the secured party been conducted in conformity with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(5)*].

[v] Secured Party Must Account for Surplus

In a consumer transaction, the secured party must account to the debtor for any surplus, except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040* (payments to judgment lien creditors) [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(6)*]. This requirement appears redundant to the requirement of *Com. Code § 9615(d)(1)*, discussed in [5][e], *above*.

[8] Alternative Rights to Foreclose Mixed Security

[a] Creditor's Options

If an obligation secured by personal property or fixtures is also secured by an interest in real property or an estate therein, the secured party may do any of the following [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)*; *see also Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)* (defining fixtures)]:

- Proceed, in any sequence, (1) in accordance with the secured party's rights and remedies in respect of real property as to the real property security, and (2) in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* as to the personal property or fixtures.

- Proceed, in any sequence, as to both some or all of the real property and some or all of the personal property or fixtures in accordance with the secured party's rights and remedies in respect of the real property, by including the portion of the personal property or fixtures selected by the secured party in the judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure of the real property in accordance with the procedures applicable to the real property. In such a proceeding [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)*]:

  - No provision of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* other than this subparagraph, *Com. Code § 9604(a)(4)(C)* (discussed in [c], *below*), *Com. Code § 9604(a)(7)* (discussed in [e], *below*), and *Com. Code § 9604(a)(8)* (discussed in [b], *below*) will apply to any aspect of the foreclosure.

  - A power of sale under a deed of trust or mortgage will be exercisable with respect to both the real property and the personal property or fixtures being sold.

  - The sale may be conducted by the mortgagee under the mortgage or by the trustee under the deed of trust.

  - The secured party will not be deemed to have elected irrevocably to proceed as to both real property and personal property or fixtures as with respect to any particular property, unless and until that particular property has been actually disposed of pursuant to a unified sale (judicial or nonjudicial) conducted in accordance with the procedures applicable to real property, and then only as to the property so sold.

- Proceed, in any sequence, as to part of the personal property or fixtures as provided in *Com. Code §*

9604(a)(1)(A), and as to other of the personal property or fixtures as provided in *Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)*.

[b] Limited Application of One Action Rule and Antideficiency Legislation

If an obligation secured by an interest in personal property or fixtures [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)*] is also secured by an interest in real property or an estate therein, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9604(a)(3)* (discussed *below*), provisions and limitations of any law respecting real property and obligations secured by an interest in real property or an estate therein, including but not limited to *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, provisions regarding acceleration or reinstatement of obligations secured by an interest in real property or an estate therein, prohibitions against deficiency judgments, limitations on deficiency judgments based on the value of the collateral, limitations on the right to proceed as to collateral, and requirements that a creditor resort either first or at all to its security, do not in any way apply to either of the following [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(A)*]:

- Any personal property or fixtures other than personal property or fixtures as to which the secured party has proceeded or is proceeding under *Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)* (unified sale); or

- The obligation.

In the event that an obligation secured by personal property or fixtures would otherwise become unenforceable by reason of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* or of any requirement that a creditor resort first to its security, then, notwithstanding that section or any similar requirement, the obligation nevertheless remains enforceable to the full extent necessary to permit a secured party to proceed against personal property or fixtures securing the obligation in accordance with the secured party's rights and remedies as permitted under *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*[*Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)(B)*; *see also Com. Code § 9604(a)(3)(G)* (discussed in last subparagraph of list, *below*)].

The three-month time limit for seeking a deficiency judgment after a real property judicial foreclosure sale set forth in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 726(b)* does not apply to a mixed collateral obligation, when the real property is sold in a nonunified sale [*Florio v. Lau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 637, 653, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 409* (deciding, in case of first impression, that *Code of Civ. Proc. § 726(b)* cannot be applied in its entirety to mixed collateral situation without running afoul of Legislature's stated purpose in enacting mixed collateral statutes)].

The exceptions in which *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* or the antideficiency statutes *do* apply are as follows [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(3)*]:

- *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not limit the application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* (no deficiency on purchase money mortgage, deed of trust, or chattel mortgage on residential property).

- If the secured party commences an action, as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 22*, and the action seeks a monetary judgment on the debt [*see Com. Code § 9604(a)(6)* (discussed in [d], *below*)], *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not prevent the debtor's assertion of any right to require the inclusion in the action of any interest in real property or an estate therein securing the debt. If a monetary judgment on the debt is entered in the action, *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not prevent the debtor's assertion of the subsequent unenforceability of the encumbrance on any interest in real property or an estate therein securing the debt and not included in the action.

- Nothing in *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* may be construed to excuse compliance with *Civ. Code § 2924c* as a prerequisite to the sale of real property, but *Civ. Code § 2924c* has no application to the right of a secured party to proceed as to personal property or fixtures except, and then only to the extent that, the secured party is proceeding as to personal property or fixtures in a unified sale as provided in *Com. Code*

§ 9604(a)(1)(B).

- *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not deprive the debtor of the protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* against a deficiency judgment following a sale of real property collateral pursuant to a power of sale in a deed of trust or mortgage.

- *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not affect, nor will it determine the applicability or inapplicability of, any law respecting real property or obligations secured in whole or in part by real property with respect to a loan or a sale made to any individual primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

- *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not deprive the debtor of the protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* (procedure of obtaining money judgment) following a sale of real property collateral.

- If the secured party violates any statute or rule of law that requires a creditor who holds an obligation secured by an interest in real property or an estate therein to resort first to its security before resorting to any property of the debtor that does not secure the obligation, *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)* does not prevent the debtor's assertion of any right to require correction of the violation, any right of the secured party to correct the violation, the debtor's assertion of the subsequent unenforceability of the encumbrance on any interest in real property or an estate therein securing the obligation, or the debtor's assertion of the subsequent unenforceability of the obligation except to the extent that the obligation is preserved by *Com. Code § 9604(a)(2)(B)* (discussed *above*).

The foregoing rules of real property law are discussed in Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

When a secured party proceeds by unified sale as to both real and personal property [*see Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)* (discussed under [1], *above*)], then, for purposes of applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* or *726(b)* to the unified sale, the personal property or fixtures included in the unified sale are deemed to be included in the "real property or other interest sold," as that term is used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* or *726(b)* [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(8)*].

[c] When Application of Proceeds of Disposition of Personal Property Collateral Does Not Cure of Default

When an obligation is secured by both an interest in personal property or fixtures [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)*] and an interest in real property or an estate therein, if the secured party realizes proceeds from the disposition of collateral that is personal property or fixtures, then the disposition of the collateral, the realization of the proceeds, the application of the proceeds, or any one or more of the foregoing does not operate to cure any nonmonetary default [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(4)(A)*]. Similarly, disposition of collateral that is personal property or fixtures, the realization of the proceeds, the application of the proceeds, or any one or more of the foregoing does not operate to cure any monetary default (although the application of the proceeds will, to the extent of those proceeds, satisfy the secured obligation) so as to affect in any way the secured party's rights and remedies under *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* with respect to any remaining personal property or fixtures collateral [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(4)(B)*; *see Com. Code § 9604(a)(5),(6)* (discussed in [d], *below*)].

All proceeds realized from the disposition of collateral that is personal property or fixtures must be applied by the secured party to the secured obligation in accordance with the agreement of the parties and applicable law [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(4)(C)*].

[d] Definition of Monetary Judgment on Debt

As used in *Com. Code § 9604(a)*, "monetary judgment on the debt" means a judgment for the recovery from the debtor of all or part of the principal amount of the secured obligation, including contractual interest on it. Monetary judgment

on the debt does not include a judgment that provides only for other relief (whether or not that other relief is secured by the collateral), such as one or more forms of nonmonetary relief, and monetary relief ancillary to any of the foregoing, such as attorney's fees and costs incurred in seeking the relief [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(6)*].

An action by the secured party using any available judicial procedure, as provided in *Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)*, is in no way affected by the omission of a prayer for monetary judgment on the debt. Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, any prohibition against splitting causes of action, or any other statute or rule of law, a judicial action that neither seeks nor results in a monetary judgment on the debt does not preclude a subsequent action seeking a monetary judgment on the debt [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(5)*].

[e] Effect of Secured Party's Noncompliance on Purchaser

When an obligation is secured by both an interest in personal property or fixtures [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)*] and an interest in real property or an estate therein, and the secured party, in proceeding with a unified sale as to both real and personal property [*see Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)* (discussed in [a], *above*)], fails to comply with the procedures applicable to real property, a purchaser for value of any interest in the real property at a judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding conducted pursuant to *Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)* takes that interest free from any claim or interest of another person, or any defect in title, based on that noncompliance unless one of the following conditions applies [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(7)*]:

- The purchaser is the secured party and the failure to comply with *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* occurred other than in good faith; or

- The purchaser is other than the secured party and at the time of the sale of the real property at that foreclosure the purchaser had knowledge of the failure to comply with *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* and that the noncompliance occurred other than in good faith.

Even if the purchaser at the foreclosure sale does not take his or her interest free of claims, interests, or title defects based on that noncompliance with *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.*, a subsequent purchaser for value who acquires an interest in that real property from the purchaser at that foreclosure takes that interest free from any claim or interest of another person, or any defect in title, based on that noncompliance, unless at the time of acquiring the interest the subsequent purchaser has knowledge of the failure to comply with *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* and that the noncompliance occurred other than in good faith [*Com. Code § 9604(a)(7)*].

[9] Rights and Duties of Secondary Obligors

[a] After Assignment of Secured Obligation or Collateral or Subrogation

Secondary obligors are defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(71)*, discussed in *§ 503.11 [9][c]* and *[d]*, and include guarantors and persons with a right of recourse against the debtor or another obligor with respect to the collateral. A secondary obligor acquires the rights and becomes obligated to perform the duties of the secured party after any of the following occurs [*Com. Code § 9618(a)*]:

- The secondary obligor receives an assignment of a secured obligation from the secured party.

- The secondary obligor receives a transfer of collateral from the secured party and agrees to accept the rights and assume the duties of the secured party.

- The secondary obligor is subrogated to the rights of a secured party with respect to collateral.

An assignment, transfer, or subrogation described in *Com. Code § 9618(a)* is not a disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9610* and it relieves the secured party of further duties under Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9618(b)*]. When a secondary obligor becomes assignee, transferee, or subrogee, it does not assume any liability for the earlier actions or inactions of the secured party whom it has succeeded unless it agrees to do so. Once the successor becomes obligated, it is responsible for complying with the secured party's duties. The assignment or transfer relieves the original secured party of any further duties under Division 9 but does not excuse the assignor from duties that arose before the event or impose liability on the assignee for the assignor's failure to comply [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9618*].

Application of *Com. Code § 9618* may require an investigation into the agreement of the parties. *Com. Code § 9618* does not constitute a comprehensive or general rule for allocating rights and duties on assignment of a secured obligation, but is limited to the situations involving a secondary obligor described in *Com. Code § 9618(a)*. In other contexts, the agreement of the parties and applicable law other than Division 9 determine whether the assignment imposes on the assignee any duties to the debtor and whether the assignor retains its duties to the debtor after the assignment [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9618*].

Secondary obligors are entitled to the same notification of disposition as the debtor [*Com. Code § 9611(c)*], and they are entitled to purchase the collateral at a disposition under *Com. Code § 9610* [*see Com. Code § 9615(f)* (discussed in*§ 503.27[5][d]*, special rule for calculation of surplus or deficiency on disposition to secondary obligor)]. If the secondary obligor acquires the collateral at a disposition and simultaneously or subsequently discharges any unsecured deficiency obligation, *Com. Code § 9618(a)(1)* is not implicated [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9618*]. Similarly, a secondary obligor who takes the collateral on disposition in exchange for payment that is applied against the secured obligation may or may not be subrogated to the rights of the secured party as contemplated by *Com. Code § 9618(a)(3)*. The secondary obligor becomes subrogated only to the extent that it makes a payment in satisfaction of its secondary obligation. To the extent its payment constitutes the price of the collateral at a *Com. Code § 9610* disposition by the (original) secured party, the secondary obligor would not be subrogated [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9618*].

[b] Before Succeeding to Secured Party's Position

A secondary obligor has rights based on that status before it succeeds to the secured party's position or if it never does. Those rights, in addition to the right to notification of any disposition [*Com. Code § 9611(c)*] and the right to purchase the collateral at a disposition under *Com. Code § 9610* [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9618*; *Com. Code § 9615(f)*], discussed in*§ 503.27[9][a]*, include the following:

- If the secured party is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor and has recourse against the secondary obligor based on the nonpayment or other default of an account debtor or other obligor on the collateral, the secondary obligor has the right to require a secured party in possession of the collateral to use reasonable care in the custody and preservation of collateral in the secured party's possession. In the case of chattel paper or an instrument, reasonable care includes taking necessary steps to preserve rights against prior parties unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 9207(a), (d)(1)(B)*].

- A secondary obligor may require the secured party to proceed in a commercially reasonable manner if the secured party undertakes to collect from or enforce an obligation of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral when that secured party is entitled to charge back uncollected collateral or otherwise to full or limited recourse against the debtor or a secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9607(c)*].

- A secondary obligor's approval is required to allow a secured party to delay, beyond 90 days from the date it takes possession, disposition of consumer goods in the situations covered by *Com. Code § 9620(e)* [*Com. Code § 9620(f)(2)*].

- A secondary obligor is entitled to receive notice of, and may object to, a secured party's proposal to accept collateral in partial satisfaction of the secured obligation [*Com. Code § 9621(b)*].

- A secondary obligor may redeem collateral by an appropriate time under *Com. Code § 9623* [*Com. Code § 9623(a)*].

- A secondary obligor may waive the right to notification of disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9611*, or except in a consumer-goods transaction, the right to redeem collateral under *Com. Code § 9623*, only by an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default [*Com. Code § 9624(a), (c)*].

- A secondary obligor may sue for injunctive relief and damages if the secured party fails to comply with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9625*].

- A secondary obligor may require the secured party to prove, in an action for surplus or deficiency, arising other than from a consumer transaction, that the secured party acted in compliance with *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* and if the secured party does not so prove, to have its liability for deficiency limited as provided by *Com. Code § 9626(a)(3)-(5)* or its surplus calculated in accordance with *Com. Code § 9615(f)*[*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1), (5)*].

- In an action for surplus or deficiency arising from a consumer transaction, a secondary obligor may have the benefit of *Com. Code § 9626(b)*.

[10] Rights of Owners of Collateral Other Than Primary Obligors

"Debtor" is defined in revised Division 9 to include anyone who has an interest (other than a security interest) in the collateral, whether or not that person is an obligor [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(28)(A)*; *compare Com. Code § 9102(a)(59)(ii)* (obligor is someone who has provided property *other than the collateral* to secure payment or other performance of the obligation)]. Therefore, in revised Division 9, there is no counterpart to former *Com. Code § 9112*, and a person who owns any interest in the collateral (other than a security interest) is entitled to all the rights expressed in revised Division 9 as rights of debtors.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.28

§ 503.28 Debtor's Rights on Default

[1] In General

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9601(g)* and in *Com. Code § 9605* (discussed in *§ 503.29[4]*), after default, a debtor and an obligor have the rights provided in *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* and by agreement of the parties [*Com. Code § 9601(d)*]. *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* impose no duties on a secured party that is a consignor or is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes except, as provided by *Com. Code § 9607(c)*, to require that a secured party proceed in a commercially reasonable manner if the secured party undertakes to collect from or enforce an obligation of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral and the secured party is entitled to charge back uncollected collateral or otherwise to full or limited recourse against the debtor or a secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9601(g)*].

[2] Waiver, Renunciation, and Modification of Rights

[a] Prohibited Waivers

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9624* (discussed in*§ 503.20[2][b]*, to the extent that they give rights to a debtor or obligor and impose duties on a secured party, the debtor or obligor may not waive or vary the rules stated in the following listed sections [*Com. Code § 9602*]:

- *Com. Code § 9207(b)(4)(C)*, which deals with use and operation of the collateral by the secured party.

- *Com. Code § 9210*, which deals with requests for an accounting and requests concerning a list of collateral and statement of account.

- *Com. Code § 9607(c)*, which deals with collection and enforcement of collateral.

- *Com. Code § 9608(a)* and *Com. Code § 9615(c)* to the extent that they deal with application or

payment of noncash proceeds of collection, enforcement, or disposition.

- *Com. Code § 9608(a)* and *Com. Code § 9615(d)* to the extent that they require accounting for or payment of surplus proceeds of collateral.

- *Com. Code § 9609* to the extent that it imposes on a secured party that takes possession of collateral without judicial process the duty to do so without breach of the peace.

- *Com. Code § 9610(b)*, and *Com. Code §§ 9611, 9613*, and *9614*, which deal with disposition of collateral.

- *Com. Code § 9615(f)*, which deals with calculation of a deficiency or surplus when a disposition is made to the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor.

- *Com. Code § 9616*, which deals with explanation of the calculation of a surplus or deficiency.

- *Com. Code §§ 9620, 9621*, and *9622*, which deal with acceptance of collateral in satisfaction of obligation.

- *Com. Code § 9623*, which deals with redemption of collateral.

- *Com. Code § 9624*, which deals with permissible waivers.

- *Com. Code §§ 9625* and *9626*, which deal with the existence of a deficiency and with the secured party's liability for failure to comply with Division 9.

The parties may determine by agreement the standards measuring the fulfillment of the rights of a debtor or obligor and the duties of a secured party under a rule stated in *Com. Code § 9602* if the standards are not manifestly unreasonable [*Com. Code § 9603(a)*]. However, that right does not apply to the duty under *Com. Code § 9609* to refrain from breaching the peace [*Com. Code § 9603(b)*].

Provisions that are not specified in *Com. Code § 9602* are subject to the general rules in *Com. Code § 1302(a), (b)* [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9602*]. Further, *Com. Code § 9602* does not restrict the ability of the parties to agree, settle, compromise, or renounce claims for past conduct that may have constituted a violation or breach of the rights and duties listed in *Com. Code § 9602*, even if the settlement involves an express waiver [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9602*]. The restrictions on waiver contained in *Com. Code § 9602* apply to obligors as well as debtors. This resolves questions under former Division 9 as to whether secondary obligors were permitted, under the law of suretyship, to waive rights and duties under the filing provisions [*Com. Code § 9501 et seq.*], assuming that secondary obligors were "debtors" for purposes of the filing provisions [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9602*].

[b] Permitted Waivers

A debtor or secondary obligor may waive the right to notification of disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9611* (discussed in *§ 503.27[5][b]*) only by an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default [*Com. Code § 9624(a)*].

A debtor may waive the right to require disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9620(e)* (discussed in *§ 503.42[5][a]*) only by an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default *Com. Code § 9624(b)*].

Except in a consumer goods transaction, a debtor or secondary obligor may waive the right to redeem collateral under

Com. Code § 9623 (discussed in [4], *below*) only by an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default [*Com. Code § 9624(c)*].

No renunciation or modification by the debtor of any of his or her rights under *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* as to consumer goods is valid or enforceable unless the renunciation or modification is in consideration of a waiver by the secured party of any right to a deficiency on the debt [*Com. Code § 9629*]. California's *Com. Code § 9629* is a nonuniform provision. Waivers made in accordance with *Com. Code § 9624* must be made in authenticated agreements. Under *Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)*, an "agreement" means a bargain of the parties in fact." In considering waivers under *Com. Code § 9624* and analogous agreements in other contexts, courts should carefully scrutinized putative agreements that appear in records that also address many additional or unrelated matters [*see* UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9602*].

[3] Defense Against Assignee

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9403*, an agreement between an account debtor and an assignor not to assert against an assignee any claim or defense that the account debtor may have against the assignor is enforceable by an assignee that takes an assignment for value, in good faith, without notice of a claim of a property or possessory right to the property assigned, and without notice of a defense or claim in recoupment of the type that may be asserted against a person entitled to enforce a negotiable instrument under *Com. Code § 3305(a)*, discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* [*Com. Code § 9403(b)*; *see Com. Code § 9403(a)* (in *Com. Code § 9403*, "value" has the meaning provided in *Com. Code § 3303(a)*, discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*)]. *Com. Code § 9403(b)* does not apply to defenses of a type that may be asserted against a holder in due course of a negotiable instrument under *Com. Code § 3305(b)*, the so-called "real defenses," discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* [*Com. Code § 9403(c)*; UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9403*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9403(d)*, *Com. Code § 9403* does not displace law other than Division 9 which gives effect to an agreement by an account debtor not to assert a claim or defense against an assignee [*Com. Code § 9403(f)*].

In a consumer transaction, if a record evidences the account debtor's obligation, law other than Division 9 requires that the record include a statement to the effect that the rights of an assignee are subject to claims or defenses that the account debtor could assert against the original obligee, and the record does not include such a statement, then the record has the same effect as if the record included such a statement and the account debtor may assert against an assignee those claims and defenses that would have been available if the record included such a statement [*Com. Code § 9403(d)*]. *Com. Code § 9403* is subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9403(e)*]. *Com. Code § 9403(d)* is new in revised Division 9 and applies to rights evidenced by a record that is required to contain the notice set out in Federal Trade Commission Rule 433 [*see 16 C.F.R. § 433.1 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*]. Thus, *Com. Code § 9403(d)* effectively renders waiver-of-defense clauses ineffective in the transactions with consumers to which it applies [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9403*].

[4] Right of Redemption

A debtor, any secondary obligor, or any other secured party or lienholder may redeem collateral [*Com. Code § 9623(a)*]. Redemption may occur at any time before a secured party has (1) collected the collateral [*see Com. Code § 9607*]; (2) disposed of the collateral or entered into a contract for its disposition [*see Com. Code § 9610*]; or (3) accepted the collateral in full or partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures under *Com. Code § 9622* [*Com. Code § 9623(c)*].

To redeem collateral, a person must tender both fulfillment of all obligations secured by the collateral and the secured party's reasonable expenses for retaking and holding the collateral, preparing it for disposition, processing, and disposing of the collateral, and, to the extent provided for by agreement and not prohibited by law, reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses incurred by the secured party [*Com. Code § 9623(b)*; *see Com. Code § 9614(1)(C)* (notice of disposition in consumer transaction must give phone number from which amount that must be paid to secured party to

redeem collateral is available) *Com. Code § 9615(a)(1)* (expenses required to be paid on redemption)].

[5] Bringing Secured Party Into Compliance With Law

If it is established that a secured party is not proceeding in accordance with Division 9, a court may order or restrain collection, enforcement, or disposition of collateral on appropriate terms and conditions [*Com. Code § 9625(a)*; *see §§ 503.102*, *503.103* (forms)]. As an alternative, the debtor or obligor may recover damages for the secured party's noncompliance, as discussed in *§ 503.29* [*Com. Code § 9625(b)-(g)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.29

§ 503.29 Secured Party's Liability for Noncompliance

[1] In General

In addition to obtaining injunctive relief to restrain noncompliance or to bring a secured party into compliance [*see Com. Code § 9625(a)*, discussed in *§ 503.29[5]*], a debtor or obligor may recover damages in the amount of any loss caused by a person's failure to comply with Division 9. Recovery is subject to *Com. Code § 9625(c), (d)*, and *(f)*, discussed in [2], *below* and in *§ 503.100[4]*, respectively. Loss caused by a failure to comply may include loss resulting from the debtor's inability to obtain, or increased costs of, alternative financing [*Com. Code § 9625(b)*]. For a complaint that can be adapted to seek damages for any type of noncompliance, see *§ 503.101[1]*.

[2] Parties Who May Recover Damages

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9628*, discussed in [4], *below*, a person that, at the time of the failure, was a debtor or an obligor, or held a security interest in or other lien on the collateral, may recover damages under *Com. Code § 9625(b)* for its loss [*Com. Code § 9625(c)*]. In this regard, *Com. Code § 9628(d)* contains what appears to be a drafting error; it provides that a secured party is not liable under *Com. Code § 9625(c)(2)* more than once with respect to any one secured obligation. However, the California version of the Uniform Commercial Code has no provision numbered 9625(c)(2). In the national version of the UCC, Section 9-625(c)(2) refers to consumer transaction and establishes a "floor" for damages equal to a credit service charge plus 10% of the obligation. However, the latter provision does not appear in the California version of Section 9-625(c).

A debtor whose deficiency is eliminated under *Com. Code § 9626*, discussed in *§ 503.27[7][b]*, may recover damages for the loss of any surplus. However, in a transaction other than a consumer transaction, a debtor or secondary obligor whose deficiency is eliminated or reduced under *Com. Code § 9626* may not otherwise recover under *Com. Code § 9625(b)* for noncompliance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* relating to collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance [*Com. Code § 9625(d)*].

[3] Statutory Damages

In addition to any damages recoverable under *Com. Code § 9625(b)*, the debtor, consumer obligor, or person named as a debtor in a filed record, as applicable, may recover $500 in each case from any of the following persons [*Com. Code § 9625(e)*; *see also Com. Code § 9625(f)* (statutory damages for failure to reply to request or statement under *Com. Code § 9210*, discussed in *§ 503.100[4*])]:

- A person that fails to comply with *Com. Code § 9208* (after obligation secured by deposit account, electronic chattel paper, investment property, or letter of credit right is satisfied).

- A person that fails to comply with *Com. Code § 9209* (release after assignment).

- A person that files a record that the person is not entitled to file under *Com. Code § 9509(a)*.

- A person that fails to cause the secured party of record to file or send a termination statement as required by *Com. Code § 9513(a)* or *(c)*.

- A person that fails to comply with *Com. Code § 9616(b)(1)* (explanation of calculation of surplus or deficiency in a consumer goods transaction) and whose failure is part of a pattern, or consistent with a practice, of noncompliance.

- A person that fails to comply with *Com. Code § 9616(b)(2)* (explanation of calculation of deficiency in a consumer goods transaction).

[4] Secured Party Must Know of, and How to Communicate With, Debtor or Obligor

Unless a secured party knows that a person is a debtor or obligor, knows the identity of the person, and knows how to communicate with the person, the secured party is not liable to the person, or to a secured party or lienholder that has filed a financing statement against the person, for failure to comply with Division 9, nor does the secured party's failure to comply with Division 9 affect the liability of the person for a deficiency [*Com. Code § 9628(a)*].

A secured party does not owe and duty based on its status as a secured party and is not liable because of its status as secured party to a person that is a debtor or obligor, unless the secured party knows all of the following [*Com. Code §§ 9605(1)* (duty), *9628(b)(1)* (liability)]:

- That the person is a debtor or obligor.

- The identity of the person.

- How to communicate with the person.

Further, a secured party does not owe any duty because of its status as a secured party and is liable because of its status as a secured party to a secured party or lienholder that has filed a financing statement against a person, unless the secured party knows both that (1) the person is a debtor and (1) the identity of the person [*Com. Code §§ 9605(2)* (duty), *9628(b)(2)* (liability)].

A secured party may also be free from liability based on its reasonable belief that a transaction is not a consumer transaction [*see Com. Code § 9628(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.42[6]*].

126 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Creation, Perfection, and Priorities of Security Interests Generally

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.30-503.39

[Reserved]

§§ 503.30[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.40

§ 503.40 Goods

[1] Security Interests in Goods Arising Under Sales Law

A security interest arising under *Com. Code § 2401*, *2505*, *2711(3)*, or *10508(e)*, is subject to Division 9. However, until the debtor obtains possession of the goods, all of the following apply [*Com. Code § 9110*]:

- The security interest is enforceable, even if *Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)* has not been satisfied.
- Filing is not required to perfect the security interest.
- The rights of the secured party after default by the debtor are governed by Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*) or Division 10 (*Com. Code § 10101 et seq.*).
- The security interest has priority over a conflicting security interest created by the debtor.

Security interests arising under *Com. Code § 2401* or *2505*, a buyer's security interest under *Com. Code § 2711(3)*, or a lessee's security interest under *Com. Code § 10508(e)*, until the debtor obtains possession of the collateral, are perfected when they attach [*Com. Code § 9309(6)*].

The general rule [*Com. Code § 9322(a)-(e)*] governing priority of security interests is subject to *Com. Code § 9110* with respect to a security interest arising under Division 2 (*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*) or Division 10 (*Com. Code § 10101*) [*Com. Code § 9322(f)(4)*].

[2] Perfection of Interest in Goods

[a] Generally

A security interest in goods may be perfected by filing [*Com. Code §§ 9310(a), 9501(a)-(b)*], or by the secured party taking possession of the goods [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(6), 9313(a)*]. See *§ 503.23* for discussion of choice of law rules.

Perfection of a security interest in goods by compliance with a certificate of title statute, see *§ 503.22[5]*. *Com. Code § 9303*, discussed in *§ 503.23[3]*, sets forth the choice of law rules regarding goods covered by certificates of title.

[b] Goods in Possession of Bailee Issuing Nonnegotiable Document

While goods are in the possession of a bailee that has issued a nonnegotiable document covering the goods, a security interest in the goods may be perfected by any of the following methods [*Com. Code § 9312(d)*]:

- Issuance of a document may in the name of the secured party.
- The bailee's receipt of notification of the secured party's interest.
- Filing as to the goods.

Once perfected, a security interest in goods in the possession of a bailee, other than one that has issued a negotiable documents for the goods, remains perfected for 20 days without filing if the secured party makes available to the debtor the goods or documents representing the goods for the purpose of ultimate sale or exchange, or for the purpose of loading, unloading, storing, shipping, transshipping, manufacturing, processing, or otherwise dealing with them in a manner preliminary to their sale or exchange [*Com. Code § 9312(f)*]. After the expiration of the 20-day period, perfection depends on compliance with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9312(h)*].

Priority between conflicting security interests in the goods is subject to provisions governing priority of purchase money security interests [*see Com. Code § 9324(a), (b)*], discussed in [5][c], *below*, in the case of goods other than inventory, and at *§ 503.41[2]*, in the case of inventory.

Perfection of a security interest in goods in the possession of a bailee that has issued a negotiable document covering the goods is discussed in *§ 503.48[1][b]*.

[3] Accessions

[a] Security Interest In Accessions

"Accession" means goods that are physically united with other goods in such a manner that the identity of the original goods is not lost [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(1)*], for example tires placed on an automobile [*see* UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9335*]. A security interest may be created in an accession and continues in collateral that becomes an accession [*Com. Code § 9335(a)*]. If a security interest is perfected when the collateral becomes an accession, the security interest remains perfected in the collateral [*Com. Code § 9335(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9335* does not address whether a secured party acquires a security interest in the whole if its collateral becomes an accession. Normally, that will turn on the description of the collateral in the security agreement. Similarly, *Com. Code § 9335* does not address whether perfection against collateral that becomes an accession is effective to perfect a security interest in the whole. Other provisions of Division 9, including the requirements for indicating the collateral covered by a security agreement resolve that question [*see* UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9335*].

A security interest in an accession is subordinate to a security interest in the whole which is perfected by compliance with the requirements of a certificate of title statute under *Com. Code § 9311(b)* [*Com. Code § 9335(d)*]. Except for the foregoing, the priority of a security interest in an accession is determined by the other provisions governing perfection and priorities (*Com. Code § 9301 et seq.*) [*Com. Code § 9335(c)*; *see* UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9335*].

[b] Remedies on Default Involving Accessions

After default and subject to the provisions governing default generally (*Com. Code § 9601 et seq.*), a secured party with

a security interest in an accession which has priority over the claims of every person having an interest in the whole may remove the accession from other goods [*Com. Code § 9335(e)*]. The secured party must promptly reimburse any holder of a security interest or other lien on, or owner of, the whole or of the other goods, other than the debtor, for the cost of repair of any physical injury to the whole or the other goods. The secured party need not reimburse the holder or owner for any diminution in value of the whole or the other goods caused by the absence of the accession removed or by any necessity for replacing it. A person entitled to reimbursement may refuse permission to remove until the secured party gives adequate assurance for the performance of this obligation [*Com. Code § 9335(f)*].

[4] Commingled Goods

In *Com. Code § 9336*, "commingled goods" means goods that are physically united with other goods in such a manner that their identity is lost in a product or mass [*Com. Code § 9336(a)*]. No security interest exists in commingled goods as such. However, a security interest may attach to a product or mass that results when goods become commingled goods [*Com. Code § 9336(b)*]. If collateral becomes commingled goods, a security interest attaches to the product or mass [*Com. Code § 9336(c)*]. If a security interest in collateral is perfected before the collateral becomes commingled goods, the security interest that attaches to the product or mass under *Com. Code § 9336(c)* is perfected [*Com. Code § 9336(d)*]. Except as discussed below, when two or more security interests attach to the same product or mass under *Com. Code § 9336(c)*, the other provisions of the general rules governing priority determine the priority of a security interest that attaches to the product or mass under *Com. Code § 9336(c)* [*Com. Code § 9336(e)*; *see, e.g., Com. Code § 9315(b)* (secured party's rights in proceeds, discusses at *§ 503.21[4][a]*)].

If more than one security interest attaches to the product or mass under *Com. Code § 9336(c)*, a security interest that is perfected under *Com. Code § 9336(d)* has priority over a security interest that is unperfected at the time the collateral becomes commingled goods [*Com. Code § 9336(f)(1)*]. If more than one security interest is perfected under *Com. Code § 9336(d)*, the security interests rank equally in proportion to the value of the collateral at the time it became commingled goods [*Com. Code § 9336(f)(2)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Multiple Security Interests in Final Product. SP-1A has a perfected first priority security interest in Debtor's eggs. SP-1B has a perfected second priority security interest in the same collateral. The eggs have a value of $300. Debtor owes SP-1A $200 and $200 to SP-1B. SP-2 has a security interest in Debtor's flour, which has a value of $500 and secures a debt of $600. Debtor uses the eggs and flour to make cakes, which have a value of $1,000. Do all three security interests in the cakes rank equally and what amount of the cakes' value is reachable by each? For purposes of *Com. Code § 9336(f)(2)*, SP-1A and SP-1B are treated like a single secured party; and the secured parties share in the ratio of 3 (for SP-1A and SP-1B combined) to 5 (for SP-2). Applying this ratio to the entire product, SP-1A and SP-1B would be entitled in the aggregate to 3/8 x $1,000 or $375; and SP-2 would be entitled to 5/8 x $1,000 or $625 (except SP-2 is only entitled to $600, the amount it is owed). SP-1A and SP-1B would share the $375 in accordance with their priority as established other than under *Com. Code § 9336*: because SP-1A has first priority, it would receive $200 and SP-1B would receive $175 [*see* UCC Comments 4 and 6 to *Com. Code § 9336*].

[5] Priority of Security Interests in Goods

[a] When Buyer of Goods Takes Free of Interest That Secures Advance

A buyer of goods, other than a buyer in ordinary course of business, takes free of a security interest to the extent that it secures advances made after the earlier the time the secured party acquires knowledge of the buyer's purchase or 45 days after the purchase [*Com. Code § 9323(d)*], unless the advance was made pursuant to a commitment entered into without knowledge of the buyer's purchase and before the expiration of the 45-day period [*Com. Code § 9323(e)*]. A buyer in the ordinary course of business who takes free of a security interest under *Com. Code § 9320* (discussed in *§*

503.24[3]) is not subject to any future advance [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9323*].

[b] When Lessee of Goods Takes Free of Interest That Secures Advance

A lessee of goods, other than a lessee in ordinary course of business, takes the leasehold free of a security interest to the extent that it secures advances made after the earlier the time the secured party acquires knowledge of the lease or 45 days after the lease contract becomes enforceable [*Com. Code § 9323(f)*], unless the advance was made pursuant to a commitment entered into without knowledge of the lease and before the expiration of the 45-day period [*Com. Code § 9323(g)*]. A lessee in the ordinary course of business who takes free of a security interest under *Com. Code § 9321* (discussed in *§ 503.24[3]*) is not subject to any future advance [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9323*].

[c] Purchase Money Security Interest in Good Other than Inventory

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9324(g)* (conflicting purchase money security interests, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*), a perfected purchase money security interest [*see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest," discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)] in goods other than inventory or livestock [*see* discussions in *§ 503.41[2]* and at [d], *below*] has priority over a conflicting security interest in the same goods, and, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.58[3]*], a perfected security interest in its identifiable proceeds also has priority, if the purchase money security interest is perfected when the debtor receives possession of the collateral or within 20 days thereafter [*Com. Code § 9324(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9317(e)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*].

[d] Purchase Money Interest in Livestock

Subject to *Com. Code § 9324(e)*, and except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9324(g)* (conflicting purchase money security interests, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*), a perfected purchase money security [*see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest," discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)] in livestock that are farm products [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(34)(B)-(D)*, discussed in *§ 503.11[14][d]*] has priority over a conflicting security interest in the same livestock, and, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.58[3]*], a perfected security interest in their identifiable proceeds and identifiable products in their unmanufactured states also has priority, if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9324(d)*; *see also Com. Code § 9317(e)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*]:

- The purchase money security interest is perfected when the debtor receives possession of the livestock.
- The purchase money secured party sends an authenticated notification to the holder of the conflicting security interest.
- The holder of the conflicting security interest receives the notification within six months before the debtor receives possession of the livestock.
- The notification states that the person sending the notification has or expects to acquire a purchase money security interest in livestock of the debtor and describes the livestock.

Com. Code § 9324(d)(2)-(4), inclusive, apply only if the holder of the conflicting security interest had filed a financing statement covering the same types of livestock before the date of the filing, if the purchase money security interest is perfected by filing, or if the purchase money security interest is temporarily perfected without filing or possession under *Com. Code § 9312(f)*, before the beginning of the 20-day period thereunder [*Com. Code § 9324(e)*].

[e] Purchase Money Security Interest in Software

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9324(g)* (conflicting purchase money security interests, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*), a perfected purchase money security [*see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest," discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)] in software has priority over a conflicting security interest in the same collateral, and, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* (discussed in *§ 503.58[3]*), a perfected security interest in its identifiable proceeds also has priority, to the extent that the purchase money security interest in the goods in which the software was acquired for use has priority in the goods and proceeds of the goods under *Com. Code § 9324* [*Com. Code § 9324(f*); *see also Com. Code § 9317(e)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*; *Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)* (when software is goods, discussed in *§ 503.11[14][b]*)].

[6] Rules for Disposition of Goods on Default

In proceeding to dispose of collateral after the debtor's default, the secured party, without removal, may render equipment unusable and dispose of it on the debtor's premises in the regularly prescribed manner [*Com. Code § 9609(a)(2)*; *see Com. Code § 9610* (conditions for disposal)]. When the collateral is documents, the secured party may proceed either as to the documents or as to the goods covered thereby [*Com. Code § 9601(a)(2)*].

A secured party generally has all the options discussed in *§ 503.27*, except for limitations and requirements specific to collateral that is consumer goods, such as the requirement that the goods be disposed of (*see Com. Code § 9620(e), (f)*, discussed in *§ 503.42[5][a]*) and the fact that in a consumer transaction, a secured party may not accept collateral in partial satisfaction of the obligation it secures [*see Com. Code § 9620(g)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[4][b]*; *see also Com. Code § 9624* (waivers permitted and prohibited, discussed in *§ 503.28[2]*)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.41

§ 503.41 Inventory

[1] Exception to Certificate of Title Statute

During any period in which goods that are collateral are inventory held for sale or lease by a person or leased by that person as lessor and that person is in the business of selling goods of that kind, the Division 9 filing provisions, not the certificate of title statute, apply to a security interest in that collateral [*Com. Code § 9311(d)*; *Louis & Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1585-1586, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889* (Commercial Code governed perfection of interest in dealer's inventory)].

Perfection of security interests under certificate of title statutes is discussed in *§§ 503.22[5]* and *503.23[3], [4]*. The perfection of purchase money security interests in goods that are inventory are discussed in [2], *below*. Priority of security interests in goods generally is discusses at *§ 503.40[5]*.

[2] Priority of Purchase Money Security Interest in Inventory

Subject to *Com. Code § 9324(c)* and except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9324(g)* (conflicting purchase money security interests, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*), a perfected purchase money security interest [*see Com. Code § 9103* (defining "purchase money security interest," discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*)] in inventory has priority over a conflicting security interest in the same inventory, has priority over a conflicting security interest in chattel paper or an instrument constituting proceeds of the inventory and in proceeds of the chattel paper, if so provided in *Com. Code § 9330* (discussed in *§ 503.24[3]*), and, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* (discussed in *§ 503.28[3]*), also has priority in identifiable cash proceeds of the inventory to the extent the identifiable cash proceeds are received on or before the delivery of the inventory to a buyer, if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9324(b)*]:

- The purchase money security interest is perfected when the debtor receives possession of the inventory.

- The purchase money secured party sends an authenticated notification to the holder of the conflicting security interest.

- The holder of the conflicting security interest receives the notification within five years before the debtor receives possession of the inventory.

- The notification states that the person sending the notification has or expects to acquire a purchase money security interest in inventory of the debtor and describes the inventory.

Com. Code § 9324(b)(2)-(4), inclusive, apply only if the holder of the conflicting security interest had filed a financing statement covering the same types of inventory as follows [*Com. Code § 9324(c)*]:

- If the purchase money security interest is perfected by filing, before the date of the filing.

- If the purchase money security interest is temporarily perfected without filing or possession under *Com. Code § 9312(f)*, before the beginning of the 20-day period thereunder.

For purposes of the *Com. Code § 9330(a)* and *(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.50[3]* the holder of a purchase money security interest in inventory gives new value for chattel paper constituting proceeds of the inventory [*Com. Code § 9330(e)*]. A purchase money priority in inventory carries over to proceeds consisting of chattel paper and its proceeds (and also to instruments) to the extent provided by *Com. Code § 9330*. Taken together *Com. Code § 9334(b)* and *Com. Code § 9330(e)* enable a purchase money inventory secured party to obtain priority in chattel paper consisting of proceeds of inventory, even if the secured party does not actually give new value for the chattel paper, provided the purchase money secured party satisfies the other conditions for achieving priority [UCC Comment 8 to *Com. Code § 9324*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.42

§ 503.42 Consumer Goods

[1] Definitions and Issues Discussed Elsewhere

Consumer goods are goods that are used or bought for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(23)*; *see also § 503.11[8], [9][b], [14][d]* (related definitions)]. By definition, a consignment that is subject to Division 9 does not occur with respect to consumer goods [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)(C)*; *see § 503.11[7]*].

No special rule governs the creation or attachment of a security interest in consumer goods except that, as discussed in *§ 503.21[5]*, a security interest does not attach to after-acquired consumer goods, other than accessions given as additional security, unless the debtor acquires rights in them within 10 days after the secured party gives value [*Com. Code § 9204(b)(1)*]. With respect to notices in consumer transaction documents addressing assertion of defenses against assignees [*Com. Code § 9403(d)*], see *§ 503.28[3]*.

After a consumer's default, the requirements for the notice of disposition are governed by *Com. Code § 9614*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][b][iv]* and *[v]*. Waivers by consumer debtors and obligors are governed by *Com. Code §§ 9602, 9603, 9624, 9629* and discussed in *§ 503.28[2]*. A secured party must provide a consumer obligor with an explanation that meets the requirements of *Com. Code § 9616* of how the secured party calculated the surplus or deficiency after disposition [*see Com. Code § 9616(b)*, form and discussion in *§ 503.122*]. Limitations on a secured party's liability for failure to comply with requirements of Division 9 specifically applicable to consumer transactions are governed by *Com. Code § 9628(c)* (reasonable belief that transaction was not consumer transaction), and discussed in [6], *below*. Other limitations and procedural requirements regarding deficiency judgments in consumer transactions are governed by *Com. Code § 9626* and discussed in *§ 503.27[7][b]*. When and whether a secured party must file a termination statement with respect to a consumer transaction is governed by *Com. Code § 9513*, discussed in *§ 503.22[6][k]*.

[2] Perfection by Filing of Financing Statement; Purchase Money Security Interest

Generally, the filing of a financing statement is necessary to perfect a security interest in consumer goods [*Com. Code § 9310(a), (b)(2), (3)*; *see Com. Code § 9501(a)(2)* (place of filing)], except that a purchase money security interest [*see Com. Code § 9103*, discussed in *§ 503.11[19]*] in consumer goods (other than goods subject to a certificate of title or

other statue mentioned in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*) is perfected on attachment [*Com. Code § 9309(1)*]. *Com. Code § 9309(1)* represents a change from former *Com. Code § 9302(1)(d)* to allow perfection of a purchase money security interest in consumer goods, other than goods such as automobiles, that are subject to a statute or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*, without filing or any other step. However, filing is required to perfect a non-purchase-money security interest in consumer goods and is necessary to prevent a buyer of consumer goods from taking free of a security interest under *Com. Code § 9320(b)*, discussed in [3], *below* [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9309*]. A fixture filing is required for priority over conflicting interests in fixtures to the extent provided by *Com. Code § 9334* [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9309*; *see Com. Code § 9334(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[6][b]*]. Priority of purchase money security interests is discussed in *§ 503.24[2][c]*.

Com. Code § 9108(e) establishes the degree of specificity required into describe the consumer goods in which a security agreement grants a security interest [*see* discussion in *§ 503.20[1]*]. Descriptions of consumer good collateral also must meet the applicable requirements of *Civ. Code § 1799.100* [*Com. Code § 9108(f)*]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 1799.100*, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

[3] Buyer May Take Free Before Financing Statement Is Filed

Except when the goods are in the possession of the secured party under *Com. Code § 9313* [*Com. Code § 9320(e)*], a buyer of goods from a person who used or bought the goods for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes takes free of a security interest, even if perfected, if the buyer buys for value, without knowledge of the security interest, primarily for the buyer's personal, family, or household purposes, and before the filing of a financing statement covering the goods [*Com. Code § 9320(b)*]. To the extent that it affects the priority of a security interest over a buyer of goods under *Com. Code § 9320(b)*, the period of effectiveness of a filing made in the jurisdiction in which the seller is located is governed by *Com. Code § 9316(a)* and *(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.23[4]* [*Com. Code § 9320(c)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.24[3][a]*].

Com. Code § 9320(b) deals with buyers of collateral that the debtor-seller holds as "consumer goods." As to purchase money security interests that are perfected without filing under *Com. Code § 9309(1)* (discussed in [2], *above*), a secured party may file a financing statement, although filing is not required for perfection. If the secured party does file, all buyers take subject to the security interest. If the buyer secured party does not file, a buyer who meets the qualifications of *Com. Code § 9320(b)* takes free of the security interest [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9320*].

As to security interests for which a perfection step is required--namely non-purchase-money security interests and all security interests, whether purchase money or not, in goods subject to a certificate-of-title statute or treaty described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)*, such as automobiles--as long as the required perfection step has not been taken, and the security interest remains unperfected, not only the buyers described in *Com. Code § 9320(b)*, but also the purchasers described in *Com. Code § 9317* (unperfected interests, discussed in *§ 503.24[1]*) will take free of the security interest [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9320*]. After a financing statement has been filed or the perfection requirements of any applicable certificate-of-title statute or treaty have been complies with [*see Com. Code § 9311(b)* (compliance is the equivalent of filing)], all subsequent buyers, under the rule of *Com. Code § 9320(b)*, are subject to the security interest [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9320*].

The rights of a buyer under *Com. Code § 9320(b)* turn on whether a financing statement has been filed against consumer goods. Occasionally, a debtor changes his or her location after a filing is made. *Com. Code § 9320(c)*, *above*, deals with the continued effectiveness of the filing under the circumstances interest [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9320*]. For a form of complaint for use by a buyer in the ordinary course of business to seek a declaration that he or she takes free of another interest, see *§ 503.161*.

[4] Secured Party in Possession of Consumer Goods

A secured party in possession of collateral that is consumer goods is not necessarily entitled to use or operate that collateral in the manner and to the extent agreed by the debtor [*Com. Code § 9207(b)(4)(C)*], but may use or operate the collateral for the purpose of preserving the collateral or its value and as permitted by an order of a court having competent jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9207(b)(4)(A), (B)*]. For detailed discussion of the rights of a secured party in possession of collateral, see *§ 503.26[1]*.

[5] Secured Party's Duty to Dispose of Consumer Goods in Possession After Default

[a] When Disposition Is Required

Unless the debtor has waived the right to require disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9620(e)* by an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default, a secured party who has taken possession of collateral consisting of consumer goods must dispose of it on default pursuant to *Com. Code § 9610* if there is (1) a purchase money security interest in the collateral, and the debtor has paid 60 percent of the cash price, or (2) a nonpurchase money security interest in the collateral, and the debtor has paid 60 percent of the secured obligation [*Com. Code § 9620(e)*; *see Com. Code §§ 9602(10), 9624(b)* (waiver)]. If the secured party fails to dispose of the consumer goods within 90 days after taking possession, or within any longer period to which the debtor and all secondary obligors have agreed in an agreement to that effect entered into and authenticated after default [*Com. Code § 9620(f)*], the debtor has the option to recover either in conversion [*see* discussion [b], *below*] or under *Com. Code § 9625(b)-(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.29*.

For a form for waiver of debtor's right to require disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9620(e)*, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.242* (Matthew Bender). For a complaint for damages under *Com. Code § 9625(a)-(d)* that can be modified for use in this situation see *§ 503.102*. As a third alternative, the debtor or obligor may request the court to arrange for disposition of the collateral pursuant to *Com. Code § 9625(a)*, discussed in *§ 503.28[5]*. For a complaint that can be modified to use to seek an order for disposition, see *§ 503.103*.

[b] Enforcement by Suit for Conversion of Consumer Goods

Former Division 9 [*see* former *Com. Code § 9505(1)*] specified that the debtor was allowed to sue in conversion if, after default, the secured party took possession collateral that was consumer goods and failed to dispose of them in a prescribed time period when 60 percent of the cash price or secured obligation had been paid [*see Com. Code § 9620(e), (f)*, discussed in [a], *above*]. Current *Com. Code § 9620(e)* has eliminated the superfluous reference to conversion; but remedies available under other law, including conversion, remain available [*see* UCC Comment 12. to *Com. Code § 9620*, *see also Com. Code §§ 1302, 1305* (general principles and remedies available unless specifically displaced, but consequential, special, or penal damages may not be had except as specifically provided in the Commercial Code or by other rule of law)]. For a complaint for conversion for use in this situation, see *§ 503.104*.

[6] Secured Party's Immunity Based on Reasonable Belief That Transaction Is Not Consumer Goods Transaction

A secured party is not liable to any person, and a person's liability for a deficiency is not affected, because of any act or omission arising out of the secured party's reasonable belief that a transaction is not a consumer goods transaction or a consumer transaction [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(24), (26)* (definitions, discussed in *§ 503.11*[8])] [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(23)* (definition, discussed in *§ 503.11[14][d]*)], if the secured party's belief is based on its reasonable reliance on either (1) a debtor's representation concerning the purpose for which collateral was to be used, acquired, or held, or (2) an obligor's representation concerning the purpose for which a secured obligation was incurred [*Com. Code § 9628(c)*]. Of course, if the secured party's belief is not reasonable or, even if reasonable, is not based on reasonable reliance on the debtor's representation, the limitation on liability is not applicable [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9628*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.43

§ 503.43 Perishable Agricultural Commodities

Perishable agricultural commodities [*7 U.S.C. § 499a(b)(4)*] received by a commission merchant, broker, or dealer [*7 U.S.C. § 499a(b)(5)-(7)*] in interstate or foreign commerce [*7 U.S.C. § 499a(b)(8)*], inventories of food or other products derived from perishable agricultural commodities, and any receivables or proceeds from the sale of perishable agricultural commodities or products are held by the commission merchant, broker, or dealer in trust for the benefit of all unpaid sellers, suppliers, or agents [*7 U.S.C. § 499e(c)(2)*]. The unpaid seller, supplier, or agent loses the benefit of the trust unless it gives notice of intent to preserve the trust to the commission merchant, broker, or dealer within 30 days after (1) payment was due, either in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture [*see 7 C.F.R. § 46.2(aa)*] or in accordance with the parties' written agreement entered into before the transaction; or (2) the seller, supplier, or agent received notice of dishonor of a promptly presented payment instrument [*7 U.S.C. § 499e(c)(3)*]. The written notice to the commission merchant, dealer, or broker must set forth information in sufficient detail to identify the transaction subject to the trust [*7 U.S.C. § 499e(c)(3)*].

When the parties agree to a payment period different from that established by the Secretary, each party must have a copy of the agreement, and those payment terms must be disclosed on invoices, accountings, and other documents relating to the transaction [*7 U.S.C. § 499e(c)(3)*; *see In re San Joaquin Food Service, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 958 F.2d 938, 940-941* (produce seller's interest in trust nullified by its failure to include payment terms on invoices; fact that buyer had actual knowledge of payment terms did not provide defense)].

Notice of intent to preserve the trust must be given directly to the commission merchant, dealer, or broker in order to preserve the benefits of the trust as against a competing secured party [*In re Marvin Properties, Inc. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1183, 1186* (receipt of copy of USDA's letter acknowledging receipt of notice of intent held insufficient)].

Federal district courts have jurisdiction over actions by trust beneficiaries to enforce payment from the trust [*7 U.S.C. § 499e(c)(5)(i)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.44

§ 503.44 Timber and Minerals

[1] Extent of Division 9 Applicability to Timber to Be Cut and As Extracted Collateral

The filing system in revised Division 9 is oriented more towards personal property and less towards real property than the former Division 9 [*see* UCC Comment 4c to *Com. Code § 9102*]. Crops, for instance, are goods [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(34)(A), (44)* ("farm products" means goods, other than standing timber, with respect to which the debtor is engaged in a farming operation and includes crops grown, growing, or to be grown, even if the crops are produced on trees, vines, or bushes)], and a security interest in growing crops is perfected by filing in the Secretary of State's office [*Com. Code §§ 9310(a), 9501(a)*], or by the secured party taking possession of the crops [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(6), 9313(a)*]. See *§§ 503.23, 503.40[2][a]* for discussions of choice of law rules and general rules for perfecting security interests in goods. The priority of a security interest in crops as against an owner or encumbrancer of the land is established in accordance with *Com. Code § 9334(i)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][e]*. In Revised Division 9, there is a distinction between crops and standing timber [UCC Comment 4a to *Com. Code § 9102*].

"Goods" includes standing timber that is to be cut and removed under a conveyance or contract for sale [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)(ii)*]. A security interest in timber to be cut is perfected by filing in the office designated for the filing or recording of a record of a mortgage on the related real property [*see Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)(A)*]. *Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)(A)* is also applicable to filing to perfect interest in as-extracted collateral, which is defined as either of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(6)*]:

- Oil, gas, or other minerals that are subject to a security interest that both (1) is created by a debtor having an interest in the minerals before extraction and (2) attaches to the minerals as extracted.

- Accounts arising out of the sale at the wellhead or minehead of oil, gas, or other minerals in which the debtor had an interest before extraction.

Under Revised Division 9, oil, gas, and other minerals that have not been extracted from the ground are treated as real property to which Division 9 does not apply [*see Com. Code § 9109(d)(11)*]. On extraction, minerals become personal

property (goods) eligible to be collateral under Division 9 [UCC Comment 4c to *Com. Code § 9102*]. The definition of "goods" excludes oil, gas, or other minerals before extraction [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*].

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Elements of Definition of "As-Extracted Collateral." Debtor owns an interest in oil that is to be extracted and contracts to sell the oil to Buyer at the wellhead. In an authenticated agreement, Debtor agrees to sell to Lender the right to payment from Buyer (carved out production payment). This right to payment is an account that constitutes "as-extracted collateral." If Lender then resells the right to payment to Financier, Financier acquires a security interest. Is Financier's security interest "as-extracted collateral?" No. The Debtor-seller in that transaction (Lender) had no interest in the oil before extraction, thus, Financier's collateral (the account it owns) is not "as-extracted collateral" [UCC Comment 4c to *Com. Code § 9102*, Example 6].

Under the same facts, before extraction, Buyer grants a security interest in the oil to Bank. Is Bank's security interest in as-extracted collateral?" No. Although Bank's security interest attaches when the oil is extracted, Buyer did not have an interest in the oil before extraction, so Bank's collateral is not "as-extracted collateral" [UCC Comment 4c to *Com. Code § 9102*, Example 7].

[2] Security Agreement as to Timber to Be Cut

A security agreement that grants a security interest in timber to be cut must include a description of the land concerned *Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)(A)*; *see also Com. Code § 9502(b)(3)* (real property description in financing statement, discussed in*§ 503.44[3]*]. For general discussion of the requirements of a security agreements, see *§ 503.21[2][a]*.

[3] Perfecting a Security Interest in Timber to Be Cut or As Extracted Collateral

Security interests in minerals attach on extraction and in accounts resulting from the sale of minerals at the wellhead or minehead [*see Com. Code § 9301(4)* (choice of law, discussed in *§ 503.23[1][c]*)]. The term "at the wellhead" encompasses arrangements based on a sale of the product from the moment that it passes from the ground, and is measured without technical distinctions as to whether title passes "at the Christmas tree" of a well, the far side of a gathering tank, or at some other point. The term "at the minehead" is comparable [UCC Comment 4c to *Com. Code § 9102*]. A security interest as extracted collateral is perfected by filing in the office designated for the filing or recording of a record of a mortgage on the related real property [*see Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)(A)*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9501(b)*, to be sufficient, a financing statement that covers as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut (, or which is filed as a fixture filing and covers goods that are or are to become fixtures), must satisfy *Com. Code § 9502(a)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[6][b]*, and also satisfy all of the following conditions [*Com. Code § 9502(b)*]:

- Indicate that it covers this type of collateral.
- Indicate that it is to be recorded in the real property records.
- Provide a description of the real property to which the collateral is related sufficient to give constructive notice of a mortgage under the law of this state if the description were contained in a record of the mortgage of the real property.
- If the debtor does not have an interest of record in the real property, provide the name of a record owner.

A record of a mortgage is effective, from the date of recording, as a financing statement filed as a fixture filing or as a financing statement covering as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut only if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Com. Code § 9502(c)*]:

- The record indicates the goods or accounts that it covers.

- The goods are or are to become fixtures related to the real property described in the record or the collateral is related to the real property described in the record and is as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut.

- The record satisfies the requirements for a financing statement in *Com. Code § 9502* [*see* at *§ 503.22[6][b]*] other than an indication that it is to be filed in the real property records.

- The record is duly recorded.

Financing statements covering as-extracted collateral (or timber to be cut) must be recorded and the filing office must index them in accordance with *Com. Code § 9519(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.47[5]* [*see Com. Code § 9519(e)* (indexing of assignment of financing statement that covers as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut)].

[4] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Minerals Takes Free of Encumbrance

A buyer in ordinary course of business buying oil, gas, or other minerals at the wellhead or minehead or after extraction takes free of an interest arising out of an encumbrance [*Com. Code § 9320(d)*]. For general discussion of priority accorded buyers in the ordinary course of business, see *§§ 503.24[3], 503.42[3]*]. For a complaint for use by a buyer in the ordinary course of business to seek a declaration that he or she takes free of another interest, see *§ 503.161*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.45

§ 503.45 Agricultural Liens

[1] Perfection of Agricultural Liens

Agricultural liens, defined by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(5)*, which is set forth in *§ 503.11[3]*, are perfected by the filing of a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9310(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9302* (choice of law regarding agricultural liens, discussed in *§ 503.23[1][d]*)]. An agricultural lien is perfected if the lien has become effective and the financing statement has been filed. An agricultural lien is perfected when it becomes effective if the applicable requirements are satisfied before the agricultural lien becomes effective [*Com. Code § 9308(b)*]. An agricultural lien is perfected continuously if it is originally perfected by one method under Division 9 and is later perfected by another method under Division 9, without an intermediate period when it was unperfected [*Com. Code § 9308(c)*].

If a secured party assigns a perfected agricultural lien, it is not necessary to make an additional filing to continue the perfected status of the lien against creditors of and transferees from the original debtor [*Com. Code § 9310(c)*].

A person is authorized to file an initial financing statement (or an amendment that adds collateral covered by a financing statement, or an amendment that adds a debtor to a financing statement) with respect to an agricultural lien if that person holds an agricultural lien that has become effective at the time of filing and the financing statement covers only collateral in which the person holds an agricultural lien [*Com. Code § 9509(a)(2)*].

[2] Statute Creating Agricultural Lien May Give It Priority

A perfected agricultural lien on collateral has priority over a conflicting security interest in or agricultural lien on the same collateral if the statute creating the agricultural lien so provides [*Com. Code § 9322(g)*]. If the statute creating the agricultural lien does not grant it priority, *Com. Code § 9322(a)* applies the same priority rules to an agricultural line as to a security interest, regardless of whether the agricultural line conflicts with another agricultural lien or with a security interest [UCC Comment 12 to *Com. Code § 9322*]. For general discussion of priority, see *§ 503.24[2]*.

[3] Statute Creating Agricultural Lien Determines Time of Default

For purposes of *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.*, a default occurs in connection with an agricultural lien at the time the secured party becomes entitled to enforce the lien in accordance with the statute under which it was created [*Com. Code § 9606*]. For general discussion of a secured party's options on debtor's default, see *§ 503.27*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.46

§ 503.46 Goods on Consignment

[1] Definitions and Parties

The term "consignment" does not imply a sale, but rather imports an agency and that the title remains in the consignor. The consignor entrusts property to the consignee as agent for the purposes of sale. There may be any kind of sale arrangement, such as that the consignee may sell for any price but remit to the consignor only a fixed price. It may also be that at the time of sale the consignee will be considered the purchaser. Prior to the contemplated sale, however, the goods are the property of the consignor [*see Cass v. Rochester (1917) 174 Cal. 358, 361, 362, 163 P. 212* ; *see also § 503.133* (complaint in intervention by consignor, who complied with filing and notification procedure, to protect ownership in consigned goods); *Fariba v. Dealer Servs. Corp. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 156, 172-173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219* (trial court properly instructed jury that possession as between competing claimants to goods in inventory at premises of consignment merchant is accomplished when one with right to possess accomplishes actual custody and control of those goods under all circumstances demonstrated by evidence; wholesaler that had consigned used vehicles to dealer was entitled to possession of them after dealer went out of business, and consignor had actual custody and control of those vehicles because of having keys to them in hand, even after vehicles were taken from dealer's premises by creditor that had security interest in dealer's inventory)].

The consignments governed by revised Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9109(a)(4)*], are defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(20), set forth in § 503.11[7]* to exclude consignments of goods that were consumer goods immediately before delivery to the consignee. Consignments of consumer goods are governed in California by *Com. Code § 2326*, which is discussed in Ch. 500, *Sales: UCC Sales* . A consignment that is subject to Division 9 creates a security interest in the consignor [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35*], who, under Division 9 is a secured party [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(72)(C)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(12)(C), (28)(C)* (consigned goods are collateral; consignee is debtor)]. The security interest of the consignor is a purchase money security interest in inventory [*Com. Code § 9103(d)*], and it must be perfected as such [*see Com. Code § 9324(b), (c)*; *see also §§ 503.46[2], [3], 503.42[1]*].

[2] Consignor's Goods Subject to Claims of Consignee's Creditors

Under Division 2 of the Commercial Code, governing sales, when goods are delivered to a person primarily for resale,

the goods are deemed to be on "sale or return" [*Com. Code § 2326(1)(b)*]. Goods held on "sale or return" are subject to the claims of creditors of the "buyer" or consignee while they are in the "buyer's" or consignee's possession [*Com. Code § 2326(2)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9319(b)*, for purposes of determining the rights of creditors of, and purchasers for value of goods from, a consignee, while the goods are in the possession of the consignee, the consignee is deemed to have rights and title to the goods identical to those the consignor had or had power to transfer [*Com. Code § 9319(a)*]. For purposes of determining the rights of a creditor of a consignee, law other than Division 9 determines the rights and title of a consignee while goods are in the consignee's possession if, under the priority rules of Division 9, a perfected security interest held by the consignor would have priority [*Com. Code § 9319(b)*]. over the rights of the creditor.

ILLUSTRATION:

Consignor Does Not Perfect Security Interest. SP-1 delivers goods to Debtor in a consignment transaction as defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)*. SP-1 does not file a financing statement. Debtor then grants a security interest in the goods to SP-2, SP-2 files a financing statement. Whose interest is senior: SP-1's or SP-2's? Under *Com. Code § 9322(a)(2)*, SP-2's interest is senior. Even though, under a "true" consignment, Debtor is a mere bailee and would not have any rights, beyond those of a bailee, in the consigned goods to which SP-2's security interest could attach, under *Com. Code § 9319(a)*, for purposes of determining the rights of Debtor's creditors, Debtor is deemed to have SP-1's rights [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9319*].

ILLUSTRATION: Consignor Does Perfect Security Interest. SP-1 delivers goods to Debtor in a consignment transaction as defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)*. SP-1 files a proper financing statement. Debtor then grants a security interest in the goods to SP-2. Whose interest is senior: SP-1's or SP-2's? Under *Com. Code § 9322(a)*, SP-1's interest is senior. Further, under *Com. Code § 9319(b)*, Debtor acquired only the special interest of a bailee in the consigned goods; thus, SP-2's security interest would attach only to that special interest [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9319*].

[3] Filing and Notification Procedure for Protection of Consignments

In order to enjoy the priority of its security interest as a purchase money security interest in inventory [*Com. Code § 9103(d)*], a consignor must perfect that interest as it would perfect a security interest in inventory; that is, in accordance with *Com. Code § 9324(b)* and *(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.41[2]* [*see* UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9324*]. The consignor must file a financing statement before the consignee receives possession of the goods [*Com. Code § 9324(b)(1)*]. If the holder of a competing security interest has filed a financing statement covering the same types of inventory/goods before the date of the consignor's filing, the consignor must give that secured party authenticated notification that the consignor expectsto acquire a security interest in the goods on consignment and describes the goods [*Com. Code § 9324(b)(2), (4), (c)(1)*]. This notice must be received within five years before the consignee receives possession of the goods [*Com. Code § 9324(b)(3)*; *see § 503.133*].

[4] Form of Financing Statement for Consignments

A consignor (as well as a lessor or other bailor of goods, a licensor, or a buyer of a payment intangible or promissory note) may file a financing statement, or may comply with a registration or certificate of title statue [*see Com. Code § 9311(a)*], using the terms "consignor," "consignee," (or "lessor," "lessee," "bailor," "bailee," "licensor," "licensee," "owner," "registered owner," "buyer," "seller,") or words of similar import, instead of the terms "secured party" and "debtor" [*Com. Code § 9505(a)*]. The filing of a financing statement or compliance that is equivalent to filing a financing statement under a registration or certificate of title statue [*see Com. Code § 9311(b)*] is not of itself a factor in determining whether the collateral secures an obligation. If it is determined for another reason that the collateral secures an obligation, a security interest held by the consignor (or lessor, bailor, licensor, owner, or buyer) which attaches to the collateral is perfected by the filing or compliance [*Com. Code § 9505(b)*].

[5] Ordinary Duties of Secured Party in Possession Do Not Apply to Consignor

The ordinary duties of a secured party in possession of collateral [*see Com. Code § 9207(a)*, discussed in *§ 503.26[1]*], do not apply to a consignor (or to a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes) unless the secured party is entitled under an agreement either to charge back uncollected collateral or otherwise to full or limited recourse against the debtor or a secondary obligor based on the nonpayment or other default of an account debtor or other obligor on the collateral [*Com. Code § 9207(d)(1)*]. *Com. Code § 9207(b)*, discussed in *§ 503.26[1]*, and *Com. Code § 9207(c)*, discussed in *§ 503.50[4]*, do not apply at all to a secured party who is a consignor or a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes [*Com. Code § 9207(d)(2)*].

[6] Actual Knowledge That Consignee Sells Goods on Consignment

When a consignor of goods does not have the superior security interest in the goods that arises from filing a financing statement [*see § 503.46[3]*], it is possible for the consignor to have a superior interest, relative to a creditor with a perfected security interest in the inventory of the consignee, based on proof that, when the creditor's security interest in the consignee's inventory was perfected, either (1) the consignee's creditors generally knew that the consignee was substantially engaged in selling the goods of others [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)(A)(iii)*], or (2) the particular creditor in question actually knew that the consignee was substantially engaged in selling the goods of others [*Fariba v. Dealer Servs. Corp. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 156, 166, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219]* .

Jury instructions in the following forms would be proper on the crucial issues of fact [*Fariba v. Dealer Servs. Corp. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 156, 160, 163-164, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219]* :

- The consignor holds a superior interest in the consigned goods if the consignor proves, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the secured party had actual knowledge, at the date of perfection of the security interest, that the debtor was substantially engaged in selling of the goods of others.

- The debtor is considered to be substantially engaged in selling goods that belong to others if 20 percent or more of the debtor's inventory belonged to others.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.47

§ 503.47 Fixtures

[1] Relation to Goods for Security Interest Purposes

Division 9 applies to a transaction, regardless of its form, that creates a security interest in fixtures by contract [*Com. Code § 9109(a)(1)*; *see Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)* (defining "security interest" to include interest in fixtures)] and defines goods to include fixtures [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(44)*].

Fixtures are an exception to the general rule that Division 9 does not apply to creation or transfer of an interest in or lien on real property, including a lease or rents thereunder. Division 9 applies to fixtures to the extent provided in *Com. Code § 9334* and to fixture filings as provided in *Com. Code §§ 9501, 9502, 9512, 9516,* and *9519* [*Com. Code § 9109(d)(11)(B), (C)*].

[2] "Fixtures" and "Trade Fixtures" Defined

"Real property" consists not only of land, but also that which is affixed to it, or incidental or appurtenant to it, and that which is immovable by law (except for certain land products to be sold) [*Civ. Code § 658*]. Things are "affixed to land" when attached to it by roots, imbedded in it, permanently resting on it, or permanently attached to what is thus permanent--such as by means of cement, plaster, nails, bolts, or screws [*Civ. Code § 660*]. Division 9 defines "fixtures" as goods that have become so related to particular real property that an interest in them arises under real property law [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)*].

A tenant is entitled to remove during the lease any "trade fixtures," that is, anything affixed for trade, manufacture, ornament, or domestic use purposes, if removal will not injure the premises, and unless the manner of fixation has caused it to become an integral part of the premises [*Civ. Code § 1019*]. While "trade fixtures" are ordinarily removable by the tenant on termination of the lease, the lease may effectively provide that on termination for breach by the tenant the trade fixtures will belong to the landlords. In effect, a trade fixture is not formally considered a fixture at all under California law; nor is "fixture" a factual description of an object, but only a statement of a legal conclusion as to whether it constitutes, in the circumstances, a part of the real property [*Goldie v. Bauchet Properties (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 307, 313, 316, 124 Cal. Rptr. 161, 540 P.2d 1* ; *see § 503.110*].

[3] Creation of Security Interest in Fixtures

A security interest under Division 9 may be created in goods that are fixtures or may continue in goods that become fixtures. However, no security interest exists under Division 9 in ordinary building materials incorporated into an improvement on land [*Com. Code § 9334(a)*]. Division 9 does not prevent creation of an encumbrance on fixtures under real property law [*Com. Code § 9334(b)*].

[4] Procedure and Effectiveness of Fixture Filing

A fixture filing, which is a financing statement recorded in the real property records and covering goods which are, or are to become fixtures [*Com. Code §§ 9102(a)(40), 9501(a)(1)(B), 9502(b)*], may be recorded at the county recorder's office without acknowledgment, certificate of acknowledgment, or further proof [*Gov. Code § 27282(a)(7)*]. A filing office may refuse to accept a financing statement tendered to be filed or recorded under *Com. Code § 9501(a)(1)* if the statement does not provide a sufficient description of the real property to which it relates [*Com. Code § 9516(b)(3)(D)*]. A mortgage with certain additions prescribed by law may be effective as a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9502(c)*; *see § 503.44[3]*]. A financing statement filed as a fixture filing to perfect a security interest in fixtures of a transmitting utility must be filed in the office of the Secretary of State [*Com. Code § 9501(b)*].

A financing statement filed as a fixture filing, if the debtor is not a transmitting utility, must contain certain statutorily required statements in order to be effective [*see Com. Code § 9502(a), (b),* discussed in *§§ 503.22[6][b]* and *503.44[3],* respectively]. Financing statements substantially complying with statutory requirements of *Com. Code § 9502* are effective even though containing minor errors that are not seriously misleading [*Com. Code § 9506*]. A fixture filing is effective for five years from the date of filing [*Com. Code § 9515(a)*; *but see Com. Code § 9515(b)* (financing statement filed in connection with manufactured home transaction is effective for 30 years after date of filing if it indicates that it is filed in connection with a manufactured home transaction)]. The effectiveness of the filed financing statement lapses on the expiration of the five-year period unless a continuation statement is filed within six months before the expiration of the five-year period [*Com. Code § 9515(c), (d)*]. A real estate mortgage effective as a financing statement filed as a fixture filing [*see Com. Code § 9502(c)*] remains effective as a financing statement filed as a fixture filing until the mortgage is released or satisfied of record or its effectiveness otherwise terminates as to the real property [*Com. Code § 9515(g)*].

An assignment of record of a security interest in a fixture covered by a record of a mortgage which is effective as a financing statement filed as a fixture filing under *Com. Code § 9502(c)* can be made only by an assignment of record of the mortgage in the manner provided by California law other than the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 9514(c)*].

[5] Notice to Real Estate Interest

If a financing statement is filed as a fixture filing (or covers as-extracted collateral or timber to be cut), it must be recorded and the filing office must index it both (1) under the names of the debtor and of each owner of record shown on the financing statement as if they were the mortgagors under a mortgage of the real property described, and (2) to the extent that California law provides for indexing records of mortgages under the name of the mortgagee, under the name of the secured party as if the secured party were the mortgagee thereunder, or, if indexing is by description, as if the financing statement were a record of a mortgage of the real property described [*Com. Code § 9519(d)*]. When properly containing the description of the real property affected thereby [*see Com. Code § 9502(b)(3)*], the fixture filing constitutes constructive notice of its contents to subsequent purchasers and mortgagees, from the time it is filed with the recorder for record [*Gov. Code § 27282(b)*].

[6] Priorities as to Fixtures

[a] Residual Rule

In cases not governed by *Com. Code § 9334(d)-(h)*, inclusive, discussed in*§ 503.47[6][b] -[h]*, a security interest in fixtures is subordinate to a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the related real property other than the debtor [*Com. Code § 9334(c)*].

[b] Perfected Interests in Fixtures

A perfected security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property in the following cases:

- First, except as discussed in*§ 503.47[6][d]* with respect to construction mortgages [*see Com. Code § 9334(h)*], a perfected purchase money security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the debtor has an interest of record in or is in possession of the real property, the interest of the encumbrancer or owner arises before the goods become fixtures, and the security interest is perfected by a fixture filing before the goods become fixtures or within 20 days thereafter [*Com. Code § 9334(d)*].

- Second, a perfected security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the debtor has an interest of record in the real property or is in possession of the real property, the security interest is perfected by a fixture filing before the interest of the encumbrancer or owner is of record, and the security interest has priority over any conflicting interest of a predecessor in title of the encumbrancer or owner [*Com. Code § 9334(e)(1)*; *see also* UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9334*].

- Third, a perfected security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the fixtures are readily removable factory or office machines or readily removable replacements of domestic appliances that are consumer goods [*Com. Code § 9334(e)(2)*].

- Fourth, a perfected security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the conflicting interest is a lien on the real property obtained by legal or equitable proceedings after the security interest was perfected by any method permitted by Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9334(e)(3)*].

- Finally, a perfected security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if the security interest is created in a manufactured home in a manufactured home transaction and is perfected pursuant to a certificate of title statute described in *Com. Code § 9311(a)(2)*[*Com. Code § 9334(e)(4)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(53), (54)* (defining "manufactured home" and "manufactured home transaction")]. *Com. Code § 9334(e)(4)* is only one of the priority rules applicable to security interests in a manufactured home that becomes a fixture. Thus, a security interest in a manufactured home that does not qualify under *Com. Code § 9334(e)(4)* may qualify under another provision [*see* UCC Comment 10 to *Com. Code § 9334*].

[c] Unperfected Interests in Fixtures

Whether or not it has been perfected, a security interest in fixtures has priority over a conflicting interest of an encumbrancer or owner of the real property if either (1) the encumbrancer or owner has consented, in an authenticated record, to the security interest or disclaimed an interest in the goods as fixtures; or (2) the debtor has a right to remove the goods as against the encumbrancer or owner [*Com. Code § 9334(f)*]. In the latter instance, if the debtor's right to remove the goods as against the encumbrancer or owner terminates, the priority of the security interest continues for a reasonable time [*Com. Code § 9334(g)*].

[d] Construction Mortgage

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9334(e)* and *(f)*, discussed in*§ 503.47[6][b]* and *[c]*, a security interest in fixtures is subordinate to a construction mortgage if a record of the mortgage is recorded before the goods become fixtures and the goods become fixtures before the completion of the construction. A mortgage is a construction mortgage to the extent that it secures an obligation incurred for the construction of an improvement on land, including the acquisition cost of the land, if the recorded record of the mortgage so indicates [*Com. Code § 9334(h)*]. A mortgage has this priority to the same extent as a construction mortgage to the extent that it is given to refinance a construction mortgage [*Com. Code § 9334(h)*].

[7] Governing Law When Foreign Goods Affixed to California Property

If goods are or become fixtures in relation to real estate located in California, the both perfection of a security interest in the goods by filing a fixture filing and the effect of perfection or nonperfection and the priority of a nonpossessory security interest in the collateral are governed by California law, specifically, Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9301(3)(A), (C)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.48

§ 503.48 Documents

[1] Perfection of Interests in Negotiable Documents

[a] Negotiation

A negotiable tangible document of title is negotiated as follows [*Com. Code § 7501(a)(1)-(4)*]:

- If the document's original terms run to the order of a named person, the document is negotiated by the named person's indorsement and delivery. After the named person's indorsement in blank or to bearer, any person may negotiate the document by delivery alone.

- If the document's original terms run to bearer, it is negotiated by delivery alone.

- If the document's original terms run to the order of a named person and it is delivered to the named person, the effect is the same as if the document had been negotiated.

- Negotiation of the document after it has been indorsed to a named person requires indorsement by the named person and delivery.

A negotiable electronic document of title is negotiable as follows [*Com. Code § 7501(b)(1), (2)*]:

- If the document's original terms run to the order of a named person or to bearer, the document is negotiated by delivery of the document to another person. Indorsement by the named person is not required to negotiate the document.

- If the document's original terms run to the order of a named person and the named person has control of the document, the effect is the same as if the document had been negotiated.

A negotiable tangible or electronic document or title is "duly negotiated" if it is negotiated in the appropriate manner

stated above to a holder that purchases it in good faith, without notice of any defense against or claim to it on the part of any person, and for value, unless it is established that the negotiation is not in the regular course of business or financing or involves receiving (in the case of a tangible document) or taking delivery of (in the case of an electronic document) the document in settlement or payment of a monetary obligation [*Com. Code § 7501(a)(5)* (tangible documents), (b)(3) (electronic documents)]. The holder acquires title to the document, title to the goods covered thereby, and specified rights against the issuer and certain agents of the issuer [*Com. Code § 7502(a)*; *see also Com. Code § 9331*]. However, such a document confers no right in goods against one who before its issuance had a legal interest or a perfected security interest in them and who neither delivered nor entrusted them or any document covering them to the bailor, or a nominee of the bailor, with actual or apparent authority to ship, store, or sell, or with power to obtain delivery [*see Com. Code § 7403*] or with power of disposition under any statute or rule of law, nor acquiesced in the procurement by the bailor or a nominee of the bailor of any document of title [*Com. Code § 7503(a)*].

[b] Perfection

A security interest in tangible negotiable documents may be perfected by the secured party's act of taking possession of the documents [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*]. It also may be perfected by filing [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*]. However, it may be perfected without filing or taking possession or control for a period of 20 days from the time it attaches to the extent that it arises for new value given under an authenticated security agreement [*Com. Code § 9312(e)*].

While goods are in the possession of a bailee that has issued a negotiable document covering the goods, a security interest in the goods is perfected by perfecting a security interest in the document [*Com. Code § 9312(c)(1)*]. A security interest perfected in the document has priority over any security interest that becomes perfected in the goods by another method during that time [*Com. Code § 9312(c)(2)*]. A perfected security interest in a negotiable document can remain perfected for 20 days without filing if the document representing the goods is made available to the debtor by the secured party for certain purposes, in the same manner as that described for goods in possession of a bailee not issuing a negotiable document for those goods [*Com. Code § 9312(f)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.40[2][b]*].

After the expiration of the 20-day period in either *Com. Code § 9312(e)* or *(f)*, perfection depends on compliance with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9312(h)*].

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Documents

The question as to which jurisdiction's law governs the perfection or nonperfection of and the priority of a security interest in documents is resolved in the same manner as that applicable generally, discussed in *§ 503.23[1]* [*Com. Code § 9301*]. However, the distinction between possessory and nonpossessory interests [*Com. Code § 9301(1), (2)*] creates the potential for the same jurisdiction to apply two different choice of law rules to determine perfection in the same collateral. For example, if a secured party was in possession of an instrument or document to relinquish possession in reliance on temporary perfection, the applicable law immediately would change from that of the location of the collateral to that of the location of the debtor. The application of two different choice-of-law rules for perfection is unlikely to lead to any material practical problems because the perfection rules of one Division 9 jurisdiction are likely to be identical to those of another. Moreover, under *Com. Code § 9301(3)(C)*, the relative priority of competing security interests in tangible collateral is resolved by reference to the law of the jurisdiction in which the collateral is located, regardless of how the security interests are perfected [UCC Comment 5a to *Com. Code § 9301*].

Com. Code § 9301 takes a bifurcated approach with respect to collateral mentioned in *Com. Code § 9301(3)* (negotiable tangible documents, goods, instruments, money, or tangible chattel paper): *Com. Code § 9301(1)* and *(2)* govern perfection, while under *Com. Code § 9301(3) (C)*, the law of the jurisdiction where the collateral is located determines "the effect of perfection or nonperfection and priority," including for example, the effect of an execution lien on priority [*see* UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9301*].

[3] Secured Party's Rights on Default Involving Documents

If the collateral consists of documents, on the default of the debtor the secured party may proceed either as to the documents or as to the goods they cover [*Com. Code § 9601(a)(2)*].

[4] Secured Party's Duties When Electronic Document of Title No Longer Secures Any Obligation

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party having control of an electronic document of title under *Com. Code § 7106* must give control of the electronic document to the debtor or its designated custodian. If the debtor designates a custodian that is the designated custodian with which the authoritative copy of the electronic document is maintained for the secured party, then the secured party must communicate to the custodian an authenticated record releasing the designated custodian from any further obligation to comply with instructions originated by the secured party and instructing the custodian to comply with instructions originated by the debtor. The secured party must take appropriate action to enable the debtor or its designated custodian to make copies of or revisions to the authoritative copy which add or change an identified assignee of the authoritative copy without the consent of the secured party. All of the above must be done within 10 days after the secured party receives an authenticated demand by the debtor [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(6)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.49

§ 503.49 Instruments

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Instruments

The term "instruments" is defined by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(47)*, and includes promissory notes, as defined by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(65)*. Both definitions are *set forth in § 503.11[15]*. A security interest in an instrument may be perfected by filing [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*], which is a change from prior law, or by the secured party taking possession of the instrument [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*]. If perfection of a security interest depends on possession of the instrument by the secured party, perfection occurs no earlier than the time the secured party takes possession and continues only while the secured party retains possession [*Com. Code § 9313(d)*].

A security interest in an instrument is perfected without filing or the taking of possession or control for a period of 20 days from the time it attaches to the extent that it arises for new value given under an authenticated security agreement [*Com. Code § 9312(e)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(57)* ("new value," discussed in *§ 503.11[24]*)]. After the 20-day period expires, perfection depends on compliance with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9312(h)*].

Subject to *Com. Code § 9312(h), above*, a perfected security interest in an instrument remains perfected for 20 days without filing if the secured party delivers the instrument to the debtor for the purpose of ultimate sale or exchange, presentation, collection, enforcement, renewal, or registration of transfer [*Com. Code § 9312(g)*].

It is not necessary to file a financing statement to perfect a security interest in an instrument which is perfected without filing, control, or possession under *Com. Code § 9312(e)-(g)* [*Com. Code § 9310(b)(5)*].

The buyer's security interest created by the sale of a promissory note is perfected when it attaches [*Com. Code § 9309(4)*].

With respect to perfection of a security interest in proceeds of an instrument, see *§ 503.21[7]* [*see Com. Code § 9315(c),(d)*; *see also Com. Code § 9315(a) (b)* (security interest in proceeds of unauthorized disposition of collateral, discussed in *§ 503.21[4]*)].

Attachment of a security interest in any supporting obligation for the instrument [*Com. Code § 9203(f)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)* (supporting obligation defined, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][b])*], and in any security interest, mortgage, or other lien that secures the instrument [*Com. Code § 9203(g)*], is discussed in *§ 503.21[2][c]*.

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Instruments

The question as to which jurisdiction's law governs the perfection or nonperfection of, and the priority of a security interest in, instruments is resolved in the same manner as that applicable generally, discussed in *§ 503.23[1]* [*Com. Code § 9301*]. However, the application of *Com. Code § 9301* to instruments is subject to the same complications as those applicable in the case of documents, discussed in *§ 503.48[2]*.

[3] Priorities Among Interests in Instruments

Instruments are governed by the general priority rules of *Com. Code § 9322*, discussed in *§ 503.24*. Because instruments may be proceeds of other collateral, *Com. Code § 9322(d)* and *(e)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][b]*, may be applicable.

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9331(a)* (holders in due course, discussed in *§ 503.21[3]*), a purchaser of an instrument has priority over a security interest in the instrument perfected by a method other than possession if the purchaser gives value and takes possession of the instrument in good faith and without knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9330(d)*; *see Com. Code § 1204*, defining "value," discussed in *§ 503.11[24]*]. *Com. Code § 9330(d)*, applies to checks as well as notes [UCC Comment 7 to *Com. Code § 9330*]. For purposes of *Com. Code § 9330(d)*, if an instrument indicates that it has been assigned to an identified secured party other than the purchaser, a purchaser of instrument has knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9330(f)*].

[4] Secured Party's Rights and Duties as to Instruments

In addition to the ordinary duties of a secured party in possession of collateral [*see Com. Code § 9207*, discussed in *§ 503.26[1]*], in the case of an instrument, the secured party's duty of reasonable care includes taking necessary steps to preserve rights against prior parties unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 9207(a)*].

[5] Right to Make Collection

When so agreed, and in any event after default, a secured party is entitled to notify the obligor on an instrument to make payment to or for the benefit of the secured party and to otherwise exercise the rights of the debtor with respect to the obligations represented by the collateral and with respect to any property that secures the obligations on the collateral, including for example, the right to foreclose a mortgage that secures an instrument. The secured party also is entitled to take control of any proceeds to which he or she is entitled under *Com. Code § 9315* [*Com. Code § 9607(a)(1)-(3)*; *see Com. Code § 9608* (application of proceeds of collection); *§ 503.27[1], [3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.50

§ 503.50 Chattel Paper

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Chattel Paper

[a] Tangible Chattel Paper

"Chattel paper" is defined by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(11)*, which is set forth in *§ 503.11[5]*. A security interest in chattel paper may be perfected by the secured party's taking possession of it [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*] or filing a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*]. If perfection of a security interest depends on possession of the instrument by the secured party, perfection occurs no earlier than the time the secured party takes possession and continues only while the secured party retains possession [*Com. Code § 9313(d)*].

[b] Electronic Chattel Paper

"Electronic chattel paper" is defined by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(31)*, which is set forth in *§ 503.11[5]*. A security interest in electronic chattel paper may be perfected by the secured party's taking by control of the collateral under *Com. Code § 9105* [*Com. Code § 9314(a)*] or filing a financing statement [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*].

A security interest in electronic chattel paper is perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9105* when the secured party obtains control and remains perfected by control only while the secured party retains control [*Com. Code § 9314(b)*]. A secured party has control of electronic chattel paper if the record or records comprising the chattel paper are created, stored, and assigned in such a manner that each of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 9105*]:

(1) A single authoritative copy of the record or records exists which is unique, identifiable, and, except as otherwise provided in (4), (5), and (6), *below*, unalterable.

(2) The authoritative copy identifies the secured party as the assignee of the record or records.

(3) The authoritative copy is communicated to and maintained by the secured party or its designated custodian.

(4) Copies or revisions that add or change an identified assignee of the authoritative copy can be made only with the participation of the secured party.

(5) Each copy of the authoritative copy and any copy of a copy is readily identifiable as a copy that is not the authoritative copy.

(6) Any revision of the authoritative copy is readily identifiable as an authorized or unauthorized revision.

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Security Interests in Chattel Paper

The question as to which jurisdiction's law governs the perfection or nonperfection of, and the priority of a security interest in, chattel paper is resolved in the same manner as that applicable generally, discussed in *§ 503.23[1]* [*Com. Code § 9301*]. However, the application of *Com. Code § 9301* to tangible chattel paper is subject to the same complications as those applicable in the case of documents, discussed in *§ 503.48[2]*.

[3] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

[a] Over Claim of Interest in Chattel Paper as Proceeds of Inventory

A purchaser of chattel paper has priority over a security interest in the chattel paper which is claimed merely as proceeds of inventory subject to a security interest if, in good faith and in the ordinary course of the purchaser's business, the purchaser gives new value and takes possession of the chattel paper or obtains control of the chattel paper under *Com. Code § 9105* and the chattel paper does not indicate that it has been assigned to an identified assignee other than the purchaser [*Com. Code § 9330(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(57)*, defining "new value," discussed in *§ 503.11[24*]; *Com. Code § 9342(b)*, regarding conflicting purchase money interest in inventory, discussed in *§ 503.41[2]*]. For purposes of the foregoing, the holder of a purchase money security interest in inventory gives new value for chattel paper constituting proceeds of the inventory [*Com. Code § 9330(e)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.41[2]*].

Com. Code § 9330(a) revises the rule in former *Com. Code § 9308(b)* to eliminate reference to what the purchaser knows. Instead, a purchaser who meets the possession or control, ordinary course, and new value requirements takes priority over a competing security interest unless the chattel paper itself indicates that it has been assigned to an identified assignee other than the purchaser. This recognized the common practice of placing a "legend" on chattel paper to indicate that it has been assigned. This approach, allowing the purchaser who gives new value to rely on the lack of a legend, without concern for other facts that it may know, comports with the expectations of both inventory and chattel paper financers [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

If a possessory security interest in chattel paper does not qualify for priority under *Com. Code § 9330*, it may be subordinate, under *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)* to a security interest that was perfected by filing [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

[b] Over Interest Claimed Other than as Proceeds

A purchaser of chattel paper has priority over a security interest in the chattel paper which is claimed other than merely as proceeds of inventory subject to a security interest if the purchaser gives new value and takes possession of the chattel paper or obtains control of the chattel paper under *Com. Code § 9105* in good faith, in the ordinary course of the purchaser's business, and without knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9330(b)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(57)* (defining "new value" discussed in *§ 503.11[24*]); *Com. Code § 9342(b)* (regarding conflicting purchase money interest in inventory, discussed in *§ 503.41[2]*)]. For purposes of the foregoing, the holder of a purchase money security interest in inventory gives new value for chattel paper constituting proceeds of

the inventory [*Com. Code § 9330(e)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.41[2]*]. In addition, for purposes of *Com. Code § 9330(b)*, if chattel paper indicates that it has been assigned to an identified secured party other than the purchaser, a purchaser of the chattel paper has knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9330(f)*].

Com. Code § 9330(b) eliminates the former requirement that the purchaser take without knowledge that the "specific paper" is subject to the security interest and substitutes for it the requirement that the purchaser take "without knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of the secured party." The current standard derives from the definition of "buyer in the ordinary course of business" in *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*. The source of the purchaser's knowledge is irrelevant. "Knowledge" means "actual knowledge" as defined inCom. Code § 1202(b) [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

If a possessory security interest in chattel paper does not qualify for priority under *Com. Code § 9330*, it may be subordinate, under *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)* to a security interest that was perfected by filing [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

[c] Competing Priorities in Proceeds

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327* (discussed in *§ 503.58[3]*), a purchaser having priority in chattel paper under *Com. Code § 9330(a)* or *(b)* also has priority in proceeds of the chattel paper to the extent that either *Com. Code § 9322* provides for priority in the proceeds, or the proceeds consist of the specific goods covered by the chattel paper or cash proceeds of the specific goods, even if the purchaser's security interest in the proceeds is unperfected [*Com. Code § 9330(c)*]. Returned and repossessed goods may constitute proceeds of chattel paper [UCC Comment 9 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

ILLUSTRATIONS:

Chattel Paper Purchaser's Rights in Returned or Repossessed Goods. SP-1 has a security interest in all inventory of a dealer in goods. SP-1's security interest is perfected by filing. Dealer sells some of its inventory to a buyer in the ordinary course of business (BIOCOB) under a conditional sales contract (chattel paper) that does nod indicate that it has been assigned to SP-1. SP-2 purchases the chattel paper from Dealer and takes possession of the paper in good, faith, in the ordinary course of business, and without knowledge that the purchase violates the rights of SP-1. Subsequently, BIOCOB returns the goods to Dealer because they are defective. Who has the superior security interest in the returned goods? SP-2 does, under *Com. Code § 9330(c)(2)*. Dealer is merely a bailee and acquires no interest to which SP-1's security interst could attach. SP-2 enjoys priority regardless of whether or when SP-2 filed a financing statement covering the chattel paper.

If Dealer acquires the goods under circumstances in which it once again becomes the owner (BIOCOB's revocation or rejection), whose security interest is superior? Again, under *Com. Code § 9330(c)(2)*, SP-2. SP-1's security interest would reattach because the goods would be proceeds of chattel paper [*see Com. Code § 9315(d)*]. Because Dealers's newly reacquired interest in the goods is also proceeds of the chattel paper, SP-2's security interest also attaches to the goods as proceeds collection.

If Dealer, SP-1, or SP-2 repossesses, who has the superior interest? Again, under *Com. Code § 9330(c)(2)*, SP-2. BIOCOB remains owner of the goods. Dealer's interest is in the chattel paper, not the goods. SP-1's interest in the goods does not reattach until Dealer reacquires an interest beyond bare possession, for instance, if Dealer purchases at a foreclosure sale the goods [UCC Comments 9 and 10 to *Com. Code § 9330*].

[d] While Buyer's Security Interest is Unperfected

A debtor that has sold chattel paper does not retain a legal or equitable interest in the collateral sold [*Com. Code § 9318(a)*]. For purposes of determining the rights of creditors of, and purchasers for value of chattel paper from, a debtor that has sold chattel paper, while the buyer's security interest is unperfected, the debtor is deemed to have rights and title to the chattel paper identical to those the debtor sold [*Com. Code § 9318(b)*]. If the purchaser of chattel paper does not perfect it's interset, it is vulnerable: seller/debtor can transfer, and the creditors of the seller can reach, the chattel paper as if it had not been sold [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9318*].

[4] Secured Party in Possession of Chattel Paper

In addition to the ordinary duties of a secured party in possession of collateral [*see Com. Code § 9207*, discussed in *§ 503.26[1]*], in the case of chattel paper, the secured party's duty of reasonable care includes taking necessary steps to preserve rights against prior parties unless otherwise agreed [*Com. Code § 9207(a)*]. *Com. Code § 9601 et seq.* impose no duties on a secured party that is buyer of chattel paper except, as provided by *Com. Code § 9607(c)* (when secured party who undertakes to make collections on collateral must do so in commercially reasonable manner), discussed in *§ 503.27[3][a]* [*Com. Code § 9601(g)*].

[5] Right to Make Collection

When so agreed, and in any event after default, a secured party is entitled to notify the obligor on chattel paper to make payment to or for the benefit of the secured party and to otherwise exercise the rights of the debtor with respect to the obligations represented by the collateral and with respect to any property that secures the obligations on the collateral. The secured party is also entitled to take control of any proceeds to which he or she is entitled under *Com. Code § 9315* [*Com. Code § 9607(a)(1)-(3)*; *see Com. Code § 9608* (application of proceeds of collection); *§ 503.27[1]* and *[3]*].

[6] Secured Party's Duties When Electronic Chattel Paper No Longer Secures Any Obligation

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party, other than a buyer, having control of a chattel paperaccount under *Com. Code § 9105* must do all of the following within 10 days after receiving an authenticated demand by the debtor [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(3)*]:

- Communicate the authoritative copy of the electronic chattel paper to the debtor or its designated custodian.

- If the debtor designates a custodian that is the designated custodian with which the authoritative copy of the electronic chattel paper is maintained for the secured party, communicate to the custodian an authenticated record releasing the designated custodian from any further obligation to comply with instructions originated by the secured party and instructing the custodian to comply with instructions originated by the debtor.

- Take appropriate action to enable the debtor or its designated custodian to make copies of or revisions to the authoritative copy which add or change an identified assignee of the authoritative copy without the consent of the secured party.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.51

§ 503.51 Accounts

[1] Expanded Definition Under Revised Division 9

"Account" is defined in revised Division 9 by *Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*, set forth in *§ 503.11[1]*. The new definition of account is broader than the definition in former Division 9 and includes things that were general intangibles under the former law [UCC Comment 5 a to *Com. Code § 9102*]. "Account" is no longer limited to rights to payment relating to goods or services. Many categories of rights to payment that were classified as general intangibles under former law are accounts under revised Division 9. Thus, if they are sold, a financing statement must be filed to protect the buyer's in them. Among the types of property that are expressly excluded from the definition of account in revised Division 9 (they are still general intangibles) are rights to payment of money or funds advanced or sold. Money is limited essentially to currency [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(24)*]. As used in the exclusion from the definition of account, "funds" is a broader concept (although the term is not defined). For example, when a bank-creditor credits a deposit account with the amount of a loan, the bank's advance of funds is not a transaction giving rise to an account [UCC Comment 5a to *Com. Code § 9102*; *see* UCC Comment 5d to *Com. Code § 9102* (deposit account is separate type of collateral)].

The definition of "health care insurance receivable" was new in revised Division 9. "Health care insurance receivables" are a subset of "account." However, the rules generally applicable to debtors on accounts [*see, e.g., Com. Code §§ 9404(e), 9405(d), 9406(i)*, discussed in *§§ 503.54[2], 503.60*] do not apply to insurers obligated on health care insurance receivables [UCC Comment 5a to *Com. Code § 9102*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.54*].

Certain accounts are also "as-extracted" collateral [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(6)*; discussion in *§ 503.44[1]*].

[2] Conflict of Laws as to Interests in Accounts

Accounts may be governed by the general choice of law rule of *Com. Code § 9301(1)*, that while a debtor is located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in collateral [*see also Com. Code § 9301(2)* (choice of law governing possessory security interests, discussed in *§ 503.23[1]*)]. If the debtor moves, *Com. Code § 9316(a)(2)*, discussed in *§ 503.23[4]*, will generally continue perfection until the expiration of four months after a change of the debtor's location to another

jurisdiction [*see also Com. Code § 9307* (defining "debtor's location," discussed in *§ 503.23[2*])].

[3] Perfection of Security Interest in Account

Although a security interest represented by an assignment of accounts or payment intangibles which does not by itself or in conjunction with other assignments to the same assignee transfer a significant part of the assignor's outstanding accounts or payment intangibles is perfected when it attaches [*see Com. Code § 9309(2)*], any person who regularly takes assignments of any debtor's accounts or payment intangibles should file. Note also that *Com. Code § 9109(d)(4)-(7)* (discussed in *§ 503.13[2]*) exclude specified transfers of accounts, chattel paper, and payment intangibles from Division 9 [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9309*]. Because of the expansion of the definition of "account" in revised Division 9 [*see* [1], *above*], an interest perfected as a general intangible under former law may need to be reperfected as an interest in an "account" after July 1, 2001 [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9703*, Example 3].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.52

§ 503.52 Sales of Accounts or Chattel Paper, Payment Intangibles, or Promissory Notes

[1] Terminology: "Assignment" and "Transfer"

In numerous provisions, Division 9 refers to the "assignment" or "transfer" of property interest, but these terms are not defined. Division 9 generally follows common usage by using the terms "assignment" and "assign" to refer to transfers of rights to payment, claims, and lines and other security interests. Division 9 generally uses the term "transfer" to refer to other transfers of interests in property. Except when used in connection with a letter-of-credit transaction [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9107*], no significance should be placed on the use of one term or the other. Depending on the context, each term may refer to the assignment or transfer of an outright ownership interest or the assignment or transfer of a limited interest, such as a security interest [UCC Comment 26 to *Com. Code § 9102*]. Thus, the provisions discussed in *§ 503.60* also may need to be considered in connection with the sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, and promissory notes.

A sale of an account, chattel paper, payment intangible, or promissory note includes any right in the receivable, such as the sale of a participation interest. The term also includes the sale of an enforcement right, for example, a person "entitled to enforce a negotiable promissory note" [*see Com. Code § 3301*], may sell its ownership rights in the instrument [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*; *see* UCC Comment 1 to *Com. Code § 3203*]. The right under *Com. Code § 3309* to enforce a lost, destroyed, or stolen negotiable promissory note also may be sold to a purchaser who could enforce that right by requiring the seller to provide the proof required under that section. Article 9 rejects cases reaching a contrary result, such as *Dennis Joslin Co. v. Robinson Broadcasting (D.D.C. 1997) 977 F. Supp. 491* [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*].

Nothing in *Com. Code § 9109* prevents the transfer of a full and complete ownership of an account, chattel paper, instrument, or payment intangible. However, as mentioned in UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9109* neither Division 9 nor the definition of security interest [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*] provide rules for distinguishing sales transactions from those that create a security interest securing an obligation. Division 9 applies to both types of transactions. The principle effect of this coverage is to apply Division 9's perfection and priority rules to these sales transactions. Use of terminology such as "security interest," "debtor," and "collateral" is merely a drafting convention adopted to reach this

end, and its use has no relevance to distinguishing sales form other transactions [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*].

[2] Extent to Which Division 9 Is Applicable

[a] Those Covered by Division 9

The term "security interest" includes any interest of a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, a payment intangible, or a promissory note in a transaction that is subject to Division 9 [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*]. Those include most sales of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes [*see Com. Code § 9109(a)(3)*], except the single assignments listed in *Com. Code § 9109(d)(4)-(7), below*. Division 9 will not govern if another California statute expressly governs the creation, perfection, priority, or enforcement of a security interest created by California or a governmental unit of California. These statutes include statutes that provide for pledges, liens, or security interests to secure bonds or other obligations (including, without limitation, leases) of California or a governmental unit of California, whether the statute is of general application like *Gov. Code §§ 5450* and *5451*, or is specific to particular types of obligations of the state of California or of governmental units or to particular governmental units [*Com. Code § 9109(c)(1), (2)*]. The following sales of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes also are outside the scope of Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9109(d)(4)-(7)*]:

- A sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes as part of a sale of the business out of which they arose.

- An assignment of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes which is for the purpose of collection only.

- An assignment of a right to payment under a contract to an assignee that is also obligated to perform under the contract.

- An assignment of a single account, payment intangible, or promissory note to an assignee in full or partial satisfaction of a preexisting indebtedness.

Certain "accounts," namely health care insurance receivables and "as-extracted collateral" (accounts arising at wellhead), are subject to particular rules of their own, which are discussed in *§§ 503.53* and *503.44*, respectively. Priority afforded to purchasers of chattel paper is governed in part by *Com. Code § 9330*, discussed in *§ 503.50[3]*.

[b] Expansion in Revised Division 9 to Include Payment Intangibles and Promissory Notes

Under *Com. Code § 9109(a)(3)*, as under former *Com. Code § 9102*, Division 9 applies to sales of accounts and chattel paper. This approach generally has been successful in avoiding problems of distinguishing between transactions in which a receivable secures an obligation and those in which the receivable has been sold outright. In many commercial financing transactions, the distinction is blurred [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9109*]. Although Division 9 occasionally distinguishes between outright sales of receivables and sales that secure an obligation, neither Division 9 nor the definition of security interest [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*] delineates how a particular transaction is to be classified. That issue is left to the courts [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9109*].

Com. Code § 9109(a)(3) expands the scope of Division 9 by including the sale of a payment intangible (defined as a general intangible under which the account debtor's principal obligation is to pay money) [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(61)*, as discussed in *§ 503.11 [12]*] and the sale of a promissory note (defined as an instrument, specifically an instrument that evidences a promise to pay a monetary obligation, does not evidence an order to pay, and does not contain an acknowledgment by a bank that the bank has received for deposit a sum of money or funds) [*see Com. Code*

§ 9102(a)(65); *§ 503.11[15]*]. To a considerable extent, Division 9 treats those transactions as identical to a sale of accounts or chattel paper. In some respects, however, sales of payment intangibles and promissory notes are treated differently [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9109*; *see, e.g., Com. Code§ 9309* (automatic attachment on perfection, discussed in [6], *below*); *Com. Code § 9408* (effect of restrictions on assignment, discussed in [5], *below*)].

By virtue of the expanded definition of "account," Division 9 now covers sales of and other interests in health care insurance receivables [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9109*], which are discussed in *§ 503.54*.

[3] Conflict of Laws as to Sales of Receivables

Conflict of laws governing security interests in chattel paper, accounts, promissory notes, and general intangibles is governed by the general choice of law rule of *Com. Code § 9301*, discussed in *§ 503.23[1]*. Under *Com. Code § 9301(3)(C)* the effect of perfection or nonprefection and the priority of a nonpossessory security interest in tangible chattel paper [*see § 503.50[2]*] and instruments, which includes promissory notes [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(47), (65)*; *see § 503.48[2]*], is governed by the local law of the jurisdiction where the collateral is located. For discussion of the complications that may arise in applying *Com. Code § 9301(1), (2)*, and *(3)(C)* to promissory notes and tangible chattel paper, see discussion in *§ 503.48[2]*. If the debtor moves, *Com. Code § 9316(a)(2)*, discussed in *§ 503.23[4]*, will generally continue perfection until the expiration of four months after a change of the debtor's location to another jurisdiction [*see also Com. Code § 9307* (defining "debtor's location," discussed in *§ 503.23[2*])].

[4] Buyer as Secured Party; Seller as Debtor

A seller of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes is a debtor [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(28)(B)*]. A person to which accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes have been sold is a "secured party" [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(72)(D)*].

[5] Ineffectiveness of Terms Against Transfer or Assignment

A term in a promissory note or in an agreement between an account debtor and a debtor which relates to a health care insurance receivable or a general intangible, including a contract, permit, license, or franchise, and which term prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of the person obligated on the promissory note or the account debtor to, the assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in, the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible, is ineffective to the extent that the term does, or would either (1) impair the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest, or (2) provide that the assignment or transfer or the creation, attachment, or perfection of the security interest may give rise to a default, breach, right of recoupment, claim, defense, termination, right of termination, or remedy under the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible [*Com. Code § 9408(a)*]. The foregoing rule applies to a security interest in a payment intangible or promissory note only if the security interest arises out of a sale of the payment intangible or promissory note [*Com. Code § 9408(b)*].

Similarly, any rule of law, statute, or regulation, that prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of a government, governmental body or official, person obligated on a promissory note, or account debtor to the assignment or transfer of, or the creation of a security interest in, a promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible, including a contract, permit, license, or franchise between an account debtor and a debtor, is ineffective to the extent that the rule of law, statute, or regulation does, or would, either (1) impair the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest, or (2) provide that the assignment or transfer or the creation, attachment, or perfection of the security interest may give rise to a default, breach, right of recoupment, claim, defense, termination, right of termination, or remedy under the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible [*Com. Code § 9408(c)*]. *Com. Code § 9408(c)* does not apply to an assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of a security interest in, a claim or right to receive compensation for injuries or sickness as described in *26 U.S.C. §*

104(a)(1) or *(2)*, as amended, or a claim or right to receive benefits under a special needs trust as described in *42 U.S.C. § 1396p(d)(4)*, as amended, to the extent that it is inconsistent with those laws [*Com. Code § 9408(e)*].

To the extent that a term in a promissory note or in an agreement between an account debtor and a debtor which relates to a health care insurance receivable or general intangible or a rule of law, statute, or regulation described in *Com. Code § 9408(c)* would be effective under law other than Division 9 but is ineffective under *Com. Code § 9408(a)* or *(c)*, all of the following rules apply with respect to the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible [*Com. Code § 9408(d)*]:

- It is not enforceable against the person obligated on the promissory note or the account debtor.

- It does not impose a duty or obligation on the person obligated on the promissory note or the account debtor.

- It does not require the person obligated on the promissory note or the account debtor to recognize the security interest, pay or render performance to the secured party, or accept payment or performance from the secured party.

- It does not entitle the secured party to use or assign the debtor's rights under the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible, including any related information or materials furnished to the debtor in the transaction giving rise to the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible.

- It does not entitle the secured party to use, assign, possess, or have access to any trade secrets or confidential information of the person obligated on the promissory note or the account debtor.

- It does not entitle the secured party to enforce the security interest in the promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible.

[6] Interest of Buyer of Promissory Note or Payment Intangible Is Perfected on Attachment

An assignment of accounts or payment intangibles which does not by itself or in conjunction with other assignments to the same assignee transfer a significant part of the assignor's outstanding accounts or payment intangibles also is perfected on attachment without further action [*Com. Code § 9309(2)*]. *Com. Code § 9309(2)* is an expansion of former *Com. Code § 9302(1)(e)* by affording automatic perfection to certain assignments of payment intangibles as well as accounts. The purpose of *Com. Code § 9309(2)* is to save from ex post facto invalidation casual or isolated assignments--assignments which no one would think of filing. Any person who regularly takes assignments of debtor's accounts or payment intangibles should file [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9309*].

A security interest arising from the sale of a promissory note or payment intangible is perfected on attachment without further action [*Com. Code § 9309(3), (4)*]. *Com. Code § 9309(3), (4)* are new in revised Division 9 and reflect practice under former Division 9. Under former Division 9, filing a financing statement did not affect the rights of a buyer of payment intangibles or promissory notes because the former Division 9 did not cover those sales. To the extent that the exception on *Com. Code § 9309(2)* covers outright sales of payment intangibles, which are automatically perfected under *Com. Code § 9309(3)*, the exception is redundant [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9309*].

[7] Seller's Interest

Following a debtor's outright sale and transfer of ownership of a receivable [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(28)(B)* (seller as debtor)], the debtor-seller retains no legal or equitable rights in the receivable that has been sold [*Com. Code § 9318(a)*;

UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*]. This is so whether the buyer's security interest is perfected. A security interest arising from the sale of a promissory note or payment intangible is perfected on attachment without further action [*see Com. Code § 9309(3), (4)*; UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*]. However, if the buyer's interest in accounts or chattel paper is unperfected, a subsequent lien creditor, perfected secured party, or qualified buyer can reach the sold receivable and take priority over (or take free of) the buyer's unperfected security interest under *Com. Code § 9317* (discussed in *§ 503.24[1]*). This is so not because the seller of a receivable retains any rights in the property sold; it does not. Nor is this so because the seller of a receivable is a "debtor" and the buyer of a receivable is a "secured party" under Division 9 (they are). It is so for the simple reason that *Com. Code § 9317, 9318(b)*, and *9322* make it so, as did former *Com. Code §§ 9301, 9312*. Because the buyer's security interest is unperfected, for purposes of determining the rights of creditors of and purchasers for value from the debtor-seller under *Com. Code § 9318(b)*, the debtor-seller is deemed to have the rights and title it sold. *Com. Code § 9317* subjects the buyer's unperfected interest in accounts and chattel paper to that of the debtor-seller's lien creditors and other persons who qualify under that section [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9109*].

[8] Priority Accorded Buyer

Except against a perfected purchase money security interest which has been the subject of a filing [*see Com. Code § 9317(e)*], a buyer, other than a secured party, of tangible chattel paper takes free of security interest or agricultural lien if that buyer gives value and receives delivery of the collateral without knowledge of the security interest or agricultural lien and before it is perfected [*Com. Code § 9317(b)*]. Buyers of chattel paper are also accorded priorities by *Com. Code § 9330*, which is discussed in *§ 503.50[3]*.

The priority rules of *Com. Code § 9323(a)* and *(b)*, with respect to future advances (discussed in *§ 503.24[1], [2][d]*) do not apply to a security interest held by a secured party that is a buyer of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes or a consignor [*Com. Code § 9323(c)*]. The priority of the security interest of a buyer of accounts is governed by the general rule of *Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)*, discussed in *§ 503.24[2][a]*.

[9] Special Rules Regarding Surplus and Deficiency

If the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, and the secured party has made collections on those receivables [*see Com. Code § 9607(a)(1)-(3)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[3][a]*], the debtor is not entitled to any surplus, and the obligor is not liable for any deficiency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)*, relating to the payment of proceeds applies only if the security agreement provides that the debtor is entitled to any surplus [*Com. Code § 9608(b)*].

Similarly, when the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, and the secured party has disposed of the collateral [*see Com. Code § 9610*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5]*], the debtor is not entitled to any surplus, the obligor is not liable for any deficiency, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)*, relating to the payment of proceeds applies only if the security agreement provides that the debtor is entitled to any surplus [*Com. Code § 9615(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.53

§ 503.53 Insurance Policies

[1] Policy Loans Not Covered by Division 9

California's provisions with regard to insurance policies are not uniform. Although, consistent with the uniform provisions, California's Division 9 does not apply to any loan made by an insurance company pursuant to the provisions of a policy or contract issued by it and on the sole security of the policy or contract [*Com. Code § 9109(d)(8)*], California's Division 9 applies to other security interests in and claims under insurance policies. Like the uniform provisions, California's Division 9 applies to and has specific provisions governing assignment of health care insurance receivables, discussed in *§ 503.54, below*.

[2] Perfection of Security Interest in Insurance Policy

A financing statement is not necessary to perfect a security interest in an insurance policy. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9315(c)* and *(d)*, with respect to proceeds, a security interest in, or claim in or under, any policy of insurance, including unearned premiums, may be perfected only by giving written notice of the security interest or claim to the insurer. This provision does not apply to a health care insurance receivable [*Com. Code §§ 9310(b)(11), 9312(b)(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.54

§ 503.54 Health Care Insurance Receivables

[1] Defined

"Health care insurance receivable" means an interest in or claim under a policy of insurance which is a right to payment of a monetary obligation for health care goods or services provided or to be provided [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(46)*]. The term "account" includes health care insurance receivables [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(2)*].

[2] Assignment of Health Care Insurance Receivable

No financing statement is necessary to perfect a security interest in a health care insurance receivable. A security interest created by the assignment of a health care insurance receivable to the provider of the health care goods or services is perfected when it attaches [*Com. Code § 9309(5)*]. Assignments of health care insurance receivables are not subject to the ordinary rules regarding debtor's assertion of claims and defenses against the assignee [*Com. Code § 9404(e)*], making a modification of the original contract effective as against the assignee [*Com. Code § 9405(d)*], discharge by payment to assignor [*Com. Code § 9406(i)*]. See also *Com. Code § 9408*, discussed in *§ 503.52[5]*, which renders ineffective any prohibition (in an agreement between an account debtor and a debtor which relates to a health care insurance receivable) on the assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in, the health care insurance receivable.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.55

§ 503.55 Financial Assets

[1] Defined

"Financial asset," except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 8103*, means any of the following [*Com. Code § 8102(a)(9)*; *see Com. Code § 8103(f)* (excludes from definition of financial asset, a commodity contract, as defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(15)*)]:

- A security.

- An obligation of a person or a share, participation, or other interest in a person or in property or an enterprise of a person, that is, or is of a type, dealt in or traded on financial markets, or that is recognized in any area in which it is issued or dealt in as a medium for investment.

- Any property that is held by a securities intermediary for another person in a securities account if the securities intermediary has expressly agreed with the other person that the property is to be treated as a financial asset under this division. As context requires, the term means either the interest itself or the means by which a person's claim to it is evidenced, including a certificated or uncertificated security, a security certificate, or a security entitlement.

[2] Security Interest of Unpaid Financial Intermediary

If a person buys a financial asset [*see Com. Code § 8102(a)(9)* (definition)] through a securities intermediary [*see Com. Code § 8102(a)(14)* (definition)] in a transaction in which the buyer is obligated to pay the purchase price to the securities intermediary at the time of the purchase, and the securities intermediary credits the financial asset to the buyer's securities account [*see Com. Code § 8501(a)* (definition)] before the buyer pays the securities intermediary, a security interest in favor of the securities intermediary attaches to the buyer's security entitlement [*Com. Code § 9206(a)*; *see Com. Code § 8102(a)(17)* (defining "securities entitlement")] securing the buyer's obligation to pay for the financial asset [*Com. Code § 9206(b)*]. A security agreement is not required for attachment or enforceability of that security interest [*Com. Code § 9203(c)*], and the security interest is automatically perfected by control [*Com. Code §*

9314(a); *see Com. Code §§ 8106(d), 9106(a),(c)* (defining "control" of security entitlements and securities accounts)].

If a certificated security [*see Com. Code § 8102(a)(4)* (definition)], or other financial asset [*see Com. Code § 8102(a)(9)* (definition)] represented by a writing that in the ordinary course of business is transferred by delivery with any necessary endorsement or assignment is delivered under an agreement between persons in the business of dealing with those securities or financial assets and the agreement calls for delivery against payment, a security interest in favor of the person who delivers the certificate or other financial asset attaches to the security or other financial asset securing the obligation to make payment for the delivery [*Com. Code § 9206(c)*]. A security agreement is not required for attachment or enforceability of the security interest [*Com. Code § 9203(c)*]; and the security interest is automatically perfected [*Com. Code § 9309(9)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.56

§ 503.56 Investment Property

[1] Perfection of Security Interests in Investment Property

[a] Definitions and Descriptions

"Investment property" means a security, whether certificated or uncertificated, security entitlement, securities account, commodity contract, or commodity account [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(49)*; *see also* related definitions, discussed in *§ 503.11[16]*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9108(e)*, in a security agreement or financing statement, a description of a security entitlement, securities account, or commodity account is sufficient if it describes either the collateral by those terms or as investment property or if it describes the underlying financial asset or commodity contract [*Com. Code § 9108(d)*]. In a consumer transaction, a description only by type of collateral defined in the Commercial Code is an insufficient description of a security entitlement, a securities account, or a commodity account [*Com. Code § 9108(d)(2)*]. Further, a description of investment property collateral also must meet the applicable requirements of *Civ. Code § 1799.103* [*Com. Code § 9108(f)*]. For discussion of sufficiency of description of collateral generally, see *§ 503.20[1]*.

[b] By Control or Filing

A security interest in investment property may be perfected by filing [*Com. Code § 9312(a)*], or by the secured party taking control of the collateral under *Com. Code § 9106*[*Com. Code § 9314(a)*; *see also Com. Code §§ 9203(b)(3)(D)* (when security interest in investment property becomes enforceable, discussed in *§ 503.21[2][a]*), 9310(b)(8) (filing not necessary to perfect security interest in investment property perfected by control)].

A person has control of a certificated security, uncertificated security, or security entitlement as provided in *Com. Code § 8106* [*Com. Code § 9106(a)*].

A secured party who is the commodity intermediary with which a commodity contract is carried has control of that

commodity contract [*Com. Code § 9106(b)(1)*]. A secured party also has control of a commodity contract if the commodity customer, secured party, and commodity intermediary have agreed that the commodity intermediary will apply any value distributed on account of the commodity contract as directed by the secured party without further consent by the commodity customer [*Com. Code § 9106(b)(2)*].

A secured party having control of all security entitlements or commodity contracts carried in a securities account or commodity account has control over the securities account or commodity account [*Com. Code § 9106(c)*].

A security interest in investment property is perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9106* from the time the secured party obtains control and remains perfected by control until both the secured party does not have control and one of the following occurs [*Com. Code § 9314(c)(2)*]:

- If the collateral is a certificated security, the debtor has or acquires possession of the security certificate.

- If the collateral is an uncertificated security, the issuer has registered or registers the debtor as the registered owner.

- If the collateral is a security entitlement, the debtor is or becomes the entitlement holder.

PRACTICE TIP:

Interest Perfected by Control Is Superior to Interest Perfected by Filing. A security interest in investment property, including certificated securities, uncertificated securities, security entitlements, and securities accounts, may be perfected by filing. However, security interests created by brokers, securities intermediaries, or commodity intermediaries are automatically perfected [*Com. Code § 9309(10), (11),* discussed in [d], *below*]; filing is of no effect. A security interest in all kinds of investment property may also be perfected by control [*Com. Code §§ 9106, 9314(a)*]; and a security interest in a certificated security also may be perfected by the secured party taking delivery under *Com. Code § 8301* [*see* [c], *below*] A security interest perfected only by filing is subordinate to a conflicting security interest perfected by control or delivery [*Com. Code § 9328(1), (5),* discussed in [3], *below*]. Thus, although filing is a permissible method of perfection, a secured party who perfects by filing takes the risk that the debtor has granted or will grant a security interest in the same collateral to another party who obtains control. In addition, perfection by filing would not give the secured party protection against other types of adverse claims, because Division 8's adverse claim cut-off rules [*Com. Code § 8510*] require control [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9312*].

[c] By Possession of Certificated Security

A secured party may perfect a security interest in certificated securities by taking delivery of the certificated securities under *Com. Code § 8301* [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*; *see Com. Code § 9310(b)(7)* (filing not necessary)]. A security interest in a certificated security in registered form is perfected by delivery when delivery of the certificated security occurs under *Com. Code § 8301* and remains perfected by delivery until the debtor obtains possession of the security certificate [*Com. Code § 9313(e)*; *see also Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)(C)* (when security interest in certificated security in registered form becomes enforceable, discussed in *§ 503.21[2][a]*)]. A person in possession of collateral is not required to acknowledge that it holds possession for a secured party's benefit [*Com. Code § 9313(f)*], but if a person acknowledges that it holds possession for the secured party's benefit, the acknowledgment is effective under *Com. Code § 8301(a),* even if the acknowledgment violates the rights of a debtor [*Com. Code § 9313(g)(1)*]. For delivery to occur when a person other than the secured party holds possession for the secured party, the person may not be a securities intermediary [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9313*].

A security interest in a certificated security is perfected without filing or the taking of possession or control for a period of 20 days from the time it attaches to the extent that it arises for new value given under an authenticated security agreement [*Com. Code § 9312(e)*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(57)* ("new value," discussed in *§ 503.11[24*]); *Com. Code § 9310(b)(5)*]. A perfected security interest in a certificated security remains perfected for 20 days without filing if the secured party delivers the security certificate to the debtor for the purpose of ultimate sale or exchange, presentation, collection, enforcement, renewal, or registration of transfer [*Com. Code § 9312(g)*; *see Com. Code § 9310(b)(5)*]. After either of those 20-day periods expires, perfection depends on compliance with Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9312(h)*].

Perfection of a securities intermediary's security interest in the buyer's certificated security or other financial asset [*Com. Code § 9206(c)*], which is perfected on attachment [*Com. Code § 9309(9)*], is discussed in *§ 503.55[2]*.

[d] Perfection of Security Interests Created by Broker or Intermediary on Attachment

A security interest in investment property created by a broker or securities intermediary is perfected on attachment [*Com. Code § 9309(10)*], as is a security interest in a commodity contract or a commodity account created by a commodity intermediary [*Com. Code § 9309(11)*]. Perfection of a securities intermediary's security interest in the buyer's certificated security or other financial asset [*Com. Code § 9206(c)*], which is perfected on attachment [*Com. Code § 9309(9)*], is discussed in *§ 503.55[2]*.

Com. Code § 9309(10) and *(11)* replace former *Com. Code § 9115(4)(c)* and *(d)* concerning secured financing of securities and commodity firms and clearing corporations. The former sections indicated that with respect to security interests created by a securities intermediary or a commodity intermediary, "[t]he filing of a financing statement ... has no effect for purposes of perfection or priority with respect to that security interest." No change in meaning is intended by deletion of the quoted phrase [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9309*].

Secured financing arrangements for securities firms are currently implemented in various ways. In some circumstances, lender may require that the transactions be structured as "hard pledges," in which the securities are transferred on the books of the clearing corporation from the debtor's account to the lender's account or to a special pledge account for the lender from which they cannot be disposed of without the specific consent of the lender. In other circumstances, lenders are content with so-called "agreement to pledge" or "agreement to deliver" arrangements, in which the debtor retains the positions in its own account, but reflects on its books that the positions have been hypothecated and promises that the securities will be transferred to the secured party's account on demand [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9309*]. The perfection and priority rules of Division 9 are designed to facilitate current secured financing arrangements for securities firms as well as to provide sufficient flexibility to accommodate new arrangements that develop in the future. Hard pledge arrangement are covered by the concept of control [*see Com. Code §§ 8106, 9106, 9314(a)*]. Non-control secured financing arrangements for securities firms are covered by the automatic perfection rule of *Com. Code § 9309(10)*. Before the 1994 revision of Divisions 8 and 9, agreement to pledge arrangements could be implemented under a provision that a security interest in securities given for new value under a written security agreement was perfected without filing or possession for 21 days. Although those security interests were temporary in legal theory, the financing arrangements, in practice, could be continued indefinitely by rolling over the loans at least every 21 days. Accordingly, a knowledgeable creditor of a securities firm realizes that the firms' securities may be subject to security interests that are not discoverable from the public records. The automatic perfection rule of *Com. Code § 9309(10)* makes it unnecessary to engage in the purely formal practice of rolling over these arrangements every 21 days [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9309*].

In some circumstances, a clearing corporation may be the debtor in a secured financing arrangement. For example, a clearing corporation that settles delivery-versus-payment transactions among its participants on a net, same-day basis relies on timely payment from all participants with net obligations due to the system. If a participant that was a net debtor were to default on its payment obligation, the clearing corporation would not receive some of the funds necessary to settle with participants that are net creditors to the system. To complete end-of-day settlement after a

payment default by a participant, a clearing corporation that settles on a net, same-day basis may need to draw on credit lines and pledge securities of the defaulting participant or other securities pledged by participants in the clearing corporation to secure those drawings. The clearing corporation may be the top-tier securities intermediary for the securities pledged, so that it would not be practical for the lender to obtain control. Even when the clearing corporation holds some types o securities through other intermediaries, however, the clearing corporation is unlikely to be able to complete the arrangements necessary to convey "control" over the securities to be pledged in time to complete settlement in a timely manner. However, the term "securities intermediary" is defined in *Com. Code § 8102(a)(14)* to include clearing corporations. Thus, the perfection rule of *Com. Code § 9309(10)* applies to security interests in investment property granted by clearing corporations [UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9309*].

[e] Perfection Includes Perfection in Entitlements and Commodity Contracts

Perfection of a security interest in a securities account also perfects a security interest in the security entitlements carried in the securities account [*Com. Code § 9308(f)*]. Perfection of a security interest in a commodity account also perfects a security interest in the commodity contracts carried in the commodity account [*Com. Code § 9308(g)*].

[2] Choice of Law Governing Perfection and Priority of Security Interests in Investment Property

[a] Perfection Under Law Where Debtor Is Located

The local law of the jurisdiction in which the debtor is located governs all of the following [*Com. Code § 9305(c)*]:

- Perfection of a security interest in investment property by filing.
- Automatic perfection of a security interest in investment property created by a broker or securities intermediary.
- Automatic perfection of a security interest in a commodity contract or commodity account created by a commodity intermediary.

[b] Certificated Securities

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9305(c)*, (discussed in [a], *above*), while a security certificate is located in a jurisdiction, the local law of that jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in the certificated security represented thereby [*Com. Code § 9305(a)(1)*].

[c] Uncertificated Securities

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9305(c)*, (discussed in [a], *above*), the local law of the issuer's jurisdiction as specified in *Com. Code § 8110(d)* governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in an uncertificated security [*Com. Code § 9305(a)(2)*]. "Issuer's jurisdiction" means the jurisdiction under which the issuer of the security is organized or, if permitted by the law of that jurisdiction, the law of another jurisdiction specified by the issuer. An issuer organized under California law may specify the law of another jurisdiction as the law governing the following matters [*Com. Code § 8110(a)(2)-(5), (d)*]:

- The rights and duties of the issuer with respect to registration of transfer.
- The effectiveness of registration of transfer by the issuer.
- Whether the issuer owes any duties to an adverse claimant to a security.

- Whether an adverse claim can be asserted against a person to whom transfer of a certificated or uncertificated security is registered or a person who obtains control of an uncertificated security.

[d] Securities Entitlements and Securities Accounts

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9305(c)*, (discussed in [a], *above*), the local law of the securities intermediary's jurisdiction as specified in *Com. Code § 8110(e)* governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in a security entitlement or securities account [*Com. Code § 9305(a)(3)*]. The following rules determine a "securities intermediary's jurisdiction" for purposes of *Com. Code § 8110* [*Com. Code § 8110(e)*]:

(1) If an agreement between the securities intermediary and its entitlement holder governing the securities account expressly provides that a particular jurisdiction is the security intermediary' s jurisdiction for purposes of this code, that jurisdiction is the securities intermediary's jurisdiction.

(2) If (1) does not apply and an agreement between the securities intermediary and its entitlement holder governing the securities account expressly provides that the agreement is governed by the law of a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the securities intermediary's jurisdiction.

(3) If neither (1) nor (2) applies and an agreement between the securities intermediary and its entitlement holder governing the securities account expressly provides that the securities account is maintained at an office in a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the securities intermediary's jurisdiction.

(4) If neither (1), (2), or (3) applies, the securities intermediary's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the office identified in an account statement as the office serving the entitlement holder's account is located.

(5) If none of the preceding rules applies, the securities intermediary's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the chief executive office of the securities intermediary is located.

[e] Commodity Contract or Commodity Account

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9305(c)*, (discussed in [a], *above*), the local law of the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in a commodity contract or commodity account [*Com. Code § 9305(a)(4)*]. The following rules determine a commodity intermediary's jurisdiction for purposes of *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342* [*Com. Code § 9305(b)*]:

(1) If an agreement between the commodity intermediary and commodity customer governing the commodity account expressly provides that a particular jurisdiction is the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction for purposes of *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*, Division 9, or the Commercial Code, that jurisdiction is the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction.

(2) If (1) does not apply and an agreement between the commodity intermediary and commodity customer governing the commodity account expressly provides that the agreement is governed by the law of a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction.

(3) If neither (1) nor (2) applies and an agreement between the commodity intermediary and commodity customer governing the commodity account expressly provides that the commodity account is maintained at an office in a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction.

(4) If neither (1), (2), or (3) applies, the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the office identified in an account statement as the office serving the commodity customer's account is located.

(5) If none of the preceding rules applies, the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the chief executive office of the commodity intermediary is located.

[3] Priority of Security Interests in Investment Property

A security interest of a secured party who has control of investment property under *Com. Code § 9106* (discussed in [1][b], *above*) has priority over a security interest held by a secured party who does not have control of the investment property [*Com. Code § 9328(1)*].

When conflicting security interests are held by secured parties each of which has control under *Com. Code § 9106*, except as otherwise provided with respect to security interests held by a securities intermediary or a commodity intermediary [*see Com. Code § 9328(3)* and *(4), below*], the security interests rank according to priority in time of one of the following [*Com. Code § 9328(2)*]:

- If the collateral is a security, obtaining control.

- If the collateral is a security entitlement carried in a securities account and if the secured party obtained control under *Com. Code § 8106(d)(1)*, the secured party's becoming the person for which the securities account is maintained.

- If the collateral is a security entitlement carried in a securities account and if the secured party obtained control under *Com. Code § 8106(d)(2)*, the securities intermediary's agreement to comply with the secured party's entitlement orders with respect to security entitlements carried, or to be carried, in the securities account.

- If the collateral is a security entitlement carried in a securities account and if the secured party obtained control through another person under *Com. Code § 8106(d)(3)*, the time on which priority would be based under this paragraph if the other person were the secured party.

- If the collateral is a commodity contract carried with a commodity intermediary, the satisfaction of the requirement for control specified in *Com. Code § 9106(b)(2)* (discussed in [1][b], *above*) with respect to commodity contracts carried, or to be carried, with the commodity intermediary.

A security interest held by a securities intermediary in a security entitlement or a securities account maintained with the securities intermediary has priority over a conflicting security interest held by another secured party [*Com. Code § 9328(3)*]; and a security interest held by a commodity intermediary in a commodity contract or a commodity account maintained with the commodity intermediary has priority over a conflicting security interest held by another secured party [*Com. Code § 9328(4)*]. A security interest in a certificated security in registered form which is perfected by taking delivery under *Com. Code § 9313(a)* and not by control under *Com. Code § 9314* has priority over a conflicting security interest perfected by a method other than control [*Com. Code § 9328(5)*]. Conflicting security interests created by a broker, securities intermediary, or commodity intermediary which are perfected without control under *Com. Code § 9106* rank equally [*Com. Code § 9328(6)*].

In all other cases, priority among conflicting security interests in investment property is governed by *Com. Code §§ 9322* and *9323*, discussed in *§§ 503.24[1], [2][a], [b], [d], 503.40[5][a], [b]* [*Com. Code § 9328(7)*; *see also Com.*

Code § 9331, discussed in *§ 503.24[3][d]*].

[4] Secured Party's Duty When Investment Property No Longer Secures Any Obligation

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party having control of investment property under *Com. Code § 8106(d)(2)* or under *Com. Code § 9106(b)* must send to the securities intermediary or commodity intermediary with which the security entitlement or commodity contract is maintained an authenticated record that releases the securities intermediary or commodity intermediary from any further obligation to comply with entitlement orders or directions originated by the secured party. This must be done within 10 days after the secured party receives an authenticated demand by the debtor [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.57

§ 503.57 Collateral of Transmitting Utilities

[1] "Transmitting Utility" Defined

"Transmitting utility" means a person primarily engaged in the business of any of the following [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(80)*]:

- Operating a railroad, subway, street railway, or trolley bus.
- Transmitting communications electrically, electromagnetically, or by light.
- Transmitting goods by pipeline or sewer.
- Transmitting or producing and transmitting electricity, steam, gas, or water.

[2] Financing Statement for Utility's Collateral

[a] Place of Filing

The proper place to file in order to perfect a security interest in collateral, including fixtures, of a transmitting utility, is the office of the Secretary of State. The financing statement also constitutes a fixture filing as to the collateral indicated in the financing statement which is or is to become fixtures [*Com. Code § 9501(b)*].

[b] May Be Effective Until Termination Statement Filed

If the debtor is a transmitting utility, and the filed financing statement so indicates, the financing statement is effective until a termination statement is filed [*Com. Code § 9515(f)*]. Except that a record authorized by one secured party of record does not affect the financing statement with respect to another secured party of record [*see Com. Code § 9510(b)*], the filing with the filing office of a termination statement relating to a financing statement that indicates that the debtor is a transmitting utility also causes the effectiveness of the financing statement to lapse for the following

purposes [*Com. Code § 9513(d)*]:

- The time when filing office may remove debtor's name from the index [*see Com. Code § 9519(g)*].

- The time the filing office is required to retain retrievable information with regard to financing statements [*see Com. Code § 9522(a)*].

- Providing acknowledgments of filings [*see Com. Code § 9523(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.58

§ 503.58 Bank Deposits

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Deposit Account

"Deposit account" means a demand, time, savings, passbook, or similar account maintained with a bank, but does not include investment property or accounts evidenced by an instrument [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(29)*]. Division 9 does not apply to an assignment of a deposit account in a consumer transaction, except to the extent that *Com. Code §§ 9315* and *9322* apply with respect to proceeds and priorities in proceeds [*Com. Code § 9109(d)(13), set forth in § 503.13[2]*]. Because a "deposit account" is a separate type of collateral, a security agreement covering general intangibles will not adequately describe deposit accounts. A security agreement must reasonably identify the deposit accounts that are the subject to the security interest, e.g., by using the term "deposit accounts" [*see* UCC Comment 16 to *Com. Code § 9109*].

Except with respect to perfection of security interests in proceeds [*see Com. Code § 9315(c), (d)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[7]*], a security interest in a deposit account may be perfected only by control under *Com. Code § 9314* [*Com. Code § 9312(b)(1)*]. A security interest in a deposit account is perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9104* when the secured party obtains control and remains perfected by control only while the secured party retains control [*Com. Code § 9314(a), (b)*]. A secured party has control of a deposit account if any of the following conditions is satisfied [*Com. Code § 9104(a)*]:

- The secured party is the bank with which the deposit account is maintained [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(8)* ("bank" means an organization that is engaged in the business of banking, including savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, and trust companies)].

- The debtor, secured party, and bank have agreed in an authenticated record that the bank will comply with instructions originated by the secured party directing disposition of the funds in the account without further consent by the debtor. Division 9 does not require a bank to enter into an agreement of this kind, even if its customer so requests or directs. A bank that has entered into such an agreement is not required to confirm the existence of the agreement to another person unless requested to do so by its customer [*Com. Code § 9342*].

- The secured party becomes the bank's customer with respect to the deposit account.

A secured party that has satisfied *Com. Code § 9104(a)* has control, even if the debtor retains the right to direct the disposition of funds from the deposit account [*Com. Code § 9104(b)*].

For discussion of a secured party's right to require payment of the balance of a deposit account to it on default as provided by *Com. Code § 9607(a)(4)* and *(5)*, see *§ 503.27[3][a]*.

[2] Choice of Law Governing Interests in Deposit Accounts

[a] Originally

The local law of a bank's jurisdiction, specifically, the jurisdiction in which the office identified in an account statement as the office serving the customer's account is located, governs perfection the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in a deposit account maintained with that bank [*Com. Code § 9304(a), (b)(4)*]. If no office is identified in the account statement as the office serving the customer's account, the bank's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction in which the chief executive office of the bank is located [*Com. Code § 9304(b)(5)*]. However, the parties may agree otherwise, as follows:

- If an agreement between the bank and its customer governing the deposit account expressly provides that a particular jurisdiction is the bank's jurisdiction for purposes of *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*, Division 9, or the Commercial Code, that jurisdiction is the bank's jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9304(b)(1)*].

- If an agreement between the bank and its customer governing the deposit account expressly provides that the agreement is governed by the law of a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the bank's jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9304(b)(2)*].

- If an agreement between the bank and its customer governing the deposit account expressly provides that the deposit account is maintained at an office in a particular jurisdiction, that jurisdiction is the bank's jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9304(b)(3)*].

[b] Change Due to Change of Bank's Jurisdiction

A security interest in deposit accounts, letter-of-credit rights, or investment property, which is perfected under the law of the bank's jurisdiction, the issuer's jurisdiction, a nominated person's jurisdiction, the securities intermediary's jurisdiction, or the commodity intermediary's jurisdiction, as applicable, remains perfected until the earlier of (1) the time the security interest would have become unperfected under the law of that jurisdiction, or (2) the expiration of four months after a change of the applicable jurisdiction to another jurisdiction [*Com. Code § 9316(f)*]. This four-month period is deemed long enough for a secured party to discover in most cases that the law of a different jurisdiction governs perfection and to reperfect under the law of that jurisdiction. If the secured party properly reperfects before its interest becomes unperfected, the security interest remains perfect continuously thereafter [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9316*]. If a security interest described in *Com. Code § 9316(f)* becomes perfected under the law of the other jurisdiction before the earlier of the time or the end of the period described in that subdivision, it remains perfected thereafter. If the security interest does not become perfected under the law of the other jurisdiction before the earlier of that time or the end of that period, it becomes unperfected and is deemed never to have been perfected as against a purchaser of the collateral for value [*Com. Code § 9316(g)*].

[3] Priorities of Security Interests in Deposit Accounts

A security interest held by a secured party having control of the deposit account under *Com. Code § 9104* has priority

over a conflicting security interest held by a secured party that does not have control [*Com. Code § 9327(1)*], such as a security interest in identifiable cash proceeds under *Com. Code § 9315*, discussed in *§§ 503.21[4]* and *503.22[7]* [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9327*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327(3)* and *(4)*, security interests perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9314* rank according to priority in time of obtaining control [*Com. Code § 9327(2)*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9327(4)*, a security interest held by the bank with which the deposit account is maintained has priority over conflicting security interest held by another secured party [*Com. Code § 9327(3)*]. A security interest perfected by the secured party's becoming the bank's customer with respect to the deposit account [*see Com. Code § 9104(a)(3)*] has priority over a security interest held by the bank with which the deposit account is maintained [*Com. Code § 9327(4)*]. A secured party who claims a deposit account as proceeds of other collateral can reduce the risk of becoming junior by obtaining (1) the debtor's agreement to deposit proceeds into a specific cash-collateral account and (2) the bank's agreement to subordinate all its claims to those of the secured party [*see* UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9327*].

Com. Code § 9327 overrides conflicting priority rules, such as *Com. Code §§ 9322(f)(1)* (agricultural liens), *9324(a),(b), (d), (f)* (purchase money security interests) [*see* UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9327*]. The priority afforded by *Com. Code § 9327* does not extend to proceeds of a deposit account. Rather, *Com. Code § 9322(c)-(e)* and the provisions referred to in *Com. Code § 9322(f)* govern priorities in proceeds of a deposit account [*see* discussion in *§ 503.24[2][b]*]. *Com. Code § 9315(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[7]*, addresses continuation of perfection in proceeds of deposit accounts. For discussion of funds transferred from deposit accounts that constitute collateral, see *Com. Code § 9332*, discussed in [4], *below* [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9327*].

[4] Transferee of Money From Deposit Account Takes Free of Security Interest

A transferee of funds from a deposit account takes the funds free of a security interest in the deposit account unless the transferee acts in collusion with the debtor in violating the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9332(b)*]. For discussion of rights and remedies in a case of collusion between the debtor and a transferee, see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances* .

An unsecured judgment creditor of the owner of a deposit account becomes a "transferee" under *Com. Code § 9332(b)* on obtaining funds from the account pursuant to a writ of execution [*Orix Financial Services, Inc. v. Kovacs (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 242, 245-246, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900*].

[5] Bank's Right to Recoupment or Set-off

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9340(c)*, a bank with which a deposit account is maintained may exercise any right of recoupment or setoff against a secured party that holds a security interest in the deposit account [*Com. Code § 9340(a)*]. Similarly, except as otherwise provided *Com. Code § 9340(c)*, the application of Division 9 to a security interest in a deposit account does not affect a right of recoupment or setoff of the secured party as to a deposit account maintained with the secured party [*Com. Code § 9340(b)*]. However, a bank's exercise of a setoff against a deposit account is ineffective against a secured party that holds a security interest in the deposit account which was perfected by the secured party's becoming the bank's customer with respect to the deposit account [*see Com. Code § 9104(a)(3)*], if the setoff is based on a claim against the debtor [*Com. Code § 9340(c)*; *see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9340* (bank's right of set-off for debt owed to it by secured party is preserved)].

Com. Code § 9340 deals with rights of set-off and recoupment that a bank may have under other law. It does not create a right of set-off or recoupment, nor is it intended to override any limitations or restrictions that other law imposes on the exercise of those rights [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9340*].

[6] Bank's Rights and Duties With Respect to Deposit Account

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9340(c)*, discussed in [5], *above*, and unless the bank otherwise agrees in an authenticated record, a bank's rights and duties with respect to a deposit account maintained with the bank are not terminated, suspended, or modified by (1) the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in the deposit account, (2) the bank's knowledge of the security interest, or (3) the bank's receipt of instructions from the secured party [*Com. Code § 9341*].

Com. Code § 9341 does not address the obligations of banks that issue instruments evidencing deposits, such as certain certificates of deposit [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9341*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(29)* (defining "deposit account" to exclude investment property or accounts evidenced by an instrument)]. *Com. Code § 9341* is designed to prevent security interests from impeding the free flow of funds. A secured party who wishes to deprive the debtor of access to the funds on deposit or to appropriate those funds for itself needs to obtain the agreement of the bank, utilize the judicial process, or comply with the procedures set forth in other law [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9341*].

Division 9 does not determine whether a bank that pays out funds from an encumbered deposit is liable to the holder of a security interest. Although the fact that a secured party has control over the deposit account and the manner by which control was achieved may be relevant to the imposition of liability, whatever rule applies generally when a bank pays out funds in which a third party has an interest would determine liability to a secured party. That rule is usually found in a non-UCC adverse claim statute [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9341*].

[7] Secured Party's Duties When Deposit No Longer Secures Any Obligation

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party having control of a deposit account under *Com. Code § 9104(a)(2)* (agreement between bank, debtor, and secured party, discussed in [1], *above*) must send to the bank with which the deposit account is maintained, within 10 days after receiving an authenticated demand by the debtor, an authenticated statement that releases the bank from any further obligation to comply with instructions originated by the secured party [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(1)*].

In the case of a secured party having control of a deposit account under *Com. Code § 9104(a)(3)* (secured party is bank's customer with respect to the deposit account, discussed in [1], *above*), if there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party must, within 10 days after receiving an authenticated demand by the debtor, either pay the debtor the balance on deposit in the deposit account or transfer the balance on deposit into a deposit account in the debtor's name [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.59

§ 503.59 Letter-of-Credit Rights

[1] Perfection of Security Interest in Letter-of-Credit Rights

[a] In General

"Letter-of-credit right" means a right to payment or performance under a letter of credit, whether or not the beneficiary has demanded or is at the time entitled to demand payment or performance, but does not include the right of a beneficiary to demand payment or performance under a letter of credit [*Com. Code § 9102(a)(51)*; *see Com. Code § 5102* (defining letter of credit)]. Transfer of a beneficiary's right to demand payment or performance is governed by Division 5 [UCC Comment 5 e to *Com. Code § 9102*]. The Division 9 definition of letter-of-credit right is consistent with *Com. Code § 9109(c)(4)*, which provides that Division 9 does not apply to the extent that the rights of a transferee beneficiary or nominated person under a letter of credit are independent and superior under *Com. Code § 5114*. For discussion, procedural guides and forms relating to letters of credit, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 56, *Letters of Credit and Electronic Fund Transfers* (Matthew Bender).

Except with respect to perfection of security interests in proceeds [*see Com. Code § 9315(c), (d)*, discussed in *§ 503.22[7]*], and as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9308(d)* (perfection of a security interest in collateral also perfects a security interest in a supporting obligation for that collateral, discussed in *§ 503.22[1]*), a security interest in a letter-of-credit right may be perfected only by control under *Com. Code § 9314*[*Com. Code § 9312(b)(2)*]. A security interest in a letter-of-credit right is perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9107* when the secured party obtains control and remains perfected by control only while the secured party retains control [*Com. Code § 9314(b)*]. A secured party has control of a letter-of-credit right to the extent of any right to payment or performance by the issuer or any nominated person if the issuer or nominated person has consented to an assignment of proceeds of the letter of credit under *Com. Code § 5114(c)* or otherwise applicable law or practice [*Com. Code § 9107*]. To obtain control under *Com. Code § 9107*, the secured party will have to obtain consent from anyone who is obligated to give value under the letter of credit. In many cases the person or persons (issuer or nominated person) who will give value under a letter of credit will be clear from the terms of the letter of credit. In other cases, prudence may suggest obtaining consent from more than one person [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9107*].

Com. Code § 5114(c) follows traditional banking terminology by referring to a letter of credit beneficiary's assignment of its right to receive payment under the letter of credit as an assignment of the "proceeds of a letter of credit." As the seller of goods can assign its right to receive payment (an "account") before it has been earned by delivering the goods to the buyer, so the beneficiary of a letter of credit can assign its contingent right to payment before the letter of credit has been honored. If the assignment creates a security interest, the security interest can be perfected at the time it is created. An assignment of, including creation of a security interest in, a letter-of-credit right is an assignment of a present interest [UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9107*]. Letter of credit law and practice distinguish between transfers and assignment. Under an transfer, the transferee itself becomes the beneficiary and acquires the right to draw. Whether a new, substitute credit is issued or the issuer advises the transferee of its status as such, the transfer constitutes a novation under which the transferee is the new, substituted beneficiary, to the extent of the transfer. *Com. Code § 5114(e)* provides that the rights of a transferee beneficiary or nominated person are independent of the beneficiary's assignment of the proceeds [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9107*].

[b] As Supporting Obligation

A letter-of-credit right is a supporting obligation as defined in *Com. Code § 9102(a)(77)*. Under *Com. Code § 9203* and *Com. Code § 9308(d)* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.22[1]*], a security interest in a letter-of-credit right automatically attaches and is automatically perfected if the security interest in the supported obligation is a perfected security interest. However, unless the secured party has control of the letter-of-credit right or itself becomes a transferee beneficiary, it cannot obtain any rights against the issuer or nominated person under Division 5. Thus, as a practical matter, the secured party's rights would be limited to its ability to locate and identify proceeds distributed by the issuer of nominated person under the letter of credit [UCC Comment 5 to *Com. Code § 9107*].

[2] Choice of Law Governing Interests in Letter-of-Credit Rights

Subject to *Com. Code § 9306(c)*, the local law of the issuer's jurisdiction or a nominated person's jurisdiction governs perfection, the effect of perfection or nonperfection, and the priority of a security interest in a letter-of-credit right if the issuer's jurisdiction or nominated person's jurisdiction is a state *Com. Code § 9306(a)*]. For purposes of *Com. Code §§ 9301-9342*, an issuer's jurisdiction or nominated person's jurisdiction is the jurisdiction whose law governs the liability of the issuer or nominated person with respect to the letter-of-credit right as provided in *Com. Code § 5116* [*Com. Code § 9306(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9306* does not apply to a security interest that is perfected only under *Com. Code § 9308(d)* (perfection of security interest in collateral also perfects security interest in supporting obligation for the collateral) [*Com. Code § 9306(c)*].

If the jurisdiction whose law governs security interest in a letter-of-credit right changes, due to a change in the issuer's jurisdiction, the security interest will remain perfected or require to be reperfected in accordance with *Com. Code § 9316(f)* and *(g)*, discussed in *§ 503.58[2]*.

[3] Priority of Security Interests in Letter-of-Credit Rights

A security interest held by a secured party having control of the letter-of-credit right under *Com. Code § 9107* has priority to the extent of its control over a conflicting security interest held by a secured party that does not have control [*Com. Code § 9329(1)*], such as one that is perfected automatically under *Com. Code § 9308(d)*. This is consistent with international letter-of-credit practice and provides finality to payments made to recognized assignees of letter-of-credit proceeds [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9329*].

Security interests perfected by control under *Com. Code § 9314* rank according to priority in time of obtaining control [*Com. Code § 9329(2)*]. If the issuer or nominated person recognizes multiple security interests in the letter-of-credit proceeds, resulting in multiple parties having control, the security interests rank according to time of obtaining control [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9329*].

[4] Secured Party's Duties When Letter-of-Credit Right No Longer Secures Any Obligation

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, a secured party having control of a letter-of-credit right under *Com. Code § 9107* must send to each person having an unfulfilled obligation to pay or deliver proceeds of the letter of credit to the secured party an authenticated release from any further obligation to pay or deliver proceeds of the letter of credit to the secured party. The release must be sent within 10 days after the secured party receives an authenticated demand for it from the debtor [*Com. Code § 9208(a), (b)(5)*].

[5] Ineffectiveness of Term Against Assignment of Letter-of-Credit Right

A term in a letter of credit or a rule of law, statute, regulation, custom, or practice applicable to the letter of credit which prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of an applicant, issuer, or nominated person to a beneficiary's assignment of or creation of a security interest in a letter-of-credit right is ineffective to the extent that the term or rule of law, statute, regulation, custom, or practice does, or would (1) impair the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in the letter-of-credit right, or (2) provide that the assignment or the creation, attachment, or perfection of the security interest may give rise to a default, breach, right of recoupment, claim, defense, termination, right of termination, or remedy under the letter-of-credit right [*Com. Code § 9409(a)*]. The automatic attachment and perfection of a security interest in a letter-of-credit right under *Com. Code § 9203* and *Com. Code § 9308(d)* (*see* discussion in *§ 503.22[1]*) would anomalous or misleading if, under other law, such as Division 5, a restriction on transfer or assignment were effective to block attachment and perfection [UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9409*].

To the extent that a term in a letter of credit is ineffective under *Com. Code § 9409(a),* but would be effective under law other than Division 9 or a custom or practice applicable to the letter of credit, to the transfer of a right to draw or otherwise demand performance under the letter of credit, or to the assignment of a right to proceeds of the letter of credit, all of the following rules apply with respect to the creation, attachment, or perfection of a security interest in the letter-of-credit right [*Com. Code § 9409(b)*; *see Com. Code §§ 5112, 5114*; UCC Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9409*]:

- It is not enforceable against the applicant, issuer, nominated person, or transferee beneficiary.

- It imposes no duties or obligations on the applicant, issuer, nominated person, or transferee beneficiary.

- It does not require the applicant, issuer, nominated person, or transferee beneficiary to recognize the security interest, pay or render performance to the secured party, or accept payment or other performance from the secured party.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.60

§ 503.60 Assignments of Accounts, Chattel Paper, General Intangibles, and Promissory Notes

[1] Ineffectiveness of Agreement Against Assignment

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9406(e)* with respect to sales of payment intangibles or promissory notes, and in *Com. Code §§ 9407* and *10303* with respect to leases, and subject to *Com. Code § 9406(h)*, a term in an agreement between an account debtor and an assignor or in a promissory note is ineffective to the extent that it either [*Com. Code § 9406(d)*; *but see Com. Code § 9406(e)* (*Com. Code § 9406(d)* does not apply to sale of payment intangible or promissory note, discussed in *§ 503.52*)]:

- Prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of the account debtor or person obligated on the promissory note to the assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of a security interest in, the account, chattel paper, payment intangible, or promissory note; or

- Provides that the assignment or transfer or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of the security interest may give rise to a default, breach, right of recoupment, claim, defense, termination, right of termination, or remedy under the account, chattel paper, payment intangible, or promissory note.

Similarly, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code §§ 9407* and *10303* with respect to leases, and subject to *Com. Code § 9406(h)* and *(i)* [*see Com. Code § 9406(h)* (*Com. Code § 9406* is subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes); *Com. Code § 9406(i)* (*Com. Code § 9406* does not apply to an assignment of a health care insurance receivable)], a rule of law, statute, or regulation, that prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of a government, governmental body or official, or account debtor to the assignment or transfer of, or creation of a security interest in, an account or chattel paper is ineffective to the extent that the rule of law, statute, or regulation either [*Com. Code § 9406(f)*; *see Com. Code § 9406(j)*]:

- Prohibits, restricts, or requires the consent of the government, governmental body or official, or account debtor to the assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of

a security interest in, the account or chattel paper; or

- Provides that the assignment or transfer or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of the security interest may give rise to a default, breach, right of recoupment, claim, defense, termination, right of termination, or remedy under the account or chattel paper.

Com. Code § 9406(f) is not applicable to an assignment or transfer of, or the creation, attachment, perfection, or enforcement of a security interest in, a right to receive workers' compensation benefits or personal injury awards as described in 26 U.S.C. § 1049a)(1) and (2), or a claim or right to receive benefits under a special needs trust as described in *42 U.S.C. § 1396p(d)(4)* to the extent that *Com. Code § 9406(f)* is inconsistent with those laws [*Com. Code § 9406(j)*].

Subject to *Com. Code § 9406(h)* (account debtor in consumer transaction), an account debtor may not waive or vary its option under *Com. Code § 9406(b)(3)*, discussed in [5], *below*, to make partial payments to the assignee [*Com. Code § 9406(g)*].

[2] Security Interest Perfected on Attachment

An assignment of accounts or payment intangibles which does not by itself or in conjunction with other assignments to the same assignee transfer a significant part of the assignor's outstanding accounts or payment intangibles is perfected when it attaches [*Com. Code § 9309(2)*].

[3] Assignee's Position Against Account Debtor

Except with respect to assignments of health care insurance receivables [*Com. Code § 9404(e)*], unless an account debtor has made an enforceable agreement not to assert defenses or claims, and subject to *Com. Code § 9404(b)-(d)*, inclusive, the rights of an assignee are subject to (1) all terms of the agreement between the account debtor and assignor and any defense or claim in recoupment arising from the transaction that gave rise to the contract, and (2) any other defense or claim of the account debtor against the assignor which accrues before the account debtor receives a notification of the assignment authenticated by the assignor or the assignee [*Com. Code § 9404(a)*]. For discussion of why tortfeasors, banks, and persons obligated under letters of credit are not "account debtors" for purposes of *Com. Code § 9404(a)*, see UCC Comment 5 d to *Com. Code § 9102*, discussed in *§ 503.11[12]*.

Subject to *Com. Code § 9404(c)* (consumer transactions) and except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 9404(d)*, the claim of an account debtor against an assignor may be asserted against an assignee under *Com. Code § 9404(a)* only to reduce the amount the account debtor owes [*Com. Code § 9404(b)*].

Com. Code § 9404 is subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9404(c)*]. In a consumer transaction, if a record evidences the account debtor's obligation, law other than Division 9 requires that the record include a statement to the effect that the account debtor's recovery against an assignee with respect to claims and defenses against the assignor may not exceed amounts paid by the account debtor under the record, and the record does not include such a statement, the extent to which a claim of an account debtor against the assignor may be asserted against an assignee is determined as if the record included such a statement [*Com. Code § 9404(d)*]. *Com. Code § 9404(d)* applies to rights evidenced by a record that is required to contain the notice set out in Federal Trade Commission Rule 433 [*see 16 C.F.R. § 433.1 et seq.*, discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*]. Thus, *Com. Code § 9404(d)* a consumer account debtor has the same right to an affirmative recovery from an assignee of such a record as the consumer would have had against the assignee has the record contained the required notice [UCC Comment 4 to *Com. Code § 9404*].

[4] Modifications by Original Parties After Assignment

Except with respect to assignments of health care insurance receivables [*Com. Code § 9405(d)*], and subject to *Com. Code § 9405(b), (c)*, a modification of or substitution for an assigned contract is effective against an assignee if made in good faith. The assignee acquires corresponding rights under the modified or substituted contract. The assignment may provide that the modification or substitution is a breach of contract by the assignor [*Com. Code § 9405(a)*].

The preceding rule applies to the extent that the right to all or part of a payment under an assigned contract has not been fully earned by performance, or the right to all or part of a payment has been fully earned by performance and the account debtor has not received notification of the assignment under *Com. Code § 9406(a)* [*Com. Code § 9405(b)*]. *Com. Code § 9405* is subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9405(c)*].

[5] Account Debtor's Payments on Assignment

Subject to *Com. Code § 9406(b)-(i)*, inclusive, an account debtor on an account, chattel paper, or a payment intangible may discharge its obligation by paying the assignor until, but not after, the account debtor receives a notification, authenticated by the assignor or the assignee, that the amount due or to become due has been assigned and that payment is to be made to the assignee. After receipt of the notification, the account debtor may discharge its obligation by paying the assignee and may not discharge the obligation by paying the assignor [*Com. Code § 9406(a)*]. The preceding rule is subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9406(h)*].

Except in the case of an assignment of a health care insurance receivable [*see Com. Code § 9406(i)*; *§ 503.54[2]*], notification is ineffective under *Com. Code § 9406(a)* as follows [*Com. Code § 9406(b)*]:

- If it does not reasonably identify the rights assigned.

- To the extent that an agreement between an account debtor and a seller of a payment intangible limits the account debtor's duty to pay a person other than the seller and the limitation is effective under law other than Division 9.

- At the option of an account debtor, if the notification notifies the account debtor to make less than the full amount of any installment or other periodic payment to the assignee, even if (1) only a portion of the account, chattel paper, or payment intangible has been assigned to that assignee, (2) a portion has been assigned to another assignee, or (3) the account debtor knows that the assignment to that assignee is limited.

Subject to law other than Division 9 which establishes a different rule for an account debtor who is an individual and who incurred the obligation primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*Com. Code § 9406(h)*], if requested by the account debtor, an assignee must seasonably furnish reasonable proof that the assignment has been made. Unless the assignee complies, the account debtor may discharge its obligation by paying the assignor, even if the account debtor has received a notification under *Com. Code § 9406(a)* [*Com. Code § 9406(c)*].

If an account debtor uses a payment agent, the agent does not have the same obligations as the account debtor under *Com. Code § 9406* (or under principles of agency law) [*Nationwide Transp. Fin. v. Cass Info. Sys. (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 1051, 1065*].

[6] Secured Party's Right to Collect on Default Under Accounts Collateral

When so agreed, and in any event on default, the secured party is entitled to notify an account debtor to make payment to the secured party whether or not the assignor was then making collections on the collateral, and also to take control of any proceeds to which the secured party is entitled under *Com. Code § 9608* [*Com. Code § 9607(a)*].

[7] Secured Party's Duty to Release Debtor After Assignment When Obligation Has Been Satisfied

If there is no outstanding secured obligation and the secured party is not committed to make further advances, incur obligations, or otherwise give value, within 10 days after receiving an authenticated demand by the debtor, a secured party must send to an account debtor that has received notification of an assignment to that secured party as assignee under *Com. Code § 9406(a)*, an authenticated record that releases the account debtor from any further obligation to the secured party [*Com. Code § 9209(a), (b)*]. The preceding rule does not apply to an assignment constituting the sale of an account, chattel paper, or payment intangible [*Com. Code § 9209(c)*].

148 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Transactions in Particular Collateral

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.61-503.69

[Reserved]

§§ 503.61[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.70

§ 503.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Bender's Forms of Discovery

For interrogatories relating to actions on secured transactions, see the following chapters of Bender's Forms of Discovery (Matthew Bender):

Ch. 172, *Secured Transactions*

Ch. 208, *Uniform Commercial Code*

[2] California Legal Forms

For discussion and transactional forms concerning secured transactions and related topics discussed in this chapter, see the following chapters of California Legal Forms (Matthew Bender):

Ch. 42, *Secured Transactions*

Ch. 43, *Commercial Loans*

Ch. 44, *Accounts Receivable Financing and Factoring*

Ch. 45, *Consumer Installment Loans and Credit Sales*

Ch. 49, *Agricultural Transactions*

Ch. 52, *Sales of Goods Under the Uniform Commercial Code*

Ch. 53, *Personal Property Leasing*

Ch. 55, *Negotiable Instruments*

Ch. 56, *Letters of Credit and Electronic Fund Transfers*

[3] California Real Estate Law and Practice

For discussion of personal property security when it is affixed as part of secured real estate, see California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 111, *Deeds of Trust and Mortgages* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of remedies and litigation, see California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 121, *Priority of Liens* , and Ch. 122, *Antideficiency Legislation* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of security interests in connection with real estate leases, see California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 202, *Fixtures in Landlord-Tenant Context* , and Ch. 203, *Security Deposits* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion on security interests in connection with ownership rights, see California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 342, *Fixtures* (Matthew Bender)

[4] Other Matthew Bender Publications

California Points and Authorities, Ch. 166, *Negotiable Instruments* (Matthew Bender)

McDonnell, Secured Transactions Under the Uniform Commercial Code (Matthew Bender)

McDonnell, Uniform Commercial Code Analysis of Revised Article 9 (Matthew Bender 1999)

Hart & Willier, Forms and Procedures Under the Uniform Commercial Code (Matthew Bender)

Article Rev 9, *Secured Transactions* (post-July 1, 2001 law).

Article 9, *Secured Transactions* (pre-July 1, 2001 law).

Rabkin & Johnson, Current Legal Forms With Tax Analysis, Ch. 6, *Credit and Finance* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.71

§ 503.71 Federal Statutes

Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act. *7 U.S.C. § 499a et seq.*

Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. *50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.72

§ 503.72 State Statutes

[1] Applicability of Civil Procedure Laws to Secured Transactions

Inapplicability of attachment procedure to security interests subject to Division 9 of Commercial Code, except to extent security has become valueless without creditor's fault. *Code Civ. Proc. § 483.010(b)*

Writ of possession is available for wrongfully detained personalty. *Code Civ. Proc. § 512.010*

Enforcement of judgments for possession or sale of personal property by writ of execution. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 699.530, 714.010, 714.020*

Unavailability of exemption from execution on judgment for foreclosure of lien or encumbrance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010(b)*

Third-party claim procedure to preserve priority of security interest in property over another's claims. *Code Civ. Proc. § 720.210 et seq.*

One form of action required when creditor holds both real property and personal property security interests for same obligation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*

Stay of judicially ordered delivery or sale of personal property only on special undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.2*

Suspension of certain civil obligations and liabilities of national-guard and military-reserve members during qualifying periods of military service after September 11, 2001. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*

[2] Applicability of Realty Security Laws to Secured Transactions

Inapplicability of mortgage statutes to secured transactions governed by Commercial Code. *Civ. Code § 2914, 2944* (

but cf. Com. Code §§ 9109(d)(2), (11), 9334, 9501, 9502, 9504, 9604(a)(1)(B) (fixture filings and foreclosure of mixed collateral))

[3] Applicability of Other Divisions of Commercial Code

[a] General Definitions

"Agreement." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(3)*

"Buyer in ordinary course of business." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*

"Contract." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(12)*

"Creditor." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(13)*

"Delivery." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(15)*

"Good faith." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(20)*

"Money." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(24)*

"Notice." *Com. Code § 1202*

"Organization." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(25)*

"Purchase." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(29)*

"Purchaser." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(30)*

"Remedy." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(32)*

"Security Interest." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(35)*

"Value." *Com. Code § 1204*

"Warehouse receipt." *Com. Code § 1201(b)(42)*

[b] Construction of Code

Liberal construction of code and of remedies provided in code. *Com. Code §§ 1103(a), 1305(a)*

Purposes and policies of code. *Com. Code § 1103(a)*

Principles of law and equity supplement code. *Com. Code § 1103(b)*

Rule against implicit repeal by subsequent legislation. *Com. Code § 1104*

Parties' power to vary code provisions, except the obligations of good faith, diligence, reasonableness, and care. *Com. Code § 1302(a), (b)*

[c] Sales

Division 2 applies to transactions in goods, except it does not apply to any transaction which, although in form of an unconditional contract to sell or present sale, is intended to operate only as a security transaction, nor does Division 2 impair or repeal any statute regulating sales to consumers, farmers or other specified classes of buyers. *Com. Code § 2102*

Reservation of security interest on passage of title. *Com. Code § 2401(1), (2)*

Reservation of security interest through bill of lading. *Com. Code § 2505(1)(b), (2)*

"Person in position of seller" including holder of security interest. *Com. Code § 2707(1)*

Buyer's security interest on rejection of goods or justifiable revocation. *Com. Code § 2711(3)*

Buyer's right of replevin for goods identified to contract or shipped under reservation and satisfaction of the security interest in them has been made or tendered. *Com. Code § 2716(3)*

[d] Commercial Paper

Transfer of instrument. *Com. Code §§ 3203, 3303*

Holder of instrument. *Com. Code §§ 3203, 3204, 3302*

[e] Bank Deposits and Collections

Security interest of collecting bank in particular items without necessity of filing. *Com. Code § 4210*

Bank's status as holder in due course through security interest held. *Com. Code § 4211*

Presenting bank's lien for expenses relating to dishonored item. *Com. Code § 4504(b)*

[f] Letters of Credit

Assignment of right to proceeds of letter is assignment of account. *Com. Code § 5114*

Security interest of issuer or nominated person in document presented under letter of credit to extent that issuer or nominated person honors or gives value for presentation. *Com. Code § 5118*

[g] Bulk Sales

"Bulk sale" defined. *Com. Code § 6102(a)(3)*

Security interest transactions to which bulk sales law (Division 6) is inapplicable. *Com. Code § 6103(c)(1)-(5)*

[h] Documents of Title

Notations required on warehouse receipts. *Com. Code § 7202(b)*

Lien for services. *Com. Code §§ 7209, 7307*

Enforcement of liens. *Com. Code §§ 7210, 7308*

Document of title confers no rights against certain secured parties. *Com. Code § 7503*

[i] Investment Securities

Definitions. *Com. Code §§ 8102, 8103*

Adverse claims to investment securities. *Com. Code § 8104*

Control of investment security. *Com. Code § 8106*

Issuer's lien on security. *Com. Code § 8209*

[j] Personal Property Leases

Definitions. *Com. Code § 10103*

Transfer of interest in lease, including creation of security interest; effect of provisions prohibiting transfer or making transfer default. *Com. Code § 10303*; *see also Com. Code § 9407*

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 10306*, lessee's creditor takes subject to lease contract. *Com. Code § 10307(a)*

Lessor's creditor takes subject to lease contract unless that creditor's lien attached to goods before lease contract became enforceable. *Com. Code § 10307(b)*

Except as otherwise provided [*see Com. Code §§ 9317, 9321*, and *9323*], lessee takes leasehold interest subject to any security interest held by lessor's creditor. *Com. Code § 10307(c)*

Lease subject to Division 10 may be of goods that are fixtures or may continue in goods that become fixtures, but no lease exists under Division 10 of ordinary building materials incorporated into improvement on land. *Com. Code § 10309(b)*

Priorities between interests of lessors of fixtures, including lessor's residual interest, and conflicting interest of encumbrancer or owner of real estate who is not lessee. *Com. Code § 10309(d)-(g)*

Lessee's remedies, including security interest in rejected goods. *Com. Code § 10508*

[4] Division 9 of Commercial Code

[a] General Provisions

Citation of division. *Com. Code § 9101*

Definitions. *Com. Code § 9102*

Purchase money security interests. *Com. Code § 9103*

Control of deposit account. *Com. Code § 9104*

Control of electronic chattel paper. *Com. Code § 9105*

Control of security, security entitlement, or commodity contract. *Com. Code § 9106*

Control of letter-of-credit right. *Com. Code § 9107*

Adequacy of description *Com. Code § 9108*

Application of Division 9. *Com. Code § 9109*

Provisions governing security interests arising under other divisions. *Com. Code § 9110*

[b] Security Agreements and Security Interests; Rights of Parties

Effectiveness of security agreement in general; applicability of other laws; conflict of law. *Com. Code § 9201*

Immateriality of title to collateral. *Com. Code § 9202*

Attachment of security interest; enforceability. *Com. Code § 9203*

Interest in after-acquired collateral; future advances. *Com. Code § 9204*

Effect of debtor's right to use or dispose of collateral; requirement of possession. *Com. Code § 9205*

Interest in favor of securities intermediary; interest in favor of person who delivers financial asset. *Com. Code § 9206*

Rights and duties of secured party in possession or control of collateral. *Com. Code § 9207*

Obligations of secured party having control of deposit account, investment property, or letter-of-credit right. *Com. Code § 9208*

Secured party's obligation to release account debtor that has received notice of assignment. *Com. Code § 9209*

Response to request for accounting, statement of account, or list of collateral. *Com. Code § 9210*

[c] Perfection and Priority

Law governing perfection, effect of perfection or nonperfection, and priority. *Com. Code § 9301*

Law governing perfection and priority issues relating to farm products. *Com. Code § 9302*

Law governing perfection and priority issues relating to goods covered by certificate of title. *Com. Code § 9303*

Law governing perfection and priority issues relating to deposit accounts; bank's jurisdiction. *Com. Code § 9304*

Law governing perfection and priority issues relating to investment property; determination of commodity intermediary's jurisdiction. *Com. Code § 9305*

Law governing perfection and priority relating to letter-of-credit rights. *Com. Code § 9306*

Determination of debtor's location. *Com. Code § 9307*

What constitutes perfection of security interest or agricultural lien. *Com. Code § 9308*

Security interests that are perfected when they attach. *Com. Code § 9309*

Requirement that financing statement be filed to perfect security interest or agricultural lien. *Com. Code § 9310*

Perfection of security interests in property subject to certain statutes, regulations, or treaties. *Com. Code § 9311*

Perfection of security interest in chattel paper, negotiable documents, instruments, or investment property; interests perfected by control or by notice of interest or claim; goods in possession of bailee; temporary perfection. *Com. Code § 9312*

Perfection by taking possession of collateral or by delivery. *Com. Code § 9313*

Perfection by control of collateral. *Com. Code § 9314*

Effect of disposition of collateral on security interest or agricultural lien; interest in proceeds. *Com. Code § 9315*

Effect of change in governing law on perfection of security interest. *Com. Code § 9316* Subordination of security interest or agricultural lien; persons who take free of interest or lien. *Com. Code § 9317*

Effect of sale of collateral on rights of debtor. *Com. Code § 9318*

Rights of consignee in relation to creditors and purchasers. *Com. Code § 9319*

Rights of buyer in ordinary course of business; buyer of goods from seller who bought or used them for personal or household use. *Com. Code § 9320*

Rights of licensee in ordinary course of business (until January 1, 2013). *Com. Code § 9321(a), (b), (d)*

Rights of lessee in ordinary course of business. *Com. Code § 9321(c)*

Priority among conflicting security interests and agricultural liens in same collateral. *Com. Code § 9322*

Dating of perfection from time of advance; subordination of security interest to interest of lien creditor; rights of buyer of goods; lessee of goods. *Com. Code § 9323*

Priority of perfected purchase money security interest. *Com. Code § 9324*

Subordination of security interest created by debtor to security interest created by another person. *Com. Code § 9325*

Subordination of security interest created by new debtor. *Com. Code § 9326*

Priority among conflicting security interests in same deposit account. *Com. Code § 9327*

Priority among conflicting security interests in same investment property. *Com. Code § 9328*

Priority among conflicting security interests in same letter-of-credit right. *Com. Code § 9329*

Priority of rights of purchaser of chattel paper; priority in proceeds. *Com. Code § 9330*

Rights of holder in due course of negotiable instrument, holder of negotiable document of title, or protected purchaser of security; rights of person protected under Division 8. *Com. Code § 9331*

Transferee of money or funds from deposit account. *Com. Code § 9332*

"Possessory lien"; priority over security interest. *Com. Code § 9333*

Security interest in fixtures; priority; security interest in growing crops. *Com. Code § 9334*

Security interest in accession; collateral that becomes an accession. *Com. Code § 9335*

"Commingled goods"; security interest and priority issues with respect to commingled goods. *Com. Code § 9336*

Certificate of title failing to show security interest perfected under another jurisdiction's law. *Com. Code § 9337*

Effect of inaccurate financing statement on security interest or agricultural lien. *Com. Code § 9338*

Subordination by agreement. *Com. Code § 9339*

Bank's right of recoupment or setoff against party holding security interest in deposit account. *Com. Code § 9340*

Effect of security interest on bank's rights and duties with respect to deposit account. *Com. Code § 9341*

Bank's right with respect to agreement giving secured party control of deposit account. *Com. Code § 9342*

[d] Rights of Third Parties

Transferability of debtor's rights. *Com. Code § 9401*

Secured party's liability for debtor's acts or omissions. *Com. Code § 9402*

"Value"; agreement not to assert claims or defenses against assignee. *Com. Code § 9403*

Claims and defenses assertable against assignee. *Com. Code § 9404*

Effect of modification or substitution of assigned contract. *Com. Code § 9405*

Discharge of account debtor; notice of assignment; proof of assignment; ineffective prohibitions or restrictions on assignments. *Com. Code § 9406*

Ineffective prohibitions or restrictions in lease agreement. *Com. Code § 9407*

Restrictions on assignment or transfer of promissory note, health care insurance receivable, or general intangible. *Com. Code § 9408*

Ineffective restrictions on assignment or creation of security interest in letter-of-credit right. *Com. Code § 9409*

[e] Filing

Office for filing financial statement for security interest or agricultural lien. *Com. Code § 9501*

Requirements for financing statement; record of mortgage as financing statement. *Com. Code § 9502*

Sufficiency of provision of debtor's name. *Com. Code § 9503*

Sufficiency of description of collateral. *Com. Code § 9504*

Filing by bailor of goods, licensor, or buyer of payment intangible or promissory note. *Com. Code § 9505*

Substantial compliance with requirements. *Com. Code § 9506*

Continuing effectiveness of filed financing statement. *Com. Code § 9507*

Effect of new debtor's rights in collateral. *Com. Code § 9508*

Authority to file initial financing statement or amendment adding collateral or debtor. *Com. Code § 9509*

Effectiveness of filed record. *Com. Code § 9510*

Person constituting secured party of record. *Com. Code § 9511*

Procedure for amending financing statement; effectiveness. *Com. Code § 9512*

Termination statement. *Com. Code § 9513*

Assignment of secured party's power to authorize amendment; assignment of record of security interest in fixture. *Com. Code § 9514*

Effective period for filed financing statement; effect of lapse. *Com. Code § 9515*

What constitutes filing; effect of filing office's failure to accept record for filing. *Com. Code § 9516*

Effect of incorrect indexing of record. *Com. Code § 9517*

Correction statement for filed record. *Com. Code § 9518*

Duties of filing office in dealing with records. *Com. Code § 9519*

Refusal by filing office to accept record. *Com. Code § 9520*

Forms for financing statement, amendment to statement, and addendum for either. *Com. Code § 9521*

Required retention of information from financing statement; destruction of written record. *Com. Code § 9522*

Acknowledgment of filing; information to be communicated from records on request; sale or licensing of records. *Com. Code § 9523*

Excuses for filing office failure to meet time limits. *Com. Code § 9524*

Fees for filing and indexing records. *Com. Code § 9525*

Rules and practices for filing offices. *Com. Code § 9526*

Annual report on filing office operation. *Com. Code § 9527*

Issuance of combined certificate with information about financing statements and liens. *Com. Code § 9528*

[f] Default

Rights of secured party after default; rights of debtor and obligor; relation back of judgment lien. *Com. Code § 9601*

Waiver or variance of rules by debtor or obligor. *Com. Code § 9602*

Agreement on standards for fulfilling rights and duties. *Com. Code § 9503*

Procedure if obligation secured by security interest in personal property or fixtures is also secured by interest in real property. *Com. Code § 9604*

Duty of secured party to unknown debtor or obligor or unknown secured party or lienholder. *Com. Code § 9605*

Time of default in connection with agricultural lien. *Com. Code § 9606*

Secured party's rights with respect to collection and enforcement. *Com. Code § 9607*

Application of proceeds; entitlement to surplus or liability for deficiency. *Com. Code § 9608*

Secured party's rights with respect to collateral following default. *Com. Code § 9609*

Disposition of collateral after default; treatment of warranties. *Com. Code § 9610*

"Notification date"; notification of disposition of collateral. *Com. Code § 9611*

Reasonable time for sending notification. *Com. Code § 9612*

Contents of notification; form. *Com. Code § 9613*

Notice of disposition for consumer goods transaction; form. *Com. Code § 9614*

Order of payment of cash proceeds; proof of subordinate security interest or lien; surplus or deficiency. *Com. Code § 9615*

"Explanation"; "request"; secured party's obligation to send explanation relating to surplus or deficiency. *Com. Code § 9616*

Rights of transferee of collateral disposed of after default. *Com. Code § 9617*

Rights and duties of secondary obligor. *Com. Code § 9618*

"Transfer statement"; rights of transferee; effect of transfer of record or legal title. *Com. Code § 9619*

Conditions for accepting collateral in full or partial satisfaction of obligation; requirement that collateral be disposed of. *Com. Code § 9620*

Persons who must receive secured party's proposal to accept collateral. *Com. Code § 9621*

Effect of acceptance of collateral. *Com. Code § 9622*

Persons who may redeem collateral; procedure. *Com. Code § 9623*

Waiver of rights. *Com. Code § 9624*

Sanctions for failure to proceed in accordance with Division; liability for damages. *Com. Code § 9625*

Action in which amount of deficiency or surplus is in issue. *Com. Code § 9626*

What constitutes commercially reasonable collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance. *Com. Code § 9627*

Limitations on liability of secured party. *Com. Code § 9628*

Condition to validity of renunciation or modification of rights by debtor. *Com. Code § 9629*

[g] Transition Provisions

Operative date of division. *Com. Code § 9701*

Effect of division on transactions or liens entered into or created before its operative date; effect on actions, cases, or proceedings. *Com. Code § 9702*

Effect of division on security interests enforceable before operative date. *Com. Code § 9703*

Effect of division on security interest enforceable before operative date but subordinate to rights of person becoming lien creditor. *Com. Code § 9704*

Effect of certain actions prior to operative date of division. *Com. Code § 9705*

Conditions to continuing effectiveness of financing statement filed before operative date. *Com. Code § 9706*

Amendment of pre-effective-date financing statement. *Com. Code § 9707*

Persons entitled to file initial financing statement or continuation statement under chapter. *Com. Code § 9708*

Determination of priority of conflicting claims to collateral; dating priority of security interest. *Com. Code § 9709*

[5] Vehicles

[a] Repossession of Vehicles

Notice to authorities by repossessor. *Veh. Code § 28*

Waiver of delinquencies on repossessed vehicles. *Veh. Code § 9561*

[b] Provisions Applicable to Vehicles Held as Security Interests

"Legal owner" defined. *Veh. Code § 370*

Transfer of security interest. *Veh. Code §§ 5600 et seq., 5900 et seq.*

Filing of instruments evidencing security interest. *Veh. Code §§ 6300-6303*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.73

§ 503.73 Decisions

[1] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business

Allowing buyers in ordinary course of business to take free of security interest facilitates sales of inventory even if buyer knows goods are subject to security interest, as long as buyer does not have actual knowledge that sale violates terms of security agreement. *United States v. Handy & Harman (9th Cir. [Cal] 1984) 750 F.2d 777, 781-782* ; *Dowell v. Beech Acceptance Corp., Inc. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 544, 548, 91 Cal. Rptr. 1, 476 P.2d 401* (decided under former *Com. Code § 9307(1)*)

System of recordation of title to aircraft under former 49 U.S.C. § 1403 [*see now 49 U.S.C. §§ 44107, 44108, 44110*] preempted priorities under former *Com. Code § 9307(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9320(a)*] between prior security holders and subsequent buyers in ordinary course of business, so that holder of prior, recorded security interest in new airplane prevailed over subsequent buyer in ordinary course of business who neither recorded own title nor searched Federal Aviation Agency records to discover security holder's prior claim. *Dowell v. Beech Acceptance Corp., Inc. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 544, 546, 91 Cal. Rptr. 1, 476 P.2d 401*

Only way to construe *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)* (formerly *Com. Code § 1201(9)*) and former *Com. Code § 9307(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9320(a)*] together is to allow buyer who merely knows of security interest covering goods to take free of that interest, but to hold buyer who knows of security interest, and knows that sale is in violation of some term of security agreement not waived by secured party, subject to secured party's interest. *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 653-654, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Debtor's financer, by advancing flooring money to debtor, was not buyer in ordinary course of business when, as financing agency only, it was excluded from protection for ordinary course buyers in former *Com. Code § 9307(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9320(a)*], and when debtor had no rights in collateral to give to financer. *Mother Lode Bank v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 807, 815, 120 Cal. Rptr. 429* Buyers of boat were not buyers in ordinary course of business under *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)* (formerly *Com. Code § 1201(9)*) and did not take property free of security interest under former *Com. Code § 9307(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9320(a)*] when security interest was created not by their seller but by earlier owner, who was not in business of selling boats. *Security Pacific*

Nat. Bank v. Goodman (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 131, 135-136, 100 Cal. Rptr. 763

Buyers were not buyers in ordinary course of business under *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)* (formerly *Com. Code § 1201(9)*) and former *Com. Code § 9307(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9320(a)*] when purported sale was not in good faith and not in ordinary course of either debtor's or buyer's business, as purpose of transaction was to finance and provide means for buyers to acquire control of floundering debtor, and when transaction was not sale but security transaction expressly excluded from *Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*. *Sierra Financial Corp. v. Brooks-Farrer Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 698, 702-703, 93 Cal. Rptr. 422*

[2] Duties of Secured Parties

Financing assignment, in which note and real estate deed of trust were assigned from debtor who was lender and mortgagee thereunder to debtor's own creditor as security only for separate obligation, did not impose duties on creditor but only assigned rights thereto, so that creditor had no duty to provide debtor's mortgagor with beneficiary statement of unpaid balance [*see Civ. Code § 2943*] on demand of latter, nor was creditor liable for damages resulting from failure to provide statement [*see now Com. Code §§ 9109(b), 9402*; *see also Com. Code § 2210(4)*]. *Black v. Sullivan (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 557, 564, 565, 122 Cal. Rptr. 119*

[3] Equitable Principles

Although equitable principles may be applied to require secured creditor who would otherwise be unjustly enriched to make restitution to third party [*see Com. Code § 1103(b)*], application of doctrine is limited to situations in which secured party instigated or acquiesced in third party's benefit to or preservation of collateral; mere enhancement of collateral by third party's efforts is not enough to require secured party to compensate third party who knew of secured party's interest, or could easily have learned of it, and took no steps to protect its position. *Atascadero Factory Outlets, Inc. v. Augustini & Wheeler, LLP (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 717, 721-722, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911* ; *Knox v. Phoenix Leasing, Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1357, 1366-1368, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 141*

Applying principles of unjust enrichment, because secured party knew of and acquiesced in third party's expenditure, which was necessary to development of crop (collateral), and ultimately benefited from that expenditure, amount expended by third party to harvest crop was deducted from amount of proceeds to which secured party was entitled. *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 658-660, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

[4] Pledges

Pledge is bailment for security; it is perfected by delivery of possession of pledged property, although title remains in pledgor; secured party or bailee owes fiduciary duty of care to preserve and protect pledged property and may be liable for conversion if pledged property is wrongfully sold or transferred without authority. *Hartford v. State Bar (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1139, 1153 n.11, 270 Cal. Rptr. 12, 791 P.2d 598* ; *see also* former *Com. Code §§ 8313, 8320-8321* (pledge of securities); *now see Com. Code § 8101 et seq.*

[5] Priorities

When federal government sought, pursuant to *31 U.S.C. § 3713*, to assert priority of federal tax lien over judgment lien that had been perfected under Pennsylvania law, federal Tax Lien Act rather than federal priority statute was governing statute; therefore, under *I.R.C. § 6323(a)*, unrecorded federal tax lien did not have priority over perfected judgment lien. *United States v. Estate of Romani (1998) 523 U.S. 517, 118 S. Ct. 1478, 1488, 140 L. Ed. 2d 710*

Because California motor vehicle registration system is "full title system," transferee who has no knowledge of defect in title is entitled to rely on information in registration and ownership certificates without further inquiry. *T & O Mobile Homes, Inc. v. United California Bank (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 441, 454, 454-455, 220 Cal. Rptr. 627, 709 P.2d 430* (transferee prevails over technically perfected security interest mistakenly not disclosed in certificate); *Louis & Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1587, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889* (transferee prevails over unperfected interest)

When consideration for subordination agreement was plaintiff's continued extension of credit to debtor, but agreement did not specify duration of continued financing, reasonable time was implied; whether four months was reasonable length of time was question of fact, which should not have been resolved by summary judgment. *Walter E. Heller Western, Inc. v. Tecrim Corp. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 149, 159-160, 241 Cal. Rptr. 677*

Owners of cattle which they put out to feed at cattle ranch did not have interest prior to security interest of bank which had filed financing statement covering all cattle owned or acquired by ranch owner, in that either cattle owner's interest did not arise until receiving cattle from rancher, in which case cattle were subject of bank's interest already covering ranch cattle, or ownership interest preceded delivery of cattle to ranch but owners failed to record cattle feeding contract in order to avoid priority security interest of bank as bona fide encumbrancer of cattle. *Calva Prod. v. Security Pac. Nat'l Bank (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 409, 416-417, 168 Cal. Rptr. 582* (holding former *Civ. Code § 2980.5* constitutional in its requirement of recording cattle feeding contract in order to retain priority over subsequent bona fide encumbrancer)

Federal tax lien took priority over perfected security interest in accounts receivable when security did not exist, as defined by *I.R.C. § 6323(h)* prior to tax lien filing and when accounts receivable were not acquired within requisite time period for security interest to take priority over tax lien. *Gold Coast Leasing Co. v. California Carrots, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 274, 279-280, 155 Cal. Rptr. 511*

Assignment of right to payment for services rendered did not create security interest until those services had been rendered, for purposes of calculating whether interest amounted to one in existence as "commercial transactions financing agreement" sufficiently before federal tax lien was filed in order to have priority over federal tax lien [*see I.R.C. § 6323(d)*]. *Gold Coast Leasing Co. v. California Carrots, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 274, 278-280, 155 Cal. Rptr. 511*

Person surrendering taxpayer's property pursuant to federal tax lien, being thereby discharged under federal law from any obligation to taxpayer (*see I.R.C. § 6323(d)*), is also discharged from liability to holder of security interest in that property when that interest is subordinate to federal tax lien under federal law. *Gold Coast Leasing Co. v. California Carrots, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 274, 280, 281, 155 Cal. Rptr. 511*

[6] Proceeds

[a] Examples of Proceeds

Given flexible and broad definition of "proceeds" under former *Com. Code § 9306(1)*, federal farm subsidy payments are proceeds of sugar beet farmer-debtor's collateral when security agreement is drafted with awareness of importance of subsidy payments to sugar beet farm financing and when interested third party examining financing statement could be expected to know that crops described in financing statement were sugar beets. In the Matter of Munger (9th Cir. [Cal] 1974) *495 F.2d 511, 513*

Flooring agreement that described collateral as "sales and service of new and used automobiles" created security

interest in inventory consisting of newand used automobiles and proceeds thereof, including proceeds of disposition of automobiles under conditional sales agreements. *Biggins v. Southwest Bank (9th Cir. [Cal] 1973) 490 F.2d 1304, 1308, 1311*

Security interest in inventory applies equally to proceeds of sale and attaches to deposit account to extent that funds are identifiable as sale proceeds. *ITT Commercial Fin. Corp. v. Tech. Power Inc. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1551, 1556-1557, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344* .

Security interest in debtor's inventory and proceeds includes debtor's accounts receivable, given broad definition of "proceeds" in former *Com. Code § 9306(1)* and given absence of expression in security agreement of narrower interpretation of "proceeds." *Western Decor & Furnishings Industries, Inc. v. Bank of America (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 293, 302, 154 Cal. Rptr. 287*

[b] Need Not Come Into Debtor's Possession

Debtor is not required to take possession of whatever is received in exchange for collateral in order for it to be "proceeds;" thus, secured party was entitled to recover from buyer proceeds paid to third parties who, with debtor, misrepresented to buyer that they owned crop. *American National Bank v. Cloud (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 766, 775-776, 247 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 652-653, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Although "account" in hands of marketing cooperative to which crop was sold was "proceeds," secured party that had perfected interest in crop and proceeds waived its interest in proceeds by allowing crop to be delivered to marketing cooperative with competing claim to proceeds, even though agreement between competing claimants specified that delivery of crop would not change rights of either; court interpreted agreement in favor of cooperative based on its first-perfected interest in proceeds. *Bank of Stockton v. Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 144, 151-153, 156-159, 244 Cal. Rptr. 744*

When buyer of collateral paid seed, harvesting, and other standard costs and paid remainder of purchase price to secured party, entire purchase price was proceeds even though none of it ever came into debtor's possession; however, under equitable principles, because secured party knew of and acquiesced in expenditures necessary for development of crop and ultimately benefited from those expenditures, buyer was entitled to recover those costs from crop proceeds. *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 651, 658-660, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Proceeds in which creditors' security interest was perfected included payment of transportation charges advanced by unsecured creditor. *Johanson Transportation Service v. Jimmy Grizzard Sales, Inc. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 583, 592, 210 Cal. Rptr. 433* Secured party's interest in proceeds of debtor's hay crop does not extend to advances made by buyer to debtor before buyer knew of secured party's lien, but on delivery of hay to buyer, account payable became proceeds of sale of hay crop and buyer was not entitled to apply proceeds to reduction of its outstanding advances to debtor. Imperial NH3 v. *Central Valley Feed Yards, Inc. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 513, 520, 139 Cal. Rptr. 8*

[c] Secured Party's Interest in Proceeds of Disposition

Even though no Commercial Code provision permitted purchaser of collateral who knew of secured party's interest and that sale was in violation of security agreement to pay harvesting costs from proceeds, equitable considerations supported payment to prevent secured party's unjust enrichment. *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 658-660, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Secured party that authorized sale of collateral by prior conduct, loses its lien on collateral on completion of sale, but

does not necessarily lose its lien on the proceeds. *Producers Cotton Oil Co. v. Amstar Corp. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 647, 652-653, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914*

[7] Secured Party in Possession

Fuel tax charges assessed against collateral in possession of secured party were chargeable to debtor and secured by collateral; on sale of collateral by secured party, taxes were required to be paid from proceeds before being applied to satisfaction of underlying indebtedness. *J.T. Jenkins Co. v. Kennedy (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 474, 480, 119 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Requirement that secured party in possession of collateral use reasonable care in custody and preservation thereof [*see Com. Code § 9207(a)*], when applied to securities being held, does not require secured party to sell call options on debtor's advice when secured party then would have been obligated to hold securities for additional length of time and to have realized on that sale far less than amount of debtor's obligation outstanding, and which would also conflict with secured party's right to hold collateral until principal obligation has been satisfied or to sell on default in good faith and commercially reasonable manner as prescribed by governing law [*see Com. Code § 9610*]. *Hutchison v. Southern California First Nat. Bank (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 572, 582, 583, 103 Cal. Rptr. 816*

[8] Secured Party's Remedies

[a] In General

Court order that debtor must convey collateral to secured party was reversible error when security agreement did not contain any promise to convey but contained only assignment of property as collateral; secured party was limited to remedies specified in Division 9 of *Commercial Code. Resolution Trust Corp. v. Winslow (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1799, 1813-1814, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510*

Equipment lease for carwash coupled with note was not itself collateral, such that on termination of lease and repossession of abandoned equipment note proper could be called "unsecured" and sued on for unpaid balance without first disposing of equipment and showing of deficiency thereafter. *Grossman v. Lippson (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 554, 559-562, 146 Cal. Rptr. 741*

[b] Commercially Reasonable Collection or Disposition

Requirements of notice and of commercial reasonableness of former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* [*see now Com. Code §§ 9610(a), (b), 9611*], including reasonable advertising, are distinct. *Ford & Vlahos v. ITT Commercial Financial Corp. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 1220, 1231, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 464, 885 P.2d 877*

Secured party's organization of active collection program in attempting to realize on debtor's accounts receivables (only inactive when it had agreed to let cocreditor have responsibility for collecting on its own share of interests), coupled with fact that value of accounts was probably inflated and that debtor had failed to provide secured party with supporting records, was substantial evidence that secured party acted in commercially reasonable manner in collecting from account debtors. *Western Decor & Furnishings Industries, Inc. v. Bank of America (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 293, 303-305, 154 Cal. Rptr. 287*

[c] Notice of Disposition

Notice of sale sent to debtor, on default of whom collateral was being disposed of under security interest, by certified

mail, return receipt requested, addressed to debtor at residence thereof, but which was returned unclaimed before sale, after which no further attempt was made to notify debtor by secured party although its officers knew debtor's whereabouts and had business dealings with debtor through branch office, created rebuttable presumption that notice was given, which could be overcome by uncontradicted evidence of debtor that notice was never received. *In re Carter (1975) 511 F.2d 1203, 1204* ; *see* UCC Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9611* (Division 9 leaves to judicial resolution, based on facts of each case, whether second try or attempt to locate debtor is necessary when secured party learns debtor did not receive first notification).

To obtain deficiency judgment, secured creditor who sells defaulting debtor's repossessed car must comply with Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*] as well as with any relevant provisions in Commercial Code Division 9; failure to give debtor proper notice of public sale pursuant to former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* [*see now Com. Code § 9614(3)* (form of notice)], including notice of both time and place of sale, precluded deficiency judgment. *Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 210, 213-214, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 918, 960 P.2d 1133*

"Recognized market" within meaning of former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* [*see now Com. Code 9611(d)* (notice of sale or disposition of collateral need not be given to debtor if collateral is type customarily sold on recognized market)] is one in which sales involve many items so similar that individual differences are nonexistent or immaterial, in which haggling and competitive bidding are not primary factors in each sale, and in which prices paid are currently available by quotation. *Aspen Enterprises, Inc. v. Bodge (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1811, 1825*

Whether there is recognized market within meaning of former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* [*see now Com. Code 9611(d)* (notice of disposition of collateral need not be given to debtor if collateral is type customarily sold on recognized market)] is generally question of fact. *Aspen Enterprises, Inc. v. Bodge (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1811, 1825*

Creditor who mistakenly conducted sale one day before the date announced in notification was allowed to collect deficiency judgment after properly renoticing and conducting second sale because debtor was not prejudiced; factors influencing court included creditor's admission of its mistake and reasonableness in doing what it could to rectify matters and fact that debtor could raise good faith and commercial reasonableness on retrial. *PWS, Inc. v. Ban (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 223, 226-230, 285 Cal. Rptr. 598*

Purposes of notice are to allow debtor to discharge debt and redeem collateral, to produce another purchaser, and/or to ensure that sale is held in commercially reasonable manner. *Brunzell Construction Co., Inc. v. Smith (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 617, 621, 246 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Secured party is exempted from requirement of giving notice of sale [former *Com. Code § 9504(3)*; *see now Com. Code 9611(d)*] if sale of collateral is conducted by court-appointed receiver because receiver, not secured party, controls time and place of sale; creditor is required to account to debtor for any proceeds of sale received by it after discharge of receiver. *Security Pacific National Bank v. Geernaert (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1425, 1431, 1431, 245 Cal. Rptr. 712* (stating as dicta that same reasoning and result would apply to sale by trustee in bankruptcy)

Threatened speedy decline in value of collateral that results from secured party's procrastination is not within exception; notice is still required; failure to give notice barred deficiency. *Backes v. Village Corner, Inc. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 209, 213-215, 242 Cal. Rptr. 716*

"Retroactive" notice given after private sale is invalid. *Backes v. Village Corner, Inc. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 209, 212 n. 3, 242 Cal. Rptr. 716* (dicta)

Doctrine of substantial compliance is not applicable to notice required by former *Com. Code § 9504(3)* [*see now Com. Code 9611(d)*]; thus, creditor was barred from recovering deficiency judgment when notice gave incorrect street

address, even though creditor's employees were allegedly posted at address given in notice to direct bidders to true location of sale. *C.I.T. Corp. v. Anwright Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1422-1424, 237 Cal. Rptr. 108* ; *but see PWS, Inc. v. Ban (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 223, 226-230, 285 Cal. Rptr. 598*

Guarantor was entitled to notice of sale; guarantor's waiver, prior to default, of right to receive notice was ineffective. *C.I.T. Corp. v. Anwright Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1425-1427, 237 Cal. Rptr. 108* ; *Connolly v. Bank of Sonoma County (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1119, 1123-1125, 229 Cal. Rptr. 396* (both discussed and declined to follow *Rutan v. Summit Sports, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 965, 973, 219 Cal. Rptr. 381* , which held otherwise)

[d] Repossession

Secured party retaining possession of equipment, after debtor had delivered it for repair, because of debtor's default in payments, was not liable in conversion because it also demanded payment of former debt not covered under present security agreement before releasing equipment, if debtor was still in default under present agreement. *Clark Equipment Co. v. Mastelotto, Inc. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 88, 92-94, 150 Cal. Rptr. 797*

Principal who authorized agent to repossess collateral, when taking of possession was otherwise lawful, was not liable in punitive damages for wrongful method of taking on part of agent if principal itself was not shown to have had malice attended by outrageous conduct, requiring principal to have participated personally in wrongful acts, previously authorized them, or subsequently ratified them with full knowledge of facts. *Henderson v. Security Nat. Bank (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 764, 772, 773, 140 Cal. Rptr. 388*

Repossession of collateral by means of unlawful entry, such as breaking lock of garage door to obtain automobile, even though taking of possession is otherwise lawful, constitutes conversion for which principal who ordered repossession by agent may be liable based on unwarranted interference with debtor's dominion over property without regard to principal's good or bad faith, care or negligence, knowledge or ignorance of method of repossession. *Henderson v. Security Nat. Bank (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 764, 770, 771, 140 Cal. Rptr. 388*

Delivery to buyer of goods without taking of some form of security agreement did not entitle unpaid seller to repossess goods but rather rendered seller liable for conversion thereon. *English v. Ralph Williams Ford (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1046-1049, 95 Cal. Rptr. 501*

Repossession of vehicle by secured party after debtor's default without removing other property contained therein and returning it to debtor on demand constituted conversion of other property. *Varela v. Wells Fargo Bank (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 741, 749, 750, 93 Cal. Rptr. 428*

[9] Security Interests

[a] Continuing Effectiveness

Security agreement giving creditor security interest in accounts receivable that was executed by proprietorship continued to be effective as to accounts receivable generated by corporation that was successor entity to proprietorship because debtor could not evade obligation of validly executed security agreement by altering its business structure. *In re West Coast Food Sales (9th Cir. 1981) 637 F.2d 707, 709-710*

[b] Creation of Security Interest

Bank can obtain valid security interest in one of its own deposit accounts under former *Com. Code § 9203(1)(c)* [*see*

now Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)(D)]; bank's interest attaches to personal property of depositor, not bank's own property. *Bakersfield Westar Ambulance, Inc. v. Parker (9th Cir. 1997) 123 F.3d 1243, 1246-1247*

Arrangement characterized as "negative pickup" deal did not provide appellants with superior security interest in tangible film materials; failure to show all elements required by former *Com. Code § 9203(1)* [*see now Com. Code § 9203(b)*]. *LeFlore v. Grass Harp Productions Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 824, 835, 840, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340*

Stipulation in civil action fulfilled all requirements for security agreement and creation of security interest. *Louis & Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1586, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889*

Assignment of accounts which constituted consideration for consenting creditors, granting to debtor corporations under contemporaneous agreement limited moratorium on enforcement of their claims and limited extension of time within which corporations might pay, was not mere assignment of accounts for purpose of collection only which would be excluded from Division 9 of Commercial Code [*see* former *Com. Code § 9104(f), now Com. Code § 9109(d)(5)*], but was transaction intended to create security interest with security agreement. *People ex rel. Franchise Tax Bd. v. Credit Managers Assn., (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 344, 349, 350, 142 Cal. Rptr. 777*

Sale in which demonstrated purpose was to enable seller to obtain financing for foundering enterprise and provide means to acquire control of another business, and in which price for goods--coupled with contemporaneous agreement for resale at close to market price--evidenced transaction for security, did not amount to sale to buyers in ordinary course of business which would take free of security interest created by seller [*see Com. Code §§ 1201(b)(9), 9320(a)*]. *Sierra Financial Corp. v. Brooks-Farrer Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 698, 702, 703, 93 Cal. Rptr. 422*

[c] Description of Collateral

Security agreement describing collateral by type and stating it is located at particular address in particular city, when actually collateral was never located there but only in other cities, did not give adequate description of collateral for purposes of creating valid security agreement versus claim of bankruptcy trustee; and description was not permissibly able to be corrected by parol evidence although reference to other documents containing fuller description, or coupling with fuller description in financing statement, would be capable of rendering complete description. *Matter of Cal. Pump & Mfg. Co., Inc. (1978) 588 F.2d 717, 719, 720*

Security agreement covering inventory and proceeds thereof included right to payment of debtor on latter's sale of inventory without having to specify in agreement that it covered accounts receivable. *Western Decor & Furnishings Industries, Inc. v. Bank of America (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 293, 301, 302, 154 Cal. Rptr. 287*

[d] Disguised as Lease

Lease and charter party were security interests when their purpose was to allow lessee to borrow money and to provide lessor greater security than it would have under ship mortgage; when lease is actually security interest, lessor has no reversionary ownership interest in subject of "lease"; thus, cancellation of charter party prior to attachment of vessel would not deprive "lessee" of attachable interest. *Interpool Ltd. v. Char Yigh Marine (Panama) S.A. (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 1453, 1459-1461* (applying California law)

[e] Perfection of Security Interests

Creditor could obtain security interest in proceeds of sale of FCC license; interest constituted "general intangible" that could be perfected before sale of license. *MLQ Investors LP v. Pacific Quadracasting, Inc. (9th Cir. 1998) 146 F.3d*

746, 749

Former *Com. Code § 9402(8)* [*see now Com. Code § 9506(a)*], providing that financing statement containing minor errors that are not seriously misleading may be effective, is displacement of principles of equity and law otherwise applicable; minor error is seriously misleading when it does not indicate to interested third party possible existence of prior encumbrance on collateral; reformation due to mistake was not available when error was seriously misleading. *In re Pacific Trencher & Equipment, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 735 F.2d 362, 364-365*

Secured party attempting to perfect security interest in instruments by taking possession thereof through having debtor make notations thereon that they were held as security but otherwise remaining in possession of those instruments, does not accomplish perfection under former *Com. Code §§ 9304(1), 9305* [*see now Com. Code §§ 9312, 9313*] because only secured party, agent, or bailee may perfect interest through possession, and debtor cannot qualify as agent [*see* U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9313*]. *Matter of Staff Mortgage & Inv. Corp. (1977) 550 F.2d 1228, 1230*

Security interest in account in which the debtor has rights can be perfected before debtor earns right to payment under terms of account by performance. *Bank of Stockton v. Diamond Walnut Growers, Inc. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 144, 152-153, 244 Cal. Rptr. 744*

Perfection of security interest in vehicle that was part of dealer's inventory was governed by Commercial Code, not Vehicle Code, and required filing of financing statement or possession. *Louis & Diederich, Inc. v. Cambridge European Imports, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1574, 1585-1586, 234 Cal. Rptr. 889*

Secured party's failure to file continuation statement of security interest in collateral when original financing statement lapsed after five years precluded action for conversion and impairment of security interest when collateral was transferred by debtor. *Growth Properties v. Lempert (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 983, 989, 193 Cal. Rptr. 102*

[10] Waiver or Modification of Debtor's Rights

Former *Com. Code §§ 9501(3), 9504,* and *9505* [*see now Com. Code §§ 9602, 9603,* and *9624*] did not prohibit individual debtor, guarantor of business obligation, after default, from consenting to entry of deficiency judgment; after entry of deficiency judgment in favor of secured party, execution and levy on debtor's property, including any collateral, were no longer governed by Division 9 of the *Commercial Code. Brunzell Construction Co., Inc. v. Smith (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 617, 622-623, 246 Cal. Rptr. 182* ; *but see Com. Code § 9629* (waiver by debtor of rights after default as to consumer goods is not valid or enforceable unless it is in consideration of secured party's waiver of any right to deficiency)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.74

§ 503.74 Attorney General Opinions

Under California Control of Profits of Organized Crime Act, court may distribute forfeited property to innocent holder of security interest. *78 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 92 (1995)*

California Uniform Commercial Code forms prescribed by the Secretary of State are subject to format standards of California's recording laws adoped in 1994; those forms need not comply with format requirements of *Government Code section 27361.6*, but cover sheet must be recorded for any document not meeting new standards. *78 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 8 (1995)*

Continuation of "trust receipt" concept for certain purposes of public policy. *49 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 118, 120 (1967)*

Overlap of "security agreement" and Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act's "lien contract." *45 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 8, 10 (1965)*

Financing statements in proper form are acceptable for filing regardless of collateral involved. *43 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 254 (1964)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.75

§ 503.75 Law Reviews

Symposium on Revised Article 9, 73 Am. Bankr. L. xi (Winter, 1999)

J. Braucher *Deadlock: Consumer Transactions Under Revised Article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 61 (Winter, 1999)

S. N. Cohen, K. B. Gelertnt, K. Kalenmbka *Revised Article 9 of the UCC: Securitization Simplified, 45 Prac. Law. 15, (December, 1999)*

T. J. Cunningham *The amended Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act: Further Concealment of a Lien Already Nearly Invisible, 116 Banking L. J. 253 (March, 1999)*

D. H. Frazer, *A Collateral Matter: The Priority Battle Between the Tax Authorities and Deposit Account Financing Lenders, 116 Banking L. J. 358 (March, 1999)*

G. A. Hisert, *Letters of Credit and Article 9: Mixing Oil and Water*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 183 (Winter, 1999)

E. H. Krinick, *Banks' Security Interests v. Consignors Claims: Unless Consignors Take Specific Steps Set Forth in UCC Section 2326(3) Banks Typically Have Priority in Consigned Goods, 116 Banking L. J. 718 (October, 1999)*

E. F. Leitess, S. N. Leitess, *Inventory Financing Under Revised Article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 119 (Winter, 1999)

R. J. Mann *Secured Credit and Software Financing, 85 Cornell L. Rev. 134 (November, 1999)*

J. B. McDonnell, *Is Revised Article 9 a Little Greedy? 104 Com. L. J. 241 (Fall, 1999)*

D. J. Rapson, *Receivables Financing Under Revised Article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 133 (Winter, 1999)

P. J. N. Roy, J. P. Brockland, J. F. Lawler, *Security Interests in Technology Assets and Related Intellectual Property:*

Practical and Legal Considerations, 16 Computer Law 3 (August, 1999)

L. Rusch, *Farm Financing Under Revised Article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 211 (Winter, 1999)

P. M. Shupack, *Making Revised Article 9 Safe for Securitizations: A Brief History*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 167 (Winter, 1999)

P. H. Shur, *New Article 9: A Commercial Lawyer's Synopsis*, *10 Banking L. J. 843 (December, 1999)*

H. C. Sigman, *The Filing System Under Revised Article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 61 (Winter, 1999)

E. E. Smith, *Overview of Revised article 9*, 73 Am. Bankr. L. 1 (Winter, 1999)

S. O. Weise, *An Introduction to Revised UCC Article 9*, *70 Pa. B.A.Q. 159 (October, 1999)*

T. R. Zinnicker, *The Default Provisions of the Revised Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code*, (Pt. 2) *54 Bus. Law. 1737 (August, 1999)*

T. R. Zinnicker, *The Default Provisions of the Revised Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code*, (Pt. 1) *54 Bus. Law. 1113 (May, 1999)*

*Note: *An Addendum for Protected Purchasers: UCC Security Interest Opinions*, *53 Bus. Law. 1261 (May, 1999)*

C. M. Jones, R. S. Gross, L. A. Shot, *Electronic "Chattel Paper" Under Revised Article 9*, *31 U.C.C. L J 47 (Summer, 1998)*

E. H. Krinick, *UCC Commentary: Financing Statements and Continuation Statements: Substantial Compliance Applies to Both*, *115 Banking L. J. 962 (October, 1998)*

G. A. Nation III, *Creation and Perfection on Non-seller Purchase Money Security Interests: Current Law and Proposed Changes Under Revised Article 9*, *31 U.C.C. L J 84 (Summer 1998)*

S. Neth, *The First to File Priority in Article 9: Can You Sell Your Place in Line?* *31 U.C.C. L J 64 (Summer, 1998)*

W. D Pierce, *Revised Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code: Filing Systems Improvements and Their Rationale*, *31 U.C.C. L J 16 (Summer, 1998)*

M. Shanker, *A Response to The First to File Priority in Article 9: Can You Sell Your Place in Line?* *31 U.C.C. L J 82 (Summer, 1998)*

155 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.76

§ 503.76 Text References

The New Article 9; Uniform Commercial Code (American Bar Association 2d ed. 2000

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 3, ch. VI, *Secured Transactions in Personal Property*, §§ 171, 173 (10th ed. 2005)

156 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.77-503.99

[Reserved]

§§ 503.77[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.100

§ 503.100 Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party to Supply Statement of Information Requested by Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9210, 9625(b)-(f)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party to Supply Statement of Information Requested by Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9210, 9625(b)-(f)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES--FAILURE OF SECURED PARTY TO SUPPLY INFORMATION REQUESTED UNDER SECURITY AGREEMENT
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant and if germane to creation of agricultural lien add:* In the ordinary course of business, defendant provides goods and service to farming operations].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

[3. As shown in this complaint, this action is subject to the provisions of _____ (*Civil Code Section 1812.10 or Civil Code Section 2984.4 or Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*).]

[*EITHER, if defendant's security interest was created by a security agreement*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a security agreement _____ [entitled _____ (*specify e.g.,* "Security Agreement" *or* "Installment Sales Contract" *or* "Promissory Note and Agreement") *or* consisting of _____ (*specify e.g.,* a promissory note and mortgage of _____ [personal property *or* fixtures] *or* an agreement assigning certain _____ (*specify e.g.,* accounts receivable])]. A true copy of this agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the agreement") is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A [consisting of Documents _____ through _____] and made a part of it by this reference.

[*AND*]

5. According to the provisions of the agreement, defendant agreed to _____ [*describe benefit given by secured party*], and plaintiff agreed to _____ [*describe consideration given therefor by plaintiff*]. By the agreement plaintiff also gave to defendant a security interest in _____ [*describe collateral*]. [*If financing statement was filed with respect to security interest, add:* A financing statement was _____ (filed *or* recorded) (in connection with perfection of the security interest under the agreement) on or about _____ (*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). (A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.)]

[*OR, if defendant's interest is an agricultural lien*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [furnished _____(*specify goods or services, e.g.,* feed and materials) *or* leased real property] to plaintiff in connection with plaintiff's [*specify if desired, e.g.,* dairy] farming operation. Plaintiff agreed to _____ [*describe consideration promised by plaintiff*]. [The foregoing is evidenced by a(n) _____ (lease *or* agreement), dated _____, a true copy of which (hereinafter referred to as _____ ["the agreement" *or* "the lease") is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A (consisting of Documents _____ through _____) and made a part of it by this reference.]

[*AND*]

5. The effect of the transaction(s) described in Paragraph 4 was to give defendant an agricultural lien on plaintiff's _____ [*describe collateral, e.g.,* proceeds from the sale of milk] in accordance with _____[*specify statute creating lien whose effectiveness does not depend on defendant's possession of the personal property, e.g., Sections 57401 to 57414 of the Food and Agricultural Code*]. [*If filing was made to perfect agricultural lien, add:* A financing statement was filed in connection with perfection of the agricultural lien created by that _____ (agreement *or* lease) on or about _____ (*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.]

[*CONTINUE*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [authenticated *or* signed] a statement _____ [requesting that the defendant provide an accounting of the unpaid obligations secured by collateral *or* indicating what plaintiff believed to be _____ (the aggregate amount of unpaid indebtedness *or* a list of the collateral *or both*)] [under the agreement] as of that date, and sent it to defendant [with a request that the statement be approved or corrected and returned]. A true copy of this statement is attached to this complaint as Exhibit C and made a part of it by this reference. [Because plaintiff made a previous request for, and defendant supplied, a similar statement or accounting, at defendant's request, during the six months previous to sending the request that is the subject of this complaint, plaintiff included payment of a charge of $_____ (*amount not to exceed $25*).]

7. Defendant failed and refused to return a written _____ [accounting *or* correction or approval of the statement] within 14 days after receiving plaintiff's request therefor or _____ [at any other time since *or* within a reasonable time], and without reasonable excuse.

8. Plaintiff requested the _____ [accounting *or* statement] from defendant in order to _____[*describe purpose leading to loss by defendant's action, e.g.,* obtain additional financing from one or more sources which indicated that if plaintiff's obligations to defendant were below a stated amount, as was expected to be indicated on the statement sent defendant, they would lend the amount needed and secure it on the collateral subordinate to the defendant's security interest]. As a result of defendant's failure to respond to plaintiff's request for a statement, plaintiff has been injured in the amount of $_____, representing _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the difference in the cost of financing and in interest which plaintiff could have obtained at the time by using the collateral as security, as against the cost plaintiff did pay for the financing obtained, without being able to rely on the collateral].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

[2. For additional damages, as provided by *Commercial Code Section 9625*, of $500;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including attorney's fees, if appropriate; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a debtor who has sent a secured party a request for accounting [*Com. Code § 9210(a)(2)*] or a statement regarding the remaining indebtedness or list of collateral for approval or correction [*Com. Code § 9210(a)(3), (4)*], and who has been injured in a particular fashion by failure of the secured party to return the statement [*see Com. Code §§ 9210, 9625(b), (f), (g)*; *see also* discussion in *§§ 503.25, 503.29*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The capacity and residence of defendant (Paragraph 1).

- Fictitious names of defendants later to be discovered and joined, if any (Paragraph 2).

- Whether the action involves a retail installment agreement or motor vehicle conditional sales contract or arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*], thereby requiring the plaintiff to comply with the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 1812.10* or *2984.4* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see* discussion in [6], *below*].

- Identification and execution of a security agreement and any financing statement, in the case of a security interest, or, a description of the transaction(s) that provide the basis for an agricultural lien (alternative Paragraphs 4).

- The key provisions of the security agreement, or the statute granting the agricultural lien, including the security interest or agricultural lien given in particular collateral (alternative Paragraphs 5).

- The sending of the request for accounting or the statement or collateral or outstanding indebtedness for approval or correction (Paragraph 6).

- Defendant's failure to return an accounting or the statement (Paragraph 7).

- The resulting injury to plaintiff (Paragraph 8). *Com. Code § 9625(b)* specifies that a person is liable for damages in the amount of any loss caused by a failure to comply with Division 9 and specifically provides that loss may include loss resulting from the debtor's inability to obtain, or increased costs of,

alternative financing. This form uses as an example a loss relating to additional financing rather than alternative financing.

[4] Statutory Damages

Com. Code § 9625(f) provides that in addition to damages under *Com. Code § 9625(b)*, a debtor or consumer obligor may recover $500 in each case from a person that, without reasonable cause, fails to comply with a request under *Com. Code § 9210*. A recipient of a request under *Com. Code § 9210* which never claimed an interest in the collateral or obligations that are the subject of a request has a reasonable excuse for failure to comply with the request within the meaning of this subdivision [*Com. Code § 9625(f)*; *see also Com. Code §§ 9210(d), (e), 9625(g)*, discussed in *§ 503.25[2]*].

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Installment or Auto Sales Actions

[a] Filing of Affidavit or Declaration of Proper Venue Required

In any action subject to the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (RISA) [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicles Sales and Finance Act (Rees-Levering Act) [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*], or that arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*], the plaintiff, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, must file an affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a proper place for the trial of the action under *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *Civ. Code § 2984.4*. In lieu of filing a separate affidavit or declaration, the plaintiff may allege these facts in a verified complaint, but not on information and belief. If an affidavit or declaration is filed with the complaint, a copy of the affidavit or declaration must be served with the summons [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

[b] Consequences of Failure to File Affidavit or Declaration

If the plaintiff fails to file the affidavit or declaration or state facts showing proper venue in a verified complaint as required in *Civ. Code § 1810.10*, *Civ. Code § 2984.4*, or *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*, no further proceedings may occur, and the court, on its own motion or the motion of any party, must dismiss the action without prejudice. The court, however, on terms that may be just, may permit the affidavit or declaration to be filed after the filing of the complaint. In this case, a copy of the affidavit or declaration must be served on the defendant, and the time to answer or otherwise plead begins at the time of that service [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

For further discussion of venue requirements for RISA, and a form for a declaration of proper venue, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, § 501.102* . For further discussion of venue requirements for the Rees-Levering Act, and related forms, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* . For venue allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

[7] Attorney's Fees

In an action on a contract, when the contract specifically provides that attorney's fees and costs incurred to enforce the provisions of the contract will be awarded to one of the parties, reasonable attorney's fees may be recovered by the prevailing party, but as an element of the costs of suit, not as damages [*Civ. Code § 1717*].

The court must award costs and attorney's fees to a prevailing plaintiff in litigation governed by *Civ. Code § 1780* (consumer suffering damage from any practice deemed unlawful under *Civ. Code § 1770*) [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*]. Reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded to a prevailing defendant on a finding by the court that the plaintiff's prosecution of the action was not in good faith [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*]. For discussion and forms relating to recovery of attorney's fees, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq.

For discussion of attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717.5* in certain contract actions based on a book account as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 337a*, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.101

§ 503.101 Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party in Possession to Preserve Collateral [Com. Code §§ 9207, 9625(b)-(d)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Failure of Secured Party in Possession to Preserve Collateral [Com. Code §§ 9207, 9625(b)-(d)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR LOSS OF
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	COLLATERAL BY SECURED PARTY IN POS-
	)	SESSION
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of security agreement or statute granting agricultural lien, and filing of financing statement. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

6. Defendant _____ [under the agreement had remained in *or* on or about _____ (*date*), took] possession of the collateral. However, defendant failed to use reasonable care in the custody and preservation of the collateral in that _____ [*describe failure, e.g.,* despite repeated warnings from plaintiff and precautions written in the instructions accompanying the equipment, and despite its obvious susceptibility to temperature, defendant kept the equipment stored outdoors directly in the heat of the sun, so that eventually the parts melted down from first-class working condition to a completely useless and valueless state *or, if collateral consisted of instruments or chattel paper, show, for example, how defendant failed to take necessary steps to preserve rights against prior parties (in the absence of agreement otherwise)*].

7. Plaintiff has suffered injury as a proximate result of defendant's failure to care properly for the collateral in the amount of $_____, the difference between the value of the collateral as it would be in its proper condition and its value as a result of the defendant's failure to preserve the collateral.

[*Prayer. See § 503.100[1].*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a debtor or obligor to recover damages caused by the loss of or injury to collateral in the possession of a secured party who has not properly maintained the collateral [*see Com. Code §§ 9207, 9625(b)-(d)*; *see also* discussion in *§§ 503.26[1], 503.29*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges in pertinent part (1) the failure of the secured party to preserve properly the collateral in its possession (Paragraph 6); and (2) the resultant damage to the collateral, based on its value before injury (Paragraph 7) [*see Com. Code § 9207(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.102

§ 503.102 Complaint to Restrain Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law From Dispositions of Collateral [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Refusal to Honor Debtor's Right of Redemption [Com. Code § 9623]

[1] FORM Complaint to Restrain Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law From Dispositions of Collateral [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Refusal to Honor Debtor's Right of Redemption [Com. Code § 9623]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	COMPLAINT TO RESTRAIN UNLAWFUL DIS-
	)	POSITION OF COLLATERAL AND TO ENFORCE
	)	RIGHT OF REDEMPTION

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of security agreement or statute that grants agricultural lien, and filing of any financing statement. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff defaulted _____ [under the security agreement *or* in his/her/its obligation to defendant] in that _____ [*describe default*]. Defendant _____ [had remained in *or* thereupon took] possession of the collateral. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [D]efendant then prepared, and is now ready and about, to dispose of the collateral. [Defendant _____ (delivered *or* sent) to plaintiff a notice of sale on or about _____ (*date*), a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by this reference.]

7. Defendant is not proceeding in accordance with the provisions of Division 9 of the Commercial Code, for the following reasons:

(a) On or about _____[*date*], plaintiff made demand on defendant to redeem the collateral and tendered fulfillment of all obligations secured thereby, as well as for the expenses reasonably incurred by defendant in [retaking,] holding, preparing and processing for disposition, and for reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses as provided for in the security agreement.

(b) This was accomplished by _____ [*describe process, e.g.,* plaintiff first calculated that the entire sum of the above could be no more than $_____ and subsequently deposited such sum in escrow with _____ (*name of escrow holder*). The escrow holder then mailed and telephoned plaintiff's demand for redemption along with plaintiff's demand, made in good faith, for a statement from defendant of the aggregate amount of unpaid indebtedness as of _____ (*date*), containing plaintiff's statement that the obligation amounted to a total of $_____. _____ (*name of escrow holder*) explained in his/her/its cover letter that the funds were deposited to plaintiff's account and would be delivered as soon as the amount of the obligation was settled. A true copy of that correspondence is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference].

(c) Defendant refused, and still refuses, to honor plaintiff's demand for redemption and has refused to accept any tender from plaintiff therefor.

8. By virtue of defendant's failure to proceed in accordance with the provisions of Division 9 of the Commercial Code, plaintiff is entitled to seek that disposition of the collateral be restrained on the appropriate terms and conditions as provided in *Section 9625(a) of the Commercial Code*.

[9. *Add if seeking temporary restraining order:* Furthermore, defendant's threatened disposition of the collateral, unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* equipment that is virtually irreplaceable in the recent market will not be returned to plaintiff's manufacturing establishment, effectively crippling plaintiff's enterprise in the manufacture of _____ [*describe*]).]

10. [As a proximate result of defendant's wrongful conduct, plaintiff has been damaged in the amount of $_____ for _____ (*describe basis, e.g.,* inability to properly operate a manufacturing plant). Plaintiff will be further damaged in like manner so long as defendant continues its conduct.] [Further,] [I]f defendant proceeds in noncompliance with the provisions of the Commercial Code referred to above, and disposes of the collateral, plaintiff will be injured in an amount not now known or calculable and will [seek leave to] amend this complaint to state that amount when it becomes known to plaintiff, or on proof thereof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

[1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any, why defendant should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;]

2. For a [temporary restraining order,] preliminary injunction[,] and a permanent injunction[, each] enjoining defendant and any agent, servant, or employee of defendant, and all persons in concert with any such persons, or on behalf of any such persons:

a. From disposing of the collateral by sale, lease, or in any other manner;

b. To honor plaintiff's right to redeem the collateral as tendered heretofore and by this action on terms provided by court order and to return the collateral;

3. For [damages in the sum of $_____, plus] damages in any sums that may be sustained and are ascertained before final judgment;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a debtor who desires to restrain the secured party from disposing of the collateral after default when the secured party has failed to honor the debtor's offer and tender to redeem the collateral [*see Com. Code §§ 9623, 9625(a)*; *see also* discussions at *§ 503.28[4]* and *[5]*; *Englert v. IVAC Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 178, 184, 154 Cal. Rptr. 804* (alternative of action for possession when collateral is wrongfully withheld after attempt to redeem)].

The special allowance of injunctive relief in *Com. Code § 9625(a)* is of particular importance when sought prospectively, before the unreasonable disposition of the collateral has been concluded. *Com. Code § 9625(a)* will apparently be applied even though plaintiff has not alleged additional facts which are ordinarily required to entitle him or her to injunctive relief under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges in pertinent part:

- Plaintiff's default under the security agreement, and defendant's preparation to dispose of the collateral (Paragraph 6).

- Defendant's refusal to honor plaintiff's offer and tender to redeem the collateral [*Com. Code § 9623*] (Paragraph 7).

- The right to restrain disposition of collateral when a secured party is proceeding in violation of Division 9 of the Commercial Code (Paragraph 8) [*Com. Code § 9625(a)*].

- Additional facts entitling plaintiff to a temporary restraining order (Paragraph 9) [*Com. Code § 9625(a)*].

[4] Special Requirements for Injunctive Relief

A complaint seeking injunctive relief, particularly where accompanied by application for a temporary restraining order, requires the filing of additional certificates, affidavits, or declarations accompanying the complaint or the pleading of specific evidentiary facts in a verified complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527*]. For discussion of the procedure for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.103

§ 503.103 Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	COMPLAINT TO ORDER DISPOSITION OF
	)	COLLATERAL AFTER REJECTION OF PROPOS-
	)	AL TO RETAIN IT ON DEFAULT

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of security agreement or statute that grants agricultural lien, and filing of any financing statement. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff defaulted under the agreement in that _____ [*describe default* (*see § 503.100[1], Paragraph 6*): Defendant _____ (had remained in *or* thereupon took) possession of the collateral. On or about _____ (*date*), defendant sent plaintiff an authenticated proposal that the collateral be retained in satisfaction of the obligation under the agreement. Within 20 days thereafter, on or about _____ (*date*), defendant received from _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*name*), a third-party creditor entitled to receive notice of defendant's original proposal], an authenticated objection to the proposal. Copies of this proposal and rejection are attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively, and incorporated by this reference.

7. Defendant is not proceeding in accordance with the provisions of Section *§ 9610 of the Commercial Code*, dealing with default, in that defendant has retained the collateral and failed and refused to dispose of it under the governing law although he/she/it received the aforementioned authenticated objection to the proposal to retain the collateral in satisfaction. By virtue of defendant's conduct, plaintiff is entitled to seek that disposition of the collateral be ordered on appropriate terms and conditions in accordance with the provisions of *Commercial Code Section 9625(a)*.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order requiring disposition of the collateral by _____ [*specify person or enterprise which would best protect debtor's interest*], with application of proceeds to be made in the following order:

a. To the costs of the taking, keeping, and selling of the collateral;

b. To the costs of suit [and attorney's fees] herein, as may be awarded by the court;

c. To the satisfaction of plaintiff's indebtedness secured by defendant's _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien];

d. To the satisfaction of indebtedness secured by any subordinate security interest in or other subordinate lien on the collateral [and to the satisfaction of any subordinate attachment lien or execution lien pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 701.040(b)*] [to the extent the foregoing are senior to the interest of _____ (*name*), as consignor, and] if written notification of demand therefor is received before distribution of the proceeds is completed;

[e. *If underlying transaction was a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, the following is inapplicable: To plaintiff as to any surplus thereafter;*]

2. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use when the collateral is any type other than consumer goods, at least 60 percent of which had been paid for, and the secured party, after default, has failed to dispose of the collateral after the debtor rejected the secured party's proposal to retain the collateral in satisfaction of the obligation [*see Com. Code §§ 9620, 9625(a)*; *see also* discussions in *§§ 503.27[3]* and *503.28[5]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- After default, defendant, being in possession of the collateral, made an authenticated proposal to retain the collateral in satisfaction of the obligation, and plaintiff's or other person's rejection of that proposal (Paragraph 6)

- The failure of defendant to comply with statute requiring disposition of the collateral (Paragraph 7) [*see Com. Code §§ 9610, 9620*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.104

§ 503.104 Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint to Order Disposition of Collateral When Secured Party Not Proceeding in Accordance With Law [Com. Code § 9625(a)]--Failure to Dispose of Collateral After Debtor Rejected Proposal to Retain Collateral in Satisfaction of Obligation [Com. Code § 9620(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	(Conversion of Consumer Goods Collateral After
	)	Default Under Security Agreement)
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement. See § 503.100[1], first alternative Paragraph 4.*]

5. According to the provisions of the agreement, plaintiff agreed to pay $_____ over a period of _____ [*time*] at _____ percent interest, and defendant agreed to deliver immediately to plaintiff for plaintiff's use and possession certain consumer goods in the form of _____ [*describe*]. By the agreement plaintiff also gave to defendant a purchase money security interest in the goods. [*If financing statement was filed with respect to security interest, add:* A financing statement was _____ (filed *or* recorded) (in connection with perfection of the security interest under the agreement) on or about _____ (*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). (A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.)]

6. By _____ [*date*], plaintiff had paid the sum of $_____, a sum which amounted to [more than] 60 percent of the cash price. On or about the same date plaintiff defaulted under the agreement in that _____[*describe default*]. Defendant thereupon took possession of the collateral.

7. At no time during the 90 days following defendant's repossession did defendant dispose of the collateral. Plaintiff never agreed to any longer period of time within which defendant could dispose of the collateral. The value of the collateral was $_____, and by retaining it, defendant has converted the collateral to his/her/its own use.

[8. *If seeking punitive damages, add:* The aforementioned acts of defendant were willful, wanton, malicious, and oppressive (, were undertaken with the intent to defraud plaintiff), and justify the awarding of exemplary and punitive damages.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the value of the property converted in the amount of $_____ less the amount of $_____ representing the remainder of plaintiff's indebtedness to defendant under the obligation, along with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from the date of conversion;

[2. For punitive and exemplary damages;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1]*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use when a debtor who has defaulted on a purchase money security contract or loan on consumer goods, and has paid in 60 percent of the cash price, seeks to recover damages for the conversion of the goods after the secured party's failure to dispose of the collateral within the required time period [*see Com. Code § 9620(e)(1), (f)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.42[5]*].

The complaint could be modified for use in a situation governed by *Com. Code § 9620(e)(2), (f)*, by modifying Paragraph 4 to describe a nonpurchase money transaction in consumer goods and by deleting from Paragraph 5 the reference to payment of 60 percent [or more] of the cash price and substituting instead an allegation of payment of 60 percent [or more] of the principal amount of the obligation. [*see Com. Code § 9620(e)(2)*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges

- Defendant's repossession of collateral on default after plaintiff had repaid 60 percent of the cash price (Paragraph 6) [*Com. Code § 9620(e)(1)*].

- The failure of defendant to properly dispose of the goods by the required time, and the value of the goods on that date (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code § 9620(f)*].

- Punitive damages, if desired (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 3294*].

[4] Cross Reference

For discussion and forms for use in actions for conversion generally, see Ch. 150, *Conversion*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.105

§ 503.105 Complaint for Accounting and Payment of Surplus After Collection or Disposition of Collateral After Default--By Debtor Against Secured Party [Com. Code § 9608 or 9615]

[1] FORM Complaint for Accounting and Payment of Surplus After Collection or Disposition of Collateral After Default--By Debtor Against Secured Party [Com. Code § 9608 or 9615]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR ACCOUNTING OF SURPLUS
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	AFTER COLLECTION OR DISPOSITION OF
	)	COLLATERAL
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of agreement or statute that grants agricultural lien, and filing of any financing statement. See § 503.100[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

[*EITHER, if collateral other than accounts, chattel paper, instruments, or promissory note(s)*]

6. _____ [Defendant had remained in *or* on or about _____ (*date*), defendant took] possession of the collateral. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that,] [O]n or about _____ [*date*], defendant disposed of the collateral after default of plaintiff for an amount in excess of both the indebtedness then due from plaintiff to defendant [under the agreement] and all proper expenses in connection with custody and disposition of the collateral. This excess is due therefore to plaintiff.

[*OR, if collateral was accounts, chattel paper, instruments, or promissory note(s) EXCEPT that this form is inapplicable if underlying transaction was sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangible(s), or promissory note(s) unless provided for in agreement*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], after default of plaintiff, defendant proceeded to notify _____ [account debtors *or* obligors] on the collateral to make payments to defendant instead of plaintiff, and [plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges,] collected an amount in excess of the indebtedness then due from plaintiff to defendant under the agreement and all proper expenses in connection with collection on the collateral, [under which agreement defendant _____ (was entitled to charge back collateral *or* had recourse against plaintiff personally)], which excess is due therefore to plaintiff.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. The exact amount of money received as surplus and due to plaintiff from defendant is unknown to plaintiff and cannot be ascertained without an accounting of the expenses and amount received by defendant on _____ [collection *or* disposition] of the collateral. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleged, the amount due to plaintiff exceeds $_____.]

8. Plaintiff has demanded an accounting of the disposition of collateral from defendant and payment of the surplus to plaintiff, but defendant has failed and refused, and continues to do so, to render an accounting and to pay the amount [*or allege facts showing such a demand would be useless*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an accounting between plaintiff and defendant;

[2. For damages in the amount of $_____;]

[3. For additional damages, as provided by *Commercial Code Section 9625*, of $500;]

4. For the amount found to be due from defendant to plaintiff as the surplus existing after deducting from the amount received on _____ [collection *or* disposition] of the collateral:

a. Reasonable expenses of _____ [collection and enforcement *or* (retaking,) holding, preparing for disposition, processing, and disposing of the collateral] [*if provided for by agreement and not otherwise prohibited by*

law, reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred by defendant];

b. Amount of remaining obligation secured by the _____ [security interest in *or* agricultural lien on] the collateral;

c. The indebtedness secured by a subordinate security interest in or agricultural lien on the collateral and for with regard to which defendant received authenticated notification of demand before distribution of the proceeds;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above* is for use by a debtor who, after collection or disposition of the collateral by the secured party for default of the debtor, demands an accounting of the amount realized thereon, in excess of amounts owed the secured party, to be returned as surplus to the debtor [*see Com. Code §§ 9608* (collection), *9615* (disposition); *see also* discussions in *§§ 503.27[3], [5][c]* and *[e]*]. If the underlying transaction is a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, the debtor is not entitled to any surplus [*see Com. Code §§ 9608(b), 9615(e)(1)(A)*], unless the parties have varied the statutory rule by their agreement [*see* UCC Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9608*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges in pertinent part [*see Com. Code § 9608* or *9615*]:

- The disposition of or collection on the collateral for an amount greater than that due the secured party (Paragraph 6).

- An unknown amount realized on the disposition (Paragraph 7).

- The failure of secured party to provide the debtor with an accounting of the disposition (Paragraph 8).

Counsel may wish to include allegations from Paragraphs 6 through 8 of the form in *§ 503.100[1]*, because if plaintiff's request for accounting took the form required by *Com. Code § 9210*, discussed in *§ 503.25[1]*, and defendant delayed more than 14 days without providing the accounting, plaintiff will be entitled to any actual damages caused by defendant's failure to provide the accounting and to statutory damages of $500 [*Com. Code § 9625(b)-(f)*, discussed in *§§ 503.29* and *503.100[4]*]. The bracketed items [2] and [3] in the prayer are for use when these additional allegations regarding failure to provide the accounting as required by *Com. Code § 9210* and resultant damages are used.

The form in [1], *above*, also does not include any allegation putting in issue whether defendant's conduct in collecting or disposing of the collateral was commercially reasonable [*see Com. Code §§ 9607(c), (d), 9610(a)-(c), 9627*, discussed in *§ 503.27[3][a]* and *[5][a]*]. Except in a consumer transaction, a secured party need not prove that its conduct was commercially reasonable unless the debtor puts the matter in issue [*see Com. Code §§ 9626(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[7]*]. If counsel wishes to put the question of commercial reasonableness in issue, counsel can incorporate the affirmative defense at § 503.111 or 503.112 as an allegation into complaint. Although the fact that a low price was received does not establish that a collection or disposition was not commercially reasonable [*see Com. Code § 9627(a)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[3][a]* and *[5][a]*], counsel may wish to put commercial reasonableness in issue if a low price was received, especially if the disposition was made to the secured party or an entity related to the secured party [*see Com. Code § 9615(f)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][d]*].

[4] Cross Reference

For discussion and forms of pleading for actions for accounting generally, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.106-503.109

[Reserved]

§§ 503.106[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.110

§ 503.110 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Priority in Fixtures--Trade Fixtures Did Not Become Interest in Real Estate and Were Intended to Remain Free Thereof [Civ. Code § 1019]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Priority in Fixtures--Trade Fixtures Did Not Become Interest in Real Estate and Were Intended to Remain Free Thereof [Civ. Code § 1019]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

The fixtures constituting the collateral in this action did not become and are not now part of or permanently attached to the premises. They were all affixed to the real property described herein for the purposes of _____ [trade *or* manufacture *or* ornamental *or* domestic] use. The removal thereof can be effected without injury to the premises. The manner in which those items have been affixed has not rendered them an integral part of the premises. _____ [*Name of debtor*] installed them on the premises for the specified purposes and without intending that they should become part of the real property [and _____ (*name of lessor of premises or holder of lien of deed of trust*) so understood at the time of their procurement and installation that they were temporary only and not intended to form part of the real property or of his/her/its interest therein].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint based on priority in fixtures, such as § 503.160. It contests the fact that trade fixtures, which constituted collateral under a security agreement, ever became permanently installed on or a part of the real property to which they were affixed, and thus ever passed to a third-party holder of some interest in the real property [*see Civ. Code § 1019*; *see also Com. Code § 9334(e)(2)* (priority); discussions in *§ 503.47[2]* and [6][b]].

A tenant may remove from the demised premises, any time during the continuance of his term, anything affixed to those premises for purposes of trade, manufacture, ornament, or domestic use, if the removal can be effected without injury to the premises, unless the thing, by the manner in which it is affixed, has become an integral part of the premises [*Civ.*

Code § 1019].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.111

§ 503.111 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Deficiency After Foreclosure--To Place Secured Party's Compliance in Issue [Com. Code § 9626(a)]--Secured Party Did Not Proceed in Commercially Reasonable Manner

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for for Deficiency After Foreclosure--To Place Secured Party's Compliance in Issue [Com. Code § 9626(a)]--Secured Party Did Not Proceed in Commercially Reasonable Manner

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

Plaintiff's _____ [collection *or* enforcement *or* disposition *or* acceptance] of the collateral was not conducted in compliance with *Commercial Code Sections 9601 through 9629*, inclusive, in that _____ [(collection *or* enforcement *or* disposition *or* acceptance) *then specify noncompliance and its consequences, e.g.,* was not conducted in a commercially reasonable manner, specifically, no advertisement was made of the sale, thus the sale was poorly attended and the amount realized by plaintiff on the sale of the collateral was much less than the amount that would have been realized had the disposition been conducted in good faith, after appropriate notice, and in a commercially reasonable manner].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a debtor, in a transaction that is not a consumer transaction, in an answer to a secured party's complaint for deficiency to place the burden on the secured party to prove that its collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance of the collateral was in compliance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(2)*]. Except when the underlying transaction was a consumer transaction [*compare Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(A)*], the secured party need not prove that its actions were in compliance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*, unless the debtor or a secondary obligor places the secured party's compliance in issue [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1)*]. If the secured party fails to prove that its collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance was conducted in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*, the liability of a debtor or a secondary obligor for a deficiency is limited as provided by *Com. Code § 9626(a)(3)*, discussed in *§ 503.27[7][a][ii]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.112

§ 503.112 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Deficiency After Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)]--Proceeds of Disposition to Secured (or Related) Party Were Significantly Less Than What Would Have Been Obtained on Disposition to Unrelated Party

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Deficiency After Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)]--Proceeds of Disposition to Secured (or Related) Party Were Significantly Less Than What Would Have Been Obtained on Disposition to Unrelated Party

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

The _____ [purchaser *or* lessee *or* licensee] of the collateral at the disposition alleged in the complaint was _____ [plaintiff, the secured party *or* _____(*name*), _____ (a person related to the secured party *or* a secondary obligor)]. The amount realized on that disposition was significantly below the range of prices that would have been brought by a disposition in compliance with *Commercial Code Sections 9601 through 9629*, inclusive, to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a debtor, in a transaction that is not a consumer transaction, in an answer to a secured party's complaint for deficiency to place in issue the amount to be used to calculate the deficiency when the disposition was to the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor [*see Com. Code §§ 9615(f), 9626(a)(5)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.27[5][d]*]. The debtor or obligor has the burden of proof on this issue, i. e., must prove that the amount of proceeds of the disposition is significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)*; *compare Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)* (in consumer transaction, secured party has the burden of establishing that the amount of proceeds of the disposition is not significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured

party, or a secondary obligor would have brought)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.113

§ 503.113 Defense to Action on Contract for Enforcement of Security Agreement--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 533; Mil. & Vet. Code § 408]

[1] FORM Defense to Action on Contract for Enforcement of Security Agreement--Application (Motion) for Stay of Proceedings on Ground Person Is On Active Military Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532; Mil. & Vet. Code § 408]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF APPLICATION AND APPLICATION
vs.	)	FOR ORDER TO STAY PROCEEDING [, SUP-
_____ [*name*],	)	PORTING DECLARATION OF
Defendant.	)	_____ (*name*), AND MEMOR-
	)	ANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To plaintiff _____ [*name*] and to _____ [*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of]

this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order granting a stay of these proceedings. The motion will be made on the grounds that Defendant is currently in military service (within the meaning of _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2) or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*]) and therefore is entitled under _____ [*for members of regular armed forces:* the Servicemembers Relief Act, specifically Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 533 or, for members of United States Military Reserve or National Guard*: *Military and Veterans Code Section 408*] to such a stay as a matter of right.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name of defendant or person making application on defendant's behalf*]

I, _____ [*name of defendant of person making application on defendant's behalf*], declare:

1. I am [*if someone other than defendant is making application, include the following:* acting on behalf of _____ (*name of defendant*), who is] the Defendant in this action.

[*For members of regular armed forces:*]

2. On _____ [*date*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant entered military service (within the meaning of Title *50 United States Code Appendix, Section 511(2)*) with the United States _____ [*list branch of military service, e.g.,* Army *or* Navy *or* Marine Corps *or* Air Force *or* Coast Guard], and remains in military service as of the date of this application.

[*OR, for members of United States Military Reserve or the National Guard*]

2. Defendant is a member of _____ [*specify branch of service, e.g.,* the United States Air Force Reserve *or* the California National Guard]. On _____ [*date subsequent to Sept. 11, 2001*], which date is subsequent to the date Defendant entered into the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint, Defendant was called to active military service (within the meaning of *Military and Veterans Code Section 400*) for a period in excess of seven days in a 14-day period, and remains on active military service as of the date of this application.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. By virtue of Defendant's military service, Defendant's ability to comply with the terms of the obligation described in Plaintiff's complaint has been materially affected in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* Defendant is self-employed as a _____ (*e.g.,* lawyer) and has been unable to work at _____ (his *or* her) regular occupation while on active military service, as a result of which Defendant has been unable to generate enough income to meet Defendant's financial obligations, including the obligation referred to in Plaintiff's complaint].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[Add memorandum of points and authorities supporting motion]

Respectfully Submitted,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [moving party]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an application by a defendant, or a person acting on the defendant's behalf, for an order granting a stay in an action to enforce a security interest in real or personal property due to the defendant's alleged nonpayment of any sum due on the underlying obligation, or other breach of any term of that obligation. The application seeks the stay on the ground that the nonpayment or breach occurred while the defendant was in military service [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408*].

As explained in the discussion below, under the circumstances this application functions in effect as a temporary defense to the underlying action.

[3] Governing Law

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] provides for the temporary suspension of various legal proceedings, obligations, and liabilities for persons in military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 502* (purpose of statute)]. The statute is applicable to all members of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] during periods of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*] and, in many cases, for 90 days after termination of a member's period of military service. The California counterpart to the federal legislation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*] is designed to fill certain gaps in the federal law in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001. The California statute, many provisions of which are virtually identical to their federal counterparts, is designed to apply to military reservists and National Guard members who are called to active military service under specified circumstances and, in

many cases, for limited periods of time [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400*]. For detailed discussion of the relief available under these statutes, the manner in which such relief can be requested, and the persons who qualify for this relief, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, §§ 501.60* et seq., *501.300*.

[4] Enforcement of Security Interests

The protections afforded to military personnel in the area of security instruments under both the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and the comparable California law provisions are available only with respect to an obligation on real or personal property owned by a service member (1) that originated before the period of the service member's military service; (2) for which the service member is still obligated; and (3) that is secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(a)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(a)*]. Security agreements covering goods (such as motor vehicles) under Division 9 of the Commercial Code evidently would be "in the nature of a mortgage" in this context.

A sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for a breach of an obligation described above is not valid if made during, or within 90 days after, the period of the service member's military service, except if made either on a court order granted before the sale, foreclosure, or seizure, with a return made and approved by the court, or pursuant to an enforceable waiver agreement [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)* ("pursuant to an agreement between the parties"); *see also 50 U.S.C. § 517* (waiver agreement)]. There are penalties for repossessing or attempting to repossess property in violation of these requirements. Violators are guilty of a misdemeanor [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(d)(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(d)*].

[5] Stay of Proceeding

In an action filed during, or within 90 days after, a service member's period of military service to enforce an obligation described in [4], *above*, the court may, after a hearing and on its own motion, or must, on application by a service member, when the service member's ability to comply with the obligation is materially affected by military service, either stay the proceedings for a period of time as justice and equity require or adjust the obligation to preserve the interests of all parties [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*].

The governing statutes do not specify the length of time for which a stay of the proceeding may be granted. Rather, it is simply left to the discretion of the court [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*]. This raises some interesting practical issues regarding the time period of the stay. If the stay is granted for a period of indefinite duration, such as the period of the defendant's military service or a specified amount of time (for example, six months) thereafter, it may be difficult for the plaintiff to determine when the action can resume, as it might be expected that in the ordinary case the plaintiff would not know, and could not determine without difficulty, when the defendant's period of military service is over. On the other hand, if the stay is set for a finite period of time, such as six months, and the defendant either (1) is released from active military service earlier than the time period specified in the stay, or (2) conversely, is still on active military service when the period of the stay ends, the defendant presumably would have to seek an additional stay at that point. It appears that the court would have discretion to grant either type of stay under its general authority to order a stay for a period of time as justice and equity require [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)* ("for any period as the court deems just")]. This form does not request a specific length of time for the stay, but the party filing the application may wish to consider whether inclusion of such language is desirable or whether the length of the stay would be better left to the discretion of the court. The form may be modified to add a specific length of time for the stay if desired.

Additional relief of a more general nature also may be available under *50 U.S.C. App. § 591* or *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3*, the general relief provisions of the federal and California statutes. These statutes basically grant an extension of the underlying installment obligation for a period equal to the period of military service or, in the case of installment obligations for the purchase of real property or secured by a real property mortgage or similar instrument, for a period

equal to the period of the military service plus a period equal to the remaining installments, or any part of that combined period [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 590(1)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.3(a)*]. For more detailed discussion of these provisions, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, § 501.300*.

[6] Who May Request Stay

Under federal law, the stay may be requested by the service member, or an attorney acting on the behalf of the service member, or an individual possessing a power of attorney from the service member [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 519*; *see also 50 U.S.C. § 592* (automatic extension of power of attorney while service member is missing)]. Under California law, application for a stay may be made by the person in military service or by "some person on the service member's behalf" [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*]. There are no statutory restrictions on who that "some person" may be. Presumably in many cases the service member will be absent due to the military service, and the request will have to be made by someone else on the service member's behalf.

[7] Procedure and Accompanying Papers

The statute states that a request for a stay of the type discussed in this statute is to be made by "application" to the court [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*]. For purposes of the applicable procedural requirements, an application in this context is deemed a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (any application for order is deemed a motion)]. Accordingly, the application in this form is in the form of a motion, although the term "application" is retained in deference to the statutory language.

A notice of motion normally is accompanied by one or more affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury setting forth the evidentiary facts required to establish the grounds of the motion [*see Ch. 372, Motions and Orders, §§ 372.21[5][b], [17], 372.61[2]* et seq.; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)* (evidence received at a law and motion hearing must be by declaration and affidavit); *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003* (affidavit defined), 2009, (use of affidavit in support of motion), 2015.5].

A memorandum of points and authorities must be filed and a copy served with this notice of motion [*Cal Rules of Ct, Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*].

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and general forms relating to law and motion practice, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[8] Cross References

- For discussion of how a party's military service may affect family law proceedings and declaration requirements, see Ch. 12A, *Adoptions: Termination of Parental Rights* ; Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* ; and Ch. 258, *Family Law Enforcement: General Enforcement Principles and Remedies* .

- For an application for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

- For an declaration for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , Form 19.

- For a complaint for unlawful retaliation by a lender, creditor, or other person against a person who received a stay or postponement because of military service, see *Ch. 129, Consumer Credit Reporting, § 129.150*.

- For discussion and an application for a stay of a pending action or proceeding based on military service, see *Ch. 136, Continuances, §§ 136.20[2], 136.78A.*

- For discussion and a plaintiff's declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth facts showing that the defendant is not in the military service prior to entry of default judgment, see *Ch. 205, Defaults and Default Judgments, §§ 205.25[5], 205.92 -205.94.*

- For an application for a stay of execution of a judgment or order involving a person in military service, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

- For an application for a stay of garnishment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 276, *Garnishment* .

- For a defendant's notice of admitting service of summons and complaint, waiving further notice, and waiving rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and similar state statutes, see *Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances, § 323.173*.

- For a lessee's notice of termination of a lease due to the lessee's military service, see *Ch. 332, Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy, § 332.71A.*

- For a stay of eviction in an unlawful detainer proceeding during a period of military service, see *Ch. 333, Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions, § 333.111*.

- For discussion, a procedural checklist, and general forms relating to law and motion practice, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

- For an application for relief against the enforcement of a fine or penalty against a person in military service when the penalty was incurred, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgment or Order* .

- For a service member's application for relief from judgment, supporting declaration and order, see *Ch. 489, Relief From Judgments and Orders, § 489.411*.

- For detailed discussion of relief under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and related California legislation, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts; §§ 501.60* et seq.

- For an application for stay of enforcement of pre-existing obligation during the period of the applicant's military service, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.300.*

- For an application (motion) for temporary relief from an obligation on the ground that the person is or was in active military service after entering into the obligation, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.301*.

- For an affirmative defense to an action on an interest-bearing obligation on the ground that the annual rate of interest may not exceed 6 percent per year during the period of the defendant's military service, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.302.*

- For an application (motion) in an action on a contract for the purchase of personal property for a stay of proceedings on the ground that the defendant is on active military service see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.303.*

- For discussion of ascertaining a defendant's military status at the time of service of summons and its benefits and effect on subsequent proceedings, see *Ch. 518, Service of Summons and Papers, § 518.19*.

- For a petition for a stay of foreclosure proceedings and relief from an installment contract, mortgage, or trust deed for the purchase of real property by an active member of the military service, see *Ch 555, Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages, § 555.139A*.

- For an application for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments by an active member of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139B.

- For an order staying foreclosure proceedings in relation to an obligation secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property for an activemember of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139C.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Forms for Use by Debtors or Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.114-503.119

[Reserved]

§§ 503.114[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.120

§ 503.120 Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement and for Judicial Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)] or Possession of Collateral [Com. Code § 9609] Thereunder

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement and for Judicial Foreclosure [Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)] or Possession of Collateral [Com. Code § 9609] Thereunder

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DEFAULT UNDER SECURITY AGREEMENT AND _____ [JUDICIAL FORECLOSURE *or* POSSESSION OF COLLATERAL]
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[*EITHER, if plaintiff's security interest was created by a security agreement*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a security agreement _____ [entitled _____ (*specify e.g.,* "Security Agreement" *or* "Installment Sales Contract" *or* "Promissory Note and Agreement") *or* consisting of _____ (*specify e.g.,* a promissory note and mortgage of _____ [personal property *or* fixtures] *or* an agreement assigning certain _____ (*specify e.g.,* accounts receivable])]. A true copy of this agreement (hereinafter referred to as "the agreement") is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A [consisting of Documents _____ through _____] and made a part of it by this reference.

[*AND*]

5. According to the provisions of the agreement, plaintiff agreed to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* lend defendant the sum of $_____ *or* sell and deliver to defendant certain _____ (*describe items*) *or* render services to defendant in the form of _____ (*describe performance*) *or describe other benefit*], and defendant agreed to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* repay plaintiff therefor, with interest, at certain times and places as stated in the agreement *or* perform particular services for plaintiff, as scheduled in the agreement, in the form of _____ (*describe*) *or describe other consideration*]. By the agreement defendant also gave to plaintiff a security interest in _____ [*describe collateral, e.g.,* all the items of equipment described above], to which plaintiff would be entitled to resort to in fulfillment of all obligations secured thereby, as well as expenses reasonably incurred by plaintiff in any disposition thereof, should defendant default in any way under the agreement. [*If filing was made with respect to security interest, add:* A financing statement was _____ (filed *or* recorded) (in connection with perfection of the security interest under the agreement) on or about _____(*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). (A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.)]

[*OR, if plaintiff's interest is an agricultural lien*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [furnished _____(*specify goods or services, e.g.,* feed and materials) *or* leased real property] to defendant in connection with defendant's [*specify if desired, e.g.,* dairy] farming operation. Defendant agreed to _____ [*describe consideration promised by defendant, e.g.,* repay plaintiff therefor, with interest, at certain times and places as stated in the agreement]. [The foregoing is evidenced by a(n) _____ (lease *or* agreement), dated _____, a true copy of which (hereinafter referred to as _____ ["the agreement" *or* "the lease") is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A (consisting of Documents _____ through _____) and made a part of it by this reference.]

[*AND*]

5. The effect of the transaction(s) described in Paragraph 4 was to give plaintiff an agricultural lien on defendant's _____ [*describe collateral, e.g.,* proceeds from the sale of milk] in accordance with _____[*specify statute creating lien whose effectiveness does not depend on defendant's possession of the personal property, e.g., Sections 57401 to 57414 of the Food and Agricultural Code*]. [*If filing was made to perfect agricultural lien, add:* A financing statement was filed in connection with perfection of the agricultural lien created by

that _____ (agreement *or* lease) on or about _____ (*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.]

[*CONTINUE*]

6. Plaintiff has fully performed under the agreement. However, on or about _____ [*date*], defendant defaulted on the agreement by failing _____ [*describe, e.g.,* to make any further payments as required under the agreement *or* to render performance of services as required under the agreement] in that _____ [*specify manner of default*]. As a result, pursuant to the terms of the agreement, defendant's entire obligation has become due, and there is now due, owing, and unpaid from defendant _____ [the principal sum of $_____, together with interest thereon from and after _____ (*date*), at the rate of _____ percent per annum *or* the amount of $_____, the amount as specified within the agreement to be the equivalent of that performance *or other damages as appropriate*]. No part of that amount has been paid although plaintiff has demanded it from the defendant.

[*EITHER, if possession of collateral is sought*]

7. Although, pursuant to the agreement, defendant has remained to the present time in possession of the collateral subject to plaintiff's _____[security interest *or* agricultural lien], as a further result of defendant's default, plaintiff is entitled to take immediate possession of the collateral described therein in/on which plaintiff was given a _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien]. Plaintiff has demanded possession from defendant, but defendant wrongfully has _____[refused to give plaintiff possession *or* failed to respond to plaintiff's demands or in any way give plaintiff access to that collateral *or describe other failure of defendant to transfer collateral*].

[*OR, if judicial foreclosure is sought*]

7. _____ [_____(Plaintiff, pursuant to agreement, *or* Defendant *or specify third party*) has remained to the present time in *or* Plaintiff, on defendant's default, has taken] possession of the collateral subject to plaintiff's _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien]. As a result of defendant's default, plaintiff is entitled to enforce this _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien] by judicial foreclosure of all of defendant's rights in the property through public sale thereof by the proper judicial officer.

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest from and after _____ [*date*], to date of judgment at the rate of _____ percent per annum;

[*EITHER*]

3. For possession of the collateral described above;

[*OR*]

3. For an order directing public sale of the property herein described to foreclose [all of] defendant's right(s) therein and to apply the proceeds, in the following order:

a. To the costs of taking, holding, and selling the property [and, to the extent provided for by agreement and not prohibited by law, reasonable attorney's fees and legal expenses incurred by the secured party in doing so];

b. To the costs of suit herein, as may be awarded by the court;

c. To the satisfaction of damages and interest thereon under the agreement;

d. To the satisfaction of obligations secured by any subordinate security interest in, or other subordinate lien on, the collateral, and to the satisfaction of any subordinate attachment lien or execution lien pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 701.040(b)* if authenticated demand therefor or notice of the levy of attachment or execution is received before distribution of the proceeds is completed;

[e. *If underlying transaction was other than sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangible(s), or promissory note(s):* To defendant as to any surplus thereafter;]

[*CONTINUE*]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party, after default under a security agreement or under a lease or agreement that is the basis for an agricultural lien, to a reduce its claim to judgment, and for the remedy of foreclosure or possession of the collateral [*Com. Code §§ 9601(a)(2), 9609*; *see also Bank of California v. Leone (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 444, 446, 447, 112 Cal. Rptr. 394* (secured party may sue for default on obligation without first having recourse to security)]. The usual remedy is to seek damages and to request either possession of the collateral (if not already in the secured party's possession) or judicial foreclosure. Plaintiff may request damages only and retain the option of

executing on the collateral with the same priority as under private or judicial foreclosure. It is also possible for the secured party to request both possession (if not in possession already) of the collateral and judicial foreclosure, or to later request execution. Foreclosure and execution both work in the same manner, and the sheriff, as the appropriate judicial officer for foreclosure sale, can just as easily take custody of the property from the secured party as from the debtor [*see* discussions in *§ 503.29[1], [2], [6], [9], [10]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges [*see also § 503.100 [6]*]:

- The material bargain under the agreement, consisting of (1) the benefit that plaintiff gave to defendant in return for defendant's promise to pay or perform an obligation, and (2) the collateral which defendant agreed, or, in the case of an agricultural lien, which statute provided, would secure the obligation to plaintiff (alternative Paragraphs 4 and 5).

- Plaintiff's full performance and defendant's default, leading to acceleration of the obligation in full and the fact that it is still unsatisfied (Paragraph 6) [*see Com. Code § 9601(a)*].

- Either (1) plaintiff's demand for possession of the collateral, which defendant has wrongfully refused or failed to transfer on demand after default [*see Com. Code § 9609*], or (2) plaintiff's entitlement and desire to enforce the security interest by way of judicial foreclosure (Paragraph 7) [*see Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)*].

If the claim is payable in a foreign currency, or calculable by conversion to or from a foreign currency, additional allegations should be added setting forth that fact. Otherwise, the claim is made in United States dollars [*Code Civ. Proc. § 676.6(a)*; for discussion and a form of judgment applicable to the Uniform Foreign-Money Claims Act (*Code Civ. Proc. § 676 et seq.*), *see* Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 318, *Judgments*].

[4] Alternative Methods of Judicial Foreclosure

When a judgment requires the sale of property, it may be enforced by a writ of sale reciting the judgment, or the material parts of it, and directing the proper officer to execute on it by making the sale and applying the proceeds in conformity with the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 716.010, 716.020*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 712.040(a)*, discussed in [5], *below*].

Alternatively, if the secured party has merely reduced the claim to judgment, it may then obtain issuance of a writ of execution, directing the proper officer to levy on the debtor's property serving as collateral under the security agreement [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 699.530*]. If a secured party has reduced its claim to judgment, the lien of any levy that may be made on the collateral by virtue of an execution based on the judgment relates back to the earliest of any of the following [*Com. Code § 9601(e)*]:

- The date of perfection of the security interest or agricultural lien in the collateral.

- The date of filing a financing statement covering the collateral.

- Any date specified in a statute under which the agricultural lien was created.

A sale pursuant to an execution is a foreclosure of the security interest or agricultural lien by judicial procedure within the meaning of *Com. Code § 9601*. A secured party may purchase at the sale and thereafter hold the collateral free of any other requirements of Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9601(f)*].

[5] Methods of Enforcing Possession on Judgment

If the plaintiff does not resort to claim and delivery pending trial, the judgment for possession of personal property may be enforced by a writ of possession. The writ will be directed to the levying officer in the county where the judgment is to be enforced. Separate writs are issued for each county in which the judgment is to be enforced and may be issued successively until the judgment is satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 714.010*]. A writ of possession requires the levying officer to whom it is directed to search for the property specified in the writ and, if it is in the possession of the judgment debtor or an agent of the judgment debtor, take custody of the property in the same manner as a levy under a writ of execution. The property taken into custody by the levying officer must be delivered to the judgment creditor in satisfaction of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 714.020(a)*]. If the property specified in the writ cannot be taken into custody, the levying officer must demand the property from the judgment debtor if the judgment debtor can be located. If custody is not then obtained, the levying officer must state so in the return. Thereafter the judgment for possession may be enforced in the same manner as a money judgment for the value of the property as specified in the judgment or a supplemental order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 714.020(b)*]. Under the circumstances described by *Code Civ. Proc. § 714.020(b)*, the writ of possession may be treated as a writ of execution [*Code Civ. Proc. § 714.020(c)*].

After entry of a judgment for possession of personal property, and whether or not a writ of possession has been issued, the judgment creditor may apply to the court for an order directing the judgment debtor to transfer possession of the property or documentary evidence of title to the property or both to the judgment creditor. The application must be by noticed motion if required by the court or a court rule; otherwise, it may be ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 714.030(a)*].

A writ of possession (or sale) may be enforced as a writ of execution to satisfy any money judgment included in the judgment for possession (or sale). If amounts due under the money judgment are not satisfied pursuant to the writ of possession (or sale), the judgment creditor may use a writ of execution to satisfy the money judgment after the writ of possession has been returned or 180 days after its issuance, whichever is earlier. If the judgment creditor does not want a writ of possession (or sale) to issue, as for example, when possession of property has been voluntarily surrendered, he or she is entitled to a writ of execution instead to satisfy the money judgment portion of the judgment for possession [*Code Civ. Proc. § 712.040(a)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion of and forms of action for possession of personal property generally, and for procedure and forms for writ of possession prior to trial, see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery*

For discussion and forms of breach of contract generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms of pleading for damages generally, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion of, and forms for use in, executing on personal property, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.121

§ 503.121 Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement--Failure to Pay Proceeds--By Secured Party Against Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9315, 9601(a)(1)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Default Under Security Agreement-Failure to Pay Proceeds--By Secured Party Against Debtor [Com. Code §§ 9315, 9601(a)(1)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	SECURITY AGREEMENT
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.120[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of security agreement or statute that grants agricultural lien, and filing of any financing statement. See § 503.120[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

6. According to the provisions of the _____[agreement, defendant further agreed *and/or* statute governing plaintiff's agricultural lien, defendant was required], on sale or other disposition of any of the above-described _____ [*identify goods or other collateral*], to immediately account to plaintiff for the proceeds of disposition and to pay and deliver to plaintiff all proceeds in whatever form, to be applied to the payment and discharge of defendant's obligation.

7. According to the provisions of the agreement, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____[*allege plaintiff's performance of the agreement, e.g.*, paid to _____ (*name of seller*) the sum of $_____, the purchase price in full for _____ (*identify goods or other collateral*), and delivered to defendant an endorsed bill of lading permitting defendant to take possession thereof] [, and has performed all conditions precedent to and obligations incidental to the security agreement].

8. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*allege disposition of goods or other collateral, for example, sold and delivered*] _____ [*identify goods or other collateral*] and has thereafter failed and refused to account and pay to plaintiff the proceeds of _____ [*allege disposition, for example, the sale*], although requested by plaintiff to do so.

9. By reason of defendant's _____ [breach of the security agreement *or* failure to perform in accordance with his/her/its obligations under the statute creating the agricultural lien], plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____, no part of which [other than the sum of $_____] has been paid.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an accounting of the proceeds of _____[*allege disposition, for example, the sale*].

2. For an order directing defendant to pay to plaintiff the full amount of proceeds from _____ [*allege disposition, for example, the sale*].

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party to bring an action to obtain an accounting for the proceeds of

collateral when the debtor has disposed of the collateral and has failed to pay the proceeds to the secured party in breach of the security agreement or agreement, lease, or statute that is the basis for an agricultural lien [*see Com. Code §§ 9315* (security interest in proceeds), *9601(a)(1)* (remedies)].

For further discussion proceeds and security interests in proceeds, see *§§ 503.11[18], 503.21[4],* and *503.22[7]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The parties' agreement, or the requirement in any statute creating plaintiff's agricultural lien, that defendant pay to plaintiff the proceeds of any disposition of the collateral (Paragraph 6) [*see Com. Code §§ 9201(a), 9203(f), 9315(a)*].

- Plaintiff's full performance (Paragraph 7).

- Defendant's default (Paragraph 8) [*see Com. Code § 9601(a)(1)*; *Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. Land Dynamics (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 966, 972, 163 Cal. Rptr. 348* (default under security agreement occurs when collateral is transferred without secured party's consent and proceeds from sale of collateral are not immediately delivered to secured party)].

- Plaintiff's damages (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 3300*].

[4] Rights of Secured Party on Disposition of Collateral

[a] Pursuit of Collateral

In most cases, when a debtor makes an unauthorized disposition of collateral, the security interest or agricultural lien continues in the original collateral in the hands of the purchaser or other transferee [*see Com. Code § 9315(a)(1)*; for discussion regarding whether a disposition was authorized, *see § 503.21[4][c]*]. Because the transferee takes subject to the security interest or agricultural lien, the secured party may repossess the collateral from him or her or, in an appropriate case, maintain an action for conversion. In cases in which the secured party may claim both proceeds and collateral, it may have only one satisfaction [*see* U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

[b] Pursuit of Proceeds

In many cases, a purchaser or other transferee of collateral will take free of a security interest. In those cases, the secured party's only right will be to proceeds. The transferee will take free of the secured party's interest in the original collateral whenever the disposition is authorized [*see § 503.21[4][c],* regarding whether a disposition was authorized]. The authorization may be contained in the security agreement or otherwise given. The secured party's right to proceeds, either under *Com. Code § 9315* or under the express terms of an agreement does not, in itself, constitute an authorization of disposition [*see* U.C.C. Comment 2 to *Com. Code § 9315*].

When cash proceeds are paid into the debtor's deposit account and paid out in the operation of the debtor's business, recipients of the funds take free of any claim that the secured party may have in them as proceeds unless they acted in collusion with the debtor in violating the rights of the secured party [*Com. Code § 9332(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.122

§ 503.122 Explanation to Consumer Debtor or Obligor of How Deficiency or Surplus Was Calculated [Com. Code § 9616]

[1] FORM Explanation to Consumer Debtor or Obligor of How Deficiency or Surplus Was Calculated [Com. Code § 9616]

TO: _____ [*name of debtor or consumer obligor*]

FROM: _____ [*name of secured party*]

RE: Calculation of _____ [Surplus *or* Deficiency] [on Loan #_____]

On or about _____ [*date*], the secured party disposed of collateral, specifically _____ [*describe collateral*] in which he/she/it held a security interest pursuant to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a security agreement dated _____, entitled "Installment Sales Contract"].

The amount of proceeds of this disposition were ..... $_____

Amounts applied for expenses of this disposition:

Expenses of retaking collateral.....	$_____
Expenses of holding collateral.....	$_____
Expenses of preparing collateral for disposition.....	$_____
Expenses of processing the collateral for disposition	$_____

..... ____

Expenses of disposing of the collateral $_____
..... ____

Attorney's fees..... $_____
____

Sub-total of expenses.... $_____
.....
.....
...

Net proceeds after deducting expenses of disposition $_____
..... _____
_____

Amount of obligations secured by the security interest under which the disposition was made ..... $_____
_____
_____

This amount does [not] reflect a rebate of $ _____ for [unearned interest *or* credit service charge][*if amount does reflect rebate*, calculated as of a _____ (*date*)].

[If applicable: Rebate or credit for _____ [*specify any other rebates or credits not listed above*] ..... $_____
_____
_____.

Amount of obligation remaining after deduction of proceeds ..... $_____
_____
_____

Amount of deficiency ..... $_____
_____
_____

Amount of surplus ..... $_____
_____
_____

[*If applicable, add:* Future debits, credits, charges, including additional credit service charges or interest, rebates, and expenses may affect the amount of the surplus or deficiency shown above.]

You can obtain additional information concerning this transaction _____ [by calling _____ (*telephone number*) *and/or* by inquiries addressed to _____ (*mailing address*)].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party to comply with its obligation under *Com. Code § 9616* to provide an explanation to a debtor or consumer obligor of how the secured party calculated the surplus or deficiency after disposition. This explanation is required only in consumer goods transactions [*see Com. Code § 9616(b)* at [4], *below*]. No particular phrasing of the explanation is required. An explanation complying substantially with the requirements of *Com. Code § 9616(a)* and *(c)* is sufficient, even if it includes minor errors that are not seriously misleading [*Com. Code § 9616(d)*].

[3] Contents

The form in [1], *above* includes the following:

- The amount of proceeds of the disposition [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(2)*].

- The amount (these may be presented in the aggregate or by type) and types of expenses, including expenses of retaking, holding, preparing for disposition, processing, and disposing of the collateral, and attorney's fees secured by the collateral which are known to the secured party and relate to the current disposition [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(4)*].

- The aggregate amount of obligations secured by the security interest under which the disposition was made, and, if the amount reflects a rebate of unearned interest or credit service charge, an indication of that fact [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(1)*].

- If the amount applied in satisfaction of the secured obligation reflects a rebate of unearned interest or credit service charge, the date as of which that amount is calculated depends on whether the secured party took possession of the collateral or not, and if so when. If the secured party did not take possession of the collateral or took or received possession of the collateral before default, the rebate must be calculated as of a date not more than 35 days before the disposition [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(1)(B)*]. If the secured party takes or receives possession of the collateral after default, the rebate must be calculated as of a date not more than 35 days before the secured party took or received possession [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(1)(B)*].

- The amount (this may be presented in the aggregate or by type) and types of credits, including rebates of interest or credit service charges, to which the obligor is known to be entitled and which are not reflected in the amount in *Com. Code § 9616(c)(1)* [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(5)*]. Rebates of interest or credit service charge may be included in the aggregate amount of obligations secured under *Com. Code § 9616(c)(1)* or with other types of rebates and credits under *Com. Code § 9616(c)(5)*. Rebates of interest and credit service charges are the only type of rebates for which this discretion is provided. If the secured party provides and explanation that includes rebates of pre-computed interest, its explanation must so indicate [*see* UCC Comment 3. to *Com. Code § 9616*].

- The aggregate amount of the obligations after deducting the amount of proceeds [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(3)*].

- The amount of the surplus or deficiency [*Com. Code § 9616(c)(6)*].

- If applicable, a statement that future debits, credits, charges, including additional credit service charges or interest, rebates, and expenses may affect the amount of the surplus or deficiency [*Com. Code § 9616(a)(1)(C)*].

- A telephone number or mailing address from which additional information concerning the transaction is available [*Com. Code § 9616(a)(1)(D)*].

[4] When Explanation Must Be Sent

In a consumer-goods transaction in which the debtor is entitled to a surplus or a consumer obligor is liable for a deficiency under *Com. Code § 9615*, the secured party must send an explanation to the debtor or consumer obligor, as applicable, after the disposition and either (1) before or when the secured party accounts to the debtor and pays any surplus or first makes written demand on the consumer obligor after the disposition for payment of the deficiency [*Com. Code § 9616(b)(1)(A)*], or (2) within 14 days after receipt of a request [*Com. Code § 9616(b)(1)(B)*].

The secured party need not send an explanation to a consumer obligor who is liable for a deficiency if the secured party instead sends the consumer obligor a record waiving the secured party's right to a deficiency. The waiver must be sent within 14 days after the secured party receives a request for an explanation [*Com. Code § 9616(b)(2)*].

"Request" means a record that is authenticated by a debtor or consumer obligor, requesting that the recipient provide an explanation, and is sent after collateral is disposed of under *Com. Code § 9610* [*Com. Code § 9616(a)(2)*].

[5] Charge for Explanation

A debtor or consumer obligor is entitled without charge to one response to a request under *Com. Code § 9616* during any six-month period in which the secured party did not send to the debtor or consumer obligor an explanation pursuant to *Com. Code § 9616(b)(1)*. The secured party may require payment of a charge not exceeding $25 for each additional response [*Com. Code § 9616(e)*].

[6] Liability for Failure to Provide Explanation

A secured party who fails to provide the explanation is liable for damages for noncompliance under *Com. Code § 9625(b)-(d)*, discussed in *§ 503.29*. In addition, a secured party whose failure to comply with *Com. Code § 9616(b)(1)* is part of a pattern, or consistent with a practice, of noncompliance is liable for an additional $500 in statutory damages [*Com. Code § 9625(e)(5)*], as is a secured party who fails to comply with *Com. Code § 9616(b)(2)* [*Com. Code § 9625(e)(6)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.123

§ 503.123 Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Foreclosure on Collateral After Default Under Security Agreement or Agricultural Lien [Com. Code §§ 9615, 9626]

[1] FORM Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Foreclosure on Collateral After Default Under Security Agreement or Agricultural Lien [Com. Code §§ 9615, 9626]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DEFICIENCY REMAINING
_____ [*name*] [and DOES I	)	AFTER FORECLOSURE FOR DEFAULT UNDER
_____, inclusive], Defendant.	)	SECURITY AGREEMENT
	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or transaction that provides basis for agricultural lien. See § 503.120[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

5. [*Key provisions of the agreement or statute that is basis for agricultural lien, and filing of any financing statement. See § 503.120[1], alternative Paragraphs 5.*]

6. Plaintiff fully performed under the_____ [lease *or* agreement]. However, on or about _____[*date*], defendant defaulted on the _____ [lease *or* agreement] in that _____ [*describe default*]. As a result, under the terms of the _____ [lease *or* agreement], defendant's entire obligation then became due, and there was then due, owing, and unpaid from defendant the sum of $_____ [*describe damages as appropriate*]. Plaintiff was then entitled to have recourse to the collateral securing the _____ [lease *or* agreement], which collateral _____ [has remained in plaintiff's possession pursuant to the agreement *or* plaintiff then took possession of from defendant _____ (with defendant's consent *or* by appropriate self-help procedures)].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff sent authenticated notification to defendant [and to _____ (*name(s), or* those persons listed in Exhibit _____, which is attached and incorporated by this reference) *continue if desired with status of other persons to whom notice was required to be given by Com. Code § 9611(c)(2), (3), e.g.,* as secondary obligor(s), and as a person who held a security interest in or other lien on the collateral perfected by the filing of a financing statement *and, if desired, describe method by which notification was sent, e.g,* by depositing that notification in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to defendant at the address given in the (security) agreement] of the _____ [day, date, time and place of any public disposition *or* day and date after which a private sale or other disposition was to be made]. That notification was in the form provided by Commercial Code Section _____[9613 *or* 9614]. A true copy of the notification is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference. [Notice of the time and place of the public sale was also given at least five days before the date of sale by publication once in _____ (*name of newspaper*) on _____ (*date*), a newspaper of general circulation published in _____ County, _____ (in which the sale was to be held *or* which is the county in California contiguous to the county in which the sale was to be held and having the highest population of all similarly contiguous counties).]

[8. At all times with respect to disposition of the collateral plaintiff acted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner. Disposition was made in the form of a _____ (sale *or* lease *or* license) at _____ (wholesale *or* retail) _____ (as a single unit *or* in parcels), on _____ (*date*), at _____ (*time*) at _____ (*specify locale*).]

[*EITHER, if collateral was disposed of by public sale*]

10. The locale for the disposition of the collateral was _____ [the _____ (county *or* place) specified in the (security) agreement *or specify other place if desired, e.g.,* the county in which the collateral was located]. [The sale was postponed from time to time by public announcement at the time and place last scheduled for the sale.] The collateral was disposed of for the amount of $_____, and the purchaser was _____ [plaintiff *or name of third party,* a _____ (secondary obligor *or* a person that is [not] related to plaintiff)].

[*OR, if collateral was disposed of by private sale*]

10. The collateral was disposed of for the amount of $_____, and the purchaser was _____ [*name of third party or* plaintiff, the collateral being of the type which is _____(customarily sold in a recognized market *or* the subject of widely distributed standard price quotations)].

[*CONTINUE*]

11. The amount realized on the disposition of the collateral was applied by plaintiff as follows [*list as appropriate*]:

(a) $_____ for expenses of retaking;

(b) $_____ for expenses of holding;

(c) $_____ for expenses of [processing and] preparing for disposition;

(d) $_____ for expenses of _____ [selling *or* leasing];

(e) $_____ for attorney's fees and related legal expenses, as provided for under the (security) agreement and not prohibited by law;

(f) $_____ toward satisfaction of the obligation secured by the security interest or agricultural lien under which the disposition was made. There thus remains, as a deficiency after disposition of the collateral, the amount of $_____ for [expenses and] satisfaction of the obligation which is still due, owing, and unpaid [*add if underlying transaction was other than sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangible(s), or promissory note(s) (unless agreement provides for interest)* together with interest thereon, from and after _____ (*date*), to date of judgment, at the rate of _____ percent per annum]. No part of that amount has been paid although plaintiff has demanded it from the defendant. [*If transaction was a consumer goods transaction, add*: At the time plaintiff made that demand of defendant, plaintiff provided defendant an explanation of how that deficiency was calculated. A true copy of that explanation is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____, representing the deficiency remaining after plaintiff's disposition of the collateral under the _____ [security agreement *or* agricultural lien];

[2. For interest from and after _____[*date*], to the date of judgment at the rate of _____ percent per annum;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred [including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*]; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party who, after default of the debtor, has disposed of the collateral, but has not realized sufficient amounts to satisfy the underlying obligation plus expenses, to obtain a deficiency judgment against the debtor or a secondary obligor [*see Com. Code §§ 9615(d)(2), (e)(1)(B), 9626*; *see* discussions in *§ 503.27[5], [7]*, and *[10]*].

Use of this form is only appropriate if the secured party has given notice of sale as required by *Com. Code §§ 9611-9614* [*see Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)(B)*; discussion in *§ 503.27[5][b]*]. Although *Com. Code § 9610(b)* requires every aspect of a disposition of collateral, including the method, manner, time, place, and other terms, to be commercially reasonable and to be conducted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner [*see Com. Code § 9627* (indicia of commercial reasonableness); discussion in *§ 503.27[5][a]*], the secured party has to prove that it acted in compliance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* (default) only if the underlying transaction is a consumer transaction [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(A), (2)(C)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[7][b][i]*], or if the debtor or a secondary obligor has placed the secured party's compliance in issue [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[7][a][i]*]. Hence, Paragraph 8 need only be used in a consumer transaction or to anticipate debtor's response.

If the underlying transaction is a consumer transaction, a deficiency may be prohibited by the security agreement or the Retail Installment Sales Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*), particularly *Civ. Code § 1812.5*, or any other statute [*see Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)(A)* (discussed in *§ 503.27[7][b][ii]*)], such as the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*), discussed in [4], *below*. If the underlying transaction is a consumer transaction and the secured party does not prove that the debtor and any secondary obligor were given notice, in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9611-9612, 9614*, and that the disposition of the collateral was conducted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner, the secured party cannot recover a deficiency [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(2)(B)-(C)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[7][b][ii]*].

In a transaction other than a consumer transaction, if the debtor or obligor has placed the secured party's compliance in issue and the secured party fails to prove that the disposition of the collateral was conducted in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*, the liability of a debtor or a secondary obligor for a deficiency is limited to an amount by which the secured party is undercollateralized, that is, the amount by which the sum of the secured obligation, expenses, and attorney's fees exceeds the greater of either (1) the proceeds of the collection, enforcement, disposition, or acceptance, or (2) the amount of proceeds that would have been realized had the noncomplying secured party proceeded in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(3)*; *see also Com. Code § 9626(a)(4)*; discussion in *§ 503.27[7][a][ii]*].

An additional limitation in the calculation of the amount of any deficiency may be imposed if the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor purchased the collateral at the disposition. In a consumer transaction, the secured party has to prove that the amount of proceeds of the disposition is not significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(3)*].

In a transaction other than a consumer transaction, if the debtor or obligor proves that the amount of proceeds of a disposition to the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor, is significantly below the range of prices that a complying disposition to a person other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor would have brought [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(5)*], the deficiency will be calculated based on the amount of proceeds that would have been realized in a complying disposition complying to a transferee other than the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor [*Com. Code § 9615(f)*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges that:

- All requirements for notice of sale were properly observed (Paragraph 7) [*Com. Code §§ 9611-9614*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[5][b]*]. Although the California Commercial Code no longer requires that notice of public disposition be published, UCC Comment 7. to *Com. Code § 9610*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][a]* suggests that advertisement is one indication that there was a meaningful opportunity for competitive bidding.

- The sale was conducted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner, giving the principal details, and was held as legally prescribed (Paragraphs 8, 9) [*Com. Code §§ 9610(b), 9627*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][a]*]. As noted at [2], *above*, and further discussed in *§ 503.27[7][a][i]* and *[b][i], [ii]*, the secured party has the burden of proving that it acted in good faith and in a commercially reasonable manner, only if the underlying transaction is a consumer transaction [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(A), (2)(C)*], or if the debtor or a secondary obligor has placed the secured party's compliance in issue [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1)*]. Thus, counsel may wish not to include allegations regarding that issue. Whether the purchaser was the secured party, a person related to the secured party, or a secondary obligor may effect how the deficiency is calculated [*see Com. Code §§ 9615(f), 9626(a)(5), (b)(3)*, discussed in [2], *above*, and at *§ 503.27[5][d], [7][a][iii], [b][i], [iii], [iv]*; *see also Clark v. EZN, Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 852, 857-859, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 403* (under former *Com. Code § 9504(2)(c)* trial court correctly imputed fair sales price on sale to secured party that was publicized without notice to distributors who were most likely bidders)].

- The amounts realized were allocated according to law, leaving a deficiency still to be collected (Paragraph 10) [*Com. Code § 9615*, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][c] -[g]*; *see also U.S. Roofing, Inc. v. Credit Alliance Corp. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1431, 1453, 279 Cal. Rptr. 533* (once secured party has repossessed collateral, debtor is no longer obligated to make payments under security agreement; imposition of late charges and inclusion of late charges in deficiency for period after repossession is error)]. If the underlying transaction was a consumer goods transaction, at the time the secured party demands the amount of the deficiency from the debtor or any secondary obligor, it must provide an explanation in accordance with *Com. Code § 9616* of how that deficiency was calculated. For a form for such an explanation, see *§ 503.122*.

[4] Disposition Pursuant to Rees-Levering Act

The California Supreme Court has held that to obtain a deficiency judgment, a secured creditor who sells a defaulting debtor's repossessed car must comply the provisions of the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*; *see* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act*] as well as any relevant provisions in Division 9 of the Commercial Code [*Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 210, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133]* . The legislation enacting revised Division 9 specifies that the holding in *Bank of America v. Lallana* will remain undisturbed [*see* Stats 2000, ch. 188, § 2, discussed in *§ 503.27[5][b][v]*]. *Civ. Code § 2983.2(a)* requires a creditor to give the debtor written notice of its intent to dispose of a repossessed car. That section specifies that except as otherwise provided in *Civ. Code § 2983.8*, the debtor will be liable for any deficiency after disposition of the repossessed motor vehicle if the creditor gives the debtor requisite timely notice and provides information specified by the statute. *Civ. Code § 2983.8* provides that no deficiency judgment will lie after any sale or other disposition of a motor vehicle unless the court has determined that the sale or other disposition was in conformity with the provisions of both the Rees-Levering Act and the relevant provisions of Division 9, including *Com. Code §§ 9610, 9611, 9612, 9613, 9614, 9615*, and *9626*. In *Bank of America v. Lallana*, the debtor's car was sold at a public auction, which the Court concluded was a public sale [*Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 212-213, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133]* . The court determined that the secured creditor gave proper notice pursuant to the Rees-Levering Act but because it failed to give the debtor proper notice of a public sale pursuant to former *Com. Code §*

9504(3) (notice of both the time and place of sale), it was precluded from obtaining a deficiency judgment [*Bank of America v. Lallana (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 203, 214-215, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910, 960 P.2d 1133]* . For a complaint for deficiency judgment alleging compliance with the notice provisions of both the Rees-Levering Act and Division 9, see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* , Form 89.80.

[5] Statute of Limitations

Suit for deficiency after sale of repossessed collateral is barred if brought more than four years after breach of the underlying agreement [*Massey-Ferguson Credit Corp. v. Casaulong (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 1024, 1027, 133 Cal. Rptr. 497* ; *see also KMAP, Inc. v. Town & Country Broadcasters, Inc. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 544, 546-548, 122 Cal. Rptr. 420* (suit for deficiency after sale of collateral, which collateral was obtained by earlier suit for possession after default of debtor, does not constitute splitting of single cause of action barring subsequent deficiency suit, because two different causes of action are involved: right to improve security on default, and right to satisfaction of remaining debt after exhaustion of collateral)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.124

§ 503.124 Allegations for Use in Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Collection by Secured Party of Accounts or Payment Obligations [Com. Code §§ 9607, 9608, 9626]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint for Deficiency Remaining After Collection by Secured Party of Accounts or Payment Obligations [Com. Code §§ 9607, 9608, 9626]

[*EITHER, if collateral is account, chattel paper, payment intangible, promissory note, or other payment obligation*]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified the _____ [account debtor(s) on the account(s) *or* obligor(s) under the _____ (*specify type of payment obligation, e.g,* promissory note(s)], assigned by defendant to plaintiff as collateral, to make payment to plaintiff until further notice. A true copy of this notice is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference. [At all times in undertaking to collect these _____ (accounts *or* specify type of payment obligation, e.g, promissory note(s)), plaintiff has proceeded in a commercially reasonable manner, namely: _____ (*describe collection process, e.g.,* plaintiff telephoned each account debtor to follow up on the notice, arranged a time for and manner of collection as to each account debtor, and proceeded to enforce collection as arranged, by mail or by personal appearance of plaintiff at the account debtor's premises.] Plaintiff to date has fully collected on certain _____ [*specify, e.g.,* accounts], has only realized partial collections on others, and has received nothing on still others, all as described in the schedule of notices and collections attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference]. The total amount thus collected was $_____. On or about _____ [*date*], pursuant to the (security) agreement under which plaintiff _____ [may charge back collateral to *or* has _____ (full *or* limited) recourse against] defendant, plaintiff reassigned the remaining _____ [accounts *or specify other obligation, e.g,* note(s)], to the extent uncollected, to defendant and notified all parties obligated thereunder to thereafter pay defendant, which notice is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*OR, if collateral is deposit account*]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff notified _____ [*name*], the bank at which the deposit account which is collateral is maintained, to pay the balance of that account _____ [to *or* for the benefit of] plaintiff. A true copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. Although plaintiff's collection of the collateral was not conducted in a commercially reasonable manner, the amount realized by plaintiff on the collection of the collateral was equal to the amount that would have been realized had the collection been conducted in a commercially reasonable manner.]

[3. Defendant did not enter into the secured transaction described in this complaint primarily for personal, family, or household purposes and/or the collateral was not held or acquired by defendant primarily for personal, family, or household purposes (*continue if known, e.g.*, but to carry on its business as a shoe manufacturer).]

4. The amount realized on the collection [and/or enforcement] of the collateral was applied by plaintiff as follows [*list as appropriate*]:

(a) $_____ for expenses of collection [and/or enforcement];

(b) $_____ for attorney's fees and related legal expenses, as provided for under the (security) agreement and not prohibited by law;

(c) $_____ toward satisfaction of the obligation(s) secured by the security interest or agricultural lien under which collection [and/or enforcement] was made. Thus, there remains, as a deficiency after collection [and/or enforcement] of the collateral, the amount of $_____ for [expenses and] satisfaction of the obligation which is still due, owing, and unpaid [*add if underlying transaction was other than sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangible(s), or promissory note(s) (unless agreement provides for interest)* together with interest thereon, from and after _____ (*date*), to date of judgment, at the rate of _____ percent per annum]. No part of that amount has been paid although plaintiff has demanded it from the defendant. [*If transaction was a consumer goods transaction, add*: At the time plaintiff made that demand of defendant, plaintiff provided defendant an explanation of how that deficiency was calculated. A true copy of that explanation is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference.]

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for use by a secured party instead of Paragraphs 7-11 of the form in *§ 503.123[1]* to obtain a deficiency judgment [*see Com. Code § 9626*, discussed in *§ 503.27[7]*] when the collateral involved was accounts or other payment obligations that were collected or enforced by the secured party after the debtor's default [*see Com. Code §§ 9607, 9608*, discussed in *§ 503.27[3]*], rather than collateral that was disposed of in accordance with *Com. Code § 9610*. If the underlying transaction was a sale of accounts, chattel paper, payment intangibles, or promissory notes, rather than an assignment or other arrangement for security, the secured party is not entitled to any deficiency [*Com. Code § 9608(b)*]. Alternative Paragraphs 1 provide for only the most common types of collateral that may be collected in accordance with *Com. Code § 9608*.

As with other collateral, although *Com. Code § 9607(c)* requires a secured party who undertakes to collect from or enforce an obligation of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral to proceed in a commercially reasonable manner if it is entitled to charge back uncollected collateral or otherwise to full or limited recourse against the debtor or a secondary obligor [*see Western Decor & Furnishings Industries, Inc. v. Bank of America (1979) 91*

Cal. App. 3d 293, 303-305, 154 Cal. Rptr. 287 (example of commercially reasonable collection under prior law)], the secured party has to prove that it acted in a commercially reasonable manner in collecting and enforcing the collateral only if the underlying transaction is a consumer transaction [*Com. Code § 9626(b)(1)(A), (2)(C)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[7][b][i]*], or if the debtor or a secondary obligor has placed the secured party's compliance in issue [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(1)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.27[7][a][i]*]. Hence, the bracketed allegations in Paragraph 1 of this form with respect to commercial reasonableness need only be used in a consumer transaction or to anticipate the debtor's response.

In a transaction other than a consumer transaction (optional Paragraph 3), if the debtor or obligor has placed commercial reasonableness in issue and the secured party fails to prove that its collection or enforcement of the collateral was conducted in accordance with the provisions of *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* (optional Paragraph 2), the liability of a debtor or a secondary obligor for a deficiency is limited to an amount by which the secured party is undercollateralized, that is, the amount by which the sum of the secured obligation, expenses, and attorney's fees exceeds the greater of either (1) the proceeds of the collection or enforcement or (2) the amount of proceeds that would have been realized had the noncomplying secured party proceeded in accordance with *Com. Code §§ 9601-9629* [*Com. Code § 9626(a)(3)*; *see also Com. Code § 9626(a)(4)*; discussion in *§ 503.27[7][a][ii]*].

The cash proceeds of collection are to be applied as set forth in Paragraph 4 [*see Com. Code § 9608, set forth in § 503.27[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
1. Actions Against Debtors and Obligors

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.125-503.129

[Reserved]

§§ 503.125[Reserved]

175 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.130

§ 503.130 Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priorities Among Security Interests in or Agricultural Liens on Particular Collateral

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priorities Among Security Interests in or Agricultural Liens on Particular Collateral

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],cPlaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____[*name*(*s*)],vDefendant(s).	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF TO
	)	DETERMINE PRIORITIES AMONG SECURITY
	)	INTERESTS IN OR AGRICULTURAL LIENS ON
		COLLATERAL

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff entered into a _____ [(security) agreement *or*

lease] _____ [*describe* (*see § 503.120[1]*, alternative Paragraphs 4)] with defendant _____ [*identify debtor*]. A true copy of that _____ [agreement *or* lease] is attached as Exhibit A [consisting of Documents _____through _____] and incorporated by reference. [*If filing is required to perfect security interest or agricultural lien, add:* A financing statement was filed in connection with perfection of the _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien] under that _____ (agreement *or* lease) on or about _____ (*date*), in the office of the _____ (County Recorder of _____ County, California *or* Secretary of State *as appropriate to the type of collateral*) (which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto). (A true copy of that statement is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.)] By virtue of this transaction, plaintiff was given a _____ [security interest in *or* agricultural lien on] _____ [*describe collateral*].

4. Defendant(s) also claim(s) a[n] _____[agricultural lien *or* security *or other*] interest in the _____ [personal property *or* fixtures] [*to describe, add:* by virtue of _____ (*describe, e.g.*, a security agreement with the same _____ [*name of debtor*] in which a financing statement was filed on or about _____ [*date*] at _____ [*office*])].

5. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendant(s) concerning their respective rights in and to the property in that plaintiff contends that plaintiff's interest therein has priority over that of defendant(s) [or any or all other parties herein], whereas this contention is disputed by defendant(s) on the grounds that _____ [*describe, e.g.*, defendant's security interests were perfected earlier than that of plaintiff].

6. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of the respective rights of the parties in such property, including, as appropriate, the validity of agreements involved and the perfection of security instruments thereunder, or as to which party's interpretation of documents and transaction is correct.

7. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order for plaintiff to ascertain his/her/its rights under plaintiff's _____ [*describe security remedy available, e.g.*, security agreement as a means of _____ (taking possession of *or* foreclosing on) the security and be assured of adequate realization of the obligation under the agreement free of all other obligations with any interest therein or claims of interest therein].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against the defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For a declaration that plaintiff's security interest in the property herein has priority over that of any interest of the defendant[s, and each of them] [as arising out of a valid security agreement];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use as a complaint or cross complaint by a secured party who seeks a judicial declaration of the priority of its interest over that of any other creditor or person claiming an interest in the collateral [*see* discussion in *§ 503.24[1]*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- Plaintiff's or cross complainant's security or other agreement (or lease) with the defendant or cross defendant debtor giving a security interest in or agricultural lien on particular collateral (Paragraph 3).
- Defendant's or cross defendant's claim to some type of competing interest therein (Paragraph 4).
- The actual controversy as to which interest is superior (Paragraph 5).
- The requirement of a judicial determination on key matters in the case (Paragraph 6).
- The urgency of a judicial declaration at this time to determine the status and fate of plaintiff's security interest (Paragraph 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

[4] Availability of Declaratory Relief

Anyone who is interested under a contract or who desires a declaration of his or her rights or duties with respect to another or in respect to, in, over, or on property, in cases of actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties, may bring an original action in the superior court or, along with an answer to a complaint, file a cross complaint in a pending action in a court for a declaration of those rights and duties in the premises, including a determination of any question of construction or validity arising under the instrument or contract. The pleading may ask for a declaration of rights or duties, either alone or with other relief; and the court may make a binding declaration of those rights or duties, whether or not further relief is or could be claimed at the time. The declaration may be had before there has been any breach of the obligation in respect to which the declaration is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

For discussion and forms for applying for declaratory relief with respect to controversy among parties, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[5] Jurisdiction of Actions for Declaratory Relief

This action for declaratory relief is in the jurisdiction of the superior court as an unlimited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 580(b)(4), 1060*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(7)(A)* (restricted extent to which declaratory relief may be maintained as limited civil case); *see* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.131

§ 503.131 Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Security Interest or Agricultural Lien Perfected by Filing First [Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in or Agricultural Lien on, and Possession of, Collateral

[1] FORM Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Security Interest or Agricultural Lien Perfected by Filing First [Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in or Agricultural Lien on, and Possession of, Collateral

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR POSSESSION OF COLLATERAL
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff filed a financing statement in the Office of the Secretary of State in order to perfect a _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien] expected to arise out of a proposed [security] transaction between plaintiff and _____[*name of debtor*] [*if agricultural lien, add:* relating to his/her/its framing operation]. [The financing statement was renewed on _____ [*specify date or dates on which any continuation statements were filed*]. A true copy of the financing statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

5. [*Identification and execution of security agreement or agreement that gave rise to agricultural lien. See § 503.120[1], alternative Paragraphs 4.*]

6. According to the provisions of the _____ [agreement *or* lease], plaintiff agreed to [*specify, e.g.,* loan to _____ (*name of debtor*) the sum of $_____].

7. According to the provisions of the _____ [agreement *or* lease], and in consideration of plaintiff's performance, _____ [_____ (*name of debtor*) granted plaintiff a security interest in *or set forth statute* granted plaintiff an agricultural line on] _____ [*describe collateral*], [together with all proceeds thereof]. _____ [*name of debtor*] further granted plaintiff the right to immediate possession of the collateral in the event of default by _____ [*name of debtor*] in payment of the obligation or in protection of plaintiff's interest in the collateral, or otherwise.

8. Plaintiff has fully performed his/her/its obligations under the [security] agreement. However, on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of debtor*] defaulted on the agreement in that he/she/it _____ [granted defendant a security interest in *or* entered into a transaction with defendant that gave defendant an agricultural lien on] _____ [*identify collateral*].

9. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant filed a financing statement in the Office of the Secretary of State to perfect his/her _____ [security interest *or* agricultural lien]. A true copy of the financing statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

10. According to the provisions of plaintiff's [security] agreement with _____ [*name of debtor*], on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*describe plaintiff's performance, e.g.,* loaned to _____ (*name of debtor*) the sum of $_____]. At that time, plaintiff had no knowledge of any other security interest or agricultural lien held by any other person, perfected or otherwise, in the collateral.

11. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant took and now has in his/her/its possession the above-described _____ [*identify collateral*]. As a result of _____'s [*name of debtor*] default under its security agreement with plaintiff, plaintiff is entitled to take immediate possession of the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* goods] in defendant's possession. Plaintiff has demanded possession from defendant, but defendant has wrongfully _____ [refused to give plaintiff possession *or* failed to respond to plaintiff's demands or in any way give plaintiff access to the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* goods) *or describe other failure of defendant to transfer collateral to plaintiff*].

12. At all times herein mentioned, the reasonable value of the _____ [*describe collateral, e.g.,* goods] in defendant's possession is $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment from defendant as follows:

1. For possession of the _____ [*describe collateral, e.g.,* goods] in defendant's possession, or its reasonable value in the amount of $_____, in the event delivery cannot be had;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party with a perfected nonpurchase money security interest in, or agricultural lien on, collateral to bring an action to obtain possession of the collateral, or its value, from another secured party with a perfected non-purchase money security interest in, or agricultural lien on, the same collateral of their mutual debtor. Because plaintiff filed its financing statement covering the collateral before defendant filed [*see Com. Code § 9509(a)-(c)* (when financing statement may be filed; in case of agricultural lien that is not yet effective, debtor must authorize filing)], plaintiff's interest in or lien on the collateral takes priority over defendant's interest or lien, even though defendant's security interest or agricultural lien was the first to attach to the collateral [*see Com. Code §§ 9203, 9322(a)(1)*; *Borg-Warner Acceptance Corp. v. Bank of Marin (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 286, 287-289, 111 Cal. Rptr. 361* (security interest of secured party who filed financing statement first took priority over that of party who filed subsequently, when party filing subsequently had opportunity to inform itself of earlier security interest and when listing of debtor's business name on earlier financing statement was not so different from its later corporate name as to seriously mislead party filing subsequently); for further discussion of priorities, see *§ 503.24[2]*].

This form is loosely based on based on U.C.C. Comment 4, Example 1, to *Com. Code § 9322*, which is *set forth in § 503.24[2][a]*. The form may be modified for use in other situations in which the interest of the secured party who is the first to file will take priority over that of the secured party whose interest is the first to attach but who is the last to file [*see Com. Code § 9322(a)(1)*].

If the security interest of the party who files later is a purchase money security interest, that party has priority under *Com. Code § 9324(a)* if the collateral is not inventory, and priority under *Com. Code § 9324(b)* if the collateral is inventory and the party has properly notified the party who filed first [*see* discussions in *§§ 503.40[5][c] -[e]* (goods other than inventory), *503.41[2]* (inventory)]. For a complaint for possession of inventory collateral by a purchase money secured party, see *§ 503.132*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The filing of plaintiff's financing statement (Paragraph 4) [*see Com. Code §§ 9309, 9322(a)(1), 9509*].

- Plaintiff's and debtor's material obligations under plaintiff's security or other agreement with debtor

(Paragraphs 6 and 7).

- Debtor's default by granting defendant a security interest or agricultural line and defendant's filing to perfect that interest or lien (Paragraphs 8, 9) [*see Com. Code § 9509*].

- Plaintiff's full performance of its obligations under the agreement (Paragraph 10) [*see Com. Code §§ 9201, 9203*].

- Defendant's possession to the collateral, plaintiff's demand for possession of the collateral, and defendant's refusal or failure to transfer it (Paragraph 11).

- The reasonable value of the collateral in defendant's possession (Paragraph 12).

[4] Information Concerning and Copies of Current Filings

Interested parties may obtain information concerning, and certified copies of, existing financing statements and related documents on file from the office of the California Secretary of State [*see Com. Code § 9523(c)-(f)*]. The Secretary of State has adopted a standard form for submission of these requests, known as "Uniform Commercial Code Form-UCC-11" (known generally as "UCC-11"). The form is available from the office of the Secretary of State and may be downloaded from the Secretary of State's website at http://www.sos.ca.gov/business/ucc/information-request.htm or purchased at many office supply stores. For an illustration of Form UCC-3, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.213* (Matthew Bender).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.132

§ 503.132 Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Perfected Purchase Money Security Interest in Inventory [Com. Code § 9324(b)-(c)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in and Possession of Collateral

[1] FORM Complaint for Possession of Collateral by Secured Party With Prior Perfected Purchase Money Security Interest in Inventory [Com. Code § 9324(b)-(c)] Against Secured Party With Perfected Security Interest in and Possession of Collateral

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR POSSESSION OF COLLATERAL
_____ [*name*]	)	
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of debtor*] entered into an agreement

with _____ [*name of debtor's seller*] in which _____ [*name of debtor*] agreed to buy and _____ [*name of seller*] agreed to sell and deliver _____ [*describe goods*] for a total consideration of $_____.]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and _____ [*name of debtor*] entered into a security agreement _____ [*describe security agreement, for example*, entitled "Security Agreement"]. A true copy of the agreement is marked Exhibit "_____," is attached and incorporated by reference.

6. According to the provisions of the agreement, plaintiff agreed to pay value to the account of _____ [*name of debtor*], by paying to _____ [*name of seller*] the purchase price of _____ [*describe goods*], and to deliver possession of the goods to _____ [*name of debtor*] for sale in the ordinary course of his/her/its business.

7. According to the provisions of the agreement, and in consideration of plaintiff's payment of the purchase price, _____ [*name of debtor*] granted plaintiff a security interest in the goods, together with all proceeds thereof. _____ [*Name of debtor*] agreed not to grant any other securityinterests in that inventory and further granted plaintiff the right to immediate possession of the goods in the event of any default by _____ [*name of debtor*] in payment of the obligation, in protection of plaintiff's interest in the goods, or otherwise.

8. According to the provisions of the agreement, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff performed his/her promise to pay to _____ [*name of seller*] the purchase price of the above-described goods.

9. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff took possession of the goods by receipt of negotiable bills of lading and, according to the provisions of the security agreement, delivered the bills of lading to _____ [*name of debtor*] on or about _____ [*date*], so that he/she/it might take physical possession of the goods.

[*EITHER, if no prior security holders of record exist, or if none exist to plaintiff's knowledge*]

10. At the time that _____ [*name of debtor*] took possession of the goods there were no financing statements on record with the Secretary of State pertaining to _____ [*name of debtor*] and the above-described goods, and plaintiff had no knowledge of any security interest held by any other person in the collateral.

[*OR, if there exist prior security holders who filed financing statements covering the same type of inventory either before the date plaintiff filed his/her/its financing statement or before the beginning of the 20-day period during which plaintiff's interest was temporarily perfected*]

10. Before _____ [*name of debtor*] took possession of the goods, plaintiff notified _____ [*name, address, and status of security holders of record or security holders actually known to plaintiff*] that plaintiff intended to engage in a purchase money security transaction with _____ [*name of debtor*] as debtor, and described the collateral by item and type. A true copy of the notification is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*CONTINUE*]

11. Plaintiff has fully performed his/her/its obligations under the security agreement. However, on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of debtor*] defaulted on the agreement in that he/she/it granted defendant a security interest in _____ [*identify goods*].

12. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant filed a financing statement in the Office of the Secretary of State to perfect his/her/its security interest. A true copy of the financing statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

13. On or about _____ [*specify date after defendant's filing and within 20 days after delivery of possession to the debtor*], plaintiff filed a financing statement in the Office of the Secretary of State to perfect his/her/its security interest under his/her/its security agreement with _____[*name of debtor*]. [The financing statement was renewed on _____ (*specify date or dates on which any continuation statements were filed*).] A true copy of the financing statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

14. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant took and now has in his/her/its possession the above-described _____ [*identify goods*]. As a result of _____'s [*name of debtor*] default under its security agreement with plaintiff, plaintiff is entitled to take immediate possession of the goods in defendant's possession. Plaintiff has demanded possession from defendant, but defendant has wrongfully _____ [refused to give plaintiff possession *or* failed to respond to plaintiff's demands or in any way give plaintiff access to the goods *or describe other failure of defendant to transfer collateral to plaintiff*].

15. At all times herein mentioned, the reasonable value of the goods in defendant's possession is $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment from defendant as follows:

1. For possession of the goods in defendant's possession, or its reasonable value in the amount of $_____, in the event delivery cannot be had;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party with a perfected purchase money security interest in inventory collateral to bring an action to obtain possession of the collateral, or its value, from a secured party with a perfected nonpurchase money security interest in the same inventory collateral of their mutual debtor. Because plaintiff has a purchase money security interest in the debtor's inventory, plaintiff's security interest takes priority over defendant's

conflicting security interest in the same inventory if plaintiff meets all of the requirements of *Com. Code § 9324(b), (c)* [*see Com. Code § 9324(b), (c)*, discussed in *§ 503.41[2*]; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.24[2][c]*].

In this form, plaintiff/secured party's purchase money security interest is based on a tripartite transaction between a secured party, a seller, and a debtor; in which plaintiff, the purchase money secured party, pays the purchase price of its debtor's inventory to a seller and takes, in return,negotiable bills of lading (Paragraphs 4-6). Plaintiff then delivers the bills of lading to its debtor (Paragraph 9). Having obtained possession of the bills of lading or the inventory, the debtor then violates its security agreement with plaintiff by entering into a security agreement with defendant secured party, granting defendant an interest in inventory in which plaintiff already has a security interest (Paragraph 11).

In this transaction, plaintiff obtains temporary perfection of its interest through possession of the tangible negotiable documents [*Com. Code § 9313(a)*] (Paragraph 9), and then has 20 days after delivery of the bills of lading to the debtor in which it must file a financing statement in order to continue its perfection [*Com. Code § 9312(c), (f)*; *see § 503.48[1][b]*] (Paragraph 13). Even though defendant may have filed a financing statement before plaintiff, and even though defendant had no notice of plaintiff's security interest, record or otherwise, plaintiff will have a prior perfected interest if it complies with the requirements of *Com. Code § 9324(b)* [*Com. Code § 9324(b), (c)*; *see § 503.41[2]*].

The form may be modified for use in other situations in which purchase money security interests in inventory are created.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The existence and execution of both plaintiff's and defendant's security agreements, and the existence and filing of both plaintiff's and defendant's financing statements (Paragraphs 5, 11, 12, and 13) [*see Com. Code §§ 9308(a),(c), 9312, 9324(b), (c)*].

- Either that prior secured parties did not exist or that plaintiff notified the prior secured party of plaintiff's purchase money security interest within five years before debtor received possession of the inventory (alternative Paragraphs 10) [*see Com. Code § 9324(b)(2)-(4), (c)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 503.131[4]*].

- Plaintiff's and debtor's material obligations under plaintiff's security agreement (Paragraphs 6 and 7).

- Plaintiff's full performance (Paragraphs 8, 9, and 10).

- The debtor's default (Paragraph 11).

- Plaintiff's demand for possession of the collateral and defendant's refusal or failure to transfer it (Paragraph 14).

- The reasonable value of the collateral in defendant's possession (Paragraph 15).

The complaint includes an optional allegation of the existence of a contract between the seller and debtor to establish the debtor's rights in the collateral before he or she takes delivery from plaintiff secured party (optional Paragraph 4) [*see Com. Code § 9203(a), (b)(2)* (security interest does not attach and is not enforceable against debtor or third parties, unless debtor has rights in collateral and other specified conditions are met)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.133

§ 503.133 Complaint in Intervention by Consignor Who Complied With Filing and Notification Procedure to Protect Ownership in Consigned Goods [Com. Code §§ 2326(1)(b), (2), 9324(b), (c)]

[1] FORM Complaint in Intervention by Consignor Who Complied With Filing and Notification Procedure to Protect Ownership in Consigned Goods [Com. Code §§ 2326(1)(b), (2), 9324(b), (c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*] Defendant.	)	COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION BY CON-
_____ [*name*] Intervenor.	)	SIGNOR OF GOODS VERSUS PARTIES TO SE-
	)	CURITY AGREEMENT

_____

Intervenor alleges:

1. The court herein has permitted intervenor to make timely intervention in this action by virtue of claiming an interest relating to the property that is the subject of the action, because disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede intervenor's ability to protect that interest, which is not adequately represented by the existing parties.

2. _____ [*name*] is the secured party under the security agreement described in the other pleadings herein, and _____ [*name*] is the debtor under this agreement. A copy of this security agreement is found in Exhibit _____ of the _____ [*particular pleading on file in main action*]. A copy of a financing statement filed in connection with the perfection of the security interest is found in Exhibit _____ of the _____ [*specify pleading*].

3. Intervenor is the owner of certain goods, described in the other pleadings herein, consisting of

_____ [*describe goods*]. On or about _____ [*date*], intervenor filed a financing statement covering those goods, in connection with an intended consignment thereof to _____ [*name of debtor*], in the office of the Secretary of State[, which has been maintained to date by appropriate filings relevant thereto]. A true copy of this statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference.

[4. *If secured party had filed a financing statement covering the same types of goods before the date of the filing by intervenor as consignor, add:* On or about _____ (*date*), intervenor gave sent authenticated notification to _____ (*secured party*) (*specify meals of transmittal if desired, e.g,* by _____ [personal delivery *or* _____ (certified *or* registered) mail, return receipt requested], which that party received on _____ (the same day *or* or about _____ (*date*)). This notification stated that intervenor as consignor expected to deliver goods on consignment to _____(*debtor*) and described these goods by item and type. A true copy of this notice is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference.]

5. Thereafter, and on or about _____ [*date; if notification was required to have been sent to secured party, set forth a date within five years after delivery of it*], intervenor delivered the goods, which are not consumer goods, to _____ [*name of debtor*] at his/her/its place of business, called _____ [*name of business*], at _____ [*address*], under a consignment, for sale of the goods to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the retail public *or* wholesalers *or others*]. _____ [*name of debtor*] deals in goods of that kind, is not an auctioneer, and is not generally known by its creditors to be substantially engaged in selling the goods of others. The goods delivered by intervenor had an aggregate value of $_____. The proceeds of this sale were to be remitted to intervenor less an agreed commission. This consignment was not a security interest.

6. The other parties claim an interest adverse to intervenor's rights in these goods by the terms of their security agreement and threaten to deliver the goods to _____ [*secured party*] or to otherwise dispose of the goods. Each has refused and failed to deliver the goods to intervenor although demand has been made therefor, and threaten intervenor with loss of the goods or proceeds thereof by virtue of _____'s [*secured party*] attempt to possess or foreclose on the goods. The present value of these goods is approximately $_____.

WHEREFORE, intervenor prays judgment against _____[*secured party*] and _____ [*debtor*] as follows:

1. For an order determining that the ownership interest in the goods of intervenor is superior to that of either of the other parties in this action, by virtue of a valid consignment and to the extent of the terms thereof;

2. For damages in the amount of $_____ on any disposition of such goods by the other parties, or either of them;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ _____ [*party's status and name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a consignor of goods who has properly complied with the filing and, if relevant, notification, procedure relating to consignments, to protect his or her right to the goods or their proceeds over those of a secured creditor of the consignee [*see Com. Code §§ 9102(a)(20), 2326(2), 9324(b), (c)*; *see also* discussions in *§§ 503.11[7]*, 503.46; *Fariba v. Dealer Servs. Corp. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 156, 172-173, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219* (trial court properly instructed jury that possession as between competing claimants to goods in inventory at premises of consignment merchant is accomplished when one with right to possess accomplishes actual custody and control of those goods under all circumstances demonstrated by evidence; wholesaler that had consigned used vehicles to dealer was entitled to possession of them after dealer went out of business, and consignor had actual custody and control of those vehicles by virtue of having keys to them in hand, even after vehicles were taken from dealer's premises by creditor that had security interest in dealer's inventory)].

[3] Application or Motion to Intervene Must Be Filed

Before filing a complaint for intervention, it is necessary to file an application to intervene or notice of motion to do so. Normally, the grounds of the application or motion may be referred to as being those set forth in the proposed complaint. The intervenor may choose to join the debtor as plaintiff or defendant in the main action in resisting the claims of the secured party, or may file adversely to both of them [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 387*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

If the person seeking intervention claims an interest relating to the property which is the subject of the action, and that person is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede that person's ability to protect that interest, unless that person's interest is adequately represented by existing parties, the court must, on timely application, permit that person to intervene [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387*]. Thus, if the consignor claiming an ownership interest in the goods superior to that of the consignee or a secured party of the consignee is aware of the fact that the secured party is attempting to possess or foreclose on the goods, the consignor may wish to intervene in an action for possession or foreclosure in order to best protect the consignor's interest under the consignment.

[4] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges in pertinent part:

- That the consignor filed a financing statement (Paragraph 3) [*see Com. Code § 9505*].

- That the consignor sent notification of the intended consignment to any secured party having previously filed a financing statement covering the type of goods consigned (Paragraph 4) [*see Com. Code § 9324(b)(2), (4), (c)*].

- The subsequent consignment by consignor to consignee and description of the parties and transaction as one that is governed by Division 9 (Paragraph 5) [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(20)*].

- The threatened loss of goods or proceeds (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 387*].

[5] Alternative Remedy of Third-Party Claim

Once tangible or intangible personal property has been levied on in an action by a secured party against the debtor under a particular security agreement, whether or not it is then in the actual possession of the levying officer, a third party who

claims a superior interest in the collateral under that security agreement may lodge a third-party claim. The third party, such as one who claims to be the owner or to have a priority perfected security interest, may claim the property by a written claim verified personally or by agent, setting out the reasonable value of the property and the claimant's title and right to possession. On delivery of the claim, the levying officer will release the property unless the person ordering the levy puts up an undertaking to continue execution. A hearing procedure is available for the parties to prosecute their claims to the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 720.310 et seq.*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.134

§ 503.134 Complaint for Damages and to Quiet Title By Purchaser of Chattel Paper Against Dealer, Buyer, and Secured Party Claiming Security Interest in Chattel Paper [Com. Code § 9330]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages and to Quiet Title By Purchaser of Chattel Paper Against Dealer, Buyer, and Secured Party Claiming Security Interest in Chattel Paper [Com. Code § 9330]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*] Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name(s) of known defendants*] [*if unknown defendants are included, allege:*; all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to Plaintiff's title, or claiming any cloud on Plaintiff's title thereto] [; and DOES I-_____, inclusive],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND TO QUIET TITLE
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *If "all persons unknown" are named as defendants, allege:* The defendants herein named as "all persons unknown claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to

plaintiff's title, or claiming any cloud on plaintiff's title thereto," are unknown to plaintiff. These defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described below adverse to plaintiff's title. These claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's title thereto. These claims, and each of them, are without any right whatever, and these defendants, and each of them, have no right, title, estate, lien, or interest whatever in the property described below or any part of that property.]

[4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, and therefore sues these defendants by those fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of these fictitiously named defendants claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described below adverse to plaintiff's title, and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's title to that property.]

5. Plaintiff is the sole owner of all right, title, and interest in and to certain chattel paper, consisting of _____ [*describe chattel paper, for example,* one contract of sale and security agreement, dated _____, with defendant _____ (*name of retail dealer*) as seller and holder of a security interest, and defendant _____ (*name of buyer of goods*), as debtor and buyer, and one promissory note between those parties, dated _____, with _____ (*name of retail dealer*) as payee, and _____ (*name of buyer of goods*) as maker]. A true copy is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by this reference. The chattel paper is usually located at _____ [*specify usual location of chattel paper, including county*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*] assigned all his/her right, title, and interest in the chattel paper described above to plaintiff.

7. The assignment was for new and valuable consideration, in that plaintiff _____ [*allege facts sufficient to satisfy the new value requirement of Com. Code § 9330(a), (b), e.g.,* paid to defendant _____ (*name of retail dealer*) the sum of $_____. The assignment was taken in the ordinary course of plaintiff's business as a financing institution engaged in, among other things, the purchase of chattel paper from retail dealers].

8. Defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*] delivered the chattel paper to plaintiff on or about _____[*date*]. Plaintiff is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, in possession of the chattel paper.

9. As represented by the chattel paper, and pursuant to the terms of the assignment, plaintiff now has, and at all times herein mentioned had, a security interest in _____ [*describe property secured by chattel paper, e.g.,* one motor vehicle described as _____ (*describe vehicle*)]. The _____ [*describe property secured by chattel paper, e.g.,* vehicle] was sold to defendant _____ [*name of buyer of goods*] by defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*] on or about _____ [*date*], and is presently located at _____ [*location of property secured by chattel paper*], in the possession of defendant _____ [*name of buyer of goods*].

10. On or about _____ [*specify date prior to retail dealer's assignment of chattel paper to plaintiff*], defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*] granted defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] a security interest in _____ [*identify retail dealer's inventory, and proceeds, if applicable, e.g.,* defendant _____'s (*name of retail dealer*) inventory of motor vehicles, more fully described as _____ (*identify and describe motor vehicles*), and in the proceeds from the sale, transfer, or other disposition thereof].

11. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] filed a

financing statement in the Office of the Secretary of State, in order to perfect its security interest in the inventory of defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*]. A true copy of the financing statement is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*EITHER, if defendant secured party claims the chattel paper merely as proceeds of defendant dealer's inventory*]

12. The chattel paper does not indicate that it has been assigned to an identified assignee other than plaintiff.

[*OR, if defendant secured party's interest is directly in the chattel paper (as opposed to being in the chattel paper as proceeds of inventory)*]

12. On or about _____ [*date*], when plaintiff took possession of the chattel paper from defendant _____[*name of retail dealer*], plaintiff had no knowledge that the purchase of that chattel paper violated the rights of defendant _____ [*name of secured party*].

[*CONTINUE*]

[13. *If the claim of a named defendant is unknown, uncertain, or contingent, allege:* The claim of _____ (*name of defendant*) is _____ (unknown *or* uncertain *or* contingent). (*If the lack of knowledge, uncertainty, or contingency is caused by a transfer to an unborn or unascertained person or class member, or by a transfer in the form of a contingent remainder, vested remainder subject to defeasance, executory interest, or similar disposition, allege:* _____ (*name*), age _____, is the person who would be entitled to an adverse claim if _____(*describe contingency*) had occurred prior to the commencement of this action.) (*If the person is subject to a legal disability, allege:* This person is subject to _____ (*specify legal disability*).)]

14. At all times herein mentioned, the market value of the chattel paper has been and is the sum of $_____.

15. The chattel paper is now in the possession of plaintiff, but plaintiff is unable to assign or otherwise deal with the paper due to the adverse claims and demands of defendant _____ [*name of secured party*].

16. Plaintiff seeks to quiet his/her/its title in and to the chattel paper described in Paragraph 5 and in and to his/her/its [superior] security interest in the _____ [*describe property which is security, e.g.,* motor vehicle] described in Paragraph 9 against the following claims: the claims of defendants _____[*name of retail dealer*]; _____ [*name of secured party*], and _____ [*name of retail buyer of goods*][; _____(*continue with whichever are applicable:* the claims of the successor defendants described in Paragraph _____; the claims of all unknown defendants described in Paragraph 3, whether or not the claim or cloud is known to plaintiff; and the unknown, uncertain, or contingent claim, if any, of _____ (*name*) more fully described in Paragraph 13)]. Defendants' claims, and each of them, are without any right whatever and defendants, and each of them, have no right, title, estate, lien, or interest whatever in the above-described property, or any part of that property[, except that _____ (*set forth any adverse claims of which plaintiff admits the validity, e.g.,* defendant _____ [*name of retail buyer*] is entitled to possession and title to the vehicle, subject to plaintiff's security interest as reflected by the terms of the security agreement)].

17. Plaintiff seeks to quiet title as of _____[*date*]. [*If the date is a date other than the date the complaint is filed, allege why a determination as of that date is sought.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For a judgment that plaintiff is the sole owner of all right, title, and interest in the chattel paper described above, representing its security interest in the _____ [*describe property secured by chattel paper*] possessed by defendant _____ [*name of buyer*], and that defendants have no interest in the _____ [*describe property secured by chattel paper*] adverse to plaintiff's;

2. Damages from defendant _____ [*name of retail dealer*] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a purchaser of chattel paper [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(11)*, defining chattel paper, *set forth in § 503.11[5]*] to obtain damages and to quiet its title to the chattel paper, as against a secured party with a prior perfected security interest in the paper as either inventory or proceeds [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.010-764.080*; *Com. Code § 9330*; *see Com. Code § 9102(a)(72)(D)* (purchaser of chattel paper is secured party); discussions in *§§ 503.50*, *503.52*]. The allegations related to tangible chattel paper, but the form can be modified for use with electronic chattel paper [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(31)*, defining electronic chattel paper, set forth in *§ 503.11[5]*] by changing the allegations in Paragraphs 8 and second alternative Paragraph 12 to refer to taking plaintiff's taking control of the chattel paper [*see Com. Code § 9105*, discussed in *§ 503.50[1][b]*], rather than taking possession of it, and to there being no indication on the authoritative copy of the electronic record of anyone other than plaintiff as secured party (first alternative Paragraph 12).

This form may be used, for example, when a dealer enters into a security agreement with an inventory financer (usually a bank or financing agency) in which the dealer grants the inventory financer a security interest in the dealer's inventory and all the proceeds on sale of the inventory. The transaction may be tripartite (the inventory financer takes a purchase money security interest, and the transaction involves the dealer's seller as the third party) or bipartite (the inventory financer takes a nonpurchase money security interest, and the transaction involves only the dealer and the inventory financer). The dealer then sells an item from its inventory to a purchaser in the ordinary course of business, retaining a security interest, in the form of a conditional sales contract, in the goods sold to assure payment of the credit obligation. The dealer then assigns this conditional sales contract, together with the security agreement and promissory note (these documents are known collectively as chattel paper), to a third party (usually a bank or financing agency). Often, the sale of the goods and assignment of chattel paper are contemporaneous, with the assignee ordinarily checking and approving the purchaser's credit beforehand.

If plaintiff intends to name unknown persons as defendants, before commencing the action it is recommended that plaintiff have searches done for other filings, assignments, or security interests regarding the chattel paper and the property on which that paper imposes a security interest, because in such an action, all persons having adverse claims that are of record or known to plaintiff or reasonably apparent from an inspection of the property must be named as defendants [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b)*].

[3] Allegations

[a] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The existence and identification of the chattel paper (Paragraphs 5, 9) [*see Com. Code § 9102(a)(11)*].

- Plaintiff's purchase of the chattel paper for new value and plaintiff's possession of the chattel paper in the ordinary course of its business (Paragraphs 6-8) [*see Com. Code § 9330(a), (b)*].

- Defendant secured party's perfected security interest in the chattel paper (Paragraphs 10, 11) [*see Com. Code § 9330*].

- Either the lack of any indication on the chattel paper that it had been assigned to anyone other than plaintiff [*Com. Code § 9330(a)*] (first alternative Paragraph 12), or plaintiff's lack of knowledge that the purchase/assignment violated the secured party's rights (second alternative Paragraph 12) [*see Com. Code § 9330(b), (f)*].

- The market value of the chattel paper (Paragraph 14).

- Plaintiff's damages (Paragraph 15).

[b] Quiet Title Action

A complaint in an action to quiet title in tangible personal property must allege the following:

- Defendants who have adverse claims to the title of the plaintiff against which a determination is sought (Paragraph 1) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.010*; for discussion of special requirements for naming parties in quiet title actions, *see* Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*].

- The adverse claims of unknown defendants if these defendants have been so named (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 762.020(a), 762.060*].

- A description of the property which is the subject of the action and its usual location (Paragraphs 5, 9) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*].

- The title of plaintiff as to which a determination is sought, together with the basis of the title (Paragraphs 6, 16) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(b)*].

- The adverse claims to plaintiff's title against which a determination is sought (Paragraph 16) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.020(c)*].

- That the claim (or part of it) of a person required to be named as a defendant is unknown, uncertain, or contingent, if this is so (optional Paragraph 13) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.020(b)*].

- That the uncertainty, contingency, or lack of knowledge is caused by a transfer to an unborn or unascertained person or class member; or by a transfer in the form of a contingent remainder, vested remainder subject to defeasance, executory interest, or similar disposition, if this is so; and, if so, the name, age, and legal disability (if any) of the person who would be entitled to the claim had the contingency on which the claim depends occurred prior to the commencement of the action (optional Paragraph 13) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.020(b)*].

- The date as of which the determination is sought, and if the determination is sought as of a date other than the date the complaint is filed, a statement of the reasons why a determination as of that date is sought (Paragraph 17) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)*].

- A prayer for the determination of plaintiff's title against the adverse claims (Paragraph 1 of prayer) [Civ. Code § 761.020(e)].

If plaintiff admits the validity of any adverse claim, the complaint must so state (Paragraph 16) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(c)*].

The complaint in [1], *above*, does not contain any allegations regarding defendants who are personal representatives [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(a)*] or heirs and intestate or testate successors [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)*] of persons known or believed by the plaintiff to be deceased. If those defendants are necessary in your particular situation, use the appropriate allegations from Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , Form 1.

Optional Paragraph 4 names fictitious defendants pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 760.060* (rules governing civil actions generally as applicable in quiet title actions unless they are inconsistent with quiet title provisions)].

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms for use in bringing quiet title actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[4] Verification Necessary

A complaint for an action to quiet title must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*].

[5] Priority of Purchaser of Chattel Paper

Although perfection by filing is permitted as to chattel paper, certain purchasers of chattel paper who take possession of the chattel paper take free of other security interests in the chattel paper, even those that have been perfected by filing [*see Com. Code § 9330*; *§ 503.50[3*]; *Chrysler Credit Corp. v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1303, 1313, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37* (one who takes chattel mortgage is protected against prior equities, such as third party's ownership of collateral, only if he or she takes mortgage for valuable consideration and without notice)].

[6] Quiet Title Action

[a] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction in quiet title actions as an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 580(b)(3), 760.040(a)*]. Subject to the power of the court to transfer actions, the proper county for trial of an action to quiet title to personal property is the county in which, at the commencement of the action, the personal property is principally

located or the defendants, or any of them, reside [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.050(b)*].

[b] Service of Summons

The form, content, and manner of service of summons is the same as in civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(a)*]. If unknown defendants are named, they must be served by publication and posting [*Code Civ. Proc. § 763.010(b)*]. For discussion of the requirements for service by publication and posting, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* . For discussion of the procedure for service of summons, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

180 of 184 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
2. Actions Against Competing Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.135-503.149

[Reserved]

§§ 503.135[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
3. Defenses

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.150

§ 503.150 Affirmative Defense to Complaint Alleging That Secured Party Is Not Proceeding or Did Not Proceed in Accordance With Law Based on Debtor's Authenticated Modification or Waiver of Rights After Default [Com. Code §§ 9624, 9629]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint Alleging That Secured Party Is Not Proceeding or Did Not Proceed in Accordance With Law Based on Debtor's Authenticated Modification or Waiver of Rights After Default [Com. Code §§ 9624, 9629]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

After default, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff [*if collateral is consumer goods, add:*, in consideration of defendant's waiver of any right to a deficiency on the debt,] authenticated and delivered to defendant a _____ [waiver *or* modification], a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference, in which plaintiff _____ [waived *or* modified] his/her/its right(s) _____

[*EITHER*]

[to notification of _____ (sale *or describe other disposition*) of the collateral (*if modification, describe, e.g.,* agreeing that no notification would be necessary if disposition of the collateral occurred by _____ [*date*]).]

[*OR*]

[to require that defendant, within 90 days after having taken possession of the collateral, dispose of that collateral,

which consists of consumer goods in which defendant had _____ (retained a purchase money security interest, and on which plaintiff has paid 60 percent of the cash price *or* taken a nonpurchase money security interest, and on which plaintiff has paid 60 percent of the secured obligation. (*If modification, describe, e.g.,* In this modification agreement, plaintiff agreed that if defendant had not sold the goods by _____ (*date*), defendant could retain them in satisfaction of the entire obligation.)]

[*OR*]

[to redeem the collateral herein (*if modification, describe, e.g.,* agreeing that the right to redeem could be exercised only by _____ (*date*)).]

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use by a secured party in an answer to a complaint that alleges that it is not proceeding, or did not proceed, properly under the default law (*Com. Code §§ 9601-9629*). The defense is based on the fact that the secured party, after default, obtained an authenticated waiver or modification from the debtor or a secondary obligor waiving or varying in some manner the debtor's rights on default. There are only three situations in which waiver is permitted [*see Com. Code § 9624* (discussed in *§ 503.28[2]*]:

- A debtor or secondary obligor may waive the right to notification of disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9611* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.27[5][b*].

- A debtor may waive the right to require disposition of collateral under *Com. Code § 9620(e)* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.42[5][a]*].

- Except in a consumer-goods transaction, a debtor or secondary obligor may waive the right to redeem collateral under *Com. Code § 9623* [*see* discussion in *§ 503.28[4]*].

As to consumer goods, no waiver or modification is valid or enforceable unless it is in consideration of a waiver by the secured party of any right to a deficiency on the debt [*Com. Code § 9629*; *compare Brunzell Construction Co., Inc. v. Smith (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 617, 622-623, 246 Cal. Rptr. 182* (neither former *Com. Code § 9501(3), 9504*, or *9505* prohibited individual guarantor of business obligation, after default, from consenting to entry of deficiency judgment against him or her)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Forms for Use by Secured Parties
3. Defenses

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 503.151-503.159

[Reserved]

§§ 503.151[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Forms for Use by Persons Other than Obligors or Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.160

§ 503.160 Complaint in Intervention by Party Claiming Right in Fixtures Prior to Secured Party or Debtor by Virtue of Real Property Interest [Com. Code § 9334]

[1] FORM Complaint in Intervention by Party Claiming Right in Fixtures Prior to Secured Party or Debtor by Virtue of Real Property Interest [Com. Code § 9334]

[*Caption and introduction. See § 503.133[1].*]

1. [*Basis for intervention. See § 503.133[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Identity of security agreement or agricultural lien and defendants as parties thereto, and of financing statement related thereto. See § 503.133[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[*EITHER*]

3. Intervenor is the owner _____ [in fee simple *or specify other interests*] of certain premises described as _____ [*describe*]. On or about _____[*date*], intervenor leased those premises to defendant _____ [*name of debtor*] under a written lease of that date for the purposes of _____ [*describe*] for the period of _____ years. A true copy of that lease is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*OR*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], to secure an indebtedness from defendant _____ [*name of debtor*] to intervenor in the principal amount of $_____ [for the purchase of real property hereinafter described], that defendant gave to intervenor a _____ [deed of trust *or similar security*] on

certain premises described as _____ [*describe*], carrying that date, in which _____ [*name*] was designated as trustee and intervenor was made beneficiary. This deed of trust was recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____, Book _____, page _____ [*or other record designation*] on _____[*date*]. A true copy of that deed of trust is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. According to the provisions of the above-described _____ [lease *or* deed of trust], all installations of personal property by defendant _____ [*name of debtor*] made to the real property, at any time, constituting fixtures or which are intended to be affixed to the property and become a permanent part thereof, including _____ [*describe items*], but excluding _____ [*describe items*] immediately on their installation were to become a part of the real property and _____ [*if lease:* belong to plaintiff as the owner thereof *or, if deed of trust:* are subject to plaintiffs lien thereon].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*debtor*] permanently affixed to the premises certain items which also constitute the collateral for the security agreement, described in the other pleadings herein, and consisting of _____ [*describe fixtures, e.g.,* ten 100-gallon water heaters under air conditioning system]. By virtue of the provisions of the _____ [lease *or* deed of trust] intervenor immediately thereon obtained the _____ [ownership *or* security] interest therein prior to that of defendants herein and all other parties.

6. Defendants herein contest intervenor's rights in these fixtures under their security agreement and threaten to remove the fixtures from the real property, threatening intervenor's interest with severe damage to the real property, by virtue of defendant _____'s [*secured party*] attempt to possess or foreclose on the fixtures.

WHEREFORE, intervenor prays judgment against defendants as follows:

1. For an order determining that the _____[ownership *or* security] interest of intervenor in the fixtures described herein is prior to that of either of the defendants herein [and restraining the defendants from removing, or otherwise interfering with, those fixtures];

2. For damages, in an amount not yet established but to be determined, for any removal of any fixtures from the real property described herein and for any resultant damage to the grounds or value of the property;

3. For costs of suit herein, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in intervention in [1], *above*, is for use by the holder of an interest in the real property who claims a right in any fixtures therein senior to that of a secured party under a security agreement who is attempting to possess or foreclose on them [*see Com. Code § 9334(a), (d), (e)*; *see also* discussions in *§§ 503.47[6][a]* and *[b]* (priorities as to fixtures), *503.133[3]* and [5] (procedural aspects of, and alternative to, intervention); *Civ. Code §§ 660*, *1013.5*, *1019*; *Com. Code § 9102(a)(41)* (defining fixtures, discussed in *§ 503.47[2]*;]. Generally, Division 9 does not govern the creation or transfer of an interest in or lien on real property, including a lease or rents thereunder. However, exceptions exist to the extent that provision is made for fixtures by *Com. Code § 9334* and for fixture filings by *Com. Code §§ 9501*, *9502*, *9512*, *9516*, and *9519* [*Com. Code § 9109(d)(11)*].

[3] Allegations

The form in [1], *above*, alleges:

- Allowance of intervention in the main action by the court (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 387*].
- Identification of the security arrangement between the main parties to the action (Paragraph 2).
- Intervenor's interest in the real estate and in all fixtures therein (Paragraphs 3, 4).
- Installation of the fixtures on the real property and intervenor's superior rights therein as against the threat of the secured party to possess or foreclose on them (Paragraphs 5, 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 387*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 503 SALES: SECURED TRANSACTIONS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Forms for Use by Persons Other than Obligors or Secured Parties

44-503 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.161

§ 503.161 Complaint by Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priority of Interest in Collateral and Damages--Against Seller and Secured Party Claiming Inventory Interest [Com. Code § 9320(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint by Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business for Declaratory Relief to Determine Priority of Interest in Collateral and Damages--Against Seller and Secured Party Claiming Inventory Interest [Com. Code § 9320(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*] Defendants.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF TO
	)	DETERMINE PRIORITY OF INTEREST IN COL-
	)	LATERAL AND FOR DAMAGES

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious names. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Venue for certain consumer installment sales. See § 503.100[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. Defendant _____ [*name of seller*] is engaged in the business of the retail sale of _____ [*describe goods*].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant _____ [*name of seller*], in the ordinary course of his/her/its business, sold and delivered to plaintiff certain goods consisting of _____[*describe goods*].

6. The sale was for new and valuable consideration, in that plaintiff _____ [*describe form of payment or exchange, e.g.*, paid to defendant _____ (*name of seller*) the sum of $_____]. The goods were not taken as security for or in consideration of a pre-existing money debt. The sale constituted only a portion of defendant _____ [*name of seller*]'s total inventory.

7. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant _____ [*name secured party*] notified plaintiff that it claimed a security interest in the goods sold to plaintiff, pursuant to a security agreement entered into between defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] and defendant _____ [*name of seller*]. At that time, defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] notified plaintiff that _____ [*specify secured party's threatened interference with plaintiff's interest in the goods*].

8. On or about _____ [*date*], when the goods were sold and delivered to plaintiff, plaintiff had no knowledge that the sale violated the rights of another person in the goods.

9. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendants concerning their respective rights in and to the goods, in that plaintiff contends that his/her interest therein, as a buyer in the ordinary course of business, is free of defendant _____'s [*name of secured party*] claimed security interest in the goods. This contention is disputed by defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] on the grounds that _____ [*describe defendant's contentions, for example, plaintiff is not a buyer in the ordinary course of business*].

10. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of the respective rights of the parties in the goods, including the validity of agreements and security instruments, if any, involved and the perfection, if any, of the claimed security instruments.

11. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order for plaintiff to ascertain his/her rights in the goods.

12. The _____ [*describe goods*] is/are now in plaintiff's possession, but plaintiff is unable to enjoy, use, assign, or otherwise deal with them as owner because of the adverse claims of defendant _____ [*name of secured party*].

13. At all times mentioned herein, the market value of _____ [*describe goods*] is $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For a declaration that plaintiff is the lawful owner of _____ [*describe goods*] and that defendant _____ [*name of secured party*] has no right, title, or interest therein;

2. For damages from defendant _____ [*name of seller*] in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 503.100[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use as either a complaint or cross complaint by a buyer in the ordinary course of business [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)* (definition, dismissed in § 503.161[4])] to obtain a judicial declaration of his or her ownership of goods free of a security interest in the goods created by the seller [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *Com. Code § 9320(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 503.24[3*]; *see also Com. Code § 9323(d), (e)* (priority of person buying other than in ordinary course of business, discussed in *§ 503.40[5][a])*]. In conjunction with the action for declaratory relief, the complaint also seeks damages for the secured party's interference with the buyer's ownership interest in the goods. For discussion of jurisdiction of actions for declaratory relief, see *§ 503.130[5]* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7), 580(b)(4), 1060*].

The limitations of *Com. Code § 9320(a)* on persons who may take free of a security interest apply only to unauthorized sales by the debtor. If the secured party authorized the sale, in an express agreement or otherwise, the buyer takes free *Com. Code § 9315(a)* without regard to the limitations of *Com. Code § 9320* [*see* U.C.C. Comment 6 to *Com. Code § 9320*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- Sale and delivery of goods to plaintiff (Paragraph 5).

- Plaintiff's status as a buyer in the ordinary course of business (Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 8) [*see Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)* (definition, at [4], *below*); *see also Producers Cotton Oil Co. v Amstar Corp (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 638, 653-654, 242 Cal. Rptr. 914* ; U.C.C. Comment 3 to *Com. Code § 9320* (read together, definition of buyer in the ordinary course of business and *Com. Code § 9320(a)* provide that buyer takes free of the security interest if he or she merely knows there is a security interest that covers the goods, but takes subject to the security interest if he or she knows the sale is in violation of some term of that security agreement)].

- Defendant secured party's claim of a security interest in and threatened interference with the goods (Paragraph 7).

- The actual controversy as to which interest is superior, together with the requirement of a judicial determination of the issues and the urgency of a judicial declaration to determine the status of plaintiff's

interest (Paragraphs 9, 10, and 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*].

- Plaintiff's inability to deal in the goods because of defendant secured party's adverse claims against them (Paragraph 12).

- The market value of the goods (Paragraph 13).

[4] Buyer in Ordinary Course of Business Defined

"Buyer in ordinary course of business" means a person that buys goods in good faith, without knowledge that the sale violates the rights of another person in the goods, and in the ordinary course from a person, other than a pawnbroker, in the business of selling goods of that kind. A person buys goods in the ordinary course if the sale to the person comports with the usual or customary practices in the kind of business in which the seller is engaged or with the seller's own usual or customary practices. A person that sells oil, gas, or other minerals at the wellhead or minehead is a person in the business of selling goods of that kind. A buyer in the ordinary course of business may buy for cash, by exchange of other property, or on secured or unsecured credit, and may acquire goods or documents of title under a preexisting contract for sale. Only a buyer that takes possession of the goods or has a right to recover the goods from the seller under Division 2 [*Com. Code § 2101 et seq.*] may be a buyer in ordinary course of business. A person that acquires goods in a transfer in bulk or as security for or in total or partial satisfaction of a money debt is not a buyer in ordinary course of business [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(9)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 504.syn

§ 504.syn Synopsis to Chapter 504: SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT

§ 504.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 504.02 Cross References

§ 504.03 Governing Law

§§ 504.04-504.09 [Reserved]

§ 504.10 Definitions

[1] "Consumer"

[2] "Disabled Person"

[3] "Goods"

[4] "Home Solicitation"

[5] "Person"

[6] "Senior Citizen"

[7] "Services"

[8] "Transaction"

§ 504.11 Purposes of Act

[1] In General

[2] Provisions Not Exclusive

[3] Waiver by Consumer Unenforceable and Void

[4] Federal Preemption Issues

§ 504.12 Unlawful Practices

§ 504.13 Remedies and Procedures

[1] Damages and Other Relief

[2] Damage Claims Are Arbitrable

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Additional Awards to Senior Citizen or Disabled Person

[5] Advertising Medium Excluded

[6] Precomplaint Notice and Demand

[7] Corrective Steps by Potential Defendant as Defense

[8] Declaration of Proper Court

[9] Class Actions

[a] Requirements

[b] Class Action by Senior Citizens or Disabled Persons

[c] Necessary Conditions

[d] Determinations at Hearing

[e] Notification of Class Members

[f] Dismissal Procedures

[g] Statutory Defense to Class Action

[h] Judgment in Class Action

[i] Recovery of Attorney's Fees

[j] Payment of Damages to Class Members

[k] Act's Class Action Remedy Not Exclusive

[l] Effect of Choice of Law Provision in Contract

[10] Defense of Bona Fide Error

[11] Statute of Limitation

[12] Consumer Product Bought Through Web Site--Personal Jurisdiction of Seller

§§ 504.14-504.19 [Reserved]

§ 504.20 Federal Statutes

§ 504.21 State Statutes

[1] Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[a] General Provisions

[b] Class Actions Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[c] Construction and Definitions

[d] Deceptive Practices

[e] Remedies and Procedures

[f] Statute of Limitation

[2] Receivers

[3] Related Acts and Provisions

§ 504.22 California Rules of Court

§ 504.23 Decisions

[1] Class Actions

[a] In General

[i] Attorney's Fees

[ii] Effect of Judgment

[b] Class Actions Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[i] Imposition of Notice Costs

[ii] Procedural Matters

[iii] Requisites of Action

[2] Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[a] Arbitrability of Damage Claims

[b] Attorney's Fees

[c] Requisites of Action

[d] Unlawful Practices

[e] Venue

[f] Waiver is Void

[3] Receivers

§ 504.24 Law Reviews

§ 504.25 Text References

§§ 504.26-504.29 [Reserved]

§ 504.30 Notification of Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act and Demand for Remedy [Civ. Code § 1782]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Compliance with Demand Provides Defense

§ 504.31 Complaint for Damages Based on Unlawful Practice in Sale or Lease of Consumer Goods or Services [Civ. Code § 1780(a)], including Allegations as to Class Action [Civ. Code § 1781]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] In General

[b] Excuse From Pleading Precomplaint Notice Compliance

[c] Pleading Injunctive Relief

[d] Punitive Damages

[e] Combining With Claims Under Related Acts

[4] Recovery of Attorney's Fees

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Venue

[7] Installment or Automotive Sales Actions; Certain Limited Civil Cases

[8] Limitation of Action

[9] Declaration

[10] Cross References

§ 504.32 Declaration to Be Filed With Complaint in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies [Civ. Code § 1780(d); Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 504.33 Allegations for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act To Provide Basis for Findings for Award of Additional Damages to Senior Citizen or Disabled Person [Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Modification for Use in Unfair Competition or Deceptive Practices Action

[5] Cross References

§ 503.34 Allegation for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Owners or Employees of Advertising Medium Had Knowledge of Violations of Act [Civ. Code § 1755]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 504.35-504.39 [Reserved]

§ 504.40 Affirmative Defense in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Violation Was Result of Bona Fide Error [Civ. Code § 1784]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.01

§ 504.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the Consumers Legal Remedies Act [*Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.*]. It includes:

- Discussion of the definitions of the act [*see § 504.10*], the purpose of the act [*see § 504.11*], and unlawful practices under the act [*see § 504.12*].

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[6]*] and a form [*see § 504.30*] for notice of a violation of the act and demand for remedy, which is required to be given at least 30 days prior to the filing of a complaint under the act.

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[1]*] and a form [*see § 504.31*] for a complaint for money damages and injunctive relief based on practices proscribed by the act.

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[6]*] and a form [*see § 504.32*] regarding a declaration required to be filed with the complaint.

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[4]*] and a form [*see § 504.33*] for allegations setting forth the basis for the special findings necessary to support an award of additional damages to a senior citizen or disabled person.

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[5]*] and a form [*see* § 504.34] for allegations that an owner or employee of an advertising medium published or disseminated an advertisement in violation of the act.

- Discussion [*see § 504.13[10]*] and a form [*see § 504.40*] for affirmative defense claiming that the alleged violation was the result of a bona fide error.

- Discussion of class actions under the Act [*see § 504.13[9]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.02

§ 504.02 Cross References

- For an alternative form for a complaint and additional allegations for insertion in the complaint, as well as a form for an affirmative defense, for use in an action under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, see Ch. 14, *Advertising*

- For discussion and forms for initiating or resisting arbitration pursuant to an arbitration agreement between the parties, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration*

- For discussion of additional deceptive or unfair practices or acts, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* , and Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* , § 565.10 et seq.

- For forms for use in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

- For forms for use in obtaining costs and necessary disbursements, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*

- For allegations of damages in contract and tort actions, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

- For allegations in complaints involving permanent injunctions, temporary restraining orders, and preliminary injunctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

- For forms relating to the appointment of receivers, see Ch. 486, *Receivers*

Forms of points and authorities for use in briefing issues relating to arbitrability of claims under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, class actions, injunctions, and receivers, may be found in California Points and Authorities, Ch. 20, *Contractual Arbitration* , Ch. 41, *Class and Representative Actions* , Ch. 116, *Injunctions* , and Ch. 200, *Receivers*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.03

§ 504.03 Governing Law

Unlawful methods of competition and unfair or deceptive practices in the sale or lease of consumer goods or services are proscribed by the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, which is set forth in *Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.* If any provision of the act is held unconstitutional, the remainder of the act is not affected thereby [*Civ. Code § 1753*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 504.04-504.09

[Reserved]

§§ 504.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.10

§ 504.10 Definitions

[1] "Consumer"

The term "consumer" within the meaning of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act refers to an individual who seeks or acquires, by purchase or lease, any goods or services for personal, family, or household purposes [*Civ. Code § 1761(d)*]. A third-party beneficiary of a contract for such goods or services is not a "consumer" within the meaning of the Act [*Schauer v. Mandarin Gems of California, Inc. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 949, 960, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233]* .

To be covered by the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, acts alleged as a cause of action must have been undertaken by the defendant in a consumer transaction "intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services" [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)*]. The Consumers Legal Remedies Act is not applicable if a defendant's acts were undertaken in a consumer transaction intended to result in the sale of real property. For example, a demurrer to a cause of action under the act was properly sustained without leave to amend when the consumers alleged that lenders overcharged them for underwriting, tax services, and wire transfer fees in conjunction with home loans [*McKell v. Washington Mutual, Inc. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457, 1488, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 227]* .

[2] "Disabled Person"

The term "disabled person," as used in the act, means any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities [*Civ. Code § 1761(g)*]. The term "major life activities" means functions such as caring for one's self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working [*Civ. Code § 1761(g)(2)*]. "Physical or mental impairment" means any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1761(g)(1)*]:

- Any physiological disorder or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss substantially affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological; musculoskeletal; special sense organs; respiratory, including speech organs; cardiovascular; reproductive; digestive; genitourinary; hemic and lymphatic; skin; or endocrine.

- Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional

or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities.

The term "physical or mental impairment" includes, but is not limited to, such diseases and conditions as orthopedic, visual, speech and hearing impairment, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cancer, heart disease, diabetes, mental retardation, and emotional illness [*Civ. Code § 1761(g)(1)*].

[3] "Goods"

The term "goods," as used in the act, means tangible chattels bought for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, including certificates or coupons exchangeable for those goods, and including goods that, at the time of the sale or subsequently, are to be so affixed to real property as to become a part of this real property, whether or not severable from it [*Civ. Code § 1761(a)*].

[4] "Home Solicitation"

The term "home solicitation," as used in the act, means any transaction made at the consumer's primary residence, except those transactions initiated by the consumer [*Civ. Code § 1761(h)*]. However, a consumer response to an advertisement is not a home solicitation [*Civ. Code § 1761(h)*].

[5] "Person"

The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, limited liability company, association, or other group, however organized [*Civ. Code § 1761(c)*].

[6] "Senior Citizen"

The term "senior citizen," as used in the act, means a person who is 65 years of age or older [*Civ. Code § 1761(f)*].

[7] "Services"

The term "services," as used in the act, means work, labor, and services for other than a commercial or business use, including services furnished in connection with the sale or repair of goods [*Civ. Code § 1761(b)*; *see Fairbanks v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 56, 61, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279, 205 P.3d 201* (insurer's contractual obligation to pay money under life insurance policy is not work or labor, nor is it related to sale or repair of any tangible chattel; therefore, life insurance policies are not services as defined in Consumers Legal Remedies Act)].

[8] "Transaction"

The term "transaction," as used in the act, means an agreement between a consumer and any other person, whether or not the agreement is a contract enforceable by action, and includes the making of, and the performance pursuant to, that agreement [*Civ. Code § 1761(e)*].

However, the act does not apply to a transaction on the construction, sale, or construction and sale of an entire residence or all or part of a structure designed for commercial or industrial occupancy, with or without a parcel of real property, including any site preparation incidental to that sale [*Civ. Code § 1754*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.11

§ 504.11 Purposes of Act

[1] In General

The purpose of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act is to protect consumers against unfair and deceptive business practices, insulate responsible businesses from spurious or vexatious lawsuits, and to provide efficient and economical procedures to secure that protection [*Pollard v. Ericsson, Inc. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 214, 220, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 496* ; *Kramer v. Intuit Inc. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 574, 579, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 412]* . The act is to be liberally construed and applied to promote its purposes [*Civ. Code § 1760*].

[2] Provisions Not Exclusive

The provisions of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act are not exclusive. The remedies provided in the act for violation of any section of the act or for conduct proscribed by any section of the act are in addition to any other procedures or remedies for any violation or conduct provided for in any other law [*Civ. Code § 1752*].

Because of the breadth of the unfair or deceptive acts or practices specified in *Civ. Code § 1770* [*see § 504.12, below*], several possible remedies exist under other consumer legislation that should be considered in addition to the remedies provided under the act, including the following:

- The Dance and Health Studio Acts [*Civ. Code § 1812.50 et seq.* and *Civ. Code § 1812.80 et seq.*, respectively], which are discussed in Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

- Provisions regulating home solicitation contracts [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500.3, 17533.8*; *Civ. Code § 1689.5 et seq.*], unsolicited goods or services [*Civ. Code §§ 1584.5, 1584.6, 1616*], and discount buying services [*Civ. Code § 1812.100 et seq.*], all of which are discussed in Ch. 128, *Consumer Contracts: Statutes Regulating Specific Types of Contracts* .

- Provisions of the Business and Professions Code regulating unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 et seq.* (contracts or combinations in restraint of trade), 17000 et seq. (unfair trade practices),

17200 et seq. (provisions to enjoin acts of unfair competition), 17500 et seq. (false representations to the public)], which are discussed in Ch. 14, *Advertising* , and Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

- The Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act [*Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*] and the federal Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act [*15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*] discussed in Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties* .

- Legislation regulating installment sales under the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*], discussed in Ch. 501, *Sales: Installment Sales* .

- The Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act and the Vehicle Leasing Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*], discussed in Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* .

[3] Waiver by Consumer Unenforceable and Void

A waiver by a consumer of the provisions of the act is contrary to public policy and is unenforceable and void [*Civ. Code § 1751*]. For example, in a case in which a forum selection clause designated Virginia as the jurisdiction in which all disputes arising out of the relationship would be litigated, the court held that because one of the causes of action sought class action relief under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act which voids any waiver of rights under the Act as contrary to public policy, enforcement of the clause would be the functional equivalent of a contractual waiver of the Act's statutory remedies and thus was prohibited under California law [*America Online, Inc. v. Superior Court (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1, 14-15, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699* (also concluding that because Virginia law does not allow consumer lawsuits to be brought as class actions, rights of California class members would be diminished if they were required to litigate in Virginia); *accord Doe 1 v. AOL LLC (9th Cir. 2009) 552 F.3d 1077, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 875, at *15-*19*].

[4] Federal Preemption Issues

Federal law mandates that any state law or regulation "on disclosure of fuel economy or fuel operating costs for an automobile" may impose only the same disclosure requirements as federal law imposes, with respect to any automobile covered by federal disclosure requirements [*49 U.S.C. § 32919(b)*]. The Consumers Legal Remedies Act, insofar as it prohibits the use of "unfair or deceptive acts or practices" in sales of goods [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)*; *see § 504.12*], is not a law "on disclosure of fuel economy or fuel operating costs for an automobile"; therefore, that federal preemptive mandate does not preclude application of the state law to a buyer's claim that an automobile manufacturer's statements, in a promotional brochure, relating to the fuel economy of a particular model were deceptive or misleading [*Paduano v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc. (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1453, 1478, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 90* (express preemption provisions in *49 U.S.C. § 32919* do not purport to take away state's power to regulate advertising of new vehicles, even when that advertising includes EPA mileage estimates, as long as state's regulation does not require manufacturer to provide fuel estimate different from EPA fuel economy estimate, or to make claims that go beyond, or are contrary to, what federal scheme requires)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.12

§ 504.12 Unlawful Practices

The following unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices, undertaken by any person in a transaction intended to result, or that results, in the sale or lease of goods to any consumer, are unlawful:

- Passing off goods or services as those of another [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(1)*].

- Misrepresenting the source, sponsorship, approval, or certification of goods or services [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(2)*].

- Misrepresenting the affiliation, connection, or association with, or certification by, another [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(3)*].

- Using deceptive representations or designations of geographic origin in connection with goods or services [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(4)*].

- Representing that goods or services have sponsorship, approval, characteristics, ingredients, uses, benefits, or quantities that they do not have, or that a person has a sponsorship, approval, status, affiliation, or connection that he or she does not have [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5)*; *see, e.g., Williams v. Gerber Prods. Co. (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 934, 940* (reasonable consumers buying boxed snack food for children should not be expected to look beyond misleading representations on front of box in order to discover truth from ingredients list in small print on side of box); *Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1353-1354, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22* (finding triable issues on whether provider of satellite TV service violated *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5)* with representations concerning number of channels and program schedule)].

- Representing that goods are original or new if they have deteriorated unreasonably or are altered, reconditioned, reclaimed, used, or secondhand [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(6)*].

- Representing that goods or services are of a particular standard, quality, or grade, or that goods are of

a particular style or model, if they are of another [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7)*; *see, e.g., Williams v. Gerber Prods. Co. (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 934, 940* (reasonable consumers buying boxed snack food for children should not be expected to look beyond misleading representations on front of box in order to discover truth from ingredients list in small print on side of box); *Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1353-1354, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22* (finding triable issues of fact on whether provider of satellite TV service violated *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(7)* with representations concerning number of channels and program schedule)].

- Disparaging the goods, services, or business of another by false or misleading representation of fact [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(8)*].

- Advertising goods or services with intent not to sell them as advertised [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(9)*; *see, e.g., Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1353-1354, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22* (finding triable issues of fact on whether provider of satellite TV service violated *Civ. Code 1770(a)(9)* with representations concerning number of channels and program schedule)].

- Advertising goods or services with intent not to supply reasonably expectable demand, unless the advertisement discloses a limitation of quantity [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(10)*].

- Advertising furniture without clearly indicating that it is unassembled if that is the case [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(11)*].

- Advertising the price of unassembled furniture without clearly indicating the assembled price of that furniture if the same furniture is available assembled from the seller [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(12)*].

- Making false or misleading statements of fact concerning reasons for, existence of, or amounts of price reductions [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(13)*].

- Representing that a transaction confers or involves rights, remedies, or obligations that it does not have or involve, or that are prohibited by law [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14)*; *see Wang v. Massey Chevrolet (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 856, 870, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 770* (parol evidence rule does not constitute defense or bar to claim based on *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14)*)].

- Representing that a part, replacement, or repair service is needed when it is not [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(15)*].

- Representing that the subject of a transaction has been supplied in accordance with a previous representation when it has not [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(16)*].

- Representing that the consumer will receive a rebate, discount, or other economic benefit, if the earning of the benefit is contingent on an event to occur subsequent to the consummation of the transaction [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(17)*; *Pollard v. Ericsson, Inc. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 214, 220, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 496* (cell phone rebate conditioned on certain acts that could be accomplished before or at time of cell phone purchase did not violate this section)].

- Misrepresenting the authority of a salesperson, representative, or agent to negotiate the final terms of a transaction with a consumer [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(18)*].

- Inserting an unconscionable provision in the contract [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)*; *see Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 758, 766, 767-768, 259 Cal. Rptr. 789*

(plaintiff who has reasonably available alternative sources of supply from which to obtain desired goods or services free of terms claimed to be unconscionable cannot establish unconscionability); *see also Belton v. Comcast Cable Holdings, LLC (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1245-1247, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 631* (cable service provider's requirement that all customers must buy basic tier of cable service was not unconscionable when applied to visually impaired customers wanting only music or FM service without having to take television service as well); *Freeman v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 660, 667-670, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 860* (clearly marked provision imposing service fee on shopping card after 24 months of nonuse was not unconscionable term under *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)*)].

- Advertising that a product is being offered at a specific price plus a specific percentage of that price unless (1) the total price is set forth in the advertisement, which may include, but is not limited to, shelf tags, displays, and media advertising, in a size larger than any other price in that advertisement, and (2) the specific price plus a specific percentage of that price represents a markup from the seller's costs or from the wholesale price of the product; this does not apply to in-store advertising by businesses that are open only to members or cooperative organizations organized pursuant to *Corp. Code § 12000 et seq.* when more than 50 percent of purchases are made at the specific price set forth in the advertisement [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(20)*].

- Selling or leasing goods in violation of *Civ. Code § 1797.8 et seq.* (required advertising disclosures regarding trademark consumer goods normally accompanied by manufacturer's warranty that are imported into this country through unauthorized channels and do not have manufacturer's express warranty) [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(21)*; *see* Ch. 14, *Advertising*].

- Disseminating an unsolicited prerecorded message by telephone without an unrecorded, natural voice first informing the person answering the telephone of the name of the caller or the organization being represented, and either the address or the telephone number of the caller, and without obtaining the consent of that person to listen to the prerecorded message [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(22)(A)*]. The prohibition does not apply, however, to a message disseminated to a business associate, customer, or other person having an established relationship with the person or organization making the call, to a call for the purpose of collecting an existing obligation, or to any call generated at the request of the recipient [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(22)(B)*].

- The home solicitation [*see Civ. Code § 1761(h)* (definition)] of a consumer who is a senior citizen when a loan is made encumbering his or her primary residence for the purpose of paying for home improvements and when the transaction is part of a pattern or practice in violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1639(h)* or *(i)* [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(23)*]. A third party, however, will not be liable under this subdivision unless (1) there was an agency relationship between the party who engaged in the home solicitation and the third party, or (2) the third party had actual knowledge of, or participated in, the unfair or deceptive transaction [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(23)*]. A third party who is a holder in due course under a home solicitation contract will not be liable under this subdivision [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(23)*].

- Charging or receiving an unreasonable fee to prepare, aid, or advise any prospective applicant, applicant, or recipient in the procurement, maintenance, or securing of public social services [*Civ. Code § 1770(a)(24)*; *see Civ. Code § 1780(c)* (treble damages); *see also Civ. Code §§ 1770(a)(24)(c), 1780(c)* (not applicable to attorneys licensed to practice law in California, who are subject to California Rules of Professional Conduct and to mandatory fee arbitration provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.*, when fees charged or received are for providing representation in administrative agency appeal proceedings or court proceedings for purposes of procuring, maintaining, or securing public social services on behalf of person or group of persons)].

- A mortgage broker or lender's direct or indirect use of a home improvement contractor to negotiate the terms of any loan that is secured, whether in whole or in part, by the residence of the borrower and which is used to finance all or any part of a home improvement contract [*Civ. Code § 1770(b)(1)*]. A "mortgage broker or lender" includes a licensed finance dealer [*see Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*], a license residential mortgage lender [*see Fin. Code § 50000 et seq.*], or a license real estate broker [*Civ. Code § 1770(b)(1)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10000 et seq.*].

In addition, other statutes may provide that a violation of their provisions constitutes an unlawful practice within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1770* [*see, e.g., Civ. Code §§ 1723* (posting of retailer's refund policy), 1797.86 ("grey market goods")].

Civ. Code § 1770(a) proscribes specified acts or practices "in a transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to any consumer." An extension of credit, such as by issuing a credit card, if separate and apart from the sale or lease of any specific goods or services, does not fall within the scope of the Act [*Berry v. American Express Publishing, Inc. (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 224, 232-233, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 91]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.13

§ 504.13 Remedies and Procedures

[1] Damages and Other Relief

The act provides that any consumer who suffers any damage as a result of the use or employment by any person of an unlawful act, method, or practice [*see Civ. Code § 1770, set out in § 504.12*] may bring an action against that person for restitution of property, or to recover damages, punitive damages, injunctive relief, and any other relief that the court deems proper [*Civ. Code § 1780(a)*]. The phrase "any damage" in *Civ. Code § 1780(a)* is not synonymous with "actual damages." The breadth of the phrase "any damage" indicates a category that includes, but is greater than, "actual damages"; that is, those who are eligible for the remedy of "actual damages" compose a subset of those who have suffered "any damage" [*Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 640, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*]. In order to bring an action, not only must a consumer be exposed to an unlawful practice, but also some kind of damage must result [*Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 641, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*].

Incurring transaction costs--for instance, expending time and money in threatening a lawsuit--in order to avoid the consequences of a deceptive practice falls within the broad meaning of suffering "any damage as a result of the use or employment" of an unlawful practice, whether or not those transaction costs are cognizable as actual damages [*Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 641, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*]. As another example, a consumer could have incurred "opportunity costs" if a merchant's use of an unlawful practice "diverted" the consumer from dealing with another merchant on acceptable terms [*Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 640, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*]. On the other hand, a consumer has not suffered any damage as a result of an unlawful practice if unconscionable terms in a consumer contract have not yet actually been enforced so as to impose "some kind of tangible increased cost or burden" on the consumer. In that situation, the consumer has no standing under *Civ. Code § 1780(a)* to sue for injunctive relief aimed at precluding the future use of an unlawful practice [*Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*].

For a complaint for damages for violation of the Act, see *§ 504.31*.

[2] Damage Claims Are Arbitrable

When there is an arbitration agreement between the consumer and the defendant, claims for damages under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act are arbitrable, at least to the extent those claims are governed by the Federal Arbitration Act. However, claims for injunctive relief in which the plaintiff is acting as private attorney general (a claim seeking to enjoin deceptive business practices), for example, are not arbitrable, even though hearing the damage claims and the claim for injunctive relief in separate forums is inefficient [*Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans of California (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 1066, 1072, 1079-1080, 1088, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334, 988 P.2d 67* ; *see* *Cruz v. Pacificare Health Systems, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 303, 307, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58, 66 P.3d 1157* (finding that *Broughton*'s holding on non-arbitrability of CLRA public injunctions should be extended to include claims to enjoin unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* and misleading advertising under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*)]. *Broughton* was based in part on the strong policy of the Federal Arbitration Act favoring arbitration, but California's policy favoring arbitration is also strong. Therefore, claims that were not governed by the Federal Arbitration Act probably also would be arbitrable.

For discussion and forms for initiating or resisting arbitration pursuant to an arbitration agreement between the parties, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

[3] Attorney's Fees

The court will award court costs and attorney's fees to a prevailing plaintiff in litigation filed pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780* [*Civ. Code § 1780(e)*; *see, e.g.,* *Graciano v. Robinson Ford Sales, Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 140, 149-164, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 273* (how to determine whether plaintiff has prevailed, and how to compute amount of fees to which plaintiff is entitled); *Hayward v. Ventura Volvo (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 509, 513, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514* (prevailing plaintiff is entitled to "reasonable" fees, although word is omitted from statute; court was not limited in awarding fees to those incurred under contingency fee contract); *Reveles v. Toyota By the Bay (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1139, 1154, 67 Cal. Rptr.2d 543* (entitlement to attorney's fees for net recovery on violations of *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5)-(7)*)]. Reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded to a prevailing defendant on a finding by the court that the plaintiff's prosecution of the action was not in good faith [*Civ. Code § 1780(e)*].

If the plaintiff moves for attorney's fees pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780(d)*, generally the court is required to determine whether the plaintiff is the prevailing party and, if so, what amount is to be awarded to the plaintiff. The court must do this even if the action is concluded by a settlement. However, if the parties have agreed that attorney's fees are not to be awarded pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780(d)*, then the court must give effect to that agreement [*Kim v. Euromotors West/The Auto Gallery (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 170, 178-181, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780* (stating guidelines for determining whether plaintiff is prevailing party)].

[4] Additional Awards to Senior Citizen or Disabled Person

In an action under *Civ. Code § 1780(a)*, any consumer who is a senior citizen or a disabled person, as defined in *Civ. Code § 1761(f)* and *(g)*, respectively [*see* definitions in § 504.10[2] and [6]], may seek and be awarded, in addition to the remedies provided in *Civ. Code § 1780(a)*, up to $5,000 [*Civ. Code § 1780(b)*]. Before making that award, the trier of fact must do all of the following [*Civ. Code § 1780(b)(1)*]:

- Find that the consumer has suffered substantial physical, emotional, or economic damages resulting from the defendant's conduct;

- Make an affirmative finding in regard to one or more of the factors set forth in *Civ. Code § 3345(b)* (discussed *below*); and

- Find that an additional award is appropriate.

In addition, *Civ. Code § 3345* provides for increasing any applicable fine, penalty, or other remedy up to three times the amount authorized or to be imposed in actions brought by, on behalf of, or for the benefit of senior citizens or disabled persons (as defined in *Civ. Code § 1761(f)* and *(g)*, respectively), to redress unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition [*see Civ. Code § 3345(a)*]. If a trier of fact is authorized by a statute in an action to impose either a fine or a civil penalty or other penalty, or any remedy the purpose or effect of which is to punish or deter, and the amount of the fine, penalty, or other remedy is subject to the trier of fact's discretion, the trier of fact must consider all of the factors listed below, in addition to other appropriate factors, in determining the amount of the fine, civil penalty or other penalty, or other remedy to impose. If the trier of fact makes an affirmative finding in regard to one or more of the factors listed below, it may impose a fine, civil penalty or other penalty, or other remedy in an amount up to three times greater than authorized by the statute, or, when the statute does not authorize a specific amount, up to three times greater than the amount the trier of fact would impose in the absence of that affirmative finding [*Civ. Code § 3345(b)*]. The following are the factors to be considered [*Civ. Code § 3345(b)*]:

- Whether the defendant knew or should have known that his or her conduct was directed to one or more senior citizens or disabled persons.

- Whether the defendant's conduct caused one or more senior citizens or disabled persons to suffer loss or encumbrance of a primary residence, principal employment, or source of income; substantial loss of property set aside for retirement, or for personal or family care and maintenance; or substantial loss of payments received under a pension or retirement plan or a government benefits program, or assets essential to the health or welfare of the senior citizen or disabled person.

- Whether one or more senior citizens or disabled persons are substantially more vulnerable than other members of the public to the defendant's conduct because of age, poor health or infirmity, impaired understanding, restricted mobility, or disability, and actually suffered substantial physical, emotional, or economic damages resulting from the defendant's conduct.

For a form with allegations to be used in a complaint by senior or disabled plaintiffs to redress unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition, *see § 504.33*.

[5] Advertising Medium Excluded

An action under the act may not be brought against an owner or employee of any advertising medium, including, but not limited to, newspapers, magazines, broadcast stations, billboard and transit ads, who publishes or disseminates an advertisement in violation of the act, unless plaintiff establishes that the owner or employee had knowledge of deceptive methods, acts, or practices declared to be unlawful by *Civ. Code § 1770* [*Civ. Code § 1755*]. For a form for an allegation of the advertiser's guilty knowledge, see § 504.34. For an affirmative defense for use by an advertiser who does not know of the deceptive practice, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

[6] Precomplaint Notice and Demand

At least 30 days prior to the commencement of any action for damages, the consumer must notify the potential defendant of the particular alleged violations, and demand correction, repair, replacement, or other rectification of the goods or services allegedly in violation of the act. The notice must be in writing and sent by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, to the place where the transaction occurred or to the person's principal place of business within California [*Civ. Code § 1782(a)*]. The notice may concern an individual grievance or a grievance that affects a class of consumers [*see Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 591, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060 , disapproved on other grounds, Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*]. For a form for notice and demand, see *§ 504.30*.

An action for injunctive relief under the act can be commenced without compliance with these precomplaint notice provisions. The plaintiff may amend his or her complaint for injunctive relief, without leave of court, to include a request for damages not less than 30 days after the commencement of the action for injunctive relief and after compliance with the precomplaint notice provisions. When the complaint is so amended, the defendant must be given an opportunity to remedy the violation, as discussed in *§ 504.13[7]* [*see Civ. Code § 1782(d)*].

When a consumer commences an action for injunctive relief and then amends the complaint to add a claim for damages, without having given the prescribed notice, and the defendant asserts that the claim for damages is procedurally unviable because of noncompliance with the notice requirement, the court's response to the defendant's assertion may not foreclose the plaintiff from giving the required notice, then waiting for 30 days for sufficient remedial measures by the defendant, and, if an action for damages then can be maintained [*see Civ. Code § 1782(b)*; § 504.13[7]], filing another amended complaint in which the plaintiff alleges compliance with the notice requirement [*Morgan v. AT&T Wireless Servs. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1235, 1260-1261, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 768* (trial court erred in sustaining demurrer to amended complaint without leave to amend, based on plaintiff's inability to allege that required notice was given before commencement of action)].

[7] Corrective Steps by Potential Defendant as Defense

Except for class actions under *Civ. Code § 1781* [*see* discussion in *§ 504.13[9][g]*], an action for damages may not be maintained under the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1780* if an appropriate correction, repair, replacement, or other remedy is given, or agreed to be given within a reasonable time, to the consumer within 30 days after receipt of the notice required by *Civ. Code § 1782(a)* [*Civ. Code § 1782(b)*; *see* [6], § 504.13[6]]. This provision only applies, however, if the notice given to the potential defendant concerned an individual grievance. If the notice concerned a grievance that affects a class of consumers, a prospective defendant can avert a subsequent class action only by remedying the contested practices as to all affected consumers [*Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 591, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060 , disapproved on other grounds, Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*].

Attempts by the potential defendant to comply with the precomplaint notice provisions of *Civ. Code § 1782* are construed as an offer to compromise and are inadmissible as evidence pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1152*; furthermore, attempts to comply with a demand are not considered an admission of engaging in an act or practice declared unlawful by the act. Evidence of compliance or attempts to comply with the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1782* may be introduced by a defendant for the purpose of establishing good faith or to show compliance [*Civ. Code § 1782(e)*].

[8] Declaration of Proper Court

In any action subject to *Civ. Code § 1780*, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, the plaintiff is required to file an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a county described in *Civ. Code § 1780(d)* as a proper place for the trial of the action. If the plaintiff fails to file the required affidavit or declaration, the court, either on its own motion or on the motion of any party, must dismiss the action without prejudice [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*; *see* discussion in *§ 504.31[6]*]. For a form for this declaration, see *§ 504.32*.

[9] Class Actions

[a] Requirements

If an unlawful method, act, or practice has caused damage to other consumers similarly situated, a consumer entitled to bring an action under *Civ. Code § 1780* may bring an action on behalf of himself or herself and the other consumers to recover damages or obtain other relief as provided in *Civ. Code § 1780* [*Civ. Code § 1781(a)*]. *Civ. Code § 1780(a)(1)* provides that the total award of actual damages in a class action may not be less than $1,000 [*Civ. Code § 1780(a)(1)*].

An individual consumer may bring a class action under *Civ. Code § 1781(a)* if, pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1782(a)*, he or she has put the prospective defendant on notice that the alleged violations of *Civ. Code § 1770* affect a class of consumers, and the prospective defendant has failed to correct or to seek to correct the violations as to all similarly situated consumers pursuant to the conditions set forth in *Civ. Code § 1782(c)* [*Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 595, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060 , disapproved on other grounds, Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*].

Civ. Code § 1781(b) establishes the exclusive criteria for class certification of suits brought under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act [*Hogya v. Superior Court (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 122, 140, 142 Cal. Rptr. 325]* . The fact that damages are not even a necessary objective of a consumer class-suit under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act casts doubt that the Legislature intended the certification of a class action could be denied on the ground that individual monetary recovery will be slight [*see Hogya v. Superior Court (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 122, 138, 142 Cal. Rptr. 325]* .

[b] Class Action by Senior Citizens or Disabled Persons

Judgment in a class action under *Civ. Code § 1781* brought by senior citizens or disabled persons (as defined in *Civ. Code § 1761(f)* and *(g)*, respectively) may award each class member the additional award if the trier of fact has made the findings discussed under [4], *above* [*Civ. Code § 1780(b)(2)*].

[c] Necessary Conditions

The court must permit the suit to be maintained on behalf of all members of the represented class if all of the following conditions exist [*Civ. Code § 1781(b)*]:

- It is impracticable to bring all members of the class before the court;
- The questions of law or fact common to the class are substantially similar and predominate over the questions affecting the individual members;
- The claims or defenses of the representative plaintiffs are typical of the claims or defenses of the class; and
- The representative plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

If these conditions are met, the trial court must certify the class. It has no discretion to deny certification based on other considerations [*Hogya v. Superior Court (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 122, 140, 142 Cal. Rptr. 325]* .

[d] Determinations at Hearing

If notice of the time and place of the hearing is served on the other parties at least 10 days prior to the date of the hearing (or any longer period provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* if the notice is served by mail), the court must hold a hearing, on motion of any party to the action that is supported by affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of anyone having knowledge of the facts, to determine if any of the following apply to the action [*Civ. Code § 1781(c)*]:

- A class action pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(b)* [*see* discussion in [c], *above*] is proper;
- Published notice pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(d)* [*see* discussion in [e], *below*] is necessary to adjudicate the claims of the class; or

- The action is without merit or there is no defense to the action.

This provision is in lieu of a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*], which may not be granted by the court in any action commenced as a class action pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(a)* [*Civ. Code § 1781(c)(3)*; *Olsen v. Breeze, Inc. (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 608, 623-624, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 818* ; *see also* [a], *above*]. For notices of motion that may be adopted for the determination of these issues, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

[e] Notification of Class Members

If the action is permitted as a class action, the court may direct either party to notify each member of the class of the action. If personal notification is unreasonably expensive or it appears that all members of the class cannot be notified personally, the party directed to serve notice may, with the court's consent, give notice by publication, in accordance with *Gov. Code § 6064*, in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the transaction occurred [*Civ. Code § 1781(d)*].

The notice must include the following information [*Civ. Code § 1781(f)*]:

- That the court will exclude the member notified from the class if he or she so requests by a specified date;

- That the judgment, whether favorable or not, will include all members who do not request exclusion; and

- That any member who does not request exclusion may enter an appearance through counsel if he or she desires.

The trial court, under its general authority, may impose notice costs pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(d)* on either party in the class action [*Civil Serv. Employees Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 362, 376, 149 Cal. Rptr. 360, 584 P.2d 497]* .

[f] Dismissal Procedures

A class action may not be dismissed, settled, or compromised without court approval, and notice of the proposed dismissal, settlement, or compromise must be given in any manner the court directs to each member who was given notice pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(d)* [*see* discussion in [e], *above*] and did not request exclusion [*Civ. Code § 1781(f)*]. The foregoing procedures are intended to prevent class members in future litigation from reviving the matters compromised [*Marcarelli v. Cabell (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 51, 57, 129 Cal. Rptr. 509]* .

[g] Statutory Defense to Class Action

Even though the conditions exist for a class action as provided in *Civ. Code § 1781(b)*, a class action may not be maintained if the potential defendant shows that all of the following exist [*Civ. Code § 1782(c)*; *see* *Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav.& Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 591, 595, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060 , disapproved on other grounds,* *Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*]:

- All consumers similarly situated have been identified, or a reasonable effort to identify those other consumers has been made;

- All consumers so identified have been notified that on their request the potential defendant will make

the appropriate correction, repair, replacement, or other remedy of the goods and services;

- The correction, repair, replacement, or other remedy requested by those consumers has been, or in a reasonable time will be, given; and

- The potential defendant has ceased from engaging, or if immediate cessation is impossible or unreasonably expensive under the circumstances, he or she will, within a reasonable time, cease to engage, in those methods, acts, or practices.

[h] Judgment in Class Action

The judgment in a class action describes those to whom the notice was directed and who have not requested exclusion and those the court finds to be members of the class. The best possible notice of the judgment must be given in the manner the court directs to each member who was personally served with notice pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(d)* [*see* discussion in [e], *above*] and did not request exclusion [*Civ. Code § 1781(g)*].

[i] Recovery of Attorney's Fees

Recovery of attorney's fees in a class action is authorized by *Civ. Code § 1780(e)*, discussed in [3], *above*. Attorney's fees in class actions have been awarded under other theories, including the substantial benefit theory, the common fund principle, and the private attorney general theory, which may be relevant to calculation of the amount of attorney's fees provided for by *Civ. Code § 1780(e)*. Those theories are discussed in *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq.

[j] Payment of Damages to Class Members

Neither the act nor other statutory provision specifies a procedure for the payment of damages to consumers represented in a class action under *Civ. Code § 1781*. In the absence of a local court rule or practice specifying a particular procedure, a receiver may be appointed to carry the judgment into effect and after the judgment to dispose of the property according to the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3), (4)*; *see also* Ch. 486, *Receivers*].

[k] Act's Class Action Remedy Not Exclusive

Nothing in the act limits any other statutory or any common law rights of the Attorney General or any other person to bring class actions. Class actions by consumers brought under the act are governed exclusively by the provisions of the act. However, the consumer is not deprived of any statutory or common law right to bring a class action without resort to the act. If any act or practice proscribed under the act also constitutes a cause of action in common law or a violation of another statute, the consumer can assert that common law or statutory cause of action under the procedures and with the remedies provided for in that law [*Civ. Code § 1752*].

[l] Effect of Choice of Law Provision in Contract

A consumer contract, especially the usual kind of contract of adhesion (such as a credit card agreement), commonly contains a provision specifying that the parties' rights and obligations will be governed, not by California law, but by the law of another state. That law often will have rules that are not in the consumer's interest, since the choice of governing law is dictated by the other party, and naturally the law selected tends to favor that party. Under Delaware law (which is chosen in many cases), one such rule holds that a class action waiver, if clearly stated in the contract, is enforceable. When the waiver is found in a consumer contract of adhesion in a setting in which disputes between the contracting parties predictably involve small amounts of damages, and when it is alleged that the party with the superior bargaining power has carried out a scheme to deliberately cheat large numbers of consumers out of individually small sums of money, then, at least to the extent that the obligation at issue is governed by California law, the waiver becomes in

practice what is prohibited by statute: the exemption of the stronger party from responsibility for its own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another [*see Civ. Code § 1668*]. Under these circumstances, those waivers are unconscionable under California law and should not be enforced [*Discover Bank v. Superior Court (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 148, 162-163, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 76, 113 P.3d 1100* ; *Szetela v. Discover Bank (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1094, 1099-1102, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 862]* . This is a "fundamental policy" of California, in the context of resolving a choice of law issue [*Klussman v. Cross Country Bank (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1283, 1294, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728]* . For discussion of how courts resolve choice of law issues and the significance of a state's fundamental policy in that context, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*, § 140.30.

In a case brought under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, if the plaintiff pursues a class action the court might have to determine whether to give effect to a foreign law rule under which a class action waiver would be enforceable, when under California's fundamental policy the waiver would not be enforceable. Since the plaintiff would be asserting claims under California law, the court might well conclude that California's interest in enforcing its fundamental policy is greater than the other state's interest in enforcing its contrary law [*Klussman v. Cross Country Bank (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1283, 1298-1300, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728* (trial court correctly ruled that class action waiver in consumer contract of adhesion governed by Delaware law could not be enforced in action under Consumers Legal Remedies Act and California's unfair competition law)].

[10] Defense of Bona Fide Error

No award of damages may be given in an action based on violation of the act if the alleged violator proves that the violation was not intentional and was the result of a bona fide error, notwithstanding the use of reasonable procedures adopted to avoid any such error, and he or she takes appropriate corrective measures of *Civ. Code § 1782(b), (c)* discussed in *§ 504.13[7]* and *[9][g]* [*Civ. Code § 1784*]. Moreover, evidence of compliance or attempts to comply with the corrective measures set out in *Civ. Code § 1782(b), (c)* may be introduced by a defendant for the purpose of establishing good faith or showing compliance with the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1782(b), (c)* [*Civ. Code § 1782(e)*]. For an affirmative defense alleging bona fide error, see *§ 504.40*. (Although *Civ. Code § 1784* does not explicitly remove mistakes of law from the scope of the "bona fide error" defense--whereas some other statutes allowing the same defense do exclude mistakes of law--the defense probably does not cover a violation that arose from the defendant's mistaken interpretation of statutory requirements [*cf.* *Jerman v. Carlisle, McNellie, Rini, Kramer & Ulrich LPA (2010) -- U.S. --, 130 S. Ct. 1605, 176 L. Ed. 2d 519, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 3480, at *15-*59* (such defense allowed by Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, *15 U.S.C. § 1692k(c)*, in same language as *Civ. Code § 1784*, did not cover debt-collecting attorney's mistake of law as to Act's requirements)].)

[11] Statute of Limitation

Any action under the act for unlawful practice must be commenced not more than three years from the date of commission of that unlawful practice [*Civ. Code § 1783*].

[12] Consumer Product Bought Through Web Site--Personal Jurisdiction of Seller

While it is possible that Internet activity alone could create the necessary minimum contacts to expose a nonresident defendant to personal jurisdiction in California courts, that issue must be determined by examining the level of interactivity and commercial nature of the exchange of information that occurs on the defendant's web site [*Pavlovich v. Superior Court (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 262, 274, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 58 P.3d 2* ; *see Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances, § 323.14[4][b]*]. A disgruntled California consumer will not necessarily be able to sue a nonresident seller in a California court. In one case, for instance, a Florida seller's web site merely advertised a consumer product (a car) for sale, which a California resident bought after initiating contact with the seller. There was no evidence that files were exchanged through the web site or that any business was actually conducted through the web site, nor any evidence that anything about the web site specifically targeted California

residents, and the seller had none of the traditionally sufficient ties with California to establish minimum contact. Therefore, the seller's maintenance of the web site alone was insufficient to establish personal jurisdiction when the California consumer sued the seller in a California court for rescission or damages [*Shisler v. Sanfer Sports Cars, Inc. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1260-1262, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 335]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 504.14-504.19

[Reserved]

§§ 504.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.20

§ 504.20 Federal Statutes

Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act. *15 U.S.C. § 2301 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.21

§ 504.21 State Statutes

[1] Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[a] General Provisions

Civ. Code § 1750 et seq. cited as Consumers Legal Remedies Act. *Civ. Code § 1750*

Waiver of provision of act is unenforceable and void. *Civ. Code § 1751*

Provisions of act not exclusive. *Civ. Code § 1752*

Nothing in act affects right to bring class action. *Civ. Code § 1752*

Unconstitutional provision does not affect remaining provisions of act. *Civ. Code § 1753*

Provisions of act do not apply to construction or sale of an entire residence, to structures designed for commercial or industrial occupancy, or to sale of parcel of real property. *Civ. Code § 1754*

[b] Class Actions Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

Right of consumer to bring class action. *Civ. Code § 1781(a)*

Conditions precedent to class action. *Civ. Code § 1781(b)*

Notice and hearing procedures as to determination of right to bring class action. *Civ. Code § 1781(c)*

Procedures as to notification of class members of class action. *Civ. Code § 1781(d)*

Contents of notice to class members. *Civ. Code § 1781(e)*

Requirement of court approval of dismissal, settlement, or compromise of class action. *Civ. Code § 1781(f)*

Judgment and notice in class actions. *Civ. Code § 1781(g)*

Effect of attempts to comply with notice and demand on right to bring class action for damages. *Civ. Code § 1782(c)*

[c] Construction and Definitions

Act liberally construed. *Civ. Code § 1760*

"Goods" defined. *Civ. Code § 1761(a)*

"Services" defined. *Civ. Code § 1761(b)*

"Person" defined. *Civ. Code § 1761(c)*

"Consumer" defined. *Civ. Code § 1761(d)*

"Transaction" defined. *Civ. Code § 1761(e)*

[d] Deceptive Practices

Delineation of unlawful practices constituting unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices. *Civ. Code § 1770* Failure to post policy limiting buyer's right to return goods for refund or exchange to less than seven days is subject to remedies provided by Consumers Legal Remedies Act. *Civ. Code § 1723*

Sale of "grey market goods" is deceptive practice under *Civ. Code § 1770*. *Civ. Code § 1797.86*

[e] Remedies and Procedures

Action for actual damages, injunction, restitution punitive damages, and other relief. *Civ. Code § 1780(a)*

Additional award in action by senior or disabled plaintiff. *Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345(b)*

Proper court for trial of action by consumer. *Civ. Code § 1780(d)*

Requirement of affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], as to commencement of action in proper court for trial. *Civ. Code § 1780(d)*

Attorney's fees. *Civ. Code § 1780(e)*

Conditions precedent to right to bring action for damages consists of notice of unlawful practice and demand for correction thereof. *Civ. Code § 1782(a)*

Compliance with notice and demand forecloses right to bring action for damages. *Civ. Code § 1782(b)*

Action for injunctive relief does not require prior notice and demand. *Civ. Code § 1782(d)*

Evidentiary treatment of attempts to comply with requirements of *Civ. Code § 1782*. *Civ. Code § 1782(e)*

No damage award for unintentional violations of act if correction made. *Civ. Code § 1784*

[f] Statute of Limitation

Action under act for unlawful practice must be commenced not more than three years from date of commission of unlawful practice. *Civ. Code § 1783*

[2] Receivers

In absence of local court rule specifying particular procedure, receiver may be appointed to carry class action judgment into effect and to dispose of property according to judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3), (4)*

[3] Related Acts and Provisions

Contracts or combinations in restraint of trade. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 et seq.*

Cartwright Act on combinations in restraint of trade. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750*

Unfair Practices Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*

Provisions to enjoin acts of unfair competition. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*

Provisions prohibiting false representations to public. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*

Home solicitation contracts. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500.3, 17533.8*; *Civ. Code § 1689.5 et seq.*

Unsolicited goods or services. *Civ. Code §§ 1584.5, 1584.6, 1616*

Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. *Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*

Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act. *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*

Dance Studio Act. *Civ. Code § 1812.50 et seq.*

Health Studio Act. *Civ. Code § 1812.80 et seq.*

Discount buying services. *Civ. Code § 1812.100 et seq.*

Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act. *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.22

§ 504.22 California Rules of Court

Ex parte appointment, confirmation, and miscellaneous provisions on receivers. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.23

§ 504.23 Decisions

[1] Class Actions

[a] In General

[i] Attorney's Fees

Plaintiff successfully protecting, preserving, or increasing fund for benefit of himself and others is entitled to compensation from fund for services of attorney. *Estate of Reade (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 669, 671-672, 191 P.2d 745*

Attorney's fees in class action payable out of moneys recovered for joint benefit of class members for which plaintiff has prosecuted action. *Farmers etc. Nat'l Bank v. Peterson (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 601, 607, 55 P.2d 867*

[ii] Effect of Judgment

Class action judgment is res judicata as to claims of members represented. *Daar v. Yellow Cab Co. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 695, 704, 63 Cal. Rptr. 724, 433 P.2d 732*

[b] Class Actions Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[i] Imposition of Notice Costs

California trial courts clearly possess general authority to impose notice costs pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1781(d)* on either party in class action. *Civil Serv. Employees Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 362, 376, 149 Cal. Rptr. 360, 584 P.2d 497*

[ii] Procedural Matters

Procedural devices of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure may be used when provisions of *Civ. Code § 1781* of Consumers Legal Remedies Act are inadequate to encompass all procedural problems facing trial court in class actions. *Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 821, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964*

Civ. Code § 1781(f), dealing with dismissals and compromises in class action suits, is intended to prevent class members in future litigation from reviving the matters compromised. *Marcarelli v. Cabell (1967) 58 Cal. App. 3d 51, 57, 129 Cal. Rptr. 509*

[iii] Requisites of Action

Conditions precedent to class action; plaintiff must put prospective defendant on notice that alleged violations of *Civ. Code § 1770* affect class of consumers, and prospective defendant has failed to correct or to seek to correct violations as to all similarly situated consumers pursuant to conditions set forth in *Civ. Code § 1782(c).* *Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 595, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060 , disapproved on other grounds,* *Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*

To obtain relief in class action, both named plaintiff and class members must have suffered some damage caused by practice deemed unlawful under *Civ. Code § 1770*; that damage is "any damage," which is not synonymous with "actual damages" and may encompass harms other than pecuniary damages; putative class plaintiff was entitled to show that defendant's alleged deceptive conduct--namely, selling drug product over-the-counter without disclosing that product was unlawful to buy or possess without prescription--caused same damage to all members of class, by showing that alleged misrepresentation was material, even if defendant might be able to show that some class members would have bought its product even if they had known that product was unlawful to buy or possess without prescription; on showing that material misrepresentations were made to class members, putative class plaintiff would at least raise inference of reliance and therefore damage as to entire class; and that showing could be made because any reasonable person would find it important to know, when determining whether to buy particular product, that it is unlawful to buy or possess that product without prescription, since no reasonable person would knowingly commit criminal act. *Steroid Hormone Prod. Cases (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 145, 155-157, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 329*

Evidence supported trial court's conclusion that whether drug manufacturer's misrepresentations were material, and therefore induced reliance, was matter on which individual issues prevailed over common issues, justifying denial of class certification with respect to claim under *Consumers Legal Remedies Act. In re Vioxx Class Cases (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 116, 134, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 83*

Civ. Code § 1781(b) establishes exclusive criteria for class certification suits brought under *Consumers Legal Remedies Act. Hogya v. Superior Court (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 122, 140, 142 Cal. Rptr. 325*

Fact that damages are not necessary in consumer class suit under Consumers Legal Remedies Act casts doubt that Legislature intended certification of class action could be denied on ground that individual monetary recovery will be slight. *Hogya v. Superior Court (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 122, 138, 142 Cal. Rptr. 325*

[2] Consumers Legal Remedies Act

[a] Arbitrability of Damage Claims

When there is an arbitration agreement between consumer and defendant, claims for damages under CLRA are arbitrable, at least to extent those claims are governed by Federal Arbitration Act; however, claims for injunctive relief in which plaintiff is acting as private attorney general are not arbitrable. *Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans of*

California (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 1066, 1072, 1079-1080, 1088, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334, 988 P. 2d 67 ; *see* *Cruz v. Pacificare Health Systems, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 303, 307, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58, 66 P.3d 1157* (finding that *Broughton*'s holding on inarbitrability of CLRA public injunctions should be extended to include claims to enjoin unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* and misleading advertising under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*)

[b] Attorney's Fees

Prevailing plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees for net recovery for violations of *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5), (6)* & *(7). Reveles v. Toyota By the Bay (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1139, 1154, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543*

[c] Requisites of Action

In action in U.S. district court, claim based on violation of CLRA is subject to *Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b),* which mandates that allegations of fraud must be pleaded with particularity; failure to plead with required particularity warrants dismissal. *Kearns v. Ford Motor Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 567 F.3d 1120, 1127*

In order to bring action, not only must consumer be exposed to unlawful practice, but also some kind of damage must result; consumer has not suffered any damage as result of unlawful practice if unconscionable terms in consumer services contract have not yet actually been enforced so as to impose transaction costs on consumer; in that situation, consumer has no standing under *Civ. Code § 1780(a)* to sue for injunctive relief aimed at precluding future use of unlawful practice. *Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 643, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295*

[d] Unlawful Practices

Manufacturer's limited-period express warranty could not be construed as implicit representation that product had any characteristic it did not have or was of particular standard or quality when it was not [*see Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5), (7)*], even if, at time of making warranty, manufacturer knew of, and did not disclose, latent defect that could result in valid claim if it became manifest during warranty period. *Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 824, 833-837, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118*

Plaintiffs' claim for violation of CLRA failed because complaint neither alleged facts showing defendant was bound to disclose its use of inferior tubular steel exhaust manifolds (in lieu of superior cast iron manifolds), nor alleged facts showing defendant gave any information of other facts which could have likely effect of misleading public for want of communication of fact it used tubular steel exhaust manifolds, nor alleged any affirmative representation by defendant regarding exhaust manifolds. *Bardin v. DaimlerChrysler Corp. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1255, 1276, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 634*

Triable issues of fact existed on whether provider of satellite TV service violated *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5), (7), (9)* with representations concerning number of channels and program schedule. *Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1353-1354, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22*

Clearly marked provision imposing service fee on shopping card after 24 months of nonuse was not unconscionable term under *Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)*; take-it-or-leave-it situation without any reasonable alternative but to accept shopping card terms did not exist, as plaintiff could use card before imposition of fee or simply decline to purchase shopping card and make purchases by other means. *Freeman v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 660, 667-670, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 860*

Claim based on former *Civ. Code § 1770(s)* (*now see Civ. Code § 1770(a)(19)*; unconscionable provision in contract) required plaintiff to show (1) oppression, which refers to inequality of bargaining power resulting in no real negotiation and the absence of meaningful choice, and (2) surprise, which occurs when supposedly agreed-on terms of bargain are hidden in prolix printed form drafted by a party seeking to enforce disputed terms; element of oppression was absent when plaintiff had reasonably available alternative sources of supply from which to obtain desired goods or services free of terms claimed to be unconscionable. *Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 758, 766, 767-768, 259 Cal. Rptr. 789* (plaintiff challenging $50 IRA termination fee could have gone to competing financial service that did not charge fee)

[e] Venue

Venue provisions of the CLRA (place of transaction) do not override general venue provisions, i.e., *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* placing venue in county where defendant resides. *Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 543, 545, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304*

[f] Waiver is Void

When forum selection clause designated Virginia as jurisdiction in which all disputes arising out of relationship would be litigated, and one of causes of action sought class action relief under Consumers Legal Remedies Act, enforcement of clause would be functional equivalent of contractual waiver of statutory remedies and thus was prohibited under California law. *America Online, Inc. v. Superior Court (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1, 14-15, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699*

[3] Receivers

Appointment of receiver is proper in action not prosecuted by plaintiff for his or her own right or for his or her own benefit but prosecuted by plaintiff in behalf of corporation to recover funds in which others were equally interested. *Fox v. Hale & Norcross S. M. Co. (1895) 108 Cal. 475, 477, 41 P. 328*

Court has power to appoint receiver to carry its judgment into effect. *Fox v. Hale & Norcross S. M. Co. (1895) 108 Cal. 475, 477, 41 P. 328*

15 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.24

§ 504.24 Law Reviews

Smolin, *Investment Securities: Beyond the Scope of California's Consumers Legal Remedies Act? 25 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 127 (1991)*

16 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.25

§ 504.25 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure Vol. 4, *Pleading*, §§ 246-251 (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 504.26-504.29

[Reserved]

§§ 504.26[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.30

§ 504.30 Notification of Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act and Demand for Remedy [Civ. Code § 1782]

[1] FORM Notification of Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act and Demand for Remedy [Civ. Code § 1782]

NOTICE OF VIOLATION OF CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT AND DEMAND FOR REMEDY

To: _____ [*name of person accused of violation*]

You are hereby notified that on or about _____ [*date*], in carrying out the terms of a transaction you entered into with _____ [*name of consumer*] namely _____ [*specify transaction, the particular goods or services involved, and, if applicable, the alleged violator's required performance under the transaction*], you violated the provisions of the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act by _____ [*specify method, act, or practice employed or committed in violation of act*] as proscribed by Subdivision(s) _____ [*specify*] of *Section 1770 of the Civil Code*. [You further violated that act by _____ (*specify any other violation*) as proscribed by Subsection(s) _____ (*specify*) of *Section 1770 of the Civil Code*.]

_____ [*Set out any other transaction and violation for which consumer seeks damages or other remedy*]. Demand is hereby made that you _____ [correct *or* repair *or* replace *or specify other remedy*] the _____ [violation *or* goods *or* services] within 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Dated: _____ [*date*].

Respectfully submitted,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____

[*name of consumer*]

[2] Use of Form

A notice [*see Civ. Code § 1782(a)(1)*] and demand [*see Civ. Code § 1782(a)(2)*] must be sent by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested [*see § 504.31[3][b]*], 30 days or more prior to the commencement of an action for damages pursuant to the provisions of the act. The notice is sent to the place where the transaction which resulted in a violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act occurred or to the alleged violator's principal place of business in California [*see Civ. Code § 1782(a)*; *see also* discussions at *§ 504.13[6]* and *[9][a]*].

This notice is not required to be sent before the commencement of an action for injunctive relief. However, the plaintiff must serve the notice before amending the complaint to include a request for damages [*see Civ. Code § 1782(d)*].

[3] Compliance with Demand Provides Defense

Unless the action is a class action, no action for damages may be maintained as provided in *Civ. Code § 1780* if an appropriate correction, repair, replacement, or other remedy is given, or agreed to be given within a reasonable time, to the consumer within 30 days after receipt of this notice [*Civ. Code § 1782(b)*; *see § 504.13[7*]. In a class action, the correction process must extend to all members and meet the other requirements of *Civ. Code § 1782(c)*, as set forth in § 504.14[9][g]].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.31

§ 504.31 Complaint for Damages Based on Unlawful Practice in Sale or Lease of Consumer Goods or Services [Civ. Code § 1780(a)], including Allegations as to Class Action [Civ. Code § 1781]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages Based on Unlawful Practice in Sale or Lease of Consumer Goods or Services [Civ. Code § 1780(a)], including Allegations as to Class Action [Civ. Code § 1781]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff, [a consumer on behalf of himself/herself	)	NO. _____
and all other consumers similarly situated,]	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES [AND INJUNC-
vs.	)	TION]
_____ [*names*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendants.	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

Plaintiff [on behalf of himself/herself and all other consumers similarly situated] alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California[, and plaintiff is bringing this action on behalf of himself/herself and all other consumers similarly situated].

[*The following Paragraphs 2-6, inclusive, are included if the action is a class action. If it is not a class action, Paragraphs 2-6 are to be omitted and subsequent paragraphs renumbered accordingly.*]

[2. Plaintiff is a member of a class of consumers, and the members of this class of consumers were similarly situated and similarly affected by the alleged _____ (*specify violation, e.g.,* misrepresentations) of the

defendant and incurred similar damage, as alleged in this complaint, as a result of these _____ (*specify, e.g.,* misrepresentations) of the defendant.]

[3. It is impracticable to bring all members of the above class of consumers as individual plaintiffs before the court for the reasons that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the members of the class are too numerous, consisting of approximately _____ (*number*) members *or other or additional allegations).*]

[4. The questions of law or fact common to the class are substantially similar and predominate over the questions affecting the individual members in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the deceptive practices of the defendant, as alleged in this complaint, resulted in numerous sales under similar circumstances to individual consumers who are members of the above class of consumers *or other or additional allegations*).]

[5. The claims or defenses of this plaintiff are typical of the claims or defenses of the class in that _____ (*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff and all other members of the class similarly affected relied on the representations of the defendant, as alleged in this complaint, and suffered similar damages from the deceptive nature of such representations *or other or additional allegations*).]

[6. The interests of the class will be fairly and adequately protected by this plaintiff for the reason that _____ (*specify e.g.,* the success or failure of the plaintiff is identical with the success or failure of each of the members of the class *or other allegations showing lack of conflict between plaintiff and other class members*).]

7. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principal office for the transaction of business in _____ County [*or allege other capacity of defendant*], _____ [authorized *or* licensed] to engage, and engaging, in business as a _____ [*describe, e.g.,* seller of stereo and video and miscellaneous electronic equipment to the general public].

8. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged in this complaint, and that plaintiff's damages as alleged were proximately caused by such defendants.]

9. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff _____ [*allege facts of purchase or lease of consumer goods or services by plaintiff, e.g.,* purchased a _____ (*brand name*) four-track stereo cassette deck].

10. The _____ [goods *or* services] as described above were _____ [bought by *or* leased by *or* rendered to] plaintiff [and _____ (by *or* to) other consumers similarly situated] primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. [*If action under Consumers Legal Remedies Act is joined with another cause of action, add appropriate allegations, such as*: The retail installment contract, attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference, was and is subject to the requirements of the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act (*Civil Code Section 1801 et seq.*), as well as to the requirements of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (*Civil Code Section 1750 et seq.*).]

11. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California, and prior to the _____ [purchase *or* lease *or* rendering] of the above-mentioned _____ [goods *or* services], defendant, in violation of Subdivision(s)

_____ [*specify*] of *Section 1770 of the Civil Code*, _____ [*allege facts constituting unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices by defendant, e.g.*, represented that the above-mentioned goods were manufactured by _____ Company while in fact the goods were manufactured by _____ Company].

12. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that] [T]he above-mentioned _____ [*specify violations, e.g.*, misrepresentations] [were intended by defendant to] result[ed] in the above-mentioned _____ [sale *or* lease] of the _____ [goods *or* services] to plaintiff[, and in other sales of like _____ (goods *or* services) to consumers similarly situated to plaintiff].

13. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff sent to defendant a written Notice of Violation of Consumers Legal Remedies Act and Demand for Remedy, attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference, by _____ [certified *or* registered] mail, return receipt requested, to _____ [*place where transaction occurred, such as defendant's principal place of business within California, or, if neither will effect actual notice*, the office of the Secretary of State of California]. This notice and demand notified defendant of its above-mentioned violations of the Civil Code that resulted in the sale of the _____ [goods *or* services] to plaintiff [and in similar sales of _____ (goods *or* services) to members of the class of consumers that plaintiff is representing] and demanded that defendant remedy the violations.

14. [*If action is other than a class action, add:* Within 30 days of the receipt of the notice and demand, attached as Exhibit B, defendant failed to correct, repair, replace, or otherwise rectify, and failed to agree to correct, repair, replace, or otherwise rectify within a reasonable time, the above-mentioned violations of Subdivision(s) _____ (*specify*) of *Section 1770 of the Civil Code*].

15. By reason of the above-mentioned violations of the Civil Code, plaintiff[, and each member of the class of consumers of which plaintiff is a member,] _____ [has *or* have] suffered damages in the amount of $_____, determined as follows: _____ [*specify basis for determination of amount of damages, such as the difference between the purchase price of the goods or services and their fair retail price at time of purchase*].

[16. Defendant continues to engage in the above-described deceptive practices and unless enjoined from doing so by this court will continue to do so, all to the damage of its consumer who will purchase its _____ (goods *or* services) on the basis of its _____ (*specify e.g.*, misrepresentations) as herein alleged.]

[17. The aforementioned violations of the Civil Code by defendant were willful and _____ (*specify, e.g.*, oppressive *or* fraudulent *or* malicious). Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays[, on behalf of himself/herself and all other consumers similarly situated and constituting the class which plaintiff is representing,] judgment as follows:

1. For actual damages in the sum of $_____;

[2. For punitive damages;]

[3. For a permanent injunction enjoining the defendant, and its agents and employees from _____ (*set forth terms of requested permanent injunction*);]

[4. That defendant be required to make restitution to each plaintiff of any and all money or property paid by that plaintiff;]

[5. That each senior citizen and disabled person who is a plaintiff be awarded $5,000, as authorized by *Sections 1780(b)* and *3345(b) of the Civil Code*;]

6. For reasonable attorney's fees;

[7. For an allowance out of the total sum awarded for general, special, and punitive damages payable to plaintiff for his/her reasonable and nonreimbursable expenses incurred in bringing this action;]

[8. For a determination by the court of the most suitable mode by which class members are to come forward, identify themselves, and prove their entitlement to share in the total sum awarded by the court for actual and punitive damages;]

9. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

10. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use when filing an action under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act. The act provides that any consumer who suffers damage as a result of the use or employment by any person of a method, act, or practice declared to be unlawful by the act [*see Meyer v. Sprint Spectrum L.P. (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 634, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 859, 200 P.3d 295, 2009 Cal. LEXIS 337, at *7-*9* ; *see also § 504.13[1]*] may bring an action against that person to recover or obtain any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1780(a)*]:

- Actual damages, but in no case is the total award of damages in a class action to be less than $1,000.
- An order enjoining the prohibited methods, acts, or practices.

- Restitution of property.
- Punitive damages.
- Any other relief which the court deems proper.

Any consumer entitled to bring an action under the Act, if the unlawful method, act, or practice has caused damage to other consumers similarly situated, may bring a class action on behalf of himself or herself and the other consumers to recover damages or obtain other relief as provided for in *Civ. Code § 1780* [*Civ. Code § 1781(a)*].

For allegations supporting an additional award to senior and disabled plaintiffs pursuant to *Civ. Code §§ 1780(b)* and *3345(b)*, see *§ 504.33*.

[3] Allegations

[a] In General

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The plaintiff's name (Paragraph 1).
- If the action is filed as a class action [*see Civ. Code § 1781(b)*]:
  - That the plaintiff is a class member (Paragraph 2).
  - The impracticability of bringing all class members before the court and the reasons why it would be impracticable (Paragraph 3).
  - A common question of law or fact (Paragraph 4).
  - That the plaintiff's claims or defenses are typical of the claims or defenses of the class (Paragraph 5).
  - That the plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class (Paragraph 6).
  - The defendant's name and status (Paragraph 7).
  - The type of business in which the defendant is engaged (Paragraph 7).
  - Fictitious defendants (Paragraph 8).
  - Facts regarding the plaintiff's purchase or lease of goods or services (Paragraph 9).
  - The purpose for which the goods or services were purchased or leased (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 1761(a), (b)*].
  - Acts of the defendant in violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Paragraph 11) [*see Civ. Code § 1770*].

- That the sale or lease of the goods or services was intended to result or did result in the alleged violations (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code § 1770*].

- The plaintiff's compliance with precomplaint notice requirements (Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 1782(a)*].

- The defendant's failure to take corrective measures (Paragraph 14), which is an essential element only if the action is not a class action [*see Civ. Code § 1782(b)*].

- Damages suffered by the plaintiff and, if a class action is filed, damages suffered by each class and the basis for determining class damages (Paragraph 15) [*see Civ. Code § 1780(a)(1)*; *see also § 504.13[1]*].

- Continued acts in violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Paragraph 16) [*see Civ. Code § 1780(a)(2)*]; *see also § 504.31[3][c]*].

- Entitlement to exemplary damages (Paragraph 17) [*see Civ. Code § 1780(a)(4)*; *see also § 504.31[3][d]*].

Allegations in a complaint based on the Consumers Legal Remedies Act are not required to be confined to specific language of the Act [*Outboard Marine Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 30, 36, 124 Cal. Rptr. 852]* .

A plaintiff asserting a CLRA claim sounding in fraud [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 1770(a)(5), (7)*] must establish actual reliance on the relevant representations or omissions, because under *Civ. Code § 1780(a)*, the plaintiff must show that the defendant's deception caused harm to the plaintiff [*Buckland v. Threshold Enters. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 798, 809-810, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 543* ; *accord, Princess Cruise Lines, Ltd. v. Superior Court (Wang) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 36, 46, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 323*].

[b] Excuse From Pleading Precomplaint Notice Compliance

Substantial compliance with the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1782(a)*, requiring the sending of a notice of violation and a demand for remedy 30 days before the filing of a complaint under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, is not sufficient. The fact that the defendant had notice of the violation does not excuse the sending of the notice because the 30-day period provided in *Civ. Code § 1782(b)* is designed to give the violator a chance to settle the matter before the filing of an action. However, the defendant can waive the right to a precomplaint notice by showing an actual intention to relinquish it or by conduct so inconsistent with the intent to enforce the notice requirement as to induce a reasonable belief that it has been relinquished. That conduct can take place even after the complaint has been filed, such as when the defendant expressly treats a letter of demand for correction, sent after the complaint was filed, as a notice under *Civ. Code § 1782(a)* [*see Outboard Marine Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 30, 41, 124 Cal. Rptr. 852]* .

An action for injunctive relief under the act can be commenced without first sending a precomplaint demand and notice. However, if the plaintiff amends his or her complaint for injunctive relief to include a claim for damages, the demand and notice must be given, as discussed in *§ 504.13[6]* [*see Civ. Code § 1782(d)*].

[c] Pleading Injunctive Relief

The plaintiff may plead for relief from unlawful methods, acts, or practices by way of injunction [*Civ. Code § 1780(a)(2)*]. If a specific statute provides for injunctive relief, allegations showing a violation of that statute are sufficient cause for the issuance of an injunction [*see Paul v. Wadler (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 615, 625, 26 Cal. Rptr. 341* (when injunctive relief was authorized by statute, allegation of irreparable injury was unnecessary if specific

statutory violation was alleged)]. Therefore, it appears that specific allegations of irreparable injury, inadequacy of legal remedy, or multiplicity of judicial proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2), (4), (6)*] are not necessary or intended by the Legislature to be required in pleading an action for injunctive relief under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act.

[d] Punitive Damages

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case or whether it is a limited civil case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion and forms for reserving the right to punitive damages when seeking a default judgment, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq., and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115*].

[e] Combining With Claims Under Related Acts

The provisions of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act are not exclusive [*Civ. Code § 1752*] and a single unfair or deceptive act or practice may provide the basis for additional remedies under other consumer legislation, including the following acts [*see also* discussion in *§ 504.11[2]*]:

- Cartwright Act on combinations in restraint of trade. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750*
- Unfair Practices Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*
- Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act. *Civ. Code § 1790 et seq.*
- Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act. *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*
- Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act. *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*

[4] Recovery of Attorney's Fees

The court must award court costs and attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in litigation filed pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780* [*Civ. Code § 1780(e)*; *see Hayward v. Ventura Volvo (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 509, 513, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514* (prevailing plaintiff is entitled to "reasonable" fees, although word is omitted from statute; court was not limited in awarding fees to those incurred under contingency fee contract); *Reveles v. Toyota By the Bay (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1139, 1154, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543* (entitlement to attorney's fees for net recovery)]. Reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded to a prevailing defendant on a finding by the court that the plaintiff's prosecution of the action was not in good faith [*Civ. Code § 1780(e)*].

If the plaintiff moves for attorney's fees pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780(e)*, generally the court is required to determine whether the plaintiff is the prevailing party and, if so, what amount is to be awarded to the plaintiff. The court must do this even if the action is concluded by a settlement. However, if the parties have agreed that attorney's fees are not to be awarded pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1780(e)*, then the court must give effect to that agreement [*Kim v. Euromotors West/The Auto Gallery (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 170, 178-181, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 780* (stating guidelines for determining whether plaintiff is prevailing party)].

For discussion and forms for motions relating to recovery of attorney's fees, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq.

[5] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in

controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*]. However, if the optional language seeking permanent injunctive relief is included, the action may not be a limited civil case except as otherwise authorized by statute [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), 580(b)(2)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

For further discussion, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter* .

[6] Venue

Venue is proper in the county in which the defendant resides, has his or her principal place of business, or is doing business, or in the county in which the transaction or any substantial portion of it occurred [*Civ. Code § 1780(c)*].

Any court in the county having jurisdiction of the subject matter is the proper court for trial [*Civ. Code § 1780(c)*].

The venue provisions of the CLRA do not override the general venue provisions, i.e., *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* placing venue in the county where defendant resides [*Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 543, 545, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

In *Gallin*, which arose out of the great Milli Vanilli 'lip-synching' fraud, plaintiff sought to base venue on a single retail transaction in San Diego County although none of the multiple defendants resided there. Leaving open the question of whether a single retail transaction is enough on which to base venue, the court of appeal ordered a change of venue to Los Angeles County after distinguishing the CLRA from another act with special venue provisions on the basis that the interests protected by the CLRA in this case could just as easily be vindicated in the county where defendants resided [*Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 545, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

For further discussion, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[7] Installment or Automotive Sales Actions; Certain Limited Civil Cases

In any action or proceeding subject to the provisions of the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*], the plaintiff must state facts in the complaint, verified by his or her oath or the oath of his or her attorney, or in an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney filed with the complaint, showing that the action has been commenced in the proper court for trial and that the action or proceeding is subject to the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4* (proper courts for commencing actions under the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act and the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act). When the affidavit or declaration is filed with the complaint, a copy must be served with the summons. If a proper complaint or affidavit or declaration is not filed, then unless the court, on any terms that may be just, permits the affidavit or declaration to be filed after the complaint is filed, the action must be dismissed without prejudice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*; *see Civ. Code §§ 1812.10(c), 2984.4(c)*]. For a declaration for use under the Unruh Retail Installment Sales Act, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, § 501.102*. These verification and affidavit requirements also apply in any case that arises from an offer or provision of goods, services, loans or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family or household use, or from a transaction consummated as the result of either an unsolicited telephone call made by a seller or a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(b), 396a(a)*].

[8] Limitation of Action

An action brought under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act based on unlawful methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices [*Civ. Code § 1770*] must be commenced not more than three years after the date of the commission of the method, act, or practice [*Civ. Code § 1783*].

[9] Declaration

In any action filed under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act for relief other than injunctive relief, concurrently the plaintiff must file an affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], showing that the action has been commenced in the proper county [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*; *see § 504.32*].

[10] Cross References

- For an alternative complaint and form for insertion in the complaint, as well as a form of affirmative defense, for use in an action under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, see Ch. 14, *Advertising*

- For discussion of additional deceptive or unfair practices or acts, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* , and Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* , § 565.10 et seq.

- For additional forms for use in filing class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

- For additional forms for use in injunction actions that may be adapted for use in an action for injunctive relief under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

- For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

- For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

- For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

- For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

- For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

- For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

- For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

- For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

- For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.32

§ 504.32 Declaration to Be Filed With Complaint in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies [Civ. Code § 1780(d); Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

[1] FORM Declaration to Be Filed With Complaint in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies [Civ. Code § 1780(c); Code Civ. Proc. § 396a]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____
Defendant.	)	[*name*]
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name of plaintiff*], declare:

1. I am the plaintiff in this action.

2. I declare that the complaint therein is being filed concurrently with the filing of this declaration in a proper place for the trial thereof, which is _____ [*specify e.g.*, the county in which the defendant resides *or* the county in which the defendant has his or her principal place of business *or* the county in which the defendant is doing business, which is the county in which the transaction, the subject matter of the above-captioned action, or a substantial portion thereof, occurred].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration in [1], *above*, is for use in an action under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act to set forth facts showing that the action is commenced in the proper court [*see § 504.31[5] -[7]*]. These facts may also be set forth in an affidavit, as opposed to a declaration under penalty of perjury [*Civ. Code § 1780(d)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*]. For a form for an affidavit, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

Civ. Code § 1780(d) in part provides that concurrently with the filing of the complaint the plaintiff must file an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury executed in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a county described in the section as a proper place for the trial of the action. The section further provides that, if plaintiff fails to file the affidavit, the court must on its own motion or on the motion of any party dismiss the action without prejudice.

This form also may be used to comply with the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1812.10* or *2984.4* when the action is subject to the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*, the Retail Installment Sales Act, or *Civ. Code § 2891 et seq.*, the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*]. For further discussion of these requirements, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.33

§ 504.33 Allegations for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act To Provide Basis for Findings for Award of Additional Damages to Senior Citizen or Disabled Person [Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345]

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act To Provide Basis for Findings for Award of Additional Damages to Senior Citizen or Disabled Person [Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345]

[*EITHER*]

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] is, and at the time of the acts complained of herein, was, over 65 years of age.

[*AND/OR*]

2. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] has, and at the time of the acts complained of herein, had, _____ [*specify physical or mental impairment, e.g.,* multiple sclerosis], which prevents and prevented plaintiff from _____ [*specify substantial limitation of one or more major life activities, e.g.,* walking, speaking, working, and caring for himself/herself without the aid of special braces and a mechanized wheelchair].

[*CONTINUE*]

3. As a result of defendant's conduct, plaintiff [and other senior citizens or disabled persons] has/have suffered substantial _____ [physical *and/or* emotional *and/or* economic] loss in that _____ [*allege factual basis of loss, e.g.,* plaintiff's inability to use the wheelchair purchased from defendant, or to have it repaired to conform to the representations made by defendant, and the resultant immobility, inability to care for himself/herself, inability to socialize, and inability to continue work(, as alleged below,) caused plaintiff great frustration, embarrassment, confusion, anger, depression, despair, mortification, humiliation, loss of sleep and appetite, mental anguish, and emotional distress].

[*EITHER*]

4. Defendant knew or should have know that its conduct was directed to one or more senior citizens or disabled persons in that _____ [*state facts showing defendant's advertising or marketing practices, or experience, or the nature of the good(s) or service(s) that would lead defendant to know that senior citizens or disabled persons would be affected, e.g.,* senior citizens or disabled persons are the only people likely to need, use, or invest in wheelchairs].

[*AND/OR*]

5. As a result of defendant's conduct, plaintiff has suffered the loss of _____ [*specify one or more losses of a type described in Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)(2) and Civ. Code § 3345(b)(2), e.g.,* a minimum of _____ hours of time and least $_____ trying to have the wheelchair repaired to conform to the representations made by defendant. Plaintiff had to expend $_____ for substitute care and devices, and during a two-month period, was prevented from attending his regular employment. As a result, plaintiff lost his principal employment and was forced to expend substantial amounts of funds that had been set aside for personal care and maintenance and were assets essential to plaintiff's health and welfare].

[6. _____ (Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that information and belief, alleges, that other *or* Other) senior citizens or disabled persons have suffered similar _____ (*allege as many as are applicable:* losses of principal employment or source of income; loss or encumbrance of a primary residence; substantial loss of property set aside for retirement, or for personal or family care and maintenance; or substantial loss of payments received under pension or retirement plan or a government benefits program, or assets essential to their health or welfare) because of the _____ (*specify conduct of defendant, e.g.,* deceptive marketing practices of defendant).]

[*AND/OR*]

7. Because of _____ [plaintiff's *or* their] _____ [*allege as many as are applicable:* age, poor health or infirmity, impaired understanding, restricted mobility *and/or* disability], plaintiff [and other senior citizens or disabled persons] is/are, and was/were, substantially more vulnerable than other members of the public to defendant's conduct.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for use in an action under *Civ. Code § 1780(a)* by or on behalf of one or more senior citizens or disabled persons against a defendant who engaged in a practice declared unlawful under *Civ. Code § 1770* [*Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345(a)*]. Those allegations provide the basis for the findings necessary under *Civ. Code §§ 1780(b)* and *3345(b)* to support an *additional* award of up to $5,000 for each senior or disabled plaintiff [*Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345(b)*; *see* discussions at *§ 504.12* and *§ 504.13[4]*].

Paragraphs 1 and/or 2 of this form may be inserted between Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the form of complaint in § 504.31[1]. The remaining paragraphs from this form may be inserted after Paragraph 16 of the complaint in § 504.31.

[3] Allegations

Either Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 2 of this form is necessary to establish plaintiff's status as a person who may seek the

benefit of *Civ. Code §§ 1780(b)* and *3345(b)* [*see Civ. Code §§ 1780(b), 3345(b)* (discussed in *§ 504.13[4*]); *see also Civ. Code § 1761(f)* (senior citizen defined); *Civ. Code § 1761(g)* (disabled person defined)]. Paragraph 3, alleging substantial emotional, physical, or economic loss, is also necessary [*Civ. Code § 1780(b)(1)(A)*]. Then, one or more of Paragraphs 4, 5, or 7 is necessary [Civ. Code § 1780(b)(1)(B); *see Civ. Code § 3345*]. Paragraph 6 is optional for use with Paragraph 5 [*see Civ. Code § 3345(b)(2)*].

No allegation is made that the additional award is appropriate, but a finding to that effect must be made to support any additional award [*Civ. Code § 1780(b)(1)(C)*]. For discussion and forms for regarding findings and requests for findings, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

[4] Modification for Use in Unfair Competition or Deceptive Practices Action

The allegations in [1], *above*, may be adapted for use in an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1*, or in an action based on any statute imposing a civil penalty for unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition brought by or on behalf of one or more senior citizens or disabled persons [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(a), (c)* (discussed in *Ch. 565, Unfair Competition, § 565.10* et seq.; *Civ. Code § 3345* (discussed in Ch. 14, *Advertising*)]. In those situations, either Paragraph 1 or Paragraph 2 of the foregoing form is necessary to establish plaintiff's status as a person who may seek the benefit of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(1)* (senior citizen defined); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(2)* (disabled person defined); *Civ. Code § 3345(a)*].

Paragraphs 3 and 5 may be used together to describe the loss sustained, but neither alone is sufficient to establish the findings required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)(3)* or *Civ. Code § 3345(b)(3)* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)(3)*; *Civ. Code § 3345(b)(3)*]. In addition, pursuant to the passage of Proposition 64 in 2004, a private person may bring an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* only upon having suffered injury in fact and having lost money or property as a result of unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*]. A private plaintiff may file a representative action on behalf of others only if the plaintiff meets both this actual injury requirement and the requirements for class actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 382* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*]. Thus, any action seeking recovery under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1* must include allegations that the plaintiffs have suffered actual financial or property loss as a result of the defendant's conduct, and if a representative action is pursued, the requirements for a class action will have to be met.

Paragraph 4 relates to the factors referred to in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)(1)* and *Civ. Code § 3345(b)(1)*. Paragraphs 5 and 6 allege the existence of the facts addressed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)(2)* and *Civ. Code § 3345(b)(2)*. One or more of the factors set forth in *Civ. Code § 3345(b)* must be established to support a trebled penalty pursuant to that section [*Civ. Code § 3345(b)*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)* requires only that the trier of fact consider those factors, in addition to any other appropriate factors, in determining whether to impose the civil penalty authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(a)* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)*].

[5] Cross References

- For discussion of additional deceptive or unfair practices or acts, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* and Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* , § 565.10 et seq.

- For discussion of, and forms for use in, class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

- For discussion and forms for regarding findings and requests for findings, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 503.34

§ 503.34 Allegation for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Owners or Employees of Advertising Medium Had Knowledge of Violations of Act [Civ. Code § 1755]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Owners or Employees of Advertising Medium Had Knowledge of Violations of Act [Civ. Code § 1755]

Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s) of owner(s) or employee(s) of advertising medium*] _____ [published *or* disseminated] the above-described advertisement in violation of the act with knowledge of the aforementioned _____ [method *or* act *or* practice] constituting the violation.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, may be inserted after Paragraph 12 of the complaint in § 504.31[1], which is a general complaint for damages and other relief for violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, when an owner or employee of any advertising medium published or disseminated an advertisement in violation of the act knowing of the deceptive methods, acts, or practices alleged to be unlawful. Without proof of such knowledge, no owner or employee of any advertising medium can be liable under the act [*see Civ. Code § 1755*, discussed in *§ 504.13[5]*]. Subsequent paragraphs of the form of complaint in § 504.31[1] will be renumbered accordingly and appropriate changes must be made to allege additional defendants.

23 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 504.35-504.39

[Reserved]

§§ 504.35[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 504 SALES: CONSUMERS LEGAL REMEDIES ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-504 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 504.40

§ 504.40 Affirmative Defense in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Violation Was Result of Bona Fide Error [Civ. Code § 1784]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense in Action Under Consumers Legal Remedies Act That Violation Was Result of Bona Fide Error [Civ. Code § 1784]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state:* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The violation of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act alleged in plaintiff's complaint was not intentional but resulted from a bona fide error notwithstanding the use of reasonable procedures that defendant adopted to avoid any violation of the act. Defendant has also made an appropriate _____ [correction *or* repair *or* replacement *or specify other remedy*] of the _____ [goods *or* services] plaintiff purchased from defendant, namely _____ [*specify remedy*].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, may be included in a defendant's answer to a complaint brought under the Consumers Legal Remedies Act when defendant [*Civ. Code § 1784*; *see* discussion in *§ 504.13[10]*]:

- Can prove that the alleged violation of the act was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error, notwithstanding the use of reasonable procedures adopted to avoid any such error, and

- Has made an appropriate correction, repair, or replacement or other remedy of the goods and services as provided in *Civ. Code § 1782(b)* or *(c)*

Under *Civ. Code § 1782(b)* and *(c)*, it is a complete defense to an individual action under the act if defendant has remedied, or agreed to remedy, the alleged violation within 30 days after receiving plaintiff's notice of the violation. Therefore, it appears that the foregoing defense would be used in any class action or in an individual action when defendant has failed to remedy, or to agree to remedy, the violation within 30 days after receiving the notice of

violation.

[3] Cross References

For discussion of answers and general forms of answer with which this form may be used, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 505.syn

§ 505.syn Synopsis to Chapter 505: SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT

§ 505.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 505.02 Cross References

§§ 505.03through 505.09 [Reserved]

§ 505.10 Governing Law

§ 505.11 Purpose of Act

§ 505.12 Exclusion for Liquor Distributors

§ 505.13 Definitions

[1] Chargeback

[2] Distributor

[3] Jobber

[4] Manufacturer

[5] Wholesale Sales Representative

§ 505.14 Requirements of Written Contract

§ 505.15 Payment Documentation Required

§ 505.16 Jurisdiction Over Nonresidents

§ 505.17 Treble Damages for Representative; Attorney's Fees

§§ 505.18through 505.29 [Reserved]

§ 505.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 505.31 State Statutes

§ 505.32 Decisions

§§ 505.33through 505.39 [Reserved]

§ 505.40 Complaint for Damages for Willful Failure to Pay Commission or to Enter into Written Contract as Required by Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 [Civ. Code § 1738.15]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.01

§ 505.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the requirements of the Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 (*Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.*), and provides a form for a complaint for use by an independent wholesale representative to collect treble the amount of unpaid commissions [*see § 505.40*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.02

§ 505.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 23000 et seq.*), see Ch. 18, Alcoholic Beverage Licensing.

- For general discussion and forms relating to contacts, see Ch. 140, Contracts.

- For discussion and forms relating to California Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*), see *Ch. 515, Securities and Franchise Regulations, § 515.50* et seq.

28 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART I. SCOPE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 505.03through 505.09

[Reserved]

§§ 505.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.10

§ 505.10 Governing Law

The Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 is set forth in *Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511

Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT

PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.11

§ 505.11 Purpose of Act

The Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 (*Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.*; hereinafter referred to as the "Wholesale Sales Representatives Act") contains a statement of legislative intent to protect independent sales representatives from unjust termination of territorial market areas. It was the intent of the Legislature in enacting the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act to provide security and clarify the contractual relations between manufacturers and their nonemployee sales representatives, who the Legislature recognizes are a key ingredient in the California economy and who spend many hours developing their territories in order to properly market their products [*Civ. Code § 1738.10*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.12

§ 505.12 Exclusion for Liquor Distributors

The Wholesale Sales Representatives Act does not apply to any person licensed pursuant to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 23000 et seq.*) [*Civ. Code § 1738.17*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.13

§ 505.13 Definitions

[1] Chargeback

"Chargeback," within the meaning of the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act, is any deduction taken against the commissions earned by the sales representative that are not required by state or federal law [*Civ. Code § 1738.12(d)*].

[2] Distributor

A "distributor," within the meaning of the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act, is any business organization engaged in offering for sale products that are shipped from its inventory, or from goods in transit to its inventory, to purchasers and intended for resale to, or use by, California consumers [*Civ. Code § 1738.12(c)*].

[3] Jobber

A "jobber," within the meaning of the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act, is any business organization engaged in the business of purchasingproducts intended for resale and invoicing to purchasers for resale to, or use by, California consumers [*Civ. Code § 1738.12(b)*].

[4] Manufacturer

A "manufacturer," within the meaning of the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act, is any organization engaged in the business of producing, assembling, mining, weaving, importing, or by any other method of fabrication, a tangible or intangible product, intended for resale to, or use by, California consumers [*Civ. Code § 1738.12(a)*].

[5] Wholesale Sales Representative

A "wholesale sales representative," within the meaning of the Wholesale Sales Representatives Act, is any person who contracts with a manufacturer, jobber, or distributor for the purpose of soliciting wholesale orders and is compensated, in whole or in part, by commissions, but does not include one who places orders or purchases exclusively for his or her

own account for resale and does not include one who sells or takes orders for direct sale of products to the ultimate consumer [*Civ. Code § 1738.12(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.14

§ 505.14 Requirements of Written Contract

Whenever a manufacturer, jobber, or distributor is engaged in business within California, uses the services of a wholesale sales representative who is not an employee of the manufacturer, jobber, or distributor to solicit wholesale orders at least partially within California, and the contemplated method of payment involves commissions, the manufacturer, jobber, or distributor must enter into a written contract with the sales representative [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(a)*]. The written contract must include all of the following [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(b)*]:

- The rate and method by which the commission is computed.
- The time when the commissions will be paid.
- The territory assigned to the sales representative.
- All exceptions to the assigned territory and customers in that territory.
- What chargebacks will be made against the commissions, if any.

The sales representative and the manufacturer, jobber, or distributor must each be provided with a signed copy of the written contract, and the sales representative must sign a receipt acknowledging receipt of the signed contract [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(c)*].

No contract may contain any provision that waives any rights established pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.* Any waiver is deemed contrary to public policy and void [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(e)*].

For additional discussion of these requirements, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 91, *Contracts With Sales Representatives* (Matthew Bender). For an illustrative contract complying with the above requirements, see Form 91.160 in that publication.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.15

§ 505.15 Payment Documentation Required

The sales representative must be provided with the following written information and documentation with payment of the commission [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(d)*]:

- An accounting of the orders for which payment is made, including the customer's name and invoice number.
- The rate of commission on each order.
- Information relating to any chargeback included in the accounting.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.16

§ 505.16 Jurisdiction Over Nonresidents

A manufacturer, jobber, or distributor who is not a resident of California and who enters into a contract regulated by *Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.* is deemed to be doing business in California for purposes of personal jurisdiction [*Civ. Code § 1738.14*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.17

§ 505.17 Treble Damages for Representative; Attorney's Fees

A manufacturer, jobber, or distributor who willfully fails to enter into a written contract as required by *Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.*, or willfully fails to pay commissions as provided in the written contract, is liable to the sales representative in a civil action for treble the damages proved at trial [*Civ. Code § 1738.15*]. In a civil action brought by a sales representative pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1738.15*, the prevailing party is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs in addition to any other recovery [*Civ. Code § 1738.16*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 505.18through 505.29

[Reserved]

§§ 505.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.30

§ 505.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

California Legal Forms, Ch. 91, *Contracts With Sales Representatives* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.31

§ 505.31 State Statutes

Statement of legislative purpose. *Civ. Code § 1738.10*

Definitions. *Civ. Code § 1738.12*

Requirement of written contract; contents. *Civ. Code § 1738.13(a),(b)*

Information required to be provided to sale representative with payments. *Civ. Code § 1738.13(d)*

Waiver of required provisions is void and contrary to public policy. *Civ. Code § 1738.13(e)*

Nonresident that enters into contract subject to Act is deemed to be doing business in California for purposes of personal jurisdiction. *Civ. Code § 1738.14*

Treble damages for willful failure to enter into written agreement or to pay commissions. *Civ. Code § 1738.15*

Prevailing party in action under Act is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees. *Civ. Code § 1738.16*

Act is inapplicable to person licensed under Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 23000 et seq.*). *Civ. Code § 1738.17*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.32

§ 505.32 Decisions

Plaintiffs were franchisees, not wholesale distributors, because they did more than solicit orders and were operating under marketing plan prescribed in substantial part by defendant. *Gentis v. Safeguard Bus. Sys. Inc. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1294, 1306-1306, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 122*

41 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 505.33through 505.39

[Reserved]

§§ 505.33[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 505 SALES: INDEPENDENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENTATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT
PART IV. FORMS

44-505 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 505.40

§ 505.40 Complaint for Damages for Willful Failure to Pay Commission or to Enter into Written Contract as Required by Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 [Civ. Code § 1738.15]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Willful Failure to Pay Commission or to Enter into Written Contract as Required by Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act of 1990 [Civ. Code § 1738.15]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF IND-
_____ [*nameds*], [and DOES I	)	PENDNENT WHOLESALE SALES REPRESENT-
through _____,]	)	ATIVES CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS ACT-
Defendant(s).	)	-TREBLE DAMAGES
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
		[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ [California *or other*] [authorized to transact, and transacting, intrastate business in California] with its principal place of business [in this state and] situated in _____ County, _____ [California *or other*] [*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES I through _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

[3. At all times herein mentioned, DOES I through _____ were the agents, servants, and employees of their codefendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged were acting in the course and scope of theirauthority as agents, servants, and employees, with the permission and consent of their codefendants.]

4. Plaintiff is engaged in the business of soliciting wholesale orders for the purchase by _____ [retailers *or other entity that will make the ultimate sale to the consumer*] of products manufactured, jobbed, or distributed by others. Plaintiff is compensated by the manufacturer, jobber, or distributor _____ [*describe, e.g.,* by commissions].

5. Defendant is engaged in the business of _____ [*describe manufacturing, jobbing, or distributing business of defendant, e.g.,* development, manufacture, and production of tennis rackets intended for resale to, or use by consumers, including California consumers].

6. On _____ [*date*], [at _____, California,] plaintiff and defendant entered into a written agreement[, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference,] making plaintiff a wholesale sales representative of defendant for a term of _____ [*specify period, e.g.,* one year] beginning _____ [*date*]. The agreement provides in part _____ [*describe terms relating to defendant's breach or noncompliance, e.g.,* that plaintiff be defendant's only wholesale representative in California, and that plaintiff be paid a commission of two and one half percent on the gross receipts from orders generated by plaintiff. Commissions are payable to plaintiff quarterly, on April 30, July 31, October 31, and January 1 for payments collected by defendant from the purchaser during the previous calendar quarter].

7. Plaintiff devoted substantial time and effort to promoting defendant's product and _____ [*describe relevant scope of plaintiff's performance, e.g.,* forwarded orders aggregating $ _____ during the first six months of the term of the agreement].

8. On _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*describe terms relating to defendant's breach or noncompliance, e.g.,* forwarded plaintiff a check for $ _____, covering commissions for the period _____ to _____ (*dates*). Although receipts from purchasers for orders generated by plaintiff during that period were $ _____, defendant failed and refused to pay plaintiff any commission on goods purchased by _____ (*name of purchaser*). Defendant claimed that _____ (*name of purchaser*) was already a direct customer of defendant and thus constituted an exception to plaintiff's territory. Under *Civil Code Section 1738.13(b)(4),* all exceptions to the assigned territory and customers therein are required to be stated the written contract, but the contract between plaintiff and defendant (Exhibit A) does not state any such exception. Therefore, no such exception for _____ (*name of purchaser*) was contemplated, and plaintiff is entitled to commissions on defendant's receipts from sales to _____ (*name of purchaser*)].

9. Because of the acts of defendant described above, plaintiff has sustained actual damages in the sum of $ _____.

10. The acts of defendant stated in this complaint constitute a violation of the Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act and plaintiff is entitled under *Civil Code Section 1738.15* to damage from the defendant amounting to treble the damages proved at trial.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____, and that sum be trebled;

2. For interest from and after _____ [*date of breach or on which amount of damages was ascertainable*] at _____ [the legal rate *or* the rate of _____ (*rate specified in contract*) percent per annum];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, including reasonable attorney's fees; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by an independent wholesale representative to collect treble the amount of damages he or she sustained as a result of a manufacturer's, jobber's, or distributor's willful failure to pay commissions provided for in their written contract, or willful failure to enter into a written contract as required by *Civ. Code § 1738.13*; [*Civ. Code § 1738.15*; *see also* discussion at *§ 505.13* (definitions)].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The capacity and residence of defendant (Paragraph 1) [*see Civ. Code § 1738.14*, discussed at *§ 505.16*].

- Fictitious defendant (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*].

- The existence of an agency relationship between the defendants (Paragraph 3).

- That plaintiff is an independent wholesale representative as that term is defined by *Civ. Code § 1738.12(e)* (Paragraph 4).

- That defendant is a manufacturer, jobber, or distributor, as defined by *Civ. Code § 1738.12(a), (b),* or *(c),* respectively (Paragraph 5).

- The formation of a contract between the parties, whether the contract was written or oral, and its relevant terms (Paragraph 6) [*Civ. Code § 1738.13(a),(b)*].

- Plaintiff's performance of the relevant contract terms (Paragraph 7).

- Defendant's breach of the contract or other actions that caused damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 8).

- The resultant damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 9).

- That defendant's acts violate the Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act, thereby entitling plaintiff to treble damages (Paragraph 10) under *Civ. Code § 1738.15*.

[4] Verification

Verification of a complaint is not required, but verification of a complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes a general denial except in limited civil cases. Even in limited civil cases, if the cause of action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection, verification of the complaint will preclude general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Statute of Limitations

An action on liability created by statute, other than a penalty or forfeiture, is subject to a three-year limitation period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapters 506-509 [RESERVED]

44-506 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 506-509

[RESERVED]

Chapters 506[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 510.syn

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.syn Synopsis to Chapter 510: SANCTIONS

§ 510.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 510.02 Cross References

§§ 510.03-510.09 [Reserved]

§ 510.10 Determining Basis for Sanctions

§ 510.11 Power of Court to Award Sanctions Generally

§ 510.12 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7

[1] Effective Dates

[2] Patterned on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11

[3] Application to Judicial Arbitration

[3A] Applicability to Juvenile Court Proceedings

[4] Showing Sanctionable Conduct Under Section 128.7

[5] Types of Sanctions

[6] Amount of Sanctions

[7] Law Firms Subject to Derivative Liability

[8] Safe Harbor Provisons

[9] Section 128.7 Sanctions Inapplicable to Discovery Matters

[10] Signature and Address Requirement for Pleadings, Petitions, Written Notice of Motions, or Other Similar Papers

[11] Conditions Certified to by Attorney or Unrepresented Party Presenting Papers to Court

[12] Who Is Subject to Sanctions

[12A] Who May Recover Sanctions

[13] Liability for Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(1)

[a] Burden of Proof

[b] Primarily for Improper Purpose

[c] Objective Standard Established

[14] Duty of Reasonable Inquiry Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)-(4)

[15] Pleadings On Information and Belief

[16] General Denials

[17] Court's Consideration of Due Diligence of Party Seeking Sanctions

[18] Sanctions Authorized Under Section 128.7 When Attorney's or Party's Certification Violated

[a] Types of Sanctions

[b] Directives of a Nonmonetary Nature

[c] Expenses and Attorney's Fees for Prevailing Party on Sanctions Motion

[d] Limit on Sanctions Against Party Based on Unwarranted Legal Contentions

[e] Procedural Prerequisite to Award of Money Sanctions on Court's Own Motion

[19] Availability of Punitive Damages in Action by Felon

[20] Procedure

[a] Notice and Reasonable Opportunity to Respond

[b] Notice of Motion

[c] Service of Notice; Opportunity to Withdraw Challenged Paper, Claim, Defense, Contention, Allegation, or Denial

[d] Court's Order to Show Cause

[21] Requirement Concerning Sanction Order

[22] Improper Sanction Motion Is Sanctionable

§ 510.13 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5 for Violation of Lawful Court Order

[1] Basic Rule

[2] Notice and Hearing Required to Obtain Section 177.5 Sanctions

[3] Order Imposing Section 177.5 Sanctions Required to Be in Writing and Specify Reasons

§ 510.14 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 for Violation of Local Court Rule

[1] Basic Rule

[2] Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 Sanction Not to Affect Party if Counsel Is Responsible

[3] Notice, Hearing, and Order Requirements

§ 510.15 Sanctions Under Gov. Code § 68608(b) for Violation of Fast Track Rules

[1] Basic Rules

[2] Procedural Requirements

§ 510.16 Relationship of Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 and Gov. Code § 68608 Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rules

§ 510.17 Sanctions Under Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30 for Violation of California Rules of Court

[1] Application

[2] Sanctions Available

[3] Notice and Procedure

[4] Award of Expenses

§ 510.18 Effect of Bankruptcy Laws on Sanctions

§ 510.19 Defense Costs Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1038 if Court Determines That Proceeding Not Brought in Good Faith and With Reasonable Cause

[1] Basic Rules

[2] Procedure Under Section 1038

[3] Lack of Either Good Faith or Reasonable Cause as Sufficient Showing

§ 510.20 Appellate Review

[1] Time for Review of Ruling Granting of Monetary Sanctions

[2] Aggregation of Sanctions to Meet Appealable Amount

[3] In Limited Civil Case

[4] Standing

[5] Denial of Sanctions

[6] Standard of Review

[a] Abuse of Discretion

[b] Failure to Specify Conduct or Circumstances in Order

[7] Staying Execution Pending Appeal

§ 510.21 Ethical Pitfalls Concerning Sanctions

§ 510.22 Duty to Notify State Bar of Imposition of Sanctions

§§ 510.23-510.39 [Reserved]

§ 510.40 California Points and Authorities

§ 510.41 State Statutes

[1] General Authority for Sanctions

[2] Sanctions in Specific Actions

[3] Review of Sanctions

§ 510.42 California Rules of Court

§ 510.43 Decisions

[1] Amount of Award

[2] Appellate Review

[3] Change of Venue Motion

[4] Discretion of Trial Court

[5] Frivolous Defined

[6] Interveners

[7] Nonappearance at Hearing

[8] Notice and Reasons for Order Required

[9] Persons Who May Seek Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 Sanctions

[10] Refusing Settlement

[11] Safe Harbor Provision of § 128.7

[12] Violation of Court Order

[13] Violation of Local Rule

[14] Writ Proceedings

§ 510.44 Law Reviews

§ 510.45 Text References

§§ 510.46-510.59 [Reserved]

§ 510.60 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Punitive Damages

[4] Notice Requirements

[5] Declaration

[6] Supporting Memorandum

[7] Cross Reference

§ 510.61 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Content of Order

[4] Cross Reference

§ 510.62 Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Notice

of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Judicial Notice

[4] Cross Reference

§ 510.63 Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross Reference

§ 510.64 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Declaration

[4] Supporting Memorandum

[5] Cross Reference

§ 510.65 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross Reference

Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro
*Editorial Consultant n**

FOOTNOTES:
(n95)Footnote *. **Anita Rae Shapiro** served as Commissioner of the Los Angeles Superior Court from 1982 to 1997. After that, she presided over all Long Beach Civil Law and Motion and Probate calendars. She has also conducted civil mandatory and voluntary settlement conferences, sat in civil and criminal trial, family law, and juvenile departments. In addition, she developed and successfully implemented a Temporary Judge Program. Retired from the bench, she conducts private dispute resolution. **Lawrence M. Freiser,** Attorney at Law, authored and updated a substantial portion

of this chapter. **Evelio M. Grillo,** formerly a civil litigator in San Francisco, now a Superior Court judge in Alameda County, provided additional commentary on *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* sanctions.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.01

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses sanctions that may be awarded in trial courts. It includes forms for the following notices of motions and orders:

- To obtain sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [§§ *510.60, 510.61*].
- To have a monetary sanction imposed in the county's favor under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* [*§§ 510.62, 510.63*].
- To obtain sanctions under local rules [*§§ 510.64, 510.65*].

Sanctions applicable only to particular procedures are discussed in connection with those procedures. [*See § 510.02*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.02

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.02 Cross References

For discussion of an attorneys duties to the client and court, see Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics* .

For discussion of the imposition of sanctions in the appellate courts, see Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision* .

For discussion and forms relating to evidence preclusion order for noncompliance with a bill of particulars under *Code Civ. Proc. § 454*, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts* .

For discussion and forms relating to contempt, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

For discussion and forms relating to costs and attorney's fees, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

For discussion of discovery sanctions, see Ch. 192, *Discovery: Sanctions for Discovery Abuse* .

For discussion and forms relating to sanctions against a small claims judgment debtor under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830*, see Ch. 526, *Small Caims* .

For discussion of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* on a motion for change of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For discussion and forms relating to restrictions on vexatious litigants, see Ch. 573, *Vexatious Litigants* .

47 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART I. SCOPE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 510.03-510.09

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 510.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.10

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.10 Determining Basis for Sanctions

Sanctions may be based on a number of statutes or rules, which are discussed in this chapter. The sanctions available and procedure for imposing them varies.

The general sanctions statute is *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*. Sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* apply to a "complaint or petition filed on or after January 1, 1995, and any other pleading, written notice of motion, or other similar paper filed in such a matter" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(i)*; *see § 510.12*].

If sanctions are sought for violation of a court order, *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* is the basis for the sanctions [*see § 510.13*].

If sanctions are sought for violation of a local court rule, *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* and *Gov. Code § 68608* are the basis for the sanctions [*see §§ 510.14, 510.15*].

If defense costs are sought against a plaintiff, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* is the basis for a sanction available in limited circumstances [*see § 510.19*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.11

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.11 Power of Court to Award Sanctions Generally

A court cannot order the payment of attorney's fees or other expenses as monetary sanctions absent express statutory authority [*Bauguess v. Paine (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 626, 635-639, 150 Cal. Rptr. 461, 586 P.2d 942* ; *Vidrio v. Hernandez (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1443, 1454-1455* ; *Andrews v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 779, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 426*]. A court has no inherent power to do so [*Bauguess v. Paine (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 626, 635-639, 150 Cal. Rptr. 461, 586 P.2d 942* ; *Lind v. Medevac, Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 516, 522-523, 268 Cal. Rptr. 359]* .

Thus, for example, a court may not impose monetary sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128*. Although that section provides the court with statutory powers to control proceedings before it, the court has no inherent power pursuant to that statute to impose monetary sanctions, whether as attorney's fees or as a penalty [*Bauguess v. Paine (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 626, 635-639, 150 Cal. Rptr. 461, 586 P.2d 942* ; *Andrews v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 779, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 426*]. However, when a party's deliberate and egregious misconduct makes any sanction other than a terminating sanction inadequate, the trial court has inherent power to impose a terminating sanction [*Stephen Slesinger, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 736, 757-776, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 268]* . In addition, although attorney's fees may not be awarded as a sanction under the trial court's supervisory power, they may be awarded under the court's equitable power [*Rudnick v. Rudnick (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1333, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493* (trust case)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.12

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.12 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7

[1] Effective Dates

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 became effective January 1, 1995. The section applies to a complaint or petition filed on or after that date and to any other pleading, written notice of motion, or similar paper filed in the matter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(i)*; *see § 510.10*].

[2] Patterned on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 closely tracks *Fed. R. Civ. P. 11*, although there are some significant differences. Federal cases construing *Rule 11* may frequently be persuasive, though not controlling, in construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*. The legislature has stated its intent for the courts to be guided (but not bound) by the Advisory Committee Notes to the 1993 amendments to *Rule 11* when interpreting *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*. For further discussion of *Rule 11* and cases applying it, see Moore's Federal Practice, Ch. 11, *Signing of Pleadings, Motions, and Other Papers; Representations to Court; Sanctions* (3d ed. Matthew Bender).

[3] Application to Judicial Arbitration

Because *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* sanctions require certification of papers presented to the court, the question may arise whether sanctions are available in the context of judicial arbitration proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.10 et seq.*; *see also § 510.12[11]*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* is silent on the matter.

[3A] Applicability to Juvenile Court Proceedings

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 on its face applies to all civil courts and civil proceedings, and therefore applies to juvenile court proceedings. For example, a juvenile court hearing a dependency case [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 300*, discussed in Ch. 328, *Juvenile Courts: Dependency Proceedings*] may lawfully impose sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [*In re Mark B. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 61, 74-80, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 697]* . Further, a juvenile court referee in

dependency proceedings may lawfully impose sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, because a juvenile court referee in dependency proceedings has essentially the same powers as a judge, and any differences are not material to this issue [*In re Mark B. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 61, 80-81, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 697]* .

[4] Showing Sanctionable Conduct Under Section 128.7

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, sanctions may be imposed if it is "primarily" presented to the court for an improper purpose. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, does not provide for a subjective bad faith standard.

[5] Types of Sanctions

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 allows sanctions to be awarded in favor of a party, and expressly provides for the imposition of nonmonetary directives, and for the payment of penalties to the court.

[6] Amount of Sanctions

By "limiting" sanctions to an amount sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated, *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* may allow larger sanctions than former Section 128.5 which authorized only reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, as sanctions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)*].

[7] Law Firms Subject to Derivative Liability

Law firms may be derivatively liable for acts of partners, attorneys, and employees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*]. For discussion, see *§ 510.12[12]*.

[8] Safe Harbor Provisons

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 expressly provides the offending attorney or party with 21 days from receipt of a notice of motion or order to show cause re sanctions to withdraw or appropriately correct the challenged matter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1),(2)*]. The purpose of the safe harbor provisions is to permit an offending party to avoid sanctions by withdrawing the improper pleading during the statutory safe harbor period without penalty, saving the court and the parties time and money litigating the pleading as well as the sanctions request [*Galleria Plus v. Hanmi Bank (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 535, 538, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803* ; *Li v. Majestic Industrial Hills LLC (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 585, 591, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 334* (safe harbor period indicates *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* is remedial, not punitive); *Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. McKenzie (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 681, 692, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910* ; *Malovec v. Hamrell (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 434, 441, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 712]* . To avoid the award of sanctions, however, the offending party must not only take action to correct or withdraw the challenged pleading, it must also give notice to the moving party that it has taken the step. Absent that notice, the moving party has no knowledge that the problem has been resolved and will proceed with filing the sanctions motion with the court [*Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. McKenzie (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 681, 692, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910]* .

Specifically, once the motion has been served, it may not thereafter be *filed* until 21 days from service have elapsed without a withdrawal or correction of the of the paper, claim, defense, contention, allegation, or denial that is challenged by the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*].

If a motion for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* is served at a time when it is no longer possible for the opposing party to taken the necessary corrective action, the motion violates the safe harbor provision and must be denied, even if the moving party otherwise waited the requisite 21 days before filing the motion. Thus, for example, it is improper to award sanctions based on a motion claiming that the complaint is without merit, when the motion is not served until after judgment has been entered in the action, and the plaintiff accordingly has lost the ability to correct or withdraw the challenged pleading. A motion for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* claiming that a case is without

merit must, at the very least, be served before the conclusion of that case [*Barnes v. Department of Corrections (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 126, 128, 135-136, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 594* (reversing award of sanctions)]. In addition, a ruling on the challenged motion during the safe harbor period precludes recovery of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [*Li v. Majestic Industrial Hills LLC (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 585, 595, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 334* (party seeking sanctions must move to continue challenged motion or shorten safe harbor period)].

On the other hand, an order sustaining a demurrer without leave to amend does not bar a motion for § 128.7 sanctions unless the order is reduced to judgment before the sanctions motion is served and filed [*Banks v. Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers & Chrisman (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 949, 954, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803]* .

When the party that is the subject of the sanctions does not take corrective action until after the safe harbor period has ended, such as by dismissing the complaint, the belated action does not fulfill the object of the safe harbor provision, and policies favoring allowing sanctions remain notwithstanding the corrective action [*see Eichenbaum v. Alon (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 967, 974-976, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (dismissal of complaint with prejudice after safe harbor period expired did not preclude award of sanctions)].

[9] Section 128.7 Sanctions Inapplicable to Discovery Matters

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 does not apply to disclosures and discovery requests, responses, objections, and motions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(g)*]. Thus, in actions initiated on or after January 1, 1995, discovery sanctions may only be available through the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure applicable to discovery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.*]. One purpose of eliminating discovery from the ambit of Section 128.7 was to reduce "satellite" litigation that could be generated if the general sanctions statute continued to be applicable to discovery [Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 3594 at 4 (Aug. 16, 1994)]. For discussion of sanctions under the discovery act, see Ch. 192, *Discovery: Sanctions for Discovery Abuse* .

[10] Signature and Address Requirement for Pleadings, Petitions, Written Notice of Motions, or Other Similar Papers

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*, every pleading, petition, written notice of motion, or other similar paper must be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney's individual name. If, however, a party is not represented by an attorney, the party must sign the papers. Each paper must state the signer's address and telephone number, if any [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*]. An unsigned paper must be stricken unless the omission of the signature is corrected promptly after being called to the attorney's or party's attention [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*].

Except when otherwise provided by law, a pleading need not be verified or accompanied by an affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 446* (verification requirements generally); for discussion of verification, *see* Ch. 572, *Verification*].

[11] Conditions Certified to by Attorney or Unrepresented Party Presenting Papers to Court

Section 128.7 ties sanctions to the certification of pleadings, petitions, notices of motion and similar papers presented to the court. Certification is not in the nature of a verification, but is implied by law in every pleading. By presenting to the court a pleading, petition, written notice of motion, or other similar paper, an attorney or unrepresented party certifies under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* that to the best of the person's knowledge, information, and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, all of the following conditions are met:

- It is not being presented primarily for an improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in litigation cost.

PRACTICE TIP:

Primarily for an Improper Purpose. The "primarily for an improper purpose" standard is different from the *Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* standard which allows sanctions when a paper is filed for *any* improper purpose. The *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 primarily* standard is higher. *By Evelio M. Grillo.*

- The claims, defenses, and other legal contentions set forth in the papers are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law.

- There is evidentiary support for the allegations and other factual contentions or, if specifically so identified, the allegations and other factual contentions are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery.

- The denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence, or if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on a lack of information or belief.

A paper is presented to the court by any of the following actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*]:

- Signing.

- Filing.

- Submitting.

- Later advocating.

Although the meaning of signing, filing, and submitting a paper to the court is relatively clear, the concept of "later advocating" a pleading is not. On the basis of the similarity of Section 128.7 to *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11*, it could be argued that the later advocacy requirement of Section 128.7(b) is intended to create the same duty of candor in superior courts as is present in federal courts. Under Rule 11, attorneys and parties may not continue to insist on or argue a position to the court after the factual or legal basis for the position becomes untenable. The litigants' obligation to be candid regarding the contents of papers filed with the court is measured as of the time the papers are submitted to the court and also as of the time a pleading or paper is advocated to the court, that is, argued or supported by motions or other papers. Counsel and the parties who are not candid with the court by advocating positions contained in a motion or other pleading after learning that the position has no merit may be sanctioned under Rule 11. Thus, "later advocacy" may tip an originally meritorious pleading over the line and allow the imposition of sanctions if a pleading has been presented for an improper purpose (such as delay or harassment) or is found to be lacking a sound evidentiary basis [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* advisory committee's note]. This interpretation of Section 128.7 is consistent with both the Notes of Advisory Committee to the 1993 Amendments of Rule 11 as well as California cases decided under Section 128.5 which took into consideration counsel's candor when imposing sanctions [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* advisory committee's note; *cf. Luke v. Baldwin-United Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 664* (counsel filing motion later determined through discovery to be unmeritorious exonerated from sanctions where motion was timely withdrawn) *with Park Magnolia v. Fields (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 1, 4-5* (pursuit of obviously invalid writ of possession and requiring opposing counsel to vacate writ through motion and hearing totally and completely without merit would support imposition of sanctions)].

The certification is more than a simple prophylactic measure designed to make litigants "stop and think" prior to filing pleadings with the court, although that is certainly one of the purposes [Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 3594 at 3 (Aug. 16, 1994)]. Under Section 128.7, actual sanctions may flow from a violation of any one of the four certifications. The certifications required by Section 128.7 are broad enough to embrace all of the grounds for sanctions

under former Section 128.5, and more.

For discussion of the impact of the implied certification on pleading, see Ch. 26, *Answers* , and Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* is explicit concerning the requirement of a signature and the consequences of failing to sign a pleading, it does not address technical issues related to the signature requirement. These include the following:

- Not defining what constitutes signing in an attorney's "individual name" for the purposes of certification.

- Not addressing whether an attorney's partner or an associate may sign the complaint if the attorney handling the case is unavailable.

- Omitting to define who is liable if a partner, associate or employee who is unfamiliar with the case, signs for the attorney who has primary responsibility, in the event that any of the *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)* certifications are untrue.

Although there is no California authority on point, federal cases decided under analogous provisions of Rule 11 have held the requirement of the signing of a pleading in the individual attorney's name will not be satisfied by a typewritten name on a pleading [*Giebelhaus v. Spindrift Yachts (9th Cir. 1991) 938 F.2d 962, 965-966]* . Certification should require the actual signature of the certifying attorney, in the individual attorney's name. Thus, a pleading signed in the name of the firm "by (name of attorney)" would be sufficient, but a pleading signed "The XYZ Law Firm" without an individual attorney's signature would not be [*Giebelhaus v. Spindrift Yachts (9th Cir. 1991) 938 F.2d 962, 965-966]* .

The second issue, whether an attorney may delegate the signing of a pleading to another attorney, is intertwined with the third issue, liability for a Rule 11 violation. Prior to 1993, an attorney could not delegate his or her obligations under *Rule 11* [*Pavelic & Le Flore v. Marvel Entertainment Group (1989) 493 U.S. 120, 125-127, 110 S. Ct. 456, 107 L. Ed. 2d 438* (1983 version of Rule 11 did not permit sanctions of law firm signing groundless complaint)]. However, the 1993 amendments to Rule 11, the model for Section 128.7, incorporated provisions that allow an attorney, law firm, or employee to be sanctioned for a violation of the rule [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* advisory committee's note]. The purpose of the 1993 amendments was, absent exceptional circumstances, also to hold the law firm responsible when a partner, employee, or associate violated Rule 11. The federal rule allows the court to make additional inquiry in order to determine whether the sanctions should be imposed on additional persons, or the law firm, instead of the person actually making the presentation to the court [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11* advisory committee's note].

The court may impose appropriate sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c),(d)* for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*. For sanctions that may be imposed, see discussion *§ 510.12[18]*.

[12] Who Is Subject to Sanctions

Sanctions for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* may be awarded against attorneys, law firms, or parties that violated the section or that are responsible for the violation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)*]. Moreover, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, a law firm is required to be held jointly responsible for violations that are committed by its partners, associates and employees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*].

Monetary sanctions may not be awarded against a represented party for a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)* (certification) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)(1)*]. Alternatively, it may be argued that monetary sanctions are authorized against a represented party for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(1)* (improper purpose, harassment, unnecessary

delay or needless cost), (b)(3) (no evidentiary support), and (b)(4) (denials unwarranted by evidence) [*see Laborde v. Aronson (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 459, 466, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 119 , overruled on other grounds, Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rtpr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560*].

[12A] Who May Recover Sanctions

An attorney or any other party who chooses to represent himself or herself in an action does not "incur" or become liable for attorney's fees and therefore is not entitled to an award of such fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* [*Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560*]. In *Musaelian v. Adams,* an attorney acted in propria persona to defend an action on the grounds that the claims were subject to the litigation privilege of *Civ. Code § 47*. The attorney defendant also moved under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* for sanctions including attorney's fees against the plaintiff. The California Supreme Court held that the attorney could not recover attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* as compensation for the time and effort expended on his own behalf to address the plaintiff's violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*. The Court held that the inclusion of the words "incur" and "attorney's fees" in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* implies an agency relationship under which the client and the party are not one and the same, and out of which the attorney expects remuneration [*Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560*].

The Court's holding disapproved, to the extent inconsistent, of two court of appeal decisions that had previously allowed recovery of attorney's fees by pro se attorney litigants [*Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560* (disapproving, to the extent inconsistent, decisions in *Abandonato v. Coldren (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 264, 269, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 429* and *Laborde v. Aronson (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 459, 469, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 119*)].

[13] Liability for Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(1)

[a] Burden of Proof

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b) imposes liability for sanctions when a paper or pleading is presented "primarily for an improper purpose" such as harassment or delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(1)*], and also for inadequate investigation, that is, when factual and legal assertions and contentions are not "warranted by existing law," or "likely to have evidentiary support," or are not "reasonably based on lack of information and belief" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)*, (3), (4)]. Each of these terms, in turn, relates to the burden of proof to be applied under each subsection of the statute.

[b] Primarily for Improper Purpose

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5 generally required an action or tactic to be taken in bad faith, or to be "frivolous," which was defined as "totally and completely without merit" or for the "for sole purpose of harassing" an opposing party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(b)(2)*]. Section 128.7 does not require such a high level of improper conduct, but rather specifies that if any pleading or paper is filed primarily for an improper purpose, the proponent of the paper will be subject to sanctions. These improper purposes are defined in Section 128.7(b) to include "causing unnecessary delay," "harassment," or "needless increase in the cost of litigation."

The burden of establishing the filing of a pleading primarily for an improper purpose under Section 128.7 is clearly higher than under Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 11*, which allows sanctions to be imposed if a pleading is filed for any improper purpose.

[c] Objective Standard Established

Based on the legislative history, *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* appears to establish an objective standard for the imposition of sanctions if a pleading is more likely than not to have been submitted to the court for an improper purpose. This is

similar to California's preponderance of evidence standard. Borrowing from Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 11* and California case law construing Section 128.5, the determination of whether a pleading or paper "more likely than not" has been presented for an improper purpose should be made from the standpoint of the reasonable attorney: If a reasonable attorney would agree that it is more likely than not that a pleading or other paper has been filed for an improper purpose, the proponent of that pleading may be sanctioned [*compare Derechin v. State University of New York (2d Cir. 1992) 963 F.2d 513, 520*] (sanctions may be imposed under Rule 11 when after reasonable inquiry competent attorney could not form reasonable belief that pleading is well grounded) *with Abbett Electric Corp. v. Sullwold (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 708, 713-714, 238 Cal. Rptr. 496* (objective determinations under *Section 128.5* to be made from standpoint of "reasonable attorney").

[14] Duty of Reasonable Inquiry Under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)-(4)

An alternative basis for awarding sanctions under *Section 128.7* is contained in Subsections *(b)(2), (b)(3)*, and *(b)(4)*, which provide that by signing a paper or other pleading, the signatory is certifying that the claims, defenses, and legal contentions contained in a pleading are warranted by existing law, or a non-frivolous argument for extension, modification, reversal, or establishment of new law; that allegations and factual contentions have an evidentiary basis, or may reasonably be expected to have such support after further investigation and discovery; and that denials are reasonably based on a lack of information and belief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)-(4)*]. In effect, these subsections impose a duty of reasonable inquiry on counsel to determine the legal and factual bases of all contentions asserted in a pleading.

The extent of the reasonable inquiry required of counsel and unrepresented parties is undefined by *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*. However, under analogous provisions of *Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11*, reasonable inquiry depends on a number of factors such as [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* advisory committee's note]:

- The time available to the signatory.
- Whether the attorney has had to rely on the client for information contained in the pleading.
- Whether the view of the law expounded in the pleading is plausible.

This view comports also with California cases, which require the court to consider timing considerations, such as potential statute of limitations problems, when considering imposing sanctions under *Section 128.5* [*see Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Stockton Port Dist. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 111, 115, 117, 189 Cal. Rptr. 208]* .

Although the burden of proof for awarding sanctions for a violation of subsections (b)(2), (b)(3), and (b)(4) is not specified, based on *Rule 11* and California authority construing Section 128.5, and the legislative history, two generalizations are possible. First, under *Section 128.7*, as under *Rule 11*, the obligation to conduct inquiry and research of legal theories and factual contentions is that which would be conducted by a reasonable attorney under the circumstances. [*Business Guides v. Chromatic Com. Enterprises (1991) 498 U.S. 533, 550-551, 111 S. Ct. 922, 112 L. Ed. 2d 1140]* . Second, creative "objective" legal arguments will still be permissible under *Section 128.7*, but "empty head, pure heart arguments" are prohibited, and will subject the proponent of a pleading to sanctions [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11* advisory committee's note; Letter from Assemblyman T. Weggeland to Senator B. Lockyer (Aug. 17, 1994) (discussing legislative intent)].

[15] Pleadings On Information and Belief

Current pleading practice allows allegations and denials of material facts in both verified and unverified complaints to be made on information and belief [*Horacek v. Smith (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 186, 191, 199 P.2d 929* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d), (e)-(f)*]. Prior to January 1, 1995, the effect of an allegation or denial on information and belief was to raise

and to place into issue a material allegation or allegations of the complaint [*see FPI Development v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 383, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508]* . Pleadings filed after that date continue to have the same effect, but also implicitly certify that such allegations meet the criteria of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)-(4)*, that is, that the allegations have or will have evidentiary support after the opportunity for reasonable discovery or investigation [*see § 510.12[14][a]*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Paraphrase *Section 128.7* in Pleading. To remove all doubt as to the scope of the certification as to matters pleaded on information and belief, counsel should add a paragraph at the beginning of the body of a pleading which paraphrases *Section 128.7*, such as, for example, "The allegations of this complaint stated on information and belief have evidentiary support or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery." This should protect counsel from sanctions under Section 128.7 and, provided counsel has conducted adequate investigation of the factual contentions which are not asserted on information and belief, make it more difficult for a prevailing party in litigation from establishing the elements of malicious prosecution in a later action.

[16] General Denials

A litigant responding to an unverified complaint filed by a private party may file a general denial that serves to place at issue all material allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. In contrast to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which expressly subject general denials to the provisions of *Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11*, *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128.7* and *431.30* do not expressly contemplate the application of *Section 128.7(b)* certifications to general denials [*compare Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(b) with Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30, 446*]. California case authorities on this point antedate both *Sections 128.5* and *128.7*, but suggest that litigants could be subjected to sanctions under *128.7* for failing to investigate the underlying factual basis of a general denial [*see Burke v. Superior Court (1968) 71 Cal. 2d 276, 282, 78 Cal. Rptr. 481, 455 P.2d 409* (general denials not distinguishing between allegations that are unquestionably true and thosethat are at issue in good faith are to be justly condemned); *Williamson v. Clapper (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 645, 648, 199 P.2d 337* (loose practice of pleading resulting in incorporation in answer of known false denials is to be condemned)]. By the plain language of *Section 128.7*, the court could clearly could impose sanctions for a litigant's general denial to an unquestionably true allegation of a complaint. Nevertheless, given the entrenched practice of interposing general denials to all unverified complaints, it is uncertain whether the courts will view the general denial as an exception to *Section 128.7* or subject to the statute's certification and reasonable investigation requirements.

[17] Court's Consideration of Due Diligence of Party Seeking Sanctions

A court in determining what sanction, if any, to impose must consider whether the party seeking sanctions has exercised due diligence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)*].

The due diligence requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* has no counterpart in *Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 11*. The purpose of including the due diligence requirement appears to have been to preclude counsel from intentionally delaying the filing of a motion for sanctions under Section 128.7 in order to maximize a potential award of attorney's fees relating to conduct or tactics that occurred earlier in the litigation, and could have been remedied [Senate Committee on Judiciary Analysis of AB 3594 at 6 (Aug. 16, 1994)]. This is consistent with *Code. Civ. Proc. § 128.7(h)*, which allows sanctions to be imposed if a motion for sanctions has been brought for an improper purpose, as well as California case law disfavoring the dilatory use of procedural motions to obtain a tactical advantage, when conduct underlying the motion or the motion is motivated by bad faith [*see M.E. Gray Co. v. Gray (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1025, 1034-1036, 210 Cal. Rptr. 285* (affirming sanctions imposed on counsel who sought dismissal on technicality after having obtained extension of five-year statute); for discussion of *Section 128.7(h), see § 510.12[22]*].

[18] Sanctions Authorized Under Section 128.7 When Attorney's or Party's Certification Violated

[a] Types of Sanctions

A court imposing sanctions for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* is required to limit the sanction to that which is sufficient to deter repetition of the conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)*]. Subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)(1)* and *(2)*, sanctions that a court can impose may consist of, or include [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)*]:

- Directives of a nonmonetary nature,
- An order to pay a penalty into court, or
- If imposed on motion and warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment to the movant of some or all of the reasonable attorney's fees and other expenses incurred as a direct result of the violation.

[b] Directives of a Nonmonetary Nature

"Directives of a nonmonetary nature" authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)* are not defined by the statute, but could include the full panoply of nonmonetary sanctions available under *Fed. R. Civ. P. 11*. These sanctions might include, in the appropriate case, injunctive relief, disqualifying counsel from further participation in the litigation, and perhaps even referral to the appropriate bar disciplinary authorities [*see Total Television Entertainment Corp. v. Chestnut Hill Village Associates (E.D. Pa. 1992) 145 F.R.D. 375* ; *Merrigan v. Affiliated Bankshares of Colorado, Inc. (D. Colo. 1991) 775 F. Supp. 1408* (injunctive sanctions appropriate where monetary are not effective)]. For discussion of when the State Bar must be notified of the imposition of sanctions, see *§ 510.22*.

[c] Expenses and Attorney's Fees for Prevailing Party on Sanctions Motion

If a noticed motion for sanctions has been brought, the court may award to the prevailing party on the motion, if warranted, the reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in presenting or opposing the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*; for discussion of the notice of motion procedure, see *§ 510.12[20]*].

An attorney may not recover sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* if the attorney represents himself or herself in the action and does not pay or "incur" any liability for attorney's fees [*Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560* , *see § 510.12[12A]*].

[d] Limit on Sanctions Against Party Based on Unwarranted Legal Contentions

Money sanctions may not be awarded against a represented party for a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)(2)*, that is, for violation of the condition that the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions set forth in the papers are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)(1)*].

[e] Procedural Prerequisite to Award of Money Sanctions on Court's Own Motion

When the court proceeds on its own motion to impose sanctions, monetary sanctions may not be awarded unless the court issues its order to show cause before a voluntary dismissal or settlement of the claims made by or against the party that is, or whose attorneys are, to be sanctioned [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)(2)*)]. For order to show cause procedure, see discussion in *§ 510.12[20][d]*.

[19] Availability of Punitive Damages in Action by Felon

In addition to any award of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* for conduct described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*, the court may assess punitive damages against the plaintiff if the court determines that the following four requirements are met [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(f)*]:

- The plaintiff has been convicted of a felony;
- The action is brought against the plaintiff's victim, or the victim's heirs, relatives, or estate, or personal representative;
- The action is an action for injuries arising from the acts for which the plaintiff was convicted; and
- The plaintiff is guilty of fraud, oppression, or malice in maintaining the action.

[20] Procedure

[a] Notice and Reasonable Opportunity to Respond

For a court to award sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* for a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* notice and a reasonable opportunity to respond is required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)*].

[b] Notice of Motion

A party may seek sanctions by way of noticed motion. The motion for sanctions must be made separately from other motions or requests. It must describe the specific conduct alleged to violate *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*].

[c] Service of Notice; Opportunity to Withdraw Challenged Paper, Claim, Defense, Contention, Allegation, or Denial

The notice of motion must be served as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*. It cannot, however, be filed with or presented to the court unless, within 21 days after service of the motion, or such other period as prescribed by the court, the challenged paper, claim, defense, contention, allegation, or denial is not appropriately corrected or withdrawn [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*; *see, e.g., Galleria Plus v. Hanmi Bank (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 535, 538, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 803* (motion that did not provide 21-day notice was defective)].

[d] Court's Order to Show Cause

The court, on its own motion may enter an order describing the specific conduct that appears to violate *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* and directing an attorney, law firm, or party to show cause why it has not violated *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* unless, within 21 days of service of the order to show cause, the challenged paper, claim, defense, contention, allegation, or denial is appropriately corrected or withdrawn [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(2)*].

[21] Requirement Concerning Sanction Order

The court when imposing sanctions must describe the conduct determined to constitute a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* and must explain the basis for the sanctions imposed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(e)*]. Due process requires that any order imposing sanctions state with particularity the basis for finding a violation of the section [*see Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977-978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (construing former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227; *now see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*)].

[22] Improper Sanction Motion Is Sanctionable

A motion for sanctions is itself subject to a motion for sanctions if it is brought by a party or a party's attorney primarily for an improper purpose, for example, to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(h)*]. It is the Legislature's intent that the courts vigorously use its sanctions authority to deter such improper conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(h)*].

Under Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 11*, and presumably under *Section 128.7*, improper conduct may include using sanctions motions as a discovery device or as a tool for exacting an unjust settlement, or to intimidate one's adversary into withdrawing contentions that are debatable [*Fed. R. Civ. P. 11*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.13

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.13 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5 for Violation of Lawful Court Order

[1] Basic Rule

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a judicial officer has the power to impose reasonable money sanctions not to exceed $1500 payable to the county in which the judicial officer is located if a person violates any lawful court order without good cause or substantial justification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*]. This power does not apply, however, to advocacy before the court by counsel [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*].

Imposition of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* is within the court's discretion, which must be exercised in a reasonable manner with the statutorily authorized purposes in mind and guided by existing legal standards as adapted to current circumstances [*In re Woodham (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 438, 443, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431* ; *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 501, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* .

Imposition of sanctions under Section 177.5 requires a knowing violation of a valid court order without good cause or substantial justification [*In re Woodham (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 438, 442, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431* ; *Winikow v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 719, 726, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 413* ; *see People v. Muhammad (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 313, 323-326, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308* (*§ 177.5* has no application without court order)].

For the purposes of *Section 177.5*, the term "person" is defined to include a witness, a party, a party's attorney, or both [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*].

Unlike *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, *Section 177.5* is by its terms limited to a violation of a lawful court order, there is a $1500 limitation, and the sanction is payable to the county, not to the opposing party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*]. Moreover, *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*, applies to both civil and criminal matters [*People v. Tabb (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1300, 1310, 279 Cal. Rptr. 480]* . Furthermore, a magistrate presiding over a criminal matter qualifies as a "judicial officer" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* [*People v. Tabb (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1300, 1306 n.5, 279 Cal. Rptr. 480]* .

The apparent purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* is to compensate public agencies, such as a court, for the costs of an unnecessary hearing [*Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 499, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296* ; *see In re Woodham (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 438, 443, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431* (court properly imposed sanctions on Board of Prison Terms for unnecessary litigation)]. The section was enacted, according to its author, "to insure that all parties are present and prepared for court appearances" and "to help eliminate unnecessary delays in civil court proceedings" [*Seykora v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1075, 1080, 283 Cal. Rptr. 857]* . Section 177.5 requires only that a person violate any lawful court order without good cause or substantial justification for sanctions to be awarded [*Seykora v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1075, 1080, 283 Cal. Rptr. 857]* .

Thus, for example, sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* have been upheld when counsel failed to file a joint at-issue memorandum as required by a fast track local rule and thereafter failed to comply with a court order to appear [*Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 501, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* . Similarly, sanctions were upheld when counsel walked out of a courtroom after being ordered to remain [*Seykora v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1075, 1083-1084, 283 Cal. Rptr. 857]* . A second sanction imposed for failure to pay the original *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* was upheld for the purpose of penalizing the attorney's ignoring lawful orders of the court [20th *Century Ins. Co. v. Choong (2000) 79 Cal.App. 4th 1274, 1277-1279, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753* (first sanction imposed for failure to prepare mandatory settlement conference statement pursuant to local rule)]. Rules of Professional Conduct are not normally regarded as court orders of the type referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* [*Conservatorship of Becerra (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1482-1484, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 910* (violation of *Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 2-100(A)* not properly pursued under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*)].

[2] Notice and Hearing Required to Obtain Section 177.5 Sanctions

A judicial officer cannot impose monetary sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* except on notice contained in a party's moving papers or responding papers, or on the court's own motion, after notice and an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*; for a form of notice of motion, *see § 510.62*]. Adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard is mandated not only by statute, but also by the due process clauses of both the state and federal constitutions [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 976-977, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (notice held adequate when counsel had requested sanctions under the discovery act but learned at hearing that court was considering *Section 177.5* sanctions based on same facts as those relevant to discovery act sanctions motion)].

The scope of the hearing under *Section 177.5*, is in the trial court's discretion [*see Seykora v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1075, 1081-1083, 283 Cal. Rptr. 857* (no abuse of discretion in denying request to call witnesses)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Supporting and Opposing Evidence. Put all evidence in support of and in opposition to *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* motions for sanctions in declarations, authenticated documents, and requests for judicial notice filed with the moving or opposing papers. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

[3] Order Imposing Section 177.5 Sanctions Required to Be in Writing and Specify Reasons

An order imposing sanctions must be in writing and must recite in detail the conduct or circumstances justifying the order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*; for a form of order, *see § 510.63*]. The language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* is similar to that in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* and presumably the same rules apply [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977-978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126]* . Thus, for example, an order that set forth no facts justifying the imposition of sanctions but merely stated "good cause appearing" to impose sanctions was held insufficient [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977-978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* ; *see also Conservatorship of Becerra (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1484-1485, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 910* (order referring to "good cause for issuance of" sanctions insufficient)]. Due process requires that any order imposing sanctions state with particularity the basis for finding a

violation of the section [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977-978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126]* . For further discussion, see *§ 510.13[2]*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Preparing Order. When a *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* motion for sanctions is granted, the prevailing party should volunteer to prepare an attorney order if not ordered to do so by the court. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.14

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.14 Sanctions Under Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 for Violation of Local Court Rule

[1] Basic Rule

Superior courts may promulgate local rules under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.1* for the supervision and management of actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 575.1(a)*]. These rules may provide that if counsel, a party represented by counsel, or a pro se party fails to comply with any of their requirements, the court on a party's motion, or on the court's own motion may do any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(a)*; *see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 7.13 and 8.0 (providing for sanctions)]:

- Strike out all or any part of that party's pleadings,
- Dismiss the action or proceeding or any part of it,
- Enter a default judgment against that party, or
- Impose other penalties of a lesser nature as otherwise provided by law.

The court may also order that the party or party's counsel pay to the moving party the reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorney fees, in making the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(a)*; *see e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.0; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30* (discussed in *§ 510.17*)].

A court may not impose sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* for conduct that, although objectionable, does not constitute a violation of local rules. For example, under Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.12, a lawyer should avoid *ex parte* communication on the substance of a pending case with a judge (or the judge's law clerk) before whom the case is pending. It is not a violation of this rule for an attorney simply to call the court clerk to request that status conference be scheduled without having first conferred with other counsel, as the ex parte prohibitions were not intended to preclude simple communications between attorneys and court clerks on purely administrative matters

having nothing to with the substance of the case [*Blum v. Republic Bank (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 245, 248-249, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 226]* .

[2] Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 Sanction Not to Affect Party if Counsel Is Responsible

Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b) limits the imposition of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(a)*. If a failure to comply with local rules is the responsibility of counsel and not of the party, sanctions can only be imposed on counsel and the sanction cannot adversely affect the party's cause of action or defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)*]. *Section 575.2(b)* is thus an exception to the general rule that an attorney's negligence is imputed to the client [*State of California ex rel. Public Works Bd. v. Bragg (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1026, 228 Cal. Rptr. 576* ; *see Tliche v. Van Quathem (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1054, 1059-1064, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 458* (holding that it was error to dismiss action for attorney's failure to serve summons and complaint within 60 days under fast-track rules when there was no evidence that plaintiff, rather than attorney, caused the delay, and no less severe sanctions were imposed)]. Moreover, if negligent counsel does not invoke Section 575.2(b) to protect the client against sanctions the court must move sua sponte to do so to guarantee protection of an innocent party [*State of California ex rel. Public Works Bd. v. Bragg (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1028-1029, 228 Cal. Rptr. 576]* .

Thus, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)*, a trial court's order denying a jury trial in a personal injury case because of defense counsel's failure to submit proposed jury instructions within the local fast-track rule deadline has been held to be error [*Cooks v. Superior Court (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 723, 726-727, 274 Cal. Rptr. 113]* . Similarly, it has been held error for a trial court not to have relieved a plaintiff from a jury waiver based on the plaintiff's counsel's failure to post jury fees as required under a local rule, when nothing suggested that the plaintiff was responsible for counsel's failure [*Massie v. AAR Western Skyways, Inc. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 405, 409-412, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 654]* . Sanctions that effectively deny a party a trial on the merits because of counsel's actions are also improper under Section 575.2(b) [*see State of California ex rel. Public Works Bd. v. Bragg (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1029-1030, 228 Cal. Rptr. 576* (error to grant motion in limine based solely on deputy attorney general's mistake in not timely filing a complete appraisal report as required by local rule that had practical effect of preventing the introduction of any evidence on the valuation of property when only issue was the property's fair market value; court could have devised other penalty and remedial action); *In re Marriage of Colombo (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 572, 578-580, 242 Cal. Rptr. 100* (error to rule that objections and disputes regarding matters in pretrial statement had been waived by attorney's failure to file responsive pretrial statement in accordance with applicable local rules when ruling precluded party from offering any evidence on those issues)].

Gov. Code § 68608(b), authorizing sanctions to enforce Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*), does not include comparable protection for parties. For discussion of whether *Section 68608(b)* takes precedence over *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2, see § 510.16*.

[3] Notice, Hearing, and Order Requirements

The court may not impose a sanction under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* for violation of a local court rule without prior notice to the party against whom the sanction is sought to be imposed and providing the party an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(a)*; *see Annex British Cars, Inc. v. Parker-Rhodes (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 788, 792, 244 Cal. Rptr. 48* (due process requires notice and hearing before sanctions can be imposed under *§ 575.2(a)*); for a form of notice of motion, *see § 510.64*]. Similarly, due process requires that the sanction order state with particularity the basis for finding a violation of the statute [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (construing former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227 [*now see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*]); for a form of order, *see § 510.65*]. For further discussion of notice, hearing and order requirements, *see § 510.14[3]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.15

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.15 Sanctions Under Gov. Code § 68608(b) for Violation of Fast Track Rules

[1] Basic Rules

The Trial Court Delay Reduction Act is contained in *Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.* The Judicial Council is required to adopt standards of timely disposition for the processing and disposition of civil and criminal actions [*Gov. Code § 68603(a)*]. The courts are given power under the act to enact local court rules to carry out the mandate of the act [*Gov. Code §§ 68607, 68612*; *see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 7.0 et seq.]. The judges have all the powers authorized by law to impose sanctions under the act, including the power to strike pleadings or dismiss actions, if less severe sanctions would appear not to be effective after taking into account the effect of any previous sanctions or previous lack of compliance in the case [*Gov. Code § 68608(b)*; *see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 7.7(c), 7.13 (sanctions; imposition on party and/or, if appropriate, counsel)]. Moreover, judges are encouraged to impose sanctions to achieve the purposes of the act [*Gov. Code § 68608(b)*; *but see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.13 (court allowed to impose sanctions for specified conduct, but urged to do so sparingly and only when clearly warranted)]. The ultimate sanction, however, is rarely if ever proper in the first instance [*Sigala v. Anaheim City School Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 661, 673-674, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38* (striking a request for a trial de novo after judicial arbitration held improper when there were no earlier refusals to comply with court orders or prior imposed sanctions)].

It is a drastic measure to prevent parties from presenting their cases on the merits. Terminating sanctions should only be ordered when there has been previous noncompliance with an order or rule and it appears that a less severe sanction would not be effective. Terminating sanctions should not be ordered as a first response when noncompliance is through no fault of the party [*Wantuch v. Davis (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 786, 795, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 47* (in propria persona litigant; striking pleadings and entry of judgment for failure to appear at status conference held improper when nonappearance not wilful but solely result of imprisonment of which trial court was aware throughout proceedings)].

Unlike *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2, Gov. Code § 68608(b)* does not include protection for the party when the sanction is based on the attorney's actions. For discussion of whether *Section 68608(b)* takes precedence over *Code Civ. Proc. §*

575.2, see § 510.16.

[2] Procedural Requirements

Before sanctions can be imposed under *Gov. Code § 68608(b)* the procedural due process requirements of a fair warning and an opportunity to be heard must be met [*Youngworth v. Stark (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 395, 406, 283 Cal. Rptr. 668* (decided under former *Gov. Code § 68609(d)* (*now Gov. Code § 68608(b)*)); *see Sigala v. Anaheim City School Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 661, 673, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38* (striking defendant's request for trial de novo when defendant told sanction hearing would be heard under *Cal. Rules of Ct. Rules 3.1380* and *2.30, Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* and local rules, but no mention made of striking the request for trial de novo); for a form of notice of motion, *see § 510.64*]. The adequacy of notice to satisfy basic due process requirements will be determined on a case by case basis rather than on an arbitrary number of days' notice [*Youngworth v. Stark (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 395, 407, 283 Cal. Rptr. 668]* . Similarly, due process requires that the sanction order state with particularity the basis for finding a violation of the statute [*Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 978, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (construing *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*); for a form of order, *see § 510.65*]. For further discussion of notice, hearing and order requirements, see *§ 510.14[3]*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Responding to Potential Dismissal. If the court issues an Order to Show Cause re Dismissal, be sure to file and serve an opposition. Failure to timely file and serve an opposition may preclude oral opposition at the court hearing. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.16

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.16 Relationship of Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 and Gov. Code § 68608 Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rules

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 177.5, 575.1, 575.2, together with *Gov. Code § 68608(b),* provide a comprehensive statewide scheme of regulation concerning fast track matters, and local rules supplement the statewide scheme [*see Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 500, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* . It is unclear, however, whether *Gov. Code § 68608(b)* supersedes *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)* so as to allow fast track courts to dismiss actions or otherwise impose sanctions on parties for their counsel's failure to comply with local court rules [*see Youngworth v. Stark (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 395, 404-405, 283 Cal. Rptr. 668]* .

There is authority that has held that *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)* applies to fast track rules and that when a party is in no way personally responsible for counsel's failure to comply with a local fast track rule, sanctions must only be imposed on counsel, not the innocent party [*Cooks v. Superior Court (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 723, 725-727, 274 Cal. Rptr. 113* ; for discussion of the protection of the party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b), see § 510.14[2]*].

On the other hand, there is authority that has held that former *Gov. Code § 68609(d), now Gov. Code § 68608(b),* controls concerning the imposition of sanctions for violation of local delay reduction rules and therefore the standards set forth in that section take precedence over *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)* [*Laguna Auto Body v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 481, 490 n.8, 282 Cal. Rptr. 530 (Fourth Dist., Div. Three)* ; *Intel Corp. v. USAIR Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1565-1568, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569 (Second Dist., Div. Four)]* . Under this view, trial courts have discretionary authority to impose the sanction of dismissal based on counsel's failure to comply with local fast track rules, if the standards set forth in *Gov. Code § 68608(b)* are satisfied [*Intel Corp. v. USAIR Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1565-1566, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569]* . Thus, a dismissal sanction has been upheld under former Section § 68609(d), now *Gov. Code § 68608(b),* based on plaintiffs' counsel's repeated failure to proceed in accordance with local fast track rules [*Intel Corp. v. USAIR Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1566-1568, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569]* . Note that in *Intel* the court referred to *Cooks v. Superior Court,* discussed above, which was decided in the same appellate district and division, and stated that the *Cooks* opinion should not be understood to contradict the holding reached in *Intel* [*Intel Corp. v. USAIR Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1566 n.6, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Familiarity With Local Rules. Learn and comply with local fast track rules so you will not have to argue that the court does not have the authority to dismiss an action based on counsel's failure to comply with fast track rules, and you will not have to defend a subsequent legal malpractice lawsuit. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.17

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.17 Sanctions Under Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30 for Violation of California Rules of Court

[1] Application

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30 prescribes sanctions for violations of California Rules of Court relating to general civil cases [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1 et seq.*], unlawful detainer cases, probate proceedings [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.1 et seq.*], civil proceedings in the appellate division of the superior court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.700 et seq.*], and small claims cases [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(a)*; *Vidrio v. Hernandez (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1443, 1456-1458* (upholding constitutionality of rule); for rules relating to small claims cases, *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100 et seq.*].

Former Rule 227 provided for sanctions for unlawful interference with the proceedings of the court by failure to comply with the California Rules of Court, local rules, or court orders, unless good cause was shown, or failure to participate in good faith in a conference the California Rules of Court or a court order required. Effective July 1, 2001, former Rule 227 was amended to authorize monetary sanctions for failure to comply with the civil pretrial and trial rules of the California Rules of Court [former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 222, Drafter's Note]. Effective January 1, 2004, former Rule 227 was amended to provide sanctions for failure to comply with the California Rules of Court specified above. Effective January 1, 2007, former Rule 227 was renumbered as part of the reorganization of the California Rules of Court to be *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*. The renumbering made no substantive changes.

[2] Sanctions Available

In addition to any other sanctions permitted by law, the court may order a person to pay reasonable monetary sanctions to the court, to an aggrieved person, or both, for failure without good cause to comply with the California Rules of Court relating to general civil cases, unlawful detainer cases, probate proceedings, civil proceedings in the appellate division of the superior court, and small claims cases, after written notice and an opportunity to be heard. For these purposes, "person" means a party, a party's attorney, a witness and an insurer or any other individual or entity whose consent is necessary for the disposition of the case [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(b)*]. If the failure to comply with an applicable rule is counsel's responsibility, not the party's responsibility, the court must impose the penalty on counsel. The penalty must not adversely affect the party's cause of action or defense [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(b)*].

Effective July 1, 2001, former Rule 227 appeared to provide independent authority for the court to impose sanctions for violations of the Rules of Court. It no longer provided that the court could impose sanctions authorized under statutes, including *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* and *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*, or for violations of local rules or court orders. Cases decided under previous versions of Rule 227 that referred to the court's authority in relation to statutory authority or to violations of local rules or court orders no longer appeared to be relevant [*see, e.g., Blum v. Republic Bank (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 245, 248-249, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 226* (improper to impose sanctions under Rule 227 for conduct that does not actually constitute violation of local rule); *Trans-Action Commercial Investors, Ltd. v. Jelinek (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 352, 362-365, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 449* (while court's authority to sanction under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227 appeared broad, it was limited to situations in which there was statutory authority for sanctions because Rule 227 was intended only to consolidate authority found in statutes and did not provide independent authority to impose sanctions); *Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 979, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (when court awards sanctions to county pursuant to Rule 227 as penalty for violating court order, maximum permissible sanction is $1,500, amount set in *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* as maximum sanction payable to county for violating court order)]. Cases interpreting former Rule 227 with regard to violations of the Rules of Court, however, are probably still good law [*see, e.g., Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 979, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (if sanction award pursuant to Rule 227 is based on violation of state rule, limitation to $1,500 imposed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* does not apply)].

[3] Notice and Procedure

The court may not impose sanctions under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30* except on noticed motion by the party seeking sanctions or on the court's own motion after the court provides notice and an opportunity to be heard [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(c)*]. A party's motion for sanctions must do each of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(c)*]:

- State the applicable Rule of Court that was violated.
- Describe the specific conduct that allegedly violated the rule.
- Identify the attorney, law firm, party, witness or other person against whom the party seeks sanctions.

The court on its own motion may issue an order to show cause that does each of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(c)*]:

- Sets forth the applicable Rule of Court that was violated.
- Describes the specific conduct that appears to have violated the Rule.
- Directs the attorney, law firm, party, witness or other person to show cause why the court should not impose sanctions against them for violation of the Rule.

The court must provide adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard to satisfy procedural due process requirements before imposing sanctions [*Bergman v. Rifkind & Sterling, Inc. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1387, 278 Cal. Rptr. 583* ; *Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 976, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (both decided under pre-2001 versions of Rule 227)]. The court must provide notice before deciding whether, in fact, to impose sanctions and before making findings [*Bergman v. Rifkind & Stirling, Inc. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1387, 278 Cal. Rptr. 583]* .

An order imposing sanctions must be in writing. It must recite in detail the conduct or circumstances justifying the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(e)*; *see also Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 978, 272 Cal.*

Rptr. 126 (due process required that order imposing sanctions under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227 state with particularity basis for finding violation of rule; construing former Rule 527)].

[4] Award of Expenses

In addition to the sanctions awardable under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(b)*], the court may order the person who violated an applicable rule [*see discussion under § 510.17[1]*] to pay to the party aggrieved by the violation that party's reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees and costs, incurred in connection with the motion for sanctions or the order to show cause [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.18

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.18 Effect of Bankruptcy Laws on Sanctions

Federal bankruptcy laws may not be invoked to obstruct the imposition of sanctions by California courts against an attorney for frivolous or abusive litigation tactics [*Papadakis v. Zelis (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1389, 282 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . Thus, the filing of a petition in bankruptcy by an attorney who has engaged in such tactics has been held not to invoke the automatic bankruptcy stay and a state court could thereafter consider and impose sanctions against the attorney [*see* *Papadakis v. Zelis (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1389-1390, 282 Cal. Rptr. 18* (upholding sanctions against attorney for frivolous appeal)]. For general discussion of bankruptcy, see Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.19

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.19 Defense Costs Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1038 if Court Determines That Proceeding Not Brought in Good Faith and With Reasonable Cause

[1] Basic Rules

Code Civ. Proc. § 1038 authorizes an award of defense costs, in addition to those costs normally awarded to a prevailing party, in certain types of actions not brought in good faith and with reasonable cause. The actions Section 1038 applies to are [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a)*]:

- Civil proceedings under the California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*).
- Civil proceedings for express or implied indemnity or for contribution in a civil action.

For defense costs to be awardable under *Section 1038* in these proceedings one of the following motions must be brought by a defendant or cross defendant and must be granted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(d)*]:

- Summary judgment.
- Judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8*.
- Nonsuit.
- Directed verdict.

If the court finds that the proceeding was not brought in good faith and with reasonable cause, the defendant or cross defendant may recover all reasonable and necessary defense costs, in addition to costs normally awarded to the prevailing party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a)*].

Defense costs for the purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* include reasonable attorney's fees, expert witness fees, the expense of services of experts, advisors and consultants in defending the proceeding, and where reasonably and necessarily incurred in defending the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(b)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1038 authorizes the trial court to make a supplemental assessment for costs incurred in connection with an unsuccessful, but not frivolous, appeal [*Gonzales v. ABC Happy Realty (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 391, 392-393, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 566* (proceeding for indemnity or contribution)].

[2] Procedure Under Section 1038

The court, on the motion of the defendant or cross defendant must at the time of granting any summary judgment, motion for directed verdict, motion for judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8*, or any nonsuit dismissing the moving party other than the plaintiff, petitioner, cross-complainant, or intervenor, or at a later time set by a Judicial Council rule adopted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1034*, determine whether or not the plaintiff, petitioner, cross-complainant, or intervenor brought the proceeding with reasonable cause and in the good faith belief that under the facts and law there was a justifiable controversy that warranted filing of the complaint, petition, cross-complaint, or complaint in intervention. If the court determines that the proceeding was not brought in good faith and with reasonable cause, the court is required to decide an additional issue as to the defense costs reasonably and necessarily incurred by the party or parties opposing the proceeding. The court is required to render judgment in favor of that party in the amount of all reasonable and necessary defense costs, in addition to those costs normally awarded to the prevailing party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a)*].

Notice contained in a party's papers and an opportunity to be heard are, however, required before defense costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* can be awarded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a)*]. Moreover Section 1038 is applicable only on motion made before the jury is discharged or judgment entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(c)*].

Any party that requests relief under Section 1038 waives the right to seek damages for malicious prosecution [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(c)*]. Failure to make the motion, however, is not deemed a waiver of the right to bring a malicious prosecution action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(c)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Obtain Client's Decision. When preparing written motions for summary judgment, directed verdict, judgment under. *Code Civ. Proc § 631.8* or nonsuit, for a client defendant that is not a public entity, determine whether your client wishes to request *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* defense costs as part of the motion, or not to request these defense costs to preserve the right to pursue a later malicious prosecution lawsuit [*see City of Long Beach v. Bozek (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 527, 538 n.9, 538-539, 183 Cal. Rptr. 86, 645 P. 2d 137* (holding that public entity cannot maintain malicious prosecution action and indicating in dicta that public employee acting through private counsel might be able to do so)]. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

[3] Lack of Either Good Faith or Reasonable Cause as Sufficient Showing

Application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* is not limited to the initiation of an action. The section also applies to steps to pursue it after the action has been filed [*Kobzoff v. Los Angeles County Harbor/UCLA Medical Center (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 851, 853 n.1, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803, 968 P.2d 514* ; *Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 931-932, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874* ; *Carroll v. State of California (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 134, 140, 265 Cal. Rptr. 753]* . A plaintiff must have filed and pursued the action in good faith and with reasonable cause to avoid an order to pay defense costs under *Section 1038* [*Kobzoff v. Los Angeles County Harbor/UCLA Medical Center (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 851, 861-862, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803, 968 P.2d 514* ; *Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 931, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874]* . Thus, a defendant, assuming the procedural criteria of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* is satisfied, need only show either that

the plaintiff (1) did not act in good faith, or (2) lacked a reasonable cause for the action [*Kobzoff v. Los Angeles County Harbor/UCLA Medical Center (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 851, 861-862, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803, 968 P.2d 514* ; *Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 931-932, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874]* . Good faith or its absence involves a factual inquiry into plaintiff's subjective state of mind. A subjective state of mind is rarely susceptible of direct proof and will usually be inferred from circumstantial evidence. Reasonable cause is determined objectively, as a matter of law, on the basis of facts known to the plaintiff when the plaintiff filed or maintained the action. Once it is determined what the plaintiff or plaintiff's counsel knew, the court decides whether any reasonable attorney would have thought the claim tenable [*Kobzoff v. Los Angeles County Harbor/UCLA Medical Center (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 851, 861-862, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803, 968 P.2d 514* ; *Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 932, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874]* .

Thus, it has been noted that under *Section 1038* "[i]f a legislative purpose to protect public entities from meritless claims is to be served, a plaintiff must bear a burden of investigation sufficient to establish at least a basis for reasonable belief that all elements [of the cause of action] exist" [*Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 933, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.20

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.20 Appellate Review

[1] Time for Review of Ruling Granting of Monetary Sanctions

An immediate appeal may be taken from a superior court order or interlocutory judgment in an unlimited civil case directing the payment of monetary sanctions by a party or a party's attorney if the amount exceeds $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12)*]. The *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.104*, time limits for filing a notice of appeal apply to a interlocutory judgment or order in an unlimited civil case directing the payment of money sanctions in excess of $5,000 that is immediately appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11)-(12)* [*see Imuta v. Nakano (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1570, 1578-1579, 285 Cal. Rptr. 681]* . Therefore, if the sanction is to be appealed, it is essential that the appeal be taken timely [*see Chong v. Fremont Indemnity Co. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1097, 1102-1103, 249 Cal. Rptr. 264* (appeal dismissed as untimely when notice of appeal not filed within period specified in Rule 8.104 after entry of order imposing sanctions, but rather filed after determination of main issue in action)].

A sanction order or judgment against a party or party's attorney for $5,000 or less may be reviewed on an appeal by the sanctioned party after entry of final judgment in the main action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(b)*; *Calhoun v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 39, 45 n.1, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 337*]. Alternatively, at the court of appeal's discretion, a sanction order or judgment for less than $5,000 may be reviewed on a petition for an extraordinary writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(b)*; *see Rao v. Campo (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1557, 1566-1567, 285 Cal. Rptr. 691* (extraordinary writ review under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)*, now *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(1)*, available regardless of dollar amount of sanctions)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Cost Considerations. It may not be cost effective to request appellate review of a sanction order or judgment for $5,000 or less in a writ petition. Petitions for extraordinary writs are discretionary and are rarely heard on the merits. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

On appeal challenging sanctions imposed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, argument based on oral findings or statements made by the judge at the time the sanctions were imposed is inappropriate. The appellate court will review the trial

court's sanction order based on the written order [*see 580 Folsom Associates v. Prometheus Development Co. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1, 22-23, 272 Cal. Rptr. 227* (construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*)].

[2] Aggregation of Sanctions to Meet Appealable Amount

Separate sanctions involving separate acts and payable to separate persons cannot be aggregated to meet the $5000 appealability threshold amount contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12)* [*Imuta v. Nakano (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1570, 1585 n.20, 285 Cal. Rptr. 681* (refusing to aggregate three contemporaneous orders to meet the former $750 threshold)]. Whether multiple monetary sanctions involving the same conduct may be aggregated is less clear. One case has suggested in dicta that aggregation would be proper if the sanctions all involved the same conduct [*Champion/L.B.S. Associates Development Co. v. E-Z Serve Petroleum Marketing, Inc. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 56, 59-60, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (Fourth Dist; declining to aggregate to meet the $750 threshold in the case before it)]. However, in a case involving sanctions ordered in favor of two different parties but based on the same conduct, it was held that aggregation is never appropriate [*Calhoun v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 39, 42-45, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 337* (First Dist., rejecting the *Champion/L.B.S. Associates Development Co.* dicta)].

[3] In Limited Civil Case

Code Civ. Proc. § 904.2 contains no provision on the right to appeal from a prejudgment order or interlocutory judgment for monetary sanctions in a limited civil case, and it has been held that such an order is not appealable [*Lim v. Silverton (1997) 61 Cal. App. 4th Supp. 1, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 408* (recognizing that order may be reviewed on appeal from the judgment in the action and that a post judgment sanction order would be subject to appeal under *Code. Civ. Proc. § 904.2(b)*]. In some cases, review by extraordinary writ might be appropriate.

[4] Standing

Assuming the monetary threshold of *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12)* is met, if a superior court order is directed against a party's attorney, the attorney has the right and standing to appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12)*; *Imuta v. Nakano (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1570, 1580-1581, 285 Cal. Rptr. 681* ; *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 497, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296* ; *see Calhoun v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 39, 42, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 337]* . If the sanctioned attorney does not file a separate notice of appeal, however, but only names an unsanctioned party in the notice of appeal, it has been held that the appellate court lacks jurisdiction to review the sanction ruling, and the purported appeal will be dismissed [*Calhoun v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (1993) 20 Cal.App. 4th 39, 42, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 337* (party, who was not sanctioned, appealed from order sanctioning attorney); *see Huenergardt v. Huenergardt (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 455, 459, 32 Cal. Rptr. 714* ; *but see Ellis v. Roshei Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 642, 645 n.3, 192 Cal. Rptr. 57* (court reviewed sanction order although appeal brought in name of unsanctioned party, not sanctioned attorney)]. Under such circumstances it would be better practice for the sanctioned attorney to file a separate notice of appeal although, if the notice of appeal includes as an additional appellant the unsanctioned party, the notice may be liberally construed in favor of its sufficiency [*Calhoun v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 39, 42, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 337* ; *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 497, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* .

[5] Denial of Sanctions

Denial of a motion for sanctions is not appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12)* [*Wells Properties v. Popkin (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1055, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(k)*; appeal from order denying motion for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* dismissed)]. In unusual and compelling circumstances an appellate court may treat a purported appeal from a nonappealable order as a petition for a writ of mandate. A denial of a motion for sanctions has been held, however, not to present such circumstances [*Wells Properties v. Popkin (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1056, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845* (dissenting opinion would have treated appeal from nonappealable order as a petition for extraordinary relief)]. It appears that review of denial of such an order

may be had in connection with an appeal from an appealable order or final judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 906*; *Wells Properties v. Popkin (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845* (dissenting opinion)]. Presumably, within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 906* dealing with the scope of appellate review, the denial of such a motion would be construed as involving the merits or necessarily affecting the judgment, or substantially affecting the rights of a party. Similarly, in some instances review by extraordinary writ may be appropriate.

[6] Standard of Review

[a] Abuse of Discretion

A trial court is vested with broad discretionary power to award sanctions. The test on appeal is whether there has been an abuse of discretion [*Olson Partnership v. Gaylord Plating Lab, Inc. (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 235, 240, 276 Cal. Rptr. 493* ; *Winick Corp. v. County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 230 Cal. Rptr. 289]* . An appellate court will not reverse a trial court's imposition of sanctions unless the court finds that there has been an abuse of discretion [*Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc. v. Sparks (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 299, 304, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371* (sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*); *Intel Corp. v. USAIR, Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1565-1566, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569* (sanctions under former *Gov. Code § 68609(d), now Gov. Code § 68608(b)*); *see Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126* (sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*; former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227, *now Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*)].

To be entitled to appellate relief, it must clearly appear that the injury resulting from the abuse of discretion in the imposition of sanctions is sufficient to amount to a miscarriage of justice. A showing is insufficient to reverse the trial court if it merely affords an opportunity for different opinions [*Winick Corp. v. County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1175-1176, 230 Cal. Rptr. 289]* . An appellate court is neither authorized to nor warranted in substituting its judgment for the trial court's judgment [*Winick Corp. v. County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 230 Cal. Rptr. 289]* . The trial court's judgment or order is presumed correct. All intendments and presumptions are indulged in to support it. An affirmative showing of error must be made [*Brewster v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 701, 713, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89]* . The appellate court will not disturb the trial court's findings when the evidence is in conflict [*Brewster v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 701, 713, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89]* .

When it is claimed that the evidence is insufficient to justify sanctions, several appellate courts in determining whether there was an abuse of discretion have applied the substantial evidence rule to see if substantial evidence supported the trial court's findings [*see, e.g.,* *West Coast Development v. Reed (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 693, 697-698, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790* ; *Brewster v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 701, 712, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89* ; *Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 977, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126]* .

[b] Failure to Specify Conduct or Circumstances in Order

The harmless error doctrine does not apply on appellate review of an order that fails to set forth in detail the conduct or circumstances justifying sanctions. Therefore, when faced with a statutorily insufficient order, a reviewing court is required to remand the case to the trial court for the fashioning of a proper order. Remand is required even when sanctions follow a detailed motion by opposing counsel that was fully argued and considered in an open hearing. Remand is also required even though the reviewing court has combed the record and determined it sufficient to sustain a finding in support of the imposition of sanctions [*West Coast Development v. Reed (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 693, 705-706, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790* (order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Thoroughness of Order. When preparing an attorney order for the court's signature, set forth all of the conduct or circumstances that justify the sanctions imposed to avoid the delay of a remand of the case by the appellate court for the entry of a proper order. *By Commissioner Anita Rae Shapiro.*

[7] Staying Execution Pending Appeal

Although an award of attorney's fees authorized by contract, statute, or law is statutorily defined as costs [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(10)*], and a bond is not required to stay execution of a judgment solely for costs [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 917.1(d)*], an award of attorney's fees as sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* has been held to be more analogous to a judgment for money damages than a judgment for costs, so that it must be bonded to stay execution pending appeal [*Banks v. Manos (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 123, 128-129, 283 Cal. Rptr. 318* (holding *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(10)* reference to attorney's fees authorized by statute to be inapplicable because *Section 128.5* does not "routinely" authorize attorney's fees; decided before *Section 1033.5(a)(10)*; was amended to include attorney's fees when authorized by "law" as costs)]. If part of a judgment must be bonded, the judgment must be bonded in its entirety to stay execution pending appeal [*Banks v. Manos (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 123, 128-129, 283 Cal. Rptr. 318* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 917.1*]. Presumably, this rule applies to the award of sanctions under the other statutes or rules of court.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.21

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.21 Ethical Pitfalls Concerning Sanctions

It is an attorney's duty to maintain inviolate the confidence, and at every peril to the attorney preserve the secrets, of the client [*Bus. and Prof. Code § 6068(e)*]. In certain instances a court's decision whether to impose sanctions on the attorney, on the client, or both, may give rise to ethical, privilege, or conflict problems. Counsel may not be able to exonerate himself or herself without breaching the attorney-client privilege or his or her ethical obligation to the client [*see generally Wong v. Davidian (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 264, 271-272, 253 Cal. Rptr. 675* ; *Luke v. Baldwin-United Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 664, 668-670, 213 Cal. Rptr. 654]* . Recognizing this, it has been noted that to avoid placing counsel in an impossible conflict situation the better practice in most cases is for the court to sanction the client party and leave it up to the client and the attorney to thereafter work out between themselves the ultimate responsibility for the sanctions [*Wong v. Davidian (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 264, 272, 253 Cal. Rptr. 675]* .

When, however, the misconduct is solely that of the attorney, for example, failure to appear at a hearing, it has been noted that it is proper to sanction the attorney alone [*Wong v. Davidian (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 264, 272, 253 Cal. Rptr. 675]* .

A sanction award against counsel alone for filing a motion to quash, which was not utterly without merit when filed but was thereafter withdrawn, has been reversed when the court had no way to determine whether counsel or the client was to blame for filing the motion without invading the attorney-client privilege and the privilege prevented counsel from exonerating themselves [*Luke v. Baldwin-United Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 664, 668-670, 213 Cal. Rptr. 654* ; *compare Manzetti v. Superior Court (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 373, 381, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 857* (sanctions in Court of Appeal; attorney constrained by ethical obligation not to disclose communications with client accepted full responsibility for sanctions)].

On the other hand, an attorney does not have an ethical obligation to his or her client to commit perjury or to file knowingly frivolous or bad faith motions (or to otherwise engage in tactics that the attorney concludes are frivolous or breach the attorney's obligation to the legal system). If a client demands that an attorney engage in such conduct, the attorney has an obligation to withdraw from the case [*Young v. Rosenthal (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 96, 127-128, 260*

Cal. Rptr. 369 , cert. denied, 494 U.S. 1080 (1990) ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(c), (d)*; *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rules 3-700, 5-200*]. Under such circumstances, if the attorney does not withdraw the attorney does not face an ethical dilemma in that the attorney's obligation is to withdraw and an award of sanctions against the attorney is appropriate [*Young v. Rosenthal (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 96, 127-128, 260 Cal. Rptr. 369 , cert. denied, 494 U.S. 1080 (1990)]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.22

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.22 Duty to Notify State Bar of Imposition of Sanctions

An attorney against whom judicial sanctions are imposed, except sanctions for failure to make discovery or monetary sanctions of less than $1,000, must report this to the agency charged with attorney discipline. The report must be made in writing within 30 days of the time the attorney has knowledge of the imposition of the sanctions *Bus. and Prof. Code § 6068(o)(3)*].

Similarly, the court is required to notify the State Bar of the imposition of judicial sanctions, except sanctions for failure to make discovery or monetary sanctions for less than $1,000 [*Bus. and Prof. Code § 6086.7(a)(3)*]. The court must also notify the sanctioned attorney that the matter has been referred to the State Bar [*Bus. and Prof. Code § 6086.7(b)*]. The State Bar must investigate the matter to determine if initiating disciplinary proceedings against the attorney is appropriate [*Bus. and Prof. Code § 6086.7(c)*].

For further discussion of the attorney's duty to maintain confidences, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.30* et seq. For discussion of actions by an attorney exceeding the attorney's duty to zealously represent the client, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.270* et seq._____

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 510.23-510.39

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 510.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.40

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.40 California Points and Authorities

For memorandum in support of a motion to recover attorney's fees and other reasonable expenses under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 60, *Costs* , and Ch. 80, *Discovery* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.41

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.41 State Statutes

[1] General Authority for Sanctions

Sanctions for violation of signature and certification requirement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*

Money sanctions payable to county for violation of lawful court order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*

Sanctions for failure to comply with local rules promulgated under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.1*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2*

Appellate court sanctions when an appeal is frivolous or taken solely for delay. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 907, 1109*

Sanctions under the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) for violation of fast track rules. *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*

[2] Sanctions in Specific Actions

Reasonable attorney's fees and costs in connection with action for misappropriation of trade secrets. *Civ. Code § 3426.4*

Reasonable attorney's fees when appeal from small claims court not based on good faith. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790*

Sanctions, including attorney fees, against small claim judgment debtor for noncompliance concerning debtor asset form. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830*

Reasonable expenses and attorney's fees in making or resisting a motion to transfer an action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*

Sanctions based on bad faith affidavits in connection with a summary judgment motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(i)*

Evidence preclusion order for failure after a demand to deliver a timely account. *Code Civ. Proc. § 454*

Sanctions when court grants relief from a default, default judgment or dismissal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*

Sanctions for failure to appear at debtor examination. *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170*

Reasonable attorney's fees based on action against peace officer arising out of performance of peace officer's duties or against public entity employing officer, including action for libel or slander, when action not filed or maintained in good faith and with reasonable cause. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.7*

Reasonable litigation expenses in addition to other costs if small business or licensee prevails in any civil action over state regulatory agency if agency's action was taken without substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028.5*

Defense costs in civil proceedings under the California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*), or in civil proceedings for express or implied indemnity, or for contribution based on the proceeding not being brought in good faith or with reasonable cause. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038*

Sanctions concerning discovery and expert witnesses. See generally *Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010 et seq.*

Reasonable attorney's fees and court costs in proceeding brought by county to enforce child's right to support. Fam. Law § 4002

Sanctions concerning continuance of a hearing in a criminal proceeding. *Penal Code §§ 1050, 1050.5*

[3] Review of Sanctions

Appellate review of monetary sanctions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(11), (12), (b)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.42

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.42 California Rules of Court

Appellate court sanctions. *Cal Rules of Ct., Rules 8.276* (Supreme Court and courts of appeal) and 8.764 (superior court)

Sanctions for violation of Rules of Court. *Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.43

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.43 Decisions

[1] Amount of Award

Sanctions of large amount may be assessed when necessary to discourage party and party's attorney from pursuing totally baseless claims. *Simonian v. Patterson (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 773, 787, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 722*

Award of compensation for airfare and reimbursement for lost vacation is, under appropriate circumstances, item of reasonable expenses within meaning of *Cal. Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc. v. Sparks (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 299, 307-308, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371*

Term "expenses" in *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(a)* is not limited to costs and attorney's fees; sanctions award as capable of including other expenses, such as compensation for time spent by party's nonlegal employees in defending against action brought in bad faith. *580 Folsom Associates v. Prometheus Development Co. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1, 27-28, 272 Cal. Rptr. 227*

In awarding attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*, court is not bound in its determination by such traditional factors as hours consumed, statements mailed, results attained, and the like; court does not need expert testimony to make determination of reasonable fees award. *Dwyer v. Crocker National Bank (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1418, 1438, 240 Cal. Rptr. 297*

[2] Appellate Review

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in imposing sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* on law firm for acting in bad faith in pursuing litigation activities on behalf of corporate client suspended for failure to file statement required by *Corp. Code § 1502*, when although case law had not determined that suspension under *Corp. Code § 1502* for failure to file statement, rather than under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23301* for nonpayment of taxes, disqualified corporation from

exercising any powers including right to resort to courts in litigation, any reasonable attorney reviewing relevant statutes would entertain strong suspicion that client was disqualified from pursuing litigation activities and law firm chose to conceal its knowledge of suspension and probable disability of client from both court and opposing counsel; when firm's failure to recommend to client to file required statement supported inference that firm made no investigation at time it discovered client's suspended status and likely believed client was suspended for failure to pay taxes and willful concealment of suspension militated toward finding of bad faith; and when record supported conclusion that firm suspected client was disabled from litigation but deliberately concealed this fact from court and other parties and continued to litigate vigorously, even seeking summary proceedings to terminate case before client's suspended status was discovered, serving only to delay and avoid otherwise inevitable default judgment in absence of any acts by client to cure suspended status. *Palm Valley Homeowners Assn., Inc. v. Design MTC (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 553, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 350*

Party's failure to object to trial court's proposed sanctions award at trial constitutes waiver of objection and party may not later claim on appeal that order was deficient. *Andrus v. Estrada (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1043, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 300*

Order denying motion for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* is not appealable. *Wells Properties v. Popkin (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1055, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845*

Judgment including sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* must be bonded pending appeal. *Banks v. Manos (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 123, 128-129, 283 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Postjudgment order declining to award sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* is not appealable if it presents same issues as prior appeal from judgment or does not affect prior judgment. *Lubetzky v. Friedman (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 35, 45, 278 Cal. Rptr. 706*

[3] Change of Venue Motion

Sanction was proper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* against party for frivolously moving for change of venue. *Lieppman v. Lieber (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 914, 919, 225 Cal. Rptr. 845*

[4] Discretion of Trial Court

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in dismissing plaintiff's complaint as terminating sanction for deliberate and egregious misconduct after plaintiff (1) employed investigator who improperly entered areas of defendant's properties not accessible to public and trespassed onto document destruction firm's secure facility, and improperly took documents at those locations; (2) knew of investigator's illegal conduct or acted with deliberate indifference to whether investigator's conduct was legal; and (3) altered stolen documents with intent to mislead by creating false impression that documents were not confidential or that defendant had created confidential and nonconfidential sets of documents. *Stephen Slesinger, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 736, 757-776, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 268*

Trial court did not abuse its discretion in awarding monetary sanctions, including attorney's fees to defendant, against plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel for filing fourth amended complaint, when first-time assertion of fraud cause of action against decedent was precluded by previous orders striking all references to him from prior declaratory relief causes of action and failed to account for frivolousness of claim against deceased individual; when complaint contained misleading allegations regarding plaintiff's knowledge that decedent intended to withdraw his disclaimer of his transfer of partnership interest to plaintiff; and when, although plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel were assessed penalties under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*, more than half of sanctions at issue were awarded under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*, which specifically authorizes award of attorney's fees for sanctions motion itself, and rest of attorney fee sanctions were

admittedly authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(d)* and carefully limited by court, in relation to defendant's request for more than twice as much. *Eichenbaum v. Alon (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 967, 976-977, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*

Sanctions against party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* in conjunction with summary denial of party's motion was abuse of discretion when party's motion was absolutely meritorious as matter of law. *Optical Surplus, Inc. v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 776, 785, 279 Cal. Rptr. 194*

Trial court's refusal to award sanctions against plaintiff under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* was abuse of discretion when plaintiff engaged in trial tactics which any reasonable attorney would agree were totally devoid of merit, including the use of a void default judgment to obtain a writ of possession against defendant. *Park Magnolia v. Fields (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d Supp 1, 4-5, 236 Cal. Rptr. 900*

[5] Frivolous Defined

Action not frivolous due to lack of uniformity in case law. *Betz v. Pankow (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 931, 941, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841*

Mere absence of judicial construction does not by itself make all challenges arguably meritorious. *Bach v. McNelis (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 852, 878, 255 Cal. Rptr. 232*

[6] Interveners

Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5 sanctions are properly imposed when intervener files pleadings in action after intervener's right to appear in action has been terminated and intervener provides no discussion in pleadings of standing issue. *McFarland v. City of Sausalito (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 909, 911-912, 267 Cal. Rptr. 412*

[7] Nonappearance at Hearing

Bad faith failure of attorney to appear was adequate ground for imposition of sanctions against attorney under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *Wong v. Davidian (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 264, 271-272, 253 Cal. Rptr. 675*

[8] Notice and Reasons for Order Required

Procedural due process requires notice and opportunity to be heard before ordering award of fees as sanctions for frivolous action, and requires written statement of reasons in order imposing sanctions. *In re Marriage of Flaherty (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 637, 651-654, 183 Cal. Rptr. 508, 646 P.2d 179*

Notice and opportunity to be heard as requirements before sanctions can be imposed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *Eby v. Chaskin (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1049, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 517*

Trial court's award of sanctions against attorneys, in unreported status conference held in the judge's chambers, based on attorneys' alleged bickering, was improper when attorneys were not given notice of court's intent to impose sanctions and opportunity to be heard; indirect allusion by judge, made to only one of two attorneys, of possibility of sanctions award did not satisfy notice requirement; attorneys should have been provided with opportunity to explain, on record, their conduct before the court made its decision. *Barrientos v. City of Los Angeles (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 63, 71-72, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520*

Trial court's offer to strike order imposing sanctions on condition that parties settle constitutes an improper attempt to coerce settlement. *Barrientos v. City of Los Angeles (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 63, 71-72, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520*

Notice of motion or intent to dismiss and an opportunity to be heard are requirements before action can be dismissed under *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*. *Reid v. Balter (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1186, 1193, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 287*

Summary in minute order of court's reasons for imposing sanctions met requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *Olson Partnership v. Gaylord Plating Lab, Inc. (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 235, 240-241, 276 Cal. Rptr. 493*

Court was not required to provide a strict accounting of expenses when imposing sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *On v. Cow Hollow Properties (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1568, 1577, 272 Cal. Rptr. 535*

Imposition of sanction, whether imposed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*, which requires notice and opportunity to respond, or under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 227 [*now see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30*], which was silent on the issue, always requires procedural due process, i.e., notice, an opportunity to be heard and that order imposing sanctions state with particularity the basis for finding a violation of the rule. *Caldwell v. Samuels Jewelers (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 970, 976-977, 272 Cal. Rptr. 126*

Failure to raise issue of inadequate notice in trial court is waiver of any objection based on that ground; formal written signed order is requirement for imposition of sanctions; order making no direct reference to conduct of attorney was insufficient to justify imposition of sanctions against attorney. *Jansen Associates, Inc. v. Codercard, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1166, 1170-1171, 267 Cal. Rptr. 516*

Order imposing sanctions on attorney under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* based on grounds not asserted before its rendition constituted denial of due process when attorney had no adequate notice of or opportunity to respond to threat of sanctions. *In re Marriage of Quinlan (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1417, 1419, 1421-1422, 257 Cal. Rptr. 850*

Fair warning and an opportunity to be heard are required before sanctions may be imposed under local rule pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 572.2. *Annex British Cars, Inc. v. Parker-Rhodes (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 788, 792, 244 Cal. Rptr. 48*

Adequate notice is provided when sanctioned parties had knowledge for extended period of time that sanctions hearing was upcoming, knew that relevant subjects and categories of bad faith conduct would be examined at the hearing, and had ample opportunity to prepare for hearing. *Dwyer v. Crocker National Bank (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1418, 1437, 240 Cal. Rptr. 297*

Trial court's order imposing sanctions against plaintiff's counsel is reversible when defendant's written request for sanctions asked only for sanctions against plaintiffs; person against whom sanctions sought is entitled to actual notice of potential liability. *Staples v. Hoefke (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1397, 1418-1419, 235 Cal. Rptr. 165*

Order imposing sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* must include factual recital, with reasonable specificity, of circumstances that led court to impose sanctions; case remanded to trial court with order to draft new factual recital to replace conclusionary order. *Lieppman v. Lieber (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 914, 920-921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 845* ; *Lavine v. Hospital of the Good Samaritan (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 1019, 1028-1030, 215 Cal. Rptr. 708*

Notice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* is insufficient when expenses in defense were substantial and one or two days notice afforded plaintiff did not give him time to prepare declarations in support of his position. *Lesser v. Huntington Harbor Corp. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 922, 930-935, 219 Cal. Rptr. 562*

Order imposing sanctions is erroneous when attorney against whom sanctions were imposed was not given sufficient

notice that motion was directed against him and order failed to detail reasons for sanctions as required by former *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* (now *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(c)*). *Corralejo v. Quiroga (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 871, 873-874, 199 Cal. Rptr. 733*

Award of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* did not satisfy statutory requirements or due process when notice was telephonic, rather than written, hearing was ex parte, and order did not recite detailed justification for imposition of sanctions. *O'Brien v. Cseh (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 957, 962, 196 Cal. Rptr. 409*

[9] Persons Who May Seek Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7 Sanctions

Pro se litigant does not "incur" attorney's fees and therefore may not recover *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* sanctions in form of attorney's fees. *Musaelian v. Adams (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 512, 520, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 475, 198 P.3d 560*

[10] Refusing Settlement

Defendant's decision to insist on its constitutional right to jury trial rather than to settle case, even if failure to settle was motivated by ulterior and allegedly improper purposes, is not sanctionable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*. *Triplett v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1415, 1421-1422, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 741*

[11] Safe Harbor Provision of § 128.7

A ruling on the challenged motion during the safe harbor period precludes recovery of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*. Accordingly, the party seeking sanctions must move to continue the challenged motion or shorten the safe harbor period. *Li v. Majestic Industrial Hills LLC (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 585, 595, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 334*

Trial court did not lose authority to impose sanctions on plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* after plaintiff dismissed action with prejudice after defendant moved for sanctions, when plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel were given full latitude of the safe harbor period, which they ignored, and did not withdraw complaint, by dismissal, until after sanctions motion had been filed, argued, and submitted for decision. *Eichenbaum v. Alon (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 967, 974-976, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*

Trial court erred in vacating sanctions order and ruling that sustaining of demurrer eviscerated defendant's right to seek sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* because trial court no longer had jurisdiction, when defendant served motion to dismiss action as frivolous and for monetary sanctions and demurred to complaint, trial court sustained demurrer without leave to amend, defendant filed and again served motion for sanctions two days after ruling on demurrer, trial court granted motion, dismissed complaint and ordered sanctions against plaintiff's attorney, so that defendant had timely served motion for sanctions and waited until safe harbor period passed, and plaintiff's counsel's action in requesting extension, filing amended complaint, opposing demurrer and moving for relief from default and new trial after trial court sustained demurrer was completely unjustified, and when order sustaining demurrer without leave to amend does not bar motion for *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* sanctions unless order is reduced to judgment before sanctions motion is served and filed. *Banks v. Hathaway, Perrett, Webster, Powers & Chrisman (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 949, 954, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803*

In action by former husband against former wife for abuse of process and intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, alleging wife had falsely reported she was not receiving child support payments, trial court erred in awarding sanctions to wife under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, when wife's sanctions motion violated safe harbor provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*, since wife's motion filed in November 1998, which court granted, was not same motion as she had served in December 1997, since it was based on new evidence and different legal theories, and by

November 1998, husband had dismissed case. *Hart v. Avetoom (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 410, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 511*

Trial court properly imposed sanctions on insured for naming insurer's employee as cross defendant as cross defendant, when insured did not dispute that insurance employee cannot be sued for either breach of contract or breach of implied covenant of good faith, and where although insured dismissed employee less than 30 days after being served with insurer's motion to dismiss, insured did not serve insurer with notice of dismissal and insurer did not learn of dismissal until more than 30 days after insurer had served insured with motion requesting dismissal, which was four days after insurer had served court with sanctions motion and one day before hearing. *Liberty Mutual Fire Ins. Co. v. McKenzie (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 681, 689-692, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910*

[12] Violation of Court Order

Rules of Professional Conduct are not normally regarded as court orders of the type referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*. *Conservatorship of Becerra (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1482-1484, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 910*

Trial court erroneously sanctioned prosecutor under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* for discriminatory exercise of peremptory challenges to jurors, resulting in mistrial, because trial court did not order prosecutor not to violate constitution so that there was no court order on which to base sanction. *People v. Muhammad (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 313, 323-326, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308*

Trial court exercised its discretion in reasonable manner in imposing sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* against Board of Prison Terms in habeas corpus proceedings brought by life-term inmate to compensate county for unnecessary litigation, based on Board's violation of earlier court order requiring it to respond in timely manner to administrative appeals filed by life-term inmates, when inmate's petition for habeas corpus focused on Board's alleged violation of his due process rights by not answering his appeal, not on merits of his contention that he had right to be present at review hearing denying him parole, and asked court to set guidelines and time limits for Board to respond to life-term inmate appeals, and where hearing on petition was not inevitable and necessary, since if Board had timely responded to administrative appeal, it was by no means certain that inmate would have filed habeas corpus petition based solely on issue of whether he had legal right to be present at review hearing denying him parole or that court would have issued order to show cause requiring hearing to consider only that legal issue; further, even if hearing had been held solely on that issue, counsel and court would not have been required to consider factual circumstances surrounding Board's violation of underlying order. Further, on record, trial court could reasonably conclude Board violated underlying order without valid excuse, because Board's excuses of administrative error and backlog of appeals did not establish that Board had good cause or substantial justification for violating order. *In re Woodham (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 438, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431*

Trial court erroneously imposed sanctions on counsel under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* for violation of court order to give notice to opposing counsel of status conference, at which opposing counsel did not appear, by giving notice by mail instead of by personal service, when opposing counsel was personally served with summons and first amended complaint two days before status conference, which did not require appearance until 30 days after that service, so that even if opposing counsel had been personally served with notice of status conference, opposing counsel would not have been required to attend so that there was no proximate causation between failure to serve personally and opposing counsel's lack of attendance; and when notice of status conference required counsel to give notice to counsel of record or parties in *pro per*, and as of date of status conference, opposing counsel had not yet made formal appearance in action, so that counsel was under no duty to give notice of status conference. *Winikow v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 719, 726-727, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 413*

[13] Violation of Local Rule

Trial court properly imposed monetary sanction on counsel under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* for violation of Sacramento County Superior Court Rule 12.04 for failure to participate meaningfully in judicial arbitration, when counsel arrived 25 minutes late for arbitration, clients were not available, counsel failed to provide copies of complaint and answer and short arbitration brief to arbitrator as ordered by trial court, and counsel failed to produce evidence at arbitration, violating parts of local rule requiring attendance of those necessary to proceed to meaningful conclusion and production of evidence. *Rietveld v. Rosebud Storage Partners (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 250, 254-257, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 791*

[14] Writ Proceedings

Respondent against whom peremptory writ has issued as subject to sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* for knowingly taking action that is contrary to intent of writ. *Union Pacific R.R. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 138, 157-158, 260 Cal. Rptr. 565, 776 P.2d 267*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.44

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.44 Law Reviews

Robertson, Keeping the Faith at Settlement Conferences, *14 Los Angeles Lawyer 38 (November 1991)*

Woods, Sanctions-Stepchild or Natural Heir to Trial and Appellate Court Delay Reduction, *17 Pepperdine L. Rev. 665 (1990)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.45

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.45 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 7, *Trial*, § 239 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 510.46-510.59

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

[Reserved]

§§ 510.46[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.60

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.60 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SANCTIONS SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND MEMORANDUM
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____

of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*)] will move pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 128.7* for an order _____ [*specify sanction sought, e.g.,* awarding reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, in the amount of $_____, to be paid by _____ (*specify against whom the motion is directed, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney, _____ *name*)] [and awarding punitive damages, to be paid by plaintiff, _____ (*name*)]. The motion will be made on the ground that _____ [*describe specific conduct alleged to violate Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b), e.g.,* the motion made by plaintiff's attorney to disqualify defendant's attorney for a conflict of interest is devoid of any evidentiaty support, is not warranted by existing law or by the nonfrivolous argument for extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law and was interposed for primarily an improper purpose, i.e., to cause unnecessary delay and a needless increase in the cost of litigation].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Specify against whom the motion is directed, e.g.,* _____ (*Name*), attorney for plaintiff in this action], _____ [*state facts showing that Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b) has been violated, e.g.,* signed the notice of motion dated _____ (*date*) to disqualify the defendant's attorney for a conflict of interest. The motion was totally and completely without merit having no evidentiary support and was interposed for the purpose of harassing defendant, (*name*), and was solely intended to cause unnecessary delay and needless increase in the cost of the litigation in that _____ (*specify conduct, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney _____ (*name*) neither produced any evidence nor pointed to anything in the record in this action to support factually the motion to disqualify defendant's attorney for a conflict of interest; moreover, plaintiff's attorney _____ (name) admitted to the court that there is no statutory or case law supporting the motion)].

3. As a result of this conduct, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*),] has incurred attorney's fees in the sum of $_____, and other costs/expenses in the sum of $_____, as follows _____ [*itemize amount sought giving a detailed calculation showing that each was incurred as a result of the specified conduct*].

[4. _____ (*If appropriate, set forth facts establishing entitlement to punitive damages under Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(f), e.g.,* Defendant is entitled to recover punitive damages against plaintiff because plaintiff was convicted on _____ (*date*) of _____ (*specify felony, e.g,* voluntary manslaughter) against

_____ (*specify victim, e.g.,* _____ (*name*), the defendant's daughter), this action was for injuries arising from the acts for which plaintiff was convicted, and plaintiff is guilty of _____ (malice *and/or* fraud *and/or* oppression) in maintaining this action in that _____ (*specify circumstances indicating malice, fraud, or oppression*)).]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use to move for the imposition of sanctions for violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* authorizes the court to award monetary or other sanctions against the attorneys, law firms or parties that have violated *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* subject to the conditions specified in that section. Section 128.7 applies to a complaint or petition filed on or after January 1, 1995, and any other pleading, written notice of motion, or any other similar paper filed is such a matter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(i)*]. For discussion of the types of sanctions that the court may award, see *§ 510.12[18]*. For discussion of grounds and requirements for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, see *§ 510.12*.

With appropriate modifications, this notice of motion and supporting declaration may be used when the facts are such that other statutes or rules of court providing for monetary or other sanctions also apply. For examples of such other provisions, see *§§ 510.41*, *510.42*. For notices of motion for sanctions based on other authorities, see *§§ 510.62* and *510.64*.

[3] Punitive Damages

The notice of motion includes optional language for use when the moving party seeks to recover punitive damages under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(f)*, in addition to an award of sanctions for conduct violating *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)*. For discussion of when punitive damages are recoverable, see *§ 510.12[19]*. For general discussion of punitive damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

[4] Notice Requirements

A noticed motion for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* must be made separately from other motions or requests and must describe the specific conduct alleged to have violated *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*]. Local court rules and policies should be checked beforehand to ascertain if there are any local requirements.

Notice of motion must be served as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*. It cannot, however, be filed with or presented to the court unless within 21 days after service of the motion, or such other period as prescribed by the court, the challenged paper, claim, defense, contention, allegation, or denial is not withdrawn or appropriately corrected [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(c)(1)*; *see, e.g., Galleria Plus v. Hanmi Bank (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 535, 538, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d. 803* (motion that did not provide 21-day notice was defective)]. For further discussion, see *§ 510.12[20]*.

[5] Declaration

The supporting declaration must show facts within the personal knowledge of the declarant supporting the motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declaration in lieu of affidavit)]. The declaration should make an evidentiary showing of a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b)* and why the specific sanction sought is warranted. If a monetary sanction based on the movant's expenses and attorney's fees is sought, the declaration should state detailed facts showing the calculation.

[6] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion of memorandum of points and authorities and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[7] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 510.60, 510.62,* and *510.64*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.61

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.61 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*),] for an order to impose sanctions pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 128.7* on _____ [*specify against whom sanctions sought, e.g.,* _____ (*name*), attorney of record for _____ (status, e.g., plaintiff) _____ (*name*)], came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court, the court finds that an order granting the motion is justified in that _____ [*describe the conduct determined to violate Code Civ. Proc. Section 128.7 and the basis for the sanctions imposed]. Accordingly,*

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted in favor of _____ [specify moving

party, e.g., defendant, _____ (*name*),] and that [*specify sanction imposed, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*), is awarded the sum of $_____ for his/her attorney's fees and expenses, and _____ (*specify party and/or party's attorney against whom order is directed, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney, _____ (*name*), is ordered to pay _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant) this sum within _____ (*specify time period, e.g.,* 30 days).]

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant), _____ (*name*), is awarded punitive damages in the sum of $_____, and plaintiff, (name), is ordered to pay _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant), _____ (*name*), this sum within _____ (*specify time period, e.g.,* 30 days)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when a motion to impose sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* is granted. Local rules or policies may require that a proposed order be served and lodged with the motion [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.17 (requirement for proposed order in separate blueback not attached to moving papers)].

[3] Content of Order

When imposing sanctions, the court must describe the conduct determined to constitute a violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* and explain the basis for the sanction imposed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(e)*].

[4] Cross Reference

See also *§ 510.63* and *510.65*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.62

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.62 Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[*Caption. See § 510.60.*]

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*),] will move for an order pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 177.5* requiring _____ [*identify witness, party, attorney to be sanctioned, e.g.,* plaintiff, _____ (*name*),] to pay $_____ [*specify amount not to exceed $1,500*] to the County of _____ as a sanction. The motion will be made on the ground that _____ [*name of person to be sanctioned] violated this court's lawful order dated* _____ *[set forth order, violation of which is the basis of the sanctions*].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [*specify violated order*], of which this court is requested to take judicial notice pursuant to the provisions of *Evidence Code Section 452, subdivision (d)* and *Section 453*, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*)

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Specify person against whom the motion is directed, e.g.*, _____ (*Name*), plaintiff in this action], _____ [*state facts showing that the person to be sanctioned violated a lawful order of the court*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by a party who seeks to have the court impose monetary sanctions on a witness, party, or attorney who has violated a court order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*]. The sanction is not available in regard to counsel's advocacy before the court. The maximum amount of the sanction is $1500, and it is payable to the county [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*].

With appropriate modifications, this notice of motion and supporting declaration may be used when other statutes or rules of court providing for monetary or other sanctions also apply. For examples of such other provisions, see *§§ 510.41, 510.42*. See also *§§ 510.60* and *510.64*.

A separate noticed motion for sanctions is not required so long as notice is contained in the party's moving or responding papers [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*]. Consequently, this form may be modified for inclusion in such other papers. Local court rules and policies should be checked beforehand, however, to ascertain if there are any local requirements in this or any other regard.

A memorandum is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion of memoranda and forms, see Ch. 417, *PoInts and Authorities* .

For discussion of grounds and procedural requirements for sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*, see *§ 510.13*.

[3] Judicial Notice

The form includes a request that the court take judicial notice of the order claimed to have been violated. Check local rules for any special requirements regarding how to bring a court file to the court's notice [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.2(b) (requiring separate document requesting clerk to order delivery of the file for the hearing)].

[4] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 510.60, 510.63,* 510.65.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.63

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.63 Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Monetary Sanction for Violation of Court Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5]--Order Granting Motion

[*Caption. See 510.61*]

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*),] for an order to impose monetary sanctions pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 177.5* on _____ [*specify person to be sanctioned, e.g.,* _____ (*status, e.g.,* plaintiff) _____ (*name*)], came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court, the court finds that an order granting the motion is justified in that _____ [*recite in detail the violation of the court's order justifying the impostion of sanctions*]. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that _____ [*specify person against whom order is directed, e.g.,* plaintiff, _____ (*name*),] is ordered to pay _____ [*specify county*] $_____ within _____ [*specify time period, e.g.,* 30 days].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when a motion to impose a monetary sanction of up to $1500 payable to the county for violation of a lawful court order is granted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*]. This form of order can be modified when a sanction motion is also based on other statutes or rules of court providing for other sanctions and the motion is granted.

[3] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 510.63, 510.65*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.64

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.64 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration

[*Caption. See § 510.60.*]

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*),] will move for an order pursuant to _____ [*specify appropriate statutes, California Rules of Court and local rules authorizing sanctions*] _____ [imposing a monetary sanction in the amount of $_____ to be paid by _____ (*specify party and/or attorney to be sanctioned) or specify other sanction sought, e.g.,* dismissing this action]. The motion will be made on the ground that _____ [*specify grounds, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney has repeatedly failed to meet trial court delay reduction deadlines in this case contained in _____ (*specify local rule*) despite prior orders imposing monetary sanctions].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*)

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Specify facts supporting imposition of the sanction requested*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by a party who seeks to to have the court impose sanctions on a party or attorney who has violated local court rules [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2*; *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2 provides general authority for the court to enforce local rules with sanctions [for discussion, *see § 510.14*]; *Gov. Code § 68608(b)* specifically authorizes sanctions to enforce local trial court delay reduction (fast track) rules [for discussion, *see § 510.15*]. For discussion of the relationship of these statutes and potential conflict between them as to what sanctions may be appropriate, see *§ 510.16* .

With appropriate modifications, this notice of motion and supporting declaration may be used when other statutes or rules of court providing for monetary or other sanctions also apply. For examples of such other provisions, see *§ 510.41* .

Local court rules and policies should be checked beforehand to ascertain if there are any local requirements concerning the motion.

[3] Declaration

If a monetary sanction based on the movant's expenses and attorney's fees is sought, the declaration should state detailed facts showing the calculation. If more severe sanctions, such as dismissal, are sought, the declaration should state facts showing repeated lack of compliance with local rule requirements and the ineffectiveness of lesser sanctions previously imposed in the case [*Sigala v. Anaheim City School Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 661, 673-674, 19 Cal Rptr. 2d 38* ;

Intel Corp. v. USAIR, Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1565-1568, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569] .

[4] Supporting Memorandum

A memorandum is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion of memoranda and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[5] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 510.60, 510.62*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 510 SANCTIONS
PART IV. FORMS

44-510 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 510.65

AUTHOR: Hon. Anita Rae Shapiro Editorial Consultant

§ 510.65 Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings to Impose Sanctions for Violation of Local Court Rule [Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2; Gov. Code § 68608(b)]--Order Granting Motion

[*Caption. See § 510.61]*

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*)] for an order to impose sanctions pursuant to _____ [*specify, e.g., Government Code Section 68608(b)*] on _____ [*specify person to be sanctioned, e.g.,* _____ (*status, e.g.,* plaintiff) _____ (*name*)], came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court, the court finds that an order granting the motion is justified in that _____ [*recite in detail the conduct or circumstances justifying imposition of sanction ordered*]. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that _____ [_____ (*specify person against whom order is directed, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney, _____ (*name*),) is ordered to pay _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant, (name),) $_____ within _____ (*specify time period, e.g., 30 days*) *or specify other sanction being imposed*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when the court grants a motion to impose a monetary sanction for violation of local court rules, as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* and/or *Gov. Code 68608(b)*. This form of order can be modified when a sanction motion is also based on other statutes or rules of court and the motion is granted.

[3] Cross Reference

See also *§§ 510.60, 510.63*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 511.syn

§ 511.syn Synopsis to Chapter 511: SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS

§ 511.01 Scope of Chapter

§§ 511.03-511.09 [Reserved]

§ 511.10 Governing Statutes

§ 511.11 Garbage Disposal Districts

§ 511.12 Community Facilities Improvement Districts

[1] Formation

[2] Powers

§ 511.13 County Sanitation Districts

§ 511.14 Sewer Maintenance Districts

§ 511.15 Sanitary Districts

[1] Formation

[2] Powers

[3] Construction Contracts

[4] Liability for Damages

§ 511.16 Garbage and Refuse Disposal, Rural Sewer, County Sewerage and Water, Joint Municipal Sewage Disposal, and Regional Sewage Disposal Districts

§ 511.17 Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

[1] Actions to Determine Validity of Bonds

[2] Actions to Determine Validity of Fees and Charges for Sewer or Water Connection

[3] Proceedings to Compel Performance of Ministerial Duty

[4] Liability for Torts

[5] Liability for Contracts

[6] Claims Statutes

[7] Venue of Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

[8] Statute of Limitations on Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

§§ 511.18-511.29 [Reserved]

§ 511.30 State Statutes

[1] Claims of Laborers and Suppliers

[2] Elections

[3] Provisions Governing Districts Generally

[4] Recyclable Materials

[5] Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

[6] Sanitation and Sewerage Systems, Projects, Zones

[7] Solid Waste

[8] Termination of Service

§ 511.31 Decisions

§ 511.32 Text References

§§ 511.33-511.49 [Reserved]

§ 511.50 Allegation of Capacity--District as Plaintiff or Defendant [Gov. Code § 945]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Legal Capacity of Districts

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 511.51 Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Issuance of Improvement Bonds and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526]--By Property Owner Against Sanitary District

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Certification re Notice

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Parties

[8] Statute of Limitations

[9] Consolidation

[10] Preference

[11] Costs

[12] Judgment; Inapplicability of Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473, 473.5

[13] Dismissal

[14] Appeal

[15] State Statutes

[16] Decisions

[a] Injunctive Relief

[b] Relief Denied

[17] Text References

[18] Cross References

§ 511.52 Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 49167] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ.

Proc. §§ 860-870] Against County Sanitation District [Health & Safety Code § 4701], County Sewerage and Water District [former Health & Safety Code § 5501] or Garbage and Refuse Disposal District [Health & Safety Code § 49100]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] In Action Against County Sanitation District

[b] In Action Against County Sewerage and Water District

[c] In Action Against Garbage and Refuse Disposal District

[3] State Statutes

[a] County Sanitation Districts

[b] County Sewerage and Water Districts

[c] Garbage and Refuse Disposal Districts

[4] Cross References

§ 511.53 Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 4994] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870] Against Sewer Maintenance District [Health & Safety Code § 4951]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 511.54 Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Ordinance, Resolution, or Motion Adopting or Modifying Fee or Service Charge for Sewer or Water Connection [Gov. Code § 66022]--By Property Owner Against Local Agency

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART I. SCOPE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.01

§ 511.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses garbage disposal; community facilities; county sanitation; sewer maintenance; sanitary, garbage, and refuse disposal; rural sewer, county sewerage and water, and joint municipal sewage disposal districts. It contains a form of complaint against a sanitary district seeking injunctive and declaratory relief and the invalidation of bonds [*see § 511.51*], as well as forms of allegations for use in validating proceedings against other districts discussed in this chapter [*see § 511.51, 511.53*]. Also included is a form for use in alleging the capacity of the districts discussed in this chapter in actions in which such districts are named as parties [*see § 511.50*], and a form of complaint to invalidate an ordinance, resolution, or motion pertaining to fees or charges for sewer or water connections [*see § 511.54*].

For a discussion of and forms for use in actions against governmental entities generally, including tort claims and taxpayers' actions, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* . For a discussion of and forms for use in actions against related types of districts, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation* .

For a discussion of the liability of a utility for damages resulting from the utility's failure to commence service connection or repair within a specified period pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1722(c)*, see Ch. 545, *Telephone and Telegraph Communication* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART I. SCOPE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 511.03-511.09

[Reserved]

§§ 511.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.10

§ 511.10 Governing Statutes

The Health and Safety and Public Contract Codes contain provisions for the organization of garbage disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49000 et seq.], community facilities improvement districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4600 et seq.*], county sanitation districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4700 et seq.*], sewer maintenance districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4860 et seq.*], sanitary districts [*Health & Safety Code § 6400 et seq.*; *Pub. Contract Code § 20800 et seq.*], garbage and refuse disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49100 et seq.], rural sewer districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5500 et seq.*], joint municipal sewage disposal districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5700 et seq.*], and regional sewage disposal districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5900 et seq.*]. The foregoing provisions cited as "former" Health and Safety Code sections continue to govern the entities created or organized by those statutes [*see* Stats. 1959, ch. 1309; *see also § 511.16*].

Additionally, the Government and Public Contract Codes provide for the creation and regulation of joint sanitation projects [*Gov. Code § 55000 et seq.*], joint projects for sanitation and electrical lines [*Gov. Code § 55300 et seq.*], and community services districts [*Gov. Code § 61000 et seq.*; *Pub. Contract Code § 20680 et seq.*]. Procedure for the organization, operation, and government of districts is set forth in *Gov. Code § 58000 et seq.* Authority and procedure for changes of organization of districts appears in the Cortese Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985 (*Gov. Code § 56000 et seq.*).

Counties and cities are also empowered to make and enforce within their limits all sanitary ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws [*Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7*]. A city's legislative body may construct, establish, and maintain drains and sewers [*Gov. Code § 38900*], and, whenever the public interest or convenience requires, the legislative body of any municipality may acquire or install certain sanitary and sewerage works or improvements [*Sts. & Hy. Code § 10102*]. However, if the jurisdictions of a district and a municipality overlap, the operations of sanitation and sewerage districts, which are created by state law, are a matter of state rather than municipal concern, and provisions of state law control over municipal charters [*Jarvis v. Los Angeles (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 834, 837, 136 Cal. Rptr. 843* ; *see also Home Gardens Sanitary Dist. v. City of Corona (2001) 96 Cal. App. 4th 87, 91, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.11

§ 511.11 Garbage Disposal Districts

A garbage disposal district may be formed by election of the voters registered in the proposed district after the board of supervisors has determined that a portion of the county is in need of facilities for the disposal of garbage and that a district should be formed for that purpose [Health & Safety Code §§ 49006, 49010]. The district is given certain powers [*Health & Safety Code § 4121 et seq.*], including the right to enter into contracts for the disposal of garbage and other refuse matter [Health & Safety Code § 49019] and to levy and collect taxes [Health & Safety Code § 49030].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.12

§ 511.12 Community Facilities Improvement Districts

[1] Formation

Community facilities improvement districts are governed by the Community Facilities Law [*Health & Safety Code § 4601 et seq.*]. Such districts may be formed by the governing body of any city whenever in its judgment, after public hearing, the district is necessary or convenient for any improvement authorized by such law [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4605, 4609(d)*]. Improvements include, but are not limited to, the acquisition or construction of sanitary sewers of all types, the acquisition or construction of sewage treatment plants, works, or systems, and other related projects [*see Health & Safety Code § 4602.4*].

[2] Powers

The districts are given the power to levy and collect taxes and to issue bonds [*Health & Safety Code § 4614.13*]. A city may enter into contracts for the construction of any improvement for the district, including the acquisition of any property which the improvement includes, or a city may itself construct or complete the improvement [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4627, 4634*]. In addition, a city may require the owners of property within a district to pay a reasonable fee for connecting to any sanitary sewer improvement acquired or constructed pursuant to the Community Facilities Law [*Health & Safety Code § 4640.6*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.13

§ 511.13 County Sanitation Districts

County sanitation districts are governed by the County Sanitation District Act [*Health & Safety Code § 4700 et seq.*]. The district may employ persons needed to effect its powers, to acquire property, to enter into contracts, to issue bonds, and to levy and collect taxes, among other things [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4739, 4740, 4742.1, 4742.3, 4742.5, 4746, 4747*].

Under *Health & Safety Code § 4744*, which gives a county sanitation district the right to sell or otherwise dispose of any water, sewage effluent, or fertilizer resulting from the operations of the sewage system, a sanitation district has a right to sell sewage effluent without the consent of a water district to private persons, firms, or corporations for treatment and processing with the resulting product of purified water to be used in steam-flooding operations [*Taft v. West Kern County Water Dist. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 291, 297-298, 68 Cal. Rptr. 675]* .

The Local Agency Public Construction Act [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20100 et seq.*] governs construction contracts of county sanitation districts [*Pub. Contract Code § 20780*]. Specific provisions of the Act apply to construction contracts of county sanitation districts [*Pub. Contract Code § 20780*]. Under the applicable provision requiring award of bids to the highest qualified bidder [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20783*], a lease of pasture owned by a sanitation district for purposes of dispose of reclaimed municipal water in a fashion which, absent the agreement, the district would perform, constitutes a public work subject to the bid requirements [*Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1369, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458]* . The term "responsible" refers not only to the attribute of trustworthiness, but also to the quality, fitness and capacity of the bidder to perform the proposed agreement satisfactorily [*Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1368, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458* (ordering district to determine whether highest bidder was qualified)].

The district must make the initial determination whether a bidder is qualified [*Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1369, 1370, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458]* . Before a contract may be awarded to one other than the lowest (or highest) bidder, the public body must [*Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1369, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458]* :

- Notify that bidder of any evidence reflecting upon the bidder's responsibility received from others or

adduced as a result of independent investigation,

- Afford the bidder an opportunity to rebut such adverse evidence, and
- Permit the bidder to present evidence of qualification.

A mere statement that the district suggested that the bidder may have been qualified to operate the property is insufficient to satisfy the requirement that the bidder be found qualified [*Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1370, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.14

§ 511.14 Sewer Maintenance Districts

Any portion of the territory of a county, whether incorporated or unincorporated, in which lateral or collecting sanitary sewers have been installed and in which no provisions have been made to maintain or repair such sewers, may be formed into a sewer maintenance district on the determination of the board of supervisors of a county after a public hearing [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4870-4872*]. Such a district may become a part of a county sanitation district if the board of supervisors determines that it is in the best interests of the district [*Health & Safety Code § 4879*]. Sewer maintenance districts may acquire and dispose of property, enter into contracts for the purpose of carrying out certain of their purposes, issue bonds, and levy and collect taxes [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4886, 4887, 4888, 4891, 5002*]. A sewer maintenance district may also contract with other governmental entities for the joint construction or operation of facilities [*Pub. Contract Code § 20790 et seq.*]. The Local Agency Public Construction Act [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20100 et seq.*] governs construction contracts of sewer maintenance districts [*Pub. Contract Code § 20101*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.15

§ 511.15 Sanitary Districts

[1] Formation

A sanitary district may be formed on the petition of 25 persons in the county or counties involved who are residents and freeholders in the proposed district [*Health & Safety Code §§ 6420, 6422*]. The petition is presented to the board of supervisors, which holds a public hearing and schedules an election on the issue of formation [*Health & Safety Code §§ 6420, 6440, 6446(b)*; *Stumpf v. Board of Supervisors (1901) 131 Cal 364, 368, 63 P 663* (failure to adhere to requirements for notice of election to create district renders election void); *Andresen v. Board of Supervisors (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 436, 442, 45 Cal. Rptr. 306* (sanitary district is not formed until it is favorably acted on by electors of proposed district)]. If a majority of the votes cast in each county are in favor of formation, the board of supervisors orders that a district of the name and with the boundaries stated in the order calling the election has been established [*see Health & Safety Code § 6465*]. A vote in favor of formation entails an election of the persons who will comprise the governing board of the district [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 6463, 6464*]. The supervisors' order establishing the district is conclusive evidence of, among other things, the existence and validity of the district [*see Health & Safety Code § 6465*].

[2] Powers

The full range of the sanitary district's powers is set forth in *Health and Safety Code § 6510 et seq.* These powers include the district's ability to acquire, to construct, to operate, and otherwise to become involved with garbage dump sites, garbage collection and disposal systems, sewers, drains, septic tanks, and other sanitary and water systems, as the board deems necessary and proper [*see Health & Safety Code § 6512(a)*]. Additionally, the district may acquire, lease, and dispose of property, and make and accept contracts [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 6514, 6514.1, 6515*]. The district is also empowered to collect charges for its services and facilities [*see Health & Safety Code § 6520.5*], and to certify to the county board of supervisors and the county auditor a statement of any delinquent and unpaid charges for services requested by a property owner. The amount of these charges that remains delinquent and unpaid for a period of 60 days or more becomes a part of the annual taxes next levied on the property and becomes a lien on the property in the same manner as a tax lien [*see Health & Safety Code § 6520.10*; *see also Health & Safety Code §§ 6520.11-6520.12*].

A sanitary district is a "similar public corporation" for purposes of *Cal. Const., art. I, § 14*, which gives those entities

the power to take the immediate possession and use of an easement or right of way sought to be condemned for purposes for which the district is empowered to undertake by *Health & Safety Code § 6512* [*Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 845, 849, 215 P.2d 462* ; for discussion of condemnation generally, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain*].

A sanitary district is allowed not only to construct its sewers in any public street [*Health & Safety Code § 6518*], but also to compel all residents and property owners in the district to connect their houses and habitations and structures requiring sewerage disposal service with the sewers [*Health & Safety Code § 6520*; *Galeb v. Cupertino Sanitary Dist. (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 294, 304-305, 38 Cal. Rptr. 580* (dedicator of right of way to which sanitary district had access was not entitled to compensation upon compulsory connection to sanitary district's service); *see Home Gardens Sanitary District v. City of Corona (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 87, 94, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638]* . Where a sanitary district decides to exercise exclusive jurisdiction, the district's jurisdiction to provide sanitary services to the territory of its district is exclusive [*Home Gardens Sanitary Dist. v. City of Corona (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 87, 95, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638* (sanitary district exercised its jurisdiction exclusively); *Rodeo Sanitary Dist. v. Board of Supervisors (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1443, 1447, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601]* .

By the same token, a sanitary district may reserve to itself the exclusive right, through its own agents or employees, to collect garbage within its limits [*Health & Safety Code § 6518.5*; *In re Sozzi (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 304, 306, 129 P.2d 40* (private party had to right to engage in business of garbage collection where sanitary district had exercised exclusive right to collect garbage)].

A city has the power to require a sanitation district to obtain a permit before excavating city streets and that City has the power to impose reasonable restrictions upon the excavation. However, a city may not attempt to require a sanitary district to amend its regulations to provide for a new procedure for the issuance of wastewater discharge permits, because such an attempt constitutes a usurpation of power that the Legislature vested exclusively in the board of the district [*West Bay Sanitary Dist. v. City of East Palo Alto (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1507, 1511, 237 Cal. Rptr. 245]* . In fact, a city may not use its general police power to override a district's authority to provide sewer service [*Home Gardens Sanitary District v. City of Corona (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 87, 91, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638* (court enjoined city from annexing land within sanitary district and imposing restrictions on property owners' ability to connect to district's sewers)]. The same rule applies to counties [*Rodeo Sanitary Dist. v. Board of Supervisors (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1443, 1447, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601* (*Pub. Res. Code § 40059* does not mandate otherwise)].

An improvement district may be formed within a sanitary district to undertake any project for the sanitary district that is of special benefit to the area of the improvement district projects [*Health & Safety Code §§ 6550.1, 6550.10, 6550.12, 6550.13*].

A sanitary district may become a part of a county sanitation district if the board of supervisors determines, after a hearing, that it is in the best interests of the district [*Health & Safety Code § 6524*]. A sanitary district may also issue bonds and assess, levy, and collect taxes for a variety of purposes [*Health & Safety Code §§ 6640, 6697*].

A sanitary district may also contract with other governmental entities for the joint construction or operation of facilities [*Health & Safety Code § 6823*]. Under this statutory authorization, a sanitary district does not have the contractual power to grant a preference in limited disposal capacity to entities outside the district who are not ready to use the capacity when such preference inhibits service to members of the district who have a current need for such service [*Trimont Land Co. v. Truckee Sanitary Dist. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 330, 350-351, 193 Cal. Rptr. 568* (clause in contract between sanitary district and outside resort developer was ultra vires and void to the extent it purported to grant perpetual guarantee of disposal capacity to outside development during shortage)].

[3] Construction Contracts

The Local Agency Public Construction Act [*see Pub. Contract Code § 20100 et seq.*] governs construction contracts of sanitary districts [*Pub. Contract Code § 20101*]. Specific provisions of the Act apply to construction contracts of sanitary districts [*Pub. Contract Code § 20800*]. They apply to any construction, reconstruction, alteration, enlargement, renewal, or replacement of sewer facilities which the district is authorized to do, including, but not limited to, the furnishing of supplies or materials for any such work [*Pub. Contract Code § 20801*]. When the expenditure required for a subject project exceeds fifteen thousand dollars, it must be contracted for and let to the lowest responsible bidder after notice [*Pub. Contract Code § 20803*]. The "lowest responsible bidder" requirements must be followed even if the expenditure for a public work is not made from the district's treasury [*East Bay Garbage Co. v. Washington Township Sanitation Co. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 708, 713, 344 P.2d 289* (contract calling for direct payments from customers to contractor was subject to bidding requirements)].

The request for bids must constitute proper notice [see *Pub. Contract Code § 20804*]. A contract with a sanitary district may be adjudged null and void because the bidding process did not comply with the notice requirements, such as for the failure to advertise the notice at least twice [*East Bay Garbage Co. v. Washington Township Sanitation Co. (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 708, 714, 344 P.2d 289* (contract awarded after only one publication of notice was void under prior similar statute requiring at least two publications of notice)].

Bids must be accompanied by proper security [*Pub. Contract Code § 20804.5*]. The district board has discretion to reject any bids presented and readvertise. If two or more bids are the same and the lowest, the district board may accept the one it chooses. If no bids are received, the district board may have the project done without further complying with this article [Pub. Contract Code § 2080]. Likewise, if the original contractor's contract is terminated, the district does not have to re-notice the contract for the completion of the original contract [*Shore v. Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 465, 469, 25 Cal. Rptr. 419* (decided under prior similar statute)].

For discussion of public works contracts, see *Ch. 481, Public Works, § 481.10* et seq.

[4] Liability for Damages

A sanitary district is liable for creating and maintaining a nuisance [*Mulloy v. Sharp Park Sanitary Dist. (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 438, 441, 330 P.2d 441* ; *Ambrosini v. Alisal Sanitary Dist. (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728-729, 317 P.2d 33]* and negligence [*Mulloy v. Sharp Park Sanitary Dist. (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 438, 441, 330 P.2d 441* (failure to inspect sewer pipes)].

As a municipal corporation, a sanitary district may be liable for inverse condemnation arising from damage caused by the district's acts in pursuit of a public purpose, such as overflow from an outflow pipe [*Ambrosini v. Alisal Sanitary Dist. (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728-731, 317 P.2d 33* (damage award affirmed)]. However, the sanitary district may seek indemnity from a contractor responsible for defective construction of an outflow pipe causing damage to a third party's property where the district reasonably relied upon representations by the contractor that it adhered to the construction standards set forth n the contract [*Alisal Sanitary Dist. v. Kennedy (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 69, 82, 4 Cal. Rptr. 379]* .

For discussion of inverse condemnation generally, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* . For discussion of inverse condemnation generally, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.16

§ 511.16 Garbage and Refuse Disposal, Rural Sewer, County Sewerage and Water, Joint Municipal Sewage Disposal, and Regional Sewage Disposal Districts

The formation of garbage and refuse disposal districts, as the site for disposal of garbage and refuse, has not been authorized since October 1, 1961 [Health & Safety Code §§ 49111, 49118]. However, the statutes governing the powers, duties, and other aspects of existing garbage and refuse disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49120 et seq.] remain in effect.

The statutes authorizing creation and organization of rural sewer districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 4659 et seq.*], county sewerage and water districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5500 et seq.*], joint municipal sewage disposal districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5700 et seq.*], and regional sewage disposal districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 5900 et seq.*] were repealed effective September 18, 1959 [Stats. 1959, ch. 1309]. Notwithstanding the repeal, however, the existence, organization, and powers of any district created by or organized pursuant to those statutes remains unaffected and continues to be governed by those statutes [Stats. 1959, ch. 1309].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.17

§ 511.17 Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

[1] Actions to Determine Validity of Bonds

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870 authorize any public agency or interested person to bring an action to determine the validity of any matter which under any other law is authorized to be determined pursuant to these sections [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860, 863*]. The Health and Safety Code specifically authorizes such validating actions to determine the validity of any bonds issued by community facilities improvement districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4624*], county sanitation districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4803*; *see § 511.52*], sewer maintenance districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4996*; *see § 511.53*], and sanitary districts [*Health & Safety Code § 6653*; *see § 511.51*]. Additionally, the Health and Safety Code specifically authorizes actions to determine the validity of bonds issued by county sewerage and water districts [former Health & Safety Code § 5587; *see § 511.52*], joint municipal disposal districts [former Health & Safety Code § 5830], and regional sewage disposal districts [former Health & Safety Code § 6071]. It is not clear, however, if *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* apply to such actions, since these Health and Safety Code provisions, all of which still apply to districts formed prior to 1960 [*see* Stats. 1959, ch. 1309], were repealed prior to the enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.* in 1961. Similarly, Health & Safety Code § 49167, authorizing validating proceedings against garbage and refuse disposal districts, the formation of which has not been authorized since October 1961 [Health & Safety Code § 49118], does not refer to *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.* Therefore, the procedures set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.* may not apply to an action under Health & Safety Code § 49167. For further discussion of the applicability of *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.*, see *§§ 511.51 -511.53*.

There is no statutory authority for validating proceedings against garbage disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49000], although such districts are empowered to issue bonds and levy taxes in the same manner as garbage and refuse disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49017]. Nor are validating proceedings authorized against rural sewer districts [former *Health & Safety Code § 4659*], which are empowered to levy and collect taxes [former Health & Safety Code § 4665], but not to issue bonds.

Validating proceedings may also be brought to determine the legality of the existence of a district governed by the District Organization Law (*Gov. Code § 58000 et seq.*) [*Gov. Code § 58200*].

The aforementioned general laws may not apply to a sewer district created by special law, where the general law is permissive and the special law is mandatory [*Fairfield-Suisun Sewer Dist. v. Hutcheon (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 502, 507-508, 294 P.2d 102* (approval of bond election under terms of special law affirmed)].

Mandate is a proper remedy to require a district clerk to publish and mail a notice of sale of sewer district bonds [*Fairfield-Suisun Sewer Dist. v. Hutcheon (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 502, 504, 294 P.2d 102]* .

[2] Actions to Determine Validity of Fees and Charges for Sewer or Water Connection

Fees charged by a local agency for a sewer or water connection must not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee charged in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two thirds of those electors voting on the issue [*Gov. Code § 66013(a)*]. A local agency must hold a public meeting according to specified procedures prior to levying a new fee or service charge, or prior to approving an increase in an existing fee or service charge [*see Gov. Code § 66016(a)*], and can levy or approve the fees or charges only by ordinance or resolution [*see Gov. Code § 66016(b)*]. The term "local agency" means a county, general law or charter city, city and county, school district, special district, authority, agency, any other municipal public corporation or district, or other political subdivision of California [*Gov. Code §§ 66000(c), 66013(b)(4)*].

Any person may request an audit to determine whether the fees levied by a local agency exceed the amount reasonably necessary to cover the cost of any product or service provided by the local agency. If a request is made, the legislative body of the local agency may retain an independent auditor to determine whether the fees are reasonable, and the costs of the audit may be recovered from the person who made the request [*Gov. Code § 66023(a),(b)*].

A local agency or interested person may bring a judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul an ordinance, resolution, or motion adopting a new fee or service charge or modifying or amending an existing fee or service charge for a sewer or water connection. An action may also be brought to attack an ordinance, resolution, or motion providing for an automatic adjustment in a fee or service charge for a sewer or water connection that results in an increase in the fee or charge [*see Gov. Code §§ 66013, 66016, 66022*]. These actions by a local agency or interested person must be brought pursuant to the provisions governing validating proceedings contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 66022(b*); *see Barratt Am., Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 685, 704, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149, 124 P. 3d 719* ; *§ 511.54*; *Barratt American, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 685, 704-705, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149, 124 P. 3d 719]* .

Rates fixed by a lawful local agency for sewer or water service are presumed to be reasonable, fair, and lawful, and the burden of overcoming this presumption is on the party challenging the rates [*see Winnaman v. Cambria Community Services Dist. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 49, 54, 256 Cal. Rptr. 40]* .

[3] Proceedings to Compel Performance of Ministerial Duty

A writ of mandate may be sought to compel a sanitation or sewerage district or its officers to perform a ministerial duty [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Rogers v. Detrich (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 90, 104, 128 Cal. Rptr. 261]* . For example, such proceedings may be brought to compel the publication of notice of the sale of improvement bonds [*Solvang Mun. Improvement Dist. v. Jensen (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 237, 238, 244 P.2d 492]* , to compel a county auditor to pay a valid judgment against a county sanitation district for bond interest [*Mitchell v. County Sanitation Dist. (1957)150 Cal. App. 2d 366, 370, 309 P.2d 930]* , or to compel a district to levy assessments to pay its bonds and interest thereon [*May v. Board of Directors (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 125, 129-136, 208 P.2d 661* ; *see Health & Safety Code §§ 5042, 5055*]. Mandate is not proper, however, to restrain the levy and collection of assessments, because it conflicts with the principle of withholding judicial restraints on tax levies when adequate remedies at law, such as validating proceedings, are available to test the validity of bonds and assessments [*Water Users Assn. v. Board of Directors (1973) 34 Cal.*

App. 3d 131, 135, 109 Cal. Rptr. 592] . For further discussion and forms for use in mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[4] Liability for Torts

A sanitary or sewerage district is considered a public entity under *Gov. Code § 811.2*. As such, it is liable for torts committed by it or its officers, within the limitations set forth in the Government Code concerning the liability of public entities [*see Gov. Code § 815 et seq.*; *see also* Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*].

[5] Liability for Contracts

A contract between a district and a private individual, such as the original contractor [*Civ. Code § 3095*], is generally subject to the same rules of construction as a contract between private parties [*Hawley v. Orange County Flood Control Dist. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 708, 713, 27 Cal. Rptr. 478]* .

The remedies of subcontractors on public works contracts are cumulative. The rights of all persons furnishing labor, services, equipment, or materials for any public improvement work, with respect to any fund for payment of construction costs, except those rights created by direct written contract between such persons and the fundholder, such as the district, are governed exclusively by *Civ. Code § 3179 et seq.* (stop notices) [*Civ. Code § 3264*]. The claimant [*Civ. Code § 3085*] on the stop notice may also have a cause of action on his or her contract with the original contractor [*see George F. Kennedy, Inc. v. Miles & Sons Constr. Div. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 516, 522, 85 Cal. Rptr. 298]* . For further discussion and forms for use in actions on public works contracts, see Ch. 481, *Public Works* .

[6] Claims Statutes

All claims for money or damages against sanitation and sewerage districts are governed by *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.*, except as provided therein or by other applicable statutes [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 4817, 5745, 6096, 6805*, 49040, 49150]. Prior timely presentation of a claim for money or damages in compliance with *Gov. Code § 905* is a prerequisite to maintaining an action against a sanitation or sewerage district. For procedure in preparation and presentation of claims, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[7] Venue of Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

The venue of validating proceedings, which must be brought in the superior court, is in the county in which the principal office of the district is located [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860, 863*]. The venue of an action for damages against a sanitary district is in the county or city and county in which the district is situated; if the action is brought in a county other than that in which the district is situated, it must be transferred to a neutral county on motion of the defendant district [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]. Since actions against sanitary districts are governed by the venue provisions for suits against local agencies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*], *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, which authorizes venue in the county in which the defendants reside, is inapplicable [*Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 702, 705-706, 148 Cal. Rptr. 801]* .

[8] Statute of Limitations on Actions Against Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

Validation proceedings brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.* must be initiated within 60 days of the existence of the matter that is to be determined thereby, such as the validity of district bonds [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860, 863*]. Challenges to intermediate or later steps of an approval process must also be filed within the initial 60-day time limit [*Embarcadero Mun. Improvement Dist. v. County of Santa Barbara (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 781, 790-791, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 6]* . This limitation period may be considered substantive (jurisdictional) rather than procedural, since it is contained in the statute that creates the validation cause of action [*see Adams v. Albany (1954) 124 Cal. App. 2d 639, 643, 269 P.2d 142]* . For further discussion of the statute of limitations applicable to validating proceedings against

specific districts, see *§§ 511.51* and *511.53*.

A claim against a public entity under the Government Code relating to a cause of action for death or for injury to person, personal property, or growing crops must be presented not later than six months after the accrual of the cause of action; a claim relating to any other cause of action must be presented not later than one year after the accrual of the cause of action [*Gov. Code § 911.2(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 901*; *see also* Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*].

An action on a stop notice claim may be commenced at any time after 10 days from the date of the service of the stop notice on the public entity, but not later than 90 days following the expiration of the period within which stop notices must be filed as provided in *Civ. Code § 3184* [*Civ. Code § 3210*].

A judicial action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul an ordinance, resolution, or motion adopting a new fee or service charge or modifying or amending an existing fee or service charge for a sewer or water connection must be commenced within 120 days of the effective date of the ordinance, resolution, or motion. If an ordinance, resolution, or motion provides for an automatic adjustment in a fee or service charge that results in an increase in the fee or charge, the action or proceeding must be commenced within 120 days of the effective date of the increase [*Gov. Code § 66022(a)*].

The statute of limitations governing actions against districts, other than validating proceedings, is determined by the nature of the underlying cause of action. See generally Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

86 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 511.18-511.29

[Reserved]

§§ 511.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.30

§ 511.30 State Statutes

[1] Claims of Laborers and Suppliers

Stop notices for public works. *Civ. Code §§ 3082 et seq., 3179 et seq.*

Payment bonds on public works. *Civ. Code §§ 3247-3252*; *Pub. Contract Code § 7103*

Construction fund claimants governed by stop notice provisions. *Civ. Code § 3264*

[2] Elections

District and bond issues election procedures. *Elec. Code § 5150 et seq.*

[3] Provisions Governing Districts Generally

District as "public entity." *Gov. Code § 811.2*

Liability of public entities. *Gov. Code § 815 et seq.*

Claims against public entities. *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.*

Uniform Standby Charge Procedures Act. *Gov. Code § 54984 et seq.*

Cortese Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985. *Gov. Code § 56000 et seq.*

Organization, operation, and government of districts. *Gov. Code § 58000 et seq.*

[4] Recyclable Materials

Authorized recycling agent. Gov. Code § 40105

Designated collection location. Gov. Code § 40120

Segregation from other waste material. Gov. Code § 40190

Unauthorized removal of recyclable materials from collection location as unlawful. Gov. Code § 41950 et seq.

[5] Sanitation and Sewerage Districts

Community services districts. *Gov. Code § 61000 et seq.*; *Pub. Contract Code § 20680 et seq.*

Community facilities improvement districts. *Health & Safety Code § 4600 et seq.*

County sanitation districts. *Health & Safety Code § 4700 et seq.*

Sewer maintenance districts. *Health & Safety Code § 4860 et seq.*

Sanitary districts. *Health & Safety Code § 6400 et seq.*; *Pub. Contract Code § 20800 et seq.*

Garbage disposal districts. Health & Safety Code § 49000 et seq.

Garbage and refuse disposal districts. Health & Safety Code § 49100 et seq.

Rural sewer districts. Former *Health & Safety Code § 4659 et seq.*

County sewerage and water districts. Former *Health & Safety Code § 5500 et seq.*

Joint municipal sewage disposal districts. Former *Health & Safety Code § 5700 et seq.*

Regional sewage disposal districts. Former *Health & Safety Code § 5900 et seq.*

[6] Sanitation and Sewerage Systems, Projects, Zones

Joint sanitation projects. *Gov. Code § 55000 et seq.*

Joint projects for sanitation and electrical lines. *Gov. Code § 55300 et seq.*

Sanitation and sewerage systems. *Health & Safety Code § 5470 et seq.*

On-site wastewater disposal zones. *Health & Safety Code § 6950 et seq.*

[7] Solid Waste

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Gov. Code § 40000 et seq.

Disposal and handling of solid waste. *Health & Safety Code § 4500 et seq.*

[8] Termination of Service

Termination of service as requiring notice. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 16482, 16482.1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.31

§ 511.31 Decisions

Due process guarantees under both federal and state constitution not violated by unification of billing of all city services accompanied by cessation of water service on failure to pay only that portion of bill relating to municipal garbage collection. *Perez v. City of San Bruno (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 875, 893, 168 Cal. Rptr. 114, 616 P.2d 1287*

Sewer assessment districts as permitted to be created pursuant to general provisions of Municipal Improvement Act of 1913 [*Sts. & Hy. Code §§ 10000-10610*] as well as under Sewer Right of Way Law of 1921 [*Gov. Code §§ 39000-39374*] and Community Facilities Law of 1911 [*Health & Safety Code § 4600 et seq.*], none of which is exclusive means for formation. *Dawson v. Los Altos Hills (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 676, 685-686, 129 Cal. Rptr. 97, 547 P.2d 1377*

In reviewing trial court's grant of petition for peremptory writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, involving sanitation district's award of public contract, appellate court's scope of review is whether district's decision is supported by substantial evidence. *Boydston v. Napa Sanitation Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1369, 272 Cal. Rptr. 458*

Liability and obligation of industrial wastewater discharger to pay required surcharge or user charge fee, based on its discharge of industrial wastewater into sanitation district's wastewater and collection treatment system, is statutory liability arising from sanitation district ordinance, subject to three-year period of limitations prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*. County *Sanitation Dist. v. Superior Court (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 98, 101, 106-108, 266 Cal. Rptr. 777*

Local agency formation commission (LAFCO) has power under *Gov. Code § 56375(a)* to make changes in city incorporation proposal that would change new sanitation district's status from independent entity to subsidiary of proposed city; LAFCO-mandated changes in city incorporation proposal as proper so long as changes do not change general purpose or effect of proposal. *Fallbrook Sanitary Dist. v. San Diego Local Agency Formation Com. (1989)*

208 Cal. App. 3d 753, 765, 256 Cal. Rptr. 590

County entitled to impose gate fees on school districts for use of county's solid waste disposal site. *Anaheim City School District v. County of Orange (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 697, 700-702, 210 Cal. Rptr. 722*

County not precluded by *Gov. Code § 6103* or former *Gov. Code § 66780.1* from adopting resolution to charge user fees for commercial handlers to dump solid wastes at county landfill or transfer sites. *Garden Grove Sanitary Dist. v. County of Orange (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 842, 847-852, 208 Cal. Rptr. 777*

Sources of city's authority to discharge its annexation or sewage functions as impliedly vesting it with authority to contract for either purpose, since city has authority to enter into contracts which enable it to carry out its necessary functions. *Morrison Homes Corp. v. Pleasanton (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 724, 734, 130 Cal. Rptr. 196*

Sanitary and flood control district created by special act of Legislature and empowered to prescribe, revise, and collect tolls, as not required to follow *Health & Safety Code § 5474*, relating to notice of fees to land owners, since district is empowered by and collects fees pursuant to special act, rather than general legislation. *English Manor Corp. v. Vallejo Sanitation & Flood Control Dist. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 996, 1002, 117 Cal. Rptr. 315*

Maintenance of sewer districts by their governing bodies as vital government function and as not subject to application of initiative or referendum. *Dare v. Lakeport City Council (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 864, 869, 91 Cal. Rptr. 124*

Consent of county water district pursuant to *Water Code § 30065* as prerequisite to board of supervisors proceeding with formation of sanitary district. *Andresen v. Board of Supervisors of Santa Cruz County (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 436, 439-440, 45 Cal. Rptr. 306*

Construction, maintenance, and repair of sewers and storm drains, and making reasonable charge for connection to and use of sewers as permitted to be provided by ordinance as valid exercise of police power in interest of public health and incident to construction and maintenance of streets. *Longridge Estates v. City of Los Angeles (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 533, 539, 6 Cal. Rptr. 900*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.32

§ 511.32 Text References

Antieau, Local Government Law (Matthew Bender)

California Government Tort Liability Practice (Cal. CEB 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 511.33-511.49

[Reserved]

§§ 511.33[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART IV. FORMS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.50

§ 511.50 Allegation of Capacity--District as Plaintiff or Defendant [Gov. Code § 945]

[1] FORM Allegation of Capacity--District as Plaintiff or Defendant [Gov. Code § 945]
At all times mentioned herein, _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] _____ [*name of district*] _____ [*type of district, e.g.*, Sanitary] District was, and now is, organized and existing as a _____ [*type of district, e.g.*, sanitary] district under Section _____ [*statute authorizing organization and existence of district, e.g.*, 6400] of the Health and Safety Code.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegation of capacity is for use in any action in which any sanitation or sewerage district created under *Health & Safety Code §§ 4100, 4170, 4602.1, 4701, 4861, 6400*, 49000, or 49100; or under former Health & Safety Code §§ 4660, 5501, 5700.02, or 5902 is a named party [*see §§ 511.51 -511.53*]. Note that the caption of any pleading must also reflect the appropriate type of district involved.

[3] Legal Capacity of Districts

Sanitation and sewerage districts are "local public entities" and as such, may sue and be sued [*Gov. Code §§ 940.4, 945*]. The Health and Safety Code also specifically provides that county sanitation districts and sanitary districts may sue and be sued in their own names [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4738, 6511*].

[4] State Statutes

District as "local public entity." *Gov. Code § 940.4*

Public entity's capacity to sue and be sued. *Gov. Code § 945*

County sanitation district's capacity to sue and be sued in own name. *Health & Safety Code § 4738*

Sanitary district's capacity to sue and be sued in own name. *Health & Safety Code § 6511*

[5] Cross References

For alternative forms of allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

See also *§ 511.51*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART IV. FORMS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.51

§ 511.51 Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Issuance of Improvement Bonds and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526]--By Property Owner Against Sanitary District

[1] FORM Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Issuance of Improvement Bonds and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. § 526]--By Property Owner Against Sanitary District

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT TO
vs.	)	INVALIDATE
_____ [*name*],	)	SANITARY DISTRICT
Defendants,.	)	PROCEEDINGS
	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 863*]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ County [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*].

2. [*Capacity of defendant. See § 511.50* .]
3. _____ [*Allege facts showing that plaintiff is an interested person as required by Code Civ. Proc. § 863, e.g. Code Civ. Proc. § 863*, Defendant has formed the _____ (*name of district*) Special Assessment District No. _____. Plaintiff is the owner of a[n] _____-acre parcel of

land, bearing Assessment No. _____, lying within this assessment district].
[4. _____ (*Allege facts showing that the defendant issued bonds, the validity of which is authorized to be challenged pursuant to the Health and Safety Code, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), defendant adopted Resolution No. _____, a resolution calling a special election for the purpose of submitting to the qualified voters of the district the proposition of incurring a bonded indebtedness by the issuance of bonds and setting the date of such election, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and made a part hereof. The special election on the issue of incurring the aforementioned bonded indebtedness was held on or about _____ (*date*). On or about _____ (*date*), defendant gave notice of a sale of the improvement bonds authorized by the results of the special election, the sale to be held on _____ (*date*). On or about _____ (*date*), defendants received bids for the purchase of the improvement bonds, therein designated as "Series _____ No. _____." Thereafter, defendant purported to sell the improvement bonds of the district designated as "Series _____ No. _____").]
5. _____ [*Allege facts showing irregularities or informalities in the special bond election resulting in election being unfairly conducted*].

6. [*Allege in separate paragraphs any other acts or omissions of defendants which show defendants' lack of compliance with the statutory requisites for the issuance of improvement bonds.*]
7. The above-described irregularities [, errors, and omissions] committed by defendant substantially affect the rights of plaintiff in that _____ [*show substantial rights of plaintiff adversely affected by defendant's irregularities as required by Code Civ. Proc. § 866*]. For these reasons the bonds are not a valid or lawful lien on the real property of plaintiff hereinabove described, and any attempt by defendant to collect unpaid assessments thereon from plaintiff would be unlawful and improper.
8. _____ [*Allege that complaint is being filed within statutory time limitation, e.g.,* This action has been brought within 60 days of the existence of the bonds, the validity of which is authorized to be determined pursuant to these proceedings].
9. Defendant's [threatened] wrongful conduct as alleged herein, unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff in that _____ [*specify particular facts which will constitute great and irreparable injury, e.g.,* the collection of unpaid assessments from plaintiff on plaintiff's real property pursuant to the void improvement bonds would result in irreparable financial injury since _____ (*describe injury*)].
10. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries _____ [currently being suffered *or* which are threatened] _____ [*specify facts in addition to those previously alleged which tend to show the inadequacy of any legal remedy, especially monetary damages, which plaintiff might pursue, e.g.,* it will be impossible for plaintiff to determine the precise amount of damage which he or she will suffer if defendant's conduct is not restrained in that _____ (*describe speculative nature of damage*)].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:
1. That the court render its judgment adjudicating the improvement bonds purportedly issued by defendant, designated as "Series _____ No. _____," void and illegally issued, and not a lien on any of the property of plaintiff;

2. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any it has, why it should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;
3. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant and its agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for it from _____ [*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendant is to be prohibited from doing, commencing, continuing, maintaining, failing to do, etc., e.g.,* collecting unpaid assessments on plaintiff's property from plaintiff pursuant to the void improvement bonds];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

CAUTION:
The allegtions of this complaint assume that counsel will file affidavits (declarations [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5E. ***E. H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union I. L. A. 38-44 (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1 San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Asso. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582 Code Civ. Proc. § 527***

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action to determine the validity of improvement bonds issued by a sanitary district and for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction and permanent injunction against the collection of unpaid assessments on plaintiff's land pursuant to the invalid bonds [*Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*; *Health & Safety Code § 6653*]. The complaint also prays for judgment that the allegedly void bonds are not a lien on any of the plaintiff's property.

This form of complaint may also be adapted for use in proceedings for invalidation of improvement bonds issued by sewer maintenance districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4996*; see *§ 511.53*], community facilities improvement districts (formerly, municipal sewer and water districts) [*Health & Safety Code § 4624*], county sanitation districts [*Health & Safety Code § 4803*; *see § 511.53*], county sewerage and water districts [former Health & Safety Code § 5587; *see § 511.52*], joint municipal disposal districts [former Health & Safety Code § 5830], regional sewage disposal districts [former Health & Safety Code § 6071], and garbage and refuse disposal districts [Health & Safety Code § 49167; *see § 511.52*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges (1) plaintiff's capacity to sue (Paragraph 1). This need not be alleged if plaintiff is a natural person, but if plaintiff is a legal entity, failure to allege capacity to sue may be grounds for demurrer to the complaint under *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(b)*. It alleges (2) defendant's capacity to be sued (Paragraph 2) [for discussion and form of allegations of capacity, *see § 511.50*], (3) facts showing that plaintiff is an interested person as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 863* (Paragraph 3) [for discussion of who are interested parties under *Code Civ. Proc. § 863, see Empire W. Side Irrigation Dist. v. Lovelace (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 911, 913-914, 85 Cal. Rptr. 552* (validating proceeding on irrigation proceeding contract) and *Regus v. Baldwin Park (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 968, 971, 972, 139 Cal. Rptr. 196* (validation and taxpayers' action on redevelopment project), and (4) facts showing that the defendant conducted the challenged bond election and purported to sell the authorized bonds (Paragraph 4).

The holding of the election and resulting issuance of bonds should be alleged (Paragraph 4), since a validating proceeding on sanitary district improvement bonds may only be brought on the ground that certain irregularities or informalities in the bond election resulted in the election being unfairly conducted and rendered the bonds void [*Health & Safety Code § 6550.11*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860, 864* (validating proceedings as permitted only if bonds have come into existence); *Health & Safety Code § 6550.10* (sanitary improvement bonds issued only if approved by election)].

Note that although validating proceedings are the sole remedy of a plaintiff, other than a public agency, officer, or agent, to challenge the issuance of bonds after the election is held [*Code Civ. Proc. § 869*; *Health & Safety Code §*

6550.11; *see also Millbrae School Dist. v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1494, 1499, 261 Cal. Rptr. 409* (third party public agencies as required to comply with validating procedures)], mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] may be available to any interested party to challenge alleged irregularities in the proceedings leading up to the election [*see Miller v. Greiner (1964) 60 Cal. 2d 827, 830, 36 Cal. Rptr. 737, 389 P.2d 129]* . For example, mandate appears to lie to prevent further district proceedings if the board schedules a bond election even though the requisite number of property holders protest against the proposed project which the bonds are intended to finance [*Health & Safety Code § 6550.7*].

The complaint must also allege (5) facts showing irregularities or informalities in the bond election resulting in it being unfairly conducted (Paragraphs 6, 7) [*Health & Safety Code § 6550.11*]. Any error, irregularity, or omission which does not affect the substantial rights of the interested parties will be disregarded by the court and thus, will not serve to invalidate the bonds (Paragraph 7) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 866*; cf *De Jong v. Pasadena Unified School Dist. (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 877, 881, 70 Cal. Rptr. 913* (issuance of bonds as not invalidated under former Educ. Code § 21708, which provided that school district bonds would not be invalidated absent actual fraud in the proceedings leading to their issuance, when election officials failed to deface unused ballots in compliance with the Election Code)].

In addition, the complaint alleges (6) that the action has been brought within the statutory time limitation for validating proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* (Paragraph 8) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860, 863*; *see also* discussion *§ 511.51[8]*].

The complaint alleges facts supporting the prayer for injunctive relief, including facts showing why defendant's conduct will constitute great and irreparable injury (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526(a)(2), 527*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1]* . It also alleges the inadequacy of any legal remedy which plaintiff might pursue (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(4),(5)*; *Helms Bakeries v. St. Bd. Equalization (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 417, 425, 128 P.2d 167* , and Ch. 303, *Injunctions*, *see § 511.50*, Comments].

[4] Verification

If a complaint is verified it precludes a general denial in the answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. Verification of the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff is seeking a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction on a complaint without the use of affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527*]. Otherwise, verification of the complaint is not required. The answer of a district or officer sued in his or her official capacity need not be verified whether or not the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. Since the purpose of verifying the complaint is to require a verified answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30(d)-(f), 446*], there would be no purpose served by verifying the foregoing complaint if plaintiff is not seeking a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction on a complaint without the use of affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury).

[5] Certification re Notice

When a temporary restraining order is sought without formal notice, the applicant or the applicant's attorney is required to certify to the court under oath that either (1) within a reasonable time prior to the application he or she informed the opposing party (or his or her attorney, if any) at what time and where the application would be made, (2) he or she in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party (or attorney) but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to do so, or (3) for reasons specified he or she should not be required to inform the opposing party (or attorney) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(c)*].

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

A validation action must be brought in the superior court of the county in which the principal office of the district is located [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 860*]. Because the action is in the nature of a proceeding in rem, the jurisdiction of the

superior court is complete after the date specified in the summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 862*] if the statutory conditions for service of summons have been complied with [*Arnold v. Newhall County Water Dist. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 794, 799-801, 89 Cal. Rptr. 450]* .

The form of the summons and its manner of service are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 861*, *861.1*, and *863*. The Judicial Council form of summons may be used if it is modified to be directed to "all persons interested in the matter of _____ [*specifying the matter*]," and to contain a notice to all persons interested in the matter to appear and answer the complaint not later than the date specified in the summons, which should be 10 or more days after the completion of publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 861.1*].

[7] Parties

If no validation action has been brought by a public agency, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 860*, any interested person may bring the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 863*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 17* ("person" as including corporation)]. In an action by an interested person, the public agency must be named as a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 863*]. In addition, since the action is an in rem proceeding, any interested party may appear and contest the legality or validity of the matter to be determined within the time specified in the summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 862*].

[8] Statute of Limitations

The action may be brought on the date of coming into existence of any matter which is authorized to be determined pursuant to these proceedings and for 60 days thereafter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 860*]. Bonds are deemed to be in existence upon their authorization, and they are deemed to be authorized as of the date of adoption by the governing body of the public agency of a resolution or ordinance authorizing their issuance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 864*]. Since the 60-day limitations period may be considered jurisdictional [*see* discussion in *§ 511.17[8]*], the complaint should allege compliance with the 60-day period.

In addition to the foregoing general statute of limitations on all validating proceedings brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*, a provision enacted subsequent to *Code Civ. Proc. § 860* provides that any action or proceedings contesting the validity of the formation of a sanitary improvement district or of any bonds issued for it must be commenced within three months from the date of the election authorizing the formation of the district or the issuance of the bonds; otherwise, the bonds and all proceedings relating to them, including the formation of the district, will be held valid and in every respect legal and incontestable [*Health & Safety Code § 6550.11*]. This longer statute of limitations may apply to actions brought under provisions other than *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*, since *Health & Safety Code § 6653* provides only that validating actions "may" be brought under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*; it does not require that such actions be brought pursuant to those procedures [*see Health & Safety Code § 6653*].

[9] Consolidation

If more than one action is pending concerning similar contests, they must be consolidated for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 865*].

[10] Preference

Validating proceedings have preference over all other civil actions in the matter of setting for hearing or trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 867*].

[11] Costs

Costs of a validating proceeding may be allowed and apportioned between the parties or taxed to the losing party in the discretion of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 868*].

[12] Judgment; Inapplicability of Code Civ. Proc. §§ 473, 473.5

Judgments in validating proceedings are binding and conclusive as to all matters adjudicated or which could have been adjudicated notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* (relief from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect) or 473.5 (relief from default); the judgment must permanently enjoin any action or proceeding by any person raising any issue as to which the judgment is binding and conclusive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 870*].

[13] Dismissal

If the interested person bringing the action fails to complete publication pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 861* and file proof thereof within 60 days from the filing of the complaint, the action must be dismissed on motion of the public agency unless good cause for such failure is shown by the interested person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 863*]. Without a showing of good cause, failure to comply with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 863* with respect to the publication of a proper summons within the fixed time imposes a mandatory duty on the court to dismiss the action in its entirety [*Arnold v. Newhall County Water Dist. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 794, 89 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *see also Millbrae School Dist. v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1494, 1500, 261 Cal. Rptr. 409* (mistaken but reasonable belief that *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* does not apply as good cause for trial court to permit belated compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 863*)].

[14] Appeal

Notwithstanding any other provision of law including, without limitation, *Code Civ. Proc. § 901* (authorizing review of judgments and orders in civil actions and proceedings) and any rule of court, no appeal shall be allowed from any judgment entered in validation actions or proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* unless a notice of appeal is filed within 30 days after the notice of entry of the judgment, or, within 30 days after the entry of the judgment if there is no answering party. If there is no answering party, only issues related to the jurisdiction of the court to render a judgment pursuant to this chapter may be raised on appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 870(b)*].

[15] State Statutes

Grounds for issuance of final injunction. *Civ. Code § 3422*

"Person" as including corporation as well as natural person. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17*

Required contents of complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*

Grounds for objection to complaint or cross complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10*

Form and content of answer to complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30*

Verification of pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Grounds for issuance of injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Liability of litigant wrongfully seeking to restrain issuance or sale of securities for costs, damages, and necessary

expenses of defendant if litigant is interested in public utility of same nature. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526b*

Procedure to obtain preliminary injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 527*

Validating proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*

Writ of mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*

Certification under penalty of perjury in place of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

Action to test validity of community facilities district bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 4624*

Protests against formation of sanitary district. *Health & Safety Code § 6550.7*

Bond elections for sanitary districts. *Health & Safety Code § 6550.10*

Irregularities in sanitary district elections; limitation of actions. *Health & Safety Code § 6550.11*

Action to test validity of sanitary district bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 6653*

[16] Decisions

[a] Injunctive Relief

General averment in complaint "that great and irreparable injury will result" from threatened acts insufficient as basis for injunctive relief; facts concerning alleged irreparable injury as required to be pleaded. *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582*

[b] Relief Denied

Relief denied in action by landowner to establish illegality of improvement bonds and restrain collection of assessments by sanitary district because irregularities with respect to issuance of bonds, consisting of changes in denominations and maturity dates, as nonjurisdictional and subject to remedy by curative statutes. *Richardson Bay Foundation v. Richardson Bay Sanitary Dist. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 5, 13, 9 Cal. Rptr. 343*

[17] Text References

Antieau, Local Government Law, Vol. 2, Ch. XIV, *Special Assignments* ; Ch. XV, *Municipal Borrowing* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 2, *Courts*, §§ 211, 215; Vol. 3, *Actions*, § 907; Vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 812 (4th ed. 1997)

[18] Cross References

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For alternative forms of prayers and verifications, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* , and Ch. 572, *Verification* , respectively

For forms of taxpayers' complaints to enjoin or recover illegal expenditures of public funds, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions*

93 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART IV. FORMS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.52

§ 511.52 Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 49167] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870] Against County Sanitation District [Health & Safety Code § 4701], County Sewerage and Water District [former Health & Safety Code § 5501] or Garbage and Refuse Disposal District [Health & Safety Code § 49100]

[1] FORM Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 49167] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870] Against County Sanitation District [Health & Safety Code § 4701], County Sewerage and Water District [former Health & Safety Code § 5501] or Garbage and Refuse Disposal District [Health & Safety Code § 49100]

1. _____ [*Allege facts showing that the provisions of the Health and Safety Code which authorize the issuance of bonds by county sanitation, county sewerage and water, or garbage and refuse disposal districts are unconstitutional or that the required hearing formation of the district was not regularly held or that proper notice of the hearing was not given*].

2. The hereinabove described _____ [unconstitutional statutes *or* irregularities *or* failure to give proper notice] substantially affect[s] the rights of plaintiff in that _____ [*show substantial rights of plaintiff adversely affected by defendant's irregularities as required by Code Civ. Proc. § 866*]. For these reasons the bonds are not a valid or lawful lien on the real property of plaintiff hereinabove described, and any attempt by defendant to collect unpaid assessments thereon from plaintiff would be unlawful and improper.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use in a proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* to test the validity of county sanitation or county sewerage and water, or garbage and refuse disposal district bonds (see *§ 511.52[2][c]*) [former Health & Safety Code § 5546]. With appropriate modification in the caption to *see § 511.51*, these allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 5 and 6 of that form to state a cause of action to invalidate the proceedings of a county sanitation district, county sewerage and water district, or garbage and refuse disposal district.

[a] In Action Against County Sanitation District

Validating proceedings against a county sanitation district are authorized to be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* [*Health & Safety Code § 4809.2*]. It should be noted that *Health & Safety Code § 4809.2* also authorizes

separate proceedings to test the validity of bonds issued for improvement of a portion of a county sanitation district. The allegations in Paragraphs 5 and 6 of *§ 511.51*, which allege such irregularities or informalities, are sufficient for a validating action under *Health & Safety Code § 4809.2*, although the caption of the complaint should be modified accordingly. The statute of limitations for an action under *Health & Safety Code § 4809.2* is three months from the date of the special bond election [*Health & Safety Code § 4809.2*], which appears to conflict with the 60-day limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 860*. However, compliance with the 60-day limitation period for bringing a validating proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* should be alleged since it appears to be a substantive rather than a procedural requirement [*see* discussion in *§ 511.17[8]*; *see also § 511.51*]

[b] In Action Against County Sewerage and Water District

While the statutes authorizing the creation and organization of county sewerage and water districts [former *Health & Safety Code §§ 5500-5656*] were repealed effective September 18, 1959 [Stats. 1959, ch. 1309], the existence, organization, and powers of any district created by or organized pursuant to those statutes continues to be governed by their provisions [Stats. 1959, ch. 1309]. While former Health & Safety Code § 5587 authorizes an action to test the validity of county sewerage and water district bonds on the grounds that the provisions authorizing their issuance [former Health & Safety Code §§ 5580-5603] are unconstitutional or that the required hearing regarding the formation of the district [former Health & Safety Code § 5514] was not regularly held or proper notice of it not given [former Health & Safety Code §§ 5511, 5513], it is not specifically provided that the validating proceedings should be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*. However, former Health & Safety Code § 5603 provides that the governing board of the district may commence validating proceedings to superior court similar to the proceeding in relation to irrigation bonds and that the judgment shall have the same effect as a judgment in relation to irrigation bonds [former Health & Safety Code § 5603]. Since validating proceedings in regard to irrigation district bonds may be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* [*Water Code § 22670*], it may be assumed that the same procedures govern validating proceedings in regard to county sewerage and water district bonds.

[c] In Action Against Garbage and Refuse Disposal District

While Health & Safety Code § 49167 authorizes an action to test the validity of garbage and refuse disposal district bonds on the grounds that the provisions authorizing their issuance [Health & Safety Code § 49160 et seq.] are unconstitutional or that the required hearing regarding the formation of the district [Health & Safety Code § 49111] was not regularly held or proper notice of it not given [Health & Safety Code §§ 49111-49113], there is no specific provision that such proceedings should be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*, a requirement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 860* for invoking the jurisdiction of the court under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*. This absence of a specific reference may be inadvertent, however, since former *Health & Safety Code § 4186.07*, the predecessor statute of Health & Safety Code § 49167, was enacted prior to the enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* in 1961, and the formation of garbage and refuse disposal districts has not been authorized since October 1961.

[3] State Statutes

[a] County Sanitation Districts

County sanitation district defined. *Health & Safety Code § 4701*

Issuance of county sanitation district bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 4746*

Grounds for invalidity of district bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 4787*

Procedure governing validating proceeding. *Health & Safety Code § 4803*

Validity of improvement bonds for portion of district. *Health & Safety Code § 4809.2*

[b] County Sewerage and Water Districts

Creation and organization of county sewerage and water districts. Former *Health & Safety Code §§ 5500-5656*

County sewerage and water district defined. Former Health & Safety Code § 5501

Formation of county sewerage and water district and notice of hearing on formation. Former Health & Safety Code § 5511

Notice of district formation hearing. Former Health & Safety Code § 5513

Hearing of objections to district formation. Former Health & Safety Code § 5514

Issuance of bonds. Former Health & Safety Code § 5546

County sewerage and water district bonds. Former Health & Safety Code §§ 5580-5603

Grounds for invalidity of county sewerage and water district bonds. Former Health & Safety Code § 5587

Procedure governing county sewerage and water district validating proceedings. Former Health & Safety Code § 5603

Procedure governing irrigation district validating proceedings. *Water Code § 22670*

[c] Garbage and Refuse Disposal Districts

Garbage and refuse disposal district defined. Health & Safety Code § 49100

Authorization and procedure for formation of garbage and refuse disposal district. Health & Safety Code §§ 49111-49113

Invalidity of garbage and refuse disposal district bonds. Health & Safety Code § 49167

Issuance of garbage and refuse disposal district bonds. Health & Safety Code § 49160 et seq.

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 511.51*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART IV. FORMS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.53

§ 511.53 Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 4994] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870] Against Sewer Maintenance District [Health & Safety Code § 4951]

[1] FORM Allegations [Health & Safety Code § 4994] for Use in Complaint for Validating Proceedings [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870] Against Sewer Maintenance District [Health & Safety Code § 4951]
1. _____ [*Allege facts showing errors, defects, irregularities, informalities, neglect, or omissions of any officer of the district in any proceeding relating to the bonds which affect the jurisdiction of the governing body to order the proposed acts, e.g., to issue the bonds*].
2. The hereinabove described _____ [errors (defects, irregularities, informalities, and neglect) *and/or* omissions] committed by defendant substantially affect the rights of plaintiff in that _____ [*show substantial rights of plaintiff adversely affected by defendant's errors as required by Code Civ. Proc. § 866*]. For these reasons the bonds are not a valid or lawful lien on the real property of plaintiff hereinabove described, and any attempt by defendant to collect unpaid assessments thereon from plaintiff would be unlawful and improper.
3. _____ [*Allege facts showing that plaintiff has exhausted any administrative remedies available to contest the bond proceedings prior to the special bond election, e.g.,* At the hearing held by defendant on _____, 20 _____, pursuant to Resolution No. _____, a resolution of intention to construct improvements in the special assessment district, plaintiff appeared and filed a protest, objection, appeal, and notice of irregularity in proceedings, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, and made a part hereof. Following a hearing of plaintiff's protests, defendant overruled and denied plaintiff's protest, objection, appeal, and notice of irregularity in proceedings and called a special election to submit the proposition of acquiring or constructing the proposed works].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of allegations is for use in a proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* to test the validity of sewer revenue bonds [*Health & Safety Code § 4986*]. With appropriate modifications in the caption and paragraph numbers of *§ 511.51*, Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the foregoing form may be substituted for Paragraphs 5 and 6 of *§ 511.51*, and Paragraph 3 inserted after Paragraph 7 of *§ 511.51*, to state a cause of action to invalidate the proceedings of a sewer maintenance district.

These proceedings are authorized to be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870* [*Health & Safety Code § 4996*]

on the ground that an error, defect, irregularity, informality, neglect, or omission of any district officer in any proceedings under *Health & Safety Code §§ 4950-5072* which affects the jurisdiction of the governing body to issue the bonds invalidates those bonds [*Health & Safety Code § 4994*; *see also Health & Safety Code § 4979*]. However, the authorization of validating proceedings under *Health & Safety Code § 4996* conflicts with *Health & Safety Code § 4994*, which provides that the exclusive remedy of any person affected or aggrieved by such error, defect, irregularity, informality, neglect, or omission is to the governing body involved [*Health & Safety Code § 4994*]. Nevertheless, it would appear that the legislative intent in enacting *Health & Safety Code § 4996* in 1961 was to provide the additional remedy of judicial recourse under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 860-870*, and that the failure to amend *Health & Safety Code § 4994*, which was enacted in 1939, was thus an oversight.

The validity of sewer revenue bonds may be challenged on the basis of irregularities in any proceeding leading to the issuance of the bonds, not merely on the basis of errors in the bond election or in the hearing on the formation of the district [*Health & Safety Code § 4994*]. The district is required, in its resolution of intention to acquire or construct sewer works, to notice a hearing where interested persons may appear before the governing body and voice any protests or objections they may have against the acquisition or construction and the issuance and sale of bonds before the special bond election takes place [*Health & Safety Code §§ 4966(g), 4975*]. Failure to appear at that hearing and raise any objections which exist at that time and to allege in the complaint for validating proceedings that plaintiff has done so, may result in the dismissal of plaintiff's action for lack of jurisdiction [*Environmental Law Fund, Inc. v. Town of Corte Madera (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 105, 111-112, 122 Cal. Rptr. 282]* .

[3] State Statutes

Sewer revenue bonds. *Health & Safety Code §§ 4950-5072*

District defined. *Health & Safety Code § 4951*

Hearing on acquisition or construction of proposed sewer works and issuance and sale of bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 4966(g)*

Petition for sewer revenue bond election. *Health & Safety Code § 4975*

Designation of sewer revenue bonds. *Health & Safety Code § 4986*

Grounds for invalidity of sewer revenue bonds and exclusiveness of remedy. *Health & Safety Code § 4994*

Procedure governing validating proceeding. *Health & Safety Code § 4996*

[4] Cross References

See also Comments and References to *§ 511.51*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 44: Sales thru Sanitation and Sewerage Districts-Chs. 500-511
Chapter 511 SANITATION AND SEWERAGE DISTRICTS
PART IV. FORMS

44-511 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 511.54

§ 511.54 Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Ordinance, Resolution, or Motion Adopting or Modifying Fee or Service Charge for Sewer or Water Connection [Gov. Code § 66022]--By Property Owner Against Local Agency

[1] FORM Complaint to Invalidate [Code Civ. Proc. § 863] Ordinance, Resolution, or Motion Adopting or Modifying Fee or Service Charge for Sewer or Water Connection [Gov. Code § 66022]--By Property Owner Against Local Agency

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT TO INVALIDATE FEE OR SER-
vs.	)	VICE CHARGE FOR
	)	_____ [SEWER *or*
_____ [*name*],	)	WATER] CONNECTION
Defendant.	)	[Code Civ. Proc. § 863 Gov. Code § 66022]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff, when appropriate. See see § 511.51, Paragraph 1.*]
2. Defendant _____ [*specify, e.g.,* City of _____ (*name*)] is, and at all times herein mentioned has been, a _____ [*specify local agency capacity, e.g.,* a municipal corporation existing under and by virtue of the laws of California, and located in _____ County].
3. _____ [*Allege facts showing that plaintiff is an interested person as required by Code Civ. Proc. § 863, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 863* Plaintiff owns a building located at _____ (*address*), City of

_____ (*name*), California. Plaintiff connected this building to defendant's public sewer system on _____ (*date*). Defendant charged plaintiff the amount of $_____ as a fee for the sewer connection. Plaintiff has refused to pay the fee, and defendant has threatened a lien against plaintiff's property unless the fee is paid.]
4. _____ [*Allege that complaint is being brought within statutory time limitation, e.g.,* This action has been brought within 120 days of _____ (*date*), the effective date of Ordinance Number _____ of the City of _____ (*name*) which raised the fee for a sewer connection to the amount of $_____ from the amount of $ _____.]
5. _____ [*Allege facts showing why ordinance, resolution, or motion levying or modifying fee or service charge for sewer or water connection is invalid, e.g.,* The fee for a sewer connection in the amount of $_____, as established in Ordinance Number _____ of the City of _____ (*name*), exceeds the amount of $_____, the estimated reasonable cost of providing this service. However, the fee was neither submitted to nor approved by a popular vote of two thirds of those electors voting on the issue, and thus violates *Sections 66013* and *66018 of the Government Code*.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:
1. That the court render its judgment, adjudicating _____ [*specify ordinance, resolution, or motion levying or modifying fee or service charge, e.g.,* Ordinance Number _____ of the City of _____ (*name*)] to be void and invalid [, and declaring that no lien be applied to plaintiff's property for failure to pay any fee or service charge pursuant to such _____ (ordinance *or* resolution *or* motion)];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of complaint is for use in an action by an interested person to determine the validity of an ordinance, resolution, or motion adopting a new fee or service charge, or modifying or amending an existing fee or service charge, adopted by a local agency for a sewer or water connection [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.*; *Gov. Code § 66022*]. As an optional request, the complaint also prays for judgment that no lien be applied to plaintiff's property for failure to pay the fee or service charge.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges (1) plaintiff's capacity to sue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(b)* (if plaintiff is a legal entity, allegation avoids possible demurrer for failure to allege capacity)], (2) defendant's capacity to be sued (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 863*; *Gov. Code §§ 66000(c), 66022*], (3) facts showing that plaintiff is an interested person as required byCode *Civ. Proc. § 863* (Paragraph 3) [*see Regus v. Baldwin Park (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 968, 971-973, 139 Cal. Rptr. 196* (citizen, resident, and taxpayer as interested person in validation and taxpayers' action on redevelopment project)], (4) that the action has been brought within the statutory time limitation for actions reviewing local agency fees and charges (Paragraph 4) [*Gov. Code § 66022(a)*], and (5) facts showing that the ordinance, resolution, or motion adopting or modifying the fee or service charge for sewer or water connection is invalid (Paragraph 5) [*see Gov. Code §§ 66013, 66016* (requirements for valid sewer or water connection fee)].

[4] State Statutes

Procedures for validation action by or against public agency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq.*

Limits on fees by local agencies for sewer and water connection. *Gov. Code § 66013*

Requirements for public meeting by local agency prior to adopting new or increasing existing fee or service charge. *Gov. Code § 66016*

Statute of limitations on action to review fees and charges. *Gov. Code § 66022(a)*

Action by local agency or interested person to review fees and charges as brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 860 et seq. Gov. Code § 66022(b)*

[5] Decisions

When legislature has provided for validation action to review government actions, mandamus is unavailable to bypass the statutory remedy after the limitations period has expired. *Barratt American, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 685, 704-705, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149, 124 P.3d 719*

Vested rights doctrine as not shielding property developer from unforeseen increases in connection fees. *Winnaman v. Cambria Community Services Dist. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 49, 56-57, 256 Cal. Rptr. 40*

Judicial action challenging fee increase in new ordinance as barred under former *Gov. Code § 54995* (*now see Gov. Code § 66022*) unless brought within 120 days of effective date of ordinance. *Winnaman v. Cambria Community Services Dist. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 49, 53-54, 256 Cal. Rptr. 40*

Community services district as required to comply with *Health & Safety Code § 5471* and *Gov. Code § 61621.5* (repealed effective January 1, 2006), which allow for rate increases only through ordinance; more general provision of former *Gov. Code § 54992* (*now see Gov. Code § 66016*) allowing for increase through resolution as not controlling. *Cavalier Acres, Inc. v. San Simeon Acres Community Services Dist. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 798, 801-802, 199 Cal. Rptr. 4*

[6] Cross References

For further discussion, see *§ 511.51*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 512.syn

§ 512.syn Synopsis to Chapter 512: SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

§ 512.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 512.02 Cross References

§§ 512.03-512.09 [Reserved]

§ 512.10 Governing Statutes

§ 512.11 Certificated Employees

§ 512.12 Certification Documents; Definitions

§ 512.13 Verification and Falsification of Credential Application

§ 512.14 Issuance of Credentials

§ 512.15 Denial of Issuance or Renewal of Credential

[1] Grounds

[2] Hearing

[3] Judicial Review of Credential Denial

§ 512.16 Revocation or Suspension of Credential by Commission on Teacher Credentialing

[1] At Request of Holder

[2] Failure to Fulfill Contract Duties

[3] Other Grounds for Revocation or Suspension

[a] In General

[b] Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct

[4] Right to Hearing

[5] Committee of Credentials Procedure--Investigation

[6] Formal Review

[7] Notice to Applicant or Certificate Holder

[8] Decision

[9] Hearing by County Board of Education

[10] Judicial Review of Revocation or Suspension

§ 512.17 Revocation or Suspension of Certificate by County Board of Education

[1] Grounds

[2] Notice and Hearing

[3] Unauthorized Departure From Service

§ 512.18 Mandatory Revocation of Certification Documents

[1] Conviction of Crime

[2] Sexual Psychopaths

§ 512.19 Classification of Certificated Employees

§ 512.20 Permanent (Tenured) Employees

[1] Attainment of Tenure

[a] Large School District

[b] Small School District

[2] Computation of Service Time

[3] Scope of Tenure

[a] In General

[b] Multiple Credentials

[c] Administrative or Supervisory Positions

§ 512.21 Probationary Employees

[1] In General

[2] Reclassification of Temporary and Substitute Employees to Probationary Status

§ 512.22 Substitute Employees

§ 512.23 Temporary Employees

[1] Generally

[2] Limited Hiring Preference for Credentialed Teachers Employed by District

[3] Employment of Temporary Employees to Fill Vacancies Caused by Leaves of Absence or Illnesses

[4] Employment of Temporary Employees for First Semester Only

§ 512.24 Effect of Reorganization of District on Classification

§ 512.25 Mandate Proceeding to Compel Reclassification

§ 512.26 General Principles Applicable to Dismissal or Suspension

§ 512.27 Constitutional Restraints on Dismissal

§ 512.28 Dismissal or Suspension of Permanent Employees

[1] Grounds

[2] Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct; Unfitness to Teach

[a] In General

[b] Evident Unfitness for Service

[c] Unprofessional Conduct; Notice Requirement

[d] Dishonesty

[e] Unsatisfactory Performance; Notice Requirement

[f] Physical or Mental Condition; Contagious Diseases

[g] Persistent Violation of School Laws or Rules

[h] Conviction of Crime

[i] Communist or Subversive Affiliations

[3] Notice of Charges

[4] Time Limit on Demand for Hearing; Governing Board's Response

[5] Immediate Suspension for Certain Charges

[a] Charges

[b] Time for Giving Notice of Suspension

[c] Payment of Salary During Suspension

[6] Hearing Procedure

[a] Time for Hearing

[b] Conduct of Hearing Before Commission on Professional Competence

[c] Right to Counsel

[d] Discovery Rights

[e] Commission on Professional Competence

[f] Place of Hearing

[g] Evidence Admissible

[h] Decision of Commission on Professional Competence

[i] Expenses of Hearing Before Commission on Professional Competence

[7] Judicial Review of Commission on Professional Competence Decision

[8] Effect of Judgment in Mandate Proceeding on Future Civil Action

[9] Reinstatement and Back Salary

§ 512.29 Dismissal or Suspension of Probationary Employees in Large School District

[1] Grounds

[2] Notice Required

[3] Hearing Procedure

§ 512.30 Dismissal or Suspension of Probationary Employees in Small School District

[1] During School Year

[2] At End of School Year for Reasons Other Than Those Specified in Educ. Code § 44955

[a] Initial Notice

[b] Grounds for Refusal to Rehire

[c] Request for Hearing

[d] Conduct of Hearing and Decision by Administrative Law Judge and Governing Board

[e] Expenses of Hearing

[f] Final Notice of Dismissal

[g] Effect of Continuance

§ 512.31 Judicial Review of Governing Board Decisions Regarding Dismissal of Probationary Employees

§ 512.32 Dismissal of Temporary and Substitute Employees

§ 512.33 Reduction of Number of Employees

[1] When Authorized

[2] Seniority Rights

[3] Procedure

[a] Initial Notice

[b] Request for Hearing

[c] Conduct of Hearing

[d] Decisions of Administrative Law Judge and Governing Board

[e] Expenses of Hearing

[f] Effect of Continuance

[g] Final Notice of Termination of Services; Effect of Failure to Give Notice and Hearing

[h] Sufficiency of Notice

[4] Reemployment Rights

§ 512.34 Compulsory Leaves of Absence for Employees Charged With Criminal Offenses

§ 512.35 Suspension or Transfer for Mental Illness

§ 512.36 Notice of Intent to Return to Teaching Position

§ 512.37 Resignations

§ 512.38 Reemployment After Resignation

§ 512.39 Salaries of Certificated Employees

[1] Generally

[2] Salary Schedules

[a] Uniformity Requirement

[b] Effect of Collective Bargaining Agreement

[3] Increase or Decrease in Salary

[4] Mandate Proceeding for Recovery of Salary

[a] Generally

[b] PERB Jurisdiction

§ 512.40 Waiver of Employment Rights as Void

§§ 512.41-512.59 [Reserved]

§ 512.60 California Points and Authorities

§ 512.61 State Constitution

§ 512.62 State Statutes

[1] Basic Skills Proficiency Examination

[2] Certification Documents; Issuance, Denial, Revocation, Suspension

[3] Classification of Certificated Employees

[4] Communist or Subversive Activities

[5] Definitions

[6] Dismissal or Suspension of Certificated Employees

[a] Permanent Employees

[b] Probationary Employees

[c] Substitute and Temporary Employees

[7] Employment of Certificated Persons

[8] Layoffs

[9] Miscellaneous Provisions

[10] Salaries of Certificated Employees

§ 512.63 Administrative Regulations

§ 512.64 Decisions

[1] Certification Documents; Denial, Revocation, Suspension

[a] Grounds

[b] Procedure

[2] Classification

[a] Permanent Employees

[b] Probationary Employees

[c] Temporary Employees

[3] Constitutional Rights

[a] First Amendment Rights

[b] Due Process

[4] Dismissal of Permanent Employees

[a] Generally

[b] Attorney's Fees

[c] Discovery

[d] Grounds

[i] Conviction of Crime

[ii] Evident Unfitness for Service

[iii] Immoral Conduct

[iv] Unsatisfactory Performance

[v] Persistent Violation of or Refusal to Obey School Laws or Rules

[vi] Physical or Mental Disability

[e] Notice of Unprofessional Conduct

[f] Pretermination Hearing

[g] Judicial Review

[5] Dismissal of Probationary Employees

[a] During School Year

[b] End of School Year

[i] Generally

[ii] Grounds

[iii] Judicial Reviews

[iv] Notice

[6] Layoffs

[a] In General

[b] Notice

[7] Mental Illness

[8] Preferential Hiring

[9] Resignations

[10] Salaries

[11] Sick Leave--Differential Compensation

[12] Waiver of Employment Rights as Void

§ 512.65 Attorney General Opinions

§ 512.66 Law Reviews

§ 512.67 Text References

§§ 512.68-512.79 [Reserved]

§ 512.80 Scope of Checklists

§§ 512.81-512.99 [Reserved]

§ 512.100 Investigation by Committee of Credentials

§ 512.101 Adjudicatory Hearing

§ 512.102 Judicial Review

§§ 512.103-512.119 [Reserved]

§ 512.120 Permanent Employees

§ 512.121 Probationary Employees

§§ 512.122-512.139 [Reserved]

§ 512.140 Grounds

§ 512.141 Procedure

§§ 512.142-512.159 [Reserved]

§ 512.160 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Teacher Credentialing [Educ. Code § 44246]--Denial, Suspension, or Revocation of Credential or Life Diploma

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

[b] Alternative Writ Procedure

[c] Noticed Application Procedure

[3] Allegations

[4] Evidentiary Hearing Required

[5] Invalidity of Decision

[6] Attorney's Fees

[7] Venue

[8] Time for Filing Petition

[9] Verification

[10] Cross References

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Text References

§ 512.161 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Professional Competence [Educ. Code § 44945]--Dismissal of Permanent Employee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

[b] Related Uses

[3] Allegations

[4] Attorney's Fees

[5] Cross References

[6] California Points and Authorities

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[9] Cross References

§ 512.162 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--Failure to Follow Statutory Dismissal Procedure [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a); Educ. Code §§ 44932-44947].

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Failure to Follow Statutory Procedure

[4] Cross References

§ 512.163 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1)]--Failure to

Show Lack of Fitness to Teach

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 512.164 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unsatisfactory Performance [Educ. Code § 44932(a), (4)]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 512.165 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1), 44933]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

§ 512.166 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Nonreemployment of Probationary Employee Employed Prior to 1983-1984 Fiscal Year or in Small School District for Subsequent School Year [Educ. Code § 44948.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] California Points and Authorities

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] Cross References

§ 512.167 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Dismissal of Probationary Employee Whose Probationary Period Commenced During or After 1983-1984 Fiscal Year [Educ. Code § 44948.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

[b] Related Use

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 512.168 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Termination of Services Due to Reduction of Number of Certificated Employees [Educ. Code §§ 44949, 44955]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 512.169 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Recognition of Permanent Status of School District Employee [Educ. Code § 44929.21]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Ordinary Mandate

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Cross References

[7] California Points and Authorities

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

§ 512.170 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel School District to Reemploy and Reclassify Employee as Probationary [Educ. Code § 44918]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 512.171 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Payment of Lawful Salary by Governing Board to School District Employee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] California Points and Authorities

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART I. SCOPE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.01

§ 512.01 Scope of Chapter

This part discusses and contains forms for use in actions involving certificated employees of public elementary and secondary school districts (i.e., employees holding positions that require certification qualifications [*see Educ. Code §§ 44001, 44006*]). This part does not cover actions involving classified school district employees (i.e., those holding positions not requiring certification qualifications [*see Educ. Code § 45104*]). Classified employees are governed by separate provisions set forth in *Educ. Code § 45100 et seq.*

Included are forms of petitions for writs of mandate to review the denial, suspension, or revocation of a teaching credential [*see § 512.160*], to review the dismissal of a permanent employee of a school district [*see §§ 512.161 -512.164*], to review the failure to reemploy a probationary employee for the following school year [*see § 512.166*], to compel the governing board of a school district to recognize a teacher's permanent status [*see § 512.169*], to compel a governing board to reemploy a substitute or temporary teacher and reclassify him or her as a probationary employee [*see § 512.170*], and to compel a school district to pay a teacher's salary in accordance with law [*see § 512.171*].

For a discussion of the public school system and school districts generally, including constitutional limitations on public school finance and racial segregation in public schools, see *Ch. 513, Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities, § 513.10 et seq.*

For a discussion and forms relating to actions involving employees subject to the civil service system, see Ch. 118, *Civil Service* .

For discussion and forms relating to student rights and responsibilities, see Ch. 513, *Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities* .

For discussion and forms relating to injuries to students, see Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART I. SCOPE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.02

§ 512.02 Cross References

For a discussion and forms relating to public employees subject to the civil service system, see Ch. 118, *Civil Service*

For discussion, forms, and a procedural checklist relating to ordinary mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For discussion and forms relating to administrative hearings conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*) and judicial review thereof by petition for writ of mandate, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART I. SCOPE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.03-512.09

[Reserved]

§§ 512.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.10

§ 512.10 Governing Statutes

General definitions and provisions relating to certificated employees of school districts are set forth in *Educ. Code § 44000 et seq.* General rights and duties of all school district employees are set forth in *Educ. Code § 44030 et seq.* The issuance, denial, suspension, and revocation of certification documents are governed by *Educ. Code § 44200 et seq.* General rules governing the employment and classification of certificated employees are set forth in *Educ. Code § 44830 et seq.* Resignations, dismissals, and leaves of absence of certificated employees are governed by *Educ. Code § 44930 et seq.* Salaries of certificated employees are governed by *Cal. Const., art. IX, § 6*, and *Educ. Code § 45021 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.11

§ 512.11 Certificated Employees

A position requiring certification qualifications is a position for which certification qualifications are established pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44000-44012, 44065*, and *44200 et seq.* [*Educ. Code § 44001*]. Besides classroom teachers and counselors, such positions include principals [*see Educ. Code § 44860*], home teachers [*see Educ. Code §§ 44864, 44865*], librarians [*see Educ. Code §§ 44868, 44869*], teaching supervisors [*see Educ. Code § 44870*], and school health personnel [*see Educ. Code §§ 44871-44879*]. The governing board of a school district may employ for such positions only those persons who possess the qualifications prescribed therefor by law, including the requisite certificate or credential [*Educ. Code § 44830(a)*; *see Holbrook v. Board of Educ. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 316, 329, 231 P.2d 853]* .

Any certificated employee who is required by an administrative superior to accept an assignment for which he or she has no legal authorization must, after exhausting any existing local remedies, notify the county superintendent of schools in writing of the illegal assignment. Adverse action against a certificated person who files such a notification of misassignment is prohibited. During the period of misassignment, the certificated person who filed a notification is exempt from *Educ. Code § 45034*, which prohibits payment of salary to any person employed in a position without proper certification. In addition, any performance evaluation of the employee in a subject to which he or she was misassigned must be nullified [*Educ. Code § 44258.9(e)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.12

§ 512.12 Certification Documents; Definitions

A certification document refers to a certificate, credential, or life diploma [*Educ. Code § 44007*]. A certificate is a document issued by a county board of education to license the holder to perform the service specified in the certificate [*Educ. Code § 44004*]. For this purpose, a "credential" includes a credential, certificate, life document, life diploma, permit, certificate of clearance, or waiver issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (referred to in this part as "CTC") [*Educ. Code § 44002*; *see Educ. Code § 44210 et seq.* (CTC)]. A life diploma is a document issued on the basis of a credential on completion by the applicant of specified requirements [*Educ. Code § 44003*].

A certificated person is one who holds one or more certification documents which singly or in combination license the holder to engage in the school service designated in the document or documents [*Educ. Code § 44006*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.13

§ 512.13 Verification and Falsification of Credential Application

The credential application form is required to contain a verification under penalty of perjury, dated and subscribed by the applicant, of every fact necessary to establish his or her qualifications for the issuance of the license, credential, or certificate authorizing the performance of services in the public schools [*Educ. Code § 44362*; *see Educ. Code §§ 44360*, *44361* (misusing or fraudulently obtaining certificate as misdemeanor)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.14

§ 512.14 Issuance of Credentials

The CTC issues two types of credentials: teaching credentials and service credentials [*Educ. Code § 44250*]. The Commission may also issue an internship teaching or service credential [*Educ. Code § 44250*]. The CTC is authorized to establish standards and procedures for the issuance of credentials [*Educ. Code § 44252(a)*]. The various types of credentials and the minimum requirements for obtaining a given credential are set forth in *Educ. Code § 44250 et seq.* The issuance and form of certificates and credentials are governed by *Educ. Code § 44330 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.15

§ 512.15 Denial of Issuance or Renewal of Credential

[1] Grounds

The CTC may deny any application for the issuance or renewal of a credential made by any applicant under the following conditions [*Educ. Code § 44345*]:

(a) Lacks the qualifications that are prescribed by law or by regulations adopted by the commission pursuant thereto;

(b) Is physically or mentally so disabled as to be rendered unfit to perform the duties authorized by the credential for which he or she applies; provided, however, that the mere fact that an applicant has sought or received psychiatric treatment may not be considered preliminary evidence of mental disability and may not provoke special scrutiny of the applicant's qualifications for a credential;

(c) Is addicted to the use of intoxicating beverages to excess;

(d) Is addicted to the use of narcotics or habit-forming drugs;

(e) Has committed any act involving moral turpitude;

(f) Has had a certification document revoked;

(g) Has intentionally practiced or attempted to practice any material deception or fraud in his or her application;

(h) Fails or refuses to furnish reasonable evidence of identification or good moral character; or

(i) Has been convicted of any offense defined in *Penal Code § 314(1)* (indecent exposure) prior to September 7, 1955.

Any denial of an application pursuant to (a) through (e), *above*, must be based on reasons related to the applicant's fitness to teach or fitness to perform other duties for which that applicant is certificated, or his or her competence to

perform the duties which the credential would authorize the applicant to perform [*Educ. Code § 44345*; *see, e.g., Watson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 559, 563-565, 99 Cal. Rptr. 468]* .

The CTC may take an adverse action on an existing credential, on the ground that an applicant or licensee subverted or attempted to subvert a licensing examination or its administration [*Educ. Code § 44439* (listing examples of conduct constituting such subversion)].

Furthermore, the CTC must deny any application for the issuance or renewal of a credential made by any applicant under the following conditions [*Educ. Code § 44346(a)*]:

(1) Has been determined to be a sexual psychopath under the provisions of *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 6300-6330* or under similar provisions of law of any other state;

(2) Has been convicted of any sex offense as defined in *Educ. Code § 44010*;

(3) Has been convicted of any controlled substance offense as defined in *Educ. Code § 44011*; or

(4) Has been found to be insane through a criminal proceeding by a federal court or a court in this or any other state.

Note that *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 6300-6330*, which are referred to in *Educ. Code § 44346(a)(1)*, were repealed by the Legislature in 1981 [*see* Stats. 1981, ch. 928, § 2].

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44346(a)(2), (3)* (discussed *above*), ordinarily no person may be denied a credential solely because he or she has been convicted of a crime specified therein if he or she has obtained a certificate of rehabilitation under *Penal Code §§ 4852.01-4852.21* and if his or her probation has been terminated and the information or accusation has been dismissed pursuant to *Penal Code § 1203.4* [*Educ. Code § 44346(b)(1)*]. However, the CTC must deny a credential to any applicant who is required to register as a sex offender pursuant to the Sex Offender Registration Act [*Penal Code § 290 et seq.*] or a similar law of another state or of the United States [*Educ. Code § 44346(b)(2)*].

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44346(a)(3), (b)* (discussed *above*), the CTC may issue a credential to a person convicted of a controlled substance offense as defined in *Educ. Code § 44011* if the CTC determines from the evidence presented that the person has been rehabilitated for at least five years, or has received a certificate or rehabilitation and pardon pursuant to *Penal Code § 4852.01*, or if the accusation or information against the person has been dismissed and he or she has been released from all disabilities and penalties resulting from the offense pursuant to *Penal Code § 1203.4* [*Educ. Code § 44346(c)*].

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44346(a)(4)*, the CTC may issue a credential to a person found to be insane through a criminal proceeding by a federal court or a court in this or any other state if the commission determines from the evidence presented that the person has been rehabilitated for at least 5 years [*Educ. Code § 44346(d)*].

Whenever the holder of a credential is adjudged insane, the commission must immediately revoke all credentials held by that person [*Educ. Code § 44425.5*].

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, revocation of a credential shall be final without possibility of reinstatement if the holder is charged with a felony sex offense, a felony controlled substance offense involving a minor, or murder, and in response to the charge, the holder of the credential is found to be insane through a criminal proceeding by a federal court or a court in this or any other state [*Educ. Code § 44425.5*].

[2] Hearing

The CTC's duty to deny an application for issuance or renewal of a credential made by persons convicted of designated sex or controlled substance offenses under *Educ. Code § 44346* [*see § 512.15[1]*] is mandatory, and the CTC is not required to hold a hearing prior to denying such an application. Automatic denial of credentials pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44346* has been upheld as not violating equal protection or due process [*Vogulkin v. State Board of Education (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 424, 429-433, 15 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . By contrast, a hearing must be held prior to denial of issuance or renewal of a credential under *Educ. Code § 44345* [*see Educ. Code § 44242.5*; Matteson v. State Board of Education *(1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 995, 998, 999-1000, 136 P.2d 120* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.15[1]*].

Each allegation of an act or omission by an applicant for, or holder of, a credential for which he or she may be subject to an adverse action shall be presented to the Committee of Credentials [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(a)*]. An "adverse action" in this context means the denial of an application for a credential, a private admonition or public reproval of a credential holder, or the suspension or revocation of a credential [*Educ. Code § 44000.5*]. It is the committee's duty to investigate each allegation and, if it is determined that probable cause for denial of the application exists, to initiate an adjudicatory hearing before the CTC in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528* if requested by the applicant or credential holder [*see Educ. Code §§ 44242.5(c), 44246*]. The procedures of the CTC and the Committee of Credentials relating to the denial of applications are the same as those for the suspension or revocation of credentials, and are further discussed in *§ 512.16[5]*.

[3] Judicial Review of Credential Denial

A person who has been improperly denied issuance or renewal of a certification document may seek judicial review of the denial by petition for writ of mandate; however, the aggrieved party must first exhaust all administrative remedies [*see Pete v. State Bd. of Educ. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 38, 39-42, 300 P.2d 147* ; *see also* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*]. For a form of petition for a writ of mandate to review a decision of the commission denying a credential, see *§ 512.160*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.16

§ 512.16 Revocation or Suspension of Credential by Commission on Teacher Credentialing

[1] At Request of Holder

Whenever the holder of any credential issued by the CTC requests in writing that the credential held by him or her be revoked, the CTC must revoke the credential [*Educ. Code § 44423(a)*]. However, a revocation pursuant to this procedure does not deprive the CTC of its authority to [*Educ. Code §§ 44423(b), 44440(b)*]:

- Institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the credential holder on any ground provided by law;
- Enter an order suspending or revoking the credential; or
- Issue a public reproval or private admonition to the credential holder.

When the CTC revokes a credential at the request of the holder pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44423*, no vestige of the credential remains, and any subsequent application to reinstate the credential must be treated as an original application for issuance of a credential [*Vogulkin v. State Board of Education (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 424, 427, 15 Cal. Rptr. 335]* .

[2] Failure to Fulfill Contract Duties

Whenever any person employed by a school district in a position requiring certification qualifications refuses, without good cause, to fulfill a valid contract of employment with the district or leaves the service of the district without the consent of the superintendent, if there is one, or the governing board of the district, except in the manner provided by law, the CTC must, after proof of the fact is made, take an adverse action on the credential holder but may not suspend the credential for more than one year or revoke the credential [*Educ. Code § 44420(a)*]. An "adverse action" in this context includes a private admonition, a public reproval of the credential holder, or the suspension of a credential [*Educ. Code § 44000.5*]. If a person's credentials become subject to suspension under the above provision for a second or subsequent time, the CTC may suspend his or her credentials for not more than two years [*Educ. Code § 44420(b)*].

[3] Other Grounds for Revocation or Suspension

[a] In General

The CTC must revoke or suspend any credential issued by it, or privately admonish or publicly reprove the holder, for (1) immoral or unprofessional conduct, (2) persistent defiance of, and refusal to obey, the laws regulating the duties of persons serving in the public school system, (3) evident unfitness for service, or (4) any cause that would have warranted the denial of an application for a credential or the renewal of the credential [*Educ. Code § 44421*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.15[1]*]. The CTC may also take an adverse action on the ground that an applicant or credential holder has subverted or attempted to subvert any licensing examination or the administration of an examination [*Educ. Code § 44439* (examples of conduct constituting such subversion)].

An action by the local school board to dismiss a teacher pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44932-44949* [*see* discussions in *§§ 512.64[4]* and *[5]*] is not a prerequisite to the revocation of his or her teaching credential by the CTC pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44421* [*Alford v. Department of Educ. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 884, 890-891, 91 Cal. Rptr. 843]* .

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44421*, the CTC must take an appropriate adverse action on any credential holder who knowingly and willfully reports false fiscal expenditure data relative to the conduct of any educational program [*Educ. Code § 44421.5*].

The CTC must also suspend a credential when it receives notice that (1) another state has taken final action to revoke a credential or license authorizing the holder of the credential to perform any duty in the public schools of the other state [*Educ. Code § 44423.5*]; (2) the ability of the holder of the credential to associate with minors has been limited as a term or condition of probation or sentencing resulting from a criminal conviction in California, another state, or the United States [*Educ. Code § 44423.6(a)(1)*; *see Educ. Code § 44423.6(a)(2)* (suspension not required when conviction is based solely on violation of domestic-violence protective order as set forth in *Penal Code § 273.6(a)*]; or (3) the holder of the credential has been ordered to surrender a credential or certification document as a term or condition of probation or sentencing resulting from a criminal conviction in California, another state, or the United States [*Educ. Code § 44423.6(b)*].

[b] Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct

Certification documents may not properly be revoked pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44421* for immoral or unprofessional conduct, or acts involving moral turpitude, unless the teacher's conduct demonstrates unfitness to teach. In determining whether a teacher's conduct indicates unfitness to teach, the CTC and courts may consider such factors as (1) the likelihood that such conduct may have adversely affected students or fellow teachers; (2) the degree of such adversity anticipated; (3) the proximity or remoteness in time of the conduct; (4) the type of teaching certificate held by the party involved; (5) the extenuating or aggravating circumstances, if any, surrounding the conduct; (6) the praiseworthiness or blameworthiness of the motives resulting in the conduct; (7) the likelihood of the recurrence of the questioned conduct; and (8) the extent to which disciplinary action may inflict an adverse impact or chilling effect on the constitutional rights of other teachers [*Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 225, 229, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375]* .

Generally, the mere fact that a teacher has engaged in homosexual conduct or has been convicted of possession of marijuana is not in itself sufficient to justify revocation of a credential on grounds of immoral conduct [*see Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 235-238, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375* ; *Comings v. State Bd. of Educ. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 94, 104-105, 100 Cal. Rptr. 73* (revocation held improper)]. However, revocation may be proper if the record contains additional evidence of unfitness to teach [*see Pettit v. State Bd. of Education (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 29, 34-36, 109 Cal. Rptr. 665, 513 P.2d 889* ; *Moser v. State Bd. of Educ. (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 988, 988-992, 101 Cal. Rptr. 86* (revocation upheld)].

[4] Right to Hearing

Although the Education Code does not explicitly require a hearing prior to the suspension or revocation of a credential pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44421*, it has been held that a teacher has a right to such a hearing [*see Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 998, 136 P.2d 120* (interpreting similarly worded provisions of former School Code); *see also Educ. Code §§ 44242.5(c)(3)(B), 44246*]. Moreover, such a hearing would appear to be mandatory because of the rule that a teacher may not be deprived of his or her teaching credential for immoral or unprofessional conduct absent evidence that he or she is unfit to teach [*see Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 218 n.4, 225, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375* ; *cf. Purifoy v. State Bd. of Educ. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 187, 194, 106 Cal. Rptr. 201* (distinguishing automatic revocation provisions of former Educ. Code § 13207 (*now see Educ. Code § 44425*) under which no hearing is required)].

[5] Committee of Credentials Procedure--Investigation

The CTC may assign to the Committee of Credentials administrative duties as it may see fit relating to adverse actions concerning applicants and credential holders [*Educ. Code § 44243(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 44243(b)* (CTC to supervise committee and provide statements of policy relative to committee operation and procedures as it deems appropriate)]. Each allegation of an act or omission by an applicant for, or holder of, a credential for which he or she may be subject to an adverse action shall be presented to the Committee of Credentials [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(a)*]. An "adverse action" in this context means the denial of an application for a credential, a private admonition, a public reproval of a credential holder, or the suspension or revocation of a credential [*Educ. Code § 44000.5*].

The committee has jurisdiction to commence an investigation on receipt of any of the following [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)*]:

(1) Official records of the Department of Justice, of any law enforcement agency, of any state or federal court, and of any other agency of California [*see Gov. Code § 11000*].

(2) An affidavit or declaration signed by person or persons with personal knowledge of the acts alleged to constitute misconduct.

(3) A statement from an employer notifying the CTC that, as a result of, or while an allegation of misconduct is pending, a credential holder has been dismissed, nonreelected, suspended for more than 10 days, or placed pursuant to a final adverse employment action on unpaid administrative leave for more than 10 days, or has resigned or otherwise left employment [*see Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)(3)(B)* (employer must provide such notice to CTC not later than 30 days after employee's dismissal, nonreelection, suspension, placement on unpaid administrative leave, resignation, or departure from employment)].

(4) A notice from an employer that a complaint was filed with the school district alleging sexual misconduct by a credential holder. Results of an investigation by the committee based on this paragraph shall not be considered for action by the committee unless there is evidence presented to the committee in the form of a written or oral declaration under penalty of perjury that confirms the personal knowledge of the declarant regarding the acts alleged to constitute misconduct.

(5) A notice from a school district, employer, public agency, or testing administrator of a violation of *Educ. Code §§ 44420, 44421.1, 44421.5*, or *44439*.

(6) An affirmative response, or failure to disclose information that would constitute an affirmative response, on any application submitted to the CTC as to any conviction, adverse action on, or denial of, any license, or pending investigation into any criminal allegation or pending investigation of any noncriminal allegation of misconduct by a

governmental licensing entity.

[6] Formal Review

No later than six months after the commencement of the committee's initial review, the committee ordinarily must conduct the formal review [*Educ. Code § 44244(b)(1)*]. However, the chair of the CTC may grant the committee an extension of time, not exceeding six months, if the committee demonstrates that additional time is necessary to complete its investigation or determination, as described in subdivision (b) [*Educ. Code § 44244(c)*]. The formal review must determine either that no adverse action will be taken or that the allegations are sufficient to cause the application or credential to be subject to adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44244(b)(1)*].

The committee has jurisdiction to commence a formal review on receipt of any of the following [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(d)*]:

(1) Official records of any state or federal court that reflect a conviction or plea, including a plea of nolo contendere, to any criminal offense, or official records of any state court that adjudge a juvenile to be a dependent of the court [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 300*] due to allegations of sexual misconduct or physical abuse by a credential holder or applicant. However, the committee's authority to conduct a formal review of these allegations does not relieve the CTC from the confidentiality provisions, notice, and due process requirements applicable to such judicial records [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 827*].

(2) An affidavit or declaration signed by a person or persons with personal knowledge of the acts alleged to constitute misconduct.

(3) A statement from an employer notifying the CTC that, as a result of, or while an allegation of misconduct is pending, a credential holder has been dismissed, nonreelected, suspended for more than 10 days, or placed pursuant to a final adverse employment action on unpaid administrative leave for more than 10 days, or has resigned or otherwise left employment [*see Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)(3)(A)*; *see also Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)(3)(B)*; (employer must provide such notice to CTC not later than 30 days after employee's dismissal, nonreelection, suspension, placement on unpaid administrative leave, resignation, or departure from employment)].

(4) Official records of any governmental licensing entity that reflect an administrative proceeding or investigation, otherwise authorized by law or regulation, that has become final.

(5) A notice from a school district, employer, public agency, or testing administrator of a violation of *Educ. Code §§ 44420*, *44421.1*, *44421.5*, or *44439* [*see Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)(5)*].

(6) An affirmative response, or failure to disclose information that would constitute an affirmative response, on any application submitted to the CTC as to any conviction, adverse action on, or denial of, any license, or pending investigation into any criminal allegation or pending investigation of any noncriminal allegation of misconduct by a governmental licensing entity [*see Educ. Code § 44242.5(b)(6)*].

On the commencement of the formal review, the committee must investigate all alleged misconduct and the circumstances in mitigation and aggravation. The investigation must include, but is not limited to, all of the following [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(a)*]:

(1) Investigation of the fitness and competence of the applicant or credential holder to perform the duties authorized by the credential for which he or she has applied or that he or she presently holds.

(2) Preparation of a summary of the applicable law, a summary of the facts, contested and uncontested, and a summary

of any circumstances in aggravation or mitigation of the allegation.

(3) Determination of probable cause for an adverse action on the credential. If the allegation is for unprofessional or immoral conduct, the committee must permit the employer of the credential holder to be present while testimony is taken. If the allegation of unprofessional or immoral conduct involves sexual abuse, the employer must be examined for any relevant evidence relating to the sexual abuse.

All testimony before the committee must be verified under penalty of perjury by oath or affirmation. The chair of the committee may administer the oath or affirmation. The chair may designate staff to administer the oath or affirmation for statements taken during the investigation of allegations of misconduct [*Educ. Code § 44244(b)(2)*].

[7] Notice to Applicant or Certificate Holder

At least 30 days prior to any formal review, the committee must notify the applicant or certificate holder of the specific allegations of misconduct that make the application or credential subject to adverse action. The notification must be in ordinary and concise language and must set forth the acts or omissions charged and the statutes or rules violated. Supplemental allegations of misconduct must be sent to the holder or applicant at least 30 days prior to the formal review. The portions of the investigation of the original or supplemental allegations that constitute the basis for the allegations must be open to inspection and copying by the holder or applicant and his or her attorney. The statement of the allegations must inform the applicant or holder that the allegations, if true, are sufficient to cause his or her application or credential to be subject to adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44244(a)*].

[8] Decision

If the committee determines that probable cause for an adverse action does not exist, the committee must terminate the investigation [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(c)(3)(A)*]. If the committee determines that probable cause for an adverse action on the credential exists, on receipt of a request from the applicant or credential holder [*see Educ. Code § 44244.1*], the CTC must initiate an adjudicatory hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*] by filing an accusation or statement of issues [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(c)(3)(B)*]. For a discussion and forms relating to administrative hearings conducted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.* , see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* .

On completion of its investigation, the committee must report its actions and recommendations to the CTC, including its findings as to probable cause, and if probable cause exists, its recommendations as to the appropriate adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(1)*]. The findings may not contain any information that reveals the identity of persons other than the person who is the subject of the investigation [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(3)*]. The findings must be available, on request, to the employing or last known employing school district [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(2)*]. Also, if adverse action is recommended by the committee and the credential holder has not filed a timely appeal of the recommendation [*see Educ. Code § 44244.1*], the committee's findings must be available, on a request made within five years of the date of the committee's recommendations, to a school district providing verification that the credential holder has applied for employment in the district [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(2)*]. The findings must, for all purposes, remain confidential and limited to school district personnel in a direct supervisory capacity in relation to the person investigated. Any person who otherwise releases findings received from the committee or the CTC, absent a verified release signed by the person who is the subject of the investigation, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(2)*].

A copy of the written recommendation of the committee must be delivered to the credential holder or applicant personally or sent to him or her by certified mail within 14 days after the formal review, together with specific information relative to any appeal rights to which the credential holder or applicant is entitled [*Educ. Code § 44244(d)*].

[9] Hearing by County Board of Education

Whenever the holder of a credential issued by the State Bd. of Educ. or the Commission is charged with immoral or unprofessional conduct, evident unfitness for service, or persistent defiance of and refusal to obey the laws regulating the duties of his or her position, the Commission, in its discretion, after notifying the person charged of its intention to do so, may require the county board of education of the county in which the person charged is serving or last served to give notice of and conduct a hearing of the charges. The hearing must be conducted in the manner prescribed by law for the hearing of charges for private admonition, or for the revocation or suspension of a certificate by a county board of education [*Educ. Code § 44422*; *see § 512.17[2]*]. It is not clear whether such a hearing by the county board of education is in addition to or in lieu of a hearing by the Commission conducted in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528* [*see Educ. Code §§ 44242.5(c), 44246*].

After the hearing, the county board of education must report to the Commission its findings and a summary of the evidence, and make a definite recommendation concerning the revocation or suspension of the credential. On receipt of a copy of the findings, summary of evidence, and recommendation, the Commission may suspend or revoke the credential for the causes stated, or order the charges dismissed [*Educ. Code § 44422*].

[10] Judicial Review of Revocation or Suspension

A decision to suspend or revoke a teaching credential is reviewable in a mandate proceeding [*see Educ. Code § 44246*; *Gov. Code § 11523*]. In such a proceeding, the trial court must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence, and the appellate court must sustain the decision of the trial court if there is any credible, competent evidence to support its findings [*see Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 508, 326 P.2d 850]* .

For discussion and forms relating to judicial review of administrative decisions made pursuant to an adjudicatory hearing, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* . For a form of petition for writ of mandate to review a decision of the commission to revoke or suspend a credential, *see § 512.160*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.17

§ 512.17 Revocation or Suspension of Certificate by County Board of Education

[1] Grounds

County boards of education may revoke or suspend the certificates granted by them for immoral or unprofessional conduct [*see* discussion in *§ 512.16[3][b]*], evident unfitness for teaching, or persistent defiance of and refusal to obey the laws regulating the duties of teachers [*Educ. Code § 44427*].

[2] Notice and Hearing

No certificate may be revoked or suspended, except on written request of its holder, until after a hearing before the county board of education, and then only on the affirmative vote of at least four members of the board [*Educ. Code § 44428*]. All charges of immoral or unprofessional conduct, evident unfitness for teaching, or persistent defiance of and refusal to obey the laws relating to the duties of teachers must be presented to the board in writing and verified under oath [*Educ. Code § 44429*].

Notice of the time of hearing and a full and complete copy of the charges must be furnished to the accused at least 10 days before the hearing [*Educ. Code § 44430*]. The accused must be given a fair and impartial hearing and must have the right to be represented by counsel [*Educ. Code § 44431*]. The hearing is governed and conducted by the rules of the board [*Educ. Code § 44432*].

[3] Unauthorized Departure From Service

Any teacher employed by a school board of trustees for a specified time who leaves school before expiration of the time without the written consent of the trustees is guilty of unprofessional conduct. The county board of education may, on receiving notice of the fact, suspend the certificate of the teacher for a period of one year [*Educ. Code § 44433*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.18

§ 512.18 Mandatory Revocation of Certification Documents

[1] Conviction of Crime

On final conviction of the holder of any credential issued by the State Bd. of Educ. or the CTC, or the holder of any certificate issued by a county board of education, of a violation, or attempted violation, of certain designated Penal Code sections, the CTC or county board of education must forthwith revoke the credential or certificate [*Educ. Code §§ 44424(a), 44435*; *see Educ. Code § 44346.1*; *see also Educ. Code § 44424(b)* (plea of nolo contendere to listed crimes results in suspension pending CTC's final disposition regarding credential); *but see Educ. Code § 44424(d)* (credential not to be revoked solely on basis of conviction of violent or serious felony if holder has obtained certificate of rehabilitation and pardon under *Penal Code § 4852.01 et seq.*); *Gebremicael v. California Comm'n on Teacher Credentialing (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1477, 1481-1489, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 777* (felony conviction that has been reduced to misdemeanor under *Penal Code § 17(b)(3)* becomes misdemeanor for all purposes and therefore is not ground for denial of credential under *Educ. Code § 44346.1*)].

Furthermore, whenever the holder of a certification document issued by the State Board of Education, the CTC, or a county board of education is convicted of a sex offense (as defined in *Educ. Code § 44010*) or a controlled substance offense (as defined in *Educ. Code § 44011*), the CTC or county board of education must forthwith suspend the document. If the conviction is reversed and the holder is acquitted of the offense in a new trial or the charges against him or her are dismissed, the CTC or board must forthwith terminate the suspension of the document. When the conviction becomes final or when imposition of sentence is suspended, the CTC or board must forthwith revoke the document [*Educ. Code §§ 44425, 44436*].

Revocation of certification documents on conviction of designated sex or narcotics offenses pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44425* is automatic and mandatory and the CTC is not required to hold a hearing prior to such revocation [*see DiGenova v. State Board of Education (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 255, 259-260, 288 P.2d 862]* . The mandatory revocation provisions of *Educ. Code § 44425* do not violate equal protection or due process [*Purifoy v. State Bd. of Educ. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 187, 190-198, 106 Cal. Rptr. 201]* .

[2] Sexual Psychopaths

Whenever the holder of a certification document issued by the State Board of Education, the CTC, or a county board of education has been determined to be a sexual psychopath under the provisions of *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 6300-6330* or under similar provisions of law of any other state, the CTC or county board of education must forthwith suspend the certification document. If the determination is reversed and the holder is determined in a new proceeding not to be a sexual psychopath or the proceeding to determine whether he or she is a sexual psychopath is dismissed, the CTC or board must forthwith terminate the suspension of the document. When the determination becomes final, the CTC or board must forthwith revoke the document [*Educ. Code §§ 44426, 44437*].

Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 6300-6330 were repealed by the legislature in 1981 [*see* Stats. 1981, ch. 828, § 2]. Because the references in *Educ. Code §§ 44426* and *44437* are specific to these repealed provisions, the continuing validity of the mandatory revocation requirements is questionable.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.19

§ 512.19 Classification of Certificated Employees

The Education Code classifies certificated employees into four types: permanent, probationary, substitute, and temporary. An employee's rights with respect to termination of employment depend on his or her classification. Under the statutory classification system, permanent and probationary teachers have positions of a settled and continuing nature, and are protected against arbitrary dismissal by the requirement of notice and a hearing before termination. By contrast, substitute and temporary teachers fill the short range needs of the school district and may be summarily released absent an infringement of constitutional or contractual rights [*Balen v. Peralta Junior College Dist. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 821, 826, 114 Cal. Rptr. 589, 523 P.2d 629* ; *see* discussions in *§ 512.64[4]*, *§ 512.64[5]*, and *§ 512.32*].

The classification of a certificated employee depends on the position he or she occupies, and a school district may not determine a teacher's classification based on the type of credential or certification he or she has. For example, if a certificated employee occupies a position the Education Code defines as tempo rary, he or she is a temporary employee; if it is not a position that requires temporary classification (or permanent or substitute), he or she is a probationary employee [*California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 135, 150, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (*Educ. Code § 44915* mandates that teachers be classified as probationary employees if they are not permanent and do not fall within one of narrowly defined classes of temporary employees); *Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Bakersfield City School Dist. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1299, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 486* (Educ. Code grants school districts no discretion to deviate from statutory classification scheme)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.20

§ 512.20 Permanent (Tenured) Employees

[1] Attainment of Tenure

[a] Large School District

Every employee of a school district of any type or class that has an average daily attendance of 250 pupils or more who, after having been employed by the district for two complete consecutive school years in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, is reelected for the next school year to a position requiring certification qualifications, must be classified as and become a permanent employee of the district at the commencement of the succeeding school year [*Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* (applicable to probationary employees whose probationary period commenced during 1983-1984 fiscal year or thereafter); *see Vasquez v. Happy Valley Union Sch. Dist. (2008)159 Cal. App. 4th 969, 985-986, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 15* (timely notice of non-reelection for third school year prevents teacher from attaining permanent status, even if teacher ultimately works for district during portion of third year)]. The decision to grant tenure lies within the discretion of the governing board, and it may be denied for any lawful reason regardless of the sufficiency of the cause [*McFarland Unified School Dist. v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 166, 169, 279 Cal. Rptr. 26, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405* (but holding that PERB may order reinstatement of probationary teacher dismissed for engaging in protected labor activities, even if reinstatement results in teacher receiving tenure)]. No statement of reasons or hearing is required [*Grimsley v. Board of Trustees (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1440, 1444-1448, 235 Cal. Rptr. 85* ; *see Bellflower Education Assn. v. Bellflower Unified School Dist. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 805, 279 Cal. Rptr. 179]* .

The governing board must notify the employee, on or before March 15 of the employee's second complete consecutive school year of employment by the district in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, of the decision to reelect or not reelect him or her to such a position for the next succeeding school year [*Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*]. The notice must be given by personal service or some other method that imparts actual notice [*Hoschler v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 258, 263-264, 269, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 115* (because *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* does not prescribe method of service and previous versions of the statute allowing service by mail were omitted in subsequent versions, personal service is contemplated)]. If the governing board does not give this notice on or before March 15, the employee is deemed reelected for the next succeeding school year [*Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* (applicable to probationary employees whose probationary period commenced during 1983-1984 fiscal

year or thereafter)]. However, the March 15 notice need not be given if the governing board has elected to proceed with termination for cause [*Zhigulina v. Board of Education (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 159, 161-162, 254 Cal. Rptr. 728* ; *see Educ. Code § 44948.3* (dismissal of probationary employee for cause); *see also § 512.29*].

For the purpose of calculating the two-year probationary period, the employee's status as a probationary employee begins not on the teaching credential validity date, but on the date stated in probationary contract with the employing school district. Thus, if a teacher serving under an emergency permit accepts a new contract as a probationary teacher during the school year, the teacher's probationary status begins on execution of the new contract, even if the validity date of the teacher's credential preceded the beginning of the school year [*Fine v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1070, 1076-1080, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 876* (teacher serving under emergency permit continues to serve under that permit, and under agreed contract, until teacher is issued credential and registers it with school district)].

The probationary period is mandatory. A district may not waive it and grant tenure before the teacher has completed the period [*Fleice v. Chualar Union Elementary School Dist. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 886, 889-893, 254 Cal. Rptr. 54]* .

Procedures relating to the evaluation of probationary teachers preparatory to the granting of tenure may be the proper subject of a collective bargaining agreement under *Gov. Code § 3543.2*. However, the tenure decision remains within the unfettered discretion of the school board. An arbitrator under the collective bargaining agreement may not order reinstatement of a probationary teacher, either to extended probationary status or to tenured status, as a remedy for any violation of the established procedures [*Bellflower Education Assn. v. Bellflower Unified School Dist. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 805, 808-813, 279 Cal. Rptr. 179* (limiting arbitrator's remedy to "cease and desist" order); *Fontana Teachers Assn. v. Fontana Unified School Dist. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1524-1526, 247 Cal. Rptr. 761* (calling arbitration of dismissal of probationary teacher "pointless")].

A full-time employee holding a position in which some or all of the assigned duties require certification qualifications for the statutory period is entitled to full-time permanent status in the certificated position, notwithstanding that some of the assigned duties do not require certification qualifications [*see Holbrook v. Board of Educ. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 316, 319-321, 333, 231 P.2d 853]* .

[b] Small School District

Every employee of a school district of any type or class that has an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils, who, after having been employed by the district for three complete consecutive school years in a position or positions requiring certification qualifications, is reelected for the next succeeding school year to a position requiring certification qualifications, may be classified by the governing board of the district as a permanent employee of the district. If the board does not so classify him or her, the employee does not attain permanent status and may be reelected thereafter, from year to year, without becoming a permanent employee until the classification is made [*Educ. Code § 44929.23(a)*].

A governing board that elects to dismiss probationary employees under *Educ. Code § 44948.2* (*see § 512.30[1]*) must classify as a permanent employee any probationary employee who, after being employed for two complete school years in a position requiring certification qualifications, is reelected for the next succeeding school year to such a position. Any probationary employee who has been employed by the district for two or more consecutive years on the date of that election in a position requiring certification qualifications must be classified as a permanent employee [*Educ. Code § 44929.23(b)*]. If the election is made, *Educ. Code § 44929.21* [*see § 512.20[1][a]*], including its notice requirements, applies to the district [*Educ. Code § 44929.23(b)*].

The governing board of a school district that employs in a position requiring certification qualifications any person who has become a permanent certificated employee in any other school district, may employ the person as a permanent certificated employee [*Educ. Code § 44929.28*].

[2] Computation of Service Time

For purposes of computing the service time required for the attainment of permanent status, a probationary employee who, in any one school year, has served for at least 75 percent of the number of days during which the regular schools of the district in which he or she is employed are maintained is deemed to have served a complete school year. With respect to evening schools, 75 percent of the number of days during which the evening schools of the district are in session is deemed to be a complete school year [*Educ. Code § 44908*]. This provision has also been construed as applying to a teacher who has taught at least 75 percent of the hours required of a full-time teacher during the school year, even though he or she has not taught 75 percent of the days of the school year [*see Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 119-121, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . However, an approved leave of absence during the probationary period shall not be construed as a break in the continuity of service required for classification of the employee as permanent under *Educ. Code § 44975* [*Griego v. Los Angeles Unified School District (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 515, 519-521, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 556]* .

Not included in computing the service time required for attainment of permanent status are:

- Service as an instructor at a regional occupation center, unless the employee is a regularly credentialed teacher who has been employed to teach in the regular educational programs of the school district and subsequently assigned as an instructor in a regional occupational center or program [*Educ. Code § 44910*; *see Reis v. Biggs Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 809, 816-821, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 393* (teacher who retains part-time regular teaching position, and is assigned additional part-time regional occupation center teaching position, is not "subsequently assigned" to regional occupation center for purposes of *Educ. Code § 44910*); *Sullivan v. Calistoga Joint Unified School Dist. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1313, 1318, 279 Cal. Rptr. 529]* ;

- Service under a provisional credential [*Educ. Code § 44911*; *see California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 135, 155, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (unless matters of tenure are involved, Educ. Code does not restrict provisionally credentialed teachers from enjoying rights afforded to their fully credentialed colleagues of same classification)];

- Service under a credential authorizing service only as a teacher of basic military drill [*Educ. Code § 44912*]; and

- Summer school employment [*Educ. Code § 44913*].

Also, time spent teaching under an emergency teaching credential may not be counted in computing an employee's progress toward permanent status, unless the employee is credentialed in another state and demonstrates adequate basic skills proficiency pending successful completion of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) [*Culbertson v. San Gabriel Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1392, 1397-1399, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234* (service under "Emergency Long Term Single Subject Teaching Permit" may not be included in computing service required for classification as permanent employee); *Smith v. Governing Bd. of Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 563, 567-569, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (service under "Emergency Education Specialist Instruction Permit" may not be included in computing service required for classification as permanent employee); *Summerfield v. Windsor Unified Sch. Dist. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1026, 1030-1035, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 233* (emergency teaching credential issued under *Educ. Code § 44300* is "provisional teaching credential" for purposes of *Educ. Code § 44911*, which excludes time spent teaching under provisional credential in computation of service time required for attainment of permanent status); *see Educ. Code § 44252* (CBEST requirement)].

An employee's service in a position requiring certification in a program or project conducted under contract with a public or private agency, or in a categorically funded project that is not required by federal or state statutes, generally is

not included in computing the service time for attainment of permanent status. However, one year of such service may be counted if (1) the employee has served in that position (pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44909*) for at least 75 percent of the number of days the regular schools of the district are maintained, and (2) the employee is subsequently employed as a probationary employee in a position requiring certification qualifications [*Educ. Code § 44909*; *Schnee v. Alameda Unified School Dist. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 555, 560-565, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 800]* .

If an employee of a school district has served as a probationary employee of the district in a position requiring certification qualifications for one complete school year, and in the year immediately preceding the probationary service has served as a substitute employee, or as a substitute and probationary employee, for at least 75 percent of the number of days the regular schools of the district were maintained, the governing board of the district may count the year the teacher served as a substitute, or served as a substitute and probationary employee, as one year of the probationary period that the employee is required by law to serve as a condition to being classified as a permanent employee of the district [*Educ. Code § 44914*].

Under certain conditions, a probationary year served under a university internship credential [*see Educ. Code § 44450 et seq.* (Teacher Education Internship Act of 1967)] may count toward the attainment of tenure. Specifically, if a person has completed a university teaching internship program and obtained a clear credential, the last year of teaching under the university internship credential counts toward tenure if the person is employed for the next complete school year under the clear credential by the same school district that employed him or her in the last year of internship [*Educ. Code § 44466*]. Thus, at the completion of the first year under the clear credential, the person will attain tenure unless the school district gives timely notice of its decision not to reelect him or her [*Peoples v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 463, 468-472, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 383* ; *see Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*].

[3] Scope of Tenure

[a] In General

A tenured school teacher (that is, one who has attained permanent status) has a vested right to permanent employment within the scope of the certification document under which tenure was acquired. Tenure does not, however, bestow on a school teacher any vested right to teach at a specific school or to teach a specific grade level of students within a school. The school district may assign a teacher to any position within the scope of his or her certificate according to the needs of the district, subject only to a requirement of reasonableness [*Adelt v. Richmond School Dist. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 149, 152, 58 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

[b] Multiple Credentials

If an employee is authorized to render service in more than one type of position for which certification qualifications are required, either by virtue of his or her possession of one certification document authorizing service in two or more certificated positions, or by virtue of his or her possession of separate certification documents authorizing service in two or more positions, or any combination thereof, then, on satisfying all other requirements prescribed by law, the employee acquires permanent status as follows [*Educ. Code § 44894(b)*]:

(1) If the employee is authorized to render service as a classroom teacher, he or she acquires permanent status as a classroom teacher; or

(2) If the employee is not authorized to render service as a classroom teacher, he or she acquires permanent status below the administrative or supervisory level as a staff employee with multiple qualifications. The employee's right to serve in one or more of the positions for which he or she is qualified to serve is subject to the power of assignment of the school district governing board.

Thus, for example, an employee who holds both teaching and counseling certificates acquires permanent status as a classroom teacher only, regardless of the length of time served as a counselor and regardless of which position was held by the employee at the completion of the probationary period. Such an employee may be reassigned from a counseling position to a teaching position without notice or hearing, subject only to the requirement of reasonableness [*Thompson v. Modesto City High School Dist. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 620, 626, 139 Cal. Rptr. 603, 566 P.2d 237* ; *Netwig v. Huntington Beach Union High School Dist. (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 529, 532, 125 Cal. Rptr. 170]* .

[c] Administrative or Supervisory Positions

A person employed in an administrative or supervisory position requiring certification qualifications in a school district having an average daily attendance of 250 pupils or more attains permanent status as a classroom teacher on completing the probationary period, including any time served as a classroom teacher. Classification as a permanent employee is discretionary in a district having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils [*Educ. Code § 44897*]. A permanent employee who is advanced from a teaching position to an administrative or supervisory position, or who is assigned any special or other type of work, or who is given a special classification or designation requiring certification qualifications, retains his or her permanent classification as a classroom teacher [*Educ. Code § 44893*; *see Educ. Code § 44895*].

In general, school administrators attain no tenure in their status as administrators [*Jefferson v. Compton Unified School Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 32, 38, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474* ; *Hentschke v. Sink (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 19, 22, 109 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . Administrative and supervisory personnel may be removed from their positions and reassigned to other positions within the scope of the certificate under which tenure was attained for any reason satisfactory to the school board, without a hearing [*Jefferson v. Compton Unified School Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 32, 38-39, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474* ; *Whisman v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 782, 791-792, 150 Cal. Rptr. 548* ; *Hentschke v. Sink (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 19, 22, 109 Cal. Rptr. 549* ; *see McFall v. Madera Unified School Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1228, 1234-1235, 272 Cal. Rptr. 345]* .

If, however, a person employed in an administrative or supervisory position requiring certification qualifications is transferred to a teaching position, the governing board of the school district must, on request, furnish him or her with a written statement of the reasons for the transfer. If the reasons include incompetence, a performance evaluation of the person must have been completed not more than 60 days prior to the giving of the notice of transfer [*Educ. Code § 44896*; *see Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665* (employee performance evaluations)].

Incompetence is not defined in the statute, and it is unclear to what extent the district's dissatisfaction with the employee's performance as an administrator is a charge of incompetence. One court has found the term neither vague nor uncertain and refused to treat a district's dissatisfaction with certain aspects of job performance as a charge of incompetence [*see Quirk v. Board of Education (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 729, 734, 244 Cal. Rptr. 924* (board thought that principal, although "competent" administrator, did not possess type of leadership style necessary to deal with problems at particular school)]. Another court accepted without elaborate analysis that a list of 30 reasons for transfer, apparently involving numerous instances of dissatisfaction with job performance, constituted a charge of incompetence despite the fact that the term was not expressly used in the list [*Hahn v. Board of Education (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 744, 747, 750, 252 Cal. Rptr. 471* (board thought that administrator lacked willingness to maintain professional demeanor with teachers, parents, and staff involved in special education program)].

The remedy for a failure to properly evaluate before transfer is not, however, reinstatement in the administrative position. The employee is only entitled to a proper evaluation and to compensation for any diminution in salary suffered as a result of the transfer, up to the time when the evaluation is completed [*Jefferson v. Compton Unified School Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 32, 40, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474* ; *Hahn v. Board of Education (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 744, 750-752, 754, 252 Cal. Rptr. 471]* . Moreover, the failure to perform the evaluation does not prevent the school district from reassigning an employee for reasons other than incompetency [*Jefferson v. Compton Unified School Dist. (1993)*

14 Cal. App. 4th 32, 40, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474] .

A governing board may, by local regulation, expand the rights of administrators to retain their positions beyond those provided in the Education Code. If these regulations are incorporated by reference into the administrator's contract, the administrator is entitled to the protection of the regulations during the term of the contract [*see Jones v. Palm Springs Unified School Dist. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 518, 527-528, 216 Cal. Rptr. 75]* . However, the protections may not apply to nonrenewal of the contract at the end of its term unless they expressly so provide [*see McFall v. Madera Unified School Dist. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1228, 1235-1236, 272 Cal. Rptr. 345]* . Moreover, unless incorporated in an administrator's contract, a governing board's past practice of recognizing such expanded rights does not give the administrator a constitutionally protected property right to continue in the administrative position [*see Bernstein v. Lopez (9th Cir. 2003) 321 F.3d 903, 905-907]* .

With certain statutory exceptions, if an administrative or supervisory employee is to be released or transferred from his or her position for the next school year, notice must be given by March 15. Notice must be by registered mail, or must be actually signed by the employee prior to the determinative date [*Educ. Code § 44951*; *see Ellerbroek v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 348, 366-367, 177 Cal. Rptr. 910]* . This notice requirement is jurisdictional, and strict compliance is required [*Hahn v. Board of Education (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 744, 751-752, 252 Cal. Rptr. 471* ; *Hoyme v. Board of Education (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 449, 452, 165 Cal. Rptr. 737* ; *but see Gilliam v. Moreno Valley Unified School District (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 518, 520-521, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 695* (notice requirements of *Educ. Code § 44951* do not apply to transfer of administrator within same classification)]. However, at least one court of appeal has held that the March notice requirement of *Educ. Code § 44951* does not apply when an administrative or supervisory employee is reassigned for cause [*see Jefferson v. Compton Unified School Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 32, 39, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 474]* .

If notice is not timely given or properly served, the governing board is no longer free to change the employee's assignment at its pleasure [*Barton v. Governing Board (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 476, 479, 131 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . Reassignment is ineffective, and the employee is entitled to reinstatement [*Hahn v. Board of Education (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 744, 751, 252 Cal. Rptr. 471]* . However, a change in assignment may be effected after the notice date has passed on a showing of cause [*see Ellerbroek v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 348, 365, 177 Cal. Rptr. 910]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.21

§ 512.21 Probationary Employees

[1] In General

The governing board of a school district must classify as probationary employees those persons who have been employed for the school year in positions requiring certification qualifications but who have not been classified as permanent employees or as substitute employees [*Educ. Code § 44915*]. In districts having an average daily attendance of more than 250 pupils, probationary status lasts for two years, after which time the teacher obtains tenure (permanent employee status) if reemployed for a third year [*see Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*, discussed in *§ 512.20[1][a]*].

First and second-year probationary employees may be dismissed during the school year only for unsatisfactory performance or for cause [*see Educ. Code § 44948.3*, discussed in *§ 512.29*]. However, probationary teachers have no statutory or due process right to reemployment for the succeeding school year [*Grimsley v. Board of Trustees (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1440, 1444-1452, 235 Cal. Rptr. 85]* . The final determination about rehiring probationary teachers lies within the discretion of the governing board, and reemployment may be denied for any lawful reason regardless of the sufficiency of the cause [*McFarland Unified School Dist. v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 166, 169, 279 Cal. Rptr. 26, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405* (but holding that dismissal for engaging in protected labor activities is not for lawful reason)].

Furthermore, the California Supreme Court has held that *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* preempts any collective bargaining agreement provision purporting to give probationary teachers greater procedural protections (for example, 30 days' notice of decision not to reelect or right to hearing on non-reelection) than those specified by the statute [*Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 284-287, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193]* . Rather, Educ. Code § 44949.21(b) vests the school district with exclusive authority over whether to rehire probationary teachers at the end of their second year of employment [*Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 287, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193* ; *Sunnyvale Unified Sch. Dist. v. Jacobs (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 168, 179-183, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (school district's allegedly retaliatory decision not to reelect probationary teacher may not be made subject to collectively bargained arbitration procedures)].

The governing board must give notice of its decision not to reemploy a second-year probationary teacher on or before

March 15 of the second year [*Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*, discussed in *§ 512.20[1][a]*]. Notice of a decision not to reemploy a first-year probationary teacher for a second year may be given at any reasonable time before the end of the first year [*see Grimsley v. Board of Trustees (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1440, 1447-1448, 235 Cal. Rptr. 85* (noting that late notice might be deemed unreasonable if employee relied on satisfactory performance evaluations in not seeking other employment)].

[2] Reclassification of Temporary and Substitute Employees to Probationary Status

Except in districts with an average daily attendance of over 400,000 [*see Educ. Code § 44918(f)*], any employee classified as a substitute or temporary employee who serves during one school year for at least 75 percent of the number of days during which the regular schools of the district were maintained in that school year and who has performed the duties normally required of a certificated employee of the school district is deemed to have served a complete school year as a probationary employee if he or she is employed as a probationary employee for the following school year [*Educ. Code § 44918(a)*]. Any such employee must be reemployed for the following school year to fill any vacant positions in the school district for which he or she is certified and qualified to serve unless the teacher is given notice of nonreelection for the next succeeding year before the end of the school year [*Educ. Code § 44918(b)*; *see Educ. Code § 44954(b)*, discussed in *§ 512.32*]. This provision also applies to temporary employees who were hired under *Educ. Code § 44920* and who have fulfilled the 75-percent requirement of *Educ. Code § 44918* [*Taylor v. Board of Trustees (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 500, 502, 204 Cal. Rptr. 711, 683 P.2d 710* ; *Royster v. Cushman (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 65, 69, 261 Cal. Rptr. 458]* . If the number of substitute and temporary teachers qualified to be reemployed as probationary teachers for the subsequent school year under *Educ. Code § 44918* exceeds the number of vacant positions, the school district is not required to fill the vacant positions on the basis of seniority [*Fair v. Fountain Valley School Dist. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 180, 187-188, 153 Cal. Rptr. 56]* .

A temporary employee who is given notice of nonreelection after serving 75 percent of the school year, but who nevertheless has served as a temporary or substitute certificated employee in the district for 75 percent of the year for two consecutive years, must receive first priority if the district fills a vacant position at the grade level at which the employee served during either year. In the case of a departmentalized program, the employee must have taught in the subject matter in which the vacant position occurs [*Educ. Code § 44918(c)*].

Educ. Code § 44918 requires only actual performance of the duties of a certificated employee, not satisfactory performance. A temporary or substitute employee who is performing unsatisfactorily should be dismissed before he or she completes 75 percent of the instructional school year of a second consecutive year [*see Kalamaras v. Albany Unified School Dist. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1571, 1575-1580, 277 Cal. Rptr. 577* ; *see also § 512.32*].

Those employees classified as substitutes who are employed to serve in an on-call status to replace absent regular employees on a day-to-day basis are not entitled to reemployment rights under *Educ. Code § 44918* [*Educ. Code § 44918(d)*].

Permanent and probationary employees dismissed under *Educ. Code § 44955* (reduction in number of employees due to decline in average daily attendance, decline in attendance due to termination of interdistrict tuition agreement, modification of curriculum required by state law, or reduction of a particular service) have, during the period of preferred right to reemployment, prior rights to any vacant position in which they are qualified to serve that are superior to those rights afforded under *Educ. Code § 44918* to temporary and substitute personnel who have become probationary employees [*Educ. Code § 44918(e)*].

Any person employed for one complete school year as a temporary employee must be classified as a probationary employee if he or she is reemployed for the following school year in a vacant position requiring certification qualifications, and the previous year's employment as a temporary employee must be deemed one year's employment as a probationary employee for purposes of acquiring permanent status [*Educ. Code §§ 44917, 44920*; *see Fine v. Los*

Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1070, 1080-1082, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 876 (teacher serving under emergency permit does not qualify as temporary employee for this purpose)].

A "vacant position" means a position in which the employee is qualified to serve and which is not filled by a permanent or probationary employee. The term does not include a position that would be filled by a permanent or probationary employee except for the fact that such employee is on leave [*Educ. Code § 44920*].

If a school district hires a certificated person as a temporary employee, the employee must receive, at the time of initial employment during each academic year, a written statement clearly indicating the temporary nature of the employment and the length of time for which the person is being employed [*see Educ. Code § 44916*]. For this purpose, "the time of initial employment" is the certificated employee's first day of paid service for the school district [*Kavanaugh v. West Sonoma County High Sch. Dist. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 911, 924-926, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 811, 62 P.3d 54* (rejecting argument that "time of initial employment" refers to time when school district's governing board formally approves employee's hiring)]. If a statement indicating the temporary nature of the employment is not received on or before that day, the certificated employee shall be deemed to be a probationary employee of the school district, unless employed with permanent status [*Educ. Code § 44916*; *see California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 285, 292-293, 240 Cal. Rptr. 549* (teacher hired under "Contract of Temporary Employment" for less than semester in one year, and then rehired for entire following school year, as entitled to probationary classification in absence of written statement)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.22

§ 512.22 Substitute Employees

Educ. Code § 44917 provides that except as provided in *Educ. Code §§ 44888* and *44920* (reclassification of substitute employees as probationary employees), governing boards of school districts must classify as substitute employees those persons employed in positions requiring certification qualifications to fill positions of regularly employed persons absent from service. After September 1 of any school year, the governing board of a school district may employ for the remainder of the school year in substitute status any otherwise qualified person who consents to be employed in a position for which no regular employee is available, including persons retired from service under the State Teacher's Retirement System. However, the governing board must demonstrate inability to acquire the services of a qualified regular employee to the satisfaction of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Counsel should note that the cross reference to *Educ. Code § 44888* in *Educ. Code § 44917* is apparently erroneous as there is presently no section numbered 44888 in the Education Code.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.23

§ 512.23 Temporary Employees

[1] Generally

The governing board of a school district must classify the following persons as temporary employees:

(1) Persons requiring certification qualifications, other than substitute employees, who are employed to serve from day to day during the first three school months of any school term to teach temporary classes that will not exist after the first three school months of any school term, or to perform any other duties that do not last longer than the first three school months of a school term, or to teach in special day and evening classes for adults or in schools of migratory population for not more than four school months of any school term. If the classes or duties continue beyond this period, the certificated employee, unless a permanent employee, must be classified as a probationary employee. The school year may be divided into not more than two terms for purposes of this provision [*Educ. Code § 44919(a)*].

(2) Persons, other than substitute employees, who are employed to serve in a limited assignment supervising student athletic activities. Such an assignment must first, however, be made available to teachers presently employed by the district. Such service is not included in computing the service required to attain classification as a permanent employee [*Educ. Code § 44919(b)*].

In any district, the governing board may, to prevent the stoppage of school district business when an actual emergency arises and persons are not immediately available for probationary classification, make an appointment to a position on a temporary basis for a period not to exceed 20 working days. The person so appointed is deemed to be a temporary employee who is employed to serve from day to day. Service by a person in such an appointment on a temporary basis is not included in computing the service required to attain classification as a permanent employee [*Educ. Code § 44919(c)*].

[2] Limited Hiring Preference for Credentialed Teachers Employed by District

Education Code § 44919(b) requires a governing board to give a limited employment preference to credentialed teachers presently employed by the school district when filling limited-duty assignments of athletic coach [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Rialto Unified School Dist. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 627, 652-653, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671,*

927 P.2d 1175] . The statutory language directing that such positions "first be made available to teachers presently employed by the district" evinces a legislative intent that such teachers "have some tangible advantage in the hiring process not shared by walk-on candidates" [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Rialto Unified School Dist. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 627, 633-635, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671, 927 P.2d 1175]* . However, the Legislature's policy decision that governing boards of individual districts have power over matters of interscholastic athletics means that presently employed credentialed teachers do not have a right of first refusal of limited-duty athletic coach assignments. Rather, individual districts retain discretion over the hiring of athletic coaches; they may establish specific qualifications and evaluate whether candidates meet those qualifications [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Rialto Unified School Dist. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 627, 639-640, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671, 927 P.2d 1175]* . Accordingly, if a credentialed teacher presently employed the district meets the established local qualifications, he or she is entitled to the hiring preference, not a guarantee [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Rialto Unified School Dist. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 627, 643-644, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671, 927 P.2d 1175]* .

[3] Employment of Temporary Employees to Fill Vacancies Caused by Leaves of Absence or Illnesses

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 44917* and *44919*, the governing board of a school district may employ as a teacher for a complete school year, but for not less than one semester unless the date of rendering first paid service occurs during the second semester and prior to March 15, any person holding appropriate certification documents, and may classify the person as a temporary employee. The employment of such a person must be based on the need for additional certificated employees during a particular semester or year because a certificated employee has been granted leave for a semester or year, or is experiencing long-term illness, and must be limited to the number of persons necessary to fill that need, as determined by the governing board [*Educ. Code § 44920*].

The governing board need not assign an employee hired pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44920* to the classroom of a particular permanent or probationary teacher whose absence (due to leave or illness) necessitated the hiring, in order to classify the teacher hired as a temporary employee. All that is required is that the number of temporary teachers so hired not exceed the total number of permanent and probationary employees on leave at any one time [*see Santa Barbara Fed'n of Teachers v. Santa Barbara High School Dist. (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 223, 229, 231-233, 142 Cal. Rptr. 749* ; *Paulus v. Bd. of Trustees (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 59, 62-63, 134 Cal. Rptr. 220]* .

[4] Employment of Temporary Employees for First Semester Only

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44919*, the governing board of a unified or high school district may employ, and classify as temporary employees, persons requiring certification qualifications for the first semester only, whenever the district expects a reduction in student enrollment during the second semester due to students completing graduation requirements at midyear. The number of persons so employed must be limited to requirements based on the anticipated reduced enrollment as determined by the governing board. Persons so employed who are continued in employment beyond the first semester are deemed probationary employees for the entire school year [*Educ. Code § 44921*].

Any such employee must be reemployed for the following semester or school year to fill any vacant position in the school district for which the employee is certified, in accordance with *Educ. Code §§ 44845* and *44846* (general provisions governing priority of reemployment). A "vacant position" is one in which the employee is qualified to serve and which is not filled by a permanent or probationary employee. The term does not include a position that would be filled by a permanent or probationary employee except for the fact that such employee is on leave [*Educ. Code § 44921*; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.21[2]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.24

§ 512.24 Effect of Reorganization of District on Classification

The division, uniting, unionization, or consolidation of any school district, or any change in the school district boundaries or organization, does not affect the classification of certificated employees already employed by any school district affected. Such employees retain the same status, including time served as probationary employees, that they had prior to the reorganization [*see Educ. Code § 44902*].

If a school district that has an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils is unionized, unified, united, or consolidated with another district in which the average daily attendance was, or as a result of the unionization, unification, uniting, or consolidation becomes, 250 or more pupils, then the regular three-year probationary period [*see* discussion in *§ 512.20*] is deemed to have commenced at the beginning of the employee's first complete year of consecutive employment by the school district having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils. Every certificated employee who has been employed for three or more complete consecutive school years by a district having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils must, immediately on employment in a certificated position following unionization, unification, uniting, or consolidation with the larger school district, be classified as a permanent employee [*Educ. Code § 44903*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.25

§ 512.25 Mandate Proceeding to Compel Reclassification

Mandate is an appropriate remedy for an employee seeking reclassification as a permanent or probationary employee [*see, e.g., Campbell v. Graham-Armstrong (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 482, 485-486, 107 Cal. Rptr. 777, 509 P.2d 689* ; *Middaugh v. Board of Trustees (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 776, 781, 119 Cal. Rptr. 826]* .

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings generally, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* . For forms of petitions for writs of mandate to compel reclassification of a certificated employee, *see §§ 512.169* and *512.170*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.26

§ 512.26 General Principles Applicable to Dismissal or Suspension

Under the Education Code, permanent and probationary teachers are entitled to certain procedural protections against arbitrary dismissal or suspension [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932-44948.5*; *Balen v. Peralta Junior College Dist. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 821, 826, 114 Cal. Rptr. 589, 523 P.2d 629]* . A school district's unilateral termination of a permanent or probationary teacher's employment is governed by these statutory provisions, rather than by general contract law [*see Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817]* . Furthermore, an employee who is subject to dismissal only for cause has a property interest in continued employment that is entitled to constitutional protection [*Shields v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 955, 959, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391* ; *Mendoza v. Regents of University of California (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 168, 174-175, 144 Cal. Rptr. 117]* . Statutes that have as their object the termination of a permanent employee's right of continued employment must be strictly construed [*Shields v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 955, 959, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391* ; *Tuffli v. Governing Board (1995) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1398, 1404, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433]* . Thus, unless the school district follows the statutory procedures for dismissal or suspension, its action in dismissing or suspending a permanent or probationary employee is illegal, and the employee is entitled to be reinstated in his or her position with full salary from the date of dismissal or suspension [*see Mass v. Board of Education (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 617-618, 630, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579* ; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 1000, 136 P.2d 120* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.28[9]*].

Suspension of a teaching credential, voluntary or otherwise, does not automatically deprive an individual of the right to continued public employment, nor does it relieve a school district from complying with the due process requirements of notice and the opportunity for a hearing prior to dismissal embodied in *Educ. Code § 44934 et seq.* During the period of suspension, the tenured employee's status as a permanent employee remains unaffected. Therefore, cause for dismissal of a suspended permanent employee must be established after adequate notice and opportunity for a hearing [*Educ. Code §§ 44934, 44935, 44936, 44937, 44944*; *Shields v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 955, 958-962, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391]* .

However, the California Supreme Court has held that probationary teachers do not possess the same due process rights as permanent teachers, and pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*, school districts may simply decline to "reelect" (as opposed to "dismiss") probationary teachers without showing grounds for cause or following the procedures required

for a dismissal of permanent teachers [*Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 284-287, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193]* . The court also held that *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* preempts any collective bargaining agreement purporting to provide greater due process rights to probationary teachers than those afforded by the code [*Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 287, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193* ; *see Sunnyvale Unified Sch. Dist. v. Jacobs (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 168, 179-183, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (school district's allegedly retaliatory decision not to reelect probationary teacher may not be made subject to collectively bargained arbitration procedures)]. Similarly, statutory provisions for the preferential rehiring of teachers who have been laid off for economic reasons [*see Educ. Code §§ 44955, 44957*] do not prevent a school district from validly determining not to reelect a probationary teacher under *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* [*California Teachers Assn. v. Mendocino Unified Sch. Dist. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 522, 526-528, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 879]* . Thus, although a school district must follow the layoff statutes when it releases a probationary employee for economic reasons, it may thereafter choose not to reelect that employee for other reasons, such as his or her lack of a full or clear teaching credential [*California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 135, 157* & n11, *56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.27

§ 512.27 Constitutional Restraints on Dismissal

A public school teacher may not be dismissed from employment for the exercise of constitutional rights absent a showing that the restraints imposed on those rights are justified by a compelling public interest [*Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 585-586, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* . Generally, a teacher's right to speak is constitutionally protected as long as it does not result in any disruption or impairment of discipline or materially interfere with school activities [*Adcock v. Board of Educ. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 60, 65, 109 Cal. Rptr. 676, 513 P.2d 900]* . In the absence of actual disruption, disciplinary action is improper when a teacher espouses his or her unpopular views in a polite but forceful manner, in an appropriate forum for the airing of different views on controversial issues [*see* *Adcock v. Board of Educ. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 60, 68-69, 109 Cal. Rptr. 676, 513 P.2d 900]* . However, a school which reprimands a science teacher for protesting a requirement that he teach evolution does not violate the teacher's rights under the *establishment clause of the First Amendment*. The school district may also restrict a teacher's conversations with students on religious matters during the school day and on school property [*Peloza v. Capistrano Unified School District (9th Cir. 1994) 37 F. 3d 517, 521-522]* .

The refusal by a hearing officer and school board to consider evidence that a teacher was dismissed for the exercise of constitutional rights whose limitation was not justified by a compelling public interest constitutes legal error that invalidates a dismissal [*Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 587-588, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* . When reviewing the dismissal of a teacher in a mandate proceeding, the trial court must make an independent assessment of the evidence on the question of whether the true reason for the dismissal was the teacher's exercise of constitutional rights [*Bekiaris v. Board of Educ. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 593, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.28

§ 512.28 Dismissal or Suspension of Permanent Employees

[1] Grounds

A permanent employee may be dismissed only for one or more of the following causes [*Educ. Code § 44932(a)*]:

(1) Immoral or unprofessional conduct (discussed *below*);

(2) Commission, or aiding or advocating the commission, of acts of criminal syndicalism, as prohibited by Stats. 1919, ch. 188 or any amendment thereof;

(3) Dishonesty (discussed *below*);

(4) Unsatisfactory performance (discussed *below*);

(5) Evident unfitness for service (discussed in *§ 512.28[2]*);

(6) Physical or mental condition rendering the employee unfit to instruct or associate with children;

(7) Persistent violation of or refusal to obey the school laws of the state or reasonable regulations prescribed for the government of the public schools by the State Board of Education or by the governing board of the employing school district (discussed *below*);

(8) Conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude (discussed *below*);

(9) Violation of *Educ. Code § 51530* (prohibition against teaching or advocation of communism in public schools for purpose of indoctrinating students) or any conduct specified in *Gov. Code § 1028* (knowing membership in Communist Party or any organization advocating forceful overthrow of government as sufficient cause for dismissal of public employee) (discussed *below*);

(10) Violation of any provision in former *Educ. Code §§ 7001-7007* (relating to knowing membership of public school employees in Communist Party) (discussed *below*);

(11) Knowing membership by the employee in the Communist Party (discussed *below*);

(12) Alcoholism or other drug abuse that makes the employee unfit to instruct or associate with children.

A permanent employee may be dismissed or suspended on grounds of unprofessional conduct consisting of acts or omissions other than those specified in *Educ. Code § 44932*. However any such charge must specify instances of behavior deemed to constitute unprofessional conduct [*Educ. Code § 44933*]. A dismissal for unprofessional conduct under *Educ. Code § 44933* must be based on acts or omissions other than those supporting dismissal under *Educ. Code § 44932(a)* [*Perez v Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1172, 197 Cal. Rptr. 390]* .

Counsel should note that *Educ. Code §§ 7001-7007*, which are referred to in *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(10)*, were repealed by the Legislature in 1981 [*see* Stats. 1981, ch. 470, § 11].

A particular act or omission of a teacher may constitute several different causes for dismissal under *Educ. Code § 44932(a)*, such as unprofessional conduct, evident unfitness for service, and persistent violation of school rules [*see Board of Education v. Swan (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 546, 550-551, 261 P.2d 261]* .

The governing board of a school district may suspend a permanent certificated employee or, in a school district with an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils, a probationary employee, without pay for a specific period of time on grounds of unprofessional conduct pursuant to the procedures specified in *Educ. Code §§ 44933-44937*, *44943*, and *44944*. This authorization is not applicable to any school district that has adopted a collective bargaining agreement pursuant to *Gov. Code § 3543.2* [*Educ. Code § 44932(b)*].

[2] Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct; Unfitness to Teach

[a] In General

A permanent teacher may not be dismissed on grounds of immoral or unprofessional conduct unless his or her conduct indicates unfitness to teach [*Board of Educ. v. Jack M. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 691, 696-697, 139 Cal. Rptr. 700, 566 P.2d 602* ; *see* *Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 225, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375* ; *West Valley-Mission Community College Dist. v. Concepcion (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1766, 1773-1774, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 5* ; *see also* discussion in *§§ 512.16* and *512.16[3][b]*]. Unfitness to teach is evaluated under the so-called *Morrison* standards [*see* *Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375]* . In *Morrison*, the California Supreme Court held that an individual may be removed from the teaching profession only on a showing that retention poses a significant danger of harm to either students, school employees, or others who might be affected by his or her actions as a teacher [*Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 235, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375]* . In determining whether a teacher's conduct indicates unfitness to teach, the governing body may consider such matters as the likelihood that the conduct may have adversely affected students or fellow teachers, the degree of adversity anticipated, the proximity or remoteness in time of the conduct, the type of teaching certificate held by the party involved, the extenuating or aggravating circumstances, if any, surrounding the conduct, the praiseworthiness or blameworthiness of the motives resulting in the conduct, the likelihood of a recurrence, and the extent to which disciplinary action may inflict an adverse impact or chilling effect on the constitutional rights of the teacher involved or other teachers [*Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 229, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375* ; *Governing Board v. Haar (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 369, 383-385, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744* ; *West Valley-Mission Community College Dist. v. Concepcion (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1766, 1774, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 5* ; *see Perez v Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1173, 197 Cal. Rptr. 390]* . The

ultimate inquiry is whether the teacher's future classroom performance and overall impact on his or her students is likely to meet the standards of the school district employing the teacher [*Oakland Unified Sch. Dist. v. Olicker (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1098, 1109, 102 Cal. Rptr. 421]* .

Other courts have recently recast the *Morrison* factors to include the following: (1) the likelihood of recurrence of the questioned conduct; (2) the extenuating or aggravating circumstances, if any; (3) the effect of notoriety and publicity; (4) any impairment of teacher-student relationships; (5) any disruption of educational process; (6) motive; and (7) the proximity or remoteness in time of the conduct [*Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 991, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *Bassett Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1444, 1453, 247 Cal. Rptr. 865]* . This fitness-to-teach standard makes specific the kind of conduct required of teachers in this regard and clarifies the term "unprofessional conduct," so that the term is not unconstitutionally vague [*Perez v Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1174, 197 Cal. Rptr. 390]* .

Commission of a sex offense does not demonstrate unfitness to teach as a matter of law [*see* *Board of Educ. v. Jack M. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 691, 700-704, 139 Cal. Rptr. 700, 566 P.2d 602]* . However, sexual misconduct may justify dismissal on grounds of immoral conduct under the facts of a particular case [*see, e.g.,* *Governing Board v. Metcalf (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 546, 550-551, 111 Cal. Rptr. 724* ; *Bd. of Trustees v. Stubblefield (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 820, 824-827, 94 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . Acquittal of a teacher in criminal proceedings for commission of a sex offense does not preclude a subsequent dismissal of the teacher for immoral conduct pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1)* based on the same act [*Board of Educ. v. Calderon (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 490, 493-496, 110 Cal. Rptr. 916]* .

Possession of marijuana or other narcotics does not by itself, constitute immoral conduct as a matter of law justifying dismissal of a permanent teacher. The question of whether or not an offense relating to the possession of prohibited substances constitutes immoral conduct presents an issue of fact to be determined in light of all of the surrounding facts and circumstances [*Von Durjais v. Bd. of Trustees (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 681, 688, 148 Cal. Rptr. 192* ; *see, e.g., West Valley-Mission Community College Dist. v. Concepcion (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1766, 1775-1778, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 5* (interpreting similarly worded provisions of *Educ. Code § 87732* governing dismissal of community college instructors; under facts of case, substantial evidence supported trial court's finding that teacher's participation in cocaine dealing demonstrated unfitness to teach); *Comings v. State Bd. of Educ. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 94, 105-106, 100 Cal. Rptr. 73]* . It should be noted, however, that alcoholism or other drug abuse that makes the employee unfit to instruct or associate with children is a separate cause for dismissal under *Educ. Code § 44932(a)* [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(12)*].

Immoral conduct is not necessarily limited to conduct involving sex or narcotics offenses. For example, the falsification of student attendance records by a teacher has been held to constitute immoral conduct justifying the teacher's dismissal [*Board of Educ. v. Weiland (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 808, 811-812, 4 Cal. Rptr. 286]* .

[b] Evident Unfitness for Service

Evident unfitness for service is a separate ground for dismissal, apart from immoral or unprofessional conduct [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1), (5)*]. Because immoral or unprofessional conduct requires a showing of unfitness to teach, the two grounds substantially overlap, at the least, and, in the view of some courts, may have merged into a single ground [*see* *Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 991, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *Oakland Unified Sch. Dist. v. Olicker (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1098, 1108, 102 Cal. Rptr. 421]* .

Nevertheless, other courts have found evident unfitness for service still to be a separate and unique ground for dismissal. Under this view, evident unfitness for service means clearly not fit, not adapted to, or unsuitable for teaching, ordinarily because of temperamental defects or inadequacies. Unlike unprofessional conduct, evident unfitness for service connotes a fixed character trait, presumably not remediable merely on receipt of notice that one's conduct fails to meet the expectations of the employing school district [*see* *Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1442-1445, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227* (and cases cited therein); *see*

also § 512.25[2][c]].

Under both views, the *Morrison* factors [*see § 512.28[2]*] must be analyzed [*Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1445, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227* ; *Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 991, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57]* . Nevertheless, under the view that unprofessional conduct and evident unfitness for service are distinct, the conclusion that a teacher is unfit under the *Morrison* criteria is only the threshold point of inquiry. The next step is to determine whether the unfitness is "evident," that is, whether the offensive conduct is caused by a defect in temperament [*Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1445, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227]* .

[c] Unprofessional Conduct; Notice Requirement

The governing board of a school district may not act on any charges of unprofessional conduct [*see Educ. Code § 48932(a)(1)*] unless, at least 45 calendar days prior to the date of the filing, the board or its authorized representative has given the employee against whom the charge is filed written notice of the unprofessional conduct, specifying the nature the conduct alleged to constitute unprofessional conduct with specific instances of behavior and with sufficient particularity to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge. The notice must include the evaluation made pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44660 et seq.* (employee performance evaluations), if applicable to the employee [*Educ. Code § 44938(a)*]. The term "unprofessional conduct" as used in *Educ. Code § 44938* refers to and means the unprofessional conduct particularly specified as a cause for dismissal or suspension in *Educ. Code §§ 44932* and *44933* and does not include any other cause for dismissal specified in *Educ. Code § 44932* [*Educ. Code § 44938(c)*]. A district "acts on" a charge of unprofessional conduct by suspending a teacher from employment, as well as by dismissing the teacher [*Crowl v. Commission on Professional Competence (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 334, 342-347, 275 Cal. Rptr. 86]* .

The same conduct may constitute both unprofessional conduct and another ground for dismissal [*Board of Education v. Swan (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 546, 551, 261 P.2d 261* , overruled on other grounds in *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480* ; *Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1444-1445, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227]* . In these cases, there is some uncertainty as to whether the notice need be given. Apparently, in the majority's view, the notice is not required to dismiss if the district elects to proceed under a ground set forth in *Educ. Code § 44932* other than unprofessional conduct [*Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1446-1448, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227* (unprofessional conduct is lesser-included form of evident unfitness for service; no notice required to proceed solely on latter ground because, under court's definition of evident unfitness, teacher is incapable of correcting behavior); *see also Pittsburg Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 964, 974, 194 Cal. Rptr. 672]* . Nevertheless, there is some authority for the proposition that the district ought not to be able to avoid the notice requirement by means of the particular label chosen if the essence of the charge is unprofessional conduct [*see Livermore Valley Joint Unified Sch. Dist. v. Feinberg (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 920, 922, 112 Cal. Rptr. 923* ; *see also Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1461, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227* (opinion of Blease, Acting P.J., dissenting)].

The notice requirement of *Educ. Code § 44938(a)* is jurisdictional, and any action taken without notice is invalid [*Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1446, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227]* . In contrast, the portion of the statute that pertains to the opportunity to correct behavior is not jurisdictional, but merely an evidentiary consideration [*Crowl v. Commission on Professional Competence (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 334, 348-349, 275 Cal. Rptr. 86* ; *Blake v. Commission of Professional Competence (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 513, 517, 260 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . Thus, the teacher's inability to take advantage of the opportunity because of illness or disability does not deprive the Commission on Judicial Competence of jurisdiction to proceed on the charge. Nevertheless, the failure to provide the teacher with the opportunity to correct his or her deficiencies may constitute a defect in due process [*Blake v. Commission of Professional Competence (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 513, 517-518, 260*

Cal. Rptr. 690 ; *see* *Tarquin v. Commission on Professional Competence (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 251, 148 Cal. Rptr. 522* (teacher transferred to nonclassroom position immediately after given notice)]. Further, if the evidence establishes that the teacher has remedied the conduct during the 45-day period, the teacher may not be suspended based on prior acts of unprofessional conduct [*Crowl v. Commission on Professional Competence (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 334, 349-352, 275 Cal. Rptr. 86* (not reaching issue of whether teacher may demonstrate remediation simply by refraining from unprofessional conduct for 45 days, because district had stipulated that teacher had remedied his conduct)].

For a form of allegation of failure to comply with *Educ. Code § 44938(a)* to be included in a petition for writ of mandate to review dismissal of a permanent teacher, see *§ 512.165*.

[d] Dishonesty

Not every falsehood constitutes dishonesty as a ground for discipline [*Fontana Unified School Dist. v. Burman (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 208, 220 n.12, 246 Cal. Rptr. 733, 753 P.2d 689]* . A permanent teacher may not be dismissed on grounds of dishonesty [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(3)*] unless his or her conduct indicates unfitness to teach [*Bassett Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 1444, 1453-1454, 247 Cal. Rptr. 865]* . For discussion of unfitness to teach, see *§ 512.28[2]*.

[e] Unsatisfactory Performance; Notice Requirement

The governing board of a school district may not act on any charges of unsatisfactory performance [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(4)*] unless, at least 90 calendar days prior to the date of the filing, the board or its authorized representative has given the employee against whom the charge is filed written notice of the unsatisfactory performance. The governing board may, however, act during the time period composed of the last one fourth of the school days it has scheduled for purposes of computing apportionments in any fiscal year if, prior to the beginning of that time period, the board or its authorized representative has given the employee against whom the charge is filed, written notice of the unsatisfactory performance. In any case, the notice must specify the nature of the conduct alleged to constitute unsatisfactory performance and must specify instances of behavior with sufficient particularity to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge. The notice must include an evaluation made pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665* (employee performance evaluations), if applicable to the employee [*Educ. Code § 44938(b)*]. However, the failure of a district to adopt the uniform written guidelines called for by *Educ. Code § 44660* does not deprive a district of jurisdiction to dismiss a teacher for incompetency under *Educ. Code § 44938* [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 27, 33-36, 192 Cal. Rptr. 358* , decided prior to 1995 legislation, which amended *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(4)* by changing "incompetency" to "unsatisfactory performance"].

The term "incompetency," as used in *Educ. Code § 44938*, refers only to the unsatisfactory performance particularly specified as a cause for dismissal in *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(4)*, and does not include any other cause for dismissal specified in *Educ. Code § 44932* [*Educ. Code § 44938(c)*]. Thus, the failure by a school board to comply with the provisions of *Educ. Code § 44938* does not preclude the board from seeking dismissal of a teacher on grounds other than unsatisfactory performance (for example, evident unfitness for service) [*Tarquin v. Commission on Professional Competence (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 251, 260, 148 Cal. Rptr. 522]* .

The purpose of former *Educ. Code § 44938* (*now see Educ. Code § 44938(b)(1)*) is to give a permanent teacher 90 days to correct the deficiencies alleged to constitute unsatisfactory performance. If the school district deprives the teacher of this opportunity by transferring him or her to a nonteaching position prior to the expiration of 90 days after service of notice under former *Educ. Code § 44938* (*now see Educ. Code § 44938(b)(1)*), the district lacks jurisdiction to proceed against the teacher on charges of unsatisfactory performance [*Tarquin v. Commission on Professional Competence (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 251, 257-259, 148 Cal. Rptr. 522]* .

For a form of allegation of failure to comply with *Educ. Code § 44938(b)* to be included in a petition for writ of mandate to review dismissal of a permanent teacher, see *§ 512.164*.

[f] Physical or Mental Condition; Contagious Diseases

A permanent employee may be dismissed on the ground of a physical or mental disability that renders him or her unfit to instruct or associate with children [*Educ. Code § 44932(a)(6)*; *see also Educ. Code § 44942* (suspension or transfer of certificated employee on ground of mental illness), discussed in *§ 512.35*]. However, disabled persons are protected from employment discrimination by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Act) [*see 29 U.S.C.S. § 794*]. Under this Act, recipients of federal funds are prohibited from discriminating against otherwise qualified persons in employment solely on the basis of handicap [*29 U.S.C.S. § 794*]. Disabled individuals are also protected from employment discrimination by the Americans With Disabilities Act (*42 U.S.C.S. § 12101 et seq.*) and by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 12926(i), (k), 12940(a)*; *2 Cal. Code Reg. § 7293.6*].

In the employment context, an otherwise qualified person under the Rehabilitation Act is one who, with reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the job in question [*45 C.F.R. § 84.3*(*l*)(1)]. Accommodation is not reasonable if it either imposes undue financial and administrative burdens or requires a fundamental alteration in the nature of the program [*Southeastern Community College v. Davis (1979) 442 U.S. 397, 410-413, 99 S. Ct. 2361, 60 L. Ed. 2d 980]* .

Persons with contagious diseases are disabled within the meaning of the Rehabilitation Act and, therefore, afforded its protections [*School Board of Nassau County v. Arline (1987) 480 U.S. 273, 280-286, 107 S. Ct. 1123, 94 L. Ed. 2d 307* (tuberculosis)]. However, a person who poses a significant risk of communicating an infectious disease to others in the workplace is not otherwise qualified for the job if reasonable accommodation will not eliminate the risk [*School Board of Nassau County v. Arline (1987) 480 U.S. 273, 280-286 n.16, 107 S. Ct. 1123, 94 L. Ed. 2d 307]* . Inquiry is required based on reasonable medical judgment, given the state of medical knowledge, about (1) the nature of the risk, that is, how the disease is transmitted; (2) the duration of the risk, that is, how long the carrier is infectious; (3) the severity of the risk, that is, the potential harm to third parties; and (4) the probabilities that the disease will be transmitted. In making these findings, the court ordinarily should defer to the reasonable medical judgment of public health officials [*School Board of Nassau County v. Arline (1987) 480 U.S. 273, 280-286, 107 S. Ct. 1123, 94 L. Ed. 2d 307]* .

A person who has tested positive for Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) is a disabled person under the Act [*Chalk v. U.S. Dist. Court Cent. Dist. of California (9th Cir. 1988) 840 F.2d 701, 705 n.6* ; *accord*, *Raytheon Co. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1250, 1252, 261 Cal. Rptr. 197* (decided under Fair Employment and Housing Act)]. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has noted that the overwhelming consensus of medical opinion is that there is no evidence that demonstrates any appreciable risk of transmitting the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), the viral agent that causes AIDS, under circumstances likely to occur in the ordinary school setting. Therefore, the court held that a teacher with AIDS who was reassigned to nonclassroom duty amply demonstrated a strong possibility of success on the merits in proving that his rights under the Rehabilitation Act had been violated [*Chalk v. U.S. Dist. Court Cent. Dist. of California (9th Cir. 1988) 840 F.2d 701, 704-709* (reversing denial of preliminary injunction and ordering teacher returned to classroom pending trial)].

For discussion and forms relating to employment discrimination, see Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination* . For comprehensive discussion of equal employment opportunity laws, including prohibitions on discrimination against disabled individuals, see K. Wilcox, ed., California Employment Law, chs. 40-44 (Matthew Bender).

If a school district applies to the State Teachers' Retirement System (STRS) for a disability benefit for a teacher, and the STRS finds the teacher not to be disabled, the teacher must be reinstated to his or her former position [*Educ. Code § 44986.1*]. If the teacher applies and is denied, the finding is a prima facie statement of recovery, giving rise to the

district's duty either to reinstate him or her or to hold a competency or dismissal hearing [*Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1358, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354]* .

[g] Persistent Violation of School Laws or Rules

A permanent teacher may not be dismissed for violating school laws or rules unless the violations are persistent [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(7)*; Governing Bd. of the Oakdale Union School Dist. v. Seaman (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 77, 81-82, 104 Cal. Rptr. 64, 66]. Thus, a single violation of a school board regulation prohibiting absence without leave does not justify dismissal of a permanent teacher, at least if the violation is not accompanied by an attitude of continuous insubordination, even though the single violation results in an absence of several days [*Governing Bd. of the Oakdale Union School Dist. v. Seaman (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 77, 82-83, 104 Cal. Rptr. 64]* .

A permanent teacher may not be dismissed for refusal to obey an order that is invalid. Insubordination as a ground for dismissal may be rightfully predicated only on refusal to obey an order that a superior officer is entitled to give and to have obeyed [*see Pasadena Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 309, 314, 314 n.7, 142 Cal. Rptr. 439, 572 P.2d 53]* .

[h] Conviction of Crime

A permanent teacher may not be dismissed under *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(8)* for conviction of a felony or other crime unless the felony or other crime involves moral turpitude [*Bd. of Trustees v. Judge (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 920, 925-926, 123 Cal. Rptr. 830* (also holding that cultivation of marijuana is not offense involving moral turpitude as matter of law)]. Conviction of certain crimes, however, results in automatic revocation of certification documents, regardless of whether or not the particular offense involved moral turpitude [*see Educ. Code §§ 44424, 44425, 44435, 44436*; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.18[1]*].

[i] Communist or Subversive Affiliations

No teacher giving instruction in any school, or on any property belonging to any agencies included in the public school system, may advocate or teach communism with the intent to indoctrinate or to inculcate in the mind of any pupil a preference for communism [*Educ. Code § 51530*]. For purposes of *Educ. Code § 51530*, communism is a political theory that states that the presently existing government of the United States or of California should be changed by force, violence, or other unconstitutional means to a totalitarian dictatorship that is based on the principles of communism as expounded by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin [*Educ. Code § 51530*]. A violation of *Educ. Code § 51530* is grounds for dismissal of a permanent employee [*see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(9)*]. Furthermore, *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(11)* provides that knowing membership in the Communist Party is grounds for dismissal.

Counsel representing the school district should exercise caution in using these provisions as bases for instituting dismissal proceedings because they may be held unconstitutional in light of the opinions of the *United States Supreme Court in Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents (1967) 385 U.S. 589, 606-610, 87 S. Ct. 675, 17 L. Ed. 2d 629* and the *California Supreme Court in Vogel v. County of Los Angeles (1967) 68 Cal. 2d 18, 22-24, 64 Cal. Rptr. 409, 434 P.2d 961* , holding that public employment may not constitutionally be denied for mere membership in a subversive organization, absent a showing of intent by the member to further its unlawful aims. For a further discussion of the constitutional limits on discipline of public school teachers, see *§ 512.27*.

[3] Notice of Charges

On filing with the governing board of a school district of written charges, duly signed and verified by the person filing them, or on a written statement of charges formulated by the governing board, charging that there exists cause, as specified in *Educ. Code § 44932* or *44933*, for the dismissal or suspension of a permanent employee of the district, the board may, on majority vote, give notice to the employee of its intention to dismiss or suspend him or her within 30

days from the date of service of the notice unless the employee demands a hearing [*Educ. Code § 44934*]. Suspension proceedings may be initiated pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44934* only if the governing board has not adopted a collective bargaining agreement pursuant to *Gov. Code § 3543.2* [*Educ. Code § 44934*].

Any written statement of charges of unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance must specify instances of behavior and the acts or omissions constituting the charge so that the teacher will be able to prepare his or her defense. If applicable, the statement must state the statutes and rules that the teacher is alleged to have violated, but it must also set forth the facts relevant to each occasion of alleged unprofessional conduct or incompetency.

The notice given pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44934* must not be given between May 15 and September 15 in any year. It must be in writing and served on the employee personally or by United States registered mail addressed to his or her last known address. A copy of the charges filed, containing the information required by *Gov. Code § 11503* (requiring specification of any statutes and rules allegedly violated and statement of charges setting forth alleged acts and omissions in ordinary and concise language), together with a copy of the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 44930-44988*, must be attached to the notice [*Educ. Code § 44936*].

[4] Time Limit on Demand for Hearing; Governing Board's Response

If the employee does not demand a hearing by filing a written request for hearing with the governing board, he or she may be dismissed or suspended without pay for a specific period of time at the expiration of the 30-day period [*Educ. Code § 44937*]. When any employee who has been served with notice of the governing board's intention to dismiss or suspend him or her demands a hearing, the governing board has the option of either rescinding its action or scheduling a hearing on the matter [*Educ. Code § 44943*].

If the employee makes a timely demand for a hearing, the governing board cannot terminate the employee without conducting the hearing, even if the termination is based on the long-term suspension of the employee's teaching credential. For example, in a case in which a permanent, tenured teacher's credential had been suspended for 10 years due to allegations of sexual misconduct, and the employing school district had notified the teacher of its intention to terminate the teacher's employment, the district could not refuse the teacher's request for a pretermination hearing [*Shields v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 955, 958-962, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391* (permanent, tenured teacher has property interest in continued employment that is entitled to constitutional protection through procedural due process)].

Because the governing board of a school district is a "legislative body" of a "local agency" subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act [*Gov. Code §§ 54951, 54952*; *see Gov. Code § 54950 et seq.*], the employee will be entitled to demand an open hearing on the charges [*Bell v. Vista Unified Sch. Dist. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 672, 682, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 263]* . The Brown Act's general requirement of open meetings is subject to a "personnel exception," under which the board may hold closed meetings to consider the appointment, employment, evaluation of performance, discipline, or dismissal of a public employee [*Gov. Code § 54957(b)*; *Kolter v. Commission on Prof'l Competence of L.A. Unified Sch. Dist. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1352, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 620* (personnel exception applies, and governing board may hold closed session, when governing board will consider or deliberate whether charges justify dismissal or disciplinary action, but will not conduct evidentiary hearing); *Duval v. Board of Trs. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 902, 909-910, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 517* ("evaluation of performance" may include preliminary matters such as selection of criteria and establishment of process for evaluation, and post-evaluation action finding it satisfactory)]. However, the personnel exception is inapplicable when the board is conducting an evidentiary hearing on specific complaints or charges against an employee with potential disciplinary consequences [*Bell v. Vista Unified Sch. Dist. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 672, 682-684, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 263]* .

[5] Immediate Suspension for Certain Charges

[a] Charges

If a permanent employee has been charged in writing with (1) immoral conduct, (2) conviction of a felony or of any crime involving moral turpitude, (3) incompetency due to mental disability, (4) willful refusal to perform regular assignments, as prescribed by reasonable rules and regulations of the employing school district, (5) violation of *Educ. Code § 51530, (6)* knowing membership in the Communist Party, or (7) violation of any of the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 7001-7007*, the governing board may, if it deems the action necessary, immediately suspend the employee from his or her duties, and give the employee notice of the suspension and of its intention to dismiss him or her within 30 days after service of the notice, unless he or she demands a hearing [*Educ. Code § 44939*]. *Educ. Code § 44939* applies only to certificated or credentialed employees. Thus, an employee whose credential has lapsed must be suspended immediately without regard to the procedures in this section [*Stewart v. Acalanes Union High Sch. Dist. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1147-1148, 257 Cal. Rptr. 692* ; *see Educ. Code § 45034* (prohibiting drawing pay warrant to uncredentialed person employed in position requiring credential)].

Counsel should note that *Educ. Code §§ 7001-7007*, which are referred to in *Educ. Code § 44939*, were repealed by the Legislature in 1981 [*see* Stats. 1981, ch. 470, § 11].

[b] Time for Giving Notice of Suspension

The notice of suspension and intention to dismiss given pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44939* must be in writing and served on the employee personally or by United States registered mail addressed to the employee's last known address. A copy of the charges filed, containing the information required by *Gov. Code § 11503* (requiring specification of any statutes and rules allegedly violated and statement of charges setting forth alleged acts and omissions in ordinary and concise language), together with a copy of the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 44930-44988* must be attached to the notice. If the employee does not demand a hearing with the 30-day period, he or she may be dismissed at the expiration of 30 days after service of the notice [*Educ. Code § 44941*].

Unlike notice given pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44934* and *44936* [*see § 512.28[3]*], notice given pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44939* may be given between May 15 and September 15, or at any other time during the school year [*compare Educ. Code § 44936 with Educ. Code § 44941*]. However, a school board may not dismiss a permanent teacher on grounds contained only in *Educ. Code § 44932* by giving notice after the May 15 deadline prescribed in *Educ. Code § 44936*, notwithstanding that the teacher is, at the same time, given notice of immediate suspension and intention to dismiss for grounds specified in *Educ. Code § 44939* [*Board of Educ. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 664, 668, 132 Cal. Rptr. 516]* .

[c] Payment of Salary During Suspension

If the permanent employee is suspended on charges of knowing membership in the Communist Party or for any violation of *Educ. Code § 7001, 7002, 7003, 7006, 7007*, or *51530*, he or she may, within 10 days after service on him or her of notice of such suspension, file a written, verified denial of the charges. In such event, if the employee demands a hearing within the 30-day period, he or she will continue to be paid his or her regular salary during the period of the suspension until the entry of the decision of the Commission on Professional Competence, provided that the employee furnishes to the school district a suitable bond or other security acceptable to the governing board, as a guarantee that the employee will repay to the district the amount of salary paid to him or her during the suspension in case the decision of the Commission on Professional Competence is to dismiss the employee. If it is determined that the employee may not be dismissed, the school board must reimburse the employee for the cost of the bond [*Educ. Code § 44939*].

Counsel should note that *Educ. Code §§ 7001-7003, 7006*, and *7007*, which are referred to in the second paragraph of *Educ. Code § 44939*, were repealed by the Legislature in 1981 [*see* Stats. 1981, ch. 470, § 11].

[6] Hearing Procedure

[a] Time for Hearing

In the event a hearing is requested by the employee, the hearing must be commenced within 60 days from the date of the employee's demand for a hearing. If any continuance is granted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11524*, the time limitation for commencement of the hearing must be extended for a period of time equal to such continuance. The extension may not, however, include any period of time attributable to an unlawful refusal by either party to allow the discovery provided for in *Educ. Code §§ 44944* [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.28[6][d]*]. The parties may stipulate that the hearing will commence merely as a ceremonial formality within the 60-day limit, with no evidence being presented until the hearing reconvenes beyond the 60-day limit [*Wilmot v. Commission on Professional Competence (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1139-1148, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656* ("the parties may 'stipulate that the necessary ceremonial has been observed' and may thereby satisfy the 60-day requirement")].

[b] Conduct of Hearing Before Commission on Professional Competence

The hearing must be initiated and conducted, and a decision must be made, in accordance with *Gov. Code § 11500-11528*; the Commission on Professional Competence has all the power granted to an agency under those sections [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.28[6][e]*]. For a discussion and forms relating to administrative hearings conducted pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* .

[c] Right to Counsel

The governing board and the employee have the right to be represented by counsel at the hearing [*Educ. Code § 44944(c)*].

[d] Discovery Rights

The right of discovery of the parties in a hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44944* is not limited to matters set forth in *Gov. Code § 11507.6* (scope of discovery in administrative proceedings), but includes the rights and duties of any party to a civil action brought in a superior court. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary, and except for the taking of oral depositions, no discovery may occur later than 30 calendar days after the employee is served with a copy of the accusation pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11505*. In all cases, discovery must be completed prior to seven calendar days before the date on which the hearing commences [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

If the right of discovery is denied by either the employee or the governing board, all the remedies in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.010 et seq.* are available to the party seeking discovery [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*]. The court of proper jurisdiction to entertain a motion to compel discovery is the superior court of the county in which the hearing will be held [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

The time periods in *Educ. Code § 44944*, *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.* must not be applied so as to deny discovery in a hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44944*. The superior court of the county in which the hearing will be held may, on motion of the party seeking discovery, suspend the hearing so as to comply with this requirement [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

For a discussion and forms relating to discovery in civil actions, see Chs. 190- 200, *Discovery* .

[e] Commission on Professional Competence

The hearing provided for in *Educ. Code § 44944* must be conducted by a Commission on Professional Competence

(hereinafter referred to as the "CPC"). One member of the CPC is selected by the employee, one member is selected by the governing board, and one member must be an administrative law judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings who must be the chairman and a voting member of the CPC. The administrative law judge is responsible for assuring that the legal rights of the parties are protected at the hearing [*Educ. Code § 44944(b)*].

If either the governing board or the employee fails for any reason to select a CPC member at least seven calendar days prior to the date of the hearing, the failure constitutes a waiver of the right to selection, and the county board of education or its specific designee must immediately make the selection. If, however, the county board of education is also the governing board of the school district or has been granted the powers of a governing board by statute, the selection must be made by the Superintendent of Public Instruction who must be reimbursed by the school district for all costs incident to the selection [*Educ. Code § 44944(b)*].

The member selected by the governing board and the member selected by the employee must not be related to the employee and must not be employees of the district initiating the dismissal. Each member must hold a currently valid credential and have at least five years experience within the past ten years in the employee's discipline [*Educ. Code § 44944(b)*].

[f] Place of Hearing

The hearing provided for in *Educ. Code § 44944* must be conducted in a place selected by agreement among the members of the CPC. In the absence of such agreement, the place must be selected by the administrative law judge [*Educ. Code § 44944(f)*].

[g] Evidence Admissible

No witness may be permitted to testify at the hearing except on oath or affirmation. No testimony may be given or evidence introduced relating to matters that occurred more than four years prior to the date of the filing of the notice of intention to dismiss. Evidence of records regularly kept by the governing board may be introduced, but no decision relating to the dismissal or suspension of any employee may be made based on charges or evidence of any nature relating to matters occurring more than four years prior to the filing of the notice [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*]. This four-year limit is subject to equitable exceptions, however. For example, an employee may be equitably estopped from asserting the four-year limit if the employee's own conduct induced the school district or governing board to delay the filing of the notice of intent to dismiss or suspend the employee [*Atwater Elementary Sch. Dist. v. California Dep't of Gen. Servs. (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 227, 235-238, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233, 158 P.3d 794]* .

Evidence of criminal misconduct seized by law enforcement officers in violation of the constitutional prohibition against unreasonable searches and seizure is admissible at the hearing [*see Governing Bd. v. Metcalf (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 546, 551, 111 Cal. Rptr. 724]* .

The employee is entitled to present any defense to termination, including constitutional and civil rights defenses, at the hearing [*Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1484-1485, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *see Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 592, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480* ; *see also Gov. Code § 11506*]. Furthermore, if the employee fails to present all possible defenses, he or she may be precluded from doing so in a later civil action by principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel [*see Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1481-1485, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578]* . For further discussion, see *§ 512.28[8]*.

[h] Decision of Commission on Professional Competence

The decision of the CPC must be made by a majority vote and the CPC must prepare a written decision containing findings of fact, determinations of issues, and a disposition, which must be, solely, (1) that the employee should be

dismissed, (2) that the employee should be suspended for a specific period of time without pay, or (3) that the employee should not be dismissed or suspended [*Educ. Code § 44944(c)*]. The CPC may base its decision on the preponderance-of-the-evidence standard of proof [*Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039-1040, 210 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

The CPC has no power to dispose of the charge of dismissal by imposing probation, or other alternative sanctions. The imposition of suspension pursuant to (2) above is available only in a suspension proceeding authorized pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44932(b)* or *44933* [*Educ. Code § 44944(c)*]. However, if the district seeks only dismissal and not suspension, the CPC has the discretion to find that cause for discipline exists without approving dismissal if it is not persuaded that the offense is serious enough to warrant dismissal. The school district may avoid the all-or-nothing result by seeking suspension instead of or in addition to dismissal [*Fontana Unified School Dist. v. Burman (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 208, 220, 221-222, 246 Cal. Rptr. 733, 753 P.2d 689]* .

The decision of the CPC that the employee should not be dismissed or suspended may not be based on nonsubstantive procedural errors committed by the school district or governing board unless the errors are prejudicial. The decision of the CPC is deemed to be the final decision of the governing board [*Educ. Code § 44944(c)*].

[i] Expenses of Hearing Before Commission on Professional Competence

Educ. Code § 44944(e) provides that if the CPC determines that the employee should not be dismissed or suspended, the governing board must pay the expenses of the hearing, including the cost of the administrative law judge, any compensation of CPC members for service during summer recess or vacation periods [*see Educ. Code § 44944(d)(2)*] the reasonable expenses (as determined by the administrative law judge) of the CPC member selected by the governing board and the member selected by the employee (including, but not limited to, payments or obligations incurred for travel, meals, and lodging), the cost of any substitute members, and reasonable attorney fees incurred by the employee.

The Supreme Court has held a cost-sharing provision of *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* unconstitutional on its face. That provision required a teacher who requested a hearing on his or her threatened suspension or dismissal, but who did not ultimately prevail (either at the administrative level or after judicial review), to pay half the cost of the administrative law judge. The Court explained that, since the provision's application was not limited to frivolous hearing requests, it impermissibly chilled teachers' constitutional right to a pretermination opportunity to be heard. Any legitimate interest the state may have in conserving administrative resources or discouraging hearings that result in an administrative or judicial decision against a teacher is outweighed by the teacher's strong interest in presenting his or her side of the case and in invoking the discretion of an adjudicator [*California Teachers Assn. v. State (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 327, 345-357, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425, 975 P.2d 622]* .

[7] Judicial Review of Commission on Professional Competence Decision

The decision of the CPC may, on petition of either the governing board or the employee, be reviewed by a court of competent jurisdiction in the same manner as a decision made by a hearing officer under *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, that is, by petition for a writ of mandate [*see Gov. Code § 11523*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *see also* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* . The court, on review, must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence. The proceeding must be set for hearing at the earliest possible date and must take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special precedence is given by law [*Educ. Code § 44945*].

For a form of petition for writ of mandate to review the decision of a CPC dismissing a permanent employee, *see § 512.161*. For examples of allegations to be included in such a petition, *see §§ 512.162 -512.165*

[8] Effect of Judgment in Mandate Proceeding on Future Civil Action

A terminated employee must succeed in having the administrative determination set aside on mandate as a condition precedent to bringing a tort action based on the termination [*City of Fresno v. Superior Court (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1484, 1488-1493, 234 Cal. Rptr. 136* ; *see Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 469, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410* ; see also *§ 512.28[7]*]. However, a contractual right to employment is a single primary right, and a wrongful termination of that employment gives rise to a single cause of action [*Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1474-1475, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *see Takahashi v. Bd. of Trustees of Livingston (9th Cir. 1986) 783 F.2d 848, 851]* . Therefore, principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel prohibit the raising of any defense to termination for the first time in a subsequent civil action. All legal theories on which it is alleged that the termination was unlawful must be asserted at the administrative hearing and on review by mandate, including violations of procedures set forth in the Education Code, civil rights violations, other constitutional violations, and contract and tort theories [*Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1481-1485, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578]* .

The interaction of these rules essentially means that the question of liability for wrongful termination under any theory of law is to be decided pursuant to a petition for a writ of mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1090* (disputed issues of fact may be tried by jury)]. If on mandate it is determined that the termination was contrary to law, the employee may then bring a civil action for damages [*Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1476-1477, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *City of Fresno v. Superior Court (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1484, 1489-1490, 234 Cal. Rptr. 136]* . The statute of limitations for this action is tolled during the period that the employee-plaintiff is exhausting administrative remedies by seeking mandate [*see Campbell v. Graham-Armstrong (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 482, 490, 107 Cal. Rptr. 777, 509 P.2d 689]* . Presumably, the school district would be precluded by principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel from relitigating the lawfulness of the termination in the second action.

Other conditions precedent to the bringing of a civil action for damages should be satisfied in a timely manner when the employee first becomes aware of the potential right of action. For example, a claim against the school district should be filed within the applicable time periods as required by the Government Claims Act [*see Gov. Code § 911.2*; *see also City of Stockton v. Superior Court (Dec. 3, 2007) 42 Cal. 4th 730, 2007 Cal. LEXIS 13743, at *19-*20* ("Henceforth, we will refer to [*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*] as the Government Claims Act," rather than "Tort Claims Act," because it applies to contract claims as well as tort claims)]. Also, an administrative complaint alleging civil rights violations must be filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing within the applicable time period as required by the Fair Employment and Housing Act [*Takahashi v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1478-1481, 249 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *see Gov. Code § 12960*].

For further discussion of these matters, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* , Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination* , Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* , Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* , Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* , and Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* .

[9] Reinstatement and Back Salary

If the employee has been suspended pending the hearing in the dismissal proceeding, he or she must be reinstated within five days after a decision in his or her favor and must be paid his or her full salary by the governing board for the period of suspension [*Educ. Code § 44946*], including retirement benefits [*Mass v. Board of Education (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 623, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579* ; *see Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1367, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354* (in case of refusal to reinstate after disability leave, back pay awarded from date of formal denial of request for reinstatement)]. In addition, the prevailing employee is entitled to prejudgment interest on each salary payment from the date of accrual to the entry of judgment [*Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 624, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579* ; *see Civ. Code § 3287(a)*].

The measure of recovery of a wrongfully discharged employee is the amount of salary that he or she would have earned, plus other benefits, less the amount that the employer proves the employee has earned or might have earned from other employment [*Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 994, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *see* *Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 627-628, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579]* . The governing board is not entitled to deduct any amounts from backpay owed for periods during which the teacher was unable to return to work; however, workers' compensation benefits received because of an inability to return to the classroom setting as a teacher may be taken into account. Earnings from night or weekend work that are not inconsistent with school employment are not to be set off against any back pay award [*Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 994, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1367-1368, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354]* .

If a permanent employee is suspended without pay pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44939* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.28[5]*] and later cleared of the charges that were the basis of the suspension, the employee is entitled to recover back salary for the period of the suspension, notwithstanding that he or she is ultimately dismissed on other grounds [*Von Durjais v. Bd. of Trustees (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 681, 686-687, 148 Cal. Rptr. 192* ; *Board of Educ. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 664, 669-670, 132 Cal. Rptr. 516]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.29

§ 512.29 Dismissal or Suspension of Probationary Employees in Large School District

[1] Grounds

First and second year probationary employees may be dismissed during the school year for unsatisfactory performance determined pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665* (performance evaluations), or for cause pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44932* [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)*]. The governing board may suspend a probationary employee for a specified period of time without pay as an alternative to dismissal pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44948.3* [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(b)*].

Educ. Code § 44948.3 applies only to dismissal or suspension during the school year. It does not provide any rights with regard to reemployment for the succeeding school year [*Grimsley v. Board of Trustees (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1440, 1446, 235 Cal. Rptr. 85* ; *see § 512.21*].

Educ. Code § 44948.3 applies only to employees whose probationary period commenced during the 1983-1984 fiscal year or any fiscal year thereafter, and does not apply to probationary employees in a school district having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(c)*; *but see Educ. Code § 44948.2* (small school district may elect to dismiss under *Educ. Code § 44948.3*)]. For discussion of the procedures applicable to dismissal of probationary employees in districts with less than 250 pupils, see *§ 512.30*.

[2] Notice Required

The superintendent of the school district or the superintendent's designee must give the employee written notice of dismissal 30 days prior to the dismissal, and, in the case of second-year probationary employees, the notice must be given not later than March 15. The notice must include a statement of the reasons for the dismissal and notice of the opportunity to appeal. If the dismissal is for unsatisfactory performance, a copy of the evaluation conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44664* must accompany the written notice [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(1)*; *see Achene v. Pierce Joint Unified Sch. Dist. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 757, 769-771, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 899* (classroom observation report stating that employee needed to "refine" her performance, and lacking any indication that employee's performance was unsatisfactory or that she would be dismissed if she did not make the recommended refinements, did not constitute sufficient notice of unsatisfactory performance under *Educ. Code § 44664(b)*)].

If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932(a)(1), (4), 44938(c)*], the school district must also have sent the employee a previous written notice specifying the nature of the unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance, with such specific instances of behavior and with such particularity as to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge. This previous notice must include a copy of the evaluation conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44664* [*Educ. Code § 44938(a),(b)*]. If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct, this previous notice must have been given at least 45 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described in the preceding paragraph [*Educ. Code § 44938(a)*]. If the cause is unsatisfactory performance, this previous notice ordinarily must have been given at least 90 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described in the preceding paragraph [*Educ. Code § 44938(b)*; *see Achene v. Pierce Joint Unified Sch. Dist. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 757, 766-768, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 899* (because *Educ. Code § 44938* specifies procedure for dismissal for cause under *Educ. Code § 44932*, it also applies to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance of probationary teacher under *Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)*, which incorporates procedures applicable to dismissal for cause under *Educ. Code § 44932*)].

[3] Hearing Procedure

Within 15 days of receipt of the notice of dismissal, the employee may submit a written request for a hearing to the governing board. The failure of an employee to request a hearing this time period constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing. The governing board may establish procedures for the appointment of an administrative law judge to conduct the hearing and submit a recommended decision to the board [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.30

§ 512.30 Dismissal or Suspension of Probationary Employees in Small School District

[1] During School Year

Probationary employees who are employed in a school district having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils (hereinafter referred to as a "small school district") may be dismissed during the school year for cause only, as in the case of permanent employees [*Educ. Code § 44948(a)*]. *Educ. Code § 44948* has been interpreted by the courts as giving probationary employees dismissed during the school year the same procedural protections applicable to the dismissal of permanent employees [*Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see* discussion in *§ 512.28*]. A probationary employee is dismissed during the school year, within the meaning of *Educ. Code § 44948*, if he or she is prohibited from meeting with his or her classes or performing any other professional services for the rest of the school year, notwithstanding that the school district pays his or her salary for the rest of the year [*Lunderville v. Emery Unified School Dist. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 459, 462-464, 68 Cal. Rptr. 768]* .

The governing board of a small school district may elect to dismiss probationary employees during the school year for cause under *Educ. Code § 44948.3* (otherwise applicable only to larger school districts; *see § 512.29*). Once a district has made such an election, it may only dismiss probationary certificated employees during the school year under *Educ. Code § 44948.2* [*Educ. Code § 44948.2*].

A probationary employee in a small school district may also be dismissed or suspended on grounds of unprofessional conduct consisting of acts or omissions other than those specified in *Educ. Code § 44932*, but any such charge must specify instances of behavior deemed to constitute unprofessional conduct [*see Educ. Code § 44933*]. Such an employee may also be suspended without pay by the governing board of a school district for a specific period of time on grounds of unprofessional conduct pursuant to the procedures specified in Educ. Code §§ 44933-44937, 44943, 44944. This authorization does not, however, apply to any school district that has adopted a collective bargaining agreement pursuant to *Gov. Code § 3543.2(b)* [*Educ. Code § 44932(b)*].

[2] At End of School Year for Reasons Other Than Those Specified in Educ. Code § 44955

[a] Initial Notice

A probationary employee who is employed by a small school district must be notified in writing by the superintendent of the school district or his or her designee (or the clerk or secretary of the governing board if the district has no superintendent) if it has been recommended that the employee not be reemployed for the ensuing school year for reasons other than those specified in *Educ. Code § 44955* (pertaining to reduction of number of permanent and probationary employees for fiscal reasons). The notice must state the reasons for the recommendation that the employee not be reemployed. It must be given to both the employee and the governing board no later than March 15, and before final notice by the governing board that the employee's services will not be required for the following year. If, however, the employee has been employed by the district for less than 45 days on March 15, the giving of such notice may be deferred until the 45th day of employment, and all other time periods and deadline dates prescribed by *Educ. Code § 44948.5* must be coextensively extended [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(b)*].

Until the employee has requested a hearing as provided in *Educ. Code § 44948.5(c)* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.33[3][b]*] or has waived his or her right to a hearing, the notice and the reasons therefor are confidential and must not be divulged by any person except as necessary in the performance of duties. Violation of the requirement of confidentiality does not, however, of itself affect the validity of any hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44948.5* [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(b)*].

[b] Grounds for Refusal to Rehire

The governing board's determination not to reemploy a probationary employee pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44948.5* for the ensuing school year must be for cause only. The determination of the governing board as to the sufficiency of the cause is conclusive, but the cause must relate solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(e)*]. The question of whether or not a particular cause relates solely to the welfare of the school and its pupils is a question of law for the reviewing court, not the school board, to decide [*Lindros v. Governing Bd. of The Torrance Unified School Dist. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 524, 533-534, 108 Cal. Rptr. 185, 510 P.2d 361 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 1112, 94 S. Ct. 842, 38 L. Ed. 2d 739* ; *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 587, 589, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480* (decided under former *Educ. Code § 44949(d)*)].

Age and obesity, by themselves, have been held not to constitute causes that relate solely to the welfare of the school and its pupils justifying dismissal of a probationary employee [*see Blodgett v. Board of Trustees (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 183, 190-193, 97 Cal. Rptr. 406* ; *Thornton v. Board of Trustees (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 761, 765-766, 68 Cal. Rptr. 842]* . By contrast, failure to satisfactorily perform classroom duties, and lack of self-restraint and tact in dealing with coworkers, pupils, and parents have been held to be matters that clearly relate to the welfare of the school and its pupils [*see Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 827-828, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115* ; *Griggs v. Board of Trustees (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 93, 97, 37 Cal. Rptr. 194, 389 P.2d 722]* . The failure to pass a competency examination in the field in which the probationary teacher was employed, when passing the examination was a condition of the employment contract, has also been held to be sufficient cause for not reemploying probationary teachers under former *Educ. Code § 44949(d)* (*now see Educ. Code § 44948.5(e)*) [*Alba v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1009, 189 Cal. Rptr. 897]* .

[c] Request for Hearing

The employee may request a hearing to determine if there is cause for not reemploying him or her for the ensuing school year. Failure to do so constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(c)*]. The hearing request procedures of *Educ. Code § 44948.5(c)* are substantially the same as those provided in *Educ. Code § 44949(b)* for refusal to rehire for reasons specified in *Educ. Code § 44955* [*see* discussion in § 512.3[3][b]].

[d] Conduct of Hearing and Decision by Administrative Law Judge and Governing Board

The provisions of *Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)* governing the conduct of the hearing and the decision by the administrative

law judge and governing board are the same as those provided in *Educ. Code § 44949(c)* [*see Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)*; *see also* discussion in *§§ 512.33[3][c]* and *[d]*].

[e] Expenses of Hearing

All expenses of the hearing, including the cost of the administrative law judge, must be paid by the governing board from the district funds [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)*].

[f] Final Notice of Dismissal

The governing board must give final notice to the probationary employee that his or her services will not be required for the ensuing year no later than May 15 [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(f)*]. If the board fails to do so, the employee must be deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(i)*; *see Rutherford v. Bd. of Trustees (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 775, 779-781, 112 Cal. Rptr. 560* ; *Stewart v. San Mateo Junior College Dist. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 345, 347-348, 112 Cal. Rptr. 272]* . The purpose of the May 15 deadline is to give a teacher whose employment will be ended at the end of the school year timely notice of the fact so that he or she will have a fair opportunity to seek other employment in his or her profession during the coming school year [*Stewart v. San Mateo Junior College Dist. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 345, 348, 112 Cal. Rptr. 272* (decided under former *Educ. Code § 44949(c)*]. If, however, the school board notifies the employee of its decision not to reemploy him or her prior to May 15, but the decision is reversed because of a legal error in the hearing proceeding, the employee's remedy is a new hearing rather than automatic reinstatement, notwithstanding that a new hearing would make final notice of the board's decision before May 15 impossible [*see Lucas v. Board of Education (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 674, 681-683, 119 Cal. Rptr. 462, 532 P.2d 110]* .

If the governing board notifies a probationary employee that his or her services will not be required for the ensuing year, the board must, within 10 days after delivery to it of the employee's written request, provide the employee with a statement of its reasons for not reemploying him or her for the ensuing school year [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(g)*]. Any notice or request is deemed sufficient if it is delivered in person to the employee to whom it is directed or if it is deposited in the United States registered mail, postage prepaid, and addressed to the last known address of the employee [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(h)*].

[g] Effect of Continuance

If, after a request for hearing made pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44948.5(c)*, any continuance is granted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11524*, the dates prescribed in *Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)* (deadline for submission of proposed decision), (e) (effective date of final decision), (f), and (i) (deadline for giving final notice of decision not to reemploy) that occur on or after the date of the granting of the continuance are extended for a period of time equal to the length of the continuance [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(j)*]. Thus, for example, if the employee procures a continuance for discovery purposes, the deadline for giving the employee final notice that he or she will not be rehired is extended beyond May 15 for a period equal to the length of the continuance [*see Grzeskowiak v. Bd. of Trustees (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 131, 135-136, 132 Cal. Rptr. 918]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.31

§ 512.31 Judicial Review of Governing Board Decisions Regarding Dismissal of Probationary Employees

The decision of a governing board not to reemploy a probationary employee is reviewable in a mandate proceeding [*see Blodgett v. Board of Trustees (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 183, 190, 97 Cal. Rptr. 406* ; *Thornton v. Board of Trustees (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 761, 763, 68 Cal. Rptr. 842]* . However, in *Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193* , the California Supreme Court distinguished between a "dismissal for cause" pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44932 et seq., 44941 et seq.*, and *44948 et seq.*, and a "decision against reelection" pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)*. Accordingly, Section 44929.21(b) permits a school district to decline reelection of a probationary teacher at the end of the second year without showing grounds for cause or otherwise allowing any procedural redress. Furthermore, Section 44929.21(b) grants the district exclusive discretion over reelection and preempts any collective bargaining agreement purporting to provide greater due process rights to probationary teachers [*Board of Education v. Round Valley Teachers Assn. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 269, 284-287, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 115, 914 P.2d 193* ; *see Sunnyvale Unified Sch. Dist. v. Jacobs (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 168, 179-183, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (school district's allegedly retaliatory decision not to reelect probationary teacher may not be made subject to collectively bargained arbitration procedures)].

For a discussion and forms relating to judicial review of administrative hearings by writ of mandate, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* . For a form of petition for writ of mandate to review the decision of a governing board not to reemploy a probationary employee, see *§ 512.166*.

Unlike permanent teachers, probationary teachers have no vested right to be rehired for the succeeding school year. Thus, in a mandate proceeding to review the decision of a school board not to rehire a probationary teacher, the reviewing court must accept the school board's findings of fact if supported by substantial evidence and may not exercise its independent judgment on the evidence [*Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 824-827, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115* (disapproving *Young v. Governing Bd. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 769, 115 Cal. Rptr. 456* , to the extent it is inconsistent)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.32

§ 512.32 Dismissal of Temporary and Substitute Employees

The governing board of a school district may dismiss substitute employees at any time at the pleasure of the board [*Educ. Code § 44953*]. The board may release temporary certificated employees at its pleasure until the employee has served 75 percent of the number of days during which the regular schools of the district are maintained [*Educ. Code § 44954(a)*]. After that time, the employee may be dismissed only on notification before the end of the school year of the district's decision not to reelect the employee for the next succeeding year [*Educ. Code § 44954(b)*; *but see Educ. Code § 44920* (certain employees as permitted to be classified as temporary for an entire school year or semester) and discussion in *§ 512.23*]. If the notice is not given, the employee must be reemployed for the following school year to fill any vacant positions in the district [*Educ. Code § 44918(b)*; *see § 512.21[2]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.33

§ 512.33 Reduction of Number of Employees

[1] When Authorized

The governing board of a school district may, if it deems such action necessary, reduce the number of permanent and probationary employees whenever any of the following apply [*Educ. Code § 44955(a)*]:

(1) The average daily attendance in all of the schools of the district for the first six months in which school is in session declines below the corresponding period of either of the previous two school years;

(2) A particular kind of service is to be reduced or discontinued not later than the beginning of the following school year;

(3) The governing board determines that attendance in the district will decline in the following year as a result of the termination of an interdistrict tuition agreement as defined in *Educ. Code § 46304*; or

(4) The amendment of state law requires the modification of curriculum.

In any of these situations, the governing board may terminate the services of not more than a corresponding percentage of the certificated employees, permanent as well as probationary, at the close of the school year [*Educ. Code § 44955(b)*]. In determining the number of certificated employees who may be terminated pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955(b)*, the board must consider attrition in the form of retirements, resignations, and deaths occurring within the computation period, but not the number of employees who are merely on leaves of absence for the subsequent school year [*Campbell Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Abbott (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 796, 809-810, 143 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

In addition, *Educ. Code § 44955.5* permits a governing board to terminate the services of any permanent or probationary certificated employees of the district (including employees holding a position that requires an administrative or supervisory credential) if, during the time period between five days after enactment of the Budget Act and August 15 of the fiscal year to which the Budget Act applies, the governing board determines that its total revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for the fiscal year of that Budget Act has not increased by at least 2 percent

and if, in the opinion of the governing board, it is therefore necessary to decrease the number of permanent employees in the district. In that case, the termination must follow the procedures in *Educ. Code §§ 44951* and *44955* [*see §§ 512.20[3][c]* and *512.33* et seq.]. However, notwithstanding those sections, the terminations will follow a schedule of notice and hearing adopted by the governing board [*Educ. Code § 44955.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 44955.5(b)* (statute inoperative from July 1, 2002, through July 1, 2003)].

[2] Seniority Rights

Except as otherwise provided by statute, a permanent employee's services may not be terminated under the provisions of *Educ. Code § 44955(b)* while any probationary employee, or any other employee with less seniority, is retained to render a service that the permanent employee is certificated and competent to render [*Educ. Code § 44955(b)*]. However, a full-time employee may not be displaced by a part-time employee with greater seniority [*Hildebrandt v. St. Helena Unified Sch. Dist. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 334, 339-346, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 855]* .

As between employees who first rendered paid service to the district on the same date, the governing board must determine the order of termination solely on the basis of the needs of the district and its students. On request of any employee whose order of termination is so determined, the governing board must furnish a written statement of the specific criteria used in determining the order of termination and the application of the criteria in ranking each employee relative to other employees in the group no later than five days before the commencement of the hearing held pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44949*. The requirement that the board provide such a written statement must not be interpreted to give the employee any other legal right or interest that would not exist without such a requirement [*Educ. Code § 44955(b)*].

The governing board shall make assignments and reassignments in such a manner that the employees shall be retained to render any service that their seniority and qualifications entitle them to render. However, prior to assigning or reassigning any certificated employee to teach a subject that he or she has not previously taught and for which he or she does not have a teaching credential or that is not within the employee's major area of postsecondary study or the equivalent thereof, the governing board shall require the employee to pass a subject matter competency test in the appropriate subject [*Educ. Code § 44955(c)*].

Notwithstanding *Educ. Code § 44955(b)*, a school district may deviate from terminating a certificated employee in order of seniority for either of the following reasons [*Educ. Code § 44955(d)*]:

(1) The district demonstrates a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study or to provide services authorized by a services credential with a specialization in either pupil personnel services or health for a school nurse, and the certificated employee has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study or to provide those services that others with more seniority do not possess [*see Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified Sch. Dist. (2008) 170 Cal. App. 4th 127, 138, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 13* (district's demonstration of its specific "needs" is not required to be evidenced by formal, written policies, course or job descriptions, or program requirements); or

(2) For purposes of maintaining or achieving compliance with constitutional requirements related to equal protection of the laws.

[3] Procedure

[a] Initial Notice

An employee must be notified in writing by the superintendent of the school district or his or her designee (or the clerk or secretary of the governing board if the district has no superintendent) if it has been recommended that the employee not be reemployed for the ensuing school year for the reasons specified in *Educ. Code § 44955*. The notice must state the reasons for the recommendation that the employee not be reemployed. It must be given to both the employee and the

governing board no later than March 15 and before final notice by the governing board that the employee's services will not be required for the following year [*Educ. Code § 44949(a)*].

Until the employee has requested a hearing as provided in *Educ. Code § 44949(b)* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.33[3][b]*] or has waived his or her right to a hearing, the notice and the reasons for it are confidential and must not be divulged by any person except as necessary in the performance of duties. Violation of the requirement of confidentiality does not, however, of itself affect the validity of any hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44949* [*Educ. Code § 44949(a)*].

[b] Request for Hearing

The employee may request a hearing to determine if there is cause for not reemploying him or her for the ensuing year. A request for a hearing must be in writing and must be delivered to the person who sent the notice pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44949(a)* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.33[3][a]*] on or before a date specified in the notice, which must not be less than seven days after the date on which notice is served on the employee. Failure to request a hearing on or before the date specified in the notice constitutes a waiver by the employee of his or her right to a hearing. The notice provided for in *Educ. Code § 44949(a)* must advise the employee of all of this information [*Educ. Code § 44949(b)*].

[c] Conduct of Hearing

In the event a hearing is requested by the employee, the proceeding must be conducted and a decision made in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, and the governing board has all the power granted to an agency therein, except for the following [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*].

(1) The employee must file his or her notice of defense, if any, within five days after service on him or her of the accusation and the accusation must notify the employee of the five-day period;

(2) The discovery authorized by *Gov. Code § 11507.6* is available only if it is requested within 15 days after service of the accusation, and the notice required by *Gov. Code § 11505* must so indicate; and

(3) The hearing must be conducted by a an administrative law judge who must prepare a proposed decision, containing findings of fact and a determination as to whether or not the charges sustained by the evidence are related to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof.

For a discussion and forms relating to administrative hearings conducted pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions* .

[d] Decisions of Administrative Law Judge and Governing Board

The proposed decision of the administrative law judge must be prepared for the governing board and must contain a determination as to the sufficiency of the cause for nonreemployment and a recommendation as to disposition; however, the governing board must make the final determination as to sufficiency of the cause and disposition. None of the findings, recommendations, or determinations contained in the proposed decision are binding on the governing board. Nonsubstantive procedural errors committed by the school district or governing board of the school district do not constitute cause for dismissing the charges unless the errors are prejudicial [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*].

Copies of the proposed decision must be submitted to the governing board and to the employee on or before May 7 of the year in which the proceeding is commenced [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*]. If the governing board decides not to adopt the proposed decision of the administrative law judge, its own decision to dismiss the employee must be in writing and contain findings of fact and a determination of the issues [*see* *Lucas v. Board of Education (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 674*,

678, 119 Cal. Rptr. 462, 532 P.2d 110] .

[e] Expenses of Hearing

All expenses of the hearing conducted under *Educ. Code § 44949*, including the cost of the administrative law judge, must be paid by the governing board from the district funds [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*].

[f] Effect of Continuance

If, after request for hearing pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44949(b)*, any continuance is granted under *Gov. Code § 11524*, the dates prescribed in *Educ. Code § 44949(c)* (final date for submitting copy of proposed decision) that occur on or after the date of granting the continuance and the date prescribed in *Educ. Code § 44955(c)* that occurs after the date of granting the continuance shall be extended for a period of time equal to the continuance [*Educ. Code § 44949(e)*].

[g] Final Notice of Termination of Services; Effect of Failure to Give Notice and Hearing

Notice of termination of employment pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955(b)* must be given before May 15 in the manner prescribed by *Educ. Code § 44949* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.33[3][h]*]. The services of these employees must be terminated in the inverse order in which they were employed, as determined by the board in accordance with the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 44844* and *44845* [*Educ. Code § 44955(c)*; *but see* discussion in *§ 512.33[2]*]. In the event that a permanent or probationary employee is not given the notices and a right to a hearing as provided for in *Educ. Code § 44949*, he or she must be deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year [*Educ. Code § 44955(c)*].

[h] Sufficiency of Notice

Any notice shall be deemed sufficient when it is delivered in person to the employee to whom it is directed, or when it is deposited in the United States registered mail, postage prepaid and addressed to the last known address of the employee [*Educ. Code § 44949(d)*].

[4] Reemployment Rights

Permanent and probationary employees who are terminated pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955* have certain preferred rights to reemployment which are set forth in *Educ. Code §§ 44956-44958*. Notwithstanding these preferences, however, the school district may validly determine not to reelect a probationary employee under *Educ. Code § 44929.21(b)* [*California Teachers Assn. v. Mendocino Unified Sch. Dist. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 522, 526-528, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 879* ; *see § 512.26*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.34

§ 512.34 Compulsory Leaves of Absence for Employees Charged With Criminal Offenses

Compulsory leaves of absence for certificated employees charged with specified criminal offenses are governed by *Educ. Code §§ 44940* and *44940.5*. Offenses for which compulsory leaves of absence may be imposed are divided into "mandatory leave of absence offenses" and "optional leave of absence offenses" [*see Educ. Code § 44940(a), (b)*]. A mandatory leave of absence offense means (1) any sex offense as defined in *Educ. Code § 44010*; or *(2)* any offense involving aiding or abetting the unlawful sale, use, or exchange to minors of controlled substances listed in Schedule I, II, or III, as contained in *Health & Safety Code §§ 11054, 11055*, and *11056*, with the exception of marijuana, mescaline, peyote, or tetrahydrocannabinols [*Educ. Code § 44940(a)*]. An optional leave of absence offense means (1) any controlled substance offense as defined in *Educ. Code §§ 44011* or *87011*; (2) a violation or attempted violation of *Penal Code § 187* (murder); or (3) a violation or attempted violation of *Health & Safety Code §§ 11357-11361, 11363, 11364*, or *11370.1*, insofar as those sections relate to any controlled substances except marijuana, mescaline, peyote, or tetrahydrocannabinols [*Educ. Code § 44940(b)*]. An employee is deemed to be "charged with" one of these offenses if he or she is charged with the specified offense by complaint, information, or indictment filed in a court of competent jurisdiction [*see Educ. Code § 44940(a), (b)*]. If an employee is charged with an offense deemed to fall into both the mandatory and optional leave of absence categories, as defined in *Educ. Code § 44940(a)* and *(b)*, the offense is treated as a mandatory leave of absence offense for purposes of *Educ. Code § 44940* [*Educ. Code § 44940(e)(1)*].

Whenever any certificated employee is charged with a mandatory leave of absence offense, as defined in *Educ. Code § 44940(a)*, the governing board of the school district must immediately place the employee on compulsory leave of absence for not more than 10 days after the date of entry of judgment in the proceedings. The employee's teaching or service credential will automatically be suspended for the same period of time [*Educ. Code § 44940(d), (e)(2)* (school district to forward copy of complaint, information, or indictment to Commission on Teacher Credentialing)]. Whenever a certificated employee is charged with an optional leave of absence offense, as defined in *Educ. Code § 44940(b)*, the governing board of the school district may immediately place the employee on compulsory leave of absence in accordance with the procedures in *Educ. Code §§ 44940* and *44940.5* [*Educ. Code § 44940(e)(1)*].

The governing board may extend the compulsory leave of absence of the employee beyond the initial period specified in *Educ. Code § 44940* by giving notice to the employee within 10 days after the entry of judgment in the criminal proceedings that the employee will be dismissed at the expiration of 30 days from the date of service of the notice

unless he or she demands a hearing as provided in *Educ. Code §§ 44930-44988* [*Educ. Code § 44940.5(a)*].

Any employee placed on compulsory leave of absence pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44940* and *44940.5* must be paid his or her regular salary during the period of the compulsory leave of absence if he or she furnishes to the school district a suitable bond, or other security acceptable to the governing board, as a guarantee that the employee will repay to the school district the amount of salary so paid to him or her during the compulsory leave of absence in case the employee is convicted of the charges, or fails or refuses to return to service following an acquittal of the offense or dismissal of the charges. If the employee is acquitted of the offense, or the charges against the employee are dismissed, the school district must reimburse the employee for the cost of the bond on his or her return to service in the school district [*Educ. Code § 44940.5(b)*]. If the employee does not elect to furnish the bond or other security, and if the employee is acquitted of the offense, or the charges against him or her are dismissed without his or her guilt being established, the school board must pay the employee his or her full compensation for the period of the compulsory leave of absence on his or her return to service in the school district [*Educ. Code § 44940.5(c)*]. If the charges against the employee are dismissed as a result of the employee's successful completion of a drug diversion program, on the employee's return to service in the school district the employee may elect to have the district pay the employee any accrued leave, and differential pay [*see Educ. Code §§ 44977, 45195, 45196*], for up to the length of the employee's compulsory leave of absence [*Educ. Code § 44940.5(c)*]. Back pay is to be reduced by the amount of any other compensation that the teacher earned during the period of compulsory leave [*Unzueta v. Ocean View School Dist. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1689, 1693-1700, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614]* .

Any action taken by a governing board pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44940.5* must be reported immediately to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The Commission must give priority to the investigation and resolution of such cases [*Educ. Code § 44940.5(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.35

§ 512.35 Suspension or Transfer for Mental Illness

Any certificated employee may be suspended or transferred to other duties by the governing board if the board has reasonable cause to believe that the employee is suffering from mental illness of such a degree as to render him or her incompetent to perform his or her duties [*Educ. Code § 44942(a)*]. The refusal to reinstate a teacher following voluntary leave for mental illness constitutes a suspension triggering the rights provided by *Educ. Code § 44942* if the teacher presents medical evidence that he or she is capable of returning to employment [*see Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1356, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354]* . The district has the burden of proving the employee's mental incompetence [*Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1359, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354]* .

The governing board must immediately give to the employee suspended or transferred a written statement of the facts giving rise to the board's belief and an opportunity to appear before the board within 10 days to explain or refute the charges [*Educ. Code § 44942(b)*]. If, after the employee's appearance or refusal to appear, the board decides to continue the suspension or transfer, it must offer the employee, in writing, the opportunity to be examined by a panel of three persons who are either psychiatrists or psychologists (but at least one of whom must be a psychiatrist), in accordance with *Educ. Code § 44942(c)*. The examination and report of the panel must be conducted in accordance with *Educ. Code § 44942(d)*.

If a majority of the panel concludes that the employee should be permitted to return to his or her duties, no written record of the suspension or of the determination of the panel may be retained, and any written record concerning the employee must appear in all respects as it did before the suspension was made [*Educ. Code § 44942(e)*]. If a majority of the panel finds in its report that the employee is suffering from mental illness of such a degree as to render him or her incompetent to perform his or her duties, the governing board may, on receipt of the report, place the employee on mandatory leave of absence for sickness for a period not to exceed two years, during which period the employee is entitled to sick leave, hospital, and medical benefits that accrued to him or her during his or her employment by the governing board [*Educ. Code § 44942(f)*].

The governing board may not require the employee to submit to a program of psychological tests or to submit to additional examinations by the panel once the first examination has been completed. If the panel fails after its first

examination to make an express finding that the employee is suffering from a mental illness of such a degree as to render him or her incapable of performing his or her duties, the governing board must treat this failure as a finding that no such incapacitating mental illness exists, and must reinstate the employee to his or her position, with full salary and benefits. Because *Educ. Code § 44942* does not contemplate any other ground for suspension other than incapacitating mental illness, the panel need not make a separate determination as to whether or not the employee should be returned to work once it has determined whether the existence of an incapacitating mental illness can be established [*Buchan v. Las Virgenes Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1096-1099, 177 Cal. Rptr. 788]* .

An employee who is placed on mandatory sick leave for mental disability may demand a hearing in superior court pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44942(g)*. If the court finds that the employee was not, at the time of the suspension, incompetent to perform his or her assigned duties and should not have been placed on mandatory sick leave, the employee must immediately be reinstated to the same or a substantially similar position with full back salary, and any written record of the suspension or transfer or any report of the panel must be destroyed [*Educ. Code § 44942(h)*].

If the court confirms the placing of the employee on mandatory sick leave, or if the employee does not request a hearing, the governing board must, on written request of the employee made not earlier than six months nor later than two years after the date the employee was placed on mandatory sick leave, convene a new panel of three persons who are either psychiatrists or psychologists (but at least one of whom must be a psychiatrist) to review the original conclusion of the board. If the original conclusion is not changed by the new panel as a result of the review, the employee must be continued on the mandatory sick leave. When the employee's total period of absence exceeds two years, the governing board must either rescind its action and reinstate the employee to the same or a substantially similar position, or serve the employee with a notice of intention to dismiss him or her [*Educ. Code § 44942(i)*]. If a majority of the new panel concludes in its report, or any subsequent review thereof, that the suspended employee or employee on mandatory sick leave should be permitted to return to his or her duties, or if the court so concludes, the governing board must take immediate action to restore the employee to the position from which he or she was suspended or transferred, or to a substantially similar position [*Educ. Code § 44942(j)*].

Every hearing and action by or before the governing board under *Educ. Code § 44942* must be conducted in executive session. No decision, action, or occurrence involved in the proceeding may be made public unless the employee so requests in writing [*Educ. Code § 44942(k)*].

An employee who is suspended or refused reinstatement without the required procedures is entitled to back pay from the time that the hearing rights are triggered either by suspension or denial of reinstatement. Setoff of retirement system or workers' compensation permanent disability benefits is proper if the benefits were awarded on a finding that the employee could not return to work [*see Bevli v. Brisco (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 986, 994, 260 Cal. Rptr. 57* (termination on other grounds); *Kalinowski v. Board of Education (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 245, 250-251, 153 Cal. Rptr. 178* (suspension)]. For further discussion of the right to back pay and the computation of the amount, see *§ 512.28[9]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.36

§ 512.36 Notice of Intent to Return to Teaching Position

A teacher in a school district having an average daily attendance of less than 2,500 must, by May 15 of each year, inform the district whether he or she intends to return to a teaching position for the following school year [*Educ. Code § 44832(a), (c)*]. This requirement does not apply to employees who are notified pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955* (*see § 512.33[1]*) [*Educ. Code § 44832(a)*]. The district and the exclusive bargaining representative may agree to include provisions regarding the required notice in any collective bargaining agreement applying to classroom teachers [*Educ. Code § 44832(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.37

§ 512.37 Resignations

The governing board of a school district must accept the resignation of any employee and fix the time when the resignation takes effect, which generally must be no later than the close of the school year in which the resignation has been received by the board [*Educ. Code § 44930(a)*]. However, the employee and the governing board may agree that the resignation will be accepted as a mutually agreed date not later than two years beyond the close of the school year during which board receivers the resignation [*Educ. Code § 44930(b)*]. In any event, resignations that are required of school teachers for the purpose of evading the tenure statutes are without effect [*Mitchell v. Board of Trustees (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 64, 67-68, 42 P.2d 397]* , and resignations procured by the board through the exercise of undue influence may be rescinded [*see Odorizzi v. Bloomfield School Dist. (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 123, 130-135, 54 Cal. Rptr. 533]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.38

§ 512.38 Reemployment After Resignation

If a permanent certificated employee resigns and then is reemployed within 39 months by the same district, the governing board must, disregarding the break in service, classify him or her as, and restore to him or her all of the rights, benefits, and burdens of, a permanent employee [*Educ. Code § 44931*]. This statute requires that the district give a reemployed teacher salary-schedule credit for all years of service with the district prior to resignation [*Dixon v. Board of Trustees (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1269, 1281-1286, 265 Cal. Rptr. 511* ; *see § 512.39[2]*]. However, the teacher does not regain his or her original hiring date for seniority purposes [*Educ. Code § 44848*; *see San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 641, 192 Cal. Rptr. 710]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.39

§ 512.39 Salaries of Certificated Employees

[1] Generally

The governing board of a school district must fix and order paid the compensation of persons employed by the board in public school service requiring certification qualifications unless otherwise prescribed by law [*Educ. Code § 45022*].

[2] Salary Schedules

[a] Uniformity Requirement

The governing board of each school district must adopt and cause to be printed and made available to each certificated employee a schedule of salaries to be paid [*Educ. Code § 45023*]. Each person employed by a district in a position requiring certification qualifications, except a person employed in a position requiring an administrative or supervisory credential, must be classified on the salary schedule on the basis of uniform allowance for years of training and years of experience, except if the school district and the employees' exclusive representative negotiate and mutually agree to a salary schedule based on other criteria [*Educ. Code § 45028(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 45028(e)* (public school employers and teachers' exclusive representatives are encouraged to recognize teacher contributions to improving pupil achievement, provide incentives to teachers to accept teaching assignments in areas of highest need, and recognize relevant professional experience on the salary schedule in lieu of units and degrees or in lieu of teaching experience)]. Employees must not be placed in different classifications on the schedule, or paid different salaries, solely on the basis of the respective grade levels in which the employees serve [*Educ. Code § 45028(a)*].

All certificated employees, regardless of their date of hire, must be classified for salary purposes, and the classification must proceed wholly on a uniform basis for years of training and experience, except if the school district and the employees' exclusive representative negotiate and mutually agree to a salary schedule based on other criteria. Disparate treatment of teachers hired before and after the effective date of *Educ. Code § 45028* is not permitted [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 695, 701, 280 Cal. Rptr. 286]* .

Under the requirement of *Educ. Code § 45028* that employees be classified on the salary schedule on the basis of a uniform allowance for years of training and experience, a school district must make a credit allowance for teaching

experience outside the district available to all employees on a uniform basis, and may not make the availability of the credit contingent on the teacher's seniority within the system [*see Palos Verdes Faculty Assn. v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School Dist. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 650, 660-661, 147 Cal. Rptr. 359, 580 P.2d 1155] . Educ. Code § 45028* does not, however, preclude a school district from adopting a pay incentive program that conditions advancement to the next salary step on the satisfactoriness of the previous year's service, provided that such a program is uniformly applied to all teachers in the district [*Mayer v. Bd. of Trustees (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 476, 487-496, 165 Cal. Rptr. 655* ; *see Palos Verdes Faculty Assn. v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School Dist. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 650, 661 n.6, 147 Cal. Rptr. 359, 580 P.2d 1155* (dictum)].

A district may not establish a system that considers years of training as a salary factor to the exclusion of years of experience. A district may not penalize teachers who fail to acquire additional training by freezing future salary increases despite acquisition of additional years of experience [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 695, 702-703, 280 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *Wygant v. Victor Valley Joint Union High School Dist. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 319, 329, 214 Cal. Rptr. 205]* . Nor may a district limit the number of classification advances for training that a teacher may obtain to one per year. Such a limitation creates a lack of uniformity among teachers with the same training and experience based on the amount of time it takes a teacher to achieve the level of training [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 695, 703-704, 280 Cal. Rptr. 286]* .

In no case may the governing board of a school district draw orders for the salary of any teacher in violation of *Educ. Code § 45028*, nor may any superintendent draw any requisition for the salary of any teacher in violation thereof. *Educ. Code § 45028* does not apply to teachers of special day and evening classes in elementary schools, teachers of special classes for elementary pupils, teachers of special day and evening high school classes, and substitute teachers [*Educ. Code § 45028*]. It is not a violation of the uniformity requirement for a school district, with the agreement of the certificated employees' exclusive representative, if any, to grant any employee who is hired after a locally specified date differential credit for prior years of experience or prior units of credit for purposes of initial placement on the district's salary schedule [*Educ. Code § 45028(b)*].

[b] Effect of Collective Bargaining Agreement

A district and the exclusive bargaining representative of its certificated employees must, on the request of either, meet and negotiate regarding the payment of additional compensation based on criteria other than training and years of experience [*Educ. Code § 45028(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 45028(e)* (public school employers and teachers' exclusive representatives are encouraged to recognize teacher contributions to improving pupil achievement, provide incentives to teachers to accept teaching assignments in areas of highest need, and recognize relevant professional experience on the salary schedule in lieu of units and degrees or in lieu of teaching experience)]. If the parties do not reach mutual agreement, then the training and experience criteria of § 45028(a) apply [*Gov. Code § 3543.2(e)*]. However, *Gov. Code § 3543.2(e)* does not provide blanket authority for the parties to a collective bargaining agreement to deviate from *Educ. Code § 45028* in any manner they choose. Years of training and years of experience are the only criteria allowable in setting base salaries. *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d), (e)* then allows for collective bargaining on additional compensation. However, there must be some particularized bargained-for criteria, other than years of training and years of experience, to support disparate pay between teachers with like training and experience [*California Teachers' Assn. v. Livingston Union School Dist. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1503, 1522-1523, 269 Cal. Rptr. 160* ; *San Francisco Classroom Teachers Assn. v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 627, 635, 242 Cal. Rptr. 352* ; *see California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 695, 704-705, 280 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *see also § 512.39[4][b]*]. Thus, if teacher salary schedules are based solely on education and experience, with no other criteria established by the applicable collective bargaining agreement, the salary schedules must be *wholly* uniform, and teachers with the same education and experience must receive the same salary [*Adair v. Stockton Unified Sch. Dist. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1436, 1444-1447, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 62*].

Under *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)*, a negotiated one-time payment to teachers does not violate the uniform pay requirement

of *Educ. Code § 45028* if at least one criterion on which the payment is based is neither years of training nor years of experience. For example, a school district may make a one-time payment of 3 percent of base salary limited to teachers who returned to work for a specified school year or retired at the end of the preceding school year [*California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Hilmar Unified Sch. Dist. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 183, 189-197, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 323* (exclusion of teachers who left district's employment without retiring constituted criterion other than years of training or years of experience)].

[3] Increase or Decrease in Salary

The governing board of a school district may, at any time during the school year, increase the salaries of persons employed by the district in positions requiring certification qualification, and such an increase is effective on any date ordered by the governing board [*Educ. Code § 45032*]. A governing board may reduce the salary of a teacher with whom it has contracted in previous years to teach at a higher salary, if it does so in the exercise of reasonable discretion and before the beginning of the school year [*Brown v. Hanford Elementary School Bd. (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 170, 174, 69 Cal. Rptr. 154]* . The board may not, however, lower salaries fixed by the salary schedule after the beginning of the school year [*A.B.C. Federation of Teachers v. A.B.C. Unified Sch Dist. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 332, 337-338, 142 Cal. Rptr. 111]* . Also, the governing board may not decrease the annual salary of any certificated employee for failure to meet any requirement of the district that the person complete additional educational units, courses of study, or work in any college or university or any equivalent thereof [*Educ. Code § 45033*].

[4] Mandate Proceeding for Recovery of Salary

[a] Generally

A petition for a writ of mandate is the appropriate remedy for a teacher to recover salary due from a school district [*A.B.C. Fed'n of Teachers v. A.B.C. Unified School Dist. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 332, 340-342, 142 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

[b] PERB Jurisdiction

If a teacher's claim for salary is based on the criteria established under *Educ. Code § 45028* and the district's defense is that disparity was collectively bargained for as authorized by *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d), (e)* (district and employees' representative may agree on additional compensation based on other criteria [*see* discussion in *§ 512.39[2]*]), one court has held that an arguable unfair labor practice is alleged that may violate the Educational Employment Relations Act (EERA) [*see Gov. Code § 3540 et seq.*]. In such a case, the teacher must exhaust appropriate administrative remedies before the Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) [*McCammon v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 661, 664-665, 241 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *see Gov. Code § 3541.5*]. However, other courts have rejected, questioned, and limited any such rule.

It has been held that exclusive PERB jurisdiction does not lie if the collective bargaining agreement predates July 28, 1983, the effective date of *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)*, because prior to that date, there was no authority for agreements that varied from *Educ. Code § 45028* [*United Teachers of Ukiah v. Board of Education (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 632, 639, 251 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; *see Educ. Code § 44924* (discussed in *§ 512.40*); *see also Dixon v. Board of Trustees (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1269, 1280, 265 Cal. Rptr. 511]* . As for collective bargaining agreements negotiated on or after July 28, 1983, it has been held that PERB does not have exclusive jurisdiction over salary schedule placement disputes if the collective bargaining agreement and *Educ. Code § 45028* are not in conflict over where the teacher should be placed on the salary schedule. Further, a placement on the salary schedule that violates any provision of the Education Code other than *Educ. Code § 45028* is not within the exclusive jurisdiction of PERB by reason of being included in a collective bargaining agreement because the authority to collectively bargain over salary criteria under *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)* does not include the right to violate any other provision of the Education Code [*Dixon v. Board of Trustees (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1269, 1280-1281, 265 Cal. Rptr. 511]* .

A third court has rejected PERB jurisdiction entirely, even if compensation policies that deviate from *Educ. Code § 45028* are contained in a post-July 28, 1983 collective bargaining agreement. In the view of this court, *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)* permits parties to collectively bargain for such a deviation only under limited circumstances [*see § 512.39[2][b]*]. Whether a particular collective bargaining agreement provides appropriate criteria to deviate is not a labor-practice issue within the jurisdiction of PERB, but simply a question of whether the Education Code has been violated [*California Teachers' Assn. v. Livingston Union School Dist. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1503, 1510-1526, 269 Cal. Rptr. 160* (noting that a failure to meet and confer on additional criteria, as required by *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)*, might be an unfair labor practice)].

For full discussion of the EERA, see Zerger, Janiak, Johnson, and Kay, California Public Sector Labor Relations (Matthew Bender). For a discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings generally, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* . For a form of petition for writ of mandate to compel a school district to pay salary owing to a teacher, see *§ 512.171*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.40

§ 512.40 Waiver of Employment Rights as Void

Except as provided in *Educ. Code § 44937* (relating to the waiver of a hearing in dismissal or suspension proceedings initiated under *Educ. Code § 44934*) and *Educ. Code § 44956* (waiver of reemployment rights by terminated permanent employee), any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive the benefits of *Educ. Code § 44800 et seq.* (setting forth employment rights), or any part thereof, is null and void [*Educ. Code § 44924*]. This nonwaiver provision applies to collective bargaining agreements [*see California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 695, 704-705, 280 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1357, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354* ; *California Teachers' Ass'n v. Parlier Unified School Dist. (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 174, 183, 204 Cal. Rptr. 20* ; *see also Gov. Code § 3540* (Education Code prevails over conflicting provision of collective bargaining agreement)]. For discussion of the relationship between collective bargaining agreements and provisions of the Education Code, see Zerger, Janiak, Johnson, and Kay, California Public Sector Labor Relations, Chs. 11, 16, and 35 (Matthew Bender).

131 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.41-512.59

[Reserved]

§§ 512.41[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.60

§ 512.60 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving civil service employees, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 36, *Civil Service* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in mandate proceedings generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in mandate proceedings to review an administrative decision made as the result of an adjudicatory hearing, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in mandate proceedings involving certificated employees of school districts, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* , Pt. II (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.61

§ 512.61 State Constitution

Minimum salary of full-time public school teachers. *Cal. Const., art. IX, § 6*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.62

§ 512.62 State Statutes

[1] Basic Skills Proficiency Examination

Requirement of passing basic skills proficiency examination for initial issuance of credential and exemptions. *Educ. Code § 44252(b)*

Requirement of taking basic skills proficiency test when applying for approved credential program. *Educ. Code § 44252(f)*

Deferral of basic skills proficiency test because of illness, family death, or another similar and justifiable personal reason. *Educ. Code § 44252.8*

Requirement of passing basic skills proficiency examination for employment and exemptions. *Educ. Code § 44830(b)*

[2] Certification Documents; Issuance, Denial, Revocation, Suspension

Establishment of Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *Educ. Code §§ 44210-44236*

Establishment of Committee of Credentials. *Educ. Code §§ 44240-44242*

Procedure of Commission on Teacher Credentialing and Committee of Credentials for denial, suspension, or revocation of credentials. *Educ. Code §§ 44242.5-44247*

Bilingual and cross-cultural competence certificates. *Educ. Code §§ 44253.5, 44253.7, 52178-52178.4, 56362.7*

Issuance and registration of certificates. *Educ. Code §§ 44330-44332.5*

Grounds for denial of application for issuance or renewal of credentials. *Educ. Code §§ 44345, 44346*

Penalties for submission of fraudulent documents. *Educ. Code §§ 44360-44362*

Revocation or suspension of credential by Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *Educ. Code §§ 44420-44426, 44439*

Revocation or suspension of certificate by county board of education. *Educ. Code §§ 44427-44437*

Certification of language development specialists. *Educ. Code §§ 44475-44481*

[3] Classification of Certificated Employees

Classification of permanent employees. *Educ. Code § 44929.20 et seq.*

Scope of permanent status. *Educ. Code §§ 44893-44897, 44929.26, 44929.27*

Effect of reorganization of school district on classification. *Educ. Code §§ 44902-44904*

Computation of service time required for permanent status. *Educ. Code §§ 44908-44914*

Classification of probationary employees. *Educ. Code §§ 44915, 44916*

Classification of substitute employees. *Educ. Code § 44917*

Reclassification of temporary and substitute employees as probationary. *Educ. Code § 44918*

Classification of temporary employees. *Educ. Code §§ 44919-44921*

[4] Communist or Subversive Activities

Prohibition against teaching or advocating communism in public schools with intent to indoctrinate or create a preference in mind of any student for communism. *Educ. Code § 51530*

[5] Definitions

Position requiring certification qualifications. *Educ. Code § 44001*

Credential. *Educ. Code § 44002*

Life diploma. *Educ. Code § 44003*

Certificate. *Educ. Code § 44004*

Certificated person. *Educ. Code § 44006*

Certification document. *Educ. Code § 44007*

Conviction of crime. *Educ. Code § 44009*

Sex offense. *Educ. Code § 44010*

Controlled substances. *Educ. Code § 44011*

[6] Dismissal or Suspension of Certificated Employees

[a] Permanent Employees

Grounds for suspension. *Educ. Code §§ 44932, 44933*

Notice of charges and intent to dismiss. *Educ. Code § 44934*

Service of notice of intent to dismiss. *Educ. Code § 44936*

Demand for hearing and waiver. *Educ. Code § 44937*

Advance notice of charges of incompetency or unprofessional conduct as required. *Educ. Code § 44938*

Immediate suspension and hearing on certain charges for dismissal of permanent employee. *Educ. Code § 44939*

Compulsory leave of absence for employees charged with certain crimes. *Educ. Code §§ 44940, 44940.5*

Notice of suspension and intent to dismiss. *Educ. Code § 44941*

Suspension or transfer of employee for mental illness. *Educ. Code § 44942*

Governing board action on request for hearing. *Educ. Code § 44943*

Conduct of hearing by Commission on Professional Competence. *Educ. Code § 44944*

Judicial review. *Educ. Code § 44945*

Reinstatement and back salary. *Educ. Code § 44946*

[b] Probationary Employees

Grounds for suspension without pay of probationary employee in small school district. *Educ. Code §§ 44932(b), 44933*

Dismissal or suspension during school year of probationary employees employed prior to 1983-1984 or in small school district. *Educ. Code § 44948*

Dismissal or suspension during school year of probationary employees employed during or after 1983-1984 fiscal year. *Educ. Code § 44948.3*

Nonreemployment of probationary employees employed prior to 1983-1984 or in small school district; notice and hearing procedure. *Educ. Code § 44948.5*

[c] Substitute and Temporary Employees

Dismissal of substitute employees. *Educ. Code § 44953*

Dismissal of temporary employees. *Educ. Code § 44954*

[7] Employment of Certificated Persons

Employment of certificated persons. *Educ. Code §§ 44830, 44831*

Automatic declining of continued employment. *Educ. Code § 44842*

Minimum age for certificated employment. *Educ. Code § 44862*

Waiver of benefits of *Educ. Code §§ 44800-45060* as null and void. *Educ. Code § 44924*

Resignations. *Educ. Code § 44930*

Leaves of absence and sick leave. *Educ. Code § 44930 et seq.*

[8] Layoffs

Reduction in number of permanent employees due to decline in average daily attendance, decline in attendance due to termination of interdistrict tuition agreement, modification of curriculum required by state law, or reduction or elimination of particular service; procedure and notice. *Educ. Code § 44955(b)*

Notice and procedure for layoffs. *Educ. Code § 44949*

Reduction of number of permanent and probationary certificated employees during period between five days after enactment of Budget Act and August 15 of fiscal year to which Budget Act applies permitted when governing board determines that its total revenue limit per unit of average daily attendance for fiscal year has not increased by at least 2 percent and that it is therefore necessary to decrease number of employees. *Educ. Code § 44955.5*

Rights of terminated permanent employees (provision inoperative from July 1, 2002, through July 1, 2003). *Educ. Code § 44956*

Effect of employment in administrative position on seniority rights. *Educ. Code § 44956.5*

Rights of terminated probationary employees. *Educ. Code §§ 44957, 44958*

[9] Miscellaneous Provisions

Mandate proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1097, 1107-1110b*

Prohibition of discrimination with regard to educational benefits, programs, and employment on basis of disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any characteristic listed in *Penal Code § 422.55* definition of "hate crimes." *Educ. Code § 220 et seq.*

Classified employees. *Educ. Code § 45100 et seq.*

Exchange of certificated school district or county office of education employees with credentialed private sector teacher. *Educ. Code §§ 44929.1-44929.16*

Educational labor relations. *Gov. Code §§ 3540-3549.3*

Administrative hearing procedure. *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*

[10] Salaries of Certificated Employees

Governing board as required to fix and pay salaries. *Educ. Code § 45022*

Adoption and printing of salary schedules. *Educ. Code § 45023*

Classification of salary schedule on basis of uniform allowance for years of training and experience as required. *Educ. Code § 45028*

Governing board power to increase salaries. *Educ. Code § 45032*

Prohibition against decrease in salary for failure to meet additional educational requirements. *Educ. Code § 45033*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.63

§ 512.63 Administrative Regulations

Certificated personnel. *5 Cal. Code Reg §§ 5500-5722*

Credentials and institutions preparing candidates for credentials. *5 Cal. Code Reg §§ 6000-6699*

Rules of Commission on Teacher Credentialing governing issuance, denial, suspension, and revocation of credentials. *5 Cal. Code Reg. § 80001 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.64

§ 512.64 Decisions

[1] Certification Documents; Denial, Revocation, Suspension

[a] Grounds

Revocation of married woman's life diploma as justified on grounds of unfitness to teach where evidence showed that she had engaged in oral copulation with three men, none of whom were her husband, in presence of strangers in semi-public atmosphere of club party and where there was expert testimony that she was unfit to teach. *Pettit v. State Bd. of Education (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 29, 34-36, 109 Cal. Rptr. 665, 513 P.2d 889*

Revocation of certification documents for "immoral or unprofessional conduct" or "acts involving moral turpitude" as improper under former Educ. Code § 13202 (now *Educ. Code § 44421*) unless such conduct indicates unfitness to teach; statute as not unconstitutional when so interpreted. *Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 225-235, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375*

Record showing bare fact of teacher's arrest and conviction for possession of marijuana, without any further evidence of teacher's unfitness to teach, as insufficient to justify revocation of certification documents. *Comings v. State Bd. of Educ. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 94, 104-105, 100 Cal. Rptr. 73*

Revocation of teaching credential as proper where teacher engaged in homosexual conduct in public view in public rest-room. *Moser v. State Bd. of Educ. (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 988, 989-992, 101 Cal. Rptr. 86*

Denial of life diploma as proper where teacher had series of criminal convictions for public offenses involving the use of alcohol which demonstrated his unfitness to teach. *Watson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 559, 563-565, 99 Cal. Rptr. 468*

Revocation of teaching credential and denial of new credential as proper where substantial evidence in form of medical testimony demonstrated appellant was unfit to teach because of her mental illness. *Alford v. Department of Educ. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 884, 888-889, 91 Cal. Rptr. 843*

[b] Procedure

Standard of review in mandate proceeding to review revocation of credential. *Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 508, 326 P.2d 850*

State Board of Education as not required to hold hearing prior to revoking credentials under former Educ. Code § 12756 (later Educ. Code § 13207, now *Educ. Code § 44425*) for conviction of certain sex offenses; such provision as not violating due process or equal protection. *DiGenova v. State Board of Education (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 255, 259-260, 262, 288 P.2d 862* ; *Purifoy v. State Bd. of Educ. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 187, 190-198, 106 Cal. Rptr. 201*

State Board of Education as under mandatory duty under former Educ. Code § 13130 (now *Educ. Code § 44346*) to deny application for issuance of credential by any applicant who has been convicted of certain designated sex offenses, without holding a hearing; such provision as not violating equal protection or due process. *Vogulkin v. State Board of Education (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 424, 429-433, 15 Cal. Rptr. 335*

[2] Classification

[a] Permanent Employees

School principals as not securing tenure in that capacity; failure of principal to accept assignment as classroom teacher as constituting insubordination which justifies dismissal. *Board of Education v. Swan (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 546, 555-556, 261 P.2d 261*

School superintendent, contract employee, is not entitled to constitutional or statutory due process rights to position as superintendent, but is entitled to due process rights granted to contract employees by school board in its rules and regulations, including predemotion rights. *Jones v. Palm Springs Unified School Dist. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 518, 523-529, 216 Cal. Rptr. 75*

Teacher whose permanent employee status was disputed by school board was entitled to writ of mandate to direct recognition of status without first having to exhaust administrative remedies. *California Teachers' Assn. v. Governing Board (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 735, 749, 193 Cal. Rptr. 650*

Reemployment of permanent certificated employee within 39 months after resignation restores all individual rights, benefits, and burdens of permanent employee except original hiring date for seniority purposes. *San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 631, 192 Cal. Rptr. 710*

Educ. Code § 44850.1 precludes tenure in principal position notwithstanding county charter provision purporting to make position permanent after three years. *LaBelle v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 292, 299-300, 189 Cal. Rptr. 530*

Charter provisions, ordinances, and regulations relating to schools as subject to preemption by conflicting state laws; rights acquired under such provisions as not vested. *Whisman v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 782, 789-790, 794-795, 150 Cal. Rptr. 548*

Supervisory personnel reassigned to other positions within scope of certificate under which tenure acquired as not entitled to notice and hearing; procedural protections of *Educ. Code § 44955* as applicable only to dismissals, not reassignments. *Whisman v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 782, 791-792, 150 Cal. Rptr. 548*

Unlike classroom teachers, school administrators attain no tenure in status as administrators; school board as permitted

to remove administrator for any reason satisfactory to it, without hearing, subject to requirement that administrator be furnished, on request, with statement of reasons for reassignment to different status. *Hentschke v. Sink (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 19, 22, 109 Cal. Rptr. 549*

Probationary teacher's right to be classified as permanent teacher as automatically renewed each year in which teacher is in position of having taught complete school year for previous three years; three-year statute of limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* as applicable to mandamus proceeding by teacher seeking classification as permanent employee. *Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 121-122, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319*

[b] Probationary Employees

Unless statutory mandate compels otherwise, position of teacher as created and fixed by terms of employment contract; where contract between teacher and district classifies teacher as substitute, teacher as not attaining probationary status merely because she is subsequently assigned to teach classes of teacher who resigned from her position for remainder of school year. *Rutley v. Belmont Elementary School Dist. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 702, 705-706, 107 Cal. Rptr. 671*

[c] Temporary Employees

Community college teacher hired on temporary basis pursuant to *Educ. Code § 87482.5* but assigned to work in excess of 60 percent of full-time hours for more than two semesters or three quarters in three-year period is entitled to automatic reclassification as contract employee. *Stryker v. Antelope Valley Community College Dist. (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 324, 329-338*

Community college district employee hired on temporary basis pursuant to *Educ. Code § 87482.5* to teach not more than 60 percent of full-time hours is not entitled to automatic reclassification to contract employee status, and such reclassification is prohibited when employee's service as substitute is on day-to-day basis. *Balasubramanian v. San Diego Community College Dist. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 977, 982-985, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 837*

Temporary bilingual teacher teaching under waiver of bilingual credential requirement pursuant to *Educ. Code § 52178* is not entitled to reemployment under *Educ. Code § 44918* over newly hired credentialed bilingual teacher if temporary teacher has not complied with progress requirements required for waiver. *Royster v. Cushman (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 65, 69-71, 261 Cal. Rptr. 458*

[3] Constitutional Rights

[a] First Amendment Rights

School that reprimands science teacher for protesting requirement that he teach evolution does not violate teacher's rights under *establishment clause of First Amendment*; school district may also restrict teacher's conversations with students on religious matters during school day and on school property. *Peloza v. Capistrano Unified School District (9th Cir. 1994) 37 F. 3d 517, 521-522*

Nature of teacher's constitutional right to speak. *Adcock v. Board of Educ. (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 60, 65, 68-69, 109 Cal. Rptr. 676, 513 P.2d 900*

Refusal by hearing officer and school board to consider evidence that teacher was dismissed for exercise of constitutional rights whose limitation was not justified by compelling public interest as constituting legal error. *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 587-588, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480*

When reviewing dismissal of a teacher by way of petition for writ of mandate, trial court as required to make independent assessment of evidence on question whether true reason for dismissal was teacher's exercise of constitutional rights. *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 593, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480*

Public employer is prohibited from disciplining or discharging public employee for expressive conduct protected by *U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV*; however, whether employee's conduct is deemed protected speech depends on balancing of interests of employer and employee, and therefore antiwar demonstration speech by college professor that resulted in disruption, materially interfered with school activities, and impaired discipline was not protected by constitutional prohibition. *Franklin v. Leland Stan. Junior University (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 322, 336, 342, 218 Cal. Rptr. 228*

Trial court's refusal to order teacher reinstated was not erroneous even though there was testimony that letter written by teacher, which was partially protected by *U.S. Const., amend. I*, was factor in decision to deny teacher's reassignment because judge could have found that nonprotected areas of letter were only areas affecting decision, and judge could accept testimony that same decision would have been made despite existence of letter. *Shimoyama v. Board of Education (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 517, 524-527, 174 Cal. Rptr. 748*

[b] Due Process

Teacher does not have constitutionally protected liberty interest in additional assignment as baseball coach and, therefore, district's failure to renew one-year coaching contract was not actionable under *42 U.S.C.S. § 1983* (deprivation of civil rights); nonrenewal was also permissible under *Educ. Code § 44923* (additional assignment given to tenured full-time employee is terminable at any time). *Lagos v. Modesto City Schools Dist. (9th Cir. 1988) 843 F.2d 347, 348, 349-350*

Teacher's denial of reassignment as football coach by principal who was given sole discretion by school district to make decision on hiring or firing coach was not denial of due process because those in state executive and administrative positions routinely have responsibility of appointment and dismissal, subject to review only by electorate or their administrative superiors, and there is no authority to indicate that coaches are in different category. *Shimoyama v. Board of Education (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 517, 527-529, 174 Cal. Rptr. 748*

[4] Dismissal of Permanent Employees

[a] Generally

Equitable exceptions may limit application of *Educ. Code § 44944(a)*, which provides that school district may not dismiss or suspend permanent, certificated employee based on charges or evidence relating to matters occurring more than four years prior to filing of notice of intent to dismiss or suspend employee; thus, employee may be equitably estopped from asserting four-year limit if employee's own conduct induced school district to delay filing of notice of intent to dismiss or suspend employee. *Atwater Elementary Sch. Dist. v. California Dep't of Gen. Servs. (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 227, 235-238, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233, 158 P.3d 794*

School board as not permitted to dismiss permanent teacher unless it complies with statutory procedures for dismissal; teacher failing to renew credential as not automatically forfeiting permanent status. *Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 617-620, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579*

School district's substantial compliance with former *Educ. Code § 44938* (*now see Educ. Code § 44938(a)*) and Stull Act (*Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665*) satisfies statutory requirements for notice of intent to dismiss certificated teacher. *Governing Board v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 324, 333-334, 217 Cal. Rptr.*

457

School board's unilateral termination of a teacher's contract by reason of teacher's behavior during school year as governed by Education Code provisions relating to dismissal of teachers, rather than by general contract law. *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817*

[b] Attorney's Fees

Attorney's fees in certificated employee dismissal proceedings by school district are governed by *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* rather than by *Gov. Code § 800*. *Fontana Unified School Dist. v. Burman (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 208, 225, 246 Cal. Rptr. 733, 753 P.2d 689* ; *Forker v. Board of Trustees (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 13, 21, 206 Cal. Rptr. 303*

Employee who prevails in judicial review of commission decision is entitled to attorney's fees, as well as to costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*. *Fontana Unified School Dist. v. Burman (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 208, 225, 246 Cal. Rptr. 733, 753 P.2d 689*

Teacher who successfully defends against dismissal action is entitled to attorney's fees under *Educ. Code § 44944(e)*, even though teacher's legal fees were paid under group legal plan provided by teachers association. *Forker v. Board of Trustees (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 13, 21, 206 Cal. Rptr. 303* ; *Russell v. Thermalito Union School Dist. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 880, 883-884, 176 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[c] Discovery

Teacher in dismissal proceeding under *Educ. Code § 44944* does not have privilege accorded criminal defendant to refuse to appear as witness and testify; thus, trial court abuses discretion in refusing to grant school district's petition for order compelling teacher to appear at deposition and to produce certain documents. *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 231, 234-236, 172 Cal. Rptr. 42*

[d] Grounds

[i] Conviction of Crime

Health & Safety Code § 11361.7(b) as depriving school board of authority to dismiss permanent teacher because of arrest for, or conviction of, possession of marijuana occurring prior to January 1, 1976. *Governing Board v. Mann (1977) 18 Cal. 3d 819, 826-828, 135 Cal. Rptr. 526, 558 P.2d 1*

Offense of cultivation of marijuana as not involving moral turpitude as matter of law. *Board of Trustees v. Judge (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 920, 923-925, 123 Cal. Rptr. 830*

[ii] Evident Unfitness for Service

Finding of trial court that permanent teacher's use of supplementary reading and discussion materials containing obscene words did not justify dismissal on grounds of immoral conduct and evident unfitness for service as supported by substantial evidence. *Board of Trustees v. Metzger (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 206, 210-212, 104 Cal. Rptr. 452, 501 P.2d 1172*

Frequency and duration of teacher's absences are not sole criteria in determining evident unfitness to teach pursuant to former *Educ. Code § 44932(e)* (*now see Educ. Code § 44932(a)(5)*), and trial court finding that teacher was unfit was

not supported by evidence that consisted of stipulation that absences were for reasons considered legitimate under school district policy. *San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 278, 286-287, 185 Cal. Rptr. 203*

Teacher's distribution of materials written by students containing obscene and vulgar language, without more, as not constituting evident unfitness for service justifying her dismissal as matter of law. *Oakland Unified School Dist. v. Olicker (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1098, 1109-1111, 102 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Trial court finding that teacher's dismissal was justified on grounds of evident unfitness for service as supported by substantial evidence where record showed that teacher had repeatedly used vulgar language and gestures during classes and had torn out a loudspeaker in the classroom. *Palo Verde etc. School Dist. v. Hensey (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 967, 969-976, 88 Cal. Rptr. 570*

[iii] Immoral Conduct

Commission of a public sex offense as not demonstrating unfitness to teach per se and as not justifying dismissal of permanent teacher on grounds of immoral conduct. *Board of Educ. v Jack M. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 691, 700-704, 139 Cal. Rptr. 700, 566 P.2d 602*

Employee who has been summarily dismissed for conviction of sex offense has right to due process review of dismissal when conviction has been reversed and charges dismissed. *Tuffli v. Governing Board (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1398, 1408-1409, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433*

Viewed in its entirety, teacher's conduct of (1) while dressed as Santa Claus, inducing students to sit on his lap so that he might hug and kiss them, (2) rubbing student's thigh, (3) tightly hugging a student, and (4) holding student's hand until she pushed away constitutes immoral conducting warranting immediate suspension and dismissal without written notice of specific charges under *Educ. Code § 44939*. *Governing Board v. Haar (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 369, 379-385, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744*

Trial court finding that probationary teacher's dismissal justified on grounds of immoral conduct as supported by substantial evidence where evidence showed that teacher had filed affidavit, later made public, admitting that she used marijuana with beneficial effects, claiming that laws prohibiting its use were unconstitutional, and advocating their change, and where there was testimony concerning her unfitness to teach. *Governing Bd. v. Brennan (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401-402, 95 Cal. Rptr. 712*

Dismissal of permanent teacher on grounds of immoral conduct and evident unfitness as justified where teacher discovered in compromising position with female student in his car while parked on public street and, when discovered, verbally and physically assaulted peace officer and fled from scene at high speed. *Board of Trustees v. Stubblefield (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 820, 824-827, 94 Cal. Rptr. 318*

[iv] Unsatisfactory Performance

Concept of incompetency does not invoke subjective analysis of individual conduct; absence in record of dismissal proceedings of empirical standards for measuring competency did not defeat educational commission's decision to dismiss teacher when decision was based on specific facts, such as teacher's failure to teach basis skills or maintain classroom discipline. *Perez v. Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1176, 197 Cal. Rptr. 390* (incompetency construed under *Educ. Code § 48917*, which was amended in 1995 to change "incompetency" to "unsatisfactory performance")

Failure of district to adopt uniform written guidelines as required by *Educ. Code § 44660* does not deprive district of jurisdiction to dismiss teacher for incompetency under *Educ. Code § 44938*. *California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 27, 33-36, 192 Cal. Rptr. 358* (incompetency construed under *Educ. Code § 48917,* which was amended in 1995 to change "incompetency" to "unsatisfactory performance")

[v] Persistent Violation of or Refusal to Obey School Laws or Rules

Failure to supply lesson plans for substitute teachers during numerous intermittent absences totaling 21 percent of all work days over four-year period constituted substantial evidence of violations that were stubborn and continuing, and therefore persistent. *San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1183, 220 Cal. Rptr. 351*

In determining whether or not violations were persistent, trial court correctly considers (1) likelihood of recurrence of questioned conduct, (2) extenuating or aggravating circumstances, (3) effect of notoriety and publicity, (4) impairment of teacher-student relationships, (5) disruption of education process, (6) motive, and (7) proximity or remoteness in time of conduct. *San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1183, 220 Cal. Rptr. 351* (applying seven criteria outlined in *Morrison v. State Board of Education (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 214, 229, 82 Cal. Rptr. 175, 461 P.2d 375*)

Board improperly dismissed teacher under *Educ. Code § 44932(a)(7)* for repeatedly refusing to admit agreement with principal's assertion that teacher needed improvement in two areas, because difference of opinion and continual debate between teacher and principal cannot reasonably be transformed into "persistent" violation of rules. *Bourland v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 317, 320-321, 219 Cal. Rptr. 906*

Teacher's failure to obey school district rules by not preparing adequate and timely lesson plans for substitutes in two of 16 instances did not demonstrate willfulness as matter of law. *San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 278, 287-288, 185 Cal. Rptr. 203*

[vi] Physical or Mental Disability

Exclusive-remedy principle of workers' compensation law do not deprive employee receiving workers' compensation benefits for mental disability of due process rights provided in Education Code regarding reinstatement. *Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1363-1366, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354*

[e] Notice of Unprofessional Conduct

Plaintiff had no cause to complain of violation of 90-day notice requirement for filing charges of unprofessional conduct under former *Educ. Code § 44938* (*now see Educ. Code § 44938(a), 45* days notice for charges of unprofessional conduct and *Educ. Code § 44938(b), 90* days notice for charges of incompetency) when charge of unprofessional conduct was dismissed at hearing. *Pittsburg Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 964, 974, 194 Cal. Rptr. 672*

[f] Pretermination Hearing

Cost-sharing provision of *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* (requiring teacher who requested hearing on threatened suspension or dismissal, but who did not ultimately prevail, to pay half of cost of administrative law judge) is unconstitutional on its face. *California Teachers Assn. v. State (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 327, 345-357, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425, 975 P.2d 622*

Governing board of school district is required by Ralph M. Brown Act, *Gov. Code § 54950 et seq.* , to conduct open proceedings when it hears specific complaints or charges against the employee with potential disciplinary consequences. *Bell v. Vista Unified Sch. Dist. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 672, 682-684, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 263*

Permanent, tenured teacher has constitutional right to procedural due process before termination of employment for cause; thus, even if permanent, tenured teacher's credential has been suspended for 10 years due to allegations of sexual misconduct, and employing school district has notified teacher of its intention to terminate teacher's employment, district cannot refuse teacher's timely request for pretermination hearing under *Educ. Code § 44934 et seq.*. *Shields v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 955, 958-962, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391*

[g] Judicial Review

CPC is not indispensable party, within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 389(a)*, to administrative mandamus proceeding brought by school district to challenge commission's decision that employee's dismissal was unwarranted. *Fontana Unified School Dist. v. Burman (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 208, 224, 246 Cal. Rptr. 733, 753 P.2d 689*

Factual finding of Commission on Professional Competence, which is professional body with experience and expertise in area of determining fitness to teach, made after extensive factual hearing with opportunity to see, hear, and evaluate veracity of witnesses, that cause was not established to discharge teacher for unfitness to teach and persistent refusal to obey district rules, was entitled to substantial weight in "independent judgment" hearing before superior court. *San Dieguito Union High School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 278, 288, 185 Cal. Rptr. 203*

[5] Dismissal of Probationary Employees

[a] During School Year

Former Educ. Code § 13442 (now *Educ. Code § 44948*) as giving probationary teachers, employed prior to 1983-1984 fiscal year or in small school district, during school year same procedural protections applicable to dismissal of permanent teachers; where school board failed to follow required statutory procedure for terminating teacher's employment during school year, its action in dismissing teacher as nullity. *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817*

[b] End of School Year

[i] Generally

School district governing board may hold closed session on matters of performance evaluation and dismissal of probationary teacher; teacher's right to request open session under *Gov. Code § 54957* applies only if board is hearing specific complaints or charges against teacher. *Fischer v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 87, 95-98, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 452*

Educ. Code § 44882(b), allowing dismissal without cause, without notice, and without any redress by hearing or appeal, applies to first-year probationary teachers notified of nonreelection for second school year without statement of reasons. *Grimsley v. Board of Trustees (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1440, 1447-1448, 235 Cal. Rptr. 85*

Probationary teacher wrongfully denied employment for particular year as entitled to recover back pay for that year, but

not reinstatement for subsequent year. *Tarquino v. Franklin-McKinley School Dist. (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 832, 836, 152 Cal. Rptr. 108*

[ii] Grounds

Teacher's reading to class of short story containing a vulgar expression as part of lesson as not constituting cause for refusal to reemploy which relates solely to welfare of school and its pupils under facts of case. *Lindros v. Governing Bd. of The Torrance Unified School Dist. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 524, 535-538, 108 Cal. Rptr. 185, 510 P.2d 361 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 1112, 94 S Ct 842, 38 L Ed2d 739*

Failure to pass competency examination in subject as required by employment contract was sufficient grounds for failure to rehire probationary teacher. *Alba v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1009, 189 Cal. Rptr. 897*

[iii] Judicial Reviews

Right of probationary teacher to be rehired for succeeding year as not vested; in mandate proceeding to review decision of school board not to rehire probationary teacher, court as required to accept fact findings of school board if supported by substantial evidence. *Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 824-827, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115* (disapproving *Young v. Governing Bd. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 769, 115 Cal. Rptr. 456* to the extent it is inconsistent)

[iv] Notice

Where school board fails to follow procedure for dismissing probationary teacher under former Educ. Code § 13443 (now *Educ. Code § 44948.5*), remedy as being new hearing rather than automatic reinstatement, notwithstanding that new hearing would make final notice of board's decision not to reemploy teacher before May 15 impossible. *Lucas v. Board of Education (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 674, 681-683, 119 Cal. Rptr. 462, 532 P.2d 110*

Under former Educ. Code § 13447(h) (now *Educ. Code §§ 44948.5(i), 44955(c)*), probationary teacher as deemed reemployed for subsequent year unless final notice of board's decision not to reemploy given on or before May 15 of preceding year; notice provision as mandatory. *Rutherford v. Board of Trustees (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 775, 779-781, 112 Cal. Rptr. 560* ; *Stewart v. San Mateo Junior College Dist. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 345, 347-348, 112 Cal. Rptr. 272*

[6] Layoffs

[a] In General

When exercising its discretion under *Educ. Code § 44956* with regard to rehiring tenured employees on layoff status, school district is not permitted to impose hiring requirements on laid-off employees that are different from those imposed on continuing status employees in filling open job position. *Martin v. Kentfield School District (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 294, 300-301, 197 Cal. Rptr. 570, 673 P.2d 240*

Educ. Code § 44956 is intended to provide terminated school employees with same rights they would have had they been retained by school district; terminated teacher is entitled to new position over retained teacher with less seniority. *Poppers v. Tamalpais Union High School Dist. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 399, 404-407, 229 Cal. Rptr. 77*

Validly laid off employee retain same employment rights as if no lay off had intervened; employee's reinstatement is not subject to requirement not imposed on other employees who continued in service. *Forker v. Board of Trustees (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 13, 18-20, 206 Cal. Rptr. 303*

In deciding whether to reduce or discontinue particular kind of service pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955*, school district is entitled to consider its financial circumstances, and has discretion to determine necessary and proper extent to which a particular kind of service may be reduced, subject to minimum level required by law. *San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 636, 638, 192 Cal. Rptr. 710*

In making decision not to rehire certified employees due to reduction of particular kinds of services, school district is not required to consider positively assured attrition occurring between date of preliminary notice not to rehire and final notice in determining number of employees to be terminated. *San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 630, 192 Cal. Rptr. 710*

Educ. Code § 44955 does not permit monolingual teachers to be discharged in favor of junior bilingual teachers when the latter are not employed to teach classes in formal bilingual program; bilingual ability of teachers is not a criterion for evaluation of competency. *Alexander v. Board of Trustees (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 567, 575-576, 188 Cal. Rptr. 705*

Pursuant to former *Educ. Code § 44955* (*now see Educ. Code § 44955(b)*), school district is permitted to retain certificated administrators while dismissing certificated employees with more seniority since, under that section, an administrator may be retained just as any other employee holding a special credential or needed skill, if those credentials and competency are not shared by more senior employee. *Santa Clara Federation of Teachers v. Governing Board (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 831, 842-843, 172 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *Moreland Teachers Assn. v. Kurze (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 648, 655, 167 Cal. Rptr. 343*

March 15 notice specifying both statutory grounds for termination of employment pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955* (providing for reduction of number of certificated employees due to decline in average daily attendance or reduction in particular service) was sufficiently specific. *Santa Clara Federation of Teachers v. Governing Board (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 831, 841, 172 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *Moreland Teachers Assn. v. Kurze (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 167 Cal. Rptr. 343*

In determining number of teachers to be dismissed by reason of decline in average daily attendance, school board as required to consider number of teachers who had departed system during the computation period. *Burgess v. Board of Education (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 571, 578-579, 116 Cal. Rptr. 183*

Where school board acts to reduce number of employees pursuant to former Educ. Code § 13447 (now *Educ. Code § 44955(b)*), board as without power to terminate teachers for any reason not specified in initial March 15 notice of intention to terminate. *Karbach v. Board of Educ. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 355, 363, 114 Cal. Rptr. 84*

[b] Notice

Preliminary notice pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44949(a)* and *44955* recommending termination of certain certified employees because of reduction in particular kinds of services is sufficiently specific if it designates categories of services to be reduced or discontinued even though specific positions to be eliminated are not specified. *San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 630, 192 Cal. Rptr. 710*

[7] Mental Illness

Governing board must treat lack of express finding by psychiatric panel after examination pursuant to *Educ. Code §*

44942(c) that employee is suffering from mental illness of such degree as to render him or her incompetent to perform duties as finding that employee is not suffering from such mental illness; governing board is not permitted to require psychological testing or additional examinations after one examination has been conducted. *Buchan v. Las Virgenes Unified School Dist. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1096, 1098, 177 Cal. Rptr. 788*

[8] Preferential Hiring

Preferential reemployment rights granted to certain substitute and temporary teachers under *Educ. Code § 44918* apply to teachers hired as temporaries under the provisions of *Educ. Code § 44920*. *Taylor v. Board of Trustees (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 500, 502, 507, 204 Cal. Rptr. 711, 683 P.2d 710*

[9] Resignations

Former Educ. Code § 13260 (renumbered *Educ. Code § 44842*) as giving governing board discretionary authority to determine whether failure by permanent teacher to notify board of intention to remain by statutory deadline should constitute declining of employment; school district as abusing discretion where board had taken no action to employ a replacement teacher prior to teacher's notice that he intended to continue and where district did not suffer any other prejudice, detriment, harm, or injury whatsoever as a result of teacher's inadvertent failure to return contract by deadline date. *California Teachers Ass'n v. Governing Bd. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 833, 842-843, 139 Cal. Rptr. 155*

Resignations required of school teachers and accepted as subterfuge in attempt to evade tenure statutes as without effect. *Mitchell v. Board of Trustees (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 64, 67-68, 42 P.2d 397*

[10] Salaries

Proper remedy for *Educ. Code § 45028* violation is reclassification of all affected teachers to afford them full credit for all prior teaching experience, rather than mere backpay for period of violation or downward reclassification of favorably treated teachers who already had vested rights to their salaries. *United Teachers of Ukiah v. Board of Education (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 632, 644, 644 n.10, 251 Cal. Rptr. 499*

Salary schedule that subclassifies top "experience" classification violated *Educ. Code § 45028* when it distinguished among equally highly trained teachers with equal seniority, who had served district equal number of years, solely on basis of order in which years of training and years of service accrued. *San Francisco Classroom Teachers Assn. v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 627, 633-634, 242 Cal. Rptr. 352*

Statute of limitations barring claim for earned but unpaid salary does not bar teacher from receiving retirement service credits under *State Teachers' Retirement System. California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Board (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 35, 41-45, 214 Cal. Rptr. 777*

School district's professional growth policy, which denied credit for years of experience as teacher based on failure to obtain certain number of specified professional growth units, violated *Educ. Code § 45028*, which requires salary classification of employees to be based on uniform allowance for years of training and years of experience. *Wygant v. Victor Valley Joint Union High School Dist. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 319, 326, 330, 214 Cal. Rptr. 205* (construing *Educ. Code § 45028* prior to effective date of *Gov. Code § 3543.2(d)*, which allows school and representative to negotiate regarding payment of additional compensation based on criteria other than years of training and experience)

School district rule governing salary advancement of certificated teachers, which limited teacher who advanced on salary schedule from one column to next on attainment of higher educational level to a one-step increase for experience,

even though teacher had additional years of experience and new column had steps for those additional years of experience, violated *Educ. Code § 45028*, which requires that each person employed by district in position requiring certification qualifications be classified on salary schedule on basis of uniform allowance for years of training and years of experience. *California Teachers Assn. v. Board of Education (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 826, 828, 181 Cal. Rptr. 432*

Teacher's application for and receipt of disability benefits as not by itself effecting retirement or termination of previous employment status or of right to reinstatement. *Kalinowski v. Board of Education (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 245 249-250, 153 Cal. Rptr. 178*

School district as estopped from recovering alleged overpayments to school teachers where necessary elements of estoppel present. *Shoban v. Board of Trustees (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 534, 544, 81 Cal. Rptr. 112*

School district as generally entitled to recover erroneous overpayment of salary from teachers. *Aebli v. Board of Educ. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 706, 725-727, 145 P.2d 601*

[11] Sick Leave--Differential Compensation

Under *Educ. Code § 44977*, five months of differential-pay sick leave (certificated employee's regular salary less amount actually paid to substitute teacher in his or her absence) is available "per illness or accident," not for each resulting injury, so teacher who suffers multiple injuries in single accident is entitled to only one differential-pay period for that accident. *Veguez v. Governing Bd. of Long Beach Unified School Dist. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 406, 418-420, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 526*

Five-month period for differential pay pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44977* begins to run immediately after exhaustion of teacher's 10 days of current annual sick leave, rather than after exhaustion of accumulated sick leave. *Napa Valley Educators' Assn. v. Napa Valley Unified School Dist. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 243, 247, 239 Cal. Rptr. 395*

Teacher has statutory right (*Educ. Code §§ 44977, 44978*) to differential compensation for any absence of five months or less, commencing immediately on exhaustion of all sick leave. *California Teachers' Ass'n v. Parlier Unified School Dist. (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 174, 178-182, 204 Cal. Rptr. 20*

[12] Waiver of Employment Rights as Void

Portion of collective bargaining agreement which conflicted with *Educ. Code § 44977* by creating conditions on right to receive sick leave benefits under that section were nullified by *Educ. Code § 44924*. *Jefferson Classroom Teachers Assn. v. Jefferson Elementary School Dist. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 993, 999-1000, 187 Cal. Rptr. 542*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.65

§ 512.65 Attorney General Opinions

Payment of one-time bonus to certificated employees under bargaining agreement is permissible even when based on criteria other than those set forth in *Educ. Code § 45028*. *69 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 268 (1986)*

Governing board as not required to obtain consent of teacher prior to assignment within scope of credential under which teacher is teaching; Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing [*now* Commission on Teacher Credentialing] as without authority to hear and resolve disputes or promulgate regulations relating to assignment of teachers. *61 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 353 (1978)*

Destruction by school board of derogatory material in personnel file of teacher. *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 422 (1975)*

Authority of school board regarding personal necessity leave. *56 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 473 (1973)*

Grant of immunity from prosecution under *Penal Code § 1324* as not prohibiting Committee of Credentials from taking civil action to revoke credentials. *55 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 289 (1972)*

Transfer of tenured teacher from regular reaching program of district to program of correctional institution administered by district's adult school division without teacher's consent as prohibited. *41 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 175 (1963)*

Procedure of State Board of Education regarding denial of application for reinstatement of credential. *40 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 256 (1962)*

Right of State Board of Education to deny or revoke credential for knowing membership in Communist Party; power to delegate investigatory duties to Committee of Credentials; power to question applicant or holder. *37 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 201 (1961)*

Finding that teacher committed acts constituting crime as able to be based solely on record of conviction of crime. 34

Ops Cal. Attry Gen 34 (1959)

Notwithstanding terms of contract stating teacher's position is "part-time," teacher who actually teaches full-time as required to be paid minimum salary established by law. *26 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 27 (1955)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.66

§ 512.66 Law Reviews

Note, *School District's Restraint on Public Comment by Employees: A First Amendment Infringement, 15 Golden Gate U.L. Rev. 211 (1985)*

Johnson, *The Scope of Injunction in California Public School Employee Strikes, 17 U.S.F. L. Rev. 203 (1983)*

Wenkart, *Dismissal of California Public School Employees Engaged in Union Activity, 22 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1133 (1982)*

Comment, *The Impact of Collective Bargaining on California Education Code Laws Governing Teacher Tenure, Evaluations, and Dismissal, 11 Pacific L.J. 799 (1980)*

Comment, *The Part-Time Teacher and Tenure in California, 10 Golden Gate L. Rev. 765 (1980)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.67

§ 512.67 Text References

California Public Sector Labor Relations (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 3, *Agency and Employment*, §§ 295-311 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.68-512.79

[Reserved]

§§ 512.68[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. In General

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.80

§ 512.80 Scope of Checklists

NOTE:

These procedural checklists are intended to provide a brief chronological summary of the procedures applicable to the denial, suspension, or revocation of teaching credentials and the dismissal of permanent and probationary certificated employees. The procedures are set forth in more detail in § 512.10 et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
A. In General

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.81-512.99

[Reserved]

§§ 512.81[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Denial, Revocation, Or Suspension Of Credential

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.100

§ 512.100 Investigation by Committee of Credentials

1. Investigation into fitness of applicant or holder, or presentation of allegations to committee [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(a)*].

2. No later than six months after commencement of committee's initial review, committee ordinarily must conduct formal review to determine either that no adverse action will be taken or that allegations are sufficient to cause application or credential to be subject to adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44244(b)(1)*].

3. At least 30 days prior to any formal review, committee must notify applicant or certificate holder of specific allegations of misconduct; statement of allegations must inform applicant or holder that allegations, if true, are sufficient to cause his or her application or credential to be subject to adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44244(a)*].

4. If committee determines that probable cause for adverse action does not exist, committee must terminate investigation [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(c)(3)(A)*]; if committee determines that probable cause for adverse action on credential exists, on receipt of request from applicant or credential holder [*see Educ. Code § 44244.1*], CTC must initiate adjudicatory hearing [*see Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*] by filing an accusation or statement of issues [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(c)(3)(B)*].

5. Committee must report its actions and recommendations to CTC, including its findings as to probable cause, and if probable cause exists, its recommendations as to appropriate adverse action [*Educ. Code § 44242.5(e)(1)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Denial, Revocation, Or Suspension Of Credential

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.101

§ 512.101 Adjudicatory Hearing

1. Adjudicatory hearing is conducted by Commission on Teacher Credentialing in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, and Commission has all powers granted therein [*Educ. Code §§ 44242.5(c)(3)(B)*, *44246*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Denial, Revocation, Or Suspension Of Credential

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.102

§ 512.102 Judicial Review

1. Procedure: Petition for writ of mandate [*see Gov. Code § 11523*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. See *§ 512.160*.

2. Standard of review:

a. Suspension or revocation: Independent judgment test [*see Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 508, 326 P.2d 850]* .

b. Denial of application: No cases on point, but substantial evidence test is apparently applicable [*cf. Bixby v. Pierno (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 130, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 234, 481 P.2d 242]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
B. Denial, Revocation, Or Suspension Of Credential

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.103-512.119

[Reserved]

§§ 512.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Dismissal Or Suspension Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.120

§ 512.120 Permanent Employees

1. Causes.

a. Dismissal only for one or more of causes listed in *Educ. Code § 44932(a)* or *44933* [*see § 512.28[1]*].

b. Suspension without pay for specified period of time for unprofessional conduct pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44932(b)*.

2. Notice of Dismissal.

NOTE:
If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932(a)(1), (4), 44938(c)*], the school district must also have sent the employee a previous written notice specifying the nature of the unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance, with such specific instances of behavior and with such particularity as to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge. This previous notice must include a copy of the evaluation conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44664* [*Educ. Code § 44938(a), (b)*]. If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct, this previous notice must have been given at least 45 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described below [*Educ. Code § 44938(a)*]. If the cause is unsatisfactory performance, this previous notice ordinarily must have been given at least 90 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described below [*Educ. Code § 44938(b)*].

a. Time:
(1) For grounds specified in *Educ. Code § 44932* may not be given between May 15 and September 15 [*Educ. Code § 44936*].

(2) For immediate suspension and dismissal for grounds specified in *Educ. Code § 44939*, may be given at any time [*see Educ. Code § 44941*].

b. Contents [*Educ. Code §§ 44934, 44936, 44941*]:

(1) Notice of charges against employee.

(2) Information required by *Gov. Code § 11503*.

(3) Copy of provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 44930-44988*.

(4) Intention of governing board to dismiss or suspend employee within 30 days unless employee demands hearing.

3. Hearing.

a. Demand for hearing and response by governing board:

(1) Employee response: Must demand hearing in writing within 30 days after notice is served, or hearing is deemed waived and employee may be dismissed or suspended without pay [*Educ. Code § 44937*].

(2) If employee demands hearing, governing board may either rescind its action or schedule hearing [*Educ. Code § 44943*].

b. Time for hearing: Within 60 days after employee's demand [*Educ. Code § 44944(a)*].

c. Conduct of hearing: Hearing is conducted by a Commission on Professional Competence in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*, and Commission on Professional Competence has all powers of an agency granted therein [*Educ. Code § 44944(a), (b)*; *see* Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions*].

d. Discovery rights: See discussion in *§ 512.28[6][d]*.

e. Place of hearing: Place selected by agreement among members of Commission on Professional Competence or, in absence of agreement, place selected by administrative law judge [*Educ. Code § 44944(f)*].

f. Decision by majority vote of Commission on Professional Competence [*Educ. Code § 44944(c)*] must contain:

(1) Findings of fact.

(2) Determination of issues.

(3) Disposition which must be:
(a) That employee be dismissed,

(b) That employee be suspended for specific period of time without pay, or

(c) That employee not be dismissed.

g. Expenses of hearing: if Commission on Professional Competence determines that employee should not be dismissed or suspended, governing board must pay expenses of hearing, including following [*Educ. Code § 44944(e)*]:

NOTE:

The Supreme Court has held a cost-sharing provision of *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* unconstitutional on its face. That provision required a teacher who requested a hearing on his or her threatened suspension or dismissal, but who did not ultimately prevail (either at the administrative level or after judicial review), to pay half the cost of the administrative law judge [*California Teachers Assn. v. State (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 327, 345-357, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425, 975 P.2d 622]* . See discussion in *§ 512.28[6][i]*.

(1) Cost of administrative law judge.

(2) Compensation of Commission on Professional Competence members for service during summer recess or vacation periods [*see Educ. Code § 44944(d)(2)*].

(3) Reasonable expenses (as determined by administrative law judge) of Commission on Professional Competence members, including, but not limited to, payments or obligations incurred for travel, meals, and lodging.

(4) Cost of any substitute members of Commission on Professional Competence.

(5) Reasonable attorney fees incurred by employee.

h. Judicial review:

(1) Procedure: Petition for writ of mandate [*Educ. Code § 44945*; *Gov. Code § 11523*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. See *§ 512.161*.

(2) Standard of review: Independent judgment test [*Educ. Code § 44945*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Dismissal Or Suspension Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.121

§ 512.121 Probationary Employees

1. Employed during or after 1983-1984 fiscal year [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(c)*].

a. Grounds for dismissal or suspension without pay [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a), (b)*]:
(1) Unsatisfactory performance determined pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665*.

(2) Cause pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44932*.

b. Notice of Dismissal.

NOTE:
If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932(a)(1), (4), 44938(c)*], the school district must also have sent the employee a previous written notice specifying the nature of the unprofessional conduct or unsatisfactory performance, with such specific instances of behavior and with such particularity as to furnish the employee an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the grounds for the charge. This previous notice must include a copy of the evaluation conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44664* [*Educ. Code § 44938(a), (b)*]. If the cause for dismissal is unprofessional conduct, this previous notice must have been given at least 45 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described below [*Educ. Code § 44938(a)*]. If the cause is unsatisfactory performance, this previous notice ordinarily must have been given at least 90 calendar days before the notice of dismissal described below [*Educ. Code § 44938(b)*; *see Achene v. Pierce Joint Unified Sch. Dist. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 757, 766-768, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 899* (because *Educ. Code § 44938* specifies procedure for dismissal for cause under *Educ. Code § 44932*, it also applies to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance of probationary teacher under *Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)*, which incorporates procedures applicable to dismissal for cause under *Educ. Code § 44932*)].

(1) Time [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(1)*]:

(a) 30 days prior to dismissal or suspension.

(b) For second year probationary employees, must given no later than March 15.

(2) Contents [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(1)*]:

(a) Statement of reasons for dismissal or suspension.

(b) Notice of opportunity to appeal.

(c) If dismissal or suspension is for unsatisfactory performance, a copy of evaluation conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44664*.

c. Request for hearing: Written request must be submitted by employee within 15 days of receipt of notice of dismissal or right to hearing is waived [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(2)*].

d. Hearing procedure: Established by governing board [*see Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)(2)*].

2. Employed prior to 1983-1984 fiscal year or in small school district.

a. During School Year.

(1) Dismissal: Causes and procedure same as for dismissal of permanent employees [*see Educ. Code § 44948(a)*; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see also § 512.120*]. Pursuant to 1991 legislation, small school district may elect to dismiss probationary employees during school year under *Educ. Code § 44948.3* [*see* Paragraph 1, *above*].

(2) Suspension without pay.
(a) Employees hired prior to 1983-1984 fiscal year: Causes and procedure same as for suspension of permanent employees [*see Educ. Code § 44948(a)*; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see also § 512.120*].

(b) Small school districts.
(i) Procedure: Same as for dismissal or suspension of permanent employees [*see Educ. Code § 44932(b)*].

(ii) Grounds: Unprofessional conduct, including acts or omissions other than those listed in *Educ. Code § 44932* [*see Educ. Code § 44932(b), 44933*].

b. At end of school year:

(1) Cause: Sufficiency of cause is to be determined by governing board, but cause must relate solely to welfare of schools and pupils thereof [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(e)*].

(2) Notice.

(a) Initial notice [*Educ. Code § 44948.5*]:
(i) Time: Before March 15.

(ii) Contents:

(A) Statement that it has been recommended that employee not be reemployed for ensuing school year, and reasons therefor.

(B) Notice of right to hearing if demanded in writing on or before the date specified in the notice (which must not be less than seven days after service of the notice).

(b) Final notice: After hearing procedures of *Educ. Code § 44948.5* have been complied with, final notice to employee that his or her services will not be required for ensuing school year must be given on or before May 15. Failure to so notify employee results in employee being deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year [*see Educ. Code § 44948.5(f), (i)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.30[2][f]*].

(c) Expenses of hearing: Paid by governing board [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)*].

(3) Proposed decision of administrative law judge [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)*]:

(a) Time: Copies must be delivered to employee and to governing board by May 7.

(b) Contents: Must contain findings of fact, determination as to sufficiency of cause and whether it relates to welfare of school and its pupils, and recommended disposition.

(c) Effect: Recommended decision of administrative law judge is not binding on governing board.

(4) Decision of governing board: Board may either

(a) Adopt administrative law judge's decision, or

(b) Reject administrative law judge's decision and prepare its own, which must be in writing and contain findings of fact and a determination of issues [*see Lucas v. Board of Education (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 674, 678, 119 Cal. Rptr. 462, 532 P.2d 110]* .

3. Judicial review.

(a) Procedure: Petition for writ of mandate [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *see Blodgett v. Board of Trustees (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 183, 190, 97 Cal. Rptr. 406]* . See *§ 512.166*.

(b) Standard of review: Substantial evidence test [*Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 824-827, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
C. Dismissal Or Suspension Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.122-512.139

[Reserved]

§§ 512.122[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
D. Reduction Of Number Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.140

§ 512.140 Grounds

For discussion of grounds for reducing number of permanent and probationary certificated employees under *Educ. Code § 44955(b)*, see *§ 512.33[1]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
D. Reduction Of Number Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.141

§ 512.141 Procedure

1. Notice.

a. Initial notice [*Educ. Code § 44949(a), (b)*]:
(1) Time: Before March 15.

(2) Contents:
(a) Statement that it has been recommended that employee not be reemployed for ensuing school year, and reasons therefor.

(b) Notice of right to hearing if demanded in writing on or before the date specified in the notice (which must not be less than seven days after service of the notice).

b. Final notice: After hearing procedures of *Educ. Code § 44949* have been complied with, final notice to employee that his or her services will be terminated for ensuing school year must be given on or before May 15. Failure to provide notices and right to hearing set forth in *Educ. Code § 44949* results in employee being deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year [*see Educ. Code § 44955(c)*; *see also § 512.33[3][g]*.

c. Expenses of hearing: Paid by governing board [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*].

2. Proposed decision of administrative law judge [*Educ. Code § 44949(c)*].

a. Time: Copies must be delivered to employee and to governing board by May 7.

b. Contents: Must contain findings of fact, determination as to sufficiency of cause and whether it relates to welfare of school and its pupils, and recommended disposition.

c. Effect: Recommended decision of administrative law judge is not binding on governing board.

3. Decision of governing board: Board may either

a. Adopt administrative law judge's decision, or

b. Reject administrative law judge's decision and prepare its own, which must be in writing and contain findings of fact and a determination of issues [*see* *Lucas v. Board of Education (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 674, 678, 119 Cal. Rptr. 462, 532 P.2d 110]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST
D. Reduction Of Number Of Certificated Employees

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 512.142-512.159

[Reserved]

§§ 512.142[Reserved]

153 of 164 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.160

§ 512.160 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Teacher Credentialing [Educ. Code § 44246]--Denial, Suspension, or Revocation of Credential or Life Diploma

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Teacher Credentialing [Educ. Code § 44246]--Denial, Suspension, or Revocation of Credential or Life Diploma

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name* (*s*)],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT
Respondent(s)[,]	)	OF MANDATE
[_____ (*name* (*s*)), Real	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]
Party (Parties) in Interest].	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.

[*EITHER, if petitioner seeks review of revocation or suspension of credential*]

2. Petitioner is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, the holder of a valid _____ [*identify type of credential or life diploma held, e.g.,* teaching credential], authorizing him/her to _____ [*describe services authorized by credential or life diploma, e.g.,* teach mathematics in all public secondary schools in the State of California], duly issued by the _____ [State Board of Education *or* respondent Commission on Teacher Credentialing].

[*OR, if petitioner seeks review of denial of credential*]

2. Petitioner meets all of the qualifications for a _____ [*describe type of certification document applied for, e.g.,* teaching credential] established by law. On or about _____, [*date*], petitioner applied to respondent Commission on Teacher Credentialing for a _____ [*describe type of certification document applied for, as above*] in compliance with all statutes and administrative regulations governing such an application.

3. Respondent Commission on Teacher Credentialing is an administrative agency of the State of California charged by law with the duty of implementing the provisions of *Sections 44200 through 44354 of the Education Code*, of establishing and promulgating standards and procedures for certifying educational personnel as qualified for a license to practice in the public schools of California, and of supporting, facilitating, and delineating functions and programs of preparation for the teaching profession. Respondent Committee of Credentials is an administrative agency whose members are appointed by respondent Commission on Teacher Credentialing and which is charged by law with the performance of such duties as are assigned to it by respondent commission relating to the granting, issuance, suspension, and revocation of credentials and life diplomas.

4. Under *Sections 44242.5*, *44243*, *44244*, and *44246 of the Education Code*, respondents have discretion to determine the facts concerning whether or not a ground exists for _____ [denying an application for a _____ (credential *or* life diploma) *or* suspending or revoking a _____ (credential *or* life diploma)], and particularly whether _____ [*specify alleged facts constituting ground for denial, suspension, or revocation of credential, e.g.,* the _____ (applicant for *or* holder of) a _____ (credential *or* life diploma) has committed an act involving moral turpitude]. Pursuant to *Sections 44242.5* and *44246 of the Education Code*, *Sections 11500 through 11528 of the Government Code*, and the decisional law of this state, respondent Commission on Teacher Credentialing is required to hold a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of those facts.

5. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify meeting place*], a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue of whether or not a ground exists for _____ [denial of petitioner's application for a _____ (credential *or* life diploma) *or* _____ (suspension *or* revocation) of the _____ (credential *or* life diploma) which petitioner then held and which was then in full force and effect]. Petitioner attended the hearing.

6. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received respondent commission's decision and order _____ [denying petitioner's application for a _____ (credential *or* life diploma) *or* _____ (suspending *or* revoking) petitioner's _____ (credential *or* life diploma)] on the ground that _____ [*specify ground for action, e.g.,* petitioner had committed an act involving moral turpitude]. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result* .] A copy of the notice of decision is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

7. _____ [A verbatim transcript of the record of the hearing, containing the evidence received, is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof *or* The substance of the evidence received at the hearing is as

follows: _____ (*describe substance of evidence*)].

8. Respondent commission's decision and order are invalid for the following reasons: _____ [*in subparagraphs which follow, state reasons why decision is invalid, e.g.,*

a. The administrative law judge found that _____ (*state all findings*). Respondent commission does not have authority to _____ (deny petitioner's application *or* _____ (revoke *or* suspend) petitioner's _____ (credential *or* life diploma)) based on any of these findings in that such findings do not constitute _____ (*specify statutory ground for action taken, e.g.,* an act involving moral turpitude) or any other ground for _____ (denial *or* suspension *or* revocation) of a _____ (credential *or* life diploma).

b. The evidence received at the hearing does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ (*specify*).

c. _____ (*In this and following subparagraphs, allege any other reasons for invalidity of decision under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5,* such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, or abuse of discretion as established by a failure to proceed as required by law or failure of the findings to support the decisions. For examples of such allegations, see the petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision in the Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, §§ 474C.90, 474C.91*)].

[9. *If appropriate, add:* Petitioner has the following relevant evidence that was not produced at the hearing: _____ (*describe evidence completely*). This evidence could not be produced at the hearing because _____ (*specify reason why, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, petitioner could not produce evidence and why, if appropriate, evidence could not be produced on reconsideration*). This evidence tends to show that _____ (*state what evidence will prove*).]

[10. *If attorney's fees are claimed under Gov. Code § 800, add:* As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has become, and is, obligated personally to pay to his/her counsel _____ (*name*), attorney's fees _____ (exceeding $7,500 *or* in the sum of $_____).]

11. Petitioner has exhausted all his/her administrative remedies, as alleged above, and the decision of respondent has become final insofar as respondent is presently concerned.

12. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law in that the law provides no other means whereby petitioner can require respondent to set aside its decision.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision and order of _____(*date*), _____ (denying petitioner's application for issuance of a _____ (*specify nature of certification document applied for, e.g.,* teaching credential) and to _____ (reconsider whether petitioner is entitled to receive a _____ (*specify nature of document applied for, as above*), as applied for, *or* issue petitioner a _____ (*specify nature of document applied for, as above*), as applied for, *or* _____ (revoking *or* suspending) petitioner's _____ (*specify type of certification document held by petitioner, e.g.,* teaching credential) and to reinstate petitioner's _____ (*specify type of document held by petitioner, as above*) as it existed before that order was issued), or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____ (*date*), _____ (*specify effect of order, e.g.,* revoking petitioner's teaching credential) until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*add, if appropriate:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate for use by an aggrieved applicant for, or holder of, a credential or life diploma to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to deny, suspend, or revoke the credential or life diploma. This petition is to be used where the decision to deny, suspend, or revoke the document is the result of an evidentiary hearing required by law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *see also* discussion in § 516.160[4]]. For a complete discussion of petitions for writs of mandate to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

The petitioner may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as described below.

[b] Alternative Writ Procedure

If petitioner proceeds by the alternative writ procedure, he or she should prepare a petition, an order for issuance of an alternative writ (if local rules or practice so require), and an alternative writ of mandate. He or she must serve a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest, and file the petition along with proof of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. At the time of filing the petition, the alternative writ is deposited, but not filed, with the clerk of the court. Five days after the filing of the petition, the court must examine the papers on file and either issue or decline to issue the alternative writ. During the five-day period, the respondent or real party in interest may file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to the issuance of the writ, and serve a copy of the memorandum on the petitioner [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. If the court decides to issue the alternative writ, the judge either signs the order for issuance or signs the writ itself. A copy of the writ is then served on respondent and real party in interest in the same manner as a summons [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*]. The alternative writ commands the respondent to either do the specified act or to appear at a time and place specified in the writ and show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate ordering respondent to do the act should not be issued [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*].

For a form of alternative writ of mandate, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[c] Noticed Application Procedure

If petitioner follows the noticed application procedure, he or she should prepare a petition and a notice fixing a time (at least 10 days after the notice) and place for hearing the petition [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*]. Copies of these papers are then served on the respondent and real party in interest and the petition and notice are then filed along with proof of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, if proof of service is not filed with the petition pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*, copies of these papers may be filed and served in the same manner as in an ordinary civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Respondent or real party in interest may file points and authorities in opposition to the petition within five days after the filing of the petition [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. If the petition is filed in the trial court pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*, the respondent has 30 days to answer or otherwise respond after service of the petition when a record of the proceeding to be reviewed has been filed with the petition or when no record is required, or has 30 days to answer or otherwise respond following receipt of a copy of the record if a record has been requested pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11523* or otherwise, and the record has not been filed with the petition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1089.5*]. No alternative writ is issued under the noticed application procedure. Instead, the court hears the petition and respondent's answer, if any, on the date fixed by the notice for the hearing. If the court determines that issuance of a writ of mandate is proper, it issues, or orders issued, the peremptory writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1088, 1089, 1094*].

For a form of notice of application for a writ of mandate, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Petitioner's capacity and residence (Paragraph 1).

- Petitioner's beneficial interest in the respondent's decision to deny, suspend, or revoke his or her credential or life diploma, and thus in the issuance of the writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 2).

- Capacity of respondents (Paragraph 3).

- The discretionary authority of respondents Commission on Teacher Credentialing and Committee of Credentials to determine whether grounds exist to deny, suspend, or revoke a credential or life diploma [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code §§ 44242.5, 44243, 44244, 44246*] (Paragraph 4).

- That a hearing is required to be held and evidence taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code §§ 44242.5, 44246*; *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*; *Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 998, 136 P.2d 120] (Paragraph 4)* .

- Facts regarding the holding of the hearing (Paragraphs 5-7).

- Reasons for the invalidity of the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.160[5]*] (Paragraph 8).

- Where appropriate, the nature of any additional, relevant evidence that could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been produced at the administrative hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*] (Paragraph 9).

- Where appropriate, the amount of attorney's fees claimed under *Gov. Code § 800* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.160[6]*] (Paragraph 10).

- Exhaustion of administrative remedies [*see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291-296, 109 P.2d 942] (Paragraph 11)* .

- Petitioner's lack of a plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 12).

For a complete discussion of the essential allegations of a petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision, see *Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474C.90[5]*.

[4] Evidentiary Hearing Required

This petition is for review of an administrative decision pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. One of the prerequisites to the maintenance of a mandate proceeding under that section is that there be a requirement in law that a hearing be held and that evidence be taken by the administrative agency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see* Paragraph 4]. Thus, this procedure may not be used to review the denial of an application for a credential pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44346* (mandatory denial of credential on conviction of certain crimes) or the revocation of a credential pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44424* or *44425* (mandatory revocation of credential on conviction of certain crimes), for which no hearing is required by law [*see DiGenova v. State Board of Education (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 255, 259-260, 288 P.2d 862* ; *Vogulkin v. State Board of Education (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 424, 428-429, 15 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . However, a decision to deny a

credential pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44345* (discretionary denial of credential for certain grounds) or to revoke or suspend a credential under *Educ. Code § 44422* (discretionary revocation or suspension of credential for certain grounds) is reviewable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* because an evidentiary hearing is required in such cases [*see Educ. Code §§ 44242.5(b), 44246, 44422*; *Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 998, 136 P.2d 120* ; *see also* discussions in *§§ 512.15[2]* and *512.16[4]*].

[5] Invalidity of Decision

The decision of an administrative agency made as a result of an evidentiary hearing required by law may be invalid under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* for any of the following reasons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *see* Paragraph 8]:

(1) The agency proceeded without, or in excess of, jurisdiction, as, for example, when respondent denies, suspends, or revokes petitioner's credential for reasons other than those prescribed by law;

(2) Petitioner was denied a fair trial; or

(3) The agency abused its discretion in one of the following ways: (a) it did not proceed in the manner required by law; (b) the decision is not supported by the findings resulting from the administrative hearing; or (c) the findings are not supported by the evidence received at the hearing.

[6] Attorney's Fees

In any civil action to appeal or review the award, finding, or other determination of any administrative proceedings under the Government Code or under any other provision of state law, except actions by the State Board of Control, if it is shown that the award, finding, or other determination of the proceeding was the result of arbitrary or capricious action or conduct by a public entity or an officer thereof in his or her official capacity, the prevailing complainant may collect reasonable attorney's fees, computed at $100 per hour but not to exceed $7,500, from the public entity, if he or she is personally obligated to pay such fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded [*Gov. Code § 800*; *see* Paragraph 10].

[7] Venue

Venue in a mandate proceeding brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* [*Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 930-931, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* provides that the county in which the cause of action, or some part thereof, arose is the proper county for the trial of an action against a public officer or person especially appointed to execute his or her duties for an act done by him or her by virtue of the public office, or against a person who does anything touching the duties of the public officer by the officer's command or in his or her aid.

[8] Time for Filing Petition

Where judicial review pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is sought of a decision made pursuant to a proceeding conducted under *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528* (governing administrative hearings), the petition for writ of mandate must be filed within 30 days after the last day on which reconsideration can be ordered [*Gov. Code § 11523*; *see Gov. Code § 11521*]. The limitation period does not begin to run until a copy of the administrative decision has been delivered or mailed to the petitioner [*Koons v. Placer Hills Union Sch. Dist. (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 484, 490, 132 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

[9] Verification

A petition for writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[10] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to procedures for conducting administrative trials pursuant to *Gov. Code § 11500 et seq.*, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 473H, *Alternative Procedures for Agency Decisions*

For discussion and alternate forms of captions and introductions, see ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings generally, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* for review of administrative decisions, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*

For discussion and alternate forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[11] State Statutes

Issuance of writ of mandate generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1086*

Form of writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1087*

Alternative writ and notice procedure. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088*

Answer to alternative writ or notice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1089*

Writ of mandate to determine validity of administrative decision made as result of evidentiary hearing required by law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Service of writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*

Proof of service of petition; opposing points and authorities. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*

Procedure of Commission on Teacher Credentialing and Committee of Credentials relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of credentials. *Educ. Code §§ 44242-44247*

Denial of application for credential. *Educ. Code §§ 44345, 44346, 44439*

Revocation or suspension of certification document. *Educ. Code § 44420 et seq.*

Judicial review of proceedings conducted under *Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528* by petition for writ of mandate. *Gov. Code § 11523*

[12] Decisions

In mandate proceeding to review administrative decision revoking teaching credential, trial court as under duty to exercise independent judgment on evidence; appellate court as required to sustain trial court decision if any credible, competent evidence supports its findings. *Tringham v. State Board of Education (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 507, 508, 326 P.2d 850*

Aggrieved party as required to exhaust all administrative remedies as prerequisite to maintaining mandate proceeding to review denial of issuance of credential. *Pete v. State Bd. of Educ. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 38, 39-42, 300 P.2d 147*

Requirement of notice and hearing prior to deprivation of teaching credential. *Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 998, 136 P.2d 120*

[13] Text References

California Administrative Mandamus (Cal CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure (2d ed), Vol. 5, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 223-243

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.161

§ 512.161 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Professional Competence [Educ. Code § 44945]--Dismissal of Permanent Employee

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Commission on Professional Competence [Educ. Code § 44945]--Dismissal of Permanent Employee

[*Caption. See § 512.160.*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. At all times herein mentioned, petitioner was a duly certificated permanent employee of real party in interest _____ School District.

3. Respondent Commission on Professional Competence is an administrative body duly constituted in accordance with *Section 44944 of the Education Code* and charged by law with the duty of conducting a hearing to determine whether real party in interest _____ School District may dismiss petitioner from his/her position as a certificated permanent employee of real party in interest.

4. Real party in interest _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California. Real parties in interest _____ [*names*] are the duly elected or appointed, qualified, and acting members of the _____ [*title of governing board of district, e.g.,* Board of Education] of real party in interest _____ School District. Real parties in interest have an interest which is directly affected by this proceeding in that they initiated the proceeding for dismissal of petitioner from his/her employment by real party in interest _____ School District which is the subject of this petition.

5. Under *Section 44944 of the Education Code*, respondent Commission on Professional Competence has discretion to determine the facts concerning whether or not cause exists for dismissal of a permanent certificated employee from his/her position with real party in interest _____ School District, and particularly whether _____ [*specify alleged facts constituting ground for dismissal, e.g.,* a permanent employee has engaged in immoral or unprofessional conduct]. Pursuant to *Section 44944 of the Education Code*, and *Sections 11500 through 11528 of the Government Code*, respondent Commission on Professional Competence is required to conduct a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of those facts.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], the governing board of real party in interest _____ School District notified petitioner of its intention to dismiss petitioner from his/her position with real party in interest _____ School District on the ground that _____ [*specify alleged cause for dismissal, e.g.,* petitioner was guilty of immoral conduct and evident unfitness for service]. [A copy of that notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.] Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], within 30 days following service of the notice, petitioner filed a written request for a hearing with the governing board pursuant to *Sections 44937* and *44943 of the Education Code*.

7. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify meeting place*], a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue of whether or not cause exists to dismiss petitioner from his/her position as a certificated permanent employee of the real party in interest _____ School District. Petitioner attended that hearing.

8. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received respondent Commission on Professional Competence's decision and order that petitioner should be dismissed from his/her permanent position as a certificated permanent employee of _____ School District on the ground that _____ [*specify ground for action, e.g.,* petitioner was guilty of immoral conduct]. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result.*] [A copy of the notice of decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]

9. [*Attachment of verbatim transcript of hearing or summary of substance of evidence received at hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 7.*]

10. The decision and order of respondent Commission on Professional Competence are invalid for the following reasons: _____ [*in subparagraphs which follow, state reasons why decision is invalid, e.g.,*

a. Respondent Commission on Professional Competence found that _____ (*state all findings*). Respondent and real parties in interest do not have authority to dismiss petitioner based on any of these findings in that _____ (*specify reasons why findings do not support decision, e.g.,* such findings do not constitute immoral conduct or any other cause for dismissal alleged by real parties in interest).

b. The evidence received at the hearing does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ (*specify*).

c. _____ (*In this and following subparagraphs, allege any other reasons for invalidity of decision under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5, such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, or abuse of discretion as established by a failure to proceed as required by law or failure of the findings to support the decision. For examples of such allegations, see the petitions for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision in the Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, §§ 474C.90, 474C.91*)].

[11. *If appropriate, allege existence of additional relevant evidence that petitioner could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have produced at the hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 9.*]

12. Pursuant to *Section 44944 of the Education Code*, petitioner is entitled to recover expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, incurred by him/her in this proceeding.

13. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 512.160, Paragraph 11*].

14. [*Lack of plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in ordinary course of law. See § 512.160, Paragraph 12*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision and order of _____ (*date*), that petitioner should be dismissed from his/her position as a certificated permanent employee of real party in interest _____ School District and to _____ (reconsider whether cause exists for petitioner's dismissal *or* enter a decision ordering that petitioner not be dismissed, and that petitioner be reinstated in his/her position and paid back salary, plus interest at the legal rate, from _____ [*date*], or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____ [*date*], that petitioner be dismissed until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*if appropriate, add:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate for use by a certificated permanent employee of a public school district to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by a Commission on Professional Competence that the employee should be dismissed. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b]* and *[c]*. For a complete discussion of petitions for writs of mandate to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[b] Related Uses

In an appropriate case, this form may be adapted for use when a permanent certificated employee has been suspended without pay for a specific period of time [*see Educ. Code §§ 44932(b), 44933*].

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Petitioner's status as a permanent employee, and thus his or her beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 2).

- Capacity of respondents and real parties in interest (Paragraphs 3, 4).

- Respondent's discretion to determine whether or not cause exists for dismissal, and requirement in law that an evidentiary hearing be held [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 44944*] (Paragraph 5).

- Notice of intention to dismiss by governing board and demand for hearing by petitioner [*Educ. Code §§ 44934, 44937, 44943*] (Paragraph 6).

- Facts regarding holding of the hearing (Paragraphs 7-9).

- Reasons for invalidity of the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*] (Paragraph 10).

The allegations in this petition which consist of cross references to allegations contained in other forms are set forth in the Comments to those *forms in §§ 512.160[3], 512.161[3], 512.166[3], 512.167[3], 512.168[3], 512.169[3],* and *512.170[3]*.

[4] Attorney's Fees

Gov. Code § 800 (providing that complainant who prevails in civil action to review determination of administrative proceeding may recover reasonable attorney's fees, computed at $100 per hour, but not exceeding $7,500, if determination is found to be arbitrary or capricious) does not apply to proceedings to dismiss a permanent certificated employee under *Educ. Code § 44944*. Attorney's fees in such proceedings are governed instead by *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* which provides, in part, that if the Commission on Professional Competence determines that the employee should not be dismissed, the governing board of the school district must pay the expenses of the hearing, including reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the employee [*Board of Educ. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 555, 562-563, 162 Cal. Rptr. 590* ; *see California Teachers Assn. v. State (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 327, 345-357, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425, 975 P.2d 622* (invalidating portion of *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* that would have required teacher who did not ultimately prevail (either at the administrative level or after judicial review), to share cost

of hearing)]. Although *Educ. Code § 44944(e)* does not specifically refer to attorney's fees in a mandate proceeding to judicially review the dismissal of a permanent employee, the courts have held that a permanent employee who prevails in such a mandate proceeding is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees [*see Board of Educ. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 555, 565-566, 162 Cal. Rptr. 590* ; *De Groat v. Newark Unified School Dist. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 538, 542, 133 Cal. Rptr. 225]* .

[5] Cross References

For a petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision to dismiss a civil service employee, see Ch. 118, *Civil Service*

[6] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of a petition for writ of mandate to review the dismissal of a permanent certificated employee of a school district, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* , Pt. II (Matthew Bender)

[7] State Statutes

Causes for dismissal or suspension without pay of permanent certificated employee. *Educ. Code §§ 44932, 44933*

Charges and notice of intention to dismiss or suspend permanent employee. *Educ. Code § 44934*

Request for hearing and waiver. *Educ. Code § 44937*

Board action on demand for hearing. *Educ. Code § 44943*

Conduct of hearing by Commission on Professional Competence. *Educ. Code § 44944*

Judicial review of decision of Commission on Professional Competence. *Educ. Code § 44945*

Reinstatement and payment of back salary. *Educ. Code § 44946*

[8] Decisions

School board as not permitted to dismiss permanent teacher unless it complies with statutory procedures for dismissal. *Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 617-618, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579*

Where permanent teacher is suspended pending hearing in dismissal proceeding, and decision is in his favor, teacher as entitled to full salary, including participation in retirement benefits, for period of suspension. *Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 623, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579*

In mandamus proceeding to compel reinstatement of permanent teacher, prevailing teacher as entitled to prejudgment interest on each salary payment from the date of accrual to the entry of judgment. *Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 624, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579*

School district's substantial compliance with *former Educ. Code § 44938* (*now see Educ. Code § 44938(a)*) and Stull

Act (*Educ. Code §§ 44660-44665*) satisfied statutory requirements for notice of intent to dismiss certificated teacher. *Governing Board v. Commission on Professional Competence (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 324, 333-334, 217 Cal. Rptr. 457*

When action of local school board in dismissing permanent teacher was illegal, teacher as entitled to be restored to position with full salary from date of dismissal. *Matteson v. State Bd. of Educ. (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 991, 1000, 136 P.2d 120*

[9] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 512.160*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.162

§ 512.162 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--Failure to Follow Statutory Dismissal Procedure [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a); Educ. Code §§ 44932-44947].

[1] FORM Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--Failure to Follow Statutory Dismissal Procedure [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a); Educ. Code §§ 44932-44947].

Respondent Commission on Professional Competence [and real parties in interest] failed to proceed as required by law in that _____ [*specify failure to follow particular statutory procedure, e.g.,* notice of cause for dismissal under *Section 44932(a) of the Education Code* and intention to dismiss petitioner was given to petitioner on _____ (*date*), which is between May 15 and September 15, and therefore in violation of *Section 44936 of the Education Code*].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a petition for writ of mandate to review the administrative decision of a Commission on Professional Competence to dismiss a permanent certificated employee. It may be inserted as a subparagraph of Paragraph 10 in *see § 512.161*. With appropriate modifications, this allegation may also be included in a petition for writ of mandate to review the determination of the governing board of a school district not to reemploy a probationary teacher for the ensuing school year [*see § 512.166*].

For forms of allegations that the school district dismissed petitioner for unsatisfactory performance or unprofessional conduct without giving petitioner previous notice and an opportunity to correct his or her deficiencies as required by *Educ. Code § 44938, see §§ 512.164* and *512.165*.

[3] Failure to Follow Statutory Procedure

This allegation alleges that respondent failed to proceed as required by law. Failure by an administrative agency to

proceed in the manner required by law establishes abuse of discretion which may invalidate an administrative decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. When the governing board of a school district fails to follow the statutory procedures required by law for dismissal of a teacher, any subsequent dismissal is invalid [*see Mass v. Board of Educ. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 612, 617-618, 39 Cal. Rptr. 739, 394 P.2d 579* ; *Pennel v. Pond Union School Dist. (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 832, 838-839, 105 Cal. Rptr. 817]* . For a discussion of the statutory procedures for dismissal of a permanent employee, see *§ 512.28*.

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160* and *512.161*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.163

§ 512.163 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1)]--Failure to Show Lack of Fitness to Teach

[1] FORM Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Immoral or Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1)]--Failure to Show Lack of Fitness to Teach

Respondent Commission on Professional Competence ordered that petitioner be dismissed on the ground that he/she was guilty of _____ [immoral *or* unprofessional *or both*] conduct. Respondent has no authority to dismiss petitioner on this ground because _____ [it made no finding that petitioner was unfit to teach by reason of his/her alleged conduct *or* the evidence received at the hearing is not sufficient to support a finding that petitioner is unfit to teach in that _____ (*specify*) *or* the findings made by respondent as a result of the hearing do not demonstrate that petitioner is unfit to teach in that _____ (*specify*)].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a petition for writ of mandate to review the administrative decision of a Commission on Professional Competence to dismiss a permanent certificated employee. It may be inserted as a subparagraph of Paragraph 10 in *see § 512.161*. It alleges that respondent was without authority to dismiss petitioner for immoral or unprofessional conduct because of the failure to show that petitioner is unfit to teach. A permanent teacher may not be dismissed on grounds of immoral or unprofessional conduct unless his or her conduct indicates unfitness to teach [*Board of Educ. v. Jack M. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 691, 696-697, 139 Cal. Rptr. 700, 566 P.2d 602* ; *see* discussion in *§ 512.16*].

This allegation may be adapted for use when respondent was without authority to suspend without pay a permanent certificated employee, or a probationary employee in a school district with an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils, for unprofessional conduct under *Educ. Code §§ 44932, 44933*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 512.160* and *512.161*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.164

§ 512.164 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unsatisfactory Performance [Educ. Code § 44932(a), (4)]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(b)]

[1] FORM Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unsatisfactory Performance [Educ. Code § 44932(a), (4)]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(b)]

Respondent Commission on Professional Competence ordered that petitioner be dismissed on the ground that he/she was guilty of unsatisfactory performance. Respondent had no authority to dismiss petitioner on this ground because [the evidence received at the hearing showed that] the governing board of real party in interest _____ School District _____ [failed to give petitioner written notice of the nature of the alleged unsatisfactory performance that was the alleged ground for petitioner's dismissal, as required by *Section 44938(b) of the Education Code*, _____ (at least 90 calendar days prior to filing of the written charges *or* prior to the beginning of the time period composed of the last one-fourth of the school days the governing board has scheduled for purposes of computing apportionments in the fiscal year) *or* served petitioner with notice of the nature of the alleged unsatisfactory performance pursuant to *Section 44938(b) of the Education Code* on _____ [*date*]. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], less than 90 calendar days after service of the notice, petitioner was transferred to a nonteaching position, thereby depriving petitioner of the opportunity to correct his/her faults and overcome the grounds for the charges].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a petition for writ of mandate to review the administrative decision of a Commission on Professional Competence to dismiss a permanent certificated employee. It may be inserted as a subparagraph of Paragraph 10 in § 512.161. It alleges that respondent was without authority to dismiss petitioner on the ground of unsatisfactory performance because of the failure of the governing board of the school district to provide petitioner with advance notice of the nature of the charges and an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the charges as required by *Educ. Code § 44938(b)* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.28[2][e]*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160 -512.162*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.165

§ 512.165 Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1), 44933]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(a)]

[1] FORM Allegation--For Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Commission on Professional Competence to Dismiss Permanent Employee [Educ. Code § 44945]--On Ground of Unprofessional Conduct [Educ. Code § 44932(a)(1), 44933]--Failure to Give Notice and Opportunity to Correct Faults [Educ. Code § 44938(a)]

Respondent Commission on Professional Competence ordered that petitioner be dismissed on the ground that he/she was guilty of unprofessional conduct. Respondent had no authority to dismiss petitioner on this ground because [the evidence received at the hearing showed that] the governing board of real party in interest _____ School District _____ [failed to give petitioner written notice of the nature of the alleged unprofessional conduct at least 45 calendar days prior to the filing of the charges that were the alleged ground for petitioner's dismissal, as required by *Section 44938(a) of the Education Code or* served petitioner with notice of the nature of the alleged unprofessional conduct pursuant to *Section 44938(a) of the Education Code* on _____ [*date*]. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], less than 45 calendar days after service of the notice, petitioner was transferred to a nonteaching position, thereby depriving petitioner of the opportunity to correct his/her faults and overcome the grounds for the charges].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a petition for writ of mandate to review the administrative decision of a Commission on Professional Competence to dismiss a permanent certificated employee. It may be inserted as a subparagraph of Paragraph 10 in § 512.161. It alleges that respondent was without authority to dismiss petitioner on the ground of unprofessional conduct because of the failure of the governing board of the school district to provide petitioner with advance notice of the nature of the charges and an opportunity to correct his or her faults and overcome the charges as required by *Educ. Code § 44938(a)* [*see* discussion in *§ 512.28[2][c]*].

This allegation may be adopted for use when respondent was without authority to suspend either a permanent

certificated employee or a probationary employee in a school district with an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils, for unprofessional conduct under *Educ. Code § 44932, 44933*, but only if the governing board has not adopted a collective bargaining agreement pursuant to *Gov. Code § 3543.2*.

[3] Decisions

Trial court as required to exercise its independent judgment when reviewing decision of *Commission on Professional Competence. Pittsburg Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 964, 976, 194 Cal. Rptr. 672*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.166

§ 512.166 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Nonreemployment of Probationary Employee Employed Prior to 1983-1984 Fiscal Year or in Small School District for Subsequent School Year [Educ. Code § 44948.5]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Nonreemployment of Probationary Employee Employed Prior to 1983-1984 Fiscal Year or in Small School District for Subsequent School Year [Educ. Code § 44948.5]

[*Caption. See § 512.160.*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. At all times herein mentioned, petitioner was a duly certificated probationary employee of _____ School District.

[*EITHER*]

3. Petitioner was hired and his/her probationary period commenced on _____ [*date*]. This date was prior to the 1983-1984 fiscal year.

[*OR*]

3. _____ School District has an average daily attendance of less that 250 pupils.

4. Respondent _____ [*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] is the duly constituted governing board of the _____ School District. _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

5. Under *Section 44948.5 of the Education Code*, respondent _____ [*title of governing board of district, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] has discretion to determine the facts concerning whether or not cause exists to not reemploy a probationary certificated employee for the ensuing school year for reasons other than those specified in *Section 44955 of the Education Code* and whether such cause relates solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof. Pursuant to *Section 44948.5 of the Education Code*, and *Sections 11500 through 11528 of the Government Code*, respondent is required to con duct a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of those facts.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent notified petitioner that it had been recommended that petitioner not be reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____. [A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.] Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], petitioner filed a timely written request for a hearing with respondent in accordance with *Section 44948.5(c) of the Education Code*.

7. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify meeting place*], a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue of whether or not cause exists to not reemploy petitioner as a certificated probationary employee for the ensuing school year _____- _____. Petitioner attended the hearing.

8. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received respondent's final decision and determination that (1) petitioner not be reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____ on the ground that _____ [*specify ground for respondent's action*] and (2) that this constitutes a cause for not reemploying petitioner which is related solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result.*] [A copy of the notice of decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]

9. [*Attachment of verbatim transcript of hearing or summary of substance of evidence received at hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 7.*]

10. Respondent's decision and order are invalid for the following reasons: _____ [*in subparagraphs which follow, state reasons why decision is invalid, e.g.,*

a. Respondent found that _____ (*state all findings*). Respondent does not have authority to not reemploy petitioner based on any of these findings in that such findings do not constitute cause for nonreemployment which is solely related to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof.

b. Respondent failed to proceed in the manner required by law in terminating petitioner's employment in that respondent failed to give petitioner final notice of its determination not to reemploy him/her prior to May 15, in violation of *Section 44948.5(f) of the Education Code*. Pursuant to *Section 44948.5(i) of the Education Code*, petitioner must therefore be deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____.

c. The evidence received at the hearing does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ (*specify*).

[d. _____ (*In this and following subparagraphs, allege any other reasons for invalidity of the*

decision under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5, such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, and abuse of discretion as established by a failure to proceed as required by law or failure of the findings to support the decision. For examples of such allegations, see the petitions for writ of mandate to review administrative decision in Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, §§ 474C.90, 474C.91)].

[11. *If appropriate, allege existence of additional relevant evidence that petitioner could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have produced at the hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 9.*]

[12. *If petitioner seeks attorney's fees pursuant to Gov. Code § 800, allege amount of attorney's fees incurred. See § 512.160, Paragraph 10.*]

13. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 512.160, Paragraph 11*].

14. [*Lack of plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in ordinary course of law. See § 512.160, Paragraph 12*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision and order of _____ [*date*], that petitioner should not be reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____ and to _____ (reconsider whether cause exists for not reemploying petitioner for the ensuing school year _____- _____ *or* enter a decision ordering that petitioner be reemployed by _____ School District for the ensuing school year _____- _____, or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____ (*date*), that petitioner not be reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____) until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*if appropriate, add:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for writ of mandate for use by a probationary employee employed prior to the 1983-1984 fiscal year in a public school district or employed in a small public school district (that is, one having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils) to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by the governing board of the district not to reemploy the employee for the ensuing school year. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed motion procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For a complete discussion of petitions for writs of mandate to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Petitioner's status as a probationary employee, and thus his or her beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 2).

- Petitioner's employment by the school district prior to the 1983-1984 fiscal year or by a small public school district (i.e., one having an average daily attendance of less than 250 pupils) [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(a)*] (Paragraph 3).

- Capacity of respondent school board (Paragraph 4).

- Respondent's discretionary authority to determine whether or not cause exists for not reemploying petitioner and the requirement in law that respondent hold an evidentiary hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 44948.5*] (Paragraph 5).

- Service of notice of intention not to reemploy petitioner and demand for hearing by petitioner [*see Educ. Code § 44948.5(b), (c)*] (Paragraph 6).

- Facts regarding holding of the hearing (Paragraphs 7-9).

- Reasons for the invalidity of the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*] (Paragraph 10); including:

  - Lack of cause related to the welfare of the school and its pupils [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(e)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.30[2][b]*] (Paragraph 10, subparagraph a).

  - Failure by respondent to give petitioner final notice of nonreemployment by May 15 [*Educ. Code § 44948.5(g), (i)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.30[2][f]*] (Paragraph 10,

subparagraph b); and

- Failure of the evidence to support the findings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*] (Paragraph 10, subparagraph c).

The allegations in the petition which consist of cross references to allegations contained in other forms are *set forth in §§ 512.160[3], 512.161[3], 512.166[3], 512.67[3], 512.168[3], 512.169[3],* and *512.170[3]*.

[4] Statute of Limitations

The 30-day statute of limitations for judicial review of administrative proceedings contained in *Gov. Code § 11523* is applicable to review of proceedings to dismiss a probationary teacher under *Educ. Code § 44948.5*. The limitation period commences to run on the date the decision is mailed or delivered [*Koons v. Placer Hills Union Sch. Dist. (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 484, 489, 490, 132 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

[5] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting a petition for writ of mandate to review the decision of a school district's governing board not to reemploy a probationary employee for the ensuing school year, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* , Pt. II

[6] State Statutes

Procedure for dismissal of probationary employee employed prior to 1983-1984 fiscal year or in small public school district at end of school year. *Educ. Code § 44948.5*

[7] Decisions

District's failure to issue findings of fact and conclusions of law as required by former *Educ. Code § 44949(c)* (now see *Educ. Code § 44948.5(d)* as potentially harmless when only one ground, known to teacher, was basis for failure to rehire. *Alba v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1007-1008, 189 Cal. Rptr. 897*

Right of probationary teacher to be rehired for succeeding year as not vested; in mandate proceeding to review decision of school board not to rehire teacher, court as required to accept fact findings of school board if supported by substantial evidence. *Turner v. Board of Trustees (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 818, 824-827, 129 Cal. Rptr. 443, 548 P.2d 1115* (disapproving *Young v. Governing Bd. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 769, 115 Cal. Rptr. 456* to extent it is inconsistent)

Question whether or not cause for refusal to rehire probationary teacher relates solely to welfare of school and its pupils as question of law for courts to determine. *Lindros v. Governing Bd. of The Torrance Unified School Dist. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 524, 533-534, 108 Cal. Rptr. 185, 510 P.2d 361 , cert. denied 414 U.S. 1112, 94 S. Ct. 842, 38 L. Ed. 2d 739* ; *Bekiaris v. Board of Education (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 575, 587, 589, 100 Cal. Rptr. 16, 493 P.2d 480*

Under former Educ. Code § 13443(h) (now *Educ. Code § 44948.5(i)*), probationary teacher as deemed reemployed for subsequent school year un less final notice of board's decision not to reemploy is given on or before May 15 of preceding school year; notice provision as mandatory. *Rutherford v. Board of Trustees (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 775, 779-781, 112 Cal. Rptr. 560* ; *Stewart v. San Mateo Junior College Dist. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 345, 347-348, 112 Cal. Rptr. 272*

Former Educ. Code § 13443 (now *Educ. Code § 44948.5*) requiring notice and hearing prior to dismissal of probationary teachers as applicable to all school districts, regardless of size. *Shaughnessy v. Wilsona School Dist. (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 742, 745-749, 105 Cal. Rptr. 707*

Mandate proceeding as appropriate remedy for probationary teacher wrongfully denied reemployment for ensuing school year. *Blodgett v. Board of Trustees (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 183, 190, 97 Cal. Rptr. 406* ; *Thornton v. Board of Trustees (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 761, 763, 68 Cal. Rptr. 842*

[8] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160* and *512.161*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.167

§ 512.167 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Dismissal of Probationary Employee Whose Probationary Period Commenced During or After 1983-1984 Fiscal Year [Educ. Code § 44948.3]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Dismissal of Probationary Employee Whose Probationary Period Commenced During or After 1983-1984 Fiscal Year [Educ. Code § 44948.3]

[*Caption. See § 512.160.*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Petitioner's employment as probationary employee. See § 512.166, Paragraph 2.*]

3. Petitioner was hired and his/her probationary period commenced on _____ [*date*]. This date was _____ [during *or* after] the 1983-1984 fiscal year.

4. [*Capacity of respondent governing board of school district.*]

5. Under *Section 44948.3(a) of the Education Code*, respondent _____ [*title of governing board of school district, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] has discretion to determine the facts concerning whether or not a probationary certificated employee should be dismissed for unsatisfactory performance, as determined pursuant to *Sections 44660 through 44665 of the Education Code*, or for cause, pursuant to *Section 44932 of the Education Code*. Pursuant to *Section 44948.3(a)(2) of the Education Code*, respondent is required to conduct a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for determination of those facts.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent notified petitioner that he/she would be dismissed, effective _____ [*date*]. [A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof by reference.] Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], petitioner submitted to respondent a timely written request for a hearing pursuant to *Section 44948.3 of the Education Code*.

7. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify meeting place*], a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue of whether or not petitioner should be dismissed. Petitioner attended the hearing.

8. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received respondent's final decision and determination that petitioner should be dismissed on the following ground(s): _____ [*specify, e.g.*, unsatisfactory performance]. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result.*] [A copy of the notice of decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]

9. [*Attachment of verbatim transcript of hearing or summary of substance of evidence received at hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 7.*]

10. Respondent's decision and order are invalid for the following reasons: _____ [*in subparagraphs which follow, state reasons why decision is invalid under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5, such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, and abuse of discretion as established by failure to proceed as required by law, failure of the findings to support the decision, and failure of the evidence to support the findings. For examples of such allegations, see the petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision in Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*].

[11. *If appropriate, allege existence of additional relevant evidence that petitioner could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have produced at the hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 9.*]

[12. *If petitioner seeks attorney's fees pursuant to Gov. Code § 800, allege amount of attorney's fees incurred. See § 512.160, Paragraph 10.*]

12. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 512.160, Paragraph 11.*]

13. [*Lack of plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in ordinary course of law. See § 512.160, Paragraph 12.*]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows;

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision and order of _____ (*date*), that petitioner should be dismissed and to _____ (reconsider whether cause exists for dismissing petitioner *or* enter a decision ordering that petitioner not be dismissed and that he/she be reinstated in his/her position and paid back salary, plus interest at the legal rate, from _____ [*date*]), or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*if appropriate, add:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record];

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[2] Use of Form

[a] In General

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate for use by a certificated probationary employee (in a district with an average daily attendance of 250 or more pupils) whose probationary period commenced during or after the 1983-1984 fiscal year to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by the governing board of the district to dismiss the employee pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44948.3*. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed motion procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For complete discussion of petitions for writs of mandate to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[b] Related Use

With appropriate modifications, this petition may be used when the governing board has suspended a probationary employee for a specific period of time without pay, as authorized by *Educ. Code § 44948.3(b)*.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- Petitioner's status as a probationary employee whose probationary period commenced during or after the 1983-1984 fiscal year [*see Educ. Code § 44948.3(c)*], and thus his or her beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraphs 2, 3).

- Respondent's discretionary authority to determine whether cause exists for dismissing petitioner and the requirement in law that respondent hold an evidentiary hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see*

Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)] (Paragraph 5).

- Service of notice of dismissal and petitioner's written demand for a hearing [*Educ. Code § 44948.3(a)*] (Paragraph 6).

- Facts pertaining to conduct of the hearing (Paragraphs 7-9).

- Reasons for invalidity of the governing board's decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*] (Paragraph 10).

The allegations in this petition that consist of cross references to allegations contained in other forms are *set forth in §§ 512.160[3], 512.161[3], 512.166[3], 512.167[3], 512.168[3], 512.169[3]*, and *512.170[3]*.

[4] State Statutes

Dismissal or suspension of probationary employee whose probationary period commenced during or after 1983-1984 fiscal year. *Educ. Code § 44948.3*

[5] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160, 512.161*, and *512.166*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.168

§ 512.168 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Termination of Services Due to Reduction of Number of Certificated Employees [Educ. Code §§ 44949, 44955]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5; Gov. Code § 11523] of Governing Board of School District--Termination of Services Due to Reduction of Number of Certificated Employees [Educ. Code §§ 44949, 44955]

[*Caption. See § 512.160*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. At all times herein mentioned, petitioner was a duly certificated _____ [permanent *or* probationary] employee of _____ School District.

3. Respondent _____ [*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] is the duly constituted governing board of the _____ School District. _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

4. Under *Section 44949 of the Education Code*, respondent _____ [*title of governing board of district, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] has discretion to determine the facts concerning whether or not a certificated employee's services should be terminated for the ensuing school year due to reduction in the number of certificated employees for the reasons specified in *Section 44955(b) of the Education Code*. Pursuant to Sections 44949(b), (c) and *44955(c) of the Education Code*, and *Sections 11500 through 11528 of the Government Code*, respondent is required to conduct a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of those facts.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent notified petitioner that it had been recommended that petitioner's services be terminated for the ensuing school year _____- _____ for the reasons specified in *Section 44955 of the Education Code* [A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.] Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], petitioner filed a timely written request for a hearing with respondent in accordance with *Section 44949(b) of the Education Code*.

6. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify meeting place*], a hearing was held to receive evidence on the issue of whether or not petitioner's services should be terminated for the ensuing school year _____- _____. Petitioner attended the hearing.

7. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received notice of the termination of his/her services for the ensuing school year _____- _____ for the reason that _____ [*specify the reason for terminating petitioner's services under Educ. Code § 44955, e.g.,* a decline in average daily attendance from the corresponding period of the previous school year had made it necessary to terminate the services of a corresponding percentage of probationary and permanent employees, and petitioner had less seniority than any of the employees whose services were retained]. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result.*] [A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ and made a part hereof.]

8. [*Attachment of verbatim transcript of hearing or summary of substance of evidence received at hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 7.*]

9. Respondent's decision and order are invalid because _____ [*specify reasons for invalidity of decision, e.g.,*

a. Respondent failed to proceed in the manner required by law in terminating petitioner's employment in that respondent failed to give petitioner final notice of its determination not to reemploy him/her prior to May 15, in violation of *Section 44955(c) of the Education Code*. Pursuant to *Section 44955(c) of the Education Code*, petitioner must therefor be deemed reemployed for the ensuing school year _____- _____.

b. The evidence received at the hearing does not support the findings for the following reasons: (*specify*).

c. _____ (*In this and following subparagraphs, allege any other reasons for invalidity of the decision under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5, such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, and abuse of discretion as established by a failure to proceed as required by law or failure of the findings to support the decision. For examples of such allegations, see the petition for writ of mandate to review administrative decision in Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, §§ 474C.90, 474C.91*)].

[10. *If appropriate, allege existence of additional relevant evidence that petitioner could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have produced at the hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph 9.*]

[11. *If petitioner seeks attorney's fees pursuant to Gov. Code § 800, allege amount of attorney's fees incurred. See § 512.160, Paragraph 10.*]

12. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 512.160, Paragraph 11*].

13. [*Lack of plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in ordinary course of law. See § 512.160, Paragraph 12*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its decision and order of _____ (*date*), that petitioner's services be terminated for the ensuing school year _____- _____ and to _____ (reconsider whether cause exists for terminating petitioner's services for the ensuing school year _____- _____ *or* enter a decision ordering that petitioner be reemployed by _____ School District for the ensuing school year _____- _____), or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____ (*date*), that petitioner's services be terminated for the ensuing school year _____- _____ until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*if appropriate, add:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160*].

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for writ of mandate for use by a probationary or permanent employee of a public school district to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by the governing board of the district to terminate the employee's services for the ensuing school year due to a reduction in the number of certificated employees for the reasons specified

in *Educ. Code § 44955*. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed motion procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For a complete discussion of petitions for writs of mandate to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Petitioner's status as a probationary or permanent employee, and thus his or her beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 2).

- Capacity of respondent school board (Paragraph 3).

- Respondent's discretionary authority to determine whether or not cause exists for terminating petitioner's services pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44955* and the requirement in law that respondent hold an evidentiary hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code §§ 44949, 44955*] (Paragraph 4).

- Service of notice of intention not to reemploy petitioner and demand for hearing by petitioner [*see Educ. Code § 44949(a), (b)*] (Paragraph 5).

- Facts regarding holding of the hearing (Paragraphs 6-8).

- Reasons for the invalidity of the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *Educ. Code §§ 44949, 44955*] (Paragraph 9), including:

  - Failure by respondent to give petitioner final notice of nonreemployment by May 15 [*Educ. Code § 44955(c)*; *see* discussion in *§ 512.30[2][f]*] (Paragraph 9, subparagraph a); and

  - Failure of the evidence to support the findings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*] (Paragraph 9, subparagraph b).

The allegations in the petition which consist of cross references to allegations contained in other forms are *set forth in §§ 512.160[3], 512.161[3], 512.166[3], 512.167[3], 512.168[3], 512.169[3]*, and *512.170[3]*.

[4] State Statutes

Procedure for terminating employee's services at end of school year for reasons specified in *Educ. Code § 44955*. *Educ. Code § 44949*

Reduction of number of permanent and probationary certificated employees. *Educ. Code § 44955*

[5] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160, 512.161*, and *512.166*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.169

§ 512.169 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Recognition of Permanent Status of School District Employee [Educ. Code § 44929.21]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Recognition of Permanent Status of School District Employee [Educ. Code § 44929.21]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*names*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]
Respondents.	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a duly certificated public school employee, holding _____ [*describe certification documents*].

3. Respondent _____ [*name*] School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California. Respondent _____ [*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Education of the _____ School District] is the duly constituted and acting governing board of respondent _____ [*name*] School District.

4. At all times herein mentioned, respondent _____ School District had an average daily attendance equal to or in excess of 250 pupils.

[*EITHER, for probationary employees whose probationary period commenced during the 1983-1984 or subsequent fiscal years*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], and prior to the commencement of the school year _____- _____, petitioner was employed by respondent _____ School District for the school year _____- _____ as _____ [*describe position, e.g.,* a teacher of mathematics at _____ School], which is a position requiring certification qualifications. Petitioner served in this position during the entire school year _____- _____ and was at all times during the school year classified by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] as a probationary employee of respondent _____ School District. Thereafter, petitioner was duly reelected and reemployed by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] as a probationary employee in this position for the next school year _____- _____. Petitioner served in this position during the whole of the above-mentioned school year, and was duly classified as a probationary employee of respondent _____ School District during the whole of the above-mentioned school year.

6. Thereafter, petitioner was reemployed by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] for a third consecutive year, the school year _____- _____, and became a permanent employee of respondent _____ School District by operation of law under the provisions of *Section 44929.21(b) of the Education Code*. Ever since then, petitioner has been a permanent employee of respondent _____ School District, entitled to serve and serving as such in the schools of the district.

[*OR, for probationary employees whose probationary period commenced prior to the 1983-1984 fiscal year*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], and prior to the commencement of the school year _____- _____, petitioner was employed by respondent _____ [*name*] School District for the school year _____- _____ as _____ [*describe position, e.g.,* a teacher of mathematics at _____ School], which is a position requiring certification qualifications. Petitioner served in this position during the entire school year _____- _____ and was at all times during the school year classified by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] as a probationary employee of respondent _____ School District. Thereafter, petitioner was duly reelected and reemployed by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] as a probationary employee in this position for each of the next two consecutive school years, _____- _____ and _____- _____. Petitioner served in this position during the whole of each of the above-mentioned school years, and was duly classified as a probationary employee of respondent _____ School District during the whole of each of the above-mentioned school years.

6. Thereafter, petitioner was reemployed by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] for a fourth consecutive year, the school year _____- _____, and became a permanent employee of respondent _____ School District by operation of law under the provisions of *Section 44929.21(a) of the Education Code*. Petitioner has ever since been a permanent employee of respondent _____ School District, entitled to serve and serving as such in the schools of the district.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. _____ [*Allege failure by respondents to recognize petitioner's status as permanent employee, e.g.,* On or about _____, (*date*), respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) notified petitioner that it did not recognize his/her status as a permanent employee of _____ School District, and that it intended to dismiss petitioner without holding a hearing. Thereafter, respondents proceeded to dismiss petitioner from his/her position without complying with any of the provisions of *Sections 44932 through 44946 of the Education Code*, and refused to permit petitioner to serve as permanent certificated employee of _____ School District for the school year _____- _____].

8. _____ [*Allege demand by petitioner that respondent recognize his/her permanent status, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), the first day that certificated employees were required to report for duty and assignment for the school year _____- _____, petitioner duly reported to the appropriate official of respondent _____ School District, presented himself/herself, and demanded that he/she be permitted to serve and perform the services which he/she is certificated to perform for the school year _____- _____. Respondents refused, and continue to refuse, to recognize petitioner's status as permanent employee of respondent _____ School District and refuse to permit petitioner to serve as a certificated employee of the district].

9. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* no other remedy is provided by the law to compel respondents to reinstate petitioner and recognize his/her status as a permanent certificated employee of respondent _____ School District].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondents to forthwith recognize petitioner's status as a full-time permanent certificated employee of respondent _____ School District, from and after _____ (*date*), and _____ (*specify other appropriate relief, e.g.,* to reinstate petitioner in his/her position and employment as permanent employee of respondent _____ School District, assigning him/her to active teaching duties, and to fix petitioner's salary according to his/her proper salary classification in accordance with the salary schedule of respondents for the school year _____- _____), or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

2. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085* and *1086* to compel the governing board of a school district with an average daily attendance of 250 or more pupils to recognize that an employee has attained permanent status. It may be used where the school district has attempted to discharge the employee without following the procedures applicable to the dismissal of a permanent employee, or in other situations where the school district has failed to accord the employee the rights of a permanent employee.

The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For a discussion of mandate proceedings generally and a form of alternative writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Respondent's capacity as a school district (Paragraph 3);

- Average daily attendance for the school district of 250 or more pupils [*Educ. Code § 44929.21*] (Paragraph 4);

- Petitioner's service as a probationary certificated employee for the applicable number of consecutive complete school years under *Educ. Code § 44929.21(a)* or *(b)* (Paragraph 5);

- Petitioner's reemployment for the next consecutive school year and attainment of permanent status, and hence his or her beneficial interest in issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Educ. Code § 44929.21(a), (b)*] (Paragraph 6);

- Refusal by respondent to recognize petitioner's right to permanent employment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] (Paragraph 7);

- Demand by petitioner and refusal by respondent to recognize petitioner's rights (Paragraph 8); and

- Petitioner's lack of a plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 9).

[4] Ordinary Mandate

Because an employee's right to be classified as a permanent employee under *Educ. Code § 44929.21* (former *Educ.*

Code § 44882) is automatic, and not the result of a hearing or any other administrative proceeding [*see Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 118, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319]* , ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085* and *1086* is the appropriate remedy for a teacher seeking to compel a school district to recognize his or her permanent status, rather than administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*]. A teacher who has attained permanent status may seek a writ of mandate to compel the district to recognize his or her status without exhausting any administrative remedy [*see Middaugh v. Board of Trustees (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 776, 781, 119 Cal. Rptr. 826* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

[5] Statute of Limitations

A mandate proceeding by a teacher seeking classification as a permanent employee is governed by the three-year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* for actions on liability created by statute, other than a penalty or forfeiture [*Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 121-122, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319]* .

[6] Cross References

For a discussion, procedural checklist, and forms relating to ordinary mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For a related form, see *§ 512.160*.

[7] California Points and Authorities

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting a petition for writ of mandate to compel a school district to recognize the permanent status of a certificated employee, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* , Pt. II

[8] State Statutes

Mandatory classification of permanent employees. *Educ. Code § 44929.21*

Discretionary classification of permanent employees. *Educ. Code §§ 44929.22, 44929.23*

[9] Decisions

When requirements for permanent status contained in Education Code are met, attainment of permanent status as automatic; application by teacher and affirmative action by school board as unnecessary to attainment of permanent status. *Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 118, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Probationary teacher's right to be classified as permanent teacher as automatically renewed each year in which teacher is in position of having taught the complete year for the previous three years; three-year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* as applicable to mandate proceeding by teacher seeking classification as permanent employee. *Vittal v. Long Beach Unified School Dist. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 112, 121-122, 87 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Tenured teacher as having vested right to continued permanent employment within scope of certificate under which tenure is attained. *Adelt v. Richmond School Dist. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 149, 152, 58 Cal. Rptr. 151*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.170

§ 512.170 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel School District to Reemploy and Reclassify Employee as Probationary [Educ. Code § 44918]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel School District to Reemploy and Reclassify Employee as Probationary [Educ. Code § 44918]

[*Caption. See § 512.169.*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Certification qualifications of petitioner. See § 512.169, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Capacity of respondent school district and governing board. See § 512.169, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], petitioner was employed by respondent _____ School District for the school year _____ - _____, as _____ [*describe position*], which is a position requiring certification qualifications. Petitioner served in this position for _____ days during the school year _____ - _____, which is _____ [equal to *or* in excess of] 75 percent of the number of days that the regular schools of respondent _____School District were maintained in the school year _____ - _____. Petitioner performed all the duties normally required of such a certificated employee of the district. At all times during the school year _____ - _____, petitioner was classified by respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] as a _____ [temporary *or* substitute] certificated employee of respondent _____ School District. At no time prior to the end of the school year did petitioner receive any notice of nonreelection for the next succeeding school year under *Education Code Section 44954(b)*.

5. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at the commencement of the following school year, _____ - _____, respondent had available _____ [*number*] vacant positions in which petitioner was qualified to serve by virtue of his/her possession of the appropriate certification documents plus his/her completion of the appropriate academic preparation and experience. Petitioner is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that none of these vacant positions would have been filled by another permanent or probationary employee of respondent _____ School District except for the fact that such employee was on a leave of absence.

6. Under the provisions of *Section 44918 of the Education Code*, petitioner is entitled to be reemployed by respondent _____ [*name*] School District in one of the above-described vacant positions f or the school year _____- _____. Petitioner is further entitled to have his/her previous year's service as a _____ [temporary *or* substitute] employee, as described above, deemed one complete year of service as a probationary employee of respondent _____ School District.

7. _____ [*Allege demand by petitioner that he/she be reemployed and reclassified and refusal by respondents to comply, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], the first day that certificated employees were required to report for duty and assignment for the school year _____- _____, petitioner duly reported to the appropriate official of respondent _____ School District, presented himself/herself, and demanded that he/she be permitted to serve as a certificated probationary employee of respondent _____ School District for the school year _____- _____, and that he/she be assigned to active duties within the scope of his/her certification documents. Respondents refused, and continue to refuse, to reemploy petitioner as a certificated probationary employee (, or in any other certificated position,) for the school year _____- _____; respondents also refused, and continue to refuse, to classify petitioner as a probationary employee for the school year _____- _____].

8. [*Lack of a plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law. See § 512.169, Paragraph 9.*]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondents to forthwith reemploy petitioner as a probationary certificated employee for the school year _____- _____, to reclassify petitioner as a probationary employee for the previous school year _____- _____, and to assign petitioner to active duties in a position within the scope of his/her certification documents and qualifications, or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

2. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085* and *1086* to compel the governing board of a school district to reemploy a temporary or substitute employee who has served for more than 75 percent of the days of the previous school year and to reclassify such employee as a probationary employee of the district [*see Educ. Code § 44918*; *see also* discussion in *§ 512.21[2]*]. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For a discussion, procedural checklist, and forms relating to ordinary mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- Petitioner's employment during previous school year as temporary or substitute employee and service for at least 75 percent of school days [*Educ. Code § 44918*] (Paragraph 4);

- Availability of vacant positions for subsequent school year [*Educ. Code § 44918*] (Paragraph 5);

- Petitioner's right to be reemployed in one of vacant positions and to be reclassified as a probationary employee, and thus his or her beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ [*Educ. Code § 44918*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 6); and

- Demand by petitioner and refusal by respondent to reemploy and reclassify petitioner for subsequent school year [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*] (Paragraph 7).

The allegations in the petition which consist of cross references to allegations contained in other forms are *set forth in §§ 512.160[3], 512.161[3], 512.166[3], 512.168[3], 512.169[3],* and *512.170[3].*

[4] State Statutes

Reclassification of temporary and substitute employees as probationary employees. *Educ. Code § 44918*

[5] Decisions

Reemployment of temporary employees eligible under terms of *Educ. Code § 44918* as clear, present, and usually ministerial duty for which writ of mandate can issue. *Taylor v. Board of Trustees (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 500, 507, 204 Cal. Rptr. 711, 683 P.2d 710*

Employee otherwise qualified under terms of *Educ. Code § 44918* need not be hired for vacant probationary position only if he or she does not hold appropriate credential or if he or she lacks both appropriate academic preparation and experience in subject matter. *Taylor v. Board of Trustees (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 500, 509, 204 Cal. Rptr. 711, 683 P.2d 710*

Mandate as appropriate remedy for teachers seeking reclassification as probationary employees. *Campbell v. Graham-Armstrong (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 482, 485-486, 107 Cal. Rptr. 777, 509 P.2d 689*

Substitute teacher's claim for backpay and fringe benefits in mandate proceeding under *Educ. Code § 44918* as not subject to claim presentation requirement of Government Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*) because relief is incidental to request for reemployment and, therefore, falls within scope of *Gov. Code § 905(c)* (exception for public employee's claim for salary or wages). *Eureka Teacher's Assn. v. Board of Education (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 469, 474-476, 247 Cal. Rptr. 790*

Teachers' association, as exclusive bargaining representative, as having standing under *Gov. Code § 3543.8* to sue on behalf of all members of teachers' bargaining unit, including nonpaying members, for enforcement of *Educ. Code § 44918*. *Anaheim Elementary Ed. Assn. v. Board of Education (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1153, 1159, 225 Cal. Rptr. 468*

Where number of substitute and temporary teachers qualified to be reemployed as probationary teachers for subsequent school year under *Educ. Code § 44918* exceeds number of vacant positions, school district as not required to fill available positions on basis of seniority. *Fair v. Fountain Valley School Dist. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 180, 187-188, 153 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Doctrine of laches as applicable to action by teacher seeking reclassification as probationary teacher. *American Fed'n of Teachers v. Board of Educ. (1977) 77 Cal. App. 3d 100, 108-109, 143 Cal. Rptr. 264*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160* and *512.169*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 512 SCHOOLS: CERTIFICATION, DISMISSAL, AND RELATED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES
PART V. FORMS

45-512 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 512.171

§ 512.171 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Payment of Lawful Salary by Governing Board to School District Employee

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Payment of Lawful Salary by Governing Board to School District Employee

[*Caption. See § 512.169.*]

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. [*Capacity and residence of petitioner. See § 512.160, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Certification qualifications of petitioner. See § 512.169, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Capacity of respondent school district and governing board. See § 512.169, Paragraph 3.*]

4. _____ [*Allege facts concerning petitioner's employment, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), and prior to the commencement of the school year _____- _____, petitioner was employed by respondent _____ School District for the school year _____- _____ as a _____ (*describe position*), which is a position requiring certification qualifications. Petitioner served in this position during the entire school year _____- _____, performing all duties required by such position, and was at all times during the school year classified as a _____ (*specify classification, e.g.,* probationary) employee of respondent _____ School District by respondent _____ (*title of governing board*). Thereafter, petitioner was duly reelected and reemployed by respondent _____ School District for each of the next succeeding school years: _____ (*list years*). Petitioner served in this position during each of the above-mentioned school years, performing all duties required by the position, and was duly classified as a _____ (*specify, e.g.,* probationary) employee by respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) during the whole of each of such school years. Petitioner is currently employed by respondent

_____ School District in such position].

5. The actual rate of salary paid to petitioner during each of the above-mentioned school years was as follows: _____ [*specify*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] adopted a salary schedule and policy memorandum for certificated employees of respondent _____ School District for the school year _____- _____, which provided that _____ [*set forth pertinent provisions of salary schedule and policy memorandum*]. [Copies of the above-described salary schedule and policy memorandum are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B and made a part hereof.]

7. The above-described salary schedule and policy memorandum of respondents are illegal in that _____ [*specify reasons for illegality, e.g.,* the salary schedule makes an allowance for years of experience that is not uniformly applied to all certificated employees of respondent _____ School District and was not negotiated and mutually agreed to between the certificated employees' exclusive bargaining representative and _____ School District, violating *Section 45028 of the Education Code* in that _____ (*specify*)].

8. Petitioner is lawfully entitled to receive the following rate of salary: _____ [*allege rate of pay to which petitioner is entitled*] and is entitled to $_____ in back salary, computed as follows: _____ [*specify manner of computing back salary*].

9. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law in that no other remedy than mandate is provided by law to compel the payment of proper salary by a public entity to a public employee.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondents to forthwith vacate their salary schedule and policy memorandum decision of _____ (*date*), and to establish a new salary schedule and policy memorandum as follows: _____ (*specify*), and to pay petitioner his/her lawful salary in accordance with such new schedule and policy and to pay him/her back salary in the amount of $_____ or, in the alternative, to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

2. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms or proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 512.160.*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for a writ of mandate to compel the governing board of a school district to pay a certificated employee his or her proper salary in accordance with law, which requires that covered employees be classified either on a salary schedule based on uniform allowance for years of training and years of experience or on other criteria mutually negotiated between the covered employees' exclusive bargaining representative and the school district. The employee may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2][b], [c]*. For a discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings generally, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[3] Cross References

For a form of petition for writ of mandate to compel a public entity to pay a civil service employee at the lawful prevailing rate, see Ch. 118, *Civil Service*

For related forms, see *§§ 512.160* and *512.169*.

[4] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of a petition for writ of mandate to compel a school district to pay a certificated employee his or her lawful salary, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* , pt. II.

[5] State Statutes

Salaries of certificated employees. *Educ. Code §§ 45022-45060*

Salary criteria negotiated between certificated employees' exclusive bargaining representative and district. *Gov. Code § 3543.2(e)*.

[6] Decisions

Teacher's incorrect placement on salary table enshrined in collective bargaining agreement constitutes unfair labor practice, and, therefore, claim is subject to exclusive jurisdiction of *Public Employment Relations Board. McCammon*

v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 661, 664-665, 241 Cal. Rptr. 1

Mandate as appropriate remedy for school teacher to recover salary due from school district. *A.B.C. Federation of Teachers v. A.B.C. Unified Sch Dist. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 332, 340-342, 142 Cal. Rptr. 111*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 513.syn

§ 513.syn Synopsis to Chapter 513: SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

§ 513.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 513.02 Cross References

§§ 513.03-513.09 [Reserved]

§ 513.10 Governing Law

§ 513.11 Public School System

[1] Power of State

[2] Purpose of System

§ 513.12 School Districts

[1] Power of Legislature to Create, Alter, and Dissolve

[2] Nature and Powers

[3] Applicability of Local Regulations

§ 513.13 Compulsory Education

[1] In General

[2] Constitutionality

[3] Exclusions

[4] Exemptions

§ 513.14 School District Finance

§ 513.15 Racial Segregation

[1] Obligation to Desegregate

[2] Judicial Remedies

[3] Discriminatory Intent

[a] United States Constitution

[b] California Constitution

[4] Statutory Restrictions on Pupil Transportation and School Assignment

§ 513.16 Parent's Right to Control Over Sexual Information Provided to Children

§ 513.17 Discrimination

§§ 513.18-513.29 [Reserved]

§ 513.30 Governing Statutes

§ 513.31 Right to Free Public Education

§ 513.32 Educational Malpractice

§ 513.33 Special Education

[1] Right to Free Appropriate Public Education

[2] Assessment of Educational Needs

[3] Individualized Education Program

[4] Parental Consent Required

[5] Procedural Safeguards

[a] Mandated by IDEA

[b] Right to Examine Records

[c] Initiation of Hearing Procedure

[d] Mediation

[e] Conduct of Due Process Hearing

[f] Attorney's Fees

[g] Judicial Review

[i] Proper Court

[ii] Time to Bring Action

[iii] Standard of Review

[iv] Burden of Proof

[v] Representation of Child

[vi] Standing

[h] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[i] In General

[ii] Placement Pending Review

[iii] Confidentiality of Information

[iv] Scope of Review

[v] Relief Available

[vi] Education in English

§ 513.34 Freedom of Expression

[1] In General

[2] Oral Speech

[3] Use of School Facilities

[a] In General

[b] Equal Access Act

[4] Dress and Appearance

[5] Official Student Publications and Activities

[6] Underground Publications

[7] School Library and Instructional Materials

[8] Associational Rights

§ 513.35 Freedom of Religion

[1] Constitutional Protections and Limitations

[2] Federal Equal Access Act

§ 513.36 Sexual Harassment

[1] Liability Under Title IX

[2] By Teacher

[3] By Other Student

§ 513.37 Searches of Students

§ 513.38 Student Discipline

[1] Authority of Public Schools

[2] Constitutional Limitations

[3] Grounds for Discipline

§ 513.39 Suspension Procedure

[1] Use of Suspension

[2] By Teacher

[3] By Principal or Superintendent

[4] By Governing Board

[5] Total Length of Suspensions

[6] Extension of Suspension Pending Expulsion Proceedings

[7] Parental Meeting With Superintendent

[8] Completion of Work Missed

[9] Judicial Review

§ 513.40 Expulsion Procedure

[1] Use of Expulsion

[2] Expulsion of Pupil With Previously Identified Exceptional Needs

[3] Length of Expulsion

[4] Establishment of Rules and Regulations

[5] Right to Notice and Hearing

[6] Conduct of Hearing

[7] Final Decision to Expel

[8] Suspension of Expulsion Order

[9] Right to Appeal to County Board of Education

[10] Regulations Establishing Procedures for Expulsion Appeals

[11] Obtaining Documents Required for Appeal

[12] Hearing of Appeal by County Board

[13] Hearing of Appeal by Hearing Officer or Administrative Panel

[14] Scope of Review by County Board

[15] Decision by County Board

[16] Judicial Review

[17] Enrollment in Different School District After Expulsion

[a] In General

[b] Disclosure of Expulsion Records

§ 513.41 Corporal Punishment

§ 513.42 Parental Liability for Student Misconduct

§§ 513.43-513.59 [Reserved]

§ 513.60 California Points and Authorities

§ 513.61 Federal Constitution

§ 513.62 State Constitution

§ 513.63 Federal Statutes

§ 513.64 State Statutes

[1] Rights and Duties Generally

[2] Special Education

[3] Student Discipline

§ 513.65 Federal Regulations

§ 513.66 State Regulations

§ 513.67 Decisions

[1] Educational Malpractice

[2] Freedom of Expression

[3] Freedom of Religion

[4] Right to Public Education

[5] Search and Seizure

[6] Sexual Harassment

[7] Special Education

[8] Student Discipline

[9] Racial Segregation

§ 513.68 Attorney General Opinions

§ 513.69 Law Reviews

§§ 513.70-513.89 [Reserved]

§ 513.90 Complaint for Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527], Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060], and Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--By Disabled Pupil and by Parent Against School District and, if Applicable, Other Public Education Agency--Failure to Provide Free Appropriate Public Education [20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2); Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Venue

[7] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

[8] Parent as Party

[9] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[10] Remedies Available

[11] Attorney's Fees

[12] Statute of Limitations

[13] Cross References

[14] Federal Statutes

[15] State Statutes

[16] Decisions

§ 513.91 Complaint for Declaratory [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527]--By Public School Student Against School Officials--Denial of Freedom of Speech [U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a); Educ. Code § 48907]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Cross References

[6] Federal Constitution

[7] State Constitution

[8] Federal Statutes

[9] State Statutes

[10] Decisions

§ 513.92 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages for Discrimination under Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 [20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.] for Sexual Harassment by Teacher or Fellow Student

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 513.93 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Hostile Racial Educational Environment [42 U.S.C. § 2000d]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 513.94 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Unlawful Search and Seizure U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 513.95 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Governing Board of School District and County Board of Education [Educ. Code §§ 48918, 48924]--Expulsion of Public School Student

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] California Points and Authorities

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] Law Reviews

[9] Text References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.01

§ 513.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms for use in actions involving public elementary and secondary schools. Excluded from coverage are public postsecondary educational institutions, such as community colleges, and private schools.

This chapter starts with a discussion regarding the public school system and school districts generally. It also discusses constitutional limitations on public school finance, and on racial segregation in public schools [*see § 513.10* et seq.].

This chapter then discusses the rights and responsibilities of students in the public elementary and secondary school system, including the general right to a public education, the right of disabled children to free appropriate special education, the student's constitutional and statutory rights of freedom of expression and religion, sexual harassment of a student, and school searches. Also discussed are the grounds and procedures for discipline of students [*see § 513.30* et seq.].

This chapter also contains forms of complaints for declaratory and injunctive relief to compel school officials to provide a disabled student with a free appropriate public education [*see § 513.90*] and to enjoin school officials from interfering with a student's right to freedom of expression [*see § 513.91*]. It also contains complaints for damages by a student based on sexual harassment by a teacher or fellow student [*see § 513.92*], based on a hostile racial educational environment [*see § 513.93*], and based on violation of the *Fourteenth Amendment of the federal constitution* based on unreasonable search and seizure [*see § 513.94*]. This chapter also contains a form of petition for writ of mandate to obtain judicial review of an expulsion order [*see § 513.95*].

For discussion and forms relating to school employee certification, dismissal, and other related employment issues, see Ch. 512, *Schools: Certification, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues* .

For discussion and forms relating to student injuries, see Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationSchool DistrictsGeneral OverviewEducation LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationGeneral OverviewEducation LawReligion in SchoolsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsRight to EducationEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureRemediesEducation LawStudentsSpeechGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.02

§ 513.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the constitutional right to freedom of assembly, see Ch. 59, *Assemblies, Meetings, and Demonstrations*

For discussion and forms relating to discrimination in government-funded programs and activities, see Ch. 112, *Civil Rights: Government-Funded Programs and Activities* .

For discussion and forms relating to the federal post-Civil War civil rights statutes (*e.g., 42 U.S.C. § 1983,* which prohibits any action under color of state law that subjects an individual to deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by federal constitution and laws), see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

For discussion and forms relating to the civil rights of prisoners, see Ch. 114, *Civil Rights: Prisoners' Rights* .

For discussion and forms relating to employment discrimination, see Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination* .

For discussion and forms relating to discrimination in business establishments, see Ch. 116, *Civil Rights: Discrimination in Business Establishments* .

For discussion and forms relating to housing discrimination, see Ch. 117, *Civil Rights: Housing Discrimination* .

For discussion and forms relating to interference with civil rights by threats, intimidation, coercion, or violence (e.g., "hate crimes"), see Ch. 117A, *Civil Rights: Interference with Civil Rights by Threats, Intimidation, Coercion, or Violence* .

For discussion and forms for use in bringing class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

For discussion and forms for use in actions for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms relating to tort actions by and against minors, see Ch. 364, *Minors: Tort Actions* .

For a discussion of parental liability for the misconduct of a child, see Ch. 394, *Parent and Child* .

For discussion and forms relating to tort actions against public entities and officers, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureClass ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil Rights LawGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of AssemblyTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityFamily MembersChildren & Parents

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 513.03-513.09

[Reserved]

§§ 513.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.10

§ 513.10 Governing Law

The public education system of California is provided for and governed by the provisions of *Cal. Const., art. IX, §§ 1-16*. Other state constitutional provisions specifically applicable to public education are *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)* (providing that the obligations of school officials with respect to pupil school assignment and transportation under the California Constitution do not exceed those imposed by *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*), *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 21* (providing for an annual tax levy by local school districts), and *Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 5* (prohibiting the expenditure of public funds for religious or secular institutions or purposes).

Detailed statutory provisions governing public and private education are set out in the Education Code. The code contains general provisions governing all public and private education [*Educ. Code § 1 et seq.*], provisions governing elementary and secondary education [*Educ. Code § 33000 et seq.*], and provisions governing postsecondary education [*Educ. Code § 66000 et seq.*].

Provisions governing state administration of public elementary and secondary education are set forth in *Educ. Code § 33000 et seq.* School districts and their governing boards are governed by *Educ. Code § 35000 et seq.* School operations and facilities are governed by *Educ. Code § 37060 et seq.* School district finance is governed by *Educ. Code §§ 14000 et seq.* and *41000 et seq.* Provisions governing school district employees are set forth in *Educ. Code § 44000 et seq.* Provisions relating to pupil admission, attendance, discipline, rights, records, health, safety, and counseling are set forth in *Educ. Code § 46000 et seq.* Instructional programs and materials are governed by *Educ. Code § 51000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationBoards of Elementary & Secondary SchoolsGeneral OverviewEducation LawAdministration & OperationSchool DistrictsGeneral OverviewEducation LawAdministration & OperationTransportationEducation LawDiscriminationEqual Educational OpportunitiesCoverageEducation LawFundingLevies & Taxes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.11

§ 513.11 Public School System

[1] Power of State

Public education in California is an obligation that the state assumed by the adoption of its state Constitution [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 680, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240]* . The California Constitution declares that because a general diffusion of knowledge and intelligence is essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the Legislature must encourage, by all suitable means, the promotion of intellectual, scientific, moral, and agricultural improvement [*Cal. Const., art. IX, § 1*]. The Legislature is therefore directed to provide for a system of common schools by which a free school is maintained and supported in each district for at least six months of every year [*Cal. Const., art. IX, § 5*; *see § 513.31*].

The public school system of California includes all kindergarten, elementary, secondary, and technical schools, and all state colleges, that are established in accordance with law. It also includes the school districts and other agencies authorized to maintain the schools and colleges. No school, college, or other part of the public school system may be transferred, directly or indirectly, from the system or placed under the jurisdiction of any authority other than one included within the public school system [*Cal. Const., art. IX, § 6*].

Management and control of the public school system is a matter of state, not local, care and supervision [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 681, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240]* . The power of the Legislature in school matters is plenary and subject only to constitutional restrictions [*Hall v. Taft (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 177, 180-181, 302 P.2d 574* ; *Mountain View School Dist. v. City Council (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 89, 97, 335 P.2d 957]* . The supervisory power over public education is an exclusive state function that may not be delegated to any other agency [*Piper v. Big Pine School Dist. (1924) 193 Cal. 664, 669, 226 P. 926]* .

[2] Purpose of System

According to the Education Code, each child is a unique person with unique needs. The purpose of the state educational system is to enable each child to develop all of his or her own potential [*Educ. Code § 33080*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawSeparation of PowersConstitutional ControlsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsRight to EducationGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLegislatures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.12

§ 513.12 School Districts

[1] Power of Legislature to Create, Alter, and Dissolve

The system of public schools is administered through local school districts created by the Legislature. Nevertheless, it is a single system, applicable to all the common schools [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 680, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240]* .

The Legislature has the power, by general law, to provide for the incorporation and organization of school districts, high school districts, and community college districts of every kind and class and to classify these districts. The Legislature may authorize the governing boards of all school districts to initiate and carry on any programs or activities or otherwise to act in any manner that is not in conflict with the laws and purposes for which school districts are established [*Cal. Const., art. IX, § 14*].

The Legislature has plenary power over school districts. It may create, divide, alter, or abolish school districts at its pleasure, without the necessity of a local election, and it may delegate this power to a local government unit [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 681, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240* (93 D.O.S. 39, 43); *Tinsley v. Palo Alto Unified School Dist. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 871, 904 , 154 Cal. Rptr. 591]* . A school district has no vested right in its own continued existence and may not challenge the Legislature's basic power to abolish the district. However, the district does have standing to litigate the constitutionality of the means selected by the Legislature for the district's abolition [*Alta Loma School Dist. v. San Bernardino County Com. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 542, 549, 177 Cal. Rptr. 506]* .

[2] Nature and Powers

A school district is an agency of the state for local operation of the state school system [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 681, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240* ; *Town of Atherton v. Superior Court (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 417, 421, 324 P.2d 328]* and is an independent and separate government agency distinct from the county, city, or town in which it is geographically situated [*Gould v. Richmond School Dist. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 497, 502, 136 P.2d 864]* . Although it exercises a portion of the state's powers of government, a school district is a separate public

entity and is not the state or part of the state itself. A school district may not act on behalf of the state unless authorized to do so by statute [*Johnson v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 692, 698-699, 266 Cal. Rptr. 187* ; *Gonzales v. State of California (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 585, 590, 592, 105 Cal. Rptr. 804]* . Thus, employees of a school district are not state employees, and the state is not liable for the acts of a school district under agency law or under a general theory of respondeat superior [*First Interstate Bank v. State of California (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 627, 633, 243 Cal. Rptr. 8* ; *Gonzales v. State of California (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 585, 591, 105 Cal. Rptr. 804* ; *see Johnson v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699-700, 266 Cal. Rptr. 187* (filing tort claim with state rather than with local school district does not constitute substantial compliance with the California Tort Claims Act, discussed in Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students*)]. However, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that California school districts are state agencies for purposes of *U.S. Const., amend. XI*, and are entitled to the immunity from suit in federal court provided by the *11th Amendment* [*Belanger v. Madera Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 963 F.2d 248, 254 , cert. denied, 507 U.S. 919]* .

School districts, by statutory provision, act through school boards, and the authority of the districts is measured by the authority statutorily conferred on the boards [*Johnson v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699, 266 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . However, a school district, including the county superintendent of schools and the county board of education, may initiate and carry on any program or activity or otherwise act in any manner that is not in conflict with any law or with the purposes for which school districts are established [*Educ. Code §§ 35160, 35160.2*]. A school district may not, however, set additional terms or conditions on school attendance that frustrate rights created by statute [*Burton v. Board of Educ. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 52, 58, 139 Cal. Rptr. 383]* .

[3] Applicability of Local Regulations

Because the public school system is a matter of statewide supervision and concern [*see §§ 513.11, 513.12[1]*] state legislative enactments thereon control over attempted regulation by local government units [*Hall v. Taft (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 177, 181, 302 P.2d 574* ; *Town of Atherton v. Superior Court (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 417, 421, 324 P.2d 328]* . Thus, for example, school districts are not subject to city garbage collection regulations [*City of Santa Ana v. Board of Educ. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 178, 179-180, 62 Cal. Rptr. 863]* , and school district acts and resolutions are not subject to referendum by local voters [*Board of Education v. Superior Court (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 578, 581-582, 155 Cal. Rptr. 839]* .

Although, as noted above, school districts are generally not subject to local regulation, the Legislature has provided an exception to this general rule in the case of city and county building and zoning ordinances. Such ordinances are applicable to all local state agencies, including school districts [*see Gov. Code §§ 53090, 53091*; *City of Santa Clara v. Santa Clara Unified School Dist. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 152, 158, 99 Cal. Rptr. 212]* . The governing board of a school district may, however, by a two-thirds vote, render a city or county zoning ordinance inapplicable to a proposed use of its property for classroom purposes. If the governing board takes such action, the city or county may seek judicial review of the action in superior court. If the court finds that the governing board's action was arbitrary or capricious, it must declare the action void, and the zoning ordinance in question will be applicable to the school district's proposed use of its property [*see Gov. Code § 53094*; *see City of Santa Cruz v. Santa Cruz Schools Bd. of Education (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7-9, 258 Cal. Rptr. 101* ("nonclassroom facility" is one not directly used for or related to student instruction; athletic field serves important educational purpose and thus is classroom facility); *see also People ex rel. Cooper v. Rancho Santiago College (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1281, 1286, 277 Cal. Rptr. 69* (swap meet in parking lot is not classroom activity, regardless of fact that proceeds fund instructional program)].

School districts are, however, required to comply with city or county ordinances [*Gov. Code § 53097*]:

- Regulating drainage improvements and conditions;
- Regulating road improvements and conditions, or

- Requiring review and approval of grading plans as these ordinance provisions relate to the design and construction of onsite improvements that affect drainage, road conditions, or grading.

School districts are required to give consideration to the specific requirements and conditions of city and county ordinances relating to the design and construction of off-site improvements. If the school district chooses not to comply with those ordinances, the city and county are not liable for any injury or damage to property resulting from the noncompliance [*Gov. Code § 53097*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawSeparation of PowersLegislative ControlsScope of Delegated AuthorityEducation LawAdministration & OperationSchool DistrictsGeneral OverviewEducation LawAdministration & OperationSchool DistrictsAlterationEducation LawAdministration & OperationSchool DistrictsCreationEducation LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.13

§ 513.13 Compulsory Education

[1] In General

Each person between the ages of 6 and 18 years not exempted under the provisions of *Educ. Code § 48200 et seq.* or *48400 et seq.* [*see § 513.13[4]*] is subject to compulsory full-time education [*Educ. Code § 48200*]. In addition, each person between the ages of 16 and 18 years who is not exempted under the provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 48400-48454* must attend special continuation education classes maintained by the governing board of the high school district in which he or she resides or by a neighboring district for not less than four hours per week during the regularly established annual school term [*Educ. Code § 48400*].

Each person subject to compulsory full-time education or compulsory continuation education must attend the public full-time day schools or continuation school or classes for the full school day as established by the governing board of the school district in which the parent or legal guardian of the pupil resides [*Educ. Code § 48200*; *but see Educ. Code §§ 48204* (certain allowable interdistrict attendance), 48207 (hospital's school district if temporarily disabled)]. The parent, legal guardian, or other person having control of a person subject to compulsory full-time education or compulsory continuation education must send the pupil to such school for the designated time [*Educ. Code § 48200*].

Any pupil subject to compulsory full-time education or to compulsory continuation education who is absent from school without a valid excuse for more than three days or tardy in excess of 30 minutes on each of more than three days in one school year is a truant [*Educ. Code § 48260*]. Pupils who are habitually truant are subject to juvenile court proceedings [*see Educ. Code §§ 48262, 48263, 48267-48271*]. The parent, guardian, or other person having control or charge of any pupil who fails to comply with the compulsory education laws is subject to criminal penalties [*see Educ. Code §§ 48293, 48454*]. The segregated condition of schools is no defense to a prosecution for violation of the compulsory education laws [*People v. Serna (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 229, 232-233, 139 Cal. Rptr. 426]* .

[2] Constitutionality

The constitutionality of California's compulsory education law has been upheld as not violating due process and equal protection rights of parents [*People v. Turner (1953) 121 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 861, 865-867 , 263 P.2d 685 , appeal*

dismissed, 347 U.S. 972, 74 S. Ct. 785, 98 L. Ed. 1112 (1954)] .

Although the state has the power to require all children to attend some school, it may not constitutionally force children to accept public instruction only [*Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925) 268 U.S. 510, 534-535, 45 S. Ct. 571, 69 L. Ed. 1070* ; *see Roman Catholic etc. Corp. v. Piedmont (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 325, 330, 289 P.2d 438]* . However, California's compulsory education law is not open to constitutional attack on this ground because it specifically exempts pupils from mandatory public school attendance who are attending private full-time day schools that meet certain minimum standards [*see Educ. Code § 48222*].

That the state's power to require compulsory education in public or private schools is subject to constitutional scrutiny when it impinges on the right to free exercise of religion guaranteed by *U.S. Const., amend. I* [*see Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972) 406 U.S. 205, 213-215, 234-236, 92 S. Ct. 1526, 32 L. Ed. 2d 15* (further holding that Wisconsin's compulsory education laws could not constitutionally be applied to certain persons of Amish faith)].

[3] Exclusions

Children under six years of age are excluded from attending public schools, except as otherwise provided by the Education Code [*Educ. Code § 48210*; *see Educ. Code §§ 48000-48011* (exception for kindergarten)]. In addition, the governing board of a school district may exclude from attendance at school any child whose physical or mental disabilities are such as to cause his or her attendance to be inimical to the welfare of other pupils [*Educ. Code § 48212*].

The governing board is not required to send prior notice of an exclusion to the pupil's parent or guardian in the following circumstances [*Educ. Code § 48213*]:

- If the pupil is excluded from attendance pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 120230*, relating to the exclusion of students residing where any contagious, infectious, or communicable disease exists or has recently existed, and who is subject to strict isolation or quarantine of contact.

- If the pupil is excluded from attendance pursuant to *Educ. Code § 49451*, regarding exclusion of a child whose parent has not consented to a physical examination of the child.

- If a principal or his or her designee determines that the continued presence of the child would constitute a clear and present danger to the life, safety, or health of a pupil or school personnel.

However, the governing board must send a notice of the exclusion as soon as is reasonably possible after the exclusion [*Educ. Code § 48213*]. For discussion of removal of students for disciplinary reasons, see *§§ 513.38, 513.40*.

The federal Rehabilitation Act of 1974, which prohibits recipients of federal funds from discriminating against "otherwise qualified" handicapped persons [*see 29 U.S.C. § 794*], provides additional limitations on the power of school districts to exclude children who have contagious diseases from the public schools. Persons with contagious diseases are handicapped within the meaning of the Act [*see School Board of Nassau County v. Arline (1987) 480 U.S. 273, 289, 107 S. Ct. 1123, 94 L. Ed. 2d 307* (involving tuberculosis)].

For example, a child who has tested positive for Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) was held to be a handicapped person within the meaning of the Act [*Thomas v. Atascadero Unified School Dist. (C.D. Cal. 1987) 662 F. Supp. 376, 383]* . A child who has tested positive for AIDS must be placed in the regular educational environment unless it is demonstrated that the education of the person in the regular environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily [*45 C.F.R. § 84.34(a)*]. Exclusion cannot be based on the ground that the child poses a risk of transmission of the AIDS virus to others in the school environment solely because of the existence of the disease or the presence of antibodies for the disease in the child's blood [*Thomas v. Atascadero Unified School*

Dist. (C.D. Cal. 1987) 662 F. Supp. 376, 382 ; *see also Phipps v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1110, 1115-1119, 251 Cal. Rptr. 720* (upholding permanent injunction against school district from excluding child with AIDS from public school)].

[4] Exemptions

Certain classes of persons are exempt from compulsory full-time education and from compulsory continuation education [*see Educ. Code §§ 48220 et seq., 48410*]. Unlike the provisions of the Education Code that provide for exclusions from public education, the exemption provisions merely excuse those who seek to be excused from compliance with the compulsory education requirements. The exemption provisions do not authorize a school district to initiate an action to remove a child from school over the parents' objection [*see Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 160-165, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177]* .

California statutes permit home schooling as a species of private school education, which is exempted from compulsory education laws, but the statutory permission to home school may constitutionally be overridden in order to protect the safety of a child who has been declared dependent [*Jonathan L. v. Superior Court (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1088-1105, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 571*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAttendanceCompulsory EducationEducation LawAttendanceExemptionsEducation LawAttendanceMandatory AttendanceEducation LawAttendanceTruancyEducation LawDiscriminationDisability DiscriminationRehabilitation ActProtected Individuals

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.14

§ 513.14 School District Finance

The California Constitution provides for the establishment of a state school fund from state revenues that must be apportioned in its entirety each fiscal year, in a manner provided by the Legislature, to school districts and other agencies for the support of the public schools [*see Cal. Const., art. IX, § 6*]. The Constitution also directs the Legislature to provide for an annual tax levy by school districts that is sufficient to produce for each district annual revenues determined by the district's governing board to be necessary for its schools and district functions [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 21*]. The provision for a local school tax does not, however, constitutionally mandate a school finance system in which school district expenditures are a function of the assessed valuation of taxable property in the district per unit of average daily attendance. Such a system, in effect, makes the availability of educational opportunity dependent on the taxable wealth of the school district and, in the absence of justification by a compelling state interest, violates the equal protection provisions of *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)* [*Serrano v. Priest (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 728, 768-775, 135 Cal. Rptr. 345, 557 P.2d 929 , cert. denied sub nom., Clowes v. Serrano 432 U.S. 907 (1977)]* . Therefore, the Legislature funds California's public schools by a system that relies on local property tax revenues, state equalizing payments, and categorical aid for targeted categories of children with needs that require special attention [*see Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 679 n.11, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240* ; *see also Belanger v. Madera Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 963 F. 2d 248, 251-252 , cert. denied, 507 U.S. 919]* .

Proposition 13, passed in 1978, further restricts the way in which school districts may levy special assessments. Special assessments must be approved by two-thirds vote of the qualified electors of the district and cannot be based on the value of the real property [Cal. Const., art. XIIIA, § 4; *see Arvin Union School Dist. v Ross (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 189, 198-200, 221 Cal. Rptr. 720* (district override assessments under former *Educ. Code § 42244* (repealed July 24, 1979) are not permissible special district assessments because based on value of real property)]. Subject to this constitutional limitation from Proposition 13, a school district may impose qualified special taxes pursuant to procedures established in the Government Code [*Gov. Code § 50079*; *see Gov. Code §§ 50075-50077.5* (procedures)].

The statutory provisions governing school finance are set forth in *Educ. Code §§ 14000-14240* and *41000-43002*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawFundingGeneral OverviewEducation LawFundingLevies & TaxesTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.15

§ 513.15 Racial Segregation

[1] Obligation to Desegregate

The segregation of school children into separate schools because of their race constitutes a denial of equal protection of the laws under both the United States and California Constitutions [*Brown v. Board of Educ. of Topeka (1954) 347 U.S. 483, 493-495, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. Ed. 873* ("Brown I"); *Jackson v. Pasadena City School Dist. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 876, 880, 31 Cal. Rptr. 606, 382 P.2d 878]* . Such racial segregation violates equal protection of the laws even though the physical facilities and methods of instruction in the several schools may be equal, because separate educational facilities are inherently unequal [*Brown v. Board of Educ. of Topeka (1954) 347 U.S. 483, 495, 74 S. Ct. 686, 98 L. Ed. 873* ("Brown I"); *see Jackson v. Pasadena City School Dist. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 876, 880, 31 Cal. Rptr. 606, 382 P.2d 878]* . School officials are therefore required to desegregate unconstitutionally segregated schools with all deliberate speed [*Brown v. Board of Educ. of Topeka (1955) 349 U.S. 294, 301, 75 S. Ct. 753, 99 L. Ed. 1083, 71 Ohio Law Abs. 584* ("Brown II")].

The concept of race may still be employed if its use is found necessary to repair injuries inflicted on persons because of race [*Freeman v. Pitts (1992) 503 U.S. 467, 494, 112 S. Ct. 1430, 118 L. Ed. 2d 108* ; *Ho by Ho v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 854, 864]* . However, racial balancing cannot be the objective unless the balancing is shown to be necessary to correct the effects of government action of a racist character [*Freeman v. Pitts (1992) 503 U.S. 467, 494, 112 S. Ct. 1430, 118 L. Ed. 2d 108* ; *Ho by Ho v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 854, 865]* . When a governmental body defends racial quotas, the burden of justification falls on the government. A generalized assertion of past discrimination and present effects does not meet that burden [*City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co. (1989) 488 U.S. 469, 498, 109 S. Ct. 706, 102 L. Ed. 2d 854* ; *Ho by Ho v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1998) 147 F.3d 854, 865]* .

However, the racial and ethnic balancing component of a school district's open-transfer policy promulgated under *Educ. Code § 35160.5*, in which white student open enrollment transfers out of a specific high school and non-white student transfers into a school are limited to a one-for-one basis, violates Proposition 209, *Cal. Const., art. I, § 31*. On the other hand, a general recognition of the demographics of neighborhoods in student assignments without classifying students

by race by looking at a student's residential neighborhood and considering average household income in the neighborhood, the average education level of adults residing in the neighborhood, and the racial composition of the neighborhood as a whole and giving every student within a given neighborhood the same treatment regardless of race does not discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race in violation of *Cal. Const., art. I, § 31* [*American Civil Rights Foundation v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 207, 216-222, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789]* . Further, while the federal Constitution prohibits a school district from acting to segregate schools, there is no federal constitutional mandate necessitating the implementation of a proactive program of integration, and such a plan is not required by the federal *equal protection clause* [*Crawford v. Huntington Beach Union High Sch. Dist. (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1275, 1279-1285, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96]* . When a school district voluntarily adopts a student assignment plan that relies on race to determine which public schools certain children may attend, the district must show that the plan is necessary under the strict scrutiny standard of equal protection analysis [*see* *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School Dist. No. 1 (2007) 551 U.S. 701, 127 S. Ct. 2738, 2751-2768, 168 L. Ed. 2d 508* (under strict scrutiny analysis, school districts did not carry burden of showing ends they sought justified classifying individual students on basis of their race and discriminating among them on that basis)].

[2] Judicial Remedies

In enforcing the obligation of school districts to eliminate racial segregation, the court's function is to ascertain whether or not a school board has initiated a course of action to alleviate the effects of segregation in its schools and has made reasonable progress toward that goal. If the court finds that the board has not done so, it must intervene to protect the rights of minority students [*Crawford v. Board of Educ. (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 280, 302-307, 130 Cal. Rptr. 724, 551 P.2d 28]* . However, judicial power to correct racial segregation may be exercised only on the basis of a constitutional violation, and the nature of the violation determines the scope of the remedy [*Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ. (1971) 402 U.S. 1, 16, 91 S. Ct. 1267, 28 L. Ed. 2d 554* ; *see* *Diaz v. San Jose Unified School Dist (9th Cir. 1988) 861 F.2d 591, 595-597* (considering issues such as magnet schools, freedom of choice, and disproportionate burdens in review of desegregation plan)].

Generally, the constitutional command to desegregate schools does not require that every school in a school district reflect the racial composition of the district as a whole [*Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ. (1971) 402 U.S. 1, 24, 91 S. Ct. 1267, 28 L. Ed. 2d 554* ; *Crawford v. Board of Educ. (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 280, 302, 130 Cal. Rptr. 724, 551 P.2d 28]* . School districts need only take reasonable and feasible steps to eliminate segregated schools, that is, schools in which the minority student enrollment is so disproportionate as to realistically isolate minority students from other students and thus deprive minority students of an integrated educational experience [*Crawford v. Board of Educ. (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 280, 303, 130 Cal. Rptr. 724, 551 P.2d 28]* . Mathematical racial quotas may, however, be used by the court as a starting point in the process of shaping a remedy [*Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ. (1971) 402 U.S. 1, 25, 91 S. Ct. 1267, 28 L. Ed. 2d 554]* .

A court may require a school district to levy taxes at a level sufficient to fund a court-ordered desegregation plan and then enjoin the operation of state laws that prevent the district from exercising its taxing power [*State of Missouri v. Jenkins (1990) 495 U.S. 33, 55-58, 110 S. Ct. 1651, 109 L. Ed. 2d 31]* . In California, limited state funding is available to reimburse a school district for the cost of implementing a desegregation plan [*see* Educ. Code § 422.47.3; *see also San Francisco NAACP v. San Francisco U. School D. (9th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 412]* .

[3] Discriminatory Intent

[a] United States Constitution

Under *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*, a plaintiff seeking to establish a denial of equal protection on the basis of racial discrimination must prove a discriminatory purpose on the part of public officials [*Washington v. Davis (1976) 426 U.S. 229, 239-240, 96 S. Ct. 2040, 48 L. Ed. 2d 597]* . Thus, in a school desegregation case, the plaintiff must show not

only that segregated schooling exists, but also that it was brought about or maintained by intentional state action [*see Columbus Bd. of Educ. v. Penick (1979) 443 U.S. 449, 464, 99 S. Ct. 2941, 61 L. Ed. 2d 666]* . Moreover, under the federal equal protection provision, a court may not order a remedy embracing more than one school district to correct a constitutional violation found to exist in only one school district absent a showing that racially discriminatory acts of that district or of the state have been a substantial cause of interdistrict segregation [*Milliken v. Bradley (1974) 418 U.S. 717, 744-745, 94 S. Ct. 3112, 41 L. Ed. 2d 1069]* .

[b] California Constitution

The California Supreme Court held that under the equal protection provisions of the California Constitution [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*], school boards bear an obligation to take reasonably feasible steps to alleviate all racial segregation in public schools, regardless of whether such segregation is de jure (i.e., the result of deliberately discriminatory actions and policies) or de facto [Crawford v. Board of *Educ. (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 280, 289-302, 130 Cal. Rptr. 724, 551 P.2d 28* ; *Jackson v. Pasadena City School Dist. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 876, 881, 31 Cal. Rptr. 606, 382 P.2d 878]* . A court of appeal held that the California Constitution authorizes judicial remedies to eliminate interdistrict segregation where feasible [*see Tinsley v. Palo Alto Unified School Dist. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 871, 899-907, 154 Cal. Rptr. 591]* .

Subsequent to these decisions, however, California voters approved an amendment to *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)* which provides that nothing in the California Constitution "imposes upon the State of California or any public entity, board, or official any obligations or responsibilities which exceed those imposed by the *Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution* with respect to the use of pupil school assignment or pupil transportation. In enforcing this subdivision or any other provision of this Constitution, no court of this state may impose upon the State of California or any public entity, board, or official any obligation or responsibility with respect to the use of pupil school assignment or pupil transportation, (1) except to remedy a specific violation by such party that would also constitute a violation of the *Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution*, and (2) unless a federal court would be permitted under federal decisional law to impose that obligation or responsibility upon such party to remedy the specific violation of the *Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution*."

The apparent effect of the amendment to *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)* is to partly overrule the holdings of *Crawford* and *Tinsley* by prohibiting the use of pupil school assignment and mandatory busing to correct de facto racial segregation, and by eliminating interdistrict remedies except where there is a showing that de jure segregation in one district was a substantial cause of de facto segregation in another district or that the district boundaries were drawn by the state with a discriminatory purpose, as required by the *Milliken* decision. The amendment requires those seeking interdistrict busing or pupil assignment to show de jure segregation and meet *Milliken* standards. Remedies other than pupil assignment and transportation are still available to cure alleged de facto segregation, and requests for other forms of relief, such as requiring a school district to adopt a reasonably feasible plan to alleviate racially segregated schools, are still within the authority of the state courts to impose [*Tinsley v. Superior Court (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 90, 99-100, 109-110, 197 Cal. Rptr. 643]* . For a further discussion and criticism of the amendment, see Comment, "California's Anti-Busing Amendment: A Perspective on the Now Unequal *Equal Protection Clause*," *10 Golden Gate L Rev 611 (1980)*. The amendment was upheld by the United States Supreme Court as not violative of the equal protection provisions of *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*, or of any other constitutional requirement or federal law [*Crawford v. Los Angeles Board of Education (1982) 458 U.S. 527, 102 S. Ct. 3211, 73 L. Ed. 2d 948, 955-961* ; *see Tinsley v. Superior Court (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 90, 100, 197 Cal. Rptr. 643]* .

Subsequently, a California court of appeal held that the rationale in *Crawford* was applicable to the contention that the amendment impermissibly encouraged or sanctioned racial segregation in schools. The California Supreme Court denied hearing. The court of appeal stated that although state courts may be able to freely determine the scope and meaning of the amendment, *Crawford* gave total approval to the constitutionality of the amendment and that approval was binding on state courts. The court of appeal noted that techniques other than busing and school reassignment were

still within the authority of state courts to impose to cure alleged de facto segregation [*see Tinsley v. Superior Court (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 90, 102-104, 109, 197 Cal. Rptr. 643]* .

[4] Statutory Restrictions on Pupil Transportation and School Assignment

Educ. Code § 35350 prohibits governing boards from requiring any student or pupil to be transported for any purpose or reason without the written permission of his or her parent or guardian. *Educ. Code § 35351* provides that no pupil may be assigned to or required to attend a particular school because of the characteristics listed in *Educ. Code § 220* (disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation). The former provision has been construed as doing no more than giving the parent the right to reject compulsory busing by the school district and to choose some other more convenient means of transportation [*San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Johnson (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 937, 946, 92 Cal. Rptr. 309, 479 P.2d 669 , cert. denied sub nom. Fehlhaber v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. 401 U.S. 1012 (1972)]* . Both provisions have been held unconstitutional to the extent that they purport to restrict the use of pupil reassignment to correct unconstitutional racial segregation [*see Santa Barbara Sch. Dist. v. Superior Court (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 315, 324-328, 118 Cal. Rptr. 637, 530 P.2d 605* ; *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Johnson (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 937, 954-959, 92 Cal. Rptr. 309, 479 P.2d 669 , cert. denied sub nom. Fehlhaber v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. 401 U.S. 1012 (1972)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawEqual ProtectionRaceEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationDesegregationInvoluntary Student PlacementEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationDesegregationRacial ImbalanceEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationDesegregationRemediesEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationEqual Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.16

§ 513.16 Parent's Right to Control Over Sexual Information Provided to Children

Parents do not have a constitutional right to control the upbringing of their children by introducing them to matters of and relating to sex in accordance with their personal and religious values and beliefs. There is no specific right in parents to determine when and how their children are exposed to sexually explicit subject matter, and there is no such right encompassed within their fundamental due process right to control their children's upbringing and their constitutional right to privacy to make intimate familial decisions [*Fields v. Palmdale Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2005) 427 F.3d 1197, 1203-1208* ; *see Troxel v. Granville (2000) 530 U.S. 57, 66 , 120 S. Ct. 2054, 147 L. Ed. 2d 49* (plurality opinion) (*due process clause of Fourteenth Amendment* protects fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning care, custody, and control of their children); *Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925) 268 U.S. 510, 45 S. Ct. 571, 69 L. Ed. 1070* (state has power reasonably to regulate all schools; inspect, supervise, and examine schools, teachers, and pupils; require all children of proper age to attend some school, teachers to be of good moral character and patriotic disposition, certain studies plainly essential to good citizenship be taught, and nothing be taught which is manifestly inimical to public welfare); *Meyer v. Nebraska (1923) 262 U.S. 390, 43 S. Ct. 625, 67 L. Ed. 1042* ; *see also Runyon v. McCrary (1976) 427 U.S. 160, 177, 96 S. Ct. 2586, 49 L. Ed. 2d 415* (no parental right to educate children in private segregated schools); *Norwood v. Harrison (1973) 413 U.S. 455, 461-462, 93 S. Ct. 2804, 37 L. Ed. 2d 723* (discussing limited scope of *Pierce); Wisconsin v. Yoder (1972) 406 U.S. 205, 239, 92 S. Ct. 1526, 32 L. Ed. 2d 15* (White, J., concurring) (*Pierce* right lends no support to contention that parents may replace state educational requirements with their own idiosyncratic views of what knowledge child needs to be productive and happy member of society)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessPrivacyPersonal DecisionsEducation LawInstructionCurriculaParental AuthorityFamily LawParental Duties & RightsConsentEducationGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsPolice Power

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.17

§ 513.17 Discrimination

Educ. Code § 220 prohibits discrimination based on disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any other characteristic contained in the definition of hate crimes in *Penal Code § 422.55* in any program or activity conducted by an educational institution that receives, or benefits from, state financial assistance or enrolls pupils who receive state student financial aid [for discussion of racial segregation in public schools, *see § 513.15*].

One listed characteristic upon which discrimination is prohibited is sexual orientation. To prevail on a claim under Section 220 for peer sexual orientation harassment, a plaintiff must show each of the following [*Donovan v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 567, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285* ; for discussion of sexual harassment under federal law, *see § 513.36*]:

- He or she suffered severe, pervasive, and offensive harassment that effectively deprived the plaintiff of the right of equal access to educational benefits and opportunities.
- The school district had actual knowledge of the harassment.
- The school district acted with deliberate indifference in the face of such knowledge.

The elements of liability in connection with students' equal protection claims against school officials are the same elements that apply in an action under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 for money damages, which also govern a private suit for damages under Section 220 [*Donovan v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 567, 596-608, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285]* .

Money damages are available in a private enforcement action under section 220 [*Donovan v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 567, 592-596, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285* , citing *Educ. Code § 262.3(b)*].

The federal Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 prohibits states from denying equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of the individual's race, color, sex, or national origin by, inter alia, an educational agency's

failure to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs [*20 U.S.C. § 1703(f)*]. By simply requiring a state to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers without specifying particular actions a state must take, Congress intended to leave state and local educational authorities a substantial amount of latitude in choosing the programs and techniques to use to meet their obligations under the Act [*Horne v. Flores (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2579, 2589, 2597, 174 L. Ed. 2d 406* ; *Castaneda v. Pickard (5th Cir. 1981) 648 F.2d 989, 1009]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Public School System

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 513.18-513.29

[Reserved]

§§ 513.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.30

§ 513.30 Governing Statutes

Provisions governing special education are set forth in *Educ. Code § 56000 et seq.* Federal provisions governing aid to states for the provision of special education are contained in *20 U.S.C. § 1401 et seq.*

The right of public school students in California to freedom of speech is governed by *Educ. Code §§ 48907, 48950*.

Suspension and expulsion of students is governed by *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.* Corporal punishment is governed by *Educ. Code §§ 49000* and *49001*. The duty of students to comply with school regulations, to pursue the required course of study, and to submit to the authority of the teachers is set forth in *Educ. Code § 48908*.

Federal provisions relating to sexual harassment in violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 are set forth in *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.*. Search and seizure of students in public schools is governed by *U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV*, as enforced through actions brought under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, and by *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13*. For discussion of Section 1983, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityCivil Rights Act of 1871Education LawDiscriminationEqual Educational OpportunitiesCoverageEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsCorporal PunishmentEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsExpulsionsEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsSuspensionsEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsSpeechGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.31

§ 513.31 Right to Free Public Education

The opportunity to attend and receive instruction in the public schools is a legal right that is enforceable by the same means as any other legal right [*Piper v. Big Pine School Dist. (1924) 193 Cal. 664, 669-670, 226 P. 926* ; *Ward v. Flood (1874) 48 Cal. 36, 50]* . Public education is a fundamental right under the equal protection provisions of the California Constitution [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 678-680, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240* ; *Serrano v. Priest (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 728, 765-766, 135 Cal. Rptr. 345, 557 P.2d 929* , *cert. denied sub nom., Clowes v. Serrano 432 U.S. 907 (1977)* ; *see Serrano v. Priest (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 584, 596 n.11, 604-610, 96 Cal. Rptr. 601, 487 P.2d 1241]* .

The California Constitution makes public education uniquely a fundamental concern of the state [*see § 513.11[1]*]. It prohibits maintenance and operation of the public school system in a way that denies basic educational equality to the students of particular districts. The state itself bears the ultimate authority and responsibility to ensure that its district-based system of common schools provides basic equality of educational opportunity [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 685, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240]* . This right to equality of educational opportunity requires that the state's schools be funded in such a way that the quality of education does not depend on the wealth of the local school district [*see Serrano v. Priest (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 584, 595, 96 Cal. Rptr. 601 . 487 P.2d 1241 (Serrano I)* ; *see also Serrano v. Priest (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 728, 768-775, 135 Cal. Rptr. 345, 557 P.2d 929 (Serrano II)]* . Further, the state must intervene if a local district's fiscal problems would otherwise deny its students basic educational equality, unless the state can demonstrate a compelling reason not to do so [*Butt v. State of California (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 668, 678-679, 692, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 480, 842 P.2d 1240* (affirming trial court injunction that required state to loan additional funds to keep local school district open and operating for full scheduled number of school days, even though district board had exhausted funds provided under state's equalizing school financing formula); *see § 513.14*].

The California Constitutional *equal protection clause* also establishes rights of students in areas other than school funding. For example, the state may not condition the availability of public education on compliance with an unconstitutionally vague standard of conduct, nor may it deprive a child of the opportunity of a public education without due process, including notice of the grounds for denial and an opportunity to be heard [*see Abella v. Riverside*

Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 168-169, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177 ; *Myers v. Arcata etc. School Dist. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 549, 560, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . In light of the importance of education to society and to the individual, the courts must unsympathetically examine any action of a public body that has the effect of depriving children of the opportunity to obtain an education [*Manjares v. Newton (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 365, 375-376, 49 Cal. Rptr. 805, 411 P.2d 901]* .

Cal. Const., art. IX, § 5, requires the state to maintain and support a *free* school in each district for at least six months of every year. The free school guarantee extends not only to classes, but also to extracurricular activities that are educational in character, such as athletic, music, and drama programs [*Hartzell v. Connell (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 899, 904-913, 201 Cal. Rptr. 601, 679 P.2d 35]* . It does not, however, extend to school transportation, which is deemed not to be an educational activity but a supplemental service [*Arcadia Unified School Dist. v. State Dept. of Education (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 251, 259-265, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545, 825 P.2d 438]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawEqual ProtectionScope of ProtectionEducation LawDiscriminationEqual Educational OpportunitiesCoverageEducation LawFundingAllocationEducation LawStudentsEqual ProtectionEducation LawStudentsRight to Education

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.32

§ 513.32 Educational Malpractice

Although courts have said that children have a "right" to an education at public expense, students have generally been unsuccessful in their attempts to hold schools and teachers liable for "educational malpractice," that is, for failure to use reasonable care to give a student a suitable or minimally acceptable education. There is no cause of action for damages if a school negligently fails to provide proper remedial education [*Peter W. v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 814, 817-825, 131 Cal. Rptr. 854]* , or if a school places a student in a class for mentally disabled students although the school knows or should have known the student in question was not mentally retarded [*Smith v. Alameda County Social Services Agency (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 929, 941-942, 153 Cal. Rptr. 712]* . Nor is there a cause of action for negligence in failing to comply with special education program requirements [*Keech v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 464, 468-469, 210 Cal. Rptr. 7]* .

On the other hand, certain facts may constitute a cause of action for appropriate relief (such as injunction) to assure students of getting a minimally acceptable education in the future. For example, a school may be enjoined from placing students in classes for mentally retarded students on the basis of their scores on culturally biased IQ tests, if the consequence of the use of such criteria creates racial imbalance in the composition of such classes [*see Larry P. by Lucille P. v. Riles (9th Cir. 1984) 793 F.2d 969, 982-984* ; *P. v. Riles (N.D. Cal. 1972) 343 F. Supp. 1306, 1315]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityEducational Malpractice

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.33

§ 513.33 Special Education

[1] Right to Free Appropriate Public Education

To assist states and localities in providing for the education of disabled children, Congress has enacted the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; *20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*). The IDEA was intended by Congress to do all of the following [*20 U.S.C. § 1400(d)*]:

- Ensure that all children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education emphasizing special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs and to prepare them for further education, employment, and independent living.

- Ensure that the rights of children with disabilities and the parents of such children are protected.

- Assist states, localities, educational service agencies, and federal agencies to provide for the education of all children with disabilities.

- Assist states in implementing statewide, comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

- Ensure that educators and parents have the necessary tools to improve educational results for children with disabilities by supporting system improvement activities; coordinated research and personnel preparation; coordinated technical assistance, dissemination, and support; and technology development and media services.

- Assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate children with disabilities.

However, in enacting the IDEA, Congress did not intend to create a federal claim for every activity or type of conduct that may impede an individual's ability to take advantage of the educational opportunities [*Armstrong v. Alicante (E.D.*

Cal. 1999) 44 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1089] .

After examining the states' progress under IDEA, in 1997, Congress found that substantial gains had been made in the area of special education but that more needed to be done to guarantee children with disabilities adequate access to appropriate services. The 1997 Amendments to the IDEA were intended to place greater emphasis on improving student performance and ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality public education [*see* S. Rep. No. 105-17, p. 5 (1997)]. Consistent with that goal, the Amendments preserved the Act's purpose of providing a "free appropriate public education" (FAPE) to all children with disabilities [*Forest Grove School Dist. v. T. A. (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2484, 2491-2492, 174 L. Ed. 2d 168]* .

The term "free appropriate public education" means special education and related services that [*20 U.S.C. § 1401(9)*; *see* 45 C.F.R. § 121a.4]:

- Have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge;
- Meet the standards of the state educational agency;
- Include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the state involved; and
- Are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under *20 U.S.C. § 1414(d).*

"Related services" means transportation, and developmental, corrective, and other supportive services required to assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education, including the early identification and assessment of disabling conditions in children. Supportive services may also include speech-language pathology and audiology services; psychological services; physical and occupational therapy; recreation, including therapeutic recreation; social work services; counseling services, including rehabilitation counseling; orientation and mobility services; and medical services. However, medical services must be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only [*20 U.S.C. § 1401(26)*]. The IDEA contains no explicit definition of "medical services" [*see Cedar Rapids Community School District v. Garret F. (1999) 526 U.S. 66, 119 S. Ct. 992, 143 L. Ed. 2d 154* (school district required to provide ventilator-dependent student continuous one-on-one nursing services student required during school hours in order to remain in school); *Irving Independent School Dist. v. Tatro (1984) 468 U.S. 883, 888-892, 104 S. Ct. 3371, 82 L. Ed. 2d 664* (services that may be provided by school nurse are not excluded medical services); *Clovis Unified v. Office of Administrative Hearings (9th Cir. 1990) 903 F.2d 635, 638, 641, 647* (cost of residential treatment program in psychiatric hospital is excluded medical service, notwithstanding fact that treatment was required for child to benefit from educational program)]. Preventing illegal drug use is not the type of supportive services contemplated by the IDEA [*Armstrong v. Alicante (E.D. Cal. 1999) 44 F. Supp. 2d 1087, 1089]* .

Schools under the IDEA include residential schools [*see 20 U.S.C. § 1401(6), (27)*]. If placement in a public or private residential program is necessary to provide special education and related services to a disabled child, the program, including nonmedical care and room and board, must be at no cost to parents of the child [*34 C.F.R. § 300.302*; *see Clovis Unified v. Office of Administrative Hearings (9th Cir. 1990) 903 F.2d 635, 641, 647* (rejecting acute psychiatric hospital as such a "residential program," despite provision of some educational services as part of program)].

When a public school fails to provide a "free appropriate public education" (FAPE), and a child's parents place the child in an appropriate private school without the school district's consent, a court may require the district to reimburse the parents for the cost of the private education [*see School Comm. of Burlington v. Department of Ed. of Mass. (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 370, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385]* . The IDEA Amendments of 1997 [111 Stat. 37] do not categorically prohibit reimbursement for private education costs if a child has not previously received special education

and related services under the authority of a public agency [*Forest Grove School Dist. v. T. A. (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2484, 2491-2496, 174 L. Ed. 2d 168* ; see *20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(10)(C)(ii)*]. When a court or hearing officer concludes that a school district failed to provide a FAPE and the private placement was suitable, it must consider all relevant factors, including the notice provided by the parents and the school district's opportunities for evaluating the child, in determining whether reimbursement for some or all of the cost of the child's private education is warranted [*Forest Grove School Dist. v. T. A. (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2484, 2496, 174 L. Ed. 2d 168]* .

The IDEA requires states to provide some measure of special education and related services to disabled children in private schools [*see 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(10)(A), (C)*; *34 C.F.R. §§ 300.403-300.452*]. Services may be provided to children with disabilities on the premises of parochial schools to the extent consistent with law [*20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(10)(A)(ii)(I), (II)*], but need not be provided on site at a private school [*WJM ex rel. KDM v. Reedsport Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1999) 196 F.3d 1046]* .

A state satisfies the requirement of providing a disabled child with a free appropriate public education by providing personalized instruction with sufficient support services to permit the child to benefit educationally from the instruction. Instruction and services must be provided at public expense, must meet the state's educational standards, must approximate the grade levels used in the state's regular education, and must comport with the child's individualized educational program. In addition, the individualized education program and the personalized instruction should be formulated in accordance with the requirements of the IDEA and, if the child is being educated in the regular classrooms of the public education system, should be reasonably calculated to enable the child to achieve passing marks and advance from grade to grade [*Board of Education v. Rowley (1982) 458 U.S. 176, 203, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 73 L. Ed. 2d 690* (also holding that provision of sign language interpreter not required when student performs better than average child in class, is advancing easily from grade to grade, and is receiving personalized instruction and related services calculated by school administrators to meet student's educational needs)].

Under the IDEA, each state desiring to receive federal funds must meet certain conditions and establish procedures for protecting the rights of children with disabilities and their parents [*see 20 U.S.C. §§ 1411-1420*; 45 C.F.R. § 121a.110 et seq.]. To comply with the IDEA, the California Legislature has enacted *Educ. Code § 56000 et seq.*, which extends to all individuals with exceptional needs the right to participate in a free appropriate public education [*Educ. Code § 56000*; *see Educ. Code § 56040*].

"Individuals with exceptional needs" are persons [*Educ. Code § 56026(a)-(d)*]:

- Who are identified by an individualized education program team as children with a disability as that phrase is defined in former *20 U.S.C. § 1401(a)(3)*;

- Whose impairment requires instruction, services, or both that cannot be provided with modification of the regular school program;

- Who come within one of the age categories set forth in *Educ. Code § 56026(c)*; and

- Who meet eligibility criteria set forth in regulations adopted by the board, including, but not limited to, those adopted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56333 et seq.*

Unless they are disabled within the meaning of *Educ. Code § 56026(a)-(d)*, pupils whose educational needs are due primarily to the following are not individuals with exceptional needs [*Educ. Code § 56026(e)*]:

- Limited English proficiency.

- A lack of instruction in reading or mathematics.

- Temporary physical disabilities.
- Social maladjustment.
- Environmental, cultural, or economic factors.

State standards that impose a greater duty to educate handicapped children, if not inconsistent with federal standards, are enforceable in federal court under the IDEA [*Union School Dist. v. Smith (9th Cir. 1994) 15 F.3d 1519, 1524 , cert. denied, 513 U.S. 965]* . Thus, for example, California's statutory scheme mandating that handicapped three- to five-year-old students may, when appropriate, be placed in a program that only provides designed instruction and services without simultaneous special education [*see Educ. Code §§ 56026, 56361, 56441.11(b)*] is not inconsistent with the IDEA. It is therefore enforceable in the federal courts [*Union School Dist. v. Smith (9th Cir. 1994) 15 F.3d 1519, 1527 , cert. denied, 513 U.S. 965]* .

An employee of a school district, county office of education, or a special education local planning area may not directly or indirectly use or attempt to use the official authority or influence of the employee, as defined in *Educ. Code § 56046(e)(2)*, for the purpose of intimidating, threatening, coercing, or attempting to intimidate, threaten, or coerce any person for the purpose of interfering with the action of that person at any time, to assist a parent or guardian of a pupil with exceptional needs to obtain services or accommodations for that pupil [*Educ. Code § 56046(a)*]. For these purposes, services or accommodations includes information that would assist a parent or guardian to obtain a free appropriate education for his or her child as guaranteed by the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*], or other services or accommodations guaranteed by the federal Rehabilitation Act [*29 U.S.C. § 794*] and the federal Americans with Disabilities Act [*42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*], as well as under state laws regarding individuals with exceptional needs [*Educ. Code § 56046(e)(1)*].

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended requires that disabled individuals not be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives federal funds [*29 U.S.C. § 794*]. The United States Department of Education regulations implementing § 504 include a requirement that disabled children in schools receiving federal funds be provided a "free appropriate public education" (FAPE) [*34 C.F.R. § 104.33*]. The regulations define "appropriate education" as regular or special education and related aids and services designed to meet individual educational needs of handicapped persons as adequately as the needs of non-handicapped persons and based on adherence to procedures that satisfy the requirements of *34 C.F.R. §§ 104.34, 104.35*, and *104.36* [*34 C.F.R. § 104.33(a), (b)*].

Section 504 establishes an implied private right of action allowing victims of prohibited discrimination, exclusion, or denial of benefits to seek the full panoply of remedies, including equitable relief and compensatory damages [*Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 930, 935* ; *Greater L.A. Council on Deafness, Inc. v. Zolin (9th Cir. 1987) 812 F.2d 1103, 1107* ; *see also Barnes v. Gorman (2002) 536 U.S. 181, 189, 122 S. Ct. 2097, 153 L. Ed. 2d 230 (2002)*]. Whether a plaintiff can bring an action to enforce § 504 regulations depends on whether those regulations come within the § 504 implied right of action [*Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 935-939*]. Punitive damages are not available under § 504 [*Barnes v. Gorman (2002) 536 U.S. 181, 189, 122 S. Ct. 2097, 153 L. Ed. 2d 230 (2002)* ; *Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 930*].

The FAPE requirements in the IDEA and in the § 504 regulations are overlapping but different. While the IDEA focuses on the provision of appropriate public education to disabled children, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 more broadly addresses the provision of state services to disabled individuals. The IDEA contains a statutory FAPE provision and allows private causes of action only for prospective relief. Section 504 contains a broadly worded prohibition on discrimination against, exclusion of, and denial of benefits for disabled individuals, under which the federal Department of Education has promulgated regulations containing a FAPE requirement worded somewhat differently from the IDEA

FAPE requirement. Section 504 can be privately enforced to provide, in addition to prospective relief, compensatory but not punitive damages for past violations [*Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 928-930*]. The availability of injunctive relief under the IDEA does not preclude suits for damages under § 504 for government actions that violate both statutes; thus, the availability of relief under the IDEA does not limit the availability of a damages remedy under § 504 for failure to provide the FAPE independently required by § 504 and its implementing regulations [*Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 932-935*].

[2] Assessment of Educational Needs

Generally, each local public educational agency operating a special education program is required to actively and systematically seek out all individuals with exceptional needs, 21 years old or younger, who reside within the agency's jurisdiction [*see Educ. Code § 56300*]. Before an individual with exceptional needs can be placed in a special education program, the agency must conduct an individual assessment of his or her educational needs [*see Educ. Code § 56320*]. The parents or guardians of a pupil referred for initial assessment, or of a pupil already identified as an individual with exceptional needs, must be afforded an opportunity to participate in meetings with regard to the identification, assessment, and educational placement of the pupil, pursuant to *Educ. Code §§ 56342.5* and *56341.5(b), (c)*, and with regard to the provision of a free appropriate public education, as provided in *34 C.F.R. § 300.501* [*Educ. Code § 56304*]. Whenever an assessment for the development or revision of the individualized education program is to be conducted, the parent or guardian of the pupil must be given, in writing, a proposed assessment plan within 15 days of the referral for assessment not counting days between the pupil's regular school sessions or terms or days of school vacation in excess of five schooldays from the date of receiving the referral, unless the parent or guardian agrees, in writing, to an extension. In any event, the assessment plan must be developed within 10 days after the commencement of the subsequent regular school year or the pupil's regular school term as determined by each district's school calendar for each pupil for whom a referral has been made 10 days or less before the end of the regular school year. In the case of pupil school vacations, the 15-day time recommences on the date the pupil's regular schooldays reconvene [*Educ. Code § 56321(a)*; *but see Keech v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 464, 468-469, 210 Cal. Rptr. 7* (school district's failure to comply with time requirement does not support action in negligence)]. A copy of the notice of a parent's or guardian's rights must be attached to the assessment plan. A written explanation of all the procedural safeguards under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*], and the rights and procedures contained in *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.*, must be included in the notice of a parent's or guardian's rights, including information on (1) the procedures for requesting an informal meeting, prehearing mediation conference, mediation conference, or due process hearing; (2) the timelines for completing each process; (3) whether the process is optional; and (4) the type of representative who may be invited to participate [*Educ. Code § 56321(a)*].

The proposed assessment plan must (1) be in language easily understood by the general public; (2) be provided in the native language of the parent or guardian or other mode of communication used by the parent or guardian, unless to do so is clearly not feasible; (3) explain the types of assessments to be conducted; and (4) state that no individualized education program will result from the assessment without the consent of the parent [*Educ. Code § 56321(b)*].

A parent or guardian has the right to obtain, at public expense, an independent educational assessment of the pupil from qualified specialists, as defined by the board's regulations, if the parent or guardian disagrees with an assessment obtained by the public education agency, in accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.502*. A parent or guardian is entitled to only one independent educational assessment at public expense each time the public education agency conducts an assessment with which the parent or guardian disagrees. If a public education agency observed the pupil in conducting its educational assessment, or if its assessment procedures make it permissible to have in-class observation of a pupil, an equivalent opportunity applies to an independent educational assessment of the pupil in the pupil's current educational placement and setting, and observation of an educational placement and setting, if any, proposed by the public education agency, regardless of whether the independent educational assessment is initiated before or after the filing of a due process hearing proceeding [*Educ. Code § 56329(b)*]. The public education agency may initiate a due process hearing in accordance with *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* [*see § 513.33[5]*] to show that its assessment is appropriate. If

the final decision resulting from the due process hearing is that the assessment is appropriate, the parent or guardian still has the right for an independent educational assessment, but not at public expense [*Educ. Code § 56329(c)*]. If the parent or guardian obtains an independent educational assessment at private expense, the results of the assessment will be considered by the public education agency with regard to the provision of free, appropriate public education to the child, and may be presented as evidence at a due process hearing under *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* regarding the child [*Educ. Code § 56329(c)*]. If a public education agency observed the pupil in conducting its assessment, or if its assessment procedures make it permissible to have in-class observation of a pupil, an equivalent opportunity applies to an independent educational assessment of the pupil in the pupil's current educational placement and setting, and observation of an educational placement and setting, if any, proposed by the public education agency, regardless of whether the independent educational assessment is initiated before or after the filing of a due process hearing proceeding [*Educ. Code § 56329(c)*].

On completion of the administration of tests and other assessment materials, an individualized education program team meeting, including the parent or guardian and his or her representatives, must be scheduled pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56341*, to determine whether the pupil is an individual with exceptional needs as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026*, and to discuss the assessment, the educational recommendations, and the reasons for the recommendations [*Educ. Code § 56329(a)(1)*]. In making a determination of eligibility, a pupil may not be determined to be an individual with exceptional needs if the determinant factor for the determination is any of the following [*Educ. Code § 56329(a)(2)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1414(b)(5)*; *34 C.F.R. § 300.306(b)*]:

- Lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction as defined in *20 U.S.C. § 6368(3)*.
- Lack of instruction in mathematics.
- Limited-English proficiency.
- If the pupil does not otherwise meet the eligibility criteria under *34 C.F.R. § 300.8(a)*.

A copy of the assessment report and the documentation of determination of eligibility must be given to the parent or guardian [*Educ. Code § 56329(a)(3)*].

If a parent or guardian proposes a publicly financed placement of the pupil in a nonpublic school, the public education agency must have an opportunity to observe the proposed placement and the pupil in the proposed placement, if the pupil has already been unilaterally placed in the nonpublic school by the parent or guardian. Any such observation must only be of the pupil who is the subject of the observation and may not include the observation or assessment of any other pupil in the proposed placement. The observation or assessment by a public education agency of a pupil other than the pupil who is the subject of the observation may be conducted, if at all, only with the consent of the parent or guardian. The results of an observation or assessment of another pupil without permission is inadmissible in any due process or judicial proceeding regarding the free appropriate public education of that other pupil [*Educ. Code § 56329(d)*].

As part of the assessment plan given to parents pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56321*, the parent of the pupil must be provided with written notice that, on completion of administration of tests and other assessment materials, an individualized education program team meeting, including the parent and his or her representatives, will be scheduled pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56341* to determine whether the pupil is an individual with exceptional needs as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026*; and to discuss the assessment, the educational recommendations, and the reasons for these recommendations. A copy of the assessment report and the documentation of determination of eligibility must be given to the parent [*Educ. Code § 56329(a)*].

[3] Individualized Education Program

Each local educational agency must initiate and conduct meetings for the purposes of developing, reviewing, and revising the individualized education program of each individual with exceptional needs in accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.323(c)* [*Educ. Code § 56340*]. The meetings must be conducted and an individualized program developed in accordance with *Educ. Code §§ 56341-56347*.

[4] Parental Consent Required

Written parental consent must be obtained before any assessment of the pupil is conducted, unless the public education agency prevails in a due process hearing relating to the assessment or placement [*Educ. Code § 56506(e)*; *see Educ. Code § 56321(c)*; *see also § 513.33[5]*]. Informed parental consent need not be obtained in the case of a reassessment of the pupil if the local educational agency can demonstrate it has taken reasonable measures to obtain consent and the pupil's parent has failed to respond [*Educ. Code § 56506(e)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.505(c)*]. In accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.300(d)(1)*, parental consent is not required before reviewing existing data as part of an assessment or reassessment, or before administering a test or other assessment that is administered to all children, unless before administration of that test or assessment, consent is required of the parents of all the children [*Educ. Code § 56321(e)*].

Furthermore, written parental consent under *Educ. Code § 56321* must be obtained before the pupil is placed in a special education program [*Educ. Code § 56506(f)*]. Although there is some confusion in the statutes, it appears that a parent's refusal to consent to the pupil's educational placement, as opposed to assessment, may not be challenged by the public education agency in a due process hearing [*compare Educ. Code § 56506(e) with Educ. Code § 56506(f)*; *see also Educ. Code § 56501(a)(1)-(4)*, as amended by Stats. 1980, ch. 1353, § 68, to eliminate parent's refusal to consent to educational placement as situation when due process hearing procedures may be invoked].

Consent for initial assessment may not be construed as consent for initial placement or initial provision of special education and related services to an individual with exceptional needs, pursuant to *20 U.S.C. § 1414(a)(1)(D)(i)(I)* [*Educ. Code § 56321(d)*].

If the child is a ward of the state and is not residing with his or her parent, the agency must make reasonable efforts to obtain the informed consent from the parent, as defined in *Educ. Code § 56028*, for an initial assessment to determine whether the child is an individual with exceptional needs [*Educ. Code § 56321.1*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1414(a)(1)(D)(iii)*].

[5] Procedural Safeguards

[a] Mandated by IDEA

Any state or local education agency receiving funds under IDEA must establish and maintain procedures in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415* to assure that disabled children and their parents or guardians are guaranteed procedural safeguards with respect to the provision of a free appropriate public education by such agencies [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(a)*]. Any state law that is inconsistent with the federally mandated procedures is superseded by the federal law [*Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Los Angeles v. Honig (9th Cir. 1992) 976 F.2d 487, 492-493* ; *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. State of California (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 54, 65, 182 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

In compliance with IDEA, *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* prescribe the applicable due process procedures. These procedures extend to the parent, as broadly defined under *Educ. Code § 56028*, and to the public education agency involved. They also extend to the pupil under certain limited circumstances [*Educ. Code § 56501(a)*]. The parent and the agency may initiate due process hearing procedures under any of the following circumstances [*Educ. Code § 56501(a)*]:

- There is a proposal to initiate or change the identification, assessment, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child;

- There is a refusal to initiate or change the identification, assessment, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child;

- The parent refuses to consent to an assessment of the child; or

- There is a disagreement between a parent or guardian and a district, special education local plan area, or county office regarding the availability of a program appropriate for the child, including the question of financial responsibility, as specified in *34 C.F.R. § 300.148*.

The due process hearing procedures include, but are not limited to [*Educ. Code § 56501(b)*]:

- The right to examine pupil records under *Educ. Code § 56504* [*see § 513.33[5][b]*];

- The right to a mediation conference under *Educ. Code § 56500.3*, including the right to request mediation at any point during the hearing process [*see § 513.33[5][d]*];

- The right to request a mediation conference at any point during the hearing process; and

- The right to a fair and impartial administrative hearing at the state level, before a person knowledgeable in the laws governing special education and administrative hearings who is under contract with the Department of Education, under *Educ. Code § 56505* [*see § 513.33[5][e]*].

Even though a child has not previously been identified as disabled, his or her alleged disability may be raised in an IDEA administrative due process hearing [*Hacienda La Puente Unified School District Los Angeles v. Honig (9th Cir. 1992) 976 F.2d 487, 492]* .

When a school district does not perform exactly as called for by the IEP, the district does not violate the IDEA unless it is shown to have materially failed to implement the child's IEP. A material failure occurs when the services provided to a disabled child fall significantly short of those required by the IEP [*Van Duyn v. Baker School District (9th Cir. 2007) 481 F.3d 770, 779-780]* .

[b] Right to Examine Records

The parent has the right and opportunity to examine all school records of the child and to receive copies under *Educ. Code §§ 49065* and *56504* within five business days after a request is made by the parent, either orally or in writing. A public education agency may charge no more than the actual cost of reproducing such records, but, if this cost effectively prevents the parent from exercising the right to receive copies of the records, the copies must be reproduced at no charge to the parent [*Educ. Code § 56504*].

[c] Initiation of Hearing Procedure

A request for a due process hearing arising under *Educ. Code § 56501(a)* must be filed within two years from the date the party initiating the request knew or had reason to know of the facts underlying the basis for the request [*Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*).] However, this time period does not apply to a parent if the parent was prevented from requesting the due process hearing due to either of the following [*Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*); *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(D)*]:

- Specific misrepresentations by the local educational agency that it had solved the problem forming

the basis of the due process hearing request.

- The withholding of information by the local educational agency from the parent that was required under this part to be provided to the parent.

All requests for a due process hearing must be filed with the superintendent [*Educ. Code § 56502(a)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.508(a), (b)*]. The superintendent must develop a model form to assist parents and guardians in filing a request for due process that is in accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.509* [*Educ. Code § 56502(b)*]. The party initiating a due process hearing by filing a written request with the superintendent, or the attorney representing the initiating party, must provide the other party to the hearing with a copy of the request at the same time as the request is filed with the superintendent [*Educ. Code § 56502(c)(1)*]. The due process hearing request notice must remain confidential [*Educ. Code § 56502(c)(1)*].

The due process hearing request must include all of the following [*Educ. Code § 56502(c)(1)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)*; *see also Educ. Code § 56502(c)(2)* (party may not have due process hearing until party or attorney representing party files request for meeting requirements listed in *Educ. Code § 56502(c)(1)*)]:

- The name of the child, the address of the residence of the child, or available contact information in the case of a homeless child, and the name of the school the child is attending.

- In the case of a homeless child or youth within the meaning of *42 U.S.C. § 11434a(2)* (McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act), available contact information for the child and the name of the school the child is attending.

- A description of the nature of the child's problem relating to the proposed initiation or change, including facts relating to the problem.

- A proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the party at the time.

The due process hearing request notice required by *20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)* will be deemed to be sufficient unless the party receiving the notice notifies the due process hearing officer and the other party in writing that the receiving party believes the due process hearing request notice has not met the notice requirements. The party providing a hearing officer notification must provide the notification within 15 days of receiving the due process hearing request notice. Within five days of receipt of the notification, the hearing officer must make a determination on the face of the notice of whether the notification meets the requirements of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)(A)* and immediately notify the parties in writing of the determination [*Educ. Code § 56502(d)(1)*].

The response to the due process hearing request notice must be made within 10 days of receiving the request notice [*Educ. Code § 56502(d)(2)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(c)(2)(B)*]. A party may amend a due process hearing request notice only if the other party consents in writing to the amendment and is given the opportunity to resolve the hearing issue through a meeting held pursuant to *20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(1)(B)*, or the due process hearing officer grants permission. However, the hearing officer may only grant permission at any time not later than five days before a due process hearing occurs. The applicable timeline for a due process hearing under *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* recommences at the time the party files an amended notice, including the timeline under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(1)(B)* [*Educ. Code § 56502(e)*].

The superintendent must take steps to ensure that within 45 days after receiving the written hearing request the hearing is immediately commenced and completed, including, any mediation requested at any point during the hearing process pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56501(b)(2)*, and a final administrative decision is rendered, unless a continuance has been granted under *Educ. Code § 56505* [*Educ. Code § 56502(f)*]. Notwithstanding any procedure set forth in *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.*, a public education agency and a parent or guardian may, if the party initiating the hearing so chooses,

meet informally to resolve any issue or issues relating to the identification, assessment, or education and placement of the child, or the provision of a free, appropriate public education to the child, to the satisfaction of both parties before the hearing. The informal meeting will be conducted by the district superintendent, county superintendent, or director of the public education agency or his or her designee. Any designee must have the authority to resolve the issue or issues [*Educ. Code § 56502(g)*].

Operative until October 9, 2006, any request for a due process hearing arising under *Educ. Code § 56501(a)* must be filed within three years from the date the party initiating the request knew or had reason to know of the facts underlying the basis for the request. A party initiating a request for a due process hearing on and after October 7, 2005, may file the request within the two-year statute of limitations provision in *20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(6)(B)*. A party may file a request within the three-year statute of limitations provision of *Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*) until October 9, 2006, but must, in accordance with *Educ. Code § 56501.5*, participate in a mediation conference conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* in an effort to resolve the due process hearing issue [*Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*) (operative until October 9, 2006)]. Effective October 10, 2006, any request for a due process hearing arising under *Educ. Code § 56501(a)* must be filed within two years from the date the party initiating the request knew or had reason to know of the facts underlying the basis for the request [*Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*) (operative October 10, 2005)].

In accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(D)*, the time period specified in *Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*) does not apply to a parent if the parent was prevented from requesting the due process hearing due to either of the following [*Educ. Code § 56505*(*l*)]:

- Specific misrepresentations by the local educational agency that it had solved the problem forming the basis of the due process hearing request.

- The local educational agency's withholding of information from the parent that was required under this part to be provided to the parent.

Educ. Code § 56500 et seq., in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(o)*, does not preclude a parent from filing a separate due process hearing request on an issue separate from a due process hearing request already filed [*Educ. Code § 56509*].

On receipt by the superintendent of a written request by the parent or guardian or public education agency, the superintendent or his or her designee or designees must immediately notify, in writing, all parties of the request for the hearing and the scheduled date for the hearing. The notice must advise all parties of all their rights relating to procedural safeguards [*Educ. Code § 56502(h)*]. The superintendent or his or her designee must provide both parties with a list of persons and organizations within the geographical area that can provide free or reduced cost representation or other assistance in preparing for the due process hearing. This list must include a brief description of the requirement to qualify for the services. The superintendent or his or her designee has complete discretion in determining which individuals or groups are included on the list [*Educ. Code § 56502(h)*].

The party requesting the due process hearing may not raise issues at the due process hearing that were not raised in the notice filed under *Educ. Code § 56502*, unless the other party agrees otherwise [*Educ. Code § 56502(i)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(B)*].

[d] Mediation

The right to a formal due process hearing does not preclude the parties from agreeing to a mediation conference or resolving their dispute in an informal, nonadversarial manner [*Educ. Code § 56503*]. Before the hearing, the public education agency and a parent may, if the party initiating the hearing so chooses, meet informally to resolve any issues relating to the identification, assessment, or education and placement of the child or to the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child, to the satisfaction of both parties. The informal meeting must be conducted by

the district superintendent, the county superintendent, or the director of the public education agency or his or her designee. Any designee must have the authority to resolve the issues [*Educ. Code § 56502(g)*].

It is the Legislature's intent that parties to special education disputes be encouraged to seek resolution through mediation before filing a request for a due process hearing [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(a)*]. However, requesting or participating in a mediation conference is not a prerequisite to requesting a hearing [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(c)*].

All requests for a mediation conference must be filed with the superintendent. The party initiating the conference must provide the other party with a copy of the request at the same time the request is filed [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(d)*]. The conference must be scheduled within 15 days of receipt by the superintendent, and must be completed within 30 days after receipt of the request unless both parties agree to an extension of time [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(e)*]. It must be held at a time and place reasonably convenient to the parent and pupil [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(h)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.506(b)(5)*]. The parties may meet informally, at the request of the initiating party, to resolve any issues before the conference [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(j)*].

The mediation conference must be conducted by a person who is knowledgeable in the laws and regulations governing special education and who is under contract with the department [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(d)*; *see Educ. Code § 56504.5*]. The mediator must also be knowledgeable in the process of reconciling differences in a nonadversarial manner [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(d)*]. The mediation conference is conducted in accordance with regulations adopted by the board [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(i)*]. The process is to be informal and conducted in a nonadversarial atmosphere to resolve the issues to the satisfaction of both parties. Therefore, attorneys or other independent contractors used to provide legal advocacy services may not attend or otherwise participate [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(a)*]. Nevertheless, a parent who is also an attorney is not excluded. Further, any party may be accompanied and advised by a nonattorney representative and may consult an attorney before or after the conference [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(b)*].

In accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2)(F)*, if a resolution is reached that resolves the due process issue through the mediation process, the parties will execute a legally binding written agreement that sets forth the resolution and does the following [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(f)*]:

- States that all discussions that occurred during the mediation process will be confidential and may not be used as evidence in any subsequent due process hearing or civil proceeding.

- Is signed by both the parent and the representative of the public education agency who has the authority to bind the agency.

- Is enforceable in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a federal district court of the United States.

If the mediation conference fails to resolve the issues to the satisfaction of all parties, the party who requested mediation may file for a state-level hearing under *Educ. Code § 56505*. The mediator may assist the parties in specifying any unresolved issues to be included in the hearing request [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(g)*].

A party may still request a mediation conference even though a request for a state-level hearing is filed or even if a hearing has commenced [*Educ. Code § 56503*]. However, once a hearing has been requested, a mediation conference may be scheduled only if both parties agree to mediate and are willing to extend the 45-day limit for issuing a hearing decision for a period equal to the length of the mediation process. The limitation on the period of extension is not applicable if the parties agree to take the hearing off the calendar. Attorneys and advocates are permitted to participate in mediation conferences that are scheduled after the filing of a request for a hearing [*Educ. Code § 56501(b)(2)*].

Pursuant to *34 C.F.R. § 300.506(b)(3)*, and to encourage the use of mediation, the state bears the cost of the mediation

process, including any meetings described in *34 C.F.R. § 300.506(d)* [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(e)*].

The procedures and rights regarding mediation must be included in the notice of parent rights attached to the pupil's assessment plan [*Educ. Code § 56500.3(k)*; *see Educ. Code § 56321*, discussed in *§ 513.33[4]*].

[e] Conduct of Due Process Hearing

The state-level due process hearing must be conducted, in accordance with regulations adopted by the State Board of Education, by a person knowledgeable in the laws governing special education and administrative hearings who has satisfactorily completed training [*Educ. Code § 56505(a), (c)*; *see Educ. Code § 56504.5*]. The hearing officer must encourage the parties to consider the option of mediation as an alternative to a hearing [*Educ. Code § 56505(c)*]. The hearing must be held at a time and place that is reasonably convenient to the parent and pupil [*Educ. Code § 56505(b)*].

Any party to the hearing must be afforded the following rights, consistent with state and federal statutes and regulations [*Educ. Code § 56505(e)*]:

- The right to be accompanied and advised by counsel and by individuals with special knowledge or training relating to the problems of individuals with exceptional needs;

- The right to present evidence, written arguments, and oral arguments;

- The right to confront, cross examine, and compel the attendance of witnesses;

- The right to a written or, at the option of the parents or guardians, electronic verbatim record of the hearing;

- The right to written or, at the option of the parents, electronic findings of fact and decisions [*see 20 U.S.C. §§ 1415(h)(4), 1417(c)*]. The record of the hearing and the findings of fact and decisions will be provided at no cost to parents or guardians in accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.512(c)(3)*;

- The right to be informed by the other parties to the hearing, at least 10 days before the hearing, as to what those parties believe are the issues to be decided at the hearing and their proposed resolution of those issues. On the request of a parent not represented by an attorney, the agency responsible for conducting hearings must provide a mediator to assist the parent in identifying the issues and the proposed resolution of the issues;

- The right to receive from other parties to the hearing, at least five business days before the hearing, a copy of all documents and a list of all witnesses the parties intend to present at the hearing, and the general area of their testimony; and all assessments completed by that date and recommendations based on the assessments that the parties intend to use at the hearing; and

- The right to prohibit the introduction of any evidence at the hearing that has not been disclosed to that party at least five business days before the hearing [*see 34 C.F.R. § 300.512(d)(3)*].

The findings of fact and decisions will be made available to the public after any personally identifiable information has been deleted consistent with the confidentiality requirements of *20 U.S.C. § 1417(c)* and will be transmitted to the Advisory Commission on Special Education pursuant to *20 U.S.C. § 1415(h)(4)* [*Educ. Code § 56505(e)(5)*].

During the pendency of the hearing proceedings, including the actual state-level hearing or judicial proceeding regarding a due process hearing, the pupil must remain in his or her present placement, except as provided in *34 C.F.R.*

§ 300.533, unless the public agency and the parent agree otherwise [*Educ. Code § 56505(d)*; *34 C.F.R. § 300.518(a)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(j), (k)(4)*]. A pupil applying for initial admission to a public school must, with the consent of his or her parent or guardian, be placed in the public school program until all proceedings have been completed [*Educ. Code § 56505(d)*]. If the decision of a hearing officer in a due process hearing or a state review official in an administrative appeal agrees with the pupil's parent or guardian that a change of placement is appropriate, that placement will be treated as an agreement between the state or local agency and the parent or guardian [*Educ. Code § 56505(d)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.518(d)*].

20 U.S.C. § 1415(j) creates a presumption in favor of the child's current educational placement that school officials can overcome only by showing that maintaining the child in the current placement is substantially likely to result in injury either to the child or to others [*see Honig v. Doe (1988) 484 U.S. 305, 328, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(3)*, similar to current *20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)*)]. However, a preliminary injunction to maintain the educational status quo of a disabled child need not always be automatically granted. The court will apply traditional preliminary injunction factors, including a showing of irreparable harm and a likelihood of success on the merits [*Johnson ex rel. Johnson v. Special Educ. Hearing Office (9th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 1176, 1180]* .

However, a parent's violation of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)* by placing the child in a private school without the consent of local school authorities during the pendency of the hearing proceedings does not waive the parents' right to reimbursement for expenses from the private placement. Nevertheless, the parents assume a risk in violating *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)*: If the court ultimately determines the proposed individualized educational program was appropriate, the parents are barred from reimbursement for any period during which their child's placement violates *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)* [*see School Committee of Burlington v. Department of Education (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 371-374, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(3)*)].

By contrast, if the court determines that the proposed individualized educational program is inappropriate, a parent is not barred from reimbursement, even though the parent violates *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)* by placing the child in a private school that does not meet the *20 U.S.C. § 1401(9)* definition of a "free appropriate public education." The requirements of *20 U.S.C. § 1401(9)* do not apply to parental placements [*see Florence County Sch. Dist. Four v. Carter by & Through Carter (1993) 510 U.S. 7, 12-13, 114 S. Ct. 361* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1401(a)(18)*, similar to current *20 U.S.C. § 1401(9)*)].

If either party intends to be represented by counsel at the hearing, notice of that intent must be given to the other party at least 10 days before the hearing. The failure to provide the notice is good cause for a continuance [*Educ. Code § 56507(a)*].

The hearing officer may do any of the following during the hearing [*Educ. Code § 56505.1*]:

- Question a witness on the record before any of the parties question the witness;

- With the consent of both parties, request that conflicting experts discuss an issue or issues with each other while on the record;

- Visit the proposed placement site or sites if the physical attributes of the site are at issue;

- Call a witness to testify at the hearing if all parties consent to the witness giving testimony or the hearing is continued for at least five days after the witness is identified and before the witness testifies;

- Order that an impartial assessment of the pupil be conducted for purposes of the hearing and continue the hearing until the assessment has been completed;

- Bar introduction of any documents or the testimony of any witnesses not disclosed to the hearing officer at least five business days before the hearing and bar introduction of any documents or the testimony of any witnesses at the hearing without the consent of the other party not disclosed to the parties at least five business days before the hearing pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56505(e)(7)*;

- In decisions relating to the provision of related services by other public agencies, call as witnesses independent medical specialists qualified to present evidence in the area of the pupil's medical disability; and

- Set a reasonable limit on the length of the hearing after consideration of all of the following:

  (1) The issues to be heard;

  (2) The complexity of the facts to be proven;

  (3) The ability of the parties and their representatives, if any, to present their respective cases; and

  (4) The estimate of the parties as to the time needed to present their respective cases.

The cost of any assessment or evidence obtained by an impartial assessment or through independent medical specialists must be included in the contract between the department and the organization or entity conducting the hearing [*Educ. Code § 56505.1*]. The burden of proof in an administrative due process hearing challenging an individualized education plan is on the party seeking relief. Thus, for example, the burden of persuasion was on the child, as represented by his parents, when the parents believed their child's IEP was inappropriate, and they requested an impartial due process hearing [*Schaffer v. Weast (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 126 S. Ct. 528, 533-537, 163 L. Ed. 2d 387]* .

The decision of a due process hearing officer must be made on substantive grounds based on a determination of whether the child received a free appropriate public education [*Educ. Code § 56505(f)(1)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(f)(3)(E)*]. In matters alleging a procedural violation, a due process hearing officer may find that a child did not receive a free appropriate public education only if the procedural violation did any of the following [*Educ. Code § 56505(f)(2)*]:

- Impeded the child's right to a free appropriate public education.

- Significantly impeded the parents' opportunity to participate in the decisionmaking process regarding the provision of a free appropriate public education to the parents' child.

- Caused a deprivation of educational benefits.

The hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56505* must be completed and a written, reasoned decision, including the reasons for any nonpublic, nonsectarian school placement, the provision of nonpublic, nonsectarian agency services, or the reimbursement for the placement or services, taking into account the requirements of *Educ. Code § 56365(a)*, must be mailed to all parties to the hearing within 45 days from the expiration of the 30-day period pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56501.5(c)* [*Educ. Code § 56505(f)(3)*]. Either party to the hearing may request the hearing officer to grant an extension. The extension must be granted on a showing of good cause. Any extension extends the time for rendering a final administrative decision for a period only equal to the length of the extension [*Educ. Code § 56505(f)(3)*]. *Educ. Code § 56505(f)* does not preclude a due process hearing officer from ordering a local educational agency to comply with procedural requirements under *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.* [*Educ. Code § 56505(f)(4)*].

Educ. Code § 56505(f) does not alter the burden of proof required in a due process hearing, or prevent a hearing officer

from ordering a compensatory remedy for an individual with exceptional needs [*Educ. Code § 56505(g)*]. The decision must indicate the extent to which each party prevailed on each issue heard and decided, including issues involving other public agencies named as parties to the hearing [*Educ. Code § 56507(d)*].

In a hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 56505*, the hearing officer may not base a decision solely on nonsubstantive procedural errors, unless the hearing officer finds that the nonsubstantive procedural errors resulted in the loss of an educational opportunity to the pupil or interfered with the opportunity of the pupil's parent or guardian to participate in the formulation process of the individualized education program [*Educ. Code § 56505(j)*].

In decisions relating to the placement of individuals with exceptional needs, the person conducting the state hearing must consider cost in addition to all other factors that are considered [*Educ. Code § 56505(i)*]. A hearing officer may not render a decision that results in the placement of an individual with exceptional needs in a nonpublic, nonsectarian school, or that results in a service for an individual with exceptional needs provided by a nonpublic, nonsectarian agency, if the school or agency has not been certified under *Educ. Code § 56366.1* [*Educ. Code § 56505.2(a)*]. The hearing officer must consider *Educ. Code §§ 56365*, *56366*, and *56366.1* during a due process hearing concerning an issue of placement of an individual with exceptional needs in a nonpublic, nonsectarian school, or services for an individual with exceptional needs provided by a nonpublic, nonsectarian agency [*Educ. Code § 56505.2(b)*].

The hearing conducted under *Educ. Code § 56505* is the final administrative determination and is binding on all parties [*Educ. Code § 56505(h)*]. However, the parties are not precluded from exercising the right to appeal the decision to a state court of competent jurisdiction. An appeal must be made within 90 days of receipt of the decision. During the pendency of any administrative or judicial proceeding conducted under *Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.*, unless the public education agency and the parents of the child agree otherwise, the child involved in the hearing must remain in his or her present educational placement [*Educ. Code § 56505(k)*; *see § 513.33[5][g]*]. An aggrieved party may also exercise the right to bring a civil action in a district court of the United States without regard to the amount in controversy [*Educ. Code § 56505(k)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.516*].

[f] Attorney's Fees

An award of reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing parent, guardian, or pupil may only be made either with the agreement of the parties following the conclusion of the administrative hearing process or by a court of competent jurisdiction under the IDEA [*Educ. Code § 56507(b)(1)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)*]. The "degree of success" standard articulated by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Hensley v. Eckerhart (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 103 S. Ct. 1933, 76 L. Ed. 2d 40* , for attorney's fees awards under *42 U.S.C. § 1988*, applies to attorney's fees awards under the IDEA. Thus, the "significant issue" test under IDEA is only the first step in a fee award analysis. Passing the significant issue test merely makes a plaintiff eligible for a fee award as a prevailing party; it does not mandate recovery of all fees. Partial success may result in a partial fee award [*Aguirre v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 461 F.3d 1114, 1117-1121* ; *see Ch. 113, Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes, § 113.17[2]*, for discussion of attorney's fees awards under *42 U.S.C. § 1988*].

The court, in its discretion, may award reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs to a prevailing party that is a state educational agency or local educational agency in the following circumstances [*Educ. Code § 56507(b)(2)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)*]:

- Against the attorney of a parent who files a due process hearing request or subsequent cause of action that is frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation, or against the attorney of a parent who continued to litigate after the litigation clearly became frivolous, unreasonable, or without foundation.

- Against the attorney of a parent, or against the parent, if the parent's due process hearing request or subsequent cause of action was presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, to cause

unnecessary delay, or to needlessly increase the cost of litigation.

The IDEA provides that in any action or proceeding brought under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* (*see § 513.40[16]*), the court in its discretion may award reasonable attorney fees as part of the costs to the parents of a child with a disability who is the prevailing party [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)* (as amended by Pub. L. 105-17, effective June 4, 1997)]. There is a split of authority at the federal district court of appeals level as to whether *20 U.S.C. § 1415* supports an independent civil action for fees by a party who has prevailed at the administrative level. The Ninth Circuit has aligned with the majority, which construes Section 1415 to support the independent action [*see Kletzelman v. Capistrano Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1996) 91 F.3d 68, 70* ; *McSomebodies v. Burlingame Elementary School Dist. (9th Cir. 1989) 897 F.2d 974* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(4)(B)*); *see also Lucht v. Molalla River School Dist. (9th Cir. 2000) 225 F.3d 1023* (district court has jurisdiction over case in which fees are sought although liability is established outside district court proceeding itself; prevailing at state's Complaint Resolution Procedure (CRP) entitles parents to attorney's fees)].

Parents and pupils may be the prevailing party for attorney's fees purposes under the IDEA even if the pupil is not denied a free and appropriate public education [*see Weissburg v. Lancaster School Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 591 F.3d 1255, 1258-1260* (administrative law judge's conclusion that school district misclassified pupil as mentally retarded rather than autistic qualified parents for attorney's fees under IDEA as prevailing party, even though pupil was not denied FAPE since he received instruction by qualified teacher, because change in disability classification legally entitled pupil to instruction by teachers qualified to teach students with both mental retardation and autism and before decision, school district refused to recognize his classification as autistic, and thus his legal right to such instruction)].

The Ninth Circuit has adopted a bright-line rule prohibiting attorney's fees for attorney-parents who provide legal services for their own child in proceedings brought under the IDEA [*Ford v. Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 461 F.3d 1087, 1090-1091]* . However, more distant relatives, such as grandparents, who are attorneys and litigate IDEA actions may be entitled to attorney's fees, so long as they are not the pupil's legal guardian or acting in place of the pupil's natural or adoptive parent [*Weissburg v. Lancaster School Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 591 F.3d 1255, 1260-1261* (parents were eligible for attorney's fees under IDEA because pupil's paternal grandmother, who was practicing attorney and not his legal guardian or acting in place of his natural or adoptive parent, represented him)].

However, the attorney's fees provision in IDEA does not authorize prevailing parents to recover fees for services rendered by experts in IDEA actions [*Arlington Central School Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Murphy (2006) 548 U.S. 291, 126 S. Ct. 2455, 165 L. Ed. 2d 526*].

[g] Judicial Review

[i] Proper Court

A party aggrieved by the findings and decision made pursuant to the state hearing procedure may bring a civil action to review the decision in any state court of competent jurisdiction or in a United States district court, without regard to the amount in controversy [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*]. The party seeking judicial relief must exhaust all state administrative remedies prior to bringing an action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)* [*see Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 1298, 1303* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2), now 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*)]. However, exhaustion is not required if it would be futile or would offer inadequate relief [*see Honig v. Doe (1988) 484 U.S. 305, 326-327, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2), now 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*)], or if the agency has adopted a policy or has pursued a practice of general applicability that is contrary to the law [*see Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 1298, 1303-1304* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2), now 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*)]. The party alleging futility or inadequacy of IDEA procedures bears the burden of proof [*see Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 1298, 1303* (construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2), now 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*)]. A disabled student seeking monetary damages only, which is a type of relief not available under the IDEA, is not required to exhaust administrative remedies before bringing an action

under, for example, *42 U.S.C. § 1983, 29 U.S.C. § 794* (Rehabilitation Act), or *42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.* (Americans with Disabilities Act) [*Witte by Witte v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1999) 197 F.3d 1271]* .

[ii] Time to Bring Action

The action must be brought within three years of accrual, measured from the time when the parent or other representative of the child knew, or had reason to know, of the facts underlying the cause of action. The statute of limitations is not tolled during the minority of the child. Thus, representatives of disabled children must promptly assert the children's educational rights [*Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1987) 817 F.2d 551, 555-556* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*].

However, Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 3* controls when an action that arises under federal law is "commenced" for purposes of tolling the statute of limitations borrowed from state law. Thus, federal procedural rules thereafter govern the action when there is a federal rule to apply. Since Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 4(m)* provides a time limit for service of process, a federal court borrowing a state's time period for filing suit brought under federal law should not also borrow the state's time limits for serving the complaint [*S.J. v. Issaquah Sch. Dist. No. 411 (9th Cir. 2006) 470 F.3d 1288, 1289, 1290-1293* (IDEA action was timely commenced for purposes of tolling borrowed statute of limitations when it was filed within 30 days and timely served under Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 4(m)*)].

[iii] Standard of Review

The standard of review in cases involving the IDEA is different from the standard normally employed by federal courts reviewing decisions of administrative agencies. The IDEA allows federal courts to receive evidence in addition to that put forth at the administrative hearing and to weigh the additional evidence equally [*see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)*]. Appellate courts give less deference normally to the Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ's) findings of fact. However, complete de novo review is inappropriate; the courts must defer to the states' specialized knowledge and experience by giving due weight to the decisions of the states' administrative bodies [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1126* ; *Amanda J. v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 877, 882 n.1*]. The due weight to be given is within the appellate court's discretion [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1126-1127* ; *Union Sch. Dist. v. B. Smith (9th Cir. 1994) 15 F.3d 1519, 1524]* . For example, factual determinations afforded due weight would include the ALJ's finding as to the following [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1127* ; Clyde K. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., No. 3 *(9th Cir. 1994) 35 F.3d 1396, 1401]* :

- The academic benefits a student would have received from a mainstream placement;
- The non-academic benefits a student would have received from a mainstream placement;
- The effects a student's presence would have had on mainstream teachers and students; and
- The cost of educating the student in a mainstream classroom.

The district court may review the ALJ's findings and make its own factual determinations, after granting the ALJ's findings due weight, on a preponderance of the evidence. The district court's factual findings, even when based on the written record of administrative proceedings, are reviewed for clear error [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1127* ; *Amanda J. v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 877, 887* ; *but see Ojai Unified Sch. Dist. v. Jackson (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 1467, 1473* (appellate court grants only due weight to factual findings of ALJ, even if district court relied on administrative proceedings for its own findings)].

The conclusion of both the ALJ and the district court as to whether a student's placement under the IDEA constitutes a

free appropriate public education is a legal conclusion reviewed de novo [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1127* ; *Amanda J. v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 877, 889 n.11* ; *Seattle Sch. Dist., No. 1, v. B.S. (9th Cir. 1996) 82 F.3d 1493, 1499* ; *Clyde K. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., No. 3 (9th Cir. 1994) 35 F.3d 1396, 1401]* .

[iv] Burden of Proof

At the administrative hearing, the school district has the burden of proving that it complied with the IDEA [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1127* ; *Clyde K. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., No. 3 (9th Cir. 1994) 35 F.3d 1396, 1398]* . In the district court and on appellate review, however, the burden of proof is on the party challenging the administrative ruling [*Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1127]* .

[v] Representation of Child

When parents and their child, dissatisfied with the outcome of the due process hearing, seek review in a United States District Court, the parents on their own behalf may proceed in court unrepresented by counsel even though they are not trained or licensed as attorneys. The IDEA accords to parents rights of their own that can be vindicated in court proceedings, which are not limited to certain procedural and reimbursement-related matters [*Winkelman v. Parma City Sch. Dist. (2007)550U.S.516, 127 S. Ct. 1994, 1999-2006, 167 L. Ed. 2d 904]* .

[vi] Standing

In order to have standing to bring an action in court under the IDEA, a party must be "aggrieved" [*see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*]. Parties are aggrieved under the IDEA only if they meet both of the following criteria [*Levina v. San Luis Coastal Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 514 F.3d 866, 868*]:

- They have suffered an injury in fact that is concrete and particularized and actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical.

- They are denied relief they affirmatively requested.

[h] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[i] In General

Before bringing suit for violation of the IDEA, a complainant must normally exhaust the due process hearing procedures required by *20 U.S.C. § 1415* [*see Porter v. Bd. of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unif. Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 1064, 1069* (parents exhausted California's due process procedure and received order in their favor)]. The exhaustion requirement is not, however, a rigid one. Parents need not exhaust the procedures in *20 U.S.C. § 1415* when resort to the administrative process would be either futile or inadequate [*Porter v. Bd. of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unif. Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 1064, 1069-1070]* . A parent also need not exhaust administrative remedies when suing for the parent's own emotional distress caused by a school district's failure to accommodate the child and implement the child's individual education plan, because the IDEA provides remedies including educational services for a child, not an adequate remedy for the parent [*see Blanchard v. Morton Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2005) 420 F.3d 918, 920-922]* . Further, the IDEA does not require exhaustion of a state's statutory complaint resolution procedure ("CRP") in addition to exhaustion of the due process hearing system before filing suit for violations of the IDEA [*Porter v. Bd. of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unif. Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 1064, 1071-1074]* .

On the other hand, in an action under the Americans with Disabilities Act [*42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*], Rehabilitation Act [*29 U.S.C. § 794*], and state anti-discrimination statutes, brought against county and local educational authorities

based on alleged discrimination against children who were part of a special education program, the students sufficiently exhausted administrative remedies under the IDEA by pursuing a complaint resolution procedure to completion [*Christopher S. v. Stanislaus County Office of Educ. (9th Cir. 2004) 384 F.3d 1205, 1209-1214]* . By contrast, an action by parents and a student under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* and *§ 504* of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 based on conflicts between the plaintiffs and the school district over the student's IEP was properly dismissed because the plaintiffs failed to exhaust administrative remedies [*Kutasi v. Las Virgenes Unified Sch. Dist. (2007) 494 F.3d 1162, 1167-1170]* .

[ii] Placement Pending Review

During the pendency of the proceeding, unless the state or district and the parents or guardian otherwise agree, the child must remain in his or her then-current educational placement [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)*]. For purposes of this "stay put" provision, the current educational placement is typically the placement described in the child's most recently implemented Individualized Education Program (IEP) [*Johnson ex rel. Johnson v. Special Educ. Hearing Office (9th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 1176, 1180]* . If applying for initial admission to a public school, the child must, with the consent of the parents or guardian, be placed in the public school program until the proceedings have been completed [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(j*); *see Clovis Unified v. Office of Administrative Hearings (9th Cir. 1990) 903 F.2d 635, 640-641* ("stay put" provisions apply, at district's expense, during review after parents have received favorable determination by hearing officer, even if subsequently reversed on review)].

[iii] Confidentiality of Information

The confidentiality of personally identifiable information about individuals with exceptional needs is governed and protected in accordance with *20 U.S.C. §§ 1412(a)(8), 1417(c)*, and *34* C.F.R. § 300.1 et seq., including *34 C.F.R. § 300.611 et seq.*, including the following [*Educ. Code § 56515(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 49060*]:

- Notice to parents.
- Access rights and records of access.
- Records on more than one child.
- Lists of types and locations of information.
- Parental consent regarding the disclosure of personally identifiable information.
- Fees.
- Amendment of records at parent's request.
- Opportunity for a hearing.
- Result of hearing.
- Hearing procedures.
- Consent.
- Destruction of information.
- Children's privacy rights.

- Enforcement.

- Disciplinary information about an individual with exceptional needs.

"Personally identifiable," as used in this context, includes all of the following information [*Educ. Code § 56515(b)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 300.500(b)(3)*]:

- The name of the child, the child's parent, or other family member.

- The child's address.

- A personal identifier, including, but not limited to, the child's social security number, a pupil number, a list of personal characteristics, or other information that would make it possible to identify the child with reasonable certainty.

In accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.622*, parental consent must be obtained before personally identifiable information is disclosed to the parties, other than officials of participating agencies [*see 34 C.F.R. § 300.622(b)(1)*], unless the information is contained in education records, and the disclosure is authorized without parental consent [*Educ. Code § 56515(c)(1)*; *see 34 C.F.R. § 99.1 et seq.*]. Parental consent is not required before personally identifiable information is released to officials of participating agencies for purposes of meeting a requirement *Educ. Code § 56000 et seq.* or 34 C.F.R. § 300.1 et seq. [*Educ. Code § 56515(c)(1)*]. However, parental consent, or the consent of an eligible child who has reached the age of 18 years, must be obtained before personally identifiable information is released to officials of participating agencies providing or paying for transition services in accordance with *34 C.F.R. § 300.321(b)(3)* [*Educ. Code § 56515(c)(2)*]. If a child is enrolled, or is going to enroll in a private school not located in the local educational agency of the residence of the parent, parental consent must be obtained before any personally identifiable information about the child is released between officials in the local educational agency where the private school is located and officials in the local educational agency of the residence of the parent [*Educ. Code § 56515(c)(3)*].

[iv] Scope of Review

In an action brought under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*, the court must receive the records of the administrative proceedings, hear additional evidence at the request of a party, and make an independent decision based on the preponderance of the evidence [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)*]. A court's inquiry in suits brought under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* is twofold:

- Whether the state has complied with the procedures set forth in IDEA; and

- Whether the individualized educational program developed through IDEA procedures is reasonably calculated to enable the child to receive educational benefits.

If these requirements are met, the state has complied with the obligations imposed by Congress. The courts cannot require more [*Board of Education v. Rowley (1982) 458 U.S. 176, 206-207, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 73 L. Ed. 2d 690* (refusing to find that courts have only limited authority to review for state compliance with IDEA, while cautioning courts to avoid imposing their view of preferable educational methods on states; construing former *20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*); *but see In re John K. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 783, 216 Cal. Rptr. 557* (*Rowley* two-step inquiry not entirely appropriate when question is one of fiscal responsibility for student's residential placement, and there is no dispute as to whether trial court substituted its own notions of sound educational policy for those of school authorities)].

The Ninth Circuit has interpreted the "independent decision based on the preponderance of the evidence" language in *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)* as calling for de novo review [*County of San Diego v. California Special Educ. Hearing Office*

(9th Cir. 1996) 93 F.3d 1458, 1466 (court reviews de novo appropriateness of administrative decisions regarding special education placement under *IDEA); Union School Dist. v. Smith (9th Cir. 1994) 15 F.3d 1519, 1524 , cert. denied, 513 U.S. 965]* . However, both reviewing courts and district courts must give deference to the state hearing officer's findings, particularly when those findings are thorough and careful. Courts also must give due weight to judgments of education policy when reviewing state hearings. Courts should not substitute their own notions of sound educational policy for those of the school authorities they review [*Union School Dist. v. Smith (9th Cir. 1994) 15 F.3d 1519, 1524 , cert. denied, 513 U.S. 965* ; *Seattle School Dist., No. 1 v. B.S. (9th Cir. 1996) 82 F.3d 1493, 1499]* .

[v] Relief Available

Once a court holds that a public placement violated the IDEA, the court may grant the relief the court determines appropriate [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)(iii)*]. The court has broad discretion in fashioning relief that is appropriate in light of the purposes of the IDEA. Appropriate relief is not limited in form. Thus, for example, the IDEA allows reimbursement to parents for their expenditures on private special education for a child if the court determines that private placement, rather than a proposed individualized educational program, is proper under the IDEA [*School Committee of Burlington v. Department of Education (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 369-371, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385* (reimbursement is not the same as damages)].

Equitable considerations are also relevant in fashioning relief. Courts fashioning discretionary equitable relief under the IDEA must consider all relevant factors, including the appropriate and reasonable level of reimbursement that should be required. Total reimbursement is inappropriate if the court determines the cost of the private education was unreasonable [*Florence County School Dist. Four v. Carter By and Through Carter (1993) 510 U.S. 7, 15-16, 114 S. Ct. 361, 126 L. Ed. 2d 284]* .

However, money damages are not available under the IDEA for the pain and suffering of a disabled child [*Witte ex rel. Witte v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1999) 197 F.3d 1271, 1275*]. Further, *42 U.S.C. § 1983* does not create a cause of action for money damages under the IDEA for the lost earnings and suffering of a parent pursuing IDEA relief [*Blanchard v. Morton Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 504 F.3d 771, 773-774*].

A state is not immune under *U.S. Const., amend. XI* from suit in federal court for violations of the IDEA that occur in whole or part after October 30, 1990 [*20 U.S.C. § 1403(a), (c)*; *Porter v. Bd. of Trustees of Manhattan Beach Unif. Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 1064, 1074]* . In a suit against a state for a violation of the IDEA, remedies, including remedies both at law and in equity, are available to the same extent as those remedies are available for the same violations in a suit against a public entity other than a state [*20 U.S.C. § 1403(b)*]. Thus, pursuant to *20 U.S.C. § 1403*, Congress has unequivocally expressed its intent to abrogate state immunity from suit under the IDEA for violations that occur in whole or part after October 30, 1990 [*see Hayes v. Commission on State Mandates (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1588 n.13, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547* (Congress' intent to enforce *Fourteenth Amendment* in enacting IDEA has been made clear); *compare Dellmuth v. Muth (1989) 491 U.S. 223, 232, 109 S. Ct. 2397, 105 L. Ed. 2d 181* (former *20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.* failed to evince unmistakably clear intention to abrogate states' *Eleventh Amendment* immunity from suit)].

In an action or proceeding brought under the IDEA, the court, in its discretion, may award reasonable attorneys' fees as part of the costs to the parents of a child with a disability who is the prevailing party [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)*; *see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(D)(ii)* (award of attorneys' fees relating to meeting of IEP Team)]. Fees awarded under the attorney fees provisions of the IDEA must be based on rates prevailing in the community in which the action or proceeding arose for the kind and quality of services furnished. Courts may not use a bonus or multiplier in calculating the fees awarded under the IDEA [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(C)*].

Congress intended *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)* to be interpreted consistent with fee provisions under *42 U.S.C. § 1988* and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [*Abu-Sahyun v. Palo Alto Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1988) 843 F.2d*

1250, 1251 , citing S. Rep. No. 99-112, 99th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1986 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 1798, 1803-1805; for detailed discussion of fee provisions in *42 U.S.C. § 1988* and Title VII, including numerous "Practice Tips," *see Ch. 113, Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes, § 113.17*, and Wilcox, *California Employment Law, Ch. 43, Civil Actions Under Equal Employment Opportunity Laws, § 43.10[9][f]*, respectively]. As a result, courts have held that a district court's discretion to deny a request for attorneys' fees under the IDEA is narrow [*Kletzelman v. Capistrano Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1996) 91 F.3d 68, 70* ; *Abu-Sahyun v. Palo Alto Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1988) 843 F.2d 1250, 1252]* .

For the purpose of awarding attorneys' fees, a prevailing party is one that succeeds on any significant issue in litigation that achieves some of the benefit the parties sought in bringing suit [*Hensley v. Eckerhart (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 433, 103 S. Ct. 1933, 76 L. Ed. 2d 40* ; *Kletzelman v. Capistrano Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1996) 91 F.3d 68, 70]* . At a minimum, to be considered a prevailing party, the plaintiff must be able to point to a resolution of the dispute that changes the legal relationship between itself and the defendant [*Texas Teachers v. Garland School Dist. (1989) 489 U.S. 782, 792, 109 S. Ct. 1486, 103 L. Ed. 2d 866]* . If the plaintiff's success on a legal claim can be characterized as purely technical or de minimis, the plaintiff may not recover fees as a prevailing party. There must be a causal link between the litigation brought and the outcome gained [*Texas Teachers v. Garland School Dist. (1989) 489 U.S. 782, 792, 109 S. Ct. 1486, 103 L. Ed. 2d 866* ; *Kletzelman v. Capistrano Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1996) 91 F.3d 68, 71]* .

However, the court must reduce the amount of attorneys' fees awarded under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* if the court finds any of the following [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(F)*]:

- The parent or the parent's attorney, during the course of the action or proceeding, unreasonably protracted the final resolution of the controversy.

- The amount of the attorneys' fees otherwise authorized to be awarded unreasonably exceeds the hourly rate prevailing in the community for similar services by attorneys of reasonably comparable skill, reputation, and experience.

- The time spent and legal services furnished were excessive considering the nature of the action or proceeding.

- The attorney representing the parent did not provide the appropriate information to the school district in the due process complaint in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(7)*.

The attorney fee reduction provisions of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(F)* do not apply in an action or proceeding in which the court finds that the state or local educational agency unreasonably protracted the final resolution of the action or proceeding, or that there was a violation of *20 U.S.C. § 1415* [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(G)*].

In addition, the court may not award attorneys' fees or order related costs reimbursed in an action or proceeding under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* for services performed after the time of a written offer of settlement to a parent if all of the following are true [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(D)(i)*]:

- The offer is made within the time prescribed by *Fed. R. Civ. P. 68* or, in the case of an administrative proceeding, at any time more than 10 days before the proceeding begins;

- The offer is not accepted within 10 days; and

- The court or administrative hearing officer finds that the relief finally obtained by the parents is not more favorable to the parents than the offer of settlement.

However, despite the provisions of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(D)*, an award of attorneys' fees and related costs may be made to a parent who is the prevailing party and who was substantially justified in rejecting the settlement offer [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(E)*].

For a form of complaint for use in an action for an injunction, declaratory relief, and damages under *20 U.S.C. § 1415*, see *§ 513.90*.

[vi] Education in English

Educ. Code § 300 et seq. requires children in California's public schools who are of "Limited English Proficiency" (LEP) to be taught only in English. This requirement is subject to the right of the parents of each affected child to seek a waiver from the requirement of English-only instruction [*Educ. Code § 310 et seq.*]. *Educ. Code § 300 et seq.* on their face do not violate the federal *equal protection clause* (*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*) [*Valeria G. v. Davis (9th Cir. 2002) 307 F.3d 1036, 1039-1042* (Proposition 227 did not unconstitutionally restructure political process by placing decision-making over bilingual education, and only bilingual education, at state-wide level)]. *Educ. Code § 320*, which allows parents to sue and hold personally liable a teacher, administrator, or official who willfully and repeatedly refuses to implement the English-only requirement is sufficiently clear so as not to violate the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments* by being void for vagueness [*California Teachers Ass'n v. State Board of Education (9th Cir. 2001) 263 F.3d 888]* .

Local school districts may not apply under *Educ. Code § 33050* to the State Board of Education for waivers from program requirements of the Education Code not enumerated in § 33050. *Educ. Code § 300 et seq.* guarantee that LEP students receive educational instruction in the English language, and English immersion programs are provided to facilitate their transition into English-only classes, and vests parents of LEP students with the sole right to seek a waiver from the Chapter's provision requiring English-only instruction for their own children [*MacLaughlin v. State Board of Educ. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 196, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 295]* .

The English Learner and Immigrant Pupil Federal Conformity Act [*Educ. Code § 430 et seq.*] was enacted by the California Legislature to ensure that instructional services are provided to pupils with limited English proficiency in conformity with federal requirements designed to ensure that all pupils have reasonable access to educational opportunities that are necessary for the pupils to achieve at high levels in English and in the other core curriculum areas of instruction. The Act is declaratory of Title III of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 [*20 U.S.C. § 6801 et seq.*] and is intended to assist local education agencies in understanding the requirements and funding formulas to provide allowable services. The requirements of *Educ. Code § 430 et seq.* apply only to local educational agencies receiving federal funds under Title III of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 [*Educ. Code § 430*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActAssessment & IdentificationEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActCoverageEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActEnforcementEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActIndividualized Educational ProgramsDevelopmentEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActProcedural SafeguardsEducation LawStudentsBilingual Students

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.34

§ 513.34 Freedom of Expression

[1] In General

Public school students, like other persons, have constitutional rights to freedom of speech and expression [*U.S. Const., amend. I*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*] that they do not shed at the schoolhouse gate [*Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 506, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731]* . However, the constitutional rights of students in public schools are not automatically coextensive with the rights of adults in other settings [Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 682, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549]* . To justify restriction of a particular expression of opinion, school officials must show that the forbidden conduct would materially and substantially interfere with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school. In determining whether regulation of speech violates students' *First Amendment* rights, courts look at the totality of the relevant facts, that is, at the students' actions as well as the circumstances confronting the school officials that might reasonably portend disruption [*LaVine v. Blaine School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 981, 989* (applicable to regulation of speech that falls into the third category of student speech, that governed by *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731*); *see below*]. However, the court should not use the public concern standard from the government employment context for determining whether the *First Amendment* protects student speech. The proper standard is that articulated in *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School District* [*Pinard v. Clatskanie Sch. Dist. 6J (9th Cir. 2006) 467 F.3d 755, 765-768*].

Schools must achieve a balance between protecting the safety and well-being of students and respecting the students' constitutional rights [*LaVine v. Blaine School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 981, 987* (schools cannot expel students just because they are "loners," wear black, and play video games)]. A school need not tolerate student speech that is inconsistent with its basic educational mission [*LaVine v. Blaine School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 981, 988]* . On the other hand, a desire merely to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that accompany expression of an unpopular viewpoint is not sufficient to justify a prohibition of speech [*Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 509, 512-513, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731]* .

There are three distinct areas of student speech, each of which is governed by a different United States Supreme Court

precedent [*LaVine v. Blaine School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 981, 988-989* ; *Chandler v. McMinnville School Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 524, 529]* :

- Vulgar, lewd, obscene, and plainly offensive speech, governed by Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549* .

- School-sponsored speech, governed by *Hazelwood School Dist. v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592* .

- Speech falling into neither of these categories, governed by *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731* .

Schools may take steps to safeguard those entrusted to their care from speech that can reasonably be regarded as encouraging illegal drug use [*Frederick v. Morse (2007)551U.S.393127 S. Ct. 2618, 2625-2629, 168 L. Ed. 2d 290]* . Public schools may restrict student speech that intrudes on the rights of other students or collides with the rights of other students to be secure and to be let alone. Vulgar, lewd, obscene, indecent, and plainly offensive speech by definition, may well impinge on the rights of other students, even if the speaker does not directly accost individual students with his or her remarks [*Harper v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 445 F.3d 1166, 1177-1178* (upholding prohibition of wearing t-shirt condemning and denigrating other students on basis of their sexual orientation), quoting *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 508, 509, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731* ; *Chandler v. McMinnville School Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 524, 529]* . Other speech capable of causing psychological injury may also be restricted [*Harper v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 445 F.3d 1166, 1178]* .

The protection of the right of free speech and press provided by *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*, has been construed as more definitive and inclusive that the *U.S. Const., amend I* [*Wilson v. Superior Court (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 652, 658, 119 Cal. Rptr. 468, 532 P.2d 116]* . Also, in California, the scope of a student's rights to free expression in the school setting are fixed by statute in certain areas [*see Educ. Code §§ 48907, 48950*]. In some instances, the statutory scope of students' rights is more expansive than the constitutional scope. The comparative scope of constitutional and statutory protection is discussed in *§ 513.34[3]*. For a form of complaint for use in an action to enjoin school officials from interfering with a student's right to freedom of expression under federal and state constitutional and statutory standards, see *§ 513.91*.

By statute in California, school districts may not make or enforce any rule subjecting any high school pupil to disciplinary sanctions solely on the basis of conduct that is speech or other communication that, if engaged in off campus, is protected from government restriction by the *First Amendment* or by *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2* [*Educ. Code § 48950(a)*].

[2] Oral Speech

Students in public schools cannot be punished merely for expressing their personal views on the school premises unless school authorities have reason to believe that the expression will substantially interfere with the work of the school or impinge on the rights of other students [*Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 266, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592* ; *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 509, 512-513, 89 S.Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731]* . However, an appropriate function of public school education is to prohibit the use of vulgar and offensive terms in public discourse. Offensive forms of expression may be prohibited even in the making of what the speaker considers to be a political point. Therefore, the determination of what manner of speech in the classroom or in a school assembly is inappropriate properly rests with school authorities [Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 682-683, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549* (involving obscene language at school assembly)].

The parameters of what is offensive within this rule are not settled. The Supreme Court's opinion stressed the right of

the schools to protect children from exposure to sexually explicit, indecent, or lewd speech [*see* Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 684, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549]* . It also reaffirmed the need to tolerate divergent political and religious views, even if the views expressed may be unpopular. However, the Court also stated that the sensibilities of other students must be taken into account. The undoubted freedom to advocate unpopular and controversial views in schools must be balanced against the society's countervailing interest in teaching students the boundaries of socially appropriate behavior [*see* Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 681, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549]* .

The scope of protection of oral speech under the California Constitution has also not been directly addressed [*see Leeb v. DeLong (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 47, 54-55, 243 Cal. Rptr. 494* , discussed in *§ 513.34[5*] (noting that student publications are entitled to greater protection under California Constitution than under *U.S. Const., amend. I*)]. By statute, public school students are generally afforded the right to exercise freedom of speech, subject to reasonable time, place, and manner regulation [*see Educ. Code §§ 48907, 48950*]. However, expression that is libelous, slanderous or obscene is prohibited. "Material" that so incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of unlawful acts on school premises or the violation of lawful school regulations or a substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the school is also prohibited [*Educ. Code § 48907(a)*]. Each governing board of a school district and each county board of education may adopt rules and regulations in the form of a written publications code, which must include reasonable provisions for the time, place, and manner of conducting such activities within its respective jurisdiction [*Educ. Code § 48907(b)*].

A pupil who is enrolled in a school at the time that the school has made or enforced a rule in violation of students' statutory right to freedom of expression [*see Educ. Code § 48950(a)*, discussed in [1], *above*] may commence a civil action to obtain appropriate injunctive and declaratory relief. Attorney's fees may also be awarded if the plaintiff prevails [*Educ. Code § 48950(b)*].

[3] Use of School Facilities

[a] In General

Public schools do not possess all of the attributes of streets, parks, and other traditional public forums that have been used for purposes of assembly, communicating thoughts, and discussing public questions. Therefore, school facilities may be deemed to be public forums only if school authorities have, by policy or practice, opened those facilities for indiscriminate use by the general public or by some segment of the public such as student organizations. If the facilities instead have been reserved for other intended purposes, communicative or otherwise, no public forum has been created, and school officials may impose reasonable restrictions on the speech of students, teachers, and other members of the school community. The government does not create a public forum by inaction or by permitting limited discourse, but only by intentionally opening a nontraditional forum for public discourse [*Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 267, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592]* .

With regard to access by the public, for purposes of the *First Amendment*, a school district may restrict school property in its use to educational activities. Thus, for example, the district may exclude filming of movies by motion picture studios *[80 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 155, 159 (1997)]* . Even if the district has previously allowed rental of school facilities to motion picture studios solely for the purpose of enhancing revenues, thus not acting with the purpose of providing a public forum for expressive activity, the district may deny permission to film certain movies based solely on content so long as the district's actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns *[80 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 155, 169 (1997)]* . In addition, a school's administration may constitutionally limit access to outsiders, regardless of their message or purpose, to prevent disruption [*see Reeves v. Rocklin Unified School Dist. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 652, 660-666, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213* (high school administration could deny access to school by members of group wishing to distribute anti-abortion, pro-abstinence literature to students before classes)].

[b] Equal Access Act

It is unlawful for any public secondary school that receives federal financial assistance and that has a limited open forum to deny equal access or a fair opportunity to, or to discriminate against, any students who wish to conduct a meeting within that limited open forum on the basis of the religious, political, philosophical, or other content of the speech at such meetings [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(a)* (Equal Access Act)]. A school has a limited open forum if it grants an offering to or opportunity for one or more non-curriculum-related student groups to meet on school premises during noninstructional time [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(b)*]. The meaning of "limited open forum" under the Act is not the same as the doctrine of "limited public forum," which is a judicially created concept used in the constitutional analysis of free speech cases [*Westside Community Schools v. Mergens (1990) 496 U.S. 226, 242-243, 110 S. Ct. 2356, 110 L. Ed. 2d 191]* .

The Act sets forth certain "triggers" for its applicability. It applies only if the school in question satisfies each of the following [*Prince v. Jacoby (9th Cir. 2002) 303 F.3d 1074, 1079]* :

- The school is a public secondary school;
- The school receives federal funding; and
- The school has established a "limited open forum" by allowing other "noncurriculum" groups to meet on school premises.

Once it is established that a secondary school receives federal funds and has created a limited open forum, a student organization denied access must demonstrate a denial of equal access, or fair opportunity, or discrimination based on the content of the speech at its meetings to prevail [*Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1009-1012* (no violation where religious club denied access because of discriminatory membership criteria rather than content of speech at meetings)].

A "noncurriculum related" group is one that does not directly relate to the body of courses offered by the school. A student group directly relates to the school's curriculum if the subject matter of the group is actually taught or will soon be taught in a regularly offered course; if the subject matter of the group concerns the body of courses as a whole; if participation in the group is required for a particular course; or if participation in the group results in academic credit [*Westside Community Schools v. Mergens (1990) 496 U.S. 226, 239-240, 110 S. Ct. 2356, 110 L. Ed. 2d 191]* .

Schools are deemed to offer a fair opportunity to students who wish to conduct a meeting within a limited open forum if the school uniformly provides all of the following [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(c)*]:

- The meeting is voluntary and student initiated.
- There is no sponsorship of the meeting by the school, the government, or its agents or employees.
- Employees or agents of the school or government are present at religious meetings only in a nonparticipatory capacity.
- The meeting does not materially and substantially interfere with the orderly conduct of educational activities within the school.
- Nonschool persons may not direct, conduct, control, or regularly attend activities of the student groups.

For further discussion of the use of school facilities for religious purposes, see *§ 513.35*.

[4] Dress and Appearance

If there is empirical evidence that an aspect of a student's dress or appearance has a disruptive effect within a school, a governing body may prohibit it. However, any dress code or policy must not be so vague and standardless that it leaves uncertainty as to the conduct it prohibits or lacks legally fixed standards as to what is prohibited and what is not [*Myers v. Arcata etc. School Dist. (1969) 269 Cal App. 2d 549, 558-560, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . Under this standard, a policy prohibiting students from having beards has been upheld [*see Akin v. Board of Education (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 161, 169]* , but a policy prohibiting "extreme" hairstyles has been rejected for vagueness [*see Myers v. Arcata etc. School Dist. (1969) 269 Cal App. 2d 549, 559-561, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68]* .

The wearing of buttons, badges, and other insignia is expressly protected by statute in California [*Educ. Code § 48907(a*); *see Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 506-513, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731* (*U.S. Const., amend. I*, protects student's right to wear armband as political statement)]. This statutory right appears to be subject to the qualification that the item not be obscene or libelous [*see Educ. Code § 48907(a*); *compare* Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 682, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549* (dicta suggesting that students do not have constitutional right to wear clothing bearing obscenity), *with Cohen v. California (1971) 403 U.S. 15, 22-26, 91 S. Ct. 1780, 29 L. Ed. 2d 284* (adult may not be prohibited from wearing clothing bearing obscenity)]. The right may also be subject to the limitation that "material" that so incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of unlawful acts on school premises or the violation of lawful school regulations or the substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the school is prohibited [*see Educ. Code § 48907(a)*]. It is not clear whether buttons, badges, and other insignia may be such "material."

The governing board of a school district may adopt or rescind a reasonable dress code policy requiring pupils to wear a schoolwide uniform or prohibiting pupils from wearing "gang-related apparel" if the governing board of the school district approves a plan that may be initiated by an individual school's principal, staff, and parents and determines that the policy is necessary for the health and safety of the school environment. Individual schools may include the policy as part of its school safety plan under *Educ. Code § 32281* [*Educ. Code § 35183(b)*]. A dress code policy requiring pupils to wear a uniform cannot be implemented with less than six months' notice to parents and the availability of resources to assist economically disadvantaged pupils [*Educ. Code § 35183(d)*]. The governing board must also provide a method whereby parents can choose not to have their children comply with a school uniform policy [*Educ. Code § 35183(e)*]. Any adopted policy must include a provision that no pupil will be penalized academically or otherwise discriminated against or denied attendance if the pupil's parents choose not to have the pupil comply with the school uniform policy [*Educ. Code § 35183(f)*]. Any policy may not preclude pupils participating in a nationally recognized youth organization from wearing organization uniforms on days the organization has a scheduled meeting [*Educ. Code § 35183(g)*]. School sites must allow articles of sun-protective clothing for outdoor use during the school day, including, but not limited to, hats. Each schoolsite may set a policy related to the type of sun-protective clothing pupils will be allowed to use outdoors, and specific clothing and hats determined by the district or schoolsite to be gang-related or inappropriate apparel may be prohibited by the dress code policy [*Educ. Code § 35183.5(a)*]. Each schoolsite must allow pupils the use of sunscreen during the school day without a physician's note or prescription and may set a policy related to the use of sunscreen by pupils during the school day [*Educ. Code § 35183.5(b)*].

A mandatory dress policy, sometimes referred to as a school uniform policy, adopted by a public school in an effort to focus student attention and reduce conflict can survive constitutional scrutiny. For example, a policy prohibiting students from displaying any printed messages on their clothing save for the school logo may not necessarily unconstitutionally restrict students' rights to engage in pure speech while in school, unconstitutionally restrict students' rights to engage in expressive conduct, or require students to unconstitutionally engage in compelled speech, so long as the policies are viewpoint- and content-neutral. Unless they restrict speech on the basis of content, school uniform policies will implicate the *First Amendment* only insofar as they place content-neutral restrictions on students' pure

speech and place incidental restrictions on students' expressive conduct, and the appropriate level of scrutiny is thus intermediate scrutiny. Thus, if a school district's school uniform policies advance important government interests unrelated to the suppression of free speech in ways that effect as minimal a restriction on students' free expression as possible, the policies should be upheld [*Jacobs v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2008) 526 F.3d 419, 427-435*].

[5] Official Student Publications and Activities

Under *U.S. Const., amend. I*, there is a fundamental difference between the toleration and the affirmative promotion of student expression [*Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 270-271, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592]* . The latter question concerns educators' authority over school-sponsored publications and other expressive activities that may reasonably be perceived as bearing the imprimatur of the school. Educators are entitled to exercise greater control over this second form of student expression. They are entitled to exercise editorial control over the style and content of school-sponsored expressive activities as long as their actions are reasonably related to legitimate pedagogical concerns [*Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 273, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592]* .

Under California statute, students are entitled to freedom of the press, including, subject to certain limitations, the right of freedom of expression in official publications, whether or not the publications are supported financially by the school [*Educ. Code § 48907(a)*]. Official school publications are material produced by students in journalism, newspaper, yearbook, or writing classes and distributed to the student body, either free or for a fee [*Educ. Code § 48907(e)*].

Student expression in official publications that is obscene or libelous is prohibited. Material that so incites students as to create a clear and present danger of the commission of unlawful acts on school premises, the violation of lawful school regulations, or the substantial disruption of the orderly operation of the school is also prohibited [*Educ. Code § 48907(e)*; *see Smith v. Novato Unif. School Dist. (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 1439, 1454-1459, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 508* (controversial student editorial on immigration was protected speech under *Educ. Code § 48907* because student author did not intend to cause disruption of school)].

Student editors of official school publications are responsible for assigning and editing the news, editorial, and feature content of their publications, subject to these limitations. However, it is the responsibility of a faculty adviser within a school to supervise the production of the student staff, to maintain professional standards of English and journalism, and to enforce the statutory limitations on student expression [*Educ. Code § 48907(c)*]. There may be no prior restraint of material prepared for official school publications other than material that violates the statutory standards. School officials have the burden of showing justification without undue delay prior to any limitation of student expression [*Educ. Code § 48907(d)*].

The right of a school district to control the content of school-sponsored publications is more limited under the California statute than under *U.S. Const., amend. I*. Under *U.S. Const., amend. I*, the district need show only a "legitimate pedagogical concern" [*see Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier (1988) 484 U.S. 260, 273, 108 S. Ct. 562, 98 L. Ed. 2d 592]* . Under California law, editorial control is vested in student editors alone, subject to prohibitions on material that falls into one of the narrowly drawn statutory categories [*Leeb v. DeLong (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 47, 54, 243 Cal. Rptr. 494* ; *see Educ. Code § 48907(e)*].

The limitations in the California statute have been held to meet the standards of the free-press rights set forth in *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2*, at least to the extent that they are designed to protect a school district from potential tort liability. However, the terms "libelous" and "slanderous" in the statute must be narrowly construed to take applicable privileges and rules concerning public figures into account. Any decision to impose prior restraint for potential defamation must, at a minimum, be based on a good faith and objectively rational determination of the probable effect of the challenged material, that is, that it contains a false statement (or one that cannot be proved to be true) that is likely to harm the reputation of another or to hold that person up to shame, ridicule, or humiliation. It is not enough that a lawsuit is

threatened, because freedom of the press may not hinge on the subjective pique of an offended prospective plaintiff. There must be a clear chance of prevailing in a tort action against the school district [*Leeb v. DeLong (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 47, 60-62, 243 Cal. Rptr. 494]* .

[6] Underground Publications

The United States Supreme Court has not directly addressed the scope of *First Amendment* protection for non-school-sponsored or "underground" publications disseminated on public school premises [*cf.* *Papish v. University of Missouri (1973) 410 U.S. 667, 93 S. Ct. 1197, 35 L. Ed. 2d 618* (finding *First Amendment* protection for contents of underground newspaper disseminated on university campus)]. However, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has held that student distribution of non-school-sponsored material cannot be subjected to regulation on the basis of undifferentiated fears of possible disturbances or embarrassment to school officials. The court struck down a policy of requiring prior submission for approval of such material as overbroad and in violation of *First Amendment* rights. The holding was limited to attempts to control content and does not prohibit reasonable time, place, and manner regulation of distribution [*Burch v. Barker (9th Cir. 1988) 861 F.2d 1149, 1159]* .

The California Supreme Court construed a substantially similar former state statute as not permitting any form of prior restraint over non-school-sponsored publications [*Bright v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 450, 465-466, 134 Cal. Rptr. 639, 556 P.2d 1090* ; *see* former *Educ. Code § 48916*]. In dicta in a footnote, one California appellate court stated that a school district may not ban privately produced student publications under *Educ. Code § 48907* [*Leeb v. DeLong (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 47, 57 n.6, 243 Cal. Rptr. 494]* .

Educ. Code § 48907 protects the right of students to distribute printed materials or petitions, but this right could be construed as subject to the same limitations as apply to official school publications. One court has held that the distribution on school property of materials advertising the existence and meeting time of a religious study group is in violation of constitutional provisions prohibiting the establishment of religion [*Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 68-75, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545* ; *see U.S. Const., amend. I*; *Cal. Const., art. I, §§ 4, 24, art. XVI, § 5*; *see also § 513.35*].

[7] School Library and Instructional Materials

The United States Supreme Court has yet to reach a majority opinion as to the scope of *First Amendment* protection for materials in a school library. In 1982, four justices essentially took the position that the selection of materials for a school library was a matter to be left wholly to the discretion of school officials and was not subject to federal judicial review [*Board of Education v. Pico (1982) 457 U.S. 853, 885-897, 102 S. Ct. 2799, 73 L. Ed. 2d 435* (opinions of Burger, ch. J., Powell, J., Rehnquist, J., and O'Connor, J.)]. Five justices accepted the right of the federal judiciary to review the acts of school officials in removing library books for *First Amendment* violations, but were unable to agree on the applicable standards that courts should employ in review [*Board of Education v. Pico (1982) 457 U.S. 853, 855-884, 102 S. Ct. 2799, 73 L. Ed. 2d 435* (opinions of Brennan, J., joined by Marshall, J., Stevens, J., and in part by Blackman, J.; Blackman, J.; and White, J.)]. At least four justices were of the opinion that local school boards have a substantial legitimate role to play in the determination of school library content, but may not remove books simply because they dislike the ideas contained in the books. These justices were of the opinion that school boards could remove vulgar books and books that were "educationally unsuitable." They also rejected any *First Amendment* protection for the decision as to what books to place in the library in the first instance, as opposed to the removal of books already in the library [*Board of Education v. Pico (1982) 457 U.S. 853, 872-875, 102 S. Ct. 2799, 73 L. Ed. 2d 435* (opinion of Brennan, J., joined by Marshall, J., Stevens, J., and Blackman, J.)]. The fifth justice stated only that the case should be remanded for trial on the issue of the reason for the board's removal of the books and refused to express an opinion as to the scope of *First Amendment* protection [*Board of Education v. Pico (1982) 457 U.S. 853, 883-884, 102 S. Ct. 2799, 73 L. Ed. 2d 435* (opinion of White, J.)].

The Ninth Circuit has held that courts may not ban books or other literary works from school curricula on the basis of their content, even when the works are accused of being racist in whole or in part [*Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022, 1028-1032* (excluding from holding and analysis educational material subject to prohibitions of religion clauses of *U.S. Const., Amend. I*)]. Ruling on whether a parent's complaint seeking removal of allegedly racially discriminatory books from a high school's mandatory curriculum stated a cause of action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* based on the *Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution*, the court found that attaching civil liability on the basis of the assignment of a book and requiring removal of literary works from the classroom, would severely restrict a student's right to receive material that the school board or other educational authority determines to be of legitimate educational value, and that when a school board identifies information that it believes to be a useful part of a student's education, the student has the right to receive the information [*Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022, 1028-1029* (complaint sought to bar assignment of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* by Mark Twain and *A Rose for Emily* by William Faulkner based on use of word "nigger" as racially discriminatory and encouraging racial discrimination and harassment of African-American students)]. Allowing the complaint to go forward would inevitably lead many school districts to "buy their peace" by avoiding the use of books or other materials that express messages or simply use terms that could be argued to cause harm to a group of students [*Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022, 1029]* , and a school board attempting to remove books from its curriculum on the ground that the works might offend would likely be vulnerable to *First Amendment* actions brought by students wishing to study those books, and possibly teachers, as well [*Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022, 1030]* . Important countervailing considerations that (1) books and words can hurt, particularly racist epithets; (2) some of the most lauded works of literature convey, explicitly or more subtly, messages of racism and sexism, or other ideas that if accepted blindly would serve to maintain or promote the invidious inequalities that exist in our world today, the younger a person is, the more likely it is that those messages will help form that person's thinking, and the feelings of minority students, especially younger ones, are extremely vulnerable when it comes to books that are racist or have racist overtones; and (3) American society has all too often failed to afford its African-American citizens the equal treatment that the *Fourteenth Amendment* requires, particularly in the area of public education, do not outweigh the *First Amendment* considerations [*Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022, 1031-1032]* .

One California court has accepted the relevance of motive in a case involving removal of certain materials from the school curriculum. The court held that curriculum decisions will survive a *First Amendment* challenge as long as the decision is reasonably related to legitimate educational concerns. However, school officials are precluded from imposing a pall of orthodoxy on classroom instruction, which implicates the state in the propagation of a particular religious or ideological viewpoint. Therefore, a curriculum decision may not be motivated by an intent to prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion [*McCarthy v. Fletcher (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 130, 140, 146, 254 Cal. Rptr. 714]* .

Whether school library and instructional materials are protected by the California Constitution or statute appears to have not yet been addressed by any California appellate court [*see Cal. Const., art. I, § 2*; *Educ. Code § 48907*]. By statute, the governing board of any school district may exclude from schools and school libraries, all books, publications, or papers of a sectarian, partisan, or denominational character [*Educ. Code § 18111*; *see § 513.35*].

Once it is established that a secondary school receives federal funds and has created a limited open forum, a student organization denied access must demonstrate a denial of equal access, or fair opportunity, or discrimination based on the content of the speech at its meetings to prevail [*Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1009-1012* (no violation where religious club denied access because of discriminatory membership criteria rather than content of speech at meetings)].

[8] Associational Rights

Students enjoy some degree of *First Amendment* protection for associating with others and against "forced-inclusion,"

i.e., against being forced to associate with those with whom students may not wish to associate [*see Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1012-1015* (religious club failed to show that denial of recognition based on its general membership restrictions to those professing belief burdened *First Amendment* interest, which was threshold inquiry)].

Students have some rights to associate with each other. However, associational activities need not be tolerated when they infringe reasonable campus rules, interrupt classes, or substantially interfere with the opportunity of other students to obtain an education [*Healy v. James (1972) 408 U.S. 169, 181-182, 184, 189, 92 S. Ct. 2338, 33 L. Ed. 2d 266* (denial of official recognition to group of college students desiring to form local chapter of Students for a Democratic Society implicated cognizable *First Amendment* associational interest, but if district court on remand found there was evidence to support conclusion that local chapter posed substantial threat of material disruption, decision to deny official recognition should be affirmed)].

Incidental infringements on students' associational rights may be proper, so long as the school's reason for denying official recognition is directed at an organization's activities, rather than its philosophy [*Healy v. James (1972) 408 U.S. 169, 188, 92 S. Ct. 2338, 33 L. Ed. 2d 266]* . To determine whether a campus rule that incidentally burdens expressive rights is permissible under the *First Amendment*, courts apply a four-part test [*Healy v. James (1972) 408 U.S. 169, 189 n.20, 92 S. Ct. 2338, 33 L. Ed. 2d 266* ; *United States v. O'Brien (1968) 391 U.S. 367, 377, 88 S. Ct. 1673, 20 L. Ed. 2d 672 (1968)]* :

- The rule is within the constitutional power of the Government.
- The rule furthers an important or substantial governmental interest.
- The governmental interest is unrelated to the suppression of free expression.
- The incidental restriction on alleged *First Amendment* freedoms is no greater than is essential to the furtherance of that interest.

Thus, for example, a high school club failed to establish that its policy of excluding persons who did not share Christian values from its general membership had any expressive content, thus also failing to show the required incidental infringement of a *First Amendment* interest [*see Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1013]* .

Students also enjoy some rights against forced inclusion, *i.e.*, a regulation imposing a Hobson's choice on a student organization: include unwanted members or disband [*Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1013-1015* ; *see BSA v. Dale (2000) 530 U.S. 640, 653, 120 S. Ct. 2446, 147 L. Ed. 2d 554* (state non-discrimination law requiring organization to admit gay-rights activist violated *First Amendment* because it forced organization to send message conflicting with sincerely held views of organization); *California Democratic Party v. Jones (2000) 530 U.S. 567, 577, 120 S. Ct. 2402, 147 L. Ed. 2d 502* (state primary law violated *First Amendment* because it forced political parties to associate with, have their nominees and their positions determined by, those who, at best, refused to affiliate with party, and, at worst, expressly affiliated with rival); *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston (1995) 515 U.S. 557, 559, 575, 115 S. Ct. 2338, 132 L. Ed. 2d 487* (state law violated *First Amendment* because it required parade organizers to allow gay, lesbian, and bisexual contingent to march in parade); *Democratic Party of the United States v. Wisconsin ex rel. La Follette (1981) 450 U.S. 107, 125-126, 101 S. Ct. 1010, 67 L. Ed. 2d 82* (overturning on *First Amendment* grounds state law effectively requiring national political party, in violation of party's rules, to allow non-party members to participate in selection of party's presidential nominee); *cf. Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights, Inc. (2006) 547 U.S. 47, 126 S. Ct. 1297, 1312, 164 L. Ed. 2d 156* (upholding Solomon Amendment against challenge on ground military recruiters required to be admitted to law schools come onto campus for limited purpose of trying to hire students, not become members of school's expressive association); *Roberts v. United States Jaycees (1984) 468 U.S. 609, 627-629, 104 S. Ct. 3244, 82 L. Ed. 2d 462* (upholding against *First Amendment* challenge state law requiring national organization to admit women as voting members in part because

organization already invited women to share group's views and philosophy and to participate in much of its training and community activities)]. In forced-inclusion scenarios, courts apply strict scrutiny, asking whether the organization's freedom of expressive association could be overridden by regulations adopted to serve compelling state interests, unrelated to the suppression of ideas, that cannot be achieved through means significantly less restrictive of associational freedoms [*Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1014]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechForumsEducation LawLibrariesRemoval of MaterialsEducation LawStudentsSpeechGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsSpeechPublicationsEducation LawStudentsSpeechPure Speech & Expression

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.35

§ 513.35 Freedom of Religion

[1] Constitutional Protections and Limitations

Both the Federal and California Constitutions prohibit any law respecting an establishment of religion [*U.S. Const., amend. I*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 4*]. The California Constitution also specifically forbids the appropriation or granting of public funds or property for the aid or support of any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose [*Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 5*; *but see Cal. Const., art. XVI, § 3* (permitting public aid to private institutions for certain limited purposes)]. Furthermore, no public money may be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school or of any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools, and no sectarian or denominational doctrine may be taught in the public schools of the state [*Cal. Const., art. IX, § 8*].

The United States Supreme Court's construction of the *First Amendment establishment clause* has, as admitted by Justice White, "sacrificed clarity and predictability for flexibility" [*Committee for Public Education v. Regan (1980) 444 U.S. 646, 662, 100 S. Ct. 840, 63 L. Ed. 2d 94]* . Cases are analyzed in terms of a three-part test. State action violates the *establishment clause* if it fails to satisfy any of these conditions: (1) it must have a secular purpose; (2) it must neither advance nor inhibit religion; and (3) it must not foster an excessive governmental entanglement with religion [*Lemon v. Kurtzman (1971) 403 U.S. 602, 612-613, 91 S. Ct. 2105, 29 L. Ed. 2d 745]* .

Impermissible state action designed to promote religion has been found in the following cases [*see Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 83 n.13, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545]* :

- A statutory requirement that "creation science" be taught in conjunction with the teaching of evolution [*Edwards v. Aguillard (1987) 482 U.S. 578, 107 S. Ct. 2573, 96 L. Ed. 2d 510]* .

- A moment of silence in public schools for meditation or voluntary prayer [*Wallace v. Jaffree (1985) 472 U.S. 38, 105 S. Ct. 2479, 86 L. Ed. 2d 29]* .

- The required posting of the Ten Commandments in public classrooms [*Stone v. Graham (1980)*

449 U.S. 39, 101 S. Ct. 192, 66 L. Ed. 2d 199] .

- A state prohibition on the teaching of evolution [*Epperson v. Arkansas (1968) 393 U.S. 97, 89 S. Ct. 266, 21 L. Ed. 2d 228]* .

- A requirement that each school day begin with bible reading [*Abington School Dist. v. Schempp (1963) 374 U.S. 203, 83 S. Ct. 1560, 10 L. Ed. 2d 844]* .

- The recital of prayer in the classroom [*Engel v. Vitale (1962) 370 U.S. 421, 82 S. Ct. 1261, 8 L. Ed. 2d 601]* .

- Prayer at graduation ceremonies [*Lee v. Weisman (1992) 505 U.S. 577, 112 S. Ct. 2649, 120 L. Ed. 2d 467* ; *see Sands v. Morongo Unified School Dist. (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 863, 884, 918, 281 Cal. Rptr. 34, 809 P.2d 809* (also construing federal *establishment clause*); *Bennett v. Livermore Unified School Dist. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1016-1017, 238 Cal. Rptr. 819* (same result under state constitution)].

- The use of religious school teachers in the public school curriculum [*McCollum v. Board of Education (1948) 333 U.S. 203, 68 S. Ct. 461, 92 L. Ed. 649]* .

The following cases have rejected *establishment clause* challenges to school activities that allegedly promoted religion:

- A statute authorizing public schools to lend textbooks free of charge to parochial school students [*Board of Education v. Allen (1968) 392 U.S. 236, 88 S. Ct. 1923, 20 L. Ed. 2d 1060* ; *but see California Teachers Assn. v. Riles (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 794, 812, 176 Cal. Rptr. 300, 632 P.2d 953* (holding that practice violates California Constitution)].

- Providing release time from school to attend religious instruction or services [*Zorach v. Clauson (1952) 343 U.S. 306, 72 S. Ct. 679, 96 L. Ed. 954* ; *see Educ. Code § 46014* (release time authorized in California)].

- Expending public funds for the transportation of students to parochial schools [*Everson v. Board of Education (1947) 330 U.S. 1, 67 S. Ct. 504, 91 L. Ed. 711* ; *see Bowker v. Baker (1956) 73 Cal. App. 2d 653, 666-667* (reaching same result under California Constitution)].

- Distribution of federal funds to state and local governments as part of a longstanding school aid program known as Chapter 2, which in turn lend educational materials and equipment to public and private schools, many of which are religiously affiliated [*Mitchell v. Helms (2000) 530 U.S. 793, 120 S. Ct. 2530, 2540, 147 L. Ed. 2d 660]* .

- A state statute and school district policy requiring teacher-led recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by students in public schools, but not compelling students to participate, and the Pledge itself [*Newdow v. Rio Linda Union Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 597 F.3d 1007, 1017-1042]* .

The right to conduct religious activities on school property is more restricted under the California Constitution than under *U.S. Const., amend. I* [*Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 68, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545* ; *see Cal. Const. art. I, §§ 4, 24, art. XVI, § 5*]. Public schools may engage in no official involvement, whatever its form, that has the direct, immediate, and substantial effect of promoting religious purposes [*California Educational Facilities Authority v. Priest (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 593, 605 n.12, 116 Cal. Rptr. 361, 526 P.2d 513]* .

This California constitutional limitation has been held to prohibit the use of school property for meetings by a voluntary bible study club [*see Johnson v. Huntington Beach Union High Sch. Dist. (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 137 Cal. Rptr. 43 , cert. denied, 434 U.S. 877]* . It has also been extended to apparently prohibit lunchtime or recess congregations of students to practice religion, at least in a situation in which the students identify themselves as a group and disseminate advertising on school property of their existence and meeting times [*Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 68-75, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545]* . In so holding, the court did not discuss the statutory right of students to distribute printed materials as an element of their right to freedom of expression, which suggests that the scope of this right is constitutionally limited with regard to religious materials [*see Educ. Code § 48907* (discussed in *§ 513.34[6*]); *see also Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 78-82, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545* (dissenting opinion analyzing as freedom-of-expression case rather than simply as establishment-of-religion case)].

[2] Federal Equal Access Act

Schools may be required, under the federal Equal Access Act (EAA) [*20 U.S.C. §§ 4071-4074*], to permit religious groups to use school premises for purposes that were previously found to violate the California Constitution. The EAA provides that a public secondary school that receives federal assistance and has a "limited open forum" may not deny equal access to the forum to students who wish to conduct religious meetings [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(a)*]. The provisions of the EAA are *set forth in § 513.34[3]*. The United States Supreme Court, without a majority opinion on the point, held that the EAA does not violate the *establishment clause of the United States Constitution* [*Westside Community Schools v. Mergens (1990) 496 U.S. 226, 247-253, 260-262, 263-269, 110 S. Ct. 2356, 110 L. Ed. 2d 191]* .

The EAA expressly limits participation by school officials at religious meetings, which must be held during noninstructional time [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(b), (c)(2), (3)*]. The EAA therefore avoids the problems of the students' emulation of teachers as role models and mandatory attendance requirements. The school bears the responsibility for taking whatever further steps are necessary to make clear to all students that recognition of a religious club does not reflect endorsement of the views of the club's participants [*see Westside Community Schools v. Mergens (1990) 496 U.S. 226, 250, 269, 110 S. Ct. 2356, 110 L. Ed. 2d 191]* .

Under the supremacy clause of the United States Constitution, a right created by a federal statute is supreme to a right under a state constitution [*see* U.S. Const., art. VI, *cl. 2; Garnett v. Renton School Dist. No. 403 (9th Cir. 1993) 987 F.2d 641, 644-646 (EAA preempts Washington state constitutional law contrary to it) , cert. denied, 510 U.S. 819]* . Thus, the holdings of *Johnson v. Huntington Beach Union High Sch. Dist. (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 1, 137 Cal. Rptr. 43* , and *Perumal v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 64, 243 Cal. Rptr. 545* , prohibiting the use of school premises by religious groups, may be reversed by the United States Supreme Court's construction of the EAA. However, nothing in the EAA may be construed to authorize a public entity to influence the form or content of any prayer or other religious activity or to require any person to participate in prayer or other religious activity [*20 U.S.C. § 4071(d)(1), (2)*].

Nothing in the Education Code may be construed to prevent, or exclude from the public schools, references to religion or references to or the use of religious literature, dance, music, theater, and visual arts or other things having a religious significance when the references or uses do not constitute instruction in religious principles or aid to any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, and when the references or uses are incidental to or illustrative of matters properly included in the course of study [*Educ. Code § 51511*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of ReligionEstablishment of ReligionEducation LawReligion in SchoolsEstablishment Clause ProtectionsEducation LawReligion in SchoolsFacilities UseEducation

LawReligion in SchoolsPrayer & Related Activities

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.36

§ 513.36 Sexual Harassment

[1] Liability Under Title IX

Title IX of the Education Amendments, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.*, provides that no person may be excluded, on the basis of sex, from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance [*20 U.S.C. § 1681(a)*; *see Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* . There is a private right of action under Title IX, and money damages are available in these suits. Actionable discrimination under Title IX includes sexual harassment [*Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School District (1998) 524 U.S. 274, 281, 118 S. Ct. 1989, 141 L. Ed. 2d 277* ; *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools (1992) 503 U.S. 60, 74-75, 112 S. Ct. 1028, 117 L. Ed. 2d 208* ; *see Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* .

A recipient of federal funds may be liable in damages under Title IX only for its own misconduct, and that conduct must exclude participation in, deny the benefits of, or subject a person to discrimination under a program or an activity. Damages liability under Title IX is coextensive with the government's enforcement power against the funding recipient and does not extend to parties outside the scope of the enforcement power [*Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* . For the liability of a school district or board of education for the harassment of students by teachers or by other students, see *§§ 513.39[2]*, and *§ 513.36[3]*, respectively.

Qualified immunity is not a defense to school officials when the duty imposed on school officials by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.*, to prevent sexual harassment of students was clearly established at the time the harassment occurred [*Oona, R.S. v. McCaffrey (9th Cir. 1998) 143 F.3d 473* , *cert. denied, 526 U.S. 1154 (1999)* (no qualified immunity for school officials for failure to remedy sexual harassment both as inappropriate conduct by student teacher and as hostile environment created by other students, where United States Supreme Court had decided *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, recognizing sexual harassment as actionable discrimination under Title IX before conduct occurred)].

[2] By Teacher

In *Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School Dist. (1998) 524 U.S. 274, 118 S. Ct. 1989, 141 L. Ed. 2d 277* , the United States Supreme Court held that Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681*, unquestionably places on funding recipient's the duty not to permit teacher-student harassment in schools. In determining the standard under which to determine liability, however, the Court held that agency principles may not be used to impute liability under Title IX to a recipient of federal education funds such as a school district for the misconduct of its teachers. Further, a school district will not be liable under Title IX for what amounts to a negligence standard, *i.e.* for a failure to react to harassment of which it knew or should have known. The recipient of federal education funds may only be liable in damages under Title IX when it is deliberately indifferent to known acts of sexual harassment by a teacher; liability arises from an official decision by the recipient not to remedy a violation. The Court imposed this high standard in *Gebser* to eliminate any risk that the funding recipient would be found liable in damages for its employees' independent actions, rather than for its own official decisions [*Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* .

For a form complaint alleging sexual harassment by a teacher or fellow student in violation of Title IX, see *§ 513.92*.

[3] By Other Student

In *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839* , the United States Supreme Court held that under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.*, a private right of action may lie against a recipient of Title IX funding, such as a school board, in cases of "student-on-student" harassment. However, liability will lie only under the following circumstances [*Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 650, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d. 839]* :

- The funding recipient acts with deliberate indifference to known acts of harassment in its programs or activities;

- The harasser is under the school's disciplinary authority; and

- The harassment is so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars the victim's access to an educational opportunity or benefit.

In *Davis*, the Court applied the standard of deliberate indifference to known acts of harassment it had previously articulated in *Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School Dist (1998) 524 U.S. 274, 118 S. Ct. 1989, 141 L. Ed. 2d 277* , for cases based on sexual harassment of a student by a teacher [*see § 513.36[2]*]. Liability for damages is limited to circumstances in which the recipient exercises substantial control over both the harasser and the context in which the known harassment occurs, such as when the misconduct occurs during school hours and on school grounds, as in the facts alleged in *Davis* [*Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 645, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* .

The funding recipient's response to the harassment or the lack of a response must be clearly unreasonable in light of the known circumstances. The response need not necessarily be expulsion of every student accused of sexual misconduct in all circumstances [*Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 648-650, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationSexual HarassmentEducation LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationTitle IXCoverageEducation LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationTitle IXProtected

IndividualsEducation LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationTitle IXRemedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.37

§ 513.37 Searches of Students

The *Fourth Amendment* prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures applies to searches conducted by public school officials [*Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 652, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564* ; *New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 336-337, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720]* . The state constitutional prohibition of unreasonable searches and seizures in *Cal. Const., art. I, § 13* also applies to public school officials [*In re William G. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 550, 558-561, 221 Cal. Rptr. 118, 709 P.2d 1287]* . However, public school students' rights against unreasonable search and seizure are different than elsewhere in that the inquiry into whether the search is reasonable or unreasonable may not disregard schools' custodial and tutelary responsibility for students [*Vernonia School Dist. v. Action (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 656, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564]* . Further, the broad authority of school administrators over student behavior, school safety, and the learning environment requires that school officials have the power to stop a minor student to ask questions or conduct an investigation even in the absence of reasonable suspicion, so long as the authority is not exercised in an arbitrary, capricious, or harassing manner [*In re Randy G. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 556, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516, 28 P.3d 239]* .

In conducting searches of students, school officials must act reasonably [*Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 652-653, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564* ; *New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 333-342, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720]* . The standard for determining reasonableness under both federal and state constitutions is less than probable cause [*New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 333-342, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720* ; *In re William G. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 550, 562, 221 Cal. Rptr. 118, 709 P.2d 1287]* . They need not obtain a warrant before searching a student under their authority, since a warrant requirement would unduly interfere with swift and informal disciplinary procedures needed in a school context [Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. *Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 653, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564* ; *New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 340-341, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720* ; *In re William G. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 550, 564-565, 221 Cal. Rptr. 118, 709 P.2d 1287]* . A warrantless school search will be justified when school officials have reasonable grounds for suspecting the search will yield evidence the student has violated or is violating either the law or school rules, and when the measures adopted for the search are reasonably related to the objectives of the search and not excessively intrusive in light of the age and sex of the student and the nature of the infraction [*New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 333-342, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720* (search based on individualized suspicion of wrongdoing by student)]. The indignity of a search does not outlaw it, but it does

implicate the requirement that the search as actually conducted be reasonably related in scope to the circumstances that justified the interference in the first place [*Safford Unified School Dist. v. Redding (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2633, 2642, 174 L. Ed. 2d 354* ; *see* *New Jersey v. T.L.O. (1985) 469 U.S. 325, 341, 105 S. Ct. 733, 83 L. Ed. 2d 720]* . The scope will be permissible when it is not excessively intrusive in light of the age and sex of the student and the nature of the infraction [*Safford Unified School Dist. v. Redding (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2633, 2642, 174 L. Ed. 2d 354* (content of suspicion failed to match degree of intrusion)].

A search of any one student need not be based on individualized suspicion if the search is otherwise reasonable [*Smith v. McGlothlin (9th Cir. 1997) 119 F.3d 786* (school official who ordered search of group of high school students suspected of smoking near campus that led to discovery of one student's possession of knives entitled to qualified immunity since at time, search was not clearly improper, and, in fact, search without individualized suspicion was proper); *see also* *Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 663-665, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564* (policy of random urinanalysis of high school students participating in interscholastic athletic programs not violation of *Fourth Amendment*); *People v. Alexander B. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1572, 1577-1578, 270 Cal. Rptr. 342* (student search is reasonable when suspicion focused on group of five or six rather than defendant alone)].

A school official ordering or conducting a search of a student may be entitled to qualified immunity in an action brought against the official for violation of the student's rights under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* even if the student's rights are violated by the search if there is reason to question the clarity with which the right was established [*Safford Unified School Dist. v. Redding (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2633, 2643-2644, 174 L. Ed. 2d 354* ; for discussion of qualified immunity for government officials in § 1983 actions generally, *see* Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post Civil-War Civil Rights Statutes*].

The *Fourth Amendment* also applies to searches and seizures of students at schools by officials other than school officials, such as child protective services caseworkers [*see* *Greene v. Camreta (9th Cir. 2009) 588 F.3d 1011, 1022-1030* (warrantless, in-school interview of suspected child abuse victim was unreasonable seizure violating child's *Fourth Amendment* rights)]. The general law of search warrants applies to child abuse investigations, so that once the police have initiated a criminal investigation into alleged abuse in the home, responsible officials must provide procedural protections appropriate to the criminal context, including for in-school interviews of the alleged victims, at least where there is direct involvement of law enforcement in an in-school seizure and interrogation of a suspected child abuse victim [*Greene v. Camreta (9th Cir. 2009) 588 F.3d 1011, 1030]* . Prior to the Ninth Circuit's articulation of this rule, a child protective services officer and a law enforcement officer involved in an in-school seizure and interrogation were entitled to qualified immunity, because Ninth Circuit precedent did not clearly establish that an in-school seizure of a student suspected of being a victim of child sexual abuse could be subject to traditional *Fourth Amendment* protections [*Greene v. Camreta (9th Cir. 2009) 588 F.3d 1011, 1030-1033]* .

For a form of complaint for violation of a student's rights by unlawful search and seizure in violation of *U.S. Const., amends. IV* and *XIV*, brought against school officials and employees under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, see *§ 513.94*. For detailed coverage of *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, including Practice Tips and sample complaints, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureSearch & SeizureWarrantless SearchesSchool SearchesEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureReasonablenessEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureRemediesEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureScope of ProtectionEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureSearch Warrants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.38

§ 513.38 Student Discipline

[1] Authority of Public Schools

Subject to constitutional and statutory limitations, school districts have authority to maintain discipline in the schools and to suspend or expel any pupil for refusing or neglecting to obey school rules and regulations or for other misconduct [*Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 167, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177* ; *see Educ. Code § 35291*; *see also Educ. Code § 35291.5(a)* (school districts required to adopt rules; time and participation requirements)]. Public school teachers have the duty of enforcing school regulations and of holding pupils to strict account for their conduct on the way to and from school, on the playground, and during recess [*see Educ. Code §§ 44805, 44807*]. All pupils must comply with school regulations and submit to the authority of teachers [*Educ. Code § 48908*].

Educ. Code § 48900 et seq., governing suspension and expulsion of pupils, also applies to pupils attending the California School for the Blind and the two California Schools for the Deaf, which are referred to as the "state special schools" [*Educ. Code § 48927(a)*]. Pupils in the state special schools have the same due process procedural protections afforded to pupils in the public school districts of the state [*Educ. Code § 48927(c)*].

[2] Constitutional Limitations

As noted previously, education at public expense is a fundamental right under the California Constitution [*see § 513.31*]. Having established a right to public education, the state may not withdraw that right on grounds of misconduct without affording the student due process [*Goss v. Lopez (1975) 419 U.S. 565, 574, 95 S. Ct. 729, 42 L. Ed. 2d 725]* . Due process requires, at the very minimum, that students threatened with removal from school receive notice of the grounds for their removal and an opportunity to be heard [*Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 169, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177]* . Notice may take a simple form, however, such as the proscription of certain behavior in a school disciplinary rule that sufficiently notifies a student that engaging in that behavior could subject the student to sanctions [Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549]* . The grounds for discipline may not be unconstitutionally vague and standardless [*see Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 169-170, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177* ; *Myers v. Arcata etc. School Dist. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 549, 559-560, 561, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . Generally, however, the requirements of due process are

less rigid in the case of student suspension for a limited period of time fixed by law than in the case of student expulsion or indefinite suspension [*see Charles S. v. Board of Education (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 83, 91, 97 Cal. Rptr. 422 , appeal dismissed, 405 U.S. 1005 (1972)]* . For example, two days' suspension does not rise to the level of a penal sanction calling for the full panoply of federal procedural due process protections applicable to a criminal prosecution [*Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549]* .

The use of force as part of student discipline short of expulsion or suspension is constitutionally limited by the *Fourth Amendment* protection against unreasonable search and seizure [*Doe v. Haw. Dep't of Educ. (9th Cir. 2003) 334 F.3d 906, 908-909]* .

[3] Grounds for Discipline

A pupil may not be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion unless the superintendent or principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines that the pupil has committed one of the following acts [*Educ. Code § 48900*]:

(a) Caused, attempted to cause, or threatened to cause physical injury to another person, or willfully used force or violence on another person, except in self-defense;

(b) Possessed, sold, or otherwise furnished any firearm, knife, explosive, or other dangerous object unless, in the case of possession of any such object, the pupil had obtained written permission from a certificated school employee that is concurred in by the principal or the designee of the principal;

(c) Unlawfully possessed, used, sold, or otherwise furnished, or been under the influence of, any controlled substance (as listed in *Health & Safety Code §§ 11053-11058*), alcoholic beverage, or intoxicant of any kind;

(d) Unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell any controlled substance listed in *Health & Safety Code §§ 11503-11058*, an alcoholic beverage, or an intoxicant of any kind, and then sold, delivered, or otherwise furnished to any person another liquid, substance, or material and represented the liquid, substance, or material as a controlled substance, alcoholic beverage, or intoxicant;

(e) Committed or attempted to commit robbery or extortion;

(f) Caused or attempted to cause damage to school property or private property;

(g) Stolen or attempted to steal school property or private property;

(h) Possessed or used tobacco or any products containing tobacco or nicotine products, including, but not limited to, cigarettes, cigars, miniature cigars, clove cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, snuff, chew packets, and betel; however, a pupil is not prohibited from using or possessing his or her own prescription products [*see also Educ. Code § 48901* (no smoking or using tobacco or tobacco products by students on school grounds)];

(i) Committed an obscene act or engaged in habitual profanity or vulgarity;

(j) Unlawfully possessed or unlawfully offered, arranged, or negotiated to sell, any drug paraphernalia, as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 11014.5*;

(k) Disrupted school activities or otherwise willfully defied the valid authority of supervisors, teachers,

administrators, school officials, or other school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties;

(l) Knowingly received stolen school property or private property;

(m) Possessed an imitation firearm as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900(m)*;

(n) Committed or attempted to commit a sexual assault as defined in *Penal Code §§ 261, 266c, 286, 288, 288a*, or *289*, or committed a sexual battery as defined in *Penal Code § 243.4*;

(o) Harassed, threatened, or intimidated a pupil who is a complaining witness or witness in a school disciplinary proceeding for the purpose of either preventing that pupil from being a witness or of retaliating against that pupil for being a witness, or both;

(p) Unlawfully offered, arranged to sell, negotiated to sell, or sold the prescription drug Soma;

(q) Engaged in, or attempted to engage in, hazing as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900(q)*; or

(r) Engaged in an act of bullying, including, but not limited to, bullying committed by means of an electronic act [*see Educ. Code § 32261(f), (g)*], directed specifically toward a pupil or school personnel.

As used in *Educ. Code § 48900*, "school property" includes, but is not limited to, electronic files and databases [*Educ. Code 48900(u)*].

A pupil may not be suspended or expelled for any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* unless the act is related to school activity or school attendance occurring within a school under the jurisdiction of the superintendent or principal or occurring within any other school district [*Educ. Code § 48900(s)*; *see Fremont Union High Sch. Dist. v. Santa Clara County Board of Education (Matthew G.) (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1182, 1185-1188, 286 Cal. Rptr. 915* (expulsion proper if conduct was at school site other than student's own school; construing former *Educ. Code § 48900*, similar to current *Educ. Code § 48900(s)*)]. A pupil may be suspended or expelled for acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* that are related to school activity or attendance, and that occur at any time, including, but not limited to, any of the following [*Educ. Code § 48900(s)*]:

- While on school grounds.
- While going to or coming from school.
- During the lunch period whether on or off the campus.
- During, or while going to or coming from, a school sponsored activity.

A pupil who aids or abets, as defined in *Penal Code § 31*, the infliction or attempted infliction of physical injury to another, may be suspended, but not expelled, except that a pupil adjudged by a juvenile court to have committed, as an aider and abettor, a crime of physical violence in which the victim suffered great bodily injury or serious bodily injury, is subject to recommendation for expulsion [*Educ. Code § 48900(t)*].

A superintendent or principal may use his or her discretion to provide alternatives to suspension or expulsion, including, but not limited to, counseling and an anger management program, for a pupil subject to discipline under *Educ. Code § 48900* [*Educ. Code § 48900(v)*]. It is the intent of the Legislature that alternatives be imposed against a pupil who is truant, tardy, or otherwise absent from school activities [*Educ. Code § 48900(w)*].

In addition to the grounds specified under *Educ. Code §§ 48900* and *48900.2*, a pupil (in grade 4 or higher) may be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion if the superintendent or the principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines that the pupil has committed sexual harassment [*Educ. Code § 48900.2*; *see Educ. Code § 212.5* ("sexual harassment" defined under Education Code); for the liability of a school district or board of education for damages for sexual harassment of one student by another, *see § 513.36[3]*]. The conduct must be considered by a reasonable person of the same gender as the victim to be sufficiently severe or pervasive to have a negative impact on the individual's academic performance or to create an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational environment [Educ. Code § 49000.2; *see also Educ. Code § 231.5* (requirement that school districts develop and disseminate policy on sexual harassment)].

In addition to the grounds specified in *Educ. Code §§ 48900-48900.4*, a pupil in grades 4 to 12 may be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion if the superintendent or the principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines that the pupil has caused, attempted to cause, threatened to cause, or participated in an act of, hate violence, as defined in *Educ. Code § 233(e)* [*see Educ. Code § 48900.3* (referring to former *Educ. Code § 33032.5(e)*, though that section was renumbered as *Educ. Code § 233* effective January 1, 1999)]. A pupil may also be suspended or recommended for expulsion from school if the superintendent or principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines the pupil intentionally engaged in harassment, threats, or intimidation directed against school district personnel or pupils, that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to have the actual and reasonably expected effect of materially disrupting classwork, creating substantial disorder, and invading the rights of either school personnel or pupils by creating an intimidating or hostile educational environment [*Educ. Code § 48900.4*]. Pupils in grades 4 or higher may also be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion if the superintendent or principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines the pupil made terroristic threats, as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900.7(b)*, against school officials or school property, or both [*Educ. Code § 48900.7(a)*].

The grounds listed in *Educ. Code § 48900*, along with the grounds listed for expulsion in *Educ. Code §§ 48900.2*, *48900.3*, and *48900.4*, establish the exclusive grounds for which a student may be suspended or expelled [*Educ. Code § 48900*; *T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1276, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532]* .

As part of or instead of disciplinary action prescribed by *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.*, the principal of a school, the principal's designee, the superintendent of schools, or the governing board may require a pupil to perform community service on school grounds or, with written permission of the pupil's parent or guardian, off school grounds, during the pupil's nonschool hours. Community service may include, but is not limited to, work performed in the community or on school grounds in any of the following areas [*Educ. Code § 48900.6*]:

- Outdoor beautification;
- Community or campus betterment; and
- Teacher, peer, or youth assistance programs.

The community service option, however, does not apply if a pupil has been suspended, pending expulsion, in accordance with *Educ. Code § 48915*. However, the option does apply if the recommended expulsion is not implemented or is, itself, suspended by stipulation or other administrative action [*Educ. Code § 48900.6*].

For purposes of parental notification, and for reporting expulsion or suspension offenses to the State Department of Education, each school district must specifically identify, by offense committed, in all appropriate official pupil records each suspension or expulsion of the pupil for committing any of the offenses in *Educ. Code §§ 48900*, *48900.2*, *48900.3*, *48900.4*, *48900.7*, or *Educ. Code § 48915* [*Educ. Code § 48900.8*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsDue ProcessEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsExpulsionsEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsSuspensionsEducation LawStudentsMisconductGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.39

§ 513.39 Suspension Procedure

[1] Use of Suspension

Suspension may be imposed only if other means of correction fail to bring about proper conduct; however, a pupil, including an individual with exceptional needs as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026*, may be suspended for any of the reasons enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*see § 513.38[3]*] on a first offense if the principal or superintendent of schools determines that the pupil violated *Educ. Code § 48900(a), (b), (c), (d)*, or *(e)* or that the pupil's presence causes a danger to persons or property or threatens to disrupt the instructional process [*Educ. Code § 48900.5*].

[2] By Teacher

A teacher may suspend any pupil from his or her class for any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*see § 513.38[3]*] for the day of the suspension and the day immediately following. The teacher must immediately report the suspension to the principal of the school and send the pupil to the principal or the principal's designee for appropriate action. If that action requires the continued presence of the pupil at the school site, the pupil must be under appropriate supervision as defined in policies and related regulations adopted by the governing board of the school district. As soon as possible, the teacher must ask the parent or guardian of the pupil to attend a parent-teacher conference regarding the suspension. If practicable, a school counselor or a school psychologist may attend the conference. A school administrator must also attend the conference if the teacher or the parent or guardian so requests. The pupil may not be returned to the class from which he or she was suspended during the period of the suspension without the concurrence of the teacher of the class and the principal [*Educ. Code § 48910(a)*]. A pupil suspended from a class may also not be placed in another regular class during the period of suspension. However, if the pupil is assigned to more than one class per day, this restriction applies only to other regular classes scheduled at the same time as the class from which the pupil was suspended [*Educ. Code § 48910(b)*].

In addition to suspending a pupil from the class, a teacher may refer a pupil, for any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900*, to the principal or the principal's designee for consideration of suspension from the school [*Educ. Code § 48910(c)*].

Each school district may adopt a policy under which teachers can provide that the pupil's parent or guardian attend a portion of a school day in the class from which his or her child or ward was suspended, if the suspension was for reasons specified in *Educ. Code § 48900(i)* (obscene act or habitual profanity or vulgarity) or (k) (disruption of school activities or willful defiance of valid authority) [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(a)*]. The policy must take into account reasonable factors that may prevent compliance with a notice to attend, and the attendance of the parent or guardian is limited to the class from which the pupil was suspended [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(a)*]. The legislation applies only to a parent or guardian who is actually living with the pupil [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(c)*].

Parents and guardians must be notified of the district's policy before its implementation. The teacher must apply the policy uniformly to all pupils in the classroom [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(b)*]. The parent or guardian must receive a written notice stating that his or her attendance is pursuant to law [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(c)*]. The notice may specify that the parent or guardian's attendance be on the day in which the pupil is scheduled to return to class or within a reasonable period of time thereafter [*Educ. Code § 48900.1(d)*].

The parent or guardian should give reasonable notice to his or her employer that it will be necessary to take time off from work to appear in the child's or ward's school in response to a request made under *Educ. Code § 48900.1*. If this notice is given, no employer may discharge or in any manner discriminate against an employee for taking time off to appear in the school [*Lab. Code § 230.7(a)*]. Any employee who is threatened with discharge or is discharged, demoted, suspended, or in any other manner discriminated against in the terms and conditions of employment by his or her employer because the employee has taken time off to appear in school under *Educ. Code § 48900.1* is entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by those acts of the employer [*Lab. Code § 230.7(b)*].

For discussion of wrongful termination of employment generally, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* .

[3] By Principal or Superintendent

The principal of the school, his or her designee, or the superintendent may suspend a pupil from the school for any of the reasons enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*see § 513.38[3]*], and pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48900.5*, for no more than five consecutive school days [*Educ. Code § 48911(a)*]. *Educ. Code § 48911* is not an exception to, nor does it place any limitation on, *Educ. Code § 48903*, which governs the total length of time for which a pupil may be suspended [*Educ. Code § 48911*; *see § 513.39[5]*].

Suspension by the principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent must be preceded by an informal conference that is conducted by the principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent of schools between the pupil and, whenever practicable, the teacher, supervisor, or school employee who referred the pupil to the principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent of schools. At the conference, the pupil must be informed of the reason for the disciplinary action and the evidence against him or her and must be given the opportunity to present his or her version and evidence in his or her defense [*Educ. Code § 48911(b)*]. A principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent of schools may suspend a pupil without affording the pupil an opportunity for a conference only if the principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent of schools determines that an emergency situation exists. The term "emergency situation" means a situation determined by the principal, the principal's designee, or the superintendent of schools to constitute a clear and present danger to the lives, safety, or health of pupils or school personnel. If a pupil is suspended without a conference prior to the suspension, both the parent (or guardian) and pupil must be notified of the pupil's right to such a conference and the pupil's right to return to school for this purpose. The conference must be held within two school days unless the pupil waives this right or is physically unable to attend for any reason including, but not limited to, hospitalization or incarceration, in which case the conference must be held as soon as the pupil is physically able to return to school for the conference [*Educ. Code § 48911(c)*].

At the time of suspension, a school employee must make a reasonable effort to contact the pupil's parent or guardian in person or by telephone. Whenever a pupil is suspended from school, the parent or guardian must be notified in writing of the suspension [*Educ. Code § 48911(d)*].

A school employee is required to report the suspension of the pupil, including the cause for the suspension, to the governing board of the school district or to the district superintendent in accordance with the regulations of the governing board [*Educ. Code § 48911(e)*].

The parent or guardian of any pupil must respond without delay to any request from school officials to attend a conference regarding his or her child's behavior. However, no penalties may be imposed on a pupil for failure of the pupil's parent or guardian to attend such a conference, nor may a reinstatement of the suspended pupil be contingent on the attendance at the conference by the pupil's parent or guardian [*Educ. Code § 48911(f)*].

An individual with exceptional needs, as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026*, may be suspended from school in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)*, the discipline provisions in *34 C.F.R. § 300.530 et seq.*, and provisions of *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.* that do not conflict with federal law and regulations [*Educ. Code § 48915.5(a)*]. A free appropriate public education for individuals with exceptional needs suspended from school must be in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1)* and *34 C.F.R. § 300.530(d)* [*Educ. Code § 48915.5(b)*]. The site principal of a contracting nonpublic, nonsectarian school providing services to individuals with exceptional needs under *Educ. Code §§ 56365* and *56366* has the same duties and responsibilities with respect to the suspension of pupils with previously identified exceptional needs prescribed for the suspension of pupils under *Educ. Code § 48911* [*Educ. Code § 48911.5*].

[4] By Governing Board

The governing board may suspend a pupil from school for any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*Educ. Code § 48912(a)*].

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Educ. Code § 35145* and *Gov. Code § 54950*, the governing board of a school district, when considering the suspension or a disciplinary or any other action except expulsion against any pupil, shall, unless a request has been made to the contrary, hold closed sessions if a public hearing on the question would lead to the giving out of information concerning a school pupil that would be in violation of *Educ. Code §§ 49073-49078* [*Educ. Code § 48912(b)*].

Before calling a closed session to consider these matters, the governing board shall, in writing, by registered or certified mail or by personal service, notify the pupil and the pupil's parent or guardian, or the pupil if the pupil is an adult, of the intent of the governing board to call and hold a closed session. Unless the pupil or the pupil's parent or guardian shall, in writing, within 48 hours after receipt of the written notice of the board's intention, request that the hearing be held as a public meeting, the hearing to consider these matters shall be conducted by the governing board in closed session. In the event that a written request is served on the clerk or secretary of the governing board, the meeting shall be public, except that any discussion at that meeting that may be in conflict with the right to privacy of any pupil other than the pupil requesting the public meeting shall be in closed session [*Educ. Code § 48912(c)*].

The governing board of a school district may also suspend a pupil enrolled in a continuation school or class if any acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* occurred. Such a suspension must meet the requirements of *Educ. Code § 48915* [*Educ. Code 48912.5*; for discussion of requirements of *Educ. Code § 48915*, *see § 513.40[1]*].

[5] Total Length of Suspensions

Except as provided in *Educ. Code §§ 48911(g)* (suspension of students attending a continuation school) and 48912, a pupil may not be suspended from school for more than 20 school days in any one school year. However, if a pupil is

transferred to or enrolled in another regular school, an opportunity school or class, or a continuation education school or class, for adjustment purposes, the total number of school days that the pupil may be suspended may not exceed 30 days in any school year [*Educ. Code § 48903*]. The governing board may suspend a pupil from school for any number of school days within the limits prescribed by *Educ. Code § 48903* [*Educ. Code § 48912(a)*]. The governing board of a school district may suspend a pupil enrolled in a continuation school or class for a period not longer than the remainder of the semester [*Educ. Code § 48912.5*].

[6] Extension of Suspension Pending Expulsion Proceedings

If expulsion from any school or suspension for the balance of the semester from a continuation school is being processed by the governing board, the school district superintendent or other person designated by him or her in writing may extend the suspension until the governing board renders a decision in the action. However, an extension may be granted only if the superintendent or his or her designee has determined, following a meeting in which the pupil and the pupil's parent or guardian are invited to participate, that the presence of the pupil at the school or in an alternative school placement would cause a danger to persons or property or a threat of disrupting the instructional process. If the pupil or the pupil's parent or guardian has requested a meeting to challenge the original suspension pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48914*, the purpose of the meeting shall be to decide on the extension of the suspension order under *Educ. Code § 48911* and may be held in conjunction with the initial meeting on the merits of the suspension [*Educ. Code § 48911(g)*].

[7] Parental Meeting With Superintendent

Each school district is authorized to establish a policy that permits school officials to conduct a meeting with the parent or guardian of a suspended pupil to discuss the causes, the duration, the school policy involved, and other matters pertinent to the suspension [*Educ. Code § 48914*].

[8] Completion of Work Missed

The teacher of any class from which a pupil is suspended may require the suspended pupil to complete any assignments and tests missed during the suspension [*Educ. Code § 48913*].

[9] Judicial Review

Review of a suspension by writ of mandate and subsequent appeal has been allowed in a case that presented questions of continuing public interest likely to recur [*Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 533, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657* (question of role of the exclusionary rule in high school disciplinary proceedings)]. The appeal was allowed against a motion to dismiss as moot. At the time of appeal, the student was eligible to return to the high school and arguably suffered no actual interruption of his academic career because he had been permitted to attend a high school in another district during the period of his suspension from the subject school [*Gordon J. v. Santa Ana Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 530, 532-533, 208 Cal. Rptr. 657]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppeals & ReviewsEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsDecisionsEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsNoticeEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsSuspensionsEducation LawStudentsMisconductGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.40

§ 513.40 Expulsion Procedure

[1] Use of Expulsion

Unless the principal or superintendent finds, and so reports in writing to the governing board, that expulsion is inappropriate due to the particular circumstance, which must be set out in the report of the incident, the principal or the superintendent of schools must recommend a pupil's expulsion for any of the following acts [*Educ. Code § 48915(a)*]:

- Causing serious physical injury to another person except in self-defense.

- Possession of any knife, as defined in *Educ. Code § 48915(g)*, or other dangerous object of no reasonable use to the pupil at school or at a school activity off school grounds.

- Unlawful sale of any controlled substance, as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 11053 et seq.*, except for the first offense for the sale of not more than one avoirdupois ounce of marijuana, other than concentrated cannabis.

- Robbery or extortion.

- Assault or battery, as defined in *Penal Code §§ 240, 242*, on any school employee.

On recommendation by the principal, superintendent of schools, or a hearing officer or administrative panel appointed under *Educ. Code § 48918*, the governing board may order a pupil expelled on finding the pupil committed an act listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(a)* or in *Educ. Code § 48900(a)-(e)*, based on a finding of one or both of the following [*Educ. Code § 48915(b)*]:

- Other means of correction are not feasible or have repeatedly failed to bring about proper conduct; and/or

- Due to the nature of the act, the presence of the pupil causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the pupil or others.

The principal or superintendent of schools must immediately suspend, under *Educ. Code § 48911*, and must recommend expulsion of a pupil the principal or superintendent determines has committed any of the following acts at school or at a school activity off school grounds [*Educ. Code § 48915(c)*]:

- Possessing, selling, or otherwise furnishing a firearm, only if the possession is verified by a school district employee, unless the pupil had obtained prior written permission to possess the firearm from a certificated school employee, in which the principal or a designee of the principal concurred.

- Brandishing a knife, as defined in *Educ. Code § 48915(g)*, at another person.

- Unlawfully selling a controlled substance listed in *Health & Safety Code § 11053 et seq.*

- Committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault or committing a battery, as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900(n)*.

- Possession of an explosive, as defined in *Educ. Code § 48915(h)*.

Under *Educ. Code § 48900* and *Educ. Code § 48915*, "possession" of a firearm for purposes of expulsion means the pupil knowingly and voluntarily has direct control over a firearm, unless the pupil has the permission of school officials to possess the firearm or the possession is brief and solely for the purpose of disposing of the firearm, such as handing it to school officials *[80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 91 (1997)]* .

The governing board must order the pupil expelled on finding the pupil committed an act listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(c)* and refer the pupil to a program of study meeting all of the following conditions [*Educ. Code § 48915(d)*]:

- The program is appropriately prepared to accommodate pupils exhibiting discipline problems.

- The program is not provided at a comprehensive middle, junior, or senior high school, or at any elementary school.

- The program is not housed at the schoolsite attended by the pupil at the time of suspension.

On recommendation by the principal, superintendent of schools, or a hearing officer or administrative panel appointed pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48918(d)*, the governing board may order a pupil expelled on finding that the pupil violated *Educ. Code § 48900(f)-(m), 48900.2, 48900.3*, or *48900.4*, and that other means of correction are not feasible or have repeatedly failed to bring about proper conduct or, because of the nature of the violation, the presence of the pupil causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the pupil or others [*Educ. Code § 48915(e)*].

In *Educ. Code § 48915*, the Legislature specified the circumstances for triggering an expulsion hearing and the findings that must be made at these hearings, and grouped those circumstances into the following three primary categories [*T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1277-1278, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532]* :

- With regard to very serious offenses, the principal or superintendent of schools must recommend expulsion of a pupil he or she determines has committed acts at school or at a school activity off school grounds specified in *Educ. Code § 48915(c)*. If the governing board finds a student committed one of these offenses, the school board must order expulsion [*Educ. Code § 48915(c)*].

- With regard to the net level of expulsion offenses, the principal or superintendent of schools must recommend expulsion, unless the principal or superintendent finds expulsion inappropriate due to the particular circumstance, for the acts listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(a)*. With respect to these offenses, a school board cannot expel a student unless it also finds either (1) that other means of correction are not feasible or have repeatedly failed to bring about proper conduct, or (2) due to the nature of the act, the presence of the pupil causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the pupil or others [*Educ. Code § 48915(b)(1), (2)*].

- With regard to the remaining statutory expulsion offenses, the Legislature did not provide a mandatory or presumptive referral requirement. Instead, on recommendation by the principal, superintendent of schools, or a hearing officer or administrative panel, the governing board may order a pupil expelled on finding that the pupil violated the identified statutory expulsion ground [*Educ. Code § 48915(e)*]. With respect to these offenses, a student cannot be expelled unless it is found that either (1) other means of correction are not feasible or have repeatedly failed to bring about proper conduct, or (2) due to the nature of the violation, the presence of the pupil causes a continuing danger to the physical safety of the pupil or others [*Educ. Code § 48915(e)(1), (2)*]. Additionally, with regard to certain of these offenses, an expulsion may be ordered only if the student committed the act at school or during a school activity [*see Educ. Code § 48915(e)*].

The governing board must refer a pupil who has been expelled pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48915(b)* or *(e)* to a program of study meeting all of the conditions specified in *Educ. Code § 48915(d)*. With regard to a pupil expelled under *Educ. Code § 48915(e)*, if the superintendent certifies that an alternative program of study is not available at a site away from a comprehensive middle, junior, or senior high school, or an elementary school, and the only option for placement is at another comprehensive middle, junior, or senior high school, or another elementary school, the pupil may be referred to a program of study provided at a comprehensive middle, junior, or senior high school or elementary school [*Educ. Code § 48915(f)*].

[2] Expulsion of Pupil With Previously Identified Exceptional Needs

An individual with exceptional needs, as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026*, may be expelled from school in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1415(k)*, the discipline provisions in *34 C.F.R. § 300.530 et seq.*, and provisions of *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.* that do not conflict with federal law and regulations [*Educ. Code § 48915.5(a)*]. A free appropriate public education for individuals with exceptional needs expelled from school must be in accordance with *20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1)* and *34 C.F.R. § 300.530(d)* [*Educ. Code § 48915.5(b)*].

If an individual with exceptional needs is excluded from schoolbus transportation, the pupil is entitled to be provided with an alternative form of transportation at no cost to the pupil or parent or guardian provided that transportation is specified in the pupil's individualized education program [*Educ. Code § 48915.5(c)*].

[3] Length of Expulsion

An expulsion order must remain in effect until such time as the governing board may, in the manner prescribed in *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.*, order the readmission of a pupil. Except for pupils who have been expelled for acts listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(c)* [*see § 513.40[1]*], at the time an expulsion of a pupil is ordered, the governing board must set a date, not later than the last day of the semester following the semester in which the expulsion occurred, when the pupil may apply for readmission to a school maintained by the district. The governing board is not required to readmit the pupil [*Educ. Code § 48916*]. If the pupil is expelled for reasons relating to controlled substances or alcohol, the governing board may require, with the consent of the pupil's parent or guardian, that the pupil enroll in a county-supported drug rehabilitation program before returning to school [*Educ. Code § 48916.5*].

[4] Establishment of Rules and Regulations

The governing board of each school district must establish rules and regulations governing procedures for the expulsion of pupils. These procedures must include, but are not limited to, those set forth in *Educ. Code § 48918(a)-(k)* [*Educ. Code § 48918*; *see § 513.40[5]*].

Educ. Code § 48918 sets forth detailed and extensive mandatory procedures a school district must follow before the district may expel a student who has committed one of the identified expulsion offenses [*T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1276, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532]* . A school district's adoption of rules governing expulsions under a "zero tolerance" policy that required the principal or designee to immediately suspend and recommend for expulsion a pupil that had committed specified acts at school or at a school activity off school grounds did not violate state law by eliminating a principal's statutory discretion to decide not to recommend a student for an expulsion hearing. There are no provisions in the Education Code requiring a district to provide a principal with the authority to dismiss an expulsion charge if (1) the principal found the student had committed the expulsion offense, (2) the stricter recommendation procedures did not infringe on the student's statutory rights to an objective and fair expulsion procedure, and (3) the mandatory recommendation requirements did not preclude the principal from expressing his or her own views as to whether expulsion was appropriate [*T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1281-1285, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532]* . The rules also did not violate a student's federal and state due process rights, because (1) the rule provided required procedural protections to students, (2) a student is not constitutionally entitled to notice of the scope of a principal's authority vis-a-vis the governing school board, and (3) inconsistencies within the district's rules with regard to whether the principal or superintendent could recommend expulsion for offenses not included in the provisions of the Education Code did not create an inevitable due process violation [*T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1285-1287, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532]* .

[5] Right to Notice and Hearing

In the context of student disciplinary proceedings in which expulsion is sought, the basic requirements for due process are prior notice and a hearing [*Dornes v. Lindsey (C.D. Cal. 1998) 18 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1089* (plaintiff given notice and hearing conducted properly under California Education Code)]. However, brief suspensions may be made without a prior hearing [Black Coalition v. Portland School District No. 1 *(9th Cir. 1973) 484 F.2d 1040, 1044* ; *Dornes v. Lindsey (C.D. Cal. 1998) 18 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1089]* . The pupil is entitled to a hearing to determine whether the pupil should be expelled. An expulsion hearing must be held within 30 school days of the date the principal or the superintendent of schools determines that the pupil has committed any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*see § 513.38[3]*], unless the pupil requests in writing that the hearing be postponed. The pupil is entitled to at least one postponement for a period of not more than 30 calendar days of an expulsion hearing. Any additional postponement may be granted at the discretion of the governing board [*Educ. Code § 48918(a)*].

During the regular school year, if it is impracticable for the governing board to comply with the time requirements for conducting an expulsion hearing under *Educ. Code § 48918(a)*, the superintendent of schools or his or her designee may, for good cause, extend the time period for holding the hearing for an additional five schooldays. If it is impracticable for the governing board to comply with the time requirements for conducting an expulsion hearing under *Educ. Code § 48918(a)* due to a summer recess in governing board meetings of more than two weeks, the days during the recess period do not count as schooldays in meeting the time requirements. Days not counted as schooldays in meeting the time requirements for an expulsion hearing because of a summer recess of governing board meetings cannot exceed 20 schooldays as defined in *Educ. Code § 48925(c)*. Unless the pupil requests in writing that the expulsion hearing be postponed, the hearing must be held no later than 20 calendar days prior to the first day of school for the school year [*Educ. Code § 48918(a)*].

Reasons for the extension must be included as a part of the record at the time the expulsion hearing is conducted. On the commencement of the hearing, all matters will be pursued and conducted with reasonable diligence and shall be

concluded without any unnecessary delay [*Educ. Code § 48918(a)*]. The provisions of former *Educ. Code § 48914(a)* (now see *Educ. Code § 48918(a)*) were mandatory rather than directory, and a failure to comply with the time requirements invalidated the expulsion [*Garcia v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Education (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 807, 813, 177 Cal. Rptr. 29]* . It would appear that this would still be true of the time requirements in *Educ. Code § 48918(a)*, though this can not be stated with certainty since the time requirements in the new statute have been changed.

Written notice of the hearing must be forwarded to the pupil at least 10 calendar days prior to the date of the hearing. The notice must include the following [*Educ. Code § 48918(b)*]:

- The date and place of the hearing.
- A statement of the specific facts and charges on which the proposed expulsion is based.
- A copy of the disciplinary rules of the district that relate to the alleged violation.
- A notice of the parent's, guardian's, or pupil's obligation under *Educ. Code § 48915.1(b)* to inform another school district in which enrollment is sought of the expulsion (*see § 513.40[17]*).
- A notice of the opportunity of the pupil and his or her parent or guardian to:
  - Appear in person or employ and be represented by counsel legal counsel or a nonattorney advisor. Legal counsel is an attorney or lawyer admitted to the practice of law in California and an active member of the State Bar of California; a nonattorney advisor is an individual who is not an attorney or lawyer, but who is familiar with the facts of the case, and has been selected by the pupil or pupil's parent or guardian to provide assistance at the hearing. However, *Educ. Code § 48918* does not require a pupil or pupil's parent or guardian to be represented by counsel or an advisor at the hearing.
  - Inspect and obtain copies of all documents to be used at the hearing.
  - Confront and question all witnesses who testify at the hearing.
  - Question all other evidence presented.
  - Present oral and documentary evidence, including witnesses, on the pupil's behalf.

In a hearing in which a pupil is alleged to have committed or attempted to commit a sexual assault or sexual battery as specified in *Educ. Code § 48900(n)*, a complaining witness must be given five days' notice before being called to testify, and is entitled to have up to two adult support persons, including, but not limited to, a parent, guardian, or legal counsel, present during the testimony. Before a complaining witness testifies, support persons must be admonished that the hearing is confidential. Nothing in *Educ. Code § 48918(b)* precludes the person presiding over the expulsion hearing from removing a support person the presiding person finds disrupting the hearing. If one or both of the support persons is also a witness, the provisions of *Penal Code § 868.5* must be followed for the hearing [*Educ. Code § 48918(b)*].

[6] Conduct of Hearing

Notwithstanding Gov. Code § 54593 and *Educ. Code § 35145*, the governing board must conduct a hearing to consider the expulsion of a pupil in a session closed to the public unless the pupil requests, in writing, at least five days prior to the date of the hearing, that the hearing be conducted at a public meeting. Whether an expulsion hearing is conducted in closed or public session, the governing board may meet in closed session for the purpose of deliberating and

determining if the pupil should be expelled. If the governing board or the hearing officer or administrative panel, appointed under *Educ. Code § 48918(d)* to conduct the hearing, admits any other person to a closed deliberation session, the parent or guardian of the pupil, the pupil, and the counsel of the pupil must also be allowed to attend the closed deliberations. If the hearing is to be conducted at a public meeting, and there is a charge of committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault or committing a sexual battery as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900(n)*, a complaining witness has the right to have his or her testimony heard in a session closed to the public when testifying at a public meeting would threaten serious psychological harm to the complaining witness and there are no alternative procedures to avoid the threatened harm, including, but not limited to, videotaped deposition or contemporaneous examination in another place communicated to the hearing room by means of closed-circuit television [*Educ. Code § 48918(c)*].

Instead of conducting an expulsion hearing itself, the governing board of any school district may contract with the county hearing officer, or with the Office of Administrative Hearings of the State of California pursuant to *Educ. Code § 35207* and *Gov. Code § 27720 et seq.*, for a hearing officer to conduct the hearing, or the board may appoint an impartial administrative panel of three or more certificated persons, none of whom is a member of the board or employed on the staff of the school in which the pupil is enrolled. The hearing must be conducted in accordance with all of the procedures established under *Educ. Code § 48918* [*Educ. Code § 48918(d)*].

Within three school days after the hearing, the hearing officer or administrative panel must determine whether to recommend the expulsion of the pupil to the governing board. If the hearing officer or administrative panel decides not to recommend expulsion, the expulsion proceedings are terminated and the pupil must be immediately reinstated and permitted to return to a classroom instructional program, any other instructional program, a rehabilitation program, or any combination of these programs. Placement in one or more of these programs must be made by the superintendent of schools or the superintendent's designee after consultation with the school district personnel, including the pupil's teachers, and the pupil's parent or guardian. The decision not to recommend expulsion is final [*Educ. Code § 48918(e)*].

If the hearing officer or administrative panel recommends expulsion, findings of fact in support of the recommendation must be prepared and submitted to the governing board. All findings of fact and recommendations must be based solely on the evidence adduced at the hearing. If the governing board accepts the recommendation calling for expulsion, acceptance must be based either on a review of the findings of fact and recommendations submitted by the hearing officer or panel, or on the results of any supplementary hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48918* that the governing board may order. The decision of the governing board to expel a pupil must be based on substantial evidence relevant to the charges adduced at the expulsion hearing or hearings. Except as provided in *Educ. Code § 48918*, no decision to expel may be based solely on hearsay evidence. The governing board or the hearing officer or administrative panel may, on a finding that good cause exists, determine that the disclosure of either the identity of a witness or the testimony of the witness at the hearing would subject the witness to an unreasonable risk of psychological or physical harm. Upon that determination, the testimony of the witness may be presented at the hearing in the form of sworn declarations which can be examined only by the governing board or the hearing officer or administrative panel. Copies of these sworn declarations edited to delete the name and identity of the witness, must be made available to the pupil [*Educ. Code § 48918(f)*; *see John A. v. San Bernardino City Unified School District (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 301, 307-308, 187 Cal. Rptr. 472, 654 P.2d 242* ; *Dornes v. Lindsey (C.D. Cal. 1998) 18 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1090* (reliance in some instances on students' statements and reports in lieu of live testimony does not constitute due process violation; where revelation of name of student witness or requiring student to testify could subject student to risk, statements and reports of students may be relied on in lieu of live testimony, and students' names do not have to be revealed)].

A record of the hearing must be made which may be maintained by any means, including electronic recording, so long as a reasonably accurate and complete written transcription of the proceedings can be made [*Educ. Code § 48918(g)*]. Technical rules of evidence do not apply to an expulsion hearing, but relevant evidence may be admitted and given probative effect only if it is the kind of evidence on which reasonable persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs. A decision of the governing board to expel must be supported by substantial evidence showing that the

pupil committed any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* [*Educ. Code § 48918(h)*].

In hearings including an allegation of committing or attempting to commit a sexual assault or committing a sexual battery (as defined in *Educ. Code § 48900(n)*), evidence of specific instances of a complaining witness' prior sexual conduct are presumed inadmissible and may not be heard absent a determination by the person conducting the hearing that extraordinary circumstances exist requiring the evidence to be heard. Before that determination is made, the complaining witness must be given notice and an opportunity to oppose the introduction of the evidence. In the hearing on the admissibility of the evidence, the complaining witness is entitled to be represented by a parent, guardian, legal counsel, or another support person. Reputation or opinion evidence regarding the sexual behavior of the complaining witness is not admissible for any purpose [*Educ. Code § 48918(h)*].

Before the hearing begins, the governing board may issue subpoenas at the request of either the superintendent or the superintendent's designee or the pupil, for the personal appearance of percipient witnesses. After the hearing has begun, the governing board or the hearing officer or administrative panel may, on request of either the county superintendent of schools or the superintendent's designee or the pupil, issue subpoenas. All subpoenas must be issued in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1985.1, 1985.2*. Enforcement of subpoenas must be in accordance with *Gov. Code § 11455.20* [*Educ. Code § 48918(i)(1)*; *see Woodbury v. Brown-Dempsey (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 421, 430-439, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 124* (school board did not have mandatory duty under *Educ. Code § 48918(i)(1)* to issue subpoenas for witnesses that students to be expelled sought to attend disciplinary hearing)]. Any objection raised by the superintendent of schools or the superintendent's designee or the pupil to the issuance of subpoenas may be considered by the governing board in closed session, or in open session, if requested by the pupil before the meeting. Any decision by the governing board in response to an objection to the issuance of subpoenas is final and binding [*Educ. Code § 48918(i)(2)*]. If the governing board, hearing officer, or administrative panel determines, in accordance with *Educ. Code § 48918(f)* that a percipient witness would be subject to an unreasonable risk of harm by testifying at the hearing, a subpoena may not be issued to compel the personal attendance of that witness at the hearing. However, that witness may be compelled to testify by means of a sworn declaration as provided in *Educ. Code § 48918(f)* [*Educ. Code § 48918(i)(3)*]. Service of process will be extended to all parts of the state and served in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*. All witnesses appearing pursuant to subpoena, other than the parties or officers or employees of the state or political subdivision, receive fees, and all witnesses appearing pursuant to subpoena, except the parties, receive mileage in the same amount and under the same circumstances as witnesses in civil actions in a superior court. Fees and mileage are paid by the party at whose request the witness is subpoenaed [*Educ. Code § 48918(i)(4)*; for discussion of witness fees in civil actions generally, *see* Ch. 535, *Subpoena*].

In addition to any other immunity, any testimony provided by a pupil witness in an expulsion hearing conducted under *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.* is expressly deemed to be a privileged publication or broadcast protected by *Civ. Code § 47(b)* [*Educ. Code § 48918.6*]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

[7] Final Decision to Expel

Whether an expulsion hearing is conducted by the governing board or before a hearing officer or administrative panel, a final action to expel may be taken only by the governing board in a public session. Written notice of any decision to expel or to suspend the enforcement of an expulsion order during a period of probation must be sent by the superintendent of schools or his or her designee to the pupil or to his or her parent or guardian. This notice must be accompanied by all of the following notices [*Educ. Code § 48918(j)*; *see § 513.40[9], [17]*]:

- Notice of the right to appeal the expulsion to the county board of education.

- Notice of the education alternative placement to be provided to the pupil during the time of expulsion.

- Notice of the obligation of the parent, guardian, or pupil under *Educ. Code § 48915.1(b)*, on the pupil's enrollment in a new school district, to inform that district of the pupil's expulsion.

A decision of the governing board whether to expel a pupil must be made within 10 school days following the conclusion of the hearing, unless the pupil requests in writing that the decision be postponed. If the hearing is held by a hearing officer or an administrative panel, or if the district governing board does not meet on a weekly basis, the governing board must make its decision within 40 school days after the pupil's removal from the pupil's school of attendance for the incident for which the recommendation for expulsion is made by the principal or superintendent, unless the pupil requests in writing that the decision be postponed [*Educ. Code § 48918(a)*; *see § 513.40[5]*].

The governing board must maintain a record of each expulsion, including the cause for it. Records of expulsions are a nonprivileged, disclosable public record. The expulsion order and the causes for it are recorded in the pupil's mandatory interim record and forwarded to any school in which the pupil subsequently enrolls on receipt of a request for the pupil's school records from the admitting school [*Educ. Code § 48918(k)*]. The pupil's name and the offense committed must be disclosed to the public when the governing board orders the pupil expelled *[80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 85 (1997)]* .

[8] Suspension of Expulsion Order

A governing board, on voting to expel a pupil, may suspend the enforcement of the expulsion order for a period of not more than one calendar year [*Educ. Code § 48917(a)*]. A school district may suspend enforcement of an expulsion order even if the pupil committed an offense listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(c)*, for which expulsion must be ordered under *Educ. Code § 48915(d) [80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 85 (1997)* ; for discussion of offenses for which expulsion must be ordered, see *§ 513.40[1]*]. The governing board's criteria for suspending the enforcement of an expulsion order must be applied equally to all pupils, including individuals with exceptional needs as defined in *Educ. Code § 56026* [*Educ. Code § 48917(b)*; *see § 513.40[2]*]. During the expulsion order's suspension period, the pupil is on probationary status [*Educ. Code § 48917(c)*].

As a condition of the suspension, the board may assign the pupil to a school, class, or program that is deemed appropriate for the rehabilitation of the pupil [*Educ. Code § 48917(a)*]. The rehabilitation program may provide for involvement of a parent or guardian, but a parent's or guardian's refusal to participate in the rehabilitation program is not to be considered in the governing board's determination as to whether the pupil has satisfactorily completed the rehabilitation program [*Educ. Code § 48917(a)*].

The governing board may revoke the suspension of an expulsion order under *Educ. Code § 48917* on the pupil's commission of any of the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900* or for any violation of the district's rules and regulations governing pupil conduct. On revocation of the suspension of an expulsion order, a pupil may be expelled under the terms of the original expulsion order [*Educ. Code § 48917(d)*].

On satisfactory completion of the rehabilitation assignment of a pupil, the pupil must be reinstated by the governing board in a school of the district. On reinstatement, the governing board may also order the expungement of any or all records of the expulsion proceedings [*Educ. Code § 48917(e)*].

A decision of the governing board to suspend an expulsion order does not affect the time period and requirements for filing an appeal of the expulsion order with the county board of education required under *Educ. Code § 48919*. Any appeal must be filed within 30 days of the original vote of the governing board [*Educ. Code § 48917(f)*].

[9] Right to Appeal to County Board of Education

Within 30 days following the decision by a governing board to expel a pupil, the pupil or the pupil's parent or guardian may appeal the decision to the county board of education, which must hold a hearing and render a decision. The board

of education, or in a class 1 or class 2 county a hearing officer or impartial administrative panel, must hold the hearing within 20 school days following the filing of the formal request under *Educ. Code § 48919*. If the county board of education hears the appeal without a hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48919.5*, the board must render a decision within three school days of the hearing conducted under *Educ. Code § 48920*, unless the pupil requests a postponement [*Educ. Code § 48919*].

A county board of education in a class 1 or class 2 county may elect to have appeals under *Educ. Code § 48919* heard by a hearing officer or by an impartial administrative panel appointed by the board [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 48919.5(e)(1)-(3)* (definition of class 1 and class 2 counties)]. The hearing officer or impartial administrative panel must prepare a recommended decision, including findings or conclusions required for the decision, for a final decision by the county board of education [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(b)*]. A hearing officer or an impartial administrative panel in a class 1 or class 2 county is also required to hold the hearing within the 20-school-day period.

The period within which an appeal is to be filed is determined from the date a governing board votes to expel, even if enforcement of the expulsion action is suspended and the pupil is placed on probation pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48917*. A pupil who fails to appeal the original action of the board within the prescribed time may not subsequently appeal a decision of the board to revoke probation and impose the original order of expulsion [*Educ. Code § 48919*].

[10] Regulations Establishing Procedures for Expulsion Appeals

The county board of education must adopt rules and regulations establishing procedures for expulsion appeals conducted under *Educ. Code § 48919*. The adopted rules and regulations must include, but need not be limited to, the following [*Educ. Code § 48919*]:

- The requirements for filing a notice of appeal;
- The setting of a hearing date;
- The furnishing of notice to the pupil and the governing board regarding the appeal;
- The furnishing of a copy of the expulsion hearing record to the county board of education;
- Procedures for the conduct of the hearing; and
- The preservation of the record of the appeal.

If the county board of education in a class 1 or class 2 county elects to use the hearing procedures in *Educ. Code § 48919.5*, the board must adopt rules and regulations establishing procedures for expulsion appeals under that statute [*Educ. Code § 48919*; *see Educ. Code § 48919.5(e)(1)-(3)* (definition of class 1 and class 2 counties)].

[11] Obtaining Documents Required for Appeal

The pupil may submit a written request for a copy of the written transcripts and supporting documents from the school district simultaneously with the filing of the notice of appeal with the county board of education. The school district must provide the pupil with the transcriptions, supporting documents, and records within 10 school days following the pupil's written request. On receipt of the records, the pupil must immediately file suitable copies of these records with the county board of education [*Educ. Code § 48919*; *see § 513.40[12]*].

[12] Hearing of Appeal by County Board

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Educ. Code § 35145* and *Gov. Code § 54950*, the county board of education must hear an appeal of an expulsion order in closed session unless the pupil's guardian requests that the hearing be a public meeting. Such a request must be made in writing at least five days before the date of the hearing. If the submission of a request for a public meeting is timely, the county board of education must honor the request. Whether the hearing is conducted in closed or public session, the county board may meet in closed session for the purpose of deliberations. If the county board admits any representative of the pupil or the school district, the board must, at the same time, admit representatives from the opposing party [*Educ. Code § 48920*].

The county board of education must determine the appeal on the basis of the record of the hearing before the governing board of the district, together with such applicable documentation or regulations as may be ordered. Unless a de novo proceeding is granted as provided in *Educ. Code § 48923* [*see § 513.40[15]*], no evidence other than that contained in the record of the proceedings of the governing board may be heard by the county board [*Educ. Code § 48921*].

The pupil has the responsibility of submitting a written transcript of the hearing for review by the county board. The pupil must bear the cost of the transcript except in the following circumstances [*Educ. Code § 48921*]:

- When the pupil's parent or guardian certifies to the school district that he or she cannot reasonably afford the cost of the transcript because of limited income or exceptional necessary expenses, or both; or

- In a case in which the county board reverses the decision of the local governing board, the county board must require that the local board reimburse the pupil for the cost of the transcript.

[13] Hearing of Appeal by Hearing Officer or Administrative Panel

A county board of education in a class 1 or class 2 county may have a hearing officer pursuant to *Gov. Code § 27720 et seq.*, or an impartial administrative panel of three or more certificated persons appointed by the county board of education, hear appeals filed under *Educ. Code § 48919* [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 48919.5(e)(1)-(3)* (definition of class 1 and class 2 counties)]. However, members of an impartial administrative panel may not be employees or members of the governing board of the school district from which the pupil filing the appeal was expelled. Nor may the hearing officer or any member of the administrative panel hearing a pupil's appeal have served as the hearing officer or as a member of the administrative panel that conducted the pupil's expulsion hearing [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(a)*].

A hearing officer or impartial administrative panel may not issue a final order after conducting a hearing pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48919.5*. Rather, the hearing officer or administrative panel must prepare a recommended decision, including any findings or conclusions required for that decision, and submit the recommendation and the record to the county board of education within three school days of hearing the appeal [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(b)*]. Within 10 school days of receiving the recommended decision of the hearing officer or the impartial administrative panel, the county board of education must review the decision and the record and render a final order of the board [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(d)*]. The procedural requirements of *Educ. Code §§ 48919*, *48920*, *48921*, *48922*, *48923*, and *48925* are applicable to a hearing conducted pursuant to *Educ. Code § 48919.5* [*Educ. Code § 48919.5(c)*; for discussion of review by county board, *see § 513.40[14]*].

[14] Scope of Review by County Board

The review by the county board of the decision of the governing board is limited to the following questions [*Educ. Code § 48922(a)*]:

- Whether the governing board acted without or in excess of its jurisdiction;

- Whether or not there was a fair hearing before the governing board;
- Whether or not there was a prejudicial abuse of discretion in the hearing; or
- Whether or not there is relevant and material evidence which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or which was improperly excluded at the hearing before the governing board.

A proceeding without or in excess of jurisdiction, as used in *Educ. Code § 48922(a)*, includes, but is not limited to, (1) a situation when an expulsion hearing is not commenced within the time periods prescribed by *Educ. Code §§ 48900-48925, (2)* a situation when an expulsion order is not based on the acts enumerated in *Educ. Code § 48900,* or *(3)* a situation involving acts not related to school activity or attendance [*Educ. Code § 48922(b)*].

An abuse of discretion, for purposes of *Educ. Code § 48922*, is established if (1) school officials have not met the procedural requirements of *Educ. Code §§ 48900-48925, (2)* the decision to expel a pupil is not supported by the findings prescribed by *Educ. Code § 48915*, or *(3)* the findings are not supported by the evidence [*Educ. Code 48922(c)*].

A county board of education may not reverse the decision of a governing board to expel a pupil based on a finding of an abuse of discretion unless the county board of education also determines that the abuse of discretion was prejudicial [*Educ. Code § 48922*].

[15] Decision by County Board

If the county board finds that relevant and material evidence exists which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or which was improperly excluded at the hearing before the governing board, it may either (1) remand the matter to the governing board for reconsideration and order the pupil reinstated pending the reconsideration, or (2) grant a hearing de novo on reasonable notice to the pupil and to the governing board to be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in *Educ. Code § 48919* [*Educ. Code § 48923(a)*].

If the county board determines that the decision of the governing board is not supported by the findings required by *Educ. Code § 48915*, but evidence supporting the required findings exists in the record of the proceedings, the county board must remand the matter to the governing board for adoption of the required findings. The remand for adoption and inclusion of the required findings will not result in an additional hearing under *Educ. Code § 48918*, except that final action to expel the pupil based on the revised findings of fact must meet all requirements of *Educ. Code § 48918(j)* and *(k)* [*Educ. Code § 48923(b)*].

In all other cases, the county board must enter an order either affirming or reversing the decision of the governing board. In any case in which the county board enters a decision reversing the local board, the county board may direct the local board to expunge the record of the pupil and the records of the district of any references to the expulsion action, and the expulsion will be deemed not to have occurred [*Educ. Code § 48923(c)*].

The decision of the county board of education is final and binding on the pupil and on the governing board of the school district. The pupil and the governing board must be notified of the final order of the county board, in writing, either by personal service or by certified mail. The order becomes final when rendered [*Educ. Code § 48924*].

[16] Judicial Review

An expulsion order is apparently reviewable by petition for administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see, e.g., Miller v. Dailey (1902) 136 Cal. 212, 214-220, 68 P. 1029* ; *Fremont Union High School District v. Santa*

Clara County Board of Education (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1182, 286 Cal. Rptr. 915 ; *Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 26-31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513* ; *Myers v. Arcata etc. School Dist. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 563, 75 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . The expelled student must, however, exhaust his or her administrative remedies, including appeal to the county board of education, before instituting a mandate proceeding [*see Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 29-31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513]* . For a discussion and forms relating to administrative mandate proceedings, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For a form of petition for writ of mandate to review an expulsion order, see *§ 513.95*.

[17] Enrollment in Different School District After Expulsion

[a] In General

If the governing board receives a request for enrollment from a pupil who has been expelled from another school district for an act other than those described in *Educ. Code § 48915(a)* [*see § 513.40[1]*], the board must hold a hearing, conducted according to the rules and regulations governing expulsion procedures, as set forth in *Educ. Code § 48918*, to determine whether the applicant poses a continuing danger either to the pupils or employees of the enrolling school district [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(a)*; *see §§ 513.40[5], [6]*]. The enrolling school district may request information regarding the applicant's expulsion from his or her former school district, and the district receiving the request must respond within five working days [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(a)*].

On enrollment in a new district, the expelled pupil's parent or guardian (or the pupil if he or she is emancipated or of legal age) must inform the receiving district of his or her status with the previous district. If this information is not provided to the receiving district and the district later determines that the pupil was expelled from the previous school, the lack of compliance must be recorded and discussed at the hearing [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(b)*].

If after a hearing, the board determines that the pupil poses a potential danger to the pupils or employees of the enrolling district, it may deny enrollment for the remainder of the expulsion period [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(c)*]. If the board determines that the pupil does not pose such a danger, the board must permit the pupil to enroll, provided that the pupil satisfies the residency requirements set forth in *Educ. Code § 48200* or can enroll by interdistrict agreement [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(e)*]. The governing board may also consider the options of denying or permitting enrollment, or permitting conditional enrollment in a regular school program or another educational program [*Educ. Code § 48915.1(d)*].

A pupil expelled from school for any of the offenses listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(a)* will not be permitted to enroll in any other school or school district during the period of expulsion, unless it is a county community school, a juvenile court school, or a community day school [*Educ. Code § 48915.2(a)*; *see also Educ. Code § 1980 et seq.* (community schools) and *Educ. Code § 48645 et seq.* (juvenile court schools)]. After a determination, pursuant to a hearing under *Educ. Code § 48918*, that an individual expelled from another school district for an offense listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(a)* does not pose a danger to the pupils or employees of the school district, the governing board may permit the individual to enroll in the school district after the term of expulsion, if the pupil has established legal residence in the school district, or if the pupil is enrolled in the school pursuant to an interdistrict agreement [*Educ. Code § 48915.2(b)*].

[b] Disclosure of Expulsion Records

Under *Educ. Code § 49076*, a school district is not authorized to permit access to pupil records to any person without written parental consent or under judicial order with certain exceptions. However, records of expulsions, which school boards are required to keep, are a non-privileged, disclosable public record [*Educ. Code § 48918*; *see 80 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 85, 91 (1997)* (school board's public action to expel student must include student's name and reason for expulsion, and this information must be included in school district responses to requests from public for expulsion records)]. The

federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) provides for the privacy of education records, defined as documents containing information directly related to a student or maintained by an educational agency or institution [*20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(A)*]. FERPA preempts *Educ. Code § 48918* in that § 48918 requires the public disclosure of student expulsion records while FERPA conditions the receipt of federal funds on protecting students and their parents from disclosure of this very type of record [*Rim of the World Unif. Schl. Dist. v. Superior Court (2003) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1393, 1396-1399, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 11]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppeals & ReviewsEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsDecisionsEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsDue ProcessEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsNoticeEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsExpulsions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.41

§ 513.41 Corporal Punishment

The protection against corporal punishment extends to children while they are under the control of the public schools [*Educ. Code § 49000*]. No person employed by or engaged in a public school may inflict, or cause to be inflicted, corporal punishment on a pupil. Every resolution, bylaw, rule, ordinance, or other act or authority permitting or authorizing the infliction of corporal punishment on a pupil attending a public school is void and unenforceable [*Educ. Code § 49001(b)*].

For purposes of *Educ. Code § 49001*, "corporal punishment" means the willful infliction of, or willfully causing the infliction of, physical pain on a pupil. An amount of force that is reasonable and necessary for a person employed by or engaged in a public school to quell a disturbance threatening physical injury to persons or damage to property, for purposes of self-defense, or to obtain possession of weapons or other dangerous objects within the control of the pupil, is not and may not be construed to be corporal punishment within the meaning and intent of *Educ. Code § 49001*. Physical pain or discomfort caused by athletic competition or other such recreational activity, voluntarily engaged in by the pupil, is not and may not be construed to be corporal punishment within the meaning and intent of *Educ. Code § 49001* [*Educ. Code § 49001(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsCorporal Punishment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.42

§ 513.42 Parental Liability for Student Misconduct

Notwithstanding *Civ. Code § 1714.1*, the parent or guardian of any minor whose willful misconduct results in injury or death to any pupil or any person employed by or performing volunteer work for a school district or private school, or who willfully cuts, defaces, or otherwise injures any real or personal property belonging to a school district or private school or any personal property of any school employee is liable for all damages so caused by the minor. The parent's or guardian's liability, however, may not exceed $10,000. The parent or guardian of a minor is also liable for any school property loaned to a minor that is not returned on demand of a school employee authorized to make the demand [*Educ. Code § 48904(a)*]. For a further discussion of parental liability for the willful misconduct of minors, see Ch. 394, *Parent and Child* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawStudentsMisconductGeneral OverviewFamily LawFamily Relationships & TortsTort LiabilityChild TortsTortsVicarious LiabilityFamily MembersChildren & Parents

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 513.43-513.59

[Reserved]

§§ 513.43[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.60

§ 513.60 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in civil rights actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 35, *Civil Rights* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in class actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 41, *Class and Representative Actions* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions for declaratory relief, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 67, *Declaratory Relief* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions for injunctive relief, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in mandate proceedings, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions against public entities and officers generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 196, *Public Entities* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in a mandate proceeding to review the expulsion of a pupil from a public school, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureClass ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil

Rights LawPractice & ProcedureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.61

§ 513.61 Federal Constitution

Freedoms of speech, assembly, and press. *U.S. Const., amend. I*

Right to due process and equal protection of laws. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of AssemblyConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawEqual ProtectionScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.62

§ 513.62 State Constitution

Freedoms of speech and press. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*

Right to due process and equal protection of laws. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*

Rights guaranteed by California Constitution as not dependent on those guaranteed by United States Constitution. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 24*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of AssemblyConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawEqual ProtectionScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawState Constitutional Operation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.63

§ 513.63 Federal Statutes

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. *20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*

Procedural safeguards for disabled children and their parents. *20 U.S.C. § 1415*

Federal Equal Access Act. *20 U.S.C. § 4071*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActProcedural SafeguardsEducation LawReligion in SchoolsFacilities Use

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.64

§ 513.64 State Statutes

[1] Rights and Duties Generally

Prohibition of discrimination on basis of disability, gender, nationality, race or ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or any basis contained in prohibition of hate crimes set forth in *Penal Code § 422.55*, with regard to educational benefits, programs, financial aid, or employment. *Educ. Code §§ 220-230*

Pupil's right to refuse to participate in educational project involving harmful or destructive use of animals. *Educ. Code §§ 32255-32255.6*

Liability of principal or designee for damages caused by false and reckless report to parents of student's alcohol or drug abuse. *Educ. Code § 44049*

Teachers' duty to enforce school regulations. *Educ. Code § 44805*

Teachers' duty to hold pupils to strict account for conduct. *Educ. Code § 44807*

Principal, principal's designee, or any other person reporting known or suspected act described in *Educ. Code § 48902(a)* (violation of *Pen. Code 245*) or *Educ. Code § 48902(b)* (violation of *Educ. Code § 48900(c), (d)*) is not civilly or criminally liable as result of making any report authorized by *Educ. Code § 48900 et seq.* unless it can be proven that false report was made and person knew report was false or report was made with reckless disregard for its truth or falsity. *Educ. Code § 48902(d)*

Parental liability for willful pupil misconduct. *Educ. Code §§ 48904, 48905*

Withholding of grades, diploma, or transcripts until pupil or parent pays for damages to school employee or property. *Educ. Code §§ 48904(b), 48904.3*

Right of public school students to freedom of speech. *Educ. Code § 48907*

Students' duty to comply with school regulations, pursue required course of study, and submit to authority of teachers. *Educ. Code § 48908*

Student organizations. *Educ. Code §§ 48930-48938*

Access to and privacy of pupil records. *Educ. Code §§ 49060-49078*

Adoption of maximum weight standards for textbooks used by pupils in elementary and secondary schools. *Educ. Code § 49415*

Equal access of all students to technological educational programs. *Educ. Code §§ 51006, 51007*

[2] Special Education

Individual instruction for certain hospitalized, temporarily disabled children. *Educ. Code §§ 48206.3-48208*

Expulsion procedure. *Educ. Code § 48915.5*

Right of individuals with exceptional needs to free appropriate public education. *Educ. Code §§ 56000, 56040*

Definitions. *Educ. Code §§ 56020-56033*

Administration of special education programs. *Educ. Code § 56100 et seq.*

Elements of local plans. *Educ. Code §§ 56200-56243*

Identification and referral of individuals with exceptional needs. *Educ. Code §§ 56300-56303*

Assessment. *Educ. Code §§ 56320-56329*

Development and review of individualized education program. *Educ. Code §§ 56340-56347, 56380, 56381*

Implementation of plan and services required as part of plan. *Educ. Code §§ 56360-56393*

Procedural safeguards. *Educ. Code §§ 56500-56506*

Confidentiality of information. *Educ. Code § 56515*

Funding of special education programs. *Educ. Code §§ 56700-56830*

[3] Student Discipline

Adoption of rules for government and discipline of schools in school district. *Educ. Code §§ 35291-35291.7*

Grounds for suspension or expulsion. *Educ. Code §§ 48900, 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, 48900.7, 48915(a)*

Teacher's authority to request classroom attendance of parent or guardian of pupil suspended for specified acts. *Educ.*

Code § 48900.1

Suspension procedure. *Educ. Code §§ 48911, 48911.5, 48914*

Expulsion procedure. *Educ. Code §§ 48911.5, 48915.5, 48918*

Appeal of expulsion order to county board of education. *Educ. Code §§ 48919-48924*

With regard to suspension and expulsion, pupils in California School for the Blind and two California Schools for the Deaf have same due process procedural protections afforded to pupils in California public school districts. *Educ. Code § 48927(c)*

Penalty for assault or battery committed on school property or against teachers and other specified school employees. *Penal Code §§ 241.2, 241.3, 241.6, 243.2, 243.3, 243.6*

Corporal punishment. *Educ. Code §§ 49000, 49001*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationEqual Educational OpportunitiesGeneral OverviewEducation LawFaculty & StaffDutiesGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.65

§ 513.65 Federal Regulations

Assistance to states for education of handicapped children. 45 C.F.R. §§ 121a.1-121a.754

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActFundingEducation LawStudentsStudent RecordsGeneral OverviewPublic Health & Welfare LawSocial ServicesDisabled & Elderly PersonsEducation & TrainingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.66

§ 513.66 State Regulations

Pupil records. *5 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 50, 51, 400-450*

Special education and handicapped children. *5 Cal. Code Reg. § 3000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationSexual HarassmentEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActEnforcementEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.67

§ 513.67 Decisions

[1] Educational Malpractice

School district's failure to comply with time requirements in assessment of student referred to special education was not negligence. *Keech v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 464, 468-469, 210 Cal. Rptr. 7*

Person claiming to have been inadequately educated by public school system has no cause of action in tort against public school authorities; school officials are under no actionable duty of care to educate students adequately. *Peter W. v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 814, 817, 825, 131 Cal. Rptr. 854*

In action by student club against school district for violation of club member's rights under Federal Equal Access Act (FEAA) [*20 U.S.C. § 4071*] by refusing to grant club rights enjoyed by other clubs permitted to meet on campus, trial court erred in granting school district summary judgment, holding that other clubs were curriculum related, when court's finding that other clubs' provision of community service to satisfy graduation requirement established curriculum relatedness was erroneous, since community service clubs are at best only marginally related to usual high school curriculum so that making participation in clubs satisfy graduation requirement did not transform clubs into scholastic endeavors; and when evidence of inclusion of units in curriculum on subject of community service was insufficient to establish that no triable issue of material fact existed as to curriculum relatedness of service clubs at issue or of excluded club under community service criteria, since school district presented no evidence as to whether or to what extent teachers actually taught subject of community service in classroom; further, FEAA requires only that on-campus meetings of student groups be student initiated, so that initiation of club itself by faculty did not offend. *FEAA. Van Schoick v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 522, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562*

[2] Freedom of Expression

School officials did not violate *First Amendment* by confiscating pro-drug banner at school-sanctioned and school-supervised event held offsite and suspending student responsible for it. Morse v. Frederick (2007) 551U.S.393,

127 S. Ct. 2618, 2625-2629, 168 L. Ed. 2d 290

School prohibition of use of lewd, indecent, vulgar, or offensive speech or conduct by students in public discourse was not prohibited by *U.S. Const., amend. I.* Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 685-686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549*

Students and teachers do not shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate. *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 506, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731*

School administrator did not violate high school student's *First Amendment* free expression rights by requiring musical numbers to be played at high school graduations to be secular in nature, thus requiring student to select musical piece other than Ave Maria to play at graduation, where, although instrumental performance of Ave Maria was protected speech under *First Amendment*, school district's restriction was constitutionally permissible within context given that district was acting to avoid repeat of earlier controversy by prohibiting any reference to religion at its graduation ceremonies and district's policies regarding religious musical performances evidenced desire to remain neutral with regard to all religions. *Nurre v. Whitehead (9th Cir. 2009) 580 F.3d 1087, 1092-1095*

Middle school students who walked out of school to participate in protests against immigration legislation failed to raise triable issue as to claim that school principal violated their *First Amendment* rights by disciplining them for leaving school without permission, where, although there was no evidence students gave speeches, discussed matters of immigration reform, or carried placards or signs conveying their messages during walkout, reasonable jury could have concluded students were engaging in expressive conduct, but where students did not have retaliation claim based on threats of discipline for *First Amendment* activity because principal's threat was itself based upon lawful consequences and was not actually administered, and where disciplining students for walking out of school did not violate their *First Amendment* rights because they were punished for disruption caused by leaving campus without permission, not for expressive activity and school's anti-truancy policy was content-neutral rule furthering important interest unrelated to suppression of expression, which was narrowly tailored to government's legitimate interests in enforcing compulsory education, keeping minors safe from influences of street, maximizing school funding based on attendance, and limiting potential liability for negligent failure to supervise truant student properly. Even assuming students had shown they engaged in constitutionally protected activity, their claim would have failed because they failed to show that principal's actions had retaliatory motive. *Corales v. Bennett (9th Cir. 2009) 567 F.3d 554, 562-569*

School district's viewpoint- and content-neutral uniform dress policies did not violate students' *First Amendment* free expression rights, where district's articulated interests in increasing student achievement, promoting safety, and enhancing a positive school environment qualified as important sufficiently to withstand intermediate scrutiny, district's interests were unrelated to suppression of free expression, and policies did not restrict speech more than necessary. Policies did not infringe on students' *First Amendment* rights by compelling students to express support for conformity, with which some students disagreed, where school did not force student to communicate any message, including expressing support for conformity or community affiliation, simply by requiring student to wear clothes mandated by its uniform policy. *Jacobs v. Clark County Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2008) 526 F.3d 419, 427-438*

High school did not violate Equal Access Act by denying recognition to religious club based on discriminatory membership criteria rather than on content of speech at meetings. Club also failed to show denial of recognition based on its general membership restrictions burdened *First Amendment* interest prohibiting forced inclusion. *Truth v. Grohe (9th Cir. 2007) 499 F.3d 999, 1009-1015*

Under standard articulated in *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 514, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731* , high school varsity basketball students' petition requesting that coach resign and complaints against coach were protected speech because they could not reasonably have led school officials to forecast substantial disruption of or material interference with school activity. However, students' refusal to board bus to play in

game was not protected by *First Amendment* because, even if expressive conduct, it substantially disrupted and materially interfered with operation of the varsity boys basketball program. On remand to district court for consideration of students' claims of retaliation for exercise of speech, court was required to determine whether students offered evidence from which reasonable jury could conclude petition and complaints against coach were substantial or motivating factor in decision to suspend them permanently from basketball team, because if so, defendants would not be entitled to summary judgment unless they could show they would have imposed permanent suspension even in absence of petition and complaints against coach. *Pinard v. Clatskanie Sch. Dist. 6J (9th Cir. 2006) 467 F.3d 755, 763-771*

Petition and complaints by members of high school basketball team against their coach were protected speech because they could not reasonably have led school officials to forecast substantial disruption of or material interference with school activity. However, students' refusal to board bus to play in out-of-town game was not protected by *First Amendment*. Even if expressive conduct, it substantially disrupted and materially interfered with operation of varsity boys' basketball program. Remand of claim of retaliation based on suspension from basketball team was required for district court to determine whether team members offered evidence from which reasonable jury could conclude petition and complaints against coach were substantial or motivating factor in decision to suspend them permanently from team, not simply boycott of game. *Pinard v. Clatskanie School Dist. 6J (9th Cir. 2006) 446 F.3d 964, 972-979* .

Public high school could prohibit student from wearing T-shirt with message condemning and denigrating other students on basis of their sexual orientation without violating *First Amendment*. Evidence was sufficient to permit school officials to reasonably find that wearing of T-shirt collided with rights of other students in most fundamental way. *Harper v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 445 F.3d 1166, 1185-1191*

School officials were properly granted qualified immunity and did not violate student's *First Amendment* rights by allowing references to God as they related to student's own beliefs but censoring sectarian, proselytizing portions of speech he gave at his high school graduation ceremony, and rejecting "disclaimer" stating that views of student speakers did not represent views of school district but allowing student to hand out copies of full text of his proposed draft speech just outside graduation ceremony site, when school officials' acts were necessary to avoid violating *Establishment Clause* to avoid appearance of government sponsorship of religion and because allowing speech would have had impermissibly coercive effect on dissenters, requiring them to participate in religious practice even by their silence. *Lassonde v. Pleasanton Unif. Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 2003) 320 F.3d 979, 982-985*

Under totality of facts, high school did not violate student's *First Amendment* expression rights by temporarily expelling student based on poem which school officials perceived as implied threat of violent harm to himself and others, when, even though content of poem was factor in their decision, school officials had duty to prevent potential violence on campus to student himself or to other students and when officials decided not to allow student to attend class, they were aware of substantial number of facts that in isolation would probably not have warranted their response, but in combination gave them reasonable basis for their actions, including student's previous suicidal ideations, previous domestic dispute when student was forced to move out of family home, pressure placed on student by family to rescind charges filed against his father as result of domestic dispute, that student had broken up with his girlfriend and was reportedly stalking her, several disciplinary problems in past at least one of which involved some violence, and that he had been absent from school in three days before turning in poem to his English teacher; when poem itself was filled with imagery of violent death and suicide, which at its most mild interpretation appeared to be "cry for help"; and when this occurred against backdrop of recent actual school shootings. However, placement and retention in student's file of negative documentation did violate his rights, when letter was written and placed in file after perceived threat had subsided and student had returned to classes. *LaVine v. Blaine School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 257 F.3d 981*

Controversial student editorial on immigration was protected speech under *Educ. Code § 48907*, where there was no evidence student-author intended to cause substantial disruption of school, as opposed to other action, such as enforcement of immigration laws. School district did not violate *Educ. Code § 48907* by holding meetings providing opportunity for protestors to express their reactions or by sending letter disavowing author's viewpoint, but did violate §

48907 by announcing that editorial was not protected speech, which was likely to chill future speech. *Smith v. Novato Unif. School Dist. (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 1439, 1454-1465, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 508*

High school administration could deny access to school by members of group wishing to distribute anti-abortion, pro-abstinence literature to students before classes, because school campuses are not public fora, and statutes and school district procedures focused on maintenance of peaceful, nonconfrontational environment for educational activities and school administration acted reasonably in determining that group's presence on campus would disrupt that atmosphere. *Reeves v. Rocklin Unified School Dist. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 652, 660-666, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213*

Official school publications are limited forum in which the state has compelling interest in prior restraint of profanity. *Lopez v. Tulare Joint Union High School District (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1302, 1328-1330, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762*

Hair style, without more, is not per se expression of speech within protection of *First Amendment*; under *Fourteenth Amendment*, student hairstyle regulation need only be justified by some reasonable relationship between legitimate educational concerns of school administration and controlling male hair length and style. *Montalvo v. Madera Unified School Dist. Bd. of Educ. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 323, 334-335, 98 Cal. Rptr. 593*

First Amendment does not guarantee student right to hold on-campus rallies when evidence showed that similar rallies in past had substantially disrupted educational process and when school provided readily available forum in which to exercise right of free speech. *Lipkis v. Caveney (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 383, 385-387, 96 Cal. Rptr. 779*

[3] Freedom of Religion

Federal government's distribution of funds to state and local governmental agencies as part of longstanding school aid program known as Chapter 2, which in turn lend educational materials and equipment to public and private schools, many of which are religiously affiliated, does not violate *Establishment Clause*, where Chapter 2 has undisputed secular purpose, and where Chapter 2 neither results in religious indoctrination by government nor defines its recipients by reference to religion. *Mitchell v. Helms (2000) 530 U.S. 793, 120 S. Ct. 2530, 2540, 147 L. Ed. 2d 660*

State statute and school district policy requiring teacher-led recitation of Pledge of Allegiance by students in public schools, but not compelling students to participate, and Pledge itself, did not constitute establishment of religion prohibited by United States Constitution, where there was no excessive entanglement with religion, primary effect was neither to advance nor inhibit religion, and Congress' purpose in enacting Pledge was patriotic, not to try to impress religious doctrine upon anyone; where Pledge did not violate Endorsement Test, i.e., did not have purpose or effect of endorsing, favoring, or promoting religion; where recitation of Pledge in public school classroom did not unconstitutionally coerce objecting students into affirming belief in God; and where "under God" was added as description of "one Nation" primarily to reinforce idea that U.S. was founded upon concept of limited government, in stark contrast to unlimited power exercised by communist governments. *Newdow v. Ria Lindo Union Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 597 F.3d 1007, 1017-1042*

School district's policy requiring musical numbers to be played at high school graduations to be secular in nature, requiring student to select musical piece other than Ave Maria to play at graduation, did not violate student's *Establishment Clause* rights to be free from hostility to religion, where district prohibited performance of Ave Maria in effort to avoid conflict with *Establishment Clause*; where reasonable person, informed as to history of district's prohibition on performance, would understand that action had secular effect of maintaining neutrality and ensuring district's continued compliance with *Establishment Clause*; and where policy did not create either administrative or political entanglement with religion. *Nurre v. Whitehead (9th Cir. 2009) 580 F.3d 1087, 1095-1098*

Public high school could prohibit student from wearing T-shirt with message condemning and denigrating other

students on basis of their sexual orientation without violating *First Amendment*. Restriction regarding T-shirt did not impose substantial burden on free exercise of student's religious beliefs, and school had compelling interest in providing proper educational environment for students and its actions were narrowly tailored to achieve that end. Also, there was no evidence school's actions were based on other than entirely secular and legitimate aim of protecting rights of students and promoting tolerant and safe learning environment and no evidence school authorities sought to coerce or encourage student to participate in some other religion or to adopt state-supported or other religious faith. *Harper v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 445 F.3d 1166, 1186-1191*

School district's policy of treating after school religious groups differently than non-religious groups violated federal Equal Access Act when access to student body association funding, yearbook, public address system, and bulletin boards is required by the Act. Act did not similarly encompass policy's restriction of religious group's access to student/staff time, school supplies, vehicles, or AV equipment, but such policy violated *First Amendment*, when, while not required to grant student clubs access to these benefits, school had chosen to do so and may not deny access to some groups without compelling government interest that is narrowly drawn to achieve that end, and when district's restriction on access to facilities was based purely on religious group's religious viewpoint in violation of *First Amendment*, and when requiring that district grant religious groups access would ensure neutrality rather than violate *Establishment Clause*. *Prince v. Jacoby (9th Cir. 2002) 303 F.3d 1074, 1078-1094*

Oregon regulation precluding school district from providing special education services to student at sectarian school does not violate federal constitution's guarantee of free exercise of religion or prohibition of establishment of religion. *WJM ex rel. KDM v. Reedsport Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1999) 196 F.3d 1046*

Granting official school recognition under Federal Equal Access Act (FEAA) [*20 U.S.C. § 4071*] of student club with avowed aim of having Christian presence on campus and influencing others into Christian faith would not result in violation of either federal constitutional *establishment clause* or its state constitutional analog, when merely granting club same privileges enjoyed by all other campus clubs offends neither federal nor state constitution; when involvement of teachers with club does not tip *establishment clause* balance against club since their involvement occurs off campus and only nonparticipating faculty member would be involved on campus so that students would not be exposed to teachers' involvement in club, which would make unlikely that club's on-campus meetings would convey message of state approval or endorsement of religion; and when FEAA was carefully crafted to ensure against possibility that religious group's access to public high school's campus would offend *establishment clause*, and full compliance by club with provisions of FEAA is small price to pay for cost of admission to campus. *Van Schoick v. Saddleback Valley Unified School Dist. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 522, 532, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562*

School district's rejection of sign proffered by private party containing Ten Commandments in response to district's fund raising campaign did not violate party's free exercise rights under *Cal. Const., art. I, § 4*, when party's freedom to worship was not inhibited and when private party is not free to impose religious beliefs on children in educational arena. *DiLoreto v. Board of Educ. of Downey Unif. Sch. Dist. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 267, 278-279, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 791*

[4] Right to Public Education

California statutes permitted home schooling as species of private school education exempted from compulsory education laws, but for family with history of dependency court proceedings involving charges of physical abuse, neglect, and failure to prevent sexual abuse, dependency court erred in declining to issue order that two youngest children be sent to private or public school after they were declared dependent due to abuse and neglect of their siblings, where statutory permission to home school could be constitutionally be overridden to protect safety of children. *Jonathan L. v. Superior Court (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1088-1105, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 571*

Education is fundamental interest for purposes of state constitutional provisions guaranteeing equal protection of the

laws. *Serrano v. Priest (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 728, 765-766, 135 Cal. Rptr. 345, 557 P.2d 929 , cert. denied sub nom. Clowes v. Serrano 432 U.S. 907 (1977)* ; *see Serrano v. Priest (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 584, 596 n.11, 604-610, 96 Cal. Rptr. 601, 487 P.2d 1241*

Refusal by school board to furnish transportation is abuse of discretion when failure to provide transportation would totally deprive minor plaintiffs of opportunity to attend school, and when school was in sound fiscal position to meet additional expenses of providing such transportation. *Manjares v. Newton (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 365, 373-376, 49 Cal. Rptr. 805, 411 P.2d 901*

Opportunity to attend and receive instruction at public schools is enforceable legal right. *Piper v. Big Pine School Dist. (1924) 193 Cal. 664, 669-670, 226 P. 926* ; *Ward v. Flood (1874) 48 Cal. 36, 50*

Right to participate in interscholastic athletics is not fundamental right entitled to strict scrutiny review on equal protection, but rather is tested by rational basis standard, despite fact that public education itself is fundamental right under *California Constitution. Steffes v. California Interscholastic Federation (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 739, 748, 222 Cal. Rptr. 355* ; *see California Interscholastic Federation v. Jones (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 751, 754, 757-758, 243 Cal. Rptr. 271* (CIF rule restricting student's eligibility for interscholastic athletics to eight semesters is constitutional under rational basis test)

Residency requirement for admission into public schools [*Educ. Code § 48200*] that operated to exclude child of parents admitted into United States on nonimmigrant, nonresident visas was constitutional since it applied uniformly to all persons, regardless of alienage or citizenship. *Anselmo v. Glendale Unified School District (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 520, 522, 523, 177 Cal. Rptr. 427*

[5] Search and Seizure

Thirteen-year-old student's *Fourth Amendment* right was violated when she was subjected to search of her bra and underpants by school officials acting on reasonable suspicion she had brought forbidden prescription and over-the-counter drugs to school, where there were no reasons to suspect drugs presented danger or were concealed in her underwear; however, because there was reason to question clarity with which right was established, officials who ordered and conducted unconstitutional search were entitled to qualified immunity from liability. *Safford Unified School Dist. v. Redding (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2633, 2639-2644, 174 L. Ed. 2d 354*

Warrant and finding of probable cause are unnecessary in public school context because such requirements would unduly interfere with maintenance of swift and informal disciplinary procedures needed. Board of Education of Independent School District No. 92 of *Bd. of Educ. v. Earls (2002) 536 U.S. 822, 122 S. Ct. 2559, 2564, 153 L. Ed. 2d 735* ; Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. *Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 653, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564*

Public school district's policy of suspicionless drug testing as requirement for participation in extra-curricular activities was constitutional, when student's privacy interest is limited in public school environment in which state is responsible for maintaining discipline, health, and safety, when manner in which production of urine sample is monitored was negligible intrusion and test results were kept confidential, and when testing students who participate in extracurricular activities is reasonably effective means of addressing school district's legitimate concerns in preventing, deterring, and detecting drug use. Board of Education of Independent School District No. 92 of *Bd. of Educ. v. Earls (2002) 536 U.S. 822, 122 S. Ct. 2559, 2566-2569, 153 L. Ed. 2d 735*

Suspicionless drug testing of athletes as requirement of participation is constitutional. *Vernonia School Dist. 47J v. Acton (1995) 515 U.S. 646, 657-665, 115 S. Ct. 2386, 132 L. Ed. 2d 564*

Child protective services officer's decision to seize and interrogate suspected child abuse victim at school with law enforcement officer present, in absence of warrant, court order, exigent circumstances, or parental consent, violated child's *Fourth Amendment* rights, where general law of search warrants applied to child abuse investigations; where, with direct involvement of law enforcement in in-school seizure and interrogation, child was not seized for some special need beyond normal need for law enforcement. *Greene v. Camreta (9th Cir. 2009) 588 F.3d 1011, 1022-1030*

High school teacher's opening of student's purse to find identification document so she could write referral for student's disruptive behavior without any suspicion student had engaged or was engaging in any proscribed activity justifying search and for which there was no suspicion student had knife or other prohibited item in her purse justifying teacher opening it was unreasonable search and evidence of knife would be suppressed in prosecution of student for carrying knife on school grounds, when student's disruptive behavior in class did not authorize school official to rummage through student's personal belongings, and when student did not refuse request to produce identification. *In re Lisa G. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 801, 805-808, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 163*

[6] Sexual Harassment

Under Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.*, private right of action may lie against a recipient of Title IX funding, such as school board, in cases of "student-on-student" harassment when (1) recipient acts with deliberate indifference to known acts of harassment in its programs or activities, (2) harasser is under school's disciplinary authority, and (3) harassment is so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively bars victim's access to educational opportunity or benefit. *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839*

District court properly granted summary judgment to college in student's action under Title IX on ground that college was not deliberately indifferent, when, on receiving actual knowledge of alleged sexual harassment of student by teacher, college provided student with counselors to assist her in documenting and presenting her case before school's committee on sexual harassment, provided her with one-on-one counseling sessions, instructed teacher against whom harassment was alleged to avoid contact with student alleging harassment, conducted hearing, concluded that teacher had sexually harassed student, and imposed number of disciplinary sanctions on teacher; lengthy delay between date of initial complaint and hearing did not constitute deliberate indifference because there were valid reasons for delay, including administrative hurdles, such as formation of sexual harassment hearing committee, student had difficulty retaining counsel, and student had relocated. *Oden v. Northern Marianas College (9th Cir. 2002) 284 F.3d 1058*

Although trial court erred in instructing jury under *Educ. Code § 220* on claim by public students who suffered severe, pervasive, and offensive peer sexual orientation harassment while attending high school, including death threats, being spit on, physical violence and threats of physical violence, vandalism to personal property, and being subject to antigay epithets, by applying negligence principles derived from California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), instead of the more stringent elements of liability derived from Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, where Legislature intended Title IX's elements to govern action under § 220, record contained sufficient evidence to support jury's findings that students suffered violations of *Educ. Code § 220* in school officials' and district's acting with deliberate indifference to antigay harassment to which students were subject by their peers. *Donovan v. Poway Unif. School Dist. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 567, 592-619, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285*

[7] Special Education

IDEA Amendments of 1997 did not categorically prohibit reimbursement for private education costs if child had not previously received special education and related services under authority of public agency. *Forest Grove School Dist. v. T. A. (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 2484, 2491-2496, 174 L. Ed. 2d 168*

Parents may seek review of due process hearing in United States District Court on their own behalf, unrepresented by counsel even though they are not trained or licensed as attorneys, because IDEA accords to parents rights of their own that can be vindicated in court proceedings, which are not limited to procedural and reimbursement-related matters. *Winkelman v. Parma City Sch. Dist. (2007) 550 U.S. 516, 127 S. Ct. 1994, 1999-2006, 167 L. Ed. 2d 904*

Attorney's fees provision in IDEA does not authorize prevailing parents to recover fees for services rendered by experts in IDEA actions. *Arlington Cent. Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Murphy (2006) 548 U.S. 291, 126 S. Ct. 2455, 165 L. Ed. 526, 538*

Burden of proof in administrative due process hearing challenging individualized education plan is on party seeking relief. Thus, burden of persuasion was on child, as represented by his parents, when parents believed child's IEP was inappropriate, and they requested impartial due process hearing. *Schaffer v. Weast (2005) 546 U.S. 49, 126 S. Ct. 528, 533-537, 163 L. Ed. 2d 387*

Under requirement of providing "related services" under IDEA, school district must provide ventilator-dependent student continuous one-on-one nursing services student required during school hours in order to remain in school. *Cedar Rapids Community School District v. Garret F. (1999) 526 U.S. 66, 119 S. Ct. 992, 143 L. Ed. 2d 154*

Appropriate relief under former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2)* (*now see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*) is not limited in form and includes reimbursement to parents for private special education expenditures if court determines that private placement, rather than proposed individualized educational program, is proper under IDEA; parents' violation of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(3)* by placing child in private school without consent of local school authorities during pendency of hearing proceedings was not waiver of rights under former *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2)* (*now see 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*). *Burlington School Comm. v. Massachusetts Dept. of Ed. (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 369-374, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385*

Whenever remedy under § 504 of Rehabilitation Act [*29 U.S.C. § 794*] is provided with more clarity and precision under former Education of the Handicapped Act (now known as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*], plaintiff is not allowed to circumvent or enlarge on remedies available under EHA by resort to § 504. *Smith v. Robinson (1984) 468 U.S. 992, 1018, 104 S. Ct. 3457, 82 L. Ed. 2d 746*

IDEA [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*] requires states receiving federal funding to provide all handicapped children with free appropriate public education, including related services such as supportive services as may be required to assist handicapped child to benefit from special education. *Irving Independent School Dist. v. Tatro (1984) 468 U.S. 883, 889, 104 S. Ct. 3371, 82 L. Ed. 2d 664*

Court's inquiry in suit under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* is twofold: (1) whether state has complied with procedures set forth in IDEA, and (2) whether individualized educational program developed through IDEA's procedures is reasonably calculated to enable child to receive educational benefits; state complies with obligations imposed by Congress if these requirements are met. *Board of Education v. Rowley (1982) 458 U.S. 176, 206-207, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 73 L. Ed. 2d 690*

District court properly dismissed action brought by mother on behalf of autistic student for negligence, outrage, and violations of *42 U.S.C. § 1983* predicated on student's constitutional rights and statutory rights under IDEA for lack of subject matter jurisdiction based on mother's failure to exhaust her administrative remedies before coming into federal court, where mother sought relief for injuries caused by administration of disciplinary measures as part of larger educational strategy, which could have been redressed to some degree by IDEA's administrative procedures. *Payne v. Peninsula Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 598 F.3d 1123, 1126-1128*

School district failed to provide pupil student of average intelligence that district had diagnosed with learning disabilities in first grade with free appropriate public education in eighth, ninth and tenth grades and was required to

reimburse parents for three years of private school tuition and attorney's fees, where school district erroneously concluded that 1997 amendment to IDEA drastically changed free appropriate public education standard and proper standard to determine whether disabled child received free appropriate public education was "educational benefit" standard set forth by Supreme Court in *Rowley*. District did fail to confer free appropriate public education based on procedural violations involving district's "pre-meeting meeting," where there was no evidence district made program decisions at preparatory meeting, parents actively participated in individualized educational program formulation process, and district changed various aspects of program based on recommendations of parents and psychologist. District did not commit procedural violation of IDEA by not specifying teaching methodologies in pupil's individualized educational programs, where district's determination and ALJ's finding that teachers needed flexibility in teaching methodologies because there was not single methodology that would always be effective was entitled to deference. District court erred in concluding that district committed procedural violation by not specifying minutes of instruction to be devoted to each service in individualized educational program, where amount of time to be devoted to services was appropriate to specific services provided, and even if district did commit procedural violation by failing to specify minutes, it did not result in denial of free appropriate public education. Plaintiffs failed to exhaust claim that district violated IDEA procedurally in regards to transition services by failing to raise argument in administrative complaint or due process hearing. *J. L. v. Mercer Island Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 592 F.3d 938, 946-954*

Administrative law judge's conclusion that school district misclassified pupil as mentally retarded rather than autistic qualified parents for attorney's fees under IDEA as prevailing party, even though pupil was not denied FAPE since he received instruction by qualified teacher, where change in disability classification legally entitled pupil to instruction by teachers qualified to teach students with both mental retardation and autism, and before decision, school district refused to recognize his classification as autistic, and thus his legal right to such instruction. Further, parents were entitled to attorney's fees even though pupil was represented by his paternal grandmother, who was practicing attorney, where grandmother was not his legal guardian or acting in place of his natural or adoptive parent. *Weissburg v. Lancaster School Dist. (9th Cir. 2010) 591 F.3d 1255, 1258-1261*

District court did not abuse its discretion by denying reimbursement for private school tuition to parents of student diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder who was eligible for services under IDEA, where district court properly reviewed state hearing officer's decision to grant partial reimbursement de novo giving his determinations due weight; and where substantial evidence supported district court's conclusion that placement at residential facility was not necessary to provide special education and related services, and it was child's "risky behaviors" outside of school that prompted her parents to enroll her in residential facility. *Ashland School District v. Parents of Student R.J. (9th Cir. 2009) 588 F.3d 1004, 1010-1011*

District court properly reversed hearing officer's award of reimbursement to parents for residential placement of their child after conducting independent review of record and determining that parents were not entitled to reimbursement for expenses associated with residential placement either before or after they provided school district with notice, where district court properly reviewed state hearing officer's award of reimbursement de novo and adequately responded to hearing officer's conclusions, and where district court was not required to give deference to hearing officer's conclusions. District court properly considered high cost of residential treatment after concluding that much of cost of medical care in residential placement expenses was unrelated to educational needs, and properly found that after giving parents 23-page pamphlet explaining their rights and obligations under IDEA, including their obligation to give notice before unilaterally transferring child to residential educational setting, district was not obligated to remind them of this obligation once it knew they were considering residential placement; and ample evidence supported district court's conclusion that residential placement was necessitated by medical, rather than educational, concerns. Although hearing officer's decision was delayed, parent's entitlement to relief under IDEA "stay put" provision was properly reduced, where delay was not unreasonable based on numerous motions and briefs parties filed, as well as voluminous record. *Ashland School District v. Parents of Student E.H. (9th Cir. 2009) 587 F.3d 1175, 1181-1188*

District court erred by reversing state administrative agency's finding that procedural violation of IDEA amounted to

harmless error, where district court failed to properly consider whether school district's policy of limiting parents' classroom observational opportunities to 20 minutes was harmless because parents nevertheless had full opportunity to participate in process to fashion appropriate educational plan for their child with help from informed and knowledgeable expert; and where there was no evidence supporting finding that parents' right to participate was significantly affected. District court properly denied "stay put" order requiring school district to reimburse parents for continuing education expenses beyond that covered in its original order, where private program chosen by parents alone did not qualify as "current education placement" under IDEA. *L. M. v. Capistrano Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 2009) 556 F.3d 900, 909-913*

School district committed procedural violation when it did not inform parents and children of its impending evaluations of children, which deprived children of free appropriate public education, and parents were entitled to full reimbursement for private evaluations of children, which they reasonably sought when they were not told district would conduct evaluations of their children, because their refusal to share information did not harm district, which had to obtain its own evaluation, and their refusal to share information had no connection to district's violation of IDEA's notice provisions. District court did not abuse its discretion in refusing to grant parents reimbursement for services for which they paid during delay in evaluating children, where district had to provide services only upon determination of eligibility and had no obligation to provide services until after evaluations. State's 45-school-day timeline was not an inconsistent interpretation of IDEA's reasonable timeliness requirement but did not provide school districts with safe harbor, where, regardless of compliance with state regulatory requirement, IDEA required that districts act within reasonable time to evaluate potentially disabled children; 110-day delay, which occurred during summer vacation and complied with state regulation, was reasonable, where administrative delay was needed to promote effective test results, it made sense to allow district degree of leeway during summer vacation. District conducted proper evaluation even though it did not test children for autism before it finalized IEPs, where district could not effectively administer autism tests until after test administrators had gotten to know children, so that evaluations qualified as initial evaluations under IDEA; initial IEPs were reasonably calculated to provide children with educational benefits even though they did not address autism, where children received educational benefits while district pursued autism eligibility determinations. District was capable of implementing later IEPs, where IDEA did not require district to employ behavior analyst, and district had personnel capable of implementing *IEPs. JG v. Douglas County School Dist. (9th Cir. 2008) 552 F.3d 786, 793-802*

Elementary school district violated IDEA by failing to meet its procedural obligation to evaluate child to determine whether he was autistic, where district's failure to meet its obligation to evaluate child in all areas of suspected disability, including whether he was autistic, was procedural error that denied him FAPE. However, district court did not apply incorrect standard in employing "regression/recoupment" standard in determining that child was not entitled to extended school services, as opposed to a multi-faceted inquiry, as purportedly required by state law, and it was reasonable for hearing officer to rely on testimony of district's witnesses because they had observed child's school performance. *N.B. v. Hellgate Elementary Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2008) 541 F.3d 1202, 1207-1213*

Dismissal of father's action under IDEA against state department of education without prejudice did not confer prevailing party status on defendant for purposes of attorneys' fees award under IDEA, where dismissal without prejudice did not constitute judgment on merits, and where dismissal without prejudice did not alter legal relationship of parties because defendant remained subject to risk of re-filing. *Oscar v. Alaska Dep't of Educ. & Early Dev. (9th Cir. 2008) 541 F.3d 978, 981-982*

District court erred by reversing state administrative agency's finding that procedural violation of IDEA amounted to harmless error, where district court failed to properly consider whether parents' right to participate was significantly affected, i.e., whether district's policy of limiting parents' classroom observational opportunities to 20 minutes was harmless because parents nevertheless had full opportunity to participate in process to fashion appropriate educational plan with help from informed and knowledgeable expert; and where there was no evidence to support finding that parents' right to participate was significantly affected. However, district court properly denied "stay put" order, where

parents could not argue they prevailed in their procedural challenge to IEP, or that district court determined that child's privately funded educational services were appropriate. *L.M. v. Capistrano Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2008) 538 F.3d 1261, 1267-1271*

In action by parents individually and as guardians ad litem for their autistic daughters against state education department for alleged violations of IDEA and § 504 of Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended [*29 U.S.C. § 794*], Ninth Circuit would not decide whether plaintiffs alleged privately enforceable cause of action for damages, where, although injunctive relief was available under IDEA, monetary damages were not; and where, although FAPE requirements in IDEA and in § 504 regulations requiring FAPE were overlapping but different, availability of relief under IDEA did not limit availability of damages remedy under § 504 FAPE regulations, and § 504 provided private right of action for damages, parents did not specify which § 504 regulations they believed were violated and which supported privately enforceable cause of action. *Mark H. v. Lemahieu (9th Cir. 2008) 513 F.3d 922, 928-930, 932-940*

After school district filed administrative complaint against mother when she refused to consent to Individualized Education Plan for her son, and administrative hearing officer dismissed complaint without prejudice, mother lacked standing to pursue action in federal district court under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)* claiming hearing officer erred in failing to dismiss with prejudice and in failing to identify her as prevailing party, where mother did not suffer injury in fact because her injuries were speculative, and where mother did not affirmatively request relief because school district had filed administrative complaint and when hearing officer dismissed matter without prejudice, it merely restored status quo. *Levina v. San Luis Coastal Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 514 F.3d 866, 868-869*

Mother was not entitled to damages to compensate her for lost income and emotional distress she experienced during her ultimately successful efforts to obtain benefits for her son under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, because *42 U.S.C. § 1983* did not create cause of action for money damages under IDEA for lost earnings and suffering of parent pursuing IDEA relief. Further, because mother was not qualified individual with disability, her claim was not cognizable under either title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 [*42 U.S.C. § 12132*], or § 504 of Rehabilitation Act of 1973 [*29 U.S.C. § 794(a)*; *see 29 U.S.C. § 705(20)*]. *Blanchard v. Morton Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 504 F.3d 771, 773-774*

After 1997 amendments, IDEA no longer requires presence of child's current regular education teacher on IEP team, so failure to include both child's past or current regular education teacher and current special education teacher was not procedural error; however, failure to include special education teacher or provider on team who actually taught child was procedural violation of IDEA. Procedural error was harmless, however, where child did not qualify for IDEA relief. *R.B. v. Napa Valley Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 496 F.3d 932, 937-947*

Action by parents and autistic student brought under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* and *§ 504* of Rehabilitation Act of 1973, based on conflicts between plaintiffs and school district over student's IEP, was properly dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, where plaintiffs alleged injuries that could be redressed to some degree by IDEA's administrative procedures and remedies. *Kutasi v. Las Virgenes Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 494 F.3d 1162, 1167-1170*

Because hearing officer determined that student was deprived of free and appropriate public education and eligible for special education, student was prevailing party entitled to award of attorney's fees even though school had started assessment process during course of proceedings and hearing officer purportedly limited his determination of eligibility to specific time period preceding issuance of his opinion, where hearing officer's limitation did not mean there were no significant aspects of order that were judicially enforceable, thus altering legal relationship of parties, and where student's victory was not *de minimis* or technical. *Parent V.S. v. Los Gatos-Saratoga Joint Union High School Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 484 F.3d 1230, 1233-1234*

In action under IDEA for reimbursement for private school education parents obtained for child after withdrawing her

from public school system, district court's acceptance of hearing officer's determination that child was not legally entitled to receive publicly funded special education was not clear error, where district court did not clearly err in determining that child was not legally entitled to special education based on specific learning disability, because any existing severe discrepancy between ability and achievement appeared correctable in regular classroom; and where district court did not clearly err in determining child was not legally entitled to special education based on other health impairment in form of seizure disorder or attention deficit disorder, because it was reasonable for hearing officer to conclude that any impairment could be accommodated in general classroom. *Hood v. Encinitas Union Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 482 F.3d 1175, 1180-1186* (reprinted a amended *Hood v. Encinitas Union Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2007) 486 F.3d 1099*)

School district's failure to implement portions of severely autistic student's IEP in transition from elementary to middle school did not violate either procedural or substantive requirements of IDEA, where school district's failures were not material, with exception of math instructions shortfall, which was remedied in response to ALJ's order, because failures did not fall significantly short of those required by IEP. However, because student did partially prevail, he was to that extent entitled to reasonable attorney's fees for relevant work done at administrative hearing level, but not for his mother, who acted as one of his attorneys in proceedings. *Van Duyn v. Baker School District (9th Cir. 2007) 481 F.3d 770, 779-784*

District court's dismissal of claims under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for failure to serve timely complaint was error, where although district court properly applied state's statute of limitations because IDEA had no statute of limitations at time, district court improperly applied state rule that complaint had to be served within 30 days of service of final order by state administrative agency, which plaintiff conceded he did not do, because Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 3* controlled when action arising under federal law was commenced for purposes of tolling statute of limitations borrowed from state law, and Fed. R. *Civ. Proc. 4(m)* provided time limit for service of process with which plaintiff had complied. *S.J. v. Issaquah Sch. Dist. No. 411 (9th Cir. 2006) 470 F.3d 1288, 1289, 1290-1293*

Attorney's fees awarded under IDEA [*20 U.S.C. § 1415*] are governed by standards set forth by U.S. Supreme Court in *Hensley v. Eckerhart (1983) 461 U.S. 424, 103 S. Ct. 1933, 76 L. Ed. 2d 40* and its progeny for fee awards under *42 U.S.C. § 1988*. Thus, although district court's partial attorney's fees award to mother may ultimately prove consistent with *Hensley*, award would be vacated and remanded to district court when it did not appear from record that court applied *Hensley* because it did not consider mother's degree of success. *Aguirre v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 461 F.3d 1114, 1117-1121* Mother whose conflict with school district about education of her son was resolved by settlement agreement signed only by parties was not entitled to attorney's fees and costs under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)*, because mother was not prevailing party. Although through IDEA, mother secured some special education benefits for her child from district and so met first prong of test for prevailing party by achieving material alteration of legal relationship of parties, there was nothing in record that could be construed as judicial sanction of settlement agreement. *P.N. v. Seattle School Dist. No. 1 (9th Cir. 2006) 458 F.3d 983, 985-991*

School district fulfilled its duty under IDEA by notifying student's mother it was her obligation to remove earwax from son's ear or have it removed by medical professional as condition for completion of audiology test, so there was no procedural violation when mother failed to have wax removed and test was not completed. No procedural violation in failure to assess double vision or optic nerve damage, when consultant found student's vision was not hindering his education. Failure to include and consider all available information from people knowledgeable about student in development of individualized education plan (IEP) did not violate IDEA, when IEP was developed for student as result of his records, observations, assessments by qualified individuals and participation by his parents, and qualified administrator conducted thorough hearing to review individual education plan, and largely approved of proposal but supplemented plan with further goals. District did not violate IDEA's procedures when it conducted suitable functional behavioral assessment and subsequently proposed behavior intervention plan, when IEP team and parents had opportunity to discuss plan when it was proposed, and mother exercised her rights by contesting plan and then challenging plan through statutory procedures. Failure to assess student in Korean, his primary language, did not violate

IDEA, when five assessments were at issue, mother consented to assessment plan specifying speech and language assessment be conducted in English, occupational therapy, physical therapy and vision assessments were nonverbal, and psychological assessment was largely nonverbal; Korean interpreter was present during verbal portions but direct verbal cues were not given in Korean, because hearing officer agreed with psychologist that giving Korean cues would have disturbed validity of test. District did not fail to provide adequate support services to allow student to meet proposed educational goals by not providing related therapy services, when evidence did not conclusively demonstrate related therapy services were necessary to ensure student received some educational benefit. Hearing officer and district court did not abuse discretion by awarding compensatory education services in form of individualized instruction for teachers addressing implementation of IEP's self-help goals and objectives. District court did not abuse its discretion in not awarding attorney's fees to parents by finding district prevailed on all significant issues and parents prevailed only on some minor issues. *Park v. Anaheim Union High Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2006) 444 F.3d 1149, 1154-1157*

District court erred in dismissing for failure to exhaust administrative remedies mother's action for emotional distress based on school district's failure to accommodate her child's special education needs and implement his individualized education plan, when remedies available under IDEA included educational services for disabled children, but did not provide adequate remedy for mother. *Blanchard v. Morton Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 2005) 420 F.3d 918, 920-922*

School district's failure to include regular education teacher on team that prepared individualized education program (IEP) for student with disability, when there was possibility that student would be placed in integrated classroom, rendered IEP invalid. Failure to include regular education teacher on team significantly deviated from procedural requirements of IDEA that at least one regular education teacher be included in development of IEP for student with disability pursuant to *20 U.S.C. § 1414(d)(1)(B)(ii)*. Further, critical structural defect in constitution of IEP team precluded court from considering whether IEP developed without inclusion of at least one regular education teacher was reasonably calculated to enable student with disability to receive free and appropriate public education. *M.L. v. Federal Way School Dist. (9th Cir. 2004) 387 F.3d 1101, 1108*

In action under Americans With Disabilities Act, Rehabilitation Act, and state anti-discrimination statutes, against county and local educational authorities based on alleged discrimination against autistic children who were part of special education program by giving them shorter school day, students sufficiently exhausted administrative remedies under IDEA by pursuing complaint resolution procedure to completion, when requiring each autistic student to seek due process hearing would not further purposes of exhaustion or Congressional intent behind IDEA scheme. *Christopher S. v. Stanislaus County Office of Educ. (9th Cir. 2004) 384 F.3d 1205, 1209-1214*

School district's failure to include regular education teacher on individualized educational placement team when there was possibility child might be included in regular education classroom was procedural violation of IDEA, but since violation did not result in loss of educational opportunity, failure to include teacher on team did not violate IDEA. By articulating academic expectation that kindergarten students will learn to read, district did not determine placement based on rigid policy or criteria. District did not violate IDEA's mainstreaming requirement by placing child in self-contained classroom, when record showed there would be little to no benefit to placing child in regular education classroom, and program offered in self-contained classroom would offer him substantial benefits in all developmental areas. Although teacher can be deliberately indifferent to teasing of disabled child and teasing can be so severe that child can derive no benefit from services offered by school district so that child has been denied FAPE, record did not support conclusion that either teacher or district were deliberately indifferent to any teasing or that teasing denied child educational opportunity. *M.L. v. Federal Way School District (9th Cir. 2003) 341 F.3d 1052, 1062-1072*

School district's efforts to serve educational interests of student disabled by Down's Syndrome by temporary individualized educational placement (IEP) in special classroom complied with substantive and procedural requirements of IDEA. District provided meaningful opportunity for mother to participate in IEP process, developed IEP plan to best of its ability after mother and district could not come to a consensus about IEP, and afforded mother two due process hearings to establish validity of its proposed plan, so that district did not violate *34 C.F.R. § 300.345*. Because

implementation of student's last agreed-on IEP in district from which she transferred would have been impossible in new district, and because explicitly temporary and malleable nature of placement that district offered approximated last agreed-on IEP as closely as possible, district abided by "stay-put" provisions of IDEA during pendency of due process hearing. Because student was not enrolled in any district at time of scheduled meetings and was home-schooled entirely for preceding year, mother's presence as student's then-current home-school teacher sufficed to meet requirement in *20 U.S.C.S § 1401(a)(2)*. Finally, in light of flexible and temporary nature of IEP, district's interim placement was substantively proper and provided for mainstreaming to extent appropriate. *Ms. S. ex rel. G v. Vashon Island School District (9th Cir. 2003) 337 F.3d 1115, 1129-1138*

School district violated IDEA's procedural mandates in its development of severely hearing-impaired child's Individual Education Plan (IEP), and thereby denied child free appropriate public education, by not including either representative from special school child had attended for preceding three years and was currently attending or child's parents at meeting at which IEP was developed. Trial court properly awarded parents cost of tuition at special school to which parents sent child during that school year. Shapiro v. Paradise Valley Unif. Schl. Dist. No. 69 *(9th Cir. 2003) 317 F.3d 1072, 1076-1080*

District court properly held that state's hearing officer correctly ruled assessment that child was not learning disabled child was adequate assessment under *20 U.S.C. § 1414* despite lack of administering traditional IQ test as part of assessment, when state regulation requires only "standardized tests" only if valid for particular student, and if not, alternative measures are to be spelled out in assessment plan, when school district administered six standardized tests to child, complying with literal requirement that it use standardized tests if applicable, and when district used alternative measures to evaluate intellectual ability rather than relying on traditional standardized IQ tests, including interviews, observations, parent-teacher reports, review of records and tests of specific skills and parents signed and approved plan. *Ford v. Long Beach Unified School District (9th Cir. 2002) 291 F.3d 1086*

District court properly denied preliminary injunction sought by autistic child under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)* to modify "stay put" order by state Special Education Hearing Office to retain services provided by IFSP rather than IEP as ordered by state, when school district that became responsible for child's education argued persuasively that it could meet requirements of stay put provision by providing comparable educational placement rather than what child was receiving under IFSP by analogizing district's responsibilities to child to its responsibilities to incoming transfer student as dictated by California law, and Hearing Office's order preserved tutors, goals, and plan child used in his IFSP but only changed plan supervisors, so that child could not show irreparable harm and likelihood of success on merits. *Johnson ex rel. Johnson v. Special Educ. Hearing Office (9th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 1176*

School district's failure to give parents of autistic child copies of evaluations indicating possibility of autism and need for further psychiatric evaluations when district learned of possible diagnosis violated procedural requirements of IDEA by preventing parents from fully and effectively participating in creation of individualized education program (IEP) for child and making it impossible to design IEP that addressed unique needs as autistic child so as to deny her free appropriate public education; district court erred by according greater deference to credibility determinations of State Review Officer than to those of Hearing Officer in applying due weight standard. *Amanda J. v. Clark County School Dist. (9th Cir. 2001) 267 F.3d 877, 881-882*

Parents of autistic son entitled to special education benefits under IDEA, who prevailed at state Complaint Resolution Procedure (CRP) on complaints of violations of IDEA as result of which school district held several Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings attended by parents represented by counsel, resulting in revised IEP for their son in compliance with IDEA, were properly awarded attorney's fees in separate district court action, where district court has jurisdiction over case in which fees are sought even though liability is established outside district proceeding itself; plaintiff parents were prevailing party; CRP is "proceeding brought under" *20 U.S.C. § 1415*, entitled prevailing party to attorney's fees under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)*; and where *20 U.S.C.§ 1415(i)(3)(D)(ii)* does not preclude parents from recovering fees for attorney's attendance at IEP meetings convened as result of *CRP. Lucht v. Molalla River School*

Dist. (9th Cir. 2000) 225 F.3d 1023

Providing vision specialist to vision-impaired student off site rather than at parochial school that student attended did not violate *IDEA. KDM v. Reedsport Schl. Dist. (9th Cir. 1999) 196 F.3d 1046*

An award of compensatory education equal to time lost while school district denied IDEA [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*] benefits to student is equitable, not contractual, remedy; if student has suffered no ultimate harm and has graduated high school before age 21, court is not required to award compensatory education. Parents of Student W. v. Puyallup School Dist. 3 *(9th Cir. 1994) 31 F.3d 1489, 1497*

IDEA [*20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq.*] includes physical safety of students as part of appropriate public education; state is required to make such reasonable adjustments as are necessary to make school for blind and multi-handicapped students as safe for them as other state schools are for their nonhandicapped students. *Students of Cal. School for the Blind v. Honig (9th Cir. 1984) 736 F.2d 538, 545-547*

Exhaustion of state administrative remedies before institution of action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* is not required when exhaustion of such remedies would be futile. *Monahan v. Nebraska (D. Neb. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 1074, 1086* ; *Loughran v. Flanders (D. Conn. 1979) 470 F. Supp. 110, 112*

Former Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (now known as Individuals With Disabilities Act) [*20 U.S.C. § 1401 et seq.*] provides specific procedural safeguards that must be adopted by states receiving funds thereunder and that supercede any inconsistent state law. *Monahan v. Nebraska (D. Neb. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 1074, 1086, 1091* ; *Vogel v. School Bd. of Montrose R-14 School Dist. (W.D. Mo. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 989, 991 n.1, 993*

20 U.S.C. § 1415 permits educational agency to suspend for short but not indefinite period of time a handicapped student who is danger to herself on emergency basis without following procedural safeguards of that section. *Sherry v. New York State Educ. Dep't. (W.D.N.Y. 1979) 479 F. Supp. 1328, 1337*

When parents accepted school district's eligibility finding but challenged proposed placement, and when district made eligibility and placement decisions based on its expert's observation of child in present setting, *i.e.*, private school, but refused to allow parents' expert to observe placement proposed by district, parents had statutory right to have their expert testify at administrative hearing, thus, ipso facto were entitled to have their expert observe proposed placement before participating in administrative hearing at which propriety of proposed placement would be determined. There were no administrative remedies to exhaust, because purpose of *Educ. Code § 56329(b)* was to permit independent observation before hearing was held so student and his parents were in position to challenge proposed placement at hearing. Finally, child's right to have his expert observe district's proposed placement was not contingent on his exercise of right to conduct expensive and time-consuming independent educational assessment. *Benjamin G. v. California Special Educ. Hearing Office (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 875, 880-884, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366*

Parents' unilateral placement in private school rather than juvenile system facility of teenager with history of truancy and juvenile offenses was done under exceptional circumstances, including bad faith on part of respondents, excusing application of "stay put" provision of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)* and entitled parents to reimbursement for teenager's private educational costs, because respondents failed to undertake diagnostic reassessment and latest placement was woefully inadequate and inappropriate in light of teenager's history of educational handicap, despite fact that teenager's problems were formidable and extremely difficult for diagnosis and treatment. *In re John K. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 783, 795-798, 216 Cal. Rptr. 557*

Educ. Code §§ 56000-56369 was designed to provide substantive and procedural educational rights to emotionally and mentally handicapped children and their parents and to relieve damage to those individuals and society resulting from denial of full educational opportunities; statutes not designed to protect parents of emotionally or mentally handicapped

child from monetary expenses incurred in providing medical, psychological, or related services for child during assessment time. *Keech v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 464, 468-469, 210 Cal. Rptr. 7*

"Stay put" provision of *Educ. Code § 56505(d)* requiring that student remain in current placement pending hearing on right to special education did not preclude reimbursement of parents for unilateral placement when parents placed student in private school after administrative hearing erroneously denied special placement. *Byrnes v. Riles (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1180, 204 Cal. Rptr. 100*

Damages are appropriate relief under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*, authorizing court to grant appropriate relief for improper denial of special education, when student has fully complied with state "stay put" requirements set out in *Educ. Code § 56505(d)*, but attorney's fees are not justified when district did not act arbitrarily or capriciously and district's behavior did not amount to discrimination against student. *Byrnes v. Riles (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1180, 204 Cal. Rptr. 100*

Witnesses and parties germane to determining which agency should pay for special educational services for student are not necessary for due process hearing under *Educ. Code § 56505*, which is forum for deciding single issue of whether student is entitled to services. *Nevada County Office of Education v. Riles (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 767, 774-775, 197 Cal. Rptr. 152*

"Stay put" provision of *20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)* (pupil must remain in present placement pending hearing on child's free appropriate public education unless educational agency and parents agree) proscribes unilateral action by parents in absence of justifying circumstances and does not entitle parents to reimbursement for costs of unilateral placement prior to determination that placement appropriate. *Newport-Mesa Unified School Dist. v. Hubert (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 724, 730-735, 183 Cal. Rptr. 334*

On review from judgment granting school district's peremptory writ of mandate setting aside state Department of Education's decision that child required full-time residential educational program, appellate court was precluded from determining appropriate method of reviewing department's decision because school district waived right to appeal on issue by accepting benefits of judgment, and because child and department are not "aggrieved" parties under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* and did not suffer prejudice from use of mandamus action. *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. State of California (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 54, 64-65, 182 Cal. Rptr. 525* (dictum stating that review of administrative decision should be limited to civil action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2)*, precluding use of state administrative mandate remedy under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*)

Substantial evidence in form of expert testimony supported hearing officer's finding that child's emotional problems adversely affected his ability to learn and thus justify requiring individualized education program; although preference for "mainstreaming" established in EAHCA, substantial evidence that child's home life was major factor in his learning disability as supporting finding that residential placement was appropriate and necessary. *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. State of California (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 54, 70-71, 182 Cal. Rptr. 525*

Appeal from judgment setting aside state Department of Education's decision that child required full-time residential educational program did not result in enforcement of important right affecting public interest so as to justify recovery of attorney's fees on private attorney general theory, but restitution of tuition costs for child's placement was appropriate in interests of justice. *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. State of California (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 54, 71-72, 182 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[8] Student Discipline

Two days' suspension did not rise to level of penal sanction calling for full panoply of federal procedural due process

protections applicable to criminal prosecution. Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549*

School disciplinary rule proscribing obscene language and prespeech admonitions of teachers give adequate warning to student that his lewd speech could subject him to sanctions. Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549*

School board's interpretation of its rules was not to be relitigated under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*. *Bd. of Education of Rogers, Arkansas v. McCluskey (1982) 458 U.S. 966, 102 S. Ct. 3469, 73 L. Ed. 2d 1273, 1277*

State having established right to public education as not permitted to withdraw that right for misconduct without due process. *Goss v. Lopez (1975) 419 U.S. 565, 574, 95 S. Ct. 729, 42 L. Ed. 2d 725*

Pre-school teacher was not entitled to qualified immunity for seizure of preschooler who had been diagnosed with tuberous sclerosis and who suffered from non-verbal autism and her alleged slapping, forced participation in self-beating and slamming, where preschooler posed no danger to anyone nor was he disruptive in classroom, and at young age and suffering from significant and serious disabilities, he was even more vulnerable than average pre-school child, so that teacher used excessive force in violation of preschooler's *Fourth Amendment* rights; and where at time of alleged abuse, right of public school students to be free from excessive force imposed by their teachers was uncontroverted. Complaint also sufficiently alleged that school officials were individually liable under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* for their inaction in training, supervision and control of teacher and that officials showed reckless and callous indifference to preschooler's rights by permitting teacher to continue to work with preschooler, knowing she posed safety risk to children, and by not reporting or remediating alleged abuse when they became aware of it. *Preschooler II v. Clark County Sch. Bd. of Trustees (9th Cir. 2007) 479 F.3d 1175, 1180-1183*

Vice principal was not entitled to qualified immunity in second-grade student's action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, based on vice principal's having taped student's head to tree as discipline for fighting and refusing to stand quietly against wall as punishment, when student's *Fourth Amendment* right to be free from unreasonable seizure and protected from use of excessive force extended to seizure by or at direction of school officials and being held to tree with tape for five minutes was restraint on student's liberty and constituted seizure within meaning of *Fourth Amendment's* prohibition against unreasonable search and seizure, and when student's right to be free from excessive force at hands of teachers employed by state was clearly established. *Doe v. Hawaii Dept. of Education (9th Cir. 2003) 334 F.3d 906, 908-910*

Educ. Code § 48915, insofar as it compels suspension and mandates recommendation of expulsion for certain offenses, constitutes "higher level of service" under Cal. Const. art. XIIIB, § 6, and imposes reimbursable state mandate for all resulting hearing costs, even costs attributable to procedures required by federal law. *San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 859, 867-890, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466, 94 P.3d 589*

Reliance by disciplinary panel in school expulsion hearing on statements and reports rather than on testimony by witnesses is improper when evidence is conflicting and there is no showing that witnesses were unavailable or that disclosure of their identity and presence would subject witnesses to significant and specific risk of harm. *John A. v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 301, 308, 187 Cal. Rptr. 472, 654 P.2d 242*

Presence of district teachers on disciplinary hearing panel deprived student subjected to expulsion hearing of neither an impartial hearing panel nor due process. *John A. v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 301, 308-309, 187 Cal. Rptr. 472, 654 P.2d 242*

Notice to student facing expulsion does not require that student be informed of availability of free legal assistance. *John A. v. San Bernardino City Unified School Dist. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 301, 309-310, 187 Cal. Rptr. 472, 654 P.2d 242*

School district's "zero tolerance" policy governing expulsions, which required principal or designee to immediately suspend and recommend for expulsion pupil who committed specified acts at school or school activity off school grounds did not violate state law by eliminating principal's statutory discretion to decide not to recommend student for expulsion hearing. No provisions in Education Code require district to provide principal with authority to dismiss expulsion charge if (1) principal found student had committed offense, (2) stricter recommendation procedures did not infringe on student's statutory rights to objective and fair expulsion procedure, and (3) mandatory recommendation requirements did not preclude principal from expressing own views as to whether expulsion was appropriate in particular case. Rules did not violate due process rights, when (1) rule provided required procedural protections, (2) student was not constitutionally entitled to notice of scope of principal's authority vis-a-vis governing school board, and (3) inconsistencies in rules with regard to whether principal or superintendent could recommend expulsion for offenses not included in Education Code provisions did not create inevitable due process violation. *T.H. v. San Diego Unified School Dist. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1281-1287, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532*

Under *Educ. Code § 48918(i)(1)*, school board trustees did not have mandatory duty to subpoena witnesses requested by students to be expelled, because by using "may" rather than "shall," § 48918(i)(1) vests school boards with discretion to issue subpoenas in expulsion proceedings, and legislative history and purpose of legislation indicate intent to make issuance of subpoenas matter of discretion. Although in adopting blanket policy never to issue subpoenas trustees abdicated their discretion, rather than exercising it, in refusing to issue subpoenas in this case, trustees did not act arbitrarily or abuse discretion, because students named many witnesses and claimed they were "percipient" witnesses to events at issue, but backed up these claims with nothing other than bald assertion, and entire conduct of proceedings on students' behalf exposed their advocate's manifest purposes, *i.e.*, delay, obstruction, obfuscation, disruption, and harassment. *Woodbury v. Brown-Dempsey (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 421, 430-439, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 124*

In *42 U.S.C. § 1983* action arising from suspension of male high school student for five days based on sexual harassment of female student by touching or grabbing her buttocks, trial court erred in deciding suspended student was denied due process under federal and state constitutional law, state Education Code, and school district regulations, where, when facing temporary short-term suspension, student has minimal procedural due process rights, including right to hearing, and informal meeting between school official and student or between official and student and his parents has been held to comport with due process, and where student was informed about complaints against him and given opportunity to respond to them. Further, there was no violation of suspension procedures in *Educ. Code § 48911(b)*, requiring that suspension be preceded by informal conference between principal and student, which occurred, student could be suspended for first offense under *Educ. Code § 48900.5*, and there was no violation of Administrative Regulation 5144.1, authorizing first-time expulsion for variety of acts not including acts for which student was suspended, because suspension is justified under state law even when grounds for suspension are not expressly stated under school rules. *Granowitz v. Redlands Unified School Dist. (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 349, 354-359, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 410*

Alleged violations of suspension and expulsion provisions of *Educ. Code §§ 48900, 48911*, and *48918* do not constitute tort for purposes of action under *Gov. Code § 815.6* (breach of mandatory duty imposed by enactment), or for purposes of action in negligence for breach of implied duty of care created by statute, because provisions were not designed to protect students and their parents from money damages resulting from "educational" injuries. *Tirpak v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 639, 643, 646, 232 Cal. Rptr. 61*

"Physical, behavioral, or emotional disorder which prevents or renders inadvisable attendance at school" is unconstitutionally vague when used as sole ground for involuntary exclusion from public school. *Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 169-170, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177*

Due process requirements for suspension of students for limited period. *Charles S. v. Board of Education (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 83, 94, 97 Cal. Rptr. 422 , appeal dismissed, 405 U.S. 1005 (1972)*

[9] Racial Segregation

Student assignment policy aiming to achieve social diversity by using neighborhood demographics when assigning students to schools that did not use racial classifications or consider individual student's race at all when assigning student to school, but looked at student's residential neighborhood and considered average household income in neighborhood, average education level of adults residing in neighborhood, and racial composition of neighborhood as whole and gave every student within given neighborhood same treatment regardless of his or her individual race, did not violate *Cal. Const., art. I, § 31(a)*, where including general recognition of demographics of neighborhoods in student assignments without classifying student by race did not discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race. *American Civil Rights Foundation v. Berkeley Unified School Dist. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 207, 216-222, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789*

"Magnet" and "Permit with Transportation" programs of California public school district did not violate Proposition 209 [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 31*], prohibiting discrimination against or preferential treatment in favor of any individual or group on basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin in operation of public education, on ground that programs took into account student's race or ethnicity in determining admission, where Proposition 209 expressly exempts from its reach court-ordered integration plans in existence prior to its effective date and programs were part of existing court-ordered integration plan approved and implemented prior to effective date of Proposition 209. *American Civil Rights Foundation v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 436, 449-452, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 754*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityEducational MalpracticeEducation LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationSexual HarassmentEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActEnforcementEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsSpeechGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.68

§ 513.68 Attorney General Opinions

Members of news media may not attend child's individualized education program meeting as observers even though their attendance has consent of child's parents. *02 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 406 (2002)*

School district may deny all applications for pupil admissions based on parent's employment within district when reason for denial is that district's school facilities are overcrowded at relevant grade level. District that has admitted elementary school pupil on basis of parent's employment within district and has entered into interdistrict transfer agreement based on child care needs of pupil may not deny pupil continued attendance at school within district because of overcrowded school facilities at relevant grade level. District may deny applications for interdistrict attendance agreements based on child care needs of pupil when reason for denial is that district's school facilities are overcrowded at relevant grade level. *01 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 316 (2001)*

Under state and federal law, school district may release videotape of one student's assault on another student on school bus, which was recorded on videotape, to district attorney to determine whether criminal charges should be filed, juvenile justice proceedings instituted or some alternative program considered in dealing with assault without subpoena, court order, or parents' consent. *01 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 209 (2001)*

Public high school administrators may not implement a policy requiring on unannounced, random, and neutral basis that pupils vacate classroom leaving personal belongings behind for sniffing by canines trained in drug detection, with students away from immediate vicinity of canines at all times, and under which, if canine's behavior indicated presence of drugs, school administrators would search pupil's personal belongings without pupil's consent. *83 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 257 (2000)*

Extent of public school district's obligation to provide special education programs to child with disabilities who has been voluntarily enrolled by parent in private school. *83 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 132 (2000)*

"Possession" of firearm for purposes of expulsion under *Educ. Code §§ 48900, 48915* is pupil's knowing and voluntary

direct control over firearm unless pupil has permission of school officials to possess firearm or possession is brief and solely for purpose of disposing of firearm, such as handing it to school officials. *80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 91 (1997)*

School district may suspend enforcement of expulsion order even if pupil committed offense listed in *Educ. Code § 48915(c)*, for which expulsion must be ordered under *Educ. Code § 48915(d)*. Pupil's name and offense committed must be disclosed to public when governing board orders expulsion. *80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 85 (1997)*

Former *Educ. Code § 48909(b)* (*now see Educ. Code § 48904(b)*), authorizing withholding of certain student records, is not operative in context of interdistrict transfer by student in view of *Educ. Code § 49068*, which requires such record transfer when student transfers to another district, even though student has damaged school property or has failed to return a book or to pay fees. *64 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 867 (1981)*

School district not having opportunity classes or schools is permitted to transfer students under age 16 years to continuation schools for disciplinary reasons. *54 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 262 (1971)*

Governing board of school district is without authority to exclude pupils from public schools solely by reason of their married status. *39 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 256 (1962)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationBoards of Elementary & Secondary SchoolsRecordsEducation LawAttendanceGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActIndividualized Educational ProgramsIEP MeetingsEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsMisconductWeaponsEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureDog Sniff SearchesEducation LawStudentsStudent RecordsDisclosure & Release

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.69

§ 513.69 Law Reviews

Gelfman and Gutman, *How To Handle Student Discipline Cases*, 37(6) Prac. Law. 43 (1991)

Roe, *Valuing Student Speech: The Work of the Schools as Conceptual Development, 79 Cal. L. Rev. 1269 (1991)*

Note, *Beyond Mergens: Ensuring Equality of Student Religious Speech Under the Equal Access Act, 100 Yale L.J. 2149 (1991)*

Note, *Restricting Gang Clothing in Public Schools: Does a Dress Code Violate a Student's Right of Free Expression? 64 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1321 (1991)*

Weber, *The Transformation of the Education of the Handicapped Act: A Study in the Interpretation of Radical Statutes, 24 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 349 (1990)*

Comment, *Hazelwood School District v. Kuhlmeier: Prior Restraint Doctrine Finds a Home in America's Public Schools, 20 Pac. L.J. 359 (1989)*

Note, *The Promise of Pico: A New Definition of Orthodoxy, 97 Yale L.J. 1805 (1988)*

Ares, *Religious Meetings in the Public High School: Freedom of Speech or Establishment of Religion? 200 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 313 (1987)*

Comment, *Prior Restraint and the Public High School Student Press: The Validity of Administrative Censorship of Student Newspapers Under the Federal and California Constitutions, 20 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1055 (1987)*

Comment, *Protecting Children With AIDS Against Arbitrary Exclusion from School, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 1373 (1986)*

Note, *The Exclusionary Rule in the Public School Administrative Disciplinary Proceeding: Answering the Question After New Jersey v. T.L.O., 37 Hastings L.J. 1133 (1986)*

Lichtenstein, *Children, the Schools, and the Right to Know: Some Thoughts at the Schoolhouse Gate, 19 U.S.F. L. Rev. 91 (1985)*

Freeman, *The Supreme Court and First Amendment Rights of Students in the Public School Classroom: A Proposed Model of Analysis, 12 Hastings Const. L.Q. 1 (1984)*

Comment, *The Constitutional Implications of Special Education Placement and Curriculum: An Equal Protection Analysis, 15 Sw. U.L. Rev. 155 (1984)*

Comment, *The Meaning of Appropriate Education to Handicapped Children under the EHCA: The Impact of Rowley, 14 Sw. U.L. Rev. 521 (1984)*

Comment, *Reshelving the First Amendment: Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District No. 26 v. Pico, 17 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1057 (1984)*

Note, *Tinker Goes to the Theater: Student First Amendment Rights and High School Theatrical Productions in Seyfried v. Walton, 11 Hastings Const. L.Q. 247 (1984)*

Comment, *Challenging Educational Fee Increases, Program Termination and Deterioration, and Misrepresentation of Program Quality: The Legal Rights and Remedies of Students, 19 Cal. W.L. Rev. 467 (1983)*

Comment, *Education for Emotionally Disturbed Children in California, 17 U.S.F. L. Rev. 249 (1983)*

Comment, *Students and the Fourth Amendment: "The Torturable Class," 16 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 709 (1983)*

Note, *The Constitutional Dimensions of Student-Initiated Religious Activity in Public High Schools, 92 Yale L.J. 499 (1983)*

Note, *The Unconstitutionality of State Statutes Authorizing Moments of Silence in the Public Schools, 96 Harv. L. Rev. 1874 (1983)*

Turnbull, Brotherson, Wheat, and Esquith, *The Least Restrictive Education for Handicapped Children: Who Wants It? 16 Fam. L.Q. 161 (1982)*

Comment, *Corporal Punishment in Public Schools: A Violation of Substantive Due Process? 33 Hastings L.J. 1245 (1982)*

Funston, *Educational Malpractice: A Cause of Action in Search of a Theory, 18 San Diego L. Rev. 743 (1981)*

Hyatt, *Litigating the Rights of Handicapped Children to an Appropriate Education: Procedures and Remedies, 29 UCLA L. Rev. 1 (1981)*

Note, *Due Process, Due Politics, and Due Respect: Three Models of Legitimate School Governance, 94 Harv. L. Rev. 1106 (1981)*

Comment, *Implications of Minimum Competency Legislation: A Legal Duty of Care? 10 Pac. L.J. 947 (1979)*

Note, *The ABC's of Duty: Educational Malpractice and the Functionally Illiterate Student, 8 Golden Gate L Rev 293 (1978)*

Steinberg, *Corporal Punishment in Schools: Baker v. Owen--The Need for Reexamination,* 10 U.S.F. L. Rev. (1976)

Note, *Coercive Behavior Control in the Schools: Reconciling "Individually Appropriate" Education with Damaging Changes in Educational Status, 29 Stan. L. Rev. 93 (1976)*

Kirp, Buss, & Kuriloff, *Legal Reform of Special Education: Empirical Studies and Procedural Proposals, 62 Cal. L. Rev. 40 (1974)*

Letwin, *Regulation of Underground Newspapers on Public School Campuses in California, 22 UCLA L. Rev. 141 (1974)*

Dimond, *The Constitutional Right to Education: The Quiet Revolution, 24 Hastings L.J. 1087 (1973)*

Comment, *Public Instruction to the Learning Disabled: Higher Hurdles for the Handicapped, 8 U.S.F. L. Rev. 113 (1973)*

Note, *Grayned v. City of Rockford--A Limitation on the Application of the Overbreadth Doctrine to Antidisturbance Regulations in the Schools, 24 Hastings L.J. 1263 (1973)*

Boone, *Expulsion in California Public High Schools--Due Process a Decade After Dixon, 8 San Diego L. Rev. 333 (1971)*

Comment, *The Court and the Classroom, 11 Santa Clara L. Rev. 72 (1970)*

Note, *Constitutional Law: First Amendment Right of Association for High School Student--Robinson v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist. (Cal. App. 1966), 55 Cal. L. Rev. 911 (1967)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityEducational MalpracticeEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActGeneral OverviewEducation LawReligion in SchoolsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsCorporal PunishmentEducation LawStudentsSpeechGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 513.70-513.89

[Reserved]

§§ 513.70[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.90

§ 513.90 Complaint for Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527], Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060], and Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--By Disabled Pupil and by Parent Against School District and, if Applicable, Other Public Education Agency--Failure to Provide Free Appropriate Public Education [20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2); Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.]

[1] FORM Complaint for Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527], Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060], and Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--By Disabled Pupil and by Parent Against School District and, if Applicable, Other Public Education Agency--Failure to Provide Free Appropriate Public Education [20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2); Educ. Code § 56500 et seq.]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name of child*],	)	
[a minor, by _____ (*name*),	)	
his/her Guardian ad Litem,] and	)	
_____ [*name of parent*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiffs,	)	COMPLAINT FOR PRELIMINARY AND PER-
vs.	)	MANENT INJUNCTION[, DECLARATORY RE-
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	LIEF AND DAMAGES]
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiffs _____ [*names*], allege:

Plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] [, a minor, through his/her guardian ad litem,] and plaintiff _____ [*name of parent*] allege:

[1. *If pupil is a minor, allege:* For purposes of this action, _____ (*name*) was appointed by the above-entitled court, and now is, guardian ad litem of plaintiff _____ (*name of child*), a minor.]

2. Plaintiff _____ [*name of parent*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California, and the _____ [parent *or* legal guardian] of plaintiff _____ [*name of child*].

3. Plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [, and a pupil duly enrolled in _____ (*describe educational program*) at _____ School, which is maintained and operated by defendant _____ School District].

4. Plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] is an individual with exceptional needs, within the meaning of *Education Code Section 56026*, in that _____ [*allege fact showing that (1) plaintiff has been identified by an individualized education program team as a child with a disability as defined by applicable federal law [Educ. Code § 56026(a)], (2) plaintiff requires instruction or services, or both, that cannot be provided with modification of the regular school program, (3) plaintiff is within one of the age groups specified in Educ. Code § 56026(c), and (4) plaintiff meets the eligibility requirements set forth in regulations of the State Board of Education*].

5. Defendant _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

6. _____ [*If a public education agency other than the school district is responsible for administering special education programs in the geographical region under Educ. Code § 56170, allege name and capacity of that agency.*]

7. Under *Education Code Section 56000 et seq.* and Title *20, United States Code, Section 1400 et seq.*, defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*] has/have a duty to provide plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] with a free public education and related services appropriate to his/her unique needs. Plaintiff _____ [*name of chid*] has a right to receive such education and services at no cost to himself/herself or to his/her parents.

8. Defendant(s) has/have failed and refused, and continues/continue to fail and refuse, to perform its/their duty to provide plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] with a free appropriate public education and related services in that _____ [*specify manner in which defendants have failed to comply with their duty to provide a free appropriate public education, including, if appropriate, specific violations of any applicable federal or state statutes and regulations*].

9. On _____ [*date*], plaintiffs filed a request for a hearing with the Superintendent of Public Instruction under *Education Code Section 56502*, for the purpose of determining the appropriateness of the education and services then being provided to plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] by defendant(s), and requesting the following relief: _____ [*specify relief requested*].

10. _____ [No party requested a prehearing mediation conference in this matter *or* On _____ (*date*), a mediation conference was held in this matter under *Education Code Section 56500.3*, which failed to resolve the dispute between the parties to their mutual satisfaction. (The mediator's written specification of unresolved issues is attached as Exhibit _____ to this complaint and made a part hereof.)]

11. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*place of hearing*], a hearing was held under *Education Code Section 56505*, before _____ [*name*], a hearing officer, under contract with the

Department of Education, to consider the appropriateness of the education and services being provided to plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] by defendant(s). All parties attended the hearing. A verbatim transcript of the hearing is attached hereto as Exhibit _____ and made a part hereof.

12. On _____ [*date*], plaintiffs received the hearing officer's decision and order denying plaintiffs the relief requested.

13. The decision of the hearing officer is [erroneous and] invalid in that _____ [*specify all substantive and procedural grounds for invalidity of the decision*].

14. Under Title *20, United States Code, Section 1415(i)(2)*, this court has jurisdiction to review the record of the proceedings before the hearing officer, to hear any additional evidence presented by the parties, and to grant all appropriate relief based on the preponderance of the evidence.

15. Unless and until enjoined by order of this court, the wrongful failure and refusal of defendant(s) to provide plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] with a free appropriate public education to which he/she is entitled under state and federal law will cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiffs in that _____ [*allege specific facts constituting great and irreparable injury*].

16. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law for the injuries that are currently being suffered and that will be suffered in the future in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* it will be impossible for plaintiffs to calculate the precise amount of damage they will suffer if defendant is not enjoined from failing and refusing to provide plaintiff _____ (*name of child*) with a free appropriate public education].

17. _____ [*Allege damages, if any, e.g.,* As a proximate result of defendant's (defendants') wrongful conduct and violation of duty, plaintiffs have been damaged in the sum of $_____, in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name of parent*) has been required to expend this amount for private special instruction and other services for plaintiff _____ (*name of child*), which instruction and services should have been provided to plaintiff _____ (*name of child*) by defendant(s), at no cost to plaintiffs). (Plaintiffs will be further damaged in like manner so long as defendant's (defendants') conduct continues. The full amount of such damage is not now known to plaintiffs, and plaintiffs will amend this complaint to state such amount when the same becomes known to them, or on proof thereof).]

18. _____ [*If declaratory relief is sought, add:* An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiffs and defendant(s) concerning their respective rights and duties in that plaintiffs contend _____ (*allege plaintiffs' contentions as to legal consequences of facts alleged in preceding paragraphs*), whereas defendant(s) disputes/dispute these contentions and contend that _____ (*specify defendant's/defendants' contentions*). Plaintiffs desire a judicial determination of their rights and duties and a declaration as to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* whether plaintiff _____ (*name of child*) is entitled to receive the following instruction and services from defendant(s) at no cost to plaintiffs: _____ (*specify*)). A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiffs may ascertain their rights and duties _____ (*specify, e.g.,* with respect to the obligation of defendant(s) to provide the above-described instruction and services). _____ (*Allege any financial, educational, or other burden being caused plaintiffs by the unsettled state of affairs*).]

19. Under Title *20, United States Code, Section 1415(j)*, plaintiff _____ [*name of child*] _____ [is entitled to remain in his/her current educational placement in _____ (*describe educational program*) at _____ School *or* is entitled to be placed in _____ (*describe public school special education program*)], pending the completion of this action.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant(s) to show cause, if any, why it/they should not be enjoined, as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;

2. For a preliminary injunction enjoining defendant(s) and its/their agents and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for it/them, from _____ [removing plaintiff _____ (*name of child*) from his/her current educational placement in _____ (*describe program*) *or* failing or refusing to place plaintiff _____ (*name of child*) in _____ (*describe public school special education program*)], during the pendency of this action;

3. For a permanent injunction enjoining defendant(s) and its/their agents and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for it/them, from _____ [*specify particular actions, policies, procedures, etc. to be prohibited*];

4. For a permanent injunction requiring defendant(s) and its/their agents and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for it/them, to _____ [*specify particular actions, policies, procedures, etc., to be compelled*];

[5. For damages in the sum of $_____, plus damages in such further sums as may be sustained and as are ascertained before final judgment herein;]

[6. For a judicial declaration that _____ (*state the determination that the court is requested to render*);]

7. For attorney's fees as authorized by Title *20, United States Code, Section 1415(i)(3)(B)*;

8. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am [one of] the plaintiff(s) in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:

Unless counsel will be filing affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) in support of the allegations of this complaint, this complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*], and counsel must take care to plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to injunctive relief [*see E. H. Renzel v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* .

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a pupil with a disability and his or her parent or guardian in an action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* to obtain appropriate judicial relief if the school district or other responsible public education agency has not fulfilled its duty to provide the pupil with a free appropriate public education.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

(1) Appointment of a guardian ad litem for the minor plaintiff, if appropriate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 372*] (Paragraph 1);

(2) Capacity and residence of plaintiffs (Paragraphs 2, 3);

(3) Minor plaintiff's status as an individual with exceptional needs [*see Educ. Code § 56026*] (Paragraph 4);

(4) Capacity of defendants (Paragraphs 5, 6);

(5) Minor plaintiff's right to a free appropriate public education and related services and defendants' duty to provide the education and services [*see Educ. Code §§ 56000, 56001, 56040, 56140, 56170*; *20 U.S.C. § 1401 et seq.*] (Paragraph 7);

(6) Defendants' breach of duty to provide such education and services (Paragraph 8);

(7) Exhaustion of state administrative hearing remedy and adverse result [*Honig v. Doe (1988) 484 U.S. 305, 326-327, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686* ; *Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 1298, 1303* ; *see Educ. Code §§ 56500-56507*; *20 U.S.C. § 1415*] (Paragraphs 9-13);

(8) Right to judicial relief [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*] (Paragraph 14);

(9) Great and irreparable injury unless defendants are enjoined [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2)*] (Paragraph 15);

(10) Inadequate remedy at law [*see Civ. Code § 3422(1), (2)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(4), (5)*] (Paragraph 16);

(11) Amount and nature of damages, if any [*see Civ. Code § 3333*] (Paragraph 17);

(12) Right to declaratory relief [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*] (Paragraph 18); and

(13) Minor plaintiff's right to remain in his or her current educational placement or, if making initial application for admission to public schools, to be placed in the public school program, pending

completion of the proceeding [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)*] (Paragraph 19).

[4] Verification

If plaintiff is seeking a preliminary injunction, the complaint must be verified, unless the plaintiff files affidavits with the complaint showing that sufficient grounds exist for issuance of the preliminary injunction [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If a preliminary injunction is not sought, the complaint need not be verified. A school district or other public agency need not file a verified answer to a verified complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]; however, verification of the complaint precludes a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[5] Jurisdiction

An action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* may be brought in any state court of competent jurisdiction. Such actions may also be brought in a United States district court, which has jurisdiction of such actions regardless of the amount in controversy [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*]. For forms of jurisdictional allegations for use in actions brought in federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

[6] Venue

If an action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* is brought in a superior court, venue is apparently proper in either the county in which the cause, or some part thereof, arose [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* (actions against public officer or person especially appointed to execute his or her duties, for act done by him or her by virtue of the public office)] or the county in which the local public education agency is situated [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* (actions against county, city and county, city, or local agency)].

[7] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

When a minor, an incompetent person, or a person for whom a conservator has been appointed is a party to a civil action, the court in which the action is pending must appoint a guardian ad litem to appear for him or her [*Code Civ. Proc. § 372*; *see* Paragraph 1]. For a discussion and forms relating to the appointment of a guardian ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians Ad Litem* .

[8] Parent as Party

Under both federal and state law, procedural safeguards, including the right to a due process hearing, extend to both the handicapped pupil and his or her parent or guardian [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(a), (h)*; *Educ. Code § 56501(a)*]. The right to bring a civil action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* specifically extends to *any party* aggrieved by the findings and decision made pursuant to the state due process hearing procedure [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(A)*; *see Educ. Code § 56505(k)*]. Thus, a parent or guardian is a proper party to a civil action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415*.

[9] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

A party seeking judicial relief under *20 U.S.C. § 1415* must exhaust all state administrative remedies and procedures prior to bringing such an action, unless to do so would be futile. Therefore, the complaint should allege facts showing either that the state administrative remedies have been exhausted or that exhaustion of such remedies would be futile [*see Honig v. Doe (1988) 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686* ; *Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist. (9th Cir. 1992) 967 F.2d 1298, 1303* (exhaustion required unless it would be futile or offer inadequate relief, or agency has adopted policy or pursued practice of general applicability contrary to law); *see also* Paragraphs 9-13].

[10] Remedies Available

In an action under *20 U.S.C. § 1415*, the court has the power to grant such relief as it determines is appropriate [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C)(iii)*]. Usually, the relief granted will consist of injunctive or declaratory relief, or both [*see, e.g., Sherry v. New York State Educ. Dep't. (W.D.N.Y. 1979) 479 F. Supp. 1328, 1331, 1339]* . In addition, some federal courts have held that compensatory damages may be awarded if appropriate [*Boxall v. Sequoia Union High School Dist. (N.D. Cal. 1979) 464 F. Supp. 1104, 1112]* . For further discussion, see *§ 513.33[5][g]*.

[11] Attorney's Fees

The court, in its discretion, may award reasonable attorney fees as part of the costs to the parents of a child with a disability who is the prevailing party [*20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)*]. Congress intended *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(3)(B)* to be interpreted consistent with fee provisions under *42 U.S.C. § 1988* and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 [*Abu-Sahyun v. Palo Alto Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1988) 843 F.2d 1250, 1251* , citing S. Rep. No. 99-112, 99th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1986 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 1798, 1803-1805]. For further discussion of attorney fees under IDEA, see *§ 513.33[5][f]*; for discussion of fee provisions in *42 U.S.C. § 1988* and Title VII, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

[12] Statute of Limitations

The IDEA does not specify a statute of limitations. Reviewing courts apply the most closely analogous state statute of limitations, unless it would undermine the policies underlying the IDEA. In determining the most analogous state statute of limitations, courts look to whether the scope of judicial proceedings available to a plaintiff under the state act is similar to the review available under the IDEA [Livingston School Dist. Nos. 4 and 1 v. *Keenan (9th Cir. 1996) 82 F.3d 912, 915]* . Concluding that a civil action under the IDEA challenging an administrative hearing officer's decision after a due process hearing is more analogous to judicial review of an administrative appeal than to an action on a liability created by statute, the Ninth Circuit has applied the forum state's broadly-applicable statute of limitations for judicial review of administrative decisions [*see* Livingston School Dist. Nos. 4 and 1 v. *Keenan (9th Cir. 1996) 82 F.3d 912, 916-918* (applying Montana Administrative Procedure Act's 30-day statute of limitations for judicial review of administrative decisions); *but see Alexopulos v. San Francisco Unified School Dist. (9th Cir. 1987) 817 F.2d 551* (applying California's three-year limitations period for statutory causes of action for liabilities created by statute to plaintiffs' respective IDEA action in case not involving challenge to administrative hearing officer's decision following due process hearing)]. Under California law, an "appeal" must be made within 90 days of receipt of the hearing decision [*Educ. Code § 56505(k)*]. In the absence of any authority to the contrary, counsel should assume that this short limitation period will be held to apply to a civil action brought under *20 U.S.C. § 1415*.

[13] Cross References

For alternative forms of allegations of capacity and residence, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For alternative forms of allegations of damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For alternative forms of complaints for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For discussion and forms relating to the appointment of guardians ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians Ad Litem*

For alternative forms of complaint for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

[14] Federal Statutes

Procedural safeguards for handicapped children and their parents. *20 U.S.C. § 1415*

Civil action to review state administrative decision concerning the provision of a free appropriate public education to disabled children. *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)*

[15] State Statutes

Injunctive relief. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525, 526, 527*

Declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*

Procedural safeguards for individuals with exceptional needs and their parents or guardians. *Educ. Code §§ 56500-56507*

[16] Decisions

20 U.S.C. § 1415(j) prohibits school officials from unilaterally excluding child from class pending review proceedings because of dangerous conduct by that child if it is the child's inability to conform his or her conduct to socially acceptable norms renders him or her handicapped. *Honig v. Doe (1988) 484 U.S. 305, 323-328, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686*

20 U.S.C. § 1415(j) creates presumption in favor of child's current educational placement, which school officials can overcome only by showing that maintaining current placement is substantially likely to result in injury either to that child or to others; school officials entitled to seek injunctive relief under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(e)(2)* in appropriate cases. *Honig v. Doe (1988) 484 U.S. 305, 326-328, 108 S. Ct. 592, 98 L. Ed. 2d 686*

Appropriate relief under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* not limited in form and may include reimbursement to parents for private special education expenditures if court determines that private placement, rather than proposed IEP, is proper under IDEA. *Burlington School Comm. v. Department of Education (1985) 471 U.S. 359, 369-370, 105 S. Ct. 1996, 85 L. Ed. 2d 385*

Court's inquiry in suit under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)* is twofold: (1) whether state has complied with procedures set forth in IDEA, and (2) whether individualized educational program developed through IDEA's procedures is reasonably calculated to enable child to receive educational benefits; state complies with obligations imposed by Congress if these requirements are met. *Board of Education v. Rowley (1982) 458 U.S. 176, 102 S. Ct. 3034, 73 L. Ed. 2d 690, 712*

Preliminary injunction to maintain educational status quo of disabled child under *20 U.S.C. § 1415(j)* need not always be automatically granted; court will apply traditional preliminary injunction factors, including showing of irreparable harm and likelihood of success on merits. *Johnson ex rel. Johnson v. Special Educ. Hearing Office (9th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 1176, 1180*

Availability of relief under IDEA bars plaintiffs from seeking similar relief with added bonus of attorney's fees under "and laws" provision of *42 U.S.C. § 1983*. *Doe v. Maher (9th Cir. 1986) 795 F.2d 787, 790*

IDEA provides specific procedural safeguards that must be adopted by states receiving federal funds under it; state law inconsistent with federally mandated procedures superseded by *IDEA. Monahan v. Nebraska (D. Neb. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 1074, 1086, 1091* ; *Vogel v. School Bd. of Montrose R-14 School Dist. (W.D. Mo. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 989, 991 n.1, 993*

Failure to initiate due process procedures of *20 U.S.C. § 1415* as excused if parents unilaterally placed teenager in private school rather than juvenile system facility, and parents entitled to recover educational costs in administrative proceeding, as well as attorney's fees under *Gov. Code § 800*, because respondents failed to undertake diagnostic reassessment of teenager and latest placement at juvenile facility was woefully inadequate and inappropriate in light of teenager's educational handicap, despite fact that teenager's problems were formidable and extremely difficult for diagnosis and treatment. *In re John K. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 783, 795-798, 216 Cal. Rptr. 557*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationDisability DiscriminationGeneral OverviewEducation LawDiscriminationEqual Educational OpportunitiesEnforcementEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActEnforcementEducation LawStudentsRight to Education

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.91

§ 513.91 Complaint for Declaratory [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527]--By Public School Student Against School Officials--Denial of Freedom of Speech [U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a); Educ. Code § 48907]

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and Injunctive Relief [Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527]--By Public School Student Against School Officials--Denial of Freedom of Speech [U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a); Educ. Code § 48907]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], [a minor,	)	
by _____ (*name*),	)	
his/her Guardian ad litem,]	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND IN-
vs.	)	JUNCTIVE RELIEF
_____ [*names*],	)	[*U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV*; *42 U.S.C. § 1983*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*; *Educ. Code § 48907*]
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff _____ [*name*] [, a minor, through his/her guardian ad litem,] alleges:

[1. *Appointment of guardian ad litem, if appropriate. See § 513.90, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California, and a

pupil duly enrolled in _____ School, which is maintained and operated by defendant _____ School District.

3. Defendant _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

4. _____ [*Allege capacity of individual defendants, e.g.,* Defendants _____ (*names*) are the duly qualified, elected, and acting members of _____ (*title of governing board, e.g.,* the Board of Education of the _____ School District), which is the governing board of defendant _____ School District. Defendant _____ (*name*) is the principal of _____ School and an employee of defendant _____ School District]. In doing the things hereinafter mentioned, these defendants acted under color of their authority and under the color of the customs and usages of defendant _____ [*name of school district*] and pursuant to the official policies of defendant _____ [*name of school district*] as enacted and adopted by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the governing board] acting under color of its authority as such.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe circumstances surrounding alleged deprivation of freedom of speech, e.g.,* defendants _____ (*names*), acting in their capacity as the governing board of defendant _____ School District, adopted and promulgated a school district regulation, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, which provides, in pertinent part that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* all students of _____ School District are prohibited from wearing any badge or button bearing a political message or slogan while on school property during school hours)].

6. _____ [*Further describe alleged deprivation of freedom of speech, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), while lawfully on the premises of _____ School for the purpose of attending classes therein, plaintiff was wearing a political campaign button bearing the following inscription: _____ (*set forth precise words*). Thereafter, defendant _____ (*name of school official*), acting pursuant to the above-described school district regulation, ordered plaintiff to remove the above-described button or, in the alternative, to leave the school premises until plaintiff was willing to comply with the regulation described above. When plaintiff refused to do either, defendant _____ (*name of school official*) further stated that plaintiff would be suspended from school unless he/she complied with the above order, whereupon plaintiff left the premises of the school].

7. _____ [*Allege violation of constitutional and statutory right to freedom of speech, e.g.,* The above-described school district regulation denies plaintiff his/her right of freedom of speech and expression as guaranteed by the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, Section 2(a) of Article I of the California Constitution*, and *Section 48907 of the Education Code*, both on its face and as applied to plaintiff, and is unconstitutionally vague and overbroad (in that _____ (*specify*))].

8. [*Allege facts showing exhaustion of any available administrative remedies*].

9. Unless and until enjoined by order of this court, defendants will continue to _____ [*specify conduct, e.g.,* enforce the above-described school district regulation], thereby causing plaintiff great and irreparable injury in that plaintiff will thereby be deprived of his/her rights to freedom of speech and expression under the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution, Section 2(a) of Article I of the California Constitution*, and *Section 48907 of the Education Code*, as hereinabove alleged.

10. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries suffered, and to be suffered in the future, in that _____ [*allege facts showing inadequacy of legal remedy, e.g.,* it is impossible for plaintiff to calculate a sum of money damages that will compensate him/her for the loss of his/her rights to freedom of speech and

expression].

11. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendants concerning their respective rights and duties in that plaintiff contends _____ [*specify plaintiff's contentions as to legal consequences of the facts alleged, e.g.,* that the above-described school district regulation is invalid and unenforceable, both on its face and as applied to plaintiff, because it deprives plaintiff of his/her rights of freedom of speech and expression under the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution*, *Section 2(a) of Article I of the California Constitution*, and *Section 48907 of the Education Code*. Plaintiff further contends that defendants have no right, pursuant to the above-described regulation or otherwise, to prevent plaintiff from wearing the above-described political campaign button or any other such button while attending school or to harass, threaten, intimidate, discourage, discriminate against, discipline, or otherwise punish plaintiff for wearing such a button to school]. Defendants, dispute these contentions, however, and contend that _____ [*specify defendant's contentions, e.g.,* the above-described school district regulation is a reasonable regulation of the time, place, and manner of expression].

12. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of his/her rights and duties and a declaration as to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* whether the above-described school district regulation is invalid and unenforceable as violative of plaintiff's rights of free speech and expression under the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution*, *Section 2(a) of Article I of the California Constitution*, and *Section 48907 of the Education Code*, either on its face or as applied to plaintiff, or both].

13. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her rights and duties _____ [*specify, e.g.,* with respect to his/her right to wear political campaign buttons while attending classes on school property]. _____ [*Allege any financial, educational, or other burden caused plaintiff by the unsettled state of affairs*].

14. By reason of defendants' acts and conduct as herein alleged, plaintiff was deprived of his/her rights, privileges, and immunities secured to him/her by the *First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States*, all in violation of Title *42 of the United States Code*, *Section 1983*.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendants to show cause, if any, why they should not be enjoined, as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;

2. For a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction enjoining defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them from _____ [*specify acts to be enjoined, e.g.,* (1) enforcing the above-described school district regulation in any manner whatsoever, and (2) threatening, harassing, intimidating, discouraging, punishing, discriminating against, or disciplining plaintiff for violating the above-described school district regulation or for the use, display, creation, or wearing of the political campaign button described hereinabove, or any other similar political campaign button];

3. For a judicial declaration that _____ [*state determination that court is requested to make, e.g.,* the above-described school district regulation is unconstitutional, invalid, void, and unenforceable, both on its face and as applied to plaintiff];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred;

5. For reasonable attorneys' fees as authorized by Title *42 United States Code*, *Section 1988(b)*; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 513.90.*]

CAUTION:

Unless counsel will be filing affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) in support of the allegations of this complaint, the complaint must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*], and counsel must take care to plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to injunctive relief [*see E. H. Renzel v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* .

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a public school student in an action to enjoin school officials from engaging in conduct that violates the student's rights of free speech and expression under *U.S. Const., amends. I* and *XIV*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*; and *Educ. Code § 48907*. The complaint also contains allegations and a prayer for declaratory relief. The complaint also alleges a count under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* for deprivation of federal constitutional rights under color of law, which gives rise to a right to attorneys' fees under *42 U.S.C. § 1988(b)*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges in pertinent part: (1) capacities of the parties (Paragraphs 2-4); (2) conduct by defendants violating plaintiff's rights of free speech and expression [*see U.S. Const., amends. I* and *XIV*; *42 U.S.C. § 1983*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*; *Educ. Code § 48907*] (Paragraphs 5-7); (3) exhaustion of administrative remedies [*see Pan Pacific Properties, Inc. v. County of Santa Cruz (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 244, 249-251, 146 Cal. Rptr. 428]* (Paragraph 8); (4) great and irreparable injury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(1)*] (Paragraph 9); (5) inadequacy of legal remedy [*see Civ. Code § 3422(1), (2)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(4), (5)*] (Paragraph 10); (6) right to declaratory relief [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*] (Paragraphs 11-13); and (7) deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law [*see 42 U.S.C. § 1983*] (Paragraphs 4, 14).

[4] Verification

See discussion in *§ 513.90[4]*.

[5] Cross References

For forms of complaints for declaratory and injunctive relief to enjoin public officials from denying the constitutional right to freedom of assembly, see Ch. 61, *Assemblies and Meetings* .

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For discussion of actions brought under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* for deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

For alternative forms of complaints for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For discussion and forms relating to the appointment of guardians ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians Ad Litem*

For alternative forms of complaint for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

[6] Federal Constitution

Right to freedom of speech. *U.S. Const., amends. I, XIV*

[7] State Constitution

Right to freedom of speech. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(a)*

[8] Federal Statutes

Liability, in action at law or equity, of persons acting under color of law for deprivation of a citizen's constitutional rights. *42 U.S.C. § 1983*

Attorneys' fees as recoverable in any action or proceeding to enforce *42 U.S.C. § 1983. 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b)*

[9] State Statutes

Right of public school students to freedom of speech. *Educ. Code § 48907*

[10] Decisions

School prohibition of use of lewd, indecent, vulgar, or offensive speech or conduct by students in public discourse not prohibited by *U.S. Const., amend. I.* Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 683-685, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549, 558-560*

Federal constitutional rights of public school students not automatically coextensive with rights of adults in other settings; *First Amendment* gives high school student classroom right to wear armband, but not to wear obscene tee-shirt; does not follow that simply because use of offensive form of expression may not be prohibited to adults making what speaker considers political point, same latitude must be permitted to public school children. *Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549, 558*

Students and teachers do not shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech and expression at the schoolhouse gate; showing that forbidden speech conduct would materially and substantially interfere with requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of school required to justify prohibition of particular expression of opinion by school officials. *Tinker v. Des Moines Community School Dist. (1969) 393 U.S. 503, 506, 509, 512-513, 89 S. Ct. 733, 21 L. Ed. 2d 731*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechExpressive ConductEducation LawCivil LiabilityCivil Rights Act of 1871Education LawStudentsSpeechPolitical & Symbolic Speech

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.92

§ 513.92 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages for Discrimination under Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 [20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.] for Sexual Harassment by Teacher or Fellow Student

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages for Discrimination under Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972 [20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.] for Sexual Harassment by Teacher or Fellow Student

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, _____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	Civil Action, File No. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT AND
vs.	)	DEMAND FOR JURY
_____ [*name*],	)	TRIAL
Defendant(s).	)	(Violation of Title IX of Education
	)	Amendments of 1972)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. This is an action for violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.* for discrimination on the basis of sex based on sexual harassment of plaintiff which excluded plaintiff from participation in, denied plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjected plaintiff to discrimination under an education program or activity of

defendant. Defendant is a recipient of federal financial assistance for purposes of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq.* Jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action is established in this court under Title *28 of the United States Code, Section 1343*.

2. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, a _____ [citizen or person within the jurisdiction] of the United States, residing at _____ [*street address*], _____ County, California, who, at times herein relevant, was a student at _____ [*specify name and location of educational institution plaintiff attended, e.g.,* Lagunitas Elementary School, a public school located in Marin County, California].

3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant _____ [*name*] was _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a school district *or* county board of education], and a recipient of federal financial assistance.

4. [*Describe actions by sexual harasser that form the basis of the action, e.g.*, From about _____ (*date*), to _____ (*date*), plaintiff was subject to sexual harassment by _____ (*name of person who sexually harassed plaintiff*), who is/was _____ [*allege if the harasser was a teacher or fellow student*], in that _____ (*name of harasser*) performed the following acts: _____ (*specify acts of harassment, e.g.,* _____ (*On various dates during the period of* _____ (*date*) to _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of harasser*) attempted to touch plaintiff's breasts and genital area and made vulgar statements of a sexually provocative nature to plaintiff, _____ (*name of harasser*) rubbed his/her body against plaintiff many times in a sexually suggestive and often aggressive manner, _____ (*name of harasser*) effectively prevented plaintiff from attending physical education class over this period by acting in a sexually manner toward plaintiff, *etc.*]. The acts of _____ [*name of harasser*] interfered with plaintiff's ability to attend school and perform her studies and activities.

5. Throughout the period of _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*], plaintiff [*add if appropriate* and plaintiff's mother *and/or* father *or name of other adult*] reported each of the incidents described in Paragraph _____ to _____ [*describe persons and capacity of those persons to whom plaintiff reported the sexually harassing conduct, e.g.* Richard Simon, plaintiff's classroom teacher, and Frances Newman, plaintiff's physical education teacher, at all times herein relevant, and John Jones, the principal of Lagunitas Elementary School at all times herein relevant]. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's deliberate indifference to the acts of harassment, e.g.* Notwithstanding these reports no disciplinary action was taken against _____ (*name of teacher or fellow student who harassed plaintiff*). Further, at not time herein relevant, despite plaintiff's requests and the request of her parents, was plaintiff allowed to change seats in her class or to change to a different physical education class so as to be physically removed from proximity with _____ (*name of harasser*). Also, at all times herein relevant, defendant had not instructed its personnel on how to respond to sexual harassment of students by teachers or fellow students and had not established a policy on the issue of teacher or "student-on-student" sexual harassment.] The deliberate indifference of defendant to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the acts of _____ (*name of harasser*) and defendant's failure to have and implement a policy concerning sexual harassment of students by teachers and/or fellow students excluded plaintiff from participation in, denied plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjected plaintiff to discrimination on the basis of sex].

6. As a proximate result of defendants' action against plaintiff, as alleged above, plaintiff has been harmed in that plaintiff _____ [*specify damages incurred, e.g.*], all to his/her damage _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof] [*add if appropriate*, and incurred medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof)].

[7. The above-recited actions of defendant in excluding plaintiff from participation in, denying plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjecting plaintiff to discrimination on the basis of sex in violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of

1972. were done with evil motive or intent, or with reckless or callous indifference to plaintiff's rights.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff request judgment as follows against defendant:

1. For general damages _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof];

[2. For medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof);]

[3. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish defendants for their wrongful conduct and set an example for others;].

4. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to Title *42 of the United States Code, Section 1988(b)*;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The plaintiff in the above-entitled action requests a trial by jury as provided by *Amendment VII of the United States Constitution* and by *Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.*

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

State of California)
[City and] County of _____)) ss.

_____ [*Name*], being duly sworn, deposes, and says:

He/She is the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. He/She has read the foregoing complaint and knows the contents thereof. The same is true of his/her own knowledge [, except as to matters therein stated on information and belief, and

as to those matters he/she believes it to be true].

_____ [*signature of plaintiff*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]
Notary Public-California
[City and] County of _____
My commission expires _____ [*date*]

[*notary seal*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff in an action under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, *20 U.S.C. § 1681*, for damages for sexual harassment by a teacher or fellow student.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The federal court's jurisdiction of the action (Paragraph 1) [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*].

- Defendant's status as a recipient of federal educational funding assistance and thus subject to Title IX (Paragraphs 1, 3).

- Plaintiff's status as a student and the educational institution plaintiff attends (Paragraph 2).

- Facts showing the nature of the acts of sexual harassment perpetrated against plaintiff by a teacher or fellow student (Paragraph 4).

- Plaintiff's acts and/or the acts of others in making the acts of sexual harassment alleged in paragraph 3 known to defendant and defendant's deliberate indifference to the acts of sexual harassment (Paragraph 5).

- Actual damages incurred by the plaintiff (Paragraph 6).

- The exclusion of plaintiff from participation in, denial of the benefits of, and/or subjection of plaintiff to discrimination under an educational program or activity receiving federal financial assistance in violation of Title IX (Paragraph 7).

The complaint is based on the allegations made in *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) 526 U.S. 629, 119 S. Ct. 1661, 143 L. Ed. 2d 839* , in which the United States Supreme Court recognized a right of action for damages under Title IX for "student-on-student" sexual harassment. In *Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School Dist (1998) 524 U.S. 274, 118 S. Ct. 1989, 141 L. Ed. 2d 277* , the Court recognized a right of action for damages under Title IX for sexual harassment of a student by a teacher. In both cases, the plaintiff/student must show that the recipient of federal education funding assistance, such as a school district or a county board of education, was deliberately indifferent to acts of sexual harassment made known to it; see discussion in *§ 513.36*.

[4] Cross References

For additional forms of jurisdictional allegations for complaints in federal courts, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationSexual HarassmentEducation LawDiscriminationGender & Sex DiscriminationTitle IXRemedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.93

§ 513.93 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Hostile Racial Educational Environment [42 U.S.C. § 2000d]

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Hostile Racial Educational Environment [42 U.S.C. § 2000d]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, _____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action, File No. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT AND
_____ [*name*],	)	DEMAND FOR JURY
Defendant(s).	)	TRIAL
	)	(Violation of *42 U.S.C. § 2000d*)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. This is an action for violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *42 U.S.C. § 2000d*, for discrimination based on race based on a hostile racial educational environment which excluded plaintiff from participation in, denied plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjected plaintiff to discrimination under a program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. Defendant is a recipient of federal financial assistance for purposes of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *42 U.S.C. § 2000d*.

2. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, a _____ [citizen *or* person within the jurisdiction] of the United States, residing at _____ [*street address*], _____ County, California, who, at times herein relevant, was a student at _____ [*specify name and location of educational institution plaintiff attended, e.g.* Sir Francis Drake High School, a public school located in Marin County, California].

3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant _____ [*name*] was _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a school district or county board of education], and a recipient of federal financial assistance.

4. Beginning on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was subject to a racially hostile educational environment at _____ [*name of school, e.g.,* Sir Francis Drake High School], in that _____ [*specify acts by fellow students creating racially hostile educational environment, e.g.,* fellow students repeatedly addressed plaintiff with a racial epithet ("nigger"), and plaintiff and other African-American students were subject to the appearance of racially offensive graffiti on classroom and other school walls].

5. Throughout the period of _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], plaintiff [*add if appropriate* and _____ (plaintiff's mother *and/or* father *or name of other adult*)] informed _____ [*specify names and capacities of officials of defendant school district to whom incidents were reported, e.g.,* Richard Simon, plaintiff's English teacher at all times herein relevant, Frances Newman, plaintiff's physical education teacher at all times herein relevant, and John Jones, the principal of Sir Francis Drake High School at all times herein relevant] of the racially offensive conduct by other students to which plaintiff was subject described in Paragraph _____. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's deliberate indifference to acts creating hostile racial educational environment, e.g.,* Notwithstanding the reports of racially offensive conduct by plaintiff (and _____ (plaintiff's mother *and/or* father *or name of other adult*), at no time did any officials or employees of defendant school district acknowledge the racially offensive conduct directed at plaintiff and other students described in Paragraph _____, attempt to discover the identities of the students responsible for that conduct, or take any disciplinary or other action to attempt to stop the racially offensive conduct from occurring]. The deliberate indifference of defendant to the racially offensive conduct directed at plaintiff and other students [*add if appropriate,* and defendant's failure to have and implement a policy concerning racial harassment] or the creation of a hostile racial educational environment by fellow students excluded plaintiff from participation in, denied plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjected plaintiff to discrimination on the basis of race.

6. Jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action is established in this court under Title *28 of the United States Code, Section 1343*.

7. As a proximate result of defendants' action against plaintiff, as alleged above, plaintiff has been harmed in that plaintiff _____ [*specify damages incurred, e.g.,*], all to his/her damage _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof] [*add if appropriate,* and incurred medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof)].

[8. The above-recited actions of defendants in excluding plaintiff from participation in, denying plaintiff the benefits of, and/or subjecting plaintiff to discrimination on the basis of race in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights of 1964, were done with evil motive or intent, or with reckless or callous indifference to plaintiff's rights.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff request judgment as follows against defendant:

1. For general damages _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof];

[2. For medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according

to proof);]

[3. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish defendants for their wrongful conduct and set an example for others;].

4. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to Title *42 of the United States Code, Section 1988(b)*;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The plaintiff in the above-entitled action requests a trial by jury as provided by *Amendment VII of the United States Constitution* and by *Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.*

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

State of California)
[City and] County of _____) ss.
)

_____

_____ [*Name*], being duly sworn, deposes, and says:

He/She is the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. He/She has read the foregoing complaint and knows the contents thereof. The same is true of his/her own knowledge [, except as to matters therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters he/she believes it to be true].

_____ [*signature of plaintiff*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]

Notary Public-California
[City and] County of _____
My commission expires _____ [*date*]

[*notary seal*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff in an action under *42 U.S.C. § 2000d* for damages for discrimination on the basis of race in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, based a hostile racial educational environment by fellow students.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's status as a student and the educational institution plaintiff attends (Paragraph 2).

- Defendants' status as a school district and recipient of federal educational funding assistance so as to be subject to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Paragraphs 1, 3).

- Facts showing the nature of the acts of racially offensive conduct directed at plaintiff and other students (Paragraph 4).

- Plaintiff's acts and/or the acts of others in making the acts of racially offensive conduct alleged in Paragraph 4 known to defendant and defendant's deliberate indifference to the racially offensive acts (Paragraph 5).

- The federal court's jurisdiction of the action (Paragraph 6) [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*].

- Actual damages incurred by the plaintiff (Paragraph 7).

- The exclusion of plaintiff from participation in, denial of the benefits of, and/or subjection of plaintiff to discrimination on the basis of race in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by a recipient of federal educational assistance funding (Paragraph 8).

The complaint is based on the allegations in the complaint in *Monteiro v. Tempe Union High School District (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1022* for violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *42 U.S.C. § 2000d*, which were found sufficient by the Ninth Circuit to state a cause of action.

[4] Cross References

For forms of complaints under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* generally, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights : The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes*

For additional forms of jurisdictional allegations for complaints in federal courts, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationEqual ProtectionEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationRacial HarassmentEducation LawDiscriminationRacial DiscriminationTitle VIRemedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.94

§ 513.94 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Unlawful Search and Seizure U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983]

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] in United States District Court for Damages--by Public School Student Against School Officials--Unlawful Search and Seizure U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, _____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action, File No. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT AND
_____ [*name*],	)	DEMAND FOR JURY
Defendant(s).	)	TRIAL
	)	(Violation of *U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV*; *42 U.S.C.*
	)	*§ 1983*)

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Jurisdiction: This is an action for violation of *42 U.S.C. § 1983* for violation of the Fourth and Fourteen Amendments of the United States Constitution, protecting United States citizens against unlawful search and seizure. Jurisdiction of the subject matter of this action is established in this court under Title *28 of the United States Code, Section 1343*.

2. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was, and now is, a _____ [citizen *or* person within the jurisdiction] of the United States, residing at _____ [*street address*], _____ County,

California, who, at times herein relevant, was a student at _____ [*specify name and location of educational institution plaintiff attended*].

3. At all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant _____ [*name*] was _____ [*specify capacity,, e.g.,* the vice principal at _____ (*name of school*]. [*If more than one defendant, add:* At all times hereinafter mentioned, defendant _____ (*name*) was _____ (*specify capacity, e.g.,* a teacher at _____ (*name of school*))].

4. [*Describe actions by defendant that form the basis of the action, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff was subject to a search of her person by defendant _____ (*name of person who searched plaintiff*), who at all times relevant was _____ (*e.g.,* a teacher at _____ (*name of school*)), on the orders of defendant _____ (*name and capacity of person who ordered search*). At the time of the search, neither defendant _____ (*name of person who searched plaintiff*), nor defendant _____ (*name of person who ordered search*) gave plaintiff or any other student a reason for the conduct of the search].

5. At no time before or during the time of the search was plaintiff engaged in any conduct that could have given rise to or have been reasonably construed by any school officials or employees to give rise to reasonable grounds for the search. Further, at no time before or during the time of the search was plaintiff associated with any other student or students who were engaged in any conduct that could have given rise to or have been reasonably construed by any school officials or employees to give rise to reasonable grounds for the search.

6. As a proximate result of defendants' action against plaintiff, as alleged above, plaintiff has been harmed in that plaintiff _____ [*specify damages incurred, e.g.*], all to his/her damage _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof] [*add if appropriate*, and incurred medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof)].

[7. The above-recited actions of defendants in ordering the search of and/or searching plaintiff were done with evil motive or intent, or with reckless or callous indifference to plaintiff's rights.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff request judgment as follows against defendant:

1. For general damages _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof];

[2. For medical expenses _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* in an amount according to proof);]

[3. For punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish defendants for their wrongful conduct and set an example for others;].

4. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to Title *42 of the United States Code, Section 1988(b)*;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

The plaintiff in the above-entitled action requests a trial by jury as provided by *Amendment VII of the United States Constitution* and by *Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.*

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

State of California)
[City and] County of _____)) ss.
_____

_____ [*Name*], being duly sworn, deposes, and says:

He/She is the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. He/She has read the foregoing complaint and knows the contents thereof. The same is true of his/her own knowledge [, except as to matters therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters he/she believes it to be true].

_____ [*signature of plaintiff*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]
Notary Public-California
[City and] County of _____
My commission expires _____ [*date*]

[*notary seal*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff in an action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* for damages for unlawful search and seizure of a public school student by a school official or employee in violation of *U.S. Const., amends. IV, XIV*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The federal court's jurisdiction of the action (Paragraph 1) [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*].
- Plaintiff's status as a student and the educational institution plaintiff attends (Paragraph 2).
- Defendants' status as school officials or employees (Paragraph 3).
- Facts showing the nature of the search of plaintiff performed and/or ordered by a school employee or official (Paragraph 4).
- The fact that nothing about Plaintiff's conduct or the conduct of other students with whom Plaintiff associated gave rise to reasonable grounds for the search (Paragraph 5).
- Actual damages incurred by the plaintiff (Paragraph 6).

For discussion of searches of students by school officials or employees, see *§ 513.37*.

[4] Cross References

For forms of complaints under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* generally, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes*

For additional forms of jurisdictional allegations for complaints in federal courts, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityCivil Rights Act of 1871Education LawStudentsSearch & SeizureRemedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 513 SCHOOLS: STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PART IV. FORMS
A. Student Rights and Responsibilities

45-513 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 513.95

§ 513.95 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Governing Board of School District and County Board of Education [Educ. Code §§ 48918, 48924]--Expulsion of Public School Student

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5] of Governing Board of School District and County Board of Education [Educ. Code §§ 48918, 48924]--Expulsion of Public School Student

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name of pupil*]	)	
[, a minor, by _____ (*name*),	)	
his/her Guardian ad Litem], Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*names*],	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

Petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] [, a minor, through his/her guardian ad litem,] respectfully represents:

[1. For purposes of this action, _____ (*name*) was appointed by the above-entitled court, and now is, guardian ad litem of petitioner _____ (*name of pupil*)].

2. Petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California, and a pupil duly enrolled at _____ School, which is operated and maintained by respondent _____ School District.

3. Respondent _____ School District is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

4. Respondent _____ [*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Trustees of the _____ School District] is the duly constituted governing board of respondent _____ School District.

5. _____ [*Allege names and capacities of all individual respondents, e.g.,* Respondents _____ (*names*) are the duly qualified, elected or appointed, and acting members of respondent _____ (*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Trustees of the _____ School District). Respondent _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ (*allege capacity of any other individual respondent, e.g.,* principal of _____ School, and a duly certificated employee of respondent _____ School District)].

6. Under *Section 48918(d) of the Education Code*, respondent _____ [*title of governing board, e.g.,* Board of Trustees of the _____ School District] has discretion to determine whether cause exists to expel a pupil of the district, or to delegate such authority to a county hearing officer, a hearing officer of the State Office of Administrative Hearings, or an impartial administrative panel of three or more certificated persons, none of whom may be members of the Board or employed on the staff of the school in which the pupil is enrolled. Pursuant to *Section 48918(d) of the Education Code*, respondent board or its delegate is required to conduct a hearing and take evidence in its proceedings for the determination of the facts.

7. On or about _____ [*date*], respondents served petitioner with written notice, pursuant to *Section 48918(b) of the Education Code*, that the expulsion of petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] from school had been recommended on the ground that _____ [*specify alleged grounds for expulsion*], and setting a date for a hearing on whether petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] should be expelled. A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

8. On _____ [*date*], a hearing was held before _____ [respondent _____ (*title of governing board, as in preceding paragraphs*) *or* an administrative _____ (hearing officer *or* panel) appointed by respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) pursuant to *Section 48918(d) of the Education Code*] to receive evidence on the issue of whether petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] should be expelled from school. Petitioner attended the hearing. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received respondent board's final decision and determination that petitioner _____ [*name of pupil*] should be expelled on the ground that _____ [*specify ground for action*]. [*If appropriate, allege application for reconsideration and adverse result.*] A copy of the notice of decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

9. A verbatim transcript of the record of the hearing before the _____ [respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) *or* administrative _____ (hearing officer *or* panel)], containing the evidence received, is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

10. On _____ [*date*], within 30 days following the decision of respondent _____ [*title of governing board*], _____ [petitioner *or* his/her _____ (parent *or* guardian)] appealed the decision to respondent _____ County Board of Education pursuant to *Section 48919 of the Education Code*. On _____ [*date*], a hearing of the appeal was held before _____ [respondent County Board of Education *or* a hearing officer *or* an impartial administrative panel] pursuant to *Sections 48919-48921 of the Education Code*. Petitioner attended this hearing. On _____ [*date*], respondent _____ County Board of Education made a final decision affirming the decision of respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] to expel petitioner. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received a copy of the decision of respondent _____

County Board of Education affirming petitioner's expulsion. [A copy of the decision of respondent _____ County Board of Education is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.]

11. The decision(s) of respondent _____ [*title of governing board*] [and respondent _____ County Board of Education] _____ [is *or* are] invalid for the following reasons: _____ [*in subparagraphs that follow, state reasons why decision is invalid, e.g.,*

a. _____ (Respondent Board *or* The hearing officer *or* The administrative panel) found that _____ (*state all findings*). Respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) does not have authority to expel petitioner in that such findings do not constitute any of the grounds for expulsion set forth in *Sections 48900, 48900.2, 48900.4,* or *48900.7 of the Education Code*.

b. The evidence received at the hearing does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ (*specify*).

[c. _____ (*In this and following subparagraphs, allege any other reasons for invalidity of decision under Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5, such as action by respondent without or in excess of authority, denial of a fair hearing, or abuse of discretion as established by failure to proceed as required by law, failure of the findings to support the decision, and failure of the evidence to support the findings. For examples of such allegations, see the petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative decision in Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, §§ 474C.90, 474C.91*).]

[12. *If appropriate, allege existence of additional relevant evidence that petitioner could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have produced at the hearing. See § 512.160, Paragraph* 9.]

[13. *If petitioner seek attorney's fees pursuant to Gov. Code § 800, allege amount of attorney's fees incurred. See § 512.160, Paragraph 10*.]

14. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 512.160, Paragraph 11*].

15. [*Lack of plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in ordinary course of law. See § 512.160, Paragraph 12*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. *If alternative writ procedure is used:* For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent _____ (*title of governing board*) to set aside its decision and order of _____ [*date*], expelling petitioner from _____School, to reinstate petitioner as a pupil at _____ School, and to order expunged any mention of the expulsion proceedings from any records or files respecting petitioner which are maintained by respondent _____ School District, or any of its agents, employees, or officers, or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. *If petitioner seeks a stay of operation of administrative order or decision pending judgment, state:* For an order restraining respondent from giving effect to its order of _____ (*date*), _____ (*specify effect of order, e.g.,* expelling petitioner from _____ School) until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____ [*set out terms of proposed peremptory writ at length as in Paragraph 1 of this prayer, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred [*add, if appropriate:*, including $_____ for preparation of the administrative record]; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioners _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am [guardian ad litem for] the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:

This petition must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service of a copy of the petition on each respondent and real party in interest must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing (except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. However, in a trial court, if no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application for the writ at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition for writ of mandate filed in superior court, although they are not expressly required by statute.

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition for a writ of mandate is for use by a public school student to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision by the governing board of a school district expelling the student from school. For a complete discussion of mandate proceedings to review administrative decisions, see Ch. 474, *Availabitlity of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* . The petitioner may proceed by either the alternative writ procedure or the noticed application procedure, as discussed in *§ 512.160[2]*.

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges: (1) appointment of a guardian ad litem if the pupil is a minor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 372*] (Paragraph 1); (2) capacities and residences of parties (Paragraphs 2-5); (3) petitioner's status as a pupil (thus, his or her beneficial interest in issuance of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]) (Paragraph 2); (4) discretionary authority of respondent governing board or its delegate to determine whether petitioner should be expelled [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 48918*] (Paragraph 6); (5) legal requirement that a hearing be held and evidence be taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see Educ. Code § 48918*] (Paragraph 6); (6) facts concerning the holding of the hearing (Paragraphs 7-9);

(7) appeal to county board of education and adverse result [*see Educ. Code §§ 48919-48924*] (Paragraph 10); (8) reasons for invalidity of decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*; *see § 512.160*] (Paragraph 11); (9) existence of any additional relevant evidence which could not, with due diligence, have been produced at the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*] (Paragraph 12); (10) if appropriate, the amount of attorney's fees claimed under *Gov. Code § 800* [*see § 512.160*] (Paragraph 13); (11) exhaustion of administrative remedies [*Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 29-31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513]* (Paragraph 14); and (12) lack of a plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*] (Paragraph 15).

For a complete discussion of the essential allegations of a petition for writ of mandate to review an administrative adjudicatory decision, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*, § 474C.90[5].

[4] Cross References

For alternative forms of allegations of capacity and residence, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

For discussion and alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings generally, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings to review administrative adjudicatory decisions, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

For discussion and alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[5] California Points and Authorities

For points and authorities supporting a petition for writ of mandate to review the decision to expel a public school pupil, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 210, *Schools*

[6] State Statutes

Mandate proceedings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1089*

Writ of mandate to determine validity of administrative decision made as result of evidentiary hearing required by law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Service of writ. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1096*

Proof of service; opposing points and authorities. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*

Permissible grounds for expulsion. *Educ. Code §§ 48900, 48900.2, 48900.3, 48900.4, 48900.7, 48915(a)*

Procedure for expulsion of public school pupils. *Educ. Code §§ 48915, 48918*

Appeal of expulsion order to county board of education. *Educ. Code §§ 48919-48924*

[7] Decisions

Two-day suspension did not rise to level of penal sanction calling for full panoply of federal procedural due process protections applicable in criminal prosecution; school disciplinary rule proscribing obscene language and pre-speech admonitions of teachers gave adequate warning to student that his lewd speech could subject him to sanctions. Bethel School Dist. No. 403 v. *Fraser (1986) 478 U.S. 675, 686, 106 S. Ct. 3159, 92 L. Ed. 2d 549*

Authority of school district to maintain discipline in schools and to suspend or expel pupils for refusing or neglecting to obey school rules or for other misconduct, subject to constitutional and statutory limits. *Abella v. Riverside Unified School Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 153, 167, 135 Cal. Rptr. 177*

Pupil expelled from school as required to exhaust administrative appellate remedy prior to bringing mandate proceeding for judicial review of expulsion. *Noonan v. Green (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 25, 29-31, 80 Cal. Rptr. 513*

[8] Law Reviews

Boone, "Expulsion in California Public High Schools--Due Process a Decade After Dixon," *8 San Diego L Rev 333 (1971)*

[9] Text References

California Administrative Mandamus (Cal CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 295-331 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusEducation LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDisciplinary ProceedingsAppeals & ReviewsEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsExpulsions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 514.syn

§ 514.syn Synopsis to Chapter 514: SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS

§ 514.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 514.02 Cross References

§§ 514.03-514.09 [Reserved]

§ 514.10 Governing Statutes

§ 514.11 Right to Safe Schools

§ 514.12 Liability for Acts or Omissions of School District Employees

[1] Generally

[2] Duty to Supervise Students

[3] Injuries to Students Not on School Property

[4] Off-Campus Injury Resulting From Negligent On-Campus Supervision

[5] No Duty to Protect Third-Party from Off-Campus Injury Absent Knowledge of Dangerous Student

[6] Defamation Liability for Reporting Threats

§ 514.13 Liability for Dangerous Condition of School Property

§ 514.14 Immunity for Hazardous Recreational Activity

§ 514.15 Immunity for Asbestos-Related Injuries

§ 514.16 Liability for Negligence of Independent Contractors

§ 514.17 Liability for Failure to Discharge Mandatory Duty

§ 514.18 Presentation of Written Claim to School District as Prerequisite to Action for Damages; Time Limits

§ 514.19 Punitive Damages Prohibited

§ 514.20 Defenses Available to School District and Employees

§§ 514.21-514.39 [Reserved]

§ 514.40 California Points and Authorities

§ 514.41 State Statutes

[1] Claims and Actions

[2] Liability of School Districts

[a] Generally

[b] Dangerous Condition of School Property

[3] Liability of School Employees

§ 514.42 Administrative Regulations

§ 514.43 Decisions

[1] Claims and Actions Against School Districts

[2] Dangerous Conditions

[3] Independent Contractors

[4] Injuries to Parents

[5] Negligent Supervision

[a] Generally

[b] Off-Campus Injury

§ 514.44 Attorney General Opinions

§ 514.45 Law Reviews

§ 514.46 Text References

§§ 514.47-514.59 [Reserved]

§ 514.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District and Employees--By Injured Student--Negligent Supervision of Students [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code §§ 815.2,

820]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Presentation of Written Claim as Prerequisite to Action for Damages

[5] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

[6] Venue

[7] Statute of Limitations

[8] Verification

[9] Specifying Amount of Damages

[10] Cross References

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

§ 514.61 Allegation--Negligent Supervision of Students--By School District and Employees [Gov. Code §§ 815.2, 820]--Failure to Prevent Unauthorized Departure From School Grounds

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Law Reviews

[5] Cross References

§ 514.62 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District, Employees, and Independent Contractor--By Injured Student--Negligence of Independent Contractor [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code § 815.4] and Dangerous Condition of School Property [Gov. Code §§ 835, 840.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART I. SCOPE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.01

§ 514.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the liability of public school districts and their employees for injuries to students caused by the negligent or wrongful acts of school district employees or by the dangerous condition of school property [*see § 514.10* et seq.].

It includes forms of a complaint for damages for personal injuries to a student as a result of negligent supervision by school personnel [*see § 514.60*], an allegation of negligent failure by school employees to prevent the unauthorized departure of a student from the school grounds during the school day [*see § 514.61*], and a complaint for damages for personal injuries to a student based on the dangerous condition of school property and on the negligence of an independent contractor of the school district [*see § 514.62*].

For discussion of the public school system and school districts generally, including limitations on public school finance and racial segregation, see *Ch. 513, Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities, § 513.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to student rights and responsibilities, see Ch. 513, *Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities* .

For discussion and forms relating to school employee certification, dismissal, and other related employment issues, see Ch. 512, *Schools: Certifcation, Dismissal, and Related Employment Issues* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawCivil LiabilityNegligenceTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesSchools

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART I. SCOPE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.02

§ 514.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to actions for assault and battery, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

For discussion and forms relating to wrongful death and survival actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to liability for injuries incurred in games, sports, and athletics, see Ch. 273, *Games, Sports, and Athletics*

For discussion and forms relating to the appointment of guardians ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians Ad Litem*

For discussion and forms relating to tort actions by minors and the compromise of a minor's claims, see Ch. 364, *Minors: Tort Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to negligence actions, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For discussion and forms relating to tort actions against and between a parent and child, see Ch. 394, *Parent and Child*

For discussion and forms relating to premises liability, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

For discussion and forms relating to claims and actions against public entities and employees and the tort liability of public entities and employees, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For discussion and forms relating to personal injury actions involving falls, see Ch. 525, *Slip and Fall*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityInjuries of Student AthletesFamily LawFamily Relationships & TortsGeneral

OverviewFamily LawGuardiansAppointmentTortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryElements of AssaultTortsNegligenceActionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsSurvival Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART I. SCOPE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 514.03-514.09

[Reserved]

§§ 514.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.10

§ 514.10 Governing Statutes

The tort liability of public entities and employees generally is governed by *Gov. Code § 810 et seq.* A "public entity" includes the state, the Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state [*Gov. Code § 811.2*]. A public school district is a public entity within the meaning of *Gov. Code § 811.2* [*see Wright v. Compton Unified Sch. Dist. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 177, 181, 120 Cal. Rptr. 115]* .

The liability of school districts for injuries to students participating in school-sponsored field trips is governed by *Educ. Code § 35330*. The duty of teachers to control the conduct of students outside the classroom is set forth in *Educ. Code § 44807*. The liability of school districts and their employees for the conduct or safety of students when they are not on school property is governed by *Educ. Code §§ 44808-44808.5*. A school district employee's tort liability for defamation for stating that a specific student or other specified person has made a threat to commit violence or potential violence on the school grounds involving the use of a firearm or other deadly or dangerous weapon is governed by *Civ. Code § 48.8*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawCivil LiabilityDefamationEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of StudentsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.11

§ 514.11 Right to Safe Schools

Cal. Const. art. I, § 28(c), provides that all students and staff of public primary, elementary, junior high, and senior high schools have the inalienable right to attend campuses that are safe, secure, and peaceful. All school districts must comply with *Cal. Const. art. I, § 28(c)*, and are prohibited from taking official actions that violate or contravene its provisions. However, *Cal. Const. art. I, § 28(c)*, does not establish an affirmative duty to act on the part of school districts. Further, it does not provide any remedies for violations, and does not create a private cause of action for damages [*Clausing v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1224, 1235-1238, 271 Cal. Rptr. 72* ; *see In re Latasha W. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1524, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886* (random metal detector weapon searches of high school students did not violate student's *Fourth Amendment* right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, where needs of school district to keep weapons off campus, as embodied in *Cal. Const. art. I, § 28*, was substantial, no system of more suspicion-intense searches was workable, and searches were minimally intrusive); *Leger v. Stockton Unified Sch. Dist. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1448, 1453-1457, 249 Cal. Rptr. 688]* .

The School Safety and Violence Prevention Act, which was enacted in 1999, is a statewide program administered by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It was the intent of the legislature that public schools serving pupils in grades 8 to 12, inclusive, have access to supplemental funds to establish programs and strategies that promote school safety and emphasize violence prevention among children and youth in the public schools [*Educ. Code § 32228(a)*]. School sites receiving these funds must accomplish all of the following goals [*Educ. Code § 32228(c)*]:

- Teach pupils techniques for resolving conflicts without violence;

- Train school staff and administrators to support and promote conflict resolution and mediation techniques for resolving conflicts between and among pupils;

- Reduce incidents of violence at the school site with an emphasis on prevention and early detection; and

- Provide age-appropriate instruction in domestic violence prevention, dating violence prevention, and interpersonal violence prevention.

The administration of this funding program is governed by *Educ. Code § 32228.1 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureSearch & SeizureWarrantless SearchesSchool SearchesEducation LawAdministration & OperationSafetyGeneral OverviewEducation LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsSearch & SeizureScope of Protection

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.12

§ 514.12 Liability for Acts or Omissions of School District Employees

[1] Generally

Like all public entities, a school district is not liable for any injury, except as provided by statute [*Gov. Code § 815*]. A school district is liable for any injury proximately caused by an act or omission of its employee within the scope of his or her employment if the act or omission would have given rise to a cause of action against that employee. If, however, the employee is immune from liability, so is the school district [*Gov. Code § 815.2*]. For a further discussion and forms relating to the liabilities and immunities of public entities and employees in general, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

When students have been sexually molested by teachers, school districts have been sued on the theory that the employing school district can be held vicariously liable for the teacher's acts under the doctrine of respondeat superior. Most courts have found no liability on the part of the school district in such cases, on the grounds that such acts are outside the scope of employment [*John R. v. Oakland Unified Sch. Dist. (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 438, 447-452, 256 Cal. Rptr. 766, 769 P.2d 948* ; *Kimberly M. v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 545, 547-549, 263 Cal. Rptr. 612]* . However, school districts may be held liable for negligent hiring and supervision of teachers by school district employees who knew or should have known of a teacher's prior sexual misconduct toward students [*Virginia G. v. ABC Unified Sch. Dist. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1848, 1854-1855, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671]* . It should be noted that while a school district may be directly liable under such circumstances, the district cannot logically be allocated 100 percent of the fault, with no fault allocated to the offending teacher, since the district's conduct only becomes wrongful in the context of the teacher's wrongful acts of abuse [*Ortega v. Pajaro Valley Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1057-1058, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 777]* . For general discussion of an employer's liability for its employee's torts, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* .

[2] Duty to Supervise Students

Although school authorities are not insurers of the physical safety of students, they are under a duty at all times to supervise the conduct of students on school grounds and to enforce those rules and regulations necessary for their protection. In carrying out this duty, school personnel are held to that degree of care which a person of ordinary prudence, charged with comparable duties, would exercise under the same circumstances. Either a total lack of

supervision or ineffective supervision may constitute a lack of ordinary care on the part of those responsible for student supervision [*Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360* ; *Aaris v. Las Virgenes Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1118-1119, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801]* . Under *Gov. Code § 815.2(a)*, a school district is vicariously liable for injuries proximately caused by the negligent failure of its employees to adequately supervise student conduct [*Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360]* .

In addition, pursuant to *Educ. Code § 44807*, every teacher in the public schools must hold pupils to a strict account for their conduct on the way to and from school, on the playgrounds, or during recess. For example, this statutory duty is breached when a child is injured in a clod fight during school recess [*Lucas v. Fresno Unified Sch. Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 866, 872-873, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79]* , or when a high school student is injured in an unsupervised slap boxing match [*Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360]* . However, a school district did not breach its statutory duty under *Educ. Code § 44807* to supervise a cheerleader injured while practicing a gymnastic stunt that occurred during supervision and training by her coach, though the coach urged the cheerleaders to practice and perfect the stunt, with which they had little experience [*Aaris v. Las Virgenes Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1119-1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801]* .

The mere fact that some third party is the immediate actor in causing the injury does not of itself absolve a school district from liability if it was negligent in failing to provide adequate supervision [*Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City School Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 521, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851* ; *Charonnat v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1943) 56 Cal. App. 2d 840, 846, 133 P.2d 643]* . Thus, willful misconduct or boisterous behavior by the injured student or another student does not necessarily relieve the school district of liability, since the duty to supervise is necessary in part because of the tendency of students to engage in aggressive and impulsive behavior which exposes them and their peers to the risk of serious physical harm [*Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 748, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360* ; *Beck v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 503, 508-509, 37 Cal. Rptr. 471]* .

A school should also consider the special vulnerability of special-needs students when monitoring the school grounds, as these students are more susceptible to victimization by other students. For example, if a school district allows a hidden area to be maintained on campus without taking adequate steps to prevent access by students, the foreseeability of that area being used to inflict injury on a special-needs student may be imputed to the district even without proof of prior incidents of victimization taking place in that hidden area [*Jennifer C. v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1328-1329, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 274*].

Adequacy of supervision and proximate causation are generally considered questions of fact that the jury must decide [*see, e.g.,* *Beck v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 503, 508-509, 37 Cal. Rptr. 471* ; *Ziegler v. Santa Cruz City High Sch. Dist. (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 277, 284-286, 335 P.2d 709]* . The occurrence of similar incidents may be relevant to the existence of a duty to protect students against similar injuries [*see* *Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 752 n.8, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360]* .

A school district is not under a general duty to supervise the conduct of persons who come onto school property when school is not in session for purposes unrelated to school activities and functions [*see* *Bartell v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Sch. Dist. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 492, 498-500, 147 Cal. Rptr. 898]* .

For a form of complaint against a school district and its employees for damages proximately caused by negligent supervision, *see § 514.60*.

[3] Injuries to Students Not on School Property

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Education Code, no school district, city or county board of education,

county superintendent of schools, or officer or employee of such district or board is responsible or in any way liable for the conduct or safety of any pupil of the public schools at any time when the pupil is not on school property unless the district, board, or person has done any of the following [*Educ. Code § 44808*]:

- Undertaken to provide transportation for the pupil to and from the school premises.
- Undertaken a school-sponsored activity off the school premises.
- Otherwise specifically assumed such responsibility or liability.
- Failed to exercise reasonable care under the circumstances.

The phrase "failed to exercise reasonable care under the circumstances" has been construed to modify the preceding phrases, which set forth the circumstances in which a duty to provide for the safety and conduct of a pupil arises by virtue of a specific assumption of obligation. Therefore, this portion of *Educ. Code § 44808* does not create any independent duty of care in the absence of some specific assumption of a duty to provide for a pupil's safety and conduct off campus [*Cerna v. City of Oakland (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1357, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168* ; *Torsiello v. Oakland Unified Sch. Dist. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 41, 47-49, 242 Cal. Rptr. 752]* . For example, the court of appeal has held that a school district has no duty to students, who are waiting after school for their parents to pick them up, to protect them from injuries that occur off-campus on a public street that is not under the school district's control, at least if the injury does not result from the school district's on-campus negligence and the district has not undertaken any specific responsibilities to supervise or protect those students [*Guerrero v. South Bay Union Sch. Dist. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 264, 269-270, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 509* ; *but see Eric M. v. Cajon Valley Union School Dist. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 285, 299, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 428* (triable issue of fact as to whether school violated duty to supervise 6-year-old child who boarded then disembarked from school bus unattended and was struck by car off school property while walking home)].

In the event of such a specific undertaking, the district or board is liable or responsible for the safety or conduct of any pupil only while the pupil is or should be under the immediate and direct supervision of an employee of the district or board [*Educ. Code § 44808*; *see, e.g., Ramirez v. Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 182, 190, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 128* (school district that encouraged students to participate in camp that school did not supervise was not liable under *Educ. Code § 44808* for student's death at camp)]. Thus, a school district is under no actionable duty to supervise or provide for the protection of students on their way to or from school unless it has undertaken to provide transportation for them [*Gilbert v. Sacramento Unified Sch. Dist. (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 505, 508-510, 65 Cal. Rptr. 913* ; *Kerwin v. County of San Mateo (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 304, 307, 1 Cal. Rptr. 437]* . Similarly, a school district is not liable for injuries sustained as a result of its failure to provide transportation or its failure to assign a pupil to a particular school within the district [*Girard v. Monrovia City Sch. Dist. (1953) 121 Cal. App. 2d 737, 743-744, 264 P.2d 115* ; *but see Manjares v. Newton (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 365, 373-375, 49 Cal. Rptr. 805, 411 P.2d 901* (school district may be required to provide transportation when failure to do so would effectively prevent student from attending school at all)].

If, however, the school district does provide transportation, it is under a duty to provide a reasonably safe system [*Raymond v. Paradise Unified Sch. Dist. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 1, 9, 31 Cal. Rptr. 847* ; *see Farley v. El Tejon Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-379, 274 Cal. Rptr. 780* (in wrongful death action brought after 8-year-old boy was killed while crossing road after being dropped off by school bus, determination of whether defendant exercised reasonable care as required by *Educ. Code § 44808* was question of fact); *see also Veh. Code § 22112* (schoolbus driver's duties of flashing red signal lights and stop signal arm and escorting pupils across highway)]. As noted above, however, liability will only be imposed if, at the time of the injury, the student was or should have been under the direct supervision of a school employee [*Bassett v. Lakeside Inn, Inc. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 863, 872, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 827* (district not liable to student killed by drunk driver off school property on way to school bus stop

because student was not and should not have been under school supervision)].

Unless circumstances indicate that it is unreasonable not to do so, school authorities need not determine the safety of the surrounding neighborhood before dismissing students from school [*see Brownell v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 787, 795-796, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756]* . Thus, school authorities were not liable for negligent supervision because they dismissed students without first ascertaining that there were no gang members on nearby streets, when a student was then shot and wounded by gang members on a public street adjacent to school property [*see Brownell v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 787, 794-798, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756]* . Schools have no duty to engage in a visual inspection for gang activity, absent either (1) any specific indication of a real and imminent gang-related threat at a particular time and place or (2) prior incidents reflecting not necessarily a specific type of harm but that the possibility of harm in the form of an assault is foreseeable [*Brownell v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 787, 797, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756]* .

All persons who participate in "field trips or excursions" conducted by a school district are deemed to have waived all claims against the district, a charter school, or the state for injury, accident, illness, or death occurring during or because of the field trip or excursion [*Educ. Code § 35330(d)*]. This provision has been held to apply only to field trips or excursions in which students are not required to participate [*Wolfe v. Dublin Unified Sch. Dist. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 126, 135, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 280* ; *Castro v. Los Angeles Bd. of Educ. (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 232, 235-236, 126 Cal. Rptr. 537]* . If the activity is one that requires attendance and for which attendance credit may be given, then the district is liable under *Educ. Code § 44808* for the safety of the pupil while the pupil is or should be under the direct supervision of an employee of the district. Students who are off the school's property for required school purposes are entitled to the same safeguards as those who are on school property, within supervisorial limits [*see Castro v. Los Angeles Bd. of Educ. (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 232, 235-236, 126 Cal. Rptr. 537]* . However, students who participate in non-required trips or excursions, though possibly in furtherance of their education but not as required attendance, are effectively on their own; the voluntary nature of the event absolves the district of liability [*Wolfe v. Dublin Unified Sch. Dist. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 126, 135, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 280* (affirming summary judgment in school district's favor); *see Castro v. Los Angeles Bd. of Educ. (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 232, 235-236, 126 Cal. Rptr. 537* (reversing order sustaining demurrer in wrongful death action against school district)].

The court of appeal has reached a similar result under *Educ. Code § 87706* and *5* Cal. Code Reg. § 55450, provisions analogous to *Educ. Code §§ 35330, 44808* that govern the liability of community college districts. In that case, the court held that the more specific immunity provision applied to the facts and controlled the outcome, although the court disagreed that the voluntary nature of a student's participation was material to the analysis [*Barnhart v. Cabrillo Cmty. Coll. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 818, 827-829, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709]* .

The court of appeal has held that the field trip immunity of *Educ. Code § 35330* applies to school district employees acting in the course and scope of employment, even though school district employees are not explicitly included in the language of the statute [*Casterson v. Superior Court (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 177, 189, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 637]* . According to the court, a contrary conclusion would effectively destroy the immunity of the school district, because the district would be vicariously liable for the employee's conduct under *Gov. Code § 815.2(a)* [*Casterson v. Superior Court (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 177, 180, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 637* ; *see Gov. Code § 815.2(a)*].

The governing board of a school district may permit the pupils enrolled at any high school to leave the school grounds during lunch hour. Neither the school district nor any officer or employee thereof is liable for the conduct or safety of any pupil who has left the school grounds pursuant to such permission [*Educ. Code § 44808.5*].

[4] Off-Campus Injury Resulting From Negligent On-Campus Supervision

The duty or lack of duty to supervise the conduct of students who are off campus must be distinguished from the recognized duty of school officials to supervise students when they are on school property [§ 514.12[2]]. When school

officials negligently fail to provide adequate supervision of students while they are on school property, the fact that the resulting injury to the student occurs off campus does not relieve the district from liability [*Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 514-518, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851* ; *Satariano v. Sleight (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 278, 284, 129 P.2d 35]* . Thus, for example, a school district may be held liable for off-campus injuries that are proximately caused by its failure to exercise reasonable care in supervising students so as to prevent their unauthorized departure from the school grounds [*Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 514, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851]* .

For a form of allegation of negligent failure to prevent a student from leaving school without permission, *see § 514.61*.

[5] No Duty to Protect Third-Party from Off-Campus Injury Absent Knowledge of Dangerous Student

The duty to supervise students under a school's care is primarily designed to protect the students themselves from injury. It does not extend to nonstudents who are injured by a student off school premises, at least when the school neither knew nor had reason to know that the particular student posed a danger [*Hoff v. Vacaville Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 925, 934-937, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 811, 968 P.2d 522]* . Thus, in one case a school district owed no duty to a third party who was injured across the street from a school parking lot when struck by a student driving in a reckless manner away from an unsupervised school parking lot. In that particular case, the school considered the student to be responsible and had no reason to know that he would drive his car away from the lot in a reckless manner [*Hoff v. Vacaville Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 925, 934-937, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 811, 968 P.2d 522]* .

In that case, the Supreme Court also rejected the argument that liability could be predicated on *Educ. Code § 44807*, because that statute was designed to protect students rather than members of the general public who were not on school property. The Court also rejected an argument based on *Educ. Code § 44808*, finding that the school had not specifically assumed responsibility for the student's off-campus conduct at the parking lot at issue merely by providing supervision at another parking lot [*Hoff v. Vacaville Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 925, 938-940, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 811, 968 P.2d 522* ; *see § 514.12[3]*].

[6] Defamation Liability for Reporting Threats

A communication by any person to a school principal, or a communication by a student attending the school to the student's teacher or to a school counselor or school nurse and any report of that communication to the school principal, stating that a specific student or other specified person has made a threat to commit violence or potential violence on the school grounds involving the use of a firearm or other deadly or dangerous weapon, is a communication on a matter of public concern. It does not subject the person making the statement to liability for defamation unless there is clear and convincing evidence that the communication or report was made with knowledge of its falsity or with reckless disregard for the truth or falsity of the communication [*Civ. Code § 48.8*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityDefamationEducation LawCivil LiabilityNegligenceEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of StudentsEducation LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.13

§ 514.13 Liability for Dangerous Condition of School Property

Except as provided by statute, a school district, like other public entities, is liable for injury caused by a dangerous condition of its property if the plaintiff establishes the following [*Gov. Code § 835*]:

- The property was in a dangerous condition at the time of the injury;
- The injury was proximately caused by the dangerous condition;
- The dangerous condition created a reasonably foreseeable risk of the kind of injury that was incurred; and
- Either (a) a negligent or wrongful act or omission of an employee of the school district within the scope of his or her employment created the dangerous condition, or (b) the public entity had actual or constructive notice under *Gov. Code § 835.2* of the dangerous condition a sufficient time prior to the injury to have taken measures to protect against the dangerous condition.

A "dangerous condition" is a condition of property that creates a substantial (as distinguished from a minor, trivial, or insignificant) risk of injury when the property or adjacent property is used with due care in a manner in which it is reasonably foreseeable that it will be used [*Gov. Code § 830(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 830.2*]. A condition of school property that is not inherently dangerous but merely allows access to school property at times when no school personnel are present to supervise the conduct of persons on the premises is not a dangerous condition within the meaning of *Gov. Code §§ 830* and *835* [*Bartell v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Sch. Dist. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 492, 496-498, 147 Cal. Rptr. 898]* .

However, a dangerous condition on school property may exist even though the condition is dangerous only by reason of a condition that exists on adjacent property over which the school has no control. In one case, for example, a school district was liable to a student who was struck by a car while crossing a dangerous crosswalk on an adjacent city street. The school district's liability was based on the district's placement of an entrance gate adjacent to the crosswalk, encouraging students to cross at that crosswalk even though the district was aware that the crosswalk, which had no

lights or stop signs, was at a heavily traveled intersection [*Joyce v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 292, 298-300, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* ; *see also* *Bonanno v. Central Contra Costa Transit Auth. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 139, 144, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 65 P.3d 807]* .

For a further discussion and forms relating to the liability of public entities and employees for dangerous conditions of public property, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityInjuries at School CrossingsEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesSchoolsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.14

§ 514.14 Immunity for Hazardous Recreational Activity

As a public entity, a school district is immune from liability for any damage or injury to property or persons arising out of a hazardous recreational activity conducted on the property of the school district [*see Gov. Code § 831.7(a)*]. "Hazardous recreational activity" means a recreational activity that creates a substantial, as distinguished from a minor, trivial, or insignificant, risk of injury to a participant or a spectator [*Gov. Code § 831.7(b)*]. Under *Gov. Code § 831.7*, the district is immune from liability to any person who participates in the hazardous recreational activity, who assists a participant, or to any spectator who knew or reasonably should have known that the activity created a substantial risk of injury to himself or herself and was voluntarily in the place of risk, or having the ability to leave, failed to do so [*Gov. Code § 831.7(a)*].

"Hazardous recreational activity" is further defined to mean the following [*Gov. Code § 831.7(b)(1)-(3)*]:

- Water contact activities, except diving, in places where or at a time when lifeguards are not provided and reasonable warning thereof has been given or the injured party should reasonably have known that there was no lifeguard provided at that time;

- Any form of diving into water from other than a diving board or diving platform, or at any place or from any structure where diving is prohibited and reasonable warning therof has been given; and

- Animal riding, including equestrian competition, archery, bicycle racing or jumping, boating, cross-country and downhill skiing, hang gliding, kayaking, motorized vehicle racing, off-road motorcycling or four-wheel driving of any kind, orienteering, pistol and rifle shooting, rock climbing, rocketeering, rodeo, spelunking, sky diving, sport parachuting, body contact sports (that is, sports in which it is reasonably foreseeable that there will be rough bodily contact with one or more participants), surfing, trampolining, tree climbing, tree rope swinging, water skiing, white water rafting, and wind surfing.

There are specified exceptions to this immunity, such as gross negligence by the school district or its employee that proximately causes the injury [*Gov. Code § 831.7(c)(5)*]. For a further discussion of this immunity, see Ch. 464, *Public*

Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act .

School districts, including colleges, have been denied immunity from liability under *Gov. Code § 831.7* for injuries to students engaged in school-sponsored athletic practices under the negligent supervision of school personnel, based on the conclusion that these activities are part of the educational mission of the school and therefore not considered "recreational" [*Avila v. Citrus Cmty. Coll. Dist. (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 148, 159-160, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 299, 131 P.3d 383* (community college was not immune under statute for injury to intercollegiate baseball player sustained during game); *Iverson v. Muroc Unified Sch. Dist. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 218, 227, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 35* (body contact sport performed during required physical education class was not "recreational"); *Acosta v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 471, 477-478, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 171* (school district has duty of reasonable supervision). However, a school district may be relieved from liability by the common-law doctrine of primary assumption of risk for an injury sustained by a student during a supervised extracurricular sports activity, if the injury was among the normal risks inherent in the sports activity [*Avila v. Citrus Cmty. Coll. Dist. (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 148, 163-165, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 299, 131 P.3d 383* (primary assumption of risk protected community college from liability to intercollegiate baseball player who was struck by pitch, perhaps intentionally, because risk was inherent in game); *Lilley v. Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 939, 943-946, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638* (rejecting argument that *Educ. Code § 44807* precluded application of primary assumption of risk doctrine to injury sustained in supervised extracurricular sports participation)]. For a discussion of primary assumption of risk, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityInjuries in Physical Education ClassesEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries of Student AthletesEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of StudentsEducation LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesSports FacilitiesTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.15

§ 514.15 Immunity for Asbestos-Related Injuries

A school district and its officers, directors, or employees have no civil liability in any civil action for injury, disease, death, or economic loss arising out of exposure on or after January 1, 1989, to asbestos contained in buildings owned, leased, or otherwise used by a school district, except on proof that the injury, disease, death, or economic loss was caused by the negligence of the school district, its officers, directors, or employees [*Gov. Code § 905.5*; for forms relating to negligence by public entities and public employees, *see* Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*]. Notwithstanding *Gov. Code § 815.6* (public entity's liability on failure to discharge mandatory duty) and *Evid. Code § 669* (presumption of failure to exercise due care), no presumption of negligence applies to any action under *Gov. Code § 905.5* [*Gov. Code § 905.5*].

Gov. Code § 905.5 applies only to actions against school districts. It does not apply to any other action, including, but not limited to, actions against a manufacturer, contractor, or any person who makes, sells, distributes, furnishes, or installs asbestos-containing materials. *Gov. Code § 905.5* does not affect, alter, or otherwise modify the law pertaining to workers' compensation claims. Nor does it affect the right of a school district or its officers, directors, or employees to seek indemnification [*Gov. Code § 905.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationPropertyEquipment & FacilitiesEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesAsbestosGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEnvironmental RegulationIndoor Air & Water QualityTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.16

§ 514.16 Liability for Negligence of Independent Contractors

Like other public entities, a school district is liable for any injury proximately caused by a tortious act or omission of an independent contractor of the school district to the same extent that the district would be liable if it were a private person [*Gov. Code § 815.4*]. Thus, a school district is liable for the negligent failure of an independent contractor to construct or maintain buildings or install permanent fixtures in a reasonably safe condition [*see O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795]* . The school district's potential vicarious liability under *Gov. Code § 815.4* for the negligence of its independent contractors is broader than its liability for dangerous conditions under *Gov. Code § 835* because there is no requirement of either tortious conduct on the part of the district's employees or notice of the condition on the part of the district [*O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646-647, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

For a form of complaint for damages against a school district and its employees and independent contractors for the negligence of the independent contractor and for the dangerous condition of school property, *see § 514.62*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationPropertyConstruction & RepairEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawCivil LiabilityNegligenceTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityIndependent ContractorsOwners & Possessors of Real Property

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.17

§ 514.17 Liability for Failure to Discharge Mandatory Duty

When a public entity, such as a school district, is under a mandatory duty imposed by an enactment [*see Gov. Code § 810.6* ("enactment" defined as constitutional provision, statute, charter provision, ordinance, or regulation)] that is designed to protect against the risk of a particular kind of injury, the public entity is liable for an injury of that kind proximately caused by its failure to discharge the duty, unless the entity establishes that it exercised reasonable diligence to discharge the duty [*Gov. Code § 815.6*]. For further discussion and a complaint alleging failure by a public entity to discharge a mandatory statutory duty, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

The obligation imposed on school districts by various provisions of the Education Code to adequately educate students is not a mandatory duty imposed by an enactment designed to protect against the risk of a particular kind of injury within the meaning of *Gov. Code § 815.6*. Thus, the violation of those provisions by a school district imposes no liability under *Gov. Code § 815.6* [*Rodriguez v. Inglewood Unified Sch. Dist. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 707, 721, 230 Cal. Rptr. 823* ; *Peter W. v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 814, 826-827, 131 Cal. Rptr. 854* ; *see also* Ch. 513, *Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities*]. Similarly, there is no basis for liability under *Gov. Code § 815.6* when a school district violates certain suspension and expulsion provisions of the Education Code (*Educ. Code §§ 48900, 48911, 48918*), because those provisions were not designed to protect students and their parents from money damages resulting from "educational" injuries [*Tirpak v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 639, 643, 232 Cal. Rptr. 61]* . Additionally, *Gov. Code § 815.6* provides no basis for liability for violations of *Educ. Code §§ 49000* and *49001*, which prohibit corporal punishment, in that those sections do not create any mandatory, affirmative duty on the part of public schools or districts to take action or carry out measures to ensure that students are never subjected to corporal punishment by teachers [*Clausing v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1224, 1239-1240, 271 Cal. Rptr. 72]* . For discussion of *Educ. Code §§ 49000* and *49001*, see Ch. 513, *Schools: Student Rights and Responsibilities* .

Although one court of appeal opinion held that the statutory duty to investigate a teacher's background and deny employment to those convicted of a sex offense could not be used to support a private right of action under *Gov. Code § 815.6* [*State of California v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 954, 958, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527* ; *see Educ. Code § 44346(a)(2)*; *Gov. Code § 815.6*], the California Supreme Court has subsequently rejected, in a different context, the rationale employed to reach that conclusion [*Haggis v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 490, 500 n.2, 93 Cal.*

Rptr. 2d 327, 993 P.2d 983 (application of *Gov. Code § 815.6* does not depend on whether Legislature intended underlying statute to create private right of action)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsCorporal PunishmentEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsExpulsionsEducation LawStudentsDiscipline MethodsSuspensionsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.18

§ 514.18 Presentation of Written Claim to School District as Prerequisite to Action for Damages; Time Limits

A written claim relating to a cause of action for death or personal injury must be presented to the school district in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* not later than six months after accrual of the cause of action [*see Gov. Code §§ 905, 910, 911.2*]. The claim must be presented to the school district. Presentation of the claim to the State Board of Control will not suffice. Although a school district is a state agency, it is a local public entity under the claim-filing requirement of the Tort Claims Act because it is not a state agency for which tort claims are paid by warrants issued by the controller. Potential liability for a claim for personal injuries rests with the school district, not the state [*Johnson v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699-700, 266 Cal. Rptr. 187]* .

The governing board of the district must act on the claim (by allowing it or rejecting it in whole or in part) within 45 days after presentation of the claim. If the claim is amended, the board must act on the claim within 45 days after filing of the amended claim. If the board fails or refuses to act on the claim within this time, the claim is deemed rejected on the 45th day [*Gov. Code § 912.4*; *see Gov. Code § 912.6*]. Notice of the action taken on the claim must be given to the claimant in a form prescribed by statute [*see Gov. Code § 913*].

An injured party may apply in writing for leave to present a claim after six months following accrual of the cause of action if the application is presented to the school district within a reasonable time not exceeding one year after the accrual of the cause of action and states the reason for the delay in presenting the claim [*Gov. Code § 911.4*]. If the governing board does not grant or deny the application within 45 days after it is presented, the application is deemed denied on the 45th day [*Gov. Code § 911.6*]. If the application is denied, the claimant may petition the court for an order relieving him or her from the necessity of filing a claim prior to maintaining an action against the district [*see Gov. Code § 946.6*].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code § 946.4* (agency's failure to file statement required by *Gov. Code § 53051*) and *Gov. Code § 946.6* (judicial relief from claim requirement), no suit for money or damages may be brought against a school district on a cause of action for which a written claim is required to be presented under *Gov. Code §§ 910-915.4* until such a claim has been presented to the district and has been acted on or deemed rejected by the governing board of the district [*Gov. Code § 945.4*]. Any such suit against a school district must be commenced [*Gov. Code § 945.6(a)*]:

- If written notice of the board's action on the claim is given in accordance with *Gov. Code § 913*, not later than six months after the date such notice is personally delivered or deposited in the mail; or

- If written notice is not given in accordance with *Gov. Code § 913*, within two years after accrual of the cause of action.

For a further discussion and forms relating to the presentation of written claims to public entities, see *§ 514.14* and Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityClaim PresentationActual NoticeTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityClaim PresentationContent & FormTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityClaim PresentationTime LimitationsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsProcedural Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.19

§ 514.19 Punitive Damages Prohibited

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a school district, like other public entities, is not liable for exemplary or punitive damages [*Gov. Code § 818*]. For a discussion of other immunities of public entities and employees, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesEducation LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesAvailabilityGovernmental EntitiesTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.20

§ 514.20 Defenses Available to School District and Employees

The liability of a school district and its employees, like that of other public entities and their employees, is subject to any defense that would be available if the district or its employee was a private person [*Gov. Code §§ 815(b), 820(b)*]. In addition, school districts and their employees are entitled to certain immunities from tort liability which are applicable to public entities and employees generally. For a discussion of these immunities, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawImmunitiesSchool District ImmunityTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 514.21-514.39

[Reserved]

§§ 514.21[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.40

§ 514.40 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to tort claims and actions against public entities, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 196, *Public Entities* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.41

§ 514.41 State Statutes

[1] Claims and Actions

Claims against public entities. *Gov. Code §§ 900-935.6*

Actions against public entities and employees. *Gov. Code §§ 940-960.8*

[2] Liability of School Districts

[a] Generally

Waiver of claims against school district, charter school, and state for injury, accident, illness, or death occurring during or because of school-sponsored field trip or excursion. *Educ. Code § 35330*

Liability of school district, officers, and employees for safety and conduct of pupils when not on school property. *Educ. Code §§ 44808-44808.5*

Definitions under Tort Claims Act [*Gov. Code §§ 810-996.6*]. *Gov. Code §§ 810-811.8*

Liability generally. *Gov. Code § 815*

Liability for injury proximately caused by torts of employees within scope of employment. *Gov. Code § 815.2*

Liability for injury caused by independent contractor. *Gov. Code § 815.4*

Liability for failure to discharge mandatory statutory duty. *Gov. Code § 815.6*

Immunities. *Gov. Code §§ 818-818.8*

[b] Dangerous Condition of School Property

Definitions and general provisions relating to dangerous conditions. *Gov. Code §§ 830-831.8*

Immunity and exceptions for hazardous recreational activities conducted on school property. *Gov. Code § 831.7*

Liability for dangerous conditions. *Gov. Code § 835*

Actual or constructive notice of dangerous condition. *Gov. Code § 835.2*

Reasonableness as defense. *Gov. Code § 835.4*

Immunity for asbestos-related injuries. *Gov. Code § 905.5*

[3] Liability of School Employees

No liability for defamation for reporting threats without clear and convincing evidence that report made with knowledge of falsity or with reckless disregard for truth or falsity. *Civ. Code § 48.8*

Teachers as required to hold pupils to strict account for conduct on their way to and from school, on playgrounds, and during recess. *Educ. Code § 44807*

Liability of employees generally. *Gov. Code § 820*

Immunities of employees generally. *Gov. Code §§ 820.2-822.2*

Indemnification of and by employees. *Gov. Code §§ 825-825.6*

Immunity and exceptions for hazardous recreational activities conducted on school property. *Gov. Code § 831.7*

Liability and immunities for dangerous conditions generally. *Gov. Code § 840*

Liability for dangerous conditions of public property. *Gov. Code § 840.2*

Actual or constructive notice of dangerous condition. *Gov. Code § 840.4*

Reasonableness as defense. *Gov. Code § 840.6*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewEducation LawCivil LiabilityDefamationEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawCivil LiabilityReleasesEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of StudentsEducation LawImmunitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty off PremisesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesSchoolsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityImmunityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersActivities & ConditionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.42

§ 514.42 Administrative Regulations

Health and safety of pupils. *5 Cal. Code Reg §§ 550-632*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawAdministration & OperationSafetyGeneral OverviewEducation LawStudentsCounseling & Health ServicesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.43

§ 514.43 Decisions

[1] Claims and Actions Against School Districts

Parents whose child was expelled from junior high school without due process hearing as entitled to enforce claim for attorneys fees expended in administrative hearing that led to child's reinstatement under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [*20 U.S.C.S. § 1415*] without having to comply with *Gov. Code § 905*, because claims statute does not apply to actions enforcing federal rights. *Hacienda La Puente Sch. Dist. v. Honig (9th. Cir. 1992) 976 F.2d 487, 495-496*

Under circumstances, trial court as abusing discretion in failing to grant minor's request under *Gov. Code § 946.6(c)(2)* for relief from obligation of filing claim with school district prior to maintaining action against it. *Williams v. Mariposa County Unified Sch. Dist. (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 843, 849-852, 147 Cal. Rptr. 452*

Minor as permitted to file action against school district within 30 days after court makes order relieving minor from obligation to file written claim against district under *Gov. Code § 946.6*, notwithstanding fact that statute of limitations applicable to personal injury actions generally had previously expired. *Brown v. Huntington Beach Union HIgh Sch. Dist. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 640, 642, 93 Cal. Rptr. 417*

Claim presented to city as not satisfying statutory requirements for presentation of claim to board of education of school district where, by statute, the school district, and not the city, was liable for any judgment against the school district arising out of the claim. *Jackson v. Board of Educ. (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 856, 857-859, 58 Cal. Rptr. 763*

[2] Dangerous Conditions

School district as liable under *Gov. Code § 835* for dangerous condition on public property when school children were struck and injured by car while waiting to be picked up after school; school parking lot was very congested and there was no barrier between lot and sidewalk where children waited to be picked up after school by parents. *Constantinescu v. Conejo Valley Unified Sch. Dist. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1474-1476, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734*

Where alleged condition of school property (unlocked gate and broken fence) was not inherently dangerous but merely allowed access to school grounds where decedent engaged in dangerous game, plaintiff as failing to plead dangerous condition of public property within meaning of *Gov. Code §§ 830* and *835*. *Bartell v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Sch. Dist. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 492, 496-498, 147 Cal. Rptr. 898*

[3] Independent Contractors

School district as liable under *Gov. Code § 815.4* for negligent failure of independent contractor to construct or maintain buildings in reasonably safe condition. *O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646-647, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795*

[4] Injuries to Parents

Teacher's disclosure of student's fatal disease to his classmates as not giving rise to any cause of action against the school district for shock and mental distress caused to student's parents. *Wynne v. Orcutt Union Sch. Dist. (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 1108, 1110-1111, 95 Cal. Rptr. 458*

[5] Negligent Supervision

[a] Generally

School district's duty to supervise students; standard of care; vicarious liability of school district for failure to adequately supervise. *Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360*

Fact that student's injuries and death were result of boisterous behavior ("slap boxing") engaged in by him and fellow student as not precluding finding of negligent supervision by school district. *Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 748, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360*

School district liable for sexual assault of special education student by another student in unsupervised restroom before start of classes because district had knowledge of assailant's disciplinary history and special needs of victim. *M. W. v. Panama Buena Vista Union Sch. Dist. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 508, 520-521, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 673*

School district not liable for failing to protect student from injuries caused by another student during fight, despite fact that student who caused injuries had been in trouble before; no aspect of assailant's prior conduct bore any relation to plaintiff, there was no indication that assailant even knew plaintiff before attack, and fight arose suddenly during lunch break, immediately after school monitor had passed through area in which fight occurred. *Thompson v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1352, 1369-1372, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 748*

School district was entitled to summary judgment on claim that it failed to protect student from injuries caused by another student during fight, despite fact that student who caused injuries had been in trouble before; no aspect of assailant's prior conduct bore any relation to plaintiff, there was no indication that assailant even knew plaintiff before attack, and fight arose suddenly during lunch break, immediately after school monitor had passed through area in which fight occurred. *Thompson v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1352, 1369-1372, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 748*

Educ. Code § 44807 as creating duty on part of school district to supervise students on school playground such that

school district could not rely on implied assumption of risk doctrine to avoid liability on summary judgment for injuries caused to plaintiff school child who was struck in the eye by a dirt clod thrown by fellow student during recess. *Lucas v. Fresno Unified Sch. Dist. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 866, 871-873, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79*

School district as not under general duty to supervise and control conduct of all persons on premises at all times apart from school-related activities and functions that require persons to be on school grounds. *Bartell v. Palos Verdes Peninsula Sch. Dist. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 492, 498-500, 147 Cal. Rptr. 898*

Willful misconduct of student as not in itself sufficient to relieve school district of liability for injuries to another student; questions of adequacy of supervision and proximate cause as questions of fact properly left to jury. *Beck v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 503, 508-509, 37 Cal. Rptr. 471*

Where student died from injuries sustained when he fell from railing at school, question of whether school district was liable for negligently failing to supervise area and warn students not to sit on railing as question of fact for jury. *Ziegler v. Santa Cruz City High Sch. Dist. (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 277, 284-286, 335 P.2d 709*

Mere fact that some third party is immediate cause of injury as not of itself absolving school district from liability if it negligently failed to provide adequate supervision. *Charonnat v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1943) 56 Cal. App. 2d 840, 846, 133 P.2d 643*

[b] Off-Campus Injury

School district's duty to exercise ordinary care in supervising students while on school premises as including duty to exercise ordinary care to keep students on campus during school hours; district as liable for student injuries which are proximately caused by district's failure to exercise such care, notwithstanding that injury occurs off campus. *Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 513-520, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851*

Instructors of adult education truck driving course that expressly and properly undertook to supervise off-campus project involving loading of bleachers onto flatbed truck owed duty of care to provide immediate and direct supervision, especially given that goal of project was to teach students how to load truck properly. *Patterson v. Sacramento City Unified School Dist. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 821, 831-832, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 337*

Educ. Code § 44808 protected school district from liability for off-campus injury to student who fell off van being driven by coach, because injury was not incurred during school-sponsored or school-sanctioned activity. *Mosley v. San Bernardino City Unified Sch. Dist. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1264-1265, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 724*

Educ. Code § 44807 (duty to hold pupils to strict account for their conduct on their way to and from school) as creating no duty to stop and investigate activities of students when their conduct does not manifest some degree of impropriety. *Torsiello v. Oakland Unified Sch. Dist. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 41, 45-46, 242 Cal. Rptr. 752*

Where busy high school loading area was used as bus stop for elementary school children, school district as under duty as matter of law to provide adequate supervisory measures to protect children using the bus loading zone. *Raymond v. Paradise Unified Sch. Dist. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 1, 10-11, 31 Cal. Rptr. 847*

Duty of school district to supervise students during school hours as not ceasing merely because students must cross a public street in going from class to class. *Satariano v. Sleight (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 278, 284, 129 P.2d 35*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityInjuries at School CrossingsEducation LawCivil LiabilityInjuries on School PropertyEducation LawCivil LiabilityNegligenceEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of StudentsEducation LawDiscriminationIndividuals With Disabilities Education ActRemediesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesSchoolsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsProcedural Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.44

§ 514.44 Attorney General Opinions

Disclosure by school district of information about sex offender in community. *82 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 20 (1999)*

Liability of school district for injuries to pupils while going to and from places of worship under released-time program. *2 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 160 (1943)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityInjuries at School Crossings

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.45

§ 514.45 Law Reviews

Note, *The Modern Concept of Duty: "Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City School District" and School District Liability for Injuries to Truants, 30 Hastings L.J. 1893 (1979)*

Case Note, *Negligence--School District Liable For Truant's Injuries If District's Negligent Supervision Is the Proximate Cause of Such Injures, 19 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1125 (1979)*

Seitz, *Legal Responsibility Under Tort Law of School Personnel and School Districts as Regards Negligent Conduct Towards Pupils, 15 Hastings L.J. 495 (1964)*

Note, *Negligence Liability of Schoolteachers in California, 15 Hastings L.J. 567 (1964)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Education LawCivil LiabilityNegligenceEducation LawCivil LiabilitySupervision of Students

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.46

§ 514.46 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions,* §§ 223 et seq., Vol. 4, *Pleading,* 577 et seq. (4th ed. 1996)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 5, *Torts,* §§ 166 et seq., 324, 327 et seq. (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 514.47-514.59

[Reserved]

§§ 514.47[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART IV. FORMS

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.60

§ 514.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District and Employees--By Injured Student--Negligent Supervision of Students [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code §§ 815.2, 820]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District and Employees--By Injured Student--Negligent Supervision of Students [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code §§ 815.2, 820]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], [a minor,	)	
by _____ (*name*),	)	NO. _____
his/her Guardian ad Litem,]	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Plaintiff,	)	(Negligence)
vs.	)	[Amount demanded _____
_____ [*names*],	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff [, through his/her guardian ad litem,] alleges:

[1. *If appropriate, allege:* On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*name*) was appointed guardian ad litem of plaintiff _____ (*name*), a minor of the age of _____ years, by order of the above-entitled court, and is now the qualified and acting guardian ad litem of plaintiff for purposes of this action.]

2. Defendant _____ [*name of school district*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school district duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California.

3. _____ School is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a school facility operated by and under the management and control of defendant _____ [*name of school district*], its governing board, officers, and employees, and located in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant(s) _____ [*name(s) of teacher(s) or other school employee(s)*] _____ [was *or* were] [an] employee(s) of defendant _____ [*name of school district*], and in doing the acts hereinafter described, _____ [was *or* were] acting within the scope of his/her/their employment.

5. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff _____ [*name*] was a resident of _____ County, California and a student duly enrolled at _____ School.

[6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is negligently responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by the negligence of these defendants.]

[7. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) [A]t all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1- _____, inclusive, was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants and was at all times acting within the purpose and scope of such agency and employment.]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe how injury occurred, e.g.,* plaintiff was on the premises of _____ School for the purpose of attending classes there. While eating lunch in the cafeteria of _____ School, plaintiff, without provocation of any kind on his/her part, was attacked and struck by students _____ (*names*) and other unknown students and was knocked to the ground, proximately causing the injuries hereinafter alleged].

9. Defendants _____ [*name of school district*] and _____ [*name(s) of teacher(s) or other school employee(s)*], and each of them, had a duty at all times to supervise the conduct of students on the grounds of _____ School and to enforce those rules and regulations necessary for the protection of the students of _____ School. In particular, defendants had a duty to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* supervise the conduct of students in the cafeteria of _____ School during the lunch period and exercise ordinary care to protect students from the type of attack described above].

10. Defendants _____ [*name of school district*] and _____ [*name(s) of teacher(s) or other school employee(s)*], and each of them, were negligent and careless in that _____ [*allege nature of negligent supervision, e.g.,* they failed to exercise ordinary care in supervising the conduct of students in the cafeteria of _____ School during the lunch period so as to prevent the type of attack herein alleged. Prior to occurrence of the injuries herein alleged, defendants had actual and constructive notice that fights, beatings, and attacks such as have been alleged herein had occurred before, and were likely to occur again, in the absence of adequate supervision; defendants were negligent and careless in that having such knowledge they nevertheless failed to use ordinary care in the supervision of students during the lunch hour and failed to provide adequate supervision or any supervision at all].

11. As a proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff was hurt and

injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her body and shock and injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

12. As a further proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses.

[13. *If damages for lost earning capacity sought, allege:* As a further proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and at present.]

14. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff presented to _____ [*name of school district*] by _____ [delivering *or* mailing] to the _____ [clerk *or* secretary *or* auditor] thereof, a written claim for the injuries, disability, losses, and damages suffered and incurred by him/her by reason of the above-described occurrence, all in compliance with the requirements of *Sections 900 through 915.4 of the Government Code*. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

15. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of school district*] _____ [rejected the claim in its entirety *or* allowed the claim in the amount of $_____ and rejected it as to the remainder *or* failed to act on the claim within the period of 45 days after its presentation, and the claim was thus deemed rejected, under the provisions of *Section 912.4 of the Government Code*, at the expiration of the 45-day period].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. [For loss of earnings and earning capacity according to proof];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein

alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use in an action by a student to recover damages for personal injuries sustained as a result of negligent supervision by a public school district and its employees. With appropriate modifications, the allegations of the complaint may be used in a complaint by the student's heirs for wrongful death, if the injuries sustained by the student resulted in his or her death. For forms of complaints for wrongful death, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

If some third person, other than the school district or its employees, is directly responsible for plaintiff's injuries, counsel may also include a separate cause of action against that person directly. For instance, in the factual example provided in the form, plaintiff's counsel might insert a second cause of action for assault or battery against the students who attacked plaintiff. If the third party was negligently responsible for plaintiff's injuries, counsel might insert a separate cause of action against the third party based on negligence. For forms of complaints based on assault, battery, and negligence, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* , and Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- Appointment of a guardian ad litem, if appropriate (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 372-373.5*].

- Capacity and residence of the parties (Paragraphs 2, 4, 5).

- Management and control of school grounds by defendant school district (Paragraph 3).

- Fictitious name allegations, where appropriate (Paragraphs 6, 7).

- A description of how the injury occurred (Paragraph 8).

- Defendant's duty to exercise ordinary care in supervising students on the school grounds and its negligent failure to do so (Paragraphs 9, 10) [*see, e.g., Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360* ; *Taylor v. Oakland Scavenger Co. (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 594, 600, 110 P.2d 1044]* .

- Proximate causation of general damages and special damages in the form of medical expenses and, where appropriate, lost earning capacity (Paragraphs 11-13).

- Presentation of a written claim to the school district in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* and rejection of the claim by the school district (Paragraphs 14, 15) [*see Gov. Code § 945.4*; *Dujardin v. Ventura County Gen. Hosp. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 350, 355, 138 Cal. Rptr. 20]* .

[4] Presentation of Written Claim as Prerequisite to Action for Damages

Generally, no action for damages may be commenced against a public school district on a cause of action for which a written claim is required to be presented under *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* until the claim has been presented to the district and has been acted on by its governing board or has been deemed to be rejected by its governing board [*Gov. Code § 945.4*]. The claim must be presented to the school district. Presentation of the claim to the State Board of Control will not suffice [*Johnson v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699-700, 266 Cal. Rptr. 187]* . Timely compliance with the claim filing requirements and rejection of the claim by the school district must be pleaded in a complaint in order to state a cause of action [*see Dujardin v. Ventura County Gen. Hosp. (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 350, 355, 138 Cal. Rptr. 20]* .

Presentation of a written claim is not a prerequisite to maintaining an action against the school district if the school district has failed to file an accurate statement pertaining to the district in the Roster of Public Agencies in the office of the Secretary of State, as required by *Gov. Code § 53051*, or if the court has made an order relieving plaintiff from the requirement of filing a claim pursuant to *Gov. Code § 946.6* [*Gov. Code § 945.4*; *see Gov. Code §§ 946.4, 946.6*].

For a further discussion of and a procedural checklist and forms relating to the presentation of written claims to public entities, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[5] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem

When a minor is a party to an action, the minor must appear by a guardian ad litem appointed by the court in which the action or proceeding is pending, or by a judge thereof [*Code Civ. Proc. § 372(a)*]. For a discussion of and forms relating to the appointment of a guardian ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* .

[6] Venue

In an action against a local public entity, such as a school district, for personal injuries, the proper place for trial of the action is the county in which the entity is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*].

[7] Statute of Limitations

Any suit brought against a public school district on a cause of action for which a claim is required to be presented in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* must be commenced [*Gov. Code § 945.6(a)*]:

- If written notice of the district's action on the claim is given in accordance with *Gov. Code § 913*, not later than six months after the date such notice is personally delivered or deposited in the mail; or

- If written notice is not given in accordance with *Gov. Code § 913*, within two years from the accrual of the cause of action.

[8] Verification

A public entity need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. The verification of a complaint against a public entity does, however, preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[9] Specifying Amount of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual

or punitive damages demanded for this cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(a)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[10] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For forms of complaints for use in assault and battery actions, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For a discussion of and forms for use in wrongful death and survival actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For a discussion of and forms relating to the appointment of a guardian ad litem, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*

For alternative forms of complaints for use in negligence actions, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For alternative forms of prayers and verifications, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* , and Ch. 572, *Verification*

For discussion and forms relating to the presentation of written claims to public entities, and forms of affirmative defenses and alternative forms of complaints for use in actions against public entities and employees, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

[11] State Statutes

Liability of public entity for act or omission of employee acting within scope of employment. *Gov. Code § 815.2*

Public employee as liable for injury caused by his or her acts or omissions to same extent as private person. *Gov. Code § 820*

Presentation of claim in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* and rejection by governing board of public entity as prerequisite to action against entity for damages. *Gov. Code § 945.4*

[12] Decisions

Duty to supervise students; standard of care. *Dailey v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 741, 747, 87 Cal. Rptr. 376, 470 P.2d 360*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART IV. FORMS

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.61

§ 514.61 Allegation--Negligent Supervision of Students--By School District and Employees [Gov. Code §§ 815.2, 820]--Failure to Prevent Unauthorized Departure From School Grounds

[1] FORM Allegation--Negligent Supervision of Students--By School District and Employees [Gov. Code §§ 815.2, 820]--Failure to Prevent Unauthorized Departure From School Grounds

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff left the grounds of _____ School before the regular hour for the closing of school, and without the approval or permission of the principal of _____ School or other appropriate school official. Thereafter, plaintiff _____ [*describe how injury occurred, e.g.,* while crossing a public street adjacent to _____ School, was struck by a motor vehicle that was negligently and carelessly operated by defendant _____ [*name*] and was thrown to the ground, proximately causing the injuries hereinafter described].

2. Defendants _____ [*name of school district*] and _____ [*name(s) of teacher(s) or other school employee(s)*], and each of them, had a duty at all times to supervise the conduct of students on the grounds of _____ School and to enforce rules and regulations necessary for their protection, and particularly to exercise ordinary care to prevent students from leaving the premises of _____ School before the regular hour for the closing of school without permission of the principal or other appropriate school official.

3. Defendants _____ [*name of school district*] and _____ [*name(s) of teacher(s) or other school employee(s)*], and each of them, were negligent and careless in that they failed to exercise ordinary care in supervising students so as to prevent them from leaving the grounds of _____ School before the regular hour for the closing of school without permission of the principal or other appropriate school official.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint for damages by a student against a public school district and its employees for personal injuries sustained as a result of the negligent failure of the district's employees to adequately supervise its students. It alleges a failure by the district and its employees to exercise ordinary care to prevent students from leaving the school grounds before the close of the school day without the permission of the appropriate school officials. When such negligence proximately causes injury to a student, the school district is liable for the injury [*see Hoyem v.*

Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 514-519, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851] .

Paragraphs 1-3 of this form may be inserted in lieu of Paragraphs 9-11 of the *form in § 514.60*.

[3] Decisions

School district's duty to exercise ordinary care in supervising students while on school premises as including duty to exercise ordinary care to prevent students from leaving school premises during school hours without permission of school officials; district as liable for student's off-campus injuries which are proximately caused by failure to exercise to such care. *Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 513-520, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851*

[4] Law Reviews

Note, *The Modern Concept of Duty: "Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City School District" and School District Liability for Injuries to Truants* , *30 Hastings L.J. 1893 (1979)*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 514.60*

71 of 71 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 514 SCHOOLS: INJURIES TO STUDENTS
PART IV. FORMS

45-514 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 514.62

§ 514.62 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District, Employees, and Independent Contractor--By Injured Student--Negligence of Independent Contractor [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code § 815.4] and Dangerous Condition of School Property [Gov. Code §§ 835, 840.2]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--Against Public School District, Employees, and Independent Contractor--By Injured Student--Negligence of Independent Contractor [Civ. Code § 1714(a); Gov. Code § 815.4] and Dangerous Condition of School Property [Gov. Code §§ 835, 840.2]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], [a minor,	)	
by _____ (*name*),	)	NO. _____
his/her Guardian ad Litem,]	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
Plaintiff,	)	(Negligence; Dangerous Condition of Public Prop-
vs.	)	erty)
_____ [*names*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendants.	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff [, through his/her guardian ad litem,] alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Dangerous Condition of Public Property)

[1. *Appointment of guardian ad litem, if plantiff is minor. See § 514.60, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity of defendant school district. See § 514.60, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Management and control of school facility by defendant school district. See § 514.60, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Capacity of defendant school employee(s) and allegation of action within scope of employment. See § 514.60, Paragraph 4.*]

[5. *Capacity of plaintiff as student. See § 514.60, Paragraph 5.*]

[6., 7. *Fictitious name allegations, if appropriate. See § 514.60, Paragraph 6, 7.*]

8. On the premises of _____ School, there is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*describe portion of property where dangerous condition is located, e.g.,* a gymnasium, which is the property of defendant _____ [*name of school district*], and which contains a stairwell with steps constructed of concrete and steel, and a metal handrail adjacent to the stairwell and attached to the walls thereof].

9. On _____ [*date*], and prior thereto, the above-described property was in a dangerous condition, which created a substantial risk of the type of injury hereinafter alleged when the property was used with due care in a manner in which it was reasonably foreseeable that such property would be used, in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the steps in the above-described stairwell were wet and slippery and the handrail attached to the walls thereof was inadequately attached to the wall to sustain the force placed on such handrail when used in a normal manner].

[*EITHER*]

10. On or about _____ [*date*], [defendant] _____ [*name of school employee*], acting within the scope of his/her employment by defendant _____ [*name of school district*], negligently and carelessly _____ [*specify, e.g.,* spilled water on the steps of the above-described stairwell and failed to clean it up or post an adequate warning of the condition], which negligence created the dangerous condition described above. [*If school employee is a defendant, add:* (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) [D]efendant _____ (*name of school employee*) had the authority and funds and other means immediately available to take alternative action which would not have created the dangerous condition described above.]

[*AND/OR*]

10. Defendant(s) _____[*name(s)*] had _____ [actual knowledge of the existence of the above-described condition and knew or should have known of its dangerous character *or* constructive notice of the dangerous condition described above, in that the condition had existed for a sufficient period of time, at least _____ (*specify period of time*), and was of such an obvious nature that defendant(s), in the exercise of due care should have discovered the condition and its dangerous character], for a sufficient period of time prior to _____[*date*], to have taken measures to protect against the dangerous condition. [*If school employee is defendant, add:* Defendant(s) _____ (*name(s) of school employee(s)*) had the authority and it was his/her/their responsibility to (inspect the above-described property or to see that inspections were made to determine whether dangerous conditions existed in the property and to) take adequate measures to protect against the dangerous

condition at the expense of the public entity and the funds and other means for doing so were immediately available to him/her/them.]

[*CONTINUE*]

11. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe how injury occurred, e.g.,* while plaintiff was lawfully on the above-described property for the purpose of attending classes therein, and as a proximate result of the above-described dangerous condition, plaintiff slipped and fell on the wet stairs causing the injuries to plaintiff hereinafter alleged].

12. As a proximate result of the dangerous condition of defendant _____'s [*name of school district*] property, plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her body and shock and injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

13. As a further proximate result of the dangerous condition of defendant _____'s [*name of school district*] property, plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses.

[14. *If damages for lost earning capacity are sought, allege:* As a further proximate result of the dangerous condition on defendant _____'s (*name of school district*) property, plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and at present.]

[15., 16. *Presentation of written claim by plaintiff and rejection by school district. See § 514.60, Paragraphs 14, 15.*]

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Negligence)

1. Plaintiff refers to Paragraphs 1 through 8, inclusive, and Paragraphs 15 and 16 of his/her First Cause of Action herein, and by reference makes them a part hereof.

2. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [D]efendant _____ [*name of school district*] employed defendant _____ [*name*] as an independent contractor to _____ [*specify purposes for which independent contractor was employed, e.g.,* construct the above-described gymnasium at _____ School, including the stairwell, steps, and handrail, as described above, which are located therein].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of independent contractor*] _____ [*describe negligence of independent contractor, e.g.,* constructed the above-described gymnasium in such a negligent and careless manner that it was not in a reasonably safe condition in that the handrail on the above-described stairs was not adequately and properly attached to the wall of the stairwell, and the surfaces of the stairs were constructed of an unreasonably unsafe and slippery material].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe how injury occurred, e.g.,* while plaintiff was descending the above-described stairs in the gymnasium of _____ School and leaning on the handrail, the above-described handrail came loose, which caused plaintiff to slip and fall down the stairs, proximately causing the injuries described hereinafter].

[5-7. *Proximate causation of damages. See § 514.60, Paragraphs 11-13.*]

[*Prayer. See § 514.60.*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 514.60.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use in an action by a student against a school district, its employees, and independent contractors to recover damages for personal injuries sustained on school property. The first cause of action is based on the liability of a school district, as a public entity, and of its employees for a dangerous condition of school property [*see Gov. Code §§ 835, 840.2*]. The second cause of action is based on the vicarious liability of a school district for the negligence of its independent contractor in constructing and maintaining school buildings [*see Gov. Code § 815.4*; *O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646-647, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

With appropriate modifications, the allegations of this complaint may be used in a complaint by the student's heirs for wrongful death, where the injuries sustained by the student resulted in his or her death. For forms of complaints for use in wrongful death actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[3] Allegations

The first cause of action of this complaint alleges:

- The existence of a dangerous condition on school property, which condition existed at the time of the injury (Paragraphs 8, 9) [*see Gov. Code §§ 830(a), 835, 840.2*].

- Negligence of an employee of the school district which created the dangerous condition, or actual or constructive notice of the dangerous condition by the district and its employees prior to the occurrence of the injury, or both, as appropriate (Paragraph 10) [*Gov. Code §§ 835, 835.2, 840.2, 840.4*].

- Proximate causation of the injury to plaintiff and resulting special and general damages (Paragraphs 11-14) [*Gov. Code §§ 835, 840.2*].

The second cause of action incorporates by reference the pertinent allegations of the first cause of action and further alleges:

- Employment by the school district of an independent contractor (Paragraph 2).

- Negligence on the part of the independent contractor (Paragraph 3) [*see Gov. Code § 825.4*; *O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646-647, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795]* .

- Description of how plaintiff's injury occurred (Paragraph 4).

[4] Cross References

For forms of complaints and affirmative defenses for use in actions against public entities and employees based on dangerous conditions of public property, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For a related form, see *§ 514.60*

[5] State Statutes

Liability of public entity for torts of independent contractor. *Gov. Code § 815.4*

Liability of public entity for dangerous condition of public property. *Gov. Code § 835*

Actual or constructive notice of dangerous condition by public entity. *Gov. Code § 835.2*

Liability of public employee for dangerous condition of public property. *Gov. Code § 840.2*

Actual or constructive notice of dangerous condition by public employee. *Gov. Code § 840.4*

Immunity for asbestos-related injuries. *Gov. Code § 905.5*

[6] Decisions

School district as liable for negligent failure of its independent contractor to construct or maintain school buildings in reasonably safe condition. *O'Gan v. King City Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 641, 646-647, 83 Cal. Rptr. 795*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 515.syn

§ 515.syn Synopsis to Chapter 515: SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION

§ 515.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 515.02 Cross References

§§ 515.03-515.09 [Reserved]

§ 515.10 Governing Law

[1] California

[2] Waiver of Statutory Compliance

[3] Federal

§ 515.11 Federal Preemption of State Securities Regulation

[1] 1996 Legislation

[2] Extent of Federal Preemption

[3] Continued State Authority With Respect to Fraud Enforcement Actions

[4] Definition of "Covered Security"

[a] Nationally Traded Securities

[b] Registered Investment Companies

[c] Sales to Qualified Purchasers

[d] Certain Exempt Offerings

[5] Additional Effects of Improvement Act

[a] Investment Companies

[b] Broker-Dealers

[c] Investment Advisers

§ 515.12 Class Action Lawsuits Involving Nationally Traded Securities

[1] Federal Standards Affecting State Actions

[2] Class Action Limitations

[3] Exceptions

§ 515.13 Definitions

[1] "Securities"

[2] Refinement of Term "Security"

[a] Risk Capital Approach

[b] Investment Contract Approach

[3] "Offer" and "Sale"

[4] Marketing Personnel

[a] "Broker-Dealer" Under California Law

[b] "Agent" Under California Law

[c] "Investment Adviser" Under California Law

[5] "Investment Adviser Representative"

[a] California Regulation

[b] Definitions Under Federal Law

§ 515.14 Qualification of Offers and Sales in California

[1] Requirement

[2] When California Law Applies

[3] Issuer and Nonissuer Transactions

[a] Distinctions

[b] Qualification of Securities in Issuer Transactions

[c] Processing Nonissuer Transactions

[4] Securities and Transactions Not Subject to Qualification

[a] In General

[b] "Covered Securities"

[c] Securities Sold in Transactions Exempt From Federal Registration

[d] Offers and Sales to Qualified Purchasers

[5] Exemption From Qualification

[a] Scope

[b] Securities Exempted

[c] "Rollup" Transactions

[d] Issuer Transactions Exempted

[e] Private Presale Offers

[f] Private Debt Transaction

[g] Unadvertised Offers or Sales of Securities Sold to No More Than 35 Persons

[h] Institutional Investor Transactions

[i] Noncontributory Employee Stock Plans

[j] Small Offering Exemption

[k] Qualified Purchaser Limited Public Offering Exemption

[l] Securities Issued Pursuant to Option or Purchase Plan

[m] Sale by Person Licensed Under Capital Access Company Law

[n] Sale of Viatical or Life Settlement Contracts

[o] Sale of Series of Notes Secured by Real Property

[p] Recapitalizations and Reorganizations

[q] Nonissuer Transactions Exempted

[6] Burden of Proof

§ 515.15 Securities Broker-Dealers

[1] License Requirement

[2] Interaction of Securities Broker-Dealer and Real Estate Broker Licensing Requirements

[3] Duties

[a] Fiduciary Duty

[b] When Broker Controls Account

[c] When Broker Is Limited to Clearing and Trading Functions

[d] No Special Relationship Justifying Tort Damages

§ 515.16 Administrative Enforcement

[1] Powers of Commissioner

[2] Review of Administrative Actions

§ 515.17 Civil Remedies

§ 515.18 Liability for Market Manipulation

[1] Wash Sales

[2] Illusory Market

[3] Tipster Sheet

[4] False or Misleading Statements

[5] Tipster Hireling

[6] Civil Liability for Manipulation

[7] Limitation of Actions for Manipulation

§ 515.19 Liability for Material Misrepresentation

[1] Untruth or Omission

[2] Rescission for Misrepresentation

[3] Damages for Misrepresentation

[4] Limitation of Actions for Misrepresentation

[5] Affirmative Defenses

[a] Plaintiff's Knowledge of Misrepresentation

[b] Defendant's Ignorance of Misrepresentation

[6] Liability of Management Principals or Persons Who Materially Aid in Violation

[a] Limitation of Actions for Liability of Principals and Aides

[b] Defense Based on Principal's or Aide's Ignorance

[7] Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons

[8] Joint and Several Liability of Experts

[a] Limitation of Actions for Experts' Liability

[b] Defense Based on Expert's Belief in Representations

[c] Defense Based on Inaccurate Reflection of the Expert's Opinion

[d] Defense Based on Expert's Filing of Disclaimer of Report

§ 515.20 Holder's Action for Fraud or Negligent Misrepresentation

§ 515.21 Liability for Regulatory Violations

[1] Types of Liability

[2] Rescission for Violation

[3] Damages When Rescission Unavailable

[4] Damages When Recapitalization or Reorganization Involved

[5] Limitation of Actions for Violations

[6] Defense Based on Qualification of Securities Prior to Receipt of Consideration

[7] Defense Based on Written Repurchase Offer

[8] Joint and Several Liability of Offering Principals and Underwriters

§ 515.22 Liability for Insider Trading

[1] Prohibited Acts

[2] Civil Liability to Purchaser or Seller for Insider Dealings

[3] Civil Liability to Issuer for Insider Dealings

[4] Limitation of Actions Against Insiders

[5] Defense of Belief of Plaintiff's Informed Status

[6] Defense of Plaintiff's Actual Informed Status

[7] Defense of Plaintiff's Commitment to Transaction

§ 515.23 Broker-Dealer's Liability for Failure to Obtain License Before Sale

§ 515.24 Liability for Unlawful Alteration of Records or Making Untrue Statement

§ 515.25 Liability on Securities Issuer's Bond

[1] Prohibited Acts

[2] Bond Requirement

§ 515.26 Service of Process on Commissioner

§ 515.27 Survival of Actions

§ 515.28 Criminal Liability

§ 515.29 Nonliability for Good-Faith Compliance With Commissioner Rule

§§ 515.30-515.49 [Reserved]

§ 515.50 Governing Law

[1] California

[2] Federal

[3] Attempt to Waive Compliance Under California Law

[4] Exclusivity of Liability Provisions of Franchise Investment Law

§ 515.51 Definitions Under Franchise Investment Law

[1] "Franchise"

[2] Nonprofit Retailers' Cooperatives Excluded

[3] "Area Franchise"

[4] Petroleum Products Franchises

[5] "Franchisor" and "Franchisee"

[6] "Franchise Fee"

[7] "Offers" and "Sales"

[8] "Subfranchise"

§ 515.52 Purpose of Franchise Investment Law

§ 515.53 Registration of Offers and Sales in California

[1] Requirement

[2] When California Law Applies

[3] Registration Procedure

[4] Notification of Material Change

§ 515.54 Exemption From Registration

[1] Seasoned Franchisors

[2] Seasoned Petroleum Products Franchisors

[3] Resale by Franchisee or Subfranchisor

[4] Other Statutory Exemptions

[5] Exemptions by Rule of Commissioner

[6] Burden of Proof

§ 515.55 Regulation of Franchise Sales

[1] Presale Delivery of Offering Circular

[2] Disclosure Exemption for Sophisticated Investors

[3] Alternative Disclosure for Variance From Registered Terms

[4] Franchise Modification

[5] Marketing Personnel

§ 515.56 Duties of the Commissioner of Corporations

[1] Administrative Processing

[2] Enforcement

[3] Review of Administrative Acts

§ 515.57 Violation of Commissioner's Regulatory Requirements

§ 515.58 Material Misrepresentations Under Franchise Investment Law

[1] Generally

[2] Misrepresentation in Documents Filed With Commissioner

[3] Misrepresentation in Offers or Sales

[4] Misrepresentation in Seasoned Franchisor's Disclosures

§ 515.59 Liability for Violation of Registration or Exemption Requirements

[1] Generally

[2] Limitation on Actions for Registration or Exemption Violations

[3] Defense of Plaintiff's Knowledge

[4] Defense of Defendant's Ignorance

§ 515.60 Liability for Misrepresentation in Franchise Transactions

[1] Generally

[2] Limitation on Actions for Misrepresentation in Transactions

[3] Defenses to Transaction Misrepresentation

§ 515.61 Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals and Materially Aiding Personnel for Violations

§ 515.62 Infringement of Franchisee's Right to Join Trade Association

[1] Generally

[2] Jurisdiction and Venue

[3] Limitation of Actions for Right of Association

§ 515.63 Service of Process on Commissioners

§ 515.64 Survival of Actions

§ 515.65 Criminal Liability

[1] Generally

[2] Regulation of Franchise Loans

§§ 515.66-515.79 [Reserved]

§ 515.80 Governing Statutes

§ 515.81 Definitions

[1] "Franchise"

[2] Parties to Franchise

[3] "Franchise Fee"

[4] Nonprofit Retailers' Cooperatives Also Excluded

§ 515.82 Applicability of Franchise Relations Act

§ 515.83 Termination of Franchise

[1] Good Cause With Notice to Comply

[2] Cause for Immediate Termination

§ 515.84 Transfers

§ 515.85 Nonrenewal

[1] Notice and Necessary Conditions

[2] Resale Condition

[3] Condition Requiring Waiver of Clause Not to Compete

[4] Termination Condition

[5] Agreement Condition

[6] Fair Withdrawal Condition

[7] Condition of Failure to Agree to Changes or Addenda

§ 515.86 Notice Procedure

§ 515.87 Obligation on Improper Termination or Nonrenewal

[1] Generally

[2] Other Remedies

§ 515.88 Arbitration

§ 515.89 Covenants Not to Compete

§§ 515.90-515.109 [Reserved]

§ 515.110 Governing Statutes

§ 515.111 Federal Law of Franchisor's Termination or Nonrenewal of Franchise

[1] Preemption of State Termination or Nonrenewal Provisions

[2] Laws Governing Assignment Not Totally Preempted

[3] Definitions

[a] "Franchise"

[b] Franchise Parties and Relationship

[c] Marketing Parties and Product

[4] Grounds for Interrupting Franchise

[5] Franchises Excepted From Nonrenewal Restrictions

[6] Liability

[7] Concurrent State and Federal Jurisdiction

§ 515.112 Definitions Applicable to California Petroleum Franchises

§ 515.113 California Law of Termination, Cancellation, or Nonrenewal of Petroleum Products Franchises

[1] Preemption by Federal Law

[2] Good Cause Required for Discontinuing Franchise

[3] Right to Counsel

[4] Liability

[5] Notification of Franchisor's Withdrawal

[6] Unlawful Detainer Action by Franchisor Against Franchisee

§ 515.114 Regulation of Petroleum Products Franchisee's Dealings With Outside Suppliers

[1] Definitions

[2] When Franchisee May Resort to Outside Suppliers

[3] Notice Requirements

[4] Disclosure to Consumer

[5] Prohibited Tie-in Requirements

[6] Civil Penalty

[7] Civil Liability

§ 515.115 Right of Franchisee to Designate Successor in Interest

[1] Definitions

[2] Designation of Successor

[3] Successor's Assumption of Franchise

[4] Franchisor's Requirements for Designation

[5] Nature of Interest Devolving

[6] Procedure as Between Alternate Successors

[7] Interim Procedure Preceding Successor's Assumption of Franchise

[8] Liability

§ 515.116 Petroleum Products Franchisee's Ability to Transfer Franchises

[1] Franchises Affected

[2] Restrictions on Franchisor's Withholding Consent

[3] Transfer Fee

§§ 515.117-515.129 [Reserved]

§ 515.130 Governing Law

§ 515.131 Definitions

[1] "Franchise"

[2] Franchise Parties

[3] "Relevant Market Area"

§ 515.132 Applicability and Administration of New Motor Vehicle Dealership Franchise Legislation

§ 515.133 Procedure for Terminating or Refusing to Continue Franchise

§ 515.134 Modification or Replacement of Franchise

§ 515.135 Criteria for Board's Disposition of Issue of Discontinuation or Alteration of Franchise

§ 515.136 Establishment of Additional Dealership or Relocation of Existing One

§ 515.137 Establishment of Satellite Warranty Facility or Relocation of Existing One

§ 515.138 Criteria for Board Disposition of Issue of Establishment or Relocation

§ 515.139 Delivery and Preparation

[1] Franchisor's Requirements as to Franchisee's Obligations

[2] Franchisor's Schedule of Compensation for Franchisee's Performance

§ 515.140 Warranty Work

[1] Compensation Schedule and Franchisee's Protest to Board

[2] Franchisee's Claim for Defective Parts or Warranty Compensation

[3] Time for Payments, Audits, and Chargebacks

§ 515.141 Claims Under Warranty Incentive Programs

§ 515.142 Board Hearing Procedure and Review of Decisions

[1] Grant of Authority

[2] Judicial Review

§§ 515.143-515.149 [Reserved]

§ 515.150 Recreational Vehicle Franchise

[1] Definition

[2] Delivery of Agreement to Dealer

[3] Franchise Agreement Is Necessary

§§ 515.151-515.159 [Reserved]

§ 515.160 Governing Statutes

§ 515.161 Fair Dealership Law

[1] Purpose and Policies

[2] Definitions

[a] "Dealership"

[b] Dealership Parties and Relationship

[3] Prohibitions on Discriminatory Acts

[4] Liability

§ 515.162 Civil Rights Legislation Covering Franchises Generally

[1] Scope of Nondiscriminatory Provisions

[2] Liability

§§ 515.163-515.179 [Reserved]

§ 515.180 Governing Statutes

§ 515.181 Purpose of Regulatory Legislation

§ 515.182 Definitions

[1] "Seller Assisted Marketing Plan"

[2] "Seller"

[3] "Purchaser"

[4] Business Items

[5] "Contract"

[6] Financing Terms

§ 515.183 Jurisdiction of Plan Transactions

§ 515.184 "Buy-Back" Representations

[1] Restrictions on Use in Solicitation

[2] Bond or Trust Account Requirements

§ 515.185 Earnings Representations

§ 515.186 Trademark Restrictions

§ 515.187 Advertising Restrictions

§ 515.188 Disclosure Requirements

§ 515.189 Plan Contract Requirements

[1] Drafting and Presenting

[2] Cancellation Rights

[3] Defenses Against Assignees

[4] Payment Restrictions

§ 515.190 Other Seller Requirements

§ 515.191 Consent to Service on Secretary of State

§ 515.192 Voidability of Plan Contract

[1] Purchaser's Right

[2] Voiding for Misrepresentation or Noncompliance With Law

[3] Voiding for Nondelivery

§ 515.193 Policy Against Waiver of Rights by Purchaser

§ 515.194 Liability

§ 515.195 Burden of Proof

§§ 515.196-515.209 [Reserved]

§ 515.210 Governing Statutes

[1] Purpose

[2] Application to Equipment "Suppliers" and "Dealers"

[3] Effective Date

§ 515.211 Prohibited Transactions by Suppliers

[1] In General

[2] Requiring Optional Equipment

[3] Requiring Supplemental contract

[4] Refusing to Deliver Equipment

[5] Terminating or Failing to Renew Dealer Contract Without Cause

[6] Conditioning Renewal of Dealer Contract on Renovations or New Dealership Site

[7] Discriminating in Pricing

[8] Preventing Changes in Dealership's Capital Structure

[9] Requiring Dealer to Execute Release of Liability

[10] Withholding Consent to Transfers of Dealership Interests

[11] Requiring Purchase of Goods

[12] Coercing Refusal of Competition

[13] Penalizing Purchase From Competitor

[14] Discriminating Between Dealers

§ 515.212 Provisions Limiting Competition

§ 515.213 Annual Surplus Parts Inventory Return Program

[1] Return Period

[2] Return Authority

[3] Covered Parts

[4] Credit Amount

[5] Outstanding Balance

§ 515.214 Terminating Contracts Between Non Single-Line Dealers and Non Single-Line Suppliers

[1] Good Cause Required

[2] Written 180-Day Notice

[3] Special Rules for Consistent Failure to Meet Supplier's Requirements

§ 515.215 Terminating Contracts Between Single-Line Dealers and Single-Line Suppliers

[1] Applicable Terms

[2] Good Cause Required

[3] Written 90-Day Notice

[4] Dealer's Death

§ 515.216 Repurchase Requirements When Dealer Contract Is Canceled or Not Renewed

[1] Computers and Data Processing Equipment

[2] Few Equipment

[3] Demonstrators

[4] Equipment Used in Incentive Programs

[5] Repair Parts

[6] Specialized Equipment or Repair Tools

[7] Payment and Allowance of Credit

[8] Shipping Costs

[9] Exclusions

[10] Supplier's Liability for Failure to Repurchase

[11] Lien Against Inventory

[12] Security Interests

[13] Cancellation to Avoid Payment

[14] Multiple Business Locations

[15] When Supplier's Product Is Limited

§ 515.217 Dealer's Lien for Repurchase Amount

[1] Scope of Lien

[2] Formalities

[a] Notice of Lien

[b] Perfection of Lien by Filing Notice of Claim

[c] Use of Amended Financing Statement

[d] Filing Notice of Claim With Secretary of State

[e] Notice of Claim to Lien Debtor After Filing

[3] Request for Lien Information

[4] Priority of Lien

[5] Assignment or Transfer of Lien

[6] Termination of Lien

[7] Foreclosure

§ 515.218 Inventory Repurchase on Death of Dealer

§ 515.219 Sale or Transfer of Business of Non-Single-Line Dealer

§ 515.220 Warranty Claims

[1] Approval or Rejection by Supplier

[2] Resubmission of Claim by Dealer

[3] Performance of Warranty Work

[4] Supplier's Written Policies and Procedures

[5] Alternate Terms and Conditions

[6] Work Performed at Supplier's Request

[7] Audit of Warranty Claims

[8] Supplier's Nonpayment of Dealer's Claim

§ 515.221 Action by Dealer for Violations by Supplier

§ 515.222 Choice of Law or Forum

§§ 515.223-515.239 [Reserved]

§ 515.240 Forms of Discovery

§ 515.241 California Legal Forms

§ 515.242 Federal Statutes

§ 515.243 State Statutes

§ 515.244 Federal Administrative Regulations

§ 515.245 California Administrative Regulations and Releases

§ 515.246 Decisions

[1] Burden of Proof--Duty of Clearing Broker

[2] Burden of Proof--Duty of Stockbroker

[3] Choice of Laws

[4] Common Law Actions

[5] Damages

[6] Definition of Security

[7] Evidence

[8] Nature of Offer

[9] Exempt Transactions

[a] Nonpublic Offerings

[b] Partnerships or Joint Ventures

[c] Nonissuer Transactions

[10] Federal Law

[a] Aiding and Abetting Rule 10b-5 Violation

[b] Brokers and Broker's Duties

[c] Class Action Limitations

[d] Contribution Among Defendants

[e] Criminal Penalties

[f] Definition of Security

[g] Jurisdiction

[h] Material Misrepresentation

[i] Procedural Requirements for Pleading Fraud

[j] Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO)

[k] Remedies

[l] Standing

[m] Statute of Limitations

[10A] Federal Preemption of State Law

[11] Fiduciary Duties

[12] Jurisdiction

[13] Liability for Material Misrepresentation

[14] Marketing Personnel--Licensing

[15] Punitive Damages

[16] Purpose of Securities Laws

[17] Rescission

[18] Securities Exempt

[19] Statute of Limitations

[20] Unlawful Competition Law Inapplicable

[21] Waiver of Statutory Compliance with California Law

§ 515.247 Law Reviews

§ 515.248 Text References

§§ 515.249-515.259 [Reserved]

§ 515.260 State Statutes

§ 515.261 Federal Administrative Regulations

§ 515.262 California Administrative Regulations

§ 515.263 Decisions

§ 515.264 Law Reviews

§ 515.265 Text References

§§ 515.266-515.279 [Reserved]

§ 515.280 State Statutes--Franchise Relations Act

§ 515.281 Decisions

[1] Antitrust Applications

[2] Arbitration

[3] Franchisor's Breach of Agreement

[4] Tort Damages

§§ 515.282-515.299 [Reserved]

§ 515.300 Federal Statutes--Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (franchise protection provisions)

§ 515.301 State Statutes

§ 515.302 Decisions

[1] Attorney's Fees

[2] State Claims

[3] Termination or Nonrenewal Under Petroleum Marketing Practices Act

[4] Transfer of Franchise Under State Law

§ 515.303 Text References

§§ 515.304-515.319 [Reserved]

§ 515.320 Federal Statutes

§ 515.321 State Statutes

§ 515.322 Administrative Regulations

§ 515.323 Decisions

[1] Administrative Due Process

[2] Breach of Agreement

[3] Conditions of Dealership

[4] Consolidation of Protests

[5] Implied Extension of Franchise Term

[6] Interpretation of Agreements

[7] Jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board

[8] Modification of Dealership

[9] Notice of Termination

§ 515.324 Text References

§§ 515.325-515.339 [Reserved]

§ 515.340 State Statutes

[1] Civil Rights Protection for Franchisees

[2] Fair Dealership Law

§§ 515.341-515.359 [Reserved]

§ 515.360 State Statutes

§ 515.361 Decisions

§§ 515.362-515.379 [Reserved]

§ 515.380 California Legal Forms

§ 515.381 State Statutes

§ 515.382 Decisions

§§ 515.383-515.399 [Reserved]

§ 515.400 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25500] for Manipulation of Market Price of Securities [Corp. Code § 25400]--By Purchaser or Seller at Affected Price Against Manipulating Party--Fraudulent "Wash Sale" Transaction Failing to Effect Change in Beneficial Ownership [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] State Statutes

[6] Administrative Regulations

[7] Text References

§ 515.401 Allegation--Entry of Transaction Order Contemplating Substantially Identical Entry of "Wash Sale" [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(2), (3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.402 Allegations--Manipulative Trading to Induce Transactions [Corp. Code § 25400(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 515.403 Allegations--Dissemination of Manipulative "Tipster" Information [Corp. Code § 25400(c), (e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 515.404 Allegations--False or Misleading Statement to Manipulate Market [Corp. Code § 25400(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Corp. Code § 25400(d) Requirements

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 515.405 Complaint for Rescission [Corp. Code § 25501] of Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Elements of Various Claims

[a] First Cause of Action

[b] Second Cause of Action

[c] Third Cause of Action

[d] Fourth Cause of Action

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Decisions

[a] In General

[b] Aider and Abettor Liability

[c] Alter Ego Liability

[d] Controlling Person Liability

[e] Federal Law

[i] Liability as Seller

[ii] Right to Rescission

[f] Statute of Limitations

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 515.406 Complaint for Damages for Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 515.407 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Facts Behind Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.408 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.409 Affirmative Defense to Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Aides--Defendant Was Without Knowledge or Belief [Corp. Code § 25504]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.410 Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Reasonable Belief in Accuracy of Representations [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.411 Affirmative Defenses to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Document Not Accurate Reflection of Expert's Views [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(2)].

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.412 Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Expert Filed Disclaimer [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.413 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25502] for Securities Transaction--By Purchaser or Seller Against Corporate "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Material Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Text References

[6] Cross References

§ 515.414 Complaint for Treble Damages [Corp. Code § 25502.5] for Securities Transaction--By Issuer Against "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 515.415 Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Belief That Plaintiff Was Informed as to Undisclosed Matters Regarding Securities [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.416 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Material Information Regarding Securities Not Publicly Disclosed [Corp. Code § 25502]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.417 Affirmative Defense--Price of Securities Transaction Unaffected by Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25502]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.418 Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale and Restitution of Consideration Paid [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Decisions

[a] Exemptions From Registration

[b] Joint Liability of Responsible Individuals

[c] Punitive Damages

[d] Scienter Required to Prove Criminal Violation of Corp. Code § 25110

[e] Statute of Limitations

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 515.419 Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 515.420 Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Recapitalization or Reorganization Issuer Transaction [Corp. Code § 25120]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Cross References

§ 515.421 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Rescission for Damages for Sale of Securities in Violation of Condition Imposed by Commissioner of Corporations [Corp. Code § 25503] Respecting Qualification [Corp. Code § 25141]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.422 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Qualification Violations--Security or Transaction Was Exempt From Qualification Requirements [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

[5] Cross References

§ 515.423 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Security or Transaction Was Not Subject to Qualification [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Federal Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 515.424 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Qualification of Sale of Securities Prior to Payment Therefor [Corp. Code § 25503]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.425 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Plaintiff in Position of Being Equally in the Wrong (in Pari Delicto) [Civ. Code § 3524] With Defendant

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Doctrine of In Pari Delicto

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

[6] Cross References

§ 515.426 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Approved Written Offer Was Sent to Rectify Violation [Corp. Code § 25507(b), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations and Releases

[5] Cross References

§ 515.427 Complaint for Indemnity [Corp. Code § 25505] for Willful Violation of Securities Law--By Corporation Against Controlling Personnel

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Indemnification of Corporation

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] California Points and Authorities

[7] Decisions

[8] Text References

[9] Cross References

§ 515.428 Complaint for Contribution [Corp. Code § 25505] for Liability for Violation of Corporate Securities Law of 1968--By Adjudged Tortfeasor Against Unadjudged Joint Tortfeasor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] Cross References

§ 515.429 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Defendant was Negligent Violator [Corp. Code § 25505]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Willful Violator as Having No Contribution Right Against Negligent Violator

[4] Cross References

§ 515.430 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Principal Executive Officer, Director, or Contracting Person of Defendant Corporation [Corp. Code § 25505]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Management's Inability to Demand Corporate Contribution

[4] Cross References

§ 515.431 Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Acts Regarding Securities Conformed to Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 25700]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 515.432 Complaint in Interpleader [Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)] by Surety Against Claimants--On Security Issuer's Statutory Bond [Corp. Code § 25216(e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Asserting Interpleader by Cross Complaint

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] Allegations

[6] Cross References

[7] California Legal Forms

[8] State Statutes

[9] State Administrative Regulations

§ 515.433 Complaint for Damages Based on Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300]--By Purchaser Against Stockbroker--Failure to Deliver Some or All of Shares Purchased

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Burden of Proof

[4] Statute of Frauds

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Decisions

§ 515.434 Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities or Damages--Unlicensed Broker-Dealer [Corp. Code § 25501.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Damages Recoverable

[5] State Statutes

[6] Text References

§§ 515.435-515.449 [Reserved]

§ 515.450 Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Sale of Franchise [Corp. Code § 31300]--Failure to Register Franchise Offer [Corp. Code § 31110] or Properly Exercise Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]--By Franchisee Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Decisions

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 515.451 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Franchisor's Material Misrepresentation in Registration Application [Corp. Code § 31200] or Seasoned Franchisor Exemption Disclosure [Corp. Code § 31202]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

[5] Cross References

§ 515.452 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Materially Changed Offering of Which Commissioner of Corporations Was Not Notified [Corp. Code §§ 31123, 31200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Text References

[4] Cross References

§ 515.453 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Failure to Register Franchise--Offer Was Exempt From Registration by Virtue of Proper Exercise of Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Administrative Regulation

[4] Cross References

§ 515.454 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Rescission or Damages Based on Failure to Register Franchise--Franchise Offer Was Exempt From Registration Because Franchise Was Sold by Franchisee or Subfranchisor for Own Account [Corp. Code § 31102]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.455 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 31301]--Purchase of Franchise Based on Reliance on Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 31201]--By Franchisee Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Text References

[7] Cross References

§ 515.456 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 41.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff Knew of Facts Concerning Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Defense of Plaintiff's Knowledge as to Misrepresented Facts

[4] Cross References

§ 515.457 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.458 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Improper Offer and Sale of Area Franchise--By Subfranchisor Against Seller

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.459 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Rescission of Franchise Agreement or for Damages Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant Sent Approved Written Notice of Violation of Franchise Investment Law [Corp. Code §§ 31303, 31304]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 515.460 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration or Exemption Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant's Acts Regarding Franchise in Conformity With Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 31511]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Reliance on Rule, Form, Order, or Opinion

[4] Cross References

§ 515.461 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Allegation of Joint and Several Liability for Franchise Investment Law Violation--Defendant Did Not Know or Believe in Existence of Violation [Corp. Code § 31302]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

§ 515.462 Complaint for Injunction or Damages for Interference With Right of Franchisee to Join Trade Association [Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Text References

[6] Cross References

§§ 515.463-515.479 [Reserved]

§ 515.480 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Franchise Relations Act in Terminating or Not Renewing Franchise [Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Remedy Under Franchise Relations Act

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§§ 515.481-515.499 [Reserved]

§ 515.500 Complaint for Treble Damages Based on Franchisor's Prohibiting Petroleum Products Franchisee to Deal With Outside Suppliers [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4]--Requiring Franchisee to Purchase Franchisor's Automotive Accessories [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 515.501 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Disallowing Petroleum Products Franchisee's Successor-in-Interest Designation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)--Failure to Honor Successor's Election to Operate Franchise--By Franchisee's Successor Against Franchisor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§§ 515.502-515.519 [Reserved]

§ 515.520 Protest to New Motor Vehicle Board [13 Cal. Code Reg. § 583] Against Establishment of Additional, or Relocation of Existing, Motor Vehicle Dealership or Satellite Warranty Facility [Veh. Code § 3062]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Protest Preparation--Drafting and Serving Protest

[5] Filing Protest

[6] Respondent's Notice of Appearance

[7] Administrative Regulations

[8] Decisions

§§ 515.521-515.539 [Reserved]

§ 515.540 Complaint for Injunction and Damages Under Fair Dealership Law for Discrimination for Refusal to Consent to Transfer of Dealership [Civ. Code § 86]--By Dealer and Prospective Dealer Against Grantor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Injunctive Relief and Damages for Grantor's Acting on Dealership Matters With Bias and Prejudice

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§§ 515.541-515.559 [Reserved]

§ 515.560 Complaint for Rescission, Damages, and Punitive Damages for Violation of Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Provisions [Civ. Code § 1812.218]--Misrepresentation in Selling Plan [Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)]--By Purchaser Against Seller, Surety or Trustee [Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)], and Escrow Holder [Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Cross References

§§ 515.561-515.579 [Reserved]

§ 515.580 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Statutory Requirements in Terminating or Not Renewing Dealer Contract [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22902, 22903, 22903.2, 22905, 22925]--By Dealer Against Supplier

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Remedies

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART I. SCOPE

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.01

§ 515.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter covers regulation of all securities transactions under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*), whether in the form of offers or sales of corporate securities or in the form of general investments. It also covers the regulation of securities broker-dealers [*see § 515.10* et seq.]. The following forms are included:

- A complaint, and allegations that may be used in the complaint, by securities purchasers for damages for manipulation of the securities market [*see §§ 515.400 -515.404*].

- Complaints by purchasers for rescission and damages, with allegations regarding joint and several liability, for material misrepresentation, and affirmative defenses for use in those actions [*see §§ 515.405 -515.412*].

- Complaints by a purchaser or seller, or the issuer, for damages against an "insider" who obtained an advantage by having undisclosed material information concerning a security transaction, with affirmative defenses for use in the action [*see §§ 515.413 -515.417*].

- Complaints and allegations by purchasers for rescission and damages for violation of securities qualification requirements or regulatory conditions, and affirmative defenses that may be asserted in such actions [*see §§ 515.418 -515.426*].

- A complaint for indemnity by a corporation against controlling persons [*see § 515.427*].

- A complaint for contribution among defendants, with defenses that may be asserted in such actions [*see §§ 515.428 -515.430*].

- A general affirmative defense for securities violations based on compliance with official guidelines [*see § 515.432*].

- A complaint for damages based on breach of contract by a purchaser against a stockbroker for failure

to deliver shares purchased [*see § 515.433*].

This chapter also covers the federal preemption provisions of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 and the effect of those provisions on the qualification of securities offerings in California [*see § 515.11* et seq.].

The extensive regulation of securities under federal law is not discussed in this part. For a full discussion of federal law, regulations, and actions under the 1933 federal act, see Sowards, Federal Securities Act--Analysis, Procedures and Forms (Matthew Bender). The federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction of matters under the 1934 act, and for a full discussion of federal law, regulations, and actions under that act, see Gadsby, Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Matthew Bender).

For discussion and forms relating to liabilities that may accrue based on acts committed or omitted in the course of the issuance of shares and thereafter, see Ch. 162, *Corporations: Issuance of Shares* , and Ch. 163, *Corporations: Transfers of Shares* .

This chapter also discusses the regulation of the sale of franchises or franchise investments under the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*; *see § 515.450* et seq.]. Included are forms for a complaint, allegations, and defenses for use in a franchisee's rescission or damage action based on a violation of the requirements for, or a material representation made in, the registration of a franchise or the securing of a seasoned franchisor exemption [*see §§ 515.450 -515.454*]; a complaint and defenses for use in an action based on a material misrepresentation in the offer or sale of a franchise [*see §§ 515.455 -515.457*]; an allegation of injury for use by a subfranchisor who is in the position of a franchisee [*see § 515.458*]; general defenses to complaints for rescission or damages when the defendant has sent an approved notice acknowledging violation of the law [*see § 515.459*], has complied with regulatory provisions [*see § 515.460*], or is alleged to be jointly and severally liable for a violation of which he or she had no knowledge [*see § 515.461*]; and a complaint for injunction or damages for a franchisor's violation of a franchisee's trade association rights [*see § 515.462*].

This chapter also discusses the Franchise Relations Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20000-20041*] which governs the renewal, transfer, and termination of franchises other than particular franchises involving petroleum products or new motor vehicles [*see § 515.480* et seq.]. It contains a complaint for damages on behalf of a franchisee whose franchise has been improperly terminated or has not been renewed [*see § 515.480*]. This part does not discuss Chapter 28 of Division 8 of the Business and Professions Code (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*), which governs manufacturers' and suppliers' relations with retail equipment dealers.

This chapter also covers regulatory legislation dealing with petroleum products franchises, which normally consist of service station dealerships [*see § 515.500* et seq.]. Forms in this chapter include a class action complaint by franchisees for treble damages for violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21140.2* and *21140.4*, which regulate dealing with outside suppliers [*see § 515.500*], and a complaint for damages for failure of the franchisor to comply with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)*, which allows a franchisee to have a successor in interest [*see § 515.501*].

This chapter also deals with franchises in the form of new motor vehicle dealerships [*see § 515.520* et seq.]. It includes a form for use by a franchisee before the New Motor Vehicle Board in protesting a franchisor's establishing of an additional or relocating an existing motor vehicle dealership [*see § 515.520*].

This chapter also discusses statutory provisions prohibiting discrimination in the granting, transfer, or discontinuance of franchises or dealerships [*see § 515.540* et seq.]. It includes a complaint for use by dealers in a class action for injunctive relief and damages against a dealership grantor who has refused to grant or permit the transfer of dealerships on discriminatory grounds or who has discontinued dealerships on those grounds [*see § 515.540*].

This chapter also covers seller assisted marketing plans, a type of investment device substantially similar to but formally

different from a security or franchise [*see § 515.560* et seq.]. It includes a complaint for rescission, damages, and punitive damages by a purchaser of the plan against the seller for misrepresentation in the sale [*see § 515.560*].

This chapter also discusses the regulation of business relations between independent dealers, manufacturers, distributors, and wholesalers of agricultural, construction, utility, industrial, mining, outdoor power, forestry, and lawn and garden equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*; *see § 515.210* et seq.]. It includes a complaint for use by a dealer against a supplier for damages sustained as a result of the supplier's improper termination or failure to renew a dealer contract [*see § 515.580*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesEquitable ReliefBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryGasoline Dealers & DistributorsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsFederal PreemptionSecurities LawRegulation of Securities MarketsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART I. SCOPE

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.02

§ 515.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms regarding compelling arbitration, including the arbitrability of claims against securities brokers under state and federal laws, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

For discussion and forms related to damages in actions based on deceptive advertising and unfair or deceptive trade practices, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* , Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* , and Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

For discussion of the duties owed by brokers to their clients other than under the securities laws, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and forms relating to causes of action for discrimination and infringement of civil rights generally, see Ch. 112, *Civil Rights: Government-Funded Programs and Activities* .

For forms for use in actions involving conversion of securities by stockbrokers, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

For discussion of aspects of director's duties and disclosure obligations in regard to corporate mergers, see Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors* , and Ch. 169, *Corporations Reorganizations* .

For discussion of fraud and constructive fraud or breach of fiduciary duty as defenses and grounds for avoidance of contracts, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

For discussion and forms relating to fraud generally, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

For forms relating to actions in federal court under the federal Securities Act of 1933 and the federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

For discussion and forms relating to licensing and premises liability of petroleum products businesses, see Ch. 274, *Garages and Gas Stations* .

For discussion and forms related to the enforcement of liens in general, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences* .

For discussion and forms relating to the sale of goods under Division 2 of the Commercial Code, see Ch. 500, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

For discussion and forms relating to secured transactions under Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

For discussion and a form relating to actions by an independent wholesale sales representative pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1738.10 et seq.*, see Ch. 505, *Sales: Independent Wholesale Sales Representatives Contractual Relations Act* .

For discussion and forms relating to unfair business practices and restraints of trade, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawTrade Practices & Unfair CompetitionState RegulationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersManagement Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsArbitrabilityCivil Rights LawGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)General OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityAdvisers, Brokers & DealersGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesGeneral Overview

4 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART I. SCOPE

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.03-515.09

[Reserved]

§§ 515.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.10

§ 515.10 Governing Law

[1] California

Both the federal and state governments regulate the entire area of securities transactions because of the significant policy interest at each level of authority in protecting the public from investment fraud. However, state regulation is subject to the federal preemption of state authority over certain securities offerings [*see § 515.11*].

These transactions are governed in California by the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*]. The law is administered through the Department of Corporations by the Commissioner of Corporations [*Corp. Code § 25600 et seq.*]. Departmental rules for processing transactions are contained in *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.000 et seq.*.

[2] Waiver of Statutory Compliance

Any condition, stipulation, or provision purporting to bind any person acquiring any security to waive compliance with any provision of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 or any rules or orders promulgated under that law is void [*Corp. Code § 25701*].

[3] Federal

Transactions at the federal level with respect to issuance of securities are governed primarily under the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.*], and with respect to secondary trading in securities are governed primarily under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.*], with implementation as to special kinds of securities through certain related legislation. Administration of the federal requirements is effected mainly through the Securities and Exchange Commission [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77b(5), 77s, 78b(15), 78d, 78w*], whose regulations are collected in Title 17 of the Code of Federal Regulations [*see 17 C.F.R. §§ 230.100 et seq., 240.0-1 et seq.*].

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with federal courts under the 1933 act, and a suit commenced in a state court is not subject to federal removal [*15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)*]. The Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, which permits in general the removal to federal court of high-dollar class actions involving diverse parties [*see 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d), 1453(b)*;

see also Ch. 120, Class Actions, § 120.13[1]; *Ch. 265, Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal, § 265.15[6][a]*], does not supersede the specific bar of *15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)* against removal of cases arising under the Securities Act of 1933 [*Luther v. Countrywide Home Loans Serv'g LP (9th Cir. 2008) 533 F.3d 1031, 1032, 1034*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934General OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsFederal PreemptionSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933General Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.11

§ 515.11 Federal Preemption of State Securities Regulation

[1] 1996 Legislation

The National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 (Improvement Act) [Pub. L. No. 102-290, 110 Stat. 3416 (H.R. 3005)], which took effect on October 11, 1996, made significant changes to the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.*], the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.*], the Investment Company Act of 1940 [15 U.S.C. § 801-1 et seq.], and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 80b-1 et seq.*]. Most significant to California practice is the Improvement Act's prohibition against state regulation of certain issuers and transactions by means of federal preemption in many areas of securities regulation that formerly were subject to dual regulation by the states under blue sky laws and by the SEC or other federal agencies.

[2] Extent of Federal Preemption

Section 18(a) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r*], as amended by the Improvement Act, provides that no state may prohibit an offering or sale in the state, impose additional disclosure requirements, impose "merit" standards, require the registration or qualification of a security or transaction, or prohibit or limit the use of any offering document prepared on behalf of the issuer in an offering (including proxy statements and reports to shareholders required to be filed under Section 15A of the 1934 Act [*15 U.S.C. § 78o-3*] unless the issuer is incorporated in the state) if the security offered is a "covered" security [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(a)*; *see § 515.11[4]*]. However, the states may continue to impose notice filing requirements and filing fees, and to investigate and bring enforcement actions for fraud or unlawful conduct by a broker and dealer.

In various releases issued in response to the Improvement Act, the Department of Corporations has noted that the California Constitution provides that a state administrative agency has no power to declare a state statute unenforceable on the basis that federal law prohibits the enforcement of the statute, unless an appellate court has made a determination that the enforcement of the statute is prohibited by federal law or regulations [*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; see Dept. Corps. Release Nos. 101-C, 102-C, 103-C, 104-C].

California's legislative response to the Improvement Act in the form of conforming amendments, was made in 1997 [*see*

Stats. 1997, ch. 391]. Those statutory changes are incorporated throughout this chapter. For extensive coverage of the Improvement Act and its interaction with California securities laws, see Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 3A, *Federal Preemption of State Securities Regulation* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Continued State Authority With Respect to Fraud Enforcement Actions

Notwithstanding the preemption of state regulation of securities offerings, the securities commission of any state retains jurisdiction under the laws of that state to investigate and bring enforcement actions with respect to fraud or deceit, or unlawful conduct by a broker or dealer, in connection with securities or securities transactions [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(c)(1)*; *see, e.g., Capital Research & Management Co. v. Brown (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 58, 61, 67, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770* (California Attorney General could pursue injunctive relief and penalties against covered security's investment advisor and wholesale broker-dealer who allegedly made inaccurate or inadequate representations to purchasers)].

[4] Definition of "Covered Security"

[a] Nationally Traded Securities

Since the definition of "covered security" determines whether or not the federal preemption applies, that definition is set forth in some detail below.

A "covered security" for purposes of the Improvement Act includes a security that is listed, or authorized for listing, on the New York Stock Exchange, on the NYSE Amex (formerly known as the American Stock Exchange), on the NASDAQ Global Market (formerly known as the National Market System of the NASDAQ Stock Market), on any successor to those entities, or on a national securities exchange (or tier or segment of such an exchange) that has listing standards that the SEC determines by rule are substantially similar to the listing standards of the exchanges listed above [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(1)(A), (B)*]. A security of the same issuer that is equal in seniority or is a senior security [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77r(d)(4)* (definition)] to the securities just described also is a "covered security" [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(1)(C)*] (note that the exchange name changes are not yet reflected in the statutory language); *see also Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 3A, Federal Preemption of State Securities Regulation, § 3A.04[1]* for discussion].

Since the California Corporations Commissioner has certified the New York Stock Exchange and the (former) American Stock Exchange (renamed "NYSE Amex LLC") [*see* Dept. of Corps. Release No. 27-C (Mar. 4, 1972); *see also Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 3A, Federal Preemption of State Securities Regulation, § 3A.04[1]*], as well as the and the NASDAQ Capital Market of the NASDAQ Stock Market LLC [*see* Dept. of Corps. Release No. 87-C (revised) (Aug. 17, 2009)] pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25100(o)*, the federal preemption is irrelevant in California with respect to those listed securities, which are already exempt by California law.

[b] Registered Investment Companies

A security is a "covered security" if it is a security issued by an investment company that is registered, or that has filed a registration statement, under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(2)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*].

[c] Sales to Qualified Purchasers

A security is a "covered security" with respect to its offer or sale to qualified purchasers as defined by the SEC by rule. In prescribing such a rule, the Commission may define the term "qualified purchaser" differently with respect to different categories of securities, consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(3)*].

[d] Certain Exempt Offerings

A security is a "covered security" with respect to a transaction that is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to any of the following:

- Section 4(1) [*15 U.S.C. § 77d(1)*] (transactions by any person other than an issuer, underwriter or dealer) or Section 4(3) [*15 U.S.C. § 77d(3)*] (with certain exemptions, transactions by a dealer), if the issuer files reports with the SEC pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the 1934 Act [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(A)*; *see 15 U.S.C. §§ 78m, 78o(d)*].

- Section 4(4) [*15 U.S.C. § 77d(4)*] (certain brokers' transactions executed on a customer's order) [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(B)*].

- Section 3(a) [*15 U.S.C. § 77c(a)*] (which exempts a large number of securities, including those of various governmental entities, commercial paper, charitable organizations, etc.), other than the offer of sale of a security that is exempt from registration pursuant to Section 3(a)(4), (10), or (11) [*15 U.S.C. § 77c(a)(4), (10), (11)*] (securities of charitable organizations, exchanges of securities for bona fide outstanding securities, and intrastate exemption). However, a municipal security that is exempt from registration pursuant to Section 3(a)(2) [*15 U.S.C. § 77c(a)(2)*] is not a covered security with respect to its offer or sale in the state in which the issuer of that security is located [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(C)*].

- SEC rules or regulations issued under Section 4(2) [*15 U.S.C. § 77d(2)*] (transactions by an issuer not involving any public offering), except that this restriction on state action does not prohibit a state from imposing notice filing requirements that are substantially similar to those required by rule or regulation under that section that were in effect on September 1, 1996 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(D)*].

A transaction must actually qualify for a registration exemption in order for the subject security to be a "covered security." Filing of the necessary documents and payment of the required fees are not sufficient, since an exemption-based "covered security" under the Improvement Act is a security in "a transaction that *is exempt* from registration" [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)* (emphasis added); *Consolidated Management Group, LLC v. Department of Corps. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 598, 607-608, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795*].

[5] Additional Effects of Improvement Act

[a] Investment Companies

The Improvement Act preempts all state regulation of investment companies that are registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(a), (b)(2)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*].

[b] Broker-Dealers

The Improvement Act does not prevent a state from requiring the registration of broker-dealers in any circumstances, but it does severely restrict the scope of state regulation of on broker-dealers. Section 15(a)(h) of the 1934 Act [*15 U.S.C. § 78o(h)*], as added by the Improvement Act, provides that a state may not "establish capital, custody, margin, financial responsibility, making and keeping records, bonding, or financial or operational reporting requirements for brokers, dealers, municipal securities dealers, government securities brokers, or government securities dealers that differ from, or are in addition to, the requirements in those areas established under this title [the 1934 Act]" [*15 U.S.C. § 78o(h)(1)*]. Since these are most, if not all, of the areas in which broker-dealers are regulated, this provision effectively prohibits states from imposing any regulation on broker-dealers that is inconsistent with or in addition to that imposed by the SEC.

[c] Investment Advisers

The Improvement Act divides the state and federal authority to regulate investment advisers between the states and the federal government based upon the size of assets under management by the investment advisers. The statute requires registration under the federal Investment Advisers Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 80b-1 et seq.*] of an investment adviser who has more than $25 million under management, or is an investment adviser to a registered investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*], and exempts all other investment advisers from such registration [*15 U.S.C. § 80b-3(a)(1)*].

Investment advisers that are exempted from federal regulation are left to regulation by the state authorities, and the states are prohibited from requiring the registration of advisers that are required to be registered under the 1940 Act.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsFederal PreemptionSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment AdvisersSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawInvestment AdvisersExemptions, Recordkeeping & RegistrationSecurities LawInvestment CompaniesActivitiesSecurities LawRegulation of Securities MarketsRegistration & Regulation of Brokers & Dealers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.12

§ 515.12 Class Action Lawsuits Involving Nationally Traded Securities

[1] Federal Standards Affecting State Actions

Following passage of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 [P.L. 104-67, 109 Stat. 737 (December 22, 1995)], which sought to reduce the number of frivolous class action suits in federal court, a number of securities class action lawsuits shifted from federal to state courts. To prevent state private securities class action lawsuits alleging fraud from being used to frustrate the objectives of that Act, in 1998 Congress enacted national standards for securities class action lawsuits involving nationally traded securities, while preserving the appropriate enforcement powers of state securities regulators and not changing the current treatment of individual lawsuits [P.L. 105-353, 112 Stat. 3227, §§ 1, 2]. As discussed below, the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998 amended the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934. For further coverage of that Act, see Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws (Matthew Bender).

[2] Class Action Limitations

Under the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998, no covered class action based on the statutory or common law of any state or subdivision thereof may be maintained in any state or federal court by any private party alleging either an untrue statement or omission of a material fact in connection with the purchase or sale of a "covered security," or that the defendant used or employed any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in connection with the purchase or sale of a covered security [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(b)*, 78bb(f)(1); *see, e.g., Falkowski v. Imation Corp. (9th Cir. 2003) 320 F.3d 905, 906* (state law fraud claims relating to employee stock options were preempted by SLUSA; alleged fraud took place "in connection with" purchase or sale of "covered security")].

The term "covered class action" means a single lawsuit in which either [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(f)(2), 78bb(f)(5)(B)*]:

- Damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons or prospective class members, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class, without reference to issues of individualized reliance on an alleged misstatement or omission, predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members; or

- One or more named parties seek to recover damages on a representative basis on behalf of themselves and other unnamed parties similarly situated, and questions of law or fact common to those persons or members of the prospective class predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons or members.

"Covered class action" also means a group of lawsuits filed in or pending in the same court and involving common questions of law or fact, in which damages are sought on behalf of more than 50 persons, and the lawsuits are joined, consolidated, or otherwise proceed as a single action for any purpose. The term does not include an exclusively derivative action brought by one or more shareholders on behalf of a corporation [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(f)(2), 78bb(f)(5)(B)*].

The term "covered security" means a security that satisfies the standards for a covered security specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 18(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (listed and national market system securities, senior securities, and securities of federally registered investment companies) [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(1), (2)*; *see § 515.11[4]*] at the time during which it is alleged that the misrepresentation, omission, or manipulative or deceptive conduct occurred. However, the term does not include any debt security that is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to rules issued by the Commission under section 4(2) [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77d(2)*] of that Act [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(f)(3), 78bb(f)(5)(E)*].

Any covered class action brought in any state court, involving a covered security, is removable to the U.S. district court for the district in which the action is pending, and in that court the action will be subject to the prohibition discussed above [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(c), 78bb(f)(2)*]. Since an action that is not precluded as discussed above is not removable, it follows that if the federal court determines that the action is not thus precluded, then the court has no jurisdiction to reach the merits, and the proper course is to remand the case to the state court [*Kircher v. Putnam Funds Trust (2006) 547 U.S. 633, 644, 126 S. Ct. 2145, 165 L. Ed. 2d 92]* .

[3] Exceptions

Notwithstanding the general prohibition discussed in [2], *above*, a covered class action based on the statutory or common law of the state in which the issuer is incorporated (in the case of a corporation) or organized (in the case of any other entity) may be maintained in a state or federal court by a private party if it is in one of two categories [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(d)(1)(A), 78bb(f)(3)(A)(i)*]:

- Actions involving the purchase or sale of securities by the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer exclusively from or to holders of equity securities of the issuer [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(d)(1)(B)(i), 78bb(f)(3)(A)(ii)(I)*].

- Actions involving any recommendation, position, or other communication with respect to the sale of securities of the issuer, if the communication (1) is made by or on behalf of the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer to holders of equity securities of the issuer and (2) concerns decisions of those equity holders with respect to voting their securities, acting in response to a tender or exchange offer, or exercising dissenters' or appraisal rights [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(d)(1)(B)(ii), 78bb(f)(3)(A)(ii)(II)*; *e.g.,* Madden v. Cowen Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 556 F.3d 786, 793-794 (action for negligent representation and professional negligence, based on California law, against investment bank which, acting on behalf of California corporation, made communication to its shareholders in form of "fairness opinion" letter concerning shareholders' impending decision on how to respond to exchange offer for that corporation's shares)].

Some of the ambiguity in the statutory language describing the second category of excepted actions, as stated above, has been resolved by judicial construction. Plainly, the statute allows a shareholder to bring a covered class action under

state law against any "issuer" that has made certain communications regarding the sale of its "securities," and those securities need not be the "covered securit[ies]" referred to in the preclusionary language of *15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(b)* and *78bb(f)(1)* discussed in [2], above [Madden v. Cowen Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 556 F.3d 786, 794-795]. Further, as a matter of common sense, the requirement for a material communication to be made "on behalf of" the issuer refers to a communication made by any individual or entity to the issuer's shareholders and in the interest of, or as a representative of, the issuer. There is no reason to suppose that the statute refers to communications made only by certain persons such as officers, directors, and employees of the issuer [Madden v. Cowen Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 556 F.3d 786, 796-797] .

A state or political subdivision or a state pension plan may bring an action involving a covered security on its own behalf, or as a member of a class comprised solely of other states, political subdivisions, or state pension plans that are named plaintiffs and have authorized participation in such an action [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(d)(2), 78bb(f)(3)(B)*].

If an action has been removed to the U.S. district court pursuant to *15 U.S.C. § 77p(c)* or *78bb(f)(2)* [see [2], above], and the federal court determines that the action may be maintained in the state court pursuant to one of the exceptions described above, then the federal court must remand the action to the state court [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77p(d)(4), 78bb(f)(3)(D)*; Madden v. Cowen Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 556 F.3d 786, 793] .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureClass ActionsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsFederal PreemptionSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawLiabilityPrivate Securities LitigationGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityPrivate Securities LitigationFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.13

§ 515.13 Definitions

[1] "Securities"

The term "securities" includes, in general, any interest or instrument commonly known as a "security." This takes on such familiar forms as the following [*Corp. Code § 25019*; *cf. 15 U.S.C. § 77b(1)*]:

- Stock, including (a) transferable shares, and (b) treasury stock.
- Evidence of indebtedness, including (a) notes, (b) bonds, (c) debentures, and (d) collateral trust certificates.
- Membership, whether in an incorporated or unincorporated association.
- Preorganization certificate or subscription.
- Voting trust certificate.
- Certificate of deposit for securities.
- Beneficial interest or other security issued in connection with a funded employee's pension, profit sharing, stock bonus, or similar benefit plan.
- Investment contract.
- Viatical settlement contract [*see Corp. Code § 25023(a)*; former *Ins. Code § 10113.1(a)(1)* (repealed 2009; successor section defines arrangement as "life settlement contract"); *see § 515.14[5][n]*] or fractionalized or pooled interest therein.

- Life settlement contract or fractionalized or pooled interest therein [*see Corp. Code § 25023(a)* (definition); *see § 515.14[7]*].

- Certificate of interest or participation in any (1) profit-sharing agreement, or (2) oil, gas, or mining title or lease, or in payment out of production under such a title or lease.

- Any certificate or interest or participation in, temporary or interim certificate for, receipt for, guarantee of, or warrant or right to subscribe to or purchase any of the foregoing.

- Interest in a limited liability company and any class or series of interests in a limited liability company.

Whether something is to be considered a security within the meaning of the Corporate Securities Law is a question of fact to be determined in each case, bearing in mind that the general purpose of that law is to protect the public against the imposition of unsubstantial, unlawful, and fraudulent stock and investment schemes and the securities based on them [*People v. Syde (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 765, 768, 235 P.2d 601* ; *Consolidated Management Group, LLC v. Department of Corps. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 598, 609, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795* ; *Moreland v. Department of Corps. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 512, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 385, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327*].

Regardless of the form the security may take, it need not be shown by a written document [*Corp. Code § 25019*].

The term "security" does not include (1) any beneficial interest in a voluntary inter vivos trust not created for the purpose of carrying on a business or solely for voting purposes; (2) a beneficial interest in a testamentary trust; or (3) an insurance or endowment policy or annuity contract under which locally admitted insurers promise to pay monetary sums at some designated time or times [*Corp. Code § 25019*].

"Security" also does not include any franchise subject to registration under the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code §§ 31000-31516*], or exempted from registration by Commissioner's rule [*see Corp. Code § 31100*] or under the "seasoned franchisor" exemption [*see Corp. Code § 31101*] of that law [*see Corp. Code § 25019*].

[2] Refinement of Term "Security"

[a] Risk Capital Approach

The statutory definition of "security" is designed, in part, to protect the public against spurious schemes to attract risk capital. Therefore, a court is required to look through the form of a particular transaction to its substance [*Silver Hills Country Club v. Sobieski (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 811, 813, 815, 13 Cal. Rptr. 186, 361 P.2d 906* ; *People ex rel. Bender v. Wind River Mining Project (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1390, 1399-1400, 269 Cal. Rptr. 106* ; *see United Housing Foundation, Inc. v. Forman (1975) 421 U.S. 837, 847-848, 95 S. Ct. 2051, 44 L. Ed. 2d 621* (stating that even use of the word "stock" does not necessarily mean "security" under federal law's substantially similar definition of "security" but that, although name given to instrument is not dispositive, it is also not wholly irrelevant)].

In this respect, profit to the supplier of capital is not the test of what is a security. Rather, the law affords those who risk their capital at least a fair chance of realizing their objective in a legitimate venture, whether or not they expect a return on their capital in one form or another [*Silver Hills Country Club v. Sobieski (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 811, 813, 815, 13 Cal. Rptr. 186, 361 P.2d 906* (construing former *Corp. Code § 25008* in finding "memberships" in "recreational club" which were being sold to raise capital to develop business enterprise for profits, were securities); see also *Clejan v. Reisman (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 224, 233, 84 Cal. Rptr. 897]* .

The "risk capital" test announced in *Silver Hills Country Club v. Sobieski (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 811, 13 Cal. Rptr. 186* is the test generally employed by California courts in assessing the elusive concept of the meaning of security [*People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 389, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327* ; *but see People v. Smith (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 230, 236-238, 263 Cal. Rptr. 684* ("indiscriminate public offering" element not necessary in every context; for instance, criminal liability for violation of *Corp. Code § 25401* may be imposed even if security was not offered to public)]. The "risk capital" test requires consideration of the following factors [*Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 519, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *Leyva v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 462, 470, 210 Cal. Rptr. 545]* :

- Whether funds are being raised for a business venture or enterprise;
- Whether the transaction is offered indiscriminately to the public at large;
- Whether investors are substantially powerless to effect the success of the enterprise; and
- Whether the investors' money is substantially at risk because it is inadequately secured.

[b] Investment Contract Approach

The definition of a security under state and federal law includes both an "investment contract" and "any instrument commonly known as a 'security' " [*see Corp. Code § 25019*; *15 U.S.C. § 77b(1)*; *see also § 515.211*]. The United States Supreme Court has taken the position that there is no distinction between these two forms of securities for purposes of distinguishing a securities transaction from other kinds of commercial dealings, and therefore defines a security as an investment contract [*United Housing Foundation, Inc. v. Forman (1975) 421 U.S. 837, 852, 95 S. Ct. 2051, 44 L. Ed. 2d 621]* .

California apparently has not considered the terms coequal, since it continues to employ the risk capital approach in some cases [*see § 515.13[2][a]*]. Nevertheless, since *Corp. Code § 25019* is derived from *15 U.S.C. § 77b* and since an investment contract is one form of security under California law [*see Corp. Code § 25019*], federal cases defining an investment contract under federal law have been cited by California courts as persuasive authority for defining an investment contract under California law [*see* Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) Cal. App. 3d 506, 512, *239 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *People v. Park (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 550, 563, 151 Cal. Rptr. 146]* .

Federal cases, and California courts that have followed these cases, have defined an investment contract to mean a contract, transaction, or scheme whereby a person invests his or her money in a common enterprise and is led to expect profits solely from the efforts of the promoter or a third party [Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) Cal. App. 3d 506, 513, *239 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *see Securities Exch. Comm'n v. W.J. Howey Co. (1945) 328 U.S. 293, 298-299, 66 S. Ct. 1100, 90 L. Ed. 1244* ; *SEC v. R.G. Reynolds Enters. (9th Cir. 1991) 952 F.2d 1125, 1130-1131, 1133-1135* (gold program based on pooling of investors' funds to finance construction of plant that would refine ore purchased by investors was investment contract); *People v. Park (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 550, 563, 151 Cal. Rptr. 146]* . It is immaterial whether the shares in the enterprise are evidenced by formal certificates or by nominal interests in the physical assets employed in the enterprise [*see Securities Exch. Comm'n v. W.J. Howey Co. (1945) 328 U.S. 293, 298-299, 66 S. Ct. 1100, 90 L. Ed. 1244* ; *SEC v. Goldfield Deep Mines Co. of Nevada (9th Cir. 1985) 758 F.2d 459, 461-464* (agreement for participation in mining operation by purchase of units of 18 tons of ore as "security")].

The Ninth Circuit distills the *Howey* definition into a three part test requiring (1) an investment of money, (2) in a common enterprise, (3) with an expectation of profits to be produced by the efforts of others. The expectation of profits to be produced by the efforts of others involves two distinct concepts: an expectation of profits and an expectation that the profits will result from the efforts of a person other than the investor. The investment-of-money part of the test requires that the investor must have committed assets to the common enterprise in such a manner as to become subject

to the risk of financial loss [*Warfield v. Alaniz (9th Cir. 2009) 569 F.3d 1015, 1020-1021* (charitable gift annuity contracts, under which individuals handed over money and liquid assets in exchange for promise of regular lifetime payments and promise that any surplus existing at individual's death would go to his or her chosen charity, were investment contracts)].

The most essential consistency in the cases that have considered the meaning of investment contract is the emphasis on whether or not the investor has substantial power to affect the success of the enterprise. When success requires professional or managerial skill on the investor's part, and he or she has authority corresponding with this responsibility, the investment is not a security within the meaning of the state or federal securities act. When the investor is relatively uninformed and unskilled and then turns over his or her money to others, essentially depending on their representation, honesty, and skill in managing it, the transaction is an investment contract [*Securities & Exch. Comm'n v. Glenn W. Turner Enterprises, Inc. (D Ore 1972) 348 F. Supp. 766, 774* ; *see People v. Park (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 550, 563, 151 Cal. Rptr. 146* (condominium development as investment contract); *see also Tomei v. Fairline Feeding Corp. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 394, 398-399, 137 Cal. Rptr. 656* ; *People v. Witzerman (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 169, 178, 105 Cal. Rptr. 284* (both cases construing cattle care agreements as investment contracts); *but see United Housing Foundation, Inc. v. Forman (1975) 421 U.S. 837, 849, 858, 95 S. Ct. 2051, 44 L. Ed. 2d 621* (failing to follow district court's language in *Glenn W. Turner, above,* but stating that investment contract is present when return on investment is prospect that attracts investor as opposed to situation when one purchases either commodity for personal consumption or living quarters for personal use)].

The United States Supreme Court has held that an investment scheme promising a fixed rate of return can be an "investment contract" and thus a "security" subject to the federal securities laws [*SEC v. Edwards (2004) 540 U.S. 389, 124 S. Ct. 892, 157 L. Ed. 2d 813, 822* (involving scheme in which investors bought pay phones for fixed price and leased them back to seller for fixed monthly payment pursuant to leaseback and management agreement, resulting in 14 percent annual return)]. The court found that under the *Howey* test [*see SEC v. W.J. Howey (1946) 328 U.S. 293, 66 S. Ct. 1100, 90 L. Ed. 1244* , discussed *above*] for determining whether a particular scheme is an investment contract, there was no reason to distinguish between promises of fixed returns and promises of variable returns. Furthermore, the fact that purchasers had a contractual entitlement to a return did not mean that the return was not also expect to come "solely from the efforts of others" under that test [*SEC v. Edwards (2004) 540 U.S. 389, 124 S. Ct. 892, 157 L. Ed. 2d 813, 822]* .

[3] "Offer" and "Sale"

An "offer" or "offer to sell" includes every attempt or offer to dispose of, or solicitation of an offer to buy, a security or interest therein for value [*Corp. Code § 25017(b)*]. A "sale" or "sell" includes every contract of sale of, contract to sell, or disposition of, a security or interest therein for value. These concepts of sale include exchange of securities as well as changes in the rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions of or on outstanding securities [*Corp. Code § 25017(a)*]. The defined terms do not include the following: (1) bona fide secured transactions in, or loans of, outstanding securities; (2) stock dividends of common stock payable in shares of that stock when it is the only voting class outstanding, as provided in *Corp. Code § 25017(f)(2)*; and *(3)* acts incident to certain judicially approved transactions or reorganizations in which securities are issued and exchanged [*see Corp. Code § 25017(f)*; *cf. 15 U.S.C. § 77b(a)(3)*].

In addition to these three statutory exclusions, a California court has held that the transfer of corporate stock as part of the division of community property in a divorce settlement is not to be treated as a "sale" of those securities for purposes of California's securities laws [*see D'Elia v. D'Elia (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 415, 423-424, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (citing *Corp. Code § 25017*)].

[4] Marketing Personnel

[a] "Broker-Dealer" Under California Law

A securities "broker-dealer" is any person engaged in the business of effecting transactions in securities in California for the account of another or for his or her own account. "Broker-dealer" also includes a person engaged in the regular business of issuing or guaranteeing options with regard to securities not of its own issue [*Corp. Code § 25004(a)*; *see Corp. Code § 25019* (defining security)]. However, "broker-dealer" does *not* include any of the following [*Corp. Code § 25004(a)*]:

- Any other issuer;
- An agent who is an employee of a broker-dealer or issuer;
- A bank, trust company, or savings and loan association;
- Any person insofar as he or she buys or sells securities for his or her own account, either individually or in some fiduciary capacity, but not as a part of a regular business;
- A person who has no place of business in California if he or she effects transactions in California exclusively with (1) the issuers of securities involved in the transactions or (2) other broker-dealers;
- A broker licensed by the Real Estate Commissioner of California when engaged in transactions in securities exempted under *Corp. Code § 25100(f)* (interests in subdivisions or real estate developments) or *Corp. Code § 25100(p)* (notes secured by real property) or in securities the issuance of which is subject to authorization by the Real Estate Commissioner of California or in transactions exempted by *Corp. Code § 25102(e)* (debt securities that are not offered publicly); or
- An exchange certified by the Commissioner of Corporations when it is issuing or guaranteeing options.

An agent is an employee of a broker-dealer for these purposes when the agent is employed by or associated with the broker-dealer under all of the following conditions [*Corp. Code § 25004(b)*]:

- The agent is subject to the supervision and control of the broker-dealer;
- The agent performs under the name, authority, and marketing policies of the broker-dealer;
- The agent discloses to investors the identity of the broker-dealer; and
- The agent is reported pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25210(c)* and rules adopted thereunder.

[b] "Agent" Under California Law

An "agent" is any individual, other than a broker-dealer or a partner of a licensed broker-dealer, who represents a broker-dealer or who for compensation represents an issuer in effecting or attempting to effect purchases or sales of securities in California [*Corp. Code § 25003(a)*]. "Agent" does not include an individual who has no place of business in California if he or she effects transactions in California only with broker-dealers; nor does it include an individual who only represents an issuer in effecting transactions in the following exempted securities [*Corp. Code § 25003(b)*]:

- Domestic or foreign government securities [*see Corp. Code § 25100(a), (b)*];
- Securities the issuance of which is subject to authorization by the Insurance Commissioner, the

Public Utilities Commission, or the Real Estate Commissioner [*see Corp. Code § 25100(e)*];

- Interests in subdivisions or real estate developments [*see Corp. Code § 25100(f)*];
- Mutual capital certificates or savings accounts [*see Corp. Code § 25100(g)*];
- Nonprofit corporation securities [*see Corp. Code § 25100(j)*];
- Life income contracts of qualified issuers [*see Corp. Code § 25100(k)*];
- Short term commercial paper that is not offered to the public in amounts of less than $25,000 to any one purchaser [*see Corp. Code § 25100(l)*]; or
- Issuer transactions that are exempted under *Corp. Code § 25102*.

"Agent" also does not include an associated person of a broker or dealer effecting transactions described in Section 15(h)(3) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, subject to the provisions of Section 15(h)(2) of that act [*Corp. Code § 25003(c)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 78o(h)*].

An officer or director of a broker-dealer or issuer, or an individual occupying a similar status or performing similar functions, is an agent only if he or she otherwise comes within the definition of agent and receives compensation specifically related to purchases or sales of securities [*Corp. Code § 25003(d)*].

[c] "Investment Adviser" Under California Law

An "investment adviser," with certain exceptions, is someone who, for compensation, engages in the business of advising others, directly or through publications or writings, as to the value of securities or the advisability of investing in, purchasing, or selling securities; or the investment adviser, for compensation and as part of a regular business, publishes analyses or reports concerning securities [*Corp. Code § 25009(a)*]. "Investment adviser" also includes, with some exceptions, any person who uses the title "financial planner" and who, for compensation, engages in the business, principally or as part of another business, of advising others as described above [*Corp. Code § 25009(b)*]. "Investment adviser" does not include persons excepted from the definition of "investment adviser" by Section 202(a)(11) of the federal Investment Advisers Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*]. However, with regard to those persons, the Commissioner may investigate and bring enforcement actions with respect to fraud and deceit, including fraud and deceit under *Corp. Code § 25235* and any rules adopted under that section [*Corp. Code § 25009.1*]. An "underwriter" agrees with an issuer or other person on whose behalf a distribution of securities is to be made either to purchase them for distribution, to distribute them for or on behalf of those parties, or to manage or supervise the distribution [*Corp. Code § 25022*].

[5] "Investment Adviser Representative"

An "investment adviser representative" or "associated person of an investment adviser" means any partner, officer, director, or other individual (except clerical or ministerial personnel) who is employed by, associated with, or subject to the supervision and control of an investment adviser that has obtained (or is required to obtain) a certificate in California and who does any of the following [*Corp. Code 25009.5(a)*]:

- Makes any recommendations or otherwise renders advice regarding securities;
- Manages accounts or portfolios of clients;

- Determines which recommendation or advice regarding securities should be given;
- Solicits, offers, or negotiates for the sale or sells investment advisory services; or
- Supervises employees who perform any of the above.

With respect to an investment adviser subject to *Corp. Code § 25230.1* (persons subject to notice rather than certification requirements), the term means a person defined as an investment adviser representative by SEC Rule 303A-3 [*17 C.F.R. § 275.203A-3*] and who has a place of business in California [*Corp. Code § 25009.5(b)*].

[a] California Regulation

The Commissioner of Corporations has responsibility for licensing marketing personnel and policing professional offering and selling activities. Broker-dealers must be certificated unless exempt; agents for broker-dealers or issuers also must comply with the commissioner's sales regulations [*Corp. Code § 25210*; *see* Dept. of Corp. Release No. 119-C (Oct. 22, 2008) (broker-dealer licensure requirements for officers and directors of issuers)]. Investment advisers must be certificated as well, unless exempt or not subject to certification [*Corp. Code § 25230(a)*; *see Corp. Code § 25230.1*]. A person registered under Section 203 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 is not subject to certification. However, such an investment adviser may not conduct business in California unless the person has less than six clients [*see Corp. Code § 25202(a)*] or has complied with notice filing requirements [*Corp. Code § 25230.1*; *see* Dept. of Corp. Release No. 109-C (Dec. 18, 1997) (form for notice)]. By rule of the Commissioner, certain aliens are not eligible for an investment adviser certificate [*10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 250.60, 250.61*; *see Corp. Code § 25231*].

[b] Definitions Under Federal Law

Marketing personnel do not necessarily have the same designations under the federal securities laws. Under federal laws, a "dealer" may be an agent, broker, or principal handling securities issued by another person under the 1933 Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77b(a)(12)*], whereas, under the 1934 act, a "dealer" only buys or sells for personal account [*see 15 U.S.C. § 78c(a)(5)*] and a "broker" (not defined at all under the 1933 act) effects securities transactions for the account of others [*see 15 U.S.C. § 78c(a)(4)*]. An "investment adviser" is one under contract who regularly advises as to the desirability of securities transactions or who may determine which securities are to be purchased or sold, with various exceptions [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 78c(a)(20), 80a-2(a)(20)*].

An "underwriter" is one who, with certain exceptions, has purchased from an issuer with a view to, or offers or sells for an issuer in connection with, the distribution of any security. Such a person may participate or have a direct or indirect participation in any such undertaking or the underwriting of any such undertaking [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 77b(11), 78c(a)(20), 80a-2(a)(40)*]. Unlike California law, the federal definition includes individual investors who are not professionals in the securities business, if they are found to act as links in a chain of transactions through which securities move from an issuer to the public [*see 17 C.F.R. § 230.144* (preliminary note)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawBlue Sky LawsInvestment Contracts & StocksSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & SaleSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment AdvisersSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawInvestment AdvisersDefinitions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.14

§ 515.14 Qualification of Offers and Sales in California

[1] Requirement

All offers and sales of securities in California must first be authorized and approved through a process of qualification with the Commissioner of Corporations unless, either by the nature of the security itself or by the contemplated or actual disposition of the security, the transactions are expressly exempted by law or not subject to qualification [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130*]. The term "qualification" is not defined but refers to completion of the prescribed processing system by the Department of Corporations. The term is used indiscriminately in the statutes and regulations as well as by the commentators for a process affecting either "securities" or "transactions" therein [*see, e.g., Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25111*; *cf. Corp. Code § 25120*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.103*; *see also* Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities* (Matthew Bender)].

The following discussion summarizes the requirements for, and exceptions from, qualification. A more detailed discussion of matters pertaining to issuance of equity or debt securities, and to processing securities for qualification with the Commissioner of Corporations, or arranging for exempt status of securities transactions, is discussed in California Legal Forms, Chs. 6 through 6J (Matthew Bender).

[2] When California Law Applies

An offer or sale of a security is made in California, and thus subject to state law, when (1) an offer to sell is made in California, (2) an offer to buy is accepted in California, or (3) if both seller and purchaser are domiciled in California, the security is delivered to the purchaser in California [*Corp. Code § 25008(a)*]. An offer to buy or a purchase of a security is made in California when an offer to buy is made in California or an offer to sell is accepted in California, or the security is delivered to the purchaser in California if both seller and purchaser are domiciled in California [*Corp. Code § 25008(a)*]. Offers to sell or buy (or sales or purchases) are also made in California when they either originate in California or are directed to California by the offeror and received at the place to which they are directed. Offers are accepted in California when acceptance is communicated to the offeror in California [*Corp. Code § 25008(a), (b)*].

Acceptance is communicated to an offeror in California when the offeree directs it to the offeror in California,

reasonably believing the offeror to be in California, and it is received where directed. A security is delivered to the purchaser in California when the certificate or other evidence of the security is directed to the purchaser in California and received where directed [*Corp. Code § 25008(b)*].

Offers are not made in California merely because a publisher circulates or there is circulated on the publisher's behalf any bona fide newspaper or other publication of general, regular, and paid circulation that has had more than two thirds of its circulation outside of California during the past 12 months. Likewise, offers are not made in California because a radio or television program originates outside the state but is received in California [*Corp. Code § 25008(c)*].

[3] Issuer and Nonissuer Transactions

[a] Distinctions

The offer or sale of securities may take place through either an issuer [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120*] or a nonissuer [*see Corp. Code § 25130*] transaction. The "issuer" is the person or entity that issues, or proposes to issue, a security [*Corp. Code § 25010*]. A "nonissuer transaction" is one not directly or indirectly for the benefit of the issuer. A transaction is indirectly for the benefit of the issuer if any portion of the purchase price of any securities involved in the transaction will be received indirectly by the issuer [*Corp. Code § 25011*].

[b] Qualification of Securities in Issuer Transactions

Issuer transactions (other than recapitalizations and reorganizations [*see Corp. Code § 25120*]) may be qualified in any of the following ways [*Corp. Code § 25110*]:

- Securities for which a registration statement has been filed under the federal Securities Act of 1933 in connection with the same offering may be qualified by coordination under the procedures set forth in *Corp. Code § 25111(b), (c)* [*see Corp. Code § 25111*];

- Securities issued by persons who are issuers of securities registered under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*see* 15 U.S.C. § 78] or by persons registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*see 15 U.S.C. § 80a-8*], a related law dealing with mutual fund issuers, may be qualified by a "notification" procedure if they are ineligible under the coordination procedure [*see Corp. Code § 25112*];

- All securities, whether or not eligible for the coordination or notification procedures, may be qualified by permit [*see Corp. Code § 25113*]; and

- Securities of an open-end investment company or a unit investment trust previously qualified by coordination may be qualified by providing certain information and documents as specified in *Corp. Code § 25111(d)(1), (2)* [*see Corp. Code § 25111*].

An offer or sale of any of these securities is not qualified if the manner of the offer or sale differs from, exceeds the scope of, or fails to conform with, either (1) a material term or condition of qualification as set forth in the permit or qualification order or (2) a material representation regarding the manner of offering that is set forth in the application for qualification [*Corp. Code § 25110*].

Securities offered or sold in connection with recapitalizations or reorganizations--that is, transactions involving changes in the rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions of or on outstanding securities; or in any exchange of securities by the issuer with its existing security holders exclusively; in any exchange in connection with any merger, consolidation, or purchase of assets for stock issuance; or in an entity conversion transaction [*see* Corp. Code § 25001.1

(definition)]--must be qualified by permit [*see Corp. Code §§ 25120, 25121*].

[c] Processing Nonissuer Transactions

Securities of nonissuer transactions must be qualified under the coordination procedure available for certain issuer transactions when eligible. Otherwise, they must be qualified by a notification procedure, except that securities offered pursuant to the federal "Regulation A" exemption [*see 17 C.F.R. §§ 230.251-230.264*] must qualify under the regular permit procedure [*Corp. Code § 25131(a)*].

[4] Securities and Transactions Not Subject to Qualification

[a] In General

In response to the preemptive effect of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 [*see* P.L. 104-290, 110 Stat. 3416 (H.R. 3005); *see also § 515.11*], conforming California legislation was enacted in 1997 to set forth securities and transactions that are not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* [*see* Stats. 1997, ch. 391]. This legislation, and its interaction with the 1996 federal legislation, is discussed under the subheadings immediately below.

[b] "Covered Securities"

A security defined as a "covered security" under Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(1)*] is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* [*Corp. Code § 25100.1(a)*]. Those securities are listed in § 515.11[4].

In addition, a security issued by an investment company that is registered or has filed a registration statement under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*see 15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*] that is defined as a "covered security" pursuant to Section 18(b)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(2)*] is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* if, prior to any offer or sale in California, all of the following are filed with or paid to the Commissioner [*Corp. Code § 25100.1(b)(1)*]:

- A notice consisting of all documents that are part of a federal registration statement filed with the SEC pursuant to the Securities Act of 1993 (or a form prescribed by the Commissioner in lieu of the notice), and that a consent to service of process is on file or attached to the notice [*see* Dept. of Corp. Release No. 109-C (Dec. 18, 1997) (Uniform Form NF developed by the North American Securities Administrators Association is acceptable for filing)].

- A report of the value of securities covered that are offered or sold in California, as necessary to compute fees.

- The notice filing fee set forth in *Corp. Code § 25608.1(a)*. That fee is $200 plus one fifth of one percent of the aggregate value of the securities sought to be sold in California, up to a maximum aggregate free of $2,500 [*Corp. Code § 25608.1(a)*]. The maximum fee that may be levied on a filing pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25100.1(b)* applies, unless the Commissioner sets the fees below the maximum level at the beginning of the fiscal year [*Corp. Code § 25608.2(b)*; *see Corp. Code § 25608.3* (Commissioner may set any fee under *Corp. Code § 25608.1* at an amount below maximum)].

Furthermore, if any offer or sale is to be made pursuant to Section 18(b)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(2)*] and *Corp. Code § 25100.1(b)* more than 12 months after the date the notice was filed, the issuer must file another notice and pay the fee set forth in *Corp. Code § 25608.1(a)* [*Corp. Code § 25100.1(b)(2)*].

[c] Securities Sold in Transactions Exempt From Federal Registration

A security that is offered or sold in a transaction that is exempt from registration under Section 4(1) or Section 4(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77d(1)*] pursuant to Section 18(b)(4)(A) of that act [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(A)*] is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* if the issuer, other than a foreign (other country) issuer, files the required reports with the SEC pursuant to Section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*Corp. Code § 25101.1(a)*; *15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.*; *see 15 U.S.C. §§ 78m, 78o(d)*].

A security of a foreign (other country) issuer that avails itself of the exemption from registration under Section 12(g)(3) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 is subject to the qualification requirements of *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130,* unless the issuer is a reporting company under that Act and files the required reports under Section 12 or 15(d) of that Act [*Corp. Code § 25101.1(b)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 78m, 78o(d)*].

[d] Offers and Sales to Qualified Purchasers

Any offer or sale of a security to a "qualified purchaser" as defined by SEC rule pursuant to Section 18(b)(3) of the Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(3)*] is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* if all of the following are met [*Corp. Code § 25102.1(a)*]:

- A notice is filed with the Commissioner prior to an offer in California, along with any documents filed with the SEC in annual or periodic reports that the Commissioner by rule or order deems appropriate [*see* Dept. of Corps. Release No. 109-C (Dec. 18, 1997) (no notice proposed as SEC has not yet adopted rule under Section 18(b)(3))].

- A consent to service of process [*see Corp. Code § 25165*] is filed with the notice.

- Payment of the notice filing fee set forth in *Corp. Code § 25608.1(b)* is made. That fee is $600 [*Corp. Code § 25608.1(b)*]. The maximum fee that may be levied on a filing pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25102.1(a)* applies, unless the Commissioner sets the fees below the maximum level at the beginning of the fiscal year [*Corp. Code § 25608.2*; *see Corp. Code § 25608.3* (Commissioner may set any fee under *Corp. Code § 25608.1* at an amount below maximum)].

Any offer and sale of a security with respect to a transaction that is exempt from registration under Section 4(4) of the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to Section 18(b)(A) and (B) of that act is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* [*Corp. Code § 25102.1(b)*].

Any offer or sale of a security with respect to a transaction that is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to Section 18(b)(4)(C) of that act is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* [*Corp. Code § 25102.1(c)*].

These requirements do not apply to securities offered and sold to the class of investors or in the transactions described in *Corp. Code § 25102(d), (g), (i),* and *(k),* or to the class of investors or in the transactions described in *Corp. Code § 25104(c), (d), (e),* and *(f).*

Any offer or sale of a security with respect to a transaction that is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to Section 18(b)(4)(D) of that act [*15 U.S.C. § 77r(b)(4)(D)*] is not subject to *Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120,* and *25130* if all the following requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 25102.1(d)*; *Consolidated Management Group, LLC v. Department of Corps. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 598, 608 n.2, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795* (statute refers to security in transaction that "is exempt," which plainly means actually exempt; merely filing documents and paying fees in order to obtain exemption is not sufficient)]:

- A notice in the form of a copy of the completed Form D [*17 C.F.R. § 239.500*] filed with the SEC is filed with the Commissioner within 15 days of the first sale in California, along with documents filed with the SEC in annual or periodic reports that the Commissioner by rule or order deems appropriate [*see* Dept. of Corps. Release No. 109-C (Dec. 18, 1997) (also requiring letter of transmittal)]. (The commissioner may allow for a notice in the form of the electronic transmission of the information in Form D.)

- A consent to service of process [*see Corp. Code § 25165*] is filed with the notice.

- Payment of the notice filing fee set forth in *Corp. Code § 25608.1(c)* is made. The statutory fee is $300 [*see Corp. Code § 25608.1(c)*; *see also Corp. Code § 25608.3* (Commissioner may set any fee under *Corp. Code § 25608.1* at an amount below maximum); Dept. of Corps. Release No. 115-C (Revised May 28, 2004)]. The maximum fee that may be levied on a filing pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25102.1(d)* applies, unless the Commissioner sets the fees below the maximum level at the beginning of the fiscal year [*Corp. Code § 25608.2*].

Notwithstanding the above, an issuer may file an application for qualification by coordination, notification, or permit pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25111, 25112, 25113, 25121, 25131,* or 24142 [*Corp. Code § 25102.1(e)*].

[5] Exemption From Qualification

[a] Scope

There is a large body of exemptions from qualification requirements. Exemption does not remove the security entirely from corporate security regulation but only from the need to obtain qualification for offers or sales [*see* Corp. Code §§ 25100-25105; *see also § 515.422*]. Thus, persons involved in securities transactions still remain subject to antifraud provisions and liable to certain civil actions or for criminal violations under the law [*see Corp. Code §§ 25400-25504.2, 25540-25542*].

For a complete list of the California securities exemptions, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 6, Securities Regulation Issues, § 6.200* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Securities Exempted

Illustrative of securities exempt from all qualification provisions are those of institutions that are heavily regulated by other governmental agencies (such as public securities, securities of foreign countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, and securities issued or guaranteed by state and federal banks and savings and loans), those of nonprofit organizations (except debt securities), those listed or approved for listing on a national securities exchange, and those which constitute single notes to single entities (that is, not being part of a series of notes of equal priority or a note in which beneficial interests are sold to more than one person or entity) secured by real property [*see Corp. Code § 25100(a)-(j), (o)-(t)*].

[c] "Rollup" Transactions

A "rollup" transaction is a transaction, or a series of transactions, that directly or indirectly through acquisition or otherwise involves the combination or reorganization of any rollup participant and that meets certain requirements [*Corp. Code § 25014.6*]. A "rollup participant" is a finite-life limited partnership, which is a limited partnership that (1) operates as a conduit for investors to participate in the ownership of assets for a limited time, (2) has a policy or purpose of distributing to investors substantially all proceeds from the sale, financing, or refinancing of assets, whether for the term of the partnership or after an initial period, rather than reinvesting those proceeds in the business, and (3) is not

excluded under *Corp. Code § 25014.6(b)*. A rollup participant does not include a partnership registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 or a business development company as defined in *15 U.S.C. § 80a-2(a)(48)* [*Corp. Code § 25014.5*].

Certain reorganization and recapitalization transactions involving mainly securities holders with addresses outside California are exempt from qualification in California [*see Corp. Code § 25103(c), (d)*; *discussion under § 515.14[7][b]*]. This exemption does not extend to a rollup transaction [*Corp. Code § 25103(c)*].

Certain rollup transactions are "eligible" rollup transactions [*see Corp. Code § 25014.7*]. The exemption for securities listed or approved for listing on a national securities exchange [*see Corp. Code § 25100(o)*; *discussion under § 515.14[5][b]*] does not apply to securities listed or approved in a rollup transaction unless it is an eligible rollup transaction [*Corp. Code § 25100(o)*].

[d] Issuer Transactions Exempted

There is a wide range of exempt issuer transactions [*see Corp. Code § 25102*]. Some of the more frequently encountered kinds are briefly described below.

[e] Private Presale Offers

An offer (but not a sale) that does not involve a public offering, and the execution and delivery of an agreement for the sale of securities pursuant to the offer, are exempt. The agreement must contain a cautionary legend prescribed by statute. No part of the purchase price may be paid or received and no securities may be issued until the sale is qualified [*Corp. Code § 25102(a)*].

No public offering is involved in the above-described transaction if an offer is made to not more than 35 persons. This number of offerees is exclusive of any institutional investors and affiliates, officers, and directors of the issuer [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.1*; *see Corp. Code § 25102(i)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.102.10, 260.102.12-260.102.14* (describing and defining institutional investors and affiliates); *see also § 515.14[5][h]*]. A husband and wife (together with any trustee or custodian acting for the account of their minor children) are counted as one person, as is a partnership, corporation, or other organization not specifically formed for the purpose of purchasing the security offered in reliance on this exemption [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.1*].

[f] Private Debt Transaction

An offer or sale of any evidence of indebtedness, whether secured or unsecured, and any guarantee thereof, in a transaction not involving any public offering, is exempt [*Corp. Code § 25102(e)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.3* (excluding certain convertible debt securities from scope of exemption)]. Similarly, any offer or sale of conditional sales agreements, equipment trust certificates, or certificates of interest or participation in them, or partial assignments of them, covering the purchase of railroad rolling stock or equipment or the purchase of motor vehicles, aircraft, or parts for them, in a transaction not involving a public offering, is exempt [*Corp. Code § 25102(g)*]. For purposes of these two exemptions, an offer or sale does not involve a public offering if offers are not made to more than 25 persons and sales are not consummated to more than 10 such persons, and if all the offerees either have a preexisting personal relationship with the offeror, its partners, officers, directors, or controlling persons, or have sufficient business or financial experience to be assumed to be able to protect their own interests in regard to the transaction [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.2*].

[g] Unadvertised Offers or Sales of Securities Sold to No More Than 35 Persons

An offer or sale of any security, if not made to a pension or profit-sharing trust of the issuer, is exempt if the transaction meets each of the following requirements [*Corp. Code § 25102(f)*]:

- Sales of the security are not made to more than 35 persons, including persons outside California. The number of purchasers is calculated by excluding any of the institutional investors described in *Corp. Code § 25102(i)*, any officer, director, or affiliate of the issuer, or manager (as appointed or elected by the members) if the issuer is a limited liability company, and any other purchaser whom the commissioner designates by rule [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.13* (excluded purchasers)]. A husband and wife (together with any trustee or custodian acting for the account of their minor children) are counted as one person, as is a partnership, corporation, or other organization not specifically formed for the purpose of purchasing the security offered in reliance on this exemption.

- All purchasers either have a preexisting personal or business relationship with the offeror or any of its partners, officers, directors, or controlling persons, or managers (as appointed or elected by the members) if the offeror is a limited liability company, or by reason of their business or financial experience, or the business or financial experience of their professional advisors who are unaffiliated with, and who are not compensated by, the issuer or any affiliate or selling agent of the issuer, directly or indirectly, could be reasonably assumed to have the capacity to protect their own interests in connection with the transaction [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.12(c)-(i)* (defining purchaser, relationship, controlling person, partners, professional advisors, unaffiliated, and affiliate)].

- Each purchaser states that the purchase is for the purchaser's own account (or a trust account if the purchaser is a trustee) and not with a view to or for sale in connection with any distribution of the security.

- The offer and sale of the security is not accomplished by the publication of any advertisement [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.12(j)* (defining publication of advertising)].

The issuer must file a notice of transaction under this exemption with the commissioner [*Corp. Code § 25102(f)(4)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.14* (notice must be filed electronically unless issuer claims hardship exemption); *see* Dept. Corps. Release 116-C (July 1, 2005))]. Failure to file the notice, or failure to file it within the time specified by the commissioner's rule, does not affect the availability of this exemption, but within 15 business days after discovery of the failure to file the notice or after demand by the commissioner, whichever occurs first, the issuer must file the notice and pay a fee equal to that payable had the transaction been qualified under *Corp. Code § 25110* [*Corp. Code § 25102(f)(4)*].

[h] Institutional Investor Transactions

An offer or sale is exempt if it is made to a bank, savings and loan association, trust company, insurance company, registered investment company, pension or profit-sharing trust (except one belonging to the issuer, a self-employed individual retirement plan, or individual retirement account), or such other institutional investor, governmental agency, or instrumentality as the commissioner may designate by rule. The exemption is available whether the purchaser is acting for itself or as trustee. The exemption also includes certain corporations with outstanding securities registered under federal authority in designated situations in which the corporation will own the entire, outstanding capital stock of the issuer of the securities after the offer or sale [*Corp. Code § 25102(i)*]. The commissioner has designated as institutional investors certain nonprofit organizations and corporations of certain prescribed financial proportions [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.10*].

[i] Noncontributory Employee Stock Plans

Any offer or sale of a stock to a pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus, or employee stock ownership plan is exempt if (1) the plan meets the requirements for qualification under *I.R.C. § 401*, and *(2)* the employees are not required or permitted

individually to make any contributions to the plan. This exemption is not affected by whether the stock is contributed to the plan, purchased from the issuer with contributions by the issuer or an affiliate of the issuer, or purchased from the issuer with funds borrowed from the issuer, an affiliate of the issuer, or any other lender [*Corp. Code § 25102(m)*].

[j] Small Offering Exemption

An offer or sale of voting common stock by a corporation incorporated in any state is exempt if, immediately after the proposed sale and issuance, there will be only one class of stock of the corporation outstanding, that is owned beneficially by no more than 35 persons. However, a number of additional requirements must be met concerning the following: (1) the prohibition on advertising and selling expenses, (2) the nature of the consideration to be received for the shares and prohibition of promotional consideration, (3) the filing of a prescribed form of notice signed by an active member of the State Bar of California and accompanied by an irrevocable consent to service, and (4) each purchaser's representation that the purchase is made only for the purchaser's own account (or a trust account if the purchaser is a trustee), and not with a view to or for sale in connection with any distribution of the stock [*Corp. Code § 25102(h)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.102.8*, *260.102.9* (form of notice and proof of mailing), 260.102.11 (advances and loans in connection with offering)]. Failure to file the notice, or failure to file it within the time specified by the commissioner's rule, does not affect the availability of this exemption, but within 15 business days after discovery of the failure to file the notice or after demand by the commissioner, whichever occurs first, the issuer must file the notice and pay a fee equal to that payable had the transaction been qualified under *Corp. Code § 25110* [*Corp. Code § 25102(h)(4)*]. "Selling expenses" means commissions, discounts, or other compensation paid to any person as remuneration for selling the securities [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.7*].

All securities held by a husband and wife, whether or not jointly, are considered to be owned by one person; but all securities held by a corporation that has issued stock under the exemption are considered to be held by the shareholders to whom it has issued that stock [*Corp. Code § 25102(h)*]. Securities held by a partnership or joint venture are considered to be owned beneficially by each of its partners or joint venturers. Securities held by a trustee are considered to be owned beneficially by each of the beneficiaries, present, future, and contingent, of the trust. However, a future or contingent beneficiary is disregarded if he or she is an ancestor, descendant, or spouse of a present beneficiary, or a custodian or trustee for his or her account. In determining the number of beneficial owners, the provisions of *Corp. Code § 158* (defining "close corporation") are not controlling, and reference should be made instead to *Corp. Code § 25102(h)* and *10* Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.5 [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.5*].

Debt securities are not a "class of stock." However, a corporation does not have "only one class of stock" outstanding if, at the time its shares are issued, there exists or is presently intended to be executed a shareholders' agreement pursuant to which any rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions enumerated in *Corp. Code § 25103(e)* [*see § 515.14[7][b]*] are or would be modified as to any shares or the holders thereof in a way that does not apply to all outstanding shares [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.4*].

[k] Qualified Purchaser Limited Public Offering Exemption

An offer or sale of any security in a transaction, other than an offer or sale of a security in a rollup transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25014.6* ("rollup transaction" defined)], is exempt if the issuer is either a California corporation or a foreign corporation subject to *Corp. Code § 2115* or any other form of business entity including, without limitation, a California partnership or trust, but excluding a "blind pool" issuer or an investment company subject to the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*Corp. Code § 25102(n)(1)*]. However, additional requirements must be met concerning all of the following [*see Corp. Code § 25102(n)(2)-(7)*; *see also 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.102.16-260.102.18*]:

- Disclosure;
- Types of qualified purchasers to whom securities may be sold;

- The restriction that securities must be purchased only for the purchaser's own account (or for a trust account if the purchaser is a trustee) and not for sale in connection with a distribution of securities;

- The general announcement of the proposed offering; and

- The filing of a notice of this transaction with the Commissioner of Corporations.

[l] Securities Issued Pursuant to Option or Purchase Plan

An offer or sale of any security issued by a corporation or LLC pursuant to a purchase plan or agreement, or issued by a corporation or LLC pursuant to an option plan or agreement, is exempt, at the time of issuance or grant, if the security is exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to *17 C.F.R. 230.701* [*Corp. Code § 25102(o)*].

The exemption is subject to three conditions. First, the offering must be exempt from registration under the Securities Act of 1933 pursuant to Rule 701 dealing with compensatory benefit plans. The latter exemption is in turn subject to a number of conditions. The most important to the use of Rule 701 are the requirement that the issuer be a non-reporting company under the 1934 Act (and not an investment company), a quantity limitation on the amount of stock issued pursuant to Rule 701 ranging from $500,000 to $5,000,000, and a limitation of the aggregate offering price and the number of options outstanding to 15 percent of the total assets of the issuer or 15 percent of the total number of outstanding securities of the class being offered. Second, the terms of any stock option or purchase plan must comply with the substantive and disclosure requirements contained in the applicable provisions of the rules [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.140.41, 260.140.42, 260.140.45, 260.140.46*]. Third, the issuer must file a notice of the transaction no later than 30 days after the initial issuance of any security in California [*see Corp. Code § 25008*] under the plan in accordance with rules adopted by the Commissioner [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.102.19*]. The notice must be accompanied by the filing fee specified in *Corp. Code § 25608(y)* [*Corp. Code § 25102(o)*; *see Corp. Code § 25608.3* (Commissioner may set fee at amount below statutory maximum)]. The failure to file a notice of transaction, or the failure to file that notice within the specified time, however, will not affect the availability of the exemption. Within 15 business days after discovery of the failure to file the notice or after demand by the commissioner, whichever occurs first, an issuer that has failed to file the notice must file it and pay the commissioner a fee equal to the maximum aggregate fee payable had the transaction been qualified under *Corp. Code § 25110* [*Corp. Code § 25102(o)*].

Offers and sales exempt under this subdivision are deemed to be part of a single, discrete offering and are not subject to integration with any other offering or sale, whether qualified as an issuer transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25100 et seq.*], otherwise exempt, or not subject to qualification [*Corp. Code § 25102(o)*].

[m] Sale by Person Licensed Under Capital Access Company Law

A transaction is exempt from *Corp. Code § 25110* when it is an offer or sale of nonredeemable securities to accredited investors [*Corp. Code § 28031* (definition)] by a person licensed under the Capital Access Company Law [*see Corp. Code § 28000 et seq.*]. All nonredeemable securities must be evidenced by certificates that have stamped or printed prominently on their face a legend in a form to be prescribed by rule or order of the Commissioner restricting transfer of the securities in the manner as the rule or order provides [*Corp. Code § 25102(p)*].

[n] Sale of Viatical or Life Settlement Contracts

The listed categories of securities subject to the Corporate Securities Law includes "viatical settlement contracts" as defined in *Ins. Code § 10113.1* and "life settlement contracts," defined as an agreement, other than a viatical settlement contract, for the purchase, sale, assignment, transfer, devise, or bequest of any portion of the death benefit or ownership of a life insurance policy or certificate for consideration that is less than the expected death benefit of the life insurance

policy or certificate [*Corp. Code §§ 25019, 25023(a)*], with specified exceptions [*Corp. Code § 25023(b)*]. Effective January 1, 2010, however, the Insurance Code no longer covers viatical settlement contracts as such, and henceforth regulates only life settlement contracts as now defined in a version of *Ins. Code § 10113.1* that supersedes the version referenced in the Corporate Securities Law [*see Ins. Code § 10113.1(k)*; *see also* Stats. 2009, ch. 343]. The Corporate Securities Law was not amended to reflect that change. Therefore, insofar as it governs viatical settlement contracts as discussed below, it is unclear whether the Corporate Securities Law continues to apply to contracts formerly defined in *Ins. Code § 10113.1* as such; and, while it continues to apply to a life settlement contract as defined in *Corp. Code § 25023*, the Legislature has not indicated whether the Corporate Securities Law applies also to contracts defined as "life settlement contracts" in the current version of *Ins. Code § 10113.1*.

An offer or sale of any viatical or life settlement contract or fractionalized or pooled interest therein is exempt if the transaction meets certain criteria [*Corp. Code § 25102(q)*]. A "viatical settlement contract" is an agreement entered into between a person owning a life insurance policy upon the life of a person with a catastrophic or life-threatening illness or condition and another person by which the policy owner receives compensation or anything of value less than the death benefits of the insurance policy in return for an assignment, transfer, sale, devise, or bequest of the death benefits or ownership of the insurance policy, but does not include an assignment of a life insurance policy to a licensed lending institution or credit union as collateral for a loan [*Corp. Code § 25023(a)*; former *Ins. Code § 10113.1(a)(1)* (repealed eff. 1/1/2010)]. A "life settlement contract" is an agreement, other than a viatical settlement contract, for the purchase, sale, assignment, transfer, devise, or bequest of any portion of the death benefit or ownership of a life insurance policy or certificate for consideration that is less than the expected death benefit of the life insurance policy or certificate [*Corp. Code § 25023(a)*]. These terms do not include any of the following [*Corp. Code § 25023(b)*]:

- The assignment, transfer, sale, devise, or bequest of a death benefit, life insurance policy, or certificate of insurance by the insured or the original owner to any person if it is not accompanied by the publication of any advertisement and is not effected by or through a broker-dealer [*see Corp. Code § 25004*].

- The assignment of a life insurance policy to a bank, savings bank, savings association, credit union, or other lender (whether or not licensed) as collateral for a loan, or to a stop-loss insurer or reinsurer.

- The exercise of accelerated benefits pursuant to the terms of a life insurance policy issued in accordance with the insurance laws of California.

- The assignment, transfer, sale, devise, or bequest of any undivided death benefit, life insurance policy, or certificate of insurance by an entity licensed pursuant to *Ins. Code § 10113.2* [*but see* 2009 Stats., ch. 343, §§ 4, 5 (version of *Ins. Code § 10113.2* referenced in Corporations Code is repealed and replaced with new version effective 1/1/2010; Insurance Code no longer regulates viatical settlements)], or a viatical or life settlement provider licensed from another state, to one individual or entity, provided that the individual or entity represents that it is purchasing for its own account (or trust account, if the entity is a trustee) and not with a view to or for sale in connection with a distribution of the individual death benefit, life insurance policy, or certificate of insurance.

The transaction must meet all of the following criteria in order for the exemption to apply [*Corp. Code § 25102(q)*]:

- Sales of securities are made only to qualified purchasers, or other persons the issuer reasonably believes after reasonable inquiry to be qualified purchasers [*see Corp. Code § 25102(q)(1)* (defining "qualified purchasers")].

- Each purchaser represents that the purchaser is purchasing for that purchaser's own account (or trust account, if the purchaser is a trustee) and not with a view to or for sale in connection with a distribution

of the security [*Corp. Code § 25102(q)(2)*].

- Each natural person purchaser, including a corporation, partnership, or other organization specifically formed by natural persons for the purpose of acquiring the securities offered by the issuer, receives certain written information at least five business days before securities are sold to (or a commitment to purchase is accepted from) the purchaser [*see Corp. Code § 25102(q)(3)* (list of required information)].

In addition to any other rights provided under the Corporate Securities Law, including rescission or damages for misrepresentation [*see, e.g., Corp. Code § 25501*; *see also § 515.246[13]*], a person who purchases a viatical or life settlement contract, or a fractionalized or pooled interest therein, may rescind or cancel the purchase for any reason, at any time before seven calendar days after the date the person remits the required consideration to the issuer or the issuer's agent [*Corp. Code § 25508.5*].

[o] Sale of Series of Notes Secured by Real Property

A transaction is exempt from *Corp. Code § 25110* when it is the sale of a series of notes secured directly by an interest in the same real property, or the sale of undivided interests in a note secured directly by real property equivalent to a series transaction that complies with all of the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10237 et seq.* (imposing notice and advertising requirements on certain sales to 10 or fewer persons by or through a real estate agent) [*Corp. Code § 25102.5*]. A licensed real estate broker who engages in the offer and sale of notes secured directly by real property of various makers, which are a series of notes or notes in which undivided interests are offered and sold, will be deemed to be the issuer of these notes and undivided interests if the notes of the various makers are offered and sold pursuant to a plan or arrangement that is common to the various makers with respect to documentation and loan standards and that include provisions for servicing these notes on behalf of purchasers [*Corp. Code § 25102.5*].

[p] Recapitalizations and Reorganizations

There are also many kinds of exempt issuer transactions involving recapitalizations and reorganizations [*Corp. Code § 25103*].

Generally, negotiations, or an agreement, prior to general solicitation of approval by the holders of equity securities, and subject to that approval, of a change in the rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions of or on outstanding securities, a merger, consolidation, or a sale of assets in consideration of the issuance of securities, or an entity conversion transaction [*see* Corp. Code § 25001.1 (definition)] is exempt [*Corp. Code § 25103(a)*]. Any change in the rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions of or on outstanding securities or any entity conversion transaction [*see* Corp. Code § 25001.1 (definition)] is also exempt unless the holders of at least 25 percent of the outstanding shares or units of any class of securities that will be directly or indirectly affected substantially and adversely by the change or transaction have addresses in California according to the issuer's records [*Corp. Code § 25103(b)*]. An "entity conversion transaction" is a conversion pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1151, 1157, 15677.2, 15677.8, 15911.02, 15911.08, 16902, 16908, 17540.2*, or *17540.8* (covering corporations, limited partnerships, partnerships, and LLCs, respectively), or a conversion that occurs entirely out of state, unless the interests in the entity resulting from the conversion to be held by the equity holders of the entity being converted as a result of the conversion are not securities [*Corp. Code § 25005.1*]. For purposes of *Corp. Code §§ 25103* and *25120*, an entity conversion transaction is not a change in the rights, preferences, privileges, or restrictions of or on outstanding securities or an exchange of securities by the issuer with its existing security holders exclusively [*Corp. Code § 25005.1*].

For purposes of *Corp. Code § 25103(b)* and *(c)* (mergers, except "rollup transactions" defined in *Corp. Code § 25014.6* or excluded from that definition by *Corp. Code § 25014.6(b)(5)* or *(6)*), any securities held to the knowledge of the issuer in the names of broker-dealers, and any securities controlled by any one person who controls directly or indirectly

50 percent or more of the outstanding securities of that class, are not considered outstanding. Whether or not 25 percent of the outstanding securities are held by persons having addresses in California is determined as of the record date for the determination of the security holders entitled to vote on or consent to the action involved, if such approval is required, or if not, as of the date of directors' approval of the action [*Corp. Code § 25103(d)*].

Any such changes in securities incidents also are not exempt in the case of certain changes enumerated in *Corp. Code § 25103(e)* (such as in dividend rights or redemption provisions) that materially and adversely affect any class of shareholders [*Corp. Code § 25103(e)*]. Stock splits or reverse stock splits, except as provided in *Corp. Code § 25103(f),* are also exempt [*Corp. Code § 25103(f)*; *see Corp. Code § 25103(e)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.103.2, 260.103.5*].

Any change in the rights of outstanding debt securities is exempt, except those changes enumerated in *Corp. Code § 25103(g)* (such as changing the rights to interest thereon) which substantially and adversely affect any class of securities [*Corp. Code § 25103(g)*].

An exchange incident to a merger, consolidation, or sale of assets (other than a "rollup transaction" as defined in *Corp. Code § 25014.6*) in consideration of the issuance of equity securities of another entity or any entity conversion transaction [*see* Corp. Code § 25001.1 (definition)] is exempt if the exchange or entity conversion transaction, had it involved the issuance of a security in a transaction subject to *Corp. Code § 25110* (rather than *Corp. Code § 25120*), would have been exempt from qualification by *Corp. Code § 25102(f)* (without giving effect to *Corp. Code § 25102(f)(3)*, regarding purchaser representations), and *either* of the following sets of conditions apply [*Corp. Code § 25103(h)*]:

- (i) Not less than 75 percent of the outstanding equity securities of each constituent or converting entity entitled to vote on the proposed transaction voted in favor of the transaction, (ii) not more than 10 percent of the outstanding equity securities of each constituent or converting entity entitled to vote on the proposed transaction voted against the transaction, and (iii) each constituent or converting entity whose security holders are entitled to vote on the proposed transaction is subject to a state statute that has provisions for dissenters' rights for holders of equity securities entitled to vote on the proposed transaction that do not vote in favor of or voted against the transaction; or

- (i) The transaction is solely for the purposes of changing the issuer's state of incorporation or organization, or form of organization, (ii) all the securities of the same class or series, unless all the security holders of the class or series consent, are treated equally, and (iii) the holders of nonredeemable voting equity securities receive nonredeemable voting equity securities.

Any exchange of securities in connection with any merger or consolidation or sale of corporate assets in consideration wholly or in part of the issuance of securities or any entity conversion transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25005.1*] under or pursuant to a plan of reorganization that, under the Bankruptcy Code, has been confirmed or is subject to confirmation by court decree or order, is an exempt transaction [*Corp. Code § 25103(i)*].

The Commissioner, by rule, may require the acquiring or surviving entity to file a notice of transaction [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.103.6*; *see also Corp. Code § 25608(z)* (filing fee); *see Corp. Code § 25608.3* (Commissioner may set fee at amount below statutory maximum)]. Failure to file the notice or to file it within the time specified by the rule, however, will not affect the availability of the exemption. An acquiring or surviving entity that fails to file the notice as provided by rule of the Commissioner, within 15 business days after demand by the Commissioner, must file the notice and pay a fee equal to the fee payable had the transaction been qualified under *Corp. Code § 25110* or *25120* [*Corp. Code § 25103(h)*].

[q] Nonissuer Transactions Exempted

Exempt nonissuer transactions are listed in *Corp. Code § 25104*. They include privately arranged sales of securities by owners thereof for their own accounts, and sales in the course of business by creditors holding them as loan security [*see Corp. Code § 25104(a), (e)*].

[6] Burden of Proof

In any proceeding under the corporate securities laws, the burden of proving an exemption or an exception from a definition is on the person claiming it [*Corp. Code § 25163*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocationInsurance LawLife InsuranceViatical SettlementsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsExcluded TransactionsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsExempt Nonissuer & Resale TransactionsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsExempted IssuersSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & Sale

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.15

§ 515.15 Securities Broker-Dealers

[1] License Requirement

Subject to the preemption provisions of the National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996 ("the Improvement Act," Pub. L. No. 102-290, 110 Stat. 3416 (H.R. 3005)) [*see § 515.11[1]* and *§ 515.11[5][b]*], unless exempted by *Corp. Code §§ 25200-25208*, a broker-dealer must not effect any transaction in, or induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in California without first obtaining a certificate from the Corporations Commissioner [*Corp. Code § 25210(a)*; *see* Dept. of Corp. Release No. 119-C (Oct. 22, 2008) (broker-dealer licensure requirements for officers and directors of issuers)]. The Commissioner is empowered to promulgate rules establishing exemptions from the certificate requirements [*Corp. Code § 25204*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.200 et seq.*]. In addition, under the Commissioner's rules, certain aliens are not eligible to receive a broker-dealer certificate [*10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 250.60, 250.61*; *see Corp. Code § 25211*].

A person who purchases a security from or sells a security to a broker-dealer that is required to be licensed and has not, at the time of the sale or purchase, applied for and secured from the Commissioner a certificate [*see Corp. Code § 25200 et seq.*] that is in effect at the time of the sale or purchase authorizing that broker-dealer to act in that capacity, may bring an action for rescission of the sale or purchase. If the plaintiff or the defendant no longer owns the security, the plaintiff may bring an action for damages [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(1)*; *see § 515.23*].

Any person acting on behalf of a broker-dealer or on behalf of an issuer must comply with the commissioner's regulations relating to agents before effecting any transaction in, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in California [*Corp. Code § 25210(b)*]. Upon the filing of a notice of (1) the employment or transfer of an agent for a broker-dealer, (2) an amendment to the information filed by the agent at the time of employment or transfer, and (3) the termination of employment of the agent from the broker-dealer, the Commissioner will review the disciplinary histories of agents, consistent with *Corp. Code § 25213* (grounds for censure) [*Corp. Code § 25210(c)*].

The provisions of the Corporate Securities Law requiring a stockbroker to first secure a license are designed to protect

the public against unscrupulous operators [*see, e.g., Corp. Code § 25221* (criminal background checks of broker-dealer job applicants)]. Thus, a contract employing a broker to sell corporate stock is void when the broker is not licensed, and the broker is not allowed to recover his or her commission [*Rhode v. Bartholomew (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 272, 282, 210 P.2d 768]* .

Corp. Code § 25210 does not apply to an agent of an issuer when engaged in transactions exempt by *Corp. Code § 25102(q)* (viatical or life settlement contracts) [*see § 515.14[5][n]*], provided that the agent is a life agent licensed in California or in the purchaser's state of domicile [*Corp. Code § 25209*].

[2] Interaction of Securities Broker-Dealer and Real Estate Broker Licensing Requirements

Securities broker-dealers licensed under federal or California law are not subject to California real estate licensing requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10000 et seq.*] in connection with "any transaction that involves the sale, lease, or exchange of a business opportunity" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10008.5*]. However, the phrase "any transaction involving the sale, lease, or exchange of a business opportunity" does not include any of the acts described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10131* (which generally describes acts relating to real property sales, lease, or mortgage transactions) or *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10131.2* [*see* Ch. 103, *Brokers*] (which applies to persons who charge an advance fee for promoting the sale or lease of real property or of a business opportunity by advance fee listing, advertisement, or other offering, and certain related activities), if the substance of the transaction is to transfer, sell, lease, or exchange an interest in real property for the purpose of evading the real estate licensing requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10008.5*].

"Business opportunity" includes the sale or lease of a business and goodwill of an existing business enterprise or opportunity [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10030*]. "Business opportunity" has been held to encompasses any transfer of ownership of an entire ongoing business in corporate form, whether accomplished by transfer of all the corporate stock or by transfer of all assets [*All Points Traders, Inc. v. Barrington Associates (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 723, 731, 259 Cal. Rptr. 780]* .

Bus. & Prof. Code § 10008.5 apparently was enacted in response to *All Points Traders, Inc. v. Barrington Associates (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 723, 259 Cal. Rptr. 780* , which held that the fact that a transaction might be subject to the securities licensing laws was irrelevant to the determination of whether or not a real estate broker's license was required [*All Points Traders, Inc. v. Barrington Associates (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 723, 734-735, 259 Cal. Rptr. 780* (denying commission relating to sale of business to investment banker because it had no real estate broker's license; investment banker's claim that it was exempt from broker-dealer licensing requirements by *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.204.5* was uncontested)]. The statement of legislative intent provides that *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10008.5* was enacted to clarify existing law regarding licensing requirements and to restore and clarify the basis for practice by which both licensed real estate brokers and licensed securities broker-dealers may participate in transactions involving business opportunities without unnecessary duplicate licensing requirements [1989 Stats., ch. 1116, § 8]. Case law has long provided that a licensed real estate broker may recover any commission due on the sale of a business without a securities broker's license even when that sale involves the transfer of stock if the transfer of stock is only incidental to the transaction [*see, e.g.,* *Lyons v. Stevenson (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 595, 603, 135 Cal. Rptr. 457* ; *Weber v. Jorgensen (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 74, 77, 82-83, 93 Cal. Rptr. 668* (transfer of stock was only incidental to sale of real and personal property, licenses, and permits comprising business opportunity and stock transfer agreement was drafted and handled by attorney, not by broker); *Stoll v. Mallory (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 694, 696, 699, 343 P.2d 970* (decision to effect sale of business by transfer of stock was not made until after broker brought parties together); *but see Owen v. Off (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 751, 753, 227 P.2d 457* (real estate broker without securities broker license who was engaged to sell building denied recovery of commission after seller decided to effect transaction by selling stock of corporation that owned building)].

Similarly, the rules of the Corporations Commissioner exempt licensed real estate brokers from the securities broker licensing requirement with respect to transactions initiated in good faith as sales of real estate or existing businesses that

changed to securities transactions not due to the broker's recommendation or advice. This exemption can only be used for one transaction every 12 months [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.204.1*].

A real estate broker licensed by the California Real Estate Commissioner is not considered a broker-dealer within the securities law definition and thus is not required to hold a broker-dealer's license in order to engage in transactions in securities exempted under *Corp. Code § 25100(f)* (interests in subdivisions or real estate developments) or *Corp. Code § 25100(p)* (notes secured by real property), or in securities the issuance of which is subject to authorization by the Real Estate Commissioner of California, or in transactions exempted by *Corp. Code § 25102(e)* (debt securities that are not offered publicly) [*see Corp. Code § 25004(a)(6)* (exclusion from definition of broker-dealer)]. A real estate broker licensed by the California Real Estate Commissioner is exempt from the securities broker-dealer licensing requirements when engaged in transactions in any interest in any general or limited partnership, joint venture, unincorporated association, or similar organization (but not a corporation) owned beneficially by no more than 100 persons and formed for the sole purpose of, and engaged solely in, investment in or gain from an interest in real property, including, but not limited to, a sale, exchange, trade, or development. An interest held by a husband and wife is considered held by one person for purposes of this provision [*Corp. Code § 25206*].

[3] Duties

[a] Fiduciary Duty

The fiduciary duty of a stockbroker to his or her client requires the broker to exercise the utmost good faith and integrity [*Blankenheim v. E.F. Hutton & Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1475, 266 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1531, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 708-709, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222]* . The stockbroker-client relationship is fiduciary in nature regardless of whether the customer is a sophisticated investor or not [*Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1533, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740]* , and regardless of whether the broker actually controls the account. The scope or extent of the broker's fiduciary duty varies, however, depending on the facts of the particular case [*Petersen v. Securities Settlement Corp. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1456, 277 Cal. Rptr. 468* ; *Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1534-1536, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740* (describing *Caravan Mobile Home Sales v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 561, 567* , and Leboce, S. A. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner, etc. *(9th Cir. 1983) 709 F.2d 605, 607-608* , as involving relatively narrow scope of agency and duty)].

[b] When Broker Controls Account

Although a stockbroker may be obliged merely to carry out his or her customer's stated objectives when the broker is acting merely as an agent to carry out purchases or sales selected by the customer, with or without the broker's recommendation, when the customer invariably follows the broker's recommendations, the broker controls the account [*Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1522-1534, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740* (when broker's authority to select investments is formalized, account is referred to as "discretionary"); *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 719, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222]* .

Whether or not the customer and the broker refer to the account as a discretionary account, if the broker is the controlling factor in the transactions for all practical purposes, the broker's fiduciary duty obligates him or her to determine the customer's actual financial situation and needs [*Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1531-1532, 1537-1538, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 719, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222]* . If, based on the customer's actual financial situation and needs, it would be improper and unsuitable to carry out the customer's expressed objectives, the broker has the further obligation (1) to make sure that the customer understands the investment risks in the light of his or her actual financial situation; (2) to inform the customer that no speculative investments are suitable if the customer persists in wanting to engage in speculative transactions without the broker's being persuaded that the customer is able to bear the financial risks involved; and (3)

to completely refrain from soliciting the customer's purchase of any speculative securities that the broker considers to be beyond the customer's risk threshold. As long as these duties are met, if the customer nevertheless insists on purchasing speculative securities, the stockbroker is not barred from advising the customer about various speculative securities and purchasing for the customer those securities that the customer selects [*Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1532, 1538-1539, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 721, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222]* .

Sometimes, the foregoing obligations require a stockbroker to make an independent determination regarding the customer's resources or sophistication. For instance, when a trustee of a profit-sharing trust fund approached a stockbroker to invest fund assets in options, which are highly speculative, the broker had the obligation to investigate the nature and amount of funds sought to be invested before soliciting or recommending any speculative investments and to refrain from soliciting transactions when it became apparent that they would be inappropriate [*Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1532, 1538-1540, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740]* .

[c] When Broker Is Limited to Clearing and Trading Functions

A broker's duty does not always extend to providing investment advice. For instance, a "clearing broker," that is, a broker that has a contractual relationship with the stockbroker and the investor but will only execute orders on the primary broker's instruction, whose contractual obligations are limited to clearing and trading functions, and who has no direct contact with the investor and makes no specific representations to the investor, does not owe a duty to investigate the suitability of stocks the primary broker recommends [*Petersen v. Securities Settlement Corp. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1453-1457, 277 Cal. Rptr. 468* ; *Mars v. Wedbush Morgan Securities, Inc. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1608, 1614-1615, 283 Cal. Rptr. 238]* .

Restatement (Second) of Torts § 551(2)(e) would require disclosure by any broker who knew that an investor was about to enter into a transaction under a mistaken belief about the transaction if the investor, because of the relationship with the broker, the customs of the trade, or other objective circumstances, would reasonably expect disclosure of the facts [*Petersen v. Securities Settlement Corp. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1457-1458, 277 Cal. Rptr. 468* (clearing broker had no knowledge that plaintiff was ignorant of important fact; contract between clearing broker and primary broker specifically prohibited clearing broker from giving investment advice)].

[d] No Special Relationship Justifying Tort Damages

Even though the relationship between investor and stockbroker is fiduciary in nature, it is generally motivated by the investor's desire to make profits, and thus is not a special relationship that entitles the investor to tort damages for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing [*Trustees of Capital Wholesale Electric etc. Fund v. Shearson Lehman Brothers, Inc. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 617, 623-625, 270 Cal. Rptr. 566]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsDuties & LiabilitiesCare, Good Faith & Reasonable SkillGeneral OverviewReal Property LawBrokersDiscipline, Licensing & RegulationSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityRescission & RestitutionSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment Advisers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.16

§ 515.16 Administrative Enforcement

[1] Powers of Commissioner

The Commissioner of Corporations has broad powers affecting securities. The Commissioner may bring an action for injunction, receivership, or other appropriate ancillary relief, and an action on behalf of the state for civil penalty, in the case of violations of the law [*see Corp. Code §§ 25530, 25535*; *see also Corp. Code § 25530.1* (prohibitions that may be imposed in *Corp. Code § 25530* proceeding)]. The Commissioner also may bring an action in federal court for violation of the federal Commodities Exchange Act [*see Corp. Code § 25536(a)*], may hold investigations and conduct hearings regarding possible violations by persons who issue or trade securities [*see Corp. Code § 25531*], and may issue desist and refrain orders if a security, which is subject to qualification, is being sold without having been qualified, or if a security not subject to qualification [*see Corp. Code §§ 25100.1, 25101.1, 25102.1*] is being sold without meeting applicable notice requirements [*see Corp. Code § 25532*]. The Commissioner may also issue desist and refrain orders if in the Commissioner's opinion, a person has violated or is violating *Corp. Code § 25401* (misrepresentation of material fact) [*Corp. Code § 25532(c)*].

The Commissioner also may issue a stop order denying effectiveness to, or suspending or revoking the effectiveness of, any underwritten securities offering that is automatically qualified or qualified by administrative application, or may suspend or revoke any permit when qualification is achieved by the issuance of a permit, if the Commissioner finds that (1) the order is in the public interest and (2) the proposed plan of business of the issuer or the proposed issuance or sale of securities is not fair, just, or equitable, that the issuer does not intend to transact its business fairly and honestly, or the securities proposed to be issued or the method to be used in issuing them will tend to work a fraud on the purchaser [*Corp. Code § 25140(a)(1)*]. The Commissioner may issue a stop order denying effectiveness to, or suspending or revoking the effectiveness of, any securities offering that is not underwritten and that was automatically qualified or qualified by administrative application unless the Commissioner finds (1) that the stop order is not in the public interest, and (2) that the proposed plan of business of the applicant or the proposed issuance of securities is fair, just, and equitable, that the issuer intends to transact its business fairly and honestly, and that the securities that the issuer proposes to issue or the method to be used in issuing them will not work a fraud on the purchaser of those securities [*Corp. Code § 25140(a)(2)*].

The Commissioner may refuse to issue a permit for a security (other than a security issued as part of a recapitalization or reorganization) unless he or she finds that the proposed plan of business of the applicant and the proposed issuance of securities are fair, just, and equitable, that the applicant intends to transact its business fairly and honestly, and that the securities which it proposes to issue, and the methods to be used by it in issuing them, will work a fraud on the purchaser of a security [*Corp. Code § 25140(b)*].

The Commissioner may refuse to issue a permit for a security issued in connection with a recapitalization or reorganization unless he or she finds that the proposed plan of recapitalization on reorganization and the proposed issuance of the securities are fair, just, and equitable to all security holders affected [*Corp. Code § 25140(c)*].

The Commissioner has the additional power to summarily postpone or suspend the effectiveness of any qualification pending final determination of any proceeding he or she may bring under *Corp. Code §§ 25140-25151*. Notice must be given of the summary action, after which a hearing may be requested [*Corp. Code § 25143(a)*].

[2] Review of Administrative Actions

All major decisions and orders of the Commissioner of Corporations are subject to an administrative hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 11500-11528*]. Stop orders affecting qualification are reviewable under the regular administrative hearing procedure. If qualification consists of the issuance of a permit rather than occurring automatically through the filing process, the applicant must request the hearing, which then will be held on notice within 20 business days unless the permit is first issued [*Corp. Code § 25143(b)*]. Desist and refrain orders issued against transactions that are believed to have evaded qualification requirements also are reviewable by this administrative procedure, on request, and those orders are automatically rescinded unless the hearing is held within 15 business days (or a longer period agreed upon by the parties) [*Corp. Code § 25532(d)*], as is the case with orders against advertising [*Corp. Code § 25302*]. Actions taken against licensed marketing personnel are reviewable in a similar manner [*see Corp. Code §§ 25215, 25220, 25233*], as is the case with orders against advertising [*Corp. Code § 25302*].

For procedure and forms applicable to administrative hearings generally, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* , and Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , et seq.

In addition, the Department of Corporations has its own informal hearing procedure. Hearings held in connection with exchanges of securities are special departmental reviews [*see Corp. Code § 25142*]. Otherwise, the person entitled to a regular administrative hearing may arrange, with the consent of the Commissioner of Corporations, to have a hearing conducted before the Department of Corporations by an independent hearing officer [*Corp. Code § 25702*]. This hearing commences with the serving by the Department of Corporations of a notice of hearing stating the facts, the issues, and the time and place of hearing, after which the hearing proceeds according to an order [*see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 250.17-250.25*].

Every final order, decision, license, or other official act of the Commissioner of Corporations is subject to judicial review [*Corp. Code § 25609*]. For procedure and forms applicable to review of administrative hearings, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & Enforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.17

§ 515.17 Civil Remedies

In addition to extensive administrative powers for enforcing the Corporate Securities Act of 1968, the act provides a large number of civil remedies for statutory liabilities that may be privately enforced. These liabilities include the prohibition against market manipulation [*see § 515.18*], material misrepresentations in the offering or selling of any security [*see § 515.19*], violations of provisions regulating the qualification and issuance of securities [*see § 515.21[1]*], and the prohibition against insider trading [*see § 515.22[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.18

§ 515.18 Liability for Market Manipulation

It is unlawful to engage, directly or indirectly, in certain designated acts of market manipulation in California [*Corp. Code § 25400*; *see §§ 515.400 -515.404*]. These acts are discussed below.

[1] Wash Sales

A person may not do any of the following, for the purpose of creating a false or misleading appearance of active trading in any security, or a false or misleading appearance with respect to the market for any security [*Corp. Code § 25400(a)*; *see §§ 515.400, 515.401*]:

- Effect any transaction in a security which involves no change in the beneficial ownership thereof;

- Enter an order or orders for the purchase of any security with the knowledge that an order or orders of substantially the same size, at substantially the same time and at substantially the same price, for the sale of any such security, has been or will be entered by or for the same or different parties; or

- Enter an order or orders for the sale of any security with the knowledge that an order or orders of substantially the same size, at substantially the same time and at substantially the same price, for the purchase of any such security, has been or will be entered by or for the same or different parties.

[2] Illusory Market

A person may not effect, alone or with one or more other persons, a series of transactions in any security either creating actual or apparent active trading in the security or raising or depressing the price of the security for the purpose of inducing the purchase or sale of the security by others [*Corp. Code § 25400(b)*; *see § 515.402*].

[3] Tipster Sheet

A person who is a broker-dealer or other person selling or offering for sale or purchasing or offering to purchase the

security may not induce the purchase or sale of any security by the circulation or dissemination of information to the effect that the price of any such security will or is likely to rise or fall because of market operations of any one or more persons conducted for the purpose of raising or depressing the price of that security [*Corp. Code § 25400(c)*; *see § 515.403*].

[4] False or Misleading Statements

If the person is a broker-dealer or other person selling or offering for sale or purchasing or offering to purchase the security, that person may not make, for the purpose of inducing the purchase or sale of the security by others, any statement which either (1) was, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made, false or misleading with respect to any material fact, or (2) omitted to state any material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading. The person must have known or had reasonable ground to believe the statement was false or misleading [*Corp. Code § 25400(d)*; *see § 515.404*].

The California Supreme Court has construed *Corp. Code §§ 25400(d)* and *25500* to find that the remedy provided in those sections is not limited to transactions made in California. The language of *Corp. Code § 25400* which proscribes certain actions "in this state" simply describes the location in which the proscribed conduct must occur [*Diamond Multimedia Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 19 Cal. 4th 1036, 1046, 1064, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 968 P.2d 539* , *cert. denied, 527 U.S. 1003* (noting that Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998, which preempts certain state class actions [P.L. 105-353, 112 Stat. 3227; *see 15 U.S.C. §§ 77p, 78bb*], was inapplicable to pending actions and thus had no impact on this case)]. The Court has also held that liability for market manipulation is not limited to sellers and buyers of corporate stock, or to corporations or broker-dealers, but extends to individuals and to the purchase and sale of securities for which there is no open market [*StorMedia Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 449, 457-461, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 843, 976 P.2d 214]* . Furthermore, no actual sale is necessary to find a violation of *Corp. Code § 25400(d)*, and that subdivision does not require that the intent or purpose be to induce a particular buyer to purchase the stock [*StorMedia Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 449, 461-463, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 843, 976 P.2d 214* (privity is not required)].

Corp. Code §§ 25400(d) and *25500*, however, apply only to defendants who were engaged in market activity at the time of making misrepresentations. Defendants must both (1) sell or offer to sell or buy or offer to buy a security, and (2) make misleading statements for the purpose of inducing the purchase or sale of a security, in order to be liable under *Corp. Code § 25500* [*Kamen v. Lindly (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 197, 205-206, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (trial court properly sustained defendants' demurrers on basis that plaintiffs failed to allege that defendants engaged in both activities); *see Murphy v. BDO Seidman, LLP (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 687, 705-706, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770* (aggrieved investors failed to state cause of action because defendant accountants who prepared allegedly misleading financial statements did not buy or sell, or offer to buy or sell, stock)].

[5] Tipster Hireling

A person, for a consideration received directly or indirectly from a broker-dealer or other person selling or offering for sale or purchasing or offering to purchase the security, may not induce the purchase or sale of any security by the circulation or dissemination of information to the effect that the price of the security will or is likely to rise or fall because of the market operations of any one or more persons conducted for the purpose of raising or depressing the price of the security [*Corp. Code § 25400(e)*; *see § 515.403*].

[6] Civil Liability for Manipulation

Anyone who willfully participates in an act or transaction constituting proscribed market manipulation is liable to anyone else who purchases or sells any security at a price that was affected by the event for the damages sustained

thereby [*Corp. Code § 25500*; *see California Amplifier, Inc. v. RLI Ins. Co. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 102, 106, 116-117, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 915* (liability under *Corp. Code § 25500* requires "willful act" within meaning of *Ins. Code § 533*, which precludes coverage under directors and officers liability insurance for losses caused by a willful act of insured)].

The damages that may be recovered are the difference between the price at which the other person purchased or sold securities and the market value which the securities would have had at the time of the purchase or sale in the absence of the manipulative activity, plus interest at the legal rate [*Corp. Code § 25500*]. Because there is no reference in *Corp. Code § 25500* to any date other than the date of the pertinent transaction, prejudgment interest accrues from that date [*OCM Principal Opportunities Fund v. CIBC World Markets Corp. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 835, 883 n.32, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828*].

[7] Limitation of Actions for Manipulation

An action to enforce liability for proscribed market manipulation must be brought before the expiration of five years after the act or transaction constituting the violation, or before the expiration of two years after discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation, whichever period expires first [*Corp. Code § 25506(b)*; *but see Corp. Code § 25506(a)* (shorter periods for actions commenced before 2005)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawTrade Practices & Unfair CompetitionState RegulationCoverageGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & Sale

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.19

§ 515.19 Liability for Material Misrepresentation

[1] Untruth or Omission

It is unlawful for anyone to offer or sell, or to buy or offer to buy, a security in California by means of a written or oral communication which (1) includes an untrue statement of a material fact, or (2) omits to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading [*Corp. Code § 25401*]. The prohibition against untrue statements or material omissions in *Corp. Code § 25401* does not create a strict liability offense. Rather, knowledge of the falsity or misleading nature of a statement or of the materiality of an omission, or criminal negligence in failing to investigate and discover them, are elements of the criminal offense described in *Corp. Code § 25401* [*People v. Simon (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 493, 522, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 278, 886 P.2d 1271* (defendant solicited investments in limited partnerships but did not advise investors of transfers of funds among partnerships because defendant believed that, as general partner, he had authority to make such transfers)].

Anyone who violates *Corp. Code § 25401* is liable to the plaintiff, who may sue either for rescission or for damages if the plaintiff or the defendant, as the case may be, no longer owns the security [*Corp. Code § 25501*; *see §§ 515.405, 515.406*].

Liability requires privity between the plaintiff and the defendant [*Corp. Code § 25501* ("[a]ny person who violates Section 25401 shall be *liable to the person who purchases a security from him or sells a security to him,* who may sue either for rescission or for damages" [emphasis added]); *Apollo Capital Fund LLC v. Roth Capital Partners (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 226, 252-254, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199* (broker-dealer that was placement agent for issuing company in securities offering had no fiduciary duty to investors who were not broker-dealer's customers and so could not be liable to them under *Corp. Code § 25501*, but broker-dealer could be liable to any customer who bought those securities through customer's account with broker-dealer)].

[2] Rescission for Misrepresentation

In a suit for recission [*see § 515.405*], a purchaser may recover the consideration paid for the security, plus interest at the legal rate, less the amount of any income received on the security, on tender thereof. A rescinding seller may recover

the security, on tender of the consideration paid for the security plus interest at the legal rate, less the amount of any income received by the defendant on the security. Tender may be made at any time before entry of judgment [*Corp. Code § 25501*].

[3] Damages for Misrepresentation

In a suit for damages [*see § 515.406*], a purchaser may recover the amount equal to the difference between (1) the price at which the security was bought, plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase, and (2) the value of the security at the time it was disposed of by the plaintiff plus the amount of any income received on the security by the plaintiff. A seller may recover the amount equal to the difference between (1) the value of the security at the time of filing of the complaint plus the amount of any income received by the defendant on the security, and (2) the price at which the security was sold plus interest at the legal rate from date of sale [*Corp. Code § 25501*].

[4] Limitation of Actions for Misrepresentation

An action to enforce liability based on a purchase or sale effected by means of a material misrepresentation must be brought before the expiration of five years after the act or transaction constituting the violation, or before the expiration of two years after discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation, whichever period expires first [*Corp. Code § 25506(b)*; *but see Corp. Code § 25506(a)* (shorter periods for actions commenced before 2005)].

With respect to commencement of the limitation period "after discovery by the plaintiff of the facts," *Corp. Code § 25506* imposes a notice-inquiry standard. The limitation period starts when the plaintiff knows the facts constituting the violation or when the circumstances would suggest to an investor of ordinary intelligence the possibility of having been defrauded [*Deveny v. Entropin, Inc. (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 408, 423, 428-429, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 807* ; *contra, Eisenbaum v. Western Energy Resources, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 314, 325-326, 267 Cal. Rptr. 5* (same court's construction of identical language in *Corp. Code § 25507*, distinguished in *Deveny; see § 515.21[5]*)].

[5] Affirmative Defenses

[a] Plaintiff's Knowledge of Misrepresentation

A defendant alleged to have sold a security to or purchased a security from a plaintiff by means of material misrepresentation is not liable if he or she is able to prove that the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untruth or omission involved [*Corp. Code § 25501*; *see § 515.408*].

[b] Defendant's Ignorance of Misrepresentation

A defendant alleged to have effected a securities transaction by means of a material misrepresentation may avoid liability by proving that he or she exercised reasonable care and did not know of the untrue representation or omission, or that even if the defendant had exercised reasonable care, he or she still would not have known of the misrepresentation [*Corp. Code § 25501*; *see § 515.409*].

[6] Liability of Management Principals or Persons Who Materially Aid in Violation

Joint and several liability attaches to the following [*Corp. Code § 25504*]; *see § 515.405*:

- Anyone who directly or indirectly controls a person liable for material misrepresentation under *Corp. Code § 25501*.

- Any partner in a firm so liable.

- Any principal executive officer or director of a corporation so liable.
- Anyone occupying a similar status or performing similar functions.
- Any employee of a person so liable who materially aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation.
- Any broker-dealer or agent who gives similar aid.

Such a person is liable with and to the same extent as any person liable under *Corp. Code § 25501* unless the person who is alleged to be liable under *Corp. Code § 25504* had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist [*Corp. Code § 25504*]. See *§ 515.409* for an affirmative defense based on such lack of knowledge.

The test under *Corp. Code § 25504* is the same as that under federal securities laws (*15 U.S.C. §§ 77o, 78t*); therefore, federal cases are persuasive authority in this area [*Durham v. Kelly (9th Cir. 1987) 810 F.2d 1500, 1505* (addressing claims under both state and federal law)].

[a] Limitation of Actions for Liability of Principals and Aides

No action may be maintained to enforce any joint or several liability as described above [*see § 515.19[6]*] unless the action is brought within the limitation periods applicable to bringing actions against the primary defendants in such situations [*Corp. Code §§ 25506, 25507*; *see § 515.19[4]*].

[b] Defense Based on Principal's or Aide's Ignorance

No joint or several liability may be imposed on a management principal or aide if he or she had no knowledge of, or reasonable grounds to believe in the existence of, the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist [*Corp. Code § 25504*; *see § 515.430*].

[7] Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons

Anyone who, with intent to deceive or defraud, materially assists another in making a material misrepresentation in the offer or sale of securities [*see Corp. Code § 25401*], is jointly and severally liable with the person primarily responsible [*see Corp. Code §§ 25501, 25503*] for the violation [*Corp. Code § 25504.1*; *see § 515.246[13]*]. The same limitation of actions applicable to suits against management principals and aides [*see § 515.19[6][a]*] is applicable against materially assisting persons [*see Corp. Code §§ 25506, 25507*].

The requirement for imposition of aider and abettor liability under *Corp. Code § 25504.1* is stricter than that required under federal law. *Corp. Code § 25504.1* requires the aider or abettor to have an intent to deceive or defraud, whereas federal law only requires that the aider or abettor have actual knowledge of the primary wrong and substantially assist in furthering it [*Orloff v. Allman (9th Cir. 1987) 819 F.2d 904, 907-908]* .

[8] Joint and Several Liability of Experts

Professional experts may be jointly and severally liable for injuries resulting from material misrepresentation made in connection with a securities transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25501*; *see also § 515.406*]. A professional expert includes any accountant, engineer, appraiser, or other person whose profession gives authority to a statement made thereby [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)*] including, without limitation, an actuary, assayer, attorney, financial analyst, geologist, investment adviser, mineralogist, petrologist, or tax consultant, and any firm or other organization or association

engaged in the practice of any such profession [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.504.2.1(a)*].

The professional must have given written consent to be, and have been, named in a prospectus or offering circular distributed in connection with the offer or sale of securities as having prepared or certified in that capacity either any part of the document or any written report or valuation which is distributed with or referred to in the document [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)*]. The expert will be deemed to have prepared or certified only those portions of the violative documents which are expressly stated with the expert's written consent to have been made on his or her authority [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(c)*].

In order for the expert to be held jointly and severally liable for a material misrepresentation, the part of the document prepared or certified, or the report or valuation distributed or referred to therein, must include an untrue statement of a material fact, or must omit to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading. Additionally, the person asserting the liability must have acquired a security described in the document in reliance on the untrue statement, or, if a material omission was made, in reliance on that part of the document or on the report or valuation without notice of the omission [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)(1), (2)*].

[a] Limitation of Actions for Experts' Liability

No action may be maintained to enforce liability against professional experts as described above on a joint and several basis unless brought within one year after the discovery of the facts constituting the violation, or after that discovery should have been made by the exercise of reasonable diligence. In no event may an action be brought more than three years after the act or transaction constituting the violation [*Corp. Code § 25506.1*].

[b] Defense Based on Expert's Belief in Representations

An accountant, engineer, appraiser, or other professional person will not be held liable as provided in *Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)* if he or she is able to sustain the burden of proof as to a reasonable belief in the accuracy of the representations made. The expert must have had reasonable ground to believe, after reasonable investigation, and must have believed at the time of consenting to the use of his or her name that the statements so included in the part of the document, or in the report or valuation, were true, and that there was no omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(1)*; *see § 515.411*].

[c] Defense Based on Inaccurate Reflection of the Expert's Opinion

An accountant, engineer, appraiser, or other professional person will not be held liable jointly and severally for a material misrepresentation if he or she is able to sustain the burden of proof as to the fact that the document in question did not accurately reflect his or her views. The part of the document in question must not fairly represent the defendant's statement as an expert, or must not be a fair extract from that person's report or valuation as an expert [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(2)*; *see § 515.412*].

[d] Defense Based on Expert's Filing of Disclaimer of Report

An accountant, engineer, appraiser, or other professional person will not be held liable jointly and severally for a material misrepresentation if he or she is able to sustain the burden of proof as to the fact that he or she filed an appropriate disclaimer of the document, report, or valuation in question. Prior to the acquisition of the security by the person asserting the liability, the expert must have advised the issuer and the Commissioner of Corporations, in writing, that the expert would not be responsible for the part of the document, report, or valuation in question [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(3)*; *see § 515.413*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudDefensesSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudElements of ProofSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudStatutes of LimitationsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityRescission & RestitutionSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & Sale

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.20

§ 515.20 Holder's Action for Fraud or Negligent Misrepresentation

A plaintiff may bring a "holder's action" (a cause of action by persons wrongfully induced to hold, rather than purchase or sell, stock) for fraud or negligent misrepresentation. In *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc.* [*Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 167, 171, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 65 P.3d 1255]* , a stockholder filed an action claiming that defendant corporation and its officers sent its stockholders a fraudulent quarterly financial report that grossly overreported earnings and profits. The plaintiff alleged that when the fraud was discovered, the price of the corporate stock dropped sharply, causing injury to stockholders like himself. The court concluded that California law should allow such an action, as it has long acknowledged that if the effect of a misrepresentation is to induce persons not to take action and they are damaged as a result, they have a cause of action for fraud or negligent misrepresentation. That conclusion does not expand the tort of common law fraud, but simply applies long-established legal principles to the factual setting of misrepresentations that induce stockholders to hold onto their stock [*Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 167, 171, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 65 P.3d 1255]* . The court noted that persons who hold stock in reliance upon misrepresentations are totally dependent for redress upon state common law causes of action. They have no remedy under either federal *Rule 10b-5* [*see 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5*] or California's Corporate Securities Law [*see Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*] because those provisions are limited to suits by buyers or sellers of securities [*Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 167, 180, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 65 P.3d 1255]* . However, the court also held that the holder's cause of action is limited to stockholders who can make a bona fide showing of actual reliance on the misrepresentation [*Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc. (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 167, 171, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 65 P.3d 1255* (finding that plaintiff failed to plead element of actual reliance with sufficient specificity to meet that requirement, and remanding with directions to grant plaintiff leave to amend complaint); *see Murphy v. BDO Seidman, LLP (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 687, 701-702, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770* (citing *Small* for proposition that holding stock can be actionable reliance, and following its guidance in directing trial court to grant appellants leave to amend to specify how many shares they would have sold and when they would have sold them)].

For detailed discussion of common law actions for fraud and negligent misrepresentation, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudElementsTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationNegligent MisrepresentationElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.21

§ 515.21 Liability for Regulatory Violations

[1] Types of Liability

Civil liability also may be imposed based on the violation of any one of certain statutes pertaining to securities regulation administered by the Commissioner of Corporations, or the violation of certain regulatory requirements made pursuant to the following statutes [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see §§ 515.419 -515.422*]:

- *Corp. Code § 25110* (qualification of issuer transactions other than under *Corp. Code § 25120*) [*see §§ 515.419, 515.420*; *see also Apollo Capital Fund LLC v. Roth Capital Partners (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 226, 250-252, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199* (investors' cause of action arising from sale of securities not qualified in accordance with state law requirements was not preempted by federal law)];

- *Corp. Code § 25130* (qualification of nonissuer transactions) [*see §§ 515.419, 515.420*];

- *Corp. Code § 25133* (requirements under escrow or certain legend conditions imposed on stock by the commissioner);

- Condition of qualification under *Corp. Code §§ 25110-25115* (qualification procedures for issuer transactions other than under *Corp. Code § 25120*) imposed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25141* (conditions permitted to be imposed by the commissioner) [*see § 515.422*];

- Order suspending trading issued pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25219* (commissioner's ability to summarily suspend trading on exchanges or over-the-counter trading for certain periods); and

- With respect to recapitalization and reorganization types of issuer transactions:

    - *Corp. Code § 25120* (qualification) [*see § 515.421*];

- Condition of qualification under *Corp. Code §§ 25120-25122* (qualification procedures) imposed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25141* (conditions permitted to be imposed by commissioner) [*see § 515.422*].

[2] Rescission for Violation

With respect to regulatory violations, except those involving recapitalizations and reorganizations, the plaintiff may rescind the transaction by tendering the securities at any time before entry of judgment and recover the consideration paid for the security with interest at the legal rate, less the amount of any income received therefrom. The plaintiff must take damages in lieu of the consideration if the consideration is no longer capable of being returned, which damages must be equal to the value of the consideration plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see § 515.419*].

[3] Damages When Rescission Unavailable

With respect to regulatory violations, except those specifying recapitalizations and reorganizations, the plaintiff must accept damages if he or she no longer owns the security involved. If the original consideration is recoverable, plaintiff receives the difference between (1) the purchase price plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase, and (2) the value of the security at the time it was disposed of by plaintiff plus the amount of any income received therefrom by the plaintiff. If the consideration is incapable of being returned, plaintiff receives the difference between (1) the value of the consideration given for the security plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase, and (2) the value of the security at the time it was disposed of by the plaintiff plus the amount of any income received therefrom by plaintiff [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see § 515.420*].

[4] Damages When Recapitalization or Reorganization Involved

When an action for failure to qualify or comply with a condition of a recapitalization or reorganization is involved, plaintiff may recover the difference between (1) the value of the consideration received by the defendant seller, and (2) the value of the security at the time it was received by the plaintiff buyer, with interest thereon at the legal rate from the date of purchase [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see § 515.421*].

[5] Limitation of Actions for Violations

An action for violation of the regulatory requirements must be brought before the expiration of two years after the violation on which it is based, or the expiration of one year after the discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation, whichever expires first [*Corp. Code § 25507(a)*].

By its plain language, *Corp. Code § 25507(a)* requires actual knowledge, not just "inquiry notice," even if the plaintiff and defendant do not have a fiduciary relationship [*Eisenbaum v. Western Energy Resources, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 314, 325-326, 267 Cal. Rptr. 5]* ; *but see Deveny v. Entropin, Inc. (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 408, 422-423, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 807* (distinguishing *Eisenbaum* and reaching opposite conclusion about construction of identical language in *Corp. Code § 25506*, discussed in *§ 515.19[4]*). When there is a fiduciary relationship, the plaintiff is entitled to rely on statements by defendant that the offering is qualified or exempt from qualification [*Eisenbaum v. Western Energy Resources, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 314, 326, 267 Cal. Rptr. 5* ; *Sherman v. Lloyd (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 693, 700, 226 Cal. Rptr. 495]* . Plaintiff's right to relief is statutory, and the doctrine of unclean hands does not enter into the situation. Thus, the fact that the buyer, a California resident, was told by defendant to use an out-of-state address does not place the buyer in pari delicto or foreclose the right to rescission [*Eisenbaum v. Western Energy Resources, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 314, 326-327, 267 Cal. Rptr. 5]* .

[6] Defense Based on Qualification of Securities Prior to Receipt of Consideration

No person is liable under the civil remedy provisions for violation of qualification requirements [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130*] if the sale of the security is qualified prior to the payment or receipt of any part of the consideration for the security sold. This defense is available even though an offer to sell or a contract of sale may have been made or entered into without qualification. This defense does not apply to complaints for violations of conditions on qualification imposed by the Commissioner of Corporations or of suspension of trading thereby [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see § 515.426*].

[7] Defense Based on Written Repurchase Offer

No buyer may commence an action for the above-described regulatory violations or may attempt to impose joint or several liability therefor if, before the suit is commenced, the buyer has received a special offer prescribed by statute but has failed to accept it in writing within the specified time after its receipt. The offer must be in writing, approved as to form by the Commissioner of Corporations, and must contain the following [*Corp. Code § 25507(b)*; *see § 515.428*]:

- A statement of how liability may have arisen under *Corp. Code § 25503*;

- An offer either to repurchase the security for a cash price payable on delivery of the security, to pay the buyer an amount in cash equal in either case to the amount recoverable by the buyer in accordance with *Corp. Code § 25503*, or to rescind the transaction by putting the parties back in the same position as before the transaction;

- A provision permitting the offer to be accepted by the buyer at any time within a specified period of not less than 30 days after the date the offer was received, unless the buyer has previously rejected it;

- The provisions of *Corp. Code § 25507(b)* (setting forth requirements); and

- Other information the commissioner may require by rule or order.

Pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25507(d)*, the Commissioner of Corporations has promulgated *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.507*, which imposes certain conditions on approval of the rectifying offer. These conditions may require [*Corp. Code § 25507(c)*]:

- That equivalent and concurrent offers be made to all other investors similarly affected;

- That the offer be conditioned on the issuer not being disabled from business by reason of acceptances of such offers;

- That the offer be made within a specified time after approval;

- That a rejected offer will not act as a bar to action in a case in which the offeree did not pay money or the offer is of rescission and the offeree would not recover damages equivalent to that allowed by statute [*see Corp. Code § 25503*] or the parties would not be placed in the same position as before the transaction; or

- That the offeror file a report concerning the proceedings involving the offer and related legal compliance. A prescribed form of irrevocable consent to service of process on the Commissioner on behalf of the offeror must be filed with the Commissioner, unless one is already on file in connection with a qualification [*see Corp. Code § 25507(d)*].

[8] Joint and Several Liability of Offering Principals and Underwriters

Anyone on whose behalf an offering is made, and any underwriter of the offering (whether on a best efforts or a firm commitment basis) is jointly and severally liable for regulating violations [*see § 515.21[1]*]. In no event, however, is an underwriter liable for damages in excess of the total price at which the securities underwritten and distributed thereby to the public were offered to the public. This limitation on damages does not apply if the underwriter has knowingly received from the issuer for acting as an underwriter some benefit, directly or indirectly, in which all other underwriters similarly situated did not share in proportion to their respective interest in the underwriting [*Corp. Code § 25503*; *see § 515.419*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityRescission & RestitutionTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsJoint & Several Liability

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.22

§ 515.22 Liability for Insider Trading

[1] Prohibited Acts

It is unlawful for an issuer or anyone who is an officer, director, or controlling person, or any other person whose relationship to the issuer gives him or her personal access, directly or indirectly, to material information about the issuer not generally available to the public, to purchase or sell any security of the issuer in California at a time when he or she knows material information about the issuer gained from the relationship that would significantly affect the market price of that security and that is not generally available to the public, and that the insider knows is not intended to be so available [*Corp. Code § 25402*]. For purposes of *Corp. Code § 25402*, an issuer or person described in that section will not be deemed to have purchased or sold an issuer's security at a time when that person knows material information about the issuer if the issuer or person demonstrates that the purchase or sale of the issuer's security was in accordance with Rule 10b5-1(c) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*10 Cal. Code Reg. 260.402*; *see 17 C.F.R. § 240.10b5-1(c)* (providing affirmative defense to allegations of insider trading under federal securities laws); *see also* Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities* , § 466.05 (Matthew Bender)].

[2] Civil Liability to Purchaser or Seller for Insider Dealings

Anyone who violates the insider trading prohibition contained in *Corp. Code § 25402* is liable for damages to the person who purchases a security from, or sells a security to, the insider [*Corp. Code § 25502*; *see § 515.413*]. Damages are equal to the difference between the price at which the security was purchased or sold and the market value that the security would have had at the time of the transaction if the information known to the defendant had been publicly disseminated prior to that time, and a reasonable time had elapsed for the market to absorb the information. Interest also is awarded at the legal rate [*Corp. Code § 25502*].

[3] Civil Liability to Issuer for Insider Dealings

Any person other than the issuer who violates *Corp. Code § 25402* with respect to securities issued by a corporation that has total assets in excess of $1 million and a class of equity security held of record by 500 or more persons is liable to the corporate issuer of the security purchased or sold in violation of *Corp. Code § 25402* for treble damages. The

measure of damages before trebling is the difference between the price at which the security was purchased or sold and the market value that the security would have had at the time of the purchase or sale if the information known to the defendant had been publicly disseminated prior to that time and a reasonable time had elapsed for the market to absorb that information [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(a), (d)*; *see § 515.413*.1]. The amount recoverable by the issuer under *Corp. Code § 25502.5(a)* is reduced by any amount paid by the defendant in a proceeding brought by the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to the same transaction or transactions under the federal Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984 (*15 U.S.C. §§ 78a, 78c, 78o, 78t, 78u, 78ff*) or any other act. The reduction applies regardless of whether the amount was paid pursuant to a judgment or settlement or paid before or after the filing of an action by the plaintiff against the defendant [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(b)*]. If a proceeding has been commenced by the SEC but has not been finally resolved, the court hearing the action under *Corp. Code § 25502.5* must delay entering a judgment for the plaintiff until the SEC proceeding is resolved [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(b)*].

The action under *Corp. Code § 25502.5* can be brought by the corporate issuer or as a derivative action. The corporation or plaintiff may recover reasonable costs and attorney's fees [*see Corp. Code § 25502.5(a)*]. If a shareholder of the issuer alleges to its board that there has been a violation compensable under *Corp. Code § 25502.5*, the board must consider the allegation in good faith. If the allegation involves misconduct by a director, that director is not entitled to vote on any matter involving the allegation; however, that director may still be counted in determining the presence of a quorum at a meeting of the board or a committee of the board [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(c)*].

[4] Limitation of Actions Against Insiders

For proceedings commencing before January 1, 2005, no action is available for insider trading unless brought before the expiration of four years after the act or transaction constituting the violation, or the expiration of one year after the discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation, whichever expires first [*Corp. Code § 25506(a)*]. For proceedings commencing on or after January 1, 2005, no such action is available unless brought before the expiration of five years after the act or transaction constituting the violation, or the expiration of two years after discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation, whichever expires first [*Corp. Code § 25506(b)*].

[5] Defense of Belief of Plaintiff's Informed Status

It is not unlawful for an insider to trade in securities of the issuer corporation in violation of the insider trading activity prescribed by statute if the insider has reason to believe that the person selling to or buying from him or her is also in possession of the information [*see Corp. Code § 25402*, and *see § 515.416*].

[6] Defense of Plaintiff's Actual Informed Status

An insider is not liable for prohibited insider trading if he or she is able to prove that the plaintiff knew the information the nondisclosure of which was the basis for which the action was instituted [*see Corp. Code § 25502*, and *see § 515.417*].

[7] Defense of Plaintiff's Commitment to Transaction

There is no liability on the part of an insider who otherwise engages in prohibited insider trading if the insider is able to prove that the plaintiff would have purchased or sold the securities at the same price even if the insider information had been revealed to the plaintiff [*Corp. Code § 25502*; *see § 515.418*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & SaleSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934

ActionsInsider TradingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.23

§ 515.23 Broker-Dealer's Liability for Failure to Obtain License Before Sale

A person who purchases a security from or sells a security to a broker-dealer that is required to be licensed and has not, at the time of the sale or purchase, applied for and secured from the Commissioner a certificate [*see Corp. Code § 25200 et seq.*] that is in effect at the time of the sale or purchase authorizing that broker-dealer to act in that capacity, may bring an action for rescission of the sale or purchase or, if the plaintiff or the defendant no longer owns the security, an action for damages [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(1)*; *see § 515.434*]. On rescission and tender of the security, a purchaser may recover the consideration paid for the security plus interest at the legal rate, less the amount of any income received on the security [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(2)*]. Upon rescission and tender of the consideration paid for the security plus interest at the legal rate, a seller may recover the security plus the amount of any income received by the defendant on the security [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(3)*].

Damages recoverable by a purchaser will be an amount equal to the difference between the following [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(4)*]:

- The price at which the security was bought plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase; and

- The value of the security at the time it was disposed of by the plaintiff plus the amount of any income received on the security by the plaintiff.

Damages recoverable by a seller will be an amount equal to the difference between the following [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(5)*]:

- The value of the security at the time of the filing of the complaint plus the amount of any income received by the defendant on the security; and

- The price at which the security was sold plus interest at the legal rate from the date of sale.

A tender of a security or of consideration paid for a security plus interest may be made at any time before entry of judgment [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(6)*]. The court, in its discretion, may award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to a prevailing plaintiff [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityRescission & RestitutionSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment Advisers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.24

§ 515.24 Liability for Unlawful Alteration of Records or Making Untrue Statement

It is unlawful for any person to knowingly alter, destroy, mutilate, conceal, cover up, falsify, or make a false entry in any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the administration or enforcement of the Corporate Securities Law [*Corp. Code § 25404(a)*]. It is also unlawful for any person to knowingly make an untrue statement to the Commissioner during the course of licensing, investigation, or examination, with the intent to impede, obstruct, or influence the administration or enforcement of any provision of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*Corp. Code § 25404(b)*]. Note, however, that these sections do not form the basis for any civil liability, since they do not explicitly provide for such liability [*see Corp. Code § 25510* (no civil liability arises by implication)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.25

§ 515.25 Liability on Securities Issuer's Bond

[1] Prohibited Acts

Corp. Code § 25216 prohibits broker-dealers and agents from engaging is specified practices. These practices include effecting any transaction in, or inducing or attempting to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in California by means of any manipulative, deceptive, or other fraudulent scheme, device, or contrivance as defined by rule [*Corp. Code § 25216(a)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.216-260.216.7*]. Similarly, no broker-dealer or agent may effect any transaction in, or induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in California in connection with which the broker-dealer or agent engages in any fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative act or practice or makes any fictitious quotation as defined by rule [*Corp. Code § 25216(b)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.216.8-260.216.11, 260.216.16*].

In addition, no broker-dealer or agent may effect any transaction in, or induce or attempt to induce the purchase or sale of, any security in California in contravention of such rules as the Commissioner may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors to provide safeguards with respect to the financial responsibility of broker-dealers [*Corp. Code § 25216(c)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.216.12, 260.216.12.1*].

Finally, no broker-dealer or agent may effect or attempt to effect in California, in contravention of such rules as the Commissioner may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors, specified transactions involving puts, calls, straddles, or other options or privileges [*see Corp. Code § 25216(d)*].

[2] Bond Requirement

The Commissioner, by rule, may require any issuer who employs agents in connection with any security or transaction not exempted by *Corp. Code §§ 25100-25105* to post a surety bond in an amount not exceeding $10,000, conditioned that the issuer will comply with the provisions of *Corp. Code § 25216* and the rules and orders issued thereunder. The bond, unless previously canceled, must cover the entire period during which the qualification is in effect. If a deposit in lieu of a bond is made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710* (for deposits with Secretary of State, available only before January 1, 1999), the deposit may include an appropriate deposit of securities. No suit may be maintained to enforce any

liability on the bond unless brought within two years after the contract of sale or other act on which the suit is based [*Corp. Code § 25216(e)*; *see 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.216.15* (bond requirement and deposits in lieu of bond)].

The Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) applies to bonds given pursuant to California statute except to the extent that the statute prescribes a different rule or is inconsistent [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.020(a)*]. For discussion and forms relating to statutory bonds and deposits in lieu of bond, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* . For a complaint in interpleader under *Code Civ. Proc. § 386* that may be used by the surety when claims against the bond exceed $10,000, *see § 515.432*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment Advisers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.26

§ 515.26 Service of Process on Commissioner

Every applicant for qualification of the sale of securities or every person filing an application or a notice under *Corp. Code §§ 25100.1*, *25101*, *25102.1* and *25230.1* (securities and transactions not subject to qualification) or request for or notice of exemption from qualification, other than a California corporation or California-licensed broker-dealer, must have on file or submit a consent to service of process appointing the Commissioner of Corporations as attorney for receipt of service in any noncriminal suit arising under the securities legislation. Service is made by leaving a copy of the process in the Department of Corporations office, but is not effective unless the plaintiff (who may be the Commissioner of Corporations) forthwith sends notice and a copy to the defendant at the last address on file therefor, and the plaintiff's affidavit of compliance is filed on or before the return day for process [*Corp. Code § 25165*]. The same requirement applies to applicants for a certificate as to a broker-dealer or as an investment adviser and every investment adviser subject to *Corp. Code § 25230.1* (persons subject to notice but not certification requirements), other than a California corporation [*Corp. Code § 25240*].

In any case, anyone, including a nonresident, who engages in conduct prohibited or made actionable under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 or any rule or order thereunder, whether or not he or she has filed a consent to service, thereby, in effect, "appoints" the Commissioner of Corporations his or her attorney for purposes of receiving service, whenever personal jurisdiction cannot be otherwise obtained; service is made in the same manner as when a consent is on file [*Corp. Code § 25550*]. However, it is important to make certain in such instances that attempts to obtain personal jurisdiction have been exhaustive, such as through court-ordered personal service on the Secretary of State on behalf of a local corporation [*see Corp. Code § 1702*] or on behalf of a foreign corporation doing business here [*see Corp. Code § 2111*; *see also* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsService Upon AgentsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & Enforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.27

§ 515.27 Survival of Actions

Every cause of action for civil liability under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 survives the death of any person who might have been a plaintiff or defendant [*Corp. Code § 25509*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsSurvival Actions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.28

§ 515.28 Criminal Liability

It is a crime to willfully violate any provision of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*Corp. Code § 25540*]; to willfully employ, directly or indirectly, any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud in connection with the offer, purchase, or sale of any security; or to willfully engage, directly or indirectly, in any act, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit on any person in connection with the offer, purchase, or sale of any security [*Corp. Code § 25541*]. The term "willfully," as used in *Corp. Code § 25540*, simply implies a purpose or willingness to commit the act or to make the omission in question. It does not require any intent to violate the law or to injure another person or to acquire any advantage. The California definition of "willfully" does not encompass guilty knowledge or criminal negligence, even under statutes patterned after or using language identical to federal statutes or regulations that do require guilty knowledge [*People v. Baumgart (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1219-1222, 267 Cal. Rptr. 534* ; *People v. Johnson (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1369, 1374-1376, 262 Cal. Rptr. 366]* .

Thus, criminal liability exists for violation of the various qualification requirements or proceedings not in conformity with the terms of qualification--such as filing untruthful applications [*see Corp. Code § 25166*]; or for violations of conditions imposed on distributions by the Commissioner of Corporations--such as reselling securities in violation of legend restrictions imprinted thereon [*see Corp. Code § 25133*]. Broker-dealers, agents, and investment advisers, and persons operating in similar capacities, are also subject to various regulations concerning appropriate market conduct [*see Corp. Code 25243, 25243.5, 25245, 25246*].

A court may order a defendant found guilty of criminal violations of *Corp. Code §§ 25110* and *25540* (selling securities without a permit) to make restitution if (1) restitution would serve a rehabilitative purpose, (2) the amount of restitution is supported by the factual record, and (3) defendant's conduct caused the victim's loss [*People v. Baumgart (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1222-1223, 267 Cal. Rptr. 534]* . *Corp. Code §§ 25110* and *25540* are "strict liability" offenses in the sense that it does not matter whether defendant knew a permit was required. Nevertheless, when there is a finding by the court that the defendant had a culpable state of mind, the rehabilitative function may be served [*People v. Baumgart (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1222-1224, 267 Cal. Rptr. 534]* . The causation element is established if defendant's solicitation of the victim was a cause of the loss. The lack of permit does not have to be the proximate cause of the loss. If the defendant's solicitation was a cause of the victim's loss, the fact that fraud or mismanagement by

others also caused the loss does not invalidate a restitution order [*People v. Baumgart (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1222-1224, 267 Cal. Rptr. 534]* . Similarly, a defendant found guilty of criminal violations of *Corp. Code §§ 25110* and *25540* may be ordered to make restitution of the full amount lost even though other people had a hand in causing the loss [*see People v. Baumgart (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1222-1224, 267 Cal. Rptr. 534* (dicta, inasmuch as defendant was only required to make restitution equal to 30 percent of losses)].

Violation of rules or orders promulgated by the Commissioner of Corporations is not punishable by imprisonment if the defendant proves he or she had no knowledge of such matters [*Corp. Code § 25540*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudSecurities FraudGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudSecurities FraudElementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudSecurities FraudPenaltiesSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.29

§ 515.29 Nonliability for Good-Faith Compliance With Commissioner Rule

No liability, civil or criminal, lies for any act done or omitted in good faith in conformity with any rule, form, permit, order, or written interpretative opinion of the Commissioner of Corporations, or any opinion of the Attorney General, whether or not the rule or order is subsequently modified or invalidated [*Corp. Code § 25700*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureDefensesIgnorance & Mistake of LawSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudDefensesSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.30-515.49

[Reserved]

§§ 515.30[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.50

§ 515.50 Governing Law

[1] California

Investments in franchises are governed in California by the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*]. If a franchise is subject to registration under the Franchise Investment Law or exempted from such registration either by rule of the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 31100*] or under the seasoned franchisor exemption [*see Corp. Code § 31101*], it is not subject to the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*Corp. Code § 25019*; *see People v. Kline (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 587, 168 Cal. Rptr. 185]* . The Franchise Investment Law is administered through the Department of Corporations by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 31502*]. Departmental rules for processing franchise investments are contained in the California Code of Regulations [*10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 310.002-310.005*].

Commercial loans made by franchisors (and subfranchisors) to current or prospective franchisees for the acquisition, construction, operation, development, equipping, expansion, contraction, consolidation, merger, recapitalization, reorganization, or termination of a franchised business are regulated by *Fin. Code § 22063* [*see § 515.65[1]*].

[2] Federal

Federal cases in the past have found some franchises to be investment contracts and hence securities subject to regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission [*see, e.g., Lino v. City Inv. Co. (3rd Cir. [NJ] 1973) 487 F.2d 689, 692]* . The Federal Trade Commission, however, has since assumed supervision of franchise sales through its power to prohibit unfair or deceptive acts or practices under the Federal Trade Commission Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 45*; *16 C.F.R. §§ 436.1-436.3*]. Although the commission's regulations are beyond the scope of this chapter, generally, they require a franchisor [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.2(c)*] or franchise broker [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.2(j)*], unless exempted, to furnish a prospective franchisee [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.2(d)*] certain prescribed information in a writing at the earlier of the "time for making disclosures" [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.2(g)*] or the first "personal meeting" [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1(a)*]. The regulations do not apply unless the franchise is advertised, offered, licensed, contracted, sold, or otherwise is promoted in or affects interstate commerce [*16 C.F.R. § 436.1*].

The following are also regulated under federal law:

- Oral, written, and visual representations that concern sales, income, or profits of existing or potential outlets [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1(b)-(e)*] or that contradict information contained in required disclosures [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1(f)*].

- The furnishing of the franchise agreement and related documents to the franchisee [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1(g)*].

- The franchisor's return of all refunds or deposits when required to do so in disclosures made to the franchisee [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1(h)*].

[3] Attempt to Waive Compliance Under California Law

Corp. Code § 31512 provides that any condition, stipulation, or provision purporting to bind anyone acquiring a franchise to waive compliance with any provision of the Franchise Investment Law or any rule or order thereunder is void. *Corp. Code § 31512*, however, has been held invalid as violating the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution to the extent that it requires judicial consideration of claims and resultant refusal to enforce an arbitration clause in a franchise agreement or related contract [*Southland Corp. v Keating (1984) 465 U.S. 1, 10, 104 S. Ct. 852, 79 L. Ed. 2d 1* (overruling *Keating v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 584, 183 Cal. Rptr. 360, 645 P.2d 1192*)].

[4] Exclusivity of Liability Provisions of Franchise Investment Law

Except as explicitly provided under the civil liability statutes of the Franchise Investment Law, no civil liability in favor of any private party arises against any person by implication from or as a result of the violation of any provision of that law or any rule or order thereunder. However, nothing in the civil liability sections limits any liability that would exist by virtue of any other statute or under common law if this law were not in effect [*Corp. Code § 31306*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawFederal Trade Commission ActGeneral OverviewAntitrust & Trade LawFederal Trade Commission ActCoverageAntitrust & Trade LawTrade Practices & Unfair CompetitionFederal Trade Commission ActBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal PreemptionContracts LawTypes of ContractsInvestment ContractsSecurities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawBlue Sky LawsInvestment Contracts & Stocks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.51

§ 515.51 Definitions Under Franchise Investment Law

[1] "Franchise"

A "franchise" is any contract or agreement to which the following apply [*Corp. Code § 31005(a)*; *see* Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 3-F (revised 1994)]:

- The franchisee is granted the right to engage in the business of offering, selling, or distributing goods or services under a marketing plan or system prescribed in substantial part by the franchisor;

- The operation of the business is substantially associated with franchisor's trademark, service mark, trade name, logotype, advertising, or other commercial symbol designating the franchisor or its affiliate; and

- The franchisee is required to pay, directly or indirectly, a franchise fee.

The presence of a prescribed marketing plan is considered crucial to the concept of a franchise. The Commissioner of Corporations has stated that the following elements in an agreement, alone or together, may suggest the presence of a marketing plan [*see* Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 3-F (revised 1994)]:

- Prescribing or limiting resale prices.

- Restricting the use of advertising or a mail order business.

- Requiring display racks.

- Giving detailed directions and advice concerning operating techniques.

- Assigning exclusive territory.
- Providing for uniformity or distinctiveness of appearance.
- Limiting sale of competitive products.
- Limiting use of products.
- Requiring approval of advertising and signs.
- Prohibiting and engaging in other activities.
- Providing training sessions.
- Assigning a contract.
- Using a manual.
- Providing trade secrets.

It is not a condition to the definition of a franchise that there be a fully prescribed, realized, detailed marketing plan or system at the time of the offer or sale; otherwise, a franchisor could circumvent the registration provisions of the Franchise Investment Law by selling or offering to sell a franchise but omitting a marketing plan or system until after the sale [*see People v. Kline (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 587, 594-595, 168 Cal. Rptr. 185* (upholding the commissioner's guidelines in 1974 version of Release No. 3-F)].

Neither the Franchise Investment Law nor any decision of the Commissioner of Corporations defines or interprets the phrase "offering, selling, or distributing goods or services" [*see Corp. Code § 31005(a)(1)*]. One court has construed this phrase liberally, finding that it evidences an intention to designate alternative or separate categories. Thus, parties who could not enter into binding contracts or pass title to goods nevertheless were held to be franchisees. By operating independent businesses through which they solicited orders, demonstrated products, solved customer problems, installed the franchisor's systems, maintained contact with existing customers, generated new business, and provided ongoing service to customers, they were more than simply sales representatives [*Gentis v. Safeguard Business Systems (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1294, 1304-1305, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 122]* .

[2] Nonprofit Retailers' Cooperatives Excluded

For purposes of *Corp. Code §§ 31000-31516*, the term "franchise" does not include a nonprofit organization operated on a cooperative basis by and for independent retailers that wholesales goods and services primarily to its member retailers and in which all of the following are applicable [*Corp. Code § 31005(c)*]:

- Control and ownership of each member is substantially equal;
- Membership is limited to those who will avail themselves of the services furnished by the organization;
- Transfer of ownership is prohibited or limited;
- Capital investment receives no return;

- Substantially equal benefits pass to members on the basis of patronage of the organization;

- Members are not personally liable for obligations of the organization in the absence of a direct undertaking or authorization by them;

- Services of the organization are furnished primarily for the use of the members;

- Each member and prospective member is provided with an offering circular that complies with the specifications of *Corp. Code § 31111* (*discussed under § 515.53[3]*); and

- No part of the receipts, income, or profit of the organization is paid to any profitmaking entity, except for arms-length payments for necessary goods and services, and members are not required to purchase goods or services from any designated profitmaking entity.

The nonprofit organization is subject to an action for rescission or damages under *Civ. Code § 3343.7* if the organization fraudulently induces the plaintiff to join the organization [*Corp. Code § 31005(d)*]. Under *Civ. Code § 3343.7*, "fraudulently induced" includes the failure to disclose all information required under *Corp. Code § 31005(c)(8)* or *31111*, unless the defendant proves that the plaintiff know the facts concerning the untruth or omission or that the defendant exercised reasonable care and did not know (or, if the defendant had exercised reasonable care, would not have known) of the untruth or omission [*Civ. Code § 3343.7*]. The plaintiff is entitled to rescission of a membership contract entered into, or for damages sustained, as a consequence of being fraudulently induced to join the organization [*Civ. Code § 3343.7*].

[3] "Area Franchise"

The term "franchise" also includes (except as specifically stated otherwise in the law) an "area franchise" and a "subfranchise" [*Corp. Code § 31010*; § 515.51[8] for a definition of that term]. An area franchise is any franchise between a franchisor and a franchisee whereby the franchisee is granted the right to operate more than one unit within a specified geographic area [*Corp. Code § 31008*].

[4] Petroleum Products Franchises

The term "franchise" also includes a contract between (1) a refiner and either a distributor or a retailer, or (2) a distributor and either another distributor or a retailer. In either instance the refiner or distributor authorizes or permits the distributor or retailer to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel. The trademark is owned or controlled by the refiner, or by a refiner that supplies motor fuel to the distributor that authorizes or permits its use [*Corp. Code § 31005(b)(1), (2)*].

The term "franchise" includes a contract under which a retailer or distributor is authorized or permitted to occupy leased marketing premises, which are to be employed in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel under a trademark. The trademark is owned or controlled by the refiner, or by a refiner that supplies motor fuel to the distributor that authorizes or permits the occupancy. The term includes a contract pertaining to the supply of motor fuel to be sold, consigned, or distributed under a trademark owned or controlled by a refiner, or under certain contracts existing continuously from an earlier time. The term includes the unexpired portion of franchise properly transferred or assigned [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2801(1)(B)*].

The availability of an exemption from registration requirements for seasoned petroleum franchisors is *discussed under § 515.54[2]*. For discussion of other special regulatory law applicable to petroleum products franchises, see *§ 515.110* et seq.

[5] "Franchisor" and "Franchisee"

A "franchisor" is the one who grants a franchise [*Corp. Code § 31007*], and the "franchisee" is the one to whom the franchise is granted [*Corp. Code § 31006*].

[6] "Franchise Fee"

A "franchise fee" is any fee or charge that a franchisee or subfranchisor is required to pay or agrees to pay for the right to enter into a business under a franchise agreement. The term includes any payment for goods and services. It does not include the purchase, or agreement to purchase, goods at a bona fide wholesale price if no obligation is imposed on the purchaser to buy or pay for a quantity of the goods in excess of that which a reasonable businessperson normally would purchase by way of starting--or maintaining a going--inventory or supply. Nor does the term include the payment of a reasonable service charge to the issuer of a credit card by an establishment accepting or honoring the card, nor amounts paid to a trading stamp company [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17750*] by one issuing such stamps in connection with the retail sale of merchandise or service [*Corp. Code § 31011*].

The franchise law defines a franchise fee as a fee paid for the right to do business. A person is not a franchisee if the person does not invest anything in return for the right to enter into business with or for a so-called franchisor, makes no required contribution of capital, makes no unrecoverable investment in the so-called franchisor, is not required to purchase any inventory, is not required to purchase services from the so-called franchisor in order to become a dealer, and places none of his or her own funds, even the de minimis amounts required under the franchise law, at risk in exchange for a dealership. Ordinary business expenses paid during the course of business cannot be counted as a franchise fee [*Thueson v. U Haul Internat., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 664, 676, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 669]* .

Examples of franchise fees, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Corporations, include the following [*see* Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 3-F (revised 1994)]:

- A performance guarantee or deposit.
- A deposit of money.
- An initial or set-up fee.
- A fee for advertising.
- A nonrefundable bookkeeping charge.
- A payment for training and school expenses.
- A royalty or percentage of gross receipts.
- Charges for sales kits, brochures, programs, forms, decals, shirts, displays, and announcements.
- A rental or lease fee.
- Payment for services, such as consulting or management fees.

[7] "Offers" and "Sales"

"Sale" or "sell" under the Franchise Investment Law includes every contract or agreement of sale of, contract to sell, or

disposition of, a franchise or interest therein for value. "Offer" or "offer to sell" includes every attempt to dispose of, or any solicitation of an offer to buy, a franchise or interest therein for value. These terms do not include the renewal or extension of an existing franchise if there is no interruption in the operation of the franchised business by the franchisee. However, a material modification of an existing franchise, whether on renewal or otherwise, does constitute a sale [*Corp. Code § 31018*].

[8] "Subfranchise"

The term "subfranchise" means any contract or agreement between a franchisor and a subfranchisor whereby the subfranchisor is granted the right, for consideration given in whole or in part for that right, to sell or negotiate the sale of franchises in the name or in behalf of the franchisor. A contract or agreement that is a franchise does not become a subfranchise merely because under its terms a person is granted the right to receive compensation for referral to a franchisor or subfranchisor or to receive compensation for action as a sales representative on their behalf [*Corp. Code § 31008.5*]. If an agreement with a distributor constitutes a franchise, the distributor's agreement granting to a sub-distributor the right to appoint lower level sub-distributors for a consideration is a subfranchise, which is also subject to the registration requirement of *Corp. Code § 31110*. Thus, the same agreement may constitute both a franchise and a subfranchise, which means that a person may be both a franchisee and a subfranchisor under the same agreement. However, the definition of subfranchise does not require the subfranchisor to also be a franchisee and the agreement constituting a subfranchise may be a totally separate and independent agreement [*see* Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 3-F (revised 1994)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsElementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise FeesEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & Marketing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.52

§ 515.52 Purpose of Franchise Investment Law

The purpose of the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31000*] is to provide each prospective franchisee with the information necessary to make an intelligent decision regarding the franchises being offered. The law is also designed to prohibit the sale of a franchise if it would lead to fraud or a likelihood that the franchisor's promises would not be fulfilled, and to protect the franchisor and franchisee by providing a better understanding of the business relationship between the franchisor and franchisee [*Corp. Code § 31001*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.53

§ 515.53 Registration of Offers and Sales in California

[1] Requirement

It is necessary to register a franchise before offering or selling it in California, unless the franchise is exempt from registration [*Corp. Code § 31110*; *see § 515.54*]. If the offer or sale of the franchise is made in California, a choice of some other law in the franchise agreement will not render California's Franchise Investment Law inapplicable. The choice of law provision will only govern construction and interpretation of the franchise agreement [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 171* (applying California law)].

[2] When California Law Applies

An offer or sale of a franchise is made in California when (1) an offer to sell is made in California, (2) an offer to buy is accepted in California, or (3) if the franchisee is domiciled in California, the franchised business is or will be operated in California [*Corp. Code § 31013(a)*].

An offer to sell is made in California when the offer either originates in California or is directed into California by the offeror and received at the place to which it is directed [*Corp. Code § 31013(b)*]. For example, the sale of a franchise to a nonresident franchisee to operate entirely outside California was "sold in California" because negotiations and execution of the agreement occurred in California and payments were made in California [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 171-172* (applying California law)]. An offer to sell is accepted in California when acceptance is communicated to the offeror in California. Acceptance is communicated when the offeree directs it to the offeror in California, reasonably believing that person to be in California, and it is received at the place to which it is directed [*Corp. Code § 31013(b)*]. An offer to sell is not made in California merely because the publisher circulates (or on whose behalf there is circulated) in California a bona fide newspaper or other publication of general, regular, and paid circulation that has had more than two thirds of its circulation outside California during the past 12 months. Nor is such an offer made in California merely because a radio or television program originating outside California is received in California [*Corp. Code § 31013(c)*].

[3] Registration Procedure

Registration of an offer is made by filing an application with the Commissioner of Corporations on the Uniform Franchise Registration Application (of the North American Securities Administrators Association, Inc.), as identified, modified, and supplemented by rule of the commissioner [*Corp. Code § 31111(a)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.111* ("Uniform Franchise Registration Application" means information required from applicant in accordance with the Uniform Franchise Disclosure Document Guidelines, as adopted by NASAA in 2007)]. The application must be accompanied by the proposed offering prospectus, which must contain the material information disclosed in the application [*Corp. Code § 31114*].

[4] Notification of Material Change

A franchisor must notify the commissioner promptly in writing, by an application to amend the registration, of any material change in the information contained in the application as originally submitted, amended, or renewed [*Corp. Code § 31123*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionChoice of LawBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.54

§ 515.54 Exemption From Registration

[1] Seasoned Franchisors

Offers and sales of franchises by seasoned franchisors, as described below, are exempted from the registration and related requirements of the Franchise Investment Law if the franchisor meets certain net worth, experience, disclosure, and notice filing requirements. A franchisor (and, when necessary, a parent corporation that owns at least 80 percent of the franchisor) must have a net worth, according to its financial statements for the fiscal year just ended, or in the case of audited statements, ended within 15 months of the fiscal year end date, of either (1) not less than $5 million on a consolidated basis according to an audited financial statement; or (2) not less than $1 million if its parent has a net worth of not less than $5 million according to audited financial statements of the franchisor and the parent; or (3) not less than $1 million according to its unaudited financial statement if its parent (a) has a net worth on a consolidated basis of not less than $5 million according to its audited financial statements and (b) unconditionally guarantees to assume the franchisor's duties and obligation under the franchise agreement [*Corp. Code § 31101(a)*].

To satisfy the experience requirements, the franchisor or a parent corporation that owns at least 80 percent of the franchisor must have complied with one or more of the following conditions throughout the five-year period immediately preceding the offer and sale of the franchise [*Corp. Code § 31101(b)*]:

- The franchisor has had at least 25 franchisees conducting business that is the subject of the franchise.
- The franchisor has conducted business that is the subject of the franchise.
- The parent has had at least 25 franchisees conducting business that is the subject of the franchise.
- The parent has conducted business that is the subject of the franchise.

The exemption criteria are met by compliance with one of the preceding conditions during part of the five-year period

and one or more of those conditions during the balance of the period [*Corp. Code § 31101(b)*].

The franchisor must also make certain required disclosures in writing to each prospective franchisee at least 10 business days prior to either the franchisee's execution of any binding franchise or other agreement or to the receipt of any consideration. The disclosures must include basic information identifying the franchisor, its business background, a copy of the franchise agreement, fees or payments to come from the franchisee, conditions for effectively terminating the franchise, required purchases and limitations on merchandising, details of financing arrangements, documentation of projected franchise earnings, and a statement as to the exclusivity of the franchise territory [*Corp. Code § 31101(c)(1)*]. The franchisor must also provide the prospective franchisee with copies of the financial statements used to meet the net worth criteria for the exemption and, if applicable, a copy of the unconditional guarantee required by *Corp. Code § 31101(a)(3)* [*Corp. Code § 31101(c)(1)(O), (P)*].

Finally, the franchisor must file a notice of exemption with the commissioner and pay the fee required by *Corp. Code § 31500(f)* prior to an offer or sale of a franchise in California during any calendar year in which one or more franchises are sold, excluding any material modification [*Corp. Code § 31101(d*); *see also Corp. Code § 31101(c)(2)* (requirements of material modification of existing franchise)].

If there is to be a material modification of an existing franchise, the seasoned franchisor must disclose information in writing to each franchisee concerning the specific sections of the franchise agreement proposed to be modified and any additional information that may be required by rule or by order by of the commissioner. Agreement to the modifications is not binding on the franchisee if, within 10 business days after receipt of the writing identifying the material modifications (that is, after the writing is delivered to the franchisee), the franchisee notifies the franchisor in writing that the franchise agreement is rescinded. The franchisee's notice of rescission is effective when delivered to the franchisor or when deposited in the mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the franchisor in accordance with any notice provisions in the franchise agreement, or when delivered or mailed to a person designated in the agreement to receive notices for the franchisor [*Corp. Code § 31101(c)(2)*].

[2] Seasoned Petroleum Products Franchisors

There is a special registration exemption for a seasoned petroleum corporation or distributor [§ 515.51[4]]. A "seasoned petroleum products franchisor" is a wholesale distributor or marketer of petroleum products who has been doing business continuously for the past five years and who neither requires an advance of funds in the nature of a fee or lease for such franchise agreements nor engages in the production or refining of petroleum. The franchisor must also comply with the requirements applicable to other seasoned franchisors under *Corp. Code § 31101(c)* and *(d)* [*Corp. Code § 31104(a), (b)*; *see § 515.54[1]*].

A "wholesale distributor" or "marketer" is an entity that, for wholesale, purchases or receives through transfer, or obtains, by consignment or otherwise, refined petroleum products and resells or otherwise transfers the products without substantially changing their form to other purchasers. An "advance of funds" is a fee or lease for a franchise agreement. The term does not include rent for the possession or use, or both, of premises or property, the purchase of inventory for resale or supplies, utility deposits, and other consideration or expenditures for the formation or operation, or both, of a wholesale distributor or marketer entity [*Corp. Code § 31104(c)*].

[3] Resale by Franchisee or Subfranchisor

The offer or sale of a franchise by a franchisee for the franchisee's own account, or the offer or sale of an entire area franchise owned by a subfranchisor for the subfranchisor's own account, is exempt from registration if the sale is not effected by or through a franchisor. A sale is not considered effected by or through a franchisor merely because a franchisor has a right to approve or disapprove a different franchisee [*Corp. Code § 31102*]. Sale by the franchisee of all the shares in a particular franchise--although the franchisee also owned all the shares of the franchisor and the

franchisor facilitated the sale but did not receive itself any proceeds of the sale--has been construed as a sale by the franchisee exempt from registration under the Franchise Investment Law [*see Fox v. Ehrmantraut (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 127, 142, 167 Cal. Rptr. 595, 615 P.2d 1383]* .

[4] Other Statutory Exemptions

Franchise registration requirements do not apply to bank credit card plans by regulated banks or certain of their holding companies or bank subsidiaries [*Corp. Code § 31103*]. Those requirements also do not apply to any offer, sale, or other transfer of a franchise (or any interest) to a non-California resident if all locations from which sales, leases, or other transactions between the franchised business and its customers are made, or goods or services are distributed, are physically located outside of California [*Corp. Code § 31105*]. An exemption from franchise registration requirements also applies to a prospective franchisee with financial and operational experience in a similar business [*Corp. Code § 31106*]. Certain offers (but not sales) by a franchisor during pendency of an application for renewal or amendment are exempt [*Corp. Code § 31107*].

An offer or sale of a franchise is also exempt from franchise registration requirements if the franchise involves the adding of a new product or service line to the existing business of a prospective franchisee, and all of the following requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 31108*]:

- The prospective franchisee has been engaged for at least the last 24 months before the sale in a business offering substantially similar products or services.

- The new product or service is substantially similar to that of the prospective franchisee's existing business.

- The franchised business is to be operated from the same business location as the prospective franchisee's existing business.

- At the time of the agreement establishing the franchise relationship, the parties anticipated in good faith that sales will not represent more than 20 percent of the total sales in dollar volume of the franchisee on an annual basis.

- The prospective franchisee is not controlled by the franchisor.

- The franchisor files a notice of exemption and pays the required fee [*see Corp. Code § 31500(f)*] before an offer or sale of the franchise in California during any calendar year in which one or more of those franchises are sold.

An offer or sale of a franchise to experienced purchasers is also exempt from franchise registration requirements if all of following requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 31109*]:

- Every purchaser of the franchise is either a partner, executive officer, or director of the franchisor; an entity with total assets exceeding $5,000,000; a natural person whose net worth exceeds $1,000,000; a natural person whose gross income exceeds $300,000; or an entity in which all equity owners meet one of the above conditions.

- Every purchaser has knowledge and experience in financial and business matters, with the capacity to evaluate the merits and risks of the franchise investment.

- Every purchaser purchases the franchise for the purchaser's own account.

- The immediate cash payment required from a natural person does not exceed 10 percent of that person's net worth.

- The franchisor files a notice of exemption and pays the required fee [*see Corp. Code § 31500(f)*] before an offer or sale of the franchise in California during any calendar year in which one or more these franchises are sold.

Also exempted from registration requirements is the offer and sale of a franchise registered under *Corp. Code §§ 31111, 31121*, or *31123* on terms different from the terms of the offered registered if the prospective franchisee receives information regarding each material negotiated term [*see Corp. Code § 31109.1*].

For a detailed discussion of these exemptions, see Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Investment Franchise Law, § 40.05* (Matthew Bender).

[5] Exemptions by Rule of Commissioner

The commissioner may also exempt by rule franchise transactions that are found to be not comprehended within the purposes of the Franchise Investment Law and their registration is found not necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors [*Corp. Code § 31100*]. Under this power, the commissioner has exempted offerings that would require registration only because of a franchise fee which does not exceed a prescribed annual fee [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.011*] or payments for equipment or fixtures that do not exceed prescribed annual charges if the charges are no more than competitive costs for the items [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.011.1*].

Negotiated sales are also exempted by the commissioner from the ordinary registration requirements. "Negotiated sales" are sales to franchisees with sufficient business or financial experience to protect their own interests on terms that have been specially negotiated after an initial offer is registered by the filing of the application pursuant to *Corp. Code § 31111*. Even then, specified items, such as fees and territories, cannot differ from those in the registered offer unless the franchisee (1) has a net worth of at least $1 million (excluding home, home furnishings, and automobiles), or (2) an annual income of $200,000 in the preceding two years and anticpates annual income of $200,000 in the current year, or (3) owned at least 50 percent of a business of the type subject to the offer during the 36 months immediately preceding the offer. There are other specific certifications and legends that must be included in the registered offer in order to qualify for the negotiated sale exemption, and a notice of negotiated sale, in a form specified by the commissioner, must be filed with the commissioner within 15 business days after such a sale is consummated [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.100.2*].

The commissioner also has granted an exemption from registration for any communication made through the Internet, World Wide Web, or any other similar proprietary or common carrier electronic delivery system, of an offer to sell a franchise ("Internet offer"), provided all of the following conditions are met [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.100.3(a)*]:

- The Internet offer indicates, directly or indirectly, that the franchise is not being offered to the residents of the State of California.

- The internet offer is not otherwise directed to any person in California by or on behalf of the franchisor or anyone acting with the franchisor's knowledge.

- No franchises are sold in California by or on behalf of the franchisor until the offering has been registered under the Franchise Investment Law and declared effective, and the Uniform Franchise Offering Circular (UFOC) has been delivered to the offeree before the sale and in compliance with the Franchise Investment Law.

Reliance on an exemption from registration under this rule does not preclude a franchisor from relying on any other exemption provided under the Franchise Investment Law or the rules promulgated thereunder [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.100.3(b)*].

[6] Burden of Proof

In any proceeding under the Franchise Investment Law, the burden of proving an exemption or exception from a definition is on the person claiming it [*Corp. Code § 31153*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirementsEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.55

§ 515.55 Regulation of Franchise Sales

[1] Presale Delivery of Offering Circular

A franchise that must be registered may not be sold in California unless the prospective franchisee is first provided with a copy of the offering circular, together with a copy of all proposed agreements relating to the sale. These papers must be delivered at least 14 days before the franchisee's execution of any binding franchise or other agreement, or 14 days before receipt of any consideration, whichever first occurs [*Corp. Code § 31119(a)*]. Nothing in the Franchise Investment Law will be construed to prevent a franchisor from providing copies of the offering circular documents to prospective franchisees through electronic means pursuant to any requirements or conditions that may be imposed by rule or order of the commissioner [*Corp. Code § 31119(b)*].

A franchisor may provide copies of the offering circular documents to prospective franchisees through electronic means pursuant to any requirements or conditions that may be imposed by rule or order of the commissioner [*Corp. Code § 31119(b)*].

[2] Disclosure Exemption for Sophisticated Investors

Effective January 1, 2005, any offer or sale of a franchise is exempt from the disclosure provisions of the Franchise Investment Law under a "sophisticated investor" exemption [*see Corp. Code § 31110 et seq.*] if it meets all of the requirements set out below [*Corp. Code § 31109*].

Each and every purchaser of the franchise must be one of the following:

- An entity, all of the equity owners of which are persons or entities described in the following four items [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(5)*].

- Any partner, executive officer, or director of the franchisor, or any executive officer of its corporate general partner if the franchisor is a partnership, or any manager if the franchisor is a limited liability

company [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(1)*].

- Any natural person whose net worth, or joint net worth with the person's spouse, exceeds $1,000,000 at the time of purchase of the franchise, excluding the value of the person's personal residence, any and all retirement or pension plan accounts or benefits, home furnishings, and automobiles [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(3)*].

- Any natural person whose gross income exceeds $300,000 per year in each of the two most recent years, or whose joint gross income with the person's spouse exceeds $500,000 per year in each of those years, and who reasonably expects to reach the same income level in the current year [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(4)*].

- Any entity with total assets exceeding $5,000,000 according to its most recent financial statements and not specifically formed for the purpose of acquiring the franchise offered [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(2)*].

The financial statements referred to in the preceding item must meet both of the following requirements [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(2)*]:

- Be prepared as of a date not more than 90 days before the earlier of either the date on which the first prospective purchaser signs any binding franchise or other agreement with the franchisor in connection with the award of the franchise, or the date on which the franchisor receives any consideration from the first prospective purchaser in connection with the award of the franchise.

- Be prepared in accordance with either (1) generally accepted accounting principles and, if the entity has consolidated subsidiaries, on a consolidated basis, or (2) the rules and requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission, whether or not required by law to be prepared in accordance with those rules and requirements.

For purposes of the foregoing tests, "entity" means an organization described in *I.R.C. § 501(c)(3)*, a corporation, a Massachusetts or similar business trust, a limited liability company, or a partnership [*Corp. Code § 31109(a)(2)*]. For discussion of how a court may be expected to deal with the reference to generally accepted accounting principles, see *Ch. 165, Corporations: Corporate Records and Reports, § 165.25[2]*.

Each and every purchaser of the franchise must have knowledge and experience in financial and business matters, either alone or with professional advisers of the purchaser who are unaffiliated with, and not directly or indirectly compensated by, the franchisor or an affiliate or selling agent of the franchisor, such that the franchisor reasonably believes, based on reasonable inquiry before the sale, that each and every purchaser has the capacity to evaluate the merits and risks of, and protect their own interests in, the franchise investment [*Corp. Code § 31109(b)*].

Each and every purchaser of the franchise must purchase the franchise for the purchaser's own account, or a trust account if the purchaser is a trustee, for the purpose of conducting the business as a franchise and not with a view to, or for a sale in connection with, any resale or distribution of the franchise or any interest in the franchise [*Corp. Code § 31109(c)*].

The immediate cash payment required from a purchaser of the franchise who is a natural person, on the purchase of the franchise, must not exceed 10 percent of that person's net worth or joint net worth with the person's spouse, exclusive of the person's personal residence, any and all retirement or pension accounts or benefits, home furnishings, and automobiles [*Corp. Code § 31109(d)*].

The franchisor must file with the commissioner a notice of exemption and pay a prescribed fee before any offer or sale of a franchise in California for which the exemption is claimed during any calendar year in which one or more franchises are sold, excluding any material modification [*Corp. Code § 31109(e)*].

No franchisor or any of its officers, directors, employees, or agents may form, organize, engage, or assist any person to purchase a franchise for resale or distribution to avoid the registration disclosure requirements of the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31109(f)*].

[3] Alternative Disclosure for Variance From Registered Terms

The offer and sale of a registered franchise on terms different from the terms of the offer registered under *Corp. Code § 31111, 31121,* or *31123* is exempt from the disclosure provisions of the Franchise Investment Law [*see Corp. Code § 31110 et seq.*] if all of the following requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(a)*]. The franchisor must certify or declare in an appendix to its application for renewal that it has complied with all of the requirements set out below, in the event this exemption is claimed [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(a)(3)*].

The initial offer must be the offer registered under *Corp. Code § 31111, 31121,* or *31123* [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(a)(1)*].

The prospective franchisee must receive all of the following in a separate written appendix to the offering circular [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(a)(2)*]:

- A summary description of each material negotiated term that was negotiated by the franchisor for a California franchise during the 12-month period ending in the calendar month immediately preceding the month in which the negotiated offer or sale is made under Section 31109.1.

- A statement indicating that copies of the negotiated terms are available on written request.

- The name, telephone number, and address of the representative of the franchisor to whom requests for a copy of the negotiated terms may be obtained.

The commissioner may prescribe by rule or order the format and content of the summary description of the negotiated terms [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(c)*].

The negotiated terms, on the whole, must confer additional benefits on the franchisee [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(a)(4)*].

The franchisor must provide a copy of the negotiated terms described above to the prospective franchisee within five business days following the request of the franchisee [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(b)*].

The franchisor must maintain copies of all material negotiated terms for which this exemption is claimed for a period of five years from the effective date of the first agreement containing the relevant negotiated term. "Material" means that a reasonable franchisee would view the terms as important in negotiating the franchise. On the commissioner's request, the franchisor must make the copies available to the commissioner for review [*Corp. Code § 31109.1(c), (d)*].

[4] Franchise Modification

Except as discussed below, it is unlawful to solicit the agreement of a franchisee to a proposed material modification of an existing franchise without first delivering to the franchisee a written disclosure as the commissioner may prescribe. The delivery must be made five business days prior to the execution of any binding agreement by the franchisee to the modification; otherwise, the disclosure must state that the franchisee, by written notice mailed or delivered to the franchisor or a specified agent within not less than five business days following the execution of the agreement, may

rescind the agreement to the proposed modification [*Corp. Code § 31125(b)*].

Any modification of a franchise agreement with an existing franchisee of a franchisor is exempt from the disclosure provisions of the Franchise Investment Law [*see Corp. Code § 31110 et seq.*] if the modification is offered on a voluntary basis and does not substantially and adversely impact the franchisee's rights, benefits, privileges, duties, obligations, or responsibilities under the franchise agreement [*Corp. Code § 31125(d)*].

Any modification of a franchise agreement with an existing franchisee of a franchisor is exempt from those disclosure provisions if all of the following requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)*]:

- The franchisee must receive the complete written modification at least five business days before the execution of a binding agreement, or providing that the franchisee, by written notice mailed or delivered to the franchisor or a specified agent of the franchisor within not less than five business days following the execution of the agreement, may rescind the agreement to the material modification [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(1)*].

- The agreement must not be executed within 12 months after the date of the franchise agreement [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(1)(A)*].

- The modification must not waive any right of the franchisee under the Franchise Relations Act [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20000 et seq.*]; however, the modification may include a general release of all known and unknown claims by a party to the modification [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(1)(B)*].

- The modification must meet one of the following tests [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(2)*]:

  - The proposed modification is in connection with the resolution of a bona fide dispute between the franchisor and the franchisee or the resolution of a claimed or actual franchisee or franchisor default, and the modification is not applied on a franchise system-wide basis at or about the time the modification is executed. A modification will not be deemed to be made on a franchise system-wide basis if it is offered on a voluntary basis to fewer than 25 percent of the franchisor's California franchises within any 12-month period [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(2)(A)*; *see Corp. Code § 31125(e)* (definition of "California franchise")]; or

  - The proposed modification is offered on a voluntary basis to fewer than 25 percent of the franchisor's California franchises within any 12-month period, provided each franchisee is given a right to rescind the modification agreement if the modification is not made in compliance with the first three requirements above [*Corp. Code § 31125(c)(2)(B)*].

A franchisor must not make modifications in consecutive years for the purpose of evading the 25 percent requirements set forth above [*Corp. Code § 31125(f)*]. "California franchise" for these purposes means either (1) an existing franchise of a franchisee with any location in California from which sales, leases, or other transactions between the franchised business and its customers are made or goods or services are distributed, or (2) an existing franchise of a franchisee that is a resident of California and that owns, controls, or has an equity interest in the franchise [*Corp. Code § 31125(e)*]. Further, any modification of a franchise agreement with an existing franchise of a franchisee will be exempted from the provisions of *Corp. Code § 31110 et seq.* if the modification is offered on a voluntary basis and does not substantially and adversely impact the franchisee's rights, benefits, privileges, duties, obligations, or responsibilities under the franchise agreement [*Corp. Code § 31125(d)*].

[5] Marketing Personnel

The only persons entitled to effect sales of franchises in California are the people identified in an application for registration of a franchise, licensed real estate brokers or salespersons, and licensed securities broker-dealers or regulated agents [*Corp. Code § 31210*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.56

§ 515.56 Duties of the Commissioner of Corporations

[1] Administrative Processing

Supervision and regulation of franchise investments is handled by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code §§ 31004, 31502*] through the Department of Corporations [*see § 515.16*]. The commissioner may impose escrow or impound conditions after an application for registration has been made if the commissioner finds that these conditions are required because the applicant has failed to demonstrate adequate financial arrangements for providing real estate, improvements, equipment, inventory, training, or other items promised. At the franchisor's option, a surety bond may be furnished instead [*Corp. Code § 31113*]. Registration becomes effective automatically after a prescribed interval unless the commissioner has issued a stop order [*Corp. Code §§ 31115, 31116*].

For a detailed discussion of the administrative processing of a franchise offering, along with appropriate implementing forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 51, *Franchise Agreements*, and Ch. 51A, *Franchise Registration* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Enforcement

The commissioner has broad powers to enforce the provisions of the Franchise Investment Law. The commissioner may impose protective restrictions on offerings [*Corp. Code § 31113*], carry out investigative hearings [*Corp. Code § 31401*], initiate injunctive proceedings, including claims for ancillary relief, such as restitution and disgorgement or damages on behalf of injured persons [*Corp. Code § 31400*], and issue stop orders denying, suspending, or revoking the effectiveness of any registration [*Corp. Code § 31115*]. The commissioner may issue desist and refrain orders whenever the commissioner, on inspection or investigation, based on a complaint or otherwise, has cause to believe that a person is violating any provision of the Franchise Investment Law or any rule or order promulgated pursuant to that law [*Corp. Code § 31406(a)*]. This is specifically authorized with respect to persons who effect or attempt to effect franchise sales without being properly identified in an application on file with the commissioner or being properly licensed [*Corp. Code §§ 31210, 31211*], or without having either registered the franchise [*Corp. Code § 31402*] or complied with the conditions for exemption [*Corp. Code § 31403*] when such registration or compliance is required in the commissioner's

opinion.

The commissioner may assess, and obtain a judgment for, an administrative penalty whenever the commissioner issues a desist and refrain order to a person who is violating any provision of the Franchise Investment Law or any rule or order promulgated pursuant to that law [*Corp. Code § 31406(a), (e)*].

If, after examination or investigation, the commissioner has reasonable grounds to believe that any person is conducting business in violation of any provision of the Franchise Investment Law or related rule or order binding on it, the commissioner may, by written order addressed to the person, direct the discontinuance of the violation [*Corp. Code § 31407(a)*].

To enhance the efficient administration and enforcement of the Franchise Investment Law, it is the intent of the Legislature that the commissioner maintain a risk-based process of reviewing franchise applications. That process involves reviewing application information representing the greatest risk to prospective franchisees in accordance with *Corp. Code § 31115*, with emphasis on risks associated with the franchisor's financial condition and compliance record, and significant deficiencies with the franchisor's application [*Corp. Code § 31001.1(a), (b)*].

If the commissioner determines it is in the public interest, the commissioner may include in any administrative action brought under the Franchise Investment Law (including a stop order) a claim for ancillary relief, including, but not limited to, a claim for rescission, restitution or disgorgement, or damages on behalf of the persons injured by the act or practice constituting the subject matter of the action. An administrative law judge has jurisdiction to award additional relief. The person affected may be required to attend remedial education, as directed by the commissioner [*Corp. Code § 31408(a)*].

[3] Review of Administrative Acts

Franchisors may by written request call for a hearing on any stop order within 15 days after receiving notice of an action; otherwise, it remains in effect until modified or vacated [*Corp. Code § 31117*]. Similar action may be taken with respect to advertising cited as fraudulent [*Corp. Code § 31157*]. If a desist and refrain order has issued, a hearing must be commenced within 15 days of written request by the franchisor (unless postponed by consent) or else the orders are rescinded. All such hearings are by regular administrative tribunal, although the parties may mutually arrange a hearing before the Department of Corporations by an independent hearing officer instead. After such a hearing, the franchisor is not entitled to any further administrative remedy [*Corp. Code § 31513*]. All final acts of the Commissioner of Corporations are subject to judicial review [*Corp. Code § 31501*].

For procedure and forms applicable to administrative hearing and review, see Ch. 473, *Public Agency Adjudication* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.57

§ 515.57 Violation of Commissioner's Regulatory Requirements

It is unlawful for any person to violate any order of the Commissioner of Corporations or to violate any condition to the effectiveness of a registration of an offer or sale of a franchise [*Corp. Code § 31203*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.58

§ 515.58 Material Misrepresentations Under Franchise Investment Law

[1] Generally

Material misrepresentation in connection with the registering of a franchise, securing an exemption from registration, or offering or selling a franchise are prohibited under the Franchise Investment Law. Liability for these forms of misrepresentation as well as the various defenses and limitations periods that apply to them are discussed in *§ 515.59*.

[2] Misrepresentation in Documents Filed With Commissioner

It is unlawful for any person to do any of the following [*Corp. Code § 31200*; *see § 515.53*; for a discussion of the ambiguity of this provision, *see § 515.452*]:

- Willfully make any untrue statement of a material fact in any application, notice, or report filed with the Commissioner of Corporations under the Franchise Investment Law;

- Willfully omit to state in any such application, notice, or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein; or

- Fail to notify the commissioner of any material change as required by *Corp. Code § 31123*.

[3] Misrepresentation in Offers or Sales

It is unlawful for any person to offer or sell a franchise in California by means of any written or oral communication not listed in *Corp. Code § 31200* [*see § 515.58[1]*] which includes an untrue statement of a material fact or omits a material fact that is necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading [*Corp. Code § 31201*].

[4] Misrepresentation in Seasoned Franchisor's Disclosures

It is unlawful for any person to willfully make any untrue statement of a material fact in any statement required to be disclosed in writing pursuant to the disclosure requirements for seasoned franchisor exemptions under *Corp. Code § 31101* [*see § 515.54[1]*] or to willfully omit to state in any such statement any material fact which is required to be stated therein [*Corp. Code § 31202*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.59

§ 515.59 Liability for Violation of Registration or Exemption Requirements

[1] Generally

Any person who offers or sells a franchise (1) in violation of any provision of the Franchise Investment Law that provides an exemption from all or any of the disclosure provisions of that law [*see Corp. Code § 31110 et seq.*; *discussion under § 515.55*], or (2) in violation of the following registration or exemption requirements is liable to the franchisee or subfranchisor. The plaintiff may sue for damages caused by the violation, and, if the violation is willful, the franchisee may also sue for rescission. The particular statutory violations are the following [*Corp. Code § 31300*; *see Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1244-1245, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117* (sufficient evidence that violation was willful)]:

- *Corp. Code § 31101* [*see § 515.54[1]*, and *see § 515.450*].
- *Corp. Code § 31110* [*see § 515.53*, and *see § 515.450*].
- *Corp. Code § 31119* [*see § 515.55*].
- *Corp. Code § 31200* [*see § 515.58[2]*, and *see § 515.451*].
- *Corp. Code § 31202* [*see § 515.58[3]*, and *see § 515.451*].

If the offer or sale of the franchise is made in California, a choice of some other law in the franchise agreement will not render California's Franchise Investment Law inapplicable, and thus does not defeat the franchisee's right to rescission. The choice of law provision only governs construction and interpretation of the franchise agreement [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 171* (applying California law)].

The term "willful" as used in *Corp. Code § 31300* means an act that is committed knowingly and intentionally. There is

no requirement of a showing of an intent to violate the law, an evil motive, or a purpose to gain undue advantage. Good faith or reasonable care are not defenses to willfulness under *Corp. Code § 31300*, except to a limited extent in the case of violations of *Corp. Code §§ 31200* and *31202* [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172-173* (applying California law); *see People v. Gonda (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 774, 779, 188 Cal. Rptr. 295* (similar construction of "willful" under criminal provision, *Corp. Code § 31410*)]. In cases of violations of *Corp. Code §§ 31200* and *31202*, the defendant may prove that plaintiff knew the facts concerning the omission or untruth, or that the defendant exercised reasonable care and did not know, or if the defendant had exercised reasonable care, would not have known, of the untruth or omission [*Corp. Code § 31300*; *Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172]* . Thus, violations of *Corp. Code §§ 31101, 31110, 31119* (for example, a failure to file notice of exemption or to register the offering or a failure to disclose material facts concerning the franchisor) are willful even if the defendant did not know the requirements of the California law [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172-173]* .

[2] Limitation on Actions for Registration or Exemption Violations

An action may not be maintained to enforce any liability created under *Corp. Code § 31300* (liability for violation of registration or exemption requirements) unless it is brought within the following time limits: (1) the expiration of four years after the act or transaction constituting the violation; (2) the expiration of one year after the discovery by the plaintiff of the fact constituting the violation; or (3) 90 days after delivery to the franchisee of a written notice disclosing any violation of *Corp. Code § 31110* [*see § 515.53*] or 31200 [*see § 515.58[2]*], if the notice is in a form approved by the Commissioner of Corporations, whichever limitations period first expires [*Corp. Code § 31303*; *see People ex rel. Department of Corporations v. Speedee Oil Change Systems, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 709, 723-725, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (claims for violations of *Corp. Code § 31300* were barred by four-year statute; *Corp. Code § 31306* constitutes an express statement of unequivocal legislative intent that statute of limitations provisions in *Corp. Code § 31303* are to be the sole controlling limits on time for filing suit under the Franchise Investment Law, and therefore delayed discovery or tolling rules did not apply to franchisees' causes of action)].

Like all statute of limitations defenses, the defense of *Corp. Code § 31303* must be affirmatively pleaded or it is waived [*Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1243-1244, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117]* .

[3] Defense of Plaintiff's Knowledge

The defendant is not liable in an action for material misrepresentation in documents filed with the commissioner [*see Corp. Code § 31200*] or in required seasoned franchisor exemption disclosures [*see Corp. Code § 31202*] if he or she is able to prove that the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untruth or omission [*Corp. Code § 31300*; *see § 515.456*].

[4] Defense of Defendant's Ignorance

The defendant also is not liable in an action for material misrepresentation in connection with registration or exemption requirements [*see Corp. Code §§ 31200, 31202*; *see also § 515.59[2]*] if it can be proved that he or she exercised reasonable care and did not know, or, if he or she had exercised reasonable care, would not have known of the untruth or omission [*Corp. Code § 31300*; *see § 515.457*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionChoice of LawBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory

DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesEquitable ReliefGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.60

§ 515.60 Liability for Misrepresentation in Franchise Transactions

[1] Generally

Any person who offers or sells a franchise in California by means of a material misrepresentation [*see Corp. Code § 31201* and *discussion under § 515.58[2]*] is liable for damages to any person who, not knowing or having cause to believe that the statement was false or misleading, purchased a franchise while relying on the statement [*Corp. Code § 31301*].

[2] Limitation on Actions for Misrepresentation in Transactions

An action may not be maintained to enforce any liability created under *Corp. Code § 31301* (liability for misrepresentation in franchise transactions) unless it is brought within the first of following time limits to expire [*Corp. Code § 31304*; *see People ex rel. Department of Corporations v. Speedee Oil Change Systems, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 709, 723-725, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (claims for *Corp. Code § 31201* violations were barred by two-year statute; *Corp. Code § 31306* constitutes an express statement of unequivocal legislative intent that statute of limitations provisions in *Corp. Code § 31304* are to be the sole controlling limits on time for filing suit under the Franchise Investment Law, and therefore delayed discovery or tolling rules did not apply to franchisees' causes of action)]:

- The expiration of two years after the violation on which it is based;

- The expiration of one year after the discovery by the plaintiff of the facts constituting the violation; or

- 90 days after delivery to the franchisee of a written notice disclosing any violation of *Corp. Code § 31201* [*see § 515.58[2]*] or *Corp. Code § 31202* [*see § 515.58[4]*], if the notice is in a form approved by the Commissioner of Corporations.

[3] Defenses to Transaction Misrepresentation

The defendant is not liable in an action for material misrepresentation in a franchise transaction if he or she is able to prove either plaintiff's awareness of the misrepresentation [*see § 515.59[2]*] or defendant's lack of awareness of the misrepresentation [*see § 515.58[4]*] in the same manner as these defenses are available in an action based on a misrepresentation in connection with registration or exemption requirements [*Corp. Code § 31301*; *see Corp. Code § 31300*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirementsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.61

§ 515.61 Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals and Materially Aiding Personnel for Violations

The following persons are jointly and severally liable with and to the same extent as persons originally liable for particular violations under the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31302*]:

- Every person who directly or indirectly controls a person liable under *Corp. Code § 31300* (liability for violation of registration or exemption requirements) or *Corp. Code § 31301* (liability for misrepresentation in franchise transactions).

- Every partner in a firm so liable.

- Every principal executive officer or director of a corporation so liable.

- Every person occupying a similar status or performing similar functions as the person so liable.

- Every employee of a person so liable who materially aids in the act or transaction constituting the violation [*see Courtney v. Waring (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1440-1442, 237 Cal. Rptr. 233* (causes of action stated as to vice president and director, controlling person, and vice president)].

The language "with and to the same extent" as the actual seller in *Corp. Code § 31302* is not applied literally. Imposition of secondary liability under *Corp. Code § 31302* does not require that a plaintiff successfully sue the franchise seller. Plaintiff is only required to establish that the seller could have been liable under *Corp. Code §§ 31201* and *31301* [*Courtney v. Waring (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1441-1442, 237 Cal. Rptr. 233* (literal seller was bankrupt and had been dismissed from action)]. For a complaint for damages based on *Corp. Code §§ 31201, 31301, see § 515.455*.

Joint or several liability may not be imposed on any person who had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist [*Corp. Code § 31302*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsJoint & Several Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.62

§ 515.62 Infringement of Franchisee's Right to Join Trade Association

[1] Generally

A franchisor, directly or indirectly, through any officer, agent, or employee, may not restrict or inhibit the right of franchisees to join a trade association. The franchisor may also not prohibit the right of free association among franchisees for any lawful purposes [*Corp. Code § 31220*].

A franchisor who violates these provisions may be sued for temporary and permanent injunctive relief and for damages, if any, as well as for the costs of suit, including reasonable attorney's fees. The plaintiff is not required to allege or prove that actual damages have been suffered in order to obtain injunctive relief [*Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)*]. Liability is civil only; a violation of the statutory prohibitions is not a crime [*see Corp. Code § 31220*].

[2] Jurisdiction and Venue

A suit against a franchisor for interfering with the franchisee's right of association is to be brought in the superior court. The action may be commenced either in the county in which the defendant resides or in the county in which a franchise affected by the violation does business [*Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)*].

[3] Limitation of Actions for Right of Association

An action to enforce any liability for the franchisor's violation of the franchisee's rights of association may not be maintained unless brought before (1) the expiration of two years after the violation on which it is based, or (2) the expiration of one year after the plaintiff's discovery of the facts constituting the violation, whichever occurs first [*Corp. Code § 31302.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesInjunctive Relief

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.63

§ 515.63 Service of Process on Commissioners

Every applicant for registration, other than a California corporation, California limited partnership, or California limited liability company, must file with the Commissioner a consent to service for purposes of appointing the Commissioner as attorney for receipt of service of process in any civil action arising under the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31155*]. Whether or not such a consent has been filed, service may be made on the Commissioner against anyone alleged to have engaged in conduct prohibited under the law if personal jurisdiction cannot be obtained otherwise. Service may be made in either event by leaving a copy of the process with the Commissioner which is effective only after (1) notice of the service and a copy of the process is sent to the defendant by registered or certified mail at his or her last known address, or other steps reasonably calculated to give actual notice are taken, and (2) an affidavit of compliance is filed with the court prior to return of the service or within such further time as is allowed by the court [*Corp. Code § 31420*; *see Thomson v. Anderson (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 258, 262-263, 267-268, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 262* (*Corp. Code § 31420* does not create independent basis for personal jurisdiction for claims arising under Franchise Investment Law)]. For further discussion and forms for use in serving the summons, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsService Upon Agents

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.64

§ 515.64 Survival of Actions

Every cause of action under the civil liability sections of the Franchise Investment Law survives the death of any person who might have been a plaintiff or defendant [*Corp. Code § 31305*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsSurvival Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.65

§ 515.65 Criminal Liability

[1] Generally

It is a crime to willfully violate any provision of the Franchise Investment Law or any rule or order thereunder, punishable by fine and/or imprisonment. Imprisonment is not permitted if the defendant can prove having had no knowledge of the law, rule, or order [*Corp. Code § 31410*]. It is also a crime to willfully employ, directly or indirectly, any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud in connection with the offer or sale of any franchise. Similarly, it is a crime willfully to engage, directly or indirectly, in any act, practice, or course of business which operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit on anyone in connection with the offer, purchase, or sale of a franchise [*Corp. Code § 31411*]. These provisions do not limit the power of the state to punish any person for conduct constituting a crime under any other statute [*Corp. Code § 31412*].

[2] Regulation of Franchise Loans

Commercial loans made by franchisors (and subfranchisors) to current or prospective franchisees for the acquisition, construction, operation, development, equipping, expansion, contraction, consolidation, merger, recapitalization, reorganization, or termination of a franchised business are exempt from regulation under the Finance Lenders Law [*see Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.*], provided the requirements below are met [*see Fin. Code § 22063(a)*, *(b)(8)*; *see also Fin. Code § 22063(b)(1)-(7)* (definitions)]. If the requirements are met, the loan is subject to the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing under *Civ. Code § 1655* (stipulations that are necessary to make a contract reasonable, or conformable to usage, are implied as to matters about which the contract manifests no contrary intention) [*Fin. Code § 22063(b)(8)(D)*]. Nothing in *Fin. Code § 22063* is intended to abrogate or diminish the application of any other laws that are designed to protect borrowers, including, but not limited to, laws pertaining to licensing, unfair competition, usury, and conflicts of interest [*Fin. Code § 22063(d)*].

The franchisor or subfranchisor making the franchise loan must comply with all applicable federal and state franchise disclosure and registration laws, regulations, rules and orders, including, but not limited to, the Franchise Investment Law [*see Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*] and the FTC's rule on disclosure requirements and prohibitions concerning

franchising and business-opportunity ventures [*see 16 C.F.R. § 436.1 et seq.*], in connection with the offer or sale of any franchise, area franchise, or subfranchise to which the franchise loan relates [*Fin. Code § 22063(b)(8)(A)*].

The proceeds of the franchise loan must be intended by the borrower for use primarily for other than personal, family, or household purposes [*Fin. Code § 22063(b)(8)(B)*]. The lending franchisor or subfranchisor may rely on any written statement of intended purposes by the borrower. The statement may be a separate statement signed by the borrower or may be contained in another document signed by the borrower. The lending franchisor or subfranchisor is not required to ascertain that the proceeds of a franchise loan are used in accordance with the statement of intended purposes [*Fin. Code § 22063(c)*].

The loan, if secured, must be secured solely by the assets of the franchised business to which the franchise loan relates. Property used by the borrower primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, including the borrower's personal residence, must not be taken as security for the loan [*Fin. Code § 22063(b)(8)(C)*].

The lending franchisor or subfranchisor must fully and clearly disclose to the borrower, at or before the time the loan is made, the rates of interest, charges, and costs of the loan [*Fin. Code § 22063(b)(8)(E)*].

Presumably, if the foregoing requirements are not met, the franchisor or subfranchisor making a franchise loan is subject to regulation under the Finance Lenders Law. For discussion of that law, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 102B, *Pawnbrokers, Finance Lenders, and Secondhand Goods Dealers* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.66-515.79

[Reserved]

§§ 515.66[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.80

§ 515.80 Governing Statutes

The Franchise Relations Act, which governs the proper termination, transfer, or nonrenewal of most franchises in California, is contained in *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20000-20041*. Provisions applicable to petroleum products franchises are discussed in *§ 515.110* et seq., and those provisions applicable to new motor vehicle dealerships are discussed, in *§ 515.130* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & Marketing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.81

§ 515.81 Definitions

[1] "Franchise"

The term "franchise" is used under the Franchise Relations Act exactly as it is used under the Franchise Investment Law [*see Corp. Code § 31005*, discussed in *§ 515.51*] except that under the Franchise Relations Act the term does not include any franchise governed by the federal Petroleum Marketing Practice Act (that is, franchises involving motor fuel refiners, distributors, and retailers) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20001(d)(1)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 2801*]. In addition, the term does not include lease departments, licenses, or concessions at or with a general merchandise retail establishment which are incidental and ancillary to the general commercial operation of the retail establishment by amounting to less than 10 percent of the establishment's sales [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20001(d)(2)*]. The term always includes an "area franchise" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20006*; *cf. Corp. Code § 31010*, discussed in *§ 515.51[3]*].

A contract is a franchise and governed by the Franchise Relations Act if the three following conditions are met [*Boat & Motor Mart v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1285, 1288]* :

- A franchisee is granted the right to engage in the business of offering, selling, or distributing goods or services under a marketing plan or system prescribed in substantial part by the franchisor;

- The operation of the franchisee's business pursuant to the plan or system is substantially associated with the franchisor's trademark, service mark, name, logotype, advertising, or other commercial symbol designating the franchisor or its affiliate; and

- The franchisee is required to pay, directly or indirectly, a franchise fee.

A mere promise to sell aggressively is held by the Corporation Commissioner's guidelines [*see* Commissioner of Corporation's Release No. 3-F (rev. 1994)] to be too vague to constitute a marketing plan under the first criteria [*see Boat & Motor Mart v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1285, 1289* (finding substantial direction by

franchisor)].

The Commissioner of Corporations' regulations, releases, guidelines, and interpretive opinions under the Franchise Investment Law, regarding whether or not an agreement constitutes a franchise within the meaning of that law, are prima facie evidence of the scope and extent of coverage of the definition of franchise under the Franchise Relations Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20009*; *see § 515.51[1]*].

[2] Parties to Franchise

A "franchisor" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20003*; *see Corp. Code § 31007*], "franchisee" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20002*; *see Corp. Code § 31006*], "area franchise" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20004*; *see Corp. Code § 31008*], "subfranchisor" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20005*; *see Corp. Code § 31009*] and "person" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20008*; *see Corp. Code § 31015*] are defined exactly as the terms are defined under the Franchise Investment Law [*see § 515.51[1]*].

[3] "Franchise Fee"

A "franchise fee" is defined exactly as the term is defined under the Franchise Investment Law [*see Corp. Code § 31011*, discussed in *§ 515.51[6]*] except that the term excludes (1) the payment, directly or indirectly, of a franchise fee which, on an annual basis, does not exceed the sum of $100; and (2) the payment of a sum not exceeding $1,000 annually on account of the purchase price or rental of fixtures, equipment, or other tangible property to be utilized in, and necessary for, the operation of the franchised business, if the price or rental so charged does not exceed the cost which would be incurred by the franchisee acquiring the items from other persons or in the open market [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20007*].

[4] Nonprofit Retailers' Cooperatives Also Excluded

Also excluded from the definition of franchise for purposes of the Franchise Relations Act is a nonprofit organization operated on a cooperative basis by and for independent retailers that wholesales goods and services primarily to its member retailers, if all of the following are applicable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20001(d)(3)*]:

- Control and ownership of each member is substantially equal.
- Membership is limited to those who will use the services furnished by the organization.
- Transfer of ownership is prohibited or limited.
- Capital investment receives no return.
- Substantially equal benefits pass to members on the basis of patronage of the organization.
- Members are not personally liable for obligations of the organization in the absence of a direct undertaking or authorization by them.
- Services of the organization are furnished primarily for the use of the members.
- Each member and prospective member is provided with an offering circular that complies with the specifications of *Corp. Code § 31111* (discussed in *§ 515.53[3]*).
- No part of the receipts, income, or profit of the organization are paid to any profit-making entity, except for arms-length payments for necessary goods and services, and members are not required to

purchase goods or services from any designated profit-making entity.

- The nonprofit organization is subject to an action for rescission or damages under *Civ. Code § 3343.7* if the organization fraudulently induces the plaintiff to join the organization. Under *Civ. Code § 3343.7*, "fraudulently induced" includes the failure to disclose all information required under *Corp. Code § 31005(c)(8)* or *31111*, unless the defendant proves that the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untruth or omission or that the defendant exercised reasonable care and did not know (or if the defendant had exercised reasonable care would not have known) of the untruth or omission [*Civ. Code § 3343.7*]. Plaintiff is entitled to rescission of a membership contract entered into, or for damages sustained, as a consequence of being fraudulently induced to join the organization [*Civ. Code § 3343.7*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsElementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.82

§ 515.82 Applicability of Franchise Relations Act

The Franchise Relations Act applies to any franchise if either the franchisee is domiciled in California or the franchised business is or has been operated in California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20015*]. The act also applies to franchises granted or renewed after January 1, 1981, or to franchises of an indefinite duration which may be terminated by the franchisee or franchisor without cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20041*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionChoice of LawBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.83

§ 515.83 Termination of Franchise

[1] Good Cause With Notice to Comply

A franchisor may not terminate a franchise prior to the expiration of its term except for good cause and as otherwise provided under the Franchise Relations Act. Good cause includes, but is not limited to, the failure of the franchisee to comply with any lawful requirement of the franchise agreement after being given notice and a reasonable opportunity to cure the failure. This period in no event needs to be more than 30 days [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20020*].

[2] Cause for Immediate Termination

Immediate notice of termination without an opportunity to cure is deemed reasonable if one of the following events listed under the Franchise Relations Act occurs during the period in which the franchise is in effect, and is relevant to the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20021*]:

- Either (1) the franchisee or the business to which the franchise relates is declared bankrupt or is judicially determined to be insolvent, (2) all or a substantial part of the assets of the bankrupt franchisee are assigned to or for the benefit of any creditor, or (3) the franchisee admits inability to pay debts as they come due;

- The franchisee abandons the franchise by failing to operate the business for five consecutive days during which it is required to be operated under the franchise terms, unless the failure to operate is due to fire, flood, earthquake, or other similar causes beyond the franchisee's control. A shorter period may be substituted if, after which, under the facts and circumstances, it is not unreasonable for the franchisor to conclude that the franchisee does not intend to continue to operate the franchise;

- The franchisor and franchisee agree in writing to terminate the franchise;

- The franchisee makes any material misrepresentations relating to the acquisition of the franchise

business or engages in conduct which reflects materially and unfavorably on the operation and reputation of the franchise business or system;

- The franchisee fails, for a period of 10 days after notification of noncompliance, to comply with any federal, state, or local law or regulation applicable to the operation of the franchise;

- The franchisee, after curing any failure in response to a notice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20020*] of noncompliance with lawful requirements of the franchise agreement, engages in the same acts of noncompliance whether or not these acts of noncompliance were corrected after notice;

- The franchisee repeatedly fails to comply with one or more requirements of the franchise, whether or not the acts of noncompliance were corrected after notice;

- Either (1) the franchised business or business premises of the franchise are seized, taken over, or foreclosed by a government official in the exercise of official duties, or by a creditor, lienholder, or lessor (a final judgment against the franchisee, however, must have remained unsatisfied for 30 days unless a supersedeas or other appeal bond has been filed) or (2) a levy of execution is made on the license granted by the franchise agreement or on any property used in the franchised business, and the levy is not discharged within five days;

- The franchisee is convicted of a felony or any other criminal misconduct which is relevant to the operation of the franchise;

- The franchisee fails to pay any franchise fees or other amounts due the franchisor or its affiliate within five days after receiving written notice that those fees are overdue; or

- The franchisor makes a reasonable determination that continued operation of the franchise by the franchisee will result in an imminent danger to public health or safety.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice RequirementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsOpportunity to Cure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.84

§ 515.84 Transfers

For a reasonable time after the death of a franchisee or majority shareholder of a franchisee, a franchisor may not deny the surviving spouse, heirs, or estate of the deceased franchisee or majority shareholder of the franchisee the opportunity to participate in the ownership of the franchise under a valid franchise agreement. During that time, the surviving spouse, heirs, or estate of the deceased must either satisfy all of the then current qualifications for a purchaser of a franchise or sell, transfer, or assign the franchise to a person who satisfies the franchisor's then current standards for new franchisees. The surviving spouse, heirs, or estate of the deceased must maintain all standards and obligations of the franchise in order to retain these rights [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20027(a)*].

A franchisor may, however, after receipt of a bona fide offer to purchase the franchise by a proposed purchaser of the franchise, exercise the right of first refusal [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20027(b)*].

These rules do not apply to any agreement or contract in effect prior to January 1, 1984, except an agreement or contract of an indefinite duration, and do not apply to any bequest or intestate succession that took effect prior to January 1, 1984 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20027(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersContracts LawFormationRights of First Refusal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.85

§ 515.85 Nonrenewal

[1] Notice and Necessary Conditions

A franchisor may not fail to renew a franchise unless the franchisor has provided the franchisee at least 180 days prior written notice of intention not to renew. In addition, at least one of several designated nonrenewal conditions must be present, as discussed below [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025*]. When one of these conditions must exist for a designated period of time, a franchisor may offer or agree, before expiration of the current franchise term, to extend the term of the franchise in order to satisfy the particular period [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20026*].

A franchise agreement providing that the franchisee waives any claim for damages arising out of the franchisor's failure to give the 180-day notice required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025* has been upheld on the ground that it would be valid unless the Franchise Relations Act or some other California law created a right to damages. The only remedies provided are the resale rights [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(a)*] and the requirement of the Franchise Relations Act that the franchisor repurchase the franchise's inventory [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*], which the franchisor did in this case [*Boat & Motor Mart v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1285, 1290-1292* (also holding agreement not unconscionable as it was short, there was no opportunity for surprise, and franchisee knew agreement might not be renewed and that it waived damages)].

[2] Resale Condition

During the 180 days prior to expiration of the franchise, as one condition for nonrenewal, the franchisor may permit the franchisee to sell the business to a purchaser meeting the franchisor's then current requirements for granting new franchises. If the franchisor is not granting a significant number of new franchises, the purchaser may meet the then current requirements for granting renewal franchises [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(a)*].

[3] Condition Requiring Waiver of Clause Not to Compete

A franchisor may refuse to renew a franchise when it is not for the purpose of converting the franchisee's business

premises to operation by employees or agents of the franchisor for the latter's own account (although a franchisor may still exercise a right of first refusal to purchase the franchisee's business) if on expiration of the franchise, the franchisor must agree not to seek to enforce any covenant of the nonrenewed franchisee not to compete with the franchisor or any franchisees of the franchisor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(b)*]. However, it is doubtful such a covenant would ever be enforceable [*see Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1040-1046* (*discussed under § 515.89*; refusing to enforce covenant not to compete after termination by franchisee and implying that such a covenant would not be enforceable after nonrenewal either)].

[4] Termination Condition

A franchisor may refuse to renew a franchise if any of the statutory grounds for terminating a franchise under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20020* and *20021* exist [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(c)*; *see § 515.83*].

[5] Agreement Condition

If the franchisee and the franchisor agree not to renew the franchise, the franchisor may refuse to renew the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(d)*].

[6] Fair Withdrawal Condition

If the franchisor withdraws from distributing its products or services through franchises in the geographic market served by the franchisee, the franchisor may refuse to renew the franchise. On expiration of the franchise, the franchisor must agree not to seek to enforce any covenant of the nonrenewed franchisee not to compete with the franchisor or franchisees of the franchisor. The failure to renew must not be for the purpose of converting the business conducted by the franchisee pursuant to the franchise agreement to operation by employees or agents of the franchisor for the latter's own account [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(e)(1), (2)*]. In addition, if the franchisor has determined to sell, transfer, or assign its interest in the marketing premises occupied by the franchisee, (1) the franchisor must offer the franchisee a right of first refusal if it has received a bona fide offer from someone else to purchase the franchisor's interest in the premises (the offer must be made during the 180-day period after a notice of intent not to renew has been made, and it must be of at least 30 days duration); or (2) a purchaser, transferee, or assignee of the franchisor's interest in one or more other controlled marketing premises must offer the franchisee a franchise in good faith and on substantially the same terms and conditions currently being offered by that person to other franchisees [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(e)(3)*].

[7] Condition of Failure to Agree to Changes or Addenda

A franchisor may refuse to renew a franchise if the franchisor and franchisee are unable to agree to changes or additions to the terms and conditions of the franchise agreement. The changes or additions must be such as would result in renewal of the franchise agreement on substantially the same terms and conditions on which the franchisor is currently customarily granting renewal franchises. If the franchisor is not currently granting a significant number of renewal franchises, the terms and conditions should be those on which the franchisor is currently customarily granting original franchises. The franchisor may give the franchisee written notice of a date, which should be at least 30 days from the date of the notice, on or before which a proposed written agreement of the terms and conditions of the renewal franchise must be accepted in writing by the franchisee. If the notice is given not less than 180 days before the end of the franchise term, it may state that in the event of failure of such acceptance by the franchisee, the notice is to be deemed a notice of intention not to renew at the end of the franchise term [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionCovenants Not to CompeteBusiness &

Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice RequirementsContracts LawFormationRights of First Refusal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.86

§ 515.86 Notice Procedure

Any notice of termination or nonrenewal required under the Franchise Relations Act must be in writing. It must be posted by registered, certified, or other receipted mail, or else personally delivered or delivered by a telegram, to the franchisee. The notice must contain a statement of intent to terminate or not to renew the franchise, the reasons therefor, and the effective date of the termination, nonrenewal, or expiration [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20030*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.87

§ 515.87 Obligation on Improper Termination or Nonrenewal

[1] Generally

If the franchisor terminates or fails to renew the franchise other than in accordance with the provisions of the Franchise Relations Act, the franchisor must offer to repurchase from the franchisee the latter's resalable current inventory which meets the franchisor's current standards as required by the franchise agreement or commercial practice and held for use or sale in the franchised business. The offered price must be the lower of the fair wholesale market value or the price paid by the franchisee. The franchisor need not offer to purchase personalized items which have no value to the franchisor in the business being franchised [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*].

The franchisor may offset, against any repurchase offer made under the act, those sums owed the franchisor or its subsidiaries by the franchisee pursuant to the franchise or to any ancillary agreement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20036*].

[2] Other Remedies

Unless otherwise expressly provided under the Franchise Relations Act, nothing in the act prevents the franchisee from suing under any other law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20037*]. Although, nothing presently in the act expressly provides for any suit to enforce its provisions [*see* Comments to *see § 515.480*], a California appellate court has held that the repurchase of inventory is not the exclusive remedy for wrongful termination of a franchise pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035* [*JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 178, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840* (plaintiff could pursue its breach of contract claim against franchisor for wrongful termination of franchise agreement)].

A provision in a franchise agreement under which the franchisee waives claims for damages arising out of the franchisor's failure to comply with the Act may be upheld [*see Boat & Motor Mart v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1285, 1290-1292* (also holding agreement not unconscionable since it was short, there was no opportunity for surprise, and franchisee knew agreement might not be renewed and that it waived damages)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.88

§ 515.88 Arbitration

The Franchise Relations Act is not intended to limit the right of the franchisor and franchisee to agree, either before or after a dispute has arisen, to binding arbitration of claims under the act. The standards to be applied in the arbitration must not be less than the requirements specified in the act. Any arbitrators employed must be chosen from a list of impartial arbitrators supplied by the American Arbitration Association or by some other impartial person [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20040*; *see generally* Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration*].

To the extent that a franchise agreement is a contract of adhesion, it may be subject to the California Supreme Court's holding in *Discover Bank v. Superior Court (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 148, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 76, 113 P.3d 1100* , which held that in some cases in California, class-action waivers in consumer contracts of adhesion are unenforceable, whether the consumer is being asked to waive the right to class-action litigation or the right to class-wide arbitration [*see* discussion of this case in Ch. 140, *Contracts*, § 140.25[2][a]]. Therefore, in an appropriate case, a ban on class-wide arbitration under a franchise agreement may be unenforceable [*Independent Ass'n of Mailbox Ctr. Owners, Inc. v. Superior Court(2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 396, 410-411*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAlternative Dispute ResolutionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsArbitration Clauses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.89

§ 515.89 Covenants Not to Compete

Covenants not to compete, even those with temporal and geographic limitations, after termination of a franchise term are void and unenforceable against the former franchisees under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* [*Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1040-1046* (failure to so specify in Corp. Code § 20020 did not imply exemption from *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*); for discussion of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* and covenants not to compete, *see* Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* is such a strong policy interest of California that it will govern the validity of a noncompetition clause in a franchise agreement that provides it is to be governed by the law of another state [*Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1039-1041* (relying on *Frame v. Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 668, 672-674, 97 Cal. Rptr. 811*)]. Whether or not customer lists, forms, or other aspects of the franchised business constitute trade secrets, which would be entitled to protection, is a question that must be determined on a case by case basis. A customer list that was developed by franchisees through their own efforts, personal knowledge, and business contacts is not entitled to protection as a trade secret [*Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1044-1045]* . Trade secrets are discussed in Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionCovenants Not to CompeteBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionRestraints of TradeBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForum Selection ClausesContracts LawTypes of ContractsCovenantsTrade Secrets LawOwnership RightsCovenants Not to CompeteTrade Secrets LawProtected InformationCustomer Lists

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.90-515.109

[Reserved]

§§ 515.90[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.110

§ 515.110 Governing Statutes

Several different acts and regulations apply to petroleum products franchises. The federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (PMPA), which preempts any state law in its specific area of concern of termination and nonrenewal of franchises [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2806(a)*], is codified in *15 U.S.C. §§ 2801-2806*. Related California provisions appear in *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999-20999.4*. Trade practice provisions affecting the franchisee's ability to procure supplies from outside sources are found in *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21140-21140.4*. Designation of a franchisee's successor in interest, and implementing procedures, are governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6*. Business hours legislation is covered in *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21150* and *21150.1*. Transfers of franchises are regulated under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21148-21149*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPreemptionEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActFranchise Nonrenewal & Termination

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.111

§ 515.111 Federal Law of Franchisor's Termination or Nonrenewal of Franchise

[1] Preemption of State Termination or Nonrenewal Provisions

The federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act states that, to the extent any of its provisions apply to nonrenewal or termination of any franchise relationship, or the furnishing of notification with respect thereto, no state or local law or regulation applicable to renewals, terminations, or notice may be enacted, promulgated, or continued in effect unless it is the same as the applicable federal provision. This preemption also applies to any remedy or penalty for violations of state or local measure [*15 U.S.C. § 2806(a)(1)*]. The PMPA also states that no state may adopt, enforce, or continue in effect any state or local law or regulation that requires a payment for the goodwill of a franchise on the termination of a franchise or on the nonrenewal of a franchise relationship [*15 U.S.C. § 2806(a)(2)*]. In 1981, the California Legislature amended state provisions governing petroleum franchises to change the definitions of "franchise," and related terms, to conform to the definitions of those terms under federal law [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999, 21140, 21150*; *Corp. Code §§ 31005, 31005.5*; and discussions in *§§ 515.111[3][a]* and *515.112*].

State laws governing petroleum product franchises are not the only state statutes preempted by the PMPA. California's Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*) and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, relating to unfair business practices, are also preempted to the extent that they cannot be relied on to enjoin or prohibit a franchise termination, or the nonrenewal of a franchise, that would be proper under the PMPA [*Exxon Corp. v. Miro (DC Cal. 1983) 555 F. Supp. 234, 237-238* ; *California Arco Distributors, Inc. v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 349, 364, 204 Cal. Rptr. 743]* . Similarly, preemption extends to California common law and tort theories, such as claims for damages for violation of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, fraud, and interference with prospective economic advantage. Whenever the essence of the franchisee's claims is the termination of the franchise, state common law and tort theories are preempted. One reason for the preemption is to avoid conflict between the PMPA provisions and state law regarding exemplary damages, determination by a jury or the court of entitlement to exemplary damages [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2805(d)(2)*], and attorney's and expert witness fees [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2805(d)(3)*; *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 485, 488-490, 234 Cal. Rptr. 482]* .

[2] Laws Governing Assignment Not Totally Preempted

The federal law does not authorize any transfers or assignments of franchises, or prohibit any such transactions, that may be authorized by provisions of franchises themselves or by applicable state laws governing these transactions without regard to franchise provisions [*15 U.S.C. § 2806(b)(1)*]. By *15 U.S.C. § 2806(b)*, Congress did not intend either to authorize or to prohibit franchise assignments but, as a general rule, left the matter to state law [*Humboldt Oil Co. v. Exxon Co, U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 373, 375* ; *Prestin v. Mobil Oil Corp. (9th Cir. 1984) 741 F.2d 268, 270* (*15 U.S.C. § 2806(b)* renumbered without change by Pub. L. No. 103-371, § 5, 108 Stat. 3485); *now see 15 U.S.C. § 2806(b)(1)*; *see Forty-Niner Truck Plaza, Inc. v. Union Oil Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1276-1278, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532* (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.25(a)* is not preempted by *PMPA); California Service Station etc. Assn. v. Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 51-53, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279* (specifically holding that former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148(a)(3)* is not preempted by PMPA)]. Federal law does not prohibit any state from specifying the terms and conditions under which any franchise or franchise relationship may be transferred to the designated successor of a franchisee on the death of the franchisee [*15 U.S.C. § 2806(b)(2)*].

Nevertheless, a state law regarding assignment cannot be applied to frustrate federal objectives. This applies often in the so-called "cure" area. A franchisee cannot avoid the consequences of his or her own conduct that gave rise to a notice of termination or nonrenewal by assigning the franchise after having been notified of the franchisor's intent to terminate or not to renew. For instance, a franchisee who is convicted of a felony that provides grounds for termination under *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C), (c)(12)* cannot assign the franchise to a corporation that he or she controls or to a third party with whom the franchisee has an agreement allowing him or her to continue to operate the business [*Humboldt Oil Co. v. Exxon Co, U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 373, 375* ; *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Guerami (9th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 280, 282-283]* . A franchisee who has received notice of termination based on station closings and failure to pay the franchisor for gasoline cannot file a petition in bankruptcy and rely on *11 U.S.C. § 365(f)* (debtor's right to assume and assign executory portion of contract or lease) to allow assignment [*In re Herbert (9th Cir. 1986) 806 F.2d 889, 893-895]* .

When the assignment is allowed under California law, a franchisor can refuse consent to an assignment or sublease only when it has a good faith reasonable objection to it [*Prestin v. Mobil Oil Corp. (9th Cir. 1984) 741 F.2d 268, 270-273* (considering franchise entered into before effective date of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148, discussed under § 515.116[1]*)].

Once the assignment of an unexpired portion of a regular franchise is achieved, the resulting franchise is not a trial franchise as defined in *15 U.S.C. § 2803(b)(1)*, and the franchisor is subject to the more stringent requirements regarding nonrenewal and termination applicable to regular franchises [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2803(b)(2)*]. Thus, although the PMPA permits a franchisor to require a franchisee who has not previously been a party to a franchise with the franchisor to accept a trial franchise in certain instances, it specifically excludes assignments of existing franchises from that requirement, leaving the regulation of assignments and transfers to state law [*California Service Station etc. Assn. v Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 51-53, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279]* .

[3] Definitions

[a] "Franchise"

A "franchise" is a contract between (1) a refiner and either a distributor or a retailer, or (2) a distributor and either another distributor or a retailer. In either instance, the refiner or distributor authorizes or permits the distributor or retailer to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel. The trademark is owned or controlled by the refiner, or by a refiner that supplies motor fuel to the distributor that authorizes or permits its use [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(1)(A)*].

The term "franchise" includes a contract under which a retailer or distributor is authorized or permitted to occupy leased marketing premises that are to be employed in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel

under a trademark. The trademark is owned or controlled by the refiner, or by a refiner that supplies motor fuel to the distributor, who authorizes or permits the occupancy. The term includes a contract pertaining to the supply of motor fuel to be sold, consigned, or distributed under a trademark owned or controlled by a refiner, or under certain contracts existing continuously from an earlier time. The term includes the unexpired portion of franchise properly transferred or assigned [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2801(1)(B)*].

[b] Franchise Parties and Relationship

A "franchisor" is a refiner or distributor who authorizes or permits, under a franchise, a retailer or distributor to use a trademark in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of motor fuel [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(3)*]. A "franchisee" is a retailer or distributor who is so authorized or permitted [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(4)*]. The concept of a "trademark" includes a trade name, service mark, or any identifying symbol or name [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(11)*]. A "franchise relationship" is the respective motor fuel marketing or distribution obligations and responsibilities of a franchisor and franchisee resulting from the marketing of motor fuel under a franchise [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(2)*].

[c] Marketing Parties and Product

A "refiner" is anyone engaged in the refining of crude oil to produce motor fuel, including any affiliate of such a person [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(5)*]. A "retailer" is one who purchases motor fuel for sale to the general public for ultimate consumption [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(7)*]. A "distributor" is someone, or an affiliate of someone, who purchases motor fuel for sale, consignment, or distribution to another. Alternatively, a "distributor" may be one who receives motor fuel on consignment for consignment or distribution to another's own fuel accounts or to accounts of another's supplier; but this designation does not include a person who is an employee of, or merely serves as a common carrier providing transportation service for, the supplier [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(6)*]. "Motor fuel" refers to gasoline and diesel fuel of a type distributed for use as a fuel in self-propelled vehicles designed primarily for use on public streets, roads, and highways [*15 U.S.C. § 2801(12)*].

[4] Grounds for Interrupting Franchise

Under the PMPA, motor fuel franchisors may not terminate a franchise (entered into or renewed after June 19, 1978) or fail to renew a franchise relationship, except under prescribed conditions, which require proper notification [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2804*], and under permissible grounds. These grounds include the following: (1) the franchisee's failure to comply with reasonable and material franchise provisions or failure to exert good faith efforts to carry out these provisions; (2) the occurrence of an event such as fraud, criminal conduct, bankruptcy, the franchisee's being severely disabled for at least three months, resulting in an inability to run the operation; (3) an agreement between the parties under certain protective conditions; and (4) the franchisor's withdrawal from the market area. Additional grounds for nonrenewal include the inability of the parties to agree on changes, numerous customer complaints to the franchisor, and the failure to operate the franchise in a clean, safe, and healthful manner [*see 15 U.S.C. § 2802(b), (c)*].

Some grounds for termination require a determination that the franchise relationship has actually been undermined, whereas others do not. For instance, if the ground for termination is a breach of contract under *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(A)*, the nature and effect of the alleged contractual breach would determine whether grounds existed for termination of the franchise [*Khorenian v. Union Oil Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 761 F.2d 533, 536]* . If, however, the ground for termination were the franchisee's conviction of a felony involving moral turpitude, no determination of actual undermining would be required because the PMPA specifies that conviction of a felony involving moral turpitude is sufficient ground for termination of the franchise [*15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C), (c)(12)*; *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Guerami (9th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 280, 282-283]* .

A franchisee cannot recover for constructive *termination* under the PMPA if the franchisor's allegedly wrongful conduct did not compel the franchisee to abandon its franchise. The PMPA prohibits only franchisor conduct that has the effect

of ending a franchise. A necessary element of any constructive termination claim under the PMPA is that the complained-of conduct forced an end to the franchisee's use of the franchisor's trademark, purchase of the franchisor's fuel, or occupation of the franchisor's service station. A franchisee may not maintain a claim for constructive *nonrenewal* under the PMPA after the franchisee signs and then operates under a renewal agreement with the franchisor, even if the franchisee signs "under protest" because of unfair and coercive conduct by the franchisor. The franchisee may pursue state-law remedies for the franchisor's wrongful conduct [*Mac's Shell Serv. v. Shell Oil Prods. Co. LLC (2010) -- U.S. --, 130 S. Ct. 1251, 176 L. Ed. 2d 36, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 2203, at *6, *13, *23-*24, *27, *31]* .

[5] Franchises Excepted From Nonrenewal Restrictions

Federal regulation of franchise renewals does not apply to "trial franchises" (which involve first-time franchisees of the franchisor in an initial contract period for up to one year) or "interim franchises" (which are continuations for up to three years of franchises that were not renewed because the franchisor withdrew from the market area) [*15 U.S.C. § 2803*].

[6] Liability

If the franchisor fails to comply with federal termination or nonrenewal requirements, the franchisee may maintain a civil action, without regard to the amount in controversy, in the United States District Court for the area in which the franchisor has its principal place of business or the franchisee does business. The action must be commenced within one year after the date of the termination or nonrenewal, or the date of the failure to comply with the applicable requirements, whichever occurs later [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(a)*].

The court must grant a preliminary injunction in the action if (1) the franchisee shows that there has been a termination or nonrenewal and that serious questions on the merits exist for litigation, and (2) the court finds that the franchisee would suffer greater hardship than the franchisor without such relief [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(b)(2)*]. This standard for preliminary injunction under *15 U.S.C. § 2805(b)(2)* is more liberal than the general requirements for preliminary injunction. *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65* (irreparable harm), is not applicable. The franchisee need only show (1) that it will suffer greater hardship from nonissuance of a preliminary injunction than the franchisor will from issuance, and (2) that the franchisee has a reasonable chance of success on the merits [*Khorenian v. Union Oil Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 761 F.2d 533, 535-536]* .

The franchisor may avoid injunction on certain grounds of economic detriment. The court may require that the franchisee post a bond. Injunctive relief may be denied, however, if the action is commenced after periods of time recognized in the statute as posing too great a delay [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(b)(3), (e)(1)*].

Burdens of proof and producing evidence are specially set out by law [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(c)*]. The franchisee may recover actual and court-imposed punitive damages as well as attorney and expert witness fees. Even if the franchisor has been able to avoid injunction, damages and expenses are still available [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(d), (e)(2)*; *see Union Oil v. O'Riley (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 199, 214-215, 276 Cal. Rptr. 483* (upholding $40,000 punitive damage award on grounds that defendant acted in willful disregard of notice requirements, created indebtedness by delivering oil while franchisee was in hospital, and in fact was retaliating for franchisee's complaints)].

No franchisor may require, as a condition of entering into or renewing the franchise relationship, that a franchisee release or waive any right that the franchisee has under the PMPA, any other federal law, or any applicable state law [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(f)(1)*]. Further, no provision of any franchise will be valid or enforceable if the provision specifies that the interpretation or enforcement of the franchise will be governed by the law of any state other than the state in which the franchisee has its principal place of business [*15 U.S.C. § 2805(f)(2)*].

[7] Concurrent State and Federal Jurisdiction

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with federal courts over PMPA claims [*Union Oil v. O'Riley (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 199, 204, 276 Cal. Rptr. 483]* . This position is at odds with earlier holdings in *Rustom v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (D.C. Cal. 1985) 618 F. Supp. 210* , and *Niakan v. Samaan (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 716, 245 Cal. Rptr. 24* . Nevertheless, it seems to reflect the intention of the United States Supreme Court in vacating the previous state court judgment of dismissal in *O'Riley* and remanding the case for further consideration in light of *Tafflin v. Levitt (1990) 493 U.S. 455, 110 S. Ct.792, 107 L. Ed. 2d 887* , which held that state courts had concurrent jurisdiction over RICO suits (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, *18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.*) [*Union Oil v. O'Riley (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 199, 202, 204, 276 Cal. Rptr. 483]* .

The grant of federal jurisdiction in *15 U.S.C. § 2805(a)* is permissive, not mandatory. The presumption of concurrent jurisdiction is not to be lightly discarded, and random comments in the congressional discussion about federal judges and actions in district court are not sufficient to overcome the presumption of concurrent jurisdiction. Nor do desire for uniformity or reference in the PMPA to federal rules of procedure create a clear incompatibility with federal interests or necessitate a finding that Congress meant only federal courts to rule on PMPA matters [*Union Oil v. O'Riley (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 199, 204, 276 Cal. Rptr. 483]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPreemptionEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActFranchise Nonrenewal & TerminationEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActLegislative Policies & Purposes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.112

§ 515.112 Definitions Applicable to California Petroleum Franchises

The definitions applicable to California legislation governing the termination, cancellation, and nonrenewal of petroleum products franchises, a petroleum products franchisee's dealings with outside suppliers, the right to designate a successor in interest and transfer the franchise, and hours of business are the same as those that apply to the federal Petroleum marketing Practices Act, discussed in *§ 515.111[3][a]* [*compare 15 U.S.C. § 2801 with Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999* (termination, cancellation, and nonrenewal of franchise), 21140 (franchisee's dealings with outside suppliers and designation of successor in interest), 21150 (franchisee's hours of business and operation)].

California statute broadens the definition of the term "fuel" to include gasoline, diesel, gasohol, or aviation fuel, in contrast to the more limited definition of fuel as motor fuel under federal law [*compare Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999(l), 21140(k), 21150(k) with 15 U.S.C. § 2801(12)*]. In addition, California defines "marketing premises" to mean, in the case of any franchise, premises that, under such franchises, are to be employed by the franchisee in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of fuel [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999(h), 21140(g), 21150(g)*], and "leased marketing premises" to mean marketing premises owned, leased, or in any way controlled by a franchisor and that the franchisee is authorized or permitted by the franchise to employ in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of fuel [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999(i), 21140(h), 21150(h)*]. "Contract" means any oral or written agreement. For supply purposes, delivery levels during the same month of the previous year are prima facie evidence of an agreement to deliver those levels [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20999(j), 21140(i), 21150(i)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActFranchise Nonrenewal & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.113

§ 515.113 California Law of Termination, Cancellation, or Nonrenewal of Petroleum Products Franchises

[1] Preemption by Federal Law

The federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act expressly provides for preemption of state legislation or regulation purporting to govern in identical areas of concern [*15 U.S.C. § 2806(a)(1)*; *see § 515.111*].

[2] Good Cause Required for Discontinuing Franchise

A franchisor may not terminate, cancel, or fail to or refuse to renew an existing franchise without good cause, notwithstanding the terms of the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1*]. This provision only prevents a franchisor from discontinuing a franchise when the franchise agreement gives the franchisor the right to do so on a ground other than that which constitutes good cause as discussed below. If the agreement terminates by its own terms, however, the provision does not apply. That is, discontinuance must be for good cause as specified in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* if the franchisee is given some right of renewal or, in the case of termination or cancellation, the franchisor has canceled or terminated the franchise prior to the date of its expiration as provided in the agreement [*see Witt v. Union Oil Co. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 435, 438-439, 160 Cal. Rptr. 285]* .

Good cause is limited to particular subject matter. It exists if the gasoline dealer or petroleum distributor failed to comply with essential and reasonable requirements of the franchise agreement. It is present also if either the distributor or dealer failed to act in good faith in carrying out the terms of the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1(a), (b)*].

Good cause also exists if the franchisor is withdrawing from the marketing location of a gasoline dealer's franchise. However, the franchisor must pay the dealer the current wholesale market value for all qualifying equipment and supplies purchased by the dealer from the franchisor or from an affiliate thereof. The phrase "qualifying equipment and supplies" means all equipment and supplies purchased by the gasoline dealer from the franchisor, or an affiliate thereof, that are (1) free and clear of all liens, security interests, and other encumbrances, (2) valued on a first-in, first-out basis, and (3) evidenced by receipted invoices. Additionally, these goods must (1) be in first-class and resalable condition, (2) remain in the original packages or containers, (3) bear the original labels and trademarks, and (4) display no evidence of

deterioration. This form of good cause is pertinent only to franchises entered into or renewed on or after January 1, 1979 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1(c)*].

Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1(d)* also provides that good cause may arise for other legitimate business reasons (except that a termination or cancellation of a franchise for the purpose of enabling the petroleum distributor or manufacturer to assume operation of the distributor's or gasoline dealer's business shall not be considered to be a legitimate business reason, unless the gasoline dealer or distributor is paid reasonable compensation for the value of the franchise, including a reasonable amount for goodwill), this provision has been held to be preempted by *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C)* because it is not the same as the PMPA, and therefore it stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress [*California Arco Distributors, Inc. v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 349, 360-363, 204 Cal. Rptr. 743* ; *but see* concurrence in *E. S. Bills, Inc. v. Tzucanow (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 824, 835-838, 215 Cal. Rptr. 278, 700 P.2d 1280* (claiming *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* is valid)].

[3] Right to Counsel

A petroleum distributor may not deny to any present or prospective gasoline dealer the right to be accompanied by counsel or a personal representative to any meeting held between the parties for the purpose of negotiating the terms of a franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.2*].

[4] Liability

Anyone who violates the termination, cancellation, or nonrenewal requirements pertaining to petroleum products franchises may be sued in the superior court in the county in which either the defendant resides or a franchise affected by the violation does business. Suit may be for temporary and permanent injunctive relief as well as for damages, if any, and the costs of suit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.3(a)*]. The proceeding must be brought within two years after the violation on which it is based or one year after the plaintiff's discovery of the facts constituting the violation, whichever occurs first [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.3(b)*].

[5] Notification of Franchisor's Withdrawal

When a franchisor intends to withdraw from marketing fuel through retail and distribution outlets in the relevant geographic market area, the franchisor shall promptly submit notification to the Governor, together with a plan describing the schedule and conditions of withdrawal [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.4*].

[6] Unlawful Detainer Action by Franchisor Against Franchisee

Except as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1166a*, in any action for unlawful detainer brought by a petroleum distributor against a gasoline dealer, possession will not be restored to the petroleum distributor unless the court in the unlawful detainer action determines that the petroleum distributor had good cause under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* to terminate, cancel, or refuse to renew the franchise of the gasoline dealer. In any action for unlawful detainer brought by a petroleum distributor against a gasoline dealer, the court may, at the time of request by either party, require the tenant to make rental payments into the court for the lessor at the contract rate, pending the resolution of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1174(a)*]. However, at least the "other legitimate business reason" grounds of termination under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1(d)* seems to be preempted by the PMPA [*California Arco Distributors, Inc. v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 349, 360-363, 204 Cal. Rptr. 743* (holding *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1(d)* preempted by *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C)*; *but see* concurrence in *E. S. Bills, Inc. v. Tzucanow (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 824, 835-838, 215 Cal. Rptr. 278, 700 P.2d 1280* (claiming *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* is valid)]. In a case in which the PMPA is clearly inapplicable, a trial court's exclusion of evidence crucial to defendant's ability to disprove the good cause requisite to a judgment for plaintiff under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1174(a)* and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* is grounds for reversal [*E. S. Bills, Inc. v. Tzucanow (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 824, 828, 835, 215 Cal. Rptr. 278, 700 P.2d 1280]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 1166a* relates to obtaining immediate possession; for discussion, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesInjunctive ReliefBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice RequirementsEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPreemptionEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActFranchise Nonrenewal & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.114

§ 515.114 Regulation of Petroleum Products Franchisee's Dealings With Outside Suppliers

[1] Definitions

The definitions of "franchise," "franchisor," "franchisee," "trademark," "refiner," "retailer," and "distributor," for purposes of regulating dealings between franchisees and suppliers other than their franchisors, conform with the definitions provided under the federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140; *15 U.S.C. § 2801*; *see § 515.211*]. In addition, for purposes of regulating these dealings, California provides the following definitions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140(g)-(i), (k), (l)*]:

- "Marketing premises" are premises that under the franchise are to be employed by the franchisee in connection with the sale, consignment, or distribution of fuel.

- "Leased marketing premises" are premises owned, leased, or controlled by a franchisor, that the franchisee is authorized or permitted by franchise to employ.

- A "contract" is any oral or written agreement.

- "Fuel" is gasoline, diesel, gasohol, or aviation fuel.

- An "affiliate" is any person who, other than by franchise, controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, any other person.

[2] When Franchisee May Resort to Outside Suppliers

Notwithstanding the terms of the franchise, a franchisee is not precluded from purchasing fuel from any available source if the franchisor is unable or refuses to supply the franchisee with fuel. Failure to deliver contracted, agreed on, or requested quantities of fuel within 72 hours of the specified contract time, agreement, or request constitutes an inability or refusal to supply the franchisee. However, nondelivery of such products by the franchisor due to accident,

fire, theft, or other similar acts does not constitute an inability or refusal to supply the franchisee. Additionally, the legislation does not permit a franchisee to purchase more fuel than may be allowed by any federal statute or regulation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.1*].

[3] Notice Requirements

Requests for deliveries of petroleum products may be telephoned to the franchisor. However, when the franchisee intends to seek these products from another supplier because the franchisor is unable or refuses to supply the products, a written request for the products must be made to the franchisor at least 48 hours before desired delivery. Once such notice has been given and the franchisor fails to deliver the products as contracted, agreed on, or requested, no further written request is required from the franchisee until such time as the franchisor notifies the franchisee in writing that the former is prepared to deliver contracted, agreed on, or requested quantities of the products [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.1*].

[4] Disclosure to Consumer

If the franchisee sells petroleum products supplied from a source other than the franchisor, the franchisee must post a sign prominently disclosing this fact to the public on each pump dispensing the particular product so purchased. The sign may not be smaller than 8 inches by 10 inches, with letters no less than three inches in height [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.1*].

[5] Prohibited Tie-in Requirements

It is illegal for a petroleum products franchisor to require a franchisee to purchase only those tires, batteries, motor oil, and other automotive accessories sold by the franchisor. A franchised retail gasoline dealer may sell any such accessories available to the dealer for retail sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2*].

[6] Civil Penalty

The franchisor's executive officer, representative, or agent who negotiates any contract in violation of the provisions governing a franchisee's outside dealings for petroleum products and automotive accessories, or who otherwise coerces a franchisee in violation of such provisions is liable for a civil penalty of up to $100,000 for each offense. The action may be brought by the attorney general, district attorney, county counsel, or city attorney [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.3*].

[7] Civil Liability

Anyone injured in his or her business or property by reason of a violation of the provisions regulating franchisees' outside dealings for petroleum products may sue in any proper court in the county where the defendant or any agent of the defendant resides or is found, or where service may be obtained, without respect to the amount in controversy. Recovery is for treble damages sustained plus costs and attorney's fees. The action must be brought within four years after the cause of action accrues [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsCauses of Action & RemediesBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionRestraints of TradeBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsCommunity of InterestBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesPunitive DamagesEnergy & Utilities

LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.115

§ 515.115 Right of Franchisee to Designate Successor in Interest

[1] Definitions

The definitions applicable to the law allowing a petroleum products franchisee to designate a successor in interest to take over the franchise operation after the franchisee's death are the same as those *found in § 515.114[1]*.

[2] Designation of Successor

It is unlawful to include in a franchise agreement, on or after January 1, 1980, any term which provides for the termination of the franchise by the franchisor on the death of the franchisee if the latter, prior to his or her demise, designates a successor in interest in a form prescribed by and delivered to the franchisor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(a)*]. The "successor in interest" is restricted to either a surviving spouse or adult child of the franchisee who, at the time of the franchisee's death, meets the reasonable qualifications then being required of dealers by the franchisor for the operation of service stations [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(b)*]. The designated successor provisions do not apply to a "trial franchise" as defined in the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(c)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 2803(b)*; *see also § 515.111[5]*].

[3] Successor's Assumption of Franchise

The designated successor in interest must be allowed 21 days after the franchisee's death to give written notice of his or her election to assume and operate the franchise. The notification should contain such information regarding business experience and creditworthiness as is reasonably required by the franchisor. The successor should offer to assume the franchise in writing three business days after the election and must commence operation of the franchise within 10 days after it has been assumed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(d)*].

[4] Franchisor's Requirements for Designation

The franchisor may require a franchisee who desires to designate a successor in interest to deposit with the franchisor at

the time of designation a sum that would be reasonably estimated to be necessary to compensate the franchisor for rent for a period of 21 days. The deposit is intended to compensate the franchisor if the designee, during the 21-day period after the franchisee's death, fails to assume the franchise obligation. Any unearned portion of the deposit resulting from an earlier assumption of the responsibility, or from the franchisor's temporary operation of the facility during that time period, must be refunded to the estate or legal representative of the deceased franchisee. In addition to the deposit, the franchisor may require a franchisee desiring to designate a successor to arrange for the discharge or performance of other franchise obligations, such as insurance--but excluding any obligation to be open to the public--for a period of up to 21 days after the franchisee's demise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(e)*].

[5] Nature of Interest Devolving

Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6, entitling a franchisee to designate a successor in interest, does not entitle the successor to a greater or lesser franchise than existed in the name of the deceased franchisee at the time of death. This section also neither expands nor diminishes the rights of the franchisor or the franchisee under federal or state law [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(f)*]. All actions to be performed by the franchisor or successor in interest must be done in a reasonable time in each instance [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(h)*].

[6] Procedure as Between Alternate Successors

The franchisee may designate a primary and one alternate successor in interest. The alternate, if one is designated, has no rights under the protective legislation in the event of any exercise of rights by the primary successor. If the alternate desires to assume and operate the franchise in the event the primary successsor fails to do so, the alternate must give notice of the election and otherwise comply with the requirements incumbent on the primary successor in giving notice and assuming the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(g)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(d)*].

[7] Interim Procedure Preceding Successor's Assumption of Franchise

The franchise may not be operated by anyone following the death of the franchisee until all parts of the franchise have been expressly assumed as provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6*. Assumption includes, but is not limited to, such items as leases, products agreement, loaned equipment agreement, federal and state environmental law compliance agreements, licensing, and tax permits. This prohibition does not prevent the franchisor from operating the franchise for his or her own account, nor does it prevent any operation the franchisor agrees to in writing otherwise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(i)*].

If the franchisor elects to operate the franchise for his or her own account, it is without obligation or duty to the heirs or estate of the deceased franchisee or to the successor in interest. The franchisor, however, must account to the heirs or the deceased franchisee's estate for the inapplicable portion of any prepaid rent or other sums prepaid to the franchisor, and for any physical inventory salvaged from the franchise and used or sold by the franchisor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(j)*]. Similarly, if the successor in interest assumes the franchise and there has been no intervening operation thereof by the franchisor, the successor must account to the heirs or estate of the deceased franchisee for the value or other disposition of personal property of the franchisee located at or related to the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(k)*].

[8] Liability

Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6* does not specifically provide for an action for violation of the successor in interest requirements, it does state that liability for failure to comply with the requirements is limited to regular contract damages as provided in *Civ. Code § 3300*--that is, the amount which will compensate the aggrieved party for all the detriment proximately caused by the breach of obligation, or which, in the ordinary course of things, would be likely to result therefrom. It also provides that an action must be commenced within one year after the cause of action accrues [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.116

§ 515.116 Petroleum Products Franchisee's Ability to Transfer Franchises

[1] Franchises Affected

Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21148-21149 restrict the ability of the franchisor to withhold consent to a proposed sale of a petroleum products franchise by the franchisee, if the franchise was entered into after 1980 [Stats. 1980, ch. 698, § 4; *see Kreisher v. Mobil Oil Corp. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 389, 403-405, 243 Cal. Rptr. 662* (Corp. Code § 21148 not retroactive; statute did not require franchisor to consent to assignment of lease executed in 1980, for term commencing January 1, 1981)]. The definitions applicable to this legislation are the same as those discussed in *§ 515.211*.

[2] Restrictions on Franchisor's Withholding Consent

Notwithstanding the terms of the petroleum products franchise, generally the franchisor may not withhold consent to the sale, transfer, or assignment of the franchise by the franchisee to someone else. Statutory exemptions to this general rule permit the franchisor to withhold consent if the franchisor demonstrates in writing to the franchisee, within 45 days of receiving the application or required paperwork, any of five conditions. The franchisor may withhold consent if the proposed purchaser either has less business experience and training or less financial resources than are normally required by the franchisor of prospective franchisees or does not satisfy the then-current, uniformly applied requirements, if any, of the franchisor applicable to prospective franchisees [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148(a)(1)-(3)*; *see California Service Station etc. Assn. v Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 51-53, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279* (provision regarding satisfaction of then-current uniform requirements, is not preempted by PMPA)]. Consent may also be refused if the purchaser operates a franchise under an agreement with a different franchisor, and the then-current, uniformly applied requirements of the franchisor, if any, preclude operating franchises of other franchisors [Corp. Code § 21148(a)(4)]. Finally, consent may be withheld if the franchisee has not offered the proposed transaction in writing to the franchisor on the same terms and conditions as those offered to the proposed purchaser, and allowed the franchisor at least 30 days prior to the proposed transaction in which to accept or decline the offer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148(a)(5)*].

Notwithstanding the terms of any franchise, a franchisor may not withhold its consent to the sale, transfer, or

assignment of the franchise by the franchisee to another person for the purposes of diminishing the market value of the franchise [Corp. Code § 21148(b)]. Further, notwithstanding the terms of any franchise, a franchisor may not withhold its consent to the sale, transfer, or assignment of the franchise by the franchisee to another person because that other person is of foreign origin or is non-English speaking, as long as the prospective franchisee is able to adequately able to communicate with the franchisor and the appropriate federal, state, and local governmental agencies concerning matters of management, operations, environmental compliance, and public safety [Corp. Code § 21148(c)].

A franchisor's "uniformly applied requirements" allowing three-year franchises with renewal options to franchisees who had previously held a franchise with the franchisor but only allowing one-year franchises terminable at any time for any reason to persons who had not previously held one of its franchises was found to violate *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148*. The effect of the franchisor's policy was to prevent franchisees from selling or assigning the unexpired portions of their franchises to anyone except persons who were or had previously been franchisees of the same franchisor [*California Service Station etc. Assn. v Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 56, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279* (further implementation of franchisor's practice enjoined under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*)].

These exceptions do not apply in the care of a sale, transfer, or assignment of the franchise to a corporation in which the franchisee has a controlling interest if the franchisee offers in writing to guarantee personally the corporation's performance of its obligations under the franchise [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21149*].

[3] Transfer Fee

If the franchisor consents to the sale, transfer, or assignment of the petroleum products franchise to a prospective purchaser, the franchisor may require the franchisee to pay a transfer fee to the franchisor. The amount of this fee must be reasonable when compared to the sale price of the franchise, and it may not be required in an effort to frustrate the proposed sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & Marketing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.117-515.129

[Reserved]

§§ 515.117[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.130

§ 515.130 Governing Law

The subject of new motor dealership franchises in California is covered in *Veh. Code §§ 331-331.3, 507*, and *3060-3069*. Administrative regulations of the New Motor Vehicle Board are contained in *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 585-592*. California law also regulates recreational vehicle franchises in *Veh. Code §§ 331.3* (definition), 11713.22, and 11713.23 [*see* discussion in *§ 515.150*].

Federal law also gives a franchise automobile dealer a remedy of civil suit in federal court when an automobile manufacturer or distributor engaged in interstate commerce fails to act in good faith in performing or complying with any term of the franchise or in terminating, cancelling, or not renewing the franchise [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1221*; *see generally 15 U.S.C. §§ 1221-1225*]. Federal law does not invalidate any provision of state law except when there is a direct conflict between the two laws [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1225*]. Presently, there appears to be no such conflict between federal and California law.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGood Faith & Fair DealingBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.131

§ 515.131 Definitions

[1] "Franchise"

A new motor vehicle dealership franchise is a written agreement between two or more persons having all of the following conditions [*Veh. Code § 331(a)*]:

- A commercial relationship of definite duration or continuing indefinite duration [*Veh. Code § 331(a)(1)*].

- The franchisee is granted the right to offer for sale or lease, or to sell or lease at retail, new motor vehicles or new trailers subject to identification pursuant to *Veh. Code § 5014.1* manufactured or distributed by the franchisor, or the right to perform authorized warranty repairs and service, or the right to perform any combination of these activities [*Veh. Code § 331(a)(2)*].

- The franchisee constitutes a component of the franchisor's distribution system [*Veh. Code § 331(a)(3)*].

- The operation of the franchisee's business is substantially associated with the franchisor's trademark, trade name, advertising, or other commercial symbol designating the franchisor [*Veh. Code § 331(a)(4)*].

- The operation of a portion of the franchisee's business substantially depends on the franchisor for a continued supply of new vehicles, parts, or accessories [*Veh. Code § 331(a)(5)*].

The term "franchise" does *not* include an agreement entered into by a manufacturer or distributor and a person who [*Veh. Code § 331(b)*]:

- Is authorized to perform warranty repairs and service on vehicles manufactured or distributed by the

manufacturer or distributor;

- Is not a new motor vehicle dealer franchisee of the manufacturer or distributor; and

- Has a repair and service facility not located within the relevant market area of a new motor vehicle dealer franchisee of the manufacturer or distributor.

[2] Franchise Parties

The franchisor is a manufacturer, assembler, or distributor of new motor vehicles subject to registration under the Vehicle Code or new off-highway motorcycles [*see Veh. Code § 436* (definition)], new all-terrain vehicles [*see Veh. Code § 111* (definition)], or new trailers subject to identification pursuant to *Veh. Code § 5014.1*, who grants the franchise [*Veh. Code § 331.2*]. The franchisee receives new motor vehicles, new off-highway motorcycles, new all-terrain vehicles, or new trailers subject to identification pursuant to *Veh. Code § 5014.1* from the franchisor and offers them for sale or lease at retail, or sells or leases them at retail, or is granted the right to perform authorized warranty repairs and service or the right to perform any combination of these activities [*Veh. Code § 331.1*].

[3] "Relevant Market Area"

The "relevant market area" involved in new motor vehicle franchising is any area within a radius of 10 miles from the site of a potential new dealership [*Veh. Code § 507*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsCommunity of InterestBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsElementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.132

§ 515.132 Applicability and Administration of New Motor Vehicle Dealership Franchise Legislation

The special legislation governing new motor vehicle dealership franchises applies to all such dealership franchises regardless of when a franchise was established [*Veh. Code § 3069*].

The legislation is administered through the New Motor Vehicle Board (contained in the Department of Motor Vehicles), which hears disputes over licensing within the motor vehicle industry, disposes of complaints concerning licensee practices, and hears and considers protests presented by new motor vehicle dealership franchisees [*Veh. Code § 3050(b)-(d)*].

In response to court decisions holding the composition of the Board to be an unconstitutional denial of due process in disputes between dealers and new car manufacturers, and in protests regarding termination, establishment, or relocation of dealerships, even when the dealers did not participate as voting members because of a substantial probability of bias, the powers of the dealer members of the board were redefined effective September 29, 1985 [*see Nissan Motor Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 109, 113, 202 Cal. Rptr. 1* (any decision of improperly constituted board is void); *see also University Ford Chrysler-Plymouth,Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 796, 804-806, 224 Cal. Rptr. 908* (policy of new vehicle dealer board members, implemented after *Nissan* decision, to automatically recuse themselves from participation, hearing, commenting on, or advising on dealer-manufacturer disputes as not curing unconstitutionality in statute as amended in 1979); *Chevrolet Motor Division v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 533, 539, 541, 194 Cal. Rptr. 270* ; *but see American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 469-473, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769* (upholding decision of board heard under voluntary recusal policy as no prejudice shown)]. Since then, members of the board who are new motor vehicle dealers cannot participate in, hear, comment, advise other members on, or decide (1) any matter considered by the board pursuant to *Veh. Code § 11700 et seq.* (licensing) that involves a dispute between a franchisee and a franchisor [*Veh. Code § 3050(c)*], or (2) any matter involving a protest filed pursuant to *Veh. Code § 3060 et seq.* (termination, establishment, or relocation of dealerships, delivery, preparation, and warranty obligations) [*Veh. Code §§ 3050(d), 3066(d)* (allowing participation upon stipulation of all parties to protest); *see British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 87-89, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280* (recusal and nonparticipation of four

dealer members as sufficient to protect distributor's due process rights)].

The New Motor Vehicle Board may also mediate, arbitrate, or otherwise resolve any honest difference of opinion between any member of the public and any new motor vehicle dealer, manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor branch, or representative [*Veh. Code § 3050(c)*; *but see Tovas v. American Honda Motor Co. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 506, 509, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145* ; *Hardin Oldsmobile v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 585, 598, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 583* ; *discussed under § 515.142[1]*]. Third-party dispute resolution processes used to resolve disputes between buyers and manufacturers relating to the manufacturer's failure, after reasonable attempts at repair, to conform a new motor vehicle to express warranties are discusssed in Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* and Ch. 502, *Sales: Warranties.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAlternative Dispute ResolutionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.133

§ 515.133 Procedure for Terminating or Refusing to Continue Franchise

Notwithstanding *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.1* or the terms of the franchise, a new motor vehicle franchisor may not terminate or refuse to continue an existing franchise unless all of the following conditions are met [*see Veh. Code § 3060(a)*]:

First, the franchisee and the New Motor Vehicle Board must have received written notice from the franchisor. The notice must be received at least 60 days before its effective date and must set forth specific grounds for terminating or refusing to continue. The notice is effective, however, if it is received 15 days before its effective date and if (1) an ownership or an interest in the franchise is transferred without the consent of the franchisor, as long as the consent was not unreasonably withheld; (2) the franchisee made a misrepresentation in applying for the franchise; (3) the franchisee is insolvent or bankruptcy or receivership proceedings have been commenced by or against the franchisee; (4) the franchisee engages in an unfair business practice after having been warned thereof; or (5) the motor vehicle dealer failed to conduct its customary sales and service operations during its customary hours of business for seven consecutive business days, giving rise to a good faith belief on the part of the franchisor that the motor vehicle dealer is in fact going out of business, except when this failure to conduct sales and service operations was due to circumstances beyond the direct control of the motor vehicle dealer or by order of the Department of Motor Vehicles [*Veh. Code § 3060(a)(1)*].

Second, if the franchisee files a protest with the board within 30 days after receiving a 60-day notice or within 30 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor, or 10 days after a 15-day notice, or within 10 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor, the board must hold a hearing, as provided in *Veh. Code § 3066*, after advising the franchisor that a protest has been filed, and it must find that there is good cause for terminating or refusing to continue the franchise [*Veh. Code § 3060(a)(2)*]. The 10-day or 15-day period within which the franchisee must file a protest does not begin until the manufacturer or distributor has sent proper notices of termination to both the dealer and the board. Thus, in a case in which no notice was given to the board and the notice to the dealer did not give a reason for the termination, a protest filed more than a year from the date of termination was considered timely [*British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 93-94, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280]* .

Third, the franchisor must receive the written consent of the franchisee, or the appropriate period for filing a protest must have elapsed [*Veh. Code § 3060(a)(3)*; *see British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 93-94, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280* (defective notice does not trigger period for filing protest)].

If a franchise has expired by its terms and without an express agreement between the dealer and the manufacturer to extend it, the court will look to the conduct of the parties to determine if there is an implied extension. Sending notice of termination during a period not covered an express extension has been held to manifest an agreement to continue the franchise beyond its stated expiration date [*British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 91-92, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280]* .

If the franchisee files a protest pursuant to *Veh. Code § 3060* and the undisputed facts show good cause for termination of the franchise, the New Motor Vehicle Board has implied authority to dismiss the protest [*Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 637, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501* (although Board did not have express statutory authority to dismiss, purpose of Board and goal of administrative efficiency supported conclusion that Board had implied authority to dismiss protest when undisputed facts demonstrated good cause for franchise termination as matter of law and afforded no basis for preventing termination of franchise)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.134

§ 515.134 Modification or Replacement of Franchise

The franchisor must not modify or replace a franchise with a succeeding franchise without adequate written notice [*see Veh. Code § 3060(b)(2)* (contents of notice)], or within 10 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor if that action would substantially affect the franchisee's sales or service obligations or investment. Notice must be given to the board and to each affected franchisee at least 60 days in advance of the action being taken [*Veh. Code § 3060(b)(1)*].

Within 30 days of receipt of the notice, or within 30 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor, a franchisee may file a protest with the board. The modification or replacement does not become effective until the board finds that there is good cause for that action. However, if a replacement franchise is the successor franchise to an expiring or expired term franchise, the prior franchise continues in effect until resolution of the protest by the board. If there are multiple protests, hearings are consolidated to expedite disposition of the issue [*Veh. Code § 3060(b)(1)*].

If a dealership agreement grants the franchisee an exclusive, nonmodifiable trading area beyond its statutory "relevant market area," and the franchisor seeks to establish another dealership within the exclusive trading area, the encroachment may constitute a modification of the franchise that would entitle the dealer to protest under *Veh. Code § 3060* [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 456, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546]* . The dealership agreement in *Ri-Joyce* provided that the franchisor could establish a new dealership "near" the franchisee's existing one, but only if (1) the franchisor's business expectations were not being fulfilled, (2) the franchisor determined that it would be in the best interests of itself or its customers to do so, (3) it gave the dealer 60 days' notice of the intended action, and (4) during the 60 days, had discussed reasonable alternatives with the dealer. The term "near" was not defined, but could reasonably be interpreted (as urged by the dealer) to extend beyond the statutory relevant market area into a community (Petaluma) previously served by the dealer (Santa Rosa) and from which it derived a significant portion of its business. When a dealership agreement is reasonably susceptible to the meaning urged by the dealer, the Board must hear and consider the dealer's extrinsic evidence to determine what rights are granted by the agreement and whether the franchisor's action constitutes a modification. If the Board finds a modification, it would have to proceed with further

consideration of the protest, determining whether the agreement's requirements were met in good faith [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 457-458, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionCovenants Not to CompeteBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsContracts LawContract ModificationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.135

§ 515.135 Criteria for Board's Disposition of Issue of Discontinuation or Alteration of Franchise

The first step in evaluating a protested modification is to determine what rights were granted under the franchise agreement. Within the meaning of *Veh. Code § 3060* a franchise is a written agreement subject to the normal rules relating to interpretation of contracts [*see Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 458, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* (*discussed under § 515.134* with respect to whether establishment of new dealership outside statutory relevant market area may be modification under particular agreement, thus entitling dealer to protest)].

In determining whether good cause has been established for modifying, replacing, terminating, or refusing to continue a franchise, the board takes into consideration the existing circumstances including any of the following [*Veh. Code § 3061*]:

- The amount of business transacted by the franchisee as compared to the business available to the franchisee.
- The investment necessarily made and obligations incurred by the franchisee.
- The permanence of the investment.
- The effect on the public welfare.
- Adequacy of the franchisee's facilities, equipment, parts, and personnel.
- Adequacy of services to the public.
- Fulfillment of warranty obligations by the franchisee.
- The franchisee's compliance with the terms of the franchise.

- Any similar relevant circumstances.

The board, however, is not required to take evidence on each of the listed factors. For example, if a franchise is terminated because the manufacturer stops making the product, a dealer's proof that it has performed its obligations will not avoid termination [*Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 642-643, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501* (board did not commit prejudicial abuse of discretion by refusing to conduct hearing on good cause factors in *Veh. Code § 3061*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationContracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract ModificationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.136

§ 515.136 Establishment of Additional Dealership or Relocation of Existing One

A franchisor sometimes seeks to enter into a franchise establishing an additional motor vehicle dealership or a satellite warranty facility [*see Veh. Code § 3062(e)(1), (2)* (definitions of motor vehicle dealership and satellite warranty facility); *see also § 515.137*] within a relevant market area where the same line-make is already represented, or relocating an existing dealership. Except for nominal relocations, the franchisor first is required to notify, in writing, the board and each franchisee in that line-make in the relevant market area of the franchisor's intention to establish an additional dealership or to relocate an existing one within or into that area [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)(1)*].

Any franchisee required to be given the notice may file with the board a protest to the proposed action within 20 days of receiving the notice or within 20 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor. If within this time a franchisee files with the board a request for additional time to file a protest, the board or its executive director, upon a showing of good cause, may grant an additional 10 days to file the protest. The board then informs the franchisor of the timely protest, the required hearing, and the automatic hold placed on the proposed action until the hearing. The board also will caution the franchisor that the action cannot take place at all if the board determines that there is good cause for not permitting the proposed establishment or relocation of the dealership. Hearings may be consolidated in the event of multiple protests [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)(1)*; *see New Motor Vehicle Bd. v. Orrin W. Fox Co. (1978) 439 U.S. 96, 108, 99 S. Ct. 403, 58 L. Ed. 2d 361* ; *Chrysler Corp. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1041, 1043, 153 Cal. Rptr. 135* (holding *Veh. Code § 3062* to be constitutional)].

Nothing in the New Motor Vehicle Board Act prevents a franchisor from reserving for itself, in a dealership agreement, an unqualified right to establish a new dealership. If a franchisor has reserved that right, the franchisee is not entitled to object to the establishment of the new dealership beyond its relevant market area, that is, more than 10 miles away [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 456, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* (construing the holding in *BMW of North America, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 980, 991, 209 Cal. Rptr. 50*)]. On the other hand, if the dealership agreement grants the franchisee an exclusive, nonmodifiable trading area beyond its statutory "relevant market area," and the franchisor seeks to establish another dealership within the exclusive trading area, the encroachment may constitute a modification of the franchise, which would entitle the dealer to protest under

Veh. Code § 3060 [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 456, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* ; *see § 515.134*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionCovenants Not to CompeteBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsContracts LawContract ModificationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.137

§ 515.137 Establishment of Satellite Warranty Facility or Relocation of Existing One

If a franchisee seeks to enter into a franchise that authorizes a satellite warranty facility [*see Veh. Code § 3062(e)(2)* (definition)] to be established at, or relocated to, a proposed location which is within two miles of any dealership of the same line-make, the franchisor must first give written notice [*see Veh. Code § 3062(a)(3)* (contents of notice)] of the intention to establish or relocate a satellite warranty facility at the proposed location to the board and each franchisee operating a dealership of the same line-make within two miles of the proposed location [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)(2)*]. Within 20 days of receiving the notice or 20 days after the end of any appeal procedure provided by the franchisor, any franchisee required to be given the notice may file with the board a protest to the establishing or relocating of the satellite warranty facility. If within this time the franchisee files with the board a request for additional time to file a protest, an additional 10 days to file may be granted upon a showing of good cause. When such a protest is filed, the board must inform the franchisor that a timely protest has been filed, that a hearing is required, and that the franchisor must not establish or relocate the proposed satellite warranty facility until the board has held the hearing, nor thereafter if the board has determined that there is good cause for not permitting the satellite warranty facility. If multiple protests are filed, hearings may be consolidated to expedite the disposition of the issue [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.138

§ 515.138 Criteria for Board Disposition of Issue of Establishment or Relocation

The board determines whether good cause has been established for not entering into or relocating an additional franchise for the same line-make by considering the following circumstances [*Veh. Code § 3063*]:

- Permanence of the investment and its effect on the vehicle business and the consuming public.
- Whether the investment is injurious to the public welfare.
- Adequacy of present competition and consumer care (including sales and service facilities, equipment, supply of vehicle parts, and qualified service personnel).
- Desirability of increased competition.
- Any other circumstances.

These standards suggest that the board balance (1) the dealers' interest in maintaining viable businesses, (2) the manufacturer's interest in promoting sales, and (3) the public's interest in adequate competition and convenient service [*see Piano v. California ex rel. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 412, 417, 418, 163 Cal. Rptr. 41]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsCommunity of InterestBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.139

§ 515.139 Delivery and Preparation

[1] Franchisor's Requirements as to Franchisee's Obligations

The franchisor must specify to the franchisee the delivery and preparation obligations of the latter prior to delivery of new motor vehicles to retail buyers. These obligations constitute the franchisee's only responsibility to the franchisor for product liability; however, they do not affect in any way the franchisee's responsibility for product liability between the purchaser and either the franchisee or franchisor. The franchisor must file a copy of the obligations with the board [*Veh. Code § 3064(a)*].

On delivery of the vehicle, the franchisee needs to give a copy of the delivery and preparation obligations to the purchaser, along with a written certification that the franchisee has fulfilled such obligations [*Veh. Code § 3064(b)*].

[2] Franchisor's Schedule of Compensation for Franchisee's Performance

The franchisor must draft a schedule of compensation to be paid to franchisees for the work and services they will be required to perform in connection with their obligations. The franchisor must file the schedule with the board. The compensation set forth on the schedule then constitutes the actual compensation to be remitted to the franchisee for performing these obligations [*Veh. Code § 3064(a)*].

The schedule of compensation must be reasonable and is subject to the approval of the board when a franchisee files a notice of protest with such body. In determining the reasonableness of the schedule, the board considers all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the time required to perform each function that the dealer is obligated to perform, and the appropriate labor rate [*Veh. Code § 3064(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionAgency RelationshipsBusiness & Corporate

LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewTortsProducts LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityFranchisees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.140

§ 515.140 Warranty Work

[1] Compensation Schedule and Franchisee's Protest to Board

Similar provisions exist for warranty agreements [*Veh. Code § 3065*] and warranty incentive programs [*Veh. Code § 3065.1*]. The provisions applicable to warranty incentive programs are discussed below. With respect to warranty agreements, a franchisor must properly fulfill every warranty agreement it makes. It must compensate each of its franchisees adequately and fairly for labor and parts used when the franchisee has fulfilled warranty obligations of repair and servicing. A copy of the warranty reimbursement schedule or formula must be filed with the board. The schedule or formula must be reasonable with respect to the time and compensation allowed the franchisee for the warranty work and all other conditions of such obligation. The reasonableness of the schedule or formula is subject to the board's determination when a notice of protest is filed by a franchisee [*Veh. Code § 3065(a)*]. The Board has jurisdiction over all aspects of Section 3065 and its implementation. *Veh. Code § 3050(c)* grants the Board authority to consider any matter involving warranty reimbursement practices, including a petition seeking an order that the franchisor cease and desist making statements that formed the basis for a slander action. The statements alleged to have been made by the franchisor after an audit were that it was "pulling the franchise" because it had found evidence of "massive warranty fraud" that "hit a new record" [*Mathew Zaheri Corp. v. Mitsubishi Motor Sales (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 288, 291-295, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325]* .

In determining the adequacy and fairness of the compensation, the franchisee's effective labor rate charged to its various retail customers may be considered along with other relevant criteria [*Veh. Code § 3065(b)*].

[2] Franchisee's Claim for Defective Parts or Warranty Compensation

The franchisee may make a claim on the franchisor that a particular part is defective. The claim must be approved or disapproved within 30 days after it is received by the franchisor. Any claim not specifically disapproved in writing within 30 days from receipt by the franchisor will be deemed approved on the 30th day. If the claim is disapproved, the franchisee who submitted it must be notified in writing within the required 30-day period. The notice needs to state the specific grounds on which the disapproval is based [*Veh. Code § 3065(d)*]. The franchisor may disallow a claim for a

defective part, alleging that the part is, in fact, not defective. In such a case the part must be returned to the franchisee at the expense of the franchisor, or else the franchisee must be reimbursed for the cost of the part, at the option of the franchisor [*Veh. Code § 3065(c)*].

A franchisor can disapprove a claim for warranty compensation only for good cause, such as performance of nonwarranty repairs, lack of material documentation, or fraud [*Veh. Code § 3065(e)*].

[3] Time for Payments, Audits, and Chargebacks

All claims made by franchisees for labor and parts must be paid within 30 days following approval by the franchisor. In individual instances failure to approve or pay within the specified time limits for reasons beyond the franchisor's reasonable control is not a violation of the governing law [*Veh. Code § 3065(d)*].

A franchisor may conduct audits of franchisee warranty records on a reasonable basis, and for a period of 12 months after a claim is paid or credit issued [*Veh. Code § 3065(e)*]. Any chargeback to a franchisee for warranty parts or service compensation must be made within 90 days of the completion of the audit. If a franchisee submitted a false claim with intent to defraud the franchisor, a longer period for audit and any resulting chargeback may be permitted if the franchisor obtains an order from the board [*Veh. Code § 3065(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)WarrantiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionBreach of WarrantyContracts LawSales of GoodsWarrantiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.141

§ 515.141 Claims Under Warranty Incentive Programs

The provisions governing warranty incentive programs [*Veh. Code § 3065.1*] are the same as, or substantially similar to, those governing warranty agreements in the following ways:

- All claims made by a franchisee for payment under the terms of a franchisor incentive program must be either approved or disapproved within 30 days after receipt by the franchisor [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

- A claim for payment under the terms of a franchisor incentive program can be disapproved only for good cause, such as ineligibility under the terms of the incentive program, lack of material documentation, or fraud [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(b)*].

- When any claim is disapproved, the franchisor must notify the franchisee writing of its disapproval within the required (30-day) period, and each notice must state the specific grounds on which the disapproval is based [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

- An approved claim must be paid within 30 days following approval [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

- Any claim not specifically disapproved in writing within 30 days from receipt is deemed approved on the 30th day [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

- Failure to approve or pay a claim under an incentive program within the above specified time limits, in individual instances for reasons beyond the reasonable control of the franchisor, does not constitute a violation of the governing law [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

Following the disapproval of a claim for payment under the terms of a franchisor incentive program, a franchisee has one year from receipt of the notice of disapproval in which to appeal the disapproval to the franchisor and file a protest with the board [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(a)*].

The franchisor may audit the franchisee's incentive records on a reasonable basis for a period of 18 months after a claim is paid or credit issued [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(b)*; *see Veh. Code § 3065(e)* (12 months for warranty agreement)]. Following the audit, the franchisor has 90 days within which to make chargeback, except that a longer period applies if the franchisee submitted a false claim with the intent to defraud the franchisor, and the franchisor obtains an order from the board [*Veh. Code § 3065.1(b)*; *see Veh. Code § 3065(e)* (same rule applies to warranty agreements)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)WarrantiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsWarrantiesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.142

§ 515.142 Board Hearing Procedure and Review of Decisions

[1] Grant of Authority

Veh. Code § 3050(c) grants the New Motor Vehicle Board authority to consider any matter concerning the activities or practices of any persons holding licenses as new motor vehicle dealer and/or manufacturer [*Mathew Zaheri Corp. v. Mitsubishi Motor Sales (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 288, 295, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325* ; *see Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 637, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501* (when Board had subject matter jurisdiction over dispute but lacked authority to grant any remedy when franchise termination was due to discontinuation of product line, Board had implied authority to dismiss franchisee's protest)]. The Board, however, is a quasi-judicial administrative agency of limited jurisdiction. It does not have plenary authority to resolve any and all disputes which may arise between a franchisor and a franchisee [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 455, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546]* . The jurisdiction of the Board is limited to consideration and resolution of only a circumscribed domain of matters. Thus, one court has held that the New Motor Vehicles Board's assertion of jurisdiction over a dealer's state statutory and common-law claims arising out of allegations of the manufacturer's misdealing violated the judicial powers clause of California Constitution [*Hardin Oldsmobile v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 585, 598, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 583]* . Another court, after examining the legislative history of *Veh. Code § 3050(c)*, has held that a cause of action for contractual interference based on tortious business practices independent of any franchise agreement, brought by a nonsignatory to a franchise agreement with Honda, is not the type of claim over which that section gives the Board jurisdiction [*Tovas v. American Honda Motor Co. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 506, 509, 521, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145]* .

Further, *Veh. Code § 3050(e)* provides that the courts have jurisdiction over all common law and statutory claims originally cognizable in the courts, and that for those claims a party may initiate an action directly in any court of competent jurisdiction. Thus, in a case in which a manufacturer demurred to a dealers's complaint which consisted entirely of common law claims, on the basis of the dealer's failure to exhaust its administrative remedies, the court of appeal held that the trial court erred in sustaining the demurrer and dismissing the action [*South Bay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corporation (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1079-1080, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (finding that

Legislature never intended Board to be exclusive arbiter of all disputes between new motor vehicle dealers and manufacturers)]. The court also held that the trial court's referral of the case to the Board under the doctrine of primary jurisdiction was inappropriate because the factual issues and common law claims raised by nothing the complaint were not beyond the usual competence of the courts [*South Bay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corporation (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1081-1082, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (referral was also inconsistent with court's dismissal of action)].

The procedure for drafting and filing protests, setting the hearing date, and hearing on the protest is set out in *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 583-598*. Either party is entitled to seek judicial review of final decisions of the board. Filing for such review is permitted up to 45 days from the date on which the final order of the board is made public and delivered to the parties personally or sent to them by registered mail [*Veh. Code § 3068*].

[2] Judicial Review

Judicial review is by way of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*]. The trial court hearing the petition for the writ performs essentially an appellate function. Unless there is a fundamental right at issue, the trial court cannot reweigh the evidence, but only determines whether there was substantial evidence to support the board's decision [*Champion Motorcycles, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 819, 823-825, 246 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 90-92, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280]* . The right to terminate or modify a dealership, to add a new dealership, or to choose one's business associations, even though related to freedom of contract and freedom of association, involves merely the preservation of an economic interest, not a fundamental vested right [*Champion Motorcycles, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 819, 823-825, 246 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 90, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawSeparation of PowersPrimary JurisdictionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.143-515.149

[Reserved]

§§ 515.143[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.150

§ 515.150 Recreational Vehicle Franchise

[1] Definition

A "recreational vehicle franchise" is a written agreement between two or more persons for a commercial relationship of definite duration or continuing indefinite duration, in which the franchisee is granted the right to offer for sale or lease, or to sell or lease at retail, new recreational vehicles [*see Health & Safety Code § 18010(a)* (definition)] that are manufactured or distributed by the franchisor, or the right to perform authorized warranty repairs and service, or the right to perform any combination of these activities [*Veh. Code § 331.3*].

[2] Delivery of Agreement to Dealer

When parties mutually agree to enter into a recreational vehicle franchise, it is unlawful and a violation of the Vehicle Code for a manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch licensed under the Vehicle Code to fail or refuse to provide a recreational vehicle dealer with a written recreational vehicle franchise that complies with the requirements of *Veh. Code § 331.3* [*Veh. Code § 11713.22(a)*]. Notwithstanding *Veh. Code § 331.3*, the agreement must include, but not be limited to, provisions regarding dealership transfer, dealership termination, sales territory, and reimbursement for costs incurred by the dealer for work related to the manufacturer's warranty for each line-make of recreational vehicle covered by the agreement [*Veh. Code § 11713.22(b)*].

These requirements do not extend to an agreement with a dealer who deals exclusively in truck campers [*Veh. Code § 11713.22(c)*].

[3] Franchise Agreement Is Necessary

A recreational vehicle manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch licensed under the Vehicle Code may not sell a new recreational vehicle in California to or through a recreational vehicle dealer without having first entered into a written recreational vehicle franchise, with that recreational vehicle dealer, that complies with the requirements of *Veh. Code § 331.3* and has been signed by both parties [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(a)*]. A recreational

vehicle dealer may not sell a new recreational vehicle in California without having first entered into a written recreational vehicle franchise, with a recreational vehicle manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch licensed under the Vehicle Code, that complies with the requirements of *Veh. Code § 331.3* and has been signed by both parties [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(b)*].

Beginning January 1, 2009, a recreational vehicle manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch may not ship a new recreational vehicle to a recreational dealer without a recreational vehicle franchise that has been signed by both parties [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(c)(1)*]. On or after January 1, 2009, a recreational vehicle dealer also may not receive a new recreational vehicle from a recreational vehicle manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch without a recreational vehicle franchise that has been signed by both parties [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(c)(2)*]. Any new recreational vehicle inventory that was bought by a recreational vehicle dealer, or shipped by a manufacturer, manufacturer branch, distributor, or distributor branch, before January 1, 2009, may be sold at any time without a recreational vehicle franchise [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(d)*].

These requirements do not extend to an agreement with a dealer who deals exclusively in truck campers [*Veh. Code § 11713.23(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.151-515.159

[Reserved]

§§ 515.151[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.160

§ 515.160 Governing Statutes

Legislation prohibiting discrimination in the area of franchises and dealerships is contained specifically in the California Fair Dealership Law, *Civ. Code §§ 80-86*, as well as in *Civ. Code § 51.8*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPrivate Discrimination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.161

§ 515.161 Fair Dealership Law

[1] Purpose and Policies

The California Fair Dealership Law [*Civ. Code § 80*] is designed to prohibit unlawful discrimination in the granting, sale, transfer, bequest, termination, and nonrenewal of dealerships. The requirements of the law may not be varied by contract or agreement and any portion of a contract or agreement purporting to do so is void and unenforceable. The law is to be liberally construed and applied to promote its underlying purposes and policies [*Civ. Code § 82*].

[2] Definitions

[a] "Dealership"

A "dealership" under the Fair Dealership Law is a contract or agreement, either express or implied, oral or written, between two or more persons (a) under which a person is granted the right to sell or distribute goods or services or to use a trade name, trademark, service mark, logotype, or advertising or other commercial symbol and (b) in which there is a community of interest in the business of offering, selling, or distributing goods or services at wholesale or retail, by lease, agreement, or otherwise. A "community of interest" is a continuing financial interest between the grantor and grantee in the operation of the dealership or the marketing of the goods or services [*Civ. Code § 81(b), (d)*].

[b] Dealership Parties and Relationship

A "grantor" is the person who sells, leases, or otherwise transfers a dealership [*Civ. Code § 81(c)*]; a "grant" is a sale, lease, or transfer of any kind [*Civ. Code § 81(f)*]; and a "dealer" is the grantee of a dealership situated in California [*Civ. Code § 81(e)*]. A grantor or grantee may be a natural person, partnership, joint venture, corporation, limited liability company, or other entity [*Civ. Code § 81(a)*].

[3] Prohibitions on Discriminatory Acts

The following actions are prohibited under the Fair Dealership Law, whether taken directly or indirectly:

- The grantor's refusal to grant a dealership to any person because of any characteristic listed or defined in *Civ. Code § 51(b), (e)* ("Unruh Civil Rights Act"); that is, sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status, or sexual orientation (including a perception that a person has, or is associated with someone who has or is perceived to have, any particular characteristic or characteristics within the listed categories) [*Civ. Code § 83*].

- The grantor's termination, cancellation, or refusal to renew a dealership agreement for these reasons [*Civ. Code § 84*].

- The grantor's or the dealer's refusal to make or consent to an assignment, sale, transfer, or bequest of a dealership to any person because of these characteristics of that person (this does not create any such right in a dealer to assign, sell, transfer, or bequeath a dealership if the right did not exist prior to the effective date of this law, January 1, 1981) [*Civ. Code § 85*].

[4] Liability

Although the California Fair Dealership Law does not specifically provide for a cause of action for damages whenever a franchisor violates its provisions, it does provide that the prevailing party in any action based on a violation of the law is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and court costs [*Civ. Code § 86*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCivil Rights LawPrivate Discrimination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.162

§ 515.162 Civil Rights Legislation Covering Franchises Generally

[1] Scope of Nondiscriminatory Provisions

No franchisor may discriminate in the granting of franchises solely on account of the sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status, or sexual orientation of the franchisee and the composition of a neighborhood or geographic area reflecting any of those characteristics in which the franchise is located [*Civ. Code §§ 51(b), 51.8(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 51(e)* (definitions)].

The preceding prohibitions do not prohibit a franchisor from granting a franchise to prospective franchisees as part of a program or programs to make franchises available to persons lacking the capital, training, business experience, or other qualifications ordinarily required of franchisees, or any other affirmative action program adopted by the franchisor [*Civ. Code § 51.8(a)*].

The anti-discrimination mandate does not require any construction, alteration, or repair, whether structural or otherwise, or modification of any sort whatsoever, beyond whatever construction, alteration, repair, or modification is otherwise required by other provisions of law, as to any new or existing establishment, facility, building, improvement, or any other structure. Nor does the anti-discrimination mandate augment, restrict, or alter in any way the authority of the state architect to require construction, alteration, repair, or modifications that the state architect otherwise possesses pursuant to other laws [*Civ. Code § 51.8(b)*].

[2] Liability

No remedial provision in *Civ. Code § 43 et seq.* (concerning personal rights) creates any liability for damages based on a violation of *Civ. Code § 51.8*. The remedy for an aggrieved franchisee, therefore, is an action for appropriate equitable relief, such as an injunction to restrain and prevent a violation of the statute.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesInjunctive ReliefCivil Rights LawPrivate Discrimination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.163-515.179

[Reserved]

§§ 515.163[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.180

§ 515.180 Governing Statutes

The regulation of seller assisted marketing plans is governed by *Civ. Code § 1812.200 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.181

§ 515.181 Purpose of Regulatory Legislation

The California Legislature has found that purchasers of "seller assisted marketing plans," often connected with the sale of vending machines, racks, or work-at-home paraphernalia, are frequently inexperienced in business matters, many of them elderly, who use their life savings to purchase the plan in hope of supplementing retirement income or present salary. The initial payment is usually in the form of a purchase of overpriced equipment or products. Because of significant losses suffered in the past and the resulting impact on local economy, the Legislature has provided disclosure procedures to be followed by the seller to allow the purchaser to make a more informed decision as to the purchase of the plan, as well as to safeguard against deceit and financial hardship and to enhance competition and fair dealing in such sales. The legislation, which also prohibits misleading representations and unfair contract terms, is to be construed liberally toward such ends [*Civ. Code § 1812.200*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.182

§ 515.182 Definitions

[1] "Seller Assisted Marketing Plan"

A "seller assisted marketing plan" is any sale, lease, or offer to sell or lease any product, equipment, supplies, or services, requires a total initial payment exceeding $500, but requires an initial cash payment of less than $50,000, that will aid, or be used by or on behalf of, a purchaser in connection with or incidental to beginning, maintaining, or operating a business. The seller of the plan must advertise or in some other manner solicit the purchase or lease of the plan and represent that (1) the purchaser will, is likely to, or can earn an amount in excess of the initial participation payment; (2) a market exists for the product, equipment, supplies, or services, or any product marketed by the user of the product, equipment, supplies, or services sold or leased or offered for sale or lease to the purchaser by the seller, including any tangible or intangible item or service the purchaser made, produced, fabricated, grew, bred, modified, or developed using, in whole or in part, such product, equipment, supplies, or services; or (3) that the seller will, or is likely to, buy back any product made, produced, fabricated, grown, or bred by the purchaser using, in whole or in part, the matters initially involved in the sale or lease, or offered thereof [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(a)*].

A seller assisted marketing plan does not include any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(b)*]:

- A qualified or exempt security [*see Corp. Code § 25019*];

- A franchise, whether registered or exempt from registration under the Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*];

- Any transaction in which either seller or purchaser, lessor or lessee, is licensed pursuant to, and the transaction is governed by, the Real Estate Law [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10000*].

- A license granted by a general merchandise retailer allowing the licensee to sell goods, equipment, supplies, products, or services to the general public under the retailer's trademark, trade name, or service

mark, if (1) the general merchandise retailer has been doing business in California continually for five years prior to the grant; (2) the general merchandise retailer sells diverse kinds of goods, equipment, supplies, products, or services; (3) the general merchandise retailer also sells the same goods, equipment, supplies, products, or services directly to the general public; and (4) during the previous 12 months, the general merchandise retailer's direct sales of the same goods, equipment, supplies, products, or services to the public accounted for at least 50 percent of its yearly sales of those things made under the retailer's trademark, trade name, or service mark.

- A newspaper distribution system [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6362*].

- A sale or lease to an existing or beginning business enterprise that also sells or leases equipment, products, or supplies, or performs services that are not supplied by the seller and that the purchaser does not utilize with the items or services supplied by the seller, and the equipment products, supplies, or services not supplied by the seller account for more than 25 percent of the purchaser's gross sales.

- The sale in the entirety of an ongoing business, that is, a business that for at least six months prior to the sale has been operated from a given specific location, has been open for business to the general public, and has had all equipment and supplies necessary for operating the business at that location; the sale must be of the entire "ongoing business" and not merely a portion of the ongoing business.

- A sale or lease, or offer thereof, to a purchaser who has for at least six months previously bought products, supplies, services, or equipment sold under the same trademark or trade name, or that were produced by the seller, and who has received on resale of such items or services an amount which is at least equal to the amount of the initial payment.

- The renewal or extension of an existing seller assisted marketing plan contract.

- A product distributorship that meets each of the following requirements:

    - The seller sells products to the purchaser for resale by the purchaser, and it is reasonably contemplated that substantially all of the purchaser's sales of the product will be at wholesale;

    - The agreement between the parties does not require that the purchaser pay the seller, or any person associated with the seller (i.e., a person, including an individual or a business entity, controlling, controlled by, or under the same control as the seller), a fee or any other payment for the right to enter into the agreement, and does not require the purchaser to buy a minimum or specified quantity of the products, or to buy products for a minimum or specified period of time;

    - The seller is a corporation, partnership, limited liability company, joint venture, or any other business entity;

    - The seller has a net worth (which may be determined on a consolidated basis if the seller is a subsidiary of another business entity that is permitted by generally accepted accounting standards to prepare financial statements on a consolidated basis and that business entity absolutely and irrevocably agrees in writing to guarantee the seller's obligations to the purchaser) of at least $10,000,000 according to audited financial statements of the seller done during the 18 months preceding the date of the initial sale of products to the purchaser; and the seller's net worth is verified by a certification to the

Attorney General from an independent certified public accountant that the audited financial statement reflects a net worth of at least $10,000,000, provided within 30 days following receipt of a written request from the Attorney General;

- The seller grants the purchaser a license to use a trademark that is registered under federal law; and

- It is not an agreement or arrangement encouraging a distributor to recruit others to participate in the program and compensating the distributor for recruiting others into the program or for sales made by others recruited into the program.

[2] "Seller"

The "seller" is the person who sells or leases, or offers to sell or lease, a seller assisted marketing plan. To be a seller, one must have sold or leased, or represent or imply that he or she has sold or leased, whether in California or elsewhere, at least five plans within 24 months prior to the solicitation. Otherwise, the seller must intend, or represent or imply an intent, to sell or lease, whether here or elsewhere, at least five plans within 12 months following the solicitation. The seller is the person to whom the purchaser becomes contractually obligated. The term "seller" does not include a licensed real estate broker or salesperson engaging in the sale or lease of a "business opportunity" [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10030*] under the Real Estate Law [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(d)*].

[3] "Purchaser"

The "purchaser" is the person who is solicited to become obligated, or who does become so, under a seller assisted marketing plan [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(e)*].

[4] Business Items

"Equipment" includes machines, all electrical devices, video or audio devices, molds, display racks, vending machines, coin-operated game machines, machines which dispense products, and display units of all kinds [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(f)*]. "Supplies" includes any and all materials used to produce, grow, breed, or make any product or item [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(g)*]. A "product" includes any tangible chattel, including food or living animals, that the purchaser intends to (1) sell or lease; (2) use to perform a service; (3) resell or attempt to resell to the seller; or (4) provide or attempt to provide to the seller, or person whom the seller suggests the buyer contact, so that the seller or other person directly or indirectly assisting the buyer in disposing of the product might resell the product to the general public [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(h)*]. "Services" include any assistance, guidance, direction, work, labor, or services provided by the seller to initiate or maintain a business [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(i)*].

[5] "Contract"

The "seller assisted marketing plan contract" (or "contract") is any contract or agreement that obligates a purchaser to a seller [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(j)*].

[6] Financing Terms

The "initial payment" is the total amount the purchaser is obligated to pay to the seller under the terms of the plan contract prior to or at the time of delivery of the equipment, supplies, products, or services, or within six months of the purchaser commencing operation of the plan. If the contract sets forth a specific total sale price for purchase of the plan that is to be paid partially as a downpayment and then in specific monthly payments, the "initial payment" is the entire total sale price [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(k)*]. The "initial cash payment" or "downpayment" is the portion of the initial payment which the purchaser is obligated to pay to the seller prior to, or at the time of, delivery of the above items or

services. It does not include any amount financed, or for which financing is to be obtained, by the seller, or financing which the seller assists in obtaining [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(l)*]. References to "buy-back" or "secured investment" are considered to be representations that imply that the purchaser's initial payment is protected from loss [*see Civ. Code § 1812.201(m)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.183

§ 515.183 Jurisdiction of Plan Transactions

An offer to sell or to lease a seller-assisted marketing plan occurs in California whenever the offer is made in California, the purchaser resides in California at the time of the offer, or the offer either originates in California or is directed by the seller or lessor to California and received at the place to which directed. A sale or lease of such a plan occurs in California whenever the offer to sell or to lease is accepted in California, the purchaser resides in California at the time of the sale, or the acceptance is communicated to a seller situated in California [*Civ. Code § 1812.202*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsLong-Arm JurisdictionCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.184

§ 515.184 "Buy-Back" Representations

[1] Restrictions on Use in Solicitation

A seller must not use the phrase "buy-back" or "secured investment" or similar phrase orally or in writing when soliciting, offering, leasing, or selling a plan if (1) the "security" is the value of the equipment, supplies, products, or services supplied by the seller to the purchaser [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(a)*]; or (2) if there are any restrictions or qualifications whatsoever preventing or limiting a purchaser from being able to invoke the "buy-back" or "secured" portion of the plan contract at any time the purchaser so desires during the one-year period following the contract date. On invocation of a "buy-back" or "security" provision, the purchaser is entitled to have returned, at minimum, the full amount of the initial payment, less the "amount actually received" from the operation of the plan. This latter amount is either that which the seller actually paid the purchaser for a product resold to the seller, or the money the purchaser received for use of the product or services, less what the purchaser paid (1) for placing the product or services at a particular location and (2) to obtain other items needed to sell, or develop in some manner, the item that the purchaser intends to sell or otherwise dispose of [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(b)*].

[2] Bond or Trust Account Requirements

The seller may not represent that a purchaser's initial payment is "secured" in any way or to any degree, or that the seller is providing a "buy-back" arrangement unless the seller has, as provided in *Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)*, obtained a surety bond issued by a surety company admitted in California, or established a trust account at a federally insured bank or a savings and loan located in California [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(c)*]. The bond or trust account required must be in favor of the State of California for the benefit of any person who is damaged by any violation of *Civ. Code §§ 1812.200-1812.221* or by the seller's breach of a seller assisted marketing contract or of any obligation arising from that contract [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)(2)*], and must be in an amount equal to the total amount of the "initial payment" portion of all seller assisted marketing plan contracts the seller has entered into during the previous year or $300,000, whichever is less, but in no case less than $50,000 [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)(4)*]. Any person claiming against the trust account for a violation of *Civ. Code §§ 1812.200-1812.221* may maintain an action at law against the seller and the trustee. The surety or trustee is only liable for actual damages, not for the punitive damages permitted under *Civ. Code §*

1812.218. The aggregate liability of the trustee to all persons damaged by a seller's violation may in no event exceed the amount of the trust account [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)(3)*]. For additional discussion of enforcement of statutory surety bonds, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* . Note, however, that when the seller has elected to maintain a trust account in lieu of a bond, the person asserting a claim against the trust, in lieu of the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*, must establish a claim by furnishing evidence of a money judgment and evidence that the claimant is a person described in *Civ. Code § 1812.214* to the Attorney General [*see Civ. Code § 1812.221(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.185

§ 515.185 Earnings Representations

The seller is not allowed to represent that the seller assisted marketing plan provides income or earning potential of any kind unless the seller has data to substantiate such a claim. The data must be based on the experiences of at least 10 purchasers of the offered plan, and be disclosed to the purchaser at the time the claim is made, if made in person, or at the time of the first in-person communication, if the claim is made in writing or over the telephone. At the time the data is disclosed, it must be left with the purchaser [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(d)*].

The data the seller leaves must at least disclose (1) the time the seller has been selling the particular plan being offered, and (2) the number of purchasers and percentage of total purchasers from the seller that the seller knows to have made at least the same sales, income, or profits as represented [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.186

§ 515.186 Trademark Restrictions

The seller is not entitled to use the trademark, service mark, trade name, logotype, advertising, or other commercial symbol of any business which does not either control the ownership interest in the seller or accept responsibility for all representations made by the seller in regard to the seller assisted marketing plan. An exception is made if the nature of the seller's relationship to the other business entity is set forth immediately adjacent to that business's commercial symbol, in type size equal to or larger than that used to depict the symbol. If a member of a trade association, the seller may use the logo or registration mark of that group in advertisements and materials [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesTrademark LawProtection of RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.187

§ 515.187 Advertising Restrictions

The seller must not place, or cause to be placed, any advertisement for a seller assisted marketing plan that does not include the actual business name of the seller. If the name differs from that under which the plan is operated, the seller must also include the latter name. The street address of the principal place of business of the seller must also be included [*Civ. Code § 1812.204(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationAntitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.188

§ 515.188 Disclosure Requirements

The seller, or his or her representative, must provide a document to the potential purchaser in the first in-person communication or in the first written response to an inquiry from the latter, whichever occurs first. The document must provide data about the selling company, the initial payment to be paid, services to be provided, potential earnings, and the nature of any "buyback" or "secured" arrangement [*see Civ. Code § 1812.205*]. At least 48 hours before execution of the seller assisted marketing plan, or 48 hours prior to the receipt of any consideration, whichever occurs first, the seller, or his or her representative, must also provide to the prospective purchaser a written information sheet disclosing the management team behind the plan, any history of business violations and bankruptcies thereof, the seller's experience in selling such plans, information as to any required bond, a copy of a recent financial statement, as updated, and an unexecuted copy of the plan contract. The contract may be combined with the first required disclosure form, together to be titled "DISCLOSURES REQUIRED BY CALIFORNIA LAW," if they can satisfy the information and time obligations of each disclosure requirement [*see Civ. Code § 1812.206*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.189

§ 515.189 Plan Contract Requirements

[1] Drafting and Presenting

Each contract for sale or lease of a seller assisted marketing plan in California must be in writing and is subject to all statutory requirements governing such plans. A copy of the fully completed contract and all other documents requiring the purchaser's signature must be given to the purchaser at the time of signing [*Civ. Code § 1812.207*]. The plan contract must set forth information as required by law pertaining to payments, the seller's services and business entity information, dates and places of delivery, and the identity of the supplier, of products, equipment, or supplies to be furnished the purchaser, the nature of any "buy-back" or "security" arrangement if one has been represented during solicitation, and appropriate notices as to cancellation and voidability provisions [*see Civ. Code § 1812.209*]. In addition, if an escrow account is required by *Civ. Code § 1812.210(b)* (*discussed under § 515.189[4]*) because the purchaser has to make more than 20 percent of the initial payment before delivery of the equipment, supplies, or products or services to be furnished under the terms of the contract, the contract must disclose the name and address of the escrow holder, as well as the institution, branch, and account number of the escrow account [*Civ. Code § 1812.209(a)*].

[2] Cancellation Rights

The purchaser has the right to cancel a seller assisted marketing plan contract for any reason, and at any time, within three business days of the date the parties sign it. Notice of the right to cancel, along with proper procedure therefor, is contained within the plan contract, both as prescribed by law [*see Civ. Code § 1812.208*]. Written notice of cancellation may be mailed or delivered to the seller. The seller must return all sums paid by the purchaser within five business days of receipt of the notice. By five business days after receipt of those sums, the purchaser must make available, at his or her address or at the place at which they were caused to be located, all products, equipment, or supplies provided to the purchaser under the contract. The seller may also demand that these items be made available at the time the purchaser receives full repayment by cash, money order, or certified check [*Civ. Code § 1812.209(b)*].

[3] Defenses Against Assignees

Any assignee of a plan contract or the seller's rights is subject to all equities, rights, and defenses of the purchaser against the seller [*Civ. Code § 1812.211*]. A seller assisted marketing plan contract may also not require or entail the execution of any notes or series of notes by the purchaser that, when separately negotiated, will cut off as to third parties any right or defense the purchaser may have against the seller [*Civ. Code § 1812.210(a)*].

[4] Payment Restrictions

The plan may not require a downpayment of more than 20 percent of the initial payment amount. The plan contract payment schedule must not provide for the seller to receive more than this percentage before delivery of equipment, supplies, or products unless all sums paid in excess thereof are placed in escrow, as provided in *Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)*. Funds placed in an escrow account must not be released until the purchaser notifies the escrow holder in writing of the delivery within the time limits set forth in the plan contract. Notification of delivery by the purchaser to the escrow holder must not be unreasonably withheld [*Civ. Code § 1812.210(b)*].

The escrow holder must be independent of the seller and cannot release the funds without written notification from the purchaser [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)(1)*]. The escrow holder may be joined in an action against the seller by any person claiming against against the escrow account. The escrow holder is only liable for actual damages, not for punitive damages permitted by *Civ. Code § 1812.218*. The escrow holder's aggregate liability to all persons damaged by a seller's violations may not exceed the amount of the escrow account [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)(3)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.190

§ 515.190 Other Seller Requirements

The seller may not make or authorize the making of reference to its compliance with the requirements for seller assisted marketing plans in *Civ. Code § 1812.200 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1812.212*]. The seller also must maintain a complete set of books, records, and accounts of sales of seller assisted marketing plans for at least four years [*Civ. Code § 1812.213*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.191

§ 515.191 Consent to Service on Secretary of State

If the seller is not a California corporation, it must file with the Attorney General an irrevocable consent appointing the Secretary of State to act as the seller's attorney to receive service on the seller, or his or her successor, executor, or administrator, in any noncriminal action arising out of a local seller assisted marketing plan transaction. The plaintiff who takes advantage of this service provision forthwith must send to the defendant or respondent seller a notice that such service was made and a copy of the process. The papers must be sent by first class mail to the last address of the defendant or respondent on file with the Secretary of State. The plaintiff's affidavit of compliance with these service requirements must be filed in the case on or before the return date of the process, if any, or within such further time as the court allows [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsService Upon Agents

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.192

§ 515.192 Voidability of Plan Contract

[1] Purchaser's Right

The purchaser may elect to render the contract voidable under the circumstances described below. These rights are cumulative to all others given under the law governing seller assisted marketing contracts or in any other law [*Civ. Code § 1812.215*].

[2] Voiding for Misrepresentation or Noncompliance With Law

A purchaser may elect to avoid a plan contract if the seller uses any untrue or misleading statement to sell or lease the plan or fails to provide or file [*Civ. Code § 1812.203*] the disclosure documents or to disclose the information required therein, or if the plan contract does not comply with requirements of the governing law. This election must be made within one year of the date of the contract by sending written notice to the seller, at which time the contract becomes unenforceable by the seller or any assignee thereof as contrary to public policy. The purchaser is entitled to receive all sums paid to the seller when he or she is able to return all equipment, supplies, or products delivered by the seller. If this return is not possible, the purchaser is entitled to receive all sums paid less the fair market value at the time of delivery of the items not returned after their delivery. On receipt of the money, the purchaser must make available to the seller at the purchaser's address or at the places they are located at the time of the above notice, the matters received from the seller [*Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*].

However, if the seller inadvertently has failed to make any of the required disclosures, or the contract inadvertently fails to comply with requirements of the governing law, the seller may cure the defect by providing the correct disclosure statements or contract. At the time of providing the correct versions the seller also must inform the purchaser in writing that because of the seller's error, the purchaser has an additional 15-day period after receipt of the correct disclosures or contract within which to cancel and receive full return of all moneys paid in exchange for the return of whatever equipment, supplies, or products the purchaser has. If he or she has not canceled within 15 days after receipt of the correct papers, the purchaser may not exercise the right thereafter to void the contract automatically on the grounds of noncompliance with the disclosure or contract requirements [*Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*].

[3] Voiding for Nondelivery

If the seller fails to deliver the equipment, supplies, or product within 30 days of the delivery date stated in the contract for any reason other than one that was beyond the control of the seller, at the purchaser's election and on written notice to the seller, the contract becomes voidable by the purchaser and unenforceable by the seller or seller's assignee as contrary to public policy. The election may be made at any time prior to actual delivery of the commodities or within 30 days after delivery [*Civ. Code § 1812.215(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.193

§ 515.193 Policy Against Waiver of Rights by Purchaser

A waiver by the purchaser of the provisions of the law governing seller assisted marketing plans is deemed contrary to public policy and is void and unenforceable. In addition, any attempt by a seller to have the purchaser waive any such rights is a violation of the provisions regulating seller assisted marketing plans [*Civ. Code § 1812.216*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.194

§ 515.194 Liability

In addition to the possible criminal actions that may be brought against a seller, agent, or independent contractor, any purchaser injured by a violation of the law governing seller assisted marketing plans, or by the seller's breach of a plan contract or of any obligation arising from the sale or lease of a plan, may bring any action for actual damages plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs. The judgment may not award less than the amount of the initial payment, provided the purchaser is able to return all the equipment, supplies, or products delivered by the seller. If a complete return cannot be made, the minimum award may be no less than the amount of the initial payment less the fair market value at the time of delivery of the commodities that cannot be returned although actually delivered. The award may include punitive damages if the trial court deems it proper [*Civ. Code § 1812.218*].

Remedies provided for violating the law pertaining to seller assisted marketing plans or for conduct proscribed by any provision thereof are cumulative to any other procedures or remedies for any violation or conduct provided for in any other law. No other statutory or common law rights of any public official or any other person may be limited by the statutes governing seller assisted marketing plans. Any common law or statutory cause of action that exists for an activity proscribed by the statutes governing seller assisted marketing plans may be asserted independently by the purchaser for the remedies provided by that other law [*Civ. Code § 1812.219*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesPunitive Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.195

§ 515.195 Burden of Proof

In any proceeding involving *Civ. Code §§ 1812.200-1812.221*, governing seller assisted marketing plan contracts, the burden of proving an exemption or an exception from a definition is on the person claiming it [*Civ. Code § 1812.216(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.196-515.209

[Reserved]

§§ 515.196[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.210

§ 515.210 Governing Statutes

[1] Purpose

The Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22900-22927*] ("Act") regulates the business relations between equipment suppliers and dealers. The Act's statement of legislative intent recognizes that the retail distribution, sales, and rental of agricultural, construction, utility, industrial, mining, outdoor power, forestry, and lawn and garden equipment, utilizing independent dealers operating under contract with the supplier, vitally affects the general economy of the state, the public interest, and the public welfare [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900*]. The Act therefore prohibits certain coercive or discriminatory practices by suppliers [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902*; §§ 515.211, 515.212], sets forth requirements for supplier termination of both single-line and non single-line dealer contracts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22903-22903.2*; §§ 515.214, 515.215], regulates the approval and rejection of warranty claims [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3*; § 515.220], and provides for return or repurchase of inventory [*see* Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22904, 22905; §§ 515.213, 515.216-215.219].

[2] Application to Equipment "Suppliers" and "Dealers"

For purposes of the Act, a "supplier" is any person engaged in the business of manufacturing, assembly or wholesale distribution of equipment or repair parts, and any successor in interest [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(v)* (definition); *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(s)* (repair parts defined)].

A "dealer" is any person primarily engaged in the retail sale of equipment, and does not include a "franchisee" as defined in *Veh. Code § 331.1* or a "new motor vehicle dealer" as defined in *Veh. Code § 426* [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(f)* (definition)].

"Equipment" includes all-terrain vehicles and other machinery, equipment, implements, or attachments used in connection with certain landscaping, agricultural, livestock, and industrial activities [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(j)* (definition)]. Self-propelled vehicles designed primarily for the transportation of persons or property on a street or highway are specifically excluded from the definition of equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(j)(2)*].

The Act contains numerous definitions of additional terms [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901*], which are incorporated into the applicable discussions below.

[3] Effective Date

The Act applies to dealer contracts [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(g)* (definition)] in effect on October 7, 2005, that have no expiration date and that are continuing contracts, and all other dealer contracts entered into or renewed on or after that date [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22927*; *see* 2005 Stats., ch. 712, § 25, 26 (urgency statute)]. The prior version of the law applied to dealer agreements in effect on January 1, 1993, that had no expiration date and were continuing agreements, and to all other dealer agreements entered into or renewed on or after January 1, 1993 [*see* former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22927*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsWarrantiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.211

§ 515.211 Prohibited Transactions by Suppliers

[1] In General

The statutory provisions regulating the retail distribution, sales, and rental of agricultural, construction, utility, industrial, mining, outdoor power, forestry, and lawn and garden equipment by independent dealers operating under contract with suppliers contain a number of specific prohibitions that are designed to prevent a supplier from imposing new or increased conditions on a dealer than those set forth in the original dealer agreement between the parties [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902*]. These prohibitions are discussed in the following subsections. A dealer has a cause of action for any damages sustained as a result of a supplier's violation of any of these prohibitions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*; *see § 515.220*; *see also § 515.580*].

[2] Requiring Optional Equipment

A supplier is prohibited from compelling any dealer to order or accept delivery of any equipment or parts that the dealer has not voluntarily ordered, except as required by any applicable law or unless the equipment or repair parts are safety features required by the supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(a)*].

[3] Requiring Supplemental contract

A supplier may not coerce or compel any dealer to enter into any contract, whether written or oral, or amend an existing dealer contract with the supplier unless that contract or amendment is imposed on all other similarly situated dealers in the state [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(b)*].

[4] Refusing to Deliver Equipment

A supplier may not refuse to deliver to any dealer, in reasonable quantities and within a reasonable time after receipt of the dealer's order, equipment covered by the dealer contract specifically advertised or represented by the supplier to be available for immediate delivery or on an agreed-upon delivery date. The failure to deliver that equipment is excused if

the failure is due to reasonable restrictions on the extension of credit by the supplier to the dealer, any breach of or default under the agreement by the dealer, an act of God, a work stoppage or delay due to a strike or labor difficulty, a bona fide shortage of materials, a freight embargo, or a business decision by the supplier to limit the production volume of the equipment if written notice is provided to the dealer within 30 days of that decision, other cause over which the supplier has no control [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(c)*].

[5] Terminating or Failing to Renew Dealer Contract Without Cause

A supplier may not terminate, cancel, or fail to renew a dealer contract or materially change the competitive circumstances of a dealer contract without good cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(d)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(l)* (defining "good cause"), and *discussion under §§ 515.214, 515.215*].

[6] Conditioning Renewal of Dealer Contract on Renovations or New Dealership Site

A supplier may not condition the renewal or extension of a dealer contract on a dealer's completing substantial renovation of the dealer's place of business or on acquiring new or additional space to serve as the dealer's place of business unless the supplier provides at least one year's written notice of the condition. The written notice must state all grounds supporting the condition. Not less than two years time must be provided for the dealer to complete the renovation or acquisition after the one year's notice period has expired [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(e)*].

[7] Discriminating in Pricing

A supplier may not discriminate, directly or indirectly, in prices charged between different dealers with respect to purchases of equipment or repair parts of like grade and quality and identical brand, when the effect of that discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition, tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any dealer who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of the discrimination. However, different prices may be charged if (1) the differences are due to differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery of the equipment or repair parts, or (2) the supplier can show that its lower price was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor and the lower price was made available to other dealers, or (3) the differences are related to the volume of equipment purchased by dealers if the supplier offers all other similarly situated dealers the same volume program [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(f)*].

[8] Preventing Changes in Dealership's Capital Structure

A supplier may not prevent, by contract or otherwise, any dealer from changing its capital structure, ownership, or the means by which the dealership is financed. Any change in capital structure made by dealer must at all times meet any reasonable capital standards imposed by the supplier or as otherwise agreed to between the dealer and the supplier and imposed on similarly situated dealers. In addition, any change in capital structure made by an dealer may not result in a change in the controlling interest in the executive management, the board of directors, or any guarantors of the dealership [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(g)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(h)* ("dealership" defined)].

[9] Requiring Dealer to Execute Release of Liability

A supplier may not require a dealer to agree to a release, assignment, novation, waiver, or estoppel that would relieve any person from liability imposed by the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(i)*].

[10] Withholding Consent to Transfers of Dealership Interests

A supplier may not prevent, by contract or otherwise, any dealer or any officer, member, partner, or stockholder of an dealer from selling or transferring any part of their interest in a dealership [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(h)*

("dealership" defined)] to any other party. However, no dealer, officer, partner, member, or stockholder has the right to sell, transfer, or assign the dealership itself or the management or control of the dealership without the written consent of the supplier. [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(h)*].

[11] Requiring Purchase of Goods

A supplier may not require any dealer to purchase goods or services as a condition of the sale by the supplier to the dealer of any equipment, repair parts, or other goods or services. However, a supplier may require the dealer to purchase repair parts, special tools, and training reasonably necessary to maintain the safe operation or quality of operation in the field of any equipment offered for sale by the dealer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(j)*].

[12] Coercing Refusal of Competition

A supplier may not coerce any dealer into a refusal to purchase equipment manufactured by another supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(k)*].

[13] Penalizing Purchase From Competitor

A supplier may not penalize any dealer that purchases equipment or repair parts for sale manufactured by another supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(l)*].

[14] Discriminating Between Dealers

A supplier may not discriminate, directly or indirectly, between dealers of the same product line in filling an order placed by a dealer for retail sale or lease of equipment under a dealer contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902(l)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionRestraints of TradeBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesContracts LawSales of GoodsGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsForm, Formation & ReadjustmentGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsPerformanceBuyer's Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.212

§ 515.212 Provisions Limiting Competition

Nothing in *Bus. & Prof. § 22900 et seq.* permits the offering or enforcement of a provision in a dealer contract that requires a dealer to comply with a minimum price-fixing provision or any other provision to limit competition. A provision in a dealer contract providing for exclusive territorial rights and its corresponding provisions will not be prohibited [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawPrice Fixing & Restraints of TradeGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsOutput, Exclusive & Requirements Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.213

§ 515.213 Annual Surplus Parts Inventory Return Program

[1] Return Period

Every supplier must establish a return program that allows its dealers an opportunity to return a portion of their surplus parts inventory for credit each year [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(n)* ("inventory" defined as equipment, repair parts, data-processing hardware or software, and specialized service or repair parts)]. This parts return program is voluntary on the dealers' part, who can choose not to participate in any given year [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(f)*].

The specified procedure is for the supplier to notify its dealers of a time period each year during which they may submit their surplus parts list and return their surplus parts to the supplier. The designated return period must run for at least 90 days for each dealer. A supplier may choose to designate a different period of time for each dealer to return surplus parts [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(a)*]. If a supplier has not notified dealer of a specific time period in which to return surplus parts within the preceding 12 months, the supplier must authorize and allow the dealer to return surplus parts within 60 days after receiving a request from the dealer to do so [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(b)*].

[2] Return Authority

A supplier must allow surplus parts return authority equal to 10 percent of the total dollar value of parts purchased by the dealer from the supplier during the 12-month period immediately preceding the notification to the dealer by the supplier of the surplus parts return program, or the month the dealer's return request is made, whichever is applicable. [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(c)*].

[3] Covered Parts

Returned parts must be in new and unused condition and must have been purchased by the dealer form the supplier to whom they are returned. Obsolete and superseded parts may be returned if listed in the supplier's current returnable parts list or if those parts have not been the subject of the supplier's parts return program by the time the equipment

dealer is notified of or requests a return period, whichever is applicable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(d)*].

[4] Credit Amount

The minimum credit that must be allowed for returned parts is 95 percent of the current net parts cost as listed in the supplier's current returnable parts list at the time the equipment dealer is notified of or requests a return period [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(e)*].

[5] Outstanding Balance

If an outstanding balance is owed to the supplier, the supplier may credit the dealer's account within 30 days after the supplier's receipt of the dealer's returned parts. If no balance exists, the supplier must pay the dealer within 30 days after the supplier's receipt of the dealer's returned parts. If a supplier refuses to credit the dealer's account or pay the dealer for returned parts covered by this section within 30 days of the supplier's receipt of returned parts, the supplier will be liable for 110 percent of the total current net parts cost, plus interest at the statutory rate from the payment due date until the date of payment, and actual costs for any court or arbitration proceeding, including costs for attorney's fees and arbitrators [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsPerformanceBuyer's Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.214

§ 515.214 Terminating Contracts Between Non Single-Line Dealers and Non Single-Line Suppliers

[1] Good Cause Required

The discussion in this section applies only to dealer contracts between dealers who are *not* single-line dealers and suppliers who are *not* single-line suppliers [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(t), (u)* (definitions); *see also § 515.215[1]*, for definition of those terms].

A supplier may not, directly or through an officer, agent, or employee, terminate, cancel, fail to renew, or materially change the competitive circumstances of a dealer contract without good cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(w)* ("terminate" defined)]. "Good cause" means failure by a dealer to comply with the requirements imposed on the dealer by the dealer contract, if those requirements are not different from those requirements imposed on other similarly situated dealers in this state [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(l)*]. In addition to that definition, "good cause" exists whenever the dealer has taken any of the following actions [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)*]:

- Transferred a controlling ownership interest in the dealership without the consent of the supplier, who may not unreasonably withhold consent [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(1)*].

- Made a material misrepresentation or falsification of any record [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(2)*].

- Filed a voluntary petition in bankruptcy or had an involuntary petition in bankruptcy filed against them that has not been dismissed within 60 days following the filing, or became insolvent or placed in receivership [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(3)*].

- Pled guilty to or been convicted of a felony involving an act of moral turpitude [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(4)*].

- Failed to operate in the normal course of business for seven consecutive business days without the consent of the supplier or have terminated the business [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(5)*].

- Relocated or established a new or additional equipment dealer's place of business without the supplier's consent [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(6)*].

- Materially defaulted under any chattel mortgage or other security agreement between the dealer and the supplier, or there has been a revocation of any guarantee of the dealer's present or future obligations to the supplier. However, good cause does not exist if a person revokes any guarantee in connection with or following the transfer of that person's entire ownership interest in the dealer unless the supplier requires that person to execute a new guarantee of the dealer's present or future obligations in connection with that transfer of ownership interest [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(7)*].

- Failed to satisfy any payment obligation as it became due and payable to the supplier, failed to promptly account to the supplier for any equipment sales proceeds, or failed to hold those proceeds in trust for the benefit of the supplier [*Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(8)*].

- Engaged in conduct that is injurious or detrimental to any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(9)*]:

  - The dealer's customers (including but not limited to excessive pricing, misleading advertising, failure to provide service and replacement parts, and failure to perform warranty obligations).

  - The public welfare.

  - The representation or reputation of the supplier's product.

- Consistently failed to meet building and housekeeping requirements, or failed to provide adequate sales, service, or parts personnel commensurate with the dealer contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(10)*].

- Consistently failed to comply with the applicable licensing laws pertaining to the products and services being represented for and on the supplier's behalf [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(11)*].

- Consistently failed to meet and maintain the supplier's requirements for reasonable standards and performance objectives, if the supplier has given the dealer reasonable standards and performance objectives that are based on the manufacturer's experience in other comparable market areas [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(12)*].

The last four categories above are subject to special notice requirements, as discussed in [2] and [3], *below* [*see Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(b), (d)*].

[2] Written 180-Day Notice

Except when the grounds for termination of a dealer contract are those set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(1)-(8)* [*see* [1], *above*], or the consistent failure to meet a supplier's requirements [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(12)*; *see also* [1], *above*], a supplier must give the dealer 180 days written notice of the supplier's intent to terminate the dealer contract. The notice must include all reasons constituting good cause for the termination and must provide the dealer with 60 days to cure any claimed deficiency. If the deficiency is cured within 60 days to the satisfaction of the supplier,

which must be determined in good faith, the notice of termination will be void [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(b)*].

[3] Special Rules for Consistent Failure to Meet Supplier's Requirements

Except as discussed *below* [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(d)*], a supplier may not terminate a dealer contract based on a failure to meet the supplier's requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(12)*; *see* [1], *above*] unless the supplier gives the dealer notice of that action at least one year before the effective date of that action. If the dealer achieves the supplier's requirements for reasonable standards or performance objectives before the expiration of the one-year notice period, the notice will be void and the dealer contract will continue in full force and effect [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(a)*].

Notwithstanding *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(c)* [discussed in [1], *above*], if the sales, service, rental, and repair of a supplier's product represents the lesser of 10 percent or $350,000 of the dealer's total gross annual revenue that includes, but is not limited to, the sales, service, rental, or repair, for each dealer location, the supplier may terminate a dealer contract based on *Bus & Prof. Code § 22903(c)(12)* [*see* [1], *above*] upon providing the dealer with notice of that action at least 180 days before the effective date of the action. If the dealer achieves the supplier's requirements for reasonable standards or performance objectives within 60 days of receipt of the termination notice, the notice will be void and the dealer contract will remain in effect [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(d)*].

Notwithstanding a dealer contract that provides for exclusivity during the term of the contract, a supplier may begin contract negotiations with a potential replacement dealer 60 days prior to the expiration of the notice period that has been provided *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(b)* or *(d)* if the dealer failed to achieve the supplier's requirements for reasonable standards or performance objectives within 60 days of receipt of the termination notice. A replacement dealer, however, may not conduct operations with a supplier during the term of a dealer contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.215

§ 515.215 Terminating Contracts Between Single-Line Dealers and Single-Line Suppliers

[1] Applicable Terms

Special requirements, discussed in this section, apply to dealer contracts between a single-line dealer and its single-line supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(a)*].

"Single-line dealer" means a dealer that has (1) purchased construction, industrial, forestry and mining equipment from a single supplier constituting 75 percent of the dealer's new equipment, calculated on the basis of net cost; and (2) a total annual average sales volume in excess of $40,000,000 for the three calendar years immediately preceding the applicable determination date. The sales threshold, however, will be increased each year by an amount equal to the current sales threshold multiplied by the percentage increase in the index from January 1 of the immediately preceding year to January 1 of the current year [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(t)*]. "Index" means the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics purchase price index for construction machinery series identification number pcu333120333120, or any successor index measuring substantially similar information [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(m)*].

"Single-line supplier" means the supplier that is selling the single-line dealer construction, industrial, forestry and mining equipment constituting 75 percent of the dealer's new equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(u)*].

[2] Good Cause Required

No supplier may terminate a dealer contract without good cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(b)*]. "Terminate" means to terminate, cancel, fail to renew, or materially change the competitive circumstances of a dealer contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(w)*].

"Good cause" is the failure by a dealer to comply with the requirements imposed on the dealer by the dealer contract, if those requirements are not different from those requirements imposed on other similarly situated dealers in this state [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(l)*]. In addition, good cause exists whenever any of the following applies [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(b)*]:

- There has been a closeout or sale of 65 percent or more of the dealer's assets related to the equipment business or there has been a commencement of a dissolution or liquidation of the dealer [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(f)* (dealer assets do not include land or buildings)].

- The dealer has changed its principal place of business or added additional locations without prior approval of the supplier, which may not be unreasonably withheld.

- The dealer has materially defaulted under a chattel mortgage or other security agreement between the dealer and the supplier, or there has been a revocation or discontinuance of a guarantee of a present or future obligation of the dealer to the supplier.

- The dealer has failed to operate in the normal course of business for seven consecutive days, without the consent of the supplier, or has otherwise abandoned the business.

- The dealer has pleaded guilty to or has been convicted of a felony involving an act of moral turpitude.

- The dealer has transferred an interest in the dealership [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(h)* ("dealership" defined)], or a person with a substantial interest in the ownership or control of the dealership, including an individual, proprietor, partner or major shareholder [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(o)* ("major shareholder" defined)], has withdrawn from the dealership or died, or a substantial reduction has occurred in the interest of a partner or major shareholder in the dealership. However, good cause does not exist if the supplier has consented to an action described in this paragraph.

[3] Written 90-Day Notice

Except as otherwise provided, a supplier must provide a dealer with at least 90 days written notice of termination. The notice must state all reasons constituting good cause for termination and must state that the dealer has 60 days in which to cure any claimed deficiency. If the deficiency is cured within 60 days, the notice will be void. Notwithstanding the above, if the good cause for termination is due to the dealer's failure to meet or maintain the supplier's requirements for market penetration, a reasonable period of time must have existed in which the supplier has worked with the dealer to gain the desired market share. The notice and right to cure provisions under this subdivision will not apply if the reason for termination is for any reason set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(b)* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(c)*; *see* [1], *above*].

[4] Dealer's Death

If a dealer dies, a supplier will have 90 days in which to consider and make a determination on a request by a family member to enter into a new dealer contract to operate the dealership. "Family member" means a spouse, parent, sibling, child, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, and lineal descendent, including those by adoption [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(k)*]. If the supplier determines that the requesting family member is not acceptable, the supplier must provide the family member with a written notice of its determination with the stated reasons for rejection. This provision does not entitle an heir, personal representative, or family member to operate a dealership without specific written consent of the supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(d)*].

However, if a supplier and dealer have previously executed an agreement concerning succession rights prior to the dealer's death, and if that agreement is still in effect, the agreement will be observed even if it designated someone other than the surviving spouse or heirs of the decedent as the successor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGood CauseBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGrounds for TerminationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsNotice Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.216

§ 515.216 Repurchase Requirements When Dealer Contract Is Canceled or Not Renewed

[1] Computers and Data Processing Equipment

Whenever a dealer contract is terminated by cancellation or nonrenewal, the supplier is obligated to repurchase much of the equipment dealer's property used in carrying on the business. The supplier is obligated to repurchase or assume the lease on any specific data processing hardware that the supplier required the equipment dealer to purchase under the dealer contract, including computer systems equipment required and approved by the supplier. The fair market value of property subject to repurchase will be deemed to be equal to the acquisition cost, including any shipping, handling, and set-up fees, less straight line depreciation of that acquisition cost over three years. If the dealer purchased data processing hardware or software that exceeded the supplier's minimum requirements, the acquisition cost of that data processing hardware or software will be deemed to be the acquisition cost of hardware or software of similar quality that did not exceed the minimum requirements of the supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(a)*].

[2] Few Equipment

When a dealer agreement is canceled or not renewed, the supplier is obligated to repurchase the equipment dealer's equipment and inventory. The supplier must pay a sum equal to 100 percent of the net equipment cost [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(q)* (definition)] of all new, unsold, undamaged, and complete equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(b)*].

[3] Demonstrators

The supplier must pay a sum equal to 100 percent of the net equipment cost [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(q)* (definition)] of all unsold, undamaged demonstrators, less depreciation due to usage of those demonstrators. "Demonstrator" means equipment in a dealer's inventory that has not been sold, but has had its usage demonstrated to potential customers, either without charge or pursuant to a short-term rental agreement, with the intent of encouraging the potential customer to purchase the equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(i)*]. The depreciation adjustment will be based on published industry rental rates to the extent those rates are available. For these purposes, demonstrators, with hour meters that have less than 50 hours of use will be considered new, unsold equipment subject to repurchase under

this section [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(c)*].

[4] Equipment Used in Incentive Programs

The supplier must pay a sum equal to 100 percent of the net equipment cost [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(q)* (definition)] of all unsold and undamaged equipment used in a manufacturer created incentive program [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(p)* (definition)], less depreciation due to usage and bonus or volume incentive received by the dealer for the equipment. The depreciation adjustment must be based on published industry rental rates to the extent these rates are available. For these purposes, equipment with hour meters used in a manufacturer created incentive program with less than 50 hours of use will be considered new, unsold equipment subject to repurchase [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(d)*].

[5] Repair Parts

The supplier must pay a sum equal to 95 percent of the current net parts costs [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(e)* (definition)] on new, unsold, undamaged repair parts that had previously been purchased from the supplier and held by the dealer on the date that the dealer contract terminates or expires [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(e)*]. "Repair parts" are all parts and products related to the service or repair of equipment, including superseded parts [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(s)*].

The supplier also must pay the dealer five percent of the current net parts cost on all new, unused, and undamaged repair parts returned, to cover the cost of handling, packing, and loading of those parts for return to the supplier. The dealer may allow the supplier to perform the handling, packing, and loading of parts instead of receiving the five percent payment for these services. When the supplier is chosen to perform these services, the dealer must make available to the supplier, at the dealer's address or at the places at which it is located, all equipment previously purchased by the dealer expires [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(f)*].

[6] Specialized Equipment or Repair Tools

The supplier must pay a sum equal to 75 percent of the net equipment cost [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(q)* (definition)], including shipping, handling, and set-up fees, of all specialized equipment or repair tools previously purchased pursuant to requirements of the supplier prior to the date of the applicable notification of termination or nonrenewal of the dealer contract. The specialized equipment or repair tools must be unique to the supplier's product line and must be complete and in operating condition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(g)*].

[7] Payment and Allowance of Credit

Upon the payment or allowance of credit to the dealer's account of the required sums, the title to all inventory purchased will pass to the supplier making payment, and the supplier will be entitled to the possession of the inventory. All payments or allowances of credit due to dealers must be paid or credited within 90 days after receipt by the supplier of property required to be repurchased. Any payments or allowances of credit due to dealers that are not paid within the 90-day period will accrue interest at the statutory rate. The supplier may withhold payments due during the period of time in which the dealer fails to comply with its contractual obligations to remove any signage indicating that the dealer is an authorized dealer of the supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(h)*].

[8] Shipping Costs

The supplier and dealer must each pay 50 percent of the costs of freight to ship equipment to the nearest retail outlet or to ship repair parts to the nearest supplier distribution center [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(i)*].

[9] Exclusions

When a dealer agreement is canceled or not renewed, the supplier is not required to repurchase the following items from the equipment dealer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(j)*]:

- Any repair part that is in a broken or damaged package. However, the supplier will be required to repurchase a repair part in a broken or damaged package, for a repurchase price that is equal to 85 percent of the current net parts cost for the repair part, if the aggregate current price for the entire package of repair parts is $75 or higher.

- Any repair part that, because of its condition, cannot be resold as a new part without reconditioning.

- Any inventory for which the equipment dealer is unable to furnish evidences satisfactory to the suppliers of clear title, free and clear of all claims, liens, and encumbrances.

- Any inventory that the dealer desires to keep, if the dealer has a contractual right to do so.

- Any equipment or repair parts that are is not in new, unsold, undamaged, complete condition, subject to the provisions of the Act relating to demonstrators [*see § 515.216[3]*].

- Any equipment or repair parts acquired by the dealer from any source other than the supplier, unless the equipment or repair parts were ordered from, or invoiced to the dealer by, the supplier

- Any equipment or repair parts that are not returned to the supplier within 90 days after the latter of (1) the effective date of termination of a dealer contract, or (2) the date the dealer receives from the supplier all information, documents, or supporting materials required by the supplier to comply with the supplier's return policy. However, this does not apply to a dealer if the supplier did not give the dealer notice of the 90-day deadline at the time the applicable notice of termination was sent to the dealer.

[10] Supplier's Liability for Failure to Repurchase

If any supplier fails or refuses to repurchase any inventory within 90 days after termination of a dealer contract, the supplier becomes liable for 110 percent of the current net equipment cost of the inventory, plus any freight charges paid by the dealer, interest accrued at the statutory rate from the date of shipment to the supplier, until the date of payment, and 5 percent for handling, packing, and loading, and actual costs for any court or arbitration proceedings, including costs for attorney's fees and arbitrators [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(k)*].

[11] Lien Against Inventory

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in the Commercial Code, the dealer retains a first and prior lien against all inventory returned by the dealer to the supplier until the dealer has paid all amounts owed by the supplier for the repurchase of inventory required [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(l)*].

[12] Security Interests

Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905 will not be construed to affect any security interest that the supplier may have in the inventory of the dealer, and any repurchase will not be subject to the provisions of the bulk sales law [*see Com. Code § 6101 et seq.*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(b)*] or to the claims of any secured or unsecured creditors of the supplier or any assignee of the supplier until such time as the dealer has received full payment or credit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(m)*].

[13] Cancellation to Avoid Payment

The dealer may not cancel a dealer contract to avoid a payment obligation to the supplier for equipment or parts [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(n)*].

[14] Multiple Business Locations

If a dealer has more than one business location covered by the same dealer contract, the repurchase requirements will apply only to the repurchase of a dealer's inventory obtained from the supplier or the supplier's distributor by the particular business location or locations involved in the dealer contract termination and will not apply to any other business locations covered by the same contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(o)*].

[15] When Supplier's Product Is Limited

If a supplier's product represents the lesser of 10 percent or $350,000 of the dealer's total gross annual revenue that includes, but is not limited to, the sales, service, rental, or repair for each dealer location, then the supplier must repurchase the inventory only if a dealer contract is canceled or not renewed by the dealer for any of the following reasons [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(p)*]:

- The supplier consistently failed to provide adequate product support for the type and use of the product, which includes, but is not limited to, technical assistance, operators and repair manuals, and parts lists and diagrams.

- The supplier consistently failed to provide adequate training, required by the supplier, for maintenance, repair, or usage of the supplier's product.

- The supplier consistently failed to provide marketing and marketing support for the supplier's product if marketing is a requirement of the dealer contract.

- The supplier's product is defective and breaches the implied warranty of merchantability as defined in *Civ. Code § 1791.1*.

- The supplier consistently failed to meet its warranty obligations to the dealer.

- The supplier abandons the market thereby failing to provide parts and services necessary for a dealer to perform warranty obligations.

- The supplier engaged in conduct that is injurious or detrimental to the dealer's customers, the public welfare, or the reputation of the dealer.

- The supplier made a material misrepresentation or falsification of any record.

- The supplier violated any provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*

Notwithstanding the above provisions, nothing in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905* will be construed to limit the supplier's responsibility to repurchase a dealer's inventory when the supplier cancels or fails to renew a dealer contract [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(q)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.217

§ 515.217 Dealer's Lien for Repurchase Amount

[1] Scope of Lien

A dealer is entitled to establish a lien for the repurchase amount for returned equipment and for the costs of enforcing the lien for sums that remain unpaid after a dealer agreement is canceled or not renewed [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22905, 22906(b)*; *see also Bus & Prof. Code § 22905(b)-(f)* (calculation of repurchase amount)]. The amount of charges secured by the lien may not exceed the reasonable or agreed-on charges for the equipment specified in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22906(d)*]. The lien attaches to the proceeds of any sale of the equipment returned for repurchase [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22906(c)*]. Repurchase liens are subject to Division 9 of the Commercial Code, except as otherwise provided [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(e)*].

For further discussion of Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

For the purposes of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*, as used in Division 9 of the Commercial Code (*Com. Code § 9101 et seq.*), the following terms have the following meanings [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(b)*]:

- "Secured party" refers to the dealer, lien creditor, lien claimant, or assignee.
- "Debtor" refers to the supplier, lien debtor, or debtor.
- "Collateral" refers to the equipment subject to the lien discussed here.

A security agreement is not necessary to make an equipment repurchase lien created under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* enforceable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(c)*]. Nor does an equipment repurchase lien created under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* continue in the repurchased equipment following the disposition of that equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(d)*].

The right of a dealer to enforce the lien created under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* is governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* and not by Chapter 6 (*Com. Code § 9601 et seq.*) of Division 9 of the Commercial Code [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22922(e)*].

[2] Formalities

[a] Notice of Lien

A dealer is not entitled to establish a lien pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* unless the lien claimant (the dealer) first sends a written notice of lien to the lien debtor (the supplier) by certified mail that states all of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22906(a)*]:

- The payment of the reasonable or agreed-on charges is more than 90 days overdue. This requirement does not apply to equipment subject to repurchase that was returned to the supplier after the return of other equipment for which payment is overdue.

- The amount of the reasonable or agreed-on charges that are overdue.

- The lien debtor has the following three alternatives:

  - Allow the lien to be filed;

  - Enter into a consensual security interest in the proceeds pursuant to the Commercial Code; or

  - Pay the reasonable or agreed-on charges that are overdue.

- A notice to the lien debtor that (1) he or she has 10 days from receipt of the notice to select an alternative, to notify the lien claimant of the alternative selected, to satisfy all of the requirements of the selected alternative, and that (2) the lien claimant may file a notice of claim of lien at any time thereafter if the lien debtor does not comply with these instructions. Only the part of the notice referred to in clause (1) needs to be in 10-point type or bolder [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22906(b)(4)*].

The notice of lien remains in effect, and no new notice of claim of lien is required in order to maintain the lien, as long as the dealer remains unpaid for the amounts secured by the lien [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22907*].

[b] Perfection of Lien by Filing Notice of Claim

After sending the lien debtor a written notice of lien, a dealer may proceed to perfect the lien by filing a notice of claim of lien with the Secretary of State [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22908*]. A notice of claim of lien must contain all of the following information [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22909*]:

- The name and address of the lien claimant.

- The name and address of the lien debtor.

- The location to which the equipment was returned.

- A statement that payment of the reasonable or agreed-on charges is more than 90 days overdue.

- The amount of the reasonable or agreed-on charges that are overdue.

- A statement, signed under penalty of perjury, that the lien claimant sent a notice of lien to the lien debtor, that more than 10 days have elapsed since the notice was received by the lien debtor, and that the lien debtor has not complied with the instructions contained in the notice of lien.

- A statement that the lien claimant has an equipment repurchase lien having complied with the notice requirements.

A notice of claim of lien may be signed by the lien claimant or by a person authorized by the claimant [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22910*].

[C] Use of Amended Financing Statement

A notice of claim of lien must be filed on the form prescribed by the Secretary of State pursuant to *Com. Code § 9502* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22911*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 22923* (Secretary of State may adopt regulations and prescribe necessary forms)]. The standard form must be completed in its entirety with the following changes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22911(a)-(d)*]:

- The lien claimant may be identified either as a lien claimant or as a secured party.

- The form must be signed by the lien claimant and need not be signed by the lien debtor.

- The description of the collateral must be the information required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22909(c)-(e), (g)* for the notice of claim of lien (set forth in [6]; *above*) must be inserted.

- A separately signed statement containing the information required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22909(f)* for the notice of claim of lien (set forth in item [6], *above*) must be attached to the form.

For discussion of filing financing statements, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* . For additional discussion and a sample financing statement (Form UCC-1), see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.211* (Matthew Bender).

[d] Filing Notice of Claim With Secretary of State

A notice of claim of lien is filed, indexed, and marked in the Secretary of State's office in the same manner as a financing statement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22912*; *see Com. Code §§ 9516, 9519*]. For the purpose of the Secretary of State's index and for the purpose of issuing a certificate disclosing financing statement information, the Secretary of State must identify a notice of claim of lien as a financing statement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22914*; *see Com. Code §§ 9516, 9519, 9523, 9528*].

For further discussion of filing financing statements, procedures in the Secretary of State's office, and requests for financing statement information, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* ; see also California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, *Secured Transactions* (Matthew Bender).

[e] Notice of Claim to Lien Debtor After Filing

The lien claimant must provide written notice of the claim of lien to the lien debtor within 10 days of filing the lien with the Secretary of State [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22913*].

[3] Request for Lien Information

The public has a right to obtain a certificate from the Secretary of State identifying whether there is a lien on file and any notice of claim of lien naming a particular debtor, and if so, giving the date and time when each notice was filed and the names and addresses of each lienholder [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22916*]. The public also has a right to obtain a copy of any notice of an equipment repurchase lien, including notices affecting the notices from the Secretary of State [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22917*]. The Secretary of State may impose a fee for providing the certificate or copies [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22916, 22917*; *see Com. Code §§ 9523, 9525* (permissible fees)].

For a sample request for information (Form UCC-11) pursuant to Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, *Secured Transactions* (Matthew Bender).

[4] Priority of Lien

A lien created under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900* ranks in priority with conflicting security interests according to the time it is filed with the Secretary of State [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22915(a)*]. The lien has the same priority as a security interest perfected by filing a financing statement as of the date the notice of claim of lien was filed with the Secretary of State [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22915(b)*].

The lien does not have priority over labor claims for wages and salaries for personal services that were provided by any employee to any lien debtor in connection with the equipment or the proceeds of its sale that is subject to the lien [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22915(c)*].

[5] Assignment or Transfer of Lien

An equipment repurchase lien is assignable or transferable by the lien holder, with full rights of enforcement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22921(a)*]. The lienholder must file a statement of assignment or transfer with the Secretary of State's office in the same manner as prescribed in *Com. Code § 9514* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22921(b)*]. For further discussion of filing under Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

[6] Termination of Lien

When a lien claimant receives payment for the total amount secured by the lien, he or she must send the lien debtor a statement relinquishing the security interest under the notice of claim of lien. The claim of lien must be identified by the date, the names of the parties, and the file number. If the lienholder of record fails to send a termination statement within 10 days of receiving full payment, he or she is liable to the debtor for all actual damages the debtor suffers due to the failure to do so. If the failure to send the termination statement is in bad faith, the lienholder also is liable for a penalty of $100 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22920(a)*].

The filing officer for the Secretary of State's office must mark each termination statement with the date and time of filing and index the statement under the name of the lien debtor and under the file number of the original lien. If the filing officer has an electronic microfilm or other photographic record of the lien and related filings, he or she may remove and destroy the originals after receipt of the termination statement. If the filing officer does not have a microfilm or other photographic record, he or she may remove and destroy the originals after one year from the receipt of the termination statement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22920(b)*].

For a sample termination statement (Form UCC-3) pursuant to Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, Secured Transactions, § 42.214* (Matthew Bender).

[7] Foreclosure

A lien claimant may foreclose on an equipment repurchase lien only in an action to recover the reasonable or agreed-on

charges. The final judgment is enforceable under the Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.*) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22919*; *see* Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*].

A lien claimant must provide written notice to secured creditors at least 30 days prior to enforcing the claim of lien. For these purposes, a "secured creditors" means any entity named as a secured party in the financing statement filed with regard to the debtor and that covers returned equipment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22918*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)Application & ConstructionDefinitionsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)Attachment of Security InterestsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)PerfectionMethodsFilingsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)PerfectionMethodsFilingsTermination StatementsCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)PriorityLiens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.218

§ 515.218 Inventory Repurchase on Death of Dealer

In the event of the death or incapacity of a dealer, the heirs or the executor have the option of requiring the supplier to repurchase the inventory from the estate as if the supplier had terminated the dealer contract and the inventory repurchase provisions were applicable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(n)* ("inventory" defined as equipment, repair parts, data-processing hardware or software, and specialized service or repair parts)]. This provision specifically applies only to an owner, an equal or majority partner, or the majority stockholder of a corporation operating as a dealer. The heirs or the executor have 180 days following the equipment dealer's death to exercise this option, and they are not entitled to operate the dealership beyond that period without the supplier's consent [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924(a)*].

The inventory need not be repurchased if the heirs or the executor and the supplier enter into a new dealer agreement. In addition, the inventory need not be repurchased if a successor to the dealer is established under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1*; *see § 515.218* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924(a)*]. These procedures are subject to any provisions in the dealer contract pertaining to the dealer's death or to succession rights to the extent that they are not inconsistent [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924(a)*].

The right of the heirs or the executor to require a supplier to repurchase the inventory on a dealer's death is supplemental to any agreement between the dealer and the supplier covering the return of equipment, attachments, and repair parts. If the option is exercised, the supplier has the right to charge back discounts previously paid or credited to the equipment dealer's account on previous inventory purchases. In addition, any inventory repurchase under these provisions is not subject to the bulk sales law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924(b)*; *see* Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages &

RemediesBuyer's Damages & RemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.219

§ 515.219 Sale or Transfer of Business of Non-Single-Line Dealer

Special requirements, discussed in this section, apply to a sale or transfer of a business when a contract is between a dealer who is *not* a single-line dealer and a supplier who is *not* a single-line supplier [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(t), (u)* (definitions); *see also § 515.215*].

If a supplier has contractual authority to approve or deny a request for a sale or transfer of a dealer's business or an equity ownership interest in the business, the supplier must approve or deny the request within 60 days after receiving a written request from the dealer. If the supplier has neither approved nor denied the request within the 60-day period, the request will be deemed approved. The dealer's request must include reasonable financial information, personal background, character references, and work history information for the acquiring persons. If a supplier denies a such a request, the supplier must provide the dealer with a written notice of the denial that states the reasons for the denial. A supplier may only deny a request based on the failure of the proposed transferees to meet the reasonable requirements consistently imposed by the supplier in determining approval of transfers or approvals of new dealers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(b)*].

If a dealer dies and the supplier has contractual authority to approve or deny a request for the sale or transfer of the dealer's business or an equity ownership interest in the business, the dealer's estate or other person with authority to transfer the dealer's assets will have 180 days to submit to the supplier a written request for a sale or transfer of that business or equity ownership interest. If the request is timely submitted, the supplier must approve or deny that request in accordance with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(b)*. Any attempt by a supplier to terminate the dealer contract as a result of the death of a dealer will be delayed until there has been compliance with the terms of this section or the 180-day period has expired, as applicable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(c)*].

Nonetheless, if a supplier and dealer executed an agreement concerning succession rights prior to the dealer's death, and if the agreement is still in effect, the agreement will be observed even if it designated someone other than the surviving spouse or heirs of the decedent as the successor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(d)*].

A supplier may withhold consent to a transfer of an interest in a dealership if, with due regard to regional market conditions and distribution economies, the dealer's area of responsibility or trade area does not afford sufficient sales potential to reasonably support a dealer. In any dispute between a supplier and dealer under this subdivision, the supplier will bear the burden of proving that the dealer's area of responsibility or trade area does not afford sufficient sales potential to reasonably support a dealer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness Opportunities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.220

§ 515.220 Warranty Claims

[1] Approval or Rejection by Supplier

If a dealer submits a warranty claim [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(c)* ("claim" defined)] to a supplier while the dealer contract is in effect or within 60 days after the termination of the dealer contract, and if the claim is for work performed before the termination or expiration of the dealer contract, the supplier must approve or reject that warranty claim by written notice to the dealer within 45 days after the supplier's receipt of the warranty claim. If the supplier approves the warranty claim, the supplier must pay the dealer or credit the dealer's account the entire amount owed with respect to the claim within 30 days of approval. If the supplier rejects the warranty claim, the supplier must give the dealer written or electronic notice of the grounds for rejection. These reasons must be consistent with the supplier's reason for rejecting the warranty claims of other dealers, both in terms and manner of enforcement. If the supplier does not provide the dealer with grounds for rejection, the claim will be deemed to be approved [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(a)*].

[2] Resubmission of Claim by Dealer

Any claim that is not approved by the supplier based upon the dealer's failure to properly follow the procedural or technical requirements for submission of the warranty claim may be resubmitted in proper form by the dealer within 30 days of receipt of the supplier's rejection notification [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(b)*].

[3] Performance of Warranty Work

Warranty work performed by the dealer must be compensated in accordance with the reasonable and customary amount of time required to complete the work, expressed in hours and fractions multiplied by the dealer's established customer hourly retail labor rate, which must have been made known previously to the supplier. Parts used in warranty repair work must be reimbursed at the current net parts cost plus 15 percent and the cost of freight. For these purposes, "established customer hourly retail labor rate" means the lowest posted customer in-shop retail labor rate for the six months preceding the claim [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(c)*].

[4] Supplier's Written Policies and Procedures

The requirements of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(a), (b),* and *(c)* [*see § 515.220[1] -[3]*] apply to all warranty claims submitted by a dealer to a supplier when the dealer has complied with the supplier's reasonable written policies and procedures for warranty reimbursement. A supplier's warranty reimbursement policies and procedures will be deemed unreasonable to the extent they conflict with any of the provisions of this section [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(f)*].

[5] Alternate Terms and Conditions

A dealer may choose to accept alternate reimbursement terms and conditions instead of those discussed in *§ 515.220[1] -[3]* if there is a written dealer contract between the supplier and the dealer that requires the supplier to compensate the dealer for warranty labor costs either as (1) a discount in the pricing of the equipment to the dealer; or (2) a lump-sum payment to the dealer that is made to the dealer within 90 days of the sale of the supplier's new equipment. If these requirements are met and alternate terms and conditions are in place, the requirements discussed in *§ 515.220[1] -[3]* do not apply and the alternate terms and conditions are enforceable. However, the supplier's obligation to reimburse the dealer for parts in accordance with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(c)* is unaffected in any case [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(g)*].

[6] Work Performed at Supplier's Request

Any repair work or installation of replacement parts with respect to the dealer's equipment in inventory or equipment of the dealer's customers at the request of the supplier, including work performed pursuant to a product improvement program, will be deemed to create a warranty claim for which the dealer must be paid [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(d)*].

[7] Audit of Warranty Claims

A supplier may audit warranty claims submitted by its dealers for a period of up to one year. If the audit reveals an amount was misrepresented by the supplier, the supplier may charge its dealers the amount shown by the audit to be misrepresented. If a warranty claim is misrepresented, then subsequent warranty claims submitted within the two-year period ending with the date of the audit may be audited. However, a supplier may not audit a warranty claim more than once [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(e)*].

[8] Supplier's Nonpayment of Dealer's Claim

If a supplier fails or refuses to pay for warranty work covered under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3* within 30 days of the supplier's approval of the dealer's claim, the supplier will be liable for 110 percent of the total claim, plus interest at the statutory rate from the payment due date until the date of payment, and actual costs for any court or arbitration proceeding, including costs for attorney's fees and arbitrators [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3(h)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesPunitive DamagesContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionBreach of WarrantyContracts LawSales of GoodsWarrantiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.221

§ 515.221 Action by Dealer for Violations by Supplier

Any dealer may bring an action against a supplier in any court of competent jurisdiction for damages sustained by the dealer as a consequence of the supplier's violation of any provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*, together with costs and reasonable attorney's fees. A dealer may also be granted injunctive relief against unlawful termination, cancellation, nonrenewal, and change in competitive circumstances. These remedies are not exclusive, and are in addition to any other remedies permitted by law. The actions authorized under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* also are not intended to affect current law pertaining to product liability actions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*; *see* Ch. 460, *Products Liability*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesInjunctive ReliefContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages & RemediesBuyer's Damages & RemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.222

§ 515.222 Choice of Law or Forum

A provision in any contract or agreement with respect to a supplier that requires jurisdiction or venue or forum outside of California or that requires the application of the laws of another state is void with respect to a claim otherwise enforceable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22927*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionChoice of LawContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForum Selection Clauses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.223-515.239

[Reserved]

§§ 515.223[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.240

§ 515.240 Forms of Discovery

For interrogatories relating to securities regulation, see Bender's Forms of Discovery (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesFormSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & Enforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.241

§ 515.241 California Legal Forms

For transactional forms relating to issuance and qualification of corporate securities, see California Legal Forms, Chs. 6 through 6J (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & Enforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.242

§ 515.242 Federal Statutes

Securities Act of 1933. *15 U.S.C. §§ 77a-77aa*

Trust Indenture Act of 1939. *15 U.S.C. §§ 77aaa-77bbbb*

Securities Exchange Act of 1934. *15 U.S.C. §§ 78a-78kk*

Insider Trading and Securities Fraud Enforcement Act of 1988. *15 U.S.C. §§ 78c, 78o, 78t-1, 78u, 78u-1, 78ff, 78kk, 80b-4a*

National Securities Markets Improvement Act of 1996. P.L. 102-290, 110 Stat. 3416 (H.R. 3005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawFederal ActsTrust Indenture ActSecurities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934General OverviewSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933General OverviewSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934 ActionsInsider TradingGeneral OverviewSecurities LawRegulation of Securities MarketsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawTrust IndenturesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.243

§ 515.243 State Statutes

Telephonic sellers; exemption for sellers of certain securities. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17511 et seq., 17511.1(e)(16)*

Treble penalty in action by or on behalf of senior citizens or disabled person for deceptive or unfair acts, practices, or methods of competition. *Civ. Code § 3345*

Financial planners, investment advisors, and specified others are held to standard of expert; liability for return of compensation and damages; specified exception include persons licensed under Investment Advisors Act of 1940, Corporate Securities Law of 1968, California Commodity Law, Insurance Law, and Real Estate Law. *Civ. Code § 3372*

Contract for sale of security enforceable whether or not there is writing, even if contract not capable of performance within one year of its making. *Com. Code § 8113* (effective January 1, 1997)

Definitions. *Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*

Qualification of sale of securities. *Corp. Code § 25100 et seq.*

Regulation of agents, broker-dealers, and investment advisers. *Corp. Code § 25200 et seq.*

Advertising securities. *Corp. Code § 25300 et seq.*

Fraudulent and prohibited practices. *Corp. Code § 25400 et seq.*

Enforcement and liabilities. *Corp. Code § 25500 et seq.*

Departmental hearing. *Corp. Code § 25702*

Prohibitions and disclosure requirements relating to sale of securities in retail branch of savings and loan associations. *Fin. Code § 4980 et seq.*

Trust or special purpose entity that is used to apply for and initiate issuance of life insurance policies for investors, when no beneficiary of that trust or entity has insurable interest in lives being insured, violates insurable interest laws and prohibition against wagering on life; device, scheme, or artifice designed to give appearance of insurable interest when there is no legitimate insurable interest violates insurable interest laws. *Ins. Code § 10110.1(d), (e)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOffer & SaleSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsRegistration of Agents, Broker-Dealers & Investment Advisers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.244

§ 515.244 Federal Administrative Regulations

Practice under Securities Act of 1933. *17 C.F.R. § 230.100 et seq.*

Practice under Securities Exchange Act of 1934. *17 C.F.R. § 240.0-1 et seq.*

Practice under Trust Indenture Act of 1939. *17 C.F.R. § 260.0-1 et seq.*

Accounting practice under federal securities laws. *17 C.F.R. § 210.1-01 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawFederal ActsTrust Indenture ActSecurities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934General OverviewSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933General OverviewSecurities LawTrust IndenturesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.245

§ 515.245 California Administrative Regulations and Releases

General regulations promulgated by of Commissioner of Corporations. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 250.1 et seq.*

Administrative hearings before Department of Corporations. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 250.17 et seq.*

Rules of Commissioner of Corporations relating to corporate securities. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.000 et seq.*

Guidelines for determining when securities are being "offered to the public." Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 5-C (1969)

Repurchase offers. Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 36-C (Rev 1975)

Broker-dealer licensure requirements for officers and directors of issuers. Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 119-C (Oct. 22, 2008)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & Enforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.246

§ 515.246 Decisions

[1] Burden of Proof--Duty of Clearing Broker

Fraud cause of action not stated against clearing broker for fraud based on conduct of primary broker because clearing broker was agent of primary broker and did not exercise any control over primary broker. *Mars v. Wedbush Morgan Securities, Inc. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1608, 1616, 283 Cal. Rptr. 238*

[2] Burden of Proof--Duty of Stockbroker

Broker not permitted to sell customer's stock or to use it for broker's own purposes except as authorized by customer or permitted by law. *Edwards v. Jenkins (1932) 214 Cal. 713, 720, 7 P.2d 702* (holding unauthorized sale to be conversion)

California cities and local agencies that deposited funds with Orange County Treasurer for investment in statutory investment trust which then collapsed pleaded facts sufficient to state causes of action on direct claims for relief against securities and financial broker; trust beneficiaries were entitled to assert claims of fraud, conspiracy to defraud, negligent misrepresentation, breach of fiduciary duty, aiding and abetting breach of fiduciary duty, receiving stolen property, and violations of RICO directly against broker. *City of Atascadero v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 445, 486, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329*

In investors' action against stockbroker for negligent misrepresentation, justifiability of reliance was question of fact; grant of summary judgment in favor of broker based on disclosures in offering memoranda was error when investors alleged misrepresentations regarding matters not addressed by memoranda and not necessarily inconsistent with disclosures in memoranda. *Blankenheim v. E. F. Hutton & Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1474-1475, 266 Cal. Rptr. 593*

As matter of public policy, *Civ. Code § 1668* renders hold-harmless agreement void in action by investor against

stockbroker for negligent misrepresentation. *Blankenheim v. E. F. Hutton & Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1472-1473, 266 Cal. Rptr. 593*

Impact of state action for common law breach of stockbroker's fiduciary duty to clients, who were trustees of profit-sharing trust investing trust funds, on trust or its administration was too tenuous, remote, and peripheral for action to be preempted by ERISA (*29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.*). *Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1529, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740*

[3] Choice of Laws

Criminal liability for violation of *Corp. Code § 25401* may be imposed even if security was not offered to public. *People v. Smith (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 230, 236-238, 263 Cal. Rptr. 684* (distinguishing definition of security used in *People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 382, 385, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327* , and *People v. Miller (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1507, 1510, 238 Cal. Rptr. 168* , which included "indiscriminate public offering" element)

Penal Code § 1203.4 prohibits imposition of criminal liability for violation of *Corp. Code § 25401* based on failure to disclose offeror's principal's felony conviction that was reduced to misdemeanor. *People v. Smith (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 230, 238-239, 263 Cal. Rptr. 684*

Privity between issuer and investor not necessary for imposition of criminal liability under *Corp. Code §§ 25110* (selling unregistered securities) and 25401 (false representations); thus, maker of notes secured by interests in trust deeds who misrepresented value of properties securing notes to mortgage broker was liable, although only mortgage company dealt with ultimate investors. *People v. Miller (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1511-1512, 238 Cal. Rptr. 168*

Plaintiff required to establish "scienter" in making claim under Securities Exchange Act of 1934, § 10(b) (*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*, relating to manipulative or deceptive devices employed in purchase or sale of registered securities), and punitive damages not recoverable, whereas cause of action under state law for negligent misrepresentation required showing of negligence only, and punitive damages recoverable under *Civ. Code § 3294* in certain actions. *Schneider v. Vennard (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1340, 1348, 228 Cal. Rptr. 800*

[4] Common Law Actions

California law allows cause of action for fraud or negligent misrepresentation by persons wrongfully induced to hold stock instead of selling it; cause of action is limited to stockholders who can make bona fide showing of actual reliance upon misrepresentations. *Small v. Fritz Companies, Inc. (2003) 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 65 P.3d 1255*

Complaint sufficiently alleged common law fraud and negligent misrepresentation claims against broker-dealer based on both oral misrepresentations and written misrepresentations in offering documents, relating to repayment of bridge notes from preferred-stock offering and status of that offering. *Apollo Capital Fund LLC v. Roth Capital Partners (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 226, 240-243, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199*

[5] Damages

Damages for stockbroker's breach of fiduciary duty are measured by value of securities at time of unauthorized transactions or unsuitable investment, plus amount those securities would have earned if retained, less amount of cash and securities withdrawn by client. *Hobbs v. Eichler (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 174, 197, 210 Cal. Rptr. 387* ; *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 730, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222*

[6] Definition of Security

Sales of interests in joint ventures for oil and gas exploration were transactions in "securities" because purported venturers, although experienced in business affairs generally, had insufficient experience in oil and gas exploration to participate in those ventures in any meaningful way except as passive investors; Ninth Circuit's "investment contract" test applied in *Holden v. Hagopian (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1115, 1119* (whether investors had experience in business generally), and developed in earlier cases [*see generally § 515.246[10][f]*] was rejected, and court elected to follow Fifth Circuit's test based on *Williamson v. Tucker (5th Cir. 1981) 645 F.2d 404* (whether investors had experience in particular kind of business in which capital was being invested). *Consolidated Management Group, LLC v. Department of Corps. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 598, 610-612, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795*

Gold production agreements and gold delivery agreements, which promised delivery of gold in 15 months from ore that was to be mined with unique, experimental, and untested process financed by sale of agreements, was security. *People ex rel. Bender v. Wind River Mining Project (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1390, 1401-1406, 269 Cal. Rptr. 106* (distinguishing scheme in *Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 516-523, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558* , in which gold had already been mined and assayed)

Proper jury instruction for definition of security; judge's function was to instruct regarding definition of security and jury's was to determine whether particular piece of paper meets that definition. *People v. Smith (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 230, 236, 263 Cal. Rptr. 684*

Gold ore sales contract and refining contract was not security under *Corp. Code § 25019* "risk capital" test because they involve no contribution of risk capital to business enterprise and investor is adequately secured. *Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 522-524, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558*

"Risk capital" factors are whether (1) funds are being raised for business venture, (2) transaction is offered indiscriminately to public at large, (3) investors do not control success of enterprise, and (4) investors' money is substantially at risk because it is inadequately secured. *Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 519, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *Leyva v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 462, 470, 210 Cal. Rptr. 545*

Gold ore sales contract and refining contract was marketable commodity, not security, under federal criteria, because there was no common enterprise and expected profits would come not from efforts of others, but from fluctuations in price of gold. *Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 518-519, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558*

Federal law was persuasive in interpreting *Corp. Code § 25019*, defining security; three elements required of security under federal test are (1) investment of money, (2) in common enterprise, (3) with profits to come solely from efforts of others. *Moreland v. Department of Corporations (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 506, 512-513, 239 Cal. Rptr. 558*

Applying federal standard, fractional interest in promissory note and related deeds of trust constituted securities within the meaning of *Corp. Code § 25019*. *People v. Miller (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1511, 238 Cal. Rptr. 168* ; *People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 389, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327*

Corp. Code § 25019 not to be literally construed so as to make every note security; each situation to be determined on its own facts; fractional interest in note secured by deed of trust not shown to be security under either California "risk capital" or federal test when no evidence was submitted that plaintiff relied on management ability, skill, services, or solvency or that collateral was inadequate. *Leyva v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 462, 470, 474-475, 210 Cal. Rptr. 545*

Test generally employed by California courts in assessing elusive concept of meaning of security is "risk capital" test

announced in *Silver Hills Country Club v. Sobieski (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 811, 13 Cal. Rptr. 186* . *People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 389, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327*

15 U.S.C. § 77b(1) is source of definition of "security" under *Corp. Code § 25019*. *People v. Coster (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1188, 1193, 199 Cal. Rptr. 253*

Transaction is investment contract and within meaning of "security" under *Corp. Code § 25019* when investor is relatively uninformed and unskilled and turns money over to others, essentially depending on their representations and their honesty and skill in managing it. *People v. Coster (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1188, 1194, 199 Cal. Rptr. 253*

Transaction in form of loans evidenced by unsecured promissory notes providing for payment of interest and portion of business's gross income was within regulatory purpose of Corporate Securities Law since defendant received "risk capital" in return for notes. *People v. Coster (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1188, 1195, 199 Cal. Rptr. 253*

[7] Evidence

In action brought to recover for mismanagement of securities account, evidence indicated contributory negligence on part of plaintiff when it showed plaintiff did not even examine confirmation slips sent her, she admitted she usually did not examine slips, and she stated she did not always open monthly statements sent her. *Fortenberry v. Weber (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 213, 222, 95 Cal. Rptr. 834*

Defendant stockbrokers acted improperly, fraudulently, in breach of fiduciary relationship, and negligently in performance of their fiduciary duties in handling plaintiff's investment account when plaintiff's evidence established that defendants took over for her account management and control of funds and securities entrusted to them, and thus owed plaintiff duty to ascertain her financial situation and needs. *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 720, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222*

[8] Nature of Offer

Writing signed by defendant agreeing to transfer shares of corporation when other party constructed and completed prototype franchise building was offer to sell securities regardless of whether accompanied by consideration or whether other party accepted by performance. *People v. Kline (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 587, 596, 168 Cal. Rptr. 185*

[9] Exempt Transactions

[a] Nonpublic Offerings

Defendant failed to carry burden of proving exemption from qualification requirement on contention that securities were involved in private offering when evidence disclosed no limit was placed on number of persons who could invest, there appeared to be no relationship between issuer and offerees nor among offerees, offeror or agents thereof initiated transactions, and investors revealed no expertise or sophistication. *People v. Skelton (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 691, 725, 167 Cal. Rptr. 636*

Private offering not demonstrated when there was mere showing of occasional meetings without demonstrating true nature of relationship between them, there was no showing that investors were sophisticated, and there was no showing that developer made requisite data available to investors to enable them to make intelligent investment decisions. *People v. Park (1980) 87 Cal. App. 3d 550, 565, 151 Cal. Rptr. 146*

Offering and sale of demand notes in connection with mobile home community development was public offering rather than private one. *People v. Humphreys (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 693, 697-698, 84 Cal. Rptr. 496* (conviction of selling securities without license affirmed)

[b] Partnerships or Joint Ventures

Joint venture exemption to permit requirement of California Corporate Securities Law was inapplicable to sale of interest in oil and gas drilling leases when parties never intended to create joint venture and when only one party made decisions most affecting ultimate success or failure of enterprise. *Parvin v. Davis Oil Co. (9th Cir. 1979) 655 F.2d 901, 904*

Exemption of former *Corp. Code § 25102(f)* as it existed prior to November 1, 1981, was only available to bona fide partnership; because bona fide partnership is not established unless each partner has right to determine membership of all other partners, limited partnership in which limited partners did not know each other was not entitled to exemption. *Sherman v. Lloyd (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 693, 700-701, 226 Cal. Rptr. 495*

Limited partnership interest is security when it so qualifies under "risk capital" test; neither short-term relationship with offeree nor offeree's investment sophistication was sufficient to bring limited partnership interest within nonpublic transaction exemption of *Corp. Code § 25102(f).* *People v. Graham (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1159, 1168-1169, 1174, 210 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Neither partnership nor joint venture exemption from qualification was present when parties agreed only with respect to sharing of profits but made no provisions as to distribution of losses; when investors were accorded no right at all to participate in management or to exercise control over enterprise; and when no evidence that by investing specific sum in project either investors or developer intended to create joint venture or partnership. *People v. Park (1980) 87 Cal. App. 3d 550, 564, 151 Cal. Rptr. 146*

Agreement with defendant cattle handler to invest plaintiff's funds in cattle purchase and maintenance, all of which defendant would take care of, was not exempt partnership or joint venture arrangement because (1) it did not purport to be one, (2) defendant--who did not take profits but received service fees and financing percentages--did not participate in losses, and (3) it was apparently not a nonpublic offering in that about 100 others had entered into such agreements with defendant in past two years. *Tomei v. Fairline Feeding Corp. (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 394, 401-402, 137 Cal. Rptr. 656*

[c] Nonissuer Transactions

Sale of ongoing incorporated business by owner advertising sale of that business is exempt from qualification requirement when transfer of securities is merely incidental to sale of business. *Fox v. Ehrmantraut (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 127, 138, 167 Cal. Rptr. 595, 615 P.2d 1383* (construing *Corp. Code § 25104(a)(1)*)

[10] Federal Law

[a] Aiding and Abetting Rule 10b-5 Violation

Private plaintiff lacks standing to maintain aiding-and-abetting suit under *Rule 10b-5* because *15 U.S.C. 78j(b)* prohibits only making of material misstatement or omission or commission of manipulative act, not aiding and abetting those violations. *Central Bank v. First Interstate Bank (1994) 511 U.S. 164, 114 S. Ct. 1439, 1445-1448, 128 L. Ed. 2d 119 , superseded by statute as stated in 552 U.S. 148* ; *In re Glenfed, Inc. (9th Cir. 1995) 60 F.3d 591, 592* ; *but*

see 15 U.S.C. § 78t(e) (congressional response to Central Bank case directs prosecution of aiders and abettors by the SEC, but does not create private right of action against aiders and abettors; *see also Stoneridge Inv. Partners, LLC v. Scientific-Atlanta, Inc. (2008) 552 U.S. 148, 162-163, 128 S. Ct. 761, 169 L. Ed 2d 627*

Plaintiff has no private right of action for conspiracy liability under Rule 10 [*see 15 U.S.C. 78j*] because Supreme Court's holding in *Central Bank v. First Interstate (1994) 511 U.S. 164, 114 S. Ct. 1439, 128 L. Ed. 2d 119* (*see entry, above*) that language of Rule 10b confers no private right of action for aiding and abetting precludes any such action for conspiracy liability. *In re Glenfed, Inc. (9th Cir. 1995) 60 F.3d 591, 592*

[b] Brokers and Broker's Duties

Stockbroker's conduct in selling customer's securities and using proceeds for stockbroker's own benefit, without customer's knowledge or consent, was "in connection with purchase or sale of any security" within meaning of § 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act and SEC *Rule 10b-5* [*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*; *17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5*]. *SEC v. Zandford (2002) 535 U.S. 813, 122 S. Ct. 1899, 1906, 153 L.Ed. 2d 1*

Bank holding company was permitted, under Bank Holding Company Act [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1843(c)(8)*], to acquire subsidiary engaged in retail securities brokerage business; retail securities brokerage business was not barred by § 20 of Glass-Steagall Act (former *12 U.S.C. § 377*, repealed 1999), which prohibited issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale, or distribution of securities by bank or bank affiliate when no investment advice was provided and purchases and sales were for account of customer. *Securities Ind. Assn. v. Fed. Reserve Bd. (1984) 468 U.S. 207, 214-221, 104 S. Ct. 3003, 82 L. Ed. 2d 158*

Agent of seller was seller for purposes of imposing liability under *15 U.S.C. § 77l(1)* (misstatements or omissions in prospectus), even though agent did not solicit customers, but waited until customers initiated contact, if agent's participation in sale was substantial factor in transaction and agent received commission. *Harelson v. Miller Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1141, 1142*

Brokerage firm was liable for employee broker's fraud in inducing securities purchase under federal law, for failure to provide reasonable supervision and training, and under California law, for acts of its agent performed within scope of agent's authority. *Seymour v. Summa Vista Cinema, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 1385, 1388*

Punitive damage award against brokerage firm whose employee broker defrauded securities purchasers was proper for firm's own malice as evidenced by its failure to investigate prior suits against broker for similar conduct in reckless disregard of rights of others and failure to supervise, or on basis of firm's ratification of broker's acts, by failure to act when it knew of broker's fraudulent activity. *Seymour v. Summa Vista Cinema, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 1385, 1388*

Fraud liability is not imposed simply because one is led to make unprofitable investment. *Vucinich v. Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 454, 460*

Broker's failure to explain short selling to client in way that client could understand was both reckless violation of SEC Commission *Rule 10b-5* (*17 C.F.R. § 240.10b-5*) and constructive fraud under *Civ. Code § 1575(1)*; explanation was required to include debtor nature of short seller's position and responsibility for margin calls and dividends, including fact that dividend responsibility would erode client's position, and that short selling is normally what is meant by phrase "capital gains objective." *Vucinich v. Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 454, 460*

Under federal securities law, when client has nondiscretionary account, agency relationship arises when client places order and terminates when transaction is complete and broker has no continuing obligation to advise clients of

information that affects their securities; in absence of showing that broker exercised control over account or acted as investment counselor, account was nondiscretionary. *Caravan Mobile Home Sales v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 561, 567* (comparing standard under California law which requires showing that broker "for all practical purposes" controls account)

Duty owed by broker under SEC *Rule 10b-5* is determined by several factors including relationship, relative access to information, benefit derived from relationship by broker, broker's awareness of client's reliance on him or her, and broker's activity in initiating transactions at issue; under California law, statute of limitations for broker's fraud is tolled by broker's reassuring client on concerns relevant to claimed misrepresentations. *Vucinich v. Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1434, 1435-1436*

Confidentiality clause in settlement agreement that prohibited securities customer from discussing dealer's misconduct with regulatory authorities was void and unenforceable as violation of public policy; rules of National Association of Securities Dealers (now known as Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or FINRA) are valid source of public policy so as to allow court to void contract that is contrary to them. *Cariveau v. Halferty (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 126, 138, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 417*

[c] Class Action Limitations

State law fraud claims relating to employee stock options were preempted by Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998; alleged fraud took place "in connection with" purchase or sale of "covered security." *Falkowski v. Imation Corp. (9th Cir. 2003) 320 F.3d 905, 906*

[d] Contribution Among Defendants

SEC allowed to recover investor funds traced to "nominal defendant" to collect proceeds that resulted from underlying fraud. *SEC v. Colello (1998) 139 F.3d 674, 676-677*

Section 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*] and SEC *Rule 10b-5* establishes implied right of contribution for nonsettling defendant in civil action; defendants' shares of damages is apportioned in accordance with their relative culpability, rather than pro rata. *Smith v. Mulvaney (9th Cir. 1987) 827 F.2d 558, 560-561*

[e] Criminal Penalties

Criminal liability under § 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act may be predicated on "misappropriation theory," which outlaws trading on basis of nonpublic information by corporate "outsider" in breach of duty owed to source of information, and complements "classical theory" which targets corporate insider's breach of duty to shareholders with whom insider transacts. *United States v. O'Hagan (1997) 521 U.S. 642, 649, 117 S. Ct. 2199, 138 L. Ed. 2d 724* (holding that person who trades in securities for personal profit, using confidential information misappropriated in breach of fiduciary duty to source of information, is guilty of violating § 10(b) and *Rule 10b-5*)

Criminal conviction for violation of § 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*] affirmed because court was evenly divided on issue of whether person defrauded must be one who traded in securities. *Carpenter v. United States (1987) 484 U.S. 19, 108 S. Ct. 316, 98 L. Ed. 2d 275, 282*

Newspaper's interest in prepublication confidentiality of contents and publication schedule of column is property right within meaning of federal mail and wire fraud statutes [*18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343*] sufficient to sustain conviction against writer and "tippee" for disclosure in furtherance of investment scheme. *Carpenter v. United States (1987) 484 U.S.*

19, 108 S. Ct. 316, 98 L. Ed. 2d 275, 283-285

Even if one is ignorant of regulation and has pleaded guilty, conviction for violation of *17 C.F.R. § 240.14e-3* (willfully engaging in fraudulent, deceptive, or manipulative act) on basis of insider trading is crime involving moral turpitude. *Chadwick v. State Bar (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 103, 110-111, 260 Cal. Rptr. 538, 776 P.2d 240*

[f] Definition of Security

Investment scheme promising fixed rate of return can be "investment contract" and thus "security" subject to federal securities laws; fact that purchasers had contractual entitlement to return did not mean that return was not also expected to come solely from efforts of others. *SEC v. Edwards (2004) 540 U.S. 389, 124 S. Ct. 892, 157 L. Ed. 2d 813, 822*

In determining whether note is security, first test is so-called "family resemblance" test developed by Second Circuit; if that test is not determinative, four criteria must be considered: (1) whether parties' motivation was for investment or commercial purposes; (2) plan of distribution used; (3) expectations of investing public; (4) whether application of securities laws is unnecessary due to some other regulatory scheme. *Reves v. Ernst & Young (1990) 494 U.S. 56, 63-67, 110 S. Ct. 945, 108 L. Ed. 2d 47*

Unsecured, uninsured demand notes sold by agricultural cooperative to raise capital for general business needs were securities when purchasers were motivated to earn profit in form of interest, advertising referred to them as investments, and they were sold to broad segment of public. *Reves v. Ernst & Young (1990) 494 U.S. 56, 70-73, 110 S. Ct. 945, 108 L. Ed. 2d 47*

Exclusion from definition of security of notes maturing less than nine months from time of issuance [*15 U.S.C. § 78c(a)(10)*] was not applicable to unsecured, uninsured demand notes when parties did not contemplate that demand would be made within statutory period. *Reves v. Ernst & Young (1990) 494 U.S. 56, 72-73, 110 S. Ct. 945, 108 L. Ed. 2d 47*

Sale of 50 percent or 100 percent of stock of closely held business was "security" within meaning of Securities Exchange Acts of 1933 and 1934 so as to allow defrauded purchaser antifraud remedies of Acts; when instrument is stock, court need not look to economic substance of transaction to determine if it is "security"; sale of business doctrine, which would compel contrary result, was abrogated in sale of traditional stock of closely held corporation. *Gould v. Ruefenacht (1985) 471 U.S. 701, 703-706, 105 S. Ct. 2308, 85 L. Ed. 2d 708* ; *Landreth Timber Co. v. Landreth (1985) 471 U.S. 681, 685-692, 694-697, 105 S. Ct. 2297, 85 L. Ed. 2d 692*

Commercial paper is security; trial court had to determine whether bank's selling of commercial paper of its corporate customers was "underwriting" within prohibition of *12 U.S.C. § 24* para. 7 and *12 U.S.C. § 378(a)(1)*. *Securities Ind. Assn. v. Fed. Reserve Bd. (1984) 468 U.S. 137, 139-140, 148-160, 104 S. Ct. 2979, 82 L. Ed. 2d 107*

Single, unique agreement, negotiated "one-on-one" between two parties that is not ordinarily considered to be security and that was not designed to be publicly traded was not security under federal securities law. *Marine Bank v. Weaver (1982) 455 U.S. 551, 560, 102 S. Ct. 1220, 71 L. Ed. 2d 409* (certificate of deposit issued by domestic bank); *Mace Neufeld Productions v. Orion Pictures Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 860 F.2d 944, 946* (production and profit-sharing agreement)

Based on factors set forth in *Reves v. Ernst & Young*, discussed *above*, promissory notes did not bear sufficiently strong family resemblance to judicially created list of non-securities, nor did they warrant addition of new category to list. *SEC v. J.T. Wallenbrock (9th Cir. 2002) 313 F.3d 532, 537*

Under family resemblance test set forth in *Reves v. Ernst & Young*, promissory notes in question did not resemble either bank character loan or commercial loan to maintain business operations, so as to fall outside 1934 Act; court declined to add additional category additional category to list of non-securities. *McNabb v. SEC (9th Cir. 2002) 298 F.3d 1126, 1131-1133*

Question of fact exists as to whether partnership investment contract for jojoba farming is security; factors enunciated in *Williamson v. Tucker (5th Cir. 1981) 645 F.2d 404* , *Hocking v. Dubois (9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 1449* , was key to "control" element of *Howey* test: (1) agreement affords so little legal responsibility and authority to investing partners as to place them in position of limited partners, (2) investing partners' sophistication and expertise in business affairs is such that they are incapable of intelligently exercising their partnership powers, or (3) investing partners are so dependent on some unique entrepreneurial or managerial ability of promoter that they cannot exercise meaningful partnership powers. *Koch v. Hankins (9th Cir. 1990) 928 F.2d 1471, 1478*

"Risk capital" test enunciated in *Great Western Bank & Trust v. Kotz (9th Cir. 1976) 532 F.2d 1252, 1255* , is not applied when it is clear from context of underlying transaction that no "security" is involved. *Danner v. Himmelfarb (9th Cir. 1988) 858 F.2d 515, 521-522*

Note secured by deed of trust on real property and given in exchange for sale of peso deposits in Mexican bank was not security when payee initiated transaction to circumvent Mexican currency regulations and realize on pesos "trapped" in *Mexico. Danner v. Himmelfarb (9th Cir. 1988) 858 F.2d 515, 522*

Expectation that profits would be derived solely from managerial efforts of others was not proper criteria; investment is security if undeniably significant or essential managerial efforts are expected to be rendered other than by investor. *Deutsch Energy Co. v. Mazur (9th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 1567, 1569*

Purchaser of oil lease rights who had sufficient general business experience to exercise managerial powers under lease agreements was not able to turn leases into investments by delegating managerial discretion to seller. *Deutsch Energy Co. v. Mazur (9th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 1567, 1570*

Discretionary commodities trading account is not security or investment contract under Securities Act of 1933 definition because there is no common enterprise between investor and promoter. *Lopez v. Dean Witter Reynolds (9th Cir. 1986) 805 F.2d 880, 884-885*

Partner's interest in general partnership was not security under federal law because general partner participated fully in management. *Stone v. Millstein (9th Cir. 1986) 804 F.2d 1434, 1439*

Prepayment plan for purchase of gold coins was not security under federal securities laws (*15 U.S.C. §§ 77b(1), 78c(a)(10)*) because buyer's profit would not come solely from efforts of others but primarily from fluctuations in world price of gold. *SEC v. Belmont Reid & Co., Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 794 F.2d 1388, 1390-1391*

Dismissal not proper because allegations that plaintiffs purchased fractional interests in oil and gas rights and entered into management agreement providing for defendants to manage their interests raised triable issue of fact as to whether plaintiffs contributed risk capital subject to entrepreneurial and management efforts as would constitute security. *Simon Oil Co., Ltd. v. Norman (9th Cir. 1986) 789 F.2d 780, 781-782*

In determining whether notes are securities, central distinction was whether transaction more resembles investment or commercial lending situation; notes secured by assignments of beneficial interests in third party notes and deeds of trust were securities when choice of collateral was made by borrowers, each lender's contribution was small compared to total amount borrowed, foreclosure right was not likely to be enforced due to limited size of individual lender's investment, and very little could actually be negotiated by lenders. *Underhill v. Royal (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1426,*

1430-1431 ; *but see* *Reves v. Ernst & Young (1990) 494 U.S. 56, 64, 110 S. Ct. 945, 108 L. Ed. 2d 47* (characterizing *Underhill*'s approach as substantially similar to so-called *Howey* test (*SEC v. W. J. Howey Co. (1946) 328 U.S. 293, 66 S. Ct. 1100, 90 L. Ed. 1244*) and disapproving application of *Howey* test to notes)

Certificate of deposit issued by foreign bank is not "security" within meaning of federal securities acts. *Wolf v. Banco Nacional de Mexico, S. A. (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1458, 1463-1464*

[g] Jurisdiction

15 U.S.C. § 78aa authorizes nationwide service of process and confers personal jurisdiction over resident defendants in any district; minimum contacts of nonresident defendant with any district or actions outside United States that cause sufficient foreseeable consequences in United States are basis for personal jurisdiction over nonresident defendants. *Securities Investor Protection Corp. v. Vigman (9th Cir. 1985) 764 F.2d 1309, 1315-1316*

[h] Material Misrepresentation

Company that sold option to buy stock while secretly intending never to honor option violated § 10b-5, which prohibits using any manipulative or deceptive device or contrivance in connection with purchase or sale of any security; option to purchase stock constituted "security," oral agreement to purchase did not preclude 10b-5 claim, and sale of option with secret intent not to honor it related to value of security purchase and therefore violated § 10b-5. *The Wharf (Holdings) Limited v. United International Holdings, Inc. (2001) 532 U.S. 588, 590, 121 S. Ct. 1776, 1780-1782, 149 L. Ed. 2d 845*

Conclusionary terms, statements of reasons, opinions, and beliefs in proxy statement soliciting merger understood to rest on factual basis that justifies them as accurate, absence of which renders them misleading. *Virginia Bankshares, Inc. v. Sandberg (1991) 501 U.S. 1083, 111 S. Ct. 2749, 115 L. Ed. 2d 929, 945-947*

Directors' disbelief or undisclosed belief or motivation was insufficient to sustain action under § 14(a) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (proxy solicitation; *15 U.S.C. § 78n(a)*); fact that some accurate facts are included did not save misleading conclusion from being material unless inconsistency would exhaust misleading conclusions's capacity to influence reasonable shareholder. *Virginia Bankshares, Inc. v. Sandberg (1991) 501 U.S. 1083, 111 S. Ct. 2749, 115 L. Ed. 2d 929, 947-948*

In civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* (*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*) fraud actions, standard of materiality was same standard applied in proxy context: omitted, withheld, or misrepresented fact is material if substantial likelihood exists that reasonable shareholder would consider it important in deciding how to act, in that disclosure would have been viewed by reasonable investor as having significantly altered total mix of information available. *Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 208-209, 214, 219-220*

In civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* fraud actions, materiality of preliminary merger negotiations is dependent on probability that transaction will be consummated and on significance of merger to issuer; thus, materiality of preliminary merger negotiations is question of fact to be determined on case by case basis; factors to be considered include size of companies involved, indicia of interest of board members, whether investment banks have become involved, whether directors' resolution has been passed, and potential for stock involved to command premium in excess of market value. *Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 212-214, 220*

In civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* fraud actions relating to disclosure of preliminary merger negotiations, "agreement-in-principle" standard of materiality (no disclosure required until agreement-in-principle exists as to price and structure) is abrogated for artificially excluding from definition of materiality information that would otherwise be significant to trading decision of reasonable investor. *Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct.*

978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 212, 220

In civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* fraud actions relating to disclosure of preliminary merger negotiations, rule that negotiations become material by virtue of statement denying their existence is abrogated; falsity or incompleteness of statement is not sufficient to confer materiality on otherwise insignificant fact. *Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 212, 220*

In civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* fraud action relating to false denials of preliminary merger negotiations, investors entitled to rely on rebuttable presumption of reliance under "fraud on the market" theory, which assumes that market system develops price on basis of all available information; thus, market price reflects false information, whether or not known to investor, and has effectively defrauded investor as much as direct reliance would; severance of link between false information and price paid or received by plaintiff or between false information and plaintiff's decision to trade will rebut presumption of reliance. *Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 215-219, 220, 220* (three judges not participating; four judges concurring; two judges dissenting); *see In re Apple Computer Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1109, 1113, 1119* (fraud on market theory and its effect on plaintiff's burden of proof)

Attorney who undertakes to make representations to prospective purchasers of securities is under obligation, imposed by Section 10(b) [*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*], to tell truth about those securities; that he or she may have attorney-client relationship with seller of those securities is irrelevant under Section 10(b). *Thompson v. Paul (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1055, 1063*

Allegations of seriously mishandled audit, which set out compelling case of negligence or even gross negligence, were insufficient to plead scienter under heightened pleading requirements of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act [*15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(2)*]. *DSAM Global Value Fund v. Altris Software, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 288 F.3d 385, 390-391*

Rule 10b-5 and Rule 14e-3 (which governs fraud in connection with tender offers) prohibit only misleading and untrue statements, not statements that are incomplete; thus to survive motion to dismiss, complaint must specify reasons why statements were misleading or untrue, not simply why statements were incomplete; corporation's press releases were not misleading under applicable standards. *Brody v. Transitional Hospitals Corporation (9th Cir. 2002) 280 F.3d 997, 1006-1007*

Failure to disclose any intent to engage in short sales of stock did not support claim of securities fraud in violation of *Rule 10b-5*; short sales executed in accordance with SEC rules and regulations not only are lawful, but do not distort markets or create a false impression of supply and demand because they are legitimate transactions with real buyers on the other side of the sale who are betting that the stock's price will rise. *GFL Advantage Fund, Ltd. v. Colkitt (3rd Cir. 2001) 272 F.3d 189, 212-214*

With respect to whether CEO who, with scienter, signs SEC filing containing misrepresentations "makes statement" so as to be liable as primary violator under § 10(b), district court erred in granting CEO judgment as a matter of law; demonstration of possible motive combined with red flags of company's financial condition were sufficient to withstand motion for judgment as a matter of law on issue of scienter. *Howard v. Everex Systems, Inc. (9th Cir. 2000) 228 F. 3d 1057, 1063-1065*

Company's failure to disclose disagreement with largest customer regarding effect of early repayment of loan by company did not violate securities laws when there was no evidence that company had agreed to or could be forced to pay off loan, and any possible negative effect resulting from information which company allegedly failed to disclose regarding its contractual relationship, rights, and duties was at most speculative and uncertain. *Abromson v. American Pacific Corp. (9th Cir. 1997) 114 F.3d 898, 902-903*

Ninth Circuit has adopted "bespeaks caution" doctrine, holding that if precise cautionary language directly addresses itself to future projections, estimates, or forecasts in a prospectus, the projections will not give rise to a claim of securities fraud in violation of *15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*. *In re Worlds of Wonder Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1995) 35 F.3d 1407, 1414-1415*

Corporation's failure to disclose identity of potential buyer of subsidiary was material but not misleading and, thus, not actionable omission under *15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)* because shareholder knew he did not know name of potential buyer but nonetheless chose to sell securities back to issuer; issuer's disclosure that it knew name of potential buyer (but would not identify potential buyer) was sufficient, particularly in light of shareholder's considerable sophistication. *McCormick v. Fund American Companies, Inc. (9th Cir. 1994) 26 F.3d 869, 879-880*

Bank's deliberate failure to recognize problem loans, thus knowingly understating its loan reserve, constituted omission or misrepresentation of material fact actionable under *15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*; bank's act not dismissable as mere internal mismanagement, unsound business practices, or poor accounting judgment. *In re Wells Fargo Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1993) 12 F.3d 922, 926* .

Seller's use of false identity when selling securities through brokerage firm under name of former client, without disclosure that securities were issued by corporation in which seller was officer and director, did not constitute securities fraud in violation of *15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)* because misrepresentation and omission were not material. *U.S. v. Bingham (9th Cir. 1993) 992 F.2d 975, 976-977*

Investor's sophistication did not preclude his or her reliance on "fraud-on-the-market" theory of action and was not sufficient, in context of motion for summary judgment, to rebut presumption of reliance; sophisticated investors are as entitled to rely on the fraud-on-the-market theory as anyone else. *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp. (9th Cir. 1992) 976 F.2d 497, 506-507*

In "fraud on market" case, plaintiff not required to show actual reliance on particular misrepresentation or omission; plaintiff only required to show reliance on integrity of stock price established by market; investor's reliance on market equivalent to reliance on statements made to market or nondisclosure of material information. *In re Convergent Technologies Securities Lit. (9th Cir. 1991) 948 F.2d 507, 512 n.2*

Company required to discuss factors that would cause reported financial information not to be necessarily indicative of future financial operating results in its annual 10-K filing; company not required to do so in quarterly report to shareholders. *In re Convergent Technologies Securities Lit. (9th Cir. 1991) 948 F.2d 507, 514*

Ordinarily materiality and scienter fact-specific issues that should be left to trier of fact; but when plaintiff could only prove those elements of case and no others, grant of summary judgment for defendants is proper. *In re Apple Computer Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1109, 1113, 1119*

Projections and general expressions of optimism may be actionable; each such statement contains three implied factual assertions, inaccuracy of which is actionable. *In re Apple Computer Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1109, 1113*

Under fraud on market theory, defendants' failure to disclose material information is excused if that information has been made credibly available to market by other sources; credibility of other sources is to be compared to impact of statements by insiders; only in rare case will intense and sustained focus by press on risks of product in development excuse unqualified exuberance of insiders and their failure to disclose problems with project. *In re Apple Computer Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1109, 1115-1116*

Materiality of alleged misrepresentation and reasonableness of purchaser's reliance on it not to be considered in

isolation but in context of entire presentation and other misrepresentations, if any; thus, oral assurance that investment was "sure thing" was actionable and grant of summary judgment for seller was error. *Casella v. Webb (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 805, 808*

No civil SEC *Rule 10b-5* cause of action was stated against law firm that issued opinion regarding marketability of title to real property purchased by issuer because law firm had no duty to disclose to investors that issuer paid inflated price for property or that another client of law firm had investment in property. *Roberts v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 857 F.2d 646, 653-654*

Fact is material if its existence or nonexistence is matter to which reasonable person would attach importance in determining his or her course of action with respect to transaction; materiality is mixed question of law and fact. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 469* ; *Caravan Mobile Home Sales v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 561, 565*

Failure to receive financial information is not material when investment predates commencement of business in view of investor's testimony that fact that business was new was not material consideration in his decision to invest. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 469*

Omission to state whether fishing boats would be leased or purchased was not material when investor testified it was not issue for him when he decided to invest. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 469*

Decision made after close of offering to fish for shrimp rather than for red snapper, lobster, and conch as stated in offering summary was not material to decision to invest since materiality must be determined in light of facts existing at time of nondisclosure or misinformation. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 469*

State securities and fraud claims are subject to same test of materiality as federal securities claims. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 470*

At time of plaintiff's purchases neither inventory build-up, intention to sell two profitable subsidiaries, nor reclassification of oil reserves from proven to unproven and downward valuation of reserves was material; materiality is not to be determined by hindsight. *Caravan Mobile Home Sales v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 561, 565-567*

Summary judgment on issue of materiality is only proper when court has engaged in meticulous and well articulated analysis of each item of withheld or misrepresented information and reasonable minds could not differ as determination of materiality. *Caravan Mobile Home Sales v. Lehman Bros. Kuhn Loeb (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 561, 565*

Allegedly false statements concerning computer product bugs and problems were not actionable as matter of law because they were already known to investors; omission is materially misleading in fraud-on-the-market case only if information has not already entered market. *In re Sybase, Inc. Securities Litigation (N.D. Cal. 1999) 48 F. Supp. 2d 958, 961-962*

[i] Procedural Requirements for Pleading Fraud

Complaint was sufficient, under heightened pleading standard of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, in alleging facts showing that company and three top executives intentionally or with deliberate recklessness withheld reports of adverse effects of and lawsuits concerning pharmaceutical product that was responsible for the company's remarkable sales increase. Siracusano v. Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. (9th Cir. 2009) 585 F.3d 1167, 1183

Drawing inference that facts crucial to company's "core operations" (or to particular important transaction) were known by company's key officers is permissible, but that cannot alone be sufficient except in unusual circumstances, to support conclusion that complaint raises strong inference of scienter and so satisfies heightened pleading standard of *Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. South Ferry LP v. Killinger (9th Cir. 2008) 542 F.3d 776, 784-785*

Third amended complaint alleging securities fraud class action was properly dismissed with prejudice; although complaint exceeded 370 pages, allegations ultimately failed to meet exacting requirements of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act--that is, strong implication that defendant acted with intent to deceive, manipulate, or defraud, and specification of what statements by defendant were misleading and why--as well as ordinary standards for pleading loss causation. *Metzler Inv. GMBH v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 534 F.3d 1068, 1090-1091*

Complaint alleging securities fraud was improperly dismissed with prejudice, for failure to plead "false statements" with particularity and to satisfy scienter requirement pursuant to heightened pleading requirements of *Private Securities Litigation Reform Act. Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc. (9th Cir. 2003) 316 F.3d 1048, 1051*

Dismissal with prejudice of complaint alleging securities fraud, for failure to plead "false statements" with particularity and to satisfy scienter requirement pursuant to heightened pleading requirements of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, reversed. *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc. (9th Cir. 2003) 316 F.3d 1048, 1051*

Allegations in securities fraud class action did not meet heightened pleading requirements of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act [*15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(b)(1), (2)*] because they were not sufficiently particularized and did not raise "strong inference" that misleading statements were made knowingly or with deliberate recklessness. *Fischer v. Vantive Corp.(In re Vantive Corp. Secs. Litig. (9th Cir. 2002) 283 F.3d 1079, 1085*

Allegations of securities fraud did not raise strong enough inference to meet heightened pleading requirements of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act; calling executives bad managers or forecasters does not plead fraud unless it can be shown they knew or were deliberately reckless in disregarding misleading nature of their forecasts. *Ronconi v. Larkin (9th Cir. 2001) 253 F.3d 423, 437*

Dismissal of complaint alleging corporate securities fraud for failure to satisfy requirements of Rule 9(b) [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(b)*] was correct when none of complaint's factual allegations satisfied Rule 9(b)'s requirement that complaint aver with particularity "circumstances constituting fraud"; complaint did not allege with sufficient particularity details about existence of alleged "non-public confidential information" that revealed "true facts" that were inconsistent with various statements by defendants. *Yourish v. California Amplifier (9th Cir. 2000) 191 F.3d 983, 994-998*

Although plaintiff may satisfy rule requiring that fraud be pleaded with particularity in corporate securities fraud case [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(b)*] through reliance on presumption that allegedly false and misleading group published information complained of is collective action of officers and directors, if outside directors are named, complaint must allege that they had some kind of operational involvement or special relationship with corporation, such as participating in its daily activities or preparing or communicating group information. *In re Glenfed, Inc. (9th Cir. 1995) 60 F.3d 591, 593*

Plaintiff may satisfy rule requiring that fraud be pleaded with particularity in securities fraud case [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(b)*] by alleging necessary condition of mind of actor without setting forth circumstances from which condition may be inferred; rule does not mandate that facts giving rise to either strong inference or some inference of fraudulent intent be set forth. *In re Glenfed, Inc. Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1995) 42 F.3d 1541, 1546-1547*

[j] Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO)

President and sole shareholder of closely held corporation that promoted boxing matches was a "person" distinct from the "enterprise" for purposes of liability under *18 U.S.C. § 1962(c)*; incorporation's basic purpose is to create distinct legal entity with rights, obligations, powers, and privileges different from those of natural individuals who created it, who own it, or whom it employs. *Cedric Kushner Promotions, Ltd. v. King (2001) 533 U.S. 158, 164-165, 121 S. Ct. 2087, 150 L. Ed. 2d 198*

Section 107 of Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, eliminating conduct actionable as fraud in purchase or sale of securities as predicate for civil claims under RICO, could not be applied retroactively to bar civil RICO claims filed after Act's effective date based on conduct occurring before effective date. *Scott v. Boos (9th Cir. 2000) 215 F.3d 940, 941-942*

One fraudulent scheme or one criminal episode is sufficient "pattern of racketeering" if it involves two or more predicate acts that are (1) not isolated events, (2) separate in time, and (3) in furtherance of single criminal scheme; purchasers of savings and loan association's stock stated civil RICO cause of action (*18 U.S.C. § 1964*) against all but newest director and attorney of issuer based on misrepresentations in annual reports, offering circulars, press releases, and conversations over 14-month period. *Blake v. Dierdorff (9th Cir. 1988) 856 F.2d 1365, 1368, 1369-1371* (directors), 1371-1372 (attorney)

When fraudulent statements are made in "group-published information," such as prospectuses, registration statements, annual reports, or press releases, presumption of collective action is applicable to satisfy federal requirement that fraud be specifically pleaded. *Blake v. Dierdorff (9th Cir. 1988) 856 F.2d 1365, 1369*

No civil RICO cause of action was stated against issuer's accountants or accounting firm when all actions taken by accountants and information learned by them were in furtherance of single audit, which thus constituted only one predicate act. *Blake v. Dierdorff (9th Cir. 1988) 856 F.2d 1365, 1371*

Complaint of California cities and local agencies that deposited funds with Orange County Treasurer for investment in statutory investment trust which then collapsed sufficiently alleged conduct in breach of duties owed directly to appellants by broker under federal RICO statutes. *City of Atascadero v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner Smith, Inc. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 445, 484&485, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329*

[k] Remedies

Minority shareholder whose vote is not required by law or bylaw to authorize transaction (merger) was unable to show causation of damages recoverable in implied private right of action under § 14(a) of Securites Exchange Act of 1934 (*15 U.S.C. § 78n(a)*). *Virginia Bankshares, Inc. v. Sandberg (1991) 501 U.S. 1083, 111 S. Ct. 2749, 115 L. Ed. 2d 929, 951-955*

Since deterrence as well as restoration of investor to status quo ante is purpose of Securities Act of 1933, rescissionary damages for fraud under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2) was not to be subject to deduction for income tax saved by investor because of investment; actual damage limitation of *15 U.S.C. § 78bb(a)* did not authorize reduction of amount of rescissionary damages for violation of § 10(b) of Securities Act of 1933 (*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*) by amount of income tax saved by investor because of investment; because income tax impact was not measured only by actual amount of limited partners' investment but by their proportionate shares of nonrecourse loans to partnership, this result was possibly not applicable to other types of investment. *Randall v. Loftsgaarden (1986) 478 U.S. 647, 649-667, 106 S. Ct. 3143, 92 L. Ed. 2d 525*

Tippees who traded on misrepresented material nonpublic information not barred from recovering losses in civil action

against broker and corporate insider tippers; pari delicto defense was inapplicable because (1) plaintiffs' culpability was much less than defendants', and (2) private civil suits are important for enforcement of securities laws and protection of investing public. B. Eichler, H. Richards, Inc. v. *Berner (1985) 472 U.S. 299, 310-319, 105 S. Ct. 2622, 86 L. Ed. 2d 215*

Cancellation of hostile takeover tender offer and finalization of agreement based on negotiation and "friendlier" offer did not involve misrepresentation, deception, or nondisclosure sufficient to establish a cause of action under *15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)*; "manipulation" as used in *15 U.S.C. § 78n(e)* as requires intentional or willful conduct designed to deceive. *Schreiber v. Burlington Northern, Inc. (1985) 472 U.S. 1, 12-13, 105 S. Ct. 2458, 86 L. Ed. 2d 1*

Broker-dealer tippee's actions in passing on to investor's information received from insider that corporation's assets were overvalued due to fraud was not violation of antifraud provisions of *15 U.S.C. §§ 77q(a), 78j(b)*; tippee had no fiduciary duty to shareholders and no derivative duty from insider/tipper who received no personal benefit from revealing information and was motivated only to expose fraud. *Dirks v. SEC (1983) 463 U.S. 646, 648, 661, 103 S. Ct. 3255, 77 L. Ed. 2d 911*

Under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2), purchaser is entitled to rescission without showing that misrepresentation was cause of economic loss. *Casella v. Webb (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 805, 808-809*

If ICC has approved tender offer and merger [*see 49 U.S.C. § 11341(a)*], transaction is exempt from attack under all other laws and no cause of action can be stated against directors of railroad for dishonesty or obtaining too low price; result not altered because merger was accomplished through voting trust. *Deutsch v. Flannery (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 60, 62-63*

Federal law overrides choice of law provision in trust indenture agreement; subsequent purchasers were not automatically assigned causes of action from original purchasers who relied on misleading statements or omissions in offering materials; cause of action is personal to purchaser who relied. *In re Nucorp Energy Securities Litigation (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1486, 1489-1490*

Redress under Section 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. § 78) that proscribes use of any deceptive or manipulative device "in connection with the purchase or sales of any security" is also available when there is sale of security and fraud "touches" sale. *Arrington v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith (9th Cir. 1981) 651 F.2d 615, 619*

[l] Standing

Shareholder who brought derivative action for short swing profits taken by insiders [*see* § 16(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 34 (*15 U.S.C. § 78p(b)*)] not deprived of standing by merger in which plaintiff's shares were exchanged for those of parent corporation. *Gollust v. Mendell (1991) 501 U.S. 115, 111 S. Ct. 2173, 115 L. Ed. 2d 109, 122*

State law governs federal derivative action; federal court may not require demand if demand would be excused as futile under state law. *Kamen v. Kemper Financial Services, Inc. (1991) 500 U.S. 90, 111 S. Ct. 1711, 114 L. Ed. 2d 152, 172* (action under Investment Securities Act of 1940 (*15 U.S.C. § 80a-1 et seq.*) remanded for determination whether plaintiff had adequately pleaded futility)

Investors whose trades occurred two months after corporation's repurchase did not satisfy judicially-created contemporaneous trading "standing" requirement applicable to insider trading claims; there is no distinction between *Rule 10b-5* and Rule 14e-3 (which governs fraud in connection with tender offers) regarding need for contemporaneous trading allegation. *Brody v. Transitional Hospitals Corporation (9th Cir. 2002) 280 F.3d 997, 1001-1003, 1005*

Former shareholder who exchanges stock for contingent rights to receive stock has standing to sue as purchaser of stock for purposes of § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and *Rule 10b-5*. *Griggs v. Pace American Group Inc. (9th Cir. 1999) 170 F.3d 877, 880* (adopting rule that attachment of contingency to contractual right to receive stock does not remove that right from coverage of federal securities laws)

Subscribers and dealers who failed to show fraud "in connection with" purchase or sale of securities had no standing to bring § 10(b) class action suit against corporation issuing securities. *Cohen v. Stratosphere Corp. (9th Cir. 1997) 115 F.3d 695, 703*

[m] Statute of Limitations

Amendment to Securities and Exchange Act permitting reinstatement on motion of any action begun on or before June 19, 1991 (date of Supreme Court's decision in *Lampf, Pleva, Lipkind, Prupis & Petigrow v. Gilbertson (1991) 501 U.S. 350, 111 S. Ct. 2773, 115 L. Ed. 2d 321*), but dismissed after that date as time barred, if action would have been timely filed under applicable law on or before June 19, 1992, is unconstitutional to extent it requires federal courts to reopen final judgments entered before its enactment because it violates separation of powers doctrine. *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc. (1995) 514 U.S. 211, 115 S. Ct. 1447, 1452-1453, 131 L. Ed. 2d 328, 342*

Usual rule that when Congress fails to provide statute of limitations, federal cause of action "borrows" state limitation is not applicable to private 10b-5 claims [*see 15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*, which does not create cause of action]; 10b-5 claims must be commenced within one year after discovery of facts constituting violation and within three years of violation. *Lampf v. Gilbertson (1991) 501 U.S. 350, 111 S. Ct. 2773, 115 L. Ed. 2d 321, 331-334, 336*

Equitable tolling doctrine is inconsistent with "1- and-3-year" limitation for 10b-5 claims and thus is inapplicable; action was barred even though plaintiffs could not have known until IRS changed its position that investment did not qualify for tax benefit as represented in offering materials. *Lampf v. Gilbertson (1991) 501 U.S. 350, 111 S. Ct. 2773, 115 L. Ed. 2d 321, 336*

Because press article's general skepticism about company's future prospects would not have led reasonable investor to investigate possibility of fraud, regardless of whether actual discovery or inquiry notice was used as governing standard, limitations period had not run when plaintiffs filed their suit. *Berry v. Valence Technology, Inc. (9th Cir. 1999) 175 F.3d 699, 703-706*

Civil enforcement actions brought by Securities and Exchange Commission not subject to one-year/three-year limitation period adopted for private fraud actions brought under *15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*. *SEC v. Rind (9th Cir. 1993) 991 F.2d 1486, 1489-1490*

Amendment to Securities and Exchange Act permitting reinstatement of securities fraud actions pending on date new statute of limitation became effective [*see 15 U.S.C. § 78aa-1*] not unconstitutional because Congress changed underlying substantive law and did not violate either Separation of Powers doctrine, *Due Process clause of 5th Amendment*, or *Equal Protection clause*. *Gray v. First Winthrop Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 989 F.2d 1564, 1569-1570, 1572-1574* ; *but see* *Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc. (1995) 514 U.S. 211, 115 S. Ct. 1447, 1452-1453, 131 L. Ed. 2d 328, 342* , *above*

Statute of limitations against seller's agent who was deemed seller for purposes of liability for violation of *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(1) begins to run when agent ceases to participate in sale, here, when buyer's check was forwarded to seller. *Harelson v. Miller Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1141, 1142*

Although pendency of class action tolls limitation period for all asserted members of class, not just for intervenors, limitation period not tolled with respect to subsequent federal securities class action by class members; class member's subsequent individual action not barred because limitation period was tolled during pendency of prior class action. *Robbin v. Fluor Corp. (9th Cir. 1987) 835 F.2d 213, 214-215* ; note that the result under California law may be contrary [*see Jolly v. Eli Lilly & Co. (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 1103, 1121-1122, 245 Cal. Rptr. 658, 751 P.2d 923* (declining to apply *American Pipe & Construction Co. v. Utah (1974) 414 U.S. 538, 94 S. Ct. 756, 38 L. Ed. 2d 713* , on which *Robbin* was based, to "mass tort" action)]

[10A] Federal Preemption of State Law

Federal law creating national system for clearance and settlement of securities transactions [*see 15 U.S.C. § 78q-1*] does not reflect Congressional intent to occupy field of clearing and settling securities transactions to exclusion of state law; however, claims based on state law and asserted against entities carrying out that federal law would be preempted if in conflict with Congressional intent. *Whistler Invs., Inc. v. Depository Trust Clearing Corp. (9th Cir. 2008) 539 F.3d 1159, 1165-1166*

State law fraud claims relating to employee stock options were preempted by Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998; alleged fraud took place "in connection with" purchase or sale of "covered security." *Falkowski v. Imation Corp. (9th Cir. 2003) 320 F.3d 905, 906*

Federal securities law preempted state law claims of securities brokers' customers who challenged nondisclosure of receipt of "order flow payments" from brokers through whom purchase and sale orders were executed. *McKey v. Charles Schwab & Co. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 731, 741-742, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 213*

State action for breach of broker's common law fiduciary duty to trustees of profit-sharing trust, who invested trust funds, had impact on trust or its administration that was too tenuous, remote, and peripheral for action to be preempted by ERISA [*29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.*)]. *Duffy v. Cavalier (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1517, 1529, 264 Cal. Rptr. 740*

[11] Fiduciary Duties

Because of fiduciary relationship of securities broker and client, constructive fraud was shown in inducement into entire agreement, as well as arbitration clause, causing arbitration agreement to be unenforceable. *Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1020, 1027, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895*

Relationship between stockbroker and principal is fiduciary in nature and imposes on broker duty of acting in highest good faith toward principal; obligation of diligent and faithful service is same as that imposed on trustee [*Civ. Code § 2322*]. *Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 709, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222* (decided under prior version of *Civ. Code § 2322*; *now see Civ. Code § 2322(c)*, which imposes duties set forth in *Prob. Code §§ 16002, 16004, 16005*, and *16009*)

One who induced unsophisticated persons to invest money in various ventures in his name assumed fiduciary status as investment advisor, trustee of commodities accounts, managing partner of mining venture, and securities broker-dealer; fiduciary's material misrepresentations to induce investors not to withdraw their funds, failure to disclose significant risks, and failure to register securities were not only statutory violations [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25401*] but also constructive fraud, which supports award of punitive damages. *Stokes v. Henson (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 187, 194-197, 265 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[12] Jurisdiction

National Association of Securities Dealers (now known as Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or FINRA) was protected by absolute immunity against claims by trader in secondary limited partnership market alleging improprieties arising out of NASD's attempted disciplinary actions against it. *Partnership Exch. Sec. Co. v. NASD (9th Cir. 1999) 169 F.3d 606, 608*

Claims against National Association of Securities Dealers (now known as Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, or FINRA) for temporarily de-listing and suspending trading in stock on opening day of public offering, although articulated in terms of state law, were properly removed to federal district that had subject matter jurisdiction; NASD, as self-regulatory organization, was entitled to regulatory immunity from claims when acting under aegis of Securities Exchange Act's delegated authority. *Sparta Surgical Corp. v. NASD, Inc. (9th Cir. 1998) 159 F.3d 1209, 1212-1215*

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with federal courts over suits arising under Securities Act of 1933 (*15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.*). *Lakewood Bank & Trust Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 463, 468, 180 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Nationwide service of process provisions of Securities Act of 1933, § 22(a) (*15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)*), and similar section of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (*15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq.*) confer personal jurisdiction over defendant for pendant state law claims only after court has obtained subject matter jurisdiction on a federal issue and can justify entertaining state claims in interest of judicial economy. *Lakewood Bank & Trust Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 463, 470, 180 Cal. Rptr. 914* ; *accord, Danner v. Himmelfarb (9th Cir. 1988) 858 F.2d 515, 521-522* (upholding dismissal of state claims after entry of summary judgment for defendant because note was not security within meaning of federal securities laws and there was no independent basis for jurisdiction)

California court may obtain jurisdiction over out-of-state defendant pursuant to Securities Act of 1933, § 22(a) (*15 U.S.C. § 77v(a)*), authorizing extraterritorial service of process, only if it can be shown that claim against out-of-state defendant is either brought to enforce any liability or duty created by Securities Act of 1933 or is fundamentally derived from and dependent on such a claim. *Lakewood Bank & Trust Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 463, 470-471, 180 Cal. Rptr. 914*

Claims that are fundamentally derived from, and dependent on, suits to enforce liability or duty created by Securities Act of 1933 are limited to claims against parties who actually are involved in either offer or sale of security. *Lakewood Bank & Trust Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 463, 472-473, 180 Cal. Rptr. 914*

State court has jurisdiction over claim under Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and/or regulations promulgated thereunder only if claim is asserted in addition to state claims and is based on common law; federal jurisdiction is exclusive only as to action that goes beyond common law rights that state court could have fully adjudicated prior to passage of *Act. Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 704-706, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222* (*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 78aa, 78bb(a)*)

[13] Liability for Material Misrepresentation

Under California law, partnership relation, and thus fiduciary duty of disclosure, terminates on formation of contract for sale of partnership interest; contract was formed when selling partner communicates to buying partner acceptance of offer to purchase; after formation of contract, matters affecting value of interest sold were not required to be disclosed. *Stone v. Millstein (9th Cir. 1986) 804 F.2d 1434, 1437-1438*

State securities and fraud claims are subject to same test of materiality as federal securities claims. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 470*

Anti-SLAPP motion to strike cause of action under *Corp. Code § 25400(d)* based on misrepresentation was properly denied when former owners of common stock alleged that defendant publishers of market research reports on plaintiffs' company engaged in concerted wrongful actions to depress price of common stock for their financial benefit, and plaintiffs provided prima facie evidence that defendants willfully participated in scheme by participating in development and publication of false statements concerning company, concealing their role in obtaining negative tenor and content of published reports, and delaying publication to facilitate other defendants' establishment of short positions in that stock. *Overstock.com, Inc. v. Gradient Analytics, Inc. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 688, 717, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 29*

Directors of corporation targeted for takeover have no duty to disclose merger negotiations to shareholders until agreement in principle has been reached, even though withdrawal from prior agreement in principle and termination of earlier merger negotiations had been publicly announced. *Eldridge v. Tymshare, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 767, 772-776, 230 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *but see Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 212-214, 220* (probably applicable to abrogate agreement-in-principle standard under California law; cases listed in § 515.246[10][h])

Misrepresentation or concealment of fact was not material; reliance on statement or omission in connection with tender offer was not required. *Lynch v. Cook (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1087-1088, 196 Cal. Rptr. 544*

[14] Marketing Personnel--Licensing

In determining whether person involved in particular transaction was subject to business opportunity licensing requirement, crucial question is not whether transaction met statutory definition of business opportunity [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10030*], but whether person "[sold] or offer[ed] to sell, [bought] or offer[ed] to buy, solicit[ed] prospective sellers or purchasers of, solicit[ed] or obtain[ed] listings of, or negotiate[d] the purchase, sale or exchange of" business opportunity [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10131*]--in other words, inquiry should be focused on person's actions in attempting to create business relationship, not on form that business relationship ultimately took: for example, person would come within statute if he or she solicited or negotiated purchase or sale of business opportunity, but would not come within statute if he or she solicited or negotiated different kind of transaction, even if transaction ultimately was consummated as purchase or sale of business opportunity. *Nein v. HostPro, Inc. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 833, 848, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34*

"Business opportunity" as used in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10030* encompasses any transfer of ownership of entire ongoing business in corporate form, whether by transfer of all stock or all assets, and thus person negotiating transaction is required to have real estate broker's license. *All Points Traders, Inc. v. Barrington Associates (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 723, 731, 734, 259 Cal. Rptr. 780* ; *but see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10008.5* (providing that real estate and business opportunity broker licensing requirements do not apply to person licensed as security broker); *see also* Stats. 1989, ch. 1116, § 8 (statement of legislative intent that rights and obligations of parties in *All Points Traders* not be affected)

Provisions of Corporate Securities Act [*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*] requiring stockbroker to first secure license [former *Corp. Code § 25700*; *now see Corp. Code § 25210*] are designed to protect public against unscrupulous operators; contract employing broker to sell corporate stock is void if broker is not licensed to sell and broker as not allowed to recover commission. *Rhode v. Bartholomew (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 272, 282, 210 P.2d 768*

Person who negotiates for securities on behalf of purchaser as being broker-dealer required to be licensed, since inducing purchase or sale of securities [*see Corp. Code § 25210*] is business of effecting transactions therein [*see Corp. Code § 25004*] and is not area excluded from licensing requirements of securities law. *Nationwide Investment Corp. v. California Funeral Serv., Inc. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 494, 502, 114 Cal. Rptr. 77*

Licensing provisions of securities law cover all persons acting as broker-dealers or agents even though securities in

which they deal may be exempted from qualification provisions. *Nationwide Investment Corp. v. California Funeral Serv., Inc. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 494, 503, 114 Cal. Rptr. 77*

[15] Punitive Damages

Punitive damage award against brokerage firm whose employee broker defrauded securities purchasers was proper for firm's own malice, as evidenced by its failure to investigate prior suits against broker for similar conduct in reckless disregard of rights of others and failure to supervise, or on basis of firm's ratification of broker' acts by failure to act when it knew of broker's fraudulent activity. *Seymour v. Summa Vista Cinema, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 1385, 1388* (decided under *Civ. Code § 3294* before 1987 amendment)

Punitive damages of $220,000, equal to 2.3 times compensatory award or one percent of stock brokerage firm's net worth, were appropriate when individual broker's conduct was ratified and approved by managing agent, and churning (over 500 unauthorized transactions in six-year period) was so egregious that capital was turned over six times per year. *Hobbs v. Eichler (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 174, 192-196, 210 Cal. Rptr. 387*

[16] Purpose of Securities Laws

Primary purpose of California securities law is to afford to those who risk their capital at least fair chance of realizing their objectives. *People v. Miller (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1510, 238 Cal. Rptr. 168*

[17] Rescission

Rescission of securities transaction is available under *Civ. Code § 1689*, for instance, when agreement required stock purchaser to make tender offer for outstanding shares held by minority interests at price no less than price paid to seller, and, if it acquired 80 percent of outstanding shares, to adjust price paid to seller to reflect price paid to offerees; purchaser's failure to make tender offer is breach of contract and failure of consideration; whether failure of consideration was sufficiently material to allow seller to rescind as question of fact. *FDIC v. Air Florida System, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 822 F.2d 833, 839-840*

[18] Securities Exempt

Fractionalizing of promissory notes is no different than issuance of promissory that is one of series of notes secured by same real property; therefore, it is not exempt from securities regulation under *Corp. Code § 25100(e)*. *People v. Schock (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 379, 389, 199 Cal. Rptr. 327*

[19] Statute of Limitations

Under California law, statute of limitations for broker's fraud was tolled by broker's reassuring client on concerns relevant to claimed misrepresentations. *Vucinich v. Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 454, 460*

Civil liability under Securities Act of 1933 [*15 U.S.C. §§ 77 l*(1), 77m] for use of mails or other instrumentality of interestate commerce for sale, delivery, or offer to sell unregistered security is subject to one year limitation of *15 U.S.C. § 77m* from date of last sales-related activity; complaint as required to allege facts demonstrating compliance with statute of limitation. *Toombs v. Leone (9th Cir. 1985) 777 F.2d 465, 468*

Six-year period established by Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board for arbitration of claim for reclamation (rescission) of transaction involving stolen bearer bonds commences on seller's refusal of demand for reclamation, not on date of theft, so claim for arbitration was timely filed and confirmation of award was proper. *Citibank v. Crowell, Weedon & Co. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 844, 848-850, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 906*

[20] Unlawful Competition Law Inapplicable

In action by investors alleging they were defrauded by "pyramid" or "Ponzi" scheme orchestrated by foreign brokerage houses from which they purchased shares of stock, trial court did not err in holding that *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* does not apply to securities transactions. *Bowen v. Ziasun Techs., Inc. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 777, 786-787, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*

[21] Waiver of Statutory Compliance with California Law

Right of buyer of securities in California to have California law apply to future dispute arising out of transaction is "provision" within meaning of *Corp. Code § 25701* and is not subject to waiver or evasion by stipulation of parties to securities transaction; therefore choice of law provision in agreement violated *Corp. Code § 25701*. *Hall v. Superior Court (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 411, 418, 197 Cal. Rptr. 757*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAgents DistinguishedFiduciary RelationshipsFiduciary ResponsibilitiesBusiness & Corporate LawJoint VenturesGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudSecurities FraudGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesRacketeeringRacketeer Influenced & Corrupt OrganizationsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934DefinitionsSecuritySecurities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934Jurisdiction & ScopeGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsExcluded TransactionsSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsJoint Ventures & PartnershipsSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933JurisdictionSecurities LawLiabilityAdvisers, Brokers & DealersGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityRemediesGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Act of 1933 ActionsDefinitionsSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934 ActionsImplied Private Rights of ActionHeightened Pleading RequirementsSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934 ActionsImplied Private Rights of ActionStanding

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.247

§ 515.247 Law Reviews

Levine & Pritchard, *The Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998: The Sun Sets on California's Blue Sky Law, 5 Bus. Law. 1 (1998)*

Campbell, *The Impact of NSMIA on Small Issuers, 53 Bus. Law. 575 (1998)*

Delgado, *Using the Securities Registration Exemptions*, 43(1) Prac. Law. 59 (1997)

Bertram, *Offers and Sales of Securities on the Internet*, 42(7) Prac. Law. 23 (1996)

Goforth, *Why Limited Liability Company Membership Interests Should Not Be Treated as Securities and Possible Steps to Encourage This Result, 45 Hastings L.J. 1223 (1994)*

Broadwin, *Insider Security Sales (Part 1)*, 38(2) Prac. Law. 77 (1992)

Jamroz, *The Net Capital Rule, 47 Bus. Law. 863 (1992)*

Rapp, *The Proper Role of Securities Act Section 12(2) as an Aftermarket Remedy for Disclosure Violations, 47 Bus. Law. 711 (1992)*

Colvin, *A Dynamic Definition of and Prohibition Against Insider Trading, 31 Santa Clara L. Rev. 603 (1991)*

Ferrara, Ferrigno, and Darland, *Hardball! The SEC's New Arsenal of Enforcement Weapons, 47 Bus. Law. 33 (1991)*

Fippinger and Pittman, *Disclosure Obligations of Underwriters of Municipal Securities, 47 Bus. Law. 127 (1991)*

Gerard and Hirschfeld, *The Scienter Requirement Under Rule 10b-6, 46 Bus. Law. 777 (1991)*

Berger, *Issuer Recovery of Insider Trading Profits Under Section 25502.5 of the California Corporations Code , 21 Pac. L.J. 221 (1990)*

Thel, *The Original Conception of Section 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act, 42 Stan. L. Rev. 385 (1990)*

Shea, *Inside the New Insider Trading Act, 35 Prac. Law. 65 (1989)*

Comment, *The New Gold Rush: The Last Frontier of the Securities Laws? 29 Santa Clara L. Rev. 359 (1989)*

Note, *Aiding and Abetting Liability Under Securities Exchange Act Section 10(b) and SEC Rule 10b-5: The Infusion of a Sliding-Scale, Flexible Factor Analysis, 22 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1189 (1989)*

Note, *Carpenter v. United States: Securities Trading, Mail Fraud, and Confidential Business Information--New Liability for Outsiders? 20 Pac. L.J. 839 (1989)*

Barker, *The Federal Reserve and Junk Bond Financing: Anomaly or Inconvenience? 19 Pac. L.J. 769 (1988)*

Gordon, *Flying Into Blue Sky: Aircraft Leasebacks as Securities, 35 UCLA L. Rev. 779 (1988)*

Hagen II, *Insider Trading Under Rule 10b-5: The Theroretical Bases for Liability, 44 Bus. Law. 13 (1988)*

Wang, *A Cause of Action for Option Traders Against Insider Option Traders, 101 Harv. L. Rev. 1056 (1988)*

Comment, *A Statutory Proposal Determining Arbitral Forums for 10(b) Disputes, 28 Santa Clara L. Rev. 389 (1988)*

Note, *Does Rule 10b-5 Cover Misappropriaters? A Look at the United States Supreme Court's Indecision in United States v. Carpenter, 18 Sw. U. L. Rev. 79 (1988)*

Note, *Securities Regulation for a Changing Market: Option Trader Standing Under Rule 10b-5 , 97 Yale L.J. 623 (1988)*

Wang, *The "Contemporaneous" Traders Who Can Sue an Inside Trader, 38 Hastings L.J. 1175 (1987)*

Comment, *Structure and Price: Striking a Delicate Balance in Tender Offer Negotiations, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 987 (1987)*

Comment, *West German Bank Secrecy: A Barrier to SEC Insider Trading Investigations, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 609 (1987)*

Note, *Insider Trading by Intermediaries: A Contract Remedy for Acquirers' Increased Cost of Takeovers, 97 Yale L.J. 115 (1987)*

Comment, *Financial Columnists as Investment Advisers: After Lowe and Carpenter, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 2061 (1986)*

Note, *The Inadequacy of Rule 10b-5 to Address Outsider Trading by Reporters, 38 Stan. L. Rev. 1549 (1986)*

Buchanan and Stevenson, *Developments in Litigation and Enforcement Under State Securities Laws, 40 Bus. Law. 705 (1985)*

Lanctot, Powers, and Harris, *Recent Developments in State Regulation of Public Real Estate Syndication Offerings, 40 Bus. Law. 745 (1985)*

Langevoort, *Information Technology and the Structure of Securities Regulation, 98 Harv. L. Rev. 747 (1985)*

McLucas, *Stop Order Proceedings Under the Securities Act of 1933: A Current Assessment, 40 Bus. Law. 515 (1985)*

Warren, *Developments in State Takeover Regulation: MITE and Its Aftermath, 40 Bus. Law. 671 (1985)*

Farley, *A Current Look at the Law of Insider Trading, 39 Bus. Law. 1771 (1984)*

Fields, *Real Estate Interests as Investment Contracts: An Update and a New Application-- The Shared-Equity Program*, 12 Real Est. L.J. 307 (1984)

O'Hara, *Erosion of the Privity Requirement in Section 12(2) of the Securities Act of 1933: The Expanded Meaning of Seller, 31 UCLA L. Rev. 921 (1984)*

Stern, *Potential Liability of Purchaser Representatives, 39 Bus. Law. 1801 (1984)*

Note, *Pleading Securities Fraud With Particularity Under Rule 9(b), 97 Harv. L. Rev. 1432 (1984)*

Beatty, *Exchange-Traded Options and Section 16(b): Panacea or Plague for Insider's Short-Swing Profits? 38 Bus. Law. 515 (1983)*

Longstreth, *SEC Disclosure Policy Regarding Management Integrity, 38 Bus. Law. 1413 (1983)*

Mirvis, *Two-Tier Pricing: Some Appraisal and "Entire Fairness" Valuation Issues, 38 Bus. Law. 485 (1983)*

Branch and Rubright, *Integrity of Management Disclosures Under the Federal Securities Laws, 37 Bus. Law. 1447 (1982)*

Fischel, *Use of Modern Finance Theory in Securities Fraud Cases Involving Actively Traded Securities, 38 Bus. Law. 1 (1982)*

Fogelson, *Rule 144--A Summary Review, 37 Bus. Law. 1519 (1982)*

Langevoort, *Insider Trading and the Fiduciary Principle: A Post-Chiarella Restatement, 70 Cal. L. Rev. 1 (1982)*

Lehr, *Some Securities Law Issues in Lending on Pledged Stock, 38 Bus. Law. 91 (1982)*

Longstreth, *Reliance on Advice of Counsel as a Defense to Securities Law Violations, 37 Bus. Law. 1185 (1982)*

Maloney, *Blue Sky Regulation of a Regulation D Offering: A 50 State Survey*, 16 Bev. Hills B.J. 133 (1982)

Maloney, *The Regulation D Offering in California*, 16 Bev. Hills B.J. 242 (1982)

Pickard and Djinis, *NASD Disciplinary Proceedings: Practice and Procedure, 37 Bus. Law. 1213 (1982)*

Abrams, *Criminal Liability of Corporate Officers and Directors for Strict Liability Offenses--A Comment on Dotterweich and Park, 28 UCLA L. Rev. 463 (1981)*

Burke, *The Availability of Injunctive Relief to Private Litigants for Violation of Section 13(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.F. L. Rev. 399 (1981)*

Chazen, *Fairness From a Financial Point of View in Acquisitions of Public Companies: Is "Third-Party Sale Value" the Appropriate Standard? 36 Bus. Law. 1439 (1981)*

Easterbrook and Fischel, *Takeover Bids, Defensive Tactics, and Shareholders' Welfare, 36 Prac. Law. 1733 (1981)*

Gilson, *A Structural Approach to Corporations: The Case Against Defensive Tactics in Tender Offers, 33 Stan. L. Rev. 819 (1981)*

Seldin, *When Stock Is Not a Security: The "Sale of Business Doctrine" Under the Federal Securities Laws, 37 Bus. Law. 647 (1981)*

Wang, *Trading on Material Nonpublic Information on Impersonal Stock Markets: Who Is Harmed and Who Can Sue Whom Under SEC Rule 10b-5? 54 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1217 (1981)*

Deacon & Prendergast, *Defining a 'Security' After the Forman Decision, 11 Pacific LJ 213 (1980)*

Small, *An Attorney's Responsibilities Under Federal and State Securities Laws: Private Counselor or Public Servant, 61 Cal. L Rev 1189 (1973)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawBlue Sky LawsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsBlue Sky FraudGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsCivil LiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsOnline TransactionsSecurities LawLiabilityGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityPrivate Securities LitigationGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilitySecondary LiabilityAiding & AbettingElements of ProofSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934 ActionsImplied Private Rights of ActionGeneral OverviewSecurities LawLiabilitySecurities Exchange Act of 1934 ActionsInsider TradingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.248

§ 515.248 Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws (4th ed.) (Matthew Bender)
Ch. 7, *Issuance of Shares and Indebtedness*
Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities Law*

Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws (Matthew Bender)

Cavitch, Business Organizations With Tax Planning (Matthew Bender)
Ch. 93, *Impact of Federal Securities Regulation on Financing: Scope and Coverage of Securities Act of 1933*
Ch. 93A, *The Registration Process*
Ch. 94, *Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Overview; Registration of Securities*
Ch. 94A, *Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Reporting Requirements; Proxies*
Ch. 95, *Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Short-Swing Insider Trading; Tender Offers and Other Acquisitions*
Ch. 95A, *Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Fraud and Manipulation; SEC Enforcement*
Ch. 96, *The SEC and Accounting and Auditing Standards*
Ch. 97, *Private RICO Litigation*
Ch. 98, *The Trust Indenture Act of 1939*
Ch. 99, *Blue Sky Registration*

Federal Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Matthew Bender)

Federal Securities Act of 1933 (Matthew Bender)

Securities Law Techniques (Matthew Bender)

Sowards & Hirsch, Blue Sky Regulation (Matthew Bender)

Fried, Taxation of Securities Transactions (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, Corporations, § 250 et seq. (9th ed. 1989)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Securities LawAdditional Offerings & the Securities Exchange Act of 1934General OverviewSecurities LawBlue Sky LawsAdministration & EnforcementSecurities LawInitial Public Offerings & the Securities Act of 1933General OverviewSecurities LawLiabilityRICO ActionsGeneral OverviewSecurities LawTrust IndenturesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.249-515.259

[Reserved]

§§ 515.249[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.260

§ 515.260 State Statutes

Definitions. *Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*

Regulation of the sale of franchises. *Corp. Code § 31100 et seq.*

Fraudulent and prohibited practices. *Corp. Code § 31200 et seq.*

Enforcement. *Corp. Code § 31300 et seq.*

Administration. *Corp. Code § 31500 et seq.*

General provisions. *Corp. Code § 31510 et seq.*

Regulation of franchise loans. *Fin. Code § 22063*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionFraud & MisrepresentationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

124 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.261

§ 515.261 Federal Administrative Regulations

Disclosures required in sales of franchises. *16 C.F.R. §§ 436.1, 436.2*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureRequirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.262

§ 515.262 California Administrative Regulations

Rules of Commissioner of Corporations relating to franchises. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.002 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.263

§ 515.263 Decisions

Corp. Code § 31512 violates Supremacy Clause of U.S. Constitution when applied to preclude arbitration as required by contract arbitration clause. *Southland Corp. v. Keating (1984) 465 U.S. 1, 10, 104 S. Ct. 852, 79 L. Ed. 2d 1 , overruling Keating v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 584, 183 Cal. Rptr. 360, 645 P.2d 1192*

Grant of exclusive territory required to be expressly set forth in contract and will not be implied; right to use franchisor's trademark and trade dress at particular location do not amount to grant of exclusive territory; thus, franchisor did not breach agreement by establishing company stores in same market area. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 149, 163-164* (determining pendent state claim)

Corp. Code § 31306 constitutes express statement of unequivocal legislative intent that statute of limitations provisions in *Corp. Code §§ 31303, 31304* are to be sole controlling limits on time for filing suit under Franchise Investment Law; thus delayed discovery or tolling rules did not apply to franchisees' causes of action. *People ex rel. Department of Corporations v. Speedee Oil Change Systems, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 709, 723-725, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497*

Requirement, in definition of franchise, that franchisee is granted right to engage in business of "offering, selling, or distributing goods or services" [*see Corp. Code § 31005(a)(1)*] construed liberally to find that parties who could not enter into binding contracts or pass title to goods nonetheless were franchisees. *Gentis v. Safeguard Business Systems (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1294, 1304-1305, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 122*

Requirement, in definition of franchise, that operation of franchisee's business must be substantially associated with franchisor's mark, name, or symbol [*Corp. Code § 31005(a)(2)*] met when employer contracts for establishment and operation of employees' cafeteria by corporation whose business is constructing cafeteria facilities, licensing operation to individuals who pay license fees, and monitoring and provisioning licensees' operations, even though licensees' customers never see corporation's mark, name, or symbol used in association with licensees' operation of cafeterias. *Kim v. Servosnax, Inc. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1356-1358, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 422*

Under evidence and agreement at issue, franchisor was not liable to broker for commission on sale of franchise owned by third party. *Klinger v. Realty World Corp. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1549, 1552-1553, 242 Cal. Rptr. 592*

Cause of action for legal malpractice was stated by franchisees against attorneys who prepared false or misleading prospectus, knowing it would be shown to prospective franchisees and used to induce them to purchase franchises. *Courtney v. Waring (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1443-1444, 237 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Violations of Franchise Investment Law do not have effect of continuing life of franchise that the franchisor is seeking to terminate and thus are not relevant to issue of possession after franchise terminated. *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Handley (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 956, 963-964, 143 Cal. Rptr. 321* (franchised petroleum dealer evicted from service station premises)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAlternative Dispute ResolutionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsElementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.264

§ 515.264 Law Reviews

Root, *The Meaning of "Franchise" Under the California Franchise Investment Law: A Definition in Search of a Concept*, *30 McGeorge L. Rev. 1163 (1999)*

Note, *Vylene Enterprises v. Naugles: Remedies for Franchisor Encroachment*, *27 Sw. U. L. Rev. 353 (1997)*

Laufer, *The Safe Way to Terminate a Franchise* (Part 2), 41(3) Prac. Law. 63 (1995)

Laufer, *The Safe Way to Terminate a Franchise* (Part 1), 41(2) Prac. Law. 63 (1995)

McErlean & Cannon, *Disclosure for Franchisors*, 40(6) Prac. Law. 23 (1994)

Cantor, *The Federal and State Regulation of Franchises* (Part 1), 27(6) Prac. Law. 55 (1981)

Cantor, *The Federal and State Regulation of Franchises* (Part 2), 27(7) Prac. Law. 77 (1981)

Mattes, *Franchise Concept*, 47 State B.J. 300 (1972)

Augustine & Hrusoff, *California Franchise Investment Law*, 46 State B.J. 50 (1971)

Augustine & Hrusoff, *Franchise Regulation*, *21 Hastings L.J. 1347 (1970)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate

LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.265

§ 515.265 Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Investment Franchise Law, §§ 40.01 -40.22* (Matthew Bender)

Glickman, Franchising, Ch. 13, *Litigation and Dispute Settlement* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations*, §§ 287, 288, 289 (9th ed, 1989)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer and Sale Under the Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.266-515.279

[Reserved]

§§ 515.266[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.280

§ 515.280 State Statutes--Franchise Relations Act

Definitions. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20001-20009*

Inapplicability to federal regulated petroleum products franchises. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20001(d)*

Nonwaivability of provisions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20010*

Jurisdiction. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20015*

Termination of franchises. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20020, 20021*

Nonrenewal of franchises. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20025, 20026*

Notice requirements. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20030*

Repurchase offers. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 20035-20037*

Arbitration. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20040*

Applicability of law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20041*

Inapplicability to new motor vehicle dealerships. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20042*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAlternative Dispute ResolutionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & Marketing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.281

§ 515.281 Decisions

[1] Antitrust Applications

Even if lease was illegal tie-in, action was barred by four-year limitation of *15 U.S.C. § 15b*; new overt act was required to apply continuing violation theory to lease commenced more than four years prior to action; mere acceptance of rent by franchisor did not constitute overt act. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 149, 160*

Allegation that franchisor's unstated policy was to terminate any franchisee who bought equipment package from another entity insufficient force or leverage to establish tying violation. *Murphy v. Business Cards Tomorrow, Inc. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1202, 1204* (overruled on other grounds in *Townsend v. Holman Consulting Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 929 F.2d 1358, 1363)*

[2] Arbitration

Parties who entered into franchise agreement that specified Oklahoma forum for arbitration, when offering circular pointed out that California law requires California forum for franchise agreement dispute resolution, never clearly agreed to Oklahoma forum; district court therefore erred in enforcing forum selection clause of franchise agreement. *Laxmi Investments LLC v. Golf USA (9th Cir. 2000) 193 F.3d 1095, 1097*

When franchisee, resisting petition to compel arbitration on issue of franchisee's right to rescind franchise agreement, contends that there was no meeting of minds as to arbitration provision in franchise agreement, and franchisee submits evidence supporting that contention, court has authority to determine whether parties in fact made agreement to arbitrate. *Winter v. Window Fashions Professionals, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 943, 948-949, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 89*

Franchisor was entitled to preliminary injunction, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.8*, to prevent franchisee from continuing to use franchise trademark and continuing to operate as rightful franchisee during pendency of arbitration of

dispute between parties as to whether franchise agreement was rightfully terminated by franchisor. *Jay Bharat Devs., Inc. v. Minidis (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 437, 446-447, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 267*

When (1) license agreement provided for arbitration and related lease did not, (2) franchisee and franchisor were parties to pending class action regarding license agreement, and (3) grounds for franchisor's termination of lease were alleged breaches of same provisions of license agreement that were subject of class action, arbitration of unlawful detainer action was required to be compelled, but arbitration had to be stayed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.2(c)* until resolution of class action to avoid conflicting rulings. *Pioneer Take Out Corp. v. Bhavsar (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1353, 1357-1358, 257 Cal. Rptr. 749*

[3] Franchisor's Breach of Agreement

When contract at issue gave franchisor sole option and discretion to relocate franchisee's kiosk, franchisor did not breach agreement in refusing to allow franchisee to relocate on request. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 149, 164* (determining pendent state claim)

When franchisor unilaterally terminated subfranchise agreement and franchisee (as subfranchisor) sued for breach of contract, evidence was sufficient to support award for lost franchise fees and expenses incurred trying to set up subfranchisees; evidence, however, was insufficient to support award for lost profits or cause of action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage. *Parlour Enters., Inc. v. Kirin Group, Inc. (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 281, 283-284*

Repurchase of inventory is not exclusive remedy for wrongful termination of franchise pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*; plaintiff can pursue breach of contract claim against franchisor for wrongful termination of franchise agreement. *JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 178, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840*

[4] Tort Damages

Without evidence that would support inference that decline in franchisee's sales was caused by franchisor's company stores in same area, franchisee failed to establish cause of action for intentional interference with prospective business advantage. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 871 F.2d 784, 801* (determining pendent state claim)

Franchisor-franchisee relationship was not fiduciary in nature, nor characterized by elements of public interest or adhesion; thus, California law regarding breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing and tortious termination of contract did not extend to termination of distributorship and franchise agreement. *Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 871 F.2d 784, 803* (determining pendent state claim); *Premier Wine & Spirits v. E & J Gallo Winery (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 537, 540* (diversity action; plaintiff had abandoned its claims under California Franchise Relations Act)

Franchise Relations Act did not impose fiduciary duties on franchisor; far from being traditional trustee, franchisor was free to make pricing and distribution decisions for its own benefit; no duty of good faith and fair dealing was imposed on franchisor for failure to renew franchise. *Boat & Motor Mart v. Sea Ray Boats, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 1285, 1292*

Franchisor that wrongfully terminated franchise without good cause was liable to franchisee for breach of contract, not intentional interference with prospective economic advantage; essential nature of claim was breach of contract, which cannot be transmuted into tort liability by claim that breach interfered with franchisee's business. *JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 183, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840*

No tort cause of action existed for breach of agreement in violation of public policy (refusal to make repairs in retaliation for franchisee's reporting underground gasoline leaks to authorities and failing to comply with defendant's pricing policies). *Harris v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 70, 82, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAlternative Dispute ResolutionBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGood Faith & Fair DealingBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionRestraints of TradeBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.282-515.299

[Reserved]

§§ 515.282[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.300

§ 515.300 Federal Statutes--Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (franchise protection provisions)

Definitions. *15 U.S.C. § 2801*

Protected franchise relationships. *15 U.S.C. § 2802*

Exclusion of trial and interim franchises. *15 U.S.C. § 2803*

Notification requirements. *15 U.S.C. § 2804*

Enforcement provisions. *15 U.S.C. § 2805*

Preemptive or other relationship to state law. *15 U.S.C. § 2806*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.301

§ 515.301 State Statutes

Termination and nonrenewal of petroleum products franchises. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999 et seq.*

Franchisee's recourse to outside suppliers. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21140-21140.4*

Franchisee's designation of successor in interest. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6*

Franchisee transfers. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21148, 21149*

Franchisee's ability to do late-hour business. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21150, 21150.1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & Marketing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.302

§ 515.302 Decisions

[1] Attorney's Fees

Trade association that obtained declaratory relief and injunction against franchisor's discriminatory policy under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204* was not entitled to attorney's fees pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4* because it never established that it was damaged. *California Service Station etc. Assn. v Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 58-59, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279*

[2] State Claims

Although there is disparity of bargaining power between gasoline refiners and franchise distributors, relationship is based on commercial contract undertaken for profit; thus California law regarding breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing does not extend to alleged constructive termination of franchise occasioned by elimination of credit card program and imposition of harsher payment terms on franchisees. *Little Oil. Co., Inc. v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 852 F.2d 441, 446-447*

[3] Termination or Nonrenewal Under Petroleum Marketing Practices Act

Franchisor, acting pursuant to *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(3)(D)* to withdraw from market, properly declined to renew franchise agreement having term of three or more years and decided to sell premises because (1) that determination was made by franchisor in good faith and in normal course of business, and (2) before selling premises, franchisor offered franchisee right of first refusal of at least 45 days duration of offer, made by another, to purchase franchisor's interest in premises. *BP W. Coast Prods. LLC v. May (9th Cir. 2006) 447 F.3d 658, 663-665* (in absence of some evidence of bad faith in initial decision-making to sell facilities, court is precluded from second-guessing franchisor's economic determination to withdraw from market and sell facilities)

Legislative intent behind *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C)* and *(c)(4)*, allowing termination of franchise because of franchisor's loss of possession of service-station premises on expiration of ground lease, was thwarted when franchisor gave required notice of termination on that ground while actually intending to keep possession so as to operate service station directly instead of through franchisee, and franchisor manipulated negotiations with ground lessor and with franchisee to produce that result. *Mustang Mktg., Inc. v. Chevron Prods. Co. (9th Cir. 2005) 406 F.3d 600, 609-610*

Franchisor's withdrawal from market complied with PMPA timing requirements and transfer to trust rather than successor for financing purposes did not violate PMPA provisions [*15 U.S.C. 2802(b)(2)(E)*]; because this was a market withdrawal involving the termination of franchise agreements, state and federal law were not in conflict and the PMPA rather than *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.25(a)* controlled. *Unocal Corp. v. Kaabipour (9th Cir. 1999) 177 F.3d 755, 768-771*

To be sufficient for termination under *15 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C), (c)(10)*, willful adulteration, mislabeling, or misbranding must involve voluntary action, done either with intentional disregard of, or plain indifference to, requirements of franchise agreement; willfulness not established by franchisee's purchase of gasoline from third party when franchisee asked third party to supply ARCO gasoline and gasoline supplied by third party was for most part either ARCO gasoline or gasoline that met ARCO's standards. *Retsieg Corp. v. ARCO Petroleum Products Co. (9th. Cir. 1989) 870 F.2d 1495, 1498-1499*

Question of whether circumstances made it unreasonable for franchisor to give 90 days' notice of termination was mixed question of law and fact; when city had revoked conditional use permit for mini-mart because of franchisee's failure, over six-month period, to comply with conditions of permit, 12 days notice of termination was sufficient. *Abujudeh v. Mobil Oil Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 841 F.2d 310, 311-312*

Termination of franchise under 28 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C), (c)(12) was proper when franchisee was convicted of felony involving moral turpitude (possession of heroin for sale); attempted assignment of franchise to corporation controlled by individual franchisee was not effective under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21149* without either franchisor's consent or franchisee's guarantee of assignor's performance. *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Guerami (9th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 280, 282-283*

Termination of franchise held by corporate franchisee was proper under 28 U.S.C. § 2802(b)(2)(C), (c)(12) when franchisee's sole shareholder was convicted of felony involving moral turpitude; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21148*, which gives franchisee right to assign, was preempted in this situation to prevent frustration of termination that would be proper under federal scheme. *Humboldt Oil Co. v. Exxon Co., U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1982) 695 F.2d 386, 389* (vacating injunction); *Humboldt Oil Co. v. Exxon Co., U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 373, 375* (reversing judgment for franchisee)

Summary adjudication that franchisor had duty to make offers of sale to franchisees, as required by federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act, did not convert franchisees into "vendees in possession" so as to relieve them of duty to pay rent during pendency of litigation; franchisees were remaining lessees until binding contracts of sale exist; if sales consummated, franchisees entitled to credit against purchase price equal to rents paid during period sale was wrongfully delayed by franchisor. *Abadjian v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 363, 372-374, 214 Cal. Rptr. 234*

[4] Transfer of Franchise Under State Law

Lessor gas companies violated *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.25(a)* by relinquishing title, possession, and control of gas stations to LLP without offering lessees a chance to purchase the stations; LLP was "another person" under that statute, even though it was owned and controlled by gas companies, and oil companies' contribution of assets to LLP was "sale,

transfer, or assignment" under that statute. *Abrahim & Sons Enterprises v. Equilon Enters., LLC (2002) 292 F.3d 958, 963-964*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 20999.25(a) requiring franchisor considering sale to make offer or provide right of first refusal to franchisee is not preempted by PMPA. *Forty-Niner Truck Plaza, Inc. v. Union Oil Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1276-1278, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 532*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesAssignments & TransfersBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGood Faith & Fair DealingBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryFranchising & MarketingEnergy & Utilities LawOil IndustryPetroleum Marketing Practices ActFranchise Nonrenewal & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.303

§ 515.303 Text References

Glickman, Franchising, Ch. 13, § 13.03[2] (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.304-515.319

[Reserved]

§§ 515.304[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.320

§ 515.320 Federal Statutes

Automobile dealers' rights against manufacturers. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1221-1225*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.321

§ 515.321 State Statutes

"Dealer." *Veh. Code §§ 285, 286*

"Distributor." *Veh. Code § 296*

"Distributor branch." *Veh. Code § 297*

"Franchise." *Veh. Code § 331*

"Franchisee." *Veh. Code § 331.1*

"Franchisor." *Veh. Code § 331.2*

"Manufacturer branch." *Veh. Code § 389*

"New motor vehicle dealer." *Veh. Code § 426*

"Vehicle manufacturer." *Veh. Code § 672*

Jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board. *Veh. Code § 3050(d)*

Termination or nonrenewal of franchises. *Veh. Code §§ 3060, 3061*

Establishing additional or relocating dealerships. *Veh. Code §§ 3062, 3063*

Manufacturer and dealer relations on consumer work. *Veh. Code §§ 3064, 3065*

Protest hearing requirements. *Veh. Code §§ 3066-3068*

Applicability of law. *Veh. Code § 3069*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcementBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.322

§ 515.322 Administrative Regulations

Form of protest. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 583, 593-597*

Service of protest. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 584*

Filing of protests and other matters before board. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 585, 585.1, 586, 598*

Hearing requirements and considerations. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 587-592*

Format of papers filed before board. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 593-598*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.323

§ 515.323 Decisions

[1] Administrative Due Process

Recusal and nonparticipation of four dealer members held sufficient to protect distributor's due process rights. *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 87-89, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Absent evidence that public members of board had any financial or personal interest in outcome, mere interaction between public members and dealer members on other board business was insufficient to raise presumption of bias. *American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 472-473, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769* (matter heard under voluntary recusal policy)

Without showing that hearing officer shared financial stake of dealer members of board or had own financial interest in outcome, dealer members' participation in selection of hearing officer did not result in denial of due process. *American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 472-473, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769* (matter heard under voluntary recusal policy)

[2] Breach of Agreement

When dealership agreement listed three addresses as dealership location, moving showroom from one listed address to another was not breach of agreement. *American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 475-476, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769*

[3] Conditions of Dealership

Manufacturer's requirement that dealers do warranty repair work to maintain franchise was not illegal tying

arrangement under federal antitrust law because dealers are sellers of allegedly tied product (repair work), not buyers. *49er Chevrolet, Inc. v. General Motors Corp. (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1463, 1469*

[4] Consolidation of Protests

Consolidation requirement of *Veh. Code § 3060(c)* [*see now Veh. Code § 3060(b)(1)*] was only applicable to concurrent protests filed by different franchisees and not to successive protests from same franchisee. *Sonoma Subaru, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 13, 25-26, 234 Cal. Rptr. 226*

[5] Implied Extension of Franchise Term

When franchise has expired by its terms and without express agreement to extend it, court determined from conduct of the parties whether there is implied extension; sending notice of termination manifested implied agreement to continue franchise beyond its stated expiration date. *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 91-92, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280*

[6] Interpretation of Agreements

Dealership agreement did not require dealer to maintain separate showroom even though original letter of intent required one, because final agreement specifically superseded all prior agreements, understandings of parties. *American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 474-475, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769*

[7] Jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board

Purpose of New Motor Vehicle Board and goal of administrative efficiency support conclusion that Board had implied authority to dismiss protest when undisputed facts demonstrated good cause for franchise termination as matter of law and afford no basis for preventing termination of franchise. *Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 637, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*

Trial court erred in sustaining manufacturer's demurrer to dealers's complaint, which consisted entirely of common law claims, on basis of failure to exhaust its administrative remedies; *Veh. Code § 3050(e)* provides that courts have jurisdiction over all common law and statutory claims originally cognizable in courts and that for those claims a party may initiate action directly in any court of competent jurisdiction. *South Bay Creditors Trust v. General Motors Acceptance Corporation (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1079-1080, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1*

In breach of contract action against automobile manufacturer for unreasonable refusal to approve buyer for dealership, dealer was not required to exhaust administrative remedies, even if claim was within New Motor Vehicle Board's statutory authority; existence of Board's authority under *Veh. Code § 11713.3* does not subject claim to exhaustion requirement. *Kemp v. Nissan Motor Corp. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1527, 1529-1530, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 794*

New Motor Vehicle Board does not have jurisdiction pursuant to *Veh. Code § 3050(c)* over cause of action for contractual interference based on tortious business practices independent of any franchise agreement, brought by nonsignatory to franchise agreement with *Honda. Tovas v. American Honda Motor Co. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 506, 509, 521, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

New Motor Vehicle Board's assertion of jurisdiction over dealer's state statutory and common-law claims arising out of allegations of manufacturer's misdealing violated judicial powers clause of *California Constitution. Hardin*

Oldsmobile v. New Motor Vehicle Board (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 585, 593, 598, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 583 (disagreeing with holding in *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382 , below*)

Jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board under *Veh. Code § 3050(c)(2)* as extending to dealer's claim that manufacturer wrongfully terminated dealer's franchise and dealer's claim for damages arising from manufacturer's allegedly wrongful allocation of vehicles among its dealers. *Ray Fladeboe Lincoln-Mercury, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 51, 53-56, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 598*

In action against former franchisee by its creditor, franchisee's cross complaint against franchisor as barred for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 652, 659-660, 240 Cal. Rptr. 806* (franchisee had dismissed protest with prejudice)

In action against former franchisee by its creditor, franchisee's cross complaint against franchisor for breach of contract, breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, fraud, negligent misrepresentation, interference with business relations, and unlawful restraint of trade was within jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board because most conduct complained of was within scope of *Veh. Code §§ 11713.2* and *11713.3* or related to termination of franchise. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 652, 657-660, 240 Cal. Rptr. 806*

Administrative mandate properly denied for failure of car dealer to protest termination of its franchise before New Motor Vehicle Board within 10 days of receipt of termination notice pursuant to *Veh. Code § 3060(b)* [*see now Veh. Code § 3060(a)(2)*]; implication of good cause exception to 10-day requirement would frustrate Legislative intent and statutory scheme. *Sonoma Subaru, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 13, 20-22, 234 Cal. Rptr. 226*

Dealer's claim that manufacturer breached implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by abandonment of advertising and promotion was within jurisdiction of New Motor Vehicle Board under *Veh. Code § 3050(c)*; thus, dealer required to exhaust administrative remedies before New Motor Vehicle Board. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1242-1243, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382*

[8] Modification of Dealership

Under dealership agreement that reserved to franchisor unqualified right to establish new dealership's, dealer was not entitled under *Veh. Code § 3062* to protest establishment of new dealership 15.2 miles away, beyond statutory 10-mile "relevant market area"; nor did that establishment constitute modification of franchise within meaning of *Veh. Code § 3060*. *BMW of North America, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 980, 989-994, 209 Cal. Rptr. 50* ; *cf. Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* (discussed in *§ 515.134* different outcome under different type of agreement)

[9] Notice of Termination

Notice that did not state reason for termination and was not sent to Board but only to dealer did not trigger period within which protest could be filed. *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 93-94, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Notice not defective and no denial of due process for failure to state that dealer had 10 days to file protest; fact that notice said dealer had right to protest and must act promptly was sufficient. *Sonoma Subaru, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 13, 23-24, 234 Cal. Rptr. 226*

Notice not defective, no denial of due process, and not misleading for proximity of notice of right to file protest and of

notice of 15-day period within which to cure default or suffer termination; notice was clear that 15-day period applied to time to cure default, not to time to file protest. *Sonoma Subaru, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 13, 24-25, 234 Cal. Rptr. 226*

Manufacturer not permitted to raise at hearing additional grounds for termination not specified in notice of termination; *Veh. Code § 3060(a)* requires notice of specific grounds for termination. *American Isuzu Motors, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 464, 476-477, 230 Cal. Rptr. 769*

Manufacturer's failure to give notice of its modification and establishment of new franchise as required by *Veh. Code §§ 3060, 3062* did not divest New Motor Vehicle Board of jurisdiction to determine dealer's protest. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1240, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingDue ProcessBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesFranchise RelationshipsFranchise AgreementsBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.324

§ 515.324 Text References

Glickman, Franchising, Ch. 13, *Litigation and Dispute Settlement*, § 13.03[2] (federal Automobile Dealer's Franchise Act)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.325-515.339

[Reserved]

§§ 515.325[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.340

§ 515.340 State Statutes

[1] Civil Rights Protection for Franchisees

Discrimination against franchisee and location of franchise. *Civ. Code § 51.8*

[2] Fair Dealership Law

Definitions. *Civ. Code § 81*

Purposes and policies. *Civ. Code § 82*

Discrimination prohibited in dealership transactions. *Civ. Code §§ 83-85*

Recovery of attorney's fees. *Civ. Code § 86*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCivil Rights LawPrivate Discrimination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.341-515.359

[Reserved]

§§ 515.341[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.360

§ 515.360 State Statutes

Telephonic sellers; exemption for sellers of seller assisted marketing plan. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17511 et seq., 17511.1(c)(6)*

Purposes of seller assisted marketing plan laws. *Civ. Code § 1812.200*

Definitions under seller assisted marketing plan laws. *Civ. Code § 1812.201*

Jurisdiction of offers or sales of plans. *Civ. Code § 1812.202*

Filing of disclosure statements. *Civ. Code § 1812.203*

Restrictions on representations in offers or sales. *Civ. Code § 1812.204*

Bond requirements for certain representations. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.204(c), 1812.214(b)*

Required disclosures and information to be presented to purchasers. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.205, 1812.206*

Requirements of seller assisted marketing plan contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.207-1812.210*

Assignee rights. *Civ. Code § 1812.211*

Recordkeeping by sellers. *Civ. Code § 1812.213*

Consent to service on plan sellers. *Civ. Code § 1812.214(a)*

Voidability of seller assisted marketing plan contracts. *Civ. Code § 1812.215*

Nonwaivability of legislative provisions. *Civ. Code § 1812.216(a)*

Burden of proving exception or exemption. *Civ. Code § 1812.216(b)*

Criminal offenses. *Civ. Code § 1812.217*

Civil liabilities. *Civ. Code §§ 1812.218, 1812.219*

Claims against trust deposit made in lieu of bond. *Civ. Code § 1812.221*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.361

§ 515.361 Decisions

Business operation meeting definition of seller assisted marketing plan [*Civ. Code § 1812.201(a)*] not exempted because arrangement was also for sale of partnership interests. *People v. Mott (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 394, 400-401, 189 Cal. Rptr. 589*

Knowledge of disclosure requirements [*Civ. Code §§ 1812.203, 1812.205*] not necessary for criminal liability [*Civ. Code § 1812.217*]. *People v. Mott (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 394, 402-403, 189 Cal. Rptr. 589*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesBusiness OpportunitiesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRegistration & DisclosureGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.362-515.379

[Reserved]

§§ 515.362[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.380

§ 515.380 California Legal Forms

For a transaction guide and forms relating to financing statements and secured transactions under Division 9 of the Commercial Code, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 42, *Secured Transactions* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)PerfectionMethodsFilingsFinancing StatementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.381

§ 515.381 State Statutes

Legislative intent of Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900*

Definitions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901*

Supplier violations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902*

Price-fixing provisions prohibited. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22902.5*

Termination of contract between non single-line dealer and non single-line supplier. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903*

Supplier's approval or denial of transfer of interest by dealer who is not single-line dealer. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.1*

Termination of contract between single-line dealer and single-line supplier. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.2*

supplier's approval or denial of dealer's warranty claim. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22903.3*

Annual surplus parts return program. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22904*

Inventory repurchase requirements. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905*

Equipment repurchase liens. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22906-22923*

Inventory repurchase on death of dealer. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22924*

Dealer's remedies in action against supplier for violation of act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*

Severability of Act's provisions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22926*

Application of act to new dealer contracts and to specified existing dealer contracts; validity of provisions for choice of law or forum. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22927*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionRestraints of TradeBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsWarrantiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.382

§ 515.382 Decisions

California Equipment Dealers Act applied to nonrenewal of international distributor agreement, even though decision not to renew was made outside California; no unstated geographical limitations prevented application to case; Act can be applied to out of state dealer through choice of law provision. *Gravquick v. Trimble (9th Cir. 2003) 323 F.3d 1219, 1222-1223*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionChoice of LawBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.383-515.399

[Reserved]

§§ 515.383[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.400

§ 515.400 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25500] for Manipulation of Market Price of Securities [Corp. Code § 25400]--By Purchaser or Seller at Affected Price Against Manipulating Party--Fraudulent "Wash Sale" Transaction Failing to Effect Change in Beneficial Ownership [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(1)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25500] for Manipulation of Market Price of Securities [Corp. Code § 25400]--By Purchaser or Seller at Affected Price Against Manipulating Party--Fraudulent "Wash Sale" Transaction Failing to Effect Change in Beneficial Ownership [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(1)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Manipulation of Market Price of Securities)
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a securities _____ [broker-dealer *or* agent] duly licensed by the Commissioner of Corporations to effect security transactions in this state, and conducting his/her business in _____ County, California.

1. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of _____ [the State of California, with its principal place of business in _____

County *or* the State of _____, authorized to transact and transacting business in the State of California with its principal office for the transaction of business in this state in _____ County].

1. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California [*or state other capacity and residence of defendant*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant effected a transaction in securities consisting of _____ [*describe security, e.g.*, the common stock of X Corporation] in which a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of these securities were sold by _____ [*name of seller*] to _____ [*name of buyer*] for a series of prices ranging from $_____ to $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. These transactions involved no change in the beneficial ownership of the securities in that _____ [*describe continuing beneficial identity, e.g.*, the purchasing party was then, and is now, a wholly owned subsidiary of the selling party].

4. Defendant _____ [willfully performed *or* participated in] the above acts, which constitute, in effect, "wash sales" for the purpose of creating a false or misleading appearance _____ [of active trading *or* with respect to the market for these securities].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [purchased from *or* sold to] _____ [*name*] _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of the above securities for a price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*] and a total price of $_____. That price was affected by the above-described acts of defendant. The market value these securities would have had at the time of plaintiff's _____ [purchase *or* sale] in the absence of the above-described acts of defendant is $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*].

6. As a result of defendant's acts with regard to these securities, plaintiff has sustained damages in the amount of the difference between the price plaintiff _____ [received *or* paid] for these securities, and the amount plaintiff would have _____ [received *or* paid] as the market price in the absence of defendant's acts, which difference is the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on this sum at the legal rate;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for injuries caused by market manipulation involving a securities transaction effected with no change in beneficial ownership [*see Corp. Code §§ 25400(a)(1), 25500*]. This is a version of the "wash sale," in which market activity at one end of a transaction is designed to be canceled or "washed" out at the other end [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.05[2][c]* (Matthew Bender)]. For a discussion of this form of market manipulation, see *§ 515.18[1]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- Capacity and residence of defendant (Paragraph 1).
- Fictitious names of defendants (Paragraph 2).
- Defendant's effecting of a securities transaction in which no change in beneficial ownership of the securities took place (Paragraph 3) [*Corp. Code § 25400(a)(1)*].
- Defendant's willful performance of such an act in order to create the appearance of trading or of a market (Paragraph 4).
- Plaintiff's injury therefrom by making a transaction in those securities at a time when the price was affected by defendant's act to plaintiff's detriment (Paragraph 5).
- The amount of damages sustained, being the difference between the purchase or sale price and the market price that otherwise would have prevailed at the time of plaintiff's transaction (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 25500*].

[4] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] State Statutes

Fraudulent market manipulation. *Corp. Code § 25400(a)*

Liability and damages for market manipulation. *Corp. Code § 25500*

Limitation of actions for market manipulation. *Corp. Code § 25506*

[6] Administrative Regulations

Regulation of broker-dealers and agents. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.216-260.218.6*

[7] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, § 463.05 (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, § 14.05* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations*, § 298 (9th ed. 1989)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.401

§ 515.401 Allegation--Entry of Transaction Order Contemplating Substantially Identical Entry of "Wash Sale" [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(2), (3)]

[1] FORM Allegation--Entry of Transaction Order Contemplating Substantially Identical Entry of "Wash Sale" [Corp. Code § 25400(a)(2), (3)]

On or about _____ [*date*], in _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant entered orders for the _____ [purchase *or* sale] of a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the common stock of X Corporation] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. Those orders were entered with the knowledge that orders of substantially the same size, at substantially the same time, and at substantially the same price, for the _____ [sale *or* purchase, *that is, the reverse of defendant's transaction*] of these securities _____ [had been *or* would be] entered by or for _____ [the same *or* different] party (parties). The latter orders were in fact entered on or about _____ [*list any dates for related transactions*] for a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] sold by _____ [*seller*] to _____ [*buyer*] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. [The relationship of the parties of the latter transaction to those of the former transaction is _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the former parties are corporations controlled by the latter parties).]

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 3 of § 515.400 in an action for injuries caused by market manipulation involving a defendant's entering of one or more orders for securities purchased or sold with the knowledge that a substantially similar transaction was also being effected [*see Corp. Code § 25400(a)(2), (3)*]. For a discussion of this particular type of market fraud, see *§ 515.18[1]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.402

§ 515.402 Allegations--Manipulative Trading to Induce Transactions [Corp. Code § 25400(b)]

[1] FORM Allegations--Manipulative Trading to Induce Transactions [Corp. Code § 25400(b)]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant effected _____ [with one or more other persons *or list names*], a series of transactions in securities consisting of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the preferred stock of Y Corporation] in which a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of those securities were sold [by _____ (*seller*) to _____ (*buyer*)] _____ [at a price of $_____ per _____ (share *or other security*) *or* for a series of prices ranging from $_____ to $_____ per _____ (share *or other security*)]. Those transactions _____ [created _____ (actual *or* apparent) active trading in those securities *or* _____ (raised *or* depressed) the price of those securities].

2. Defendant [willfully performed *or* participated in] the above acts, which constitute manipulative trading activity for the purpose of inducing the _____ [purchase *or* sale] of those securities by others.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 3 and 4, respectively, of § 515.400, in an action for injuries caused by market manipulation in which defendant directly or indirectly effected a series of transactions designed to give the illusion of an active market in the securities [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.05[2][d]* (Matthew Bender)]. For discussion of this particular type of market fraud, see *§ 515.18[2],* and the illusory market transaction described in Paragraph (b).

[3] State Statutes

Fraudulent market manipulation by inducing purchases of securities. *Corp. Code § 25400(b)*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.403

§ 515.403 Allegations--Dissemination of Manipulative "Tipster" Information [Corp. Code § 25400(c), (e)]

[1] FORM Allegations--Dissemination of Manipulative "Tipster" Information [Corp. Code § 25400(c), (e)] [*EITHER, if defendant is offering or selling security*]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant, as a _____ [broker-dealer *or other person*], _____ [sold *or* offered to sell *or* purchased *or* offered to purchase] a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the Class A common stock of Z Company] [_____ (to *or* from) _____ (plaintiff *or other persons*)] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. In conjunction with those transactions, defendant _____ [circulated *or* disseminated] [, in the form of _____ (*describe, e.g.,* a personal letter), a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof,] information to the effect that the price of those securities _____ [would *or* was likely to] _____ [rise *or* fall] because of market operations of _____ [*names, or* certain persons (then active in the market),] that were being conducted for the purpose of _____ [raising *or* depressing] the price of those securities.

1. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of third party*], as a _____ [broker-dealer *or other person, e.g.,* direct agent of the Q Investment Institute] _____ [sold *or* offered to sell *or* purchased *or* offered to purchase] a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* October _____ (*year*) stock warrants of the R Company] [_____ (to *or* from) _____ (plaintiff *or other persons*)] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. _____ [At the same time *or give date*], and in conjunction with the above transaction, defendant received from _____ [*name of above third party*], directly or indirectly, a consideration [in the form of _____ (*describe or give amount*)]. For such consideration, defendant circulated and disseminated information in _____ [*specify locality*], California, [in the form of _____ (*describe, e.g.,* a business newsletter), a true copy of which is

attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference,] to the effect that the price of those securities _____ [would *or* was likely to] _____ [rise *or* fall] because of market operations of _____ [*names, or* certain persons (defendant represented as being then active in the market),] that were being conducted for the purpose of _____ [raising *or* depressing] the price of those securities.

2. Defendant _____ [willfully performed *or* participated in] those acts of dissemination and circulation of the information, which constituted in effect an investment market _____ ["tipster sheet" *or* "tip"] and induced the purchase or sale of those securities by others.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 3 and 4, respectively, of § 515.400 in an action for injuries as a result of the promulgation of "tipster" information in the marketplace which induces transactions in the securities involved [*see Corp. Code § 25400(c)*].

As described in Paragraph 1 of the above form, defendant may be either a market professional or a trader offering or selling the particular securities involved, but requiring no separate consideration for promulgating the tipster information, or any person who has promulgated the tipster information for a consideration received from another market professional or trader in the securities involved.

Both alternatives in the form are for use in a case involving variations of the type of market fraud known as "tipster" dissemination, in which information is spread that the market will react upwards or downwards because of certain trader conduct designed to achieve that effect [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.05[2][c]* (Matthew Bender)]. For discussions of this particular type of market fraud, see *§ 515.18[3], [5]*.

[3] State Statutes

Improper circulation of "tipster" information to induce securities transactions. *Corp. Code § 25400(c), (e)*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.404

§ 515.404 Allegations--False or Misleading Statement to Manipulate Market [Corp. Code § 25400(d)]

[1] FORM Allegations--False or Misleading Statement to Manipulate Market [Corp. Code § 25400(d)]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, as a _____ [broker-dealer *or other person*] _____ [sold *or* offered to sell *or* purchased *or* offered to purchase] a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the 6 percent cumulative preferred notes, due January _____ [*date*], of A Industries] [_____ (to *or* from) _____ (plaintiff *or other persons*)] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*]. In conjunction with those transactions, defendant, in _____ [*specify locality*], California, in the form of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* a proxy statement], [a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference,] _____ [made the statement (at page _____) *or* made a statement to the effect] that _____ [*recite substance of statement, e.g.,* A Industries had been awarded a million-dollar federal contract *or quote statement verbatim*]. This statement _____ [was, at the time and in the light of the circumstances under which it was made, false or misleading with respect to the material fact that *or* omitted to state the material fact--which was necessary in order to make the statement made, in the light of the circumstances under which it was made, not misleading--that] _____ [*set out material fact, e.g.,* the contract was conditional on approval of the State of _____, which was never given].

2. Defendant knew, or had reasonable ground to believe, that the above statement made was false or misleading [in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* defendant had read, or had a copy of, the government contract referred to, which contained reference to such qualifying conditions)]. Defendant willfully _____ [made *or* participated in the making of], the _____ [false *or* misleading] statement for the purpose of inducing the _____ [purchase *or* sale] of those securities by others.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 3 and 4, respectively, of § 515.400, in an action for injuries caused by a market trader making false or misleading statements for the purpose of inducing transactions in securities [*see*

Corp. Code § 25400(d)]. In contrast to the complaint for rescission in § 515.405, in which the defendant is alleged to have made a material misrepresentation in order to induce a particular transaction, in these allegations, which are designed to be included in a complaint for damages, defendant is alleged to have made the misrepresentation in order to induce a purchase or sale in the security. It is not necessary to allege that defendant made the misrepresentation to induce plaintiff to make the purchase or sale but, also unlike *see § 515.405*, it is necessary to allege that defendant knew or has reason to know of the misrepresentation.

For a discussion of this particular type of market fraud, see *§ 515.18[4]* [*see also* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, Civil Liabilities, § 14.05[2][d]* (Matthew Bender)].

[3] Corp. Code § 25400(d) Requirements

The California Supreme Court has construed *Corp. Code §§ 25400(d)* and *25500* to find that the remedy provided in those sections is not limited to transactions made in California. The language of *Corp. Code § 25400* which proscribes certain actions "in this state" simply describes the location in which the proscribed conduct must occur [*Diamond Multimedia Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 19 Cal. 4th 1036, 1064, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 968 P.2d 539 , cert. denied, 144 L. Ed. 2d 235* (noting that Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act of 1998, which preempts certain state class actions [P.L. 105-353, 112 Stat. 3227 (S. 1260)], was inapplicable to pending actions and thus had no impact on this case)].

Liability for market manipulation is not limited to sellers and buyers of corporate stock, or to corporations or broker-dealers, but extends to individuals and to the purchase and sale of securities for which there is no open market [*StorMedia Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 449, 457-461, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 843, 976 P.2d 214]* . Furthermore, no actual sale is necessary to find a violation of *Corp. Code § 25400(d)*, and that subdivision does not require that the intent or purpose be to induce a particular buyer to purchase the stock [*StorMedia Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 449, 461-463, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 843, 976 P.2d 214* (privity is not required)].

Corp. Code §§ 25400(d) and *25500*, however, apply only to defendants who were *engaged in market activity* at the time of making misrepresentations. Defendants must both sell or offer to sell or buy or offer to buy a security, *and* make misleading statements for the purpose of inducing the purchase or sale of a security, in order to be liable under *Corp. Code § 25500* [*Kamen v. Lindly (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 197, 205-206, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (trial court properly sustained defendants' demurrers on basis that plaintiffs failed to allege that defendants engaged in both activities); *see Murphy v. BDO Seidman, LLP (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 687, 705-706, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770* (aggrieved investors failed to state cause of action because defendant accountants who prepared allegedly misleading financial statements did not buy or sell, or offer to buy or sell, stock)].

Liability under *Corp. Code § 25500* requires a "willful act" within the meaning of *Ins. Code § 533*, which precludes coverage under directors and officers liability insurance for losses caused by the willful act of the insured; only persons who willfully, not merely recklessly, violate *Corp. Code § 25400(d)* can be liable for damages [*California Amplifier, Inc. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 102, 106, 116-117, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 915]* .

[4] State Statutes

Liability for false or misleading statements made to manipulate transactions in securities. *Corp. Code § 25400(d)*

[5] Decisions

Stockbroker and brokerage firm not ostensible agents of "clearing broker" (broker that has contractual relationship with stock broker and investor and maintains account in client's name, but only executes orders on instructions of

stockbroker and makes no specific representations to investor); thus, clearing agent has no liability under *Corp. Code §§ 25400(d), 25401* or for breach of agency agreement or fraud based on stockbroker's inappropriate investment recommendations. *Petersen v. Securities Settlement Corp. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1452-1453, 277 Cal. Rptr. 468*

[6] Cross References

For forms and discussion of common law fraud, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*

For related forms, *see §§ 515.400* and *515.405*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.405

§ 515.405 Complaint for Rescission [Corp. Code § 25501] of Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Rescission [Corp. Code § 25501] of Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR
Plaintiff,	)	RESCISSION OF
vs.	)	PURCHASE
_____ [*name*],	)	(Material
Defendant.	)	Misrepresentation in
	)	Securities Transaction)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Material Misrepresentation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, in _____ [*specify locality*], California, _____ [offered and sold to *or* offered to buy and bought from] plaintiff a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the common stock of X Corporation] at the price of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*] for a total price of $_____. That transaction was made by means of a[n] _____ [written *or* oral] communication in the form of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* a prospectus], which _____ [included an untrue statement of a material fact *or* omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made in that communication, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading]. The communication [at page _____] recited that _____ [*restate or quote, e.g.,* the company doubled its profit for the year _____]. The communication _____ [was untrue in that *or* omitted to state that] _____ [*true material fact, e.g.,* the change in the company's profit was due to a change from the cash to the accrual method of accounting]. [A true copy of such communication is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

4. As a result of the material misrepresentation, plaintiff is entitled to rescind the above-described _____ [purchase *or* sale].

[*EITHER, if plaintiff was purchaser*]

5. Plaintiff _____ [tenders *or* before entry of judgment will tender] to defendant _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of the above-described securities as purchased from defendant and on which to date plaintiff has received $_____ as total income.

[*OR, if plaintiff was seller*]

5. Plaintiff _____ [tenders *or* before entry of judgment will tender] to defendant $_____ as the consideration paid to plaintiff for the security, plus $_____, the amount of interest at the legal rate to date of tender, less $_____, the amount representing the income received by defendant to date on the security.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Materially Aiding Personnel)

6. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-4 of the First Cause of Action.

7. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege appropriate capacity and residence of joint defendant; see § 515.400, Paragraph 1*].

8. Defendant was, at the time of the acts alleged herein, _____

[*EITHER*]

a person who, directly or indirectly, controlled _____ [*name of primary defendant*] in that _____ [*describe control, e.g.,* he/she owned the largest single block of stock of such company, consisting of _____ percent of the common stock],

[*OR*]

a principal member of the management of _____ [*name of primary defendant*] in that he/she was _____ [a partner in such firm *or* president *or other principal executive officer or* a director of the corporation *or* _____, a person occupying a similar status to, or performing similar functions of, _____ (*specify executive officer or director, e.g.,* the president of a corporation) of that organization],

[*OR*]

_____ [an employee of _____ (*name of primary defendant*) *or* a broker-dealer *or* a securities agent] who materially aided in the _____ [act *or* transaction] constituting the violation hereinafter complained of, in that he/she _____ [*describe act*].

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons)

9. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-4 of the First Cause of Action.

10. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence of joint defendant; see § 515.400, Paragraph 1*.]

11. At the time of the acts alleged herein, this defendant materially assisted in the _____ [*identify nature of offense*] in that _____ [*describe act*].

12. Defendant _____ [*name*] acted with intent to deceive or defraud.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Experts)

13. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-4 of the First Cause of Action.

14. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity, if appropriate, and residence; see § 515.400, Paragraph 1*]. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, as a _____ [*describe professional capacity, e.g.,* accountant *or* engineer *or* appraiser], was a person whose profession gave authority to a statement made by him/her.

15. Pursuant to *Title 10, Section 260.504.2.2 of the California Code of Regulations*, this defendant gave written consent to be and was named in a[n] _____ [prospectus *or* offering circular] distributed in connection with the securities herein described as having _____ [prepared *or* certified] in his/her professional capacity

_____ [_____ (*identify part of document, e.g.,* Part V, "Financial History" *or* a written _____ (report *or* valuation) entitled _____ (*name of writing*) which was _____ (distributed with *or* referred to in) the document].

16. The _____ [document so _____ (prepared *or* certified) *or* _____ (report *or* valuation) so _____ (distributed *or* referred to)] _____ [included an untrue statement of a material fact *or* omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading]. The _____ [document *or* writing] [at page _____] recited that _____[*restate misrepresentation*]. This statement _____ [was untrue in that *or* omitted to state that] _____ [*describe misrepresentation from Paragraph 3 of First Cause of Action*]. [A true copy of the _____ (document *or* writing) is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.]

17. Plaintiff acquired the securities described herein and in that document in reliance on the _____ [untrue statement *or* _____ (part of the document *or* writing) without notice of the omission].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

[*EITHER, if plaintiff is purchaser*]

1. For rescission of the purchase and restitution of $_____ as original consideration paid for the securities, less $_____, which plaintiff received on the security;

[*OR, if plaintiff is seller*]

1. For rescission of the sale and recovery of the securities;

[2. *If plaintiff is purchaser, add* For interest on the original consideration at the legal rate from _____ (*date of purchase*);]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for rescission of a purchase or sale of securities when the purchase or sale was made by means of an oral or written misrepresentation of a material fact [*see Corp. Code §§ 25401, 25501*].

The possible defendants include the following [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2*]:

- The person who sold or purchased the security from the plaintiff (First Cause of Action) [*see Corp. Code § 25501*].

- A person who indirectly or directly controls the purchaser or seller or one who occupies the status, or performs the functions, of a partner, principal executive officer, or director of a firm exercising such control (Second Cause of Action) [*see Corp. Code § 25504*].

- Any broker-dealer or agent who materially aided in the misrepresentation (Second Cause of Action) [*see Corp. Code § 25504*].

- Any person who materially assisted in the violation with intent to deceive or defraud (Third Cause of Action) [*see Corp. Code § 25504.1*].

- Any person whose profession gives authority to a statement which contained a misrepresentation and on which the plaintiff relied if (a) the statement was made in a prospectus or offering circular and (b) the professional consented to be named and was named in the prospectus or circular (Fourth Cause of Action) [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2*].

For a discussion of material misrepresentation, see *§ 515.246[13]*, and note particularly the discussion under § 515.49[2] [*see also Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, Civil Liabilities, § 14.03* (Matthew Bender)].

[3] Elements of Various Claims

[a] First Cause of Action

The First Cause of Action in this form is based on *Corp. Code §§ 25401* and *25501*, which impose liability for rescission (or damages, as in *§ 515.406*, if the plaintiff or defendant, as the case may be, no longer owns the security), if the purchase or sale was accomplished by use of a written or oral communication that included an untrue statement of material fact or an omission that, in the light of the circumstances, was misleading [*see Corp. Code § 25401*]. The ordinary elements of inducement and reliance are not necessary allegations in the First Cause of Action [*see* discussion in *§ 515.19[1]*].

[b] Second Cause of Action

The Second Cause of Action is based on *Corp. Code §§ 25501* and *25504*. *Corp. Code § 25504* extends liability under *Corp. Code § 25501* to every person who directly or indirectly controls a person who is liable under *Corp. Code § 25501* or *25503*. That includes the following [*see Corp. Code § 25504*; *see, e.g., Apollo Capital Fund LLC v. Roth Capital Partners (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 226, 255-256, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199* (complaint alleged facts sufficient to support liability of broker-dealer under *Corp. Code § 25504*)]:

- Every partner in a firm that is so liable.

- Every executive officer or director of a corporation so liable and every person occupying a similar status or performing a similar function.

- An employee of a person so liable, or a broker-dealer or agent, but only if the employee or broker-dealer or agent materially aided in the act or transaction constituting the violation of *Corp. Code § 25501* (which is alleged in the First Cause of Action).

To state the claim set out in the Second Cause of Action, the plaintiff must allege that the defendant either was in control of a person who is liable under *Corp. Code § 25501* (or *Corp. Code § 25503*)--liability of a controlled person under any other code section would not be sufficient--or was one of the related persons described above; and the plaintiff must allege further that the plaintiff and the person liable under *Corp. Code § 25501*--not the plaintiff and the defendant who was in control or was a related person--were in privity as parties to a sale of securities (which is stated in the First Cause of Action) [*Bains v. Moores (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 445, 479, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 309* (complaint charging vicarious liability under *Corp. Code § 25504* was demurrable for failure to allege liability under applicable code section and failure to allege required privity)].

A controlling person or related person described above is jointly and severally liable with, and to the same extent as, defendants charged in the First Cause of Action, unless the controlling or related person who is allegedly liable had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in the existence of the facts by reason of which the liability is alleged to exist [*Corp. Code § 25504*, discussed in *§ 515.19[6]*]. See *§ 515.409* for an affirmative defense based on such lack of knowledge.

[c] Third Cause of Action

The Third Cause of Action is based on *Corp. Code §§ 25401* and *25504.1*. *Corp. Code § 25504.1* extends liability under *Corp. Code § 25501* to every person who materially assisted in the violation (of *Corp. Code § 25401*, for purposes of the form) with intent deceive or defraud. Thus, this is the first cause of action in the form to require the allegation that a defendant acted with intent to deceive or defraud (Paragraph 12). Such a person or entity is jointly and severally liable with any other person who is liable for the violation [*Corp. Code § 25504.1*; *see, e.g.,* *Apollo Capital Fund LLC v. Roth Capital Partners (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 226, 257, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199* (complaint alleged facts sufficient to support liability of broker-dealer under *Corp. Code § 25504*)].

[d] Fourth Cause of Action

The Fourth Cause of Action is based on *Corp. Code § 25504.2*, which extends liability under *Corp. Code § 25501* (arising for purposes of this form from a violation of *Corp. Code § 25401*) to "experts," such as accountants, engineers, appraisers, whose name and statements appear in, or are referred to in, a prospectus or offering circular distributed in connection with the transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2*, discussed in the Introduction, beginning at § 515.19[8]]. To impose liability on experts under *Corp. Code § 25504.2*, the document or statement must include an untrue statement of material fact or omit a material fact necessary to make the statements that were made not misleading, in light of the circumstances (Paragraph 16) [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)(1)*]; and, the person seeking to impose liability under *Corp. Code § 25504.2* must have acquired the security in reliance on the untrue statement or omission (Paragraph 17) [*Corp. Code § 25504.2(a)(2)*].

Corp. Code § 25504.2(b) provides specific defenses to these experts. Those defenses are discussed in *§ 515.19[8][b]* et seq. and are the basis for the affirmative defenses in §§ 515.410-515.412.

There is a one-year limitation period (from discovery of facts constituting the violation) for imposition of lability on experts under *Corp. Code § 25504.2* [*see Corp. Code § 25506.1*, discussed in *§ 515.19[8][a]*].

[4] State Statutes

Prohibition against material misrepresentation in securities transactions. *Corp. Code § 25401*

Liability and damages for misrepresentation. *Corp. Code § 25501*

Joint and several liability of management principal and materially aiding personnel. *Corp. Code § 25504*

Joint and several liability of materially assisting persons. *Corp. Code § 25504.1*

Joint and several liability of professional experts who authenticate material misrepresentation. *Corp. Code § 25504.2*

Statute of limitations on misrepresentation action. *Corp. Code § 25506*

Statute of limitations on joint and several liability of experts for material misrepresentation. *Corp. Code § 25506.1*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Regulation of expert's consent to documents, reports, and statements. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.504.2-260.504.2.4*

[6] Decisions

[a] In General

Elements of criminal offense described in *Corp. Code § 25401* include knowledge of falsity or misleading nature of statement or of materiality of omission, or criminal negligence in failing to investigate and discover them. *People v. Simon (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 493, 522, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 278, 886 P.2d 1271* (defendant solicited investments in limited partnerships but did not advise investors of transfers of funds among partnerships because defendant believed that, as general partner, he had authority to make such transfers)

Award of interest under *Corp. Code § 25501* to successful purchaser who is granted rescission based on fraudulent misrepresentation is not discretionary but mandatory. *Boam v. Trident Financial Corp. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 738, 744-746, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177*

Misrepresentation or concealment of fact was not material. *Lynch v. Cook (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1087-1088, 196 Cal. Rptr. 544 , disapproved on other grounds, In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227*

Reliance on statement or omission in connection with the tender offer not required. *Lynch v. Cook (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1087-1088, 196 Cal. Rptr. 544 , disapproved on other grounds, In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227* ; *Bowden v. Robinson (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 705, 715, 136 Cal. Rptr. 871*

[b] Aider and Abettor Liability

Statement of claim of aiding and abetting securities fraud requires pleading (1) existence of independent primary wrong, (2) actual knowledge or reckless disregard by alleged aider and abettor of wrong and of his or her role in furthering it, and (3) substantial assistance in wrong. *Levine v. Diamanthuset (9th Cir. 1991) 950 F.2d 1478, 1483*

Cause of action for aider and abettor liability stated against accounting firm who knew that memoranda it aided in preparing were false and did not disclose that fact, and when plaintiffs alleged they relied on accounting firm's reputation in deciding to invest and would not have invested if accounting firm had disclosed fraud. *Roberts v. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 857 F.2d 646, 652-653*

To be secondarily liable in securities fraud action, aider and abettor is required to have actual knowledge of wrong and

of his or her role in furthering it and must substantially assist in wrongdoing; negligence insufficient for imposition of aider and abettor liability, but silence is sufficient; cause of action for aider and abettor liability stated against accountant who failed to include in tax opinion fact that defendant corporation had been suspended for failure to pay California franchise taxes. *DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 183, 188-189*

Under federal securities law, aider's or abettor's actual knowledge of primary wrong and substantial assistance in furthering it required to establish liability; *Corp. Code § 25504.1* standard stricter and requiring aider or abettor to have intent to deceive or defraud. *Orloff v. Allman (9th Cir. 1987) 819 F.2d 904, 907-908*

Defendant's status as spouse of culpable individual and director of corporation that offered securities pursuant to allegedly fraudulent scheme was not sufficient for imposition of aider and abettor liability under federal law. *Durham v. Kelly (9th Cir. 1987) 810 F.2d 1500, 1505*

[c] Alter Ego Liability

To impose alter ego liability on corporate president in federal securities case by piercing corporate veil, president still required to have requisite mental state. *Orloff v. Allman (9th Cir. 1987) 819 F.2d 904, 908*

Alter ego liability not to be imposed on corporate president under California law in securities case by piercing corporate veil merely because president wished to limit liability when there is no abuse of corporate form, such as undercapitalization. *Orloff v. Allman (9th Cir. 1987) 819 F.2d 904, 908-909*

[d] Controlling Person Liability

Determination of who is controlling person for purposes of liability under *15 U.S.C. § 78t* is generally "intensely factual question"; director is not automatically liable as controlling person; control commonly rests with group of persons, such as members of corporation's management. *Arthur Children's Trust v. Keim (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1390, 1396-1397*

As matter of law, once facts establish relationship between registered broker-dealer and its representative, broker-dealer is controlling person under *15 U.S.C. § 78t(a)* with respect to its registered representatives. *Hollinger v. Titan Capital Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 914 F.2d 1564, 1574*

In context of registered broker-dealer and its representative, once plaintiff establishes that broker-dealer is "controlling person," burden of proof under *15 U.S.C. § 78t(a)* shifts to broker-dealer to prove its good faith. *Hollinger v. Titan Capital Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 914 F.2d 1564, 1575* (without deciding whether "power and influence" test articulated in *Buhler v. Audio Leasing Corp. (9th Cir. 1987) 807 F.2d 833, 835-836* , and *Christoffel v. E.F. Hutton & Co. (9th Cir. 1978) 588 F. 2d 665, 668-669* , still applies to relationships other than broker-dealer/representative)

General council's licensing and promotion of ministers not sufficient control for imposition of secondary liability under *15 U.S.C. § 78t(a)* for alleged fraudulent construction fund share issuance by local church. *Kersh v. General Council of Assemblies of God (9th Cir. 1986) 804 F.2d 546, 549*

Broker-dealer has no common law duty to supervise sales by registered representative of investments in which broker-dealer has no economic interest to persons who are not customers of broker-dealer, when registered representative is not broker-dealer's employee, registered representative has no actual or apparent authority to sell investment, and broker had no notice of and did not benefit from transaction. *Asplund v. Selected Investments in Financial Equities, Inc. (2000) 86 Cal. App. 4th 26, 29, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34*

[e] Federal Law

[i] Liability as Seller

Not only one who passes title, but those who solicit purchase may be liable as "seller" [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(a)(1), (2)] if their solicitation is motivated by desire to serve their own or securities owner's financial interest; "substantial factor" is not proper test of solicitation because it fails to distinguish between those who solicit and those whose efforts are merely collateral to offer or sale. *Pinter v. Dahl (1988) 486 U.S. 622, 641655, 108 S. Ct. 2063, 100 L. Ed. 2d 658* (liability under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(1)); *Moore v. Kayport Package Exp., Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 531, 535-536* (liability under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2))

Efforts of lawyers and accountants must be directed toward producing sale rather than merely providing professional services in order for them to be liable as seller under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(1). *Pinter v. Dahl (1988) 486 U.S. 622, 651, 108 S. Ct. 2063, 100 L. Ed. 2d 658* (dicta)

No cause of action stated under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2) against lawyers and accountants who drafted prospectuses and promotional materials when there was no allegation that they played any role in soliciting purchases. *Moore v. Kayport Package Exp., Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 531, 536*

[ii] Right to Rescission

Buyer's right of rescission under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(a)(2) against seller who makes material misrepresentation or omission by means of prospectus does not extend to private contract of sale because term "prospectus" is confined to documents related to public offerings [*see 15 U.S.C. § 77c* ("prospectus" defined)]. *Gustafson v. Alloyd Co. (1995) 513 U.S. 561, 115 S. Ct. 1061, 1067-1068, 131 L. Ed. 2d 1, 12-13*

Under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2), purchaser entitled to rescission without showing that misrepresentation was cause of economic loss. *Casella v. Webb (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 805, 808-809*

Under *15 U.S.C. § 77 l*(2), seller may be charged with constructive knowledge of falsity, but not purchaser; purchaser who did not read prospective entitled to rely on oral misrepresentation that was contrary to statements in prospectus and is not required to prove due diligence but only actual ignorance of true facts. *Casella v. Webb (9th Cir. 1989) 883 F.2d 805, 809*

[f] Statute of Limitations

Corp. Code § 25506 imposes notice-inquiry standard: limitation period starts when plaintiff knows facts constituting violation or when circumstances would suggest, to investor of ordinary intelligence, possibility of having been defrauded. *Deveny v. Entropin, Inc. (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 408, 423, 428-429, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 807*

Action for rescission based on violation of *Corp. Code § 25401* governed by four-year limitation of *Corp. Code § 25506*. *Stokes v. Henson (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 187, 193 n.4, 265 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[7] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities* , §§ 463.03, 463.06 (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, Civil Liabilities, § 14.03* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations*, § 299 (9th ed. 1989)

[8] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400* and Comments and References to §§ 515.404, 515.407, and 515.418

For forms and discussion of common law fraud generally, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*

For forms and discussion applicable to actions for rescission generally, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.406

§ 515.406 Complaint for Damages for Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Securities Transaction Made Through Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25401]--By Purchaser or Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
	)	(Material Misrepresentation in Securities Transaction)
_____ [*name*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
[and DOES I through _____],	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant(s).	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Material Misrepresentation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Transaction as based on false or misleading statement. See § 515.405, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [O]n or about _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *if plaintiff was purchaser or* defendant *if defendant was purchaser*] _____ [*specify how security was disposed of, e.g.,* sold the security to _____ (*name*) for $_____ per share].

5. As a result of defendant's material misrepresentation as alleged herein, defendant is liable to plaintiff, who is entitled, in lieu of rescission, to sue for damages as a result of _____ [plaintiff's *or* defendant's] disposition of the security.

[*EITHER, if plaintiff is purchaser*]

6. The value of the securities at the time plaintiff disposed of them was _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per share]. Plaintiff has received $_____ in income from those securities.

[*OR, if plaintiff is seller*]

6. The value of the securities at the time of the filing of the complaint herein was _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per share]. To the time of resale, _____ [*specify disposition, e.g.,* defendant had received $_____ in income from those securities].

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Materially Aiding Personnel)

7. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

8, 9. [*Named defendant as management principal or material aide. See § 515.405, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 7, 8.*]

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons)

10. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 7.*]

11-13. [*Named defendant as materially assisting person. See § 515.405, Third Cause of Action, Paragraphs 10-12.*]

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Experts)

14. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 10.*]

15-18. [*Named defendant as liable expert. See § 515.405, Fourth Cause of Action, Paragraphs 14-17.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

[*EITHER*]

1. [*If plaintiff is purchaser:* For damages in the amount equal to the difference between:

a. the price at which the securities were bought, plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase; and

b. the value of the securities at the time they were disposed of by plaintiff, plus the amount of any income received by plaintiff thereon];

[*OR*]

1. [*If plaintiff is seller:* For damages in the amount equal to the difference between:

a. the value of the securities at the time of filing of the complaint herein, plus the amount of any income received on the securities by defendant; and

b. the price at which the securities were sold, plus interest at the legal rate from the date of sale];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for damages for the purchase or sale of securities effected by means of misrepresentation of a material fact [*see Corp. Code §§ 25401, 25501*]. For a discussion of the cause of action for damages for this type of injury, see *§ 515.19[3]*. If plaintiff or defendant was the purchaser of the securities, and still retains the securities then plaintiff's remedy is a complaint for rescission as set out in *see § 515.405*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges that defendant is liable to plaintiff for the misrepresentation, but is liable only for damages since the securities have been resold (Paragraphs 4, 5), and further alleges the value of the securities at the time of their disposal, along with an accounting of any income received thereon to that time (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 25501*].

[4] Decisions

Failure of prospectus to state that some types of mergers could be accomplished without approval of preferred shares being offered or that common stock could be delisted, resulting in destruction of value of conversion rights of preferred shares being offered, was neither material nor misleading. *Insurance Underwriters Clearing House, Inc. v. Natomas Co. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1520, 1526-1530, 228 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Issue of materiality, on which reasonable minds cannot differ, may be resolved as matter of law; fact is material if reasonable investor would consider it in reaching investment decision; in connection with purchase and sale of stock, disclosure of preliminary merger negotiations not required and immaterial as matter of law. *Insurance Underwriters Clearing House, Inc. v. Natomas Co. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1520, 1526-1528, 228 Cal. Rptr. 449* ; *but see Basic Incorporated v. Levinson (1988) 485 U.S. 224, 108 S. Ct. 978, 99 L. Ed. 2d 194, 212-214, 220* (probably applicable to abrogate agreement-in-principle standard under California law)

Under some circumstances, risk of demisting sufficiently material to require disclosure in offering prospectus; however, if no merger is being contemplated and no appreciable risk of demisting exists at time of offering, mere possibility of future demisting as not sufficiently material to require disclosure. *Insurance Underwriters Clearing House, Inc. v. Natomas Co. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1520, 1528-1530, 228 Cal. Rptr. 449*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.407

§ 515.407 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Facts Behind Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Facts Behind Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Plaintiff knew the facts concerning the alleged _____ [untrue statement *or* omission] ascribed to defendant's communication in connection with the _____ [purchase *or* sale] of the described securities _____ [to *or* from] plaintiff, in that _____ [*describe occasion of knowledge, e.g.,* defendant, on or about _____ [*date*], and prior to the transaction, explained to plaintiff in private conference, with a special audit report as exhibit, all accounting discrepancies in the prospectus].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for rescission [*see § 515.405*] or damages [*see § 515.406*] alleging securities transaction effected by means of material misrepresentation when the plaintiff knew the actual facts behind the misrepresentation [*see Corp. Code § 25501*]. For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.19[5][a]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.408

§ 515.408 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 25501]
[*EITHER*]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. Defendant exercised reasonable care with respect to the making of the statements described in the complaint in connection with the transaction with plaintiff, in that _____ [*describe care with respect to plaintiff's specific allegations, e.g.,* defendant reasonably relied exclusively on the certified audit report of _____ (*name*), which omitted any reference to change in the accounting practice of the X Company]. As a result, defendant did not know of the alleged _____ [untruth *or* omission].

[2. In any case, even] [I]f defendant had [not] exercised reasonable care with respect to the making of the statements described in the complaint in connection with the transaction with plaintiff, defendant would not have known of the alleged _____ [untrue statement *or* omission] because _____ [*explain, e.g.,* the only published reports which could have revealed facts supportive or corrective of defendant's statements, and on which defendant or any market professional would or should have relied, did not reveal the _____ [falsity of the statement *or* omission)].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action for rescission [*see § 515.405*] or for damages [*see § 515.406*] for material misrepresentation in a securities transaction, where the defendant exercised reasonable care but was unaware of the misrepresentation, or where the exercise of reasonable care would have been of no avail [*see Corp. Code § 25501*]. For discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.59[4]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.409

§ 515.409 Affirmative Defense to Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Aides--Defendant Was Without Knowledge or Belief [Corp. Code § 25504]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Aides--Defendant Was Without Knowledge or Belief [Corp. Code § 25504]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Defendant _____ [*name of answering joint defendant*] had no knowledge of or reasonable grounds to believe in the existence of the _____ [*describe alleged material representation or violation of qualification requirement or regulatory condition*] alleged in Paragraph _____ of plaintiff's complaint, in that _____ [*explain lack of knowledge or grounds, e.g.,* defendant reasonably believed that the state qualification of the securities by coordination with their federal registration would become automatically effective at the same time as would the federal registration, whereas in fact in this case the securities were not eligible for state qualification because they had not been on file with the Commissioner of Corporations for 10 days].

[2] Use of Form

This defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for rescission [*see § 515.405,* Second Cause of Action] or damages [*see § 515.406*] based on a material misrepresentation in a security transaction or on violation of securities qualification requirements or a condition imposed by the commissioner [*see §§ 515.407 -515.421*] in which joint and several liability is alleged against defendant as a management principal or one of the materially aiding personnel in the offending transaction [*see § 515.425*]. The form alleges that the defendant did not know of or could not reasonably be expected to believe in the existence of the facts constituting the misrepresentation or violation [*see Corp. Code § 25504*; *see § 515.19[6][b]*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.410

§ 515.410 Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Reasonable Belief in Accuracy of Representations [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Reasonable Belief in Accuracy of Representations [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(1)]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Defendant, after reasonable investigation, had reasonable ground to believe, and did believe, at the time defendant consented to the use of defendant's name, that the statements cited in the complaint herein and included in the particular _____ [document *or* report *or* valuation] therein cited, were true, and that there was no omission to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading [, in that _____ (*describe further circumstances of such belief, if appropriate*)].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for rescission [*see § 515.405*, Second Cause of Action] or damages [*see § 515.406*] based on a material representation in a sale of a security in which a professional expert is named as having consented to the use of his or her name in a prospectus or offering circular containing a report by the expert which included the misrepresentation [*see § 515.405*]. The basis of the defense is the expert's reasonable belief in the accuracy of the representations he or she made [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(1)*].

For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.19[8][b]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.411

§ 515.411 Affirmative Defenses to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Document Not Accurate Reflection of Expert's Views [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(2)].

[1] FORM Affirmative Defenses to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Document Not Accurate Reflection of Expert's Views [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(2)].
[*EITHER*]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The part of the document cited in the complaint herein did not a fairly represent defendant's statement as an expert.
[*OR*]

The part of the document cited in the complaint herein was not a fair _____ [copy of *or* extract from] defendant's _____ [report *or* valuation].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for rescission [*see § 515.405*, Second Cause of Action] or damages [*see § 515.406*] charging a professional expert with responsibility for material misrepresentation in a document or report contained in a prospectus or offering circular when the document in question is not an accurate reflection of the expert's views [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(2)*].

For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.19[8][c]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.412

§ 515.412 Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Expert Filed Disclaimer [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(3)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Allegation of Expert's Joint and Several Liability for Material Misrepresentation--Expert Filed Disclaimer [Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(3)]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Prior to the plaintiff's acquisition of the security, as described in the complaint herein, defendant advised _____ [*name of issuer*], as the issuer of such security, and the Commissioner of Corporations, in writing, that defendant would not be responsible for such _____ [part of the document *or* report *or* valuation]. A true copy of the defendant's disclaimer is attached as Exhibit 1 and made a part hereof.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for rescission [*see § 515.405*, Second Cause of Action] or damages [*see § 515.406*] charging a professional expert with responsibility for a material misrepresentation in a document, or report, or valuation contained in a prospectus or offering circular when the expert had properly filed a disclaimer of the document, report, or valuation in question [*see Corp. Code § 25504.2(b)(3)*].

For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.19[8][d]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.405*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.413

§ 515.413 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25502] for Securities Transaction--By Purchaser or Seller Against Corporate "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Material Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 25502] for Securities Transaction--By Purchaser or Seller Against Corporate "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Material Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	DAMAGES
Plaintiff,	)	(Advantage of Undisclosed
vs.	)	Material Information by
_____ [*name*],	)	Corporate "Insider" in
Defendant.	)	_____ (Purchase *or*
	)	Sale) of Securities)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], in _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant _____ [sold to *or* purchased from] plaintiff securities consisting of a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe securities, e.g.,* the preferred stock] of _____ for $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*] and a total price of $_____. At that time _____ [defendant was the issuer of the securities *or* defendant was _____ (an officer *or* a director *or* a controlling person) of the issuer of the securities *or if defendant was not an issuer, officer, director, or controlling person* defendant's relationship to the issuer gave him/her direct or indirect access to material information about the issuer not generally available to the public, in that defendant was _____ (*describe position, e.g.,* the holder of 11 percent of the outstanding common stock)].

4. At the time of the above-described securities transaction with plaintiff, defendant knew certain then current material information about the issuer, information gained from defendant's relationship to the issuer, which would significantly affect the market price of the securities involved. That information was to the effect that _____ [*describe information, e.g.,* the issuer was about to be publicly charged with fraud by the Commissioner of Corporations]. This material information was not then generally available to the public, and defendant knew at that time that it was not intended to be so available.

5. The market value that the securities would have had at the time plaintiff _____ [purchased *or* sold] them _____ [from *or* to] defendant, if the information known to defendant had been publicly disseminated prior to the time of the securities transaction here involved and a reasonable time had elapsed for the market to absorb the information, is $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*].

6. As a result of defendant's acts in the transaction, defendant is liable to plaintiff for damages in the amount of $_____, the difference between what plaintiff _____ [paid *or* received] on the transaction and the market value alleged above in Paragraph 5.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest at the legal rate;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by the person who purchased securities from or sold the securities to the "insider" in an action for damages against a corporate "insider" who sold to or purchased from plaintiff a security at a time when he or she knew material information about the issuer that was gained from his or her "insider" relationship and that defendant knew was not in fact and was not intended to be generally available [*see Corp. Code §§ 25402, 25502*]. For a discussion of this cause of action, see *§ 515.22* [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.04* (Matthew Bender)]. For a complaint for use by the issuer of the securities traded in violation of *Corp. Code § 25402,*

see § 515.413.1.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part, the following:

- Plaintiff's purchase from or sale to defendant of securities of the corporation in which defendant's relationship to the issuer gave him or her direct or indirect access to material information about the issuer not generally available to the public (Paragraph 3).

- Defendant's then current knowledge, gained from the relationship, of inside matters not generally disclosed to the public that would have significantly affected the price (Paragraph 4) [*see Corp. Code § 25402*].

- The market value the securities would have had if the knowledge had been widely known (Paragraph 5).

- Defendant's liability for the difference of which defendant has had the advantage (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 25502*].

[4] State Statutes

Prohibited insider trading activity. *Corp. Code § 25402*

Liability and damages for insider trading. *Corp. Code § 25502*

Statute of limitations on insider actions. *Corp. Code § 25506*

[5] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Securities Laws, Ch. 21, § 466.05 (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, § 14.04* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations, § 300* (9th ed. 1989)

[6] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.400* and *515.415*- 17.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.414

§ 515.414 Complaint for Treble Damages [Corp. Code § 25502.5] for Securities Transaction--By Issuer Against "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM Complaint for Treble Damages [Corp. Code § 25502.5] for Securities Transaction--By Issuer Against "Insider" Having Advantage of Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25402]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR TREBLE DAMAGES
	)	("Insider Trading")
_____ [*name*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant(s).	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* California], with its principal place of business in _____ [*specify, e. g.,* County, California *or allege other capacity of plaintiff issuer*]. Plaintiff has total assets worth in excess of one million dollars ($1,000,000), and has _____ [*specify, e.g.,* outstanding common shares *or* a class of equity securities] held of record by more than 500 persons.

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

3. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On _____ [*date*], in _____ [*specify locality*], California, defendant _____ [sold *or* purchased] _____ [*number*] of _____ [shares *or other security*] of plaintiff's _____ [*describe securities, e. g.,* common stock] for $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*], for a total transaction price of $_____.
[*EITHER*]

5. At the time of the transaction complained of, defendant was _____ [an officer *or* a director *or* a controlling person] of plaintiff.
[*OR*]

5. At the time of the transaction complained of, defendant was _____ [*specify relationship, e.g.,* a physician and scientist under contract to plaintiff to develop a drug for use in the treatment of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome]. Defendant's relationship to plaintiff gave him/her direct or indirect access to material information about plaintiff that was not generally available to the public.
[*CONTINUE*]

6. At the time of the transaction complained of, defendant knew certain then current information about plaintiff that defendant had gained from his/her relationship to plaintiff. The information concerned the fact that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff was about to announce that it had received approval from the Federal Drug Administration to market the drug]. This information would significantly affect the market price of the securities involved and was not then generally available to the public. Defendant knew that the information was not intended to be available to the public.

7. If the information known to defendant had been publicly disseminated prior to the time of the transaction complained of and a reasonable time had elapsed for the market to absorb that information, at the time of the transaction complained of the securities involved would have had a market value of $_____ per _____ [share *or other security*].

8. [*Damages. See § 515.413, Paragraph 6.*]

[9. No proceeding has been commenced against defendant by the Securities and Exchange Commission under the federal Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984 (Sections 78a, 78c, 78o, 78t, 78u, and 78ff of Title 15 of the United States Code) or any other act with respect to the transaction that is the subject of this complaint.

[10. As a result of proceedings commenced against defendant by the Securities and Exchange Commission on account of the transaction that is the subject of this complaint, defendant has paid the sum of $_____.]

[11. A proceeding has been commenced against defendant by the Securities and Exchange Commission under _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the federal Insider Trading Sanctions Act of 1984 (Sections 78a, 78c, 78o, 78t, 78u, and 78ff of Title 15 of the United States Code) with respect to the transaction that is the subject of this complaint, but at the time of the filing of this complaint, no sums had been paid by defendant on account of that proceeding.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____, and that said sum be trebled;

2. For its reasonable attorney's fees;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use in an action by an issuer of securities against an insider who traded on insider information about the issuer in violation of *Corp. Code § 25402*. Treble damages may be recovered by the issuer if it has over $1 million in assets and over 500 record holders of a class of equity securities [*Corp. Code § 25502.5*; *see* discussion in *§ 515.22[3]*]. However, the trebled amount will be reduced by any sums paid by the defendant in proceedings commenced by the Securities and Exchange Commission on account of the same transaction [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(b)*].

The action may be brought by or on behalf of the issuer [*see Corp. Code § 25502.5*]. For a general complaint containing allegations that may be used to plead an action for recovery under *Corp. Code § 25502.5* as a derivative action, see Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity as an issuer of the size required by *Corp. Code § 25502.5(d)* (Paragraph 1).

- The specifics of defendant's sale or purchase of plaintiff's securities in California [*see Corp. Code § 25402*] (Paragraph 4).

- The particulars of defendant's status as an insider within the meaning of *Corp. Code § 25402* (alternative Paragraphs 5).

- Defendant's knowledge of information that was not available to the general public and that had a significant impact on the market price of the securities traded, as well as defendant's knowledge that the information was not intended to be available to the public, all as required by *Corp. Code § 25402* to constitute the offense of "insider trading" (Paragraph 6).

- The market price the securities would have had if the insider information had been available to the public sufficiently in advance of the transaction to allow the market to absorb the information (Paragraph 7) [*Corp. Code § 25502.5(a)*].

Paragraphs 9-11 are optional paragraphs addressing the reduction in damages that a defendant would be entitled to under *Corp. Code § 25502.5(b)* if he or she had paid a judgment or settlement arising from an SEC proceeding regarding the same transaction [*see Corp. Code § 25502.5(b)*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.413*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.415

§ 515.415 Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Belief That Plaintiff Was Informed as to Undisclosed Matters Regarding Securities [Corp. Code § 25402]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Belief That Plaintiff Was Informed as to Undisclosed Matters Regarding Securities [Corp. Code § 25402]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

At the time of defendant's _____ [sale to *or* purchase from] plaintiff of the securities alleged herein, defendant had reason to believe, and did believe, that plaintiff was also in possession of the [alleged] specific material information, in that _____ [*describe basis for reasons, e.g.,* plaintiff was the private accountant and longtime confidant of _____ (*name*), treasurer of the issuer company, and defendant had been given to understand by both persons that such officer routinely shared all inside information of the company with plaintiff].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action for damages based on prohibited trading in the securities of a corporation by one of its insiders [*see § 515.413*] when the defendant reasonably believed the plaintiff was fully informed of the material information about the issuer [*see Corp. Code § 25502*]. For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.22[5]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.413*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.416

§ 515.416 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Material Information Regarding Securities Not Publicly Disclosed [Corp. Code § 25502]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Knowledge of Material Information Regarding Securities Not Publicly Disclosed [Corp. Code § 25502]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

At the time of defendant's _____ [sale to *or* purchase from] plaintiff of the securities referred to, plaintiff knew that _____ [*describe material information referred to in complaint, e.g.,* _____ (name of company) was momentarily going to be pub licly charged with fraud by the Commissioner of Corporations], because _____ [*give basis for plaintiff's knowledge, e.g.,* after consulting with a reputable investment house on or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff had been advised against a securities transaction such as the one here for the reason that _____ (*name of company*) would probably be charged with fraud within a week].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages for prohibited insider trading [*see § 515.413*] where the plaintiff was in fact an equally informed person [*see Corp. Code § 25502*]. For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.22[6]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.413*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.417

§ 515.417 Affirmative Defense--Price of Securities Transaction Unaffected by Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25502]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Price of Securities Transaction Unaffected by Undisclosed Information [Corp. Code § 25502]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

At the time of defendant's _____ [sale to *or* purchase from] plaintiff of the securities alleged herein, plaintiff would have consummated the transaction at the same price even if the material information above described had been revealed to him/her, because _____ [*reason for plaintiff's adherence to trade, e.g.,* he/she had intended to buy defendant's shares in the company regardless of the amount of the company's financial assets, in order to obtain effective control of the company as a source of supply of materials for plaintiff's business].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action for damages for prohibited insider trading [*see § 515.413*] if the plaintiff would have sold or purchased the securities even if the material misrepresentation had been revealed to him or her [*Corp. Code § 25502*]. For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.22[7]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.413*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.418

§ 515.418 Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale and Restitution of Consideration Paid [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale and Restitution of Consideration Paid [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR
Plaintiff,	)	RESCISSION AND
vs.	)	RESTITUTION
_____ [*name* (*s*)],	)	(Sale of Securities in
Defendant(s).	)	Violation of Qualification
	)	Requirements)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Qualification Violation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1* .]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2* .]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant offered and sold to plaintiff a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the common stock of X Corporation] _____ [*describe consideration, e.g.,* at the price of $_____ per _____ (share *or other security*) for a total price of $_____]. Defendant was _____ [*if sale was an issuer transaction* the issuer *or if a nonissuer transaction* a broker-dealer *or specify other person*] engaged in the secondary trading of such securities.

[*EITHER, if was actually unqualified*]

4. This sale constituted _____ [an issuer transaction in that it _____ (*specify, e.g.,* was part of an initial offering of stock for capitalization purposes) *or* a nonissuer transaction in that it was _____ (*specify, e.g.,* not directly or indirectly consummated for the benefit of the issuer of the securities, and no portion of the purchase price would be received in any fashion by the issuer)]. Nevertheless, at the time of plaintiff's acquisition the sale was subject to qualification, was not exempt from qualification, and was not [and to date of this complaint has not been,] qualified as any kind of securities transaction with the Commissioner of Corporations.
[*OR, if sale was unqualified by virtue of variance from qualification permit, application, or order*]

4. This sale constituted an issuer transaction in that it _____ [*specify, e.g.,* was part of an initial offering of stock for capitalization purposes]. At the time of plaintiff's acquisition, the sale was nominally qualified in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a qualification permit had been issued by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of Corporations Code Section _____]. However, the sale in fact is not qualified within the meaning of *Corporations Code Section 25110* because _____ [*specify, e.g.,* there is a material variance between the statements made in the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* _____application for qualification that defendant's operations would be profitable from the beginning), and the true fact that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* it is unlikely that defendant will achieve profits in the initial four years of its operations)].
[*CONTINUE*]

5. As a result of the above-described acts, defendant is liable to plaintiff, who is entitled to, and hereby does, rescind the above-described purchase. Plaintiff _____ [herewith tenders *or* before entry of judgment will tender] to defendant _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of the above-described securities as purchased from defendant and on which to date plaintiff has received $_____ as total income.

[6. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the consideration given for the securities herein is not capable of being returned in that _____ (*explain, e.g.,* defendant forfeited it as security for an unpaid loan to _____ (*name of lender*) on or about _____ (*date*)). The value of the consideration plaintiff transferred to defendant was $_____.]

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Offering Principal or Underwriter)

7. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

8. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all time herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege appropriate capacity and residence of joint defendant as shown in see § 515.400, Paragraph 1*].

9. This defendant was, at the time of the acts alleged herein, _____ [the person on whose behalf the offering of the herein described sale of securities to plaintiff was made *or* an underwriter of the offering of the herein-described sale of securities to plaintiff on a _____ (firm commitment *or* best efforts) basis].

10. [*If defendant is underwriter who received a disproportionately greater benefit for acting as underwriter, add* In connection with such capacity, defendant _____ (*name*) knowingly received from the issuer for acting as an underwriter of the below-described securities some benefit, directly or indirectly, in which all other underwriters similarly situated did not share in proportion to their respective interest in the underwriting, in that _____ (*describe benefit, e.g.,* defendant received an extra block of the common stock initially offered of approximately 500 shares as his own holding or for resale at his option), by virtue of which such defendant's liability is not restricted to the total price at which the underwritten securities were offered to the public].

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Materially Aiding Personnel)

11. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, supra, Paragraph 7.*]

12, 13. [*Named defendant as management principal or material aide. See § 515.405, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 7, 8.*]

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons)

14. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 7.*]

15-17. [*Named defendant as materially assisting person. See § 515.405, Third Cause of Action, Paragraphs 10-12.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For rescission of the purchase and recovery of $_____ [*or describe other matter*] as [the value of] the original consideration paid for the securities [less $_____, the amount of income received on the security];

2. For interest on [the value of] the original consideration at the legal rate [from the date of purchase and transfer of the consideration];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400* .]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action to rescind a purchase of securities made in an issuer or nonissuer transaction and recover the purchase price if the securities are subject to qualification, not exempt from qualification, and have not been qualified [*see Corp. Code § 25503* (discussed in *§ 515.21*)]. A security may be "unqualified" within the meaning of *Corp. Code § 25110* (issuer transactions only), if the manner of the offer or sale differs from, exceeds the scope of, or fails to conform with, either (1) a material term or condition of qualification as set forth in the permit or qualification order or (2) a material representation regarding the manner of offering that is set forth in the application for qualification [*Corp. Code § 25110*]. The second alternative Paragraph 4 is for use in that situation.

The form may not be used to rescind an issuer transaction that is in the form of recapitalizations or reorganizations; for a complaint for rescission of such a transaction, see *§ 515.420*.

For a discussion of regulatory violations alleged in the complaint, see *§ 515.21*. For a description of the causes of action brought under this complaint, see *§ 515.21[1]* [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.06[1]* (Matthew Bender)].

The Second, Third, and Fourth Causes of Action are for joint and several liability of particular persons for the violation specified in the First Cause of Action. For discussion of joint and several liability of offering principals and underwriters under the Second Cause of Action, see *§ 515.21[8]* [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.06[3][a], [b]* (Matthew Bender)]. For discussion of joint and several liability of management principals and materially aiding personnel under the Third Cause of Action, and for such liability of materially assisting persons under the Fourth Cause of Action, see *§ 515.61* [*see* Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.06[3][c]* (Matthew Bender)].

If plaintiff has resold or otherwise no longer retains the securities, the appropriate action is for damages [*see § 515.419*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges in the First Cause of Action the following:

- The offer and sale to plaintiff of securities by the issuer or secondary trader (Paragraph 3).

- The fact that the transaction was an issuer or nonissuer one but that the securities were subject to qualification, were not exempt from qualification, and had not been qualified (first alternative Paragraph 4), or that the transaction was a nominally qualified issuer transaction, but was not in fact qualified within the meaning of *Corp. Code § 25110* (second alternative Paragraph 4).

- Plaintiff therefore rescinds the sale by proper tender of the securities, with an accounting of income received thereon (Paragraph 5).

- The value of plaintiff's consideration if it was nonmonetary and cannot be returned [*see Corp. Code § 25503*].

The subsequent causes of action allege joint and several liability of particular persons by alleging the circumstances of their relationship to the securites transaction described in the First Cause of Action. The Second Cause of Action alleges, in part, the following: (1) the defendant was an offering principal or an underwriter (Paragraph 3); and (2) if

relevant, that the underwriting defendant's role was such that the underwriter is not entitled to the protection of the ceiling on liability which is normally restricted to the underwritten figure [*see Corp. Code § 25503*].

The applicable limitation period under *Corp. Code § 25507(a)* is discussed in *§ 515.21[5]*.

[4] State Statutes

Requirement of qualification of issuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25110*

Requirement of qualification of nonissuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25130*

Liability for failure to qualify securities. *Corp. Code § 25503*

Joint and several liability of management principals and materially aiding personnel. *Corp. Code § 25504*

Joint and several liability of materially assisting persons. *Corp. Code § 25504.1*

Statute of limitations on actions for failure to qualify securities. *Corp. Code § 25507*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Qualification procedures. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.110-260.131*

Standards for exercise of authority of Commissioner of Corporations. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.140-260.140.139*

Promotional share conditions. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.141-260.141.3*

Transfer restriction conditions. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.141.10-260.141.15*

Impound conditions. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.141.20-260.141.27*

[6] Decisions

[a] Exemptions From Registration

Exemption of former *Corp. Code § 25102(f)* as it existed prior to November 1, 1981, was only available to bona fide partnership; because bona fide partnership is not established unless each partner has right to determine membership of all other partners, limited partnership in which limited partners did not know each other was not entitled to exemption. *Sherman v. Lloyd (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 693, 700-701, 226 Cal. Rptr. 495*

[b] Joint Liability of Responsible Individuals

Control person liability under *15 U.S.C. § 77o* and under *Corp. Code § 25504* are substantially the same; to establish controlling person liability controlled entity must be liable and alleged controlling person must have controlled that entity. *Underhill v. Royal (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1426, 1433*

Controlling person not liable if he or she had no knowledge of, or reasonable grounds to believe in, existence of facts by reason of which liability exists; alleged controlling person has burden of proof of this defense; given radio and

newspaper advertising throughout San Diego area over 5-year period, verdict for investors supported by evidence despite controlling person's claim of lack of knowledge of sales to nonresidents which would make intrastate offering exemption from federal registration requirements unavailable. *Underhill v. Royal (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1426, 1433-1434*

Verdict for investors supported by evidence despite controlling person's claim of reliance on advice of counsel that offering was exempt from California registration requirements when controlling person was aware that Corporations Department had raised questions as to exemption and liability was founded on facts that fostered those doubts. *Underhill v. Royal (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1426, 1433-1434*

Liability of affiliated corporate mortgage broker for violations of federal securities laws by franchisee which sold unregistered securities was supported by evidence that advertisements and newsletters used only affiliate/franchisor's name, that both corporations were founded and controlled by same person, and use of franchisor's trade name and mark; liability for California violations established without finding of privity since defendant never offered instruction on privity. *Underhill v. Royal (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1426, 1434-1435*

When all funds of limited partnership in which plaintiff invested were invested by general partner in second limited partnership, both partnerships were liable under to plaintiff under *Corp. Code § 25503*, and general partners of both partnerships and officer, director, and major shareholder of corporate general partner of second partnership were jointly and severally liable under *Corp. Code § 25504*, but accounting firm of first partnership was not liable because it had no other connection to transaction. *Sherman v. Lloyd (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 693, 703, 226 Cal. Rptr. 495*

[c] Punitive Damages

One who induced unsophisticated persons to invest money in various ventures in his or her name assumes fiduciary status as investment advisor, trustee of commodities accounts, managing partner of mining venture, and securities broker-dealer; fiduciary's material misrepresentations to induce investors not to withdraw their funds, failure to disclose significant risks, and failure to register securities were not only statutory violations [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25401*] but also constructive fraud, which supports award of punitive damages. *Stokes v. Henson (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 187, 194-197, 265 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[d] Scienter Required to Prove Criminal Violation of Corp. Code § 25110

Defendant is not guilty of selling unregistered security in violation of *Corp. Code § 25110* if there is reasonable doubt that defendant knew that security was not exempt from regulation or reasonable doubt that defendant was criminally negligent in failing to know that security was not exempt; however, lack of knowledge that security is not exempt, or lack of criminal negligence, is affirmative defense, on which trial court must instruct only if defendant presents enough evidence to raise reasonable doubt. *People v. Salas (2006) 37 Cal. 4th 967, 981, 982, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 624, 127 P.3d 40*

[e] Statute of Limitations

Action for rescission based on violation of *Corp. Code § 25110* is governed by two-year limitation of *Corp. Code § 25503*. *Stokes v. Henson (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 187, 193 n.4, 265 Cal. Rptr. 836*

When all funds of limited partnership in which plaintiff invested were invested by general partner in second limited partnership, limitation period commences on discovery that offering violated registration requirements rather than at time plaintiff learned of two-tier arrangement; defendant general partner was fiduciary of plaintiff limited partner

because of partnership relationship, thus plaintiff was entitled to rely on defendant's assurances that two-tier structure was in compliance with securities law. *Sherman v. Lloyd (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 693, 700, 226 Cal. Rptr. 495*

[7] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities*, § 463.02 (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, Civil Liabilities, § 14.06* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations*, § 245 (9th ed. 1989)

[8] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.400* and *515.420*- 22.

For general forms and discussion of rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.419

§ 515.419 Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Issuer or Nonissuer Transaction (Except Recapitalization or Reorganization) [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25130]--By Purchaser Against Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
	)	(Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale)
_____ [*name*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Qualification Violation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Sale to plaintiff by defendant in particular relationship to securities. See § 515.418, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Status of transaction as not qualified. See § 515.418, Paragraph 4.*]

5. As a result of the above-described acts, defendant is liable to plaintiff for damages in lieu of rescission since plaintiff no longer owns the securities. The value of the securities at the time plaintiff disposed of them was $_____ per share. Plaintiff had received $_____ in income from the securities.

6. [*Value of consideration given if defendant is unable to return. See § 515.418, Paragraph 6.*]

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Offering Principals or Underwriters)

7. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

8-10. [*Named defendant as offering principal or underwriter. See § 515.418, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2-4.*]

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Materially Aiding Personnel)

11. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 7.*]

12, 13. [*Named defendant as management principal or materially aiding personnel. See § 515.406, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2, 3.*]

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons)

1. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 7.*]

2-4. [*Named defendant as materially assisting person. See § 515.406, Third Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2-4.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages in the amount equal to the difference between:

a. the amount of $_____ as _____ [the purchase price *or* the value of original consideration] plus interest at the legal rate from the date of purchase; and

b. the value of the security at the time it was disposed of by plaintiff plus the amount of any income received thereon by plaintiff;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400* .]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action for damages resulting from a purchase of securities made in an issuer or nonissuer transaction, when the securities had not been qualified and plaintiff sold the securities prior to filing the complaint [*see Corp. Code § 25503*]. If plaintiff still owns the security, rescission is the proper remedy [*see § 515.418*]. In any case, if the transaction was in the form of recapitalizations or reorganizations, the complaint in § 515.420 should be used.

For a discussion of an action for damages for a regulatory violation, see *§ 515.21[3]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges, in the First Cause of Action, defendant's liability, defendant's inability to rescind because of disposition of the securities, and an accounting of the value of the securities at the time of transfer and of any income received thereon [*see Corp. Code § 25503*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.420

§ 515.420 Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Recapitalization or Reorganization Issuer Transaction [Corp. Code § 25120]--By Purchaser Against Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Sale of Securities Not Qualified for Sale [Corp. Code § 25503]--Recapitalization or Reorganization Issuer Transaction [Corp. Code § 25120]--By Purchaser Against Seller [*Caption, introduction. See § 515.419.*]

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Qualification Violation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant offered and sold to plaintiff a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the 6 percent cumulative preferred stock of A Corporation] in exchange for a total of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of _____ [*describe security, e.g.,* the common stock of B Corporation] from plaintiff, at the rate of _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of the former for _____ [*number*] _____ [shares *or other security*] of the latter. Defendant was the issuer of the securities being sold [as well as those being received in exchange].

4. That sale constituted an issuer transaction in the form of a _____ [recapitalization *or* reorganization] in that it represented _____ [*describe business purpose, e.g.,* an exchange of securities in connection with the merger of the issuer A Corporation and B Corporation]. Nevertheless, at the time of plaintiff's acquisition, that sale was subject to qualification, was not exempt from qualification, and was not [, and to

date of this complaint that sale has not been,] qualified as any kind of securities transaction with the Commissioner of Corporations.

5. As a result of the above-described failure to qualify the securities, defendant is liable for damages. The value of the consideration received by defendant in the above-described transaction was $_____. The value of such securities at the time they were received by plaintiff was $_____.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Offering Principals and Underwriters)

6. Plaintiff sets forth by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-5 of the First Cause of Action.

7-9. [*Named defendant as offering principal or underwriter. See § 515.418, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2-4.*]

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Management Principals or Materially Aiding Personnel)

10. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, supra, Paragraph 6.*]

11, 12. [*Named Defendant as management principal or material aide. See § 515.405, Second Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2, 3.*]

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Materially Assisting Persons)

13. [*Incorporation of First Cause of Action. See Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 6.*]

14-16. [*Named defendant as materially assisting person. See § 515.405, Third Cause of Action, Paragraphs 2-4.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____, being the difference between:

a. the value of the consideration received from plaintiff; and

b. the value of the securities at the time they were received by plaintiff;

2. For interest thereon at the legal rate from the date of purchase;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400* .]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action for damages resulting from failure to qualify the sale of securities involved in an issuer transaction that is in the form of a recapitalization or reorganization [*see Corp. Code § 25503*]. Actions based on violation of qualification requirements involving other issuer transactions or involving nonissuer transactions are provided for in Forms 18 (for rescission) and 19 (for damages).

For further discussion of violation of qualifications involving a recapitalization or reorganization, see *§ 515.21[1]* and *[4]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges in the First Cause of Action, in pertinent part, the following [*see Corp. Code § 25503*]:

- The sale of securities to plaintiff in the form of an exchange of securities (Paragraph 3);
- That the sale constituted a recapitalization or reorganization that was not qualified (Paragraph 4); and
- Defendant's liability to plaintiff, and an accounting of the value of the securities and consideration given therefor.

[4] State Statutes

Requirement for qualification of recapitalizations and reorganizations. *Corp. Code § 25120*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Regulation of recapitalizations and reorganizations. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 260.140.60-260.140.63*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.418* and *515.419*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.421

§ 515.421 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Rescission for Damages for Sale of Securities in Violation of Condition Imposed by Commissioner of Corporations [Corp. Code § 25503] Respecting Qualification [Corp. Code § 25141]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Rescission for Damages for Sale of Securities in Violation of Condition Imposed by Commissioner of Corporations [Corp. Code § 25503] Respecting Qualification [Corp. Code § 25141]

That sale constituted a[n] _____ [issuer transaction *or* nonissuer transaction *or* issuer transaction in the form of a _____ (recapitalization *or* reorganization) in that _____ [*describe: for issuer transaction, see § 515.419, Paragraph 4; for nonissuer transaction, see § 515.420, Paragraph 4*]. At the time of that sale the Commissioner of Corporations had, and there remained in effect, certain conditions with respect to the offer and sale of those securities, that provided that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* those securities were not to be transferred without bearing a legend restricting their transferability, and were not to be transferred without the prior written consent of the commissioner]. A true copy of these conditions affecting the securities is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. However, defendant failed to comply with these conditions in the above-described sale in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the commissioner never reviewed or consented to the sale to plaintiff].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 4 of either of the complaints in Forms 18 or 19, as appropriate, to be used in an action for rescission or damages in the case of an issuer or nonissuer transaction, or of the complaint in § 515.420 to be used in an action for damages, for the violation of any condition of qualification or transfer of securities imposed by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 25503*]. For discussion of violation of the commissioner's conditions on qualification, see *§ 515.21[1]*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.418 -515.420*.

23 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.422

§ 515.422 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Qualification Violations--Security or Transaction Was Exempt From Qualification Requirements [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Qualification Violations--Security or Transaction Was Exempt From Qualification Requirements [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The _____ [security *if exempted under Corp. Code § 25100 or 25101 or Corp. Code § 25100* or *25101* transaction *if exempted under Corp. Code §§ 25102-25105 Corp. Code* §§ 25102-25105] here involved was exempt from all qualification requirements under Section _____ [*appropriate number, e.g.,* 25104(e)] of the Corporations Code in that _____ [*describe nature of security or transaction revealing character of exemption, e.g.,* defendant having received the security on _____ (*date*), from _____ (*name*) to secure a debt from such person of $_____ covered under a note of the same date, and such person having defaulted on the note at its maturity on _____ (*date*), defendant as a bona fide secured party sold the securities herein to plaintiff in the ordinary course of defendant's business in order to liquidate this bona fide debt].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for rescission or damages for the sale of a security in violation of qualification requirements [*see §§ 515.418 -515.420*], when the defendant contends that because of the nature of the securities or of the transaction involved, the sale was exempted from qualification requirements [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130*]. For a discussion of exemptions from qualification requirements, see *§ 515.14[5]*.

[3] State Statutes

Exempt issuer securities. *Corp. Code § 25100*

Exempt nonissuer securities. *Corp. Code § 25101*

Exempt issuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25102*

Exempt reorganizations and recapitalizations. *Corp. Code § 25103*

Exempt nonissuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25104*

Exempt transactions under commissioner's rule. *Corp. Code § 25105*

Exemption from qualification of issuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25110*

Exemption from qualification of issuer transaction in form of recapitalization or reorganization. *Corp. Code § 25120*

Exemption from qualification of nonissuer transactions. *Corp. Code § 25130*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Exemptions from qualification. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.100 et seq.*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.423

§ 515.423 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Security or Transaction Was Not Subject to Qualification [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Security or Transaction Was Not Subject to Qualification [Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The _____ [*if not subject to qualification under Corp. Code § 25100.1 or 25101.1:* security *or, if not subject to qualification under Corp. Code § 25102.1:* transaction] involved was not subject to qualification requirements pursuant to _____ [*state appropriate statute, e.g., Corporations Code Section 25100.1*] in that _____ [*describe nature of security or transaction meeting requirements of statutory provision, e.g.,* it was a covered security under the Securities Act of 1933].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for rescission or damages for the sale of a security in violation of qualification requirements [*see* Forms 18-20] when the defendant contends that because of the nature of the securities or the transaction involved, the sale was not subject to qualification [*see Corp. Code §§ 25110, 25120, 25130*]. For a discussion of securities and transactions not subject to qualification, see *§ 515.14[4]*.

[3] State Statutes

Securities not subject to qualification. *Corp. Code §§ 25100.1, 25101.1*

Transactions not subject to qualification. *Corp. Code § 25102.1*

[4] Federal Statutes

Federal preemption of state securities regulation. *15 U.S.C. § 77r*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.424

§ 515.424 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Qualification of Sale of Securities Prior to Payment Therefor [Corp. Code § 25503]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Qualification of Sale of Securities Prior to Payment Therefor [Corp. Code § 25503]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

On or about _____ [*date*], the offer and sale of the securities herein described in connection with the _____ [issuer transaction (in the form of a _____ (recapitalization *or* reorganization)) *or* nonissuer transaction] alleged in the complaint was qualified with the Commissioner of Corporations prior to payment by plaintiff or receipt by defendant from plaintiff of any part of the consideration of the securities sold.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in answer to a complaint for rescission or damages for the sale of a security in violation of qualification requirements [*see §§ 515.418 -515.420*] when the security was qualified prior to receipt of any part of the consideration even though an offer to sell or a contract for sale may have been made or entered into without qualification [*see Corp. Code § 25503*].

For a discussion of the defense, see *§ 515.21[6]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.425

§ 515.425 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Plaintiff in Position of Being Equally in the Wrong (in Pari Delicto) [Civ. Code § 3524] With Defendant

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Plaintiff in Position of Being Equally in the Wrong (in Pari Delicto) [Civ. Code § 3524] With Defendant

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Plaintiff was equally in the wrong (in pari delicto) with defendant in the [alleged] _____ [failure to qualify the securities transaction here involved *or* sale of securities here involved for which the qualification was without effectiveness] in that _____ [*describe plaintiff's acts, e.g.,* plaintiff, a sophisticated investor of many years, insisted defendant issue stock to him/her without attempting to qualify it and assured him/her that, in plaintiff's informed experience, qualification was unnecessary because the offering was in his/her opinion exempt under the law]. Under there circumstances plaintiff may not interpose the law between the parties to this transaction on the alleged point of failure to observe requirements of qualification of securities.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for violation of qualification requirements [*see §§ 515.418 -515.420*] where the defendant contends that the plaintiff was in the wrong equally with the defendant.

[3] Doctrine of In Pari Delicto

The defense that the plaintiff was in pari delicto (or equally in the wrong) with defendant in failing to qualify a particular security had been well established under the securities law as it existed prior to the Corporate Securities Law of 1968. The defense was not a statutory one and applied only when defendant had clearly established that plaintiff was as responsible as defendant for the violation [*see Wells v. Comstock (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 528, 531-532, 297 P.2d 961* ; *see also Smith v. Turner (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 141, 149-153, 47 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . It is unclear whether or not the

defense continues to apply in an action based on a violation of the qualification requirements under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968. However, there does not appear to have been any substantive change in the law preventing the raising of such a defense. The doctrine is a basic tenet of the common law and is incorporated in the maxim of jurisprudence that provides that the law does not interpose between those who are equally in the wrong [*see Civ. Code § 3524*; Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch.14, § 14.06[5]*; *see also Civ. Code §§ 3515-3517*].

[4] Decisions

Where plaintiff foreign bank tried to collect for losses under agreement whereby defendant underwriter agreed to bear them if plaintiff funded entire investment, which funding was in violation of federal requirements applicable to plaintiff as "broker" but not to defendant as "customer," there was no basis for exception to in pari delicto doctrine although plaintiff may otherwise have acted in good faith and defendant reprehensibly. *UFITEC, S.A., v. Carter (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 238, 250, 142 Cal. Rptr. 279, 571 P.2d 990*

[5] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities* , § 463.02

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, § 14.06*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.426

§ 515.426 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Approved Written Offer Was Sent to Rectify Violation [Corp. Code § 25507(b), (c)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Violation of Qualification Requirements--Approved Written Offer Was Sent to Rectify Violation [Corp. Code § 25507(b), (c)]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. Prior to commencement of the action herein, and on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff received from _____ [defendant *or name of other person who sent offer*] a written offer, the form of which was approved by the Commissioner of Corporations [and complied with all conditions required thereby].

2. This offer stated the manner in which liability may have arisen with regard to any alleged violation of *Section 25503 of the Corporations Code*. The writing offered to _____ [repurchase the securities for the cash price of $_____, payable on delivery of the security *or describe offer of rescission or damages*]. The writing specified the offer could be accepted by plaintiff at any time within a specified period of not less than 30 days after the date of receipt unless rejected earlier during that period by plaintiff. The writing set forth the provisions of *Section 25507(b) of the Corporations Code* and contained all other information required by the Commissioner of Corporations. A true copy of the written offer is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and made a part hereof.

3. Plaintiff failed to accept this offer within the specified period after receipt thereof.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in answer to a complaint for damages for the sale of a security in violation of qualification requirements or regulatory conditions pertaining to the security (or in violation of a condition imposed in connection with the suspension of trading) [*see §§ 515.418 -515.421*] where the defendant or others similarly situated have sent the plaintiff an officially approved form of written offer to rectify the violation which was not accepted in the prescribed time period [*see Corp. Code § 25507(b), (c)*]. For a discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.21[7]*.

[3] State Statutes

Offer to repurchase as defense to violation of qualification requirements or regulatory condition. *Corp. Code § 25507(b), (c)*

[4] Administrative Regulations and Releases

Form of application for approval of repurchase offer (including guidelines for offer). *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.507*

Repurchase offers. Commissioner of Corporations Release No. 36-C (Rev. 1975)

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.418*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.427

§ 515.427 Complaint for Indemnity [Corp. Code § 25505] for Willful Violation of Securities Law--By Corporation Against Controlling Personnel

[1] FORM Complaint for Indemnity [Corp. Code § 25505] for Willful Violation of Securities Law--By Corporation Against Controlling Personnel

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	INDEMNITY
_____ [*name*],	)	(Violation of Corporate
Defendant(s).	)	Securities Law)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of _____ [California, with its principal place of business in _____ County *or* the State of _____, authorized to transact and transacting business in the State of California with its principal office in this state in _____ County *or other residence of defendant corporation*].

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant(s). See § 515.400, Paragraph 1* .]

3. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2* .]

4. On _____ [*date*], defendant was _____ [the _____ (*specify a principal executive officer, e.g.,* president) *or* a director *or* a controlling person] of plaintiff corporation, in that _____ [he/she had been _____ (elected *or* appointed) to such position by _____ (the Board of Directors *or* the stockholders *or specify other*) on _____ (*date*), *or* he/she was _____ (*explain manner of control, e.g.,* the holder of 60 percent of the common stock of plaintiff)]. On the date first mentioned, defendant _____ [*describe violation of securities law, e.g.,* prepared a proxy statement to accompany the proposed reorganization of plaintiff through an exchange of all outstanding 6 percent cumulative preferred stock, which contained liquidation preference rights, for issue of a newly created Class B of common stock. A copy of that prospectus is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. The prospectus contained an untrue statement of a material fact in that it recited that the exchange was necessary or else a particular new proposed bank loan could not go through. In truth it was a matter in indifference to the bank whether or not the liquidation preference was removed. Plaintiff corporation then sold such securities in _____ (*specify locality*), California, on _____ (*date*)].

5. Defendant's acts as described above were willful and resulted in _____ [*specify nature of violation, e.g.,* the offer and sale of the securities of plaintiff corporation by means of a material misrepresentation].

6. On _____ [*date*], in an action entitled _____, filed in the _____ [*name*] Court, Action No. _____, judgment was rendered against plaintiff herein for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* selling such exchange securities by means of the false statement] in the prospectus alleged above. Plaintiff's liability is a direct result of defendant's unlawful acts. A copy of that judgment is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. [In addition, on _____ (*date*), plaintiff notified defendant by written notice of this action pending against it and therein requested defendant to take charge of the defense, which defendant refused to do. A copy of this request is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.]

7. As a result of such judgment, plaintiff has become immediately liable for the sum of $_____, consisting of _____ [*specify liability, e.g.,* $_____ in damages, $_____ as costs of that action, plus interest at the legal rate]. [In addition, the defense of this action cost plaintiff $_____ in attorney's fees.] For all such liability, plaintiff is entitled to indemnification from defendant.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For indemnification in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on this sum at the legal rate;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper[, including additional attorney's fees as described above when they become known].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used in an action for indemnification by a corporation which is liable under any provision of civil liability under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 against any of its principal executive officers, directors, or controlling persons whose willful violation of any provision of that law gave rise to plaintiff's liability [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

For further discussion, see Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.07[1]* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part [*see Corp. Code § 25505*]:

- The capacity of the plaintiff corporation (Paragraph 1).
- Defendant's identity as a principal executive officer, a director, or a controlling person and his or her wrongful act (Paragraph 4).
- The willfulness of defendant's act (Paragraph 5).
- Plaintiff's liability for defendant's wrongful act.
- The amount of plaintiff's liability (Paragraph 7) [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

[4] Indemnification of Corporation

A corporation found liable under any of the special civil actions featured in the preceding forms in this chapter has a statutory right of indemnification against any of its principal executive officers, directors, and controlling persons whose willful violation of provisions of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 gave rise to such liability [*Corp. Code § 25505*]. The statute specifies that the indemnification arises when the corporation is "liable" and that indemnification lies for willful acts giving rise to that "liability" [*see Corp. Code § 25505*]. It is not clear, however, to what extent this statutorily imposed obligation for indemnification automatically follows the law of contractual indemnification. Under the rules of contractual indemnification, an indemnification for "liability" (as against indemnification for claims or demands, damages, or costs), arises when the plaintiff is held liable for payments; the plaintiff need not first have made payment before seeking indemnification [*see Civ. Code § 2778(1), (2)*]. The person indemnifying also is obliged to defend on the plaintiff's request [*see Civ. Code § 2778(4)*].

It has been recognized in this state that even though liability arises from a statute, the liability at the same time may be contractual in nature. Contracts may be made or evidenced by a statute and by conduct ensuing thereon [*County of San Luis Obispo v. Gage (1903) 139 Cal. 398, 406, 73 P. 174]* . Thus, a person who is a principal executive officer, director, or controlling person and who willfully violates the securities law, which violation results in the corporation's liability, may be said to be in an implied contractual relationship of indemnitor to the corporation by statute. For a full discussion of the various obligations of an indemnitor for liability under an express or implied contract of indemnity, including entitlement to attorney's fees and other defense costs, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

[5] Statute of Limitations

An action to enforce any right of indemnification created by *Corp. Code § 25505* must be brought before the expiration

of one year after final judgment based on the liability for which the right of indemnification exists [*Corp. Code § 25508*].

[6] California Points and Authorities

For forms of memoranda of points and authorities relating to implied indemnity, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 115, *Indemnity and Contribution*

[7] Decisions

Federal securities law [Section 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*) and SEC *Rule 10b-5*] do not define right of contribution between persons liable or potentially liable as defendants in civil action; however, judicially created implied right of contribution approved. *Musick, Peeler v. Wausau Ins. (1993) 508 U.S. 286, 113 S. Ct. 2085, 124 L. Ed. 2d 194, 200, 202-205*

Right of contribution under federal securities law [Section 10(b) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (*15 U.S.C. § 78j(b)*) and SEC *Rule 10b-5*] is judicially created right requiring damages to be apportioned in accordance with defendants' relative culpability, rather than pro rata. *Smith v. Mulvaney (9th Cir. 1987) 827 F.2d 558, 560-561*

[8] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, § 463.07 (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, § 14.07* (Matthew Bender)

[9] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

For forms for complaints relating to implied indemnity, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.428

§ 515.428 Complaint for Contribution [Corp. Code § 25505] for Liability for Violation of Corporate Securities Law of 1968--By Adjudged Tortfeasor Against Unadjudged Joint Tortfeasor

[1] FORM Complaint for Contribution [Corp. Code § 25505] for Liability for Violation of Corporate Securities Law of 1968--By Adjudged Tortfeasor Against Unadjudged Joint Tortfeasor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	CONTRIBUTION
_____ [*name*],	)	(Violation of Corporate
Defendant(s).	)	Securities Law of 1968)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1* .]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2* .]

3. On _____ [*date*], defendant was _____ [*specify position related to liability, e.g.,* a broker-dealer acting jointly with plaintiff as underwriter of the _____ (*name*) Corporation's new offering of 6 percent debentures by virtue of an express agreement between the corporation and plaintiff and defendant

as its underwriters. A true copy of the agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference].

4. On _____ [that date *or specify other date*] plaintiff and defendant _____ [*describe violation of securities law, e.g.,* mutually prepared, disseminated, and circulated a "tipster" sheet containing information to the effect that the price of the debentures was about to rise rapidly because of the market operations of certain persons related to those underwriters conducted for the purpose of raising the price of the securities. These acts of plaintiff and defendant were committed willfully and unlawfully in _____ (*specify locality*), California, to induce purchases of such securities].

5. On _____ [*date*], in an action entitled _____, filed in the _____ [*name*] Court, Action No. _____, judgment was rendered against plaintiff herein for commission of the above acts. [A _____ (true *or* certified) copy of that judgment is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.] As a result of such judgment, plaintiff herein became liable for the entire judgment rendered in the sum of $_____, consisting of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* $_____ in damages, $_____ as costs of such action, plus interest at the legal rate].

6. Because defendant is similarly liable, plaintiff is entitled to contribution from defendant based on defendant's proportionate share of the adjudged total liability in the above-described action. This liability amounts to _____ [*proportion, e.g.,* one-half] of plaintiff's liability, or the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For contribution in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on this sum at the legal rate;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for contribution by a person who has been adjudged liable for violation of the civil liability provisions of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 against another person similarly liable but who was not named in the previous action [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

All persons liable under the civil liability provisions of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 have a right of contribution against all other persons similarly liable, based on each person's proportionate share of the total liability [*Corp. Code § 25505*]. This complaint is a separate action for contribution [*see Corp. Code § 25508, discussed under § 515.433[5]*] available when defendant is alleged to be with plaintiff but was not named in the underlying action. If the parties are joint defendants, a motion for contribution should be made at the end of the original action when one defendant has overpaid his or her portion of the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 875*].

For further discussion, see Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, § 14.07[3]* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The act committed by plaintiff and defendant in violation of the securities law (Paragraph 4).
- The fact of plaintiff's liability for such act and the established amount thereof (Paragraph 5).
- The similar liability of defendant in a proportionate amount for which plaintiff is entitled to contribution (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

[4] Statute of Limitations

An action maintained to enforce any right of contribution created by *Corp. Code § 25505* must be brought before the expiration of one year after final judgment based on the liability for which the right of contribution exists [*Corp. Code § 25508*].

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

For forms for seeking contribution against joint tortfeasors by motion made at the end of an action against joint defendants, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.429

§ 515.429 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Defendant was Negligent Violator [Corp. Code § 25505]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Defendant was Negligent Violator [Corp. Code § 25505]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Plaintiff's violation of the securities law at issue herein, which gave rise to the liability for which plaintiff seeks contribution herein, was willful in nature in that _____ [*describe willfulness, e.g.,* plaintiff was a director of the _____ (*name of parent*) Corporation, the securities of which plaintiff and defendant had mutually arranged to sell to _____ (*name of subsidiary*) Corporation; and plaintiff knew that _____ (*name of parent*) Corporation wholly owned the beneficial interest of the outstanding common stock of _____ (*name of subsidiary*) Corporation, rendering the transaction contemplated, and then consummated, a "wash sale"]. Defendant's own violation of the securities law in the same instance, however, was merely negligent in that _____ [*describe negligence, e.g.,* he/she did not know, nor should have known, that the facts would give rise to the "wash sale" but, instead, reasonably relied on plaintiff, who initiated the illegal sale of the security interests in violation of the law].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for contribution based on the mutual liability of plaintiff and defendant for a violation of the securities law [*see § 515.427*], when defendant contends the plaintiff was a willful violator of the law whereas defendant was only guilty of a negligent breach [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

[3] Willful Violator as Having No Contribution Right Against Negligent Violator

No person whose willful violation of any provision of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 that has given rise to any liability has any right of contribution against any other person guilty merely of a negligent violation [*Corp. Code §*

25505].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.428*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.430

§ 515.430 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Principal Executive Officer, Director, or Contracting Person of Defendant Corporation [Corp. Code § 25505]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Contribution--Plaintiff Was Willful Violator of Securities Law and Principal Executive Officer, Director, or Contracting Person of Defendant Corporation [Corp. Code § 25505]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Plaintiff's violation of the securities law which gave rise to the liability for which he/she seeks contribution herein was willful in nature in that _____ [*describe willfulness, e.g.,* he/she had supplied all information to the attorneys who drafted defendant corporation's application for qualification of the securities herein, and knew he/she had failed to honestly supply on such form the information that he/she had been the subject of a recent investigation hearing before the Securities and Exchange Commission. Plaintiff knew that such omitted information was required on this form by the Commissioner of Corporations. By failing to draft the application properly, the effectiveness of the later qualification by notification of the securities here involved was suspended by the Commissioner just before the time of the transaction which constituted the violation herein of the securities law]. At the time of the willful acts plaintiff was _____ [a principal executive officer *or* a director *or* a controlling person] of defendant corporation [in that plaintiff _____ (*describe position, e.g.,* was the president *or* held 60 percent of the common stock *or other*) of the company].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for contribution based on the plaintiff's and defendant's mutual liability for a violation of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*see § 515.427*] where plaintiff's liability is willful and defendant is the corporation of which the plaintiff was a principal executive officer, a director, or a controlling member [*see Corp. Code § 25505*].

[3] Management's Inability to Demand Corporate Contribution

No principal executive officer, director, or controlling person of a corporation whose willful violation has given rise to any liability under the securities law may have any right of contribution against such corporation [*Corp. Code § 25505*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.428*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.431

§ 515.431 Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Acts Regarding Securities Conformed to Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 25700]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Defendant's Acts Regarding Securities Conformed to Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 25700]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The matters complained of herein and attributed to defendant as allegedly wrongful acts _____ [done *or* omitted] were _____ [performed *or* abstained from] in good faith by defendant in conformity with _____ [a rule *or* contents of a form *or* a permit *or if promulgated by Commissioner of Corporations,* an order *or if promulgated by Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General* a written interpretive opinion] of the _____ [Commissioner of Corporations *or* Attorney General] of the State of California, issued on _____ [*date*], entitled _____, and _____ [contained at _____ (*cite source*) *and/or* a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference]. That _____ [*specify issuance*] was to the effect that _____ [*describe portion to which defendant's behavior conformed*]. [This opinion had been requested by defendant on _____ (*date*), with respect to the matters herein involved and had been issued expressly for defendant's particular situation.]

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in the answer to any complaint seeking liability under the provisions of the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 when the defendant's acts or omissions conformed in good faith to an official issuance of the Commissioner of Corporations or the Attorney General [*see Corp. Code § 25700*]. For discussion of this defense, see *§ 515.29*.

[3] State Statutes

Nonliability for reliance on official issuance of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General. *Corp. Code § 25700*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.432

§ 515.432 Complaint in Interpleader [Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)] by Surety Against Claimants--On Security Issuer's Statutory Bond [Corp. Code § 25216(e)]

[1] FORM Complaint in Interpleader [Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)] by Surety Against Claimants--On Security Issuer's Statutory Bond [Corp. Code § 25216(e)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT IN INTERPLEADER
	)	[Amount demanded _____
_____ [*name*],	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times herein mentioned plaintiff _____ [*name of surety*] was, and now is, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ [*specify state*], authorized to engage and engaged in the surety insurance business in the State of California, with its principal place of business at _____ [*street address and if any, city*], _____ County, California.

2. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of

_____County, California, residing at _____ [*street address and if any, city*]; defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California, residing at _____ [*street address and if any, city*]; [*continue to allege any additional defendants claiming against the bond*].

[3. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by these fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously-named defendants has a claim on the bond herein described.]

4. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of principal*] was [*specify capacity if other than individual, e.g.*, a corporation duly organized under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ (*specify state*), and was] an issuer employing agents in California in connection with a _____ [security *or* transaction] qualified under Section _____ of the Corporations Code.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff, as surety, and _____ [*name of principal*], as principal, made, executed, and delivered to the California Commissioner of Corporations, an issuer's bond No. _____ in the amount of $10,000, conditioned as required by law, and particularly by the provisions of *Section 25216 of the Corporations Code* of the State of California. The bond was in effect from _____ [*date*], until _____ [*date*], when it was canceled.

6. By the provisions of the bond and of *Section 25216 of the Corporations Code*, the total aggregate liability of plaintiff, as surety, under the bond is limited to the sum of $10,000.

7. Each of the defendants asserts a claim against plaintiff on the bond for loss or damage claimed to have been suffered as a result of the wrongful acts of _____ [*name of principal*], as a securities issuer, during the period the bond was in effect and as a result of the failure of _____ [*name of principal*] to honestly and faithfully perform its obligations and undertakings under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968. These claims are as follows: _____ [*specify in separately lettered subparagraphs the name of each claimant together with the nature and amount of each claim*].

8. Plaintiff cannot ascertain _____ [the validity of the defendants' respective claims *or* what part, if any, of the amount of plaintiff's obligation should be paid to each defendant *or both if appropriate*]. By reason of these multiple and potentially conflicting claims, plaintiff is in doubt as to which of the defendants, if _____ [either *or* any], it should pay and how the total amount of plaintiff's liability on the bond should be equitably distributed _____ [between *or* among] the defendants if the total number of valid claims exceeds the total amount of plaintiff's obligation.

9. Because of defendants' claims, plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury, possibly will be subject to judgments in excess of its obligation under the bond, and will be subjected to a multiplicity of actions and extensive litigation unless the defendants are required to interplead in this action and are restrained from instituting any other proceedings against plaintiff.

[10. Plaintiff has, at the time of filing this complaint, deposited with the clerk of this Court the sum of $10,000, which is the amount of its obligation under the bond.]

11. Plaintiff has incurred an obligation to pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs in this action.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That defendants, and each of them, be ordered to interplead and litigate their respective claims against _____ [*name of principal*] and to the sums that plaintiff may be obligated to pay the defendants, or _____ [each *or* either] of them, under the bond;

2. That defendants, and each of them, be enjoined from instituting or prosecuting any action against plaintiff by reason of its issuer's bond furnished on behalf of _____ [*name of principal*], as principal, except to come into this action, and to set up their respective claims against said bond;

3. That [on delivering $10,000 to the clerk of this Court,] plaintiff be discharged from all liability to any of the defendants with respect to the bond;

4. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs, to be paid _____ [out of the sum heretofore deposited by plaintiff with the court clerk *or* subtracted from any amounts plaintiff may be required to pay on its obligation under the bond], as the Court may direct; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

CAUTION:

A complaint seeking a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunctive relief must either be verified or be accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 314, *Interpleader* , and Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a surety on a securities issuer's statutory bond to require all claimants on the bond to interplead in the action so that the liability of the surety on the bond can be adjudicated in one action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 386*; *Corp. Code § 25216(e)*]. The bond is required to be in the amount of $10,000 and to stipulate that the issuer will comply with the provisions of *Corp. Code § 25216* and with the rules and orders issued thereunder [*Corp. Code § 25216(e)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.216.15*].

Attorney's fees and costs may be allowed to the plaintiff in interpleader out of the amount in dispute that is deposited with the court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 386.6*].

[3] Asserting Interpleader by Cross Complaint

If the surety has been made a defendant in an action brought on one or more of the claims, the surety may file a cross complaint in interpleader. If counsel modifies this form for use as a cross complaint, the cross complaint must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)*; for further discussion of interpleader, and proceeding by cross complaint, see Ch.

314, *Interpleader*].

[4] Statute of Limitations

No suit may be maintained to enforce any liability on the bond unless brought within two years after the contract of sale or other act on which the suit is based [*Corp. Code § 25216(e)*].

[5] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 1);
- The residence of the defendants (Paragraph 3); the principal's capacity as a securities issuer (Paragraph 4);
- The execution, amount, and conditions of the bond (Paragraphs 5, 6);
- Breach of the condition of the bond and multiple claims in excess of the amount of plaintiff's liability on the bond (Paragraphs 7, 8) [*Corp. Code § 25216(e)*];
- The plaintiff's exposure to multiple judgments in excess of its liability (Paragraph 9) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)*]; and
- Incurrence of attorney's fees and costs in interpleading (Paragraph 11) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 386.6*].

The form also includes optional allegations to include fictitious defendants (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; for further discussion, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*] and to indicate that the amount of the liability on the bond has been deposited with the clerk of the court (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 386(c)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative allegations of defendant's capacity, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For discussion and additional forms relating to interpleader, see Ch. 314, *Interpleader*

[7] California Legal Forms

For a securities bond issued under *Corp. Code § 25216(e)* and *10* Cal. Code Reg. § 260.216.15(a), see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 6H, Qualification of Securities, § 6H.273* (Matthew Bender)

[8] State Statutes

Action in interpleader when amount of money involved does not exceed $25,000 is limited civil case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(2)*

Complaint in interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386(b)*

Effect of depositing funds at time of filing complaint in interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386(c)*

Order restraining parties to action from instituting or further prosecuting any other proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386(f)*

Allowance of costs and attorney's fees in action for interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386.6*

Recovery of costs and attorney's fees in interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386.6*

"Issuer" defined. *Corp. Code § 25010*

Bond on filing for security issuer's certificate. *Corp. Code § 25216(e)*

Statute of limitations on action on security issuer's bond. *Corp. Code § 25216(e)*

[9] State Administrative Regulations

Bond required to be in amount of $10,000. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 260.216.15*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.433

§ 515.433 Complaint for Damages Based on Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300]--By Purchaser Against Stockbroker--Failure to Deliver Some or All of Shares Purchased

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages Based on Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300]--By Purchaser Against Stockbroker--Failure to Deliver Some or All of Shares Purchased

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
[and DOES I through _____],	)	(Breach of Contract)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff purchased from defendant stockbroker _____ [*quantity*] shares of _____ [*issuer and type of stock, e.g.,* Acme Typewriter Co. Class A common] stock for the sum of $_____. On that day plaintiff paid defendant stockbroker that sum, and defendant receipted for the sum in writing and agreed in writing to deliver those shares to plaintiff.

3. Thereafter, defendant stockbroker _____ [failed to deliver to plaintiff any of the agreed-upon shares

or delivered to plaintiff only _____ (*number*) shares, and failed to deliver to plaintiff the balance of _____ (*number*) shares]. Defendant still refuses to deliver to plaintiff the [balance of] the agreed-on shares although demand has been made on defendant to deliver those shares to plaintiff. The reasonable market value of the [undelivered] shares on the date that defendant should have delivered them to plaintiff was $_____ per share, for a total value of $_____.

4. By reason of defendant's breach of his/her/its agreement with plaintiff, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For general damages in the sum of $_____.

2. For costs of suit herein incurred.

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used in an action by a purchaser of stock against a stockbroker for damages based on breach of contract when the broker has failed to deliver to the purchaser some or all of the shares purchased.

For forms to use in actions involving conversion of securities by stockbrokers, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

For an overview of the licensing, regulation, and basic duties of securities broker-dealers under California and federal law, see *§ 515.13[4][a]*. For detailed discussion of securities broker dealers, see Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 13, *Regulation of Agents, Broker-Dealers, and Investment Advisers* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Burden of Proof

The burden of proof of a contract for purchase of stock is on the plaintiff purchaser [*Bandoni v. Walston (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 178, 184-185, 179 P.2d 365]* .

[4] Statute of Frauds

A contract or modification of a contract for the sale or purchase of a security is enforceable whether or not there is a writing signed or a record authenticated by the party against whom enforcement is sought, even if the contract or modification is not capable of performance within one year of its making [*Com. Code § 8113* (effective January 1, 1997)].

[5] Statute of Limitations

The two-year statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* applies to actions against stockbrokers for their carelessness and negligence [*Twomey v. Mitchum, Jones & Templeton, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 690, 724, 69 Cal. Rptr. 222]* .

[6] Decisions

Complaint charging defendant with exercising dominion over property inconsistent with ownership of plaintiff sets forth good cause of action for conversion when no special demurrer for uncertainty is interposed. *Haigler v. Donnelly (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 674, 681, 117 P.2d 331*

Stockbroker, having executed customer's order for purchase of securities, was required to deliver securities to customer on receipt of his advances for prices and his commissions whenever he called for them; customer was entitled to have securities maintained in situation in which they were available for delivery to him on tender and demand. *Edwards v. Jenkins (1932) 214 Cal. 713, 720, 7 P.2d 702*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.434

§ 515.434 Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities or Damages--Unlicensed Broker-Dealer [Corp. Code § 25501.5]

[1] FORM Complaint for Rescission of Sale of Securities or Damages--Unlicensed Broker-Dealer [Corp. Code § 25501.5]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff, vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT FOR (RESCISSION *or* DAMAGES)
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded (exceeds *or* does not exceed)
	)	$10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1*.]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2*.]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] offered and sold to _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] a total of _____ [*number*] shares of _____ [*describe securities, e.g.,* the common stock of X Corporation] _____ [*describe consideration, e.g.,* at the price of $_____ per share for a total price of $_____].

4. At the time of sale and purchase, defendant was required to be licensed as a broker-dealer, but had not applied for and secured from the Commissioner of Corporations a certificate under *Corporations Code Section 25200* authorizing defendant to act in that capacity.
[*EITHER, in action for rescission of sale:*]

5. As a result of the above-described acts, defendant is liable to plaintiff, who is entitled to, and hereby does, rescind the above-described purchase. Plaintiff _____ [herewith tenders *or* will tender before entry of judgment] to defendant _____ [(*number*) shares of the above-described securities *or* $_____, the consideration paid for the security plus interest at the legal rate].
[*OR, if security is no longer owned:*]

5. As a result of the above-described acts, defendant is liable to plaintiff, who has been damaged in the sum of $_____.
[*CONTINUE with the following:*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:
[*EITHER, in action for rescission of sale:*]

1. _____, [$_____, the consideration paid for the security plus interest at the legal rate, less the amount of any income received on the security *or* The security plus the amount of any income received by defendant on the security].
[*OR, in action for damages by purchaser:*]

1. $_____, the difference between the price at which the security was bought plus interest at the legal rate from date of purchase, and the value of the security at the time it was disposed of by plaintiff plus amount of any income received on the security by plaintiff.
[*OR, in action for damages by seller:*]

1. $_____, the difference between the value of the security at the time of filing the complaint plus the amount of any income received by defendant on the security, and the price at which security was sold plus interest at the legal rate from date of sale.

2. Because defendant _____ [*name of unlicensed broker-dealer*] caused injury or damage to _____ [*name of plaintiff*] as a result of performing services for which a license is required under [*Corp. Code § 25210 et seq. or Corp. Code § 25230 et seq.*], plaintiff is entitled to treble damages as provided by *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1029.8*.

3. For costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees.

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use in an action for damages or rescission of a purchase or sale of securities made by a broker-dealer who was unlicensed at the time of that purchase or sale. It may be used by either a purchaser or seller.

The cause of action set forth in this form is authorized by *Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)*. For discussion of that section, see Broker-Dealer's Liability for Failure to Obtain License Before Sale, in the Introduction to this Part. For further coverage, see Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 14, *Civil Liabilities* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The purchase or sale by or to plaintiff of securities by defendant broker-dealer (Paragraph 3).

- The fact that defendant was required to be licensed but did not have a certificate in effect at the time of purchase or sale authorizing defendant to act in that capacity (Paragraph 4).

- If the securities are still owned, the fact that plaintiff rescinds the sale by proper tender of the securities or the consideration paid for the securities (Paragraph 5).

[4] Damages Recoverable

In addition to the damages recoverable under *Corp. Code § 25501.5(a)(2)-(5)*, as set forth in this form, the court in its discretion may award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to a prevailing plaintiff under that section [*Corp. Code § 25501.5(b)*]. Furthermore, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.8* provides that any unlicensed person who causes injury or damage to another person as a result of providing goods or performing services for which a license is required under *Corp. Code § 25210 et seq.* or *Corp. Code § 25230 et seq.* will be liable to the injured person for treble the amount of damages assessed in a civil action in any court having proper jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.8(a)*].

[5] State Statutes

Certificate requirement for broker-dealer. *Corp. Code § 25210*

Action for rescission or damages against unlicensed broker-dealer. *Corp. Code § 25501.5*

Treble damages available. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.8*

[6] Text References

Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 21, *Corporate Securities* , § 466.05B. (Matthew Bender)

Marsh & Volk, Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 13, *Regulation of Agents, Broker-Dealers, and Investment Advisers* , Ch. 14, *Civil Liabilities* (Matthew Bender)

36 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Securities Regulation

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.435-515.449

[Reserved]

§§ 515.435[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.450

§ 515.450 Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Sale of Franchise [Corp. Code § 31300]--Failure to Register Franchise Offer [Corp. Code § 31110] or Properly Exercise Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]--By Franchisee Against Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Sale of Franchise [Corp. Code § 31300]--Failure to Register Franchise Offer [Corp. Code § 31110] or Properly Exercise Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]--By Franchisee Against Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[RESCISSION *or*
Plaintiff,	)	DAMAGES]
vs.	)	(Failure to _____
_____ [*name* (*s*)],	)	[Register Franchise *or*
Defendant(s).	)	Properly Exercise
	)	Exemption Privilege])
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Failure to _____ [Register *or* Secure Exemption])

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____, California, defendant offered [and sold] to plaintiff a franchise for _____ [*name of franchise business*], of which defendant was the _____ [franchisor *or, if purchased from one holding an area franchise,* subfranchisor (for the area of _____) *or* previous franchisee making the offer (and sale) on the account of _____ (*name of franchisor or subfranchisor*), the _____ (franchisor *or* subfranchisor)] for a fee of $_____. By the terms of the franchise agreement, plaintiff was given the right to engage in the business of _____ [offering *or* selling *or* distributing] _____ [*specify goods or services involved*] under a marketing plan or system prescribed in substantial part by defendant [_____ (on account of *or* in the name of *or* on behalf of) _____ (*name of franchisor*), the franchisor], whereby the operation of plaintiff's business pursuant to that plan or system would be substantially associated with the _____ [trademark *or other commercial symbol*] designated by _____ [defendant *or* the franchisor (or its affiliate)]. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.
[EITHER, *if defendant failed to register franchise:*]

4. Defendant [willfully] failed to register the franchise offer with the Commissioner of Corporations at the time of the offer [and sale] to plaintiff [, and it has not been registered at any time prior to the filing of this complaint].
[OR, *if defendant failed to comply with seasonal Franchiser exemption requirements*]

4. At the time of the offer [and sale] of the franchise to plaintiff, defendant [willfully] had not complied properly with the exemption from registration of franchises applicable to large, seasoned franchisors in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant (willfully) did not disclose to plaintiff in writing at least 48 hours prior to plaintiff's execution of a binding franchise agreement the information required by *Section 31101(c) of the Corporations Code*]; nor was defendant's franchise offering registered at that time [, or at any time subsequent thereto].

5. [*If rescission is requested, allege* Plaintiff herewith tenders to defendant all materials constituting the grant of the franchise, consisting of _____ (*describe papers, e.g.,* an agreement entitled Franchise Agreement attached to this complaint as Exhibit A), and on which defendant has to date received $_____ as net profit].

6. [*If damages are requested, allege* Defendant's violation of the requirements of the Franchise Investment Law as described above proximately caused plaintiff damages in that _____ (*describe damages*)].
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability of Defendant _____[*name*]

7. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

8. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege appropriate capacity and residence of joint defendant as shown in see § 515.400, Paragraph 1*] and was, at the time of the acts alleged herein, _____ [*select one of the following:*]
[*EITHER*]

a person who, directly or indirectly, controlled _____ [*name of primary defendant*] in that _____ [*describe control, e.g.,* he/she held the largest single block of stock of that company,

consisting of _____ percent of the common stock].
[*OR*]

a principal member of management of _____ [*name of primary defendant*] in that _____ [*position, e.g.,* he/she was a partner in such firm *or* president *or other principal executive officer or* a director of that corporation *or* _____ (*a person occupying a similar status to, or performing similar functions of, the foregoing*) of that organization].
[*OR*]

an employee of _____ [*name of primary defendant*], who materially aided in the act or transaction constituting the violation hereinabove complained of, in that such defendant _____ [*describe act, e.g.,* insisted on, and caused, the continuing sale of franchises during the time he/she was aware the Commissioner of Corporations had issued a hearing under the stop order on the sale hereinabove described].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s)[, and each of them,] as follows:

1. [*If for rescission, add* For rescission of the franchise agreement and restitution of the sum of $_____, which represents the fee paid to defendant as consideration for the franchise, with interest thereon at the legal rate, less the sum of $_____ received by plaintiff as net profit on that franchise];

2. [*If for damages, add* For $_____ as damages, with interest at the legal rate];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for rescission or damages, or both, against a defendant who has offered or sold a franchise in violation of the provisions of the seasoned franchisor exemption [*see Corp. Code § 31101*] or the registration requirement [*see Corp. Code §§ 31110, 31300*]. For an allegation that may be incorporated in the foregoing form to allege a material misrepresentation in registration filings or disclosure materials required to be submitted in obtaining the seasoned franchisor exemption or in requesting approval of the franchise offer, *see § 515.451*.

For discussion of liability for violation of the requirement to properly secure a seasoned franchisor's exemption from registration or for violation of the requirement to register a franchise, see *§ 515.59*.

The second cause of action identifies particular defendants as being either management principals of the defendant or personnel of the defendant who materially aided in the violation alleged in the First Cause of Action, and who, therefore, are jointly and severally liable with the defendant franchise-offeror [*see Corp. Code § 31302*]. For discussion of such liability, see *§ 515.61*.

[3] Allegations

The First Cause of Action in the complaint alleges:

- The capacity and residence of the defendant (Paragraph 1).
- Fictitious names, if any, of defendants (Paragraph 2).
- The offer and sale of the franchise (Paragraph 3).
- The failure to either register the franchise offering or properly employ the procedures for the seasoned franchisor exemption (if rescission is re quested, the willfulness of the action should be alleged) (Paragraph 4).
- If rescission is requested, the tender of the franchise, with an accounting of income earned to date (Paragraph 5).
- If damages are requested either in lieu of or in addition to rescission, the damages proximately caused (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 31300*].

The second cause of action alleges that the named defendant was a management principal of the defendant or one of defendant's personnel who materially aided in the violation, thus subjecting such defendant to joint and several liability with the defendant in the first cause of action [*see Corp. Code § 31302*].

[4] State Statutes

Seasoned franchisor exemption from registration. *Corp. Code § 31101*

Registration requirements for franchises. *Corp. Code § 31110*

Rescission or damages for registration or exemption violations or misrepresentation in connection therewith. *Corp. Code § 31300*

Joint and several liability of management principals and materially aiding personnel. *Corp. Code § 31302*

Statute of limitations on registration and related misrepresentation violations. *Corp. Code § 31303*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Registration and exemptions from registration of offers and sales of franchises. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.002 et seq.*

[6] Decisions

"Willful" as used in *Corp. Code § 31300* refers to act that is committed knowingly and intentionally; no showing of intent to violate law, evil motive, or purpose to gain undue advantage is required; good faith or reasonable care are not defenses to "willfulness" of violations of *Corp. Code §§ 31101, 31110,* and *31119.* *Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172-173*

If offer or sale of franchise is made in California, choice of some other law in franchise agreement does not defeat franchisee's right to rescission. *Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 171* (applying

California law)

Proof that principal knew that business was franchise, and referred to it as franchise, and that attorney had advised against franchising because of amount of paperwork required was sufficient to establish that failure to register was willful violation. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1244-1245, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Sale for fee, without registration, of business substantially associated with seller's commercial symbol, which seller represents will constitute franchise and include marketing plan or system to be prescribed in substantial part by seller, was unlawful sale of unregistered franchise. *People v. Kline (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 587, 595, 168 Cal. Rptr. 185*

[7] Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Investment Franchise Law, §§ 40.05 -40.13, 40.17* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 9, *Corporations*, § 286 (9th ed. 1989)

[8] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.400, 515.451*, and 52.

For forms relating to rescission generally, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.451

§ 515.451 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Franchisor's Material Misrepresentation in Registration Application [Corp. Code § 31200] or Seasoned Franchisor Exemption Disclosure [Corp. Code § 31202]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Franchisor's Material Misrepresentation in Registration Application [Corp. Code § 31200] or Seasoned Franchisor Exemption Disclosure [Corp. Code § 31202]

1. Defendant made the sale by _____ [registering the franchise offer with the Commissioner of Corporations *or* exercising of the seasoned franchisor exemption from formal registration of the franchise offer with the Commissioner of Corporations]. In so doing, defendant _____ [*if registration involved* filed a _____ (notice *or* report) as part of an application for registration *or, if exemption is involved* provided defendant with a written disclosure in the form of _____ (*describe, e.g.,* an offering brochure)], in which defendant willfully _____ [made an untrue statement of a material fact *or* omitted to state a material fact required to be stated therein]. The material fact, as it should have been stated, was that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* any franchise could be terminated by _____ (*year*) if at least 50 franchises were not in operation at that time]; whereas defendant, by its _____ [statement *or* omission] [appearing at page _____] _____ [*describe effect of fraudulent disclosure, e.g.,* made it appear that termination of any franchise was not dependent on the number of other franchises in operation at any time]. A true copy of defendant's _____ [application _____ (including the notice in issue *or* including the report in issue) *or* written disclosure to defendant] is attached as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 4 of § 515.450 (complaint for rescission or damages arising out of sale of a franchise) if the violation consisted of a willful act of material misrepresentation made in filings with the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 31200*] or in written disclosures made in connection with processing of the seasoned franchisor exemption [*see Corp. Code §§ 31202, 31300*].

For a discussion of liability for misrepresentation in filings with the commissioner or in securing an exemption, see the discussion in *§ 515.59*.

[3] State Statutes

Misrepresentation in franchise filings with Commissioner of Corporations. *Corp. Code § 31200*

Misrepresentation in processing seasoned franchisor exemption. *Corp. Code § 31202*

[4] Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Franchise Investment Law, § 40.16[1]* (Matthew Bender)

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.450*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.452

§ 515.452 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Materially Changed Offering of Which Commissioner of Corporations Was Not Notified [Corp. Code §§ 31123, 31200]

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Rescission or Damages Arising Out of Sale of Franchise--Materially Changed Offering of Which Commissioner of Corporations Was Not Notified [Corp. Code §§ 31123, 31200]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant registered the offering of such franchise[, which was thereafter _____ (amended *or* renewed) on _____ (*date*),] with the Commissioner of Corporations. However, subsequent to the registration [and subsequent processing as described above], and prior to and during the time of the offer and sale of the franchise to plaintiff, there was a material change in the information contained in the registration filing as originally _____ [submitted *or* amended *or* renewed], in that _____ [*describe material change, e.g.,* the franchise agreements no longer contained exclusive rights within the counties in which they were located], whereas [in the latest filing on record,] in the registered offering at the time of the sale _____ [*describe matter before change, e.g.,* these exclusive county franchises were granted as a matter of course to each purchasing franchisee]. Nevertheless, at the time of the change and until the time of sale to plaintiff [and the date of this complaint], defendant [willfully] failed to give notification of such material change to the Commissioner of Corporations, as required by law, in an application to amend the registration.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 4 of § 515.450 when a franchisee seeks rescission or damages for sale of a franchise on the ground that a material change in the nature of a registered offering was made of which the Commissioner of Corporations was not properly notified [*see Corp. Code § 31200*; *see also § 515.53[4]*].

Corp. Code § 31200 provides that "[i]t is unlawful for any person willfully to make any untrue statement of a material fact in any application, notice or report filed with the commissioner under [The Franchise Investment Law], or willfully to omit to state in any such application, notice, or report any material fact which is required to be stated therein, or fail

to notify the commissioner of any material change as required by [*Corp. Code § 31123*]." In declaring illegal the failure to notify the commissioner of a material change in a registered offering, the Legislature appears to have inadvertently omitted the word "to," and it may have inadvertently omitted the word "willfully." Since it is not otherwise clear that the Legislature intended to distinguish between the first two types of proscribed activities in *Corp. Code § 31200* (willfully making an untrue statement of material fact and willfully omitting material fact) from a failure to notify the commissioner of a material change, the better practice appears to be to plead the willfulness of the failure to notify.

For a discussion of this type of offense as constituting liability for registration violations, see *§ 515.59*.

[3] Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration Under the California Franchise Investment Law, § 40.14* (Matthew Bender)

[4] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.450* and *515.451*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.453

§ 515.453 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Failure to Register Franchise--Offer Was Exempt From Registration by Virtue of Proper Exercise of Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Failure to Register Franchise--Offer Was Exempt From Registration by Virtue of Proper Exercise of Seasoned Franchisor Exemption [Corp. Code § 31101]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The franchise offer involved here was exempt from all registration requirements under the Franchise Investment Law; and defendant qualified the offer and sale for the exemption allowed by *Section 31101 of the Corporations Code*in the following manner:

(a) At the time of the offer, defendant satisfied the net worth requirement of Paragraph (a) of *Section 31101 of the Corporations Code*because _____ [*describe how net worth qualification was met, e.g.,* defendant's net worth, as shown on its audited financial statement for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1990, was $12,546,000]. That financial statement is part of Exhibit "A" attached and incorporated by reference;

(b) At the time of the offer, defendant satisfied the experience requirement of Paragraph (b) of *Section 31101 of the Corporations Code* because _____ [*describe how experience qualification was met, e.g.,* defendant has had over 300 franchisees continuously since 1971];

(c) Defendant satisfied the disclosure requirements of Paragraph (c) of *Section 31101 of the Corporations Code* by delivering to plaintiff on or about _____ [*date*], which was more than 10 business days prior to the execution by plaintiff of any binding franchise or other agreement and more than 10 business days prior to the receipt by defendant of any consideration paid by plaintiff, a written _____ [*describe, e.g.,* offering circular], a true copy of which is attached, marked exhibit "A" and incorporated by reference, containing all the information required to be disclosed; and

(d) Prior to the offer and sale defendant satisfied requirement of Paragraph (d) of *Section 31101 of the Corporations Code* by filing Notice of Exemption Under *Section 31101 Corporations Code* with the Department of Corporations and paying the related fee. A true copy of that notice [and receipt] is attached, marked as Exhibit "B" and incorporated by reference.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on the failure to register a franchise offer [*see § 515.450*] when the defendant has complied with the requirements for exemption from registration set out for seasoned franchisors [*see Corp. Code § 31101*; *see § 515.54[1]*].

This defense would not be required in an answer to a complaint for rescission or damages based on the franchisor's failure to follow the seasoned franchisor exemption requirements (also included in *see § 515.450*). In that situation, denial of the allegation alleging the particular failure to qualify for the exemption [*see, e.g., § 515.450*, second alternative Paragraph 4] would be sufficient.

[3] Administrative Regulation

Form for notice of exemption under *Corp. Code § 31101*; instructions for filing. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.101*

Form for offering circular. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.114.1*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.450*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.454

§ 515.454 Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Rescission or Damages Based on Failure to Register Franchise--Franchise Offer Was Exempt From Registration Because Franchise Was Sold by Franchisee or Subfranchisor for Own Account [Corp. Code § 31102]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Complaint for Rescission or Damages Based on Failure to Register Franchise--Franchise Offer Was Exempt From Registration Because Franchise Was Sold by Franchisee or Subfranchisor for Own Account [Corp. Code § 31102]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The [area] franchise offer that is the subject of plaintiff's complaint herein was exempt from all registration requirements under the Franchise Investment Law in that the sale was for _____ [a franchise *or* an entire area franchise] of which defendant was the previous _____ [franchisee *or, if area franchise,* subfranchisor]. The sale was made strictly for defendant's own account, and was not effected in any way by or through the franchisor [, notwithstanding the fact that the franchisor had or exercised any right to approve or disapprove the particular transferee].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on the franchisor's failure to register a franchise offer [*see § 515.450*] when the defendant was a franchisee reselling a franchise, or a subfranchisor reselling a subfranchise, for his or her own account [*see Corp. Code § 31102* and discussion in *§ 515.54[3]*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.450*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.455

§ 515.455 Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 31301]--Purchase of Franchise Based on Reliance on Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 31201]--By Franchisee Against Seller

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Corp. Code § 31301]--Purchase of Franchise Based on Reliance on Material Misrepresentation [Corp. Code § 31201]--By Franchisee Against Seller

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR
Plaintiff,	)	DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Purchase of Franchise
_____ [*name*],	)	Based on Reliance on
Defendant.	)	Material
	)	Misrepresentation)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Material Misrepresentation)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Sale to plaintiff by defendant of particular franchise. See § 515.450, First Cause of Action, Paragraph 3.*]

4. Such offer and sale by defendant to plaintiff was made by means of a[n] _____ [written *or* oral] communication in the form of _____ [*describe form, e.g.,* an offering prospectus, *that is, form must be other than an application, notice, or report filed with the commissioner*] which _____ [included an untrue statement of a material fact *or* omitted to state a material fact necessary in order to make the statements made in such communication, in the light of the circumstances under which they were made, not misleading]. The communication [at page _____] recited that _____ [*restate or quote, e.g.,* the franchisee could learn the business quickly while on the job]. The communication _____ [was untrue in that *or* omitted to state that] _____ [*state true material fact, e.g.,* the franchisee must, in order to learn the business, spend up to six months in training at the franchisor's master business in _____ (*city*), and hire one of the franchisor's special managers at a salary of $_____ to run plaintiff's franchise during that six months]. [A true copy of this communication is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

5. Plaintiff _____ [read *or* heard] this communication prior to the time of sale and purchased such franchise in direct reliance on the statements therein. Plaintiff, at the time of purchase, did not know and had no cause to believe that the statement in question in such communication was false or misleading.

6. As a result of defendant's material misrepresentation described above, plaintiff has sustained damages in the amount of $_____, consisting of _____ [*describe damages, e.g.,* the salary plaintiff was obligated to pay franchisor's manager during plaintiff's training period in _____ (*city*) while his/her franchise was operated in this county, plus plaintiff's living expenses of $_____ during such stay in _____ (*city*), consisting of _____ (*specify*)].

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Joint and Several Liability)

7. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

8. [*Joint and several liability of principal of defendant named in First Cause of Action or materially aiding employee. See § 515.450, Second Cause of Action, Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) [, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest thereon at the legal rate;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for damages caused a franchisee in purchasing a franchise in reliance on a material misrepresentation of the seller [*see Corp. Code § 31201*]. For a discussion of this form of liability, see *§ 515.60*.

The Second Cause of Action is for joint and several liability of management principals of the defendant or personnel of the defendant who materially aided in the violation described in the first cause of action [*see Corp. Code § 31302*].

[3] Allegations

The first cause of action in this complaint alleges, in part, the following:

- The selling of a franchise by means of a material misrepresentation (Paragraph 4) [*see Corp. Code § 31201*].

- Plaintiff's detrimental reliance on the misrepresentation and lack of knowledge that the representation was false or misleading (Paragraph 5).

- Resulting damages to plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*see Corp. Code § 31301*]

The Second Cause of Action alleges that the named defendant was a management principal of defendant or one of its personnel who materially aided in the violation, thus rendering that defendant jointly and severally liable for the offense described in the First Cause of Action [*see Corp. Code § 31302*].

Anyone who violates *Corp. Code § 31201* by making a material misrepresentation is liable in damages to anyone who does not know or have cause to believe that the statement made was false or misleading and who, while relying on the statement, purchased a franchise [*Corp. Code § 31301*]. Since the liability of any violator of *Corp. Code § 31201* is thus contingent on an aggrieved person's not knowing or having cause to believe that the misrepresentation was false or misleading, it appears that plaintiff should allege and prove such a lack of knowledge (*see* Paragraph 5). However, the Franchise Investment Law also provides that as an affirmative defense to the plaintiff's cause of action, defendant may prove that the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untruth or omission [*see Corp. Code § 31301*; *see § 515.456*]. This affirmative defense evidently should be used if the defendant seeks to introduce evidence to show that the plaintiff actually knew what the true facts were. This defense would not have to be alleged if defendant seeks to introduce evidence to show only that plaintiff did not believe the misrepresentation since a denial of the allegation would seem to be sufficient.

[4] State Statutes

Misrepresentation in offers and sales of franchises. *Corp. Code § 31201*

Liability for misrepresentation in offers and sales. *Corp. Code § 31301*

Statute of limitations for misrepresentation in offers and sales. *Corp. Code § 31303*

[5] Decisions

Proof that principal materially aided act that was violation (failure to register) and knew that business was franchise, referred to it as franchise, and knew that attorney had advised regarding requirements of franchising was sufficient to impose personal liability. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1247, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Cause of action for legal malpractice was stated by franchisees against attorneys who prepared false or misleading prospectus, knowing it would be shown to prospective franchisees and used to induce them to purchase franchises. *Courtney v. Waring (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1443-1444, 237 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Plaintiff not required to sue literal seller in order to establish liability of management and aiding personnel under *Corp. Code § 31302*; plaintiff only required to establish that seller could have been liable under *Corp. Code § 31201* and *31301*. *Courtney v. Waring (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1434, 1441-1442, 237 Cal. Rptr. 233* (literal seller was bankrupt and had been dismissed from action)

[6] Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Investment Franchise Law, § 40.16[1]* (Matthew Bender)

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.450*

For forms relating generally to an action for rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.456

§ 515.456 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 41.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff Knew of Facts Concerning Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 41.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Plaintiff Knew of Facts Concerning Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Plaintiff knew the facts concerning the alleged _____ [untruth *or* omission] ascribed to defendant's _____ [registration filings *or* disclosure materials *or* communication] in connection with the sale of the described franchise to plaintiff, in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* prior to accepting the franchise offer plaintiff had been reliably informed of defendant's training program for franchisees, including the fact that new franchisees are required to train for a six-month period during which a special manager would conduct the franchisee's business for the fees alleged in plaintiff's complaint].

CAUTION:

A federal court in affirming a judgment for rescission and damages has interpreted *Corp. Code § 31300* to mean that the defenses enumerated in that section are not available in the case of violations of *Corp. Code § 31101, 31110,* or *31119,* but only in the case of violations of *Corp. Code § 31200* or *31202* [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172* ; *see* discussion in *§ 515.457*].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages or for rescission of a franchise agreement based on a material misrepresentation made in a franchise registration filing or a required seasoned franchisor exemption disclosure [*see §§ 515.450, 515.451*] or in connection with the sale of a franchise [*see § 515.455*] when the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untrue representation or omission [*see Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301*]. For

discussions of this defense, see *§§ 515.59[3]* and *515.60[3]*.

[3] Defense of Plaintiff's Knowledge as to Misrepresented Facts

The defendant is not liable for a material misrepresentation made in any filings with the commissioner, in disclosures required for obtaining a seasoned franchisor exemption, or in offers and sales of franchises, if he or she is able to prove that the plaintiff knew the facts concerning the untruth or omission [*Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301*]. It appears that this defense should be raised in the answer as new matter, since denial of an allegation in the complaint that the plaintiff did not know the representation was false is not sufficient to show that plaintiff knew what the true facts were.

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.455*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.457

§ 515.457 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Material Misrepresentation--Defendant's Exercise of Care as to, and Lack of Knowledge of, Misrepresentation [Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301]
[*EITHER*]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Defendant exercised reasonable care with respect to the making of the statements described in plaintiff's complaint concerning the _____ [registration filings *or* disclosure materials *or* offer and sale to plaintiff of the franchise], in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* defendant cross checked the information behind the representations from diverse sources that should have known the facts independently of one another]. As a result, defendant did not know of the alleged _____ [untruth *or* omission].

If the defendant had exercised reasonable care with respect to the making of the statements described in the complaint in connection with the _____ [registration filings *or* disclosure materials *or* offer and sale to plaintiff of the franchise], defendant would not have known of the alleged _____ [untruth *or* omission] because _____ [*explain, e.g.,* the error in accounting originated with the independent accounting firm that drafted the financial statements for the franchisor in this matter, and was it carried forward from several years before in the accounting firm's annual reporting, so that no one could have discovered the inaccuracy from the financial information itself].

CAUTION:
A federal court in affirming a judgment for rescission and damages has interpreted *Corp. Code § 31300* to mean that the "reasonable care defense" or defendant's lack of knowledge is not available in the case

of violations of *Corp. Code § 31101*, *31110*, or *31119*, but that this defense is limited to violations of *Corp. Code § 31200* or *31202* [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172]* .

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on a material misrepresentation made in a franchise registration filing or a required seasoned franchisor exemption disclosure [*see §§ 515.450, 515.451*] or in connection with the sale of a franchise [*see § 515.455*] when the defendant in the exercise of reasonable care did not know, or would not have known, of the untruth or omission [*see Corp. Code §§ 31300, 31301*]. For discussions of this defense, see *§§ 515.59[4]* and *515.60[3]*.

The specific violations involved in the case referred to in the CAUTION, *above* [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172]* , were:

- The franchisor's failure to register the offering.

- Failure to file a notice of exemption.

- Failure to disclose certain actions against it and its principals, some of which were specifically required by *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.114.1* to be disclosed.

- Failure of the disclosure to contain certain financial information required by *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 310.111.2*.

Defendant's argument focused on whether its conduct was willful within the meaning of *Corp. Code § 31300*. The court's statement that the defenses enumerated in *Corp. Code § 31300* are only available in cases involving violations of *Corp. Code §§ 31200* and *31202* was made in the context of reasoning that a willful violation did not require a finding that defendant knew it was violating the law. The fact that it knew that it had not registered or filed a notice of exemption and the fact that it knew what it did not disclose were sufficient [*Dollar Systems v. Avcar Leasing Systems (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 165, 172]* . Thus, the defense provided by this form may not be available to the extent that the material misrepresentations involve the failure to disclose items required to be disclosed by *Corp. Code §§ 31101* or *31119* or related regulations.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.455*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.458

§ 515.458 Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Improper Offer and Sale of Area Franchise--By Subfranchisor Against Seller

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Improper Offer and Sale of Area Franchise--By Subfranchisor Against Seller

On or about _____ [*date*], defendant offered and sold an area franchise to plaintiff for _____ [*name of franchise business*], of which defendant was the _____ [franchisor *or* previous subfranchisor *or describe licensed status of seller*] for a consideration of $_____. Defendant thereby granted to plaintiff the right as a subfranchisor to sell or negotiate the sale of franchises of the defendant _____ [in the name *or* on behalf] of _____ [the defendant *or other*] as franchisor [in the area of _____ (*describe geographical area*)]. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the complaint for rescission or damages for violation of franchise regulations or seasoned franchisor exemption requirements [*see § 515.450*; *see also §§ 515.451, 515.452*] or for damages suffered when a franchise is purchased based on material misrepresentation [*see § 515.455*], when the franchise being offered and sold was an area franchise and the plaintiff is the subfranchisor of the franchise [*see § 515.51[3]*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.450, 515.455*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.459

§ 515.459 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Rescission of Franchise Agreement or for Damages Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant Sent Approved Written Notice of Violation of Franchise Investment Law [Corp. Code §§ 31303, 31304]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Rescission of Franchise Agreement or for Damages Based on Registration Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant Sent Approved Written Notice of Violation of Franchise Investment Law [Corp. Code §§ 31303, 31304]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

More than 90 days prior to commencement of the action herein, and on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [defendant *or specify other party*] delivered to plaintiff a written notice disclosing the violation of the Franchise Investment Law complained of herein, stating in effect that _____ [*give substance of notice, e.g.,* defendant as franchisor had failed to register the franchise offering under which the sale of the franchise had been made to plaintiff through an improper attempt to exercise the seasoned franchisor exemption from registration]. The form of this notice had first been approved by the Commissioner of Corporations. A true copy of this notice is attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense based on a special statute of limitations may be used in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on a violation under the Franchise Investment Law pertaining to registration, failure to obtain a seasoned franchisor exemption, or to a misrepresentation in the offer or sale of a franchise. The defendant first must have delivered to the plaintiff an officially approved form of notice advising plaintiff of a violation of *Corp. Code §§ 31110* (registration requirement), 31200 (misrepresentation in filed documents), 31201 (misrepresentation in a franchise transaction), or 31202 (misrepresentation in required exemption disclosures), after which the plaintiff must have failed to bring the action within 90 days [*see Corp. Code §§ 31303, 31304*]. For discussions of the limitations on these particular kinds of actions, see *§§ 515.59[2]* and *515.60[2]*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 515.450, 515.455*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.460

§ 515.460 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration or Exemption Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant's Acts Regarding Franchise in Conformity With Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 31511]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Complaint for Damages or Rescission of Franchise Agreement Based on Registration or Exemption Violation or Misrepresentation--Defendant's Acts Regarding Franchise in Conformity With Written Opinion of Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General [Corp. Code § 31511]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

The matters complained of herein and attributed to defendant as wrongfully _____ [done *or* omitted] were _____ [performed *or* abstained from] in good faith by defendant in conformity with _____ [a rule *or* the contents of a form *or* a permit *or if promulgated by Commissioner of Corporations* an order *or promulgated by Commissioner of Corporations or Attorney General* a written interpretive opinion] of the _____ [Commissioner of Corporations *or* Attorney General] of the State of California, as issued on _____ [*date*], entitled _____, and _____ [contained at _____ (*cite source*) *or* a true copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 and incorporated by reference]. This _____ [*specify official issuance, e.g.,* order] was to the effect that _____ [*describe relevant portion*]. [The opinion had been requested by defendant on _____ [*date*], in respect to the matters herein involved and had been issued expressly for defendant's particular situation.]

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on any violation of the Franchise Investment Law when the defendant's acts or omissions conformed to the official

guidelines of the Commissioner of Corporations or the Attorney General [*see Corp. Code § 31511*].

[3] Reliance on Rule, Form, Order, or Opinion

There is no liability under the Franchise Investment Law for any act done or omitted in good-faith conformity with either (1) any rule, form, order, or written interpretive opinion of the Commissioner of Corporations or (2) any opinion of the Attorney General. Such reliance constitutes a defense even if the rule, form, order, or written interpretive opinion is later amended, rescinded, or determined by judicial or other authority to be invalid for any reason [*Corp. Code § 31511*]. Although *Corp. Code § 31511* includes "any opinion of the Attorney General," it is unlikely that an informal, oral opinion, such as an informal conversation with a deputy Attorney General, is sufficient.

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.461

§ 515.461 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Allegation of Joint and Several Liability for Franchise Investment Law Violation--Defendant Did Not Know or Believe in Existence of Violation [Corp. Code § 31302]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Allegation of Joint and Several Liability for Franchise Investment Law Violation--Defendant Did Not Know or Believe in Existence of Violation [Corp. Code § 31302]

AS A [(*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

Defendant _____ [*name of answering joint defendant*] had no _____ [knowledge *or* reasonable grounds to believe in the existence] of the facts alleged in the complaint, and therefore is not liable for any violation in the transaction between defendant _____ [*name of primary defendant*] and plaintiff by means of a _____ [material misrepresentation *or* sale to plaintiff of a franchise not appropriately processed before the Commissioner of Corporations] in that _____ [*explain lack of knowledge or grounds for reasonable belief*].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint for damages or rescission of a franchise agreement based on a violation of the Franchise Investment Law [*see §§ 515.450, 515.455,* Second Cause of Action] in which the defendant is alleged to be jointly and severally liable with the primary defendant but where the defendant had no knowledge or basis for belief in the facts behind the cause of action [*see Corp. Code § 31302*]. For a description of this defense, see *§ 515.61*.

[3] Decisions

Officer seeking to avoid personal liability on basis of no knowledge exception of *Corp. Code § 31302* has burden of proving it; when only evidence was that officer was present at time offer was made, imposition of personal liability was proper. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1247-1248, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

When violation of franchise law has been established by franchisees as to fraudulent sales of franchises without required registration and disclosure, burden of proof is on individual officers of franchisor to prove their exemption from liability through proof of their lack of knowledge of acts giving rise to liability. *Spahn v. Guild Industries Corp. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 143, 158, 156 Cal. Rptr. 375* ; *Eastwood v. Froehlich (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 523, 531, 131 Cal. Rptr. 577*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.462

§ 515.462 Complaint for Injunction or Damages for Interference With Right of Franchisee to Join Trade Association [Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM Complaint for Injunction or Damages for Interference With Right of Franchisee to Join Trade Association [Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	_____ [INJUNCTION
_____ [*name*],	)	*or* DAMAGES]
Defendant.	)	(Interference with Right
	)	of Franchisee to Join
	)	Trade Association)
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious names of defendants. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*If county of filing complaint is not residence of defendant, add* The franchise of plaintiff that is affected by the below-described violation of defendant does business in _____ County (*county in which complaint is*

filed)].

4. [*Sale to plaintiff by defendant of particular franchise. See § 515.450, First Cause of Action, Paragraph 3.*]

5. While the franchise agreement has remained in effect, defendant has _____ [prohibited the right of free association among the plaintiff and other franchisees of defendant for lawful purposes *or* _____ (restricted *or* inhibited) the right of plaintiff as franchisee to join a trade association], in that defendant _____ [*describe offense, e.g.,* through his/her various officers, agents, and employees has threatened to withhold all new supplies from plaintiff should plaintiff alone or with others attempt to form an association of franchisees for purposes of developing better business practices and a better bargaining position with defendant *or* issued by letter a statement of company policy forbidding the joining of trade associations, a true copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. Through various officers, agents, and employees of defendant's company, defendant has threatened to cancel the franchise if plaintiff violates that policy].

6. [*If plaintiff seeks preliminary injunctive relief, add* Plaintiff nevertheless _____ (is in the process of (forming and) joining *or* belongs to) a trade association of _____ (franchisees of the defendant company *or other prohibited association*) in direct opposition to the _____ (restrictions *or* inhibiting actions *or* prohibitions) of defendant, in that _____ (*describe, e.g.,* plaintiff has assisted in having incorporated a nonprofit association of those franchisees for the purposes of promoting better franchise business practices and dealings with defendant).

7. [Plaintiff has (or will have) suffered damages on account of defendant's above-described violation of plaintiff's rights of free association above-described including consulting of counsel and taking various legal and business steps to cope with defendant's repressive measures in that regard (including _____ (*describe, e.g.,* retaining attorneys to negotiate with defendant for free trade association of defendant's franchisees, and to organize and negotiate with various other franchisees)). _____ (These damages amount to $_____ *or* The exact amount of these damages cannot be ascertained at this time. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to state these damages when ascertained)].

8. Plaintiff has incurred reasonable attorney's fees in this matter in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a [preliminary and] permanent injunction prohibiting defendant during the entire period of the franchise with plaintiff, or in any renewal or continuation of any kind thereafter, through any officer, agent, or employee, from directly or indirectly interfering, restricting, inhibiting, or prohibiting in any way the right of plaintiff from entering into or remaining in free association with any trade association or other association for lawful purposes, and from taking any retaliatory action of any sort in franchise dealings with plaintiff;

2. [For damages incurred as a result of defendant's actions to prevent _____ (trade *or* lawful) association of plaintiff (in the amount of $_____)];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees [in the amount of $_____];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For any other and further relief that the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 515.400.*]

CAUTION:
If preliminary and permanent injunctions are sought, counsel should prepare the complaint either by filing affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) in support of the allegations in the complaint or by pleading evidentiary facts which would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1 ; San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* and verifying the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action by a franchisee to enjoin the franchisor from interfering with the franchisee's right to engage in any sort of trade association activity and to obtain damages for that interference [*see Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)*]. For a discussion of the franchisee's rights of association, see *§ 515.62*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part, the following:

- Facts showing that show that venue is in the county in which plaintiff's franchise is located when the county is not defendant's residence (Paragraph 3) [*see Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)*].

- Defendant's interference with the plaintiff's right to free association (Paragraph 5) [*see Corp. Code § 31220*].

- Plaintiff's present trade association activity, if preliminary relief is sought (Paragraph 6).

- Damages resulting from defendant's actions, if damages are sought (Paragraph 7).

- Reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 8) [*see Corp. Code § 31302.5(a)*].

[4] State Statutes

Injunctive relief generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*

Right of franchisees to join trade association or freely associate. *Corp. Code § 31220*

Liability for violation of franchisee's rights of association. *Corp. Code § 31302.5*

[5] Text References

Marsh & Volk, *Practice Under the California Securities Laws, Ch. 40, Registration of Franchises Under the California Investment Franchise Law, § 40.16[3]* (Matthew Bender)

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

For discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms relating to proper joinder of plaintiffs and class actions, see Ch. 395, *Parties*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
1. Offer And Sale Under The Franchise Investment Law

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.463-515.479

[Reserved]

§§ 515.463[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.480

§ 515.480 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Franchise Relations Act in Terminating or Not Renewing Franchise [Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Franchise Relations Act in Terminating or Not Renewing Franchise [Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR
Plaintiff,	)	DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Improper _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[Termination *or*
Defendant.	)	Nonrenewal] of Franchise)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*If franchise business was not operated in California, add:* Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, domiciled in and a resident of _____ County, California (*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*).

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1* .]

3. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2* .]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant as franchisor of _____ [*name of business*] granted to plaintiff a franchise to conduct business of such enterprise at _____ [*specify location in California if plaintiff not otherwise domiciled here*]. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff continuously conducted the business of the franchise from that time until the time of the event described herein [through (successive) renewal(s) of the franchise agreement].

5. On or about _____, [*date*], defendant _____ [terminated *or* refused to renew] the franchise and thereafter refused to supply and service plaintiff's business as called for under the franchise agreement [and ordered plaintiff off the premises leased to plaintiff under the franchise arrangement]. That _____[termination *or* nonrenewal] was improper under _____ Business and Professions Code Section in that _____ [*specify reasons; if termination, e.g.,* good cause did not exist for the termination *or* defendant failed to send plaintiff proper notice of termination, affording a reasonable opportunity to cure any cited default *or* no cause existed for immediate termination without opportunity to cure default *or if nonrenewal, e.g.,* defendant failed to provide plaintiff with proper notice 180 days prior to the intended nonrenewal of the franchise *or* no statutory ground existed which permitted defendant to refuse to renew the franchise].

6. In _____ [terminating *or* failing to renew] the franchise in accordance with the provisions of the Franchise Relations Act, *Business and Professions Code Sections 20000-20041*, defendant was obligated but failed to [properly] offer to repurchase from plaintiff the resalable current inventory of the franchise that met defendant's then present standards that was held for use or sale in plaintiff's business. The fair repurchase price of the inventory would have been $_____, representing _____ [the fair wholesale market value thereof *or* the price paid by plaintiff therefor], less the amount of $_____ as sums owing defendant or subsidiaries thereof by plaintiff.

7. In addition, plaintiff has suffered damages resulting from defendant's improper _____ [termination *or* nonrenewal] of the franchise by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* having to store the inventory and close down the business] in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action by a franchisee for the type of relief available under the Franchise Relations Act from a franchisor who improperly has terminated or failed to renew an existing franchise [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*]. For discussions of proper grounds and procedure for termination or nonrenewal of franchise, and a franchisor's obligations on failure to comply, see § 518.80 et seq.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part:

- Plaintiff's domicile in California (if franchise was not conducted here) (Paragraph 1) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20015*].

- The existence of the franchise contract (Paragraph 4).

- Improper termination or nonrenewal of the franchise by defendant (Paragraph 5).

- Defendant's failure to repurchase plaintiff's inventory, and the amount owing therefor (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*].

- Any consequential damages resulting from defendant's act (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 3300*].

[4] Remedy Under Franchise Relations Act

The Franchise Relations Act does not explicitly provide a form of civil liability to a franchisee if a franchisor violates the provisions of the act. Instead, the act merely provides that the failure of a franchisor to terminate [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20020*] or to fail to renew [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20025*] a franchise, other than in accordance with the legislative requirements, obligates the franchisor to make a prescribed type of repurchase offer to the franchisee [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*, discussed in *§ 515.87*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035* indirectly refers to this obligation as a "liability" on the franchisor's part since, as a limitation on the items required to be covered in the repurchase offer, the statute states that the franchisor "shall not be liable" for offering to buy certain personalized items of the franchisee. The act further provides that, except as expressly provided in the act, nothing in the legislation abrogates the right of a franchisee "to sue under any other law" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 20037*].

The repurchase of inventory is not the exclusive remedy for wrongful termination of a franchise pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*, and a franchisee can pursue its breach of contract claim against a franchisor for wrongful termination of a franchise agreement [*JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 178, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840* (complaint for termination of franchise without good cause sounds in contract, not tort, and therefore awards of compensatory and punitive damage for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage are impermissible)].

The Franchise Relations Act thus has given the franchisor two alternatives: either the franchisor complies with the provisions as to termination or nonrenewal of franchises or else the franchisor consequently is bound by the particular terms of a repurchase offer as imposed by statute. If the franchisor fails to make the binding offer, the franchisee should be able to sue for any damages resulting from the failure of the franchisor to make the statutory purchase offer.

[5] State Statutes

Liability to make repurchase offer for improper termination or nonrenewal of franchise. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*

[6] Decisions

Repurchase of inventory is not exclusive remedy for wrongful termination of franchise pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 20035*; plaintiff can pursue breach of contract claim against franchisor for wrongful termination of franchise agreement. *JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 178, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840*

Franchisor that wrongfully terminated franchise without good cause was liable to franchisee for breach of contract, not intentional interference with prospective economic advantage; essential nature of claim was breach of contract, which cannot be transmuted into tort liability by claim that breach interfered with franchisee's business. *JRS Prods., Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 183, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840*

Distributorship agreement is governed by *Com. Code § 2207(2)*, so that attorney's fee provisions in invoices between manufacturer and distributor are additional term of dealership agreement. *Boyd v. Oscar Fisher Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 368, 378-379, 258 Cal. Rptr. 473*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
2. Termination, Transfer, Or Nonrenewal Generally Under The Franchise Relations Act

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.481-515.499

[Reserved]

§§ 515.481[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.500

§ 515.500 Complaint for Treble Damages Based on Franchisor's Prohibiting Petroleum Products Franchisee to Deal With Outside Suppliers [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4]--Requiring Franchisee to Purchase Franchisor's Automotive Accessories [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM Complaint for Treble Damages Based on Franchisor's Prohibiting Petroleum Products Franchisee to Deal With Outside Suppliers [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4]--Requiring Franchisee to Purchase Franchisor's Automotive Accessories [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR
Plaintiff,	)	TREBLE DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Petroleum Products
_____ [*name*],	)	Franchisor's Prohibiting
Defendant.	)	Franchisee's Dealings with
	)	Outside Suppliers)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant petroleum _____ [refiner *or* distributor] as franchisor of _____ [*name of business or of petroleum products*] granted to plaintiff a franchise to become a gasoline dealer of defendant's business at _____ [*state location*]. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. [Plaintiff continuously has conducted that franchise business to the present time.]

4. During the existence of plaintiff's franchise, defendant has required plaintiff to purchase only those _____ [*describe automotive accessories, e.g.,* tires *or* batteries *or* motor oil] which are sold by defendant, in addition to the petroleum products defendant supplies plaintiff under the terms of the franchise agreement. Defendant has effected this requirement by _____ [*describe, e.g.,* including a provision in the franchise contract by which plaintiff is required to make purchases of such items exclusively from defendant, on penalty that the franchise will be terminated if the requirement is not complied with, a true copy of which provision is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference *or* refusing to supply plaintiff with any or all amounts of petroleum products unless plaintiff purchases prescribed amount of defendant's accessories and those of no other supplier].

5. Plaintiff has been injured in his/her business and property by reason of defendant's violation of law in requiring such tie-in automotive accessory purchases, in that _____ [*describe type of injury, e.g.,* plaintiff has been forced to comply with defendant's demands and carry only defendant's automotive accessories as described above and has been denied free access to cheaper competitive products, with consequent greater profits to plaintiff and greater savings to consumers, and a more available supply to meet consumer demand and the challenge of competition in this area *or specify individual injuries*]. The amount of those damages is _____ [$_____ *or* not ascertainable at this time but this complaint will be amended to state those damages when they become known], and for which injury plaintiff is entitled to three times the amount of those damages.

6. Plaintiff has incurred reasonable attorney's fees in this matter [in the amount of $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For treble the amount of damages found to be due to plaintiff in this matter [, or $_____];

2. For reasonable attorney's fees in the amount _____ [of $_____ *or* to be determined];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for treble damages against a petroleum products franchisor who has required the plaintiff franchisee to purchase the franchisor's automotive accessories in violation of the provisions of *Bus. & Prof.*

Code § 21140.2. For discussion of ability of franchisees to purchase accessories anywhere, see the discussion in *§ 515.114[5]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part:

- The granting of the petroleum products franchise (Paragraph 3).

- Defendant's requirement that plaintiff purchase tie-in automotive accessories along with its petroleum products (Paragraph 4) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2*].

- Damages resulting from defendant's act in violation of trade practice regulation, for which plaintiff is entitled to treble damages (Paragraph 5).

- Reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4*].

[4] State Statutes

Improper tie-in requirements in petroleum products franchises. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.2*

Liability, damages, venue, and limitations for improper tie-in requirement. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.4*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.501

§ 515.501 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Disallowing Petroleum Products Franchisee's Successor-in-Interest Designation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)--Failure to Honor Successor's Election to Operate Franchise--By Franchisee's Successor Against Franchisor

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Disallowing Petroleum Products Franchisee's Successor-in-Interest Designation of Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)--Failure to Honor Successor's Election to Operate Franchise--By Franchisee's Successor Against Franchisor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Action for Petroleum Products Franchisor's Disal-
_____ [*name*],	)	lowing Franchisee's Designation of
Defendant.	)	Successor in Interest)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name*], plaintiff's predecessor-in-interest, received from defendant as franchisor of _____ [*name of business*], a franchise to carry and sell petroleum products of such defendant at _____ [*location*] for a term of _____ [*duration*]. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of predecessor*] designated plaintiff, who was his/her _____ [spouse *or* adult child], as his/her successor in interest on a form provided by defendant and delivered to defendant after it was completed. [_____ (At the same time *or* On or about _____ (*date*)), _____ (*name of predecessor*) also deposited with defendant(, at the latter's request,) the amount of $_____ as a sum estimated to be necessary to compensate defendant for rent for a period of 21 days after _____'s (*name of predecessor*) death, and also, at the defendant's request, _____ (*describe compliance with defendant's other requirements for designation which were necessary for the discharge or performance of other franchise obligations, such as insurance provisions*).]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of predecessor*] died. On or about _____ [*date*], and within 21 days of his/her death, plaintiff gave written notice to defendant of plaintiff's election to assume and operate the franchise. [In response to defendant's request, this notice fully described plaintiff's business background and credit-worthy qualifications.] Plaintiff satisfied the reasonable qualifications defendant then required of franchise dealers for the operation of service stations. A true copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], within three business days after giving defendant the above-described notice, plaintiff wrote to defendant, offering to assume the franchise [and indicating his/her readiness to commence operation of the franchise within _____ (10 *or specify shorter time*) days after plaintiff assumed the franchise]. A true copy of that offer is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

7. However, defendant, on or about _____ [*date*], rejected plaintiff's bid to assume operation of the franchise and take over the franchise as the successor in interest of _____ [*name of predecessor*], and ever since has prevented plaintiff from assuming operation of the franchise [but has _____ (itself assumed the operation of the franchise *or* granted the franchise to a third party, who has assumed the operation thereof *or describe other*)].

8. Plaintiff has been damaged by the refusal of defendant to allow assumption of the franchise as successor in interest, in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff, who always comanaged the franchise with _____ (*name of predecessor*), would have been able to continue to earn the type of profit the franchise had been producing at a continual and steady growth rate of $_____ for the ensuing _____ (*number*) years remaining under the franchise, an amount which the franchise has continued to earn to the date of the filing of this complaint]. [Additionally, plaintiff has been damaged in that _____ (*describe foreseeably consequential damages*).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

[2. For consequential damages in the amount of $_____;]

3. For interest at the legal rate [on all amounts of damages in the form of earnings on profits that plaintiff would have earned had he/she been permitted to assume operation of the franchise];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action by a plaintiff who was designated as the successor in interest of a petroleum products franchise against a defendant franchisor who wrongfully failed to honor the plaintiff's right to assume operation of the business [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)*]. For a discussion of the rights of a successor in interest who was designated by a predecessor franchisee to assume the franchise after the predecessor died, see the discussion in *§ 515.115*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part:

- The grant of the original franchise to a predecessor and the terms of the franchise (Paragraph 3).

- The predecessor's proper designation of plaintiff as the successor in interest (Paragraph 4) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(a)-(c), (e)*].

- Plaintiff's notification to defendant of his or her election to assume and operate the franchise (Paragraph 5).

- Plaintiff's offer to assume the business after making the election (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(d)*].

- Defendant's rejection of plaintiff's bid and refusal to allow plaintiff's assumption of the franchise (Paragraph 7).

- The damages resulting from defendant's act (Para graph 8) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)* (providing that the damages that may be recovered are those specified in *Civ. Code § 3300* for breach of contract)].

[4] State Statutes

Franchisee's right to designate successor in interest, and latter's ability to assume franchise on predecessor's demise. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6*

Liability in damages and limitations period for failure to comply with successor in interest provisions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21140.6(l)*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.500*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
3. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of Petroleum Products Franchises

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.502-515.519

[Reserved]

§§ 515.502[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.520

§ 515.520 Protest to New Motor Vehicle Board [13 Cal. Code Reg. § 583] Against Establishment of Additional, or Relocation of Existing, Motor Vehicle Dealership or Satellite Warranty Facility [Veh. Code § 3062]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

[1] FORM Protest to New Motor Vehicle Board [13 Cal. Code Reg. § 583] Against Establishment of Additional, or Relocation of Existing, Motor Vehicle Dealership or Satellite Warranty Facility [Veh. Code § 3062]--By Franchisee Against Franchisor

NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD
_____ [*name and state bar number of attorney*]
_____ [*office address, or residence, if no office*]
_____ [*mailing address if different from above*]
_____ [*telephone number*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Protestant,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PROTEST
	)	(_____ [Establishment of
_____ [*name*],	)	Additional *or* Relocation of Existing] Motor Vehicle
Respondent.	)	Dealership [*or* Satellite Warranty Facility])
	)	
	)	

Protestant alleges:

1. The name of respondent is _____. His/Her/Its address is _____. Respondent _____ [is *or* is not] the holder of license No. _____ issued to him/her/it as a _____ [manufacturer *or* manufacturer branch *or* distributor *or* distributor branch].

2. The mailing address and telephone number of protestant is _____. The name, state bar number, mailing address, and telephone number of protestant's attorney are set out in the top left-hand corner of the cover page of this protest and is hereby incorporated by reference.

3. On or about _____ [*date*], protestant became a franchisee of a new motor vehicle dealership at _____ [*street address*] in the line-make of _____ [*describe make of vehicle(s)*] by a grant from respondent, who was and is, as the _____ [manufacturer *or* assembler *or* distributor] of such line-make, the franchisor. Protestant ever since this date has remained in good standing as a franchisee under such franchise. A true copy of the franchise agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. [Under the term of the franchise agreement, protestant was and is to remain the exclusive dealer in such line-make in an area with a radius of _____ (*state figure up to 10*) miles from its present location].
[*EITHER, for motor vehicle dealership*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent served written notice on protestant that he/she/it sought to _____ [enter into a franchise establishing an additional *or* relocate an existing] motor vehicle dealership in the line-make in the relevant market area in which petitioner was and is currently representing the same line-make _____ [as described above in Paragraph 3 *or* consisting of _____ (*describe the line represented by petitioner*)].
[*OR, for satellite warranty facility*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], respondent served written notice on protestant that he/she/it sought to enter into a franchise that authorizes a satellite warranty facility to be _____ [established *or* relocated to] within two miles of where petitioner was and is currently operating a dealership in the same line-make _____ [as described above in Paragraph 3 *or* consisting of _____ (*describe the line represented by petitioner*)].
[*CONTINUE as part of the same paragraph*]

A true copy of this notice is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. [This notice provided a time of _____ days in which protestant might appeal; the time for appeal expired on _____ (*date*). Protestant did make a formal appeal to respondent within this period but respondent failed and refused to alter his/her/its intention to proceed as specified in the notice.] The specific grounds of respondent's notice of intent to _____ [establish *or* relocate] the franchise are as follows: _____ [*briefly enumerate franchisor's grounds in separate subparagraphs*].

5. Good cause does not exist for this board to permit the _____ [establishment *or* relocation] of the _____ [motor vehicle dealership *or* satellite warranty facility], in that _____ [*enumerate reasons and factual contentions in response to the specific grounds set forth in franchisor's notice to show the adverse effect on the permanence of franchisee's investment, the effect on business and consumers in the industry, the public welfare, and the competition and consumer care* (*including facilities, equipment, parts, and sales and service personnel*)].

6. Attached and incorporated by reference are the following exhibits to support this protest: _____ [*list photographic, documentary, or similar physical evidence with appropriate description sufficient to identify them and explain their relevancy. If helpful, these exhibits should also be referred to in Paragraph 5, e.g.,* exhibit C: _____ (*describe, e.g.,* a map showing the availability of new motor vehicle dealers within the relevant market area herein described and the line-makes represented thereby, and showing access routes to all

neighborhoods and the population of the area)].

7. Protestant _____ [desires *or* does not desire] to appear before the board in a hearing on this protest.

8. Protestant estimates that _____ days will be required to complete the hearing on the protest herein.

[9. Protestant requests a prehearing conference.]

WHEREFORE, protestant prays that this board determine there is good cause for not permitting the _____ [establishment *or* relocation] of the _____ [dealership *or* satellite warranty facility] protested in this matter.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name of protestant*]
Protestant
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Protestant

[2] Use of Form

This protest form is for use in a proceeding on a protest before the New Motor Vehicle Board brought by a new motor vehicle dealer against its franchisor, manufacturer, or distributor, who intends to establish an additional dealership or satellite warranty facility, or to relocate an existing one [*see Veh. Code § 3062*]. For a discussion of a protest on these grounds, see the discussion §§ 515.136 and 515.134.

Under a franchise agreement that grants the dealer an exclusive, nonmodifiable trading area beyond its statutory "relevant market area," the establishment of another dealership within that exclusive trading area may constitute a modification of the franchise that would entitle the dealer to protest under *Veh. Code § 3060* [*Ri-Joyce, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 445, 456, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* ; *see* discussion in *§ 515.134*].

[3] Allegations

This protest alleges the following:

- Respondent's name, address, and status as licensee (Paragraph 1) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 595*].

- Mailing address and identifying data of the protestant and of the protestant's attorney, if any (Paragraph 2) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 585(d), 595*].

- Status of protestant as franchisee of respondent franchisor (Paragraph 3).

- Respondent's notification to protestant of intent to establish or relocate dealership or satellite warranty facility (Paragraph 4).

- Existence of good cause for not allowing respondent to establish or relocate dealership or satellite warranty facility (Paragraph 5) [*see Veh. Code §§ 3062, 3063*; *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(b)*].

- Listing of exhibits supporting evidence (Paragraph 6) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(c)*].

- Protestant's desire to appear or not to appear before the board (Paragraph 7) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(e)*].

- Estimate of the number of days required to complete hearing (Paragraph 8) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(f)*].

- Request for a prehearing conference if one is desired (Paragraph 9) [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(g)*].

The protest concludes with the signatures of both the protestant and the protestant's attorney [*see 13 Cal. Code Reg. § 597*].

[4] Protest Preparation--Drafting and Serving Protest

Protests must be written and signed by the franchisee or the franchisee's attorney [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 583*]. A copy must be served on the franchisor, and proof of such service must accompany the official filing [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 584*]. The protest should set forth in clear and concise language the franchisee's factual contentions. The franchisee may submit, as exhibits to the protest, photographic, documentary, or similar physical evidence relevant to the matter in support of the protest [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(c)*]. The exhibits should be described sufficiently to identify them and to explain their relevancy [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(c)*]. The protest should clearly reflect the name, mailing address, and telephone number of the franchisee and of any attorney or authorized agent. All correspondence with the franchisee and notices to the franchisee thereafter must be addressed to that address, if the franchisee represents himself or herself, or to the address of the attorney or agent, if the franchisee is represented by an attorney or agent. [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(d)*]. The franchisee should indicate whether or not he or she desires to appear before the board [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(e)*].

The board has no preprinted forms for protests. Protests should be prepared in the manner of any type of document submitted to the board [10 Cal. Code Reg. § 583; *see 13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 593-598*].

[5] Filing Protest

Protests involving entering into a franchise establishing an additional dealer ship or a satellite warranty facility, or relocating an existing one have to be filed, unless an extension is otherwise granted on request, within 20 days of receiving notice of such an action, or within 20 days after the end of any appeal procedure the franchisor has provided [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)*]. If, within this time, the franchisee files with the board a request for additional time to file, an additional 10 days may be granted on a showing of good cause [*Veh. Code § 3062(a)*]. Filing occurs on the date the board's executive director receives the protest or on the date of its certified or registered mailing [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(a)*]. The franchisee should set forth in the protest an estimate of the number of days required to complete the hearing, and a request for a prehearing conference, if desired [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585(f), (g)*].

[6] Respondent's Notice of Appearance

The respondent must file a notice of appearance with the board within 15 days of receipt of the protest. Failure to file a timely notice of appearance will result in the proceedings being suspended until the notice if filed. The notice must contain language indicating whether the party desires to appear at the hearing for purposes of submitting evidence and oral argument, and whether the respondent contends that the protest was submitted in a timely manner [*13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585.1*].

[7] Administrative Regulations

Contents of protest. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 583, 585*

Format of protest. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 593-598* (defining "papers," size of paper, pagination, etc., format of first and last pages, conformance of copies, and acceptance of nonconforming papers for good cause)

Time of filing. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 585*

Respondent's notice of appearance. 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 585.1

Schedules of compensation for preparation and delivery obligations and warranty reimbursement schedules. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 586*

Stipulation of fact. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 587*

Deliberations of board. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 588*

Failure to appear. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 589*

Hearings by board and hearing officer. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 590*

Notice of hearing. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 591*

Continuances. *13 Cal. Code Reg. § 592*

Briefs filed with board required to contain copies of decisions other than those from official reporter. 10 Cal. Code Reg. § 593.2

[8] Decisions

When New Motor Vehicle Board had subject matter jurisdiction over dispute but lacked authority to grant any remedy when franchise termination was due to discontinuation of product line, Board had implied authority to dismiss franchisee's protest. *Duarte & Witting, Inc. v. New Motor Vehicle Board (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 626, 637, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*

Protest filed one year after termination was timely when notice of termination did not state reason for termination and was not sent to Board but only to dealer. *British Motor Car Distributors, Ltd. v. New Motor Vehicle Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 81, 93-94, 239 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Dealer's claim that manufacturer breached implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by refusing to supply new model motorcycle and by establishing new dealerships in same geographic area to handle that model is claim regarding modification of franchise agreement; thus, dealer was required to exhaust administrative remedies before New Motor Vehicle Board. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1238-1242, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382*

Manufacturer's failure to give notice of its modification and establishment of new franchise as required by *Veh. Code §§ 3060, 3062* is not waiver of its right to insist that dealer exhaust administrative remedies; purpose of notice is to establish time within which dealer may protest; when no notice is filed, no time limit is placed on dealer's right to protest. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1239-1240, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382*

Manufacturer's failure to give notice of its modification and establishment of new franchise as required by *Veh. Code §§ 3060, 3062* does not divest New Motor Vehicle Board of jurisdiction to determine dealer's protest. *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1240, 230 Cal. Rptr. 382*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
4. Trade Practices And Termination Or Nonrenewal Of New Motor Vehicle Dealerships

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.521-515.539

[Reserved]

§§ 515.521[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.540

§ 515.540 Complaint for Injunction and Damages Under Fair Dealership Law for Discrimination for Refusal to Consent to Transfer of Dealership [Civ. Code § 86]--By Dealer and Prospective Dealer Against Grantor

[1] FORM Complaint for Injunction and Damages Under Fair Dealership Law for Discrimination for Refusal to Consent to Transfer of Dealership [Civ. Code § 86]--By Dealer and Prospective Dealer Against Grantor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION AND DAM-
_____ [*name*],	)	AGES
Defendant.	)	(Discrimination Prohibited
	)	by Fair Dealership Law)
	)	

_____

Plaintiffs allege:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant granted to _____ [*name of transferor*], a dealership to conduct the business of _____ [*name of franchisor*] at _____ [*location*]. A true copy of the dealership contract is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. From such time and to the time of the filing of this complaint plaintiff dealer has been operating such franchise.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of transferor*] and _____ [*name of transferee*] agreed to transfer the dealership to _____ [*name of transferee*]. On or about _____ [*date*], both plaintiffs applied to defendant for consent to the transfer of the dealership as agreed to between the plaintiffs in compliance with the requirements of the dealership contract that defendant's prior written consent be obtained for any such transfer. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [refused to consent to that transfer *or* refused and failed to further entertain the application for consent to transfer] and ever since has failed and refused to consent to transfer as requested by the plaintiffs.

5. Defendant has so failed and refused to consent to transfer of the dealership herein because of _____'s [*name of transferee*] _____ [*specify characteristic(s) listed or defined in Civ. Code § 51(b),(e):* sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status, *or* sexual orientation]. [Defendant further threatens to _____ (terminate *or* refuse to renew) _____'s (*name of transferor*) dealership in order to prevent or repress the possibility of the transfer.] [_____ (*Name of transferee*) has remained at all times herein mentioned qualified in every respect according to defendant's current standards for prospective dealers and ready to take transfer of the dealership.]

6. Each plaintiff will suffer great and irreparable injury without adequate compensation at law unless defendant is restrained from acting out of discrimination as herein alleged in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* _____ (terminating *or* failing to renew) plaintiff dealer's dealership, and in] refusing to consent to the transfer of the dealership to _____ [*name of prospective dealer*].

7. Each of the plaintiffs has or will have suffered damages by reason of defendant's refusal to consent to the transfer requested by plaintiffs in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name of transferor*) has expended time and funds on acquiring a transferee and will be required to expend further funds to acquire a replacement transferee. He/She would have realized $_____ from the transfer of the franchise. Plaintiff _____ (*name of transferee*) has spent time and funds in acquiring this franchise opportunity and will have to spend further time and funds to acquire a replacement. He/She would have realized a franchise opportunity of future earnings and of present value over the transfer price of approximately $_____]. _____ [The total amount of these damages is $_____ *or* Plaintiffs, and each of them, are unable to determine the exact amount of these damages at this time, but will amend this complaint to state these damages when the exact amount is ascertained].

8. [*Attorney's fees. See § 515.500, Paragraph 6.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs, and each of them, pray judgment as follows:

1. For a permanent injunction prohibiting defendant from acting on the basis of the discrimination alleged herein [in terminating or failing to renew the dealership of plaintiff _____ (*name of transferor*)] and in refusing to consent to the transfer of the dealership to plaintiff _____ [*name of transferee*];

2. For damages as a result of defendant's actions in preventing plaintiff _____ [*name of transferor*] and plaintiff _____ [*name of transferee*] dealer from consummating transfer of the dealership, and for further damages for losses therefrom if injunctive relief is not awarded to either plaintiff [, and for the termination or nonrenewal of plaintiff former dealers' dealerships on the basis of bias and prejudice as herein alleged].

3. For reasonable attorney's fees [in the amount of $_____];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

CAUTION:
If preliminary and permanent injunctions are sought in the foregoing complaint, counsel should either file affidavits (or declarations under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) in support of the allegations in the complaint or take care to plead evidentiary facts which would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E. H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* and have the complaint verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action by a franchisee and a prospective franchisee against a dealership grantor who has refused to permit the transfer of the franchise because of any characteristic listed or defined in *Civ. Code § 51(b)* or *(e)*; that is, sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status, or sexual orientation (including a perception that a person has, or is associated with someone who has or is perceived to have, any particular characteristic or characteristics within the listed categories) [*see Civ. Code § 85*]. The complaint is for injunction, possibly to prevent retaliatory action by the defendant against the existing dealer, but in any event to prevent the grantor from unreasonably withholding consent and for damages for the improper refusal [*see Civ. Code §§ 85, 86*]. For a discussion of the relief and remedies available against grantors for discrimination in the grant, transfer, or termination of dealerships, see the discussion in *§ 515.340[2]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges, in part, the following [*see Civ. Code § 86*]:

- The granting of the dealership to the present dealer (Paragraph 3).
- The application of the present and prospective dealers to defendant for consent to a transfer of the dealership, and defendant's refusal (Paragraph 4).
- Discrimination as the basis of defendant's refusal and any threatened retaliatory action by defendant in support of the refusal (Paragraph 5).
- The need for injunctive relief (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*].
- Damages resulting from defendant's actions (Paragraph 7).
- Reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 8).

[4] Injunctive Relief and Damages for Grantor's Acting on Dealership Matters With Bias and Prejudice

The California Fair Dealership Law states that it is intended to be liberally construed and applied in order to promote its

underlying purposes and policies [*see Civ. Code § 82*], and mentions the possibility of a court awarding both "relief" and "remedy" [*see Civ. Code § 86*]. It therefore appears that injunctive relief may be requested to prevent the grantor from discontinuing any existing franchise on the basis of bias or prejudice, as well as to prevent the grantor from refusing to grant dealerships or to allow transfer of existing dealerships on such grounds in the future [*see Civ. Code §§ 83-85*].

[5] State Statutes

California Fair Dealership Law. *Civ. Code §§ 81-86*

Liability for discriminating in grant, transfer, or discontinuance of dealerships. *Civ. Code § 86*

Injunctive relief requested. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

[6] Decisions

Complaint alleging on information and belief and declaration by widow, not party to contract, regarding her expectations as to survivability of dealership, as insufficient for injunction. *San Francisco Newspaper Printing Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 438, 441-442, 216 Cal. Rptr. 462*

Widow's community property interest in dealership as not giving her standing to continue business when dealership contract between deceased and newspaper agency clearly specified it was nonassignable. *San Francisco Newspaper Printing Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 438, 443, 216 Cal. Rptr. 462*

Dealership contract as one of adhesion and so enforceable unless unconscionable or not within reasonable expectation of weaker party; nonassignment clause as not unconscionable; agreement as clear, unambiguous, and not susceptible of reasonable expectation of assignability or survival. *San Francisco Newspaper Printing Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 438, 442-444, 216 Cal. Rptr. 462*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

For a discussion and forms for civil rights actions generally, see Ch. 112, *Civil Rights: Government-Funded Programs and Activities*

For discussion and forms for injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
5. Dealership Discrimination

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.541-515.559

[Reserved]

§§ 515.541[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.560

§ 515.560 Complaint for Rescission, Damages, and Punitive Damages for Violation of Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Provisions [Civ. Code § 1812.218]--Misrepresentation in Selling Plan [Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)]--By Purchaser Against Seller, Surety or Trustee [Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)], and Escrow Holder [Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Rescission, Damages, and Punitive Damages for Violation of Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Provisions [Civ. Code § 1812.218]--Misrepresentation in Selling Plan [Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)]--By Purchaser Against Seller, Surety or Trustee [Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)], and Escrow Holder [Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RESCISSION AND DAMAGES
	)	(Violation of Seller Assisted Marketing Plan Provi-
_____ [*name*],	)	sions)
[and _____ (*name(s) of*	)	[Amount demanded _____
surety or trustee, and/or escrow holder), (a California	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Corporation,)]	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name of seller*] is _____ [*allege residence and capacity. See §*

515.400, Paragraph 1], and is the primary defendant herein whose acts as defendant are described below.

[2. Defendant _____ (*name of trustee or surety*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of _____ (the United States *or* the state of _____ (California *or other state; if other state, continue:* authorized to transact, and transacting, intrastate business in California)), with its principal place of business (in California) in _____County, and authorized to transact and transacting business in California as a _____ (surety *or* trustee) (*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant as appropriate*).]

[3. Defendant _____ (*name of escrow holder*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of _____ (California *or other state; if other state, continue:* authorized to transact, and transacting, intrastate business in California), with its principal place of business (in California) in _____County, and licensed to transact and transacting business in California as an escrow holder (*or allege other capacity and residence of defendant as appropriate*).]

4. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

[5. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (defendant _____ (*name of surety*) issued its bond number _____ (*number*) *or* defendant seller established a trust account, number _____ (*number*) with _____ (*name and address of trustee*) as trustee). The _____ (bond *or* trust account) was made out in favor of the State of California for the benefit of anyone damaged by any violation by the primary defendant of the seller assisted marketing plan laws of this state or by such defendant's breach of any plan, contract, or obligation arising therefrom, and also directly in favor of any person damaged by such practices of the primary defendant herein. A true copy of the _____ (bond *or* terms and provisions of such trust account) is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____, California, defendant offered to sell to plaintiff a seller assisted marketing plan consisting of _____ [*describe plan and brand name, if any, e.g.,* the _____ (*name*) system for distributing and stationing machines vending audiovisual critiques of current dining and entertainment available in local business districts to passerby foot traffic]. In making this offer and in negotiations with plaintiff thereafter, defendant made certain _____ [untrue *or* misleading] statements in that defendant stated _____ [orally *or* in writing *or* within disclosure materials submitted to plaintiff] that _____ [*describe statement, e.g.,* the plan was an immediate buy-back investment if plaintiff was not satisfied]. The statement was _____ [untrue *or* misleading] in that _____ [*explain, e.g.,* the buy-back provision only became effective after plaintiff put the required amount of $_____ into the business and devoted one year's efforts to it].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff purchased the seller assisted marketing plan from defendant for $_____ (*total sale price*). A true copy of the contract and agreement is attached marked Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. The purchase price was required to be paid by plaintiff as follows: _____ [*specify payment schedule (see Civ. Code § 1812.201(k), (l), defining "initial payment," "initial cash payment," and "downpayment"), e.g., Civ. Code § 1812.201(k), (l)* an initial cash payment of $2,500 was required at the time the contract was executed, and the remainder of the price was to be paid in six monthly installments of $1,000, beginning _____ (*date*)]. [*If relevant (see Civ. Code § 1812.209(a), requiring escrow if more than 20 percent of initial payment is required before delivery of goods, equipment, supplies, etc. by seller), continue: Civ. Code § 1812.209(a)* The contract further provided that the first delivery of equipment and supplies would be made by defendant on or before _____ (*date*)]. Plaintiff paid the $_____ directly to defendant on _____ [*date*].

[8. The contract states that escrow account number _____ (*number*) was established at the branch of

defendant _____ (*name of escrow holder*) _____, _____ (*street address and city*) in accordance with *Sections 1812.210(b)* and *1812.214(c) of the Civil Code* to receive payments in excess of 20 percent of the initial payment that were required by defendant seller to be made by plaintiff prior to delivery of the equipment, supplies, products, or services to be furnished under the contract. On _____ (*date(s)*), plaintiff _____ (*allege payments made to that account, e.g.,* made three equal payments of $_____ each into that account). _____ (Plaintiff never authorized any disbursements from that account *or specify disbursements authorized, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff authorized a $_____ disbursement from that account).]

9. On or about _____ [*specify date within one year from date of the contract*], plaintiff discovered the plan had been sold to him/her through the misrepresentation described above, when _____ [*describe discovery or effect of misrepresentation, e.g.,* plaintiff failed to make a profit and suffered losses in operating the marketing plan and demanded that defendant repurchase such plan as represented. Defendant refused to buy back the plan until plaintiff had invested $_____ in the business and spent a year attempting to develop it]. Plaintiff thereupon served written notice on defendant that plaintiff was electing to void the contract, and offered therein to immediately return _____ [all *or* the remaining] equipment, supplies, and products delivered to plaintiff by defendant under the plan at _____ [*location(s)*] in return for all sums paid to defendant [seller, and to the escrow account,] by plaintiff [less the fair market value at the time of their receipt by plaintiff of items not returnable, which is $_____]. A true copy of that notice is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

10. Defendant failed and refused to return the sums described above to plaintiff or to receive the items plaintiff tendered for return, and still so fails and refuses although plaintiff still tenders all such items for return to defendant. A list of items for return is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference [, containing also an accounting of those items that cannot be returned, with the fair market value of each such item].

11. Plaintiff has been further damaged in that _____ [*describe consequential damages, e.g.,* plaintiff has incurred, and still incurs, charges for storage of equipment and supplies at various locations, and must continue to pay for licenses of particular vending machines that cannot be disengaged although not operating. The approximate amount of such damages is $_____].

[12. *If punitive damages are sought against primary defendant seller, add:* Defendant's making of the _____ (untrue *or* misleading) statements described in Paragraph 6 constituted an intentional _____ (misrepresentation, *or* deceit, *or* concealment) of a material fact known to the defendant with the intent on defendant's part of thereby depriving plaintiff of property and legal rights (and of otherwise causing plaintiff injury) thereby entitling plaintiff to punitive or exemplary damages.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____, representing the return of all sums paid to defendant [less the fair market value of all equipment, supplies, or products that cannot be returned to defendant], after receipt of which plaintiff will deliver all equipment, supplies, and products [deliverable] to defendant _____ [*describe*];

2. For interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ [*date of notification of election to rescind*];

[3. For consequential damages consisting of _____ (*specify*) in the amount of $ _____;]

[4. For punitive or exemplary damages;]

5. For reasonable attorney's fees;

6. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action for rescission, damages, and punitive damages based on misrepresentation practiced in the sale to plaintiff of a seller assisted marketing plan [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.215(a), 1812.218*]. For a discussion of the actionability of misrepresentation in the sale of a seller assisted marketing plan and damages lying thereon, see the § 515.192[2]. If the seller made any buy-back representations, a bond or trust account would have been required, so that plaintiff would be able to join the surety or trustee for damages other than punitive for any violation of the seller assisted marketing plan legislation [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.204(c), 1812.214(b)*]. For a discussion of bond or trust account requirements, see *§ 515.184[2]*.

In addition, if plaintiff was required to pay more than 20 percent of the initial payment [*see Civ. Code § 1812.201(k)* (defining "initial payment", discussed in *§ 515.182[6]*)] before delivery of the equipment, supplies, or products or services to be furnished under the terms of the contract, the excess payments would have to be made into an escrow account, to be disbursed to the seller only on plaintiff's written notification to the escrow holder [*Civ. Code § 1812.209(a)*]. If there were funds left in the escrow account, the escrow holder may be joined as a defendant, although the escrow holder is only liable only for actual damages, not punitive damages, and the escrow account holder's aggregate liability to all persons damaged by a seller's violations is limited to the amount of the escrow account [*Civ. Code § 1812.214(c)(3)*].

The form may be modified to allege a cause of action against a defendant who leased a seller assisted marketing plan to the plaintiff. It also may be used against a defendant who failed to provide plaintiff, or to file with the Attorney General, certain disclosure documents or failed to comply with the legal requirements for a plan contract [*see Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part, the following:

- Capacity and residence of defendant seller, defendant surety or trustee, and defendant escrow holder (Paragraphs 1-3).

- Availability of any surety bond or trust account for damages proved in the action (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 1812.214(b)*].

- Defendant's act of misrepresentation in selling the plan to plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*].

- Sale of the plan to plaintiff and the terms of that sale (Paragraph 7), including an escrow account involved (Paragraph 8).

- Discovery of the misrepresentation and election to void the plan contract and tender items for return (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*].

- Defendant's failure to act on the rescission (Paragraph 10).

- Consequential damages, if appropriate (Paragraph 11).

- If appropriate, the fact that the seller's misrepresentation was intentional, entitling plaintiff to punitive damages (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1812.218, 3294(a), (c)(3)*].

Attorney's fees are provided by statute [*Civ. Code § 1812.218*] and need not be alleged. A successful plaintiff may recover them as costs under any of the procedures set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(c)(5)*, which is discussed in Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

To protect personal privacy and other legitimate interests, parties and their attorneys must not include financial account numbers, or must redact such numbers if their inclusion is necessary, in all pleadings and other papers filed in the court's public file, whether filed in paper or electronic form, unless otherwise provided by law or ordered by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.20(b)*]. However, it is not clear whether "financial account" would include an escrow account.

[4] State Statutes

Voidability of seller assisted marketing plan contract for misrepresentation in offer or sale; procedure for voiding contract. *Civ. Code § 1812.215(a)*

Action for violation of seller assisted marketing plan laws. *Civ. Code § 1812.218*

Claims against trust deposit made in lieu of bond. *Civ. Code § 1812.221*

Punitive damages. *Civ. Code § 3294*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Attorney General's approved form of seller assisted marketing plan surety bond. 11 Cal. Code Reg. § 63.6 (unpublished; consult Business Law Section of Attorney General's Office)

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

For discussion of exemplary damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

For discussion and forms relating to suretyship, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
6. Seller Assisted Marketing Plans

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 515.561-515.579

[Reserved]

§§ 515.561[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 515 SECURITIES AND FRANCHISE REGULATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Franchise Regulation
7. Fair Practices of Equipment Manufacturers, Distributors, Wholesalers, and Dealers

45-515 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 515.580

§ 515.580 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Statutory Requirements in Terminating or Not Renewing Dealer Contract [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22902, 22903, 22903.2, 22905, 22925]--By Dealer Against Supplier

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Failure to Comply With Statutory Requirements in Terminating or Not Renewing Dealer Agreement [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22902, 22903, 22905, 22925]--By Equipment Dealer Against Supplier

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
	)	(Improper _____ (Termination *or*
_____ [*name*],	)	Nonrenewal) of Dealer Contract)
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, domiciled in and a resident of _____ County, California [*or allege other capacity and residence of plaintiff*].

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 515.400, Paragraph 1.*]

3. [*Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate. See § 515.400, Paragraph 2.*]

4. Defendant _____ [*name*] is a supplier engaged in the _____ [manufacturing *and/or* assembly *and/or* wholesale distribution] of _____ [*describe equipment, e.g.,* machinery used for industrial applications]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, as the supplier of _____ [*describe equipment, e.g.,* machinery used for industrial applications], entered into a dealer contract with plaintiff to conduct the business of retail sales of that equipment at _____ [*specify location*]. A true copy of the dealer contract is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff continuously conducted the business of selling the supplier's equipment at retail from that time until the time of the event described in this complaint[, including through (successive) renewal(s) of the dealer contract].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [terminated *or* refused to renew] the dealer contract and thereafter refused to supply and service plaintiff's business as called for under the dealer contract. This _____ [termination *or* nonrenewal] was improper under Business and Professions Code Section(s) _____ [*specify, e.g.,* 22902(d), 22903, 22903.2 and 22905] in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* good cause did not exist for the _____ (termination *or* nonrenewal) *or* defendant failed to provide plaintiff with proper notice prior to the intended _____ (termination *or* nonrenewal) of the dealer contract, and thus did not afford plaintiff at least 60 days in which to cure any claimed deficiency].

7. In _____ [terminating *or* failing to renew] the dealer contract in accordance with the provisions of *Business and Professions Code Sections 22900-22927,* defendant was obligated but failed to offer _____ [to assume the lease *or* to repurchase] from plaintiff the property used by plaintiff in carrying on the business under the dealer contract including, but not limited to, _____ [*specify property, e.g.,* computer systems equipment required and approved by defendant and data processing hardware required by defendant]. The fair repurchase price of the computer systems equipment, data processing hardware, and specialized repair tools would have been $_____, representing the fair market value of the computer systems equipment and data processing hardware.

8. Defendant was also obligated but failed to offer to repurchase plaintiff's equipment, consisting of _____ [*specify equipment, e.g.,* all new, unsold, undamaged, and complete equipment]. The fair repurchase price of plaintiff's equipment would have been $_____, representing 100 percent of net cost.

9. Defendant was also obligated but failed to offer to repurchase plaintiff's inventory, consisting of _____ [*specify inventory, e.g.,* all new, unsold, and undamaged repair parts that had previously been purchased from defendant and were held by plaintiff on the date of contract termination]. The fair repurchase price of plaintiff's inventory would have been $_____, representing 95 percent of the current net cost of the inventory.

[10. *Add if plaintiff was not compensated for packing and returning repair parts:* Defendant was also obligated but failed to pay plaintiff $_____ for returned parts, representing 5 percent of the current net cost on the new, unused, and undamaged repair parts that plaintiff returned to defendant.]

[11. *Add if plaintiff was not compensated for unsold demonstrators*: Defendant was also obligated but failed to pay plaintiff $_____ for unsold, undamaged demonstrators. The sum due was equal to 100 percent of the net equipment cost of all unsold, undamaged demonstrators, less depreciation due to usage of those demonstrators.]

[12. *Add if plaintiff was not compensated for equipment used in a manufacturer created incentive program*: Defendant was also obligated but failed to pay plaintiff $_____ for all unsold and undamaged equipment used in a manufacturer created incentive program. The sum due was equal to 100 percent of the net cost of that equipment, less depreciation due to usage and bonus or volume incentive received by the dealer for the equipment.]

[13. *Add if plaintiff was not compensated for specialized equipment or repair tools previously purchased pursuant to defendant's requirements prior to termination:* Defendant was also obligated but failed to pay plaintiff $_____ for all specialized equipment or repair tools previously purchased pursuant to defendant's requirements prior to termination, which were unique to defendant's product line. The sum due was equal to 75 percent of the net cost, including shipping, handling, and setup fees of those tools which were in complete and operating condition.]

14. In addition to the damages specified above, plaintiff has suffered damages resulting from defendant's improper _____ [termination *or* nonrenewal] of the dealer contract by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* incurring freight charges; having to handle, pack, and load the inventory; having to store the inventory; and closing down the business], in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred;

4. For attorney's fees; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 515.400.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in an action by a dealer for the type of relief available under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* from a supplier who has improperly terminated or failed to renew an existing dealer contract [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22902, 22903, 22903.2, 22905, 22925*]. For a discussion of this and other violations that may be grounds for an action by an equipment dealer against a supplier, see *§§ 515.211, 515.212, 515.214,* and *§ 515.215* et seq.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges, in part:

- Plaintiff's domicile in California (Paragraph 1).
- Capacity and residence of defendant (Paragraph 2).

- Fictitious names of defendants, if appropriate (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*].

- The nature of defendant's business as a supplier of equipment (Paragraph 4) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22901(j)(1), (v)*].

- The existence of the dealer contract (Paragraph 5).

- The improper termination or nonrenewal of the dealer contract (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22902(d), 22903, 22903.2*].

- Defendant's failure to repurchase plaintiff's business machinery, equipment, and inventory, and the amount owing therefor (Paragraphs 7-13) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905(a)-(g)*].

- Any consequential damages resulting from defendant's act (Paragraph 14) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*].

[4] Remedies

A dealer may bring an action against a supplier in any court of competent jurisdiction for damages sustained by the dealer as a consequence of the supplier's violation of any provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.* The dealer may also recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*].

The dealer may also be granted injunctive relief against unlawful termination, cancellation, nonrenewal, and change in competitive circumstances [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*]. For sample allegations for injunctive relief against dealership discrimination, *see § 515.540*. For discussion and general forms for complaints for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

These remedies are not exclusive, and are in addition to any other remedies permitted by law. They also do not affect current law pertaining to product liability actions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22925*; *see* Ch. 460, *Products Liability*].

A supplier is also obligated to repurchase any business machinery, equipment, and inventory pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22905* after canceling or failing to renew an existing dealer agreement. For discussion of these obligations, see *§ 515.215*.

A dealer also is entitled to establish a lien for the repurchase charges for returned equipment and for the costs of enforcing the lien for amounts that remain unpaid under a repurchase agreement entered into when a dealer agreement is canceled or not renewed [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22905, 22906(b)*]. For discussion of the creation, perfection, and enforcement of this lien, see *§ 515.216*.

[5] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case *Cal. Const. art VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the first paper must state whether the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 515.400*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 516 [RESERVED]

45-516 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 516

[RESERVED]

Chapter 516[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 517.syn

§ 517.syn Synopsis to Chapter 517: SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES

§ 517.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 517.02 Cross References

§§ 517.03-517.09 [Reserved]

§ 517.10 Governing Statutes

§ 517.11 Definitions

[1] Self-Service Storage Facility

[2] Owner

[3] Occupant

[4] Rental Agreement

[5] Personal Property

[6] Last Known Address

§ 517.12 Self-Service Storage Facility Contracts

§ 517.13 Individual Storage Containers

[1] Definition

[2] Transportation Not Subject to Public Utility Regulation

[3] Pickup and Delivery

[4] Transportation at Company's Expense

[5] Authority of Public Utility Commission

[6] Operation Under Authority of Household Goods Permit

§ 517.14 Lien on Stored Personal Property

[1] Scope of Lien

[2] Vehicles and Vessels

[3] Preliminary Lien Notice

[4] Attachment

[5] Notice of Lien Sale

[6] Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale

§ 517.15 Lien Sale

[1] When Available

[2] Advertisement

[3] Security Interest Claims

[4] Presale Redemption

[5] Conduct and Disposition of Proceeds

§ 517.16 Action to Enforce Lien

[1] Procedures

[2] Sale to Enforce Judgment

§ 517.17 Rights of Good Faith Purchaser

§ 517.18 Household and Personal Property of Military Service Members

§§ 517.19-517.29 [Reserved]

§ 517.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 517.31 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Definitions

[3] Lien on Stored Personal Property

[a] In General

[b] Notices and Declarations

[c] Sale

[4] Self-Service Storage Facility Contracts

§ 517.32 Decisions

§§ 517.33-517.49 [Reserved]

§ 517.50 Complaint by Owner of Self-Service Storage Facility Against Occupant to Foreclose Lien on Personal Property [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Summons and Service

[6] Time for Response

[7] Enforcement

[8] Cross References

§ 517.51 Summons--Storage Lien Enforcement--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-140]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.01

§ 517.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses agreements for the rental or lease of storage space in self-service storage facilities, as well as attachment and enforcement of liens on personal property stored at these facilities for rent, labor, or other charges incurred pursuant to rental agreements.

The chapter includes a complaint for use by an owner of a self-service storage facility against an occupant of the facility to foreclose an owner's lien for unpaid rent and other charges on personal property located at the facility [*see § 517.50*] and a summons adopted for mandatory use by the Judicial Council [*see § 517.51*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.02

§ 517.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to warehouses and warehouse receipts, see *Ch. 213, Documents of Title, § 213.50* et seq.

- For discussion and forms relating to bailments of personal property, see Ch. 93, *Bailments* . Bailments for hire, also referred to as hirings, are *covered in Ch. 413, Personal Property Leases, § 413.30* et seq.

- For discussion and forms relating to personal property leases under the Commercial Code, see *Ch. 413, Personal Property Leases, § 413.50* et seq.

- For discussion and forms for use by a landlord in giving notice regarding disposition of property on the landlord's premises, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy*

- For discussion and forms relating to enforcement of liens generally, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

- For discussion and forms relating to lost or unclaimed property, see Ch. 355, *Lost and Unclaimed Property*

- For discussion and forms relating to actions arising from transactions secured by personal property, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Documents of Title (Article 7)Warehouse ReceiptsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Secured Transactions (Article 9)General OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBailmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal PropertyReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART I. SCOPE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 517.03-517.09

[Reserved]

§§ 517.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.10

§ 517.10 Governing Statutes

Self-service storage facilities are governed by the California Self-Service Storage Facility Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.*).

The Act does not apply to garages or other storage areas in private residences, nor does it apply to warehouses or public utilities as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 216*. If the owner of a storage facility issues a warehouse receipt, bill of lading, or other document of title for the personal property stored, the rights and obligations of both the owner and the occupant are governed by *Com. Code § 7101 et seq.*, and the Self-Storage Facility Act does not apply [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(a)*; for discussion of *Com. Code § 7101 et seq., see Ch. 213, Documents of Title, § 213.70* et seq.].

The Self-Service Storage Facility Act applies to rental agreements entered into, extended, or renewed after January 1, 1982 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21714*]. All rental agreements entered into prior to that date, and not extended or renewed thereafter, as well as the rights, duties, and interests flowing from those agreements, remain valid, and may be enforced or terminated in accordance with their terms or as permitted by any other California statute or law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21715*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.11

§ 517.11 Definitions

[1] Self-Service Storage Facility

The term "self-service storage facility" means real property designed and used for the purpose of renting or leasing individual storage space to occupants who are to have access to the space for the purpose of storing and removing personal property, or for storing individual storage containers [*see § 517.13*] provided to occupants who have exclusive use of the container for the purpose of storing and removing personal property, whether or not the individual storage containers are transported pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1* [*discussed under § 517.13*].

"Self-service storage facility" does not include a garage or other storage area in a private residence. No occupant may use a self-service storage facility for residential purposes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(a)*].

A self-service storage facility is not a warehouse and is not a public utility as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 216*. If an owner issues a warehouse receipt, bill of lading, or other document of title for the personal property stored, the owner and the occupant are subject to Division 7 of the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 7101 et seq.*], and the Self-Service Storage Facility Act does not apply [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(a)*].

An owner of a self-service storage facility when renting or leasing individual storage spaces to occupants, who are to have access to the space for the purpose of storing or removing personal property, is a commercial landlord and does not have care, custody, or control of the occupants' stored personal property [Stats. 1998 ch. 45, § 3 (declaration of legislative intent)].

[2] Owner

The term "owner" as used in the Self-Service Storage Facility Act means the owner, operator, lessor, or sublessor of a self-service storage facility, his or her agent, or any other person authorized by him or her to manage the facility, or to receive rent from an occupant under a rental agreement, whether or not the person has a real estate license [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(b)*].

[3] Occupant

The term "occupant" as used in the Self-Service Storage Facility Act means a person, or his or her sublessee, successor, or assign, who is entitled to the use of the storage space at a self-service storage facility under a rental agreement, to the exclusion of others [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(c)*].

[4] Rental Agreement

The term "rental agreement" as used in the Self-Service Storage Facility Act means any written agreement or lease that establishes or modifies the terms, conditions, rules, or any other provision concerning the use and occupancy of a self-service storage facility [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(d)*].

Rental agreements under the Act do not involve the delivery of a thing to another for some special purpose or object, to be held in conformity with the objects or purposes of delivery, and thus do not constitute contracts of bailment [*compare Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(a),(d)* (defining self-service storage facility and rental agreement) *with Windeler v. Scheers Jewelers (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 844, 850, 88 Cal. Rptr. 39* (defining bailment)]. For discussion and forms relating to bailment of personal property, see Ch. 93, *Bailments* .

[5] Personal Property

The term "personal property" as used in the Self-Service Storage Facility Act means movable property not affixed to land, including goods, merchandise, furniture, and household items [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(e)*].

[6] Last Known Address

The term "last known address" as used in the Self-Service Storage Facility Act means the address provided by the occupant in the latest rental agreement, or the address provided by the occupant in a subsequent written notice of a change of address [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.12

§ 517.12 Self-Service Storage Facility Contracts

A contract for the rental or lease of individual storage space in a self-service storage facility must be in writing. In addition to the provisions otherwise required or permitted by law to be included, the contract must contain a statement that the occupant's property will be subject to a claim of lien and may be sold to satisfy the lien if the rent or other charges due remain unpaid for 14 consecutive days. The contract must also state that actions relating to these liens are authorized by the Self-Service Storage Facility Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21712(a)*].

The rental agreement must request and provide space for the occupant to give the name and address of another person to whom preliminary lien notices and subsequent notices required by the Self-Service Storage Facility Act may be sent. If the agreement does not so provide, the Self-Service Storage Facility Act does not apply, and liens authorized by the Act will not attach. An occupant's failure to provide an alternative address, however, does not affect an owner's remedies under the Act or any other provision of law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21712(b)*].

The Self-Service Storage Facility Act may not be construed to impair or affect the rights of the parties to a rental agreement to create additional rights, duties, and obligations in and by virtue of the agreement. The rights provided by the Act are in addition to all other rights provided by law to a creditor against his or her debtor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21713*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsLease ProvisionsReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.13

§ 517.13 Individual Storage Containers

[1] Definition

The term "individual storage container" means a container that meets all of the following requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(d)*]:

- It is fully enclosed and locked.
- It contains not less than 100 cubic feet and not more than 1,100 cubic feet.
- It is constructed out of a durable material appropriate for repeated use. A box constructed out of cardboard or a similar material is not an individual storage container.

[2] Transportation Not Subject to Public Utility Regulation

The owner or operator of a self-service storage facility, or a household goods carrier, may, for a fee, transport individual storage containers to and from a self-service storage facility that he or she owns or operates. This transportation activity, whether performed by an owner, operator, or carrier, is not transportation for compensation or hire as a business of used household goods, and is not subject to regulation under Public Utilities Code Chapter 7 (commencing with *Pub. Util. Code § 5101*), if the following requirements are met [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)*]:

- The fee charged to deliver an empty individual storage container to a customer and to transport the loaded container to a self-service storage facility, or the fee charged to return a loaded individual storage container from a self-service storage facility to the customer must not exceed $100 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(1)*].
- The owner, operator, or carrier, or any affiliate of the owner, operator, or carrier, must not load, pack, or otherwise handle the contents of the container [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(2)*].
- The owner, operator, or carrier must be registered under *Veh. Code § 34620 et seq.* or must hold a

permit under *Pub. Util. Code § 5101 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(3)*].

- The owner, operator, or carrier must maintain cargo insurance in the amount of at least $20,000 per shipment. Proof of cargo insurance coverage must be maintained on file and presented to the Department of Motor Vehicles or Public Utilities Commission on written request [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(4)*].

- Not later than the time the empty individual storage container is delivered to the customer, the company must provide the customer with an informational brochure containing the following information about loading the container [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(6)*]:

  - Packing and loading tips to minimize damage in transit;

  - A suggestion that the customer should make an inventory of the items as they are loaded and should keep any other record (for example, photographs or a video recording) that may assist in any subsequent claims processing;

  - A list of items that are impermissible to pack in the container (for example, flammable items); and

  - A list of items that are not recommended to be packed in view of foreseeable hazards inherent in the company's handling of the containers and in view of any limitation of liability contained in the rental agreement.

- The owner, operator, or carrier must disclose to the customer in advance the following information regarding the container transfer service offered, in a written document separate from others furnished at the time of disclosure [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(5)*]:

  - A detailed description of the transfer service, including a commitment to use best efforts to place the container in an appropriate location designated by the customer;

  - The dimensions and construction of the individual storage containers used;

  - The unit charge, if any, for the container transfer service, in addition to the storage charge or any other fees under the rental agreement;

  - The availability of delivery or pickup by the customer of his or her goods at the self-service storage facility;

  - The maximum allowable distance, measured from the self-service storage facility, for the initial pickup and final delivery of the loaded container;

  - The precise terms of the company's right to move a container from the initial storage location at its own discretion, and a statement that the customer will not be required to pay additional charges with respect to that transfer; and

  - Conspicuous disclosure, in boldface text, of the allocation of responsibility for the risk of loss or damage to the customer's goods, including any disclaimer of the company's liability, and the procedure for presenting any claim regarding loss or damage to the company.

The customer must receive the disclosure of terms and conditions along with the rental agreement at least 72 hours before delivery of the empty individual storage container; however, the customer may, in writing, knowingly and voluntarily waive that receipt. The company must record in a writing, which must be retained for at least six months after the end of the rental, the time and method of delivery of the information, any waiver made by the customer, and the times and dates of initial pickup and redelivery of the containerized goods [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(a)(5)*].

[3] Pickup and Delivery

Pickup and delivery of the individual storage containers must be on dates agreed to by the customer and the company. If the company requires the customer to be physically present at the time of pickup, the company must be at the customer's premises prepared to perform the service not more than four hours later than the agreed-upon time, and in the event of a preventable breach of that obligation by the company, the customer is entitled to receive a penalty of $50 from the company and to elect rescission of the rental agreement without liability [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(b)*].

[4] Transportation at Company's Expense

No charge may be assessed with respect to any movement of the container between self-service storage facilities by the company at its own discretion, nor for the delivery of a container to a customer's premises if the customer advises the company, at least 24 hours before the agreed time of container drop-off, orally or in writing, that he or she is rescinding the request for service [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(c)*].

[5] Authority of Public Utility Commission

Nothing in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1* limits the authority of the Public Utilities Commission to investigate and commence an appropriate enforcement action against any person transporting household goods in individual storage containers in a manner other than that described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1(e)*].

[6] Operation Under Authority of Household Goods Permit

Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701.1, which describes the transportation activities that may be provided without a household goods carrier permit, is not intended to limit the ability of an owner or operator of a self-service storage facility to otherwise transport household goods under the authority of a household goods carrier permit [Stats. 1998, ch. 45, § 3 (declaration of legislative intent)]. Thus, an owner or operator who holds such a permit may operate freely under that permit, and is not required to rely on the provisions of the Self-Storage Facility Act discussed above.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawTransportation & PipelinesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.14

§ 517.14 Lien on Stored Personal Property

[1] Scope of Lien

The owner of a self-service storage facility and his or her heirs, executors, administrators, successors, and assigns have a lien on all personal property located at a self-service storage facility for rent, labor, late-payment fees, or other charges, present or future, incurred pursuant to the rental agreement, and for expenses necessary for the preservation, sale, or disposition of personal property subject to the provisions of the Self-Service Storage Facility Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702*].

[2] Vehicles and Vessels

Any lien on a vehicle or vessel subject to registration or identification under the Vehicle Code that has attached and is set forth in the documents of title to the vehicle or vessel has priority over a lien created pursuant to the Self-Service Storage Facility Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702.5(a)*].

A lien created pursuant to the Self-Service Storage Facility Act on a vehicle or vessel subject to registration and identification under the Vehicle Code must be enforced in accordance with the provisions of *Civ. Code § 3071* (vehicles) or *Harb. & Nav. Code § 503* (vessels), and not as prescribed by *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21705-21711*, except that actions to enforce a lien may be conducted as provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710*[*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702.5(b)*; for discussion of actions pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710, see § 517.16, below*].

The proceeds from a lien sale must be disposed of pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3073* (vehicles) or *Harb. & Nav. Code § 507.5* (vessels) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702.5(d)*].

A lien created pursuant to the Self-Service Storage Act on a vehicle or vessel subject to registration and identification under the Vehicle Code may not include any charges for rent, labor, or other services incurred pursuant to the rental agreement, that accrue more than 60 days after the date the lien attaches pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705*, and before application is made for authorization to conduct the lien sale pursuant to the requirements of *Civ. Code § 3071*(vehicles) or *Harb. & Nav. Code § 503*(vessels) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702.5(c)*].

[3] Preliminary Lien Notice

If any part of the rent or other charges due from an occupant remain unpaid for 14 consecutive days, an owner may terminate the occupant's right to use of the storage space by sending a preliminary lien notice to the occupant's last known address, and to the alternative address specified in the rental contract pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21712(b)*, by certified, or by regular first-class mail if the owner obtains a certificate of mailing indicating the date the notice was mailed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703*]. Although certified mail is more expensive, it may be more advantageous to the owner to use this method because the owner's right to remove property from the space accrues more quickly when certified mail is used [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(a),(b)*, discussed in [4], *below*].

The preliminary lien notice must contain all of the following:

- An itemized statement of the owner's claim showing the sums due at the time of the preliminary lien notice and the date when the sums became due [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703(a)*].

- A statement that the occupant's right to use the storage space will terminate on a specified date not less than 14 days after the mailing of the notice unless the occupant pays all sums due prior to that date [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703(b)*].

- A notice that the occupant may be denied access to the storage space after the termination date if the sums are not paid, and that an owner's lien, as provided for in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702*, may be imposed thereafter [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703(c)*].

- The name, street address, and telephone number of the owner, or his or her designated agent, whom the occupant may contact to respond to the notice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703(d)*].

A preliminary lien notice form that satisfies the requirements of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703* is set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21704*.

[4] Attachment

If a preliminary lien notice [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703*] has been sent as specified in [3], *above*, and the total sum due has not been paid as of the date specified in the preliminary lien notice as the termination date, a lien attaches as of that date [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(a),(b)*]. The owner may then enter the space and deny the occupant access to it [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(a)(1),(2),(b)*]. If the preliminary lien notice was sent by certified mail and the total sum due was not paid as of the termination date, the owner may also remove any property found in the space to a place of safekeeping [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(a)(3)*]. If the preliminary lien notice was sent by regular first class mail with a certificate of mailing, the owner still may enter the space and deny the owner access to it if the total sum due has not been paid as of the termination date, but may not remove the occupant's property until at least 14 days after the termination date, during which time the occupant may regain full use of the space by paying the full lien amount [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(b)*]. In either case, the owner must then send the occupant a Notice of Lien Sale and a blank Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)*; *see* [5] and [6], *below*].

[5] Notice of Lien Sale

When a lien attaches pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705* [*see* [4], *above*] the owner must send to the occupant, addressed to the occupant's last known address, and to the alternative address provided in the rental contract, by certified mail, postage prepaid, a notice of lien sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(1)*]. The notice of lien sale must state the following:

- That the occupant's right to use the storage space has terminated and that the occupant no longer has access to the stored property [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(1)(A)*];

- That the stored property is subject to a lien, and the amount of the lien [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(1)(B)*];

- That the property will be sold to satisfy the lien after a specified date that is not less than 14 days from the date the notice was mailed, unless the amount of the lien is paid or the occupant executes under penalty of perjury and returns by certified mail a declaration in opposition to the lien sale in the form prescribed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(2)* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(1)(C)*; *see* [6], *below*]; and

- That any proceeds of the sale in excess of the lien amount and costs of sale will be retained by the owner and may be reclaimed by the occupant, or claimed by another person, at any time for a period of one year from the sale and that after one year the proceeds will escheat to the county [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(1)(D)*].

For a notice of lien sale, *see California Legal Forms, Ch. 54A, Storage of Goods, § 54A.222* (Matthew Bender).

[6] Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale

In addition to the notice of lien sale, on attachment of the lien, the owner must send the occupant, addressed to the occupant's last known address and to the alternative address provided in the rental contract, by certified mail, postage prepaid, a blank declaration in opposition to the lien sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(2)*].

A declaration form is set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(2)*, and generally requires the occupant to declare under penalty of perjury receipt of the notice of lien sale, opposition to the lien sale, his or her address, and that he or she understands that the lienholder may file an action in court, and if the action results in a judgment for the lienholder, that the occupant may be liable for court costs [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(c)(2)*]. For a declaration in opposition to a lien sale, *see California Legal Forms, Ch. 54A, Storage of Goods, § 54A.223* (Matthew Bender).

If a declaration in opposition to the lien sale, executed under penalty of perjury, is not received prior to the date of sale set forth in the notice of lien sale, the owner may sell the property [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21706*; *see § 517.15, below*]. If a declaration in opposition to the lien sale is received prior to the date set forth in the notice of lien sale, the owner may enforce the lien in an action pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710*[*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710*; *see § 517.16, below*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.15

§ 517.15 Lien Sale

[1] When Available

Once an owner's lien has attached, and if a declaration in opposition to the lien sale, executed under penalty of perjury, is not received prior to the date of sale set forth in the notice of lien sale, the owner of a self-service storage facility may sell the property. The sale is subject to the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21708*, relating to security interest claims, and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21709*, relating to pre-sale redemption [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21706*; *see* [3] and [4] *below*]. Additionally, the sale must comply with the requirements of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21707* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21706*; *see* [2] and [5], *below*].

[2] Advertisement

After the expiration of the time given in the notice of lien sale, pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705(a)*, an advertisement of the lien sale must be published once a week for two weeks consecutively in a newspaper of general circulation published in the judicial district in which the sale is to be held. The advertisement must include a general description of the goods, the name of the person on whose account they are being stored, the space number of the occupant, and the name and location of the storage facility. If there is no newspaper of general circulation published in the judicial district in which the sale is to be held, the advertisement must be posted at least 10 days before the sale in at least six conspicuous places in the neighborhood of the proposed sale [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21707(a)]. For an advertisement of lien sale, *see California Legal Forms, Ch. 54A, Storage of Goods, § 54A.224* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Security Interest Claims

If no declaration of opposition to the lien sale is executed and returned by the occupant, any person who has a perfected interest under *Com. Code § 9101 et seq.* may claim any personal property subject to that security interest and subject to a lien pursuant to the Self-Service Storage Facility Act by paying the total amount due, as specified in the preliminary lien notice, for the storage of the property. On payment of the total amount due, the owner must deliver possession of the particular property subject to the security interest to the person who paid the total amount due [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21708*]. The owner is not liable to any person for any action taken pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21708* if the owner has fully complied with the requirements of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21704-21705*, relating to notices [*Bus. & Prof. Code*

§ 21708].

[4] Presale Redemption

Prior to a lien sale authorized pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21706*, any person claiming a right to the goods may pay the amount necessary to satisfy the lien and reasonable expenses incurred for particular actions taken pursuant to the Self-Service Storage Facility Act. Under these circumstances, the goods may not be sold, and must be retained by the owner subject to the terms of the Self-Service Storage Facility Act pending a court order directing a particular disposition of the property [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21709*].

[5] Conduct and Disposition of Proceeds

A lien sale must be conducted in a commercially reasonable manner, and, after deducting the amount of the lien and costs of sale, the owner must retain any excess proceeds of the sale on the occupant's behalf. The occupant, or any other person having a court order or other judicial process against the property, may claim the excess proceeds, or a portion thereof sufficient to satisfy the particular claim, at any time within one year of the date of sale. Thereafter, the owner must pay any remaining excess proceeds to the treasury of the county in which the sale was held [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21707(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.16

§ 517.16 Action to Enforce Lien

[1] Procedures

If a declaration in opposition to the lien sale is received prior to the date set forth in the notice of lien sale, the owner may enforce the lien in an action commenced by filing a verified complaint setting forth the facts on which the claim of lien is based. The summons and complaint may be served by certified mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the occupant at his or her last known address, in which case service will be deemed completed on the fifth day after the mailing, or in any other manner authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(a)*; *see generally* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

The occupant has 10 days in which to respond to the complaint after service of the summons is completed, and this period may be extended for good cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(b)*]. If the occupant does not respond to the complaint by answer or demurrer within the time allowed after service is completed, the clerk, or the judge if there is no clerk, on application of the owner, will enter the default of the occupant. The owner may then apply to the court for judgment in the amount of the lien, including costs [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(c)*; *see generally* Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*].

[2] Sale to Enforce Judgment

An owner may sell the property to enforce a judgment in his, her, or its favor entered in an action on a lien authorized by the Self-Service Storage Facility Act. The sale must be conducted in a commercially reasonable manner, and must take place 10 days or more from the entry of judgment, unless within that time period, or at any time prior to the sale, the occupant pays the owner the full amount of the judgment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(d)*]. Enforcement of the judgment may be stayed, pending appeal, if the occupant posts a bond in an amount one and one-half times the amount of the judgment. If the occupant posts a bond, the property may be released to him or her [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.17

§ 517.17 Rights of Good Faith Purchaser

A purchaser in good faith of goods sold to enforce a lien or a judgment entered on the lien in favor of the owner on goods stored at a self-service storage facility takes the goods free of all rights of persons against whom the lien was claimed. A good faith purchaser takes the property free of these rights, despite noncompliance by the owner of the storage facility with the requirements of the Self-Service Storage Facility Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21711*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawSales of GoodsTitle, Creditors & Good Faith PurchasersPassing of TitleContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.18

§ 517.18 Household and Personal Property of Military Service Members

Under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] and similar California law [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*], no person may exercise any right to foreclose or enforce any lien for storage of household goods, furniture, or personal effects of a member [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 511(1)*] of the uniformed services [*see 10 U.S.C. § 101(a)(5)* (definition)] or the national guard or military reserve [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)*] during his or her period of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. § 511(1)-(3)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(b)* (active service or active duty)], and for 90 days after that period, except on an order previously granted by a court on application and a return made and approved by the court. In that proceeding the court may, after hearing, in its discretion on its own motion, and must on application to it by a service member or some person on his or her behalf, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the defendant to pay the storage charges due is not materially affected by reason of his or her military service, stay the proceedings as provided in the governing law and make whatever other disposition of the case is equitable to conserve the interest of all parties [*50 U.S.C. App. § 537(b)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.1(b)*].

Dependents of a service member are entitled to the benefits accorded to service members under the foregoing provisions, on application to a court for the benefits, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the dependents to comply with the terms of the storage contract has not been materially impaired by reason of the military service of the person on whom the applicants are dependent [*50 U.S.C. App. § 538*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 517.19-517.29

[Reserved]

§§ 517.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.30

§ 517.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For discussion and forms relating to the storage of goods generally, and under the California Self-Service Storage Facility Act, *see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 54A, *Storage of Goods* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsBailmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.31

§ 517.31 State Statutes

[1] In General

California Self-Service Storage Facility Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.*

[2] Definitions

Self-service storage facility. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(a)*

Owner. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(b)*

Occupant. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(c)*

Rental agreement. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(d)*

[3] Lien on Stored Personal Property

[a] In General

Owner's lien authorized. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702*

Vehicles and vessels. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702.5*

Attachment. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705*

Action by owner to enforce lien is authorized on receipt of declaration in opposition to lien sale. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710*

[b] Notices and Declarations

Preliminary lien notice is required to terminate occupant's right to use of storage space for unpaid rent or charges; contents of notice. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703*

Form of preliminary lien notice. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21704*

Blank declaration in opposition to lien sale is required to be sent to occupant by owner on attachment of lien; form. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705*

Notice of lien sale is required to be sent to occupant by owner on attachment of lien; contents. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705*

[c] Sale

Authorization to enforce lien. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21706*

Advertisement. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21707(a)*

Conduct and disposition of proceeds. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21707(b)*

Security interest claims. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21708*

Presale redemption. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21709*

Authorization to enforce judgment in favor of owner entered in action on lien. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(d)*

Rights of good faith purchaser. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21711*

[4] Self-Service Storage Facility Contracts

Requirements. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21712*

Self-Service Storage Facility Act does not impair or affect rights of parties to rental agreement to create additional rights, duties and obligations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21713*

Self-Service Storage Facility Act applies only to agreements entered into, extended, or renewed after January 1, 1982. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21714, 21715*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.32

§ 517.32 Decisions

California Self-Service Storage Facility Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.*] permits rental agreements to be construed as leases, rather than licenses, even though Act provides expedited remedy against occupants of self-storage units who are delinquent in rent. *In re Safeguard Self-Storage Trust (9th Cir. 1993) 2 F.3d 967, 970-971*

In event of occupant's bankruptcy, bankruptcy court could apply *Civ. Code § 1980 et seq.* (governing disposition of personal property remaining on rented premises at termination of tenancy) in determining whether occupant's property in storage unit could be sold by storage facility owner to collect overdue rent after owner had notice of bankruptcy. *Ozenne v. Bendon (In re Ozenne) (Bankr. 9th Cir. 2006) 337 B.R. 214, 219*

Self-storage agreement controls by placing its lock on occupant's unit after it was vandalized and requesting occupant to inspect unit for stolen items and to replace lock with one of occupant's (as required by contract), owner did not become involuntary bailee [*see Civ. Code § 1815*] and was not liable for subsequent theft of items from unit. *Sackett v. Public Storage Management (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1089, 1092-1093, 272 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawEstate PropertyGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBailmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsCommercial LeasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 517.33-517.49

[Reserved]

§§ 517.33[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART IV. FORMS

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.50

§ 517.50 Complaint by Owner of Self-Service Storage Facility Against Occupant to Foreclose Lien on Personal Property [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.]

[1] FORM Complaint by Owner of Self-Service Storage Facility Against Occupant to Foreclose Lien on Personal Property [Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT TO FORECLOSE LIEN ON PER-
_____ [*name*],	)	SONAL PROPERTY
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	(Self-Service Storage Facility)
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is the _____ [*specify capacity as self-service storage facility owner as defined in Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(b), e.g.,* owner and operator] of a self-service storage facility, as defined in *Business and Professions Code Section 21701(a)*, commonly referred to as _____[*specify name and street address of self-service storage facility*], _____ County, California ("the facility").

2. Defendant(s) is/are, and at all times mentioned in this complaint was/were, _____ [a resident *or* residents] of _____ County, California.

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate, e.g.,* Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants

sued herein as DOES I- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of such fictitiously named defendants claims an interest in the property sought to be sold in this proceeding or is indebted to plaintiff on the obligation described in this complaint.)]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate, e.g.,* At all times herein mentioned defendant _____ (*name*) was authorized and empowered by defendant _____ (*principal*) to act and did act as the agent of defendant _____(*principal*), and each and all of the things herein alleged to have been done by him/her were done in the capacity of and as agent for defendant _____ (*principal*).]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant(s) entered into _____ [a written *or* an oral] agreement ("the agreement"), by the terms of which plaintiff rented storage space _____ [*identify storage space, e.g.,* unit 123] ("the storage space"), to defendant(s) _____ [*describe nature of tenancy, e.g.,* for a term of one year] at the agreed rental of $_____ per _____ [*specify, e.g.,* month] payable _____ [*specify, e.g.,* in advance on the first day of each month], commencing on _____ [*date*]. [A copy of the rental agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference.]

6. Pursuant to the terms of the rental agreement, defendant(s) was/were entitled to use of the storage space to the exclusion of others, and was/were _____ [an occupant *or* occupants] of the facility as defined by *Business and Professions Code Section 21701(c).*

7. Defendant(s) took possession of the storage space on _____ [*date*].

8. Plaintiff has duly performed all of the conditions of the rental agreement to be performed on his/her/its part.

9. Rent has accrued and is unpaid under the rental agreement for the months of _____ [*month*], _____ [*year*] to _____[*month*], _____ [*year*], in the total sum of $_____. [Additional charges for _____ (*specify e.g.,* security fees) have accrued and are unpaid pursuant to the rental agreement in the sum of $_____.]

10. On _____ [*date*], pursuant to the requirements of *Business and Professions Code Section 21703*, plaintiff mailed a preliminary lien notice to defendant(s) at the address _____ [provided by him/her/them in the rental agreement *or* provided by him/her/them to plaintiff in a written notice of change of address dated _____. (A copy of the notice of change of address is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.)]. Pursuant to *Business and Professions Code Section 21703*, plaintiff also mailed the preliminary lien notice to the alternative address specified by defendant(s) in the rental agreement. A copy of the preliminary lien notice is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated herein by reference.

11. Pursuant to *Business and Professions Code Section 21703(b)*, the preliminary lien notice provided that the right(s) of defendant(s) to use the storage space would terminate on _____ [*specify termination date set forth in preliminary lien notice*] if defendant(s) did not pay all sums due plaintiff prior to that date.

12. As of _____ [*specify termination date set forth in preliminary lien notice*], the sums described in the preliminary lien notice as due and owing had not been paid, and plaintiff _____ [*specify actions taken by plaintiff pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705, e.g.,* denied defendants access to the storage space and removed the property therein to a place of safe keeping].

[13. In removing and preserving the property plaintiff has incurred expenses in the amount of $_____.]

14. Pursuant to *Business and Professions Code Section 21700 et seq.*, plaintiff has a lien in the amount of $_____ [*specify total amount of rent and charges owed, and all expenses incurred in removing property and preserving it in a place of safekeeping*] on the property stored in the storage space by defendant(s).

15. On _____ [*specify termination date set forth in preliminary lien notice*], plaintiff mailed to defendant(s), at the address _____ [provided by him/her/them in the rental agreement *or* provided by him/her/them to plaintiff in a written notice of change of address dated _____], and to the alternative address specified by defendant(s) in the rental agreement, a Notice of Lien Sale and blank Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale, as required pursuant to *Section 21705 of the Business and Professions Code*. Copies of the Notice of Lien Sale and blank Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale are attached as Exhibits D and E and incorporated herein by reference.

16. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff received a Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale, executed by defendant(s) under penalty of perjury. A copy of the executed Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale is attached as Exhibit F and incorporated herein by reference.

17. The rental agreement provides for the payment of attorney's fees to the prevailing party in any action brought to enforce the terms of the agreement. The sum of $_____ is a reasonable attorney's fee to allow plaintiff for the commencement and prosecution of this action.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For $_____ as the amount of the lien;

2. That the lien be foreclosed;

3. That the property be ordered sold for payment of the lien and that the lien be paid from the proceeds of the sale;

4. For reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of $_____;

5. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____[*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by the owner of a self-service storage facility against an occupant of the facility to enforce an owner's lien for rent or other charges on personal property stored at the self-service storage facility [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710*].

This form is based in part on a form contributed by Paul S. Rudder of Rudder, Liebersbach & Mohun of Mammoth Lakes, California.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity as an owner as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(b)* of a self-service storage facility (Paragraph 1).

- The name and address of the self-service storage facility (Paragraph 1).

- Defendant's or defendants' residence(s) (Paragraph 2).

- An optional allegation as to fictitiously named defendants (Optional Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*].

- An optional allegation for use when agents were acting for defendant (Optional Paragraph 4) [*see Civ. Code §§ 2318, 2319*].

- The agreement between plaintiff and defendant for rental of the storage space (Paragraph 5).

- Defendant's capacity as an occupant as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21701(c)* (Paragraph 6).

- Defendant's possession of the storage space (Paragraph 7).

- Performance by plaintiff of all conditions of the rental agreement to be performed on his, her, or its part (Paragraph 8).

- The amount of unpaid, accrued rent and other charges owed plaintiff by defendant (Paragraph 9).

- That plaintiff mailed defendant a preliminary lien notice pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21703*, and the date that the notice was mailed (Paragraph 10).

- The termination date as set forth in the preliminary lien notice (Paragraph 11).

- That as of the termination date the sums owed had not been paid, and the actions taken by plaintiff pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code 21705* (Paragraph 12).

- An optional paragraph for use when plaintiff has incurred expenses in removing and preserving the property (Optional Paragraph 13).

- That plaintiff has a lien on the property pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.*, and the amount of the lien (Paragraph 14).

- That plaintiff mailed defendant a Notice of Lien Sale and blank Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale, as required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21705*, and the date of mailing (Paragraph 15).

- That plaintiff received an executed Declaration in Opposition to Lien Sale, and the date of receipt (Paragraph 16).

- An optional allegation for use when the rental agreement provides for payment of attorney's fees (Paragraph 17).

[4] Verification

A complaint that seeks to enforce an owner's lien authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21702* for unpaid rent or other charges on personal property located at a self-service storage facility must be verified [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(a)*].

[5] Summons and Service

For the mandatory Judicial Council summons form for use in actions to enforce storage liens [Judicial Council Form SUM-140], see *§ 517.51*.

The summons and complaint may be served by certified mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the defendant(s) at the address provided in the rental agreement or in a subsequent written notice of change of address. Service is deemed completed on the fifth day after the mailing, or in any other manner authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(a)*; *see generally* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[6] Time for Response

The defendant has 10 days within which to respond to the complaint after service of the summons is completed; this time may be extended for good cause [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(b)*]. If the defendant does not respond by answer or demurrer within the time allowed after service is completed, the clerk, or the judge if there is no clerk, on application of the plaintiff, will enter the defendant's default, and the plaintiff may apply to the court for judgment in the amount of the lien, including costs [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(c)*; *see generally* Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*].

[7] Enforcement

The plaintiff may enforce a judgment entered in an action on a lien authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21700 et seq.* by a sale of the property. The sale must be conducted in a commercially reasonable manner, and must take place 10 days or more from the entry of judgment, unless within that time period, or at any time prior to the sale, the occupant pays the owner the full amount of the judgment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(d)*]. Enforcement of the judgment may be stayed, pending appeal, if the occupant posts a bond in an amount one and one-half times the amount of the judgment. If the occupant posts a bond, the property may be released to him or her [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710(e)*].

[8] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, *see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.140* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to FAX filing and service of papers, see Ch. 264, *Fax Filing and Service of Papers*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and forms relating to actions for recovery of rent, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy*

For discussion and forms relating to enforcement of liens generally, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 517 SELF-SERVICE STORAGE FACILITIES
PART IV. FORMS

45-517 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 517.51

§ 517.51 Summons--Storage Lien Enforcement--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-140]

[1] FORM Summons--Storage Lien Enforcement--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-140]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The summons illustrated in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of a form adopted by the Judicial Council for use in a civil action to enforce a storage lien on personal property [*see § 517.50*]. Use of this form, when applicable is mandatory [*see Gov. Code § 68511*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; Judicial Council Form SUM-140].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

For additional discussion regarding the service of summons and complaint in this type of action, see *§ 517.50[5]*. For general discussion of completion of the standard Judicial Council summons forms generally, see *Ch. 517, Service of Summons and Papers, § 518.70*. For discussion and forms relating to proof of service of the summons in civil actions generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 518.syn

§ 518.syn Synopsis to Chapter 518: SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS

§ 518.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 518.02 Cross References

§ 518.03 Governing Law

§§ 518.04-518.09 [Reserved]

§ 518.10 "Summons" Defined

§ 518.11 Procedural Due Process Requirement

§ 518.12 Persons Immune to Service of Summons or Suit

§ 518.13 Acquisition of In Personam Jurisdiction

[1] By Service of Summons or General Appearance

[2] Minimum Contacts Requirement

§ 518.14 Issuance of Summons and Amended Summons

[1] Issuance by Clerk and Court's Retention of Original Summons

[2] Electronic Summons

[3] Multiple Copies Available

[4] Amended Summons

§ 518.15 Service of Summons

[1] Governing Statutes

[2] In Case Not Covered by Statute

[3] By Whom Made

[a] Qualifications

[b] Registered Process Servers

[4] Time for Service of Summons

§ 518.16 Manners of Serving Summons

[1] Hand Delivery

[2] Substituted Service

[a] Term "Constructive Service" Distinguished

[b] Statutes Authorizing Substituted Service

[3] Combination Service

[a] Business and Public Entities

[b] Individuals

[i] Generally

[ii] Reasonable Diligence

[4] Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt

[a] Procedure

[b] When Service Is Complete

[5] Certified or Registered Mail (Outside California)

[6] Publication (Constructive Service)

[a] Affidavit for Service by Publication

[b] Order for Service by Publication

[c] Completion of Service by Publication

[d] Service of Statement of Damages by Publication

[7] Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

[8] Transmitted by Telegraph

[9] In Foreign Country

[a] Convention on Service Abroad

[i] Existence of and Signatories to Convention

[ii] Determining When Convention Governs

[b] Service Under Convention

[i] Procedure Specified

[ii] Article 10 Alternatives

[c] Service Under Foreign Service Immunities Act

§ 518.17 Service on Particular Defendants

[1] Active Corporation

[a] Under Code of Civil Procedure

[b] Under Corporations Code

[i] Domestic Corporation

[ii] Foreign Corporation

[iii] Applicability of Prior Law

[1A] Suspended Domestic Corporation

[2] Defunct Corporation

[3] Joint Stock Company or Association

[4] Unincorporated Association or Partnership

[a] In General

[b] Association Domiciled Outside California

[c] Service Through Secretary of State

[d] Court-Ordered Service on Member

[4.1] Registered Limited Liability Partnership Whose Principal Office Is Not in State or Foreign Limited Liability Partnership

[a] Designation of Agent

[b] On Whom Service Can Be Made

[c] Court Ordered Service on Secretary Of State

[d] Secretary of State's Certificate as Evidence

[5] Limited Liability Company

[a] Service on Agent

[b] Agent Has Resigned or Cannot Be Found

[c] Members Consent to Service

[5A] Business Organization When Form Unknown

[6] Public Entity

[a] Service on Clerk, Attorney General, Officer, or Other Agency Directors

[b] If Appropriate Officer Cannot Be Ascertained

[7] Minor

[8] Person Other Than Minor for Whom Guardian, Conservator, or Similar Fiduciary Has Been Appointed

[9] Candidate for Public Office

[10] Persons Not Otherwise Specified

[11] Resident Motorist

[a] Consent to Service in or Outside of California

[b] Manner of Service on Resident Outside California

[12] Nonresident Motorist

[a] Consent to Service

[b] Manner of Service on Nonresident Motorist

[i] Vehicle Code Provisions

[ii] Code of Civil Procedure Provisions

[13] Nonresident Executor or Administrator

[14] Nonresident Insurer

[15] Nonresident Real Estate Licensee or Subdivider

[16] Under Securities and Franchise Investment Laws

[a] Consent to Service on Commissioner

[b] Service on Commissioner

[c] Equivalents to Appointment of Commissioner

[d] Other Methods of Service

[17] Incarcerated Individual

§ 518.18 Service at Gated Community

[1] Access to Community

[2] Substituted Service on Guard

§ 518.19 Ascertaining Defendant's Military Status at Time of Service of Summons

§ 518.20 Proof of Service

[1] Governing Statutes

[2] Judicial Council Forms

[3] Within California

[a] In General

[b] Personal Service or Combination Service

[c] Service by Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt

[d] Service by Publication

[e] Service in Unlawful Detainer Action

[f] Service Under Other California Statute

[4] Outside California

[a] Under California Service Statute

[b] Service in Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

[c] Service Pursuant to Court Order

[d] Written Admission

[5] By Registered Process Server

§ 518.21 Filing Proof of Service and Presumptions

[1] Filing Requirement

[2] Presumptions

§ 518.22 Dismissal of Action for Failure to Serve Summons or File Proof of Service

[1] Generally

[2] Effect of Trial Delay Reduction Programs

§ 518.23 Bad Faith Service and Filing of Complaints and Cross Complaints

§§ 518.24-518.29 [Reserved]

§ 518.30 List of Parties and Addresses

[1] First-Named Plaintiff's Duties to Maintain and Furnish

[2] Duties of All Parties

§ 518.31 Filing and Service

[1] In General

[2] Except in Case of Default

[3] Drop Box for Filing Documents

§ 518.32 Limitations on Filing of Papers

[1] Papers That Will Not Be Filed

[2] Duty to Retain Originals of Unfiled Papers

§ 518.33 Time for Service and Computing "Court Days"

§ 518.34 Manner of Service

[1] In General

[2] Service on Party or Attorney

[3] Service on Nonresident, Nonrepresented Party Who Has Appeared

[4] Personal Service

[5] Substituted Service on Absent Attorney

[6] Substituted Service and Service by Mail on Party

[7] Service by Other Methods

[a] By Mail

[b] By Express Mail or Overnight Delivery

[c] By Facsimile Transmission

[c.1] By Electronic Service

[d] When Service Is Complete and Extension of Time

[i] Service by Mail

[ii] Service by Express Mail or Overnight Delivery

[iii] Service by Facsimile Transmission

[iv] Electronic Service

[e] When Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 Extension of Time Inapplicable

[f] Notation on Papers Served by Other Methods

[8] Service by Telegraph

[9] Service in Foreign Country

§ 518.35 When Service by Mail by Court Clerk Is Complete

§ 518.36 Proof of Service

§ 518.37 Defects in Service or Notice

§§ 518.38-518.39 [Reserved]

§ 518.40 Adoption of Local Rules Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6 and Statewide Uniform Rules of Court for Electronic Filing and Service

§ 518.41 Legal Effect of Electronically Filed Document

[1] Same as Original Paper Document

[2] No Effect on Filing Deadline

§ 518.42 Documents That May Be Filed Electronically

[1] General Rule

[2] Original Documents

[3] Orders and Judgments

§ 518.43 Court Order Requiring Electronic Filing and Service in Special Cases

§ 518.44 Requirements and Options for Courts Accepting Electronically Filed Documents

[1] Internet-Accessible System

[2] Publication of Electronic Filing Requirements

[3] Problems With System

[4] Public Access to Electronically Filed Documents

[5] Option of Contracting with Electronic Filing Service Providers

[a] Right to Contract and Provisions

[b] Transmission of Filing to Court

[c] Confirmation of Receipt and Filing of Document

[d] Ownership of Information

[e] Technical Standards

§ 518.45 Responsibilities of Persons Filing Electronic Documents

[1] Definitions

[2] Conditions of Filing

[3] Format of Electronically Filed Documents

[4] Signature Requirements

[a] Documents Under Penalty of Perjury

[b] Document Not Under Penalty of Perjury

[c] Documents Requiring Signatures of Opposing Parties

[d] Digital Signatures

[e] Electronic Judicial Signatures

[5] Filing Fees

[a] Payment of Fees

[b] Waiver of Fees

§ 518.46 Actions by Court on Receipt of Electronic Filing

[1] Confirmation of Receipt and Filing of Document

[2] Notice of Rejection of Document for Filing

[3] Court Business Hours and Delayed Delivery

[4] Endorsement

§ 518.47 Issuance of Electronic Summons

§ 518.48 Electronic Service

[1] Applicability and Election

[2] When Service is Complete

[3] Extension of Time for Motion Papers Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 1005

[4] Proof of Service

[5] Change of Electronic Notification Address

[6] Electronic Service by Court

§ 518.49 [Reserved]

§ 518.50 Federal Treaties

§ 518.51 State Statutes

[1] Appearance

[2] Civil Action

[3] Manner in Which Summons May Be Served

[4] Proof of Service of Summons

[5] Return of Service of Summons

[6] Sanctions

[7] Service of Papers Other Than Summons and Complaint

[8] Service of Summons Generally

[9] Service on Particular Defendants

[10] Summons

§ 518.52 California Rules of Court

§ 518.53 Decisions

[1] Abuse of Process

[2] Action for Unpaid Taxes

[3] Civil Action Pending Workers' Compensation Case

[4] Foreign Corporations

[5] Process

[6] Proof of Service

[7] Service of Papers Other Than Summons

[a] By Mail

[b] By Service on Attorney

[c] Service of Deposition Subpoena

[8] Service of Process

[9] Service of Summons by Hand

[10] Service of Summons by Mail

[11] Service of Summons by Publication

[a] In General

[b] Showing of Diligence Required

[12] Service of Summons on Sister State

[13] Substituted Service

[14] Substituted Service Combined With Service by Mail

[15] Summons

[16] Tortious Service

§ 518.54 Law Reviews

§ 518.55 Text References

§§ 518.56-518.59 [Reserved]

§ 518.60 Plaintiff's Checklist for Service and Return of Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Preparation of Papers

[3] Issuance and Service of Summons

[4] Proof of Service

[5] Filing Proof of Service

§ 518.61 Defendant's Checklist for Responding to Service of Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Preparation of Papers

[3] Service of Papers

[4] Filing of Papers

§ 518.62 Checklist for Filing and Service of Papers Other Than Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Preparation of Papers

[3] Service of Papers

[4] Filing of Papers

§§ 518.63-518.69 [Reserved]

§ 518.70 Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20, 465]--Judicial Council Form SUM-100

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Judicial Council Summons Forms

[a] Six Summons Forms

[b] Additional Party Attachment

[4] General Summons Form Contents

[a] Overview

[b] Names of Parties

[c] Title and Number of Case

[d] Title and Address of Court

[e] Directions, Legends, and Warnings

[f] Plaintiff or Plaintiff's Attorney

[g] Capacity in Which Defendant Is Served

[5] Number of Copies of Summons

§ 518.70A Summons--Cross-Complaint--Judicial Council Form SUM-110

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 518.71 Additional Parties Attachment to Summons--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-200(A)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filling Out Form

§ 518.72 Proof of Service of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-412.40]--Judicial Council Form POS-010

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filling Out Form

[a] Block Heading

[b] Body of Form

[i] Paragraphs 1 and 2

[ii] Paragraph 3

[iii] Paragraph 4

[iv] Paragraph 5

[v] Paragraphs 6 and 7

[vi] Paragraphs 8 and 9

[vii] Date

[4] Computer-Generated or Typewritten Alternative Form

[5] Filing

[6] Number of Copies

§ 518.73 Notice of Service of Summons by Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(a)]--Judicial Council Form POS-015

[1] FORM

[2] Source and Use of Form

[3] Failure of Person Served to Acknowledge Receipt

§ 518.74 Proceedings for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50]

[1] Application for Order--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)]

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Local Forms

[d] Procedure

[e] Caption

[f] Showing Required

[g] Reasonable Diligence

[h] Statement of Facts

[i] Multiple Affidavits

[2] Order for Publication--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)]

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Contents of Court Order

[d] Accomplishing Service by Publication

[e] When Service Is Complete

[f] Service in Another Manner

§ 518.75 Proceedings to Serve Summons on Corporation by Delivery of Process to Secretary of State [Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d); Corp. Code §§ 1702(a) (Domestic Corporation), 2111(a) (Foreign Corporation)]

[1] Application for Order

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Application for Order

[d] Procedure

[e] Showing Required

[i] Domestic Corporation

[ii] Foreign Corporation

[2] Order

[a] FORM

[b] Use of Form

[c] Delivery to Secretary of State

[i] Domestic Corporation

[ii] Foreign Corporation

§ 518.76 Return of Summons Unserved Because of Inability to Find Defendant--Declaration by One Other Than

Law Enforcement

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 518.77 [Reserved]

§ 518.78 Declaration of Mailing of Copy of Summons, of Complaint, and of Order for Publication to Defendant Pursuant to Order for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Proof of Service by Publication

[4] Filing

§§ 518.79-518.89 [Reserved]

§ 518.90 Proof of Personal Service--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1011]--Judicial Council Form POS-020; Judicial Council Form POS-020(D); Judicial Council Form POS-020(P)

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 518.91 Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013, 1013a]--Judicial Council Form POS-030; Judicial Council Form POS-030(D); Judicial Council Form POS-030(P)

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Attorney's Certificate

[4] Presumption of Receipt

[5] Presumption of Invalidity

[6] Cross References

§ 518.92 Proof of Service By Personal Service, Mail, Overnight Delivery, Messenger Service, Facsimile, or E-Mail/Electronic Transmission [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011, 1013, 1013a, 2015.5]--Judicial Council Form POS-040; Judicial Form POS-040(D); Judicial Council Form POS-040(P)

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service by Express Mail, Overnight Delivery, or Facsimile Transmission

[4] Service by E-Mail or Electronic Transmission

[5] Cross References

§ 518.93 Proof of Service of Papers by Mail--Certificate by Active Member of State Bar [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

§ 518.94 Consent to Electronic Service and Notice of Electronic Notification Address [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)]--Judicial Council Form EFS-005

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 518.95 Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address [Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(d)]--Judicial Council Form EFS-010

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 518.96 Proof of Electronic Service [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)]--Judicial Council Form POS-050/EFS-050; Judicial Council Form POS-050 (D)/EFS-050(D); Judicial Council Form POS-050 (P)/EFS-050(P)

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART I. SCOPE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.01

§ 518.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the requirements for the service of summons in civil actions generally under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 410.10-418.10* and in those special proceedings whose governing statutes incorporate the rules of practice set forth in Part Two of the Code of Civil Procedure (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 410.10-418.10*), such as, *Fam. Code § 2331* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1167* (unlawful detainer) [*see § 518.10* et seq.]. The chapter includes checklists for service and filing proof of service of summons [*see § 518.60*] and for responding to summons [*see § 518.61*]. The chapter also contains the following forms relating to summons:

- Judicial Council approved forms of summonses and proofs of service [*see §§ 518.70 -518.73*].
- Forms of applications for orders and of orders relating to service of summons [*see §§ 518.74, 518.75*].
- Form of declarations for return of summons when the defendant could not be served because he or she could not be found [*see § 518.76*].
- Form of declaration of mailing of summons and complaint pursuant to an order for service by publication [*see § 518.78*].

This chapter also discusses service of papers and pleadings during the pendency of civil actions under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465* and *1010-1020* [*see § 518.30* et seq.] and provides a procedural checklist for serving papers under those sections [*see § 518.62*]. It includes forms of declaration of proof of service in the following ways:

- By personal service [*see §§ 518.90, 518.92*].
- By service using first-class mail [*see §§ 518.91, 518.92*].
- By overnight delivery [*see § 518.92*].

- By messenger service [*see § 518.92*].
- By facsimile [*see § 518.92*].
- By e-mail/electronic transmission [*see § 518.92*].
- By mail using an attorney's certificate in lieu of an affidavit or declaration [*see § 518.93*].

This chapter also discusses the authorization of and requirements for electronic filing and service of documents under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.* [*see § 518.40* et seq.].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART I. SCOPE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.02

§ 518.02 Cross References

- For discussion, a procedural checklist, and forms relating to service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

- For discussion and forms relating to service by fax transmission, see Ch. 264, *Fax Filing and Service of Papers* .

- For discussion of additional methods of serving foreign and domestic limited partnerships, see Ch. 405, *Partnerships: Actions Between Limited Partners or Partnerships and Third Parties* .

- For discussion and forms of notices of motion to quash service of summons for lack of personal jurisdiction and motions to stay or dismiss an action on the ground of inconvenient forum, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* .

- For discussion and forms relating to notices of appearances and waivers of service of summons, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* .

- For discussion and forms relating to involuntary dismissal for failure to complete service and return of summons within the mandatory time period, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

- For a discussion of motions to set aside void judgments (*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*), including those that are void for lack of personal jurisdiction over the defendant, as well as other provisions relating to relief from defaults and default judgments, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

- Specific provisions and forms that apply to service of summons and papers in particular situations are covered in the following chapters:

  - For forms of notice of service, declarations of service outside California in action against nonresident motorist, see *Ch. 83, Automobiles: Bringing the Action, § 83.164* et

seq.

- For discussion of the manner of serving papers to bring a party into contempt [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*], see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

- For forms of summonses used in dissolution of marriage, legal separation, and declaration of nullity proceedings, see Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* .

- For forms of summonses used in joint debtor proceedings after judgment, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

- For forms of summonses used in unlawful detainer proceedings, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

- For service of probate notices, see Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements* .

- For discussion of the manner of serving subpoenas, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART I. SCOPE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.03

§ 518.03 Governing Law

The form, contents, issuance, service, and return of summons are governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-417.40*. A number of special provisions in other parts of the Code of Civil Procedure and in other codes relate to the following:

- The contents of the summons and of any required attachments [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 460.5, 460.7* (defamation actions), 751.05, 751.07 (action to reestablish destroyed land records), 861.1 (validation action), 990, 991 (proceeding after judgment against joint debtor), 1167, 1167.3 (proceeding in unlawful or forcible detainer or forcible entry); *Veh. Code § 17462* (action against nonresident motorist); *Civ. Code § 4503*;], or providing that the form and contents of the summons shall be as in civil actions generally [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 872.310(a)* (partition action), 1250.120(a) (eminent domain proceeding)];

- Manners of service [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 751.06, 751.08* (publication and posting, respectively, in action to reestablish destroyed land records), 861 (publication in validation action), 872.310, 872.320, 872.330 (service generally, service by publication, and limitations on service by publication, respectively, in partition action), 1250.120-1250.130 (service by publication and posting in eminent domain proceeding)];

- Particular persons or entities on whom summons is to be served [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10151.5* (nonresident real estate licensees), 11007 (nonresident subdividers); *Corp. Code §§ 1701-1702, 2011* (domestic corporations); *Corp. Code §§ 2110-2111, 2114* (foreign corporations); *Corp. Code § 15627* (foreign and domestic limited partnerships governed by California Revised Limited Partnership Act); *Corp. Code § 15800* (foreign partnerships, with specified exceptions), *Corp. Code § 15901.16* (foreign and domestic limited partnerships governed by Uniform Limited Partnership Act of 2008); *Corp. Code § 16959* (registered limited liability partnership whose principal office not in state and foreign limited liability partnership); *Corp. Code § 18200 et seq.* (unincorporated associations); *Gov. Code §§ 960.2, 960.3* (public entities); *Ins. Code § 12931* (reciprocal and nonresident insurers); *Veh. Code §§ 17451, 17454, 17455* (nonresident motorists); *Pub. Util. Code § 21414* (nonresident aircraft

operators); *Harb. & Nav. Code § 601* (nonresident boat owners); *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 474* (fictitiously named defendants), 1018 (foreign corporations, nonresidents, or absent residents incurring tax liability in California), 1250.140 (eminent domain proceeding against state)]; and

- Proof of service [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2010, 2011* (publication); *Veh. Code § 17456* (actions against nonresident motorists)].

The mandatory or discretionary dismissal of an action for failure to serve and return the summons within specified periods after the action is commenced against a defendant is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.210-583.250* and *583.410-583.430*.

In cases proceeding under the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act of 1986 (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*), local rules affect deadlines for service and return of summons. For further discussion of these rules, see *§ 518.22[2]*.

Service of pleadings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 422.10*] subsequent to the complaint is required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 465* and service of notices of motion and papers by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*. The manners in which papers may be served are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011-1020*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a) authorizes trial courts to adopt local rules for electronic filing and service of documents subject to rules adopted by the Judicial Council under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)*. Any trial court local rules so adopted are subject to enumerated conditions set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)*. The Judicial Council has adopted uniform, statewide rules of court addressing electronic filing and service [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.*].

88 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART I. SCOPE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.04-518.09

[Reserved]

§§ 518.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.10

§ 518.10 "Summons" Defined

A summons is the process or notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 17(b)(6)*; *Gov. Code §§ 22, 26660*] by which a court acquires jurisdiction over the person of a defendant or cross defendant and over the subject of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50*; *see also Harrington v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 185, 189, 228 P. 15* ; *Pinon v. Pollard (1945) 69 Cal. App. 2d 129, 133, 158 P.2d 254]* . By its service, the court presumably also acquires jurisdiction over the person of the plaintiff. Although this is not expressly stated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50*, it is implied, and it was expressly provided in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 416* [*see Mungia v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 280, 284, 37 Cal. Rptr. 285* ; *Apartments, Inc. v. Trott (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 7, 14, 342 P.2d 32]* , the predecessor to *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50*. The Judicial Council, in its Official Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50*, has indicated that no change in the prior law was intended.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.11

§ 518.11 Procedural Due Process Requirement

The *Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution* provides that no state shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*]. This prohibition has been construed to mean that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without first having received notice of the claim or charge against the person and an opportunity to be heard in opposition to it. Thus, the American Law Institute has provided that a state may not exercise judicial jurisdiction over a person, although the person is subject to its judicial jurisdiction, unless a reasonable method is employed to give the person notice of the action and unless the person is afforded a reasonable opportunity to be heard [Restatement (Second) Conflict of Laws § 25]. This prohibition has been referred to as "procedural due process" to distinguish it from "substantive due process" (which goes to the power of the state's legislative branch to enact laws).

In California, notice of the claim against a defendant in a civil action is given by the service of a summons on the person [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20, 413.10-416.90*; *see also §§ 518.10, 518.15*]. The nature of the claim against the defendant is set forth in the complaint that accompanies the summons [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.45*]. Mere knowledge by a defendant of plaintiff's suit is neither equivalent to nor a substitute for adequate service of summons and complaint [*Kuchins v. Hawes (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 535, 540, 276 Cal. Rptr. 281]* .

A defendant who makes a general appearance forfeits any objection to personal jurisdiction based on defective service, even when the defendant does not know at the time that such an objection is available. Any rule that a general appearance does not waive objections to service unless the waiver is knowing and intelligent would exalt form over substance; a defendant who has actual knowledge of the action and who has submitted to the authority of the court should not be able to assert a violation of rules that exist only to bring about such knowledge and submission [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Sparks Construction (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1148, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 446]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.12

§ 518.12 Persons Immune to Service of Summons or Suit

Various constitutional and statutory provisions provide that specified persons are immune to service of summons at specified times or for specified periods, or both, or immune to suit altogether. For a discussion of these provisions and of the persons coming within them, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.13

§ 518.13 Acquisition of In Personam Jurisdiction

[1] By Service of Summons or General Appearance

Except as otherwise provided by statute, the court in which an action is pending has jurisdiction over a party from the time summons is served on him or her as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*. A general appearance is equivalent to personal service of summons on that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(a)*]. For what constitutes a general appearance, as well as the distinction between general and special appearances, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

Once the court obtains jurisdiction court over the parties, jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of the action continues throughout subsequent proceedings in the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 410.60* (jurisdiction over trustees and stockholders or members of corporation that has forfeited its charter or right to do business or has dissolved); *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.70* (jurisdiction of court to proceed against defendant or defendants served in action on contract against two or more defendants jointly, jointly and severally, or severally liable on a contract)].

[2] Minimum Contacts Requirement

For a California court to acquire personal jurisdiction over a defendant served outside this state, the defendant must have certain minimum contacts with this state so that "maintenance of the action does not offend traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice" as that requirementis construed primarily by the United States Supreme Court [*see International Shoe Co. v. Washington (1945) 326 U.S. 310, 316, 66 S. Ct. 154, 90 L. Ed. 95* (leading case); *Kulko v. California Superior Court (1979) 436 U.S. 84, 91-92, 98 S. Ct. 1690, 56 L. Ed. 2d 132]* . That is, the exercise of jurisdiction by the court must not be inconsistent with the due process requirements of the constitution of this state or of the United States [*Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*].

For a more detailed discussion of the minimum contacts requirement as it impacts on the court's jurisdiction over the person of a defendant or cross defendant, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.14

§ 518.14 Issuance of Summons and Amended Summons

[1] Issuance by Clerk and Court's Retention of Original Summons

After payment of the applicable fees [*see Gov. Code §§ 70611, 70613*], the plaintiff or cross complainant may have the clerk issue one or more summonses for any defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*]. The clerk must keep each original summons in the court records and provide a copy of each summons issued to the plaintiff who requested issuance of the summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*].

Amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10* effective January 1, 2006, deleted the requirement of giving the plaintiff the original summons, and deleted the requirement that the summons be returned or a declaration of lost summons be filed with the court [2005 Stats. 300].

The clerk's issuance of a summons is a routine ministerial duty when the filing of a complaint and payment of fees [*Maginn v. City of Glendale (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1102, 1107, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639]* .

A court may not issue a summons by fax because a court may not issue by fax any document intended to carry the original seal of the court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.300(b)*].

For discussion of the court's power to issue an electronic summons, see *518.14[2], below.*

The California Judicial Council has adopted mandatory forms for summons in a civil action depending on the type of action or procedure:

- SUM-100, Summons
- SUM-110, Summons--Cross-Complaint
- SUM-120, Summons (Joint Debtor)

- SUM-130, Summons--Unlawful Detainer--Eviction
- SUM-140, Summons--Storage Lien Enforcement

For an illustration of SUM-100, Summons, see *§ 518.70*. For an illustration of SUM-110, Summons--Cross-Complaint, see *§ 518.70A*. For a checklist for use by a plaintiff in preparing and serving summons, see *§ 518.60*.

[2] Electronic Summons

Trial courts are authorized to adopt local rules permitting electronic filing and service of documents subject to rules adopted by the Judicial Council pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)* and the conditions set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)*]. If a trial court enacts such local rules, on the electronic filing of a complaint, petition, or other document that must be served with a summons, the trial court, upon request of the party filing the action, must issue a summons with the court seal and the case number, and the court must keep the summons in its records and may electronically transmit a copy of the summons to the requesting party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)(2)*].

If the trial court plans to electronically transmit a summons to the party filing a complaint, the court must immediately on receipt of the complaint notify the attorney or party that a summons will be electronically transmitted to the electronic address given by the person filing the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*].

Personal service of the printed form of an electronic summons has the same legal effect as personal service of an original summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)(3)*].

For further discussion of electronic filing, see *§ 518.40* et seq.

[3] Multiple Copies Available

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*, any number of copied summonses may be issued. Hence, if a summons is lost before service, counsel may simply have a new copy issued.

[4] Amended Summons

Once jurisdiction over a defendant is obtained by service of a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint, amendment of the complaint does not require either a new summons or a new service of summons upon the defendant; the amended complaint alone is served, usually upon the defendant's attorney [*see* Judicial Council Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*]; but, if the complaint is amended before any service, an amended summons that refers to the amended complaint should be issued and served with a copy of the amended complaint [*see* Judicial Council Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*; *Dowling v. Comerford (1893) 99 Cal. 204, 206, 33 P. 853* ; *Koeper v. Koeper (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 118, 119, 269 P.2d 905]* . However, if an amendment adds a new party defendant, an amended or new summons naming that party as a defendant must be issued and served upon the new defendant, since no jurisdiction would be obtained by serving the defendant with a copy of the summons that does not name the defendant [*see* Judicial Council Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*; *Baldwin v. Foster (1910) 157 Cal. 643, 647, 108 P. 714* ; *W.H. Marston Co. v. Kochritz (1926) 80 Cal. App. 352, 361, 251 P. 959]* . Section 412.10 permits the plaintiff, or in appropriate cases a cross complainant, to secure, as a matter of course, the issuance of such amended summons [*see* Judicial Council Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*; *cf. Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 4(h)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.15

§ 518.15 Service of Summons

[1] Governing Statutes

The service of summons is governed by Chapter 4, Title 5, Part Two, of the Code of Civil Procedure [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 provides that, except as otherwise provided by statute, a summons is served as follows:

> (a) Within California as provided by Chapter 4;
>
> (b) Outside California but within the United States, as provided by Chapter 4, or as prescribed by the law of the place where the person is served; or
>
> (c) Outside the United States, as provided in Chapter 4 or as directed by the court in which the action is pending, or, if the court before or after service finds that the service is reasonably calculated to give actual notice, as prescribed by the law of the place where the person is served or as directed by the foreign authority in response to a letter rogatory. These rules are subject to the provisions of the Convention on the "Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents" in Civil or Commercial Matters (Hague Service Convention) [*see § 518.16[9]*].

The prefatory phrase, "Except as otherwise provided by statute," as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10*, would seem to make it clear that the methods of service prescribed in the section may be used in all civil actions, even when another statute prescribes a special method of service, unless the other statute expressly prohibits use of the general statutes or conditions their use on court approval. Some of the special statutes expressly refer to the general statutes [*see, e.g., Corp. Code §§ 1700, 2011(c)* (domestic corporations), 2110.1 (foreign corporations)], though others merely prescribe a special method or methods of service without indicating that the general methods may also be used. In those cases, use of the general methods of service would appear to be available at the attorney's option [*see* discussion in Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process, § 1.17 (Cal. C.E.B. 1970)].

[2] In Case Not Covered by Statute

When no provision is made for service of summons, or when the statutory procedure cannot wholly or partly be followed in a particular action, the court in which the action is pending may direct that summons be served in a manner that is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served and that proof of service be made as prescribed by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 187* (implied powers of court); Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process, § 1.19 (Cal. C.E.B. 1970)].

[3] By Whom Made

[a] Qualifications

A summons may be served by any person who is at least 18 years of age and not a party to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 414.10*], and hence may be served by a party's attorney [Sheehan v. All Persons, etc. *(1926) 80 Cal. App. 393, 398, 252 P. 337]* .

Various code provisions, however, expressly authorize or require service by specified persons. For example, *Gov. Code § 26665* provides that process in civil actions or proceedings may be served by any duly qualified and acting marshal or sheriff of any county in the state, subject to the Code of Civil Procedure [*see also Gov. Code § 26608* (service by sheriffs)].

In any action or proceeding in which the sheriff is a party, the coroner is required to discharge the duties of sheriff [*Gov. Code § 27469*]. This includes execution of the process or orders in the action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 262.6*], though, in an action against a sheriff, all process and orders may be served by any United States citizen over the age of 18 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 262.7*]. In addition, process and orders in an action or proceeding may be executed by a person residing in the county who is designated by the court or the judge thereof and denominated an elisor, in the following cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 262.8*]:

- When the sheriff and coroner are both parties;
- When either of these officers is a party, and the process is against the other; or
- When either of these officers is a party, and there is a vacancy in the office of the other, or when it appears by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]), to the satisfaction of the court in which the proceeding is pending or the judge thereof, that both of these officers are disqualified or by reason of any bias, prejudice, or other cause would not act promptly or impartially.

[b] Registered Process Servers

Registered process servers are governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 22350-22360*. Generally, any nonexcepted person who makes more than 10 services of process in California during one calendar year, for specific compensation or in expectation of specific compensation, where that compensation is directly attributable to the service of process, must file and maintain a verified certificate of registration as a process server with the county clerk of the county in which he or she resides or has his or her principal place of business. Similarly, any corporation or partnership that derives or expects to derive compensation from service of process within California must also file and maintain a verified certificate of registration as a process server with the county clerk of the county in which the corporation or partnership has its principal place of business [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350(a)*].

The following are excepted from the filing requirement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350(b)*]:

- Any sheriff, marshal, or government employee acting in the course of his or her employment.

- An attorney or his or her employees, when serving process related to cases for which the attorney is providing legal services.

- A person specially appointed by a court to serve its process.

- A licensed private investigator or his or her employees.

- A professional photocopier registered under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22450* whose only service of process relates to subpoenas for the production of records, which subpoenas specify that the records be copied by that professional photocopier.

Any service of summons that complies with the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure is not, however, rendered invalid or ineffective because it was made by a person in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.40*].

[4] Time for Service of Summons

By statute, a summons and complaint must be served upon a defendant within three years after the action is commenced (i.e. the complaint is filed) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(a)*]; and proof of service of the summons must be filed within 60 days after the time the summons and complaint must be served upon a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(b)*]. However, Trial Court Delay Reduction rules require the summons and complaint generally to be served on all named defendants and filed with the court within 60 days after the complaint is filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(b)*]. When the complaint is amended to add a defendant, the added defendant must be served and proof of service must be filed within 30 days after the filing of the amended complaint [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(b)*].

The time limits of *Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule 3.110(b)* apply to the service of pleadings in civil cases except for unlawful detainer actions, proceedings under the Family Code, and other proceedings for which different service requirements are prescribed by law [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(a)*]. Check for local rules that may adjust filing requirements.

Additionally, the 60-day service requirement of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(b)* does not apply to collections cases, as defined in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.740(a)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.740(c)(1)*]. A "collections case" is an action for recovery of not more than $25,000, exclusive of interest and attorney fees, arising from a credit transaction for property, services, or money. The action may not seek [*Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 3.740(a)*]:

- Tort damages.

- Punitive damages.

- Recovery of real property.

- Recovery of personal property.

- Prejudgment writ of attachment.

The complaint in a collections case must be served on all named defendants, and proofs of service on those defendants must be filed, or the plaintiff must obtain an order for publication of the summons, within 180 days after the filing of the complaint [*Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 3.740(d)*]. If proofs of service on all defendants are not filed or the plaintiff has not obtained an order for publication of the summons within 180 days after the filing of the complaint, the court may issue

an order to show cause why reasonable monetary sanctions should not be imposed. If proofs of service on all defendants are filed or an order for publication of the summons is filed at least 10 court days before the order to show cause hearing, the court must continue the hearing to 360 days after the filing of the complaint [*Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 3.740(e)*].

A cross-complaint against a party who has appeared in the action must be accompanied by proof of service of the cross-complaint at the time it is filed. If the cross-complaint adds new parties, the cross-complaint must be served on all parties and proofs of service on the new parties must be filed within 30 days of the filing of the cross-complaint [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(c)*].

The court, on its own motion or on the application of a party, may extend or otherwise modify the times provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(b)-(d)*; and an application for a court order extending the time to serve a pleading must be filed before the time for service has elapsed. The application must be accompanied by a declaration showing why service has not been completed, documenting the efforts that have been made to complete service, and specifying the date by which service is proposed to be completed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(e)*].

For discussion of moving to dismiss for failure to timely serve and file summons and complaint, see *§ 518.22*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.16

§ 518.16 Manners of Serving Summons

[1] Hand Delivery

A summons may be served by personal delivery, that is, hand delivery of a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served. Service of a summons in this manner is deemed complete at the time of delivery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10*].

Personal service usually contemplates actual delivery of a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served. The person on whom service is sought, however, is not permitted to deny personal service on the ground of lack of delivery by merely declining to take the document offered, when, under the circumstances, it would be obvious to a reasonable person that personal service was being attempted. In such a case, service may be made by merely depositing the process in some appropriate place where it would be most likely to come to the attention of the person being served [*Crescendo Corp. v. Shelted, Inc. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 209, 212, 72 Cal. Rptr. 776]* .

Personal service of a printed form of an electronic summons issued under local court rule adopted pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* has the samelegal effect as personal service of an original summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259*]. For discussion of the issuance of electronic summons, see *§ 518.47*.

[2] Substituted Service

[a] Term "Constructive Service" Distinguished

The terms "substituted service" and "constructive service" are sometimes used interchangeably. Strictly speaking, however, constructive service consists of service by publication or posting (discussed at [6], *below*), whereas substituted service consists of delivery of a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to a person other than the defendant who is authorized by the defendant, or by law, to receive service on defendant's behalf. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90*, for example, provides that a summons may be served on a person not otherwise specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10-416.80* (persons to be served) by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to that person or to a person authorized by him or her to receive service or process. Service on the agent under this section constitutes

substituted service on the defendant [*see Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Golden West Music Sales (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1018, 112 Cal. Rptr. 71]* . For determining who is a proper agent for acceptance of service on behalf of a defendant, a specific appointment is not required, but the principal-agent relationship must be close and enduring enough to make it highly probable the defendant will receive actual notice [*Summers v. McClanahan (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 403, 412, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 338* (service on actor's personal manager did not comport with statutory requirements despite defendant having actual notice of complaint)].

[b] Statutes Authorizing Substituted Service

In addition there are a number of other statutes in the Code of Civil Procedure and other codes authorizing service on behalf of a specified defendant to be made on, among others, the Secretary of State, the Commissioner of Corporations, the Director of Motor Vehicles, The Department of Real Estate, and the Insurance Commissioner.

Examples of such statutes are:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10151.5* (nonresident real estate licensee).
- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11007* (nonresident subdivider).
- *Corp. Code §§ 1702, 2011(b)* (domestic corporation).
- *Corp. Code §§ 2111, 2114(b)* (foreign corporation).
- *Corp. Code § 15800* (foreign partnership).
- *Corp. Code § 25550* (violator of Corporate Securities Law).
- *Corp. Code § 31420* (Franchise Investment Law).
- *Gov. Code §§ 960.2, 960.3, 53051* (public entity).
- *Veh. Code §§ 17451, 17454, 17455* (nonresident motorist).
- *Prob. Code § 8574* (nonresident executor).
- *Ins. Code § 12931* (reciprocal and nonresident insurers).

These statutes are all discussed at *§ 518.17*.

Substituted service is also recognized in relation to gated communities [*see Bein v. Brechtel-Jochim Group, Inc. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1387, 1393, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 351* ; *see also § 518.18[2]*].

To obtain in personam jurisdiction through any form of substituted service, strict compliance with the statutory procedures is required, and the applicable statutes are strictly construed. The form of substituted service utilized must be reasonably calculated to give an interested party actual notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to be heard, so that traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice implicit in due process are satisfied [*Zirbes v. Stratton (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1416, 232 Cal. Rptr. 653* (involving substituted service, but using "substituted" and "constructive" interchangeably); *compare* Zirbes *with Stafford v. Mach (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1183, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809* (involving substituted service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*; pre-1969 service of process statutes requiring strict and exact compliance have now been more liberally construed to effectuate service if actual notice has

been received by defendant)].

[3] Combination Service

[a] Business and Public Entities

In certain situations, a combination of substituted service and service by mail may be used in lieu of personal delivery to effect service of the summons. Thus, in lieu of personal delivery of the papers to the person to be served as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10* (corporations), 416.20 (dissolved corporations or corporations having forfeited their charter or right to do business), 416.30 (joint stock companies), 416.40 (unincorporated associations and partnerships), and 416.50 (public entities), all discussed at *§ 518.18[1] -[6]*, the summons may be served by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint during usual office hours in his or her office or, if no physical address is known, at his/her usual mailing address, other than a U.S Postal Service post office box, with the person who is apparently in charge thereof, and by thereafter mailing a copy of the summons and complaint by first-class mail, postage prepaid to the person to be served at the place where a copy of the summons and complaint were left. When service is effected by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint at a mailing address, it must be left with a person at least 18 years of age, who must be informed of the contents thereof [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*].

Service of a summons in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after the mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*].

A defendant will not be permitted to defeat service by rendering physical service impossible. The purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20* is to permit service to be completed on a good faith attempt at physical service on a responsible person, plus actual notification of the action by mailing thesummons and complaint to the appropriate party [*Khourie, Crew & Jaeger v. Sabek, Inc. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1013, 269 Cal. Rptr. 687]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

Combination Service on Corporation Held Effective. A process server attempting service on a domestic corporation (1) went to the defendant's place of business, during usual business hours, and, finding the door locked, rang the bell; (2) a woman responded but refused to unlock the door or tell the server her name and said she would not accept the papers; (3) the server told the woman he was leaving the papers outside the door and did so as she watched him; and (4) the server thereafter mailed a copy of the complaint and summons to the defendant at its place of business. Is this sufficient to effect service? Yes. The process server provided actual notice of the documents to the person apparently in charge of the office and, prevented by the person from leaving them inside the office, left them on the other side of the office door. No more is required to effect service other than to mail a copy of the summons and complaint to defendant, which the process server did, and the service therefore became complete 10 days after the mailing [*Khourie, Crew & Jaeger v. Sabek, Inc. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1012-1014, 269 Cal. Rptr. 687]* .

[b] Individuals

[i] Generally

If a copy of the summons and complaint cannot with reasonable diligence be delivered personally to the person to be served as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.60* (minors), 416.70 (persons other than minors having a guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary appointed), 416.80 (candidates for public office), or 416.90 (persons not otherwise specified), the summons may be served by leaving a copy of the summons and complaint at one of the following locations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*]:

- The person's dwelling house.

- The person's usual place of abode.
- The person's usual place of business.
- The person's usual mailing address other than a U.S. Postal Service post office box.

The terms "dwelling house" and "usual place of abode" take their meaning from the federal rules. The meaning of these terms is not clearly defined in the abstract but must be answered with the notice requirements of due process in mind [*Zirbes v. Stratton (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1416-1417, 232 Cal. Rptr. 653* (home of parents of party not party's abode when party maintained household elsewhere)].

The papers must be left in the presence of a competent member of the household or a person apparently in charge of the office, place of business,or usual mailing address, who is at least 18 years of age and who must be informed of contents of the papers served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*].

Thereafter, a copy of the summons and of the complaint must be mailed, by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the person to be served at the place where the copies of the papers were left [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*].

Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*].

The plain language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)* authorizes substitute service at a defendant's usual mailing address, which can include a private/commercial post office box [*Ellard v. Conway (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 540, 546, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399]* .

[ii] Reasonable Diligence

Service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)* is available only as indicated in [i], *above*, after plaintiff has exercised reasonable diligence in attempting to effect personal service [*Evartt v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 795, 799-802* ; *see* *Stafford v. Mach (1988) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1182, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809* (reasonable diligence requirement to permit substituted service ordinarily should be satisfied when personal service has been attempted two or three times)].

As a condition of establishing that the party to be served cannot with reasonable diligence be served in another manner specified in this article, the court may not require that a search be conducted of public databases where access by a registered process server to residential addresses is prohibited by law or by published policy of the agency providing the database, including, but not limited to, voter registration rolls and records of the department of motor vehicles [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(e)*].

On a motion to quash service of summons served under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*, the burden is on plaintiff to show that reasonable diligence to effect personal service was exercised; however, no single formula or mode of search can be said to constitute reasonable diligence in every case and each case must, therefore, be judged on its own facts [*Evartt v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 795, 801, 152 Cal. Rptr. 836* (holding reasonable diligence under facts of case was not exercised and issuing writ of mandate directing trial court to vacate its order denying defendant's motion to quash service)].

Whether or not there has been reasonable diligence should be liberally construed to effectuate service and uphold jurisdiction of the court if actual notice has been received by the defendant [*Espindola v. Nunez (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1389, 1391, 245 Cal. Rptr. 596* (reasonable diligence was shown when process server served wife and left husband's copy of summons and complaint with her on fourth attempt to serve husband and wife defendants at their home);

Burchett v. City of Newport Beach (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1472, 1477-1478 , 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1 (service quashed when plaintiffs exercised no diligence whatsoever)].

[4] Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt

[a] Procedure

The summons may also be served by mail. This is done by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint, together with two copies of the notice and acknowledgment of receipt specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(b)*, discussed below, and a return envelope, postage prepaid, addressed to the sender, by first-class mail or airmail, postage prepaid, to the person to be served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(a)*]. If summons is to be served outside the United States, the return postage may be prepaid at the post office.

A post office box is a sufficient address for *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* service when the plaintiff knows the person to be served is receiving mail at that address [*Transamerica Title Ins. Co. v. Hendrix (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 740, 744-746, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50* service by publication not authorized when plaintiff knew of post office box and did not attempt service by mail)].

The notice and acknowledgment of receipt of summons sent must be substantially in the form prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(b)*, though a notice of acknowledgment of receipt in form approved by the Judicial Council [*see § 518.73*] is deemed to comply with the section [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(e)*].

[b] When Service Is Complete

Service of summons by mail is deemed complete on the date a written acknowledgment of receipt is executed, if the acknowledgment is thereafter returned to the sender [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(c)*]. The written acknowledgment of receipt may be on the Judicial Council's approved form [*see § 518.73*] or on any other form satisfactory to the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(a)*].

A person so served who fails to complete and return an acknowledgment within 20 days from the date it was mailed will be liable for reasonable expenses thereafter incurred in serving or attempting to serve the person by another permitted method. The court in which the action is pending, on motion, with or without notice, must, except for good cause shown, award the party making service such expenses whether or not that party is otherwise entitled to recover costs in the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(d)*].

When the summons is served by mail, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* extending the time for exercising a right or doing an act do notextend any time specified in the foregoing paragraph or the time in which the defendant must file a responsive pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.20*].

[5] Certified or Registered Mail (Outside California)

The summons may be served on a person outside California by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*].

Service by return receipt first-class mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* is deemed complete on the 10th day after mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*] and the time extensions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* do not apply [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.20*]. Effective service by mail on a defendant outside the state does not require an executed acknowledgment of receipt [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 1000, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* . Read together, *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.40* and *417.20* permit completion of service by mail when the return receipt is signed by a person so authorized by the defendant, and evidence that a mailed summons actually reached the individual to be served is

sufficient to establish valid service, and thus to establish substantial compliance, even if the summons was signed for by someone who did not have the authority to do so [*Cruz v. Fagor America, Inc. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 488, 499-500, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 862]* . For requirements of proof of service concerning service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*, see *§ 518.20[4][a]*.

The summons may be served on a person outside the United States as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40* or as directed by the court in which the action is pending or, if the court before or after service finds that the service is reasonably calculated to give actual notice, as prescribed by the law of the place where the person is served or as directed by the foreign authority in response to a letter rogatory. These rules are subject to the provisions of the Convention on the "Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents" in Civil or Commercial Matters (Hague Service Convention) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)*; *see also* [9], *below*].

[6] Publication (Constructive Service)

[a] Affidavit for Service by Publication

The summons may be served by publication if, on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) the following facts appear to the satisfaction of the court in which the action is pending [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)*]:

(1) That the party to be served cannot with reasonable diligence be served in any of the following manners:

(a) Hand delivery under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10* [*see* [1], *above*];

(b) Combination service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20* [*see* [3], *above*];

(c) Mail and acknowledgment service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* [*see* [4], *above*]; or

(d) First-class mail to a person outside California with return receipt required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* [*see* [5], *above*]; and

(2) That either

(a) A cause of action exists against the party on whom service is to be made or the party is a necessary or proper party to the action; or

(b) The party to be served has or claims an interest in real or personal property in California that is subject to the jurisdiction of the court or the relief demanded in the action consists wholly or in part in excluding the party from any interest in that property.

For forms of application and order for service by publication, see *§ 518.74*.

[b] Order for Service by Publication

On a proper application and showing [*see § 518.74[1]*], the court will order that the summons be published in a named newspaper published in California that is most likely to give actual notice to the party to be served. If the party to be served resides or is located out of this state, the court may also order the summons to be published in a named newspaper outside this state that is most likely to give actual notice to that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*]. The court will also direct that a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint be forthwith mailed to the party if the party's address is ascertained before the time prescribed for publication of summons expires. Except as otherwise

provided by statute, the publication is made as provided in *Gov. Code § 6064* (once a week for four successive weeks), unless the court in its discretion orders publication for a longer period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*; *see § 518.74[2]*].

Notwithstanding an order for publication, the summons may be served in another manner authorized by "this chapter," that is, by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*, in which event the service supersedes any published summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(d)*].

[c] Completion of Service by Publication

Service of summons by publication is deemed complete as provided in *Gov. Code § 6064* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(c)*].

If service is to be by publication, the publication must be completed before the expiration of the three year mandatory dismissal period for service of summons [*see Watts v. Crawford (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 743, 761, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 81, 896 P.2d 807* (disapproving *Quaranta v. Merlini (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 22, 237 Cal. Rptr. 179*); *Perez v. Smith (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1595, 1599-1600, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 186* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.210, 583.250*].

[d] Service of Statement of Damages by Publication

If a party has not appeared in an action, a statement of damages must be served in the same manner as a summons before a default may be taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.11(c), (d)*]; this provision applies even where a summons was served by publication. Once a party obtains a court order allowing service of the summons and complaint by publication, a separate order is not necessary to also simultaneously serve the statement of damages by publication [*Anastos v. Lee (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1314, 1318, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716]* .

[7] Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

The summons in a proceeding for unlawful detainer, forcible entry, or forcible detainer must be served and returned in the same manner as a summons in a civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1167*], that is, in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*. These sections include provisions specifically authorizing service of summons in certain unlawful detainer proceedings by a combination of posting the premises and mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.45*] or by certified mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.47*]. For further discussion and a form of summons for use in unlawful detainer proceedings, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[8] Transmitted by Telegraph

A summons may be transmitted by telegraph for service anywhere. The telegraphic copy may be served by the officer or person to whom it is sent for that purpose and returned by that person in the same manner and with the same effect as the original could have been had it been delivered to him or her. The officer or person serving the summons has the same authority and is subject to the same liabilities as if the copy were the original. The telegraph operator need not telegraph a description of the seal or any word or device on it, but the seal may be expressed in the telegraphic copy by the letters "L.S." (locus sigilli, Latin for place of the seal), or by the word "seal" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1017*].

[9] In Foreign Country

[a] Convention on Service Abroad

[i] Existence of and Signatories to Convention

The rules for service of summons outside the United States are subject to the provisions of the Convention on the "Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents" in Civil or Commercial Matters (Hague Service Convention)

[*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)*].

In addition to the United States, the signatories include the following as of 1995:

- Antigua and Barbuda
- Barbados
- Belgium
- Botswana
- Canada
- China
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Egypt
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Japan
- Luxembourg
- Malawi
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Pakistan

- Portugal
- Seychelles
- Slovak Republic
- Spain
- Sweden
- Turkey
- United Kingdom

Through the United Kingdom the treaty extends to many British territories, including Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, and Fiji.

On the part of the United States, the treaty covers service in all of the states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The treaty is binding on the states pursuant to U.S. Const., art. VI, *cl. 2.*A state court may not assume jurisdiction in a case when to do so would violate the treaty [*Shoei Kako Co. v. Superior Court (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 808, 819, 109 Cal. Rptr. 402* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)*].

[Ii] Determining When Convention Governs

If the address of the person to be served is known, a summons may be served on that person in certain foreign countries pursuant to the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters [20 U.S.T. 361; for text and accompanying declarations of signatories, *see* 28 U.S.C.A., Fed. R. Civ. P., following Rule 4, after Notes of the Advisory Committee on Rules in annual pocket part].

Service through the Hague Service Convention provides the exclusive means of service on a foreign national whose foreign address is known [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)*; *Kott v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1130, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215* ; *see also Suzuki Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1476, 1484, 249 Cal. Rptr. 376* ; *Dr. Ing H.C.F. Porsche A.G. v. Superior Court (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 755, 760, 177 Cal. Rptr. 155]* .

If the person's address is unknown, the Convention does not apply and service by publication in California is appropriate [People v. Parcel No. 056-500-09 *(1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 120, 125, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 51* (service by publication upheld); *Kott v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1130-1131, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215* (service by publication improper due to lack of diligence in determining defendant's address); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*]. For discussion of service by publication, see [6], *above*.

ILLUSTRATION:

Diligence Required in Determining Defendant's Status and Address. At the start of the case, plaintiff apparently believed the individual defendant was an employee of a corporate defendant with offices in Beverly Hills. When plaintiff attempted to serve the individual defendant at the corporate office, the process server was told that the individual defendant was not available there and was not eligible for substituted service. Nevertheless, plaintiff's process server left a copy of the summons and complaint at the corporate office in Beverly Hills, mailed a copy to the individual defendant at that address, and filed an affidavit of due diligence. The individual defendant filed a motion to quash, at which point counsel for both the corporate and individual defendants explained that the individual defendant was not an employee of the corporate defendant, but rather the agent of a firm consulting to

the corporate defendant, and a Canadian national. The motion to quash was granted, but then plaintiff sought to serve the individual defendant by publication in Los Angeles on the basis of an investigation that found no address, telephone listing, motor vehicle registration, voter registration, or record of property ownership for the individual defendant in Los Angeles County. The court issued an order for service by publication of summons in the Los Angeles Daily Journal. Defendants' counsel sought to quash that service. Were plaintiff's attempts to locate defendant sufficient to support service in Los Angeles by publication? No. After plaintiff learned the individual defendant was a Canadian national, it made no attempt to locate defendant in Canada, nor did it inquire of defendants' counsel as to the location of the individual defendant or if counsel was authorized to accept service. The individual defendant's address remained unknown to plaintiff because plaintiff ignored obvious avenues of obtaining that information [*Kott v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1131-1133, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215]* .

[b] Service Under Convention

[i] Procedure Specified

Service may be effected pursuant to the treaty by the following procedure:

(1) Obtain three or more copies of the "Request for Service Abroad of Judicial or Extrajudicial Documents" and of the "Summary of the Document to Be Served" from any office of the United States Marshal. These are forms prescribed by the treaty.

(2) Fill out both forms in triplicate.

(a) If English is not the official language, or one of the official languages, of the country in which service will be made, complete two sets of forms, one in English, the other in the appropriate foreign language [*see Julen v. Larson (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 325, 328-330, 101 Cal. Rptr. 796]* . Label each form at the top as a translation (e.g., "English Translation" and, if the other is translated into French, "Traducion Francaise"). The reverse side of the request form is a blank "Certificate" to be completed by the process server in the foreign country.

(b) The request form calls for the identity and address of the applicant and the identity of the receiving authority in the foreign country, to whom the local process server forwards the request and accompanying forms and papers.

(c) The treaty's signatories have each designated a Central Authority to receive requests for service coming from other contracting states. These are contained in the signatories' accompanying declarations to the treaty and are set forth in 28 U.S.C.A., Fed. R. Civ. P., following Rule 4, after Notes of the Advisory Committee on Rules in the annual pocket part. The name and address of the appropriate receiving authority may also be obtained from the office of the United States Marshal or from the United States Department of Justice. Some sheriffs may also be able to provide this information.

(3) If English is not the official language, or one of the official languages, of the country in which service will be made, have the summons and complaint translated into the appropriate foreign language [*see Julen v. Larson (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 325, 328-330, 101 Cal. Rptr. 796]* . Two copies will be needed.

(4) Deliver the completed forms, copies of the summons and complaint, and translations, if any, all in

duplicate, to the appropriate receiving authority in the foreign country or to the local process server, with a request that they be forwarded to the receiving authority in the foreign country as provided in the treaty. Eventually, the certificate on the reverse side of the request form should be returned, showing that service was or was not effected.

Failure to comply with the Convention renders the service void, even if the defendant has actual notice of the lawsuit [*Floveyor Internat., Ltd. v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 789, 794, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457]* .

[ii] Article 10 Alternatives

Article 10 of the treaty provides that, if the state of destination does not object, "the present Convention" shall not interfere with any of the following:

(a) The freedom to send judicial documents by postal channels directly to persons abroad;

(b) The freedom of judicial officers, officials, or other competent persons of the state of origin to effect service of judicial documents directly through the judicial officers, officials, or other competent persons of the state of destination; or

(c) The freedom of any person interested in a judicial proceeding to effect service of judicial documents directly through the judicial officers, officials, or other competent persons of the state of destination.

Article 10(a) of the Convention allows service of process by mail; permitting service by mail under article 10(a) is consistent with the logic and structure of the Convention itself, with the interpretative materials on the issue, including the report of the Commission, Handbook, and State Department, is consistent with the understanding of some of the signatories, and also furthers the Convention's primary purpose of establishing a uniform, simple, and efficient system for establishing service abroad. Allowing service of process by mail, so long as the signatory does not object, promotes a smooth and efficient international legal system [*Denlinger v. Chinadotcom Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1396, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 530]* .

The United Kingdom has objected to Article 10 paragraph (c) in a statement that ambiguously referred also to paragraph (b). The objection regarding "service through official channels" was intended to apply to documents from an embassy or consular official, and does not invalidate service under paragraph (b) through "other competent persons of the State of destination" [*see* *Balcom v. Hiller (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1758, 1762, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 536* (upholding service in United Kingdom by person who did so in manner authorized by law of United Kingdom)].

For a discussion of article 10 of the Convention and its effect on service by mail outside the United States under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10(c), 415.30,* and *415.40,* see *Honda Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1043, 1049, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 861* (attempted service on Japanese defendant by certified mail as insufficient under *Hague Convention); Suzuki Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1476, 1484, 249 Cal. Rptr. 376* (service of process on Japanese defendants by registered mail as not authorized by treaty); and *Shoei Kako Co. v. Superior Court (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 808, 821-824, 109 Cal. Rptr. 402* . See also [5], *above*.

[c] Service Under Foreign Service Immunities Act

The Foreign Services Immunity Act (FSIA) (*28 U.S.C.S. § 1602 et seq.*) is the sole basis for obtaining jurisdiction over a "foreign state," its "political subdivisions" and "agencies or instrumentalities" [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 992, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* .

Service of process on a sovereign state or its political subdivisions must comply strictly with the requirements of *28*

U.S.C.S. § 1608(a), which provides for service of process through diplomatic channels unless the parties have a separate prior arrangement for service [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 993, 993 n.1, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* .

The FSIA's requirements for service of process on an "agent or instrumentality of a foreign state" is less stringent under *28 U.S.C.S. § 1608(b)(3)* and may be adequate if reasonably calculated to give actual notice. The weight of authority recognizes that an individual can qualify as an "agent or instrumentality of a foreign state" if he or she is an official of a foreign state and is sued in his or her official capacity [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 994-995, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* .

Because of Congress's different treatment between the sovereign state itself and its agents or instrumentalities, several courts have held service of process on entities falling within the latter category is adequate if the plaintiff substantially complies with the service requirements of *28 U.S.C.S. § 1608(b),* which does not require service through diplomatic channels [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 994-995, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* . In any event, when serving process on an "agent or instrumentality of a foreign state" the requirements of *28 U.S.C.S. § 1608(b)(3)* should be strictly followed to avoid any successful argument being sustained as to defective service of process.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.17

§ 518.17 Service on Particular Defendants

[1] Active Corporation

[a] Under Code of Civil Procedure

Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10 provides several methods for serving corporations. Section 416.10 governs both domestic and foreign corporations [*see Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 303, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892]* .

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10*, a summons may be served on a corporation by delivering a copy of the summons and the complaint as follows:

- To the person designated as the agent for service of process pursuant to any provision in *Corp. Code § 202, 1502, 2105*, or *2107* (or by former Corp. Code §§ 3301-3303 (domestic corporations) or 6500-6504 (foreign corporations) as in effect on December 31, 1976, with respect to corporations to which they remain applicable (*see Corp. Code §§ 2302, 2317*; *see also* [b][iii], *below*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(a)*; *see Workman v. Superior Court (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 493, 499, 222 Cal. Rptr. 69* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10*, requiring service of summons and complaint on corporation to be personally on person designated as agent for service of process, officer, or person authorized by corporation to receive service of process, does not apply to nonjudicial arbitration proceedings)].

- To the president chief executive officer or other head of the corporation, a vice president, a secretary or assistant secretary, a treasurer or assistant treasurer, a controller or chief financial officer a general manager, or a person authorized by the corporation to receive service of process [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(b)*; *see also Pasadena Medi-Center Associates v. Superior Court (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 773, 777-782, 108 Cal. Rptr. 828, 511 P.2d 1180* (service on ostensible, rather than official, secretary-treasurer of corporation held sufficient); *Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 313-313, 308, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892* (service on manager of regional office with ostensible authority to accept it); *but see Dill v. Berquist Construction Co. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1426, 1436-1439, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 746* (service on foreign corporation as ineffective to strictly or substantially

comply with service requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.40* and *416.10* through signature of "agent" of corporation on receipt of summons when no evidence was presented that individual was agent for service of process)].

- If the corporation is a bank, to a cashier or assistant cashier or to a person specified in Paragraph (1) or (2), *above* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(c)*].

- If authorized by any provision in *Corp. Code § 1701, 1702, 2110,* or *2111* (or former Corp. Code §§ 3301-3303 (domestic corporations) or 6500-6504 (foreign corporations) as in effect on December 31, 1976, with respect to corporations to which they remain applicable [*see Corp. Code §§ 2302, 2317*; *see also* [b][iii], *below*]), as provided by that provision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d)*; *see* [b][i], [ii], *below*; *see also § 518.75*].

[b] Under Corporations Code

[i] Domestic Corporation

Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d) authorizes service of process on a domestic corporation (that is, one formed under California law [*Corp. Code § 167*]) in any manner provided in *Corp. Code §§ 1701* and *1702*. This authorization is repeated in *Corp. Code § 1700* which provides that process may be served on domestic corporations as provided in *Corp. Code §§ 1701* and *1702* as well as according to the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*.

Corp. Code § 1701 provides that hand delivery of a copy of any process against a corporation to any natural person designated by it as agent or, if a corporate agent has been designated, to any person named in the latest certificate of the corporate agent, filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505*, at the corporate agent's office shall constitute valid service on the corporation.

Corp. Code § 1702(a) authorizes substituted service on a domestic corporation by hand delivery of the process to the Secretary of State, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, in the following situations:

- The agent for service of process has resigned and has not been replaced;

- The agent designated cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the address designated for personally delivering the process; or

- No agent has been designated.

This form of substituted service requires a court order made on application (affidavit or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) showing to the court's satisfaction the existence of the conditions specified in the section [*see § 518.75*]. *Corp. Code § 1702(a)* further provides that service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State.

Section 1702 suggests that a party is under no duty to attempt substituted service of a corporation through the Secretary of State unless service cannot, with reasonable diligence, be accomplished pursuant to either *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* or *416.20* [*Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 311-312, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892* (party should, and arguably must, first attempt service on both the officers and agents enumerated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10 (b), (c)*, and on a trustee pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20*, before resorting to Secretary of State service)].

The court order pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1702(a)*, that service of process be made on the corporation by delivery to the Secretary of State, may be an order of a court of another state or of any federal court if the suit, action, or proceeding

has been filed in that court [*Corp. Code § 1702(d)*].

On receipt of the process and payment of the required fee, the Secretary of State must give the corporation notice of the service by forwarding to it at its principal executive office, by registered, or certified [*Corp. Code § 113*], return receipt mail, the copy of the process. If the Secretary of State's records do not disclose an address for the corporation's principal executive office, the Secretary of State must forward the copy in the same manner to the last designated agent for service of process who has not resigned. If the agent has resigned and has not been replaced and the Secretary of State's records do not disclose an address for the corporation's principal executive office, no action need be taken by the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 1702(b)*].

The Secretary of State is required to keep a record of all process so served on him or her, including the time of service and his or her action with reference to it. The Secretary's certificate, under his or her official seal, certifying to the receipt of process, the giving of notice of the process to the corporation, and the forwarding of the process as stated above is competent and prima facie evidence of the matters stated in the certificate [*Corp. Code § 1702(c)*].

[ii] Foreign Corporation

Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d) authorizes service on a foreign corporation in any manner provided by *Corp. Code §§ 2110* and *2111*. A foreign corporation actually doing business in California is amenable to service in California whether or not it has registered to do business pursuant to California law [*Raynolds v. Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 997, 1001-1002, 80 Cal. Rptr. 610]* or whether or not the extent of its contacts with California require it to register [*Raynolds v. Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 997, 1003, 80 Cal. Rptr. 610]* .

A foreign corporation is, generally, any corporation other than a domestic corporation, but, as used in the Corporations Code, the term in certain cases [*Corp. Code § 171*].

- Includes a foreign association [defined in *Corp. Code § 170*] and
- Excludes a corporation or association chartered under federal laws.

This authorization is substantially repeated in *Corp. Code § 2110.1* which provides that process may be served on a foreign corporation as provided in *Corp. Code § 2100 et seq.* as well as in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.*

Hand delivery of any process against a foreign corporation constitutes valid service if delivered to any of the following [*Corp. Code § 2110*]:

- An officer of the corporation or its general manager in this state, or if the corporation is a bank to a cashier or an assistant cashier.
- An natural person designated by it as agent for the service of process.
- If the corporation has designated a corporate agent, to any person named in the latest certificate of corporate agent, filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505*.

A copy of that statement and designation, or a copy of the latest statement filed under *Corp. Code § 2117*, certified by the Secretary of State, is sufficient evidence of the appointment of an agent for the service of process [*Corp. Code § 2110*].

Corp. Code § 2111(a) authorizes substituted service on a foreign corporation by personal delivery of the process to the Secretary of State, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, in the following situations:

- The agent designated for service of process is a natural person and cannot be found with due diligence at the address stated in the designation.

- The designated agent is a corporation and no person can be found with due diligence to whom the delivery authorized by *Corp. Code § 2110* may be made for the purpose of delivery to the corporate agent.

- The agent designated is no longer authorized to act.

- No agent has been designated.

This form of substituted service also requires a court order made on application (affidavit or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) showing to the court's satisfaction the existence of the conditions specified in thesection [*see § 518.75*]. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 2111(a)*].

On receipt of the process, order, and required fee, the Secretary of State must forthwith give notice to the corporation of the service by forwarding, by registered or certified [*Corp. Code § 113*], return receipt mail, a copy of the process and order to the address specified in the order, if the corporation has not filed the statement required by *Corp. Code § 2105* for it to obtain a certificate of qualification to transact business in this state, or to the two stated addresses of the corporation set forth in the latest statement filed under *Corp. Code § 2105* or *2117*, or if only one address is set forth in the latest statement, to the sole stated address of the corporation [*Corp. Code § 2111(b)*].

The Secretary of State is required to keep a record of all process so served on him or her, including the time of service and his or her action with respect to it. The Secretary of State's certificate, under his or her official seal, certifying to the receipt of process, the giving of notice thereof to the corporation, and the forwarding of the process as stated above, is competent and prima facie evidence of the matters stated in the certificate [*Corp. Code § 2111(c)*].

A foreign corporation which has transacted intrastate business and has thereafter withdrawn from business in this state may be served with process in the manner provided in *Corp. Code §§ 2110* and *2111* in any action brought in this state arising out of such business, whether or not the corporation has ever complied with the requirements of *Corp. Code §§ 2100-2116*, governing foreign corporations transacting intrastate business [*Corp. Code § 2114(a)*].

A foreign corporation that has surrendered its right to transact intrastate business pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2112* or *2113* may be served with process in any action on a liability or an obligation incurred in this state before the surrender by delivery of the process to the Secretary of State, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2111*, but no court order authorizing the service is required. The process must be mailed in the manner prescribed in *Corp. Code § 2111(b)*, except that it must be sent to the address to which the process is authorized to be sent in the certificate of surrender or to the address of the surviving domestic corporation in the case of a surrender under *Corp. Code § 2113* [*Corp. Code § 2114(b)*].

[iii] Applicability of Prior Law

Corp. Code §§ 2300-2319 contain the transition provisions between the former General Corporation Law [former *Corp. Code §§ 100-6804*, repealed by Stats. 1975, ch. 682, operative January 1, 1977], referred to as "the prior law," and the new General Corporation Law [*Corp. Code §§ 100-2319*], referred to as "the new law." These sections provide, in part, that when any corporate agent for service of process has been designated prior to the effective date of the new

law and such designation of agent included a name of a city, town, or village in which the corporate agent maintained an office, service on the agent may be effected at any office of the agent set forth in the certificate of the corporate agent filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505* of the new law or filed pursuant to Corp. Code § 3301.5, 3301.6, 6403.5, or 6403.6 of the prior law, whether or not the office is in that city, town, or village [*Corp. Code § 2317*].

[1A] Suspended Domestic Corporation

Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23301*, the powers of a domestic corporation are suspended, not dissolved, due to its failure to pay taxes. A suspended corporation may be sued, and service of process on a suspended corporation is effected in the same manner as service on a corporation that is not suspended [*Grell v. Laci Le Beau Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1306, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358]* . Thus, a domestic corporation that has been suspended by the Secretary of State for failure to file appropriate tax returns may be validly served under *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* when the corporation continues to operate as an ongoing business during the period of suspension and has no designated agent for process [*Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 302-303, 308, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20 is not the exclusive means of serving a suspended domestic corporation. At most, *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20* provides a permissible alternative to *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* for service of process on such corporations, on the theory that a suspension is equivalent to a forfeiture of the corporation's right to do business, which is a dubious proposition. It is also possible, however, to construe *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20* as not applying to a domestic corporation unless it is in receivership or has dissolved [*Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 305, 308-310, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892]* .

[2] Defunct Corporation

A summons may be served on a corporation that has forfeited its charter or right to do business, or has dissolved, by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint as follows:

- To a person who is a trustee of the corporation and of its stockholders or members [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20(a)*]; or

- When authorized by any provision in *Corp. Code § 2011* or *2114* (or former Corp. Code §§ 3301-3303 (domestic corporations) or 6500-6504 (foreign corporations) as in effect on December 31, 1976, with respect to corporations to which they remain applicable [*see Corp. Code §§ 2302, 2317*; *see also* [1][b][iii], *above*]) as provided by *Corp. Code § 2317* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20(b)*].

Corp. Code § 2011 provides for actions against the dissolved corporation to the extent of its undistributed assets, or if the corporation's assets have been distributed to shareholders, against shareholders to a limited extent [*see Corp. Code § 2011*]. For discussion, including the method of serving summons under Section 2011(b), see Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*.

Corp. Code § 2114 applies to foreign corporations qualified to transact intrastate business. Section 2114 provides that when such a corporation has had its right to transact intrastate business forfeited by the Franchise Tax Board pursuant to the Corporation Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*] it may be served with process in the manner set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 2110* and *2111* [*see* [1][b][ii], *above*], as if the right to transact intrastate business had not been forfeited [*Corp. Code § 2114(c)*].

[3] Joint Stock Company or Association

A summons may be served on a joint stock company or association by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* (ongoing company or association [*see* [1][b][i], [ii], *above*]) or

416.20 (defunct company or association [*see* [2], *above*]) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.30*].

[4] Unincorporated Association or Partnership

[a] In General

A summons may be served on an unincorporated association, including a partnership, by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint as follows:

- If the association is a general or limited partnership, to the person designated as agent for service of process in a statement filed with the Secretary of State or to a general partner or the general manager of the partnership [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40(a)*];

- If the association is not a general or limited partnership, to the person designated as agent for service of process in a statement filed with the Secretary of State or to the president or other head of the association, a vice president, a secretary or assistant secretary, a treasurer or assistant treasurer, a general manager, or a person authorized by the association to receive service of process [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40(b)*];

- When authorized by *Corp. Code § 18220* as provided by that section [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40(c)*].

For discussion of additional methods of serving foreign and domestic limited partnerships, see Ch. 405, *Partnerships: Actions Between Limited Partners or Partnerships and Third Parties* .

[b] Association Domiciled Outside California

Corp. Code § 15800 requires partnerships domiciled outside California and having no regular place of business in California to file a statement in the office of the Secretary of State in accordance with *Corp. Code § 16309* designating a natural person or corporation as the partnership's agent on whom process may be served. This requirement does not apply to a foreign limited partnership subject to *Corp. Code § 15611 et seq.* or *Corp. Code § 15900 et seq.*, or to a commercial or banking partnership established and transacting business outside the United States [*Corp. Code § 15800(a)*]. Process may be served in the manner provided in *Corp. Code § 16310(b)* on the designated person [*Corp. Code § 15800(b)*]. Under *Corp. Code § 24003(e)*, service is made by hand delivery to the agent designated, if a natural person, or, if the agent is a corporation, to any person named in the corporate agent's last certificate, filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505*, at the corporate agent's office [*Corp. Code § 24003(e)*].

[c] Service Through Secretary of State

Service may be made by personal delivery to the Secretary of State, Assistant Secretary of State, or a Deputy Secretary of State in the following circumstances [*Corp. Code § 15800(b)*]:

- The partnership has not designated an agent.

- A natural person designated as agent cannot be found.

- No person can be found with due diligence to whom the delivery authorized by Section 16310(b) may be made for the purpose of delivery to the corporate agent.

- The agent is no longer authorized to act.

The process (one copy of the summons and one copy of the complaint) must be accompanied by a written statement,

signed by the party seeking service or by the party's attorney, setting forth the last known address of the partnership. The Secretary of State must in this event forward the process to the partnership by registered, or certified [*Corp. Code § 8*], return receipt mail at the address given in the written statement [*Corp. Code § 15800(b)*]. Though not required by statute, an additional copy of each paper should be delivered to the Secretary of State for his or her files.

Service on the person designated, or personal delivery of the process and statement of address together with the service fee of $50 to the Secretary of State or an assistant or deputy secretary of state is a valid service on the partnership. The partnership so served is required to appear within 30 days after service on the person designated or within 30 days after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State or an assistant or deputy secretary of state [*Corp. Code § 15800(c)*; *Gov. Code § 12197* (amount of fee)].

[d] Court-Ordered Service on Member

Corp. Code § 18220 provides that, if designation of an agent for the purpose of service has not been made as provided in *Corp. Code § 18200* or if the agent designated cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the address specified in the index referred to in *Corp. Code § 18205* for hand delivery of the process, and it is shown by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the satisfaction of a court or judge that process against an unincorporated association cannot be served with reasonable diligence on the designated agent by hand or the unincorporated association in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10*, *415.20(a)*, or *415.30*, the court or judge may make an order that service be made on the unincorporated association by delivering a copy of the process (that is, summons and complaint) to one or more of the association's members designated in the order and by mailing a copy of the process to the association at its last known address. Though not expressly required by the statute (unless it is deemed included in the meaning of the word "process"), the better practice is to include a copy of the court order with each copy of the summons and complaint served. Service in this manner constitutes personal service on the unincorporated association [*Corp. Code § 18220*].

[4.1] Registered Limited Liability Partnership Whose Principal Office Is Not in State or Foreign Limited Liability Partnership

[a] Designation of Agent

Each registered limited liability partnership whose principal office is not in California and each foreign limited liability partnership registered under *Corp. Code § 16959* must designate as its agent for service of process any natural person or a domestic or foreign corporation entitled to be designated as agent for the service of process pursuant to *Corp Code § 1505* [*Corp. Code § 16962(a)*].

[b] On Whom Service Can Be Made

In addition to service that may be made as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40* [*see* [4][a], *above*], delivery by hand of a copy of any process against a registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership registered under *Corp. Code § 16959* to any natural person designated by it as agent, or if a corporate agent has been designated, to any person named in the latest certificate of the corporate agent filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505* at the office of that corporate agent constitutes valid service on the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership [*Corp. Code § 16962(b)*].

[c] Court Ordered Service on Secretary Of State

If an agent for the purpose of service of process has resigned and has not been replaced or if the agent designated cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the address designated for personally delivering the process, or if no agent has been designated, and it is shown by affidavit (or declaration [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the court's satisfaction that process against a registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership required to be

registered under *Corp. Code § 16959* cannot be served with reasonable diligence on the designated agent by hand in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10*, *415.20(a)*, or *415.30(a)* or on the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*, the court may order that the service be made on the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership by delivering by hand to the Secretary of State, or to any person employed in the Secretary of State's office in the capacity of assistant or deputy, one copy of the process for each defendant to be served, together with a copy of the order authorizing that service and a $50 fee. If the court makes that order, the Secretary of State or the assistant or deputy who receives the process, is required to accept the process. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 16962(c)*; *Gov. Code § 12197(b)* (amount of fee)].

The order under *Corp. Code § 16962(c)*, that service of process be made on the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership by delivery to the Secretary of State, may be a court order of a court of another state, or of any federal court, if the suit, action, or proceeding has been filed in that court [*Corp. Code § 16962(f)*].

The Secretary of State, on the receipt of the copy of process and the fee, must give notice of the service of process to the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership registered under *Corp Code § 16959* at its principal executive office, by forwarding to that office, by registered mail with request for return receipt, the copy of the process or, if the records of the Secretary of State do not disclose an address for that principal executive office, by forwarding the copy in the same manner to the last designated agent for service of process who has not resigned. If the agent for service of process has resigned and has not been replaced and the records of the Secretary of State do not disclose an address for its principal executive office, no action need be taken by the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 16962(d)*].

[d] Secretary of State's Certificate as Evidence

The Secretary of State must keep a record of all process served on the Secretary of State under *Corp Code § 16962* and must record therein thetime of service and the Secretary of State's action with reference thereto. The certificate of the Secretary of State, under the Secretary of State's official seal, certifying to the receipt of process, the giving of notice thereof to the registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership, and the forwarding of the process pursuant to *Corp. Code § 16962* is competent and prima facie evidence of the matters stated therein [*Corp. Code § 16962(e)*].

[5] Limited Liability Company

[a] Service on Agent

In addition to the procedures provided in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.*, process may be served on limited liability companies and foreign limited liability companies as provided in *Corp. Code § 17061* [*Corp. Code § 17061(a)*].

A limited liability company or foreign limited liability company may be served by personal service of a copy of any process against the company by the following methods of delivery [*Corp. Code § 17061(b)*; *see Corp. Code § 17061(d)(1)* (designation of agent)]:

- Either, to any individual designated by it as agent

- Or, if the designated agent is a corporation, to any person named in the latest certificate of the corporate agent filed pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1505* at the corporate agent's office.

No change in the address of the agent for service of process or appointment of a new agent for service of process is effective until an amendment to the statement described in *Corp. Code § 17060* is filed with the Secretary of State [

Corp. Code § 17061(b)].

In the case of a foreign limited liability company that has appointed the Secretary of State as agent for service of process by reason of *Corp. Code § 17456(d)* (regarding cause of action arising out of transaction in this state by company without registration), process (i.e., summons and complaint) must be delivered by hand to the Secretary of State, or to any person employed in the capacity of assistant or deputy, and must include one copy of the process for each defendant to be served, together with a copy of the court order authorizing the service and the fee for it. The order shall set forth the address to which the process shall be sent by the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 17061(b)*].

[b] Agent Has Resigned or Cannot Be Found

If an agent for service of process has resigned and has not been replaced or if the designated agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the address designated for personal delivery of the process, and it is shown by affidavit to the satisfaction of the court that process against a limitedliability company or foreign limited liability company cannot be served with reasonable diligence on the designated agent by hand in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10*, *415.20(a)*, or *415.30(a)*, the court may order that the service shall be made on the company by delivering by hand to the Secretary of State, or to any person employed in the Secretary of State's office in the capacity of assistant or deputy, one copy of the process for each defendant to be served, together with a copy of the order authorizing the service. Service in this manner shall be deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 17061(c)(1)*].

On receiving the copy of process and the required fee, the Secretary of State will forward the copy of the process to the limited liability company or foreign limited liability company, at its principal executive office by registered mail with request for return receipt [*Corp. Code § 17061(c)(2)*].

The Secretary of State keeps a record of all process served on the Secretary of State under the Beverly-Killea Limited Liability Company Act, including the time of service and the action taken by the Secretary. A certificate under the Secretary of State's official seal, certifying to the receipt of process, the giving of notice to the limited liability company or foreign limited liability company, and the forwarding of the process pursuant to *Corp. Code § 17061*, constitutes competent and prima facie evidence of the service of process [*Corp. Code § 17061(c)(3)*].

[c] Members Consent to Service

Members of limited liability companies may consent in writing to be subject to the jurisdiction of courts or to arbitration [*see Corp. Code § 17061(h)*; *see also Corp. Code § 17001(x)* (member defined)]. Along with that consent, a member may consent to be served with legal process in the manner prescribed in a written operating agreement or other writing [*Corp. Code § 17061(h)*].

[5A] Business Organization When Form Unknown

When the defendant is a "business organization, form unknown," summons may be served by *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.95(a)*]:

- Leaving a copy of the summons and complaint, during usual office hours, with the person who is apparently in charge of the office of that business organization; and

- Thereafter mailing a copy of the summons and complaint by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the person served at the place where a copy of the summons and complaint was left.

Service of summons in this manner is complete on the 10th day after mailing. Service of summons under *Code Civ.*

Proc. § 415.95(a) is not valid for a corporation with a registered agent for service of process listed withthe Secretary of State [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.95(b)*]. Service of summons on these corporations must follow statutes directing personal or combination service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.20, 416.10, 416.20*].

[6] Public Entity

[a] Service on Clerk, Attorney General, Officer, or Other Agency Directors

A summons may be served on a public entity by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the clerk, secretary, president, presiding officer, or other head of its governing body [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50(a)*]. The term "public entity," as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*, includes the state and any office, department, division, bureau, board, commission, or agency of the state, the Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in this state [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50(b)*].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 811.9, 955.6, 955.8*, and *955.9*, service of summons in all actions on claims against the state must be made on the Attorney General [*Gov. Code § 955.4*]. In actions for the taking or damaging of private property for public use arising out of work done by the Department of Transportation, service of summons must be made on the Attorney General or the Director of Transportation [*Gov. Code § 955.6*]. In actions for the taking or damaging of private property for public use on claims arising out of work done by the Department of Water Resources, service of summons must be made on the Attorney General or the Director of Water Resources [*Gov. Code § 955.6*].

For a complete discussion and forms for tort actions against public entities, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

The names and addresses of the officers of public entities may be obtained from the "Roster of Public Agencies" maintained by the Secretary of State and County Clerk [*see Gov. Code §§ 53050, 53051*; *see also Hovd v. Hayward Unified Sch. Dist. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 470, 472, 141 Cal. Rptr. 527* (inapplicability of *Gov. Code § 53051(a)* to subdivisions of public agency)].

Service of process may be made in conformity with the information contained in the statement in the Roster of Public Agencies pertaining to the particular public agency which is on file at the time of the service. Service in this manner, if otherwise made in compliance with law, constitutes personal service on the public agency [*Gov. Code § 960.8*].

[b] If Appropriate Officer Cannot Be Ascertained

If it is shown by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the satisfaction of the court or judge that the facts required by *Gov. Code § 53051* have not been placed on the Roster of Public Agencies, or have been misstated, thus preventing service of summons, the court or judge may make an order that service of process be made on the public agency [*Gov. Code §§ 960.2, 960.3(a)*] by leaving two copies of the process (that is, summons and complaint) for each public agency defendant to be served, together with two copies of the order authorizing such service, in the Secretary of State's office in Sacramento or by sending the copies to that office by certified or registered mail, addressee only, return receipt requested [*Gov. Code § 960.3(b)*]. An additional copy of each paper should also be delivered to the Secretary of State at the same time for his or her files, though this is not required by statute.

Service in this latter method is effective as of the day the return receipt is received from the Secretary of State's office [*Gov. Code § 960.3(b)(2)*].A $50 fee for each public agency on which service is to be so made is required to be paid by plaintiff [*Gov. Code § 960.3(d)*]. Service in this manner is declared to constitute personal service on the public agency [*Gov. Code § 960.3(c)*].

On receipt of the process, the Secretary of State is required to serve it by forwarding a copy of it by registered return receipt mail to the public agency's governing body at its principal office in this state. If only a county address is disclosed by the Secretary of State's records, then the process must be mailed to the county seat, addressed to the public agency in care of the county clerk, or it may be mailed to any address for the public agency specified in the court order. If it is mailed in care of the county clerk, the county clerk must promptly send it to the public agency at its address within the county if known or, if unknown, cause it to be posted at the county courthouse for 30 days.

If no address for the agency is disclosed by the Secretary of State's records, the Secretary of State must mail a copy of the process to the county clerk of either the county in which the transaction or occurrence took place or the county in which the agency's real property is situated, and the county clerk in turn must promptly send it to the public agency at its address within the county if known or, if unknown, must cause it to be posted at the county courthouse for 30 days. The Secretary of State must also, on receipt of the process, immediately forward to the Attorney General a copy of all papers served on him or her. The Attorney General, on receipt of the process, may locate the responsible officers of the public agency involved, and the governing body of the agency may relieve the Attorney General of any further responsibility and may designate any other attorneys to defend the action or take any other action it may determine [*Gov. Code § 960.4*].

[7] Minor

A summons may be served on a minor by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the minor's parent, guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary, or, if no such person can be found with reasonable diligence, to any person having the care or control of the minor or with whom the minor resides or by whom the minor is employed, and to the minor if he or she is at least 12 years of age [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.60*; see also *Miller v. Superior Court (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 49, 51-53, 13 Cal. Rptr. 673, 362 P.2d 497]* .

[8] Person Other Than Minor for Whom Guardian, Conservator, or Similar Fiduciary Has Been Appointed

A summons may be served on a person, other than a minor, for whom a guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary has been appointed by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person's guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary and to the person. For good cause shown, the court in which the action is pending may dispense with delivery to the person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.70*].

[9] Candidate for Public Office

A summons may be served on a candidate for public office when authorized and as provided by *Elec. Code § 12* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.80*].

[10] Persons Not Otherwise Specified

A summons may be served on a person not otherwise specified in *Code of Civil Procedure sections 416.10-416.80* [*see* [1]-[9], *above*] by delivering a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to that person or to anyone authorized by that person to receive service of process [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90*].

The specific appointment of an agent to receive service of process on behalf of another under *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90* is not required. The principal-agent relationship must, however, be close and enduring enough to make it highly probable that the defendant will receive actual notice if it is served on the agent [*Warner Bros. Records, Inc. v. Golden West Music Sales (1974) 36 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1017, 112 Cal. Rptr. 71* ; *but see Summers v. McClanahan (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 403, 412, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 338* (service on actor's personal manager did not comport with statutory requirements despite defendant having actual notice of complaint)].

[11] Resident Motorist

[a] Consent to Service in or Outside of California

The acceptance by a California resident of a certificate of ownership or a certificate of registration of any motor vehicle, or the renewal of such certificate, issued under the laws of California, or the acceptance or retention by a California resident of a California driver's license, constitutes a consent by the resident that in any action brought in a California court on a cause of action arising in California out of the ownership or operation of the owned or registered vehicle, or the operation of any motor vehicle by the licensed resident, the summons may be served on the resident in or out of California, whether or not he or she is then a California resident [*Veh. Code §§ 17459, 17460*; *see Ostrus v. Price (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 518, 524, 146 Cal. Rptr. 922]* .

[b] Manner of Service on Resident Outside California

Veh. Code § 17461 provides that if summons is served outside California pursuant to the resident's *Veh. Code § 17459* or *17460* consent, it may be served and proof of service made in the manner provided by *Veh. Code §§ 17454-17456* for service of summons on a nonresident (*see* [12][b], *below*), or it may be served pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*. *Veh. Code § 17462* provides that a person served outside California shall have 60 days in which to appear in the action in which the summons was issued.

Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40 authorizes service of summons on a person outside California in any manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.50*, discussed at *§ 518.16*, or by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt. It provides that service of summons by this form of mail is deemed complete on the 10th day after such mailing. The section does not otherwise extend the time within which a responsive pleading must be filed after service is deemed complete. That time in civil actions is 30 days under *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*. The time extensions set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*, relating to service by mail, do not apply to service of the summons by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 413.20*]. The 30-day provision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*] also applies to service under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10* (personal service, that is, hand delivery), 415.20 (combination service), and 415.30 (service by mail and acknowledgment of receipt), all discussed at *§ 518.16*. Each of these statutes specifies the time when service in the manner provided in the statute is deemed complete.

Service may be made on a person outside California under either *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* or the Vehicle Code provisions. If made under Code *Civ. Proc. § 415.40*, the defendant has 30 days to respond by virtue of *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)*; if made under the Vehicle Code provisions, the defendant has 60 days to respond by virtue of *Veh. Code § 17462* [*see Anderson v. Sherman (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 228, 237, 178 Cal. Rptr. 38* (involving nonresidents; finding the two schemes for service to be compatible alternatives)].

[12] Nonresident Motorist

[a] Consent to Service

Operation of a motor vehicle in this state by a nonresident or by a nonresident's agent, or ownership by a nonresident of a motor vehicle operated in this state by any person with the nonresident's express or implied permission is equivalent to an appointment of the California Director of Motor Vehicles as the nonresident's attorney on whom process may be served in any action or proceeding against the nonresident growing out of any accident or collision resulting from the operation of the motor vehicle in California [*Veh. Code § 17451*; *see Veh. Code § 17450*; *see also Miller v. Superior Court (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 779, 788, 16 Cal. Rptr. 36]* . The appointment is irrevocable and binding on the nonresident's executor or administrator [*Veh. Code §§ 17451, 17453*]. If the nonresident dies before commencement of the action, service of process is made on the nonresident's executor or administrator in the same manner and on the same notice as is provided in the case of a nonresident. If the nonresident dies after the action is commenced, the court will allow the action to be continued against the executor or administrator on motion with such notice as the court

deems proper [*Veh. Code § 17452*].

[b] Manner of Service on Nonresident Motorist

[i] Vehicle Code Provisions

Veh. Code § 17454 provides that service of process on a nonresident motorist is made by leaving one copy of the summons and one copy of the complaint in the hands of the Director of Motor Vehicles or in his or her office in Sacramento or by mailing the copy of the summons and complaint by certified or registered mail, addressee only, return receipt requested, to the office of the Director of Motor Vehicles in Sacramento. Service is effective as of the day the return receipt is received from the director's office. A fee of $2 for each nonresident to be served must be paid to the Director at the time of service of the copy of the summons and complaint. Such service is sufficient service on the nonresident subject to compliance with *Veh. Code § 17455*, which provides that notice of service on the Department of Motor Vehicles, a copy of the summons, and a copy of the complaint must be forthwith sent by registered mail by either the plaintiff or by the plaintiff's attorney to the defendant. An additional copy of each paper should be delivered with the required copies to the Director of Motor Vehicles, though this is not required by statute.

Veh. Code § 17455 also provides that personal service of the notice and a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint on the defendant wherever found outside this state is the equivalent of service by mail.

In the event of service by mail, proof of compliance with *Veh. Code § 17455* must be made by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney showing the mailing, together with the return receipt bearing the signature of the defendant. The affidavit or declaration and the receipt must be appended to the original summons, and the summons must be filed with the court that issued the summons within such time as the court may allow for the return of the summons. In the event of personal service outside this state, compliance with *Veh. Code § 17455* may be provided by the return of any duly constituted public officer, qualified to serve like process of and in the state or jurisdiction where the defendant is found, showing service to have been made. The return must be appended to the original summons which must be filed as set forth above [*Veh. Code § 17456*].

If service is made under the Vehicle Code provisions, the defendant has 60 days to respond [*Veh. Code § 17462*].

[ii] Code of Civil Procedure Provisions

Notwithstanding the Vehicle Code provisions, *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* authorizes service of summons on a person outside this state in any manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.50* or by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt, and provides that service of summons by that form of mail is deemed complete on the 10th day after the mailing.

If service is made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*, the defendant has 30 days to respond by virtue of *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3)* as opposed to the 60 days the defendant has to respond if he or she is served under the Vehicle Code provisions [*Veh. Code § 17462*; *see Anderson v. Sherman (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 228, 237, 178 Cal. Rptr. 38* (upholding default judgment based on shorter period for responding when service is under Code of Civil Procedure)].

[13] Nonresident Executor or Administrator

When a nonresident personal representative accepts appointment, the acceptance is equivalent to and constitutes his or her irrevocable and binding appointment of the Secretary of State to be his or her attorney for the purpose of service. If the nonresident personal representative should die, the appointment will also apply to his or her personal representative [*Prob. Code § 8572(a)*]. Under the appointment, service of process and service of notices of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.41* to continue actions pending at the time of the decedent's death may be made on the Secretary of State in any action or proceeding against the nonresident personal representative that concerns the estate, or is founded on or

arises out of acts or omissions in his or her capacity as nonresident personal representative [*Prob. Code § 8572(b)*)].

Service is made by delivering to and leaving with the Secretary of State two copies of the summons and complaint or notice of motion and either of the following [*Prob. Code § 8574(a)*]:

- A copy of the statement of permanent address, which *Prob. Code § 8573* requires the nonresident personal representative to sign and file with the court; or

- If no statement of permanent address has been filed, a copy of the letters issued to the nonresident personal representative and a written statement, signed by the party or attorney of the party seeking service, that sets forth an address for use by the Secretary of State.

The Secretary of State must promptly mail by registered mail (or certified mail under *Prob. Code § 5*) one copy of the summons and complaint or notice of motion to the nonresident personal representative at the address shown on the statement delivered to the Secretary of State [*Prob. Code § 8574(b)*].

Personal service on the nonresident personal representative wherever found is the equivalent of service on the Secretary of State under *Prob. Code § 8574* [*Prob. Code § 8574(c)*].

Service made under *Prob. Code § 8574* has the same legal force and validity as if made personally in California [*Prob. Code § 8576(a)*]. The manner of proving compliance with *Prob. Code § 8574* is set forth in *Prob. Code § 8575*.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* authorizes service of summons on a person outside this state in any manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.50* or by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt, and provides that service of summons by that form of mail is deemed complete on the 10th day after mailing.

[14] Nonresident Insurer

Service of process, notices, or other papers described in or referred to by the following Insurance Code sections may be made on the Insurance Commissioner as provided by *Ins. Code § 12931* [*Ins. Code § 12931(b)*]:

- *Ins. Code § 1452* (actions against reciprocal or interinsurance exchanges).

- *Ins. Code § 1605* (actions against admitted foreign or alien insurers).

- *Ins. Code § 1612* (actions against nonadmitted insurers).

- *Ins. Code §§ 11104, 11105* (actions against admitted and formerly admitted fraternal benefit societies).

Service is made by delivering to the Insurance Commissioner or to his or her deputy two copies of the summons and complaint for each person or party defendant so served accompanied by the required payment for each person or party [*Ins. Code § 12931(a)*]. The commissioner is required to promptly mail one of the copies to the defendant or person to be served by certified mail (or registered mail if addressed to an area outside the United States where certified mail is not available). The envelope will be addressed, in the case of a licensee, to his or her last principal place of business known to the commissioner by his or her official records, or, in the case of a nonadmitted insurer, to its last principal place of business known to the commissioner from national directories, reference books, or other reliable information available in the commissioner's office [*Ins. Code § 12931(c)*].

Service in this manner is valid and gives the court jurisdiction over the person of a nonadmitted or unauthorized defendant, provided that both of the following apply [*Ins. Code § 12931(d)*]:

- Plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, within 10 days after delivery of the process to the Insurance Commissioner, sends by certified mail (or by registered mail if addressed to an area outside the United States where certified mail service is not available) a notice of the service and a copy of the process to the defendant at its last known principal place of business; and

- The receipt of the defendant or defendant's agent, showing the name of the sender and the name and address of the addressee-defendant, and the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney showing compliance with *Ins. Code § 12931*, are filed with the clerk of the court in which the action is pending on or before the date the defendant is required to appear, or within such further time as the court may allow.

Ins. Code § 12931(f) provides that nothing in *Ins. Code § 12931* shall limit the right to serve process on any insurer in any other manner permitted by law. Other manners of service permitted by law include service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*, which authorizes service on persons outside California by return receipt mail [*see § 518.16[5]*], and in any other manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.50* [*see § 518.16[1] -[6]*].

[15] Nonresident Real Estate Licensee or Subdivider

Every nonresident applicant for a real estate license must, along with his or her application, file with the Real Estate Commissioner an irrevocable consent to service on the Department of Real Estate in the event personal service cannot be made in California after the exercise of due diligence [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10151.5*].

Every nonresident subdivider must file with the Department of Real Estate, together with a *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010* questionnaire, an irrevocable consent to service on the Secretary of State in the event personal service cannot be made in California after the exercise of due diligence [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 11007, 11010*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11007* provides for the application, insofar as possible, of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1018*, relating to service on the Secretary of State. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1018*, however, has been repealed [*see* Stats. 1999, ch. 1000, § 12].

In any event, despite the foregoing provisions, *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* authorizes service of summons on a person outside California in any manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.50* or by sending, by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt, a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served and provides that service of summons by that form of mail is deemed complete on the 10th day after mailing [*see § 518.16[1] -[6]*].

[16] Under Securities and Franchise Investment Laws

[a] Consent to Service on Commissioner

Corp. Code § 25102 exempts certain transactions from the provisions of *Corp. Code § 25110*, which requires qualification of the sale of securities in issuer transactions. Included in the exemption is the offer or sale of voting common stock by a corporation incorporated in any state if immediately after the proposed sale and issuance of stock there will be only one class of stock outstanding that is owned beneficially by no more than 35 persons and specified requirements are met [*Corp. Code § 25102(h)*]. One of the conditions that must, in the case of a non-California corporation, be met is the filing of an irrevocable consent appointing the Commissioner of Corporations as issuer's attorney to receive service of process in any noncriminal action or proceeding against the corporation or its successor that arises under the Corporate Securities Law or any rule or order thereunder after the consent has been filed, with the same force and validity as if served personally on the issuer [*Corp. Code § 25102(h)(4)*].

Every applicant for qualification of the sale of securities under the Corporate Securities Law (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*) and every person filing an application or request for or notice of an exemption from qualification, other than a California corporation or a person licensed as a broker-dealer in this state, and every applicant for a certificate as an agent [defined in *Corp. Code § 25003*], a broker-dealer [defined in *Corp. Code § 25004*], or investment adviser [defined in *Corp. Code § 25009*], other than a California corporation, must file with the Commissioner of Corporations an irrevocable consent appointing the commissioner as attorney to receive service of process in any noncriminal action or proceeding against the person filing the consent or the person's successor, executor, or administrator, that arises under the Corporate Securities Law or any rule or order thereunder after the consent has been filed, with the same force and validity as if personally served on the person who filed the consent [*Corp. Code §§ 25165, 25240*; *see also Corp. Code §§ 25211(a), (b)(3)* (application for broker-dealer certificate), 25231 (application for investment adviser certificate)].

A similar provision applies to an applicant, other than a California corporation, for registration of an offer to sell franchises under the Franchise Investment Law set forth as *Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.* [*Corp. Code § 31155*].

[b] Service on Commissioner

Service under the foregoing provisions may be made by leaving a copy of the process in the commissioner's office, but it is not effective unless both of the following conditions are met [*Corp. Code §§ 25102(h)(4), 25165, 25240, 31155*]:

- The plaintiff, who may be the commissioner in an action or proceeding instituted by him or her, forthwith sends notice of the service and a copy of the process by registered or certified mail to the defendant or respondent at its last known address on file with the commissioner; and

- The plaintiff's affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of compliance with the code provision governing service is filed in the case on or before the return day of the process, if any, or within the further time as the court allows.

[c] Equivalents to Appointment of Commissioner

Engaging in conduct prohibited or made actionable by the Corporate Securities Law or any rule or order thereunder by any person, including a nonresident of this state, whether or not the person has filed a consent to service of process under *Corp. Code § 25102(h), 25165*, or *25240*, as the case may be, is, if jurisdiction over the person cannot otherwise be obtained in this state, considered equivalent to the person's appointment of the Commissioner of Corporations as attorney to receive service of process in any noncriminal action or proceeding against the person or the person's successor, executor, or administrator which grows out of that conduct and which is brought under the Corporate Securities Law or any rule or order thereunder. Such service has the same force and validity as if the person had been personally served. Service in such case may be made by leaving a copy of the process in the commissioner's office, but it is not effective unless both of the following conditions are met [*Corp. Code § 25550*]:

- The plaintiff, who may be the commissioner in an action or proceeding instituted by him or her, forthwith sends notice of the service and a copy of the process by registered or certified mail to the defendant or respondent at his, her, or its last known address or takes other steps which are reasonably calculated to give actual notice; and

- The plaintiff's affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of compliance with the foregoing provisions is filed in the case on or before the return day of the process, if any, or within such further time as the court allows.

Corp. Code § 31420 contains similar provisions for service in actions or proceedings arising out of a violation of the

Franchise Investment Law [*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*].

[d] Other Methods of Service

None of the above-cited sections of the Corporations Code excludes service of process pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*. Consequently, it would appear that service outside California in such a case may be made in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*. That section authorizes service in any manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10 et seq.* [*see §§ 518.16[1] -[6]*] or by sending a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint to the person to be served by first-class mail, postage prepaid, requiring a return receipt and provides that service of summons by that form of mail is deemed complete on the 10th day after such mailing.

[17] Incarcerated Individual

Service directed to a person who is incarcerated within any institution in California is made to the sheriff or jailer, and may be served by any person who may lawfully serve process [*Penal Code § 4013(b)*]. The sheriff or jailer served with a paper in a judicial proceeding must forthwith deliver it to the prisoner, with a note thereon of the time of its service, and neglect to do so makes the sheriff or jailer liable to the prisoner for all damages occasioned thereby [*Penal Code § 4013(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.18

§ 518.18 Service at Gated Community

[1] Access to Community

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.21* allows process servers access to gated communities for a reasonable period of time for the purpose of performing lawful service of process or service of a subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.21(a)*]. This authority only applies to a gated community that is staffed at the time service of process is attempted by a guard or other security personnel assigned to control access to the community [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.21(b)*].

To gain access, the process server must identify to the guard the person or persons to be served, display a current driver's license or other identification and one of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.21(a)*]:

- A badge or other confirmation that the individual is acting in his or her capacity as a representative of a county sheriff or marshal.

- Evidence of current registration as a process server pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350 et seq.*

[2] Substituted Service on Guard

The Legislature expressly declared that the enactment of Section 415.21 was not intended to abrogate or modify the holding of *Bein v. Brechtel-Jochim Group, Inc. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1387, 1393, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 351* [Stats. 1994, ch. 691, § 2]. Under *Bein*, a residential gate guard, who denies a process server access to a gated community in which the person to be served resides, is considered a competent member of the household and a person apparently in charge of a corporate office, for purposes of substituted service under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*. Litigants have the right to choose their abodes; they do not have the right to control who may sue or serve them by denying physical access [*Bein v. Brechtel-Jochim Group, Inc. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1387, 1393, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 351]* .

For general discussion of substituted service, see *§ 518.16[2]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.19

§ 518.19 Ascertaining Defendant's Military Status at Time of Service of Summons

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (formerly known as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940) provides that before entering a default judgment, the plaintiff must file with the court an affidavit stating whether or not the defendant is in military service and showing necessary facts to support the affidavit [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521*]. If the plaintiff is unable to determine whether or not the defendant is in military service, that information must be stated in the affidavit. If, based upon the affidavits filed, the court is unable to determine whether the defendant is in military service, the court, before entering a default judgment, may require that additional procedural requirements be satisfied to protect the interests of defendants who may be unable to appear because of active military service.

State statutes parallel the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, providing additional protections for members of the National Guard and reservists of the United States Military Reserve called to active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*]. Under the state statutes, before a default judgment may be taken, a plaintiff must file a declaration showing the defendant is not a member of the National Guard or reservist of the United States Military Reserve called to active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*]. Ascertaining the defendant's military status is also important for other issues of the case since the state statutes provide additional protections for continuances, attachments, and a host of actions such as unlawful detainer, debt collection, family law, proceedings, and foreclosure [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*].

When the defendant is personally known to the plaintiff, this requirement poses no problem because the plaintiff can fill out the necessary declaration based on personal knowledge. If the defendant is not personally known to the plaintiff, however, it is usually easiest to obtain the necessary information by requesting that the process server ascertain the defendant's military status at the time that he or she serves the defendant with the summons and complaint, when service is accomplished by hand delivery. When that request is made to a sheriff or marshal, that officer must complete a declaration regarding the facts ascertained concerning defendant's military status [*see Gov. Code §§ 26608.1, 71265*].

Thus, before arranging for service of summons, plaintiff's counsel should always consider the advisability of requesting that the process server determine the defendant's military status, so that his or her declaration can be used, if needed, in the event that defendant defaults. Note that most counties charge an additional fee for this service when it is requested.

Moreover, some counties have their own preprinted forms of certificate or declaration for use by officers serving process, but others may require that plaintiff's counsel provide a declaration that may be filled out by the process server.

The following cross references show the breadth of how a defendant's military status may effect the case at hand:

- For discussion of how a party's military service may affect family law proceedings and declaration requirements, see Ch. 12A, *Adoptions: Termination of Parent* ; Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* ; and Ch. 258, *Family Law Enforcement: General Enforcement Principles and Remedies* .

- For an application for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

- For an declaration for a stay of attachment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , Form 19.

- For a complaint for unlawful retaliation by a lender, creditor, or other person against a person who received a stay or postponement because of military service, see *Ch. 129, Consumer Credit Reporting, § 129.150*.

- For discussion and an application for a stay of a pending action or proceeding based on military service, see *Ch. 136, Continuances, §§ 136.20[2], 136.78A.*

- For discussion and a plaintiff's declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth facts showing that the defendant is not in the military service prior to entry of default judgment, see *Ch. 205, Defaults and Default Judgments, §§ 205.25[5], 205.92 -205.94*.

- For an application for a stay of execution of a judgment or order involving a person in military service, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

- For an application for a stay of garnishment involving a person in military service, see Ch. 276, *Garnishment* .

- For a defendant's notice of admitting service of summons and complaint, waiving further notice, and waiving rights under the Soliders' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act and similar state statutes, see *Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances, § 323.173*.

- For a lessee's notice of termination of a lease due to the lessee's military service, see *Ch. 332, Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy, § 332.71A.*

- For a stay of eviction in an unlawful detainer proceeding during a period of military service, see *Ch. 333, Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions, § 333.111*.

- For an application for relief against the enforcement of a fine or penalty against a person in military service when the penalty was incurred, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgment or Order* .

- For a service member's application for relief from judgment, supporting declaration and order, see *Ch. 489, Relief From Judgments and Orders, § 489.411*.

- For detailed discussion of relief under the Soldier's and Sailors' Civil Relief Act and related California legislation, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts; § 501.60* et seq.

- For an application for stay of enforcement of pre-existing obligation during the period of the applicant's military service, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.300*.

- For an application (motion) for temporary relief from an obligation on the ground that the person is or was in active military service after entering into the obligation, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.301*.

- For an affirmative defense to an action on an interest-bearing obligation on the ground that the annual rate of interest may not exceed 6 percent per year during the period of the defendant's military service, see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.302*.

- For an application (motion) in an action on a contract for the purchase of personal property for a stay of proceedings on the ground that the defendant is on active military service see *Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Contracts, § 501.303*.

- For an application for a stay during military service in an action to enforce a security interest in real or personal property, see *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.113*.

- For a petition for a stay of foreclosure proceedings and relief from an installment contract, mortgage, or trust deed for the purchase of real property by an active member of the military service, see *Ch 555, Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages, § 555.139A*.

- For an application for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments by an active member of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139B.

- For an order staying foreclosure proceedings in relation to an obligation secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property for an active member of the military service, see Ch 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, § 555.139C.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.20

§ 518.20 Proof of Service

[1] Governing Statutes

The following statutes govern proof of service of summons:

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30* (court order).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10* (service in California).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20* (service outside California).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30* (return of service).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.40* (service by registered process server).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 2009* (use of affidavit to prove service of summons).
- *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2010* and *2011* (proof of publication).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.3* (certificate of a sheriff or marshal has same force and effect as his or her affidavit).
- *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of affidavit).

Other statutes that relate to specific actions or special proceedings or to particular classes of defendants may impose requirements on the proof of service in addition to or in lieu of those required by the above-cited statutes [*see, e.g., § 518.17*]. For proof of service in a foreign country made under the "Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters" treaty, see *§ 518.16[9]*.

[2] Judicial Council Forms

The Judicial Council has adopted a mandatory proof of service of summons form [*see § 518.72*] for use in civil actions and proceedings [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; Judicial Council Form POS-010]; for illustration, [*see § 518.72*]. The Judicial Council Forms for summons [SUM-100, SUM-110, SUM-120, SUM-130, SUM-140] all reference Judicial Council Form POS-010 for use as proof of service of summons.

In addition, a form for proof of service of a summons and complaint prepared entirely by word processor, typewriter, or similar process may be used for proof of service of a summons and complaint in any action or proceeding in lieu of the printed Judicial Council proof of service of summons form, if the form adheres to certain format requirements [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150(a)*; *see also § 518.72[4]*].

[3] Within California

[a] In General

In addition to the requirements for proof of service made in the ways discussed at [b]-[f], *below*, proof of service may also be made by the written admission of the party served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(d)*].

If the defendant was fictitiously designated in the complaint and so served, the affidavit, declaration, or certificate of service must state the fictitious name under which the defendant was served and the fact that notice of identity was given by endorsement on the summons served and the fact that the notice of identity was given by endorsement on the copy of the summons served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*].

To satisfy the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 474*, a summons must notify the recipient that he or she was sued as a fictitiously named defendant [*Carol Gilbert, Inc. v. Haller (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 852, 857, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 843]* .

To support a finding of substantial compliance with the statutory requirements for service of process requires three preconditions. First, there must have been some degree of compliance with the offended statutory requirements. Second, the objective nature and circumstances of the attempted service must have made it highly probable that it would impart the same notice as full compliance. Finally, it must in fact have imparted such notice, or at least sufficient notice to put the defendant on his or her defense. In this regard, it is not enough that the process inform the defendant of the fact of a lawsuit, or even of a lawsuit in which his or her name appears; due process requires notice of the duty to defend [*Carol Gilbert, Inc. v. Haller (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 852, 865-866, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 843]* .

[b] Personal Service or Combination Service

If the summons and complaint were served in California under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10* (personal delivery) or 415.20 (combination of substituted service and service by mail), proof of service is made by the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]), or, if service was made by a sheriff or marshal, by the certificate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.3*], of the person who made the service. The affidavit, declaration, or certificate must show the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(a)*]:

- The time (date and hour), place, and manner of service.
- Facts showing that service was made in accordance with law [*see § 518.70*].
- The name of the person to whom a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint were delivered. If the person was served under afictitious name, this includes the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 474*, discussed at [a], *above*.

- If appropriate, the title of the person served and the capacity in which he or she was served, and that the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.30* (action against corporation, unincorporated association, or partnership) appeared on the copy of the summons served, if in fact it did appear.

In the case of combination service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*; *see § 518.16[3]*], the affidavit, certificate, or declaration must also show the mailing of an additional copy of the summons and additional copy of the complaint to the person or entity served. If combination service was made on an individual [*see § 518.16[3][b]*], the same or another affidavit or declaration must also show that personal service could not have been made with reasonable diligence [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.20(b), 417.10(a)*].

[c] Service by Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt

If the summons and complaint were served under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* (service by mail and acknowledgment of receipt), proof of service is made in the manner set forth in [b], *above*, specifying the time (date) and place of mailing, the kind of mail utilized (postage prepaid, first class mail or airmail), and the address to which the mail was sent [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.30(a), 417.10(a)*].

In addition, the acknowledgment of receipt of summons in the form provided by that section [*see § 518.73*] or other written acknowledgment of receipt of summons satisfactory to the court must be attached to the proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(a)*].

[d] Service by Publication

If service was made by publication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*, proof of service may require two affidavits or declarations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)*]:

- The affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the publisher or printer, or of the publisher's or printer's foreman or clerk, showing the time and place of publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2010*]; and

- If the address of the party being served is ascertained before publication is completed, an affidavit or declaration showing the time and place a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint were mailed to the party to be served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*; *see § 518.78*].

The publisher's or printer's affidavit or declaration must be annexed to a copy of the document published, specifying the times when, and the paper in which, the publication was made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2010*] and filed with the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2011*].

[e] Service in Unlawful Detainer Action

If the proceeding is in unlawful detainer and service was made by posting pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.45*, proof of service is made by the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the person who posted the premises, showing the time and place of posting, and an affidavit or declaration showing the time and place copies of the summons and complaint were mailed to the party to be served, if in fact mailed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(e)*].

[f] Service Under Other California Statute

If service was made pursuant to a California statute other than those discussed at [a]-[e], *above*, proof of service is made in the manner prescribed by that statute or, if no manner is prescribed, in the manner prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10* for proof of a similar manner of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(c)*].

[4] Outside California

[a] Under California Service Statute

If summons was served outside California in a manner specified by a California statute, proof of service is made in the manner prescribed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10* [*see* [3], *above*].

If service is made outside California by mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* [*see § 518.16[5]*], proof of service must strictly comply with the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)* [*Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 1001, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* . The proof of service must include evidence satisfactory to the court establishing actual delivery to the person to be served, either by a signed return receipt or other evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)*; *see Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 1001, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (sufficient "other evidence" to assure court that defendants received "actual delivery" of summons and complaint within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)*); *see also Stamps v. Superior Court (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 108, 110-111, 92 Cal. Rptr. 151* (receipt returned marked "unclaimed" and without signature is not evidence of delivery)].

[b] Service in Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

If the proceeding is in unlawful detainer and service was made by posting pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.45*, proof of service is made by the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the person who posted the premises, showing the time and place of posting, and an affidavit or declaration showing the time and place copies of the summons and of the complaint were mailed to the party to be served, if in fact mailed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(e)*].

[c] Service Pursuant to Court Order

If service was made outside California pursuant to court order, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)* or *413.30*, proof of service is made in the manner prescribed in the order [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.30, 417.20(b)*].

When service is made as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(b)* (outside California but within United States) or 413.10(c) (outside United States), subject to any additional requirements that may be imposed by the court in which the action is pending, proof of service may be made in the manner prescribed by the law of the place where the person was served for proof of service in an action in its courts of general jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(c)*].

[d] Written Admission

Proof of service outside California may also be made by the written admission of the party served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(d)*].

[5] By Registered Process Server

Any proof of service which is signed by a person registered under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350 et seq.* or by his or her employee or independent contractor must indicate the county in which he or she is registered and the number assigned to him or her pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22355* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 22360*; *see § 518.70*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.21

§ 518.21 Filing Proof of Service and Presumptions

[1] Filing Requirement

After a summons has been served on a person, proof of service of the summons as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10* or *417.20* must be filed, unless the defendant has previously made a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30*]. Proof of service of the summons must be filed within 60 days after the time the summons and complaint must be served upon a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(b)*].

Amendments to the Code, effective January 1, 2006, deleted the requirement of giving the plaintiff the original summons, and deleted the requirement that the summons be returned or a declaration of lost summons be filed with the court [2005 Stats. 300].

[2] Presumptions

The filing of a proof of service creates a rebuttable presumption that the service was proper. The presumption arises, however, only if the proof of service complies with the applicable statutory requirements [*FloveyorInternat., Ltd. v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 789, 795, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457]* .

The return of service of a process server registered pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350 et seq.* establishes a presumption, affecting the burden of producing evidence, of the facts stated in the return [*Evid. Code § 647*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.22

§ 518.22 Dismissal of Action for Failure to Serve Summons or File Proof of Service

[1] Generally

The summons and complaint must be served on a defendant within three years after the action is commenced against the defendant. An action is commenced at the time the complaint is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(a)*]. In addition, proof of service of the summons must be filed within 60 days after the time the summons and complaint must be served upon a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(b)*]. For when the time limit for service does not apply, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.220*. Periods excluded from the time limits are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.240*. If service is not made and returned within the required time periods, dismissal of the action is mandated by *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.250*.

Moreover, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.410-583.430*, a court, in its discretion, may, on its own motion or the motion of the defendant, dismiss an action if it appears appropriate under the circumstances when service is not made within two years after the action is commenced against the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.410(a), 583.420(a)(1), (b)*]. The term "service," as used in the foregoing provision, includes return of summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.110(f)*].

For further discussion and forms for use by a defendant to secure dismissal of an action for plaintiff's failure to serve and return the summons within the times specified, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

[2] Effect of Trial Delay Reduction Programs

Local rules enacted to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) may affect the availability of involuntary dismissal based on failure to effect service. The rules generally require that service of the complaint be completed and proof of service filed with the court 60 days after the filing of the complaint [*see, e.g.,* San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.5; *see also Gov. Code § 68616(a)*]. Courts have the authority to dismiss an action to enforce delay reduction programs if less severe sanctions apparently would not be effective, after taking into account the effect of previous sanctions or previous lack of compliance in the case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 583.150* (authority of court to dismiss action pursuant to local rule); *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*]. Consequently, if the plaintiff has failed to meet the local deadline for service of the complaint, it appears the action may be dismissed for failure to complete service, notwithstanding the fact that the three-year or two-year period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210* or

583.420 has not elapsed for mandatory or discretionary dismissal [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.13].

For further coverage of the act and local delay reduction rules, see Ch. 552, *Trial Court Delay Reduction* . For discussion of dismissal as a sanction under trial court delay rules, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.23

§ 518.23 Bad Faith Service and Filing of Complaints and Cross Complaints

Filing a complaint or other pleading may result in the imposition of sanctions if the pleading is frivolous, lacking evidentiary support, or intended to harass the other party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(b), (c)* (sanctions for frivolous tactics in actions commenced in 1995 through 2005 unless the legislature changes the ending date; for discussion, *see* Ch. 510, *Sanctions*)].

For actions filed before that period, bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or merely intended to cause delay may result in sanctions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*]. "Actions or tactics" include the filing and service of a complaint or cross complaint, but filing without service is excluded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(b)(1)*].

For further discussion, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.24-518.29

[Reserved]

§§ 518.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.30

§ 518.30 List of Parties and Addresses

[1] First-Named Plaintiff's Duties to Maintain and Furnish

If more than two parties have appeared in a case and are represented by different counsel, the plaintiff named first in the complaint must do the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.254, 3.1103(b)*]:

- Maintain a current list of the parties and the address for service of notice on each party; and
- Furnish a copy of the list on request to any party or the court.

[2] Duties of All Parties

Each party must do the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.254*]:

- Furnish the first-named plaintiff with its current address for service of notice when it first appears in the action;
- Furnish the first-named plaintiff with any changes in its address for service of notice; and
- If it serves an order, notice, or pleading on a party who has not yet appeared in the action, serve a copy of the list at the same time as the order, notice or pleading is served.

In addition, a party or attorney whose address changes while the action is pending must serve on all parties and file written notice of change of address [*Cal Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1103(b), 2.200*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.31

§ 518.31 Filing and Service

[1] In General

All pleadings subsequent to the complaint must be filed with the clerk of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending, or with the judge if there is no clerk, and copies must be served on the adverse party or the adverse party's attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 465*; *see § 518.34[2]*]. Filing and service may be accomplished in the manners discussed below [*see § 518.34*] or by facsimile transmission, which is the subject of Ch. 264, *Fax Filing and Service of Papers*.

In the case of a cross complaint, the cross complainant must serve a copy of the most recently amended complaint and any answers on cross defendants who have not previously appeared [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.222*].

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.110(c) requires that a cross complaint against a party who has appeared in the action be accompanied by proof of service of the cross complaint at the time it is filed; if the cross complaint adds new parties, the cross complaint must be served on all parties and proofs of service on the new parties must be filed within thirty days of the filing of the cross-complaint.

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.221(a) requires that each court must make available to the plaintiff, at the time of filing of the complaint, an ADR information package that includes specified information. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.221(c)* requires that each plaintiff must serve a copy of the ADR information package on each defendant along with the complaint, and each cross complainant must serve a copy of the ADR information package on any new parties to the action along with the cross complaint.

Notices must be in writing, and the notice of a motion, other than for a new trial, must state when, and the grounds on which, it will be made,and the papers, if any, on which it is to be based. If the paper has not previously been served on the party to be notified and was not filed by that party, a copy of it must accompany the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*]. For discussion of papers that are not to be filed, see *§ 518.32*.

As used in the Cal. Rules of Ct., unless a statute or rule provides for a different method for filing or service, a

requirement to serve and file a document means a copy of the document must be served on the attorney for each party separately represented, on each self-represented party, and on any other person or entity when required by statute, rule, or court order, and that the document and a proof of service of the document must be filed with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.21(b)*].

[2] Except in Case of Default

No bill of exceptions, notice of appeal, or other notice or paper, other than amendments to the pleadings or an amended pleading, need be served on any party whose default has been duly entered or who has not appeared in the action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*].

A defendant appears in an action when he or she proceeds in the following ways [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*]:

- Answers;
- Demurs;
- Files a notice of motion to strike;
- Files a notice of motion to transfer pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*;
- Files a notice of motion for reclassification pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 403.040*;
- Gives plaintiff written notice of appearance; or
- When an attorney gives notice of appearance for the defendant.

After appearance, a defendant or defendant's attorney is entitled to notice of all subsequent proceedings of which notice is required to be given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*].

[3] Drop Box for Filing Documents

Whenever a clerk's office filing counter is closed at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on a court day, the court must provide a drop box for depositing documents to be filed with the clerk; a court may provide a drop box during other times [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.210(a)*].

Any document deposited in a court's drop box up to and including 4:00 p.m. on a court day is deemed to have been deposited for filing on that day [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.210(b)*]. A court may provide for same-day filing of a document deposited in its drop box after 4:00 p.m. on a court day. If so, the court must give notice of the deadline for same-day filing of a document deposited in its drop box [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.210(b)*].

Any document deposited in a court's drop box is deemed to have been deposited for filing on the next court day if [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.210(c)*]:

(1) It is deposited on a court day after 4:00 p.m. or after the deadline for same-day filing if a court provides for a later time, or

(2) It is deposited on a judicial holiday.

A court must have a means of determining whether a document was deposited in the drop box by 4:00 p.m., or after the

deadline for same-day filing if a court provides for a later time, on a court day [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.210(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.32

§ 518.32 Limitations on Filing of Papers

[1] Papers That Will Not Be Filed

The following papers, whether offered separately or as attachments to other documents, may not be filed unless they are offered as relevant to the determination of an issue in a law and motion proceeding or other hearing or unless they are ordered filed for good cause [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.250(a)*]:

(1) Subpoena.

(2) Subpoena duces tecum.

(3) Deposition notice, and response.

(4) Notice to consumer or employee and objection.

(5) Notice of intention to record testimony by audio tape or videotape.

(6) Agreement to set or extend time for deposition, agreement to extend time for response to discovery requests, and notice of these agreements.

(7) Declaration for additional discovery.

(8) Agreement for physical and mental examinations.

(9) Demand for delivery of medical reports, and response.

(10) Stipulation to enlarge the scope of [*sic*] number of discovery requests from that specified by statute, and notice of the stipulation.

(11) Demand for bill of particulars or an accounting, and response.

(12) Request for statement of damages, and response, unless it is accompanied by a request to enter default and is the notice of special and general damages.

(13) Demand for jury trial, unless it is submitted pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 631(4)* or *631.01(a)(4), (b)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 631(d)(4)*) or is included in the at-issue memorandum.

(14) Notice of deposit of jury fees.

(15) Notice to produce party, agent, or tangible things before a court, and response.

(16) Offer to compromise, unless accompanied by an original proof of acceptance and a written judgment for the court's signature and entry of judgment.

The word "papers" includes printed forms furnished by the clerk, but does not include notices filed and served by the clerk [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.250(c)*].

[2] Duty to Retain Originals of Unfiled Papers

Unless the paper served is a response, the party who serves a paper listed under [1], *above*, must retain the original with the original proof of service affixed. The original of a response must be served, and it must be retained by the person on whom it is served. All original papers must be retained until six months after final disposition of the case, unless the court, on motion of any party and for good cause shown, orders the original papers preserved for a longer period [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.250(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.33

§ 518.33 Time for Service and Computing "Court Days"

The time for serving copies of papers generally is same as the time for filing the originals [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc § 1005(b)* (moving papers to be served and filed at least 16 court days before hearing; extension of time for service by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery)].

The amount of time required to notice various motions or serve court documents depends on the procedure sought [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* (notice of motion for summary judgement must be served 75 days before hearing on the motion); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* (motion to quash service of summons must be served 16 days before hearing)] or the documents issued (*see e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 537(d)(2)* (temporary restraining order must be served within 5 days)]. Review the specific statutes for time requirements and exceptions peculiar to the procedure sought. For discussion of how the manner of service affects the amount of time to serve papers, see *§ 518.34*. For discussion of how to shorten or extend time for service of papers, in general, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* .

Counsel should consult local rules for additional requirements relating to service of papers [*see, e.g.,* Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 3.03(B), (C) (opposition and reply papers to be served by means to ensure receipt by opposing counsel no later than one court day of filing on penalty of sanctions or court's discretion not to consider document)].

Depending on statute or rule of court, service may be based on either calendar days or court days. Calendar days are determined using a standard calendar, and the time in which an act provided by law is to be done is computed by excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday, and then it is also excluded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12*].

A "court day" may be defined as any day in which the court is not closed due to a judicial holiday [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 133, 134*]. While courts of justice may be held and business transacted on any day, [*Code Civ. Proc. § 133*], courts must be closed for the transaction of judicial business on judicial holidays, for all but the following purposes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(a), (b)*]:

- To give, upon request, instructions to a deliberating jury.

- To receive a verdict or discharge a jury.
- For arraignments in criminal actions.
- For Saturday Small Claims court sessions.
- For injunctions and writs of prohibition, which may be issued and served on any day.

The fact that a court is open on a judicial holiday cannot make that day a nonholiday for purposes of computing the time required for the conduct of any proceeding nor for the performance of any act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(d)*].

The term "holiday" includes Saturday [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12a*] and Sunday [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12a, Gov. Code § 6700(a)*]. It also includes holidays specified in *Gov. Code § 6700*, as adjusted for weekends pursuant to *Gov. Code § 6701* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12a, Gov. Code § 6700(b), (d)-(e), (g)-(o)*]:

- January 1st.
- February 12th (Lincoln Day).
- The third Monday in February (Presidents Day).
- The last Monday in May (Memorial Day).
- July 4th.
- The first Monday in September (Labor Day).
- September 9th (Admission Day).
- The second Monday in October (Columbus Day).
- November 11th (Veterans Day).
- December 25th.
- Good Friday from 12 noon to 3:00 p.m.
- Every day appointed by the President or Governor for a public fast, thanksgiving, or holiday.

Two holidays listed in *Gov. Code § 6700* are excluded from the definition of holiday in *Code Civ. Proc. § 12a*. They are [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12a*; *Gov. Code § 6700(c), (f)*]:

- The third Monday in January (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day).
- March 31st (Cesar Chavez Day).

In addition, if any city, county, or state office, other than a branch office, is closed for the whole of a day, that day is considered a holiday as to the business of that office for computing time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 12a* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12b*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 12a, discussed under § 345.17[1]*]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 12b* does not define

"branch office," the ordinary definition would include outlying districts of a superior court. Thus, when local rule permitted the filing of a complaint in either the west district or the downtown central district, the downtown courthouse as well as the west district courthouse would have to have been closed before Section 12b could apply to give the plaintiff an additional day to file the complaint [*Bennett v. Suncloud (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 91, 98-99, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80* (factual issue sufficient to overcome demurrer was raised as to whether central district courthouse was closed due to Northridge earthquake)].

If a day appointed for the holding or sitting of a court, or to which it is adjourned, falls on a judicial holiday, it is deemed appointed for or adjourned to the next day [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(d)*].

A court may designate one or more departments to remain open on a judicial holiday or at any hours of the day or night [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(c)*], however these courts are still judicial holidays for purposes of computing the time required for the conduct of any proceeding or for the performance of any act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(d)*]; and any paper lodged with the court during that time must be filed by the court on the next non-judicial holiday if the document meets the filing criteria [*Code Civ. Proc. § 134(d)*].

Discussion of county holiday having the same effect as a judicial holiday, *see 57 Op. Atty. Gen. Cal. 641* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.34

§ 518.34 Manner of Service

[1] In General

Notices and other papers are served in the manner prescribed by Chapter 5, Part Two, Title 14 of the Code of Civil Procedure [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*] when not otherwise provided by the code [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*].

[2] Service on Party or Attorney

If a party has an attorney in the action or proceeding, the service of papers, when required, must be on the attorney instead of on the party,except for service of subpoenas, writs, and other process issued in the suit and of papers to bring the party into contempt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.21(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1016*].

If the sole attorney for a party is removed or suspended from practice, the party has no attorney within the meaning of the foregoing provision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

If the sole attorney for a party has no known office in this state, notices and papers may be served by leaving a copy of each of them with the court clerk, or with the judge if there is no clerk, unless the attorney has filed in the cause an address where notices and papers may be served on him or her, in which event they may be served at such place [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

[3] Service on Nonresident, Nonrepresented Party Who Has Appeared

When a plaintiff or a defendant who has appeared resides out of California and has no attorney in the action or proceeding, the service may be made on the clerk or on the judge if there is no clerk [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*].

[4] Personal Service

The service may be personal by hand-delivering a copy of the required notice or paper to the person to be served or to the person's attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*].

[5] Substituted Service on Absent Attorney

Service may be made at the attorney's office by leaving papers to be served in an envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or with a person having charge of the office. If there is no one in the office with whom the notice or papers may be left for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(a)* at the time service is to be effected, service may be made by leaving the papers between 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in a conspicuous place in the office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(a)*].

If the office is not open, service may be made by leaving the papers at the attorney's residence, if it is in the same county as the attorney's office, with a person who is at least 18 years old. If the attorney's residence is not known or it is not in the same county as the attorney's office, or if it is in the same county but it is not open or a person 18 years of age or older cannot be found at the attorney's residence, then, service may be made by mailing the papers to the attorney at the attorney's office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(a)*].

If neither the attorney's office nor residence is known, service may be made by delivering the notice or papers to the address of the attorney or party of record as designated on the court papers, or by delivering thenotice or papers to the court clerk, for the attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(a)*; for a similar provision governing service of summons, *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*]. For requirements of mail service, see [7][a], *below*.

[6] Substituted Service and Service by Mail on Party

If service is to be made on a party, it must be made in the manner specifically provided in particular cases, or, if there is no specific provision, service may be made by leaving the papers to be served at the party's residence between 8:00 A.M. and 6:00 P.M. with some person at least 18 years of age. If no such person can be found at the residence between those hours, the papers may be served by mail, and, if the party's residence is not known, the papers may be served by delivering them to the court clerk, for the party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(b)*; for a similar provision governing service of summons, *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*].

When service is made on the clerk or judge because a party's address is unknown, the papers must be enclosed in an envelope addressed to the party in care of the clerk or the judge. The back of the envelope must state the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.252*]:

- Service is being made under *Code of Civil Procedure section 1011(b)* on a party whose residence address is unknown.
- Name of the party whose address is unknown.
- Case name and number.

[7] Service by Other Methods

[a] By Mail

In addition to the service by mail provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*, service may be made by mail when the person to be served resides or has his or her office at a place where mail is delivered or where the person making the service and the person on whom it is to be made reside or have their offices in different places between which there is a regular communication by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1012*].

Successful service by mail requires strict compliance with all statutory requirements; failure to comply deprives a court of jurisdiction to act [*see Lee v. Placer Title Co. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 503, 511, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 572]* . This

requirement applies to mailings by the court clerk as well as to mailings by parties [*see Lee v. Placer Title Co. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 503, 508, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 572]* . For example, dismissal of an action was void when the court clerk did not mail notice of dismissal to plaintiffs' counsel's current address on file in the cause, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*, but to an old address [*see Lee v. Placer Title Co. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 503, 509-511, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 572]* .

In case of service by mail, the notice or other paper must be deposited in the United States Post Office, a mail box, subpost office, substation, mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage paid. The envelope must be addressed to the person to be served at his or her office address as last given on any document that he or she has filed in the cause and served on the party making service or otherwise at his or her place of residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1011(a)*].

Any notice required by law, other than a notice required to be given to a party to an action or to the party's attorney, the service of which is not governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1019* and which is not otherwise specifically provided for by law, may be given by sending it by registered (or certified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 11*]) return-receipt mail, with proper postage prepaid, addressed to the addressee's last known address. The production of a returned receipt purporting to be signed by the addressee creates a disputable presumption that the notice was received by the person to whom it was required to be sent [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1020*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1020* is *permissive*; where a notice is required to be sent by mail, compliance with the mailing requirement *may* be satisfied by sending the notice by registered mail with a return receipt requested [*Bear Creek Master Assn. v. Edwards (2005) 130 Cal App. 4th 1470, 1486, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 337]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 1020* does not *require* mailed notices to be sent by registered mail. Likewise, while a signed return receipt *may* create a rebuttable presumption that the notice was received, the absence of such a signed return receipt does not negate any other presumptions concerning mailed items, and a party cannot defeat notice by a willful failure to accept certified mail [*Bear Creek Master Assn. v. Edwards (2005) 130 Cal App. 4th 1470, 1486, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 337]* .

[b] By Express Mail or Overnight Delivery

In case of service by express mail, the notice or other paper must be deposited in a post office, mailbox, subpost office, substation, mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service for receipt of express mail, in a sealed envelope, with express mail postage paid, addressed to the person on whom it is to be served at the office address as last given by that person on any document filed in the cause and served on the party making service by express mail; otherwise, it should be addressed to the party's place of residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*].

In case of service by another method providing for overnight delivery, the notice or other paper must be deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier or delivered to an authorized courier or driver authorized by the express service carrier to receive documents, in an envelope or package designated by the express service carrier with delivery fees paid or provided for, addressed to the person onwhom it is to be served at the office address as last given by that person on any document filed in the cause and served on the party making service; otherwise, it should be addressed to the party's place of residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*].

[c] By Facsimile Transmission

Service by facsimile transmission is permitted only if the parties agree and a written confirmation of that agreement is made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.306(c)*]. The Judicial Council has adopted rules implementing the service of documents by facsimile transmission [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.300 et seq.*].

In case of service by facsimile transmission, the notice or other paper must be transmitted to a facsimile machine maintained by the person on whom it is served at the facsimile machine telephone number as last given by that person

on any document that he or she has filed in the cause and served on the party making the service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.306(d)*].

For further discussion of and forms relating to service by facsimile transmission, see Ch. 264, *Fax Filing and Service of Papers* .

[c.1] By Electronic Service

In actions in courts in which electronic service is authorized, when notice may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission, electronic service of the notice and any accompanying documents may be authorized when a party has agreed to accept service electronically in that action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260*; *but see Insyst v. Applied Materials, Inc. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1129, 1140, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808* (attorneys were notified by an electronic service provider that a judgment had been electronically filed, and they were given instructions for accessing the document on the Internet, including a hyperlink that led to a document description that included another hyperlink that opened a file-stamped copy of the judgment; in finding that this electronic notification did not trigger the 60-day time period for filing a notice of appeal, the Sixth District Court of Appeal found that neither *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* nor its implementing rules "authorize[] serving a document by giving a party notice of where he or she may find it. ... We do not regard an e-mail explanation of where to electronically locate a judgment as the equivalent of the electronic transmission of the document.")].

For discussion of the requirements and obligations of electronic service, see *§ 518.48*.

[d] When Service Is Complete and Extension of Time

[i] Service by Mail

Service by mail is complete at the time the paper to be served is deposited in the mail as described at [a], *above*. However, any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, is extended by the following periods when service is by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*]:

- Five calendar days, if the place of address and of mailing are both within California.

- Ten calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside California but within the United States.

- Twenty calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside the United States.

Exceptions to these extensions of time are discussed at [e], *below*.

[ii] Service by Express Mail or Overnight Delivery

Service by express mail or another form of overnight delivery is complete at the time of the deposit, but any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or to make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document served by express mail or other method of overnight delivery is be extended by two court days [*Code Civ Proc. § 1013(c)*].

Exceptions to this extension of time are discussed at [e], *below*.

[iii] Service by Facsimile Transmission

Service by facsimile transmission is complete at the time of transmission [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*; *but see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.306(e)* (service complete on receipt of entire document by the receiving party's fax machine)]. Nevertheless, any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, is extended by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*].

Exceptions to this extension of time are discussed at [e], *below*.

[iv] Electronic Service

Electronic service is complete at the time of transmission, but any period of notice or any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended after service by electronic transmission by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(1)*, (2)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* provides for some exceptions to this extension and also states that the extension applies in the absence of a specific exception provided for by any other statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(3)*, (4)].

For discussion of the exceptions and the relationship of section 1010.6 with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*, see *§ 518.48[3]*.

[e] When Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 Extension of Time Inapplicable

The extensions provided when service is by mail, express mail or other overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission apply unless a specific exception is provided by statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a), (c)*,(e)]. By the terms of Section 1013, the extensions do not apply to the time for taking the following actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a), (c), (e)*]:

- Filing notice of intention to move for new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 659*].
- Filing notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.
- Filing notice of appeal.

The Section 1013 extensions do not apply to a notice of motion, papers opposing a notice of motion, or reply papers governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*, which has its own extension provision that parallels the extensions provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* [*compare Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b) with Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a), (c), (e)*]. The motions to which Section 1005 applies are listed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)*. Section 1005 specifically provides that the Section 1013 time extensions do not apply to a notice of motion, papers opposing a notice of motion, or reply papers governed by Section 1005 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*].

For discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* and the proceedings to which it applies, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Since Section 1013 only applies when the relevant time limit begins to run from the service of a document to which a response is directed [*Citicorp N. Am., Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 563, 567, 261 Cal. Rptr. 668]* , where the time period is commenced by an act other than service, it does not operate to extend the filing deadline [*Camper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 679, 684, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101, 836 P.2d 888* ; *Dep't of Indus. Relations v. Atl. Baking Co., Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 891, 895, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* ; *San Mateo Fed'n of Teachers v. Pub. Employment Relations Bd. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 150, 152, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 387* ; *Citicorp N. Am., Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 563, 567, 261 Cal. Rptr. 668* ; *Cole v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1, 4, 222 Cal. Rptr. 426]* .

Section 1013 also does not apply to jurisdictional deadlines [*Dep't of Indus. Relations v. Atl. Baking Co., Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 891, 895, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44* (Section 1013 does not apply to petition for writ of mandate from order issued by Labor Commissioner)].

[f] Notation on Papers Served by Other Methods

Papers served by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery should either bear a notation of the date and place of deposit or transmission, or be accompanied by an unsigned copy of the affidavit or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] or certificate of mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(b), (d), (f)*]. This requirement is directory, not mandatory [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(g)*].

[8] Service by Telegraph

Any writ or order in any civil suit or proceeding and all other papers requiring service may be transmitted by telegraph for service in any place. The telegraphic copy of the writ, order, or paper so transmitted may be served or executed by the officer or person to whom it is sent for that purpose, and returned by him or her, if any return is required, in the same manner, and with the same force and effect in all respects, as the original document might be if delivered to him or her. The officer or person serving or executing the same has the same authority, and is subject to the same liabilities, as if the copy were the original. The original, if a writ or order, must also be filed in the court from which it was issued, and a certified copy must be preserved in the telegraph office from which it was sent. In sending it, the operator may use either the original or the certified copy for that purpose. Whenever any document to be sent by telegraph bears a seal, either private or official, it is not necessary for the operator in sending it to telegraph a description of the seal or any words or device on it, but the seal may be expressed in the telegraphic copy by the letters "L.S." (locus sigilli, that is, place of the seal) or by the word "seal" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1017*].

[9] Service in Foreign Country

A paper may be served on a person in a foreign country in the manner a summons is served pursuant to the "Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters" [20 U.S.T. 361]. For further discussion, see *§ 518.16[9]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.35

§ 518.35 When Service by Mail by Court Clerk Is Complete

When the clerk makes service of process by mail, the clerk's certificate of mailing will state, among other things, the date and place of deposit in the mail and that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage fully prepaid [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*]. This form of proof of service is sufficient for service of process in which the clerk or deputy clerk signing the certificate places the document for collection and mailing on the date shown on the proof of service, so as to cause it to be mailed in an envelope so sealed and addressed on that date following standard court practices [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*].

When service has been made by the clerk pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*, a party served may move the court to deem that the service was complete on the date of the postage cancellation or postage meter imprint as shown on the envelope if that date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in the certificate. The court is to grant the motion if it finds good cause [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.36

§ 518.36 Proof of Service

As used in the Cal. Rules of Ct., proof of service means a declaration stating that service has been made as provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.21(a)* and *(b)*. If the proof of service names attorneys for separately represented parties, it must also state which party or parties each of the attorneys served is representing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.21(c)*].

Proof of service by mail may be made in the following ways:

- By a nonattorney as described under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(1)* or *(3)* [for forms, *see § 518.91*].
- By an attorney as prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)* [for a form, *see § 518.93*].
- By a clerk of a court of record as prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*.

Although not specifically authorized by state, proof of service by messenger, express mail or other form of overnight delivery [*see § 518.34[7][b]*], facsimile transmission [*see § 518.34[7][c]*], or electronic service [*see § 518.34[7][d]*], may be made by declaration by an attorney or nonattorney. For an optional Judicial Council form containing the elements for proof of service using one of these methods, see *§ 518.92*.

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020 do not provide for proof of service by personal, that is, hand delivery or by substituted service, although such service is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*. The practice, however, has been to prove such service by affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*] or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] of the person making the service or by the written acknowledgment of the person served [*cf. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10(d), 417.20(d)* (service of summons)]. For an optional Judicial Council form containing the elements for proof of personal service, see *§ 518.90*. When service is personally made by an attorney of record, proof of service is usually made by the certificate of the attorney [*cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)* (proof of service by mail)].

Courts have consistently concluded that listing the city and state where the documents were placed in the United States mail is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a* regarding the place of deposit in the mail [

Him v. City and County of San Francisco (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 437, 443-444, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 838] .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.37

§ 518.37 Defects in Service or Notice

Any objection to defects in the manner or proof of service or in a notice of motion must be made in the trial court and cannot normally be raised for the first time on appeal [*see Peers v. Stoll (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 511, 512, 90 P.2d 119* (notice of motion), disapproved on other grounds, *Butcher v. Brouwer (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 354, 358, 132 P.2d 205]* . Moreover, these defects are waived by contesting a motion on the merits without objection [*see Thieme v. Commercial Lighting & Maintenance Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 575, 576, 2 Cal. Rptr. 382* ; *Otsuka v. Balangue (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 208 P.2d 65* ; *see also Andre v. General Dynamics, Inc. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 839, 842, 118 Cal. Rptr. 95* ; *Farrar v. McCormick (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 701, 705, 102 Cal. Rptr. 190]* , although an appearance in oppositionto a motion for the limited purpose of objecting to the sufficiency of the notice does not constitute a waiver of the defect [*Bohn v. Bohn (1913) 164 Cal. 532, 539, 129 P. 981]* . In addition, the granting of a motion required to be made on notice that was not noticed at all is a ground, on motion, for vacating the resultant order [*Harris v. Board of Education (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 677, 680, 313 P.2d 212* ; *see also Maguire v. Collier (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 309, 314, 122 Cal. Rptr. 510* ; *Farrar v. McCormick (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 701, 705, 102 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *Armstead v. Jackson (1929) 100 Cal. App. 725, 729, 280 P. 1028]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Service of Papers

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.38-518.39

[Reserved]

§§ 518.38[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.40

§ 518.40 Adoption of Local Rules Under Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6 and Statewide Uniform Rules of Court for Electronic Filing and Service

Effective January 1, 2000, a trial court may adopt local rules permitting electronic filing and service of documents, subject to rules the Judicial Council has adopted pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.*], and the conditions specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)* [*Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)*]. The rules set forth in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.* must be construed to authorize and permit filing and service by electronic means to the extent feasible [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.251*].

The Legislature's intent in enacting the act is to [Stats. 1999, Ch. 514, § 3]:

- Provide for the eventual standardization of electronic filing and service procedures on a statewide level, and

- Provide that a court shall not adopt an electronic filing procedure that requires a litigant or attorney to possess specialized, cumbersome or expensive equipment or software to utilize the electronic filing system.

Effective January 1, 2003, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b), Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.* to govern electronic filing and service of documents in the superior court. Additionally, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)*, the statewide uniform rules of court provide policies on vendor contracts, privacy, and access to public records [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.254-2.256*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.41

§ 518.41 Legal Effect of Electronically Filed Document

[1] Same as Original Paper Document

A document that is filed electronically in accordance with the Judicial Council rules has the same legal effect as an original paper document [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(1)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(e)(1)*].

[2] No Effect on Filing Deadline

Filing a document electronically does not alter any filing deadline [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(e)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.42

§ 518.42 Documents That May Be Filed Electronically

[1] General Rule

A court may permit electronic filing of a document in any action or proceeding unless the Judicial Council rules for electronic filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.*] or other legal authority expressly prohibit electronic filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(a)*].

A document is a pleading, a paper, a declaration, an exhibit, or another filing submitted by a party or by an agent of a party on the party's behalf. A document may be in paper or electronic form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(2)*]. Electronic filing is the electronic transmission to a court of a document in electronic form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(4)*].

[2] Original Documents

In a proceeding that requires the filing of an original document, an electronic filer may file a scanned copy of a document if the original document is then filed with the court within 10 calendar days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(b)*]. Electronic filer is defined as a party filing a document in electronic form with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(3)*].

[3] Orders and Judgments

The court may electronically file any notice, order, minute order, judgment, or other document prepared by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.43

§ 518.43 Court Order Requiring Electronic Filing and Service in Special Cases

The court may, on the motion of any party or on its own motion, after finding that such an order would not cause undue hardship or significant prejudice to any party, order all parties in any class action, a consolidated action, a group of actions, a coordinated action, or an action that is complex under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.403* to:

- Serve all documents electronically, except when personal service is required by statute or rule [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(a)(1)*];
- File all documents electronically [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(a)(2)*]; or
- Serve and file all documents electronically, except when personal service is required by statute or rule [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(a)(3)*].

The court's order may also provide that:

- Documents previously filed in paper form may be resubmitted in electronic form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(b)(1)*]; and
- When the court sends confirmation of filing to all parties, receipt of the confirmation constitutes service of the filing if the filed document is available electronically [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(b)(2)*].

When it is not feasible for a party to convert a document to electronic form by scanning, imaging, or another means, a court may allow that party to serve, file, or serve and file the document in paper form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.253(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.44

§ 518.44 Requirements and Options for Courts Accepting Electronically Filed Documents

[1] Internet-Accessible System

A court that orders electronic filing must allow for filing over the Internet by means designed to ensure the security and integrity of a transmission [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.254(a)(1)*]. The court may make an exception to Internet transmission if doing so facilitates the management of a particular action or proceeding and does not cause undue prejudice to a party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.254(a)(2)*].

[2] Publication of Electronic Filing Requirements

A court that permits electronic filing must publish, in both electronic and print formats, the court's electronic filing requirements [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.254(b)*].

[3] Problems With System

If a court is aware of a problem that impedes or precludes electronic filing during the court's regular filing hours, it must promptly take reasonable steps to provide notice of the problem [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.254(c)*].

[4] Public Access to Electronically Filed Documents

Except as provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.500-2.506* (Public Access to Electronic Trial Court Records), and electronically filed document is a public document at the time it is filed unless it is sealed under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)* or made confidential by law [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.254(d)*].

[5] Option of Contracting with Electronic Filing Service Providers

[a] Right to Contract and Provisions

A court may contract with one or more electronic filing service providers to furnish and maintain an electronic filing

system for the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(a)(1)*]. If the court contracts with an electronic filing service provider, it may require electronic filters to transmit the documents to the provider [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(a)(2)*]. If there is a single provider or in-house system, it must accept filing from other electronicfiling service providers to the extent it is compatible with them [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(a)(3)*].

The court's contract with an electronic filing service provider may allow the provider to charge electronic filers a reasonable fee in addition to the court's filing fee; and the contract may also allow the electronic filing service provider to make other reasonable requirements for the use of the electronic filing system [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(b)*].

[b] Transmission of Filing to Court

An electronic filing service provider must promptly transmit any electronic filing, with the applicable filing fee, to the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(c)*].

[c] Confirmation of Receipt and Filing of Document

An electronic filing service provider must [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(d)(1)*, (2)]:

- Promptly send to an electronic filer confirmation of the receipt of any document that the filer has transmitted to the provider for filing with the court.

- Send its confirmation to the filer's electronic notification address and indicate the date and time of the receipt in accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)*.

After reviewing the documents, the court must [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(d)(3)*]:

- Promptly transmit to the provider and the electronic filer the court's confirmation of filing or notice of rejection of filing in accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259*.

For discussion of the court's confirmation requirements when no electronic service provider is involved, see *§ 518.46*.

[d] Ownership of Information

Any contract between a court and an electronic filing service provider must acknowledge that the court is the owner of the contents of the filing system and has the exclusive right to control its use [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255(e)*].

[e] Technical Standards

The Advisory Committee Comment issued with the adoption of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.255* states: "The Court Technology Advisory Committee recommends that electronic filing service providers comply with the technical standards specified on the California Courts Web site at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/efiling. The committee anticipates thatthese rules may be amended to require compliance with the California Electronic Filing Technical Standards once the standards are sufficiently developed."

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.45

§ 518.45 Responsibilities of Persons Filing Electronic Documents

[1] Definitions

An electronic filer is a party filing a document in electronic form with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(3)*], by an agent, or through an electronic filing service provider. A document is a pleading, a paper, a declaration, an exhibit, or another filing submitted by a party or by an agent of a party on the party's behalf. A document may be in paper or electronic form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(2)*]. Electronic filing is the electronic transmission to a court of a document in electronic form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(4)*]. Regular filing hours are the hours during which a court accepts documents for filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(7)*].

An electronic filing service provider is a person or entity that receives an electronic filing from a party for retransmission to the court. In submission of filings the electronic filing service provider does so on behalf of the electronic filer and not as an agent of the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(5)*].

Electronic notification address of a party means the electronic address at or through which the party has authorized electronic service [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(8)*].

Practice Tip:
The electronic filing of any document with the court indicates that a party accepts electronic service from other parties and the court, with service to any electronic notification address furnished to the court. [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)(2)(B)*]. Be sure to consider the consequences of this election and to assure proper monitoring of all electronic notification address furnished to the court. For discussion of electronic service, see *§ 518.48*.

[2] Conditions of Filing

An electronic filer agrees to, and must [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.256(a)(1)-(5)*]:

- Comply with any court requirements designed to ensure the integrity of electronic filing and to

protect sensitive personal information;

- Furnish information the court requires for case processing;

- Take all reasonable steps to ensure that the filing does not contain computer code, including viruses, that might be harmful to the court's electronic filing system and to other users of that system;

- Furnish one or more electronic notification addresses, in the manner specified by the court, at which the electronic agrees to accept service; and

- Immediately provide the court and parties with any change to his or her electronic notification addresses.

[3] Format of Electronically Filed Documents

A document that is filed electronically with the court must be in a format specified by the court unless it cannot be created in that format [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.256(b)*]. The format adopted by a court must meet the following requirements [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.256(b)*]:

- The software for creating and reading documents must be in the public domain or generally available at a reasonable cost.

- The printing of documents must not result in the loss of document content, format, or appearance.

[4] Signature Requirements

[a] Documents Under Penalty of Perjury

When a document to be filed requires the signature under penalty of perjury of any person, the document is deemed signed by that person if filed electronically and if a printed form of the document has been signed by that person prior to, or on the same day as, the date of filing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(2)(B)*]. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(1)* provides that the document is deemed signed if the signature on the printed form of the document is signed *before* filing. By electronically filing the document, the electronic filer indicates that he or she has complied with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(1)* and that the original, signed document is available for review and copying at the request of the court or any party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(2)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(2)(B)* (act of filing represents compliance with that section)].

Practice Tip:
While *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(2)(B)* specifically provides that the signing of the original document may occur prior to, or on the same day as, the date of filing, the prudent practice is to assure the signature on the printed form before electronically filing the document to comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)*, and to avoid the situation where the signatory is unable or unwilling to sign the printed form, that day, after the electronic document is filed.

The attorney or person filing the document must maintain the printed form of the document bearing the original signature and make it available for review and copying on the request of the court or any party to the action or proceeding in which it is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(2)(B)*]. At any time after the document is filed, any other party may serve a demand for production of the original signed document; and the demand must be served on all other parties but need not be filed with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(3)*]. Within five days of service of the demand, the party on whom the demand is made must make the original signed document available for review and copying by all other parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(4)*].

[b] Document Not Under Penalty of Perjury

If a document does not require a signature under penalty of perjury, the document is deemed signed by the party if the document is filed electronically [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(b)*].

[c] Documents Requiring Signatures of Opposing Parties

When a document to be filed electronically, such as a stipulation, requires the signatures of opposing parties, the following procedures apply [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(c)(1)-(3)*]:

- The party filing the document must obtain the signatures of all parties on a printed form of the document.

- The party filing the document must maintain the original, signed document and must make it available for review and copying as provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)(2)*.

- By electronically filing the document, the electronic filer indicates that all parties have signed the document and that the filer has the signed original in his or her possession.

[d] Digital Signatures

A party is not required to use a digital signature on an electronically filed document [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(d)*].

[e] Electronic Judicial Signatures

If a document requires a signature by a court or a judicial officer, the document may be electronically signed in any manner permitted by law [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(e)*].

[5] Filing Fees

[a] Payment of Fees

A court may permit the use of credit card, debit cards, electronic funds transfers, or debit accounts for the payment of filing fees associated with electronic filing, as provided in *Gov. Code § 6159* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.820* or otherwise applicable law; and a court may authorize other methods of payment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.258(a)*].

[b] Waiver of Fees

Eligible persons may seek a waiver of court fees and costs, as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 68630-68641*, *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(c)*, and Title 3, Division *2 of the Rules of Court* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.258(b)*]. A court must permit electronic filing of an application for waiver of court fees and costs in any proceeding in which the court accepts electronic filing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(7)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.252(c)*]. The court is not required to waive a filing fee that is not otherwise waivable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(7)*].

For discussion of waiving court fees because of a person's financial condition, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.110* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.46

§ 518.46 Actions by Court on Receipt of Electronic Filing

[1] Confirmation of Receipt and Filing of Document

A court receiving a document submitted electronically must promptly send the electronic filer a confirmation of receipt of the document, indicating the date and time of the receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(4)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(1)*]. If the document complies with filing requirements and all required filing fees have been paid, the court must promptly send the electronic filer confirmation that the document has been filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(4)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(1)*]. A document is considered received at the date and time the confirmation of receipt is created [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)*].

The filing confirmation must indicate the date and time of the filing and is proof that the document was filed on the date and time specified [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(2)*]. The confirmation must also specify [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(2)*]:

- Any transaction number associated with the filing;
- The titles of the documents as filed by the court; and
- The fee assessed for the filing.

The court is also required to [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(3)*]:

- Send its confirmation to the electronic filer at the electronic notification address the filer furnished to the court in accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.256(a)(4)*.
- Maintain a record of its confirmation of receipt and filing.

In the absence of confirmation of receipt and filing, there is no presumption that the court received and filed the

document [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(3)*]. Verification of the receipt and filing of any document by the court is the responsibility of the electronic filer [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(a)(3)*].

[2] Notice of Rejection of Document for Filing

If a document is not filed by the clerk because it does not comply with applicable filing requirements or because the required filing fee has not been paid, the court must promptly send notice to the electronic filer, andthe notice must set forth the reasons the document was rejected for filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(b)*].

[3] Court Business Hours and Delayed Delivery

A document that is filed electronically with the court after the close of business is considered to been filed on the next court day; and "close of business" means 5 p.m. or any other time on a court day, as defined by *Code Civ. Proc. § 133,* at which the court stops accepting documents for filing at its filing counter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(3)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.250(1), 2.259(c)*]. A court must provide notice of its close-of-business time electronically and may give this notice in any manner it deems appropriate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(3)*].

If a technical problem with respect to a court's electronic filing system precludes the court from accepting an electronic filing during its regular filing hours on a particular day, and the electronic filer demonstrates the he or she attempted to file on that day, the court must deem the filing received on that day; however this provision does not apply to the complaint or any other initial pleading in an action or proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(d)*]. "Regular filing hours" means the hours during which a court accepts documents for filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250(7)*].

[4] Endorsement

The court's endorsement of a document electronically filed must contain the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(e)(1)*]:

> "Electronically filed by Superior Court of California, County of _____, on _____, [date], _____ [name of the court clerk]"

The endorsement has the same force and effect as a manually affixed endorsement stamp with the signature and initials of the court clerk [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(e)(2)*].

A complaint or initial pleading in an action or proceeding that is filed and endorsed electronically may be printed and served on the defendant or respondent in the same manner as if it had been filed in paper form [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(e)(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.47

§ 518.47 Issuance of Electronic Summons

On the electronic filing of a complaint, a petition, or another document that must be served with a summons, the court may transmit a summons to the electronic filer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)(1)*]. The summons must contain an image of the court's seal and the assigned case number [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)(2)*]. Personal service of the printed form of an electronic summons has the same legal effect as personal service of an original summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.259(f)(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.48

§ 518.48 Electronic Service

[1] Applicability and Election

When a notice may be served by mail, express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission, electronic service of the notice and any accompanying documents is permitted when authorized by the California Rules of Court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)(1)*].

A party indicates that the party agrees to accept electronic service by either [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)(2)*]:

- Filing and serving a notice that the party accepts electronic service; and the notice must include the electronic notification addresses at which the party agrees to accept service; or

- Electronically filing any document with the court; and by the act of electronically filing, the party agrees to accept service at any electronic notification address the party has furnished to the court in accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.256(a)(4)*.

Effective January 1, 2010, the Judicial Council approved five optional forms to assist persons filing documents electronically with the courts and providing proof of electronic service:

- The Consent to Electronic Service and Notice of Electronic Notification Address form (form EFS-005) provides a means for a party to state its consent to electronic service and provide its electronic notification address to the court and other parties under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)* [see *§ 518.94*].

- The Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address form (form EFS-010) provides a means for parties to give notice of a change in electronic notification address under Rule 2.260(d) [see *§ 518.95*].

- The Proof of Electronic Service (form POS-050/EFS-050) is designed to be used by persons serving documents electronically to show proof of service. The one-page form contains all the information and

statements required on proofs of electronic service under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)* [see *§ 518.96*].

- The Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Documents Served) (form POS-050(D)/EFS-050(D)) provides a means for persons using the Proof of Electronic Service form to list additional documents served [see *§ 518.96*].

- The Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Persons Served) (form POS-050(P)/EFS-050(P)) provides a means for persons using the Proof of Electronic Service form to identify additional parties served and indicate the dates and times of service [see *§ 518.96*].

Additionally, the Judicial Council revised POS-040, the current multipurpose proof of service form, to reflect an amendment to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)(1)(D)* [see *§ 518.92*].

[2] When Service is Complete

Electronic service is complete at the time of transmission [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(1)*].

Although electronic service is complete at the time of transmission, any period of notice or any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which time period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, shall be extended after service by electronic transmission by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(2)*]. This extension does not apply to extend the time for filing the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(3)*]:

- Notice of intention to move for new trial.

- Notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.

- Notice of appeal.

This extension applies in the absence of a specific exception provided for by any other statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*].

Service that occurs after the close of business is considered to have occurred on the next court day [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(4)*]. "Close of business" means 5 p.m. or any other time on a court day, as defined by *Code Civ. Proc. § 133*, at which the court stops accepting documents for filing at its filing counter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(3)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.250(1), 2.254(c)*].

[3] Extension of Time for Motion Papers Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 1005

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*, all moving and supporting papers must be filed and served at least 16 court days before the hearing. The 16-day period is extended by varying amounts if service is by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*]. Section 1005(b) additionally requires opposing papers to be filed at least 9 court days, and reply papers at least five court days before the hearing. Section 1005(b) does not provide for any extension of the time periods it establishes for opposition and reply papers.

Section 1005(b) does provides that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*, which extends the time within which a right may be exercised or an act may be done when papers are served by mail, fax, or overnight delivery does not apply to a notice of motion, opposition papers, or reply papers governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* is silent as to extensions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6*. Particularly given the language of section 1010.6(a)(6) that the

extension under section 1010.6(a)(6) applies in the absence of a specific exception provided for by another statute or rule of court, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* may be construed to extend the times provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*.

[4] Proof of Service

Proof of electronic service may be any of the methods provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*, except that proof of service must state all of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)(1)(A)-(D)*]:

- The electronic notification address of the person making the service, in addition to that person's residence or business address.

- The date and time of the electronic service, in place of the date and place of deposit in the mail.

- The name and electronic notification address of the person served, in place of that person's name and address as shown on the envelope.

- That the document was served electronically, in place of the statement that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with postage fully prepaid.

Proof of service may be in electronic form and may be filed electronically with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)(2)*]. In accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(c)*, proof of service of the moving papers must be filed at least five calendar days before the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)(3)*].

The party filing the proof of service must maintain the printed form of the document bearing the declarant's original signature and must make the document available for review and copying on the request of the courtor any party to the action or proceeding in which it is filed, in accordance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.257(a)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(c)(4)*].

For the Judicial Council's optional Proof of Electronic Service (form POS-050/EFS-050), Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Documents Served) (form POS-050 (D)/EFS-050(D)), and Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Persons Served) (form POS-050 (P)/EFS-050(P)), see *§ 518.96*.

[5] Change of Electronic Notification Address

A party whose electronic notification address changes while the action or proceeding is pending must promptly file a notice of change of address with the court electronically and must serve this notice on all parties or their attorneys of record [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(d)(1)*].

An electronic notification address is presumed valid for a party if the party files electronic documents with the court from that address and has not filed and served notice that the address is no longer valid [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(d)(2)*].

For the Judicial Council's optional Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address form (form EFS-010), see *§ 518.95*.

[6] Electronic Service by Court

A court may electronically serve any notice, order, judgment, or other document prepared by the court in the same manner that parties may serve documents by electronic service [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)*].

In *Insyst v. Applied Materials, Inc. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1129, 1140, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808* , attorneys were notified by an electronic service provider that a judgment had been electronically filed, and they were given instructions for accessing the document on the Internet, including a hyperlink that led to a document description that included another hyperlink that opened a file-stamped copy of the judgment. In finding that this electronic notification did not trigger the 60-day time period for filing a notice of appeal, the Sixth District Court of Appeal found that neither *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* nor its implementing rules "authorize[] serving a document by giving a party notice of where he or she may find it. ... We do not regard an e-mail explanation of where to electronically locate a judgment as the equivalent of the electronic transmission of the document."

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Electronic Filing and Service

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.49

[Reserved]

§ 518.49[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.50

§ 518.50 Federal Treaties

Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters. 20 U.S.T. 361

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.51

§ 518.51 State Statutes

[1] Appearance

General appearance as equivalent to service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.50(a)*

[2] Civil Action

Commenced by filing of complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 350, 411.10*

[3] Manner in Which Summons May Be Served

Service pursuant to laws of sister state or foreign country where defendant is served. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(b), (c)*

Service may be specified in court order if no statute provides manner. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30*

By hand. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10*

By combination of substituted service and service by mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*

By mail and acknowledgment of service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30*

By return receipt first-class prepaid mail outside *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*

By posting on premises in unlawful detainer proceeding and mailing process to defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.45*

By mail in unlawful detainer proceeding after notice of nonabandonment of leased real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.47*

By publication of summons (constructive service) and mailing process. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*

[4] Proof of Service of Summons

Pursuant to court order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30*

Proof of publication and filing. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10(b), 2010, 2011*

In *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10*

Outside *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20*

Of registered process server. *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.40*

Affidavit to prove service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*

Certificate of sheriff or marshal as having same force and effect as his or her affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.3*

Declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[5] Return of Service of Summons

Requirement that summons be returned to court with proof of service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30(a)*

Procedure if summons is lost after service, but before return. *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30(b)*

[6] Sanctions

Sanctions for bad faith frivolous or delaying tactics in actions filed before January 1, 1995. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*

Sanctions for filing frivolous or unsupported paper or filing paper for delay or to harass party in actions commenced on or after January 1, 1995. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*

[7] Service of Papers Other Than Summons and Complaint

Service of papers other than summons and complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465, 1010, 1016*

Extensions of time when service is by mail, fax, overnight delivery, or electronic. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010.6(b), 1013*

Electronic filing and service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(b)*

Manner of service. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010.6, 1011-1013, 1020*

Proof of service by mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*

Proof of service of papers by affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1013a(1), (3), 2009*

"Appearance" defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*

Person to be served. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1015*

Transmittal of papers by telegraph. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1017*

Declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

Presumption that letter correctly addressed and properly mailed has been received in ordinary course of mail. *Evid. Code § 641*

[8] Service of Summons Generally

Inapplicability of time extensions specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* to service of summons by mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.20*

Validity of service by nonregistered process server. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.40*

Who may serve. *Code Civ. Proc. § 414.10*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 262.6-262.8*; *Gov. Code §§ 26608, 26665*

Mandatory and discretionary dismissal of action for three-year or two-year delay, respectively, in service and return of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.210, 583.420*

Service of electronically issued summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(5)*

Transmission of summons by telegraph for service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1017*

Recovery in action of costs for service of process. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(4)*

[9] Service on Particular Defendants

Nonresident contact lens seller. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2546.4*

Nonresident real estate licensee or subdivider. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10151.5, 11007*

Telephonic sellers. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17511.6*

Manner of service inside and outside *California. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10, 415.10-415.50*

Manner of service if not provided by law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30*

Active corporation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10*; *Corp. Code §§ 1702, 2011, 2204* (domestic corporation), 2110, 2111, 2114 (foreign corporation)

Defunct corporation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20*; *Corp. Code §§ 2011, 2114(c)*

Joint stock company. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.30*

Unincorporated association or partnership. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*; *Corp. Code § 15627* (foreign and domestic limited partnerships governed by California Revised Limited Partnership Act); *Corp. Code § 15800* (foreign partnerships, with specified exceptions), *Corp. Code § 15901.16* (foreign and domestic limited partnerships governed by Uniform Limited Partnership Act of 2008); *Corp. Code §§ 24003-24007* (unincorporated association or partnership)

Public entity. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*; *Gov. Code §§ 955.4, 960.2-960.4, 53051*

Minor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.60*

Person other than minor for whom guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary has been appointed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.70*

Candidate for political office. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.80*; *Elec. Code § 12*

Person not otherwise specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10-416.80*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90*

Defendant in defamation action. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 460.5, 460.7*

Fictitiously named defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 474*

"Shall" as mandatory and "may" as permissive in Corporations Code. *Corp. Code § 15*

Under Corporate Securities Law. *Corp. Code §§ 25165, 25240, 25550*

Under Franchise Investment Law. *Corp. Code §§ 31155, 31420*

California State Lottery. *Gov. Code § 8880.72*

Licensed farm labor contractor unavailable for service. *Lab. Code § 1684(a)(1)(C)*

Nonresident watercraft operator. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 600-609*

Nonresident insurer. *Ins. Code §§ 1452, 1605, 1612, 11105, 12931*

Nonresident executor, administrator, or administrator with will annexed. *Prob. Code §§ 8572-8577*

Public entity in action by contractor for relief from bid. *Pub. Contract Code § 5102*

Director and Department of Motor Vehicles. *Veh. Code § 24.5*

Owner of closed driving school or traffic violator school; operators and instructors who no longer reside at address filed with DMV. *Veh. Code §§ 11111.2, 11217.5*

Vehicle verifier who no longer resides at address filed with DMV. *Veh. Code § 11302.2*

Owner of closed automobile dismantling business who has failed to notify DMV of another address where service of process may be made. *Veh. Code § 11513(b)*

Lessor-retailer of automobiles who has closed business without informing DMV of another address where service of

process may be made. *Veh. Code § 11610(c)*

Dealer, manufacturer, remanufacturer, distributor, or transporter who has closed business without informing DMV of another address where service of process may be made. *Veh. Code § 11712(c)*

Currently or previously licensed automobile salesperson who has not informed DMV of current address. *Veh. Code § 11812(d)*

Nonresident motorist. *Veh. Code §§ 17451-17456*

Resident motorist served outside state. *Veh. Code §§ 17459-17461*

[10] Summons

Defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 17(b)(6)*; *Gov. Code §§ 22, 26660*

Format and content. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 153(b), 412.20, 412.30, 474*

Issuance of summons on payment of fees. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*

Restraining orders in summons in actions for marital dissolution, legal separation, annulment, and to restrain domestic violence. *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.21(a), (c)*

Restraining orders in summons in actions under Uniform Parentage Act (*Civ. Code §§ 7000-7021*). *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.21(b), (c)*

In action to establish lost record of title to land. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 751.05-751.07*

In validation action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 861.1*

In joint debtor proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 990, 991*

Issuance of electronic summons. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6*

In unlawful detainer proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1167*

In condemnation proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1250.120*

Restraining orders in summons in actions for marital dissolution, legal separation, or annulment. *Fam. Code § 231 et seq.*

Restraining orders in summons in actions under Uniform Parentage Act (*Fam. Code § 7600 et seq.*). *Fam. Code § 231(b) et seq.*

In proceeding for dissolution of marriage or legal separation. *Fam. Code § 2331*

In action against out-of-state motorist. *Veh. Code § 17462*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.52

§ 518.52 California Rules of Court

Particular papers not to be filed unless offered as relevant to determination of issue in law and motion proceeding or unless ordered to be filed for good cause. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.250*

Service of papers on clerk or judge when party's address is unknown. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.252*

Service and filing of notice of change of address. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.200*

Duties with respect to maintaining and furnishing current list of parties and their addresses for service of notice. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.254*

Facsimile filing and serving of documents other than summons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.300 et seq.*

Electronic filing of documents and service. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.250 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.53

§ 518.53 Decisions

[1] Abuse of Process

Knowing execution of false declaration of service is actionable abuse of process. *Kappel v. Bartlett (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1463-1467, 246 Cal. Rptr. 815*

[2] Action for Unpaid Taxes

In county's action for unpaid taxes, service on taxpayer is not effective without evidence tending to show that taxpayer was California resident on date cause of action for unpaid taxes arose. *Ward v. Superior Court (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1, 4, 88 Cal. Rptr. 726*

[3] Civil Action Pending Workers' Compensation Case

Proper procedure if plaintiff in civil damage action against third-party tortfeasor desires to await outcome of related workers' compensation cases before trying civil matter is to serve summons within reasonable time after complaint is filed and, if necessary, to apply for continuance in bringing case to trial. *Black Bros. Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 501, 509, 71 Cal. Rptr. 344* , disapproved on other grounds, *Denham v. Superior Court (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 557, 563, 86 Cal. Rptr. 65, 468 P.2d 193*

[4] Foreign Corporations

Service on foreign corporation can be made only in manner and form authorized by statute. *Cannon v. American Hydrocarbon Corp. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 639, 646, 84 Cal. Rptr. 575*

[5] Process

"Process" defined. *In re Baker (1916) 32 Cal. App. 320, 323-324, 162 P. 922*

[6] Proof of Service

Jurisdiction does not depend on proof of service but on fact that service was made. *Vail v. Jones (1930) 209 Cal. 251, 255, 287 P. 99* ; *City & County of San Francisco v. Carraro (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 509, 518, 33 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *Otsuka v. Balangue (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 788, 791, 208 P.2d 65*

Gov. Code § 915.2 does not mandate strict compliance with the proof of service requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*. Instead, it provides that proof maybe made in compliance with that statute. Also, even where proof of service must conform to the requisites of Section 1013a, only substantial compliance is required. Courts have consistently concluded that listing the city and state where the documents were placed in the U.S. mail is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of section 1013a. [*Him v. City and County of San Francisco (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 437, 443, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 838]* .

Proof of service by mail on out-of-state defendants must strictly comply with requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)*. *Bolkiah v. Superior Court (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 984, 1001, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*

Filing proof of service creates rebuttable presumption that service was proper, but only if proof of service complies with applicable statutory requirements. *Floveyor Internat., Ltd. v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 789, 795, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457*

Failure to follow requirement of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 410* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10*) that certificate of service recite that summons and complaint served on defendant contained notice that defendant was served in multiple capacity does not deprive trial court of jurisdiction to enter default judgment when service was otherwise valid. *Willen v. Boggs (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 520, 523-524, 97 Cal. Rptr. 917*

[7] Service of Papers Other Than Summons

[a] By Mail

Code Civ. Proc. § 1020 does not *require* mailed notices to be sent by registered mail. Likewise, while a signed return receipt *may* create a rebuttable presumption that the notice was received, the absence of such a signed return receipt does not negate any other presumptions concerning mailed items, and a party cannot defeat notice by a willful failure to accept certified mail. *Bear Creek Master Assn. v. Edwards (2005) 130 Cal App. 4th 1470, 1486, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 337*

The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* apply to the 10-day notice requirement set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*, which requires that a section 998 offer be served not less than 10 days prior to the commencement of trial, therefore a mailed 998 offer must be mailed at least 15 days prior to commencement of trial. *Lecuyer v. Sunset Trails Apartments (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 920, 927, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 169*

Under former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 337*, notice of jurisdictional and dispositional hearings must be made personally or by certified mail, return receipt requested. Neither service by first-class mail nor by leaving a telephone message constitutes adequate service under California law. In *Re Alyssa F. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 846, 854, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Successful service by mail requires strict compliance with statute; thus, effective service requires strict compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1012, 1013, 1013(a)*. *Silver v. McNamee (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 269, 279, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* (service by mail of *Code Civ. Proc. § 364* notice)

Proof of service by mail was fatally defective when first affidavit did not state address to which request for trial de novo had been mailed and second affidavit, which did state address, was prepared 11 months after mailingand did not explain how affiant had recalled that address. *Dobrick v. Hathaway (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 913, 921-922, 207 Cal. Rptr. 50*

Strict compliance with section governing service by mail is required. *Valley Vista Land Co. v. Nipomo Water & Sewer Co. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 172, 174, 63 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Notice by mail entails physical act of depositing written notice in mail box. *Bird v. McGuire (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 702, 715, 31 Cal. Rptr. 386*

Service on defendant of notice of motion for judgment on pleadings may be made by mail when defendant has no attorney of record. *Batchelor v. Finn (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 410, 425, 337 P.2d 545, 341 P.2d 803, 346 P.2d 795*

Burden of proof of service by mail is not on sender. *Caldwell v. Geldreich (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 78, 81, 289 P.2d 832*

Mere fact that person to be served with document may not have received it does not establish that affidavit of mailing is false. *Miller v. Cortese (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 47, 48, 288 P.2d 297*

[b] By Service on Attorney

Service on attorney discharged by client constitutes service on client when client failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 284* and *285* in discharging attorney. *Forslund v. Forslund (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 476, 488, 37 Cal. Rptr. 489*

Notice to attorney is notice to client. *Mindess v. Goodman (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 566, 570, 18 Cal. Rptr. 909*

[c] Service of Deposition Subpoena

As between *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5* (requiring that in the case of a subpoena duces tecum requiring appearance and the production of matters and things at the taking of a deposition, the subpoena is not valid unless a copy of the affidavit upon which the subpoena is based and the designation of the materials to be produced, as set forth in the subpoena, is attached to the notice of taking the deposition served upon each party or its attorney) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.510(b)* (providing that a deposition subpoena commanding the attendance and the testimony of the deponent, as well as the production of business records, documents, or tangible things, does not need to be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the production of the documents and things designated), the latter controls. Thus, service of a deposition subpoena on a nonparty witness is effective despite the absence of a supporting affidavit or declaration. *Terry v. SLICO (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 352, 355, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900*

[8] Service of Process

A finding of substantial compliance with the statutory requirements for service of process requires three preconditions. First, there must have been some degree of compliance with the offended statutory requirements. Second, the objective nature and circumstances of the attempted service must have made it highly probable that it would impart the same notice as full compliance. Finally, it must in fact have imparted such notice, or at least sufficient notice to put the defendant on his or her defense. In this regard, it is not enough that the process inform the defendant of the fact of a lawsuit, or even of a lawsuit in which his or her name appears; due process requires notice of the duty to defend.

Carol Gilbert, Inc. v. Haller (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 852, 865-866, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 843

Service on a defendant's personal manager was not upheld on the theory a close connection between the defendant manager where it was highly probable that defendant would receive actual notice of the service of process on the manager. An actual notice rule would create a standardless free-for-all in which defendants would bring motions to quash service claiming they never received actual notice and, in many cases, plaintiffs would be unable to prove otherwise. In addition, such a rule would put a premium on defendants developing creative ways of evading service thereby thwarting the fundamental principle disputes should be resolved in courts, on the merits. *Summers v. McClanahan (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 403, 415, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 338*

Strict compliance with statutes governing service of process not required; in deciding whether service valid, statutory provisions regarding service of process should be liberally construed to effectuate service and uphold jurisdiction of court if defendant received actual notice; thus, substantial compliance sufficient; service on person who was ostensibly, even if not actually, corporate officer sufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10*. *Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 313, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892*

California jurisdiction generally requires strict statutory compliance with requirements for service of original process. *In re Abrams (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 685, 693-694, 166 Cal. Rptr. 749*

No requirement that summons be served with temporary restraining order. *Chrysler Credit Corp. v. Waegele (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 681, 687-689, 105 Cal. Rptr. 914*

[9] Service of Summons by Hand

When attempted manual delivery of summons is sufficient. *In re Abrams (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 685, 694-695, 166 Cal. Rptr. 749* ; *Crescendo Corp. v. Shelted, Inc. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 209, 212, 72 Cal. Rptr. 776* ; *Sternbeck v. Buck (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 829, 833, 307 P.2d 970*

[10] Service of Summons by Mail

Read together, *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.40* and *417.20* permit completion of service by mail when the return receipt is signed by a person so authorized by the defendant. The personal signature of the defendant is not required. Evidence that a mailed summons actually reached the individual to be served is sufficient to establish valid service, and thus to establish substantial compliance, even if the summons was signed for by someone who did not have the authority to do so. The Legislature has determined that plaintiffs may serve foreign individuals and entities by mail and has incorporated significant safeguards into the process to create a process that is reasonably calculated to provide notice to defendants. The fact that the internal mail handling procedures of a company may have resulted in the misplacement of documents that the evidence establishes were delivered to the company is not a sufficient excuse. *Cruz v. Fagor America, Inc. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 488, 499-500, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 862*

Service by mail does not constitute personal service. *People ex rel. Cranston v. Bonelli (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 129, 132, 92 Cal. Rptr. 828*

[11] Service of Summons by Publication

[a] In General

Nonresident defendant served by publication has 30 days from date of last publication of summons within which to appear in action. *Whealton v. Whealton (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 656, 659, 63 Cal. Rptr. 291, 432 P.2d 979*

Sufficiency of affidavit for order for publication. *Vorburg v. Vorburg (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 794, 797, 117 P.2d 875* (defendant cannot be found within state); *Langley v. Zurich Gen. A. & L. Ins. Co (1933) 219 Cal. 101, 105, 25 P.2d 418* (defendant conceals self to avoid service); *Bell v. McDermoth (1926) 198 Cal. 594, 598-600, 246 P. 805* (defendant departed state); *Bender v. Hutton (1911) 160 Cal. 372, 373, 117 P. 322* (nonresident defendant)

Once a party obtains a court order allowing service of the summons and complaint by publication, a separate order is not necessary to also simultaneously serve a statement of damages by publication before taking a default. *Anastos v. Lee (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1314, 1318, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716*

Compliance with statutory conditions for constructive service is jurisdictional; person not designated by own name is not proper party. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*

[b] Showing of Diligence Required

Plaintiff's failure to use reasonable diligence to locate out-of-state defendant under Hawaii statute comparable to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50* was established when plaintiff resorted only to phone directory when it could have examined county clerk's fictitious name file or contacted codefendant's counsel. *Donel, Inc. v. Badalian (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333-334, 150 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Civ. Code § 235(b) requires showing of due diligence to locate and serve parent in proceeding to declare child free from parental control as prerequisite to order for service on parent by publication. *In re Beebe (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 643, 646, 115 Cal. Rptr. 322*

Affidavits devoid of averments of facts showing that diligence was exercised to make service are not sufficient, and orders for service by publication based on such affidavits are beyond jurisdiction of court and void. *Batte v. Bandy (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 527, 534, 332 P.2d 439*

[12] Service of Summons on Sister State

Validity of service of process on sister state and its university pursuant to *Veh. Code §§ 17450-17463*, providing for service of process on nonresidents who operated vehicles on highways of California. *Hall v. University of Nevada (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 522, 524-526, 105 Cal. Rptr. 355, 503 P.2d 1363 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 820, 94 S. Ct. 114, 38 L. Ed. 2d 52 (1973)* ; *see also Hall v. University of Nevada (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 280, 284, 141 Cal. Rptr. 439 , aff'd sub nom. Nevada v. Hall (1978) 440 U.S. 410, 99 S. Ct. 1182, 59 L. Ed. 2d 416*

[13] Substituted Service

The plain language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)* authorizes substitute service at a defendant's usual mailing address, which can include a private/commercial post office box. *Ellard v. Conway (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 540, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399*

Party is under no duty to attempt substituted service of corporation through Secretary of State unless service cannot, with reasonable diligence, be accomplished pursuant to either *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* or *416.20*; *Corp Code § 1702* suggests that party serving process on corporation that failed to designate agent for service of process should, and arguably must, first attempt service on both offices and agents enumerated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(b), (c),* and on

trustee pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20,* before resorting to Secretary of State service; only if it can show that it cannot accomplish service by one of these methods is party required to seek assistance of court and Secretary of State in obtaining jurisdiction over corporate defendant. *Gibble v. Car-Lene Research, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 295, 311-312, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892*

Reasonable diligence requirement to permit substituted service ordinarily should be satisfied when personal service has been attempted two or three times; if form of substituted service is reasonably calculated to give interested party actual notice of proceedings and opportunity to be heard, traditional notions of fair play substantial justice implicit in due process are satisfied; pre-1969 service of process statutes requiring strict and exact compliance have now been more liberally construed to effectuate service if actual notice has been received by defendant. *Stafford v. Mach (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1182-1183, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809*

Substituted service is ineffective if service was effectuated at address having no connection to party alleged to be served. *Corcoran v. Arouh (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 310, 315, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326*

To obtain in personam jurisdiction through any form of substituted service, strict compliance with statutory procedures is required; to be constitution ally sound, form of substituted service must be reasonably calculated to give interested party actual notice of proceedings and opportunity to be heard so that traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice implicit in due process are satisfied. *Zirbes v. Stratton (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1407, 1416, 232 Cal. Rptr. 653*

Substituted service under former Corp. Code § 6408 (*now see Corp. Code § 2111*) in action for breach of license agreement is not proper if corporation's transactions in California were interstate rather than intrastate. *U.S. Cap & Closure, Inc. v. Superior Court (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 408, 409-413, 71 Cal. Rptr. 184*

[14] Substituted Service Combined With Service by Mail

Sufficiency of service of summons in compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)* when summons and complaint were left with person apparentlyin charge of the common reception room serving corporate defendant's office during usual office hours, and plaintiff later mailed copy of same papers to same place. *Ludka v. Memory Magnetics International (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 316, 319-321, 101 Cal. Rptr. 615*

[15] Summons

The Foreign Money-Judgments Act does not exempt compliance with the procedures applicable to civil actions, including service of a summons. Compliance with the statutory procedures for service of process is essential to establish personal jurisdiction. *Renoir v. Redstar Corp. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 1145, 1152*

Minor variances, such as designation of defendant in complaint by misspelled or otherwise erroneous names, that are carried over to summons will not defeat jurisdiction when service is otherwise properly made and person served is aware that he or she is person named as defendant in erroneous manner; minor variances may be corrected by amended return. *Billings v. Edwards (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 826, 831, 154 Cal. Rptr. 453*

Requirement that statutes prescribing form of summons must be substantially observed. *Community Redevelopment Agency v. Superior Court (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 164, 170-173, 56 Cal. Rptr. 201*

[16] Tortious Service

Allegations that defendants caused service of civil process on plaintiff by pounding on front door of plaintiff's home at

midnight in loud and boisterous manner (in spite of fact that home was unlit and equipped with functioning doorbell) thereby awakening plaintiff, his family, and his neighborhood and that defendants had not attempted service previously and had no reason to believe service could not be effected at reasonable time and manner states cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress. *Golden v. Dungan (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 295, 310, 97 Cal. Rptr. 577*

127 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.54

§ 518.54 Law Reviews

Weisbaum, *The Hague Service Convention and Code Civ. Proc. Section 413.10* , 47 L.A. Bar B. 390 (1972)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.55

§ 518.55 Text References

Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process (Cal. C.E.B. 1970)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 874-989, Vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 22-29 (4th ed. 1996, 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.56-518.59

[Reserved]

§§ 518.56[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.60

§ 518.60 Plaintiff's Checklist for Service and Return of Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ For each defendant to be served, determine:

☐ Name, or names.

☐ Business and residence address, and times at which defendant is likely to be at each address.

☐ Defendant's status and the capacity in which defendant will be served [*see § 518.17*]. Consider the following:

☐ A minor [*see § 518.17[7]*].

☐ An incompetent or other person for whom a guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary has been appointed [*see § 518.17[8]*].

☐ An active domestic corporation or joint stock company [*see § 518.17[1][b], [3]*].

☐ An active foreign corporation or joint stock company [*see § 518.17[1][b], [3]*].

☐ A corporation that has dissolved or forfeited its charter or right to do business [*see § 518.17[2]*].

☐ An unincorporated association or partnership [*see § 518.17[4]*].

☐ A limited liability company [*see § 518.17[5]*].

☐ A public entity [*see § 518.17[6]*].

☐ A candidate for public office [*see § 518.17[9]*].

☐ A resident motorist to be served outside of California [*see § 518.17[11][b]*].

☐ A nonresident motorist [*see § 518.17[12]*].

☐ A nonresident executor or administrator [*see § 518.17[13]*].

☐ A nonresident insurer [*see § 518.17[14]*].

☐ A nonresident real estate licensee or subdivider [*see § 518.17[15]*].

☐ A nonresident watercraft owner or operator [*see § 518.17[16]*].

☐ A nonresident aircraft owner or operator [*see § 518.17[17]*].

☐ A nonresident or absent tax debtor [*see § 518.17[18]*].

☐ An issuer (other than a California corporation) of securities qualified or required to be qualified under the Corporate Securities Law (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.* [*see § 518.17[16]*].

☐ An offeror or seller of franchises registered or required to be registered under the Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.* [*see § 518.17[16]*].

☐ Whether defendant resides in a gated community [*see § 518.18*].

☐ Whether defendant is incarcerated; and if so, the jailer or sheriff to which service of process is to be directed [*Penal Code § 4013*; *see § 518.17[17]*].

☐ Whether defendant has appointed an agent for service of process.

☐ If defendant is a corporation, or other business or public entity, the name, title, and business address of the officers authorized to accept service for the corporation or other business or public entity.

☐ Whether defendant is likely to be serving in the military at the time of service of process, or whether the process server should seek to determine defendant's military status at the time of service [*see § 518.19*].

☐ Whether attorney, if known, is authorized to accept service for defendant.

☐ Determine manner of service most likely to be effective. Consider the following:

☐ Hand delivery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10*]; see *§ 518.16[1]*.

☐ Is defendant likely to acknowledge receipt of summons and complaint by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(c)*]? For discussion and form, see *§§ 518.16[4], 518.73*.

☐ Is defendant likely to sign receipt for certified or registered mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*, discussed at *§ 518.16[5]*]? This is effective outside of California and possibly outside the United States [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(b), (c)*, discussed at *§ 518.16[9]*].

☐ If defendant is one of the following, does it maintain an office where there is likely to be someone to accept service of process during normal business hours [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 414.20(a), discussed at *§ 518.16[3][a]*]?

☐ A corporation, active or dissolved [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10* or *416.20*].

☐ A joint stock company [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.30*].

☐ An unincorporated association [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*].

☐ A public entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*].

☐ If an individual defendant will probably not be amenable to personal service, is there likely to be someone competent toreceive service at the defendant's dwelling house, usual place of abode, usual place of business, or mailing address (other than a post office box) [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 414.20(b), discussed at *§ 518.16[3][b]*]?

☐ If action is one for unlawful detainer, forcible entry, or forcible detainer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.45, 415.47, 1167*], see *§ 518.16[7]* and Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

☐ Service by telegraph [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1017*, discussed at *§ 518.16[8]*].

☐ Whether service will be governed by the Hague Service Convention [*see Code Civ. Proc. §*

413.10(c), discussed at *§ 518.16[9]*].

☐ Determine whether a court order will be necessary. Consider the following provisions:

☐ *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*, regarding publication [*see § 518.16[6*] for discussion and § 518.74 for forms of application and order for service by publication].

☐ *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.70*, dispensing with service on person (other than minor) for whom guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary has been appointed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 416.70*, discussed at *§ 518.16[8]*].

☐ *Corp. Code § 1702*, governing service on domestic corporation or joint stock company and discussed at *§ 518.17[1][b][i]* and *[3]* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10*, *416.20*, *416.30*; for forms of application and order for service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1702*, *see § 518.75*].

☐ *Corp. Code § 2111* or *2114*, regarding service on foreign corporation or joint stock company, discussed at *§ 518.17[1][b][ii]*, *[3]* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10*, *416.20*, *416.30*; for forms of application and order for service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2111*, *see § 518.75*].

☐ *Corp. Code § 18220*, regarding service on unincorporated association that has not appointed an agent for service of process or whose agent cannot be found, as discussed at *§ 518.17[4][d]* [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*].

☐ *Corp. Code § 16962*, regarding service on registered limited liability partnership whose principal office is not in State or on foreign limited liability partnership, discussed at *§ 518.17*[4.1][c].

☐ *Corp. Code § 17061(b)*, regarding service on a foreign limited liability company that has appointed the Secretary of State as its agent for service of process, as discussed at *§ 518.17[5][a]*.

☐ *Corp. Code § 17061(c)*, regarding service on a limited liability company whose agent has resigned or cannot be found, as discussed at *§ 518.17[5][b]*.

☐ *Gov. Code § 960.3*, regarding service on public entity whose appropriate officer for service of process cannot be ascertained, as discussed at *§ 518.17[6][b]*.

☐ Decide who will serve the summons and complaint, discussed at *§ 518.15[3]*.

☐ Determine amount of fees required for issuance of summons and for process server or other entity that will aid in service.

[2] Preparation of Papers

☐ Determine which summons to use [*see § 518.70[3][a]*]:

☐ Summons for general use [*see* Judicial Council Form SUM-100; for illustration, *see § 518.70*].

☐ Summons for cross-complaint [*see* Judicial Council Form SUM-110; for illustration, *see § 518.70A*].

☐ Summons (Joint Debtor) [Judicial Council Form SUM-120].

☐ Summons (Unlawful Detainer) [Judicial Council Form SUM-130; *see* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

☐ Summons (Family Law) [*Fam. Code § 231 et seq.* (summons required to include specified temporary restraining orders in certain domestic relations and paternity proceedings); *See* Judicial Council Form FL-110 *see* Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procdure*].

☐ Summons (Joinder) [*See* Judicial Council Form FL-375; *see* Ch. 221 *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure*].

☐ Prepare summons [*see § 518.70*].

☐ If notice and acknowledgment of service will be used, prepare original and one copy for mailing to each person to be served, and two or more office copies for each person to be served [*see § 518.73*].

☐ If an application for order is necessary, prepare the application, with as many supporting declarations as are necessary [*see, e.g., §§ 518.74, 518.75*].

☐ The original of the application and supporting declaration(s) should be filed with the court and copies served on any party who has appeared in the action. Additional office copies should be retained as desired. The proposed form of order should be submitted with the application. For specifics required to support the various types of orders likely to be applied for, see the following:

☐ For discussion regarding service by publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*], see *§ 518.16[6]*. For forms of application and order for service by publication, see *§ 518.74*.

☐ For discussion of an order dispensing with service on person (other than minor) for whom guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary has been appointed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.70*; *see § 518.17[8]*].

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 1702*, on a domestic corporation or joint stock company [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10, 416.20, 416.30*], see *§ 518.17[1][b][i], [3]*. For forms of application and order for service pursuant to *Corp.*

Code § 1702, see *§ 518.75*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2111* or *2114*, on a foreign corporation or joint stock company [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10, 416.20, 416.30*], see *§ 518.17[1][b][ii], [3]*. For forms of application and order for service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2111*, see *§ 518.75*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 18220*, on an unincorporated association that has not appointed an agent for service of process or whose agent cannot be found, see *§ 518.17[4][d]* [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*].

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 17061(b)*, on a foreign limited liability that has appointed the Secretary of State as its agent for service of process, see *§ 518.17[5][a]*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Corp. Code § 17061(c)*, on a limited liability whose agent has resigned or cannot be found, see *§ 518.17[5][b]*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Gov. Code § 960.3*, on a public entity whose appropriate officer for service of process cannot be ascertained, see *§ 518.17[6][b]*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10151.5*, on a nonresident real estate licensee, see *§ 518.17[15]*.

☐ For discussion of service pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11007*, on a nonresident subdivider, see *§ 518.17[15]*.

☐ In any of the instances listed below, when process will be made through the Secretary of State, prepare the statements required by the specific statute authorizing service in that manner. Generally, prepare an original for delivery with process to the Secretary of State, an office copy, and additional copies, as desired, of the statements required as follows:

☐ For service under *Corp. Code § 15800* on foreign partnership [*see § 518.17[4][c]*].

☐ For service under *Prob. Code § 8574* on nonresident personal representative [*see § 518.17[13]*].

☐ For service under *Corp. Code § 16962(c)* on registered limited liability partnership whose principal office is not in State or on foreign limited liability partnership [*see § 518.17*[4.1][c]].

☐ Additional notices of service are required to complete service in the following instances pursuant to the particular statutory scheme. Generally, prepare an original of the notice of service for filing, a copy to

be sent with the copy of summons and the copy of the complaint by certified or registered mail to defendant, an office copy, and additional copies, as desired.

☐ If defendant is a nonresident motorist, and service was made on the Director of Motor Vehicles pursuant to *Veh. Code § 17454*, notice of service will be required by *Veh. Code § 17455*, discussed at *§ 518.17[12][b][i]*.

☐ If defendant is a nonresident insurer and service was made by delivery to the Insurance Commissioner, notice of service will be required by *Ins. Code § 12931(d)*, discussed at *§ 518.17[14]*.

[3] Issuance and Service of Summons

☐ Present originals and copies of the summons to the clerk of the court in which the action is commenced, so that the clerk, after payment of all applicable fees, will issue the summonses.

NOTE:
The summons ordinarily is presented to the clerk for issuance at the time the complaint is filed. Counsel will at that time concurrently present all of the original summonses as well as the copies to the clerk. The clerk will sign and seal [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20(a), 153(b)*] the originals, insert the case number, conform the copies, retain the original summons for the court file, and return the copies to counsel [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*].

CAUTION: Local rules enacted to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) may require that service of the complaint be completed and proof of service filed with the court 60 days after the filing of the complaint. Failure to meet this time limit may result involuntary dismissal [*see Gov. Code § 68616(a)*]. For discussion, see *§ 518.22[2]* and Ch. 552, *Trial Court Delay Reduction* . Failure to serve the summons and complaint and return summons within two years may result in discretionary dismissal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.420*]. Dismissal is mandatory if the complaint and summons are not served and the summons returned within three years [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.210, 583.250*]. For further discussion, see *§ 518.22[1]* and Ch. 212 *Dismissal* .

☐ Have summons served. Often this involves delivering one summons and one copy of the complaint for each person to be served, to the sheriff, marshal, process server, Secretary of State, or other entity, together with a form of proof of service which the person serving the process will complete and return to counsel.

☐ If service is by hand delivery to the individual or entity being served, or to its designated agent, use the procedure described at § 518.16[1] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30*], having marked the summons appropriately as discussed at *§ 518.70[4][g]*. See also *§ 518.19*, regarding need to have process server determine defendant's military status.

☐ If service is to be made on a person living in a gated community, use the procedure described at § 518.18 to gain entry or to make substituted service on the guard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.21*].

☐ If service is to be made on a defendant who is incarcerated, use the procedure described at § 518.17[17] to make service on the sheriff or jailer [*Penal Code § 4013*].

☐ If service is to be made by mail and acknowledgment of receipt, use the procedure described at § 518.16[4] and the form set forth at § 518.73 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30*].

☐ If combination service will be made on a legal entity, use the procedure described at § 518.16[3][a] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*].

☐ If combination service will be made on an individual who could not, with reasonable diligence, be personally served, use the procedure described at § 518.16[3][b] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*].

☐ If service will be made on a defendant outside California by return-receipt, first-class mail, use the procedure described at § 518.16[5] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*].

☐ If service is to be made by publication, use the procedure described at § 518.74[2][d] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*; *see also §§ 518.16[6], 518.78* (form of proof of mailing)].

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a domestic corporation or joint stock company, by delivery of process to the Secretary of State under *Corp. Code § 1702, 2011(b)*, or *2011(c)*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.75[2][c][i]* [*see also § 518.17[1][b][i], [3]*].

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a foreign corporation or joint stock company, by delivery of process to the Secretary of State under *Corp. Code § 2111* or *2114*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.75[2][c][ii]* [*see also § 518.17[1*][b][ii], [3]].

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a foreign partnership, by delivery of process to the Secretary of State under *Corp. Code § 15800*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[4][c]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on an unincorporated association, by court-ordered service on a member pursuant to *Corp. Code § 24007*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[4][d]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a foreign limited liability company that has designated the Secretary of State as its agent for service of process under *Corp. Code § 17061(b)*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[5][a]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a domestic or foreign limited liability company whose agent has resigned or cannot be found [*Corp. Code § 17061(c)*], use the

procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[5][b]*.

☐ If service is to be made on a member of a limited liability who has consented to be served in the manner provided by the operating or other agreement [*Corp. Code § 17061(h)*], use the procedure set forth in the agreement [*see also § 518.17[5][c]*].

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a registered limited liability partnership whose principal office is not in the State or on a foreign limited liability partnership by delivery to the Secretary of State when the conditions in *Corp. Code § 16962(c)* exist, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17*[4.1][c].

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a public entity when the appropriate officer for service cannot be ascertained [*Gov. Code § 960.3*], use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[6][b]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident or absent resident motorist by delivery to the Director of Motor Vehicles [*Veh. Code §§ 17454, 17455*], use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[12][b][i]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident executor or administrator by delivery to the Secretary of State pursuant to *Prob. Code § 8574*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[13]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident insurer by delivery to the Insurance Commissioner, followed by certified mailing pursuant to *Ins. Code § 12391*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[14]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident issuer of securities qualified or required to be qualified under the Corporate Securities Law (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*) by delivery to the Commissioner of Corporations and registered or certified mail pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 25102(h)(4), 25165, 25240*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[16][b]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident or absent resident who has engaged in conduct prohibited or made actionable by the Corporate Securities Law (*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*) by delivery to the Commissioner of Corporations and registered or certified mail pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25550*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[16][c]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident seller or offeror of franchises registered or required to be registered under the Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*) by delivery to the Commissioner of Corporations and registered or certified mail pursuant to *Corp. Code § 31155*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[16][b]*.

☐ If substituted service is to be made on a nonresident or absent resident who has

violated the Franchise Investment Law (*Corp. Code § 31000 et seq.*) by delivery to the Commissioner of Corporations and registered or certified mail pursuant to *Corp. Code § 31420*, use the procedure discussed at *§ 518.17[16][c]*.

[4] Proof of Service

☐ Prepare proofs of service and review proofs of service prepared by others [for an illustration of Judicial Council Form POS-010, Proof of Service of Summons, *see § 518.72*].

☐ For personal or combination service on an individual [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20(b), 416.90*], use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a], [b]*.

☐ In the case of combination service on an individual [*see § 518.16[3][b]*], a declaration of diligence must be attached [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.20(b), 417.10(a)*].

☐ For personal or combination service [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20(a)*] on an active corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10*], defunct corporation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.20*], joint stock company [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.30*], or unincorporated association or partnership [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.40*], use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a], [b]*.

☐ For personal or combination service [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20(a)*] on a public entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*], use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a], [b]*.

☐ For service by mail and acknowledgment of receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30*], use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a] -[c]*.

☐ For service outside California by first-class, prepaid mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40*], use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a], [b], [4][a]*, and that the return receipt or other evidence of delivery is attached as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)*.

☐ For service outside California but within the United States pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(b)* or outside the United States pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10(c)*, subject to any other or additional requirements imposed by the court, use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][a], [b], [4][a], [c]*, unless other or additional requirements are prescribed by the law of the place where the person was served or the court order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(b), (c)*].

☐ For service by publication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*] use the form of certificate at § 518.72, and ensure that it and its attached declaration(s) sets forth the elements discussed at *§ 518.20[3][d]* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)*; for a form of declaration of mailing pursuant to an order for publication, *see § 518.78*].

[5] Filing Proof of Service

☐ Attach the original of each affidavit, declaration, or certificate of proof service to the copy of the summons issued by the court.

☐ If there was a copy of summons for each person to be served, the original of the affidavit, declaration, or certificate of proof of service prepared for each summons, will be attached to the summons to which it applies.

☐ Deliver, for filing, the proof of service of summonses with attachments to the clerk of the court in which the action is pending [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30(a)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.61

§ 518.61 Defendant's Checklist for Responding to Service of Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Determine the following facts:

☐ Date, time, place, and manner in which summons was served on client.

☐ All facts surrounding the cause of action, including where it arose and the names and addresses of witnesses, if any, sufficient to determine:

☐ Which allegations of the complaint are true and which are not.

☐ Whether any affirmative defenses exist.

☐ Whether any cross actions exist.

☐ Determine whether the court obtained jurisdiction over the defendant by the service of summons [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*; *see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*]:

☐ Whether service was properly effected on the defendant; and

☐ Whether there is a proper basis of jurisdiction existing between defendant and this state [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*].

CAUTION:
If jurisdiction has not been obtained, and counsel intends to file a noticed motion to quash service on the

ground of lack of personal jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)*], no paper may be filed in the action or proceeding other than the notice of motion to quash, except as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10* and the supporting affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*] or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] and memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1113*]. For discussion, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

☐ Determine whether the action should be stayed or dismissed on the ground of inconvenient forum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(2)*; *see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*].

☐ Determine whether action is subject to dismissal for delay in prosecution under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.110 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(3)*; *see* Ch. 212, *Dismissal*].

☐ Whether any other actions are pending between the same parties for the same cause. If so, consider how to raise the issue:

☐ By demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(c)*], invoking judicial notice [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(a), 430.70*] of the other pending action [*Evid. Code § 452(d)*; for procedure and forms, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

☐ By affirmative defense in the answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(c), 430.30(b), 431.30(b)(2)*].

☐ Determine whether the action is barred by the doctrine of res judicata. If so, consider how to raise the issue:

☐ By demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)* (failure to state a cause of action)], invoking judicial notice [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.30(a), 430.70*] of the prior action [*Evid. Code § 452(d)*; for procedure and forms, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* ; for memoranda of points and authorities, *see* California Points and Authorities , Ch. 71, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

☐ By affirmative defense in the answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(b), 431.30(b)(2)*].

☐ By motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*; for procedure and forms, *see* Ch. 537, *Summary Judgment ;* for memoranda of points and authorities, *see* California Points and Authorities , Ch. 221, *Summary Judgments*].forms, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* ; for

☐ Determine when defendant must file a responsive pleading or motion extending time to plead to avoid the entry of default. The periods within which defendant must appear are as follows:

☐ Personal service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 430.40*]:

☐ Within 30 days from the date the copy of the summons and copy of the complaint were served on defendant.

☐ Substituted service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.20, 430.40*]:

☐ Within 40 days from the date the copy of the summons and the copy of the complaint were mailed.

☐ Service by mail and acknowledgment of receipt [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.30, 430.40*]:

☐ Within 30 days from the date the acknowledgment of service is executed, if it is then returned to the sender.

☐ Service by publication [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.50*. 430.40; *Gov. Code § 6064*]:

☐ Within 30 days after the last date of publication.

☐ Service by first-class mail, postage prepaid, outside California [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.40, 430.40*]:

☐ Within 40 days after date of mailing.

☐ If the defendant was served pursuant to some statute other than the foregoing, see discussion of the specific statutes at § 518.17.

[2] Preparation of Papers

☐ Prepare one of the following:

☐ A responsive pleading (answer or demurrer), in at least three copies (original for filing, copy for service on plaintiff, and office copy); and

☐ If a demurrer is prepared, the supporting memorandum of points and authorities and the notice of hearing [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1113(a), 3.1320(b)*], in the same number of copies as the demurrer [*see* Ch. 26, *Answers* ; Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*]; or

☐ One of the following motions, in at least three copies (original for filing, copy for service and plaintiff, and office copy), and, in the same number of copies, the supporting affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*] or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], if any, and the memorandum of points and authorities [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1113(a)*]:

☐ A motion to strike [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 435*; Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings*; Ch. 376, *Motions to Strike: anti-SLAPP*].

☐ A motion to transfer pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*.

☐ A motion to quash service of summons pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(1)* [*see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances*].

☐ A motion to stay or dismiss the action for inconvenient forum pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(2)* [*see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances*].

☐ A motion to dismiss for delay in prosecution pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)(3)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 418.10(d), 585* (relating to entry of default); Ch. 212, *Dismissal*].

☐ Prepare the certificate, affidavit, or declaration of service [*see § 518.62*].

☐ If a demurrer or related motion is prepared, attach the originals of the demurrer, memorandum of points and authorities, and notice of hearing or the originals of the notice of motion, supporting affidavit or declaration, if any, and memorandum of points and authorities together. The copies of these documents should also be attached to make three sets. Local court rule may require that these papers appear under a single cover, in which case the demurrer or notice of motion, in its caption, to the right of the title of the case, will list all three papers.

[3] Service of Papers

☐ Serve a copy of the answer and/or demurrer or motions (and accompanying papers) listed above on counsel for plaintiff [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465, 1015*], either by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*] or as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1011* [*see §§ 518.30 -518.36, 518.62*].

[4] Filing of Papers

☐ Deliver, for filing, the originals of the papers served to the clerk of the court in which the action is pending.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.62

§ 518.62 Checklist for Filing and Service of Papers Other Than Summons

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Determine governing statute or statutes; consider:

☐ Specific statute governing procedure [*see* specific titles throughout this publication].

☐ *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* with respect to any proceeding under the Code of Civil Procedure in which notice is required and no other time or method is prescribed by law or by court or judge [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)*; for a checklist, *see Ch. 372, Motions and Orders, § 372.50* et seq.].

☐ *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* with respect to any other notice or paper [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*; continue with this checklist].

☐ Determine method of service to be used:

☐ Personal service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*].

☐ Mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1012*], taking into consideration extension of notice period [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* (*see* exceptions to extension, listed below)]:

☐ Five calendar days, if the place of address and of mailing are both within California.

☐ Ten calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside California but within the United States.

☐ Twenty calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside the United States.

☐ Express Mail or other overnight service, taking into consideration two court day extension of notice period [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)* (*see* exceptions to extension, listed below)].

☐ Fax, if parties have agreed to fax filing, taking into consideration two court day extension of notice period [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)* (*see* exceptions to extension, listed below)].

☐ Electronic service, if authorized by court rule and party has agreed to accept electronic service, taking into consideration two court day extension of notice period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(2)* (*see* exceptions to extension, listed below)].

☐ Exceptions to extension of time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6), 1013(a), (c), (e)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(e)(3)*]:

☐ Notice of intention to move for new trial.

☐ Notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.

☐ Notice of appeal.

☐ Consider whether to seek shorter or longer notice period [*see* Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time*].

[2] Preparation of Papers

☐ Prepare the pleading, notice, or other paper or papers to be served in at least three copies [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465, 1010, 1014*, discussed at *§ 518.31*]:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ One copy for service on adverse party.

☐ Copy for any other party who has appeared in action and is entitled to notice.

☐ Office copy.

☐ Prepare proof of service in the same number of copies [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(b)*, discussed at

§ 518.34[7][f]; *see also § 518.36*], whether service is:

☐ By mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*]:

☐ Directly deposited in United States Mail by person other than attorney [for a form of declaration, *see § 518.90*].

☐ Deposited in ordinary course of business's mailing practice by person other than attorney [for a form of declaration, *see § 518.91*].

☐ By attorney [for a form of certificate, *see § 518.92*].

☐ By Express Mail overnight delivery [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*, for a form of declaration *see § 518.93*].

☐ By overnight delivery by express service carrier [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*, for a form of declaration, *see § 518.94*].

[3] Service of Papers

☐ Place the copy of the pleading, notice, or other paper to be served, either together with an unsigned copy of the proof of service or bearing a notation of the date and place of mailing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(b)*], in an envelope addressed to the person to be served. Seal the envelope, stamp it, and post it in the mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1012*, discussed at *§ 518.34[7][a]*].

[4] Filing of Papers

☐ Deliver for filing the original or a true copy of the pleading, notice, or other paper, together with the original of the proof of service, to the clerk of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 465, 1010*, discussed at *§ 518.31[1]*].

133 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.63-518.69

[Reserved]

§§ 518.63[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.70

§ 518.70 Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20, 465]--Judicial Council Form SUM-100

[1] FORM Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20(a), 412.30, 474] With Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10]--Judicial Council Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(c); Gov. Code § 68511]--General Summons [Judicial Council Form 982(a)(9)]--Judicial Council Form SUM-100

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form of summons illustrated in [1], *above* (with attached proof of service, discussed at [3], [4], *below*), is a reproduction of the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for use in a civil action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(c)*; Judicial Council Form SUM-100]. Use of the form of summons when applicable is mandatory [*see Gov. Code § 68511*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.30*; *see also Clark v. Palmer (1891) 90 Cal. 504, 506-507, 27 P. 375* ; *Lyman v. Milton (1872) 44 Cal. 630, 634-635* (statutory form of summons as mandatory)].

[3] Judicial Council Summons Forms

[a] Six Summons Forms

The Judicial Council has adopted five additional specialized summons forms in addition to the summons for general use that is illustrated in [1], *above* [Judicial Council Form SUM-100]:

- Summons (Joint Debtor), used for enforcing a judgment against a joint debtor who was not a party to the action underlying the judgment [Judicial Council Form SUM-120; *see Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.340* et seq.];

- Summons (Unlawful Detainer), used in unlawful detainer proceedings [Judicial Council Form SUM-130; *see* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*];

- Summons (Storage Lien Enforcement), for use to enforce a storage lien under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 21710* and *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20, 465* [Judicial Council Form SUM-140; *see Ch. 517, Self-Service Storage Facilities, § 517.51*];

- Summons (Family Law), used in proceedings for dissolution of marriage, nullity of marriage, or separation and in proceedings under the Uniform Parentage Act [*Fam. Code § 231 et seq.* (inclusion of temporary restraining orders in summons in these proceedings); *see* Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure*];

- Summons (Joinder), used to bring a third party into a family law proceeding [*see* Ch. 221 *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure*].

[b] Additional Party Attachment

The Judicial Council has also adopted a form of Additional Parties Attachment that may be attached to any summons on which there is not room to list all parties [*see* Judicial Council Form SUM-200(A); for an illustration of the form, *see § 518.71*].

[4] General Summons Form Contents

[a] Overview

Except as otherwise required by statute, a summons must be directed to the defendant, signed by the court clerk (or judge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 167*]), and issued under the seal of the court in which the action is pending [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 153(b)*, requiring that summons be sealed].

The required contents of the summons are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20, 412.30, 474*.

Service of summons is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-416.90* [*see §§ 518.15, 518.17*].

Proof of service and return of the summons are governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.30, 417.10-417.40, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2015.3, 2015.5* [*see §§ 518.20 -518.21, 518.76 -518.78*].

[b] Names of Parties

The summons must contain the names of the parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(2)*].

Every plaintiff and defendant, including fictitiously named defendants [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*], must be named in the title of the case. Hence, the title of the case as it appears in the summons is the same as that in the complaint.

[c] Title and Number of Case

Although it will not be assigned until the complaint is filed and the summons is issued, the case number must be inserted in the appropriate box of the Judicial Council form.

[d] Title and Address of Court

The Judicial Council approved forms require the title of the court, including, if applicable, the name of any municipal court district or title of any branch court [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(1)*].

The post office and street address of the court or branch of the court must be included in the summons.

[e] Directions, Legends, and Warnings

The Judicial Council form of summons contains the notice to defendant, the legend indicating "YOU ARE BEING SUED," and the warning the defendant must file a response with the court within 30 days after being served with the summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(3), (6), (b), (c)*]. The form also contains a reminder advising the defendant he or she may want to seek the advice of an attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(a)(5)*]. The foregoing appear in English and in Spanish [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20(b)*].

[f] Plaintiff or Plaintiff's Attorney

The summons must contain the name, address, and telephone number of the plaintiff's attorney, or if the plaintiff does not have an attorney, the plaintiff's own name, address, and telephone number.

[g] Capacity in Which Defendant Is Served

The plaintiff must indicate on the face of the summons the capacity or capacities in which the defendant is served [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-416.90*; *see also § 518.17*].

If service is made on a person in two capacities, for instance as an individual and on behalf of a corporation or unincorporated association, the notice on the summons must indicate that service is being made on that person as an individual as well as on behalf of the corporation or unincorporated association. If that notice does not appear on the copy of the summons served, no default may be taken against the corporation or unincorporated association or against the person individually served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.30*]. The requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.30* are mandatory so that service on a corporation of a summons which fails to comply substantially with this section is ineffective [*Tresway Aero, Inc. v. Superior Court (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 431, 435, 96 Cal. Rptr. 571, 487 P.2d 1211* ; *Schering Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 737, 741, 125 Cal. Rptr. 337]* . The process server's oral statements to the person served of the fact omitted from the summons does not cure the failure of the summons to contain the notice [*Schering Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 737, 741, 125 Cal. Rptr. 337]* .

Similarly, when a person is served as a fictitiously named defendant, that notice on the summons must be checked and completed. No default or default judgment may be taken against such defendant unless the proper notice appears [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*]. Compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* is mandatory; if the provisions are not complied with, the court acquires no jurisdiction over the fictitiously named defendant [*Armstrong v. Superior Court (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 420, 424, 301 P.2d 51* ; see also *National Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 326, 328-329, 247 Cal. App. 2d 326, 329, 55 Cal. Rptr. 574* ; *see also Nissan v. Barton (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 76, 81, 84 Cal. Rptr. 36]* .

[5] Number of Copies of Summons

Counsel will ordinarily prepare (for filing with proof of service) one original summons for each defendant or person to be served. The code makes no distinction between the original and any subsequent or "alias" summons. Hence, subsequent or additional summonses will be issued against any defendant on plaintiff's request [*Code Civ. Proc. § 412.10*].

Counsel will also need a copies for service or each defendant, and as many office copies and additional copies as desired.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

1-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.70A

§ 518.70A Summons--Cross-Complaint--Judicial Council Form SUM-110

[1] FORM Summons--Cross-Complaint--Judicial Council Form SUM-110

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is used as a summons for a cross complaint. This form is approved for mandatory use by the Judicial Council of California effective January 1, 2009 [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*].

For discussion on service of summons for a cross complaint, see *Ch. 123, Complaints and Cross-Complaints, § 123.33*. For related form of proof of service, see *§ 518.72*.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at *www.lexisone.com* for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at *www.lexisone.com* at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.71

§ 518.71 Additional Parties Attachment to Summons--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-200(A)]

[1] FORM Additional Parties Attachment to Summons--Judicial Council Form [Judicial Council Form SUM-200(A)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form reproduced at [1], *above*, is an illustration of the form adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use as an attachment to any summons in civil actions and proceedings if space does not permit the listing of all parties on the summons [Judicial Council Form SUM-200(A)].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Filling Out Form

The short title of the case (normally written as the last name of plaintiff vs. last name of defendant) and case number of the action or proceeding should be set forth in the top two boxes. The appropriate box should be checked to indicate the type of party for which additional names are listed. Only one box should be checked; a separate attachment page should be used for each type of party.

If this form is used, the following statement must appear in the plaintiff or defendant box on the summons: "Additional Parties Attachment form is attached."

At the bottom of the form, the page number and the total number of pages should be set forth.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.72

§ 518.72 Proof of Service of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-412.40]--Judicial Council Form POS-010

[1] FORM Proof of Service of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-412.40]--Judicial Council Form POS-010

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form reproduced at [1], *above*, is the form adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use to prove service of summons in civil actions and proceedings [Judicial Council Form POS-010]. The form was adopted to comply with the legislative mandate that all proof of *personal* service shall be made on a form adopted by the Judicial Council [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(f)*]. However, the form is for use in all civil cases, regardless of the manner of service, although additional requirements may have to be met, as, for example, when service is made by posting the premises or by publication. For discussion of proving service by publication, see *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10(b), 2010, 2011*; also see *§ 518.16[6]*. For discussion of proving service by posting, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(e)*.

Although the use of the form in [1], *above*, is mandatory, a form for proof of service of a summons and complaint prepared entirely by word processor, typewriter, or similar process may be used for proof of service of summons and complaint in any action or proceeding in lieu of the printed Judicial Council proof of service of summons form if certain format requirements are followed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150(a)*; *see* [4], *below*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Filling Out Form

[a] Block Heading

The name, address, phone number, and state bar number of the party's attorney, or of the party if appearing in propria

persona, should be set forth in the first box of the block heading.

The name of the court (including its judicial district and branch name) should be set forth in the second box, and the short title of the case (normally last name of plaintiff vs. last name of defendant), in the third box.

If an order to show cause was served with the complaint and summons, the date, time, and department or division where the hearing will be held should, if required by local court rule, be set forth in the bottom boxes of the block heading. The case number should be inserted in the final box.

[b] Body of Form

[i] Paragraphs 1 and 2

Paragraph 1 affirms the person serving process satisfies the age and nonparty requirements.

In Paragraph 2, check the boxes indicating the documents served. At a minimum, the Complaint box should be checked because service of summons requires service of both summons and complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 414.10-415.95*]. A plaintiff or cross-complainant must serve an Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) package along with the complaint [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.221(c)*]. The court provides the package at the time the complaint is filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.221(a)*]. Also indicate whether other documents are served, such as an injunction or order to show cause.

[ii] Paragraph 3

Paragraph 3a requires insertion of the name of the party served as shown on the documents served.

In Paragraph 3b, the first box should be checked if the party specified in Paragraph 3b was actually served. If any other person was served, the second box should be checked and the name of that person and his or her title or relationship to the party should be specified. For example, if the party named was a corporation and the papers were served on an officer of the corporation, the officer's name and title should be listed in Paragraph 3b.

[iii] Paragraph 4

Paragraph 4 requires insertion of the address of the person on whom the documents were served or to whom they were delivered.

[iv] Paragraph 5

Paragraph 5 covers the manner of service.

For detailed discussion of different manners of serving summons, see *§ 518.16*.

Box 5a should be checked if service or delivery was made in person.

Box 5b and the appropriate boxes under it (boxes (1) through (5)) should be checked if service was made by a combination of substituted service and service by mail as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*.

A declaration of diligence must be attached if service is made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*, that is if service is made by leaving copy at party's dwelling, business, or usual mailing address (other than a United States Postal Service post office box) with competent member of householdor person apparently in charge and by mailing of another copy [*see § 518.16[3][b]*].

Box 5c and the appropriate boxes under it (boxes (1)-(4)) should be checked if service was by mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* or *415.40*. Note that if service was made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* [*see § 518.16[4]*], the proof of service must include the acknowledgment of receipt of summons or other written acknowledgment of receipt of summons satisfactory to the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(a)*; *see § 518.73*]. If service was made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.40* [*see § 518.16[5]*], proof of service must include evidence satisfactory to the court establishing actual delivery to the person to be served, by a signed return receipt or other evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.20(a)*].

Box 5d should be checked when a statute requires or directs a court to order the mailing of the summons and complaint to the defendant in addition to some other manner of service, such as service by publication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50* or service by posting in unlawful detainer proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.45* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b), (e)* (proof of service by publication and posting)]. When the mailing is in addition to some other manner of service, Box 3e also should be checked and the manner of service and authorizing code section should be inserted. Box 3e should be checked alone if service was in some other manner than as covered by the form and mailing of the complaint and summons was not required; the code section authorizing that form of service should also be cited. For example, if service was by certified mail under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.47* (relating to abandoned real property), Box 3e should be checked and "Certified mail under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.47*" should be inserted.

[v] Paragraphs 6 and 7

Paragraph 6 indicates how service was made on particular defendants. For detailed discussion of how service is made of different defendants, see *§ 518.17*.

With respect to Paragraph 7, any proof of service signed by a registered process server or by his or her employee or independent contractor must indicate the county in which the server is registered and the number assigned to the server pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22355* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.40*; *see* Paragraph 5(d)(1)-(3)].

[vi] Paragraphs 8 and 9

Paragraph 8 should be checked if the summons was served by anyone other than a California sheriff or marshal.

Paragraph 9 should be checked if service was by a California sheriff or marshal.

[vii] Date

The date that the proof of service was executed should be inserted on the dateline, and the person who made service should sign his or her name above the signature line.

[4] Computer-Generated or Typewritten Alternative Form

Notwithstanding the adoption of mandatory Judicial Council Form POS-010 reproduced at [1], *above*, mandatory, a form for proof of service of a summons and complaint prepared entirely by word processor, typewriter, or similar process may be used for proof of service of a summons and complaint in any action or proceeding in lieu of the printed Judicial Council proof of service of summons form, if certain format requirements are adhered to [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150(a)*]. These conditions are as follows [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150(a)*]:

1. The requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.100* (format of papers filed in trial courts) applies except as otherwise provided in Rule 3.714, but numbered lines are not required.

2. The left, right, and bottom margins of the proof of service must be at least one-half inch. The top margin must be at least three-quarters of an inch. The typeface must be Times, Courier, Arial, or an equivalent roman typeface not smaller than 9 points. Text must be single-spaced, and a blank line must

precede each main numbered item.

3. The title and all the text of form POS-010 that is not accompanied by a checkbox must be copied word for word except for instructions, which must not be copied. All the relevant text that is optional (that is, accompanied by a checkbox) must be copied word for word except that the checkboxes must not be copied.

4. The Judicial Council number of the Proof of Service of Summons must be typed as follows either in the left margin of the first page opposite the last line of text or at the bottom of each page: "Judicial Council form POS-010."

5. The text of form POS-010 must be copied in the same order as is appears on the printed form using the same item numbers. A declaration of diligence may be attached to the proof of service or inserted as item 5b(5).

6. Areas marked "For Court Use" must be copied in the same general locations and occupy approximately the same amount of space as on the printed form.

7. The telephone number of the attorney or party must appear flush with the left margin and below the attorney's or party's address.

8. The name of the court must be flush with the left margin. The address of the court is not required.

9. Material that would have been typed onto the printed form must be typed with each line indented three inches from the left margin.

The act of filing a computer-generated or typewritten form under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150* constitutes a certification by a the party or attorney filing the form that the form it complies with Rule 2.150 and is a true and correct copy of the form to the extent required by that rule [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.150(b)*].

[5] Filing

After a summons has been served on a person, proof of service of the summons must be filed, unless the defendant has previously made a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.30*]. Proof of service of the summons must be filed within 60 days after the time the summons and complaint must be served upon a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210(b)*], in order to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) [*see, e.g.,* San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.5; *see also Gov. Code § 68616(a)*; discussion at *§ 518.22[2]*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1014 defines acts that constitute an appearance [*see § 518.31[2]*]. For discussion of what constitutes a general appearance, see *Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum and Appearances, § 323.60* et seq.

[6] Number of Copies

Unless the proof of service is prepared by someone else, signed, and returned to counsel, prepare the proof of service (affidavit, declaration, or certificate) in two copies (original for filing and office copy). For discussion of return of summons, see *§ 518.21*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.73

§ 518.73 Notice of Service of Summons by Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(a)]--Judicial Council Form POS-015

[1] FORM Notice of Service of Summons by Mail and Acknowledgment of Receipt [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(a)]--Judicial Council Form POS-015]

Click here to view image.

[2] Source and Use of Form

The Notice and Acknowledgment of Receipt reproduced at [1], *above*, is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for use when the summons is served by mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* [Judicial Council Form POS-015].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

If service is made by mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30* [*see § 518.16[4], [5]*], proof of service must include the acknowledgment of receipt of summons in the form provided by that statute or other written acknowledgment of receipt of summons satisfactory to the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(a)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(b) sets forth a form of notice and requires that the notice and acknowledgment be in substantially that form. *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(e)*, however, provides that a notice or acknowledgment of receipt in the form approved by the Judicial Council is deemed to comply with this section. Use of the Judicial Council form when applicable is mandatory [*Gov. Code § 68511*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.30(b)*].

For the form of proof of service, see *§ 518.72*

[3] Failure of Person Served to Acknowledge Receipt

The failure to complete and return the acknowledgment form (or other written form of acknowledgment satisfactory to the court) within 20 days from the date the papers were mailed renders the person served liable to the serving party for reasonable expenses thereafter incurred in serving or attempting to serve the person by another method permitted by law. Except for good cause shown, the court in which the action is pending is required, on motion with or without notice, to award the party those expenses whether or not the party is otherwise entitled to recover costs in the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30(d)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.74

§ 518.74 Proceedings for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50]

[1] Application for Order--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)]

[a] FORM Proceedings for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50]--Application for Order--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER FOR
Defendant.	)	PUBLICATION OF SUMMONS
	)	
	)	

_____

Application is hereby made for an order directing that summons in this action be served on defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as "defendant," by publication of the summons in _____ [*name of newspaper*], which is a newspaper of general circulation in this state and is most likely to give defendant actual notice of the pendency of this action because _____ [*state reasons*]. In support of this application the undersigned states:

1. The complaint, which is for _____ [*specify*], was filed on _____ [*date*], and summons was duly issued on _____ [*date*].

[*EITHER*]

2. As shown by the _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, plaintiff] attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, a cause of action for _____ [*specify*] exists in favor of plaintiff against defendant for _____ [*specify*], based on _____ [*specify*].

[*OR*]

2. As shown by the _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, plaintiff] attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, defendant is a _____ [necessary *or* proper] party to this action in that _____ [*specify*].

[*OR*]

2. As shown by the _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, plaintiff] attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, defendant _____ [has *or* claims] the following interest in the _____ [*describe property*], which is _____ [situated *or* located] inthis state at _____ [*specify place*] and is subject to the jurisdiction of this court: _____ [*describe interest*].

[*OR*]

2. As shown by the _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, plaintiff] attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, the relief demanded in this action consists _____ [wholly *or* in part] of excluding defendant from any interest in the _____ [*describe property*], which is _____ [situated *or* located] in this state at _____ [*specify place*] and is subject to the jurisdiction of this court, in that _____ [*describe interest and relief sought*].

[*CONTINUE*]

3. The undersigned has made the following efforts to learn defendant's whereabouts: _____ [*state in detail acts done and date and result of each; these acts should include ascertaining identity and address of defendant's relatives, friends, last known landlord, if any, last known employer, if any, and other persons likely to know defendant's whereabouts, checking with these persons, examining of the latest city directory, phone directory, tax rolls, and voters register, and any attempts made by person signing this application to serve the defendant or to have defendant served*].

[4. As shown by the _____ (affidavit *or* declaration *or* certificate) of _____ (*name*), a _____ (registered process server *or* (deputy) _____ (sheriff *or* marshal) *or describe other person*), hereinafter referred to as "process server," which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof, attempts to serve defendant with process in this action were made by the process server at the places, on the dates, and at the times indicated, and were unsuccessful.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[b] Use of Form

The form set forth in [a], *above*, is for use in securing an order for publication of a summons [*see* [2][a], *below*] when defendant's whereabouts are unknown and defendant has no known or fixed location where service can be effected in a manner specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.40*.

[c] Local Forms

Some trial courts, for example Los Angeles Superior Court, provide their own preprinted form of application for an order for publication. When acourt has its own form, that form should, of course, be used. Blank copies may be obtained in that case from the court clerk's office.

[d] Procedure

While practice may vary from court to court, the normal procedure appears to be for counsel to present the original of the application and order to a judge at chambers for his or her signature [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 166(a)(1)*]. If the judge signs the order, the originals of the application and order will be filed and the copies conformed and returned to counsel. Counsel will then deliver a conformed copy of the order together with the summons to the newspaper which is to publish it. On completion of publication, the newspaper will prepare and file with the court a proof of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10(b), 2010, 2011*].

[e] Caption

Application for the order is made by affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)*] or, as in the foregoing form, by a declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. The application will be entitled "EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER FOR PUBLICATION OF SUMMONS" [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*]. Except for this title, the caption will conform to the caption on papers previously filed in the case.

[f] Showing Required

The application for the order must, to the court's satisfaction, satisfy the following conditions:

- Establish the exercise of reasonable diligence in attempting to serve the defendant by the other methods of service specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-415.40* (Paragraphs 3 and 4) [*see also* [g], *below*]; and

- Show that (Paragraph 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)*].

  - A cause of action exists against the defendant;

  - The defendant is a necessary or proper party to the action;

  - The defendant has or claims an interest in real or personal property in this state that is subject to the jurisdiction of the court; or

  - The relief demanded in the action consists wholly or in part in excluding the defendant from any interest in such property.

Local court rules may require a showing of other or additional facts and should be consulted before the application for the order is drafted [*see Sanford v. Smith (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 991, 1001, 90 Cal. Rptr. 256* (approving Los Angeles County Superior Court rule on scope and content of application)].

The statutory conditions on which service of summons by publication depends to obtain jurisdiction must be strictly observed; otherwise, the court has no power to render a judgment [*Bank of America v. Carr (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 727, 737, 292 P.2d 587]* .

[g] Reasonable Diligence

"Reasonable diligence" denotes a thorough, systematic investigation and inquiry conducted in good faith by the plaintiff or by the plaintiff's agent or attorney. A number of honest attempts to learn the defendant's whereabouts or address by questioning defendant's relatives, friends, acquaintances, and employer and by investigation of appropriate city and phone directories, the voters register, and the property index in the assessor's office near defendant's last known location are generally sufficient. These are likely sources of information and must be searched before resorting to service by publication. The affidavit for publication must show in detail the probative facts establishing a sincere desire and thorough search to locate the defendant, including dates and any attempts made to serve the defendant by another method of service [*see* Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process, § 1.25 (Cal. C.E.B. 1970)].

As a condition of establishing that the party to be served cannot with reasonable diligence be served in another manner specified in this article, the court may not require that a search be conducted of public databases where access by a registered process server to residential addresses is prohibited by law or by published policy of the agency providing the database, including, but not limited to, voter registration rolls and records of the department of motor vehicles [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(e)*].

[h] Statement of Facts

As already indicated, the facts establishing the right to an order for publication must be shown by affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)*]. An affidavit is one of the modes in which the testimony of a witness can be taken [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003*]. Hence, the facts stated in the affidavit must usually be within the personal knowledge of the affiant and be matters to which he or she is competent to testify. For example, the fact that a cause of action exists against the person to be served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)(1)* (requiring that a cause of action exist before service by publication)] may not be established by reference to the complaint which has been verified on information and belief by plaintiff's counsel. That verification is no substitute for the sworn statement of facts which *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(a)* requires of the affiant. For the purpose of service by publication, the existence of a cause of action is a jurisdictional fact. Accordingly, an affidavit in proper form is a jurisdictional basis of the order for publication, and the affidavit must contain a statement of some fact that would be legal evidence, having some appreciable tendency to make the jurisdictional fact appear, for the judge to act on before heor she has any jurisdiction to make the order. Unless the affidavit contains some such evidence tending to establish every material jurisdictional fact, the judge has no legal authority to be satisfied, and, if he or she makes the order, the act is without jurisdiction and all proceedings based on it are void [*Harris v. Cavasso (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 723, 726-727, 137 Cal. Rptr. 410]* .

The facts may, of course, be established by a declaration under penalty of perjury instead of an affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] or, when it is executed by a sheriff or marshal, by a certificate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.3*]. But, in any case, probative facts within the personal knowledge (not hearsay) of the affiant, declarant, or certifier, as the case may be, must normally be stated [*see Ricketson v. Richardson (1864) 26 Cal. 149, 153* ; *Sanford v. Smith (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 991, 998-1000, 90 Cal. Rptr. 256* ; *Miller v. Superior Court (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 779, 783, 16 Cal. Rptr. 36]* . However, in appropriate situations statements may be made on information and belief. For example, a statement as to the defendant's out-of-state residence would be sufficient, so long as the facts on which the statement is based are set forth [*see Davis-Heller-Pearce Co. v. Ramont (1924) 66 Cal. App. 778, 780, 226 P. 972]* .

[i] Multiple Affidavits

Since the facts set forth in the affidavits or declarations must normally be within the personal knowledge of the affiant or declarant, if some of the facts are known to plaintiff, for example, and others to plaintiff's attorney or to someone else which, taken together, would establish the required showing, a separate affidavit or declaration for each person should be prepared and executed by the affiant or declarant having personal knowledge of the particular facts. That is, under various circumstances, multiple affidavits or declarations are appropriate. For example, the plaintiff would normally make the affidavit or declaration as to the cause of action; the process server would make the affidavit, declaration, or (if the process server is a deputy sheriff or marshal) the certificate that the defendant could not be found and personally served; the person who made the inquiries and searches locate defendant would make the affidavit or declaration as to those inquiries and searches, and so forth [*see* Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process, § 1.25 (Cal. C.E.B. 1970)].

[2] Order for Publication--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)]

[a] FORM Proceedings for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50]--Order for Publication--General Form [Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	ORDER FOR PUBLICATION OF SUMMONS
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

On reading and filing the evidence consisting of plaintiff's application and _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] for this order [and the _____ (affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s) *or* certificate(s) *or combination of these*) of _____ (*name(s)*), attached to and incorporated by reference in the application], and it satisfactorily appearing to me therefrom that defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as "defendant," cannot with reasonable diligence be served in any other manner specified in *Sections 415.10 through 415.40 of the Code of Civil Procedure*, and that

[*EITHER*]

a cause of action exists in favor of plaintiff against defendant.

[*OR*]

defendant is a _____ [necessary *or* proper] party to this action

[*OR*]

defendant _____ [has *or* claims] an interest in the _____ [*describe property*] which is _____ [situated *or* located] in this state and is subject to the jurisdiction of this court

[*OR*]

the relief demanded in this action consists _____ [wholly *or* in part] in excluding defendant from any interest in the _____ [*describe property*], which is _____ [situated *or* located] in this state and is subject to the jurisdiction of this court.

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS ORDERED that the summons be served by publication in _____ [*name*], a newspaper of general circulation published in _____, California, hereby designated as the newspaper most likely togive defendant actual notice of the action, and that the publication be made once a week for four successive weeks.

[*ADD, if defendant resides or is located out of state*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the summons be served by publication in _____[*name*], a newspaper of general circulation published in _____, _____ [*city, state*], hereby designated as the newspaper in that state most likely to give defendant actual notice of the action, and that the publication be made once a week for four successive weeks.

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of the summons, a copy of the complaint, and a copy of this order be forthwith mailed to defendant if his/her address is ascertained before expiration of the time herein prescribed for publication of summons.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[b] Use of Form

The form of order in [a], *above*, is for use when the court grants an order allowing service of summons by publication. Local courts often provide printed forms of orders for publication of summons, copies of which can be obtained from the clerk's office. If none is provided, the order may be drafted using this general form, stating the appropriate grounds for the order. An order for publication of summons is jurisdictional [*McKeon v. Superior Court of San Francisco (1927) 81 Cal. App. 720, 721-722, 254 P. 944]* .

[c] Contents of Court Order

When the required showing is made to the court's satisfaction, the court will order that the summons be published in the named newspaper, published in this state, that is most likely to give actual notice to the party to be served and will direct that a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint be forthwith mailed to the party if his or her address is ascertained before expiration of the time prescribed for publication of the summons. Except as otherwise provided by statute, the publication must be made as provided by *Gov. Code § 6064* (once a week for four successive weeks), unless the court in its discretion orders publication for a longer period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*].

If the party to be served resides or is located out of this state, the court may also order the summons to be published in a named newspaper outside this state that is most likely to give actual notice to that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*].

The attempts at personal service, search, execution of the affidavits, declarations, or certificates, and the court's order for publication mustfollow in reasonably quick succession so that they all relate to conditions existing at the time of publication [Li, Attorney's Guide to California Jurisdiction and Process (Cal. C.E.B. 1970), § 1.25].

[d] Accomplishing Service by Publication

Deliver the original and one copy of the summons, together with a copy of the court order for publication, to the newspaper in which the summons is to be published. In addition, mail a copy of the summons, of the complaint, and of the order for publication to the party to be served if his or her address is ascertained before expiration of the time prescribed for publication of summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(b)*; for a form of proof of this mailing, *see § 518.78*].

[e] When Service Is Complete

Service of summons by publication is deemed complete as provided in *Gov. Code § 6064* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(c)*]. *Gov. Code § 6064* provides that the period of notice commences with the 1st day of publication and terminates at the end of the 28th day, including the first day.

[f] Service in Another Manner

Notwithstanding an order for publication, a summons may be served in another manner authorized by the code, in which event such service supersedes any published summons [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50(d)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.75

§ 518.75 Proceedings to Serve Summons on Corporation by Delivery of Process to Secretary of State [Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d); Corp. Code §§ 1702(a) (Domestic Corporation), 2111(a) (Foreign Corporation)]

[1] Application for Order

[a] FORM Proceedings to Serve Summons on Corporation by Delivery of Process to Secretary of State [Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d); Corp. Code §§ 1702(a) (Domestic Corporation), 2111(a) (Foreign Corporation)]--Application for Order

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
a _____ [*state or country of incor-*	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER DIR-
poration] Corporation,	)	ECTING SERVICE OF SUMMONS ON DEFEND-
Defendant.	)	ANT CORPORATION BY DELIVERY OF PRO-
	)	CESS TO SECRETARY OF STATE

_____

Application is hereby made for an order directing that process in this action be served on defendant _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as "defendant," by personally delivering to the Secretary of State of California, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, _____ [one copy *or* two copies] of the summons and complaint, together with _____ [one copy *or* two copies] of the order herein requested. In support of this application, the undersigned states:

1. The complaint in this action, which is for _____ [*specify*], was filed on _____ [*date*], and summons was duly issued on _____ [*date*].

2. Defendant is/was a corporation organized and existing under the laws of _____ [*state or country*] [and authorized to do business in California (as a bank)], with its principal place of business in this state located at _____ [*address*]. [On or about _____ (*date*), defendant, as shown by the Certificate of the Secretary of State of California which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, _____ (forfeited its _____ (charter *or* right to do business in California) for _____ (*specify ground for forfeiture*) *or* was dissolved (by order of the _____ Court of _____, in a proceeding entitled _____, number _____. A certified copy of the court's judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof)].

[*EITHER*]

3. As shown by the Certificate of the Secretary of State of California, which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof, _____ [defendant has failed to designate an agent for service of process *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process, _____ (*name*), has resigned and has not been replaced *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process, _____ (*name*), is no longer authorized to act for the defendant].

[*OR*]

3. As shown by the Certificate of the Secretary of State of California, which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof, defendant has designated _____ [*name*], a _____ [natural person, whose designated _____ (business *or* residence) address is _____ (*specify*), *or* _____ (*name*), a corporation] as its agent for service of process. [*If agent is a corporation, add:* The corporate agent's certificate on file in the Secretary of State's office, a certified copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof, sets forth as the address(es) of its office(s) in this state where any corporation designating it as agent for service of process may be served. It designates the following named employees at (each) office to whom the corporate agent authorizes delivery of a copy of any such process: _____ (*specify*). The agent's certificate contains its consent that delivery of process to any such person at the office where the person is employed shall constitute delivery of any such copy to it, as such agent.]

[*CONTINUE*]

4. Plaintiff has been unable to effect service of process on defendant by delivery of a copy of the summons and complaint [to defendant's designated agent for service of process in any manner specified by *Section 415.10, 415.20, Subdivision (a)*, or *415.30, Subdivision (a), of the Code of Civil Procedure* or] to any of the [other] persons listed in Section _____ [416.10, Subdivisions (a) and (b), of the Code of Civil Procedure *or 416.20, Subdivision (a), of the Code of Civil Procedure or 2110 of the California Corporations Code*], although plaintiff has made diligent efforts to do so as follows: _____ [*specify efforts made and results within personal knowledge of person signing this application; if any such efforts or results are not within personal knowledge of such person, an affidavit or declaration of person having such knowledge should be executed, attached to this application, and incorporated in this application by reference*].

[5. The (name and title of the person to whom and) address to which the process is to be sent by the Secretary of State

is/are as follows: _____ (*specify*).]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[b] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use in securing a court order that service of summons on a domestic or foreign corporation be made by delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code §§ 1702(a), 2111(a)*].

[c] Application for Order

Application for the order is made by affidavit [*Corp. Code §§ 1702(a), 2111(a)*] or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. For the requirement that affidavits set forth probative facts to which the affiant is competent to testify, see *§ 518.74[1][h], [i]*. The application should be entitled "EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER DIRECTING SERVICE OF SUMMONS ON DEFENDANT CORPORATION BY DELIVERY OF PROCESS TO SECRETARY OF STATE" [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*]. Except for the title of the paper, the caption will conform to the caption on papers previously filed in the case.

[d] Procedure

Although practice may vary from court to court, the normal procedure appears to be for counsel to present the original of the application and of the order [*see* [2], *below*] to a judge at chambers for his or her signature [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 166(a)(1)*]. If the judge signs the order, the originals of the application and order will be filed and the copies conformed and returned to counsel. Counsel will then deliver the required copy or copies of the order and process, together with the required fee, to an assistant or deputy in the Secretary of State's office in person or have them personally so delivered.

The certificate of the Secretary of State, under his or her official se al, certifying to the receipt of process, the giving of notice thereof to the corporation, and the forwarding of the process is competent and prima facie evidence of the matters stated in it [*Corp. Code §§ 1702(c), 2111(c)*].

[e] Showing Required

[i] Domestic Corporation

Service on a domestic corporation by delivery of process to the Secretary of State is authorized by *Corp. Code § 1702(a)* [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d)*], which provides that if the agent for service of process has resigned and not been replaced, or if the agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the address designated for service, or if no agent hasbeen designated, and it is shown by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the court's satisfaction that process cannot be served with reasonable diligence on the designated agent as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10* (personal delivery), 415.20(a) (combination of substituted service and service by mail), or 415.30(a) (service by mail and acknowledgment of receipt), or on the corporation in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(a)-(c)* (service on agent or officer) or 416.20 (service on defunct corporation), the court may order that service be made on the corporation by hand delivery to the Secretary of State, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, of one copy of the process for each defendant to be served, together with a copy of the court order. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after the process is delivered to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 1702(a)*].

[ii] Foreign Corporation

Service on a foreign corporation by delivery of process to the Secretary of State is authorized by *Corp. Code § 2111(a)* [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d)*], which provides that if the agent designated for the service of process is a natural person and cannot be found with due diligence at the address stated in the designation or if the agent is a corporation and no person can with due diligence be found to whom the delivery authorized by *Corp. Code § 2110* (corporate officer or general manager, or, in case of bank, cashier or assistant cashier, or agent designated for service of process) can be found after diligent search and it is so shown by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) to the court's satisfaction, the court may order that service be made by personal delivery to the Secretary of State, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, of two copies of the process together with two copies of the court order. If, however, the corporation to be served has not filed the statement required by *Corp. Code § 2105* (to obtain certificate of qualification), only one copy of the process and order need be delivered, but the order must include an address to which the process shall be sent by the Secretary of State. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code § 2111(a)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 518.17[1] -[3]*.

[2] Order

[a] FORM Proceedings to Serve Summons on Corporation by Delivery of Process to Secretary of State [Code Civ. Proc. § 416.10(d); Corp. Code §§ 1702(a) (Domestic Corporation), 2111(a) (Foreign Corporation)]--Order

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
a _____ [*state or country of incor-*	)	ORDER DIRECTING SERVICE OF SUMMONS
poration] Corporation,	)	ON DEFENDANT CORPORATION BY DELIV-
Defendant.	)	ERY OF PROCESS TO SECRETARY OF STATE
	)	

_____

[*EITHER (domestic corporation)*]

On reading and filing the evidence consisting of plaintiff's application and _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] for this order [and the _____ (affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s) *or* certificate(s) *or combination of these*) of _____ (*name(s)*), attached to and incorporated by reference in the application,] and it satisfactorily appearing to me therefrom that defendant _____ [*name*] is a domestic corporation and that _____ [defendant has failed to designate an agent for service of process *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process, _____ (*name*), has resigned and has not been replaced *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process, _____ (*name*), cannot with reasonable diligence be found at _____ (*address*), which is the address designated for personal delivery of the process] and process against defendant corporation cannot be served with reasonable diligence on [defendant's designated agent for service of process in the manner provided in *Section 415.10, 415.20, Subdivision (a)*, or *415.30, Subdivision (a), of the Code of*

Civil Procedure or on] defendant in the manner provided in Section _____ [416.10, Subdivisions (a) and (b) *or* 416.10, Subdivisions (a) and (c) *or* 416.20, Subdivision (a)], of the Code of Civil Procedure,

[*OR (foreign corporation)*]

On reading and filing the evidence consisting of plaintiff's application and _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] for this order [and the _____ (affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s) *or* certificate(s) *or combination of these*) of _____ (*name(s)*), attached to and incorporated by reference in the application,] and it satisfactorily appearing to me therefrom that defendant _____ [*name*] is a foreign corporation and that _____ [defendant has failed to designate an agent for service of process *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process, _____ (*name*), is no longer authorized to act for the defendant *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process is a natural person, _____ (*name*), and cannot with due diligence be found at _____ (*address*), which is the address stated in the designation *or* defendant's designated agent for service of process is a corporation, _____ (*name*), and no person can be found with due diligence to whom the delivery authorized by *Section 2110 of the California Corporations Code* can be made for the purpose of delivery to such corporate agent,] and none of the officers or agents of the corporation specified in *Section 2110 of the California Corporations Code* can be found after diligent search,

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS ORDERED that service on defendant _____ [*name*] be made by personal delivery to the Secretary of State of California, or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state, of _____ [one copy *or* two copies] of the summons and complaint, together with _____ [one copy *or* two copies] of this order.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the (name and title of the person to whom, and the) address to which the process and order are to be sent by the Secretary of State _____ (is *or* are) as follows: _____ (*specify*).]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____Superior Court

[b] Use of Form

The order in [a], *above*, is for use in conjunction with the application in [1], *above*, to effect service on a domestic or foreign corporation by delivery of process to the Secretary of State [*see Corp. Code §§ 1702* (domestic corporation), 2111, 2114(a)-(c) (foreign corporation)]. An order for service on a domestic corporation in this manner may properly be issued by a court outside of California or by a federal court if the suit, action, or proceeding is filed in that court [*Corp. Code § 1702(d)*].

[c] Delivery to Secretary of State

[i] Domestic Corporation

To effect service by delivery of process to the Secretary of State under *Corp. Code § 1702, 2011(b)*, or *2011(c)*, hand deliver [*Corp. Code § 1702(a)*] one copy of the summons, together with one copy of the complaint and one copy of the court order authorizing the service, and therequired fee, to the Secretary of State or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state. Although not required by statute, an additional copy of each paper should be delivered to the Secretary of State for

his or her files. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code §§ 1702(a), 2011(b)*].

[ii] Foreign Corporation

To accomplish service on a foreign corporation by delivery of process to the Secretary of State under *Corp. Code § 2111(a), 2114(a), 2114(b),* or *2114(c),* personally deliver [*Corp. Code §§ 2111(a), 2114(a)-(c)*] to the Secretary of State or to an assistant or deputy secretary of state two copies of the summons, together with two copies of the complaint, two copies of the court order authorizing service, and the required fee.

Only one copy of each of these papers need be delivered if the defendant has not filed the statement required by *Corp. Code § 2105* (designation of agent and consent to service of process on agent or Secretary of State). Although not required by statute, an additional copy of each paper should be delivered to the Secretary of State for his or her files. Service in this manner is deemed complete on the 10th day after delivery of the process to the Secretary of State [*Corp. Code §§ 2111(a), 2114(a)-(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.76

§ 518.76 Return of Summons Unserved Because of Inability to Find Defendant--Declaration by One Other Than Law Enforcement

[1] FORM Return of Summons Unserved Because of Inability to Find Defendant--Declaration by One Other Than Law Enforcement

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	RETURN OF SUMMONS UNSERVED
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am _____ [not a registered California process server *or* exempt under *Section 22350(b) of the Business and Professions Code* from registration as a California process server *or* a process server duly registered in _____ County, California, registration number _____ *or* an _____ (employee *or* independent contractor) of _____ (*name*), who is a process server duly registered in _____ County, California, registration number _____].

I am, and at all times herein mentioned was, over the age of 18 and not a party to the above-entitled action. I received the attached summons on _____ [*date*], for service on the above-named defendant. I was instructed to serve the defendant as follows: _____ [*state*]. I made the following attempts to effect service with the following results: _____ [*describe, giving dates, times, and places*]. [In addition, I have made the following searches and inquiries to locate the defendant but have been unable to find him/her or to learn of his/her whereabouts: _____ (*describe, giving dates, times, and places*).] I have, therefore, been unable to serve the summons on the defendant.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a person other than a sheriff or marshal to return the summons unserved because of the inability to locatethe defendant [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 417.40* (requirements of proof of service by registered process server)]. For discussion of process servers, see *§ 518.15*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.77

[Reserved]

§ 518.77[Reserved]

143 of 152 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.78

§ 518.78 Declaration of Mailing of Copy of Summons, of Complaint, and of Order for Publication to Defendant Pursuant to Order for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)]

[1] FORM Declaration of Mailing of Copy of Summons, of Complaint, and of Order for Publication to Defendant Pursuant to Order for Publication of Summons [Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs. _____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF MAILING OF SUMMONS
Defendant.	)	AND COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO ORDER FOR
	)	PUBLICATION OF SUMMONS
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am, and at all times herein mentioned was, over the age of 18 and not a party to the above-entitled action. My _____ [residence *or* business] address is _____ [*specify*] and I am _____ [a resident of *or* employed in] _____ County, California [*county where mailing occurred*].

On _____ [*date*], I deposited a true and correct copy of the Complaint for _____ [*e.g.*

, damages] herein filed, a true and correct copy of the Summons, and a true and correct copy of the order for publication issued in this action in the United States mail in _____ [*city*], California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to the defendant as follows: _____ [*state full name and address of defendant as they appeared on the envelope*].

[At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the places of deposit and address.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use to prove mailing of copies of the following documents pursuant to a court order for service by publication [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.50, 417.10(b)*, discussed at *§§ 518.16[6], 518.20*]:

- The summons.
- The complaint.
- The order for publication to defendant.

The cited sections do not prescribe the contents of the affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]), other than that it must show "the time and place a copy of the summons and of the complaint were mailed to the party to be served" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 417.10(b)*]. Consequently, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*, relating to service of papers by mail [*see §§ 518.90 -518.93*], are usually followed.

For a form of proof of service by mail executed by a member of the California Bar, see *§ 518.92*.

[3] Proof of Service by Publication

Proof of service of a summons by publication is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10(b), 2010, 2011*, as discussed at *§ 518.20[3]*]. The proof of publication is normally prepared by the printer or publisher.

[4] Filing

Both the proof of publication provided by the publisher and the proof of mailing must be filed with the court. When following the provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*, relating to proof of service by mail, it is sufficient for the proof of service set forth the exact title of the document served and filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*]. Thus, the proof of mailing of a copy of the summons and a copy of the complaint, pursuant to the court's direction in its order for publication, carrying its own caption, may be filed without copies of the summons and complaint attached to it. The publisher's or printer's affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of publication, on the other hand, is required to be annexed to a copy of the document published [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2010*] which is then filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2011*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
A. Service of Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 518.79-518.89

[Reserved]

§§ 518.79[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Proof of Service of Papers Other Than Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.90

§ 518.90 Proof of Personal Service--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1011]--Judicial Council Form POS-020; Judicial Council Form POS-020(D); Judicial Council Form POS-020(P)

[1] FORM Proof of Personal Service--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1011]--Judicial Council Form POS-020; Judicial Council Form POS-020(D); Judicial Council Form POS-020(P)

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The Proof of Personal Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-020 reproduced at [1], *above*, is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for use when a person at least 18 years of age or older personally serves documents other than a summons and complaint. This form should not be used for proof of service of a summons and complaint; for that purpose, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010) [*see § 518.72*].

The Attachment to Proof of Personal Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-020(D) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the documents served when there is insufficient space to list the documents served on Judicial Council Form POS-020. The Attachment to Proof of Personal Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-020(P) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the persons served when there is insufficient space to list the persons served on Judicial Council Form POS-020.

These forms are optional and may be used by parties and must be accepted for filing by all courts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*].

Another set of optional Judicial Council forms that may be used in lieu of the above forms for personal service are Proof of Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-040, Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(D) and Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(P). This alternative set of proof of service forms are a catch-all set of forms that allow the person filing out the primary form to select from one of six forms of service: (1) personal service; (2) messenger service; (3) by mail; (4) by facsimile; (5) by overnight delivery; or (6) by e-mail/electronic service. If using this alternative set of forms for personal

service, select the appropriate boxes on Judicial Council Form POS-040 indicating personal service.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Cross References

For reproductions of the optional alternative set of proof of service forms that include personal service, Proof of Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-040, Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(D) and Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(P), see *§ 518.92*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Proof of Service of Papers Other Than Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.91

§ 518.91 Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013, 1013a]--Judicial Council Form POS-030; Judicial Council Form POS-030(D); Judicial Council Form POS-030(P)

[1] FORM Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013, 1013a]--Judicial Council Form POS-030; Judicial Council Form POS-030(D); Judicial Council Form POS-030(P)

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-030, reproduced at [1], *above*, is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for use when a person at least 18 years of age or older serves documents other than a summons and complaint by first-class mail. This form should not be used for proof of service of a summons and complaint; for that purpose, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010) (*see § 518.72*).

The Attachment to Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-030(D) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the documents served when there is insufficient space to list the documents served on Judicial Council Form POS-030. The Attachment to Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-030(P) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the persons served when there is insufficient space to list the persons served on Judicial Council Form POS-030.

These forms are optional and may be used by parties and must be accepted for filing by all courts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*].

Another set of optional Judicial Council forms that may be used in lieu of the above forms for proof of service by mail are Proof of Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-040, Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(D) and Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(P). This alternative set of proof of service forms are a catch-all set of forms that allow the person filing out the primary form to select from one of six forms of service: (1) personal service; (2) messenger service; (3) by mail; (4) by facsimile; (5) by overnight delivery; or (6) by e-mail/electronic service. If using this

alternative set of forms for service by mail, select the appropriate boxes on Judicial Council Form POS-040 indicating service by mail.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Attorney's Certificate

In lieu of above form, an attorney who is an active member of the State Bar may execute a certificate of proof of service by mail without the requirement of being made by affidavit or under declaration of penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)*; *see § 518.93*].

[4] Presumption of Receipt

There is a presumption that a correctly addressed and properly mailed letter is received in ordinary course of mail [*Evid. Code § 641*].

[5] Presumption of Invalidity

On motion of a party served, service that was made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(3)* (placing the envelope for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices rather than depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service) is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit form mailing contained in the affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(3)*].

[6] Cross References

For a certificate of proof of service of papers by mail by an active member of the state bar, see *§ 518.93*.

For reproductions of the optional alternative set of proof of service forms that include service by mail, Proof of Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-040, Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(D) and Attachment to Proof of Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(P), see *§ 518.92*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Proof of Service of Papers Other Than Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.92

§ 518.92 Proof of Service By Personal Service, Mail, Overnight Delivery, Messenger Service, Facsimile, or E-Mail/Electronic Transmission [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011, 1013, 1013a, 2015.5]--Judicial Council Form POS-040; Judicial Form POS-040(D); Judicial Council Form POS-040(P)

[1] FORM Proof of Service By Personal Service, Mail, Overnight Delivery, Messenger Service, Facsimile, or E-Mail/Electronic Transmission [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011, 1013, 1013a, 2015.5]--Judicial Council Form POS-040; Judicial Form POS-040(D); Judicial Council Form POS-040(P)

Click here to view image.

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The Proof of Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-040, reproduced at [1], *above*, is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for proof of service using one of six methods of service: (1) personal service; (2) messenger service; (3) by mail; (4) by facsimile; (5) by overnight delivery; or (6) by e-mail/electronic service. This form should not be used for proof of service of a summons and complaint; for that purpose, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010) (*see § 518.72*).

This form is a catch-all form in that it includes both the elements of personal service and service by mail that are already addressed in Proof of Personal Service, Judicial Council Form POS-020 and Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-030; and, it adds the elements required for the four other methods of service listed above. It would appear the better practice is to use the more specific forms for personal service and service by mail when using those methods, and to use this form when method of service is by messenger service, by facsimile, by overnight delivery, or by e-mail/electronic service.

The Attachment to Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(D) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the documents served when there is insufficient space to list the documents served on Judicial Council Form POS-040. The Attachment to Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil

(Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-040(P) is the form prescribed by the Judicial Council for listing the persons served when there is insufficient space to list the persons served on Judicial Council Form POS-040.

These forms are optional and may be used by parties and must be accepted for filing by all courts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Service by Express Mail, Overnight Delivery, or Facsimile Transmission

Papers served by express mail, overnight delivery, or facsimile transmission involve the same extension by two court days of any prescribed period within which to exercise any right or duty to any act as is provided for service by express mail or another form of overnight delivery [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e), (f); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.300 et seq.*].

[4] Service by E-Mail or Electronic Transmission

Code Civ. Proc. § 1005 is silent as to whether service by e-mail or electronic transmission extends by two court days any prescribed period within which to exercise any right or duty to any act; however, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* might be construed to extend the times provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* [*see § 518.48[3]*].

[5] Cross References

For reproductions of the optional alternative forms for personal service, Proof of Personal Service--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-020, Attachment to Proof of Personal Service--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-020(D) and Attachment to Proof of Personal Service--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-020(P), see *§ 518.90*.

For reproductions of the optional alternative forms for service by mail, Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil, Judicial Council Form POS-030, Attachment to Proof of Service by First-Class Mail--Civil (Documents Served), Judicial Council Form POS-030(D) and Attachment to Proof of Service First-Class Mail--Civil (Persons Served), Judicial Council Form POS-020(P), see *§ 518.91*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
B. Proof of Service of Papers Other Than Summons

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.93

§ 518.93 Proof of Service of Papers by Mail--Certificate by Active Member of State Bar [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

[1] FORM Proof of Service of Papers by Mail--Certificate by Active Member of State Bar [Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY
Defendant.	)	MAIL
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], certify:

I am, and at all times mentioned herein was, an active member of the State Bar of California and not a party to the above-entitled cause. My business address is _____ [*specify address*].

I served the _____ [*set forth exact title of document(s) served*] on _____ [*date*], by depositing _____ [a copy *or* _____ (*number*) copies] of _____ [the document *or* each of these papers] in the United States mail [at _____ (*location*)] in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, in a sealed envelope, with postage fully prepaid, addressed to _____ [*state full name and address of addressee as they appeared on the envelope*], who is/are the [attorney(s) of record for the] _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant *or* petitioner *or*

respondent *or other*] in the above-entitled cause. [At that time there was regular delivery of United States mail between the place of deposit and place of address.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use to prove service of one or more papers by an active member of the State Bar [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)*]. It should be noted that an attorney's certificate of service is not required to be made by affidavit or otherwise sworn to and, hence, is not executed "under penalty of perjury." That is, the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* do not apply to such a certificate, which is merely an unsworn statement of the service [*cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.3* (certificate of sheriff or marshal as having same force as affidavit)].

Nevertheless, a willfully false proof of service would constitute a violation of the attorney's oath to discharge the duties of an attorney to the best of his or her knowledge and ability [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6067*] and of the duty not to mislead the judge or any judicial officer by an artifice or false statement of fact or law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(d)*] and, hence, would subject the attorney to possible suspension or disbarment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103*].

[3] Contents

The certificate of service must set forth the exact title of the document served and filed in the cause. It must also show the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(2)*]:

- The name and business address of the person making the service.
- That he or she is an active member of the State Bar of California and is not a party to the cause.
- The date and place of deposit in the mail.
- The name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope.
- That the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage on it fully prepaid [*see also Evid. Code § 641* (presumption that correctly addressed and properly mailed letter is received in ordinary course of mail)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Optional Electronic Service Forms

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.94

§ 518.94 Consent to Electronic Service and Notice of Electronic Notification Address [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)]--Judicial Council Form EFS-005

[1] FORM

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, provides a means for a party to state its consent to electronic service and provide its electronic notification address to the court and other parties under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(a)*.

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form EFS-005, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Cross References

For a Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address form, see *§ 518.95*. For a Proof of Electronic Service, Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Documents Served), and Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Persons Served), see *§ 518.96*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Optional Electronic Service Forms

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.95

§ 518.95 Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address [Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(d)]--Judicial Council Form EFS-010

[1] FORM

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, provides a means for a party to give notice of a change in electronic notification address under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(d)*.

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form EFS-010, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Cross References

For a Consent to Electronic Service and Notice of Electronic Notification Address form, see *§ 518.94*. For a Proof of Electronic Service, Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Documents Served), and Attachment to Proof of Electronic Service (Persons Served), see *§ 518.96*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 518 SERVICE OF SUMMONS AND PAPERS
PART V. FORMS
C. Optional Electronic Service Forms

45-518 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 518.96

§ 518.96 Proof of Electronic Service [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)]--Judicial Council Form POS-050/EFS-050; Judicial Council Form POS-050 (D)/EFS-050(D); Judicial Council Form POS-050 (P)/EFS-050(P)

[1] FORM

Click here to view image.

Click here to view image.

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The forms in [1], *above*, provide a means for a person serving documents electronically to show proof of service. Form POS-050/EFS-050 is a one-page form that contains all the information and statements required on proofs of electronic service under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.260(f)*. Form POS-050(D)/EFS-050(D) provides a means for persons using the Proof of Electronic Service form to list additional documents served, and Form POS-050(P)/EFS-050(P) provides a means for persons using the Proof of Electronic Service form to identify additional parties served and indicate the dates and times of service.

These forms are illustrative reproductions of Cal. Judicial Council Forms adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Cross References

For a Consent to Electronic Service and Notice of Electronic Notification Address form, see *§ 518.94*. For a Notice of Change of Electronic Notification Address form, see *§ 518.95*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 45: Schools: Certification thru Service of Summons and Papers-Chs. 512-519
Chapter 519 [RESERVED]

45-519 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 519

[RESERVED]

Chapter 519[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 520.syn

§ 520.syn Synopsis to Chapter 520: SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE

§ 520.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 520.02 Cross References

§§ 520.03-520.09 [Reserved]

§ 520.10 Governing Law

§ 520.11 Settlement With Authority of Attorney

§ 520.12 Settlement Without Attorney

§ 520.13 Settlement Agreement as Contract

§ 520.14 Offer to Compromise Pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 998

[1] In General

[2] Joint Offers

[a] Definition

[b] Offers by or to Multiple Plaintiffs

[c] Offers by or to Multiple Defendants

[3] Acceptance of Offer

[4] Expiration of Offer

[5] Revocation or Rejection of Offer

[6] Effect of Defendant's Offer on Costs

[7] Effect of Offer on Cost of Expert Witness Services

[a] In General

[b] Recovery by Plaintiff

[8] Effect of Plaintiff's Offer on Prejudgment Interest in Personal Injury Action Under Civ. Code § 3291

[a] Recovery by Plaintiff

[b] Definition of Personal Injury Action

[c] Allocation of Award in Mixed Action

[d] Calculation of Amount of Prejudgment Interest

[e] Effect of Policy-Limit Offer by Insurer

[f] Application During Arbitration

[9] Determination of Whether More Favorable Judgment Was Obtained

[a] Post Offer Costs Excluded

[b] Joint Offers

[c] Structured Settlements

[10] Post Offer Debt Payments in Action on Debt

[11] Post-Offer Payments Not Under Contract

[12] Post-Offer Prejudgment Interest

[13] Determination if Offer Made in Good Faith

[a] Reasonableness of Offer

[b] Measuring Reasonableness of Defendant's Offer

[c] Measuring Reasonableness of Plaintiff's Offer

§ 520.15 Exceptions to Code Civ. Proc. § 998 and Civ. Code § 3291

[1] Eminent Domain Actions

[2] Inverse Condemnation

[3] Family Law Act

[4] Enforcement Actions

[5] Arbitration

[6] Relinquishment of Additional Claims

§ 520.16 Settlement With Less Than All Joint Codefendants

[1] In General

[2] Interaction With Proposition 51

[3] Sliding Scale Recovery Agreement

[a] Initial Requirements

[b] Definition

[c] Notice of Intent

§ 520.17 Communication of Settlement Offer to Client

§ 520.18 Notice to Court and Arbitrator of Settlement

§ 520.19 Mandatory Request for Dismissal

§ 520.20 Enforcement of Settlement Agreement

§ 520.21 Motion Under Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6

[1] Nature of Motion

[2] Determination That Settlement Is Binding

[3] Written Settlements

[4] Oral Settlements

[5] Judgment Enforcing Settlement

[6] Time for Motion

§ 520.22 Pleading Compromise and Settlement as Affirmative Defense

[1] In General

[2] Accord and Satisfaction

[3] Pleading Tender in Action to Recover Money

§ 520.23 Supplemental Pleading and Trial of Separate Issue

§ 520.24 Rescinding or Opposing Enforcement of Settlement Agreement

§ 520.25 Effect of Settlement Negotiations on Statutory Time Limitations

§ 520.26 Settlement on Appeal

§§ 520.27-520.39 [Reserved]

§ 520.40 Governing Statutes

§ 520.41 Definitions

[1] Release

[2] Releasor and Releasee

§ 520.42 Covenant Not to Sue Distinguished

§ 520.43 Interpretation of Release Agreements

§ 520.44 Effect of Release Agreement

[1] Cause of Action Extinguished

[2] Limitations on Effect of General Release

[a] Unknown Claims

[b] Release Given During Period of First Physical Confinement

[3] Exculpatory Release

[4] Release of Less Than All Joint Debtors, Tortfeasors, or Coobligors

§ 520.45 Requirements for Formation of Valid Release

[1] In General

[2] Mutual Assent

[3] Necessity of Writing

[4] Consideration

[5] Delivery

[6] Conditions Affecting Operation of Release

§ 520.46 Enforcement of Release Agreement

[1] Affirmative Defense

[2] Action for Specific Performance or Declaratory Relief

§ 520.47 Opposing Enforcement of Release Agreement

[1] Generally

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Controverting Defense of Release

[a] Pleading Requirements

[b] Separate Trial on Defense Before Trial on Underlying Claim

§ 520.48 Rescission of Voidable Release

[1] Availability

[2] Grounds for Rescission

[3] Notice and Restitution

§ 520.49 Nullifying Void Release

§ 520.50 Ratification of Release

§§ 520.51-520.69 [Reserved]

§ 520.70 California Torts

§ 520.71 California Legal Forms

§ 520.72 State Statutes

§ 520.73 Rules of Professional Conduct

§ 520.74 California Rules of Court

§ 520.75 Local Court Rules

[1] Alameda County

[2] Los Angeles County

[3] San Bernardino County

[4] San Diego County

§ 520.76 Decisions

[1] Generally

[2] Attorney's Fees

[3] Authority of Attorney

[4] Costs

[5] Dismissal of Codefendant

[6] Enforcement of Compromise or Settlement Agreements

[7] Offer to Compromise Pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 998

[8] Satisfaction of Compromise or Settlement Judgments

[9] Settlement With One or More of Several Tortfeasors

§ 520.77 Law Reviews

§ 520.78 Text References

§§ 520.79-520.89 [Reserved]

§ 520.90 California Legal Forms

§ 520.91 California Torts

§ 520.92 State Statutes

§ 520.93 Decisions

[1] Conditions Affecting Operation of Release

[2] Consideration for Release

[3] Definition of Release

[4] Effect of Release

[5] Requirements for Formation of Valid Release

[6] Enforcement of Release

[7] Interpretation of Release

[8] Joint Debtors, Tortfeasors, and Coobligors

[9] Ratification of Release

[10] Rescission of Voidable Release

[11] Review

[12] Summary Judgment

§ 520.94 Law Reviews

§ 520.95 Text References

§§ 520.96-520.109 [Reserved]

§ 520.110 Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise Before Commencement of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Signatures

[4] Time and Manner of Service

[5] Cross References

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

§ 520.110A Offer to Compromise and Acceptance Under Code Civ. Proc. § 998--Judicial Council Form CIV-090

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 520.111 Notice [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] of Acceptance of Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Requirement of Writing and Signature

[4] Timing of Acceptance

[5] Notice to Court

[6] Obtaining Judgment or Arbitration Award

[7] State Statutes

[8] California Rules of Court

[9] Cross References

§ 520.112 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Compromise of Claim Before Suit by Acceptance of Defendant's Promise

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

§ 520.113 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30]--Tender Before Commencement of Action of Full Amount Due Plaintiff and Deposit of That Amount in Court [Civ. Code § 1717; Code Civ. Proc. § 1025]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

§ 520.114 Notice of Settlement of Entire Case [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 225]--Judicial Council Form CM-200

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] California Rules of Court

§ 520.115 Notice of Motion to Enter Judgment Pursuant to Settlement [Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 520.116-520.129 [Reserved]

§ 520.130 General Release Agreement [Civ. Code §§ 1541, 1542]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Drafting Requirements

[a] In General

[b] Exclusion of Specified Claims

[c] Signature

[4] Waiver of Protection of Civ. Code § 1542

[5] California Legal Forms

[6] California Torts

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 520.131 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--General Release [Civ. Code § 1541]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternate Form of Pleading Release

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

§ 520.132 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Release of Joint Tortfeasor or Coobligor for Amount Sufficient to Satisfy Entire Claim [Code Civ. Proc. § 877]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Effect of Release of Less Than All Joint Tortfeasors or Coobligors

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART I. SCOPE

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.01

§ 520.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms for use in entering into and pleading a compromise and settlement agreement in an action. Included are forms for use in making an offer to compromise after commencement of an action [*§§ 520.110, 520.110A, 520.111*], forms for pleading a compromise or tender of money due as an affirmative defense [§§ 520.112, *520.113*], a form for notice of settlement that is required to be given to the court or arbitrator [*see § 520.114*], and a form for a motion to enter judgment pursuant to a settlement [*see § 520.115*].

This chapter also discusses the discharge of a preexisting legal obligation by release. It contains a form for a general release [*see § 520.130*], a form for an affirmative defense to a general release [*see § 520.131*], and a form for an affirmative defense to the release of one of several joint tortfeasors [*see § 520.132*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsEnforcementTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsOffersTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART I. SCOPE

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.02

§ 520.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For discussion and forms for use in settling a dispute by accord and satisfaction, see Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction*

For discussion and forms relating to accounts stated, see Ch. 8, *Accounts Stated and Open Accounts*

For discussion and forms relating to settlement agreements arising from mediation, see Ch. 31, *Mediation*

For discussion and forms relating to dismissal pursuant to settlement on appeal, or stipulated reversal of the trial court judgment pursuant to settlement on appeal, see Ch. 48, *Appeal: Abandonment, Dismissal, and Stipulated Reversal*

For discussion and form relating to required notice of settlement on appeal, see Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision*

For a discussion of the authority of an attorney to bind a client by an agreement, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.190* et seq.

For a discussion and forms relating to the settlement of insured motorist claims, see Ch. 88, *Automobiles: Automobile Insurance*

For discussion and forms relating to the cancellation of written instruments, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*

For discussion of settlements in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to novation and modification, as alternate methods of extinguishing a contractual obligation, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussions of the effect of tenders before commencement and offers to compromise on costs, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms of defense to contract actions based on mistake, fraud, or undue influence, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*

For a discussion and forms relating to final settlement offers in eminent domain proceedings, see *Ch. 247, Eminent Domain, § 247.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to contribution and indemnity among joint nontort obligors and multiple tortfeasors, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.30 et seq. and § 300.60* et seq.

For a discussion of the effect of settlement by a joint tortfeasor on the right to comparative indemnity, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.90* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to the effect of a release, dismissal, or covenant not to sue, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, on contribution and equitable indemnity among multiple tortfeasors, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

For a discussion and forms relating to the effect of settlements on the comparative indemnity rights of tortfeasors and the contribution rights of nontort obligors and discussion and forms regarding judicial determination of the good faith of a settlement pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.60* et seq.

For a discussion and forms for use in obtaining a judgment by stipulation, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

For a discussion of the effect of settlement on the disposition of jury fees deposited with the court, see Ch. 322, *Juries and Jury Selection*

For a discussion of the effect of settlement on a lis pendens filed in an action, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*

For discussion of releases from liability for future negligence, also known as exculpatory releases, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For a discussion of the requirements of *Civ. Code § 56.105* in the settlement of a medical malpractice action, see Ch. 415, *Physicians: Medical Malpractice*

For a discussion and forms relating to settlement conferences, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings*

For discussion and forms relating to settlement of an administrative adjudicatory proceeding under the Administrative Procedures Act, see Ch. 473C, *Prehearing Procedures in Agency Adjudications*

For discussion and forms relating to rescission and restitution, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

For discussion of the release of a security interest in all or part of the collateral covered by a filed financing statement, see Ch. 500, *Sales and Secured Transactions*

For discussion of the liability of a surety to a creditor who, without the assent of the surety, may have released the principal, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

For discussion and forms relating to the effect of a plaintiff's receipt of workers' compensation benefits on settlement, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation*

For discussion and forms relating to the compromise of claims for workers' compensation benefits and the release of the employers and their insurance carriers from liability, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsConsent DecreesCivil ProcedureAppealsStipulated ReversalsContracts LawPerformanceAccord & SatisfactionContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceObligationsSettlementsReal Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsProcedureTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesContributionTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesIndemnityTortsProcedureSettlemen
OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART I. SCOPE

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.03-520.09

[Reserved]

§§ 520.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.10

§ 520.10 Governing Law

Provisions governing compromise and settlement agreements are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 877, 877.5, 877.6,* and *998*. The tender of money due before commencement of an action is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1025*. Compromise and settlement agreements are also governed by the legal principles applicable to contracts in general [*see § 520.13*]. The notice required to be filed with the court and given to arbitrators or other court-connected ADR neutral involved in the case of a settlement is governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.11

§ 520.11 Settlement With Authority of Attorney

An attorney must be specifically authorized to settle and compromise a claim, and has no implied or ostensible authority to bind his or her client to a compromise settlement of pending litigation merely on the basis of his or her employment [*Navrides v. Zurich Ins. Co. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 698, 702 n.1, 97 Cal. Rptr. 309, 488 P.2d 637* ; *Bice v. Stevens (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 222, 231-232, 325 P.2d 244*]. However, a client is bound by an unauthorized settlement if the client accepts the benefits of the settlement or otherwise ratifies the settlement agreement [*Navrides v. Zurich Ins. Co. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 698, 704, 97 Cal. Rptr. 309, 488 P.2d 637* (action to enforce agreement constituted ratification); *Villa v. Cole (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1327, 1336-1337, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (accepting benefits of agreement constituted ratification); *City of Fresno v. Baboian (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 753, 758-760, 125 Cal. Rptr. 332*]. Further, a rebuttable presumption exists that an attorney has the authority to compromise the client's action that he or she is prosecuting [*Gagnon Co. Inc. v. Nevada Desert Inn (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 448, 460-461, 289 P.2d 466*]. For further discussion of the authority of an attorney, see Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActContracts & ConveyancesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsLegal EthicsClient RelationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.12

§ 520.12 Settlement Without Attorney

Litigants may enter into settlements without the concurrence of their attorneys of record. A contrary rule would countervail the public policy that favors settlement of litigation. If there are no elements of fraud, coercion, or overreaching and both parties freely and with full understanding of their rights to the advice of counsel wish to negotiate a settlement without the involvement of their attorneys, they may do so [*In re Marriage of Hasso (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1174, 1184-1185, 280 Cal. Rptr. 919*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationRight to Self-RepresentationCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.13

§ 520.13 Settlement Agreement as Contract

Compromise and settlement agreements are governed by the legal principles applicable to contracts in general [*Folsom v. Butte County Assn. of Governments (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668, 677, 186 Cal. Rptr. 589, 652 P.2d 437* ; *Vaillette v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1994) 18 Cal. App. 4th 680, 686, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 807* ; *In re Marriage of Hasso (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1174, 1180, 280 Cal. Rptr. 919* ; *Distefano v. Hall (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 380, 385, 69 Cal. Rptr. 691*]. The agreement must be supported by sufficient consideration [*Tooley v. Parker (1942) 51 Cal. App. 2d 542, 549-551, 125 P.2d 66* ; *see Gill v. Southern Pac. Co. (1916) 174 Cal. 84, 88, 161 P. 1153*]. However, if a claim is compromised in good faith, it is not essential that the claim be a valid or subsisting obligation [*California Viking Sprinkler Co. v. Pacific Indem. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 844, 854, 29 Cal. Rptr. 194*].

Settlement agreements are subject to any applicable statute of frauds [*Nicholson v. Barab (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1671, 1681-1683, 285 Cal. Rptr. 441* ; *but see Kohn v. Jaymar-Ruby, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1534-1535, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780* (refusing to apply statute of frauds to bar enforcement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*); *see § 520.21[1]*]. For further discussion of contractual enforcement of settlement agreements, see *§ 520.21*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.14

§ 520.14 Offer to Compromise Pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 998

[1] In General

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, any party may serve an offer in writing on any other party to the action to allow judgment to be taken or an award to be taken in accordance with the terms and conditions stated at that time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. A statutory offer of compromise need not contain any magic language, so long as it is clear the offer, which must be written, is made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* and, if accepted, will result in the entry of judgment or an alternative final disposition of the action legally equivalent to a judgment. In the absence of a specific alternative disposition stated in the written offer, a Section 998 offer that does no more than refer to the statute and proposes finally "to settle the case" against a particular defendant for a specified sum will, if accepted, result in a judgment being taken against the offeree by the court [*Berg v. Darden (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 721, 731-732, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829*].

The written offer must include a statement of the offer, containing the terms and conditions of the judgment or award, and a provision allowing the accepting party to indicate acceptance of the offer by signing a statement that the offer is accepted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. In addition, the offer must remain open for the statutorily designated period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(2)* ("prior to trial or ... within 30 days after it is made, whichever occurs first") [*Marina Glencoe, L.P. v. Neue Sentimental Film AG (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 874, 880, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 800*].

The Judicial Council has promulgated a standard form (Judicial Council Form CIV-090) for optional use by plaintiffs for offers to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. The form includes space for acceptance of the offer by the defendant. The Judicial Council form may be used only in civil actions involving a single plaintiff and a single defendant, and the offer and acceptance must involve a money judgment. The court will file the offer and acceptance only if it is accompanied by a judgment prepared for the court's signature and entry of judgment. For an illustration of Form CIV-090, *see § 520.110A*. For forms for judgment and entry of judgment, *see* Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

The offer must be served not less than 10 days before the commencement of trial or arbitration under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1281, 1295* (agreement to arbitrate and arbitration of medical services contract, respectively) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* apply to the 10-day notice requirement in *Code Civ. Proc. §*

998(b); thus, if the offer is served by mail, it must be served not less than 15 days before commencement of the trial or arbitration [*Lecuyer v. Sunset Trails Apartments (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 920, 925-927, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 169*]. Formal proof of service, or a certificate of mailing is one method by which the date of service may be established. However, formal proof of service is not required. It is sufficient proof of mailing offer served by mail bears a notation of the date and place of mailing [*Berg v. Darden (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 721, 733, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(b)*]. For purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*, a trial or arbitration is deemed to be actually commenced at the beginning of the opening statement of the plaintiff or counsel and, if there is no opening statement, at the time the oath or affirmation is administered to the first witness or with the introduction of any evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(3)*].

A party who makes an erroneous Section 998 offer may obtain relief pursuant to the discretionary relief provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*. Thus, for example, in typing up a Section 998 offer to compromise, an attorney's legal assistant typed the word "against" instead of the phrase "in favor of," and as a result, the document mistakenly offered to settle the matter for a judgment against the attorney's client. The party making the offer was entitled to relief after the opposing party accepted [*Zamora v. Clayborn Contr. Group, Inc. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 249, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187, 47 P.3d 1056*].

Judicial arbitration does not constitute a "trial" for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Nott v. Superior Court (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1106-1108, 251 Cal. Rptr. 842*].

If the offer is rejected, the costs allowed under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1031* and *1032* will be withheld or augmented as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(a)*]. Items of costs that are allowable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032* are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5* [*see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10* et seq.]. Note that both attorney's fees authorized by statute or bylaw and those recoverable under a contract are now considered to be costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(10)*]. Thus, if an offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is not accepted, it may affect the plaintiff's right to prejudgment interest and the apportionment of the costs of trial with the nonaccepting party recovering less or paying more costs, depending on the circumstances [*see Civ. Code § 3291*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(a), (c)-(e)*; *see also §§ 520.14[6], [7], [8], 520.110, 520.111*].

In interpreting a Section 998 offer, general contract principles apply when they neither conflict with nor defeat the statute's purpose of encouraging the settlement of lawsuits prior to trial [*T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273* ; *Elite Show Services, Inc. v. Staffpro, Inc. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 263, 268, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184*]. Under California law, a contract is enforceable if it is sufficiently definite that a court can ascertain the parties' obligations and determine whether those obligations have been performed or breached [*Elite Show Services, Inc. v. Staffpro, Inc. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 263, 268, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184* ; *Ersa Grae Corp. v. Fluor Corp. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 613, 623, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288*]. The issue of whether a settlement offer is sufficiently certain to be enforceable involves a question of law, which an appellate court reviews de novo [*Elite Show Services, Inc. v. Staffpro, Inc. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 263, 268, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184]* .

[2] Joint Offers

[a] Definition

A joint offer to compromise is one made either by a single party to multiple parties or by multiple parties to a single party. A joint offer to compromise served on any other party or on each of several other parties to an action must be unconditional [*Hutchins v. Waters (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 69, 72-74, 123 Cal. Rptr. 819* (defendant made offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* for aggregate sum with apportionment between plaintiffs but conditioned it on acceptance by both plaintiffs)].

[b] Offers by or to Multiple Plaintiffs

A joint offer to compromise made by a single defendant to multiple plaintiffs is a nullity if it fails to designate the amount offered to each plaintiff [*Randles v. Lowry (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 68, 74, 84 Cal. Rptr. 321* (discussing former *Code Civ. Proc. § 997*); *see Meissner v. Paulson (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 785, 791, 260 Cal. Rptr. 826* (as matter of law, only offer made to single plaintiff, without need for allocation or acceptance by other plaintiffs, qualifies as valid *Section 998* offer); *see also Burch v. Children's Hospital of Orange County Thrift Stores, Inc. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 537, 544, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 404* (single lump sum offer to multiple plaintiffs requiring them to agree to apportionment among themselves is not valid); *Palmer v. Schindler Elevator Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 154, 157, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339* (to be effective, offer to multiple parties must be explicitly apportioned among parties to whom offer is made so each offeree may accept or reject offer individually)].

Under the general rule, an offer made by multiple plaintiffs is null unless the amount demanded is apportioned among all plaintiffs so that it may be determined with regard to each plaintiff whether the amount awarded after trial was more favorable [*Hurlbut v. Sonora Community Hospital (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 388, 409-410, 254 Cal. Rptr. 840*]. However, a Section 998 offer made to a married couple asserting damage to a singular interest in community property does not have to be allocated between the husband and wife, and is not inherently conditional on acceptance by both [*Vick v. DaCorsi (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 206, 209-213, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 626*]. Further, one court refused to apply this rule mechanically under circumstances in which the sole plaintiff whose claim was tried was awarded damages in excess of the joint Section 998 offer [*Fortman v. Hemco, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 241, 262-263, 259 Cal. Rptr. 311* (joint offer of $1 million; verdict for sole plaintiff in excess of $23 million)].

There also appears to be a split of authority regarding the applicability of this rule to a wrongful death action. One court refused to find an unsegregated offer made by multiple heir-plaintiffs to be invalid because, in a wrongful death action, there is a single verdict to be compared to the single offer [*Stallman v. Bell (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 740, 745-747, 286 Cal. Rptr. 755*]. This court stated that the proper procedure is for the court to apportion, in a separate proceeding, the amount awarded in the verdict among the various plaintiffs [*see Canavin v. Pacific Southwest Airlines (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 512, 529-530, 196 Cal. Rptr. 82*]. Another court has found such an offer void under the view that a wrongful death action is not a joint cause of action, but merely involves compulsory joinder of the separate causes of each heir-plaintiff [*Gilman v. Beverly California Corp. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 121, 124-126, 283 Cal. Rptr. 17*]. Another court has stated that a wrongful death defendant can settle with either all or some heirs. According to this court, when the claims of all heirs are encompassed in a lump-sum settlement, the court has authority to apportion the settlement, and, if the settlement is with less than all known heirs, the defendant waives the right to face only a single wrongful death action and the non-settling heirs may continue to pursue the action against the defendant [*Smith v. Premier Alliance Ins. Co. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 691, 698, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 461*]. For further discussion of the nature of a wrongful death action, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

When an offer to multiple plaintiffs does not involve money, such as an offer to settle for waiver of costs, the court will imply that the offer is conditioned on acceptance by all plaintiffs so that the offer is void [*Menees v. Andrews (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1540, 1545-1546, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 664*].

[c] Offers by or to Multiple Defendants

Multiple defendants who are sued on a theory of joint and several liability may make a joint offer to compromise to a single plaintiff, with all defendants to be released on acceptance [*Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 114-116, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486* ; *Brown v. Nolan (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 445, 449-451, 159 Cal. Rptr. 469*]. However, the effect of Proposition 51's elimination of joint and several liability for noneconomic damages has yet to be addressed [*see Civ. Code § 1431.2(a)*, discussed in Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*]. It would seem that the amount of any joint and several judgment for economic damages would have to be added separately to each several-only judgment for noneconomic damages to determine whether the plaintiff obtained a more favorable judgment than the Section 998 offer [*see Civ. Code § 1431.2(a)*]. The sums would be compared to the offer

amount separately with regard to each defendant.

A plaintiff seeking damages against multiple defendants may make separate 998 offers to each defendant. In light of the principles of comparative indemnity and the effect of Proposition 51 on joint and several liability, the offer will not trigger the Section 998 penalties for nonacceptance unless it is sufficiently specific to determine the exact amount that the plaintiff is seeking from each defendant [*Taing v. Johnson Scaffolding Co. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 579, 586, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820*]. Thus, to be effective, an offer to multiple parties under *Section 998* must be explicitly apportioned among the parties to whom the offer is made so that each offeree may accept or reject the offer individually [*Burch v. Children's Hospital of Orange County Thrift Stores, Inc. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 537, 544, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 404* (in general, *Section 998* offer to multiple parties is valid only if it is expressly apportioned among them and not conditioned on acceptance by all of them); *Palmer v. Schindler Elevator Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 154, 157, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339* (offer to three defendants jointly and severally was defective)].

The plaintiff may also make a Section 998 offer to fewer than all of the defendants. The offer as to any particular defendant may take into account that defendant's liability for the conduct of other defendants through principles of vicarious liability [*see* *Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 658 n.9, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179* ; *Bihun v. AT&T Information Systems, Inc. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 976, 1000-1001, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 787* (both involving Section 998 offers made to employer based on conduct of both employer and employee for which employer was also liable under principle of respondeat superior); *see also § 520.16*].

[3] Acceptance of Offer

Any acceptance of an offer to compromise pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, whether made on the document containing the offer or on a separate document of acceptance, must be in writing and signed by counsel for the accepting party or, if not represented by counsel, by the accepting party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*].

If an offer to compromise pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is accepted, the offer, with proof of acceptance, must be filed, and the clerk or the judge must enter judgment accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(1)*]. In the case of an arbitration, the offer with proof of acceptance must be filed with the arbitrator or arbitrators who must promptly render an award accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(1)*]. A judgment or award so entered is deemed to be a compromise settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(f)*]. It operates as a bar to the reopening of the original controversy [*see* *County of Los Angeles v. Law Bldg. Corp. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 848, 853, 62 Cal. Rptr. 542* (compromise agreement resulting in dismissal); *Klinker v. Klinker (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 687, 695, 283 P.2d 83* (judgment by stipulation); *see* Ch. 491, *Res Judicata*]. Although evidence of the offer is inadmissible for proving liability for the claim that the offer is an attempt to compromise, evidence of the offer may be admissible to prove other issues such as the bad faith of the offeror [*see* *White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 888-889, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309*]. A qualified acceptance of the offer is considered a counteroffer [*Glende Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 389, 393-398, 205 Cal. Rptr. 682 , disapproved on other grounds*, *Poster v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 266, 270-272, 276 Cal. Rptr. 321, 801 P.2d 1072*].

Section 998 does not expressly require service of an acceptance. Under general contract principles, an acceptance of an offer must be communicated to the offeror to become effective, and consent is deemed to be fully communicated as soon as the party accepting a proposal has put his or her acceptance in the course of transmission to the proposer [*Civ. Code § 1582*; *see* *Drouin v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 486, 491, 209 Cal. Rptr. 623*]. Any mode of communicating acceptance is appropriate, unless a specific mode is prescribed in the offer itself [*Civ. Code § 1582*; *Hofer v. Young (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 52, 56-57, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*]. Contract law requires that the acceptance be communicated in a clear and unequivocal fashion [*Gray v. Stewart (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1397, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*]. Prior to the amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* effective January 1, 2006, requiring that acceptance of a Section 998 offer be in writing and signed, courts held that an undisputed oral acceptance of a Section 998 offer followed by written proof of acceptance was permitted unless the offer required another mode of acceptance. However,

a purported oral acceptance evidenced by written notice of acceptance that included an additional term not present in a Section 998 offer did not communicate an absolute and unequivocal acceptance of the offer as required by *Civil Code § 1585* [*Bias v. Wright (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 811, 817-821, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 137*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Acceptance by Fax Valid Even Though Fax Service Not Permitted by Local Rule. Plaintiff served a Section 998 offer on defendants by mail. Two days before the 35-day time limit, defendants faxed and mailed a letter accepting the offer. In sending the letter, however, defendants put the wrong zip code on the envelope, and the letter did not arrive within the time limit. Further, service by fax is not allowed in defendants' county. After receiving the faxed acceptance, plaintiff's counsel mailed and faxed a revocation of the offer stating that plaintiff rejected the faxed acceptance. Was the acceptance effective even though service by fax was not allowed under local rules of court? Yes. Section 998 does not require that an acceptance be served, therefore statutory restraints on fax service do not apply. According to general principles of contract law, the section 998 offer was deemed accepted on dispatch. Moreover, because the defendants communicated their acceptance within the required time period, it is irrelevant that the confirming letter was misdirected and arrived after the limit [*Hofer v. Young (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 52, 56-57, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 998 does not require service of the acceptance. Further, filing proof of acceptance after an attempted revocation of the offer does not affect the validity of an acceptance made before the offer is revoked, since that section does not dictate when proof of acceptance must be filed [*Gray v. Stewart (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1397-1398, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217]* .

[4] Expiration of Offer

If an offer to compromise is not accepted prior to trial or within 30 days after it is made, whichever occurs first, it must be deemed withdrawn and cannot be given in evidence in the trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(2)*]. For these purposes, a trial or arbitration is deemed to be actually commenced at the beginning of the opening statement of the plaintiff or counsel, and if there is no opening statement, at the time of the administering of the oath or affirmation to the first witness, or the introduction of any evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(3)*]. The 30-day period is extended five days by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* if the offer is served by mail [*Poster v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 266, 272-275, 276 Cal. Rptr. 321, 801 P.2d 1072*].

[5] Revocation or Rejection of Offer

Code Civ. Proc. § 998 is silent on a number of issues, including what constitutes acceptance, whether an offer may be revoked before it expires under the terms of the statute, and what effect a counteroffer has on the viability of the offer. Because the settlement and compromise process encompassed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is contractual, the courts have referred to general contract principles to interpret the gaps in the statutory language [*see One Star, Inc. v. Staar Surgical Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1089-1090, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195]* . However, contract law does not necessarily resolve all the gaps in the language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. Courts properly apply contract principles only to the extent that they do not conflict with the statute nor undermine its purpose of encouraging settlement [*Guzman v. Visalia Community Bank (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1375, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*]. On the one hand, for example, the Supreme Court determined that the policy reflected in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is best promoted by applying contract law so as to permit an offeror to make an express revocation of an offer before it expires under terms of the statute. Revocable settlement offers promote the public policy of compensating injured parties because newly discovered evidence may indicate greater culpability than originally thought, and the offeror will not be bound to an inadequate compromise [*T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273, 280-282, 204 Cal. Rptr. 143, 682 P.2d 338* ; *One Star, Inc. v. Staar Surgical Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1090-1091, 102 Cal Rptr. 3d 195* ; *see also Estate of Watts (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1160, 1162-1165, 208 Cal. Rptr. 846* (offer of defendant to compromise terminated by

plaintiff offeree's death under general contract principles)].

Similarly, courts have applied contract principles in holding that an unexpired but still unaccepted Section 998 offer is necessarily revoked by a subsequent, different offer [*Palmer v. Schindler Elevator Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 154, 157, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339* ; *Distefano v. Hall (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 380, 385, 69 Cal. Rptr. 691* ; *see T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273, 279, 204 Cal. Rptr. 143, 682 P.2d 338* (approving rule of *Distefano*)]. This is true even if the subsequent offer is defective [*Palmer v. Schindler Elevator Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 154, 157-159, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339*]. If a Section 998 offer is withdrawn by a party before its statutory expiration, the withdrawing party's right to cost shifting under Section 998 is determined by the last rejected Section 998 offer [*One Star, Inc. v. Staar Surgical Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1093-1094, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195]* .

In other respects, however, courts have rejected contract principles in favor of more "bright line" rules. For example, the Supreme Court held that an offeree's counteroffer does not terminate the original offer. The offeree may negotiate for other terms during the 30-day period, and still accept the original offer unless it is expressly revoked by the offeror [*Poster v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 266, 270-272, 276 Cal. Rptr. 321, 801 P.2d 1072*]. The Court, in so ruling, reasoned that applying the normal contract principle, that a counteroffer operates as a rejection of the offer, would not only be inconsistent with the purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* of encouraging settlements, but would also result in significant and undesirable uncertainty requiring constant resolution of the factual question of whether a particular communication constituted a counteroffer or merely an inquiry into the possibility of different terms [*Poster v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 266, 271-272, 276 Cal. Rptr. 321, 801 P.2d 1072*].

Citing this reasoning in *Poster*, one court of appeal rejected the application of normal contract principles with respect to what constitutes an offeree's rejection of a Section 998 offer, adopting instead another bright line rule. The court ruled that, absent an *unequivocal* rejection of a Section 998 offer, the offer remains effective and may be accepted until it has been revoked or has expired under the terms of the statute [*Guzman v. Visalia Community Bank (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1378, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*]. Thus, an offeree's communication that merely criticizes or disparages a Section 998 offer, without expressly rejecting it, does not operate as a rejection that terminates the offer, notwithstanding contrary contract principles [*Guzman v. Visalia Community Bank (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376-1378, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*].

Along these same lines, another court of appeal held that communications made during judicial arbitration, which do not constitute an express rejection or an express revocation of a Section 998 offer, do not terminate the offer, and if that offer has not yet expired under the statute it may still be accepted by the offeree following such arbitration [*Nott v. Superior Court (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1108-1109, 251 Cal. Rptr. 842*].

An offer unilaterally revoked before the expiration of the period specified by *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* forfeits its status as an offer under the remaining provisions of that section. Thus, for example, a Section 998 offer that is unilaterally revoked before the expiration of the statutory period does not trigger the cost shifting provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Marcey v. Romero (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1215-1217, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 402]* .

[6] Effect of Defendant's Offer on Costs

If an offer made by a defendant (or cross defendant) under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is not accepted and the plaintiff (or cross complainant) fails to obtain a more favorable judgment or award, the plaintiff does not recover his or her postoffer costs and must pay the defendant's costs from the time of the offer. In addition, in any action or proceeding other than an eminent domain action, the court or arbitrator, in its discretion, may require the plaintiff to pay a reasonable sum to cover costs of the service of expert witnesses, who are not regular employees of any party, actually incurred and reasonably necessary preparation of the defendant's case for trial or arbitration, or presentation of defendant's case during trial or arbitration, or both [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 998(f)* ("plaintiff" includes cross

complainant and "defendant" includes cross defendant)].

If an offer made by a defendant is not accepted and the plaintiff fails to obtain a more favorable judgment or award, the costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998,* from the time of the offer, are deducted from any damages awarded in favor of the plaintiff. If the costs awarded to the defendant exceed plaintiff's damages, the net amount is awarded to the defendant and judgment or award is entered accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(e)*; *see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10* et seq.].

[7] Effect of Offer on Cost of Expert Witness Services

[a] In General

Although expert witness fees not ordered by the court are generally not recoverable as costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(b)(1)*], *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(1)* expressly authorizes augmentation of recoverable costs to include expert witness fees as within the court's discretion when plaintiff rejects defendant's offer and then fails to obtain a more favorable judgment or award [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. Fremont General Corp. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1264-1265, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127*]. It is not against public policy to award defendant expert witness fees in an action for civil penalties, restitution or injunctive relief brought by the Attorney General pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500* [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. Fremont General Corp. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1265-1267, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127*]. However, this case was decided before the effective date of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(g)(2)* (January 1, 2002) which provides the 998 offers do not apply in enforcement actions brought in the name of the state of California by the attorney general, a district attorney, or a city attorney acting as a public prosecutor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(g)(2)*].

The costs for services of expert witnesses, whether recoverable by the plaintiff or defendant after a rejected 998 offer, may not exceed those specified in *Gov. Code § 68092.5* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(h)*; *see Evers v. Cornelson (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 310, 314-320, 209 Cal. Rptr. 497* (discussing scope of recoverable expenses for expert witnesses under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*)]. This reference means that any fees charged for trial time may not exceed the expert's normal rate [*Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 123, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486*]. Police officers are considered expert witnesses [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(f)*]. Fees are not assessed with regard to a witness who testifies both as a percipient witness and an expert [*Stiles v. Estate of Ryan (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1057, 1067, 219 Cal. Rptr. 647*].

The award and amount of expert witness costs to either plaintiff or defendant is within the discretion of the court and will be set aside only for abuse of discretion [*Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 121, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486* ; *Brake v. Beech Aircraft Corp. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 930, 940, 229 Cal. Rptr. 336*]. If there are multiple parties and expert costs are to be assessed against only one of them, it is within the court's discretion to award only a proportionate share [*see Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 124-125, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486*]. It has been noted, in dicta, that the court may consider a party's ability to pay in exercising its discretion with regard to expert costs [*see Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 125 n.7, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486*].

[b] Recovery by Plaintiff

If a defendant does not accept an offer made by the plaintiff and subsequently fails to obtain a more favorable judgment or award in any action or proceeding other than an eminent domain action, the court or arbitrator, in its discretion, may require the defendant to pay a reasonable sum to cover the costs of the services of expert witnesses (other than regular employees of any party) actually incurred and reasonably necessary in preparation of the plaintiff's case for trial or arbitration, or presentation of plaintiff's case during trial or arbitration, or both, in addition to the other allowable costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(d)*; *see Weisman v. Blue Shield of California (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 61, 68, 209 Cal. Rptr. 169*].

[8] Effect of Plaintiff's Offer on Prejudgment Interest in Personal Injury Action Under Civ. Code § 3291

[a] Recovery by Plaintiff

If a plaintiff makes a *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* offer that the defendant does not accept prior to trial or within 30 days, whichever occurs first, and then obtains a more favorable judgment, the plaintiff is entitled to prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291* in addition to costs. *Civ. Code § 3291* has a narrower application than *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. It applies only in actions brought to recover damages for personal injury, whether by negligence or by willful intent and whether the injury was fatal or otherwise [*Civ. Code § 3291*]. However, the *Civ. Code § 3291* is pre-empted in actions brought under the Federal Employers Liability Act [*Lund v. San Joaquin Valley Railroad (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 412, 71 P.3d 770*].

The purpose of awarding prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291* is to encourage settlements by creating a risk of increased cost to the defendant [*Gutierrez v. State Ranch Services (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 83, 88, 198 Cal. Rptr. 16* (rejecting retroactive application to offers made prior to January 1, 1983)]. There is no requirement that the complaint include a separate prayer for prejudgment interest [*Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 662 n.12, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179*]. The award is not considered to be in the nature of additional damages [*Mendez v. Kurten (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 481, 486, 215 Cal. Rptr. 924*].

The award is mandatory if the conditions of the statute are met, even if the defendant ultimately offers to settle for an amount that exceeds the judgment [*Morin v. ABA Recovery Service, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 200, 205-207, 240 Cal. Rptr. 509*]. The plaintiff bears the burden of proving entitlement to prejudgment interest [*Morin v. ABA Recovery Service, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 200, 207-212, 240 Cal. Rptr. 509* ; *see* *Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 657-662, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179*].

A judgment does not operate to terminate rights to prejudgment interest under Code of *Civ. § 998* and *Civ. Code § 3291*, when that judgment is later vacated and a new trial is held [*Saakyan v. Modern Auto, Inc. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 383, 389-392, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 674*].

[b] Definition of Personal Injury Action

Whether a claim is one for "personal injury" within the meaning of the statute depends on the nature of the action, not on the damages sought [*Holmes v. General Dynamics Corp. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1418, 1435-1437, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 172*]. The scope of the term is broader than "bodily injury," but does not encompass all actions sounding in tort. Actions that essentially involve invasion of a property right are not within the statute, even though damages for incidental emotional distress may be recoverable [*Gourley v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., (1991) 279 Cal. Rptr. 307, 806 P.2d 1342* .] It does encompass claims of emotional distress that are not merely incidental to an invasion of a property interest [*Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 657 n.8, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179* .] Under this distinction, prejudgment interest has been allowed, for example, on claims for defamation [*O'Hara v. Storer Communications, Inc. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1101, 1117-1119, 282 Cal. Rptr. 712*] and denied on claims for bad-faith insurance practices [*Gourley v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. (1991) 279 Cal. Rptr. 307, 806 P.2d 1342*] and wrongful termination in violation of public policy [*Holmes v. General Dynamics Corp. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1418, 1435-1437, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 172*]. The statute has been held to apply to actions brought on a strict products liability theory [*Fortman v. Hemco, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 241, 262, 259 Cal. Rptr. 311*].

[c] Allocation of Award in Mixed Action

If a judgment awards both personal injury and other damages, prejudgment interest may be awarded only on the personal injury portion. A plaintiff who seeks recovery both for personal injury and other injury bears the burden of

proving what portion of the judgment constitutes damages for personal injury [*Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 661, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179*]. Special jury findings should be requested in order to allocate the damages awarded among the various injuries [*Morin v. ABA Recovery Service, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 200, 211-212, 240 Cal. Rptr. 509*]. Interest is computed only on the part of the judgment that represents compensatory damages for personal injury; interest is not computed on any punitive damages that are awarded [*Lakin v. Watkins Associated Industries (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 644, 662-664, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 863 P.2d 179*].

[d] Calculation of Amount of Prejudgment Interest

Prejudgment interest is awarded at the legal rate of 10 percent per annum, calculated from the date of the plaintiff's first *Section 998* offer that is exceeded by the judgment [*Civ. Code § 3291*]. When there are two successive unaccepted Section 998 offers tendered by a successful plaintiff in personal injury litigation and that plaintiff subsequently recovers a judgment in excess of either offer, the prejudgment interest awarded pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3291* begins from the date of the first offer [*Ray v. Goodman (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 83, 87-92, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 659]* .

Interest accrues until the judgment is satisfied [*Civ. Code § 3291*]. The 10-percent interest rate of *Civ. Code § 3291* is not combined with the 10-percent interest rate of *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010(a)* (judgment bears 10-percent rate of interest from date judgment rendered) to give a combined interest rate of 20 percent, but instead is applied separately or conjunctively with *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010(a)* to permit recovery of no more than a 10-percent rate of interest for the covered time period [*Mendez v. Kurten (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 481, 487, 215 Cal. Rptr. 924* (applied separately or conjunctively so as not to offend *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*)].

[e] Effect of Policy-Limit Offer by Insurer

An insurer may, if authorized by appropriate policy language, terminate any obligation to pay prejudgment interest assessed against its insured under *Civ. Code § 3291* by making an offer to settle for the policy limits. There is no requirement that the insurer show a reasonable possibility that the policy-limits offer will be accepted [*State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Crane (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1127, 1134-1138, 266 Cal. Rptr. 422*].

[f] Application During Arbitration

In addition to proceedings in court, *Civ. Code § 3291* has been held to apply to offers made and judgments entered in cases resolved by judicial arbitration [*Wagy v. Brown (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-10, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 48* ; *Joyce v. Black (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 318, 322-323, 266 Cal. Rptr. 8*]. It has been held not to apply to cases resolved by contractual arbitration [*Woodard v. Southern Cal. Permanente Medical Group (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 656, 665-666, 217 Cal. Rptr. 514*]. By its terms, the statute does not apply to a public entity or to a public employee for an act or omission within the scope of employment [*Civ. Code § 3291*].

[9] Determination of Whether More Favorable Judgment Was Obtained

[a] Post Offer Costs Excluded

In determining whether the plaintiff obtains a more favorable judgment, the court or arbitrator must exclude the postoffer costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(2)(A)*].

The Legislature's intent in enacting *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(2)(A)* was to supersede the holding in *Encinitas Plaza Real v. Knight (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 996, 1001, 1003, 257 Cal. Rptr. 646* , that attorney's fees awarded to the prevailing party were not costs for purposes of Section 998 but were a part of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)(2)(B)*].

[b] Joint Offers

In the case of an offer made by or to multiple parties, whether a party has obtained a more favorable judgment may require that a joint offer be properly apportioned among the parties [*see Hurlbut v. Sonora Community Hospital (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 388, 409-410, 254 Cal. Rptr. 840*]. For further discussion of joint offers, see *§ 520.14[2]*.

[c] Structured Settlements

Offers that are completely or partially in the form of a structured settlement are neither expressly authorized nor prohibited by the statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 998*]. However, such an offer, if it is made, involves valuation problems. The offeror bears the burden of proving that the present value of the payments called for under the offer is less or more than the amount obtained at trial [*Hurlbut v. Sonora Community Hospital (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 388, 408-409, 254 Cal. Rptr. 840* ; *see Atkins v. Strayhorn (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1398-1399, 273 Cal. Rptr. 231*].

[10] Post Offer Debt Payments in Action on Debt

In a contract action on a debt, when the defendant makes a Section 998 offer that is not accepted, and then afterwards makes a voluntary payment on the debt that is the subject of the action, this payment to plaintiff must be included with any judgment awarded in plaintiff's favor, when determining whether or not the judgment is less favorable than the settlement offer for purposes of awarding post offer costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Mesa Forest Products, Inc. v. St. Paul Mercury Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 324, 334-335, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 398*]. For example, in *Mesa Forest Products*, defendant in a contract action on a debt made a settlement offer to plaintiff of $62,690. After the offer expired, the defendant made a voluntary and unilateral payment on the debt in the amount of $62,690. The jury, after having been appraised of defendant's $62,690 payment, awarded plaintiff damages of only $13,205. Defendant argued that it was entitled to post offer costs and fees because the offer exceeded this award. The trial court, however, compared the amount of the offer not just with the amount of the award, but with the amount of the sum of the award, plaintiff's pre-offer costs, and the defendant's payment, the last of which the jury had applied to offset the damages it awarded to plaintiff. As this total exceeded the unaccepted offer, the trial court ruled that plaintiff, rather than defendant, was entitled to recover post offer costs and fees. The court of appeal agreed, reasoning that to hold otherwise would lead to absurd results contrary to the purpose underlying *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Mesa Forest Products, Inc. v. St. Paul Mercury Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 324, 334-335, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 398*].

[11] Post-Offer Payments Not Under Contract

Post-offer payments by a non-prevailing party who made the Section 998 offer to the prevailing party can be properly included in the determination of whether the prevailing party obtained a more favorable recovery, even when the action is not on a contract. For example, a condominium owner was found to have obtained a recovery more favorable than the Section 998 offer made by the homeowner's association she sued for failure to properly maintain the common areas, resulting in damage to her unit. She sued for damages and declaratory relief. The association admitted its liability and agreed to perform its obligations. After making the Section 998 offer, which the owner refused, the association paid her sums of money for a variety of things. The trial court specifically added that sum to the jury's award to determine that the award was more favorable than the offer. The court of appeal agreed with the trial court's analysis and held that when a Section 998 offer includes a nonmonetary component, the offer must be evaluated in light of all the terms and conditions attached to it, not just the monetary component, in order to determine whether the plaintiff has received a more favorable judgment. When the reverse is true, i.e., the offer contains only a monetary offer but the relief recovered is both monetary and nonmonetary, the trial court must also consider the offer in light of the totality of the recovery [*Arias v. Katella Townhouse Homeowners Assn., Inc. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 847, 853-856, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 113*].

[12] Post-Offer Prejudgment Interest

Prejudgment interest accruing after an Section 998 offer has been made is excluded from the judgment when determining whether the plaintiff obtained a judgment more favorable than the defendant's offer under *Code Civ. Proc.*

§ 998 [*Bodell Construction Co. v. Trustees of the California State University (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1508, 1523-1527, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 450*].

[13] Determination if Offer Made in Good Faith

[a] Reasonableness of Offer

Offers made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* are subject to a good faith requirement [*Barba v. Perez (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 444, 450-451, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715* (court can determine good faith of offer made before answer is filed); *Elrod v. Oregon Cummins Diesel, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 692, 698, 241 Cal. Rptr. 108*]. Thus, if a party makes an unreasonable settlement offer that is rejected, even if the offeree fails to obtain a more favorable judgment, the offeror is barred from claiming costs from the offeree under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*see* *Elrod v. Oregon Cummins Diesel, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 692, 698-699, 241 Cal. Rptr. 108*].

The reasonableness of a settlement offer is evaluated in light of the circumstances existing at the time the offer is made and is a matter left to the discretion of the trial court [*Elrod v. Oregon Cummins Diesel, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699-700, 241 Cal. Rptr. 108*].

A judgment that is more favorable than the offer is prima facie evidence that the offer was reasonable. The burden is on the offeree to prove unreasonableness [*Santantonio v. Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 102, 117, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486*]

[b] Measuring Reasonableness of Defendant's Offer

Two objective tests must be satisfied to determine whether a defendant's offer is reasonable. The first test is premised on information that was known or reasonably should have been known by the defendant. The court evaluates whether, based on such information, the defendant's offer represents a reasonable prediction of the amount of money, if any, defendant would have to pay plaintiff following a trial. The second test is premised on information known, or that should have been known, by the plaintiff [*Elrod v. Oregon Cummins Diesel, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 692, 699, 241 Cal. Rptr. 108*].

[c] Measuring Reasonableness of Plaintiff's Offer

Although no California court has stated the test for determining the reasonableness of a plaintiff's settlement offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, it seems likely that courts will apply the two-part objective test used for defendants' offers. Thus, a court will determine whether the plaintiff objectively knew or should have known that his or her settlement offer was reasonable. Then, the court will determine whether or not the defendant knew or should have known the information on which the plaintiff's settlement offer was made.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentCounteroffersCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentMaking of OffersCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentRejectionsCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentWithdrawalsTortsProcedureSettlementsOffers

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.15

§ 520.15 Exceptions to Code Civ. Proc. § 998 and Civ. Code § 3291

[1] Eminent Domain Actions

The procedure for offers to compromise does not apply to an offer made by a plaintiff in an eminent domain proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(g)(1)*].

[2] Inverse Condemnation

Code of Civil Procedure section 998 does not authorize an award of costs against an inverse condemnation plaintiff that obtains a judgment less favorable than the public entity's settlement offer, in an action in which the plaintiff shows that the governmental entity had interfered with the plaintiff's use of its property [*Orpheum Bldg. Co. v. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 863, 878, 146 Cal. Rptr. 5*], because an award of costs against a party whose property was taken or damaged by a governmental entity would reduce the just compensation mandated by the California Constitution [*Goebel v. City of Santa Barbara (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 549, 559, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 901*]. However, when the court determines there was no taking or damage by the governmental entity, there is no constitutional bar to assessing costs against an unsuccessful inverse condemnation plaintiff, and no policy reason to excuse the plaintiff from the operation of section 998 [*Goebel v. City of Santa Barbara (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 549, 559-560, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 901*].

[3] Family Law Act

Code of Civil Procedure section 998 does not apply to proceedings under the Family Law Act [*In re Marriage of Green (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 14, 23-24, 261 Cal. Rptr. 294*].

[4] Enforcement Actions

Code Civ. Proc. § 998(g)(2) specifically excludes any enforcement action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General, a district attorney, or city attorney, acting as public prosecutor, from the provisions of section 998 [*Civ. Code § 998(g)(2)*]. However, before the January 1, 2002, effective date of this exception,

the court held that it is not against public policy to award defendant expert witness fees in an action for civil penalties, restitution or injunctive relief brought by the Attorney General pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500* [*People ex rel. Lockyer v. Fremont General Corp. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1265-1267, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127*].

[5] Arbitration

It has been held that *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* and *Civ. Code § 3291* do not apply to arbitration [*Woodard v. Southern Cal. Permanente Medical Group (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 656, 665-666, 217 Cal. Rptr. 514*]. However, this rule has been limited to judgments entered after contractual arbitration; the statutes have been held to apply to judgments entered after judicial arbitration proceedings [*Wagy v. Brown (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-10, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 48* ; *Joyce v. Black (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 318, 322-323, 266 Cal. Rptr. 8* ; *see also § 520.14[8]*. For discussion of arbitration fees and expenses, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* , Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration: Appointment of Arbitrator and Conduct of Proceeding* , and Ch. 34, *Contractual Arbitration: Judical Review* .

[6] Relinquishment of Additional Claims

Costs may not be shifted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* if the settlement offer requires relinquishment of claims in addition to those contained in the complaint that is the basis of the litigation being settled. For example, if a defendant in a personal injury case offers a plaintiff a particular amount on the condition that the plaintiff release the defendant, its attorneys, and its insurance carrier from liability for bad faith or any other causes of action related to the injury, the plaintiff rejects the offer, and the jury awards plaintiff less than the offered amount, the offer is ineffective to shift costs to the plaintiff [*Valentino v. Elliott Sav-On Gas, Inc. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 692, 701, 247 Cal. Rptr. 483*]. However, the requirement of a general release as part of the settlement does not defeat an award of costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Linthicum v. Butterfield (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 259, 271-272, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 538]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsOffers

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.16

§ 520.16 Settlement With Less Than All Joint Codefendants

[1] In General

If a settlement is entered into in good faith between the plaintiff and one or more, but less than all, tortfeasors claimed to be liable for the same tort or coobligors mutually subject to contribution rights, it has the following effects: (1) it does not discharge any other party from liability to the plaintiff unless its terms so provide [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*]; (2) it reduces the claims against other parties in the amount stipulated in the settlement or in the amount of consideration paid for it, whichever is the greater [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*]; and (3) it discharges the settling defendant from all liability for any "contribution" to any other party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(b)*; *see Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1333, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *American Motorcycle Assn. v. Superior Court (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 578, 604, 146 Cal. Rptr. 182, 578 P.2d 899* (extending meaning of term "contribution" to encompass judicially created doctrine of comparative or equitable indemnity)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877* does not apply to coobligors who have expressly agreed in writing to an apportionment of liability for losses or claims among themselves [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(c)*]. Nor does it apply to contract debts on contracts entered into before January 1, 1988 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(d)*].

As used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, the "claims" that are reduced as to the remaining tortfeasors, due to a settlement with another tortfeasor, ordinarily do not encompass costs awarded to the prevailing party after the issue of liability has been determined, unless the settlement so specified [*Reed v. Wilson (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 439, 441, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510*].

Some courts allow a nonsettling defendant to introduce a settlement into evidence, and then instruct the jury to reduce any verdict against the nonsettling defendant by the amount paid in settlement [*see Helling v. Lew (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 434, 440, 104 Cal. Rptr. 789*]. Other courts inform the jury of a settlement, but also instruct the jury that the jury's award of damages should be made without considering any amount that the plaintiff may have received in settlement and that after the jury has returned a verdict, the judge will make the proper deduction from the award of damages [*CACI No. 3926*; *see also BAJI No. 14.64*]. Still other courts take the view that the presentation of evidence concerning the amount or fact of settlement to the jury is confusing and can lead to abuse in argument [*Shepherd v. Walley (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 1079, 1083, 105 Cal. Rptr. 387*], and these courts reduce the verdict award by the amount paid in

settlement before entering judgment on the verdict [*Syverson v. Heitmann (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 106, 111, 214 Cal. Rptr. 581* ; *see also Brawley v. J.C. Interiors, Inc. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1133-1134, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*].

When each party sues the other for breach of contract, and each party is found by the jury to have breached the contract, the proper procedure for the court is to offset the jury's damages award findings against each other, just as the court would do if there had been no settlement, and to then apply the settlement credit to any net amount of damages for which the nonsettling defendant would have been liable if there had been no settlement [*Brawley v. J.C. Interiors, Inc. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1134, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*].

For further discussion of the effect of good faith settlements, including discussion of the standards and procedures for making the good faith determination, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.60* et seq.

[2] Interaction With Proposition 51

The effect of a settlement on the liabilities of nonsettling defendants and on indemnity and contribution rights are affected by the Fair Responsibility Act of 1986 (Proposition 51), which abolished the rule of joint and several liability for certain "noneconomic" damages [*see Civ. Code §§ 1431.1-1431.5*]. Proposition 51 is discussed in *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.60* et seq. Many of the issues surrounding the interaction of Proposition 51 and settlements are unresolved. For discussion of these issues, see N. Levy, M. Golden & L. Sacks, eds., California Torts, Ch. 74 (Matthew Bender).

[3] Sliding Scale Recovery Agreement

[a] Initial Requirements

When an agreement or covenant is made that provides for a sliding scale recovery agreement between one or more, but not all, alleged defendant tortfeasors and the plaintiff or plaintiffs, the following must be done:

> (1) The parties entering into any such agreement or covenant must promptly inform the court in which the action is pending of the existence of the agreement or covenant and its terms and provisions; and
>
> (2) If the action is tried before a jury and a defendant party to the agreement is called as a witness at trial, the court must, on motion of a party, disclose to the jury the existence and content of the agreement or covenant, unless the court finds that the disclosure will create substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing the issue, or of misleading the jury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(a)*].

The amended version of *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5*, enacted in 1987, which applies to actions based on acts or omissions occurring on or after January 1, 1988 [1987 Cal. Stats, ch. 1202, § 2], provides that the information disclosed to the jury must be no more than necessary to inform the jury of the possibility that the agreement may bias the testimony of the witness [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(a)(2)*].

[b] Definition

As used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(a)*, a "sliding scale recovery agreement" is an agreement or covenant between a plaintiff or plaintiffs and one or more, but not all, alleged tortfeasor defendants that limits the liability of the agreeing tortfeasor defendants to an amount that is dependent on the amount of recovery that the plaintiff is able to recover from the nonagreeing defendant or defendants. This includes, but is not limited to, agreements within the scope of *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, and an agreement in the form of a loan from the agreeing tortfeasor defendant or defendants to the plaintiff or plaintiffs that is repayable in whole or in part from the recovery against the nonagreeing tortfeasor defendant or defendants [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(b)*].

[c] Notice of Intent

In actions based on acts or omissions occurring on or after January 1, 1988, no sliding scale agreement is effective unless, at least 72 hours before entering into the agreement, a notice of intent to enter an agreement has been served on all nonsignatory alleged defendant tortfeasors [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(c)*]. On a showing of good cause, the court or a judge of the court may allow a shorter time. The failure to comply with these notice requirements does not constitute good cause to delay commencement of trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5(c)*].

For a discussion of the validity of sliding-scale agreements, or "Mary Carter" agreements as they are commonly referred to, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.60* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityMary Carter AgreementsTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsContributionGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesPartial Settlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.17

§ 520.17 Communication of Settlement Offer to Client

An attorney must communicate promptly to his or her client all amounts, terms, and conditions of any written offer of settlement made by or on behalf of an opposing party. The term "client" includes a person employing the attorney who possesses the authority to accept an offer of settlement or, in a class action, who is a representative of the class [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103.5(a)*; *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 3-510*]. Any oral offer of settlement made to a client in a civil matter should also be communicated to the client if it constitutes a significant development in the case [*see Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rules 3-500, 3-510*; *see also Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.270* et seq.].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsLegal EthicsClient RelationsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsOffers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.18

§ 520.18 Notice to Court and Arbitrator of Settlement

If an entire case is settled, each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must immediately file written notice of the settlement with the court and serve the notice on all parties and any arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral involved in the case. Each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must also immediately give oral notice to all of them if a hearing, conference, or trial is scheduled to take place within 10 days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)(1)*].

If the plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief does not notify an arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral involved in the case of a settlement at least two days before a scheduled hearing or session with that arbitrator or neutral, the court may order the party to compensate the arbitrator or other neutral for the scheduled hearing time. The amount of compensation ordered by the court must not exceed the maximum amount of compensation the arbitrator would be entitled to receive for service as an arbitrator under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.18(b)* or that the neutral would have been entitled to receive for service as a neutral at the scheduled hearing or session [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)(2)*].

The Judicial Council has adopted Form CM-200 for mandatory use as the Notice of Settlement. For an illustrative reproduction of the form, see *§ 520.114*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.19

§ 520.19 Mandatory Request for Dismissal

Unless a settlement is conditional or involves the compromise of the claim of a minor or person with a disability, each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must serve and file a request for dismissal of the entire case within 45 days after the date of settlement of the case. If the plaintiff or other party required to serve and file the request does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case 45 days after it receives notice of settlement unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(b)*].

If the settlement agreement conditions dismissal on the satisfactory completion of specified terms that are not to be performed within 45 days of the settlement, the notice of conditional settlement served and filed by each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must specify the date by which the dismissal is to be filed. If the plaintiff or other party required to serve and file a request for dismissal within 45 days after the dismissal date specified in the notice does not do so, the court must dismiss the entire case unless good cause is shown why the case should not be dismissed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(c)*].

If the settlement of the case involves the compromise of the claim of a minor or person with a disability, the court may not hold an order to show cause hearing before the court has held a hearing to approve the settlement, provided the parties have filed appropriate papers to seek court approval of the settlement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(d)*].

If a party who has served and filed a notice of settlement under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)* determines that the case cannot be dismissed within the prescribed 45 days, that party must serve and file a notice and a supporting declaration advising the court of that party's inability to dismiss the case within the prescribed time, showing good cause for its inability to do so, and proposing an alternative date for dismissal. The notice and a supporting declaration must be served and filed at least five court days before the time for requesting dismissal has elapsed. If good cause is shown, the court must continue the matter to allow additional time to complete the settlement. The court may take other actions that may be appropriate for the proper management and disposition of the case [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(e)*].

For discussion and forms relating to filing of a voluntary dismissal before trial, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsNoticesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.20

§ 520.20 Enforcement of Settlement Agreement

Settlement agreements are contracts and are governed by the legal principles applicable to contracts in general [*Nicholson v. Barab (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1671, 1681, 285 Cal. Rptr. 441*]. Thus, a settlement may be enforced as any other contract, including by way of an equitable action for specific performance [*Gopal v. Yoshikawa (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 128, 132, 195 Cal. Rptr. 36* ; *see also Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 403-406, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372* (provisions in settlement agreement requiring that party be reinstated to employment are not specifically enforceable)]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

Unless a writing is required by a statute of frauds, oral settlement agreements are enforceable in the same manner as oral agreements in general. If the party proves the oral settlement agreement by substantial evidence and the defendant proffers no valid defense, a court will enter judgment enforcing the oral agreement [*see Ryan v. Garcia (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1006, 1009, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 158*]. Settlement agreements are not exempt from the statutes of frauds if one would otherwise apply [*Nicholson v. Barab (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1671, 1681-1683, 285 Cal. Rptr. 441* (*Civ. Code § 1624* applies to settlement agreement for sale of real property); *see Texaco, Inc. v. Ponsoldt (9th Cir. 1991) 939 F.2d 794, 800-801* (considering divisibility of settlement agreement partially within statute of frauds); *Pietrobon v. Libarle (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 992, 998-999, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718* (statute of frauds did not render settlement agreement invalid, even though agreement by its terms was not to be performed within one year from making and defendant did not sign agreement, where defendant agreed to terms of settlement on record of settlement hearing and affirmed agreement and its terms in his testimony at trial of action to enforce agreement; *see also § 520.21*].

A variety of statutes of limitation apply to actions to enforce settlement agreements, depending on the facts. In one case, the four-year statute of limitations for a written contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337*] applied, even though the defendant had not signed the settlement agreement drafted by his attorney, because defendant had agreed to the specific terms in open court at the settlement proceeding. Further, at trial, defendant admitted that he had agreed to the settlement and reaffirmed that the terms to which he had agreed were those set forth in the written settlement agreement prepared by his attorney [*Pietrobon v. Libarle (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 992, 997-998, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718* ; *see also Amen v. Merced County Title Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 528, 25 Cal. Rptr. 65, 375 P.2d 33* (when party has agreed to writing, there is no reason to invoke two-year statute of limitations applicable to oral agreements; four-year statute of limitations,

unlike statute of frauds, does not require writing be signed by party to be charged)].

In addition to contractual remedies, some settlements may be enforced by a special motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, by which disputes of fact may be resolved [*see Skulnick v. Roberts Express, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 884, 889, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 597*]. For further discussion, see *§ 520.21*. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* does not apply when the underlying matter has been dismissed and the parties did not request that the court retain jurisdiction either in a writing signed by both parties themselves, or orally before the court at the time of the stipulated settlement as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* [*Pietrobon v. Libarle (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 992, 996, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718* ; *Wackeen v. Malis (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 429, 433, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 502]* . In that situation, the party seeking to enforce the agreement is left to pursue enforcement of the settlement agreement by means of a separate action. It is worthy of note, however, that matters such as statutes of limitation and the ability to bring an absent litigant back into court make enforcement of a settlement agreement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* preferable to a separate suit [*Pietrobon v. Libarle (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 992, 996* -997, *40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718* ; *Wackeen v. Malis (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 429, 441, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 502]* .

Settlement may also be enforced by a motion for summary judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*see Kilpatrick v. Beebe (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1527, 1529-1530, 269 Cal. Rptr. 52* (enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* did not preclude enforcement of oral, out-of-court settlement agreement by summary judgment motion)]. However, summary judgment is precluded if there are disputed facts [*see Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882-883, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. For further discussion of summary judgment, see Ch. 537, *Summary Judgment* .

Settlement may also be raised as an affirmative defense [*see Thompson v. Williams (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 566, 571, 259 Cal. Rptr. 518*]. For discussion, see *§§ 520.22* and *520.23*, and Ch. 26, *Answers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementBreach of Contract ActionsContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.21

§ 520.21 Motion Under Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6

[1] Nature of Motion

If parties to pending litigation stipulate, in a writing signed by the parties outside the presence of the court or orally before the court, for settlement of the case, or part thereof, the court may entertain a motion to enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, a party who agrees to a settlement in writing outside the presence of the court may enforce it against a party who agreed to the same settlement orally before the court [*1538 Cahuenga Partners, LLC v. Turmeko Properties, Inc. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 139, 143, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 552* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* does not require that party to be bound consent to settlement "on the record," only that party consent to it "orally before the court"); *Elyaoudayan v. Hoffman (2003) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1421, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 41*]. For a form for a motion to enter judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, *see § 520.115*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 provides a summary procedure by which the trial court can specifically enforce an agreement settling pending litigation without the need of a second lawsuit [*Timney v. Lin (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1121, 1125, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 387* ; *Kirby v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 840, 843, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223*]. For *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* to apply, however, there must be pending litigation; it will not apply to a settlement reached before a lawsuit is filed [*Kirby v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 840, 844-846, 93 Cal. Rptr.2d 223* ; *see also Housing Group v. United Nat. Ins. Co. (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (parties engaged in private dispute resolution may not stipulate to appointment of judicial referee or judge pro tempore to secure settlement enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* unless they seek reference in pending litigation)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* does not apply in an ordinary civil action after a judgment, unrelated to the alleged settlement and therefore containing no provision for continuing jurisdiction to enforce it, has been entered and has become final in the sense that the time for appeal has passed [*Walton v. Mueller (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 161, 171-172, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605]* .

If requested by the parties, the court may retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*]. The latter provision, added by amendment effective January 1, 1994, is a change from prior law, under which the court had no subject matter jurisdiction to entertain a

motion if the action had been dismissed pursuant to the agreement [*see Viejo Bancorp, Inc. v. Wood (1989) 217 Cal. App. 3d 200, 206-208, 265 Cal. Rptr. 620* ; *but see Basinger v. Rogers & Wells (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 16, 21-23, 269 Cal. Rptr. 332* (noting that court could set aside voluntary dismissal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* on ground of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, and then enforce settlement)]. When the parties do not request continuing jurisdiction, the court has no subject matter jurisdiction on motions *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* once the suit has been dismissed. The parties' request for retention of jurisdiction must satisfy the same formalities that courts and the Legislature have imposed generally on Section 664.6 motions and the settlement agreements they seek to enforce, and the motion must be made prior to the dismissal of the suit. The request must be made orally before the court or in a signed writing, and it must be made by the parties, not by their attorneys, spouses or other agents. If after the suit has been dismissed, a party cannot present a request for retention of jurisdiction that meets all of these requirements, enforcement of the agreement must be left to a separate lawsuit [*Wackeen v. Malis (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 429, 433, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 502*].

On its face, *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* appears to provide a vehicle by which parties who have settled their litigation may move by stipulation to have judgment entered according to the terms of the settlement. The statute does not particularly suggest an adversary proceeding. However, sometimes parties appear to have reached an oral agreement at a judicially supervised settlement conference, but then are unable to later reduce the agreement to writing, perhaps because one party is attempting to renege on the settlement. In such a case, a Section 664.6 motion is often brought not by parties who are stipulating to a judgment, but by a party who wants to enforce the settlement against a party who now claims that there had been no sufficient meeting of the minds [*see, e.g., Datatronic Systems Corp. v. Speron, Inc. (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 1168, 1174-1175, 222 Cal. Rptr. 658*]. This use of the statute has generated a number of appellate opinions and some significant disagreements over its interpretation.

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 cannot be used to enforce a settlement signed by a party's agent, rather than the party itself, when the agent had sole and exclusive authority to settle claims on the party's behalf. The summary, expedited enforcement procedure afforded by *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* is available only when a settlement satisfies the statutory requirements designed to ensure the parties have actually consented to the terms of the settlement. A writing not signed by one of the parties does not satisfy *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* [*Gauss v. GAF Corp. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1112, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (mass tort settlement silent as to extent of party's obligation could not be enforced under *§ 664.6*)].

Even though there is a strong public policy favoring settlement, *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* does not allow a court to endorse or enforce a provision in a settlement agreement or stipulation that is illegal, contrary to public policy, or unjust [*Timney v. Lin (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1121, 1127, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 387*]. In addition, a judgment omitting material terms of the parties' settlement fails to accurately reflect their agreement and therefore fails to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* [*Hines v. Lukes (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1185, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689*].

[2] Determination That Settlement Is Binding

A Section 664.6 motion may be heard even if there is a dispute of fact regarding the alleged settlement provided that there is a sufficient meeting of the minds between the parties for the settlement to be binding [*In re Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 905, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190* ; *see Malouf Bros. v. Dixon (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 280, 283-284, 281 Cal. Rptr. 235*] In determining whether the parties entered into a binding settlement, the trial court should consider the following:

- Whether the material terms of the settlement were explicitly defined;

- Whether the supervising judicial officer questioned the parties regarding their understanding of the terms; and

- Whether the parties expressly acknowledged their understanding of, and agreement to be bound by, those terms.

In making these determinations, the court may consider declarations of the parties and their counsel, any transcript of the stipulation orally presented and recorded by a certified reporter, and any additional oral testimony [*In re Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 911, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190*]. The judge who presided over the settlement conference may also preside over the Section 664.6 hearing and rely on his or her own recollection [*see Kohn v. Jaymar-Ruby, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1533, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780*]. The standard governing review of the trial court's determination is whether the court's ruling is supported by substantial evidence [*In re Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 911, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190* ; *Conservatorship of McElroy (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 536, 544, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 485* .

When enforcing a settlement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, the court may not supply material terms not agreed to by the parties. The power to enforce a settlement agreement extends only to those terms actually agreed upon by the parties [*Weddington Productions, Inc. v. Flick (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 793, 817-819, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265*]. In addition, a judgment omitting material terms of the parties' settlement fails to accurately reflect their agreement and therefore fails to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* [*Hines v. Lukes (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1185, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689*].

Leaving an unresolved term for future agreement is not invariably fatal, because a settlement may be enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* if the parties agree the remaining issue will be decided by arbitration [*Lindsay v. Lewandowski (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1618, 1623, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 846* ; *see Weddington Prods., Inc. v. Flick (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 793, 801, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265* (parties theoretically could confer wide-ranging arbitration authority on arbitrator, even to extent of allowing arbitrator to write licensing agreement for them)]. However, the parties' agreement on the future means of resolution must be clear [*see, e.g., Lindsay v. Lewandowski (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1618, 1622-1625, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 846* (stipulation for settlement was not enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, when court could not tell what parties meant when they provided for "binding mediation" of payment dispute)].

[3] Written Settlements

A written settlement agreement must be signed by the parties [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* ("if parties ... stipulate, in writing")]. The term "parties" in § 664.6 literally means the litigants personally and does not include the litigants' attorneys of record [*Levy v. Superior Court (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 578, 580, 586, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878, 896 P.2d 171* (resolving conflicting decisions in the courts of appeals, *compare Diaz v. May (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1268, 1273, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 409 with Nicholson v. Barab (1991) 285 Cal. Rptr. 441*); *Johnson v. Department of Corrections (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1700, 1708, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 740* (applying *Levy* retroactively)]. Thus, for either a written or an oral settlement agreement to be enforceable, it must have been personally agreed to or signed by the litigant; an agreement entered only by the litigant's attorney is insufficient [*see Cortez v. Kenneally (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 523, 528, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671*]. The written settlement agreement must be signed by both parties, not just the party to be charged, in order to be enforced [*Harris v. Rudin, Richman & Appel (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 299, 304-306, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 822*].

[4] Oral Settlements

An oral settlement must be made *before the court* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*]. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* does not require that the party to be bound consent to the settlement "on the record," only that the party consent to it "orally before the court" [*1538 Cahuenga Partners, LLC v. Turmeko Properties, Inc. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 139, 143, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 552*]. This requirement means that it must be at a judicially supervised proceeding [*Skulnick v. Roberts Express, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 884, 889, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 597*]. The Calfornia Supreme Court has held that binding arbitration held before a retired judge according to the stipulation of the parties is such a proceeding and is "before the court" [*In re Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 906-910, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190*]. However, a deposition is not before the court, and a settlement placed on the record at a deposition may not be entered as a

stipulated judgment under *§ 664.6* [*City of Fresno v. Maroot (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 755, 762, 234 Cal. Rptr. 353* ; *Datatronic Systems Corp. v. Speron, Inc. (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 1168, 1173-1174, 222 Cal. Rptr. 658* ; *see* In re *Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 906, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190*].

There is a conflict of authority as to whether failure to comply with an applicable statute of frauds bars enforcement of an oral settlement agreement. It has been held that a statute of frauds is not a bar to enforcement under *Code Civ. Proc. 664.6* because judicial involvement ensures that the purpose behind the statute is fulfilled [*Kohn v. Jaymar-Ruby, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1534-1535, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780* (involving alleged applicability of statute of frauds to confidentiality provision of agreement because it could not be performed in one year)]. However, another court has found that no policy considerations favor exempting judicially supervised settlement agreements from statutes of frauds and refused to enforce an oral settlement agreement that involved a transfer of real property [*Nicholson v. Barab (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1671, 1683, 285 Cal. Rptr. 441*].

Disagreements between the parties can arise if they are unable to later reduce an oral agreement to writing, perhaps because one party was attempting to renege on the settlement [*see* discussion in *§ 520.21[1], [2]*]. A 1993 amendment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* attempted to resolve such problems by requiring parties to place an oral agreement *on the record* [*see* Stats. 1993, ch. 768], but this language has been repealed [Stats. 1994, ch. 587 § 7]. The court may consider oral testimony to resolve a conflict between the parties [*see* *In re Marriage of Assemi (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 896, 911, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265, 872 P.2d 1190* ; *Casa de Valley View Owner's Assn. v. Stevenson (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1182, 1189, 213 Cal. Rptr. 790*].

A nod of the head does not equate with oral consent. Unambiguous assent, expressed orally, *i.e.*, "uttered by the mouth or in words," is required for a settlement to be enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* [*Conservatorship of McElroy (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 536, 550-551, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 485* , citing Webster's 3d New Int'l. Dict. (1993) p. 1585].

[5] Judgment Enforcing Settlement

Voluntary acceptance of any of the benefits of a settlement agreement precludes a party from subsequently appealing from the judgment enforcing the settlement [*Epstein v. DeDomenico (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1243, 1246-1248, 274 Cal. Rptr. 521*].

A judge hearing a Section 664.6 motion may receive evidence, determine disputed facts, and enter the terms of a settlement agreement as a judgment. In ruling on a motion to enforce settlement, the judge necessarily has the power to resolve factual disputes relating to the agreement. For example, the judge has the power to extend a deadline for performance of the settlement agreement terms in favor of a party who is not at fault and against a party who is at fault. However, nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* authorizes a judge to create the material terms of a settlement, as opposed to deciding what terms the parties themselves previously agreed upon [*Hines v. Lukes (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1185, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689* (judgment omitting material terms of settlement failed to accurately reflect parties' agreement and therefore failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*); *Osumi v. Sutton (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1359-1361, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 693]* .

For forms for use to bring a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* to enter judgment on a settlement agreement, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

[6] Time for Motion

The courts of appeal are split on whether a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* to enforce the settlement must be brought within five years after the action is filed, to avoid dismissal of the pending litigation for want of prosecution [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310-583.360* (dismissal for failure to bring matter to trial within five years after action

filed); *see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(b)*]. Some courts have held that dismissal is not required and that an enforcement motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* may be brought after five years [*Malouf Bros. v. Dixon (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 280, 284-285, 281 Cal. Rptr. 235* ; *Schiro v. Curci (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 840, 844-845, 269 Cal. Rptr. 639* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 583.340(c)*; *see also Brown & Bryant, Inc. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 247, 252-256, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144* (five-year period tolled during time when settlement was in effect even though condition precedent to dismissal never occurred); *Gorman v. Holte (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 984, 987-988, 211 Cal. Rptr. 34* (decided under prior law)].

However, another court has held to the contrary and required dismissal after five years despite the settlement agreement [*Varwig v. Leider (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 312, 315-316, 217 Cal. Rptr. 208* (decided under prior law)]. Under this view, if the pending litigation is dismissed pursuant to the five-year statutory limit, thus precluding a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, the parties nevertheless retain their right to otherwise seek enforcement of the settlement agreement, which remains a contract governed by the general principles of contract law [*Varwig v. Leider (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 312, 316, 217 Cal. Rptr. 208*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsIncorporation in JudgmentsCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsValidityContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.22

§ 520.22 Pleading Compromise and Settlement as Affirmative Defense

[1] In General

If a pleading sufficiently establishes a compromise and settlement of a controversy between parties, the compromise constitutes a valid defense to the action. A pleading sufficiently establishes a compromise if it alleges (1) a dispute in good faith over a legal claim, (2) offer and acceptance of the compromise, and (3) consideration [*Stub v. Belmont (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 208, 215-217, 124 P.2d 826* ; *see § 520.112*].

[2] Accord and Satisfaction

Accord and satisfaction may also be pleaded as an affirmative defense. There has been an accord and satisfaction of an unliquidated claim if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Potter v. Pacific Coast Lumber Co. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 592, 597, 234 P.2d 16* ; *Thompson v. Williams (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 566, 571, 259 Cal. Rptr. 518]* :

- There was a bona fide dispute between the parties;
- The debtor made it clear that acceptance of the amount tendered was subject to the condition that it was to be in full satisfaction of the creditor's claim;
- The creditor clearly understood, in accepting the amount tendered, that the debtor intended the remittance to constitute payment in full of the claim.

For a discussion and forms for use in settling a dispute by accord and satisfaction, see Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction*.

[3] Pleading Tender in Action to Recover Money

In an action for the recovery of money only, the defendant may, as an affirmative defense, allege in the answer that before commencement of the action defendant had tendered to the plaintiff the full amount to which the plaintiff was entitled, and then deposit in court, for plaintiff, the amount so tendered. If the allegation is found to be true, the plaintiff

cannot recover costs, but must pay costs to the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1025*; *see § 520.113*]. The defendant may make a similar allegation in any action on a contract that specifically provides for an award of attorney's fees and costs incurred in enforcing the contract to one of the parties or to the prevailing party. If the allegation is found to be true, the defendant is deemed to be the prevailing party within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1717*, whether or not he or she is the party specified in the contract, and is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees in addition to other costs [*see Civ. Code § 1717(a), (b)(2)*]. When the deposit has been made pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1717*, the court, on the application of any party to the action, must order the deposit to be invested in an insured, interest-bearing account. Interest on the amount is required to be allocated to the parties in the same proportion as the original funds are allocated [*Civ. Code § 1717(b)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceAccord & SatisfactionContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.23

§ 520.23 Supplemental Pleading and Trial of Separate Issue

If a compromise and settlement agreement has been entered into after the filing of a complaint or answer in an action, the plaintiff or defendant, respectively, may be allowed, on motion, to make a supplemental complaint or answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 464*; *see also* Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings*]. If the issue of settlement has been properly pleaded, the issue may be separately determined pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 597* in advance of any trial on the merits [*Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 881, 883, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229* ; for discussion and forms relating to *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*, *see* Ch. 551, *Trial*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsSupplemental PleadingsCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.24

§ 520.24 Rescinding or Opposing Enforcement of Settlement Agreement

A compromise and settlement agreement is subject to the general contract principles of rescission [*see Larsen v. Johannes (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 491, 503, 86 Cal. Rptr. 744* (mutual mistake as to legal effect of agreement); *Cilibrasi v. Reiter (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 397, 400, 229 P.2d 394* (fraud or overreaching); for discussion and forms relating to rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*]. However, a party must make an effort to rescind the agreement, including by offering to return any money received in consideration of the settlement [*see Myerchin v. Family Benefits, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1526, 1533-1537, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 816*]. For a general discussion of contract defenses that may be raised in opposition to the enforcement of a settlement agreement, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

An appropriate way to challenge a judgment entered pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is by a motion for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*Premium Commercial Services Corp. v. National Bank of California (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1493, 1496, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 65*]. However, the judgment may not be vacated based on mistake or evidence of no intent, such as when a party forgets to include a cost provision in an offer to compromise [*Premium Commercial Services Corp. v. National Bank of California (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1493, 1497, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 65*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsCourt OrdersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsRescissionContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.25

§ 520.25 Effect of Settlement Negotiations on Statutory Time Limitations

Settlement negotiations may in some instances serve to estop a party from asserting the statute of limitations for filing a complaint [*see Muraoka v. Budget Rent-A-Car, Inc. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 107, 116-118, 206 Cal. Rptr. 476*]. If negotiations continue after the complaint is filed, it has been held that they do not excuse the failure to effect service of summons within three years, as is required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210* [*Lesko v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 476, 485-487, 179 Cal. Rptr. 595*].

It has been held that the mandatory five-year period within which to bring the case to trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.310* is tolled for the period during which a written settlement agreement is in effect, even if the case is never dismissed under the settlement because of the failure of a condition precedent [*Brown & Bryant, Inc. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 247, 252-256, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144*]. However, negotiations that fall short of producing an actual settlement agreement may not have the same tolling effect.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEffectsContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement AgreementsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsEquitable EstoppelGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTolling

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.26

§ 520.26 Settlement on Appeal

If the parties to an appeal reach settlement, they must provide immediate written notice to the appellate court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.244(a)(1)*; *see Huschke v. Slater (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1160, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 187* (appellant, not respondent, has duty to file notice of settlement)]. For further discussion and a form for this notice, see *Ch. 45, Appeal: Motion Procedure, § 45.26*, and Ch. 51, *Appeal: Hearing and Decision*, §§ 51.12[1][d], 51.50. For discussion and forms relating to dismissal of an appeal pursuant to settlement, or stipulated reversal of the trial court judgment pursuant to settlement on appeal, see Ch. 48, *Appeal: Abandonment, Dismissal, and Stipulated Reversal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStipulated ReversalsContracts LawTypes of ContractsSettlement Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.27-520.39

[Reserved]

§§ 520.27[Reserved]

23 of 175 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.40

§ 520.40 Governing Statutes

The requirements, effect, and coverage of a release are set forth in *Civ. Code §§ 1541-1543* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.41

§ 520.41 Definitions

[1] Release

A release is the abandonment, relinquishment, or surrender of a known right or claim, by the person in whom it exists or to whom it accrues, to the person against whom it might have been demanded or enforced, operating to extinguish a cause of action [*Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783* ; *Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229* ; *see Civ. Code § 1541*].

[2] Releasor and Releasee

Under *Civ. Code §§ 1541-1543*, a "creditor" surrenders a claim by giving a release to the "debtor" [*see Civ. Code § 1541*]. Because a release may surrender a claim other than one based on a debt, this part uses a broader terminology: "releasor" designates the person who surrenders a claim, whereas "releasee" designates the person against whom that claim might have been enforced.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityInterpretation of ReleasesContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesConstruction & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.42

§ 520.42 Covenant Not to Sue Distinguished

A covenant not to sue, as distinguished from a release, is not a present abandonment or relinquishment of a right or claim, but merely an agreement not to enforce an existing cause of action. Therefore, it does not have the effect of extinguishing a cause of action [*Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783*].

The difference between a release and a covenant not to sue is essentially that the former extinguishes the underlying claim, while the latter is an agreement not to prosecute a suit on the underlying claim [*see Civ. Code § 1541*; *Mesler v. Bragg Management Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 290, 298, 216 Cal. Rptr. 443, 702 P.2d 601*]. Practically, as between the parties to the agreement, there is no real distinction between a release and a covenant not to sue. The final result in either case is the same, that is, there is no further recovery from the settling defendant [*see Mesler v. Bragg Management Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 290, 298, 216 Cal. Rptr. 443, 702 P.2d 601* (citing *Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783*)].

The distinction between the two agreements was originally significant with respect to joint obligors who were not included in the release agreement. Under common law, a release of one joint obligor or tortfeasor was a release of all [*see, e.g., Prince v. Lynch (1869) 38 Cal. 528, 531*]. Covenants not to sue were developed to avoid this strict rule [*see Mesler v. Bragg Management Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 290, 297-298, 216 Cal. Rptr. 443, 702 P.2d 601* ; *Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783*]. This historical difference was effectively eliminated, however, by the abrogation of the strict common law rule under *Civ. Code § 1543* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 877* [*see Mesler v. Bragg Management Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 290, 298, 216 Cal. Rptr. 443, 702 P.2d 601* ; *Lippert v. Bailey (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 376, 381, 50 Cal. Rptr. 478*]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 1543* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, see *§ 520.44[4]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityCovenants Not to Sue

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.43

§ 520.43 Interpretation of Release Agreements

The policy of the law is to encourage out of court settlements. To further this policy, the parties to a dispute should be encouraged to negotiate settlements and to enter into releases. In the absence of unfair conduct on the part of the releasee, the law should extend its protection to the stability of the transaction by holding the parties to the express terms of the release [*Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 111, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*].

A release is a species of contract [*River Garden Farms, Inc. v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 986, 1000, 103 Cal. Rptr. 498*]. Therefore, the general rules governing the interpretation and construction of contracts apply to releases [*see Jersey Island Dredging Co. v. Whitney (1906) 149 Cal. 269, 272-273, 86 P. 691* (construing release at bar under principles governing construction of contracts); *see also Civ. Code §§ 1635-1662* (rules governing interpretation of contracts)].

In ascertaining the legal effect of a release, one must look to the instrument itself to determine the intent of the parties [*Hofland v. Gustafson (1955) 282 P.2d 1039*]. Therefore, the intention that the instrument work as a release must be evidenced by the instrument [*Golden West Credit etc. Co. v. Wilson (1932) 119 Cal. App. 627, 637, 7 P.2d 345*]. If a release is ambiguous, in that it refers to another document or transaction, the court must construe the release together with all referenced documents or transactions to determine the intention of the parties [*Consumers Holding Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 234, 241, 22 Cal. Rptr. 106*]. Extrinsic evidence of the parties' intentions may be admitted to show that the language of the release is reasonably susceptible to another interpretation and therefore ambiguous [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1856*; *Pacific Gas & E. Co. v. G.W. Thomas Drayage etc. Co. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 33, 37, 69 Cal. Rptr. 561, 442 P.2d 641* (the test of admissibility of extrinsic evidence to explain the meaning of a written instrument is not whether it appears to the court to be plain and unambiguous on its face, but whether the offered evidence is relevant to prove a meaning to which the language of the instrument is reasonably susceptible)]. However, if there is no ambiguity in the express language of the release, extrinsic evidence is not admissible to prove a contrary intention of a party that was undisclosed during negotiations [*Edwards v. Comstock Insurance Co. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1164, 1167-1169, 252 Cal. Rptr. 807* (in uninsured motorist case in which insureds executed "release of all claims" with their insurer, parol evidence of undisclosed intention to retain right to bring bad faith action is inadmissible); *see also Lama v. Comcast Cablevision (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 59, 64, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 224* (plaintiff

released the defendant and "any other person, corporation, association or partnership" responsible for injuries arising from a car accident, and dismissed the action with prejudice; the court held that plaintiff's subsequent action against the defendant's employer alleging respondeat superior liability was barred because the release applied to the employer and the dismissal with prejudice was a common law retraxit that served as a judgment on the merits as to the defendant and the employer); *General Motors Corp. v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 435, 441* , *15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 622* (in an action arising out of an automobile accident, the plain language of a general form release that released the owner of the vehicle that struck plaintiff's car and "all other persons, firms and corporations" also released General Motors from liability although it was not specifically named in the release; plaintiff presented no competent evidence to show that another meaning was intended by the parties)].

As with other contracts, releases are construed against those who draft them, and ambiguities in releases are construed against those who cause them to exist [*see* *Estate of O'Donnell (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 514, 519, 145 Cal. Rptr. 617*].

If a party insists on a strict interpretation of one part of a release, that party cannot complain if the entire release is literally construed [*see* *Bradbury v. Thomas (1933) 135 Cal. App. 435, 443, 27 P.2d 402*].

For discussion of the rules for interpreting contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityInterpretation of ReleasesContracts LawContract InterpretationAmbiguities & Contra ProferentemGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesConstruction & Interpretation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.44

§ 520.44 Effect of Release Agreement

[1] Cause of Action Extinguished

Absent fraud, deception, misrepresentation, duress or undue influence, a valid release, given by the releasor to the releasee, extinguishes the cause of action that is the subject of the release [*Skrbina v. Fleming Companies (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1366, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 481* ; *see Civ. Code § 1541*; *Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. A valid release conclusively estops the parties from reviving and relitigating the claim released [*Faye v. Feldman (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 319, 328, 275 P.2d 121* (when person capable of reading and understanding release signs it, he or she is bound by its provisions and estopped from claiming they are contrary to his or her intentions or understanding)]. However, assent is necessary for the release to be binding; if it can be established that a party did not in reality assent to it, i.e., due to fraud or duress, the party is not estopped from claiming the release is not binding for want of assent [*Skrbina v. Fleming Companies (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1366-1367, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 481*].

A release of one or more of a number of joint obligors does not extinguish the cause of action against the remaining joint obligors [*see Civ. Code § 1543*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*; for further discussion, *§ 520.44[4]*].

[2] Limitations on Effect of General Release

[a] Unknown Claims

A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release when those claims, if known by the creditor, would have materially affected the settlement with the debtor [*Civ. Code § 1542*]. The purpose of *Civ. Code § 1542* is to prevent the inadvertent barring of later-discovered claims by a boilerplate recital in the release [*Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 109, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*]. It is not intended to prevent a releasor who understands the significance of the act from knowingly releasing all unknown claims [*Carmichael v. Industrial Acc. Com. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 311, 314-315, 44 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *see Perez v. Uline, Inc. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 953, 958-959, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872* (release of all claims arising from employment not required to contain waiver of *Civ. Code § 1542* because plaintiff understood he

was releasing claims arising under all statutes agreement referred to, even those he did not understand); *Winet v. Price (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1159, 1166-1173, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 554*].

Whether a specific later-discovered claim was intended to be covered by a broad release can be a disputable issue of fact if the language of the release is reasonably susceptible to either interpretation [*Vega v. Western Employers Ins. Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 922, 926-927, 216 Cal. Rptr. 592 , overruled in part on other grounds, Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 310, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* ; *see Winet v. Price (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1159, 1167, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 554*]. However, if the express language of the release unambiguously encompasses all unknown claims, the uncommunicated subjective intent of the releasor that unknown or unsuspected claims were not to be released does not raise a triable issue of fact [*Winet v. Price (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1159, 1167, 1170-1171 n.7, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 554*].

In determining whether there is substantial evidence that a release of unknown claims was knowingly made, courts have considered the following [*Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 113, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*]:

- The amount of consideration received compared with the risk of the existence of unknown injuries.
- The presence of bargaining and negotiation leading to the settlement.
- The closeness of the issue of liability.
- Whether the subject of personal injuries was discussed.
- The reasonableness of the contention that the injuries were, in fact, unknown at the time the release was executed.

[b] Release Given During Period of First Physical Confinement

A general release from a liability claim obtained from any person during the period of the first physical confinement, whether as an inpatient or outpatient, in a clinic or health facility defined in *Health & Safety Code §§ 1203* and *1250*, as a result of the injury alleged to have given rise to the claim and primarily for treatment of that injury, is presumed fraudulent if the release is executed within 15 days after the commencement of the confinement or prior to release from that confinement, whichever occurs first [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6152(b)*].

[3] Exculpatory Release

As a general rule, a contract violates public policy if its object is to exempt a person from responsibility for his or her own fraud, willful injury to another's person or property, or violation of law [*Civ. Code § 1668 see Neubauer v. Goldfarb (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 47, 55-57, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 218* (waiver of corporate directors' and majority shareholders' fiduciary duties to minority shareholders in private close corporations is against public policy and contract provision in buy-sell agreement purporting to effect such a waiver is void)]. *Civ. Code § 1668* does not, however, invalidate a contract that seeks to release one from liability for future simple negligence or strict liability [*Hulsey v. Elsinore Parachute Center (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 333, 341-342, 214 Cal. Rptr. 194*]. Even a release agreement found to be a contract of adhesion is enforceable if it does not defeat the weaker party's reasonable expectations and is not unconscionable [*Hulsey v. Elsinore Parachute Center (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 333, 343-344, 214 Cal. Rptr. 194*]. A valid exculpatory release is a defense to negligence under the doctrine of express assumption of risk [*see, e.g., Coates v. Newhall Land & Farming, Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1, 4, 236 Cal. Rptr. 181*]. For discussion of this defense, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

On the other hand, an agreement made in the context of sports or recreational programs or services, purporting to

release liability for future gross negligence, generally is unenforceable as a matter of public policy [*City of Santa Barbara v. Superior Court (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 747, 753-781, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527, 161 P.3d 1095* (agreement purporting to release liability for future gross negligence committed against developmentally disabled child who participated in recreational camp designed for needs of such children violated public policy and was unenforceable)].

For a form for a release agreement designed for use as an exculpatory release of future claims, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations* (Matthew Bender).

[4] Release of Less Than All Joint Debtors, Tortfeasors, or Coobligors

Under *Civ. Code § 1543*, a release of one of two or more joint debtors does not extinguish the obligations of any of the others, unless they are mere guarantors; nor does it affect their right to contribution from the released debtor, except as provided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*. Federal common law in the Ninth Circuit generally mirrors the law of *Civ. Code § 1543* in that a release of one tortfeasor does not release all other joint tortfeasors absent an agreement to effect a release of any or all of the other tortfeasors [*see Avery v. U.S. (9th Cir. 1987) 829 F.2d 817, 819* (*Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. v. Winchester Drive-in Theatre, Inc. (9th Cir. 1965) 351 F.2d 925, 931 , cert. denied, 382 U.S. 1011 (1966)* , and *Undersea Eng. & Const. Co. v. International Tel. & Tel. Corp. (9th Cir. 1970) 429 F.2d 543, 551)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 877 applies to any release (or to any dismissal or covenant not to sue or not to enforce judgment) that is given in good faith before verdict or judgment to one or more of a number of tortfeasors claimed to be liable for the same tort or to one or more of a number of coobligors mutually subject to contribution rights. A release (or other instrument) of this type does not discharge any other such party from liability unless its terms so provide, but does reduce the claims against the others by the amount stipulated by the release or by the amount paid in consideration for the release, whichever is greater [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*]. In determining whether the "terms so provide," courts apply the same rules that govern any other contract [*Hess v. Ford Motor Co. (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 516, 524, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220, 41 P.3d 46*]. In addition, it discharges the released party from all liability for any contribution to any other parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(b)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 877 does not apply to coobligors who have expressly agreed in writing to an apportionment of liability for losses or claims among themselves [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(c)*]. Nor does *Code Civ. Proc. § 877* apply to a release given to a coobligor on an alleged contract debt when the contract was made prior to January 1, 1988 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 877(d)*].

For discussion of the procedure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, to determine whether a settlement made by release or other instrument has been made in "good faith" for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.130* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral ReleasesTortsNegligenceDefensesExculpatory ClausesGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesPartial SettlementsTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.45

§ 520.45 Requirements for Formation of Valid Release

[1] In General

To be effective in extinguishing an obligation, a release agreement must be given by the releasor to the releasee either on new consideration or in writing with or without new consideration [*Civ. Code § 1541*].

For a form for a general written release, *see § 520.130*. For discussion of requirements applicable to the formation of a valid agreement generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Mutual Assent

As with any contract, all parties to be bound by the release must first assent to its terms [*Smith v. Occidental & Oriental S.S. Co. (1893) 99 Cal. 462, 470-471, 34 P. 84*]. If there is no actual assent to the release, then it never becomes effective [*Wheat v. Morse (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 203, 206, 17 Cal. Rptr. 226*].

Generally, a releasor who has no disability preventing him or her from reading a written release is bound by its clear provisions [*DuBois v. Sparrow (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 290, 298, 154 Cal. Rptr. 717*]. However, if the releasor was under a misapprehension, not due to releasor's own neglect, as to the nature or scope of the release, and if this misapprehension was induced by the misconduct of the releasee, then the release, regardless of how comprehensively worded, is binding only to the extent actually intended by the releasor [*Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 103, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*]. For example, courts have held that a misapprehension as to the nature and scope of a release was not due to the neglect of the releasor when the releasor was unable to read the release, the release was presented to the releasor when he was still in the hospital suffering from injuries sustained in the accident, or the release was presented to the releasor within a few hours of the accident while she was still nervous and upset [*see* *Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 103 n. 2, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*].

It is for the trier of fact to determine what the releasor understood to be covered by the release, and whether the releasor's understanding, which is different from the writing, was induced by the releasee. If the trier of fact finds that the releasee is responsible for a misconception, the release is ineffective to the extent that it purports to release claims

other than those understood by the releasor to be released [*Jordan v. Guerra (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 469, 475-476, 144 P.2d 349*].

[3] Necessity of Writing

Generally, a release need not be in writing [*see Civ. Code § 1541*; *see* *Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. If, however, the release agreement is subject to the statute of frauds, such as when it provides for the performance of a continuing obligation over a period of time in excess of one year, then it must be in writing to be valid [*see Civ. Code § 1624*; for discussion of contracts required to be in writing by the statute of frauds, *see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

An oral release agreement is required to be made on new consideration, whereas a written release may be made with or without new consideration [*Civ. Code § 1541*; *see* discussion in *§ 520.45[4]*]. Further, it appears that a disputed, unpleaded oral settlement and release agreement made out of court is not enforceable by motion [*see* *Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 881-883, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229* (disputed, out of court, oral settlement is unenforceable by nonstatutory "speaking motion," even when motion is treated as one for summary judgment); *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* (if parties to pending litigation stipulate to settlement before court, court may enter judgment on motion pursuant to terms of settlement agreement)].

For further discussion of requirements for drafting a written release agreement, see *§ 520.130*.

[4] Consideration

An oral release must be supported by new consideration [*Civ. Code § 1541*]. However, a written release may, but need not be, supported by consideration [*Civ. Code § 1541*; *Worthington v. State Bd. of Control (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 697, 699-700, 72 Cal. Rptr. 449*].

If the writing is unsupported by consideration, it must be plain and explicit, given for the express purpose of effecting a complete release of the obligation [Sheehan v. Atlanta Intern. Ins. Co. (9th Cir. [Cal] 1987) *812 F.2d 465, 470]* , and expressly showing the releasor's intent to extinguish the obligation [*Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 31 n. 7, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P.2d 212*].

For discussion of the effect of insufficient or failure of consideration on the validity of a release, see *§ 520.48[2]*.

[5] Delivery

A written release, signed by the releasor, ordinarily is presently operative once it is delivered. Even though consideration may be required [*see* discussion in § 450.45[4]], the nonpayment of consideration at the time of signature and delivery does not affect the immediate operative effect of the instrument as a valid release [*Hofland v. Gustafson (1955) 132 Cal. App. 907, 282 P.2d 1039*].

[6] Conditions Affecting Operation of Release

A release may be subject to the occurrence of a condition precedent. When it is, the release is not operative for any purpose until the occurrence of the condition [*Johnson v. Pickwick Stages System (1930) 108 Cal. App. 279, 284, 291 P. 611*]. Thus, for example, if a party has been given, but has not exercised, an option to release another from liability, the release is inoperative if the option is not exercised [*see* *Johnson v. Pickwick Stages System (1930) 108 Cal. App. 279, 284, 291 P. 611*]. Similarly, if delivery of the release is subject to the occurrence of a condition precedent, delivery is not effective, and the release is not operative, until the condition occurs [*see* *Clark v. Child (1884) 66 Cal. 87, 90-91, 4 P. 1058*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.46

§ 520.46 Enforcement of Release Agreement

[1] Affirmative Defense

Because the effect of a release is to extinguish an obligation giving rise to a cause of action, it may be pleaded as an affirmative defense to an action based on the extinguished obligation [*see Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783* ; *see also Landis v. Morrissey (1886) 69 Cal. 83, 86, 10 P. 258*] (stating that plea of release admits cause of action, but sets forth release subsequently executed)]. The pleading of a release agreement is the pleading of new matter [*Landis v. Morrissey (1886) 69 Cal. 83, 10 P. 258* . It must be expressly pleaded and proved [*Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229]* . For forms for affirmative defenses, pleading the execution of a release agreement, see *§§ 520.131* and *520.132*.

When the operation of a release is subject to the occurrence of a condition precedent, the release cannot be pleaded as a bar to the underlying cause of action, because it is not operative until the occurrence of the condition. Thus, for example, if an option to exercise a release has been given, the release cannot be pleaded as a bar to the underlying cause of action unless the option has been exercised [*Johnson v. Pickwick Stages System (1930) 108 Cal. App. 279, 284, 291 P. 611* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 520.45[6]*].

On motion made, and granted at the discretion of the court, a release may be raised as an affirmative defense in a supplemental answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 464* (supplemental pleadings); *see Seehorn v. Big Meadows & Bodie Wagon Road Co. (1882) 60 Cal. 240, 250-2252* ; *see also Johnson v. Pickwick Stages System (1930) 108 Cal. App. 279, 281, 291 P. 611]* . The motion may be made and granted even after trial has begun on the underlying cause of action. Factors considered by a court in exercising its discretion whether to permit the raising of the defense in a supplemental answer are the existence of laches surrounding defendant's filing of the supple mental answer, as well the factual circumstances surrounding the transaction giving rise to the release [*see Seehorn v. Big Meadows & Bodie Wagon Road Co. (1882) 60 Cal. 240, 251-252* (trial court as abusing its discretion in denying motion to raise affirmative defense of release in supplemental answer absent laches and in view of facts surrounding settlement of case)]. For further discussion and forms relating to supplemental pleadings in general, see Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings* .

[2] Action for Specific Performance or Declaratory Relief

A release may also be pleaded as a specifically performable settlement and release agreement. When pleaded in this manner the pleading must allege a definite, just, and reasonable contract, adequacy of consideration, and resultant breach [*Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. For discussion and forms relating to specific enforcement of contracts generally, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

In some circumstances, either the releasee or the releasor may bring an action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* for a declaration of his or her rights under a release. The releasee may bring this type of action when, for example, the releasor has attempted an out-of-court rescission of the release and the releasee believes the attempted rescission is invalid [*see Union Pacific R.R. Co. v. Zimmer (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 524, 528, 197 P.2d 363* (validity of release decided under federal law)]. In a declaratory relief action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*, the court may make a binding declaration of the rights and duties of the parties, including a declaration as to the validity of the release [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see Union Pacific R.R. Co. v. Zimmer (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 524, 528, 197 P.2d 363* (validity of release decided under federal law)]. For discussion and forms for use in seeking declaratory relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsEnforcementTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.47

§ 520.47 Opposing Enforcement of Release Agreement

[1] Generally

A releasor may challenge the validity of a release agreement on the same grounds as any contract [*see, e.g., Union Pacific R.R. Co. v. Zimmer (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 524, 529, 197 P.2d 363* (stating that release may be avoided on ground of mutual mistake); *Baird v. Pacific Electric Ry. Co. (1919) 39 Cal. App. 512, 514, 179 P. 449* (stating that defense of release may be controverted by evidence of fraud, mistake, undue influence, compromise, payment, estoppel, mental incompetency, and like defenses); for discussion of defenses to the enforcement of contracts generally, see, e.g., Ch. 140, *Contracts* , Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* , and Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*].

In an action on the underlying claim, a releasor may simply controvert the affirmative defense that a release precludes the claim [*see, e.g., Baird v. Pacific Electric Ry. Co. (1919) 39 Cal. App. 512, 514, 179 P. 449* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 520.47[3]*]. The releasor may, when appropriate, bring an action to cancel a void or voidable written release [*see Civ. Code § 3412*], an action to declare a release void [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see also* discussion in]; an action to reform a release agreement [see *Civ. Code § 3399*], or an action to rescind a voidable release [*see Civ. Code § 1692*; *see also § 520.48*]. For discussion and forms of complaint relating generally to the remedies of cancellation, declaratory relief, reformation, and rescission, see respectively Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* , Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* , and Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

[2] Burden of Proof

Generally, when a releasor challenges the validity of a release, he or she has the burden of proof on that issue [*see, e.g., Myers v. Carter (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 238, 242, 30 Cal. Rptr. 91* (burden of showing undue influence); *Chung v. Johnston (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 157, 164, 274 P.2d 922* (burden of showing fraud); *Castor v. Bernstein (1906) 2 Cal. App. 703, 708, 84 P. 244* (burden of showing want of consideration pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1615*)]. When, however, the challenged release was executed during the course of a trust relationship, the party relying on the release has the burden of showing that the release is just and fair, and that it is based on a true and correct settlement and on adequate consideration [*Smith v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. (1933) 130 Cal. App. 45, 56-57, 19 P.2d 1018*].

[3] Controverting Defense of Release

[a] Pleading Requirements

A releasor seeking to recover on the underlying claim need not, in the complaint, anticipate a defense of release [*Hoffman v. Sports Car Club of America (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 119, 125, 225 Cal. Rptr. 359* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.20(b)* (all allegations of affirmative matter in answer are deemed controverted)]. Therefore, in response to an affirmative defense of release raised in the answer, plaintiff releasor need only adduce proof at trial either taking issue with the truth of the release or avoiding the release by a showing that destroys its validity as a defense [*Thompson (1920) 183 Cal. 476, 480, 191 P. 927* ; *Hoffman v. Sports Car Club of America (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 119, 125, 225 Cal. Rptr. 359*].

[b] Separate Trial on Defense Before Trial on Underlying Claim

When an affirmative defense does not involve the merits of the plaintiff's cause of action, but sets up a bar to its prosecution, the court may, either on its own motion or on the motion of any party, proceed to trial of that defense before trial of any other issue in the case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 597*]. This procedure applies to the defense of release raised in an answer [*see Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 881, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. For further discussion and forms relating to proceedings for a separate trial under *Code Civ. Proc. § 597, see Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions, § 3.110* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsEnforcementTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.48

§ 520.48 Rescission of Voidable Release

[1] Availability

A release agreement is subject to rescission in the same manner as other contracts [*Matthews v. A.T. & S.F. Ry. (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 549, 557, 129 P.2d 435*]. Rescission is necessary only with respect to a release that is voidable, rather than absolutely void [*see Garcia v. California Truck Co. (1920) 183 Cal. 767, 770, 192 P. 708*].

For discussion and forms relating to rescission generally, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

[2] Grounds for Rescission

A contract may generally be rescinded mutually, by consent [*Civ. Code § 1689(a)*], or unilaterally, on specified grounds [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)*]. The chief grounds for unilateral rescission are those negating consent: when the rescinding party, or any party jointly contracting with the rescinding party, has given his or her consent by mistake, or when that consent was obtained by duress, menace, fraud, or undue influence [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)*; *see, e.g., Carr v. Sacramento C.P. Co. (1917) 35 Cal. App. 439, 447, 170 P. 446* (release obtained by undue influence subject to rescission); for discussion and forms relating to factors negating contractual consent in general, *see* Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*].

Thus, for example, when a releasor knows that he or she is signing a release, but is fraudulently induced to do so, this fraud renders the release agreement voidable, not void, and rescission is necessary to avoid the agreement [*Bonacci v. Mass. Bonding & Ins. Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 657, 664, 137 P.2d 487* ; *see Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895* (stating rule as applicable to contracts generally); for discussion of fraud rendering a release absolutely void, *see § 520.49*].

Similarly, a release may be rescinded for mutual mistake [*see O'Meara v. Haiden (1928) 204 Cal. 354, 358, 268 P. 334* ; *see also Civ. Code §§ 1576-1578* (defining mistake)]. A release may be rescinded for a unilateral mistake concerning its effect only if the mistake arose from an unrectified misrepresentation by one party of which the other was aware [*Larsen v. Johannes (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 491, 503, 86 Cal. Rptr. 744* ; *see Myers v. Carter (1963) 215 Cal.*

App. 2d 238, 241, 30 Cal. Rptr. 91]. Thus, a releasor cannot claim that he or she was mistaken about what was in a release when he or she failed to read it before signing it [*Hoffman v. Sports Car Club of America (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 119, 126, 225 Cal. Rptr. 359*].

Another ground for unilateral rescission is mental incompetence under *Civ. Code § 39* [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(7)*], that is, when the rescinding party was of unsound mind, but not entirely without understanding, and made the contract before his or her incapacity was judicially determined [*see Civ. Code § 39*]. Thus, a releasor need not have been incompetent to make any kind of a contract or to transact any business, however simple; the test is whether he or she was mentally competent to deal with the particular subject with full understanding of his or her rights, such that he or she actually understood the nature, purpose, and effect of the release [*Carr v. Sacramento C.P. Co. (1917) 35 Cal. App. 439, 442, 170 P. 446* ; for discussion of mental incompetence rendering a release absolutely void, *see § 520.49*].

Still another basis for unilateral rescission is failure of consideration [*see Civ. Code § 1689(b)(2)-(4)*]. To justify rescission of a release, the failure must be substantial [*see Hofland v. Gustafson (1955) 132 Cal. App. 907, 909-910 282 P.2d 1039* (holding that delay in payment of consideration until several days after execution of release was not substantial failure of consideration and justified damages but not rescission)]. Moreover, a court will not set aside a written release merely because the consideration is inadequate, although this may be considered with other factors affecting its validity [*Moore v. Rogers (1958) 157 Cal. App. 2d 192, 197, 320 P.2d 524* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1541* (new consideration required to support oral, but not written, release); *Castor v. Bernstein (1906) 2 Cal. App. 703, 708, 84 P. 244* (rule under *Civ. Code § 1614*, that written instrument is presumptive evidence of consideration, applies to releases)].

For additional discussion relating to grounds for unilateral rescission generally, and forms of complaint for rescission based on these grounds, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

[3] Notice and Restitution

To rescind a contract, a party who is free from duress, menace, undue influence, or disability, and who is aware of his or her right to rescind, must promptly, on discovering the ground justifying rescission, give notice of rescission to the other party. The rescinding party must also restore to the other party everything of value that he or she has received from that party under the contract or offer to make restitution on condition that the other party do likewise, unless the other party is unable or positively refuses to do so [*see Civ. Code § 1691*]. Notwithstanding this general rule, in the case of a release, no restitution need be made until an attack is made on the release, which usually does not occur until the releasor brings an action on the underlying claim and seeks to controvert the affirmative defense that the claim is barred by release [*see O'Meara v. Haiden (1928) 204 Cal. 354, 364, 268 P. 334*].

Restitution is required only if the releasor received something of value; if the releasor received nothing, he or she need give back nothing [*Gajanich v. Gregory (1931) 116 Cal. App. 622, 633-634, 3 P.2d 389*]. Additionally, the releasor need not restore or offer to restore in any of the following circumstances: when the releasor has received only that which has no value to either of the parties; when the releasor has merely received the individual promissory note of the releasee; when the release is absolutely void; when it clearly appears that the releasee could not possibly have been injuriously affected by a failure to restore; or when, without any fault of the releasor, there have been peculiar complications that make it impossible for the releasor to offer full restoration [*see Weger v. Rocha (1934) 138 Cal. App. 109, 117-118, 32 P.2d 417*].

For further discussion relating to notice and restitution requirements generally, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsEnforcementTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.49

§ 520.49 Nullifying Void Release

A void release need not be rescinded, because there is no contract to rescind [*see Garcia v. California Truck Co. (1920) 183 Cal. 767, 770, 192 P. 708* ; *see also Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895*]. Aside from controverting a defense of release on the ground that it is void, a releasor may also seek affirmative relief opposing its enforcement, either by having it cancelled or declared void [*see Civ. Code § 3412* (cancellation of void instrument); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaratory relief); for further discussion and forms, see respectively Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* and Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

One circumstance that renders a release absolutely void is fraud in the inception, that is, when the releasor is tricked or deceived into signing a release that is different in terms and object from that which he or she has made and understands that he or she is executing [*see Meyer v. Haas (1899) 126 Cal. 560, 563, 58 P. 1042*]. In this case, the release is void because mutual assent is lacking, and it may be disregarded without resorting to rescission [*Ford v. Shearson Lehman American Express, Inc. (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1028, 225 Cal. Rptr. 895*]. The releasor need not restore any consideration received, as he or she is not avoiding the release so much as showing that he or she never made a release [*Meyer v. Haas (1899) 126 Cal. 560, 563, 58 P. 1042* ; *cf.* discussion of fraud as basis for rescission in *520.48[2]*]. For discussion and forms relating to fraud negating contractual consent in general, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

Similarly, when a releasor is totally mentally incompetent at the time of executing the release, that release is absolutely void because there is no meeting of the minds and no contract is formed. Therefore, rescission and an offer of restoration of consideration are not necessary [*Backus v. Sessions (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 380, 384, 390, 110 P.2d 51* ; *cf.* discussion of mental incompetency as basis for rescission in § 520.48[2]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of

ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.50

§ 520.50 Ratification of Release

A release that is subject to rescission may nonetheless be ratified by the conduct of the releasor. For example, the releasor's acceptance of the benefits of a release agreement subsequent to an attempted rescission of the release can amount to a waiver of the right to assert the invalidity of the release and constitute a ratification of the terms of the release [*see Eustace v. Lynch (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 486, 491, 111 P.2d 372*]. There can be no ratification of a void agreement, however, when the person alleged to have made the ratification did not know what the agreement contained or all the facts when the alleged ratification occurred [*Backus v. Sessions (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 380, 385, 110 P.2d 51*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRatificationContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.51-520.69

[Reserved]

§§ 520.51[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.70

§ 520.70 California Torts

For a general discussion of settlement considerations in tort actions, see California Torts, Ch. 73, *Settlement and Release* (Matthew Bender) For discussion of structured settlements in tort actions, see California Torts, Ch. 75, *Structured Settlements* (Matthew Bender) For general discussion of the taxation of tort damages, see California Torts, Ch. 57, *Taxation of Tort Damages* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesTaxationTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsStructured SettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.71

§ 520.71 California Legal Forms

For transactional forms relating to forms in this chapter, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.72

§ 520.72 State Statutes

Attorney's duty to communicate written offers of settlement to client; written offer of settlement or required communication of settlement offer is discoverable by either party in any action in which existence or communication of offer of settlement is factual issue. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103.5*

Effect of defendant's tender and of settlement pursuant to dismissal in action on contract providing for fees and costs. *Civ. Code § 1717(a), (b)(2)*

Authority of attorney to bind client in steps of action by entering agreement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 283*

Motion to enter judgment pursuant to terms of settlement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*

Effect of release, dismissal, or covenant not to sue or to enforce judgment given to joint tortfeasor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*

Disclosure in action of sliding scale recovery agreement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.5*

Determination of good faith of settlement entered into by plaintiff and one or more alleged joint tortfeasors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*

Offer to compromise pending action; effect of rejected offer on costs. *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*

Effect of defendant's tender to plaintiff of full amount due before commencement of action for recovery of money only. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1025*

Admissibility of evidence concerning offer and counteroffer of compromise. *Evid. Code § 1152*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsClient RelationsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.73

§ 520.73 Rules of Professional Conduct

Member of State Bar who represents two or more clients must obtain clients' informed written consent before entering into aggregate settlement of their claims. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 3-310(D)*

Member of State Bar must communicate promptly to client all amounts, terms, and conditions of any written offer of settlement made to client in noncriminal matter. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 3-510(A)(2), (B)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsClient RelationsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsOffers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.74

§ 520.74 California Rules of Court

Duty of plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief to give court and arbitrator written notice of settlement of case in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.75

§ 520.75 Local Court Rules

[1] Alameda County

Court policy is to encourage settlement. Alameda Co. Unified Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 4.01(2)(A)

Duty of counsel to notify court of settlement reached before trial. Alameda Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 4.3(3)(c), 4.15

[2] Los Angeles County

Return of deposited jury fees on settlement of case before commencement of trial. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.0(e)

Duty of each party seeking affirmative relief in action to notify court of settlement reached prior to trial. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 12.5

[3] San Bernardino County

Duty of counsel to notify court of settlement reached before trial. San Bernardino Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 416

[4] San Diego County

Duty of each party seeking affirmative relief in action to notify court of settlement reached before trial. San Diego Co. Coordinated Rules, Rule 2.2.4

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.76

§ 520.76 Decisions

[1] Generally

If Section 998 offer is withdrawn by party before its statutory expiration, withdrawing party's right to cost shifting under Section 998 is determined by last rejected Section 998 offer. *One Star, Inc. v. Staar Surgical Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1093-1094, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195*

Plaintiff's allegations that no enforceable settlement has been reached constituted good cause under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(b)* and precluded trial court from dismissing medical malpractice action; only decision before court at Rule 3.1385 hearing was whether to dismiss case or restore it to civil active list. *Irvine v. Regents of Univ. of Calif. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 994, 1000-1002, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 500*

In action for breach of contract and related causes of action, trial court erred in involuntarily dismissing action under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 225(c) [*now see Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.1385*] on grounds that declarations filed by parties were too vague after parties had notified court that they had a settlement "in principle," meaning they had yet to fix its exact terms; settlement with open material terms is not a conditional settlement and because parties never entered into binding settlement, former Rule 225 did not apply. *Levitz v. The Warlocks (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 531, 534-536, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 800*

Trial court properly found that party to settlement agreement that required it as obligor to provide security bond for quarterly payments it was required to make was in default after security company that had furnished bond became insolvent and obligor failed to supply subsequent bond, when parties intended that bond security party's continuing obligation to make quarterly payments. The objective would be achieved only if during entire period, other parties could look to bond as source of payment in event of obligor's default and parties contemplated that bond would be valid until last payment had been made. Obligor selected surety and bore risk it might become insolvent, and even if parties' conflicting interpretations were equally plausible, court would still construe security provision in other party's favor because it was for their benefit. *Citizens for Goleta Valley v. HT Santa Barbara (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1076-1077, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 249*

Settlement with car dealership that did not release dealers "assigns" did not release agency that financed car lease transaction or corporation to whom lease was assigned because their liability, if any, arose from their status as assignees of lease. *LaChapelle v. Toyota Motor Credit Corp. (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 977, 980-981, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 32*

Settlement is not required to be written; compromise settlement is governed by legal principles applicable to contracts generally and is decisive of rights of parties, serving to bar reopening of issues settled; absent fundamental defect in agreement itself, terms as binding on parties. *Gorman v. Holte (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 984, 989, 211 Cal. Rptr. 34*

Court is not able to force litigant to settle, but may order appearance and engagement in settlement negotiations. *City of El Monte v. Takei (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 244, 248, 204 Cal. Rptr. 559*

Compromise and release agreement determines rights of parties in dispute. *Burbank Studios v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 929, 935, 184 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Necessary elements of contract are required for compromise and release agreement to be effective. *Burbank Studios v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 929, 935, 184 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Law favors settlement of controversies. *Hilliger v. Golden (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 394, 398-401, 166 Cal. Rptr. 33*

Compromise distinguished from stipulation by existence of bona fide dispute between parties. *People ex rel. Dept. Pub. Wks. v. Amsden Corp. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 83, 87, 109 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Compromise of claim is settlement of differences by mutual concessions and adjustment of conflicting claims, but does not include discussions or negotiations leading up to agreement. *Isaacson v. City of Oakland (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 414, 421, 69 Cal. Rptr. 379*

[2] Attorney's Fees

On motions to enforce settlement agreement, trial court did not err in refusing to award plaintiff interest from original closing date, or plaintiff's costs or attorney fees, when trial court's order to plaintiff to pay defendant's fees and costs was an implied finding that plaintiff was the breaching party. *Osumi v. Sutton (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1360-1361, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 693*

In insolvency proceedings involving life insurance company, provisions in settlement agreements for payment of attorney's fees of various settling parties were not improperly approved by trial court when amounts in settlements were simply part of settlement package and were of no greater consequence than would have been provision for cash payment; so long as settlements overall are reasonable and to benefit of insolvency estate, trial court acts within its discretion in approving them. *In re Executive Life Ins. Co. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 344, 399, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453*

Attorney's fees were properly awarded to party granted specific performance of oral settlement agreement rescinding contract that included attorney's fee provision that did not limit attorney's fees to particular forms of action involving contract. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-842, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

[3] Authority of Attorney

Attorney's stipulation to settlement is subject to court ordered enforcement without competent evidence of disputed issues of material fact. *Phelps v. Kozakar (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 1078, 1083, 194 Cal. Rptr. 872*

[4] Costs

Absent affirmative agreement of parties to contrary, trial court retains jurisdiction to award costs and attorney's fees although settlement agreement is filed. *Folsom v. Butte County Assn. of Governments (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 668, 679, 186 Cal. Rptr. 589, 652 P.2d 437*

[5] Dismissal of Codefendant

Codefendant was properly dismissed pursuant to settlement agreement which expressly released and discharged him despite fact that he was not present during negotiations and did not sign the agreement. *Golden Bear Forest Products, Inc. v. Misale (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 573, 575, 188 Cal. Rptr. 48*

[6] Enforcement of Compromise or Settlement Agreements

Federal district court has inherent power to enforce agreement in settlement of litigation before it, and enforcement power includes authority to award damages for failure to comply with settlement agreement. *TNT Marketing, Inc. v. Agresti (9th Cir. 1986) 796 F.2d 276, 278*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 does not apply in ordinary civil action after judgment, unrelated to alleged settlement and therefore containing no provision for continuing jurisdiction to enforce it, has been entered and has become final in sense that time for appeal has passed. *Walton v. Mueller (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 161, 171-172, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 does not require that party to be bound consent to settlement "on the record," only that party consent to it "orally before the court." *1538 Cahuenga Partners, LLC v. Turmeko Properties, Inc. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 139, 143, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 552*

Judgment omitting material terms of parties' settlement failed to accurately reflect their agreement and therefore failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Hines v. Lukes (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1185, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689*

Trial court properly entered summary judgment against plaintiff after he accepted settlement from defendant, even though defendant had negotiated settlement with plaintiff directly even after he retained counsel, where evidence was insufficient as matter of law to demonstrate that settlement agreement was product of duress, was unconscionable, or was rendered void or unenforceable as matter of public policy; and where plaintiff's failure to effect rescission of settlement agreement, including specifically his failure to notify defendant he was rescinding and to tender restoration of payments he received, precluded his attempt to avoid application of agreement to claims he asserted in his complaint. *Myerchin v. Family Benefits, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1526, 1533-1541, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 816*

On motions to enforce settlement agreement, trial court did not create material term of settlement or otherwise err when it extended closing date for real property transaction, when doing so was necessary in order to grant relief sought by both parties. *Osumi v. Sutton (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1360-1361, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 693*

On motions to enforce settlement agreement, trial court did not err when it ordered plaintiff to sign purchase agreement incorporating revised counteroffer, because nothing in settlement agreement allowed plaintiff to document construction defect claims by making unchallenged evidence of alleged defects part of purchase agreement that was term of settlement. *Osumi v. Sutton (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1360-1361, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 693*

In action by condominium owners against homeowners' association arising out of water damage to condominium,

settlement reached between one condominium owner and homeowners' association's insurer and one employee of outside management company could not be enforced under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* because there was no evidence association gave insurer right to settle without association's consent and settlement prejudiced association's rights separate from payment by its insurer, because settlement limited association's ability to enforce CC&Rs for noncompliance by condominium owners in repairing water damage. *Elnekave v. Via Dolce Homeowners Assn. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1198-1200, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 663*

Stipulation for settlement was unenforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, when, although leaving unresolved term for future agreement was not necessarily fatal because settlement could be enforceable if parties agreed remaining issue would be decided by arbitration, court could not tell what parties meant when they provided for "binding mediation" of payment dispute and it was clear parties did not regard binding mediation as equivalent of arbitration. *Lindsay v. Lewandowski (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1618, 1622-1625, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 846*

In action to enforce settlement agreement, statute of frauds did not render agreement invalid, even though agreement by its terms was not to be performed within one year from making and defendant did not sign agreement drafted by his own attorney, when defendant agreed to terms of settlement on record of settlement hearing and affirmed agreement and its terms in his testimony at trial of action to enforce agreement. Four-year statute of limitations for a written contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337*] applied, even though defendant had not signed agreement, because defendant had agreed to specific terms in open court at settlement proceeding, and at trial, defendant admitted that he had agreed to settlement and reaffirmed that terms to which he had agreed were those set forth in written settlement agreement prepared by his attorney. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* did not apply because underlying matter was dismissed and parties did not request that court retain jurisdiction either in writing signed by both parties themselves or orally before court at the time of stipulated settlement as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Pietrobon v. Libarle (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 992, 996-998, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718*

Trial court properly entered judgment enforcing settlement agreement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, when defendants were all insured under policies giving insurers right to settle without defendants' consent and to bind defendants to settlement; court would not read case law to preclude enforcement pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* of insurance-funded settlement reached by authorized insurance defense counsel or adjuster when carrier had contractual right to settle. *Fiege v. Cooke (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1353-1355, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 496*

In action to enforce settlement agreement based on underlying action for specific performance of real estate sales contract, forfeiture of buyers' deposit as result of delay in delivering quitclaim deed, which caused sellers no cognizable damages, constituted illegal forfeiture provision that court could not enforce, even though parties declined to use term "liquidated damages" explicitly in contract, because legal effect of provision was to allow forfeiture for lateness without regard to any damage caused. *Timney v. Lin (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1121, 1126-1128, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 387*

When some parties to litigation agreed to settlement orally before trial court and other parties agreed to settlement by signing written agreement which, although it included terms not part of oral agreement, shared same material terms, all parties demonstrated same degree of mature reflection and deliberate assent and agreement was enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. Oral agreement that parties would later sign written agreement did not affect enforceability of oral settlement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Elyaoudayan v. Hoffman (2003) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1421, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 41*

Trial court's interpretation of party's nod as oral consent satisfying requirement *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* for enforcement of settlement agreement was error, when unambiguous assent, expressed orally, is required to minimize possibility of conflicting interpretations of settlement, and trial court did not question any party as to whether they understood settlement terms and were agreeing to be bound by them. *Conservatorship of McElroy (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 536, 550-551, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 485*

Mass tort settlements in asbestos-related cases could not be enforced against one corporate defendant under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, when defendant's agent signed settlement agreements but no corporate officer of defendant signed, and when agreements did not specify material term, i.e., what that defendant was obligated to pay. *Gauss v. GAF Corp. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370*

Documents signed by plaintiffs but not defendants, which did not specify which defendant, if any, was responsible for making settlement payments to plaintiffs, were not enforceable as settlement agreements under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, because as drafted, documents were merely unilateral offers to settle and were revoked prior to their acceptance by defendants' tender of payment, and also were not signed by parties as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Sully-Miller Contracting Co. v. Gledson/Cashman Construction, Inc. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 30, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 400*

Parties engaged in private dispute resolution may not stipulate to appointment of judicial referee or judge pro tempore to secure settlement enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* unless reference is sought in pending litigation. *Housing Group v. United Nat. Ins. Co. (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 does not apply to enforce release agreement entered into more than five months before wrongful death action is filed, since at time plaintiff executed release, there was no pending litigation. *Kirby v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 840, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223*

Requirement of personal agreement by a party does not preclude enforcement of insurance-funded settlement reached by authorized insurance defense counsel or adjuster when carrier has contractual right to settle. *Robertson v. Chen (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1290, 1295, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 264*

"Parties" in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* means litigants themselves, so that for settlement agreement to be enforceable it must have been personally agreed to or signed by litigants. *Cortez v. Kenneally (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 523, 528, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671*

Requirement that oral settlement agreement be before the court is not satisfied when agreement is before mediator who is not authorized by statute to act in quasi-judicial capacity. *Murphy v. Padilla (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 707, 714, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 722*

Direct party-litigant participation is required to enforce settlement agreements. *Murphy v. Padilla (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 707, 714, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 722*

Order approving compromise of minor's claim was binding on insurer when settlement agreement called for court to make binding determination of one outstanding issue to be used to complete otherwise stipulated disposition of claim. *Mohn v. Kohlruss (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 595, 598-599, 242 Cal. Rptr. 110*

Stipulation recited to court reporter at deposition hearing and later reduced to writing but not signed by one party was insufficient basis for judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* because oral stipulation must be entered into before court, and written stipulation must be signed by parties. *City of Fresno v. Maroot (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 755, 760-762, 234 Cal. Rptr. 353*

Entry of judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* (settlement agreement orally stipulated to before court) over objections of one party was proper when court's determination that parties entered into valid and binding settlement agreement in open court was supported by substantial evidence. *Estate of Dipinto (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 625, 629-630, 231 Cal. Rptr. 612*

When ruling on motion to compel enforcement of out-of-court settlement pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, trial

court was trier of fact and authorized to receive oral testimony or to determine motions on declarations alone; standard of appellate review is whether trial court's determination is supported by substantial evidence. *Fiore v. Alvord (1985) 182 Cal. App. 3d 561, 565-566, 221 Cal. Rptr. 400*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 makes it unnecessary to file motion for summary judgment to enforce oral settlement agreement, even when material facts of purported agreement are in dispute; legislature endorsed use of "speaking motions" to enforce disputed agreements by enacting *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Richardson v. Richardson (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 91, 96, 225 Cal. Rptr. 370*

"Parties" under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, which provides that parties may stipulate to settlement and entry of judgment, means individual litigant and his or her attorney acting on litigant's behalf; litigant is not required to be personally present at or to personally agree to settlement so long as attorney, in trial court's determination, had authority to settle. *Haldeman v. Boise Cascade (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 230, 233-234, 221 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(b)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310-583.360*), providing mandatory dismissal of action not brought to trial within five years after it is filed, was not applicable to enforcing settlement agreement. *Gorman v. Holte (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 984, 989, 211 Cal. Rptr. 34*

Oral agreements to compromise and settle lawsuits reached at judicially supervised settlement conferences are enforceable in several ways, including by motion pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*, by motion for summary judgment, by separate suit in equity, or by amendment of pleadings to raise settlement as affirmative defense. *Gorman v. Holte (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 984, 989, 211 Cal. Rptr. 34*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6 authorizes what was formerly nonstatutory speaking motion and makes it applicable to oral or written settlement stipulations; motion for entry of judgment pursuant to settlement allowed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Corkland v. Boscoe (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 989, 994-995, 203 Cal. Rptr. 356*

Motion for summary judgment is proper method to enforce pretrial settlement; granting of summary judgment is improper when triable issue of fact existed as to whether defendant's obligation under settlement agreement was conditioned on approval of written agreement. *Duran v. Duran (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 176, 179-180, 197 Cal. Rptr. 497*

Motion for order compelling enforcement of alleged settlement agreement is in effect motion for summary judgment and is improperly granted when it presents issue of material fact. *Nabi v. Laudermill (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 282, 284, 182 Cal. Rptr. 368* ; *Mancina v. Hoar (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 796, 797, 181 Cal. Rptr. 347*

[7] Offer to Compromise Pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 998

In action under Federal Employers Liability Act, trial court erroneously awarded plaintiff prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291*, because FELA preempts *Civ. Code § 3291*. *Lund v. San Joaquin Valley Railroad (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 412, 71 P.3d 770*

In action for breach of contract, in which defendant filed a cross-complaint, trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting plaintiff relief to set aside judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on typographic error in Section 998 offer plaintiff's counsel sent to defendant in which legal assistant mistakenly typed word "against" as opposed to phrase "in favor of" plaintiff, which was sent to defendant without being reviewed by plaintiff's counsel and which defendant accepted; trial court reasonably concluded that mistake made by plaintiff's counsel was excusable, even though counsel's failure to review document before sending it out was imprudent, when plaintiff was diligent in seeking relief and defendant was not prejudiced. *Zamora v. Clayborn Contr. Group, Inc. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 249, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d*

187, 47 P.3d 1056

Settlement offer made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is revocable by offeror; settlement offer made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* does not create irrevocable option. *T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273, 280-283, 204 Cal. Rptr. 143, 682 P.2d 338*

Amount of offer after suit commences is to include costs. *Spencer Kennelly, Ltd. v. Bk. of Amer. (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 586, 592, 122 P.2d 552*

Voluntary dismissal with prejudice is judgment for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Chinn v. KMR Property Management (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 175, 196, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 586*

No minimum period must elapse following commencement of suit for service of valid *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* offer. *Barba v. Perez (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 444, 450-451, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715*

Offer must remain open for the statutorily designated period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(2)* in order to constitute proper offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Marina Glencoe, L.P. v. Neue Sentimental Film AG (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 874, 880, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 800*

After plaintiff unilaterally withdrew a Section 998 offer before statutory period for defendant to respond had lapsed, plaintiff was not entitled to seek costs after jury verdict, because a Section 998 offer that was unilaterally revoked before expiration of statutory period did not trigger cost shifting provisions of *Code. Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Marcey v. Romero (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1215-1217, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 402*

In personal injury action, trial court erred in awarding plaintiff prejudgment interest from date of second Section 998 offer rather than date of first offer, when ultimate verdict was in excess of both offers. *Ray v. Goodman (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 83, 87-92, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 659*

Trial court erred in denying individual members of board of homeowners association award of expert witness fees pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* on ground that association's insurer made Section 998 offers on behalf of individuals; litigant may recover attorney fees even though litigant has not paid for them out of his or her own pocket, and Section 998 contains no requirement that any particular person must have incurred expert witness fees, just that fees must have been actually incurred. *Skistimas v. Old World Owners Assn. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 948, 951-953, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 319*

In action by condominium owner for damages and declaratory relief against homeowners association for failure to maintain common areas resulting in damage to her unit, trial court properly determined that owner obtained judgment more favorable than Section 998 offer made by association, which owner had refused, by including voluntary post-offer payments made by association to homeowner and value of association's agreement to make repairs in conformance with its legal obligations. *Arias v. Katella Townhouse Homeowners Assn., Inc. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 847, 853-856, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 113*

Section 998 offer by defendant to two plaintiffs to settle action for waiver of costs did not confer liability for expert witness fees on plaintiffs after failing to prevail at trial, when offer was conditional because it was made in single document referring to plaintiffs in conjunctive, and notice of acceptance that accompanied offer again referred to plaintiffs in conjunctive and provided only one signature line, which was for attorney representing both of them. Legislative purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is best served in multi-plaintiff cases by requiring that offers be separately prepared and served on individual plaintiffs, allowing each individual opportunity to accept individually. *Menees v. Andrews (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1540, 1545-1546, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 664*

Service of Section 998 offer more than 10 but less than 15 days before trial was not timely because provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*, requiring additional five days for service by mail, apply to 10-day notice requirement in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*. *Lecuyer v. Sunset Trails Apartments (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 920, 925-927, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 169*

Plaintiff's offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* to settle dental malpractice case for specified sum and specifying that if there was no acceptance of offer within 30 days, plaintiff would seek full panoply of Section 998 awards, including prejudgment interest starting from date of service and expert costs if she received greater sum from defendant at trial, was valid Section 998 offer and satisfied requirements of specificity and clarity, even though it did not specify method by which litigation would be finally resolved. *Berg v. Darden (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 721, 731-733, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829*

Defendant's failure to specify dollar amount for attorney's fees in settlement offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* did not render offer so uncertain as to be unenforceable, since many contracts contain provision authorizing prevailing party in litigation arising out of contract to recover reasonable attorney's fees from another party to contract, and no published authority has held that inclusion of provision renders contract uncertain or unenforceable, and when failure to specify dollar amount of reasonable fees would not have precluded court from ascertaining with reasonable certainty defendant's obligations under offer had plaintiff accepted offer because applicable statutory and rule provisions set forth procedure for determining amount of attorney's fees to be awarded pursuant to contractual provision, which did not leave matter open for parties' future agreement, nor did it create uncertainty rendering it unenforceable. Offer was not also uncertain because plaintiff would have been required to incur additional, nonrecoverable attorney's fees to bring motion to have court determine fee amount if parties could not reach agreement. *Elite Show Services, Inc. v. Staffpro, Inc. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 263, 268-270, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 184*

Defendants' offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* served on plaintiffs, who were married couple, to settle litigation between them for $35,000, which did not apportion settlement amount between plaintiffs, and which neither husband nor wife accepted, was valid and entitled defendants to recovery of expert witness fees when plaintiffs lost litigation, when plaintiff's suit arose out of their purchase of community property, they sued on choses in action which were community property, and their recovery would be community property; defendants could not allocate their settlement offer between husband and wife because they each had equal, undivided half-interest in causes of action for fraud and breach of contract and would have had equal, undivided half-interest in settlement proceeds; offer did not have to be accepted by both plaintiffs to be effective because *Fam. Code § 1100(a)* places management and control of the community personal property in either spouse. *Vick v. DaCorsi (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 206, 209-213, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 626*

Section 998 offer to multiple defendants was not valid because it was not apportioned among defendants and, as of time of the offer, under pleadings, defendants could have been found liable, but not jointly and severally liable, for full amount of the judgment under permissive user doctrine and Proposition 51. *Burch v. Children's Hospital of Orange County Thrift Stores, Inc. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 537, 547-551, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 404*

Subsequent offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* revoked prior offer, even though subsequent offer was defective because it was not explicitly apportioned among parties to whom offer was made, but was directed to all three defendants jointly and severally. *Palmer v. Schindler Elevator Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 154, 157-159, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339*

Oral acceptance of offer followed by written proof of acceptance is permitted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* when offer does not specify a mode of communicating acceptance; however, defendant did not accept plaintiff's offer in timely, absolute and unqualified manner as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, when defendant's notice of acceptance, which contained provision that parties bear own costs, which did not appear in plaintiff's offer, actually set forth counteroffer, not acceptance, and did not constitute proof of acceptance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Bias v. Wright (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 811, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 137*

In personal injury action arising from automobile accident, trial court erroneously held that jury verdict in first trial extinguished right plaintiffs acquired under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* based on their statutory offers to compromise which were not accepted, and denied prejudgment interest and expert witness fees after second trial at which they prevailed, when effect of trial court's grant of new trial was to nullify first judgment with result that neither judgment entered after first trial nor special verdict upon which it was based, existed to extinguish any benefits that may have arisen under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Saakyan v. Modern Auto, Inc. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 383, 389-392, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 674*

Section 998 settlement offer in medical malpractice action was not invalid when made jointly by husband and wife, when it was clear that bulk of $1 million offer was meant for husband because wife's recovery was limited to $250,000 on her cause of action, and jury awarded far greater amount than was requested in the Section 998 offer less the maximum that wife could have recovered. *Deocampo v. Ahn (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 758, 776-777, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79*

Provision in Section 998 settlement offer that would allow plaintiffs, at their option, to vacate their offer or a resulting Section 998-based judgment did not invalidate offer; provision was intended simply to hold defendant to discovery representation that he only had $1 million in insurance coverage, and litigants have right to condition offer to compromise on accuracy of information supplied by offeree in discovery. *Deocampo v. Ahn (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 758, 778, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79*

Section 998 offer to compromise for greater of $1 million or combined limits of defendant's policies that would provide defendant with coverage for plaintiff's claims was basic policy limit offer and was not vague as to amount requested, since actual total insurance coverage, if it differed from stated $1 million figure, was fact peculiarly within defendant's knowledge. *Deocampo v. Ahn (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 758, 779, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79*

In personal injury action, trial court properly granted defendants' motion for summary judgment on grounds that action was barred by settlement, when defendants' unequivocal oral acceptance of plaintiff's written Section 998 offer before it was revoked was valid, *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* does not require service of acceptance, and fact that proof of acceptance was filed after attempted revocation did not affect validity of acceptance. *Gray v. Stewart (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1397-1398, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

In action by Attorney General in name of People for civil penalties, restitution and injunctive relief against life insurer and its parent company under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500*, trial court properly awarded parent company expert witness fees as costs after Attorney General rejected parent company's offer to settle pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* and Attorney General failed to prove parent company's liability as life insurer's alter ego *People ex rel. Lockyer v. Fremont General Corp. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127*

Prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* applies to future periodic portion of judgment, and is calculated from date of plaintiff's first Section 998 offer. *Hrimnak v. Watkins (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 964, 980-981, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514*

"Judgment" in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)* contemplates that offer to compromise that is accepted will result in final disposition of underlying lawsuit; statute does not indicate intent to limit terms of compromise settlement or type of final disposition; compromise agreement calling for voluntary dismissal with prejudice satisfies requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. *Goodstein v. Bank of San Pedro (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 899, 906, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 740*

Trial court is entitled to infer that defendant's settlement offer was not in good faith when jury concluded that defendant was directly liable for damages almost eight times greater than settlement offer and was, through joint and several liability, liable for damages more than 20 times greater than settlement offer. *Elrod v. Oregon Cummins Diesel, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 692, 700-701, 241 Cal. Rptr. 108*

In action on contract providing for recovery of attorney's fees by prevailing party, when judgment is entered based on offer of compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, prevailing party is entitled to recover attorney fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* as item of costs after judgment, even though compromise agreement is silent on costs and fees. *Lanyi v. Goldblum (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 181, 189, 223 Cal. Rptr. 32* ; *see also Rappenecker v. Sea-Land Service, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 256, 261-264, 155 Cal. Rptr. 516* (costs)

Code Civ. Proc. § 998 (award costs of suit to offering party) and *Civ. Code § 3291* (interest on more favorable judgment secured by offering party) are inapplicable to arbitration proceedings. *Woodard v. Southern Cal. Permanente Medical Group (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 656, 666, 217 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Offer made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is governed by principles of contract law; offer is withdrawn if acceptance not communicated within statutory period. *Drouin v. Fleetwood Enterprises (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 486, 491-492, 209 Cal. Rptr. 623*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, when plaintiff rejected defendant's settlement offer and prevailed at trial, but failed to recover more favorable judgment, reduction in plaintiff's recoverable costs by amount of both defendant's and plaintiff's regular court costs incurred after time of offer was proper since provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* for recovery of costs from time of offer are mandatory. *Lafayette v. County of Los Angeles (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 547, 557, 208 Cal. Rptr. 668*

Qualified acceptance of a *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* settlement offer that contains terms or conditions materially different from those in original offer constitutes counter offer that terminates power of original offeree to accept settlement offer. *Glende Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 389, 398, 205 Cal. Rptr. 682*

In personal injury action, former *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(g)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 998(h)*) and *Gov. Code § 68092.5*, governing payment of costs by unsuccessful party who refused to compromise, restrict fees allowable to witness who testifies solely as to any expert opinion and trial court properly rejected claim for expert witness fees when witnesses were physicians whose testimony could have been compelled by simple subpoena. *Ellenberger v. Karr (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 423, 428, 179 Cal. Rptr. 583* (*Gov. Code § 68092.5* later amended to permit fees when witness testifies primarily as expert)

It is within discretion of trial court to disallow defendant's expert witness fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)* if defendant's offer to compromise is unreasonable, unrealistic, and made with no expectation of its acceptance. *Pineda v. Los Angeles Turf Club, Inc. (1980) 112 Cal. App. 3d 53, 62-63, 169 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Plaintiff's recovery of costs not prohibited by acceptance of defendant's offer to allow judgment to be taken in "full compromise settlement" of claims. *Rappenecker v. Sea-Land Service, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 256, 261-264, 155 Cal. Rptr. 516*

Compromise settlement without trial of prior action pursuant to stipulation for payment to truck driver, when stipulation included disclaimer as to liability and recited that merit of driver's claim was in dispute, did not preclude trial on merits involving party who was not party to compromise. *Clovis Ready Mix Co. v. Aetna Freight Lines (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 276, 285, 101 Cal. Rptr. 820*

Offer to compromise pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 997* made before second trial superseded higher offer made prior to first trial for purpose of recovering costs. *Distefano v. Hall (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 380, 384-385, 69 Cal. Rptr. 691*

[8] Satisfaction of Compromise or Settlement Judgments

Satisfaction of compromise settlement judgment entered under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* did not discharge liability of defendants who were not parties to settlement agreement. *Milicevich v. Sacramento Medical Center (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1000-1007, 202 Cal. Rptr. 484*

[9] Settlement With One or More of Several Tortfeasors

To extent settlement is dictated by tactical advantage of removing deep-pocket defendant, it is not made in good faith consideration of the relevant liability of all parties. *Long Beach Memorial Medical Center v. Superior Court (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 865, 877, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494*

Applying settlement credit pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 877* in satisfaction of judgment is not modification of arbitration award on which judgment was based. *Wade v. Schrader (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1045, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 865*

In contract action in which property owner sued contractor and contractor sued property owner, and in which other property owners settled with contractor, after jury determined that property owner's breach caused $32,551.52 in unmitigable damages to contractor, and that contractor's breach caused $19,800 in damages to property owner, trial court properly gave property owner credit for $100,000 settlement paid by former codefendants, which exceeded amount awarded by jury, and correctly determined that property owner therefore owed contractor nothing, but erred when it entered judgment in favor of property owner for $19,800, and should have entered judgment awarding nothing to either party, where, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*, reversal of property owner's verdict for $19,800 did not result in double recovery to contractor because trial court's judgment awarding $19,800 to property owner and nothing to contractor gave contractor no recovery at all, and judgment appellate court instructed trial court to enter on remand, awarding nothing to either side, would still give contractor no recovery at all, and only recovery contractor obtained was settlement it received from property owner's former codefendants. *Brawley v. J.C. Interiors, Inc. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1126, 1132-1135, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*

After attorneys settled malpractice and negligent misrepresentation action against them by trust beneficiaries and obtained good faith settlement determination order pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, and, in separate probate proceeding, beneficiaries sought relief against trustee for dereliction of his trust duties, which dispute was settled, trial court erred in not granting summary judgment and summary adjudication to attorneys in action by trustee, whom attorneys had represented, for torts related to services provided trustee in connection with trusts, on grounds that claims were barred by good faith determination order, when good faith determination could bar claims of unnamed party; trustee and attorneys were joint tortfeasors; trustee's claims were either for indemnification or in effect for indemnification; and therefore, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, good faith settlement barred the trustee's claims. *Gackstetter v. Frawley (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1270-1279, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 333*

Determination of good faith settlement governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6* applies only to trial court, not to *Court of Appeal. Lopez v. Jarrett (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

Finding that settlement was in good faith under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6* as possible even though insurer for one of settling defendants arguably breached its "good faith" obligations by denying coverage and refusing to negotiate on behalf of one of nonsettling defendants; possible bad faith claim against insurer as irrelevant to issue of whether settling tortfeasor acted in good faith. *Rankin v. Curtis (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 939, 944-947, 228 Cal. Rptr. 753*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsEnforcementTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesPartial SettlementsTortsProcedureSettlementsOffers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.77

§ 520.77 Law Reviews

Kornblum, *Expediting Settlement*, *35 Prac. Law. 15 (1989)*

Brazil, *Protecting the Confidentiality of Settlement Negotiations*, *39 Hastings L.J. 955 (1988)*

Comment, *The Changing Face of Mary Carter Agreements in California: The Aftermath of Abbott Ford and Proposition 51*, *16 Pepp. L. Rev. 795 (1988)*

Roberts, *The Relatively Insolvent Joint Tortfeasor and the Good Faith Settlement*, *20 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 247 (1987)*

Charfoos and Christensen, *Negotiating Settlements*, 32(2) Prac. Law. 57 (1986)

Comment, *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Panacea or Anathema*, *99 Harv. L. Rev. 668 (1986)*

Comment, *California Code of Civil Procedure Sections 877, 877.5 and 877.6: The Settlement Game in the Ballpark That Tech-Bilt*, *13 Pepp. L. Rev. 823 (1986)*

Bergeisen, *How to Manage Litigation and Evaluate Outside Counsel*, 31(3) Prac. Law. 37 (1985)

Note, *The Impact of Collateral Estoppel on Postjudgment Settlements*, *15 Sw. U.L. Rev. 343 (1985)*

Note, *Revocation of Section 998 Offers: T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court*, *19 U.S.F. L. Rev. 283 (1985)*

Roberts, *The "Good Faith" Settlement: An Accommodation of Competing Goals*, *17 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 841 (1984)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsOffers of JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityMary Carter Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.78

§ 520.78 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, § 54, vol. 9, *Appeal*, §§ 145, 490-492 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 211, 215; vol 2, *Insurance, § 28* (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.79-520.89

[Reserved]

§§ 520.79[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.90

§ 520.90 California Legal Forms

For additional forms for release, and related discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.91

§ 520.91 California Torts

For discussion of releases in the context of settlement of tort actions, see Levy, Golden, and Sacks, California Torts, Ch. 73, *Settlement and Release*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.92

§ 520.92 State Statutes

General release executed during period of first physical confinement. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6152(b)*

Obligation extinguished by release. *Civ. Code § 1541*

Claims not extinguished by release. *Civ. Code § 1542*

Effect of release on claims of joint debtors and right of contribution. *Civ. Code § 1543*

Liability of surety to creditor who may have released principal. *Civ. Code § 2824*

Trial on validity of release. *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*

Releases from and contribution among joint tortfeasors. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 875-880*

Release of lien is required, for recording, to set forth name of obligor whose obligation is basis of lien being released. *Gov. Code § 27288.1*

Effect of employer's requirement that employee release wage claim. *Lab. Code § 206.5*

Consent not required for release of third-party tortfeasor for employee's injuries. *Lab. Code § 3859*

Consent of Worker's Compensation Appeals Board to employee's release of claim for injury or death. *Lab. Code §§ 5000, 5001*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.93

§ 520.93 Decisions

[1] Conditions Affecting Operation of Release

Act of State Board of Control employee in withholding appropriation made by Legislature to compensate private citizen injured while preventing crime [former *Penal Code §§ 13600-13603, now see Gov. Code §§ 13970-13974.1*] constituted unlawful condition to payment rendering release ineffective. *Worthington v. State Bd. of Control (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 697, 699-700, 72 Cal. Rptr. 449*

[2] Consideration for Release

Written release unsupported by consideration requires express showing of creditor's intent to extinguish obligation. *Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 31 n. 7, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P.2d 212*

[3] Definition of Release

Definition and theory of release. *Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783* ; *Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*

Definition of release under *Civ. Code § 1542*. *Sime v. Malouf (1949) 95 Cal. App. 2d 82, 108-110, 212 P.2d 946*

[4] Effect of Release

Application form signed by parents releasing city and its employees from liability for "any negligent act" related to child's participation in city's summer camp for developmentally disabled children violated public policy and was unenforceable to extent it released liability for future gross negligence. *City of Santa Barbara v. Superior Court (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 747, 753-781, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527, 161 P.3d 1095*

Trial court erred in finding that release signed by plaintiff before beginning trail ride operated by stable did not bar action against stable based on negligence of employee leading ride, where release did not unambiguously exempt stable from liability for its own negligence or for any and all risks plaintiff encountered while using stable's facilities, and trial court not only improperly resolved ambiguity in favor of drafter, but ignored principle that release relieves defendant of consequences of its own negligence only if it does so in clear, unambiguous, and explicit language. *Cohen v. Five Brooks Stable (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1476, 1484-1491*

Release agreement signed by employee regarding suspension of his employment following altercation with coworker was ambiguous about scope of waiver and question of whether release waived employee's right to bring discrimination action was question of fact, for which extrinsic evidence could be introduced to resolve ambiguity. *Butler v. Vons Cos., Inc. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 943, 947-951, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151*

Release signed by dog owner to have dog neutered was complete defense to action resulting from dog's death, when claims were within scope of release language and owner failed to show defendants' retention of dog because he was not neutered was unlawful so as to establish statutory duress which coerced owner to sign release. Release applied to claims of wrongful impoundment and detention, because claims sought recovery of general and special damages arising from dog's death, which owner waived by his agreement to release defendants from and against any and all claims arising from surgery on dog. Finally, agreement, voluntarily entered into, did not violate public policy. *Tarpy v. County of San Diego (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 267, 276-279, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607*

Agreement for minority shareholder to sell stock back to majority shareholders could not release directors or majority shareholders from tort liability to seller on any claim based on their subsequent sale of company, which resulted in their receiving higher price for their shares than seller received. Agreement provided that seller would not sue merely because majority shareholders ultimately obtained more for their shares than seller received for his, but tort causes of action were not based on claim they breached duty to share ultimate proceeds from sale with him on a pro rata basis, but when that in negotiating purchase of minority shareholder's shares defendants breached their duties to disclose and not misrepresent all material facts bearing on value of shares at time he sold them. *Neubauer v. Goldfarb (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 47, 58-59, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 218*

Release conclusively estops party from reviving and relitigating claim released. *In re Mission Ins. Co. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 828, 838, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 209*

Mere recital that protection of *Civ. Code § 1542* is waived, or that release covers unknown claims or unknown parties, does not control; whether releasor intended to discharge claims or parties is ultimately question of fact. *Vega v. Western Employers Ins. Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 922, 927, 216 Cal. Rptr. 592 , overruled in part by Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 310, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58*

Release does not extend to claims not known or suspected to exist, and mere recital in release, that it covers unknown claims or that *Civ. Code § 1542* is waived, does not of itself bar assertion that bodily injuries were unknown; whether releasor actually intended to discharge claims is question of fact; and mere knowledge of some injury does not necessarily imply knowledge of extent thereof. *Grebe v. McDaniel (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 901, 903, 71 Cal. Rptr. 662*

[5] Requirements for Formation of Valid Release

Terms of release require mutual assent by all parties to release for release to be binding on them. *Smith v. Occidental and Oriental Steamship Co. (1893) 99 Cal. 462, 470-471, 34 P. 84*

Employment severance agreement could be enforced despite lack of waiver of *Civ. Code § 1542* providing that general release does not extend to claims creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at time of executing release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his or her settlement with debtor, where agreement stated plaintiff waived all claims existing as of date he signed agreement arising from or relating to his employment or termination of his employment and any claims arising under common law of contract, implied contract, tort, public policy, or statute, such as claims under specified legislative enactments, or any other federal or state law, statute, decision, order, policy or regulation establishing or relating to claims or rights of employees, including, but not limited to claims in tort or contract, based upon public policy, and any and all claims alleging breach of express or implied, or oral or written, contract, or alleging misrepresentation, defamation, interference with contract, or wrongful discharge, and plaintiff understood he was releasing claims arising under all statutes agreement referred to, even those he did not understand; and where nothing in *Civ. Code § 1542* required that it be designated in release or that party specifically waive its provisions. *Perez v. Uline (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 953, 958-959, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872*

Agreement for sale of stock could not knowingly and intelligently waive any fiduciary duty directors or majority shareholders owed to seller, because waiver of corporate directors' and majority shareholders' fiduciary duties to minority shareholders in private close corporations is against public policy and contract provision in buy-sell agreement purporting to effect such waiver is void. Even if fiduciary duty validly could be waived, waiver required knowing and intelligent relinquishment of right, and triable issue of fact existed as to whether seller's purported waiver was fully informed. *Neubauer v. Goldfarb (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 47, 55-57, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 218*

Release is knowingly and voluntarily signed notwithstanding contention that signer was not told that release would affect certain claims. *Skrbina v. Fleming Companies (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1353, 1367, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 481*

[6] Enforcement of Release

Absent laches, defendant may file supplemental answer setting up defense of release. *Seehorn v. Big Meadows & Bodie Wagon Road Co. (1882) 60 Cal. 240, 251*

[7] Interpretation of Release

Parol evidence of circumstances surrounding execution of release is admissible to place court in position of those whose language he or she must interpret. *Jersey Island Dredging Co. v. Whitney (1906) 149 Cal. 269, 273, 86 P. 691*

Release given by decedent was no bar to death action by heirs. *Earley v. Pacific Electric Ry. Co. (1917) 176 Cal. 79, 81-82, 167 P. 513*

In personal injury action by spectator against speedway owner for injuries suffered when speedway pit-area bleachers collapsed, trial court erred in finding that release of liability signed by plaintiff releasing defendant from all liability for any injuries sustained while on premises was complete defense because injury was reasonably related to purpose of release agreement. The purpose of release was not merely to give access to restricted areas of speedway, but to require releasee to assume risk of injury as result of being in close proximity to dangerous activity of automobile racing and any further risk that might result from activity of observing such a race. Plaintiff's express assumption of risk would cover all hazards related to automobile race and its observation, but release agreement did not contractually charge plaintiff with assuming risk of injury from defectively constructed or maintained bleachers. *Sweat v. Big Time Auto Racing, Inc. (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 1301, 1304-1308, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 678*

In action by skier against resort for negligence and premises liability based on fall, trial court erroneously granted defendant summary judgment based on release to which plaintiff agreed as part of season pass, which allowed plaintiff to use defendant's facilities Monday through Friday. The accident occurred on Sunday, for which plaintiff had bought

day pass which did not include a release, and defendant did not demonstrate that release necessarily applied to plaintiff's claim. *Solis v. Kirkwood Resort Co. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 354, 360-364, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265*

In carrying out de novo interpretation of release, appellate court's inquiry is whether release is broad enough in scope to cover activities in question, or whether activities were of type originally contemplated by parties in entering into release. *Paralift, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 23 Cal. App. 4th 748, 756, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177*

[8] Joint Debtors, Tortfeasors, and Coobligors

In Ninth Circuit, release of one tortfeasor does not release all other joint tortfeasors, absent agreement to effect release of any or all other tortfeasors. *Avery v. U.S. (9th Cir. 1987) 829 F.2d 817, 819*

In action against automobile manufacturer based on automobile accident, extrinsic evidence presented at trial established as matter of law that inclusion of language in release of driver of other vehicle and his insurance company ostensibly releasing all third parties from liability was mutual mistake, when testimony of contracting parties to effect that release of manufacturer was not intended was relevant in describing their disclosed intentions; trial court properly removed issue of scope of release from jury so any error in judicially noticing that there had been judicial reformation judgment conforming release to parties' intentions was harmless. *Hess v. Ford Motor Co. (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 516, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220, 41 P.3d 46*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, plaintiff in tort action who sues one party as alter ego of subsidiary corporation can proceed against alleged alter ego after settlement with subsidiary. *Mesler v. Bragg Management Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 290, 297-306, 216 Cal. Rptr. 443, 702 P.2d 601*

Settlement made in good faith under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 877* and *877.6* bars claims against settling defendant for contribution or indemnity by other joint tortfeasors, including claims for total indemnity, partial indemnity and implied contractual indemnity. *Fullerton Redevelopment Agency v. Southern California Gas Co. (2010) 183 Cal. App. 4th 428, 432, 107 Cal. Rptr. 3d 396*

Due process requires that unnamed joint tortfeasor not be bound by good faith determination under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, when that tortfeasor's potential liability was known or reasonably should have been known to settling parties but he or she was not given opportunity to be heard at good faith determination. *Singer Co. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 875, 881, 890-895, 225 Cal. Rptr. 159*

When parties stipulate to fact and amount of prior settlement after verdict but before entry of judgment, defendant is entitled to judgment in amount that reflects credit for payment received by plaintiff in settlements from other tortfeasors prior to trial; when plaintiff's settlement completely offsets damages assessed against nonsettling joint tortfeasor, judgment is reduced to zero by operation of law, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*. *Syverson v. Heitmann (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 106, 110-112, 214 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6*, good faith settlement by one or more joint tortfeasors that bars any other joint tortfeasor from claiming comparative indemnity against settling tortfeasors is available in commercial actions and not limited to personal injury actions. *Kohn v. Superior Court (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 323, 332, 191 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Requirement that settlement with released joint tortfeasor be in good faith is meant to insure that settling parties refrain from tortious or other wrongful conduct against nonsettling parties; failure of sliding scale agreements to achieve equitable apportionment or final settlement of litigation does not mean that good faith is absent. *Burlington Northern R.R. Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 942, 945-947, 187 Cal. Rptr. 376*

In action involving joint tortfeasors, settlement and release by plaintiff of one joint tortfeasor requires offset in trial judgment against nonsettling tortfeasor. *Knox v. County of Los Angeles (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 825, 832, 167 Cal. Rptr. 463*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*, release of agent before trial does not discharge principal from tort liability, even though sole basis alleged for recovery from principal is his vicarious liability for acts of agent. *Ritter v. Technicolor Corp. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 152 153-155, 103 Cal. Rptr. 686*

Release executed by tort victim in violation of good faith requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 877* did not activate common law rule that release of one joint tortfeasor releases all, but rather permitted tortfeasor to invoke release's illegality, have it set aside, and seek damages from tort victim. *River Garden Farms, Inc. v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 986, 999-1001, 103 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Effect of payment from one joint tortfeasor on amount of damages recoverable against other joint tortfeasor. *Steele v. Hash (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 1, 2-3, 27 Cal. Rptr. 853*

[9] Ratification of Release

Ratification of void release is not possible when person alleged to have ratified did not know what agreement contained or all the facts when alleged ratification occurred. *Backus v. Sessions (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 380, 385, 110 P.2d 51*

Rescindable release is subject to ratification by conduct of releasor. *Eustace v. Lynch (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 486, 491, 111 P.2d 372*

[10] Rescission of Voidable Release

Rescission is required of releases that are merely voidable, rather than void. *Garcia v. California Truck Co. (1920) 183 Cal. 767, 770, 192 P. 708*

In determining whether releasor was mentally competent to execute release, court properly receives evidence of releasor's mental condition both before and after execution of release. *Perkins v. Sunset Tel. and Tel. Co. (1909) 155 Cal. 712, 717, 103 P. 190*

Release is subject to rescission for same reasons as other contracts. *Matthews v. A.T. & S.F. Ry. (1942) 54 Cal. App. 2d 549, 557, 129 P.2d 435*

Circumstantial evidence is admissible to prove fraud in execution of release. *Wilson v. San Francisco O. T. Railways (1920) 48 Cal. App. 343, 348, 191 P. 975*

[11] Review

Appellate court is not required to consider or rule on validity of release that is neither framed by pleadings nor specially pleaded. *Hildebrand v. Stonecrest Corp. (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 158, 164, 169, 344 P.2d 378*

Generally when conflicting evidence is offered on existence of facts tending to negate consent to release, inferences to be drawn from these facts are for trier of fact, and resulting findings of fact are not to be disturbed on appeal. *Mathews v. Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 424, 430, 118 P.2d 10*

[12] Summary Judgment

Mutual release supported summary judgment against owner as to claim against architect for negligent supervision of construction contract. *Larsen v. Johannes (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 491, 496-507, 86 Cal. Rptr. 744*

Release is sufficient to support summary judgment for releasee. *Grebe v. McDaniel (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 901, 902-904, 71 Cal. Rptr. 662*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityInterpretation of ReleasesContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesContributionTortsProcedureSettlementsMultipartiesIndemnityTortsProcedureSettlemen SettlementsTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesConstruction & InterpretationTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.94

§ 520.94 Law Reviews

Comment, *Effect of the Personal Injury Release on Further Recovery in California, 42 Cal. L. Rev. 161 (1954)*

Note, *New Proposal for an Old Problem: Protect Victims of Unfair Releases, 1 Stan. L. Rev. 298 (1949)*

Note, *Releases: Partial Release of Tort Claims: Need for Legislation, 32 Cal. L. Rev. 101 (1944)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.95

§ 520.95 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 1019, 1028 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 946-949; vol. 2, *Insurance, § 253* (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewInsurance LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.96-520.109

[Reserved]

§§ 520.96[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.110

§ 520.110 Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise Before Commencement of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

[1] FORM Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise Before Commencement of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[PLAINTIFF'S *or* DEFENDANT'S] OFFER TO
Defendant.	)	COMPROMISE
	)	
	)	

_____

TO _____ [*name and designation of party, e.g.,* JANE DOE, PLAINTIFF], AND TO _____ [*name*], HIS/HER ATTORNEY OF RECORD:

[*EITHER, if defendant is offering to compromise*]

Defendant, _____ [*name*], offers to have _____ [judgment *or* award] taken against himself/herself and for plaintiff, _____ [*name*], in the above-entitled action pursuant to *Section 998 of the Code of Civil Procedure* for the sum of $_____, _____ [each party to bear his/her own costs (and attorney's fees) *or* plus taxable costs incurred to date of judgment] [, and according to the

additional terms and conditions as follow: _____ (*specify*)].

[*OR, if plaintiff is offering to compromise*]

Plaintiff, _____ [*name*], offers to have _____ [judgment *or* award] taken against defendant, _____ [*name*], and for himself/herself in the above-entitled action pursuant to *Section 998 of the Code of Civil Procedure* for the sum of $_____, _____ [each party to bear his/her own costs (and attorney's fees) *or* plus taxable costs incurred to date of judgment] [, and according to the additional terms and conditions as follow: _____ (*specify*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

If you accept this offer, please date and sign the accompanying notice of acceptance, and file the offer and notice of acceptance in the above-entitled action prior to trial or within 30 days after the offer is made, whichever occurs first, or else it will be deemed withdrawn.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant]

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____
[Plaintiff *or* Defendant]

Service on _____ [*date*], of the above offer to compromise is admitted.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____
[*specify party accepting service*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is an offer to compromise that may be served by any party on any other party to an action to allow judgment (or contractual arbitration award under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1281, 1296*) to be taken in accordance with the terms and conditions stated at that time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*].

As an alternative to this form, optional Judicial Council Form CIV-090, illustrated in § 520.110, may be used in appropriate cases. Form CIV-090 may be used only in civil actions involving a single plaintiff and a single defendant, and the offer and acceptance must involve a money judgment. In other cases, an attorney-drafted form such as this one must be used.

The written offer must include a statement of the offer, containing the terms and conditions of the judgment or award, and a provision allowing the accepting party to indicate acceptance of the offer by signing a statement that the offer is accepted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*].

If the offer is not accepted, the costs allowed under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1031* and *1032* (*see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1033-1034* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1700 et seq.*) are to be withheld as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*see*

Code Civ. Proc. § 998(a)].

This form may be adapted for use by a cross complainant or cross defendant, as *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* applies to those parties as well [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 998(f)*].

If a personal injury plaintiff's offer is not accepted and the plaintiff obtains a more favorable judgment, the judgment must bear interest from the date of plaintiff's first offer pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* which is exceeded by the judgment [*Civ. Code § 3291*].

The optional language referring to attorney's fees would be included only if there is some reason why the general rule that a party bears his or her own attorney's fees [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021*] would not apply, such as when a contract provision states otherwise [*see* discussion in Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*]. Note that if the offer is silent on attorney's fees, and the action was brought on a contract providing for recovery of attorney's fees by the prevailing party, the prevailing party may recover attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* as an item of costs after judgment [*Lanyi v. Goldblum (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 181, 189, 223 Cal. Rptr. 32*].

Similarly, when the accepted offer is silent on the issue of costs, the plaintiff may recover costs in addition to the specified amount of the written offer [*Rappenecker v. Sea-Land Service, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 256, 261-264, 155 Cal. Rptr. 516*].

This form should include a place for the offeree to accept the offer or be accompanied by a notice of acceptance [*see § 520.111*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. The offeror may also request that the offeree prepare the acceptance form, with either party filing the offer with proof of acceptance to obtain a judgment. The acceptance provision may be combined with this form instead of using a separate notice.

For forms for captions for use in contractual arbitration proceedings, see Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration: Appointment of Arbitrator and Conduct of Proceeding* .

[3] Signatures

The offer should be signed by the offeror, as well as the offeror's attorney, in order to avoid problems concerning the attorney's authority to compromise a claim for the client [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 283*; *see also § 520.76[3]*, and *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.30* et seq.].

[4] Time and Manner of Service

An offer to compromise made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* must be served not less than 10 days prior to commencement of the trial or contractual arbitration under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1281, 1296* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. According to *Code Civ. Proc. § 581(1)*, a trial or arbitration is deemed to be actually commenced at the beginning of the opening statement of the plaintiff or his or her counsel, and if there is no opening statement, then at the time of the administration of the oath or affirmation to the first witness, or of the introduction of any evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(3)*].

The offer may be served on the party or attorney by personal service, substituted service, or mail [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1013*]. Counsel should secure proof of service in case the offer is rejected and it later becomes necessary to establish the making of the offer in order to recover costs pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c), (d)* or *(e)*. This form contains an acknowledgment of service. The offeror can serve an extra copy of the form on the offeree to be signed and returned to the offeror. For forms and procedure relating to service and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[5] Cross References

For a discussion of the authority of an attorney to compromise a client's claim, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.30* et seq.

For a discussion of the effects of the acceptance or expiration of an offer to compromise, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50* et seq.

For discussion of the right to prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3291*, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

[6] State Statutes

Authority of any party to serve written offer on any other party to action to allow judgment to be taken in accordance with stated terms and conditions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b), (f)*

[7] Decisions

If a Section 998 offer is withdrawn by party before its statutory expiration, withdrawing party's right to cost shifting under Section 998 is determined by last rejected Section 998 offer. *One Star, Inc. v. Staar Surgical Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1093-1094, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195*

When judgment is entered based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* settlement offer in action brought on contract that provided for recovery of attorney's fees by prevailing party, attorney's fees may be recovered under *Civ. Code § 1717* as item of costs after judgment, even though settlement agreement is silent on costs and fees. *Lanyi v. Goldblum (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 181, 189, 223 Cal. Rptr. 32*

Settlement offer made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* is revocable by offeror; settlement offer made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* does not create irrevocable option. *T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273, 280-283, 204 Cal. Rptr. 143, 682 P.2d 338*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.110A

§ 520.110A Offer to Compromise and Acceptance Under Code Civ. Proc. § 998--Judicial Council Form CIV-090

[1] FORM Offer to Compromise and Acceptance Under Code Civ. Proc. § 998--Judicial Council Form CIV-090

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustration of California Judicial Council Form CIV-090, which is for optional use by a plaintiff to make an offer to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*. The form may be used only in civil actions involving a single plaintiff and a single defendant. The offer and acceptance must involve a money judgment. In other cases, a form such as that illustrated in § 520.110 should be used.

This form includes space for acceptance of the offer by the defendant. For an attorney-drafted form for a defendant's acceptance of a plaintiff's offer to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, see *§ 520.111*.

For general discussion of the use of a form for an offer to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998, see § 520.110[2]*. For time and manner of service, *see § 520.110[4]*.

The court will only file the offer and acceptance if accompanied by a judgment prepared for the court's signature and entry of judgment. For forms for judgment and entry of judgment, *see* Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at *www.lexisone.com* for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format is also available at *www.lexisone.com* at no charge.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.111

§ 520.111 Notice [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] of Acceptance of Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

[1] FORM Notice [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] of Acceptance of Plaintiff's or Defendant's Offer to Compromise [Code Civ. Proc. § 998]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER TO COM-
Defendant.	)	PROMISE
	)	
	)	

_____

TO _____ [*name and designation of party, e.g.,* JOHN RAE, DEFENDANT], AND TO _____ [*name*], HIS/HER ATTORNEY OF RECORD:

[*EITHER, for plaintiff's acceptance of offer to compromise*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that plaintiff, _____ [*name*], accepts the offer made by defendant to have judgment taken against defendant and for plaintiff, _____ [*name*], in the above-entitled action for the sum of $_____, _____ [each party to bear his/her own costs (and attorney's fees)

or plus taxable costs incurred to date of judgment] [, and according to the additional terms and conditions as follow: _____ (*specify*)].

[*OR, for defendant's acceptance of offer to compromise*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that defendant, _____ [*name*], accepts the offer made by plaintiff to have judgment taken for plaintiff and against defendant, _____ [*name*], in the above-entitled action for the sum of $_____, _____ [each party to bear his/her own costs (and attorney's fees) *or* plus taxable costs incurred to date of judgment] [, and according to the additional terms and conditions as follow: _____ (*specify*)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant]

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____
[Plaintiff *or* Defendant]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice for use by a party who has received an offer to compromise to notify the offeror of his or her acceptance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*]. This form may be adapted for use by a cross complainant or cross defendant, as *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* applies to those parties as well [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 998(f)*].

This form should be modified as appropriate if used in contractual arbitration proceedings. For forms for captions for use in those proceedings, see Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration: Appointment of Arbitrator and Conduct of Proceeding* .

When the plaintiff uses optional Judicial Council Form CIV-090 [*see § 520.110A*] for an offer to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, that form contains a signature block for the defendant's acceptance of the offer, and use of a separate form such as this one is unnecessary in that case.

[3] Requirement of Writing and Signature

Any acceptance of an offer to compromise under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, whether made on the document containing the offer or on a separate document of acceptance, must be in writing and signed by counsel for the accepting party or, if not represented by counsel, by the accepting party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*].

[4] Timing of Acceptance

An offer to compromise made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* must be accepted prior to trial or arbitration, or within 30 days after it is made, whichever occurs first, or else it is deemed withdrawn and cannot be given in evidence on trial or arbitration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(2)*].

[5] Notice to Court

If an entire case in superior court is settled, each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief must immediately file written notice of the settlement or other disposition with the court and serve the notice on all parties and any arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral involved in the case. Each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief also

must immediately give oral notice to all of the above if a hearing, conference, or trial is scheduled to take place within 10 days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)*]. For the Judicial Council form for a Notice of Settlement, which is required for use to notify the court and any arbitrator or court-connected ADR neutral, see *§ 520.114*.

[6] Obtaining Judgment or Arbitration Award

If the offer to compromise is accepted, the offer, with proof of acceptance, must be filed, and the clerk or the judge must enter judgment accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(1)*]. The offeree's signed notice of acceptance filed with the court should be sufficient proof of acceptance.

In the case of an arbitration, the offer of proof of acceptance must be filed with the arbitrator or arbitrators who promptly must render an award accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)*].

For forms for judgments obtained by similar procedures, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* , for forms for default judgments entered by clerk pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 585(a)*, and Ch. 318, *Judgments*, § 318.40 et seq., for a form for a judgment entered by the clerk on a jury verdict pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*.

[7] State Statutes

Acceptance of offer to compromise. *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(b)(1)*

[8] California Rules of Court

Duty of plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief to file with court and give any arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral written notice of settlement of case. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)*

[9] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 520.110*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.112

§ 520.112 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Compromise of Claim Before Suit by Acceptance of Defendant's Promise

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Compromise of Claim Before Suit by Acceptance of Defendant's Promise

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], and before the filing of plaintiff's complaint in this action, plaintiff demanded from defendant _____ [the sum sued for in the complaint *or describe other property as appropriate*], and defendant refused to _____ [pay the sum *or* deliver the property] because a dispute existed between them as to the extent of defendant's obligation to plaintiff.

2. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a[n] _____ [oral *or* written] agreement in compromise of plaintiff's claim whereby defendant promised to _____ [pay the sum of $_____ *or* deliver the property described above] to plaintiff on or before _____ [*date*], and plaintiff promised to accept defendant's promise in full compromise and satisfaction of the claim. [*If written agreement, add:* A copy of the compromise agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and made a part hereof.]

3. The time for performance of defendant's promise has not expired.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use as an affirmative defense [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*] in an answer to a complaint based on the breach of an obligation [*see Civ. Code §§ 1427, 1428*] which has been extinguished by an oral or written compromise and settlement agreement. A compromise and settlement agreement is either a form of accord and satisfaction, if the parties intended that the mere execution of the agreement without satisfaction not extinguish the underlying obligation [*see Stub v. Belmont (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 208, 217-218, 124 P.2d 826]* , or else it is a form of novation, if they intended its mere execution to extinguish the obligation [*see Armstrong v. Sacramento Valley R. Co. (1919) 179 Cal. 648, 651, 178 P. 516* ; *see also* Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction*].

[3] Allegations

A pleading sufficiently establishes a compromise and settlement agreement if it alleges the following: (1) a dispute in good faith over a legal claim; (2) offer and acceptance of the compromise (Paragraph 2); and (3) consideration (Paragraph 2) [*Stub v. Belmont (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 208, 215-217, 124 P.2d 826]* .

[4] Cross References

For forms for use in pleading a written or oral accord and satisfaction as an affirmative defense to an action based on an alleged breach of an obligation, see Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction*

For a general discussion of answers and forms for pleading affirmative defenses, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

For forms of affirmative defenses to contract actions generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

[5] State Statutes

Accord and satisfaction. *Civ. Code §§ 1521-1525*

Pleading affirmative defense in answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*

[6] Decisions

Agreement to accept debtor's promise in satisfaction of existing obligation as extinguishing obligation. *Silvers v. Grossman (1920) 183 Cal. 696, 699, 192 P. 534* ; *but see Gardiner v. Gaither (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 607, 619-621, 329 P.2d 22* (where court described acceptance of new promise as a novation)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.113

§ 520.113 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30]--Tender Before Commencement of Action of Full Amount Due Plaintiff and Deposit of That Amount in Court [Civ. Code § 1717; Code Civ. Proc. § 1025]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30]--Tender Before Commencement of Action of Full Amount Due Plaintiff and Deposit of That Amount in Court [Civ. Code § 1717; Code Civ. Proc. § 1025]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR COSTS, defendant alleges:

1. Before the commencement of the above-entitled action, defendant tendered to plaintiff the full amount to which plaintiff was entitled, in the sum of $_____.

2. Defendant herewith deposits in court for plaintiff the amount of $_____ so tendered.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use as an affirmative defense [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*] in an answer to plaintiff's request for costs in an action for the recovery of money only, in which defendant alleges that before the commencement of the action he or she tendered to the plaintiff the full amount to which he or she was entitled, and thereon deposits in court, for plaintiff, the amount so tendered. If the allegation is found to be true, the plaintiff cannot recover costs, but must pay costs to the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1025*].

The allegation may also be used as an affirmative defense in any action on a contract providing for fees and costs to determine if the defendant is a prevailing party on the contract within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1717* [*see Civ. Code § 1717(a), (b)(2)*; *see also § 520.22*].

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of the effect on payment of costs of defendant's tender before commencement, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*

[4] State Statutes

Effect of defendant's tender in action on contract providing for fees and costs. *Civ. Code § 1717(a), (b)(2)*

Pleading affirmative defense in answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*

Effect on payment of costs of defendant's tender before commencement of action for recovery of money and subsequent deposit in court of tendered amount. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1025*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.114

§ 520.114 Notice of Settlement of Entire Case [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 225]--Judicial Council Form CM-200

[1] FORM Notice of Settlement of Entire Case [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 225]--Judicial Council Form CM-200

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the Judicial Council form Notice of Settlement of Entire Case [Cal. Judicial Council Form CM-200], adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*Code Civ. Proc. § 706.120*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Appendix Rules 1.30 et seq.]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This notice must be filed immediately on settlement by each plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief and served on each party and any arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral involved in the case. Oral notice must be given if a hearing, conference or trial is scheduled to take place within 10 days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)(1)*]. Failure to give timely notice to the arbitrator or court-connected ADR neutral may result in an order to compensate the arbitrator or ADR neutral for the scheduled hearing time [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)(2)*].

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(b) governs when a request for dismissal must be filed, depending on whether the settlement is conditional or unconditional. For discussion of request for dismissal and conditional or unconditional settlement, see *§ 520.19*.

[3] California Rules of Court

Duty of plaintiff or other party seeking affirmative relief to file with court and give any arbitrator or other court-connected ADR neutral written notice of settlement. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(a)*

Dismissal after settlement. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1385(b), (c)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.115

§ 520.115 Notice of Motion to Enter Judgment Pursuant to Settlement [Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion to Enter Judgment Pursuant to Settlement [Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR EN-
Plaintiff,	)	FORCEMENT OF SETTLEMENT
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____ [*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order to enter judgment in accordance with the terms of the settlement entered into by _____ [*specify parties, e.g.,* plaintiff and defendant] on _____ [*date*] at _____ [*city*], California, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein. The motion will be made on the grounds that judgment may properly

be so entered to enforce the settlement pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion is for use in requesting that the court enter judgment pursuant to the terms of a settlement. If parties to pending litigation stipulate for settlement of the case in a writing signed outside the presence of the court or orally before the court, the court, on motion, may enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*]. For discussion, see *§ 520.21*.

A memorandum must accompany notices of motion in law and motion proceedings [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For general discussion and forms relating to memoranda, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Cross References

For general discussion and forms relating to motions and orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Settlement

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 520.116-520.129

[Reserved]

§§ 520.116[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.130

§ 520.130 General Release Agreement [Civ. Code §§ 1541, 1542]

[1] FORM General Release Agreement [Civ. Code §§ 1541, 1542]

GENERAL RELEASE OF EXISTING CLAIMS

_____ [*Name of releasor*], _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city and state*], hereinafter referred to as "Releasor," and _____ [*name of releasee*], _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city and state*], hereinafter referred to as "Releasee," in consideration of the promises made herein, agree as follows:

1. Releasor has sustained _____ [injury *and/or* damages] arising out of

[*EITHER, if claims arise from contract*]

_____ [*describe transaction, e.g.,* a contract entered into between Releasor and Releasee] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], a copy of which is marked as Exhibit _____, attached hereto, and incorporated by reference herein.

[*OR, if claims arise from tort*]

_____ [*describe occurrence, e.g.,* an automobile accident] that occurred on _____ [*date*] in _____ [*city and state*].

[*ADD, if releasor has commenced an action against releasee based on transaction or occurrence giving rise to claims released*]

2. On _____ [*date*], Releasor filed an action in the _____ Court for the County of _____, California, case number _____, entitled _____. This action arose out of the _____ [occurrence *or* transaction] described in Paragraph 1.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. Releasor, on behalf of himself/herself, his/her heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns[, and in consideration of $ _____ paid to him/her by Releasee], hereby fully releases Releasee, his/her successors, and all other persons and associations, known or unknown, from all claims and causes of action by reason of any _____ [injury *and/or* damage] which _____ [has *or* have] been sustained, or may be sustained, as a result of the above-described _____ [transaction *or* occurrence].

[*ADD, if release extends to unknown claims*]

4. Releasor acknowledges and agrees that this release applies to all claims that Releasor may have against Releasee arising out of the above-described _____ [transaction *or* occurrence] for injuries, damages, or losses to Releasor's person and property, real or personal, whether those injuries, damages, or losses are known or unknown, foreseen or unforeseen, or patent or latent.

5. Releasor certifies that he/she has read *Section 1542 of the Civil Code*, set out below, and indicates that fact by signing his/her initials here: _____.

A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him must have materially affected his settlement with the debtor.

6. Releasor hereby waives application of *Section 1542 of the Civil Code*.

7. Releasor understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of *Section 1542 of the Civil Code* is that even if Releasor should eventually suffer additional damages arising out of the above-described _____ [transaction *or* occurrence], he/she will not be permitted to make any claim for those damages. Furthermore, Releasor acknowledges that he/she intends these consequences even as to claims for _____ [injury *and/or* damages] that may exist as of the date of this release but which Releasor does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect Releasor's decision to execute this release, regardless of whether Releasor's lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

[*CONTINUE*]

8. Releasor warrants and represents that in executing this release, he/she has relied on legal advice from the attorney of his/her choice, that the terms of this release and its consequences have been completely read and explained to Releasor by that attorney, and that Releasor fully understands the terms of this release.

9. Releasor acknowledges and represents that he/she has been apprised of all relevant information and data furnished by _____ [*name of expert*] and all other information relevant to his/her claim and this release, including, without limitation, _____ [*specify, e.g.*, future risks, complications, and costs]. Releasor further acknowledges and represents that, in executing this release, he/she has not relied on any inducements, promises, or

representations made by Releasee or any party representing or serving Releasee.

10. Releasor acknowledges and warrants that his/her execution of this release is free and voluntary. [Releasor further declares that at the time he/she executed this release, he/she was neither an inpatient nor an outpatient of a medical facility for treatment of the injury that gave rise to the claim to which this release relates.]

11. This release pertains to a disputed claim and does not constitute an admission of liability by Releasee for the above-described _____ [transaction *or* occurrence]

[*ADD, if Releasor will move to dismiss underlying cause of action*]

12. Releasor will prepare and file a request for dismissal with prejudice of the action described in Paragraph 2 by _____ [*date*].

READ THE ABOVE CAREFULLY BEFORE SIGNING

_____ [*date and place*]

_____ [*signature*]
Releasor

Declaration of Witness

I, _____ [*name*], certify that Releasor acknowledged in my presence that he/she had read and fully understood the meaning and consequences of the foregoing release, and signed it in my presence.

_____ [*date and place*]

_____ [*signature*]
[*Address of witness*]

Declaration of Releasor's Attorney

I, _____ [*name*], a member of the State Bar of California and attorney for Releasor, certify that I am satisfied that Releasor fully understands the effect, significance, and consequence of the release set forth above.

_____ [*date and place*]

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Releasor

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of general release is for use to release another party from liability arising out of an occurrence or transaction giving rise to a cause of action against that party. As such, a release is generally a part of most settlement

agreements.

The foregoing form may be adapted for use in securing a release from liability in either tort or contract actions (alternative Paragraphs 1). It includes optional language for use when the releasor has filed an action arising out of the facts giving rise to liability (Paragraph 2) and has agreed to file a dismissal of that action with prejudice (Paragraph 12). The form also includes optional language for use when the release extends to claims unknown at the time of executing the release (Paragraphs 4-7).

This form is only for use to release a party from liability for acts already committed and should not be adapted as an exculpatory release from liability arising from future acts [*see also* discussion in *§ 520.44[3]*].

For alternate forms of release agreements, see 14 California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations*.

[3] Drafting Requirements

[a] In General

A written release agreement may, but need not, recite new consideration for the release (Paragraph 3) [*Civ. Code § 1541*; for further discussion relating to the effect of a written release and when a written release is required, see *§ 520.45[3]*]. Otherwise, there is no particular form or set of words essential to the validity of a release [*Coats v. General Motors Corp. (1934) 3 Cal. App. 2d 340, 351, 39 P.2d 838]* . One court has suggested that sometimes "boiler plate" or stereotyped language is acceptable in a release, if the language is used appropriately, because the language has the value of frequent usage and general understanding, and may thus enhance the clarity of the release beyond doubt [*see Dart Industries Co. v. Westwood Chemical Co. (9th Cir. 1980) 649 F.2d 646, 648-649]* .

For additional discussion regarding drafting release agreements generally, see 14 California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations*.

[b] Exclusion of Specified Claims

When the claims subject to release involve two or more joint tortfeasors or coobligors, a release of one or more will not extinguish the claims against the others [*see Civ. Code § 1543*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*; for further discussion *see § 520.44[4]*]. In conformity with this statutory exception, the foregoing form may be modified to except from release any claims that the releasor may have against persons other than the releasee. It may also be modified to exclude only specified claims that the releasor may have against the releasee [*see Western Mortgage etc. Co. v. Gray (1932) 215 Cal. 191, 200-202, 8 P.2d 1016* (claims expressly excepted from release)].

For additional discussion and an alternate form of release agreement designed for use with one of several joint tortfeasors or coobligors, see 14 California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations*.

[c] Signature

To be effective, a written release must be signed by the releasor [*see Hofland v. Gustafson (1955), 282 P. 1039*]. This is expressly required if the release agreement is subject to the statute of frauds [*see Civ. Code § 1624* (agreement subject to statute of frauds required to be signed by party to be charged, or by party's agent)]. The releasee need not sign the release to make it legally binding on the parties to it, as long as the release shows on its face that it was not intended to be signed by the releasee [*Golden Bear Forest Products, Inc. v. Misale (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 573, 576, 188 Cal. Rptr. 48* ; *Hofland v. Gustafson (1955) 282 P.2d 1039*].

[4] Waiver of Protection of Civ. Code § 1542

A releasor may waive the prohibition of *Civ. Code § 1542* against the extension of a general release to claims which the releasor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release (optional Paragraphs 4-7) [*see* *Carmichael v. Industrial Acc. Com. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 311, 314-315, 44 Cal. Rptr. 470*]. However, mere recital that the protection of *Civ. Code § 1542* is waived, or that the release covers unknown claims or unknown parties, is not controlling [*Leaf v. City of San Mateo (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 398, 411, 163 Cal. Rptr. 711*]. If the evidence, independent of the words of the release, indicates that the parties have consciously contracted in reference to unknown claims, the release is binding [*Casey v. Proctor (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 97, 109, 28 Cal. Rptr. 307, 378 P.2d 579*]. For further discussion of the effect of *Civ. Code § 1542*, see *§ 520.44[2][a]*.

[5] California Legal Forms

For additional forms of release and related discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 77, *Discharge of Obligations*

For discussion and forms of releases executed by or on behalf of minors; *see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 100A, *Personal Affairs of Minors*; Ch. 100B, *Contracts and Employment of Minors*

[6] California Torts

For discussion of releases in the context of settlement of tort actions, see Levy, Golden & Sacks, California Torts, Ch. 73, *Settlement and Release* , Part A

[7] State Statutes

Obligations extinguished by release. *Civ. Code § 1541*

Claims not extinguished by release. *Civ. Code § 1542*

Release of one of two or more joint debtors. *Civ. Code § 1543*

Statute of frauds. *Civ. Code § 1624*

Effect of release of less than all tortfeasors or coobligors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*

[8] Decisions

Definition and theory of release. *Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783*

Genuineness of releasee's signature as question of fact. *Castor v. Bernstein (1906) 2 Cal. App. 703, 706-707, 84 P. 244*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.131

§ 520.131 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--General Release [Civ. Code § 1541]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--General Release [Civ. Code § 1541]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that on or about _____ [*date*], for a good and valuable consideration, plaintiff duly executed and delivered to defendant a general release in writing, in which plaintiff released defendant from all liability to plaintiff for any and all claims of plaintiff against defendant, including the alleged cause of action set forth in the complaint, that existed at the date of execution of the release, or that might thereafter arise against defendant for, and on account of, any thing or things done by defendant prior to the date of execution of the release. A copy of the release, marked as Exhibit _____, is attached and incorporated herein by reference.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of allegation is for use in an answer to a complaint to raise the affirmative defense that the plaintiff has released defendant from all liability for the cause of action alleged in the complaint [*see Pellett v. Sonotone Corp. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 705, 711, 160 P.2d 783*]. Under certain conditions, the defense of release may be raised in a supplemental answer, which may, in turn, be filed even after trial on the underlying cause of action has begun [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 464* (supplemental pleadings); *Seehorn v. Big Meadows & Bodie Wagon Road Co. (1882) 60 Cal. 240, 251-252*].

The defense of release admits the cause of action, but sets forth a subsequently executed release [*see Landis v. Morrissey (1886) 69 Cal. 83, 86, 10 P. 258* (dictum)]. The defense must be expressly pleaded and proved [*Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*].

For further discussion of raising the affirmative defense of release, see *§ 520.46[1]*. For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which the foregoing affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Alternate Form of Pleading Release

A release may also be pleaded as a specifically performable settlement and release agreement [*Hastings v. Matlock (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 166 Cal. Rptr. 229*]. For further discussion of this mode of pleading release, see *§ 520.46[2]*.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to supplemental answers, see Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings*

For discussion and forms relating to answers in general, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

[5] State Statutes

Obligations extinguished by release. *Civ. Code § 1541*

Affirmative defenses. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*

Supplemental pleadings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 464*

[6] Decisions

When release is subject to occurrence of condition precedent, release as unable to be pleaded as bar to action until fulfillment of condition. *Johnson v. Pickwick Stages System (1930) 108 Cal. App. 279, 284, 291 P. 611*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 520 SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Release

46-520 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 520.132

§ 520.132 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Release of Joint Tortfeasor or Coobligor for Amount Sufficient to Satisfy Entire Claim [Code Civ. Proc. § 877]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Release of Joint Tortfeasor or Coobligor for Amount Sufficient to Satisfy Entire Claim [Code Civ. Proc. § 877]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff received from defendant _____ [*name of codefendant*] the sum of $ _____ in full settlement of any cause of action which plaintiff might have had against that defendant for any _____ [injuries *and/or* damages] sustained by him/her as alleged in the complaint. This sum equals or exceeds in value and amount all the _____ [damage *and/or* injury] sustained, or alleged to have been sustained, by plaintiff as set forth in the complaint.

2. At the time of receiving this payment, plaintiff executed and delivered to defendant _____ [*name of codefendant*] a release by which plaintiff released and forever discharged that defendant from all claims whatsoever arising out of the _____ [damages *and/or* injuries] alleged in the complaint to have been sustained by plaintiff. A copy of the release, marked as Exhibit _____, is attached and incorporated herein by reference.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of allegation is for use in an answer to a complaint to raise the affirmative defense that the plaintiff is barred from further recovery because he or she has received, in consideration for the release of a codefendant, a sum that equals or exceeds the amount recoverable under the cause of action alleged in the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*].

[3] Effect of Release of Less Than All Joint Tortfeasors or Coobligors

A release, given in good faith before verdict or judgment, to one or more of a number of tortfeasors claimed to be liable for the same tort, or to one or more other coobligors mutually subject to contribution rights, does not discharge any other such party from liability unless its terms so provide. It does, however, reduce the claims against the others in the amount stipulated by the release, or in the amount of the consideration paid for it, whichever is the greater [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 520.44[4]*.

[4] State Statutes

Effect of release of one or more of several tortfeasors or coobligors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877*

[5] Decisions

Code Civ. Proc. § 877(a) as mandating that award against nonsettling joint tortfeasors be reduced only by present cash value of structured settlement calling for periodic future payments. *Franck v. Polaris E-Z Go Div. of Textron, Inc. (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1107, 1120, 204 Cal. Rptr. 321*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 520.131*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 521 [RESERVED]

46-521 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 521

[RESERVED]

Chapter 521[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 522.syn

§ 522.syn Synopsis to Chapter 522: SHIPS AND SHIPPING

§ 522.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 522.02 Cross References

§§ 522.03-522.09 [Reserved]

§ 522.10 Governing Law

§ 522.11 Jurisdiction

§ 522.12 Limitation of Shipowner's Liability

[1] In General

[2] Application to Charterers

[3] Privity or Knowledge of Owner

[4] Limitation of Liability as Defense

[5] Actions for Limitation of Liability

[a] In General

[b] Injunction Against Other Actions

§§ 522.13-522.29 [Reserved]

§ 522.30 Governing Law

§ 522.31 Jones Act

[1] Nature of Action

[2] Jurisdiction in Federal and State Courts

[3] Venue

[4] Applicability of Federal Law

[5] "Seaman" Plaintiff Defined

[6] Relationship to FELA Legislation

[7] Liability for Negligence or Defects

[8] Liberality of Approach to Negligence

[9] Liability to Seaman's Survivors

[10] Defenses Not Available

[a] Contributory Negligence

[b] Assumption of Risk

[c] Employer's Ability to Limit Liability or Offset

[11] Limitation of Actions

[12] Unseaworthiness as Alternative Basis for Recovery

[13] Liberality of Application of Doctrine

§ 522.32 Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA)

[1] Overlap With State Coverage

[2] Nature of Coverage

[3] Persons Covered

[4] Compensation Procedure

[5] Exclusive Liability of Employer

[6] Negligence of Third Parties

[a] When Employee's Rights Are Assigned to Employer

[b] When Employee Sues

[c] When Vessel Is Third Party

[7] Duties of Shipowner Under LHWCA

§ 522.33 Maintenance and Cure

[1] Nature of Remedy

[2] Extent of Statutory Recognition

[3] Breadth of Liability

[4] Unavailability of Most Defenses

§ 522.34 Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

[1] Nature of Action

[2] Nature of Recovery

[3] Unavailability of Defense of Contributory Negligence

[4] Limitation of Actions

[5] Conversion of Pending Personal Injury Suit

§ 522.35 General Maritime Law

[1] Creation of Common Law Remedy for Wrongful Death

[2] Beneficiaries Determined by Reference to Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

[3] Inapplicability to Longshore and Harbor Workers

§ 522.36 Liability to Passengers

§ 522.37 Shipowner's Limitation of Liability for Personal Injuries

§§ 522.38-522.49 [Reserved]

§ 522.50 Governing Law

§ 522.51 Definitions

§ 522.52 Collection of Freight

[1] Action for Breach of Contract

[2] Maritime Liens

§ 522.53 Actions Based on Maritime Collisions

[1] Fault Requirements

[2] Federal Navigational Rules

[3] California Navigational Rules

[4] Determination of Fault--Pennsylvania Rule

[5] Apportionment of Damages

[a] In General

[b] Major-Minor Fault Rule

[6] Post-Reliable Application of Fault Rules

[7] Joint and Several Liability

[8] Effects of Settlement

§ 522.54 Partitioning Ownership Interests in Vessels

§ 522.55 Damages from Towage

§§ 522.56-522.69 [Reserved]

§ 522.70 Governing Law

§ 522.71 Actions for Cargo Damage or Loss

[1] Who May Prosecute

[2] Types of Shipping Agreements

[3] Laws Regulating Shipping Contracts

[a] In General

[b] Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

[c] Harter Act

[d] Federal Bills of Lading (Pomerene) Act

[e] California Law Regarding Cargo Damage Intrastate

[4] Actions Under Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

[a] Obligations of the Carrier

[b] Special Agreements Under Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

[c] Limitation on Scope of Carrier's Liability

[d] Limitation on Amount of Carrier's Liability

[e] Notice of Loss or Damage

[f] Period for Bringing Suit

[g] Elements of Shipper's Action

[5] Actions Under Harter Act

[a] Shipowner's Obligations and Liability

[b] Period for Bringing Suit

[c] Elements of Shipper's Action

§ 522.72 Actions by Seamen for Wages

[1] Preferential Treatment and Enforcement Generally

[2] Deductions and Set-Offs Against Wages

[3] Time of Payment

[4] Penalty for Late Payment

[5] Prepayment of Process Fees by Seamen

§ 522.73 Actions to Enforce Maritime Liens

[1] Scope and Preemption

[2] Authority to Bind Vessel

[a] Presumed Authority

[b] Officers and Agents of Charterer

[3] Services and Supplies Giving Rise to Lien

[a] In General

[b] Pilotage

[c] Seamen's Wages

[d] Salvage

[4] Waiver of Maritime Liens

[5] Enforcement of Maritime Liens

§§ 522.74-522.89 [Reserved]

§ 522.90 Federal Statutes

§ 522.91 State Statutes

§ 522.92 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

§ 522.93 Decisions

[1] Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

[2] Injuries to Seamen

[3] Longshore and Harbor Workers

[4] Loss of Consortium

[5] Maintenance and Cure

[6] Warranty of Seaworthiness

§ 522.94 Law Reviews

§ 522.95 Text References

§§ 522.96-522.109 [Reserved]

§ 522.110 Federal Constitution

§ 522.111 Federal Statutes

§ 522.112 State Statutes

§ 522.113 Decisions

[1] Collection of Freight

[2] Collisions

[3] Partitioning Ownership Interests in Vessels

[4] Damages From Towage

§ 522.114 Law Reviews

§ 522.115 Text References

§§ 522.116-522.129 [Reserved]

§ 522.130 Federal Constitution

§ 522.131 Federal Statutes

§ 522.132 State Statutes

§ 522.133 Federal Regulations

§ 522.134 Decisions

[1] Actions by Seamen for Wages

[2] Actions for Cargo Damage or Loss

[3] Actions to Enforce Maritime Liens

[4] Marshal's Costs

[5] Tariff Freight Charges

§ 522.135 Law Reviews

§ 522.136 Text References

§§ 522.137-522.149 [Reserved]

§ 522.150 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. § 30511; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F] for Claims Arising Out of Maritime Accident or Disaster

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Venue

[4] Allegations

[a] Facts and Status (Paragraphs 2-8); Transfers and Liens (Paragraphs 10-12)

[b] Jurisdictional Statement (Paragraph 1)

[5] Notice to Claimants

[6] Verification

§ 522.151 Notice to Claimants to File Claims [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)]--Against Shipowner Seeking Limitation of Liability

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Form

[4] Cross References

§ 522.152 Injunction [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(3); Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65]--Against Prosecution of Another Action When Shipowner Has Commenced Action for Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30505, 30511]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 522.153-522.169 [Reserved]

§ 522.170 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7(a), 8(a)] for Damages for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104]--By Seaman Against Shipowner--Federal Form

[1] FORM

[2] Source of Form

[3] Use of Form

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Pleading Admiralty Claims in Federal Courts

[6] Costs

[7] Demand for Jury Trial

§ 522.171 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104] and Doctrine of Unseaworthiness--By Seaman Against Shipowner--General California Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Pleading Alternative Cause of Unseaworthiness

§ 522.172 Allegation Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104]--Seaman Injured on Wharf in Course of Employment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.173 Allegation of Unseaworthiness--Aggravation of Injuries by Failure to Furnish Medical Attention While Aboard Ship

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.174 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--No Employment Relationship

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.175 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--Nonownership of Vessel by Time Charterer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Charterer Has Liability

[4] Cross References

§ 522.176 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 522.177 Allegations to Complaint for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Third Party Other Than Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.178 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Employer on Behalf of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner or Other Third Party [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 522.179 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] of Shipowner to Complaint for Injuries by Longshoreman or Harbor Worker or Employer Thereof [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--Negligence of Fellow Servants

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Defense of Fellow Servants' Negligence

[4] Cross References

§ 522.180 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Maintenance and Cure--By Seaman Against Shipowner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 522.181 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104] for Wrongful Death of Seaman--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] Allegations

§ 522.182 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner or Other Third Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 522.183 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Passenger Against Shipowner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 522.184 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Wrongful Death of Passenger Under Death on the High Seas Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.]--By Personal Representative of Passenger Against Shipowner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 522.185-522.199 [Reserved]

§ 522.200 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Written Contract for Payment of Freight--By Shipowner

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] In General

[b] Identity and Capacity of Defendants

[c] Venue Facts

[d] Specification of Damages

[4] Recovery of Interest

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

[7] Federal Statutes

[8] State Statutes

§ 522.201 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Personam and In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] for Freight Charges--By Shipowner--Against Cargo, Shippers, and Consignees

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Venue

[4] Allegations

[a] In General

[b] Jurisdictional Statement (Paragraph 1)

[c] Identification and Capacity of Parties (Paragraphs 2, 3)

[d] Fictitious Defendants (Paragraph 4)

[e] Presence of Property Within Judicial District (Paragraph 5)

[f] Description of Goods (Paragraph 6)

[g] Breach of Contract for Freight

[h] Existence of Maritime Lien (Paragraph 9)

[5] Process Against Cargo

[6] Execution or Stay of Process

[7] Relief From Arrest

[a] Prompt Hearing

[b] Immediate Sale of Seized Property

[8] Verification

[9] Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

[10] Text References

[11] Cross References

§ 522.202 Warrant [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(3)] for Arrest of Cargo, Vessel, or Other Property

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.203 Stipulation Between Shipowner and Shipper for Release of Cargo From Shipowner's Lien for Freight and Posting of Security for Judgment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Federal Statutes

[5] Text References

[6] Cross References

§ 522.204 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem and In Personam for Property Damage--By Shipowner--Against Vessel and Other Shipowner--Collision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Process Against Vessel

[a] Bond

[b] Costs of Seizure

[5] Prejudgment Interest

[6] Federal Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] Text References

[9] Cross References

§ 522.205 Motion For Transfer of Custody of Vessel From United States Marshal To Marina--By Plaintiff

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Form

[4] Cross References

§ 522.206 Complaint for Damages--By Tow Owner--Against Tug Owner--Damage to Tow

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 522.207-522.219 [Reserved]

§ 522.220 Complaint In Personam for Cargo Damage or Loss--By Shipper or Consignee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Delivery of Cargo for Transportation (Paragraph 4)

[b] Damage or Loss (Paragraph 5)

[c] Notice of Loss or Damage (Paragraph 6)

[4] Cross References

§ 522.221 Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to Cargo--Cargo Lost or Damaged Due to Perils of Sea [46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 note, § 4(2)(c); 46 U.S.C.S. § 30706(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.222 Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to or Loss of Cargo--Exoneration From Liability When Damage or Loss Caused by Fire [46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30504, 30701 note, § 4(2)(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross References

§ 522.223 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--For Supplies or Other Necessaries Furnished by Materialmen

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 522.224 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Pilotage Fees

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 522.225 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Salvage

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 522.226 Allegation for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Towage Fees

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART I. SCOPE

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.01

§ 522.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions against shipowners for damages for personal injuries or wrongful death suffered by maritime employees or passengers [*see §§ 522.10 et seq., 522.30* et seq.]. Forms include complaints and allegations for use in complaints under the Jones Act [*46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*] by an injured seaman against a shipowner [*see §§ 522.170 -522.173*] along with related affirmative defenses [§§ 522.174, 522.175], complaints by injured longshoremen or harbor workers as assigned to their employers, against third persons [*see §§ 522.176 -522.178*] with a related affirmative defense to such actions [*see § 522.179*], a complaint by a seaman against a shipowner for maintenance and cure from disablement [*see § 522.180*], complaints by personal representatives of maritime employees for wrongful death [§§ 522.181, 522.182], a complaint by a passenger against a shipowner for personal injuries [*see § 522.183*], and a complaint by the personal representative of an employee or passenger against a shipowner for wrongful death on the high seas [*see § 522.184*].

This chapter also discusses and contains forms for use in actions by shipowners to protect their property interests [*see § 522.50* et seq.]. Forms are provided for the following kinds of cases: (1) breach of contract for payment of freight for transportation of cargo [*see § 522.200* (state court complaint in personam), § 522.201 (federal complaint, combined in personam and in rem)]; (2) enforcement of maritime lien for freight [*see § 522.202* (warrant for arrest of cargo), § 522.203 (stipulation between shipowner and shipper for release of cargo from lien for freight and for posting of security)]; (3) property damage from collision between two vessels or a vessel and land object [*see § 522.204* (complaint in rem against vessel and in personam against owners), § 522.205 (motion to transfer custody of vessel from marshal to private marina)]; and (4) damages to a tow, such as a barge, during towage by tug [*see § 522.206* (complaint in state court)].

Shipowners' and carriers' defenses in actions by shippers for cargo damage are discussed in *§§ 522.70* et seq. Shipowners' actions for limitation of liability, which apply to both personal and property injuries, are discussed in *§ 522.10* et seq.

Actions for damages based on tort and breach of contract in cases involving the owner or operator of a recreational boat are discussed in Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

This chapter also discusses and contains forms for use in actions against shipowners and carriers by shippers, seamen, and the holders of maritime liens to protect their property interests. Forms are provided for the following kinds of cases: damage to or loss of cargo [*see § 522.220* (state court complaint in personam), § 522.221 (shipowner's or carrier's affirmative defense of sea peril or other exonerating cause), § 522.222 (affirmative defense of fire)]; and enforcement of maritime liens for furnishing supplies and other necessaries [*see § 522.223* (federal court complaint in rem by materialmen), § 522.224 (allegations for use in complaint in rem for pilotage fees), § 522.225 (allegations for use in complaint in rem for salvage), § 522.226 (allegation for use in complaint in rem for towage fees)].

A shipowner's action to enforce a maritime lien for freight is discussed in *§ 522.52[2]*. Shipowners' actions for limitation of liability are discussed in the In General analysis because they apply to both personal injuries and property damage [*see § 522.10* et seq.].

Actions for damages based on tort and breach of contract involving the owner or operator of a recreational boat are discussed in Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityLimitations on LiabilityAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsWrongful Death & SurvivalGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsLimitations on LiabilityTortsTransportation TortsWatercraftGeneral OverviewTransportation LawWater TransportationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART I. SCOPE

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.02

§ 522.02 Cross References

For a discussion of and forms involving claims by injured passengers against carriers, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For a discussion of and forms involving wrongful death generally, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For general forms of captions and allegations in the United States District Court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For a discussion of and forms relating to negligence actions generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For a general discussion of the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C.S. § 51 et seq.*), see Ch. 485, *Railroads*

For discussion and forms relating to actions based on torts and breach of contract in cases involving the owner or operator of a boat that is owned and operated for recreation, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*

For discussion and forms relating to an action to declare the rights and duties of coowners of a vessel, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*

For discussion and forms relating to inland carriage of persons and freight, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For discussion of consignor or consignee liability to motor carrier for steamship storage and equipment rental charges caused by delay of consignor or consignee, see Ch. 109, *Carriers*

For discussion and forms relating to actions for recovering possession of personal property, see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery*

For discussion and forms relating to actions against marine insurers, see Ch. 308, *Insurance*

For discussion and forms for removal of an admiralty action from state court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For a discussion of and forms for removal of admiralty actions from a state court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For a discussion of and forms relating to nonmaritime liens and their enforcement in a state court, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

For a discussion of and forms relating to insurers' claims for subrogation for damaged or destroyed property, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewInsurance LawBusiness InsuranceMarine InsuranceGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsRail TransportationFederal Employers' Liability ActTortsTransportation TortsWatercraftGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART I. SCOPE

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.03-522.09

[Reserved]

§§ 522.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.10

§ 522.10 Governing Law

The rights of parties to actions based on commercial shipping transactions are governed by the substantive rules of federal maritime law, regardless of whether the plaintiff chooses a state or federal forum [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . State law applies only to the extent that it does not render changes in the maritime law [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal PreemptionAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawWater TransportationGeneral OverviewTransportation LawWater TransportationState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.11

§ 522.11 Jurisdiction

The federal district courts have original jurisdiction, exclusive of state courts, of any civil case of admiralty or maritime jurisdiction, saving to suitors in all cases all other remedies to which they are otherwise entitled [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1333*]. This savings clause preserves exclusive federal jurisdiction over actions in rem against a vessel or other maritime property, but permits state courts to establish concurrent jurisdiction in actions in personam based on a common law remedy [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290*]. §§ 522.201, 522.204 and 522.224 are examples of federal in rem complaints. Admiralty jurisdiction and the choice of federal or state forum are discussed more extensively in Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureStatutory AuthorityCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsTrue in Rem ActionsCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsExclusive Jurisdiction

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.12

§ 522.12 Limitation of Shipowner's Liability

[1] In General

Federal statutes limit a vessel owner's liability for any embezzlement, loss, or destruction of any property, goods, or merchandise shipped or put on board the vessel, or for any loss, damage, or injury by collision, or for any act, matter, or thing, loss, damage, or forfeiture, done, occasioned, or incurred, without the privity or knowledge of the owner or owners. Under such circumstances, the owner's liability may not exceed the amount or value of his or her interest in the vessel and the freight then pending, except with respect to personal injuries [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30505(a), (b)*].

If the amount of a seagoing vessel owner's liability, as limited under the statute, is insufficient to pay all losses in full, and the portion of such amount applicable for payment of losses respecting loss of life or bodily injury is less than $420 per ton of the vessel's tonnage, such portion must be increased to an amount equal to $420 per ton. The increased amount is to be available only for the payment of losses for death or bodily injury. If the increased portion is insufficient to pay these losses in full, they must be paid therefrom in proportion to their respective amounts [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30506(a), (b), 30507(2)*].

The law excludes a number of vessels from the definition of "seagoing vessel" for purposes of creating the increased amount available for deaths or personal injuries. Among the vessels excluded are pleasure yachts, tugs, towboats, towing vessels, tank vessels, fishing vessels, fish tender vessels, canal boats, scows, car floats, barges, lighters (boats used to carry cargo to and from ship and wharf), or nondescript vessels [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30506(a)*].

Additional provisions apply only to deaths or personal injuries. For example, separate limits of liability apply to claims for personal injury or death arising on distinct occasions [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30506(d)*]. In addition, in a claim for personal injury or death, the privity or knowledge of the master of a seagoing vessel or of the owner's superintendent or managing agent, at or prior to the commencement of each voyage, is imputed to the vessel owner [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30506(e)*].

The limitation of liability provisions are designed to assure some recovery to death and personal injury claimants by

establishing the per-ton fund. The statute limiting liability was not intended, however, to alter established admiralty concepts by allowing a limiting ship to avoid primary liability in a mutual-fault collision case at the expense of the non-limiting ship [*Oliver J. Olson & Co. v. American S.S. Marine Leopard (9th Cir. 1966) 356 F.2d 728, 737* (decided before United States Supreme Court overturned rule of equal contribution in cases of mutual fault); *see § 522.70* et seq]. Therefore, a seagoing vessel's owner will be liable if the collision was caused, at least in part, by the fault of the vessel. Furthermore, a fund must be created to pay the owner's portion of the damages if the amount, as limited, is insufficient according to the limitation of liability statute.

[2] Application to Charterers

A charterer will be deemed the owner of a vessel within the meaning of the limitation of liability statute whenever the charterer mans, supplies, and navigates the vessel at his or her own expense or by his or her own procurement [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30501*].

[3] Privity or Knowledge of Owner

The shipowner will not be allowed to benefit from the limitation of liability provisions if the loss, injury, or damage occurred within the owner's privity or knowledge [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30505(b)*]. The determination of privity or knowledge turns on the facts of individual cases. In particular, the courts have distinguished between corporate and individual shipowners in deciding whether or not to limit liability [*Coryell v. Phipps (1943) 317 U.S. 406, 411, 63 S. Ct. 291, 87 L. Ed. 363]* .

The requisite privity or knowledge can be attributed to a corporate owner only by the acts of its employees. The courts distinguish employees having sufficient managerial authority to bind the corporate owner from employees having no general powers of superintendence [*United States v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 911, 917]* .

A corporate shipowner is within privity or knowledge if the acts of negligence are committed by a managing officer or supervisory employee. The real test of supervision is not the official's title, but the scope of his or her authority. A managing officer is any person to whom the corporation has committed the general management or general superintendence of the whole or a particular part of its business [*Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Gay Cottons (9th Cir. 1969) 414 F.2d 724, 731]* . The same standards apply when the United States seeks limitation of liability based on the absence of privity or knowledge of its employees [*United States v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1974) 495 F.2d 911, 917]* .

Some courts have ruled, with respect to individual owners, that privity means some personal participation of the owner in the fault or negligence which caused or contributed to the loss or injury. Other cases have focused on the scope of authority delegated by an individual owner, inputing privity and knowledge when the delegation has been broad. The Supreme Court has not exclusively adopted either method of determining privity, but has noted only that privity and knowledge turn on the facts of particular cases [*Coryell v. Phipps (1943) 317 U.S. 406, 411, 63 S. Ct. 291, 87 L. Ed. 363]* .

The Ninth Circuit has refused to adopt a rule basing privity and knowledge solely on the delegation of authority, because it has been termed too encompassing and all-inclusive. Accordingly, in the Ninth Circuit, the privity determination turns on all facts of the particular case [*Admiral Towing Co. v. Woolen (9th Cir. 1961) 290 F.2d 641, 648]* . The owner, however, must show lack of both knowledge and the means of obtaining knowledge [*States S.S. Co. v. United States (9th Cir. 1957) 259 F.2d 458, 466]* . Furthermore, a shipowner cannot ignore something that a prudent inspection would disclose [*Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Gay Cottons (9th Cir. 1969) 414 F.2d 724, 739]* .

[4] Limitation of Liability as Defense

Although the federal statute limiting a shipowner's liability can be asserted as a defense in state court actions, the preferable procedure is an action in federal court seeking limitation of liability. By filing in federal court, the shipowner or charterer can resolve all claims surrounding a particular incident, and avoid a diversity of suits in different states [*Providence & N.Y. S.S. Co. v. Hill Mfg. Co. (1883) 109 U.S. 578, 594, 595, 3 S. Ct. 379, 27 L. Ed. 1038]* .

[5] Actions for Limitation of Liability

[a] In General

A vessel owner may petition a district court of competent jurisdiction for limitation of liability within six months after a claimant has given to or filed with the owner written notice of claim. The owner must deposit with the court, for the benefit of claimants, a sum equal to the amount or value of the owner's interest in the vessel and freight, or approved security. As an alternative, the owner may transfer his or her interest in the vessel and freight to a trustee appointed by the court. In addition to either of the above acts, the owner must deposit such sums or approved security as the court may from time to time fix as necessary to carry out the statutory provisions. Finally, the plaintiff must give security for costs. On compliance with these requirements, all claims and proceedings against the owner with respect to the matter in question will cease [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30511*; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(1)].

In a limitation of liability proceeding, the owner or charterer bears the burden of proving the absence of privity or knowledge [*Coryell v. Phipps (1943) 317 U.S. 406, 409, 63 S. Ct. 291, 87 L. Ed. 363* ; *Tug Ocean Prince, Inc. v. United States (2d Cir. 1978) 584 F.2d 1151, 1155* ; *see also § 522.12[2]*]. The lack of privity or knowledge need only be shown by a preponderance of the evidence [*Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Gay Cottons (9th Cir. 1969) 414 F.2d 724, 738]* .

[b] Injunction Against Other Actions

On application of the plaintiff, the court must enjoin the further prosecution of any action or proceeding against the plaintiff or his or her property with respect to any claim subject to limitation in the action [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(3)]. The issuance of an injunction is not necessary to stop proceedings in separate or independent suits, however, because the statue expressly obligates every other court to stop its proceedings when a suit is properly filed in district court. Yet, the injunction against actions already filed may prove useful in protecting the exclusiveness of the court's jurisdiction [*The San Pedro (1912) 223 U.S. 365, 372, 32 S. Ct. 275, 56 L. Ed. 473]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityLimitations on LiabilityAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsLimitations on Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.13-522.29

[Reserved]

§§ 522.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.30

§ 522.30 Governing Law

Federal statutes and case law control maritime torts [*see § 522.11*], but are supplemented in some instances by state law. The significant statutes include recovery for personal injuries or death of seamen under the Jones Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*], and of longshore and harbor workers under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 901 et seq.*], and recovery for wrongful death of passengers or seamen under the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*]. The general liability of marine carriers to passengers is created by *46 U.S.C.S. § 30102* and *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 420, 491(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActTortsTransportation TortsWatercraftGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.31

§ 522.31 Jones Act

[1] Nature of Action

Under federal legislation commonly called the Jones Act, any seaman who suffers personal injury in the course of employment may, at his or her election, maintain an action for damages at law, with the right of trial by jury [*see §§ 522.170, 522.171* (First Cause of Action)]. In that action, all federal statutes that modify or extend the common law right or remedy in cases of personal injury to railway employees are applicable [*see § 522.31[6]*]. For death from personal injury, the personal representative of the seaman may maintain an action in the same manner as a living seaman's claim for injuries. The statutes affecting railway employees apply insofar as they confer or regulate the right of action for death [*see § 522.181*].

[2] Jurisdiction in Federal and State Courts

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with federal courts to entertain and try actions pleaded pursuant to the Jones Act and the general maritime law [*Donaldson v. National Marine, Inc. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 503, 510-511, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 584, 107 P.3d 254* ; *Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 94, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* . Furthermore, the Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA) expressly makes the jurisdiction of federal [*see § 522.170*] and state [*see § 522.171*] courts concurrent [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*]. Finally, the jurisdiction of United States courts (state and federal) over a suit under the Jones Act does not depend on the place where the injury is sustained, but depends on the relation of the seaman's service to the operation of the vessel plying navigable waters. Thus, American courts will exercise jurisdiction over actions for injuries on ships flying the United States flag, even if the incident occurs on the high seas beyond territorial waters. [*Correia v. Van Camp Sea Food Co. (1953) 113 Cal. App. 2d 71, 75, 76, 248 P.2d 81]* .

So long as the Jones Act applies to a seaman's claims, the claim may not be dismissed on the ground of forum non conveniens [*Zipfel v. Halliburton Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 832 F.2d 1477, 1485-1487* ; *see also Nicol v. Gulf Fleet Supply Vessels, Inc. (5th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 289, 293* ; *Needham v. Phillips Petroleum Co. of Norway (10th Cir. 1983) 719 F.2d 1481, 1483* ; *Szumlicz v. Norwegian Am. Lines, Inc. (11th Cir. 1983) 698 F.2d 1192, 1195* ; *but see Cruz v. Maritime Co. of Philippines (2d Cir. 1983) 702 F.2d 47, 48]* .

[3] Venue

Prior to amendment effective in 2007, the Jones Act provided for venue in the judicial district in which the employer resides or principal place of business is located [*see* former *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104(b)*]. That separate venue provision has been eliminated, however, and the rule of venue for cases brought in federal court is apparently now the same as that under the Federal Employers Liability Act (FELA) [*see 45 U.S.C.S. § 51 et seq.*; *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*]. Under the FELA, suit may be filed in a federal district court in the district of the residence of the defendant, in a district in which the cause of action arose, or in a district in which the defendant is doing business at the time the action is commenced [*45 U.S.C.S. § 56*].

The statute determines venue only for cases prosecuted in federal courts. Venue in state court actions must be decided according to state law [*Bainbridge v. Merchants & Miners Transp. Co. (1932) 287 U.S. 278, 280, 281, 53 S. Ct. 159, 77 L. Ed. 302]* .

An action for personal injury or wrongful death in California may be brought against an individual defendant in the county where the injury or death occurs or the county in which the defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. A corporation or association may be sued in the county where the obligation or liability arises, or in the county of the corporation's principal place of business [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

[4] Applicability of Federal Law

Federal substantive law applies to cases brought under the Jones Act and cases brought under general maritime law, regardless of whether the action is brought in a federal or state forum. This rule stems from the need for uniformity in maritime tort law, as well as the importance of protecting the rights of injured seamen. Thus, some obstacles traditionally posed by state law have been avoided. In this context, the California courts view their task as ascertaining and applying appropriate legal principles derived from the considerable body of federal maritime law that has developed in the United States [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 94, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* .

[5] "Seaman" Plaintiff Defined

"Seaman" under the Jones Act is defined solely in terms of the employee's connection to a vessel in navigation; the employee's connection to a vessel, rather than the particular job, is determinative. Although the United States Supreme Court has not defined the required connection in all its details, it has held that a necessary element of the connection is that a seaman "perform the work of a vessel" [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 355, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866]* . In that regard, it is necessary that an employee's duties contribute to the function of the vessel or to the accomplishment of its mission [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 345-346, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866* ; *Offshore Co. v. Robison (5th Cir. 1959) 266 F.2d 769, 779]* . A seaman must have a connection to a vessel in navigation that is substantial in both duration and nature [*Chandris, Inc. v. Latsis (1995) 515 U.S. 347, 368, 115 S. Ct. 2172, 132 L. Ed. 2d 314* ; *Spears v. Kajima Eng'g & Constr., Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 466, 474, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 97]* . It is not necessary that a seaman aid in navigation or contribute to the transportation of the vessel, but a seaman must be one who does the ship's work [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 355, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866]* . Examples of employees who are seamen under the Jones Act include those who aid in navigation directly, as well as firemen, engineers, carpenters, surveyors, surgeons, coopers, cabin boys, waiters, and cooks [*see McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 344-345, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866* (quoting with approval 19th-century treatise's broad definition of "mariner")].

The Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) [*33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*] and the Jones Act are mutually exclusive [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 347, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866* ; *see § 522.32*]. Inasmuch as the scope of the LHWCA is defined in part by the exclusion of an employee covered by the Jones Act--that is, a "master or member of a crew of any vessel" is not covered by the LHWCA--the scope of this exclusion is

an integral part of the definition of "seaman" under the Jones Act. In arriving at its definition, the Court therefore gleaned corresponding definitions with respect to both acts in light of the overall intent of Congress to create two distinct remedies for land-based (LHWCA) and sea-based (Jones Act) maritime employees [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337 347-355, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866]* .

The terms "member of a crew," and "seaman" are statutory terms, and their interpretation is a question of law. However, it is the court's duty to determine if there is a reasonable basis to support the jury's conclusion. If reasonable persons, applying the proper legal standard, could differ as to whether the employee was a "member of a crew," it is a question for the jury [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 356, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866]* . The inquiry into seaman status is of necessity fact-specific, and depends on the nature of the vessel, and the employee's precise relation to it. Nonetheless, summary judgment or a directed verdict is mandated if facts and the law will reasonably support only one conclusion [*McDermott Int'l v. Wilander (1991) 498 U.S. 337, 356, 111 S. Ct. 807, 112 L. Ed. 2d 866]* .

The United States Supreme Court has held that the inclusion of an occupation within the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) definition of "employee" [*33 U.S.C.S. § 902(3)*] does not necessarily preclude an employee who engages in that occupation from being a seaman under the Jones Act, because some maritime workers may in fact be Jones Act seaman performing a job specifically enumerated under the LHWCA [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 416]* . For example, an employee who works on floating marine platforms alongside vessels that are in port for purposes of repair, is not necessarily precluded from being termed a seaman with regard to injuries sustained while moving about the platform, even though a ship repairer is listed under the enumerated definitions of employee under the LHWCA. The United States Supreme Court stated that, although in some cases a ship repairer may lack the requisite connection to a vessel in navigation to qualify for seaman status, not all ship repairers lack that connection as a matter of law [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 416]* . Consequently, a maritime worker is limited to LHWCA remedies only if no genuine issue of fact exists as to whether the worker is a seaman under the Jones Act for purposes of the claim in question [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 416, 418* (issues of fact made trial court's grant of summary judgment improper); *see § 522.32[5]*].

The United States Supreme Court has rejected the contention that, if a maritime worker is arguably covered by the LHWCA, the district court should stay any Jones Act proceeding pending a final LHWCA administrative agency determination that the worker is, in fact, a "master or member of a crew" (and therefore excluded from LHWCA coverage). The Court found no indication in the LHWCA that Congress intended to preclude or stay traditional Jones Act suits in the district courts, finding instead that the LHWCA anticipated that such suits would be brought, and contains a limitations tolling provision for that purpose [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 417* ; *see 33 U.S.C.S. § 913(d)*]. Moreover, an employee who receives voluntary payments under the LHWCA without a formal award is not barred from subsequently seeking relief under the Jones Act, because the question of coverage has never actually been litigated [*see Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 418]* .

[6] Relationship to FELA Legislation

The references in the Jones Act to United States statutes applicable to railway employees [*see § 522.31[1]*] are to the Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA) [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51 et seq.*], which governs recovery for personal injury and death of railroad workers. Congress intended to treat seamen and their land-based counterparts, railroad workers, as uniformly as possible. Accordingly, judicial interpretations of the FELA are generally regarded as persuasive authority in Jones Act litigation [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 98-99, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789* ; *see § 522.31[12]*].

[7] Liability for Negligence or Defects

Under the FELA, an employer is liable in damages for injury to or death of an employee resulting in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the employer's officers, agents, or employees, or by reason of any defect or insufficiency, owing to its negligence, in any of its equipment, such as its engines, appliances, machinery, works, boats, or wharves [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]. The term "employer" includes any receiver or other person or corporation charged with the duty of the management and operation of the employer's business [*45 U.S.C.S. § 57*]. Nothing under the FELA limits the duty or liability of the employer or impairs the rights of its employees under any other federal law [*45 U.S.C.S. § 58*].

[8] Liberality of Approach to Negligence

After enactment in 1920, the Jones Act was extensively used by seamen to pursue negligence actions against their employers, because it provides for trial by jury and also affords a remedy not available under general maritime law, that of wrongful death. While these actions involve the basic elements of negligence (duty, breach, and proximate causation) it is not inaccurate to characterize them as subject to extremely liberal interpretations by the courts in favor of the seamen-litigants [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 98, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789* ; *Williams v. Tide Water Associated Oil Co. (9th Cir. 1955) 227 F.2d 791, 794* ; *see also § 522.31[13]*].

[9] Liability to Seaman's Survivors

The Jones Act, through its incorporation of the FELA, provides that a seaman's right of action for injuries due to negligence survives to the seaman's personal representatives [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 33, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . The FELA provides, in the case of the death of an employee covered under the act, that the employer is liable in damages for the employee's death to the employee's personal representative for the benefit of the surviving widow or husband and children; if none, then of the employee's parents; and, if none, then of the next of kin dependent on the employee [*45 U.S.C.S. § 51*]. In cases of recovery by survivors, there may be only one recovery for the same injury [*45 U.S.C.S. § 59*].

[10] Defenses Not Available

[a] Contributory Negligence

In any action brought against a FELA employer for injuries or death, the employee's contributory negligence does not bar recovery; but the damages are diminished by the jury in proportion to the amount of negligence attributable to the employee. However, an employee is not considered guilty of contributory negligence when the employer's violation of any statute enacted or regulation or rule adopted for the safety of the employees contributed to the injury or death [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 53, 54a*].

[b] Assumption of Risk

An employee under the FELA has not assumed the risks of his or her employment ifthe injury or death resulted in whole or in part from the negligence of any of the employer's officers, agents, or employees. Additionally, no employee has assumed the risks of employment if the employer's violation of a statute enacted or regulation or rule adopted for the safety of employees contributed to the injury or death [*45 U.S.C.S. §§ 54, 54a*].

[c] Employer's Ability to Limit Liability or Offset

Any contract, rule, regulation, or device whatsoever, the purpose or intent of which would be to enable an employer to exempt itself from any liability created under the FELA, is void to that extent. However, in any action brought against the employer under or by virtue of any provisions of the FELA legislation, the employer may set off any sum it has contributed or paid to any insurance, relief benefit, or indemnity that may have been paid to the injured employee or the person entitled to it on account of the injury or death involved [*45 U.S.C.S. § 55*].

[11] Limitation of Actions

Unless otherwise specified by law, a suit for recovery of damages for personal injury or death arising out of a maritime tort must be commenced within three years after the date the cause of action accrued [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30106*]. An action based on unseaworthiness falls within this provision because no other statute controls the time period for bringing suit [*see* [12], *below*].

[12] Unseaworthiness as Alternative Basis for Recovery

A further avenue to recovery for an injured seaman arises from the shipowner's duty to provide seamen with safe surroundings during their employment, that is, a seaworthy vessel. This duty is not based on statute but has developed over centuries through decisional admiralty and general maritime law. In recent times, the duty has expanded to the point where it is now considered a form of absolute liability [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 99, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789* ; *see §§ 522.171* (Second Cause of Action), 522.173].

A party may pursue a general maritime claim for unseaworthiness, as well as a general negligence claim, even if the party does not qualify for seaman status under the more stringent standards of the Jones Act [*Freeze v. Lost Isle Partners (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 45, 51-52, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520]* .

For further discussion of general maritime law, see *§ 522.35*.

[13] Liberality of Application of Doctrine

The California courts have commented that the demonstrated tendency of the United States Supreme Court has been to regard the Jones Act primarily as an addition to an even larger body of federal maritime law whenever FELA precedent would in some manner limit the liability imposed on a defendant shipowner. On those occasions the Court has called attention to the existence of an independent body of federal law, of which the Jones Act is only a part, and has not allowed the Jones Act to be utilized as a conduit through which limitations on liability could pass from land-based law such as FELA doctrines. Although there is considerable overlapping between Jones Act negligence and the doctrine of unseaworthiness, there is neither an authoritative precedent nor a reason of policy for imposing whatever limitations exist in Jones Act litigation on general federal admiralty law, from which the doctrine of unseaworthiness derives. Apparently, the United States Supreme Court continues to regard tort actions based on general admiralty law as the particular province of decisional law development and an area in which principles are applied with a liberal rather than a restraining hand [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 103, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* . Moreover, absolute liability is imposed only for breach of a duty to furnish a vessel and appurtenances that are reasonably fit for their intended use by ordinary seamen; the duty does not require a perfect, accident-free ship that will withstand every imaginable peril of the sea [*Smith v. Marilyn M. Fishing, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 453, 457-458, 219 Cal. Rptr. 57]* .

The concept of unseaworthiness is not limited to situations involving negligence or contractual obligation, but imposes liability regardless of fault for any deficiency in the ship's hull, equipment, or crew that renders the ship less than reasonably fit for its intended purposes [*see* *Waldron v. Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc. (1967) 386 U.S. 724, 726, 727, 87 S. Ct. 1410, 18 L. Ed. 2d 482]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsWrongful Death & SurvivalGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActComparative & Contributory NegligenceAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers'

ClaimsJones ActMariner & Seaman StatusAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActNegligence StandardAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActProcedureRemoval & VenueAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActStatutes of LimitationsAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsUnseaworthinessGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsFederal Employers' Liability Act

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.32

§ 522.32 Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA)

[1] Overlap With State Coverage

Prior to 1972, the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA) [*33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*] was simply an effort to fill the gap in workers' compensation coverage, because the state compensation systems could not reach longshore workers injured seaward of the water's edge [*P. C. Pfeiffer Co. v. Ford (1979) 444 U.S. 69, 72, 100 S. Ct. 328, 62 L. Ed. 2d 225]* . States are constitutionally barred from applying their workers' compensation systems to maritime injuries, and thus interfering with the overriding federal policy of a uniform maritime law [*Southern Pac. Co. v. Jensen (1917) 244 U.S. 205, 216-218, 37 S. Ct. 524, 61 L. Ed. 1086]* . In 1972, the LHWCA was amended to include injuries occurring beyond the shoreline of the navigable waters of the nation, an area that had always been considered to be within the province of state compensation law. Presently, an injured employee may elect relief in this overlapping area of coverage [*see § 522.32[3]*] under either the federal or state compensation systems [*Sun Ship, Inc. v. Pennsylvania (1980) 447 U.S. 715, 716-718, 100 S. Ct. 2432, 65 L. Ed. 2d 458]* .

[2] Nature of Coverage

The LHWCA provides compensation for the death or disability of most private enterprise employees resulting from injuries occurring on navigable waters of the United States, including adjoining piers, wharves, dry docks, terminals, building ways, marine railways, or other adjoining areas customarily used by employers in loading, unloading, repairing, or building vessels [*33 U.S.C.S. § 903(a)*]. Coverage extends to accidental injuries or death arising out of and in the course of employment, as well as certain related occupational diseases or infections. The act also applies to injuries caused by willful acts of third persons directed against employees because of the employment [*33 U.S.C.S. § 902(2)*].

[3] Persons Covered

Employees covered by the LHWCA include persons engaged in maritime employment, longshore workers or other persons engaged in longshoring operations, and harbor workers, including ship repairers, shipbuilders, and shipbreakers. The act excludes the following individuals from coverage if they are covered under a state workers' compensation law [

33 U.S.C.S. § 902(3)]:

- Individuals employed exclusively to perform office clerical, secretarial, security, or data processing work;

- Individuals employed by a club, camp, recreational operation, restaurant, museum, or retail outlet;

- Individuals employed by a marina who are not engaged in construction, replacement, or expansion of the marina (except for routine maintenance);

- Individuals who are employed by suppliers, transporters, or vendors, are temporarily doing business on the premises of a statutory employer, and who are not engaged in work normally performed by employees of a statutory employer;

- Aquaculture workers; or

- Individuals employed to build, repair, or dismantle any recreational vessel under sixty-five feet in length.

The LHWCA also excludes from coverage masters or members of a crew of any vessel, and any persons engaged by a master to load or unload or repair any small vessels under 18 tons, without regard to possible workers' compensation coverage [*33 U.S.C.S. § 902(3)*].

The reference of the LHWCA to longshore workers and any "other person engaged in longshoring operations" to describe persons engaged in maritime employment demonstrates that workers doing tasks traditionally performed by longshore workers are within the purview of the act as amended. The scope of maritime employment does not depend on the vagaries of union jurisdiction nor the assignment policies of the employer. Instead, the crucial factor is the nature of the activity to which a worker may be assigned. Persons moving cargo directly from ship to land transportation are engaged in maritime employment. A worker responsible for some portion of that activity is as much an integral part of the process of loading or unloading a ship as a person who participates in the entire process. Yet, coverage does not extend to all workers on the marine site. For instance, persons who only pick up stored cargo for further shipment are excluded [*P. C. Pfeiffer Co. v. Ford (1979) 444 U.S. 69, 82-83, 100 S. Ct. 328, 62 L. Ed. 2d 225]* . A welder working on a fixed offshore oil-drilling platform has also been held to be excluded from the LHWCA [*Herb's Welding, Inc. v. Gray (1985) 470 U.S. 414, 424-426, 105 S. Ct. 1421, 84 L. Ed. 2d 406* (nothing inherently marine in activity; not everyone on site satisfies status test)].

For discussion of whether a maritime worker may be a "seaman" under the Jones Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*], even though the occupation in question is enumerated under the LHWCA (for example, ship repairer), see *§§ 522.31[5]* and *522.32[5]*.

[4] Compensation Procedure

All employers are liable for and must secure the payment of compensation payable under the LHWCA. When the employer is a subcontractor, the contractor must be liable for and secure the payment of compensation to employees of the subcontractor unless the subcontractor has secured such payment. Compensation is payable irrespective of fault [*33 U.S.C.S. § 904*] except in certain instances of the employee's intoxication or willful intent to injure or kill himself or herself or another [*33 U.S.C.S. § 903(c)*]. The act provides for the timely furnishing of notice of injury or death [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 912*] and filing of claims [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 913*] and for a comprehensive program of determination and payment of expenses and compensation [*see 33 U.S.C.S. §§ 906-914*]. The statute creates a special procedure for paying claims [*see 33 U.S.C.S. §§ 919, 920*] and reviewing compensation orders [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 921*].

An administrative law judge may grant or deny a claim for benefits under the LHWCA. If the claim is denied, the claimant may take an administrative appeal to the Benefits Review Board. The claimant must file a notice of appeal from the administrative law judge's compensation order within 30 days of the day the order is filed [*33 U.S.C.S. § 921(a)*]. The running of the 30-day period for the filing of the notice of appeal is triggered by the filing of the administrative law judge's compensation order as provided in *33 U.S.C.S. § 919*, which requires that the order be submitted to the Deputy Commissioner and sent to the parties by registered or certified mail. Service on the parties must be effected before a compensation order is deemed filed [*Nealon v. California Stevedore & Ballast Co. (9th Cir. 1993) 996 F.2d 966, 970-971]* .

Review from an adverse decision of the Benefits Review Board is by petition to the court. A petition for judicial review from a final determination of the Board must be filed within sixty days [*33 U.S.C.S. § 921(c)*]. The papers will not be regarded as filed until they are actually received by the clerk of the court [*Fed. Rules App. Proc., Rule 25(a)*]. The sixty-day filing period is a jurisdictional requirement, and if the petition is not received by the court of appeals within the filing period, the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction [*Felt v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs (9th Cir. 1993) 11 F.3d 951, 952* (neither equitable tolling principles nor excusable neglect apply)].

[5] Exclusive Liability of Employer

The liability of the employer for compensation prescribed under the LHWCA is exclusive and in place of all other liability of the employer to the employee, or the employee's legal representative, spouse, parent, dependent, next of kin, or anyone otherwise entitled to recover damages from the employer at law or in admiralty because of the injury or death [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(a)*]. For example, *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(a)* has been held to bar a wrongful death action brought by the parent of a deceased employee against an employer who was liable under the provisions of the LHWCA [*see Seide v. Bethlehem Steel Corp. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 985, 989-990, 215 Cal. Rptr. 629]* .

If the employer fails to secure payment of compensation required by the LHWCA, the injured employee, or his or her legal representative in case death results from the injury, may choose between two modes of proceeding. Compensation may be claimed under the act, or an action may be maintained at law or in admiralty for damages. In an action, the defendant may not defend on the basis of negligence of a fellow servant, assumption of risk, or contributory negligence [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(a)*].

A judicially recognized exception to the exclusive liability provision of *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(a)* is that an employee may bring an action to recover for injuries resulting from an intentional tort by his or her employer [*see Seide v. Bethlehem Steel Corp. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 985, 989-990, 215 Cal. Rptr. 629]* .

A maritime worker who is arguably covered under the LHWCA is not precluded from bringing a Jones Act (*46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*) suit, nor is a Jones Act suit subject to a stay pending a final administrative determination under the LHWCA whether the worker is a "master or member of a crew" (and therefore excluded from coverage under the LHWCA) [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 417-418* (maritime worker on floating platforms, whose job involved ship repairing); *see § 522.31[5]*]. If the worker asserts "seaman" status under the Jones Act, and a genuine question of fact exists regarding that issue, it must be factually determined, and a Jones Act suit may proceed accordingly [*Southwest Marine, Inc. v. Gizoni (1991) 502 U.S. 81, 112 S. Ct. 486, 116 L. Ed. 2d 405, 417-418* ; *see § 522.31[5]*].

[6] Negligence of Third Parties

[a] When Employee's Rights Are Assigned to Employer

If the person entitled to recover under the LHWCA determines that someone other than the employer or those who work

for the employer is liable in damages, he or she need not elect whether to receive compensation under the act or to recover damages against the third person [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(a)*; *see § 522.177*]. Acceptance of compensation under an award in a compensation order operates as an assignment to the employer of the right of the entitled person to recover damages against the third person, unless the employee or other entitled person commences an action against the third person within six months after the award [*see § 522.178*]. If the employer fails to commence an action against the third person within ninety days after the cause of action is assigned, the right to bring the action reverts to the person entitled to compensation [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(b)*]. Payment of compensation into the fund on official determination that no one is entitled to receive compensation for the death of an employee who would otherwise be compensable under the statute [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 944(c)(1)*] acts as an automatic assignment to the employer of the right of the legal representative of the deceased to recover damages against the third party [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(c)*]. As an alternative to claiming subrogation rights under *33 U.S.C.S. § 933(b)*, an employer who has paid benefits to an employee injured by the negligence of a third party may bring an independent action against the tortfeasor under federal maritime law [*Stevedoring Services v. Prudential Lines, Inc. (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 154, 159, 226 Cal. Rptr. 225]* .

The employer may either bring suit [*see § 522.178*] or settle the case without suing. In either event, any amounts recovered by the employer must be distributed according to the LHWCA. The employer first retains an amount equal to expenses of the action, including a reasonable attorney's fee, the cost of medical benefits rendered, all amounts paid as compensation, and the present value of future amounts payable. The employer then retains one-fifth of the excess and pays over the remainder to the person entitled to compensation or to his or her personal representative [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(d), (e)*].

[b] When Employee Sues

If the person entitled to recover under the LHWCA determines that someone other than the employer or those who work for the employer is liable in damages, the person has six months after the award of compensation within which to sue the third party [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(a), (b)*; *see §§ 522.176, 522.182*]. If the person sues the third party, the employer is required to pay as compensation only any excess of the amount determined to be compensation due under the LHWCA over the net amount recovered against the third party. If the employee or his or her representative has settled with the third party for an amount less than is due under the act, the employer is responsible for the difference only if written approval of the settlement is obtained from the employer and the employer's insurance carrier before it is executed and filed on the appropriate form with the Secretary of Labor within 30 days [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(g)(1)*]. Failure of the employee to obtain and file a prior, written employer approval, or the failure of the employee to inform the employer of any settlement or judgment against the third party, terminates any rights to compensation and medical benefits under the LHWCA, even if the employer has already made payments or acknowledged entitlement to benefits [*33 U.S.C.S. § 933(g)(2)*]. The forfeiture provision of *33 U.S.C.S. § 933(g)(2)* also applies to a worker whose employer, at the time the worker settles with a third party, is neither paying compensation to the worker nor is yet subject to an order to pay under the LHWCA [*Estate of Cowart v. Nicklos Drilling Co. (1992) 505 U.S. 469, 112 S. Ct. 2589, 120 L. Ed. 2d 379, 389]* .

[c] When Vessel Is Third Party

If the injury was caused by the negligence of a vessel, the employee, or anyone otherwise entitled to recover, may bring an action for damages against the vessel under *33 U.S.C.S. § 933*, the provision authorizing actions against third parties [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*; *see 33 U.S.C.S. § 933*; *see also § 522.176*]. "Vessel" refers to any vessel on which or in connection with which an employee suffers injury or death arising out of or in the course of his or her employment. The term also includes the vessel's owner, owner pro hac vice, agent, operator, charter or bare boat charterer, master, officer, or crew member [*33 U.S.C.S. § 902(21)*].

If the injured person was employed to provide stevedoring services, no action lies if the injury was caused by the negligence of persons providing the same service. If the injured person was employed to provide shipbuilding,

repairing, or breaking services, and the injured person's employer was the owner, owner pro hac vice, agent, operator, or charterer of the vessel, no action lies against the employer in any capacity (including that of owner) or against other employees of the employer [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*].

The employer is not liable to the vessel for damages allowed under *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*, directly or indirectly, and any agreements or warranties to the contrary are void [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*]. In enacting this provision, Congress denied to the vessel a cause of action for indemnity against the longshore worker's employer, in order to prevent a "circuity" of actions that would result in much greater liability for the employer than otherwise owed under then existing compensation schedules, and that would reduce the longshore worker's compensation by the cost of the ensuing litigation [*Streatch v. Associated Container Transp., Ltd. (C.D. Cal. 1975) 388 F. Supp. 935, 939]* .

The liability of the vessel under *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)* is not based on the warranty of seaworthiness or a breach of that warranty at the time the injury occurred [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*]. This provision, enacted in 1972, specifically removes a longshore worker's cause of action against the vessel based on any theory other than negligence [*Streatch v. Associated Container Transp., Ltd. (C.D. Cal. 1975) 388 F. Supp. 935, 939* ; *see § 522.35[3]*].

The remedy provided under *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)* is exclusive of all other remedies against the vessel except remedies available under *33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.* [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*].

If the employer is also the shipowner, some federal courts allow a negligence action by the employee, whereas other courts hold the employer liable only for compensation, regardless of its breach of duties as a shipowner [*see, e.g., Baker v. Pacific Far E. Lines, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1978) 451 F. Supp. 84, 93-96* (negligence action not allowed)].

[7] Duties of Shipowner Under LHWCA

The vessel or shipowner owes to the stevedore and its longshore employees the duty of exercising due care under the circumstances. This duty extends at least to exercising ordinary care under the circumstances to have the ship and its equipment in such condition that an expert and experienced stevedore will be able, by the exercise of reasonable care, to carry on its cargo operations with reasonable safety to persons and property. The exercise of care also includes warning the stevedore of any hazards on the ship or with respect to the equipment that are known to the vessel or shipowner, or should be known in the exercise of reasonable care, that would likely be encountered by the stevedore in the course of its cargo operations, and that are not known by the stevedore and would not be obvious to or anticipated by the stevedore if it is reasonably competent in the performance of its work [*Marine Terminals v. Burnside Shipping Co. (1969) 394 U.S. 404, 415, 416 n.18, 89 S. Ct. 1144, 22 L. Ed. 2d 371* ; *see Scindia Steam Nav. Co. v. De Los Santos (1981) 451 U.S. 156, 166-167, 101 S. Ct. 1614, 68 L. Ed. 2d 1]* .

Generally, however, the shipowner has no general duty by way of supervision or inspection to exercise reasonable care to discover dangerous conditions that develop within the confines of the cargo operations that are assigned to the stevedore. Thus, the vessel owner is not liable to the longshore worker for injuries caused by dangers unknown to it and about which it had no duty to inform itself. This conclusion is plainly consistent with congressional intent to foreclose the faultless liability of the shipowner based on a theory of unseaworthiness or nondelegable duty. The shipowner, within limits, is entitled to rely on the stevedore and owes no duty to the longshore worker to inspect or supervise the cargo operations [*Scindia Steam Navigation Co. v. De Los Santos (1981) 451 U.S. 156, 172, 101 S. Ct. 1614, 68 L. Ed. 2d 1* ; *Dugas v. C. Brewer & Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 203, 209, 211 Cal. Rptr. 573]* .

The duty of providing safety equipment is on the stevedore, and the stevedore is liable for injuries to workers that result from breach of that duty. The shipowner is liable only in the exceptional case. Further, a longshore worker may not bring a products-liability claim against the shipowner, because the shipowner may only be held liable when the injured longshore worker can prove that the shipowner is negligent. The shipowner gives no warranty that the vessel is free from defect [*Whitehill v. United States Lines, Inc. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1207-1208, 223 Cal. Rptr. 452* ; *but*

see Streatch v. Associated Container Transp., Ltd. (C.D. Cal. 1975) 388 F. Supp. 935, 939 (strict products liability action available if defendant shipowner is in business of providing product to public)].

A shipowner may be obligated to intervene in the stevedore's cargo operation when the owner learns that an apparently dangerous condition exists or has developed. If the condition presents an unreasonable risk of harm to longshore workers and the stevedoring company's judgment is improvident, the shipowner must perform any repairs necessary for the protection of longshore workers [*see Scindia Steam Navigation Co. v. De Los Santos (1981) 451 U.S. 156, 173-176, 101 S. Ct. 1614, 68 L. Ed. 2d 1* (dicta)].

Once unloading operations have begun, the shipowner can be held liable for injuries to the employees of the stevedore resulting from open and obvious dangers only if the shipowner had actual knowledge of the hazards, and should have realized that an unreasonable risk of harm to the longshore workers existed, but did not intervene to eliminate or neutralize the hazard [*Dugas v. C. Brewer & Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 203, 210, 211 Cal. Rptr. 573]* .

A negligent shipowner's liability may be reduced but is not eliminated by the negligence of the stevedore or the longshore worker [*Dugas v. C. Brewer & Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 203, 210, 211 Cal. Rptr. 573]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAwardsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActCoverage & DefinitionsStatus RequirementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActJudicial ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActNegligenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.33

§ 522.33 Maintenance and Cure

[1] Nature of Remedy

The most basic remedy afforded an injured seaman is that of damages for "maintenance and cure" [*see § 522.180*]. The objective is primarily the same as that of land-based workers' compensation laws. The plaintiff seaman is almost always entitled to food, lodging, and medical care from the employer when the seaman is injured or becomes ill during the course of employment. This entitlement lasts until some type of stability has attached to his or her condition. However, maintenance and cure differs markedly from ordinary workers' compensation in that it is not the seaman's exclusive remedy when injured during the course of employment [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 98, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* . For discussion of a seaman's other remedies, see *§§ 522.31*, *522.34*, and *522.35*.

A seaman's right to maintenance and cure arises under general maritime law. The obligation has been recognized consistently as an implied provision in contracts of marine employment. Wages constitute only one part of a ship's obligation to sailors, while maintenance and cure is another kind [*Gilliam v. California Employment Stabilization Comm'n (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 102, 111, 278 P.2d 528]* .

The obligation or liability for maintenance and cure is not predicated on the fault or negligence of the employer. Whether by traditional standards the employer is or is not responsible for the injury or sickness, he or she is liable for the expense of curing it as an incident of the maritime employer-employee relationship [*Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395* ; *Petersen v. Marine Transport Lines (1948) 36 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 927, 935, 194 P.2d 161* , *194 P.2d 161]* .

A seaman may recover punitive damages under general maritime law for a ship owner's willful and wanton failure to pay maintenance and cure, even if such damages might not be available in an action brought solely under the Jones Act [*Atl. Sounding Co. v. Townsend (2009) -- U.S. -- 129 S. Ct. 2139, 174 L. Ed. 2d 382, 398-400* ; *see § 522.31*].

[2] Extent of Statutory Recognition

Under a California statute, if a mate or seaman becomes sick or disabled during the voyage, without his or her fault, the

expense of furnishing the person with suitable medical advice, medicine, attendance, and other provision for his or her wants, must be borne by the vessel until the close of the voyage [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 873*]. However, maintenance and cure is in fact not a statutory obligation of the employer but is a common law liability; although maintenance and cure is the payment of a liability by an employer, it is not paid under what is commonly considered an employer's liability law [*Gilliam v. California Employment Stabilization Comm'n (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 102, 114, 278 P.2d 528]* . Nevertheless, the California statute appears to reaffirm, through codification of the common law, that portion of the employer's obligation for the disability during the remainder of the voyage [*see § 522.33[3]*].

[3] Breadth of Liability

The employer's responsibility for maintenance and cure extends beyond injuries sustained because of, or while engaged in, activities required by the seaman's employment [*Petersen v. Marine Transp. Lines (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 927, 935 , 194 P.2d 161]* . Thus, seamen have been said to be "in service" even while on shore leave. Shore leave has been described as an elemental necessity in the sailing of ships, a part of the business, as old as the art and not merely a personal diversion, a necessity in the maintenance of the crew's morale, without which the efficiency of the ship's operations would be seriously impaired [*Moss v. Alaska Packers Ass'n (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 857, 859, 160 P.2d 244*]. However, a seaman who does not live aboard ship but commutes to the ship is not generally "in service of" the ship after the hours of service have ended for the day [*Price v. Connolly-Pacific Co. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1210, 1221-1223, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872* (seaman with permission to live in own camper parked on company property was not in service of ship when contracting disease from mosquito bite likely sustained after duty hours)].

[4] Unavailability of Most Defenses

So broad is the shipowner's obligation for maintenance and cure that negligence or acts short of probable misconduct on the seaman's part will not relieve the employer of the responsibility. Considerations of contributory negligence, the fellow servant rule, and assumption of risk are not relevant either. Only willful misbehavior or a deliberate indiscreet act suffices to deprive the seaman of protection. Classic examples are venereal disease and injuries received as a result of intoxication, although on occasion even the latter appear to have been qualified in recognition of the predisposition of sailors ashore [*Petersen v. Marine Transp. Lines (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 927, 935 , 194 P.2d 161]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureBenefitsAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureCovered EmployeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.34

§ 522.34 Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

[1] Nature of Action

Under the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*], whenever a person's death is caused by wrongful act, neglect, or default occurring on the high seas beyond three nautical miles from the shore of the United States, the personal representative may maintain a suit for damages in the federal courts, in admiralty, for the exclusive benefit of the decedent's wife, husband, parent, child, or a dependent relative against the person or vessel responsible [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30302*; *see § 522.184*].

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction to hear DOHSA actions, making available to DOHSA beneficiaries a convenient forum for the decision of their wrongful death claims [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30308(a)*; *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221-222, 232, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174* ; *Garofalo v. Princess Cruises, Inc. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1079-1085, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 754* (rejecting earlier court of appeals decision that state courts had no jurisdiction over DOHSA claims)]. The DOHSA does not affect state law regulating rights of action or remedies for death. Otherwise, however, state statutes are preempted by the DOHSA whenever it applies [*Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 232, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* . So long as the injury occurring on the high seas is one cause of the death, the DOHSA provides the exclusive remedy, even if the high seas injury is not the sole cause of the death [*Garofalo v. Princess Cruises, Inc. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1079, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 754]* .

Furthermore, the DOHSA does not apply to waters within the territorial limits of a state [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30308(b)*; *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* . Thus, state courts may entertain causes of action and provide wrongful death remedies for accidents arising on territorial waters (less than three nautical miles from shore) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30308(a)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*; *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* . However, the courts have construed the term "high seas" to include all waters that are not the territorial waters of the United States. Therefore, the DOHSA applies to injuries that occur within the territorial waters of another nation, even if that body of water is an inland river or lake [*Beckett v. MasterCraft Boat Co. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1048-1049, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 490]* .

For a discussion of the federal nonstatutory remedy for deaths occurring within state territorial waters, see *§ 522.35*. For additional discussion of maritime wrongful-death actions see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* . For a discussion of and forms relating to state wrongful-death actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[2] Nature of Recovery

Wrongful death recovery under the DOHSA consists of fair compensation for the pecuniary loss sustained by the persons for whose benefit the suit is brought. It is apportioned among these plaintiffs by the court in proportion to the loss they may severally have suffered by reason of the decedent's death [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30303*].

[3] Unavailability of Defense of Contributory Negligence

In suits under the DOHSA, the fact that the decedent was guilty of contributory negligence does not bar recovery, but the court takes into consideration the degree of negligence attributable to the decedent and reduces the recovery accordingly [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30304*].

[4] Limitation of Actions

A suit for wrongful death on the high seas must be commenced within three years from the date the cause of action accrued [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30106*].

[5] Conversion of Pending Personal Injury Suit

If a person dies as a result of the wrongful act, neglect, or default during the pendency in admiralty court of a suit to recover damages for personal injuries in respect to the act, neglect, or default in question, the personal representative of the decedent may be substituted as a party and the suit may proceed as one for wrongful death on the high seas [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30305*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActBeneficiariesAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActCoverageAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActDamagesAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActProcedureGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.35

§ 522.35 General Maritime Law

[1] Creation of Common Law Remedy for Wrongful Death

To achieve uniformity under the existing statutory scheme, the United States Supreme Court held that an action lies under general maritime law for death caused by violation of maritime duties, such as the duty of seaworthiness [*Moragne v. States Marine Lines (1970) 398 U.S. 375, 401, 409, 90 S. Ct. 1772, 26 L. Ed. 2d 339* ; *see § 522.31[12]* regarding the duty of seaworthiness]. The Court noted that if the Jones Act and the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA) were construed to forbid recognition of a general maritime remedy for wrongful death within territorial waters, the following anomalies would occur: (1) in territorial waters, general maritime law would allow a remedy for unseaworthiness resulting in injury, but not for death; and (2) although the DOHSA allows a remedy for death resulting from unseaworthiness on the high seas, general maritime law would not allow that recovery for a similar death in territorial waters [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 26-27, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275* ; *Moragne v. States Marine Lines (1970) 398 U.S. 375, 395, 90 S. Ct. 1772, 26 L. Ed. 2d 339]* .

Therefore, this remedy applies whether the act occurred on the high seas or in territorial waters [*see* *Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 26, 29-30, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . Although it applies to the death of a "true" seaman, it does not apply to the death of a longshore worker, because of superseding federal legislation barring that application [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 28, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275* ; *see 33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*; *see also § 522.35[3]*].

Although the holding in *Moragne* technically addressed only claims brought for a violation of the duty of seaworthiness, the United States Supreme Court has subsequently ruled that the holding extends to negligence claims as well [*Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. v. Garris (2001) 532 U.S. 811, 121 S. Ct. 1927, 150 L. Ed. 2d 34, 43]* .

The United States Supreme Court has allowed recovery for loss of support, services, and society, and funeral expenses in a claim brought under general maritime law based on the death of a longshore worker within territorial waters [*Sea-Land Servs., Inc. v. Gaudet (1974) 414 U.S. 573, 584, 94 S. Ct. 806, 39 L. Ed. 2d 9]* . Loss of society provides compensation for loss of mutual benefits of the relationship, but not for mental anguish and grief [*Sea-Land Servs.,*

Inc. v. Gaudet (1974) 414 U.S. 573, 585 n.17, 94 S. Ct. 806, 39 L. Ed. 2d 9] . That case also allowed recovery for wrongful death despite recovery by decedent during lifetime for personal injuries [*Sea-Land Servs., Inc. v. Gaudet (1974) 414 U.S. 573, 583, 94 S. Ct. 806, 39 L. Ed. 2d 9]* . The Court subsequently emphasized that its holding applies only to a claim based on the death of a longshore worker that occurs in territorial waters [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 30-31, 30 n.1, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . Because of superseding federal legislation under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*], *Sea-Land Services* is no longer applicable on its facts, because a longshore worker may no longer bring an action against a shipowner on the general maritime theory of unseaworthiness (although he or she may bring such an action on a negligence theory) [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 30 n.1, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . For further discussion, see *§ 522.35[3]*.

Subsequently, the United States Supreme Court held that damages in *Moragne*-type wrongful death actions brought for the death of a non-seafarer--that is, someone who was neither a seaman covered by the Jones Act nor a longshore worker--are subject to the application of state law [*Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Calhoun (1996) 516 U.S. 199, 202, 116 S. Ct. 619, 133 L. Ed. 2d 578]* . For a discussion of remedies afforded under California wrongful death law, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

There is no recovery for loss of society in a general maritime action for the wrongful death of a Jones Act (*46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*) seaman, which is consistent with a uniform rule barring recovery for those damages for the wrongful death of a seaman, whether brought under the DOHSA (*46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*), the Jones Act, or general maritime law [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 30-33, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . Moreover, in a general maritime action surviving the death of a seaman, the estate cannot recover damages for the decedent's lost future earnings [*Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 33-37, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* .

For discussion of wrongful-death actions under the general maritime law with emphasis on jurisdictional issues and within the context of recreational boating, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

[2] Beneficiaries Determined by Reference to Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

The class of beneficiaries in a claim for wrongful death based on general maritime law is determined by reference to the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*] and the rule expressed by a majority of the state wrongful death schemes [*Skidmore v. Grueninger (5th Cir. 1975) 506 F.2d 716, 729 n.11* ; *see Moragne v. States Marine Lines (1970) 398 U.S. 375, 407-408, 90 S. Ct. 1772, 26 L. Ed. 2d 339* ; *see also § 522.34[1]*]. For example, by analogy to these statutory provisions, adult children, parents, and posthumous illegitimate children are included in the class of beneficiaries, but an intended spouse is not [*Skidmore v. Grueninger (5th Cir. 1975) 506 F.2d 716, 729 n.11* (adult children); *Hamilton v. Canal Barge Co. (E.D. La. 1975) 395 F. Supp. 978, 985-988* (remaining beneficiaries)].

[3] Inapplicability to Longshore and Harbor Workers

In 1972, the United States Congress amended *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)* to bar any recovery from shipowners for the death or injury of a longshore or harbor worker based on any cause of action other than negligence [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*; *Miles v. Apex Marine Corp. (1990) 498 U.S. 19, 28, 111 S. Ct. 317, 112 L. Ed. 2d 275]* . The purpose of this amendment is to place a longshore or harbor worker injured aboard a vessel in the same position as he or she would be if injured in nonmaritime employment ashore, insofar as bringing a third-party damage action (for example, an action against a party other than the employer) is concerned, and not to endow the employee with any special maritime theory of liability or cause of action under whatever judicial nomenclature it may be called, such as "unseaworthiness" [*see Streatch v. Associated Container Transp., Ltd. (C.D. Cal. 1975) 388 F. Supp. 935, 939* ; *see also* H.R. Rep. No. 1441, 92nd Cong., 2d Sess. (1972), reprinted in 1972 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 4698, 4703]. This change was based on the conclusion that the "seaworthiness" concept was developed by the courts to protect seamen from the extreme hazards incident to their employment that frequently requires long sea voyages and duties of obedience to orders not generally

required of other workers; and that the rationale that justifies holding the vessel absolutely liable to seamen if the vessel is unseaworthy does not apply with equal force to longshore workers and other nonseamen working on board a vessel while it is still in port. In doing so, Congress stressed the adequacy of compensation remedies available to longshore and harbor workers under the simultaneously amended compensation provisions of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*see* H.R. Rep. No. 1441, 92nd Cong., 2d Sess. (1972), reprinted in 1972 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 4698, 4703].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActBeneficiariesAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsWrongful Death & SurvivalGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsWrongful Death & SurvivalDamagesAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.36

§ 522.36 Liability to Passengers

Whenever a passenger sustains injury or if his or her baggage sustains damage, the master and the owner of the vessel, and the vessel are liable for the full amount of damage, if the incident occurred because of neglect or failure to comply with various federal safety laws applicable to vessels, or because of known defects or imperfections of the steaming apparatus or of the hull [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30102*; *see § 522.183*]. Moreover, any person sustaining loss or injury through the negligence or willful misconduct of any master, mate, engineer, or pilot, or the defendant's neglect or refusal to obey the laws governing the navigation of vessels, may also sue the master, mate, engineer, or pilot for damages [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30103*].

The DOHSA is not restricted to maritime employees; it provides for recovery whenever the death of a person is caused by wrongful act, neglect, or default on the high seas [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30302*].

For matters more properly within the jurisdiction of state law, California provides that a marine carrier (on the ocean or arms of the sea [*Civ. Code § 2087*]) is liable in like manner as an inland carrier except for loss or injury caused by the perils of the sea or fire [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 420*]. Perils of the sea include storms and waves; rocks, shoals, and rapids; other obstacles, though of human origin; changes of climate; the confinement necessary at sea; animals peculiar to the sea; and any other dangers peculiar to the sea [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 422*]. All vessels are liable for injuries caused by them to persons or property in California [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 491(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActCoverageAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsNegligenceInvitees, Passengers & StowawaysAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsPassengersTortsTransportation TortsWatercraftGuests & InviteesTransportation LawWater TransportationMaintenance & Safety

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.37

§ 522.37 Shipowner's Limitation of Liability for Personal Injuries

The owner of a vessel may institute proceedings to limit his or her liability for personal injuries suffered on or as a result of the vessel, if the injury was incurred without the owner's privity or knowledge [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30505(b), 30511, 185*; *see § 522.12*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsNegligenceInvitees, Passengers & StowawaysAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsUnseaworthinessLimitations on LiabilityAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsPassengers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.38-522.49

[Reserved]

§§ 522.38[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.50

§ 522.50 Governing Law

The rights of shipowners in actions based on commercial shipping transactions are governed by the substantive rules of federal maritime law, regardless of whether the plaintiff chooses a state or federal forum [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . State law applies only to the extent that it does not conflict with the maritime law [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . Admiralty jurisdiction and the choice of federal or state forum are discussed more extensively in Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal PreemptionAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureForumAdmiralty LawShippingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.51

§ 522.51 Definitions

Contracts of affreightment and bills of lading set forth the essential terms governing shipping transactions. The term "contract of affreightment" encompasses any agreement for the conveyance of persons or the carriage of property by vessels. A bill of lading is merely written acknowledgment that goods have been received by a vessel for shipment to a particular place. Normally, a bill of lading also states terms of carriage, making it both a receipt and a contract [*Pollard v. Vinton (1882) 105 U.S. 7, 8, 26 L. Ed. 998]* .

The term "freight" refers to the payment or charges for shipping goods. The term "cargo" means the goods being shipped. Under California law, however, the goods being shipped are referred to as freight, while freightage means payment or charges for shipment.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsAffreightmentAdmiralty LawShippingBills of LadingGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesBills of Lading

LexisNexis®

83 of 175 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.52

§ 522.52 Collection of Freight

[1] Action for Breach of Contract

If the shipper refuses payment of freight on delivery of the goods in accordance with the parties' contract, the shipowner can seek collection through an action for breach of contract. Such actions can be maintained in personam in state court or, because shipment contracts fall within maritime jurisdiction, in federal district court [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1333*; *Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

[2] Maritime Liens

In addition to actions based on contract, a shipowner may collect freight charges by enforcement of maritime liens. A lien on the shipper's cargo arises when the owner of a vessel takes possession of the goods for shipment [*Hayes v. Campbell (1880) 55 Cal. 421, 423-426]* . Maritime liens do not depend on the parties' agreements for their existence, but arise independently, from the usages of commerce [*Bird of Paradise v. Heyneman (1867) 72 U.S. 545, 554-558, 18 L. Ed. 662]* .

The shipowner may retain the goods until freight is paid or file an action in rem against the cargo in federal court. The lien is possessory, however, and an owner should not release the cargo until after an action is filed or the shipper gives additional security [*Beverly Hills Nat'l Bank & Trust Co. v. Compania de Navegacione Almirante S.A. (9th Cir. 1971) 437 F.2d 301, 303, 304]* . Partial delivery of the goods will not defeat a lien on the remainder for the full amount of freight due [*Frothingham v. Jenkins (1850) 1 Cal. 42, 43-44]* .

The parties to a shipping transaction may modify or exclude the shipowner's lien in their contract or through their actions. In the absence of express words, the lien may be waived if the agreement contains stipulations inconsistent with the right, such as a provision that payment is due within two months after delivery of the goods [*Bird of Paradise v. Heyneman (1867) 72 U.S. 545, 554-558, 18 L. Ed. 662]* . In addition, the unconditional surrender of the goods without payment operates as a waiver of the shipowner's lien [*Beverly Hills Nat'l Bank & Trust Co. v. Compania de Navegacione Almirante S.A. (9th Cir. 1971) 437 F.2d 301, 303, 304* ; *see Eastern Transp. Co. v. United States (2d Cir.*

1947) 159 F.2d 349, 351] .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensDefensesAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensEnforcementAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensNatureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.53

§ 522.53 Actions Based on Maritime Collisions

[1] Fault Requirements

Liability for damages from collisions between two ships or a ship and a stationary object arises from fault. When neither party to the collision is at fault, damages cannot be collected by one vessel from the other [*The "Clara" (1880) 102 U.S. 200, 203, 26 L. Ed. 145]* .

[2] Federal Navigational Rules

Detailed rules of navigation govern the actions of ships on navigable waters [*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 1601-1608, 2001*-2073]. On the high seas and connected waters navigable by seagoing vessels, the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea guide vessels' movements [*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 1601-1608*]. Another set of rules applies to navigation of all vessels on the inland waters of the United States, and to vessels of the United States on the Canadian waters of the Great Lakes to the extent that there is no conflict with Canadian law [*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 2001-2073*].

[3] California Navigational Rules

California rules of navigation [*Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 240-308*] apply to navigable waters of the United States and the state insofar as they are not in conflict with the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction and laws of the United States [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 240*]. In practice, federal rules concerning navigation on navigable waters will control except as they permit application of a special local law [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 375, 159 P.2d 1]* .

[4] Determination of Fault--Pennsylvania Rule

Admiralty law imposes liability for damages from a collision on the ship whose fault causes the injury [*Pennsylvania v. Troop (1874) 86 U.S. 125, 136, 22 L. Ed. 148]* . The United States Supreme Court has established rules concerning imposition of fault when parties are in violation of the navigational statutes. The Court has held that when a ship at the

time of collision is in actual violation of a statutory rule intended to prevent collisions, it is no more than a reasonable presumption that the fault, if not the sole cause, was at least a contributing cause of the disaster. In such case, the ship must show not merely that the fault might not have been one of the causes, or that it was probably not, but that it could not have been a cause. If the ship's fault clearly had nothing to do with the disaster, it may be dismissed [*Pennsylvania v. Troop (1874) 86 U.S. 125, 136, 22 L. Ed. 148]* .

The purpose of the *Pennsylvania* rule was to enforce obedience to the mandate of safety statutes. It was also designed to simplify adjudication of collision cases [*Ishizaki Kisen Co., Ltd. v. United States (9th Cir. 1975) 510 F.2d 875, 879, 880]* . The *Pennsylvania* rule concerns only the question of whether an alleged statutory violation was one of the collision's causes. It does not exonerate a party whose negligence may also have been a cause of the disaster [*Crown Zellerbach Corp. v. Willamette-Western Corp. (9th Cir. 1975) 519 F.2d 1327, 1329]* .

The Ninth Circuit has consistently followed the *Pennsylvania* rule. The court, however, interprets the rule to mean that a ship in violation of statutory rules intended to prevent collisions must establish that the violation could not reasonably be held to have been the proximate cause of the collision. This view follows from the court's finding that the Supreme Court did not intend to establish a hard and fast rule that every vessel guilty of statutory fault must establish that the fault could not by any stretch of imagination have had any causal relation to the collision no matter how special, improbable, or remote [*States S.S. Co. v. Permanente S.S. Corp. (9th Cir. 1956) 231 F.2d 82, 86]* . The court also has ruled that the *Pennsylvania* burden is discharged by a clear and convincing showing of no proximate cause, and not by the stricter beyond-a-reasonable-doubt test [*Trinidad Corp. v. S.S. Keiyoh Maru (9th Cir. 1988) 845 F.2d 818, 825]* .

The *Pennsylvania* rule nevertheless proves frequently difficult, if not impossible, for violators to discharge [*Waterman S.S. Corp. v. Gay Cottons (9th Cir. 1969) 414 F.2d 724, 736 , modified, 419 F.2d 372]* . Until a change in 1975 by the United States Supreme Court, a vessel that could not satisfy the *Pennsylvania* burden would bear half of the damages even if its contribution to the accident was minimal [*United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 411, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251* (overruled rule of divided damages in collision cases); *see § 522.53[4]*)].

[5] Apportionment of Damages

[a] In General

If a vessel is solely at fault, it must bear its own damages as well as those of the faultless party [*The "Clara" (1880) 102 U.S. 200, 203 26 L. Ed. 145]* .

When two or more parties have contributed by their fault to cause property damage in a maritime collision or stranding, liability for such damage must be allocated among the parties in proportion to the comparative degree of their fault [*United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 411, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251]* . Under the previous rule of divided damages in collision cases, both parties' damages were added together and divided by two [*Sapphire v. Napoleon III (1874) 85 U.S. 51, 56, 21 L. Ed. 814* (describes computation of divided damages)]. According to the *Reliable* rule, damages will be allocated equally only when the parties are equally at fault or when it is not possible fairly to measure the comparative degree of their fault [*United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 411, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251]* .

The *Reliable* rule applies to collisions between two vessels and also to contact between vessels and stationary objects (allisions).

[b] Major-Minor Fault Rule

The "major-minor fault" rule attempts to ease the burden on a vessel which is guilty of a minor violation in comparison with the neglect of the other party. Under such circumstances, the vessel guilty of minor fault benefits from a

presumption that the minor fault could not have been a cause of the collision. The party primarily at fault must bear all damages unless it can rebut the presumption of its responsibility by showing that the minor fault did in fact contribute as a proximate cause of the collision [*California v. Italian Motorship Ilice (9th Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 836, 840]* . There is, however, some question as to the continued viability of this rule in light of the decision in *United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251* ; *see § 522.53[4]*.

[6] Post-*Reliable* Application of Fault Rules

The decision in *Reliable* [*United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251]* clearly overruled the holding in *Pennsylvania v. Troop (1874) 86 U.S. 125, 22 L. Ed. 148* , insofar as it relates to the principle of divided damages when two parties' fault contribute to a collision [*California v. Italian Motorship Ilice (9th Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 836, 840* (dicta)]. Courts of appeal in two circuits have ruled, however, that the *Pennsylvania* rule pertaining to the burden on vessels in violation of statutes remains in force subsequent to *Reliable* [*Florida E. C. R. Co. v. Revilo Corp. (5th Cir. 1981) 637 F.2d 1060, 1067* ; *Tug Ocean Prince, Inc. v. United States (2d Cir. 1978) 584 F.2d 1151]* .

The Ninth Circuit has applied the *Pennsylvania* rule in post-*Reliable* cases, but has not directly discussed its viability. In a pre-*Reliable* decision, the court noted that a Japanese system of comparative fault, similar to the *Reliable* method of apportioning damages, might become frustrated by application of the rule [*see Ishizaki Kisen Co., Ltd. v. United States (9th Cir. 1975) 510 F.2d 875, 880]* . However, the Ninth Circuit discussed application of the *Pennsylvania* rule in a subsequent case applying the *Reliable* principle retroactively [*Crown Zellerbach Corp. v. Willamette-Western Corp. (9th Cir. 1975) 519 F.2d 1327, 1329]* .

The "major-minor fault" rule appears to have been overturned by the *Reliable* decision. The Second Circuit has ruled that cases applying the "major-minor fault" rule are no longer viable after *Reliable* and that damages must be apportioned even if one vessel is primarily responsible for the loss and the other is only slightly negligent. The court relied on the Supreme Court's disapproval of the rule as unfair because the primarily negligent party bears the entire burden even though another party shared the fault [*Getty Oil Co., Inc. v. S.S. Ponce De Leon (2d Cir. 1977) 555 F.2d 328, 333]* .

In dicta, the Ninth Circuit has discussed the "major-minor fault" rule subsequent to the *Reliable* decision, but has made no determination of its continued effect [*California v. Italian Motorship Ilice (9th Cir. 1976) 534 F.2d 836, 840]* .

[7] Joint and Several Liability

If two parties are at fault for damages to a third party, liability is joint and several; the injured party can recover wholly from one or the other, or partially from one and partially from the other [*see The Beaconsfield (1895) 158 U.S. 303, 307, 15 S. Ct. 860, 39 L. Ed 993* ; *The "Atlas" (1876) 93 U.S. 302, 315, 23 L. Ed. 863]* .

The rule of joint and several liability appears to be largely unchanged by the rule announced in *United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251* [*see § 522.53[4]*]. In a later decision, the Supreme Court stated that the *Reliable* rule changed apportionment of liability from an equal division to a division on the basis of relative fault, but did not upset the rule that an injured party may recover for all loss from one of several joint tortfeasors [*Edmonds v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (1979) 443 U.S. 256, 271 n.30, 99 S. Ct. 2753, 61 L. Ed. 2d 521* ; *see also McDermott, Inc. v. AmClyde (1994) 511 U.S. 202, 207-208, 114 S. Ct. 1461, 128 L. Ed. 2d 148]* . This statement has been adopted and applied in a noncollision case [*Ebanks v. Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co. (11th Cir. 1982) 688 F.2d 716, 720-722]* and would appear to be equally applicable in collision cases, although the issue has yet to be squarely decided by an appellate court in that context.

Although one joint tortfeasor may be severally liable for all damages, he or she may seek pro rata contribution or partial

indemnity from other joint tortfeasors [*Edmonds v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (1979) 443 U.S. 256, 271 n.30, 99 S. Ct. 2753, 61 L. Ed. 2d 521* ; *The "Juniata" (1876) 93 U.S. 337, 340, 23 L. Ed. 930* ; *Loose v. Offshore Navigation, Inc. (5th Cir. 1982) 670 F.2d 493, 500-502* ; *Petition of Bloomfield S.S. Co. (2d Cir. 1970) 422 F.2d 728, 734]* .

If a plaintiff sues one joint tortfeasor after settling with and releasing another, the nonsettling tortfeasor's liability is reduced by that amount of the total damages that is found to be attributable to the settling tortfeasor's proportionate share of liability, and the settling tortfeasor's liability is, in turn, extinguished [*Kizer v. Peter Kiewit Sons' Co. (N.D. Cal. 1980) 489 F. Supp. 835, 837-841]* . This rule differs from California law regarding the effect of settlement, which is discussed in Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

[8] Effects of Settlement

The United States Supreme Court has established the federal common law applicable to cases in which one or more defendants have settled with plaintiff, and held that the proper calculation of the liability of nonsettling defendants is based on the jury's allocation of proportionate responsibility; the Court rejected the alternative method of giving nonsettling defendants a credit for the dollar value of the settlement [*McDermott, Inc. v. AmClyde (1994) 511 U.S. 202, 217, 114 S. Ct. 1461, 128 L. Ed. 2d 148]* . The rejected method is that reflected in California law regarding the effect of settlement, which is discussed in Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityPresumptionsAdmiralty LawCollisionsPreventionRegulatory & Statutory DutiesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawCollisionsRemediesApportionmentAdmiralty LawCollisionsRemediesDamages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.54

§ 522.54 Partitioning Ownership Interests in Vessels

Federal and state courts have concurrent jurisdiction to partition ownership interests in ships [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1333*]. Actions against the vessel in rem must be brought in federal court, while state courts retain power to adjudicate such controversies when an action is prosecuted against the vessel owners in personam [*Madruga v. Superior Court of California (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . A state court action cannot necessarily dispose of the rights of any and all persons in the vessel, however, unless every person claiming an interest in the property happens to be made a party in the action. An in rem action, on the other hand, adjudicates the interests of all persons in the property [*Madruga v. Superior Court of California (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

Accordingly, if the attorney is unsure whether or not there are any outstanding claims, an action should be prosecuted in federal court against the vessel in rem and against all known claimants in personam. Furthermore, the action must be brought in rem if any liens are outstanding against the vessel. Such liens would be considered maritime and therefore subject to the exclusive admiralty jurisdiction of federal courts [*Madruga v. Superior Court of California (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

In California, partition actions are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 872.010-874.240*. For discussion and forms relating to partition actions in state court, see Ch. 397, *Partition* . The state court forms in Ch. 397, *Partition* , may easily be converted for use in a federal in rem action by adding an admiralty jurisdiction allegation, by stating that the vessel is or will be within the district during the pendency of the action, and by following other in rem procedures provided in the federal Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims [*see §§ 522.201 -522.205*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureAttachment & GarnishmentPartition, Petitory & Possessory ActionsAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdiction

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.55

§ 522.55 Damages from Towage

Towage is the supplying of power by a tug or vessel to tow or draw another vessel. The vessel being towed is called the "tow" [*Stevens v. White City (1932) 285 U.S. 195, 200, 52 S. Ct. 347, 76 L. Ed. 699]* .

In an agreement of towage, the tow owner is responsible for its seaworthiness. The tug owner is not responsible for the proper stowage of cargo on a barge, an honest error of judgment on the part of the tug's master, or nonapparent unseaworthiness of the tow [*Nat G. Harrison Overseas Corp. v. American Tug Titan (5th 1975) 516 F.2d 89, 94]* .

The tug owner's primary responsibility is safe navigation. He or she must exercise such reasonable care and maritime skill as prudent navigators employ for the performance of similar service. Unlike the common carrier with respect to cargo, however, the tug does not act as an insurer or bailee of the vessel in tow [*Stevens v. White City (1932) 285 U.S. 195, 201, 202, 52 S. Ct. 347, 76 L. Ed. 699]* .

Suits against a tug for damages to a tow are based on negligence. The plaintiff must show that the loss was caused by a breach of the duty to exercise the skill of a prudent navigator. Unlike cases involving carriage of cargo, the fact that a tow was in good order when received by a tug and damaged when delivered does not raise any presumption of negligence [*Stevens v. White City (1932) 285 U.S. 195, 202, 52 S. Ct. 347, 76 L. Ed. 699]* .

Even though the tow owner bears the burden of proving the tug's negligence, the tug may be required to produce exculpatory evidence under certain circumstances. For instance, if an accident occurs during a deviation from the tug's course, it must show that the deviation was consistent with cautious and skillful management [*The Steamer Webb (1872) 81 U.S. 406, 414-415, 20 L. Ed. 774]* . In addition, on proof of grounding, the tug must provide evidence that the tug was operating within the designated channel and did not hit a known obstruction therein [*Mid-America Transp. Co., Inc. v. National Marine Serv., Inc. (8th Cir. 1974) 497 F.2d 776, 780 , aff'd, 526 F.2d 629 (1975)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawTowageGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawTowageContractsAdmiralty LawTowageDutiesAdmiralty LawTowageLiability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.56-522.69

[Reserved]

§§ 522.56[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.70

§ 522.70 Governing Law

The rights of shippers, seamen, and holders of maritime liens are governed by the substantive rules of federal maritime law, regardless of whether the plaintiff chooses a state or a federal forum [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . State law applies only to the extent that it does not render changes in the maritime law [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . Admiralty jurisdiction and the choice of federal or state forum are discussed more extensively in Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*.

Statutory law primarily controls the rights of shippers, seamen, and holders of maritime liens. The interests of shippers are governed by the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note] and the Harter Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 et seq.*]. Seamen's rights to wages are protected by federal and state statutes [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10301-10321* (foreign and intercoastal voyages), 10501-10509 (coastwise voyages), 10701-10711 (deceased seamen), 11101 et seq. (protection and relief of seamen); *Harb. & Nav. Code § 493*]. Finally, federal maritime lien law controls the creation of liens in favor of materialmen, tugs, pilots, seamen, and other persons furnishing services or supplies necessary for the shipping industry [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31305, 31341* et seq.].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal PreemptionAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.71

§ 522.71 Actions for Cargo Damage or Loss

[1] Who May Prosecute

An action for cargo damage or loss may be prosecuted by a shipper, consignee, holder of a negotiable (order) bill of lading or any other person demonstrating an ownership interest in the goods [*The Vaughan & Tel. (1872) 81 U.S. 258, 266, 20 L. Ed. 807* ; *The Thames (1872) 81 U.S. 98, 106, 20 L. Ed. 804]* .

[2] Types of Shipping Agreements

Usually, the conditions governing cargo damage are contained in a written agreement evidencing the shipping transaction. The contract may be a bill of lading which is also a receipt for the cargo, or a charter party.

A charter party is an agreement whereby the owner gives the charterer full capacity of the ship [*The Fri (2d Cir. 1907) 154 F. 333, 338]* . Such an agreement is a private contract of carriage and a bill of lading issued by the ship's master or by an agent of the owner operates merely as the receipt for the goods and as a document of title, passing the property of the goods. The provisions of the bill of lading do not vary the contract (charter party) between the shipowner and the charterer [*In re Marine Sulphur Queen (2d Cir. 1972) 460 F.2d 89, 103* ; *Romano v. West India Fruit & S.S. Co. (5th Cir. 1945) 151 F.2d 727, 730* ; *The Fri (2d Cir. 1907) 154 F. 333, 336-337]* .

The owner of a ship carrying the cargo of more than one shipper is called a common carrier, and the ship is referred to as a general ship [*Liverpool & Great W. Steam Co. v. Phenix Ins. Co. (1889) 129 U.S. 397, 437, 9 S. Ct. 469, 32 L. Ed. 788]* . A bill of lading issued by a common carrier is both a receipt for the goods and a contract between the parties [*Pollard v. Vinton (1882) 105 U.S. 7, 8, 26 L. Ed. 998]* .

[3] Laws Regulating Shipping Contracts

[a] In General

Shipowners and shippers must comply with several statutes that regulate commercial shipping transactions.

[b] Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

The Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note] applies to every bill of lading or similar document of title that evidences a contract for the carriage of goods (excluding cargo carried on deck and live animals) by sea to or from ports of the United States in foreign trade [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 1(b), (c)].

In addition, the COGSA governs shipments between United States ports and carriage agreements not covered for some other reason (such as the carriage of cargo on deck) if the bill of lading contains an express statement making the COGSA's provisions applicable [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 13; *North River Ins. Co. v. Fed Sea/Fed Pac Line (9th Cir. 1981) 647 F.2d 985, 987]* . If incorporated by the parties, the COGSA becomes merely another contractual term to be construed with the entire agreement [*Commonwealth Petrochemicals v. Steam Ship Puerto Rico (4th Cir. 1979) 607 F.2d 322, 324-327]* .

The COGSA specifically excludes charter parties from its coverage [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 5]. Also, a bill of lading issued by the vessel owner to a charterer would not fall within the COGSA because it is not evidence of the parties' contract [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note]. The bill of lading operates as a receipt and document of title under such circumstances, but the charter party is the contract of carriage [*In re Marine Sulphur Queen (2d Cir. 1972) 460 F.2d 89, 103]* .

Although charter parties are excluded, the act covers any bill of lading issued under or pursuant to a charter party from the moment at which such document regulates the relations between a carrier and holder of the bill [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 1(b)]. For example, if a charterer issues bills of lading to shippers instead of using the ship's entire carrying capacity, the bills of lading evidence a contract of carriage and must comply with the terms of the COGSA [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 5].

The statute covers only the period from the time when goods are loaded to the time when they are discharged from the ship [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 1(e)]. The parties may agree, however, to hold the carrier or the ship responsible for loss or damage prior to loading and subsequent to discharge of cargo [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 7].

[c] Harter Act

The Harter Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 et seq.*] was originally enacted prior to COGSA, and as now codified applies to the carriage of goods to or from any port in the United States [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30702(a)*]. However, the Harter Act has been almost completely superseded with respect to foreign trade by the COGSA [*Sunkist Growers, Inc. v. Adelaide Shipping Lines (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 1327, 1333]* . In addition, many bills of lading issued for transportation between ports within the United States include a provision making the COGSA applicable. Therefore, the Harter Act will generally apply only with respect to shipments between United States ports and only when the parties have not made the COGSA expressly applicable [*PPG Indus., Inc. v. Ashland Oil Co.-Thomas Petroleum Transit Div. (3d Cir. 1975) 527 F.2d 502, 505 , appeal on remand, 592 F.2d 138 (1978)*].

In contrast to the COGSA, the Harter Act applies to the periods prior to loading and subsequent to discharge of the goods up until delivery [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30704*; *The Monte Iciar (3d Cir. 1948) 167 F.2d 334, 336]* . The parties may contract to apply the COGSA during this period, but otherwise the Harter Act governs their rights [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 7; *46 U.S.C.S. § 30704*].

The period prior to loading begins when the goods are delivered and accepted by the carrier for transportation. The primary determinant in showing the beginning of this period is whether or not the cargo has become subjected to the ship's control. The issuance of bills of lading or dock receipts indicates that custody has taken place, but neither action

represents conclusive proof of acceptance for shipment [*Mackey v. United States (2d Cir. 1952) 197 F.2d 241, 242, 243]* .

The Harter Act's coverage of delivery comes into play as soon as the cargo has left the ship's tackle (when transportation is covered by the COGSA), and continues until the goods are properly delivered by depositing them on a fit wharf at the port of destination [*Isthmian S.S. Co. v. California Spray-Chem. Corp. (9th Cir. 1961) 290 F.2d 486, 488-490 , modified, 300 F.2d 41 (1962)]* .

[d] Federal Bills of Lading (Pomerene) Act

The Pomerene or Federal Bills of Lading Act [*49 U.S.C.S. § 80101 et seq.*] applies to bills of lading issued by any common carrier for the transportation of goods between ports within the United States (interstate) and between the United States and a foreign country [*49 U.S.C.S. § 80102*]. A common carrier issuing a bill of lading is generally liable for damages caused by nonreceipt of any part of the goods by the date shown in the bill or by failure of the goods to correspond with the description contained in the bill [*49 U.S.C.S. § 80113(a)*]. However, a common carrier issuing a bill of lading is not liable: (1) if the goods are loaded by the shipper; (2) the bill describes the goods in terms of marks or labels, or in a statement about kind, quantity, or condition, or is qualified by "contents or condition of contents of packages unknown," "said to contain," "shipper's weight, load, and count," or words of the same meaning; and (3) to the extent the carrier does not know whether any part of the goods were received or conform to the description [*49 U.S.C.S. § 80113(b)*]. In addition, a common carrier issuing a bill of lading is not liable for damages caused by improper loading if the shipper loads the goods and the bill contains the words "shipper's weight, load, and count," or words of the same meaning indicating that the shipper loaded the goods [*49 U.S.C.S. § 80113(c)*].

Although enacted later, the Pomerene Act did not repeal the Harter Act. The two acts may reasonably be read together as compatible legislation [*Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co. v. Inland Waterways Shippers Ass'n, Inc. (8th Cir. 1961) 289 F.2d 374, 382]* . Furthermore, the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA) specifically provides in *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(4), that it will not be construed as repealing or limiting the application of any part of the Bills of Lading Act. Therefore, attorneys should consider compliance with Pomerene's provisions when preparing an action under the COGSA or the Harter Act.

[e] California Law Regarding Cargo Damage Intrastate

As noted previously, federal maritime law supercedes state regulation of shipping transactions in interstate and foreign commerce [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . California statutes recognize that the rights and duties peculiar to carriers by sea are defined by acts of Congress [*Civ. Code § 2088*; *Harb. & Nav. Code § 421*]. State law applies to fill the gaps in admiralty law, but only to the extent that it does not render changes [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 399*; *Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

The carriage of freight (refers to cargo in California) within the state of California is regulated by *Civ. Code §§ 2110-2144* and *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 420-432*. Basically, a marine carrier bears the same liability as an inland carrier, except for loss or injury caused by perils of the sea or fire [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 420*]. The statute lists perils of the sea and prohibits the stowage of freight on deck unless it is usual to do so [*Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 422, 423*]. In addition, the law regulates jettison (throwing cargo overboard when necessary for the safety of the vessel or cargo) and general average loss (apportioning losses over the cargo) [*Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 425-432*]. Finally, the Civil Code specifies the place of delivery of freight, in the absence of contrary usage [*Civ. Code § 2119*].

Federal admiralty jurisdiction is determined by a two-part test, requiring a location on navigable waters and a sufficient relationship or nexus to maritime commerce [*Sisson v. Ruby (1990) 497 U.S. 358, 361, 364, 110 S. Ct. 2892, 111 L. Ed. 2d 292* ; *Executive Jet Aviation v. City of Cleveland (1972) 409 U.S. 249, 253, 261, 93 S. Ct. 493, 34 L. Ed. 2d*

454] . When the injury occurs on land, admiralty jurisdiction normally is not proper [*David Wright Charter Serv. of N.C., Inc. v. Wright (4th Cir. 1991) 925 F.2d 783, 785]* . Claims against terminal operators for damage to cargo while in storage awaiting shipment are governed by state law, rather than admiralty law. The booking of passage of cargo on a ship, followed by the turning over of the cargo to a terminal operator for storage pending shipment, creates a bailment or deposit between the cargo owner and the terminal operator under California law. *Civ. Code § 1840* limits the amount of damages recoverable for negligence by a depository or bailor to the declared value of the cargo [*Whitcombe v. Stevedoring Servs. of Am. (9th Cir. 1993) 2 F.3d 312, 314, 316]* .

For discussion of and forms for use in the liability of an inland carrier, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* .

[4] Actions Under Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

[a] Obligations of the Carrier

Under the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA), after receiving goods for transportation, the carrier must issue, on demand of the shipper, a bill of lading which (1) shows the leading marks necessary for identification of the goods as furnished by the shipper before the loading starts, (2) states the number of cargo pieces or the quantity or weight, as furnished in writing by the shipper, and (3) notes the apparent order and condition of the goods [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(3)]. The carrier need not show any marks, number, quantity, or weight which he or she has reasonable ground for suspecting not accurately to represent the goods actually received, or which he or she has had no reasonable means of checking [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(3)(c)].

The COGSA also imposes affirmative duties with respect to the ship and cargo. Before and at the beginning of a voyage, the carrier must exercise due diligence to make the ship seaworthy as well as properly manned, equipped, and supplied. Furthermore, the holds, refrigerating and cooling chambers, and all other parts of the ship in which goods are carried must be made fit and safe for the reception, carriage, and preservation of cargo [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(1)]. Finally, the carrier must properly and carefully load, handle, stow, carry, keep, care for, and discharge the goods carried [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(2)].

As an additional means of controlling contracts of carriage, the COGSA voids and nullifies any clause, covenant, or agreement relieving the carrier or the ship from liability for loss or damage to cargo arising from negligence, fault, or failure in any duties and obligations required by statute. Clauses which attempt to lessen the carrier's liability, except as provided in the statute, will also be disregarded [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(8)].

[b] Special Agreements Under Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA)

Under the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA), the shipper and carrier may enter into any agreement embodying any terms, regardless of the statute's requirements, with respect to any particular goods. Although it employs broad language, this provision applies only to extraordinary shipments where the character or condition of the property to be carried or the circumstances, terms, and conditions under which the carriage is to be performed are such as reasonably to justify a special agreement. Any stipulation regarding seaworthiness, however, must not be contrary to public policy [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 6].

[c] Limitation on Scope of Carrier's Liability

The COGSA relieves the carrier from liability for loss or damage arising or resulting from unseaworthiness unless caused by want of due diligence to make the ship seaworthy and to secure the proper personnel and equipment as specified with respect to the carrier's obligations [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(1)]. In addition, the statute exempts a carrier from liability for loss or damage arising or resulting from the following acts or events [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)]:

- Act, neglect, or default of the master, mariner, pilot, or the servants of the carrier in the navigation or in the management of the ship;
- Fire, unless caused by the actual fault or privity of the carrier;
- Perils, dangers, and accidents of the sea or other navigable waters;
- Act of God;
- Act of war;
- Act of public enemies;
- Arrest or restraint of princes, rulers, or people, or seizure under legal process;
- Quarantine restrictions;
- Act or omission of the shipper or owner of the goods, his agent or representative;
- Strikes or lockouts or stoppage or restraint of labor from whatever cause, whether partial or general: provided that nothing herein contained be construed to relieve a carrier from responsibility for the carrier's own acts;
- Riots and civil commotions;
- Saving or attempting to save life or property at sea;
- Wastage in bulk or weight or any other loss or damage arising from inherent defect, quality, or vice of the goods;
- Insufficiency of packing;
- Insufficiency or inadequacy of marks; and
- Latent defects not discoverable by due diligence.

An umbrella provision excludes any other cause arising without the actual fault and privity of the carrier and without the fault or neglect of the carrier's agents or servants [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)(q)].

The burden of proof with respect to limitation of liability falls on the carrier or any person claiming the exemption. If the loss or damage results from unseaworthiness, the person claiming exemption must prove the exercise of due diligence [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(1)]. A person claiming exemption because of an act for which the carrier is not responsible must prove the absence of causation between the damage or loss and any fault or neglect of the carrier [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)(q)]. The burden is satisfied if these facts are shown by a preponderance of the evidence [*States Marine Corp. of Del. v. Producers Coop. Packing Co. (9th Cir. 1962) 310 F.2d 206, 212, 213]* .

[d] Limitation on Amount of Carrier's Liability

The COGSA provides that neither the carrier nor the ship may in any event be liable for any loss or damage to or in connection with the transportation of goods in an amount exceeding $500 per package, or in case of goods not shipped

in packages, per customary freight unit. The shipper can avoid this limitation if the nature and value of the goods have been declared before shipment and inserted in the bill of lading. Furthermore, the parties may agree on a different maximum amount so long as it does not fall below the $500 limitation. Regardless of the amount declared, the carrier will not be liable for more than the actual damage [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(5)].

When cargo is shipped within a sealed container, the container is not considered the package or customary freight unit to which the $500 limitation applies if the bill of lading lists the number of packages within the container, notwithstanding a provision in the bill of lading that seeks to limit liability by providing that where cargo is packed into containers, the number of the containers shall be considered the number of packages or units for the purpose of limiting liability. Such a contract definition of "package" is neither reasonable nor consistent with the language and purpose of the COSGA, which provides, in *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(8), that any contract agreement lessening the statutory liability of the carrier is null and void [*All Pac. Trading v. Vessel M/V Hanjin Yosu (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1427, 1433]* .

When the carrier seeks to limit its liability to $500, the shipper must be afforded a fair opportunity to declare a higher value for the cargo and pay a corresondingly higher shipping charge [*Pan Am. World Airways, Inc. v. California Stevedore & Ballast Co. (9th Cir. 1977) 559 F.2d 1173, 1176]* . Provisions in the bill of lading and the COGSA advising shippers of the carrier's limited liability are considered prima facie evidence of the opportunity to avoid the limitation, however, and the holder of a bill of lading (or shipper) must prove that a choice of declaring a higher liability did not in fact exist [*Tessler Bros. (B.C.) Ltd. v. Italpacific Line (9th Cir. 1974) 494 F.2d 438, 443* ; *see also Continental Ins. Co. v. Columbus Line, Inc. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1190, 1200, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 199* (reference in bill of lading incorporating COGSA, but not specifically noting $500 limitation was insufficient evidence, by itself, that shipper was denied opportunity to negotiate for greater limitation)].

Although the statute appears clear in limiting the carrier's liability to $500 per package, unlimited liability may be imposed if the carrier makes an unreasonable deviation during transit. The COGSA provides that any reasonable deviation, such as to save lives or property at sea, does not constitute a breach of the parties' contract. However, a deviation for the purpose of loading or unloading passengers or cargo is regarded prima facie as unreasonable [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(4)].

The United States Circuit Courts of Appeal do not treat the issue uniformly. The Fifth Circuit has ruled that an unreasonable deviation breaches the parties' contract, rendering the $500 limitation inapplicable and restoring the carrier's full liability as an insurer of the goods [*Spartus Corp. v. S/S Yafo (5th Cir. 1979) 590 F.2d 1310, 1315-1317]* . On the other hand, the Seventh Circuit has decided that the words "in any event" in *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(5) mean that the $500 limitation applies regardless of an unreasonable deviation which breaches the contract [*Atlantic Mut. Ins. Co. v. Poseidon Schiffahrt (7th Cir. 1963) 313 F.2d 872, 874-875]* .

In the state courts of California, mere negligent conduct will not displace the $500 limitation on a carrier's liability under the COGSA. In dicta, the court of appeal has stated that even in the event of an unreasonable deviation, the statute places an invariable $500 per package limitation on the carrier's financial responsibility unless the shipper has declared a higher value in the bill of lading [*Varian Assocs. v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 369, 372-376, 149 Cal. Rptr. 534]* .

[e] Notice of Loss or Damage

Under the COGSA, the consignee or person entitled to delivery must give written notice of loss or damage and the general nature of such loss or damage to the carrier or his or her agent at the port of discharge before or at the time of the removal of the goods. If the loss or damage is not apparent, the notice must be given within three days of the delivery. The notice may be endorsed on the receipt for the goods given by the person taking delivery [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6)].

If the notice is not given, removal of the goods is prima facie evidence of the carrier's delivery of the goods as they are described in the bill of lading. The failure to give notice does not affect or prejudice the shipper's right to bring suit within the allowable time period [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6)].

[f] Period for Bringing Suit

Under the COGSA, suits for loss or damage to cargo must be brought within one year after delivery of the goods or the date when the goods should have been delivered. Otherwise, the carrier will be discharged from all liability [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6)]. Loss or damage within the meaning of *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6), refers only to direct damage to cargo and not to imdemnity claims. Thus, a cause of action for indemnity, although it originates in the same loss or damages suffered by the cargo owner, does not have legal existence until the indemnitee has incurred a loss by paying the underlying claim or judgment [*U. S. Cold Storage of Cal. v. Matson Navigation Co. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1228, 1231-1232, 209 Cal. Rptr. 144]* .

The one-year statute of limitations cannot be avoided even if the carrier intentionally violates the parties' contract by stowing cargo on deck [*Francosteel Corp. v. N. V. Nederlandsch Amerikaansche, Stoomvart-Maatschappij (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 880, 902, 903, 57 Cal. Rptr. 867]* .

For a general form asserting the affirmative defense of expiration of the time period for bringing suit, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

[g] Elements of Shipper's Action

Under the COGSA, a shipper or consignee may establish a prima facie case against the carrier by showing that the cargo was delivered to the carrier in good condition but was damaged when discharged [*Nissho-Iwai Co. Ltd. v. M/T Stolt Lion (2d Cir. 1980) 617 F.2d 907, 911, 912]* . A bill of lading issued in accordance with the act's requirements constitutes prima facie evidence of the carrier's receipt of the goods as described therein [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(4)]. Therefore, if the bill of lading states that the cargo was received in apparent good order and the goods are damaged when discharged, the shipper or consignee has established his or her case.

Once the shipper presents a prima facie case, the carrier must show that the loss or damage arose from a cause for which the carrier is not liable, such as peril of the sea, and not from any negligence with respect to the cargo [*States Marine Corp. of Del. v. Producers Coop. Packing Co. (9th Cir. 1962) 310 F.2d 206, 212, 213]* . The shipper maintains the burden of showing that the carrier's negligence contributed to the loss or damage. If the shipper establishes negligence, the carrier must bear the entire loss (subject to the limitation on amount of liability) unless the carrier can segregate that part of the loss due to the excepted cause. Under such circumstances, the carrier will pay for only the amount which relates to the wrongful conduct [*Tri-Valley Packing Ass'n v. States Marine Corp. of Del. (9th Cir. 1962) 310 F.2d 891, 892, 893]* .

[5] Actions Under Harter Act

[a] Shipowner's Obligations and Liability

The Harter Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 et seq.*] requires a shipowner (or his or her agent) to issue bills of lading which contain basically the same information mandated by the COGSA [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30703(a), (b)*]. Instead of imposing positive obligations with respect to the cargo and ship, however, the Harter Act prohibits the inclusion of exculpatory clauses in bills of lading. The owner may not insert a provision excluding liability for loss or damage arising from negligence or fault in loading, stowage, custody, care, or proper delivery of cargo [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30704*]. In addition, the law forbids a clause which lessens, weakens, or avoids the shipowner's obligation to exercise due diligence in making the ship seaworthy and properly equipped, manned, and supplied [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30705(a)*].

If the owner exercises due diligence to make the vessel in all respects seaworthy and properly manned, equipped, and supplied, the vessel and owner are not responsible for loss or damage resulting from an error in navigation or management of the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30706(a)*]. In addition, without regard to the exercise of such due diligence, neither a carrier nor a vessel are liable for loss or damage arising from [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30706(b)*]:

- Dangers of the sea or other navigable waters.
- Acts of God, or public enemies.
- Any inherent defect, quality, or vice of the thing carried.
- Insufficiency of package.
- Seizure under legal process.
- Saving or attempting to save life or property at sea, or from any deviation in rendering such service.
- Any act or omission of the shipper or owner of the goods, or his or her agent or representative.

This list includes some but not all of the causes stated in the COGSA [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)].

The generally accepted definition of "perils of the sea" is fortuitous action of elements at sea, of such force as to overcome the strength of a well-found ship or usual precautions of good seamanship. The validity of the defense depends on the nature and cause of loss under the particular facts of the case, and the carrier has the burden of showing freedom from negligence [*Taisho Mar. & Fire Ins. Co. v. M/V Sea-Land Endurance (9th Cir. 1987) 815 F.2d 1270, 1272, 1275]* . Findings of unusually high winds and seas, rolling of ship, damage to ship, loss and damage of containers, and due diligence in making the vessel and cargo system seaworthy support the conclusion that cargo was lost because of perils of the sea [*Taisho Marine & Fire Ins. Co. v. M/V Sea-Land Endurance (9th Cir. 1987) 815 F.2d 1270, 1274]* .

[b] Period for Bringing Suit

The Harter Act provides no period within which suit must be instituted. Under such circumstances, admiralty law requires application of the doctrine of laches [*Young v. Key City (1872) 81 U.S. 653, 660, 20 L. Ed. 896]* .

[c] Elements of Shipper's Action

Under the Harter Act, a shipper's or consignee's prima facie case is established much the same as in an action under the COGSA, by showing that goods delivered for transportation in apparent good order were discharged in a damaged condition [*Caterpillar Overseas, S. A. v. The Expeditor (2d Cir. 1963) 318 F.2d 720, 724]* . The carrier bears the burden of proving a cause of the loss or damage that the statute recognizes as an excepted peril [*Schnell v. Vallescura (1934) 293 U.S. 296, 303, 304, 55 S. Ct. 194, 79 L. Ed. 373]* . The owner must also show that the vessel was seaworthy at the beginning of the voyage or that due diligence was used to make it seaworthy [*W.J. McCahan Sugar Refining Co. v. S.S. Wildcroft (1906) 201 U.S. 378, 386-390, 26 S. Ct. 467, 50 L. Ed. 794]* . If the owner cannot prove seaworthiness, the statute will not provide relief from liability, regardless of whether or not the defect is causally connected with the disaster creating the loss or damage [*May v. Hamburg-Amerikanische Packetfahrt Aktiengesellschaft (The Isis) (1933) 290 U.S. 333, 350-354, 54 S. Ct. 162, 78 L. Ed. 348]* . Finally, if the cause of cargo damage falls within a statutory exception, the shipper bears the burden of proving the owner's negligence or other failure [*Schnell v. Vallescura (1934) 293 U.S. 296, 304, 305, 55 S. Ct. 194, 79 L. Ed. 373]* .

The tremendous burdens on both shipowner and shipper under the Harter Act have hampered its effectiveness and made the COGSA the preferable law under which to proceed [*Wirth Ltd. v. S/S Acadia Forest (5th Cir. 1976) 537 F.2d 1272, 1278 n.21*]. As discussed previously, however, the Harter Act will apply to all bills of lading for transportation between ports within the United States when the contract does incorporate the COGSA. In addition, the Harter provisions apply to the periods prior to loading and subsequent to discharge of the goods unless the parties have agreed to application of the COGSA during that period [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, §§ 7, 12].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCharterpartiesParty LiabilityCharterer LiabilityAdmiralty LawShippingBills of LadingConstruction & InterpretationAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesCarriage of Goods by Sea ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesHarter ActTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.72

§ 522.72 Actions by Seamen for Wages

[1] Preferential Treatment and Enforcement Generally

Seamen's wages are strictly protected by state and federal statutes [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10301-10321* (foreign and intercoastal voyages), 10501-10509 (coastwise voyages), 10701-10711 (deceased seamen), 11101 et seq. (protection and relief of seamen); *Harb. & Nav. Code § 493*]. This preferential treatment is part of the traditional protection of seamen's rights by Congress [*Isbrandtsen Co. v. Johnson (1952) 343 U.S. 779, 782, 783, 72 S. Ct. 1011, 96 L. Ed. 1294]* .

A seaman's right to wages commences either at the time he or she begins work or at the time specified in the agreement for commencement of work or presence on board, whichever occurs first [*46 U.S.C.S. § 10313(a)*]. The right to wages must not be dependent on the earning of freight by the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 10313(b)*]. In addition, a seaman may not forfeit his or her lien against the ship or be deprived of any remedy for the recovery of wages under any agreement other than one provided for under *46 U.S.C.S. § 10301 et seq.* Any stipulation in an agreement inconsistent with these provisions, or any stipulation by which a seaman consents to abandon either a right to wages if the ship is lost or a right in the nature of salvage, is void [*46 U.S.C.S. § 10317*].

A seaman's right to wages gives rise to a maritime lien, entitling the seaman to bring an action in rem against the vessel under federal maritime lien law [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.*; *see § 522.73[3][c]*]. A seaman's right to wages may also be enforced by an action in personam. For further discussion and forms of a complaint for wages, see Benedict on Admiralty (Matthew Bender).

[2] Deductions and Set-Offs Against Wages

Federal law strictly limits deductions that may be taken against seamen's wages. No wages due or accruing to any seaman are subject to attachment or arrestment from any court except for the support and maintenance of a wife and minor children [*46 U.S.C.S. § 11109(a)*]. A seaman may be required to forfeit a portion of his or her own wages as punishment for certain specific offenses, such as desertion [*46 U.S.C.S. § 11501*]. The shipowner must restrict

deductions and set-offs, however, to those recognized in the statutes as allowable for a seaman's derelictions in the performance of his or her duties [*Isbrandtsen Co. v. Johnson (1952) 343 U.S. 779, 787, 72 S. Ct. 1011, 96 L. Ed. 1294* (disallowed set-off for expenses in medical care and hospitalization of another crew member for injuries inflicted by the discharged seaman)]. In certain instances, payment of wages may take a form other than cash or a pay voucher [*American Foreign S.S. Co. v. Matise (1975) 423 U.S. 150, 160, 96 S. Ct. 410, 46 L. Ed. 2d 354* (payment in form of airline ticket for return to United States when owner not required to pay repatriation expenses)].

[3] Time of Payment

After five days have passed at the beginning of a voyage, a seaman is entitled to receive from the master, on demand, one half of the balance of unpaid wages earned at each port at which the ship loads or delivers cargo [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(e), 10504(a)*]. At the end of a foreign or intercoastal voyage, the balance of a seaman's wages due must be paid within 24 hours after the cargo has been discharged or within four days after the seaman has been discharged, whichever is earlier [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10301(a), 10313(f)*]. In either event, a seamen on such a voyage is entitled to receive one third of the wages due immediately after discharge [*46 U.S.C.S. § 10313(f)*; *see Thomas v. SS Santa Mercedes (9th Cir. 1978) 572 F.2d 1331, 1334, 1335* (purpose of latter provision is to provide seaman with funds to live on when he or she is left ashore, regardless of reason of discharge)]. In the case of a coastwise voyage, from one state to another nonadjoining state, the balance of wages due a seaman must be paid within two days after termination of the shipping agreement or when the seaman is discharged, whichever is earlier [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10501(a), 10504(b)*].

[4] Penalty for Late Payment

Every master or owner who refuses or neglects to make timely final payment without sufficient cause must pay the seaman a sum equal to two days pay for every day during which payment is delayed beyond the statutory period [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(g), 10504(c)*; *but see Petersen v. Interocean Ships, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 334, 336-337* ("wages" under *46 U.S.C.S. § 10313* does not include "comp time" earnings)]. The penalty of double payment is mandatory if a shipowner withholds payment of wages without sufficient cause. The phrase "without sufficient cause" means more than the absence of a valid defense to the claim for wages. The delay in payment must be arbitrary or unreasonable. It is not unreasonable for a shipowner to withhold payment when the seaman does not abide by a reasonable precondition, such as putting the claim for wages in writing [*Larkins v. Hudson Waterways Corp. (9th Cir. 1981) 640 F.2d 997, 999, 1000]* . Once it has been determined that a wage penalty is due, however, the courts do not have discretion to limit the period during which the penalty is assessed [*Griffin v. Oceanic Contractors, Inc. (1982) 458 U.S. 564, 102 S. Ct. 3245, 73 L. Ed. 2d 973, 979-984]* .

[5] Prepayment of Process Fees by Seamen

Prepayment of the marshal's fee for seizing and maintaining custody over the vessel may present a formidable barrier for seamen seeking to collect their wages. The amount required by the marshal may be substantial and may have to be renewed if additional time is required. Counsel should check with the local United States Marshal to determine the amount of deposit required.

28 U.S.C.S. § 1921 requires an advance payment for the marshal's costs and subsequent periodic amounts during the course of the litigation. On the other hand, *28 U.S.C.S. § 1916* allows seamen to institute and prosecute suits and appeals for wages without prepayment of fees or costs, or the furnishing of security.

The two circuit courts of appeal that have addressed the conflict between these two provisions have not resolved the question uniformly. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled that the more specific exemption for seamen in *28 U.S.C.S. § 1916* controls suits against vessels for wages [*Thielebeule v. M/S Nordsee Pilot (2d Cir. 1971) 452 F.2d 1230, 1232, 1233]* . The Fifth Circuit, however, has given controlling authority to *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921* as the more recent enactment [*Araya v. McLelland (5th Cir. 1976) 525 F.2d 1194, 1196]* . The Ninth Circuit has not dealt with the

conflict. A federal district court decision from Washington followed the Fifth Circuit's reasoning, however, in upholding the prepayment requirement of *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921* [*Setera v. F/V Olympic (W.D. Wash. 1980) 491 F. Supp. 844, 845]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsWagesLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsWage Payments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.73

§ 522.73 Actions to Enforce Maritime Liens

[1] Scope and Preemption

Federal maritime lien law [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31305, 31341* et seq.] grants a lien against a vessel in favor of any person furnishing repairs, supplies, towage, use of dry dock or marine railway, or other necessaries. The lien may be enforced by an action in rem, and a plaintiff need not allege or prove that credit was given to the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(4), 31342(a)*]. Because the existence of a maritime lien based on a breach of contract depends on a finding that the subject matter of the contract falls within the admiralty jurisdiction, the issue of admiralty jurisdiction may arise in such a case [*see Exxon Corp. v. Central Gulf Lines (1991) 500 U.S. 603, 608-612, 111 S. Ct. 2071, 114 L. Ed. 2d 649* (agency contracts are not per se excepted from admiralty jurisdiction in action brought to enforce maritime lien under former *46 U.S.C.S. § 971* (*now see 46 U.S.C.S. § 31342*); but Court did not decide whether plaintiff was entitled to maritime lien); *see generally* Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating*].

The maritime lien arises from the ship's need to obtain promptly supplies, repairs, and other services that facilitate its movement from place to place [*Piedmont & Georges Creek Coal Co. v. Seaboard Fisheries Co. (1920) 254 U.S. 1, 8, 9, 41 S. Ct. 1, 65 L. Ed. 97]* . Furthermore, federal maritime lien law supersedes any state statute conferring a lien on a vessel to the extent that the statute establishes a claim to be enforced by a civil action in rem [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31307*; *see Dampskibsselskabet Dannebrog v. Signal Oil & Gas Co. of Cal. (1940) 310 U.S. 268, 272, 60 S. Ct. 937, 84 L. Ed. 1197* (construing former Federal Maritime Lien Act)].

[2] Authority to Bind Vessel

[a] Presumed Authority

Federal maritime liew law lists persons presumed to have authority from the owner to procure services giving rise to a lien. The list includes the managing owner, ship's husband, master, or any person to whom the management of the vessel at the port of supply is entrusted [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31341(a)(3)*]. The phrase "management of the vessel" denotes direction and control for the purposes for which the vessel is used, as opposed to mere navigation of the ship [

Dampskibsselskabet Dannebrog v. Signal Oil & Gas Co. of Cal. (1940) 310 U.S. 268, 272, 60 S. Ct. 937, 84 L. Ed. 1197] . The chief officer of a vessel, second in command to the master, has been included within the definition of persons to whom management of the vessel is entrusted for purposes of binding the ship [*Atlantic & Gulf Stevedores v. M/V Grand Loyalty (5th Cir. 1979) 608 F.2d 197, 200]* .

[b] Officers and Agents of Charterer

Prior to 1972, materialmen often faced difficult problems enforcing liens against a vessel when it was operated under the terms of a charter party or contract. The law disallowed a lien when the furnisher knew or, by the exercise of due diligence, could have ascertained that, because of the terms of the charter party, the person ordering the supplies or services was without authority to bind the vessel. In effect, materialmen were precluded from asserting a lien when the charter agreement contained a provision, termed a "no lien" clause or proviso, not allowing the charterer to create a lien against the vessel [*United States v. Carver (1923) 260 U.S. 482, 488, 489, 43 S. Ct. 181, 67 L. Ed. 361]* .

At present, the law provides simply that officers and agents with presumed authority include the persons appointed by a charterer [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31341(a)(4)*]. No lien provisions are outlawed, and materialmen need not inquire into a person's authority to bind the ship for repairs, supplies, or services, beyond ascertaining the person's title [*Atlantic & Gulf Stevedores v. M/V Grand Loyalty (5th Cir. 1979) 608 F.2d 197, 201, 202]* .

[3] Services and Supplies Giving Rise to Lien

[a] In General

A person who provides necessaries to a vessel on the order of the owner or a person authorized by the owner has a maritime lien on the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31342(a)*]. The term "necessaries" includes repairs, supplies, towage, and the use of a dry dock or marine railway [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31304(4)*]. It also covers, for example, stevedoring services [Atlantic & Gulf Stevedores v. M/V Grand Loyalty *(5th Cir. 1979) 608 F.2d 197, 201]* . The term "necessaries" does not mean absolutely indispensable goods or services, but includes most goods or services that are convenient or useful to the vessel [*Ajubita v. S/S Peik (5th Cir. 1970) 428 F.2d 1345, 1346, 1347]* .

[b] Pilotage

Pilotage fees are paid to pilots for navigating vessels between ports and the open sea. Although pilotage falls within the scope of federal regulation under the Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3*), it is a local concern that may constitutionally be regulated by the states in the absence of any conflicting federal legislation [*Cooley v. Board of Wardens (1851) 53 U.S. 299, 319, 13 L. Ed. 996]* .

The federal government has assumed exclusive authority over the regulation of pilots on coastwise seagoing vessels that are not sailing on register but are either propelled by machinery and subject to inspection under *46 U.S.C.S. § 3101 et seq.* or are subject to inspection under *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 3701-3718* (carriage of liquid bulk dangerous cargoes) [*46 U.S.C.S. § 8502*]. Otherwise, pilots in the bays, rivers, harbors, and ports of the United States are left to state regulation [*46 U.S.C.S. § 8501*; *see Jackson v. Marine Exploration Co., Inc. (5th Cir. 1978) 583 F.2d 1336, 1340, 1341]* . California laws regulate pilotage of registered vessels to and from the ports in San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisan Bays [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 1100 et seq.*]. The state statutes require registered vessels to obtain pilotage by licensed pilots within these bays, and mandate payment of fees whether or not a pilot is used [*Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 1125-1127*].

Pilotage fees fall within the definition of "necessaries" under federal maritime lien law, especially when required by state law [*Ajubita v. S/S Peik (5th Cir. 1970) 428 F.2d 1345, 1346, 1347]* . At least one court has enforced a lien in favor of a pilot whose services were offered but unlawfully refused [*Blair v. M/V Blue Spruce (D. Mass. 1971) 329 F. Supp. 178, 179]* . Arguably, the same type of lien would arise in California because a vessel must pay fees when

pilotage is required even if the services are refused [*Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 1125-1127*].

[c] Seamen's Wages

Seamen's wages are considered "necessaries" under federal law, thus giving rise to a lien against the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31342*; *see Bank of New Orleans & Trust Co. v. Oil Screw Tracy Marie (5th Cir. 1978) 580 F.2d 808]* . The lien for seamen's wages takes priority over other claims against the ship [*see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(5), 31326*; *see also International Paint Co., Inc. v. M/V Mission Viking (5th Cir. 1981) 637 F.2d 382, 385]* . So long as any part of the vessel remains in existence, the sailor is entitled to the proceeds as against all other persons claiming a lien [*The John G. Stevens (1898) 170 U.S. 113, 119, 18 S. Ct. 544, 42 L. Ed. 969]* . For additional discussion of seamen's wages, see *§ 522.72*.

[d] Salvage

Salvage is compensation allowed to a person who voluntarily assists a ship at sea, saving in whole or part the vessel or cargo from impending sea peril or recovering the property from actual peril or loss, as in the case of a shipwreck. A valid salvage claim requires three elements: (1) a marine peril; (2) service voluntarily rendered when not required as an existing duty or from a special contract; and (3) success in whole or part or contribution to success by the service [*The "Sabine" (1880) 101 U.S. 384, 25 L. Ed. 982]* .

A salvor's services give rise to a maritime lien against the ship for salvage [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(5), 31342*; Veverica v. Drill Barge Buccaneer No. 7 *(5th Cir. 1974) 488 F.2d 880, 883]* . The lien for salvage may be enforced by an action in rem against the salvaged vessel or property [*The "Sabine" (1880) 101 U.S. 384, 25 L. Ed. 982]* .

A suit to recover remuneration for rendering assistance or salvage services will not be maintainable if brought later than two years after the date when the assistance or salvage was rendered, unless within the period there was no reasonable opportunity for arresting the assisted or salved vessel within the court's jurisdiction [*46 U.S.C.S. § 80107(c)*]. For a general form for asserting the affirmative defense of expiration of the time period for bringing suit, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

[4] Waiver of Maritime Liens

The furnisher of repairs, supplies, or necessaries may waive the right to a lien by agreement or otherwise [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31305*]. An express renunciation of the lien in a contract or agreement will operate as a waiver, but such action is not necessary. Waiver may come about by reliance on specific security, such as a contract making the shipowner personally liable for the debt, instead of dependence on the lien. If the furnisher of supplies or services takes other and different security, he or she must stipulate for retention of the lien against the vessel in order to prevent waiver [*W. A. Marshall & Co. v. S.S. "President Arthur" (1929) 279 U.S. 564, 568-572, 49 S. Ct. 420, 73 L. Ed. 846]* .

[5] Enforcement of Maritime Liens

A lien arising under federal maritime lien law may be enforced by an action in rem against the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31342(a)(2)*; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(1)]. Furthermore, federal law states that it is not necessary to allege or prove that credit was given to the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31342(a)(3)*]. This provision creates a strong presumption that persons who furnish repairs, supplies, and other necessaries look to the credit of the vessel itself, as opposed to any personal guaranty by the owner [*Sasportes v. M/V Sol De Copacabana (5th Cir. 1978) 581 F.2d 1204, 1209]* . A person attacking the lien bears the burden of proving that the supplier relied solely on the owner's personal credit [*Point Landing, Inc. v. Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. (5th Cir. 1958) 261 F.2d 861, 867]* . A maritime lien arises unless it is affirmatively established that necessaries were furnished solely on the personal credit of the promising party [*Point Landing, Inc. v. Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. (5th Cir. 1958) 261 F.2d 861, 867* ; *The Astorian (9th Cir. 1932) 57 F.2d 85, 89, 90]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime LiensDefensesAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensEnforcementAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensNatureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsAuthorityAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsSalvage LiensAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsWagesAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.74-522.89

[Reserved]

§§ 522.74[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.90

§ 522.90 Federal Statutes

Jurisdiction in federal and state courts in admiralty and maritime actions. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1333*

Waiver of costs for seamen prosecuting certain suits. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1916*

Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. *33 U.S.C.S. § 901 et seq.*

Federal Employers Liability Act. *45 U.S.C.S. §§ 51 et seq.*

Limitation of liability of vessel owners. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30501 et seq.*

Jones Act (seamen's recovery for personal injuries or death). *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*

Admiralty and maritime jurisdiction described. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30101*

Suits in admiralty by or against vessels or cargoes of the United States. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30901 et seq.*

Death on the High Seas Act. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*

Three-year statute of limitations for personal injury or death actions arising out of maritime tort, unless otherwise specified by law. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30106*

Suits in admiralty against United States for damages caused by public vessels or certain services. *46 U.S.C.S. § 31101 et seq.*

Carriage of passengers. *46 U.S.C.S. § 3501 et seq.*

Carriage of liquid bulk dangerous cargoes. *46 U.S.C.S. § 3701 et seq.*

Report and investigation of marine casualties. *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 6101-6307*

Unseaworthiness proceedings. *46 U.S.C.S. § 10901 et seq.*

Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over water carriers. *49 U.S.C.S. §§ 10541-10544*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsUnseaworthinessGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsLimitations on LiabilityTransportation LawWater TransportationMaintenance & SafetyWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityJones ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.91

§ 522.91 State Statutes

Liability of marine carrier. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 420*

Liability of vessels for personal injuries. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 491(f)*

Maintenance and cure of seaman until close of voyage. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 873*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.92

§ 522.92 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Pleading admiralty and maritime claims. *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.93

§ 522.93 Decisions

[1] Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA)

Federal court jurisdiction is concurrent with state jurisdiction to hear Death on High Seas Act (DOHSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 761 et seq.*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*) actions; however, state statutes are preempted by DOHSA whenever it applies. *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221-222, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174*

Damages for loss of society under general maritime law are not recoverable in addition to damages set forth in Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 761 et seq.*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.*) in action by decedent's survivors for wrongful death on high seas. *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Higginbotham (1978) 436 U.S. 618, 619, 98 S. Ct. 2010, 56 L. Ed. 2d 581*

Damages for pre-death pain and suffering under general maritime law are not recoverable because non-pecuniary damages are not available under Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA), and court is not entitled to supplement Congress's remedy. *Saavedra v. Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd. (9th Cir. 1996) 93 F.3d 547, 554*

[2] Injuries to Seamen

State law regarding forum non conveniens is not preempted by federal law in state actions filed pursuant to Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* and "saving to suitors" clause of *28 U.S.C.S. § 1333(1)*. *American Dredging Co. v. Miller (1994) 510 U.S. 443, 114 S. Ct. 981, 127 L. Ed. 2d 285, 295*

Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* does not authorize seaman who is state employee to sue state in federal court. *Welch v. Department of Highways & Pub. Transp. (1987) 483 U.S. 468, 475-476, 107 S. Ct. 2941, 97 L. Ed. 2d 389*

LHWCA renders general contractor immune from tort liability, provided contractor has not failed to honor its statutory duty to secure compensation for subcontractor employees when subcontractor itself has not secured compensation. *Washington Metro. Transit Auth. v. Johnson (1984) 467 U.S. 925, 936-941, 104 S. Ct. 2827, 81 L. Ed. 2d 768*

Seaman who accepted remittitur "under protest" and reserved "right to appeal therefrom" is bound by that acceptance and not able to challenge remittitur on direct appeal. *Donovan v. Penn Shipping Co., Inc. (1977) 429 U.S. 648, 650, 97 S. Ct. 835, 51 L. Ed. 2d 112*

Personal injury action under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* is not maintainable in rem against vessel because it does not give rise to maritime lien. *Plamals v. Pinar Del Rio (1928) 277 U.S. 151, 155-157, 48 S. Ct. 457, 72 L. Ed. 827*

In suit under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*, claims of vessel's chief cook were not barred by "primary duty rule," because injury was not caused by his breach of duty that he consciously assumed as term of employment; he did not create, nor could he have controlled or eliminated, dangerous condition that caused his injury; injury resulted from momentary inattention to his own safety, not knowing breach of duty. *Bernard v. Maersk Lines, Ltd. (9th Cir. 1994) 22 F.3d 903, 907-908*

In suit under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*, right to jury trial is option belonging only to plaintiff, not defendant; plaintiff is not able to establish right to jury trial (1) by reliance on defendant's erroneous request for jury trial, (2) under *Seventh Amendment of United States Constitution*, because of lack of diversity of citizenship, nor (3) as abuse of discretion or estoppel of defendants. *Craig v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (9th Cir. 1994) 19 F.3d 472, 476*

Unseaworthiness was established by injury to seaman caused by unsecured, open, hinged, steel hatch cover that fell on him as he ascended ladder, when obstacle kept hatch cover open ninety degrees; negligence under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* was established by uncorroborated, but uncontroverted, testimony of seaman; award for diminished earning capacity was not excessive, when trial court took into consideration possibility that seaman's future employment would again be interrupted by periods of incarceration. *Havens v. F/T Polar Mist (9th Cir. 1993) 996 F.2d 215, 218-219*

If Jones Act applies to seaman's claims, court ss precluded from dismissing claim on ground of forum non conveniens. *Zipfel v. Halliburton Co. (9th Cir. 1987) 832 F.2d 1477, 1485-1487* ; *see also Nicol v. Gulf Fleet Supply Vessels, Inc. (5th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 289, 293* ; *Needham v. Phillips Petroleum Co. of Norway (10th Cir. 1983) 719 F.2d 1481, 1483* ; *Szumlicz v. Norwegian Am. Line (11th Cir. 1983) 698 F.2d 1192, 1195* ; *but see Cruz v. Maritime Co. of Philippines (2d Cir. 1983) 702 F.2d 47, 48*

Use of words "Jones Act and General Maritime Law" in title of cause of action do not invoke admiralty jurisdiction under *28 U.S.C.S. § 1333* when complaint expressly claims jurisdiction exclusively under Jones Act and *28 U.S.C.S. § 1331*. *Trentacosta v. Frontier Pacific Aircraft Industries, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 813 F.2d 1553, 1556*

Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* was applicable to maritime action brought by Syrian seaman injured while at port in United States on vessel of Greek registry and operated by Liberian corporation, based on evidence that vessel's owners were United States nationals, and that vessel had substantial and continuing contacts with United States and virtually none with *Liberia. Dalla v. Atlas Mar. Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 771 F.2d 1277, 1278-1279*

Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* was not applicable to suit brought by American citizen arising out of accident on high seas when vessel was Mexican, based in Mexico, and owners and shareholders were *Mexican. Bilyk v. Vessel Nair (9th Cir. 1985) 754 F.2d 1541, 1542-1545*

Under general rule in personal injury actions brought in admiralty (both under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* and general maritime law) and under Federal Employers' Liability Act, contributory negligence is not complete bar to recovery, but operates to reduce amount of damages award. *Kopczynski v. Jacqueline (9th Cir. 1984) 742 F.2d 555, 558*

Punitive damages are not allowed on negligence claim based on Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*; damages under Jones Act are limited to pecuniary losses. *Kopczynski v. Jacqueline (9th Cir. 1984) 742 F.2d 555, 560-561*

Summary judgment with respect to claim under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* for alleged injuries was erroneous when material issues of fact might exist; exclusion of demonstrative evidence was not abuse of discretion when ample and more reliable evidence admitted to show severity of injury. *Lies v. Farrell Lines, Inc. (9th Cir. 1981) 641 F.2d 765, 772, 773*

In combined action for negligence under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* and for unseaworthiness under general admiralty law, trial judge is required to give negligence instruction if evidence will support submission of negligence issue to jury; failure to instruct on negligence is prejudicial error. *Mohn v. Marla Marie, Inc. (9th Cir. 1980) 625 F.2d 900, 901-902*

Plaintiff was not seaman under Jones Act because when accident occurred, he was at waterfront construction site working aboard derrick barge that was anchored to harbor bottom and secured by headline to shore. *Spears v. Kajima Eng'g & Constr., Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 466, 475-481, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 97*

Triable issue of fact as to whether plaintiff was seaman entitled to recovery under Jones Act; plaintiff was employed as pile driver on barge being used to build bridge over flood control channel, barge was moved several times weekly, barge was being moved by crane at time of accident, and plaintiff had responsibilities involved in movement of barge. *Gault v. Modern Cont'l/Roadway Constr. Co., Inc. Joint Venture (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 991, 999-1005, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 85*

Seaman's use of cigarettes, allegedly resulting in lung cancer, purchased on employer's vessel was not "in the course of his employment" for purposes of the Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*; substantial factor leading to death in unseaworthiness claim was not established by employers' on-board sale of cigarettes without warning label; summary judgment properly granted. *Tinsley v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 562, 566-569, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 851*

Damages award is not inadequate as matter of law for lack of compensation for loss of future earnings; award for future medical expenses does not require implied finding that there was loss of future earnings. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 10-11, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

Violation of National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regulation, enforcement of which had been suspended by NMFS pending reconsideration of its appropriateness, was not conscious disregard of safety of others sufficient to support punitive damages. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

Exclusive remedy provision of Workers' Compensation Act (*Lab. Code § 3601*) was inapplicable to county lifeguard and rescue boat lieutenant who sued county for damages under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* because application of Workers' Compensation Act to maritime employment cases would materially prejudice uniformity of maritime law. *Hamilton v. County of Los Angeles (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 982, 986-992, 182 Cal. Rptr. 868*

County lifeguard/rescue boat lieutenant who received workers' compensation benefits was not barred or collaterally estopped from recovering against county employer under Jones Act or general maritime law; factors necessary to recover under state Workers' Compensation Act differ from factors necessary to determine whether or not plaintiff may recover under Jones Act or general maritime law. *Hamilton v. County of Los Angeles (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 982, 997-998, 182 Cal. Rptr. 868*

Punitive damages are not precluded under federal maritime law as matter of law. *Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 104, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789*

Judgment for defendant notwithstanding verdict was improper when evidence would at least circumstantially justify jury finding that employer's negligence played some part, even though of slightest degree, in producing injury. *Catania v. Halcyon S.S. Co. (1974) 44 Cal. App. 3d 348, 356, 118 Cal. Rptr. 513*

Directed verdict was proper in action by seaman for personal injuries sustained on launch carrying seamen from shore to ship when no agency relationship shown between launch operator and shipowner defendant. *Bell v. Seatrain Lines, Inc. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 16, 23, 24, 115 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Liability of shipowner for injuries incurred while employee attempting to open stuck valve. *Texaco, Inc. v. Petroleum Specialists Corp. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 427, 434-439, 110 Cal. Rptr. 641*

Fact that widow received part of workmen's compensation award did not preclude assertion of her rights under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*; applicability of maritime law in cases within maritime jurisdiction is exclusive, and thus Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board has no jurisdiction to award compensation in these cases. *De Court v. Beckman Instruments, Inc. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 628, 632-635, 108 Cal. Rptr. 109*

Propriety of instruction that plaintiff was seaman as matter of law; refusal to furnish jury with "Present Value Table" in appendix to *BAJI No. 14.70* was not prejudicial. *Howard v. Global Marine, Inc. (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 809, 813-817, 105 Cal. Rptr. 50*

Shipowner was not under duty to provide seaman with safe means of going ashore and returning to his ship beyond ship's gangplank; shipowner had no duty to furnish transportation to and from ship to seamen granted shore leave when ship is anchored away from dock; seaman injured while on authorized shore leave was in service of his vessel for purpose of right to maintenance and cure. *Dixon v. Grace Lines, Inc. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 278, 287-291, 103 Cal. Rptr. 595*

When special purpose vessel is being used for its designated purpose, injured worker is "seaman" and "member of the crew" within meaning of Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104* if permanently assigned to vessel and work contributed to function of vessel or to accomplishment of its mission. *Soucie v. Trautwein Bros. (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 20, 25-26, 79 Cal. Rptr. 671*

Obligation of shipowner to seamen defined. *Bozanich v. Jo Ann Fisheries, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 178, 186-192, 75 Cal. Rptr. 463*

[3] Longshore and Harbor Workers

Retiree's work-related hearing-loss claim is maintainable under scheduled benefits set forth in § 8(c)(13) of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*33 U.S.C.S. § 908(c)(13)*], and not § 8(c)(23) [*33 U.S.C.S. § 908(c)(23)*], which applies to benefits provided retirees suffering from latent occupational diseases. *Bath Iron Works Corp. v. Director, OWCP, United States DOL (1993) 506 U.S. 153, 163-167, 113 S. Ct. 692, 121 L. Ed. 2d 619, 625*

Longshoreman's third-party action for personal injuries against negligent shipowner or other party is not maintainable after automatic assignment of right of action to employer 6 months following award of compensation, even though possible conflict of interest exists between employee and employer. *Rodriguez v. Compass Shipping Co. (1981) 451 U.S. 596, 603, 618, 101 S. Ct. 1945, 68 L. Ed. 2d 472* (decided before 1984 amendment of *33 U.S.C.S. § 933(b)*)

Permanently partially disabled employee entitled to compensation under LHWCA schedule establishing set amounts for specific injuries is not allowed to elect to receive larger recovery under provision that compensates for actual impairment of wage earning capacity caused by other injuries not specifically listed. *Potomac Elec. Power Co. v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs (1980) 449 U.S. 268, 270-271, 101 S. Ct. 509, 66 L. Ed. 2d 446*

Stevedore that has paid compensation benefits to injured longshoreman, though having lien therefor on longshoreman's subsequent recovery against shipowner under *33 U.S.C.S. § 933(e)*, does not have to reduce such lien by amount of longshoreman's costs in obtaining such recovery. *Bloomer v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. (1980) 445 U.S. 74, 85, 100 S. Ct. 925, 63 L. Ed. 2d 215*

Sixty-day period for filing petition for review with court of appeals from final determination of compensation order by Benefits Review Board is jurisdictional requirement; petition not regarded as filed until received by clerk of court, and if not received by court of appeals within filing period, court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. *Felt v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs (9th Cir. 1993) 11 F.3d 951, 952*

Administrative officers lack authority to impose cost as sanction against claimant who in bad faith initiates or continues workers compensation proceeding under *Longshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Metropolitan Stevedore Co. v. Brickner (9th Cir. 1993) 11 F.3d 887, 890-891*

Vessel has duty to take necessary steps to protect longshoreworkers against open and obvious cargo hazards created by on--loading foreign stevedores, not just concealed cargo hazards. *Riggs v. Scindia Steam Navigation Co. (9th Cir. 1993) 8 F.3d 1442, 1447-1448*

Filing of compensation order is not complete until service of order on parties, to begin running of 30-day period for filing of notice of appeal from compensation order. *Nealon v. California Stevedore & Ballast Co. (9th Cir. 1993) 996 F.2d 966, 970-971*

In action brought by longshore workers against employer stevedore and its liability insurers for bad faith breach of contract, based on stevedore's conduct regarding longshore workers' negligence action against shipowner, federal admiralty jurisdiction was lacking, because insurance contracts forming basis of claim were not maritime in nature, in that they only indirectly connected with maritime commerce. *Simon v. Intercontinental Transp. (ICT) B.V. (9th Cir. 1989) 882 F.2d 1435, 1441-1444*

In proceeding under Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, once longshore worker seeking permanent total disability benefits proves that work-related injury prevented him from performing his or her former job, burden shifts to employer to prove that suitable alternate work was available in community; to show job availability, employer is required to point to specific jobs that claimant can perform and not merely to point to general work that claimant may be physically able to perform. *Hairston v. Todd Shipyards Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 849 F.2d 1194, 1196*

Veterans' disability benefits are neither claimed nor paid pursuant to Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, workers' compensation law, or Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*, and thus are not included within "credit doctrine" as codified in *33 U.S.C.S. § 903(e)* (providing that amounts paid to employee for same injury, disability, or death under any other workers' compensation law or Jones Act must be credited against any liability under *LHWCA). Todd Shipyards Corp. v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs (9th Cir. 1988) 848*

F.2d 125, 127

Because statutory scheme of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act and regulations clearly contemplate that Secretary or his or her delegate shall participate as matter of course in review proceedings under *33 U.S.C.S. § 921(c)*, Director of Office of Workers' Compensation Programs should be named in those proceedings as respondent, whether or not he or she supports order of Benefits Review Board. *Goldsmith v. Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (9th Cir. 1988) 838 F.2d 1079, 1080*

Under *33 U.S.C.S. § 921(b)(3)*, Benefits Review Board reviews administrative law judge's findings of fact for support by substantial evidence in record as a whole, and court reviews board's decisions for adherence to statutory standard governing review of facts and errors of law. *Goldsmith v. Director, Office of Workers Compensation Programs (9th Cir. 1988) 838 F.2d 1079, 1080-1081*

Diver working on nonnavigable lake that does not constitute "situs" under *33 U.S.C.S. § 903(a)* was not within coverage of *LHWCA. Williams v. Director, Office of Workers' Comp. Programs (9th Cir. 1987) 825 F.2d 246, 247*

Injured longshoreman's action against shipowners based on theory that ship was negligently designed was foreclosed by LHWCA since generalized conclusions in complaint about causation constituted alternative way of saying vessel was unseaworthy, and under *29 U.S.C.S. § 905*, longshoreman's right to sue ship for unseaworthiness was abolished. *Bilderbeck v. World Wide Shipping Agency (9th Cir. 1985) 776 F.2d 817, 818-819*

Admiralty jurisdiction was conferred on suit brought by two longshoremen injured while loading car onto ramp of ship, thereby satisfying requirement of maritime locality and traditional maritime services or activities in furtherance of commerce. *Solano v. Beilby (9th Cir. 1985) 761 F.2d 1369, 1370-1372*

Primary responsibility for maintaining safe condition during cargo operations rests on stevedore; exception to stevedore's primary responsibility arises when shipowner (1) has actual or constructive knowledge of dangerous condition, (2) knows that longshoremen are continuing to work despite existence of unreasonable risk of harm, and (3) could not reasonably expect that stevedore would remedy situation. *Taylor v. Moram Agencies (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1384, 1387-1388*

Shipowner who has turned over safe vessel and equipment has right to rely on stevedore to avoid exposing longshoremen to hazards of cargo operation; shipowner who is actively involved in cargo operation or who fails to exercise due care to avoid exposing longshoremen to hazards in area or from equipment under vessel's active control is exposed to liability. *Taylor v. Moram Agencies (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1384, 1386-1387*

1972 amendments to Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act eliminated action for unseaworthiness by both private and public longshoremen. *Normile v. Maritime Co. of Philippines (9th Cir. 1981) 643 F.2d 1380, 1382*

Vessel has duty to protect longshoremen against concealed dangers created by foreign stevedore that the vessel could, in the exercise of reasonable care, have corrected or warned of. *Turner v. Japan Lines, Ltd. (9th Cir. 1981) 651 F.2d 1300, 1304 , modified on other grounds, (9th Cir. 1983) 702 F.2d 752*

Time charterer was not liable to longshoreman who was injured while working in hold of vessel, when charter-party contract placed responsibility for maintenance and repair of deck gratings on vessel owner; charterer's right to inspect deck gratings did not create agency as to their maintenance. *Torres v. Cool Carriers A.B. (1993) 26 Cal. App. 4th 900, 907, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Employer possessed subrogation right to reimbursement from worker's net recovery from third party for full amount of compensation benefits already paid under LHWCA; employer was permitted to exercise right by intervening in worker's

lawsuit and asserting compensation lien that attaches to funds obtained by worker either by settlement or by judgment. *National Metal & Steel Corp. v. Colby Crane & Mfg. Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1111, 1117, 246 Cal. Rptr. 435*

By permitting worker's employer to file complaint in intervention against them, defendants in intervention did not agree to permit employer to recover automatically from them amounts paid in compensation benefits to worker's widow; agreement was limited to permitting employer to attempt to prove defendants' liability to worker and, if able to do so, to then recover amount of benefits paid to worker's widow. *National Metal & Steel Corp. v. Colby Crane & Mfg. Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1111, 1119-1120, 246 Cal. Rptr. 435*

In action by stevedore against shipowner to recover damages for personal injuries incurred during unloading operation, contentions pertaining to questions of fact, such as defendant's knowledge of defective conditions and proximate cause, were triable issues precluding summary judgment for defendant. *Dugas v. Brewer & Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 203, 210-213, 211 Cal. Rptr. 573*

Shipowner is not liable to longshoreworkers for injuries caused by dangers unknown to owner and about which owner had no duty to become informed; but shipowner has duty to intervene and eliminate or neutralize hazard if owner knew of defect and knew that stevedore was continuing to use it. *Dugas v. Brewer & Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 203, 210, 211 Cal. Rptr. 573*

Exclusiveness of liability provision of LHWCA precludes actions for indemnity or contribution against employer based on allegations of negligence by tortfeasors when employer has paid death benefits under LHWCA to ship repairman's survivors. *Graco, Inc. v. Colberg, Inc. (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 322, 329-333, 208 Cal. Rptr. 465*

Longshoremen are precluded from suing vessel under *Veh. Code § 17154*, which provides for vicarious liability of motor vehicle bailee, since *33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)* provides longshoreman's exclusive remedy and eliminates vicarious liability of vessel. *Stance v. Jackson (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 838, 840-844, 202 Cal. Rptr. 480*

Section 905 of Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Act (pertaining to when employer not liable to vessel for injury to worker) is applicable only between vessel and stevedore, not between stevedore and wharf owner. *Crescent Wharf & Warehouse Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 979, 982-983, 184 Cal. Rptr. 901*

Longshoreman's action for injuries was barred by laches when cause of action arose more than three years prior to enactment of statute of limitations for maritime torts [former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 763a*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30106*]; trial court properly applyied one-year limitation period for negligence actions under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1* (two-year limitations period)], rather than three-year period under Jones Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*. *Ponce v. Graceous Navigation, Inc. (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 823, 827-829, 179 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Shipowner sued by stevedore's employee, who was injured while working on vessel, was unable to demand indemnity from stevedore employer, who is liable to employee under *33 U.S.C.S. § 905*, because elimination from statute of doctrine of unseaworthiness precludes any reliance on warranty of workmanlike performance. *IT Corp. v. Superior Court (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 443, 451, 147 Cal. Rptr. 828* ; *see also Davis v. Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc. (9th Cir. 1973) 483 F.2d 184, 186-188*

Judicially created rule that shipowner can be held liable for damages not due to longshoreman's own negligence was not changed by 1972 amendments to *33 U.S.C.S. § 905* (*Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act) Edmonds v. Compagnie Generale Transatlantique (1979) 443 U.S. 256, 263-264, 99 S. Ct. 2753, 61 L. Ed. 2d 521*

"Checker" and temporary laborer on stevedoring gang were both covered by *Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. Northeast Marine Terminal Co. v. Caputo (1977) 432 U.S. 249, 271, 273, 97 S. Ct. 2348, 53 L. Ed.*

2d 320

33 U.S.C.S. § 922 applies only to Deputy Commissioner's power to modify orders previously entered by him or her. *Intercounty Constr. Corp. v. Walter (1975) 422 U.S. 1, 10-12, 95 S. Ct. 2016, 44 L. Ed. 2d 643*

[4] Loss of Consortium

When pattern before injury was that seaman would go on two- or three-month fishing trips with two- or three-week intervals between trips, failure to award seaman's spouse damages for loss of consortium was not error; evidence was sufficient to support finding that there was no net loss of society, comfort, and conpanionship. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 12, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

[5] Maintenance and Cure

Shipowner's duty to furnish maintenance and cure continues from date seaman leaves ship to date when medical diagnosis is made that injury was permanent immediately after seaman's accident and therefore incurable. *Vella v. Ford Motor Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 1, 5, 95 S. Ct. 1381, 43 L. Ed. 2d 682*

Maintenance and cure is obligation of shipowner to care for seaman injured during course of maritime employment; attorney's fees are allowed only when failure to provide maintenance and cure was arbitrary, recalcitrant, or unreasonable. *Kopczynski v. Jacqueline (9th Cir. 1984) 742 F.2d 555, 559*

To be entitled to maintenance and cure, seaman is only required to show injury or illness while in service as seaman without willful misbehavior on his or her part; negligence of employer or unseaworthiness of vessel is not required to be established. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

Instruction that maintenance rate was $12 per day, which was amount established by collective bargaining agreement covering plaintiff and defendant, ws proper. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 8-9, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

[6] Warranty of Seaworthiness

Warranty of seaworthiness applies to condition of ship and gear and to fitness and competence of crew. *Boudoin v. Lykes S.S. Co. (1955) 348 U.S. 336, 339-340, 75 S. Ct. 382, 99 L. Ed. 354*

Scientific personnel not considered seamen and not entitled to benefit from doctrine of seaworthiness. *Craig v. M/V Peacock (9th Cir. 1985) 760 F.2d 953, 956*

When jury found defendants liable for breach of warranty of seaworthiness, any error in jury instruction that impaired plaintiff's negligence claim was harmless. *Da Silva v. Pacific King, Inc. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6, 240 Cal. Rptr. 395*

In action for aggravation of seaman's preexisting back injury caused by unseaworthy condition, trial court properly instructed jury that "seaworthiness" doctrine imposes duty to furnish vessel, equipment, and work methods that are reasonably fit for seaman who is equal in disposition, physical condition, and seamanship to ordinary person in calling. *Smith v. Marilyn M. Fishing, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 453, 457-461, 219 Cal. Rptr. 57*

Complaint based on injuries allegedly sustained as a result of unseaworthiness of ship is addressed to court sitting in

admiralty and is determined under federal maritime law. *Bozanich v. Jo Ann Fisheries, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 178, 185, 75 Cal. Rptr. 463*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsDeath on the High Seas ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsUnseaworthinessDutyWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityJones ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.94

§ 522.94 Law Reviews

Note, *Vessel Owner's Right to Rely on the Stevedore to Protect Longshoremen From Pre-Existing Obvious Dangers: An Analysis of the Taylor and Ollestad Decisions, 15 Golden Gate U. L. Rev. 1 (1985)*

Comment, *Unseaworthiness and Evidence of Subsequent Repairs, 19 Cal. W. L. Rev. 450 (1983)*

Comment, *Stre(a)tching the 1972 Amendments to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 31 Hastings L.J. 473 (1979)*

Comment, *Punitive Damages in Admiralty for Bad Faith Refusal to Provide Maintenance and Cure: Robinson v. Pocahontas, Inc., 15 San Diego L. Rev. 309 (1978)*

Note, *Injured Longshoreman vs. the Shipowner after 1972: Business Invitees, Land-Based Standards, and Assumption of Risk, 28 Hastings L.J. 771 (1977)*

Cundick, *High Seas Intervention: Parameters of Unilateral Action,' 10 San Diego L. Rev. 514 (1973)*

Note, *Fog, Narrow Channels, and Modern Vessels: A Proposed Prudent Mariner Navigational Standard, 46 S. Cal. L. Rev. 461 (1973)*

Note, *Maintenance, Shoreside Wages, and Mr. Crooks: A Proposed End to Twin Beds and Six Meals a Day, 24 Hastings L.J. 935 (1973)*

Norris, *The Shipowner's Liability for Ship Doctor's Negligence, 4 Sw. U. L. Rev. 46 (1972)*

Comment, *Warranty of Seaworthiness--A Non-Seaman's Dilemma, 8 San Diego L. Rev. 734 (1971)*

Kohlmeyer, *The Warranty of Seaworthiness: To Whom Is It Owed?, 7 Cal. W. L. Rev. 109 (1970)*

Comment, *Should "Maximum Cure" Be Retained as an Arbitrary Limit on Maintenance and Cure Liability?, 5 U.S.F. L. Rev. 105 (1970)*

Note, *Jones Act--Jurisdiction: Application to Alien Seamen and Shipowners. Hellenic Lines Ltd. v. Rhoditis (5th Cir. 1969), 58 Cal. L Rev. 491 (1970)*

Cook, *Death on Inland Waters, 18 Hastings L.J. 869 (1967)*

Comment, *The Ambiguous, Amphibious Employee: The Relationship Between the Longshoremen's Act and State Compensation Legislation, 18 Hastings L.J. 891 (1967)*

Note, *Can the Suits in Admiralty Act Limitation Period Be Tolled or Extended, 18 Hastings L.J. 1033 (1967)*

Note, *Proximate Cause Under the Jones Act, 18 Hastings L.J. 981 (1967)*

Note, *Punitive Damages in Admiralty, 18 Hastings L.J. 995 (1967)*

Note, *Shipowner's Indemnity: Non-Contractual Recovery of Maintenance and Cure Expenses from Third Party Tort-Feasor, 18 Hastings L.J. 1008 (1967)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Tort ActionsMultiple DefendantsIndemnityAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsJones ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsMaintenance & CureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsUnseaworthinessGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityJones Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.95

§ 522.95 Text References

Benedict on Admiralty, Vol. 1, *Jurisdiction and Principles;* Vol. 1A, *Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;* Vol. 1B, *Seaman's Actions;* Vol. 2, Ch. I, *Jurisdiction of Torts;* Ch. VII, *Death Actions;* Vol. 4, *Practice and Procedure--Forms* (Matthew Bender)

Bender's Federal Practice Forms, Vol. 4, Pt. 2, § 17 (Matthew Bender)

Moore's Federal Practice, § 703.05 (Matthew Bender)

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workmen's Compensation, Chs. 25, 27, 28 (Matthew Bender)

2 C.J.S., *Admiralty,* §§ 1-18, 62-83

79 C.J.S., *Seamen,* §§ 46-54, 188-216

2 Am. Jur. 2d, *Admiralty,* §§ 1-20, 77-86, 105-114, 127-141

32 Am. Jur. 2d, *Federal Employers' Liability and Compensation Acts,* §§ 39-115

70 Am. Jur. 2d, *Shipping,* §§ 195-235

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPersonal InjuriesDeath ActionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPersonal InjuriesMaritime Workers' ClaimsLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice &

ProcedureJurisdiction

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.96-522.109

[Reserved]

§§ 522.96[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.110

§ 522.110 Federal Constitution

Judicial power of United States extends to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. U.S. *Const. art. III, § 2*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureConstitutional Authority

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.111

§ 522.111 Federal Statutes

United States district courts have original jurisdiction, exclusive of state court, of civil cases of admiralty or maritime jurisdiction, saving to suitors all other remedies to which they are otherwise entitled. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1333*

International regulations for preventing collisions at sea. *33 U.S.C.S. §§ 1601-1608*

Inland navigational rules. *33 U.S.C.S. § 2001 et seq.*

Admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of United States extends to all cases of damage or injury, to person or property, caused by vessel on navigable water, notwithstanding that such damage or injury is done or consummated on land. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30101*

Suits in Admiralty Act. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30901 et seq.*

Carrige of Goods by Sea Act. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureStatutory AuthorityAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesCarriage of Goods by Sea ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawSovereign Immunity & LiabilityFederal GovernmentSuits in Admiralty ActGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.112

§ 522.112 State Statutes

Partition of real and personal property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 872.010-874.240*

Provisions of Harbors and Navigation Code are applicable insofar as not conflicting with federal law or admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 90, 240, 399, 406, 790*

State navigation rules are applicable insofar as not conflicting with admiralty and maritime jurisdiction and federal laws. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 240*

Navigation rules. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 240-308*

Pilots for San Pedro Bay are authorized to limit liability for performance of certain contracts. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 440-444*

Actions against vessels. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 490-505*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal PreemptionAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdictionAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsLimitations on Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.113

§ 522.113 Decisions

[1] Collection of Freight

Shipowner's lien is waived without express words to that effect when agreement contains stipulations inconsistent with exercise of the right. *Bird of Paradise v. Heyneman (1867) 72 U.S. 545, 554-558, 18 L. Ed. 662*

Lien for freight and demurrage arises and exists by force of law unless expressly waived by charter party. *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Good Hope Refineries (5th Cir. 1979) 604 F.2d 865, 872*

Shipowner's lien for freight is discharged by unconditional delivery of cargo. *Beverly Hills Nat'l Bank & Trust Co. v. Compania de Navegacione Almirante S.A. (9th Cir. 1971) 437 F.2d 301, 303, 304* ; *Eastern Transp. Co. v. United States (2d Cir. 1947) 159 F.2d 349, 351*

Partial delivery of cargo does not defeat lien on remainder for entire freight. *Frothingham v. Jenkins (1850) 1 Cal. 42, 43, 44*

[2] Collisions

Mutual contribution to fault by two or more vessels requires allocation of damages among the parties in proportion to comparative degree of their fault. *United States v. Reliable Transfer Co. (1975) 421 U.S. 397, 411, 95 S. Ct. 1708, 44 L. Ed. 2d 251*

Violation of statutory rule intended to prevent collisions requires vessel to show its violation could not have been a contributing cause of collision. *Pennsylvania v. Troop (1874) 86 U.S. 125, 136, 22 L. Ed. 148*

Pennsylvania burden is discharged by clear and convincing showing of no proximate cause, and not by stricter

beyond-a-reasonable-doubt test. *Trinidad Corp. v. S.S. Keiyoh Maru (9th Cir. 1988) 845 F.2d 818, 825*

Evidence of industry custom is usable to support finding of negligence in collisions at sea when it does not completely contradict statutory rule of navigation. *Stevens v. F/V Bonnie Doon (9th Cir. 1981) 655 F.2d 206, 208*

Pennsylvania rule regarding burden of proof on vessels in violation of navigational statutes is applicable in post-*Reliable* case. *Moran Towing & Transp. Co. v. New York City (2d Cir. 1980) 620 F.2d 356, 358*

Pennsylvania rule was overruled only in so far as *Reliable* case abolished Mutual Fault-Equal Contribution Rule and substituted new rule requiring allocation of liability proportionately to comparative degree of fault. *Tug Ocean Prince, Inc. v. United States (2d Cir. 1978) 584 F.2d 1151, 1160*

Allocation of fault in collision case is question of fact subject to clearly erroneous test on appellate review. *Getty Oil Co. v. S.S. Ponce De Leon (2d Cir. 1977) 555 F.2d 328, 334*

Reliable rule of equitable division of damages as not applicable in cargo damage case when carrier unable to allocate fault. *Vana Trading Co. v. S.S. "Mette Skou" (2d Cir. 1977) 556 F.2d 100, 106* (carrier must bear entire loss)

Reliable rule is not applicable when one party solely responsible for loss (as opposed to mutual fault). *Cliff, Jr., Inc. v. M.V. Captain Will (5th Cir. 1976) 529 F.2d 1169*

Pennsylvania rule is not applicable when vessel has committed no statutory violation. *United States v. Joyce (9th Cir. 1975) 511 F.2d 1127, 1130*

Presumption of negligence on part of moving vessel arises when moored and stationary vessel struck. *Pacific Tow Boat Co. v. States Marine Corp. of Del. (9th Cir. 1960) 276 F.2d 745, 750*

All vessels-parties bear burden of proving that individual fault could not have been one of causes of collision. *States S.S. Co. v. Permanente S.S. Corp. (9th Cir. 1956) 231 F.2d 82, 88* s

City and shipowner were jointly and severally liable to third party for negligence of pilot who was furnished by city at shipowner's request under doctrine of respondeat superior. *Societa Per Azioni De Navigazione Italia v. City of Los Angeles (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 446, 461-462, 183 Cal. Rptr. 51, 645 P.2d 102*

City's port tariff ordinance allowing city to escape respondeat superior liability for negligence of harbor pilots and to secure full indemnification from shipowners was void because in conflict with Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code §§ 810-996.6*). *Societa Per Azioni De Navigazione Italia v. City of Los Angeles (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 446, 462-465, 183 Cal. Rptr. 51, 645 P.2d 102*

[3] Partitioning Ownership Interests in Vessels

State courts are free to follow state partition laws. *Madruga v. Superior Court (1952) 40 Cal. 2d 65, 251 P.2d 1 , aff'd, (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290* (lower court decision not affirmed insofar as expressed federal policy of allowing actions by majority owners only)

[4] Damages From Towage

Contracts relieving tugs from all liability for negligence, including attempts to make pilots servants (employees) of the tow, were invalid. *Bisso v. Inland Waterways Corp. (1955) 349 U.S. 85, 75 S. Ct. 629, 99 L. Ed. 911*

Drifting of unmanned barge shortly after moored on delivery by tug presumptively established fault by tug in its duty to properly moor and shifted duty to produce evidence showing exercise of due care. *Pasco Mktg., Inc. v. Taylor Towing Serv., Inc. (8th Cir. 1977) 554 F.2d 808, 811*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityBurdens of ProofAdmiralty LawCollisionsLiabilityPresumptionsAdmiralty LawCollisionsPreventionGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawCollisionsRemediesApportionmentAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensDefensesAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensDischargeAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureAttachment & GarnishmentPartition, Petitory & Possessory ActionsAdmiralty LawTowageLiability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.114

§ 522.114 Law Reviews

Comment, *Loss of Use as an Item of Damages in Admiralty Collision Cases, 12 U.S.F. L. Rev. 311 (1978)*

Note, *Admiralty: Concurrent Jurisdiction Over Partition of Vessels, 6 Hastings L.J. 226 (1955)*

Note, *Admiralty: Partition of Ships: Concurrent Jurisdiction of State and Admiralty Courts, 42 Cal. L. Rev. 331 (1954)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsRemediesDamagesAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureAttachment & GarnishmentPartition, Petitory & Possessory ActionsAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureJurisdiction

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.115

§ 522.115 Text References

Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 21-23, 52 (Matthew Bender)

Moore's Federal Practice, Chs. 701-710 (Matthew Bender)

2 C.J.S., *Admiralty,* §§ 1-281

15 C.J.S., *Collision,* §§ 1-35, 157-212

55 C.J.S., *Maritime Liens,* §§ 1-104

65 C.J.S., *Navigable Waters,* §§ 1-54

80 C.J.S., *Shipping,* §§ 13-25, 160-170

2 Am. Jur. 2d, *Admiralty,* §§ 1-132

70 Am. Jur. 2d, *Shipping,* §§ 87-159, 242-414, 496-512

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawCollisionsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.116-522.129

[Reserved]

§§ 522.116[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.130

§ 522.130 Federal Constitution

Power of Congress to regulate commerce. U.S. *Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 3*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.131

§ 522.131 Federal Statutes

Seamen allowed to sue for wages without prepayment of fees or costs. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1916*

Prepayment of marshal's costs in seizing and maintaining custody over vessel required. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*

Harter Act. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 et seq.*

Two-year statute of limitations for actions to recover salvage. *46 U.S.C.S. § 80107(c)*

Federal Maritime Commission regulation of carriage of goods by water in interstate commerce under Shipping Act of 1916. *46 U.S.C.S. § 40101 et seq.*

Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA). *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note

Federal Maritime Commission regulation of carriage of goods by water in foreign commerce. *46 U.S.C.S. § 40101 et seq.*

Duty of person in charge of vessel to render assistance to persons found at sea in danger of being lost. *46 U.S.C.S. § 2304*

Time of commencement of right to seamen's wages. *46 U.S.C.S. § 10313(a)*

Seamen's wages may not be made dependent on earning of freight by vessel. *46 U.S.C.S. § 10313(b)*

Time for payment of seamen's wages. *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(e), (f), 10504(a),* (b)

Master's or shipowner's liability for payment of double wages to seamen. *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(g), 10504(c)*

Seamen may not forfeit lien against ship for wages. *46 U.S.C.S. § 10317*

Payment for maintenance and return to the United States of seamen discharged on account of injury or illness. *46 U.S.C.S. § 10318(e)*

Seamen's wages are not subject to attachment, except for support of spouse or children. *46 U.S.C.S. § 11109*

Penalties for offenses by seamen. *46 U.S.C.S. § 11501*

Preferred maritime liens. *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(5), 31326*

Maritime liens. *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31305, 31341* et seq.

Federal Bills of Lading (Pomerene) Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 80101 et seq.*

Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over water carrier transportation. *49 U.S.C.S. §§ 10541-10544*

Interstate Commerce Commission regulation of carriage rates. *49 U.S.C.S. § 10701 et seq.*

Unreasonably discriminatory rates are prohibited under Interstate Commerce Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 10741*

General operating requirements of carriers under Interstate Commerce Act. *49 U.S.C.S. § 11101 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawFinds & SalvageGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsWagesAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesCarriage of Goods by Sea ActGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesHarter ActLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsWage Payments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.132

§ 522.132 State Statutes

Provisions of Harbors and Navigation Code are applicable insofar as not conflicting with federal law or admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 90, 240, 399, 406, 790*

Pilots for San Pedro Bay are authorized to limit liability for performance of certain contracts. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 440-444*

Liens against vessels. *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 491-494*

Pilot is servant of vessel and its owner and operator; vessel or its owner or operator is not exempt from liability for property damage on ground that damage was result of fault of pilot. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 1134*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawPractice & ProcedureFederal PreemptionAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.133

§ 522.133 Federal Regulations

Department of State rules concerning discharge of seamen in foreign ports. 22 C.F.R. § 82.16

Responsibility of shipowner for relief and repatriation of seamen. 22 C.F.R. pt. 84

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.134

§ 522.134 Decisions

[1] Actions by Seamen for Wages

Court is without discretion to limit period during which wage penalty for holding wages without sufficient cause pursuant to former *46 U.S.C.S. § 596* [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(g), 10504(c)*] is assessed. *Griffin v. Oceanic Contractors, Inc. (1982) 458 U.S. 564, 569-577, 102 S. Ct. 3245, 73 L. Ed. 2d 973*

Seaman not required to exhaust grievance procedures contained in collective bargaining agreement before instituting federal court action to collect wages under former *46 U.S.C.S. § 596* [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 10313(g), 10504(c)*]. *U. S. Bulk Carriers v. Arguelles (1971) 400 U.S. 351, 356, 357, 91 S. Ct. 409, 27 L. Ed. 2d 456*

Seaman not able to recover "comp time" earnings under *46 U.S.C.S. § 10313*, because "comp time" earnings are not "wages" under meaning of statute. *Petersen v. Interocean Ships, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 823 F.2d 334, 336-337*

Advance for purchase of airline ticket is valid partial payment in kind of wages due. *Escobar v. S.S. Wash. Trader (9th Cir. 1981) 640 F.2d 1063, 1065, 1066*

[2] Actions for Cargo Damage or Loss

Limitation of liability provisions in COGSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4 are not applicable to stevedore (loader and unloader of cargo in port) when bill of lading shows no clear intention of limitation. *Herd & Co. v. Krawill Mach. Corp. (1959) 359 U.S. 297, 301-308, 79 S. Ct. 766, 3 L. Ed. 2d 820*

Fire defense provisions of COGSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304(2)(b)*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)(b) impose standard of personal due diligence on carrier. *Nissan Fire & Marine v. M/V Hyundai (9th Cir. 1996) 93 F.3d 641, 646*

Owners of cargo are parties to bills of lading, establishing relationship sufficient to support in personam claim against vessel owners, notwithstanding owners did not deliver cargo to vessel and did not receive bills of lading from vessel, where cargo was delivered to non-vessel-operating common carriers (NVOCCs), which delivered cargo in containers to vessel and received nonnegotiable bills of lading, and where bills of lading did not name any individual parties as "Merchant," and "Merchant" was defined only as "includ[ing] ... shipper, consignor, consignee, owner and receiver of the Goods and the Holder of this *Bill of Lading." All Pac. Trading v. Vessel M/V Hanjin Yosu (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1427, 1433*

Claim against terminal operator for damage to cargo while in storage awaiting shipment was governed by state law rather than admiralty law; booking of passage of cargo on ship, followed by turning over of cargo to terminal operator for storage pending shipment, created bailment between cargo owner and terminal operator under California law; *Civ Code § 1840* limited amount of damages recoverable for negligence by depository or bailor to declared value of cargo. *Whitcombe v. Stevedoring Servs. of Am. (9th Cir. 1993) 2 F.3d 312, 314, 316*

Limitation of liability provisions in COGSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4 are applicable to consignee whose cargo was damaged, where bill of lading effectively extended time period of $500 liability limit beyond discharge from ship, gave consignee fair opportunity to opt for higher liability limit, and extended package liability provisions to stevedore services company under Himalaya clause. *Mori Seiki USA, Inc. v. M.V. Alligator Triumph (9th Cir. 1993) 990 F.2d 444, 447-450*

In action arising from cargo damaged at sea, assertion of defense under Carriage of Goods by Sea Act former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1300 et seq.*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note did not implicitly raise issue of misrepresentation in bill of lading. *Contact Lumber Co. v. P.T. Moges Shipping Co., Ltd. (9th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 1446, 1453*

Truckers' delivery receipts noting exceptions to condition of cargo picked up from shipping dock satisfied notice requirements under former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1303(6)* (now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6)), absence of which would render acceptance of goods prima facie evidence of delivery in condition described in bill of lading. *Tokio Marine & Fire Ins. v. Vessel Sammi Aurora (9th Cir. 1990) 903 F.2d 1244, 1246*

In admiralty-law action by exporter against shipper for damage to cargo regarding first of two shipments, shipper as entitled to summary judgment on cross complaint for unpaid freight on second shipment, when exporter paid freight for first shipment, then declared goods were damaged because of negligent handling and refused payment on second shipment, which was delivered in good condition and paid for by buyer. *Genetics Int'l v. Cormorant Bulk Carriers, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 877 F.2d 806, 809*

Whether entity is intended beneficiary of Himalaya Clause (provision extending protections provided carrier to those employed by carrier) depends on contractual relation between party seeking protection and ocean carrier, as well as on nature of services performed compared to carrier's responsibilities under carriage contract. *Taisho Marine & Fire Ins. Co. v. Vessel Gladiolus (9th Cir. 1985) 762 F.2d 1364, 1367*

Foreign jurisdiction clause is valid when COGSA incorporated into contract for foreign carriage outside of ex proprio vigore coverage of either the *Harter Act or COGSA. North River Ins. Co. v. Fed Sea/Fed Pac Line (9th Cir. 1981) 647 F.2d 985, 989*

COGSA provision stating act applies when incorporated as a contractual term as fully as if automatically applicable former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1312*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 13 controls only when COGSA incorporated into domestic carriage contracts otherwise governed by the *Harter Act. North River Ins. Co. v. Fed Sea/Fed Pac Line (9th Cir. 1981) 647 F.2d 985, 988* (neither act automatically applicable because cargo carried on deck)

Pomerene Act was not applicable to private contracts of carriage. *T.J. Stevenson & Co., Inc. v. 81,193 Bags of Flour (5th Cir. 1980) 629 F.2d 338, 372*

Unreasonable deviation was not sufficient to breach parties' contract and render $500 limitation on carrier's liability former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304(5)*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(5) inapplicable. *Rosenbruch v. American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, Inc. (2d Cir. 1976) 543 F.2d 967, 971*

Definition of ship for purposes of COGSA includes lighter aboard ship barges (barges loaded with cargo and carried by ships until discharged and towed into port). *Wirth Ltd. v. S/S Acadia Forest (5th Cir. 1976) 537 F.2d 1272, 1278*

Limitation of liability provisions in COGSA former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4 extend to dry dock operator when provided in bill of lading. *Grace Line, Inc. v. Todd Shipyards Corp. (9th Cir. 1974) 500 F.2d 361, 370, 371*

Himalaya clause (provision extending protections provided carrier to those employed by carrier) in bill of lading is effective to extend COGSA $500 limitation former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304(5)*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(5) to stevedore when clearly expressed as parties' intentions. *Tessler Bros. (B.C.) Ltd. v. Italpacific Line (9th Cir. 1974) 494 F.2d 438, 446, 447*

Establishment of shipper's prima facie case imposes burden on carrier to show excepted cause or freedom from negligence. *Daido Line v. Thomas P. Gonzalez Corp. (9th Cir. 1962) 299 F.2d 669, 671, 672*

Discharge of cargo within meaning of COGSA is complete when loading onto lighter (boat used to carry cargo to and from ship and wharf when ship not anchored at wharf) has been completed or while no other cargo is being loaded onto same lighter. *Hoegh Lines v. Green Truck Sales, Inc. (9th Cir. 1962) 298 F.2d 240, 242, 243*

Harter Act is not applicable to private contracts of carriage. *Koppers Conn. Coke Co. v. James McWilliams Blue Line, Inc. (2d Cir. 1937) 89 F.2d 865, 866*

Unreasonable deviation by carrier is breach of parties' contract rendering $500 limitation on carrier's liability former *46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304(5)*, now *46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(5) not applicable. *Jones v. Flying Clipper (S.D.N.Y. 1953) 116 F. Supp. 386, 391*

[3] Actions to Enforce Maritime Liens

California statute imposing mandatory pilotage fees on registered vessels entering and leaving San Francisco Bay was valid regulation of commerce in absence of federal enactment pertaining to registered ships. *Anderson v. Pacific Coast S.S. Co. (1912) 225 U.S. 187, 202, 32 S. Ct. 626, 56 L. Ed. 1047*

Ownership of vessel by defendant was prerequisite to attachment, even though maritime lien may issue without ownership; "lease" was security instrument rather than true lease, for purposes of establishing "ownership" giving rise to attachment rights, when "lessor" does not have reversionary ownership interest in vessel. *Interpool Ltd. v. Char Yigh Marine (Panama) S.A. (9th Cir. 1989) 890 F.2d 1453, 1460*

Courts exercising admiralty jurisdiction have power to apply doctrine of equitable subordination to resolve priority disputes under former *46 U.S.C.S. §§ 951, 953* [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(5), (6), 31325, 31326*]; equitable subordination requires that (1) claimant have engaged in inequitable conduct, (2) misconduct have resulted in injury to competing claimants or unfair advantage to claimant, and (3) subordination is not inconsistent with federal law. *Wardley Int'l Bank, Inc. v. Nasipit Bay Vessel (9th Cir. 1988) 841 F.2d 259, 263*

Preferred ship mortgage enjoys priority over all other claims against vessel except certain maritime liens and fees and costs imposed by court; preferred mortgage on foreign vessel is also subordinate to maritime liens for repairs, supplies, towage, use of drydock or marine railway, or other necessaries performed or supplied in United States. *United States v. Pacific Far E. Lines, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 1435, 1438* ; *Mobil Sales & Supply Corp. v. Panamax Venus (9th Cir. 1986) 804 F.2d 541, 542*

In Ninth Circuit, grant of maritime lien under former *46 U.S.C.S. § 971* [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. § 31342*] requires that person claiming lien (1) have furnished repairs, supplies, or other necessaries (2) to any vessel (3) on order of vessel's owner or of person authorized by owner; Ninth Circuit has adopted narrow construction of "furnishing" requirement. *Foss Launch & Tug Co. v. Char Ching Shipping U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1987) 808 F.2d 697, 699, 701-703*

In action to enforce maritime lien as security for recovery of damages based on seamen's claim against vessels for aggregate amount of deferred wages and wage penalties, Congressional retroactive amendment of *46 U.S.C.S. § 10504* extinguished and prevented execution on seamen's lien for wage penalties. *Aguirre v. S.S. Sohio Intrepid (9th Cir. 1986) 801 F.2d 1185, 1190*

Under statutory presumption in favor of materialmen under former Federal Maritime Lien Act [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31305, 31341* et seq.], subcontractor who supplied steel to vessel was entitled to lien if he or she relied on vessel for repayment rather than on primary contractor. Farwest Steel Corp. v. Barge Sea-Span 241 *(9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 620, 623-624*

Salvage claim did not requirie saving by sole efforts of person seeking award of salvage. *West Coast Shipping Brokers Corp. v. Ferry "Chuchequero" (5th Cir. 1978) 582 F.2d 959, 960*

Seizure of vessel in rem before expiration of grace period for payment by owner waived lien for salvage. Veverica v. Drill Barge Buccaneer No. 7 *(5th Cir. 1974) 488 F.2d 880, 884*

Contractual salvage gave rise to lien under former Federal Maritime Lien Act [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31305, 31341* et seq.]. Veverica v. Drill Barge Buccaneer No. 7 *(5th Cir. 1974) 488 F.2d 880, 883*

Stevedore's lien against freights of vessel extends to freights that vessel expects to earn during particular voyage for which services rendered. *Schirmer Stevedoring Co., Ltd. v. Seaboard Stevedoring Corp. (9th Cir. 1962) 306 F.2d 188, 192*

[4] Marshal's Costs

28 U.S.C.S. § 1921 prohibits federal magistrate in admiralty foreclosure action from precluding federal marshal from selling vessel at foreclosure sale simply to avoid payment of marshal's fee for conducting sale. *Bank of Am. v. M/V Executive (9th Cir. 1986) 797 F.2d 772, 774*

[5] Tariff Freight Charges

Private cause of action by carrier against shipper to collect tariff freight charges is impliedly provided for by former Shipping Act of 1916 [*now see 46 U.S.C.S. § 40101 et seq.*]. *Sea-Land Serv., Inc. v. Murrey & Son's Co. Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 824 F.2d 740, 741 n.1, 742-744*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime ContractsAffreightmentAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensEnforcementAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsWagesAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsCargo Care & StowageGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingRegulations & StatutesCarriage of Goods by Sea ActGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsWage Payments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.135

§ 522.135 Law Reviews

Note, *Calculating and Allocating Salvage Liability, 99 Harv. L. Rev. 1896 (1986)*

Friedell, *The Deviating Ship, 32 Hastings L.J. 1535 (1981)*

Note, *Restitution for Life Salvage at Sea in the Wake of Peninsular & Oriental Steam Navigation Co. v. Overseas Oil Carriers, Inc., 30 Hastings L.J. 227 (1978)*

Allen, *The Expanding Scope of Federal Maritime Liens: A Critique of Blair v. M/V Blue Spruce, 9 U.S.F. L. Rev. 665 (1975)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawFinds & SalvageGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingCarrier Duties & ObligationsDeviations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.136

§ 522.136 Text References

Benedict on Admiralty (Matthew Bender)

S. Sorkin, Goods in Transit (Matthew Bender)

2 Am. Jur. 2d, *Admiralty*

70 Am. Jur. 2d, *Shipping*, §§ 112-150, 195-206, 265-271, 292-308, 440-555, 560-562

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawShippingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.137-522.149

[Reserved]

§§ 522.137[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Maritime Accidents or Disasters

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.150

§ 522.150 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. § 30511; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F] for Claims Arising Out of Maritime Accident or Disaster

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Exoneration From and/or Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 183; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F] for Claims Arising Out of Maritime Accident or Disaster

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

In the Matter of the Complaint of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, Owner of the Vessel _____ [*name of vessel*].	)))))))	Civil Action No. _____ COMPLAINT FOR _____ LIMITATION OF] LIABILITY

1. This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully appears [, and is an admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of *Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*]. This complaint for limitation of liability for claims of maritime tort on navigable waters invokes the court's jurisdiction under *Section 1333 of Title 28 of the United States Code* Service and Section 30511 of the Title 46 of the United States Code Service.

2. Plaintiff is [a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and] the owner and operator of the American merchant vessel _____ [*name*], having a gross tonnage of _____ [*specify*].

3. While on a voyage from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*], plaintiff's vessel _____ [*describe event which caused damage or injury, e.g.,* ran aground off the shores of California near Santa Barbara]. The voyage terminated on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify place*].

4. As a result of the _____ [*describe event which caused damage, e.g.,* grounding], _____ [*describe deaths, injuries, damages to or loss of property, e.g.,* passengers of the vessel were injured and its cargo was severely damaged].

[*EITHER*]

5. The vessel was damaged by the _____ [*describe event causing damage*] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify place of event*], and [, on information and belief,] its value at the close of the voyage was $_____. [The amount of pending freight recovered or recoverable is $_____.]

[*OR*]

5. The vessel was _____ [lost *or* abandoned] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify place of event*], as a result of the _____ [*describe event causing loss*] and the value of its wreckage, strippings, or proceeds is $_____. The wreckage, strippings, and proceeds are in the possession of _____ [*name*] at _____ [*specify location*]. [The amount of pending freight recovered or recoverable is $_____.]

6. Plaintiff has received _____ [written *and/or* oral] demands for _____ [damages to *and/or* loss of] property in the sum of $_____ [and demands for damages from _____ (personal injuries *and/or* death) in the sum of $_____].

[*EITHER*]

7. Plaintiff knows of no actions and proceedings involving claims from the _____ [*describe event causing damage or injury*] which are pending.

[*OR*]

7. Actions are pending against _____ [plaintiff *and/or* plaintiff's vessel] in _____ [*state court, case number, and parties, e.g.,* the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, Civil Action No. _____, _____ (*name*), Plaintiff, vs. _____ (*name*), Defendant].

[*EITHER*]

8. Plaintiff knows of no demands or unsatisfied liens or claims of lien, in contract or in tort, which have arisen as a result of the voyage, other than those stated in Paragraphs 6 and 7 of plaintiff's complaint.

[*OR*]

8. Additional _____ [demands *and/or* unsatisfied liens *and/or* claims of lien] arising on the voyage include _____ [*state additional demands, liens, or claims, e.g.,* the crew's lien against the vessel for wages and materialmen's liens for supplies furnished prior to the voyage, in the total sum of $_____].

9. The _____ [*describe event causing damage*] and all consequent damage, loss, injury, and destruction were occasioned without the privity, knowledge, fault, neglect, or want of due care on the part of the plaintiff. [At and prior to the time of the voyage, plaintiff exercised due diligence to make the vessel in all respects seaworthy and properly manned, equipped, and supplied.]

[10. A prior paramount lien against plaintiff's vessel exists for _____ (*state source of prior lien, e.g.,* a mortgage against the vessel, dated _____ [*date*], and filed of record in _____ (*place of recording*).]

[11. Since the voyage on which the claims sought to be limited arose, plaintiff's vessel has made (a) voyage(s) to _____ (*describe voyages, e.g.,* Japan and returned to the Port of San Francisco). The vessel has (not) sustained injury during the subsequent voyage(s).]

[12. Plaintiff's vessel _____ (did not incur liens during the subsequent voyage(s) *or* incurred the following liens during the subsequent voyage(s): _____ (*state names and addresses of lienors, so far as known, and amounts and causes of liens*).]

13. Plaintiff claims the benefit of limitation of liability as provided in Sections 30501-30512 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service. _____ [Plaintiff is filing with this complaint security for the value of his or her interest in the vessel _____ (*name*) and its pending freight *or* Plaintiff is transferring its interest in the vessel and pending freight to a trustee appointed by the court].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. For issuance of notice to all persons asserting claims with respect to which this complaint seeks limitation of liability and for publication of such notice as provided by law;

2. For judgment limiting plaintiff's liability for property damage to the value of plaintiff's interest in the _____ [vessel *or* wreckage, strippings, and proceeds of the vessel] and the pending freight subsequent to the _____ [*describe event causing loss*];

3. For judgment limiting plaintiff's liability for damages from _____ [personal injury *and/or* death] to the value of plaintiff's interest in the _____ [vessel *or* wreckage, strippings, and proceeds of the vessel] and the pending freight subsequent to the _____ [*describe event causing loss*];

4. For costs herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

State of _____,)
County of _____,) ss.
)

_____ [*name*], being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am [the _____ (*declarant's title*) of _____ (*name of corporation*),] the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof and the same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true.

[The sources of my information and the grounds of my belief as to all matters not stated in the complaint to be alleged on my own knowledge are reports made to me by employees and the records of the corporation.]

_____ [*signature of declarant*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]
Notary Public

[*seal*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used for an action in federal district court by a shipowner or charterer seeking limitation of liability for claims surrounding a maritime accident or disaster. The complaint must be filed in a United States district court [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30511(a)*]. In addition, the shipowner may assert the federal limitation of liability statute as a defense in state court proceedings, but usually all claims arising from an incident cannot be settled satisfactorily by defending in state court [*see Providence & N.Y. S.S. Co. v. Hill Mfg. Co. (1883) 109 U.S. 578, 594-595, 3 S. Ct. 379, 27 L. Ed. 1038]* .

[3] Venue

The complaint must be filed in any district in which the vessel has been attached or arrested to answer for any claim for which plaintiff seeks limitation of liability. If the vessel has not been attached or arrested, the complaint may be filed in any district in which the owner has been sued with respect to a claim. When there has been neither attachment of the vessel nor a suit against the owner, the action may be instituted in the district where the vessel is located. The complaint may be filed in any district if no suit has been filed and the vessel is not located within any district [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(9)].

[4] Allegations

[a] Facts and Status (Paragraphs 2-8); Transfers and Liens (Paragraphs 10-12)

Paragraphs 2-8 are required by Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(2). Paragraphs 10-12 are mandated by the same rule when the plaintiff elects to transfer its interest in the vessel to a trustee instead of depositing a sum equal to the value of the vessel [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30511(b)(2)*].

[b] Jurisdictional Statement (Paragraph 1)

A complaint in federal court must contain a short and plain statement of the court's jurisdictional base [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*]. If a claim has another ground for federal jurisdiction, the complaint may use the language in brackets in Paragraph 1 to assure application of civil rules pertaining only to admiralty cases [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*].

[5] Notice to Claimants

After the complaint is filed and security posted, the court must issue notice to all persons asserting claims with respect to which the complaint seeks limitation, admonishing them to file their claims with the court clerk and to serve a copy on plaintiff's attorney on or before the date named in the notice. The date fixed in the notice must not be less than 30 days after issuance, but for cause shown the court may enlarge the time for filing claims [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)].

The notice must also be published in such newspaper or newspapers as the court may direct once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date fixed for filing claims. Not later than the day of second publication, the plaintiff must mail a copy of the notice to every person known to have made any claim against the vessel or the plaintiff [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)]. For an example of the required notice for publication, see *§ 522.151*.

[6] Verification

Verification of a complaint for limitation of liability is not required [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*]. A verified complaint, however, may be substituted for an affidavit as the basis for granting a preliminary injunction [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Maritime Accidents or Disasters

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.151

§ 522.151 Notice to Claimants to File Claims [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)]--Against Shipowner Seeking Limitation of Liability

[1] FORM Notice to Claimants to File Claims [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)]--Against Shipowner Seeking Limitation of Liability

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

In the Matter of the Complaint of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, Owner of the Vessel _____ [*name of vessel*].	))))))))	Civil Action No. _____ NOTICE OF ACTION BROUGHT FOR _____ LIMITATION OF] LIABILITY

Notice is given that _____ [*name*] [, a corporation,] has filed a complaint pursuant to Sections 30501-30512 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service, claiming the right to limitation of liability for all claims arising on the voyage of the _____ [*name or other designation of vessel*] from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*], which terminated on _____ [*date*].

All persons having claims must file them as provided in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Supplemental Rule F, with the clerk of this court, at the United States Courthouse, _____ [*address*], and serve a copy on the plaintiff's attorney, _____ [*name and address*], on or before _____ [*specify date that is not less than 30 days after issuance of notice*] or suffer default.

Any claimant desiring to contest the right of plaintiff to limitation of liability must file an answer to the complaint, as required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Supplemental Rule F, and serve a copy on plaintiff's attorney, unless the claim has included an answer.

_____ [*signature*]
United States Marshal

[2] Use of Form

This notice must be published in such newspapers as the court may direct once a week for four successive weeks prior to the date fixed for the filing of claims. Not later than the day of the second publication, plaintiff must also mail a copy of the notice to every person known to have made any claim against the vessel or plaintiff arising out of the voyage to which claims relate [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4)].

[3] Contents of Form

The notice must state: (1) the voyage from which the limitation proceeding arises; (2) the requirements of filing and service of claims before a certain date, which must be at least 30 days after issuance of the notice; and (3) the obligation to file an answer if the claimant desires to contest the right to limitation of liability, unless the claim has included an answer [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(4), (5)].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 522.150*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Maritime Accidents or Disasters

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.152

§ 522.152 Injunction [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(3); Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65]--Against Prosecution of Another Action When Shipowner Has Commenced Action for Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30505, 30511]

[1] FORM Injunction [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(3); Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65]--Against Prosecution of Another Action When Shipowner Has Commenced Action for Exoneration From and/or Limitation of Liability [46 U.S.C.S. app. §§ 183, 185]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

In the Matter of the Complaint of _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, Owner of the Vessel _____ [*name of vessel*], _____	)))))	Civil Action No. _____ PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

An _____ [application and verified complaint *or* affidavit and complaint] having been filed on _____ [*date*], by the plaintiff as the owner of the American merchant vessel, _____ [*name*], claiming limitation of liability in connection with the _____ [*describe event causing damage, loss, or injury, e.g.,* grounding] of the vessel at _____ [*specify place of event*] on _____ [*date*], and plaintiff having deposited approved security for the benefit of claimants, and having given security for costs; and

It being shown that _____ [*name*] has commenced an action against the plaintiff in the _____ [*name and district or county of court*], claiming damages for _____ [personal injuries *and/or* loss of property *and/or* injury to property] alleged to have arisen from the _____ [*describe event*] and further, that the claim by _____ [*name*] is subject to limitation in the action pending in this court,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, as follows:

1. The claimant, _____ [*name*], is enjoined from further prosecution of the action in the _____ [*name and district or county of court*], entitled _____ vs. _____;

2. This injunction will remain in effect until determination of the limitation proceeding now pending in this court; and

3. Notice of this injunction will be given to claimant, _____ [*name*], by serving a copy on his/her attorney.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge, United States District Court
_____ District of California

[2] Use of Form

This injunction may be obtained by the plaintiff to enjoin further prosecution of any action or proceeding with respect to a claim subject to limitation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule F(3)]. Supplemental Rule F(3) provides only that the court "shall enjoin" another action on application of the plaintiff. The general Federal Rules of Civil Procedure also apply, except to the extent that they are inconsistent with these Supplemental Rules [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule A]. Thus, a verified complaint can support the issuance of a preliminary injunction [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.150, 522.151*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Maritime Accidents or Disasters

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.153-522.169

[Reserved]

§§ 522.153[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.170

§ 522.170 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7(a), 8(a)] for Damages for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104]--By Seaman Against Shipowner--Federal Form

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 7(a), 8(a)] for Damages for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688]--By Seaman Against Shipowner--Federal Form

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
_____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	Civil Action, File No. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	PERSONAL INJURIES
Defendant.	)	(Jones Act and
	)	Unseaworthiness)
	)	

_____

1. This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully appears. [*If the pleader wishes to invoke the distinctively maritime procedures referred to in Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h), add:* This is an admiralty or maritime claim within the meaning of *Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.*]

2. During all times herein mentioned defendant _____ [*name*] was the owner of the steamship

_____ [*name of vessel*] and used it in the transportation of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* freight for hire] by water in interstate and foreign commerce. _____ [Defendant resides in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California _____ *or allege capacity of defendant who is not an individual and other basis of venue as appropriate*].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify location*], plaintiff entered the employ of defendant as an able seaman on the steamship under seaman's articles of customary form for a voyage from the Port of _____ [*specify*] to the Port of _____ [*specify*] and return at a wage of $_____ per month and found, which is equal to a wage of $_____ per month as a shore worker.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], the steamship was about _____ [*number*] days out of the Port of _____ [*specify*] and was being navigated by the master and crew on the [return] voyage to the Port of _____ [*specify*]. The weather was _____ [*describe condition, e.g.,* fair and balmy], and the vessel was _____ [*describe general condition, e.g.,* apparently functioning normally]. However, defendant negligently _____ [*describe defendant's conduct, e.g.,* had permitted a master electrical switch box to be installed and maintained in a defective condition, knowing that plaintiff or any other crew member might have to operate its switches].

5. By reason of defendant's negligence in thus _____ [*briefly describe negligence described above, e.g.,* maintaining a defective switch box], and of the unseaworthiness of the steamship, plaintiff was _____ [*describe how injuries incurred, e.g.,* severely shocked and burned by electricity in attempting to operate the switch box for the normal purpose of shutting off lights in the galley after cleaning it for the day].

6. Prior to these injuries, plaintiff was a strong, able-bodied man, capable of earning and actually earning $_____ per day. By these injuries plaintiff has been made incapable of any gainful activity, has suffered great physical and mental pain, and has incurred expenses in the amount of $_____ for medicine, medical attendance, and hospitalization.

WHEREFORE plaintiff demands judgment against defendant in the sum of $_____ and costs [and for such other and further relief as the court may deem proper].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Source of Form

This form is, in part, modeled after Official Federal Forms 2(d) (allegations of jurisdiction), 9 (negligence), 14 (negligence under FELA), and 15 (complaint under Jones Act), exemplar forms officially prepared to accompany the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 84* (official forms sufficient under the rules); *see also* Moore's Federal Rules Pamphlets (Matthew Bender)].

[3] Use of Form

The complaint may be used in a federal district court when a seaman is suing for both personal injuries resulting both from the shipowner's negligence and from the unseaworthiness of the vessel. The same type of complaint for a California state court is illustrated by the *form in § 522.171*, which may be consulted for alternatives in pleading,

including more specific damages allegations and a prayer for relief. For discussion of claims for injury or death of seamen, see *§ 522.31*.

[4] Jurisdiction

See *§ 522.11* for a discussion of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction in the federal courts.

[5] Pleading Admiralty Claims in Federal Courts

Cases cognizable in admiralty are governed under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the same manner as other cases except when special procedures have been provided [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 1*]. A pleading that sets forth a claim for relief must contain a short and plain statement of the grounds of jurisdiction, a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and a demand for judgment [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*].

When a claim for relief within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction is also within the United States District Court jurisdiction on some other ground, it may contain a statement identifying the claim as an admiralty or maritime claim for the purposes of *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rules 14(c)* (certain third-party practice), 38(e) (unavailability of trial by jury), 82 (not treated as "civil action" for purposes of venue), and the Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims.

If the claim is cognizable only in admiralty, it is an admiralty or maritime claim for those purposes whether so identified or not [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*]. Typically, a party may join against an opposing party, either as independent or as alternate claims, as many claims as he or she may have, including maritime claims [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 18(a)*; *see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(e)(2)*].

Because an action under the Jones Act clearly falls within a federal court's admiralty jurisdiction, the additional bracketed information regarding *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)* need not be included in Paragraph 1 of the complaint if the complaint is based only on the Jones Act. If a claim has another ground for federal jurisdiction, the complaint may use the language in brackets to assure application of civil rules pertaining only to admiralty cases [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*].

[6] Costs

In all United States courts, seamen may institute and prosecute suits and appeals in their own names and for their own benefit for wages or salvage or the enforcement of laws enacted for their health or safety without prepaying fees or costs or furnishing security therefore [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1916*]. For discussion of the conflict between this provision and the statute mandating payment of marshal's fees [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*], see *§ 522.72[5]*.

[7] Demand for Jury Trial

Any party in federal court may demand a jury trial of any issue triable by jury by serving a written demand on the other parties any time after the commencement of the action but not later than 10 days after the service of the last pleading directed to that issue. The demand may be indorsed on a pleading of the party [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 38(c)*].

The Jones Act specifically provides for jury trial on demand of the seaman/plaintiff [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*]. However, the defendant may not demand a jury trial on the claim [*Craig v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (9th Cir. 1994) 19 F.3d 472, 476* ; *see Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., Rule 38(e)* (rules pertaining to jury trial otherwise may not be construed to create right to trial by jury of issues in admiralty or maritime claim); *see also Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., Rule 9(h)*].

If a federal court has an independent basis of jurisdiction over cases involving admiralty claims, such as diversity of citizenship, both the defendant and the plaintiff have a right to demand a jury trial under the *Seventh Amendment of the*

United States Constitution, so long as the suit is one that could traditionally have been brought at common law [*Craig v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (9th Cir. 1994) 19 F.3d 472, 476]* .

A jury may be demanded by either party to a case of contract or tort in admiralty or maritime jurisdiction involving a vessel of substantial size engaged in traffic along the coasts or interior lakes and waters [*see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1873*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.171

§ 522.171 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104] and Doctrine of Unseaworthiness--By Seaman Against Shipowner--General California Form

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688] and Doctrine of Unseaworthiness--By Seaman Against Shipowner--General California Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	PERSONAL INJURIES
Defendant.	)	(Jones Act and
	)	Unseaworthiness)
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Jones Act)

1. _____ [Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in

(_____ (*city*)), _____ County *or allege other identity, capacity, and basis of venue, of defendant as appropriate*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint and insert their names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such fictitiously named defendants are responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged.]

3. During all times herein mentioned defendant was the owner of the vessel _____ [*name of vessel*] and used it in the transportation of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* freight for hire] by water in interstate and foreign commerce. [The vessel was regularly berthed at the Port of _____ (*specify*), and is registered in California as No. _____.]

4. [*Allege hiring as seaman for particular voyage. See § 522.170, Paragraph 3.*]

[*EITHER*]

5. [*Allege injurious condition on the high seas or tidal waters. See § 522.170, Paragraph 4.*]

[*OR, allege injurious condition in port*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], the vessel was lying alongside _____ [*describe location, e.g.,* the dock at Pier 1 at the Port of _____ (*specify*), California]. Plaintiff was engaged in _____ [*describe ship's duties, e.g.,* swabbing down the promenade deck with regular cleaning apparatus]. However, defendant negligently _____ [*describe defendant's conduct, e.g.,* had affixed a large metal fan to the bottom of the deck above where plaintiff was working].

6. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff was _____ [*describe injuries, e.g.,* struck by the metal overhead fan which suddenly came loose from its boltings and dropped on plaintiff's back, causing plaintiff severe bodily injuries].

7. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

8. As a further proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses.

9. As a further proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and present.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Unseaworthiness)

10. Plaintiff incorporates by reference, as though fully set forth below, each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-4 and

6-9 of the First Cause of Action herein.

11. On or about _____ [*date*], while the vessel was lying alongside _____ [*describe location, e.g.,* the dock at Pier 1 at _____, California], plaintiff was engaged in _____ [*describe ship's duties, e.g.,* swabbing down the promenade deck with regular cleaning apparatus]. However, defendant failed to provide plaintiff with a seaworthy vessel on which to work in that _____ [*describe unseaworthy condition, e.g.,* a large metal fan affixed overhead of the portion of the deck on which plaintiff was working came loose, suddenly dropping on plaintiff]. As a result of the unseaworthiness of defendant's vessel, plaintiff suffered the severe bodily injuries alleged above.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For general damages;

2. For damages for medical and related expenses;

3. For damages for lost earnings [both past and future];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in a California court when a seaman is suing for personal injuries resulting from the shipowner's negligence under the federal Jones Act [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*]. It is joined with a second cause of action for unseaworthiness, a tort arising out of the general maritime law that is frequently coupled with the negligence count. There may, however, be instances in which a recovery would more easily fit under the doctrine of negligence or of unseaworthiness, and certain instances in which it might be had under one but not the other concept. A form for bringing the same types of causes of action in a federal court is *set out in § 522.170*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges in the first cause of action: (1) identity and capacity of the defendant (Paragraph 1); (2) fictitious names of any unknown defendants (Paragraph 2); (3) description of the maritime nature of the setting of the injuries on the defendant's vessel, with possible specification of California contacts (Paragraph 3) [*see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*]; (4) plaintiff's employment as a seaman (Paragraph 4); (5) the defendant's negligence (Paragraph 5); (6) plaintiff's resultant injuries (Paragraph 6); (7) damages to plaintiff (Paragraphs 7-9) [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*]; the complaint alleges in the second cause of action: The unseaworthiness of defendant's vessel, resulting in plaintiff's injuries (Paragraph 11) [*see Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 99, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* .

[4] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Pleading Alternative Cause of Unseaworthiness

It is common and acceptable practice for a plaintiff to plead both the Jones Act and the unseaworthiness doctrine and place both causes of action before the jury, although there is but one recovery. The distinctions between the two remedies have become largely obliterated; after several years of confusion in the courts, the two counts have come to be regarded as inseparable causes [*Baptiste v. Superior Court (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 87, 99, 164 Cal. Rptr. 789]* . For discussion of the Jones Act and unseaworthiness, see *§ 522.31*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.172

§ 522.172 Allegation Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104]--Seaman Injured on Wharf in Course of Employment

[1] FORM Allegation Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688]--Seaman Injured on Wharf in Course of Employment

On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was ordered by the master of the vessel to, and pursuant to such order did, proceed to the office of _____ [*stevedoring company*], who were the owners and operators of Pier No. _____, in the Port of _____ [*specify*]; while plaintiff was so proceeding, the _____ [*stevedoring company*] by and through its agents, servants, and employees, carelessly and negligently _____ [*describe negligence, e.g.,* owned, operated, maintained, and controlled a fork lift on the pier, so that the fork lift was caused to back into and strike plaintiff with great force and violence].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be substituted for Paragraph 4 of the *form in § 522.170* or Paragraph 5 of the *form in § 522.171*, if the seaman sues the shipowner under the Jones Act for personal injuries which occurred off the vessel.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.171*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.173

§ 522.173 Allegation of Unseaworthiness--Aggravation of Injuries by Failure to Furnish Medical Attention While Aboard Ship

[1] FORM Allegation of Unseaworthiness--Aggravation of Injuries by Failure to Furnish Medical Attention While Aboard Ship

Defendant refused and neglected to furnish plaintiff with proper and necessary medical attention or assistance, and plaintiff was unable to obtain medical attention or assistance from any other source during the course of the vessel's voyage from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*]. As a proximate result of defendant's failure to so provide a seaworthy vessel, plaintiff's injuries, as described above, were seriously aggravated, and he/she was forced to suffer great pain and inconvenience all to his/her further damage in the sum of $_____.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be added to the *form in § 522.170* or the *form in § 522.171*, if the seaman sues the shipowner for personal injuries on the additional ground of unseaworthiness due to failure to furnish adequate medical attention during the voyage [*see Trovatten v. United States (E.D. Pa. 1972) 342 F. Supp. 866, 871]* .

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.171*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.174

§ 522.174 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--No Employment Relationship

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--No Employment Relationship

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

Plaintiff and defendant never entered into a contract of employment, nor in any way created an employer-employee relationship and did not maintain any such relationship during the time of the accident alleged in the complaint. Therefore, defendant is not liable for the alleged damages from plaintiff's _____ [injury *or* death].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint brought by a seaman for personal injuries under the Jones Act or for unseaworthiness. It is for use by a defendant who maintains that a true employment relationship did not exist between the parties. In certain instances this defect to the cause of action may be obvious from the allegations of the complaint, in which event the point should be raised by demurrer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.171*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.175

§ 522.175 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--Nonownership of Vessel by Time Charterer

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action by Seaman--Nonownership of Vessel by Time Charterer

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

At the time of the accident alleged in the complaint, defendant _____ [*name*] was not the owner of _____ [*name, nationality, registry number, or other designation of vessel*]; there was no demise of the vessel to defendant; defendant was merely the time charterer of the vessel and as such neither possessed, managed, maintained, operated, nor controlled the vessel; and the master, officers, and crew of the vessel were employed by its owners. As a consequence of the foregoing, defendant owed no duty to plaintiff with respect to the matters and things alleged in the complaint [and in each cause of action thereof].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a complaint brought by a seaman for personal injuries under the Jones Act or for unseaworthiness. It is for use by a defendant who claims that he or she is not the shipowner but only a time charterer of the vessel in question.

[3] When Charterer Has Liability

Under a demise charter, the charterer is considered as having the duties of an owner in possession and could be held liable to certain maritime employees. A time charterer, in a sense, merely rents cargo space and does not have a corresponding liability. The charter for the particular leasing privileges involved may indicate which type of responsibility is to be imposed. Normally, a demise charter is not present if the owner retains control over manning, navigating, equipping, and maintaining the vessel [*see Apodoca v. Schiffahrtsgesellschaft De Vries & Co. (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 605, 608-610, 18 Cal. Rptr. 869]* . This principle is also recognized under the federal Limitation of Liability Act, which provides that a charterer who mans, supplies, and navigates a vessel at his or her own expense, or

by his or her own procurement, is to be deemed to be the owner of that vessel under the act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30501*].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.171*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.176

§ 522.176 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Longshoremen's and
Defendant.	)	Harbor Workers'
	)	Compensation Act)
	)	[*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933*;
	)	*Civ. Code § 3333*]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity and identity of defendant and facts establishing venue, e.g., adapting see § 522.171, Paragraphs 1, 3.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegations. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff's employer, _____ [*name of employer*], was engaged in rendering stevedoring services on and about the vessel _____ [*name of vessel*] then lying alongside the _____ [*describe location of vessel, e.g.,* the dock at Pier 1,] at the Port of _____ [*specify*], California, and plaintiff was employed as a _____ [longshoreman *or describe other worker*] on that site and at that time in performing such services on behalf of the employer.

4. Defendant failed to exercise due care under the circumstances toward plaintiff in that _____ [*describe breach of duty, e.g.,* defendant left a thick layer of grease lying in various places on the deck, including plaintiff's work area, which grease had been deposited as a result of a special cleaning operation of the night before]. Defendant thus failed to exercise ordinary care under the circumstances _____ [to have the ship and its equipment in such condition that plaintiff's employer, an expert and experienced stevedore, would be able, by the exercise of reasonable care, to carry on cargo operations with reasonable safety to persons and property *or* by not warning plaintiff's employer of hazards _____ (on the ship *or* with respect to the ship's equipment) that were known, or should have been known, to defendant in the exercise of reasonable care, and that were likely to be encountered by plaintiff's employer in the course of its cargo operations, but were not known by such employer and would not be obvious to or anticipated by it as a stevedore reasonably competent in the performance of its work].

5. As a proximate result of the dangerous condition and defendant's negligence, plaintiff was severely injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* swinging a crate of cargo, he/she slipped on the layer of grease], thereby sustaining injuries as described below.

[6. *Plaintiff's damages. See § 522.171, Paragraphs 7-9.*]

[*Prayer. See § 522.171* .]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.171* .]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used to obtain damages in a California court by a longshoreman or harbor worker covered under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, who contends that injuries he or she suffered were caused by the negligence of a shipowner. With appropriate modification, this form may be used to state a claim for relief in the proper United States District Court. For allegations for use when the employee sues a third party other than the shipowner, see *§ 522.177*. For a discussion of procedures for suing third parties generally, see *§ 522.32[6]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) the nature of the work plaintiff's employer and plaintiff were performing on or about the vessel (Paragraph 3); (2) the failure of the defendant to exercise the due care owed to the plaintiff under the circumstances (Paragraph 4) [*see Marine Terminals v. Burnside Shipping Co. (1969) 394 U.S. 404, 415, 416 n.18, 89 S. Ct. 1144, 22 L. Ed. 2d 371* ; *Scindia Steam Navigation Co. v. De Los Santos (1981) 451 U.S. 156, 101 S. Ct. 1614, 68 L. Ed. 2d 1, 12]* ; and (3) plaintiff's resultant injury (Paragraph 5) [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.177

§ 522.177 Allegations to Complaint for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Third Party Other Than Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]

[1] FORM Allegations to Complaint for Personal Injuries--By Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Third Party Other Than Shipowner [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant independently provided _____ [services to the vessel *or* plaintiff's employer with certain equipment and supplies with which to render services] consisting of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* a boom for loading and unloading cargo]. Defendant was negligent in providing such _____ [services *or* equipment] in that _____ [*describe carelessness, e.g.,* the boom was made defectively in that it contained unstable parts, causing the apparatus to rupture under normal strain].

5. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff was severely injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* the boom snapped during its normal use by plaintiff and others during performance of their regular labors, falling on plaintiff and crushing him/her].

[2] Use of Form

This allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the *form in § 522.176*, in a complaint by a longshoreman or harbor worker against a third party other than the shipowner for personal injuries [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 933*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 522.176*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.178

§ 522.178 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Employer on Behalf of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner or Other Third Party [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Employer on Behalf of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker Against Shipowner or Other Third Party [33 U.S.C.S. § 933]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Longshoremen's and
Defendant.	)	Harbor Workers'
	)	Compensation Act)
	)	[*33 U.S.C.S. § 933*; *Civ. Code § 3333*]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity and identity of defendant and facts establishing venue, e.g., adapting see § 522.171, Paragraphs 1, 3.*]

[2. *Ficititious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

3. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein has been, a corporation, duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of

_____ [*specify state*] [and authorized to transact business in the State of California], engaged in the business of providing and performing through its various personnel _____ [*describe services, e.g.,* stevedoring] services to vessels. Plaintiff employed the services of _____ [*name of injured employee*], (hereinafter referred to as "plaintiff's employee," from _____ [*date*], to _____ [the present time *or* _____ (*date*)] as a _____ [*specify, e.g.,* stevedore].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff entered into a contract with _____ [defendant *or other party*] to provide _____ [*describe services, e.g.,* stevedoring] services on and about the vessel _____ [*name of vessel*] then lying alongside _____ [*describe location of vessel, e.g.,* the dock at Pier 1] at the Port of _____ [*specify*]. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff dispatched plaintiff's employee to such location to perform such services.

[*EITHER, if employee's injuries were caused by the shipowner*]

5. Defendant, however, failed to exercise due care under the circumstances toward plaintiff's employee in that _____ [*describe breach of duty, e.g.,* defendant left a large electric cable hanging down the side of a cabin and in contact with standing water on the deck as a result of an incomplete watch of the previous evening]. Defendant thus failed to exercise ordinary care under the circumstances _____ [to have the ship and its equipment in such condition that plaintiff, as an expert and experienced stevedore, would be able, by the exercise of reasonable care, to carry on its cargo operations with reasonable safety to persons and property *or* in not warning plaintiff of hazards _____ (on the ship *or* with respect to the ship's equipment) that were known, or that should have been known, to defendant in the exercise of reasonable care, and that were likely to be encountered by plaintiff in the course of its cargo operations, but were not known by plaintiff and would not be obvious to or anticipated by it as a stevedore reasonably competent in the performance of its work].

[*OR, if employee's injuries were caused by negligence of third party other than shipowner*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, independently, provided _____ [services to the vessel *or* plaintiff's employer with certain equipment and supplies with which to render services] [consisting of _____ (*describe e.g.,* special detergent in barrels for both fumigating and washing the decks)]. Defendant was negligent in providing such _____ [services *or* equipment and supplies] in that _____ [*describe, e.g.,* the detergent mix had been compounded improperly with a substance that was poisonous to breathe, and the wind spread it around for plaintiff's employee and others to breathe].

[*EITHER, if employee's injuries were caused by shipowner*]

6. As a proximate result of the dangerous condition and defendant's negligence, plaintiff's employee was severely injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* he/she had to pass through the passage where the cable was hidden in the water, and stepped onto the cable receiving a severe discharge of electrical force through his/her foot].

[*OR, if employee's injuries were caused by negligence of third party other than shipowner*]

6. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff's employee was severely injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* the wind carried the poisonous fumes to plaintiff's employee

while he/she was working on the decks washed with the deleterious detergent, and he/she became violently ill from the effects thereof].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff's employee received an award under a compensation order of _____ [*describe award*] under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. A true copy of the order is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff's employee accepted the compensation under the award in the compensation order as filed and failed to commence an action against defendant within six months after the award.

[*Prayer. See § 522.171.*]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.171.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used by an employer in an action for personal injuries to an employee longshoreman or harbor worker against a shipowner or other third party responsible for the employee's injuries. With appropriate modifications, it may be used in a claim of relief filed in federal court by such an employer plaintiff.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) plaintiff's business as a stevedore, ship builder and repairer, or similar enterprise, and its employment of the employee who was injured (Paragraph 3); (2) plaintiff's engagement to render its services to a particular vessel, and its employment of the injured employee in that operation (Paragraph 4); (3) the negligence of the defendant that led to the injury--if the defendant is the shipowner, alleging the same standard of negligence as is alleged when the employee sues the shipowner [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*; *see § 522.171*]; otherwise, alleging the negligence of another third party who either rendered services or sold supplies to the vessel or provided like matters to the plaintiff who used them in rendering services to the vessel [*see § 522.177*]; and in either instance, the resultant injury to plaintiff's employee (Paragraphs 5, 6); and (4) issuance of a compensation order on behalf of the employee and the employee's acceptance of the award and failure to sue defendant, which resulted in an assignment of the employee's claim to the plaintiff employer (Paragraph 7) [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 933*; *see also § 522.32[6][a]*].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.176, 522.177*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.179

§ 522.179 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] of Shipowner to Complaint for Injuries by Longshoreman or Harbor Worker or Employer Thereof [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--Negligence of Fellow Servants

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] of Shipowner to Complaint for Injuries by Longshoreman or Harbor Worker or Employer Thereof [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--Negligence of Fellow Servants

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

_____ [Plaintiff was employed by defendant to provide _____ (stevedoring *or* shipbuilding *or* ship repair) services *or an admission to the same effect made earlier in the answer may be substituted for this allegation*]. The injury of which plaintiff complains was caused by the negligence of other persons engaged in providing the same services to the vessel as plaintiff was providing, in that _____ [*describe fellow servants' fault, e.g.,* although all stevedores had been strictly cautioned by defendant not to stand on cargo cartons, several of those stevedores working with plaintiff insisted that he/she stand on certain crates in order to accomplish his/her work and caused him/her to do so, as a result of which the injury described in the complaint occurred].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used by a shipowner in an answer to a complaint for personal injuries filed by a longshoreman or harbor worker [*see § 522.176*], when the basis for defending is the negligence of fellow servants. With appropriate modification, this defense may be used in answer to a claim for relief brought in federal court by a longshoreman or harbor worker against a shipowner for personal injuries.

[3] Defense of Fellow Servants' Negligence

Under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, when a vessel (including its owners or representatives [*see 33 U.S.C.S. § 902(21)*]) is sued by a longshoreman or harbor worker for negligence, the vessel may

resort to certain defenses denied to the employer. If the plaintiff was employed to perform stevedoring services, the action is not permitted if the injury was caused by the negligence of another stevedore. If the plaintiff was employed to provide shipbuilding, repairing, or breaking services, and the employer was the owner, owner pro hac vice, agent, operator, or charterer of the vessel, no action is permitted directly or indirectly against the employer in any capacity, including that as owner [*33 U.S.C.S. § 905(b)*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 522.176*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.180

§ 522.180 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Maintenance and Cure--By Seaman Against Shipowner

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Maintenance and Cure--By Seaman Against Shipowner

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	DAMAGES
Defendant.	)	(Maintenance and Cure of
	)	Seaman)
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity and identity of defendant. See § 522.171, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Defendant as vessel owner. See § 522.171, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Hiring of plaintiff as seaman. See § 522.170, Paragraph 3.*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], while the vessel was _____ [*describe location, e.g.,* lying alongside the dock at Pier 1, at the Port of _____ (*specify*) *or* on the high seas some _____ miles off the coast of _____ (*state or country*)], plaintiff contracted and suffered a disabling condition, _____ [*describe, e.g.,* consisting of a high fever and an inability to remain ambulatory for extended periods].

6. Immediately prior to suffering this condition plaintiff was a strong, able-bodied person, capable of continuous, gainful employment in the occupation of _____ [*describe*]. By reason of this disabling condition, plaintiff _____ [has been caused to suffer great physical and mental pain and suffering *or describe condition more specifically*], has incurred [and will continue to incur] medical and related expenses [in the sum of $_____], and is unable [and will continue to be unable] to attend to his/her usual occupation as a _____ [*describe*]. [Defendant has contributed to plaintiff's maintenance the amount of $_____, up to and ending on or about _____ [*date*].]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant, as follows:

1. For an amount representing plaintiff's maintenance until cure [in the sum of $_____];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.171.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used in a California court when a seaman is suing for maintenance and cure resulting from contracting a disabling condition while in the ship's service. With appropriate modifications, it may be adapted for a claim brought in federal court [*see § 522.170*]. The cause of action for maintenance and cure is sometimes joined to a complaint for personal injuries [*see §§ 522.170, 522.171*].

For further discussion, see *§ 522.33*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) contraction by the plaintiff of a disabling condition while in service on or to a ship (Paragraph 5); and (2) expenses incurred for treatment by plaintiff to the extent uncompensated by the defendant (Paragraph 6).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.181

§ 522.181 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30104] for Wrongful Death of Seaman--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] Under Jones Act [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 688] for Wrongful Death of Seaman--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
as _____	)	
[*specify capacity, e.g.,* Administrator (With the Will	)	NO. _____
Annexed) of the Estate *or* Executor of the Will] of	)	COMPLAINT FOR
_____ [*name*], Deceased,	)	DAMAGES FOR
Plaintiff,	)	WRONGFUL DEATH
vs.	)	OF SEAMAN
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was issued letters _____ [*specify, e.g.,* of

administration of the estate (with the will annexed) *or* testamentary of the will] of _____ [*name*] deceased, by the Superior Court of California, County of _____.

2. Plaintiff is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting personal representative of the estate of _____ [*name*], deceased.

3. Plaintiff brings this action as specified under Section 30104 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service, commonly known as the Jones Act, for the death of the decedent as a result of personal injury suffered in the course of decedent's employment as a seaman, and for the benefit of the surviving _____ [spouse (and children) of *or* children of *or* parents of *or* next of kin dependent on] such decedent seaman.

4. The surviving relatives of decedent on whose behalf this action is brought are the following:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

[5. *Capacity and identity of defendant. See § 522.171, Paragraph 1.*]

[6. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

[7. *Defendant as vessel owner. See § 522.171, Paragraph 3.*]

[8. *Hiring of decedent. See § 522.176, Paragraph 3, changing term "plaintiff" to "decedent."*]

[9, 10. *Negligence of defendant and injury to decedent. See § 522.171, Paragraphs 6, 7, changing term "plaintiff" to "decedent."*]

11. As a proximate result of the defendant's negligence, decedent was _____ [*describe injuries, e.g.,* severely burned and hospitalized for several weeks], which injuries ultimately resulted in decedent's death on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*specify location*].

12. Prior to the death of decedent, the above-named relatives were [totally] dependent on decedent for _____ [*describe, e.g.,* financial support, for services of preservation and maintenance of family and home, for nurturing, training, and guiding the children, and for providing love, affection, care, attention, companionship, comfort, and protection through his/her society].

13. As a proximate result of the defendant's negligence described above and the resultant loss of decedent, decedent's relatives have sustained pecuniary loss stemming from the loss of support, services, and society of the decedent [in the sum of $_____].

14. As a further proximate result of the defendant's acts and the loss of decedent, decedent's relative _____ [*name*] has incurred funeral and burial expenses [in the sum of $_____, which is the reasonable value of such services].

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference as though fully set forth below each and every allegation of Paragraphs 1-8 and 11-13 of the First Cause of Action herein.

[16. *Unseaworthiness of vessel as resulting in injuries. See § 522.171, Paragraph 11, or see § 522.173, changing term "plaintiff" to "decedent."*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For general damages [in the sum of $_____];

2. For funeral and burial expenses for _____ [*name*], decedent's _____ [*specify relationship*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.171.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be brought by a personal representative on behalf of a seaman killed during the course of employment. The *form in § 522.182* is a similar form for use by the personal representative of a longshoreman or harbor worker. With appropriate modification, this form may be adapted to present a claim for relief in a federal court [*see § 522.170*]. For further discussion, see *§ 522.31[9]*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.171*

[4] Allegations

This complaint alleges in the first cause of action: (1) issuance of probate letters to the plaintiff's personal representative (Paragraph 1); (2) present qualification of plaintiff to bring suit on behalf of the decedent employee (Paragraph 2); (3) bringing of the present action under the Jones Act (Paragraph 3) [*see 46 U.S.C.S. § 30104*]; (4) the names and relationships of the relatives on whose behalf the action is being brought, and who are so entitled to have it brought (Paragraph 4); (5) decedent's death as a result of defendant's negligence (Paragraph 11); (6) dependency on the decedent by the survivors (Paragraph 12); (7) resultant damages to the survivors (Paragraph 13); and (8) additional expenses of funeral and burial (Paragraph 14). The second cause of action is for unseaworthiness of the vessel (Paragraphs 15, 16).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.182

§ 522.182 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner or Other Third Party

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Longshoreman or Harbor Worker [33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933]--By Personal Representative Against Shipowner or Other Third Party

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
as _____	)	
[*specify capacity, e.g.,* Administrator (With the Will	)	
Annexed) of the Estate *or* Excutor of the Will] of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], Deceased,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR WRONGFUL
Plaintiff,	)	DEATH OF _____
vs.	)	[LONGSHOREMAN *or* HARBOR WORKER]
_____ [*name*],	)	[*33 U.S.C.S. §§ 905(b), 933*]
Defendant.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Issuance of letters to plantiff as fiduciary. See § 522.181, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Plaintiff's capacity as personal representative of decedent's estate. See § 522.181, Pargraph 2.*]

3. Plaintiff brings this action as specified under Sections 905(b) and 933 of Title 33 of the United States Code Service, the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, for the death of the decedent arising out of the course of

decedent's employment as a _____ [longshoreman *or* harbor worker], and for the benefit of the _____ [spouse *or* parent *or* dependent *or* next of kin *or other entitled person*] of such decedent.

[4. *Surviving relatives. See § 522.181, Paragraph 4.*]

[5. *Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 522.171, Paragraph 1.*]

[6. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

[7. *Describe defendant, e.g., as shipowner. See § 522.171, Paragraph 3.*]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], decedent's employer, _____ [*name of employer*], was engaged in rendering stevedoring services on and about the vessel _____ [*name of vessel*] then lying alongside _____ [*describe location of vessel, e.g.,* the dock at Pier 1,] at the Port of _____ [*specify*], and decedent was employed as a _____ [longshoreman *or describe other type of worker*] on that site, and at that time was performing such services on behalf of the employer.

[*EITHER, if injury caused by negligence of shipowner*]

9. Defendant failed to exercise due care under the circumstances toward decedent employee in that _____ [*describe breach of duty, e.g.,* defendant left a thick layer of grease lying in various places on the deck, including decedent's work area]. Defendant thus failed to exercise ordinary care under the circumstances _____ [to have the ship and its equipment in such condition that decedent's employer, as an expert and experienced stevedore, would be able by the exercise of reasonable care to carry on its cargo operations with reasonable safety to persons and property *or* in not warning decedent's employer of hazards _____ (on the ship *or* with respect to the ship's equipment) that were known, or should have been known, to defendant in the exercise of reasonable care, and that were likely to be encountered by decedent's employer in the course of its cargo operations, but were not known by such employer and would not be obvious to or anticipated by it as a stevedore reasonably competent in the performance of its work].

[*OR, if injury caused by negligence of third party other than shipowner*]

9. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant independently provided _____ [services to the vessel *or* decedent's employer with certain equipment and supplies with which to render services] consisting of _____ [*describe, e.g.,* a boom for loading and unloading cargo]. Defendant was negligent in providing such _____ [services *or* equipment] in that _____ [*describe carelessness, e.g.,* the boom was made defectively in that it contained unstable parts, causing the apparatus to rupture under normal strain or normal hours of usage].

[*EITHER, if injuries caused by shipowner*]

10. As a proximate result of the dangerous condition and defendant's negligence, decedent was fatally injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* swinging a crate of cargo, he/she slipped on the layer of grease], thereby sustaining injuries as described below.

[*OR, if injuries caused by negligence of third party other than shipowner*]

10. As a proximate result of defendant's negligence, decedent was fatally injured when _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.*, the wind carried the poisonous fumes to decedent while he/she was working on the decks washed with the deleterious detergent, and he/she became violently ill and died from the effects thereof].

[11-13. *Losses by decedent's survivors. See § 522.181, Paragraphs 12-14.*]

[*Prayer. See § 522.181.*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.171.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint that may be brought by a personal representative on behalf of a longshore or harbor worker killed during the course of employment. A similar form for use by the personal representative of a seaman is *set out in § 522.181*. With appropriate modification, this form may be adapted to present a claim for relief in a federal court [*see § 522.170*]. For further discussion, see *§§ 522.32[5], 522.32[6], 522.170, 522.171, 522.176*, and *522.177*.

For a description of the allegations, see *§ 522.181[4]* regarding the first cause of action in that form.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.183

§ 522.183 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Passenger Against Shipowner

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries--By Passenger Against Shipowner

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Personal Injuries to Ship's Passenger)
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity and identity of defendant. See § 522.171, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegations, if appropriate. See § 522.171, Paragraph 2.*]

3. Defendant is now, at all times herein mentioned was, engaged in the business of operating passenger vessels, as common carriers for hire. In that capacity, defendant operated the _____ [*name, nationality, registry number, or other designation of vessel*].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, as a common carrier for hire, agreed to transport plaintiff from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*]. Pursuant to this agreement, plaintiff was assigned to an upper berth in Cabin No. _____ on the _____ [*describe, e.g.,*

Promenade] Deck of the vessel.

5. Defendant, acting through its agents, servants, and employees on the vessel, negligently _____ [*describe, e.g.,* failed to provide plaintiff with a safe, or any, means of ascending into and descending from the upper berth in his/her cabin] so that on or about _____ [*date*], while the vessel was _____ [on the high seas *or* in _____ (*specify port*)] _____ [*describe injurious incident, e.g.,* plaintiff used a curtain rod attached to the upper berth to assist him in descending from the berth, and the rod broke off, causing him to fall from the berth to the floor of the cabin, resulting in the injuries hereinafter set forth].

6. As a proximate result of defendant's neglect and default, plaintiff was severely injured in that _____ [*describe injuries, e.g.,* his knees were crushed, his hip was dislocated, and his elbows were fractured], leading plaintiff to suffer severe damages.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For general damages;

2. For damages for past and future medical expenses according to proof;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 522.171.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a passenger against a shipowner for personal injuries sustained while traveling on the defendant's vessel.

For discussion of liabilities to passengers on vessels, see *§ 522.36*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) defendant's occupation as a common carrier (Paragraph 3); (2) defendant's arrangement to take plaintiff on the voyage (Paragraph 4); (3) defendant's breach of the duty of care to plaintiff resulting in plaintiff's injury (Paragraph 5); and (4) plaintiff's resultant damages (Paragraph 6).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.184

§ 522.184 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Wrongful Death of Passenger Under Death on the High Seas Act [46 U.S.C.S. § 30301 et seq.]--By Personal Representative of Passenger Against Shipowner

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] for Wrongful Death of Passenger Under Death on the High Seas Act [46 U.S.C.S. app. §§ 761-768]--By Personal Representative of Passenger Against Shipowner

[*EITHER*]
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION
[*OR*]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
as _____	)	
[*specify capacity, e.g.,* Administrator (With the Will	)	
Annexed) of the Estate *or* Executor of the Will] of	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], Deceased,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR WRONGFUL
Plaintiff,	)	DEATH
vs.	)	(Death on the High Seas Act)
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

_____

[1. This action is instituted under the provisions of Section 30301 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service, commonly known and designated as the Death on the High Seas Act, over which the United States District Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Section 30302 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service. (This is an admiralty or maritime

claim within the meaning of *Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*.)]

[2. *Status of plaintiff. See § 522.181, Paragraph 1*.]

[3. *Capacity of plaintiff. See § 522.181, Paragraph 2*.]

4. Plaintiff brings this action in admiralty under Section 30302 of Title 46 of the United States Code Service, known as the Death on the High Seas Act, for the exclusive benefit of the decedent's _____ [spouse *or* parent *or* child *or* dependent relative] for the death of the decedent, which was caused by a wrongful act, neglect, or default occurring on the high seas, against the responsible _____ [person *or* corporation].

[5. *Identity of surviving relatives. See § 522.181, Paragraph 4*.]

[6. *Capacity and identity of defendant. See, e.g., see § 522.170*, Paragraph 2.]

7. Defendant, as a common carrier for hire, agreed to transport the decedent from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*]. Pursuant to that agreement decedent became a passenger on the vessel on or about _____ [*date*].

8. On or about _____ [*date*], while the vessel was on the high seas _____ days out of _____ [*specify port*], [at _____ longitude, _____ latitude,] and while decedent was on board the vessel as a passenger, _____ [*state facts showing marine disaster or accident, e.g.*, so far as is known, the vessel met with some disaster at sea as a result of which the vessel was lost or destroyed].

9. As a proximate result of the disaster, decedent was _____ [killed *or* so seriously injured that he/she died at the time of the disaster or shortly thereafter] [, together with _____ (all the *or* many) other persons on board the vessel].

[10. A quantity of the wreckage from the vessel was recovered floating on the waters of the _____ Ocean, _____ (at approximately _____ latitude and _____ longitude *or* _____ miles from _____ (*nearest land*), or more than three nautical miles from the nearest land) (, including various articles that had been in the possession of decedent). _____ (Neither the body of decedent nor that of any other person on board said vessel at the time of said disaster was recovered *or* Although various crew members and passengers of the vessel were rescued from the deck and surrounding waters, the body of decedent was not recovered).]

11. The death of decedent was caused proximately by the wrongful acts, neglect, or default of defendant, through its agents, servants, and employees, in causing or permitting the above-mentioned disaster. Such act, neglect, default, or carelessness would have entitled decedent, if he/she had not died, to maintain an action against and to recover damages from defendant in respect thereto.

[12. *Dependency of relatives on decedent. See § 522.181, Paragraph 12*.]

[13. *Damages to survivors. See § 522.181, Paragraph 13, changing word "negligence" to phrase "wrongful acts, neglect, or default."*]

14. [*Funeral and burial expenses. See § 522.181, Paragraph 14*.]

[*Prayer. See § 522.181*.]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.150.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used in an action by the personal representative of a ship's passenger against the shipowner under the Death on the High Seas Act (DOHSA). This form may be adapted for use by the personal representative of a maritime employee as an alternative to the actions provided for in the *forms in §§ 522.181* and *522.182*.

The action may be brought in either federal district court or in a California state court, as federal court jurisdiction is concurrent with state jurisdiction to hear DOHSA actions, making available to DOHSA beneficiaries a convenient forum for the decision of their wrongful death claims [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30308(a)*; *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221, 232, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* . However, DOHSA preempts state statutes whenever it applies [*Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 232, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* .

If the death did not occur on the high seas but instead occurred within 3 nautical miles from shore, a wrongful death action based on state law may be brought in state court [*46 U.S.C.S. § 767*; *Offshore Logistics, Inc. v. Tallentire (1986) 477 U.S. 207, 221, 106 S. Ct. 2485, 91 L. Ed. 2d 174]* .

For discussion of recovery for wrongful death, see *§ 522.34*. For discussion and forms relating to state actions for wrongful death, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) the bringing of the action under the federal Death on the High Seas Act (Paragraph 4); (2) defendant's role as a common carrier of the decedent (Paragraph 7); (3) the ship's disaster at sea (Paragraph 8); (4) the resultant death of the decedent (Paragraph 9); (5) the debris evincing a shipwreck and/or the failure to recover decedent's body (Paragraph 10); and defendant's responsibility for the injury and death (Paragraph 11).

If the form is used to bring an action in federal court, it must allege the court's jurisdiction (Paragraph 1) [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*; see *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)* (allegation of admiralty jurisdiction when action combined with nonadmiralty claims)].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.170, 522.181, 522.182*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Personal Injuries

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.185-522.199

[Reserved]

§§ 522.185[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.200

§ 522.200 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Written Contract for Payment of Freight--By Shipowner

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300] for Breach of Written Contract for Payment of Freight--By Shipowner

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	DAMAGES
[a Corporation]	)	(Breach of Contract)
Defendant(s).	)	[*Civ. Code § 3300*]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation, organized and existing under the laws of the State of California [with its principal place of business in (_____ [*city*],) _____ County *or allege other basis of venue as appropriate*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____ inclusive, and

therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

3. Attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof is an agreement, dated _____ [*date*], whereby defendant promised _____ [*state circumstances of payment, e.g.,* to fully pay freight in the amount of $_____ on receipt of goods for shipment by plaintiff, and that the freight was payable ship and/or cargo lost or not lost].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], a shipment of _____ [*describe goods*] _____ [owned by defendant *or* consigned to defendant] was recieved by plaintiff for tranportation from _____ [*specify place*] to _____ [*specify place*].

5. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required by the terms of the parties' contract.

6. There is now due and owing and unpaid the sum of $_____. [Defendant has _____ (refused *or* ignored) plaintiff's demand(s) for payment of freight.]

7. As a result of defendant's breach of contract, plaintiff has suffered damages in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant [s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For compensatory damages, in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I beleive it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint may be used by a shipowner to prosecute an action for breach of contract for freight in state court. Because contracts of affreightment and bills of lading are maritime contracts, the action falls within federal admiralty jurisdiction and can also be brought in federal district court [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* .

Some attorneys prefer to proceed in federal court so that an in personam action based on contract can be combined with an action in rem against the cargo to enforce the shipowner's maritime lien for freight [*see § 522.201*]. Such a proceeding would fall within the exclusive admiralty jurisdiction of federal courts [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560-561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290* ; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C].

Whether the action is maintained in state or federal court, the substantive rules of federal maritime law will determine the rights of the parties [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . State law would apply to fill the gaps in admiralty law, but only to the extent that it did not render changes in the maritime law [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

[3] Allegations

[a] In General

The complaint alleges (1) defendant's identity and capacity to be sued (Paragraph 1); (2) the existence of unknown defendants, if any (Paragraph 2); (3) the existence of the written contract (Paragraph 3); (4) the performance of all conditions by plaintiff (Paragraphs 4, 5); (5) the breach by defendant (Paragraph 6); and (6) the resulting damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 7) [*see Reichert v. General Ins. Co. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 822, 830, 69 Cal. Rptr. 321, 442 P.2d 377* ; *Acoustics, Inc. v. Trepte Constr. Co. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 887, 913, 92 Cal. Rptr. 723]* . Paragraph 3 of the complaint notes that the parties' contract is written. If it cannot be ascertained from the pleading in contract actions whether the agreement is written or oral, the defendant may object by demurrer or answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*]. For additional discussion of contract actions, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[b] Identity and Capacity of Defendants

The complaint alleges an action against a corporate defendant, which may be sued as provided in the Code of Civil Procedure [*Corp. Code § 105*]. When the defendant is not a natural person, the complaint should allege the defendant's identity as an existing entity against which the court's judgment will operate such as a corporation, a partnership, an unincorporated association, or a governmental agency [*see Tanner v. Best (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 442, 445, 104 P.2d 1084]* . For additional forms of pleading and a discussion of actions against defendants in other capacities, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

Conceivably a shipowner involved in a complicated action for freight may need to proceed against defendants who are unknown at the time of filing. The lack of knowledge must be stated in the complaint and the pleading amended on discovery of the defendant's name [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*]. For further discussion and appropriate forms, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* (alternative forms of allegations for use under *Code Civ. Proc. § 474*) and Ch. 21, *Amended Supplemental Pleadings*

The caption must reflect the fact that a defendant is designated by a fictitious name [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.40*]. For appropriate forms of captions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

[c] Venue Facts

Paragraph 1 alleges venue in the county where defendant has its principal place of business. Corporations may also be sued in the county where the contract is made or is to be performed or where the obligation or liability arises, or the

breach occurs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*]. Venue need not be specifically pleaded, although often it is better practice to do so. The defendant always bears the burden of objecting against improper venue [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*]. Venue in actions against unincorporated associations is similar to venue for corporations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.2*].

[d] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages, other than for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint (or cross complaint) must state the amount of damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

[4] Recovery of Interest

Federal maritime law differs from state law on the issue of interest on damages for breach of contract. An admiralty court has discretion to award or deny prejudgment interest [*The Albert Dumois (1900) 177 U.S. 240, 254, 20 S. Ct. 595, 44 L. Ed. 751* ; *Van Nievelt Goudriaan Co's Stoomvart Maatschappij, N.V. v. Cargo & Tankship Mgmt. Corp. (2d Cir. 1970) 421 F.2d 1183, 1185]* . When damages are liquidated and based on breach of contract, the general rule favors allowing interest [*Van Nievelt Goudriaan Co's Stoomvart Maatschappij, N.V. v. Cargo & Tankship Mgmt. Corp. (2d Cir. 1970) 421 F.2d 1183, 1185]* . An award depends on the circumstances in each case [*Gardner v. Calvert (3d Cir. 1958) 253 F.2d 395]* .

In California, interest would be recoverable from the date of breach if the damages are certain or capable of being made certain [*Civ. Code § 3287(a)*]. Damages for unliquidated claims may not include interest for a period earlier than the date an action was filed [*Civ. Code § 3287(b)*; for additional discussion of interest in state court actions, see Ch. 177, *Damages*].

The circuit courts of appeal differ on the issue of postjudgment interest. Federal statutory law provides for the right to interest in civil cases at a rate allowed by state law from the date of entry of the judgment [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1961*]. In at least two circuits, courts have ruled that this rule applies in admiralty cases as well as in traditional civil litigation [*Gele v. Wilson (5th Cir. 1980) 616 F.2d 146, 148* ; *Kotsopoulos v. Asturia Shipping Co., S.A. (2d Cir. 1972) 467 F.2d 91, 95]* . These cases were decided after the admiralty and civil procedure rules merged in 1966. Previously, the Third Circuit ruled that the federal statute's use of a state's interest rate did not apply in admiralty cases because Congress had not created the same provision for maritime matters [*Gardner v. Calvert (3d Cir. 1958) 253 F.2d 395, 402-403]* .

Plaintiffs filing in state court on a maritime contract in which the damages are liquidated should request interest from the date of breach. Although the issue is not absolutely settled, the cases provide adequate grounds for the request.

[5] Verification

The form of verification shown here complies with the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446* and *2015.5*. Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Cross References

For discussion and appropriate forms relating to identifying unknown defendants under *Code Civ. Proc. § 474*, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* , and Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings*

For forms of captions to be used where a party is not a natural person suing in his or her own behalf, see Ch. 108,

Captions and Introductions

For discussion of the elements of a cause of action for damages based on breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For alternative allegations of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of prayers and verification, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* , and Ch. 572, *Verification*

[7] Federal Statutes

Interest on judgments. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1961*

[8] State Statutes

Designation of agreement as written or oral or implied by conduct. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.201

§ 522.201 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Personam and In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] for Freight Charges--By Shipowner--Against Cargo, Shippers, and Consignees

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Personam and In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] for Freight Charges--By Shipowner--Against Cargo, Shippers, and Consignees

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
[a corporation,] as owner of the vessel	)	
_____ [*name of vessel*],	)	Civil Action No. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT
vs.	)	
Certain commercial cargo of the vessel	)	
_____ [*name*]; and	)	
_____ [*name*(*s*)], the	)	
_____ [shipper(s) *and/or* consign-ee(s) *and/or* owner(s)] of the commercial cargo,		
_____ [*repeat for other defendants as appropriate*]		
Defendant.		

_____

1. This is a case of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, as hereinafter more fully appears [, and is an admiralty and maritime claim within the meaning of *Rule 9(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*].

2. Plaintiff is [a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, and] the owner and operator of the merchant vessel _____ [*name*].

[*EITHER*]

3. [On information and belief,] [D]efendant, _____ [*name of corporation*], is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ with an office and place of business at _____ [*specify address*].

[*OR*]

3. Defendant, _____ [*name of corporation*], is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of a foreign nation, the exact nature of the corporate structure of said corporation being unknown to plaintiff, with agents for the conduct of its business located within this district at _____.

[4. Defendants, DOES 1-_____, are corporations existing under the laws of a state of the United States or a country of the world (and defendant, John Doe, is an individual). Said defendants maintain some form of ownership in the cargo, as yet unascertained, and are being sued herein by fictitious names, their true names being unknown to plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

5. The commercial cargo of plaintiff's vessel is now within this district and the jurisdiction of this court and will remain here during the pendency of this action. The cargo will be delivered within the jurisdiction of this court to _____ [*name*], as bailee.

6. Attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof is a bill of lading issued by plaintiff to defendant acknowledging plaintiff's receipt of _____ [*describe goods with reasonable particularity*] on _____ [*date*], for shipment from _____ [*specify place*] to _____ [*specify place*].

7. In the bill of lading, defendant agreed _____ [*state circumstances of payment, e.g.,* to pay full freight to the point of discharge in the sum of $_____ on receipt of the goods for shipment by plaintiff. The freight was payable in full, either prior to transportation or at the destination, ship and/or cargo lost or not lost].

8. Defendant(s), _____ [shipper(s) *and/or* consignee(s) *and/or* owner(s)] of said commercial cargo, have [refused *or* ignored] plaintiff's demands for payment of freight due in the sum of $_____. Plaintiff has performed all obligations and conditions precedent required under the bill of lading embodying the parties' agreement.

9. Under maritime law, plaintiff maintains a lien for possession of defendant's cargo until freight charges are paid in full. Plaintiff claims a lien on said commercial cargo in the total amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays as follows:

1. For issuance of process against defendant cargo according to this court's practice in admiralty and maritime cases;

2. For condemnation and sale of defendant cargo to pay the amount due and owing to plaintiff with interest and costs;

3. For judgment against defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*], _____ [consignee(s) *and/or* shipper(s) *and/or* owner(s)] for damages in the amount of $_____.

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 522.150.*]

CAUTION:
The complaint in an action in rem must be verified on oath or solemn affirmation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)].

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint may be used for an action in rem and in personam in federal district court. Federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over admiralty in rem actions against cargo, vessels, or other property [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560-561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . Attorneys who wish to rely on the shipowner's maritime lien against the cargo as the basis of an action for freight must therefore proceed in federal court. The existence of an in rem cause of action does not, however, deprive a party of the alternative right to an action in personam based on the contract or debt [*see, e.g., F.T. Rounds v. Cloverport Foundry & Mach. Co. (1915) 237 U.S. 303, 307-308, 35 S. Ct. 596, 59 L. Ed. 966* ; Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(1)]. Frequently, attorneys combine actions in rem and in personam in a federal court proceeding, instead of choosing between one or the other. For additional discussion of admiralty jurisdiction and the choice of state or federal forum, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

A person proceeding in rem may alternatively proceed in personam with process of maritime attachment and garnishment [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(1)]. Essentially the same provisions apply to both types of action. Process of attachment cannot be used against a defendant's goods or property, however, unless the defendant cannot be found within the district [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule B(1)].

[3] Venue

An action in rem must be filed in the district where the property that is the subject of the action is located [*see* Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rules C(2), E(3)(a)].

[4] Allegations

[a] In General

A complaint in rem must state the circumstances from which the claim arises with such particularity that the defendant

or claimant will be able, without moving for a more definite statement, to commence an investigation of the facts and to frame a responsive pleading [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(2)].

[b] Jurisdictional Statement (Paragraph 1)

A complaint in federal court must contain a short and plain statement of the court's jurisdictional base [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(a)*]. Because an in rem action falls within exclusive admiralty jurisdiction, the paragraph's additional, bracketed information regarding *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*, need not be included. If a claim has another ground for federal jurisdiction, the complaint may use the language in brackets to assure application of civil rules pertaining only to admiralty cases [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*]. For additional discussion, see *§ 522.170*.

[c] Identification and Capacity of Parties (Paragraphs 2, 3)

In federal court, it is not necessary to state the capacity of a party to sue or be sued, except to the extent required to show the court's jurisdiction [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(a)*]. The complaint alleges plaintiff's ownership of the vessel to show plaintiff's right to the maritime lien on the cargo.

The capacity of a corporation to sue or be sued depends on the law under which it was organized [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 17(b)*]. Calfornia authorizes corporations to sue and be sued in accordance with the Code of Civil Procedure [*Corp. Code § 105*].

[d] Fictitious Defendants (Paragraph 4)

Attorneys should be very cautious about naming fictitious or unknown defendants in a federal court complaint. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure neither authorize nor disapprove of such practice, but the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has ruled against the procedure on several occasions [*Craig v. United States (9th Cir. 1969) 413 F.2d 854, 856-857* ; *Sigurdson v. Del Guercio (9th Cir. 1956) 241 F.2d 480, 482]* . The court's primary objection has been the difficulty of determining the defendants' residences for purposes of jurisdiction in diversity cases [*Molnar v. National Broad. Co. (9th Cir. 1956) 231 F.2d 684, 685-687]* . Alleging "Doe" defendants has also been considered "dangerous" in federal question and admiralty cases [*Sigurdson v. Del Guercio (9th Cir. 1956) 241 F.2d 480, 482* ; *California Stevedore & Ballast Co. v. Pan-Atlantic S.S. Corp. (9th Cir. 1961) 291 F.2d 252, 253* (admiralty case in which court alludes to obstacles in naming fictitious defendants)]. On the other hand, one district court approved of the practice in admiralty suits because of the traditionally liberal pleading rules [*Phillips v. United States (N.D. Cal. 1955) 127 F. Supp. 912, 914-916]* .

In California state courts, plaintiffs are allowed to sue defendants who are unknown at the time of filing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*]. The state's permissive rule has not made federal courts more inclined to approve the procedure [*Molnar v. National Broad. Co. (9th Cir. 1956) 231 F.2d 684, 685-687]* . For additional discussion of the California rule, see *§ 522.200*.

[e] Presence of Property Within Judicial District (Paragraph 5)

The complaint for an action in rem must state that the property being sued is located within the district or will be there during the pendency of the action [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)].

This form of complaint also states that the cargo will be delivered within the jurisdiction of the court to a bailee. Usually in actions against cargo for freight, the plaintiff will already maintain possession or some form of control over the goods, thereby facilitating execution of process on the property. For a discussion of process, see *§§ 522.201[5], 522.201[6], and 522.202 -522.205*.

[f] Description of Goods (Paragraph 6)

The complaint in an action in rem must describe the property that is the subject of the action with reasonable particularity [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)]. The complaint should state what the property is and where it can be found, such as "1,000 bushels of wheat as cargo of *The Magnate* moored at pier 87 in Oakland, California."

[g] Breach of Contract for Freight

Paragraphs 6, 7, and 8 contain the allegations essential in a breach of contract action: (1) existence of the written contract; (2) performance of all the conditions by plaintiff; (3) the breach by defendant; and (4) damage to the plaintiff [*see Reichert v. General Ins. Co. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 822, 830, 69 Cal. Rptr. 321, 442 P.2d 377* ; *Acoustics, Inc. v. Trepte Constr. Co. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 887, 913, 92 Cal. Rptr. 723]* .

[h] Existence of Maritime Lien (Paragraph 9)

An action in rem may be brought to enforce any maritime lien [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(1)]. The shipowner's lien against the cargo for freight arises when the owner takes possession for transportation unless it is excluded by the parties' agreement. Usually the bill of lading or contract of affreightment will contain a provision recognizing the lien and possibly preserving its existence beyond delivery if payment is not due until a later time [*Bird of Paradise v. Heyneman (1867) 72 U.S. 545, 554-558, 18 L. Ed. 662]* .

[5] Process Against Cargo

The prayer requests process against the defendant cargo and an in personam judgment against the individual defendant or defendants based on breach of contract.

The verified complaint and any supporting papers shall be reviewed by the court and, if the conditions for an action in rem appear to exist, an order so stating and authorizing a warrant for the arrest of the property that is the subject of the action shall issue and be delivered to the clerk who shall prepare the warrant and deliver it to the marshal for service. If the property that is the subject of the action consists in whole or in part of freight, or the proceeds of property sold, or other intangible property, the clerk shall issue a summons directing any person having control of the funds to show cause why they should not be paid into court to abide the judgment. Supplemental process enforcing the court's order may be issued by the clerk on application without further order of the court. If the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney certifies that exigent circumstances make review by the court impracticable, the clerk shall issue a summons and warrant for the arrest and the plaintiff shall have the burden on a post-arrest hearing under Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(4)(f) (relating to procedure for release from arrest or attachment) to show that exigent circumstances existed [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(3)]. Process in rem can be served only within the judicial district [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(3)(a)]. The marshal is required to execute process against tangible property by taking it into possession for safe custody, unless such action would be impracticable [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(4)(b)]. In such case, a copy of the process must be affixed to the property in a conspicuous place and a copy of the complaint and process left with the person having possession or his or her agent [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(4)(b)].

In actual practice, attorneys may be required to prepare and submit a warrant for arrest of the property [*see § 522.202*]. Service may be effected by any person, not a party, who is at least 18 years of age. At the request of the plaintiff, however, the court may direct that service be effected by a United States marshal, deputy United States marshal, or other person or officer appointed by the court specially for that purpose. Such an appointment is mandatory when the plaintiff is authorized to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to *28 U.S.C.S. § 1915* or as a seaman under *28 U.S.C.S. § 1916* [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 4(c)(2)*]. In some districts, attorneys must obtain service of process by the sheriff or other

person authorized to execute process in state court actions, with the marshal's services being available only on court order. The court clerk should be consulted before filing to determine the appropriate local practice. For a form of proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[6] Execution or Stay of Process

In an action for freight, the shipowner will usually retain possession of the cargo, turn it over to a bailee for safe keeping, or release it to the shipper in return for some other kind of security. Under these circumstances, execution of process will probably not be difficult. The plaintiff may want to have the issuance and delivery of process held in abeyance until the parties reach an agreement as to the immediate disposition of the property [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(3)(b)]. The parties may also stipulate to have process stayed or the property released pending resolution of the litigation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(a)].

After the clerk issues process, execution must be stayed or the property must be released if the defendant gives security in the form of a special bond. A special bond pertains to a specific in rem action and cannot be filed until after process in rem is issued [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(a)]. In contrast, a general bond may be filed with respect to a vessel only, in anticipation of litigation. The defendant need not wait for issuance of process [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(b); *see § 522.204[4]* regarding general bonds].

The parties may stipulate the amount and nature of the bond or security, or on their inability or refusal to do so, the court will set the terms [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(a)].

Seized property may be released on approval by the marshal of a stipulation or bond signed by the party on whose behalf the property is being detained. Otherwise, that party must obtain a court order, which the clerk may grant as a matter of course on the giving of adequate security under the rules or applicable statute. In either event, all costs and charges for seizing and holding the property must be paid prior to its release [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rules E(4)(e), (5)(c); *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*].

[7] Relief From Arrest

[a] Prompt Hearing

Any person claiming an interest in arrested property shall be entitled to a prompt hearing at which the plaintiff shall be required to show why the arrest should not be vacated or other relief granted consistent with the rules [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(4)(f)].

[b] Immediate Sale of Seized Property

Under certain circumstances the arrested cargo may be sold immediately and the proceeds paid into the registry of the court for disposal [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(9)]. The rule provides for such action under any of the following conditions: (1) if the property is perishable; (2) if the property is liable to deterioration, decay, or injury by being detained pending resolution of the action; (3) if the expense of keeping the property is excessive or disproportionate; or (4) if there is unreasonable delay in securing release of the property [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(9)].

[8] Verification

In an action in rem the complaint must be verified on oath or solemn affirmation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)].

[9] Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Pleading admiralty and maritime claims. *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9(h)*

Actions in rem. Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rules C, E

[10] Text References

Bender's Federal Practice Forms, Vol. 4, Pt. II, §§ 1-5, 8.2, 13 (Matthew Bender)

Benedict on Admiralty, §§ 183-190 (Matthew Bender)

Moore's Federal Practice, §§ 9.02, 702.02, 703.06[2], 704.02[3], 704.03[3], 705.04 (Matthew Bender)

[11] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.202 -522.205*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.202

§ 522.202 Warrant [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(3)] for Arrest of Cargo, Vessel, or Other Property

[1] FORM Warrant [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(3)] for Arrest of Cargo, Vessel, or Other Property

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. _____
_____ [*name(s) and/or*	)	WARRANT
description of property]	)	
Defendant(s)	)	
	)	
	)	

The President of the United States of America, to the Marshal of the United States for the _____ District of California--Greetings:

A complaint was filed in the United States District Court for the _____ District of California on

_____ [*date*], by _____ [*name of plaintiff*] against cargo of the vessel _____ [*name*], consisting of _____ [*describe cargo as in complaint*], in a _____ [*specify type of action, e.g.,* tort action], civil and maritime, in which the amount demanded is $_____ for the reasons and causes in the complaint, and requesting the usual process of this court in admiralty and maritime cases, and the condemnation and sale of the cargo for payment of the plaintiff's demands.

You are hereby ordered to attach the cargo and to retain it in your custody until further order of this court.

You are further ordered to make your return of service together with this writ.

Witness, the Honorable

_____

[*name*],

Judge of this court at

_____

[*city and county*]

in _____

[*district*],

this

_____

day of

_____

[*date*].

_____

Clerk

By _____ [*signature*]
Deputy Clerk

[2] Use of Form

This warrant must be used in conjunction with the *form in § 522.201* whenever an action in rem is filed against cargo, a vessel, or other property.

The warrant (writ) is signed by the judge and clerk of the court and commands the United States Marshal to take possession of the cargo, vessel, or property, pending further order of the court.

This writ should be submitted to the judge at the same time as the complaint is filed so that the signed warrant can be delivered to the United States Marshal along with the complaint. At least three copies of the warrant and the complaint should be provided to the marshal along with the originals. The originals are returned to the court, one copy of each is provided to the vessel or the person in charge of the vessel, and two copies are retained by the marshal.

One copy of the writ should be submitted for each individual, company, or corporation to be served. For service of process on an officer or agent of the United States Government, submit one copy of the writ for each officer or agent upon whom service is desired, plus an additional three writs for service on the Government of the United States.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.201* and *522.204*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.203

§ 522.203 Stipulation Between Shipowner and Shipper for Release of Cargo From Shipowner's Lien for Freight and Posting of Security for Judgment

[1] FORM Stipulation Between Shipowner and Shipper for Release of Cargo From Shipowner's Lien for Freight and Posting of Security for Judgment

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. _____
vs.	)	STIPULATION FOR
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	RELEASE OF CARGO
Defendant(s).	)	[Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty
	)	and Maritime Claims, Rules C, E(5)]
	)	

_____

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between plaintiff and defendant(s) through their respective counsel as follows:

1. Physical service of process on defendant cargo shall not be necessary. All cargo shall be deemed seized in this action without further steps by any party.

2. The cargo shall be released [into the custody of defendant _____ (*name*) *or* to the consignees of defendant _____ (*name*) entitled to delivery].

3. In consideration for release of the cargo, defendant shall post security with the court in the amount of $_____, representing the amount of freight due according to plaintiff's complaint.

4. The security posted by defendant shall be conditioned on answering the judgment of this court or any appellate court in the amount of the principal sum or less, with interest on that sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum while suit is pending.

5. The release of the cargo by plaintiff and posting of security by defendant shall not prejudice the claims of the parties or other claimants in the cargo or freight allegedly due for shipment.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Defendant

[2] Use of Form

This form of stipulation for release of cargo may be used in actions in rem against cargo for freight. The form may be used in conjunction with the *form in § 522.201*, a federal in rem complaint against cargo for freight.

By stipulation, the parties can stay execution of process and agree for the posting of a bond as security by the defendant. Use of this stipulation in a shipowner's action against cargo will facilitate the proceedings because the marshal will not need to actually serve process on the goods and the defendant can obtain immediate possession from the plaintiff. If the property has already been seized, the parties may stipulate as to its release or the defendant individually may secure the property by posting security [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)].

If the property is not released within 10 days after process is executed, the plaintiff must give public notice of the action in a newspaper of general circulation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(4)].

Furthermore, if the parties wait until after the marshal has taken custody of the property before stipulating as to its release, all costs and charges of the court and its officers must be paid prior to the release. Otherwise, release may be obtained by court order (as a matter of course by the clerk) if security for costs is posted [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(c)].

[3] Contents

The form states the elements necessary to bring the property before the court for purposes of the judicial proceeding and to release it to defendant to facilitate commerce. It provides for waiver of execution of process (Paragraph 1), release of the cargo (Paragraph 2), posting of security (Paragraph 3), and the conditioning of security on answering the court's judgment (Paragraph 4) [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(a)]. Finally, the stipulation protects the plaintiff's lien for freight and the defendant's claim to the cargo by noting that the release does not prejudice these rights (Paragraph 5).

[4] Federal Statutes

Fees to be collected by United States marshals. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*

[5] Text References

Moore's Federal Practice, § 704.02 (Matthew Bender)

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.201, 522.204*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.204

§ 522.204 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem and In Personam for Property Damage--By Shipowner--Against Vessel and Other Shipowner--Collision

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem and In Personam for Property Damage--By Shipowner--Against Vessel and Other Shipowner--Collision

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. _____
The Motor Vessel _____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT
her Engines, Boats, Tackle, Apparel, and Furniture,	)	
and _____ [*name of owner*],	)	
Defendants.	)	

_____

[1. *Allegation of admiralty jurisdiction. See § 522.201, Paragraph 1*.]

2. [*Identity and capacity of plaintiff (to the extent necessary to show court's jurisdiction). See § 522.201, Paragraph 2*.]

[3. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See § 522.201, Paragraph 3*.]

[4. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.201, Paragraph 4.*]

5. The defendant vessel, _____ [*name*], _____ [is now within this district and the jurisdiction of this court and will remain here during the pendency of this action *or* will be within this district and the juridiction of this court during the pendency of this action].

6. On _____ [*date*], while on a voyage to _____ [*specify port*] from _____ [*specify port*], plaintiff's vessel and the defendant vessel collided. The collision occurred on _____ [*state the type of waters on which the impact occurred, e.g.,* the high seas].

7. At the time of collision, defendant vessel carried the flag of _____ and was owned and operated by defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*], _____ [citizen(s) of *and/or* corporation(s) organized under the laws of] _____ [*name of country and/or state, as appropriate*]. Plaintiff's vessel operates under the flag of _____ [*name of country*].

8. The collision was not caused by any fault, negligence, or lack of due care on the part of plaintiff's vessel.

9. The collision occurred because of the negligence and fault of defendant, _____ [*name*], and of the officers, crew, agents, and associates of defendant's vessel.

10. At the time of the collision, defendant vessel was in violation of _____ [*specify set of navigational rules violated, e.g.,* the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, Title 33 of United States Code Service, Sections 1601-1608] in the following particulars:

a. _____ [*List violations, e.g.,* Defendant vessel failed to keep a proper lookout;

b. Defendant vessel was navigated at an excessive speed continuously until the impact of collision].

11. As a proximate result of the collision and defendants' negligence, faults, and errors, plaintiff's vessel _____ [was severely damaged *or* was totally destroyed].

[*EITHER*]

12. Plaintiff has suffered damages in the amount of $_____.

[*OR*]

12. The total amount of damages, costs, and expenses cannot now be ascertained with certainty, but plaintiff is informed and believes that they will approximate the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays as follows:

1. For issuance of process against defendant vessel, including the gear, engine, tackle, apparel, and furniture, according to this court's practice in admiralty and maritime cases;

2. For condemnation and sale of defendant vessel to pay the amount due and owing to plaintiff with interest from the date of the collision until judgment is satisfied and for costs of this action;

3. For judgment against defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*] for damages in the amount of $_____;

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem just and proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 522.150.*]

CAUTION:
The complaint in an action in rem must be verified on oath or solemn affirmation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used for an action in rem and in personam for damages against a vessel and its owner or owners in federal district court. If prosecuted in state court, the action based on a collision could only be brought in personam because of the exclusive federal admiralty jurisdiction over in rem actions [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290* ; *see § 522.200[2]*].

This complaint should be used in conjunction with the *form in § 522.152*, a warrant for arrest of the property being sued. As written, the *form in § 522.152* pertains to the arrest of a vessel's cargo. It can be converted for use in an action against a vessel by merely replacing references to "cargo" with the words "vessel, including gear, engine, tackle, apparel, and furniture" or simply "vessel," as appropriate.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges: (1) admiralty jurisdiction (Paragraph 1); (2) identity and capacity of plaintiff and defendant(s) to the extent necessary to show the court's jurisdiction (Paragraphs 2, 3); (3) the existence of unknown defendants, if any (Paragraph 4); (4) the presence or future arrival of the vessel within the district (Paragraph 5); (5) the fact of collision (Paragraph 6); (6) the countries under which the vessels operate, for purposes of determining applicable law (Paragraph 7); (7) the absence of fault on the part of plaintiff's vessel (Paragraph 8); (8) the negligence of defendants, including statutory violations (Paragraphs 9, 10); (9) causation between defendants' negligence and plaintiff's damage (Paragraph 11); and (10) damages to the plaintiff (Paragraph 12) [*Ishizaki Kisen Co., Ltd. v. United States (9th Cir. 1975) 510 F.2d 875, 879, 880* ; *States S.S. Co. v. Permanente S.S. Corp. (9th Cir. 1956) 231 F.2d 82, 86-88]* .

[4] Process Against Vessel

[a] Bond

Process against a vessel proceeds in much the same manner as execution against cargo. The vessel owner, however, may file a general bond which protects the vessel from seizure in all or any actions that may be brought thereafter. The amount of the bond must be at least double the aggregate amount claimed by plaintiffs in all actions begun and pending and remain at that amount in order to protect the vessel from execution of process [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(b)].

Thus the amount of the bond must be increased as additional claims are presented. The special bond or security discussed above in relation to an action against cargo applies only in a specific action after process is issued, in contrast to the general bond. If a special bond is given in a particular case, the liability on the general bond shall cease as to that case [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(b)].

[b] Costs of Seizure

The Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims do not alter provisions of the United States Code Service relating to the expenses of seizing and keeping attached or arrested property [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(4)(e)]. When the plaintiff in an in rem action against a vessel seeks execution of process, the United States Marshal must be paid in advance a deposit to cover initial expenses for storage, moving, keeping, and other costs. Additional amounts must be paid as necessary during the course of the litigation [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*]. The plaintiff can avoid or reduce the marshal's fee by substituting another custodian, such as a boatyard [*see § 522.205*].

Before any seized property can be released under a stipulation or special bond, all costs and charges of the court and its officers must be paid [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule E(5)(c)]. Thus in order to save costs, plaintiff and defendant should attempt to stipulate as to disposal of the property pending a resolution of the dispute before process is executed. The *form in § 522.203* is a stipulation providing for the release of cargo in an action in rem. It can easily be converted for use in an action against a vessel by replacing references to "cargo" with the words "vessel, including gear, engine, tackle, apparel, and furniture" or simply "vessel," as appropriate.

[5] Prejudgment Interest

The complaint requests interest from the date of the collision forward. An award of prejudgment interest in admiralty cases is discretionary with the trial judge, but the discretion must be exercised with a view to the right of interest, barring exceptional circumstances. In collision cases, prejudgment interest is not a penalty but an element of compensation for the period after destruction when the owner has lost the use of the vessel. Exceptional circumstances justifying denial of interest include unwarranted delay by counsel and the absence of evidence proving loss of use [*Alkmeon Naviera, S.A. v. M/V "Marina L" (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 789, 797, 798]* .

[6] Federal Statutes

United States marshal's fees. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1921*

[7] Decisions

Law of common flag applies when both ships are of same registry. *Alkmeon Naviera, S.A. v. M/V "Marina L" (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 789, 793*

Law of place of collision applies when collision is in foreign territorial waters. *Ishizaki Kisen Co., Ltd. v. United States (9th Cir. 1975) 510 F.2d 875, 879*

[8] Text References

Moore's Federal Practice, Ch. 705 (Matthew Bender)

[9] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.201 -522.203*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.205

§ 522.205 Motion For Transfer of Custody of Vessel From United States Marshal To Marina--By Plaintiff

[1] FORM Motion For Transfer of Custody of Vessel From United States Marshal To Marina--By Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Civil Action No. _____
vs.	)	MOTION TO
The Motor Vessel _____	)	TRANSFER CUSTODY
[*name*], her Engines, Boats, Tackle, Apparel, and	)	OF VESSEL AND
Furniture, and	)	NOTICE
_____ [*name of owner*],	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

The plaintiff moves the court to transfer custody of defendant vessel from the United States Marshal to _____ [*name of new custodian (marina or other facility)*] located at _____ [*address*]. In support of this motion, plaintiff states the following:

1. Defendant vessel is presently berthed at _____ [*specify boatyard*] [where it was seized by the

United States Marshal on _____ *date*)]. _____ [*Name*] has agreed to act as custodian of defendant vessel, until further order of this court, for a sum of $_____, including wharfage and routine services required for the safekeeping of the vessel.

2. _____ [*Name*] has adequate facilities and supervision for the proper safekeeping of defendant vessel, and has in effect adequate insurance to cover any liability for failure to do so.

[3. Defendant vessel must be moved to _____ [*specify place*] in order to effect the transfer of custody. _____ [*Name*] has agreed to perform the move and to provide insurance for loss, damage, or liability of the vessel during the movement, all for the sum of $_____.]

4. Plaintiff agrees to release the United States Marshal from any and all liability and responsibility for the care and custody of defendant vessel on surrender of possession to _____ [*name of substitute custodian*]. Plaintiff further agrees to hold the marshal harmless from any claims arising out of the custody of _____ [*name of substitute custodian*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

NOTICE

Please take notice that the above motion will be heard by this court at _____ [*street address*] on _____ [*day of week*], _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

CAUTION:

In the Northern District of California, each notice of motion must be accompanied by affidavits or declarations under penalty of perjury sufficient to support any material factual contentions, by an appropriate memorandum or brief, and by a copy of a proposed form of order [U.S. Dist. Ct., No. Dist. of Cal., Rule 220-2]. In the Southern District, a brief and complete memorandum of points and authorities must be served and filed [U.S. Dist. Ct., So. Dist. of Cal., Rule 220-8(a)].

[2] Use of Form

This form of motion may be used in any in rem action against a vessel. The substitution of a private boatyard or marina may save the plaintiff a portion of the marshal's fee for maintaining custody of the vessel [*28 U.S.C.S. § 1921* (requires advance deposit to U.S. Marshal for seizing and maintaining custody over vessel); *see § 522.72[5]*].

Local rules of court in both the Northern and Southern Districts of California permit this motion. If the order is presented before execution of process against the vessel, it could preclude costs of the initial seizure. The local rules do not expressly provide for a pre execution motion, but merely state that the notice must be given to the marshal and all parties who have appeared [U.S. Dist. Ct., No. Dist. of Cal., Rule 610-2(b), U.S. Dist. Ct., So. Dist. of Cal., Rule 310-2(b)(1)].

[3] Contents of Form

The form states (1) the amount to be charged by the new custodian (Paragraph 1); (2) the adequacy of the new custodian's facilities, supervision, and insurance coverage (Paragraph 2); (3) the necessity of moving the vessel and insurance coverage for the move, if a move is involved (Paragraph 3); and (4) release of the marshal from liability for custody of the vessel. The court's order allowing transfer of custody must fix fees to be charged and provide for their payment to the marshal in advance. If a move is involved, the judge may require the insurance referred to in Paragraph 3 [U.S. Dist. Ct., No. Dist. of Cal., Rule 610-2(b), U.S. Dist. Ct., So. Dist. of Cal., Rule 310-2(b)(1)].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.201*, *522.204*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.206

§ 522.206 Complaint for Damages--By Tow Owner--Against Tug Owner--Damage to Tow

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages--By Tow Owner--Against Tug Owner--Damage to Tow

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Negligence)
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 522.200, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.200, Paragraph 2.*]

3. Defendant _____ [*name*] is the owner of the tug _____ [*name of vessel*].

4. On _____ [*date*], defendant agreed to tow plaintiff's barge [, _____ (*name, if appropriate*),] with cargo, from _____ [*specify port*] to _____ [*specify port*].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], during the towage, plaintiff's barge sustained damages as follows:

_____ [*describe nature and location of damages*].

6. The damages to plaintiff's barge were caused by defendant's negligence in _____ [*state facts of negligence in navigation, e.g.*, straying off course and failing to adhere to the channel's navigational markers, resulting in collision between plaintiff's barge and floating logs and debris].

7. As the result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff has suffered damages to the barge in the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after the date of the accident;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.200.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used in a state court in personam action for damages to a tow during towage. The tow owner may also maintain an action in rem against the tug in federal district court. The complaint could easily be adapted for use in federal court by adding allegations of admiralty jurisdiction and the presence, or expected presence, of the tug within the judicial district during the pendency of the action [*see §§ 522.201* and *522.204* regarding complaints in rem and in personam against cargo and a vessel].

Regardless of where the action is filed, the substantive rules of federal maritime law will govern the rights of the parties [*Intagliata v. Shipowners & Merchs. Towboat Co., Ltd. (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 365, 371, 159 P.2d 1]* . State law will apply, but only to the extent that it does not render changes in maritime law [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges: (1) defendant's identity and capacity to be sued (Paragraph 1); (2) the existence of unknown defendants, if any (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*]; (3) defendant's ownership of the tug and the agreement to tow plaintiff's barge (Paragraphs 3, 4); (4) damages to plaintiff's barge during the tow (Paragraph 5); (5) defendant's negligence which proximately caused the damages (Paragraph 6); and (6) the amount of plaintiff's damages [*Stevens v. White City (1932) 285 U.S. 195, 200-202, 52 S. Ct. 347, 76 L. Ed. 699]* .

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200, 522.201, 522.204*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
1. Actions by Shipowners

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 522.207-522.219

[Reserved]

§§ 522.207[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.220

§ 522.220 Complaint In Personam for Cargo Damage or Loss--By Shipper or Consignee

[1] FORM Complaint In Personam for Cargo Damage or Loss--By Shipper or Consignee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Cargo _____ (Loss *or* Damage))
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See § 522.200, Paragraph 1*].

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 522.200, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff delivered to defendant certain cargo consisting of _____ [*describe cargo, including number of cartons or freight units*] for transporation from the Port of _____ to _____ [*port of destination*].

4. Plaintiff delivered the cargo in apparent good order and condition, as evidenced by a bill of lading signed and issued by _____ [defendant *or* the authorized agent of defendant]. A true copy of the bill of lading is attached

hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

[*EITHER*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], the cargo arrived in _____ [*state destination or point of discharge*] aboard the vessel _____ [*name*], and on discharge by _____ [defendant *or* defendant's agent] was not in good order and condition because _____ [*describe damage, e.g.,* of contact with sea water].

[*OR*]

5. Plaintiff's cargo was loaded aboard the vessel _____ [*name*], which left _____ [*port of embarkation*] on or about _____ [*date*]. _____ [On arrival of the vessel in _____ (*port of destination*), plaintiff's cargo was not found *or* The vessel and all cargo, including plaintiff's, was lost at sea]. Plaintiff's cargo has not been delivered.

[6. Plaintiff notified defendant of damages to the cargo _____ (by notation on the bill of lading attached as Exhibit A *or* by letter dated _____ [*date*], a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof).]

7. As a result of defendant's _____ [loss of *or* damage to] plaintiff's cargo, plaintiff has suffered damages in the sum of $_____.

8. Plaintiff has performed all conditions precedent required by the bill of lading attached as Exhibit A. [Defendant has _____ (refused *or* ignored) plaintiff's demands of payment for the cargo _____ (loss *or* damage).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant [s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For compensatory damages, in the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the sum of $_____ from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 522.200.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used to bring a state court action in personam against a shipowner or carrier for cargo damage or

loss. Generally, the rights of the parties will be controlled by the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note] or the Harter Act [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 et seq*].

An attorney may also file an in personam and in rem action combined, or either one individually, in federal district court. A complaint in rem against the vessel must be filed in federal court because of the exclusive admiralty jurisdiction over actions in rem [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . The *forms in §§ 522.201* and *522.204* are examples of federal complaints in rem and in personam. The *form in § 522.204*, an action against a vessel in rem for damages arising out of a collision, can be adapted for use in a federal court action for cargo damage or loss by substitution of the factual allegations of loss or damage in this state court complaint for the factual allegations of negligence from collision in the *form in § 522.204*. The allegations, in the *form in § 522.204*, of admiralty jurisdiction and presence of the vessel within the judicial district, should be included in the cargo damage or loss complaint without changes.

For additional discussion of admiralty jurisdiction and choice of state or federal forum, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Delivery of Cargo for Transportation (Paragraph 4)

The complaint alleges that the cargo was delivered to the defendant in apparent good order for transportation, as evidenced by the bill of lading. The bill of lading is both the receipt for delivery and the parties' contract when issued by a common carrier. The bill will note the condition of the cargo when received by the carrier [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(3); *46 U.S.C.S. § 30703(b), 1303(3)*]. For additional discussion of the nature of bills of lading, see *§ 522.71*.

Owners of cargo, as parties to bills of lading, had a relationship sufficient to support an in personam claim against the vessel owners, even though the owners did not deliver cargo to the vessel and did not receive bills of lading from the vessel, when the cargo was delivered to non-vessel-operating common carriers (NVOCCs), which delivered the cargo in containers to the vessel and received nonnegotiable bills of lading, and when the bills of lading did not name any individual parties as "the Merchant," and "Merchant" was defined only as "includ[ing] the shipper, consignor, consignee, owner and receiver of the Goods and the Holder of this Bill of Lading" [*All Pac. Trading, Inc. v. Vessel M/V Hanjin Yosu (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1427, 1433]* .

[b] Damage or Loss (Paragraph 5)

Plaintiff's prima facie case will be established by showing that the cargo was damaged when discharged from the ship after being received for transportation in apparent good order [*Nissho-Iwai Co. Ltd. v. M/T Stolt Lion (2d Cir. 1980) 617 F.2d 907, 911, 912]* . Therefore, Paragraph 5 contains the allegation of loss or damage on discharge.

[c] Notice of Loss or Damage (Paragraph 6)

Paragraph 6 is optional because plaintiff need not give notice of the loss or damage in order to prosecute an action. If notice is not given, however, removal of the goods shall be prima facie evidence of delivery as described in the bill of lading [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 3(6)]. Thus if the cargo was in apparent good order when delivered to the carrier and no notice of loss or damage was given on removal after discharge, the bill of lading's statement would be rebuttable evidence of good order on discharge from the ship [*Blasser Bros. v. Northern Pan-Am. Line (5th Cir. 1980) 628 F.2d 376, 381]* .

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200, 522.201, 522.204*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.221

§ 522.221 Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to Cargo--Cargo Lost or Damaged Due to Perils of Sea [46 U.S.C.S. § 30701 note, § 4(2)(c); 46 U.S.C.S. § 30706(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to Cargo--Cargo Lost or Damaged Due to Perils of Sea [46 U.S.C.S. app. § 1304(2)(c)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], the _____ [*name of vessel*] encountered _____ [*describe peril, e.g.,* a storm with high seas and winds of typhoon force] while transporting cargo between _____ [*specify place*] and _____ [*specify place*]. During the course of the storm, _____ [*describe events which caused cargo damage, e.g.,* hatches were torn off the main hold, allowing sea water to enter and damage a number of shipments, including those of the plaintiff].

2. Any loss or damage to the cargo was due to the perils and dangers of the sea for which this defendant is not liable or responsible under Section _____ [30701 note, § 4, or 30706] of Title 46 of the United States Code.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be included by the defendant when claiming that any damage to or loss of the cargo was due to a cause for which the carrier is not held responsible under the Carriage of Goods by Sea Act or the Harter Act. *46 U.S.C.S. § 30706* refers to the Harter Act exemptions.

The same form may be used to assert any of the other statutory defenses, such as act of God, act of war, or riots and civil commotions [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2); *46 U.S.C.S. § 30706(b)*]. The complete lists of exceptions are provided in §§ 522.71[4][c] and 522.71[5][a].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200, 522.220*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.222

§ 522.222 Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to or Loss of Cargo--Exoneration From Liability When Damage or Loss Caused by Fire [46 U.S.C.S. §§ 30504, 30701 note, § 4(2)(b)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense by Shipowner to Action for Damage to or Loss of Cargo--Exoneration From Liability When Damage or Loss Caused by Fire [46 U.S.C.S. app. §§ 182, 1304(2)(b)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. The _____ [damage *or* loss] enumerated in plaintiff's complaint resulted from a fire which occurred without the design or neglect of defendant. Defendant is exonerated from any and all liability for the alleged _____ [loss *or* damage] in accordance with Section _____ [30504 *and/or* 30701 note, § 4(2)(b),] of Title 46 of the United States Code Service.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used by the defendant in answering a complaint for loss or damage caused by fire. The fire statute [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30504*] exempts a vessel owner from liability for fire loss or damage unless caused by the design or neglect of such owner. The Carriage of Goods by Sea Act (COGSA) relieves the carrier and ship from responsibility for loss or damage arising or resulting from fire, unless caused by the actual fault or privity of the carrier [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(2)(b)].

Although these two statutes provide essentially the same benefit, the fire statute pertains to vessel owners, while the COGSA encompasses carriers. In order to rely on either exemption, the owner must exercise due diligence to make the vessel seaworthy and properly manned, equipped, and supplied as required by the COGSA [*In re Liberty Shipping Corp. (9th Cir. 1975) 509 F.2d 1249, 1251, 1252]* . Furthermore, the burden of showing the exercise of due diligence falls on the carrier [*46 U.S.C.S. § 30701* note, § 4(1)]. If the carrier's failure to exercise this obligation causes damage by fire, the fire exemptions cannot be invoked [*Sunkist Growers, Inc. v. Adelaide Shipping Lines (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d*

1327, 1334-1341] .

[3] Decisions

Carrier's obligation under COGSA to exercise due diligence applies to master and those who manage ship, as well as to owners or charterers personally or those who act for them in a managerial capacity. *Sunkist Growers, Inc. v. Adelaide Shipping Lines (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 1327, 1341*

Provisions of fire statute and COGSA's fire exemption have essentially same meaning. Asbestos Corp. Ltd. v. Compagnie de Navigation Fraissinet et *Cyprien Fabre (2d Cir. 1973) 480 F.2d 669, 672*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200, 522.220, 522.221*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.223

§ 522.223 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--For Supplies or Other Necessaries Furnished by Materialmen

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--For Supplies or Other Necessaries Furnished by Materialmen

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE _____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
_____ DIVISION

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. _____
The Motor Vessel _____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT TO ENFORCE MARITIME LIEN
her Engines, Boats, Tackle, Apparel, Furniture, and	)	
Cargo,	)	
Defendant.	)	

_____

[1. *Allegation of admiralty jurisdiction. See § 522.201, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Allegation that vessel is within district and jurisdiction of court or will arrive during pendency of action. See § 522.204, Paragraph 5.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff furnished the _____ [*specify name, nationality, registry number, or other designation of vessel*], docked at _____ [*port*], with _____ [materials *and/or* supplies *and/or* equipment] consisting of _____ [*describe*]. The _____ [materials *and/or* supplies *and/or* equipment], with an agreed value of $_____, were furnished to defendant vessel at the request of _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify job title, e.g.,* master] of the vessel.

4. Defendant vessel is indebted to plaintiff in the total sum of $_____, which remains due and owing [, although plaintiff has demanded payment].

5. Plaintiff claims a maritime lien against defendant vessel, her engines, tackle, boats, apparel, furniture, and cargo under *Title 46, Section 31341 et seq., of the United States Code* Service and under general maritime law.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays:

1. For issuance of process against defendant vessel, her engines, boats, tackle, apparel, furniture, and cargo according to this court's practice in admiralty and maritime cases;

2. For condemnation and sale of defendant vessel to pay the amount due and owing to plaintiff with interest and costs; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 522.150.*]

CAUTION:
The complaint in an action in rem must be verified on oath or solemn affirmation [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(2)].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint may be used for an action in rem against a vessel in federal court. Federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over admiralty actions in rem against vessels or other property [*Madruga v. Superior Court (1954) 346 U.S. 556, 560, 561, 74 S. Ct. 298, 98 L. Ed. 290]* . In the alternative, a plaintiff may file an action in personam against the person who ordered the supplies. The existence of the lien and an action in rem does not preclude an action in personam [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C(1); *see 46 U.S.C.S. § 31305*]. If an attorney doubts the validity of the lien for any reason, he or she should combine an action in rem against the vessel with an action in personam against its owner or person authorizing the supplies. For examples of combined actions against cargo and against a vessel, see *§§ 522.201* and *522.204*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges: (1) admiralty jurisdiction (Paragraph 1); (2) the presence or future arrival of the vessel within the district (Paragraph 2); (3) the furnishing of supplies, materials and/or equipment on the order of the vessel's officer or agent (Paragraph 3); (4) the failure to pay, as agreed, for the goods furnished (Paragraph 4); and (5) the existence of

plantiff's lien against the vessel under *46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.* (Paragraph 5) [*Point Landing, Inc. v. Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. (5th Cir. 1958) 261 F.2d 861, 867]* . It is not necessary to allege or prove that credit was given to the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. § 31342(a)(3)*].

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200 -522.205*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.224

§ 522.224 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Pilotage Fees

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Pilotage Fees

1. Plaintiff is a pilot duly licensed under the laws of the State of California.

[*EITHER*]

2. On _____ [*date*], at the request of the _____ [*specify title of officer*] of defendant vessel, plaintiff piloted the vessel from _____ [the high seas *or* the port of _____ (*specify*)] to _____ [the port of _____ (*specify*) *or* the high seas], for the agreed sum of $_____.

[*OR*]

2. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff offered to pilot defendant vessel, _____ [a registered vessel *or* a foreign vessel], from _____ [the high seas *or* the port of _____ (*specify*)] to _____ [the port of _____ (*specify*) *or* the high seas] for the sum of $_____. Plantiff's offer was refused by the _____ [*specify title of officer*] of defendant vessel, and _____ [the vessel proceeded without securing the services of a pilot *or* the vessel secured the services of a pilot subsequently offering pilotage].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations may be used by plaintiff in an action in rem to enforce a maritime lien for pilotage. They should be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the *form in § 522.223*. The alternative forms of Paragraph 2 of these allegations apply when pilotage is performed and payment refused or when the vessel refuses a tender of pilotage. For additional discussion, see *§ 522.73[3][b]*.

[3] State Statutes

Exclusive authority of licensed pilots to pilot vessels from high seas to ports on bays requiring pilotage and to pilot vessels within and along waters of those bays. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 1125*

Foreign vessels, vessels bound to or from foreign port, and vessels sailing under register between any port of Monterey Bay and Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun and any other port of United States are liable for pilotage. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 1127*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200 -522.205, 522.223*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.225

§ 522.225 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Salvage

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Salvage

1. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff's vessel voluntarily rendered assistance to defendant vessel by _____ [*describe peril and assistance given, e.g.,* towing the stranded ship away from dangerous shoals and into the Port of San Francisco]. Defendant vessel _____ [was fully saved *or* partially saved] as a result of plaintiff's salvage services.

2. In salvaging defendant vessel, plaintiff incurred expenses in the sum of $_____ for _____ [*describe items of expense, e.g.,* additional fuel consumed, overtime wages of the crew, and damages to the towage equipment on plantiff's vessel].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations may be used by a plaintiff in an action in rem to enforce a maritime lien for salvage. They should be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the *form in § 522.223*. To present a valid claim for salvage, a plaintiff must show that, in the face of a marine peril, services were voluntarily rendered and resulted in at least partial success [*The "Sabine" (1880) 101 U.S. 384, 25 L. Ed. 982* ; *see § 522.73[3][d]*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200 -522.205, 522.223*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 522 SHIPS AND SHIPPING
PART IV. FORMS
C. Property Interests
2. Actions Against Shipowners and Carriers

46-522 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 522.226

§ 522.226 Allegation for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Towage Fees

[1] FORM Allegation for Use in Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7] In Rem [Fed. R. Civ. P., Supp. Rules for Certain Admiralty & Mar. Claims, Rule C] to Enforce Maritime Lien [46 U.S.C.S. § 31341 et seq.]--Against Vessel--To Recover Towage Fees

1. On _____ [*date*], at the request of the _____ [*specify title of officer*] of defendant vessel, plaintiff provided towage services from _____ [*specify place*] to _____ [*specify place*] for the agreed sum of $_____.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation may be used by plaintiff in an action in rem to enforce a maritime lien for towage. It should be substituted for Paragraph 3 of the *form in § 522.223*. Federal maritime lien law specifies towage as a service giving rise to a lien against the vessel [*46 U.S.C.S. §§ 31301(4), 31342(a)(1)*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 522.200 -522.205, 522.223*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 523 [RESERVED]

46-523 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 523

[RESERVED]

Chapter 523[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 524.syn

§ 524.syn Synopsis to Chapter 524: SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME

§ 524.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 524.02 Cross References

§§ 524.03-524.09 [Reserved]

§ 524.10 Governing Law

[1] Generally

[2] Trial Court Delay Reduction Act

[a] Policy Against Continuances

[b] Limit on Stipulations to Extend Time

[c] Minimum Time Periods Allowed

§ 524.11 Computation of Time

§ 524.12 Shortening of Time

[1] By Noticed Motion

[2] By Ex Parte Application

[3] Under Other Provisions

§ 524.13 Extension of Time

[1] In General

[2] On Stipulation

[3] When Available

[4] To Plead

[5] Length of Extension

[6] Good Cause

[7] Not Usually a General Appearance

[8] Under Rules of Court

[9] By Service by Mail

[10] By Service by Overnight Delivery

[11] By Service by Facsimile Transmission

[12] For Legislator

[13] Procedures for Obtaining

[14] Appeals

[a] Filing Notice

[b] Filing Briefs

§§ 524.14-524.29 [Reserved]

§ 524.30 Related Texts From Matthew Bender

§ 524.31 State Statutes

[1] Determination of Time

[2] Extension or Shortening of Time for Discovery Procedures

[3] Extension as Not Constituting General Appearance

[4] General Provisions Relating to Extensions

[5] No Extension

[6] Specific Extensions

[7] Specific Orders Shortening Time

§ 524.32 California Rules of Court

[1] Appeals

[2] Trial Court Actions and Proceedings

§ 524.33 Decisions

[1] Discretion of Court to Extend Time

[2] Extension for Answering

[3] General Appearance May Result From Extension

[4] Service by Mail as Extending Time

[5] Shortening Time

§ 524.34 Text References

§§ 524.35-524.39 [Reserved]

§ 524.40 Checklist for Party Seeking Extension or Shortening of Time

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] By Stipulation

[3] By Ex Parte Application

[4] By Noticed Motion

§§ 524.41-524.49 [Reserved]

§ 524.50 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b); Gov. Code § 68616(b)] to Date Certain

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Stipulations by Parties to Extend Time

[4] Cross References

§ 524.51 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)] for Open Extension of Time to Plead

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 524.52 Ex Parte Application for Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time to Apply for Extension

[4] Length of Extension

[5] Extensions for Attorney Legislators

[6] Contents of Form

[7] Accompanying Papers

[8] Cross References

§ 524.53 Ex Parte Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filing and Service of Order

[4] Cross References

§ 524.53A Ex Parte Application for Extension of Time to Serve Pleading and Order Extending Time to Serve [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1200 et seq.]--Judicial Council Form CM-020

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 524.54 Application and Declaration for Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Local Requirements

[4] Cross References

§ 524.55 Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 524.56 Ex Parte Order Granting Motion to Shorten Time for Serving Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers--Los Angeles Superior Court [former Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.36]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART I. SCOPE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.01

§ 524.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the grounds, conditions, and procedures for obtaining either a shortening or extension of time [*see § 524.10* et seq.]. A Procedural Checklist [*see § 524.40*] and a Research Guide [*see § 524.30*] are included. The forms in this chapter are:

- Stipulations extending time [*see §§ 524.50, 524.51*].
- Ex parte application for an order extending time [*see § 524.52*].
- Order extending time [*see § 524.53*].
- Ex parte application for extension of time to serve pleadings and order extending time--Judicial Council Form CM-020 [*see § 524.53A*].
- Ex parte application for an order shortening time [*see § 524.54*].
- Orders shortening time [*see §§ 524.55, 524.56*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART I. SCOPE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.02

§ 524.02 Cross References

For forms of stipulation and order extending time for answer or demurrer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For discussions, procedures, and forms involving extensions during the process of an appeal, see Ch. 46, *Appeal: Extending or Shortening Time* .

For discussions, procedures, and forms involving extensions of time to prepare transcripts, to file appellate briefs, and to petition for rehearing, see Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal* ; Ch. 44, *Appeal: Preparing and Filing the Record* ; Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs* ; Ch. 52, *Appeal: Rehearing* ; and generally see Ch. 46, *Appeal: Extending or Shortening Time* .

For a discussion of and forms for continuances to delay the time of trial or hearing, see Ch. 136, *Continuances* .

For a discussion of and forms for obtaining extensions and shortening of time in discovery proceedings, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* , Ch. 194, *Discovery: Interrogatories* , Ch. 195, *Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence* , Ch. 196, *Discovery: Requests for Admissions* .

For a discussion of and alternative forms for application and order shortening time for service of notice of motion and accompanying papers, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

For a discussion of and forms for shortening time for relief from default in property actions and for a form for setting aside default judgment entered in violation of agreement extending time to answer, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* , and Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

For a discussion of and forms for obtaining extensions and shortening of time in discovery proceedings, see Ch. 190, *Discovery: Scope, Regulation, and Timing* .

For a discussion of extensions of time under the dismissal statutes, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

For a discussion of obtaining extensions or shortening of time relating to appeals in limited civil cases, and a form for

seeking extension of time, see *Ch. 345A, Limited Civil Cases, §§ 345A.56[2], 345A.58,* and *345A.120*.

For a form of stipulation and order extending time to file affidavit in support of motion for new trial, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

For a form of stipulation extending time in which action may be brought to trial, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProceduresAppealsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART I. SCOPE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 524.03-524.09

[Reserved]

§§ 524.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.10

§ 524.10 Governing Law

[1] Generally

Code Civ. Proc. § 1054 is the general section governing extensions of time. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)* governs extensions of time relating to answers and demurrers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* governs extensions and shortening of time relating to notices of motion and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* provides for extensions of time when papers or notices, other than notices of motion, are served by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery. In the case of electronic service of a notice, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)* governs the extension of time. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1* governs extensions when an attorney of record is attending the Legislature while *Code Civ. Proc. § 595* governs postponements when an attorney, party, or witness is attending the Legislature.

California Rules of Court, Rules 2.20 and *3.1300*, govern shortening and extension of time before the trial courts. *California Rules of Court, Rule 8.50 et seq.* , governs shortening and extension of time before the California Supreme Court and courts of appeal.

[2] Trial Court Delay Reduction Act

[a] Policy Against Continuances

The trial courts in all California counties are required to implement delay reduction programs for limited civil cases [*Gov. Code §§ 68605.5, 68607, 68620(a)*]. Under *Gov. Code § 68607* the trial judge is given the responsibility to maintain control over the pace of litigation. This responsibility includes the duty, consistent with statute, to adopt and use a firm, consistent policy against continuances, to the maximum extent possible and reasonable, in all stages of the litigation [*Gov. Code § 68607(g)*].

[b] Limit on Stipulations to Extend Time

The Trial Court Delay Reduction Act expressly allows the parties to stipulate to extend the time to serve responsive pleadings by an additional 15 days after service of a complaint [*Gov. Code § 68616(b)*]. The act also allows the parties, within 30 days of service of the responsive pleadings, to stipulate to a single continuance not to exceed 30 days [*Gov.*

Code § 68616(d)].

Otherwise, local rules may provide that the parties cannot stipulate to extend deadlines except as expressly permitted. For example, a rule may provide that the parties cannot stipulate to modify, extend, or continue any deadline without the written approval of the judge [Orange Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 453].

[c] Minimum Time Periods Allowed

Trial court delay reduction rules cannot require shorter time for service of notice of motion and other papers than is provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005* and *1013*, and cannot shorten the time to plead after service of summons beyond the period provided under *Code Civ. Proc. 412.20*. These periods may only be shortened as provided in those sections [*Gov. Code § 68616(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.20* (time to plead after service of summons), 1005(b) (time for service of notice of motion and supporting and opposing papers), 1013 (time for service of papers other than notice of motion)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.11

§ 524.11 Computation of Time

The time in which any act provided by law is to be done is computed by excluding the first day and including the last, unless the last day is a holiday, and then it is also excluded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12*]. If the last day for the performance of any act provided or required by law to be performed within a specified period of time is a holiday, then such period is extended to and including the next day which is not a holiday [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12a*].

The term "holiday," for purposes of computation of time, includes every Saturday and Sunday and most holidays specified in *Gov. Code §§ 6700* and *6701* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 10, 12a*]. One holiday listed in *Gov. Code § 6700* but excluded from the meaning of "holiday" under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 10* and *12a* is September 9, known as "Admission Day" [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 10, 12a, 135*; *Gov. Code § 6700*]. Insofar as the business of any city, county, state, or public office other than a branch office is concerned, any day when the office is closed for the whole day is considered a holiday [*Code Civ. Proc. § 12b*].

For extensive discussion of distinguishing between calendar days and court days, computation of time, and effect of filing papers on certain days, see *§ 518.33*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsComputationCivil ProceduresAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.12

§ 524.12 Shortening of Time

[1] By Noticed Motion

The court, or a judge thereof, may prescribe a time shorter than the 16 court days required for written notice of hearing on a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*].

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*], but the statute doesgives trial courts authority to shorten the 60-day period after the opposing party's general appearance to file the motion, and to shorten the 30-day period before the trial date for the hearing on the motion [*McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407]* .

Any order obtained at a hearing of which insufficient notice has been given is void if the adverse party was not at the hearing [*Svistunoff v. Svistunoff (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 638, 641, 239 P.2d 650]* . However, any objection to the timeliness of notice is waived by an adverse party who appears at the hearing (and argues anything other than the sufficiency of the notice) [*Lacey v. Bertone (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 649, 651, 203 P.2d 755]* .

[2] By Ex Parte Application

Although it is technically possible to obtain an order shortening time pursuant to a noticed motion, the very nature of the order sought usually dictates that there will not be enough time to give 16 court days notice for the motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*]. Therefore, of necessity, an order shortening time is usually obtained by an application for an ex parte order [for forms, *see §§ 524.54 -524.56*]. An application for an order shortening time must be supported by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(b)*].

[3] Under Other Provisions

There are also statutes providing for shortening time periods relating to other procedures. For example, the Civil Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.*], provides for shortening time periods relating to various procedures such as notice required before a deposition [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.270*], time for responding to interrogatories [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 2030.260(a)*], time for responding to requests for production or entry [*see Code Civ. Proc. §*

2031.260(a)], and time for responding to requests for admissions [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.250(a)*].

The required time periods for service of documents related to subpoenaing the personal records of a consumer or employment records may also be shortened [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(h), 1985.6(g)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 195, *Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence* and Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.13

§ 524.13 Extension of Time

[1] In General

When an act to be done, as provided in the Code of Civil Procedure, relates to the pleadings in the action, the preparation of bills of exceptions, or of amendments to them, or the service of notices other than of appeal and of intention to move for a new trial, the time allowed therefor, unless otherwise expressly provided, may be extended, on good cause shown, by the judge of the court in which the action is pending, or by the judge who presided at the trial of that action. The extension must not exceed 30 days without the consent of the adverse party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*].

The times provided in the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*), or in any other statute relating to a bond given in an action or proceeding, may be extended pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054* and *1054.1* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.050*].

[2] On Stipulation

In all cases set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* (*see* [1], *above*), an extension must be granted when all attorneys of record of parties who have appeared in the action agree in writing to the extension. Any extension granted pursuant to a stipulation by all attorneys of record of parties who have appeared in the action is not included in the computation of the 30-day limitation on extensions of time allowed by the court or judge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*].

[3] When Available

The court may grant an extension only during the period of time within which the act must be done. An order extending time made after the statutory time for action has passed is void [*Coast Electric Service, Inc. v. Jensen (1931) 111 Cal. App. 124, 126, 295 P. 346]* . However, when the time for performance is not jurisdictional, as in the filing of a cost bill, relief may be granted for late filing under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)*, based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. Board of Nat'l Missions (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 236, 243, 276 P.2d 829]* .

[4] To Plead

The court may, in furtherance of justice, and on such terms as may be proper, enlarge the time for answer or demurrer and may, in its discretion, after notice to the adverse party, allow, on such terms as may be just, an answer to be made after the time limited by the Code of Civil Procedure [*Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)*]. In the absence of a court order, a late answer or demurrer may be filed if no default has been entered, but it is subjectto the court's discretionary power to strike it on motion [*Buck v. Morrossis (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 461, 464-465, 250 P.2d 270]* .

[5] Length of Extension

An extension pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* for an act relating to the pleadings may not be granted for more than 30 days without the consent of the adverse party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)* contains no limit on the length of an extension to answer or demur [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)*]. However, other sections of the Code of Civil Procedure that provide for extensions, without limitations on the length of the extension, have been interpreted to be limited to the length of extension permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* [*see Lewith v. Rehmke (1933) 217 Cal. 563, 565, 20 P.2d 687* (interpreting former *Code Civ. Proc. § 650* regarding extensions to prepare bills of exceptions); *see also Thelander v. Superior Court (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 811, 813, 26 Cal. Rptr. 643, 376 P.2d 571]* . Therefore, it appears that the *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* limit on the length of an extension to perform an act relating to the pleadings would apply and would limit the length of a permissible extension to answer or demur under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*.

An order extending time to plead more than 30 days without the adverse party's consent is void, although reliance on this void order can be urged as grounds for relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*Kennedy v. Mulligan (1902) 136 Cal. 556, 557, 69 P. 291]* .

When all attorneys of record of parties who have appeared in the action agree in writing, the court must grant the extension [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*]. When the extension is pursuant to agreement, there evidently is no restriction on the length of the extension.

[6] Good Cause

Code Civ. Proc. § 473, although not requiring a showing of good cause for an order enlarging the time to answer or demur, does require that the order be in furtherance of justice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*, on the other hand, does require a showing of good cause for an extension. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that an application for an order extending time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* as well as under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* include a declaration setting forth facts constituting good cause for the order [for a form including such a declaration, *see § 524.52*].

A precise definition of what constitutes "good cause" for an extension has not been dealt with in cases under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*. However, good cause in general has been defined as calling "for a factual exposition of a reasonable ground for the sought order. The good cause may be equated to a good reason for a party's failure to perform that specific requirement from which he seeks to be excused" [Waters v. Superior Court (1962) 58Cal. 2d 885, 893, *27 Cal. Rptr. 153, 377 P.2d 265* (good cause for relief from requirement of service of notice of deposition on unserved defendants)].

[7] Not Usually a General Appearance

An application to the court or a stipulation by the parties for an extension of time to plead is not a general appearance by the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*]. However, a stipulation extending the time "within which to appear" has been held to be a general appearance [*RCA Corp. v. Superior Court (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 1007, 1009-1010, 121 Cal. Rptr. 441]* . A stipulation that, in addition to extending time, also accepts service of the summons and complaint is held to be a general appearance [*General Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 449, 452-453, 124 Cal. Rptr. 745, 541 P.2d 289]* . For further discussion, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

[8] Under Rules of Court

Unless otherwise provided by law, a court may extend or shorten the time within which a party must perform any act under the California Rules of Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.10(c)*].

[9] By Service by Mail

In case of service by mail of notices or other papers, any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, is extended by the following periods when service is by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*]:

- Five calendar days, if the place of address and of mailing are both within California.
- Ten calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside California but within the United States.
- Twenty calendar days if either the place of mailing or of address is outside the United States.

These extensions apply unless a specific exception is provided by statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*]. By the terms of Section 1013, the extensions do not apply to the time for taking the following actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*]:

- Filing notice of intention to move for new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 659*].
- Filing notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.
- Filing notice of appeal.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 extensions do not apply to notices of motion that are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)* (listing motions subject to Section 1005)]. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* requires a similar, although not identical, extension of the 16-court-day notice period when a notice of motion is served by mail. For discussion of extensions under section 1005(b), see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Service by mail is complete when the notice or other paper is deposited in a post office, mail box, subpost office, substation, or mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope, with postage paid, addressed to the person on whom it is to be served, at his or her office address as last given by him or her on any document that he or she has filed in the cause and served on the party making service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*]. The addressee incurs the risk of the mail failing to reach him or her [*McKeon v. Sambrano (1927) 200 Cal. 739, 741, 255 P. 178]* . However, if the envelope containing the document to be served is improperly addressed, the result is the same as if no document were ever sent [*Triumph Precision Products, Inc. v. Insurance Co. of North America (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 362, 365, 154 Cal. Rptr. 120]* .

[10] By Service by Overnight Delivery

In case of service by Express Mail or another method of overnight delivery, any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, is extended by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*].

This extension applies unless a specific exception is provided by statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*]. By

the terms of Section 1013, the extensions do not apply to the time for taking the following actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*]:

- Filing notice of intention to move for new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 659*].
- Filing notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.
- Filing notice of appeal.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 extensions do not apply to notices of motion that are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)* (listing motions subject to Section 1005)]. However, Section 1005(b) provides for a two calendar day extension. For discussion of extensions under section 1005(b), see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Service by Express Mail is complete when the notice or other paper is deposited in a post office, mailbox, sub-post office, substation, or mail chute, or other like facility regularly maintained by the United States PostalService for receipt of Express Mail, in a sealed envelope, with Express Mail postage paid, addressed to the person on whom it is to be served, at the office address as last given by that person on any document filed in the cause and served on the party making service by Express Mail, otherwise at that party's place of residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*].

Service by another method of overnight delivery is complete when the notice or other paper is deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by the express service carrier, or delivered to an authorized courier or driver authorized by the express service carrier to receive documents, in an envelope or package designated by the express service carrier with delivery fees paid or provided for, addressed to the person on whom it is to be served, at the office address as last given by that person on any document filed in the cause and served on the party making service, otherwise at that party's place of residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c)*].

[11] By Service by Facsimile Transmission

In case of service by facsimile transmission (fax), any period of notice and any right or duty to do any act or make any response within any period or on a date certain after the service of the document, which period or date is prescribed by statute or rule of court, is extended by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*].

This extension applies unless a specific exception is provided by statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*]. By the terms of Section 1013, the extensions do not apply to the time for taking the following actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*]:

- Filing notice of intention to move for new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 659*].
- Filing notice of intention to move to vacate judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*.
- Filing notice of appeal.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 extensions do not apply to notices of motion that are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(a)* (listing motions subject to Section 1005)]. However, Section 1005(b) provides for a two calendar day extension. For discussion of extensions under section 1005(b), see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Service by fax is permitted only when the parties agree and a written confirmation of that agreement is made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*]. Service is complete at the time of transmission of the notice or other paper to a fax machine

maintained by the person on whom it is served at the fax machine telephone number as last given by that person on any document which he or she has filed in the cause and served on the party making the service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(e)*].

[12] For Legislator

When an act to be done in any action or proceeding in any state court or before any state administrative agency, as provided by law or rule, relates to the pleadings in the action, the preparation of bills of exceptions, or of amendments to them, or the service of notices (other than of appeal, of intention to move for a new trial, and of intention to move to vacate a judgment), and when the act is not a motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict, the time allowed for the act, unless otherwise expressly provided, must be extended to a date certain when an attorney of record for the party applying for the extension is a member of the State Legislature and the Legislature is in session or in recess for less than 41 days or if the attorney is a member of a legislative committee that is meeting or is to meet within a period not exceeding the time reasonably necessary to enable the attorney to reach the committee meeting by the ordinary mode of travel. Any extension granted for this reason also extends, for the same period, the time for any ruling or proceeding or for the performance by any party of any act affected by the extension [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1*].

The times provided in the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*), or in any other statute relating to a bond given in an action or proceeding, may be extended pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.050*].

Whenever a member of the California Legislature is a party, principal witness, or attorney of record, the trial of any civil action or proceeding in a court, or of any administrative proceeding before a state board, or commissioner, or officer, or the hearing of any motion, demurrer, or other proceeding must be postponed to a date certain under circumstances and conditions similar to those specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 595*]. For a discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 595*, see the Introduction to Ch. 136, *Continuances.*

The extension under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1* or the continuance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 595* must be to a date certain. The length of the extension or continuance depends on such factors as the date of final adjournment of the Legislature or the commencement of a recess of more than 40 days, the date of adjournment or recess of a committee meeting, or the place of trial or hearing relative to the place of the committee meeting [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 595, 1054.1*].

Although by their own terms *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 595* and *1054.1* require mandatory extensions unless a right to relief pendente lite in a paternity action or a right to invoke a provisional remedy would be abridged, they have been interpreted to allow the court discretion in determining whether its processes and order of business should be delayed. In exercising its discretion the court should consider the nature and urgency of the rights involved, whether the party seeking delay has or can secure other counsel to represent him or her for the particular step in the proceedings thenbefore the court, and whether the attorney who is a member of the Legislature was employed for no other purpose than to attempt delay [*Thurmond v. Superior Court (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 836, 839-840, 59 Cal. Rptr. 273, 427 P.2d 985]* .

[13] Procedures for Obtaining

Although it is technically possible to obtain an order extending time pursuant to a noticed motion, the very nature of the order sought usually dictates that there will not be enough time to give 15 days notice for such motion. Therefore, of necessity, an extension of time is usually obtained pursuant to stipulation or ex parte order.

An application for an ex parte order extending time must be made to the judge before whom the matter is pending. It must disclose the nature of the case and any previous extensions by stipulation or court order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(a), (b)*; for a form including these statements, *see § 524.52*]. After obtaining the order, it must be filed immediately and served within 24 hours or within such other time as may be fixed by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(c)*].

Prior to making an application for an ex parte order, counsel should always check local court rules for additional requirements.

[14] Appeals

[a] Filing Notice

The time for filing a notice of appeal is jurisdictional and no court may extend it, unless there is an appellate emergency declared under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.66*, in which case the Chair of the Judicial Council may extend additional time ranging from 14 days to 60 days depending on the scope and duration of the appellate emergency [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.104(b), 8.308(a)*]; *see Schisler v. Mitchell (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 27, 29, 344 P.2d 61]* . The time for filing an appeal is automatically extended, however, if a motion for new trial or a motion to vacate a judgment is pending, if an appeal is filed by another party, or if the last day to file the appeal falls on a holiday [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.108, 8.60, 8.752, 8.767*; for further discussion of extensions for filing notice of appeal, *see* Ch. 42, *Appeal: Notice of Appeal*].

[b] Filing Briefs

Appellant's opening brief must be served and filed within 30 days after the record is filed in the reviewing court; the respondent's brief must be filed within 30 days after the appellant's brief is filed. By a stipulation filed with the reviewing court, the parties may extend each of these periods for not more than 60 days, and thereafter the time may be extended only bythe Chief Justice or the Presiding Justice, for good cause shown [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.216(a)*].

An application for an extension of time to file a brief must be served and filed, although the Chief Justice or presiding justice may excuse advance service. The application must state facts showing good cause--or exceptional good cause, when required by the California Rules of Court--for granting the application, and must identify any previous application filed by any party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.50*]. For discussion of extensions for filing briefs, *see Ch. 50, Appeal: Briefs, § 50.16[4]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureAppealsBriefsCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 524.14-524.29

[Reserved]

§§ 524.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.30

§ 524.30 Related Texts From Matthew Bender

For memoranda relating to forms in this chapter, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 212, *Shortening and Extension of Time*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.31

§ 524.31 State Statutes

[1] Determination of Time

Designation of holidays. *Code Civ. Proc. § 10*

Computation of time. *Code Civ. Proc. § 12*

Extension if last day for performance is holiday. *Code Civ. Proc. § 12a*

Holiday as day when public office closed for whole day. *Code Civ. Proc. § 12b*

Time to respond to amended pleading as computed from date of notice of such amendment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 472*

Time to amend, following sustaining of demurrer, as running, in absence of waiver, from date of service of decision or order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 472b*

Time to amend pleading after order sustaining demurrer without leave to amend is reversed or otherwise remanded. *Code Civ. Proc. § 472b*

[2] Extension or Shortening of Time for Discovery Procedures

Notice of deposition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025(f)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.210 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005)

Written interrogatories. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2030(h), (i)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2030.210 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005)

Inspections of documents, things, and places. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2031(i), (j)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2031.010 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005)

Requests for admissions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2033(h), (i)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.010 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005)

[3] Extension as Not Constituting General Appearance

Application to court or stipulation of parties for extension as not constituting general appearance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*

[4] General Provisions Relating to Extensions

Extension when notice of motion served by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*

Extension when notice or other paper served by electronic service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*

Extension when notice or other paper served by mail, facsimile transmission, or overnight delivery. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a), (c), (e)*

Authority for judge to grant extensions not exceeding 30 days. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*

[5] No Extension

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as not extending response time to summons served by mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.20*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as not extending notice of trial requirements for unlawful detainer actions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 594*

No extensions to file notice of intention to move for new trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 659*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as not extending time to move to vacate or set aside judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 663a*

[6] Specific Extensions

Extensions following *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(a)* motions to quash service of summons, to stay or dismiss for inconvenient forum, or to dismiss for delay in prosecution. *Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(b), (c)*

Extension by filing motion to strike. *Code Civ. Proc. § 435*

Court as having power to extend time for answer or demurrer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a)*

Court as having power to extend period of attachment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 488.510*

Court as having power to postpone trial if amendment renders postponement necessary. *Code Civ. Proc. § 594a*

Postponement of trial or hearing when party, witness, or attorney member of Legislature. *Code Civ. Proc. § 595*

Mandatory postponement of trial, or hearing of motion or demurrer, for not more than 30 days on written stipulation of all parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 595.2*

Extension to serve and file affidavits to be used in motion for new trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 659a*

Extension of time in proceeding relating to bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.050*

Mandatory extension of time for act by attorney attending Legislature. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1*

Extensions in unlawful detainer actions not to exceed 10 days. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1167.5*

[7] Specific Orders Shortening Time

Authority for court or judge to shorten time for notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*

Order shortening time relating to subpoena duces tecum of employment records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(g)*

Orders shortening time relating to subpena duces tecum of personal consumer records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(h)*

Order shortening time relating to subpoena duces tecum of employment records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(g)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsComputationCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.32

§ 524.32 California Rules of Court

[1] Appeals

Supreme Court and courts of appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.108, 8.134(b), 8.216(a), 8.264, 8.504, 8.512, 8.50, 8.60, 8.1005(d), 8.706*

Appeal to superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.703, 8.752, 8.755(b), 8.766, 8.767*

[2] Trial Court Actions and Proceedings

Power of court to extend time for requesting, preparing, objecting to, signing, and filing proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, counter findings, and proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*

Applications for extensions to be heard by judge before whom matter pending. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.20(a)*

Applications for extensions to disclose nature of case and any previous extensions. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.20(b)*

Orders extending time to be filed forthwith and served within 24 hours or within such other time as fixed by court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.20(c)*

Power of court to extend time for performance of any act required or permitted by Cal. Rules of Court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 5.15* (family law rules), 1.10(c)

Application for order shortening time in trial court required to be supported by affidavit or declaration showing good cause. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.33

§ 524.33 Decisions

[1] Discretion of Court to Extend Time

Extensions of time to plead under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* as being within sound discretion of court. *Lucci v. United Credit & Collection Co. (1934) 220 Cal. 492, 495, 31 P.2d 369*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1054 as giving court power to extend time to file cost bill. *Davis Lumber Co. v. Hubbell (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 148, 151, 290 P.2d 33*

[2] Extension for Answering

Court as having power under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 472* and *473* to impose terms as condition of answering after expiration of time to do so. *Hayes v. Butler (1914) 25 Cal. App. 743, 745, 145 P. 553*

[3] General Appearance May Result From Extension

Written agreement extending time to plead and disclosing intent to submit to jurisdiction constituted general appearance. *General Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 449, 452-453, 124 Cal. Rptr. 745, 541 P.2d 289*

Seeking extension to plead as not constituting general appearance. *Busching v. Superior Court (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 44, 51, 115 Cal. Rptr. 241, 524 P.2d 369*

Stipulation with defendant's insurance carrier extending time to plead and not challenging service precluded dismissal under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 581a* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 583.110 et seq.*). *Knapp v. Superior Court (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 799, 803, 145 Cal. Rptr. 154*

Stipulation with defendant's insurance carrier extending time to plead was insufficient to constitute general appearance.

Woodruff v. McDonald's Restaurants (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 655, 657-658, 142 Cal. Rptr. 367

[4] Service by Mail as Extending Time

Extension of time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* is not applicable to *Lab. Code § 1160.8* (time limit for filing petitions for review of ALRB orders); section 1013(a) by its terms deals only with case of service by mail whereas *Lab. Code § 1160.8* requires that petition be filed within 30 days of issuance of board decision. *Mario Saikhon, Inc. v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 581, 583, 189 Cal. Rptr. 632*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as not extending time to file action under Tort Claims Act following deposit in mail of rejection of claim against public entity. *Smith v. City & County of San Francisco (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 227, 231-232, 137 Cal. Rptr. 146*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as extending time to petition for mandate to review denial of motion to quash when denial of motion mailed to petitioner. *Shearer v. Superior Court (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 424, 426, 138 Cal. Rptr. 824*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 broadly interpreted as extending time to move for further responses to interrogatories served by mail. *California Accounts, Inc. v. Superior Court (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 483, 487, 123 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 as not extending time to file notice of appeal. *Nu-Way Associates, Inc. v. Keefe (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 926, 928, 93 Cal. Rptr. 614*

When service of notice properly made by mail pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*, risk of failure of mail is on addressee. *Meskell v. Culver City Unified School Dist. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1, 824, 90 Cal. Rptr. 381*

[5] Shortening Time

Court may not shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment, but the statute does gives trial courts authority to shorten the 60-day period after the opposing party's general appearance to file the motion, and to shorten the 30-day period before the trial date for the hearing on the motion. *McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.34

§ 524.34 Text References

California Civil Procedure Before Trial, Vol. 1, Ch. 9, *Noticed Motions,* §§ 9.49 et seq., 9.61 et seq. (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed.)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 4, *Pleading,* §§ 8-10; *Proceedings Without Trial,* §§ 15-19 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 524.35-524.39

[Reserved]

§§ 524.35[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.40

§ 524.40 Checklist for Party Seeking Extension or Shortening of Time

NOTE:

In actions conducted pursuant to the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*), local rules may restrict the shortening and extension of time. For further discussion, see *§ 524.10[2]*.

[1] Preliminary Determinations

1. Determine necessity of extension or shortening of time. If service was or will be by mail, add the appropriate number of days if *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* or *1013(a)* apply.

a. If seeking extension, ascertain last date on which act can be performed.

b. If seeking shortening, ascertain when you need act performed.

2. Determine feasibility of extension.

The time to file certain notices and/or motions cannot be extended, for example, notice of appeal, notice of intention to move for new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 659, 1054, 1054.1*].

3. Determine if opposing counsel will stipulate.

4. Determine necessity of seeking order shortening or extending time through ex parte application or noticed motion.

An extension must be obtained during the period within which the act for which the extension is sought must be performed [*Coast Electric Service, Inc. v. Jensen (1931) 111 Cal. App. 124, 126, 295 P. 346]* .

[2] By Stipulation

1. Obtain agreement of all opposing counsel to stipulate to extension or shortening [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 283* (power of attorney to enter into stipulation)].

2. Either confirm the agreement by letter to all counsel or prepare stipulation [for forms of stipulations, *see § 524.50*, *524.51*; for general discussion of and forms for stipulation, *see also* Ch. 533, *Stipulations*].

3. Have stipulation executed by all opposing counsel.

4. Prepare proof of service [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

5. Serve copies of stipulation and proof of service [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

6. File original stipulation and proof of service in court in which action is pending.

[3] By Ex Parte Application

NOTE:
Check local rules for possible additional requirements for obtaining ex parte order.

1. Prepare necessary papers including the following:

a. Application for ex parte order [Forms: §§ 524.52, 524.54].

b. Supporting declaration [Forms: §§ 524.52, 524.54], including the following:
(1) Statement of nature of case,

(2) Showing of good cause, and

(3) Statement of any previous extensions by stipulation or order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.20(b), 3.1300*].

c. Supporting points and authorities, if desired [*see* California Points and Authorities , Ch. 212, *Shortening and Extension of Time*].

d. Proposed order [Forms: §§ 524.53, 524.55, 524.56].

e. Any other necessary documents, for example, proposed notice of motion for which order shortening time is being sought, points and authorities, and, if appropriate, declaration supporting the noticed motion.

2. Present all necessary papers to judge before whom matter is pending [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(a)*].

3. File the order immediately [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(c)*].

4. Serve endorsed, filed copies of all documents, with copies of proof of service attached, on all other counsel within 24 hours or within such other time as fixed by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(c)*; *see also* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

5. File original proof of service.

[4] By Noticed Motion

If counsel has adequate time and wishes to seek an order shortening or extending time through a noticed motion, follow the procedures for noticed motions set out in Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsComputationCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 524.41-524.49

[Reserved]

§§ 524.41[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.50

§ 524.50 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b); Gov. Code § 68616(b)] to Date Certain

[1] FORM Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b); Gov. Code § 68616(b)] to Date Certain

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION EXTENDING TIME TO
Defendant.	)	_____ [*specify, e.g.,* PLEAD TO
	)	COMPLAINT]
	)	

[*EITHER, if more than one party has appeared in the action*]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties hereto through their respective undersigned attorneys that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] shall have up to and including _____ [*date*], to _____ [*state act to be performed, e.g.,* file an answer or otherwise plead to the complaint herein].

[*OR, if only one party has appeared in the action*]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by the undersigned attorney of record for plaintiff _____ [*name*] that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] shall have up to and including _____ [*time*] on _____ [*date*], to _____ [*state act to be performed, e.g.,* file an answer or otherwise plead to the complaint herein].

[*ADD date line and signature block for the attorney of record of each party who has appeared in the action, e.g.*:]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by the parties to an action or proceeding to stipulate to an extension of time to a date certain to perform an act specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(a)* (authorizing the court to grant extensions not exceeding 30 days) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)* (extension of time for acts specified in section 1054(a) by stipulation of attorneys of record for all parties); *Gov. Code § 68616(b)* (stipulation to 15-day extension to respond to complaint); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)* (attorney's power to bind client)]. The acts specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(a)* are those relating to the pleadings, preparation of bills of exceptions, or of amendments thereto, and to the service of notices other than a notice of appeal or of intention to move for a new trial.

CAUTION:

Neither an application for nor a stipulation granting an extension of time to plead is a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*]. Similarly, a stipulation extending the three-year period within which summons must be served to avoid mandatory dismissal does not constitute a general appearance in action [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.210(a), 583.220(a), 583.230(a)*]. However, any additional language in the stipulation inconsistent with a special appearance, for example, an agreement to accept service of the summons and complaint, may constitute a general appearance [*see General Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 449, 453, 124 Cal. Rptr. 745, 541 P.2d 289* ; *Busching v. Superior Court (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 44, 51, 115 Cal. Rptr. 241, 524 P.2d 369* ; for a discussion of general and special appearances and their effect, *see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*].

Although the form is designed for use under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b),* it may be used to extend time for the performance of an act to a date certain whenever a statute authorizes the parties to agree or to stipulate to an extension of time for performing a specific act.

[3] Stipulations by Parties to Extend Time

In all cases in which the court or judge is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(a)* to grant an extension of time, the extension of time shall be granted when all attorneys of record of parties who have appeared in the action agree in writing to the extension [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)*; for what constitutes an appearance generally, *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*; for the kinds of appearances and their effect, see discussion in Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*]. Any extension of time grantedby stipulation of all the attorneys of record of parties who have appeared in the action is not included in the computation of the 30-day limitation on extensions of time allowed by the court or judge under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(a)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)*].

In addition to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*, a number of other statutes authorize extensions of time on stipulation of one or more of the parties [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.230* (stipulation extending time for service of process), 583.330 (stipulation extending time within which action must be brought to trial to avoid dismissal)].

[4] Cross References

For discussion of the effect of the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, see *§ 524.10[2]*

For references to discussions and forms for stipulations extending time to perform particular acts, see *§ 524.02*

For discussion and general forms of stipulations, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.51

§ 524.51 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)] for Open Extension of Time to Plead

[1] FORM Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)] Extending Time to Perform Act [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(b)] for Open Extension of Time to Plead

[*Caption. See Form 1.*]

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between plaintiff _____ [*name*] and defendant _____ [*name*], through their respective undersigned attorneys of record, that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] shall not be required to appear further and plead to the _____ [*specify title of pleading, e.g.,* complaint] on file herein until _____ [*number*] days after notice to appear and plead to the _____ [*specify pleading, e.g.,* complaint] has been served on _____'s [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] attorney of record.

Further, it is stipulated that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] waives such right as he/she may have, or may hereafter acquire, under and in accordance with the terms and provisions of *Sections 583.110-583.430 of the Code of Civil Procedure* to dismiss the above-entitled action by reason of any delay which is the product of this stipulation.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form of stipulation in [1], *above*, is for use by the parties (1) to grant a defendant or cross defendant an open extension of time to file an answer or otherwise plead to the complaint or cross complaint, and (2) to waive any right the defendant or cross defendant might have or acquire to have the action dismissed under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.110-583.430* for failure to prosecute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 583.140* (principles of waiver and estoppel not abrogated or otherwise affected by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.110-583.430*]; *General Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 449, 452-456, 124 Cal. Rptr. 745, 541 P.2d 289* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581a, 583* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.110-583.430*])]. For a form of stipulation granting an extension of time to plead to a date certain, see *§ 524.50*.

Use of this form may not be appropriate in many actions. The Trial Court Delay Reduction Act gives the judge responsibility to assume and maintain control over the pace of litigation [*Gov. Code § 68607*]. Local rules may operate to preclude any open extension of time by requiring orders extending time to include a specific deadline. Other local requirements may also come into play. For example, in San Diego, if a party cannot make a timely general appearance within the time required by the Code of Civil Procedure, or within 15 days thereafter if the parties have stipulated to extend that time [*see Gov. Code § 68616(b)* (allowing for 15-day stipulation)], the responding party must file a Certificate of Inability to Respond, which constitutes a general appearance [San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.6].

Moreover, many attorneys do not grant open extensions because they prefer to have a date calendared for receipt of a responsive pleading. However, when the plaintiff or cross complainant does grant an open extension of time, it is suggested that this form, with its waiver provisions, be used to obviate the possibility that the extension might give the defendant or cross defendant an opportunity to make a motion to dismiss for want of prosecution under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.110-583.430*. The stipulation need not be filed, but if it is not, it must be brought to the court's attention if relevant to a dismissal motion [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.230(a), 583.330(a)*].

CAUTION:

Neither an application for nor a stipulation granting an extension of time to plead is a general appearance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 418.10(d)*]. However, any additional language in the stipulation inconsistent with a special appearance, for example, an agreement to accept service of the summons and complaint, may constitute a general appearance [*see General Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 449, 453, 124 Cal. Rptr. 745, 541 P.2d 289* ; for a discussion of general and special appearances and their effect, *see* Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*].

For further discussion of stipulations extending time, see *§ 524.50[2]* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.52

§ 524.52 Ex Parte Application for Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Application for Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER EX-
Defendant.	)	TENDING TIME TO _____ [*spe-*
	)	*cify, e.g.,* PLEAD TO COMPLAINT]
	)	

_____

_____ [*Specify party, e.g.,* Defendant] _____ [*name*], hereby applies for an order, pursuant to Section _____ [1054 *or* 1054.1] of the Code of Civil Procedure, extending the time in which he/she may _____ [*specify, e.g.,* answer or otherwise plead to the complaint on file herein] from _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*], and in support thereof, the undersigned declares:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant)].

2. This is an action for _____ [*specify nature of the case, e.g.,* breach of contract for the sale of a 1950 Mercedes automobile].

[*EITHER*]

3. _____ [*State facts showing good cause for extension of time, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), defendant, _____ (*name*), retained me as counsel in this action after discharging previous counsel. Competent and adequate representation requires an extension of time to fully study the pleadings and papers filed in this action and to fully investigate the facts surrounding the alleged incident before deciding on and preparing the appropriate responsive pleading to the complaint].

[*OR, if declarant is member of Legislature*]

3. I am a duly elected member of the Legislature of the State of California as I am a _____ [member of the Assembly of the Legislature from the _____ District *or* Senator from the _____ District *or* Senator from _____ County *or other statement as appropriate*]. _____ [The Legislature will be in _____ (regular *or* extraordinary) session *or* the _____ Committee of the Legislature, of which I am a member, isholding a hearing at _____ (*city*),] beginning _____ [*date*].

4. _____ [*State that there have been no prior extensions or specify any prior extensions, e.g.,* Extensions totaling _____ days have previously been granted by stipulation of counsel and _____ days by order of the court].

5. In the absence of an order extending time, the _____ [*specify title of pleading or other document for which extension is sought, e.g.,* answer or other responsive pleading to the complaint] would have to be filed and served on or before _____ [*date*].

6. On _____ [*date*], I notified _____ [*name*], attorney for _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff], by _____ [*manner of notification, e.g.,* telephone], that this _____ [*specify, e.g.,* application for ex parte order extending time to plead to complaint] would be made and he/she refused to agree to an extension to _____ [*date*].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], I _____ [informed defendant('s attorney) _____ (*name*) when and where the application would be made by _____ (*describe method, attaching and relevant documents as exhibits*) and he/she refused to agree to the proposed shortening of time *or* attempted to inform defendant and his/her attorney when and where the application would be made but was unable to do so in that _____ (*describe attempt, attaching any relevant documents as exhibits*) *or specify reasons why plaintiff should not be required to inform the defendant or his/her attorney*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for general use in making an ex parte application to the court for an extension of time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* or *1054.1*. The order sought by this application is *set out in § 524.53* and may be integrated into this form along with a supporting memorandum, all of which would then be listed in the caption [for supporting memoranda see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 212, *Shortening and Extension of Time*]. Extensions of time to plead under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054* are within the sound discretion of the court [*Lucci v. United Credit & Collection*

Co. (1934) 220 Cal. 492, 495, 31 P.2d 369] .

Code Civ. Proc. § 473(a) also provides the court with authority to extend the time for answer or demur. The court also has the power of to extend the time for performance of any act required or permitted by the California Rules of Court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 5.15* (family law rules), 1.10(c)]. This form may be adapted for use under those authorities.

Applications for extensions are to be heard by the judge before whom the matter is pending. [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(a)*]. Judges may grant orders and writs on ex parte application in chambers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 166*]. Local rules should be consulted for the time and place to present ex parte applications [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 9.0].

[3] Time to Apply for Extension

The application for any necessary extensions should be made during the period within which the act may be performed. The court has the power to grant an extension only during this period [*see Coast Electric Service, Inc. v. Jensen (1931) 111 Cal. App. 124, 126, 295 P. 346* (time for serving memorandum of costs)]. An application made after that time would be subject to the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* [*see Cornell Univ. Medical College v. Superior Court (1974) 38 Cal App. 3d 311, 314-315, 113 Cal. Rptr. 291]* .

[4] Length of Extension

If proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*, counsel should not seek an extension exceeding 30 days without the consent of the adverse party. Such an order would be void [*Kennedy v. Mulligan (1902) 136 Cal. 556, 557, 69 P. 291* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1054(a)*].

[5] Extensions for Attorney Legislators

The Supreme Court has decided that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1* is directory and not mandatory. It is to be applied subject to the discretion of the court as to whether its process and order of business should be delayed. Among the factors to be considered are [*Thurmond v. Superior Court (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 836, 839-840, 59 Cal. Rptr. 273, 427 P.2d 985]* :

- The nature and urgency of the rights involved.

- Whether the party seeking delay has or can secure other counsel to represent him or her for the particular step in the proceedings then before the court.

- Whether the attorney who is a member of the Legislature was employed for no other purpose than to attempt delay.

If proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1*, the attorney-legislator may wish to add additional facts to the declaration to convince the court that these factors outlined in *Thurmond*, are not present.

[6] Contents of Form

Applications for orders extending time must disclose the nature of the case andwhat extensions, if any, have previously been granted by order of court or stipulation of counsel (Paragraphs 2, 4) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(b)*].

If seeking an extension pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*, a statement of facts showing good cause for the extension must also be included (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*; for discussion, *see § 524.13[6]*].

It is good practice to clearly specify the act to be performed, the reasons supporting the application and to specify the

last day and hour by which the act is to be performed.

A party making an ex parte application for an order must notify all parties no later than 10:00 a.m. the court day before the ex parte appearance, absent a showing of exceptional circumstances [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1203(a)*], and the application must be accompanied by an affidavit or by declaration establishing one of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]:

- That, within the applicable time period under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1203*, the applicant informed the opposing party when and where the application would be made; or

- That the applicant in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform the opposing party; or

- That for reasons specified, the applicant should not be required to inform the opposing party.

If there has been an earlier application that was refused in whole or in part, any subsequent application of the same character or for the same relief, although made on an alleged different state of facts, must include a full disclosure of any previous applications and the court's actions [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1202(b)*].

For further discussion of and general forms based on Rule 3.1200 *et seq.*, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[7] Accompanying Papers

An ex parte application must be supported by a memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1201(4)*]. One exception to the memorandum requirement is if the application is made to extend the time to serve pleadings and the application is filed on Judicial Council Form CM-020 [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1114(a)(2)*; for form, *see § 524.53A*].

Any request for judicial notice must be made in a separate document listing the specific items for which notice is requested and must comply with the production and notice requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(m)*].

[8] Cross References

For a discussion of and forms for applications and orders extending time for service and filing of an appellate brief, see Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs*

For a discussion of and forms for obtaining extensions in discovery proceedings, Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*, Ch. 194, *Discovery: Interrogatories*, Ch. 195, *Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence*, Ch. 196, *Discovery: Requests for Admissions*

For a discussion of and alternative forms for applications and orders shortening and extending time for service of notice of motion and accompanying papers, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For memoranda relating to this form, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 212, *Shortening and Extension of Time*

171 of 175 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.53

§ 524.53 Ex Parte Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Order Extending Time [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1054, 1054.1]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	EX PARTE ORDER
vs.	)	EXTENDING TIME TO
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [*specify e.g.,*
Defendant.	)	PLEAD TO
	)	COMPLAINT]
	)	

_____

[*EITHER, for extension under Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*]

Application having been made by _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] and good cause appearing therefor,

[*OR, for extension under Code Civ. Proc. § 1054.1*]

Application having been made by _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] and proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court,

[*CONTINUE*]

IT IS ORDERED that _____'s [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] application to extend time to _____ [*specify act, e.g.,* answer or otherwise plead to the complaint on file herein] be, and hereby is, granted, and such time is extended to _____ [*time*] on _____ [*date*].

This order shall be served on all parties by _____ [*time*], _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*specify, e.g.,* Judge *or, if authorized,* Court Commissioner]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use in granting a party's ex parte application for an order extending time. It is frequently attached to the application [for the form of application, *see § 524.52*].

[3] Filing and Service of Order

Orders extending time must be filed immediately and copies served within 24 hours after being made or within such other time as may be fixed by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.20(c)*].

[4] Cross References

For a form for an order extending time for answer or demurrer, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.53A

§ 524.53A Ex Parte Application for Extension of Time to Serve Pleading and Order Extending Time to Serve [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1200 *et seq.*]--Judicial Council Form CM-020

[1] FORM Ex Parte Application for Extension of Time to Serve Pleadings and Order Extending Time to Serve [Code Civ. Proc. § 1054; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1200 *et seq.*]--Judicial Council Form CM-020

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The application illustrated in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of a form adopted by the Judicial Council for use in making an ex parte application for an extension of time to serve a pleading. The form includes an order if the time is granted. Use of this form, when applicable, is optional [*see Gov. Code § 68511*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; Judicial Council Form CM-020].

While an ex parte application generally must be supported by a memorandum [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1201(4)*], filing of this application on the Judicial Council form negates the supporting memorandum requirement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1114(a)(2)*]. If it would further the interest of justice, the party may submit, or the court may order, a supporting memorandum; and if so it must comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1114(b)*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

For additional discussion on notice requirements of an ex parte application to extend time, see *§ 524.52*. For discussion of ex parte applications and notice requirements in general, see *Ch. 372, Motions and Orders, § 372.19*. For additional discussion regarding the service of papers generally, see Ch. 517, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] Cross References

For a form of ex parte application for an order extending time for other than serving pleadings, see *§ 524.52*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.54

§ 524.54 Application and Declaration for Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005]

[1] FORM Application and Declaration for Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	APPLICATION AND SUPPORTING DECLARA-
Defendant.	)	TION OF _____ [*name*] FOR EX
	)	PARTE ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR SER-
	)	VICE OF NOTICE OF MOTION FOR
		_____ [*specify, e.g.,* ORDER
		COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE TO WRIT-
		TEN INTERROGATORIES] AND ACCOMPANY-
		ING PAPERS

_____

APPLICATION

I, _____ [*name*], hereby apply on behalf of _____ [*moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-captioned matter, for an order, pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1005(b),* shortening time for service of the attached notice of motion for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* order compelling further response to

written interrogatories] and supporting papers, to _____ days before the hearing.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff)].

2. _____ [*State facts showing good cause for shortening time for notice of motion, e.g.,* This is an action for damages arising from an automobile accident. It is currently scheduled to commence trial on _____ [*date*].As more fully set forth in the attached motion and accompanying papers, defendant's responses to plaintiff's first set of interrogatories were evasive and nonresponsive. Plaintiff's accident reconstruction expert needs responsive answers to the subject interrogatories in order to conduct further tests. In the absence of an order shortening time, this motion to compel further answers to interrogatories will not be heard, nor will further answers be obtained in time for the necessary tests to be performed prior to trial].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], I _____ [informed defendant('s attorney) _____ (*name*) when and where the application would be made by _____ (*describe method, attaching and relevant documents as exhibits*) and he/she refused to agree to the proposed shortening of time *or* attempted to inform defendant and his/her attorney when and where the application would be made but was unable to do so in that _____ (*describe attempt, attaching any relevant documents as exhibits*) *or specify reasons why plaintiff should not be required to inform the defendant or his/her attorney*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for general use when applying to the court for an ex parte order shortening time for service of notice of a motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* (authority of court or judge to shorten time for notice of motion)]. The moving party normally attaches a proposed order [for a form, *see § 524.55*], the notice of motion, and supporting papers to the application. This form can be modified to seek an ex parte order shortening time for proceedings other than notice of motions.

Paragraph 3 of the Declaration sets out facts concerning ex parte application notice procedures required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1200 et seq.* [For discussion, see *§ 524.52[5]*.

An application for an order shortening time in law and motion proceedings must be supported by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103(b), 3.1300(6)*].

This form refers to notice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*, but may be adapted for use to shorten other periods [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(h)* (order shortening time for service of subpena duces tecum); *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.270(d)*) (extension or shortening of time for notice of taking deposition)].

[3] Local Requirements

Local court rules should always be checked before preparation and presentation of ex parte applications [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.9; San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 9].

[4] Cross References

For discussion of requirements relating to ex parte applications generally, see *§ 524.52[2]* et seq.

For a discussion of and forms for shortening time for relief from default in property actions, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments*

For a discussion of and alternative forms for application and order shortening time for service of notice of motion and accompanying papers and for an ex parte motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For a discussion of and forms for obtaining orders shortening time in discovery proceedings, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* , Ch. 194, *Discovery: Interrogatories* , Ch. 195, *Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence* , Ch. 196, *Discovery: Requests for Admissions*

For memoranda relevant to this form, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 212, *Shortening and Extension of Time*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.55

§ 524.55 Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Order Shortening Time for Service of Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers [Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	EX PARTE ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR
Defendant.	)	SERVICE OF NOTICE OF MOTION FOR
	)	_____ [*specify, e.g.,* ORDER
	)	COMPELLING FURTHER RESPONSE TO WRIT-
		TEN INTERROGATORIES] AND ACCOMPANY-
		ING PAPERS

_____

Application having been made by _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] with proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the application of _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff], _____ [*name*], for an ex parte order shortening time for service of notice of motion for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* order compelling further response to written interrogatories] and accompanying papers is granted and the time of service of that notice of motion is shortened so that service by _____ [fax *or* personal delivery *or other manner*] to the office of the attorney for _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant], _____ [*name*], by _____ [*time*], on _____ [*date*], is sufficient notice of the proceeding.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*specify, e.g.,* Judge *or, if authorized,* Court Commissioner]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use in granting a party's application for an order shortening time for notice of motion. It is frequently attached, without its own caption, to the application and supporting declaration [for a form of application, *see § 524.54*], notice of motion, and accompanying papers.

For a form of ex parte order shortening time for notice of motion based on a form that was formerly required to be used in the Los Angeles County Superior Court, see *§ 524.56*.

An order shortening time for notice must designate a definite time within which notice must be served [*Howell v. Howell (1885) 66 Cal. 390, 391, 5 P. 681]* .

175 of 175 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 524 SHORTENING AND EXTENSION OF TIME
PART V. FORMS

46-524 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 524.56

§ 524.56 Ex Parte Order Granting Motion to Shorten Time for Serving Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers--Los Angeles Superior Court [former Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.36]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Order Granting Motion to Shorten Time for Serving Notice of Motion and Accompanying Papers--Los Angeles Superior Court [former Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.36]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER SHORTENING TIME
_____ [*name*],	)	Hearing Department _____
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Good cause having been shown therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the time of service of the foregoing _____ [*specify nature of notice and accompanying papers to be served*] is so shortened that service thereof by means of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, personal service no later than _____ o'clock on _____ [*date*], is adjudged to be sufficient notice of the proceeding mentioned therein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all papers in opposition must be filed in the Hearing Department by _____ o'clock on _____ [*date*], and served on opposing counsel by means of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, personal service or fax] by _____ o'clock on

_____ [*date*]. Proof of service of the motion and this order must be filed in the Hearing Department no later than _____ o'clock on _____ [*date*].

Opposition Papers must include the following notation on the first page, immediately below the date, time, and place of hearing:

"OPPOSITION FILED ON _____ [*date*],
PURSUANT TO EX PARTE OST
ISSUED ON _____ [*date of order*]."

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as follows:
_____
_____
_____

Hearing: _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*] in Department _____.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge/Commissioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, was adapted from a form that was in the past the mandatory form of ex parte order shortening time in Los Angeles County (former Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9, Appen. B). Los Angeles no longer mandates a specific form.

[3] Cross References

For an alternative form of ex parte order shortening time, see *§ 524.55*

For an ex parte application to shorten time, see *§ 524.54*

For discussion of ex parte applications, see *§ 524.52[2]* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 525.syn

§ 525.syn Synopsis to Chapter 525: SLIP AND FALL

§ 525.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 525.02 Cross References

§§ 525.03-525.09 [Reserved]

§ 525.10 Governing Law

§ 525.11 Standard of Care

[1] Reasonable Person Test

[2] Floors

[3] Carpets and Floor Mats

[4] Stairs

[5] Sidewalks

[6] Distinction Between Owner and Possessor

§ 525.12 Res Ipsa Loquitur Is Generally Unavailable

§§ 525.13through 525.29 [Reserved]

§ 525.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] Bender's Forms of Discovery

§ 525.31 State Statutes

§ 525.32 Decisions

[1] Architects

[2] Basis of Liability

[3] Floors

[4] Question of Fact

[5] Sidewalks

[6] Stairs

[7] Third Parties

[8] Warning

§ 525.33 Law Reviews

§ 525.34 Text References

§§ 525.35through 525.49 [Reserved]

§ 525.50 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Item Left on Floor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 525.51 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Slippery Condition

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.52 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Deteriorated Condition of Premises

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.53 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Unmarked Obstruction

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.54 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps of Unequal Height

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.55 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Dimly Lit Steps

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.56 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps With Loose Carpet

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.57 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Business Premises--Fall Resulting From Distracting Displays and/or Advertisements

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.58 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Spectator or Member of Audience Against Owner and/or Operator of Stadium/Coliseum/Theater--Fall Resulting From Overcrowded Conditions

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 525.59 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Architect/Designer--Fall Resulting From Defective Design and/or Supervision of Construction

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART I. SCOPE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.01

§ 525.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains allegations for use in complaints alleging that the negligence of the owner, possessor, or architect of particular premises was the proximate cause of personal injuries plaintiff received in a slip and fall accident. It contains forms of specific allegations [*see §§ 525.50 -525.58*] for use in an action against an owner or possessor of premises who has created and/or failed to discover, correct, or warn of a dangerous condition on the premises which caused plaintiff to slip and fall. It also contains a form of allegation [*see § 525.59*] for use in a complaint against an architect and/or designer for the negligent design and/or supervision of the construction of the structural condition which caused plaintiff to slip and fall.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART I. SCOPE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.02

§ 525.02 Cross References

For forms and discussions of the law that may be relevant to slip and fall cases in particular situations, see the following chapters:

- Ch. 16, *Airplanes and Airports*.
- Ch. 102, *Bridges*.
- Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars*.
- Ch. 110, *Churches and Religious Organizations*.
- Ch. 244, *Elevators and Escalators*.
- Ch. 246, *Emergency Vehicles*.
- Ch. 273, *Games, Sports, and Athletics*.
- Ch. 274, *Garages and Gas Stations*.
- Ch. 295, *Hospitals*.
- Ch. 297, *Hotels and Motels*.
- Ch. 334, *Landlord and Tenant: Claims for Damages*.
- Ch. 460, *Products Liability*.
- Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*.

- Ch. 485, *Railroads*.
- Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students*.
- Ch. 522, *Ships and Shipping*.
- Ch. 544, *Taxicabs*.
- Ch. 547, *Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Places*.

For discussion and forms relating to premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* , and for discussion and forms relating to negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART I. SCOPE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 525.03-525.09

[Reserved]

§§ 525.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.10

§ 525.10 Governing Law

Slip and fall accidents, like other types of actions based on negligence, are governed by *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*. The leading case defining the rights and duties of landowners and possessors is *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.11

§ 525.11 Standard of Care

[1] Reasonable Person Test

In accordance with *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*, the proper test to be applied to the liability of the possessor of land is whether, in the management of his or her property, the possessor has acted as a reasonable person in view of the probability of injury to others. Although the plaintiff's status as a trespasser, licensee, or invitee may, in the light of the facts giving rise to such status, have some bearing on the question of liability, the status is not determinative [*Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 119, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* ; *see also* *Peterson v. Superior Court (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1185, 1196-1197, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836, 899 P.2d 905* (reiterating general principles of *Rowland* and other cases regarding negligence liability, while rejecting strict liability for injuries caused by latent defects in premises)].

The statutory standard of care required by *Civ. Code § 1714(a)* is the same as the standard of care traditionally required in cases where the plaintiff's status was that of an invitee [*Beauchamp v. Los Gatos Golf Course (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 20, 25, 77 Cal. Rptr. 914]* . Therefore, those decisions delineating the duties of a landowner or possessor toward his or her invitee are not abrogated by *Rowland v. Christian* [*Beauchamp v. Los Gatos Golf Course (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 20, 25, 77 Cal. Rptr. 914]* .

The possessor of land has a duty to correct or warn of known dangerous conditions [*Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 119, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561]* . The possessor also has a duty to make a reasonable inspection to discover dangerous conditions which are not known, and a plaintiff may use evidence of the lack of inspections within a reasonable length of time to prove circumstantially that the possessor had constructive knowledge of the defect with sufficient time to correct it [*Ortega v. Kmart Corp. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 1200, 1212-1213, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 470, 36 P.3d 11* (jury question whether, considering all circumstances, lack of inspection is sufficient to support liability)]; [*Bridgman v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 443, 447, 2 Cal. Rptr. 146, 348 P.2d 696]* . However, the possessor is not required to warn of obvious dangers [*Curland v. Los Angeles County Fair Ass'n (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 691, 695, 258 P.2d 1063]* .

The court of appeal has specifically rejected the argument that a store may be liable if the store's use of a particular business model creates a greater risk that a particular hazard will arise more frequently, even though the store does not

have knowledge or constructive knowledge of the dangerous condition that actually caused the injury. In that case, for example, a department store was not liable to a patron who slipped on a french fry merely because the store leased space to a fast food restaurant and allowed patrons to take food and drink from the restaurant into the department store, absent a showing that the store knew or should have known of the french fry in time to prevent the injury [*Moore v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 472, 478-479, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 813]* .

[2] Floors

An owner or possessor of property has the duty of keeping floors dry [*Tuttle v. Crawford (1936) 8 Cal. 2d 126, 133-134, 63 P.2d 1128* ; *Lamb v. Purity Store, Inc. (1932) 119 Cal. App. 690, 692, 7 P.2d 197]* and free from foreign substances [*see* *Ahern v. S.H. Kress & Co. (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 691, 699, 218 P.2d 108]* so that they are reasonably safe to traverse. The question of reasonable safety is closely related to the type of person expected to traverse the floor. It has been held that even the mere waxing of a floor may be negligent in some cases [*Cagle v. Bakersfield Med. Group (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 77, 81, 241 P.2d 1013]* . Whether a floor is so negligently maintained as to render the person responsible for its condition liable for damages is a question of fact [*Tuttle v. Crawford (1936) 8 Cal. 2d 126, 130, 63 P.2d 1128]* .

[3] Carpets and Floor Mats

The owner or possessor of property is liable for injuries resulting from unreasonably loose carpeting [*Sharpless v. Pantages (1918) 178 Cal. 122, 124, 172 P. 384]* or unsafe floor mats [*Blumberg v. M. & T., Inc. (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 226, 229, 209 P.2d 1]* .

[4] Stairs

The owner or possessor of premises is liable for injuries caused by dangerous or defective stairs [*Megee v. Fasulis (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 94, 103, 150 P.2d 281]* . Among the conditions found to be unreasonably dangerous are slippery stairs [*see* *Donohue v. San Francisco Hous. Auth. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 658, 665, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 148* (wet concrete stairs without skid-resistant treads); *Rau v. Redwood City Woman's Club (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 546, 551-552, 245 P.2d 12]* , unlighted stairs [*see* *Ralph v. Clifton's Brookdale, Inc. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 574, 576-577, 193 P.2d 511]* , stairs with different height steps [*King v. New Masonic Temple Assn.(1942) 51 Cal. App. 2d 512, 515-516, 125 P.2d 559]* , and defective bannisters [*Trainor v. Maus (1954) 126 Cal. App. 2d 295, 299, 271 P.2d 957]* .

[5] Sidewalks

Despite the existence of a statute requiring a property owner to keep adjacent sidewalks in repair [*Sts. & Hy. Code § 5610*], the courts have held that the property owner is not liable for injury caused by dangerous conditions that are not created by the owner's positive acts [*Jones v. Deeter (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 798, 803, 199 Cal. Rptr. 825* ; *Schaefer v. Lenahan (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 324, 326-332, 146 P.2d 929]* . However, if an abutting owner created the dangerous condition [*Lay v. Pacific Perforating Co. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 233, 237, 144 P.2d 395]* , or if the dangerous condition was created for the special benefit and convenience of the abutting owner [*Daly v. Mathews (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 545, 548, 122 P.2d 81]* , the owner will be liable.

[6] Distinction Between Owner and Possessor

Common law holds the possessor of property primarily responsible for its safe condition. Possession is equated with occupancy plus control [*Low v. Sacramento (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 826, 831, 87 Cal. Rptr. 173]* . Control over property is defined as the power to prevent, remedy, or guard against the dangerous condition [*Fuller v. California (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 926, 947, 125 Cal. Rptr. 586]* . Thus, in determining liability and alleging a cause of action for slip and fall injuries, a crucial consideration is which party had control over the area where the accident occurred [

Schwartz v. Helms Bakery Ltd. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 232, 239, 60 Cal. Rptr. 510, 430 P.2d 68] . Generally, this will be the party in possession of the property.

In limited circumstances, an owner not in possession may be liable for injuries on his or her premises. Thus, a landowner may be liable for injuries resulting from his or her failure to warn a tenant of a latent dangerous condition of which the owner had notice [*Hanson v. Luft (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 443, 445, 24 Cal. Rptr. 681, 374 P.2d 641]* , for breach of a convenant to repair [*see* *McNally v. Ward (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 871, 884, 14 Cal. Rptr. 260]* , for violation of a statute [*Finnegan v. Royal Realty Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 409, 423, 218 P.2d 17]* , or for injuries occurring on a part of the property over which the owner retains control [*Sockett v. Gottlieb (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 760, 766, 9 Cal. Rptr. 831]* .

Thus, a slip and fall plaintiff would normally include the possessor of the property as a defendant, and, where there is a separate basis for liability, an owner not in possession of the property.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsDuty to InspectTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDangerous ConditionsDuty to WarnTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty off PremisesSidewalks & StreetsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesReasonable Care

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.12

§ 525.12 Res Ipsa Loquitur Is Generally Unavailable

The Supreme Court has stated that experience teaches that slips and falls are not so likely to be the result of negligence that a presumption tothat effect is justified. The Court was unwilling to go so far as to say that res ipsa loquitur can never apply to a slip and fall, but noted that a slip and fall caused by a slippery object permits a res ipsa loquitur instruction only if the evidence shows that the object had been there long enough that the owner of the premises should have discovered and removed it [*see Brown v. Poway Unified School Dist. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 820, 826-827, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 679, 843 P.2d 624* (res ipsa presumption inappropriate when delivery person slipped, and piece of luncheon meat was found on bottom of shoe; possible explanations that did not involve negligence were equally probable as those involving negligence)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceProofRes Ipsa LoquiturLimits on ApplicationTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 525.13through 525.29

[Reserved]

§§ 525.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.30

§ 525.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to forms in this chapter, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* , and Ch. 178, *Premises Liability* (Matthew Bender)

[2] Bender's Forms of Discovery

For forms of interrogatories for use in slip and fall actions, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Vol. 4, *Damages;* Vol. 7, *Negligence*, and Vol. 9, *Slip and Fall* and *Stairways and Steps*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsInterrogatoriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.31

§ 525.31 State Statutes

Property owner's or possessor's liability to recreational users. *Civ. Code § 846*

Limitation on liability of landowner toward person injured or killed during commission of crime. *Civ. Code § 847*

Care and skill required in management of property. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Procedure to require undertaking in action against architect or designer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.5*

Liability of abutting owner for condition of sidewalk. *Sts. & Hy. Code § 5610*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityProfessional ServicesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsCriminal ActivityTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty off PremisesSidewalks & StreetsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesRecreational Use Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.32

§ 525.32 Decisions

[1] Architects

Architect was liable for wrongful death resulting from failure to mention presence of high-voltage line in plans that called for excavation of footings. *Mallow v. Tucker, Sadler & Bennett, Architects & Eng'rs, Inc. (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 700, 702-703, 54 Cal. Rptr. 174*

Architect who plans and supervises construction work has duty to exercise ordinary care for protection of persons who foreseeably may be injured by architect's failure to do so, even though injury may occur after work has been accepted by person engaging architect's services. *Montijo v. Swift (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 351, 353, 33 Cal. Rptr. 133*

Architect was liable for negligent supervision of construction of sun deck. *Pieri v. Rosebrook (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 250, 257-258, 275 P.2d 67*

Architect who negligently supervises construction has liability that is separate and distinct from liability of party who negligently performs actual construction. *Alexander v. Hammarberg (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 872, 879-880, 884, 230 P.2d 399*

[2] Basis of Liability

Common law distinctions as to duty owed to guests, invitees, and trespassers abolished and liability predicated on ordinary negligence under Civ. Code§ 1714, which is civil law, not common law principle. *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 112-120, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561*

Joint liability of city and adjacent landowner for injury caused by landowner's creation of dangerous condition of

sidewalk. *Peters v. City & County of San Francisco (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 419, 429, 260 P.2d 55*

Janitorial service was not liable for slip in parking lot because service contracted by owner to sweep lot and evidence showed that contract was performed to owner's satisfaction. *Cacciaguidi v. Elliott (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 261, 264-265, 114 Cal. Rptr. 93*

Abolishment of attractive nuisance doctrine in *California. Smith v. Americania Motor Lodge (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7, 113 Cal. Rptr. 771*

Trial court committed reversible error in refusing to instruct on general rule for liability for negligence pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1714* in tenant's action against landlord for injuries sustained in fall off stairway when handrail broke. *Brennan v. Cockrell Invs. Inc. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 796, 800-802, 111 Cal. Rptr. 122*

Propriety of jury instruction on safety order set forth in California Code of Regulations in personal injury action by boy who tripped over edge of uncompleted parking lot structure; persons consensually on premises to which safety order applies also came within its protection; defense of assumption of risk was inapplicable because action based on violation of safety law intended to protect class of which plaintiff was member. *Cappa v. Oscar C. Holmes, Inc. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 978, 981-984, 102 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Liability of grandmother in case in which 4-year-old boy ran out from underneath robe rack in store and tripped woman in lingerie department. *Costello v. Hart (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 898, 900-901, 100 Cal. Rptr. 554*

[3] Floors

Duty of store proprietor to inspect, discover, make safe and/or warn of dangerous condition on floor. *Bridgman v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 443, 446-447, 2 Cal. Rptr. 146, 348 P.2d 696*

Liability of owner of office building for injury caused by unsafe floor mats. *Blumberg v. M. & T., Inc. (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 226, 229, 209 P.2d 1*

Necessity of proprietor's exercising care to keep floors and aisles safe was increased because attention of persons shopping at markets is attracted by displays of products. *Tuttle v. Crawford (1936) 8 Cal. 2d 126, 130, 63 P.2d 1128* ; *Sparks v. Allen Northridge Mkt. (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 694, 699-700, 1 Cal. Rptr. 595*

Liability of theater for injury caused by loose carpets. *Sharpless v. Pantages (1918) 178 Cal. 122, 125, 172 P. 384*

In case involving plaintiff's slip on metal bracket left on store floor, trial court did not err in giving special jury instructions derived from valid case law, because instructions did not impose on defendant any duty other than reasonable care and did not negate plaintiff's comparative fault; instruction that store owners have duty to exercise ordinary care as not "unnecessarily to expose patron to danger or accident" did not permit jury to infer that owner may only avoid liability when exercising ordinary care to do what is necessary. *Craddock v. Kmart Corp. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1306-1308, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 881*

Plaintiff who fell while dancing on floor on which soap flakes had been applied and not thoroughly swept away was not barred from recovering for injuries from owner of premises and sponsor of dance; secondary assumption of risk applied because, despite risk of falling inherent in activity of social dancing, defendants had duty to use due care not to increase risk by making floor too slippery. *Bush v. Parents Without Partners (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 322, 329, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 178*

Obviousness of danger (planks, together with other equipment and supplies of painting contractor, stacked neatly in corner of hotel lobby) negated foreseeability of injury by defendant necessary to establish negligence and established negligence on part of plaintiff who tripped and fell. *Dixon v. St. Francis Hotel Corp. (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 739, 741, 77 Cal. Rptr. 201*

Store owner not liable to patron for slip and fall caused by broken bottle on floor because store owner had neither actual nor constructive knowledge of dangerous condition. *Romeo v. Jumbo Mkt. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 817, 824, 56 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Duty of storekeeper not to wax floor so as to make it slippery enough to be dangerous to patrons. *Clayton v. J. C. Penney Co. (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 1, 6-7, 8 Cal. Rptr. 712*

People are not expected to constantly look at floor for possible dangers. *Shipman v. Norton (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 90, 93, 315 P.2d 906*

Liability of storekeeper for allowing trash on floor on which patron might slip and fall. *Goldsmith v. Mills (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 493, 496, 279 P.2d 51*

Duty of plaintiff to look where he or she is going, to observe that which is in plain sight, and to avoid obvious danger. *Curland v. Los Angeles County Fair Ass'n (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 691, 695, 258 P.2d 1063*

Negligence was established by slip and fall caused by vomit on floor adjacent to seat because exercise of ordinary care would have revealed its presence to theater; amount of time substance had remained on floor, clear visibility with flashlight, and frequency of vomiting in theater were factors indicating that ordinary care in maintaining safe conditions had not been exercised. *Travis v. Metropolitan Theatres Corp. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 664, 668, 205 P.2d 475*

Slip and fall on theater restroom floor caused by water and paper towels was negligence because manager had knowledge of dangerous condition and provided neither remedy nor warning to plaintiff who had no knowledge of condition. *Newman v. Fox W. Coast Theatres (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 428, 432-433, 194 P.2d 706*

Duty of store owner to find and remove puddle from floor. *Ahern v. S.H. Kress & Co. (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 691, 699, 218 P.2d 108*

Duty of owner or possessor of property to keep floors reasonably dry. *Lamb v. Purity Store, Inc. (1932) 119 Cal. App. 690, 692, 7 P.2d 197*

[4] Question of Fact

Whether defective condition at grocery store existed long enough that it would have been discovered if owner exercised reasonable care was question forjury. *Bridgman v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 443, 447, 2 Cal. Rptr. 146, 348 P.2d 696*

[5] Sidewalks

Right of pedestrian to assume sidewalk in reasonably safe condition. *Peters v. City & County of San Francisco (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 419, 424, 260 P.2d 55*

Liability of city and adjoining property owner for injuries received by pedestrial in slip and fall on defective sidewalk. *Laurenzi v. Vranizan (1945) 25 Cal. 2d 806, 809-810, 155 P.2d 633*

Ordinance requiring abutting landowners to maintain public sidewalk created duty only to city, not to pedestrians; trial court's instructions on negligence per se doctrine were error. *Selger v. Steven Bros., Inc. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1585, 1590-1591, 272 Cal. Rptr. 544*

Owner of sidewalk dedicated to city was not liable for pedestrian's injury due to dangerous condition caused by roots of trees habitually maintained by city. *Jones v. Deeter (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 798, 803-806, 199 Cal. Rptr. 825*

Propriety of jury instruction setting forth care required of pedestrian on sidewalk and pedestrian's right to assume it to be in safe condition in action involving slipping on transparent oil or grease on floor of auto service center. *Milton v. Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 133, 141-142, 108 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Liability of restaurant owner to prospective patron who tripped over drainage berm in private walkway that served as one approach to back door of restaurant from adjacent public parking lot. *Ross v. Kirby (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 267, 270-271, 59 Cal. Rptr. 601*

Plaintiff's knowledge of slippery condition and failure to look where she was placing her feet constituted negligence. *Harris v. Trinity Lodge (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 41, 43, 20 Cal. Rptr. 348*

Sts. & Hy. Code § 5610, which requires landowner to maintain abutting sidewalks, does not create duty to party injured because of failure to maintain sidewalk. *Schaefer v. Lenahan (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 324, 327, 146 P.2d 929*

Liability of owner of abutting property to party injured by defect in sidewalk caused by abutting owner. *Lay v. Pacific Perforating Co. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 233, 237, 144 P.2d 395*

Liability of owner of abutting property to party injured by defect in sidewalk created for special benefit and convenience of abutting owner. *Daly v. Mathews (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 545, 548, 122 P.2d 81*

Liability of restaurant owner for injuries suffered by pedestrian who fell into unguarded opening in sidewalk that led to owner's basement. *Rosella v. Paxinos (1930) 110 Cal. App. 299, 302, 294 P. 39*

[6] Stairs

Liability of apartment house owner for slips and falls in common stairways and hallways. *Harris v. Joffe (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 418, 423-424, 170 P.2d 454*

Proprietor had duty to use ordinary care to maintain carpet on steps in such condition that it would be safe for person to pass on them in ordinary manner; plaintiff's allegation of loose carpet causing foot to slip was sufficient to defeat motion of nonsuit. *Sharpless v. Pantages (1918) 178 Cal. 122, 124, 172 P. 384*

Airline not liable for negligent maintenance of stairway on premises that it did not own or lease at airport. *Marshall v. United Airlines (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 84, 87-91, 110 Cal. Rptr. 416*

Maintenance of unmarked step on a substantially unlighted patio constituted negligence. *Markewych v. Altshules (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 642, 645, 63 Cal. Rptr. 335*

Theater's rule requiring ushers to illuminate patrons' way was indicative of its recognition of standard of care required by dim lighting. *Beal v. Blumenfeld Theatres, Inc. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 192, 194, 2 Cal. Rptr. 110* (reversing nonsuit in case in which patron tripped over hat on dimly lit steps)

Maintenance of 3-inch step or drop-off between porch and walkway, and of same material and color, constituted negligence. *Shipman v. Norton (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 90, 92-93, 315 P.2d 906*

Liability of possessor of property for injury caused by defective bannisters. *Trainor v. Maus (1954) 126 Cal. App. 2d 295, 299, 271 P.2d 957*

Liability of possessor of property for injury caused by slippery stairs. *Rau v. Redwood City Woman's Club (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 546, 551, 245 P.2d 12*

Liability of innkeeper for falls caused by failure to keep stairway well lighted. *Staudinger v. Whitlock (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 288, 292, 244 P.2d 414*

Liability of possessor of property for injury caused by unlighted stairs. *Ralph v. Clifton's Brookdale, Inc. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 574, 576, 193 P.2d 511*

Duty of tavern owner to maintain stairs in safe condition. *Megee v. Fasulis (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 94, 103, 150 P.2d 281*

Maintenance of steps of unequal height constituted negligence. *King v. New Masonic Temple Assn. (1942) 51 Cal. App. 2d 512, 516, 125 P.2d 559*

Liability of hotel owner for maintaining hotel stairways in slippery condition. *Sommerfield v. Miratti (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 450, 453-454, 121 P.2d 746*

Theater maintaining parking lot for patrons was required to exercise reasonable care in providing for safety of patrons; maintenance of subsurface ramp with 6-inch retaining walls without warning or protection was substantial proof of negligence. *Martin v. Fox W. Coast Theatres Corp. (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 925, 929-930, 108 P.2d 29*

Liabilty of proprietor of sporting event for injuries to spectators caused by negligently maintained stairways. *Martin v. Angel City Baseball Ass'n (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 586, 589, 40 P.2d 287*

[7] Third Parties

Liability of possessor of land open to public for business purposes for negligent or intentional acts of third persons if possessor reasonably could have discovered those acts and protected public. *Hunter v. Mohawk Petroleum Corp. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 439, 441, 334 P.2d 193*

Duty of owner of place of business open to public to exercise reasonable care to protect business invitees from danger from conduct of third persons on premises. *Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 925-926, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919*

Duty of owner of place of business to use reasonable care to protect patrons against negligent or wrongful acts of other patrons on premises if owner has reasonable cause to anticipate such acts and probability of resulting injury. *Sample v. Eaton (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 312, 316, 302 P.2d 431*

Liability of race track operator for injury to invitee from act of another invitee was based on operator's notice of prior conduct from which that injury might be anticipated. *Porter v. California Jockey Club, Inc. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 158, 160, 285 P.2d 60*

[8] Warning

Although obviousness of water on sidewalk and driveway may have alleviated landowner's duty to warn of danger, triable issue existed as to whether landowner had other duties, such as duty to remedy. *Martinez v. Chippewa Enters., Inc. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1184-1185, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 152*

Theater operator required to use reasonable care to keep premises in reasonably safe condition and to give warning of concealed perils; operator not liable for injury resulting from obvious danger, such as wet sidewalk caused by rain. *Matherne v. Los Feliz Theatre (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 660, 665-666, 128 P.2d 59*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityProfessional ServicesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsCriminal ActivityTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty off PremisesSidewalks & StreetsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesReasonable Care

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.33

§ 525.33 Law Reviews

Comment, *California Sidewalks: A Comprehensive Scheme for Determining Municipal and Abutter Liabilities, 31 Santa Clara L. Rev. 463 (1991)*

Ursin, *Strict Liability for Defective Business Premises--One Step Beyond Rowland and Greenman, 22 UCLA L. Rev. 820 (1975)*

Comment, *California Applies Negligence Principles in Determining Liability of a Land Occupier, 9 Santa Clara Lawyer 179 (1968)*

Comment, *Rowland v. Christian: New Protection Afforded a Social Guest, 3 U.S.F. L. Rev. 170 (1968)*

Comment, *Architect Tort Liability in Preparation of Plans and Specifications, 55 Cal. L. Rev. 1361 (1967)*

Note, *Torts: Negligence: Duty of an Operator of a Place of Amusement to Protect Patrons Against Acts of Third Persons, 6 UCLA L. Rev 494 (1959)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityProfessional ServicesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsCriminal ActivityTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty off PremisesSidewalks & StreetsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesReasonable CareTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises

LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.34

§ 525.34 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 6, *Torts,* § 804, 805, 891 et seq. (9th ed. 1988)

6 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Architects, Engineers, and Surveyors,* §§ 30-32

5 Am. Jur. 2d, *Architects,* §§ 23-25

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityProfessional ServicesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 525.35through 525.49

[Reserved]

§§ 525.35[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.50

§ 525.50 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Item Left on Floor

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Item Left on Floor

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was in possession of and controlled [and owned] certain [business] premises at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* shopping] at the above-described [business] premises of defendant, defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned,] controlled, inspected, and cleaned the premises as to allow a _____ [*specify substance plaintiff tripped over, e.g.,* broken ketchup bottle] to remain on the floor of the premises for an unreasonable period of time.

3. The dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to warn of, or clean up and make safe, the condition.

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* walking down the produce aisle in defendant's premises], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint for personal injury damages resulting from plaintiff's fall on an item negligently left on the floor.

[3] Allegations

Actionable negligence involves a legal duty to use due care, a breach of such legal duty, and the breach as the proximate

or legal cause of the resulting injury [*United States Liab. Ins. Co. v. Haidinger-Hayes, Inc. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 586, 594, 83 Cal. Rptr. 418, 463 P.2d 770]* . In this form, Paragraphs 1 and 2 allege the facts from which the defendant's legal duty to use due care in the control of the premises arises; Paragraphs 2 and 3 allege defendant's breach of this duty; and Paragraph 4 alleges the breach as the proximate cause of the resulting injury.

A general form for the caption, additional general allegations, and prayer, which should be added to these allegations to complete the complaint, may be found in Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[4] Cross References

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to this form, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* , and Ch. 178, *Premises Liability* .

For forms of interrogatories for use in slip and fall actions, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Vol. 4, *Damages;* Vol. 7, *Negligence;* and Vol. 9, *Slip and Fall* and *Stairways and Steps*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.51

§ 525.51 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Slippery Condition

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Slippery Condition

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* shopping] at the above-described [business] premises of defendant and was _____ [*specify, e.g.,* descending the stairway between the first floor and the basement], defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned,] controlled, inspected, and cleaned the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* stairway] as to allow _____ [*specify slippery condition, e.g.,* an accumulation of wax] to make the surface of the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* stairway] slippery and dangerous.

3. The slippery and dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to warn of, or make safe, the condition.

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify, e.g.,* descending the stairway], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for damages resulting from the personal injuries plaintiff sustained in a fall which was proximately caused by defendant's negligently permitting slippery conditions to exist on the premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.52

§ 525.52 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Deteriorated Condition of Premises

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Resulting From Deteriorated Condition of Premises

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* shopping] at the above-described [business] premises of defendant, defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned,] controlled, maintained, and inspected the premises so as to allow the _____ [*specify area, e.g.,* floor in the southeast corner] to reach such an advanced state of deterioration that it was unsafe for persons to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* walk on the floor].

3. The deteriorated and dangerous condition of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the floor] was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to warn of, or to repair and make safe, the condition.

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff fell _____ [*specify, e.g.,* through the floor] of the premises while _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* walking from the jewelry department to the men's department], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for damages resulting from personal injuries the plaintiff sustained in a fall which was proximately caused by the defendant's negligently permitting a deteriorated condition to exist on the premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.53

§ 525.53 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Unmarked Obstruction

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall on Unmarked Obstruction

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], while plaintiff was _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* walking through the courtyard to enter a friend's apartment] at the above-described [business] premises of defendant, defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned and] controlled the premises that _____ [*specify unmarked obstruction, e.g.,* a single unmarked and unpainted step or rise, made of the same material as the upper and lower portion of the courtyard, was situated near the middle of the courtyard].

3. The dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to have _____ [*specify, e.g.,* marked the step or rise, warned users of the courtyard of the dangerous and defective condition, or have taken other measures to make the step or rise safe.]

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* walking through the courtyard to enter a friend's apartment], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for personal damages resulting from injuries plaintiff sustained in a fall which was proximately caused by defendant's negligently permitting an unmarked obstruction to be present on the premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.54

§ 525.54 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps of Unequal Height

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps of Unequal Height

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was walking _____ [up *or* down] the stairs _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* between the first floor and basement of the above-described premises], defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned and] controlled the premises that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the distance between the last step and the floor of the basement was greater than the vertical distance between the steps themselves].

3. The defective and dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person would have _____ [*specify necessary construction to remedy defect, e.g.,* rebuilt the steps so that the distance between each step was uniform], warned users of the stairs of the dangerous and defective condition, or have taken other measures to make the stairs safe.

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify, e.g.,* stepping from the last step of the stairs to the basement floor], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for damages resulting from plaintiff's fall down steps of unequal height on defendant's premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.55

§ 525.55 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Dimly Lit Steps

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Dimly Lit Steps

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was walking _____ [up *or* down] the stairs _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* leading from the theater auditorium to the lobby], defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned and] controlled, operated, maintained, and inspected the premises that _____ [*allege facts indicating defendant's negligence in not maintaining the steps in a reasonably safe condition, e.g.,* the light on the steps was so dim that plaintiff did not see a foreign object on one of the steps, stepped on the object, lost her footing, and fell down the remaining steps].

3. The defective and dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care should have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to have _____ [*specify acts that would have remedied the unsafe condition of the steps, e.g.,* installed additional lights on the steps].

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify circumstances surrounding plaintiff's injury, e.g.,* stepping down the stairs on her way to the lobby], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for damages resulting from personal injuries the plaintiff sustained in a fall that was proximately caused by the defendant's negligently maintaining dim lighting on steps on the premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.56

§ 525.56 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps With Loose Carpet

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Premises--Fall Down Steps With Loose Carpet

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was walking _____ [up *or* down] the stairs _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* leading from the theater auditorium to the lobby], defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned and] controlled, operated, maintained, and inspected the premises that _____ [*allege facts indicating defendant's negligence in not maintaining the steps in a reasonably safe condition, e.g.,* the carpeting on the steps was so loose that plaintiff's shoe was caught, his foot twisted, and he fell down].

3. The defective and dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care should have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to have _____ [*specify acts that would have remedied the unsafe condition of the steps, e.g.,* repaired the loose carpet].

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff slipped and fell while _____ [*specify circumstances surrounding plaintiff's injury, e.g.,* descending the steps on his way out of the theater], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of premises for damages resulting from personal injuries the plaintiff sustained in a fall that was proximately caused by the defendant's negligently maintaining steps on which the carpeting was loose.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.57

§ 525.57 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Business Premises--Fall Resulting From Distracting Displays and/or Advertisements

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Owner or Possessor of Business Premises--Fall Resulting From Distracting Displays and/or Advertisements

1. [*Defendant's possession and/or ownership of premises. See § 525.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was shopping _____ [*specify area of store, e.g.,* in the lingerie department on the fifth floor] at the above-described business premises of defendant, defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned,] controlled, displayed, and advertised its goods on the premises as to create a dangerous condition whereby the attention of customers such as plaintiff was likely to be distracted.

3. The dangerous and distracting condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* dismantle the display or move it to a safer area].

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff was distracted and slipped and fell on _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the step separating the lingerie department from the bath department on the fifth floor] of the premises, sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner or possessor of business premises for damages resulting from personal injuries plaintiff sustained in a fall proximately caused by defendant's negligent placement of distracting displays and/or advertisements. The allegations contained in this form may be combined with the allegations contained in other forms in this chapter when the conditions causing plaintiff's fall were aggravated by the presence of distracting displays or advertising.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

23 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.58

§ 525.58 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Spectator or Member of Audience Against Owner and/or Operator of Stadium/Coliseum/Theater--Fall Resulting From Overcrowded Conditions

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Spectator or Member of Audience Against Owner and/or Operator of Stadium/Coliseum/Theater--Fall Resulting From Overcrowded Conditions

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was in possession of [and owned] and controlled, a certain _____ [coliseum *or* stadium *or* theater] located at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was [*specify, e.g.,* entering] the above-described premises for the purposes of watching _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a boxing match], defendant so carelessly and negligently [owned and] controlled the premises that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the large crowd to whom defendant had sold general admission tickets became unruly and pushed and shoved their way through the entrance attempting to obtain desireable seats for the event].

3. The dangerous condition was known, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care would have been known, to defendant in adequate time for a reasonably prudent person to have _____ [*specify, e.g.,* sold reserved seats rather than general admission seats, hired adequate security forces, or taken other precautions to have prevented the dangerous condition from arising].

4. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant, plaintiff was pushed and shoved and caused to fall while _____ [*specify, e.g.,* entering the entrance to the premises], sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against the owner and/or operator of a stadium, coliseum, or theater for damages resulting from personal injuries plaintiff sustained in a fall which was caused by overcrowded conditions.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

For a discussion of, and complaint forms relating to civil liability based on acts of intoxicated persons, see Ch. 19, *Alchoholic Beverages: Civil Liability* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 525 SLIP AND FALL
PART IV. FORMS

46-525 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 525.59

§ 525.59 Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Architect/Designer--Fall Resulting From Defective Design and/or Supervision of Construction

[1] FORM Allegations for Use in Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injuries Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Against Architect/Designer--Fall Resulting From Defective Design and/or Supervision of Construction

1. Prior to _____ [*date*], defendant drew and prepared certain plans and specifications for [, and supervised the construction of,] a building located at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California. The building, its appurtenances, and particularly the _____ [*specify defectively designed or constructed part of building, e.g.,* stairway and attached handrail between the first floor and the basement,] were constructed in accordance with the plans and specifications prepared and drawn by defendant [, and constructed under defendant's supervision].

2. At all times herein mentioned, and particularly at the time defendant drew the plans and specifications [and supervised the construction,] defendant knew, or in the exercise of ordinary and reasonable care should have known, that _____ [*specify defect, e.g.,* having the handrail end two steps before the end of the stairway], as defendant's plans called for, would create a dangerous and unsafe condition for persons using the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* stairway].

3. As a proximate result of the negligence and carelessness of defendant, on or about _____ [*date*], while plaintiff was on the above-described premises and _____ [*specify activity, e.g.,* descending the stairway, when plaintiff's hand reached the end of the handrail, plaintiff assumed he/she had reached the end of the stairs, stepped forward,] and fell to the floor, sustaining severe injuries and damages as hereinafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint against an architect or designer for damages resulting from personal injuries plaintiff sustained in a fall proximately caused by defendant's negligent design and/or supervision of construction of the premises.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 525.50*

For a discussion of, and forms for use in, actions against architects for breach of contract or negligence, see Ch. 56, *Architects*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 526.syn

§ 526.syn Synopsis to Chapter 526: SMALL CLAIMS

§ 526.01 Scope of Chapter

§§ 526.02-526.09 [Reserved]

§ 526.10 Governing Law

§§ 526.11-526.29 [Reserved]

§ 526.30 Definitions

§ 526.31 Organization and Purpose of Small Claims Courts

§ 526.32 Subject Matter Jurisdiction

[1] Monetary Limits on Claims

[a] In General

[b] Exception for Claims Against Guarantors

[c] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Required for Claims Against Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation or Division of Juvenile Facilities

[d] Waiver of Excess Amount of Demand

[e] Filing Restrictions on Claims Exceeding $2,500

[2] Effect of Joinder of Claims by Multiple Plaintiffs

[3] Effect of Splitting Cause of Action

[a] In General

[b] Effect Of Insured's Small Claims Action on Later Subrogation Action by Insurer

[4] Incidental Equitable Relief and Conditional Judgment

[5] Jurisdictional Transfer to Small Claims Court Not Authorized

§ 526.33 Venue

§ 526.34 Parties

[1] In General

[2] Restrictions

[a] Assignee

[b] Corporation

[c] Other Entity

[d] Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation or Division of Juvenile Facilities

[3] Vexatious Litigants

§ 526.35 Legal Assistance

[1] Restriction on Attorneys

[2] Legal Advisors

[a] Individual Assistance Available to Litigants

[b] Notice of Availability

[c] Qualifications of Advisors and Conflict of Interest

§§ 526.36-526.49 [Reserved]

§ 526.50 Commencement of Action

[1] Filing of Claim

[2] Content of Claim

[3] Fees

[4] Designation of Parties

[a] Individual

[b] Partnership

[c] Unincorporated Association

[d] Minor or Incompetent

[e] Public Entities

[5] Obtaining Hearing Date

§ 526.51 Fictitious Business Name

[1] Declaration of Compliance With Laws

[2] Correct Legal Name of Defendant

§ 526.52 Service of Plaintiff's Claim and Ordering of Defendant's Appearance

[1] In General

[2] Substituted Service

[3] Service on Nonresident Motorist

[4] Service on Principal in Suretyship Action

[5] When Service Is Deemed Complete

§ 526.53 Defendant's Pleadings

[1] Answer Not Required

[2] Filing of Responsive Claim

[3] Cross Claim for More Than Jurisdictional Amount

[a] When Transferred

[b] Payment of Fees if Action Is Transferred

§ 526.54 Discovery Not Allowed

§§ 526.55-526.69 [Reserved]

§ 526.70 Hearings

[1] Informal Nature

[2] Temporary Judge

[a] Court-Appointed Temporary Judge

[b] Temporary Judge Requested by Parties

[3] Evidence

[a] Witnesses and Documents

[b] Use of Hearsay Evidence

[4] Investigation by Court

[5] Assistance in Presenting Claim or Defense

[6] Assistance by Interpreter

[7] Appearance by Representative

[a] For Proof of Account

[b] For Military Plaintiff

[c] For Incarcerated Party

[d] For Defendant Nonresident Owner of Real Property

[e] For Owner of Rental Real Property

[f] For Spouse

[8] Postponement

§ 526.71 Judgment

[1] In General

[2] Continuance for Resolution by Alternative Means

[3] Multiple Parties

[4] Notice of Judgment

[5] Costs

[6] Default Judgment

[7] No Collateral Estoppel Effect

§ 526.72 Judgment Resulting From Motor Vehicle Accident

[1] In General

[2] Determination Regarding Motor Vehicle Accident Required in Judgment

[3] Filing Notice With Department

[4] Notification of Suspension

[5] Termination of Suspension

[6] Immunity of Public Agency

§§ 526.73-526.89 [Reserved]

§ 526.90 Motions Generally

§ 526.91 Filing Fee for Motions

§ 526.92 Motion to Vacate Judgment

[1] Incorrect or Erroneous Legal Basis for Decision

[2] By Plaintiff Who Did Not Appear

[3] By Defaulting Defendant

[a] Lack of Appearance

[b] Improper Service

[c] Appeal From Denial of Motion

§ 526.93 Motion to Correct Error

§ 526.94 Appeal by Defendant or Cross Defendant

[1] Availability

[2] Notice of Appeal

[a] Time for Filing

[b] Contents

[3] Abandonment of Appeal

[4] Record on Appeal

[5] Filing Fee

[6] Setting for Trial

[7] Dismissal of Appeal

[a] By Request or Stipulation

[b] For Delay in Prosecution

[8] Plaintiff's Motions

[9] Compromise by Minor or Incompetent Person

[10] Hearing of Appeal

[a] Informal Procedures Apply

[b] Scope of Hearing

[i] Generally

[ii] Cross Claims

[iii] No Right to Jury Trial

[iv] Tentative Decision and Statement of Decision Not Required

[11] Judgment on Appeal

[12] Award of Costs on Appeal

[a] Fees and Expenses

[b] Bad Faith Appeal

[13] Review of Superior Court Judgment

§§ 526.95-526.109 [Reserved]

§ 526.110 Enforcement of Judgment

[1] Execution and Abstract of Judgment

[2] Automatic Suspension Pending Appeal

[3] Asset Questionnaire

[a] Duties of Judgment Debtor

[b] Sanctions for Willful Failure to File

§ 526.111 Satisfaction of Judgment

[1] Payment to Judgment Creditor

[2] Payment to Small Claims Court

[3] Installment Payments

§§ 526.112-526.129 [Reserved]

§ 526.130 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

[2] Appearance by Corporation or Party Suing Under Fictitious Business Name

[3] Assistance to Parties

[4] Claims by Assignees

[5] Commencement of Action

[6] County Government as Party to Small Claims Action

[7] Definitions

[8] Hearing and Disposition

[9] Judgment

[10] Jurisdiction

[11] Legal Name of Defendant Doing Business

[12] Payment of Judgment

[13] Rules and Procedures

[14] Scheduling of Sessions

[15] Venue

§ 526.131 California Rules of Court

[1] Appeal

[a] Dismissal or Abandonment

[b] Filing

[c] Trial on Appeal

[2] Assistance to Litigants

[3] Fictitious Business Names

[4] Joinder of Claims

[5] Judges

[6] Judgment

[7] Service of Claim on Defendant

[8] Venue Challenge

§ 526.132 Decisions

[1] Appeal

[2] Assignment

[3] Assistance to Parties

[4] Enforcement of Judgment

[5] Jurisdiction

§ 526.133 Law Reviews

§ 526.134 Text References

§§ 526.135-526.149 [Reserved]

§ 526.150 Information for the Small Claims Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.920(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Advisory Services

[4] Information for Defendant

§ 526.151 Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.310-116.330; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filling in Form

[a] Title of Court

[b] Naming Parties

[c] Statement of Claim

[d] Demand for Payment

[e] Venue

[f] Attorney-Client Fee Dispute

[g] Claim Against Government Agency

[h] Number of Previous Small Claims

[4] Signature and Declaration

[5] Availability of Equitable Relief and Conditional Judgment

[6] Service and Filing

[7] State Statutes

§ 526.152 Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Plaintiff's Claim) [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Judicial Council Form SC-101]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 526.153 Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20; Judicial Council Form SC-104]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

§ 526.154 Proof of Mailing After Substituted Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340, 415.20; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-104A]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.155 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Claimant's Fictitious Business Name [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(a); Judicial Council Form SC-103]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 526.156 Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1986, 1987.5; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-107]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Issuance of Subpoena

[4] Filling in Form

[a] Identification of Court and Parties

[b] Order to Appear or Produce Documents or Things (Paragraph 1)

[c] Agreement With Subpoenaing Party (Paragraph 2)

[d] Witness Fees (Paragraph 3)

[e] Appearance or Production of Records in Lieu of Appearance (Paragraph 4)

[f] Supporting Declaration When Documents or Things Are Sought

[5] Notice to Custodian of Consumer or Employee Records

[6] Disobedience of Subpoena

[7] Proof of Service

[8] Cross References

[9] State Statutes

§ 526.157 Authorization to Appear [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540; Judicial Council Form SC-109]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

§ 526.158 Defendant's Claim and Order to Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.380; Judicial Council Form SC-120]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Cross Claim

[4] Service and Filing

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross Reference

§ 526.159 Defendant's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] Requesting That Small Claims Action Be Transferred to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a), (b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Request to Transfer Claim

[a] By Filing Declaration

[b] Service of Declaration

[c] Order of Transfer

[4] Cross References

[5] Decisions

§ 526.160 Order of Small Claims Court Transferring Action Before Judgment to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross Reference

§ 526.161 Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.162 Order on Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-152]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.163 Request to Amend Party Name Before Hearing (Small Claims) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.560, 473; Judicial Council Form SC-114]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.164 Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h), (i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-130]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment

[4] Penalty for Failure to File Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment

[5] California Rules of Court

§ 526.164A Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h),(i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.164B Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-290]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.165 Request to Pay Judgment to Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-145]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Payment

[4] Partial Payment

[5] Notification and Payment of Judgment Creditor

[6] Related Forms

§ 526.166 Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Notice of Entry of Judgment) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-132]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Related Form

[4] State Statutes

§ 526.166A Decision on Attorney-Client Fee Dispute [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-202A]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.167 Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.167A Response to Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-221]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.167B Order on Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-222]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.168 Judgment Debtor's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Full or Partial Payment to Judgment Creditor [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Declaration

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

§ 526.169 Request to Correct or Cancel Judgment and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-108]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Response to Request

[4] Cross References

[5] California Points and Authorities

[6] Decision

§ 526.170 Proceedings to Vacate Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.720, 116.730, 116.740; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-135]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Motion by Plaintiff

[4] Motion by Defendant

[a] No Appearance After Proper Service

[b] No Appearance After Improper Service

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Title of Court and Case

[b] Notice

[c] Date, Time, and Place of Hearing (Paragraph 1)

[d] Motion (Paragraph 2)

[e] Date Judgment Was Entered (Paragraph 3)

[f] Date Party Learned of Entry of Judgment (Paragraph 4)

[g] Ground of Motion (Paragraph 5)

[6] Representations to Court (Paragraph 6)

[7] Decisions

[8] Cross Reference

§ 526.171 Request for Court Order and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-105]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 526.172 Notice of Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-140]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filing Notice of Appeal

[4] Defaulting Defendant

[5] Insurer of Defendant

[6] Filing Fee

[7] Procedure

[8] Decisions

[9] Cross Reference

§ 526.173 Proceedings for Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs for Bad Faith Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice Requirements

[4] Written Statement of Reasons for Resulting Order

§ 526.174 Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-133]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Deadlines for Completing Form

[4] Filling in Form

§ 526.175 Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.830(d), 708.170(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-134]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Completing and Serving the Form

[4] Order and Hearing

§ 526.176 Proof of Service by Mail [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2107; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-112A]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART I. SCOPE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.01

§ 526.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the scope of proceedings and the procedures used in small claims courts. It includes the following forms, most of which are Judicial Council forms adopted pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.920(a)*:

- An information sheet to be used by a plaintiff in a small claims action [*see § 526.150*].
- Claims that may be asserted by a plaintiff [*see §§ 526.151, 526.152*] or a defendant [*see § 526.158*].
- Proof of service for any pleading [*see § 526.153*].
- Proof of mailing after substituted service [*see § 526.154*].
- A declaration by the claimant of compliance with the fictitious business name laws [*see § 526.155*].
- A subpoena for use in a small claims actions, together with a supporting declaration for use when the subpoenaing party seeks production by the witness of document or things [*see § 526.156*].
- A declaration of a person presenting or defending a claim on behalf of another person or entity [*see § 526.157*].
- A declaration that defendant has commenced an action against plaintiff in another court [*see § 526.159*].
- An order of a small claims court judge transferring the action to a higher court [*see § 526.160*].
- A request to postpone the trial [*see § 526.161*], and an order on the request [*see § 526.162*].
- A request to amend parties names [*see § 526.163*].

- Notice of entry of judgment [*see §§ 526.164, 526.164A, 526.166, 526.166A*].
- Acknowledgment of satisfaction of judgment [*see § 526.164B*].
- A request to pay the judgment to the court [*see § 526.165*].
- A request to make installment payments on a judgment [*see § 526.167*], a response to the request [*see § 526.167A*], and an order on the request [*see § 526.167B*].
- A declaration by judgment debtor of full or partial payment of judgment [*see § 526.168*].
- A request to correct or vacate a judgment [*see § 526.169*].
- A notice of motion and declaration to vacate the judgment [*see § 526.170*].
- A notice of motion and declaration to correct error [*see § 526.171*].
- A notice of an appeal [*see § 526.172*].
- A notice of motion and declaration to award attorney's fees for a bad faith appeal [*see § 526.173*].
- A judgment debtor's statement of assets [*see § 526.174*].
- An application and order to appear for examination [*see § 526.175*].
- Proof of service by mail [*see § 526.176*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART I. SCOPE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.02-526.09

[Reserved]

§§ 526.02[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.10

§ 526.10 Governing Law

Small claims court proceedings are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.* and by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100 et seq.* In addition, the small claims division of a superior court appears to be subject to the statutes governing civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 307 et seq.*] to the extent those statutes are not inconsistent with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.* The Judicial Council has provided forms for use in small claims court proceedings [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A].

Appeals of small claims cases to the appellate division of the superior court, including practice and procedure on appeal and the time and manner in which the record on appeal is to be prepared and filed, are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.710-116.730, 116.750-116.795*, and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.950 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresAppealsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.11-526.29

[Reserved]

§§ 526.11[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.30

§ 526.30 Definitions

The following definitions apply in interpreting the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.*, unless the context indicates otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(a)-(k)*]:

- "Plaintiff" means the party who has filed a small claims action; the term includes a defendant who has filed a claim against a plaintiff.

- "Defendant" means the party against whom the plaintiff has filed a small claims action; the term includes a plaintiff against whom a defendant has filed a claim.

- "Judgment creditor" means the party, whether plaintiff or defendant, in whose favor a money judgment has been rendered.

- "Judgment debtor" means the party, whether plaintiff or defendant, against whom a money judgment has been rendered.

- "Person" means an individual, corporation, partnership, limited liability partnership, limited liability company, firm, association, or other entity.

- "Individual" means a natural person.

- "Party" means a plaintiff or defendant.

- "Motion" means a party's written request to the court for an order or other action; the term includes an informal written request to the court, such as a letter.

- "Declaration" means a written statement signed by an individual that includes the date and place of signing and a statement under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that its contents are true

and correct.

- "Good cause" means circumstances sufficient to justify the requested order or other action, as determined by the judge.

- "Mail" means first-class mail with postage fully prepaid, unless stated otherwise.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.31

§ 526.31 Organization and Purpose of Small Claims Courts

In each superior court there is a small claims division (known as small claims court) in which small claims may be tried [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.210*]. Small claims courts were created by the Legislature to hear cases involving small amounts of money in order to reduce wasteful and expensive litigation, to minimize the costs of trial, and to dispense speedy justice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.120(b)*; *Hughes v. Municipal Court (1926) 200 Cal. 215, 218, 252 P. 575* ; *see also Leuschen v. Small Claims Court (1923) 191 Cal. 133, 138, 215 P. 391*]. The small claims court functions informally and quickly. Normal pleadings other than claim and notice are not required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.310*], and hearings and dispositions are informal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510*]. There are no juries in the small claims court, and formal findings are not made on the issues [*see Sanderson v. Niemann (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 563, 573, 110 P.2d 1025*]. Small claims courts must operate to ensure that the convenience of individual parties and witnesses prevails, as much as possible, over the convenience of any other parties or witnesses [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.120(d)*]. The Judicial Council has issued a form of information for plaintiffs in small claims actions, which summarizes the purpose of and procedures used in small claims court [*see § 526.150*].

The Legislature and courts have by statute and rule encouraged litigants to take advantage of the informality and expeditious nature of small claims proceedings [*but see Discover Bank v. Superior Court (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 148, 156* (individual small-claims litigation is not adequate substitute for class litigation to vindicate substantive consumer rights in context of credit-card issuer's alleged scheme to cheat cardholders by overcharging late fees)]. Thus, the court in a limited civil case has the discretion to deny to a prevailing plaintiff all or part of the costs to which that plaintiff would otherwise be entitled to recover, when the plaintiff recovers an amount less than the maximum jurisdictional amount of the small claims court, and the plaintiff moreover could have filed the action in small claims court but did not do [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033(b)*; for further discussion, *see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10* et seq.; for discussion of costs in small claims actions, *see* discussion in *§ 526.71[5]*].

A cause of action for malicious prosecution is not allowed to be based on the institution of small claims proceedings, since this could frustrate an informal means of resolving small disputes, inject elements of time, expense, and complexity that the small claims process was established to avoid, and require a prudent claimant to consult with an attorney before making use of a supposedly attorney-free method for settling disputes over small amounts [*Pace v.*

Hillcrest Motor Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 476, 479, 161 Cal. Rptr. 662].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsCourtsCreation & OrganizationGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.32

§ 526.32 Subject Matter Jurisdiction

[1] Monetary Limits on Claims

[a] In General

A small claims court generally has jurisdiction over any action for the recovery of money in which the demand does not exceed $7,500 if the action is brought by a natural person, or $5,000 if the claimant is other than a natural person [*Code. Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.221*]. Lower monetary limits may apply if the defendant is a guarantor or if the plaintiff who has already filed, within the current calendar year, two small claims actions demanding more than $2,500 [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), (c), 116.221, 116.231(a)*; *see* [b], [e], *below*]. The small claims court's jurisdiction exists regardless of whether an action for the recovery of money is based on tort or on contract [*see Leuschen v. Small Claims Court (1923) 191 Cal. 133, 215 P. 391*].

The small claims courts also have jurisdiction over the following particular types of actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)*], and retain jurisdiction until full payment and performance of any judgment or order in these actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*]:

- Claims to enforce payment of delinquent unsecured personal property taxes in an amount not to exceed $5,000, if the legality of the tax is not contested by the defendant and with the exception provided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(c)* (discussed in *§ 526.32[2]*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(2)*].

- Actions in which the plaintiff seeks a writ of possession under *Civ. Code §§ 1861.5* and *1861.10* (providing for the issuance of a writ of possession pursuant to an innkeepers' lien), if the amount of the demand does not exceed $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(3)*]. For discussion and forms relating to an application for writ of possession under *Civ. Code § 1861.5*, *see* Ch. 297, *Hotels and Motels* .

- Actions to confirm, correct, or vacate a fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 between an attorney and client that is binding or has become binding; or to conduct a hearing de novo between an attorney and client after nonbinding arbitration of a fee disputeinvolving no more than $5,000 in

controversy, pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*]. For discussion of attorney-client fee arbitration, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.430* et seq.

- Actions for injunctive or other equitable relief only if a statute expressly authorizes a small claims court to award that relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(5)*].

The small claims courts also have express jurisdiction in actions under *Civ. Code § 1950.5* (for return of security deposit for rental of residential property) if the damages claimed, whether actual, statutory, or both, are otherwise within the jurisdictional amount of the small claims court [*Civ. Code § 1950.5(n)* (citing *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221*)]. For discussion and forms relating to actions under *Civ. Code § 1950.5*, see Ch. 334, *Landlord and Tenant: Damages Claims* .

Claims exceeding the jurisdictional amount may be brought when the excess amount is waived [*see discussion under § 526.32[1][d]*]. On the other hand, certain filing restrictions apply to larger monetary claims [*see § 526.32[1][e]*].

The small claims courts no longer have jurisdiction over unlawful detainer proceedings [*see* Stats. 1992, ch. 8, § 1]. For discussion and forms relating to unlawful detainer proceedings in general, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[b] Exception for Claims Against Guarantors

An action brought by a natural person against the Registrar of the Contractors' State License Board, as the defendant guarantor, is subject to the same $7,500 small claims jurisdictional limit that applies to other actions brought by natural persons [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(c)(1), 116.221*]. Special jurisdictional limits apply to other actions against defendant guarantors. Thus, for any action against a defendant guarantor (other than the Registrar of the Contractors' State License Board) that does not charge a fee for its guarantor or surety services, the small claims court has jurisdiction only if the amount of the demand does not exceed $2,500 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(c)(2)*]. For any action brought by a natural person against a defendant guarantor that charges a fee for its guarantor or surety services, the small claims court has jurisdiction only if the amount of the demand does not exceed $6,500 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(c)(3)*]. For any action brought by an entity other than a natural person against a defendant guarantor that charges a fee for its guarantor or surety services, or against the Registrar of the Contractors' State License Board as the defendant guarantor, the small claims court has jurisdiction only if the amount of the demand does not exceed $4,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(c)(4)*].

[c] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies Required for Claims Against Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation or Division of Juvenile Facilities

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)*, in any action filed by a plaintiff who is incarcerated in a facility of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation [*see Penal Code § 5055*], the small claims court has jurisdiction over a defendant only if the plaintiff has alleged in the complaint that he or she has exhausted his or her administrative remedies against that department, including compliance with *Gov. Code §§ 905.2* and *905.4* (requiring presentation of written claim against state). The department's final administrative adjudication or determination of plaintiff's administrative claim may be attached to the complaint at the time of filing in lieu of that allegation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(e)*]. The department's representative [*see discussion under § 526.34[2][d]*] is not required to appear personally to challenge the plaintiff's compliance with the pleading requirements, but may submit pleadings or declarations to assert that challenge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(b)*].

In any action governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(e)*, if the plaintiff fails to provide proof of compliance with that section (i.e., exhaustion of administrative remedies against the department), the judicial officer must, at his or her discretion, either dismiss the action or continue the action to give the plaintiff the opportunity to provide such proof [

Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(f)].

For purposes of Gov. Code § 116.220, "department" includes an employee of a department against whom a claim has been filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.110 et seq.* arising out of his or her duties as an employee of that department [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(g)*].

For full discussion of procedures for filing pre-litigation claims against the State of California, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[d] Waiver of Excess Amount of Demand

In any case in which the lack of jurisdiction in small claims court is due solely to an excess in the amount of the demand, the excess may be waived, but any waiver shall not become operative until judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(d)*].

Once the plaintiff has elected to bring an action as a limited civil case, the action may not thereafter be transferred to the small claims court, even if the plaintiff waives any amount in his or her claim in excess of the maximum jurisdicitional amount of the small claims court [*see Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 869, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365* and discussion in *§ 526.32[6]*].

[e] Filing Restrictions on Claims Exceeding $2,500

In general, no individual may file more than two small claims actions in which the demand exceeds $2,500, anywhere in California within any calendar year [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231(a)*]. If any demand exceeds $2,500, the party making the demand must file a declaration under penalty of perjury attesting to the fact that not more than two small claims actions in which the demand exceeded $2,500 have been filed by that party in California within the calendar year [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231(b)*; *see § 526.151*].

However, the above limitation on bringing small claims actions does not apply to filings in which the claim (the amount of the demand) does not exceed $5,000 that are filed by a city, county, city and county, or other public entity prescribed by statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231(c), (d)*].Nevertheless, if any small claims action is filed by these public entities pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231*, and the defendant informs the court either in advance of the hearing by written notice or at the time of the hearing, that he or she is represented in the action by legal counsel,the action must be transferred out of the small claims division [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231(d)*]. This exception to the general filing limitation was enacted after a pilot project demonstrated the "efficacy of the removal of the limitation on the number of actions public agencies may file in the small claims courts on claims exceeding $2,500" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231(c)*].

[2] Effect of Joinder of Claims by Multiple Plaintiffs

Generally, if there is a voluntary joinder of several plaintiffs who join separate claims against the defendant that arise out of the same transaction and if each claim is within the monetary limit of the court in which the action is filed, that court will have jurisdiction, even though the aggregate of the claims exceeds the monetary limit of the court [*Winrod v. Wolters (1903) 141 Cal. 399, 403, 74 P. 1037* ; *Colla v. Carmichael U--Drive Autos, Inc. (1930) 111 Cal. App. 784, 111 Cal. App. Supp. 784, 791-792, 294 P.378*]. Applying this rule to actions in small claims court, if there is a joinder of plaintiffs, each with a separate claim against defendant that does not exceed $5,000, the case is within the jurisdiction of the small claims division even though the total of all the plaintiffs' claims exceeds that amount [*City and County of San Francisco v. Small Claims Court (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 470, 477, 190 Cal. Rptr. 340*].

Nevertheless, if two or more plaintiffs claim a joint interest in the amount recovered, the total amount claimed by all the plaintiffs must not exceed the jurisdictional limits of the court [*see Frost v. Mighetto (1937) 22 Cal. App. 2d 612,*

615-616, 71 P.2d 932].

[3] Effect of Splitting Cause of Action

[a] In General

A single cause of action arising from the same set of facts should not be split to bring it within the jurisdiction of the small claims court, since, if the plaintiff attempts to bring another action for the balance of his or her claim, the defendant may plead the first action in abatement of the subsequent action [*see Wulfjen v. Dolton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 891, 894, 151 P.2d 846* ; *see also Purcell v. Colonial Ins. Co. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 807, 813, 97 Cal. Rptr. 874* ; Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions*]. The defense, however, is not jurisdictional and may be waived if not asserted [*Williams v. Krumsiek (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 456, 460, 241 P.2d 40*].

[b] Effect Of Insured's Small Claims Action on Later Subrogation Action by Insurer

A policyholder's small claims judgment against the tortfeasor bars the insurance company from pursuing its subrogation action because the latter action is precluded by the res judicata effect of the rule against splitting a cause of action. Neither the insured nor the subrogee-insurer may sue again, notwithstanding the insured tort victim's failure to recover for all damages suffered in the first action [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 904-905, 913, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*]. In *Allstate,* for example, a buyer purchased an automobile from a dealer who had negligently repaired the vehicle's cigarette lighter. The buyer submitted an insurance claim after the vehicle caught fire, and the insurer, declaring the vehicle to be a total loss, paid the buyer $14,583.93 under the policy. The buyer subsenquently sued the dealer/seller in small claims court for the value of personal items lost in the fire that were not covered by the policy. A subsequent action against the dealer/seller, by the insurance company seeking subrogation for the amount paid to the buyer was barred by the buyer's small claims action [*see Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 905, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*].

When a tortfeasor's single act causes the plaintiff to suffer both personal injury and property damage, there are two causes of action. Thus, some jurisdictions have found that there is no impermissible splitting of a cause of action when an insurer brings an action to recover the amount it paid the insured for property damage and the insured brings a separate action for personal injuries [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 909, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* (citing authority from other jurisdictions)]. A separate cause of action does not arise, however, for each separate item of property damaged as a result of one tortious act [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 909, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* ; *see Holmes v. David H. Bricker, Inc. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 786, 789, 76 Cal.Rptr. 431, 452 P.2d 647*]. Thus, an insurer's subrogation claim for property damage to a vehicle may be barred by a prior small claims action for property damages to personal property within the vehicle [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 909, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*].

An insurer may, however, include in its contract with the policyholder a clause prohibiting the policyholder from impairing the insurer's subrogation rights. In such a case, the insurer has the obligation to reiterate and explain this condition to the policyholder when it pays his or her insurance claim. The insurer may then agree to seek recovery of the policyholder's uninsured losses for him or her in connection with its subrogation claim, or require that the policyholder coordinate his or her action with the insurer's future legal action. If, despite this clear advisement, the insured pursues a small claims action, the insurer could resort to an action against the insured for impairment of its subrogation rights [*see Allstate Ins. Co.v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 913, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* ; *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Davis (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 23, 176 Cal. Rptr. 517*]. If an insurer does not want to risk having to sue its insured or does not want to prevent him or her from recouping her uninsured losses in an expeditious and inexpensive small claims court action with a clause prohibiting the policyholder from impairing the insurer's subrogation rights, the insurer could file an action as a prophylactic measure at the time it reimburses the policyholder for his or her insured losses and then give the third party tortfeasor an open extension of time in which to

respond to the complaint. By doing so, it creates circumstances requiring the third party tortfeasor to object to the splitting of the cause of action at the time that policyholder files the small claims action. This is because the insurer's action provides a forum in which the claims could be consolidated or coordinated [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 913, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151*].

[4] Incidental Equitable Relief and Conditional Judgment

In any action seeking relief authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(1)-(4)* (discussed in [1][a], *above*), the court may grant equitable relief in the form of rescission, restitution, reformation, and specific performance in lieu of, or in addition to, money damages [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*; *see generally* Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* , Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* , and Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*]. In addition to equitable relief, the small claims court has authority to issue a conditional judgment in these actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*].

Aside from actions described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(1)-(4)*, a small claims court may grant injunctive or other equitable relief only if a statute expressly authorizes the court to award that relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(5)*].

[5] Jurisdictional Transfer to Small Claims Court Not Authorized

Once a case is filed in superior court, it may not be transferred to small claims court, even if the plaintiff seeks the transfer and voluntarily agrees to waive damages in excess of the jurisdictional limit on small claims [*see Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 869, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365*]. Although *Rosenberg* was decided in the context of a case filed in municipal court prior to the creation of unified superior courts [*Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 868 n.3, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365* ; *see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 23* (abolition of municipal courts and unification within superior courts)], the result should be the same when an action is filed in superior court.

The only type of small claims transfer specifically authorized by statute is a transfer from small claims court to another court of competent jurisdiction, on the instigation of a defendant whose cross claim exceeds the small claims jurisdictional limit (generally, $7,500 if action is brought by natural person, or $5,000 if claimant is other than natural person) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390*; see also *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.221* and discussion in *§ 526.53[3]*]. Thus, there is no statutory authorization for a transfer from superior court to a small claims court. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396*, a transfer is permitted only when thetransferring court lacks subject matter jurisdiction. A superior court, however, does not lack subject matter jurisdiction over a claim merely because it also happens to be within the jurisdiction of the small claims court. Thus, a claimant may elect to seek recovery of an amount within the small claims court's jurisdiction by filing a case in either superior court or small claims court, but the superior court is not empowered by Section 396 to transfer the case to small claims court [*see Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 867, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365]* .

In addition, although courts have inherent power to transfer cases and otherwise control their own calendars and dockets, this inherent power does not permit the transfer of a case from superior court to small claims court. The small claims court is not simply another division or department of the superior court for purposes of transfer, and the power of transfer is not absolute. A transfer must further the ends of justice, and justice is not served when an actively litigated superior court case is transferred to a small claims court [*see Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 867-868, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365]* . The purpose of small claims--speedy and low-cost resolution--is accomplished only when a claim is initially filed in small claims court and is immediately subject to the abbreviated small claims procedures. Filing and litigating the claim in superior court first has the effect of preventing the kind of quick resolution for which small claims court is designed. Once a small claim has been litigated in superior court, it is impossible to go backward in time and process the claim through quick and informal means [*see Rosenberg v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 860, 867-868, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365]* .

A limited civil case may be reclassified as an unlimited civil case, and vice versa, on grounds of subject matter

jurisdiction [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 403.010 et seq.*]. There is, however, no statutory authorization for a jurisdictional reclassification of a limited civil case as a small claims case, just as there is none for the jurisdictional transfer of a limited civil case from superior court to a small claims court.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionAmount in ControversyCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.33

§ 526.33 Venue

The venue of the action filed in the small claims court is the same as for other civil actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*] and is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392 et seq.* (discussed in Ch. 571, *Venue*). Local court rules may prescribe the proper court locations for small claims actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*].

A defendant who wishes to challenge venue or court location may do so by writing to the court and mailing a copy to all parties without personally appearing at the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2106*]. If the court denies the challenge and the defendant is not present, the hearing must be continued to another appropriate date, and the parties must be given notice of the venue determination and the hearing date [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2106*].

In all cases, including those in which the defendant does not either challenge venue or court location or appear at the hearing, the small claims court must inquire of the parties facts sufficient to determine whether venue or court location is proper and must make its determination accordingly [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(c)*]. If the court determines that the action has not commenced in the proper venue, the court, on its own motion, must dismiss the action without prejudice unless all defendants are present and agree that the action may be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(c)(1)*]. If the court determines that the action was not commenced in the proper court location, the court may transfer the action to a proper location pursuant to local rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(c)(1)*].

If the court determines that the action was commenced in the proper venue and court location, the court may hear the case if all parties are present. If the defendant challenged venue or court location, and all parties are not present, the court must postpone the hearing for at least 15 days and must notify all parties by mail of the court's decision and of the new hearing date, time, and place [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(c)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.34

§ 526.34 Parties

[1] In General

Any person who is at least 18 years of age, or legally emancipated, and mentally competent may be a party to a small claims action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.410(a)*]. For this purpose "person" includes an individual (or natural person), corporation, partnership, limited liability partnership, limited liability company, firm, association, or other entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(e), (f)*; *see also* discussion § 526.130[7]].

A person who is a minor or who is not competent may nonetheless appear by a guardian ad litem appointed by a judge of the court in which the action is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.410(b)*; *see Fam. Code § 6500* (minor is person under age 18); *see generally* Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*].

Specific restrictions on the appearance by assignees, corporations, or other entities are discussed in *§ 526.34[2]*. For discussion of when a party may appear by a representative at the hearing, thereby waiving personal appearance, see *§ 526.70[7]*.

[2] Restrictions

[a] Assignee

The small claims statute prohibits the filing or prosecution of a claim by an assignee; only the original creditor may file or prosecute a claim in the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420(a)*]. But an action may be filed or defended by (1) a trustee in bankruptcy in the exercise of the trustee's duties as trustee, or (2) the holder of a security agreement, retailinstallment contract, or lien contract subject to the Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) or the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) purchased by the holder for his or her portfolio of investments, provided the holder is not an assignee for the purpose of collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420(b)*]. For discussion of the Rees-Levering and Unruh Acts, *see* Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* and Ch. 90, *Automobiles: Vehicle Leasing Act*].

In addition, the statutory prohibition on filing or maintaining a claim in small claims court by an assignee of the claim does not prevent the filing of a claim by a local government that is self-insured for purposes of workers' compensation and is seeking subrogation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420(c)*].

[b] Corporation

A corporation generally may appear and participate in a small claims action only through a regular employee or a duly appointed or elected officer or director who is employed, appointed, or elected for purposes other than the exclusive representation of the corporation in small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(b)*]. In addition, if the corporation is an association created to manage a common interest development [*see Civ. Code § 1351*], it may appear and participate in a small claims action through an agent, a management company representative, or a bookkeeper who appears on behalf of that association [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(b), (i)*].

Any individual representing a corporate plaintiff at the hearing of a small claims action is required to submit a declaration stating (1) that the person is authorized to appear for the corporation, (2) the basis for the person's authorization, and (3) that the person is not employed solely for the purpose of representing the corporation in the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*].

If a corporation is a party to an appeal from a small claims action, the corporation may also appear before the superior court through an attorney at law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(c)*].

[c] Other Entity

An entity that is not a natural person or a corporation may appear and participate in a small claims action only through a regular employee or a duly appointed or elected officer or director, or, in the case of a partnership, a partner, engaged for purposes other than solely representing the party in small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(c)*].

The representative of a plaintiff entity that is not a natural person is required by the court to submit a declaration stating (1) that the individual is authorized to appear for the entity, (2) the basis for that authorization, and (3) that the person is not employed solely for the purpose of representing the entity in the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*].

[d] Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation or Division of Juvenile Facilities

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540* or any other provision of law, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation [*see Penal Code § 5055*] or the Department's Division of Juvenile Facilities [*see Penal Code § 6001*] may appear and participate in a small claims action through a regular employee who is employed or appointed for purposes other than solely representing that department in small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(a)*].

At the hearing of a small claims action, the court must require any individual who is appearing as a representative of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation [*see Penal Code § 5055*] or the Department's Division of Juvenile Facilities [*see Penal Code § 6001*] under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(a)* to file a declaration stating (1) that the individual is authorized to appear for the party, (2) the basis for that authorization, and (3) that the individual is not employed solely to represent the party in small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(c)*]. Nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541* operates or may be construed to authorize an attorney to participate in a small claims action, except as expressly authorized in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.530* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(d)*; *see discussion under § 526.35*].

The foregoing provisions pertaining to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the Department's Division of Juvenile Facilities also apply to any employee of the Department or Division against whom a small claim has been filed arising out of his or her duties as an employee of the Department or Division [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.541(e)*].

[3] Vexatious Litigants

An order entered pursuant to *Code Civ Proc. § 391.7* prohibiting a vexatious litigant from filing any new litigation in state courts without prior court approval does not apply to actions filed in small claims court, because small claims court is not a court of record [*Banks v. State of California (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1147, 1149-1150, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(a)* definition of "litigation," which only refers to actions in a court of record); *see also* Ch. 573, *Vexatious Litigants*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious LitigantsGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.35

§ 526.35 Legal Assistance

[1] Restriction on Attorneys

No attorney at law or person other than the plaintiff and the defendant may take any part in the conduct or defense of a small claims action [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.530(a), 116.540(a)*]. This rule does not apply if the attorney is appearing to maintain or defend an action (1) by or againsthimself or herself, (2) by or against a partnership in which he or she is a general partner and in which all the partners are attorneys, or (3) by or against a professional corporation of which he or she is an officer or a director and of which all other officers and directors are attorneys at law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.530(b)*].

This prohibition does not prevent an attorney from (1) providing advice to a party to a small claims action, either before or after the commencement of the action, (2) testifying to facts of which he or she has personal knowledge and about which he or she is competent to testify, (3) representing a party in an appeal to the superior court, and (4) representing a party in connection with the enforcement of a judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.530(c)*].

[2] Legal Advisors

[a] Individual Assistance Available to Litigants

Each county must provide individual assistance to small claims court litigants and potential litigants at no additional charge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.260*]. Within the legislative guidelines set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.940*, each county must establish its own particular advisory service. The advisors may be volunteers, but must be members of the State Bar, law students, paralegals, or persons experienced in resolving minor disputes and must be familiar with small claims court rules and procedures. The topics that individual personal advisory services may cover include preparation of small claims court filings, procedures, including procedures related to the conduct of the hearing, and information on the collection of small claims court judgments [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.940(b)(1)*]. Advisors may not appear in court as advocates for any party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.940(e)*] and are not liable for any advice provided as a public service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.940(f)*; *Gov. Code § 818.9*].

In addition to the small claims advisors, the clerks of the small claims court are also available to assist individual litigants. A clerk is required to provide small claims forms and pamphlets, materials from the Department of Consumer Affairs, when available, and information about the small claims advisory service. The clerk must also answer the litigant's questions about filing and service of the claim, designation of the parties, scheduling of hearings, and similar matters [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2110*].

For discussion of when the court may appoint someone to assist a party present a claim or defense at the hearing, see the discussion in Assistance in Presenting Claim or Defense, *below.*

[b] Notice of Availability

The small claims court clerk is required to inform the parties orally or in writing (1) that an advisor is available to assist small claims litigants at no additional charge as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.260* and *116.940,* and *(2)* of the provisions of *Gov. Code § 818.9* (nonliability of advisors for advice given) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2120(a)*].

[c] Qualifications of Advisors and Conflict of Interest

All small claims advisors must receive training from the county sufficient to ensure competence in the following areas: small claims court practice and procedure; alternative dispute resolution programs; consumer sales; vehicular sales, leasing, and repairs; credit and financing transactions; professional and occupational licensing; landlord-tenant law; and contract, warranty, tort, and negotiable instruments law [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2120(b)*]. In addition to this training, each county may establish additional qualifications for small claims advisors [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2120(c)*].

A small claims advisor is required to disclose any known direct or indirect relationship he or she may have with any party or witness in the action and must not disclose information obtained in the course of his or her duties or use the information for financial or other advantage [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2120(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtGovernmentsCourtsCourt PersonnelGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Provisions

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.36-526.49

[Reserved]

§§ 526.36[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.50

§ 526.50 Commencement of Action

[1] Filing of Claim

A plaintiff may commence an action in small claims court by filing a claim under oath with the clerk of the small claims court in person, by mail, by facsimile transmission if authorized by statute, or by electronic means as authorized by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.5* (facsimile); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* (electronic filing)].

[2] Content of Claim

The claim must set forth the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b)*]:

- The name and address of the defendant, if known.

- The amount and basis of the claim. If the action is to enforce the payment of a debt, the claim must separately state the original debt, each payment credited to the debt, each fee and charge added to the debt, each payment credited against those fees and charges, all other debits or charges to the account, and an explanation of the nature of those fees, charges, debits, and all other credits to the debt, by source and amount [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.222*].

- That the plaintiff, when possible, has demanded payment and, in applicable cases, the possession of the property.

- That the defendant has failed or refused to pay and, when applicable, has refused to surrender the property.

- That the plaintiff understands that the judgment on his or her claim will be conclusive without right of appeal.

As required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b)*, the Judicial Council has approved of a form of claim and order for general use in small claims cases [*see § 526.151*]. Other requirements concerning the contents of plaintiff's claim are set out in the Comments to *see § 526.151*.

[3] Fees

The plaintiff must pay a filing fee. If the plaintiff has filed 12 or fewer other small claims in California within the previous 12 months, the amount of the fee depends on the amount of the claim. The filing fee is $30 if the demand is for $1,500 or less, $50 if the demand is for more than $1,500 but not more than $5,000, and $75 if the demand is for more than $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230(b)*]. If, after filing a claim and paying the required fee, the plaintiff files an amendment or amended claim that increases the amount of the claim to a level that would have required a higher filing fee had the full claim been presented initially, the plaintiff must pay the difference when filing the amendment or amended claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230(d)*]. However, if an amendment reduces the plaintiff's claim to a level that would have required a lower filing fee than the plaintiff actually paid, the court will not reimburse the plaintiff [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230(d)(4)*].

If the plaintiff has filed more than 12 other small claims in California within the previous 12 months, the filing fee is a flat $100, regardless of the amount of the demand [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230(c)*]. The plaintiff must file a declaration with the claim, stating whether he or she has filed more than 12 other small claims within the previous 12 months [Code Civ. Proc. § 1116.230(e)].

In addition to the filing fee, the plaintiff must pay the court clerk a fee of $10 for each defendant to whom the clerk mails a copy of the claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.232*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340*].

[4] Designation of Parties

[a] Individual

An individual party should be designated by his or her first name, middle initial, if any, and last name. A husband and wife may be designated as such.

[b] Partnership

A partnership may be designated by the name that it has assumed or by which it is known [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 369.5(a)*].

[c] Unincorporated Association

An unincorporated association may be designated by the name of the association [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 369.5(a)*].

[d] Minor or Incompetent

A mi nor or incompetent is designated by the name of the minor and the name of the guardian, for example, "John Doe, a minor, by Jane Doe, his guardian ad litem," or "general guardian," depending on the circumstances [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 372, 373*].

[e] Public Entities

A public entity is designated by its full name. The term "public entity" includes the state, the Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in this state [*Gov. Code § 811.2*]. An action may be brought against a public entity after a claim has been

filed and disallowed [*Gov. Code § 945.4*]. Generally, an action against a public entity must be commenced within six months after the claim has been acted on or rejected by the governing body of the public entity if written notice is given, or within two years from the accrual of the cause of action if written notice is not given [*Gov. Code § 945.6*; *see Gov. Code § 913*; *see generally* Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*].

[5] Obtaining Hearing Date

When a claim is filed in small claims court, the clerk must schedule the case for hearing in accordance with the time requirements listed below and issue an order directing the parties to appear at the scheduled hearing with witnesses and documents to prove their claim or defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330(a)*]. The case must be scheduled for hearing no earlier than 20 days but not more than 70 days from the date of the order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330(a)*].

In lieu of the method of setting the case for hearing described above, the clerk may do all of the following: (1) cause a copy of the claim to be mailed to the defendant by any form of mail providing for a return of receipt; (2) on receipt of proof that the claim was served, issue an order scheduling the case for hearing in accordance with the time requirements set out in the foregoing paragraph and direct the parties to appear at the scheduled hearing with witnesses and documents to prove their claim or defense; and (3) cause a copy of the order setting the case for hearing and directing the parties to appear to be served on the parties by any form of mail providing for a return receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.51

§ 526.51 Fictitious Business Name

[1] Declaration of Compliance With Laws

If a plaintiff operates or does business under a fictitious business name and the claim relates to that business, the plaintiff must file with the claim a declaration stating that the plaintiff has complied with the fictitious business name laws by executing, filing, and publishing a fictitious business name statement as required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(a)*]. The declaration of compliance must be filed in each case the plaintiff files [Cal. *Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100(a)*]. For the purposes of this requirement, "fictitious business name" means that which is described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17900*, and "fictitious business name statement" means that which is described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17913* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(c)*]. For a discussion of the fictitious business name laws, see *Ch. 20, Allegations Commonly Used, §§ 20.34 -20.36*.

The clerk must make the declaration of compliance available to the claimant in any one of the following ways: (1) the declaration may be on a separate form approved by the Judicial Council [*see § 526.155*]; (2) the approved Judicial Council form may be placed on the reverse of Plaintiff's Statement to the Clerk or on the back of any Judicial Council small claims form with only one side; or (3) the precise language of the declaration of compliance that appears on the approved Judicial Council form may be incorporated into the Plaintiff's Statement to the Clerk [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100(b)*].

An action filed by a party who has failed to comply with the applicable fictitious business name laws by executing, filing, and publishing a fictitious business name statement as required shall be dismissed without prejudice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(b)*].

[2] Correct Legal Name of Defendant

Whenever a claim that is filed against a person operating or doing business under a fictitious business name relates to the defendant's business, the court shall inquire at the time of the hearing into the defendant's correct legal name and the name or names under which the defendant does business. If the correct legal name of the defendant, or the name actually used by the defendant, is other than the name stated on the claim, the court shall amend the claim to state the

correct legal name of the defendant and the name or names actually used by the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.560(a)*].

Plaintiff may request the court at any time, whether before or after judgment, to amend the claim of the plaintiff or the judgment to include both the correct legal name and the actually used name or names of the defendant. On a showing of good cause, the court will amend the claim or judgment to state the correct legal name of the defendant and the name or names actually used by the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.560(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.630*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.52

§ 526.52 Service of Plaintiff's Claim and Ordering of Defendant's Appearance

[1] In General

Service of the claim and order on the defendant may be made by substituted service [*see discussion under § 526.52[2]*] or by one of the following methods [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(a)*]:

- The clerk may cause a copy of the claim and order to be mailed to defendant by any form of mail providing for a return receipt.

- The plaintiff may cause a copy of the claim and order to be delivered to defendant in person.

- Instead of serving the claim and order at the same time, the clerk may first have the claim served on the defendant by any form of mail providing for a return receipt. On receipt of proof of service by mail, the clerk may issue the order scheduling the hearing and have it served by any form of mail providing for a return receipt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330(b)*, discussed in *§ 526.50[5]*].

Generally, service must be made within California to be valid [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(e)*]. An exception is provided for the personal service of a complaint relating to real property in California on the owner of record of that property, by any of the methods described above, when the owner resides in another state and has no lawfully designated agent in California for service of process [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(f)*].

[2] Substituted Service

Service of the claim and order on the defendant may be made by substituted service, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)* or *(b)* (substituted service of summons and complaint), without the need to attempt personal service on the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(a)(3)*]. Even though *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)* requires that the plaintiff first use reasonable diligence to effect personal service on the defendant, no due diligence is required in a small claims court action [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100*].

Substituted service consists of any of the following:

- Leaving a copy of the claim during usual office hours in the defendant's office with a person who is apparently in charge, and then mailing another copy of the claim by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the defendant at the place where the copy of the claim was left [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*]. If the physical address of the defendant's office is not known, substituted service may be made by leaving a copy of the claim at the defendant's usual mailing address (other than a United States Postal Service post office box) with a person at least age 18, who must be informed of the contents of the delivery, and then mailing another copy of the claim by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the defendant at the place where the copy of the claim was left [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)*].

- Leaving a copy of the claim at defendant's dwelling house, usual place of abode, or place of business or usual mailing address (other than a United States Postal Service post office box) in the presence of a competent member of the household or a person who is apparently in charge and who is at least 18 years of age and has been informed of the contents of the claim, and then mailing another copy of theclaim to the defendant at the place where the copy of the claim was left [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(b)*]. For these purposes, substituted service may also be made at the office of the sheriff or marshal, who will deliver a copy of the claim and order to any person authorized by the defendant to receive service, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.90*, who is at least 18 years of age, and thereafter mail a copy of the claim and order to the defendant's usual mailing address [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(a)(3)*].

- If the defendant is a business organization of unknown form, leaving a copy of the claim during usual office hours with the person who is apparently in charge of the office of that business organization, and thereafter mailing a copy of the claim by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the person to be served at the place where the copy of the claim was left [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.95(a)*]. Service in this manner is not valid, however, for a corporation with a registered agent for service of process listed with the California Secretary of State [*Code Civ. Proc. § 415.95(b)*].

For further discussion of substituted service of a summons and complaint under *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)* and *(b)*, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] Service on Nonresident Motorist

Service on the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, and notice to the defendant if made by any of the methods described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340*, must satisfy the requirements of *Veh. Code § 17450 et seq.* regarding constructive service on a nonresident owner or operator of a motor vehicle involved in an accident in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(e)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to these service requirements under the Vehicle Code, see Ch. 83, *Automobiles: Bringing the Action* .

[4] Service on Principal in Suretyship Action

In any action against a principal and his or her guarantor or surety under a guarantor or suretyship agreement, a reasonable attempt must be made to complete service on the principal. If service is not completed on the principal, the action must be transferred to the court of appropriate jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(h)*]. For further discussion of suretyship contracts, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[5] When Service Is Deemed Complete

Service by either of the alternatives presented in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(a)* (*discussed under § 526.171[3][a] above*) is deemed complete on the date that the defendant signs the mail return receipt, on the dateof personal service, or as

established by other competent evidence, whichever applies to the method of service utilized [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(d)*].

When substituted service is made as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.20* or *415.95(a)*, it is deemed complete on the tenth day after mailing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340(d), 415.20, 415.95(a)*; *see also* discussion § 526.52[2]].

Service of the claim and order on defendant must be completed at least 15 days before the hearing date if defendant resides in the county in which the action is filed, or at least 20 days before the hearing date if defendant resides outside the county in which the action is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(b)*]. Proof of service of the claim and order scheduling the hearing must be filed with the small claims court at least five days before the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(c)*]. For a form of proof of service, see *§ 526.153*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsMailCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsPersonal DeliveryCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsResidential ServiceCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsService Upon AgentsGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.53

§ 526.53 Defendant's Pleadings

[1] Answer Not Required

A defendant may appear and oppose the plaintiff's claim without filing an answer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.310(a)*].

[2] Filing of Responsive Claim

The defendant may file and serve a claim in the same small claims action in an amount not exceeding the jurisdictional limit stated in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221,* and *116.231* (discussed in *§ 526.32 above*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.360(a)*]. The claim does not have to relate to the same subject or event as the plaintiff's claim [*Code Civ Proc. § 116.360(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2104*]. The claim must be filed and served in the same manner provided for filing and serving a claim of the plaintiff under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.330, 116.340* (*discussed under § 526.171[3][a] above*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.360(b)*]. The defendant must cause a copy of the claim and order to be served on the plaintiff at least five days before the hearing date, unless the defendant was served 10 days or less before the hearing date, in which event the defendant must cause a copy of the defendant's claim and order to be served on the plaintiff at least one day before the hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.360(c)*; *see § 526.158*].

[3] Cross Claim for More Than Jurisdictional Amount

[a] When Transferred

If the defendant has a claim against the plaintiff for an amount exceeding the jurisdiction of the small claims court and the claim relates to the contract, transaction, matter, or event that is the subject of the plaintiff's claim, the defendant may commence an action against the plaintiff in acourt of competent jurisdiction and request the small claims court to transfer the small claims action to that court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a)*]. At or before the time set for the hearing of the action in small claims court, defendant may make the request by filing with the small claims court in which the plaintiff commenced the action a declaration stating the facts concerning the defendant's action against the plaintiff with a true copy of the complaint so filed by the defendant against the plaintiff. The defendant must cause a copy of the declaration and complaint to be personally delivered to plaintiff at or before the time set for the hearing of the small

claims action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(b)*; *see § 526.159*].

In ruling on a motion to transfer, the court may (1) render judgment on the small claims case prior to transfer, or (2) not render judgment on the small claims case and transfer the case, or (3) refuse to transfer the small claims case on the grounds that the ends of justice would not be served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)*; *see § 526.160*]. When the small claims court orders the action transferred, it must transfer all files and papers to the transferee court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(d)*]. If the small claims action is transferred before judgment, both actions must be tried together in the transferee court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)*].

If the plaintiff in the small claims action is a health care provider and the defendant has a counterclaim of malpractice that exceeds the jurisdictional amount in small claims court, the defendant has a right to a continuance of the small claims trial if it would be necessary to ensure compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390* and with *Code Civ. Proc. § 364*, which requires a 90-day notice period prior to filing a complaint for professional negligence [*Clark v. Superior Court (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 865, 869, 169 Cal. Rptr. 898*].

[b] Payment of Fees if Action Is Transferred

The plaintiff in the small claims action is not required to pay to the clerk of the transferee court any transmittal, appearance, or filing fee unless plaintiff appears in the transferee court, in which event plaintiff is required to pay the filing fee and any other fee required of a defendant in the transferee court. Nevertheless, if the transferee court rules against the plaintiff in the action filed in that court, the court may award to the defendant in that action the costs incurred as a consequence of the transfer, including attorney's fees and filing fees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionAmount in ControversyCivil ProceduePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduePleading & PracticePleadingsCounterclaimsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.54

§ 526.54 Discovery Not Allowed

Formal discovery procedures are not permitted in a small claims action. If the defendant appeals an adverse judgment [*see* discussion in *§ 526.94*], discovery is not permitted in the trial de novo in superior court [*Bruno v. Superior Court (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1359, 1362-1363, 269 Cal. Rptr. 142*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Commencement of Claim

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.55-526.69

[Reserved]

§§ 526.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Hearing and Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.70

§ 526.70 Hearings

[1] Informal Nature

The hearing and disposition of small claims actions are informal, the object being to dispense justice promptly, fairly, and inexpensively [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510*].

[2] Temporary Judge

[a] Court-Appointed Temporary Judge

With the consent of the parties who appear at the hearing, the court may order a small claims case to be heard by a temporary judge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.240(a)*]. If the court has appointed and assigned an attorney to serve as a temporary judge [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(a)*], the court must give notice to each party of the following before the swearing-in of the first witness at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(b)*]:

- A temporary judge will be hearing the matters for that calendar.
- The temporary judge is a qualified member of the State Bar.
- The name of the temporary judge.
- The party that has a right to have the matter heard before a judge, commissioner, or referee of the court.

The court may give the foregoing notice by either of the following methods [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(c)*]:

- A conspicuous sign posted inside or just outside the courtroom, accompanied by oral notification or notification by videotape or audiotape by a court officer on the day of the hearing.

- A written notice provided to each party.

After the foregoing notice has been given, a party may sign a written stipulation agreeing that the matter may be heard by the temporary judge [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(d)(2)*]. Even without a written stipulation, however, a party will be deemed to have stipulated to the attorney serving as a temporary judge if the party fails to object to the matter being heard by the temporary judge before the temporary judge begins the proceeding [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(d)(1)*].

The temporary judge is sworn and empowered to act until the final determination of the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.240(a)*]. A party may, however, move to withdraw his or her stipulation to have the matter heard by the temporary judge if there is good cause for withdrawing the stipulation [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(e)*]. A ruling by the temporary judge based on error of fact or law does not constitute good cause for withdrawing a stipulation [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.816(e)(2)*].

The temporary judge must be an active or inactive member of the State Bar [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.240(a)*]. To qualify for appointment as a temporary judge, an attorney generally must have been admitted to practice as a member of the State Bar of California for at least 10 years before the appointment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.812(a)* (for good cause, attorney who has been admitted to practice for at least 5 years may serve as temporary judge)]. The appointee must not have any disciplinary action pending; must not have been convicted of, or pled guilty or no contest to, a felony; must have satisfied certain educational and training requirements [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.812(c), 2.813(a)-(c)*]; must have completed a application form [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.744*]; must subscribe the oath of office; and must have satisfied any other conditions imposed by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.812(b), (d), (e), (g), 2.814*].

Prior to serving as a temporary judge in small claims court, on and after July1, 2006, and at least every three years thereafter, each temporary judge must take a course of study offered by the courts on ethics and substantive law under rules adopted by the Judicial Council [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.815*]. The course must include, but not be limited to, small-claims procedures and practices; state and federal consumer laws; vehicular sales, leasing, and repair; professional and occupational licensing; landlord-tenant law along with any applicable county-specific rent deposit law, credit and financing transactions, including the state and federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Acts, the federal Truth in Lending Act, the federal Fair Credit Billing Act, and the federal Electronic Fund Transfer Act; warranty law; tort law, contract law, including defenses to contracts and defenses to debts; negotiable instruments law; and other subjects deemed appropriate by the presiding judge based on local needs and conditions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.240(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.812(c)(3)(A), 2.813(c)*]. On substantive law, the courts may receive assistance from the Department of Consumer Affairs to the extent that the department is fiscally able to provide that assistance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.240(b)*].

For detailed coverage of court-appointed temporary judges in actions other than small-claims cases, see Ch. 317, *Judges*
.

[b] Temporary Judge Requested by Parties

The parties may request that the court designate a temporary judge selected by the parties to hear their small-claims case [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21*]. The qualifications and procedures applicable to court-appointed temporary judges [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.810 et seq.*; *see also* [a], *above*] do not apply to temporary judges designated by the court at the parties' request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.810(a)*; *see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.8(a)]. However, any temporary judge requested by the parties must be an active or inactive member of the State Bar [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.810(a)*].

To request that an attorney be designated by the court to serve as a temporary judge, the parties must submit a written stipulation stating the name and office address of the member of the State Bar agreed on [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.831(a)*]. The designation of a temporary judge by stipulation of the parties in a small-claims case is subject to the same requirements that apply to the designation of temporary judges generally [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.830 et seq.*

]. For detailed coverage of those procedures, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[3] Evidence

[a] Witnesses and Documents

The parties have the right to offer evidence by witnesses at the hearing or, with the permission of the court, at another time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.520(a)*]. On request, the clerk may issue subpoenas for the witnesses or documents plaintiff needs at the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1986*; *see also § 526.150* (under What Happens at the Trial?)]. The requesting party must provide a declaration supporting the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum to compel the production of documents at the hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1987.5*]. For a form of subpoena for use in small claims actions, including a declaration for use when the subpoena seeks to compel the production of documents or things in addition to the witness' appearance, see *§ 526.156*. For further discussion and forms for use in compelling the attendance of witnesses and the production of physical evidence, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

[b] Use of Hearsay Evidence

Hearsay evidence is generally admissible at the hearing. It is excludable only if it is not relevant [*see Evid. Code § 350*], its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value [*see Evid. Code § 352*], or it is subject to anevidentiary privilege [*Houghtaling v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1131, 1137-1138, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855*].

This rule applies even on a trial de novo in the superior court [*Houghtaling v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1139, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855*], as discussed in *§ 526.70* et seq.

[4] Investigation by Court

In a small claims action the court may consult witnesses informally with or without notice to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.520(c)*]. The court's authority does not extend to authorizing another person, such as the clerk, to hear evidence [*see Thompson v. Municipal Court (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 676, 678-679, 328 P.2d 514*].

[5] Assistance in Presenting Claim or Defense

If the court determines that a party cannot properly present his or her claim or defense and needs assistance, the court may in its discretion allow another individual to assist that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(l)*].

[6] Assistance by Interpreter

If the court determines that a party does not speak or understand English sufficiently to comprehend the proceedings or to give testimony and needs assistance in so doing, the court may permit another individual (other than an attorney) to assist the party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(a)*].

Each small claims court must make a reasonable effort to maintain and make available to the parties a list of interpreters who are willing and able to aid the parties in the small claims court for no fee, or for a fee that is reasonable (considering the nature and complexity of the claim involved in the small claims court). The list must include interpreters for all languages that the court determines will require interpretation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(b)*]. Nevertheless, failure to comply with these requirements will not invalidate proceedings before the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(c)*].

If a court interpreter or other competent interpreter is not available to aid a party, at the first hearing of the case the court must postpone the hearing one time only to allow the party the opportunity to obtain another individual (other than an attorney) to assist that party. Any additional continuances are at the court's disrection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(d)*].

If the party is indigent, the court may appoint an interpreter at public expense [*Gardiana v. Small Claims Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 412, 423-424, 130 Cal. Rptr. 675*].

[7] Appearance by Representative

[a] For Proof of Account

If a party is an individual doing business as a sole proprietorship, the party may appear and participate in a small claims action by a representative and without personally appearing if the following conditions are met [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(d)*]:

(1) The claim can be proved or disputed by evidence of an account that constitutes a business record as defined in *Evid. Code § 1271* (writing as a record of an act, condition, or event) and there is no other issue of fact in the case; and

(2) The representative is a regular employee of the party for purposes other than solely representing the party in small claims actions and is qualified to testify to the identity and mode of preparation of the business record.

Any individual representing a party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(d)* is required to submit a declaration stating (1) that the person is authorized to appear for the party, (2) the basis for the person's authorization, and (3) that the person is not employed solely for the purpose of representing the party in the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*; *see § 526.157*].

[b] For Military Plaintiff

A plaintiff is not required to appear in person, and may submit declarations to serve as evidence supporting his or her claim or to allow another individual (other than an attorney at law) to appear and participate on his or her behalf if (1) plaintiff is serving on active duty in the United States armed forces outside California, (2) plaintiff was assigned to his or her duty station after his or her claim arose, (3) the assignment is for more than six months, (4) the representative is serving without compensation, and (5) the representative has appeared in small claims actions on behalf of others no more than four times during the calendar year [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(e)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(m)*].

Any individual representing a party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(e)* is required to submit a declaration stating (1) that the person is authorized to appear for the party, (2) the basis for the person's authorization, (3) the representative is serving without compensation, and (4) the representative has appeared in small claims actions on behalf of others no more than four times during the calendar year [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*; *see § 526.157*].

In the same proceeding, the defendant may file a claim in an amount not to exceed the jurisdictional limit of the court, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221,* and *116.231* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(e)*; *see* discussion in *§ 526.53*].

[c] For Incarcerated Party

A party who is incarcerated in a county jail, a facility of the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation [*see Penal Code § 5055*] or the Department's Division of Juvenile Facilities [*see Penal Code § 6001*] is not required to appear in person, and may submit declarations to serve as evidence supporting his or her claim or may authorize another individual to appear and participate on his or her behalf if that individual is serving without compensation and has appeared in small claims actions on behalf of others no more than four times during the calendar year [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(f)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(m)*].

Any individual representing a party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(f)* is required to submit a declaration making the

same statements as required of a person representing a plaintiff in the military [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*; *see § 526.157*; *see also* discussion of declaration requirements § 526.70[7][b]].

[d] For Defendant Nonresident Owner of Real Property

A defendant who is a nonresident owner of real property defending a claim relating to that property is not required to appear in person, and may submit (1) written declarations to serve as evidence supporting his or her defense, or (2) may allow another individual (other than an attorney at law) to appear and participate on his or her behalf if that individual is serving without compensation and has appeared in small claims actions on behalf of others no more than four times during the calendar year, (3) or both [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(g)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(m)*].

Any individual representing a party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(g)* is required to submit a declaration making the same statements as required of a person representing a plaintiff in the military [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*; *see § 526.157*; *see also § 526.70[7][b]*].

[e] For Owner of Rental Real Property

A party who owns rental real property may appear and participate in a small claims action through a property agent under contract for management of that property if (1) the owner has retained the agent principally to manage the rental of that property and not principally to represent the owner in small claims court, and (2) the claim relates to the rental property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(h)*; *see § 526.157*].

[f] For Spouse

A husband or wife who sues or who is sued with his or her spouse may appear and participate on behalf of his or her spouse if (1) the claim is a joint claim, (2) the represented spouse has given his or her consent, and (3) the court determines that the interests of justice would be served [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(k)*; *see § 526.157*].

[8] Postponement

Any party may submit a written request, in either letter form or on a form adopted or approved by the Judicial Council, to postpone a hearing date for good cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(1)* (Judicial Council has not adopted or approved a specific form for this procedure); *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)* (stay of proceedings while plaintiff or defendant is on military service)]. The request must be filed at least 10 days before the hearing date, unless the court determines that the requesting party has good cause to file the request at a later date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(2)*]. On the date of making the written request, the requesting party must mail or personally deliver a copy to each of the other parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(3)*]. The court must provide a prompt response by mail to the requesting party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(5)*].

If the court finds that the interests of justice would be served by postponing the hearing, the court must postpone the hearing and notify all parties by mail of the new hearing date, time, and place [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(4)(A)*].

On one occasion, on the written request of a defendant guarantor, the court must postpone the hearing for at least 30 days, and the court must take this action without a hearing. This does not limit the court's discretion to grant a postponement in the interests of justice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(4)(A)* discussed, *above* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(4)(B)*].

If service of the claim and order on the defendant is not completed within the number of days before the hearing date required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(b)* (15 days if defendant resides in county in which action was filed; 20 days if defendant resides outside county) and the defendant has not personally appeared and has not requested a postponement, the court must postpone the hearing for at least 15 days. If such a postponement is ordered, the clerk must promptly

notify all parties by mail of the new hearing date, time, and place [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(b)*]. The court also has inherent power to order postponements of hearings in appropriate circumstances [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(c)*]. A fee of $10 is charged for the filing of a request for postponement and rescheduling after service, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340*, has been made on the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims CourtsGovernmentsCourtsSpecial Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Hearing and Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.71

§ 526.71 Judgment

[1] In General

The court must give judgment for damages or equitable relief, or both damages and equitable relief, within the jurisdictional limits of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221,* and *116.231*(*see* discussion in *§ 526.32*) and may make such orders as to time of payment or otherwise as the court deems just and equitable for resolution of the dispute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(a)*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.210]. If specific property is referred to in the judgment, whether it is personal or real, tangible or intangible, the property must be identified with sufficient detail to permit efficient implementation or enforcement of the judgment [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.210].

[2] Continuance for Resolution by Alternative Means

The court may, at its discretion or on request of any party, continue the matter to a later date in order to permit the parties to attempt resolution by informal or alternative means [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(b)*].

[3] Multiple Parties

If the defendant has filed a claim against the plaintiff or if the judgment is against two or more defendants, the judgment, and the statement of decision if one is rendered, must specify the basis for and the character and amount of the liability of each of the parties including, in the case of multiple judgment debtors, whether the liability of each is joint or several [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(d)*].

In an action against several defendants, the court may, in its discretion, render judgment against one or more of them, leaving the action to proceed against the others, whenever a several judgment is proper [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(e)*].

[4] Notice of Judgment

When the court renders judgment, the clerk must promptly deliver or mail notice of entry of the judgment to the parties by first-class mail and must execute a certificate of personal delivery or mailing and place it in the file [*Code Civ. Proc.*

§ 116.610(h); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(k)* ("mail" defined); *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(b)*]. The notice of entry of judgment must be on a form approved or adopted by the Judicial Council [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(i)*; §§ 526.164, 526.164A (alternative mandatory forms)].

[5] Costs

The prevailing party is entitled to recover most of the costs of the action, including the costs of service of the order for appearance of defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(g)(1)*]. However, the prevailing party may not recover any increment in the filing fee that was imposed as a result of that party having filed 12 or more small claims in the previous 12 months [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(g)(2)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230(b), (c)*; *see also § 526.50[3]*].

[6] Default Judgment

If the defendant fails to appear, the court must nevertheless require the plaintiff to present evidence to prove his or her claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.520(b)*]. If the plaintiff is able to do so, the judge is to render judgment in favor of the plaintiff. The provisions governing small claims proceedings do not indicate any further requirements for entering a judgment against a defendant who did not appear at the hearing. However, small claims proceedings are subject to the general requirement that a default judgment cannot be entered unless the plaintiff has filed a declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth facts showing that the defendant is not in the military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(a)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 521(b)* (Servicemembers Civil Relief Act)]. Local rules may establish guidelines for compliance with this requirement. For further discussion, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[7] No Collateral Estoppel Effect

Generally, neither a small claims court judgment nor a superior court judgment on appeal from a small claims court judgment has any collateral estoppel effect in a subsequent action or proceeding [*Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1053, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* ; *see Sanderson v. Niemann (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 563, 573-575, 110 P.2d 1025*]. The courts have reasoned that collateral estoppel ordinarily cannot be given to such judgments because of their informality and the absence of a transcribed record, formal findings, or a statement of decision, which ordinarily makes it impossible to determine which issues were actually litigated in the small claims action [*see Sanderson v. Niemann (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 563, 573-574, 110 P.2d 1025* ; *Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1051-1052, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*]. However, collateral estoppel may apply to prevent a small-claims plaintiff from relitigating an issue that was decided in small claims court, if the small-claims record is sufficiently clear to enable a court in a subsequent action to determine that the issue was actually litigated and expressly decided against the plaintiff in the small claims action [*Pitzen v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1374, 1378-1388, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628*].

For full discussion of the doctrine of collateral estoppel or issue preclusion, see Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Hearing and Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.72

§ 526.72 Judgment Resulting From Motor Vehicle Accident

[1] In General

The judgment creditor may file with the Department of Motor Vehicles a notice requesting a suspension of the judgment debtor's privilege to operate a motor vehicle if a small claims judgment (1) was for $750 or less;(2) resulted from a motor vehicle accident occurring on a California highway caused by the defendant's operation of a motor vehicle; and (3) remained unsatisfied for more than 90 days after the judgment became final [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(a)*]. The department must then suspend the judgment debtor's privilege to operate a motor vehicle for up to 90 days, absent satisfactory proof that the judgment has been satisfied [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(c), (e)*; *Veh. Code § 16370.5*].

Veh. Code § 16250 et seq. (regarding the suspension of the judgment debtor's privilege to operate a motor vehicle for failing to satisfy a judgment) applies if the judgment (1) was for damage to property in excess of $750 or for bodily injury to, or death of, any person in any amount, and (2) resulted from the operation of a motor vehicle on a California highway by the defendant or by any other person for whose conduct the defendant was liable, unless the liability resulted from the defendant's signing the application of a minor for a driver's license [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.870*]. For discussion of the procedure under *Veh. Code § 16250 et seq.*, see Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Trial* .

[2] Determination Regarding Motor Vehicle Accident Required in Judgment

The small claims court judgment must include a determination whether the judgment resulted from a motor vehicle accident on a California highway caused by the defendant's operation of a motor vehicle, or by the operation by some other individual of a motor vehicle registered in the defendant's name [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(c)*]. The parties then receive notice of this determination as part of their notice of entry of judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(c), (h)*; *see also §§ 526.164, 526.164A*].

[3] Filing Notice With Department

The notice filed by the judgment creditor with the Department of Motor Vehicles must state that the judgment has not

been satisfied and must be accompanied by (1) a fee set by the department, (2) the judgment of the court determining that the judgment resulted from a motor vehicle accident occurring on a California highway caused by the judgment debtor's operation of a motor vehicle, and (3) a declaration that the judgment has not been satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(b)*].

At the time the notice is filed, the department must give the judgment creditor a copy of the notice, indicating the filing fee paid by the judgment creditor and including a space to be signed by the judgment creditor acknowledging payment of the judgment by the judgment debtor. The judgment creditor must mail (by first-class mail) or deliver a signed copy of the acknowledgment to the judgment debtor once the judgment is satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(d)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(k)* ("mail" defined)].

[4] Notification of Suspension

On receipt of a notice given pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880*, the Department of Motor Vehicles must attempt to notify the judgment debtor by telephone, if possible, or else by certified mail that his or her privilege to operate a motor vehicle will be suspended for 90 days, beginning 20 days following receipt of notice by the department from the judgment creditor unless satisfactory proof, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(e)*, is provided to the department before that date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(c)*; for discussion of proof under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(e)*, § 526.72[5]]. If the proof is not received within this time, the department must suspend the judgment debtor's privilege to drive [*see Veh. Code § 16370.5*].

[5] Termination of Suspension

The Department of Motor Vehicles shall terminate the suspension of the judgment debtor's privilege to operate a motor vehicle at the end of 90 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(e)(5)*]. The department shall otherwise terminate this suspension, or the suspension proceedings, on any of the following occurrences [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(e)*]:

> (1) Receipt of proof that the outstanding small claims judgment filed against the judgment debtor has been satisfied, either (A) by a copy of the notice filed with the department, signed by the judgment creditor acknowledging satisfaction of judgment (*discussed under § 526.72[3] above*), or (B) by a declaration of the judgment debtor stating that the judgment has been satisfied;
>
> (2) Receipt of proof that a court-ordered payment schedule is being complied with by the judgment debtor;
>
> (3) Proof that the judgment debtor had insurance covering the accident sufficient to satisfy the judgment; or
>
> (4) A deposit with the department of the amount of the unsatisfied judgment if the judgment debtor presents proof satisfactory to the department of inability to locate the judgment creditor [*see also Veh. Code § 16377(d)*].

When the suspension has been terminated under one of the foregoing conditions, the action is final and may not be reinstituted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(f)*]. Whenever the suspension is terminated, the judgment debtor is required to pay a fee for reissuance of the license [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880(f)*; *Veh. Code § 14904*].

[6] Immunity of Public Agency

No public agency is liable for any injury caused by the suspension, the termination of suspension, or the failure to suspend any person's privilegeto operate a motor vehicle as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.880* [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

116.880(g)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims CourtsTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesOperator LicensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Hearing and Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.73-526.89

[Reserved]

§§ 526.73[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.90

§ 526.90 Motions Generally

A "motion" within the context of small claims actions means a party's written request to the court for an order or other action. The term includes an informal written request to the court such as a letter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(h)*]. For a form of notice of motion and supporting declaration, see *§ 526.171*.

Some common motions in small claims court that are discussed below, include a motion to vacate judgment brought by a party who has failed to appear [*see § 526.170*], a motion to correct error [*see § 526.171*], a motion for attorney's fees and costs for frivolous appeal [*see § 526.173*], and a motion for sanctions for willful failure to file debtor's asset statement [*see § 526.175*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.91

§ 526.91 Filing Fee for Motions

The fee for the filing of any motion in small claims court matters is $14.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.92

§ 526.92 Motion to Vacate Judgment

[1] Incorrect or Erroneous Legal Basis for Decision

Any party may file a motion to vacate a judgment on the ground of an incorrect or erroneous legal basis for the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725*]. A motion to set aside and vacate a judgment on the ground of an incorrect or erroneous legal basis for the decision may be made by the court on its own motion at any time, or by a party within 30 days after the clerk mails notice of entry of judgment to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725(a)*]. Each party may file only one motion to correct a clerical error [*see § 526.93*] or to set aside and vacate the judgment on the ground of an incorrect or erroneous legal basis for the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725(b)*]. For a form of request to correct or vacate a judgment, see *§ 526.168*.5.

Code Civ. Proc. § 663 authorizes such motions generally for civil actions. For discussion of motions pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663*, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

[2] By Plaintiff Who Did Not Appear

A plaintiff who did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claimscourt. The motion must be filed within 30 days after the clerk has mailed notice of entry of the judgment to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(a)*]. The clerk must schedule the hearing on the motion to vacate for a date no earlier than 10 days after the clerk has mailed written notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(b)*]. For a form of motion to vacate a small claims judgment following plaintiff's failure to appear, see *§ 526.170*.

On a showing of good cause (circumstances sufficient to justify the requested action), the small claims court may grant the motion. If the defendant is not present, the court shall hear the motion in the defendant's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(j)* ("good cause" defined)].

If the motion is granted and if all parties are present and agree, the court may hear the case without rescheduling it. If the defendant is not present, the judge or clerk must reschedule the case and give notice in accordance with *Code Civ.*

Proc. § 116.330, which governs setting and notice of hearing after original filing of claim in small claims court (*see* discussion in *§ 526.50[5]*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(d)*].

[3] By Defaulting Defendant

[a] Lack of Appearance

A defendant who did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(a)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 402(d)* (reopening of judgment entered against defendant while on military service)]. This is the defendant's sole avenue of challenging the judgment because a defendant who did not appear at the hearing has no right to a direct appeal to the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)*]. If the small claims court denies the motion to vacate, however, the defendant may appeal the denial to the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(e)*]. Then, if that limited appeal is successful, the superior court may immediately hear the claims of all parties [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(f)*]. For discussion of appeal from denial of a motion to vacate, see *§ 526.92[3][c]*.

The motion to vacate must be filed within 30 days after the clerk has mailed notice of entry of the judgment to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(a)*]. For a form of motion to vacate a small claims judgment after a defendant's default, see *§ 526.170*.

The defendant must appear at any hearing on the motion, or submit written justification for not appearing together with a declaration in support of the motion (*see § 526.170*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(b)*].

On a showing of good cause (circumstances sufficient to justify the requested action), the court may grant the motion to vacate the judgment.If the plaintiff is not present, the court must hear the motion in the plaintiff's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(j)* ("good cause" defined)]. If the motion is granted and if all parties are present and agree, the court may hear the case without rescheduling it. If the plaintiff is not present, the judge or clerk must reschedule the case and give notice in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(d)*].

[b] Improper Service

If the defendant was not properly served as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330* (*see* discussion in *§ 526.50[5]*) or by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340* (*see* discussion in *§ 526.52[1]*) and did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court, the defendant may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(a)*]. This is the defendant's sole avenue of challenging the judgment because a defendant who did not appear at the hearing has no right to a direct appeal to the superior court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)*, discussed in *§ 526.92[3][a]*]. The motion must be accompanied by a supporting declaration and must be filed within 180 days after defendant discovers or should have discovered that the judgment was entered against him or her [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(a)*]. For a form of motion to vacate a small claims judgment, see *§ 526.170*.

The court may order that the enforcement of the judgment shall be suspended pending a hearing and determination of the motion to vacate the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(b)*].

On a showing of good cause (circumstances sufficient to justify the requested action), the court may grant the motion to vacate the judgment. If the plaintiff is not present, the court must hear the motion in the plaintiff's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.130(j)* ("good cause" defined), 116.740(d) (*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(d)-(f)* applicable to motion to vacate for improper service)].

[c] Appeal From Denial of Motion

If the motion to vacate the judgment is denied, the defendant may appeal to the superior court only on the denial of the motion. The notice of appeal must be filed with the clerk of the small claims court within 10 days after the small claims court has mailed or delivered notice of the court's denial of the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(e)*].

If the superior court determines that the defendant's motion to vacate the judgment should have been granted, the superior court may hear the claims of all parties without rescheduling the matter provided that all parties are present and the defendant has previously complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710 et seq.*, which contain the requirements for bringing a direct appeal of a small claims judgment to the superior court, as wellas with the requirements for making a motion to vacate the small claims judgment in the small claims court. Alternatively, the court may order the case transferred to the small claims court for a hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(f)*]. For discussion of the procedure for bringing an appeal, see *§ 526.94[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultFailure to Pursue the CauseCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultRelief From DefaultCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.93

§ 526.93 Motion to Correct Error

A party who discovers a mistake in the judgment as entered may file a request or motion to correct the clerical error [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725*]. A motion to correct a clerical error in the judgment may be made by the court on its own motion at any time, or by a party within 30 days after the clerk mails notice of entry of judgment to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725(a)*]. Each party may file only one motion to correct a clerical error or to set aside and vacate the judgment on the ground of an incorrect or erroneous legal basis for the decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725(b)*; *see § 526.92[1]*]. The time for filing a notice of appeal is not extended by the filing of a request to correct a mistake or by virtue of any subsequent proceedings on the request, except that a new period for filing a notice of appeal begins on the delivery or mailing of notice of entry of any modified judgment [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 116.750(c)*]. For a form of motion to correct error and supporting declaration, see *§ 526.171*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesMistakeGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.94

§ 526.94 Appeal by Defendant or Cross Defendant

[1] Availability

The defendant, with respect to plaintiff's claim, and a plaintiff, with respect to a claim of the defendant, may appeal the judgment to the superior court in the county in which the action was heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(b)*]. With respect to the plaintiff's claim, the insurer of the defendant may appeal the judgment to the superior court in the county in which the matter was heard if the judgment exceeds $2,500 and the insurer stipulates that its policy with the defendant covers the matter to which the judgment applies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(c)*]. An appeal from a judgment in a small claims action is taken by filing a notice of appeal with the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(a)*; *see discussion under § 526.94[2]*].

A defendant who did not appear at the hearing has no right to appeal the judgment, but may file a motion to vacate the judgment in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730* or *116.740* (*discussed under § 526.92[3][a] above*), and also may appeal the denial of that motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)* (discussed in *§ 526.92[3][c]*)].

The plaintiff in a small claims action has no right to appeal the judgment on the plaintiff's own claim, but a plaintiff who did not appear at the hearing may file a motion to vacate the judgment in accordance with Code *Civ. Proc. § 116.720* (*discussed under § 526.92 above*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(a)*].

[2] Notice of Appeal

[a] Time for Filing

A notice of appeal must be filed no later than 30 days after the clerk has delivered or mailed notice of entry of the judgment to the parties. A notice of appeal filed after the 30-day period is ineffective for any purpose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(b)*]. The time for filing a notice of appeal is not extended by the filing of a request to correct a mistake or by virtue of any subsequent proceedings on that request, except that a new period for filing notice of appeal shall begin on the delivery or mailing of notice of entry of any modified judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(c)*].

If the notice of appeal is filed before the judgment is entered but after it is rendered, the notice of appeal is valid and deemed to have been filed immediately after entry of the judgment. A notice of appeal filed before the judgment was rendered but after the judge has announced an intended ruling may, in the discretion of the reviewing court for good cause, be treated as filed immediately after entry of the judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(c)*].

When a notice of appeal is filed, the clerk of the small claims court must promptly mail a notification of the filing of the notice to each other party at the party's last known address or to their attorneys of record [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(b)*]. The notification must state the number and title of the action or proceeding and the date the notice of appeal was filed. In the event a party dies before the court gives notice, the mailing is a sufficient performance of the clerk's duty. The failure of the clerk to give notification of the filing of the notice of appeal does not extend the time for filing notice of appeal and does not affect the validity of the appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(b)*].

[b] Contents

A notice of appeal must be signed by the appellant or by the appellant's attorney. It is sufficient if it states in substance that the appellant appeals from either a specified judgment or, in the case of a defaulting defendant, the denial of a motion to vacate the judgment. A notice of appeal must be liberally construed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(a)*].

For a form of notice of appeal, see *§ 526.172*.

[3] Abandonment of Appeal

At any time before the file has been transmitted to the court assigned to hear the appeal, the appellant may file a written abandonment of theappeal, or the parties may file a stipulation for abandonment, in the office of the small claims court clerk [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(a)*]. The filing of either document operates to dismiss the appeal and return the case to the small claims court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(a)*]. If an appellant files an abandonment of appeal, the small claims court clerk must immediately notify the adverse party or parties of the filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(d)*].

[4] Record on Appeal

Within five days of the filing of the notice of appeal and the payment of any fees required by law, the clerk of the small claims court must transmit the file and all related papers, including the notice of appeal, to the clerk of the court assigned to hear the appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.957*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(f)*].

[5] Filing Fee

The appealing party must pay a $75 fee for filing a notice of appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.760(a)*]. A party who does not appeal will not be charged any fee for filing any document relating to the appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.760(b)*].

[6] Setting for Trial

The clerk of the superior court must schedule the hearing for the earliest available time and mail written notice of the hearing to the parties at least 14 days prior to the time set for the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(e)*]. Continuances of the trial in the superior court may be granted for good cause. A request for a continuance may be presented by one party or by stipulation. The court may grant a continuance not to exceed 30 days, but in a case of extreme hardship the court may grant a continuance exceeding 30 days [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.960*].

[7] Dismissal of Appeal

[a] By Request or Stipulation

The superior court may dismiss an appeal filed in that court if the appellant files a written request or the parties file a stipulation with the clerk of the superior court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(d)*].

The clerk of the court assigned to hear the appeal must immediately notify the parties of any order of dismissal or of any judgment for defendant made by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(d)*]. The clerk must also transmit to the small claims court a copy of the order of dismissal and all original papers and exhibits that had been transmitted to the court assigned to hear the appeal. The small claims court will proceed with the case as if no appeal had been taken [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(e)*].

[b] For Delay in Prosecution

The superior court may dismiss the appeal if the appealing party does not appear at the hearing or if the appeal is not heard within one year from the date of filing the notice of appeal with the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.795(a)*; *see discussion under § 526.94[10]*].

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c), provides guidance to the court in determining whether or not to dismiss the appeal after the one-year deadline. A dismissal cannot be ordered, nor judgment entered, if a written stipulation was in effect extending the time for trial or if the appellant shows that he or she exercised reasonable diligence in attempting to bring the case to trial [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c)*; for discussion of how the "reasonable diligence" standard is applied to dismissal of ordinary civil actions, *see* Ch. 212, *Dismissal*]. If, however, the case is not brought to trial within three years after the appeal is filed in the superior court, dismissal is mandatory [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c)*]. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c),* also requires mandatory dismissal if the case is not brought to trial within three years after the most recent order for a new trial is entered in the superior court. Apparently, however, the superior court has no power to grant a motion for a new trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)* ("final" judgment), discussed in *§ 526.94[13]*].

The clerk of the court assigned to hear the appeal must immediately notify the parties of any order of dismissal or of any judgment for defendant made by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(d)*]. The clerk must also transmit to the small claims court a copy of the order of dismissal and all original papers and exhibits that had been transmitted to the court assigned to hear the appeal. The small claims court will proceed with the case as if no appeal had been taken [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(e)*].

In addition, for good cause and when necessary to achieve substantial justice between the parties, the superior court may award a party to an appeal reimbursement of up to $150 in attorney's fees and costs, and up to $150 for loss of earnings and certain other costs, actually and reasonably incurred in connection with the appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(c)*; for further discussion of costs on appeal, § 526.94[12]].

[8] Plaintiff's Motions

When a defendant has appealed a small claims judgment to superior court, the plaintiff may not move in superior court to dismiss the small claims action. The superior court has no jurisdiction to grant such a motion [*Acuna v. Gunderson Chevrolet, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1473, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62*].

In addition, the plaintiff may not move to transfer and consolidate the appeal with another action pending in the superior court, although the defendant may make such a request if the defendant has commenced anaction against the plaintiff in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(b)*; *Acuna v. Gunderson Chevrolet, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1472-1473, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62*].

[9] Compromise by Minor or Incompetent Person

Whenever the guardian of a minor or of an insane or incompetent person seeks approval of a proposed compromise of a

case on appeal in which a new trial has been ordered, the court assigned to hear the appeal may hear and determine if the proposed compromise is for the best interest of the ward [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(f)*; for discussion of order for new trial, § 526.94[13]].

[10] Hearing of Appeal

[a] Informal Procedures Apply

The appeal to the superior court must consist of a new hearing before a judicial officer other than the judicial officer who heard the action in the small claims division [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(a)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510 et seq., governing hearings in small claims court, apply to hearings on appeal in the superior court, except that attorneys may participate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(c)*; *see also* discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510 et seq.* § 526.70].

The hearing on appeal must be conducted informally, the pretrial discovery procedures described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019(a)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.010* operative July 1, 2005) are not permitted, hearsay evidence is admissible as in small claims court [*Houghtaling v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1139, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855* ; *see § 526.70[3][b]*], and no tentative decision or statement of decision is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*]. The court may allow parties, or attorneys representing parties, to conduct direct and cross examination, subject to the court's discretion to control the manner, mode, and duration of examination in keeping with informality and the circumstances [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.966*].

[b] Scope of Hearing

[i] Generally

The scope of the hearing must include the claims of all parties who were parties to the small claims action at the time the notice of appeal was filed. The hearing must include the claims of a defendant that was heard in the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(d)*].

[ii] Cross Claims

The courts are split regarding the scope of the trial de novo in "criss-cross" cases in which both the plaintiff and the defendant assert claims.

The Third District court of appeal held that when the defendant has filed a claim against the plaintiff in the same action and lost to the plaintiff on both claims, the defendant cannot be awarded any affirmative relief on appeal, either directly or indirectly. The defendant may, however, be awarded an offset of the amount the defendant was unable to recover on his or her own claim [*Township Homes, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1587, 1589, 1594-1595, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852* (Third Appellate District, noting that 1990 amendments to small claims statutes abrogated contrary rule in *Anderson v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 698, 700, 276 Cal. Rptr. 18*)]. In *Township Homes, Inc.*, a buyer filed a defendant's claim, alleging seller's failure to complete warranty repairs. The small claims court awarded seller $1,000 on its claim but ordered that buyer take nothing on hers. Buyer appealed and the superior court made an award in buyer's favor for $3,319, offset this award by $2,681 buyer owed seller for repairs, and made a net award to buyer of $638. Thus, the buyer/appellant, who had lost both her claim and the seller's claim and owed $1,000 in small claims court came out $638 ahead because she appealed for a trial de novo [*see* *Township Homes, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1587, 1589, 1589-1590, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852*]. In the court's opinion, to allow affirmative relief to a party who had not prevailed on its claim at the small claims hearing would "impermissibly negate the plain language of sections 116.130 and 116.710," (denying a "plaintiff" a right to appeal, and defining "plaintiff" as including a defendant who has filed a claim against a plaintiff).

The First District, on the other hand, held that if both sides have filed claims, either may appeal the other's claim and the superior court will fully retry all claims [*Linton v. Superior Court (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1097, 1103* & n.7, 1106, *62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202* (First Appellate District, criticizing *Township Homes, Inc.,* above, as applying "a rule with no statutory basis")]. In *Linton*, plaintiff tenants filed a small claims action against their landlord and the defendant landlord also filed a claim against the tenants. The small claims court entered judgment for $1,000 plus $21 costs for the plaintiffs, and an identical judgment for the defendant. The *plaintiffs* appealed, but the defendant did not. After trial de novo on the appeal, the superior court entered judgment of $1,000 plus $21 costs *in favor of the plaintiffs on their claim* and judgment in favor of the plaintiffs on defendant's claim against them. The court emphasized the language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(d)* enjoining the court "rehear the claim of a defendant" [*Linton v. Superior Court (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1097, 1102* & n.6, 1104, *62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202* ; *see also Universal City Nissan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 203, 207-209, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910* (Second Appellate District; agreeing with the court in *Linton* and noting that the Legislature, by its amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770*, apparently intended to clarify its intent, misconstrued by courts such as that in *Township,* to permit full review of an unsuccessful claim or counterclaim)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Advising Small Claims Litigants of Possibility of Rehearing. Counsel should try to ascertain the position taken by the superior court in his or her county on the scope of claims to be examined when where there is an appeal in an action involving claims by both the plaintiff and defendant.

Until the disagreement by these courts on this fundamental issue is resolved by the Legislature or Supreme Court, in light of *Linton v. Superior Court*, above, counsel may wish to err on the side of caution, by advising clients that the filing of a cross claim *may* result in the rehearing of all claims in a superior court trial de novo when at least one of the parties appeal.

[iii] No Right to Jury Trial

There is no right to a jury trial in a de novo proceeding in superior court on appeal from a small claims action at law for money damages [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*; *Crouchman v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 1167, 1171-1178, 248 Cal. Rptr. 626, 755 P.2d 1075* (also holding that there is no such right to a jury trial under either *Cal. Const., art. I, § 16*, or *Code Civ. Proc. § 592*)]. Nevertheless, prior to the 1992 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220*, which removed unlawful detainer from small claims jurisdiction, there existed a right to a jury trial in de novo proceeding in superior court on appeal from a small claims action for unlawful detainer, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 592* and *1171* [*Maldonado v. Superior Court (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1259, 1262-1269, 209 Cal. Rptr. 199* ; *see also Crouchman v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 1167, 1178-1180, 248 Cal. Rptr. 626, 755 P.2d 1075* (strictly limiting decision in *Maldonado* to its fact situation)].

[iv] Tentative Decision and Statement of Decision Not Required

On conclusion of the trial, the superior court is not required to give either a tentative decision or a statement of decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*].

[11] Judgment on Appeal

Except as specified in § 526.949[12], *below* , *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610 et seq.*, which provide for the contents, notice, satisfaction, and amendment of judgments rendered in the small claims court, apply to judgments of the superior court after a hearing on appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(b)*; for discussion of these statutes, *see § 526.131[6]*].

A superior court judgment on appeal from a small claims court judgment has no collateral estoppel effect in a subsequent action or proceeding [*Rosse v. DeSoto Cab Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1047, 1053, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* ; *see discussion under § 526.71[7]*].

[12] Award of Costs on Appeal

[a] Fees and Expenses

The party who prevails after the hearing on appeal is entitled to the costs of the appeal [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(b)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(g)* applies to judgments after hearing on appeal)]. In addition, for good cause and when necessary to achieve substantial justice between the parties, the superior court may award a party to an appeal reimbursement of up to $150 in attorney's fees and costs and up to $150 for loss of earnings and expenses of transportation and lodging, actually and reasonably incurred in connection with the appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(c)*]. For discussion of cost awards in ordinary civil actions generally, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10* et seq. For discussion of the award of costs to a prevailing party on appeal in an ordinary civil action, see Ch. 53, *Appeal: Remittitur and Costs on Appeal* .

[b] Bad Faith Appeal

If the superior court finds that the appeal was without substantial merit and not based on good faith, but was intended to harass or delay the other party or to encourage the other party to abandon the claim, the court may, following a hearing on the matter, award the other party (a) attorney's fees actually and reasonably incurred in connection with the appeal not exceeding $1,000, and (b) any actual loss of earnings and any expenses of transportation and lodging actually and reasonably incurred in connection with the appeal not exceeding $1,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790*].

The "without substantial merit" standard appears to be easier to satisfy than the standard applicable in ordinary civil appeals. Sanctions for a frivolous appeal under *Code Civ. Proc. § 907* are authorized if the appeal was prosecuted to harass or delay or if any attorney would reasonably agree that the appeal was totally and completely without merit [*see In re Marriage of Flaherty (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 637, 650, 183 Cal. Rptr. 508, 646 P.2d 179* ; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.276*]. Nevertheless, *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790* appears to require that the party seeking costs demonstrate both that the claim was without substantial merit and that the appellant acted with bad intent, whereas *Code Civ. Proc. § 907* only requires that either one or the other test be met [*see San Bernardino Community Hosp. v. Office of Statewide Health Planning & Dev. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 457, 470, 231 Cal. Rptr. 673* (award was justified because sole purpose of appeal was delay, even though appeal presented colorable claim)]; for further discussion, *see* Ch. 49, *Appeal: Sanctions* .

For a form of motion for an award of attorney's fees for prosecution of a bad faith appeal, see *§ 526.173*.

[13] Review of Superior Court Judgment

The judgment of the superior court on appeal is final and may not be appealed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*]. By this legislative mandate, the judgment is immune from virtually any postjudgment attack. In a proceeding designed to be a speedy resolution of disputes over relatively minor amounts of money, this immunity is the cost of finality [*ERA-Trotter Girouard Assoc. v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1851, 1854, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381*].

Although certain rules of court governing small claims procedure contemplate the availability of a motion for new trial in the superior court after appeal from a small claims decision, these rules conflict with the "final judgment" provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*. Therefore motions for a new trial and motions to vacate the judgment are prohibited [*ERA-Trotter Girouard Assoc. v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1851, 1853-1854, 1856, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381* (First Appellate District, criticizing contrary opinion in *Adamson v. Superior Court (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 505, 508-509, 169 Cal. Rptr. 866 (Fourth Appellate District)* ; *see also Eloby v. Superior Court (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 972, 975-976* ; *144 Cal. Rptr. 597* (First Appellate District, interpreting former Code Civ. Proc. § 118.1); *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c), (f)* (referring to order for "new trial")].

Absolute finality does not exist, however. Whether a specific kind of procedure for review of a judgment is permitted depends on whether the small claims legislation was clearly intended to prevent it. For example, the superior court may entertain a motion for rehearing after a trial and judgment on appeal, on the ground that the court had made mistakes of law or of fact, because to do so is speedier and more economical than review by certification to the court of appeal or by extraordinary writ [*Adamson v. Superior Court (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 505, 506-509, 169 Cal. Rptr. 866*].

In addition, *ERA-Trotter Girouard Assoc., above*, assumed without deciding that a judge could entertain a motion to vacate or reconsider a judgment based on fundamental questions of fraud on the court or the court's action in excess of its juridiction [*ERA-Trotter Girouard Assoc. v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1851, 1857, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381*].

Because statewide precedents can only be created by appellate courts, an appellate court is not foreclosed from reviewing important issues of law by utilization of an extraordinary writ [*Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 167-168, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167* ; *see also Green v. Superior Court (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 616, 640, 111 Cal. Rptr. 704, 517 P.2d 1168* ; *Calvao v Superior Court (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 921, 922 n.1, 247 Cal. Rptr. 470*]. For example, a defendant in small claims appeal who is denied a crucial defense by the superior court may petition for a writ of mandate to entertain the defense if the superior court has abused its discretion [*Schweiger v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 507, 517-518, 90 Cal. Rptr. 729, 476 P.2d 97*]. For discussion and forms relating to petitioning for a writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsCosts & Attorney FeesCivil ProcedureAppealsDismissals of AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime LimitationsGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Motions and Appeal

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.95-526.109

[Reserved]

§§ 526.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Enforcement of Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.110

§ 526.110 Enforcement of Judgment

[1] Execution and Abstract of Judgment

A judgment of a small claims court and a judgment of the superior court after a hearing on appeal may be enforced through ordinary proceedings pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 680.010 et seq.* (enforcement of judgments generally) and 674 (abstract of judgment) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.820(a)*; for discussion of enforcement of judgments and abstract of judgments, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* , and Ch. 318, *Judgments*]. An appeal from a postjudgment enforcement order of the small claims court must be taken to the appellate division of the superior court [*General Elec. Capital Auto Fin. Servs., Inc. v. Appellate Div. of Superior Court (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 136, 138-145, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552* (in absence of specific provision pertaining to postjudgment orders of small claims court, small claims case treated as limited civil case); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.2(b)* (appellate division of superior court has appellate jurisdiction to review postjudgment enforcement orders in limited civil cases)].

The clerk of the small claims court must charge and collect all fees associated with the enforcement of judgments [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.820(b)*].

The prevailing party in any action is entitled to the costs of enforcing the judgment and accrued interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.820(c)*].

[2] Automatic Suspension Pending Appeal

Enforcement of the judgment of a small claims court, including the issuance or recording of any abstract of the judgment, is automatically suspended, without the filing of a bond by the defendant, until expiration of the time for appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.810(a)*].

If an appeal is filed as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.710-116.750* (discussed in *§ 526.94 above*), enforcement of the judgment of the smallclaims court is suspended unless (1) the appeal is dismissed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.795* (one-year statute of limitation) or (2) the superior court determines that the small claims court properly denied the defendant's motion to vacate filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730* or *116.740*. In either of these events, the

judgment of the small claims court may be enforced [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.810(b)*].

The scope of the suspension of enforcement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.810* and, unless otherwise ordered, of any suspension of enforcement ordered by the court includes any enforcement procedure described in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 680.010 et seq.* (enforcement of judgments generally) and 674 (abstract of judgment) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.810(c)*].

[3] Asset Questionnaire

[a] Duties of Judgment Debtor

At the time judgment is rendered or notice of entry of judgment is mailed to the parties, the clerk must deliver or mail to the judgment debtor a Judicial Council form containing questions regarding the nature and location of any assets of the judgment debtor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(e)*; *see also § 526.174*]. The judgment debtor must complete the form and cause it to be delivered to the judgment creditor within 30 days after the clerk has mailed by first-class mail notice of entry of judgment unless the judgment has been satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(k)* ("mail" defined)]. In the event a motion to vacate the judgment or a notice of appeal is filed, a judgment debtor must complete and deliver the form within 30 days after the clerk has delivered or mailed by first-class mail notice of denial of the motion to vacate or notice of dismissal of or entry of judgment on the appeal, whichever is applicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(c)*].

[b] Sanctions for Willful Failure to File

In the event of a judgment debtor's willful failure to complete and deliver the asset questionnaire in accordance with the foregoing requirements, the judgment creditor may request the court to apply sanctions (including arrest and attorney's fees) as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170* on contempt of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(d)*]. For a Judicial Council form for use by the judgment creditor to make this request (Application and Order to Appear for Examination, SC-134), see *§ 526.175*. For futher discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170*, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionDiscovery of AssetsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsAutomatic StaysGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Enforcement of Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.111

§ 526.111 Satisfaction of Judgment

[1] Payment to Judgment Creditor

The judgment debtor must pay the amount of the judgment either immediately or at the time and on the terms and conditions, including payment by installments, that the court may order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620(a)*].

The judgment debtor may pay the small claims judgment directly to the judgment creditor [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.840(a)*]. If full payment of the judgment is made to the judgment creditor or to his or her assignee of record, then, immediately on receipt of payment, the judgment creditor or the assignee of record must file an acknowledgment of satisfaction of judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(a)*]. Any judgment creditor or assignee of record who, after receiving full payment of the judgment and written demand by the judgment debtor, fails without good cause (circumstances sufficient to justify the action) to execute and file an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment with the clerk of the court in which the judgment is entered within 14 days after receiving the request is liable to the judgment debtor or the judgment debtor's grantees or heirs for all damages sustained by reason of the failure and, in addition, the sum of $50 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(j)* ("good cause" defined)].

At the judgment debtor's request, the clerk shall enter a satisfaction of judgment if the judgment debtor either (1) establishes a rebuttable presumption of full payment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)*, or *(2)* establishes a rebuttable presumption of partial payment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)* and complies with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(c)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(c)*].

A rebuttable presumption of full or partial payment of the judgment, whichever is applicable, is created if the judgment debtor files both of the following with the clerk of the court in which the judgment was entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)*]:

(1) Either a canceled check or money order for the full or partial amount of the judgment written by the judgment debtor after judgment and made payable to and endorsed by the judgment creditor, or a cash receipt for the full or partial amount of the judgment written by the judgment debtor after judgment and signed by the judgment creditor; and

(2) A declaration [*see § 526.168*] stating that (A) the judgment debtor has made full or partial payment of the judgment including accrued interest and costs; (B) the judgment creditor has been requested to file an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment and refuses to do so or refuses to accept subsequent payments, or the present address of the judgment creditor is unknown; and (C) the documents identified in andaccompanying the declaration constitute evidence of the judgment creditor's receipt of full or partial payment.

[2] Payment to Small Claims Court

In lieu of paying the small claims judgment directly to the judgment creditor, the judgment debtor may opt to make payment to the court in which the judgment was entered [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.840(a)*]. A judgment debtor who desires to make payment to the court in which the judgment was entered may file a request to make payment, which must be made on a form approved or adopted by the Judicial Council [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(a)*; *see § 526.165*].

On the filing of the request to make payment and the payment to the clerk of the amount of the judgment and any accrued interest and costs after judgment, plus a $20 fee to cover administrative costs [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(h)*], the clerk must enter satisfaction of the judgment and shall remit payment to the judgment creditor as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(f)* ("costs after judgment" consist of only those costs itemized in a memorandum of costs filed by the judgment creditor or otherwise authorized by the court)].

If partial payment of the judgment has been made to the judgment creditor and the judgment debtor files the declaration [*see § 526.168*] and evidence of partial payment described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)* (*see* discussion under *§ 526.111*), the clerk shall enter satisfaction of the judgment on receipt by the clerk of the balance owing on the judgment, including any accrued interest and costs after judgment, and the fee required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(h)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(c)*]. If payment is made by means other than money order, certified or cashier's check, or cash, entry of satisfaction of the judgment shall be delayed for 30 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(d)*].

The clerk shall notify the judgment creditor, at his or her last known address, that the judgment debtor has satisfied the judgment by making payment to the court. The notification shall explain the procedures that the judgment creditor has to follow to receive payment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(e)*].

Payments that remain unclaimed for three years will go to the superior court [*see Gov. Code § 68084.1*].

The board of supervisors shall set a fee, not to exceed the actual costs of administering this section, up to a maximum of $25, which shall be paid by the judgment debtor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(h)*].

[3] Installment Payments

The court may at any time for good cause (circumstances sufficient to justify the requested order), on motion by a party and notice by the clerkto all affected parties at their last known address, amend the terms and conditions for payment of the judgment to provide for payment by installment. The determination must be made without regard to the nature of the underlying debt and without regard to whether the moving party appeared before entry of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(j)* ("good cause" defined)].

In determining the terms and conditions of payment, the court may consider any factors that would be relevant to a claim of exemption under *Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620(c)*]. For a form of request to pay a judgment in installments, see *§ 526.167*. For a response to the request, see *§ 526.167A*; for an order on the request, see *§ 526.167B*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDeposits in CourtGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Enforcement of Judgment

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.112-526.129

[Reserved]

§§ 526.112[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.130

§ 526.130 State Statutes

[1] Appeal

Judgment as conclusive on plaintiff who appeared; defendant as able to appeal adverse judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(a), (b)*

Right of insurer of defendant to appeal judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(c)*

No right to trial by jury on appeal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*

Appearance of corporation on appeal in superior court through director, officer, employee, or attorney. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(b)*

Rules of practice and procedure on appeal as prescribed by Judicial Council. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(f)*

Judgment of superior court on appeal as final and not appealable. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*

[2] Appearance by Corporation or Party Suing Under Fictitious Business Name

Party filing claim in fictitious business name as required to affirm, under penalty of perjury, compliance with fictitious business name laws by executing, filing, and publishing fictitious business name statement pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17913*; action filed by party lacking compliance with applicable fictitious business name laws as required to be dismissed without prejudice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(b)*

Appearance by corporation or other entity that is not natural person. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(b), (c), (i)*

Representative of plaintiff corporation or other entity that is not natural person as required to affirm authorization to represent party under penalty of perjury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*

[3] Assistance to Parties

Prohibition on attorneys representing parties in small claims actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.530(a), 116.540(m)*

Assistance by representative of insurer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.531*

Assistance of parties by interpreters. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(a)*

Small claims court as required to make reasonable effort to maintain a list of interpreters. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(b)*

One continuance as required if interpreter is unavailable. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.550(d)*

Legal advisors as permitted to assist parties but not permitted to appear in court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.940(e)*

[4] Claims by Assignees

Claims by assignees as not generally allowed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420(a)*

[5] Commencement of Action

Fees for filing of claim. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230*

Action as commenced with filing of claim by plaintiff with clerk of small claims court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(a)*

[6] County Government as Party to Small Claims Action

County Board of Supervisors as permitted to authorize county officials who are not attorneys to initiate and conduct litigation in small claims court on behalf of county. *Gov. Code § 25203*

[7] Definitions

Plaintiff. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(a)*

Defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(b)*

Judgment creditor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(c)*

Judgment debtor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(d)*

Person. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(e)*

Individual. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(f)*

Party. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(g)*

Motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(h)*

Declaration. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(i)*

Good cause. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(j)*

Mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(k)*

[8] Hearing and Disposition

Hearing and disposition of small claims action as informal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510*

Waiver of personal appearance by military plaintiff. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(e)*

Waiver of personal appearance by incarcerated plaintiff. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(f)*

Waiver of personal appearance by defendant nonresident owner of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(g)*

Appearance by spouse on joint claim. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(k)*

Postponement of hearing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570*

[9] Judgment

Court to make orders in rendering judgment that are just and equitable for the resolution of the dispute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(a)*

Property, personal or real or tangible or intangible, identified in detail in judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(e)*

Prevailing party's entitlement to costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.610(g), 116.820(c)*

Enforcement of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.810, 116.820(a)*

Clerk as to provide judgment debtor asset questionnaire in order to locate assets of judgment debtor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830*

Requirement of filing of acknowledgment of satisfaction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.840(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.850(c), (d), 116.860(b)*

[10] Jurisdiction

General jurisdiction of small claims court over any action for recovery of money in which demand does not exceed $7,500 if action is brought by natural person, or $5,000 if claimant is other than natural person. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.221*

Jurisdiction of small claims court as including action to confirm, correct, or vacate binding fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 between attorney and client, or to conduct de novo hearing between attorney and client after nonbinding arbitration of fee dispute involving no more than $5,000. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*

Jurisdiction of small claims court over action for injunctive or other equitable relief only if statute expressly authorizes small claims court to award that relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(5)*

Retention of jurisdiction by small claims court until full payment and performance of any judgment or order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*

Jurisdiction of small claims court to grant equitable relief and conditional judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*

Special jurisdictional limits for small claims actions against guarantors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(c)*

Limitation on claims in excess of $2,500; no more than two within calendar year, except as to prescribed public entities, who may file claims without numeric limitation so long as each claim does not exceed $5,000. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.231*

[11] Legal Name of Defendant Doing Business

Fictitious business name of defendant as required to conform to legal name of defendant in small claims action. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.430-116.560*

[12] Payment of Judgment

Payment to judgment creditor; satisfaction of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.840, 116.850*

Payment to small claims court; satisfaction of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.840, 116.860*

[13] Rules and Procedures

Judicial Council as providing for practice and procedure and forms used in small claims proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.920(a)*

[14] Scheduling of Sessions

Scheduling of small claim hearings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.250*

[15] Venue

Venue for small claims actions same as that in other civil actions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionAmount in ControversyCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.131

§ 526.131 California Rules of Court

[1] Appeal

[a] Dismissal or Abandonment

Abandonment of appeal before file is transmitted to court assigned to hear appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(a)*

Dismissal of appeal on request or stipulation after file is transmitted to court assigned to hear appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(b)*

Dismissal of appeal for delay in bringing it to trial within one year, absent stipulation or showing of reasonable diligence, or within three years from filing of appeal or entry of order for new trial. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(c)*

Notification by clerk to adverse parties of filing of abandonment of appeal or of dismissal for delay in prosecution. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(d)*

Return of papers to small claims court after dismissal of appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(e)*

Hearing on proposed compromise by guardian of minor, insane, or incompetent person in case on appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.963(f)*

[b] Filing

Contents of notice of appeal from small claims judgment or denial of motion to vacate judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct.,*

Rule 8.954(a)

Notification by clerk to other parties of filing of notice of appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(b)*

Validity of premature notice of appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(c)*

Transfer of record on appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.957*

[c] Trial on Appeal

Continuances of trial in superior court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.960*

[2] Assistance to Litigants

Clerk's duty to inform and assist small claims litigants. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2110*

Availability, training, and qualifications of small claims advisors. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2121

[3] Fictitious Business Names

Filing of declaration of compliance with fictitious business name laws. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100*

[4] Joinder of Claims

Defendant as permitted to file unrelated claim against plaintiff if claim is within jurisdictional limit. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2104*

[5] Judges

Qualifications, training, and appointment of temporary judges in small-claims cases. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.810 et seq.*

[6] Judgment

Contents of small claims judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2108*

[7] Service of Claim on Defendant

Due diligence as not required when substituted service is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340* or other provision of law. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2102*

[8] Venue Challenge

Defendant's written challenge to venue without making personal appearance; notice and setting of continued hearing when challenge is denied in defendant's absence. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2106*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJoinder of Claims & RemediesClaimsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsDismissals of AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityNotice of AppealGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims CourtsGovernmentsCourtsSpecial Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.132

§ 526.132 Decisions

[1] Appeal

On appeal in superior court from small claims action at law for money damages, defendant not entitled to jury trial. *Crouchman v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 1167, 1171-1179, 248 Cal. Rptr. 626, 755 P.2d 1075*

Right of plaintiff in small claims court action to appeal from judgment against him or her on cross complaint. *Skaff v. Small Claims Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 76, 79-81, 65 Cal. Rptr. 65*

Appellate division of superior court has appellate jurisdiction to review postjudgment enforcement orders entered by small claims court. *General Elec. Capital Auto Fin. Servs., Inc. v. Appellate Div. of Superior Court (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 136, 138-145, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552*

Superior court has jurisdiction to award defendant who appeals small claims judgment in plaintiff's favor on both plaintiff's and defendant's claims an offset against plaintiff's award on appeal. *Township Homes, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1587, 1589, 1594-1595, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852*

Superior court is without jurisdiction to grant motion by plaintiff to dismiss small claims action when defendant has appealed; nor may plaintiff move to transfer and consolidate appeal with another action pending in superior court. *Acuna v. Gunderson Chevrolet, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1472-1473, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62*

Hearsay evidence is admissible at small claims and de novo hearings, and excludable only if not relevant, its prejudicial effect outweighs its probative value, or it is subject to evidentiary privilege. *Houghtaling v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1131, 1137-1139, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855*

Plaintiff electing to proceed in small claims court is finally bound by adverse judgment. *Cook v. Superior Court (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 675, 678, 79 Cal. Rptr. 285*

[2] Assignment

NOTE:

The following case was decided before 1994 legislation clarified that *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420* does not prevent the filing of a claim in small claims court by a local government that is self-insured for purposes of workers' compensation and is seeking subrogation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420(c)*]. However, this statutory change appears confined to self-insured local governments only, as opposed to worker's compensation insurers in general.

Workers' compensation insurer is assignee within meaning of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 117.5* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420*) and therefore unable to sue third-party tortfeasor in small claims court to recoup benefits paid to injured employee. *Allianz Insurance Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1046, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

[3] Assistance to Parties

Consultation with attorneys and other legal advisors and meetings to discuss strategy by group of individuals consolidating their small claims actions is constitutionally protected activity and as not violating former *Code Civ. Proc. § 117.4* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.530*; prohibiting attorney or other outside participation in filing or litigation of small claims actions). *City and County of San Francisco v. Small Claims Court (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 470, 478-479, 190 Cal. Rptr. 340*

Lay litigant in small claims court not expected to know to move for consolidation of two separate small claims actions against him and as not having waived right to make that motion. *Lekse v. Municipal Court (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 188, 192, 187 Cal. Rptr. 698*

Prohibition against appeal of decision of small claims court by plaintiff also prohibits issuance of extraordinary writ to review the judgment. *Parada v. Small Claims Court (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 766, 769, 139 Cal. Rptr. 87*

Defendant unschooled in law against whom default judgment entered and who may have been inadvertently misled by printed form or advice of clerk that appeal, rather than attempt to vacate default, was proper procedure as establishing right to relief from default. *Burley v. Stein (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 752, 761, 115 Cal. Rptr. 279* (decided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*; *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710*)

Prohibition against appearance of attorneys to litigate matters in small claims courts is constitutional since parties wishing to appear by attorney may bring suit in higher court. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. Small Claims Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 379, 381-382, 173 P.2d 38*

[4] Enforcement of Judgment

Although small claims debtor examinations often occur informally, in hallway outside courtroom or in adjacent room, debtor examination is public, not private, proceeding from which public may not be excluded; judgment creditor may

seek to have debtor examination conducted before court or appointed referee, that is, licensed attorney. *Nebel v. Sulak (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1363, 1369, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 385*

[5] Jurisdiction

Small claims court has jurisdiction to hear cases involving complex issues; legislative intent that small claims courts hear "minor civil disputes" as referring to monetary amount involved. *City and County of San Francisco v. Small Claims Court (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 470, 474-475, 190 Cal. Rptr. 340*

Superior court is without jurisdiction to consider appeal by defendant on his or her own cross complaint. *Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 170, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167*

Workers' Compensation Appeals Board has exclusive jurisdiction to fix fees of medical witnesses in matters before board; small claims court has no jurisdiction over doctor's suit for additional compensation for consultation and hearing appearance service. *Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. v. Small Claims Court (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 643, 645-647, 111 Cal. Rptr. 6*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionAmount in ControversyCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.133

§ 526.133 Law Reviews

Roodhouse, *Small Claims Court--What Should It Provide and How Well Does It Do So?* 51 Cal. St. B.J. 126 (1976)

Review of California Supreme Court 1972-1973, *Application of Procedural Due Process Standards to Small Claims Court Judgment Appeal Bond Requirement, 62 Cal. L. Rev. 421 (1974)*

Adams, *Defendant's Right to Counsel in Small Claims--Real or Fictional?* 45 Cal. St. B.J. 226 (1970)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsSupersedeas Bonds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.134

§ 526.134 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Courts*, §§ 271-328 (4th ed. 1996)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 526.135-526.149

[Reserved]

§§ 526.135[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.150

§ 526.150 Information for the Small Claims Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.920(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO]

[1] FORM Information for the Small Claims Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.920(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO, adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The purpose of the form is to explain the rules and procedures for bringing a small claims action and to provide general information about small claims court.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Advisory Services

Each county must provide free assistance in small claims cases [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.260, 116.940*]. To assist in publicizing the availability of assistance services, the final paragraph of this form contains a blank space for the court to insert information about its local advisory program.

[4] Information for Defendant

Information for the defendant is provided in Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100, Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court. For an illustrative reproduction of that form, see *§ 526.151*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.151

§ 526.151 Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.310-116.330; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100]

[1] FORM Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(1), 116.310-116.330; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100, Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The form is for use by a plaintiff to commence a small claims court action for monetary relief pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)*; it sets out the event or transaction giving rise to plaintiff's claim and directs the defendant to appear at the hearing if he or she does not agree with the claim [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b)* (authorizing adoption of form)]. The jurisdictional limit for monetary relief in small claims actions is generally $5,000 ($7,500 for an action brought by a natural person), with specified exceptions [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221*; for further discussion, *see § 526.32*].

Use of this form is mandatory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form, under "**Instructions for the person suing**," contains an outdated reference to former Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150 for general information about the plaintiff's rights in small claims court. Effective July 1, 2010, general information for the small claims plaintiff is provided in Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO; for an illustrative reproduction of that form, see *§ 526.150[1]*.

[3] Filling in Form

[a] Title of Court

The blank space near the top of the form is for the title, that is, the name and address, of the court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(3)*]. This information may be preprinted on the forms provided by the small claims court clerk. But, if it is not and the space is blank, the name and address of the court should be typed in.

[b] Naming Parties

Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the form require the names and addresses of up to two plaintiffs and two defendants. If there are additional plaintiffs or defendants, they should be listed on the form entitled Other Plaintiffs or Defendants (Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100A), which is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, and which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

If the plaintiff operates or does business under a fictitious business name and the claim relates to that business, the plaintiff must also provide the business name statement number on this form and attach Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-103 [*see § 526.155*].

[c] Statement of Claim

Paragraph 3 requires the plaintiff to state the amount and basis of the claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b)(2)*]. If the action is to enforce the payment of a debt, the claim must separately state the original debt, each payment credited to the debt, each fee and charge added to the debt, each payment credited against those fees and charges, all other debits or charges to the account, and an explanation of the nature of those fees, charges, debits, and all other credits to the debt, by source and amount [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.222*]. For discussion of amounts that may be claimed in a small claims action, see *§ 526.32*.

[d] Demand for Payment

If the plaintiff has not demanded that the defendant pay the money claimed, Paragraph 4 requires the plaintiff to explain why a demand was not made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b)(3), (4)*].

[e] Venue

The venue of actions filed in the small claims court is governed by the same statute as other civil actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*; *see* Ch. 571, *Venue*]. Local court rules may prescribe the proper court locations for small claims actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*]. Although there is no statutory requirement that the plaintiff's claim show that it is filed in a proper court, Paragraph 5 of this form does require that plaintiff indicate the basis for venue.

[f] Attorney-Client Fee Dispute

If the claim is about an attorney-client fee dispute, the plaintiff should so state in Paragraph 7. Also, if the fee dispute has been arbitrated, the plaintiff should attach Judicial Council Form SC-101 [*see § 526.152*].

[g] Claim Against Government Agency

If the claim is against a government agency, the plaintiff must state in Paragraph 8 that the requisite written claim was presented to the agency first. For further discussion see *§ 526.50[4][e]*. For more detailed discussion and forms relating to tort claim procedures against public agencies, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[h] Number of Previous Small Claims

Paragraph 9 requires the plaintiff to state if the plaintiff has filed more than 12 other small claims within the preceding 12 months. This information is necessary for the calculation of the filing fee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.230*].

[4] Signature and Declaration

By dating and signing the claim, plaintiff declares under penalty of perjury that all the statements in the claim are true and correct [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.320(a), 2015.5*].

[5] Availability of Equitable Relief and Conditional Judgment

In any action brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(1)-(4)*, the court may grant equitable relief in the form of rescission, restitution, reformation, and specific performance in lieu of or in addition to money damages [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*; *see generally* Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* , Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* , Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*]. The small claims court also has authority to issue a conditional judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(b)*].

Aside from actions described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(1)-(4)*, a small claims court may grant injunctive or other equitable relief only if a statute expressly authorizes the court to award that relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(5)*].

[6] Service and Filing

The action is commenced by the plaintiff filing the form with the clerk of the small claims court and paying the filing fee [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.230, 116.320(a)*]. Filing may be accomplished in person, by mail, by facsimile transmission if authorized by statute, or by electronic means as authorized by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.5* (facsimile); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* (electronic filing)]. For the manners in which the form may be served on the defendant, see *§ 526.52*.

[7] State Statutes

Filing of claim and service on defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.330, 116.340*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.152

§ 526.152 Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Plaintiff's Claim) [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Judicial Council Form SC-101]

[1] FORM Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Plaintiff's Claim) [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Judicial Council Form SC-101]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-101, Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Plaintiff's Claim) [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The form is for use by a plaintiff as an attachment to Plaintiff's Claim and Order to Defendant [*see § 526.151*] in those cases in which plaintiff seeks to confirm, correct or vacate an attorney fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 that is binding or has become binding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*]. It may also be used in cases in which plaintiff seeks a hearing de novo after a nonbinding attorney fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*]. In either situation, the $5,000 limit is increased to $7,500 if the plaintiff is a natural person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.221*].

In either situation, the form is used following arbitration of a dispute between an attorney and his or her client concerning fees and costs charged to the client by the attorney for professional services rendered. This fee-dispute arbitration is mandatory when requested by the client, and otherwise voluntary for the client unless the client has previously agreed in writing to submit to the arbitration; it is conducted by the State Bar or by a local bar association or lawyer referral service, pursuant to the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.* and State Bar rules adopted in accordance with these provisions [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6200, 6201*]. For detailed discussion and forms relating to this fee arbitration procedure, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.430* et seq., "Fee Collection," Subpart C, "Arbitration and Mediation of Fee Disputes."

Use of this form is mandatory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] State Statutes

$7,500 limit for small claims by natural person. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.221*

Filing of claim and service on defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.330, 116.340*

Jurisdiction of small claims court over attorney-client fee arbitration awards. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*

Arbitration of attorney-client fee disputes. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.153

§ 526.153 Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20; Judicial Council Form SC-104]

[1] FORM Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20; Judicial Council Form SC-104]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Judicial Council Form SC-104, the Proof of Service form approved by the Judicial Council for use in a small claims action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20*] by a party to prove service on another party of any of the enumerated documents. Proof of service of the claim and order scheduling the hearing must be filed with the small claims court at least five days before the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.340(c)*].

Use of the form is optional [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis[(R)] Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at *www.lexisone.com* for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at *www.lexisone.com* at no charge.

An explanation of the purpose and methods of service is available in Judicial Council Forms SC-104B (What Is Proof of Service?) and SC-104C (How to Serve a Business or Public Entity).

For a form of proof of service of documents that are allowed to be served by mail (Judicial Council Form SC-112A), see *§ 526.176*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion of related statutes governing service generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

[4] State Statutes

Proof of service. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 417.10-417.30*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.154

§ 526.154 Proof of Mailing After Substituted Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340, 415.20; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-104A]

[1] FORM Proof of Mailing After Substituted Service [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340, 415.20; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-104A]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-104A, approved by the Judicial Council for optional use as proof of mailing after substituted service in a small claims case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340, 415.20*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. If this form is used, it should be attached to Judicial Council Form SC-104 (Proof of Service) [*see § 526.153, above*].

Substituted service involves (1) the delivery of the documents to a person other than the party to be served, with (2) a subsequent mailing of the documents to the party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20*; *see* discussion in *§ 526.52[2*]; *see also* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. This form is necessary to prove mailing only if the person who mailed the documents was not the same person who delivered the documents. If the same person performed both functions, then he or she can prove mailing by filling in the appropriate information on the proof of service form (Judicial Council Form SC-104) [*see § 526.153*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.155

§ 526.155 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Claimant's Fictitious Business Name [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(a); Judicial Council Form SC-103]

[1] FORM Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Claimant's Fictitious Business Name [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(a); Judicial Council Form SC-103]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-103, Fictitious Business Name Declaration [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A].

The form is for use by a small claims plaintiff (or by a defendant who files a claim against plaintiff) doing business under a fictitious business name to advise the court that he or she has published and filed a fictitious business name statement in compliance with the fictitious business name statutes (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17900 et seq.*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100*; *see also* discussion in *§ 526.51*]. The small claims plaintiff doing business under a fictitious business name may be an individual, a partnership, an unincorporated association, a corporation, or a limited liability company [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17900(a)*].

Use of the form is optional, although some form of declaration in compliance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2100(a)* must be filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] State Statutes

"Fictitious business name" defined. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17900*

Fictitious business name statement. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17913*

Actions barred until fictitious business name statement has been executed, filed, and published. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17918*

Action filed by party who lacks standing under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17918* as required to be dismissed without prejudice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.430(b)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.156

§ 526.156 Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1986, 1987.5; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-107]

[1] FORM Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1986, 1987.5; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-107]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative, filled-in reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-107, Small Claims Subpoena and Declaration [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A], which is for use by a party to a small claims action to compel the attendance and testimony of a non-party witness at a small claims hearing, or to compel the production by that witness of documents or things, or both [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1986* and discussion in *§ 526.70[3][a]*; for detailed discussion and forms relating to subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum generally, *see also* Ch. 535, *Subpoena*].

Use of the form is mandatory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Issuance of Subpoena

The subpoena may be obtained from the clerk of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(c), 1986(a)*].

[4] Filling in Form

[a] Identification of Court and Parties

For the manner of filling in the name and address of the court, and the names of the parties, see the Comments to *see § 526.151*.

[b] Order to Appear or Produce Documents or Things (Paragraph 1)

The name, address, and telephone number of the witness, to the extent known, must be filled in under "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO."

Paragraph 1 directs the witness to appear at a particular time and place unless the appearance is excused under Paragraph 4(b), discussed in *§ 526.156[4][e]*, or the witness makes an agreement otherwise with the person named in *§ 526.156[4][c]* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(a), 1985.1*].

[c] Agreement With Subpoenaing Party (Paragraph 2)

In Paragraph 2, the subpoenaing party must fill in his or her own name and telephone number. This paragraph is included to comply with thenotice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.2*, to inform the witness that, in lieu of appearance or production at the time and place specified, he or she make an agreement with the subpoenaing party for some alternate means of complying with the subpoena [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

[d] Witness Fees (Paragraph 3)

Paragraph 3 is designed to satisfy the requirement that any witness subpoenaed in a civil or administrative action must be given written notice that he or she may be entitled to receive witness and mileage fees [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2065*]. For further discussion regarding these fees, see *Ch. 535, Subpoena, §§ 535.18, 535.19*.

[e] Appearance or Production of Records in Lieu of Appearance (Paragraph 4)

Paragraphs 4(a) and 4(b) are mutually exclusive, and only one is to be checked by the subpoenaing party. Paragraph 4(a) is checked when personal appearance by the witness or custodian is required.

Paragraph 4(b) is checked when, alternatively, the subpoenaing party does not require personal appearance but only that the witness or custodian of records mail or deliver copies of all the records described in the attached declaration (page two of the form), in compliance with *Evid. Code § 1560 et seq.* Paragraph 4(b) provides the witness or custodian with instructions for delivering the required copies. For detailed discussion relating to the procedures relating to the production of records or copies of records in lieu of appearance by the witness, *see Ch. 535, Subpoena, § 535.20[1]*.

[f] Supporting Declaration When Documents or Things Are Sought

A subpoena duces tecum, or a subpoena that seeks to compel the non-party witness to produce documents or things in addition to appearing and testifying, must be accompanied by a copy of an affidavit or declaration that shows good cause for the production of the matters and things described in the subpoena duces tecum and that sets forth their materiality to the issues involved in the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*]. The declaration on page two of the form is provided for this purpose.

In Paragraph 1 of page two, the subpoenaing party states his or her role in the action by checking the appropriate box. In Paragraph 2, 3, and 4 of page two, the subpoenaing party must, under penalty of perjury, specify in detail the documents or things over which the witness has possession or control and which are to be produced, specify their materiality to the issues involved in the action, and provide reasons that establish good cause for their production [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*]. The documents or other things should be described with such certainty that the person producing the records is reasonably apprised of what is required [*see McClatchy Newspapers v. Superior Court (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 386, 398, 159 P.2d 944* ; *Nelson v. Superior Court (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 729, 732, 73 P.2d 232*]. Identification may be considered inadequate when the books and documents sought are designated by or included within an "omnibus description" [*see Pacific Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 61, 68-69, 77 Cal. Rptr. 836]* . For further discussion, see *Ch. 535, Subpoena, § 535.16*.

[5] Notice to Custodian of Consumer or Employee Records

Paragraph 5 on the first page of the form provides notice to the witness that, if he or she is the custodian of consumer or employee records sought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* or *1985.6*, and he or she has been served by the consumer or employee with a motion to quash the subpoena or with an objection, then the witness is not to produce the records unless and until directed to do so by a court order or agreement between the parties, witness, and consumer or employee [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)*; for detailed discussion and forms relating to the procedures for production of consumer or employee records, *see Ch. 535, Subpoena, §§ 535.21[7], [8], 535.69, 535.74*].

[6] Disobedience of Subpoena

A notice at the bottom of the first page of the form states that disobedience of a subpoena may be punished as contempt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*] and that the person disobeying the subpoena will also be liable for a $500 penalty and all damages resulting from his or her failure to obey [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1992*].

[7] Proof of Service

Page three of the form contains a proof of service to be filled in by the server after service is made.

[8] Cross References

For a discussion and forms relating to declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For a discussion and forms for use in compelling the attendance of witnesses and the production of physical evidence generally, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena*

[9] State Statutes

Subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum, in general. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1997*

Affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) required for subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1987.5*

Witness fees and mileage. *Gov. Code § 68093*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.157

§ 526.157 Authorization to Appear [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540; Judicial Council Form SC-109]

[1] FORM Authorization to Appear [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540; Judicial Council Form SC-109]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-109, which is a declaration by a person who is appearing in a small claims action on behalf of another person or entity. Generally, a plaintiff or defendant in a small claims action must appear personally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(a)*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. However, as indicated by the options presented in this form, the following persons and entities may under certain conditions appear through a representative: a corporation, a sole proprietorship, a government agency or other public entity, a serviceperson on active duty outside California, an inmate, a nonresident owner of California real property that is a defendant in small claims court, and an owner of rental property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(b)-(i)*]. Also, a married person who has been sued jointly with his or her spouse may consent to be represented by the spouse if the court finds that to be in the interests of justice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(k)*]. Finally, the court has discretion to allow a nonparty to assist an individual party who cannot properly present his or her claim and needs assistance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(l)*].

The statutory authorization for representation in small claims court generally does not permit representation by attorneys. An attorney may appear in small claims court only if (1) he or she is a named party; or (2) he or she is representing a legal partnership or corporation of which he or she is a general partner, officer, or director, and then only if all of the partners, directors, and officers are also attorneys [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.530(a), (b), 116.540(m)*].

Generally, a person who is appearing in a representative capacity must file a declaration stating (1) that he or she is authorized to appear for the party, and (2) the basis for the authorization. The declaration must also set forth the prerequisites required by statute for the person to represent the particular party involved [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540(j)*]. This form reflects the appropriate statutory requirements for representation of each kind of party.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council*

Forms, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion and forms relating to declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

[4] State Statutes

Prosecution or defense of small claims actions by attorneys. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.530*

Requirements for appearance in small claims actions by individuals other than parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.540*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.158

§ 526.158 Defendant's Claim and Order to Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.380; Judicial Council Form SC-120]

[1] FORM Defendant's Claim and Order to Plaintiff [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.380; Judicial Council Form SC-120]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-120, Defendant's Claim and Order to Go to Small Claims Court [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A], and is for use by a defendant to file a cross claim within the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court against the plaintiff in a pending small claims action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.360*]. Note that the compulsory cross complaint statute (*Code Civ. Proc. § 426.30*) is not applicable to small claims actions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 426.60(b)*].

For the discussion of the procedure the defendant may follow if his or her claim is for an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of the small claims court and the defendant does not wish to waive recovery of the excess of the claim, see discussion in *§ 526.53[3]*. For a form of declaration that defendant files in the small claims court if he or she files an action on his or her claim against the plaintiff in a court of competent jurisdiction, see *§ 526.159*.

Use of this form is mandatory. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form, under "**Instructions for the person suing**," contains an outdated reference to former Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150 for general information about a claimant's rights in small claims court. Effective July 1, 2010, that general information is provided in Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100-INFO; for an illustrative reproduction of that form, see *§ 526.150[1]*.

If there are more than two plaintiffs or two defendants, they should be listed on the form entitled Other Plaintiffs or Defendants (Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-120A).

[3] Contents of Cross Claim

The required contents of the claim are prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.320(b), (c)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(a)*]. That is, the required contents of the defendant's claim against the plaintiff are the same as those of the plaintiff against the defendant. Thus, contents of the foregoing form are substantially the same (except for the statement of venue) as those of plaintiff's claim set forth in *see § 526.151*. For the manner of filling in the form and the defendant's representations to the court, see *§ 526.151*.

[4] Service and Filing

The defendant files the form with the clerk of the small claims court in person, by mail, by facsimile transmission if authorized by statute, or by electronic means as authorized by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.320(a), 116.360(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.5* (facsimile); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6* (electronic filing)]. The defendant must serve a copy of the claim and order on the plaintiff at least 5 days before the hearing date, unless the defendant was served 10 days or less before the hearing date, in which event the defendant must serve a copy of the defendant's claim and order on the plaintiff at least one day before the hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.360(c)*].

Service of defendant's claim and order is accomplished by (1) the clerk mailing a copy to the plaintiff by any form of mail providing for return receipt; (2) the defendant causing a copy to be delivered to the plaintiff in person; (3) the defendant using substituted service as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.20(a)* or *(b)* without the need to attempt personal service on the plaintiff; or (4) the clerk's mailing a copy of the claim to plaintiff by any form of mail providing for a return receipt and, on receipt of proof that the claim was delivered, issuing and serving an order on the plaintiff by any form of mail providing for a return receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.330(b), 116.340(a), 116.360(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(a), (b)* and discussion in *§ 526.52[1]*]. No answer by plaintiff to defendant's claim is required.

[5] State Statutes

Judgment of small claims court as conclusive of defendant's claim. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(a)*.

[6] Cross Reference

See also Comments and References to § 526.151.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.159

§ 526.159 Defendant's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] Requesting That Small Claims Action Be Transferred to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a), (b)]

[1] FORM Defendant's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] Requesting That Small Claims Action Be Transferred to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a), (b)]

_____ Superior Court, Small Claims Division
_____ Judicial District
_____ County, California
_____ [*Address and telephone number of Court*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
_____ [*address*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	DECLARATION
_____ [*name*],	)	OF _____ [*name*]
_____ [*address*],	)	(Small Claims)
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the defendant in the above-entitled action, which is set for hearing on _____ [*date*].

2. I have a claim against the plaintiff in excess of _____ [$7,500 *or other limit on small claims jurisdiction based on circumstances of case, as provided by Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.221, 116.231*]. This claim

relates to the _____ [contract *and/or* transaction *and/or* matter *and/or* event] that is the subject of the plaintiff's claim, in that _____ [*state facts showing relationship between defendant's action and plaintiff's claim*].

3. On _____ [*date*], I filed a complaint in the _____ Court in _____ County, asserting that claim against the plaintiff.

4. A true copy of the complaint is attached hereto.

5. I request that the above-entitled action be transferred to the _____ Court in _____ County. [The ends of justice would be served by transferring the above-entitled action before judgment because _____ (*state reasons supporting prejudgment transfer*).]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration is for use by a defendant in a small claims action to request the small claims court to transfer the action to another court of competent jurisdiction in which defendant has filed a related claim [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a), (b)*].

[3] Request to Transfer Claim

[a] By Filing Declaration

If the defendant has a claim against the plaintiff in an amount exceeding the court's jurisdictional limit (generally, $7,500 if the defendant is a natural person, or $5,000 if the defendant is other than a natural person), or has brought more than two claims over $2,500 in one calendar year, and defendant's current claim relates to the contract, transaction, matter, or event that is the subject of the plaintiff's claim, the defendant may commence an action against the plaintiff in a court of competent jurisdiction and request the small claims court to transfer the action to that court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220, 116.231*]. The defendant makes the request by filing with the small claims court in which the plaintiff commenced the action, at or before the time set for the hearing of that action, a declaration stating the facts concerning the defendant's action against the plaintiff with a true copy of the complaint so filed by the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(b)*].

[b] Service of Declaration

The defendant must cause a copy of the declaration and complaint to be personally delivered to the plaintiff at or before the time set for the hearing of the small claims action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(b)*].

[c] Order of Transfer

In ruling on a motion to transfer, the court may (1) render judgment on the small claims case prior to transfer, or (2) not render judgment on the small claims case and transfer the case, or (3) refuse to transfer the small claims case on the grounds that the ends of justice would not be served.When the small claims court orders the action transferred, it shall transmit all files and papers to the transferee court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(d)*]. If the small claims action is transferred prior to judgment, both actions shall be tried together in the transferee court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)*]. For a form of order, see *§ 526.160*.

[4] Cross References

For a discussion and forms relating to declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

[5] Decisions

Statutory provisions as permitting, though not requiring, defendant to obtain transfer of action out of small claims court when defendant has claim against plaintiff exceeding small claims jurisdiction. *Thompson v. Chew Quan (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 825, 826-827, 334 P.2d 1074*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.160

§ 526.160 Order of Small Claims Court Transferring Action Before Judgment to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)]

[1] FORM Order of Small Claims Court Transferring Action Before Judgment to Another Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(c)]

[*Caption. See § 526.159.*]

Whereas _____ [*name*], defendant in the above-entitled action, has filed in this court, on _____ [*date*], a declaration under penalty of perjury stating that he/she has commenced an action against the plaintiff in an amount in excess of the small claims jurisdiction of this court, and that the claim relates to the _____ [contract *and/or* transaction *and/or* matter *and/or* event] that is the subject of plaintiff's claim.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action, and all papers on file in this action, be transferred to the _____ Court in _____ County for final determination.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order of a small claims court judge transferring the small claims court action to a higher court may be used when the defendant in a small claims action commences an action against plaintiff that exceeds the jurisdictional limit of the small claims court and relates to the contract, transaction, matter, or event of the plaintiff's claim. The small claims court must transmit all files and papers in the small claims action to the transferee court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.390(a), (c), (d)*].

[3] Cross Reference

See also Comments and References to § 526.159

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.161

§ 526.161 Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150]

[1] FORM Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-150, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form is to be filed and served by any party who wishes to postpone or reschedule a small-claims trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570*]. Filing of the request must be made at least 10 days before the date set for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570(a)(2)*].

For a related form, see *§ 526.162* (Order on Request to Postpone Trial).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.162

§ 526.162 Order on Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-152]

[1] FORM Order on Request to Postpone Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-152]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-152, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form will be used by the court to grant or deny a party's request to postpone or reschedule a small-claims trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.570*].

For a related form, see *§ 526.161* (Request To Postpone Trial).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.163

§ 526.163 Request to Amend Party Name Before Hearing (Small Claims) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.560, 473; Judicial Council Form SC-114]

[1] FORM Request to Amend Party Name Before Hearing (Small Claims) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.560, 473; Judicial Council Form SC-114]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-114, approved by the Judicial Council for optional use in requesting that the claim in a small claims case be amended to reflect the parties' correct names [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.560*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. In general, a party may move for such an amendment at any time before or after judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.560(b), 116.630*]. For further discussion of amendments to correct parties' names, see the discussion in *§ 526.51*.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.164

§ 526.164 Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h), (i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-130]

[1] FORM Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h), (i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-130]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-130, Notice of Entry of Judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h), (i)*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. Except for the Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment (discussed *below*) at the bottom of the reverse side of the form, the form is filled out by the clerk of the small claims court who will mail a copy of it to each party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h)*]. The form is used to notify the parties in a small claims action of the court's judgment. The form also contains on its reverse side information as to the postjudgment rights and obligations of the parties and of additional procedures that may be available to vacate or cancel or to enforce the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.710-116.860*].

This form has been adopted by the Judicial Council for alternative mandatory use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. For the other alternative form, see *§ 526.164A*.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment

The Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment on the reverse side of the form of Notice of Entry of Judgment is to be filled out by the judgment creditor or his or her assignee of record and filed with the clerk of the small claims court immediately on receipt of full payment of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(a)*]. The satisfaction of judgment form, however, is to be used only if an abstract of judgment has not been filed. If an abstract of judgment has been recorded, acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment by execution or other means must be filed in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.400* and must contain the information required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 724.060* or

724.100. For further discussion of these provisions, and a Judicial Council form of acknowledgment of satisfaction of judgment for use where an abstract of judgment was recorded, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

As an alternative to the Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment appearing in this form, the judgment creditor may use Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-290 to acknowledge satisfaction of the judgment [*see § 526.164B*].

[4] Penalty for Failure to File Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment

Any judgment creditor or assignee of record who, after receiving full payment of the judgment and written demand by the judgment debtor, fails without good cause to execute and file an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment with the clerk of the court in which the judgment is entered within 14 days after receiving the request is liable to the judgment debtor or the judgment debtor's grantees or heirs for all damages sustained byreason of the failure and, in addition, the sum of $50 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(b)*].

[5] California Rules of Court

Filing notice of appeal and procedure on appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.950 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.164A

§ 526.164A Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h),(i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-200]

[1] FORM Notice of Entry of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.610(h),(i); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-200]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-200, to be used by the court clerk to provide notice of entry of the small-claims judgment. This form has been adopted by the Judicial Council for alternative mandatory use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. For the other alternative form, see *§ 526.164*.

The last two pages of this form reproduce the contents of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-200-INFO, which provides information about the parties' obligations and options after the small-claims court has decided their case.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.164B

§ 526.164B Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-290]

[1] FORM Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-290]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-290, which may be used by the judgment creditor to acknowledge satisfaction of a small-claims judgment. This form has been adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The second page of the form contains instructions for the judgment creditor.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

As an alternative to this form, if the court clerk uses Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-130 for the Notice of Entry of Judgment, the judgment creditor may use the Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment appearing at the end of that form [*see § 526.164*].

An acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment must be filed by the judgment creditor (or his or her assignee of record) with the clerk of the small claims court immediately on receipt of full payment of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(a)*]. This Acknowledgment of Satisfaction of Judgment form, however, is to be used only if an abstract of judgment has not been recorded. If an abstract of judgment has been recorded, acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment by execution or other means must be filed in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.400* and must contain the information required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 724.060* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 724.100*. For further discussion of these provisions, and a Judicial Council form of acknowledgment of satisfaction of judgment for use when an abstract of judgment was recorded, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.165

§ 526.165 Request to Pay Judgment to Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-145]

[1] FORM Request to Pay Judgment to Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-145]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-145, Request to Pay Judgment to Court [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. It is for use by a judgment debtor to pay a small claims judgment directly to the court in which the judgment was entered and thereby to obtain a satisfaction of judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860*].

Use of the form is mandatory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Accompanying Payment

The judgment debtor should mail or deliver to the court the completed form, together with an estimated payment that includes the amount of the small claims judgment, a $20 fee to cover administrative costs, and interest accruing at an annual rate of 10 percent from the date the judgment was entered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(b), (h)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010* (interest rate)]. The court clerk will calculate and fill in the total payment owed on page two of the foregoing form. If the judgment debtor does not receive a notice of satisfaction of judgment within a reasonable time, he or she should contact the court to determine whether his or her payment was sufficient to satisfy the total payment owed as calculated by the court.

When payment is made by any means other than money order, certified or cashier's check, or cash, entry of satisfaction of judgment will be delayed for a period of 30 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(d)*].

[4] Partial Payment

If the judgment debtor has already paid a portion of the judgment to the judgment creditor, the debtor should fill out Paragraph 5 and submit the balance owing on the judgment, plus costs, interest, and the court fee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(c)*]. The debtor must also attach to the foregoing form copies showing both sides of the check or money order with which he or she made partial payment to the judgment creditor or showing a dated cash receipt signed by the judgment creditor [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(1)*]. Additionally, the judgment debtor must file a declaration [*see § 526.168*] in order to raise the required rebuttable presumption of partial payment to have a satisfaction of judgment filed by the clerk [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.850(d)(2), 116.860(c)*].

[5] Notification and Payment of Judgment Creditor

On receiving the form, together with the judgment debtor's payment of the total owed to the judgment creditor, the clerk will mail the form to the judgment creditor, indicating that the judgment debtor has satisfied the judgment by making payment to the court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.860(e)*]. The judgment creditor will receive the funds after mailing or delivering to the court clerk the Judgment Creditor's Request for Funds that appears at the end of the form.

[6] Related Forms

For notice of entry of judgment, see *§§ 526.164, 526.164A*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.166

§ 526.166 Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Notice of Entry of Judgment) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-132]

[1] FORM Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Notice of Entry of Judgment) [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-132]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-132, Attorney-Client Fee Dispute (Attachment to Plaintiff's Claim) [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A; *see also § 526.151*]. The form is for use by the court as an attachment to Notice of Entry of Judgment in those cases in which plaintiff seeks to confirm, correct or vacate an attorney fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 that is binding or has become binding [*Code Civ. Proc. 116.220(a)(4)*]. It may also be used in cases in which plaintiff seeks a hearing de novo after a nonbinding attorney fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. 116.220(a)(4)*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.*].

Use of this form is mandatory if Judicial Council Form SC-130 (*see § 526.164*) is used for the Notice of Entry of Judgment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. However, if Judicial Council Form SC-200 is used for the Notice of Entry of Judgment [*see § 526.164A*], then judicial Council Form SC-202A should be used as the attachment instead [*see § 526.166A*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Related Form

For a discussion of small claims court actions seeking to confirm, correct, or vacate a binding attorney fee arbitration award and actions seeking de novo hearing of nonbinding attorney fee arbitration awards, see *§ 526.152*.

[4] State Statutes

Jurisdiction of small claims court over attorney-client fee arbitration awards. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.220(a)(4)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.166A

§ 526.166A Decision on Attorney-Client Fee Dispute [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-202A]

[1] FORM Decision on Attorney-Client Fee Dispute [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-202A]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-202A, to be used as an attachment to the Notice of Entry of Judgment in a case in which the plaintiff sought to confirm, correct, or vacate a binding attorney's fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*]. It may also be used if the plaintiff sought a de novo hearing after nonbinding fee arbitration award not exceeding $5,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(4)*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6200 et seq.*].

Use of this form is mandatory if Judicial Council Form SC-200 (*see § 526.164A*) is used for the Notice of Entry of Judgment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. However, if Judicial Council Form SC-130 is used for the Notice of Entry of Judgment [*see § 526.164*], then judicial Council Form SC-132 should be used as the attachment instead [*see § 526.166*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.167

§ 526.167 Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220]

[1] FORM Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form is to be filed by a judgment debtor who wishes to request permission to pay a small-claims judgment in installments. After filing, the court clerk will mail copies of the form to all other parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2107(b)*]. The second page of this form is a reproduction of the contents of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220-INFO, which provides information about payments in small-claims cases and the procedure for obtaining permission to make installment payments.

For related forms, see *§ 526.167A* (Response to Request to Make Payments) and § 526.167B (Order on Request to Make Payments).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.167A

§ 526.167A Response to Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-221]

[1] FORM Response to Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-221]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-221, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form is for use by a judgment creditor to respond to the judgment debtor's request for permission to pay a small-claims judgment in installments. The response must be filed within 10 days after the clerk mails the request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2107(b)*]. The judgment creditor may obtain information about installment payments, including procedural guidance, in Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220-INFO, the contents of which are reproduced on the second page of the request form, Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-220.

For related forms, see *§ 526.167* (Request to Make Payments) and § 526.167B (Order on Request to Make Payments).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.167B

§ 526.167B Order on Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-222]

[1] FORM Order on Request to Make Payments [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.620; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-222]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-221, adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

This form will be used by the court to enter its order on a judgment debtor's request for permission to pay a small-claims judgment in installments. If the request is granted, the order will specify the terms of payment.

For related forms, see *§ 526.167* (Request to Make Payments) and § 526.167A (Response to Request to Make Payments).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.168

§ 526.168 Judgment Debtor's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Full or Partial Payment to Judgment Creditor [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(2)]

[1] FORM Judgment Debtor's Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Full or Partial Payment to Judgment Creditor [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(2)]

_____ Superior Court, Small Claims Division
_____ Judicial District
_____ County, California
_____ [*Address and telephone number of Court*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
_____ [*address*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	DECLARATION
_____ [*name*],	)	OF _____ [*name*]
_____ [*address*],	)	(Small Claims)
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I have made _____ [full *or* partial] payment of the judgment including accrued interest and costs to the judgment creditor _____ [*name of judgment creditor*].

[*EITHER*]

2. The judgment creditor has been requested to file an acknowledgment of satisfaction of the judgment and refuses to do so.

[*OR*]

2. The judgment creditor refuses to accept subsequent payments.

[*OR*]

2. The present address of the judgment creditor is unknown.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. The attached _____ [*list attached document(s), e.g.,* canceled check *and/or* money order *and/or* or cash receipt] constitute evidence of the judgment creditor's receipt of _____ [full *or* partial] payment.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration is for use by a judgment debtor who has made full or partial payment of the judgment to the judgment creditor [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)*]. A judgment debtor who has made full payment of the judgment to the judgment creditor will file this form with the clerk of the small claims court in order to have a satisfaction of judgment entered by the clerk [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(c)*]. A judgment debtor who has made partial payment of the judgment to the judgment creditor will file this form with the clerk of the small claims court in order to have a satisfaction of judgment entered on receipt by the clerk of the balance owing on the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.850(c), 116.860(c)*; *see also* discussion § 526.111].

This form should also be used in conjunction with *§ 526.165* when the judgment debtor has made a partial payment.

[3] Contents of Declaration

The contents of the declaration will create a rebuttable presumption of full or partial payment of the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)*]. Paragraph 1 states that the judgment debtor has made full or partial payment of the judgment including accrued interest and costs. Alternative Paragraphs 2 state the three factual situations required for a finding of a rebuttable presumption. Paragragh 3 sets out the documents identified in and accompanying the declaration that constitute evidence of the judgment creditor's receipt of full or partial payment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(2)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.850(d)(1)*].

[4] Cross References

For a discussion and forms relating to declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

[5] State Statutes

Judgment creditor defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(c)*

Judgment debtor defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.130(d)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.169

§ 526.169 Request to Correct or Cancel Judgment and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-108]

[1] FORM Request to Correct or Cancel Judgment and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-108]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Judicial Council Form SC-108, Request to Correct or Cancel Judgment and Answer. It is for use by either the plaintiff or defendant to move to correct a clerical error in a judgment or to vacate a judgment on the ground that the legal basis for the decision is incorrect or erroneous [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.725*]. Page 2 of this form may be used by any other party to file an answer to the request.

In ruling on the request, the court may use Judicial Council Form SC-108A, Order on Request to Correct or Cancel Judgment.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Response to Request

A party served this request may file a response with the court within 15 days and serve a copy on the opposing party [*see* Paragraph 5].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms for moving to vacate a judgment in superior court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 663*, including on the ground of an incorrect or erroneous legal basis, see *Ch. 371, Motions After Trial, § 371.90* et seq.

[5] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of and opposition to a motion to vacate a judgment and enter a different judgment pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 663*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 155, *Motions After Trial* , Pt. III (Matthew Bender)

[6] Decision

Motion to vacate judgment disallowing costs and enter judgment awarding statutorily authorized costs. *Gibson v. Hammang (1904) 145 Cal. 454, 456, 78 P. 953* (superior court action)

Motion to vacate judgment when court's legal conclusions are inconsistent with uncontroverted facts showing intention of parties. *Swanson v. Wheeler (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 43, 44-45, 245 P.2d 699* (superior court action)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.170

§ 526.170 Proceedings to Vacate Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.720, 116.730, 116.740; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-135]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings to Vacate Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.720, 116.730, 116.740; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-135]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-135, Notice of Motion to Vacate Judgment and Declaration [Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A], and is for use by either the plaintiff or the defendant to move to vacate a judgment entered after the moving party failed to appear at the hearing of plaintiff's claim [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.720-116.740*].

Use of the form is optional [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Motion by Plaintiff

A plaintiff who did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claims court. The motion must be filed within 30 days after the clerk has mailed notice of entry of the judgment to the parties [*see §§ 526.164, 526.164A*]. The clerk must schedule the hearing on the motion to vacate for a date no earlier than 10 days after the clerk has mailed written notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(b)*].

On a showing of good cause, the small claims court may grant the motion. If the defendant is not present, the court must hear the motion in the defendant's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(c)*].

If the motion is granted and if all parties are present and agree, the court may hear the case without rescheduling it. If the defendant is not present, the judge or clerk shall reschedule the case and give notice in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330* (*see* discussion in *§ 526.52*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.720(d)*].

[4] Motion by Defendant

[a] No Appearance After Proper Service

A defendant who did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claims court. The motion must be filed within 30 days after the clerk has mailed notice of entry of the judgment [*see §§ 526.164, 526.164A*] to the parties.

The defendant must appear at any hearing on the motion or submit written justification for not appearing together with a declaration in support of the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(b)*].

On a showing of good cause, the court may grant the motion to vacate the judgment. If the plaintiff is not present, the court must hear the motion in the plaintiff's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(c)*]. If the motion is granted and if all parties are present and agree, the court may hear the case without rescheduling it. If the plaintiff is not present, the judge or clerk shall reschedule the case and give notice in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(d)*].

If the motion is denied, the defendant may appeal to the superior court only on the denial of the motion to vacate the judgment. The defendant must file the notice of appeal with the clerk of the small claims court within 10 days after the small claims court has mailed or delivered notice of the court's denial of the motion to vacate the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(e)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)*; *see also § 526.172*].

If the superior court determines that the defendant's motion to vacate the judgment should have been granted, the superior court may hear the claims of all parties without rescheduling the matter, provided that all parties are present and the defendant has previously complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710 et seq.* Alternatively, the court may order the case transferred to the small claims court for a hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(f)*].

[b] No Appearance After Improper Service

If the defendant was not properly served with plaintiff's claim [*see § 526.151*] as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.330* or *116.340* (*see* discussion in *§ 526.52[1]*) and did not appear at the hearing in the small claims court, the defendant may file a motion to vacate the judgment with the clerk of the small claims court. The motion must be accompanied by a supporting declaration, and shall be filed within 180 days after the defendant discovers or should have discovered that judgment was entered against him or her [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)*].

The court may order that the enforcement of the judgment must be suspended pending a hearing and determination of the motion to vacate the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(b)*].

On a showing of good cause, the court may grant the motion to vacate the judgment. If the plaintiff is not present the court must hear the motion in the plaintiff's absence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(c)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(d)-(f) also apply to this motion by defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.740(c)*; *see § 526.94*].

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Title of Court and Case

For the manner of filling in the name and address of the court and the names of the parties, see the Comments to *see § 526.151*.

[b] Notice

The name of the opposing party should be typed in to the right of "NOTICE TO (Name)," since that is the party being notified that review of the judgment is being sought.

[c] Date, Time, and Place of Hearing (Paragraph 1)

This information is normally filled in by the small claims court clerk at the time the notice of motion is filed.

[d] Motion (Paragraph 2)

The motion is for an order vacating the judgment and is set forth in layman's terms in Paragraph 2. This paragraph also sets forth the matters on which the motion (request) is based.

[e] Date Judgment Was Entered (Paragraph 3)

The date the judgment was entered should be set forth.

[f] Date Party Learned of Entry of Judgment (Paragraph 4)

The date the appealing party learned that judgment had been entered should be set forth. This date is normally the date on which the party received the clerk's notice of entry of judgment.

[g] Ground of Motion (Paragraph 5)

The box in Paragraph 5a should be checked and the reason for the failure to appear typed in. The box in Paragraph 5b should be checked when a ground other than the party's failure to appear exists for vacating the judgment. The facts establishing the ground should be set out.

[6] Representations to Court (Paragraph 6)

The moving party is required, by signing the form, to declare under penalty of perjury that he or she understands the things that must be brought to the hearing on the motion to support the granting of the motion.

The clerk will collect a $20 fee for the filing of a motion to vacate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.745*].

[7] Decisions

Defaulting defendant as required initially to appeal denial of motion to vacate judgment. *Miller v. Superior Court (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 29, 31, 154 Cal. Rptr. 491*

[8] Cross Reference

For notice of appeal, see *§ 526.172*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.171

§ 526.171 Request for Court Order and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-105]

[1] FORM Request for Court Order and Answer [Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-105]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Judicial Council Form SC-105, Request for Court Order and Answer. It is for use by any party to request that the court make a pretrial or post-trial order in a small claims case. Page 2 of this form may be used by any other party to file an answer to the request for an order.

In ruling on the request for an order, the court may use Judicial Council Form SC-105A, Order on Request for Court Order.

Use of the form is optional [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.172

§ 526.172 Notice of Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-140]

[1] FORM Notice of Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-140]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of the Judicial Council Form SC-140, Notice of Appeal [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The filed form is completed by the clerk of the small claims court who will mail a copy of it to the nonappealing party [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710*; *Skaff v. Small Claims Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 76, 80-81, 65 Cal. Rptr. 65, 435 P.2d 825* (availability of right to appeal)].

Use of this form is optional [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Filing Notice of Appeal

An appeal from a small claims court judgment is taken by filing a notice of appeal with the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(a)*]. The notice must be filed no later than 30 days after the clerk has delivered or mailed notice of entry of judgment. A notice of appeal filed after the 30-day period is ineffective for any purpose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(b)*]. The time for filing a notice of appeal is not extended by the filing of a request to correct a mistake or by virtue of any subsequent proceedings on that request, except that a new period for filing notice of appeal shall begin on the delivery or mailing of notice of entry of any modified judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.750(c)*].

The notice must be signed by the appellant or by the appellant's attorney and is sufficient if it states in substance that the appellant appeals from a specified judgment or, in the case of a defaulting defendant (discussed *below*), from the denial of a motion to vacate the judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.954(a)*].

[4] Defaulting Defendant

A defendant who did not appear at the small claims hearing may not file a notice of appeal, but may file a motion in the small claims court to vacate the judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(d)*; *see also § 526.170*]. In that event, a notice of appeal (appealing the denial of the motion to vacate only) may be filed within 10 days after the clerk has mailed or delivered notice of the court's denial of a motion to vacate the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.730(e)*].

[5] Insurer of Defendant

With respect to plaintiff's claim, the insurer of defendant may appeal the judgment to the superior court in the county in which the matter was heard if the judgment exceeds $2,500 and the insurer stipulates that its policy with the defendant covers the matter to which the judgment applies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.710(c)*].

[6] Filing Fee

The appealing party must pay a $75 fee for filing a notice of appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.760(a)*]. A party who does not appeal will not be charged any fee for filing any document relating to the appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.760(b)*].

[7] Procedure

The procedure for (1) filing the record on appeal; (2) setting for trial; and (3) dismissal, abandonment, and judgment are covered generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.750-116.795*. The appeal in the superior court consists of a new hearing before a judicial officer other than the judicial officer who heard the action in the small claims division [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(a)*]. The trial is conducted informally except that attorneys may participate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b), (c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.510*]. Neither a trial by jury nor the pretrial discovery procedures described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019(a)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.010* operative July 1, 2005) are permitted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.770(b)*]. The judgment of the superior court is final and is not appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(a)*]; however, it may, in an appropriate case, be reviewed by extraordinary writ [*see § 526.94[13]*]. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.610-116.630* (small claims court judgments) applies to judgments of the superior court after a hearing on appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(b)*], except that, for good cause and when necessary to achieve substantial justice between the parties, the superior court may award a party to an appeal reimbursement of up to $150 in attorney's fees and costs and up to $150 for loss of earnings and expenses of transportation and lodging, actually and reasonably incurred in connection with the appeal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.780(c)*].

[8] Decisions

Right of appeal by plaintiff from adverse judgment on cross claim. *Skaff v. Small Claims Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 76, 79-81, 65 Cal. Rptr. 65, 435 P.2d 825*

No right of appeal by defendant from adverse judgment on cross claim. *Davis v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 164, 168, 162 Cal. Rptr. 167*

[9] Cross Reference

For a related Form, *see § 526.170*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.173

§ 526.173 Proceedings for Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs for Bad Faith Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

[1] FORM Proceedings for Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs for Bad Faith Appeal [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790]--Notice of Motion and Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
_____ [*name*],	)	DER AWARDING ATTORNEY'S FEES AND
Defendant.	)	COSTS, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF
	)	_____ [*name*], AND SUPPORTING
	)	MEMORANDUM
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Location: _____

_____

To _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order directing that _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] pay to _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] attorney's fees in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount of no more than $1,000*] and loss of earnings, transportation, and lodging costs in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount of no more than $1,000*]. The motion will be made on

the ground that _____ [defendant's *or* plaintiff's] appeal in the above-entitled action was without substantial merit and not based on good faith, but was intended to harass or delay _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] or to encourage _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] to abandon his/her claim.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (plaintiff *or* defendant)].

2. The appeal filed by _____ [*identify party or party's attorney against whom the motion is directed, e.g.,* _____ (*name*), attorney for _____ (defendant *or* plaintiff) in the above-entitled action,] on _____ [*date*], had no substantial merit, as is demonstrated in Paragraph(s) _____ [*specify*] of the memorandum of points and authorities that accompanies this notice of motion and declaration.

3. _____ [*Identify party or party's attorney against whom the motion is directed, e.g.,* _____ (*Name*), attorney for _____ (defendant *or* plaintiff),] prosecuted the appeal in bad faith in that [he/she knew or should have known of the legal authorities cited in the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, which demonstrates that the appeal filed by him/her in the above-entitled action had no substantial merit. Furthermore,] _____ [*set out facts demonstrating that the appeal was intended to harass or delay the other party or to encourage the other party to abandon the claim, e.g.,* _____ (*name*), attorney for _____ (defendant *or* plaintiff), stated to me in telephone conversations on or about _____ (*date(s)*), that his/her client would "never pay" my client and wanted to "make an example out of" my client].

4. As a result of and in connection with this bad faith appeal, _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] has actually and reasonably incurred attorney's fees in the sum of [at least] $_____ [*specify amount of no more than $1,000*] and has incurred an actual loss of earnings and has actually and reasonably incurred expenses for transportation and lodging of [at least] $_____ [*specify amount no more than $1,000*], as follows: _____ [*itemize services rendered by attorney and loss of earnings, transportation, and lodging costs actually and reasonably incurred*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion.*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion and supporting declaration is for use by a party who seeks to recover attorney's fees and expenses incurred as a result of the other party's bad faith appeal of a small claims judgment. The superior court may award the party attorney's fees of up to, but not exceeding, $1,000 and loss of earnings and transportation and lodging expenses up to, but not exceeding, $1,000 if the court finds, following a hearing, that the appeal was without substantial merit and not based on good faith but was intended to harass or delay the other party or to encourage the other party to abandon his or her claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790*].

A memorandum in support of the motion must be filed and served with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; see *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. Counsel should use the memorandum to demonstrate that the defendant's legal grounds for appeal had no substantial legal merit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790*]. For further discussion of the showing required to justify an attorney's fees award, see *§ 526.94[12]*.

[3] Notice Requirements

Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790 does not specify any requisite notice period. If the notice is given by a noticed motion, the notice period specified by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* should be followed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)* (effective January 1, 1005, at least 16 court days' notice required for most motions)]. For discussion of notice of motions and motions in general, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[4] Written Statement of Reasons for Resulting Order

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.790* does not expressly require that an order awarding attorney's fees recite in detail the circumstances justifying the order, due process apparently requires a statement of reasons justifying the sanctions [*see Hearst v. Ferrante (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 234 Cal. Rptr. 385* (written reasons are required to support award of attorney's fees after setting aside default based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.174

§ 526.174 Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-133]

[1] FORM Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets [Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-133]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative, filled-in reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-133, Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets [*see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(e)*]. The form is delivered to the judgment debtor by the court clerk at the time judgment is rendered or is mailed to the judgment debtor with the notice of entry of judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(a)*].

Use of the form is optional [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Deadlines for Completing Form

Within 30 days after the clerk has mailed notice of entry of the judgment, unless the judgment has been satisfied, the judgment debtor shall complete the form and cause it to be delivered to the judgment creditor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(b)*]. In the event a motion is made to vacate the judgment or a notice of appeal is filed, the form must be completed within 30 days after the clerk has delivered or mailed notice of denial of the motion to vacate or notice of dismissal of or entry of judgment on the appeal, whichever is applicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(c)*]. Willful failure to complete and return the form may result in the imposition of sanctions as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170* (failure of person to appear for examination) on the request of the judgment creditor [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(d)*; *see also § 526.175*].

[4] Filling in Form

The information required by the form is self-explanatory. Property exempt from execution and procedures for claiming the exemption are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 703.010-703.140* [*see Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.175

§ 526.175 Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.830(d), 708.170(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-134]

[1] FORM Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.830(d), 708.170(a); Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-134]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-134, Application and Order to Produce Statement of Assets and to Appear for Examination. When a judgment debtor willfully fails to pay the judgment or file the Judgment Debtor's Statement of Assets [*see § 526.174*] as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(b)* or *(c)*, the judgment creditor may use this form to make the request provided for under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(d)*, that is, request that the court apply the sanctions provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170* (*discussed under § 526.175[4]*). The use of this form in making a request under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(d)* is mandatory [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Completing and Serving the Form

To make this request under *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.830(d)*, the judgment creditor fills out the application portion of the form, presents the form to the clerk and pays the fee. The clerk sets a hearing date in the order portion of the form, and returns the original and one copy to the judgment creditor. The judgment creditor must then have the form served personally on the judgment debtor by a sheriff, marshall, or registered process server at least 10 calendar days before the hearing date, and file proof of service with the court [*see* the Instructions for Judgment Creditor, printed as page two of the form (note that the page two, containing only these instructions, need not be filed and served)]. For a proof of service form, see *§ 526.153*.

[4] Order and Hearing

The order portion requires that the judgment debtor do either of the following:

- Pay the judgment, with costs and interest, before the hearing date set by the order.

- Appear with a completed Statement of Assets (*see § 526.174*), and explain why the Statement of Assets was not completed within the required time and otherwise answer questions about income and assets.

If the judgment debtor does not pay the judgment before the hearing date, the judgment creditor must attend the hearing [*see* the Instructions for Judgment Creditor, printed as page two of the form].

If the judgment debtor fails either to pay or appear at the hearing, the court may issue a warrant to have him or her brought before the court to answer for the failure to appear, and may punish the judgment debtor for contempt, or the court may issue a warrant for the arrest of the judgment debtor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170(a)(1)*; see *Code Civ. Proc. § 1993*].

If the judgment debtor's failure to appear is without good cause, the court must award the judgment creditor reasonable attorney's fees incurred in this examination proceeding. This award against the judgment debtor becomes a part of the principal amount of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170(a)(2)*; *see also* discussion in *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcements of Judgments, § 254.180* et seq.]. Thus, when the judgment creditor attends the hearing, he or she should be prepared to present to court a memorandum detailing any attorney's fees incurred in the proceedings, to provide the court with a basis for an award of fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 708.170(a)(2)* if it should later determine that the judgment debtor's failure to appear was without good cause.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 526 SMALL CLAIMS
PART IV. FORMS

46-526 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 526.176

§ 526.176 Proof of Service by Mail [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2107; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-112A]

[1] FORM Proof of Service by Mail [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.2107; Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-112A]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an illustrative reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-112A, which may be used to prove service of any document allowed to be served by mail. This form has been adopted by the Judicial Council for optional use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen. A]. The second page of the form contains instructions for accomplishing service and filing the proof of service.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

Service by mail is not permitted for the Plaintiff's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court (Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-100; *see § 526.151*) or for the Defendant's Claim and ORDER to Go to Small Claims Court (Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-120; *see § 526.158*). Service of those pleadings must be accomplished by personal service, substituted service, or mailing by the clerk of the small claims court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 116.340(a), 116.360(b)*]. For discussion of service of these pleadings, see *§ 526.52*. For a form for proof of service of these pleadings (Cal. Judicial Council Form SC-104), see *§ 526.153*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 527.syn

§ 527.syn Synopsis to Chapter 527: SOCIAL SERVICES

§ 527.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 527.02 Cross References

§§ 527.03-527.09 [Reserved]

§ 527.10 Governing Statutes

§ 527.11 Definitions

§ 527.12 Relationship of Federal and California Law

§ 527.13 Types of Aid

[1] Public Assistance Programs

[2] County Aid

§ 527.14 Administration of Public Social Services

[1] Supervision by State

[2] Administration by County

§ 527.15 Availability of Regulations and Information

§ 527.16 Due Process Requirements

[1] Pre-Termination Hearing

[2] Hearing on Denial of Application for Aid

§§ 527.17-527.29 [Reserved]

§ 527.30 Procedures Do Not Apply to County or Federally Administered Aid

§ 527.31 "Department," "Director," and "Recipient" Defined

§ 527.32 State Hearing Procedure

[1] Opportunity for State Hearing

[2] Filing Request for Hearing

[3] Setting Hearing and Giving Notice

[4] Position Statement

[5] Person to Conduct Hearing

[6] Conduct of Hearing

[a] Appearance by Applicant

[b] Appearance by County

[c] Recording of Proceedings

[d] Testimony, Procedure, and Evidence

[e] Impartial and Informal Hearing

[f] Issues to Be Determined

[g] Continuances

[h] Commencement of Payments

§ 527.33 Equitable Estoppel

§ 527.34 Process of Decision

[1] Decision by Administrative Law Judge or Director

[a] Filing of Proposed Decision

[b] Action on Proposed Decision by Director

[2] Delegation to Administrative Law Judge to Adopt Final Decision

§ 527.35 Request for Rehearing

§ 527.36 Payment of Award

§§ 527.37-527.49 [Reserved]

§ 527.50 Petition for Writ of Administrative Mandate

§ 527.51 Standard of Review

[1] In General

[2] Independent Judgment Test

[3] Substantial Evidence Rule

§ 527.52 Award of Attorney's Fees

§ 527.53 Amount of Recovery

§§ 527.54-527.59 [Reserved]

§ 527.60 Administrative Remedy Unavailable or Inadequate

§ 527.61 Relief Available to Class

§ 527.62 Jurisdiction

[1] State Court

[2] Federal Court

§§ 527.63-527.69 [Reserved]

§ 527.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 527.71 Federal Statutes

§ 527.72 State Statutes

[1] Public Social Services

[2] State Hearing Procedure

[3] Judicial Proceedings

§ 527.73 Federal Administrative Regulations

§ 527.74 State Administrative Regulations

§ 527.75 Local Court Rules

[1] Los Angeles County

[2] Sacramento County

[3] San Diego County

§ 527.76 Decisions

[1] Public Social Services

[a] Federally Assisted Programs

[b] Public Assistance Programs

[c] General Assistance Programs

[d] Medi-Cal and Medicaid Generally

[e] Construction and Enforcement of Statutes

[f] Promulgation of Regulations

[g] Interpretation of Regulations

[h] Due Process Requirements

[2] State Hearing Procedure

[3] Judicial Proceedings

[a] Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

[i] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[ii] Standard of Review

[iii] Attorney's Fees

[b] Other Judicial Actions

[c] Amount of Recovery

§ 527.77 Attorney General Opinions

§ 527.78 Law Reviews

§ 527.79 Text References

§§ 527.80-527.89 [Reserved]

§ 527.90 Petition for Writ of Mandate to Review State Hearing Decision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Filing of Petition

[6] Attorney's Fees and Costs

[7] Interest

[8] Filing of Record

[9] Memorandum

[10] Scope of Review

§ 527.91 Alternative Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 527.92 Class Action Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Declare Regulation Invalid and Petition for Writ of Mandate to Compel Benefit Payments

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Caption

[4] Allegations

[a] Class Action

[b] Complaint for Declaratory Relief

[c] Petition for Writ of Mandate

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction

[7] Statute of Limitations for Ordinary Writ of Mandate

[8] Amount of Recovery

[9] Award of Attorney's Fees

[10] Points and Authorities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART I. SCOPE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.01

§ 527.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the law relating to public social services in California and the remedies available to dissatisfied applicants and recipients, including:

- The procedure for statutory hearings before the State Department of Social Services or the State Department of Health Services [*see § 527.30* et seq.].

- Judicial review of state hearing decisions and other types of actions that can be brought to enforce the rights of applicants for and recipients of social services [*see § 527.50* et seq.].

General principles relating to social services are also discussed services [*see § 527.10* et seq.].

The chapter also contains the following forms:

- Form of petition for a writ of mandate to review a state hearing decision [*see § 527.90*].

- Form of petition for an alternative writ of mandate [*see § 527.91*].

- Form of complaint for declaratory relief and petition for a writ of mandate [*see § 527.91*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART I. SCOPE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.02

§ 527.02 Cross References

Related chapters in this publication include the following:

- For discussion, forms, and general allegations for use in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

- For discussion and forms relating to proceedings *in forma pauperis*, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.110* et seq. Copies of Judicial Council forms for use in proceedings *in forma pauperis*, suitable for reproduction, are available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

- For discussion and general forms relating to proceedings for writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

- For discussion and forms relating to actions involving public entities for failure to discharge their mandatory duties, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California tort Claims Act*, § 464.40 et seq.

- For discussion and forms relating to review of administrative trials, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

- For forms and procedure relating to unemployment insurance, see Ch. 564, *Unemployment and Disability Insurance* .

For discussion and forms relating to federal retirement, survivor, and disability benefits, including the federally administered Supplemental Security Income (S.S.I.) benefit for aged, blind, or disabled citizens, see Social Security Practice Guide (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART I. SCOPE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.03-527.09

[Reserved]

§§ 527.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.10

§ 527.10 Governing Statutes

The federal Social Security Act, which provides federal funds for state public assistance programs, is set forth in *42 U.S.C. § 301 et seq.*

California public social services law is set forth in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10000 et seq.* State hearings are governed by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* Aid and medical assistance programs, which receive funds under the federal Social Security Act, are covered by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000 et seq.*

Judicial review of state hearing decisions is governed by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.11

§ 527.11 Definitions

The following statutory definitions apply to terms used in this chapter:

- "Aid" means financial assistance provided to or in behalf of needy persons under the terms of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10000 et seq.*, including direct money payments and vendor payments [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10052*].

- "County department" means the county agency designated by the board of supervisors, or by such other authority as may be provided in the county charter, as responsible for the administration of public social services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10058*].

- "County director" means the director or other chief executive of the county department [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10059*].

- "Public assistance" and "public assistance programs" mean those public social services programs provided for in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000 et seq.* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10061*].

- "Public social services" means those activities and functions of state and local government administered or supervised by the State Department of Social Services or the State Department of Health Services that are involved in providing aid or services, or both, including health care services and medical assistance, to those people of the state who, because of their economic circumstances or social conditions, are in need of and may benefit by that aid or those services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10051*].

- "Regulations" include, but are not limited to, standards of eligibility for aid and services, procedures necessary for the proper and efficient administration of public social services, and standards regarding conditions that must be met by agencies or individuals subject to licensing or supervision by the State Department of Social Services or the State Department of Health Services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10060*].

"Services" means those activities and functions performed by the social work staff and related personnel of the State Department of Social Services and county departments with or in behalf of individuals or families that are directed toward the improvement of the capabilities of those individuals or families to maintain or achieve a sound family life, rehabilitation, self-care, and economic independence [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10053*].

A "state hearing" is a hearing pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* before either the State Department of Social Services or the State Department of Health Services, available either to a recipient of public assistance prior to suspension, reduction, discontinuation, or termination of assistance [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *45 C.F.R. § 205.10(a)(6)(i)(A)*; *see also Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267-271, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *In re Darlene T. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 939, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119*] or to an applicant for public assistance on denial of assistance [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *45 C.F.R. § 205.10(a)(5)*]. Prior to its 1991 amendment, this hearing was known as and referred to in both statutory and case law as a "fair" hearing [*see* former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *see also § 527.32[1]*]. Effective January 1, 1992, the hearing is statutorily denominated a "state" hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*, as amended by Stats. 1991, ch. 820, § 6]. State hearing procedure is *discussed under § 527.30* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.12

§ 527.12 Relationship of Federal and California Law

The federal Social Security Act provides federal funds for various public assistance programs [*see 42 U.S.C. §§ 601 et seq.* (grants to states for aid and services to needy families with children and for child-welfare services), *42 U.S.C. §§ 1381-1383c* (supplemental security income for aged, blind, and disabled), *42 U.S.C. §§ 1396-1396s* (grants to states for medical assistance programs), *42 U.S.C. §§ 1397-1397e* (grants to states for services)].

The California public social services acts were adopted or amended for the purpose of operating in harmony with the federal system in order to obtain federal assistance in providing aid to needy persons [*Pearson v. State Social Welfare Bd. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 184, 214, 5 Cal. Rptr. 553, 353 P.2d 33* ; *Newbold v. Social Welfare Bd. (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 844, 847, 174 P.2d 482]* .

Since the state assistance programs involve federal subsidies, they are subject to reasonable federal regulations. Under both the federal and state acts, administrative boards are empowered to promulgate rules, regulations, and administrative interpretations affecting these programs. These regulations should be harmonized, whenever possible, within the statutory limits established, in order to carry out the cooperative public purpose and law of both sovereigns [*Pearson v. State Social Welfare Bd. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 184, 215, 5 Cal. Rptr. 553, 353 P.2d 33]* .

It is the public policy of the state to establish and maintain conformity between the state law and the requirements of the federal act to facilitate the receipt of grants-in-aid in support of the state public assistance program [*Pearson v. State Social Welfare Bd. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 184, 189, 5 Cal. Rptr. 553, 353 P.2d 33]* . Thus, if the United States Department of Health and Human Services issues a formal ruling that any section of the Welfare and Institutions Code relating to public assistance cannot be given effect without causing California's plan to be out of conformity with federal requirements, that section becomes inoperative to the extent of its nonconformity with federal requirements [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 11003*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.13

§ 527.13 Types of Aid

[1] Public Assistance Programs

Aid is provided to needy persons in California under the aid and medical assistance programs provided for in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000 et seq.* These programs receive federal funds and must therefore be administered in conformity with federal regulations [*see Vaessen v. Woods (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 749, 751, 756-764, 200 Cal. Rptr. 893, 677 P.2d 1183* ; *Pearson v. State Social Welfare Bd. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 184, 189, 5 Cal. Rptr. 553, 353 P.2d 33* ; *see also discussion under § 527.12*].

Public assistance programs for which the federal government defrays a large portion of the cost, such as those provided for in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000 et seq.*, which are administered by the county under the supervision of the state, are sometimes referred to as "categorical" assistance programs [*see Rogers v. Detrich (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 90, 99, 128 Cal. Rptr. 261]* .

Benefits under the State Supplementary Program for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 12000 et seq.*] are paid through federal, rather than state, administration [*see Rogers v. Detrich (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 90, 94 n.3, 128 Cal. Rptr. 261]* . For detailed discussion and forms relating to the federally administered Supplemental Security Income program (S.S.I.), see Social Security Practice Guide, ch. 25, *Supplemental Security Income* (Matthew Bender).

[2] County Aid

Every county is required to relieve and support all incompetent, poor, and indigent persons and those incapacitated by age, disease, or accident, who lawfully reside in the county and are not supported and relieved by their relatives or friends, by their own means, or by state hospitals or other state or private institutions [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000*]. Aid provided by the counties through county funds is referred to as "general assistance" [*see Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 671, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* ; *Watkins v. County of Alameda (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 320, 329, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 847*].

No state or federal funds are provided for this purpose, and the counties are not required to grant any specific type of

relief or to pay any specific amount of money [*County of Los Angeles v. Department of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 458, 260 P.2d 41]* . The county has a broad discretion to determine eligibility for, the type and amount of, and conditions to be attached to indigent relief [*Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 678, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 458, 260 P.2d 41; Alford v. County of San Diego (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 16, 32, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 596 (flat income cap eligibility standard that does not consider individual's ability to pay all or part of subsistence medical care is not permitted)]* .

Despite this broad discretion, to determine the level of general assistance to be paid, counties must conduct studies of what is needed for minimum subsistence, because the general assistance level must be justified by and based on evidence of the actual cost of minimum subsistence in the county. Minimum subsistence, at the least, must include allocations for housing, food, utilities, clothing, transportation, and medical care [*Scates v. Rydingsword (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1085, 1089, 280 Cal. Rptr. 544* ; *Whitfield v. Board of Supervisors (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 451, 457, 460-461, 277 Cal. Rptr. 815* ; *Boehm v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 494, 499-502, 223 Cal. Rptr. 716* (appeal after remand)].

However, the requirement for conducting studies of what is needed for minimum subsistence appears to have been limited. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000.5*, which sets 62 percent of the federal poverty level as a sufficient standard of aid, has been held to be the legislative equivalent of repealing the requirement for a factual study of what amount is needed for minimum subsistence (*Boehm* study). Any county that meets the 62 percent requirement has by definition provided minimum subsistence needs [*Oberlander v. County of Contra Costa (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 535, 542, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182]* . In addition, the effect of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17001.5* has been held to permit a county to reduce general assistance aid to groups of unrelated adults living together, and so long as reductions do not exceed percentages set forth in the statute, the county need not conduct a *Boehm* study as to the sufficiency of its aid levels [*Oberlander v. County of Contra Costa (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 535, 543, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182]* .

Furthermore, to be valid under the general relief statutes, the county's regulations must be consistent with the statutes and reasonably necessary to effectuate the statutory purpose [*see* *Nelson v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 25, 31, 235 Cal. Rptr. 305]* .

The Department of Social Services and the Department of Health Services have no power to supervise or control the administration of indigent relief provided by the counties and have no jurisdiction to consider complaints relating to the adequacy of the relief [*see* *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 459, 260 P.2d 41* ; *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* (state hearing procedure not applicable to recipient of aid exclusively financed by county funds); *see also* discussion in *§ 527.13[2]*].

Because no federal funds are provided to the counties for general assistance, federal regulations are not applicable to the administration of county aid. However, the procedures established by the counties must satisfy the constitutional requirements of procedural due process [*see* *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 269-270, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *Griffeth v. Detrich (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 118, 120-122* , *cert. denied*, *445 U.S. 970]* . These constitutional requirements are discussed in *§ 527.15*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.14

§ 527.14 Administration of Public Social Services

[1] Supervision by State

The State Department of Social Services is designated as the single state agency with full power to supervise every phase of the administration of all public social services except health care services and medical assistance, for which grants-in-aid are received from the United States government or made by the state in order to secure full compliance with the applicable provisions of state and federal laws [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10600*].

Similarly, the State Department of Health Services is designated as the agency with the same supervisory power over health care services and medical assistance [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10740*].

Each single state agency responsible for administering federal funds can delegate specific responsibilities to other state agencies through interagency agreements, provided these plans are approved by the federal government (i.e. the state controller's office has performed Medi-Cal audits for the California Dept. of Health Services) [*RCJ Medical Services, Inc. v. Bonta (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 986, 1008, 91 Cal. App. 4th 986]* .

The State Department of Social Services must advise public officers regarding the administration of public social services by public agencies throughout the state, and must supervise the administration of state public social services, except health care services and medical assistance, to all persons receiving or eligible to receive state public social services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10603*]. The State Department of Health Services must perform the same functions with regard to health care services and medical assistance [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10742*].

In administering any funds appropriated or made available for disbursement through the counties for welfare purposes, the State Department of Social Services must do both of the following [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10604*]:

- Require, as a condition for receiving grants-in-aid, that the county bear the proportion of the total expense of furnishing aid that is fixed by relevant law.

- Establish lawful regulations fixing statewide standards for the administration of all state or federally assisted public social services, except health care services and medical assistance, that define and control the conditions under which these public social services may be granted or refused. All regulations established by the department are binding on the boards of supervisors and the county departments.

The State Department of Health Services must similarly establish regulations relating to health care services and medical assistance, which are also binding on the boards of supervisors and the county departments [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10743*].

The Director of the State Department of Social Services and the Director of the State Department of Health Services may invoke sanctions against counties that fail to comply either with code provisions or department regulations relating to public social services [*see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10605, 10744*].

[2] Administration by County

Subject to the provisions of *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 11050* (contract for state administration) and 12000 et seq. (federal administration of state supplementary program), the administration of public social services in each of the counties of the state is a county function and responsibility, and therefore rests on the boards of supervisors in the respective counties pursuant to the applicable laws, and, in the case of public social services for which federal or state funds are provided, is subject to the regulations of the State Department of Social Services and the State Department of Health Services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10800*].

For the purpose of providing for and carrying out this function and responsibility, the board of supervisors of each county, or any other agency that is otherwise provided by county charter, must establish a county department, unless otherwise provided by the county charter. The county department is the county agency for the administration of public social services and for the promotion of public understanding of the public social services provided under the Welfare and Institutions Code and the problems with which they deal [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10800*]. The county department must carry out its responsibilities in accordance with the regulations of the State Department of Social Services and the State Department of Health Services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10809*].

For a discussion of the powers of the county in the administration of general assistance, which is financed solely by county funds, see the *discussion under § 527.13[2]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.15

§ 527.15 Availability of Regulations and Information

The Director of the State Department of Social Services and the Director of the State Department of Health Services are authorized to adopt regulations, orders, or standards of general application to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced by their respective departments [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10554, 10725*]. The regulations need not be printed in the California Code of Regulations or California Administrative Register if they are included in the publications of the department [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10554, 10725*].

The State Department of Social Services and the State Department of Health Services must publish and make available, at no cost to the public, all of their respective rules and regulations relating to the government of the department and any form of public assistance or health care services or medical assistance for which state aid is granted to the counties or over the administration of which the department has supervision [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10606, 10745*].

Each department must also provide, at no cost, any subscription service that is necessary to assure prompt receipt of all additions and amendments to the rules and regulations [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10606, 10745*]. The State Department of Social Services must also provide a similar subscription service for the digests of state hearing decisions compiled under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10964* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10606*].

Copies of all laws relating to any form of public social service for which state aid is granted to counties, and over the administration of which the State Department of Social Services or State Department of Health Services has supervision, and copies of all bulletins and rules and regulations of each department must be made available to the public and for public inspection during regular office hours at each county office administering such aid and in each local or regional office of each department [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10608, 10747*].

The board of supervisors of each county, or any other agency authorized by county charter, must adopt standards of aid and care for general assistance provided to the indigent and dependent poor of the county [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 17001*; *see Pettye v. City And County of San Francisco (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 233, 243-248, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 798* (voters may amend general assistance standards through initiative process)]. The standards for general assistance promulgated by a county pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17001* must be open to public inspection under the provisions of the

California Public Records Act [*see Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*; *55 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 67 (1972)]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.16

§ 527.16 Due Process Requirements

[1] Pre-Termination Hearing

Under the *due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment*, a recipient of welfare benefits under either state or federal law is entitled to an evidentiary hearing before his or her benefits can be terminated [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 269-270, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *Wheeler v. Montgomery (1970) 397 U.S. 280, 281-282, 90 S. Ct. 1026, 25 L. Ed. 2d 307* ; *McCullough v. Terzian (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 647, 654, 87 Cal. Rptr. 195, 470 P.2d 4]* .

Procedural due process includes the following requirements [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267-271, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287]* :

- Timely and adequate notice detailing the reasons for the proposed termination.
- An opportunity for the recipient to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.
- An opportunity to present arguments and evidence orally.
- Allowing the recipient to retain counsel.
- An impartial decisionmaker.
- A statement by the decisionmaker indicating the reasons for his or her determination and the evidence relied on in making that decision.

The pre-termination hearing need not take the form of a judicial or quasi-judicial trial if a statutory fair hearing procedure provides a full administrative review [*see* *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *McCullough v. Terzian (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 647, 656-657, 87 Cal. Rptr. 195, 470 P.2d 4]* . Furthermore, no preliminary hearing is necessary if the state continues to pay benefits until after the fair hearing is concluded [

Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267 n.14, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287] .

These due process requirements are now included in federal regulations which set forth standards for hearings provided to recipients of benefits under federally assisted state programs [*see 45 C.F.R. § 205.10*]. Under these regulations, if the recipient makes a timely request for a hearing, assistance may not be suspended, reduced, discontinued, or terminated (but is subject to recovery by the agency if its action is sustained) until a decision is rendered after a hearing, unless a determination is made at the hearing that the sole issue is one of state or federal law or policy, or a change in state or federal law, and not one of incorrect grant computation [*see 45 C.F.R. § 205.10(a)(6)(i)(A)*; *see also 45 C.F.R. § 205.10(a)(16)* (final administrative action to be taken within 90 days of request for hearing)].

Fair hearing procedures in California are governed by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* These provisions are discussed further in Part B, § 527.30 et seq.

[2] Hearing on Denial of Application for Aid

An applicant for aid under federally assisted state programs is also entitled to a state hearing if his or her application is denied [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *45 C.F.R. § 205.10(a)(5)*; *see § 527.30* et seq.].

The Welfare and Institutions Code does not provide for a hearing for an applicant whose application for general assistance, which is not federally funded, has been denied [*see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10950, 17001 et seq.*]. However, a federal court of appeal has held that an applicant for general assistance has an expectation of benefits that is a property interest under *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*, and that county procedures regarding applications for general assistance must therefore satisfy due process requirements established by the United States Supreme Court [*Griffeth v. Detrich (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 118, 120-122 , cert. denied, 445 U.S. 970]* . For a discussion of these due process requirements, see [1], *above*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. General Principles Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.17-527.29

[Reserved]

§§ 527.17[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.30

§ 527.30 Procedures Do Not Apply to County or Federally Administered Aid

The discussion in this Subpart relates to the procedure for state hearings before the State Department of Social Services or the State Department of Health Services, based on requests for such hearings by applicants for or recipients of public social services.

The statutory procedures do not apply to the state supplementary program for the aged, blind, and disabled [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 12000 et seq.*]. This Supplemental Security Income (S.S.I.) program, adopted pursuant to Title XVI of the Social Security Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1381 et seq.*), is federally administered. For detailed discussion and forms relating to S.S.I. benefits, see Social Security Practice Guide, ch. 25, *Supplemental Security Income* (Matthew Bender).

These procedures also do not apply to applicants or recipients of aid exclusively financed by county funds or of aid under the state supplementary program for the aged, blind, and disabled [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*]. Aid exclusively financed by county funds is administered in accordance with procedures established by the county [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000 et seq.*; *see also § 527.13[2]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.31

§ 527.31 "Department," "Director," and "Recipient" Defined

Statutory definitions relevant to this Subpart include the following:

- "Department" means the State Department of Social Services [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10054*].

- "Director" means the Director of Social Services [*Welf. & Inst.Code § 10055*].

- "Recipient" as used in this part means an applicant for or recipient of any public social service, *except* aid exclusively financed by county funds (*see § 527.13[2]*) or aid administered pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 12000 et seq.* (S.S.I. program for aged, blind, and disabled; *see § 527.13[1]*) or aid administered under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 18350 et seq.* (state-funded payments to residential care providers for 24-hour out-of-home care for seriously emotionally disturbed children) [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*].

Additional statutory definitions that may apply, *e.g.*, "state hearing," are *set out in § 527.11*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.32

§ 527.32 State Hearing Procedure

[1] Opportunity for State Hearing

An applicant for or recipient of public social services who has filed a request for a state hearing with the state department that administers the service must be accorded an opportunity for that hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *see In re Darlene T. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 939, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119*].

The "state hearing" was, before 1992, known as a "fair hearing" in statutory and case law [*see* former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*; *see also, e.g., County of Santa Clara v. Support, Inc. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 687, 704, 152 Cal. Rptr 754]* . "Fair hearing" was a term of art set forth in former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* with roots in federal welfare law governing the procedural aspects of the termination of public assistance benefits [*see Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 257 n.3, 266-267, 267 n.14, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *McCullough v. Terzian (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 647, 650, 87 Cal. Rptr. 195, 470 P.2d 4]* . Effective January 1, 1992, the "fair" hearing was statutorily renamed as "state" hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*, as amended by Stats. 1991, ch. 820, § 6]. For the statutory definition of "state" hearing, see *§ 527.11*.

Regardless of whether the hearing is known as a "fair" hearing or a "state" hearing, the procedural due process requirements of *Goldberg v. Kelly* [*Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 267-271, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287]* still apply. These requirements are discussed in *§ 527.16*.

Hearings under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* are not available to an individual who is neither a current recipient nor a current applicant for welfare benefits and who is seeking to contest child support determinations by a district attorney's office rather than contesting welfare payment determinations by a county welfare department [*Pereira-Goodman v. Anderson (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 864, 865-866, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197]* .

[2] Filing Request for Hearing

A request for a state hearing may be filed under any of the following conditions [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*]:

- The applicant or recipient is dissatisfied with any action of the county department relating to his or her application for or receipt of public social services.

- His or her application is not acted on with reasonable promptness.

- A person who desires to apply for public social services is refused the opportunity to submit an application and is dissatisfied with the refusal.

The request for a state hearing may be filed in person or through an authorized representative, without filing a claim with the board of supervisors [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*]. Forms for requesting a state hearing and for designating an authorized representative may be obtained from the county department.

There is no right to a state hearing in either of the following cases [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*]:

- State or federal law requires automatic grant adjustments for classes of recipients, unless the reason for an individual request is incorrect grant computation.

- The sole issue is a federal or state law requiring an automatic change in services or medical assistance that adversely affects some or all recipients.

If rights not determined at the time of death accrue to the estate of an applicant or recipient, the legal representative or an heir of a deceased applicant or recipient may file a request for a hearing in behalf of the decedent's estate [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10965*].

A request for a state hearing must be filed within 90 days after the order or action complained of [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10951*].

[3] Setting Hearing and Giving Notice

The department must set the hearing to commence within 30 working days after the request is filed and, at least 10 days prior to the hearing, must give all parties concerned written notice of the time and place of the hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952*].

Those cases in which aid is not being provided pending the outcome of the hearing must be given priority when setting and deciding cases. However, the priority may not be construed to permit or excuse any failure to render decisions within the time allowed by federal and state law [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*].

[4] Position Statement

If regulations require a public or private agency to write a position statement concerning the issues in question in a state hearing or if the agency chooses to develop such a statement, not less than two working days prior to the date of a hearing provided for pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.*, the agency must make a copy of the agency's position statement on the forthcoming hearing available, at the county welfare department, to the applicant or recipient requesting a state hearing. The agency is required to comply with these provisions only if the agency has received a 10-day notice of the date and time of the scheduled hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952.5*].

If the agency does not make the position statement available within the two-working-day time period, or if the agency decides to modify the position statement, the hearing must be postponed on the request of the applicant or recipient, provided that an applicant or recipient agrees to waive the right to obtain a decision on the hearing within the deadline that would otherwise be applicable under regulations. A postponement granted because the agency has not made the

position statement available within the two-working-day time frame is deemed a postponement for good cause for purposes of determining eligibility to any applicable benefits pending disposition of the hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952.5*].

For the purposes of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952.5*, "public or private agency" does not include the State Department of Health Services.

[5] Person to Conduct Hearing

For the purposes of administering health care services and medical assistance, the State Director of Health Services has those powers and duties conferred on the Director of Social Services by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* to conduct state hearings in order to secure approval of a state plan under the applicable provisions of federal law. The State Director of Health Services may contract with the State Department of Social Services for the provision of state hearings in accordance with *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*].

The hearing must be conducted by administrative law judges employed by the department, unless the director orders that the hearing will be conducted by himself or herself [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953*]. The director may, however, contract with the Office of Administrative Hearings to conduct hearings [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953*].

The director has authority to appoint the department's administrative law judges as provided in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10555* (appointment of department assistants and employees). Each administrative law judge must be admitted to the practice of law in California, and must possess any other qualifications prescribed by the State Personnel Board. Anyone in the office of the chief referee who was employed by the department as a hearing officer prior to the effective date of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953.5* (July 17, 1986) is deemed to be an administrative law judge [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953.5*].

The director or administrative law judge, in conducting the hearing, has all of the powers and authority conferred on the head of a state department by *Gov. Code § 11180 et seq.* for conducting investigations and hearings, such as the powers to administer oaths and to subpoena witnesses [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10954*].

Gov. Code § 11500 et seq. (administrative adjudications) does not apply to hearings under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953*].

[6] Conduct of Hearing

[a] Appearance by Applicant

At the hearing, the applicant or recipient may appear in person with legal counsel of his or her own choosing, or in person without counsel [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10955*].

[b] Appearance by County

The county may appear with legal counsel. The county's legal counsel can be either the county counsel or the district attorney, even in a county in which there is a county counsel. The district attorney's participation at the hearing does not exceed his or her prosecutorial functions and, in fact, is in aid of and auxiliary to the enforcement of the criminal law [*Rauber v. Herman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 942, 949-952, 280 Cal. Rptr. 785]* . Furthermore, the presence of the district attorney at the hearing as the county's legal representative does not, in and of itself, have a chilling effect on the assertion of an applicant's or recipient's rights so as to deprive the applicant or recipient of due process of law [*Rauber v. Herman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 942, 952-953, 280 Cal. Rptr. 785]* .

When appropriate, it appears that the county may be represented by counsel other than the county counsel or the district

attorney [*see Rauber v. Herman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 942, 949, 280 Cal. Rptr. 785]* .

[c] Recording of Proceedings

The proceedings at the hearing must be reported by a phonographic reporter or otherwise perpetuated by mechanical, electronic, or other means capable of reproduction or transcription [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10956*].

[d] Testimony, Procedure, and Evidence

All testimony must be submitted under oath or affirmation. The person conducting the hearing is not bound by the rules of procedure or evidence applicable in judicial proceedings [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10955*]. However, communications between an applicant or recipient and the representative authorized by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* are confidential and privileged, even if the representative is not an attorney [*Welfare Rights Organization v. Crisan (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 766, 772, 190 Cal. Rptr. 919, 661 P.2d 1073]* .

[e] Impartial and Informal Hearing

The hearing must be conducted in an impartial and informal manner in order to encourage free and open discussion by the participants [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10955*]. Conducting the hearing in this manner does not, however, require a nonadversarial, confidential setting in which the applicant or recipient need not anticipate any strong challenge or opposition to his or her story or assertions of fact. Each party is, for example, permitted to confront and cross examine witnesses [*Rauber v. Herman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 942, 953, 280 Cal. Rptr. 785]* .

[f] Issues to Be Determined

The issues at the hearing must be limited to those issues that are reasonably related to the request for hearing, or other issues identified by either party that they have agreed, prior to or at the hearing, to discuss. All of those issues must be addressed in the hearing decisions [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10958.1*].

At the time of the hearing, the recipient has a right to raise the adequacy of the county's notice of action as an issue. If the administrative law judge determines that adequate notice was provided, the recipient must agree to discuss the substantive issue or issues, or the case will be dismissed. If the administrative law judge determines that adequate notice was not provided, the case will be postponed unless the recipient waives the adequate notice requirement, and agrees to discuss the substantive issue or issues at the hearing. If the notice was not adequate, and involved termination or reduction of aid, retroactive action must be taken by the county to reinstate any aid that is pending [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10967*].

[g] Continuances

On good cause shown, the person conducting the hearing may continue the hearing for a period no longer than 30 days. When the refusal of a county to accept a signed application for aid or services is an issue, the director may require the county to accept the application, and may continue the case until the results of the investigation have been reported to him or her [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10957*].

[h] Commencement of Payments

In any case in which aid is awarded by the director or his or her designee, the payments must commence at the time indicated by the director or his or her designee [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10957*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.33

§ 527.33 Equitable Estoppel

An applicant for or recipient of public social services may raise the defense of equitable estoppel in a state hearing, and the Department of Social Services may consider the defense when it is raised [*see Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 402-404, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* . Administrative application of equitable estoppel in a state hearing does not constitute a prohibited exercise of judicial power within the meaning of *Cal. Const., art. III, § 3,* or *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 1* [*Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 406, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

The defense may be available if a county welfare official has made a representation to the recipient or applicant that the official knew or should have known to be false and the recipient has relied on this representation to his or her injury [*see Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 398-399, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

In determining whether to apply equitable estoppel, an agency balances the injustice that would result from a failure to uphold an estoppel against the effect on public interest or policy that would result from the raising of an estoppel [*see Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 400-401, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

Estoppel against a county welfare agency may be appropriate, for example, when a government agent has negligently or intentionally caused a claimant to fail to comply with a procedural precondition to eligibility, and the failure to invoke estoppel would cause great hardship to the claimant [*Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 401-402, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

The existence of estoppel is largely a question of fact, although the policy concerns that must be conducted in a case of estoppel against the government are in part a question of law [*Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 403, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.34

§ 527.34 Process of Decision

[1] Decision by Administrative Law Judge or Director

[a] Filing of Proposed Decision

If the hearing is conducted by an administrative law judge, he or she must prepare, in writing and in a format that may be adopted as the director's decision, a fair, impartial, and independent proposed decision [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10958*]. The administrative law judge is not required to set forth any specific findings in the decision [*Oldham v. Kizer (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1046, 1070, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195* ; *see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10958*].

The absence of a requirement that findings be set forth extends to decisions in hearings to determine eligibility for Medi-Cal benefits, even though Medi-Cal is administered in accordance with the plan set forth under Title XIX of the Social Security Act, *42 U.S.C. § 1396 et seq.*, and even though Social Security Administration policy requires that findings be set forth in decisions in hearings to determine eligibility for Social Security benefits. Because the policy is not contained in a statute made applicable to state programs under Title XIX, it does not preempt state law governing practice and procedure in the administration of entitlement programs. Courts have declined to impose a findings requirement on decisions in state hearings under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* precisely because there is no state or federal statute or regulation requiring findings. Judicial preference has been to leave it to the Legislature, the Department of Social Services, or the Department of Health Services to promulgate such a requirement [*Oldham v. Kizer (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1046, 1069-1070, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195]* .

On approving the hearing decision, the department's chief administrative law judge must file a copy of the proposed decision with the director within 75 days after the conclusion of the hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10958*].

[b] Action on Proposed Decision by Director

Within 30 days after the department has received a copy of the administrative law judge's proposed decision, the director may do any of the following [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*]:

- Adopt the decision in its entirety.

- Decide the matter himself or herself on the basis of the record, including the transcript, with or without taking additional evidence.

- Order a further hearing to be conducted by himself or herself or another administrative law judge on behalf of the director.

Failure of the director to adopt the proposed decision, decide the matter himself or herself on the record, or order a further hearing within the 30 days is deemed an affirmation of the proposed decision [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*].

A further hearing is a new hearing on all or some of the issues raised in the previous hearing. The further hearing can include the introduction of new evidence or can be limited to a reconsideration of the evidence presented at the previous hearing. The term "further hearing," as used in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959* since the 1986 *amendment* [*see* Stats. 1986, ch. 415, § 8, effective July 17, 1986], is interchangeable with the term "rehearing" as used in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959* before the 1986 amendment [*Oldham v. Kizer (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1046, 1061, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195]* .

Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959 places no limitation on the number of further hearings the director can order after receiving an administrative law judge's proposed decision. Furthermore, *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959* does not set standards defining when the director can order a further hearing [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*; *see also Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1359, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60]* . Therefore, the statute allows the director to repeatedly order further hearings in a search for an administrative law judge who would rule adversely to an applicant or recipient, such as by denying an application for benefits [*Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1360, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60]* . However, the fact that Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959 effectively permits the director to go on a fishing expedition for administrative law judges who will write decisions denying benefits has been held insufficient to render the statute unconstitutionally violative of due process.

The statute has withstood attack on due process grounds for two reasons. First, the lack of restrictions on the number of further hearings that can be ordered, or the reasons for ordering them, does not confer on the director any additional power to reject an administrative law judge's decision than the director already has, inasmuch as *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959* empowers the director to reject an administrative law judge's decision and decide the matter himself or herself. Second, it appears that the director's repeated ordering of further hearings and failure to render a decision within a reasonable time would be subject to judicial review by administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. Thus, *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959* does not delegate unlimited power to the director without any means for review of the exercise of that power [*Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1360-1361, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* (affirming trial court's denial of application for Medi-Cal disability benefits)].

[2] Delegation to Administrative Law Judge to Adopt Final Decision

In addition to any other delegation powers granted to the director under law, the director may delegate his or her powers to adopt final decisions under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959 et seq.* to all administrative law judges within specified ranges in the department, in the types of cases deemed appropriate by the director. The authority to adopt final decisions must not be contingent on the outcome of the judge's resolution of the case or issue, or on the identity of a particular administrative law judge. The defined areas of delegation must be published by the department after interested groups, such as the Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations, legal aid societies, and the County Welfare Directors Association, have had a reasonable amount of time to review and comment [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966(a)*].

Notwithstanding any other provisions of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959 et seq.*, decisions rendered by the administrative law judges under the authority of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966* must be treated, for all purposes, as the decision of the director. The affected county, recipient, or applicant has the right to request a rehearing pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code §*

10960, and the right to petition for judicial review pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966(b)*].

If the director chooses to exercise the authority to delegate his or her powers to adopt final decisions to administrative law judges, the delegation must be in writing. Any delegation instrument must be a public record available at all times, including the time of hearing, from each administrative law judge to whom the authority was delegated. The written delegation instrument must include both of the following [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966(c)*]:

- A specification of the administrative law judges that are authorized to render final decisions on the director's behalf, including the effective date of the authorization.

- A specification of the types of cases or issues that are subject to the director's delegation of final authority.

The written delegation may include any other implementation instructions that the director determines are necessary for the effective implementation of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966* [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966(c)*].

Decisions rendered by administrative law judges pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966* must be fair, impartial, independent, in writing, and in a format prescribed by the Chief Administrative Law Judge [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10966(d)*].

If the director decides the matter, a copy of his or her decision must be served on the applicant or recipient and on the affected county [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*]. If the director's decision differs materially from the proposed decision of the administrative law judge, a copy of that proposed decision must also be served on the applicant or recipient and on the affected county [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*]. If a further hearing is ordered, it must be conducted in the same manner and within the same time limits specified for the original hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*].

The county director must comply with and execute every decision of the director [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10963*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.35

§ 527.35 Request for Rehearing

Within 30 days after receiving the proposed decision of an administrative law judge adopted by the director, a final decision rendered by an administrative law judge, or a decision issued by the director, the affected county, applicant, or recipient may file a request with the director for a rehearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10960*].

The director must immediately serve a copy of the request on the other party to the hearing. Within five days after the service, the other party may file with the director a written statement supporting or objecting to the request. The director must grant or deny the request no earlier than the 5th nor later than the 35th working day after receiving it. If the director grants the request, the rehearing must be conducted in the same manner and subject to the same time limits as the original hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10960*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.36

§ 527.36 Payment of Award

The decision of the director need not specify the amount of the award to be paid unless the amount of the award is in issue. If the decision is in favor of the applicant or recipient, the county department must pay to the applicant or recipient the amount of aid the director finds he or she is entitled to receive pursuant to the director's decision, or must grant the services that he or she is entitled to receive, without establishing present need [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10961*]. Payment must commence as of the date the person was first entitled to aid [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10961*].

The award must be determined no later than 30 days following the date the hearing decision is received by the county or 30 days from the date the additional information needed for compliance with the decision is provided to the county. After the award is made, the county and the claimant must be notified by the department of its determination regarding the county's compliance with the decision [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10961*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Hearings Before Departments of Health and Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.37-527.49

[Reserved]

§§ 527.37[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
1. Judicial Review of State Hearing Decisions

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.50

§ 527.50 Petition for Writ of Administrative Mandate

With regard to "state hearings" discussed in Subpart B, § 527.30 et seq., the applicant, recipient, or affected county, within one year after receiving notice of the director's final decision on the state hearing, may file a petition for writ of administrative mandate with the superior court, under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, praying for a review of the entire proceedings in the matter, on questions of law involved in the case [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*; *see In re Darlene T. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 939, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119* ; for a form of petition, *see § 527.90*; *see also § 527.31* (defining "director" and "recipient")].

Such review, if granted, is the exclusive remedy available to the applicant, recipient, or county for review of the director's decisions.

The director must be the sole respondent in the proceedings [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*]. Immediately on being served, the director must serve a copy of the petition on the other party entitled to judicial review. That party has the right to intervene in the proceedings [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
1. Judicial Review of State Hearing Decisions

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.51

§ 527.51 Standard of Review

[1] In General

Both *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* and *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* leave to the courts the establishment of standards for deciding which cases require independent judgment review and which require substantial evidence review [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (application for benefits; overruling and disapproving cases cited therein to the extent they are inconsistent with the opinion); *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1296, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492]* .

For further discussion of both the independent judgment and substantial evidence standards of review, see Ch. 474 et seq., *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*.

[2] Independent Judgment Test

The proper standard for the trial court's review of the administrative decision denying an application for or terminating a recipient's receipt of welfare benefits is the independent judgment test [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (application for benefits); *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* (termination of benefits)].

The proper standard for the trial court's review of the administrative decision denying an application for Medi-Cal disability benefits is also the independent judgment test [*see, e.g.,* *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1357-1358, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* ; *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1299, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492]* . The independent judgment test is the appropriate standard of trial court review because the right to receive welfare and disability benefits is a vested, fundamental right [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (application for benefits); *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* (termination of benefits); *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1298, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492* (application for benefits)].

In the case of an applicant's right to receive benefits, the degree to which the right is vested may not be overwhelming, but the degree to which the right is fundamental is overwhelming. Nevertheless, the court is required only to weigh the degree to which the right is vested and fundamental [*Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (application for benefits)].

The independent judgment test requires the trial court to reconsider the evidence and make its own independent findings of fact [*see, e.g.,* *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698* ; *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1358, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60]* . Abuse of discretion is established if the trial court determines that the findings are not supported by the weight of the evidence [*Anthony v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 990, 993, 281 Cal. Rptr. 516]* .

[3] Substantial Evidence Rule

On appeal, the appellate court's review of the trial court's judgment is governed by the substantial evidence rule. The appellate court is thus required to determine whether the findings and judgment of the trial court are supported by substantial, credible, and competent evidence. All conflicts in the evidence must be resolved and all inferences drawn in favor of the judgment. However, the appellate court is not bound by the trial court's determination of questions of law. On questions of law, the appellate court can make its own independent determination of whether the correct legal principles were applied in the trial court [*Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1358, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* ; *Anthony v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 990, 993, 281 Cal. Rptr. 516]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
1. Judicial Review of State Hearing Decisions

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.52

§ 527.52 Award of Attorney's Fees

If, on review, the applicant or recipient obtains a decision in his or her favor, he or she is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

However, it has been held that *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*, which provides a means by which welfare applicants and recipients may enforce their rights, does not contemplate an award of attorney's fees in a case in which review of a ruling in favor of the recipient is sought in order to obtain a more favorable legal precedent [*Le Blanc v. Swoap (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 741, 743, 129 Cal. Rptr. 304, 548 P.2d 704]* .

For example, when the director files a petition with the Supreme Court solely to adjudicate an abstract legal question regarding the applicable scope of review after the recipient has prevailed in the court of appeal, the recipient is not entitled to attorney's fees, since the purpose of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* would not be served by an award of attorney's fees to a recipient whose rights were already secure [*Le Blanc v. Swoap (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 741, 743, 129 Cal. Rptr. 304, 548 P.2d 704]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
1. Judicial Review of State Hearing Decisions

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.53

§ 527.53 Amount of Recovery

The trial court that issues the writ of mandate has the power to order that the payment of benefits be made retroactive if the circumstances so warrant [*Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 677, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749* (overruled on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*); *Blackburn v. Sarsfield (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 143, 151, 178 Cal. Rptr. 15]* . In such a case, the recipient is also entitled to an award of prejudgment interest at the legal rate from the time each payment became due [*Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 685, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789* , P.2d 749 (overruled on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
1. Judicial Review of State Hearing Decisions

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.54-527.59

[Reserved]

§§ 527.54[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
2. Judicial Actions Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.60

§ 527.60 Administrative Remedy Unavailable or Inadequate

A dissatisfied individual applicant or recipient of public social services is provided with an administrative remedy through the statutory state hearing procedure [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.*; *see also § 527.30* et seq.].

Administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is the exclusive remedy by which an applicant or recipient dissatisfied with a state hearing decision may obtain judicial review [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*; *see In re Darlene T. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 939, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119* ; *see also discussion under § 527.50*].

Thus, for example, if an invalid welfare regulation is applied or enforced in a statutory state hearing, the individual applicant or recipient may seek judicial review only by administrative mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 682, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032* ; *Granneman v. Myers (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 846, 849, 171 Cal. Rptr. 583]* .

However, if the administrative state hearing procedure with judicial review by administrative mandate as provided by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* is unavailable or inadequate, an action to obtain judicial relief may be brought by persons dissatisfied with public social services without exhausting an administrative remedy [*Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* ; *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358]* .

For example, recipients of public assistance properly filed a class action seeking injunctive and declaratory relief for the class and damages for individually named plaintiffs and did not fail to exhaust their administrative remedies, since the state hearing procedure [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.*] contemplates grants of aid or services to individuals but does not provide for class relief or damage claims [*Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93]* . A proceeding in administrative mandate would also be available [*Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1360, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* (noting availability of remedy and positing its applicability to review hypothetical case in which director repeatedly orders further hearings under *Welf. & Inst Code § 10959* and fails to render state hearing decision within reasonable time)].

Additionally, although the rights of a particular individual applicant or recipient may be determined by a state hearing decision or by judicial review of a state hearing decision by administrative mandate, the determination has no binding effect on the rights of other applicants or recipients. A class action, on the other hand, may yield a decree that can be availed of by every member of the represented class, present and future [*Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358* ; *see § 527.61*, Relief Available to Class, *below*].

Interested persons who are not entitled to state hearings because they are neither applicants for nor recipients of public social service benefits, but who otherwise have standing to complain, still may challenge invalid regulations by traditional mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or by an action for declaratory relief pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* [*Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 682, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032* ; *see California Association for Health Services at Home v. State Department of Health Services (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 696, 705-707, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102* ; *Gov. Code § 11350* (action for declaratory relief by interested person challenging validity of administrative regulation); *California Homeless & Housing Coalition v. Anderson (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 450, 458-459, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
2. Judicial Actions Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.61

§ 527.61 Relief Available to Class

A class action by welfare applicants or recipients should request whatever type of relief is necessary to enforce or protect the rights of the class in light of the facts of the case. Therefore, an action may seek declaratory [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*] or injunctive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 525*] relief, mandamus [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*], or a combination of remedies [*see, e.g., Vaessen v. Woods (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 749, 753-754, 764, 200 Cal. Rptr. 893, 677 P.2d 1183* (writ of mandate and injunctive relief); *Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93* (declaratory and injunctive relief); *Oliva v. Swoap (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 130, 130 Cal. Rptr. 411* (declaratory and injunctive relief and writ of mandate)].

A petition for writ of traditional mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* is often an appropriate device by which a class of welfare applicants or recipients may enforce their rights existing under state or federal law, since this type of mandate may be used to compel state or county welfare officials to act in accordance with state or federal law [*see, e.g., Committee to Defend Reproductive Rights v. Myers (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 252, 172 Cal. Rptr. 866, 625 P.2d 779* (mandate to bar enforcement of unconstitutional budget act provisions restricting Medi-Cal funding of abortions); *Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* (mandate to compel deduction of certain expenses in calculation of benefits in accordance with federal law and to obtain retroactive relief for benefits wrongfully withheld); *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* (mandate to order county director not to deny general assistance on sole and exclusive ground of employability); *Lowry v. Obledo (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 14, 169 Cal. Rptr. 732* (mandate to compel recalculation of benefits in accordance with state and federal laws); *Rogers v. Detrich (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 90, 128 Cal. Rptr. 261* (mandate to order county directors to determine eligibility for and amount of general assistance in accordance with state statute and to make redeterminations and retroactive payments)].

This remedy should be distinguished from a writ of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, which is used to inquire into the validity of a final administrative order after completion of the administrative appeals process [*Lowry v. Obledo (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 14, 25, 169 Cal. Rptr. 732]* . A writ of administrative mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is the appropriate mechanism to use in having a state hearing decision set aside [*see Welf. &*

Inst. Code § 10962; *see also discussion under § 527.50*].

A writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*, on the other hand, provides the traditional mandamus action to compel the performance of an act that the law specially enjoins as a duty resulting from an office. Both forms of mandate may be sought in the same action when an individually named plaintiff seeks an administrative writ for review of his or her adverse state hearing decision and a traditional writ on behalf of a class [*see, e.g., Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256]* .

For a general discussion of these forms of relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , Ch. 303, Injunctions, and Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For a form combining a complaint for declaratory relief and a petition for a writ of traditional mandate, see *§ 527.92*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
2. Judicial Actions Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.62

§ 527.62 Jurisdiction

[1] State Court

The proper court in which an action challenging public social service legislation, regulations, or practices should be brought depends on the relief sought. For example, an original action for declaratory relief must be brought in superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]. Injunctive relief may be granted by the court in which an action is brought, or by a judge of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 525*].

Superior courts also have general equity jurisdiction to grant provisional and permanent injunctive relief since they have original jurisdiction in all causes except those given by statute to other trial courts [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 525*].

A writ of mandate may be issued by any court, except a municipal, to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *see, e.g., Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* (appeal of judgment in class action for writ of mandate and declaratory relief brought in superior court); *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* (original action in mandamus in *Supreme Court); Rogers v. Detrich (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 90, 128 Cal. Rptr. 261* (petition for writ of mandate brought in court of appeal)].

[2] Federal Court

Persons who litigate issues involving public social services may also be able to invoke federal court jurisdiction [*see, e.g., Griffeth v. Detrich (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 118 , cert. denied, 445 U.S. 970* (class action by general assistance applicants under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*); *Bracco v. Lackner (N.D. Cal. 1978) 462 F. Supp. 436* (suit by Medi-Cal beneficiaries under *28 U.S.C. § 1331* and *42 U.S.C. § 1983*)].

Although the Federal Social Security Act (*42 U.S.C. § 301 et seq.*) affords no private right of action against a state, *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, which provides that anyone who, under color of state law, deprives another of rights, privileges, or

immunities secured by the Constitution and laws shall be liable to the injured party, encompasses violations of federal statutory as well as constitutional law [*State of Maine v. Thiboutot (1980) 448 U.S. 1, 100 S. Ct. 2502, 65 L. Ed. 2d 555, 559-560]* . A suit alleging a violation of constitutional or federal statutory law may therefore be brought in federal district court, if the jurisdictional requirements are satisfied, under *28 U.S.C. § 1331* (federal question jurisdiction) or *28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3), (4)* (jurisdictional counterpart to *42 U.S.C. § 1983*). For further discussion, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

For a discussion of actions involving the deprivation of civil rights brought under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* and other Post-Civil War civil rights statutes, see Ch. 113, *Civil Rights: The Post-Civil War Civil Rights Statutes* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Judicial Proceedings
2. Judicial Actions Related to Administration of Social Services

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.63-527.69

[Reserved]

§§ 527.63[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.70

§ 527.70 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to petitions for writs of mandate, that may issue to compel performance of a ministerial act or mandatory duty when there is clear legal right in the person seeking relief, a corresponding duty in the defendant, and lack of any other adequate remedy, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*, See California Points and Authorites, ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to review of a final administrative adjudicative order or decision pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see California Points and Authorites, ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion and forms relating to federal retirement, survivor, and disability benefits, including the federally administered Supplemental Security Income (S.S.I.) benefit for aged, blind, or disabled citizens, see Social Security Practice Guide, ch. 25, *Supplemental Security Income* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.71

§ 527.71 Federal Statutes

Grants to states for aid and services to needy families with children (AFDC) and for child welfare services. *42 U.S.C. § 601 et seq.*

Supplemental security income for aged, blind, and disabled. *42 U.S.C. § 1381 et seq.*

Grants to states for medical assistance programs. *42 U.S.C. § 1396 et seq.*

Grants to states for services. *42 U.S.C. § 1397 et seq.*

Low income housing assistance. *42 U.S.C. § 1437 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.72

§ 527.72 State Statutes

[1] Public Social Services

Aging and long term care. *Health & Safety Code §§ 1280, 1325 et seq.*; *Welf. & Inst. Code § 9101 et seq.*

Definitions and general provisions relating to public social services. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10000 et seq.*

Fiscal provisions. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10100 et seq.*

Social service administration. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10500 et seq.*

General provisions regarding aid and medical assistance. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000 et seq.*

Family Economic Security Act. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11200 et seq.*

State supplementary program for aged, blind, and disabled. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 12000 et seq.*

Emergency payments and special circumstances for aged, blind, and disabled. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 12500 et seq.*

Loans to blind persons. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 13000*

Nonmedical care facilities. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 13900 et seq.*

Basic health care. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14000 et seq.*

Medi-Cal benefits. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14131 et seq.*

Medi-Cal open drug formulary and therapeutic drug utilization review. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14195-14196.1*

Prepaid health plans. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14200 et seq.*

Family planning. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14500-14508*; *see Health & Safety Code § 1570.2 et seq.*

Adult day health care programs. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14520 et seq.*

Alternative methods of Medi-Cal management. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14600 et seq.*

Financial provisions regarding aid and medical assistance. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 15000 et seq.*

Supportive care organizations. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 15300 et seq.*

Supplemental food program. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 15500 et seq.*

Reports to county protective agency regarding abuse of elderly and other dependent adults. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 15600 et seq.*

Adult protective services. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 15750-15754*

Services for the care of children. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 16100 et seq.*

County aid and relief to indigents. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000 et seq.*

County preventative support services to unemployed and displaced workers; when county may contract for services with contracting agencies. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 17500, 17501*

Miscellaneous public social provisions. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 18000 et seq.*

Twenty-four-hour out-of-home care for seriously emotionally disturbed children. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 18350-18355*

[2] State Hearing Procedure

Opportunity for state hearing. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950*

Time for filing request. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10951*

Setting hearing and notice. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952*

Position statement. Welf. & Inst. Code § 10952.2

Conduct of hearing. *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10953-10955*

Appointment and qualifications of administrative law judges. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10953.5*

Perpetuation of proceedings. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10956*

Continuance of hearing. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10957*

Commencement of payments. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10957*

Procedure for proposed decision of administrative law judge. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10958*

Action on receipt of proposed decision by director. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959*

Request for rehearing. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10960*

Decision of director. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10961*

Request for hearing on behalf of decedent's estate. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10965*

Provisions of law relating to public assistance programs as to be fairly and equitably construed. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11000*

[3] Judicial Proceedings

Class actions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 382*

Writ of mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1084 et seq.*

Ordinary writ of mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*

Writ of mandate to review final administrative decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Judicial review of state hearing decision. *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.73

§ 527.73 Federal Administrative Regulations

Housing assistance payment programs established by Section 8 of United States Housing Act of 1937 (*42 U.S.C. § 1437 et seq.*). *24 C.F.R. § 880.101 et seq.*

General administration of public assistance programs. *45 C.F.R. § 205.5 et seq.*

Application, determination of eligibility, and furnishing assistance for public assistance programs. *45 C.F.R. § 206.10*

Work incentive programs for AFDC recipients. 45 C.F.R. § 224.0 et seq.

Special provisions applicable to AFDC. 45 C.F.R. § 232.1 et seq.

Coverage and conditions of eligibility in financial assistance programs. *45 C.F.R. § 233.10 et seq.*

Financial assistance to individuals. *45 C.F.R. § 234.11 et seq.*

127 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.74

§ 527.74 State Administrative Regulations

Medi-Cal regulations. *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 50000 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.75

§ 527.75 Local Court Rules

[1] Los Angeles County

Prerogative writs. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.31

[2] Sacramento County

Prerogative writs. Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.01

[3] San Diego County

Prerogative writs. San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 8.1

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.76

§ 527.76 Decisions

[1] Public Social Services

[a] Federally Assisted Programs

Food Stamp Act provision, that no household is eligible to participate in program during time that any member of household is on strike or to receive increased allotment of food stamps because of decrease in income of striking member, is constitutional. *Lyng v. Automobile Workers (1988) 485 U.S. 360, 108 S. Ct. 1184, 99 L. Ed. 2d 380, 386-393*

Pursuant to 24 C.F.R. § 882.209(d)(1), governing period of time in which eligible family must find suitable private housing and landlord willing to rent it under rent-assistance program established under *42 U.S.C. § 1437 et seq.* and providing that certificate of family participation expires after 60 days unless, within that time, family submits request for lease approval, 60-day period is tolled when timely request for lease approval is submitted to public housing agency and remains tolled until notification that request is approved or denied. *Baggett v. Housing Authority (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 383, 385, 389-390, 240 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Welf. & Inst. Code § 11250.4, prohibiting strikers from collecting AFDC benefits, applies to joint federal-state program and not state-only program, which provides aid to all families with unemployed parents (former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11201(a)(2)*). *Reyna v. McMahon (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 220, 226, 225 Cal. Rptr. 405*

[b] Public Assistance Programs

Program for aid to needy families with dependent children as created by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 11200 et seq.* to participate in federal funding authorized by *42 U.S.C. § 601 et seq.*; program is thus conditioned on compliance with applicable federal statutes and regulations, although state retains broad discretion in determining eligibility for and amounts of aid. *Vaessen v. Woods (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 749, 754-755, 200 Cal. Rptr. 893, 677 P.2d 1183*

California public social services acts were adopted or amended for the purpose of operating in harmony with the federal system in order to obtain federal assistance in providing aid to needy persons. *Pearson v. State Social Welfare Bd. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 184, 214, 5 Cal. Rptr. 553, 353 P.2d 33* ; *Newbold v. Social Welfare Bd. (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 844, 847, 174 P.2d 482*

CalWORKs "completion rule" [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 11253*] violates the Americans with Disabilities Act [*42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*], when it is applied to cut off assistance to disabled children who, due to their disability, may not be reasonably expected to complete high school by the age of 19. *Fry v. Saenz (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 256, 261, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30*

Emergency payments under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 12500 et seq.* to Supplemental Security Income recipients for "unmet shelter needs" are not available unless shelter needs result from special circumstances created by some nonrecurring event or change in circumstances. *Thornton v. Carlson (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1256, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 375*

Equal protection clause of California Constitution (*Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*) does not require that needs of undocumented alien children be taken into account when determining amount of initial public assistance grant to family units in which citizen children reside with their undocumented siblings. *Blanco v. McMahon (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 473, 475-479, 243 Cal. Rptr. 736*

In absence of statute imposing liability, public assistance recipient is free from liability for repayment of grants legitimately obtained. *Webb v. Swoap (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 191, 195-197, 114 Cal. Rptr. 897*

[c] General Assistance Programs

County has broad discretion to determine eligibility for, type and amount of, and conditions to be attached to indigent relief. *Mooney v. Pickett (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 669, 678, 94 Cal. Rptr. 279, 483 P.2d 1231* ; *County of Los Angeles v. Department of Social Welfare (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 455, 458, 260 P.2d 41*

Los Angeles County's Home Call Visitation Program as a prerequisite to receiving welfare benefits is constitutional and does not conflict with state law. *Smith v. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1104, 1115-1124, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 700*

Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 10000, 17000, 17001 do not require counties to adopt regulations setting written standards governing waiting times for receipt of medical care provided to indigents by counties. *Tailfeather v. Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1227, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 255*

Welf & Inst. Code § 17300 limits scope of "legally responsible relatives" to spouses and parents of minor children, therefore, resolution of county board of supervisors that establishes lower general assistance payments for parents who live with their adult children and adult children who live with their parents exceeded the board's authority. *Freitas v. County of Contra Costa (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 163, 173, 33 Cal Rptr. 2d 406*

Minimum-subsistence-needs study (*Boehm* study) is not required prior to reduction or termination of emergency assistance that is separate from general assistance. *Scates v. Rydingsword (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1085, 1102-1103, 280 Cal. Rptr. 544*

Federal lump-sum rule, requiring that lump sum received by family be treated as income, does not apply to families receiving federal AFDC-FG benefits. *Shaw v. McMahon (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 973, 979, 982, 268 Cal. Rptr. 535*

Former *Welf. & Inst. Code § 5709* imposes absolute limit on county mental health obligations, notwithstanding duties

of county, under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000*, to provide hospital and medical services to indigent residents and, under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10000*, to provide services promptly and humanely to needy. *Board of Supervisors v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 552, 559-563, 564, 254 Cal. Rptr. 905*

State is permitted to adopt and apply different eligibility standards for state-only and federal recipients of AFDC without violating *equal protection clause of Constitution*; status of person qualifying under state eligibility standard is different from that of person qualifying under federal standard, and, thus, those persons may be treated differently without violating equal protection. *Shaw v. McMahon (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 417, 429, 243 Cal. Rptr. 26*

County violates mandatory duty to support indigent residents under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000* by denying general relief benefits to any recipient not obtaining valid address within 60 days. *Nelson v. Board of Supervisors (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 25, 32, 235 Cal. Rptr. 305*

State is required to continue payments of Medi-Cal benefits to terminated AFDC recipients pending state's determination of recipients' eligibility for Medi-Cal benefits under nonautomatic categories. *Edwards v. Myers (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1070, 1076, 213 Cal. Rptr. 737*

[d] Medi-Cal and Medicaid Generally

A county may seek reimbursement from the Commission on State Mandates under Cal. Const., art. XIIIB, § 6, for costs of providing health care services for medically indigent adults who are excluded from Medi-Cal coverage by action of the legislature. *County of San Diego v. State of California (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 68, 75-76, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 134, 931 P.2d 312*

California participates in the federal Medicaid program thorough the Medi-Cal program. The State Department of Health Care Services is the state agency charged with administering Medi-Cal in accordance with the state plan. *Mission Hospital Regional Medical Center v. Shewry (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 460, 474, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 639*

Medicaid is a program through which the federal government provides financial assistance to qualified participating states for furnishing medical assistance to the poor. California participates in Medicaid through the Medi-Cal program. When a provider provides services to Medi-Cal beneficiaries it is reimbursed for its allowable costs, including indirect costs such as certain employee health benefit payments. *Oroville Hospital v. Department of Health Services (2006) 146 Cal. App. 4th 468, 471-472, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 695*

A treating physician's determination that a particular drug is medically necessary is a factor that the State Department of Health Service must consider in reviewing treatment authorization requests, although it is not controlling. The Department may place appropriate limitations on the use of medications, but it may not ignore the physician's determination just because the prior authorization criteria do not list it as a factor. *Paleski v. State Department of Health Services (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 713, 738, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28*

State Department of Health Services published prior authorization criteria for drugs provided by Medi-Cal were exempt from requirements of *Administrative Procedure Act. Paleski v. State Dept. of Health Services (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 713, 729, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28*

Writ of mandate issued pursuant to *Code of Civ. Proc. § 1085* directing the Department of Health to adopt and implement procedures to ensure that Medi-Cal recipients entitled to reimbursement for covered services obtained during the retroactivity period are promptly reimbursed. *Conlan v. Bonta (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 745, 753754, 764, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 788*

Legislature has by statute authorized coverage for durable medical equipment, and the Department of Health Services lacks the authority to restrict the scope of that coverage. *Blue v. Bonta (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990993, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 483*

Statutes of limitation under *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* do not apply to administrative determinations by Department of Health Services as to monetary amounts of reimbursement paid to hospital for medical assistance provided to patients under Medi-Cal program. *Little Company of Mary Hospital v. Belshe (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 325, 328-329, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626*

Department of Health may require applicants for restricted Medi-Cal benefits to declare under penalty of perjury whether they are United States citizens or nationals and whether they have satisfactory immigration status, under *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14007.5(e), 14011.2*. *Crespin v. Coye (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 700, 707, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10*

Under Medicaid Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1396 et seq.*), states as having considerable discretion in designing their Medicaid programs, and as being authorized to establish standards for individual physicians to use in determining what services are appropriate in particular case. *Ruth v. Kizer (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 380, 386, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 274*

Welf. & Inst. Code § 14100.2 as not entitling hospital to inspect county health department's records relating to patient's eligibility for Medi-Cal benefits. *Department of Health Services v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 776, 782-783, 283 Cal. Rptr. 546*

Director of Department of Health Services lacks authority to eliminate Medicaid coverage for specific services enumerated in schedule of benefits (*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14132*) on basis of fiscal considerations. *Jackson v. Stockdale (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1503, 1515-1516, 264 Cal. Rptr. 525*

State Department of Health Services is required to follow federal regulations governing termination, suspension, or reduction of Medicaid services. *Frank v. Kizer (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 919, 920, 261 Cal. Rptr. 882*

Requiring prior authorization, that is, approval by a department consultant of a specified medical service in advance of the rendition of that service based on a determination of medical necessity (*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14133(a)*), is consistent with federal law, which specifically allows individual states to place appropriate limits on a service based on utilization control procedures (*see 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(30)*; *42 C.F.R. § 440.230(d)*). *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 983, 987, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

State is permitted to place generic limit on Medicaid services based on judgment as to degree of medical necessity for those services, so long as it does not discriminate on basis of specific medical condition that occasions the need. *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 979-980, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Federal Medicaid Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1396 et seq.*) requires participating states to provide qualified individuals with financial assistance in five general categories of services: (1) inpatient hospital services, (2) outpatient hospital services, (3) laboratory and X-ray services, (4) skilled nursing facility services, and (5) physician services (*42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)*). *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 973, 977, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Medi-Cal provisions limiting health services to those "medically necessary to prevent significant illness, to alleviate severe pain, to protect life, or to prevent significant disability" (*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 14059.5, 14133.3*) are consistent with federal law. *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 973, 980, 983, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Two levels of judgment as to medical necessity exists in statutory scheme: (1) macrodecision by Legislature that only certain kinds of medical assistance are deemed sufficiently necessary to come under coverage of its plan, and (2) microdecision of physician that condition of patient warrants administering type of medical assistance made available

by that plan. *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 973, 980, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

[e] Construction and Enforcement of Statutes

Laws governing welfare programs are required to be liberally interpreted and actively enforced. *Thornton v. Carlson (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1258, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 375* ; *Robbins v. Superior Court (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 199, 208, 211 Cal. Rptr. 398, 695 P.2d 695* ; *Hansen v. Department of Social Services (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 283, 291, 238 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Even though state is not required to participate in AFDC program, once it chooses to participate, state is required to administer state plan in conformity with federal laws and regulations governing program; state regulations are invalid and unenforceable to extent they conflict or are incompatible with federal regulations governing program. *Morales v. McMahon (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 184, 186, 189, 272 Cal. Rptr. 688*

[f] Promulgation of Regulations

Emergency regulations may properly be adopted without following rulemaking procedures otherwise mandated by Administrative Procedure Act in order to implement immediately controlling provisions of Personal Responsibility Act (*16 U.S.C. § 1601 et. seq.*) that prohibit disbursement of welfare benefits for prenatal care for illegal aliens. *Doe v. Wilson (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 296, 312, 313, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187*

Department of Health Services is required to follow rulemaking procedures set forth in Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.*); rule not adopted in substantial compliance with these procedures is unenforceable. *Union of American Physicians & Dentists v. Kizer (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 490, 496-497, 272 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Grier v. Kizer (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 422, 431-432, 268 Cal. Rptr. 244*

[g] Interpretation of Regulations

Proviso or clause in regulation beginning with word "unless" means exception or condition subsequent rather than a condition precedent. *Baggett v. Housing Authority (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 383, 389, 240 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Interpretation of regulation, like interpretation of statute, is question of law and, although agency's interpretation of its own regulation obviously deserves great weight, ultimate resolution of such legal questions rests with courts. *Baggett v. Housing Authority (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 383, 387, 240 Cal. Rptr. 640*

[h] Due Process Requirements

When mass change in Food Stamp Program occurs, notice requirements to recipients are met by individual notice informing them of change; notice of precise impact of change on individual recipient is not required. *Atkins v. Parker (1985) 472 U.S. 115, 105 S. Ct. 2520, 86 L. Ed. 2d 81, 91*

Nursing homes' decisions to discharge or transfer Medicaid patients to lower level of care does not involve state action and thus does not violate rights secured by *Fourteenth Amendment due process clause*. *Blum v. Yaretsky (1982) 457 U.S. 991, 102 S. Ct. 2777, 73 L. Ed. 2d 534, 551*

Welfare recipient is entitled to evidentiary hearing before benefits may be terminated. *Goldberg v. Kelly (1970) 397 U.S. 254, 269-270, 90 S. Ct. 1011, 25 L. Ed. 2d 287* ; *Wheeler v. Montgomery (1970) 397 U.S. 280, 281-282, 90 S. Ct.*

1026, 25 L. Ed. 2d 307 ; *McCullough v. Terzian (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 647, 654, 87 Cal. Rptr. 195, 470 P.2d 4*

Applicant for general assistance has expectation of benefits which is property interest under *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*; county procedures regarding applications are required to satisfy due process requirements. *Griffeth v. Detrich (9th Cir. 1979) 603 F.2d 118, 120-122 , cert. denied, 445 U.S. 970*

Regulations allowing summary termination of aid pending fair hearing when appeal raises only issues of policy are denial of due process. *Yee-Litt v. Richardson (N.D. Cal. 1973) 353 F. Supp. 996, 1000-1001 , aff'd mem. sub nom., Carleson v. Yee-Litt (1973) 412 U.S. 924, 93 S. Ct. 2753, 37 L. Ed. 2d 152*

Termination of public assistance benefits granted under *42 U.S.C. § 601 et seq.* (aid to families with dependent children) is required to be preceded by adequate notice and opportunity for recipient to challenge proposed action. *Vaessen v. Woods (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 749, 757, 200 Cal. Rptr. 893, 677 P.2d 1183*

Welfare authorities are not constitutionally required to give notice of reduction or termination of benefits in Spanish to recipients known to be literate in Spanish but not in *English. Guerrero v. Carleson (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 808, 810-817, 109 Cal. Rptr. 201, 512 P.2d 833 , cert. denied, 414 U.S. 1137, 94 S. Ct. 883, 38 L. Ed. 2d 762*

State law exempts the State Department of Health Service's published drug criteria from the APA [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 14105.395(a), (c)*] but requires compliance with the Medi-Cal Act's notice and comment provisions [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14105.395(b), (c)*]. *Paleski v. State Department of Health Services (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 713, 717-723, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28*

State Department of Health Services published prior authorization criteria for drugs provided by Medi-Cal were exempt from requirements of *Administrative Procedure Act. Paleski v. State Dept. of Health Services (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 713, 729, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 28*

Before issuing order conditioning future AFDC benefits on participation in workfare program or initiation of job search, court is required to provide AFDC recipient with timely notice of family law procedure through which recipient's benefits may be reduced or lost; court's failure to provide timely notice is violation of recipient's due process rights. *Anderson v. Superior Court (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1321, 1331, 262 Cal. Rptr. 405*

County's failure to provide knowledgeable caseworker in attendance at pretermination hearing involving general assistance recipients' alleged failure to comply with work program constituted denial of recipients' rights of confrontation and cross examination. *Jennings v. Jones (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1083, 1091, 212 Cal. Rptr. 134*

County's termination of general assistance to recipients who fail to request hearing within two days of receiving termination notice violates due process under *California and United States Constitutions. Boehm v. County of Merced (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 447, 455-456, 209 Cal. Rptr. 530*

Emergency assistance granted prior to final determination of applicant's eligibility for aid does not create fundamental interest which requires evidentiary hearing before denial of application and termination of emergency assistance. *Jackson v. Carleson (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 12, 16, 113 Cal. Rptr. 890*

[2] State Hearing Procedure

State hearing is appropriate forum for determining applicability of equitable estoppel defense. *Lentz v. McMahon (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 393, 407, 261 Cal. Rptr. 310, 777 P.2d 83*

Communications between claimant and representative authorized by *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* are confidential and privileged, even in case of nonattorney representative. *Welfare Rights Organization v. Crisan (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 766, 772, 190 Cal. Rptr. 919, 661 P.2d 1073*

State hearing decision under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* exonerating recipient of welfare fraud collaterally estops district attorney from pursuing criminal action against recipient for same alleged misconduct. *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 489-490, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321*

Welf. & Inst. Code § 10959 does not unconstitutionally violate due process for allowing director to order unlimited further hearings after receipt of administrative law judge's proposed decision and for failing to set standards defining when further hearings can be ordered. *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1358-1361, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60*

State hearing procedures of *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950 et seq.* are consistent with federal due process right of AFDC recipients to evidentiary hearing before benefits are terminated or demand for restitution of overpayments is made. *Rauber v. Herman (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 942, 949, 280 Cal. Rptr. 785*

Medicaid recipients has right to hearing prior to any state action resulting in suspension, reduction, discontinuance, or termination of assistance. *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 986, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

State regulation requiring that request for hearing be filed within 10 days of date notice of discontinuance or reduction in aid is mailed in order to avoid termination or alteration of benefits pending administrative hearing is invalid insofar as it requires that request for hearing must occur at any time sooner than effective date of contemplated action in order to ensure aid being paid pending hearing, in view of definition of "timely notice" in *45 C.F.R. § 205.10*, which focuses on date action becomes effective, and fact that under state regulation recipient of aid has 90 days from date of notice to make request for hearing. *Ortiz v. Woods (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 672, 674, 676-680, 181 Cal. Rptr. 209*

Right to state hearing under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* is limited to action by the county welfare department and applicable only to applicants or recipients of aid, not to former recipients. *County of Santa Clara v. Support, Inc. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 687, 704, 152 Cal. Rptr. 754*

State hearing pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* is not required prior to discharge hearing by civil service commission alleging receipt of AFDC overpayments by employee of county department of public social services. *Rivera v. Los Angeles County Civil Serv. Comm'n (1979) 87 Cal. App. 3d 1001, 1006, 151 Cal. Rptr. 480*

Federal regulation requiring "final administrative action" within 90 days from request for state hearing as not requiring completion of any rehearing authorized under state law. *Westfall v. Swoap (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 109, 116, 129 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Federal regulation requiring "final administrative action" within 90 days from request for state hearing as mandating prompt administrative action but not foreclosing late administrative action. *Westfall v. Swoap (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 109, 118, 129 Cal. Rptr. 750*

[3] Judicial Proceedings

[a] Judicial Review of Administrative Decisions

[i] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Exhaustion requirement is inapplicable to class action filed by welfare recipients seeking injunctive and declaratory

relief for class and damages for individuals. *Ramos v. County of Madera (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 685, 691, 94 Cal. Rptr. 421, 484 P.2d 93*

Party generally required to exhaust administrative remedies before filing court action. *In re Darlene T. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 929, 939, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 119*

Exhaustion requirement is inapplicable to administrative mandate proceeding instituted by applicant or recipient before director has rendered state hearing decision when administrative remedy is unavailable or inadequate. *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1360, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60*

Exhaustion requirement inapplicable when right to state hearing pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10950* is denied because sole issue is federal or state law requiring automatic change in services or medical assistance, even when change adversely affects some or all recipients. *Cowan v. Myers (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 968, 975-976, 232 Cal. Rptr. 299*

Exhaustion requirement is inapplicable to welfare recipients seeking declaratory and injunctive relief and mandate to establish illegality of grant adjustments and to prohibit recoupment of overpayments. *Oliva v. Swoap (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 130, 134-136, 130 Cal. Rptr 411*

[ii] Standard of Review

Independent judgment test is proper standard for trial court's review of administrative decision denying application for welfare benefits. *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 171-180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476* (overruling and disapproving cases cited therein, to degree inconsistent with opinion)

Plaintiff is entitled to challenge validity of welfare regulation both as an individual filing action for writ of administrative mandate after receiving adverse state hearing decision and as member of class filing class action for writ of traditional mandate. *Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 143 n.12, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256*

Independent judgment test is proper standard for trial court's review of administrative decision that terminates welfare benefits. *Harlow v. Carleson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 731, 734-737, 129 Cal. Rptr. 298, 548 P.2d 698*

In reviewing agency action under enabling statute, court may find abuse of discretion when: (1) administrative action under attack has, in effect, altered or amended statute or enlarged or impaired its scope; (2) there is failure to exercise discretion; or (3) agency has engaged in unjustified, unreasonable delay in implementation of statutory commands. *Grimes v. State Dept. of Social Services (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1065, 1073, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 203* (trial court erred by affirming agency denial of request by close friend of physically handicapped person for family member licensing exemption under California Community Care Facilities Act)

While trial court exercises its independent judgment in reviewing decisions concerning grant or denial of treatment authorization request for Medi-Cal coverage of prescription medication, appellate court as confined to inquiring whether trial court's finding are supported by substantial evidence. *Holmes v. Kizer (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 395, 400-401, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 746*

Substantial evidence test is proper standard for appellate court's review of trial court's judgment, except for resolution of questions of law when facts are undisputed. *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1358, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* ; *Anthony v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 990, 993, 281 Cal. Rptr. 516*

Independent judgment test is proper standard for trial court's review of administrative decision denying application for

Medi-Cal disability benefits. *Chatterjee v. Kizer (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1348, 1357-1358, 283 Cal. Rptr. 60* ; *Cooper v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1299, 282 Cal. Rptr. 492*

Statutory construction is question of law that appellate court may resolve independently of trial court's decision. *Anthony v. Kizer (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 990, 993, 281 Cal. Rptr. 516*

[iii] Attorney's Fees

Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962 does not contemplate award of attorney's fees in case in which review is sought of ruling in favor of recipient only in order to obtain a more favorable legal precedent. *Le Blanc v. Swoap (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 741, 743, 129 Cal. Rptr. 304, 548 P.2d 704*

Public assistance recipient is entitled to attorney's fees on appeal from denial of writ in mandamus proceeding to compel county's compliance with state hearing decision of Department of Benefit Payments because enforcement of appellant's rights confers important benefit on general public. *Blackburn v. Sarsfield (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 143, 150-151, 178 Cal. Rptr. 15*

Individual entitled to attorney's fees under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* is not forfeiting fees because successfully representing class as well as own interests. *Hypolite v. Carleson (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 566, 587, 125 Cal. Rptr. 221*

Welfare recipients who successfully intervene in judicial proceedings brought to review decision of director is entitled to attorney's fees under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*. *County of Humboldt v. Swoap (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 442, 445, 124 Cal. Rptr. 510*

Public assistance recipient is entitled to attorney's fees under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* in action for writ of mandate to compel director to render state hearing decision. *Silberman v. Swoap (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 568, 571, 123 Cal. Rptr. 456*

Attorney's fees under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962* is available to legal services organization that rendered services at no charge to client. *Horn v. Swoap (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 375, 383-384, 116 Cal. Rptr 113* ; *Trout v. Carleson (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 337, 342-343, 112 Cal. Rptr. 282*

[b] Other Judicial Actions

Welfare recipients involved in dispute concerning only part of regulation has standing to challenge regulation in its entirety, since question is one of public right and object is to procure enforcement of public duty. *Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 144, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256*

Interested persons who are not entitled to state hearings because they are neither applicants for nor recipients of public social service benefits, but who otherwise have standing to complain, may challenge invalid regulations by traditional mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*. *California Association for Health Services at Home v. State Department of Health Services (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 696, 705-707, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 102*

Preliminary injunction was proper to enjoin county from implementing plan reducing cash grants to indigent residents by deeming health care in county medical facilities to be "in-kind aid," and by crediting portion of its cost against county's obligation to provide general assistance to indigents under *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000*, because "aid" as in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 17000.5* does not include medical care. *Gardner v. County of Los Angeles (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 200, 204-205, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271*

Decree sought by class action is unavailable through administrative appeal since administrative decision regarding individual applicant not binding on the rights of future applicants. *Diaz v. Quitoriano (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 807, 812, 74 Cal. Rptr. 358*

[c] Amount of Recovery

Recipient of welfare benefits adjudged entitled both to retroactive payment of benefits pursuant to statutory obligation of the state and to award of prejudgment interest at legal rate from the time each payment becomes due. *Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 685, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749* (overruled on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*); *Ferreira v. Swoap (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 875, 883-884, 133 Cal. Rptr. 449* (disapproved on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*)

Power of trial court that issues writ of mandate includes power to order that payments of benefits be made retroactive when circumstances so warrant. *Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 677, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749* (overruled on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*)

Ruling that general retroactive assistance benefits could not be awarded on class basis is error. *Gonzales v. Jones (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 978, 984-985, 171 Cal. Rptr. 567*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.77

§ 527.77 Attorney General Opinions

County is not obligated to reimburse private medical facility for emergency services furnished to indigent adult resident of county who is state hospital patient. *68 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 231 (1985)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.78

§ 527.78 Law Reviews

Bensinger, *From Public Charity to Social Justice: The Role of the Court in California's General Relief Program, 21 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 497 (1988)*

Blum and Lobaco, *Legislative Cost-Cutting Puts Medi-Cal Out For Bid*, 4(5) Cal. Law. 30 (1984)

Cochran, *Down and Out in the Valley*, 4(6) Cal. Law. 50 (1984)

Comment, *General Assistance in California, 12 U.S.F. L. Rev. 31 (1984)*

Comment, *Scaling the Welfare Bureaucracy: Expanding Concepts of Governmental Employee Liability, 21 UCLA L. Rev. 624 (1973)*

Comment, *California Welfare Fair Hearings: An Adequate Remedy? 5 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 542 (1972)*

Pearlman, *Welfare Administration and the Rights of Welfare Recipients, 29 Hastings L.J. 19 (1977)*

Brudno, *Fairness and Bureaucracy: The Demise of Procedural Due Process for Welfare Claimants, 25 Hastings L.J. 813 (1974)*

Note, *The Rejected Applicant for General Assistance and His Right to a Review, 25 Hastings L.J. 678 (1974)*

Comment, *Scaling the Welfare Bureaucracy: Expanding Concepts of Governmental Employee Liability, 21 UCLA L. Rev. 624 (1973)*

Comment, *Variance in California's General Assistance Welfare Rates: A Dilemma and a Solution, 13 Santa Clara Law. 304 (1972)*

Dienes, *To Feed the Hungry: Judicial Retrenchment in Welfare Adjudication, 58 Calif. L. Rev. 555 (1970)*

Silver, *A Practical Guide to Your First Welfare Case*, 16(6) Prac. Law. 77 (1970)

Packard, *Fair Procedure in Welfare Hearings, 42 S. Cal. L. Rev. 600 (1969)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.79

§ 527.79 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 8, *Extraordinary Writs*, §§ 72-133, 186-188, 225, 257 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 527.80-527.89

[Reserved]

§§ 527.80[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART IV. FORMS

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.90

§ 527.90 Petition for Writ of Mandate to Review State Hearing Decision

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate to Review State Hearing Decision

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Director, State Department of	)	
_____ [Social *or* Health] Services,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. Petitioner _____[*name*] ("Petitioner") is _____ [an applicant for *or* a recipient of] _____ [*specify public social service, e.g.,* Aid to Families With Dependent Children] under Welfare and Institutions Code Section _____, and is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a resident of _____ County, California.

2. Respondent _____[*name*] ("Respondent") is the Director of the State Department of _____ [Social *or* Health] Services.

3. On or about _____[*date*], _____[*name of county department that administers public social service*] notified Petitioner that _____ [*specify action or intended action of county department, e.g.,* Petitioner's monthly assistance would be reduced from $_____ to

$_____ for the following reason(s): _____ (*specify*)].

4. Petitioner requested a state hearing with the State Department of _____ [Social *or* Health] Services pursuant to *Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10950*. An administrative law judge was appointed, and a hearing was held on _____[*date*].

5. On or about _____[*date*], Petitioner received notice of a final decision issued by Respondent affirming the action of _____[*name of county department*].

[6. A copy of the record of the proceedings in this matter is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

7. Respondent's decision is invalid in that _____ [*specify questions of law, e.g.,* it does not comply with the requirements of Welfare and Institutions Code Section _____, which provides _____ (*specify*), and therefore constitutes an abuse of discretion].

8. Pursuant to *Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10962*, Petitioner's exclusive remedy is review by mandate under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.5*, and Petitioner has no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays judgment as follows:

1. For a review of the entire proceeding in this matter on the questions of law involved;

2. For an alternative writ of mandate directing Respondent to set aside his/her order of _____[*date*], _____ [*specify effect of order, e.g.,* reducing Petitioner's monthly assistance grant] [and _____ (*specify effect of any other order, e.g.,* to reconsider the amount of Petitioner's grant in light of the court's opinion and judgment)], or to show cause why he/she has not done so and why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate _____[*specify terms of writ as in Paragraph 2, omitting words relating to order to show cause*];

4. For interest on any unpaid benefits which the court may find were due Petitioner, accruing from the dates these amounts were due;

5. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to *Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10962*; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein

alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an applicant for or recipient of public social services to obtain judicial review of a final state hearing decision in a mandate proceeding in the superior court [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*]. Local practice regarding mandate proceedings varies. Therefore counsel should check with the superior court clerk regarding local practice in the county in which the writ is sought.

The petition must be accompanied by proof of service of a copy of the petition on the respondent; however, the court in which the application is filed, in its discretion and for good cause, may grant the application ex parte, without notice or service of the application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for discussion of method of serving petition, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*].

[3] Allegations

The form alleges:

- The petitioner's capacity as either the applicant, recipient, or affected county (Paragraph 1) [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

- The Director of the State Department of Social Services or the Director of the State Department of Health Services as the sole respondent in the proceeding (Paragraph 2) [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

- The action or intended action that caused the petitioner to request a state hearing (Paragraph 3).

- That a state hearing on that matter was requested and held (Paragraph 4), since judicial review is available only after a final administrative decision has been rendered [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

- Since the petition must be filed within one year after receiving notice of the final decision [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*], the petition should also specifies the date on which the petitioner received notice of the respondent's final decision (Paragraph 5). If a rehearing was requested [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10960*], allegations regarding the request and the disposition of the request should be included.

- The petition should set forth the questions of law on which review is sought (Paragraph 7) [*see Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*; *see also* discussion under [10], *below*].

- That a copy of the record is attached, if that is true (Paragraph 6).

- That the appropriate remedy is being sought in that there is no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, and a petition for a writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is the exclusive remedy for review of a state hearing decision (Paragraph 8) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

[4] Verification

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[5] Filing of Petition

No filing fee is required for the filing of a petition for review of the director's decision [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*]. Any such petition to the superior court is entitled to a preference in setting a date for hearing [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*]. No bond is required in the case of any petition for review, nor in any appeal there from [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

[6] Attorney's Fees and Costs

If the applicant or recipient obtains a decision in his or her favor, he or she is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*].

[7] Interest

A recipient of public assistance who is adjudged entitled to a retroactive payment of benefits is also entitled to an award of prejudgment interest [*Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 685, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749* (overruled on other grounds in *Frink v. Prod (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 166, 180, 181 Cal. Rptr. 893, 643 P.2d 476*); *see* discussion in *§ 527.53*].

[8] Filing of Record

The record may be filed with the petition or with the respondent's points and authorities, or may be ordered to be filed by the court. Except when otherwise prescribed by statute, the cost of preparing the record must be borne by the petitioner. When the petitioner has obtained a waiver of fees pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 68630-68641* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.50 et seq.*, and when the transcript is necessary to a proper review of the administrative proceedings, the cost of preparing the transcript must be borne by the respondent. For discussion of waiving court fees because of a person's financial condition, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.110* et seq.

When the party seeking the writ has proceeded pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5* (in trial court no alternative writ sought, and petition not accompanied by proof of service), the administrative record must be filed as expeditiously as possible, and may be filed with the petition, or by the respondent after payment of the costs by the petitioner when required, or as otherwise directed by the court.

If the expense of preparing all or any part of the record has been borne by the prevailing party, that expense is taxable as costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *see also* discussion under [5], *above*].

[9] Memorandum

A supporting memorandum is not required by statute, but may be required by local court rule or customarily filed as a matter of local practice. However, since the respondent is specifically authorized to file points and authorities in opposition to the granting of the writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)* (record may be filed with respondent's points and authorities)], it is recommended that a memorandum of points and authorities be filed with the petition.

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to review of a final administrative adjudicative order or decision pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see California Points and Authorities, ch. 195, *Public Administrative Law* (Matthew Bender).

[10] Scope of Review

When a writ of mandate to review an administrative decision is issued, the inquiry extends to the questions of whether the respondent has proceeded without, or in excess of, jurisdiction, whether there was a fair trial, and whether there was any prejudicial abuse of discretion. Abuse of discretion is established if the respondent has not proceeded in the manner required by law, the order or decision is not supported by the findings, or the findings are not supported by the evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*].

For a discussion of the appropriate standard of review of a decision denying assistance to an applicant or terminating assistance to a recipient, *see § 527.51*.

For further discussion of the powers of the court in a proceeding for a writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART IV. FORMS

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.91

§ 527.91 Alternative Writ of Mandate

[1] FORM Alternative Writ of Mandate

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ALTERNATIVE WRIT OF MANDATE
Director, State Department of	)	
_____ [Social *or* Health] Services,	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

_____

To _____[*name of respondent*]:

Good cause appearing, you are commanded, immediately after receipt of this writ, to set aside your decision made _____[*date*], in the matter entitled _____[*title of fair hearing proceeding*]; or, in the alternative, to appear on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, located at _____[*name of building and street address*], in _____[*city*], California, and then and there to show cause why you have not done so and why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued.
Dated: _____.

Clerk of the Superior Court
By _____ [*signature*]

Deputy
[*seal*]

ORDER

Let the foregoing writ issue.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use in obtaining an alternative writ of mandate from a superior court. Local practice and superior court rules should be consulted on the use of the attached order, since some courts require it, and others require the writ and the order to be prepared separately. See also *§ 527.90*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 527 SOCIAL SERVICES
PART IV. FORMS

46-527 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 527.92

§ 527.92 Class Action Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Declare Regulation Invalid and Petition for Writ of Mandate to Compel Benefit Payments

[1] FORM Class Action Complaint for Declaratory Relief to Declare Regulation Invalid and Petition for Writ of Mandate to Compel Benefit Payments

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*names*],	)	
on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	)	NO. _____
Plaintiffs,	)	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
vs.	)	
_____ [*name(s) and title(s)*],	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiffs allege:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Relief)

1. Plaintiffs _____[*names*] ("Plaintiffs") are _____ [applicants for *or* recipients of *or both*] _____[*name of assistance program*] under Welfare and Institutions Code Sections _____. They reside in _____ County, California.

2. Defendant _____[*name*] ("Defendant") is, and at all times mentioned herein was,

_____ [*specify, e.g.,* the Director of the State Department of Social Services of the State of California], who is authorized under the provisions of Welfare and Institution Code Sections _____ to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* promulgate regulations for the administration of _____ (*name of assistance program*)]. _____[*Allege capacity of other defendants, if any*].

3. Plaintiffs complain on behalf of themselves and all other persons who are _____ [*specify, e.g.,* recipients of assistance under _____ (*name of assistance program*)]. Such members of the class are readily ascertainable from the books and records of _____[*name of department(s) administering assistance program*], but are so numerous as to make joinder impracticable. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented, and the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class.

4. On _____[*date*], Defendant _____[*name*] promulgated Regulation _____, [*specify*] , a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. The regulation, since its promulgation, has been and now is in full force and effect and is enforced by Defendant(s).

5._____[*Allege facts, in consecutively numbered paragraphs, explaining the application of the regulation by defendant(s) to plaintiffs' applications for assistance or to plaintiffs' grants and the effect of the regulation*].

6._____ [*Cite and describe state statute, federal statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision with which regulation must comply, e.g.,* Pursuant to Title 42 of the United States Code Section _____, in determining a recipient's need, the state agency must take into consideration _____ (*specify statutory requirements*)].

7. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiffs and denfendant(s) as to their respective rights and duties. Plaintiffs contend that Regulation _____[*specify*] is invalid and unenforceable for failure to comply with _____[*cite state statute, federal statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision*] in that _____[*specify noncompliance*]. Defendant(s) dispute(s) Plaintiffs' contentions and maintain(s) that regulation _____[*specify*] and its application to Plaintiffs are valid.

8. Plaintiffs desire a judicial determination of their rights and a declaration as to the validity of regulation _____[*specify*]. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time and under the circumstances so that Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights. The enforcement of regulation _____ is causing a burden to Plaintiffs because _____ [*specify, e.g.,* its enforcement results in the reduction of Plaintiffs' monthly assistance grants].

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Peremptory Writ of Mandate)

9. Plaintiffs refer to Paragraphs 1-8, inclusive, of their First Cause of Action and incorporate them herein by reference.

10. Pursuant to _____[*cite state statute, federal statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision*], Defendant(s) _____ [has *or* have] a clear and present duty to _____[*specify requirements of state statute, federal statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision*].

11. Plaintiffs have a clear, present, and substantial right to the performance of this duty because _____ [*describe right, e.g.,* Plaintiffs' monthly grants should be calculated pursuant to the requirements specified above].

12. Plaintiffs have a beneficial interest in the issuance of a writ of mandate in that _____ [*describe interest, e.g.,* the failure of Defendant(s) to comply with _____ (*cite state statute, federal statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision*) has resulted in a reduction of Plaintiffs' monthly grants].

13. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the administrative hearing procedure provided by the Welfare and Institutions Code does not afford class relief].

14. The failure of Defendant(s) to perform the duty described herein has damaged Plaintiffs, in an amount to be determined at trial, because _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Plaintiffs have not received monthly grants in the amount to which they are entitled].

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration that regulation _____[*specify*] is invalid and unenforceable for failure to comply with _____[*cite state statute, federal regulation, or constitutional provision*] in that _____[*specify*];

2. For issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate commanding Defendants to _____ [*specify duty, e.g.,* calculate Plaintiffs' eligibility for assistance and benefit levels in accordance with Title 42 of the United States Code Section _____, which requires that _____ (*describe requirements*)], and pay to Plaintiffs the retroactive benefits wrongfully withheld through the enforcement of regulation _____[*specify*], together with interest thereon;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred herein; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiffs _____ [*names*]

[*Verification. See § 527.90.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use in a class action by welfare applicants or recipients to have a state or county welfare regulation declared invalid and to obtain a writ of mandate to compel the payment of benefits which have been and are being withheld pursuant to the invalid regulation. Local practice regarding mandate proceedings varies. Counsel should therefore check with the superior court clerk regarding local practice in the county in which the writ is sought.

The petition must be accompanied by proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*].

When only a peremptory writ is sought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*, however, the action may be filed and served in the same manner as an ordinary action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*]. In a trial court, proof of service need not accompany such an application at the time of filing, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[3] Caption

Local court rules should be consulted regarding requirements for captions for class actions. For example, all complaints for or against a class party filed in San Francisco Superior Courts are required to include in the caption the designation CLASS ACTION [*see* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 402]. Even if not specifically required, counsel may want to include the words "Class Action" as part of the description of the character of the action or proceeding that must appear below the case number in the caption of any complaint or petition [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(6)*].

[4] Allegations

[a] Class Action

The complaint should allege an ascertainable class and a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 382*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* .

[b] Complaint for Declaratory Relief

After alleging the capacity of the plaintiffs and the defendants (Paragraphs 1, 2), the complaint should allege:

- Facts showing that an actual controversy exists (Paragraphs 4-7), since an action for declaratory relief may be brought only in cases of actual controversy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

- That plaintiffs desire a declaration of their rights and should state why a judicial decree is necessary and appropriate at this time (Paragraph 8) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

For further discussion, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[c] Petition for Writ of Mandate

The petition should allege:

- The duty of the defendants that the plaintiffs seek to have enforced (Paragraph 10).

- The plaintiffs' right to have the duty performed (Paragraph 11).

- The plaintiffs' beneficial interest in the issuance of the writ (Paragraph 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*; *but see Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 145, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* (public right/public duty exception to beneficial interest requirement)].

- Facts showing that the plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law (Paragraph 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

- The damage sustained by the plaintiffs by the defendants' failure to perform the duty described (Paragraph 14) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1095*].

For further discussion, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[5] Verification

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[6] Jurisdiction

Although a writ of mandate may be issued by a superior or an appellate court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*], an original action for declaratory relief must be brought in the superior court as an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 86(a)(7), 1060*].

[7] Statute of Limitations for Ordinary Writ of Mandate

The statute of limitations for an action for a writ of mandate is determined not by the remedy prayed for but by the nature of the underlying right or obligation [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 141 n.10, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256]* . The obligation of a governmental entity to pay welfare benefits pursuant to law is a debt due to the recipient as of the date he or she first became entitled to the benefits [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 141, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256]* . Therefore, since a class action for mandate to recover benefits wrongfully withheld seeks to enforce a liability created by statute, it is subject to a three-year limitations period [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 141 n.10, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*].

[8] Amount of Recovery

A court issuing a writ of mandate has the power to order the retroactive payment of benefits with interest [*Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 677, 685, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749]* .

Each deficient payment constitutes a separate violation triggering the running of a new period of limitations, so that only those payments which accrued within the limitations period preceding the filing of the complaint may be recovered [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 141, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256]* . However, if it is shown that a disproportionate clerical and financial burden would result from an order requiring retroactive payments to a class for the entire period, it is in the discretion of the trial court to fix a more realistic starting date for the payment of retroactive benefits to class members [*Green v. Obledo (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 126, 142, 172 Cal. Rptr. 206, 624 P.2d 256]* .

[9] Award of Attorney's Fees

Although attorney's fees are specifically provided for by statute in a proceeding for administrative mandamus [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 10962*; *see § 527.52*], attorney's fees are not expressly provided for by statute in an ordinary mandamus proceeding [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021* (attorney's fees as matter of agreement)]. However, fees may be available to successful litigants in ordinary mandamus and declaratory relief proceedings under other statutory provisions [*Woods v. Superior Court (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 668, 681, 170 Cal. Rptr. 484, 620 P.2d 1032* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* (fees recoverable when important public interest right is vindicated); *Gov. Code § 800* (fees recoverable against public entity where its action is arbitrary or capricious)].

For further discussion of the right to recovery of attorney's fees, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions* , and Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* , § 174.40 et seq.

[10] Points and Authorities

For a discussion of the submission of a memorandum of points and authorities with a petition for a writ of mandate, see *§ 527.90[9]*.

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to petitions for writs of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*, see California Points and Authorites, ch. 150, *Mandate and Prohibition* (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 528.syn

§ 528.syn Synopsis to Chapter 528: SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

§ 528.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 528.02 Cross References

§§ 528.03-528.09 [Reserved]

§ 528.10 Governing Statutes

§ 528.11 Specific Performance Defined

[1] Equitable Remedy

[2] Quasi-Specific Performance

§ 528.12 Award of Damages Incidental to Specific Performance Decree

[1] In General

[2] Pleading

[3] Calculation of Damages

§ 528.13 Injunctive Relief

[1] In General

[2] Nonprofit Cooperative's Contract With Member

[3] Part Performance

§ 528.13A Effect of Contractual Stipulation for Equitable Relief

§ 528.14 Security for Performance

[1] Scope of Mutuality

[2] Enforcement of Contract Signed by One Party

§ 528.15 Adequacy of Consideration

[1] In General

[2] Waiver of Claim of Inadequacy of Consideration

§ 528.16 Just and Reasonable Contract

[1] In General

[2] Unconscionable Contract

§ 528.17 Mistake, Misapprehension, or Surprise

§ 528.18 Remedy at Law Inadequate

[1] In General

[2] Personal Property

[3] Real Property

§ 528.19 Fraud and Misrepresentation

§ 528.20 Contract Terms Required to Be Certain

[1] In General

[2] Term Subject to Future Agreement

[3] Use of Extrinsic Evidence in Ambiguous Situations

§ 528.21 Performance of Conditions Precedent

[1] In General

[2] When Performance or Tender of Performance Not Required

[a] Repudiation of Contract and Excuses for Nonperformance

[b] Rule Not Applicable to Unilateral Contracts

[3] Time of Performance

§ 528.22 Seller Required to Have Good Title

§§ 528.23through 528.39 [Reserved]

§ 528.40 In General

§ 528.41 Inequitability, Impossibility, and Illegality of Performance

§ 528.42 Penalties and Forfeitures

[1] Denied Specific Enforcement

[2] Determination of Penalty

[3] Enforcement of Contract Imposing Penalty

[4] Relief From Forfeiture

[a] Compensation of Other Party

[b] Partial Performance When Time Is of the Essence

[c] No Reasonable Relation to Damage

§ 528.43 Procuring Act or Consent of Spouse or Third Party

[1] In General

[2] Consent of Partner

§ 528.44 Series of Continuous Acts

§ 528.45 Contracts for Personal Services

[1] Generally Denied Enforcement

[2] Exceptions

[a] Substantially Performed

[b] Inadequate Remedy at Law

[c] Injunctive Relief When Services Have Special Value

[3] Compensation Criteria

[a] Contract Formed Before 1994

[b] Contracts Formed in or After 1994

§ 528.46 Agreement to Make Disposition of Property by Will

§ 528.47 Cooperative Marketing Association Contract

§ 528.48 Contract for Sale of Unique Goods

§ 528.49 Contract for Sale of Corporate Stock

§ 528.50 Agreement to Arbitrate Controversy

§ 528.51 Collective Bargaining Agreements

§ 528.52 Satisfaction of Accord

§ 528.53 Escrow Agreement

§ 528.54 Contract to Convey Patent Rights

§ 528.55 Deed of Trust

§§ 528.56through 528.69 [Reserved]

§ 528.70 Jurisdiction

§ 528.71 Venue

§ 528.72 Statute of Limitations

§ 528.73 Inconsistent Theories of Recovery

§ 528.74 Right to Jury Trial

§§ 528.77through 528.89 [Reserved]

§ 528.90 California Points and Authorities

§ 528.91 State Statutes

[1] Generally

[2] Particular Contracts That Are Specifically Enforceable

[3] Possession of Property

[4] Probate

[5] Reformation

§ 528.92 Decisions

[1] Adequate Consideration

[2] Adequate Remedy at Law

[3] Conditions Precedent

[4] Employment Contracts

[5] Forfeiture

[6] Injunctive Relief

[a] When Injunction Proper

[b] When Injunction Not Proper

[c] Personal Service Contracts

[d] Terms of Contract

[7] Just and Reasonable Contract

[8] Option Contracts

[9] Partnership Agreements

[10] Part Performance Avoiding Statute of Frauds

[11] Penalties

[12] Personal Service Contracts

[13] Procuring Act of Third Party

[14] Quasi-Specific Performance

[a] In General

[a] Joint Wills

[15] Relief Granted by Court

[16] Sale of Corporate Stock

[17] Separation Agreements

[18] Time of Essence

[19] Unavailability of Specific Performance

[20] Uncertain Contract

[21] Waiver

§ 528.93 Law Reviews

§ 528.94 Text References

§§ 528.95through 528.109 [Reserved]

§ 528.110 Plaintiff's Checklist

§ 528.111 Defendant's Checklist of Defenses

§ 528.130 Complaint for Specific Performance of Contract [Civ. Code § 3384]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Essential Allegations

[4] Pleading Certainty of Contract

[5] Pleading Just and Reasonable Contract and Adequacy of Consideration

[6] Exceptions to Pleading Requirement

[7] Pleading Plaintiff's Performance

[8] Excuse For Nonperformance

[9] Pleading Inadequate Remedy at Law

[10] Avoiding Statute of Frauds

[11] Action to Enforce Installment Agreements for Sale of Real Property

[12] Verification

[13] Jurisdiction

[14] Decisions

[a] Adequate Remedy at Law

[b] Principles Governing Relief

[c] Relief Granted by Court

[i] In General

[ii] Attorney's Fees

[iii] Compensation for Delay

[iv] When Specific Performance Is Denied

[d] Right to Jury Trial

[e] Uncertain Contract

[15] Text References

[16] Cross References

§ 528.131 Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Probate Court Jurisdiction

[4] Essential Allegations

[5] Parties

[6] Claim Against Estate

[7] Agreements Made In 1985-2000

[8] Agreements Made After 2000

[9] Lis Pendens

[10] State Statutes

[11] Decisions

[a] Agreements Made Before 1985

[b] Agreements Made in 1985-2000

[12] Text References

[13] Cross References

§ 528.132 Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property--Decedent Revoked Will Made in Compliance With Agreement

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Essential Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Cross References

§ 528.133 Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code §§ 3422, 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]--Enjoining Breach of Personal Services Contract [Civ. Code § 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Essential Allegations

[4] Calculating Required Compensation

[5] Verification

[6] Certification re Notice

[7] Los Angeles County Practice

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

[10] Text References

[11] Cross References

§ 528.134 Affirmative Defense--Contract to Procure Act of Third Person [Civ. Code § 3390(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Text References

§ 528.135 Affirmative Defense--Contract Requires Series of Acts

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Text References

§ 528.136 Affirmative Defense--Contract for Personal Services [Civ. Code § 3390(1), (2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Text References

§ 528.137 Affirmative Defense--Seller's Title in Doubt [Civ. Code § 3394]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

[5] Text References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART I. SCOPE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.01

§ 528.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the basic elements of a cause of action for specific performance and situations in which specific performance will and will not be granted. It contains a general form of complaint for specific performance [*see § 528.130*], including forms of complaint for quasi-specific performance of a contract to make a will [*see §§ 528.131* and *528.132*]. It also contains a form of complaint for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, and permanent injunction enjoining the breach of a personal services contract [*see § 528.133*]. Finally, the chapter includes forms of affirmative defenses for use by a defendant in an action for specific performance [*see §§ 528.134 -528.137*].

For a discussion of the basic elements of contract law, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* . For a discussion and forms for use in obtaining specific performance of a contract for the sale of goods, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART I. SCOPE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.02

§ 528.02 Cross References

For a complaint for specific performance to compel satisfaction of an accord, see Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction* .

For a complaint for specific performance of a contract to sell shares representing control of a corporation, see *Ch. 163, Corporations: Transfers of Shares, § 163.33*.

For a complaint by a corporation seeking specific performance of an option agreement to resell shares being held by a key employee whose employment has been terminated, and to obtain a preliminary injunction restraining the former employee from disposing of the shares in violation of the agreement, see *Ch. 163, Corporations: Transfers of Shares, § 163.34*.

For complaints for specific performance of options in leases, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy* .

For complaints to enjoin breach of a contract for artistic services executed during an artist's minority and for injunctive relief by a motion picture corporation against an actor and a competing motion picture corporation to enjoin breach of contract when contract for artistic services was executed during the actor's minority and approved by superior court, see Ch. 365, *Minors: Contract Actions* .

For a complaint for use by a partner against a former partner when the former partner breached an agreement not to compete, see ch. 406, *Partnerships: Dissolution*, § 406.06.

For forms for ordering conveyance of real property to complete sale on a contract entered into by a since-deceased person, see Ch. 456, *Probate: Management of Assets* .

For discussion of the operation of the statute of frauds in an action for specific performance, see Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

For a complaint for specific performance of provisions of a deed of trust, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

For discussion and forms relating to the imposition of constructive trusts, see Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* .

For forms to obtain injunctive relief to enjoin unfair interference with business relations by a former employee, to restrain unfair interference with business relations, to restrain selling below cost to eliminate competition, and to restrain a retailer from selling a commodity below its fair trade price, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

For forms to compel specific performance of contracts for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsShareholdersTransfers of SharesCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART I. SCOPE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 528.03-528.09

[Reserved]

§§ 528.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Overview

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.10

§ 528.10 Governing Statutes

The specific performance of obligations is governed by *Civ. Code §§ 3384-3395*. Preventive relief by injunction, including injunctions to prevent the breach of an obligation, are governed by *Civ. Code §§ 3420-3423* and *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawDeedsRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Overview

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.11

§ 528.11 Specific Performance Defined

[1] Equitable Remedy

Specific performance is an equitable action [*Schaefer v. United Bank & Trust Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 635, 641, 286 P. 723]* to procure the performance of a contract by the defendant [*Patterson v. Reddish (1922) 56 Cal. App. 197, 202, 204 P. 565]* . The specific performance of a contract may be compelled except when provided otherwise in *Civ. Code §§ 3384-3395* [*Civ. Code § 3384*].

An action for specific performance of a contract is usually by the buyer against the seller in situations involving a sale, although the remedy is technically available to the seller as well [*see Civ. Code § 3387*; *Laske v. Lampasona (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 284, 287-288, 200 P.2d 871* ; *see also Goldsworthy v. Dobbins (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 802, 808, 243 P.2d 883* (antideficiency statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*] does not prohibit remedy of specific performance to seller of real property)]. However, when the property involved has already been transferred to a buyer who has not paid the purchase price, the results of an action for specific performance and an action for damages are essentially the same--a judgment for the purchase price [*see* Powell on Real Property, Ch. 84, *Inter Vivos Transfer of Land Otherwise Than by Deed*, § 932 (Matthew Bender); California Real Property Sales Transactions, § 12.48 (Cal. C.E.B. 1981)].

[2] Quasi-Specific Performance

An action for quasi-specific performance is an action for the specific performance of a contract between a deceased person and the plaintiff. It is not truly for specific performance since a deceased person cannot be compelled to execute a contract. However, if the court determines that the plaintiff is entitled to receive what was promised in the contract, the court may declare a constructive trust on the property in the hands of those who have succeeded to the estate. This is the equivalent of specific performance since it accomplishes the result of enforcement of the contract [*Estate of Brenzikofer v. Schwartz (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1467, 57 Cal. Rptr.2d 401* ; *Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 130, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415* ; *Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 472, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173]* . Equitable relief in the form of quasi-specific performance is not available, however, if the plaintiff has an adequate legal remedy [*see, e.g., Wilkison v. Wiederkehr (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-833, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631* (plaintiff could not maintain action for quasi-specific performance--seeking to impose constructive trust on proceeds of

home sale--when he had claim for damages for breach of written agreement to bequeath property)].

Although the relief in a quasi-specific performance action differs from that in a traditional specific performance action, the requisites for relief are identical [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 473, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* ; *see § 528.14* et seq.].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Overview

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.12

§ 528.12 Award of Damages Incidental to Specific Performance Decree

[1] In General

When a person has a cause of action for specific performance, damages incidental to the specific performance decree, such as damages for delay in performance, may be awarded [*see Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 219, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* . For example, a party to a contract for the purchase or exchange of land who is entitled to a decree of specific performance is also ordinarily entitled to a judgment for the rents and profits from the time the party was entitled to a conveyance [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 219, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* . The amount awarded is, in reality, a form of compensation due the buyer for loss incurred because of the delay in receiving title [*Greenstone v. Claretian Theological Seminary (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 29, 343 P.2d 161 , disapproved on other grounds, Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* .

A court cannot award incidental damages, however, unless a cause of action for specific performance has been established [*Paratore v. Perry (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 384, 388, 48 Cal. Rptr. 682* ; *Rose v. Lawton (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 29 Cal. Rptr. 844]* .

Confusion has existed in the area of incidental damages because of the informal use of the term "damages" in connection with such an award. Compensation, however, neither constitutes damages as contemplated in an action for breach of contract, nor implies legal damages. The award of incidental damages is based on the theory that a court of equity, once it obtains jurisdiction of an action for specific performance, should adjust the rights of the parties and equalize any losses occasioned by the delay by offsetting them with money payments [*Greenstone v. Claretian Theological Seminary (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 29, 343 P.2d 161 , disapproved on other grounds, Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* .

[2] Pleading

No specific pleading appears necessary to implement enforcement of the contract and to allow the award of incidental damages in addition to the prayer for specific performance and the general prayer "for such other and further relief as the court may deem just" [*Greenstone v. Claretian Theological Seminary (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 32, 343 P.2d*

161 , disapproved on other grounds, Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206] .

[3] Calculation of Damages

The guiding principle in calculating damages incident to the decree of specific performance is relation of the performance back to the date set in the contract. Thus, since timely performance of a contract for the sale of real property would result in the buyer's receiving the rents and profits of the land but losing the use of the purchase money, a buyer who seeks to recover rents and profits must permit an offset for his or her use of the purchase funds during the period that performance was delayed [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 220, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7* (trial court erred in not permitting offset of interest against profits); *Addiego v. Hill (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 453, 461, 95 Cal. Rptr. 151]* . Interest is offset only against the accumulating profits that the purchaser acquires with his or her purchase. Consequently, when the contract is for the sale of corporate stock, any adjustment to the purchase price to offset interest on sums retained by the purchasers of the stock during the pendency of an appeal should not exceed the increase in the proportionate net worth of the corporation attributable to the stock in question by reason of the business transacted by the corporation during that period [*Addiego v. Hill (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 453, 462, 95 Cal. Rptr. 151]* . An offset of interest against profits is not permitted when the purchaser, with notice to the seller, has set aside money toward the purchase price in such a manner as to realize no use or benefit from it [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 221, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* .

When a seller is awarded specific performance, the seller is only entitled to the purchase price, plus interest. Damages for operating losses and loss of income while obtaining specific performance are not recoverable [*BD Inns v. Pooley (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 289, 295-296, 266 Cal. Rptr. 815]* .

For further discussion of the computation of damages, see *Ch. 569, Vendor and Purchaser, § 569.10* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesSpecial DamagesContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesIncidental DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Overview

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.13

§ 528.13 Injunctive Relief

[1] In General

Specific performance is generally granted to compel the performance of an affirmative obligation in a contract. When the obligation is negative, an agreement not to do something, an injunction may be granted [*see Long Beach Drug Co. v. United Drug Co. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 158, 170-171, 89 P.2d 386* ; *Smith v. Mendonsa (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 540, 542-544, 238 P.2d 1039]* . An injunction can also be granted to prevent the breach of an affirmative obligation. In the latter situation, injunctive relief is very similar to granting specific performance of the contract [*see* Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, §§ 308-311 (4th ed. 1997)].

An injunction, however, cannot be granted except in certain limited situations to prevent the breach of a contract which is not specifically enforceable [*Civ. Code § 3423(5)*; *Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*; *Steinmeyer v. Warner Cons. Corp. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 515, 519, 116 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; see discussion in *§ 528.45[1]*; but see discussion in *§ 528.13[1]*].

Even when a contract contains both affirmative and negative stipulations, equity will not interfere to prevent a breach of the negative covenant when the affirmative covenant is of such a nature that it cannot be specifically enforced by a judicial decree. Although this doctrine is contrary to the rule of the Restatement of Contracts, § 380, it is the settled law of California because of the express statutory provisions of *Civ. Code § 3423* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* [*Long Beach Drug Co. v. United Drug Co. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 158, 168-169, 89 P.2d 386* ; *Anderson v. Neal Institutes Co. (1918) 37 Cal. App. 174, 178-179, 173 P. 779]* .

[2] Nonprofit Cooperative's Contract With Member

An exception to the rule that an injunction cannot be granted to prevent breach of a contract that is not specifically enforceable allows the granting of an injunction to prevent the breach of a contract entered into between any nonprofit cooperative corporation or association and one of its members or stockholders with respect to any provision regarding the sale or delivery to the corporation or association of the products produced or acquired by the member or stockholder [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*].

[3] Part Performance

If the plaintiff has altered his or her position so that the denial of specific performance would operate as a fraud on the plaintiff, equity will regard plaintiff's past performance as a substantial performance and indirectly decree specific performance by defendant by enjoining him or her from breaching the contract [Poultry Producers etc. v. *Barlow (1922) 189 Cal. 278, 294, 208 P. 93]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Overview

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.13A

§ 528.13A Effect of Contractual Stipulation for Equitable Relief

As a general matter, if the parties have stipulated in the contract as to the nature or amount of a remedy, it is proper for the trial court to honor the parties' agreement unless the court finds that to do so would be contrary to a rule of law or public policy. In determining the lawfulness of a stipulation that contemplates an equitable remedy, the court should take into account the special nature of equitable remedies. Given their extraordinary nature, equitable remedies are usually unavailable when the remedy at law is adequate, as when damages are quantifiable. A court must reject a stipulation contemplating an equitable remedy that is contrary to law or public policy, as in a case in which the evidence shows that an aggrieved party actually has an adequate remedy at law; otherwise, the court should honor the parties' agreement and enforce the stipulation [*DVD Copy Control Assn. v. Kaleidescape, Inc. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 697, 725726, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 856]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.14

§ 528.14 Security for Performance

[1] Scope of Mutuality

Under former California law, neither party to an obligation could be compelled specifically to perform it unless the other party thereto had performed, or could be compelled specifically to perform, everything to which the former was entitled under the same obligation, either completely or nearly so [*see* former *Civ. Code § 3386* as enacted in 1872]. Over the years, this doctrine of mutuality of remedy was so qualified as to be of little, if any, value. Many authorities noted that the only important consideration in deciding to grant specific performance was whether or not the court of equity in which the case was brought was able to assure that the defendant would receive the agreed performance from the plaintiff [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 215, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* . Consequently, *Civ. Code § 3386* was amended in 1969 to provide that a court may compel specific performance, even though the agreed counterperformance is not, or would not have been, specifically enforceable, if (1) specific performance would otherwise be an appropriate remedy; and (2) the agreed counterperformance has been substantially performed or its concurrent or future performance is assured or, if the court considers it necessary, can be secured to the court's satisfaction [*see* *Bleecher v. Conte (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 345, 352-353, 173 Cal. Rptr. 278, 626 P.2d 1051* (seller's waiver of right to specific performance in liquidated damages clause did not preclude buyers from compelling specific performance of land-sale agreement); Rest Contracts, §§ 372, 373].

[2] Enforcement of Contract Signed by One Party

A party who has signed a written contract may be compelled specifically to perform it although the other party has not signed the contract, if the latter has performed it, or offers to perform it, on his or her part, and the case is otherwise proper for enforcing specific performance [*Civ. Code § 3388*].

The requirement of security for performance is satisfied when the non-signing plaintiff brings suit since by suing the plaintiff binds himself or herself to abide by the court's decree and empowers the court to decree specific performance against him or her. The commencement of the action is his or her offer to perform [*Harper v. Goldschmidt (1909) 156 Cal. 245, 251, 104 P. 451* ; *Riverside Fence Co. v. Novak (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 656, 664, 78 Cal. Rptr. 536* (option contract to sell real property)]. Although these cases were decided prior to the 1969 amendment of *Civ. Code § 3388*

which deleted the mutuality of remedy requirement and substituted a security for performance requirement, the cases should still be applicable since, by bringing suit, the plaintiff's performance can be ensured.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationMutual ObligationContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.15

§ 528.15 Adequacy of Consideration

[1] In General

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to a contract unless the party has received adequate consideration for the contract [*Civ. Code § 3391(1)*; [*Drullinger v. Erskine (1945) 71 Cal. App. 2d 492, 495, 163 P.2d 48* (option contract to purchase real property)]. Inadequacy of consideration is in itself sufficient to deny the granting of specific performance [*Cornblith v. Valentine (1930) 211 Cal. 243, 246, 294 P. 1065* (consideration as inadequate for agreement to exchange real property when plaintiff's equity had value of $4,100 and defendant's equity had value of *$6,200); Paratore v. Perry (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 384, 387-388, 48 Cal. Rptr. 682* (consideration inadequate when property worth $50,000 sold for $36,000)].

Adequate consideration, as used in *Civ. Code § 3391*, does not necessarily mean the highest price obtainable, but a price that is fair and reasonable under all the circumstances [*Chalmers v. Raras (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 682, 689, 19 Cal. Rptr. 531* ; *Cushing v. Levi (1931) 117 Cal. App. 94, 100-101, 3 P.2d 958]* . Moreover, adequacy of consideration does not mean equality of price or a consideration measuring the value of the property to the fullest extent [*Schader v. White (1916) 173 Cal. 441, 446, 160 P. 557* (consideration adequate when total value of property involved was $20,000 and disparity in value of respective properties was $1,000)]. In determining adequacy of consideration, the relationship of the parties and their love, affection, and regard for each other, as well as the object to be attained by the contract, must be considered, insofar as these factors amount to consideration [*Johnson v. Servaes (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 392, 402, 26 Cal. Rptr. 733* ; see *Berkeley Lawn Bowling Club v. City of Berkeley (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 280, 290, 116 Cal. Rptr. 762]* .

The adequacy of the consideration in an action for specific performance is a question of fact for the trial court and should be left to the trial court's discretion if it is substantially supported by the evidence [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 475, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* ; *Ferguson v. Fajardo (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 119, 123, 27 Cal. Rptr. 72]* .

[2] Waiver of Claim of Inadequacy of Consideration

The acceptance of the agreed consideration is a waiver of any claim of inadequacy and hence a waiver of any cause of action for specific performance [*Peters v. Binnard (1933) 219 Cal. 141, 150, 25 P.2d 834* (inadequate consideration claim waived when parties who wanted to purchase notes enjoyed benefits of another person's efforts in obtaining notes at agreed price but refused to pay that party for money he advanced); *Westwood Temple v. Emanuel Center (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 755, 759, 221 P.2d 146* (dismissal of action brought for declaration of rights of parties valid consideration and acceptance of dismissal waiver of claim of inadequacy of consideration)]. However, the mere giving of a check does not ordinarily constitute payment nor does the mere acceptance thereof raise a presumption that such acceptance constitutes payment. A check is not payment until cashed; a party attempting to prove payment by mere delivery or acceptance must in addition prove that it was agreed that such delivery and acceptance was to be accepted as payment [*Mendiondo v. Greitman (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 765, 767, 209 P.2d 817]* . The parties, however, can make an agreement that acceptance of a check constitutes payment, which obviates the rule stated above [*Beazell v. Kane (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 593, 596, 274 P.2d 224]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationAdequate ConsiderationContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFailure of ConsiderationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.16

§ 528.16 Just and Reasonable Contract

[1] In General

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to a contract if the contract is not just and reasonable as to that party [*Civ. Code § 3391(2)*; *Berkeley Lawn Bowling Club v. City of Berkeley (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 280, 290, 116 Cal. Rptr. 762]* . Consequently, equity will not enforce a contract which on its face is so manifestly harsh and oppressive as to shock the conscience. Specific performance will be refused when a contract is unfair, one-sided, unconscionable, or affected by any other inequitable feature, and when specific enforcement would be oppressive on the defendant, would prevent the enjoyment of his or her own rights, or would work injustice in any other manner [*Jacklich v. Baer (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 684, 693, 135 P.2d 179* (contract unfair and unreasonable since defendant was required to pay plaintiffs 15 percent of net proceeds from defendant's boxing contests until $13,500 was paid and 10 percent thereafter for five years, plaintiffs received almost $33,500, and plaintiffs could extend contract for five more years for $5)].

A challenge on the basis that the contract is not just and reasonable as to the defendant must be considered in view of the entire circumstances, including the object to be obtained by the contract and the relationship of the parties [*Berkeley Lawn Bowling Club v. Berkeley (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 280, 290, 116 Cal. Rptr. 762]* .

Fairness and reasonableness is determined from the circumstances that existed at the time the contract was made. Thus, a mere change of circumstances that makes performance more difficult or more expensive is not a bar to specific performance of the contract [*Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 582, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665]* . A prenuptial agreement under which the surviving spouse was to receive a life estate in decedent's residence was enforced despite the fact the decedent died unexpectedly a few months after the couple was married. The prenuptial agreement was fair and reasonable at the time it was made because at that time, the couple surely anticipated more time together than the few months they enjoyed [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 588, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773]* .

[2] Unconscionable Contract

California has recently enacted an unconscionable contract provision that is almost identical to that of the Uniform

Commercial Code [*see Civ. Code § 1670.5*; U.C.C. § 2-302]. However, since the Legislature put Section 1670.5 in the Civil Code, it apparently applies to all contracts, not just to contracts for the sale of goods.

Under this provision, if a court finds, as a matter of law, that a contract or any clause of the contract was unconscionable at the time it was made, it may refuse to enforce the contract, may enforce the remainder of the contract without the unconscionable clause, may so limit the application of any unconscionable clause as to avoid any unconscionable result [*Civ. Code § 1670.5(a)*]. The basic test is whether or not, in the light of the general background and the needs of the particular case, the clauses involved are so one-sided as to be unconscionable under the circumstances existing at the time of the making of the contract [Assembly Legislative Committee Comment to *Civ. Code § 1670.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUnconscionabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.17

§ 528.17 Mistake, Misapprehension, or Surprise

A contract will not be specifically enforced if the defendant's assent was given under the influence of mistake, misapprehension, or surprise, except that when the contract provides for compensation in case of mistake, in which case a mistake within the scope of the provision may be compensated for, and the contract specifically enforced in other respects, if such enforcement is proper [*Civ. Code § 3391(4)*; *Cornblith v. Valentine (1930) 211 Cal. 243, 247, 294 P. 1065* ; *Cavalieri v. Hess (1928) 205 Cal. 703, 706, 272 P. 295* (specific performance not granted when there is mutual mistake as to legal description of lands to be sold); *Loeb v. Wilson (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 383, 389, 61 Cal. Rptr. 377* (specific performance denied when seller's assent to contract was vitiated by her mistake of fact with respect to nature of her interest in property); for further discussion of mistake in contractual situations, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityMistakeReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.18

§ 528.18 Remedy at Law Inadequate

[1] In General

Specific performance will be decreed only when no other adequate relief is available to the plaintiff. Equity will not assume jurisdiction when the plaintiff may be adequately compensated in money [*Morrison v. Land (1915) 169 Cal. 580, 586, 147 P. 259* ; *see* *Palo Alto-Menlo Park Yellow Cab Co. v. Santa Clara County Transit Dist. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 121, 133, 135 Cal. Rptr. 192* ; see also *Wilkison v. Wiederkehr (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-833, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631* (plaintiff could not maintain action for quasi-specific performance when he had adequate legal remedy in form of claim for damages)]. The question, in determining the adequacy of plaintiff's remedy at law, is not whether he or she has some remedy at law apart from the contract, but whether the remedy at law on the contract itself is sufficient [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 474, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* ; *see* discussion in *§ 528.45[2][b]*].

[2] Personal Property

The general rule is that equity will not decree the specific performance of contracts relating to personal property when the articles concerned do not have a quality which gives them special value to the contracting party and when the recovery of damages will enable the plaintiff to purchase others in the market of like kind and quality. Thus a presumption prevails in the case of contracts for the transfer of personalty that money damages will provide adequate compensation for a breach. However, this presumption is rebuttable, and when the articles are of such a rare or sentimental value that they cannot be duplicated, specific performance may be granted [*Wehen v. Lundgaard (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 610, 613, 107 P.2d 491* ; *see* *Gilfallan v. Gilfallan (1914) 168 Cal. 23, 25, 141 P. 623* (allegations in complaint for specific performance of contract to sell plaintiff oil company stock as sufficient against demurrer when stock had no fixed, ascertainable market value and would have no such value until oil was discovered); *Com. Code § 2716(1)* (specific performance permitted when goods are unique and in other proper circumstances); for discussion of *Com. Code § 2716(1), see* Ch. 501, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*].

If part of the subject matter of the contract consists of land and the other part consists of personal property, specific performance of the entire contract may be decreed even though compensation in money would be an adequate remedy

for the promisor's failure to perform that part of the contract calling for the transfer of ordinary chattels [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 473, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173]* .

[3] Real Property

There is a presumption that the breach of an agreement to transfer real property cannot be adequately relieved by monetary damages. In the case of a single-family dwelling that the buyer intends to occupy, the presumption is conclusive. In all other cases, the presumption affects the burden of proof [*Civ. Code § 3387*]. By establishing a rebuttable presumption with respect to property other than a single-family dwelling, the Legislature left open the possibility that damages can be an adequate remedy for breach of a real estate contract. The rebuttable presumption shifts the burden of proof to the breaching party to prove the adequacy of damages. Thus, the Legislature intended that a damages remedy for a nonbreaching party to a commercial real estate contract is the exception rather than the rule [*Real Estate Analytics, LLC v. Vallas (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 463, 474, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 835* (seller, who was breaching party, did not overcome presumption against adequacy of damages merely by showing that buyer's purpose in acquiring property was to earn profits from developing or reselling it)].

Civ. Code § 3307, which specifies the detriment caused by breach of a real property contract and allows a seller to recover consequential damages and interest, does not eliminate the seller's ability to seek specific performance. The seller has a choice of remedies, and may pursue damages or specific performance [*BD Inns v. Pooley (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 289, 295-296, 266 Cal. Rptr. 815]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityAdequate Remedy at LawContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.19

§ 528.19 Fraud and Misrepresentation

A contract cannot be specifically enforced against a party if that party's assent was obtained by the misrepresentation, concealment, circumvention, or unfair practices of any party to whom performance would become due under the contract or by any promise of that party that has not been substantially fulfilled [*Civ. Code § 3391(3)*; *Cornblith v. Valentine (1930) 211 Cal. 243, 247, 294 P. 1065* (specific performance of agreement to exchange equities in properties denied when defendants had been induced to enter agreement because of false and fraudulent representations knowingly made by plaintiff that plaintiff's equity was equal in value to defendants', that plaintiff would convey to defendants all furniture in one house, and that designated mortgage was only encumbrance against plaintiff's property); *Boas v. Bank of America (1942) 51 Cal. App. 2d 592, 597, 125 P.2d 620* (specific performance refused if plaintiff's conduct in obtaining contract or acting under it has been unconscientious, inequitable, or characterized by bad faith); for further discussion of fraud in contractual situations and for related forms, *see* Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*].

The misrepresentation does not need to cause damage. When an intentional misrepresentation is made for the purpose of deceiving the defendant and is relied on by the defendant, who was deceived by the misrepresentation and who would not have entered into the contract but for the fact of the deceit, the fraud is a defense to an action for specific performance. A misrepresentation is considered material by an equitable court although not accompanied by damage [*Kelly v. Central Pac. R.R. Co. (1888) 74 Cal. 557, 561, 16 P. 386* (specific performance of contract in which railroad agreed to convey land to plaintiff denied since agent conveyed land because plaintiff had claimed that he had settled on land when in fact he had not done so and when land was being settled by another party, which plaintiff knew); Restatement of Contracts § 367 comment a]. Even if the defendant had the means and opportunity to detect the fraud by the exercise of ordinary prudence, a court of equity will not enforce a contract obtained by fraud [*Brandt v. Krogh (1910) 14 Cal. App. 39, 51, 111 P. 275* (executory contract)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal

Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.20

§ 528.20 Contract Terms Required to Be Certain

[1] In General

A contract cannot be specifically enforced if the terms of the contract are not sufficiently certain to make the precise act which is to be done clearly ascertainable [*Civ. Code § 3390(5)*; *Crail v. Blakely (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 744, 753-754, 8 Cal. 3d 744, 754, 106 Cal. Rptr. 187, 505 P.2d 1027* ; *Carlson v. Richardson (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 204, 206-207, 72 Cal. Rptr. 769* (agreement to convey realty incomplete if it lacks definite description of land to be conveyed)]. Many courts have stated that the material terms of a contract must be significantly more certain when a plaintiff demands the remedy of specific performance than when he or she seeks the traditional legal remedy of damages [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 636, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52* ; *see Long Beach Drug Co. v. United Drug Co. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 158, 164, 89 P.2d 386]* .

In determining whether the material terms of the contract are sufficiently certain for the contract to be specifically enforced, the modern trend of the law is to favor the enforcement of contracts, to lean against their unenforceability because of uncertainty, and to carry out the intentions of the parties if this can feasibly be done. Neither law nor equity requires that every term and condition of an agreement be set forth in contract. The usual and reasonable terms found in similar contracts can be looked to, unexpressed provisions of the contract may be inferred from the writing, external facts may be relied on, and custom and usage or other extrinsic evidence may be resorted to in an effort to supply a deficiency if it does not alter or vary the terms of the agreement [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 641, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52* ; *Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 819, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *see King v. Stanley (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 584, 588-589, 197 P.2d 321* , *disapproved on other grounds, Patel v. Liebermensch (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 344, 351 n.4, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366, 197 P.3d 177* (in contract for sale of property, only four terms are essential: who is seller, what property is being sold, who is buyer, and what is price)]. For example, a court has held that a contract was not fatally uncertain although the contract did not articulate the precise definition of qualified subcontractors or the exact number of bids to be taken, thus making the pricing mechanism uncertain. The court stated that the custom, usage, and trade within the real estate development industry and other relevant extrinsic evidence could be looked at to determine the requisite factors [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 644, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52]* .

Moreover, the fact that a contract does not indicate the time for performance does not necessarily render the contract so uncertain that it cannot be specifically enforced. When a person promises to will property to another individual in exchange for services of a peculiar nature involving the assumption of or continuation of a close family relationship, but dies without executing the will, although in such situations the contract generally does not specify a certain time for the promisor's performance, the courts will nonetheless decree quasi-specific performance by impressing a constructive trust on the particular property in favor of the promisee if the contract is otherwise specifically enforceable [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 477, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173]* . Specific performance should be refused only when extrinsic evidence fails to remove any ambiguity or uncertainty [*Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 819, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *Crescenta Valley Moose Lodge v. Bunt (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 682, 689, 87 Cal. Rptr. 428]* .

Only when the uncertainty or incompleteness of a contract prevents the court from knowing what to enforce does the defense of uncertainty have rationality [*Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 477, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173]* .

Moreover, the fact that part of a contract is not sufficiently certain for specific performance does not require a court to in validate the entire agreement. The court can order specific performance of the certain or definite part of the contract [*Lawrence v. Shutt (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 749, 763, 75 Cal. Rptr. 533]* .

However, a party to a contract cannot erase uncertainty from the contract by waiving the uncertain clause or term and thereby restore its contractual validity [*White Point Co. v. Herrington (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 469, 73 Cal. Rptr. 885]* , although a contracting party may waive provisions placed in a contract solely for the party's benefit [*Doryon v. Salant (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 706, 712, 142 Cal. Rptr. 378* (plaintiffs waived any condition precedent to performance and defendants were contractually assured of obtaining full purchase price in cash when plaintiffs obtained $51,000 loan although their offer was subject to obtaining $52,000 loan)].

[2] Term Subject to Future Agreement

When an important item is reserved for the future agreement of both parties, however, the promise generally cannot give rise to a legal obligation until the parties reach the agreement. Since either party, by the very terms of the promise, may refuse to agree to anything to which the other party will agree, it is impossible for the law to affix any obligation to such a promise [*White Point Co. v. Herrington (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 468, 73 Cal. Rptr. 885* ; *Magna Dev. Co. v. Reed (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 230, 238, 39 Cal. Rptr. 284]* . However, when the contract provides for an objective method of ascertaining the term left to future agreement, such as the price, the contract will not be construed as too indefinite to enforce [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 643, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52]* . Conduct of the parties in performing under the agreement before the controversy arose may provide an objective indication of what the parties intended as performance of the terms left for future agreement [*see* *Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 819-820, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220* (investment agreement providing that plaintiff could participate in future restaurants "in a manner mutually agreeable in the same ratio which we currently hold stock")].

[3] Use of Extrinsic Evidence in Ambiguous Situations

Specific performance should be refused only when extrinsic evidence fails to remove any ambiguity or uncertainty [*Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 819, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *Crescenta Valley Moose Lodge v. Bunt (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 682, 689, 87 Cal. Rptr. 428]* . Conduct of the parties in performing under the agreement before the controversy arose is one type of extrinsic evidence that may be considered [*Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 819-820, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220]* .

Parol evidence and extrinsic evidence concerning custom and usage are properly admissible to clarify otherwise ambiguous terms [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 645, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52]* .

The evidence is admissible to identify the subject matter of the contract from the written description, explain the meaning of ambiguous, abstruse, or technical expressions, and assist in interpreting the expressed intentions of the parties in the light of circumstances existing at the time of execution [*United Truckmen, Inc. v. Lorentz (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 26, 34, 249 P.2d 352]* . Even when the contract is uncertain as to the precise act to be done, extrinsic evidence is admissible to determine what the parties intended. Only when the extrinsic evidence fails to remove the ambiguity is specific performance refused [*Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 645, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52* ; *Crescenta Valley Moose Lodge v. Bunt (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 682, 689, 87 Cal. Rptr. 428* (extrinsic evidence admissible even when uncertainty extends to precise act to be done); *White Point Co. v. Herrington (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 468, 73 Cal. Rptr. 885* (ambiguous contract not specifically enforceable when parol evidence fails to remove ambiguity)].

However, although custom is admissible for the purpose of interpreting the contract or agreement of the parties, or for furnishing details not expressly covered thereby, it is not admissible to establish a contract [*White Point Co. v. Herrington (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 468, 73 Cal. Rptr. 885]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawFormationDefinite TermsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.21

§ 528.21 Performance of Conditions Precedent

[1] In General

A condition precedent is one which is to be performed before some right dependent thereon accrues, or some act dependent thereon is performed [*Civ. Code § 1436*; for further discussion, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. Specific performance cannot be enforced in favor of a party who has not fully and fairly performed all the conditions precedent on that party's part to the obligation of the other party, except when the party's failure to perform is only partial and either entirely immaterial or capable of being fully compensated, in which case specific performance may be compelled on full compensation being made for the default [*Civ. Code § 3392*; *Crail v. Blakely (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 744, 754, 106 Cal. Rptr. 187, 505 P.2d 1027* ; *Lifton v. Harshman (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 422, 433-434, 182 P.2d 222* , *disapproved on other grounds*, *Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 326 P.2d 135* ; for discussion of pleading requirements, *see* Comments to § 528.130].

Often one party's approval of the documents, or in real estate transactions, of preliminary title reports and inspections, will be a condition precedent to that party's performance [*see, e.g.*, *Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 205, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569* (seller's failure to deliver transfer disclosure statement--a nonwaivable condition precedent to buyer's duty to perform in sale covered by *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*--precluded action against buyer for specific performance and breach of contract)]. If the party whose approval is required expressly and unequivocally disapproves, the contract is terminated and cannot be revived by later "waiver" of the condition [*Beverly Way Associates v. Barham (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 49, 51, 56, 276 Cal. Rptr. 240]* .

[2] When Performance or Tender of Performance Not Required

[a] Repudiation of Contract and Excuses for Nonperformance

When a party unequivocally repudiates a contract and indicates that he or she is not bound thereby, a tender of performance is unnecessary since the law does not require the performance of an idle act. A formal tender of performance is excused by the refusal in advance of the party to accept the performance owing [*Beverage v. Canton Placer Mining Co. (1955) 43 Cal. 2d 769, 777, 278 P.2d 694* ; *Greenstone v. Claretian Theological Seminary (1959)*

173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 33, 343 P.2d 161 , disapproved on other grounds, Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7 ; *see Kossler v. Palm Springs Developments, Ltd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 88, 102, 161 Cal. Rptr. 423]* . In these circumstances, commencement of an action for specific performance in itself constitutes sufficient demand for performance [*Heinlen v. Martin (1879) 53 Cal. 321, 345-346* ; *Greenstone v. Claretian Theological Seminary (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 33, 343 P.2d 161 , disapproved on other grounds, Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* .

Additionally, under the terms of *Civ. Code § 1511* (excuses for nonperformance of contract), plaintiff's performance or tender is excused if it was prevented by defendant's conduct [*see Towne Dev. Co. v. Lee (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 147, 152, 45 Cal. Rptr. 316, 403 P.2d 724* (plaintiff excused from performing when it attempted to tender money but could not do so because escrow company had gone out of business and defendant suggested that parties go to different escrow company but agreed to wait until rezoning report was received before opening another escrow)].

Thus an incomplete performance is not a defense to an action for specific performance when there has been substantial performance and full performance was prevented by the other party [*Ambrose v. Alioto (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 362, 369, 150 P.2d 502* (plaintiff substantially performed and defendant prevented full performance when master of boat had operated it as required but defendant discharged him, preventing him from making enough profits with boat to pay off debts)].

[b] Rule Not Applicable to Unilateral Contracts

The rule that repudiation of an executory contract by one party relieves the corresponding obligor from the necessity of tendering performance as a prerequisite of maintaining a suit to enforce specific performance does not apply to unilateral contracts. Until the plaintiff accepts the offer, there is no contract obligating him or her in any way. Plaintiff can signify acceptance only in accordance with the terms of the contract and subject to all, not part, of the conditions imposed by the contract [*Marsh v. Lott (1908) 8 Cal. App. 384, 393-394, 97 P. 163]* .

[3] Time of Performance

The general rule in equity is that time is not of the essence unless it is made so by express terms or is necessarily so from the nature of the contract [*Katemis v. Westerlind (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 799, 804, 299 P.2d 383* ; *see Civ. Code § 1492*]. Valuable contractual rights should not be surrendered or forfeitures suffered by a slight delay in performance unless such an intention clearly appears from the contract, when specific enforcement will work an injustice after a delayed tender, or when delay is inexcusable [*Katemis v. Westerlind (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 537, 541-542, 543, 261 P.2d 553* (plaintiffs as entitled to bring action for specific performance although their check for remainder of purchase price for real property arrived late when it arrived Monday after Saturday it was due and escrow office was closed on due date); *see Becker v. Becker (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 324, 327, 223 P.2d 479]* . When the contract shows time was not deemed to be of the essence, equity may decree specific performance although the act was done after the date fixed in the contract [*Katemis v. Westerlind (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 799, 807, 299 P.2d 383* (time as not of essence when contact provides for performance within reasonable time)].

When time is expressly made of the essence, a delay which is not considered excusable in an action for damages at law will also prevent an action for specific performance in equity, except that equity gives relief if the result would otherwise be a severe forfeiture. Relief from forfeiture is justified when defendant would receive all the advantages of plaintiff's performance, without suffering any damage because of the delay, whereas plaintiff would lose all consideration for the work done and costs paid by him or her [*Selby v. Battley (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 659, 663-664, 309 P.2d 120]* .

Even when time is of the essence of a contract, the provision with respect to time may be waived by the parties' conduct [*Pease v. Brown (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 425, 428, 8 Cal. Rptr. 917* (sellers as acquiescing in buyers' delay in

depositing purchase price)].

When a specified time for performance has been waived by a party, that party must, in order to put the other in default, not only give notice that strict compliance will thereafter be required but must allow the other party a reasonable time within which to perform [*Kossler v. Palm Springs Developments, Ltd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 88, 98, 161 Cal. Rptr. 423]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsExpress ConditionsTime LimitationsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.22

§ 528.22 Seller Required to Have Good Title

An agreement for the sale of property cannot be specifically enforced in favor of a seller who cannot give to the buyer a title free from reasonable doubt [*Civ. Code § 3394*; *King v. Stanley (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 584, 589-590, 197 P.2d 321* (vendor as having duty of furnishing good and marketable title); *see § 528.137*]. Although the statute does not specify a particular kind of property, most of the cases involve real property [*see, e.g., King v. Stanley (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 584, 589-590, 197 P.2d 321* , *disapproved on other grounds, Patel v. Liebermensch (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 344, 351 n.4, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366, 197 P.3d 177* ; *Lansburgh v. Market Street Ry. Co. (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 426, 427, 220 P.2d 423]* . The term "reasonable doubt," in the context of real property contracts, refers to dubious defects, encumbrances, outstanding claims, or color of title in others, which if upheld would prove the title defective at the time of performance [*Lansburgh v. Market Street Ry. Co. (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 426, 430, 220 P.2d 423* (presence of provisional map in public works department office and authorization for bonded debt for street extension project as not sufficient to create reasonable doubt of seller's title)]. The time when the condition of the title must be free from reasonable doubt is the time fixed for performance by the contract [*Lansburgh v. Market Street Ry. Co. (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 426, 430, 220 P.2d 423]* . Thus, the vendor does not need to have title at the time of the contract if, when the time for performance arrives, the vendor will be able to furnish the title he or she contracted to convey [*Wheat v. Thomas (1930) 209 Cal. 306, 316, 287 P. 102* ; *see Leiter v. Eltinge (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 306, 317, 54 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

When the vendor has no title or interest in the land to be conveyed under a contract for the sale of real property, a decree of specific performance will not be awarded since a court will not attempt to require what is impossible to do [*Farnum v. Clarke (1906) 148 Cal. 610, 618, 84 P. 166* ; *Weisberg v. Ashcraft (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 225, 232, 14 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see* discussion in *§ 528.41* et seq.]. If, however, the vendor is the equitable owner and has the right to call for the legal title, specific performance will be decreed. Moreover, if the vendor has any interest in the property that he or she has contracted to convey, although the interest is not as complete as the one agreed to be conveyed, the vendee, at his or her option, may enforce the contract with respect to whatever interest the vendor possesses and may also receive compensation for the deficiency in performance [*Miller v. Dyer (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 526, 528-529, 127 P.2d 901* ; *Weisberg v. Ashcraft (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 225, 232, 14 Cal. Rptr. 817]* .

If the property is owned by a trust and the contract of sale was made by the beneficiary who had complete control over

the disposition of the trust property, the buyer can obtain specific performance against the trust even after the beneficiary has died [*Walgren v. Dolan (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 572, 578-580, 276 Cal. Rptr. 554]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

155 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General Requirements

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 528.23through 528.39

[Reserved]

§§ 528.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.40

§ 528.40 In General

Specific performance of a contract may be granted unless otherwise specified [*Civ. Code § 3384*] when the requirements discussed in *§ 528.14* et seq. are met. The Legislature, however, has specified that the following obligations cannot be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390*; *see* discussion in *§ 528.20*]: (1) an obligation to render personal service; (2) an obligation to employ another in personal service; (3) an agreement to perform an act which the party has no power lawfully to perform when required to do so; (4) an agreement to procure the act or consent of the wife of the contracting party, or of any other third person; and (5) an agreement, the terms of which are not sufficiently certain to make the precise act which is to be done clearly ascertainable. Courts have delineated other situations in which specific performance will not be granted. Particular contracts and circumstances under which specific performance will or will not be granted are discussed below.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsContracts LawFormationDefinite TermsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal Service AgreementsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.41

§ 528.41 Inequitability, Impossibility, and Illegality of Performance

Specific performance will not be granted when a contract's enforcement would be inequitable. Thus, a contract to convey land cannot be enforced against an intervening purchaser who had no actual or constructive notice of plaintiff's claim to the property and who purchased it for valuable consideration [*Crittenden v. Hansen (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 56, 59, 138 P.2d 37]* . Similarly, circumstances under which enforcement of the contract would impose a great burden on the defendant, with a slight or no corresponding benefit to the plaintiff, or under which enforcement would be detrimental to the public interest, warrant the denial of specific performance [*Herzog v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R.R. Co. (1908) 153 Cal. 496, 500, 95 P. 898* (specific performance as denied when enforcement would be oppressive or inequitable); *Stanley v. Robert S. Odell & Co. (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 521, 531, 218 P.2d 162* (contract whose object is performance of acts against sound public policy as not specifically enforceable)].

The difficulty or impossibility of enforcing a contract is also a ground for denying specific performance [*Anderson v. Neal Institutes Co. (1918) 37 Cal. App. 174, 176, 173 P. 779* ; *see Crittenden v. Hansen (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 56, 59, 138 P.2d 37* ; for discussion of impossibility, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. Even though the objects sought to be accomplished by the agreement are lawful and proper, if there are no means available for its accomplishment, the agreement cannot be specifically enforced [*Dulin v. Pacific Wood & Coal Co. (1894) 103 Cal. 357, 364, 37 P. 207]* .

Impossibility is determined at the time the matter is tried. If the defendant did not have the power to perform when the contract was breached and the action was commenced, but its performance is possible at the time of trial or entry of judgment, the court may award specific performance [*Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 894-897, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460* (sale of real property; loan that could not be prepaid matured before trial; thus, impossibility of conveying "free and clear" title was removed]. The court is not required to award specific performance because the impossibility has been removed, but must reevaluate all the equitable considerations [*Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 897, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460]* .

For example, a court stated that specific performance of a contract was not proper when its enforcement would have required the court to order the defendant to prepare medical remedies used in the treatment of patients at any institutes that might be established by plaintiff for the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts [*Anderson v. Neal Inst. Co.*

(1918) 37 Cal. App. 174, 176, 173 P. 779] . Similarly, a court refused to enforce an agreement among stockholders to elect a certain person president for two years and to pay him a specified salary since there was no means of forcing the stockholders to vote for a particular person [*Dulin v. Pacific Wood & Coal Co. (1894) 103 Cal. 357, 364, 37 P. 207]* .

An agreement to perform an act which the party does not have the power lawfully to perform when required to do so cannot be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390(3)*]. A court will not lend its aid to give effect to a contract that is illegal, whether it violates the common law or a statute, either expressly or by implication [*Kreamer v. Earl (1891) 91 Cal. 112, 117, 27 P. 735]* . Thus, the assurance of a county superintendent that retroactive unpaid leaves of absence could be granted for a period during which employees were on strike was not specifically enforceable since the superintendent did not have the authority to make the promise under the pertinent regulations [Social Workers Union Local 535 v. *Los Angeles County (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 65, 76-77, 75 Cal. Rptr. 566]* .

Furthermore, a vendor who has no title or interest in the land that he or she contracts to convey will not be required specifically to perform. Equity will not compel the vendor to obtain title [*Miller v. Dyer (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 526, 528-529, 127 P.2d 901* ; *Weisberg v. Ashcraft (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 225, 232, 14 Cal. Rptr. 817* ; *see* discussion in *§ 528.22*]. A destruction of a material part of the subject property without the fault of either party before title or possession has passed excuses the vendor's performance and entitles the purchaser to the return of any consideration paid. Therefore, the purchaser is not entitled to specific performance with an abatement for the damage [*Dixon v. Salvation Army (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 463, 467, 191 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsContracts LawDefensesPublic Policy ViolationsContracts LawPerformanceImpossibility of PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingImpossibility of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.42

§ 528.42 Penalties and Forfeitures

[1] Denied Specific Enforcement

Specific performance cannot be granted to enforce a penalty or forfeiture in any case, nor to enforce a penal law, except in the case of a nuisance or otherwise as provided by law, such as in a case of unfair competition [*Civ. Code § 3369*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17202*(unfair competition)].

[2] Determination of Penalty

In determining whether a contractual clause is an agreement for a penalty, two things must be considered: (1) whether or not the parties to the contract intended that the sum fixed as damages for the breach of the agreement by either party should be a penalty; and (2) whether or not the agreement is, in the nature of things, a penalty regardless of the language of the agreement declaring it to be liquidated damages. If a provision is actually a penalty, no expression in the agreement that it should be regarded otherwise is controlling, since the parties cannot by their agreement change something which is by nature a penalty into liquidated damages. Liquidated damages not reasonably related to actual damages are unenforceable and void as penalties, except when a sum is agreed to be paid for doing or failing to do an act with respect to which damages are uncertain and cannot be readily ascertained [*Pogue v. Kaweah Power & Water Co. (1903) 138 Cal. 664, 667-668, 72 P. 144* ; *Sybron Corp. v. Clark Hosp. Supply Corp. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 896, 900, 143 Cal. Rptr. 306* ; *Wright v. Rodgers (1926) 198 Cal. 137, 141, 243 P. 866* ; *Sybron Corp. v. Clark Hosp. Supply Corp. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 896, 900, 143 Cal. Rptr. 306* ($28,000 penalty for delay in payment of $30,000 as bearing no rational relationship to amount of actual damages suffered and as unenforceable)].

A penalty does not need to take the form of a stipulated fixed sum. Any provision by which money or property would be forfeited without regard to the actual damage suffered would be an unenforceable penalty. For example, an amount equal to the net benefits conferred by part performance bears no rational relationship to the purpose of the penalty. It not only fails to take into consideration the degree of culpability, but its severity increases as the seriousness of the breach decreases. Under such a penalty, a party who breached his or her contract before he or she paid the other party any amount would suffer no penalty, whereas one who had almost completely performed his or her contract would suffer the maximum penalty [*Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 22, 230 P.2d 629* ; *but see Smith v. Allen*

(1968) 68 Cal. 2d 93, 95, 65 Cal. Rptr. 153 P.2d 65 (above-stated rule as not applicable to executed contracts to convey real property since such contracts are governed by foreclosure statutes)].

[3] Enforcement of Contract Imposing Penalty

In a situation in which a penalty is imposed or the damages for the breach of a contract are liquidated and the party in default is willing to pay the penalty or damages, the contract itself may still be enforced if it is otherwise specifically enforceable [*Civ. Code § 3389*; *Glock v. Howard & Wilson Colony Co. (1898) 123 Cal. 1, 9* ; *Johnston v. Blanchard (1911) 16 Cal. App. 321, 325-326, 116 P. 973* (whether or not sum specified in contract is liquidated damages or penalty as immaterial under Civ. Code § 3389since in either case plaintiff may waive action at law and seek specific performance)]. This rule does not require the court to decree specific performance of any contract containing a liquidated damages provision merely because it contains such a provision. Even though a contract is specifically enforceable, the party may elect to accept the liquidated damages amount instead of seeking enforcement of the contract [*Morrison v. Land (1915) 169 Cal. 580, 589, 147 P. 259* ; for discussion of liquidated damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*].

[4] Relief From Forfeiture

[a] Compensation of Other Party

Equity will not enforce a forfeiture but, to the contrary, will grant relief from it. Whenever, by the terms of an obligation, a party to the agreement incurs a forfeiture, or a loss in the nature of a forfeiture, because of his or her failure to comply with its provisions, he or she may be relieved therefrom, on making full compensation to the other party, except in the case of a grossly negligent, willful, or fraudulent breach of duty [*Civ. Code § 3275*; *Ebbert v. Mercantile Trust Co. (1931) 213 Cal. 496, 499, 2 P.2d 776]* . For example, a court may relieve a tenant from forfeiture of a lease and restore the tenant to his or her former estate, in the case of hardship, when an application for such relief is made and on the condition that the rent due is paid or the conditions or covenants of the lease are fully performed, as far as is practicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1179*]. The equitable powers of the court exist to insure that the ultimate obligation imposed on the defaulting party is not unreasonable in proportion to the original obligation and the seriousness of the default [*Sybron Corp. v. Clark Hosp. Supply Corp. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 896, 903, 143 Cal. Rptr. 306]* .

[b] Partial Performance When Time Is of the Essence

Whenever the conditions of *Civ. Code § 3275* are satisfied, the courts have granted relief to a defaulting party even though time was made of the essence of the contract involved [*Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 118, 208 P.2d 367* (defendant's failure to meet obligation by issuing checks with insufficient funds as not grossly negligent and willful but simple negligence in management of checking account); *Valley View Home of Beaumont, Inc. v. Department of Health Services (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 161, 168, 194 Cal. Rptr. 56]* . Forfeiture is not favored, and if possible, a contract and any conditions in the contract are to be construed to avoid forfeiture. When an express condition cannot be avoided by construction, and there is an express condition making time of the essence, even a party who has violated that express condition may have its compliance excused and be granted equitable relief against its enforcement if the facts and equities are balanced in favor of granting relief from forfeiture [*Valley View Home of Beaumont, Inc. v. Department of Health Services (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 161, 168, 194 Cal. Rptr. 56]* .

If the defaulting party has partially performed, the degree of default, even when serious and prolonged, must be weighed against the degree of part performance. When part performance is substantial, it will outweigh the degree of default, particularly when the court is able to determine and award damages to the innocent party for any detriment he or she has suffered by the default [*Scarbery v. Bill Patch Land & Water Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 87, 104, 7 Cal. Rptr. 408* (although time was of essence, when more than three fourths of obligation had been paid and $60,000 had been spent in capital improvements, part performance as outweighing default)]. Under an installment land sale contract, if there has been substantial part performance or if the vendee has made substantial improvements in reliance on his or her contract,

permitting the vendor to terminate the vendee's rights under the contract and keep the installments that have been paid results in the harshest kind of forfeiture. Accordingly, relief will be granted whether or not time was made of the essence [*Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 122, 208 P.2d 367]* .

[c] No Reasonable Relation to Damage

Civ. Code § 3275 is not the exclusive source of a right to relief from forfeiture [*MacFadden v. Walker (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 809, 813, 97 Cal. Rptr. 537, 488 P.2d 1353]* . Even when a breach is willful so that a party does not qualify for relief under *Civ. Code § 3275*, a court may grant specific performance under certain circumstances. The courts have interpreted the prohibition of punitive damages for breach of contract [*Civ. Code § 3294(a)*], the strict limitations on the right to provide for liquidated damages [*Civ. Code §§ 1670, 1671*], and the provision that specific or preventive relief cannot be granted to enforce a penalty or forfeiture, as establishing a policy that precludes any forfeiture that does not have a reasonable relation to the damage caused by the breach [*MacFadden v. Walker (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 809, 813-814, 97 Cal. Rptr. 537, 488 P.2d 1353]* . Note that *MacFadden* is no longer the preferred method of giving buyer's relief for breaches of installment land sale contracts [*see Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (establishing right of redemption)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForfeiture ClausesContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.43

§ 528.43 Procuring Act or Consent of Spouse or Third Party

[1] In General

An agreement to procure the act or consent of the spouse of the contracting party, or of any other third person, is not specifically enforceable [*Civ. Code § 3390(4)*; *see Casady v. Modern Metal Spinning & Mfg. Co. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 728, 731, 10 Cal. Rptr. 790* ; *see § 528.134*]. Note that the precise language of *Civ. Code § 3390(4)*, which dates from 1872 and has not been amended since 1961, refers to an agreement to procure the act or consent of the "wife" of the contracting party. However, *Civ. Code § 3390(4)* in fact applies with equal force to either spouse, since the husband clearly falls within the category of "any other third person" even though not otherwise specifically mentioned in the statute.

Civ. Code § 3390(4) does not bar specific performance of a contract to convey real property although the contract was entered into by a tenant in common without the consent of the other tenant in common. If a vendor has any interest in the property he or she has contracted to convey, the vendee may at his or her option enforce the contract with respect to whatever interest the vendor possesses and may also receive compensation for the deficiency in performance, a contract entered into by only one tenant in common may be enforced as to that party's interest in the property [*Milkes v. Smith (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 79, 81-82, 204 P.2d 419]* . Nevertheless, if a co-owner of real property contracts to convey the property and signs the name of the other owner to the contract without the authority of the co-owner, who subsequently refuses to perform, the court will not order specific performance of the contract by the signing co-owner of his or her part of the property. Compelling performance in such a situation would force the defendant to perform a contract which he never made or intended to make [*Olson v. Lovell (1891) 91 Cal. 506, 508, 27 P. 765* ; *Jackson v. Torrence (1890) 83 Cal. 521, 538, 23 P. 695* (husband and wife)].

The necessity of securing the approval of a governmental agency to the complete performance of an agreement does not bar the granting of the specific performance of the agreement [*Bleecher v. Conte (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 345, 354, 173 Cal. Rptr. 278, 626 P.2d 1051* ; *Kaneko v. Okuda (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 217, 232, 15 Cal. Rptr. 792* (consent of Commissioner of Corporations required)]. In such a case, the primary contract is the promise to convey property. The governmental approval is a condition precedent to the duty to perform, to close escrow [*Bleecher v. Conte (1981) 29*

Cal. 3d 345, 354, 173 Cal. Rptr. 278, 626 P.2d 1051] . However, the condition of approval and the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing create a duty on the part of the party whose performance is conditioned on the approval, whether it be the approval of a governmental agency or of the board or shareholders of a corporate party to the contract, to seek that approval in good faith and in a timely manner [*see, e.g.,* *Jacobs v. Tenneco West, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1417-1418, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351* ; *Moreland Development Co. v. Gladstone Holmes, Inc. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 973, 977-978, 186 Cal. Rptr. 6* ; *Jacobs v. Freeman (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 177, 190, 163 Cal. Rptr. 680* ; *see generally* discussion in *§ 528.21*]. If approval would have been given if sought, failure to seek approval excuses the condition of approval and specific performance may be granted [*Jacobs v. Tenneco West, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1417-1418, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351]* . If approval would not have been given if sought, failure to seek approval is excused, and the party whose performance was conditioned on approval is not required to perform. This excuse for nonperformance is an affirmative defense, burden of proof of which is on party claiming it [*Jacobs v. Tenneco West, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1418-1419, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351]* .

[2] Consent of Partner

Under the Uniform Partnership Act (applicable until January 1, 1999, to partnerships formed before January 1, 1997), the case of a contract for the sale of partnership property that was executed by fewer than all partners, whether or not the contract may be specifically enforced depends on whether the performance of the contract would make it impossible to carry on the ordinary partnership business [*Corp. Code § 15009(3)(c)*]. If the partnership is in the business of operating a motel, the contract is one for the sale of that motel, and specific performance would result in the sale of all the partnership assets, the contract cannot be specifically enforced [*Patel v. Patel (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 6, 9-11, 260 Cal. Rptr. 255* (buyers' right to partial specific performance with reduction in price was not considered because it was raised for first time on appeal)]. If a partnership is a "trading" partnership, that is, one in the business of buying and selling property, and the contract executed by fewer than all the partners is one for the sale of only part of the stock held for sale, the buyer can have specific performance [*see* *Owens v. Palos Verdes Monaco (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 855, 865-866, 191 Cal. Rptr. 381]* .

The issue is further complicated if record title to the property that is the subject of the contract is only in the names of the partners who executed the contract for its sale. *Corp. Code § 15010* provides that the partners in whose names a property stands may convey it, but that the partnership may recover the property unless the partners' act binds the partnership under the provisions of *Corp. Code § 15009(1)* (every act of partner to carry on business of partnership binds partnership), or unless the property was conveyed to a bona fide purchaser for value without knowledge that the partners, in executing the contract, exceeded their authority. Faced with a conflict between *Corp. Code § 15009(3)* and *Corp. Code § 15010*, at least one court of appeal has held that when the purpose of the partnership is to operate the asset contracted to be sold, the interest protected by *Corp. Code § 15009(3)* should prevail and denied specific performance [*Patel v. Patel (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 6, 10-11, 260 Cal. Rptr. 255]* .

Under the Uniform Partnership Act of 1994 (applicable to partnerships formed on or after January 1, 1997), partnership property held in the name of the partnership may be transferred by an instrument of transfer executed by a partner in the partnership [*Corp. Code § 16302(a)(1)*; *see Corp. Code § 16303* (statement of partnership authority)]. Partnership property held in the name of one or more partners or one or more persons other than the partnership may be transferred by an instrument of transfer executed by the persons in whose name the property is held [*see Corp. Code § 16302(a)(2), (3)* (statement of partnership authority)]. For a discussion of rights relative to partnership property, see Ch. 402, *Partnerships: Actions Between General Partners or Partnership and Third Parties* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase &

SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.44

§ 528.44 Series of Continuous Acts

Generally, a court should not decree specific performance unless the subject matter of the decree is capable of being embraced in one order that is immediately enforceable [*Long Beach Drug Co. v. United Drug Co. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 158, 171, 88 P.2d 698, 89 P.2d 386* (exclusive sales contract was not specifically enforceable because it would entail unfeasible supervision by court)]. However, in some cases, a contract has been specifically enforced by requiring a succession of acts by a party or performance extending for some time. Examples include the following:

- Plugging abandoned oil wells, with creation and monitoring of a schedule for doing so [*Union Oil Co. v. Greka Energy Corp. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 129, 136-137, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 738*].

- Periodically dredging a shipping channel [*Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 580-581, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665*].

- Installing water pipes in a tract subdivision [*Bakersfield Country Club v. Pacific Water Co. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 528, 539, 13 Cal. Rptr. 573*].

- Permitting occupancy of premises for the duration of the occupants' lives, when no other specific acts or services were required [*Magee v. Magee (1917) 174 Cal. 276, 281, 162 P. 1023*].

However, other cases have followed a rule, which has been called archaic and has been "soundly criticized" [*Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 820-821, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220*], prohibiting specific enforcement when enforcement would entail protracted supervision or direction by the court and the exercise of special knowledge, skill, and judgment by the party performing the acts. Application of the rule generally has been limited to construction contracts and distribution or sales-agency agreements. Examples of contractual obligations held not to be specifically enforceable under this rule include the following:

- Sale of automobiles by a dealership [*Thayer Plymouth Center, Inc. v. Chrysler Motors Corp. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 300, 303-305, 63 Cal. Rptr. 148*].

- Operation of a rock quarry [*Whipple Rd. Quarry Co. v. L.C. Smith Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 214, 216, 249 P.2d 854*].

- Sale of real property and construction of a staircase [*Moklofsky v. Moklofsky (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 259, 262-263, 179 P.2d 628* ; *but see Gale v. Seymour (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 727, 728, 205 P.2d 752* (decree required paving of parking lot; *Moklofsky* distinguished)].

- Sale of mining claims [*Lind v. Baker (1941) 48 Cal. App. 2d 234, 247, 119 P.2d 806*].

- Drilling for oil [*Sheehan v. Vedder (1930) 108 Cal. App. 419, 427-428, 292 P. 175* ; *but see Pub. Res. Code § 3301* (specific performance of agreement for cooperative development of oil and gas)].

- Sale of all eggs produced [*Poultry Producers of S. Cal., Inc. v. Barlow (1922) 189 Cal. 278, 289-291, 208 P. 93* ; *but see Poultry Producers of Cent. Cal., Inc. v. Murphy (1923) 64 Cal. App. 450, 454, 221 P. 962* (decree required signing of agreement under which defendant would sell and deliver all eggs produced; *Barlow* was distinguished because agreement was signed by all parties in *Barlow* but defendant had refused to sign in this case)].

- Construction and operation of a railroad [*Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. v. Campbell-Johnston (1908) 153 Cal. 106, 113, 94 P. 623*];

- Preparation of land for development of a citrus grove [*Moore v. Tuohy (1904) 142 Cal. 342, 347-348, 75 P. 896*].

- Opening and development of mining property [*Stanton v. Singleton (1899) 126 Cal. 657, 665-667, 59 P. 146*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.45

§ 528.45 Contracts for Personal Services

[1] Generally Denied Enforcement

The general rule is that contracts to render personal service and to employ another in personal service will not be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390(1),(2)*; *Lyon v. Goss (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 659, 670, 123 P.2d 11* (contract to perform unique personal sales services); *Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404-405, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372* (contract for appointment to position of physician specialist in cardiology; see *Herman v. County of Los Angeles (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 484, 488-489, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691* (finding statute inapplicable to contract providing for transfer of county police officers to sheriff's department)], either directly by means of a decree directing the defendant to perform it, or indirectly by an injunction restraining him or her from violating it [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)* (no injunction to prevent breach of personal services contracts; exceptions)]. This rule is followed especially when the relation between the parties to the contract is one of mutual confidence, and the contract stipulates for acts that require special knowledge, skill, or ability, or the exercise of judgment, discretion, integrity, and like personal qualities [Poultry Producers etc. v. *Barlow (1922) 189 Cal. 278, 288, 208 P. 93* ; *Coykendall v. Jackson (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 729, 731, 62 P.2d 746* (contract for entire output in which other party agreed to devote entire time to selling and distributing output); *Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404-405, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372* (contract for appointment to position of physician specialist in cardiology); *but see Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)* (exceptions, discussed § 528.45[2][c])].

Some courts have based the rule against specifically enforcing personal service contracts on the fact that it would be an invasion of one's statutory liberty to compel a person to work for or remain in the personal service of another, since it would place that person in a condition of involuntary servitude [*see Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372]* . Another reason for the rule, according to some authorities, is that, in view of the peculiar personal relation that results from a contract of service, it would be inexpedient, from the standpoint of public policy, to attempt to enforce such a contract specifically. When one of the parties is to act as the confidential agent of the other, it is necessary that there should be entire harmony and a spirit of cooperation between the contracting parties [*Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372]* . A third reason is that it is inconvenient, or impossible, for a court of justice to conduct and supervise the operations requisite for and incident to

the execution of a decree for the specific performance of a contract involving the rendering of personal services [Poultry Producers etc. v. *Barlow (1922) 189 Cal. 278, 288-289, 208 P. 93* ; *Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372]* .

When a contract to render personal services, other than a contract of apprenticeship as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 3070-3097*, is specifically enforced, it may not be enforced against the employee beyond seven years from the commencement of service under the contract [*Lab. Code § 2855*]. Moreover, a valid contract to perform or render service of a special, unique, unusual, extraordinary, or intellectual character, which gives it peculiar value and the loss of which cannot be reasonably or adequately compensated in damages in an action at law, cannot be enforced against the person contracting to render the service for a term exceeding seven years from the commencement of service under it [*Lab. Code § 2855*; *see De Haviland v. Warner Bros. Pictures (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 225, 230-232, 153 P.2d 983* (seven years as calendar years and not years of actual service)]. This seven-year limitation cannot be waived by the employee [*De Haviland v. Warner Bros. Pictures (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 225, 237, 153 P.2d 983]* .

An employee cannot invoke the seven-year protection of *Lab. Code § 2855(a)* with respect to a contract to render personal service in the production of phonorecords [*see 17 U.S.C. § 101*] unless he or she has first given written notice to the employer in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1020*, specifying that the employee from and after a future date will no longer render service under the contract by reason of *Lab. Code § 2855(a)* [*Lab. Code § 2855(b)*].

[2] Exceptions

[a] Substantially Performed

A court may, however, order specific performance of an obligation to perform personal services when the services have been fully or substantially performed [*Stone v. Burke (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 748, 756, 244 P.2d 51]* .

[b] Inadequate Remedy at Law

In specific performance actions involving contracts for personal services, the services usually were bargained for and rendered as the consideration for the promise sued upon. When enforcement of the promise is sought, specific performance may be denied because the services rendered are adequately compensable in money. However, when a plaintiff shows the inadequacy of the legal remedy in that a money payment would not adequately compensate for the services, relief has been granted. In particular, an agreement in consideration of personal services is subject to specific performance if the services are of such a peculiar, extraordinary, or exceptional character that it is impossible to estimate their value by any pecuniary standard or to adequately compensate for them in money [*Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 676-677, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210]* .

In most of the cases granting quasi-specific performance of a contract to devise property, the services rendered as consideration for the agreement are menial or otherwise commonplace, but they are peculiar because, typically, by reason of a family or other close relationship between the contracting parties, only the promisee can perform them [*Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 677, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210* (allegations that promisor wanted promisee daughter-in-law to live in San Francisco so promisor could be near his grandson after promisor's son died as alleging rendition of peculiar, extraordinary, or exceptional services); *De Hermosillo v. Morales (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 819, 829, 304 P.2d 854]* .

However, services in a menial or other wage-compensable sense are not a sine qua non of the consideration which will support a contract to bequeath or devise property. Quasi-specific performance of a contract has been granted when the promisee-plaintiff had agreed to and did live near the promisor and furnish her with companionship without performing services as such; and when the promisor, although in his last illness, desired none of the usual services of a nurse or housekeeper and received from the promisee only comfort, care, and consolation [*Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261*

Cal. App. 2d 670, 675-677, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210 ; *see also § 528.46*].

[c] Injunctive Relief When Services Have Special Value

A contract to render personal services generally cannot be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390(1),(2)*], nor can the breach of such a contract usually be enjoined except in cases falling within the exception provided for by *Civ. Code § 3423* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* [*Long Beach Drug Co. v. United Drug Co. (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 158, 168, 89 P.2d 386* (plaintiff as not entitled to prohibitory injunction for breach of contract under which plaintiff was defendant's exclusive agent for sale of drug products)]. Those exceptions provide that an injunction may be granted to prevent breach of a personal service contract if the promised services are of such a special, unique, unusual, extraordinary, or intellectual character, that they have peculiar value, the loss of which cannot be reasonably or adequately compensated in damages in an action at law, and the contract calls for compensation within the financial parameters set forth in the statute [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*]. The issue of enjoining personal service contracts frequently arises in situations involving athletes and star performers [*see MCA Records, Inc. v. Newton-John (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 18, 22, 153 Cal. Rptr. 153* ; *Foxx v. Williams (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 223, 235, 52 Cal. Rptr. 896]* . An injunction which forbids an artist to accept new employment may be a harsh and powerful remedy. The monetary limitations in *Civ. Code § 3423(e)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)* are intended to serve as a counterweigh in balancing the equities. Conversely, the rationale underlying the enforcement of negative covenants in contracts involving the unique personal services of star performers and athletes is that the employer has contracted for the exclusive right to display the "star" for a given period. That no other entrepreneur may display that star during the period contracted for is part of the right for which the employer has bargained and has compensated the star [*Lemat Corp. v. Barry (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 671, 678, 80 Cal. Rptr. 240]* . However, fairness precludes enforcement of a contract clause similar to those employed by the record companies in response to *Foxx* and *MCA*, which gives the company the right, at any time during the contract, to agree to pay the artist the statutory minimum compensation. The practice was a way for a company to hedge its bets on the success of its artists; the company would only exercise its option if the artist was making a substantial sum of money for the company. A performer will not be enjoined from rendering personal services to another unless the performer is guaranteed the requisite minimum annual compensation under that contract, and a clause giving the employer the option to pay that amount does not satisfy the minimum compensation requirement for injunctive relief [*Motown Record Corp. v. Brockert (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 123, 135-140, 207 Cal. Rptr. 574]* .

An employer that is prohibited by *Civ. Code § 3423(e)* from enjoining a performer from performing for another company cannot enjoin the other company from hiring the employee/performer [*Beverly Glen Music, Inc. v. Warner Communications, Inc. (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1145, 224 Cal. Rptr. 260]* .

[3] Compensation Criteria

[a] Contract Formed Before 1994

If the personal services contract was entered into or or before December 31, 1993, and provides for minimum compensation at the rate of $6,000 per annum, its breach may be enjoined [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(1)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(A)*].

[b] Contracts Formed in or After 1994

If the personal service contract was entered into on or after January 1, 1994, one of two alternative compensation thresholds must be met in order for breach of the personal services contract to be enjoined [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A),(B)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i),(ii)*].

The contract must provide for minimum compensation at the rate of $9,000 per annum for the first year of the contract, $12,000 per annum for the second year of the contract, and $15,000 per annum for the third to seventh years, inclusive, of the contract [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A)(i)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i)(I)*].

In addition, after the third year of the contract, there must actually have been paid for the services through and including the contract year during which the injunctive relief is sought, over and above the minimum $15,000 specified in subclauses (i) and (I), the $15,000 per annum during the fourth and fifth years of the contract, the $30,000 per annum during the sixth and seventh years of the contract. As a condition to petitioning for an injunction, amounts payable under this clause may be paid at any time prior to seeking injunctive relief [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A)(ii)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i)(II)*]. For a chart showing how quickly these sums accumulate, and for discussion of other statutory parameters to these minimum compensation criteria, see Comments to § 528.133.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityAdequate Remedy at LawContracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal Service Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.46

§ 528.46 Agreement to Make Disposition of Property by Will

A contract to make a will or devise or other instrument, or not to revoke a will or devise or other instrument, or to die intestate, if made after 2000, can be established only by one of the following [*Prob. Code § 21700(a)*]:

- Provisions of a will or other instrument stating the material provisions of the contract.

- An expressed reference in a will or other instrument to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract.

- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.

- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and the claimant or a promise by the decedent to the claimant that is enforceable in equity.

- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and another person for the benefit of the claimant or a promise by the decedent to another person for the benefit of the claimant that is enforceable in equity.

A contract to make a will or devise, or not to revoke a will or devise, or to die intestate, if made in 1985-2000 [*see Prob. Code § 21700(c)*] can be established only by one of the following [former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* (repealed eff. Jan. 1. 2001)]:

- Provisions of a will stating material provisions of the contract;

- An express reference in a will to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract; or

- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.

Although former *Prob. Code § 150(a)*, cited above, expressly provided that a contract to make a will or devise could be established "only" by the three methods listed above, courts have repeatedly held that the language of that section, notwithstanding use of the word "only," did not preclude application of equitable estoppel in appropriate cases [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 353-354, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628* ; *Estate of Brenzikofer v. Schwartz (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401* ; *Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . In *Juran v. Epstein*, the leading case on this issue under former *Prob. Code § 150(a)*, the court held that an oral promise not to revoke a will could be enforced under the doctrine of equitable estoppel [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . The court found that while generally former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* provided the sole means under which a party could establish an agreement not to revoke a will, in enacting that section the Legislature did not express an intent to abolish the use of the equitable estoppel doctrine in appropriate circumstances [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . Subsequently, in *Estate of Housley v. Haywood*, it was held that equitable estoppel principles were available under former *Prob. Code § 150* (or its predecessor, former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*) to enforce a testator's alleged oral agreement to leave all of his property to his son if the son cared for him during the testator's lifetime [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 358, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628* (date of alleged agreement as before or after 1984 was not ascertainable)]. The court, following *Juran v. Epstein* [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* , stated that nothing in the express language of former *Prob. Code § 150* distinguished between cases in which the promisor was alive and cases in which the promisor was dead [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 354-355, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628]* . For further discussion, see *§ 528.131*.

A party may be estopped from asserting the statute of limitations as a defense to an untimely action to enforce an oral promise to make a will. In a case in which the one-year statute of limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* applied because the promisor had made an inter vivos transfer of property covered by the contract, the court followed the reasoning of *Juran v. Epstein*, discussed *above* [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* ; *see Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . It held that while *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2(b)* (at the time designated as *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2(a)(2)*), clearly shows that the Legislature intended that the one-year statute of limitations could not be "tolled" or "extended," the statute says nothing about equitable estoppel. The court concluded that in the absence of any such language or legislative history suggesting that was what the Legislature intended, the doctrine of equitable estoppel still applies [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* (appellant alleged sufficient facts to come within doctrine of equitable estoppel to application of statute of limitations)].

A contract to make a will or devise, or not to revoke a will or devise, or to die intestate, if made on or before December 31, 1984, can be established under the law applicable to the contract on December 31, 1984 [*Prob. Code § 21700(c)*]. The statute applicable to such contracts is former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*. Under the applicable laws a contract to make a particular disposition of an individual's property may be breached by not making a will disposing of the property as provided for in the agreement, or by revoking a will providing for the specified disposition, contrary to anagreement not to revoke [*Goldstein v. Hoffman (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 803, 812, 29 Cal. Rptr. 334]* . One of the remedies available to the promisee if the contract is breached is an action for equitable relief in the form of quasi-specific performance [§ 528.92[14]], in which equity gives relief equivalent to specific performance by impressing a constructive trust on the property which the decedent promised to leave to the promisee [*Goldstein v. Hoffman (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 803, 812, 29 Cal. Rptr. 334* ; *see Brown v. Superior Court (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 559, 563-564, 212 P.2d 878]* .

The execution of a joint will or mutual wills does not create a presumptions of a contract not to revoke the will or wills [*Prob. Code § 21700(b)*]. In fact, joint and mutual wills are now disfavored [*see* California Wills and Trusts, Ch. 60, *Joint and Mutual Wills* (Matthew Bender)]. Nevertheless, the following discussion of the older law is retained for use with older agreements. When two persons had made a joint will pursuant to an oral agreement to leave their entire property to the survivor and on the death of the survivor to named beneficiaries, and one person performed the agreement by failing to revoke the will prior to his death, and the other party, having received the benefit of the

agreement, then executed a new will in disregard of the agreed-on disposition, equity has granted quasi-specific performance of the oral agreement and imposed a constructive trust on the property in favor of the original beneficiaries. This remedy presumes that a constructive fraud has been practiced on the first decedent by the second decedent to the detriment of the original beneficiaries, and it hypothesizes that the newly designated beneficiaries of the surviving testator will be unjustly enriched if the oral agreement between the decedents is not enforced. Under such circumstances, the newly designated beneficiaries become derivatively estopped to plead the statutory requirement of a written agreement to make a will [*Stahmer v. Schley (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 200, 203, 157 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *see Notten v. Mensing (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 469, 474, 45 P.2d 198]* .

Before 1985 there did not need to be an express agreement not to revoke mutual wills in order to enforce a contractual obligation to leave property to designated persons at death. Every contract contains an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing that neither party will do anything which injures the right of the other to receive the benefits of the agreement. When the parties contract to make a particular disposition of property by will, the agreement necessarily includes a promise not to breach the contract by revoking the will and failing to dispose of the property as agreed. Although a will may be revoked under *Prob. Code § 23* and the parties contract with knowledge of this fact, the obligation to make the agreed disposition may still be enforced [*Brown v. Superior Court (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 559, 564-565, 212 P.2d 878* ; *Goldstein v. Hoffman (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 803, 812, 29 Cal. Rptr. 334]* .

The right to enforce a contract to make a particular disposition of property on death is not restricted to the promisee. When two parties agree to make mutual wills, each promising to dispose of his or her property to the other, or if the other is dead, to certain third persons, and one of the parties performs by leaving his or her property to the other, the intended devisees and legatees are entitled to enforce their rights as beneficiaries under the agreement. The contracting party who survived is estopped from making any other or different disposition of the property, and his or her obligation under the agreement becomes irrevocable and enforceable against him or her when he or she has availed himself or herself of the provisions of decedent's will in his or her favor and accepts substantial benefits thereunder [*Brown v. Superior Court (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 559, 564, 212 P.2d 878]* .

For further discussion of quasi-specific performance, see the Comments to §§ 528.131 and 528.132.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsJoint & Mutual Wills

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.47

§ 528.47 Cooperative Marketing Association Contract

Contracts for the sale of products by a member or stockholder of a nonprofit cooperative corporation or association to the corporation or association may be specifically enforced [*Corp. Code § 13356* (nonprofit fishmarketing association); *Food & Agric. Code §§ 54263, 54265* (nonprofit cooperative association); *Colma Vegetable Ass'n v. Bonetti (1928) 91 Cal. App. 103, 114, 267 P. 172]* . Additionally, an injunction may be granted to prevent a breach of the contract [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*; *Food & Agric. Code § 54265*;§ 528.13[1]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCooperativesMembers & Other ConstituentsBusiness & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages & RemediesBuyer's Damages & RemediesReplevin & Specific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages & RemediesSeller's Damages & RemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.48

§ 528.48 Contract for Sale of Unique Goods

Specific performance of a contract may be decreed when the subject of the contract is goods that are unique or in other proper circumstances [*Com. Code § 2716(1)*]. The decree for specific performance may include such terms and conditions concerning payment of the price, damages, or other relief as the court deems just [*Com. Code § 2716(2)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to the sale of unique goods, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code*
.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)RemediesBuyer's RemediesReplevin & Specific PerformanceCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)RemediesSeller's RemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.49

§ 528.49 Contract for Sale of Corporate Stock

Specific performance of a contract for the sale of corporate stock ordinarily will not be granted because damages are an adequate remedy, especially when the stocks are publicly held [*Treasurer v. Commercial Coal Mining Co. (1863) 23 Cal. 390* ; *see* *Fleishman v. Woods (1901) 135 Cal. 256, 260-261, 67 P. 276* (contract to transfer water stock was specifically enforceable since enforcement was essential to adequate relief for respondent)]. However, a court will decree specific performance of such a contract when the stock has a peculiar value and cannot be compensated for by damages [*Korabek v. Weaver Aircraft Corp. (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 32* (specific performance of contract to transfer corporate stock granted since stock was of undeterminable value and many conditions were attached before stock was marketed); *see* *Kaneko v. Okuda (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 217, 233-234, 15 Cal. Rptr. 792* (specific performance of stock option as proper since reasonable value was tendered, shares had peculiar value, could not be acquired on open market, and were acquired as part of business program, and damages were inadequate remedy)].

For example, a court will order the specific enforcement of a contract to sell shares of stock in a closely held corporation which are not traded in the market and which have no established market value [*Capaldi v. Levy (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 274, 281, 81 Cal. Rptr. 629]* . For further discussion and forms relating to the specific performance of contracts for the sale of corporate stock and option agreements for the purchase of corporate stock, see Ch. 163, *Corporations: Transfer of Shares* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsShareholdersTransfers of SharesContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.50

§ 528.50 Agreement to Arbitrate Controversy

A party to an agreement to arbitrate a controversy may seek specific performance of the arbitration agreement if the controversy arises but the other party refuses to arbitrate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281*]. The petition to compel arbitration must allege a written agreement to arbitrate a controversy and refusal by respondent to arbitrate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1281.2*]. For further discussion and forms relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements in general, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsArbitration ClausesContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.51

§ 528.51 Collective Bargaining Agreements

Any collective bargaining agreement between an employer and a labor organization is enforceable in equity, and a breach of such an agreement by any party is subject to the same remedies, including injunctive relief, as are available on other contracts [*Lab. Code § 1126*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceLabor & Employment LawCollective Bargaining & Labor RelationsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.52

§ 528.52 Satisfaction of Accord

The proper procedure to enforce an accord is to bring an action for specific performance of the accord [*Moving Picture etc. Union v. Glasgow Theaters, Inc. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 395, 404 n.1, 86 Cal. Rptr. 33* ; *see Civ. Code § 1522* (parties to accord as bound to execute it)]. For a form of complaint for specific performance to compel satisfaction of an accord, see Ch. 6, *Accord and Satisfaction* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformanceAccord & SatisfactionContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.53

§ 528.53 Escrow Agreement

If an escrow holder refuses to deliver the instruments after performance of the conditions, the grantee may bring an action for specific delivery of personal property since any person having the possession or control of a particular article of personal property, of which he or she is not the owner, may be compelled specifically to deliver it to the person entitled to its immediate possession [*see Civ. Code § 3380*]. For further discussion and forms relating to the specific performance of escrow agreements, see Ch. 253, *Escrows* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.54

§ 528.54 Contract to Convey Patent Rights

Specific performance is a proper action to enforce a contract to convey patent rights [*Hercules Glue Co. v. Littooy (1938) 25 Cal. App. 2d 182, 186, 76 P.2d 700* (employee as properly compelled to specifically perform promise to assign to employer patent rights for insecticide spreader invented by employee when contract stated that all patents to employee's inventions during employment would be property of employer and employee invented spreader during his employment); *Coleman v. Dawson (1930) 110 Cal. App. 201, 211, 294 P. 13]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformancePatent LawOwnershipConveyancesAssignmentsPatent LawOwnershipEmployee Inventions & Shop RightsPatent LawRemediesEquitable ReliefGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.55

§ 528.55 Deed of Trust

An action may be brought for specific performance of the provisions of a deed of trust, authorizing the beneficiary to take possession of the property after default and to collect the rents, issues, and profits, applying them toward payment of the indebtedness [*Santacroce Bros. v. Edgewater-Santa Clara, Inc. (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 584, 585-587, 51 Cal. Rptr. 613* (appointment of receiver to enter on, and take possession of, property for purpose of collecting rents is proper); *see Title Guar. & Trust Co. v. Monson (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 621, 624-625, 81 P.2d 944* (enforcement of provisions of deed of trust as governed by terms of trust deed and hence not by general rules regarding specific performance)]. Moreover, every express executory agreement in writing whereby the contracting party sufficiently indicates an intention to make particular property a security for a debt or other obligation creates an equitable lien on the property so indicated, which is enforceable against the property in the hands of the original contractor or his or her purchasers with notice or encumbrancers with notice. Thus a promise to give a mortgage or a trust deed on particular property as security for a debt will be specifically enforced by granting an equitable mortgage [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 313-314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265 , disapproved on other grounds, Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970* . For further discussion and forms relating to specific performance of provisions of deeds of trust, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawDeedsRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsEquitable MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Specific Situations

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 528.56through 528.69

[Reserved]

§§ 528.56[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.70

§ 528.70 Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of an action for specific performance [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*].

The governing statutes do not expressly specify whether or not an action for specific performance can be a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 88*]. Specific performance is an equitable remedy [*see § 528.11[1]*], and since it is not included in the list of cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], an action for specific performance will be an unlimited civil case unless it comes within one of the categories of cases in equity that are specifically designated as limited civil cases. These categories are the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.
- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.
- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

Additionally, the small claims division has jurisdiction to grant equitable relief in the form of specific performance, in lieu of or in addition to money damages, in any action brought for the recovery of money within the jurisdiction of that division [*Code Civ. Proc. § 116.220(a)(1)-(4)* (small claims division has jurisdiction of claims up to $5,000, with some exceptions)].

Because of the distribution of jurisdiction for equitable actions, a plaintiff should be very careful to meet all pleading requirements. Failure to do so might mean that the court in which the action was brought lacks jurisdiction of the action [*see Reardon v. Melbourne (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 257, 259-260, 127 P.2d 618* (court did not acquire jurisdiction over action when plaintiff added allegations of nonexistent specific performance cause of action to complaint to recover real estate broker's performance)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsSmall Claims Courts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.71

§ 528.71 Venue

The proper county for trial of an action for specific performance of a contract to sell personal property is the county in which defendant's obligation is to be performed, in which the contract in fact was entered into, or in which the defendant resides at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

When the action is for specific performance of a contract to sell real property, the proper county for trial is the county in which the real property, or some part of it, is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*; *Grocers' Fruit Growing Union v. Kern County Land Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 466, 473, 89 P. 120* (action for specific performance of contract for conveyance of land as governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* since it seeks determination of right or interest in real property)]. However, an action in which the relief sought is personal, and title to, or possession of, real property is only incidentally involved, is transitory and not local. Thus, actions by a vendor for the purchase price of land or for specific performance of a vendee's contract to purchase land are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*, not *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* [*Marcacci v. Continental Baking Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 224, 226-227, 20 Cal. Rptr. 567]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages & RemediesBuyer's Damages & RemediesReplevin & Specific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsDamages & RemediesSeller's Damages & RemediesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.72

§ 528.72 Statute of Limitations

The period of limitation for an action for specific performance is four years for a written contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)*; *see Estate of Brenzikofer v. Schwartz (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1468-1469, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401* ; *Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 133, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415* (period of limitation for quasi-specific performance of written contract to make will as four years)] and two years for an oral contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*]. The period of limitation for an action for specific performance of an installment contract accrues when the last installment is due and not until that time [*Tahoe Pines Co. v. Newman (1922) 59 Cal. App. 186, 190, 210 P. 445]* .

A contract for the sale of land cannot be taken out of the statute of limitations governing contract actions by converting the action into one for the recovery of real property through the application of the doctrine of equitable conversion. Thus the five-year period of limitation provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 318* for the recovery of real property can not be made applicable by the theory that under a contract for sale, the purchaser is deemed to be the equitable owner of the property and the seller is considered the owner of the purchase price [*Reiner v. Hermann (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 543, 546, 180 P.2d 385* (promise to convey real property if promisee married promisor)].

An action for quasi-specific performance of a written agreement is barred if not brought within the four-year period specified by *Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)* or *343* (period of limitation for actions not otherwise provided for) [*Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 133, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415]* . When the action is based on an oral contract to will property, the action is not governed by the two-year period of limitation set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 339*, but instead may be brought within four years when the property involved is impressed with the qualities of a resulting trust in the hands of the defendants [*Potter v. Bland (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 125, 134, 288 P.2d 569]* . Since a contract to make a will is breached only if it has not been complied with at the time of the promisor's death, the cause of action for the breach does not accrue or the period of limitation commence until the promisor dies [*Estate of Brenzikofer v. Schwartz (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1468-1469, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401* ; *Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 130-131, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsOral AgreementsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.73

§ 528.73 Inconsistent Theories of Recovery

A complaint may allege inconsistent theories of a cause of action in the alternative. Thus a plaintiff may seek specific performance of an agreement or, in the alternative, damages for the breach of that agreement. The court may award damages if the plaintiff is not entitled to specific performance [*Foreman & Clark Corp. v. Fallon (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 875, 883, 92 Cal. Rptr. 162, 479 P.2d 362* ; *Brandolino v. Lindsay (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 319, 324, 75 Cal. Rptr. 56* ; *see Lynn v. Knob Hill Improvement Co. (1917) 177 Cal. 56, 61, 169 P. 1009* (complaint alleging causes of action for specific performance and for recovery of purchase money as defective since plaintiff did not separate two inconsistent causes of action)].

However, the remedies of damages for breach of contract and specific performance are inconsistent so that a plaintiff cannot receive both. Thus, when one is chosen, the other is considered to be abandoned if a change of remedy would injure the other party [*Buckmaster v. Bertram (1921) 186 Cal. 673, 678, 200 P. 610]* . Counsel's oral acknowledgment, at a hearing on a motion for summary judgment, that plaintiff is no longer seeking specific performance of the contract, but only damages, has been held sufficient withdrawal of that claim to support the court's order dismissing the cause of action for specific performance [*Tri-Continent Internat. Corp. v. Paris Savings & Loan Assn. (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1354, 1358-1359, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 508]* .

On the other hand, if a plaintiff is mistaken and seeks a remedy to which he or she was never entitled, this does not prevent the plaintiff from subsequently availing himself or herself of a remedy that he or she is entitled to under the facts of the case if the defendant is placed in no worse position because of the unsuccessful prosecution of the first action [*McGibbon v. Schmidt (1916) 172 Cal. 70, 75, 155 P. 460* (when nonsuit entered in action for recovery of purchase money, plaintiff is permitted to bring subsequent action for specific performance)]. If a plaintiff recovers under one theory, however, he or she cannot recover under the other. A party cannot receive money damages, and at the same time enforce the contract [*see Boshes v. Miller (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 332, 337, 259 P.2d 447]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesContracts LawRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.74

§ 528.74 Right to Jury Trial

There is no right to a jury trial in an equitable action for specific performance. In specific performance actions involving both legal and equitable issues, however, there is a right to jury trial on the legal issues [*Gregory v. Hamilton (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 213, 219-220, 142 Cal. Rptr.563]* . Therefore, on amendment of the pleadings in an action for specific performance to include a legal cause of action for damages, the plaintiff is entitled to a jury trial on the issue of damages [*Farnsworth v. Hunter (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 27, 31-32, 77 P.2d 840]* . Additionally, when the complaint pleads a purely equitable cause of action such as one for specific performance and the defendant cross complains for legal relief such as damages, the parties are entitled to a jury trial on the legal issue [*Connell v. Bowes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 870, 871-872, 123 P.2d 456]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsActions in EquityCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

178 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Procedure

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 528.77through 528.89

[Reserved]

§§ 528.77[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.90

§ 528.90 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to actions for specific performance of escrow agreements, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 101, *Escrows*

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in opposing an injunction to prevent the breach of a contract that could not be specifically enforced, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.91

§ 528.91 State Statutes

[1] Generally

Required form for contracts involving conveyance of real property that provide for binding arbitration of disputes between principals. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1298 et seq.*

Specific performance may be compelled. *Civ. Code § 3384*

Security for performance. *Civ. Code § 3386*

Pecuniary compensation presumed inadequate to relieve breach of contract for transfer of real property. *Civ. Code § 3387*

Enforceability of unsigned contract. *Civ. Code § 3388*

Contracts providing for penalty or liquidated damages enforceable. *Civ. Code § 3389*

Contracts not subject to specific performance. *Civ. Code § 3390*

Specific performance not available for want of equity, fraud, or mistake. *Civ. Code § 3391*

Performance of conditions precedent required. *Civ. Code § 3392*

Requirement that seller have good title. *Civ. Code § 3394*

Persons bound to perform obligation with respect to real property. *Civ. Code § 3395*

[2] Particular Contracts That Are Specifically Enforceable

Right of party to real property sales contract to specific performance. *Civ. Code § 1680*

Specific performance of endorsement of transferred bill of lading. *Com. Code § 7506*

Collective bargaining agreement is enforceable at law or in equity; breach of agreement is subject to same remedies, including injunctive relief, available to other contracts. *Lab. Code § 1126*

Specific performance of agreement for cooperative development of oil and gas. *Pub. Res. Code § 3301*

[3] Possession of Property

Method of obtaining possession of real property. *Civ. Code § 3375*

Method of obtaining possession of personal property. *Civ. Code § 3379*

Compelling delivery of personal property to owner. *Civ. Code § 3380*

Agreement made by testator for sale of property disposed of by prior will does not revoke testamentary disposal but sale agreement subject to specific performance. *Prob. Code § 77*

[4] Probate

Decree ordering personal representative to convey property to person entitled to it. *Prob. Code § 850 et seq.*

[5] Reformation

Specific performance of reformed contract. *Civ. Code § 3402*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesReplevinsContracts LawRemediesReformationContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbatePersonal RepresentativesClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.92

§ 528.92 Decisions

[1] Adequate Consideration

Allegation that property is reasonably worth certain sum is averment of fact; when sum appears to be no greater than price agreed on for sale, plaintiff is fully complying with obligation to show by averment of appropriate facts that consideration for contract sought to be specifically enforced is adequate. *W.G. Reese Co. v. House (1912) 162 Cal. 740, 745, 124 P. 442*

Allegation of making of contract, setting it forth in haec verba and allegation that consideration named therein was, at time of contract's making, fair and reasonable value of property as sufficient allegation that contract was just and reasonable and consideration was adequate. *Friedrich v. Roland (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 543, 547-48, 213 P.2d 423*

Allegation that property is reasonably worth certain sum was averment of fact and when such sum appears to be no greater than price agreed on for sale, plaintiff was fully complying with obligation to aver appropriate facts showing consideration was adequate. *Friedrich v. Roland (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 543, 547-548, 213 P.2d 423*

Averment that consideration named in agreement is fair and reasonable value of property was sufficient allegation of adequacy of consideration. *Boro v. Ruzich (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 535, 540, 137 P.2d 51*

When complaint sets out contract in haec verba and further states that purchase price of property stipulated in contract was fair and reasonable value of property at time contract was made, allegation that purchase price was fair and reasonable taken in connection with terms of contract is sufficient allegation that contract is fair and equitable. *Minaker v. Sunset Bldg. & Real Estate Co. (1914) 25 Cal. App. 771, 773, 145 P. 542*

[2] Adequate Remedy at Law

Injunction is not granted when monetary damages afford adequate relief and are not extremely difficult to ascertain. *Thayer Plymouth Center, Inc. v. Chrysler Motors Corp. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 300, 306, 63 Cal. Rptr. 148*

Contract for sale and delivery of garbage by defendants to plaintiff for feeding plaintiff's hogs was not specifically enforceable since plaintiff had adequate remedy at law in damages because substitute garbage was available at higher price. *LeMoyne Ranch v. Agajanian (1932) 121 Cal. App. 423, 425, 8 P.2d 1055*

[3] Conditions Precedent

Delivery of transfer disclosure statement is nonwaivable condition precedent to buyer's duty of performance in sale covered by *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, and buyer of covered real estate has no duty to perform unless seller complies with disclosure requirements and buyer chooses not to exercise right of rescission; therefore, seller's failure to deliver required disclosure statement precluded action against buyer for specific performance and breach of contract. *Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 205, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569*

If approval would have been given if sought, failure to seek approval excused condition of approval and provided basis for specific performance. *Jacobs v. Tenneco West, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1417-1418, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351*

If approval would not have been given if sought, failure to seek approval was excused, and party whose performance was conditioned on approval was not required to perform; this excuse for nonperformance was affirmative defense, burden of proof of which was on party claiming it. *Jacobs v. Tenneco West, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1418-1419, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351*

When buyer expects to produce funds for purchase through loan, buyer is required to establish that prospective lender has ability to supply funds and is legally bound by contract to do so. *C. Robert Nattress & Associates v. CIDCO (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 55, 65, 229 Cal. Rptr. 33*

To establish ability to pay for property, buyer is not required to prove lender legally bound to lend; sufficient to find that buyer commanded adequate resources. *Henry v. Sharma (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 665, 670-672, 201 Cal. Rptr. 478*

Condition of approval and implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing creates duty on part of party whose performance is conditioned on approval to submit contract to party's board of directors for approval, and duty on part of board to confer and decide whether to approve contract. *Moreland Development Co. v. Gladstone Holmes, Inc. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 973, 977-978, 186 Cal. Rptr. 6* ; *Jacobs v. Freeman (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 177, 190, 163 Cal. Rptr. 680*

Agreement that is subject to approval of board of directors of one party is not illusory; approval is condition precedent to party's duty to perform, not to formation of contract. *Jacobs v. Freeman (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 177, 187, 189-190, 163 Cal. Rptr. 680*

Deposit of $450 in escrow by buyers accompanied by demand that $700 which was amount of rent received by seller for lease of land be credited to buyers was insufficient performance on buyers' part to warrant specific performance when agreement required deposit of $1150 into escrow, since buyers' right of possession to land and claim to rents were contingent on payment of specified sum. *Evarts v. Johnston (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 6, 9, 206 P.2d 633*

Trial court's conclusion that plaintiff purchaser was not entitled to specific performance was erroneous when plaintiff's failure to pay installment under contract was not unlawful, grossly negligent, or intentional. *Williams Plumbing Co. v. Sinsley (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1027, 1034, 126 Cal. Rptr. 345*

Finding that buyer seeking specific performance of contract has ability to purchase is supported by proof that buyer

commanded resources on which he or she could obtain requisite credit. *D-K Inv. Corp. v. Sutter (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 537, 546, 96 Cal. Rptr. 830*

[4] Employment Contracts

Lab. Code § 2855, prohibiting enforcement of employment contracts extending over more than seven years, is applicable to term of employment of minors under contracts specified in former *Civ. Code § 36* (*now Fam. Code § 6750 et seq.*) (contracts for necessities, artistic or creative services, or professional sports services). *Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. v. Brodel (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 766, 775, 192 P.2d 949*

[5] Forfeiture

Doctrine of relief from forfeiture under *Civ. Code § 3275* was unavailable to allow optionee to recover price increment under new and more costly contract it was forced to negotiate because of its own failure to exercise option within time called for. *Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Prudential Ins. Co. (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 245, 253-254, 221 Cal. Rptr. 738*

Plaintiff was entitled to specific performance of contract to convey real property on ground of relief from forfeiture when his performance was delayed although time was declared to be of the essence, since otherwise defendants would receive advantages of plaintiff's performance without suffering damage because of delay whereas plaintiff would lose all consideration for work done and costs paid by him. *Selby v. Battley (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 659, 664, 309 P.2d 120*

[6] Injunctive Relief

[a] When Injunction Proper

Issuance of permanent injunction preventing health insurer from interfering in internal management of health maintenance organization that was originally set up and funded by insurer was proper, despite conflict between original article of incorporation and amended bylaws eliminating corporate members; article was unlawful as applied. *Health Maintenance Network v. Blue Cross of So. California (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 249 Cal. Rptr. 220*

Injunction was proper to restrain owner from utilizing policy preventing more than four persons from occupying three-bedroom apartment in publicly assisted complex; *Civ. Code § 3423* was not applicable since regulatory agreement provided that city could compel owner's performance by mandamus or other legal or equitable proceeding. *Zakaria v. Lincoln Property Co. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 500, 510, 229 Cal. Rptr. 669*

Injunctive relief aws proper to enjoin defendants from permitting trees on their property to exceed certain height and to overhang plaintiff's property in violation of contract aimed at protecting plaintiff's property from shading when purpose of contract was to prevent very damage that ensued from breach, damage would recur each year, and damage would increase as trees grew. *Smith v. Mendonsa (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 540, 544, 238 P.2d 1039*

Injunction was proper remedy to prevent revocation of agency coupled with interest, whether or not contract could be specifically enforced. *Lane Mortgage Co. v. Crenshaw (1928) 93 Cal. App. 411, 431, 269 P. 672*

Defendant who was salesman for plaintiffs and who quit their employ, went into same business, and used plaintiffs' lists to solicit customers for himself was properly enjoined from further use of customer lists. *Gordon v. Wasserman*

(1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 328, 328-329, 314 P.2d 759

Enjoining continuing trespass of defendants who were occupying and using gas station in manner prohibited by contract under which defendants were to sell plaintiff's products exclusively on property leased from plaintiff was proper. *General Petroleum Corp. of Cal. v. Loughead (1933) 218 Cal. 554, 555, 24 P.2d 457*

Injunction to restrain defendants from selling products and displaying advertising other than plaintiff's under lease which stated that plaintiff should have exclusive right to use all space for advertising purposes and to keep or store gasoline and plaintiff gave defendants right to use leased premises for sole purpose of reselling plaintiff's products together with one other brand was proper. *Associated Oil Co. v. Myers (1933) 217 Cal. 297, 302-303, 18 P.2d 668*

Agreement to transfer stock of peculiar value was specifically enforceable so that breach may also be enjoined. *Steinmeyer v. Warner Cons. Corp. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 515, 519, 116 Cal. Rptr. 57*

[b] When Injunction Not Proper

Preliminary injunction to prevent termination of exclusive distributorship contract was properly denied when effect of injunction would require manufacturer to entrust marketing of its products in wide area to distributor with whom relationship of confidence and cooperation had been rendered impossible due to pendency of lawsuit. *Thayer Plymouth Center, Inc. v. Chrysler Motors Corp. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 300, 304, 63 Cal. Rptr. 148*

Permanent injunction prohibiting manufacturer from breaching contract with distributor was not proper when effect of injunction would be to specifically enforce dealership agreement requiring manufacturer to sell its products to dealer over indefinite term inasmuch as decree would impose on court impossible task of supervising continuous performance by parties. *Thayer Plymouth Center, Inc. v. Chrysler Motors Corp. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 300, 304, 63 Cal. Rptr. 148*

[c] Personal Service Contracts

Rationale underlying enforcement of negative covenants in contracts involving unique personal services of star performers and athletes is that employer has contracted for exclusive right to display "star" for given period. *Lemat Corp. v. Barry (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 671, 678, 80 Cal. Rptr. 240*

[d] Terms of Contract

All terms and conditions of proposed agreement were not required to be set forth in contract in order for injunction to be granted since usual and reasonable conditions of agreement are, in contemplation of parties, part of contract. *Nadell & Co. v. Grasso (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 420, 425, 346 P.2d 505*

[7] Just and Reasonable Contract

Contract for sale of realty as not just and reasonable was to defendant vendors within meaning of *Civ. Code § 3390* when contract provided nothing but plaintiff's good faith and business judgment to insure that they would receive anything for conveying their land. *Handy v. Gordon (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 578, 582, 55 Cal. Rptr. 769, 422 P.2d 329*

Allegation that contract is just and reasonable without allegations as to actual value of land and other circumstances showing that it was just and reasonable or that consideration was adequate is insufficient. *Salisbury v. Yawger (1921)*

184 Cal. 783, 795, 195 P. 682

Purchase of stock at value placed on it by both parties to be paid for by canceling seller's present debts and by advancing part of price to meet expected obligations of seller which she otherwise could not pay was fair and reasonable. *Gilfallan v. Gilfallan (1914) 168 Cal. 23, 27, 141 P. 623*

Requirement that specific performance can be granted only if contract is for adequate consideration and is just and reasonable is sufficiently satisfied for purpose of stating cause of action when complaint alleges contract price, that it is reasonable market value, and that contract, as to defendant, is just and reasonable. *Burrow v. Timmsen (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 283, 290, 35 Cal. Rptr. 668*

Mere allegation that agreement is just and reasonable as not precluding examination of agreement's terms as pleaded and allegation is permitted to be overcome if agreement itself, as matter of law, is unjust or unreasonable. *Burrow v. Timmsen (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 283, 290, 35 Cal. Rptr. 668*

Agreement pursuant to which plaintiff company had option to repurchase inventory of equipment at cost less 10 percent annual depreciation was unjust and unreasonable. *Beatty Safway Scaffold v. Skrable (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 650, 655-656, 4 Cal. Rptr. 543*

[8] Option Contracts

Doctrine of substantial performance was not applicable to extend term of option so as to allow exercise after expiration of stated term. *Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Prudential Ins. Co. (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 245, 251-253, 221 Cal. Rptr. 738*

When optionee had to pay rent for two years while obtaining judgment for specific performance from optionor-landlord, optionee was entitled to recover rent from date he should have had possession. *Erich v. Granoff (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 920, 930-931, 167 Cal. Rptr. 538*

Exercise of option within time specified by contract was sufficient to bind optionee so that specific performance could be granted. *Smith v. Bangham (1909) 156 Cal. 359, 363, 104 P. 689*

Option contract was fair when optionor received $10 for privilege of selling stock within two years with automatic extensions for successive periods of same duration, optionor was not overreached and thereby induced to sell, and he consciously and knowingly agreed to sell shares. *Glascock v. Sukumlyn (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 587, 591, 281 P.2d 90*

[9] Partnership Agreements

One remedy for wrongful repudiation of partnership or joint venture agreement under which partner or joint venturer converted assets of partnership or joint venture to own use and benefit was action for specific performance of partnership or joint venture agreement including remedy of judicial dissolution and accounting, and, if necessary, imposition of trust on partnership or joint venture property. *Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 564-565, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330*

[10] Part Performance Avoiding Statute of Frauds

Mere rendition of services is usually not such part performance of verbal agreement as to relieve contract from operation of statute of frauds, but when services are of such peculiar character that it is impossible to estimate value by pecuniary standard and plaintiff, after performing services, could not be restored to situation he or she was in prior to rendering services, part performance as sufficient to remove oral contract from operation of statute of frauds. *Walker v. Calloway (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 675, 678, 222 P.2d 455*

Contracts that violate statute of frauds are specifically enforceable when there has been part performance by party seeking relief. *Johnson v. Servaes (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 392, 398, 26 Cal. Rptr. 733* (action for specific performance of oral agreement to cancel note and release deed of trust)

[11] Penalties

Agreement to waive payment in default of making improvements under contract was not penalty or invalid provision for liquidated damages when specified payment was stipulation as to enhancement in value which would accrue to property if contemplated improvements were made within specified time. *Stevens v. Los Angeles Dock & Terminal Co. (1912) 20 Cal. App. 743, 748, 130 P. 197*

[12] Personal Service Contracts

Lease requiring that lessees keep gas station open 24 hours a day and conduct all business under lease in efficient manner did not require performance of personal services so that specific performance of lease is proper. *Pike v. Hayden (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 606, 613, 218 P.2d 578*

Rights of employees under *Lab. Code § 2855*, which states that contract to render personal service may not be enforced against employee beyond seven years from commencement of service, as created in public interest and was not waivable by employee. *De Haviland v. Warner Bros. Pictures (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 225, 234-235, 236, 153 P.2d 983*

Extensions of plaintiff actress's contract due to her suspensions for refusing roles and for illness was not binding plaintiff on beyond seven calendar years specified in *Lab. Code § 2855* as maximum period personal services contract can be specifically enforced. *De Haviland v. Warner Bros. Pictures (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 225, 234, 153 P.2d 983*

Contract of joint enterprise under which defendant was to furnish necessary money and plaintiff was to contribute his services in purchase of properties and in their upkeep, maintenance, and repair as specifically enforceable although plaintiff was required to contribute services since contract was not one of employment. *Harms v. Reed (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 853, 861-862, 167 P.2d 747*

[13] Procuring Act of Third Party

Agreement for sale of real property containing clause under which deferred portion of purchase price had to be secured by mortgage executed by buyers and wives, but wives did not execute contract, was specifically enforceable although clause itself would have been unenforceable since mortgage would have been due three years after delivery of deed, that time had elapsed, and court decree did not require giving of mortgage. *Wheat v. Thomas (1930) 209 Cal. 306, 316, 287 P. 102*

When father made agreement with daughter that, if daughter conveyed property to mother, mother and father would convey part of property to daughter's husband on daughter's death, compelling mother to carry out agreement was not proper, but since she accepted property, she had to comply with terms on which benefits were bestowed and had to

convey part of the property to daughter's husband or convey all of property to daughter's estate. *Simons v. Bedell (1898) 122 Cal. 341, 348, 55 P. 3*

Agreement to convey real property later found to be community property was not specifically enforceable when agreement was made by husband and wife did not sign it. *Waldeck v. Hedden (1928) 89 Cal. App. 485, 488, 265 P. 340*

[14] Quasi-Specific Performance

[a] In General

Probate decree distributing property free of any restrictions was not conclusive of rights of promisee or intended beneficiary of contract to make particular disposition of property by will. *Brown v. Superior Court (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 559, 565, 212 P.2d 878*

Plaintiff could not maintain action for quasi-specific performance--seeking to impose constructive trust on proceeds of home sale--when he had adequate legal remedy in the form of a claim for damages for breach of written agreement to bequeath property. *Wilkison v. Wiederkehr (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-833, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631*

Allegation in original complaint that plaintiff had filed claim that was disallowed against estate for money for services did not preclude plaintiff from alleging in amended complaint that services were of exceptional character and could not be estimated in money. *De Hermosillo v. Morales (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 819, 830-831, 304 P.2d 854*

[a] Joint Wills

Evidence showing that couple had consistently pooled their assets during 38-year marriage and wife had made substantial contributions to accumulation established that reciprocal will agreement was supported by adequate consideration. *Estate of Cates (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 1, 14, 93 Cal. Rptr. 696*

[15] Relief Granted by Court

When specific performance is ordered, decree is required to order performance as nearly as possible in accordance with terms of contract. *Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 220, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7* ; *Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 583, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665*

Court of equity is not required to either enforce contract completely or not at all, so that when substantial justice may result by adjusting equities between parties, court is permitted to grant relief; if plaintiff does not complain that relief granted is less than agreement called for, defendant as not permitted to complain that obligation required is not what it could have been. *Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 583, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665*

[16] Sale of Corporate Stock

Specific performance of contract to sell corporate stock was proper when complaint alleged that corporation had only forty acres of oil land, no oil had been discovered thereon and its value was speculative and uncertain, stock had no actual or market value and its value could be ascertained only on discovery of oil, stock was owned by only a few people, its value was fluctuating and dependent on oil market conditions, and plaintiff could not obtain same amount of stock elsewhere. *Gilfallan v. Gilfallan (1914) 168 Cal. 23, 26, 141 P. 623*

Specific performance decree was not inequitable because it requires purchaser to pay reasonable value of corporate stock without concomitantly directing sellers to perform conditions precedent when record established sellers had performed each and every condition of contract and had been excused from performing any acts after certain date because of purchaser's breach. *Capaldi v. Levy (1961) 1 Cal. App. 3d 274, 283, 81 Cal. Rptr. 629*

Contract for sale of shares of bowling alley corporation was specifically enforceable since shares had peculiar value to plaintiff in that they could not have been purchased on open market, could be acquired only from individual defendants, were acquired by plaintiff as part of his business program, and therefore defendants' failure to deliver could not have been compensated by money. *Kaneko v. Okuda (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 217, 233-234, 15 Cal. Rptr. 792*

[17] Separation Agreements

Separation agreements other than those relating to alimony and support are enforceable by specific performance unless provisions violate public policy or specific performance is unwarranted by facts and circumstances, such as when assent of third person not party to agreement is required. *Casady v. Modern Metal Spinning & Mfg. Co. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 728, 731, 10 Cal. Rptr. 790*

[18] Time of Essence

Trial court's conclusion that buyer was entitled to specific performance of time-of-essence contract for sale of real property was erroneous when buyers had not deposited balance of purchase price or provided notice of loan approval within escrow period required in contract. *Fogarty v. Saathoff (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 780, 786-787, 180 Cal. Rptr. 484*

Vendee otherwise entitled to specific performance of installment land sale contract in which time declared to be of essence does not forfeit right to that remedy because of willful failure to make installment payments when due after there has been substantial part performance of contract. *MacFadden v. Walker (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 809, 811, 97 Cal. Rptr. 537, 488 P.2d 1353*

When contract required plaintiff to deposit balance due within 90 days of date of writing, failure to do so precluded action for specific performance although defendant's title to property was clouded since plaintiff was not induced by defendant's word or act not to deposit balance within time specified. *Pitt v. Mallalieu (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 77, 81-82, 192 P.2d 24*

[19] Unavailability of Specific Performance

When redevelopment agency had no power to levy assessment or development fee on subsequent developer in order to refund option deposit of developer who engaged in unsuccessful negotiations with agency, specific performance of provision requiring assessment and refund was properly denied. *Price Dev. Co. v. Redevelopment Agency (9th Cir. 1988) 852 F.2d 1123, 1126-1127* (applying California law in diversity action)

[20] Uncertain Contract

Oral agreement by spouses to leave their property to surviving spouse on condition that survivor leave combined estate to their children is sufficiently certain to sustain equitable relief. *Crail v. Blakely (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 744, 753-754, 106 Cal. Rptr. 187, 505 P.2d 1027*

Contract for sale of unbuilt home on lot in unapproved subdivision was sufficiently definite for enforcement because terms of agreement were ascertainable from properly admitted extrinsic evidence of developer's tract map, site plans, standard home-feature sheets, floor plans, and elevation plans. *Blackburn v. Charnley (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 758, 766-767, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 885*

Contract is not uncertain when it defines with sufficient legal certainty types of improvements contemplated by parties, includes objective method to determine improvement costs, and provides for use of objective third parties (qualified subcontractors) to determine costs. *Larwin-Southern Cal., Inc. v. JGB Inv. Co. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 626, 643-644, 162 Cal. Rptr. 52*

Terms of escrow and written agreement for sale of corporate stock are specifically enforceable when contract provided that exact nature and extent of security for promissory note was to be determined and record disclosed that specific parcel of real property had been proposed as security at about time agreement was executed and land had been inspected and approved by sellers. *Capaldi v. Levy (1969) 81 Cal. Rptr. 629*

Use of word "contiguous" in contract renders contract uncertain since word, as used in contract, placed sellers of property in position where they could be deprived of all their choice land without adequate protection that they would be compensated by buyer for remainder. *Lawrence v. Shutt (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 749, 761, 75 Cal. Rptr. 533*

[21] Waiver

Seller's waiver of right to specific performance in liquidated damages clause did not prevent buyers from compelling specific performance of land sale agreement as long as buyers discharged their contractual duties. *Bleecher v. Conte (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 345, 354, 173 Cal. Rptr. 278, 626 P.2d 1051*

Contracting party may waive conditions placed in contract solely for that party's benefit. *Sabo v. Fasano (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 502, 505, 508-509, 201 Cal. Rptr. 270*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityAdequate Remedy at LawContracts LawConsiderationAdequate ConsiderationContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForfeiture ClausesContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsPartial PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsOption ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsPartnership AgreementsContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal Service AgreementsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsPostnuptial & Separation AgreementsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.93

§ 528.93 Law Reviews

Schwartz, *The Case for Specific Performance, 89 Yale L.J. 271 (1979).*

Note, *Statutory Minimum Compensation and the Granting of Injunctive Relief to Enforce Personal Service Contracts in the Entertainment Industry: The Need for Legislative Reform, 52 So Cal. L. Rev. 489 (1979).*

Briody, *Employment Agreements Not to Compete in California*, 47 State B.J. 318 (1972).

Comment, *Mutuality of Remedy--The Demise of An Ancient Proverb in California, 1 Pacific L.J. 654 (1970).*

Comment, *Specific Performance of Shopping Center Leases in California, 21 Hastings L.J. 532 (1970).*

Note, *Arbitration and Award: Judicial Confirmation of an Award of Specific Performance of a Personal Service Contract, 48 Cal. L. Rev. 140 (1960).*

Note, *Arbitration: Grounds for Vacating Award: Specific Performance of Personal Services Contract, 7 UCLA L. Rev. 507 (1960).*

Note, *Equity: Specific Performance: Inadequacy of Consideration as Defense, 42 Cal. L. Rev. 345 (1954).*

Note, *Equity, Specific Performance, Enforceable Contracts, Uncertainty of Terms, 24 So Cal. L. Rev. 91 (1950).*

Note, *Certainty of Terms Required for Specific Performance, 36 Cal. L. Rev. 120 (1948).*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationAdequate ConsiderationContracts LawConsiderationMutual ObligationContracts

LawFormationDefinite TermsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal Service Agreements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.94

§ 528.94 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 484 et seq. (4th ed. 1996)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 720, 741; vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 740-761, 796, 915, 916, 919, 999-1003, 1015-1026, 1048-1052 (4th ed.)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 4, *Sales* § 209; vol. 11, *Husband and Wife*, § 359; *Equity*, §§ 24-70; vol. 14, *Wills and Probate*, § 109 (10th ed.2005)

Rest Contracts, §§ 358-380, 382

Corbin on Contracts, Vol. 5A, *Specific Performance*, §§ 1136-1213

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 528.95through 528.109

[Reserved]

§§ 528.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.110

§ 528.110 Plaintiff's Checklist

A. Determine the potential defendants in an action for specific performance, including the following:

1. All persons having a claim in the subject matter of the contract.

Whenever an obligation regarding real property is specifically enforceable against a particular person, it may be enforced against any other person claiming under that party by a title created subsequently to the obligation, except a purchaser or encumbrancer in good faith and for value and except that any person may exonerate himself or herself by conveying all his or her estate to the person entitled to enforce the obligation [*Civ. Code § 3395*; *see Caras v. Parker (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 141, 142, 280 P.2d 226* (specific performance against vendor's grantee as authorized by *Civ. Code § 3395* when grantee has actual or constructive notice of prior rights of buyer)].

2. All beneficiaries or heirs at law of deceased person who breached contract [*see §§ 528.131* and *528.132*].

3. Beneficiaries under joint and mutual wills when surviving party made new will leaving the property to others [*see § 528.132*].

4. Administrator or executor of deceased person who breached contract [*see* comments to § 528.132].

5. Assignee of contract from breaching party.

6. Assignor of contract to breaching party.

7. Seller, buyer, or manufacturer of unique chattel.

8. Seller or buyer of real property.

9. Escrow officer.

10. Corporate owner of real property.

11. Any combination of the foregoing.

B. Ascertain the following facts relating to the potential cause of action:

1. Oral or written nature of contract.

2. Plaintiff's interest in obligation, e.g., party to interest, third party beneficiary, assignee, or other interest.

3. Date and place instrument was executed.

4. Subject matter of instrument.

The attorney should note that an action for specific performance cannot usually be brought to enforce (1) an obligation to render personal service, (2) an obligation to employ another in personal service, (3) an agreement to perform an act which the party has no power lawfully to perform when required to do so, (4) an agreement to procure the act or consent of the wife of the contracting party, or of any other third person, or (5) an agreement the terms of which are not sufficiently certain to make the precise act which is to be done clearly ascertainable [*Civ. Code § 3390*]. For further discussion of these agreements, see *§ 528.40* et seq.

5. Terms of instrument.

The terms of a contract must be express and definite in order to grant specific performance. If there is any doubt as to the terms, specific performance will be denied [*see Civ. Code § 3390(5)*].

6. Any consideration received by plaintiff from defendant pursuant to the contract.

7. Any consideration given by plaintiff to defendant pursuant to the contract.

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to the contract if he or she has not received an adequate consideration [*Civ. Code § 3391(1)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 528.15*.

8. Intention of contracting parties.

A written contract may be revised to express the intentions of the parties when through fraud or mutual mistake of the parties or mistake of one party, which the other at the time knew or suspected, the contract does not truly express the parties' intentions [*Civ. Code § 3399*]. As revised, the contract may be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3402*]. For discussion of reformation, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

9. Plaintiff's conduct in securing other party's assent to contract.

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to a contract when the party's assent was obtained by the misrepresentation, concealment, circumvention, or unfair practices of any party to whom performance would become due under the contract, or by any promise of such party which has not been substantially fulfilled [*Civ. Code § 3391(3)*], or when the party's assent was given under the influence of mistake, misapprehension, or surprise. When the contract provides for compensation in case of mistake, however, a mistake within the scope of the provision may be compensated for, and the contract specifically enforced in other respects, if specific performance is proper [*Civ. Code § 3391(4)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 528.17* and *§ 528.19*.

10. Plaintiff's criticisms, if any, of the conduct of the contracting party who refuses to perform.

11. Plaintiff's notification, if any, to defendant of his failure to perform.

12. Nature and extent of plaintiff's performance and excuses for nonperformance, if any, pursuant to the contract.

Specific peformance cannot be enforced in favor of a party who has not fully and fairly performed all conditions precedent on his or her part to the obligation of the other party, except when the failure to perform is only partial, and either entirely immaterial or capable of being fully compensated, in which case specific performance may be compelled on full compensation being made for the default [*Civ. Code § 3392*]. For further discussion, see *§ 528.21*.

13. Nature and extent of defendant's performance, if any, pursuant to the contract.

14. Unilateral rescission, if any, of contract by plaintiff.

. If the contract has been effectively rescinded, it cannot be specifically enforced.

a. If plaintiff attempted to rescind, did he or she notify the defendant of the rescission?

b. If plaintiff attempted to unilaterally rescind, did he or she restore, or offer to restore, the consideration received from the defendant?

c. Did defendant return, or offer to return, consideration received from plaintiff after notification of plaintiff's unilateral rescission?

To effectively rescind a contract, a party must promptly, on discovery of the facts entitling him or her to rescind, restore to the other party everything of value which he or she received from that party under the contract, or offer to restore such items on the condition that the other party do likewise, unless the latter is unable or positively refuses to do so [*Civ. Code § 1691(b)*].

For further discussion of rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

15. Unilateral rescission, if any, of contract by defendant.

On what ground was rescission attempted and what did each of the parties do with respect to the rescission?

16. Nature of defendant's breach or anticipatory repudiation of the contract.

17. Damages, if any, incurred by plaintiff as result of defendant's breach.

C. Obtain relevant documents, including the following:

1. Contract sought to be enforced, if written.

2. Papers related to contract, if any.

3. Amendments to, or modifications of, contract or related papers.

4. Any written communications between the parties relating to the contract or subject matter of the contract.

5. Outstanding leases of real property, if relevant.

6. If a party is incorporated, a copy of its articles of incorporation and bylaws, and any corporate documents relating to the contract or its subject matter.

D. Make the following determinations:

1. Whether a valid and binding contract exists.

2. Whether the contract is subject to specific performance.

Contracts which are specifically enforceable include the following:

a. Contract for sale of real property.

b. Cooperative marketing association contracts.

c. Contract for sale of unique goods.

d. Contract for sale of corporate stock.

e. Agreement to arbitrate controversy.

f. Collective bargaining agreements.

g. Satisfaction of accord.

h. Escrow agreement.

i. Contracts to convey patent rights.

j. Deeds of trust.

k. Agreement not to revoke will.

l. Agreement to make specific provisions in will.

For further discussion of these contracts, see *§ 528.40* et seq.

3. Whether or not the contract terms are sufficiently definite to be specifically enforced [*see Civ. Code § 3390(5)*].

4. Whether or not the contract is fair and reasonable as to the defendant [*Civ. Code § 3391(2)*].

5. Whether or not the defendant received adequate consideration for the contract [*Civ. Code § 3391(1)*].

6. If the remedy at law is sufficient.

It is presumed that the breach of an agreement to transfer real property is not adequately compensable by money [*Civ. Code § 3387*]. Breach of a contract for personal property can be adequately compensated at law unless the property is unique [*Wehen v. Lundgaard (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 610, 613, 107 P.2d 491]* .

7. If plaintiff has adequately performed all his or her conditions precedent to the contract and, if not, if his, or her failure was caused by the defendant or excused for some other reason [*see Civ. Code § 1511*].

8. If the contract is oral, whether or not any factors negative the defense of the statute of frauds.

For discussion of the statute of frauds, see Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

E. Consider possible counts and causes of action, such as the following:

1. Specific performance of contract with or without damages [*see §§ 528.130 -528.132*].

2. Specific performance of contract and injunction [*see § 528.133*].

3. Injunction of breach of contract [*see § 528.133*].

4. Damages for breach of contract [*see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

5. Reformation of contract and specific performance, or damages for breach of contract as reformed [*see* Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments*].

6. Restitution based on rescission of contract [*see* Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*].

7. Cancellation of contract [*see* Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*].

8. Declaration of rights of parties under the contract or of the validity of the contract [*see* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

9. Action for damages for fraud [*see* Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.111

§ 528.111 Defendant's Checklist of Defenses

NOTE:
The following list sets forth some defenses that counsel for defendant may want to consider.

Affirmative defenses can be raised by answer or by demurrer when they appear on the face of the complaint or from matters of which the court must or may take judicial notice.

Possible affirmative defenses to an action for specific performance include the following:

1. Assent obtained by misrepresentation, concealment, circumvention, or unfair practices.

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to a contract if the party's assent was obtained by the misrepresentation, concealment, circumvention, or unfair practices of any party to whom performance would become due under the contract, or by any promise of such party which has not been substantially fulfilled [*Civ. Code § 3391(3)*].

For discussion of this statutory provision, see *§ 528.19*.

2. Assent given under mistake, misapprehension, or surprise.

Specific performance cannot be enforced against a party to a contract if the party's assent was given under the influence of mistake, misapprehension, or surprise, except that when the contract provides for compensation in case of mistake, a mistake within the scope of that provision may be compensated for, and the contract specifically enforced in other respects, if such enforcement is proper [*Civ. Code § 3391(4)*].

For discussion and forms for use when assent was given by mistake, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

3. Contract for personal services.

Neither an obligation to render personal service [*Civ. Code § 3390(1)*] nor an obligation to employ another in personal service [*Civ. Code § 3390(2)*] can be specifically enforced.

For further discussion, see *§ 528.136*.

For a discussion of when an injunction can be obtained for the breach of a contract for personal services that meets certain requirements, see *§ 528.92[6]*.

4. Contract for unlawful act.

An agreement to perform an act which the party does not have the power lawfully to perform when required to do so cannot be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390(3)*].

For a form of defense based on illegality, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

5. Impossibility.

Impossibility is a ground for denying specific performance [*Anderson v. Neal Institutes Co. (1918) 37 Cal. App 174, 176, 173 P. 779]* . If there are no means available for the accomplishment of the objects of the contract, the agreement cannot be specifically enforced [*Dulin v. Pacific Wood & Coal Co. (1894) 103 Cal. 357, 364, 37 P. 207]* .

For a form of defense based on impossibility, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

6. Contract to procure act of third person.

An agreement to procure the act or consent of the wife of the contracting party, or of any third person, cannot be enforced [*Civ. Code § 3390(4)*].

For a form of defense based on procuring the act of a third person, see *§ 528.134*.

7. Seller's title in doubt.

An agreement for the sale of property cannot be specifically enforced in favor of a seller who cannot give the buyer a title free from reasonable doubt [*Civ. Code § 3394*]. This defense is generally used in situations involving the sale of real property. For discussion of contracts for the purchase and sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* . For a form of defense based on doubtful title, see *§ 528.137*.

8. Contract requires series of acts.

A contract that requires a succession of continuous acts necessitating protracted supervision and direction by the court with the exercise of special knowledge, skill, and judgment by the parties performing the acts will not be specifically enforced [*Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 580, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665]* .

For further discussion, see *§ 528.44*. For a form based on this defense, see *§ 528.135*.

9. Statute of limitations.

The period of limitations for an action for specific performance is four years for a written contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)*] and two years for an oral contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*]. Counsel should ascertain when the contract was executed to determine whether or not the period of limitations had run prior to the time the complaint was filed. If it has run, counsel should raise the defense by demurrer if the defect appears on the face of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*]. If the defect does not appear on the face of the complaint, counsel may raise the defense by a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*] or by answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(b)*].

For further discussion of the period of limitations in the context of specific performance, see *§ 528.72*. For further discussion of the limitation of actions in general and a form of defense based on the statute of limitations, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

10. Laches.

The defense of laches may be raised when the plaintiff has delayed prosecuting the action, although the statute of limitations has not yet run. However, the defendant or some other person must be prejudiced by the delay, or the lapse of time must be such that prejudice may reasonably be supposed to have occurred if the defense is to be allowed [*McGibbon v. Schmidt (1916) 172 Cal. 70, 74, 155 P. 460* ; *Marsh v. Lott (1909) 156 Cal. 643, 647, 105 P. 968* ; *see Jones v. H.F. Ahmanson & Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 93, 120, 81 Cal. Rptr. 592, 460 P.2d 464]* .

For discussion and a demurrer based on laches, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawPerformanceImpossibility of PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.130

§ 528.130 Complaint for Specific Performance of Contract [Civ. Code § 3384]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint for Specific Performance of Contract [Civ. Code § 3384]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR
vs.	)	SPECIFIC
_____ [*name*],	)	PERFORMANCE
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California *or allege other basis of venue as appropriate*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

[*EITHER*]

3. _____ [On or about _____ (*date*), at _____ (*city*), _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into a written agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference *or plead contract according to its legal effect or set forth written contract in its exact words*].

[*OR*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into an oral agreement whereby plaintiff agreed to _____ [*specify*] and defendant agreed to _____ [*specify*].

[*EITHER*]

4. The consideration set forth in the agreement was the fair and reasonable value of the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* painting] at the time the agreement was entered into and the contract is, as to defendant, just and reasonable.

[*OR*]

4. At the time the agreement was entered into, the property referred to therein was reasonably worth $_____ so that the agreement was fair, just, and reasonable as to the defendant and the consideration accruing to defendant is adequate.

[*EITHER*]

5. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required by him/her on his/her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

[*OR*]

5. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required by him/her on his/her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract, except _____ [*specify condition(s) not performed*] because _____ [*specify facts showing excuse for nonperformance*]. Plaintiff is now ready, willing, and able to perform _____ [this *or* these] condition(s) required by him/her on his/her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract and has offered, and continues to offer, to perform them.

[*OR*]

5. Plaintiff has offered, and continues to offer, to _____ [*specify conditions of agreement that plaintiff has offered to perform*] [and has tendered to defendant the sum of $_____ as provided for in the agreement]. Plaintiff was at all times, and still is, ready, willing, and able to perform all conditions required by him/her on his/her part to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

[6. *If a condition precedent imposed by the contract is an event which must happen before defendant's duty of performance accrues, allege that such event has occurred, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff removed the items from storage and took them to his/her house as required by the contract so that the items would be readily available for defendant to pick them up.]

7. Defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to perform the conditions of the contract on his/her part in that he/she _____[*state facts showing defendant's breach of contract, e.g.,* refuses to execute a conveyance of the property as provided in the agreement].

[8. *If complaint is to enforce contract other than one involving real property, add:* For the reasons heretofore stated, plaintiff has no adequate legal remedy in that _____ (*specify facts showing that legal remedy is inadequate, e.g.,* damages, if awarded, cannot be properly ascertained since there is no fixed market value and damages will be inadequate to compensate plaintiff for the detriment suffered by him/her).]

[9. *If contract was oral and within statute of frauds, allege:* Defendant is estopped from relying on the statute of frauds because _____(*specify facts which avoid the statute of frauds*).]

[*If action is to enforce terms of agreement executed after January 1, 1986, for change of ownership of real property or mobilehome subject to local property taxation, add EITHER*]

10. The agreement on which this action is based was recorded in the office of the County Recorder of _____ County on _____ [*date*].

[*OR*]

10. The change-in-ownership statement required by *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 480* for this transaction was filed with the County _____ [Recorder *or* Assessor] of _____ County on _____[*date*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That defendant be ordered to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* execute and deliver to plaintiff a sufficient conveyance of the property described herein];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged

on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint for specific performance is for use in an action in which plaintiff seeks to compel the defendant to perform a contract executed by both parties.

[3] Essential Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The making of a written or oral contract that is sufficiently definite and certain in its terms to be enforced (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)* (defendant as permitted to object by demurrer or answer on ground that one cannot ascertain from pleading whether contract is written or oral)].

- That the consideration was adequate and the contract just and reasonable as to defendant (Paragraph 4).

- That plaintiff has performed his or her side of the agreement (Paragraph 5).

- That any event that must happen before defendant's duty of performance accrues has occurred (Paragraph 6).

- That defendant has failed to perform his or her part of the contract (Paragraph 7).

- That plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law (Paragraph 8).

- That the defendant is estopped from relying on the statute of frauds if the contract was oral (Paragraph 9) [for discussion and allegations showing avoidance of the statute of frauds, *see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

These pleading requirements are discussed further in the remainder of this comment.

Since it is presumed that the breach of an agreement to transfer real property cannot be adequately relieved by pecuniary compensation [*Civ. Code § 3387*], Paragraph 8 is not necessary when this complaint is used to compel the specific performance of a contract to convey real property.

[4] Pleading Certainty of Contract

A contract cannot be specifically enforced if its terms are not certain [*see Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 500-502, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318* ; *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 838, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . Thus, the party pleading an ambiguous contract must set forth the meaning of the writing and the meaning attributed to the agreement must be one to which it is reasonably susceptible. When a pleaded agreement, because of the uncertainty of the language in which it is expressed, is susceptible to more than one construction as to its nature or as to the purpose

intended by the parties to be attained by it, the construction of the party pleading it should be accepted, if the construction is reasonable when the pleading is attacked by a general demurrer [*Connell v. Zaid (1969) 268 Cal. App. 2d 788, 794-795, 74 Cal. Rptr. 371* ; *see Durkee v. Cota (1887) 74 Cal. 313, 315, 16 P. 5]* .

[5] Pleading Just and Reasonable Contract and Adequacy of Consideration

A complaint does not state a cause of action for specific performance if it does not allege that the defendant has received adequate consideration and that the contract was just and reasonable as to the defendant [*Young v. Matthew Turner Co. (1914) 168 Cal. 671, 675, 143 P. 1029* ; *Rose v. Lawton (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 18, 19, 29 Cal. Rptr. 844* (plaintiffs as not entitled to judgment for specific performance even though taken by default when complaint did not allege adequate consideration and that contract was just and reasonable as to defendant)].

To allege merely that the contract was just and reasonable and that the consideration was fair and adequate is not sufficient; the complaint should also allege facts supporting the conclusion that the contract is fair and the consideration adequate [*Lifton v. Harshman (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 422, 434-435, 182 P.2d 222 , disapproved on other grounds, Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 326 P.2d 135* ; *W.G. Reese Co. v. House (1912) 162 Cal. 740, 745, 124 P. 442* (allegation that $2,400, mentioned in option, is, and at all times since agreement's execution was, fair and reasonable value of property as sufficient allegation of consideration's adequacy); *Conway v. Moore (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 166, 173, 160 P.2d 865* (allegation that agreement between tenant and plaintiff buyers of property was that tenant was to occupy house for 19 months rent-free in consideration of $190 payment by her and attachment to complaint of contract between plaintiffs and property owners showing purchase price of $510 as sufficient to show that contracts were fair and reasonable and that consideration was adequate even though property was assessed at $1,500 and appraised at $2,500)]. An allegation of the ultimate fact that the consideration named in the contract was the fair and reasonable value of the property at the time of the agreement is a sufficient allegation of the adequacy of the consideration and of the fairness and reasonableness of the contract [*Beverage v. Canton Placer Mining Co. (1955) 43 Cal. 2d 769, 778, 278 P.2d 694* ; *Friedrich v. Roland (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 543, 547-548, 213 P.2d 423* (allegation of making of contract, setting it forth in haec verba, and allegation that consideration named in contract was, at time of agreement's making, fair and reasonable value of property as sufficient allegation that contract was just and reasonable and consideration was adequate)].

[6] Exceptions to Pleading Requirement

Fairness and adequacy of consideration do not need to be alleged when an agreed consideration has been accepted, since the acceptance itself constitutes a waiver of any claim of inadequacy [*Beab, Inc. v. First W. Bank & Trust Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 680, 685, 22 Cal. Rptr. 583* ; *Conway v. Moore (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 166, 174, 160 P.2d 865]* .

When the facts are sufficiently pleaded, there is no necessity of expressly alleging that the contract was supported by adequate consideration and is, as to the defendant, fair and just [*Johnson v. Servaes (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 392, 399, 26 Cal. Rptr. 733* ; *Conway v. Moore (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 166, 173, 160 P.2d 865]* .

[7] Pleading Plaintiff's Performance

In order to state a cause of action for specific performance, plaintiff must allege his or her performance, offer of performance, or sufficient excuse for nonperformance of the contract terms and conditions to be performed on his or her part [*Cockrill v. Boas (1931) 213 Cal. 490, 492, 2 P.2d 774* ; *Reyburn v. Young (1936) 11 Cal. App. 2d 478, 479, 54 P.2d 86]* . A general allegation that plaintiff has duly performed all conditions on his or her part is usually sufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 457*; *Lynn v. Knob Hill Improvement Co. (1917) 177 Cal. 56, 60, 169 P. 1009* ; *Gilfallan v. Gilfallan (1914) 168 Cal. 23, 32, 141 P. 623]* . However, a general allegation of performance is insufficient to allege the performance of an expressed condition necessary to the enforcement of an option [*Estes v. Hardesty (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 747, 749, 152 P.2d 772]* . Moreover, when time is made of the essence of an agreement to pay money, an

allegation that the promisor was at all times ready, willing, and able to make the payment is not the equivalent of an allegation of payment and thus is insufficient to allege performance of conditions precedent [*Pitt v. Mallalieu (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 77, 84, 192 P.2d 24]* .

[8] Excuse For Nonperformance

Although performance may be alleged generally, excuse for nonperformance must be pleaded specifically [*Nelson v. Specialty Records, Inc. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 126, 141, 89 Cal. Rptr. 540* (plaintiff intending to raise estoppel against defendant must plead facts on which estoppel was predicated); *see Hobbs v. Davis (1914) 168 Cal. 556, 561, 143 P. 733* (complaint did not state cause of action when facts alleged as excuse for nonperformance are intended to show that defendants prevented plaintiff from performing but fail to show that plaintiff was unable to pay small amount of money due or that defendants prevented plaintiff from paying)]. Moreover, although an unqualified repudiation by the promisor may excuse tender or performance of conditions precedent before suit, a party is not excused, when seeking specific performance, from pleading and proving at trial that he or she is ready, able, and willing to perform the contractual conditions [*Dotson v. International Alliance etc. Employes (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 362, 372, 210 P.2d 5* ; *Buckmaster v. Bertram (1921) 186 Cal. 673, 678, 200 P. 610* (positive repudiation of sales contract by vendor excuses vendee from formal tender of price as condition precedent to specific performance action but does not obviate necessity of stating in complaint that he is ready, able, and willing to pay amount due); *Ray Thomas, Inc., v. Cowan (1929) 99 Cal. App. 140, 146, 277 P. 1086* (when vendor has repudiated agreement to sell, vendee's allegation that vendee is ready, willing, and able to perform vendee's part of contract is sufficient pleading of performance)].

If a condition precedent imposed by the contract is an event which must happen before the defendant's duty of performance accrues, a specific allegation of the happening of the condition must be pleaded. For example, when the defendant's obligation or promise to pay money is conditional on his or her ability to pay or on the existence of a fund from which payment is to be made, the plaintiff must allege that the condition has been satisfied [*Byrne v. Harvey (1962) 211 Cal. App. 2d 92, 112-113, 27 Cal. Rptr. 110* (quoting Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 2, *Pleading*, § 261 (2d ed. 1970))]. Similarly, when it is essential to the cause of action that the plaintiff should have actually requested that the defendant perform the contract, that request must be stated in the complaint [*California Canneries Co. v. Great W. Lbr. Co. (1919) 44 Cal. App. 69, 71, 185 P. 1008* ; *see Colm v. Francis (1916) 30 Cal. App. 742, 748-749, 159 P. 237* (complaint not subject to demurrer on ground that condition precedent to defendant's performance was not alleged since no condition precedent to that performance existed)].

[9] Pleading Inadequate Remedy at Law

A plaintiff seeking specific performance of a contract must allege facts showing the inadequacy of the legal remedy of damages. An allegation merely that the legal remedy is inadequate or that the breach cannot be adequately compensated by damages is insufficient because it is a conclusion of law; the plaintiff must also allege facts showing the inadequacy of the remedy at law [*Wait v. Kern River Mining Etc. Co. (1909) 157 Cal. 16, 24, 106 P. 98* ; *Korabek v. Weaver Aircraft Corp. (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 32, 40, 149 P.2d 876* ; *see Gilfallan v. Gilfallan (1914) 168 Cal. 23, 25, 141 P. 623]* .

Since it is presumed that the breach of an agreement to transfer real property cannot be adequately relieved by pecuniary compensation, an allegation of the inadequacy of the legal remedy is not required in an action for specific performance of a contract to transfer real property [*Civ. Code § 3387*].

[10] Avoiding Statute of Frauds

When the contract is oral and within the statute of frauds, the complaint also must allege that the defendant is estopped from relying on the statute of frauds [*Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 675, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210]* . For discussion of and forms for use in avoiding the statute of frauds, see Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

[11] Action to Enforce Installment Agreements for Sale of Real Property

Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10 provides that no person or legal entity may maintain an action in any court in California to enforce the terms of a real property agreement as defined in *Civ. Code § 2985(a)* or a conditional sales contract on a mobilehome subject to local property taxation and subject to *Health & Safety Code § 18000 et seq.* providing for a change in ownership of the real property or mobilehome subject to local property taxation until the agreement is duly recorded by the county recorder or the change in ownership statement required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480* has been filed. This requirement is only applicable when the agreement that allegedly transferred ownership was entered into after January 1, 1986 (alternative Paragraphs 10) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*; *see Gov. Code § 27288* (contract must be acknowledged before recording)].

[12] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[13] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of an action for specific performance [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*].

The governing statutes do not expressly specify whether or not an action for specific performance can be a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 88*]. Specific performance is an equitable remedy [*see § 528.11[1]*], and since is not included in the list of cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], an action for specific performance will be an unlimited civil case unless it comes within one of the categories of cases in equity that are specifically designated as limited civil cases. These categories are the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.
- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.
- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[14] Decisions

[a] Adequate Remedy at Law

Specific performance was proper remedy in action to enforce contract to include plaintiff in screen credits of film when legal remedies available for damages from future exhibitions of film were too difficult to assess and overly speculative, and when exhibitions would constitute continuing breach of contract creating danger of numerous lawsuits. *Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc. v. Sanders (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 571, 575, 193 Cal. Rptr. 409*

[b] Principles Governing Relief

Availability of remedy of specific performance is premised on showing by plaintiff of inadequacy of legal remedy, underlying contract that is reasonable and supported by adequate consideration, existence of mutuality of remedies, sufficiently definite contractual terms, and substantial similarity of requested performance to that promised in contract. *Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc. v. Sanders (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 571, 575, 193 Cal. Rptr. 409*

[c] Relief Granted by Court

[i] In General

In action by former shareholder for specific performance of buy-sell agreement by which corporation conveyed shareholder all its rights to engage in stainless steel flatware import and sale business, plaintiff was entitled to accounting of profits made by defendant on business ordered conveyed to plaintiff, plus interest on those profits, during period injunction was stayed pending appeal. *Palmco Corp. v. Superior Court (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 221, 224-226, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 916* (stay during pendency of appeal)

Specific performance of plaintiff's right under investment agreement to participate in future ventures held proper when agreement was clear that defendant handled day-to-day management and plaintiff's participation was only financial. *Okun v. Morton (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 805, 820-821, 250 Cal. Rptr. 220*

Appellate court may correct judgment containing obvious clerical error by modifying judgment; in specific performance action, when findings of fact set forth in statement of decision clearly show amount of purchase price payable and amount of and reasons for several offsets, mathematical error in judgment is clerical error. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 506-508, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

[ii] Attorney's Fees

Attorney's fees properly awarded to party granted specific performance of oral settlement agreement rescinding contract which included attorney's fee provision that did not limit attorney's fees to particular forms of action involving contract. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-842, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

Award of attorney's fees reversed when person against whom specific performance decreed not party to any contract providing for attorney's fees. *Glynn v. Marquette (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 277, 280-282, 199 Cal. Rptr. 306*

[iii] Compensation for Delay

Purchaser entitled to compensation for carrying costs during period of delay and for costs of having to reobtain governmental approvals which expired during delay wrongfully caused by vendor; vendor who does not raise issue in trial court not entitled to offset for lost interest on purchase price; question of entitlement to offset is not pure question of law but as requiring equitable accounting that involves factual and legal issues. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 499, 505-506, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Party awarded specific performance is also entitled to compensation for increased costs resulting from breaching party's delay; such compensation not limited by foreseeability but required to be reasonable and based on equitable principles. *Bravo v. Buelow (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 208, 213-215, 214 Cal. Rptr. 65*

[iv] When Specific Performance Is Denied

Defaulting purchaser who was denied specific performance of contract for sale of real property held entitled to restitution of reasonable value of services rendered by it which benefitted land owner, but not to enhanced value of property attributable to those services because that would amount to windfall. *Lesny Development Co. v. Kendall (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1022-1025, 210 Cal. Rptr. 890*

[d] Right to Jury Trial

No right to jury trial in action for specific performance of oral settlement agreement rescinding contract. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 835-836, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

[e] Uncertain Contract

Law favors carrying out parties' intentions through enforcement of contracts and disfavors holding them unenforceable for uncertainty; parole evidence is admissible to resolve ambiguity; required terms in contract of sale of real property are parties, price, terms of sale, and identity of property. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 500-502, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Agreement certain enough to be specifically enforced when reasonable time to pay is implied by law; hardship to seller not established just because value of house had risen at time of specific performance decree against seller. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 838-840, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

[15] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 740-761 (4th ed. 1997)

[16] Cross References

For alternative fictitious name allegations and allegations of capacity and residence, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For alternative forms for prayers and verifications, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* and Ch. 572, *Verification* , respectively

For alternative allegations of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For specific forms for use in compelling the specific performance of contracts involving real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.131

§ 528.131 Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property

[1] FORM Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR QUASI-SPECIFIC PERFORM-
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	ANCE OF CONTRACT TO MAKE WILL
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California *or allege other basis of venue as appropriate*]. He/She is _____ [an heir *or* a devisee and legatee under the will] of _____ [*name*], hereinafter referred to as the decedent. _____ [*Repeat allegation of residence of each defendant who is a beneficiary under the will or an heir of the decedent*].

[2. Defendant _____ (*name*) is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ (administrator of the estate (with will annexed) *or* executor of the will) of the decedent.]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and decedent entered into _____ [a written

or, if action is based on an enforceable oral agreement (see § 528.131[8]): an oral] contract by the terms of which plaintiff promised to _____ [*specify services or acts that plaintiff agreed to perform*] and decedent promised to _____ [*specify testamentary provisions decedent agreed to make in favor of plaintiff*].

[*If written contract exists, add:*]

A copy of the agreement, signed by the decedent, is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

[*OR, if contract is evidenced by other writing signed by the decedent, add:*]

The contract between plaintiff and decedent was evidenced by a writing signed by the decedent, in the form of _____ [*describe writing, e.g.,* a letter written by decedent], a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

[*OR, if contract is expressly referred to in decedent's will and there is extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract, add:*]

The contract between plaintiff and decedent is expressly referred to in Section _____ of decedent's will, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

[*CONTINUE*]

4. The contract was just and reasonable as to the decedent and the consideration accruing to decedent was adequate in that _____ [*specify facts showing adequacy of consideration*].

5. In reliance on the above-mentioned agreement, plaintiff _____ [*specify acts plaintiff performed or services plaintiff rendered in compliance with agreement*]. Plaintiff has thus performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required to be performed by him/her on his/her part in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

6. On _____ [*date*], decedent died _____ [intestate *or* testate], possessing on that date the following real and personal property: _____ [*specify real and personal property owned by decedent at time of death*].

[*EITHER, if decedent died testate*]

7. By the terms of his/her will, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference, decedent, in violation of his/her agreement with plaintiffs, devised his/her estate in the following manner: _____ [*specify property decedent left and to whom it was left*].

[*OR, if decedent died intestate*]

7. By operation of law, decedent's property _____ [has passed *or* will pass] to _____ [*specify names of decedent's heirs at law*].

[*CONTINUE*]

8. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law in that _____ [*specify reasons that legal remedy will not compensate plaintiff*].

[*If plaintiff is seeking equitable enforcement of oral agreement (see § 528.131[8]), add:*]

9. _____ [*For agreements made prior to 2001:* Defendant is estopped from relying on the statute of frauds *or, for agreements made in 2001 or later:* The agreement between plaintiff and the decedent is enforceable in equity] because plaintiff relied, to plaintiff's detriment, on decedent's promise by _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* caring for decedent from the date of the agreement between plaintiff and decedent until decedent's death], and plaintiff would suffer an unconscionable injury if the agreement between plaintiff and decedent was not enforced according to its terms.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant [s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For a declaration and judgment of the court imposing a constructive trust on the following property of the estate of the decedent: _____ [*specify*].

2. For a declaration and judgment of the court that plaintiff is the beneficiary of the constructive trust and that defendant(s) hold(s) the estate as constructive trustee(s) for the use and benefit of plaintiff;

3. For an order that defendant(s), as trustee(s), convey the property to plaintiff within _____ days from the entry of judgment;

[4. That plaintiff have and recover all income from the (real) property from the date of death of the decedent to the date of conveyance to plaintiff;]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 528.130.*]

CAUTION:

If the complaint is based on an alleged oral promise by a decedent to make a will, or not to revoke a will, or to die intestate, the circumstances under which it is enforceable are limited and the governing law may vary depending on the time at which the alleged oral promise was made. For discussion, see *§ 528.131[8]*.

[2] Use of Form

This complaint for quasi-specific performance of a contract to make a will is for use when plaintiff and a decedent entered into a contract by which decedent was to devise property to plaintiff in return for acts or services of the plaintiff. The action should be brought in a court of equity, not in a probate court [*Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 130, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415* ; *Estate of Mullins (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 924, 928-932, 255 Cal. Rptr. 430]* . If the agreement was made in 1985-2000, it will be subject to the statute of frauds requirements imposed by former *Prob. Code § 150(a)*; *see § 528.13[7]*].

[3] Probate Court Jurisdiction

The probate court in which the administration of the estate is pending does not have jurisdiction to grant quasi-specific performance of an oral agreement to make a will, even if phrased as a petition for instructions pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200*, when some of the property that is the subject of the promise is held by a trust [*Estate of Mullins (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 924, 931-932, 255 Cal. Rptr. 430* ; *cf. Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 430, 249 Cal. Rptr. 622* (when petitioner was both trustee and beneficiary of trust, all interested parties were before probate court, which had jurisdiction under *Prob. Code §§ 17000, 17001*, and could give instructions amounting to enforcement of oral promise regarding disposition of estate)]. *Prob. Code §§ 82(b)(1)* and *15003(a)* make it clear that the probate court has no equitable jurisdiction under the 1986 enactments to impose constructive trusts. The probate court's jurisdiction under *Prob. Code § 17200* is limited to matters concerning the internal affairs of the trust, while an action to impose a constructive trust to carry out an oral promise does not affect the internal affairs of the trust but is a contractual claim adverse to the beneficiaries of the trust [*Estate of Mullins (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 924, 931, 255 Cal. Rptr. 430]* . The action to impose the constructive trust must be brought as a civil action, separate from probate proceedings, in superior court [*Estate of Mullins (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 924, 928, 931, 255 Cal. Rptr. 430]* .

The superior court has jurisdiction of an action for specific performance [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*].

The governing statutes do not expressly specify whether or not an action for specific performance can be a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 88*]. Specific performance is an equitable remedy [*see § 528.11[1]*], and since is not included in the list of cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], an action for specific performance will be an unlimited civil case unless it comes within one of the categories of cases in equity that are specifically designated as limited civil cases. These categories are the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.
- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.
- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[4] Essential Allegations

The elements that must be pleaded in an action for quasi-specific performance of an agreement to make a will are the same as those necessary for specific performance of any contract [*see Porporato v. Devincenzi(1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 675, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210]* . Thus, the plaintiff must allege the following:

- A contract sufficiently definite and certain in its terms to be enforced (Paragraph 3).

- That the contract was just and reasonable and was supported by adequate consideration (Paragraph 4).

- That the plaintiff has performed his or her side of the bargain (Paragraph 5).

- That the decedent promisor failed to perform his or her part (Paragraphs 6 and 7).

The plaintiff must also allege that his or her remedy at law is inadequate (Paragraph 8) and, if the contract was oral and would otherwise be banned by the statute of frauds, that the defendant is estopped from reliance on the statute of frauds because failure to enforce the agreement would result in either unconscionable injury to the plaintiff or unjust enrichment of the defendant (Paragraph 9).

Since the relief given is in the form of imposing a constructive trust on the property in the hands of the defendants, the plaintiff also must meet the requirements of alleging a constructive trust [*see Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 130, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415]* . Consequently, the plaintiff must plead facts constituting the cause of action, such as breach of the promise to devise property (Paragraph 7) and specifically identifiable property (Paragraphs 3 and 6) [*see Ehret v. Ichioka (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 637, 642, 55 Cal. Rptr. 869]* .

[5] Parties

In an action for quasi-specific performance, since the action is against the distributee personally and not against the estate, the heirs, devisees, and legatees, neither the executor nor the administrator are necessary parties to the action [*Estate of Hoffman (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 135, 142, 71 Cal. Rptr. 230* ; *see Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 130, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415]* . All beneficiaries under a will are interested in the issues and subject of the action and can properly be joined, but they are not indispensable parties. A plaintiff may litigate his or her claim against the appearing beneficiaries alone and obtain a decree which binds them alone. Any absent beneficiaries, not being before the court, will not be bound by the judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, and their property interests will not be affected [*Bank of California v. Superior Court (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 516, 519, 524-525, 106 P.2d 879* (trial as proper even though summons served only on executor and residuary legatee)].

The executor may properly be made a party defendant for the purpose of restraining him or her from distributing the property without regard for plaintiff's interests [*Ludwicki v. Guerin (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 127, 132, 17 Cal. Rptr. 823, 367 P.2d 415]* .

[6] Claim Against Estate

The complaint for quasi-specific performance of an agreement to make a will does not need to show that, before its filing, the plaintiff presented a demand or claim for the property to the executor. Since the relief sought is equitable and plaintiff is not asserting a claim against the estate, the presentation of a claim is not a condition precedent to the maintenance of the action [*Walker v. Calloway (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 675, 683, 222 P.2d 455]* .

[7] Agreements Made In 1985-2000

Agreements to make a will or devise, or not to revoke a will or devise, or to die intestate, if made in the years 1985-2000, are governed by former *Prob. Code § 150* (repealed Jan. 1, 2001) [*Prob. Code § 21700(c)* (validity of pre-2001 agreements determined under law in effect at time agreement was made)]. Under former *Prob. Code § 150*, a contract to make a will or devise, or not to revoke a will or devise, or to die intestate, if made after December 31, 1984,

can be established only by one of the following:

- Provisions of a will stating material provisions of the contract;

- An express reference in a will to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract; or

- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.

The language of former *Prob. Code § 150*, standing alone, would appear to preclude any enforcement of oral agreements not referred to in a will or in a writing. The courts, however, have held that while former *Prob. Code § 150* generally provides the sole means under which a party can establish an agreement not to revoke a will, the Legislature, by enacting that section, did not express an intent to abolish the use of the equitable estoppel doctrine in appropriate circumstances [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . Thus, equitable estoppel principles were available under former *Prob. Code § 150* (or its predecessor, former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*) to enforce a testator's alleged oral agreement to leave all of his property to his son if the son cared for him during the testator's lifetime [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 358, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628* (whether agreement was before or after Dec. 31, 1984, was not ascertainable)]. Equitable estoppel generally may apply to avoid the statutes of fraud and to make an oral agreement enforceable if (1) the promisee detrimentally relied on the agreement and would suffer an unconscionable injury if the oral agreement were not enforced, or (2) the promisor would receive unjust enrichment if allowed to retain the benefit of the promisee's performance without abiding by the promisor's obligations under the oral agreement [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628]* . The language of optional Paragraph 9 of this form alleges detrimental reliance. It may be expected, however, that the availability of equitable estoppel will depend on the facts of each case.

A party also may be estopped from asserting the statute of limitations as a defense to an untimely action to enforce an oral promise to make awill. In a case in which the one-year statute of limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* applied because the promisor had made an inter vivos transfer of property covered by the contract, the court followed the reasoning discussed above [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* ; *see Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . It held that while *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2(b)* (at the time designated as *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2(a)(2)*), clearly shows that the Legislature intended that the one-year statute of limitations could not be "tolled" or "extended," the statute says nothing about equitable estoppel. The court concluded that in the absence of any such language or legislative history suggesting that was what the Legislature intended, the doctrine of equitable estoppel still applies [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* (appellant alleged sufficient facts to come within doctrine of equitable estoppel to application of statute of limitations)].

[8] Agreements Made After 2000

Former *Prob. Code § 150* was repealed in 2000 and replaced by *Prob. Code § 21700*, effective Jan. 1, 2001. Under *Prob. Code § 21700*, a contract to make a will or devise or other instrument, or not to revoke a will or devise or other instrument, or to die intestate, if made after 2000, can be established only by one of the following [*Prob. Code § 21700(a)*]:

- Provisions of a will or other instrument stating the material provisions of the contract.

- An expressed reference in a will or other instrument to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract.

- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.

- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and the claimant or a promise by the decedent to the claimant that is enforceable in equity.

- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and another person for the benefit of the claimant or a promise by the decedent to another person for the benefit of the claimant that is enforceable in equity.

The first three methods are carried over from the predecessor section, former *Prob. Code § 150*. The last two methods are new. Legislative analysis indicates that these additions were intended at least in part to codify the equitable basis for establishing such a contract that previously had been recognized by case law [*see* Bill Analysis, Senate Judiciary Committee, AB 1491, 1999-2000 Regulsar Session, pp. 12-13 (March 28, 2000); Bill Analysis, Assembly Committee on Judiciary, AB 1491, 1999-2000 Regulsar Session, p. 4 (Jan. 11, 2000)]. However, evidence of the agreement must be "clear and convincing."

The execution of a joint will or mutual wills does not create a presumption of a contract not to revoke the will or wills [*Prob. Code § 21700(b)*].

[9] Lis Pendens

If the property sought to be reached is real property, or has been invested in real property, counsel should file a lis pendens to preclude the possibility of a third party purchaser or encumbrancer acquiring an interest from defendant which would be superior to plaintiff's [*see Coppinger v. Superior Court (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 883, 891, 185 Cal. Rptr. 24* (action for constructive trust on real property as supporting filing of lis pendens)].

[10] State Statutes

Agreement that by its terms is not to be performed during promisor's lifetime required to be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1624(e)*

Party who gains thing by wrongful act is involuntary trustee of thing gained. *Civ. Code § 2224*

Promise to devise or bequeath property may be required to be in writing. *Prob. Code § 21700(a)*

[11] Decisions

[a] Agreements Made Before 1985

Party estopped from relying on statute of frauds (Code Civ. Proc. § 1624(6); now Code Civ. Proc. § 1624(e)) to invalidate oral agreement to dispose of property by will when unconscionable injury would result from denying enforcement after one party was induced to seriously change position in reliance on contract or when unjust enrichment would result if party receiving benefits of other's performance is allowed to invoke statute. *Redke v. Silvertrust (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 94, 101, 98 Cal. Rptr. 293, 490 P.2d 805*

When daughters sued step mother's estate and beneficiaries of step-mother's estate to impose constructive trust on property stepmother inherited from their father and had promised to leave to them, daughters were not engaged in contest within meaning of no contest clause in their father's will and could not be required to return to his estate distributions therefrom. *Estate of Watson (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 569, 574-575, 223 Cal. Rptr. 14*

Although promisee may have constructive trust imposed during promisor's lifetime if specific property is subject of promise to make will and promisor has no right to consume that property for maintenance and support or otherwise dispose of it during his or her lifetime, general promise was operative only was to property owned at date of death. *Westbrook v. Superior Court (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 703, 711-715, 222 Cal. Rptr. 317*

Promise was unenforceable when writing expressed only appreciation and intention to devise property to plaintiff, not actual promise to do so, and insufficient facts existed to estop application of statute of frauds; writing relating to claimed life estate created only agency and right to occupy rent-free during lifetime of principal. *Lombardo v. Santa Monica Young Men's Christian Assn. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 529, 537-542, 215 Cal. Rptr. 224*

Even though case law contains two conflicting lines of authority on issue of inadequacy of legal remedy as condition precedent to equitable relief for breach of contract to make will, remedy at law is inadequate when action at law would merely mark time pending development of probate administration. *Thompson v. Beskeen (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 292, 296, 35 Cal. Rptr. 676*

[b] Agreements Made in 1985-2000

Doctrine of equitable estoppel precluded application of one-year statute of limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* to untimely action to enforce father's oral promise to make will leaving vineyard to son; while statute could not be "tolled" or "extended," it did not mention equitable estoppel and in absence of statutory language or legislative history to contrary, doctrine of equitable estoppel still applied. *Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548*

Testator's alleged oral agreement to leave all of property to son if son cared for him during testator's lifetime was enforceable under equitable estoppel principles; following holding in *Juran* that use of equitable estoppel doctrine not abolished [*see Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* , court found that nothing in former *Prob. Code § 150* distinguished between cases in which promisor was alive and cases in which promisor was dead. *Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 354-355, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*

Oral agreement between husband and wife not to revoke will was enforceable by stepdaughter under doctrine of equitable estoppel after wife (plaintiff's mother) died and stepfather (defendant) revoked original will; while former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* generally provided sole means under which party could establish agreement not to revoke will, Legislature did not intend to abolish use of equitable estoppel doctrine in appropriate circumstances. *Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588*

Prenuptual agreement to leave life estate in residence was not promise to devise or bequeath property so as to be governed by former *Prob. Code § 150* when spouses contemplated that conveyance of life estate would be accomplished by modifying trust instrument; specific performance proper. *Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 583, 587-588, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773*

[12] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 744 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 31, 33; vol. 14, *Wills and Probate*, § 109 (10th ed. 2005)

[13] Cross References

For a discussion of and forms for use in actions to impose constructive trusts, see Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts , Explain, Pubkuc, Charitable, and Totten Trusts*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.132

§ 528.132 Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property--Decedent Revoked Will Made in Compliance With Agreement

[1] FORM Complaint for Quasi-Specific Performance of Contract to Make Will--Agreement to Devise Property--Decedent Revoked Will Made in Compliance With Agreement
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR QUASI-SPECIFIC PERFORM-
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	ANCE OF CONTRACT TO MAKE WILL
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is named as beneficiary in the will dated _____ [*date*], of _____ [*name of decedent*], hereinafter referred to as the decedent.

2. _____ [Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ (*city*), _____ County, California *or allege other basis of venue as appropriate*]. He/She is _____ [an heir *or* a devisee and legatee under the subsequent purported will dated _____,] of the decedent [*Repeat allegation of residence of each defendant who is a beneficiary under the subsequent, purported will of the decedent*].

[3. Defendant _____ (*name*) is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ (administrator of the estate (with the subsequent purported will annexed) *or* executor of the subsequent purported will) of the decedent in a pending proceeding in the Superior Court for the State of California for the County of _____, entitled _____, No. _____.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and decedent entered into _____ [a written *or, if action is based on an enforceable oral agreement (see discussions under [3], below; see also § 528.131[7], [8]):* an oral] contract[, signed by decedent, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference], by the terms of which plaintiff promised to _____ [*specify services or acts that plaintiff agreed to perform*] and decedent promised to _____ [*specify testamentary provisions decedent agreed to make in favor of plaintiff; e.g.,* devise decedent's entire estate to plaintiff]. Thereafter decedent did in fact execute such a will, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit Band incorporated by reference, containing provisions made in accordance with decedent's promise to plaintiff as specified in this paragraph.

5. [*Allegation that contract was just, reasonable and supported by adequate consideration. See § 528.131, Paragraph 4.*]

6. [*Allegation that plaintiff has performed his or her obligations under the contract. See § 528.131, Paragraph 5.*]

7. Subsequently, the decedent executed a new will, dated _____ [*date*], purporting to revoke the will executed in accordance with his/her agreement with plaintiff, and purporting to devise and bequeath to defendant _____ [*name*] the property that was promised to plaintiff, in contravention of the provisions of the agreement and the rights of plaintiff. A copy of the subsequent, purported will is attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated by reference.

8. [*Remedy at law inadequate. See § 528.131, Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For a declaration and judgment of the court imposing a constructive trust on the following property of the estate of the decedent: _____ [*specify*];

2. For a declaration and judgment of the court that plaintiff is the beneficiary of the constructive trust and that defendant(s) hold(s) the estate as constructive trustee(s) for the use and benefit of plaintiff;

3. For an order distributing to plaintiff the estate of the decedent as provided in the _____ [written *or* oral] agreement between plaintiff and the decedent, as hereinabove alleged, and in the will dated _____ [*date*];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 528.130.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a plaintiff against beneficiaries of a decedent's will executed in violation of an agreement between plaintiff and decedent whereby decedent agreed to devise certain property to plaintiff in return for acts or services of the plaintiff, and decedent executed a will devising the property to plaintiff, but subsequently executed a second will revoking the previous will and devising the property to beneficiaries other than plaintiff. The complaint seeks to impose a constructive trust for plaintiff's benefit on the property [*see Civ. Code § 2224*]. The complaint is adapted from the facts in *Thompson v. Beskeen (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 292, 35 Cal. Rptr. 676* .

[3] Essential Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- That plaintiff was the beneficiary under the decedent's first will (Paragraph 1).
- That defendant or defendants is or are the beneficiary or beneficiaries under decedent's subsequent will (Paragraph 2).
- That plaintiff and decedent entered into a contract under which decedent would make a will favorable to plaintiff and the contract's relevant terms, and did not in fact make such a will (Paragraph 4).
- That the contract was just, reasonable, and supported by adequate consideration (Paragraph 5).
- That plaintiff performed all of his or her obligations under the contract (Paragraph 6).
- That decedent subsequently executed a second will, revoking the first and devising his or her estate to a beneficiary or beneficiaries other than plaintiff (Paragraph 7).
- That plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law (Paragraph 8).

This complaint assumes that the first will executed by the decedent incorporated provisions contemplated by the agreement between the parties. Even if the agreement is oral, its existence may be established, in accordance with former *Prob. Code § 150* (for agreements made during 1985-2000) or *Prob. Code § 21700* (for agreements executed after 2000), by provisions of a will or other instrument stating the material provisions of the contract [*see* former *Prob. Code § 150*; *Prob. Code § 21700(a)*; *see also Prob. Code § 21700(c)* (applicable law)]. For discussion regarding the general validity and proof of oral agreements to make or revoke a will, or to die intestate, see *§ 528.131[4], [7],* and *[8]*. The *form in § 528.131[1]* also contains provisions that may be used when the existence of the agreement is to be established in some other manner.

[4] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of an action for specific performance [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*].

The governing statutes do not expressly specify whether or not an action for specific performance can be a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 88*]. Specific performance is an equitable remedy [*see § 528.11[1]*], and since is not included in the list of cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], an action for specific

performance will be an unlimited civil case unless it comes within one of the categories of cases in equity that are specifically designated as limited civil cases. These categories are the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.

- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.

- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 528.131*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.133

§ 528.133 Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code §§ 3422, 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]--Enjoining Breach of Personal Services Contract [Civ. Code § 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code §§ 3422, 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]--Enjoining Breach of Personal Services Contract [Civ. Code § 3423(e); Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
Defendant.	)	ORDER, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND
	)	PERMANENT INJUNCTION
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*identify plaintiff and allege capacity in which plaintiff is suing defendants, if that capacity is other than as individual*].

2. _____ [Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California *or allege other basis of venue as appropriate*].

3. _____ [On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff and defendant entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof *or plead contract according to its legal effect or set it forth in its exact words*]. Under the contract, defendant agreed to render personal services to plaintiff for the period from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*]. The promised services are _____ [special *or* unique *or* unusual *or* extraordinary *or* intellectual] in character which gives them peculiar value, the loss of which cannot be reasonably or adequately compensated in damages in an action at law.

4. The consideration plaintiff agreed to pay defendant for the personal services defendant agreed to render was $ _____, over the _____-year term of the contract, which exceeds the minimum rate of compensation required by *Code of Civil Procedure Section 526* and *Civil Code Section 3423*. [At the time of the filing of this complaint, payments actually made by plaintiff to defendant during the term of the contract aggregated $ _____, which exceeds the minimum rate of compensation required by *Code of Civil Procedure Section 526* and *Civil Code Section 3423*.]

[5. Defendant began performance of the contract on _____ and performed the requisite services until _____.]

6. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required to be performed on his/her part in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract up to this time and is ready, willing, and able to perform all conditions required to be performed on his/her part in the future.

[*EITHER*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant entered into a contract with _____ [*name*] to render the following services to _____ [*name of third party*]: _____ [*specify services to be rendered to third party by defendant, which are substantially similar to the ones to be rendered to plaintiff under the contract with plaintiff*]. Defendant will not be able to perform the above-mentioned services for plaintiff if he/she complies with this new contract since _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the services are to be performed at the same time as those under plaintiff's contract and defendant cannot perform both services at one time].

[*OR*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant notified plaintiff that he/she would not [continue to] perform the personal services for plaintiff as provided in the contract because _____ [*specify reasons*]. [Pursuant to this notification, defendant stopped rendering the services on _____ (*date*).] Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant has contracted with a third party to perform services for that party that are substantially similar to the ones defendant contracted to perform for plaintiff.

[*OR*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant stopped performing the personal services he/she was obligated to render under the contract with plaintiff. Plaintiff has asked defendant to continue performing the services but defendant refused, and continues to refuse, to do so. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant has contracted with a third party to perform services for that party that are substantially similar to the ones defendant contracted to perform for plaintiff.

[*ADD, if contract for producing phonorecord and seven-year period under Lab. Code § 2855 has passed*]

8. Defendant did not give written notice, in accordance with *Section 2855(b) of the Labor Code* and *Section 1020 of the Code of Civil Procedure*, to plaintiff specifying that he/she from and after a future specified date would no longer render service under the contract, which is a contract to render personal service in the production of phonorecords in which sounds are first fixed as defined in *Section 101 of Title 17 of the United States Code*.

9. [Plaintiff has spent considerable time and money in training defendant in that _____ (*specify supporting facts*).] [Plaintiff's financial stability is dependent on defendant's performing his/her services for plaintiff in that _____ (*specify reasons*)]. Plaintiff will suffer great and irreparable injury unless defendant is enjoined and restrained by order of this court from performing his/her services for anyone else in that _____ [*specify supporting facts*].

10. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries _____ [currently being suffered *or* which are threatened] in that _____ [*specify facts in addition to those previously alleged which tend to show the inadequacy of any legal remedy, especially monetary damages, which plaintiff might pursue, e.g.,* it will be impossible for plaintiff to determine the precise amount of damage which he/she/it will suffer if defendant's conduct is not restrained].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any he/she has, why he/she should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;

2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant from performing the following services for any other person, corporation, or association during the period of the contract with plaintiff: _____ [*specify services defendant is not to perform*].

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 528.130.*]

CERTIFICATION RE NOTICE

I hereby certify that _____ [*either* on _____ (*date*), I informed defendant of what time and where the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order would be made *or* in good faith I attempted to inform defendant of what time and where the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order would be made, by _____ (*specify efforts*), but I was unable to do so *or* notice to defendant of the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order should not be required for the reason that _____ (*specify*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[Attorney for] Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in obtaining a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, and permanent injunction to prevent the breach of a contract for personal services [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*; *see* discussion in *§ 528.45[2][c]* and *§ 528.45[3]*].

[3] Essential Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 1).
- Defendant's capacity (Paragraph 2).
- A contract between plaintiff and defendant, pursuant to which defendant was to perform special, unique, unusual, extraordinary, or intellectual services for plaintiff (Paragraph 3).
- The compensation plaintiff agreed to pay defendant, and that the compensation, and payments already made, exceeded the minimum prescribed by statute (Paragraph 4) [*see Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)* and discussion in [4], *below*].
- If defendant has partially performed, his or her partial performance of the contract (Paragraph 5).
- That plaintiff has performed on his or her part all conditions precedent to the contract and is willing to continue performance of the contract (Paragraph 6).
- That defendant has contracted with a third party to render services substantially similar to those promised to plaintiff or that defendant has refused to perform the requisite services or that defendant has notified plaintiff that he or she will not continue to perform those services for plaintiff (Paragraph 7).
- If the contract is for personal service in the production of phonorecords and the seven-year period under Lab. Code § 2855 has passed, that defendant failed to give written notice as required by *Lab. Code § 2855(b)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 1020* that he or she would no longer render service after a certain date (Paragraph 8).
- If plaintiff has spent considerable time and money training defendant, that he or she has done so, and that plaintiff's financial stability is dependent on defendant's performance, and that plaintiff will suffer great and irreparable injury if defendant is not enjoined from performing his or her services for another party (Paragraph 9).
- That plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law (Paragraph 10).

[4] Calculating Required Compensation

In addition to the other statutory criteria, injunctive relief for breach of a personal services contract is available only if the minimum compensation requirements specified in *Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)* have been met. The statutory minimum compensation requirements (applicable to contracts entered into on or after January 1, 1994) are listed in the following chart:

(1) Year of contract in which injunction is sought	(2) Minimum rate of compensation	(3) Aggregate minimum compensation required to be specified in contract through and including year in which injunction is sought	(4) Additional compensation that must actually be paid through and including contract year during which injunction is sought	(5) Total minimum compensation required for injunctive relief
1st	9,000	$ 9,000	_____	$ 9,000
2nd	12,000	21,000	_____	21,000
3rd	15,000	36,000	_____	36,000
4th	15,000	51,000	15,000	66,000
5th	15,000	66,000	15,000	81,000
6th	15,000	81,000	30,000	111,000
7th	15,000	96,000	30,000	126,000

A personal services contract that does not meet the foregoing criteria still can be specifically enforced if it meets the alternative criteria of *Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(B)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(ii)*, which provide that injunctive relief may be granted if the aggregate compensation actually received for the services provided under a contract that does not meet the criteria of *Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i)*, is at least 10 times the applicable aggregate minimum amount specified in clauses *Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A)(i)* and *(ii)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i)(I)* and *(II)* through and including the contract year during which the injunctive relief is sought. As a condition to petitioning for an injunction, amounts payable under these alternative minimums may be paid at any time prior to seeking injunctive relief [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(B)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(ii)*].

Compensation paid in any contract year in excess of the minimums specified in *Civ. Code § 3423(e)(2)(A)* and *(B)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(B)(i)* and *(ii)* apply to reduce the compensation otherwise required to be paid under those provisions an any subsequent contract years [*Civ. Code § 3423(e)(3)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)(C)*].

[5] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Certification re Notice

When a temporary restraining order is sought without notice to the opposite party, the applicant or the applicant's attorney must certify to the court under oath that either (1) within a reasonable time prior to the application he, she, or it informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney, if any, at what time and where the application would be made, (2) he or she in good faith attempted to so inform the opposing party and his or her attorney but was unable to do so, and specify the efforts made to contact them, or (3) for reasons specified he or she should not be required to so inform the opposing party or his or her attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1150* (procedure for obtaining TRO), 3.1203(a) (requiring notice of ex parte applications absent exceptional circumstances)]. For detailed discussion and additional forms for obtaining injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[7] Los Angeles County Practice

All applications in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County for the issuance of temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions are assigned to Writs and Receivers Department [*see* Los Angeles Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 2.5(i)].

The procedure that counsel must follow to obtain provisional injunctive relief in Los Angeles County Superior Court is specified in great detail by Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.32. Counsel seeking such relief in Los Angeles County should pay close attention to those sections.

[8] State Statutes

Obligation to render personal service or to employ another in personal service generally is not specifically enforceable. *Civ. Code § 3390(1),(2)*

Grounds for issuance of injunction. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Breach of personal service contract can be enjoined under specified circumstances. *Civ. Code § 3423(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(5)*

Definition of injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 525*

Personal service contract cannot be specifically enforced beyond seven years from commencement of service. *Lab. Code § 2855(a)*

Enforceability of contract to render personal service in production of phonorecords; action for damages for breach of contract. *Lab. Code § 2855(b)*

[9] Decisions

Strictures against judicial compulsion of personal service contract is inapplicable in action against hospital for arbitrary refusal to provide medical services when hospital would not be required to provide services of any specific physician,

and therefore injunctive relief is available. *Leach v. Drummond Medical Group, Inc. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 362, 369, 192 Cal. Rptr. 650*

[10] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 274 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, § 25 (10th ed. 2005)

[11] Cross References

For discussion of and forms for use in obtaining injunctive relief in general, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For a complaint for damages for breach of an employment contract by refusal to perform services, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.134

§ 528.134 Affirmative Defense--Contract to Procure Act of Third Person [Civ. Code § 3390(4)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Contract to Procure Act of Third Person [Civ. Code § 3390(4)]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

The contract between plaintiff and defendant is not subject to specific performance because it is an agreement to procure the act or consent of _____ [*specify name of wife of one of the contracting parties or of a third party*].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of affirmative defense is for use by defendant in an answer to a complaint for specific performance of a contract when the contract calls for procuring the act or consent of the wife of a contracting party, or of any third person [*Civ. Code § 3390(4)*].

Although *Civ. Code § 3390(4)*specifically mentions the wife of the contracting party and does not make any provision for the husband of the contracting party, it appears that an action involving an agreement to procure the act or consent of a husband could also be defended on the ground that the husband was a third party.

[3] State Statutes

Agreement to procure act or consent of wife of contracting party or third person as not specifically enforceable. *Civ. Code § 3390(4)*

[4] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, § 47 (10th ed. 2005)

58 Cal. Jur. 3d Specific Performance § 41

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.135

§ 528.135 Affirmative Defense--Contract Requires Series of Acts

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Contract Requires Series of Acts

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

The agreement entered into between plaintiff and defendant is not subject to specific performance because the contract requires a continuing series of acts that cannot be consummated in one transaction so that performance of the contract would require protracted supervision and direction by the court and the exercise of special knowledge, skill, and judgment by the parties.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint for specific performance when the contract requires a continuing series of acts that would call for protracted supervision and direction by the court.

Although California follows the rule against the specific performance of contracts that stipulate a succession of continuous acts which require protracted supervision and direction by the court [*see Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 580, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665]* , defense counsel should note that a number of cases that seem to involve a series of continuing acts have been specifically enforced [*see Bakersfield Country Club v. Pacific Water Co. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 528, 539, 13 Cal. Rptr. 573* (installation of water pipes); *Gale v. Seymour (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 727, 728, 205 P.2d 752* (paving parking lot); for further cases, see *§ 528.44*]. One court distinguished the situation before it, the periodic dredging of a channel, on the basis that the act was not as complex as those involved in the contracts for which specific performance had been denied and no cooperation between the parties was required [*Ellison v. Ventura Port Dist. (1979) 80 Cal. App. 3d 574, 581, 145 Cal. Rptr. 665]* .

[3] Decisions

*Civ. Code § 3390(4)*as not applicable to bar specific performance because of seller's failure to obtain trust deed

beneficiary's consent to prepayment, which terms of note specified it did not have to give and which buyer knew at time of contracting, because loan matured before trial and court was required to consider equities of awarding specific performance as of time of entry of judgment. *Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 897, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460*

[4] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, § 45 (10th ed. 2005)

58 Cal. Jur. 3d Specific Performance § 37

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.136

§ 528.136 Affirmative Defense--Contract for Personal Services [Civ. Code § 3390(1), (2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Contract for Personal Services [Civ. Code § 3390(1), (2)]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

The contract that plaintiff and defendant entered into was a contract to _____ [render *or* employ another in] personal services in that _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] promised to _____ [perform the following services for _____ (defendant *or* plaintiff): _____ (*specify personal services to be performed*) *or* employ _____(defendant *or* plaintiff) in personal service to perform the following services: (*specify personal services to be performed*)]. Therefore, pursuant to _____ [Section 3390(1) *or* Section 3390(2)] of the Civil Code, the obligation cannot be specifically enforced.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint for specific performance when the contract which plaintiff seeks to specifically enforce is one to render or employ another in personal service [*see Civ. Code § 3390(1), (2)*].

For a discussion of when personal service contracts can be specifically enforced, see *§ 528.45[1]*. For a discussion of when injunctive relief may be granted in situations involving personal service contracts, see *§ 528.45[2][c]*.

[3] State Statutes

Obligation to render or employ another in personal service as not specifically enforceable. *Civ. Code § 3390(1),(2)*

[4] Decisions

Settlement agreement providing that plaintiff be appointed to permanent position of physician specialist in cardiology section of hospital as personal services contract, specific performance of which is prohibited by *Civ. Code § 3390(1),(2). Barndt v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 397, 403-406, 259 Cal. Rptr. 372*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 48-51 (10th ed. 2005)

58 Cal. Jur. 3d Specific Performance §§ 45, 46

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 528 SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
PART V. FORMS

46-528 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 528.137

§ 528.137 Affirmative Defense--Seller's Title in Doubt [Civ. Code § 3394]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Seller's Title in Doubt [Civ. Code § 3394]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

The contract between plaintiff and defendant cannot be specifically enforced in favor of plaintiff seller since the plaintiff cannot give defendant buyer a title to _____ [*specify property involved in contract*] that is free from reasonable doubt in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* seller conveyed title to the property to a third party bona fide purchaser who had no notice of the contract between seller and buyer].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant buyer in an action for specific performance when the plaintiff seller is seeking to enforce a contract of sale but the seller cannot give defendant title free from reasonable doubt [*see Civ. Code § 3394*]. The defense will most likely be used in situations involving contracts for the sale and purchase of real property. See the discussion in *§ 528.22*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in actions for specific performance of contracts for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser*

[4] State Statutes

Agreement for sale of property as not specifically enforceable in favor of seller who cannot give buyer title free from reasonable doubt. *Civ. Code § 3394*

[5] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 56-57 (10th ed. 2005) 2

58 Cal. Jur. 3d Specific Performance § 24

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 529.syn

§ 529.syn Synopsis to Chapter 529: STATEMENT OF DECISION

§ 529.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 529.02 Cross References

§§ 529.03-529.09 [Reserved]

§ 529.10 Governing Law

§ 529.11 Statement of Decision in Trial Courts

§ 529.12 Request for Statement of Decision

[1] Time for Making Request

[2] Contents of Request

[3] Effect of Failure to Make Request

§ 529.13 Length of Trial Affects Form and Procedure of Statement

[1] In General

[2] Determining Length of Trial

§ 529.14 Proposals Following Request for Statement of Decision

§ 529.15 Procedure for Preparation of Proposed Statement of Decision

§ 529.16 Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision

§ 529.17 Hearing in Unlimited Civil Case on Proposals or Objections

§ 529.18 Judgment When Statement Is Waived or Not Requested

[1] Proposed Judgment

[2] Objections

[3] Filing Judgment

529.19 Extension of Time

529.20 Bifurcated Trial

§ 529.21 Contents of Statement of Decision

[1] Explanation of Factual and Legal Bases for Decision

[2] Case Law Under Prior Statute

[a] Ultimate Facts and Conclusions of Law

[b] Intermediate Evidentiary Decisions

§ 529.22 Effect of Ambiguous or Insufficient Statement of Decision

§ 529.23 Effect of Trial Court's Failure to Issue Statement of Decision

§ 529.24 Amendment of Statement of Decision by Trial Court

[1] Motion for New Trial

[2] Motion to Vacate Judgment

§ 529.25 Amendment of Statement's Factual Determinations by Appellate Court

§§ 529.26-529.49 [Reserved]

§ 529.50 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

§ 529.51 State Statutes

[1] Ambiguity or Omission in Statement of Decision

[2] Effect of Statement of Decision After Trial

[3] Proceedings Requiring Statement of Decision or Fact Determinations

[4] Statement of Decision in Trial Courts

§ 529.52 California Rules of Court

[1] Extension of and Noncompliance With Time Requirements

[2] Determinations of Fact in Appellate Court

[3] Judgment When No Statement of Decision Requested

[4] Preparation of Statement of Decision

[5] Statement of Decision Following Bifurcated Trial

[6] Trial Completed Within One Day

§ 529.53 Decisions

[1] Amendment of Statement of Decision

[2] Construction of Statement of Decision

[3] Death of Trial Judge Before Statement of Decision Filed

[a] In General

[b] Failure to Make Statement of Decision

[c] Objection to Statement of Decision

[4] Request for Statement of Decision

[5] Special Proceedings Not Requiring Statement of Decision

[6] Sufficiency and Content of Statement of Decision

§ 529.54 Decisions Under Prior Law

[1] Amendment of Findings

[2] Construction of Findings

[a] In General

[b] Antecedent Expressions of Trial Court

[c] Findings Prepared by Counsel

[d] Proposed Findings and Conclusions

[3] Construction When No Findings Required

[4] Entry of Judgment Without Required Findings

[5] Failure to Make Findings

[a] In General

[b] Prejudicial Error Required

[c] Reversal

[6] Preparation

[7] Purpose of Requiring Findings

[8] Requirements and Sufficiency of Findings

[a] Findings Required to State Ultimate Facts

[i] In General

[ii] Conclusions of Law Distinguished

[iii] Evidentiary or Probative Facts

[b] Inconsistent Findings

[c] Inferred Findings

[d] Preparation of Findings

[i] Consolidated Actions

[ii] Format

[e] Specific Probative Findings

[f] Sufficiency of Findings

[i] In General

[ii] Definiteness and Certainty Required

[9] Special Findings

[a] Failure to Make Requested Finding

[b] Failure to Request Special Findings

[i] In General

[ii] Invoking Sanction

[c] Omission in Findings

[d] Preparation of Special Finding

[e] Purpose of Special Findings

[f] When Specific Findings Not Required

[10] Specific Proceedings Requiring Findings

[a] In General

[b] Special Proceedings

§§ 529.55-529.59 [Reserved]

§ 529.60 Request for Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 529.61 Proposal as to Content of Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Distinction Between Factual and Legal Bases for Decision

[4] Timing of Proposals

§ 529.62 Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 529.63 Notice of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Supporting Memorandum

[4] Cross References

§ 529.64 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 529.65 Order Granting Motion That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 529.66 Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Omission or Ambiguity in Statement of Decision

§ 529.67 Ex Parte Application for Order, Supporting Declaration, and Order for Hearing on Proposals as to Content of Statement of Decision, on Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision, or on Objections to Proposed Judgment When Statement of Decision Not Requested [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 529.68 Notice of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Supporting Memorandum

[4] Cross References

§ 529.69 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 529.70 Order Granting Motion to Excuse Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART I. SCOPE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.01

§ 529.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses procedures for obtaining a statement of decision that is issued by the court after a nonjury trial. It includes forms for:

- Requesting a statement of decision [*see § 529.60*].
- Proposals as to the content of the statement of decision [*see § 529.61*].
- A proposed statement of decision [*see § 529.62*].
- A notice of motion, declaration, and order that the statement of decision be deemed waived [*see §§ 529.63 -529.65*].
- Objections to the proposed statement of decision [*see § 529.66*].
- An ex parte application for an order for a hearing on proposals or objections to the statement of decision [*see § 529.67*].
- A notice of motion, declaration, and order excusing noncompliance with required time limits for procedures relating to the statement of decision [*see §§ 529.68 -529.70*].

This chapter includes in the Introduction and Research Guide some case law decided prior to the 1981 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, which replaced findings of fact and conclusions of law with the statement of decision. This prior case law has been included for guidance in areas not expressly covered by the new statute and rules governing statements of decision. For discussion of the effect of case law under the former findings of fact and conclusion of law procedure, see *§ 529.10*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART I. SCOPE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.02

§ 529.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to a request that an appellate court make fact determinations in addition to those made in trial court, or take additional evidence, see Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs* .

Other chapters that may be of interest include:

- For judgment forms, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.
- For forms for motion for new trial and motion to vacate judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureAppealsBriefsCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART I. SCOPE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 529.03-529.09

[Reserved]

§§ 529.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.10

§ 529.10 Governing Law

Code Civ. Proc. § 632 governs the procedure for requesting a statement of decision and the content and form of a statement of decision. Procedures for making proposals or objections to the statement of decision, preparing a proposed statement of decision, and waiving a statement of decision are governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*.

Cases on findings and conclusions decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* may be applied by analogy to determine issues raised under present *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* [*see McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 591-592, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104 , disapproved on other grounds, In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227]* . Older cases, of course, are not relevant if a provision of the statute material to the decision has changed [*see In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227]* .

For discussion of case law prior to the 1982 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632, see § 529.21[2][a]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.11

§ 529.11 Statement of Decision in Trial Courts

Findings of fact and conclusions of law are no longer required on the trial of a question of fact by the court, but, on the request of any party appearing at trial, a statement of decision is required to be issued [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

Because a statement of decision is only required on trial of a question of fact, a statement of decision is unnecessary when the only issue tendered to the trial court is one of law. If there is no factual dispute, there is nothing to inform the appellate court about except the law and, on questions of law, the reviewing court must decipher the law for itself [*Enterprise Ins. Co. v. Mulleague (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 528, 539-540, 241 Cal. Rptr. 846* ; *see Earp v. Earp (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1008, 1012, 283 Cal. Rptr. 43* (interpretation of lease)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.12

§ 529.12 Request for Statement of Decision

[1] Time for Making Request

Any party appearing at trial may request a statement of decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. If the trial is concluded within one calendar day or in less than eight hours spread out over more than one day, the request must be made before the matter is submitted for decision [*see In re Marriage of Gray (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 974, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271* (request in court trial concluding in less than eight hours filed after tentative decision filed was untimely)]. If the trial is longer than that, the request must be made within 10 days after the court announces a tentative decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; *see Earp v. Earp(1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1008, 1012, 283 Cal. Rptr. 43* (no error in denial of statement of decision as to issue tried separately and before trial of other issues when trial lasted less than a day and party did not request statement of decision before submission of issue; request at subsequent trial of remaining issues was untimely as to the issue tried separately); *Posey v. Leavitt (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1236, 1243 n.3, 280 Cal. Rptr. 568* (request for a statement of decision six days after the trial court's denial of opposing party's motion to reconsider is timely)].

In deciding how long trial lasts in application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632, Code Civ. Proc. § 581(a)(6)* applies to determine when trial commences [*Bevli v. Brisco (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 812, 820, 212 Cal. Rptr. 36* ; for further discussion, *see § 529.13[2]*]. Judicial time off the bench does not count in determining how long a trial lasts [*Gorman v. Tassajara Development Corporation (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 44, 61-63, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 152]* .

The 10-day period for making the request commences at the time the clerk mails the copy of the minute order or decision [*Hutchins v. Glanda (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1529, 1531, 265 Cal. Rptr. 596* ; *see also Staten v. Heale (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1088, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 35* (when service of tentative decision is by mail, 10-day period, as extended by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*, normally commences on date it is deposited in mail, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*)]. In determining whether a request is "made" within the statutory 10-day period, the court refers to the date the request is received and filed, as distinguished from the date it is mailed [*Staten v. Heale (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1090-1091, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 35]* . For discussion relating to determining the length of trial, see *§ 529.13[2]*.

If counsel makes a timely request for the statement, the court's failure to prepare the statement is reversible error [Social

Service Union, Local 535 v. *County of Monterey (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 676, 681, 256 Cal. Rptr. 325* ; *In re Marriage of Ananeh-Firempong (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 272, 282, 268 Cal. Rptr. 83* ; for further discussion, *see § 529.23*].

[2] Contents of Request

The request for a statement of decision must specify the controverted issues for which a statement of decision is requested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*; for form of request, *see § 529.60*]. The trial judge is not required to sift through a host of improper specifications in search of a few arguably proper ones. While a party cannot be prevented from using the request as a way of arguing with the court rather than clarifying the grounds of its decision, a party who makes that choice is not entitled to rely on the resulting document to insulate the judgment from the presumption of correctness [*Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Systems Corp. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 547, 558-559, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (only three of 32 questions approximated nonargumentative specifications of factual issues, and it was doubtful that three even raised principal controverted issues)].

When there has been a request for a statement of decision, the statement of decision may be limited to only those issues specified in the request if less than all material issues are specified [*Harvard Investment Co. v. Gap Stores, Inc. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 704, 709 n.3, 202 Cal. Rptr. 891]* .

A party waives any objection on appeal based on the trial court's failure to file a written statement of decision when trial lasts less than one day and that party fails to make an oral request, and when language in that party's points and authorities that were alleged to be a written request was not specific, but merely asked court to find in her favor [*Martinez v. County of Tulare (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1430, 1434-1435, 235 Cal. Rptr. 851]* .

[3] Effect of Failure to Make Request

If no statement of decision has been requested, the reviewing court is required to presume that every fact essential to the judgment was proved and found by the trial court. Review in these circumstances is limited to a determination as to whether there is any evidence, contradicted or uncontradicted, to support the judgment [*Agri-Systems, Inc. v. Foster Poultry Farms (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1134-1135, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 917*]

Although a failure to request a statement of decision may be fatal to an appeal if the record contains no explanation of the final judgment, absence of the statement is not fatal to appeal if the judgment sets forth reasons for the award [*In re Marriage of Seaman & Menjou (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1494 n.2, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690]* .

For discussion of preparation of a proposed judgment when a statement of decision is not requested or is waived, see *§ 529.18*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.13

§ 529.13 Length of Trial Affects Form and Procedure of Statement

[1] In General

In addition to affecting the time within which a request for a statement of decision must be made [*see § 529.12[1]*], the length of trial also determines the form (that is, oral or written) in which the statement of decision may be made and the procedure relating to determining the statement's content.

If a trial is concluded within one calendar day or in less than eight hours over more than one day, the statement of decision may be made orally on the record in the presence of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. When a trial is completed within one day or in less than eight hours over more than one day, a request for statement of decision must be made before the matter is submitted for decision and the statement of decision may be made orally on the record in the presence of the parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(n)*].

If the trial is concluded after a longer period of time, the statement must be in writing unless the parties appearing at trial agree otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

For discussion relating to preparation of a proposed written statement of decision and motion for order that statement of decision be deemed waived, see *§ 529.15*.

[2] Determining Length of Trial

Whether a trial lasts more than one day depends on when it commences and when it concludes. A nonjury trial is deemed to commence at the beginning of the opening statement of any party or party's counsel or, if there is no opening statement, at the time the oath or affirmation is administered to the first witness or the first evidence is introduced [*Code Civ. Proc. § 581(a)(6)*].

The introduction of evidence signaling the commencement of the trial in a petition for writ of administrative mandamus has been held to be the time the judge begins reading the administrative record, thereby considering the evidence, even though the parties did not formally stipulate to the introduction of the record into the superior court proceedings until the following day. Conversely, the reading of briefs prior to the appearance of counsel does not constitute the

commencement of the trial [*Bevli v. Brisco (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 812, 820-821, 821 n.3, 212 Cal. Rptr. 36* ; *but see Milligan v. Hearing Aid Dispensers Examining Com. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1004 n.3, 191 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

The trial court's preliminary review of evidence may not be included in the calculation of the length of the trial unless its time spent in doing so is documented in the court record [*Kearl v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1986) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1051, 236 Cal. Rptr. 526]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.14

§ 529.14 Proposals Following Request for Statement of Decision

After a party has requested a statement of decision, any party may make proposals as to its content [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. Any such proposals must be made within 10 days after the date of the request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(e)*]. The procedure for preparing a proposed statement is discussed in *§ 529.15*. For a form of proposal, see *§ 529.61*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.15

§ 529.15 Procedure for Preparation of Proposed Statement of Decision

If a party requests a statement of decision, the court must, within 30 days of announcement or service of the tentative decision, prepare and serve a proposed statement of decision and a proposed judgment on all parties that appeared at the trial, unless the court has ordered a party to prepare the statement. A party that has been ordered to prepare the statement must, within 30 days after the announcement or service of the tentative decision, serve and submit to the court a proposed statement of decision and a proposed judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*].

If the proposed statement of decision and judgment are not served and submitted within the time prescribed in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*, any other party that appeared at the trial may within 10 days thereafter: (1) prepare, serve, and submit to the court a proposed statement of decision and judgment or (2) serve on all other parties and file a notice of motion for an order that a statement of decision be deemed waived [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*; for form of notice of motion, see *§ 529.63*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.16

§ 529.16 Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision

Any party may, within 15 days after service of the proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment, serve and file objections thereto [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)*]. For a form for objections to proposed statement of decision, see *§ 529.66*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.17

§ 529.17 Hearing in Unlimited Civil Case on Proposals or Objections

The court may order a hearing on any proposals for or objections to the proposed statement of decision or the proposed judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*]. For a form for an ex parte application for order for hearing on proposals or objections, see *§ 529.67*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.18

§ 529.18 Judgment When Statement Is Waived or Not Requested

[1] Proposed Judgment

If no party requests or is ordered to prepare a statement of decision and a written judgment is required, the court must prepare and serve a proposed judgment on all parties that appeared at the trial within 20 days after the announcement or service of the tentative decision or the court may order a party to prepare, serve, and submit the proposed judgment to the court within 10 days after the date of the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(h)*].

[2] Objections

Any party may, within 10 days after service of the proposed judgment, serve and file objections thereto [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(j)*].

[3] Filing Judgment

If a written judgment is required, the court must sign and file the judgment within 50 days after the announcement or service of the tentative decision, whichever is later, or, if a hearing was held under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*, within 10 days after the hearing. The judgment constitutes the decision on which judgment is to be entered under *Code of Civil Procedure § 664* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(l)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 529.19

529.19 Extension of Time

The court may extend, by written order, any of the times prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*. The court may also make a written order excusing noncompliance with any of the time periods prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*. The order excusing noncompliance with time limits must be made prior to entry of judgment, for good cause shown and on such terms as may be just [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*]. In addition, in a limited civil case the court may extend the time within which any act prescribed in the California Rules of Court is required to be done [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.10(c)*]. For forms for notice of motion, declaration, and order to excuse noncompliance with those time periods, see *§§ 529.68 -529.70*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 529.20

529.20 Bifurcated Trial

When a factual issue is tried separately and before other issues, the judge conducting the separate trial must announce his or her tentative decision on the separate issue and must issue a statement of decision regarding the separate issue if requested to do so by a party. However, the court must not prepare any proposed judgment until the other issues are tried, except when an interlocutory judgment or separate judgment may otherwise be properly entered at that time [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591(a)*].

If the other issues are tried by a different judge or judges, each judge must perform all acts required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* as to the issues tried by that judge. The judge trying the final issue prepares the proposed judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591(b)*]. A judge may proceed with the trial of subsequent issues before the issuance of a statement of decision on previously tried issues [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591(c)*].

A motion for a new trial following a bifurcated trial must be made after all the issues are tried and, if the issues were tried by different judges, each judge must hear and determine the motion as to the issues tried by that judge [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.21

§ 529.21 Contents of Statement of Decision

[1] Explanation of Factual and Legal Bases for Decision

Code Civ. Proc. § 632 requires that the statement of decision explain the factual and legal basis for the court's decision as to each of the principal controverted issues at trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

There is an essential correspondence between the "factual and legal basis" of a decision and the "findings of fact and conclusions of law" given by the trial court under former law. One court has stated that case law on findings and conclusions under former law may be applied by analogy to determine issues arising under the current statute [*see McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 592, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104]* . Thus, the distinction between ultimate facts, which must be stated, and evidentiary facts, which need not be stated, is still pertinent [*see Ingredient Communication Council, Inc. v. Lungren (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1480, 1497, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 216* ; *McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582* ; *Republic Indemnity Co. v. Empire Building Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1163, 1167, 213 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *Wolfe v. Lipsy (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 633, 643, 209 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *In re Cheryl E. (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 587, 599, 207 Cal. Rptr. 728* ; *see also § 529.21[2][a], [b]*].

Consistent with this view, reviewing courts have held that a trial court, in its statement of decision, need not address all of the legal and factual issues raised by the parties. It need only state the grounds on which the judgment rests without necessarily specifying the particular evidence considered by the trial court in reaching its decision [*Peak-Las Positas Partners v. Bollag (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 101, 112, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 775* ; *Muzquiz v. City of Emeryville (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 1124-1125, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 579* ; *Haight v. Handweiler (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 85, 89-90, 244 Cal. Rptr. 488*]. The trial court need only set out ultimate findings rather than evidentiary ones [*In re Marriage of Balcof (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1530-1531, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 183]* ; findings of ultimate facts necessarily include findings on all intermediate evidentiary facts necessary to sustain them [*Muzquiz v. City of Emeryville (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 1125, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 579* ; *In re Cheryl E. (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 587, 599, 207 Cal. Rptr. 728]* .

The statement is required to be in writing unless either of the following applies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]:

- The parties stipulate otherwise; or

- The trial lasts less than one calendar day or less than eight hours over a period of more than one day.

In these situations, the statement may be made orally on the record in the parties' presence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

Appellate courts frown on the use of any shorthand method designed to avoid the mandate of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* requiring a statement of decision that fairly discloses the court's determination of all material, factual issues involved in the action. For example, a trial court was in error when, after counsel requested a written statement of decision, the court concluded that the oral proceedings and the reporter's transcript would suffice [*Whittington v. McKinney (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 123, 126 285 Cal. Rptr. 586* (reviewing court held, however, that counsel had waived right to written statement of decision in earlier proceedings)].

In other cases, it has been stated that a trial court must make findings on "material subsidiary issues of fact" if a party makes such a request or informs the court of its failure to do so [*Midwest Television, Inc. v. Scott, Lancaster, Mills & Atha, Inc. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 442, 457, 252 Cal. Rptr. 573* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 634*, discussed in *§ 529.22*]. A material issue of fact is one that is relevant and essential to the judgment and closely and directly related to the trial court's determination of the ultimate issue in the case [*Midwest Television, Inc. v. Scott, Lancaster, Mills & Atha, Inc. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 442, 457, 252 Cal. Rptr. 573* ; *see McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 591-594, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104* (reversing for failure of court to find on "material" issue)]. These cases suggest that the focus should now be on whether or not a fact is material more than on whether it would previously have been labelled as evidentiary or ultimate [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

For discussion of case law prior to the 1982 amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, see *§ 529.21[2][a]*.

For a trial court's refusal to explain the factual and legal basis for a decision to constitute error, the request for a statement of decision must be timely [*In re Marriage of Katz (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1711, 1718, 286 Cal. Rptr. 495* ; *see § 529.12[1]*].

[2] Case Law Under Prior Statute

[a] Ultimate Facts and Conclusions of Law

Pursuant to case law decided prior to the amendment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* effective in 1982, findings of fact were required to state ultimate facts only [*see Bulmash v. Davis (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 691, 700-701, 157 Cal. Rptr. 66, 597 P.2d 469* ; *Seeley v. Combs (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 127, 132, 52 Cal. Rptr. 578, 416 P.2d 810]* . Subsequent cases continue to refer to this rule [*see McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 592, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *Republic Indemnity Co. v. Empire Building Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1163, 1167, 213 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *Wolfe v. Lipsy (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 633, 643, 209 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *In re Cheryl E. (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 587, 599, 207 Cal. Rptr. 728* ; *People v. Casa Blanca Convalescent Homes, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 509, 524, 206 Cal. Rptr. 164* ; *see also* [1], *above*].

Under that rule, although the ultimate facts found might have involved conclusions of fact, they did not include conclusions of law [*see Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054]* . The test in determining whether the findings stated ultimate facts rather than conclusions of law was the same as that applied in determining the sufficiency of the pleadings [*see D'Andrea v. Pringle (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 689, 695, 52 Cal. Rptr. 606]* .

Although the distinction between an ultimate fact and a conclusion of law is not an easy one to draw [*Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054]* , generally, if, from the facts in evidence, the result can be reached by that process of natural reasoning adopted in the investigation of truth, it is an

ultimate fact. If, on the other hand, resort must be had to the artificial processes of the law in order to reach a final determination, the result is a conclusion of law [*Levins v. Rovegno (1886) 71 Cal. 273, 278, 12 P. 161* ; *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228]* .

For example, a finding that a particular item of property was held in constructive trust [*see Efron v. Kalmanovitz (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 187, 195, 57 Cal. Rptr. 248]* , or a finding of unfairness or fraud when it is imposed by law without regard to the actual intention of the defendant [*see Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228]* is not a finding; it is a conclusion of law since it is reached by the artificial processes of law based on other subsidiary findings of fact.

For the same reason, findings in terms of statutory language may also be considered conclusions of law. Thus, a finding in an equity action to set aside a default judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* that the entry of the default judgment was due to an extrinsic mistake of fact is a conclusion of law [*see Lieberman v. Aetna Ins. Co. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 515, 530, 57 Cal. Rptr. 453]* . However, it was generally held sufficient to make findings in statutory language in cases in which the rights and liabilities of the parties were defined by statute [*see California Shipbuilding Corp. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 270, 271, 188 P.2d 27* (in workers' compensation case involving award of increased compensation under *Lab. Code § 4553*, finding of ultimate fact of serious and willful misconduct in language of statute as not fatally insufficient in form because of generality of language); *Kahn v. Gordon (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 722, 726, 57 Cal. Rptr. 725* (sufficiency of findings in language of *Civ. Code § 2334* holding principal liable for misrepresentations made by ostensible agent)].

[b] Intermediate Evidentiary Decisions

Because ultimate facts are reached by a process of natural reasoning, they are deduced from certain primary facts that are evidentiary in character [*Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054]* . Any probative or evidentiary facts that have been relied on by the trial court to support the ultimate facts were not required to be stated nor were they a proper part of the findings [*Seeley v. Combs (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 127, 132, 52 Cal. Rptr. 578, 416 P.2d 810* ; *Beaupre v. Nave (1971) 13 Cal. App. 3d 402, 407, 91 Cal. Rptr. 473]* . Thus, the trial court was not required to show the intermediate, specific determinations that it made on every conflict of evidence in deducing the ultimate facts found [*see Moreno v. Jessup Buena Vista Dairy (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 438, 447, 123 Cal. Rptr. 393]* . In other words, a court issuing a statement of decision is required only to state ultimate rather than evidentiary facts [*McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 593, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRulings on Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.22

§ 529.22 Effect of Ambiguous or Insufficient Statement of Decision

If a statement of decision is ambiguous or does not resolve a controverted issue and the record shows that the ambiguity or omission was brought to the court's attention prior to entry of judgment or at the time of a motion for new trial or motion to vacate judgment, it may not be inferred on appeal or on the motion after trial that the trial court decided in favor of the prevailing party as to those facts or that issue [*Code Civ. Proc. § 634*; *see In re Marriage of Weinstein (1991) 4 Cal. App. 4th 555, 571 , 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 558*].

The clear implication of this provision is that, if a party does not bring the deficiencies to the trial court's attention, the party waives the right to claim on appeal that the statement was deficient in these regards, and, thus, the appellate court will imply findings to support the judgment. Furthermore, *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* refers to a party's need to point out deficiencies in the trial court's statement of decision as a condition of avoiding such implied findings; merely having requested a statement initially as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* is not adequate [*In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1133-1134, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227* (disapproving *McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 594, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104* , and *Employers Casualty Co. v. Northwestern Nat. Ins. Group (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 462, 474, 167 Cal. Rptr. 296* , to extent they suggest that a party who fails to bring omission or ambiguity to trial court's attention may nevertheless avoid presumption in favor of judgment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.23

§ 529.23 Effect of Trial Court's Failure to Issue Statement of Decision

The issuance of a statement of decision after a timely request pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*, is mandatory, and a trial court's total or material failure to comply with the statute's requirements constitutes reversible error per se [*Miramar Hotel Corp. v. Frank B. Hall & Co. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1126, 1129* , *210 Cal. Rptr. 114* ; *Bevli v. Brisco (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 812, 822, 212 Cal. Rptr. 36* ; *see In re Marriage of Reilley (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1119, 1126, 242 Cal. Rptr. 302]* . For example, if a final judgment is entered after the issuance of a mere minute order, despite the appellant's timely request for a statement of decision, the court of appeal will reverse the judgment and remand for the issuance of a statement of decision [*Miramar Hotel Corp. v. Frank B. Hall & Co. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1126, 1129* , *210 Cal. Rptr. 114*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewReversible Errors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.24

§ 529.24 Amendment of Statement of Decision by Trial Court

[1] Motion for New Trial

In an action tried without a jury, on a motion for new trial made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 657*, the court may, on such terms as may be just, change or add to the statement of decision, modify or vacate the judgment in whole or in part, and grant a new trial on all or part of the issues. Alternatively, in lieu of granting a new trial, the court may vacate and set aside the statement of decision and judgment and reopen the case for further proceedings and the introduction of additional evidence. In so doing, the effect would be the same as if the case had been reopened after submission to the court but before the filing of a decision or the rendering of a judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 662*]. For further discussion and procedures, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial*, §§ 357.60 *et seq. and 357.90* et seq.

[2] Motion to Vacate Judgment

On a motion to vacate a judgment, when the judgment is set aside and vacated and a different judgment entered on the ground that there is an incorrect or erroneous legal basis for the original decision not consistent with or not supported by the facts, the statement of decision must be amended and corrected [*Code Civ. Proc. § 663*]. For further discussion and procedures, see *Ch. 371, Motions After Trial, § 357.90* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Vacate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.25

§ 529.25 Amendment of Statement's Factual Determinations by Appellate Court

In all cases in which trial by jury is not a matter of right or in which trial by jury has been waived, the reviewing court may make factual determinations contrary to or in addition to those made by the trial court. The factual determinations may be based on the evidence adduced before the trial court either with or without the taking of evidence by the reviewing court. The reviewing court may take additional evidence of or concerning facts occurring at any time prior to the decision of the appeal and may direct any judgment, and make or give any order as the case may require [*Code Civ. Proc. § 909*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 909 must be liberally construed to the end, among others, that, when feasible, cases may be finally disposed of by a single appeal and without further proceedings in the trial court, except when in the interests of justice a new trial is required on some or all issues [*Code Civ. Proc. § 909*].

For further discussion and forms relating to requests that an appellate court make additional fact determinations or take additional evidence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 909*, see Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsBriefsCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on Appeal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 529.26-529.49

[Reserved]

§§ 529.26[Reserved]

22 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.50

§ 529.50 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

For forms of memoranda of points and authorities for use in proceedings regarding statements of decision, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 215, *Statement of Decision* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.51

§ 529.51 State Statutes

[1] Ambiguity or Omission in Statement of Decision

Effect of ambiguity or omission prior to entry of judgment or on motion for new trial or motion to vacate judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 634*

[2] Effect of Statement of Decision After Trial

Motion for new trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 662*

Motion to vacate judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 663*

Additional fact determinations or additional evidence taken by appellate court on appeal from judgment in nonjury trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 909*

[3] Proceedings Requiring Statement of Decision or Fact Determinations

Action defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 22*

Special proceedings defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 23*

Required finding in hearing to issue right to attach order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 484.090*

Required findings in hearing to issue writ of attachment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 484.370, 485.220* (ex parte)

Required findings in hearing to issue additional writ of attachment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 484.520, 485.540*

Required findings in hearing to issue temporary protective order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 486.020*

Required findings in hearing to issue writ of attachment against nonresident, foreign corporation, or partnership. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 492.030, 492.090*

Required findings in hearing to issue writ of possession of personal property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 512.060*

Statement of decision in proceeding conducted by referee. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 638, 643-645*

Trial court in proceedings for third parties claiming rights in property held under writ of attachment as not required to make findings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 720.400*

Statement of decision in arbitration proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1291*

Required findings in case where issue is custody of child. *Fam. Code § 3041*

Application to probate proceedings of rules of practice in civil proceedings. *Prob. Code § 1000*

[4] Statement of Decision in Trial Courts

Request for statement of decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*

Requirements as to function and form of statement of decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*

Statement of decision as part of judgment roll. *Code Civ. Proc. § 670*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersRefereesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to VacateCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsAncillary WritsWrits of AttachmentCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealFamily LawChild CustodyProcedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.52

§ 529.52 California Rules of Court

[1] Extension of and Noncompliance With Time Requirements

Written order in superior court extending time limits or excusing noncompliance with time limits prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*

Court may extend time for doing any act required by rules of court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.10(c)*

[2] Determinations of Fact in Appellate Court

Procedure for requesting that appellate court make fact determinations or take additional evidence on appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.252*

[3] Judgment When No Statement of Decision Requested

Time limit for preparing proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(h)*

Who prepares proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(h)*

Objections to proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(j)*

Court-ordered hearing on objections to proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*

Filing of judgment by court. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(l)*

[4] Preparation of Statement of Decision

Tentative decision of court may order who will prepare proposed statement of decision or direct that tentative decision is to be statement of decision unless timely objection is made by any party. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(c)*

Response as to content of statement of decision. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(d)*

Procedure for preparation and service of proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*

Objections to proposed statement of decision. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)*

Court-ordered hearing on proposals or objections. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*

[5] Statement of Decision Following Bifurcated Trial

Separate statement of decision, but not separate proposed judgment, as required for each factual issue tried separately. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591*

[6] Trial Completed Within One Day

Procedures concerning announcement of tentative decision statement of decision and judgment when trial completed within one day. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(n)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.53

§ 529.53 Decisions

[1] Amendment of Statement of Decision

Trial court properly amended statement of decision to provide prejudgment interest, when trial court could not abrogate parties' statutory rights to object to court's statement of decision by alternative procedure without making this absolutely clear when it sought parties' approval of its proposed alternative procedure, and trial court did not clearly state parties would be precluded from submitting objections to court's statement of decision, but court stated parties would have three days to "look over" statement of decision and proposed judgment "as to form" so that plaintiff may have reasonably concluded alternative procedure to which it had agreed did not preclude it from objecting to absence of prejudgment interest in decision; and when statement of decision issued by court could not automatically constitute final decision for purposes of entry of judgment, so that trial court had inherent power to amend statement of decision to award prejudgment interest. *Bay World Trading, Inc. v. Nebraska Beef, Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 135, 138-141, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632*

Reviewing court may not disregard trial court's written statement of decision and base its determination of error on trial court's own oral explanation of decision when trial court did not modify statement of decision in accordance with oral pronouncement. *Rainier Credit Co. v. Western Alliance Corp. (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 255, 262, 217 Cal. Rptr. 291*

[2] Construction of Statement of Decision

Fact that trial court failed to mention issue in its oral statement does not preclude it from including that issue in its written statement of decision. *Wurzl v. Holloway (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1740, 1756, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 512*

Under doctrine of invited error, party is not permitted to challenge particular determination of issue that he or she proposed; however, this doctrine does not apply to preclude challenge to language that party proposed only because he or she believed that it accurately represented court's reasoning on an issue found in other party's favor. *Estate of Davis (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 663, 670 n.13, 268 Cal. Rptr. 384*

Trial court's oral announcement of tentative decision is not binding and does not preclude inclusion in statement of decision of bases for decision that was not mentioned in oral announcement. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1245, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

[3] Death of Trial Judge Before Statement of Decision Filed

[a] In General

Presiding judge of superior court properly signed and entered judgment in conformity with "Intended Decision" of trial judge who died before hearing on objections to intended decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 635*] when there was no indication that deceased judge had contemplated any modification of decision and when proposed statement of decision provided complete and adequate basis for appellate review. *Leiserson v. City of San Diego (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 41, 48 n.8, 229 Cal. Rptr. 22*

[b] Failure to Make Statement of Decision

Statement of decision is not required when the trial court is not adjudicating questions of fact, but is sitting as a reviewing court scrutinizing an administrative decision. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. City of Vernon (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 209, 221, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 661*

Failure of trial court to render statement of decision after timely request has been made is reversible error. *In re Marriage of Reilley (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1119, 1126, 242 Cal. Rptr. 302*

Improper failure of trial court to support its decision by written statement of decision requested pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* requires reversal of judgment. *Bevli v. Brisco (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 812, 822, 212 Cal. Rptr. 36*

[c] Objection to Statement of Decision

Court erred in signing judgment and statement of decision without granting party opportunity to object, but error was cured when court vacated prematurely signed judgment, considered party's objections, and issued minute order accordingly. *National Secretarial Service, Inc. v. Froehlich (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 510, 523, 258 Cal. Rptr. 506*

[4] Request for Statement of Decision

For purposes of determining whether trial was concluded within one calendar day or in less than eight hours over more than one day, judicial time off the bench is not included. *Gorman v. Tassajara Development Corporation (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 44, 61-63, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 152*

Plaintiff's request for statement of decision was not proper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, and trial court's statement supported presumption of correctness of judgment, when only three of plaintiff's 32 questions approximated nonargumentative specifications of factual issues, and it was doubtful even three raised principal controverted issues and when statement of decision, while going well beyond recital of ultimate facts found by court, clearly and adequately disclosed that it had decided plaintiff's claim. *Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Systems Corp. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 547, 558-559, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Trial court properly denied request for statement of decision as untimely in marital dissolution court trial conducted over more than one day, when request was filed after final paper and court's tentative decision were filed, when party requesting statement of decision failed to show trial court erred in making express finding that trial lasted less than eight

hours, and no legal authority required courtroom clerk to keep track of time of trial in minutes. *In re Marriage of Gray (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 974, 977-980, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271*

Although failure to request statement of decision may be fatal to appeal if record contains no explanation of final judgment, absence of statement is not fatal to appeal when judgment sets forth reasons for award. *In re Marriage of Seaman & Menjou (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1494 n.2, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690*

When there is no request for statement of decision, reviewing court is required to presume that every fact essential to judgment was proved and found by court and review is limited to determination whether there is any evidence, contradicted or uncontradicted, to support judgment. *Gibbs v. American Savings & Loan Assn. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1375, 266 Cal. Rptr. 517*

Denial of request for statement of decision in personal injury action in which liability was admitted and only issue concerned damages requires reversal of judgment; failure to distinguish between general and special damages in award of lump sum prevents effective review of judgment. *Gordon v. Wolfe (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 162, 167-168, 224 Cal. Rptr. 481*

[5] Special Proceedings Not Requiring Statement of Decision

Requirement of statement of decision on request under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* as not applicable to mandamus action testing validity of administrative decision, since trial court is limited to review of substantiality of evidence received by administrative body, which is not factfinding process; advisability of findings regardless of applicable scope of review as satisfied by court's peremptory writ of mandate setting forth basis of its decision. *City of Carmel-By-The-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 229, 237, 227 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Hearing of application for preliminary injunction, even on declarations, is not a trial for purposes of requiring statement of decision under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *People v. Landlords Professional Services, Inc. (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 68, 72, 223 Cal. Rptr. 483*

[6] Sufficiency and Content of Statement of Decision

In employment discrimination action on basis of age, trial court's statement of decision did not adopt erroneous burden of proof or fail to resolve material issues of fact, when court addressed ample evidence of employee's poor job performance in context of discussion of central issue of whether employer had discriminated on basis of age, and when statement of decision clearly addressed ultimate issue, which was whether employee had borne burden of proving employer's stated reasons for eliminating her position were pretextual and actually motivated by age discrimination; trial court adequately set out its express determination that employee failed to prove pretext, together with the ultimate facts supporting that determination and the legal basis for its decision. *Muzquiz v. City of Emeryville (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 1125-1126, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 579*

Trial court is not required to make express finding of fact on every factual matter controverted at trial, as long as its statement of decision sufficiently disposes of all basic issues in the case. *Bauer v. Bauer (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1106, 1118, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 377*

Trial court is not required to make in its statement of decision detailed findings of evidentiary facts as to each piece of evidence relied on. *People v. Dollar Rent-a-Car Systems, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 127-128, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, trial court in issuing statement of decision is not required to address each question listed

in party's request; statement that provides explanation of factual and legal basis for court's decisions regarding principal controverted issues listed in request is sufficient. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1525, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Failure of trial court to make finding on particular matter is harmless error if judgment is otherwise supported; however, failure to make finding on particular matter is error when there is sufficient evidence to sustain that finding in favor of complaining party and that finding would countervail or destroy other findings. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1525, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Statement of decision need do no more than give reasons that state grounds on which judgment rests; statement of ultimate findings are all that is required. *Haight v. Handweiler (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 85, 90, 244 Cal. Rptr. 488*

Fact that statement of decision did not state that trial court considered deposition testimony or other extrinsic evidence did not imply that trial court failed to do so because nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* requires that statement of decision specify particular evidence considered by trial court in reaching its final determination. *Aviointeriors SpA v. World Airways, Inc. (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 908, 913, 914, 226 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Fact determination is required to be on inference drawn from evidence rather than on mere speculation regarding probabilities without evidence. *California Shoppers, Inc. v. Royal Globe Insurance Co. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1, 45, 221 Cal. Rptr. 171*

Trial court rendering statement of decision under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* is required only to state ultimate rather than evidentiary facts. *McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 593, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *Republic Indemnity Co v. Empire Builders Corp. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1163, 1167, 213 Cal. Rptr. 787*

Court is not required to provide specific answers to questions by requesting party so long as findings in statement fairly disclose court's determination of all material issues. *People v. Casa Blanca Convalescent Homes, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 509, 525, 206 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRulings on EvidenceGovernmentsCourtsJudges

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.54

§ 529.54 Decisions Under Prior Law

CAUTION:

In 1981, *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 632, 634, 662,* and *909* and Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 232, were amended to replace findings of fact and conclusions of law with statements of decision. Many of the following cases were decided under prior statutes and rules, and these refer to procedures relating to findings of fact. Cases decided under prior law are mentioned, not as binding authority, but as persuasive authority only, which may be useful in providing guidance in areas not expressly covered under the amended statutes and rules [*see McCurter v. Older (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 582, 591-592, 219 Cal. Rptr. 104* , *disapproved on other grounds, In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227]* . Older cases are, of course, not relevant if a provision of the statute material to the decision has changed [*see In re Marriage of Arceneaux (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1130, 1137, 275 Cal. Rptr. 797, 800 P.2d 1227]* .

[1] Amendment of Findings

Trial court as afforded final opportunity to adjust form and contents of findings through ruling on motion for new trial. *Vogelsang v. Wolpert (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 102, 129, 38 Cal. Rptr. 440* (decided under prior law)

Appellate court as having power to amend findings where findings conflicting as result of inadvertence due to clerical error. *Johndrow v. Thomas (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 202, 207, 187 P.2d 681* (decided under prior law)

Only mode by which findings may be disturbed by trial court after they have been filed and judgment entered, except in cases of clerical error or misprision, as by granting of new trial, since entered judgment terminates power of trial court to change findings. *Hole v. Takekawa (1913) 165 Cal. 372, 375-376, 132 P. 445* (decided under prior law)

Purpose of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 662*, permitting court to change or add findings in ruling on motion for new trial, as to give to court on denying motion for new trial broad power to change its findings and to modify its judgment, thereby avoiding necessity of new trial. *Spier v. Lang (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 711, 714, 53 P.2d 138* (decided under prior law)

Findings of fact as not permitted to be amended to correct judicial error after judgment becomes final. *People v. A.T.L., Inc. (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 152, 153, 309 P.2d 552* (decided under prior law)

Findings of fact as permitted to be amended to correct mere clerical errors after judgment becomes final. *Williams v. Koenig (1934) 219 Cal. 656, 658-659, 28 P.2d 351* (decided under prior law)

[2] Construction of Findings

[a] In General

Findings of fact as required to be liberally construed to support judgment. *Johndrow v. Thomas (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 202, 207, 187 P.2d 681* (decided under prior law)

Substantial conflicts in findings as required to be resolved in favor of prevailing party and all legitimate and reasonable inferences indulged in to uphold findings if possible. *Richter v. Walker (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 634, 640, 226 P.2d 593* (decided under prior law)

Where findings of fact support conclusions necessary to judgment, absence or omission of proper specific conclusion as not availing to defeat judgment. *Roberts v. Graves (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 410, 419, 75 Cal. Rptr. 130* (decided under prior law)

Where findings are inconsistent, judgment as not permitted to be set aside unless conflict is clear and material and findings are incapable of being harmoniously construed. *Richter v. Walker (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 634, 639, 226 P.2d 593* (decided under prior law)

Inconsistent finding that supports judgment as disregarded as surplusage when correct finding also supports judgment. *Zinn v. Fred R. Bright Co. (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 597, 604, 76 Cal. Rptr. 663* (decided under prior law)

When difference exists in sum of damages between findings and judgment, findings as controlling. *Jen-Mar Constr. Co. v. Brown (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 564, 570, 55 Cal. Rptr. 832* (decided under prior law)

In absence of indications to contrary, general finding as including finding of all special facts necessary to sustain it. *Albonico v. Madera Irrigation Dist. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 735, 741, 3 Cal. Rptr. 343, 350 P.2d 95* (decided under prior law)

Mixed findings of fact and conclusions of law in interpretation of instrument as not relieving appellate court from exercising its independent judgment in construing terms of instrument. *Estate of Page (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 702, 709, 62 Cal. Rptr. 740* (decided under prior law)

[b] Antecedent Expressions of Trial Court

Memorandum opinion or other antecedent expression of the court is usable to explain its formal written findings. Chapple v. Big Bear Super Market No. 3 *(1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 867, 874, 167 Cal. Rptr. 103* (decided under prior law)

Court's memorandum of intended decision does not impeach findings of fact containing conclusions on all questions of fact submitted for decision. *Bulmash v. Davis (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 691, 701, 157 Cal. Rptr. 66, 597 P.2d 469* (decided under prior law)

No antecedent expression of judge, whether casual or cast in form of opinion, can in any way restrict judge's absolute power to declare his or her final conclusion by filing findings of fact and conclusions of law. *Strudthoff v. Yates (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 602, 616, 170 P.2d 873* (decided under prior law)

Opinion of trial court cannot be substituted for nor used to modify findings or judgment since findings of fact embody conclusions of trial court on all questions of fact submitted to it for decision. *Strudthoff v. Yates (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 602, 615-616, 170 P.2d 873* (decided under prior law)

Findings and conclusions are final deliberate expression of court, and expressions of judge during trial cannot be considered for purpose of contradicting deliberate findings and conclusions that he or she subsequently makes and files. *Martin School of Aviation v. Bank of America (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 689, 695, 312 P.2d 251* (decided under prior law)

Oral or written opinion by trial judge is not itself decision of court of judgment and cannot be used to challenge judgment or express findings. *Dairyman's Cooperative Creamery Assn. v. Leipold (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 184, 188, 109 Cal. Rptr. 753* (citing Witkin, California Procedure (2d ed.), Vol. 4, *Judgment*, § 5) (decided under prior law)

Memorandum decision cannot be relied on to fill interstices in findings and conclusions left void by failure to find pursuant to special request for findings. *Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 930, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919* (decided under prior law)

Memorandum of decision is superseded by judgment under former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 232(a) [*now see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(a)*], and is not in itself appealable. *Burgess v. Board of Education (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 571, 582, 116 Cal. Rptr. 183* (decided under prior law)

Memorandum opinion can be resorted to, to ascertain grounds of its decision, to learn process by which court reached its decision, to ascertain court's theory of decision, or to ascertain basis for conclusion of law when conclusion gives no explanation for ruling. *Estate of Russell (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 758, 763, 95 Cal. Rptr. 88* (decided under prior law)

[c] Findings Prepared by Counsel

Where findings are prepared by counsel designated by court, and counsel was at liberty to use own judgment as to text of findings, no claim of insufficiency of findings can be entertained on appeal from judgment. *Snow Mountain Water & Power Co. v. Kraner (1923) 191 Cal. 312, 325, 216 P. 589* ; *Johnson v. Rich (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 740, 747, 310 P.2d 980* (decided under prior law)

[d] Proposed Findings and Conclusions

Proposed findings and conclusions prepared by respective parties prior to signing of findings and used in settlement thereof are of no legal significance, have no value as evidence, and cannot be used in determination of appeal. *Howard v. Howard (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 122, 124, 259 P.2d 41* (decided under prior law)

[3] Construction When No Findings Required

In absence of findings of fact and conclusions of law, every intendment is in favor of judgment or order appealed from and every fact or inference essential to support or order and warranted by evidence found by court is presumed. *Reid v. Valley Restaurants, Inc. (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 606, 609, 311 P.2d 473* ; *Estate of Rule (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 1, 10, 152 P.2d 1003* (decided under prior law); *Schubert v. Reynolds (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 100, 104, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 285*

Appellate court is required to assume that trial court found all necessary facts to support judgment where no findings and conclusions are requested. *Dairyman's Cooperative Creamery Assn. v. Leipold (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 184, 188-189, 109 Cal. Rptr. 753* (decided under prior law)

[4] Entry of Judgment Without Required Findings

Entry of judgment without findings when findings are required and not waived is material error in procedure. *Petroleum Midway Co. v. Zahn (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 645, 652, 145 P.2d 371* (decided under prior law)

Judgment entered without findings when findings are required is nullity and is superseded by subsequent judgment based on findings. *Ohio Cas. Ins. Co. v. Northwestern Mut. Ins. Co. (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 204, 207, 94 Cal. Rptr. 586* (decided under prior law)

Dismissal of appeal from judgment rendered void by entry of valid judgment containing required findings and conclusions. *Supple v. Luckenbach (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 319, 323, 84 P.2d 52* (decided under prior law)

Appeal is dismissed when no findings and conclusions made as required. *Larson v. Thoresen (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 666, 670, 226 P.2d 571* (decided under prior law)

Failure to make findings of fact when required in mandate proceeding does not affect validity of judgment so much as right to appeal therefrom. *International Asso. of Fire Fighters v. Palo Alto (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 295, 300, 32 Cal. Rptr. 842, 384 P.2d 170* (decided under prior law)

Proper procedure when judgment entered without required findings and conclusions is reversal of judgment with directions to enter findings and conclusions rather than dismissal of appeal, since dismissal affirms judgment or order appealed from. *Doty v. Doty (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 672, 678, 125 Cal. Rptr. 153* (decided under prior law)

[5] Failure to Make Findings

[a] In General

Denial of defendant's request for findings under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* is reversible error when requested findings were both material and essential to determine whether defendant was entitled to allocation of costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(c)*. *Harvard Investment Co. v. Gap Stores, Inc. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 704, 708-713, 202 Cal. Rptr. 891* (decided under prior law)

1968 amendment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, changing its provisions to require findings and conclusions only on request, did not change prior case law as to effect of failure to make findings when findings are required. *Williams v. Williams (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 560, 566 n. 1, 92 Cal. Rptr. 385* (decided under prior law)

Trial court's depriving litigant of right to findings and conclusions by filing judgment or order unsupported by findings was improper. *Doty v. Doty (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 672, 678, 125 Cal. Rptr. 153* (decided under prior law)

When findings are essential, final judgment may not be rendered until findings signed and filed. *Supple v. Luckenbach (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 319, 320-321, 84 P.2d 52* (decided under prior law)

Judgment entered without findings when findings required is nullity. *McBride v. Alpha Realty Corp. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 925, 928, 123 Cal. Rptr. 270* (quoting *Ohio Cas. Ins. Co. v. Northwestern Mut. Ins. Co. (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 204, 207, 94 Cal. Rptr. 586*) (decided under prior law)

Judgment rendered without findings on all material issues must be reversed. *Weisz Trucking Co. v. Emil R. Wohl Constr. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 256, 263, 91 Cal. Rptr. 489* ; *Anderson v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 230, 235, 70 Cal. Rptr. 389* (decided under prior law)

When material issue raised by pleadings and evidence and party desiring findings on issue submitted proposed findings, failure of court to make findings is reversible error. *Williams v. Williams (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 560, 566, 92 Cal. Rptr. 385* (decided under prior law)

Failure to find on issue is not ground for reversal when record discloses no evidence on which finding favorable to complaining party could properly be made. *Kalashian v. Fresno County (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 43, 52, 110 Cal. Rptr. 429* (decided under prior law)

[b] Prejudicial Error Required

Appellant could not complain of failure to make finding which necessarily would have been adverse to him. *Santoro v. Carbone (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 721, 730 99 Cal. Rptr. 488* (decided under prior law)

Failure to find on issue is not ground for reversal when no substantial right of appellant is prejudiced thereby. *Kerr Land & Timber Co. v. Emmerson (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 200, 223, 43 Cal. Rptr. 333* (quoting from *Eastman v. Piper (1924) 68 Cal. App. 554, 559, 229 P. 1002*) (decided under prior law)

[c] Reversal

When judgment must be reversed for failure to make required findings and record does not indicate any purpose to be served in ordering new trial, proper procedure is to remand case with directions to trial court to make adequate findings based on evidence before it, to draw proper conclusions, and to enter judgment accordingly. *Weisz Trucking Co. v. Emil R. Wohl Constr. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 256, 264, 91 Cal. Rptr. 489* (decided under prior law)

Appellate court has jurisdiction to reverse judgment when findings not made when required since appeal may be taken from judgment or order notwithstanding fact that it is void. *Petroleum Midway Co. v. Zahn (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 645, 652, 145 P.2d 371* (decided under prior law)

[6] Preparation

Judge may prepare own findings. *Estate of McCormack (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 492, 501, 82 Cal. Rptr. 651* (decided under prior law)

Time for service and filing of findings and conclusions, as subject to time extension provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*. *McBride v. Alpha Realty Corp. (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 925, 929, 123 Cal. Rptr. 270* (decided under prior law)

Failure of trial court to read findings prepared by prevailing party on controverted facts was improper and constituted irregularity under *Code Civ. Proc. § 657(1)* related to motions for new trial. *Chung Sing v. Southern Pac. Co. (1920) 182 Cal. 609, 609-610* (decided under prior law)

[7] Purpose of Requiring Findings

Purpose of findings is to answer questions raised by pleadings and to make case more susceptible to review by disclosing exact grounds on which judgment rests. *Estate of Pack (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 74, 78, 43 Cal. Rptr. 361* (decided under prior law)

Duty of trial court to make findings on all material issues in order that parties and appellate court may determine factual basis for court's decision. *Green v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 819, 835, 115 Cal. Rptr. 685* (decided under prior law)

Function of trial court as normal and primary finder of facts is uniformly recognized. *Hicks v. Barnes (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 859, 863, 241 P.2d 648* (decided under prior law)

[8] Requirements and Sufficiency of Findings

[a] Findings Required to State Ultimate Facts

[i] In General

Trial court must find ultimate facts; that is, court as required to find those facts to which legal consequences attach. *London v. Guberman (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 215, 219, 29 Cal. Rptr. 279* (decided under prior law)

Ultimate facts as logical conclusions deduced from certain primary facts evidentiary in character. *Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Products Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054* (decided under prior law)

Findings of fact as not excluding conclusions of fact, only conclusions of law. *Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054* (decided under prior law)

Finding of ultimate fact of serious and willful misconduct in language of statute as not fatally insufficient in form merely because of generality of language. *California Shipbuilding Corp. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 270, 271, 188 P.2d 27* (involving award of increased compensation in workers' compensation case) (decided under prior law)

Plaintiff as having no prescriptive or other right to receive water from canal at any other level than bottom of canal as ultimate fact. *Weidenmueller v. Stearns Ranchos Co. (1900) 128 Cal. 623, 625-626, 61 P. 374* (decided under prior law)

Plaintiff as having not rescinded sales as ultimate fact. *Hollenbach v. Schnabel (1894) 101 Cal. 312, 317, 35 P. 872* (decided under prior law)

Finding of amount of damage and injury as ultimate fact to be deduced from evidence of wherein such damage consisted. *Klein v. Milne (1926) 198 Cal. 71, 75, 243 P. 420* (decided under prior law)

Defendant as having no right, title, interest, claim, or lien of, in, to, or against any of land or premises as ultimate fact. *Dam v. Zink (1896) 112 Cal. 91, 93, 44 P. 331* (decided under prior law)

Finding of indebtedness as not conclusion of law but as statement of ultimate fact. *Nisbet v. Rhinehart (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 477, 482, 42 P.2d 71* (decided under prior law)

Finding that property owned by married person is separate property as finding of ultimate fact. *In re Marriage of Knickerbocker (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1042, 118 Cal. Rptr. 232* (decided under prior law)

[ii] Conclusions of Law Distinguished

If, from facts in evidence, result can be reached by that process of natural reasoning adopted in investigation of truth, result as ultimate fact and not conclusion of law. *Levins v. Rovegno (1886) 71 Cal. 273, 278, 12 P. 161* ; *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (decided under prior law)

If, from facts in evidence, resort must be had to artificial processes of law in order to reach final determination, result as conclusion of law. *Levins v. Rovegno (1886) 71 Cal. 273, 278, 12 P. 161* ; *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (decided under prior law)

When findings made as to fact that damage was or was not suffered, or that it was suffered to certain extent, are unaccompanied by facts to support them, such findings as conclusions of law, *D'Andrea v. Pringle (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 689, 696, 52 Cal. Rptr. 606* (decided under prior law)

Finding that property was held in constructive trust as not finding but conclusion of law. *Efron v. Kalmanovitz (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 187, 195, 57 Cal. Rptr. 248* (decided under prior law)

Finding in equity action to set aside default judgment that entry of default judgment was due to extrinsic mistake of fact as conclusion of law. *Lieberman v. Aetna Ins. Co. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 515, 530, 57 Cal. Rptr. 453* (decided under prior law)

Word or phrase standing for fact in one connection as designating conclusion of law in different connection. *Hill v. Finigan (1888) 77 Cal. 267, 273, 19 P. 494* (decided under prior law)

While pleading of ownership may be that of ultimate fact, when it appears that allegation of ownership is based on evidentiary facts, ownership as then mere conclusion of law. *Palpar, Inc. v. Thayer (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 578, 583, 186 P.2d 748* ; *Morel v. Morel (1928) 203 Cal. 417, 419, 264 P. 760* (decided under prior law)

When no conflict in evidence exists, finding by trial court on issue in question as amounting to conclusion of law. *County of San Diego Trust & Sav. Bank v. San Diego (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 142, 153, 105 P.2d 94* (decided under prior law)

Unless facts on which finding of good faith or bad faith is based are stated, such finding as conclusion of law. *D'Andrea v. Pringle (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 689, 697, 52 Cal. Rptr. 606* (decided under prior law)

Finding of unfairness or fraud imposed by law without regard to actual intention of defendant as one reached by artificial processes of law based on other subsidiary findings of fact. *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (decided under prior law)

Reference to rule of evidence as not proper part of conclusion of law. *Estate of Grimble (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 741, 749, 117 Cal. Rptr. 125* (decided under prior law)

[iii] Evidentiary or Probative Facts

In marital dissolution proceeding, in response to petition's request for statement of decision with 37 questions, trial court was not required to discuss each question listed in request; court properly explained factual and legal basis of its decision regarding principal controverted issues at trial as are listed in request. *In re Marriage of Balcof (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1530-1531, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 183*

Findings, including any special findings requested, as required to state ultimate facts, and as not permitted to state evidentiary facts relied on by court to reach ultimate facts. *Seeley v. Combs (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 127, 132, 52 Cal. Rptr. 578, 416 P.2d 810* ; *Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054* (decided under prior law)

Findings as required to adequately state ultimate facts, and probative or evidentiary facts supportive thereof as neither required nor proper. *Beaupre v. Nave (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 402, 407, 91 Cal. Rptr. 473* (decided under prior law)

Where finding of ultimate fact made, trial court as not required to give its reason for finding since evidence given at trial furnished reason therefor. *Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054* (decided under prior law)

Test for determination of whether findings state ultimate facts rather than evidentiary facts or conclusions of law as same test as that applied in determining sufficiency of pleadings. *D'Andrea v. Pringle (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 689, 695, 52 Cal. Rptr. 606* (decided under prior law)

Former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 632, 634* as only requiring that findings disclose court's determination of all issues of fact in case; issues as required to relate to ultimate facts and not specific determination on every conflict of evidence, much less to diagram all intermediate decisions of law. *Moreno v. Jessup Buena Vista Dairy (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 438, 447, 123 Cal. Rptr. 393* (decided under prior law)

Fact of agency as evidentiary and as not required to be found. *Kerr Land & Timber Co. v. Emmerson (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 200, 223, 43 Cal. Rptr. 333* (decided under prior law)

[b] Inconsistent Findings

Inconsistent findings when one part would support the judgment and another would necessarily upset it as requiring reversal of judgment. Chapple v. Big Bear Super Market No. 3 *(1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 867, 875, 167 Cal. Rptr. 103* (decided under prior law)

Inconsistent or unsupported findings as not compelling reversal of judgment when at least one clear finding is sustained by evidence. *Conley v. Lieber (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 646, 658, 158 Cal. Rptr. 770* (decided under prior law)

[c] Inferred Findings

Where proper findings have been made on various issues of case, trial court as not required to negate issues contradictory thereto, since finding on particular issue is implied negation of all contradictory propositions. *Beaupre v. Nave (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 402, 408, 91 Cal. Rptr. 473* (decided under prior law)

Unless there is request for special findings or defect in findings is brought to attention of trial court, judgment as not permitted to be set aside because of failure to make express finding on issue, if finding thereon results by necessary implication from express findings which are made. *In re Marriage of Warren (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 777, 785, 104 Cal. Rptr. 860* ; *Auer v. Frank (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 396, 407, 38 Cal. Rptr. 684* (decided under prior law)

Judgment as not to be set aside because of failure to make express finding on issue if finding thereon, consistent with judgment, results by necessary implication from express findings. *Culbertson v. Cizek (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 451, 465, 37 Cal. Rptr. 548* (decided under prior law)

In absence of special request for special findings, finding that contract was fully performed as impliedly finding that alleged breaches did not occur. *Robinson v. Diller (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 813, 815, 79 Cal. Rptr. 508* (decided under prior law)

If findings support judgment, judgment as affirmed, regardless of whether or not conclusions are consistent or properly stated, or even if conclusions are omitted entirely. *Estate of Grimble (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 741, 750, 117 Cal. Rptr. 125* (decided under prior law)

[d] Preparation of Findings

[i] Consolidated Actions

Consolidated actions as permitted to be determined by single set of findings since allegations of complaints may be taken together and treated as one pleading. *Didier v. American Cas. Co. (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 742, 752, 68 Cal. Rptr. 217* (decided under prior law)

[ii] Format

Findings and conclusions ordinarily under prevailing custom and practice as set forth in separate instrument, but neither statute nor rule as requiring that this be done. *Baron v. Baron (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 933, 937, 88 Cal. Rptr. 404* (decided under prior law)

Findings and conclusions as permitted to be contained in judgment itself, although not usual practice. *Supple v. Luckenbach (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 319, 322, 84 P.2d 52* ; *Estate of Pesula (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 462, 466, 310 P.2d 39* (decided under prior law)

[e] Specific Probative Findings

Where conclusions, whether characterized as ultimate fact or conclusion of law, are drawn from specific probative findings, such conclusions as unable to stand if not supported by or inconsistent with such specific findings. *Green v. Smith (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 392, 397-398, 67 Cal. Rptr. 796* (decided under prior law)

Specific findings as controlling if in conflict with general findings as to pleadings. *Staub v. Muller (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 221, 226, 60 P.2d 283* (decided under prior law)

Finding of probative facts as not controlling, limiting, or modifying finding of ultimate facts and as not tending to establish that ultimate facts were found against evidence unless ultimate facts are necessarily based on probative findings and are completely overcome. *Banner Metals, Inc. v. Lockwood (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 643, 655, 3 Cal. Rptr. 421* (decided under prior law)

Where probative facts are found from which appellate court can declare that ultimate facts necessarily result, finding as sufficient. *McCray v. Burr (1899) 125 Cal. 636, 638, 58 P. 203* (decided under prior law)

As long as specific findings made support judgment, defective or omitted finding as unable to be prejudicial. *Rubin v. Toberman (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 319, 329, 38 Cal. Rptr. 32* (decided under prior law)

[f] Sufficiency of Findings

[i] In General

Findings as required to provide sufficient guidance to enable reviewing court to determine how trial court resolved material issues in case. *Whitney Inv. Co. v. Westview Dev. Co. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 594, 604, 78 Cal. Rptr. 302* (decided under prior law)

Finding as sufficient if it is responsive to averments and denials of pleadings with respect to issue. *Dam v. Zink (1896) 112 Cal. 91, 93, 44 P. 331* (decided under prior law)

If findings sufficient to support judgment, findings as not vitiated by unintelligibility of other findings. *Richter v. Walker (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 634, 639* (decided under prior law)

Even though minor inconsistencies, legal conclusions, and evidentiary matters may appear in findings, findings as to be liberally construed and resolved in favor of upholding rather than defeating judgment. *Woodbine v. Van Horn (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 95, 109, 173 P.2d 17* (decided under prior law)

Negative pregnants followed by recitals coupled with conjunctive as not always rendering findings insufficient. *Johndrow v. Thomas (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 202, 208-209, 187 P.2d 681* (decided under prior law)

When proceedings governed by statute, statute as generally controlling how specific findings must be. *Albonico v. Madera Irrigation Dist. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 735, 741, 3 Cal. Rptr. 343, 350 P.2d 95* (decided under prior law)

Findings that referred only to truth and falsity of allegations contained in complaint and cross complaint are not in compliance with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* and constitute reversible error since losing party is unable to prepare record on appeal. *Martin v. Baker (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1053-1054, 118 Cal. Rptr. 238* (decided under prior law)

Finding that allegations contained in pleading not in accord with or contrary to findings already found as ambiguous finding of fact since it cannot be determined which allegations in answer trial court believed to be contrary to or inconsistent with previous findings of fact. *Rubin v. Toberman (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 319, 328, 38 Cal. Rptr. 32* (decided under prior law)

Rule of negative pregnant, rendering findings insufficient, as not applicable if rule of liberal construction of findings to support judgment is applicable. *Johndrow v. Thomas (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 202, 208, 187 P.2d 681* (decided under prior law)

Finding of negligence couched in general terms as insufficient in response to complaint which alleges specific act of negligence if defendants make appropriate request for findings on such act. *Goss v. Fanoe (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 819, 824, 251 P.2d 337* (decided under prior law)

[ii] Definiteness and Certainty Required

Findings of fact as required to be definite and certain so that defeated party may show how or in what manner findings made are unsupported by evidence. *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 307, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (decided under prior law)

Findings as required to be sufficiently definite and certain so that reviewing court can arrive at just determination of merits of appeal. *Bank of Cal. v. Connolly (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 350, 369, 111 Cal. Rptr. 468* (decided under prior law)

Where finding is fatally uncertain, such finding as equivalent to failure to find. *Rubin v. Toberman (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 328-329, 226 Cal. App. 2d 319, 329, 38 Cal. Rptr. 32* (decided under prior law)

Any uncertainty in findings as to be construed to support judgment rather than defeat it. *Richter v. Walker (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 634, 639, 226 P.2d 593* ; *Sutter v. Madrin (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 161, 170, 74 Cal. Rptr. 627* (decided under prior law)

Uncertainties not brought to attention of trial court that exist in findings as to be resolved, if reasonably possible, to support judgment. *Ensele v. Jolley(1922) 188 Cal. 297, 302, 204 P. 1085* ; *Neel v. San Antonio Community Hosp. (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 233, 237, 1 Cal. Rptr. 313* (decided under prior law)

[9] Special Findings

[a] Failure to Make Requested Finding

Failure of trial court to make finding on issue for which special finding was requested as reversible error if substantial evidence introduced to support finding. *Hemmerling v. Tomlev, Inc. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 63 Cal. Rptr. 1, 432 P.2d 697* (decided under prior law)

When court required to make finding on value of property condemned and on each estate therein, failure to make finding on value of each estate following request for special finding as reversible error. *Hemmerling v. Tomlev, Inc. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 572, 576, 63 Cal. Rptr. 1, 432 P.2d 697* (decided under prior law)

Refusal of trial judge to make special findings as requested on issues of foreseeability of harm, nature and extent of duty, and acts constituting breach of duty as reversible error. *Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 927-929, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919* (decided under prior law)

Duty of complying with requirement for special findings as resting on trial court, not losing party. *Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 930, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919* (decided under prior law)

Finding of negligence in general terms as insufficient in face of request for specific factual findings under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634*, on which finding of negligence was predicated. *Shell Oil Co. v. Allied Constr. & Eng'r Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 1, 5-6, 98 Cal. Rptr. 922* (decided under prior law)

Failure to make special finding, on plaintiffs' request, on issue of whether contractor acted reasonably in rejecting sureties on bond pursuant to satisfaction clause contained in his contract with plaintiffs as reversible error. *Weisz Trucking Co. v. Emil R. Wohl Constr. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 256, 263, 91 Cal. Rptr. 489* (decided under prior law)

Finding that city had no notice of defective condition in sidewalk as insufficient when plaintiff requested special findings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* on whether there had been previous fall at the location. *Garber v. Los Angeles (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 349, 356, 38 Cal. Rptr. 157* (decided under prior law)

Finding on issue of total cost on construction contract without making further findings on reasonable value of extras and changes under contract as reversible error when such further findings were requested. *Culbertson v. Cizek (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 451, 465-466, 37 Cal. Rptr. 548* (decided under prior law)

In action to recover money from defendant who maintained fiduciary relationship with plaintiff, trial court's refusal to make special findings, as requested, on issues of subnormal intelligence of plaintiff and confidential relationship as reversible error. *Ortiz v. Avila (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 786, 790-792, 35 Cal. Rptr. 522* (decided under prior law)

When evidence offered and trial briefs argued existence of oral contract and trial court found only that there was no written contract, ambiguity as created under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* and appellate court as unable to determine issue found by trial court in favor of prevailing party. *Distribu-Dor, Inc. v. Karadanis (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 463, 467, 90 Cal. Rptr. 231* (decided under prior law)

[b] Failure to Request Special Findings

[i] In General

While failure to object to findings is not waiver of failure to find on material issue, rule that findings must be construed liberally in support of judgment as particularly applicable in absence of request for specific findings. *Pilch v. Milikin (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 212, 225, 19 Cal. Rptr. 334* ; *McKinley v. Buchanan (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 608, 612, 1 Cal. Rptr. 573* (decided under prior law)

When losing party has had opportunity to obtain specific findings but has failed to avail himself or herself of such right in trial court, his or her assertion of insufficiency of findings for uncertainty as unfair to court and prevailing party and as militating against expeditious disposition of lawsuits. *Nemeth v. Pankost (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 351, 355, 36 Cal. Rptr. 600* (decided under prior law)

Failure to request specific findings or otherwise bring to attention of court objection based on specificity as requiring appellate court to assume that finding of ultimate fact includes finding of all probative facts necessary to sustain it. *Yakov v. Board of Medical Examiners (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 67, 71 n. 2, 64 Cal. Rptr. 785, 435 P.2d 553* (decided under prior law)

[ii] Invoking Sanction

Prohibition of *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* against inferred findings as applying only if party attacking judgment requested specific finding or otherwise brought defect to attention of trial court. *In re Marriage of Warren (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 777, 785, 104 Cal. Rptr. 860* (decided under prior law)

When from all papers filed in connection with new trial motion and transcript of argument on that motion appellants never suggested to court that findings were ambiguous or incomplete, but only that findings were in error, appellate court as not bound by provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* since appellants never brought alleged deficiency to attention of trial court. *Tyler v. Norton (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 717, 725-726, 110 Cal. Rptr. 307* (decided under prior law)

[c] Omission in Findings

Request that trial court comment on certain issue as not calling court's attention to omission in findings for purposes of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634*. *Ripani v. Liberty Loan Corp. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 603, 614, 157 Cal. Rptr. 272* (decided under prior law)

[d] Preparation of Special Finding

Established practice as presupposing that counsel desiring special findings will draft and propose them in usual form. *Moreno v. Jessup Buena Vista Dairy (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 438, 447, 123 Cal. Rptr. 393* (decided under prior law)

[e] Purpose of Special Findings

Purpose of 1959 amendment to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* as to overcome effects of doctrine of implied findings by authorizing filing of request for specific findings. *Morris v. Thogmartin (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 922, 927, 105 Cal. Rptr. 919* (decided under prior law)

Purpose of 1959 amendment to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* as to discourage mere finding of so-called ultimate facts when such method left counsel and appellate court unable to determine trial court's resolution of conflicting facts needed for factual determination of case. *Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 307, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (decided under prior law)

When findings on material issue are requested but not made, reviewing court as not permitted to infer that trial court found in favor of prevailing party on issue. *Common Wealth Ins. Systems, Inc. v. Kersten (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 1014, 1032, 115 Cal. Rptr. 653* ; *Kerr Land & Timber Co. v. Emmerson (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 200, 222, 43 Cal. Rptr. 333* (decided under prior law)

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* as providing that findings in support of judgment can be inferred by appellate court unless they were requested, omitted, and the omission was brought to attention of trial court either prior to entry of judgment or afterward. *In re Marriage of Warren (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 777, 785, 104 Cal. Rptr. 860* (decided under prior law)

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634*, relating to requests for special findings, as amended in 1959, as not changing basic rule that appellate court must accept as true all evidence tending to establish correctness of findings made, taking into account all inferences which might reasonably have been thought by trial court to lead to same conclusion. *Mashon v. Haddock (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 151, 167, 11 Cal. Rptr. 865* (decided under prior law)

[f] When Specific Findings Not Required

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* as not requiring finding be made as to every minute matter on which evidence is received at trial, nor supplemental or explanatory findings on evidentiary matter. *Kanner v. Globe Bottling Co. (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 559, 567-568, 78 Cal. Rptr. 25* (decided under prior law)

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 634* as not requiring that findings be made as to every minute matter on which evidence is received at trial. *Coleman Engineering Co. v. North American Aviation, Inc. (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 396, 410, 55 Cal. Rptr. 1, 420 P.2d 713* (decided under prior law)

Court as not required to make requested special findings when case submitted on agreed statement of facts. *James v. P.C.S. Ginning Co. (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 19, 24, 80 Cal. Rptr. 457* (decided under prior law)

Unless request made, specific finding as not required on issue when it follows by necessary implication from general finding. *Beaupre v. Nave (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 402, 408, 91 Cal. Rptr. 473* (decided under prior law)

If from findings made it can be determined that requested special findings not made would have been adverse to complainant, then complainant as unable to complain of failure of court to make such findings. *Roberts v. Graves (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 410, 419, 75 Cal. Rptr. 130* (decided under prior law)

[10] Specific Proceedings Requiring Findings

[a] In General

When issues of fact are joined in contested probate matters, findings as required when required under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *Estate of McAfee (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 553, 556, 6 Cal. Rptr. 79* (decided under prior law)

Trial court as required to make findings of fact in dissolution actions in order to determine character of property and value of each asset for purposes of division of community and quasi-community property. *In re Marriage of Knickerbocker (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 1039, 1042, 118 Cal. Rptr. 232* (decided under prior law)

Former *Prob. Code § 1230* (*now see Prob. Code § 1000*) by reference made former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* applicable to trial and determination of issues of fact in probate proceedings. *Estate of Pendell (1932) 216 Cal. 384, 385-386, 14 P.2d 506* ; *Guardianship of Pankey (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 919, 928, 113 Cal. Rptr. 858* (decided under prior law)

Order denying petition for accounting, for revocation of letters of administration, and for appointment of disinterested administrator in probate proceedings as requiring findings if required under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *Estate of Dow (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 420, 423, 205 P.2d 698* (decided under prior law)

Findings as required in prohibition proceedings. *Mellinger v. Municipal Court (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 843, 847, 71 Cal. Rptr. 535* (decided under prior law)

Provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* and former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 232, applied to special proceeding of administrative mandamus in cases in which trial court has determined question of fact. *International Asso. of Fire Fighters v. Palo Alto (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 295, 300, 32 Cal. Rptr. 842, 384 P.2d 170* ; *Hadley v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 389, 394, 105 Cal. Rptr. 500* (decided under prior law)

Findings of fact and conclusions of law in arbitration proceedings as not required unless requested. *Stermer v. Modiano Constr. Co. (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 264, 271, 118 Cal. Rptr. 309* (decided under prior law)

Findings as required in equity case, whether tried with aid of jury or not. *Holland v. Kelly (1917) 177 Cal. 43, 45, 169 P. 1000* (decided under prior law)

Obligation to make findings under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8* (motion for judgment on completion of presentation of plaintiff's evidence), when required under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, as same as that applying generally in cases tried by court. *East-West Capital Corp. v. Khourie (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 553, 556, 89 Cal. Rptr. 369* (decided under prior law)

[b] Special Proceedings

Provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* and former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 232, as not applying to special proceedings. *Carpenter v. Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 307, 328, 74 P.2d 761* ; *In re Helen J. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 238, 243-244, 107 Cal. Rptr. 106* (decided under prior law)

Findings in special proceedings as not required if statute dealing with such proceeding is silent on requirement. *Carpenter v. Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 307, 328, 74 P.2d 761* (decided under prior law)

Any proceeding in court which was not under common law and equity practice (either action at law or suit in chancery) as special proceeding. *In re Helen J. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 238, 244, 107 Cal. Rptr. 106* (decided under prior law)

Proceedings in aid of execution under former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 715, 717*, as special proceedings not requiring findings under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *Lyons v. Marcher (1897) 119 Cal. 382, 382-383, 51 P. 559* (decided

under prior law)

Proceedings to declare minor child free of custody and control of natural parents as not action but special proceeding which did not require findings. *In re Helen J. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 238, 243-244, 107 Cal. Rptr. 106* (decided under prior law)

Proceedings under *Ins. Code §§ 1010-1061* relative to rehabilitation and liquidation of insurance companies as special proceedings and not within provisions of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*. *Carpenter v. Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 307, 327, 74 P.2d 761* (decided under prior law)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsDismissals of AppealsInvoluntary DismissalsCivil ProcedureAppealsRecords on AppealCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRulings on Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 529.55-529.59

[Reserved]

§§ 529.55[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.60

§ 529.60 Request for Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

[1] FORM Request for Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	REQUEST FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	STATEMENT OF
Defendant.	)	DECISION
	)	
	)	

_____ [*Specify party, e.g.,* Plaintiff], who appeared at the trial of the above-entitled action, hereby requests that the court issue a statement of decision explaining the factual and legal bases for its decision regarding the following controverted issues:

1. _____ [*Specify controverted issue, e.g.,* Whether or not defendant breached a duty of care owed to plaintiff].

[*Set forth additional controverted issues. State and enumerate each issue separately.*]

Dated: _____.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of request for statement of decision is for use by any party appearing at trial. The request must specify the controverted issues that the requesting party wishes to be included in the statement of decision and must be made within 10 days after the court announces a tentative decision or, if the trial lasts less than one calendar day, or less than eight hours over a period of more than one day, before submission of the matter for decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*].

The 10-day period commences at the time the clerk mails the copy of the minute order or decision, and the request is timely "made" when it is received and filed during this period [*see Staten v. Heale (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1088-1091, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 35]* . It appears that the statement of decision may be limited to only those issues specified in the request, when less than all material issues are specified [*see Harvard Investment Co. v. Gap Stores, Inc. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 704, 709 n.3, 202 Cal. Rptr. 891]* .

Procedure relating to the statement of decision is governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*. For discussion, see *§ 529.15*.

[3] Cross References

For a form of proposal as to the content of a statement of decision, see *§ 529.61*

For a form of proposed statement of decision, see *§ 529.61*

For a form of application for a hearing on the content of a statement of decision, see *§ 529.66*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.61

§ 529.61 Proposal as to Content of Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

[1] FORM Proposal as to Content of Statement of Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 632]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PROPOSAL AS TO CONTENT OF STATEMENT
Defendant.	)	OF DECISION
	)	
	)	

_____ [*Specify party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] in the above-entitled action hereby makes the following proposals as to the content of the statement of decision:

1. That the factual and legal bases for the court's decision regarding the controverted issue of _____ [*specify controverted issue to be included in statement of decision*] be explained as follows:

a. The court based its decision on the following facts: _____ [*set forth factual determinations explaining court's decision*].

b. The legal basis for the court's decision is _____ [*set forth legal determinations explaining court's*

decision].

[*Set forth any additional issues to be included. State and enumerate each issue separately.*]

Dated: _____.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a proposal for the content of a statement of decision for use by any party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 632*]. If a party requests a statement of decision, any other party may make proposals as to the content of the statement of decision within 10 days after the date of request for a statement of decision [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(e)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 632 does not expressly define "proposals as to the content of the statement of decision." Therefore, it is unclear whether "content" refers to the issues to be included, to the explanation of the court's decision, or both. Because any party may specify which controverted issues should be included when that party requests a statement of decision, it would seem that once a request is made, any other party would also be allowed to propose what issues will be included in the statement of decision [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 632, 634*]. Thus, counsel may wish to propose both the issues to be included and a statement of the factual and legal bases for the court's decision.

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590, refers separately to proposals as to the content of the statement of decision and the proposed statement of decision, although it does not indicate whether there is a distinction in form between the two. If it is determined that there is no distinction in form, counsel may wish to attach a proposed statement of decision, such as the one *set out in § 529.62,* to the caption and introduction of this form, as an alternative to setting out the proposed contents as done here. Counsel should consult local practice to ascertain what form of proposals and proposed statement of decision will be accepted by the court.

[3] Distinction Between Factual and Legal Bases for Decision

Code Civ. Proc. § 632 requires that the statement of decision contain the factual and legal bases for the court's decision. Formerly, findings of fact and conclusions of law were presented separately, suggesting that perhaps the factual basis and the legal basis for a court's decision should each be presented separately within the statement of decision, as in the foregoing form. In addition, *Code Civ. Proc. § 909* provides that in a nonjury trial a reviewing court may make factual determinations contrary to the factual determinations made by the trial court. In these cases, at least, the factual basis for a decision would apparently be treated separately from the legal basis for a decision.

Nevertheless, prior to the elimination of findings of fact and conclusions of law, courts held that the distinction between conclusions of fact and conclusions of law are difficult to make [*Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Construction Prod. Corp. (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 241 P.2d 1054]* . In addition, appellate courts treated factual determinations by trial courts as findings of fact, whether a trial court presented them as findings of fact or conclusions of law [*Rees v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 746, 749, 87 Cal. Rptr. 456* ; *San Francisco Boys' Club, Inc. v. County of Mendocino (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 548, 562-563, 62 Cal. Rptr. 294]* . Courts also held that conclusions of law, although mentioned in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 632,* were a relatively useless appendage to findings of fact, since the important conclusion of law is the judgment [*Mayes v. Sturdy N. Sales, Inc. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 69, 82, 154 Cal. Rptr. 43* ; *Estate of Grimble (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 741, 750, 117 Cal. Rptr. 125*].

These opinions suggest that courts have considered the distinction between findings of fact and conclusions of law as meaningless or unclear, which may have been one factor resulting in the elimination of findings of fact and conclusions of law in favor of the statement of decision as a single unit. Therefore, in a statement of decision, stating a legal basis for the court's decision separately from the factual basis for the decision may be unnecessary. Counsel may wish to modify this form, to state the factual and legal bases for a decision together. It is as yet unclear, however, whether the preferred form of statement of decision will be one in which the factual and legal determinations are set forth together or one in which they are set forth separately.

[4] Timing of Proposals

The time within which to submit proposals as to content of statement of decision is governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(e)*. For discussion, see *§§ 529.14* and *529.15*. When a trial is completed within one day or in less than eight hours over more than one day, a request for statement of decision must be made before the matter is submitted for decision and the statement of decision may be made orally on the record in the presence of the parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(n)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.62

§ 529.62 Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PROPOSED STATEMENT OF DECISION
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The above-entitled cause came on regularly for trial on _____ [*date*], in Department _____ of the above-entitled court, the Honorable _____, Judge, presiding without a jury [, a jury having been expressly waived], and was tried on that date [and on _____ (*state additional dates of trial*)]. _____ [*Name*] appeared as counsel for plaintiff and _____ [*name*] appeared as counsel for defendant. _____ [*Specify other appearances, if any*].

Oral and documentary evidence was introduced on behalf of the respective parties and the cause was argued and submitted for decision. The court, having considered the evidence and heard the arguments of counsel and being fully advised, issues the following statement of decision:

1. With regard to the issue of _____ [*specify issue*] the court's decision is _____ [*set forth decision*].

a. The court based its decision on the following facts: _____ [*set forth factual determinations explaining court's decision*].

b. The legal basis for the court's decision is _____ [*set forth legal determinations explaining court's decision*].

[*Set forth additional issues to be included, along with the decision, and factual and legal basis for the decision as to each issue. State and enumerate each issue separately.*]

Judgment is hereby ordered to be entered as follows: _____ [*specify*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is a proposed statement of decision for use by any party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*].

The party that has been ordered to prepare the statement must, within 30 days after the announcement or service of the tentative decision, serve and submit to the court a proposed statement of decision and a proposed judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*]. If the proposed statement of decision and judgment are not served and submitted within that time, any other party that appeared at the trial may within 10 days thereafter: (1) prepare, serve, and submit to the court a proposed statement of decision and judgment, or (2) serve on all other parties and file a notice of motion for an order that a statement of decision be deemed waived [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*; for a form for a notice of motion, see *§ 529.63*]. For further discussion, see *§ 529.15[1]*.

[3] Cross References

For forms of judgment, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

For a form of request for a statement of decision, see *§ 529.60*

For a form of proposal as to the content of a statement of decision, see *§ 529.61*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.63

§ 529.63 Notice of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
Defendant.	)	DER THAT STATEMENT OF DECISION BE
	)	DEEMED WAIVED
	)	

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her/its attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard in the courtroom of [_____(Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above entitled court, located at _____[*street address and city*], California, _____[*specify party, e.g.*, defendant] will, and hereby does move the court for an order that the statement of decision, requested by _____[*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] be deemed waived as provided

by *Rule 3.1590(f) of the California Rules of Court*. The motion will be made on the ground that _____[*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] who was ordered by the court to prepare a proposed statement of decision, has failed to serve or submit to the court a proposed statement of decision within 30 days after announcement or service of the tentative decision, [and within the additional time of _____(*state number of days*) granted by the court].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion for use by any party to the action when the party ordered to prepare the proposed statement of decision has failed to do so within the time limits prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*, or within any additional time limit granted by the court [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.10(c)*]. The notice of motion must be served on all other parties to the action [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*].

In lieu of serving and submitting to the court the notice of motion when the designated party has not served and submitted a proposed statement of decision, any other party that appeared at trial may prepare, serve, and submit a proposed statement of decision [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*].

[3] Supporting Memorandum

A supporting memorandum must accompany notices of motion in law and motion proceedings [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. Although the proceeding in which this form would be used does not fall within the definition of law and motion proceedings in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a)*, it is nevertheless recommended that this form be accompanied with a supporting memorandum. For general discussion and forms relating to memoranda, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Cross References

For form of declaration supporting this motion, and an order granting it, see *§§ 529.64* and 529.75

For general discussion and forms relating to motions and orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.64

§ 529.64 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*]	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Defendant.	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER THAT
	)	STATEMENT OF DECISION BE DEEMED
	)	WAIVED

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California, and the attorney or record herein for _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant].

[*EITHER, if in an unlimited civil case in superior court*]

2. I did not receive [nor did any member of the law firm with which I am associated receive] a proposed statement of decision prepared by [counsel for] _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] in this action within 15 days after _____ [expiration of the time for filing proposals as to the content of the statement of decision on _____ [*date*], *or* notification by the court that (counsel for) the _____ (*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff) was to prepare and submit the proposed statement of decision].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a declaration for use by any party to support a motion for an order that the statement of decision be deemed waived on the grounds stated in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f). Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* authorizes a declaration under penalty of perjury, as in the above form, in lieu of an affidavit. For forms of affidavits, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For the related form of notice of motion, and discussion of the motion, *see § 529.63*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.65

§ 529.65 Order Granting Motion That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion That Statement of Decision Be Deemed Waived [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION THAT STATE-
Defendant.	)	MENT OF DECISION BE DEEMED WAIVED
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order that the statement of decision be deemed waived came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name*] appeared as counsel for plaintiff and _____ [*name*] appeared as counsel for defendant. _____ [*Specify other appearances, if any*].

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be and hereby is granted and that the statement of decision is deemed waived.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when the court has granted a motion that the statement of decision be deemed waived on the ground that the party ordered by the court to prepare, serve, and submit a proposed statement of decision has failed to do so within the time specified in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*]. For the related form of notice of motion, and discussion of the motion, see *§ 529.63*.

See also References to § 529.60.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.66

§ 529.66 Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)]

[1] FORM Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED STATEMENT OF
Defendant.	)	DECISION
	)	
	)	

_____ [*Specify party, e.g.,* Plaintiff], pursuant to *Rule 3.1590(g) of the California Rules of Court*, objects to the proposed statement of decision submitted to the court by _____ *specify party, e.g.,* defendant] as follows:

1. Objection is hereby made to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the proposed statement of factual basis for the court's decision as to Issue No. 1, which was the issue _____ (*specify*), *or* the proposed decision and the proposed factual and legal bases for the decision as to Issue No. 2] of the proposed statement of decision, on the grounds that _____ [*state reasons for objection, e.g.,* it does not correctly reflect the evidence on the issue presented at trial].

[In connection with this objection, _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff) requests that the court refer to Paragraph _____ (*number*) of the proposal as to content of the statement of decision previously submitted by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff), and attached hereto as Exhibit A, and requests that the court incorporate the proposed content of Paragraph _____ (*number*) of Exhibit A into the final statement of decision.]

[*Set forth additional objections to the proposed statement of decision, and, if appropriate, references to the corresponding paragraphs in any proposals as to content of the statement of decision previously filed. State and enumerate each objection separately.*]

Dated: _____.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of objections to the proposed statement of decision is for use to make objections to the proposed statement of decision.

Objections to the proposed statement of decision or to the proposed judgment may be served and filed by any party within 15 days after the proposed statement of decision and judgment have been served [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g)*].

[3] Omission or Ambiguity in Statement of Decision

If there is an omission or ambiguity in the statement of decision issued by the court, and if the record shows that the omission or ambiguity was brought to the court's attention either prior to the entry of judgment or in conjunction with a motion for new trial or motion to vacate judgment, it may not be inferred on appeal or on a motion for new trial or motion to vacate judgment that the trial court decided in favor of the prevailing party as to that issue or those facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 634*].

For forms for use in seeking amendment of the statement of decision in a motion for new trial or motion to vacate judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial*, §§ 357.60 *et seq. and 357.90* et seq.

35 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.67

§ 529.67 Ex Parte Application for Order, Supporting Declaration, and Order for Hearing on Proposals as to Content of Statement of Decision, on Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision, or on Objections to Proposed Judgment When Statement of Decision Not Requested [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Application for Order, Supporting Declaration, and Order for Hearing on Proposals as to Content of Statement of Decision, on Objections to Proposed Statement of Decision, or on Objections to Proposed Judgment When Statement of Decision Not Requested [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION, SUPPORTING DE-
Defendant.	)	CLARATION, AND ORDER FOR HEARING ON
	)	_____ [PROPOSALS AS TO CON-
	)	TENT OF THE STATEMENT OF DECISION *or* OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED STATEMENT OF DECISION *or* OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED JUDGMENT] [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*]

_____

APPLICATION

I, _____ [*name of attorney*], hereby apply on behalf of _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order for a hearing on _____ [the proposal as to the content of the statement of

decision submitted by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) *or* the objections to the proposed statement of decision filed by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) *or* the objections to the proposed judgment filed by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant)].
Dated: _____.

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

DECLARATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant].

[*EITHER, if hearing requested on proposals*]

Proposals as to content of the statement of decision _____ [are hereby (served and) submitted concurrently with the submission of this application *or* were (served and submitted by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) and are attached hereto as Exhibit A].

[*OR, if hearing requested on objections*]

Objections to the _____ [proposed statement of decision *or* proposed judgment] _____ [are hereby served and filed concurrently with the submission of this application *or* were served and filed by _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) and are attached hereto as Exhibit A].

A hearing on the _____ [proposal as to content of the statement of decision *or* objections to the proposed statement of decision *or* objections to the proposed judgment] should be ordered because _____ [*set forth reason hearing is requested, e.g.,* the complex nature of the issues discussed in the proposal as to content of the statement of decision makes it necessary for the court to hear explanation as to how those issues should be resolved].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Set forth memorandum in support of application.*]

ORDER FOR HEARING
[*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*]

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court that the application by _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, defendant] for an order for a hearing ought to be granted,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a hearing on _____ [proposals as to content of the statement of decision *or* objections to the proposed statement of decision *or* objections to the proposed judgment] be held on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the courtroom of [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of ex parte application for an order for a hearing is for use by any party when counsel for any party seeks a hearing on proposals as to content of the statement of decision or objections to the proposed statement of decision that have been submitted or filed by that party or by any other party. It may also be used to seek a hearing on objections to the proposed judgment when a statement of decision is not requested or has been waived [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(k)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(h), (i)*]. The application should be presented to the judge for signature on the portion of the form that constitutes the order granting the hearing.

Neither *Code Civ. Proc. § 632* nor *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(d)* expressly requires that a proposal as to content of the statement of decision be served and filed or served and submitted. Therefore, if a hearing on the proposal is requested by ex parte application, it is not required that the proposal be served on the other parties, although it is better practice to do so.

Objections to either the proposed statement of decision or the proposed judgment must be served and filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(g), (j)*]. There are no requirements for serving or filing the proposal as to the content of the statement, but they would be submitted to the court. Therefore, if counsel is filing any objections concurrently with submitting the ex parte application, he or she should remember to serve the objections also.

Counsel should consult local court rules and procedure for requirements for ex parte applications.

[3] Cross References

For a form of proposal as to the content of a statement of decision and related discussion, see *§ 529.62*

For a form of proposed statement of decision and related discussion, see *§ 529.63*

For a form of objections to a proposed statement of decision and related discussion, see *§ 529.66*

For general discussion and forms relating to motions, ex parte applications, and orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.68

§ 529.68 Notice of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
Defendant.	)	DER EXCUSING NONCOMPLIANCE WITH TIME
	)	LIMIT PRESCRIBED BY *CALIFORNIA RULES OF*
	)	*COURT, RULE 3.1590*

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her/its attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, in the courtroom of [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*street address and city*], California, _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move the court for an order excusing him/her/it from compliance with the time limit prescribed in Rule 3.1590 _____ [*specify subdivision, e.g.*, (c)] of the California Rules of Court for _____ [*state act, e.g.*, serving and submitting a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____

[*set forth ground(s) showing good cause for excusing noncompliance with a time limit prescribed by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590, e.g.,* a fire in the office building of the attorney for _____ (*moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) destroyed the attorney's records in the above-entitled action on _____ [*date*], two days before the expiration of the time period within which the attorney was required to serve and submit a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion is for use by any party who has failed to comply with one of the time limits prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* [for discussion of those time periods, *see § 529.15[1]*]. At any time prior to the entry of judgment, the court may, for good cause shown and on such terms as may be just, excuse a noncompliance with the time limits prescribed for doing any act required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*].

Depending on the circumstances, it may be necessary to shorten the 16 court-day minimum notice period required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*. In such a case counsel should submit an ex parte application for an order shortening time for notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(b)* (requiring supporting declaration showing good cause for shortening time)]. The ex parte application, a supporting declaration, proposed order, and a memorandum in support of the application must be submitted to the judge along with the form. For discussion and forms of ex parte application, supporting declaration, proposed order, and order shortening time for service of notice of motion, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* .

Counsel may also move for a written order extending any of the time limits prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*]; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.10(c)* (extensions of time generally)].

[3] Supporting Memorandum

A supporting memorandum must accompany notices of motion in law and motion proceedings [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. Although the proceeding in which this form would be used does not fall within the definition of law and motion proceedings in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103(a),* it is nevertheless recommended that this form be accompanied with supporting memoranda. For general discussion and forms relating to memoranda, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Cross References

For form of declaration supporting this motion, and an order granting it, see *§§ 529.69* and *529.70*

For discussion and forms relating to a motion for an order shortening or extending time generally, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* .

For memoranda relating to shortening or extending time generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 212,

Shortening and Extension of Time

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.69

§ 529.69 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Excusing Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Defendant.	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER EXCUS-
	)	ING NONCOMPLIANCE WITH TIME LIMIT PRE-
	)	SCRIBED BY *CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT, RULE 3.1590*

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant].

2. _____ [*State facts showing good cause for excuse from noncompliance, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], a fire occurred in my office. All of the records I was keeping regarding this action were in my office at the time and were destroyed by the fire. Due to the destruction of the records in this case, I was delayed

in preparing a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment and, as a result, I was unable to serve and submit a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment until _____ [*date*], three days after expiration of the time period prescribed by *Rule 3.1590(f) of the California Rules of Court*.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration is for use by counsel for any party to support a motion for an order excusing noncompliance with a time limit prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* [for the related form of notice of motion, and discussion of the motion, *see § 529.68*]. The declaration must set forth facts showing good cause for excuse of the noncompliance [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*]. For a general discussion of what constitutes good cause for the purposes of extending time, see the Introduction to Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5 authorizes a declaration under penalty of perjury, as in the above form, in lieu of an affidavit. For forms of affidavits, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

See also Comments and References to § 529.68.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 529 STATEMENT OF DECISION
PART IV. FORMS

46-529 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 529.70

§ 529.70 Order Granting Motion to Excuse Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion to Excuse Noncompliance With Time Limit Prescribed for Doing Act Required by Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590 [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXCUSE
Defendant.	)	NONCOMPLIANCE WITH TIME LIMIT PRE-
	)	SCRIBED BY *CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT,*
	)	*RULE 3.1590*

_____

The motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] for an order excusing noncompliance with the time limit prescribed by Rule 3.1590 _____ [*specify subdivision, e.g.,* (c)] of the California Rules of Court for _____ [*state act, e.g.,* serving and submitting a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name*] appeared as counsel for plaintiff; _____ [*name*] appeared as counsel for defendant. _____ [*Specify other appearances, if any*].

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be and hereby is granted and that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] is hereby excused from noncompliance with the time limit prescribed by Rule 3.1590 _____ [*specify subdivision, e.g.,* (e)] of the California Rules of Court, that _____ [*specify effect of excuse from noncompliance, e.g.,* a statement of decision is not waived, and that _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) may serve and submit a proposed statement of decision and proposed judgment on or before _____ (*date*)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in granting a motion to excuse a noncompliance with a time limit prescribed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590* [for related form of notice of motion, and discussion of motion, *see § 529.68*]. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(m)*, provides that the order excusing noncompliance must be made on such terms as may be just.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 530.syn

§ 530.syn Synopsis to Chapter 530: STATUTE OF FRAUDS

§ 530.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 530.02 Cross References

§§ 530.03-530.09 [Reserved]

§ 530.10 Governing Statutes

§ 530.11 Purpose of Statute of Frauds

§ 530.12 Contracts Required to Be in Writing

[1] Agreements Not to Be Performed Within One Year

[a] General Requirement

[i] Statement of Rule

[ii] Real Property Leases Are Governed by Two Provisions

[iii] Possibility of Performance Within One Year

[b] Computation of One-Year Period

[c] Exception for Qualified Financial Contracts

[i] Terms of Exception

[ii] "Qualified Financial Contracts" Defined

[iii] Evidence Sufficient To Establish Qualified Financial Contract Was Made

[2] Promise to Answer for Another's Debt

[a] General Requirement and Exceptions

[b] Guaranty on Face of Commercial Paper

[c] Personal Representative's Promise to Pay Estate Debt

[d] Nonprofit Association Member's Promise to Pay Association Debt

[e] Representation Regarding Another's Credit

[3] Prenuptial Agreements

[4] Agreement to Transfer Real Property Interest

[5] Transfer of Real Property Interest

[6] Mortgages and Deeds of Trust

[7] Employment of Real Estate Broker

[8] Promise to Be Performed After Death

[9] Promise to Make Will

[a] Promise Made After 2000

[b] Promise Made in 1985-2000

[c] Promise Made Before 1985

[10] Commercial Loan Commitment in Excess of $100,000

[11] Sale of Personal Property in Excess of $5,000

[12] Sale of Goods in Excess of $500

[a] In General

[b] Written Confirmation of Contract; Notice of Objection

[c] Estoppel

[d] Effect of Admission of Contract's Existence in Pleading, Testimony, or Otherwise

[e] "Sale or Return" Transactions

[f] Sale of Securities

[g] Security Agreements

[h] Goods Being Specially Manufactured for Buyer

[i] Goods Which Have Been Accepted or Paid for

[13] Agreement Waiving or Tolling of Statute of Limitations

§ 530.13 Agent's Authority: The Equal Dignity Rule

[1] Scope of Rule

[2] Estoppel and Ratification

§ 530.14 Memorandum

[1] Sufficiency of Memorandum

[2] Memorandum May Be Contained in More Than One Document

[3] Signature

§ 530.15 Modification of Written Contract

[1] Permitted Methods of Modifying Written Contract

[2] Burden of Proof of Oral Modification of Written Contract

§ 530.16 Effect of Statute of Frauds

§ 530.17 Fully Performed Agreements

§ 530.18 Part Performance

[1] Elements of Doctrine

[2] Partially Performed Agreement Not to Be Performed Within One Year

[3] Partially Performed Prenuptial Agreements

[4] Partially Performed Real Property Transactions

[5] Partially Performed Promise to Make Will

§ 530.19 Estoppel to Assert Statute of Frauds

[1] Application of Doctrine

[2] Nature of Acts Constituting Change of Position

[3] Doctrine of Judicial Admissions

[4] Pleading Estoppel

§ 530.20 Quasi-Specific Performance

[1] Agreement to Make Will in Return for Services

[2] Mutual Wills

§ 530.21 Fraud Preventing Writing

§ 530.22 Severability of Unenforceable Promises

§ 530.23 Pleading Contract and Statute of Frauds

§ 530.24 Establishing Statute of Frauds as Defense

[1] Demurrer, Motion, or Objection Is Required

[2] Who May Assert Defense

§§ 530.25-530.29 [Reserved]

§ 530.30 Other Matthew Bender Publications

§ 530.31 State Statutes

[1] Agency

[2] Fraud Preventing Writing

[3] Marriage and Dissolution

[4] Miscellaneous Agreements

[5] Modification of Written Contracts

[6] Personal Property Transactions

[7] Real Property Transactions

[8] Satisfaction and Release of Obligation

[9] Suretyship and Guaranty

§ 530.32 Decisions

[1] Conflict of Laws

[2] Contracts Outside Statute of Frauds

[a] Contract May Be Performed Within One Year

[b] Promise to Pay Another's Debt Benefits Promisor

[c] Real Property Transactions

[d] Settlement Agreements

[3] Contracts Required to Be in Writing

[a] Agreements Not to Be Performed Within One Year

[b] Real Property Transactions

[c] Sales of Goods and Personal Property

[4] Estoppel to Assert Statute of Frauds

[a] In General

[b] Estoppel Found

[c] Estoppel Not Found

[d] Motion for Summary Judgment

[5] Fully Performed Contract

[6] Memorandum of Agreement

[a] Sufficiency of Memorandum

[b] Signature

[7] Modification of Written Agreement

[8] Part Performance

[9] Who May Assert Defense

§ 530.33 Law Reviews

§ 530.34 Text References

§§ 530.35-530.39 [Reserved]

§ 530.40 Methods by Which Statute of Frauds May Be Raised

[1] On Demurrer

[2] In Answer

[3] At Trial

§§ 530.41-530.49 [Reserved]

§ 530.50 General Form of Affirmative Defense That Contract Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Affirmative Defense Required When Oral Contract Is Admitted

[4] Cross References

§ 530.51 Affirmative Defense That Oral Contract for Sale of Goods Valued at Over $500 Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds [Com. Code § 2201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations of Optional Paragraphs

[4] Cross References

§§ 530.52-530.59 [Reserved]

§ 530.60 Allegation of Part Performance Rendering Statute of Frauds Inapplicable to Oral Contract to Convey Real Property

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Requirement of Actual Possession

§ 530.61 Allegation of Qualified Financial Contract Not Subject to Statute of Frauds [Civ. Code § 1624(b); Com. Code §§ 1206(3), 2201(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART I. SCOPE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.01

§ 530.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms relating to the statute of frauds. The chapter contains the following forms:

- Forms for affirmative defenses asserting the statute of frauds both in general and in cases relating to contracts for the sale of goods [*see §§ 530.50, 530.51*].

- A form for an allegation of part performance of a contract for the sale of real property [§ 530.60].

- A form for an allegation that the contract is exempt from the statute of frauds as a qualified financial contract [§ 530.61].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceOral AgreementsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsPartial PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART I. SCOPE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.02

§ 530.02 Cross References

- For a discussion and forms relating to the effect of the statute of frauds on auctions, see Ch. 77, *Auctions and Auctioneers* .

- The statute of frauds requirement concerning a contract to pay an agent, broker, or other person a commission in relation to a real estate transaction is not discussed in this chapter, but is covered in Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

- For a discussion and forms relating to quantum meruit, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts* .

- For a form for an affirmative defense asserting the statute of frauds, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

- For discussion of the parol evidence rule and interpretation of contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

- For a discussion and forms relating to property settlement agreements, see Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* , and Ch. 222, *Dissolution of Marriage: Property Division and Valuation* .

- For a discussion of the effect of the statute of frauds on actions for fraud and deceit, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

- For a discussion of marriage settlement agreements, see Ch. 359, *Marriage* .

- For discussion of the requirements for a writing in regard to personal property leases first effective between the parties on or after January 1, 1990, see Ch. 413, *Personal Property Leases* .

- For a discussion of the requirement that an agent have written authority to enter into a contract required to be in writing, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the statute of frauds applicable to sales of goods governed by the Commercial Code, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

- For a discussion of and forms for complaints in actions for quasi-specific performance generally, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActStatutes of FraudsCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsAuction SalesContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsPersonalty LeasesStatutes of FraudsEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceParol EvidenceFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportDissolution & DivorceProperty DistributionProperty Settlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART I. SCOPE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 530.03-530.09

[Reserved]

§§ 530.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.10

§ 530.10 Governing Statutes

The basic statute of frauds, requiring certain types of contracts to be in writing, is *Civ. Code § 1624*. In addition, numerous other statutes require that other types of contracts be in writing. Some of these statutory requirements overlap. For a list of these statutes, see *§ 530.31*.

Personal property leases first effective between the parties on or after January 1, 1990, are governed by Division 10 of the Commercial Code (*Com. Code § 10101 et seq.*), which is discussed in Ch. 413, *Personal Property Leases* , not by *Civ. Code § 1624*[*Civ. Code § 1624(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsPersonalty LeasesStatutes of FraudsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.11

§ 530.11 Purpose of Statute of Frauds

Some contracts are declared to be invalid unless the contract, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent. The requirement of a writing is imposed by a number of statutory provisions dealing with various kinds of contracts [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 1624*; *Fam. Code § 1611*]. The primary kinds of contracts that are required to be in writing are discussed in *§ 530.12*.

The purpose of the statute of frauds is to prevent fraud and perjury with respect to certain agreements by requiring more reliable evidence of those agreements in the form of a writing signed by the party to be charged in order to enforce those agreements [*Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 764, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* (*overruled on other grounds in Freeman & Mills, Inc. v. Belcher Oil Co. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 85, 88, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420, 900 P.2d 669*); *Riley v. Bear Creek Planning Committee (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 500, 509, 131 Cal. Rptr. 381, 551 P.2d 1213]* . The purpose of the statute of frauds has been described as evidentiary in nature, to prevent the enforcement of promises or contracts that were never in fact made, but not to justify repudiation of promises that were in fact made [*Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 764, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* , (*overruled on other grounds in Freeman & Mills, Inc. v. Belcher Oil Co. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 85, 88, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420, 900 P.2d 669*); *Lockwood v. Smigel (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 800, 803, 96 Cal. Rptr. 289]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.12

§ 530.12 Contracts Required to Be in Writing

[1] Agreements Not to Be Performed Within One Year

[a] General Requirement

[i] Statement of Rule

An agreement that by its terms is not to be performed within one year from the making of the agreement is invalid unless it, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*].

If a contract is silent as to its duration, but is implied by law to be for a reasonble time, the contract falls within the statute of frauds if the trier of fact determines that the reasonable time amounts to a period in excess of one year [*San Francisco Brewing Corp. v. Bowman (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 607, 615-619, 343 P.2d 1* (exclusive distributorship)].

A contingency that may extend a contract for more than one year, such as an option to renew for the succeeding year that is exercisable prior to the end of the current year, does not bring a contract within the statute of frauds [*Columbia Pictures Corp. v. DeToth (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 753, 759, 161 P.2d 217* (employment contract)].

[ii] Real Property Leases Are Governed by Two Provisions

Leases of real property for a period of longer than one year are required to be in writing by other statutory provisions, in addition to *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)* [*see Civ. Code §§ 1091, 1624(a)(3)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971*, discussed in [4], *below*]. There is no distinction in the manner in which these overlapping requirements are applied to leases, however [*see Fisher v. Parsons (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 829, 837, 29 Cal. Rptr. 210* (no distinction between *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)* and *(3)*); *but see Bed, Bath & Beyond of La Jolla, Inc. v. La Jolla Village Square Venture Partners (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 867, 875-877, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830* (finding distinction and holding that agreement to lease real property for term exceeding one year is within *Civ. Code § 1624* regardless whether agreement provides that it may be canceled or terminated within one year of date of its making and prior to commencement of the lease term)].

[iii] Possibility of Performance Within One Year

Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1) applies only to those contracts which, by their terms, cannot possibly be performed within one year [*Foley v. Interactive Data Corp. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 654, 674-675, 254 Cal. Rptr. 211, 765 P.2d 373* (employment as long as employee's performance was satisfactory); *White Lighting Co. v. Wolfson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 336, 343, 66 Cal. Rptr. 697, 438 P.2d 345* (not applicable to contract for permanent employment for indefinite period); *Hollywood Motion Picture Equip. Co. v. Furer (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 184, 187, 105 P.2d 299* (not applicable to agreement not to make castings from plaintiff's patterns exclusively for plaintiff, with no reference to time)]. For a contract to be within *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*, there must not be the slightest possibility that it can be fully performed within one year [*Foley v. Interactive Data Corp. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 654, 674-675, 254 Cal. Rptr. 211, 765 P.2d 373* ; *White Lighting Co. v. Wolfson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 336, 343 n.2, 66 Cal. Rptr. 697, 438 P.2d 345* ; *Fisher v. Parsons (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 829, 837, 29 Cal. Rptr. 210]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

Contingency Could Occur Within One Year. A requirements contract for office space provided that the lease would be effective so long as the lessee was in business and required space and so long as appropriate space was available. Did the lease come within *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*? No, contingencies could terminate the contract in less than one year [*Fisher v. Parsons (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 829, 837, 29 Cal. Rptr. 210]* .

Application of this rule provides that if a condition terminating a contract may occur within one year of its making, the contract is performable within a year and does not fall within the scope of the statute of frauds. This is true even though performance of the contract may extend for longer than one year if the condition does not occur [*Foley v. Interactive Data Corp. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 654, 673, 254 Cal. Rptr. 211, 765 P.2d 373* ; *Abeyta v. Superior Court (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1045-1046, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680]* . Thus, an employment contract for an indefinite period is not brought within the statute of frauds merely because the compensation is measured by annual gross sales or the value of the services to the employer over a period of more than one year [*White Lighting Co. v. Wolfson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 336, 343-344, 66 Cal. Rptr. 697, 438 P.2d 345* ; *see also Gray v. Superior Court (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 813, 821, 226 Cal. Rptr. 570* (following *White Lighting Co.* but noting contrary authority)]. Similarly, an oral contract of employment that is terminable only for good cause is not within statute of frauds because it good cause may exist within one year of formation of the contract [*Jenkins v. Family Health Program (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 440, 445-446, 262 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Steward v. Mercy Hospital (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1290, 1296, 233 Cal. Rptr. 881* ; *accord Robards v. Gaylord Bros., Inc. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1152, 1155]* .

[b] Computation of One-Year Period

In computing the one-year period referred to in *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*, the day on which the agreement is made is excluded; the period begins on the following day and ends at the close of the anniversary of the day on which the agreement was made [*Columbia Pictures Corp. v. DeToth (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 753, 759, 161 P.2d 217]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

One-Year Contract Commencing After Contract Is Made. A contract is limited to a one-year period, but that period is to begin in the future and not on the day following the making of the contract. Does the statute of frauds require that contract to be in writing? Yes [*Kraft v. Rooke (1930) 103 Cal. App. 552, 555, 284 P. 935* ; *see also American Trust Co. v. Kindsfater (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 735, 737-739, 9 Cal. Rptr. 840]* .

[c] Exception for Qualified Financial Contracts

[i] Terms of Exception

Notwithstanding the general requirement regarding agreements not to be performed within one year [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*; *see* discussion in [a], *above*], a "qualified financial contract" [*see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(2)*; *see also* discussion in [ii], *below*] that is valid in other respects and is otherwise enforceable is not invalid for lack of a note, memorandum, or other writing and is enforceable by way of action or defense, if either of the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(1)*]:

- There is sufficient evidence to indicate that a contract has been made [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)*; *see* discussion in [iii], *below*].

- The parties have agreed by means of a prior or subsequent written contract to be bound by the terms of the qualified financial contract from the time they reached agreement (by telephone, by exchange of electronic messages, or otherwise) on those terms.

"Qualified financial contracts" that meet the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1624(b)* also are excepted from the statute of frauds contained in *Com. Code §§ 1206* and *2201* [*Com. Code §§ 1206(3), 2201(4)*]. For an allegation of a qualified financial contract meeting these criteria, see *§ 530.61*.

[ii] "Qualified Financial Contracts" Defined

A "qualified financial contract" means an agreement as to which each party is other than a natural person and that is for any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(2)*]:

- The purchase and sale of foreign exchange, foreign currency, bullion, coin, or precious metals on a forward, spot, next-day value or other basis.

- The purchase (other than the purchase of a commodity for future delivery on, or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade), sale, or transfer of any commodity or any similar good, article, service, right, or interest that is presently or in the future becomes the subject of a dealing in the forward contract trade, or any product or byproduct thereof, with a maturity date more than two days after the date the contract is entered into.

- The purchase and sale of currency, or interbank deposits denominated in United States dollars.

- A currency option, currency swap, or cross-currency rate swap.

- A commodity swap or a commodity option (other than an option contract traded on, or subject to the rules of, a contract market or board of trade).

- A rate swap, basis swap, forward rate transaction, or an interest rate option.

- A security-index swap or option, or a security or securities price swap or option.

- Any other similar transaction relating to a price or index (including any transaction or agreement involving any combination of the above, any cap, floor, collar, or similar transaction with respect to a rate, commodity price, commodity index, security or securities price, security index, other price index, or loan price).

- An option with respect to any of the above.

[iii] Evidence Sufficient To Establish Qualified Financial Contract Was Made

Evidence of an electronic communication (including the recording of a telephone call or the tangible written text produced by computer retrieval), admissible in evidence under the laws of California, sufficient to indicate that in the communication a contract was made between the parties, is sufficient evidence that a contract has been made [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)(A)*].

If a confirmation in writing sufficient to indicate that a contract has been made between the parties and sufficient against the sender is received by the party against whom enforcement is sought no later than the fifth business day after the contract is made (or any other period of time that the parties agree in writing) and the sender does not receive, on or before the third business day after receipt (or the other period of time that the parties agree in writing), written objection to a material term of the confirmation, there is sufficient evidence that a contract has been made [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)(B)*; *see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(4)* (communication of confirmation or objection by electronic signals)].

Furthermore, there is sufficient evidence that a contract has been made if the party against whom enforcement is sought admits in its pleading, testimony, or otherwise in court that a contract was made [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)(C)*]. Finally, a note, memorandum, or other writing sufficient to indicate that a contract has been made, signed by the party against whom enforcement is sought or by its authorized agent or broker, constitutes sufficient evidence that a contract has been made [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)(D)*].

[2] Promise to Answer for Another's Debt

[a] General Requirement and Exceptions

A special promise to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another is invalid unless it, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent [*Civ. Code §§ 1624(a)(2), 2793*]. Exceptions to this rule exist when the promise to answer for the obligation of another is deemed an original obligation of the promisor, and thus need not be in writing, in any of the following cases [*Civ. Code §§ 1624(a)(2), 2793, 2794*]:

- When the promise is made by one who has received property of another on an undertaking to apply it pursuant to that promise, or by one who has received a discharge from an obligation in whole or in part, in consideration of that promise.

- When the creditor parts with value, or enters into an obligation, in consideration of the obligation in respect to which the promise is made, in terms or under circumstances which render the party making the promise the principal debtor and the person in whose behalf it is made, his or her surety.

- When a promise to answer for an antecedent obligation of another is made in a consideration for the promisee's canceling the antecedent obligation and accepting the new promise as a substitute, or in consideration for the promisee releasing the property of another from a levy or his or her person from imprisonment under an execution on a judgment obtained on the antecedent obligation.

- When the promise is given for a consideration beneficial to the promisor, whether moving from either party to the antecedent obligation or from another person.

- When a factor undertakes, for a commission, to sell merchandise and act as surety in connection with the sale.

- When the holder of an instrument for the payment of money, on which a third person is or may become liable to him or her, transfers it in payment of a precedent debt of the holder or for a new

consideration and, in connection with the transfer, enters into a promise respecting that instrument.

ILLUSTRATION:

Examples of Promises Benefitting Promisor. Assumption of a chattel mortgage may render the promisor the principal debtor [*Parrish v. Greco (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 556, 561, 258 P.2d 566* ; *see Civ. Code § 2794(2)*]. A sale made on the promisor's promise to pay with delivery to a third party may render the promisor the principal debtor [*Merz v. Poole (1927) 82 Cal. App. 12, 14-15, 254 P. 914]* . A promise to indemnify the sheriff for any damage to property attached in a suit brought by the promisor and delivered to the promisor by the sheriff rendered the promisor the principal debtor and the promise outside the statute of frauds [*Burr v. Cross (1906) 3 Cal. App. 414, 415-416, 86 P. 824]* .

In determining whether or not a promise is given for consideration beneficial to the promisor, so as to take the promise to answer for another's debt out of the statute of frauds pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2794(4)*, if the leading and main object of the promisor is not to become surety or guarantor of another but to serve the promisor's own purposes or interests, the promise is not within the statute, even though its effect may be to pay the debt or discharge the obligation of another [*Schumm v. Berg (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 174, 187, 231 P.2d 39* (promise to support child on consideration of mother's forbearance from paternity suit was not within statute)]. Under this test, for example, the promise of the majority shareholder of a corporation to pay the corporation's debt to a supplier in consideration for the supplier's continuing deliveries to the corporation may be an original obligation of the shareholder under *Civ. Code § 2794(4)* [*Michael Distrib. Co. v. Tobin (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 655, 664-666, 37 Cal. Rptr. 518]* . The consideration usually is, but does not need to be, pecuniary [*Farr & Stone Ins. Brokers, Inc. v. Lopez (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 618, 622, 132 Cal. Rptr. 641* (benefits to children's welfare and economic venture and to own business reputation were sufficient)]. An incidental or secondary benefit is insufficient, however [*Seneca Communications, Inc. v. International Bank of California (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 541, 550-551, 163 Cal. Rptr. 176* (applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*; bank's desire to keep customer was insufficient benefit in relation to representation regarding customer's account)].

If the promise to pay another person's debt is made to the debtor rather than to the debtor's creditor, there is no contract to answer for the debt of another within the statute of frauds [*King v. Smith (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 71, 74, 199 P.2d 308]* .

[b] Guaranty on Face of Commercial Paper

The obligation of a guarantor of a negotiable instrument or the obligation of an accommodation party (one who signs as maker, drawer, acceptor, or indorser for the benefit of another) may be enforced notwithstanding any statute of frauds and whether or not the accommodation party receives consideration for the accommodation [*Com. Code § 3419(b)*; *see Com. Code § 3419(d)* (when collection rather than payment is guaranteed)].

[c] Personal Representative's Promise to Pay Estate Debt

No personal representative is chargeable on a special promise to answer in damages for a liability of the decedent or to pay a debt of the decedent out of the personal representative's own estate unless the agreement for that purpose, or some memorandum or note of that agreement, is in writing and is signed by either the personal representative or by some other person specifically authorized by the personal representative in writing to sign the agreement or the memorandum or note [*Prob. Code § 9604*; *see also* Ch. 456, *Probate: Management of Estate Assets*].

[d] Nonprofit Association Member's Promise to Pay Association Debt

A member, director, or agent of a nonprofit association is not liable for a debt, obligation, or liability of the association solely by reason of being a member, director, officer, or agent [*Corp. Code § 18605*; *see Corp. Code § 21200* (nonliability of members of unincorporated association that is organized as medical society)].

A member of a nonprofit association is not liable for a contractual obligation of the association unless one of the

following conditions is satisfied [*Corp. Code § 18610*]:

- The member expressly assumes personal responsibility for the obligation in a signed writing that specifically identifies the obligation assumed.

- The member expressly authorizes or ratifies the specific contract, as evidenced by a writing, except when the member authorizes or ratifies a contract solely in the member's capacity as a director, officer, or agent of the association.

- With notice of the contract, the member receives a benefit under the contract; in this case, liability is limited to the value of the benefit received.

- The member executes the contract without disclosing that the member is acting on behalf of the association.

- The member executes the contract without authority to execute the contract.

In any event, a member or person in control of a nonprofit association may be subject to liability for a debt, obligation, or liability of the association under common law principles governing alter ego liability of shareholders of a corporation, taking into account the differences between a nonprofit association and a corporation [*Corp. Code § 18630*].

[e] Representation Regarding Another's Credit

No evidence is admissible to charge a person on a representation as to the credit of a third person unless the representation, or some memorandum of it, is in writing, either subscribed by or in the handwriting of the party to be charged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974* bars any cause of action in which proof of the oral representation is essential, including actions for negligent and fraudulent misrepresentation of a third party's credit [*Seneca Communications, Inc. v. International Bank of California (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 541, 547-548, 163 Cal. Rptr. 176* (bank not liable to creditor for false oral representation concerning existence and amount of debtor's account)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1974 is a statute of frauds provision and is to be applied consistently with *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(2)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*; *see* discussion of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(2)* at [2][a], *above*]. The requirement that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974* be applied consistently with *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(2)* is intended to make construction of *Civ. Code § 1624* applicable to cases under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*. Thus, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*, like *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(2)*, is inapplicable in cases in which the representation is made under circumstances involving an estoppel to assert the statute of frauds, a fraud by a fiduciary on his or her principal, or a benefit received by defendant himself or herself [*see Seneca Communications, Inc. v. International Bank of California (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 541, 548-549, 163 Cal. Rptr. 176]* .

For a form for a complaint for damages for misrepresentation of the creditworthiness of another, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

[3] Prenuptial Agreements

Premarital agreements executed on or after January 1, 1986 are governed by the Uniform Premarital Agreement Act (*Fam. Code § 1500 et seq.*) [*Fam. Code § 1601*]. Agreements executed prior to that date are governed by the prior law [*Fam. Code § 1503*; *see* former *Civ. Code §§ 1624(3), 5134*]. Premarital agreements are discussed in Ch. 359, *Marriage* .

The Uniform Premarital Agreement Act requires a premarital agreement to be in writing and signed by both parties in order for it to be enforceable, although no additional consideration is required [*Fam. Code § 1611*; *see Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 585, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773* (oral agreements are not enforceable outside Act despite single "throw away" legislative committee comment to contrary)]. Agreements within the Act are specifically limited to agreements between prospective spouses [*Fam. Code § 1610(a)*]. Thus, the Act does not govern agreements relating to the disposition of property between parties who live together without marrying [*see Marvin v. Marvin (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 660, 673-675, 134 Cal. Rptr. 815, 557 P.2d 106]* . Agreements by persons not contemplating marriage are discussed in Ch. 387, *Nonmarital Cohabitation* , and in Kirkland, Lurvey & Richmond, California Family Law Practice amd Procedure, 2nd ed., Chs. 2, 200 (Matthew Bender)

The Uniform Premarital Agreement Act (*Fam. Code § 1500 et seq.*) does not specifically make reference to any of the traditional exceptions to the statute of frauds. However, it does not preclude them either. A court of appeal has held that traditional exceptions do apply to *Fam. Code § 1611* [*see Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 587, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773* (oral premarital agreement made in spring of 1986 enforceable under partial performance exception, discussed in *§ 530.18[3]*)].

[4] Agreement to Transfer Real Property Interest

An agreement to sell real property or an interest therein, or to lease it for a period exceeding one year, is invalid unless the agreement, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or his or her agent. In addition, such an agreement, if made by an agent of the party sought to be charged, is invalid unless the authority of the agent is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(3)*; *see, e.g., Elias Real Estate, LLC v. Tseng (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 425, 430-434, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 360* (three brothers, who with a fourth brother owned parcel of real property as tenants in common, were not bound by fourth brother's acceptance of offer to buy, because that brother's authority, if any, to act as agent for others was not evidenced by any writing that others had signed)].

Agreements to convey an interest in real property, within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(3)*, include, for example, the following:

- A conveyance or an agreement to convey water rights [*Stepp v. Williams (1921) 52 Cal. App. 237, 253, 198 P. 661]* ;

- An option to purchase real property [*Pacific S.W. Dev. Corp. v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 62, 68, 301 P.2d 825* (*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)*); *Ganiats Constr., Inc. v. Hesse (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 377, 383-384, 4 Cal. Rptr. 706]* ; and

- Agreements restricting the right to alienate real property [*Estate of Baglione (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 192, 197, 53 Cal. Rptr. 139, 417 P.2d 683* ; *Pellerito v. Dragna (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 85, 89, 105 P.2d 1011]* .

A borrower-buyer's oral promise to grant a lien on real property in return for the loan of money with which to purchase that property is severable from its promises to repay principal and to pay interest and fees on the loan. A borrower to whom a loan is made in that situation will be required to grant the lien on the basis of estoppel and part performance [*Landes Constr. Co., Inc. v. Royal Bank of Canada (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1365, 1370 n.1* (applying California law and decided before enactment of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*, discussed at [10], *below*)].

Similarly, an agreement to share the profits from a transaction involving real estate is not required to be in writing. Thus, although an agreement assigning a fractional interest in the minerals produced under an oil and gas lease is a transfer of an interest in real property that must be in writing, an agreement giving an interest in the net profits realized

under an oil and gas lease is not required to be in writing [*Dutton v. Interstate Inv. Corp. (1941) 19 Cal. 2d 65, 69-70, 119 P.2d 138]* .

A partnership or joint venture agreement may be oral even though one party's contribution to the partnership or joint venture consists of real property [*James v. Herbert (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 741, 748, 309 P.2d 91]* .

[5] Transfer of Real Property Interest

An estate in real property, other than an estate at will or for a term not exceeding one year, can be transferred only by operation of law, or by an instrument in writing, subscribed by the party disposing of the estate or by an agent authorized by writing [*Civ. Code § 1091*; *but see Estate of Stephens v. Williams (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 665, 677-678, 678, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358, 49 P.3d 1093* (conveyance signed by amanuensis ["one who copies or writes from the dictation of another"] performing a mere mechanical function in signing rather than exercising judgment or discretion deemed valid as a deed under *Civ. Code § 1091*)]. No estate or interest in real property, other than leases for a term not exceeding one year, or any power over or concerning it or in any manner relating to it, can be created, granted, assigned, surrendered, or declared, except by operation of law, or a conveyance or other instrument in writing, subscribed by the party creating, granting, assigning, surrendering, or declaring the estate or interest, or by the party's lawful agent authorized by writing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1971*; *see also Prob. Code § 15206* (validity of trust in relation to real property)]. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971* is not to be construed to abridge the power of any court to compel the specific performance of an agreement, in case of part performance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(a)*; *see § 530.18[4]*]. Moreover, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971* does not affect the creation of a trust under the Trust Law (*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*) or prevent any trust from arising or being extinguished by implication or operation of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 82* (definition of trust within meaning of Trust Law)].

For a discussion of what constitutes an interest in real property, see [4], *above*.

[6] Mortgages and Deeds of Trust

A mortgage may only be created, renewed, or extended by writing, executed with the formalities required in the case of a grant of real property [*Civ. Code § 2922*]. Likewise, a power of attorney to execute a mortgage must be in writing, subscribed, acknowledged, or proved, certified, and recorded in the same manner as powers of attorney for grants of real property [*Civ. Code § 2933*].

An agreement by a purchaser of real property to pay an indebtedness secured by a mortgage or deed of trust on the property purchased, unless assumption of the indebtedness by the purchaser is specifically provided for in the conveyance of the property, is invalid unless the agreement, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(6)*].

A borrower-buyer's oral promise to grant a lien on real property in return for the loan of money with which to purchase that property is severable from its promises to repay principal and to pay interest and fees on the loan. A borrower to whom a loan is made in that situation will be required to grant the lien on the basis of estoppel and part performance [*Landes Constr. Co., Inc. v. Royal Bank of Canada (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1365, 1370 n.1* (applying California law and decided before enactment of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*, discussed at [10], *below*)].

An unsigned agreement by which a lender agreed to forbear from exercising the right of foreclosure under a deed of trust securing an interest in real property came within the statute of frauds. Although the forbearance agreement did not create, renew, or extend the note and deed of trust, it did modify them, and an agreement to modify a contract that is subject to the statute of frauds is also subject to the statute of frauds [Secrest v. Security National Mortgage Loan Trust 2002-2 *(2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 544, 553, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275*]. The fact that the borrowers made a down payment pursuant to the agreement did not estop the lender from asserting the statute of frauds [Secrest v. Security National

Mortgage Loan Trust 2002-2 *(2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 544, 555, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275*]. The court of appeal therefore affirmed the trial court judgment declaring valid the lender's notice of default and election to sell under the deed of trust.

[7] Employment of Real Estate Broker

An agreement authorizing or employing an agent, broker, or any other person for compensation or a commission to purchase or sell real estate, to lease real estate for a period exceeding one year, or to procure, introduce, or find a purchaser or seller of real estate or a lessee or lessor of real estate when the lease is for a period exceeding one year is invalid unless the agreement, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)*]. A contract to pay an unlicensed person a finder's fee for merely introducing a buyer and seller is also required by *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)* to be in writing [*Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 25-27, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P.2d 212]* . For further discussion of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)* and grounds for avoiding its effect, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

[8] Promise to Be Performed After Death

An agreement that, by its terms, is not to be performed during the lifetime of the promisor is invalid unless it, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(5)*]. If it is possible that a contract may be performed during the lifetime of the promisor, it is not barred by *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(5)* [*Roy v. Salisbury (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 176, 182, 130 P.2d 706]* . For example, a contract to care for a dog if the owner was unable to do so or if the owner died was not required to be in writing because that contract could have been performed in decedent's lifetime if the dog had died first [*see Roy v. Salisbury (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 176, 182, 130 P.2d 706]* .

[9] Promise to Make Will

[a] Promise Made After 2000

A contract to make a will or devise or other instrument, or not to revoke a will or devise or other instrument, or to die intestate, if made after 2000, can be established only by one of the following [*Prob. Code § 21700(a)*]:

- Provisions of a will or other instrument stating the material provisions of the contract.
- An expressed reference in a will or other instrument to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract.
- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.
- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and the claimant or a promise by the decedent to the claimant that is enforceable in equity.
- Clear and convincing evidence of an agreement between the decedent and another person for the benefit of the claimant or a promise by the decedent to another person for the benefit of the claimant that is enforceable in equity.

For discussion of equitable enforcement of contracts to make wills, see [b] and [c], *below*, and Ch. 528, *Specific Performance.*

The execution of a joint will or mutual wills does not create a presumption of a contract not to revoke the will or wills [*Prob. Code § 21700(b)*].

[b] Promise Made in 1985-2000

Under former *Prob. Code § 150* (repealed eff. Jan. 1, 2001), a contract to make a will or devise, not to revoke a will or devise, or to die intestate, if made in 1985-2000 [*see Prob. Code § 21700(c)*] can be established "only" by one of the following [former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* (repealed eff. Jan. 1, 2001)]:

- Provisions of a will stating material provisions of the contract.
- An express reference in a will to a contract and extrinsic evidence proving the terms of the contract.
- A writing signed by the decedent evidencing the contract.

The execution of a joint will or mutual wills does not create a presumption of a contract not to revoke the will or wills [former *Prob. Code § 150(b)*].

Notwithstanding the statement in former *Prob. Code § 150* that a provision to make a will can "only" be established by one of the three methods listed above, the courts have held that an oral promise not to revoke a will may be enforced under the doctrine of equitable estoppel [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . The court in *Juran v. Epstein* found that while generally former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* provided the sole means under which a party could establish an agreement not to revoke a will, in enacting that section the Legislature did not express an intent to abolish the use of the equitable estoppel doctrine in appropriate circumstances [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . Equitable estoppel principles subsequently were held to be available under former *Prob. Code § 150* (or its predecessor, former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*) to enforce a testator's alleged oral agreement to leave all of his property to his son if the son cared for him during the testator's lifetime [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 358, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628* (whether date of alleged agreement was before or after 1985 was not ascertainable)]. The court, following *Juran v. Epstein*, stated that nothing in the express language of former *Prob. Code § 150* distinguished between cases in which the promisor was alive and cases in which the promisor was dead [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 354-355, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628]* . For discussion of the doctrine of equitable estoppel to assert the statute of frauds generally, see *§ 530.19*. For application of the doctrine in an action for quasi-specific performance of a promise to make a will, see *§ 530.20* [*see also* Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* , Form 2 and Comment]. The related issue of part performance of an agreement to make a will is discussed in *§ 530.18[5]*.

A party also may be estopped from asserting the statute of limitations as a defense to an untimely action to enforce an oral promise to make a will. In a case in which the one-year statute of limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* applied because the promisor had made an inter vivos transfer of property covered by the contract, the court followed the reasoning of *Juran v. Epstein* discussed above [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* ; *see Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588]* . It held that while *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2(a)(2)* clearly shows that the Legislature intended that the one-year statute of limitations could not be "tolled" or "extended," the statute says nothing about equitable estoppel. The court concluded that in the absence of any such language or legislative history to the contrary, the doctrine of equitable estoppel still applies [*Battuello v. Battuello (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 842, 847-848, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548* (appellant alleged sufficient facts to come within doctrine of equitable estoppel to application of statute of limitations)].

A promise to leave another an interest in property is not necessarily a promise to devise or bequeath property so as to be governed by former *Prob. Code § 150*. In a case involving a promise made in contemplation of marriage to leave the prospective spouse a life estate, the agreement was held to be governed by *Fam. Code § 1611* of the Uniform Premarital Agreement Act (discussed in [3], *above*). When the agreement was made, the property was held by a trust and it was contemplated that the conveyance of the life estate would be accomplished by modifying the trust instrument. Also, the promise was made prior to marriage, and the return consideration was the prospective spouse's promise to stop working

[*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 583, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773]* .

[c] Promise Made Before 1985

An agreement to devise or bequeath property or to make any provision for any person by will, if executed on or before December 31, 1984, is governed by former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*. Under this former statute, such an agreement is invalid unless it, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by his or her agent [former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*; *see* *Estate of Baglione (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 192, 197, 53 Cal. Rptr. 139, 417 P.2d 683* (reciprocal agreement between spouses that property would go to other spouse on death); *Palmer v. Phillips (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 291, 293-295, 266 P.2d 850* (promise to make will providing for person who acts as companion and manages affairs)]. However, case law permitted enforcement of oral agreements in equity under the doctrine of equitable estoppel in appropriate circumstances. For discussion, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* , Form 2, Comments; see also [b], *above*.

[10] Commercial Loan Commitment in Excess of $100,000

A contract, promise, undertaking, or commitment to loan money or to grant or extend credit, in an amount greater than $100,000, not primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, made by a person engaged in the business of lending or arranging for the lending of money or extending credit is invalid unless it, or some note or memorandum of it, is in writing and subscribed by the party to be charged or by that party's agent [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*]. For purposes of *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*, a contract, promise, undertaking, or commitment to loan money secured solely by residential property consisting of one to four dwelling units shall be deemed to be for personal, family, or household use [*Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*].

It was the intent of the Legislature in enacting *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)* that judicially and legislatively recognized defenses and exceptions to *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)-(6)* also apply to *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)* [Stats. 1988, ch. 1096, § 3].

[11] Sale of Personal Property in Excess of $5,000

A contract for the sale of personal property is not enforceable by way of action or defense beyond $5,000 in amount or value of remedy unless there is some writing that does all of the following [*Com. Code § 1206(1)*]:

- Indicates that a contract for sale has been made between the parties at a defined or stated price.
- Reasonably identifies the subject matter.
- Is signed by the party against whom enforcement is sought or by his or her authorized agent.

Com. Code § 1206(1) does not apply to any of following [*Com. Code § 1206(2), (3)*]:

- Contracts for the sale of goods [*Com. Code § 2201*; *see* discussion in [12], *below*].
- Contracts for the sale of securities [*Com. Code § 8113*; *see* discussion in [12][f], *below*].
- Security agreements [*Com. Code §§ 9201, 9203*; *see* discussion in [12][g], *below*].
- Qualified financial contracts [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)*; *see* discussion in [1][c], *above*].

[12] Sale of Goods in Excess of $500

[a] In General

Except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 2201*, a contract for the sale of goods for the price of $500 or more is not enforceable by way of action or defense unless there is some writing sufficient to indicate that a contract for sale has been made between the parties and signed by the party against whom enforcement is sought or by his or her authorized agent or broker. A writing is not insufficient because it omits or incorrectly states a term agreed on, but the contract is not enforceable under this provision beyond the quantity of goods shown in the writing [*Com. Code § 2201(1)*].

Under *Com. Code § 2201(1)*, there are only three definite and invariable requirements for the memorandum [*Lockwood v. Smigel (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 800, 803, 96 Cal. Rptr. 289]* :

- It must evidence a contract for the sale of goods.

- It must be "signed" (any authentication identifying the party to be charged) [*see Donovan v. RRL Corp. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 261, 276-278, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 807, 27 P.3d 702* (car dealership's name in printed newspaper advertisement was "signature" within meaning of *Com. Code § 1201(38)* sufficient to satisfy statute of frauds; when advertisement reasonably justifies recipient's understanding that communication was intended as offer, offeror's intent to authenticate his or her name as signature can be established from face of advertisement)].

- It must specify a quantity.

A memorandum evidencing a requirements contract is sufficient if it indicates that there has been a real transaction for the sale of output or for the purchase of requirements [*Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 762-764, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* (*overruled on other grounds in Freeman & Mills, Inc. v. Belcher Oil Co. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 85, 88, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420, 900 P.2d 669*)].

[b] Written Confirmation of Contract; Notice of Objection

Between merchants, if a writing confirming the contract and sufficient against the sender is received within a reasonable time and the party receiving it has reason to know its contents, it satisfies the requirements of *Com. Code § 2201(1)* against the receiving party unless written notice of objection to its contents is given within 10 days after it is received [*Com. Code § 2201(2)*]. A reasonable time for taking any action is determined by the nature, purpose, and circumstances of that action [*Com. Code § 1204(2)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Letter of Credit as Confirmation. A buyer instructed its bank to issue an irrevocable letter of credit in favor of a seller. The letter of credit contained all the essential terms of the transaction and was signed by the buyer's bank, not by the buyer. Is the letter of credit a sufficient memorandum of confirmation under *Com. Code § 2201(2)* to allow the buyer to recover damages for the seller's breach of the contract? Yes. The letter of credit it was "sufficient against the sender" because the buyer's instruction to its bank to issue the letter of credit amounted to its adoption of the bank's signature as its own within the meaning of *Com. Code § 1201(39)* [*now see Com. Code § 1201(38)*]. In that limited sense, the bank was the buyer's agent, and most important, the buyer was bound by the letter of credit [*Procyon Corp. v. Components Direct, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 409, 412-413, 249 Cal. Rptr. 813]* .

[c] Estoppel

A California court of appeal has held that under *Com. Code § 1103*], equitable principles survived enactment of the Uniform Commercial Code in California. Thus, the doctrine of equitable estoppel is available to bar assertion of the statute of frauds to prevent enforcement of a contract for the sale of goods under the Commercial Code [*Allied Grape*

Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 442-443, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872 (commenting that *Com. Code § 2201(3)(c)*, discussed in *§ 530.12[12][i]*, amounts to a codification of one aspect of equitable estoppel), disagreeing with Ninth Circuit's contrary conclusion in *C. R. Fedrick, Inc. v. Borg-Warner Corp. (9th Cir. 1977) 552 F.2d 852, 856-858*]. The majority of other jurisdictions apply the doctrine of estoppel to overcome the Commercial Code statute of frauds. As in other contexts, the doctrine of estoppel is proven if one party will suffer an unconscionable injury if the statute of frauds is asserted to prevent enforcement of an oral contract. Unconscionable injury results from denying enforcement of an oral contract after one party is induced by another to seriously change its position in reliance on the oral agreement. It also occurs in cases of unjust enrichment [*Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 444, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

Estoppel in Contract for Sale of Goods. In a situation involving an oral agreement for the purchase and sale of 850 tons of grapes, plaintiff had negotiated its way out of another contract for those grapes in order to enter the oral contract with the defendant. Then, defendant refused to schedule delivery of the grapes, at a time when there was a glut of grapes on the market and heavy rains were causing the grapes to rot in the field. Was plaintiff's change in position in reliance on the contract and resulting injury sufficient to bar the application of the statute of frauds on the basis of estoppel? Yes [*Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 444-445, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

General principles for estoppel to assert the statue of frauds are discussed in *§ 530.19, below*.

[d] Effect of Admission of Contract's Existence in Pleading, Testimony, or Otherwise

A contract that does not satisfy the requirements of *Com. Code § 2201(1)*, but that is valid in other respects, is enforceable if the party against whom enforcement is sought admits in his or her pleading, testimony, or otherwise in court that a contract for sale was made. If an admission is made, the contract is enforceable to the extent of the quantity of goods admitted [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)*]. A question exists whether enactment of *Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)* would change the earlier result in *Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104* , in which it was held that the fact that a defendant made a declaration in another action and referred to "an agreement" with plaintiff in that declaration did not bar the defendant from asserting the defense of the statute of frauds in the action on the contract [*Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 311-312, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104]* .

[e] "Sale or Return" Transactions

Unless otherwise agreed, if goods that are delivered primarily for resale may be returned by the buyer even though they conform to the contract, the transaction is termed a "sale or return" [*Com. Code § 2326(1)(b)*]. This provision applies to contracts for the sale of goods to merchants who would buy only if the seller agreed to take back the goods in lieu of payment if the goods are not resold [UCC Comment to *Com. Code § 2326*]. Any "or return" term of a contract for sale is treated as a separate contract for sale within the statute of frauds provision of *Com. Code § 2201* [*Com. Code § 2326(3)*].

[f] Sale of Securities

A contract or modification of a contract for the sale or purchase of a security is enforceable whether or not there is a writing signed or record authenticated by a party against whom enforcement is sought, even if the contract or modification is not capable of performance within one year of its making [*Com. Code § 8113*]. For a discussion of the sale of securities, see Ch. 163, *Corporations: Transfers of Shares* .

[g] Security Agreements

A security interest that is subject to Division 9 of the Commercial Code (which concerns personal property and fixtures

as collateral) may be enforceable even if not created by a specific writing that was signed by the debtor [*see generally Com. Code § 9201 et seq.*]. The general rule is that a security interest is enforceable against the debtor and third parties with respect to the collateral when (1) value has been given, (2) the debtor has rights in the collateral or the power to transfer rights in the collateral to a secured party, and (3) any of four alternative conditions has been satisfied [*Com. Code § 9203(b)*]. Only one of those conditions requires a signed specific security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)(A)*]; the others require an agreement but not necessarily a signed or specific security agreement [*see Com. Code § 9203(b)(3)(B)-(D)*]. Moreover, the generally applicable provisions of Division 9 are subordinate to numerous other provisions of law, both apart from the Commercial Code [*see* Com. Code § 9201(b), (c)] and within it [*see Com. Code § 9203(c)*], that could apply in a particular transaction and might or might not require a signed writing. For further discussion of security interests and security agreements under Division 9, see *Ch. 503, Sales: Secured Transactions, § 503.20* et seq.

[h] Goods Being Specially Manufactured for Buyer

A contract that does not satisfy the requirements of *Com. Code § 2201(1)*, but that is valid in other respects, is enforceable if the goods are to be specially manufactured for the buyer and are not suitable for sale to others in the ordinary course of the seller's business, and the seller has made either a substantial beginning of their manufacture or commitments for their procurement before notice of repudiation is received and under circumstances which reasonably indicate that the goods are for the buyer [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(a)*].

An oral contract for the sale of goods that is enforceable because some of the goods are manufactured specially for the buyer and are not suitable for sale to others in the ordinary course of the seller's business may also be enforced as to other goods included in the oral contract, even though the other goods are normally saleable to others in the seller's course of business [*Distribu-Dor, Inc. v. Karadanis (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 463, 468, 90 Cal. Rptr. 231]* .

[i] Goods Which Have Been Accepted or Paid for

A contract that does not satisfy the requirements of *Com. Code § 2201(1)*, but that is valid in other respects, is enforceable with respect to goods for which payment has been made and accepted or which have been received and accepted [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(c)*; *see Com. Code § 2606*]. Receipt and acceptance of goods by a third party, to whom the goods were delivered at the buyer's request, excepts the contract from the statute of frauds pursuant to *Com. Code § 2201(3)(c)* [*Dairyman's Cooperative Creamery Assn. v. Leipold (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 184, 188, 109 Cal. Rptr. 753]* .

Part payment makes a contract enforceable only as to the portion of the goods for which payment has been made, when the goods are apportionable. The purpose of the rule is to avoid disputes over the quantity of goods claimed to be covered by the contract. If, however, a buyer claims that the contract is only for the sale of one indivisible unit, such as a single automobile, part payment will allow an oral contract to be enforced, because the part payment provides evidence of the contract and of the party to be charged and there can be no dispute over quantity when only one indivisible unit is claimed under the contract [*Lockwood v. Smigel (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 800, 803-804, 96 Cal. Rptr. 289]* .

[13] Agreement Waiving or Tolling of Statute of Limitations

An acknowledgment or promise is not sufficient evidence of a new or continuing contract to take a case out of the operation of the statute of limitations unless the acknowledgment or promise is contained in a writing signed by the party to be charged. However, any payment on account of principal or interest due on a promissory note made by the party to be charged is sufficient acknowledgment or promise of a continuing contract to stop, from the time such payment is made, the running of the time within which an action may be commenced on the principal sum or on any installment of principal or interest due on the note, and to start the running of a new period of time. Such a payment by

itself will not revive a cause of action once barred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 360*].

For discussion and forms for allegations relating to revival of an obligation barred by the statute of limitations, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* , and Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsPerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsPremarital AgreementsDefensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsWaiversLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsStatutes of FraudsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.13

§ 530.13 Agent's Authority: The Equal Dignity Rule

[1] Scope of Rule

Authority for an agent to enter into a contract required by law to be in writing can only be given in writing [*Civ. Code § 2309*]. This is sometimes called the "equal dignity rule." Exceptions to the equal dignity rule include the following:

- Authority of an executive officer of a corporation need not be in writing [*Jeppi v. Brockman Holding Co. (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 11, 17-18, 206 P.2d 847* ; *Monteleone v. Southern California Vending Corp. (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 798, 806, 70 Cal. Rptr. 703]* .

- Written authorization is not necessary when the agent merely performs the ministerial act of signing his or her principal's name to a contract whose terms have already been agreed on, an act not involving the exercise of discretion [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 214, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7* ; *Dufresne v. Elite Insurance Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 916, 923, 103 Cal. Rptr. 347]* .

- An agent need not have written authorization to exercise a right that is only required to be in writing by agreement of the parties, rather than by law [*Ripani v. Liberty Loan Corp. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 603, 610, 157 Cal. Rptr. 272* (oral authority sufficient to exercise option required by lease to be in writing)].

There is no spousal exception to the requirement that authorization to enter a contract within the statute of frauds must be written. Thus, a spouse who gives oral consent to his or her spouse to enter a contract within the statute of frauds is not bound by the contract [*O'Banion v. Paradiso (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 559, 563, 39 Cal. Rptr. 370, 393 P.2d 682]* , but may ratify it [*see* *Cano v. Tyrrell (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 824, 830, 64 Cal. Rptr. 522* (husband's oral agency ratified by wife)].

The "amanuensis" rule has been invoked successfully as an exception to *Civ. Code § 2309*. In a case in which a father orally instructed his daughter to sign his name to a grant deed conveying property to himself and to his daughter as joint tenants, the California Supreme Court held that because the daughter acted as a mere "amanuensis" ("one who copies or

writes from the dictation of another"), performing a mere mechanical function in signing the deed rather than exercising her judgment or discretion, the conveyance was deemed valid even though the signing took place outside the father's presence and the daughter was the sole beneficiary of the transfer [*Estate of Stephens v. Williams (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 665, 674-676, 678, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358, 49 P.3d 1093* (holding that although signing of grantor's name by interested amanuensis must be presumed invalid, daughter met burden of showing that signing of grantor's name was mechanical act in that grantor intended to sign using that instrumentality)].

The equal dignities rule does not bar enforcement of the agency agreement itself. Thus, an agent who had only oral authority may recover indemnification from its principal after a third party recovers damages from the agent for breach of a contract within the statute of frauds [*Sunset-Sternau Food Co. v. Bonzi (1964) 60 Cal. 2d 834, 839-843, 36 Cal. Rptr. 741, 389 P.2d 133]* .

[2] Estoppel and Ratification

A principal will not be estopped to rely on the equal dignities rule unless he or she causes the third party to believe that the agent either has or does not need written authority, or the principal orally authorized the agent and, with complete knowledge of the circumstances, receives the benefits resulting from the oral authorization. This rule applies even when the principal would be estopped to rely on the statute of frauds provision that applies to the agreement with the third party [*McGirr v. Gulf Oil Corp. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 246, 257-258, 115 Cal. Rptr. 902* ; *see Kerner v. Hughes Tool Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 924, 934, 128 Cal. Rptr. 839]* .

A contract entered into by an agent with only oral authority when written authority was required by *Civ. Code § 2309*, may be ratified by his or her principal by a subsequent writing [*Cano v. Tyrrell (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 824, 830-831, 64 Cal. Rptr. 522* ; *see Civ. Code §§ 2307, 2310*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActApparent AuthorityRelianceBusiness & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActStatutes of FraudsBusiness & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsRatificationGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.14

§ 530.14 Memorandum

[1] Sufficiency of Memorandum

A written memorandum sufficient to satisfy the statute of frauds is merely evidence of an oral contract and usually does not contain all its terms [*Crowley v. Modern Faucet Mfg. Co. (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 321, 323, 282 P.2d 33* ; *Lamle v. Mattel, Inc. (Fed. Cir. 2005) 394 F.3d 1355, 1361-1362* (finding genuine issue of material fact as to materiality of terms that were omitted from writing but agreed upon at meeting); *Kerner v. Hughes Tool Co. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 924, 934, 128 Cal. Rptr. 839]* . To be sufficient, the memorandum must contain all essential elements of a specific, consummated agreement. What is essential depends on the agreement; and failure to express that which is clearly implied does not render the memorandum deficient [*Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 773, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116, 152 P.3d 420* (extrinsic evidence properly considered to locate properties identified only by street address); *Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 762-763, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158 , overruled on other grounds in Freeman & Mills, Inc. v. Belcher Oil Co. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 85, 88, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420, 900 P.2d 669]* . The writing must state all of the following with reasonable certainty [*Ontario Downs, Inc. v. Lauppe (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 697, 702, 13 Cal. Rptr. 782* ; *Rivers v. Beadle (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696, 7 Cal. Rptr. 170]* :

- Each party to the contract.

- The land, goods, or other subject matter to which the contract relates [*see, e.g., Alameda Belt Line v. City of Alameda (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 15, 18, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 879* (trial court improperly held on summary judgment that option to repurchase real property in written contract was not sufficiently certain to be enforceable; parol evidence coming into existence after execution may be considered in order to satisfy statute of frauds and to render agreement sufficiently certain to be enforceable)].

- The terms and conditions of the promises constituting the contract.

- By whom and to whom the promises are made.

Because the memorandum itself must include the essential contractual terms, it is clear that extrinsic evidence cannot supply those required terms [*see, e.g., Friedman v. Bergin (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 535, 537-539, 140 P.2d 1]* . However, extrinsic evidence can be used to explain essential terms that were understood by the parties but otherwise would be unintelligible to others. If a memorandum includes the essential terms of the parties' agreement, but the meaning of those terms is unclear, the memorandum is sufficient under the statute of frauds if extrinsic evidence clarifies the terms with reasonable certainty and the evidence as a whole demonstrates that the parties intended to be bound. Conflicts in the extrinsic evidence are for the trier of fact to resolve, but whether the evidence meets the standard of reasonable certainty is a question of law for the court [*Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 767, 771, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116, 152 P.3d 420]*

The time of performance of an act required for the sale of property subject to the statute of frauds may be implied under *Civ. Code § 1657*. For example, in one case the statute of frauds did not prevent an agreement to transfer church property from being specifically enforced, even though the agreement contained no time of performance. The court implied a reasonable time for performance, and the agreement was enforceable with the implied term [*House of Prayer v. Evangelical Assn. for India (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 48, 52-54, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 24]* .

For a discussion of the contents required in a memorandum of a contract for the sale of goods, see *§ 530.12[12]*. For discussion of the parol evidence rule and interpretation of contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Memorandum May Be Contained in More Than One Document

The statute of frauds may be satisfied by more than one writing when the writings, viewed together in light of the conditions and circumstances of the parties at the time they were written, show unmistakably that they relate to the same matter, even though there is no express reference between the writings. Parol evidence is admissible to establish the connection between the writings [*Rader Co. v. Stone (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 10, 24, 223 Cal. Rptr. 806* (two brochures and registration statement); *Addiego v. Hill (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 280, 286, 73 Cal. Rptr. 901]* . Multiple papers may be considered together as a memorandum of the contract even though the party to be charged has signed only one of the papers [*Seck v. Foulks (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 556, 568, 102 Cal. Rptr. 170* ; *Karl v. Je Bien (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 769, 772, 42 Cal. Rptr. 461]* .

[3] Signature

The necessary signature need not appear at the end of the memorandum [*Cal. Canneries Co. v. Scatena (1897) 117 Cal. 447, 449-450, 49 P. 462]* . Additionally, the signature need not be manually affixed, but may be printed, stamped, or typewritten. An e-mail signed with a party's name was held to have satisfied the statute of frauds, assuming that a binding oral agreement existed and that the e-mail included all the material terms of that agreement [*Lamle v. Mattel, Inc. (Fed. Cir. 2005) 394 F.3d 1355, 1362-1363* (applying California common law); *Civ. Code § 1633.7* (signature may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form)]. In any case, however, it must appear from the face of the document that the party to be charged placed or adopted the name on the document with the intention of authenticating the writing [*Marks v. Walter G. McCarty Corp. (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 814, 820-821, 205 P.2d 1025* (letterhead held not to have been adopted as signature); *Skirball v. RKO Radio Pictures, Inc. (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 843, 863, 286 P.2d 954* (typewritten name at end of document adopted by initialing memorandum)]. The essential element is an intent to appropriate the name as a signature; it need not be a full handwritten signature to qualify. Thus, even initials may qualify [*Poag v. Winston (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1161, 1179, 241 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsSignaturesContracts LawStatutes

of FraudsRequirementsWritingsEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceParol EvidenceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.15

§ 530.15 Modification of Written Contract

[1] Permitted Methods of Modifying Written Contract

Contracts in writing may be modified as follows [*Civ. Code § 1698(a)-(c)*]:

- By a contract in writing.
- By an oral agreement to the extent that the oral agreement is executed by the parties.
- Unless the contract expressly provides otherwise, by an oral agreement supported by new consideration [*see Marani v. Jackson (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 695, 704-705, 228 Cal. Rptr. 518* (contract provision prohibiting modification except in writing precluded modification by executed oral agreement)].

An obligation that a party is required to perform under the written contract is not consideration that will support an oral modification [*Marani v. Jackson (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 695, 704-706, 228 Cal. Rptr. 518* ; *see also Malmstrom v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 299, 314, 231 Cal. Rptr. 820* (no consideration found)]. If the modification is by an oral agreement supported by new consideration, the statute of frauds must be satisfied if the contract, as modified, is within its provisions [*Civ. Code § 1698(c)*].

Nothing in Civ. Code § 1698precludes the application of rules of law concerning estoppel, oral novation and substitution of a new agreement, rescission of a written contract by an oral agreement, waiver of a provision of a written contract, or oral independent collateral contracts [*Civ. Code § 1698(d)*].

Personal property leases first effective between the parties on or after January 1, 1990, may be modified in accordance with *Com. Code § 10201 et seq.*, which is discussed in Ch. 413, *Personal Property Leases* .

[2] Burden of Proof of Oral Modification of Written Contract

The burden of proof for oral modification of a written contract is a preponderance of the evidence. It is error to require

oral modification to be proven by clear and convincing evidence [*Liodas v. Sahadi (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 278, 289 n.6, 137 Cal. Rptr. 635, 562 P.2d 316* ; *Barrett v. Bank of America (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1370-1371, 229 Cal. Rptr. 16* (disapproving *Coldwell Banker & Co. v. Pepper Tree Office Center Associates (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 272, 165 Cal. Rptr. 51* , to extent that it requires clear and convincing burden of proof)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract ModificationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract ModificationsOral ModificationsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.16

§ 530.16 Effect of Statute of Frauds

An oral agreement within the statute of frauds is voidable at the election of either party, and each party assumes the risk of the other party withdrawing [*Goldstein v. McNeil (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 608, 611, 265 P.2d 113]* . An oral agreement within the statute of frauds is not invalid in the sense that it is void, however, because the statute of frauds relates only to the remedy and not to the validity of the oral contract [*O'Brien v. O'Brien (1925) 197 Cal. 577, 586, 241 P. 861]* . Whatever the form of action may be, if proof of a promise or contract within the statute is essential to maintain it, there can be no recovery unless the statute is satisfied [*Beard v. Melvin (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 421, 426, 140 P.2d 720]* . However, because the contract is only voidable, and not void, it may be taken out of the operation of statute by certain circumstances, such as part or full performance of the contract, estoppel to assert the statute of frauds, or waiver of the statute by failure to assert it in court [*see* discussions at *§§ 530.17-530.19* and 530.24].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceOral AgreementsContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.17

§ 530.17 Fully Performed Agreements

A fully executed oral contract is not voidable for failure to satisfy the statute of frauds, and cannot be assailed by either party or by third persons on the ground that it is not in writing [*Realty Corp. of America, Inc. v. Burton (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 44, 57, 327 P.2d 948* ; *Freitas v. Freitas (1916) 31 Cal. App. 16, 19, 159 P. 611]* . This principle has been applied in cases in which only one party has fully performed, on the ground that it would be inequitable to allow the other party to set up the statute of frauds [*Prince v. Varona (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 673, 676, 301 P.2d 512]* . It has also been held, without reference to equitable considerations, that the statute of frauds does not apply when a contract has been fully performed by one party and nothing remains to be done except the payment of money by the other party [*see* *Blaustein v. Burton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 161, 185, 88 Cal. Rptr. 319* (producer revealed idea for motion picture to defendants); *Nesson v. Moes (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 655, 657-659, 30 Cal. Rptr. 428* (four-year employment contract)]. Similarly, the statute of frauds does not apply to a unilateral contract, that is, when a promise is given for an act rather than for another promise [*Blaustein v. Burton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 161, 184-185, 88 Cal. Rptr. 319]* .

A valid deed--one that is executed by the grantor and delivered to the grantee--is an executed contract [*Civ. Code §§ 1040, 1054*], and the statute of frauds provides no basis for invalidating an alleged oral contract to make the conveyance [*Lee v. Lee (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1553, 1557, 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516]* .

An oral prenuptial contract that has been fully performed by both parties may not be avoided even though it does not satisfy the statute of frauds [*Estate of Dokoozlian (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 531, 535, 33 Cal. Rptr. 151* ; *McComsey v. Leaf (1939) 36 Cal. App. 2d 132, 141-142, 97 P.2d 242]* . An oral prenuptial agreement that property shall be community property is taken out of the statute of frauds if confirmed by acts and conduct of the parties after marriage [*Handley v. Handley (1952) 113 Cal. App. 2d 280, 283, 248 P.2d 59* ; *see* *Estate of Piatt (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 348, 351, 183 P.2d 919]* .

Although a transfer of property after marriage pursuant to an oral prenuptial agreement may execute the agreement completely, and thus preclude the parties to the agreement from asserting its invalidity under the statute of frauds, such a transfer is voluntary, and may be set aside by creditors if the other elements of a transfer in fraud of creditors are present, because the unexecuted oral agreement to transfer the property cannot be specifically enforced [*Sudbrock v. Kroener (1934) 136 Cal. App. 624, 631-632, 29 P.2d 435]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformanceDischarges & TerminationsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsExecuted ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsOral Agreements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.18

§ 530.18 Part Performance

[1] Elements of Doctrine

Before a party can be estopped to assert the statute of frauds due to the other's part performance, it must appear that a sufficient change of position has occurred so that the application of the statutory bar would result in an unjust and unconscionable loss, amounting in effect to a fraud. Payment of money is not sufficient part performance to take an oral agreement out of the statute of frauds because a party paying money under an invalid contract has an adequate remedy at law [*Anderson v. Stansbury (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 707, 715-716, 242 P.2d 305* ; *but see Com. Code § 2201(3)(c)* (Commercial Code exception for goods being accepted and/or paid for, discussed at *§ 530.12[12][i]*].

If a party pays money or renders services under a contract that is unenforceable under the statute of frauds, and the other party does not perform voluntarily, the performing party may recover the money paid or the value of the services rendered in an action for assumpsit [*see Fuller v. Reed (1869) 38 Cal. 99, 110* ; *see* discussion and forms in Ch. 121, *Common Counts*] or by common count in quantum meruit [*White Lighting Co. v. Wolfson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 336, 346, 66 Cal. Rptr. 697, 438 P.2d 345* ; for discussion and forms relating to quantum meruit, *see* Ch. 121, *Common Counts*]. In such an action, the oral agreement, though unenforceable under the statute of frauds, is admissible as evidence of the reasonable value of the services [*Offeman v. Robertson-Cole Studios, Inc. (1926) 80 Cal. App. 1, 13-14, 251 P. 830* (quantum meruit)].

The acts relied on to establish part performance must refer unequivocally to the oral contract [*Baker v. Bouchard (1932) 122 Cal. App. 708, 711, 10 P.2d 468]* . For discussion of Com. Code *§ 2201(3)(a), the Commercial Code* exception for goods being specially manufactured for buyer, see *§ 530.12[12][h]*.

[2] Partially Performed Agreement Not to Be Performed Within One Year

When the parties to an oral contract that is not to be performed within one year have partly performed it, neither can avoid its obligations as to past transactions on the basis of the statute of frauds, and the contract is enforceable to the extent it has been performed [*Roberts v. Wachter (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 271, 281, 231 P.2d 534* ; *see Macmorris Sales Corp. v. Kozak (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 430, 442, 69 Cal. Rptr. 719* ; *but see Gressley v. Williams (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 636, 640-641, 14 Cal. Rptr. 496* (mere rendition of services usually not sufficient part performance to

avoid statute of frauds; action apparently seeking only to recover compensation under contract for amount due based on services performed)].

Part performance by the parties does not take the unexecuted portion of the contract out of the statute of frauds, and it remains unenforceable [*Long v. Long (1912) 162 Cal. 427, 431, 122 P. 1077* ; *Kraft v. Rooke (1930) 103 Cal. App. 552, 555-557, 284 P. 935]* .

[3] Partially Performed Prenuptial Agreements

Premarital agreements executed on or after January 1, 1986, are governed by *Fam. Code § 1611* in the Uniform Premarital Agreement Act (*Fam. Code § 1600 et seq.*) [*Fam. Code § 1601*]. As under the prior law [*see* former *Civ. Code §§ 1624(3), 5134*], the traditional exceptions to the statute of frauds, including the doctrine of partial performance, still apply [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 585-587, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . As under the prior law, the marriage itself and payment of money from one spouse to, or on behalf of, the other spouse is not sufficient to take the agreement out of the statute of frauds on the basis of the partial performance exception [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 586-587, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773* ; *see Betty v. Knapp (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 512, 517, 43 P.2d 325* (marriage alone insufficient); *Stevenson v. Pantaleone (1933) 131 Cal. App. 401, 404-408, 21 P.2d 703* (marriage and designation of spouse as beneficiary under insurance policy as insufficient)]. The spouse seeking to enforce the oral agreement must have irretrievably changed his or her position in reliance on the oral agreement [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 586-587, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . In *Hall,* an irretrievable change of position was established by the spouse's giving up a job and applying for Social Security at age 62 so both spouses could spend most of their time together [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 586-587, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773]* .

The acts relied on to establish partial performance sufficient to take the oral agreement out of the statute of frauds must be unequivocably referable to the contract. Acts that, although done in performance of the contract, admit to an explanation other than the contract (such as performance of husbandly or wifely duties) are not generally acts of part performance that will take the agreement out of the statute of frauds [*Hall v. Hall (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 578, 586, 271 Cal. Rptr. 773* ; *Trout v. Ogilvie (1919) 41 Cal. App. 167, 171, 182 P. 333* (marriage and payment of spouse's debts held insufficient)].

[4] Partially Performed Real Property Transactions

Equity will enforce an oral contract for the sale of real property that has been taken out of the statute of frauds by part performance. Mere payment of money is not enough, but taking possession in reliance on the oral agreement, if the possession is actual, visible, notorious, and exclusive so that it furnishes evidence of the agreement between the parties that is as good as a writing, is sufficient to take the agreement out of the statute [*Francis v. Colendich (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 128, 130-131, 14 Cal. Rptr. 56* (payment, survey, and fencing in of parcel sufficient); *Davis v. Judson (1910) 159 Cal. 121, 131-132, 113 P. 147* (payment, visiting vacant lots insufficient)]. Taking possession and making valuable improvements may be sufficient to take the contract out of the statute of frauds, but trivial expenditures are insufficient [*Harrison v. Hanson (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 370, 376-377, 331 P.2d 1084* (employment of consultants to make development plans as technical possession at most, and expenditures were trivial)]. To constitute part performance, the possession must be taken with the vendor's knowledge and consent [*Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 642, 198 P.2d 1 , overruled on other grounds, Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 497, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263* ; *Stark v. Byington (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 642, 648, 69 P.2d 995]* . Continuing in possession under a purported oral agreement after having made rental payments on the same property may constitute part performance when coupled with other acts. Thus, for example, part performance was sufficient when purchasers made a substantial down payment, increased their monthly payments to equal sellers' mortgage payments, reimbursed sellers for property taxes, and made numerous improvements to the property [*Sutton v. Warner (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 415, 422-424, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 632]* .

For an allegation of part performance of an oral contract for the sale of real property, see *§ 530.60*.

[5] Partially Performed Promise to Make Will

Execution of a will in accordance with an oral agreement does not constitute part performance of the agreement, and does not take it out of the statute of frauds when the will does not expressly refer to the agreement [*Shive v. Barrow (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 838, 848, 199 P.2d 693* ; *Zaring v. Brown (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 227, 232-233, 106 P.2d 224* ; *see also* discussion at *§ 520.12[9][a]*].

The mere rendition of services does not constitute part performance of an agreement to leave property by will in return for the services sufficient to take the agreement out of the statute of frauds [*Riganti v. McElhinney (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 116, 121, 56 Cal. Rptr. 195]* . However, it may be possible to avoid the statute of frauds by an action for quasi-specific performance to impose a constructive trust on the property, or in an action to recover the reasonable value of the services. For a discussion of these theories, see *§ 530.20[1], below*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceOral AgreementsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsPartial PerformanceContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsPerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsPremarital AgreementsDefensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.19

§ 530.19 Estoppel to Assert Statute of Frauds

[1] Application of Doctrine

Estoppel to assert the statute of frauds is applied to prevent fraud that would result from refusal to enforce oral contracts in certain circumstances. Such fraud is inherent in the unconscionable injury that would result from denying enforcement of the contract after one party has been induced by the other to seriously change his or her position in reliance on the contract or in the unjust enrichment that would result if a party who has received the benefits of the other's performance were allowed to rely on the statute [*Monarco v. Lo Greco (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 621, 623-624, 220 P.2d 737* ; *see Byrne v. Laura (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1054, 1068-1069, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 908* (citing *Monarco* and finding reliance on representations to be classic case for applying equitable estoppel doctrine); *McGirr v. Gulf Oil Corp. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 246, 253, 115 Cal. Rptr. 902]* . Both unconscionable injury and unjust enrichment may be present in some cases [*Monarco v. Lo Greco (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 621, 624, 220 P.2d 737* (son, in reliance on contract that property would be left to him, devoted years to work on family property, giving up opportunity for education and to acquire own property, and value of property enhanced by his work)].

Estoppel is an equitable remedy and will only be applied to avoid injustice. In addition, when estoppel is claimed by a person having a fiduciary relationship with the party against whom the claim is asserted, the underlying agreement must be fair and reasonable [*Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 30-33, 216 Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P.2d 212* (finder's fee claimed from corporation by corporate director)].

Estoppel to assert the statute of frauds does not require that there have been any representations with respect to the requirements of the statute indicating that a writing is not necessary or will be executed or that the statute will not be relied on as a defense, because a party's change in position may be made in reliance on the promise that the contract will be performed and because acceptance of the benefits of the contract results in unjust enrichment regardless of whether the representation related to the statute of frauds or to performance of the contract [*see Monarco v. Lo Greco (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 621, 625-626, 220 P.2d 737* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1623*, discussed at *§ 530.21*]. However, a defendant is not estopped to rely on the statute of frauds and the oral agreement will not be enforced merely because nonenforcement of the agreement would permit the defendant to assert the statute and thus avoid the parol obligation [*Estate of Baglione (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 192, 198, 53 Cal. Rptr. 139, 417 P.2d 683]* .

[2] Nature of Acts Constituting Change of Position

Estoppel to assert the statute of frauds may be based on a change in position resulting from an act that does not constitute part performance of the oral contract, such as giving up a job that was terminable only for good cause after trial in order to accept employment under an oral contract that is unenforceable under *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*because it could not be performed within one year [*see Seymour v. Oelrichs (1909) 156 Cal. 782, 794, 106 P. 88 , overruled in part by Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 770-771* , (unconscionable injury established by that change in position), *disapproved on other grounds, Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 770*]. When acts in part performance of a contract are relied on as a basis for estoppel to assert the statute of frauds, unjust enrichment or unconscionable injury due to a change in position, similar to the requirements of the doctrine of part performance, must be shown [*see Anderson v. Stansbury (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 707, 715-716, 242 P.2d 305* (part payment of price not sufficient change or injury for estoppel); *Oren Realty & Development Co. v. Superior Court (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 229, 234-236, 154 Cal. Rptr. 97* (part payment of price and loss of opportunity to purchase other land were not sufficient to establish unconscionable injury); *see § 530.18, above*].

Unlike the doctrine of part performance, the doctrine of estoppel does not require that the change of position relied on refer unequivocally to the oral agreement [*see Carlson v. Richardson (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 204, 208-209, 72 Cal. Rptr. 769]* .

[3] Doctrine of Judicial Admissions

A species of estoppel to assert the statute of frauds is referred to as the doctrine of judicial admissions. That doctrine imposes the rule that a defendant who is sued on an oral contract within the statute of frauds and who admits the contract in the answer but does not raise the statute of frauds as a defense is held to have waived the protection of the statute of frauds [*Burt v. Wilson (1865) 28 Cal. 631, 638* ; *Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 311, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *see also § 530.24[1]*]. Nevertheless, testimony that admits the existence of an oral contract does not waive the statute of frauds. Thus, the fact that a defendant made a declaration in another action and referred to "an agreement" with plaintiff in that declaration does not bar the defendant from asserting the defense of the statute of frauds in the action on the contract [*Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 311-312, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104]* . Note that under *Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)*, if the contract is one for the sale of goods for a price of $500 or more, it is not enforceable beyond the quantity of goods admitted [*see* discussion at *§ 530.12[12][d]*].

[4] Pleading Estoppel

The party pleading estoppel must allege the facts giving rise to estoppel. A conclusory pleading that the other party is estopped from asserting the defense that the contract is invalid under the statute of frauds is inadequate [*Gressley v. Williams (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 636, 640-641, 14 Cal. Rptr. 496* ; *see Carlson v. Richardson (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 204, 208, 72 Cal. Rptr. 769* (estoppel sufficiently alleged)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsHeightened Pleading RequirementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial AdmissionsEffects

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.20

§ 530.20 Quasi-Specific Performance

[1] Agreement to Make Will in Return for Services

In an action for quasi-specific performance to impose a constructive trust on property that was to be left to plaintiff by will pursuant to an oral agreement to make a will, the defendant will be estopped to assert the statute of frauds if plaintiff will suffer unconscionable injury or defendant will be unjustly enriched [*Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 675, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210]* . A testator's alleged oral agreement to leave all of his property to his son if the son cared for him during the testator's lifetime was held to be enforceable under equitable estoppel principles, notwithstanding former *Prob. Code § 150* (or its predecessor, former *Civ. Code § 1624(6)*) [*Estate of Housley v. Haywood (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 358, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628* ; *see §§ 520.13[9]* and *530.18[5]*]. The rendition of services that are compensable in money cannot be the basis for estoppel because there is an adequate legal remedy in the form of quantum meruit [*Palmer v. Phillips (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 291, 295-296, 266 P.2d 850* (no estoppel if plaintiffs performed services of both impersonal and intimate nature); *see Kennedy v. Bank of America (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 637, 647-648, 47 Cal. Rptr. 154* (no estoppel if plaintiff performed services of domestic servant and gasoline station assistant)]. However, when the services rendered are of such peculiar, extraordinary, or exceptional character that it is impossible to estimate their value in money, an estoppel arises [*Ward v. Wrixon (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 642, 655, 336 P.2d 640* (unjust enrichment and unconscionable injury found when plaintiff gave up home to live with decedent, performed heavy construction work, and was companion, all without compensation); *see Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 678-679, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210* (unconscionable injury when plaintiff performed no services but only agreed to live near decedent who wanted to be near his grandchild, plaintiff's son)]. For discussion of and forms of complaint in actions for quasi-specific performance, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

If the plaintiff cannot meet the requirements of a suit for quasi-specific performance, plaintiff may recover the reasonable value of the services rendered in an action in quantum meruit. To maintain such an action, however, plaintiff must first file a claim for the value of his or her services against the estate of the deceased promisor [*Palmer v. Phillips (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 291, 299, 266 P.2d 850* ; for discussion and forms relating to quantum meruit, *see* Ch. 121, *Common Counts*].

[2] Mutual Wills

The mere fact that wills are reciprocal or contain similar or identical provisions, or that they were executed at the same time and before the same witnesses, is not of itself sufficient evidence of an oral agreement to make a particular disposition of property by will [*see* Former *Prob. Code § 150(b)* (repealed eff. Jan. 1, 2001) (discussed at *§ 530.12[9][a]*)]. If such an agreement is proved by full, clear, and convincing evidence, however, it will be enforced. When mutual wills have been made pursuant to such an agreement and one party has died before either will has been revoked, if the second party accepts the benefits of the will of the first party, but subsequently revokes his or her will and executes a new will in violation of the agreement, the intended beneficiaries of the mutual will may bring an action for quasi-specific performance to impress a constructive trust on the persons claiming under the new will. In such an action, the persons claiming under the new will are estopped from asserting the statute of frauds, because a constructive fraud has been worked on the first decedent and the beneficiaries of the mutual will [*Juran v. Epstein (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 882, 897, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 588* ; *Crail v. Blakely (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 744, 747, 751-752, 106 Cal. Rptr. 187, 505 P.2d 1027* ; *Notten v. Mensing (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 469, 473-477, 45 P.2d 198]* .

For discussion of and forms for complaints in actions for quasi-specific performance, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsJoint & Mutual Wills

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.21

§ 530.21 Fraud Preventing Writing

When a contract that is required by law to be in writing is prevented from being put into writing by the fraud of one party to the contract, any other party who was led by that fraud to believe that the contract was in writing, and who acted on that belief to his or her prejudice, may enforce the contract against the party perpetrating the fraud [*Civ. Code § 1623*].

Similarly, a representation that one intends to sign an agreement in near future is basis for estoppel, preventing the party who made the representation from asserting the statute of frauds [*Wilk v. Vencill (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 104, 107-108, 180 P.2d 351* ; *see also § 530.19*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.22

§ 530.22 Severability of Unenforceable Promises

When a promisor makes two or more oral promises that can easily be distinguished and separated by the court by reference to the agreement, only the promise which falls clearly within the statute of frauds is unenforceable [*White Lighting Co. v. Wolfson (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 336, 345, 66 Cal. Rptr. 697, 438 P.2d 345* (oral promise to repurchase stock for $15,000, pay moving expenses, severance pay, and share of gross receipts in return for plaintiff's resignation enforceable except for purchase of stock)]. Similarly, when an oral contract contains two promises which are in the alternative, rather than being merely divisible, and only one is within the statute of frauds, recovery may be had on the promise that is not within the statute, even though performance of that promise may also constitute performance of the promise that is within the statute [*Roy v. Salisbury (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 176, 183, 130 P.2d 706* (contract to take care of decedent's dog if owner unable to do so or if owner should die enforceable when performance began under first alternative)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationSeverabilityContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsDivisible Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.23

§ 530.23 Pleading Contract and Statute of Frauds

A complaint for breach of a contract within the statute of frauds is not fatally defective for failure to allege a writing because the law will presume the contract to be valid and therefore evidenced by a writing. A defendant relying on the statute of frauds as a defense to such an action must plead the statute [*Alaska Salmon Co. v. Standard Box Co. (1910) 158 Cal. 567, 569, 112 P. 454* ; *McLaughlin v. McLaughlin (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 287, 292, 323 P.2d 820* ; for forms of affirmative defense raising the statute of frauds, *see* Forms 1, 2]. A general denial of entering into the contract is also sufficient to raise the defense of the statute of frauds [*San Francisco Brewing Corp. v. Bowman (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 607, 618, 343 P.2d 1* ; *Walsh v. Standart (1917) 174 Cal. 807, 810, 164 P. 795* ; for forms of general and specific denial of allegations, *see* Ch. 26, *Answers*]. Failure to deny the contract or to plead the statute of frauds, however, waives the defense of the statute [*Healy v. Obear (1916) 29 Cal. App. 696, 698, 157 P. 569 , reh'g denied, 157 P. 570]* .

In an action founded on a contract, the defendant or cross defendant may object by demurrer or answer that it cannot be ascertained from the pleading whether the contract is written, oral, or implied by conduct [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*]. A party failing to object to a complaint or cross complaint either by demurrer or answer is deemed to have waived the objection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.80*]. For a discussion and forms relating to demurrers on this ground, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.24

§ 530.24 Establishing Statute of Frauds as Defense

[1] Demurrer, Motion, or Objection Is Required

Even though the defense of the statute of frauds has been placed in issue by the answer, the right to rely on it is waived by failure to demur to the complaint, to object to the introduction of testimony to prove the oral agreement at trial, or to move to strike the testimony [*Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 506, 326 P.2d 135* ; *Coleman v. Satterfield (1950) 100 Cal. App. 2d 81, 83-84, 223 P.2d 61* ; *but see Tahoe Nat. Bank v. Phillips (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 11, 23-24, 92 Cal. Rptr. 704, 480 P.2d 320* (modifying approach taken in *Pao Ch'en Lee*; defendant who did not object at trial may not object on appeal to trial court's receipt of extrinsic evidence, but may argue on appeal that the extrinsic evidence conflicts with any interpretation to which instrument is reasonably susceptible); for forms of denial and affirmative defense placing the statute of frauds in issue, *see* Forms 1, 2]. An objection or motion to strike on grounds that evidence violated the statute of frauds may be made at any time during the trial [*McGirr v. Gulf Oil Corp. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 246, 252, 115 Cal. Rptr. 902* (after "substantial" testimony); *see Bank of America v. Hutchinson (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 142, 149-150, 27 Cal. Rptr. 787* (motion, two weeks after trial, to strike all testimony relating to defendant's representations regarding credit of third party properly denied as untimely and indefinite)].

A defendant may also assert the statute of frauds in a motion for nonsuit at the close of plaintiff's case [*Carrier & Braddock v. S.W. Straus & Co. (1931) 213 Cal. 508, 513, 2 P.2d 811]* . In some instances, motion for nonsuit may be the first time that the issue of the statute of frauds may be properly raised [*see Ira Garson Realty Co. v. Brown (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 615, 621, 4 Cal. Rptr. 734* (plaintiff presented case on theory of oral contract supported by written memorandum until time of motion)].

If evidence of an oral agreement is introduced to prove an oral contract not subject to the statute, or if there is evidence of estoppel to rely on the statute, so that evidence of the contract could not be excluded, a request for a jury instruction on the issue of the statute of frauds is sufficient to preserve the statute as a defense, even though there was no objection to evidence of the oral agreement, motion to strike, or motion for nonsuit [*San Francisco Brewing Corp. v. Bowman (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 607, 618-619, 343 P.2d 1]* .

[2] Who May Assert Defense

The statute of frauds may be asserted as a defense by third persons who are in privity with a party to the contract, but not by third persons who are neither parties nor in privity with a party to an unwritten contract [*O'Banion v. Paradiso (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 559, 562-563, 39 Cal. Rptr. 370, 393 P.2d 682* (successor in title to real property may assert statute); *Demeter v. Annenson (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 48, 57, 180 P.2d 998* (taxicab operators unable to raise statute in regard to contract between competitors and railway for exclusive right to solicit passengers at railway station)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsWaiver & PreservationCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for ReviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjections

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 530.25-530.29

[Reserved]

§§ 530.25[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.30

§ 530.30 Other Matthew Bender Publications

For discussion and forms relating to contracts between spouses, persons in cohabitation, and contracts in contemplation of marriage, see Kirkland, Lurvey & Richmond, California Family Law Practice and Procedure, 2nd ed., Chs. 2, 200, 201, 210 (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing a demurrer to an action for a commission on the sale of real property, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 34, *Brokers and Salespersons* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing a demurrer to an action on a common count, such as quantum meruit, based on a special count which is barred by the statute of frauds, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 43, *Common Counts and Bills of Particulars* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting a demurrer to a complaint for failure to show whether a contract is written, oral, or implied by law, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 50, *Contracts* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing a demurrer to a complaint for breach of an oral contract for the sale of goods, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 206, *Sales* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing a demurrer to a complaint for quasi-specific performance of an oral agreement to leave property by will, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 214, *Specific Performance* (Matthew Bender)

For discussions of the application and avoidance of the statute of frauds in relation to real estate transactions, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Chs. 70, 71, 73, 80, 91, 111, 115, 151-153, 172, 201, 343 (Matthew Bender)

For a discussion of the application and avoidance of the statute of frauds in relation to contracts for the employment of a real estate broker or property manager, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Chs. 61, 382 (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of contracts to make wills, see California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 61, *Contracts and Other Instruments Affecting Wills* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.31

§ 530.31 State Statutes

[1] Agency

Agent's authorization to enter into contract required by law to be in writing must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 2309*

[2] Fraud Preventing Writing

Oral contract is enforceable when writing of contract was prevented by fraud. *Civ. Code § 1623*

[3] Marriage and Dissolution

Premarital agreement made in contemplation of marriage. *Fam. Code § 1500 et seq.*

Spouses' agreement to immediate separation, support during separation, and support on dissolution must be in writing. *Fam. Code § 3580*

[4] Miscellaneous Agreements

Joint interests in property to be expressed in writing. *Civ. Code § 683*

Agreement by its terms not to be performed within one year. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*

Agreement by its terms not to be performed in promisor's lifetime. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(5)*

Pre-1985 agreement to make will. Former *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(6)* (repealed eff. Jan 1, 2001)

Commercial loan in excess of $100,000. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*

Qualified financial contracts. *Civ. Code § 1624(b)*

Revival of contract obligation barred by statute of limitations must be in writing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 360*

Waiver of statute of limitations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5*

Arbitration agreements in writing are enforceable. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1281*

Life care contracts must be in writing. *Health & Safety Code § 1787*; *see also Health & Safety Code § 1780.4(a)* (deposit subscription agreements must be in writing)

Contract made in 1985-2000 to make will or devise, or not to revoke will or devise, or to die intestate. Former *Prob. Code § 150(a)* (repealed eff. Jan 1, 2001)

Contract made after 2000 to make will or devise or other instrument, or not to revoke will or devise or other instrument, or to die intestate. *Prob. Code § 21700(a)*

[5] Modification of Written Contracts

Methods by which written contract may be modified. *Civ. Code § 1698*

[6] Personal Property Transactions

Transfer of interest in ship must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1135*

Motor vehicle conditional sales contract must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 2981.9*

Personal property sales contract over $5,000 must be in writing. *Com. Code § 1206*

Contract for sale of goods over $500 must be in writing. *Com. Code § 2201*

"Sale or return" transaction defined. *Com. Code § 2326(1)*

"Return" term of contract for sales of goods must be in writing. *Com. Code § 2326(3)*

Securities sale contract is not required to be in writing. *Com. Code § 8113*

Effectiveness of security agreements. *Com. Code § 9201 et seq.*

Personal property leases. *Com. Code § 10201 et seq.*

[7] Real Property Transactions

Estate or interest in real property created by writing or by operation of law. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1971, 1972*

Trust in relation to real property created by writing or by operation of law. *Prob. Code § 15206*

Lease of real property for over one year must be in writing. *Civ. Code §§ 1091, 1624(a)(3)*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1971, 1972*

Real property transfers required to be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1091*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1971, 1972*

Real estate sales contracts must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(3)*

Agreement to pay agent, broker, or other person commission for services in sale, purchase, or lease of real estate must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)*

Agreement by purchaser to assume indebtedness secured by mortgage or deed of trust on real property unless assumption provided for in conveyance. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(6)*

Mortgages must be created by writing. *Civ. Code § 2922*

Power of attorney to execute mortgage must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 2933*

[8] Satisfaction and Release of Obligation

Creditor's written agreement to accept part performance of obligation without new consideration extinguishes obligation. *Civ. Code § 1524*

Release of obligation without new consideration must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1541*

[9] Suretyship and Guaranty

Special promise to answer for debt, default, or miscarriage of another. *Civ. Code §§ 1624(a)(2), 2793, 2794*

Representation of third person's credit must be in writing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974*

Meaning of words of guaranty on commercial paper; exception to statute of frauds for guaranty written on commercial paper. *Com. Code § 3416*

Nonprofit association member's assumption of association debt must be in writing. *Corp. Code § 18610(a)*

Executor's or administrator's promise to pay decedent's debt from executor's or administrator's estate must be in writing. *Prob. Code § 9604*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActStatutes of FraudsCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract ModificationsOral ModificationsContracts LawSales of GoodsForm, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsPerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsContracts to Make WillsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsPremarital AgreementsDefensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.32

§ 530.32 Decisions

[1] Conflict of Laws

In federal diversity action on oral contract between California resident and New York resident, when substantive law statute of frauds of New York and of California would produce different results, each state had interest in having its law applied, and New York's interest would be most impaired by application of California law, New York law applied to bar action. *Rosenthal v. Fonda (9th Cir. 1988) 862 F.2d 1398, 1401* (applying California's conflict analysis)

[2] Contracts Outside Statute of Frauds

[a] Contract May Be Performed Within One Year

Oral agreement for permanent employment is not within statute of frauds if it is capable of being performed in one year. *Eisenberg v. Insurance Co. of North America (9th Cir. 1987) 815 F.2d 1285, 1290-1291* (criticizing *Newfield v. Insurance Co. of the West (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 440, 447, 203 Cal. Rptr. 9* , which was later disapproved by *Foley v. Interactive Data Corp. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 654, 675 n.19, 254 Cal. Rptr. 211, 765 P.2d 373*)

Provision giving one party option to end contract if other party did not meet condition, to be determined at end of one year, took contract out of operation of statute of frauds. *Plumlee v. Poag (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 541, 549-550, 198 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Oral agreement to support person for balance of his or her life is not subject to statute of frauds because possibility exists of performance within one year. *Leonard v. Rose (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 589, 592, 55 Cal. Rptr. 916, 422 P.2d 604* ; *see Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*

[b] Promise to Pay Another's Debt Benefits Promisor

Chairman of board's promise to pay corporate debt is exception to statute of frauds under *Civ. Code § 2794(4)* because

creditor promised to forbear canceling company's insurance, primarily serving chairman's object of welfare of his children, who had interest in company, and his own business reputation, as he had undertaken to save failing company. *Farr & Stone Ins. Brokers, Inc. v. Lopez (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 618, 621-622, 132 Cal. Rptr. 641*

[c] Real Property Transactions

Contract to install off-site improvements is not contract for the sale of land or interest in land, and is not within statute of frauds. *Pollyanna Homes, Inc. v. Berney (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 676, 679, 16 Cal. Rptr. 345, 365 P.2d 401*

Written forebearance agreement was not enforceable against holder of note secured by deed of trust, because agreement was not signed by holder or any predecessor in interest as secured creditor. Secrest v. Security Nat'l Mortgage Loan Trust 2002-2 *(2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 544, 552-553, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275*

Option contained in written lease allowing renewal of lease for period in excess of one year is exercisable orally because original lease provides writing satisfying statute of frauds. *Ripani v. Liberty Loan Corp. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 603, 609-610, 157 Cal. Rptr. 272*

Joint venture agreement calling for transfer of realty to venture is not within statute of frauds of *Civ. Code § 1091* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971* (former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1973*). *Epstein v. Stahl (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 53, 63-64, 1 Cal. Rptr. 143*

[d] Settlement Agreements

Statute of frauds inapplicable to oral settlement agreement stipulated to by parties to litigation before court following judicially mandated and supervised settlement conference. *Kohn v. Jaymar-Ruby, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1534, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780*

Statute of frauds is inapplicable to oral out-of-court settlement agreement involving transfer of real property. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 837, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

Lawsuit settlement agreement is not sale of chose in action and not barred by statute of frauds of *Com. Code § 1206*. *Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 604, 608-609, 159 Cal. Rptr. 657*

[3] Contracts Required to Be in Writing

[a] Agreements Not to Be Performed Within One Year

Agreement calling for employment not to be performed within one year is required to be in writing under statute of frauds. *Robinson v. Hewlett-Packard Corp. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1108, 1120 n.10, 228 Cal. Rptr. 591*

[b] Real Property Transactions

When father orally instructed daughter to sign his name to grant deed conveying property to himself and daughter as joint tenants, conveyance was deemed valid as a deed executed by the grantor under *Civ. Code § 1091* because daughter acted as mere "amanuensis," performing mere mechanical function in signing deed rather than exercising her judgment or discretion. *Estate of Stephens v. Williams (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 665, 678, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358, 49 P.3d 1093*

Oral lien on real property is precluded by statute of frauds of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971*. *Remainders, Inc. v. Bartlett*

(1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 295, 298-299, 30 Cal. Rptr. 191

Agreement restricting the use of land is within statute of frauds. *Triangle Ranch, Inc. v. Union Oil Co. (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 428, 438-439, 287 P.2d 537* ; *see Civ. Code § 1091*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1971, 1973*

[c] Sales of Goods and Personal Property

Contract between brokerage firm and customer, as purchaser, for sale and purchase of shares owned by brokerage firm was contract between vendor and purchaser, not regular agency agreement, and thus not within exception of former *Com. Code § 8319(2). Leason v. Rosart (9th Cir. 1987) 811 F.2d 1322, 1325* (except one order confirmed under *Com. Code § 8319(1)(c)*)

Confirmation under former *Com. Code § 8319(1)(c)* was effective even though mailed with wrong zip code and buyer denied receipt when there was no evidence that it was sent but not returned by postal service to sender. *Leason v. Rosart (9th Cir. 1987) 811 F.2d 1322, 1325*

[4] Estoppel to Assert Statute of Frauds

[a] In General

Doctrine of estoppel requires that unconscionable injury will result from failure to enforce oral agreement; unconscionable injury results from denying enforcement of oral contract after one party is induced by another to seriously change its position in reliance on the oral agreement or in cases of unjust enrichment. *Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 444, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872*

Doctrine of estoppel requires that unconscionable injury or unjust enrichment would result from failure to enforce oral agreement; when plaintiff will lose only opportunity and can obtain return of monies paid, estoppel is not to be invoked. *Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 313, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104*

[b] Estoppel Found

Serious change of position estopped party from relying on statute of frauds when wife, in reliance on oral contract with husband to make reciprocal will benefitting daughter after death of both testators, later failed to change will to make daughter sole beneficiary at time wife became concerned with daughter's welfare. *Redke v. Silvertrust (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 94, 101, 98 Cal. Rptr. 293, 490 P.2d 805*

Unconscionable injury and unjust enrichment were established when husband refrained from making inter vivos gifts or testamentary disposition for daughter and gave all property before and at his death to wife in reliance on agreement that her will would provide for his daughter equally with her own children. *Day v. Greene (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 404, 408-410, 29 Cal. Rptr. 785, 380 P.2d 385*

Under *Com. Code § 1103*, equitable principles survived enactment of Uniform Commercial Code in California; thus estoppel was applicable to bar assertion of statute of frauds against oral contract for sale of goods under *Commercial Code. Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 442-443, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872* ; *contra, C.R. Fedrick, Inc. v. Borg-Warner Corp. (9th Cir. 1977) 552 F.2d 852, 856-858* (California not likely to allow estoppel to bar Commercial Code statute of frauds)

Beneficiaries of will made in breach of oral contract to make mutual wills after testator accepted benefits under mutual

will were estopped to assert statute of frauds against intended beneficiaries of mutual will. *Stahmer v. Schley (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 200, 203, 157 Cal. Rptr. 756*

Unconscionable injury shown that could estop oil company from relying on statute of frauds when plaintiff gave up lease on profitable service station and entered lease, paid deposit, and bought inventory for unprofitable station in reliance on oral promise to also lease a second, profitable station. *McGirr v. Gulf Oil Corp. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 246, 253-254, 115 Cal. Rptr. 902* (but no estoppel due to *Civ. Code § 2309* "equal dignities rule")

Quasi-specific performance is available when party to reciprocal wills made pursuant to oral agreement accepts benefit of other party's will and then revokes own will; those acts constituted constructive fraud on first decedent and beneficiaries of oral agreement so as to estop reliance on statute of frauds. *Mintz v. Rowitz (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 216, 223-224, 91 Cal. Rptr. 435*

Unconscionable injury to seller estopped buyer from relying on statute of frauds when seller, in reliance on contract, sought no other buyers for perishable crop until buyer's repudiation, at which time crop had deteriorated in value. *Mosekian v. Davis Canning Co. (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 118, 123-124, 40 Cal. Rptr. 157*

Unconscionable injury to seller estopped buyer from relying on statute of frauds when seller, in reliance on contract, transported automobiles to California from Louisiana, and was caught in market slump after buyer's breach of contract made during very high market. *Goldstein v. McNeil (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 608, 611-612, 265 P.2d 113*

[c] Estoppel Not Found

Real estate broker was not able to assert equitable estoppel against statute of frauds defense to enforcement of oral commission agreement unless there was showing of actual fraud, because it was not reasonable to rely on oral listing contract. *Phillippe v. Shapell Industries (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1247, 1259-1270, 241 Cal. Rptr. 22, 743 P.2d 1279*

Unconscionable injury was not established by giving up terminable-at-will employment to go to work under oral contract not performable in one year. *Ruinello v. Murray (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 687, 698-690, 227 P.2d 251*

Testimony that admits existence of oral contract does not waive statute of frauds; fact that defendant made declaration in another action and referred to "an agreement" with plaintiff in that declaration did not bar defendant from asserting defense of statute of frauds in action on contract. *Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 311-312, 247 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *but see Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)* (contrary result if contract is for sale of goods)

Alleged oral employment contract for period of three years was within purview of statute of frauds; plaintiff's move from Texas to California for employment when unemployed and unable to maintain stable employment in Texas together with sale of home in Texas and purchase of comparable home in California did not constitute unconscionable injury; therefore defendant was not estopped to assert statute of frauds. *Munoz v. Kaiser Steel Corp. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 965, 971, 972-974, 203 Cal. Rptr. 345*

Buyer's loss of bargain was insufficient to estop seller from relying on statute of frauds. *Carlson v. Richardson (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 204, 208, 72 Cal. Rptr. 769*

Unjust enrichment of breaching seller of real property was not established by increase in property's value resulting from market conditions rather than from act of forbearance of buyer. *Carlson v. Richardson (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 204, 208, 72 Cal. Rptr. 769*

[d] Motion for Summary Judgment

Fact question regarding whether decedent's estate was equitably estopped from using statute of frauds to bar cohabitant's claim under oral property agreement precluded summary judgment for estate as to cohabitant's claim for breach of property agreement. *Byrne v. Laura (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1054, 1068-1069, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 908*

[5] Fully Performed Contract

Full performance of contract taking it out of statute of frauds was established when parties exchanged residences, assuming balances due on property acquired, one party paid balance due and received deed directly from former owner pursuant to oral exchange agreement while other party defaulted on assumed deed of trust. *McGlasson v. Blythe (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 152, 155-156, 299 P.2d 325*

Full performance of agreement terminating trust over real property and selling it to trustee and estoppel to assert statute of frauds were established when trustee gave agreed consideration, took possession, paid taxes, and made repairs and improvements. *Robison v. Hanley (1955) 136 Cal. App. 2d 820, 824-825, 289 P.2d 560*

[6] Memorandum of Agreement

[a] Sufficiency of Memorandum

If memorandum includes essential terms of agreement but meaning of those terms is unclear, memorandum is sufficient under statute of frauds if (1) extrinsic evidence clarifies terms with reasonable certainty, and (2) evidence as a whole demonstrates that parties intended to be bound. *Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 771, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116, 152 P.3d 420* Memorandum is required to contain essential elements of specific, consummated agreement; what is essential depends on agreement and failure to express that which is clearly implied does not render memorandum deficient. *Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 762-763, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158*

Writing evidencing "requirements" or output contract is sufficient when it indicates that there has been real transaction for sale of output or for purchase of requirements. *Seaman's Direct Buying Service, Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 762-764, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158*

Time of performance of act required for sale of property subject to statute of frauds is not essential element of agreement and may be implied pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1657*. *House of Prayer v. Evangelical Assn. for India (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 48, 53-54, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 24*

Application to Commissioner of Corporations for approval of stock transfer was memorandum of contract to sell stock. *Kaneko v. Okuda (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 217, 230-231, 15 Cal. Rptr. 792*

[b] Signature

E-mail signed with party's name satisfied statute of frauds, assuming binding oral agreement existed and e-mail included all material terms of that agreement. *Lamle v. Mattel, Inc. (Fed. Cir. 2005) 394 F.3d 1355, 1362-1363* (applying California common law); *see Civ. Code § 1633.7* (signature may not be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form)

"Mother" was insufficient signature when not intended to be legally binding signature. *Berdan v. Berdan (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d 478, 483, 103 P.2d 622*

[7] Modification of Written Agreement

When one party, through oral representations and conduct or custom, has behaved after execution of contract in manner antithetical to one or more terms of express written contract and induced other party to rely on those representations and conduct or custom, equity upholds apparent modification. *Wagner v. Glendale Adventist Medical Center (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1379, 1388, 265 Cal. Rptr. 412* (dicta, as conduct was not sufficient)

Oral modification of term of written agreement requires new consideration; employee's move, after elimination of position, to locale of another facility of employer did not amount to consideration because detriment was incidental to preparation to accept out-of-state offer of employment. *Malmstrom v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 299, 314, 231 Cal. Rptr. 820*

Reliance on oral statements alleged to modify or supersede written agreement is not justifiable; thus, doctrine of estoppel is unavailable to provide basis for oral modification unless unconscionable injury or unjust enrichment would result from failure to enforce oral modification. *Malmstrom v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 299, 319-320, 231 Cal. Rptr. 820*

Obligation that party was required to perform under written contract was not consideration that would support oral modification. *Marani v. Jackson (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 695, 704-706, 228 Cal. Rptr. 518*

[8] Part Performance

Part performance by parties to contract not to be performed within one year bars both parties from asserting statute of frauds. *Dean v. Davis (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 166, 168, 166 P.2d 15*

[9] Who May Assert Defense

Defendant whose fraudulent acts and misrepresentations have caused another to fail to perform in conformity with promises under oral contract is not permitted to assert statute of frauds as defense to action for tortious interference with contractual relations. *Friedman v. Jackson (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 517, 518, 72 Cal. Rptr. 129*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract ModificationsOral ModificationsContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawSales of GoodsForm, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsPartial PerformanceContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsPerformanceContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsSignaturesContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsWritingsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.33

§ 530.33 Law Reviews

Daniel, *Electronic Contracting Under the 2003 Revisions to Article 2 of the Uniform Commercial Code: Clarification of Chaos?* 20 Santa Clara Computer & High Tech. L.J. 319 (2004)

Comment, *Here's Why Hollywood Should Kiss the Handshake Deal Goodbye*, *23 Loy. L.A. Ent. L. Rev. 503 (2003)*

Phillips, *Accepting the Inevitable; California Statute Finally Embraces Oral Testamentary Contracts*, *4 J. Legal Advoc. & Prac. 1 (2002)*

Comment, *California Oral Will Contracts: The Decline of Testator Intent in the Shadow of Equitable Estoppel*, *39 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1187 (1999)*

Comment, *The Indelibility of Invisible Ink: A Critical Survey of the Enforcement of Oral Contracts Without the Statute of Frauds Under the U.C.C.*, 19 Whittier L. Rev. 423 (1997)

Comment, *Intentional Interference with Prospective Economic Advantage: A Tort That Eviscerates the Real Estate Brokers' Statute of Frauds*, *36 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1219 (1996)*

Horning, *Has Hal Signed a Contract: The Statute of Frauds in Cyberspace*, 12 Santa Clara Computer & High Tech. L.J. 253 (1996)

Beane, *The Partial Payment Exception to the UCC Sale of Goods Statute of Frauds*, 13 UCC L.J. 135 (1980)

Bouret, *Oral Will Contracts and the Statute of Frauds in California, 1896-1980: A Summary and Evaluation*, *8 Pepperdine L. Rev. 41 (1980)*

Comment, *Promissory Estoppel and the Statute of Frauds in California*, *66 Cal. L. Rev. 1219 (1978)*

Branca & Steinberg, *Antenuptial Agreements Under California Law: An Examination of the Current Law and In re Marriage of Dawley, 11 U.S.F. L. Rev. 317, 319*-324 (1977)

Comment, *The Use of Oral Admissions to Lift the Bar of the Statute of Frauds: UCC Section 2-201(3)(b) , 65 Cal. L. Rev. 150 (1977)*

Note, *Oral Employment Contracts and Equitable Estoppel: The Real Estate Broker as Victim, 26 Hastings L.J. 1503 (1975)*

Note, *Lockwood v. Smigel: California's Version of the Part Payment Rule Under the Uniform Commercial Code*, 23 Hastings L.J. 633 (1972)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentStatutes of FraudsExceptionsStatutory ExceptionsContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelStatutes of FraudsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsOral AgreementsLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsEmployment ContractsStatutes of Frauds

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.34

§ 530.34 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 999 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 277, 297-300, 318-320; Vol. 11, *Equity*, §§ 25-26, 57 (9th ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 530.35-530.39

[Reserved]

§§ 530.35[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.40

§ 530.40 Methods by Which Statute of Frauds May Be Raised

[1] On Demurrer

☐ Special demurrer:

☐ Used to force the party pleading the contract to indicate whether the contract is written, oral, or implied in law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*; *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

☐ General demurrer:

☐ Available when it appears from face of the complaint that the contract is oral and within the statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(a)*; see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

[2] In Answer

☐ General denial of unverified complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*] or complaint involving $1,000 or less [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.40*; *see Howard v. Adams (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 253, 257, 105 P.2d 971* ; Ch. 26, *Answers*].

☐ Specific denial of contract (i.e., generally denying execution of alleged contract) [*Walsh v. Standart (1917) 174 Cal. 807, 810, 164 P. 795* ; for a form, *see § 530.50*].

☐ Affirmative defense specifically pleading applicable code section requiring alleged contract to be written [*Jamison v. Hyde (1903) 141 Cal. 109, 112, 74 P. 695* ; for forms, *see §§ 530.51*, 530.52].

NOTE:

Even though the defense of the statute of frauds has been raised in the pleadings, the right to rely on the statute may be waived by failure to demur to the pleading that alleges the oral contract or by failure to preserve the defense of the statute at trial [*Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 505-506, 326 P.2d 135* ; *see* *§ 530.24[1]*].

[3] At Trial

☐ Motion to exclude or strike evidence of the oral contract [*see* *Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 505-506, 326 P.2d 135* , discussed at *§ 530.24[1]*].

☐ Motion for nonsuit [*Carrier & Braddock v. S.W. Straus Co. (1931) 213 Cal. 508, 513, 2 P.2d 811* (proper when plaintiff not prejudiced by delay; otherwise entitled to reopen); *Ira Garson Realty Co. v. Brown (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 615, 621, 4 Cal. Rptr. 734* (proper when first opportunity to object, as when case proceeded on theory of oral contract supported by memorandum); *see § 530.24[1*]; *see also* Ch. 389, *Nonsuit and Motions for Judgment*].

☐ Request for jury instructions: available when evidence of oral agreement is admissible to prove oral argreement not within statute of frauds, e.g., when there is a claim that there is a sufficient memorandum of the agreement, or when there is evidence of estoppel to assert the statute of frauds [*San Francisco Brewing Corp. v. Bowman (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 607, 618, 343 P.2d 1* ; *see § 530.24[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsNonsuitsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsRequests for InstructionsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjections

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 530.41-530.49

[Reserved]

§§ 530.41[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART V. FORMS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.50

§ 530.50 General Form of Affirmative Defense That Contract Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds

[1] FORM General Form of Affirmative Defense That Contract Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that the contract alleged in the complaint is invalid under the provisions of _____ [*allege particular statute applicable, e.g., Civil Code Section 1624(a)(5)*] because it _____ [*specify reason contract is within statute of frauds, e.g.,* is an agreement to provide for _____(*name*) by will] which is not in writing, nor is there any note or memorandum of it, subscribed by _____ [defendant *or specify person through whom defendant claims right to property*] or his/her agent.

[2] Use of Form

The form of affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to an action based on an oral agreement that is unenforceable under the provisions of the statute of frauds. Failure to deny the making of the contract or to plead the statute of frauds as a bar constitutes waiver of the defense [*Healy v. Obear (1916) 29 Cal. App. 696, 698, 157 P. 569 , reh'g denied, 157 P. 570]* . However, merely pleading the affirmative defense of the statute of frauds is not sufficient. To preserve the defense, counsel also must demur to the pleading that alleges the oral contract or raise the defense of the statute at trial, or otherwise by motion [*see Pao Ch'en Lee v. Gregoriou (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 502, 505-506, 326 P.2d 135* ; §§ 530.24[1], 530.40[1] and [3]].

[3] Affirmative Defense Required When Oral Contract Is Admitted

The assertion, as a separate defense, that a contract is invalid under the statute of frauds pursuant to a specified code section raises the issue of the statute of frauds. The issue may be raised in this manner even though the answer otherwise admits making the oral contract. However, a defendant who admits the oral contract in his or her answer must assert the statute of frauds as an affirmative defense; if the defense not raised, under the doctrine of judicial admissions, the defendant will be held to have waived protection of statute of frauds [*Jamison v. Hyde (1903) 141 Cal. 109, 112, 74 P. 695* ; *Burt v. Wilson (1865) 28 Cal. 631, 639* ; *Isaac v. A & B Loan Co. (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 307, 311, 247*

Cal. Rptr. 104 ; *cf. Com. Code 2201(3)(b)* (operative January 1, 1990; applicable to contract for sale of goods for price of $500 or more, and discussed in *§ 530.12[12][d]*); *see also § 530.19[3]*].

[4] Cross References

For an alternative form pleading statute of frauds as an affirmative defense, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART V. FORMS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.51

§ 530.51 Affirmative Defense That Oral Contract for Sale of Goods Valued at Over $500 Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds [Com. Code § 2201]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense That Oral Contract for Sale of Goods Valued at Over $500 Is Unenforceable Under Statute of Frauds [Com. Code § 2201]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. The contract set forth in plaintiff's complaint, on which plaintiff bases his/her cause of action, is an oral contract for the sale of goods valued at $500 or more, enforcement of which is barred by *Section 2201 of the Commercial Code*.

2. No written note or memorandum of the [alleged] contract signed by defendant or any authorized agent of defendant exists [(*add if parties are merchants:* nor did defendant receive any written confirmation of the (alleged) contract from plaintiff).]

[3. _____ (Defendant *or* Plaintiff) has neither accepted nor received any part of these goods, nor given anything in part payment of the (alleged) contract. (*If plaintiff is seller, add:* These goods were not specially manufactured for defendant).]

[4. The contract set forth in plaintiff's complaint is not a "qualified financial contract" excepted from the rule of *Commercial Code § 2201*.]

[2] Use of Form

The form of affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to an action based on an oral contract for the sale of goods valued at $500 or more. The form alleges facts bringing the contract within the statute of frauds pertaining to contracts for the sale of goods [*see Com. Code § 2201*, discussed at *§ 530.12[12]*].

Com. Code § 2201(1) provides that oral contracts for the sale of goods valued at $500 or more are unenforceable by

way of action or defense, except as otherwise provided in *Com. Code § 2201* [*see Com. Code § 2201*]. Paragraphs 2 through 4 of the form provide allegations negating the existence of some of the exceptions to the rule of *Com. Code § 2201(1)*. These paragraphs are included for optional use because it is not clear which party must plead and prove these exceptions to the statute of frauds--the party relying on the statute or the party seeking to come within the exception to the statute. The general rule is that a party relying on a statutory right which includes an exception in its enacting clause must negate that exception, although the party need not negate an exception made in a proviso or a subsequent section [*see People v. Gordon (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 711, 724, 234 P.2d 287]* . The effect of this rule on pleading and proof under *Com. Code § 2201* is not clear.

Omitted from this form is any allegation negating the existence of the exception of *Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)*, discussed at *§ 530.12[12][d]*, which allows enforcement of a contract for goods to the extent the party against whom the contract is sought to be enforced admits in his or her pleading, testimony, or otherwise in court that contract for sale was made [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(b)*].

[3] Allegations of Optional Paragraphs

The bracketed allegations in Paragraph 2 of the form negate the existence of the exception of *Com. Code § 2201(2)*, discussed at *§ 530.12[12][b]*, which allows enforcement of a contract between merchants if a confirmation was sent to the party against whom the contract is sought to be enforced and that party did not object to the confirmation [*Com. Code § 2201(2)*].

Paragraph 3 of the form provides an allegation negating the existence of the exceptions of *Com. Code § 2201(3)(a)* and *(c)*, discussed at *§ 530.12[12][h]* and *[i]*, which allow enforcement of a contract:

- For goods which are being manufactured specifically for defendant/buyer and are not suitable for sale to others in the ordinary course of the seller's business [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(a)*].

- To the extent of goods received and accepted or accepted and paid for [*Com. Code § 2201(3)(c)*].

Paragraph 4 of the form provides an allegation negating the existence of the exception to the rule of *Com. Code § 2201(1)* for "qualified financial contracts" [*Com. Code § 2201(4)*; *see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(2)*(definition); *see also § 530.12[1][c]*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating generally to contracts for the sale of goods, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Sales Under the Commercial Code* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART V. FORMS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 530.52-530.59

[Reserved]

§§ 530.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART V. FORMS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.60

§ 530.60 Allegation of Part Performance Rendering Statute of Frauds Inapplicable to Oral Contract to Convey Real Property

[1] FORM Allegation of Part Performance Rendering Statute of Frauds Inapplicable to Oral Contract to Convey Real Property

1. On _____ [*date*] plaintiff and defendant entered into an oral contract by which it was agreed that _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] would convey to _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] certain real property described as _____ [*describe real property*], and _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] would pay _____[plaintiff *or* defendant] $_____, to be paid _____ [*describe terms of payment, e.g.,* by check, $_____ at the time of the agreement, and $_____ on _____ (*date*)].

[*EITHER*]

2. Pursuant to the contract _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] delivered and _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] took possession of said real property, and at all times thereafter, _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff] has maintained actual possession of said premises by _____ [*allege facts constituting actual possession, e.g.,* residing thereon with his/her family and all their household possessions].

[*AND/OR*]

2. _____ [Defendant *or* Plaintiff], in reliance on the oral contract, has made substantial and permanent improvements on and to the real property in that he/she has _____ [*indicate nature and cost of improvements, e.g.,* graded and paved a driveway and constructed a garage at a cost of $_____].

[*EITHER*]

3. _____ [Defendant *or* Plaintiff] paid the purchase price of the property in full to _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] _____ [*specify amounts and dates of payments, e.g.,* by checks dated _____ (*date*), and _____ (*date*), for $_____ and $_____, respectively], and _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] accepted and retained the payment(s).

[*OR*]

3. _____ [Defendant *or* Plaintiff] has paid to _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] and _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] has accepted the following sums to be applied to the total price of said real property: _____ [*list amounts paid and dates of payment*]. _____[Defendant *or* Plaintiff] tendered the balance due of $_____to _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant], but _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] refused then, and continues to refuse, to execute a deed conveying said real property to _____ [defendant *or* plaintiff].

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, may be used in any action in which a party seeks to rely on an oral contract for the sale of real property which has been partly performed [*see Civ. Code § 1624(a)(3)*(agreement for the § 530.18[4] (sufficiency of part performance)]. Thus, for example, the allegations may be inserted in a complaint for specific performance of such a contract or for damages for breach of such a contract. When appropriate, the allegations may also be included in a defendant's answer to an action in which the defendant bases his or her rights on an oral contract for the sale of real property, such as a quiet title action or an action to enjoin interference with property rights.

For an example of a complaint for specific performance of a contract to convey real property, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The making of the oral contract (Paragraph 1),

- That the party who bought the property went into actual possession of it pursuant to the contract, or made valuable improvements on the land in reliance on the contract, or both (Pararaph 2), and

- That the vendee made full or part payment of the purchase price (Paragraph 3).

[4] Requirement of Actual Possession

Mere payment of the purchase price is not sufficient to establish part performance which would take the contract out of the statute of frauds. It must be shown that the vendee was given, and took, actual possession of the property pursuant to the terms of the contract and continued to hold possession or made valuable improvements on the land in reliance on the contract [*Davis v. Judson (1910) 159 Cal. 121, 131, 113 P. 147* ; *McGinn v. Willey (1914) 24 Cal. App. 303, 308, 141 P. 49* (possession, improvements, and part payment of purchase price)]. For example, part performance was sufficient when the vendee did the following [*Engasser v. Jones (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 171, 175-176, 198 P.2d 546]* :

- Taking possession under the oral sales contract;
- Expending money in moving onto the property;
- Furnished the house;
- Arranged to buy water rights; and
- Maintained exclusive control of the property with the vendor's consent and knowledge.

To constitute part performance, the vendee must be in physical possession of the property. The possession must be so visible, notorious, and exclusive as to clearly manifest that the vendee is claiming a distinctive ownership which is inconsistent with the right of ownership in any other person [*Davis v. Judson (1910) 159 Cal. 121, 132, 113 P. 147* (visiting lots every year or two insufficient); *Francis v. Colendich (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 128, 131, 14 Cal. Rptr. 56* (surveying, fencing, and occupying parcel adjacent to previously owned property sufficient)]. Visiting lots every year or two is not sufficient possession [*Davis v. Judson (1910) 159 Cal. 121, 132, 113 P. 147]* , nor is possession by one who is already in possession as lessee. In the later case, possession would not taken pursuant to the terms of the sale contract [*Hawke v. Ellwanger (1930) 108 Cal. App. 105, 107, 291 P. 279]* .

Slight and temporary improvements or trivial outlays, such as placing few loads of gravel on lot and planting some trees, or spending $500 for development plans, are insufficient to constitute valuable improvements taking the contract out of the statute of frauds [*Wood v. Anderson (1926) 199 Cal. 440, 445, 249 P. 862* ; *Harrison v. Hanson (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 370, 377, 331 P.2d 1084]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 530 STATUTE OF FRAUDS
PART V. FORMS

46-530 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 530.61

§ 530.61 Allegation of Qualified Financial Contract Not Subject to Statute of Frauds [Civ. Code § 1624(b); Com. Code §§ 1206(3), 2201(4)]

[1] FORM Allegation of Qualified Financial Contract Not Subject to Statute of Frauds [Civ. Code § 1624(b); Com. Code §§ 1206(3), 2201(4)]

1. On _____ [*date*] plaintiff and defendant entered into an oral contract for _____ [*specify type of qualified financial contract listed in Civ. Code § 1624(b)(2), e.g.,* the purchase and sale of foreign exchange], which was otherwise valid and enforceable.

[*EITHER*]

2. There is sufficient evidence that a contract has been made: [*specify type of evidence listed in Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3), e.g.,* plaintiff has a recording of the telephone call, admissible in evidence under California law, which indicates that the parties made a contract].

[*OR*]

2. Pursuant to a [prior *or* subsequent] written contract dated _____, plaintiff and defendant agreed to be bound by the terms of the qualified financial contract from the time they reached agreement _____ [by telephone *or otherwise*] on those terms. A copy of that contract is attached hereto marked "Exhibit A" and made a part hereof by this reference.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, may be used when a party seeks to rely on an oral contract that falls within the exception to the statute of frauds [*see Civ. Code § 1624(a)(1)*] for certain qualified financial contracts [*Civ. Code § 1624(b)*; *see § 530.12[1][c]*]. For example, the allegations may be inserted in a complaint for specific performance of such a contract or for damages for breach of such a contract.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- That the agreement or contract is a qualified financial contract which is valid in other respects and is otherwise enforceable (Paragraph 1) [*see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(2)* ("qualified financial contract" defined)].

- Either there is sufficient evidence to indicate that a contract has been made, [*see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(3)* (what constitutes sufficient evidence that contract was made)] or the parties have agreed by means of a prior or subsequent written contract to be bound by the terms of the qualified financial contract from the time they reached agreement on those terms (Paragraph 2) [*see Civ. Code § 1624(b)(4)* ("writing" includes tangible written text produced by electronic signals)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 531.syn

§ 531.syn Synopsis to Chapter 531: STATUTES AND ORDINANCES

§ 531.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 531.02 Cross References

§§ 531.03-531.09 [Reserved]

§ 531.10 Governing Statutes

§ 531.11 Statutes Defined

§ 531.12 Ordinances Defined

§ 531.13 Judicial Notice of Statutes and Ordinances

§§ 531.14-531.29 [Reserved]

§ 531.30 Necessity and Manner of Pleading Public Statutes and Ordinances

§ 531.31 Necessity and Manner of Pleading Private Statute

§ 531.32 Pleading Right to Recover Based on Statutory Liability

§ 531.33 Pleading Conditions Precedent Under Statute or Ordinance

§ 531.34 Statute or Ordinance Creating Duty in Negligence Action

§ 531.35 Effect of Repeal on Cause of Action

[1] When Right Accrues Solely From Statute

[2] When Right Accrues From Statute Codifying Common Law

§§ 531.36-531.49 [Reserved]

§ 531.50 Interpretation Is Question of Law

§ 531.51 Legislative Intent to Prevail

§ 531.52 Three-Step Analysis for Statutory Interpretation

§ 531.53 Words of Statute as First Consideration

§ 531.54 Interpretation of Unambiguous Statutes

§ 531.55 Interpretation of Ambiguous Statutes Generally

§ 531.56 Ordinary Meaning of Words

§ 531.57 Judicial Alteration of Statute Impermissible

§ 531.58 Title or Chapter Heading Not Controlling

§ 531.59 Every Word to Have Meaning

§ 531.60 Words Qualified by Context

§ 531.61 Legislative Specification of One Thing Excludes Any Other

§ 531.62 Omission of Provision Included in Related Statute

§ 531.63 Interpretation in Context of Related Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Specific Statute to Prevail Over General

§ 531.64 Presumption of Constitutionality

§ 531.65 Legislative History

[1] In General

[2] Statements of Individual Legislators

[3] Rejection of Specific Provision

[4] Reports of Drafting Commissions

[5] Election Brochure Arguments

§ 531.66 Subsequent Enactments

[1] Reenactment or Modification After Judicial Construction

[2] Use of Previously Construed Language

[3] Incorporation of Statute That Is Subsequently Amended

[4] Material Change in Language

[5] Statute Patterned on Federal Statute

[6] Use of Legislative History From Other States

[7] Expression of Intent of Earlier Act

[8] Failure to Pass Bill

[9] Nonrepealable Enactment Not Permitted

§ 531.67 Administrative Agency Interpretation

[1] Persuasiveness

[2] Internal Agency Memoranda

[3] Reenactment of Statute After Agency Interpretation

[4] Federal Agency Interpretation of Similar Federal Regulation

§ 531.68 Attorney General Interpretation

§ 531.69 Criminal Statutes

§ 531.70 Civil Statutes Imposing Monetary Penalty

§ 531.71 Retroactivity

[1] When A Statute Has Retroactive Effect

[2] Two-Step Approach for Initiatives

[3] Legislature's Expressed View Considered by Courts

[4] Postponement of Statute's Operative Date Not Determinative of Retroactive Effect

[5] Presumption of Prospective Application

[6] Clarification Is Not Considered Retroactive Enactment

[7] Due Process Challenge

[a] Change Impairing Vested Rights

[b] Alternative Analysis of Weighing Factors

[c] Change in Procedural Law

[8] Equal Protection Challenge

§§ 531.72-531.89 [Reserved]

§ 531.90 Preemption

[1] State Law by Federal

[2] Local Ordinance by State Statute

§ 531.91 Equal Protection

§ 531.92 Privileges and Immunities

§ 531.93 Due Process

§§ 531.94-531.109 [Reserved]

§ 531.110 Declaratory Relief

§ 531.111 Injunction

[1] To Restrain Enforcement or Implementation in General

[2] Penal Statutes

[3] Taxpayer's Suit

§§ 531.112-531.129 [Reserved]

§ 531.130 California Points and Authorities

§ 531.131 Federal Constitution

§ 531.132 State Constitution

§ 531.133 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

[3] Interpretation

[4] Judicial Notice

[5] Pleading

§ 531.134 Decisions

[1] City Charters

[2] Constitution

[3] Constitutional Construction Preferred

[4] Injunctive Relief

[5] Ordinances

[6] Resolutions

[7] Retroactivity

[8] Severability

[9] Special Legislation

[10] Statutory Construction

[a] Ascertaining Legislative Intent

[b] Avoiding Constitutional Questions

[c] Common-Law Language Used in Statute

[d] Conflicting Statutes; Specific Statute Prevails Over General Statute

[e] Construction to Meet Evolving Mores of Society

[f] Effect of Administrative Agency Interpretation

[g] Effect of Attorney General's Opinions

[h] Effect of Federal Acts on State Legislation

[i] Effect of Federal Acts on State Liability

[j] Effect of Sister-State Interpretation

[k] Exceptions to Statute

[l] Exclusive Versus Cumulative Statutory Remedy

[m] Implied Amendment or Repeal

[n] Initiative Measures

[o] Judicial Alteration

[p] Legislative History as Evidence

[i] Amendments in Course of Enactment

[ii] Historical Circumstances

[iii] Individual Legislator's Statements and Motives

[iv] Law Revision Commission Comments

[v] Legislative Committee Reports

[vi] Legislative Counsel Opinion

[q] No Construction of Clear Statute

[r] Particular Words

[s] Punctuation and Sentence Structure

[t] Reasonable Construction Preferred

[u] Shall and May

[v] Statutes Construed in Context of Whole

[w] Strict Construction

[x] Subsequent Enactments

[y] Surplusage Avoided

[z] Typographical Error

§ 531.135 Law Reviews

§§ 531.136-531.149 [Reserved]

§ 531.150 Allegations of Passage and Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 459] and Existence of Ordinance--Attaching Copy and Setting Forth Substance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegation of Ordinance

[4] State Statutes

§ 531.151 Allegation of Substance of Ordinance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross Reference

§ 531.152 Allegations of Compliance With Conditions Precedent Under Statute or Ordinance [Code Civ. Proc. § 459]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Allegation

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

§ 531.153 Allegation of Violation of Statute or Ordinance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

§ 531.154 Allegation of Foreign or Sister State Statute or Ordinance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegation of Statute or Ordinance

[4] State Statutes

§ 531.155 Notice of Request [Evid. Code § 453(a)] That Court Take Judicial Notice of Statute or Ordinance of Sister State, Foreign Statute, or Ordinance of Public Entity

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 531.156 Declaration of City Clerk That Ordinance Was in Effect on a Given Date

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Declaration

[4] State Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART I. SCOPE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.01

§ 531.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms relating to statutes and ordinances generally, including the manner of pleading statutes and ordinances. It includes forms to allege the existence of county ordinances and municipal corporation ordinances in California [*see §§ 531.150, 531.151*], to allege compliance with conditions precedent to an action under a statute or ordinance [*see § 531.152*], to allege violation of a statute or ordinance [*see § 531.153*], and to allege the existence of foreign or sister state statutes and ordinances [*see § 531.154*]. It also includes forms of notice of a request for the court to take judicial notice of a statute or ordinance [*see § 531.155*] and of a declaration of a city clerk that a copy of an ordinance is correct [*see § 531.156*].

This chapter also contains a brief discussion of declaratory and injunctive relief against enforcement of unconstitutional or otherwise invalid statutes or ordinances. For forms and further discussion relating to declaratory relief to determine the validity of statutes and ordinances, see Ch.183, *Declaratory Relief* . For forms and further discussion relating to a taxpayer's suit to restrain the expenditure of public money to enforce an unconstitutional statute or ordinance, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions* . For forms and further discussion relating to injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* . For forms and further discussion relating to judicial notice generally, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* . For discussion of California constitutional law, see Ch. 126A, *Constitutional Law* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART I. SCOPE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.02

§ 531.02 Cross References

For forms of complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief against enforcement of invalid statutes and ordinances, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , and for forms relating to injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion of constitutionality of statutes and ordinances generally, see Ch. 126A, *Constitutional Law* .

For a discussion of and forms for use in proceedings involving the initiative or referendum process for constitutional amendments, statutes, or ordinances, see Ch. 302, *Initiative, Referendum, and Recall* .

For a discussion of judicial notice proceedings relating to demurrers, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

For a discussion of and forms in a taxpayer's suit to enjoin implementation of an unconstitutional statute or ordinance, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions* , and for related discussions and forms, see Ch. 303, *Injunc tions* , and Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

For a discussion of and forms to use in requesting a court to take judicial notice, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* .

For a discussion of and forms for use in proceedings involving zoning ordinances generally, including a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief challenging the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance, see Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART I. SCOPE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.03-531.09

[Reserved]

§§ 531.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.10

§ 531.10 Governing Statutes

Laws, including statutes, are defined in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1895-1899*. Ordinances are authorized under *Cal. Const., art. XI, §§ 5* and *7*, and *Gov. Code § 37100*. Pleading of ordinances and private statutes and of conditions precedent under statutes and ordinances is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*.

Judicial notice is governed by *Evid. Code § 450 et seq.*, and proof of official writings is governed by *Evid. Code §§ 1530* and *1531*.

Interpretation of statutes generally is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1858, 1859*, and *1866*. Additionally, particular codes and acts may have definitions and rules of construction applicable to the interpretation of provisions included within that code or act [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 2 et seq.* (Civil Code); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 23000 et seq.* (Alcoholic Beverage Control Act)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.11

§ 531.11 Statutes Defined

The written law of California is contained in its constitution and statutes, and in the constitution and statutes of the United States. "Statutes" are written laws other than the state and federal constitutions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1897*]. Except for private statutes, which concern only certain designated individuals and affect only their private rights, all statutes are public [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1898*]. The only way in which the Legislature may make law is by statute [*Cal. Const., art. IV, § 8*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.12

§ 531.12 Ordinances Defined

Cities and counties generally may make and enforce within their limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances not in conflict with general laws [*Cal. Const., art. XI, §§ 4(h), 7*]. Ordinances must not conflict with the constitutions or statutes of California or the United States [*Gov. Code § 37100*]. However, charter cities may make and enforce ordinances in respect to municipal affairs subject only to the restrictions in their respective charters. With respect to municipal affairs, city charters supersede all inconsistent laws [*Cal. Const., art. XI, § 5(a)*; for further discussion of the scope of the power to make ordinances, *§ 531.91[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.13

§ 531.13 Judicial Notice of Statutes and Ordinances

Judicial notice may be mandatory or permissive. California courts must take judicial notice of the decisional, constitutional, and public statutory law of California and the United States, and of the provisions of any city or county charter described in *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 3, 4,* or *5* [*Evid. Code § 451(a)*]. In addition, to the extent that they are not encompassed in the mandatory notice provisions of *Evid. Code § 451*, California courts may, and on proper request, must, take judicial notice of the following matters [*Evid. Code §§ 452, 453*]:

(1) The constitutional and statutory law of any state of the United States and the resolutions and private acts of the United States Congress or the California Legislature [*Evid. Code § 452(a)*]; and

(2) Regulations and legislative enactments issued by or under the authority of the United States or any public entity in the United States [*Evid. Code § 452(b)*; *see Grant v. Hipsher (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 375, 380 n.2, 64 Cal. Rptr. 892* (city and county ordinances may be judicially noticed as regulations and legislative enactments issued by or under authority of public entity)].

For a form of request that the court take judicial notice of a statute or ordinance of a sister state, a foreign statute, or an ordinance of a public entity, see *§ 531.155*. For discussion of other matters subject to judicial notice and of the procedure for taking judicial notice, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.14-531.29

[Reserved]

§§ 531.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.30

§ 531.30 Necessity and Manner of Pleading Public Statutes and Ordinances

Matters subject to mandatory judicial notice need not be pleaded [*see Loranger v. Nadeau (1932) 215 Cal. 362, 364-366, 10 P.2d 63* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1875*, which listed matters subject to judicial notice but did not have a mandatory/permissive scheme comparable to *Evid. Code §§ 451-453*, overruled on other grounds, *Reich v. Purcell (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 551, 555, 63 Cal. Rptr. 31, 432 P.2d 727*)]. Thus, California and federal public statutes need not be pleaded [*see Evid. Code § 451(a)*]. However, because city and county ordinances are subject only to permissive judicial notice [*see Evid. Code § 452(b)*], they should be pleaded. It is sufficient to plead an ordinance by its title and date of passage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 459*]. As an alternative to the simplified method of pleading an ordinance provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*, an ordinance may be pleaded by setting forth the substance of the provision relied on [*Clements v. T.R. Bechtel Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 227, 241, 273 P.2d 5* ; *see § 531.151*]. Mere reference to an ordinance by number, however, is insufficient [*Agnew v. Los Angeles (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 105, 106, 221 P.2d 340]* . If the pleading gives notice that judicial notice of the ordinance will be requested and furnishes the court with sufficient information to enable it to take judicial notice of the ordinance, judicial notice will become mandatory [*see Evid. Code § 453*; *see also § 531.13*; for forms, *see §§ 531.150, 531.151, 531.153, 531.154*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.31

§ 531.31 Necessity and Manner of Pleading Private Statute

Because private statutes are subject only to permissive judicial notice [*see Evid. Code § 452(a)*], they should be pleaded [*see* Necessity and Manner of Pleading Public Statutes and Ordinances, *above*]. In pleading a private statute, an ordinance of a county or municipal corporation, or a right derived therefrom, it is sufficient to refer to the statute or ordinance by its title and the day of its passage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 459*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1898* (definition of "private statute"); discussion § 531.11; see also *§ 531.150*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.32

§ 531.32 Pleading Right to Recover Based on Statutory Liability

When a party seeks to recover on a purely statutory liability, the complaint must allege facts demonstrating his or her right to recover under the statute. The complaint must plead every fact which is essential to the cause of action under the statute. If the statute contains a limitation in the clause creating and defining the liability, the limitation must be negated in the complaint [*Green v. Grimes-Stassforth S. Co. (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d 52, 55, 102 P.2d 452* ; *see Bach v. McNelis (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 852, 865, 255 Cal. Rptr. 232*]. If the statutory liability is limited by a proviso, however, or by a later section in the same act, the exception does not have to be negated in the complaint [*see People v. Gordon (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 711, 724, 234 P.2d 287*]. For a form of allegation pleading a violation of statute giving rise to liability, see *§ 531.153*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.33

§ 531.33 Pleading Conditions Precedent Under Statute or Ordinance

In pleading the performance of conditions precedent under a statute, an ordinance of a county or municipal corporation, or a right derived therefrom, it is not necessary to state the facts showing performance, but it may be stated generally that the party duly performed all the conditions required by the statute or ordinance on his or her part [*Code Civ. Proc. § 459*; *Blumer v. Kirkman Corporation (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 480, 485, 241 P.2d 17*]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*, an allegation that acts were done "pursuant to," "according to," "in conformance to," or "in compliance with" a specified statute is sufficient to allege the performance of conditions precedent imposed by the statute [*Motor City Sales v. Superior Court (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 342, 347, 107 Cal. Rptr. 280*]. For a form of allegation pleading performance of conditions precedent, see *§ 531.152*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.34

§ 531.34 Statute or Ordinance Creating Duty in Negligence Action

It is not necessary to plead or to refer to a statute or ordinance relied on as creating a duty when the action is predicated on the defendant's negligence and is not an action to enforce a liability or penalty imposed by statute [*McNeill v. A. Teichert & Son, Inc. (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 5, 8-9, 289 P.2d 595* ; *Jackson v. Hardy (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 6, 12, 160 P.2d 161*]. A motion to strike an allegation of a statute or ordinance is properly granted when the cause of action is not for violation of the statute [*see* *Szopieray v. West Berkeley etc. Co. (1924) 194 Cal. 106, 113, 227 P. 720* (ordinance)].

Even though it has not been pleaded, an ordinance is admissible as evidence of negligence [*Szopieray v. West Berkeley etc. Co. (1924) 194 Cal. 106, 113, 227 P. 720* ; *McNeill v. A. Teichert & Son, Inc. (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 5, 8-9, 289 P.2d 595*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.35

§ 531.35 Effect of Repeal on Cause of Action

[1] When Right Accrues Solely From Statute

When a cause of action rests on a statute, the repeal of the statute destroys the right unless the right has been reduced to final judgment or unless the repealing statute contains a saving clause protecting the right in a pending litigation [*Governing Board v. Mann (1977) 18 Cal. 3d 819, 829, 135 Cal. Rptr. 526, 558 P.2d 1*]; *Cross v. Bonded Adjustment Bureau (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 266, 275-276, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801* .

For discussion of retroactivity and vested rights, see *§ 531.71*.

[2] When Right Accrues From Statute Codifying Common Law

The rule that a repeal of the statute destroys the right only applies when the right in question is a statutory right and does not apply to an existing right of action which has accrued to a person under the rules of the common law, or by virtue of a statute codifying the common law. In such a case, it is generally stated that the cause of action is a vested property right which may not be impaired by legislation. In other words, the repeal of such a statute or of such a right should not be construed to affect existing causes of action [*Callet v. Alioto (1930) 210 Cal. 65, 67-68, 290 P. 438* ; *Cross v. Bonded Adjustment Bureau (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 266, 275-276, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801*]. In short, the repeal of a statute affects a cause of action based solely on the statute; it does not affect a claim that exists at common law [*Cross v. Bonded Adjustment Bureau (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 266, 275-276, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Pleading Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.36-531.49

[Reserved]

§§ 531.36[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.50

§ 531.50 Interpretation Is Question of Law

The interpretation and applicability of a statute is a question of law [*Suman v. BMW of North America, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1, 9, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133* ; *Bravo Vending v. City of Rancho Mirage (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 383, 391, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* ; *Cabrera v. Plager (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 606, 611, 241 Cal. Rptr. 731*]. An appellate court is not limited by the interpretation of a statute made by the trial court, or limited to the evidence presented on the question of statutory interpretation in the trial court [*Bravo Vending v. City of Rancho Mirage (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 383, 391-392, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* ; *see Cal-Air Conditioning, Inc. v. Auburn Union School Dist. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 655, 667, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703* (interpretation and application of statutory scheme to undisputed set of facts is subject to de novo review on appeal)]. The rules of statutory construction apply equally in construing statutes enacted through the initiative process [*Day v. City of Fontana (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 268, 272, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457, 19 P.3d 1196*].

The interpretation of a statute is an exercise of the judicial power the California Constitution assigns to the courts. The Legislature has no authority to interpret a statute because that is a judicial task. If the courts have not yet finally and conclusively interpreted a statute and are in the process of doing so, a declaration of a later Legislature as to what an earlier Legislature intended is entitled to consideration. But even then, a legislative declaration of an existing statute's meaning is but a factor for a court to consider and is neither binding nor conclusive in construing the statute. Moreover, once the California Supreme Court has finally and definitively interpreted a statute, the Legislature has the power (subject to constitutional restraints) to overrule the decision by amending the statute, but it has no power to decide that the amendment merely declares existing law [*McClung v. Employment Dev. Dep't (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 467, 475-476, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 428, 99 P.3d 1015* (Legislature lacked power to state that amendment of *Gov. Code § 12940(j)* was "declaratory of existing law," because amendment changed law by overruling definitive and final judicial interpretation of that statute); *see Carter v. California Dept. of Veterans Affairs (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 914, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223, 135 P.3d 637* (because Supreme Court had not yet definitively interpreted *Gov. Code § 12940(j)(1)* with respect to employer liability for sexual harassment of employees by nonemployees, Court gave due consideration to legislative statement that 2003 amendment of statute was declaratory of existing law)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.51

§ 531.51 Legislative Intent to Prevail

The fundamental task of statutory construction is to ascertain legislative intent so as to effectuate the purpose of the law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1859*; *People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 774-775, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731* ; *Walnut Creek Manor v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 245, 268, 284 Cal. Rptr. 718, 814 P. 2d 704* ; *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 238, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871* ; *Pollack v. Department of Motor Vehicles(1985) 38 Cal. 3d 367, 372, 211 Cal. Rptr. 748, 696 P.2d 141* ; *Marina Green Homeowners Assn. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 200, 204, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 364*]. Thus, determining legislative intent is said to be the fundamental, or cardinal, rule of statutory construction [*Tyrone v. Kelley (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 1, 10-11, 106 Cal. Rptr. 761, 507 P.2d 65* ; *Los Angeles Taxpayers Alliance v. Fair Political Practices Com. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 1219, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 472*], and the many rules of statutory construction established in the decisional law are all basically guides for courts to use in determining that intent [*Kinder v. Pacific Public Carriers Co-op, Inc. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 657, 664, 164 Cal. Rptr. 567*].

Whenever possible a construction must be adopted which will give effect to all provisions of a statute [*Parris v. Zolin (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 839, 845, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109*]. Accordingly, a statute must be construed in light of its legislative purpose and design, and in enforcing its command, both the policy expressed in its terms and the object implicit in its history should be recognized [*In re Schaefer (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 588, 597, 172 Cal. Rptr. 335*].

The object that a statute seeks to achieve and the evil that it seeks to prevent are of prime consideration in its interpretation [*Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 860-861 n.12, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623 P.2d 180* ; *Dubins v. Regents of University of California (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 77, 83, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 336* ; *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 669, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564*].

When the Legislature enacts a remedial statute, courts must construe it liberally to promote its purposes and protect persons within its purview. When the meaning of such a statute is in doubt, courts must construe it to suppress the mischief at which it is addressed, to advance or extend the remedy provided, and to bring within the scope of the law every case that comes clearly within its spirit and policy [*Tetra Pak, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1751, 1756, 286 Cal. Rptr. 529*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.52

§ 531.52 Three-Step Analysis for Statutory Interpretation

Statutory interpretation involves a three-step analysis [*Herman v. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 819, 823, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144*]:

- First, a court should examine the actual language of the statute [*see* discussion in *§ 531.53*, together with following discussion of rules for interpreting words of statute].

- If the meaning of the words is not clear, the court must take the second step and refer to extrinsic sources, including the ostensible objects to be achieved, the evils to be remedied, the legislative history, public policy, contemporaneous administrative construction, and the statutory scheme of which the statute is a part [*Mejia v. Reed (2003) 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390, 74 P.3d 166* (if neither statutory language nor legislative history is dispositive, court should consider relevant policy considerations as they bear on question of legislative intent); *Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 519, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)* ; *Day v. City of Fontana (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 268, 272, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457, 19 P.3d 1196* ; *see* discussion in *§ 531.55*]. If the statute is part of a uniform act adopted by the Legislature, the history surrounding the creation and adoption of the uniform act is also relevant [*Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 519, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)]* .

- When the first two steps have failed to reveal clear meaning, the final step is to apply reason, practicality, and common sense to the language at hand.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.53

§ 531.53 Words of Statute as First Consideration

In order to determine legislative intent, courts begin by examining the current language of the statute [*Lamie v. United States Trustee (2004) 540 U.S. 526, 124 S. Ct. 1023, 157 L. Ed. 2d 1024, 1033* (starting point in discerning legislative intent is existing statutory text, not predecessor statutes); *People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 775, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731*], because those words are generally the best indicator of legislative intent [*Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1217, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129, 848 P.2d 244* ; *Hoyme v. Board of Education (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 449, 452, 165 Cal. Rptr. 737]* . If the Legislature has declared its intent, the court must accept that declaration [*Tyrone v. Kelley (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 1, 10-11, 106 Cal. Rptr. 761, 507 P.2d 65]* .

Awkward or ungrammatical language does not make a statute ambiguous, if the intended meaning is nevertheless clear. For example, the disjunctive nature of a list set forth in a statute may be made clear by the context in which the list appears, despite the inadvertent omission of the word "or." In contrast, the meaning might be altered or obscured if a "not" were missing or if an "or" were inadvertently substituted for an "and" [*Lamie v. United States Trustee (2004) 540 U.S. 526, 124 S. Ct. 1023, 157 L. Ed. 2d 1024, 1034]* .

Ambiguity may be established through the existence of conflicting opinions of courts that have interpreted either the relevant words or the same words in similar statutes [*Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 522, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)* (conflicting opinions of other states' courts interpreting uniform law demonstrate that reasonable minds may disagree over meaning of statutory words)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.54

§ 531.54 Interpretation of Unambiguous Statutes

When statutory language is clear and unambiguous, there is no need for construction and a court should not indulge in it [*People v. Jones (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 1142, 1146, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753, 857 P. 2d 1163* ; *DaFonte v. Up-Right, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 593, 601, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 238, 828 P. 2d 140* ; *In re Lance W. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 873, 886, 210 Cal. Rptr. 631, 694 P.2d 744*]. A statutory phrase is clear and unambiguous if the meaning assigned to it is not in conflict with other language in the same act [*Dubins v. Regents of University of California (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 77, 83, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 336*].

The unambiguous language must be given its plain meaning, and rules of statutory construction are applied only if there is ambiguity or conflict in the statute's provisions or if a literal interpretation would lead to absurd consequences [*Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan, & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 38, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931* ; *Marina Green Homeowners Assn. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 200, 204, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 364* ; *Castaneda v. Holcomb (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 939, 942, 170 Cal. Rptr. 875* ; *see Edgington v. County of San Diego (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 39, 46, 173 Cal. Rptr. 225*].

Nevertheless, a claim of ambiguity cannot always be decided from the face of the statute. It may be latent, in which case it requires a provisional examination of extrinsic matters to determine whether the claim is tenable [*City of Sacramento v. Public Employees' Retirement System (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 786, 795, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545*].

When ambiguity does exist, consideration should be given to the consequences that flow from a particular interpretation [*People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 782, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731]* . For further discussion, see *§ 531.55*.

The literal meaning of the words of a statute may be disregarded to avoid absurd results or to give effect to manifest purposes that, in light of the statute's legislative history, appear from its provisions considered as a whole [*People v. Belleci (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 879, 884, 157 Cal. Rptr. 503, 598 P.2d 473* (following plain meaning); *Looney v. Superior Court (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 521, 532, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182*]. One case, for example, involved a conflict between a Vehicle Code provision that, under certain circumstances, authorized immediate suspension of the driver's license of a

person with blood-alcohol content of 0.04 percent or more, and another Vehicle Code provision that required blood-alcohol content of at least 0.08 percent to sustain the suspension at an administrative hearing [*see Veh. Code §§ 13353.2(a)(3), 13557(b)(2)(C)*]. Because the two provisions could not be harmonized, the court of appeal concluded, in light of the manifest purpose of the statutes to protect the public, that a blood-alcohol content of 0.04 percent was sufficient both to warrant the initial suspension and to sustain the suspension at an administrative hearing [*Rehman v. Department of Motor Vehicles (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 581, 584, 587-588, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 510* ("[T]his is one of the rare instances in which we must disregard the literal terms of a statute because they conflict with another statute and would compel an absurd result that the Legislature obviously did not intend.")].

A literal reading of a statute may also be disregarded when one of its provisions is rendered meaningless by the literal reading [*Clavell v. North Coast Business Park (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 328, 331-332, 283 Cal. Rptr. 419* ; *see also* Every Word to Have Meaning, *below*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.55

§ 531.55 Interpretation of Ambiguous Statutes Generally

When a statute is ambiguous, courts typically consider evidence of the Legislature's intent beyond the words of the statute. The court may examine a variety of extrinsic aids, including the statutory scheme of which the provision is a part, the history and background of the statute, the apparent purpose, and any considerations of constitutionality, in an attempt to ascertain the most reasonable interpretation of the measure [*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 763, 776, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 952 P.2d 641*]. If the statute is part of a uniform act adopted by the Legislature, the history surrounding the creation and adoption of the uniform act is also relevant [*Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 519, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)*]. The court will select a construction that comports most closely with the apparent intent of the lawmakers, with a view to promoting rather than defeating the general purpose of the statute, and to avoiding an interpretation that would lead to absurd consequences [*Day v. City of Fontana (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 268, 272, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457, 19 P.3d 1196* ; *see, e.g., Graham County Soil & Water Conservation Dist. v. United States ex rel. Wilson (2005) 545 U.S. 409, 125 S. Ct. 2444, 162 L. Ed. 2d 390, 400-402* (faced with ambiguous federal statute of limitations, Court selected plausible construction that starts time limit running when cause of action accrues, rather than alternative construction under which time limit could expire before accrual of cause of action)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.56

§ 531.56 Ordinary Meaning of Words

Words in a statute should, unless otherwise clearly indicated, be given their usual, ordinary, commonsense meaning [*Crawford v. Metropolitan Gov't (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 846, 172 L. Ed. 2d 650, 656* ; *Walnut Creek Manor v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 245, 268, 284 Cal. Rptr. 718, 814 P. 2d 704* ; *People v. Belleci (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 879, 884, 157 Cal. Rptr. 503, 598 P.2d 473* ; *Hoschler v. Sacramento City Unified Sch. Dist. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 258, 263-264, 266, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 115* (when statute requires that notice be given, but does not specify manner of giving notice, personal service is required); *George M. v. Superior Court (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 755, 759, 247 Cal. Rptr. 330*]. That meaning is to be ascertained and the words interpreted in the sense in which they would have been understood at the time of the statutory enactment [*People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 782, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731* ; *see, e.g., Carcieri v. Salazar (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 1058, 172 L. Ed. 2d 791, 800-802* (in *25 U.S.C. § 479*, which authorizes Secretary of Interior to acquire property for use of Indian tribes "now under Federal jurisdiction," word "now" refers to time of time of statute's enactment, rather than time of acquisition of property)]. In determining the common meaning of statutory words, the court may refer to a standard dictionary [*see, e.g., Crawford v. Metropolitan Gov't (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 846, 172 L. Ed. 2d 650, 656* (relying on dictionary definition of "opposed," which appears in *42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a)* and is left undefined by statute); *Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 911, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191*]. However, when a statute prescribes the meaning to be given to particular terms used by it, that meaning is generally binding on the courts [*Great Lakes Properties, Inc. v. City of El Segundo (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 152, 156, 137 Cal. Rptr. 154, 561 P.2d 244*].

In according words their usual, ordinary, and commonsense meaning, the purpose for which the statute was adopted should be kept in mind [*Hamilton v. State Bd. of Education (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 132, 141, 172 Cal. Rptr. 748*]. When a word of common usage has more than one meaning, the one which will best attain the purposes of the statute should be adopted, even though the ordinary meaning of the word is thereby enlarged or restricted [*Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 860-861 n.12, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623 P.2d 180*]. For example, if a statute uses a general word in conjunction with other words describing specific acts that would ordinarily be within the ambit of the general word, the court may infer that the general word refers to conduct other than those specific acts [*see Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 911, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191* ("acknowledged the child," in *Prob. Code § 6452*, refers to conduct other than contributing to support or care of child, since statute specifically requires such

contribution *plus* acknowledgement before natural parent may inherit from child who was born out of wedlock)].

A potential ambiguity created by the organizational structure of a statute can be clarified by the clear meaning of the words of the statute. For example, in a statutory subparagraph that is divided into clauses, a limiting provision that appears only in one clause may nevertheless be construed to apply to another clause if it purports to apply to "this subparagraph" [*Koons Buick Pontiac GMC, Inc. v. Nigh (2004) 543 U.S. 50, 125 S. Ct. 460, 467-468, 160 L. Ed. 2d 389* (construing *15 U.S.C. § 1640(a)(2)(A)(i), (ii)* in light of ordinary meaning of "section," "subsection," "paragraph," "subparagraph," and "clause" as used in congressional legislative drafting manuals)].

A party contending that a provision of an act should not be applied according to the natural or customary purport of its language must show either that some other section of the act expands or restricts its meaning, that the provision itself is repugnant to the general purview of the act, or that the act, construed with other acts on the same subject matter or with the legislative history of the subject matter, imports a different meaning [*Great Lakes Properties, Inc. v. City of El Segundo (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 152, 155-156, 137 Cal. Rptr. 154, 561 P.2d 244*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.57

§ 531.57 Judicial Alteration of Statute Impermissible

In construing a statute, the court's function is simply to ascertain and declare what is in terms or in substance contained in the statute, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1858*]. The courts may not alter the words of a statute or insert qualifying provisions to accomplish a purpose or assumed intention that does not appear either on the statute's face, or from its language, or from its legislative history [*In re Hoddinott (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 992, 1002, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* ; *People v. Gaines (1980) 112 Cal. App. 3d 508, 517* ; *City of Sacramento v. Public Employees' Retirement System (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 786, 793, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545* (meaning of statute is to be sought in language used by Legislature and words may not be inserted in statute under guise of interpretation); *Cemetery Board v. Telophase Society of America (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 847, 858, 151 Cal. Rptr. 248* ; *see also People v. Tilbury (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 56, 70, 284 Cal. Rptr. 288, 813 P.2d 1318* (when Legislature enacts statute in area fraught with medical and scientific uncertainty, courts must be careful not to rewrite statute); *Planned Parenthood Affiliates v. Swoap (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 1187, 1194-1195, 219 Cal. Rptr. 664* (court may not impeach legislation by extrinsic evidence that legislation does not genuinely reflect Legislature's will)].

If the Legislature's intent is clearly ascertainable, however, words inadvertently omitted from a statute may be supplied in the process of construction in order to effectuate the legislative intent [*People v. Hernandez (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 888, 900, 168 Cal. Rptr. 898* (obvious error in reference to subdivisions of another statute corrected by court)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.58

§ 531.58 Title or Chapter Heading Not Controlling

A title or chapter heading merely states the general subject of a legislative act. Therefore, provisions found within the body of an act are not restricted in operation by the statement in the heading [*People v. Garfield (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 192, 200, 219 Cal. Rptr. 196, 707 P.2d 258* ; *People v. Tawney (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 599, 613, 336 P.2d 659]* . Although a title or chapter heading by itself is not sufficient evidence in support of a restrictive reading of provisions found within the body of an act, the heading is nevertheless a useful guide in determining the intended scope of legislation [*see People v. Garfield (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 192, 199-200, 219 Cal. Rptr. 196, 707 P.2d 258* ; *see also § 531.63[1]*]. Therefore, it appears that titles, chapters, and section headings may be persuasive when coupled with other evidence in support of a particular statutory construction [*see People v. Silverbrand (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1621, 1626, 270 Cal. Rptr. 261* (statutory reference to "criminal proceeding" includes prearrest warrant hearing because statute governing warrant hearing appears under heading of criminal "proceedings," criminal magistrate presides over hearing, and hearing comes within ordinary meaning of word "proceeding")].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.59

§ 531.59 Every Word to Have Meaning

In attempting to ascertain legislative intent, effect should be given, whenever possible, to the statute as a whole and to its every word and clause; an interpretation that renders particular terms of a statute surplusage is ordinarily rejected [*City of San Jose v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 47, 55, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 73, 850 P.2d 621* ; *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1387, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323* ; *Gay Law Students Assn. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 458, 478, 156 Cal. Rptr. 14, 595 P.2d 592* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1858*; *Adams v. Murakami (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 105, 123, 284 Cal. Rptr. 318, 813 P. 2d 1348* (court is not to presume that Legislature engages in idle acts)]. For example, the statute of limitations applicable to claims of domestic violence provides a three-year limitations period measured from the date of the "last act" of domestic violence by the defendant against the plaintiff [*Code Civ. Proc. § 340.15(a)(1)*]. A court of appeal has held that the words "last act" would be rendered superfluous unless the statute is interpreted as adopting the continuing tort theory, allowing domestic violence victims to recover damages for all acts of domestic violence occurring during the marriage, provided the victim proves a continuing course of abusive conduct and files suit within three years of the "last act" of domestic violence [*Pugliese v. Superior Court (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1444, 1451, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 681]* .

In general, a word that has a particular meaning in one part of a law should be given the same meaning in other parts of the same law. However, this axiom of statutory construction does not control when the word is qualified by different modifiers. For example, *Public Resources Code Section 5540* restricts the ability of a regional-park or open-space district to convey land that has been "actually dedicated" for park or open space purposes, and that statute specifies that dedication may be accomplished by a resolution of the district's board of directors [*Pub. Res. Code § 5540*]. *Public Resources Code Section 5565*, however, simply states that land is "dedicated" when acquired by a regional park or open space district [*Pub. Res. Code § 5565*]. Construing these provisions together, the California Supreme Court held that "actually dedicated" and "dedicated" do not mean the same thing. Treating the two usages of "dedicated" as meaning the same thing would render the qualifying word "actually" surplusage, thus violating the rule of statutory construction that courts should, if possible, accord meaning to every word and phrase in a statute so as to better effectuate the Legislature's intent [*Ste. Marie v. Riverside County Reg'l Park & Open-Space Dist. (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 282, 289-290, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 369, 206 P.3d 739* (also, if under *Pub. Res. Code § 5565* land is deemed dedicated at moment of acquisition, *Pub. Res. Code §5540*'s provision for dedication by resolution of district board would be unnecessary and

superfluous)].

Although every word in a statute must be given effect, it is important to distinguish between a prefatory statement of purpose and its operative language; the former usually does not limit or expand the scope of the operative language, although it may help to clarify the meaning of the operative language [*District of Columbia v. Heller (2008) -- U.S. --, 128 S. Ct. 2783, 171 L. Ed. 2d 637, 649* & nn.3, 4 (interpreting *U.S. Const., amend. II*)]. In any event, rules directing courts to avoid interpreting legislative enactments as surplusage are mere guides and will not be used to defeat legislative intent [*Lamie v. United States Trustee (2004) 540 U.S. 526, 124 S. Ct. 1023, 157 L. Ed. 2d 1024, 1035* (preference for avoiding surplusage constructions is not absolute); *People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 782, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.60

§ 531.60 Words Qualified by Context

The meaning of the words of a statute can only be determined with reference to the context in which the words are used; that is, with reference to such purpose as may be discerned from examining the entire enactment of which the words are part [*Dubins v. Regents of University of California (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 77, 83, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 336*]. For example, if a statute uses a general word in conjunction with other words describing specific acts that would ordinarily be within the ambit of the general word, the court may infer that the general word refers to conduct other than those specific acts [*see* *Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 911, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191* ("acknowledged the child," in *Prob. Code § 6452*, refers to conduct other than contributing to support or care of child, since statute specifically requires such contribution *plus* acknowledgement before natural parent may inherit from child who was born out of wedlock)].

The doctrine of *ejusdem generis* provides that when a general term or category follows or precedes an enumeration of particular classes of persons or things, the general term or category will be construed as applicable only to persons or things that are similar to those that are specifically enumerated [*International Fed'n of Prof'l & Technical Eng'rs, Local 21 v. Superior Court (2007) 42 Cal. 4th 319, 342, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 693, 165 P.3d 488]* . The rationale for the rule is that if the general words were intended to be used in their unrestricted sense, the particular things would not have been mentioned as they would in that case be surplusage [*Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. San Diego County Dist. Council of Carpenters (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 317, 331 n.10, 158 Cal. Rptr. 370, 599 P.2d 676*]. *Ejusdem generis* is inapplicable, however, when there is no general or collective term that precedes or follows a list of items. Thus, in a simple disjunctive phrase that combines specific and general items, *ejusdem generis* provides no basis for assuming that the specificity of some listed items is intended to limit the generality of the other listed items [*see* *Ali v. Federal Bureau of Prisons (2008) 552 U.S. 214, 128 S. Ct. 831, 169 L. Ed. 2d 680, 689-691* (construing *28 U.S.C.S. § 2680(c)*)].

Similarly, the rule *noscitur a socis* provides that the meaning of a word may be enlarged or restrained by reference to the object of the whole clause in which it is used [*People v. Stout (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 172, 177, 95 Cal. Rptr. 593* ; *but see* *Ali v. Federal Bureau of Prisons (2008)552U.S.214, 128 S. Ct. 831, 169 L. Ed. 2d 680, 691* (*noscitur a sociis* not applicable to limit ordinary expansive meaning of "any other law enforcement officer" in *28 U.S.C.S. § 2680(c)*: "although customs and excise are mentioned twice in § 2680(c), nothing in the overall statutory context suggests that

customs and excise officers were the exclusive focus of the provision")].

Additionally, words grouped in a list should be given related meaning [*Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan, & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 38, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931* (rejecting argument that, in statute regarding married person's power to lease for more than one year, sell, convey, or encumber community property, encumbrances should be treated differently than leases, sales, and conveyances)], and modifying phrases must be applied to the words immediately preceding them and are not to be construed as extending to more remote phrases [*City of Victorville v. County of San Bernardino (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1312, 1322, 285 Cal. Rptr. 206* ; *but see Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 521, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)* (application of "last antecedent" doctrine--under which qualifying words are to be applied to immediately preceding words but not to more remote ones--supported finding that language of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25120(a)* was ambiguous)]. However, the latter principle--the "last antecedent" rule--may be inapplicable, depending on the context. For example, when several words are followed by a clause that applies as much to the first and other words as to the last, or when the sense of the entire act requires that a qualifying word or phrase apply to several preceding words, the last antecedent rule does not apply [*Renee J. v. Superior Court (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 735, 743, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 28 P.3d 876 , superseded by statute as stated in In re Angelique C., 113 Cal. App. 4th 509* ("[p]rinciples of statutory construction are not rules of independent force, but merely tools to assist courts in discerning legislative intent")].

When a sentence in a statute contains a transitive verb that has an object, an adverb that modifies the verb is commonly understood to apply to the entire action conveyed by the complete predicate, including the object of the verb. Thus, under a statute that penalizes a person who "knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person" [*see 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1)*], punishment may be imposed only if the government proves not only that the defendant knew that he or she was transferring, possessing, or using something, but also that the defendant knew the something was another person's means of identification [*Flores-Figueroa v. United States (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 1886, 1890-1894, 173 L. Ed. 2d 853, 857-862]* .

Some words are particularly subject to varying interpretations and depend on context for their meaning in a given statutory provision. In one case, for example, a federal statutory provision barred judicial review of decisions of the Attorney General "the authority for which is specified under this subchapter to be in the discretion of the Attorney General" [*see 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii)*]. The parties in the case disagreed over whether the statutory word "under" referred only to the Attorney General's discretionary authority specified "in" the statute, or whether it encompassed matters made discretionary under regulations adopted "pursuant to" the statute. Looking to the context surrounding the word "under," the United States Supreme Court concluded that the word referred only to matters specified in the statute. In so holding, the Court remarked that "[t]he word 'under' is chameleon; it 'has many dictionary definitions and must draw its meaning from its context'" [*Kucana v. Holder (2010) -- U.S. --, 130 S. Ct. 827, 175 L. Ed. 2d 694, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 764, at *22* (quoting *Ardestani v. INS (1991) 502 U.S. 129, 135, 112 S. Ct. 515, 116 L. Ed. 2d 496*)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.61

§ 531.61 Legislative Specification of One Thing Excludes Any Other

Under the rule of *expressio unius est exclusio alterius,* when exceptions to a general rule are specified by statute, other exceptions are not to be implied or presumed [*In re Lance W. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 873, 888, 210 Cal. Rptr. 631, 694 P.2d 744* ; *Wildlife Alive v. Chickering (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 190, 195, 132 Cal. Rptr. 377, 553 P.2d 537* ; *Bearden v. U.S. Borax, Inc. (2006) 179 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2993, 138 Cal. App. 4th 429, 436-437, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 482* (Industrial Wage Commission lacked authority to adopt regulation creating new exemption to employers' duty to provide meal periods in addition to exemptions provided by statute)]. However, this rule gives way when it would operate contrary to the legislative intent to which it is subordinate or when its application would nullify the essence of the statute [*County of Alameda v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 374, 381, 182 Cal. Rptr. 450*].

A similar rule of construction is *inclusio unius est exclusio alterius,* inclusion of the one is the exclusion of another [*see, e.g.,* *Murillo v. Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 985, 991, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682, 953 P.2d 858* (court rejected buyer's contention regarding *Civ. Code § 1794(d)*)]. This rule of statutory construction is a rule of reasonable inference and may not control over the plain meaning of the statutory language [*Murillo v. Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 985, 991, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682, 953 P.2d 858*].

These rules of construction are inapplicable in construing two statutory provisions that govern discrete subject areas. For example, if a list of exemptions from a provision invalidating fraudulent transfers omits transfers made under marital settlement agreements, while a list of exceptions from a provision validating marital settlement agreements omits fraudulent transfers, the Legislature's failure to address the rare instance in which these provisions overlap does not suggest any legislative intent as to which should prevail [*Mejia v. Reed (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 657, 666-667, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390, 74 P.3d 166* ; *see Civ. Code § 3439 et seq.* ; *Fam. Code § 916*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.62

§ 531.62 Omission of Provision Included in Related Statute

When a statute contains a particular provision, the omission of that provision from a similar statute on the same or a related subject reveals a different intent [*Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1109* (that Legislature chose to eliminate "penalty" language in *Lab. Code § 226.7(c)*, while retaining it in other statutes enacted in same measure, indicates that "additional hour of pay," required by *Lab. Code § 226.7(b)* when employer fails to provide required meal period or rest period, constitutes wage rather than penalty); *Committee of Seven Thousand v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 491, 507, 247 Cal. Rptr. 362, 754 P. 2d 708* ; *City of Dublin v. County of Alameda (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 264, 280, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845* ; *see Suman v. BMW of North America, Inc. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10-11, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133* (when Legislature has carefully employed term in one place and excluded in another, it should not be implied where it is excluded); *but see Webster v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 29, 35-36, 242 Cal. Rptr. 685* (rule held inapplicable in light of other canons of statutory construction)]. Similarly, when one part of a statute contains a term or provision, the omission of that term or provision from another part of the same statute indicates that the Legislature intended to convey a different meaning [*Cornette v. Department of Transp. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 63, 73, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 26 P.3d 332*].

The implications raised by disparate provisions in related statutes are not as strong if the two statutes were not considered or enacted together. In one case, for example, the United States Supreme Court held that the Age Discrimination in Employment Act prohibits retaliation against a federal employee who files an age-discrimination complaint. The Court interpreted the Act's prohibition of "discrimination based on age" in federal employment [*see 29 U.S.C. § 633a(a)*] as encompassing retaliation, even though the Act's federal-sector provision does not expressly mention retaliation. In so holding, the Court rejected an argument that the express prohibition of retaliation in the Act's private-sector provision [*see 29 U.S.C. § 623(d)*] implies that Congress did not intend to prohibit retaliation in the federal sector. Noting that the federal-sector provision was enacted seven years after the private-sector provision, was not modeled after the private-sector provision, and is couched in very different terms [*Gomez-Perez v. Potter (2008) 553 U.S. 474, 128 S. Ct. 1931, 1940, 170 L. Ed. 2d 887, 899*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.63

§ 531.63 Interpretation in Context of Related Statutes

[1] In General

A statute should be construed in the context of the entire statutory system of which it is a part in order to achieve harmony among the parts [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 298, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P. 2d 1328* (construing related statutes to avoid implied repeal of conflicting provisions); *Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan, & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 43, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931* (dicta); *Ohio Farmers Ins. Co. v. Quin (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1338, 1348, 244 Cal. Rptr. 359* ; *see also CBOCS W., Inc. v. Humphries (2008) 553 U.S. 442, 128 S. Ct. 1951, 1956, 170 L. Ed. 2d 864, 870-871* (United States Supreme Court construes *42 U.S.C. § 1981*, which prohibits racial discrimination in contracts, and *42 U.S.C. § 1982*, which prohibits racial discrimination in property ownership, alike because of statutes' common language, origin, and purposes); *Sonoma County Bd. of Education v. Public Employment Relations Bd. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 689, 163 Cal. Rptr. 464* (statutes *in pari materia* (on same subject) may be construed together)].

To construe a specific provision with reference to the entire statutory system of which it is part, and to respect the policy sought to be implemented, the titles of acts, headnotes, and chapter and section headings may properly be considered in determining legislative intent [*Bowland v. Municipal Court (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 479, 489, 134 Cal. Rptr. 630, 556 P.2d 1081* ; *American Federation of Teachers v. Board of Education (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 829, 836, 166 Cal. Rptr. 89*]. Some codes, however, may provide that headings of divisions, chapters, articles, and sections are not to be considered to affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions in the code [*see, e.g., Evid. Code § 5*; *Prob. Code § 4*; *see also* Title or Chapter Heading Not Controlling, *above*].

It should be noted that various codes and acts may provide definitions and rules of construction that govern or affect the interpretation of statutory provisions within that code or act [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 2 et seq.* (governing Civil Code); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 23000 et seq.* (*Alcoholic Beverage Control Act); River Trails Ranch Co. v. Superior Court (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 562, 565-566, 168 Cal. Rptr. 747* (construing Civil Code provisions); *see also Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 298, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P. 2d 1328* (rule of liberal construction set forth in *Lab. Code § 3202* should not be used to create inconsistency among statutes to be interpreted in context of

overall statutory system)].

Even if two potentially conflicting statutes are contained in different legislative acts, the courts will strive to effectuate the purpose of each by harmonizing them, if possible, in a way that allows both to be given effect [*Chavez v. City of Los Angeles (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 970, 986, -- Cal. Rptr. 3d --, 224 P.3d 41]* . In one case, for example, the California Supreme Court dealt with a potential conflict between *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033(a)* and *Gov. Code § 12965(b)*. Section 1033(a) authorizes a trial court to deny costs to a prevailing plaintiff in an unlimited civil case if the judgment could have been recovered in a limited civil case. Section 12965(b), which is part of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), gives the trial court discretion to award attorney's fees and costs to a prevailing plaintiff in a FEHA action. Giving effect to both provisions, the Court held that section 1033(a) gives a trial court discretion to deny attorney's fees to a plaintiff who prevails on a FEHA claim but recovers an amount that could have been recovered in a limited civil case. In exercising that discretion, however, the trial court must give due consideration to the policies and objectives of the FEHA in general and of its fee-shifting provision in particular [*Chavez v. City of Los Angeles (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 970, 986989, -- Cal. Rptr. 3d --, 224 P.3d 41]* .

[2] Specific Statute to Prevail Over General

A specific provision relating to a particular subject will govern a general provision, even though the general provision standing alone would be broad enough to include the subject to which the specific provision relates [*Civ. Code § 3534*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1859*; *San Francisco Taxpayers Assn. v. Board of Supervisors (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 571, 577-578, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 245, 828 P. 2d 147* ; *Cavalier Acres, Inc. v. San Simeon Acres Community Services Dist. (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 798, 802, 199 Cal. Rptr. 4* ; *see, e.g., People v. DeLaCruz (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 955, 962, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202* (construing term "notwithstanding other provisions of law")]. The specific provision governs whether it was passed before or after the general statute [*Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1539, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823* ; *People v. Garcia (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 85, 109, 171 Cal. Rptr. 169* (passed after); *Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. v. California Milk Producers Advisory Bd. (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 433, 446, 147 Cal. Rptr. 265* (passed before)].

Statutes relating to the same subject matter should be harmonized if possible, and the Legislature is not presumed to overthrow long established principles of law unless it clearly makes its intent appear by express declaration or necessary implication. Thus, the rule that a later specific statute governs an earlier general statute on the same subject matter applies only if the statutes are irreconcilable and the necessary implication of intent to overthrow the established principle of law exists [*Palmer v. Agee (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 377, 383, 150 Cal. Rptr. 841*]. There is a strong presumption against the implied repeal of an earlier statute, and the presumption may be overcome only if the two acts are irreconcilable, clearly repugnant, and so inconsistent that the two cannot have concurrent operation [*Merrill v. Navegar, Inc. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 465, 487, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370, 28 P.3d 116* ; *Western Oil & Gas Assn. v. Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control Dist. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 408, 419-420, 261 Cal. Rptr. 384, 777 P.2d 157* ; *Sanford v. Garamendi (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1109, 1122, 284 Cal. Rptr. 897*]. When a general statute standing alone would include the same matter as a special act, and therefore conflict with it, the special act will be considered as an exception to the general statute, whether it was passed before or after that general enactment [*People v. DeLaCruz (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 955, 962, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202*].

The principle that a specific provision takes precedence over a general provision is inapplicable if neither provision under consideration is significantly more specific than the other. For example, a provision governing the validity of marital settlement agreements [*see Fam. Code § 916*] might seem more specific than a provision that generally invalidates fraudulent transfers [*see Civ. Code § 3439 et seq.* (Uniform Fraudulent Transfers Act)], because the latter applies to all transactions, not just those made as part of marital settlements. On the other hand, the fraudulent-transfer provision might seem more specific, given that it deals only with fraudulent transfers, while the marital-settlement provision regulates all transfers made in marital settlement agreements. In such a case, an apparent conflict between the provisions cannot be resolved by application of the principle that a specific provision takes precedence over a general

provision [*Mejia v. Reed (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 657, 666, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390, 74 P.3d 166*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.64

§ 531.64 Presumption of Constitutionality

A presumption exists that, in enacting a statute, the Legislature did not intend to violate the Constitution, but instead intended to enact a valid statute within the scope of its constitutional powers. Therefore, a statute must be interpreted in a manner consistent with the statute's language and purpose that eliminates doubts regarding the statute's constitutionality [*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 763, 788, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 952 P.2d 641* ; *see* *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1387, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323* ; *Rowe v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1711, 1722, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 625*]. A court may not engage in wholesale rewriting of statute, however, to preserve its constitutionality [*Bayscene Resident Negotiators v. Bayscene Mobilehome Park (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 119, 134, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626* ; *see also* Judicial Alteration of Statute Impermissible, *above*].

If a statute is reasonably susceptible of two or more interpretations, of which at least one raises constitutional questions, it should be construed in a manner that avoids any doubt about its validity [*Association for Retarded Citizens v. Department of Developmental Services (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 384, 394, 211 Cal. Rptr. 758, 696 P.2d 150*].

So long as a statute does not threaten to infringe on the exercise of constitutional rights, ambiguities in the statute, even if numerous, do not justify the invalidation of a statute on its face [*People v. Scott (1993) 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.65

§ 531.65 Legislative History

[1] In General

Courts consider legislative history as an extrinsic aid to help elucidate legislative intent [*City of San Jose v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 47, 54, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 73, 850 P.2d 621* ; *see, e.g.,* *Jevne v. Superior Court (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 935, 948, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, 111 P.3d 954* (considering report by Assembly Committee on Judiciary and Senate floor analysis in determining legislative intent); *see also* *District of Columbia v. Heller (2008) -- U.S. --, 128 S. Ct. 2783, 171 L. Ed. 2d 637, 665* ("legislative history" refers to pre-enactment statements of those who drafted or voted for law; it is persuasive not because it reflects general understanding of legislation, but because legislators who read or heard those statements presumably voted with that understanding)]. However, in construing the terms of a statute, courts resort to its legislative history only if its terms are ambiguous. An ambiguity arises only if there is more than one construction in issue that is semantically permissible, that is, more than one usage that makes sense of the statutory language given the context and applicable rules of usage [*City of Sacramento v. Public Employees' Retirement System (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 786, 795, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545*]. Statements in a report of a legislative committee concerning the object and purposes of a proposed amendment should be followed [*Hassan v. Mercy Am. River Hosp. (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 709, 717, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 623, 74 P.3d 726* ; *People v. Swinney (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 332, 342, 120 Cal. Rptr. 148* , overruled on other grounds, *People v. Zamora (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 538, 565, 134 Cal. Rptr. 784, 557 P.2d 75* ; *People v. Cherry (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1131, 1135-1136, 257 Cal. Rptr. 684*]. It is reasonable to presume that the Legislature acted with the intent and meaning expressed in the Legislative Counsel's digest [*San Francisco Police Officers' Assn. v. Superior Court (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 183, 189, 248 Cal. Rptr. 297*]. A legislative analyst's report is also admissible as "cognizable legislative history" [*Aguimatang v. California State Lottery (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 769, 788-789, 286 Cal. Rptr. 57*]. However, while the Digest may be helpful in interpreting an ambiguous statute, it is not the law. At most, the legislative counsel's interpretation of a statute is to be accorded great weight, but even that principle has no application when the comments directly conflict with the statutes; in that case the comments are to be disregarded [*In re Barry W. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 358, 367, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*].

Material in the legislative record that does not state the intent of the legislature has no persuasive value in interpreting an ambiguous statute. For example, a letter asserting a private party's interpretation of proposed legislation has no value

in interpreting the legislation if the legislative history shows no support for that interpretation from within the Legislature itself [*Hassan v. Mercy Am. River Hosp. (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 709, 722-723, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 623, 74 P.3d 726*].

[2] Statements of Individual Legislators

Statements of individual legislators showing their motives or understandings are not admissible in construing a statute, even though the legislator whose motives are profferred authored the bill in controversy, because there is no guarantee that the other supporters of the proposal shared the author's view of its compass [*Williams v. Garcetti (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 561, 569, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341, 853 P.2d 507*]. However, an individual legislator's letter may be considered if the circumstances indicate that the letter reflects the Legislature's collective intent [*City of Long Beach v. Department of Indus. Relations (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 942, 952-953, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 518, 102 P.3d 904* (prior to bill's enactment, legislator's letter was presented to full Senate, which carried legislator's motion to print it in Senate Daily Journal)]. For example, a legislator's statement may be considered when it is a reiteration of legislative discussion and events leading up to adoption of proposed amendments rather than a mere expression of personal opinion, or when the statement gives some indication of arguments made to the Legislature and was printed on motion of the Legislature as a "letter of legislative intent" [*Bronco Wine Co. v. Jolly (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 943, 977 n.46, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 180, 95 P.3d 422* (legislative intent was evidenced by statements of author of bill, particularly because statements reiterated what was contained in committee reports and did not amount to mere expressions of personal opinion); *see Sierra Club v. California Coastal Comm'n (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 839, 853 n.8, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316, 111 P.3d 294* (considering letter from author of legislation, because letter purported to reiterate statements made to Legislature during consideration of bill and letter was printed with Senate's consent pursuant to motion of author of legislation); *California Teachers Assn. v. San Diego Community College Dist. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 692, 699-701, 170 Cal. Rptr. 817, 621 P.2d 856* ; *Haworth v. Lira (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1368-1369, 284 Cal. Rptr. 62* (letter from legislator's staff member expressing staff member's opinion of legislative intent not admissible because it did not allude to arguments presented in securing passage of legislation or reiterate discussion and events taking place in Legislature)]. In addition, courts may take judicial notice of various letters and legislative staff analyses related to the particular legislation; however, in determining legislative intent, courts will not rely on evidence of the individual views of proponents of the legislation [*People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 780, fn. 9, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731*].

[3] Rejection of Specific Provision

When the Legislature rejects a specific provision contained in an act as originally introduced, or rejects an amendment to a bill, the rejection is most persuasive to the conclusion that the act should not be construed to include the omitted provision [*Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1107, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 880, 155 P.3d 284* ("The rejection of a specific provision contained in an act as originally introduced is 'most persuasive' that the act should not be interpreted to include what was left out.") (quoting *Wilson v. City of Laguna Beach (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 543, 555, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 848*); *California Coastal Com. v. Quanta Investment Corp. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 579, 601-602, 170 Cal. Rptr. 263* ; *Madrid v. Justice Court (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 125 Cal. Rptr. 348*].

If, when it enacted a given statutory provision, the Legislature was advised concerning a potential effect of the provision and chose not to address the subject with specific legislation, the absence of legislative action does not serve as a basis for drawing any conclusions as to what the Legislature intended regarding that subject [*Mejia v. Reed (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 657, 667-668, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390, 74 P.3d 166*].

[4] Reports of Drafting Commissions

Reports of commissions which have proposed statutes that are subsequently adopted are entitled to substantial weight in construing the statutes, particularly when the statute proposed by the commission is adopted by the Legislature without any change and the commission's comment is brief [*People v. Garfield (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 192, 199, 219 Cal. Rptr.*

196, 707 P.2d 258 (Law Revision Commission) ; *Owens v. Superior Court (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 238, 246, 168 Cal. Rptr. 466, 617 P.2d 1098 (Judicial Council)* ; *Brian W. v. Superior Court (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 618, 623, 143 Cal. Rptr. 717, 574 P.2d 788* (special study commission created by governor)]. In that type of situation, there is ordinarily strong reason to believe that the legislators' votes were based in large measure on the explanation of the commission in proposing the bill, lending weight to the commission report [*Brigante v. Huang (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1569, 1581, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 354* (Report of Discovery Commission)]. On the other hand, if the commission's comment on a given statutory provision is just one item in a lengthy report, the inference is less strong that the Legislature approved that comment [*Conservatorship of Wendland (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 519, 542, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 28 P.3d 151* ("one may legitimately question whether the Legislature can fairly be assumed to have read and endorsed every statement in the commission's 280-page report on the Health Care Decisions Law," 1999 Stats., ch. 658)].

[5] Election Brochure Arguments

Election brochure arguments may be used as an aid in construing legislative measures and constitutional amendments adopted pursuant to a vote of the people [*Day v. City of Fontana (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 268, 274-282, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457, 19 P.3d 1196* (reviewing ballot pamphlet materials, including ballot arguments, to support court's construction of statute enacted through initiative process); *Legislature v. Eu (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 492, 504-505, 286 Cal. Rptr. 283, 816 P.2d 1309* (in reviewing constitutionality of proposition, Supreme Court considered arguments in official ballot pamphlet both for and against proposition); *White v. Davis (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 757, 775 n.11, 120 Cal. Rptr. 94, 533 P.2d 222*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.66

§ 531.66 Subsequent Enactments

[1] Reenactment or Modification After Judicial Construction

When determining the Legislature's intent in amending a statute that has been the subject of judicial construction, courts must proceed in light of the decisional background against which the Legislature acted [*People v. Mobil Oil Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 261, 270, 192 Cal. Rptr. 155*]. A statutory amendment may explicitly state the Legislature's intent to overrule a specific judicial decision construing the statute [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 1714(b)*]. But even in the absence of the specific rejection of a judicial decision, the circumstances may indicate that the amendment was intended to reject the judicial construction of the statute [*see Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* (repeal and reenactment of statute with new language showed that Legislature was aware of, and intended to reject, judicial decisions construing statute)].

When a statute has been construed by the courts and is reenacted in the same or substantially the same terms, the Legislature is presumed to be familiar with that construction and to have adopted it as part of the law [*People v. Atkins (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 76, 90-91, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738, 18 P.3d 660* ; *Wilkoff v. Superior Court (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 345, 353, 211 Cal. Rptr. 742, 696 P.2d 134* ; *In re Marriage of Skelley (1976) 134 Cal. Rptr. 197, 556 P.2d 297* ; *see also People v. Williams (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1643, 1647, 284 Cal. Rptr. 241* (failure to change statute in a particular respect when subject is before Legislature, and changes are made in other respects, indicates intention to leave law unchanged in that respect)]. However, this presumption is merely one factor in the total effort to give fair meaning to statutory language [*I. J. Weinrot & Son, Inc. v. Jackson (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 327, 336, 220 Cal. Rptr. 103, 708 P.2d 682*]. For example, a legislative enactment subsequent to a judicial interpretation does not incorporate the judicial decision into the meaning of the statute when it is clear that the legislative enactment had nothing to do with the topic of the judicial decision [*I. J. Weinrot & Son, Inc. v. Jackson (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 327, 336, 220 Cal. Rptr. 103, 708 P.2d 682*].

When the Legislature modifies a statute without addressing a provision that had been interpreted by case law, the modification does not necessarily indicate acquiescence with the prior law. Something more than mere silence is required before acquiescence is elevated into a species of implied legislation [*Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins.*

Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 300-301, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58 (overruling previous Supreme Court interpretation of standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*)]. Legislative silence after a court has construed a statute gives rise, at most, to an arguable inference of acquiescence or passive approval. Thus, when a statute that is part of an act has been construed by the courts, and the Legislature subsequently adds other statutes to that act, but takes no action on the previously construed statute, the Legislature is not presumed to have been aware of and to have acquiesced in the judicial construction. Again, the Legislature's silence does not amount to implied legislation, because the Legislature's failure to act may indicate many things other than approval of a judicial construction of a statute [*Cianci v. Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 923, 924, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375*]. Thus, if the court determines that its original interpretation was erroneous, it may overrule that interpretation even though the Legislature has amended other aspects of the law while leaving the construed language unchanged [*Cianci v. Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 923 n.7, 924, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375* (also holding that correction is not precluded by stare decisis)].

The Legislature's failure to abrogate a decision is not a cause for finding a presumption of legislative approval of the decision when the decision is a single decision on a question of first impression, and not a consistent and long-standing judicial interpretation of the statutory language [*Snyder v. Michael's Stores, Inc. (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 991, 1002, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476, 945 P.2d 781*].

Because the Legislature is far more likely to revise the "bottom line" results of decisions rather than to rewrite broad judicial language as an abstract exercise, the presumption of legislative acquiescence in prior judicial decisions extends only to the decisions' holdings, not to broad language unrelated to the specific factual situations presented by the cases [*Harris v. Capital Growth Investors XIV (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1142, 1156-1157*].

[2] Use of Previously Construed Language

When legislation has been judicially construed and a subsequent statute on the same or an analogous subject is framed in identical language, unless a contrary intent appears, it will ordinarily be presumed that the Legislature intended the language used in the later enactment to be accorded the same meaning [*People v. Wells (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 979, 986, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699* ; *In re D. (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 210, 216, 168 Cal. Rptr. 455, 617 P.2d 1087* ; *Kaplan's Fruit & Produce Co. v. Superior Court (1979) 26 Cal. 3d 60, 73, 160 Cal. Rptr. 745, 603 P.2d 1341* ; *see also Orange County Employees Assn., Inc. v. County of Orange (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 575, 581-582, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 695* (Legislature presumably aware of Attorney General's opinions when using language identical to that previously interpreted in such opinions)]. Similarly, the court may look to prior construction of a general word [*see Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan, & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 38, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931* ("[f]rom the earliest days of statehood we have interpreted 'any' to be broad, general and all embracing")].

[3] Incorporation of Statute That Is Subsequently Amended

When a statute adopts by specific reference the provisions of another statute, regulation, or ordinance, those provisions are incorporated in the form in which they exist at the time of the reference, not as subsequently amended [*Palermo v. Stockton Theatres, Inc. (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 53, 58-59, 195 P.2d 1*]. However, if the reference is general instead of specific, such as a reference to a system or body of laws or to a general law relating to a particular subject, the referring statute takes the law or laws referred to not only in their contemporary form, but also as they may be changed from time to time or even as they may be repealed [*People v. Cooper (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 38, 44, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 219, 37 P.3d 403*].

[4] Material Change in Language

An intent to change the law or the meaning of a statute will be inferred or presumed from a material change in statutory language, as when the Legislature makes such an amendment subsequent to judicial decisions interpreting the statute in its former wording [*People v. Hickey (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 426, 439, 167 Cal. Rptr. 256* ; *Van Nuis v. Los*

Angeles Soap Co. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 222, 228, 111 Cal. Rptr. 398 ; *see Dubins v. Regents of University of California (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 77, 85, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 336* (any material change in language of original act is presumed to indicate change in legal rights)]. However, a mere change in wording, incident to a revision of the Constitution or a statute, does not result in a change of meaning unless the intent to make such a change clearly appears [*Mosk v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 474, 493, 159 Cal. Rptr. 494, 601 P.2d 1030* ; *DeCastro West Chodorow & Burns, Inc. v. Superior Court (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 410, 418, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792*]. Similarly, it is highly unlikely that the Legislature intended to codify a previous judicial decision if the amendment merely makes minor changes in wording unrelated to the substance of that decision [*Lambert v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1072, 1080, 282 Cal. Rptr. 445, 811 P.2d 737*].

[5] Statute Patterned on Federal Statute

It is presumed that the Legislature has the interpretation of a federal statute by the federal courts in mind when it enacts a state statute patterned on the federal statute. In addition, when the federal interpretation is rendered after the state statute was enacted, it may be persuasive and is entitled to great weight even though it is not binding [*Kahn v. Kahn (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 372, 387, 137 Cal. Rptr. 332* ; *see Kaplan's Fruit & Produce Co. v. Superior Court (1979) 26 Cal. 3d 60, 65, 73-74, 160 Cal. Rptr. 745, 603 P.2d 1341*]. The federal interpretation, however, is relevant only to the extent that the federal provisions may be fairly said to parallel the state statute [*Wildlife Alive v. Chickering (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 190, 202, 132 Cal. Rptr. 377, 553 P.2d 537*].

[6] Use of Legislative History From Other States

A court may also consider the legislative history of enactments in other states. For example, the California Supreme Court has considered legislative history regarding other states' fair employment practices acts in construing the meaning of similar language in the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (*Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*) [*see Robinson v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 226, 236-239, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 782, 825 P. 2d 767*].

[7] Expression of Intent of Earlier Act

When the Legislature declares a statutory amendment is intended to "clarify" the meaning of a preexisting version of the statute, any such declaration is not binding on courts or determinative of the meaning of the earlier version; courts still must ascertain the scope and meaning of the earlier version from all the pertinent circumstances and considerations [*People v. Cruz (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 764, 781, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117, 919 P.2d 731*]. However, the declared legislative intent may be considered together with other factors, including subsequent amendments or other related enactments, in arriving at the true legislative intent of the earlier version of the statute. Thus, subsequent amendments or other related enactments or attempted enactments may be considered to clarify the intent of the earlier statute [*Eu v. Chacon (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 465, 470, 128 Cal. Rptr. 1, 546 P.2d 289* (considering vetoed bill that would have created exception to statute being interpreted by court); *Estate of Lacy (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 172, 189, 126 Cal. Rptr. 432* (later statutes enacted to clarify and restate requirements of statute being interpreted); *Friends of Lake Arrowhead v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 497, 506, 113 Cal. Rptr. 539* (later statute creating exception to statute being interpreted, and amendment of statute being interpreted)].

The Legislature's subsequent expression of intent made in an act that simply states the Legislature's intent as to a prior statute and states that this was the intent when the statute was originally enacted is not binding on the court, but may properly be used in determining the effect of the prior statute [*In re Retirement Cases (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 426, 480-481, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 790*]. If the prior statute has already been construed in a different fashion by the California Supreme Court, however, an appellate court is bound by stare decisis to follow the Supreme Court's interpretation, despite the Legislature's subsequent expression of its intent [*People v. Savala (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 41, 59, 171 Cal. Rptr. 882* ; *see McClung v. Employment Dev. Dep't (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 467, 475-476, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 428, 99 P.3d 1015* (once California Supreme Court has finally and definitively interpreted statute, Legislature has power,

subject to constitutional restraints, to overrule that decision by amending statute, but it has no power to decide that amendment merely declares existing law)].

[8] Failure to Pass Bill

The failure of the Legislature to pass a bill, such as a bill that would have amended a statute so as to expressly set forth the interpretation of the statute adopted by the court, is little evidence of legislative intent because the bill may have failed passage for reasons other than its merits, including the possibility that the Legislature believed that the interpretation was already manifest [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 43, 62-63, 152 Cal. Rptr. 153* ; *Burgess v. Board of Education (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 571, 580-581, 116 Cal. Rptr. 183*]. Moreover, a later Legislature's failure to adopt a proposed amendment to an existing law is of little weight in determining the relevant intent of the earlier Legislature that enacted that law [*Lolley v. Campbell (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 367, 378-379, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571, 48 P.3d 1128* ("[N]o clear inference may be drawn from the failed amendment about the Legislature's understanding of [*Lab. Code § 98.2(c)*] at the time that it was enacted. ... [T]he statute presently in effect [is binding], not ... a legislative statement of intent that failed to become law")].

However, when the courts put the Legislature on notice of the potential scope of a statute and the Legislature fails to amend the statute to restrict the statute's scope, the Legislature's failure to act is of some, but not controlling, significance [*Coulter v. Superior Court (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 144, 151, 145 Cal. Rptr. 534, 577 P.2d 669* (failure of Legislature to exclude social hosts from liability for serving alcoholic beverages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25602* after Supreme Court decision gave notice of possibility of such liability; liability later barred by amendment of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25602* and *Civ. Code § 1714* after decision in *Coulter*)].

For a discussion of the effect of the Legislature's failure to enact a provision contained in the original bill, or in an amendment to a bill which is passed, see the discussion under Legislative History, *above.*

[9] Nonrepealable Enactment Not Permitted

A legislative body may modify or abolish acts passed by itself or its predecessors. Therefore, a legislative body cannot restrict the powers of its successors by enacting legislation that is purported to be nonrepealable. A legislature may not bind a future legislature to a particular mode of repeal. It may not declare in advance intent of future legislatures, nor may it declare in advance the effect of subsequent legislation on existing statutes [*County Mobilehome Positive Action Committee, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 727, 734, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 409*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.67

§ 531.67 Administrative Agency Interpretation

[1] Persuasiveness

The contemporaneous construction of a statute by an administrative agency charged with its enforcement generally is given great weight by courts [*Water Quality Assn. v. Santa Barbara County (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 732, 744, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 184*], and the agency interpretation of the statute will be followed if not clearly erroneous [*Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 668-669, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564* (Workers' Compensation Appeal Board interpretation of Labor Code provision); *Zenker-Felt Imports v. Malloy (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 713, 720, 171 Cal. Rptr. 482* (interpretation of Code of Civil Procedure provision by Judicial Council in California Rules of Court); *see also Federal Express Corp. v. Holowecki (2008) 552 U.S. 389, 128 S. Ct. 1147, 170 L. Ed. 2d 10, 18* (when federal agency with statutory authority to issue regulations invokes that authority to issue regulations interpreting ambiguous statutory terms, courts defer to agency's reasonable interpretations; *citing Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc. (1984) 467 U.S. 837, 843-845, 104 S. Ct. 2778, 81 L. Ed. 2d 694*); *Davey Tree Surgery Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1232, 1243, 213 Cal. Rptr. 806* (defense to safety violations developed by Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Board in board decisions)]. Moreover, the contemporaneous administrative construction of a statute is considered as highly relevant and material evidence of the likely general understanding of the times and of the opinions of the persons who probably were active in drafting the statute [*Whitcomb Hotel, Inc. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 753, 756, 757, 151 P.2d 233* ; *Webster v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 29, 36, 242 Cal. Rptr. 685* ; *see also Department of Water & Power v. Energy Resources Conservation & Development Com. (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 206, 220, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 289* (administrative agency ruling 16 years after statute was enacted is not contemporaneous and is not entitled to great weight)].

Consistent administrative construction of a statute over many years, particularly when it originated with those charged with putting the statutory machinery into effect, is entitled to great weight [*Gay Law Students Assn. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 458, 491, 156 Cal. Rptr. 14, 595 P.2d 592* ; *Castaneda v. Holcomb (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 939, 945-946, 170 Cal. Rptr. 875*]. Nonetheless, an administrative agency and its employees may not enlarge the scope of a legislative enactment [*California Department of Transportation v. Superior Court (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 852,*

858].

The general rule of deference to an agency interpretation does not apply if the interpretation was not adopted in accordance with applicable legal requirements. For example, the California Supreme Court has held that the interpretive policies contained in the enforcement manual of the California Division of Labor Standards Enforcement (DLSE) are void as regulations, because they were not promulgated in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act [*Tidewater Marine Western, Inc. v. Bradshaw (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 557, 572, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 186, 927 P.2d 296* ; *see Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.* (Administrative Procedure Act)]. As a result, courts do not give weight to statutory interpretations that may be implied from the DLSE's enforcement manual [*see, e.g.,* *Church v. Jamison (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1568, 1577-1583, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 166* (rejecting DLSE's "reverse" application of statute of limitations to limit years for which terminated employee may seek compensation for unused vested vacation under *Lab. Code § 227.3*)].

Whether or not it is owed deference, an administrative interpretation of a given statute is not *binding* on the courts. Ultimately, it is for the judiciary to ascertain the correct interpretation of statutes [*Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1106, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 880, 155 P.3d 284]* .

[2] Internal Agency Memoranda

The rule of judicial deference to the administrative interpretation of a statute by the agency charged with its enforcement does not apply to internal agency memoranda, as opposed to administrative regulations, especially when the memorandum is composed after the agency becomes amicus curiae to the case in which the memorandum is brought to the court's attention [*Jones v. Tracy School Dist. (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 99, 107, 165 Cal. Rptr. 100, 611 P.2d 441* ; *Campbell v. Arco Marine, Inc. (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1850, 1860, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626* (Department of Fair Employment and Housing non-contemporaneous interpretation of Fair Employment and Housing Act)]. However, even though not entitled to deference, the agency's interpretation of a statute is entitled to a "measure of respect" if it has been applied consistently by the agency and reflects a body of experience and informed judgment to which courts and litigants may properly resort for guidance [*Federal Express Corp. v. Holowecki (2008) 552 U.S. 389, 128 S. Ct. 1147, 1156-1158, 170 L. Ed. 2d 10, 21-23* (adopting Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's interpretation of "charge" that starts waiting period before employee may file suit under Age Discrimination in Employment Act, *29 U.S.C. § 626(d)*, as embodied in EEOC's compliance manual and internal directives, which had been binding on EEOC staff for at least five years)].

[3] Reenactment of Statute After Agency Interpretation

Reenactment of a statutory provision without a change in light of a prior administrative interpretation is persuasive of a legislative intent to adopt the administrative interpretation [*Division of Industrial Safety v. Municipal Court (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 696, 700-701, 132 Cal. Rptr. 573*]. Nonetheless, the ultimate interpretation of a statute is an exercise of judicial power, and courts are responsible for declaring a statute's true meaning even if that requires rejection of an earlier erroneous administrative interpretation [*Wheeler v. Board of Administration (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 600, 605, 159 Cal. Rptr. 336, 601 P.2d 568* ; *Estate of Elsman (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 721, 734, 141 Cal. Rptr. 657* (administrative interpretation rejected even though statute subsequently reenacted without change)].

[4] Federal Agency Interpretation of Similar Federal Regulation

A federal agency interpretation of a federal regulation may be persuasive authority for interpreting a state regulation. However, federal authority is lessened to the extent the federal regulation differs from the state regulation [*Aguilar v. Association for Retarded Citizens (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 21, 31, 285 Cal. Rptr. 515*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.68

§ 531.68 Attorney General Interpretation

The California Attorney General's opinion regarding the meaning of a constitutional provision or statute is not binding on a court [*City of Long Beach v. Department of Indus. Relations (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 942, 952, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 518, 102 P.3d 904*]. It is, however, entitled to great weight and respect, however [*Fischer v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 87, 101, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 452* ; *Tafoya v. Hastings College (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 437, 445 n.7, 236 Cal. Rptr. 395]* . This is true even though the opinion is unpublished [*California Assn. of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*].

In addition, the Legislature is presumed to act with knowledge of opinions of the attorney general that affect the subject matter of proposed legislation [*Burden v. Snowden (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 556, 564, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 531, 828 P. 2d 672]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.69

§ 531.69 Criminal Statutes

In construing a criminal statute, a defendant must be given the benefit of every reasonable doubt as to whether the statute was applicable to him or her [*People v. Baker (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 44, 46, 69 Cal. Rptr. 595, 442 P.2d 675*]. Generally, criminal statutes are to be construed according to the fair import of their terms, with a view to effect its objects and promote justice [*Penal Code § 4*; *Bowland v. Municipal Court (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 479, 487, 134 Cal. Rptr. 630, 556 P.2d 1081*]. If two interpretations of a criminal statute are possible, the construction that favors the defendant is preferred unless such a construction is contrary to the public interest, sound sense, and wise policy [*People v. Garfield (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 192, 200, 219 Cal. Rptr. 196, 707 P.2d 258* ; *People v. Squier (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 235, 241, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 536* ; *In re Kemper (1980) 112 Cal. App. 3d 434, 438, 169 Cal. Rptr. 513*].

The penalty clause of a penal statute should be given the narrowest construction which is reasonable in light of its legislative purpose. This principle applies even when the underlying action is civil in nature [*Tos v. Mayfair Packing Co. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 67, 79, 206 Cal. Rptr. 459* ; *People v. Mobil Oil Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 261, 276, 192 Cal. Rptr. 155*]. The rule of strict construction of penal statutes is not, however, an inexorable command to override common sense and evident statutory purpose [*People ex rel. Lungren v. Superior Court (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 294, 312, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855, 926 P.2d 1042* ; *People v. Anderson (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1104, 1145-1146, 240 Cal. Rptr. 585, 742 P.2d 1306*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.70

§ 531.70 Civil Statutes Imposing Monetary Penalty

The rule of strict construction of penal statutes, *discussed under § 531.69 above*, has generally been applied in this state to criminal statutes, rather than statutes which prescribe only civil monetary penalties [*People ex rel. Lungren v. Superior Court (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 294, 312, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855, 926 P.2d 1042* ; *People v. Forbis (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 599, 603-604, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836*]. The rule is not an absolute one, however, and there may be circumstances in which civil statutes should be strictly construed [*see* *People ex rel. Lungren v. Superior Court (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 294, 312, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 855, 926 P.2d 1042* (concluding that circumstances for strict construction did not exist)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.71

§ 531.71 Retroactivity

[1] When A Statute Has Retroactive Effect

A statute has retrospective effect when it substantially changes the legal consequences of past events [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* ; *Kizer v. Hanna (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 1, 7, 255 Cal. Rptr. 412, 767 P.2d 679*].

In contrast, a statute affecting the consequences of past events is not considered to have retroactive effect if it does not impair rights that arose when the events occurred [*Myers v. Philip Morris Cos. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 828, 847, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40, 50 P.3d 751*]. The California Supreme Court applied this principle in a case involving a statute that granted immunity for certain conduct but was repealed by a subsequent statute. Noting the absence of a clear indication of legislative intent to have the repealing statute act retroactively, the Court held that the repeal of the immunity statute did not remove any immunity for conduct occurring while the immunity statute was in effect [*Myers v. Philip Morris Cos. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 828, 840-847, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40, 50 P.3d 751* ; *see Civ. Code § 1714.45* (formerly granting tobacco companies complete immunity in certain product liability suits as of January 1, 1988; amended to remove that immunity as of January 1, 1998)]. However, the Court also held that the repealing statute *did* remove protection that had been available under the immunity statute for conduct occurring *before* the immunity statute's effective date. In effect, the repealing statute restored the law to what it had been prior to the effective date of the (later-repealed) immunity statute. Thus, the removal of protection for conduct predating the immunity statute was not an impermissible retroactive effect of the repealing statute, because a retroactive effect is one that impairs rights a party possessed when he or she acted [*Myers v. Philip Morris Cos. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 828, 847, 123 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40, 50 P.3d 751*].

In another case, the California Supreme Court approved the application of Proposition 64 to cases pending on the measure's effective date, because that did not constitute an impermissible "retroactive" application. Proposition 64, which took effect with its passage on November 2, 2004, added a standing requirement to California's unfair competition and false advertising laws [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq., 17500 et seq.*]. Specifically, a private plaintiff can no longer bring a class or representative action under those laws unless he or she suffered injury in fact and lost money or property as a result of the alleged unfair competition or false advertising [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17203,*

17204, 17535, as amended by Proposition 64]. The Supreme Court held that applying Proposition 64's standing provisions to cases pending on the measure's effective date did not constitute a "retroactive" application, because the measure did not change the legal consequences of past conduct by imposing any new or different liabilities based on such conduct. The measure left entirely unchanged the substantive rules governing business and competitive conduct. Nothing that was lawful before Proposition 64 became unlawful, and nothing that was unlawful before the proposition was made lawful. Moreover, the measure did not eliminate any right to recover. Although applying Proposition 64's standing rules to pending cases could be seen as impairing the settled rights and expectations of uninjured plaintiffs to continue prosecution of their actions, that consequence was relatively insignificant and did not make such application of the measure "retroactive" [*Californians for Disability Rights v. Mervyn's, LLC (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 223, 230-233, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 57, 138 P.3d 207]* .

Often, the critical question for determining retroactivity is whether the last act or event necessary to trigger application of the statute occurred before or after the statute's effective date. For example, the California Supreme Court has held that *Penal Code § 3003.5(b),* which places restrictions on where paroled sex offenders subject to lifetime registration may reside, applies to persons who were convicted of registrable offenses before the effective date of the statute but were paroled--and sought housing--after that date. The Court explained that for purposes of retroactivity analysis, the pivotal "last act or event" that must occur before the mandatory residency restrictions come into play is the registered sex offender's securing of a residence upon his or her release from custody on parole. If that last act or event occurs after the effective date of *Penal Code § 3003.5(b),* then a conclusion that it was a violation of the registrant's parole does not constitute a retroactive application of the statute [*In re E.J. (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1258, 12731274, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165, 223 P.3d 31]* .

[2] Two-Step Approach for Initiatives

Courts addressing retroactive application of initiatives generally follow a two-step analysis. First, the court must determine whether the initiative has been retroactively applied. If so, the court must then decide if the people intended that the statute be so applied. On a finding of intent, the initiative may be enacted unless it is prohibited by state or federal constitutional provisions [*Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 979, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553* ; *Gutierrez v. De Lara (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1575, 1578, 234 Cal. Rptr. 158*].

[3] Legislature's Expressed View Considered by Courts

Some codes specifically provide that their provisions do not apply retroactively unless expressly declared retroactive [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 3*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 3*; *Penal Code § 3*; *see also Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan, & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 42-43, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931*]. The Legislature's expressed views on the prior import of its statutes are entitled to due consideration by courts [*Carter v. California Dept. of Veterans Affairs (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 914, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 223, 229, 135 P.3d 637* (because Supreme Court had not yet definitively interpreted *Gov. Code § 12940(j)(1)* with respect to employer liability for sexual harassment of employees by nonemployees, Court gave due consideration to legislative statement that 2003 amendment of statute was declaratory of existing law)]. Ultimately, however, the interpretation of a statute is an exercise of the judicial power the Constitution assigns to the courts [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 244, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* ; *California Emp. etc. Com. v. Payne (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 210, 213, 187 P.2d 702*]. Moreover, once the California Supreme Court has finally and definitively interpreted a statute, the Legislature has the power (subject to constitutional restraints) to overrule the decision by amending the statute, but it has no power to decide that the amendment merely declares existing law [*McClung v. Employment Dev. Dep't (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 467, 475-476, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 428, 99 P.3d 1015*].

[4] Postponement of Statute's Operative Date Not Determinative of Retroactive Effect

The effective date of a statute is the date on which it becomes law; the operative date is the date on which the directives

of the statute may actually be implemented [*Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 223, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*]. Although the effective and operative dates often are the same, the Legislature may expressly postpone the operative date. However, a postponed operative date does not necessarily imply an intention to give the statute prospective effect only. The Legislature may postpone the operative effect for reasons unrelated to an intent to avoid retroactive effect. For example, the Legislature may delay the operation of a statute to allow persons affected by the statute [*Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 223-224, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*]:

- To become aware of it and to comply with its terms;
- To give governmental authorities sufficient time to prepare a mechanism to administer or implement the new law;
- To provide time for cleanup amendments and the passage of related legislation; or
- To simplify bookkeeping or setting retirement dates.

[5] Presumption of Prospective Application

Statutes are not given retroactive effect unless that is clearly the intent of the Legislature [*Balen v. Peralta Junior College Dist. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 821, 828, 114 Cal. Rptr. 589, 523 P.2d 629* ; *Estate of Hilton (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 890, 906-907, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491*]. Such intent may be inferred from the express provisions of the statute as well as from extrinsic sources, including the legislative history [*Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 221-222, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*].

If a statute and its legislative history are silent as to retroactive applicability, the Legislature is presumed to have intended the statute to have prospective application only [*Nelson v. A.H. Robins Co. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 862, 870, 197 Cal. Rptr. 179* (alternative ground that *Code Civ. Proc. § 3* provides that no part of the Code of Civil Procedure is retroactive unless explicitly so declared)]. This long-established presumption applies particularly to laws creating new obligations, imposing new duties, or exacting new penalties because of past transactions. The rationale behind the presumption is that retroactive laws are characterized by want of notice and lack of knowledge of past conditions, and they disturb feelings of security in past transactions. Also, the purpose of a legislative alteration would not often be significantly advanced by application of the legislation to transactions that preceded it [*In re Marriage of Reuling (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1428, 1439, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*].

The presumption is subordinate to the fundamental rule of construction that a statute must be interpreted to effectuate the Legislature's intent. Thus, the presumption is to be applied only after it is determined impossible to ascertain legislative intent [*In re Marriage of Bouquet (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 583, 587, 128 Cal. Rptr. 427, 546 P.2d 1371* (statute changing nature of property from community to separate intended to apply retroactively); *Mannheim v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 678, 686-687, 91 Cal. Rptr. 585, 478 P.2d 17* (statute adding persons as distributees for purposes of intestate succession intended to apply retroactively); *see also Hudson Properties Co. v. Governing Board (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 63, 70, 213 Cal. Rptr. 909* (rule of construction giving prospective application of statute should not be followed blindly)]. In other words, the absence of an express declaration of retroactivity does not prohibit a finding that the Legislature intended a statute to apply retroactively. However, it is a significant indication that the Legislature intended the statute to apply prospectively only [*In re Cindy B. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 771, 780-781, 237 Cal. Rptr. 677*].

[6] Clarification Is Not Considered Retroactive Enactment

A statute that merely clarifies, rather than changes, existing law does not operate retrospectively even if applied to

transactions predating its enactment [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* ; *Bowen v. Board of Retirement (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 572, 575 n.1, 229 Cal. Rptr. 814, 724 P.2d 500* ; *Negrette v. California State Lottery Com. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1739, 1744, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809* ; *Arcadia Redevelopment Agency v. Ikemoto (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 444, 457, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112*].

When a statute provides that it clarifies or declares existing law, the provision indicates a legislative intent that the amendment apply to all existing causes of action from the date of its enactment. In accordance with the general rules of statutory construction, the court must give effect to this intention unless there is some constitutional objection [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 244, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507*].

A court may consider the surrounding circumstances to determine whether material changes in statutory language by the Legislature were an effort only to clarify a statute's true meaning [*see, e.g.,* *Colmenares v. Braemar Country Club, Inc. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1019, 1028-1031* (based on legislative history and contemporaneous amendment of other statutes, enactment of *Gov. Code § 12926.1* effective January 1, 2001, clarified existing law that impairment need not *substantially* limit major life activity to constitute physical disability under Fair Employment and Housing Act, *Gov. Code § 12926(k)*)]. If the true meaning of the statute remains the same, the legislative act has no retrospective effect [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507*].

If the court does not accept the Legislature's assurance that an unmistakable change in the law is merely a "clarification," a declaration of intent may still effectively reflect the Legislature's purpose to achieve a retrospective change [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* ; *California Emp. etc. Com. v. Payne (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 210, 214, 187 P.2d 702*]. However, an erroneous statement that an amendment merely declares existing law is not sufficient to overcome the strong presumption against retroactively applying an amendment that was enacted in response to a judicial interpretation of the statute [*McClung v. Employment Dev. Dep't (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 467, 475-476, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 428, 99 P.3d 1015* (once California Supreme Court has finally and definitively interpreted statute, Legislature has no power to decide that subsequent amendment merely declares existing law)].

[7] Due Process Challenge

[a] Change Impairing Vested Rights

The retroactive application of a civil statute may be unconstitutional if it deprives a person of a vested right without due process or if it impairs the obligation of a contract [*In re Marriage of Heikes (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1211, 1218-1225, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155, 899 P.2d 1349* ; *In re Marriage of Bouquet (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 583, 591-594, 128 Cal. Rptr. 427, 546 P.2d 1371* (retroactive application of statute changing community to separate property held not to constitute unconstitutional taking of property without due process); *Mannheim v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 678, 688, 91 Cal. Rptr. 585, 478 P.2d 17* (retroactive application of amendment of intestate succession statute lessening occasions for escheat held not to constitute unconstitutional gift of public funds); *Estate of Hilton (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 890, 906-907, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (modification of statutory compensation rates could not be used to force repayment of prior interim fee award in absence of clear evidence of retroactive operation of amendment)].

However, retroactive application is not unconstitutional per se, even when it impairs vested rights. The constitutional question in such a case is not whether a vested right is impaired by the change in the law, but whether the change reasonably could be believed to be sufficiently necessary to the public welfare to justify the impairment [*In re Marriage of Bouquet (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 583, 592, 592 n.8, 128 Cal. Rptr. 427, 546 P.2d 1371*]. For example, statutes enacted to cure an injustice in the law and promote the interest of the state in the equitable division of community property have been applied retroactively against the contention that to do so would violate due process [*see* *In re Marriage of Taylor (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 435, 443, 234 Cal. Rptr. 486*]. Similarly, although the Legislature generally cannot provide retroactive relief for taxes that have become fixed and vested, a retroactive tax exemption may

be upheld if it is based on the Legislature's reasonable determination that the exemption serves a public purpose [*Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 224-225, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148* (upholding retroactivity of sales-tax exemption under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6011(c)(10), 6012(c)(10),* to further public purpose of providing certainty to business taxpayers and improving business climate in California)]. For a discussion of retroactive criminal laws as unconstitutional ex post facto laws, see California Criminal Defense Practice, ch. 140 (Matthew Bender).

[b] Alternative Analysis of Weighing Factors

An alternative analysis in determining if a retroactive initiative violates due process requires a weighing of a variety of factors [*In re Marriage of Bouquet (1976) 16 Cal.3d 583, 592, 128 Cal. Rptr. 427, 546 P.2d 1371* ; *Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 983, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*].

The following factors are considered by the court [*In re Marriage of Bouquet (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 583, 592, n.2, 128 Cal. Rptr. 427, 546 P.2d 1371* ; *Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 983, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*]:

- The significance of the state interest served by the law.
- The importance of the retroactive application of the law to the effectuation of that interest.
- The extent of reliance upon the former law.
- The legitimacy of that reliance.
- The extent of actions taken on the basis of that reliance.
- The extent to which the retroactive application of the new law would disrupt those actions.

[c] Change in Procedural Law

The application to pending litigation of a statute changing procedure or providing a new remedy for the enforcement of existing rights does not violate the principle that statutes are presumed to act prospectively only, and such laws have historically been held to apply to pending or existing matters [*Anton v. San Antonio Community Hosp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 802, 826, 140 Cal. Rptr. 442, 567 P. 2d 1162* ; *Angeli v. Lischetti (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 474, 478, 24 Cal. Rptr. 845, 374 P.2d 813* (change in manner of enforcing valid judgment); *Governing Board v. Commission on Professional Competence (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 447, 461, 140 Cal. Rptr. 206* (amendment of statute to empower agency to stay disciplinary orders subject to probationary terms applied to uphold agency action when amendment occurred pending appeal from superior court judgment upholding agency's order)]. Such an application of a change in procedural law is actually prospective in nature because it relates to procedure to be followed in the future, and the statute is not made retroactive merely because it draws on facts existing prior to its enactment [*Strauch v. Superior Court (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 45, 48-49, 165 Cal. Rptr. 552* (late filing of certificate of merit in medical malpractice action allowed by trial court saved by subsequent amendment extending time for filing and easing effect of failure to file)]. Furthermore, reasons of fairness dictate prospective application of procedural changes, in the absence of clear legislative intent to the contrary [*Estate of Hilton (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 890, 906-907, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (statutes not to be given retrospective application absent clear legislative intent to do so)].

When a new time limit has been imposed or an existing time limit has been shortened, courts have not resorted to expressions of legislative intent to determine when the new time limit began running. Rather they have relied on a presumption that drafters did not intend to terminate existing rights but instead intended to give parties a reasonable time in which to preserve their rights [*Save Our Forest & Ranchlands v. County of San Diego (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th*

1757, 1767-1768, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708]. If the statute operates immediately to cut off an existing remedy, or within so short a time that a party has no reasonable opportunity to exercise his or her remedy, then the retroactive application of the statute is unconstitutional regarding that party [*Rosefield Packing Co. v. Superior Court (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 120, 122-123, 47 P.2d 716* ; *Santangelo v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 804, 815, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 735* (when change in statute of limitations became operative, two months for claimant in uninsured motorist arbitration to complete arbitration was reasonable under circumstances)].

A statute is procedural when it neither creates a new cause of action nor deprives defendant of any defense on the merits [*Strauch v. Superior Court (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 45, 49, 165 Cal. Rptr. 552*]. The classification of a law as substantive or procedural depends on its effect rather than its form, and a statute which might ordinarily be classified as procedural may so change the legal effect of past events that its application to pending matters may be retroactive [*Perry v. Heavenly Valley (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 495, 504, 209 Cal. Rptr. 771* (presumption against retroactivity applied to amendment which abolished basis for action in negligence by making worker's compensation exclusive remedy); *Coast Bank v. Holmes (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 581, 594-595, 97 Cal. Rptr. 30* (statute altering effect of attorney's fees clauses in contracts deemed both procedural and substantive; legislative intent for retroactive application found); *City of Sausalito v. County of Marin (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 550, 557, 90 Cal. Rptr. 843* (statute on procedure for local zoning proceedings deemed substantive as it established standard of validation of such proceeding by reviewing court and did not reach court's procedure; legislative intent to apply to pending litigation found)].

[8] Equal Protection Challenge

Equal protection requires that persons similarly situated receive like treatment [*Georgie Boy Manufacturing, Inc. v. Superior Court (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 217, 224, 171 Cal. Rptr. 382*].

When a statute or initiative classifies individuals in a manner which involves economic rights, the rational basis test applies. The test is met if the court finds both of the following [*Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 986, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*]:

- The statute has a legitimate purpose.
- The lawmakers reasonably believed the classification would promote that purpose.

The court must conduct a serious and genuine judicial inquiry into the correspondence between the classification and the legislative goals even if the court is invoking only the rational relations test [*Fein v. Permanente Medical Group (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 137, 163, 211 Cal. Rptr. 368, 695 P.2d 665]* .

However, equal protection violations are generally not found under the rational relationship test unless the classification rests on grounds wholly irrelevant to the achievement of the state's objective [*Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 986, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553]* . The question therefore is not whether in fact an act will promote the legislative objectives but whether the Legislature could rationally have decided that it might do so [*American Bank & Trust Co. v. Community Hospital (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 359, 374, 204 Cal. Rptr. 671, 683 P.2d 670, 41 A.L.R. 4th 233* , quoting *Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co. (1981) 449 U.S. 456, 466, 101 S.Ct. 715, 725, 66 L. Ed. 2d 659*]. The burden to prove this rests on the challenger [*Yoshioka v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 972, 987, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*].

110 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Statutory Interpretation

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.72-531.89

[Reserved]

§§ 531.72[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Determining Constitutionality of Statutes

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.90

§ 531.90 Preemption

[1] State Law by Federal

The authority of Congress to preempt state law derives from the *Supremacy Clause* in the U.S. Constitution. It provides that the federal constitution and federal statutes and treaties are the supreme law of the land and bind state judges, despite state constitutional and statutory law to the contrary [*see U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2*]. In exercising its legislative powers, Congress may expressly preempt state law [*California Service Station etc. Assn. v. Union Oil Co. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 44, 51, 283 Cal. Rptr. 279]* . Moreover, absent express preemption, there are three bases for finding implied preemption [*Bronco Wine Co. v. Jolly (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 943, 955-956, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 180, 95 P.3d 422]* . Whether the preemption is express [*see Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 200, 205, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892]* or implied [*see Jevne v. Superior Court (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 935, 960-961, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685, 111 P.3d 954]* , the scope of the preemption must also be determined.

For detailed discussion of federal-law preemption of state law, see *Ch. 126A, Constitutional Law, § 126A.23*.

[2] Local Ordinance by State Statute

City and county ordinances must not conflict with general laws [*Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7*; *Gov. Code § 37100*], but they will be presumed valid until a conflict is shown [*Water Quality Assn. v. Santa Barbara County (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 732, 740-741, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 184]* . However, once a conflict with state law is found to exist, the ordinance is void [*Building Industry Association of Northern California v. City of Livermore (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 719, 724, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902]* .

EXCEPTION:

Under *Cal. Const., art. XI, §§ 5* and *7*, it is clear that ordinances enacted by a charter city are not subject to and controlled by conflicting state legislative action if the subject matter is a "municipal affair," as those words are used in *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 5* [*Whisman v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 782, 789, 150 Cal. Rptr. 548* (school system not municipal affair)].

For detailed discussion of state-law preemption of local law, see *Ch. 126A, Constitutional Law, § 126A.24*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Determining Constitutionality of Statutes

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.91

§ 531.91 Equal Protection

Equal protection of the law with respect to state legislation is guaranteed by *U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1,*, and *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*. The first prerequisite to a meritorious equal protection claim is a showing that the state has adopted a classification which affects two or more similarly situated groups in an unequal manner [*People v. Travis (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 1271, 1291, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177]* . There are two tests for determining the validity of a classification under the *equal protection clause*. The conventional standard presumes the legislation to be constitutional and merely requires that distinctions drawn by a challenged statute bear some rational relationship to a conceivable, legitimate state purpose. A more stringent "strict scrutiny" test is applied in cases involving "suspect classifications" or touching on "fundamental interests." In those cases, the state bears the burden of establishing not only that it has a compelling interest that justifies the law but that the distinctions drawn by the law are necessary to further its purpose [*Kasler v. Lockyer, 23 Cal. 4th 472, 480, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 334, 2 P.3d 581 (2000)* (quoting *Warden v. State Bar (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 628, 640-641, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 283, 982 P.2d 154*)].

For further discussion of equal protection, see *Ch. 126A, Constitutional Law, § 126A.60* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Determining Constitutionality of Statutes

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.92

§ 531.92 Privileges and Immunities

The privileges and immunities clause of the California Constitution, which requires privileges and immunities to be granted to all citizens on like terms [*see Cal. Const., art I, § 7(b)*], statutory classifications are valid unless the classification is unreasonable or arbitrary [*City and County of San Francisco v. Flying Dutchman Park, Inc. (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 74, 87, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532* ; *People v. Housman (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 43, 53, 210 Cal. Rptr. 186]* . Thus, this provision is "substantially the equivalent" of the *equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal constitution* [*Dep't of Mental Hygiene v. Kirchner (1965) 62 Cal.2d 586, 588, 43 Cal.Rptr. 329, 400 P.2d 321]* .

For additional discussion of privileges and immunities under *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(b)*, see *Ch. 126A, Constitutional Law, § 126A.64*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Determining Constitutionality of Statutes

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.93

§ 531.93 Due Process

Under the California constitution, a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*]. Similarly, the federal constitution provides that "no State shall ... deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law" [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*]. The touchstone of due process is protection of the individual against arbitrary action of government [*County of Sacramento v. Lewis (1998) 523 U.S. 833, 845-846, 118 S. Ct. 1708, 140 L. Ed. 2d 1043* , quoting *Wolff v. McDonnell (1974) 418 U.S. 539, 558, 94 S. Ct. 2963, 41 L. Ed. 2d 935]* , whether the fault lies in a denial of fundamental procedural fairness, i.e., procedural due process, or in the exercise of power without any reasonable justification in the service of a legitimate governmental objective, i.e., substantive due process [*County of Sacramento v. Lewis (1998) 523 U.S. 833, 846, 118 S. Ct. 1708, 140 L. Ed. 2d 1043]* .

For discussion of due process under *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7(a)*, see *Ch. 126A, Constitutional Law, §§ 126A.40, 126.50* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Determining Constitutionality of Statutes

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.94-531.109

[Reserved]

§§ 531.94[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Procedure for Testing Constitutionality and Interpretation of Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.110

§ 531.110 Declaratory Relief

The interpretation of ordinances and statutes are proper matters for declaratory relief [*Walker v. County of Los Angeles (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 626, 637, 12 Cal. Rptr. 671, 361 P.2d 247* ; *Redwood Coast Watersheds Alliance v. State Bd. of Forestry & Fire Protection (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 962, 970, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 24*].

Declaratory relief is also available to adjudicate the constitutionality of statutes and ordinances on their face or as applied to a particular party or situation [*State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 251-252, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *Excelsior College v. Board of Registered Nursing (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1218, 1228 n.2, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* .

For discussion relating to actions for declaratory relief to determine the constitutional validity of statutes, ordinances, and administrative regulations, see Ch. 126A, *Constitutional Law* .

For a further discussion and forms relating to actions for declaratory relief, including forms of complaints for declaratory relief to interpret statutes, ordinances, and administrative regulations, or to determine the validity of ordinances and administrative regulations under the statutes, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Procedure for Testing Constitutionality and Interpretation of Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.111

§ 531.111 Injunction

[1] To Restrain Enforcement or Implementation in General

As a general rule, an injunction may not be granted to prevent the execution of a public statute by officers of the law for the public benefit [*Civ. Code § 3423(d)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(4)*]. For example, injunctive relief is not available to a plaintiff who makes no claim of unconstitutionality or of irreparable injury to a property right but who is merely seeking to have a penal statute construed in a manner that will allow him or her to engage in an activity undertaken merely for pleasure [*Manchel v. County of Los Angeles County (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 501, 506, 54 Cal. Rptr. 53*].

Injunctive relief may be granted:

- When a statute or ordinance is being applied to conduct not within its terms [*Crittenden v. Superior Court (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 565, 569, 39 Cal. Rptr. 380, 393 P.2d 692* ; *Novar Corp. v. Bureau of Collection & Investigative Services (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6, 206 Cal. Rptr. 287]* ; or

- In a taxpayer action to enjoin the illegal expenditure of public funds [*Code Civ. Proc. § 526a*].

For discussion relating to actions for injunctive relief to determine the constitutional validity of statutes, ordinances, and administrative regulations, see Ch. 126A, *Constitutional Law* .

For discussion and forms relating to obtaining injunctive relief against illegal acts of public officials, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* , and see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to taxpayer's suits, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions* .

[2] Penal Statutes

Once criminal prosecution has commenced, injunctive relief against a criminal statute or ordinance is not available because there is an adequate remedy at law [*Miller v. State of California (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 202, 204-205, 85 Cal.*

Rptr. 801 ; *Holden v. Arnebergh (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 87, 92, 71 Cal. Rptr. 401 , appeal dismissed, 394 U.S. 102, 89 S. Ct. 926, 22 L. Ed. 2d 112 (1969)*].

A preliminary injunction against enforcement of a penal statute or ordinance regulating moral conduct is to be granted only under extraordinary circumstances [*Theresa Enterprises, Inc. v. Davis (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 940, 946-947*]. The applicant for preliminary injunctive relief must show that he or she will suffer irreparable injury from enforcement of an unconstitutional law pending trial [*EWAP, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 179, 188, 158 Cal. Rptr. 579* ; *7978 Corporation v. Pitchess (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 42, 46, 115 Cal. Rptr. 746*].

[3] Taxpayer's Suit

Taxpayers may bring suit to restrain the illegal expenditure of public funds, which includes the expenditure of a public official's time in performing illegal and unauthorized acts. In a taxpayer's suit, public officials may be enjoined from implementing an unconstitutional statute or ordinance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 526a*; *Blair v. Pitchess (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 258, 267-269, 96 Cal. Rptr. 42, 486 P.2d 1242* ; *see Ketchens v. Reiner (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 470, 474, 239 Cal. Rptr. 549*]. Declaratory relief is also available in a taxpayer's action [*Van Atta v. Scott (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 424, 449-450, 166 Cal. Rptr. 149, 613 P.2d 210*]. For discussion and forms relating to taxpayer's suits, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions* . Also see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* and Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Procedure for Testing Constitutionality and Interpretation of Statutes and Ordinances

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.112-531.129

[Reserved]

§§ 531.112[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.130

§ 531.130 California Points and Authorities

For forms of points and authorities supporting and opposing applications for temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions against enforcement of a statute or ordinance, and for a form of points and authorities opposing an application for a preliminary injunction to prevent a municipal corporation from taking legislative action, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

For forms of points and authorities supporting a demurrer on the basis of information which is the subject of judicial notice, and including a request that judicial notice be taken of that information, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 71, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* (Matthew Bender)

For forms of points and authorities concerning statutory interpretation, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 217, *Statutory Interpretation* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.131

§ 531.131 Federal Constitution

Supremacy clause. U.S. Const., art. VI, *cl. 2*

Due process and equal protection. *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.132

§ 531.132 State Constitution

Due process and equal protection. *Cal. Const., art. I, §§ 7(a), 15*

Manner of enacting statutes. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 8(a), (b)*

Effective date of statutes. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 8(c), (d)*

Manner of amending statute. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 9*

Statute to embrace only one subject, expressed in its title. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 9*

All laws of general nature as having uniform operation. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)*

Local or special statute as invalid if general statute can be made applicable. *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(b)*

Charter city ordinances relating to municipal affairs as superseding state law. *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 5(a)*

City and county ordinances not conflicting with general state or federal law as authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.133

§ 531.133 State Statutes

[1] In General

Laws defined. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1895-1899*

Statutes defined. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1897, 1898*; *Evid. Code § 230*

Effective date of general law county ordinances. *Elec. Code § 9141 et seq.*; *Gov. Code § 25123*

Effective date of general law city ordinances. *Elec. Code §§ 9235, 9236*; *Gov. Code § 36937*

Effective date of statutes. *Gov. Code § 9600*

Restatement and continuation of provisions carried into another statute. *Gov. Code § 9604*

Effect of amendment. *Gov. Code § 9605*

Repealed statute as not revived by repeal of repealing statute. *Gov. Code § 9607*

Ordinances not conflicting with general state or federal law as authorized. *Gov. Code § 37100*

[2] Declaratory and Injunctive Relief

Injunction to prevent execution of public statute by officers of law for public benefit as forbidden. *Civ. Code § 3423(d)*; *Code Civ. Proc. 526(b)(4)*

Injunction to prevent legislative act by municipal corporation as forbidden. *Civ. Code § 3423(g)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(b)(7)*

Declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*

[3] Interpretation

Limitations on interpretation of statutes. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1858*

Legislative intent to be pursued; particular provision to govern general. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1859*

Interpretation in favor of natural right as favored. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1866*

[4] Judicial Notice

Method of presenting matter for judicial notice on demurrer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.70*

Judicial notice of public statutes of California and United States as mandatory. *Evid. Code § 451(a)*

Judicial notice of statutes of sister states and of resolutions and private acts of California and United States as allowed. *Evid. Code § 452(a)*

Judicial notice of regulations and legislative enactments issued under authority of any public entity in United States as allowed. *Evid. Code § 452(b)*

Judicial notice of law of organizations of nations, foreign nations, and public entities in foreign nations as allowed. *Evid. Code § 452(f)*

When permissive judicial notice mandatory. *Evid. Code § 453*

Advice of learned person on law of organization of nations, foreign nation, or public entity in foreign nation to be received only in open court or in writing. *Evid. Code § 454(b)*

Judicial notice in reviewing court. *Evid. Code § 459*

Proof of official documents. *Evid. Code §§ 1530, 1531*

[5] Pleading

Pleading performance of all conditions precedent under statute or ordinance in general manner as sufficient. *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*

Pleading title and day of passage of private statute or ordinance as sufficient. *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*

Pleading private statute or ordinance by title and day of passage as sufficient in criminal action. *Penal Code § 963*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.134

§ 531.134 Decisions

[1] City Charters

City charters as interpreted by rules of statutory interpretation. *Castaneda v. Holcomb (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 939, 942, 170 Cal. Rptr. 875*

[2] Constitution

Constitutional provisions as construed in accordance with natural and ordinary meaning of its words; literal language to be disregarded to avoid absurd results and to fulfill apparent intent of framers; language to receive liberal, practical common sense construction that will meet changed conditions and growing needs of people. *Los Angeles County Transportation Com. v. Richmond (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 197, 202-203, 182 Cal. Rptr. 324, 643 P.2d 941*

Constitutional amendments as interpreted by rules of statutory construction. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Board of Supervisors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 813, 823, 164 Cal. Rptr. 739*

[3] Constitutional Construction Preferred

If terms of statute are by fair and reasonable interpretation capable of meaning consistent with requirements of Constitution, statute as given that meaning, rather than another meaning in conflict with *Constitution. Association for Retarded Citizens v. Department of Developmental Services (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 384, 394, 211 Cal. Rptr. 758, 696 P.2d 150* ; *Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 180, 186, 185 Cal. Rptr. 260, 649 P.2d 902* ; *McLaughlin v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 473, 483, 189 Cal. Rptr. 479*

Court as permitted to rewrite ambiguous language when literal meaning would cause statute to be facially unconstitutional and statute can be reasonably construed to avoid constitutional difficulty. *Lillebo v. Davis (1990) 222*

Cal. App. 3d 1421, 1439-1440, 272 Cal. Rptr. 638 (substituting "in" for "and")

[4] Injunctive Relief

When injunctive relief against legislative enactment is sought, relevant provision for purposes of appeal as being measure that is in effect at time appeal is decided; thus, in action challenging validity of ordinance, which was amended in good faith during pendency of appeal, action as remanded to trial court for reconsideration in light of new ordinance. *Building Industry Ass'n v. City of Oxnard (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 1, 3-4, 218 Cal. Rptr. 672, 706 P.2d 285*

[5] Ordinances

Rules for construction of statutes as applicable to resolutions of planning commission that were treated as ordinances under city charter. *Russ Bldg. Partnership v. City and County of San Francisco (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 839, 847 n.8, 244 Cal. Rptr. 682, 750 P.2d 324*

Rules of statutory construction as applicable to construction of city ordinance. *City of Berkeley v. Cukierman (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1338-1341, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478*

Ordinances as construed by same rules that courts apply to statutes. *Anderson v. San Francisco Rent Stabilization & Arbitration Bd. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1336, 1343, 237 Cal. Rptr. 894*

Declaration of emergency and enactment of emergency ordinance by municipality as prima facie evidence of sufficient inquiry of existence of emergency. *Northgate Partnership v. City of Sacramento (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 65, 69, 202 Cal. Rptr. 15*

Motives of city's legislative body in passing ordinance as not considered in determining ordinance's validity absent fraud when improper motives are neither shown on face of ordinance nor inferable from its operation and effect under circumstances of which judicial notice may be taken. *National Independent Business Alliance v. City of Beverly Hills (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 13, 22, 180 Cal. Rptr. 59*

[6] Resolutions

Construction of city planning commission resolution as governed by same rules as construction of statutes and ordinances when particular resolution has same force and effect as ordinance. *Terminal Plaza Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 814, 825 n.7, 230 Cal. Rptr. 875*

[7] Retroactivity

Critical question for determining retroactivity usually is whether last act or event necessary to trigger application of statute occurred before or after statute's effective date. *In re E.J. (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1258, 12731274, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165, 223 P.3d 31*

Although Legislature generally cannot provide retroactive relief for taxes that have become fixed and vested, retroactive tax exemption may be upheld if it is based on Legislature's reasonable determination that exemption serves

public purpose. *Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 224-225, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*

Context of legislation, its objective, evils to be remedied, history of times and legislation on same subject, public policy, and contemporaneous construction as factors considered in determining Legislature's intent as to whether statute is to be given retroactive effect. *Fox v. Alexis (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 621, 629, 214 Cal. Rptr. 132, 699 P.2d 309*

If retroactivity were imposed and it would have only limited effect on a defined group of people for a relatively short period of time, then members of the group lack standing to raise retroactivity question. *Quackenbush v. Superior Court (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 454, 464-465, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271*

Absence of express language providing for retroactivity as strongly implying statutory amendment was intended to be prospective only when Legislature specifically conferred retroactive application on other amendments passed in same measure. *Wienholz v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals (1989) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1501, 1505-1506, 267 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Statute as properly applied retroactively when statutory language and circumstances of enactment demonstrate that purpose of statute was merely to clarify existing law. *Bradley v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 404, 409, 260 Cal. Rptr. 470*

Statute that, by its terms, applies to matters "not final" as interpreted to govern all matters not yet free from further direct attack, including judgment on appeal. *Bradley v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 404, 408, 260 Cal. Rptr. 470*

Test of whether application of statute is retroactive as whether statute operates to alter materially legal significance of prior event. *California Trout, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 585, 609, 255 Cal. Rptr. 184*

Doctrine disfavoring retroactivity as intended to avoid unfairness that attends changing law after action has been taken in justifiable reliance on former law; doctrine as qualified with exceptions for circumstances that ordinarily do not give rise to substantial claim of unfairness. *Mahon v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 616, 620-621, 245 Cal. Rptr. 103*

Law as properly given retrospective application when Legislature clearly evinces that intent and when no vested or constitutional rights are infringed. *Leavenworth Properties v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 986, 994, 234 Cal. Rptr. 598*

Civ. Code § 4800.3 as constitutional when retroactively applied because retroactive application cures "rank injustice" of former law. *In re Marriage of Slivka (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 159, 164-168, 228 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Statute raising rate of interest on judgments that by its terms purported to become effective prior to its enactment date as construed to have only prospective effect in light of legislative history indicating effective date was inadvertent error and to avoid unconstitutionality of retroactive effect. *American National Bank v. Peacock (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d*

1206, 1210-1212, 212 Cal. Rptr. 97

Enactment's operative date as able to differ from effective date, and effective date will not be given retroactive application unless there is clearly apparent intention for so doing. *City of Sacramento v. State of California (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 182, 193-194, 203 Cal. Rptr. 258*

[8] Severability

When portion of administrative rule conflicts with statute, invalid portion as severable from whole if (1) language of invalid portion is mechanically severable from remainder of rule and (2) remaining provisions stand on their own, unaided by invalid provisions nor rendered vague by their absence nor inextricably connected to them by policy considerations. *California Beer & Wine Wholesalers Assn. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 100, 110, 247 Cal. Rptr. 60*

Severability clause in statute as not to be used to delegate task of rewriting statute to courts. *People's Advocate, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 316, 330-331 n.15, 226 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Severable, invalid parts of ordinance as not invalidating parts of ordinance that are valid in themselves; test of severability as whether or not invalid part can be severed without destroying legislative scheme or utility of remaining provisions. *Galligan v. City of San Bruno (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 869, 874, 183 Cal. Rptr. 466*

When part of statute is declared unconstitutional, remainder as standing if complete in itself and if it would have been adopted had legislative body foreseen partial invalidation of statute. *Park & Shop Markets, Inc. v. City of Berkeley (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 78, 89, 172 Cal. Rptr. 515*

[9] Special Legislation

Legislation as special when it confers particular privileges or imposes burdensome conditions, in the exercise of a common right, on class of persons arbitrarily selected from general body of persons standing in same relation to subject of legislation; law as general when it applies equally to all persons embraced in class founded on some natural, intrinsic, or constitutional distinction. *White v. Church (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 627, 632, 231 Cal. Rptr. 565*

[10] Statutory Construction

[a] Ascertaining Legislative Intent

To determine what a statute means, courts first consult the words themselves, giving them their usual and ordinary meaning. *Smith v. Fair Employment & Housing Commission (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 1143, 1155, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 700, 913 P.2d 909*

Fundamental rule of statutory construction as being that court should ascertain intent of Legislature so as to effectuate purposes of law; in determining intent, court as required to first look to words of statute. *State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1182, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385* ; *T.M. Cobb Co. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 273, 277, 204 Cal. Rptr. 143, 682 P.2d 338* ; *Price v. Tennant Community Services*

Dist. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 491, 499, 239 Cal. Rptr. 572

Legislative intent as usually determinable from statutory language; statutes as required to be given reasonable construction that conforms to apparent purpose and intention of law makers, and various parts of enactment as required to be harmonized by considering particular clause in context of whole statute. *Nunn v. State of California (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 616, 624-625, 200 Cal. Rptr. 440, 677 P.2d 846*

Court's overriding purpose in construing statute is to ascertain legislative intent and give reasonable construction conforming to that intent; in interpreting legislative intent, court first looks to usual and ordinary meaning of words of statute. *Home Depot U.S.A. v. Contractors' State License Board (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1592, 1600-1601, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 302*

Utility of legislative history as confined to construction of statutory text. *City of Sacramento v. Public Employees' Retirement System (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 786, 794-795, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545*

Legislative purpose as effectuated even when it is inconsistent with strict letter of statute. *Bliler v. Covenant Control Com. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 18, 26, 252 Cal. Rptr. 50*

When statutory language is susceptible of more than one meaning, duty of courts as being to accept that meaning intended by framers of legislation, so far as its intention can be ascertained; to discern intent, court as required to examine legislative history and statutory context of act under scrutiny. *Los Angeles County Safety Police Assn. v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1378, 1388, 237 Cal. Rptr. 920*

[b] Avoiding Constitutional Questions

Courts will not reach constitutional questions unless absolutely required to do so, if other grounds are available and dispositive of issues in the case. *California State Electronics Association v. Zeos International, Ltd. (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1274, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127*

[c] Common-Law Language Used in Statute

When new right not existing at common law is created by statute, that statutory remedy is exclusive; for rights that already existed at common law before creation of statutory right, statutory remedy is usually regarded as merely cumulative, permitting plaintiff to pursue common law remedy as well. *Cabesuela v. Browning-Ferris Industries of California, Inc. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 101, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 60*

Intent of Legislature in enacting statute that uses common-law language as presumed to continue common-law rules in statutory form. *People v. Martin (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1111, 1116, 214 Cal. Rptr. 873*

[d] Conflicting Statutes; Specific Statute Prevails Over General Statute

In examining statutes that appear to conflict, court as required, if reasonably possible, to reconcile them, even when court interprets provisions in different codes. *Walters v. Weed (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 246 Cal. Rptr. 5, 752 P.2d 443*

When special and general laws conflict, former as prevailing; special law as treated as exception to general law, regardless of which was first enacted; thus, *Com. Code § 2719(3)* rather than *Civ. Code § 1668* as applying to test unconscionability of contract limiting consequential damages in commercial transactions. *Nunes Turfgrass, Inc. v. Vaughan-Jacklin Seed Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1539, 246 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Special statute dealing with particular subject as constituting exception so as to control and take precedence over conflicting general statute on same subject, even though, standing alone, general provision would be broad enough to include subject to which more particular one relates. *Jones v. Pierce (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 736, 742, 245 Cal. Rptr. 149*

[e] Construction to Meet Evolving Mores of Society

Courts as enlarging terms and provisions of statutes to meet evolving mores of society, unless there is clear indication that to do so will interfere with legislative intent underlying enactment of statute; while powers granted by statute do not change, such powers as applying in different periods to all things to which they are in their nature applicable. *Barrett v. Superior Court (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1192, 272 Cal. Rptr. 304*

[f] Effect of Administrative Agency Interpretation

In absence of formal adoption of regulations to which courts would owe deference, agency's internal memoranda interpreting statute that agency is empowered to enforce is entitled to "measure of respect" if that interpretation has been applied consistently by agency and reflects body of experience and informed judgment to which courts and litigants may properly resort for guidance. *Federal Express Corp. v. Holowecki (2008) 552 U.S. 389, 128 S. Ct. 1147, 170 L. Ed. 2d 10, 21-23*

Agency's interpretation of statutes it is charged with enforcing and interpreting as entitled to great weight and to be followed unless clearly erroneous. *County of Alameda v. State Bd. of Control (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1106, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487*

Although statutory construction is matter for courts rather than administrative agencies, agency's construction of its own regulations as entitled to great weight unless clearly erroneous or unauthorized. *Sangster v. California Horse Racing Bd. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1033, 1038, 249 Cal. Rptr. 235*

No judicial deference to administrative construction of statute required when meaning of statutory language and its legislative history is accessible and intelligible to judges, without need for administrative expertise. *California Beer & Wine Wholesalers Assn. v. Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 100, 107, 247 Cal. Rptr. 60*

Longstanding administrative construction of statute as entitled to judicial consideration in interpreting statute because it is reasonable to assume Legislature would have taken corrective action had it disagreed with administrative interpretation. *Jones v. Pierce (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 736, 745-746, 245 Cal. Rptr. 149*

Although general presumption exists that amendment to statute is made with intent to change law, presumption as rebutted when practice of relevant administrative body indicates that amendment was merely clarification. *Anne B. v.*

State Bd. of Control (1984) 165 Cal. App. 3d 279, 285, 209 Cal. Rptr. 83

[g] Effect of Attorney General's Opinions

Legislature as presumed to act with knowledge of opinions of attorney general that affect subject matter of proposed legislation. *Burden v. Snowden (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 556, 564, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 531, 828 P. 2d 672*

California Attorney General opinion, even if unpublished, as entitled to great weight when construing statute. *California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*

Opinions of Attorney General as not controlling as to meaning of constitutional provision or statute but as entitled to great weight and respect. *Tafoya v. Hastings College (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 437, 445 n.7, 236 Cal. Rptr. 395*

[h] Effect of Federal Acts on State Legislation

Federal act as not automatically giving meaning to state legislation unless it is part of a mandatory regulatory scheme; when federal funding program is optional, state Legislature as able to enact legislation that does not fully comply with federal program. *Coastal Care Centers, Inc. v. Meeks (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 85, 93, 228 Cal. Rptr. 883*

[i] Effect of Federal Acts on State Liability

If rule requiring clear statement of Congressional intent to impose monetary liability on states is overcome or inapplicable so that liability is imposed, Supremacy Clause as making federal statute law in every state, fully enforceable in state court. *Hilton v. S.C. Pub. R. Com. (1991) 502 U.S. 197, 112 S. Ct. 560, 116 L. Ed. 2d 560, 567, 572* (rule did not prevail over application of stare decisis doctrine in FELA action; but Court stated rule should be applied in cases of statutory construction, as already applied in *Eleventh Amendment* cases)

[j] Effect of Sister-State Interpretation

Ambiguity of statutory language may be established through conflicting opinions of other states' courts interpreting uniform law; such conflict demonstrates that reasonable minds may disagree over meaning of those statutory words. *Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 522, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324 , cert. denied, 122 S. Ct. 614 (2001)*

Judicial interpretation of sister-state courts of parallel legislation on same subject as relevant in construing California legislation, if no relevant California judicial authority exists. *Webster v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 29, 37 n.3, 242 Cal. Rptr. 685*

[k] Exceptions to Statute

When statute specifies exceptions to general rule, other exceptions as not to be implied or presumed. *In re Lance W. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 873, 888, 210 Cal. Rptr. 631, 694 P.2d 744*

As general rule of statutory construction, if statute announces general rule and makes no exception to it, courts as

unable to make exception. *Burnsed v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 213, 217, 234 Cal. Rptr. 316*

[l] Exclusive Versus Cumulative Statutory Remedy

Under "new right-exclusive remedy" rule of statutory construction, statutory remedy as exclusive when statute creates right that did not exist at common law and provides comprehensive and detailed remedial scheme for its enforcement; under "preexisting right-cumulative remedies" rule of construction, new statutory remedy as cumulative when it is provided for preexisting common law right. *Rojo v. Kliger (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 65, 79, 276 Cal. Rptr. 130, 801 P. 2d 373*

[m] Implied Amendment or Repeal

Presumption against implied repeals as requiring that in order for later law to repeal or supersede earlier law, later law must constitute revision of entire subject so that court may say that it was intended to be substitute for earlier. *Board of Supervisors v. Lonergan (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 855, 868, 167 Cal. Rptr. 820, 616 P.2d 802*

Presumption against implied repeal as strong; courts as especially reluctant to find implied repeal of statutes that serve important public purpose. *Henning v. Division of Occupational Saf. & Health (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 747, 761-762, 268 Cal. Rptr. 476*

Amendment or repeal by implication as disfavored and as to be recognized only when irreconcilable conflict exists between statutes; in absence of clear expression by declaration or necessary implication, implied repeal of tax deduction as not presumed. *California State Auto. Assn. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1253, 1261, 237 Cal. Rptr. 44*

Legislative enactments as not presumed to overthrow long established principles of law unless intention to do so clearly appears either by express declaration or by necessary implication. *Hochheiser v. Superior Court (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 777, 788, 208 Cal. Rptr. 273*

[n] Initiative Measures

Courts as required to determine voters' intent when interpreting constitutional provision enacted by initiative; when existing statutory language is incorporated into initiative, court as not permitted to resolve ambiguity by turning to statute's legislative history because history demonstrates Legislature's intent, not voters' intent. *Delaney v. Superior Court (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 785, 798, 800-801, 268 Cal. Rptr. 753, 789 P.2d 934*

Ballot summaries and arguments as accepted sources for ascertaining voters' intent and understanding of initiative measures. *In re Lance W. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 873, 888 n.8, 210 Cal. Rptr. 631, 694 P.2d 744*

Words of initiative as interpreted in common, popular way and, absent some strong reason to contrary, not in technical sense inconsistent with words' popular meaning. *AIU Ins. Co. v. Gillespie (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1155, 1159, 272 Cal. Rptr. 334*

Rules of construction applicable to statutes enacted by legislature as applicable to statutes passed by voters. *San Francisco Fire Fighters v. Civil Service Com. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 919, 922, 236 Cal. Rptr. 713*

Purpose of voters' initiative as to be determined with reference to language used, ballot summary, argument and analysis presented to voters, and contemporaneous construction by *Legislature. People v. Horn (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 1014, 1028, 205 Cal. Rptr. 119*

[o] Judicial Alteration

Generally, it is not for courts to determine whether or not policy of statute is economically sound or beneficial; such determination is matter solely for legislature. *ABC Internat. Traders, Inc. v. Matsushita Electric Corp. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 1247, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112, 931 P.2d 290*

Court as not permitted to insert into statute qualifying provisions not intended by Legislature and as not permitted to rewrite statute to conform to assumed but unapparent legislative intent. *Burnsed v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 213, 217, 234 Cal. Rptr. 316*

In construing statute, court as not authorized to insert qualifying provisions not included or rewrite statute to conform to assumed intention not appearing from statutory language. *McLaughlin v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 473, 482, 189 Cal. Rptr. 479*

[p] Legislative History as Evidence

[i] Amendments in Course of Enactment

That Legislature amended original bill to eliminate "penalty" language in *Lab. Code § 226.7(c)*, while retaining it in other statutes enacted in same measure, indicates that "additional hour of pay," required by *Lab. Code § 226.7(b)* when employer fails to provide required meal period or rest period, constitutes wage rather than penalty. *Murphy v. Kenneth Cole Prods., Inc. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1094, 1107*

Rejection of specific provision that was part of act when originally introduced as indicating that law as enacted should not be construed to contain that provision. *Ventura v. City of San Jose (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1080, 199 Cal. Rptr. 216*

[ii] Historical Circumstances

Both legislative history of statute and wider historical circumstances of its enactment as properly considered in ascertaining legislative intent. *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1387, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323*

[iii] Individual Legislator's Statements and Motives

Despite judicial reticence to rely on statements made by individual legislators as expressions of entire Legislature's intent, committee hearing transcript incorporating bill author's testimony as commanding respect when (1) court has in

the past accepted that legislator's statement as aid to ascertaining statute's underlying purpose when statement gave some indication of arguments made to Legislature and was subsequently printed by Legislature, and (2) transcript reveals discussion and events at hearing showing that other legislators and witnesses share author's views. *Walters v. Weed (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 1, 10, 246 Cal. Rptr. 5, 752 P.2d 443*

Declarations of city officials and members of planning commission and board of permit appeals as disregarded to extent they purport to offer declarants' opinions, understandings, and interpretation of resolution at issue; declarations as considered, however, to extent they contained narratives of discussions and events leading to adoption of resolution. *Terminal Plaza Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 814, 827-828, 230 Cal. Rptr. 875*

Motives or understandings of individual legislators in voting for bill as not considered by courts in interpreting statute; fact that motives of individual legislator are offered creates no exception to rule because no guarantee can issue that other legislators who supported bill shared individual author's view of its compass. *Flood v. Wyeth Laboratories, Inc. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1272, 1279, 228 Cal. Rptr. 700*

[iv] Law Revision Commission Comments

Law Revision Commission's comments as declarative of intent not only of drafters of codes, but also of legislators who subsequently enact them. *Hochheiser v. Superior Court (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 777, 789 n.6, 208 Cal. Rptr. 273*

Report of Law Revision Commission proposing statute that is subsequently adopted without change as entitled to substantial weight in determining legislative purpose and intent. *Hong v. Somerset Associates (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 111, 115 n.6, 207 Cal. Rptr. 597* ; *Guthman v. Moss (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 501, 510, 198 Cal. Rptr. 54*

[v] Legislative Committee Reports

Legislative committee reports, while legitimate and valuable aids in determining legislative intent, as certainly not conclusive, and omissions in reports as inherently less reliable indicia of intent than positive statements. *Committee of Seven Thousand v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 491, 508, 247 Cal. Rptr. 362, 754 P.2d 708*

Statements of legislative committees pertaining to purpose of legislation as presumed to express legislative intent of statutes as enacted. *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 238, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871*

Legislative history of bill, including committee staff analysis and enrolled bill report, as evidence of legislative intent. *Ventura v. City of San Jose (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1080-1081, 199 Cal. Rptr. 216*

[vi] Legislative Counsel Opinion

Opinion of California Legislative Counsel as entitled to great weight when Legislature left proposed statutory language intact after receiving Legislative Counsel's opinion. *California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 17-18, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*

Summary of bill by legislative counsel forwarded to Governor as properly used to determine legislative intent. *People v. Rodriguez (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 207, 214, 206 Cal. Rptr. 563*

[q] No Construction of Clear Statute

Determination by highest state court that statute is clear and unambiguous as requiring statute's provisions to be applied according to its terms without further judicial construction. *People v. Ross (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 368, 371-372, 211 Cal. Rptr. 595*

Starting point for interpretation of statute as language of statute itself and no need for construction when language clear and unambiguous. *Guelfi v. Marin County Employees' Retirement Assn. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 297, 302, 193 Cal. Rptr. 343*

Clear words of statute as not to be changed by court to accomplish purpose not appearing from face of statute or from its legislative history. *People v. Mobil Oil Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 261, 270, 192 Cal. Rptr. 155*

[r] Particular Words

"Under" depends on context for its meaning in any particular statutory provision; in federal statute barring judicial review of Attorney General's decisions that are discretionary "under" particular law [*8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B)(ii)*], context indicates that "under" refers only to discretionary authority specified "in" that statute, rather than matters made discretionary under regulations adopted "pursuant to" that statute. *Kucana v. Holder (2010) -- U.S. --, 130 S. Ct. 827, 175 L. Ed. 2d 694, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 764, at *22*

In *25 U.S.C. § 479*, which authorizes Secretary of Interior to acquire property for use of Indian tribes "now under Federal jurisdiction," word "now" refers to time of time of statute's enactment, rather than time of acquisition of property. *Carcieri v. Salazar (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 1058, 172 L. Ed. 2d 791, 800-802*

In construing plain meaning of statute, ordinary usage of "and" is to condition one of two conjoined requirements by other, thereby causally linking them; use of conjunction "and" in one statute indicates contrasting meaning to another statute's disjunctive "or," in former public entity must act after both events occur, and in latter either event allows action. *Kobzoff v. Los Angeles County Harbor/UCLA Medical Center (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 851, 861, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803, 968 P.2d 514*

Term "notwithstanding other provisions of law" as indicating express legislative intent to have specific statute control despite existence of other law that might otherwise govern. *People v. DeLaCruz (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 955, 962, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202*

Although usually "effective" date is same as "operative" date, Legislature as having power to fix future date on which act will become operative; legislation as possibly having practical legal consequences once effective, even in advance of operative date. *Sutco Construction Co. v. Modesto High School Dist. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1220, 1230, 256 Cal. Rptr. 671*

"Consist" as meaning to be composed of or made up of, but as not synonymous with "including," which always implies there may be others that are not mentioned. *Doyle v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1358, 1364, 243*

Cal. Rptr. 572

Proviso or clause beginning with word "unless" as meaning an exception or condition subsequent rather than a condition precedent. *Baggett v. Housing Authority (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 383, 389, 240 Cal. Rptr. 640* (involving interpretation of federal regulation)

"Any" as used in statutes as interpreted to be broad, general, and all embracing; as used in such statutory expressions as "any other source," word "any" as meaning "every," thus, "every other source." *Burnsed v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 213, 217, 234 Cal. Rptr. 316*

"Or" as ordinarily used as disjunctive that marks alternative generally corresponding to "either." *Citizen Advocates, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 171, 176, 194 Cal. Rptr. 61*

[s] Punctuation and Sentence Structure

When sentence in statute contains transitive verb that has object, adverb that modifies verb is commonly understood to apply to entire action conveyed by complete predicate, including verb's object; thus *18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1)*, which penalizes person who "knowingly transfers, possesses, or uses, without lawful authority, a means of identification of another person," punishment may be imposed only if government proves not only that defendant knew he or she was transferring, possessing, or using something, but also that defendant knew that something was another person's means of identification. *Flores-Figueroa v. United States (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 1886, 1889-1894, 173 L. Ed. 2d 853*

Although not controlling, punctuation as required to be considered in interpreting statute; fact that qualifying phrase is separated from antecedents by comma as evidence that qualifying phrase is supposed to apply to all antecedents, instead of only to immediately preceding one. *Victoria Groves Five v. Chaffey Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1548, 1553, 276 Cal. Rptr. 14*

"Last antecedent rule" of statutory construction as requiring qualifying words, phrases, and clauses to be applied to words or phrases immediately preceding them and not to words or phrases more remote. *Mayo v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 406, 409, 238 Cal. Rptr. 465*

Erroneous punctuation of statute or other enactment as disregarded in construing its meaning. *Indian Springs, Ltd. v. Palm Desert Rent Review Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 127, 134, 238 Cal. Rptr. 112*

[t] Reasonable Construction Preferred

Statutes as given reasonable and commonsense interpretation consistent with apparent legislative purpose and intent, and which, when applied, will result in wise policy rather than mischief or absurdity. *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1379, 1392, 241 Cal. Rptr. 67, 743 P.2d 1323*

Statutes must be construed in a way that renders them reasonable, fair, and harmonious with their manifest legislative purpose; literal meaning of words must give way to avoid harsh results and mischievous or absurd consequences not intended by *Legislature. Hall v. Regents of the University of California (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1580, 1586, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 387*

Golden rule of statutory construction as being that unreasonableness of result produced by one among alternative possible interpretations of statute is reason for rejecting that interpretation in favor of another that would produce reasonable result. *Jones v. Pierce (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 736, 743 n.7, 245 Cal. Rptr. 149*

Statute that is reasonably susceptible to two interpretations construed as the more reasonable and just of the two. *Palmer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1241, 1249, 237 Cal. Rptr. 800*

[u] Shall and May

Justice is not the slave of grammar, and "shall" has sometimes been judicially construed as directory or permissive; "shall," used in statute, does not always import that its provisions are mandatory, although in most cases it does; the test is this: "If to construe it as directory would render it ineffective and meaningless it should not receive that construction." *Cole v. Antelope Valley Union High School Dist. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1505, 1512, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443*

When "shall" and "may" appear in close proximity in particular context, inference as proper that Legislature intended mandatory and discretionary meanings, respectively. *Mughrabi v. Suzuki (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1212, 1215, 243 Cal. Rptr. 438* ; *People v. Mobil Oil Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 261, 270, 192 Cal. Rptr. 155*

When used in statute, "shall" as importing that its provisions are mandatory if that meaning is in accord with legislative intent. *Doyle v. Board of Supervisors (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1358, 1364, 243 Cal. Rptr. 572*

Whether use of "shall" means statutory provision is mandatory or directory as distinction used to determine whether action taken in violation of provision is valid; failure to comply with mandatory, rather than merely directory, provision as rendering action void; characterization of provision as mandatory or directory as depending on provision's importance in legislative scheme. *Myers v. Patterson (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 130, 135, 241 Cal. Rptr. 751*

Word "shall," as used in a statute, as not always importing that its provisions are mandatory. *Johnson v. Mead (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 156, 159, 236 Cal. Rptr. 277*

In absence of necessity to effectuate legislative intent by using another meaning, word "may" in statute interpreted as permissive, or conferring discretion. *Rhyne v. Municipal Court (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 807, 817, 170 Cal. Rptr. 312*

[v] Statutes Construed in Context of Whole

If statute uses general word in conjunction with other words describing specific acts that would ordinarily be within ambit of general word, then court may infer that general word refers to conduct other than those specific acts; thus, "acknowledged the child" in *Prob. Code § 6452* refers to conduct other than contributing to support or care of child, since statute specifically requires such contribution *plus* acknowledgement before natural parent may inherit from child who was born out of wedlock. *Estate of Griswold (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 904, 911, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 24 P.3d 1191*

Statute to be construed with reference to whole system of law of which it is part so that all may be harmonized and have effect. *Moore v. Panish (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 535, 541, 186 Cal. Rptr. 475, 652 P.2d 32* ; *O'Brien v. Dudenhoeffer*

(1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 327, 332, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 826

Statute as required always to be construed in context, keeping in mind nature and purpose of statutory act. *CEJA v. J. R. Wood, Inc. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1375, 242 Cal. Rptr. 531*

Two code sections on same subject as required to be read together. *Johnson v. Mead (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 156, 159, 236 Cal. Rptr. 277*

[w] Strict Construction

Statutes imposing new and unusual liability in nature of penalty as strictly construed in favor of persons sought to be subjected to operation; penal statute as requiring narrowest construction that is reasonably susceptible in light of its legislative purpose. *Tos v. Mayfair Packing Co. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 67, 78-79, 206 Cal. Rptr. 459*

[x] Subsequent Enactments

When statute adopts by specific reference provisions of another statute, those provisions are incorporated in form in which they exist at time of reference, not as subsequently amended; however, if reference is general instead of specific (such as reference to system or body of laws or to general law relating to particular subject), referring statute takes law or laws referred to not only in their contemporary form, but also as they may be changed from time to time or may even be repealed. *People v. Cooper (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 38, 44, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 219, 37 P.3d 403*

Legislature as presumed to have been aware of and to have acquiesced in previous judicial construction when it amends statute without altering portions of provision that were judicially construed. *In re Malinda S. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 368, 380, 272 Cal. Rptr. 787, 795 P.2d 1244*

Reenactment of statute that has been judicially construed as establishing presumption that Legislature adopted construction placed on statute by courts. *Wilkoff v. Superior Court (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 345, 353, 211 Cal. Rptr. 742, 696 P.2d 134*

Legislature's failure to change law in particular respect when subject is generally before it and changes in other respects are made as indicative of intent to leave law as it stands in aspects not amended. *Shaw v. McMahon (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 417, 424-427, 243 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Court as considering state of law existing prior to enactment of provision in determining intent of statutory enactment. *People v. Horn (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 1014, 1031, 205 Cal. Rptr. 119*

[y] Surplusage Avoided

Word "dedicated" does not have same meaning in *Pub. Res. Code § 5540*, which restricts regional-park or open-space district's ability to convey land that has been "actually dedicated" for park or open-space purposes, and in *Pub. Res. Code § 5565*, which states that land is "dedicated" when acquired by regional-park or open-space district; treating two usages of "dedicated" as meaning same thing would render qualifying word "actually" surplusage, thus violating rule of

statutory construction that courts should, if possible, accord meaning to every word and phrase in statute so as to better effectuate Legislature's intent. *Ste. Marie v. Riverside County Reg'l Park & Open-Space Dist. (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 282, 289-290, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 369, 206 P.3d 739*

In statutory construction, courts as required, if possible, to place significance on every word, phrase, sentence and part of an act to achieve underlying legislative purpose for particular statute or legislative scheme; interpretation making some words surplusage as to be avoided. *CEJA v. J. R. Wood, Inc. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1375, 242 Cal. Rptr. 531*

Statute as not to be given construction that results in rendering one of its provisions nugatory. *St. Cyr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 468, 473, 243 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[z] Typographical Error

Trial court's substitution of "of" for "or," on theory that ambiguity in statute resulted from typographical error, as erroneous when predecessor statutes also contained "or"; court as required to presume that Legislature meant word it used. *Malibu Committee for Incorporation v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 397, 404, 271 Cal. Rptr. 505*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.135

§ 531.135 Law Reviews

Comment, *A Functional Approach to Borrowing Limitations Periods for Federal Statutes, 77 Calif. L. Rev. 133 (1989)*

Popkin, *The Collaborative Model of Statutory Interpretation, 61 S. Cal. L. Rev. 543 (1988)*

Weisberg, *The Calabresian Judicial Artist: Statutes and the New Legal Process, 35 Stan. L. Rev. 213 (1983)*

Plater, *Statutory Violations and Equitable Discretion, 70 Calif. L. Rev. 524 (1982)*

Comment, *The Use of Extrinsic Aids in Determining Legislative Intent in California: The Need for Standardized Criteria, 12 Pac. L.J. 189 (1981)*

Steck, *California Legislation: Sources Unlimited, 6 Pac. L.J. 536 (1975)*

Nunez, *The Nature of Legislative Intent and the Use of Legislative Documents as Extrinsic Aids to Statutory Interpretation: A Reexamination, 9 Cal. W. L. Rev. 128 (1972)*

Note, *Pre-emption as a Preferential Ground: A New Canon of Construction, 12 Stan. L. Rev. 208 (1959)*

Note, *Statutes: Construction: The Legislative Silence Doctrine, 43 Cal. L. Rev. 907 (1955)*

Note, *Statutes: The Use of Code Headings As Constructional Aids, 33 Cal. L. Rev. 155 (1945)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 531.136-531.149

[Reserved]

§§ 531.136[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.150

§ 531.150 Allegations of Passage and Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 459] and Existence of Ordinance--Attaching Copy and Setting Forth Substance

[1] FORM Allegations of Passage and Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 459] and Existence of Ordinance--Attaching Copy and Setting Forth Substance

1. On _____ [*date of passage*], the _____ [*legislative body, e.g.,* Board of Supervisors] of the _____ [*specific public entity, e.g.,* County of Paradise] duly made and passed an ordinance entitled "_____" [*formal title of ordinance*] [*if desired for further clarity, add:* and more commonly known as _____ (*popular name, and municipal, or other, code number*)]. The ordinance was in full force and effect _____ [at all times mentioned herein *or* on _____ (*date of occurrence or transaction at issue in the case)*]. [A correct (certified) copy of said ordinance is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

[2. The ordinance provides, in part, _____ (*allege the substance of material parts of the ordinance, verbatim or by allegations summarizing its terms and showing their legal effect, as an aid to appreciation of the significance of subsequent allegations in the pleading or paper*).]

3. _____ [*Specify pleading party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] requests that judicial notice be taken of the ordinance.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing allegation is for use in a pleading to allege the existence of an ordinance.

Matters that are judicially known do not need to be pleaded [*Loranger v. Nadeau (1932) 215 Cal. 362, 364-366, 10 P.2d 63* , overruled on other grounds, *Reich v. Purcell (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 551, 555, 63 Cal. Rptr. 31, 432 P.2d 727*]. Ordinances, however, are not subject to mandatory judicial notice but to permissive judicial notice which becomes mandatory only if a party requests notice to be taken, gives each adverse party sufficient notice of the request, through the pleadings or otherwise, to enable such adverse party to prepare to meet the request, and furnishes the court with sufficient information to enable it to take judicial notice of the matter [*see Evid. Code §§ 452(b), 453*]. Paragraph 3 of the foregoing allegation may be included in a pleading to provide notice of a request for judicial notice of the ordinance.

For further discussion and forms to use in requesting judicial notice generally, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* .

[3] Allegation of Ordinance

An ordinance or private statute may be alleged by reference to its title and day of passage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 459*]. Citation of a number or popular name, attachment of a copy, and allegation of relevant terms of the ordinance or private statute are not necessary but may be provided in order to clarify the pleading.

[4] State Statutes

Pleading ordinance or private statute by title and day of passage as sufficient. *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*

Judicial notice of regulations and ordinances of public entities. *Evid. Code § 452(b)*

Judicial notice as mandatory on noticed request and furnishing of information *Evid. Code § 453*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.151

§ 531.151 Allegation of Substance of Ordinance

[1] FORM Allegation of Substance of Ordinance

1. At all times herein mentioned, there existed in full force and effect in the _____ [*specify county or municipal corporation, e.g.,* County of Paradise] a certain _____ [municipal *or* county] ordinance providing as follows: _____ [*set forth the substance of the ordinance relied on, verbatim or by allegations summarizing its terms and showing their legal effect*]. [A correct (certified) copy of the ordinance is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

2. _____ [*Specify pleading party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] requests that judicial notice be taken of the ordinance.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing allegation is for use in pleading an ordinance. As an alternative to pleading an ordinance by title and day of passage, as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 459* [*see § 531.150*], an ordinance may be pleaded by setting forth the substance of the provision relied on or by incorporating a copy of the ordinance by reference [*Clements v. T.R. Bechtel Co. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 227, 241, 273 P.2d 5*].

Paragraph 2 of the form may be included in a pleading to provide notice of a request for judicial notice of the ordinance [*see Evid. Code § 453(a)*; for discussion, *see § 531.150*].

[3] Decisions

Pleading adoption and effect or language of ordinance as alternative to pleading title and day of passage. *Simpson v. City of Los Angeles (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 271, 277, 253 P.2d 464 , appeal dismissed, 346 U.S. 802, 74 S. Ct. 37, 98 L. Ed. 333* ; *Taliaferro v. Wampler (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 306, 308, 273 P.2d 829*

[4] Cross Reference

See also Comments and References to § 531.150

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.152

§ 531.152 Allegations of Compliance With Conditions Precedent Under Statute or Ordinance [Code Civ. Proc. § 459]

[1] FORM Allegations of Compliance With Conditions Precedent Under Statute or Ordinance [Code Civ. Proc. § 459]

[*EITHER*]

Plaintiff duly performed all the conditions precedent to _____ [the bringing of this action *or specify right derived from statute*] required by _____ [*cite or identify statute or ordinance*].

[*OR*]

Plaintiff _____ [*specify condition precedent generally, e.g.,* gave notice to defendant] in the manner and within the time provided by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* law *or cite or identify statute or ordinance*].

[*OR*]

The _____ [*specify act requiring conditions precedent, e.g.,* sale] in all respects complied with the provisions of law contained in _____ [*cite statutes, e.g.,* Division 5, Chapter 7 of the Food and Agricultural Code].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing allegations are alternatives for use in alleging performance of conditions precedent under a statute, an ordinance of a county or municipal corporation, or of a right derived therefrom. If statutory conditions are not pleaded, the complaint will be subject to a general demurrer even if the existence of the conditions does not appear on the face of the complaint, because the court takes judicial notice of their existence [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*; *Evid. Code §§*

451(a), 452(b)].

When plaintiff is relying on an ordinance as part of his or her cause of action, this form may be combined with § 531.150 or 2, pleading the ordinance and requesting that judicial notice be taken of it.

[3] Contents of Allegation

The allegations allege as a conclusion the performance of a condition precedent under a statute or an ordinance of a county or municipal corporation. In making the allegation, it is not necessary to state the facts showing performance, but it may be stated generally that the party duly performed all the conditions on his or her part required by the statute or ordinance. If the allegation is controverted, the party pleading performance must establish facts showing such performance at trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 459*].

[4] State Statutes

Pleading compliance with conditions precedent under statute or ordinance. *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*

[5] Decisions

Illustrative allegations held sufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 459*. *Blumer v. Kirkman Corporation (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 480, 485, 241 P.2d 17* ; *Motor City Sales v. Superior Court (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 342, 347-348, 107 Cal. Rptr. 280* ; *Rembold v. San Francisco (1952) 113 Cal. App. 2d 795, 798, 249 P.2d 58* ; *Bank of America v. McLaughlin etc. Co. (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 620, 635, 105 P.2d 607 , cert. denied, 313 U.S. 571, 61 S. Ct. 958, 85 L. Ed. 1529 (1941)* ; *Ley v. Babcock (1931) 118 Cal. App. 525, 527, 5 P.2d 620*

Allegation of compliance with statutory conditions precedent as necessary to state cause of action. *First Tr. & Sav. Bank v. City of Pasadena (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 220, 221-223, 130 P.2d 702* ; *People v. Ballerino (1893) 99 Cal. 598, 600, 34 P. 330* ; *Sierra Inv. Corp. v. County of Sacramento (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 339, 346, 60 Cal. Rptr. 519* ; *Chas. L. Harney, Inc. v. State of California (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 77, 101-102, 31 Cal. Rptr. 524* (questioned as to substance of condition precedent in *Savage v. State of California (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 793, 796, 84 Cal. Rptr. 650*)

Allegation held insufficient. *J.T. Jenkins Co. v. Kennedy (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 474, 481-482, 119 Cal. Rptr. 578*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.153

§ 531.153 Allegation of Violation of Statute or Ordinance

[1] FORM Allegation of Violation of Statute or Ordinance

1. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*address or location*] _____ [*allege acts or omissions in violation of statute, e.g.*, defendant, a retail automobile dealer, sold to plaintiff a motor vehicle, taking plaintiff's old car in trade and accepting an assignment of the insurance policy pertaining to plaintiff's old car. Defendant has collected $ _____ on the insurance policy, but has failed and refused to credit that amount toward plaintiff's monthly payments or to refund the amount to plaintiff] in violation of _____ [*cite or identify statute or ordinance, e.g., Section 18450 of the Business and Professions Code*], then and there in full force and effect [which provides that: _____ (*set forth relevant portions of ordinance, when ordinance is involved*)].

[2. Plaintiff requests that judicial notice be taken of _____ (*cite or identify ordinance relied on, if any, in Paragraph 1*). (A true and correct copy of that ordinance, certified as such by _____ (*certifying official*), is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.)]

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing allegation is for use in alleging violation of a statutory duty or a duty imposed by ordinance in an action to enforce a liability or penalty imposed by the statute or ordinance. It is not necessary to plead or refer to a statute relied on as creating a duty when the action is one predicated on defendant's negligence and is not one to enforce a liability or penalty imposed by statute or ordinance. When the case is predicated on negligence, the statute or ordinance is merely evidentiary, and may be introduced at trial without being pleaded [*McNeill v. A. Teichert & Son, Inc. (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 5, 8-9, 289 P.2d 595* (ordinance); *Jackson v. Hardy (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 6, 12, 160 P.2d 161* (statute)]. Although violations of statutes are frequently alleged without objection in connection with general allegations of negligence, this practice is improper, and the statutory references may be striken as surplusage [*see Szopieray v. West Berkeley etc. Co. (1924) 194 Cal. 106, 113, 227 P. 720]* .

The optional second paragraph is for use if Paragraph 1 relies on an ordinance, and is designed as a request and notice of a request for judicial notice of the ordinance [*see Evid. Code §§ 452(b), 453*; *see § 531.150*]. If the duty relied on in

Paragraph 1 arises out of a California or federal public statute, the second paragraph is unnecessary because judicial notice of such statutes is always mandatory [*see Evid. Code § 451(a)*; for a discussion of public versus private statutes, *see § 531.11*].

For forms of allegation of violation of statutes and ordinances relating to any particular subject, see the chapter relating to that subject in this set.

[3] Decisions

Statute or ordinance as evidentiary matter that need not be pleaded in action for negligence rather than for enforcement of penalty or liability imposed by statute or ordinance. *Szopieray v. West Berkeley etc. Co. (1924) 194 Cal. 106, 113, 227 P. 720* ; *Opitz v. Schenck (1918) 178 Cal. 636, 638-639, 174 P. 40* ; *Karl v. C.A. Reed Lumber Co. (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 358, 361-362, 79 Cal. Rptr. 852*

Pleading of every fact essential to existence of statutory cause of action as required. *Susman v. City of Los Angeles (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 803, 809, 75 Cal. Rptr. 240*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.154

§ 531.154 Allegation of Foreign or Sister State Statute or Ordinance

[1] FORM Allegation of Foreign or Sister State Statute or Ordinance

1. At all times herein mentioned, there was in full force and effect in _____ [*specify place of transaction or occurrence at issue*] a certain _____ [statute *or* ordinance] entitled and known as _____ [*specify title*], which provided _____ [*set forth pertinent provisions of foreign or sister state statute or ordinance*]. [A true and correct copy of the _____ (statute *or* ordinance), certified as such by (*certifying official*), is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

2. _____ [*Specify pleading party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] requests that judicial notice be taken of the _____ [statute *or* ordinance].

3. _____ [*Allege facts showing applicability of foreign or sister state statute or ordinance to the facts and issues of the case*].

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing allegation is for use in alleging foreign or sister state statutes or ordinances of public entities in foreign nations or sister states.

Statutes and ordinances of foreign countries and sister states are subject to permissive judicial notice which may be made mandatory by request, and Paragraph 2 of this form is designed to request and give notice of a request for judicial notice [*Evid. Code §§ 452(a), (b), (f), 453*; for discussion, *see § 531.150*].

[3] Allegation of Statute or Ordinance

The allegation sets out information sufficient to identify the foreign or sister state statute or ordinance which is relevant to the case.

[4] State Statutes

Judicial notice of sister state statutes. *Evid. Code § 452(a)*

Judicial notice of ordinances of public entities in sister states. *Evid. Code § 452(b)*

Judicial notice of foreign statutes and ordinances of public entities in foreign nations. *Evid. Code § 452(f)*

Judicial notice as mandatory on noticed request and furnishing of information. *Evid. Code § 453*

Information court may consider in determining whether to take judicial notice. *Evid. Code § 454*

Parties as having opportunity to present information regarding matter to be judicially noticed. *Evid. Code § 455*

Appointment of person learned in the subject matter to be judicially noticed. *Evid. Code § 460*

Proof of official writings. *Evid. Code §§ 1530, 1531*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.155

§ 531.155 Notice of Request [Evid. Code § 453(a)] That Court Take Judicial Notice of Statute or Ordinance of Sister State, Foreign Statute, or Ordinance of Public Entity

[1] FORM Notice of Request [Evid. Code § 453(a)] That Court Take Judicial Notice of Statute or Ordinance of Sister State, Foreign Statute, or Ordinance of Public Entity

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff], _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify when judicial notice will be requested to be taken, e.g.,* at the hearing on the motion for summary judgment], will request the court to take judicial notice of _____ [*specify matter to be noticed, e.g.,* _____ County ordinance _____ (*number*), duly enacted and passed by the _____ County Board of Supervisors on _____ [*date*], and entitled _____].

[*EITHER, in the case of sister state statute*]

The request will be made on the ground that the statute is subject to judicial notice under *Evid. Code §§ 452(a)* and *453*.

[*OR, in case of foreign statute or ordinance*]

The request will be made on the ground that the _____ [statute *or* ordinance] is subject to judicial notice under *Evid. Code §§ 452(f)* and *453*.

[*OR, in case of ordinance of public entity in California or sister state*]

The request will be made on the ground that the ordinance is subject to judicial notice under *Evid. Code §§ 452(b)* and *453*.

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing notice of request is for use in giving notice of a request that the court take judicial notice of an ordinance of a public entity of California, a sister state, or a foreign nation. The notice may also be used to give notice of a request to take notice of a sister state or foreign statute. The form may be adapted for use in giving notice of a request that the court take judicial notice of other matters listed in *Evid. Code § 452* [*see Evid. Code § 453*; for discussion of matters listed in *Evid. Code § 452, see § 531.13*].

This form of notice should be used when notice of a request that judicial notice be taken was not given through the pleadings. Even if notice has been given through the pleadings, this form may be used in connection with a pretrial proceeding, such as a motion for summary judgment, to make it clear that a request for judicial notice to be taken will be made at the hearing on the pretrial proceeding.

This form does not provide a complete form of notice, but is intended for incorporation in a notice of motion or points and authorities relating to the pretrial proceeding at which notice will be requested. If the issue of judicial notice should arise when no other papers are called for, the foregoing form may be adapted for use by the addition of a caption, introduction, and signature block.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 531.150, 531.154, 531.156*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 531 STATUTES AND ORDINANCES
PART IV. FORMS

46-531 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 531.156

§ 531.156 Declaration of City Clerk That Ordinance Was in Effect on a Given Date

[1] FORM Declaration of City Clerk That Ordinance Was in Effect on a Given Date

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF CITY CLERK AS TO EXIST-
Defendant.	)	ENCE OF ORDINANCE
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], the undersigned, declare that I am the City Clerk in and for the City of _____, _____ County, California; I have searched the records maintained in my office and find that Ordinance No. _____, entitled _____, was enacted by the City Council, City of _____, on _____ [*date*], and that the ordinance was in effect from that date and was still in effect on _____ [*relevant date*].

Declarant further states that [Section _____ of] the ordinance reads as follows:
_____ [*set out ordinance*].

[A certified copy (of Section _____) of the ordinance is attached as Exhibit A and made a part of this declaration.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
City Clerk

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing declaration may be used to furnish a court with sufficient information to enable it to take judicial notice of a city ordinance [*see Evid. Code §§ 452(b), 453-455*]. It may be adapted for use in furnishing the court with information regarding a county ordinance.

Use of this form is not necessary if a copy of the ordinance is available that purports to be published by the authority of the public entity in which the ordinance is kept, because such a copy is also prima facie evidence of the existence and content of the ordinance [*Evid. Code § 1530(a)(1)*].

[3] Contents of Declaration

Although *Evid. Code § 453* does not define what constitutes sufficient information to enable a court to take judicial notice of a matter, a copy of a writing in the custody of a public entity attested or certified [or declared (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*)] as a correct copy by a public employee, or by his or her deputy, having legal custody of the writing is prima facie evidence of the existence and content of the writing [*Evid. Code § 1530(a)(2)*]. Because the declaration would be prima facie evidence of an ordinance, it would of necessity be sufficient information to enable the court to take judicial notice of it.

The declaration states that the copy is a correct copy of the original, or of a specified part of the original, as is required in an attestation or certificate (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of a copy of a writing for the purpose of evidence [*Evid. Code § 1531*]. The declaration also states the day of passage of the ordinance, and that the ordinance was still in effect on the date of the transaction or occurrence at issue in the case in order to show its existence at the pertinent time.

[4] State Statutes

Sufficient evidence as required to be presented to make judicial notice of ordinance mandatory. *Evid. Code §§ 452(b), 453*

Copy attested or certified as correct copy as prima facie evidence. *Evid. Code § 1530(a)(2)*

Contents of attestation or certificate of correctness of copy. *Evid. Code § 1531*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 532 [RESERVED]

46-532 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 532

[RESERVED]

Chapter 532[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 533.syn

§ 533.syn Synopsis to Chapter 533: STIPULATIONS

§ 533.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 533.02 Cross References

§§ 533.03-533.09 [Reserved]

§ 533.10 Governing Law

[1] Attorney's Authority

[2] Local Rule Limitations

§ 533.11 Stipulation Defined

§ 533.12 Authority of Attorney to Bind Client

[1] Implied Authority

[2] Express Authority

§ 533.13 Particular Matters to Which Parties May Effectively Stipulate

[1] Extending Service of Process Requirements

[2] Extending or Waiving Pleading Requirements

[3] Preserving Confidentiality of Documents

[4] Dismissing Claims

[5] Narrowing Issues or Defenses

[6] Admitting Facts or Waiving Evidentiary Requirements

[a] Admitting Facts

[b] Admission of Otherwise Inadmissible Evidence

[c] Evidence Introduced in Other Proceedings

[d] Admission of Depositions

[e] Expert Witnesses

[f] Judicial Notice

[7] Modifying Trial Procedures

[8] Settlement and Stipulated Judgment

[a] Stipulating to Entry of Judgment

[b] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

[9] Matters Affecting Appellate Procedure or Review

§ 533.14 Particular Matters to Which Parties May Not Effectively Stipulate

[1] Matters That Are Illegal or Contrary to Public Policy

[2] Matters That Constitute Questions of Law

[3] Matters Affecting Subject Matter Jurisdiction of Court

§ 533.15 Requirements for Stipulations

[1] Written Record

[2] Exceptions to Requirement of Writing

[3] Signature or Assent by Attorney of Record

[4] Timely Filing of Written Stipulation

§ 533.16 Construction and Effect

§ 533.17 Relief From Stipulations

[1] Grounds

[a] Grounds Summarized

[b] Mistake of Fact or Law

[2] Procedure

[a] Noticed Motion

[b] Standing

[c] Timeliness of Motion

[d] Appeal

§§ 533.18-533.29 [Reserved]

§ 533.30 State Constitution

§ 533.31 State Statutes

[1] Authority to Bind Clients

[2] Stipulations Regarding Specific Matters

[a] Discovery

[b] Extensions or Postponements

[c] Settlement

[d] Venue

§ 533.32 California Rules of Court

§ 533.33 Local Rules of Court

§ 533.34 Decisions

[1] Authority of Attorney to Bind Client

[2] Construction and Effect

[3] Writing Requirement

[4] Relief From Stipulation

§ 533.35 Text References

§§ 533.36-533.39 [Reserved]

§ 533.40 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Execution and Filing

[4] Cross References

§ 533.41 Stipulation of Facts [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--Objections to Admissibility Not Waived

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Execution and Filing

[4] Cross References

§ 533.42 Notice of Motion to Set Aside Stipulation and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Grounds

[4] Timing

[5] Cross References

§ 533.43 Order Setting Aside Stipulation

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.01

§ 533.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the requirements, scope and effect of stipulations, as well as the method for seeking relief from a stipulation's terms. The chapter contains the following forms:

- General form for a stipulation [*see § 533.40*].
- Stipulation of facts [*see § 533.41*].
- Notice of motion and supporting declaration to set aside a stipulation [*see § 533.42*] and order granting the motion [*see § 533.43*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.02

§ 533.02 Cross References

For discussion of the general authority of an attorney to control litigation, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.190* et seq.

Many other chapters have discussion and forms relating to stipulations on specific subject matter as follows:

- For forms for use in obtaining continuances or dropping cases from the trial calendar, see Ch. 136, *Continuances* .

- For discussion and forms for use to obtain the entry of a judgment by stipulation, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

- For procedure and forms for use to stipulate to the amendment of pleadings and the filing of supplemental pleadings, see Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings* .

- For forms for use to stipulate to the use of answers on file and to extend time to plead, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

- For procedures and a form for use to stipulate to a general reference, see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

- For forms for use to stipulate to the substitution of a security deposit in lieu of an undertaking, to the abandonment of an appeal, and to the consolidation of appeals, see *Ch. 43, Appeal: Stay of Proceedings, § 43.71, Ch. 48, Appeal: Abandonment, Dismissal, and Stipulated Reversal, § 48.51 -48.52,* and *Ch. 42, Appeal: Notice of Appeal, § 42.100,* respectively.

- For a form for use to stipulate to judicial arbitration, see Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* .

- For procedures and forms for use to stipulate to the consolidation of actions or of issues for trial, see Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions*

- For procedures and forms for use in stipulations relating to discovery, see Ch. 190- 200: *Discovery* .

- For a form for use to stipulate to the discharge of an interpleading party, see Ch. 314, *Interpleader* .

- For procedures and forms for use to stipulate to the appointment of temporary judges, and for disqualification or transfer to a different judge, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

- For a form for use to stipulate to the calling of alternate jurors when a lengthy trial is anticipated, see *Ch. 322, Juries and Jury Selection, § 322.101*.

- For procedures and a form for use to stipulate to an extension of time to file affidavits supporting and opposing a motion for new trial, see *Ch. 371, Motions After Trial, § 371.60* et seq.

- For forms for use to stipulate to continuances of pretrial conferences, to corrections of pretrial orders, and to settlement conferences with binding determinations, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* ,.

- For forms for use to stipulate to the extension of time, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* .

- For a form for use to submit a controversy on an agreed statement of facts, see Ch. 534, *Submitted Controversy (Agreed Case)*.

- For forms for use to stipulate to the extension of time to bring an action to trial, to the removal of a case from the calendar, and to the use of photocopies as evidence at trial, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

- For a form for use to stipulate to the change of the place of trial, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsStipulationsCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART I. SCOPE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 533.03-533.09

[Reserved]

§§ 533.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.10

§ 533.10 Governing Law

[1] Attorney's Authority

An attorney's authority to enter into a stipulation is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 283*.

[2] Local Rule Limitations

All trial courts are required to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, *Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.* through local rules [*Gov. Code §§ 68605.5, 68620*]. These local rules may restrict the availability of stipulations [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.10(a) (as general rule, no time standard may be modified, extended, or avoided by stipulation unless written order approving stipulation is first obtained from judge hearing case)].

Local trial delay reduction rules must, however, allow the parties to agree, by stipulation filed with the court within 30 days of service of the responsive pleadings, to a continuance not to exceed 30 days [*Gov. Code § 68616(d)*].

For further discussion, see Ch. 552, *Trial Court Delay Reduction* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActActual AuthorityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.11

§ 533.11 Stipulation Defined

A stipulation is an agreement entered into between counsel, relating to business before the court [*see Spindell v. State Bar (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 253, 260-261, 118 Cal. Rptr. 480, 530 P.2d 168]* . Unless contrary to law, court rule or policy, it is also binding on the court [*T & O Mobile Homes, Inc. v. United California Bank (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 441, 451 n.11, 220 Cal. Rptr. 627, 709 P.2d 430]* .

It may be made at any step of the action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 283*]. For discussion of matters to which the parties may stipulate, see *§ 533.13*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.12

§ 533.12 Authority of Attorney to Bind Client

[1] Implied Authority

An attorney has the authority to bind his or her client in any of the steps of an action or proceeding [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1)*]. An attorney may enter into stipulations without a client's prior, express authority with respect to tactical decisions or necessary or incidental matters regarding the management of the suit [*Blanton v. Womancare, Inc. (1985) 38 Cal.3d 396, 404, 212 Cal. Rptr. 151, 696 P.2d 645* ; *see also Hayman v. Block (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 629, 634 n.5, 222 Cal. Rptr. 293* (attorney has control over presentation of evidence and can enter into stipulations without client's concurrence)]. An attorney also has the authority to stipulate to a temporary judge to hear the action without first obtaining express authority from the client [*In re Horton (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 82, 92-93, 284 Cal. Rptr. 305, 813 P.2d 1335]* . In these instances, the authority of the client is implied and the client is bound by the stipulation.

[2] Express Authority

An attorney must obtain his or her client's consent before entering into a stipulation which impairs a substantial portion of the case or involves a waiver or compromise of a fundamental right [*Levy v. Superior Court (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 578, 584, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878, 896 P.2d 171* (agreement to settle signed by attorneys is not enforceable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*); *Blanton v. Womancare, Inc. (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 396, 407, 212 Cal. Rptr. 151, 696 P.2d 645* (attorney cannot stipulate to binding arbitration without client's authority); *see also Linsk v. Linsk (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 272, 276-278, 74 Cal. Rptr. 544, 449 P.2d 760]* . However, a client may ratify an unauthorized stipulation entered into by his or her attorney [*Redsted v. Weiss (1945) 71 Cal. App. 2d 660, 664-665, 163 P.2d 105]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActActual AuthorityExpress AuthorityBusiness & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActActual AuthorityImplied AuthorityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.13

§ 533.13 Particular Matters to Which Parties May Effectively Stipulate

[1] Extending Service of Process Requirements

The parties may stipulate to extend the time required to effectuate service of process [*Big Bear Mun. Water Dist. v. Superior Court (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 919, 923, 75 Cal. Rptr. 580]* . However, local rules may limit the length of an extension (*see § 533.10 [2]*). For further discussion on impact of an extension on dismissal of the action, see *Ch. 212, Dismissal, § 212.60* et seq.

[2] Extending or Waiving Pleading Requirements

Subject to local rule limitations, discussed in *§ 533.10 [2]*, stipulations may extend the time to move, answer, or otherwise plead to the complaint [*see, e.g., Farrar, Herrick & Associates v. Safecare Co. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 123, 127, 131, 171 Cal. Rptr. 191* ; *Consolidated Dock & Storage Co. v. Superior Court (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 949, 951, 952, 96 Cal. Rptr. 254]* .

A stipulation granting an open extension of time to respond to a complaint will not preclude dismissal of an action for delay in prosecution [*see Marra v. Mission Foods Corp. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 724, 728, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 741* ; *Martin v. K & K Properties, Inc. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1566, 234 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

A stipulation to take a motion off calendar may have unintended consequences as, for example, where a demurrer was taken off calendar in exchange for plaintiff's agreement to file an amended complaint. The court dismissed the action with prejudice on the basis that the stipulation deemed the demurrer sustained without leave to amend [*see Harding v. Collazo (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1053, 223 Cal. Rptr. 329]* .

[3] Preserving Confidentiality of Documents

Parties commonly enter into stipulations to preserve and protect the confidentiality of certain documents during litigation. The parties may stipulate to a protective order in anticipation of or in response to written discovery requests and then seek the court's approval [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2017(c)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.020* operative July 1, 2005), *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.030* operative July 1, 2005), *Code Civ. Proc. § 2021* (*Code Civ. Proc.*

§ 2016.030 operative July 1, 2005)]. A stipulated protective order may include adescription of documents which are to remain sealed, which are to be redacted to conceal confidential information, and a procedural mechanism for the parties to challenge confidential designations of documents [*see e.g., Flagship Federal Sav. Bank v. Wall (S.D. Cal. 1990) 748 F.Supp. 742, 749]* .

[4] Dismissing Claims

Stipulations may provide for the dismissal or abatement of an action [*see, e.g., Reid v. Valley Restaurants, Inc. (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 606, 609-610, 311 P.2d 473* ; *Cal-Vada Aircraft, Inc. v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 435, 448, 224 Cal. Rptr. 809]* .

[5] Narrowing Issues or Defenses

The parties may stipulate to limit the issues or defenses to be adjudicated [*Title Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 715, 733, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 822, 842 P.2d 121* ; *see also County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1117, 1119, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290* (stipulation clarifying issues in controversy); *Golden State Homebuilding Associates v. City of Modesto (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 601, 614, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 572* (limiting scope of court's ruling to real property lots at issue)]. A stipulation may also admit liability or damages [*Gonzales v. Pacific Greyhound Lines (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 749, 754, 214 P.2d 809]* .

[6] Admitting Facts or Waiving Evidentiary Requirements

[a] Admitting Facts

Stipulations are frequently made concerning evidentiary matters. Proof of facts may be dispensed with by stipulations in civil or criminal actions [*People v. Adams (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 570, 580-582, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 831* P.2d 831; *Greatorex v. Board of Administration (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 54, 58, 154 Cal. Rptr. 37]* . Once a party has stipulated to a fact, he or she is bound by the stipulation even if other provisions of the stipulation are later set aside [*Rossman v. State Bar (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 539, 542, 216 Cal. Rptr. 919, 703 P.2d 390]* . For discussion of relief from a stipulation based on mistake of fact or law, *see § 533.17[1][b], below*.

[b] Admission of Otherwise Inadmissible Evidence

The parties may stipulate to the admission of evidence even if the evidence is otherwise inadmissible [*County of Alameda v. Risby (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1425, 1430, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 333* (paternity blood test results admissible pursuant to stipulation); *Civil Service Assn. v. Civil Service Com. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 449, 459, 188 Cal. Rptr. 806* (polygraph test results admissible pursuant to stipulation; overruled on other grounds)].

[c] Evidence Introduced in Other Proceedings

Parties may also stipulate to admit evidence introduced in other actions or proceedings [*Werner v. State Bar (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 611, 614, 150 P.2d 892* ; *see also In re Kerry O. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 326, 332, 258 Cal. Rptr. 448* (stipulation to use child's prior testimony in dependency proceeding)].

[d] Admission of Depositions

Depositions may be admitted in evidence by stipulation [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles County Employees' Assn. v. Sanitation Dist. No. 2 *(1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 294, 300, 152 Cal.Rptr. 415]* .

[e] Expert Witnesses

The parties may also stipulate to the qualifications and findings of an expert witness [*McGuire v. Baird (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 353, 356, 70 P.2d 915* ; *People v. McCoy (1953) 115 Cal. App. 2d 565, 568, 252 P.2d 371]* .

[f] Judicial Notice

The parties may stipulate that the trial court take judicial notice of particular matters [*Laguna Beach Taxpayers' Asso. v. City Council of Laguna Beach (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 412, 416, 9 Cal. Rptr. 775]* .

[7] Modifying Trial Procedures

Stipulations are frequently made pertaining to procedural steps during trial. For example, stipulations may:

- Extend the time for trial or for a hearing on a motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1054*; *see also, Miles v. Speidel (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 879, 884, 259 Cal. Rptr. 582* (extension of five-year period to bring action to trial); *but see § 355.10 [2*], discussing the impact of rules under the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act, *Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*].

- Provide that the action be tried by a temporary judge or special master [*see, e.g., In re Horton (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 82, 97-98, 284 Cal. Rptr. 305, 813 P.2d 1335]* .

- Provide for the consolidation of actions with court approval under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048(a)* [*see, e.g., Ranchers Bank v. Pressman (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 612, 616, 97 Cal. Rptr. 78]* .

- Designate the content of jury instructions [*see, e.g., Cracknell v. Fisher Governor Co. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 857, 862, 56 Cal. Rptr. 64]* .

- Waive findings by the court [*see, e.g., Worcester v. Worcester (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 56, 62, 54 Cal. Rptr. 436]* .

- Provide that the case be taken under submission without further hearing [*see, e.g., Jacoby v. Feldman (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 432, 445, 446, 146 Cal. Rptr. 334]* .

- Waive the requirement that the court provide a statement of reasons for granting a new trial when it has expressly adopted previously filed reasons [*see, e.g., Herman v. Shandor (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 476, 481, 87 Cal. Rptr. 443]* .

- Provide that the court determine liability issues before deciding whether to certify the case as a class action [*Woosley v. State of California (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 794, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758* , *cert. denied, 124 L. Ed. 2d 639 (1993)]* .

[8] Settlement and Stipulated Judgment

[a] Stipulating to Entry of Judgment

The parties to an action or proceeding may stipulate to the entry of judgment [*see, e.g., California State Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau v. Superior Court (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 658, 664, 268 Cal. Rptr. 284, 788 P.2d 1156* ; *Xebec Development Partners, Ltd. v. National Union Fire Ins. Co. (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 501, 574, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726]* . The court may enter judgment on motion of a party pursuant to the terms of a settlement agreement that has either been stipulated to orally in court or by written agreement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*; *Corkland v. Boscoe (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 989, 994, 203 Cal. Rptr. 356]* . If requested by the parties, the court may retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*].

A Section 664.6 stipulation requires the direct participation of the parties; a stipulation signed only by the attorneys is not enforceable under Section 664.6 [*Levy v. Superior Court (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 578, 585-586, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878, 896 P.2d 171]* . For further discussion of Section 664.6, see Ch. 520, *Settlement and Release* .

For forms of stipulation and notice of motion for entry of judgment pursuant to stipulation, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq., for disscussion regarding stipulating to the reversal of a judgment as part of a settlement, see Ch. 48, *Appeal: Abandonment, Dismissal, and Stipulated Reversal* .

[b] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

A stipulated judgment is a decision on the merits [*Greatorex v. Board of Administration (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 54, 58, 154 Cal. Rptr. 37]* , and the doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel apply to those claims and issues embraced within the consent judgment [*Greatorex v. Board of Administration (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 54, 58, 154 Cal. Rptr. 37* ; *Ellena v. State of California (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 245, 260, 138 Cal. Rptr. 110]* . A stipulated judgment normally determines all matters placed in issue by the pleadings but the parties can agree to restrict the scope of the judgment by expressly withdrawing an issue from it [*see In re Marriage of Buckley (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 927, 935, 184 Cal. Rptr. 290* ; *Ellena v. State of California (1977) 69 Cal.App. 3d 245, 260, 138 Cal. Rptr. 110]* . For further discussion, see Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* .

For forms of stipulation and notice of motion for entry of judgment pursuant to stipulation, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

[9] Matters Affecting Appellate Procedure or Review

The parties may stipulate to appellate procedures, including:

- Voluntary abandonment and waiver of the right to appeal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.244(b)*; *In re Cody W. (1994) 31 Cal. App. 4th 221, 231, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 848]* .

- Limitations of issues on appeal [*see, e.g., People v. Harris (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7, 95 Cal. Rptr. 468* ; *Phillips v. Patterson (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 481, 483, 93 P.2d 807]* .

- The issuance of a writ of supersedeas [*see, e.g., Willingham v. Pecora (1940) 40 Cal. App. 2d 123, 124, 104 P.2d 405]* .

- The preparation of a partial transcript [*Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 8.130(b)*].

Although parties may stipulate to have a judgment reversed or vacated, the appellate court is statutorily directed not to reverse or vacate the judgment unless the public interest outweighs the parties' reasons for the request [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128(a)(8)*]. For further discussion, including the test used by the court, see *Ch. 48, Appeal: Abandonment, Dismissal, and Stipulated Reversal, § 48.12*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsStipulationsCivil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsStipulationsCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil

ProcedureAppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStipulated ReversalsEvidenceJudicial AdmissionsAdmissions During Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.14

§ 533.14 Particular Matters to Which Parties May Not Effectively Stipulate

[1] Matters That Are Illegal or Contrary to Public Policy

A stipulation is not binding on the court if it is illegal or contrary to public policy [*see California State Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau v. Superior Court(1990) 50 Cal. 3d 658, 664, 268 Cal. Rptr. 284, 788 P.2d 1156]* . The benefits of statutes designed to protect the public interest and welfare cannot be limited or abridged by stipulation [*Wilson v. Wilson (1873) 45 Cal. 399, 405]* .

[2] Matters That Constitute Questions of Law

A stipulation will not bind the court on questions of law, including legal conclusions to be drawn from admitted or stipulated facts, or interpretations of the federal and California Constitutions, statutes, and ordinances [*Fields v. Blue Shield of California (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 570, 579, 580 n.5, 209 Cal. Rptr. 781* ; *County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 1178, 1183, 207 Cal. Rptr. 425]* .

[3] Matters Affecting Subject Matter Jurisdiction of Court

Jurisdiction over the subject matter of an action or proceeding generally cannot be conferred on the court, enlarged, or waived by stipulation of the parties [*Harrington v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 185, 188, 228 P. 15* ; *Norman I. Krug Real Estate Investments, Inc. v. Praszker (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 35, 47, 269 Cal. Rptr. 228]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsValidityContracts LawDefensesIllegal BargainsContracts LawDefensesPublic Policy Violations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.15

§ 533.15 Requirements for Stipulations

[1] Written Record

Code Civ. Proc. § 283(1), provides that a stipulation is effective at any of stage of an action or proceeding when filed with the clerk, or entered on the minutes of the court [*see Lipscomb v. Krause (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 970, 974, 151 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . The purpose of Section 283 is to ensure that there is a record of any stipulation that will preclude any question concerning its character or effect. The extent of the agreement must be ascertainable from the record--either from the minutes, if oral, or from a writing filed with the clerk [*Cathcart v. Gregory (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 179, 187, 113 P.2d 894]* . The terms of an oral stipulation entered in the minutes must be definite and certain to be valid and effective [*Harris v. Spinali Auto Sales, Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 447, 452, 49 Cal. Rptr. 610]* .

An unexecuted agreement that is neither embodied in a writing filed with the clerk nor entered on the minutes of the court is not binding and can be revoked at any time before it becomes executed [*McDowell v. Orsini (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 951, 960, 127 Cal. Rptr. 285]* .

[2] Exceptions to Requirement of Writing

Stipulations that are neither filed with the court nor entered on the minutes of the court will be recognized if they have been executed and cannot be nullified without doing an injustice to one party [*see Baker v. Ramirez (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1123, 1135, 235 Cal. Rptr. 857* (stipulation set aside due to finding of injustice)].

An oral stipulation may be enforced based on the parties' conduct through either estoppel or ratification, despite the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 283* [*Harding v. Collazo (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1052, 223 Cal. Rptr. 329]* . For example, if, under the terms of a verbal stipulation, one party has received the advantage sought, or the other party has given up some right or lost some advantage, sothat it would be inequitable to insist that the stipulation is invalid, then the first party may not repudiate the stipulation on the ground that it was not entered in the court's minutes. If the party admits making the stipulation, it will be as binding as if entered in the minutes [*Harding v. Collazo (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1052, 223 Cal. Rptr. 329* (party bound by stipulation to take hearing on demurrer off calendar and to file amended complaint by a certain date)]. If, however, the stipulation is disputed and there is no showing of estoppel or ratification, the stipulation will not be enforced [*Estate of Cattalini (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 366, 370-371, 158 Cal.*

Rptr. 640 (stipulation regarding division of broker's commission on sale of property in decedent's estate unenforceable)].

Thus, a stipulation entered into and fully executed by the parties in open court and duly reported in the trial proceedings, but not entered in the minutes, is binding on the parties [*Webster v. Webster (1932) 216 Cal. 485, 489-490, 491, 14 P.2d 522* ; *Cathcart v. Gregory (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 179, 187-188, 113 P.2d 894]* .

Similarly, the parties may not repudiate a written stipulation on the ground that it has not been filed with the clerk if they have acted on it to such an extent that it would be inequitable not to recognize its binding effect [*Smith v. Whittier (1892) 95 Cal. 279, 288-289, 30 P. 529* ; *Harding v. Collazo (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1044, 1052, 223 Cal. Rptr. 329]* .

[3] Signature or Assent by Attorney of Record

When there is an attorney of record, no stipulation as to the conduct or disposal of an action can be entertained by the court unless signed or assented to by the attorney [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. San Francisco (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 37, 42-43 152 P.2d 625* ; *Toy v. Haskell (1900) 128 Cal. 558, 560, 61 P. 89]* . A definite and complete agreement usually does not require the signature of the parties to be effective [*see Johnston, Baker & Palmer v. Record Machine & Tool Co. (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 200, 206, 6 Cal. Rptr. 847]* . For further discussion of the scope of attorneys' authority to bind clients, see *§ 533.12*.

[4] Timely Filing of Written Stipulation

There is no time limit for filing a stipulation under *Code Civ. Proc. § 283*. The stipulation should be effective when filed if no injury is shown resulting from a delay in filing [*Clemens v. Gregg (1917) 34 Cal. App. 245, 253, 167 P. 294]* .

When filed, the stipulation becomes binding on the parties as of the date of its execution [*Smith v. Whittier (1892) 95 Cal. 279, 290, 30 P. 529]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsValidity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.16

§ 533.16 Construction and Effect

Stipulations are generally considered to be contracts [*Palmer v. City of Long Beach (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 134, 142, 199 P.2d 952* ; *Rappenecker v. Sea-Land Service, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 256, 263, 155 Cal. Rptr. 516]* . In construing stipulations, courts apply the rules for construction of contracts [*J.C. Penney Co. v. Superior Court (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 666, 669, 343 P.2d 919* ; *Sy First Family Ltd. Partnership v. Cheung (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340* ; *Floystrup v. City of Berkeley Rent Stabilization Bd. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1318, 268 Cal. Rptr. 898]* .

The parties must set forth the terms of a stipulation clearly and properly if they intend to be bound by it, and a party cannot later complain if it is determined that his or her own carelessness resulted in the wrong choice of words [*Cohn v. Bugas (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 381, 392, 116 Cal. Rptr. 810]* . Thus, a court will interpret a stipulation using an objective standard to give effect to the mutual intent of the parties; it will not be construed so as to give it the effect of an admission of an act obviously intended to be controverted or a waiver of a right not plainly intended to be relinquished [*Searle v. Allstate Life Ins. Co. (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 425, 438-439, 212 Cal. Rptr. 466, 696 P.2d 1308]* .

It is immaterial that one of the parties had an undisclosed intention or belief as to what the stipulation meant [*Consolidated Dock & Storage Co. v. Superior Court (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 949, 952, 96 Cal. Rptr. 254]* . A court's paramount consideration in construing a stipulation is the parties' objective intent when they entered into it. Labels are not controlling. Where practicable, the meaning of an agreement must be derived from a reading of the whole contract. If an inconsistency exists in the language of a contract, courts must give effect to the parties' main purpose [*Sy First Family Ltd. Partnership v. Cheung (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341-1342, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340]* . The court may not add to the provisions of a stipulation, insert terms, or make a new stipulation for the parties [*California State Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau v. Superior Court (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 658, 664, 268 Cal. Rptr. 284, 788 P.2d 1156]* .

A stipulation is conclusive with respect to the matters covered by it, unless the court, for good cause shown, later permits its abandonment or withdrawal [*Spindell v. State Bar (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 253, 260-261, 118 Cal. Rptr. 480, 530 P.2d 168]* . However, when stipulations are entered into for specific restricted purposes, they should be used only for those purposes, and are not binding outside the scope of those purposes [*Winn v. Board of Pension Comm'rs (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 532, 540, 197 Cal. Rptr. 111]* .

Lack of or failure of consideration is generally not an issue in construing stipulations. One court has held that when the parties act on a stipulation that has been presented to the court, it is deemed supported by consideration [*see Barendregt v. Downing (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 733, 736, 346 P.2d 870]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.17

§ 533.17 Relief From Stipulations

[1] Grounds

[a] Grounds Summarized

A party must show good cause in order to be released from a stipulation [*Huston v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 856, 865, 157 Cal. Rptr. 355]* . A court may exercise its sound discretion and set aside the stipulation in the following situations [*see* *Baker v. Ramirez (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1123, 1135, 235 Cal. Rptr. 857* (party relieved from stipulation that had not been filed or executed); *Roth v. Morton's Chefs Services, Inc. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 380, 385-387, 218 Cal. Rptr. 684* (party relieved from stipulation on *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* motion); *In re the Marriage of Kerry (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 456, 465, 204 Cal. Rptr. 660* (party relieved from stipulation on *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* motion)]:

- When a stipulation has been entered into through inadvertence, excusable neglect, fraud, mistake of fact, or mistake of law;

- When facts stipulated have changed or there has been a change in the underlying conditions that could not have been anticipated; or

- When special circumstances exist rendering it unjust to enforce the stipulation.

The court has inherent power, independent of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* to set aside a stipulation in these situations [*see* *In re Marriage of Jacobs (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 273, 283 n.3, 180 Cal. Rptr. 234* (dicta; collecting cases discussing motion for relief that did not mention Section 473)].

A poor outcome is not a principled reason to set aside a stipulation by counsel [*Mileikowsky v. Tenet Healthsystem (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 262, 279, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 831* (discovery stipulation may waive a party's right to insist on a formal order compelling responses as a precursor to an issuance of evidentiary, issue, or terminating sanctions)].

Under some circumstances, a stipulation entered into without the consent of the client may be set aside [*see § 533.12*].

[b] Mistake of Fact or Law

The trial court may, in its discretion, disregard a stipulation that has been entered into through inadvertence or mistake of fact [*County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1121, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290]* . The court may relieve a party from a stipulation that incorrectly sets forth material facts that are contradicted by undisputed evidence [*Sinnock v. Young (1943) 61 Cal. App. 2d 130, 131, 142 P.2d 85]* . A mistake of fact must be of a material character, that will change the legal rights of the parties, as well as one that could not have been avoided by the exercise of ordinary care [*Harris v. Spinali Auto Sales, Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 447, 454, 49 Cal. Rptr. 610]* . When there is no mistake but merely a lack of full knowledge of the facts, which is due to the failure of a party to exercise due diligence to ascertain them, there is no proper ground for relief from the stipulation [*Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 784, 791, 239 Cal. Rptr. 841* ; *Huston v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 856, 866, 157 Cal. Rptr. 355* ; *see also County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1121, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290* (poor outcome is not principled reason to set aside stipulation by counsel)].

Some courts have stated that a stronger showing should be made to justify relief from the effect of a mistake in law than in the case of a mistake involving a matter of fact [*see, e.g., L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 751, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662]* . Under that view, to set aside a stipulation on the ground of a mistake of law, it must be established that the mistake was mutual or arose from a misapprehension of the law by one party, of which the other was aware but did not rectify [*see Civ. Code § 1578*; *L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 751, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1577* (mistake of fact)].

[2] Procedure

[a] Noticed Motion

A party may be relieved from a stipulation only on a noticed motion to set it aside, made in the trial court and supported by an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury stating the grounds for relief [*Harris v. Spinali Auto Sales, Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 447, 453, 49 Cal. Rptr. 610* ; *L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 750, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (declaration under penalty of perjury)]. The motion should be made to the court in which the stipulation was made, and notice should be given to the other parties to the stipulation [*Harris v. Spinali Auto Sales, Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 447, 453, 49 Cal. Rptr. 610* ; *L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 750, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662]* .

For forms of motion and order to set aside a stipulation, see *§§ 533.42 -533.43*.

[b] Standing

An individual who is not a party to a stipulation nor the person for whose benefit it was entered into may not seek to set the stipulation aside [*People v. Mendez (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1773, 1783, 286 Cal. Rptr. 216]* .

[c] Timeliness of Motion

An application to the trial court for relief from a stipulation must be timely made [*see Smith v. State Bar (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 525, 534-535, 213 Cal. Rptr. 236, 698 P.2d 139]* . What is timely depends on the circumstances.

If the motion to set aside a stipulated judgment or order is made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, the motion must be brought within a reasonable time, in no case exceeding six months of the judgment or order [*County of Alameda v. Risby (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1425, 1430-1431, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 333]* .

Motions that in effect seek to cancel a void stipulation or to rescind or reform an originally valid agreement on the ground of mistake ordinarily are controlled by the three-year statute of limitations contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* for actions for relief on the ground of fraud or mistake. From the standpoint of laches, whether a party has delayed unreasonably resulting in prejudice to another party is a question of fact and depends on the circumstances of the particular case [*L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 750-751, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662]* .

For further discussion of time requirements for Section 473 motions and relief from void judgments, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders* .

Other provisions may govern timeliness of motions for relief from stipulations. For example, in *Smith v. State Bar (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 525, 213 Cal. Rptr. 236, 698 P.2d 139* , a state bar disciplinary proceeding, the motion for relief was untimely under a former State Bar Rule of Procedure.

If the motion is addressed to the court's inherent power, independent of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, to set aside a stipulation, the motion should be made as soon as the grounds become known [*see In re Marriage of Jacobs (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 273, 283 n.3, 180 Cal. Rptr. 234* (dicta)].

[d] Appeal

An order granting or denying relief from a stipulation is not directly appealable; an appeal lies from the judgment in the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1, 904.2*].

The trial court has discretion whether or not to grant relief from a stipulation, and its discretion will not be disturbed on appeal absent a showing of abuse [*Ward v. Clay (1890) 82 Cal. 502* ; *Baker v. Ramirez (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1123, 1135, 235 Cal. Rptr. 857]* . The existence of a stipulation is also a question of fact within the trial court's discretion [*In re Marriage of Lieberman (1981) 114 Cal. App. 3d 583, 586, 170 Cal. Rptr. 757]* .

Relief from a stipulation may not be granted when requested for the first time on appeal [*Leonard v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 473, 478, 107 Cal. Rptr. 378]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsRescissionCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 533.18-533.29

[Reserved]

§§ 533.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.30

§ 533.30 State Constitution

Stipulation as to trial by temporary judge. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawState Constitutional OperationGovernmentsCourtsSpecial Judges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.31

§ 533.31 State Statutes

[1] Authority to Bind Clients

Attorney/s authority to bind client by stipulation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 283*

[2] Stipulations Regarding Specific Matters

[a] Discovery

Taking of deposition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025(t)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.610* operative July 1, 2005].

Physical, mental, or blood examination. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2032(d), (e)* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2032.320(b), (c), 2016.030* operative July 1, 2005].

Protective orders regarding interrogatories and demands for inspection of documents. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2030(e), 2031(f)* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2030.090, 2031.060* operative July 1, 2005].

Additional discovery in limited civil cases. *Code Civ. Proc. § 95(b)*

Modification of deposition and other discovery procedures. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2021* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.030* operative July 1, 2005].

[b] Extensions or Postponements

Stipulations relating to extensions or postponements. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.230, 583.330, 595, 595.2, 1054*

[c] Settlement

Stipulation as to settlement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*

Alternative procedures for awarding costs. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(c)*

[d] Venue

Venue when county or city is party to proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*

Change of venue. *Code Civ. Proc. § 398*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsStipulationsCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.32

§ 533.32 California Rules of Court

Stipulations relating to appeal. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 8.130(g), 8.122(b), 8.244(b), 8.248(b), 8.320(f)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.33

§ 533.33 Local Rules of Court

Limitations on stipulations extending time. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.10

Informing jury of stipulated facts. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.44

Written stipulation to judgment is to be separate document from judgment. Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.17

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProceduresSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProceduresTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.34

§ 533.34 Decisions

[1] Authority of Attorney to Bind Client

Attorney's authority to stipulate does not include power to compromise claim or confess judgment. *Preston v. Hill (1875) 50 Cal. 43, 50-57*

Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6, providing that parties may stipulate to settlement and entry of judgment, empowers trial court to determine whether or not litigant's attorney had authority to settle case on client's behalf. *Haldeman v. Boise Cascade (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 230, 233-234, 221 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Agreement to dismiss cause of action by attorney without client's authority is beyond attorney's authority. *Bowden v. Green (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 65, 73, 180 Cal. Rptr. 90* (dismissal of cross complaint by attorney pursuant to purported stipulation)

Stipulation in joint pretrial statement withdrawing certain objections to executor's account was not unauthorized abandonment of substantial rights by trial attorney. *Estate of Cooper (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1114, 1124, 90 Cal. Rptr. 283*

[2] Construction and Effect

A stipulation stating that defendant could file a motion for sanctions if it did not receive plaintiff's supplemental discovery responses by a certain date had the same effect as a court order stating such, despite the fact that it was neither signed by the discovery referee or court or filed with the court. *Mileikowsky v. Tenet Healthsystem (2005) 128 Cal App 4th 262, 279-280, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 831*

Stipulations are not deemed amended to conform to proof because point of stipulation is to obviate need for proof. *County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1120, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290*

Stipulation is agreement and subject to ordinary rules employed to interpret contracts; court's paramount consideration in construing stipulation is parties' objective intent when they entered into it; labels are not controlling; when practicable, meaning of agreement must be derived from reading of whole contract; when inconsistency exists in language of contract, courts must give effect to parties' main purpose. *Sy First Family Ltd. Partnership v. Cheung (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341-1342, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340*

Stipulation is agreement between attorneys for adverse parties relating to matter involved in judicial proceeding, relating to evidence or facts, and resulting in judicial admission removing issues from case. *In re Marriage of Hahn (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1236, 1239, 273 Cal. Rptr. 516*

In construing stipulations, court applies rules for construction of contracts. *Harris v. Spinali Auto Sales, Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 447, 453, 49 Cal. Rptr. 610* ; *L. A. City Sch. Dist. v. Landier Inv. Co. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 744, 752, 2 Cal. Rptr. 662*

Stipulation entered into by parties in litigation is construed according to ordinary rules for interpretation of contracts, with paramount consideration being parties' objective intention at time of contracting. *Porreco v. Red Top RV Center (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 113, 119, 264 Cal. Rptr. 609*

Stipulation to postpone trial indefinitely subject to being reset on motion to advance by any party is subject to rules of contract construction. *Imperial Ins. Co. v. California Casualty Indem. Exchange (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 540, 546, 204 Cal. Rptr. 819*

Stipulation by Workers' Comp. Appeals Board as to applicant's disability which was made after public pension board's determination to deny disability pension and labeled as for workers' compensation purposes only is not binding on pension board in determining whether to award disability pension. *Winn v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 532, 540, 197 Cal. Rptr. 111*

Stipulation extending time indefinitely to plead under *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.310* is subject to general rules for construction of contracts. *Farrar, Herrick & Associates v. Safecare Co. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 123, 130, 171 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Stipulation is conclusive on parties; having stipulated, party is estopped from taking contrary position in same or related litigation. *Palmer v. City of Oakland (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 39, 44, 150 Cal. Rptr. 41*

Stipulation that plaintiff's prior arrest was made with probable cause entered in criminal proceeding is binding so as to bar plaintiff's subsequent action for false imprisonment. *Leonard v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 473, 476-479, 107 Cal. Rptr. 378*

Stipulation is not one of usual pleadings, but proceeding in cause under court/s supervision, by means of its coercive power over parties and their attorneys; actions of unqualified temporary judge who suggested stipulation and who initiated waiver of statutory provisions as nullities. *Lovret v. Seyfarth (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 841, 856-857, 101 Cal. Rptr. 143*

Court as interpreting stipulations so as to protect parties from their erroneous legal assumptions. *Burrows v. State of California (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 29, 33, 34, 66 Cal. Rptr. 868*

Court as interpreting stipulations so as to carry out parties' intent and to ascertain that intent if language used in stipulation is ambiguous. *Southern Cal. Gas Co. v. Joseph W. Wolfskill Co. (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 882, 888, 28 Cal. Rptr. 345*

[3] Writing Requirement

Code Civ. Proc. § 283 as applicable to making of oral stipulation not reduced to writing and filed with clerk or entered in minutes. *May v. May (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 264, 277-278, 79 Cal. Rptr. 622*

[4] Relief From Stipulation

In ordinary civil case, trial court has discretion to disregard stipulation entered into by reason of inadvertence or mistake of fact; same good cause rule should apply to this workers' compensation proceeding; lack of diligence is not good cause; applicant's attorney entered into stipulation in open court that in hindsight appeared to have impaired applicant's case, but poor outcome is not principled reason to set aside stipulation by counsel; record devoid of any reasons why client should not be held to stipulation. *County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1121, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290*

Trial court has discretion to allow party to withdraw stipulation for good cause; trial court allowed city to withdraw its stipulation that plaintiff had not earlier stipulated to having commissioner hear matter and found that plaintiff had so stipulated. *Flahive v. City of Dana Point (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 241, 247, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 51*

In usual case, party is not permitted unilaterally to avoid valid stipulation; fact that stipulations serve convenience of parties, often simplify and expedite proceeding, and are supported by policy favoring compromise to reduce volume of litigation as reason for supporting stipulations against ensuing attack in most instances. *In re Marriage of Hahn (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1236, 1239, 273 Cal. Rptr. 516*

Summary adjudication that indisputably changed material circumstances relative to rights and duties of parties provided court with discretion to refuse to compel performance of stipulation. *Abadjian v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 363, 370-371, 214 Cal. Rptr. 234*

Dismissal of cause of action based on stipulation to dismiss that was not authorized by client is subject to being vacated at any time. *Bowden v. Green (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 65, 73, 180 Cal. Rptr. 90*

Lack of supporting evidence does not necessarily invalidate stipulation. *Aten v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 113, 119, 142 Cal. Rptr. 42*

Stipulation that trial court could determine issues involved on record before jury in principal action as no longer binding if made under false assumption that trial judge who presided at jury trial would decide action. *Kerr Chemicals, Inc. v. Crown Cork & Seal Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1017, 99 Cal. Rptr. 162*

Appeal from judgment by stipulation as frivolous under *Code Civ. Proc. § 907*, entitling reviewing court to add damages to costs on appeal. *Lawler v. Bannerman (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 893, 894, 87 Cal. Rptr. 756*

Relief from stipulation as available for mistake of fact or other special circumstances rendering it unjust to enforce it. *McDonagh v. Gourneau (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 1033, 1038, 83 Cal. Rptr. 63*

Setting aside of stipulation appropriate when entered into in reliance on false testimony. *Brown v. Superior Court (1935) 10 Cal. App. 2d 365, 366, 367-368, 52 P.2d 256*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsAuthority to ActActual AuthorityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsRescissionContracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.35

§ 533.35 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 1, *Attorneys*, § 289 et seq. (4th ed. 1996)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral Overview

153 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 533.36-533.39

[Reserved]

§§ 533.36[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART IV. FORMS

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.40

§ 533.40 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--General Form

[1] FORM Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties hereto, by their respective counsel, that _____ [*specify, in numbered paragraphs if convenient, the step or steps of the action or proceeding to which the parties agree to be bound, e.g.,* Joseph Stevenson, M.D., is an expert witness who is qualified to testify as to whether the defendant's treatment of plaintiff's broken arm was consistent with what other physicians in the locality in question in the exercise of reasonable care might do under similar circumstances].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant

[*Add appropriate signature(s), if client's express authorization appears necessary*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Plaintiff

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form of stipulation in [1], *above*, is for use by any party in entering into an agreement with any other party concerning any steps of an action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 283*].

[3] Execution and Filing

A written stipulation must be signed by the attorney of record, if any, and usually does not require the client's signature [for discussion, *see § 533.15 [3]*]. The stipulation should be filed in the action or proceeding to which it relates [for discussion, *see § 533.15[4]*].

[4] Cross References

For a discussion of an attorney's general authority to appear and to control the litigation, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.190* et seq.

For a form of introduction to a stipulation, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997), Vol. 1, *Attorneys*, §§ 289-310

155 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART IV. FORMS

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.41

§ 533.41 Stipulation of Facts [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--Objections to Admissibility Not Waived

[1] FORM Stipulation of Facts [Code Civ. Proc. § 283]--Objections to Admissibility Not Waived

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION OF FACTS
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties hereto, by their respective counsel, that, for the purpose of trial in this action, the facts listed below are undisputed and may be treated by the court as facts proved in open court.

The parties may, during the trial of this matter, call witnesses and offer evidence for the purpose of proving any additional facts as the parties may see fit.

[In making the stipulation, the parties do not waive any legal objection to the relevancy, the materiality, or the admissibility in evidence of any of the facts set forth in this stipulation, and each party reserves the right to offer any legal objection to those facts, or any part of those facts, either by filing written objections or by stating such objections orally in open court, at any time during the trial before the objecting party concludes his/her offer of evidence and rests his/her case. An objection so made shall be considered timely.]

The undisputed facts are as follows:

1. _____ [*List undisputed facts here and under following numbers*].
Dated: _____.

_____[*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

Dated: _____.

_____[*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use to stipulate that certain facts are undisputed and may be treated as proved in court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 283*].

Counsel may reserve any legal objections to the relevancy, materiality, or admissibility in evidence of any of the facts set forth in the stipulation by including the optional third paragraph.

[3] Execution and Filing

A written stipulation must be signed by the attorney of record, if any, and usually does not require the client's signature [for discussion, *see § 533.15 [3]*]. The stipulation should be filed in the action or proceeding to which it relates [for discussion, *see § 533.15[4]*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion of specific matters to which parties may effectively stipulate, see *§ 533.13*

For general form of stipulation, see *§ 533.40*

Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997), Vol. 1, *Attorneys*, §§ 289-310

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART IV. FORMS

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.42

§ 533.42 Notice of Motion to Set Aside Stipulation and Supporting Declaration

[1] FORM Notice of Motion to Set Aside Stipulation and Supporting Declaration

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION TO SET ASIDE STIPULA-
vs.	)	TION, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [*name*], AND MEMOR-
Defendant.	)	ANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location _____
	)	[Judge: _____]
		Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] will move for an order setting aside the stipulation _____ [*describe stipulation, e.g.,* regarding the testimony of _____ (*name*)], dated _____, on file in this action. The motion will be made on the ground that good cause exists to set aside the stipulation in that

_____ [*specify, e.g.,* the stipulation was entered into through inadvertence, surprise, excusable neglect, fraud, and mistake of fact and law *or* the facts stipulated to have changed *or* there has been a change in the underlying conditions to the stipulation that could not have been anticipated *or* special circumstances exist rendering it unjust to enforce the stipulation *or specify other ground*].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for_____ [*party's status, e.g., Defendant*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify party, e.g.,* defendant) *or other statement as appropriate*].

On or about _____ [*date*], I entered into a stipulation with _____ [*name*], attorney of record for the _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff]. On behalf of our respective clients, we stipulated that _____ [*specify effect of stipulation, e.g.,* _____ (*name*) would, if called and sworn as a witness, testify that the milk in question in this breach of contract action was grade A milk].

The stipulation should be set aside because _____ [*specify, e.g.,* of a mistake of fact, in that the facts stipulated have changed, and special circumstances now render it unjust to enforce the stipulation in that _____ (*name of witness*) has told me that a doubt now exists in his mind as to whether or not the milk in question in this action was grade A milk, as set forth more fully in the declaration of _____ (*name of witness*), also submitted in support of this motion].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____[*signature*]

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

[*Add memorandum of points and authorities supporting motion*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion and supporting declaration in [1], *above*, may be used by any party seeking to set aside a stipulation previously agreed to between the parties. A memorandum of points and authorities is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.113(a)*].

[3] Grounds

The motion is made on the general ground that good cause exists to set aside the stipulation. For discussion of particular grounds for setting aside a stipulation, see *§ 533.17[1]*.

[4] Timing

An application to the trial court for relief from a stipulation must be timely made. For further discussion of timing requirements, see *§ 533.17 [2]*.

[5] Cross References

For a form of order granting the motion, see *§ 533.43*

For a discussion and forms relating to attacking judgments and orders, including stipulated judgments, in the trial court under the grounds contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgments and Orders*

For a procedural guide and a general form of notice of motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997), Vol. 1, *Attorneys*, §§ 289-310

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 533 STIPULATIONS
PART IV. FORMS

46-533 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 533.43

§ 533.43 Order Setting Aside Stipulation

[1] FORM Order Setting Aside Stipulation

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] for an order to set aside the stipulation dated _____ [*date*], on file in this action came on regularly for hearing by the court this date. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion should be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, granted and the stipulation of _____[*date*], providing that _____ [*specify provisions*], be vacated.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants a motion to set aside a stipulation previously agreed to between the parties.

[3] Cross References

For a related form of notice of motion, see *§ 533.42*

For a procedural checklist and a general form of order, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

Witkin, California Procedure (4th ed. 1997), Vol. 1, *Attorneys*, §§ 289-310

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 534.syn

§ 534.syn Synopsis to Chapter 534: SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)

§ 534.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 534.02 Cross References

§§ 534.03-534.09 [Reserved]

§ 534.10 Governing Statutes

§ 534.11 Purpose of Submitting Controversy

§ 534.12 Distinction Between Procedures

§ 534.13 Submission of Agreed Case Without Commencement of Action

[1] Submission of Dispute That Could Have Been Subject of Civil Action

[2] Affidavit Required Stating Controversy Is Real and Brought in Good Faith

[3] Heard as Though Action Had Been Brought

[4] Judgment in Agreed Case

[5] Enforcement of Judgment

[6] Review

§ 534.14 Agreed Statement of Facts

[1] Stipulation to Facts After Action Has Been Commenced

[2] Stipulation Is Substitute for Evidence; No Jury Trial

§§ 534.15-534.29 [Reserved]

§ 534.30 State Statutes

§ 534.31 Decisions

[1] Submission of Agreed Case Without Commencement of Civil Action

[2] Agreed Statement of Facts

§ 534.32 Text References

§§ 534.33-534.39 [Reserved]

§ 534.40 Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Affidavit or Declaration Required

[4] Cross References

§ 534.41 Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--Alternate Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 534.42 Declaration Accompanying Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 534.43 Judgment on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1139]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 534.44 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] of Agreed Statement of Facts

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART I. SCOPE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.01

§ 534.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and provides forms for submitting controversies to a court on stipulated facts. The chapter discusses submission to the court both of an "agreed case" [§ 534.13] and an agreed statement of facts [§ 534.14] and compares these procedures [§§ 534.10-534.12].

The chapter includes a Research Guide [§ 534.30 et seq.], and the following forms:

- Submissions of an agreed case [§§ 534.40, 534.41].
- Declaration to accompany the submission [§ 534.42].
- Judgment on an agreed case [§ 534.43].
- Stipulation of agreed statement of facts [§ 534.44].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART I. SCOPE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.02

§ 534.02 Cross References

For a discussion of and forms relating to judicial declarations of rights, as distinguished from a judgment based on the submission of an agreed case which may include such relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For a general discussion of agreements between parties to an action concerning matters including but not limited to the facts, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations*

For a form for use in entering judgment pursuant to a stipulation of facts, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* , § t. I

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART I. SCOPE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 534.03-534.09

[Reserved]

§§ 534.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.10

§ 534.10 Governing Statutes

Submission to a court of a controversy on an "agreed case" without commencement of an action is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1138-1140*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.11

§ 534.11 Purpose of Submitting Controversy

The term "submitted controversy," as it is used in this chapter and by most California attorneys, includes both the agreed case and the agreed statement of facts submitted by stipulation. The purpose of submitting a controversy, in either manner, is to provide the court with a set of facts which both parties are willing to accept as a factual basis to which the applicable law is to be applied [*see, e.g., Faust v. San Diego (1931) 115 Cal. App. 277, 278, 1 P.2d 543]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.12

§ 534.12 Distinction Between Procedures

The agreed statement of facts is only a substitute for evidence of facts pleaded, and in this respect it differs from the agreed case which is submitted for decision without any pleadings [Towle v. Sweeney (1905) 2 Cal. App. 29-32, 83 P. 74 (disapproved on another point in Gaffigan v. Lawton (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 722, 729, 37 P.2d 79)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.13

§ 534.13 Submission of Agreed Case Without Commencement of Action

[1] Submission of Dispute That Could Have Been Subject of Civil Action

Parties to a "question in difference" may, without bringing an action, submit an agreed case to any court which would have had jurisdiction if an action had been brought to that court originally. The question in difference must be one which might be the subject of a civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*]. The persons submitting an agreed case must be interested, authorized, and capable of litigating the question as if an action had been filed [*see Bailey v. Johnson (1898) 121 Cal. 562, 562-563, 54 P. 80]* .

By using this special summary proceeding, parties may avoid the expense and delay of an ordinary action [*Market Street Ry.Co. v. Hellman (1895) 109 Cal. 571, 578, 42 P. 225]* so long as the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1138* are satisfied [*see White v. Clarke (1896) 111 Cal. 425, 427-428, 44 P. 164* (submitted controversy did not show that question in difference could be subject of civil action; affidavit did not show controversy was real or proceedings were in good faith)].

For forms for submission of the agreed case, see *§§ 534.40, 534.41*.

[2] Affidavit Required Stating Controversy Is Real and Brought in Good Faith

An affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], must be submitted by each party, stating that the controversy is real and that the proceeding is brought in good faith to determine the rights of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*; *see White v. Clarke (1896) 111 Cal. 425, 427-428, 44 P. 164* (affidavit did not show controversy was real or proceedings were in good faith)].

The affidavit or declaration is mandatory, and an agreed statement on appeal that recites that the trial court heard the case on an agreed statement and on an affidavit that the controversy was real is inadequate [*see Mellois v. Chaine (1862) 20 Cal. 679, 680]* .

For a form of declaration, see *§ 534.42*.

[3] Heard as Though Action Had Been Brought

The court hears and determines the case and renders judgment as if an action had been brought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*]. The judgment is to be determined solely from the submitted facts [*Cannon v. Handley (1887) 72 Cal. 133, 138, 13 P. 315]* .

[4] Judgment in Agreed Case

Judgment is entered as in other cases, but without costs for any proceeding prior to trial. The case, the submission, and a copy of the judgment constitute the judgment roll [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1139*]. For a form of judgment, see *§ 534.43*.

[5] Enforcement of Judgment

Judgment in an agreed case may be enforced as if it had been rendered in an action in the same court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1140*].

[6] Review

A judgment in an agreed case is subject to appeal in the same manner as any civil judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1140*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityCase or Controversy RequirementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.14

§ 534.14 Agreed Statement of Facts

[1] Stipulation to Facts After Action Has Been Commenced

An agreed statement of facts is a submission to a court, after an action is commenced and jurisdiction obtained, of a controversy involving a set of facts. The submission is nonstatutory and is made by stipulation of the parties involved [*see, e.g.,* Faust v. San Diego (1931) 115 Cal. App. 277, 275-279, 1 P.2d 543] .

For a form of stipulation, see *§ 534.44.*

[2] Stipulation Is Substitute for Evidence; No Jury Trial

A written stipulation of an agreed statement of facts may be submitted to the court by the parties involved in an action after the action has commenced. The agreed statement of facts is only a substitute for evidence of facts pleaded, and in this respect it differs from the agreed case, which is submitted for decision without any pleadings [*Towle v. Sweeney (1905) 2 Cal. App. 29, 31-32, 83 P. 74]* .

There is no jury trial when an agreed statement of facts has been submitted, for the statement itself makes formal findings unnecessary [*see, e.g., Division Labor Law Enfmt. v. Brooks (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 631, 632, 38 Cal. Rptr 284]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 534.15-534.29

[Reserved]

§§ 534.15[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.30

§ 534.30 State Statutes

Submission of agreed case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*

Judgment based on agreed case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1139*

Enforcement of judgment in agreed case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1140*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.31

§ 534.31 Decisions

[1] Submission of Agreed Case Without Commencement of Civil Action

Certain questions of public interest as prompting court to adjudicate agreed case absent real controversy. *Collier v. Lindley (1928) 203 Cal. 641, 644-645, 266 P. 526*

Necessity of real controversy between parties in agreed case. *In re De Lucca (1905) 146 Cal. 110, 111-112, 79 P. 853*

Court, on submission of agreed case, as not restricted to submitted questions or conclusions of law. *San Francisco Lbr. Co. v. Bibb (1903) 139 Cal. 325, 326, 73 P. 864*

Basis of judgment in agreed case as limited to facts submitted. *Green v. Fresno County (1892) 95 Cal. 329, 333-334, 30 P. 544*

Judgment against plaintiff as proper where agreed set of facts does not establish defendant's liability. *Crandall v. Amador County (1862) 20 Cal. 72, 74*

Agreed case with inadequate statement of facts as subject to dismissal. *Division Labor Law Enfmt. v. Brooks (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 631, 633, 38 Cal. Rptr 284*

Submission of agreed case to appellate court as improper unless agreed set of facts otherwise supports petition for writ of mandate. *Northridge etc. Water Dist. v. McDonell (1958) 158 Cal. App. 2d 123, 125-126, 322 P.2d 25*

[2] Agreed Statement of Facts

Facts occurring after stipulation of agreed statement of facts made by parties at commencement of action as included. *Ellis v. Witmer (1906) 148 Cal. 528, 536, 83 P. 800*

Effect of agreed statement of facts. *Robinson v. El Centro Grain Co. (1933) 133 Cal. App. 567, 572, 24 P.2d 554*

No necessity of findings of fact by court when stipulation of agreed statement of facts made by parties. Faust v. San Diego (1931) 115 Cal. App. 277, 279279, 1 P.2d 543

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityCase or Controversy RequirementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEffectsCivil ProcedureTrialsBench Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.32

§ 534.32 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure (3d ed), Vol. 3, *Actions*, § 78; Vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, § 72-73; Vol. 9, *Appeal*, §§ 557-559

California Civil Procedure Before Trial, Vol. 3, Ch. 59, *Submitted Case* (Cal. CEB 2000)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral Overview

171 of 176 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 534.33-534.39

[Reserved]

§§ 534.33[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART IV. FORMS

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.40

§ 534.40 Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--General Form

[1] FORM Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--General Form
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

In the Matter of the Agreed Case Between _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, and _____ [*name*], Defendant.	))))))))))	NO. _____ AGREED CASE

_____ [*Name*] and _____ [*name*], parties to the following question in difference which might be the subject of a civil action, hereby agree on the following facts concerning that question to be submitted to the proper jurisdiction of this court for its determination and judgment pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure section 1138*.

I. AGREED FACTS

1. _____ [*Here, and in successive paragraphs, set forth specifically the facts agreed on, e.g.,* In an

agreement dated _____ (*date*), attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part of this submission, _____ (*name*) agreed to sell, and _____ (*name*) agreed to purchase, certain real property described in the agreement. _____ (*Name*), as purchaser, entered into possession of the property on, _____ [*date*], and from that date received all rents and profits from the property, pursuant to the agreement. The escrow on the transaction closed on _____ [*date*], _____ days after the entry into possession by _____ (*name*), the purchaser].

[2. _____ (*Name*), the seller, and _____ (*name*), the purchaser, are parties to this submission and are interested, authorized, and capable of litigating the following question in difference for the following reasons: _____ (*state facts showing standing, capacity, etc., of parties*).]

[3. The following question in difference, if brought before this court as a civil action, would be within the proper jurisdiction of this court for the following reasons: _____ (*state facts showing venue and jurisdiction of the court*).]

II. QUESTION SUBMITTED FOR DETERMINATION

The question in difference submitted for the determination of the court is _____ [*specify, e.g.,* whether or not the seller is entitled, pursuant to the terms of the agreement, to interest on the unpaid balance of the purchase price from the date of the purchaser's entry into possession or only from the date of the closing of escrow].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Plaintiff

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Defendant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by parties who agree as to the facts of an actual controversy to submit the case to the court for determination. The form is used when no action has yet been commenced on the controversy, but when the controversy could be the subject of a civil action within the jurisdiction of the court to which it is to be submitted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*; *see also* Ziegelmaier v. Rasmussen (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 881, 881-884, *159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 881, 324 P.2d 116* (submission to court, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*, to determine whether sellers entitled to interest on unpaid purchase price from date purchasers entered into possession or from date escrow closed)].

Once submitted, the court must render judgment as if it were an action, and as such may award any proper remedy exceptpretrial costs [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1138, 1139*].The judgment may be enforced or appealed as in an ordinary civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1140*].

[3] Affidavit or Declaration Required

This form must be accompanied with a supporting affidavit, or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], from each party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*]. For a form of declaration, see *§ 534.42*.

[4] Cross References

For further discussion of agreed case, see *§ 534.13*

For an alternative form of submission, see *§ 534.41*

For a form of stipulation to agreed facts to be used if the action has already been commenced, see *§ 534.44*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For forms of stipulations generally, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART IV. FORMS

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.41

§ 534.41 Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--Alternate Form

[1] FORM Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]--Alternate Form
[*Caption. See Form 1.*]

_____ [*Name*] and _____ [*name*], parties to a controversy involving a question in difference which might be the subject of a civil action, hereby agree that the following is a true statement of the facts concerning that controversy, and hereby submit the same to the above-entitled court for its determination and judgment without action, as provided by *Section 1138 of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

I. AGREED FACTS

1. _____ [*Here, and in successive paragraphs, set forth specifically the facts agreed on, including facts showing capacity and standing of parties and venue and jurisdiction of the court, see, e.g.,* Form 1, Paragraphs under I].

II. CLAIMS AND DEFENSES TO BE DETERMINED BY THE COURT

_____ [*Specify claims and defenses constituting the question in difference between the parties, e.g.,* _____ (*Name*), the seller, claims the sum of $_____ as interest on the unpaid balance of the purchase price from the date of purchaser's entry into possession. _____ (*Name*), the purchaser, asserts in defense that no date for the commencement of interest is evidenced in the agreement and thus there is no intent shown for the payment of interest prior to the date of the execution of the promissory note for the unpaid balance of the purchase price].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Plaintiff

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Defendant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used as an alternative to the *form in § 534.40* to set forth a submission on an agreed case submitted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*]. This form must be supported by affidavit or declaration submitted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*; for a form of declaration, *see § 534.42*].

For further discussion, see *§ 534.40[2]* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART IV. FORMS

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.42

§ 534.42 Declaration Accompanying Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]

[1] FORM Declaration Accompanying Submission on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1138]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

In the Matter of the Agreed Case Between _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, and _____ [*name*], Defendant.	))))))))))	NO. _____ DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*] INSUPPORT OF AGREED CASE

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*party*) or other as appropriate].

2. The controversy in the above-entitled case is real and the proceedings are instituted in good faith to determine the rights of the parties in that _____ [*specify facts showing that controversy is real and proceeding is instituted in good faith*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to satisfy the requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1138* that a submission on an agreed case be accompanied by an affidavit verifying that the controversy is real and the proceeding has been instituted in good faith. A declaration under penalty of perjury may be submitted in lieu of an affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*].

The declaration must state that the controversy, that is, the proceeding, is in good faith; it is not adequate to state that a party's *contention* is in good faith [*see White v. Clarke (1896) 111 Cal. 425, 427-428, 44 P. 164]* .

Each party must submit an affidavit or declaration to this effect [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1138*].

For discussion, see *§ 534.13[2]*.

[3] Cross References

For alternate forms of declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART IV. FORMS

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.43

§ 534.43 Judgment on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1139]

[1] FORM Judgment on Agreed Case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1139]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

In the Matter of the Agreed Case Between _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, and _____ [*name*], Defendant.	))))))))))	NO. _____ JUDGMENT ON AGREED CASE

The above-named parties have submitted a controversy on an agreed case, duly verified by _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] as required by *Section 1138 of the Code of Civil Procedure*. The court, after examining the agreed case, after hearing _____ [*name*], attorney for plaintiff and _____ [*name*], attorney for defendant, and after due deliberation, finds on the facts submitted and determines as a matter of law that _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] _____ [*name*] is entitled to judgment.

[*EITHER*]

IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED AND ORDERED that plaintiff _____ [*name*] have judgment against defendant _____ [*name*] in the sum of $_____.

[*OR*]

IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED AND ORDERED that plaintiff take nothing.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

Counsel may submit the form of judgment in [1], *above*, for use by the court in entering a judgment pursuant to asubmission of an agreed case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1139*]. For discussion, see *§ 534.13[3]* et seq.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion and forms of judgments, generally, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 534 SUBMITTED CONTROVERSY (AGREED CASE)
PART IV. FORMS

46-534 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 534.44

§ 534.44 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] of Agreed Statement of Facts

[1] FORM Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] of Agreed Statement of Facts
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	STIPULATION OF AGREED FACTS
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to this action, acting through their respective attorneys of record that:

1. The above-entitled cause may be tried in this court without a jury, and this court may render judgment on the pleadings filed herein and on the following facts which are hereby agreed to, and which the court may consider as evidence in the case.

[*SET FORTH specifically the facts agreed on in as many paragraphs as necessary, e.g.:*]

2. In an agreement dated _____ [*date*] attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof, _____ [*name*] agreed to sell, and _____ [*name*] agreed to purchase, certain real property described therein.

3. _____ [*Name*] as purchaser, entered into possession of the property on _____ [*date*], and from that date received all rents and profits therefrom, pursuant to the agreement.

4. The escrow on the transaction closed on _____ [*date*], _____ days after the _____ [*name*], the purchaser entered into possession.

[*CONTINUE setting out relevant facts*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Plaintiff

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Defendant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of agreed facts in [1], *above*, is for use after an action has been commenced by parties who agree as to all or part of the facts, to stipulate to those facts as a substitute for evidentiary proof of the pleadings. For discussion, see *§ 534.14*.

[3] Cross References

For forms of agreed case to be used when an action has not yet been commenced, see *§§ 534.40 -534.42*

For forms of stipulations generally, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations*

For a form for use in entering judgment pursuant to a stipulation of facts, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 535.syn

§ 535.syn Synopsis to Chapter 535: SUBPOENA

§ 535.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 535.02 Cross References

§§ 535.03-535.09 [Reserved]

§ 535.10 Governing Law

§ 535.11 Use of Subpoenas and Subpoenas Duces Tecum

[1] Purposes

[2] Special Provisions

§ 535.12 Obtaining Subpoena

[1] To Require Attendance Before Court or at Trial

[2] To Require Attendance Before Commissioner Appointed by Non-California Court

[3] To Require Attendance out of Court in Cases Not Provided for by Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)

[4] To Require Attendance Before Officer on Taking Deposition

§ 535.13 Issuance

[1] By Clerk or Judge

[2] By Attorney

§ 535.14 Limitation to California Residents

[1] In General

[2] Definition of Residence

[3] Exception for Custodian of Records if Attendance Not Required

[4] Exception for Member of California Highway Patrol

§ 535.15 Agreement to Appear at Another Time

[1] Availability

[2] Failure to Appear

§ 535.16 Affidavit Supporting Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Requirements

[2] Contents

[3] Filing

§ 535.17 Service

[1] In General

[2] Time of Service

[3] Subpoena Duces Tecum

[4] On Concealed Witness

[5] On Peace Officers, Firefighters, and Other Public Employees

[6] On Nonresident Members of the California Highway Patrol

[7] Fees for Service

§ 535.18 Witness Fees

[1] In General

[2] Fees for Experts

[a] Availability

[b] Tender of Fees

[c] Motion to Set Compensation

[d] Notice of Continuation or Cancellation

§ 535.19 Fees for Public Employees

[1] City and County Employees, Peace Officers, Firefighters, and Specified Others

[a] In General

[b] Salary and Expenses

[c] Reimbursement of Entity

[d] Overpayment or Underpayment

[2] Deposit for Nonresident Highway Patrol Officer

[3] Deposit for Appearance at Subsequent Proceedings

[4] Relief From Deposit or Payment Requirement

§ 535.20 Production of Business Records by Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] When Personal Attendance Not Required

[a] In General

[b] Transmittal of Records

[c] Records Made Available to Attorney

[d] Admissibility of Copies

[2] Personal Attendance of Custodian or Witness

[a] In General

[b] Witness Fees and Mileage

[3] Reasonable Costs for Production of Business Records

[a] Set by Statute

[b] Demand for Payment and Itemized Statement of Costs

[c] Petition to Reduce Excessive Costs

[d] When Witness Entitled to Reimbursement

§ 535.21 Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Personal Records of Consumer or Employment Records of Employee

[1] In General

[2] Definitions

[a] Personal Records and Witnesses

[b] Consumer

[c] Employment Records

[d] Employee

[e] Subpoenaing Party

[3] Time Allowed for Production

[4] Service of Subpoena Duces Tecum, Affidavit, and Notice on Consumer or Employee

[a] Requirements

[b] Contents of Notice

[5] Proof of Service or Written Authorization Served on Witness

[6] Motion to Shorten Time or to Waive Notice Requirements by Subpoenaing Party

[7] Motion to Quash by Party Consumer or Employee

[8] Objection by Nonparty Consumer or Employee

[9] Medical Records

§ 535.21A Subpoena Requiring Production of Electronically Stored Information

[1] Party May Require Production

[2] "Electronic" and "Electronically Stored Information" Defined

[3] Requesting Production

[4] Opposing Production

[5] Limiting Discovery

[6] Sanctions

§ 535.21B Subpoenas in California for Out-of-State Proceedings

[1] Governing Law

[2] Definitions

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena

[4] Subpoena Form and Contents

[5] Party Not Required to Retain Local Attorney

[6] Service of Subpoena

§ 535.22 Private Records of Public Employees

§ 535.22A Nonparty Objection to Subpoena

§ 535.23 Quashing, Modifying or Enforcing Compliance With Subpoena

[1] Motion Procedure

[2] By Public Employees

[3] Grounds for Motion

[4] Costs of Motion

§ 535.24 Notice in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] Persons Subject to Notice

[2] Definition of "Benefitted Persons"

[3] Time of Service

[4] Witness Fees on Notice

[5] Requests for Books, Documents, or Other Things

[6] Objection to Notice Requesting Production

§ 535.25 Examination of Prisoners

§ 535.26 Disobedience of Subpoena

[1] Contempt

[a] In General

[b] Service of Subpoena on Witness Necessary for Jurisdiction

[c] Direct Contempt

[d] Subpoena Requiring Attendance Out of Court

[e] Public Safety Employees

[f] Sexual Assault Victims

[g] Victims of Domestic Violence

[2] Penalty

[3] Warrant and Arrest

[4] Other Sanctions

§§ 535.27-535.39 [Reserved]

§ 535.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 535.41 State Constitution

§ 535.42 State Statutes

[1] Deposition of Prisoners

[2] Disobedience of Subpoena

[3] Issuance

[4] Miscellaneous Records Subject to Subpoena

[5] Motion to Quash

[6] Notice to Attend in Lieu of Subpoena

[7] Persons in Court, But Not Subpoenaed

[8] Purpose and Use of Subpoenas

[9] Service

[10] Subpoena Duces Tecum

[11] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Employment Records of Employee

[12] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Personal Records of Consumer

[13] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Private Records of Public Employees

[13A] Subpoena Requiring Production of Electronically Stored Information

[14] Subpoenas in Particular Proceedings

[a] In General

[b] Criminal

[c] Involving State Agencies

[15] Witness Fees

§ 535.43 Decisions

[1] Administrative Proceedings

[2] Disobedience of Subpoena

[3] Motion to Quash

[4] Production of Business Records

[5] Production of Personal Records of Consumer

[6] Sufficiency of Affidavit Accompanying Subpoena Duces Tecum

[7] Witness Fees

§ 535.44 Attorney General Opinions

§ 535.45 Law Reviews

§ 535.46 Text References

§§ 535.47-535.49 [Reserved]

§ 535.50 Party Seeking Subpoena

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

[2] Decide the Type and Content of the Subpoena Best Fitting Your Needs

[3] Calendar Relevant Dates

[4] Fees for Resident Peace Officer, Other Public Employee, or Nonresident California Highway Patrol Member

[5] Prepare and Issue Subpoena

[6] Service

[7] Obtain Penalties for Noncompliance

§ 535.51 Party Seeking Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

[2] Deposit Fees for Nonresident California Highway Patrol Member

[3] Prepare and Issue Subpoena Duces Tecum, and Supporting Papers

[4] Service

[5] File Documents

[6] Obtain Penalties for Noncompliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum

§ 535.52 Person Receiving Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] For Custodian of Business Records to Comply if Attendance Is Not Required

[2] To Comply Generally

[3] To Object if a Nonparty Consumer or Employee

[4] To Quash or Modify Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum

§ 535.53 Party Seeking to Compel Appearance by Notice in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

[2] To Compel Attendance Without Production

[3] To Compel Attendance With Books, Documents, or Other Things

§ 535.54 Party Receiving Notice to Appear in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] To Comply With Notice

[2] To Object to Notice to Produce

§§ 535.55-535.59 [Reserved]

§ 535.60 Civil Subpoena with Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-001]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoenas

[4] Issuance

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Heading

[b] Attendance Requirement (Paragraph 1)

[c] Agreement to Appear at Another Time (Paragraph 2)

[d] Witness Fees (Paragraph 3)

[6] Disobedience of Subpoena

[7] Proof of Service

[8] Cross References

§ 535.61 Civil Subpoena Duces Tecum with Supporting Declaration and Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-002]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena Duces Tecum

[4] Issuance

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Heading

[b] Requirement of Attendance and Production of Records

[c] Agreement to Appear at Another Time

[d] Witness Fees

[6] Supporting Declaration

[7] Disobediance of Subpoena

[8] Proof of Service

[9] Cross References

§ 535.62 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury Supporting Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Hospital Records in Personal Injury Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Deposition Subpoenas

[4] Cross References

§ 535.63 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. § 2003] for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of X Rays in Personal Injury Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.64 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Medical Records in Malpractice Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.65 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Earning Records of Company--Loss of Earnings

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.66 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Truck and Shipping Records

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 535.67 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Custodian of Business Records to Accompany Copies of Records Mailed or Delivered to Court in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time of Compliance

[4] Declaration of Custodian or Witness

[5] Transmittal

[6] Cross References

§ 535.68 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Attorney of Subpoenaing Party to Accompany Copies of Records Made in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 535.69 Notice to Consumer or Employee and Objection [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3, 1985.6; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-025]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] Adopted by Judicial Council for Mandatory Use

[b] Notice to Consumer or Employee That Personal Records Are Being Subpoenaed

[c] Objection by Non-party Consumer or Employee

[3] Contents of Notice

[4] Procedure for Notice to Consumer or Employee

[a] Accompanying Papers

[b] Method of Service in General

[c] Method of Service When Consumer or Employee Is Minor

[5] Time of Service on Consumer or Employee

[6] Order Shortening Time or Waiving Requirements of Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)

[7] Proof of Service or Written Authorization Served on Witness

§ 535.70 Consumer's Authorization for Release of Personal Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.71 Consumer's Authorization for Release of Telephone Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f); Pub. Util. Code § 2891]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.72 [Reserved]

§ 535.73 Employee's Authorization for Release of Employment Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 535.74 Notice of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Compliance With Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.1, 1987.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[a] Generally

[b] By a Party Consumer or Employee Whose Records Are Sought

[c] By a Nonparty Consumer or Employee Whose Records Are Sought

[d] By Person Whose Personally Identifying Information Is Sought in Connection With Underlying Action Involving Free Speech Rights

[e] By Person Immune From Service of Process

[3] Awarding Expenses

[4] Accompanying Papers

[5] Cross References

§ 535.75 [Reserved]

§ 535.76 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Enforcing Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Showing Required for Subpoena Duces Tecum

[4] Cross References

§ 535.77 Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Conditional Compliance With Subpoena, or Protecting a Party, Witness, Consumer, or Employee From Unreasonable or Oppressive Demands, and Awarding Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Awarding Expenses

[4] Cross References

§ 535.78 Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Persons Subject to Notice

[4] Effect of Notice

[5] Service

[6] Cross References

§ 535.79 Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena Duces Tecum to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court and Bringing of Books, Documents, or Other Things [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time of Service

[4] Contents of Notice

§ 535.80 Objections to Request That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court on Notice to Attorney

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time for Objecting

[4] Requesting Party's Response

[5] Cross References

§ 535.81 Notice of Motion for Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Award of Expenses of Motion

[5] Cross References

§ 535.82 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order that Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Showing Required

[4] Cross References

§ 535.83 Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 535.84 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum--Order to Attend Court or Provide Documents [Penal Code § 1326; Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664; Cal. Judicial Form CR-125/JV-525]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Issuance

[a] Criminal Proceedings

[b] Juvenile Proceedings

[4] Cross References

§ 535.85 Subpoena for Production of Business Records in Action Pending Outside California [Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.100 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-035]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena

[4] Notice to Consumer or Employee and Objection

[5] Proof of Service

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART I. SCOPE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.01

§ 535.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and sets forth procedures for obtaining and serving subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum. In addition to forms for subpoenas [*see §§ 535.60, 535.61, 535.84*, 535.85], the chapter includes the following forms:

- Declarations and statements for use in declarations in support of subpoenas duces tecum [*see §§ 535.62 -535.66*].

- Declaration of a custodian of business records for use when a subpoena duces tecum does not require personal appearance [*see § 535.67*].

- Declaration by the attorney of the subpoenaing party when the business records were made available to the attorney for inspection and copying pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.68*].

- Notice to a consumer or employee that his or her personal records are being sought [*see § 535.69*] and authorization by a consumer or employee for the release of those records [*see §§ 535.70, 535.73*].

- Notice to an employee that his or her employment records are being sought [*see § 535.72*] and authorization by an employee for the release of those records [*see § 535.73*].

- Authorization by a consumer for the release of telephone records [*see § 535.71*].

- Moving papers for bringing a motion for an order to quash a subpoena [*see §§ 535.74 -535.77*].

- Notices to be used in lieu of subpoenas [*see §§ 535.78, 535.79*].

- Objections to a notice to produce [*see §§ 535.69, 535.80*].

- Moving papers for bringing a motion for an order to produce [*see §§ 535.81 -535.84*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & InspectionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART I. SCOPE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.02

§ 535.02 Cross References

For discussion, procedures, and forms relating to subpoenaing a witness to attend a deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

For discussion and a procedural checklist relating to subpoenaing witnesses to attend administrative hearings, see Ch. 473F, *Agency Adjudication Hearings* .

For discussion and forms relating to contempt proceedings, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

For discussion, procedural guides, and forms relating to subpoenas in discovery proceedings, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

For discussion and forms relating to quashing service of summons on witnesses subpoenaed from out of state to testify in a criminal proceeding in California, see Ch. 323, Jurisdiction: *Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances*.

For a form for use in worker's compensation proceedings, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProceduresSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART I. SCOPE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 535.03-535.09

[Reserved]

§§ 535.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.10

§ 535.10 Governing Law

Most of the general provisions relating to subpoenas are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1997*. The issuance of subpoenas is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985-1986*, service by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987-1988*, motions to quash, modify, or comply by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*, and penalties for disobedience of a subpoena by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1991-1994*. Temporary removal of prisoners and their production in court is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1995-1997*, and subpoenas in criminal proceedings by *Penal Code §§ 1326-1332*. The service of subpoenas on certain peace officers is governed by *Gov. Code §§ 68097.1-68097.10*. The use of subpoenas duces tecum for the production of business records is governed by *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566*.

In the case of subpoenas used in the context of obtaining discovery, the provisions governing subpoenas generally are modified by the more specific provisions of the Civil Discovery Act (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2020.010*]. Subpoenas issued in an action pending outside California are governed by the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.100 et seq.*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.500* (other applicable law)]. For further discussion and forms relating to provisions specifically applicable to deposition subpoenas, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

There are also a number of additional provisions governing issuance of subpoenas in specialized contexts and proceedings [*see, e.g., Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664* (juvenile dependency and wardship proceedings); *Mil. & Vet. Code § 460 et seq.* (military court proceedings); *Prob. Code § 451* (issuance by probate referees); *Educ. Code § 48918* (school expulsion proceedings); *Veh. Code § 14104.5* (informal hearings before the Department of Motor Vehicles)]. However, this is only a partial listing and relevant code indexes should be consulted to determine if any additional provisions governing issuance of subpoenas are applicable in a specific context.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.11

§ 535.11 Use of Subpoenas and Subpoenas Duces Tecum

[1] Purposes

A subpoena is a writ or order directed to a person requiring his or her attendance at a particular time and place to testify as a witness. It is the process by which the attendance of a witness is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*].

A subpoena duces tecum requires the witness also to bring with him or her any books, documents, or other things under the witness's control which he or she is bound by law to produce in evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*].

[2] Special Provisions

Special provisions concerning service and payment of fees apply when the witness being subpoenaed is a peace officer, fire fighter, or technical analyst in a related area [*see Gov. Code §§ 68097.1-68097.10*]. For discussion of service of subpoena and payment of fees relating to these individuals, see *§§ 535.17[5]* and *535.19[1][a]*, respectively.

Special provisions may also apply if a party has subpoenaed the records of certain businesses [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.3*; *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566*]. These provisions are discussed in *§ 535.20*.

Special requirements also apply when the personal records of consumers, as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, the employment records of employees, or the private records of public employees are sought by subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3* (consumers), 1985.4 (public employees), 1985.6 (private employers)]. These requirements are discussed in *§§ 535.21* and 525.22, respectively.

Parties and certain party-related persons may be compelled to attend and produce certain things by notice to their attorneys, instead of by a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b), (c)*]. This method of compelling attendance is discussed in *§ 535.24*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.12

§ 535.12 Obtaining Subpoena

[1] To Require Attendance Before Court or at Trial

A subpoena to require attendance before a court, or at the trial of an issue therein, is obtainable from the clerk of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*]. It is unclear what significance this provision would have when the subpoena is going to be issued by an attorney pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)* [*see discussion under § 535.13[2]*]. Since the attorney of record may sign and issue a subpoena which requires attendance pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*, it would appear that the mandatory Judicial Council subpoena forms [*see §§ 535.60, 535.61*] could be obtained from any court, as long as the attorney fills in the name of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending.

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)* refers only to subpoenas, and not to subpoenas duces tecum, it appears that both are obtained in the same manner.

[2] To Require Attendance Before Commissioner Appointed by Non-California Court

A subpoena to require attendance before a commissioner appointed to take testimony by a court of a foreign county, or of the United States, or of any other state in the United States, or before any other officers empowered by the laws of the United States to take testimony may be obtained from the clerk of the superior court of the county in which the witness is to be examined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(b)*].

[3] To Require Attendance out of Court in Cases Not Provided for by Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)

A subpoena to require attendance out of court, in cases not provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)* (*see* discussions in [1], *above* and [4], *below*), before a judge, justice, or other officer authorized to administer oaths or take testimony in any matter under California laws, is obtainable from the judge, justice, or other officer before whom the attendance is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(c)*].

[4] To Require Attendance Before Officer on Taking Deposition

Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a) provides that a subpoena to require attendance on the taking of a deposition in an action or proceeding is obtainable from the clerk of the court in which the action or proceeding is pending.

The last paragraph of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986* provides that if the subpoena will require attendance before a commissioner or other officer on the taking of a deposition, it must be obtained "as of course" from the clerk of the superior court of the county where the attendance is required on application of the party requiring it. This provision appears to conflict with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*, which provides that the court from which the subpoena is obtained is the court in which the action or proceeding is pending.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.13

§ 535.13 Issuance

[1] By Clerk or Judge

The clerk, or a judge, issues a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum signed and sealed, but otherwise blank, to the party requesting it, who must fill it in before service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*].

[2] By Attorney

The attorney of record in an action or proceeding may sign and issue a subpoena to require attendance before the court in which the action or proceeding is pending, or at the trial of an issue therein, or on the taking of a deposition in an action or proceeding pending therein. The subpoena in such a case need not be sealed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*]. The attorney of record may also sign and issue a subpoena duces tecum to require production of the matters or things described in the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.14

§ 535.14 Limitation to California Residents

[1] In General

Generally, a person is not obliged to attend as a witness before any court, judge, justice, or other officer, unless the witness is a resident within California at the time of service of the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*].

PRACTICE TIP:
Seek Voluntary Appearance. It may be worth a telephone call or a letter to the out-of-state witness. Communication may yield an agreement to appear voluntarily. *By Corinne Burt.*

[2] Definition of Residence

Residence, for the purpose of a subpoena, means residence in fact and not domicile. Pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*, the term "residence" envisages nothing more than an abode, possibly combined with a professional base of operations, which gives the resident a sojourning connection with the area of a type and duration related to the status of witness and which does not make it a hardship for him or her to attend the legal proceedings at which he or she is commanded to appear [*In re Morelli (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 819, 831, 91 Cal. Rptr. 72]* .

[3] Exception for Custodian of Records if Attendance Not Required

The limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989* do not apply when a subpoena duces tecum is served on a custodian of records or other qualified witness as provided by *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566* and his or her personal attendance is not required by the terms of the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.3*; *see* discussion in *§ 535.20[1]*].

[4] Exception for Member of California Highway Patrol

A member of the California Highway Patrol may be required by a subpoena requiring attendance to appear as a witness before any court located in California, in any civil action or proceeding, in connection with a matter regarding an event or transaction which he or she has perceived or investigated in the course of his or her duties, even if he or she is not subject to a subpoena pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989* [*Gov. Code § 68097.3*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.15

§ 535.15 Agreement to Appear at Another Time

[1] Availability

A subpoenaed person, in lieu of appearance at the time specified in the subpoena, may agree with the party at whose request the subpoena isissued to appear at another time or on such notice as may be agreed on [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*; *Gov. Code § 68097.9* (peace officers and related persons)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Coordinate With Witnesses to Save Time and Gain Cooperation. To save time and scheduling headaches, contact witnesses before serving the subpoena to let them know they will be subpoenaed and that you want to accommodate their schedule. This will not only save time, but it may yield a more cooperative witness. In the event that there is an agreement to appear at another time, make sure it is memorialized in writing. *By Corinne Burt.*

[2] Failure to Appear

Failure to appear pursuant to an agreement may be punishable as contempt by the court issuing the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*; *see* discussion in *§ 535.26[1]*, and in Ch. 135, *Contempt*]. Facts establishing or disproving such an agreement and the failure to appear may be proved by an affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of any person having personal knowledge of the facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

If a witness disobeys a subpoena served in a civil action pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*, the disobedience may be punished as a contempt as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240* [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240* provides that disobedience of deposition subpoena may be punished for contempt under *Code Civ. Proc. 2023.010 et seq.* without the necessity of a prior order of court directing compliance [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.030(e)* (court may impose a sanction for misuse of the civil discovery process by issuing an order treating the misuse as a contempt of court); for discussion of the use of contempt orders to punish disobedience of subpoenas generally, *see § 535.26[1]*]. The witness or person who fails to appear pursuant to a subpoena or a court order is also subject to the forfeiture and payment of damages set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1992* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240*]. As an alternative to a contempt sanction, the court may issue a warrant for the arrest of witness or person who fails to appear [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

1993(a)(1); *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1993(a)(2), (b), 1993.1-1993.2* (procedures); § 535.26[2]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.16

§ 535.16 Affidavit Supporting Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Requirements

A copy of an affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) on which a subpoena duces tecum is based must be served with the subpoena duces tecum [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(b), 1987.5*; *see §§ 535.61, 535.62* et seq.].

[2] Contents

The affidavit or declaration must show good cause for the production of the matters and things described in the subpoena, specifying the exact matters or things desired to be produced, setting forth in full detail the materiality thereof to the issues involved in the case, and stating that the witness has the desired matters or things in his or her possession or under his or her control [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*; *see Lee v. Superior Court (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1126-1130, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (subpoenas duces tecum were ineffective because each failed to include declaration containing "a sufficient statement of materiality" as required *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*; *see also §§ 535.61 -535.66*]. The affidavit must show that the requested material contains competent and admissible evidence that is material to some disputed issue of fact at the trial [*People v. Schmitt (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 87, 106, 317 P.2d 673]* . The affidavit cannot consist of reliance "merely upon the legal conclusion, stated in general terms, that the desired documentary evidence is relevant and material" [*McClatchy Newspapers v. Superior Court (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 386, 396, 159 P.2d 944* ; *Lee v. Superior Court (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1112, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (declarations that lacked any factual bases for legal conclusion that documents were material to proceedings failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*, collecting cases, quoting *McClatchy*); *Johnson v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 829, 837, 66 Cal. Rptr. 134* ("the trial court must be afforded the factual data by the required affidavit to enable it to make an informed ruling on the issues of materiality and good cause.")]. Rather, the documents or other things should be described with such certainty that the person producing the records is reasonably apprised of what is required [*Pacific Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 61, 68-69, 77 Cal. Rptr. 836* ; *see also Flora Crane Serv., Inc. v. Superior Court (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 767, 785-786, 45 Cal. Rptr. 79]* .

[3] Filing

The party causing the subpoena to be served must retain the original affidavit or declaration until final judgment in the

action, and must file this affidavit or declaration with the court only on reasonable request by any party or witness affected thereby [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.17

§ 535.17 Service

[1] In General

The service of a subpoena generally is made (except on peace officers, firefighters, and specified technical analysts, discussed in *§ 535.17[5]*) by delivering a copy or ticket containing its substance to the witness personally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*]. However, when service is to be made on a minor, service must be made on the minor's parent, guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary, or if one of them cannot be located with reasonable diligence, then service must be made on any person having the care or control of the minor or with whom the minor resides or by whom the minor is employed, and on the minor if the minor is 12 years of age or older. However, if the minor is alleged to come within the description of *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 300*, *601*, or *602* and the minor is not in the custody of a parent or guardian, regardless of the age of the minor, service also must be made on the designated agent for service of process at the county child welfare department or the probation department under whose jurisdiction the minor has been placed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; *Penal Code § 1328(b)*; *see Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 300* (persons subject to jurisdiction of juvenile court), 601 (persons subject to jurisdiction of juvenile court as ward for refusal to obey parents, violation of curfew, or truancy), 602 (persons subject to jurisdiction of juvenile court and adjudicated as ward for violation of law or ordinance defining crime)].

Service may be made by any person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*].

[2] Time of Service

Service must be made so as to allow the witness a reasonable time for preparation and travel to the place of attendance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Allow Witness as Much Time as possible. Give as much notice as possible to avoid the assertion that the notice given was not reasonable. *By Corinne Burt.*

When serving a written notice instead of a subpoena [*see § 535.24[1]* for discussion of when written notice may substitute for subpoena], the notice must be served at least 10 days before the time required for attendance unless the

court prescribes a shorter time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*]. The notice may include a request that the party or person bring books, documents or other things if the notice is served at least 20 days before the time required for attendance, or within such shorter time as the court may order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[3] Subpoena Duces Tecum

A copy of the affidavit on which the subpoena duces tecum is based [*see* discussion at *§ 535.16*] must be served simultaneously with the subpoena duces tecum. If it is not, the service of the subpoena duces tecum is invalid [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*]. A subpoena duces tecum requiring appearance and the production of matters and things at the taking of a deposition is not valid unless a copy of the affidavit on which the subpoena is based and the designation of the materials to be produced, as set forth in the subpoena, is attached to the notice of taking the deposition served on each party or its attorney as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2002 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*; *see also* Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*].

Although the general provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure dealing with the issuance of subpoenas, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.*, apply to deposition subpoenas as well as to trial subpoenas, they do so only to the extent that those provisions are not modified by provisions in the *nonparty* discovery chapter of the Civil Discovery Act, *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.010 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.030* (general subpoena provisions that include *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985* and *1987.5* apply to a deposition subpoena "[e]xcept as modified in this chapter"); *see § 535.10*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5* provides that in the case of a subpoena duces tecum requiring appearance and the production of matters and things at the taking of a deposition, the subpoena is not valid unless a copy of the affidavit on which the subpoena was based and the designation of the materials to be produced, as set forth in the subpoena, is attached to the notice of taking the deposition served on each party or its attorney. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.510(b)*, however, provides that a deposition subpoena commanding the attendance and the testimony of the deponent, as well as the production of business records, documents, or tangible things need not be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the production of the documents and things designated. Faced with these two contradictory and irreconcilable provisions, one court of appeal held, as a matter of first impression, that *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.510(b)* controls [*Terry v. SLICO (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 352, 355, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900]* . The court reasoned that treating *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985* and *1987.5* as the controlling provisions would be at odds with *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.030* and with the "fundamental understanding that has prevailed since the adoption of the Civil Discovery Act," that to the extent that its provisions concerning nonparty discovery overlap or conflict with other provisions of more general application, the provisions of the Civil Discovery Act prevail [*Terry v. SLICO (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 352, 359, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900]* . Because service of the deposition subpoena on a nonparty witness was effective despite the absence of a supporting affidavit or declaration, the trial court did not err in imposing reasonable monetary sanctions for the witness' failure to comply with the subpoena [*Terry v. SLICO (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 352, 359, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5 does not apply to deposition subpoenas commanding only the production of business records for copying under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.420*.

For a discussion of the special requirements for a subpoena duces tecum for production of a consumer's personal records or an employee's employment records, see *§ 535.21*.

[4] On Concealed Witness

If a witness is concealed in a building or vessel to prevent the service of a subpoena on him or her, any court, judge, or officer issuing the subpoena may, on proof by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of the concealment and of the materiality of the witness, order that the sheriff of the county serve the subpoena. The sheriff may then break into the building or vessel where the witness is concealed for the purpose of serving the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1988*].

[5] On Peace Officers, Firefighters, and Other Public Employees

If a witness is a peace officer of Department of the California Highway Patrol, member of the California State Police, employee of the Department of Justice who is a peace officer or analyst in a technical field, sheriff, deputy sheriff, marshal, deputy marshal, district attorney inspector, probation officer, building inspector, fire fighter, or city police officer, and he or she is required as a witness before a court or other tribunal in a civil action or proceeding in connection with an event or transaction that he or she has perceived or investigated in the course of his or her duties, the subpoena may be served by delivering a copy either to him or her personally or by delivering two copies to that person's immediate superior at the public entity by which he or she is employed [*Gov. Code § 68097.1(a)* (service may also be made on superior's designated agent)]. If a witness is any other state employee or any employee of the trial courts required to testify regarding a matter, event, or transaction about which he or she has expertise gained in the course of his or her duties, the subpoena may be served by delivering a copy either to him or her personally or by delivering two copies to his or her immediate superior [*Gov. Code § 68097.1(b)* (service may also be made on superior's designated agent)]. For a provision relating to service of subpoenas on peace officers in criminal proceedings, see *Penal Code § 1328*.

The attendance of this type of witness may be required pursuant to *Gov. Code § 68097.1* only in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989* [*Gov. Code § 68097.1(c)*; *see § 535.14[1]*].

[6] On Nonresident Members of the California Highway Patrol

A member of the California Highway Patrol who is not subject to subpoena pursuant to the limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989* (limitation to residents of California) may nevertheless be served by delivering a copy, during usual office hours, at least five days before the date of the member's required attendance, to the person in charge of the office of the California Highway Patrol where the member filed his or her report of the event or transaction [*Gov. Code § 68097.3*].

[7] Fees for Service

The fee for serving a subpoena by a public officer, registered process server, or other means is an allowable cost under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)(4), (b)* (defining "prevailing party," directing court to determine prevailing party in cases not coming within definition, and providing that prevailing party is entitled to recover costs) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)(4), (b)*]. If service is by a public officer, the recoverable cost is the fee authorized by law at the time of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(4)(A)*]. Fees for service by sheriffs, constables, and marshals are governed by statute. For sheriffs, the fee for service of process is governed by *Gov. Code § 26721*, and certain charges for actual expenses are set out by *Gov. Code § 26748*. Marshals are required to charge and collect for their services the fees, expenses, and mileage allowed by law to sheriffs [*Gov. Code § 71266*]. If service is by a process server registered pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22350 et seq.*, the recoverable cost is the amount actually incurred in effecting service, including, but not limited to, a stakeout or other means employed in locating the person to be served, unless those charges are successfully challenged by a party to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(4)(B)*]. If service is made by a person other than a public officer or registered process server, the recoverable cost is the sum actually incurred or the amount allowed to a public officer in California for that service, whichever is less, except that the court may allow the sum actually incurred in effecting service on application pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(c)(4)* (granting court discretion to allow or deny) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(4)(D)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.18

§ 535.18 Witness Fees

[1] In General

A witness subpoenaed in any civil or administrative action or proceeding must be given written notice on the subpoena that he or she may be entitled to receive attendance fees and payment for mileage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2065*]. If the witness demands it, payment for travel (mileage) and attendance fees for one day must be given or offered to him or her at the time of service of the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*]. A witness who demands such payment is not compelled to attend under the terms of the subpoena until the fees are paid [*Gov. Code § 68097*]. The amount of witness fees for each day's actual attendance and for mileage actually traveled, both ways, is provided for by *Gov. Code § 68093*.

PRACTICE TIP:
Have Fees Ready. Don't forget to have a check ready. Overlooking this detail could have dire consequences. *By Corinne Burt.*

[2] Fees for Experts

[a] Availability

A party subpoenaing an expert witness to testify before any court, tribunal, or arbiter in any civil action or proceeding must pay the reasonable and customary hourly or daily fee for the actual time consumed in the examination of that witness by any party attending the action or proceeding [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*]. However, the hourly or daily fee must not exceed the fee charged the party who retained the expert except when the expert donated his or her services to a charitable or other nonprofit organization [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*]. A daily fee may only be charged for a full day of attendance at a deposition, or when the expert was required by the deposing party to be available for a full day and the expert necessarily had to forego all business he or she would have otherwise conducted that day but for the request that he or she be available all day for the scheduled deposition [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*].

For the purpose of this provision, "expert witness" means a witness other than one who is a party or employee of a party, and who is one of the following [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*]:

- An expert described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.210(b)* (an expert retained by a party in connection with litigation);

- A treating physician and surgeon or other treating health care practitioner who is to be asked during the deposition to express opinion testimony, including opinion or factual testimony regarding the past or present diagnosis or prognosis made by the practitioner or the reasons for a particular treatment decision made by the practititioner, but not including testimony requiring only the reading of words and symbols contained in the relevant medical record; or

- An architect, professional engineer, or licensed land surveyor who was involved with the original project design or survey for which he or she is asked to express an opinion within his or her expertise and relevant to the action or proceeding.

An express contract, relating to compensation, entered into between a person and the party requesting or requiring the person to testify prevails over the provisions of *Gov. Code § 68092.5* [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(e)*].

There is currently no prohibition against allowing costs for expert witness fees under *Gov. Code § 68092.5*. Prior to its 1988 amendment, expert witness fees paid pursuant to *Gov. Code § 68092.5* were not allowable costs [*see* former *Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*; *see also Posey v. State of California (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 836, 852, 225 Cal. Rptr. 830* (decided under prior law)].

The deposition of an expert witness is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.010 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(f)*]. The compensation of experts for depositions is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2034.420-2034.450*. For additional discussion and forms relating to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2034.430-2034.470*, see Ch. 198, *Discovery: Exchange of Expert Witness Information* . Special provisions relating to compensation of experts appointed by the court are set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 730, 731*. For discussion of *Evid. Code §§ 730, 731*, see Ch. 551, *Trial* .

[b] Tender of Fees

The party requiring the attendance must either accompany the service of the subpoena with a tender of the expert's fees based on the anticipated length of time the expert is required to remain at the place specified in the subpoena, or must tender the fee at the required time of appearance. The expert's fee must be delivered to the attorney for the party designating the expert. If the appearance of the expert takes longer than anticipated, the party serving the subpoena must pay the balance of the expert's fee within five days of receipt of an itemized statement from the expert. The party designating the expert is responsible for any fee charged by the expert for preparing for the testimony and for traveling to the place of the civil action or proceeding, as well as for any travel expenses of the expert, unless otherwise determined by the court [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*].

The service of a proper subpoena accompanied by the tender of the expert witness fee is effective to require the party employing or retaining the expert to produce the expert for testimony. If the party serving the notice or subpoena fails to tender the expert's fee, the expert is not required to appear at that time unless the parties stipulate otherwise [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(b)*].

[c] Motion to Set Compensation

If the subpoenaing party deems that the hourly or daily fee of the expert for providing testimony is unreasonable, that party may move for an order setting the compensation of the expert. The motion must be accompanied by a declaration stating facts showing a reasonable and good faith attempt at an informal resolution of each issue presented by the motion. Notice of the motion must also be given to the expert [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(c)*].

In any such attempt at an informal resolution, either the party or the expert must provide the other with the following information [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(c)*]:

- Proof of the ordinary and customary fee actually charged and received by that expert for similar services provided outside the subject litigation;

- The total number of times the presently demanded fee has ever been charged and received by that expert; and

- The frequency and regularity with which the presently demanded fee has been charged and received by that expert within the two-year period preceding the hearing on the motion.

In addition to any other facts or evidence, the expert or the party designating the expert must provide, and the court's determination of the reasonableness of the fee must be based on, the proof described in the foregoing list. The court may also consider the ordinary and customary fees charged by similar experts for similar services within the relevant community, and any other facts the court deems necessary or appropriate to make its determination. On determining that the fee demanded by the expert is unreasonable, and based on the evidence and factors considered, the court must set the expert's fee [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(c)*].

For a form of motion to set the compensation of an expert deponent pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.470*, which may be adapted for use under *Gov. Code § 68092.5(c)*, see Ch. 198, *Discovery: Exchange of Expert Witness Information* .

[d] Notice of Continuation or Cancellation

If the proceeding at which the expert witness has been notified his or her attendance is required is continued or canceled in advance of the time for which it is scheduled, the witness must be so notified by the party requiring his or her attendance by the quickest and most reliable means of giving notice under the circumstances, or the expert witness is entitled to receive the compensation specified in *Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*, notwithstanding his or her failure to give any testimony [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.19

§ 535.19 Fees for Public Employees

[1] City and County Employees, Peace Officers, Firefighters, and Specified Others

[a] In General

Special rules apply when any employee of a local agency or any peace officer, as defined in *Penal Code § 830 et seq.*, any firefighter, or any state employee is subpoenaed [*see Gov. Code §§ 68096.1* (local agency employees, including employees of a city, county, city and county, special district, redevelopment agency, or any other political subdivision of the state), 68097.2 (peace officer, firefighter, specified county employee, state employee, or trial court employee)].

A party subpoenaing any of these individuals must tender the amount of $150, together with the subpoena, to the person accepting the subpoena for each day that the employee or officer is required to remain in attendance pursuant to the subpoena [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(b), 68097.2(b)*].

For purposes of *Gov. Code § 68097 et seq.*, the term "firefighter" has the definition provided in *Gov. Code § 50925*, and a volunteer firefighter is deemed to be employed by the public entity for which he or she volunteers as a firefighter [*Gov. Code § 68097*; *see Gov. Code § 68097.2(f)* (when payment to volunteer firefighter is required)].

[b] Salary and Expenses

Any local agency employee, peace officer, firefighter, or state employee who is obliged by subpoena to attend as a witness must receive the salary or other compensation to which he or she is normally entitled from the public entity by which he or she is employed during the time that the officer or employee travels to and from the place where the court or other tribunal is located and while required to remain at such place pursuant to that subpoena. That officer or employee must also receive from the employing public entity the actual, necessary, and reasonable traveling expenses incurred in complying with the subpoena [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(a), 68097.2(a)*].

[c] Reimbursement of Entity

The party at whose request the subpoena is issued must reimburse the public entity for the full cost the public entity

incurred in paying the employee or officer his or her salary or other compensation and traveling expenses, for each day that the employee or officer is required to remain in attendance pursuant to the subpoena [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(b), 68097.2(b)*]. However, it is not necessary to reimburse a public entity which is itself a defendant through the actions of its officers or employees. In that case the usual statutory provisions with respect to witnesses are applicable [*Patterson v. Sharp (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 838, 840-841, 61 Cal. Rptr. 517* ; *see Gov. Code §§ 68093, 68097*; *see also Gov. Code § 68096.1(a)* (specifically limiting its provisions to actions to which employing city, county, or city and county is not party)].

[d] Overpayment or Underpayment

If the actual expenses should later prove to be less than the amount tendered, the excess of the amount tendered will be refunded [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(c), 68097.2(c)*]. If the actual expenses should later prove to be more than the amount deposited, the difference must be paid to the public entity by the party at whose request the subpoena is issued [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(d), 68097.2(d)*].

[2] Deposit for Nonresident Highway Patrol Officer

When a member of the California Highway Patrol is subpoenaed under *Gov. Code § 68097.3* (when not subject to subpoena pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*; *see* discussion at *535.14[4]*), a deposit in an amount equal to the estimated amount of his or her salary and expenses for the time and travel required by the subpoena must be made with the clerk of the court prior to the issuance of that subpoena [*Gov. Code § 68097.4*].

[3] Deposit for Appearance at Subsequent Proceedings

If a court continues a proceeding on its own motion, no additional witness fee are required prior to the issuance of the subpoena or to the making of an order directing an employee or officer to appear on the date to which the proceeding is continued [*Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(e), 68097.2(e)*].

No peace officer of the Department of the California Highway Patrol, peace officer member of the State Fire Marshal's Office, employee of the Department of Justice who is a peace officer or an analyst in a technical field, sheriff, deputy sheriff, marshal, deputy marshal, firefighter, or city police officer may be ordered by the court to return for subsequent proceedings beyond the date stated in the subpoena referred to in *Gov. Code §§ 68097.1-68097.4* or the day on which that witness appeared pursuant to the provisions of *Gov. Code § 68097.9* (agreement by witness to appear at time other than specified in subpoena), unless the party at whose request the subpoena was issued, or the party at whose request the witness is ordered to return, first tenders to the public entity that employs the witness the same sum required to be tendered for the issuance of the subpoena in the first instance [*Gov. Code § 68097.5* (language was not amended to reflect amendment to *Gov. Code § 68097.2(b)* eliminating deposit prior to issuance of subpoena); *see* discussion at *§ 535.19[1][a]*].

[4] Relief From Deposit or Payment Requirement

The court, on good cause shown, including the fact that the party is proceeding in forma pauperis, may relieve a party of the duty to make any deposit or payment required by *Gov. Code §§ 68096.1, 68097.1-68097.5* [*Gov. Code § 68097.55*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.20

§ 535.20 Production of Business Records by Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] When Personal Attendance Not Required

[a] In General

When a subpoena duces tecum requiring the production of all or any part of a business' records is served on the custodian of records or other qualified witness of the business, in a civil action in which the business is neither a party nor the place where any cause of action is alleged to have arisen, the custodian or other qualified witness may comply with the subpoena duces tecum by mailing or otherwise delivering to the clerk of the court (or the judge, if there is no clerk), within 15 days after receipt of the subpoena, or within the time agreed on by the party who served the subpoena and the custodian or other qualified witness, a true, legible, and durable copy of all of the records described in the subpoena duces tecum, together with an affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1561*. This procedure does not apply if attendance is required pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1564* [*Evid. Code § 1560(b)*].

[b] Transmittal of Records

The copy of the records is to be enclosed separately from the affidavit in a sealed inner envelope or wrapper, with the title and number of the action, name of the witness, and date of the subpoena clearly inscribed on it. The sealed envelope or wrapper must then be enclosed in an outer envelope or wrapper, sealed, and directed as follows [*Evid. Code § 1560(c)*]:

- If the subpoena directs attendance in court, to the clerk of the court, or to the judge thereof if there is no clerk;

- If the subpoena directs attendance at a deposition, to the officer before whom the deposition is to be taken, at the place designated in the subpoena for the taking of the deposition, or at the officer's place of business;

- In other cases, to the officer, body, or tribunal conducting the hearing, at a like address.

Unless the parties otherwise agree, or unless the sealed envelope or wrapper is returned to a witness who is to appear personally, the copy of the records must remain sealed and will be opened only at the time of trial, deposition, or other hearing, on the direction of the judge, officer, body, or tribunal conducting the proceeding, in the presence of all parties who have appeared in person or by counsel at the trial, deposition, or hearing. Records that are original documents and that are not introduced in evidence or required as part of the record will be returned to the person or entity from whom received. Records that are copies may be destroyed [*Evid. Code § 1560(d)*].

[c] Records Made Available to Attorney

As an alternative to the procedures described in *Evid. Code § 1560(b), (c),* and *(d),* a subpoenaing party in a civil action seeking discovery of records may direct the witness to make the records available for inspection or copying by the party's attorney or the attorney's representative at the business address of the witness under reasonable conditions during normal business hours. When provided with at least five business days advance notice by the attorney or his or her representative, or by the deposition officer (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.420*), the witness must designate a time period of not less than six continuous hours on a day certain for copying of the subpoenaed records by the attorney, the attorney's representative, or deposition officer [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*].

It is the responsibility of the attorney's representative to deliver any copy of the records as directed in the subpoena [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*].

Evid. Code § 1560(e) does not apply to criminal cases [*Penal Code § 1326(b)*].

[d] Admissibility of Copies

If the original records would be admissible in evidence if the custodian or other qualified witness had been present and testified to the matters stated in the affidavit, and if the requirements of *Evid. Code § 1271* (record as evidence) have been met, the copy of the records is admissible in evidence [*Evid. Code § 1562*].

[2] Personal Attendance of Custodian or Witness

[a] In General

A party who desires the personal attendance of the custodian or other qualified witness may obtain it through a subpoena duces tecum containing the clause set out in *Evid. Code § 1564* [*see Evid. Code § 1564*; § 535.6[1]].

PRACTICE TIP:

Consider Deposing Custodian of Records. Always consider deposing the custodian of records. This is a good way to ensure that you have received all documents responsive to the subpoena. In the course of questioning the custodian, you may also learn whether further investigation is necessary. *By Corinne Burt.*

[b] Witness Fees and Mileage

When the personal attendance of the custodian of a record or other qualified witness is required pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1564* in a civil proceeding, he or she is entitled to the same witness fees and mileage permitted in a case when the subpoena requires the witness to attend and testify before a court in which the action or proceeding is pending and to any additional costs incurred as provided by *Evid. Code § 1563(b)* [*Evid. Code § 1563(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 68093* (witness fees and mileage); *see also* discussion at *§ 535.18[1]*].

[3] Reasonable Costs for Production of Business Records

[a] Set by Statute

When the records are delivered to the attorney, the attorney's representative, or a deposition officer for inspection and photocopying at the witness' place of business, the only fee for complying with the subpoena must not exceed $15, plus the actual cost, if any, charged to the witness by a third person for retrieval and return of records held offsite by the third person. If the records are retrieved from microfilm, the reasonable cost defined in *Evid. Code § 1563(b)(1)* also applies [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(6)*]. The party serving a subpoena duces tecum may be charged all reasonable costs incurred by any witness who is not a party in the production of all or any part of business records pursuant to the subpoena duces tecum [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)*].

"Reasonable cost," as used in *Evid. Code § 1563*, includes, but is not limited to, 10 cents per page for standard reproduction of standard documents, 20 cents per page for copying documents from microfilm, actual costs for reproduction of documents requiring special processing, reasonable clerical costs in locating and making the records available to be billed at the maximum rate of $24 per hour per person, actual postage charges, and the actual cost charged to the witness by a third person for the retrieval and return of records held by that third person [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(1)*].

[b] Demand for Payment and Itemized Statement of Costs

The party requesting production of business records is not required to pay reasonable production costs or any estimate of them prior to the time the records are available for delivery pursuant to the subpoena. However, the witness may demand payment of costs pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1563* simultaneous with actual delivery of the subpoenaed records, and, until such time as payment is made, is under no obligation to deliver the records [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(2)*].

The witness must submit an itemized statement for all reasonable costs to the requesting party or the requesting party's depostion officer, setting forth the reproduction and clerical costs incurred by the witness.If the costs exceed those authorized by statute [*see* [a], *above*], or if the witness refuses to produce the required itemized statement of costs, the witness, on demand of the requesting party or that party's deposition officer, must furnish a statement setting forth the actions taken by the witness in justification of the costs [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(3)*].

[c] Petition to Reduce Excessive Costs

The requesting party may petition the court in which the action is pending to recover from the witness all or a part of the costs paid to the witness, or to reduce all or a part of the costs charged by the witness pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1563(b)*, on the ground that the costs were excessive. On the filing of the petition, the court must issue an order to show cause, and from the time the order is served on the witness the court has jurisdiction over the witness. The court may hear testimony on the order to show cause, and if it finds that the costs demanded and collected, or charged but not collected, exceed the amount authorized by *Evid. Code § 1563(b)*, it must order the witness to remit to the requesting party, or reduce its charge to the requesting party by an amount equal to, the amount of the excess. If the court finds the costs excessive and charged in bad faith by the witness, the court must order the witness to remit the full amount of the costs demanded and collected or excuse the requesting party from any payment of costs charged but not collected, and the court must also order the witness to pay the requesting party the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in obtaining the order, including attorney's fees. If the court finds the costs were not excessive, it must order the requesting party to pay the witness the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in defending the petition, including attorney's fees [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(4)*].

[d] When Witness Entitled to Reimbursement

If a subpoena is served to compel the production of business records and is subsequently withdrawn, or is quashed, modified, or limited on a motion made other than by the witness, the witness is entitled to reimbursement pursuant to

Evid. Code § 1563(b)(1) for all costs incurred in compliance with the subpoena to the time that the requesting party has notified the witness that the subpoena has been withdrawn, quashed, modified, or limited. In the event the subpoena is withdrawn or quashed, if those costs are not paid within 30 days after demand therefor, the witness may file a motion in the court in which the action is pending for an order requiring payment, and the court must award the payment of expenses and attorney's fees in the manner set forth in *Evid. Code § 1563(b)(4)* [*Evid. Code § 1563(b)(5)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.21

§ 535.21 Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Personal Records of Consumer or Employment Records of Employee

[1] In General

Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3 establishes procedures for obtaining personal records of consumers by use of a subpoena duces tecum. Similarly, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6* provides requirements for seeking employment records of employees through a subpoena duces tecum. Failure to comply with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3* and *1985.6*, discussed below, is a sufficient basis for a witness to refuse to produce, by a subpoena duces tecum, personal records of a consumer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(k)*], or employment records of an employee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(j)*].

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3 and *1985.6* do not apply to any subpoena duces tecum that does not request the records of any particular consumer or employee and that requires a custodian of records to delete all information that would in any way identify the consumer or employee [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(i), 1985.6(h)*], or to proceedings under *Lab. Code §§ 50-175, 3200-6002, 6100-6149,* or *6200-6208* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(j), 1985.6(i)*]. In addition, if the subpoenaing party is the consumer or the employee, and the consumer or employee is the only subject of the subpoenaed records, notice to the consumer or to the employee and the delivery of the other documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)*, or in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(b)* is not required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*(*l*) (consumer); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(k)* (employee); *see § 535.21[4][a]*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Give Notice to Consumer. Don't forget notice to the consumer when subpoenaing personal records. *By Corinne Burt.*

[2] Definitions

[a] Personal Records and Witnesses

The phrase "personal records" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* means the original or any copy of books, documents, other writings, or electronic data pertaining to a consumer that are maintained by any "witness" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(a)(1)*]. "Witness," in turn, is defined as a physician, dentist, ophthalmologist, optometrist, chiropractor, physical

therapist, acupuncturist, podiatrist, veterinarian, veterinary hospital, veterinary clinic, pharmacist, pharmacy, hospital, medical center, clinic, radiology or MRI center, clinical or diagnostic laboratory, state or national bank, state or federal association as defined under *Fin. Code § 5102*, state or federal credit union, trust company, anyone authorized by the state to make or arrange loans that are secured by real property, security brokerage firm, insurance company, underwritten title company, title insurance company, escrow agent (either licensed under *Fin. Code § 17000 et seq.* or exempt from licensing), attorney, accountant, institution of the Farm Credit System as specified in *12 U.S.C. § 2002*, telephone corporation that is a public utility as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 216*, a psychotherapist as defined in *Evid. Code § 1010*, or a private or public preschool, elementary school, secondary school, or post secondary school as described in *Educ. Code § 76244* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(a)(1)*].

[b] Consumer

The term "consumer" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* means any individual, partnership of five or fewer persons, association, or trust that has transacted business with or has used the services of the witness or for whom the witness has acted as agent or fiduciary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(a)(2)*].

[c] Employment Records

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6*, "employment records" means the original or any copy of books, documents, other writings, or electronic data pertaining to the employment of any employee maintained by the current or former employer of the employee, or by an labor organization that has represented or currently represents the employee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(a)(3)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(a)(4)* ("labor organization" defined)].

[d] Employee

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6*, "employee" means any individual who is or has been employed by a witness subject to a subpoena duces tecum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(a)(2)*]. "Employee" also means any individual who is or has been represented by a labor organization that is a witness subject to a subpoena duces tecum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(a)(2)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(a)(4)* ("labor organization" defined)].

[e] Subpoenaing Party

The phrase "subpoenaing party" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3* and *1985.6* means the person or persons causing a subpoena duces tecum to be issued or served in connection with any civil action or proceeding. (Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, the civil action or proceeding must be commenced pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure.) The term does not include any state or local agencies described in *Gov. Code § 7465* or any entity provided for under Article VI of the California Constitution in any proceeding maintained before an adjudicative body of that entity pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6000-6228* (State Bar Act) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(a)(3), 1985.6(a)(5)*].

[3] Time Allowed for Production

The subpoena duces tecum must be served in sufficient time to allow the witness a reasonable time, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2020.410-2020.440*, to locate and produce the records themselves or copies of them [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(d)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(d) (employment records)]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.410*, a party issuing a depostion subpoena duces tecum for the production of records for copying must specify a date for compliance that is no earlier than 20 days after issuance of the subpoena, or 15 days after its service, whichever is later.

PRACTICE TIP:

Act Promptly to Object. If the consumer has objections to the subpoena or plans to file a motion to quash, counsel should notify the person or entity in control of the documents, as well as opposing counsel, *immediately*. Also, the objections and/or motion to quash should be filed with the court

immediately if opposing counsel will not agree to limit the scope of the subpoena. *By Corinne Burt.*

[4] Service of Subpoena Duces Tecum, Affidavit, and Notice on Consumer or Employee

[a] Requirements

Prior to the date called for in the subpoena duces tecum for the production of personal or employment records, the subpoenaing party must serve, or cause to be served, copies of the following on the consumer or employee whose records are being sought [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(b) (employment records); *see* [b], *below; § 535.69*]:

- The subpoena duces tecum.

- The affidavit (or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) supporting the issuance of the subpoena, if any.

- The notice described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)* (personal records of consumer) or 1985.6(e) (employment records).

- Proof of service as indicated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)* (personal records of consumer) or *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)* (employment records).

However, if the subpoenaing party is the consumer or the employee, and the consumer or employee is the only subject of the subpoenaed records, notice to the consumer or to the employee and the delivery of the other documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)*, or in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(b)* is not required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*(*l*) (consumer); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(k)* (employee)].

The service must satisfy the following requirements [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(b) (employment records)]:

- It must be made to the consumer or employee personally, or at his or her last known address, or in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*, or, if the consumer or employee is a party, to his or her attorney of record. If the consumer or employee is a minor, service is to be made on the minor's parent, guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary, or if one of them cannot be located with reasonable diligence, then service is to be made on any person having the care or control of the minor, or with whom the minor resides, or, in the case of a consumer, by whom the minor is employed, and on the minor if the minor is at least 12 years of age.

- Service must be completed not less than 10 days prior to the date for production specified in the subpoena duces tecum, plus the additional time provided for by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* if service is by mail.

- Service must be completed at least five days prior to service on the custodian of records, plus the additional time provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* if service is by mail.

If service is by mail, the time for service is extended by five calendar days if the place of address and the place of mailing is within the state of California, 10 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside California but within the United States, and 20 calendar days if either the place of mailing or the place of address is outside the United States [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.010 et seq.* (incorporating by reference provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e)* (extension when service is by Express Mail or fax); for

discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020, see generally* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

A subpoena duces tecum for personal records maintained by a telephone corporation that is a public utility, as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 216*, is not valid or effective unless it includes a consent to release, signed by the consumer whose records are requested, as required by *Pub. Util. Code § 2891* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f)*; *see § 535.71*].

[b] Contents of Notice

The notice accompanying every copy of the subpoena duces tecum and affidavit, if any, served on a consumer, employee, or his or her attorney must be in a typeface designed to call attention to the notice and must indicate the following [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(e) (employment records); *see § 535.69*]:

- Records about the consumer or employee are being sought from the witness named on the subpoena;

- If the consumer or employee objects to the witness furnishing the records to the party seeking them, he or she must file papers with the court, or serve a written objection as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)* (consumer) or 1985.6(f) (employee), prior to the date specified for production on the subpoena; and

- If the party who is seeking the records will not agree in writing to cancel or limit the subpoena, an attorney should be consulted about the consumer's or employee's interest in protecting his or her right of privacy.

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6* (employment records), the notice must also indicate that the employment records may be protected by a right of privacy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(e)*].

If a notice of taking of deposition is also served, that other notice may be set forth in a single document with the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e)* and *1985.6(e)* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(e) (employment records)]. For forms of notice of taking deposition that may be combined with the notice to a consumer, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

[5] Proof of Service or Written Authorization Served on Witness

Prior to the production of personal records of a consumer or employment records of an employee, the subpoenaing party must perform either of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(c) (employment records)]:

- Serve or cause to be served on the witness a proof of personal service or of service by mail attesting to compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)* regarding notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee is not required); [4][a], *above*]; or

- Furnish the witness with a written authorization to release the records signed by the consumer, employee, or his or her attorney of record.

The witness may presume that any attorney purporting to sign the authorization on behalf of the consumer or employee acted with the consent of the consumer or employee, and that any objection to release of records is waived [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(c) (employment records); *see § 535.70*].

[6] Motion to Shorten Time or to Waive Notice Requirements by Subpoenaing Party

On good cause shown and provided that the rights of witnesses and consumers or employees are preserved, a subpoenaing party is entitled to obtain an order shortening the time for service of a subpoena duces tecum or waiving the requirements of constructive notice and service of a certificate when due diligence by the subpoenaing party has been shown [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(h)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(g) (employment records)].

[7] Motion to Quash by Party Consumer or Employee

Any consumer or employee who is a party to the action and whose personal records are sought by a subpoena duces tecum, may, prior to the date for production, bring a motion to quash or modify the subpoena duces tecum pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*. Notice of the bringing of the motion must be given to the witness and deposition officer at least five days prior to production. No witness or deposition officer can be required to produce the records after receipt of notice that such a motion has been brought, except on order of the court in which the action is pending or by agreement of the parties, witnesses, and consumers or employees affected [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g)* (personal records of consumer), 1985.6(f) (employment records); *see § 535.74*]. The phrase "prior to the date for production" is designed to guide the witness with the records regarding when he or she may safely honor or not honor the subpoena when the consumer or employee objects. It does not limit the court's jurisdiction to motions brought by that time [*see Slagle v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1312, 260 Cal. Rptr. 122* (consumer)]. Motions to quash or modify subpoenas are discussed more fully in § 535.23.

[8] Objection by Nonparty Consumer or Employee

Any nonparty consumer or other nonparty, or any employee who is not a party to the action, whose personal records or employment records are being sought by a subpoena duces tecum, may, before the date set for production, serve on the subpoenaing party, the witness, and the deposition officer, a written objection that cites the grounds on which the production of the subpoenaed records should be denied. No witness or deposition officer is required to produce personal records of a nonparty consumer or other nonparty or employment records of a nonparty employee after receipt of notice that the motion has been brought by the consumer or employee, or after receipt of a written objection from a nonparty consumer or nonparty employee, except upon order of the court in which the action is pending or by agreement of the parties, witnesses, and consumers or employees affected. The party requesting the requests then may bring a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)* to enforce the subpoena within 20 days of service of the written objection. The motion must be accompanied by a declaration showing a reasonable and good faith attempt to resolve the matter informally between the requesting party and the consumer or the consumer's attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g)* (consumer), 1986.6(f) (employee)].

[9] Medical Records

The Confidentiality of Medical Information Act (*Civ. Code §§ 56-56.37*) [*see Ch. 429, Privacy, § 429.60* et seq.] prohibits unauthorized disclosure by a health care provider, health service plan, or contractor, of medical information regarding a patient of the health care provider, or an enrollee or subscriber of the plan [*see Civ. Code § 56.10(a)*]. An exception to this prohibition exists under *Civ. Code § 56.10(b)(3)* when disclosure is compelled by a party to a proceeding before a court or administrative agency pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum. For the exception to be valid as against a patient's privilege against disclosure of medical information, the subpoenaing party must have complied with the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, including the requirement that the consumer be given notice of his or her right to object and to seek the services of an attorney in order to protect his or her rights of privacy [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)*; *Colleen M. v. Fertility and Surgical Assocs. of Thousand Oaks (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1479, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 439* (citing *Inabnit); Inabnit v. Berkson (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1236-1239, 245 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Failure by the patient to take any action to prevent unwanted disclosure after receiving the requisite notice constitutes a waiver of the privilege, and leaves the health care provider in the position of being compelled to disclose the medical records under *Civ. Code § 56.10(b)(3)* [*see Colleen M. v. Fertility and Surgical Assocs. of Thousand Oaks (2005) 132*

Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1479, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 439 (in accordance with Code Civ. Proc. § 56.10(b)(3), subpoena required health care provider to disclose patient's medical records to ex-fiance's attorney because ex-fiance's attorney complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)*, and patient did not file objection; this undisputed evidence was sufficient to establish complete defense to cause of action under Code Civ. Proc. § 56.10(b)(3)); *Inabnit v. Berkson (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1236-1239, 245 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil Rights LawPrivacy RightsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationPersonnel Files

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.21A

§ 535.21A Subpoena Requiring Production of Electronically Stored Information

[1] Party May Require Production

A subpoena in a civil proceeding may require that electronically stored information (ESI) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.020* (definition); § 535.21A[2]] be produced for inspection, copying, testing, or sampling [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(a)(1)*]. The party serving the subpoena requiring production may specify the form or forms in which each type of ESI is to be produced [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(b)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8 establishes procedures for a party to obtain discovery of ESI [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(c)*; § 535.21A[3]; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(d)* (opposition to discovery); § 535.21A[4]].

For a more detailed discussion of the California Electronic Discovery Act [Stats. 2009, ch. 5] and the process of "e-discovery," see Ch. 195A, *Discovery: Discovery of Electronically Stored Evidence (E-Discovery)*. For in-depth coverage of e-discovery and a step-by-step guide to subpoenaing ESI from nonparties, see Matthew Bender(R) Practice Guide: California E-Discovery and Evidence, Ch. 6, *Demanding Production of Electronically Stored Evidence in California Court*.

[2] "Electronic" and "Electronically Stored Information" Defined

"Electronic" means relating to technology having electrical, digital, magnetic, wireless, optical, electromagnetic, or similar capabilities [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.020(d)*]. "Electronically stored information" is information that is stored in an electronic medium [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.020(e)*].

[3] Requesting Production

Unless otherwise agreed or ordered by the court, if a subpoena requiring production of ESI does not specify a form or forms for production, the person subpoenaed must produce the information in the form or forms in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a form that is reasonably usable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(c)(1)*]. However, the same ESI need not be produced in more than one form [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(c)(2)*].

If the person subpoenaed establishes that the ESI is from a source that is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or expense, the court may still order discovery if the subpoenaing party shows good cause, subject to specified limitations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(e)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(h)* (limitations); § 535.21A[5]].

If the court finds good cause for the production from a source that is not reasonably accessible, the court may set conditions for the discovery, including allocation of the expense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(f)*]. If necessary, the subpoenaed person, at the reasonable expense of the subpoenaing party, must translate, through detection devices, any data compilations included in the subpoena into a reasonably usable form [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(g)*].

The party serving the subpoena must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(j)*]. Additionally, a court order requiring compliance with a subpoena for ESI must protect a person who is neither a party nor a party's officer from undue burden or expense resulting from compliance [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(k)*].

[4] Opposing Production

The subpoenaed person opposing the production, inspection, copying, testing, or sampling of electronically stored information on the basis that information is from a source that is not reasonably accessible because of undue burden or expense bears the burden of demonstrating inaccessibility based on undue burden or expense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(d)*].

For a more detailed discussion and a step-by-step guide to opposing the production of ESI, see Matthew Bender(R) Practice Guide: California E-Discovery and Evidence, Ch. 6, *Demanding Production of Electronically Stored Evidence in California Court*.

[5] Limiting Discovery

The court must limit the frequency or extent of ESI discovery, even from a source that is reasonably accessible, if the court determines that any of the following conditions exists [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(h)*]:

- It is possible to obtain the information from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.

- The discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative.

- The party seeking discovery has had ample opportunity by discovery in the action to obtain the information sought.

- The likely burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs the likely benefit, taking into account the amount in controversy, the resources of the parties, the importance of the issues in the litigation, and the importance of the requested discovery in resolving the issues.

A claim of privilege or work product protection may also limit discovery of ESI [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(i)*; see *Code Civ. Proc. § 2031.285* (governing claim of privilege or protection)]. For detailed discussion of privilege and work product protection in the ESI context, see Ch. 195A, *Discovery: Discovery of Electronically Stored Evidence (E-Discovery)*.

[6] Sanctions

Absent exceptional circumstances, the court may not impose sanctions on a subpoenaed person or that person's attorney

for failure to provide ESI that has been lost, damaged, altered, or overwritten as the result of the routine, good faith operation of an electronic information system. However, this provision does not alter any obligation to preserve otherwise discoverable information [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(l)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8(l)(2)*].

For a step-by-step guide, as well as forms for use to seek or oppose sanctions for noncompliance, see Matthew Bender(R) Practice Guide: California E-Discovery and Evidence, Ch. 13, *Seeking or Opposing Sanctions for Noncompliance*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureDiscoveryCivil ProcedureDiscoveryElectronic Discovery

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.21B

§ 535.21B Subpoenas in California for Out-of-State Proceedings

[1] Governing Law

Effective January 1, 2010 [Stats. 2008 ch. 231, § 3; *Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.900*], the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.100 et seq.*] governs deposition subpoenas, subpoenas for inspections and copying of books, documents, records, ESI, or tangible things, and for inspection of premises in California for out-of-state actions. The Act applies to requests for discovery in cases pending on or after its effective date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.800*]. The Act is California's version of the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.700*].

The Civil Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq*], as well as Code Civ. Proc. Title 3 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.* (means of production)] and any other California law or court rule governing a deposition, the production of documents or other tangible items, or an inspection of premises, including any law or court rule governing payment of court costs or sanctions, apply to discovery under the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.500*].

[2] Definitions

For purposes of the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act, "foreign jurisdiction" means either a state other than California or a foreign nation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.200(a)*]. A "foreign subpoena" is a subpoena issued under authority of a court of record of a foreign jurisdiction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.200(b)*].

"Person" means an individual, corporation, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, limited liability company, association, joint venture, public corporation, government, or governmental subdivision, agency, or instrumentality, or any other legal or commercial entity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.200(c)*].

"State" means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, a federally recognized Indian tribe, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of the United States [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.200(d)*].

"Subpoena" means a document, however denominated, issued under authority of a court of record requiring a person to do any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.200(e)*]:

- Attend and give testimony at a deposition.
- Produce and permit inspection and copying of designated books, documents, records, electronically stored information, or tangible things in the possession, custody, or control of the person.
- Permit inspection of premises under the control of the person.

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena

To request issuance of a subpoena, a party must submit the original or a true and correct copy of a foreign subpoena to the clerk of the superior court in the California county in which discovery is sought to be conducted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(a)*]. A request for the issuance of a subpoena in these circumstances does not constitute making an appearance in the California courts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(a)*].

In addition to submitting a foreign subpoena, as described above, a party seeking discovery must do both of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(b)*]:

- Submit an application requesting that the superior court issue a subpoena with the same terms as the foreign subpoena. The application must be on the official Judicial Council form [see Judicial Council Form SUBP-030, reproduced and discussed in *Ch. 193, Discovery: Depositions, § 193.180*].
- Pay the specified fee [*see Gov. Code § 70626*].

When these requirements are satisfied, the court clerk must promptly issue a subpoena for service on the person to which the foreign subpoena is directed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(c)*].

[4] Subpoena Form and Contents

A subpoena issued under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300* must [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(d)*]:

- Incorporate the terms used in the foreign subpoena.
- Contain or be accompanied by the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all counsel of record in the proceeding to which the subpoena relates and of any party not represented by counsel.
- Bear the caption and case number of the out-of-state case to which it relates.
- State the name of the court that issues it.
- Be on the official Judicial Council form [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.390*; *see, e.g., § 535.85[1]* (subpoena for production of business records in action pending outside California)].

[5] Party Not Required to Retain Local Attorney

A party is not required to retain a local attorney to depose a witness in these circumstances. The Act permits an active member of the California State Bar who is retained by a party to an out-of-state court proceeding to issue a deposition subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.350(a)*]. A subpoena that issues under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.350(a)* must [*Code*

Civ. Proc. § 2029.350(b)]:

- Incorporate the terms used in the foreign subpoena.

- Contain or be accompanied by the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all counsel of record in the proceeding to which the subpoena relates and of any party not represented by counsel.

- Bear the caption and case number of the out-of-state case to which it relates.

- State the name of the superior court of the county in which the discovery is to be conducted.

- Be the official Judicial Council form [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.390*; § 535.85[1] (Judicial Council Form SUBP-035)].

[6] Service of Subpoena

A discovery subpoena issued under the Act must be personally served in compliance with California law, including, without limitation, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.400*]. For discussion of service, see *§ 535.17*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.22

§ 535.22 Private Records of Public Employees

The procedures set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* [discussed in *§ 535.21*] are applicable to a subpoena duces tecum for records containing "personal information," as defined in Code Civ. Proc. § 1798.3, that are otherwise exempt from public disclosure under *Gov. Code § 6254* that are maintained by a state or local agency as defined in *Gov. Code § 6252* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*]. For the purposes of applying the procedures of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*, the term "witness" means a state or local agency as defined in *Gov. Code § 6252*, and the term "consumer" means any employee of any state or local agency as defined in *Gov. Code § 6252*, or any other natural person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*]. *Gov. Code § 6254(c)* exempts personnel, medical, or similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy, from the public disclosure requirement of the Public Records Act (*Gov. Code §§ 6250-6267*). For a more detailed discussion of the disclosure requirement of the Public Records Act and its exemptions, see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationPublic Employees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.22A

§ 535.22A Nonparty Objection to Subpoena

Nonparties who want to challenge a deposition subpoena calling for either records only or records and testimony may, but are not required to, file a motion to quash the subpoena. They may simply wait, putting the onue on the proponent to move to compel, and object to the subpoena in opposition to the proponent's motion [*Monarch Healthcare v. Superior Court (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1284, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 619* (as matter of first impression, petitioner nonparty's timely objection to records-only discovery request for privileged information was sufficient; nonparty was not required to file a motion to quash); *see § 535.23*; *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)* (motions to quash) with *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.460(a)* (objections to disclosure)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMotions to CompelCivil ProcedureDiscoveryProtective OrdersCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.23

§ 535.23 Quashing, Modifying or Enforcing Compliance With Subpoena

[1] Motion Procedure

The court may issue an order quashing a subpoena entirely, modifying it, or directing compliance with it on specified terms or conditions. This may be done on a motion reasonably made by the party, the witness, any party-consumer described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*, any party-employee described in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.6* [*see* discussion in *§ 535.21[7]*], a person whose personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8 (definition)] is sought in connection with an underlying action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights, or on the court's own motion after giving counsel an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*]. In the case of a consumer or employee, this also may be done by on the filing of a motion by the requesting party after written objections are served by a nonparty consumer or employee pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e), (g), 1985.6(f)*]. The court may also make any other order to protect the parties, the witness, the consumer, the employee, or the person whose personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8 (definition)] is sought in connection with an underlying action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights, from unreasonable or oppressive demands, including unreasonable violations of the right of privacy of the person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g)* (consumer), 1985.6(f) (employee); for forms, *see §§ 535.74 -535.77*]. Pursuant to a motion to quash, the court examines the issues raised and determines the relevancy of the evidence sought to be elicited and whether the requested order for production would constitute an unlawful invasion of privacy [*Southern Pac. Co. v. Superior Court (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 206, 209, 100 P.2d 302]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Meet and Confer. Meet and confer with opposing counsel before bringing a motion. It may result in narrowing or eliminating the discovery dispute. *By Corinne Burt.*

[2] By Public Employees

Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1 does not mention a motion to quash by a public employee whose private records are sought by subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*; *see* discussion at *§ 535.22*]. However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*, which provides that a consumer that is a party to the action may bring a motion to quash under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*, is made applicable to certain public records by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*

defines the term "consumer" for its own purposes as an employee of a state or public agency, as defined in *Gov. Code § 6252*, or any other natural person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*]. Thus, it appears that *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g)* and *1985.4*, taken together, entitle a state or local agency employee who is a party to the action to bring a motion to quash pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)* when the records in question are covered by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*. Furthermore, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)* provides that a nonparty consumer whose personal records are sought may serve a written objection that states the specific grounds on which production should be prohibited. Therefore, a nonparty public employee would be similarly entitled to file a written objection to prevent production, in lieu of bringing a motion to quash, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)* [*see* discussion at *§ 535.21[8]*]. For a more detailed discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*, see *§ 535.22*.

[3] Grounds for Motion

A motion to quash or modify a subpoena may be made on the grounds that the subpoena fails to comply with the form, content, or service requirements of the applicable statutory provisions [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 53.30, *1985, 1985.3, 2020.210 et seq.*; *see Mosk v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 474, 479, 159 Cal. Rptr. 494* (subpoena quashed on grounds that public investigation pursuant to Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 902.5, was unconstitutional in light of California Constitution)]. It may also be made on the grounds that the matters sought to be discovered are privileged, protected, or otherwise beyond the scope of discovery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2017.010*; *see also Rudnick v. Superior Court (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 924, 929, 114 Cal. Rptr. 603* ("[t]here can be no discovery of matter which is privileged")]. The motion may also be made on the grounds that the discovery sought is an unreasonable or oppressive demand or unreasonable violation of the deponent's right to privacy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*] or that it is unreasonably cumulative, duplicative, or obtainable from another source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.030(a)*].

[4] Costs of Motion

If the court finds that the motion to quash or modify was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification, or that one or more of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive, the court, in its discretion, may award the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(a)*].

If a motion is filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* for an order to quash or modify a subpoena from the state of California for personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8(b) (definition)], for use in an action pending in another state, territory, or district of the United States, or in a foreign nation, and that subpoena has been served on any Internet service provider, or on the provider of any other interactive computer service [*see 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(2)* (definition)], the court *must* award the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in making the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees, if the moving party prevails, and if the underlying action arises from the moving party's exercise of free speech rights on the Internet, and the respondent has failed to make a prima facie showing of a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProceduresDiscoveryProtective OrdersCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenasLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationPublic Employees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.24

§ 535.24 Notice in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] Persons Subject to Notice

The service of a subpoena is not required for certain parties if written notice requesting the witness to attend before a court or at a trial of an issue therein is served on the attorney of the party or person. The following persons may be compelled to attend with written notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*]:

- A party to the record of any civil action or proceeding;
- A person for whose immediate benefit the action or proceeding is prosecuted or defended; and
- Anyone who is an officer, director, or managing agent of any such party or person.

For a discussion of the use of a notice pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280(a)* in lieu of a subpoena re deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* . For a discussion of the time of service of the notice, see *§ 535.17[2]*.

[2] Definition of "Benefitted Persons"

A benefitted person is one who would have an immediate right to an amount recovered, or some of it, as soon as it is recovered by a nominal plaintiff [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Superior Court (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 832, 837-838, 103 Cal. Rptr. 709, 500 P.2d 621* ; *Waters v. Superior Court (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 885, 897, 27 Cal. Rptr. 153, 377 P.2d 265]* . A person with immediate and direct liability is a person for whose immediate benefit an action is defended [*Waters v. Superior Court (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 885, 897, 27 Cal. Rptr. 153, 377 P.2d 265]* .

[3] Time of Service

The written notice must be served on the attorney of the party or person at least 10 days before the time required for attendance, unless the court prescribes a shorter time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*].

[4] Witness Fees on Notice

If entitled to such compensation, the witness, on demand, must be paid witness fees and mileage before being required to testify [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987*; *see § 535.18*].

[5] Requests for Books, Documents, or Other Things

If the notice is served at least 20 days before the time required for attendance, or within such shorter time as is ordered by the court, it may include a request that the party or person bring with him or her books, documents, or other things. The notice must then state the exact things or materials desired and that the party or person has them in his or her possession or under his or control [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*]. This procedure is alternative to the procedure provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985* and *1987.5* (subpoena duces tecum and accompanying affidavit), in the cases provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*. No subpoena duces tecum is required in these cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[6] Objection to Notice Requesting Production

Within five days after service of the notice, or within such other period as the court may allow, the party or person to whom the request to bring books, documents, or other things is made may serve and file written objections to all of any part of the request with a statement of grounds [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*; *see § 535.80*; *see also § 535.75* (form for Written Objection to Subpoena Duces Tecum by Nonparty Consumer or Employee)]. The five-day period for objection is extended if the notice was served by mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (e)* (extension when service is by Express Mail or fax); *Shell Oil Co. v. Superior Court (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 489, 491, 123 Cal. Rptr. 307* (interpreting *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* before 1980 amendment)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Act Promptly. This does not leave much time to object. Make sure that you review the notice immediately on receipt and make objections immediately. *By Corinne Burt.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & InspectionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.25

§ 535.25 Examination of Prisoners

A court in which the action or special proceeding is pending (with the exception of small claims court) or certain judges (as provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1995(2)*) may order the production of prisoners before the court or the prisoner's examination in jail for the purpose of deposing him or her [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1995*]. The production of the prisoner may only be required if the witness is imprisoned in a jail in the county in which the action or proceeding is pending. In all other cases, the examination of the prisoner, when allowed, must be taken on deposition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1997*].

Such an order may be made only on the motion of a party, on affidavit showing the nature of the action or proceeding, the testimony expected from the witness, and its materiality [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1996*]. See the discussion of examination of prisoners in Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*.

For depositions of prisoners in state prison, see *Penal Code § 2623* and the discussion in Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPartiesPrisonersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.26

§ 535.26 Disobedience of Subpoena

[1] Contempt

[a] In General

Disobedience to a subpoena or refusal to be sworn, to answer as a witness, or to subscribe an affidavit when required may be punished as a contempt by the court that issued the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*]. For a discussion and forms relating to contempt, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

Failure to appear at another time or place or on such notice as may be agreed on pursuant to an agreement with the party at whose request a subpoena is issued may also be punishable as contempt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*]. Facts establishing or disproving such an agreement and the failure to appear may be proved by affidavit (or declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) of any person having personal knowledge of the facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

Advising a witness to conceal himself or herself for the purpose of avoiding service of a subpoena is a violation of *Penal Code § 136.1* (preventing or dissuading person from testifying as misdemeanor), and therefore is unlawful within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1209(a)(8)* (unlawful interference with process or proceedings of court as contempt) [*In re Holmes (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 934, 942-943, 193 Cal. Rptr. 790]* .

[b] Service of Subpoena on Witness Necessary for Jurisdiction

For contempt proceedings to be proper when a witness has not obeyed a subpoena, the subpoena must have been served directly on the witness. Substituted service of a subpoena on an attorney does not confer personal jurisdiction over the witness. Therefore, the witness may not be held in criminal contempt for not obeying the subpoena if the service of the subpoena was made without the witness's knowledge and out of the witness's presence [*In re Abrams (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 685, 687, 694-695, 166 Cal. Rptr. 749]* .

[c] Direct Contempt

A contempt committed in the immediate view and presence of the court or the judge at chambers, known as a direct

contempt, is treated summarily [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1211*; *Arthur v. Superior Court (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 404, 407, 42 Cal. Rptr. 441, 398 P.2d 777]* . No hearing is required in a direct contempt proceeding [*DeGeorge v. Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 305, 315, 114 Cal. Rptr. 860]* .

[d] Subpoena Requiring Attendance Out of Court

When the subpoena requires attendance of the witness before an officer or commissioner out of court, special rules apply. The witness may not be punished for any refusal to be sworn, to answer a question, or to subscribe an affidavit, unless after a hearing on notice, the court orders the witness to be sworn, to answer, or to subscribe. The witness may then be punished for disobedience of the court's order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1991* includes provisions for reporting such disobedience and for issuing the order [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*].

Different provisions apply, however, if the subpoena requires attendance at a deposition [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1991.1, 1991.2, 2020.240, 2025.480*]. For discussion, procedures, and forms relating to acts and omissions at depositions, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

[e] Public Safety Employees

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 1211* or any other law, if an order of contempt is made affecting a public safety employee acting within the scope of employment because of the employee's failure to comply with a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum, the execution of any sentence must be stayed pending the filing within three judicial days of a petition for extraordinary relief testing the lawfulness of the court's order on which contempt is based [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128(c), 1209(d)*].

"Public safety employee" includes any peace officer, firefighter, paramedic, or any other employee of a public law enforcement agency whose duty is either to maintain official records or to analyze or present evidence for investigative or prosecutorial purposes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128(c), 1209(d)*].

[f] Sexual Assault Victims

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 1211* or any other law, if an order of contempt is made affecting the victim of sexual assault, when the contempt consists of refusing to testify concerning that sexual assault, the execution of any sentence is stayed pending the filing within three judicial days of a petition for extraordinary relief testing the lawfulness of the court's order, a violation of which is the basis for the contempt. "Sexual assault" means any act made punishable by *Penal Code § 261, 262, 264.1, 285, 286, 288, 288a,* or *289* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128(d)*].

[g] Victims of Domestic Violence

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 1211* or any other law, if an order of contempt is made affecting the victim of domestic violence, when the contempt consists of refusing to testify concerning that domestic violence, the execution of any sentence is stayed pending the filing within three judicial days of a petition for extraordinary relief testing the lawfulness of the court's order, a violation of which is the basis for the contempt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128(e)*]. In a finding of contempt for a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence who refuses to testify about that sexual assault or domestic violence crime, the court may not incarcerate the victim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1219(b)*]. As used in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128(e), 1219*, "domestic violence" means "domestic violence" as defined in *Fam. Code § 6211* [*see* Ch. 293, *Harassment and Domestic Violence*]. For purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1219*, "sexual assault" means any act punishable by *Penal Code §§ 261, 262, 264.1, 285, 286, 288, 288a,* or *289* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1219(c)*].

[2] Penalty

A witness who fails to obey a subpoena (or a court order) forfeits to the aggrieved party the sum of $500 and all

damages that he or she may havesustained by the failure of the witness to attend. This forfeiture and damages may be recovered in a civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1992*; *see* discussion in Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*]. In addition, the court may order that misuse of discovery process be treated as contempt of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240*] or, in the alternative, issue a warrant for the arrest of witness or person who fails to appear [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1993(a)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1993(a)(2), (b), 1993.1-1993.2* (procedures); *see also § 535.26[3]*].

[3] Warrant and Arrest

As an alternative to a contempt sanction [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240*], the court may issue a warrant for the arrest of a witness who failed to appear pursuant to a subpoena or a person who failed to appear pursuant to a court order. The court, on proof of the service of the subpoena or order, may issue a warrant to the sheriff of the county in which the witness or person may be located and will arrest the witness or person and bring him or her before the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1993(a)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1993(a)(2), (b), 1993.1-1993.2* (procedures); *Gov. Code § 26744.5* (fees)].

A warrant of commitment issued pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.* must specify, particularly, the cause of the commitment. If the cause is for refusing to answer a question, that question also must be stated in the warrant; *see Allison v. County of Ventura (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 689, 702, 137 Cal. Rptr. 542* (body attachment issued to compel witness's attendance must specify reason for attachment, decided under prior law)].

[4] Other Sanctions

In addition, a judicial officer has the power to impose reasonable money sanctions, not to exceed $1,500, payable to the court, for violation by any person of a lawful court order without good cause or substantial justification. The term "person" includes a witness, a party, a party's attorney, or both [*Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCriminal Contempt

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 535.27-535.39

[Reserved]

§§ 535.27[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.40

§ 535.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions to compel attendance and production at depositions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 80, *Discovery*

For a discussion of the use of deposition subpoenas, see DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Ch. 53, *Deposition of Non-Party*

For in-depth coverage of e-discovery and a step-by-step guide to subpoenaing electronically stored information (ESI) from nonparties, see Matthew Bender(R) Practice Guide: California E-Discovery and Evidence, Ch. 6, *Demanding Production of Electronically Stored Evidence in California Court*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMotions to CompelCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.41

§ 535.41 State Constitution

Subpoena in proceedings by Public Utilities Commissions. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 6*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.42

§ 535.42 State Statutes

[1] Deposition of Prisoners

Examination in jail on deposition, or for production before court or officer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1995*

Motion on affidavit for production before court or officer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1996*

Examination of prisoner who is in jail in county where action or proceeding is pending. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1997*

[2] Disobedience of Subpoena

Money sanctions for violation of lawful court order without good cause or substantial justification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5*

Contempt. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209(a)(9), 1211, 1991-1991.2, 2023.030(e)*; *Penal Code § 1331*

Failure to appear after agreement to appear at another time punishable is contempt; proof of such agreement by affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*; *Penal Code § 1331.5*

Monetary penalty for disobedience of subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1992*

Warrant and arrest for disobedience of subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1993, 1993.1-1993.2, 1994*

Disobedience of deposition subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240*

[3] Issuance

Authority of attorney of record to sign and issue. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*; *Penal Code § 1326(a)(4)*

Issuance in blank. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*; *Penal Code § 1326(a)(3)*

Issuance as of course on application of party. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986*

[4] Miscellaneous Records Subject to Subpoena

Disclosure of records of video recording sales or rental services without subject's written consent is permissible when made pursuant to subpoena. *Civ. Code § 1799.3(b)(1)*

[5] Motion to Quash

Motion to quash or modify subpoena duces tecum for production of personal records of consumer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*

Motion to quash, modify, or enforce compliance with subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*

Award of expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2*

[6] Notice to Attend in Lieu of Subpoena

Notice to attend in lieu of subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*

Notice to attend and produce books, etc., in lieu of subpoena; objections to notice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*

[7] Persons in Court, But Not Subpoenaed

Persons present in court are required to testify in same manner as if subpoenaed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1990*

[8] Purpose and Use of Subpoenas

Subpoena is writ or order directed to person and requiring attendance at particular time and place to testify as witness. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*

To require attendance before court, at trial, or on taking deposition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*

To require attendance before commissioner. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(b)*

To require attendance out of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(c)*

To require production of business records. *Evid. Code § 1560 et seq.*

[9] Service

Recovery of cost of service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(4)*

Manner of service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; *Penal Code § 1328*

Service and filing of affidavit supporting subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*

Service by sheriff on concealed witness. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1988*

Sheriff's fee for serving subpoena on witness. *Gov. Code § 26743*

Service of subpoena on peace officers. *Gov. Code §§ 68097.1(a), 68097.3*; *Penal Code § 1328*

Service of subpoena on firefighters. *Gov. Code §§ 68097.1-68097.10*

Service on district attorney inspectors, probation officers, and building inspectors. *Gov. Code §§ 68097, 68097.1(a)*

Service on state employees who are neither peace officers nor firefighters and on trial court employees. *Gov. Code § 68097.1(b)*

Service on director and Department of Motor Vehicles for production of department records. *Veh. Code § 24.5*

[10] Subpoena Duces Tecum

Subpoena duces tecum of business records. *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566*

To require witness to bring books, documents, or other things under his or her control that he or she is bound by law to produce in evidence. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*

County recorder's certified copy of microfilmed record is in compliance with subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*

Requirement and contents of supporting affadavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*

When personal attendance of custodian of records is not required. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.3*; *Evid. Code §§ 1560(b), 1564*

Service of copy of affidavit; motions for relief for production of subpoena in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*.

[11] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Employment Records of Employee

Service of copy of subpoena duces tecum, affidavit, and notice on employee. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(b), (e), (k)*

Service, on witness, of proof of service or written authorization to release records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)*

Objections by employee to furnishing of records by witness. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(e)*

Motion by employee to quash or modify subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(f)*

Order shortening time for service or waiving requirements for production of employment records of employee. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(g)*

[12] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Personal Records of Consumer

Health care provider may be required to disclose medical records pursuant to subpoena duces tecum when patient is notified and does not object. *Civ. Code § 56.10(b)(3)*

Service of copy of subpoena duces tecum, affidavit, and notice on consumer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b), (e), (l)*

Service, on witness, of proof of service or written authorization to release records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)*

Objections by consumer to furnishing of records by witness. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)*

Consumer's consent to release personal records by telephone corporation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f)*

Motion by consumer to quash or modify subpoena duces tecum. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*

Order shortening time for service or waiving requirements for production of personal records of consumer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(h)*

[13] Subpoena Duces Tecum Requiring Production of Private Records of Public Employees

Special procedures set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* are applicable to specified records of public employees and other natural persons maintained by public agencies. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*

[13A] Subpoena Requiring Production of Electronically Stored Information

Subpoena of electronically stored information and access to information by party serving subpoena. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.8*

[14] Subpoenas in Particular Proceedings

[a] In General

Subpoena to compel attendance of nonparty at deposition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.280(b)*

Actions relating to election contests. *Elec. Code § 16502*

Administrative proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 11450.05-11450.50*

Proceedings by county board of supervisors. *Gov. Code § 25170 et seq.*

Coroner's inquests. *Gov. Code §§ 27498, 27499.1 et seq.*

Military courts. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 460 et seq.*

Proceedings by county board of equalization. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1609.4, 1609.5*

Discovery subpoenas issued in actions pending outside California. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.100 et seq.*

[b] Criminal

Issuance for felony preliminary hearing. *Penal Code § 859(b)*

Issuance by magistrate, district attorney, or attorney of record of defendant. *Penal Code § 1326(a)*

Contents and prescribed form. *Penal Code § 1327*

Telegraphic copy. *Penal Code § 1328a et seq.*

Distance limitation for out-of-county witness. *Penal Code § 1330*

Agreement to appear at a time other than specified in subpoena. *Penal Code § 1331.5*

Conditional examination of witness. *Penal Code § 1342*

Habeas corpus proceedings. *Penal Code §§ 1484, 1489, 1503*

[c] Involving State Agencies

Proceedings by State Bar. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6049, 6050 et seq.*

Proceedings by State Athletic Commission. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 18845 et seq.*

Proceedings by State Board of Education. *Educ. Code § 33034*

Actions brought against Lottery Commission. *Gov. Code § 8880.72*

State Legislature proceedings. *Gov. Code § 9401 et seq.*

State Department proceedings. *Gov. Code § 11181*

Investigations by Attorney General. *Gov. Code §§ 12550, 12560*

Proceedings by State Board of Control. *Gov. Code §§ 13910, 13911*

State civil service proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 18671, 18672, 18678*

Proceedings by Commission on Judicial Qualifications. *Gov. Code § 68750 et seq.*

Proceedings by Insurance Commissioner. *Ins. Code §§ 1042, 12924*

Proceedings by Department of Natural Resources. *Pub. Res. Code § 3357*

Proceedings by probate referee. *Prob. Code §§ 450-453*

Proceedings by assessor. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 454*

Proceedings by controller regarding gift taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 16532 et seq.*

Proceedings by State Water Rights Board. *Water Code § 1080*

[15] Witness Fees

Witness fees and mileage are same for deposition as for appearance in court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1986.5*

Written notice of entitlement to fees. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2065*

Witness fees for complying with subpoena duces tecum of nonparty business records. *Evid. Code § 1563*

Superior courts. *Gov. Code § 68093*

Grand juries. *Gov. Code § 68094*

Coroner's jury. *Gov. Code § 68095*

Special fees for local agency employees. *Gov. Code § 68096.1*

Payable to witness in civil cases in advance. *Gov. Code § 68097*

Special fees for certain peace officers, members of California Highway Patrol, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, marshals, deputy marshals, district attorney inspectors, probation officers, building inspectors, fire fighters, other state employees, trial court employees and city police officers. *Gov. Code § 68097 et seq.*

Criminal proceedings. *Penal Code §§ 1329, 1329.1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureParties Prisoners General OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & InspectionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPrivacy RightsGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureDiscovery & InspectionSubpoenasGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationPublic Employees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.43

§ 535.43 Decisions

[1] Administrative Proceedings

Before confidential third party personal records may be disclosed in administrative proceedings, subpoenaing party is required to take reasonable steps to notify third party of pendency and nature of proceedings and to afford third party fair opportunity to object to disclosure by seeking protective order or by instituting other legal proceedings to limit discovery; legislature's failure to incorporate explicit notice provisions do not diminish constitutional privacy rights. *Sehlmeyer v. Department of General Services (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1072, 1079-1081, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 840*

[2] Disobedience of Subpoena

Act of knowingly assisting another person to evade service of process is unlawful act in violation of *Penal Code § 136.1* (preventing or dissuading person from testifying is misdemeanor) and is within acts or omissions constituting contempt under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1209(a)(8)*. *In re Holmes (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 934, 936, 942, 193 Cal. Rptr. 790* (attorney who assisted husband in avoiding service of subpoena compelling him to testify as expert witness in civil case)

Punishment of contempt of court is not applicable to person not duly served with subpoena. *Chapman v. Superior Court (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 194, 197, 67 Cal. Rptr. 842*

Courts and judicial tribunals possess power to compel attendance of necessary witnesses. *Walker Mining Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 257, 262-263, 95 P.2d 188*

[3] Motion to Quash

Motion to quash subpoena duces tecum on ground of improper service is denied if service was only on California partner of national corporation, not on designated out-of-state custodian of records. *Boal v. Price Waterhouse & Co.*

(1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 806, 810-811, 212 Cal. Rptr. 42

Order quashing subpoena duces tecum does not prevent party from securing subpoena for attendance of persons without books or documents described in subpoena duces tecum. *Walker v. Signal Companies, Inc. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 982, 1002, 149 Cal. Rptr. 119*

Party does not have right to quash subpoena through motion based on invasion of third party's right to privacy. *County of Kern v. Superior Court (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 396, 399, 401, 147 Cal. Rptr. 248*

Motion to quash is procedurally appropriate method of testing validity of subpoena duces tecum. *People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Younger (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 575, 579, 86 Cal. Rptr. 237*

[4] Production of Business Records

Compliance with subpoena duces tecum for production of business records under *Evid. Code § 1563(b)(1)* does not allow recovery of computer costs. *In re Marriage of Stephens (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 909, 913, 203 Cal. Rptr. 331*

[5] Production of Personal Records of Consumer

In accordance with Code Civ. Proc. § 56.10(b)(3), subpoena required health care provider to disclose patient's medical records to ex-fiance's attorney because ex-fiance's attorney complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(e)*, and patient did not file objection; this undisputed evidence was sufficient to establish complete defense to cause of action under Code Civ. Proc. § 56.10(b)(3). *Colleen M. v. Fertility and Surgical Assocs. of Thousand Oaks (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1479, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 439*

Psychiatrist served with subpoena duces tecum requiring production of patients' records is required to produce those records if patients were notified that their records were sought and were informed of their right to object, but failed to take action to prevent disclosure. *Inabnit v. Berkson (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1236-1239, 245 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[6] Sufficiency of Affidavit Accompanying Subpoena Duces Tecum

Declarations that lacked any factual bases for legal conclusion that documents were material to proceedings failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*. *Lee v. Superior Court (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1112, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (collecting cases)

Service of deposition subpoena on nonparty witness was effective despite absence of supporting affidavit or declaration; *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.510(b)*, providing that "[a] deposition subpoena need not be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the production of the documents and things designated," controlled, prevailing over *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*, which provides that service of subpoena duces tecum issued before trial without copy of affidavit is invalid. *Terry v. SLICO (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 352, 359, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900*

Subpoenas issued for investigation permitted by statute does not require affidavit showing good cause. *Fielder v. Berkeley Properties Co. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 30, 40, 99 Cal. Rptr. 791* (investigation pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 11180, 11181(a), (e)* for Agricultural Code violations)

Affidavit for issuance of subpoena duces tecum based only on information and belief is insufficient. *Grannis v. Board of Medical Examiners (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 551, 564, 96 Cal. Rptr. 863*

Party is required to show good cause supporting affidavit for subpoena duces tecum for production of matters and things described in subpoena. *Kenney v. Superior Court (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 106, 109, 63 Cal. Rptr. 84*

[7] Witness Fees

Rule that fees of experts employed by one party are not allowable is codified in *Gov. Code § 68092.5*. *Posey v. State of California (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 836, 852, 225 Cal. Rptr. 830*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPrivacy RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.44

§ 535.44 Attorney General Opinions

Deputy in charge of civil divisions of sheriff's offices may execute certificate of service with respect to summons or subpoena actually served by another deputy. *67 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 72 (1984)*

Party subpoenaing California Highway Patrol member is required to pay monies specified in *Gov. Code § 68097.2* unless that department is a party to the litigation and subject matter arises out of its activities. *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 543 (1975)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.45

§ 535.45 Law Reviews

Review of Selected 1982 California Legislation, *Civil Procedure; Subpoenas and Subpoenas Duces Tecum, 14 Pac. L.J. 484 (1983)*

Note, *Compelling Expert Testimony: A Proposed Statutory Reform, 30 Hastings L.J. 209 (1978)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasEvidenceTestimonyExpertsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.46

§ 535.46 Text References

Witkin, California Evidence, vol. 2, ch. IX, *Witnesses*, §§ 1036-1045; Ch. X, *Discovery and Production of Evidence*, §§ 1568-1579, 1612-1614, 1633 (3d ed. 1986)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & Inspection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 535.47-535.49

[Reserved]

§§ 535.47[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.50

§ 535.50 Party Seeking Subpoena

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

☐ What facts need to be proved to prevail?

☐ Who has the burden of proof?

☐ What information is necessary to prove those facts?

PRACTICE TIP:
Plan Requests to Save Costs and Avoid Objections. It is useful to spend the time before serving the subpoena to decide exactly what information is necessary, and then what specific questions or documents will yield this information. This will save expensive deposition time and may result in fewer objections to document requests. ***By Corinne Burt.***

☐ Which will be more effective proof, witness testimony, or documents, or both?

☐ Who can provide that information, either by testimony, or the production of documents?

[2] Decide the Type and Content of the Subpoena Best Fitting Your Needs

☐ Does witness reside in California [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*; § 535.14]?

☐ Status of witness:

☐ California Highway Patrol member [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 1989 Gov. Code §

68097.3; § 535.14[4]].

☐ Party or party-related person [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)(c)*; § 535.54].

☐ Purpose of subpoena:

☐ To require attendance in court or for trial of issue in court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*; § 535.12[1]].

☐ To require attendance out of court (except at deposition) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(c)*; § 535.12[3]].

☐ To require attendance on taking of deposition [*see § 535.12[4]*; *see also* Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* , Procedural Checklist].

☐ Date, time, and place for appearance.

☐ When service will be made, which must be reasonable time to allow witness to prepare and travel [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; § 535.17[2]].

☐ Documents to be produced, if any [for a checklist for a subpoena duces tecum if documents are to be requested, *see § 535.51*].

☐ Whether attorney of record in an action or proceeding may sign and issue subpoena without seal or must obtain signed and sealed subpoena from clerk or judge to be filled in by attorney. Attorney may sign and issue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*; for discussion, *see § 535.13*]:

☐ If subpoena is to require attendance before court in which action is pending; or

☐ If subpoena is to require attendance at deposition in action or proceeding.

☐ If person to be subpoenaed is public employee for whom fees must be paid [*see § 535.19[1] -[3]*], whether good cause may exist for relief from the duty to make any deposit or payment of fees or portion thereof [*see Gov. Code § 68097.55*; for discussion, *see § 535.19[4]*].

[3] Calendar Relevant Dates

PRACTICE TIP:

Calendaring the Relevant Dates Is Critical. Depending on the type of subpoena, the time within which to make an objection or motion to quash may be quite short. Always use calendaring to keep track both of the date after which objections are waived by lapse of time, and also of the date after which penalties for noncompliance may be enforced [*see §§ 535.21[7], [8], 535.23, 535.26*]. *By Corinne Burt.*

[4] Fees for Resident Peace Officer, Other Public Employee, or Nonresident California Highway Patrol

Member

☐ Be prepared to tender witness fees if witness is local agency employee, peace officer, firefighter, state employee, or trial court employee [*see Gov. Code §§ 68096.1(a), (b), 68097.1, 68097.2(a), (b)*; § 535.19[1]].

☐ If witness is a nonresident member of the California Highway Patrol, deposit fees [*see Gov. Code §§ 68097.3, 68097.4*; § 535.19[2]].

[5] Prepare and Issue Subpoena

☐ As attorney of record, fill in, sign, and issue subpoena [for the form, *see §§ 535.60, 535.61*] if subpoena is to [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*; § 535.13[2]]:

☐ Require attendance before the court in which the action or proceeding is pending.

☐ Require attendance at deposition in the action or proceeding.

☐ In any other situation, obtain signed and sealed subpoena from clerk or judge and fill it in [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*; § 535.13[1]].

[6] Service

☐ Deliver original and one copy to server, who may be any person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*].

NOTE:
The fee for a sheriff to subpoena witnesses is provided for in *Gov. Code § 26743*.

☐ Except for public employees, serve by delivering a copy of the subpoena, or ticket containing its substance, to witness personally or, if a minor, deliver to parent, guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary, and, in specified cases, to the designated agent for service of process at the county child welfare department or the probation department under whose jurisdiction the minor has been placed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; § 535.17].

☐ For peace officers, firefighters, and other public employees or employees of the trial courts [*see § 535.17[5]*], serve as follows [*Gov. Code § 68097.1(a), (b)*]:

☐ Deliver one copy to the witness personally; or

☐ Deliver two copies to the employee's immediate superior (or agent designated by that superior to receive that service) at the place of employment.

☐ For peace officers of the Department of the California Highway Patrol (CHP):

☐ Deliver a copy to the peace officer personally [*see Gov. Code § 68097.1(a)*]; or

☐ Deliver two copies to the employee's immediate superior (or agent designated by that superior to receive that service) [*see Gov. Code § 68097.1(a)*]; or

☐ If witness is nonresident member of CHP, deliver a copy during office hours to the person in charge of the office of the CHP at least five days prior to the date scheduled for attendance [*see Gov. Code § 68097.3*].

☐ Pay witness fees.

☐ If demanded, pay required fees to witness on delivery of subpoena [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; *Gov. Code § 68097*; *Gov. Code § 68093*; § 535.18].

☐ For city or county employees, peace officers, firefighters, and state employees [*see* [2], *above*].

☐ For expert witnesses [*see Gov. Code § 68092.5(a)*]. If expert's fee is unreasonable, move for an order setting the compensation of the expert [*Gov. Code § 68092.5(c)*; § 535.18[2]].

☐ Prepare proof of service [for an illustration of the form, *see §§ 535.60*, *535.61*].

☐ File subpoena and proof with court (recommended but not required) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985 et seq.*].

[7] Obtain Penalties for Noncompliance

☐ Contempt proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*, § 535.26[1], *see also* Ch. 135, *Contempt*].

☐ Request court to issue warrant to have witness arrested and brought before court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1993*, *1993.1-1993.2*; § 535.26[3]].

☐ Other sanctions or penalties [*see § 535.26[2], [4]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.51

§ 535.51 Party Seeking Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

☐ For checklist of initial determinations, see *§ 535.50[1]*.

☐ Facts showing good cause for requiring production of things to be produced under the subpoena, including [*see § 535.16*]:

☐ Materiality of the things to be produced to the issues involved in the case;

☐ Possession or control of things by witness who is to be subpoenaed.

☐ Whether subpoena is for production of business records of a business that is neither a party nor the place where the cause of action arose:

☐ If so, whether to require attendance of custodian of records and production of original records [*see § 535.20*].

☐ Whether subpoena is for production of consumer records [*see § 535.21*].

☐ Whether subpoena is for production of employment records [*see §§ 535.21, 535.22*].

☐ If records sought are personal records maintained by a public utility telephone corporation [*see Pub. Util. Code § 216*], obtain consent to release signed by the consumer [*see Code Civ. Proc. §*

1985.3(f); for a form, *see § 535.71*].

[2] Deposit Fees for Nonresident California Highway Patrol Member

☐ For checklist, see *§ 535.50[2]*.

[3] Prepare and Issue Subpoena Duces Tecum, and Supporting Papers

☐ For checklist for preparing and issuing the subpoena, see *§ 535.50[3]*.

☐ Prepare supporting affidavit or declaration supporting subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(b), 2015.5*; for forms, *see §§ 535.61 -535.68*].

☐ In case of subpoena duces tecum for personal records of consumer or employment records:

☐ Set a date for compliance that is no earlier than 20 days after issuance of the subpoena, or 15 days after its service, whichever is later [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(d), 1985.6(d), 2020.410(c)*; *see § 535.21[3]*].

☐ Prepare notice to affected consumer or employee [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e), 1985.6(e)* [for a form, *see § 535.69*]].

[4] Service

☐ For checklist for serving a subpoena, see *§ 535.50[3]*. Accompany subpoena with:

☐ Supporting affidavit or declaration of good cause.

☐ If records sought are personal records maintained by a public utility telephone corporation, consent to release signed by the consumer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f)*].

☐ If records sought are consumer or employment records:

☐ Serve notice, proof of service, subpoena duces tecum, and supporting affidavit or declaration, if any, on consumer or employee [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)(1), 1985.6(b)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee and delivery of documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* or *1985.6(b)* is not required); *see generally § 535.21*].

☐ Demonstrate compliance with notice requirements, by either:

☐ Serving subpoenaed witness with proof of personal service or of service by mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b), (c)(1), 1985.6(b), 1985.6(c)(1)*]; or

☐ Providing witness written authorization to release the records signed by consumer or employee, or by his or her attorney of record [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c)(2), 1985.6(c)(2)*; for a form, *see § 535.70*].

☐ Payment of witness fees and reasonable costs [*see § 535.50[6][c]*.

☐ If business records have been requested from a nonparty witness [*see Evid. Code §§ 1563(b)*; § 535.20[3]].

☐ Time of service:

☐ Allow reasonable time [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*; § 535.59[6][d]].

☐ Service must allow reasonable time to locate and produce the records themselves or copies of them. [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(d), (h)* (consumer) or 1985.6(d), (g) (employee)].

NOTE:
Party subpoenaing a consumer's personal records or employee's employement records may be entitled to an order shortening time for service or a waiver of the requirements for providing notice to the consumer or employee [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(h), 1985.6(g)*].

☐ Proof of service. The person making service prepares proof of service on reverse side of original subpoena [*see §§ 535.60, 535.61*].

NOTE:
Appearance at Deposition. For requirements relating to service of a subpoena duces tecum regarding a deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

[5] File Documents

☐ Retain original affidavit until final judgment, and file with court only on reasonable request [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.5*]. If original affidavit is filed on request, file with the original subpoena duces tecum and proof of service.

☐ If business records from a nonparty were made available at the place of business rather than sent, deliver copy of records as directed in the subpoena, with affidavit stating that the copy is a true copy of all the records delivered [*see Evid. Code §§ 1560(e), 1561(c)*; § 535.68].

[6] Obtain Penalties for Noncompliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum

☐ For checklist for obtaining penalties against a person for failure to comply with a subpoena, see *§ 535.50[5]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil ProcedureSanctionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.52

§ 535.52 Person Receiving Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] For Custodian of Business Records to Comply if Attendance Is Not Required

☐ Enclose and seal records [*Evid. Code § 1560(c)*] and direct to:

☐ Court clerk or judge, if subpoena directed to attendance in court.

☐ Deposition officer, if the subpoena directs attendance at a deposition.

☐ To the officer, body, or tribunal conducting the hearing in other, applicable cases.

☐ Deliver copy of records, within 15 days after receipt of the subpoena, or within the time agreed, to the clerk of the court or to the judge [*Evid. Code § 1560(b)* (civil cases; *see § 535.84[3][a]* (criminal cases)].

☐ Send affidavit or declaration as appopriate regarding compliance and the genuineness of the records [*Evid. Code § 1561(a), (b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*; § 535.67].

☐ Make records available for inspection or copying [*see Evid. Code § 1560(b)-(e)*].

[2] To Comply Generally

☐ Either attend and produce documents if required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*]; or

☐ Agree with subpoenaing party to reschedule [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

[3] To Object if a Nonparty Consumer or Employee

☐ For consumers, serve written objection pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)* in lieu of a motion to quash [*see § 535.75*].

☐ For employees, serve written objection pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(f)* in lieu of a motion to quash [*see § 535.75*].

[4] To Quash or Modify Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum

☐ Determine whether to seek to quash or modify subpoena duce tecum [*see § 535.23*].

☐ Prepare moving papers:

☐ Notice of motion to quash or modify [for a form, *see § 535.74*].

☐ Supporting declaration [for a form, *see § 535.76*].

☐ Memorandum of points and authorities [for forms, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 218, *Subpoena* (Matthew Bender)].

☐ Follow general procedures for noticed motions as set out in Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

☐ Give notice of motion to witness and deposition officer at least five days prior to production [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)(1)*].

☐ If motion is granted, prepare, file, and serve order [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1019.5, 1987.1, 1987.2*; for a form, *see § 535.77*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryProtective OrdersCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersSubpoenasCivil Rights LawPrivacy RightsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawEmployee PrivacyDisclosure of Employee InformationPublic Employees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.53

§ 535.53 Party Seeking to Compel Appearance by Notice in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] Make Preliminary Determinations

☐ Whether witness is one who may be compelled to attend by notice to their attorney in lieu of subpoena [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*; § 535.24]:

☐ A party to any civil action or proceeding.

☐ A person for whose immediate benefit the action or proceeding is prosecuted or defended.

☐ An officer, director, or managing agent of any such party or person.

☐ Date, time, and place for appearance.

[2] To Compel Attendance Without Production

☐ Prepare notice [for a form, *see § 535.78*] in the following number of copies:

☐ Original for filing.

☐ Copy for attorney to whom notice is given.

☐ Office copy.

☐ Other copies as desired.

☐ Prepare proof of service by mail [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

☐ Serve notice and execute proof of service:

☐ At least 10 days before the time required for attendance (unless the court prescribes a shorter time),

☐ Serve copy of the notice on the attorney for the witness [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*; for procedural checklist relating to service of papers, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* ; for forms for use in shortening time, *see* Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time*].

☐ Execute proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*].

☐ Present the original notice to the court clerk for filing.

[3] To Compel Attendance With Books, Documents, or Other Things

☐ Prepare notice [§ 535.79] in the same number of copies as for notice in [2], *above*.

☐ Prepare proof of service in same manner as [2], *above*.

☐ Serve notice and execute proof of service:

☐ At least 20 days before the time required for attendance (or within such shorter time as the court may order),

☐ Serve copy of the notice on the attorney for the witness [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*; *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*],

☐ Execute proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*].

☐ Present the original notice to the court clerk for filing.

☐ If objections are filed by the witness [*see § 535.54[2]*] and do the following:

☐ Prepare moving papers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*]:

☐ Notice of motion [for a form, *see § 535.81*].

☐ Supporting declaration [for a form, *see § 535.82*].

☐ Supporting memorandum [for discussion and general forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

☐ Draft copies, serve and file papers in the same manner as for any noticed motion [*see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & Inspection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.54

§ 535.54 Party Receiving Notice to Appear in Lieu of Subpoena

[1] To Comply With Notice

☐ Attend as required.

[2] To Object to Notice to Produce

☐ Prepare objections [for a form, *see § 535.80*].

☐ Sign objections.

☐ Prepare proof of service by mail [*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

☐ Serve written objections and execute proof of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1013a, 1987(c)*; § 535.24[6]].

☐ Present the original objections to the court clerk for filing.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsRequests for Production & InspectionCivil ProcedureDiscoveryProtective Orders

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 535.55-535.59

[Reserved]

§§ 535.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.60

§ 535.60 Civil Subpoena with Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-001]

[1] FORM Civil Subpoena with Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-001]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The civil subpoena set out in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-001, adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appendix, Div. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

The form is for use in requiring the personal attendance of a witness at a trial or hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*]. For a form for a subpoena duces tecum, requiring the witness to produce records in addition to or in lieu of a personal appearance, see *§ 536.61*.

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoenas

The subpoena may be obtained from the clerk of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*]. If the subpoena requires attendance before a commissioner appointed by a non-California court, it may be obtained from the clerk of the superior court of the county in which the witness is to be examined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(b)*].

[4] Issuance

The subpoena or subpoena duces tecum is issued, signed and sealed by the clerk or a judge to the party requesting it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*].

The attorney of record may also sign and issue a subpoena to require attendance before the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*].

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Heading

The heading should be filled in with the name, bar membership number, address, and telephone number of the attorney for the subpoenaing party, the name of the subpoenaing party, the name and address of the court (including its branch name, if any), the names of the plaintiff and defendant, and the case number. The name of the witness should be filled in under "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO (*name*)."

[b] Attendance Requirement (Paragraph 1)

Paragraph 1 directs the witness to appear at a particular time and place in order to testify unless the witness agrees otherwise with the person named in item 3 [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(a), 1985.1*].

[c] Agreement to Appear at Another Time (Paragraph 2)

Paragraph 2 is included to comply with the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.2*. Paragraph 1 provides that the person must appear as a witness unless the person subpoenaed makes a special agreement with the person named in Paragraph 2. Hence, Paragraphs 1 and 2 also serve to notify the witness that in lieu of appearance at the time and place specified, the witness may agree with the party at whose request the subpoena was issued to appear at another time or on such notice as may be agreed on [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

[d] Witness Fees (Paragraph 3)

Paragraph 4 is designed to satisfy the requirement that any witness subpoenaed in a civil or administrative action must be given written notice that he or she may be entitled to receive witness and mileage fees [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2065*]. See the discussion of witness fees generally at § 535.18 and fees for public employees at § 535.19.

[6] Disobedience of Subpoena

This form states that disobedience of a subpoena may be punished as contempt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*] and that the person disobeying the subpoena will also be liable for a $500 penalty and all damages resulting from his or her failure to obey [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1992*].

[7] Proof of Service

The reverse side of the subpoena form contains a proof of service to be filled in by the server after service is made.

[8] Cross References

For a discussion and forms for subpoenas for compel attendance at depositions, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*

For discussion and forms pertaining to subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum in discovery proceedings, see DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Ch. 53, *Deposition of Nonparty* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.61

§ 535.61 Civil Subpoena Duces Tecum with Supporting Declaration and Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-002]

[1] FORM Civil Subpoena Duces Tecum with Supporting Declaration and Proof of Service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-002]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The civil subpoena duces tecum and supporting declaration set out in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-002, adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appendix, Div. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

The form is for use in requiring a witness to appear in person and produce specified records, books, documents, or other things, or, alternatively, to produce the specified records only [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*; *Evid. Code § 1560 et seq.*]. For a form for a subpoena for use in requiring personal attendance only, see *§ 536.60*.

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena Duces Tecum

If the subpoena duces tecum requires attendance or production of records before a court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(a)*]. If it requires attendance or production of records before a commissioner appointed by a non-California court, it may be obtained from the clerk of the superior court of the county in which the witness is to be examined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1986(b)*].

[4] Issuance

The subpoena duces tecum is issued, signed and sealed by the clerk or a judge to the party requesting it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*]. The attorney of record may also sign and issue a subpoena duces tecum to require production of the

matters or things described in the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(c)*].

[5] Filling in Form

[a] Heading

The heading should be filled in with the name, bar membership number, address, and telephone number of the attorney for the subpoenaing party, the name of the subpoenaing party, the name and address of the court (including its branch name, if any), the names of the plaintiff and defendant, and the case number. The appropriate information should be filled in under "THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO (*name, address, and telephone number of deponent, if known*)."

[b] Requirement of Attendance and Production of Records

Paragraph 1 directs the witness to appear at a particular time and place unless the appearance is excused under Paragraph 3(b), discussed *below*, or the witness makes an agreement otherwise with the person named in Paragraph 4, discussed in [c], *below* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985(a), 1985.1*].

Paragraph 2 provides notice to the witness that, if he or she is the custodian of consumer or employee records sought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* or *1985.6*, and he or she has been served with a motion to quash the subpoena or an objection, then he or she is not to produce the records unless and until further directed by a court order or agreement of the parties [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)(3)* and discussion in *§ 535.21[7], [8]*; for forms for an objection and a motion to quash, see *respectively §§ 535.69* and *535.74*].

Paragraphs 3(a) and 3(b) are mutually exclusive, and only one is to be checked by the subpoenaing party. Paragraph 3(a) is checked when personal appearance by the witness or custodian is required.

Paragraph 3(b) is checked when, alternatively, the subpoenaing party does not require personal appearance but only that the custodian mail or deliver copies of all the records described in the subpoena in compliance with *Evid. Code § 1560 et seq.* [*see § 535.20[1]*]. Paragraph 3(b) provides the witness or custodian with instructions for delivering the required copies. Note that if the subpoenaing party in a civil action has chosen the alternative procedure set out in Paragraph 3(b), a witness or custodian may comply with a subpoena duces tecum by making the records available to the subpoenaing party's attorney or that attorney's representative or deposition officer at the business address of the witness under reasonable conditions during normal business hours [*see Evid. Code § 1560(e)* and discussion in *§§ 535.20[1][c], 535.67[2], [3]*].

[c] Agreement to Appear at Another Time

Paragraph 4 is included to comply with the notice required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.2*. Paragraph 1 provides that the witness or custodian must appear or produce records as directed, unless he or she makes a special agreement to do otherwise with the person named in Paragraph 4. Paragraphs 1 and 4 also serve to notify the witness that, in lieu of appearance or production at the time and place specified, the witness or custodian may agree with the party at whose request the subpoena was issued to appear at another time or on such notice as may be agreed on [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.1*].

[d] Witness Fees

Paragraph 5 is designed to satisfy the requirement that any witness subpoenaed in a civil or administrative action must be given written notice that he or she may be entitled to receive witness and mileage fees [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2065* and discussion in *§ 535.18* (witness fees generally), § 535.19 (fees for public employees)].

[6] Supporting Declaration

A subpoena duces tecum must be accompanied by a copy of an affidavit or declaration that shows good cause for the production of the matters and things described in the subpoena duces tecum and that sets forth their materiality to the issues involved in the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*]. Page two of the form allows to the subpoenaing party to check one of two options: (1) that the subpoena is supported by an attached declaration [*see, e.g., §§ 535.62 -535.67*], or (2) that it is supporting by the form of declaration provided on that page (with accompanying attachments, if any).

In order to make a proper showing of good cause, the affidavit or declaration must specify the exact matters or things desired to be produced, setting forth in full detail their materiality to the issues involved in the case, and stating that the witness has the desired matters or things in his or her possession or under his or her control [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*; *see Lee v. Superior Court (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1126-1130, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (subpoenas duces tecum were ineffective because each failed to include declaration containing "a sufficient statement of materiality" as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*)]. The affidavit must show that the requested material contains competent and admissible evidence that is material to some disputed issue of fact at the trial [*People v. Schmitt (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 87, 106, 317 P.2d 673]* .

The affidavit cannot consist of reliance "merely upon the legal conclusion, stated in general terms, that the desired documentary evidence is relevant and material" [*McClatchy Newspapers v. Superior Court (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 386, 396, 159 P.2d 944* ; *Lee v. Superior Court (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1112, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 712* (declarations that lacked any factual bases for legal conclusion that documents were material to proceedings failed to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*, collecting cases, quoting *McClatchy*); *Johnson v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 829, 837, 66 Cal. Rptr. 134* ("the trial court must be afforded the factual data by the required affidavit to enable it to make an informed ruling on the issues of materiality and good cause")]. Rather, the documents or other things should be described with such certainty that the person producing the records is reasonably apprised of what is required [*Pacific Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 61, 68-69, 77 Cal. Rptr. 836* ; *see also Flora Crane Serv., Inc. v. Superior Court (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 767, 785-786, 45 Cal. Rptr. 79]* .

For further discussion of the supporting declaration, including retention requirements, see *§ 535.16*.

[7] Disobediance of Subpoena

The form, at the bottom of the first page, states that disobedience of a subpoena may be punished as contempt [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1991*] and that the person disobeying the subpoena will also be liable for a $500 penalty and all damages resulting from his or her failure to obey [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1992*].

[8] Proof of Service

Page three of the form contains a proof of service to be filled in by the server after service is made.

[9] Cross References

For a discussion and forms for deposition subpoenas duces tecum, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*

For detailed discussion of subpoenas requiring the production of electronically stored evidence, see Ch. 195A, *Discovery: Discovery of Electronically Stored Evidence (E-Discovery)*.

For discussion and forms pertaining to subpoenas duces tecum in discovery proceedings, see also DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Ch. 53, *Deposition of Nonparty* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.62

§ 535.62 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury Supporting Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Hospital Records in Personal Injury Action

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury Supporting Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Hospital Records in Personal Injury Action

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
vs.	)	IN SUPPORT OF ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA
_____ [*name*],	)	DUCES TECUM
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*specify party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. This cause was duly set for trial on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], in Department _____ of the above-entitled court.

3. _____ [*Name of witness*] has in his/her possession or under his/her control the following things:

_____ [*specify exact matters or things to be produced*].

4. The described items are material to the issues and good cause exists for the production of the described items, in that:

The above-entitled action is one for personal injuries arising out of an automobile accident; the plaintiff named above received medical care and attention for said injuries at _____ Hospital, located at _____ [*address*]; these medical records, diagnoses, histories, X rays, and other data are material and relevant and necessary for a proper prosecution of the above case. Good cause exists for their production in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.*, they are unavailable elsewhere].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, signed under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], is for use in support of a subpoena duces tecum requiring a hospital to produce in court documents relating to the medical care and attention received by a plaintiff subsequent to injuries suffered by him or her. It should be attached to the mandatory form of subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[1]* and *[6]*].

Such a declaration is required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)* for issuance of a subpoena duces tecum.

For discussion of compliance by hospital records custodians with subpoenas duces tecum, see *§§ 535.20, 535.67*.

[3] Deposition Subpoenas

The process by which a nonparty is required to provide discovery through deposition is a deposition subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2020.010-2020.020, 2025.280(b)*]. The Judicial Council has adopted three forms of deposition subpoenas. One is for use to require the attendance, testimony, and production of documents or tangible things of a nonparty deponent. The other is for use to require the production of business records by a nonparty. When either form is appropriate, its use is mandatory [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.30-1.35*]. A deposition subpoena need not be accompanied by an affidavit or declaration showing good cause for the production of documents or things designated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.410(e)*]. For discussion of deposition subpoenas, and reproductions of the Judicial Council forms of deposition subpoena, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

[4] Cross References

For discussion of compliance by hospital records custodians with subpoenas duces tecum, see *§§ 535.20, 535.67*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.63

§ 535.63 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. § 2003] for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of X Rays in Personal Injury Action

[1] FORM Statements in Declaration or Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. § 2003] for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of X Rays in Personal Injury Action

[*If appropriate, the following may be substituted for Paragraph 4 in § 535.62[1].*]

4. The described items are material to the issues and good cause exists for the production of the described items in that:

Plaintiff has alleged injuries to his/her _____ [*specify, e.g.,* chest] arising out of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* an automobile collision]. The diagnosis of the extent of plaintiff's injuries was based in part on the X rays described above and the extent of plaintiff's injuries is at issue in this action. It is necessary for the fair and proper presentation of plaintiff's case that he/she have access to all of the X rays taken of the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* chest] of plaintiff, _____ [*name*], at _____ Hospital, _____ [*address*], to prove the extent of plaintiff's injuries. Good cause exists for their production in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* they are unavailable elsewhere].

[2] Use of Form

The form of statements in [1], *above*, is for use in an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a subpoena duces tecum [for the form of declaration, *see § 535.62*] requiring a hospital to produce in court X rays taken of the plaintiff subsequent to injuries suffered by plaintiff. It may also be incorporated into a printed court form of declaration in support of a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[6]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.64

§ 535.64 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Medical Records in Malpractice Action

[1] FORM Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Medical Records in Malpractice Action

[*If appropriate, the following may be substituted for Paragraph 4 in § 535.62[1].*]

4. The described items are material to the issues and good cause exists for the production of the described items in that:

[*EITHER*]

This is an action for medical malpractice. The above documents are material to the issues involved in this case, and are admissible in evidence therein, in that they show the medical treatment given to plaintiff as a result of defendant's alleged negligence. There is good cause for their production in that it is necessary for the fair and proper presentation of plaintiff's case that he/she have access to all of the above documents as _____ [*specify facts showing good cause, e.g.,* they are not available elsewhere].

[*OR*]

It is necessary for a subpoena duces tecum to issue requiring the custodian of records of Dr. _____ to appear and produce these records. They are material to the issues of damages and liability, and good cause exists for their production in that _____ [*specify reason(s), e.g.,* because they are not otherwise available to plaintiff].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use in an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a subpoena duces

tecum [for the form of declaration, *see § 535.62*] requiring a hospital to produce in court documents relating to the medical care and attention received by a plaintiff in a medical malpractice action. It may also be incorporated into a printed court form of declaration in support of a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[6]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.65

§ 535.65 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Earning Records of Company--Loss of Earnings

[1] FORM Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Earning Records of Company--Loss of Earnings

[*If appropriate, the following may be substituted for Paragraph 4 in § 535.62.*]

4. The described items are material to the issues and good cause exists for the production of the described items in that:

_____ [*name*], _____ [*address*], has been the accountant and auditor of the _____ Company, _____ [*address*], for _____ years and has certain records, books, and documents under his/her control or has a right to obtain control of all of the records of salaries and other data concerned with the financial affairs of the _____ Company for the last _____ years prior to _____ [*date*]; this action is one for personal injuries involving a loss of earnings on the part of plaintiff; one of the issues is the amount of loss of earnings of plaintiff; these records, books, and other data concern and relate to the loss of earnings of plaintiff.

The production of the above-described records is necessary to prove the regular earnings of plaintiff and the period of time plaintiff was absent from his employment, and there is good cause for their production in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* they are not otherwise available].

[2] Use of Form

The form of statements in [1], *above*, is for use in an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.62*] requiring a company to produce in court records relating to the earnings of the company and the loss of earnings incurred by the plaintiff during the period of his/her absence from employment. It may also be incorporated into a printed court form of declaration in support of a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[6]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.66

§ 535.66 Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Truck and Shipping Records

[1] FORM Statements in Declaration or Affidavit for Subpoena Duces Tecum--Materiality and Good Cause for Production of Truck and Shipping Records

[*If appropriate, the following may be substituted for Paragraph 3 in § 535.62[1].*]

3. The above-entitled action is for damages to _____ [*specify goods, e.g.,* furniture and glassware] in the possession of defendant _____ [*name*] for shipment on _____ [*date of pickup*], from _____ [*place of origin*] to _____ [*destination*] which were damaged in a collision on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location of collision*], which is alleged in the complaint to have been caused by defendant's negligence.

_____ [*Name of witness*] is _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* the Secretary of defendant _____ (*name*), a corporation]. The witness has in his/her possession or under his/her control the following documents, records, books, and facts relating to the shipment and collision which he/she can produce and be examined about: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* records, correspondence, notes, memoranda, bills of lading, inspection reports, copies of reports to police and government agencies, pictures, witnesses' statements, investigation reports, names and addresses of all drivers, reports made by such drivers on the condition of the load, records identifying the trucks, tractors, trailers, and other equipment used for the shipment, records of the purchase of the tires on the equipment and of the disposition of the tires, names and addresses of all persons and crews involved in the salvage and pickup of the equipment and the _____ (*specify goods, e.g.,* furniture and glassware) after the collision, records of the disposition of the equipment and _____ (*specify goods, e.g.,* furniture and glassware) after the collision including records of its repair, and the tachograph cards from all such equipment while being used in connection with the shipment].

[*If appropriate, the following may be substituted for Paragraph 4 in § 535.62[1].*]

4. The described items are material to the issues and good cause exists for the production of the described items in that:

They are material to the issue of defendant's negligence, in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* they indicate defendant's control of and responsibility for plaintiff's _____ (*specify goods, e.g.,* furniture and glassware)]. Good cause exists for the production of the foregoing records and the information that they contain in that _____ [*specify reasons, e.g.,* they are not otherwise available to plaintiff and it is necessary that they be produced by this witness so that plaintiff can complete his/her proof of defendant's negligence].

[2] Use of Form

The form of statements in [1], *above*, is for use in an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury in support of a subpoena duces tecum requiring a shipper to produce in court documents relating to the shipping of plaintiff's goods. It may also be incorporated into a printed court form of declaration in support of a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[6]*].

[3] Cross References

For a form for a declaration supporting a subpoena duces tecum, see *§ 535.62*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.67

§ 535.67 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Custodian of Business Records to Accompany Copies of Records Mailed or Delivered to Court in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Custodian of Business Records to Accompany Copies of Records Mailed or Delivered to Court in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Defendant.	)	RE RECORDS
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the duly authorized custodian *or if an otherwise qualified witness, state qualification*] of the records of _____ [*name of business*], and have authority to certify such records.

2. On _____ [*date*], I was served with a subpoena duces tecum and supporting _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] issued out of the _____ [*specify court, e.g.,* Superior Court of the State of California for the (City and) County of _____] in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, calling for _____ [*specify material sought, e.g.,* all medical and hospital records relating to the care and treatment of _____ (*name of patient*) during the period _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*].

[*EITHER*]

3. The accompanying copies are true copies of all the records described in the subpoena that are in my possession as custodian of records of _____ [*name of business*].

[*OR*]

3. All of the records described in the subpoena duces tecum were delivered to _____ [*name of subpoenaing party's attorney or that attorney's representative or deposition officer*] at _____ [*address*], my business address, under reasonable conditions during normal business hours.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. These records were prepared by the personnel of _____ [*name of business*], and by other persons acting under the control of those personnel, in the ordinary course of business, at or near the times of the acts, conditions, or events recorded therein.

[5. *If additional records requested are not being produced, add:* Of the records described in the subpoena duces tecum, _____ (*name of business*) does not have the following: _____.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of custodian or other qualified witness*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use by a custodian of business records or other qualified witness whose personal attendance was not requested by the subpoenaing party pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1564*, in complying with a subpoena duces tecum that requires the production of all or any part of the records of a business in an action in which the business is neither a party nor the place where any cause of action is alleged to have happened [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.3*]. It should be attached to the mandatory form of subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[1]* and *[6]*].

Alternative allegations regarding the form of the custodian's compliance are provided in Paragraph 3 [*see Evid. Code § 1561(a)(2)*]. The first alternative is for use when the custodian is providing copies of the documents requested. The second alternative is for use when the subpoenaing party in a civil action chose the procedure of *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*, and when the custodian delivered the records for copying by the subpoenaing party's attorney, that attorney's representative or deposition officer described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.420*. The declaration is to accompany the records called for in the subpoena duces tecum [*see Evid. Code § 1561(a)*].

[3] Time of Compliance

The custodian or qualified witness may comply with the subpoena duces tecum by mailing or delivering, within 15 days after receipt of the subpoena, or within the time agreed on with the subpoenaing party, a true, legible, and durable copy of all records described in the subpoena together with this declaration or an affidavit to the court clerk or, if there is no

clerk, to the judge or to another person described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2026.010* (person conducting deposition outside California) [*Evid. Code § 1560(b)*].

If the subpoenaing party in a civil action has chosen the alternative procedure authorized by *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*, there is no time of compliance specified, although the "reasonable conditions" requirement arguably implies the same 15-day requirement. When provided with at least five business days advance notice by the attorney, his or her representative, or deposition officer (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.420*), the witness must designate a time period of not less than six continuous hours on a day certain for copying of the subpoenaed records by the attorney, the attorney's representative, or deposition officer [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*]. Under that alternative, the attorney's representative has the responsibility of delivering any copy of the records as directed in the subpoena, as well as an accompanying affidavit [*Evid. Code §§ 1560(e), 1561(c)*; *see § 535.68*].

If a witness disobeys a subpoena served pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*, the disobedience may be punished as a contempt as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240* [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240* provides that disobedience of deposition subpoena may be punished for contempt under *Code Civ. Proc. 2023.010 et seq.* without the necessity of a prior order of court directing compliance [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.030(e)* (court may impose a sanction for misuse of the civil discovery process by issuing an order treating the misuse as a contempt of court); for discussion of the use of contempt orders to punish disobedience of subpoenas generally, *see § 535.26[1]*]. The witness or person who fails to appear pursuant to a subpoena or a court order is also subject to the forfeiture and payment of damages set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1992* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2020.240*]. In addition to a contempt sanction, the court may issue a warrant for the arrest of witness or person who fails to appear [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1993(a)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1993(a)(2), (b), 1993.1-1993.2* (procedures); *see generally § 535.26[2], [3]*].

[4] Declaration of Custodian or Witness

The accompanying affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of the custodian or other qualified witness must state the following [*Evid. Code § 1561(a)*]:

- The declarant is the duly authorized custodian of the records or other qualified witness and has authority to certify the records;

- The copies are true copies of all records described in the subpoena duces tecum, or, pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*, the records were delivered to the attorney, the attorney's representative, or deposition officer for copying at the custodian's or witness's place of business, as the case may be; and

- The records were prepared by the personnel of the business in the ordinary course of business at or near the time of the act, condition, or event.

If the business does not have any of the records described, or has only a part of them, the custodian or other qualified witness must so state in the affidavit and deliver the affidavit and any available records in one of the manners provided in *Evid. Code § 1560* [*Evid. Code § 1561(b)*; for discussion, *see § 535.20*].

Counsel will note some variation between the format of this form and the explicit provisions of *Evid. Code § 1561(a)*; this was deliberate and reflects compliance with *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*. There is some inconsistency between *Evid. Code §§ 1560* and *1561* regarding the description of the person served. Some provisions refer to a custodian or other witness [*see Evid. Code §§ 1560(b), 1561(a)-(c)*]. *Evid. Code § 1560(e)* specifies that the records be made available at the witness's place of business and is the only provision not using the term "custodian." Although in most instances the custodian and witness are the same person, that is not necessarily always the case and the declaration is limited to "witness."

[5] Transmittal

The copy of the records and the declaration or affidavit are mailed or delivered in the manner described in the Procedural Guide, § 535.42[1] [*see Evid. Code § 1560(c)-(e)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative forms of affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For a procedural guide and forms of affidavit or declaration by custodian certifying records for deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

For a discussion and form for use where personal attendance is not required by subpoena duces tecum re deposition for production of business records, see De Meo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Ch. 53, *Deposition of Nonparty* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.68

§ 535.68 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Attorney of Subpoenaing Party to Accompany Copies of Records Made in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury of Attorney of Subpoenaing Party to Accompany Copies of Records Made in Compliance With Subpoena Duces Tecum [Evid. Code § 1561]

[*Caption. See § 535.67* .]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*name of subpoenaing party*) *or* the representative for _____ (*name of attorney representing subpoenaing party*)].

2. On _____ [*date*], pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum and supporting _____ [affidavit *or* declaration] issued out of the _____ [*specify court, e.g.,* Superior Court of the State of California for the (City and) County of _____] in an action entitled _____ vs. _____, No. _____, _____ [*name of witness*] made available to me _____ [*specify material made available by witness, e.g.,* all medical and hospital records relating to the care and treatment of _____ (*name of patient*) during the period _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*].

3. The accompanying copies are true copies of all the records delivered to me for copying.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [Attorney *or* Representative of Attorney *or* Deposition Officer] for
_____ [*name of subpoenaing party*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use by the subpoenaing party's attorney, that attorney's representative, or deposition officer when business records have been made available by a witness pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1560(e)*. *Evid. Code § 1560(e)* provides an alternative to the procedures described in *Evid. Code § 1560(b)*, *(c)*, and *(d)*, and authorizes the subpoenaing party in a civil action to direct the witness to make the records available for inspection or copying by the party's attorney or the attorney's representative at the business address of the witness under reasonable conditions during normal business hours. When this procedure is used, the attorney's representative has the responsibility of delivering any copy of the records as directed in the subpoena [*Evid. Code § 1560(e)*]. The declaration is to accompany the copy of the records made by the attorney, his or her representative, or deposition officer [*Evid. Code § 1561(c)*].

[3] Cross References

For a form for a declaration for the custodian of business records pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum, see *§ 535.67*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.69

§ 535.69 Notice to Consumer or Employee and Objection [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3, 1985.6; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-025]

[1] FORM Notice to Consumer or Employee and Objection [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3, 1985.6; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-025]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

[a] Adopted by Judicial Council for Mandatory Use

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of Judicial Council Form SUBP-025, adopted for mandatory use in providing the notice described in [b], *below* [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appendix, Div. C]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[b] Notice to Consumer or Employee That Personal Records Are Being Subpoenaed

The primary use of the Judicial Council form in [1], *above*, is by a party who is serving a subpoena duces tecum on a witness to compel the production of records that contain personal information concerning a consumer or employee. In this situation the subpoenaing party must serve this form, together with a copy of the subpoena, in order to provide notice to the consumer or employee that his or her personal records are being sought for inspection [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b), 1985.6(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee and delivery of documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* or *1985.6(b)* is not required); *see generally § 535.21[4][a]*].

If a notice of taking a deposition is also to be served on the consumer or employee, the deposition notice may be attached to this form and served as a single document [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e), 1985.6(e)*; *see § 535.21[4][b]*]. For forms for a deposition notice, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

This form may also be adapted for use to give notice to a state or local agency employee or any other natural person of a request for production of records containing "personal information," as defined in *Civ. Code § 1798.3(a)*, maintained by a state or local agency that pertain to that individual, when this notice is required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*. The subpoena procedures set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* apply to subpoenas of records of state or local agency employees or other natural persons maintained by state or public agencies when these records are otherwise exempt from disclosure by the terms of *Gov. Code § 6254* (exemption from disclosure under Public Records Act [*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*] when disclosure invades privacy) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*].

[c] Objection by Non-party Consumer or Employee

A portion of the form set out in [1], *above* is an objection for use by a non-party recipient of the notice who wishes to object to the productionof the subpoenaed records. The objection must be served on the subpoenaing party [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)(2)*; *see § 535.21[8]*].

[3] Contents of Notice

The notice to the consumer or employee/s or to his or her representative indicate the following in a typeface designed to call attention to the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e), 1985.6(e)*]:

- Records about the consumer or employee are being sought from the witness named on the subpoena.

- If the consumer or employee objects to the witness furnishing the records to the party seeking the records, the consumer must file papers with the court prior to the date specified for production in the subpoena.

- If the party who is seeking the records will not agree in writing to cancel or limit the subpoena, an attorney should be consulted about the consumer's or employee's interest in protecting his or her right of privacy.

[4] Procedure for Notice to Consumer or Employee

[a] Accompanying Papers

Notice is given to the consumer or employee whose records are being sought, or to his or her representative, by delivering copies of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b), 1985.6(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee and delivery of documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* or *1985.6(b)* is not required); *see generally § 535.21[4][a]*]:

- The subpoena duces tecum.

- The affidavit supporting the issuance of the subpoena, if any.

- This form of notice that records of the consumer are being sought, together with the proof of service (included on the second page of this form) indicated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)* (personal records of consumer) or *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)* (employment records).

[b] Method of Service in General

If notice is given directly to the consumer or employee, it must be given personally, at the consumer's last known address, or in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.* If the consumer is a party, notice may be given to his or her attorney of record [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)(1), 1985.6(b)(1)*].

[c] Method of Service When Consumer or Employee Is Minor

If the consumer or employee is a minor, service must be made on the minor's parent, guardian, conservator, or similar fiduciary, or if one ofthem cannot be located with reasonable diligence, then service must be made on any person having the care or control of the minor or with whom the minor resides or by whom the minor is employed, and on the minor if the minor is at least 12 years of age [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)(1), 1985.6(b)(1)*].

When *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3* and *1985.6* were amended to include the notice provision for cases involving minors consumers, they were not similarly amended in their authorization or objection provisions. An authorization for release must be signed by the consumer or employee or by his or her attorney of record [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c)(2), 1985.6(c)(2)*]. Objection papers must be filed with the court by the objecting consumer or employee [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(e), 1985.6(e)*]. Thus, because *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3, 1985.6* do not explicitly allow the minor's fiduciary to authorize or object to the release of records, it is not clear whether the parent's or fiduciary's signature is sufficient. However, a witness may rely on the signature of a consumer's or employee's attorney, and, by analogy, it could be argued that a witness may presume the signature of the parent or fiduciary is valid [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c)(2), 1985.6(c)(2)* (witness may presume that attorney's authorization is with consent of consumer or employee)].

[5] Time of Service on Consumer or Employee

The subpoenaing party must deliver this form of notice with copies of the subpoena duces tecum and supporting affidavit not less than 10 days prior to the date for production specified in the subpoena duces tecum, plus the additional time provided for by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013* if service is by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)(2)*].

[6] Order Shortening Time or Waiving Requirements of Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)

If good cause and due diligence by the subpoenaing party have been shown, and provided that the rights of witnesses and consumers or employees are preserved, a subpoenaing party is entitled to obtain an order shortening the time for service of a subpoena duces tecum or waiving the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b), 1985.6(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(h), 1985.6(g)*].

[7] Proof of Service or Written Authorization Served on Witness

Prior to the production of personal records of a consumer or employee, the subpoenaing party must do either of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(c), 1985.6(c)*]:

- Serve or cause to be served on the witness a proof of personal service or of service by mail attesting to compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)* regarding service of a copy of the subpoena duces tecum,of the supporting affidavit or declaration, and of the notice on the consumer or employee [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee and delivery of documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* or *1985.6(b)* is not required); *see generally § 535.21[4][a]*]; or

- Furnish the witness with a written authorization to release the records signed by the consumer or employee or by his or her attorney of record [*see § 535.70* (written authorization)].

For discussion and forms relating to proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

If the consumer records sought are personal records maintained by a telephone corporation that is a public utility, as defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 216*, the consumer must consent to their release, as required by *Pub. Util. Code § 2891* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f)*; *see § 535.71* (consent to release)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.70

§ 535.70 Consumer's Authorization for Release of Personal Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)(2)]

[1] FORM Consumer's Authorization for Release of Personal Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)(2)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	CONSUMER'S AUTHORIZATION FOR RE-
Defendant.	)	LEASE OF PERSONAL RECORDS
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____ [*name of witness*]:

The original or any copy of books, documents, or other writings pertaining to _____ [*name of consumer*] which you possess and maintain may be released to _____ [*name of subpoenaing party*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[*ADD, if appropriate*]

Attorney of Record for _____ [*name of consumer*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of written authorization in [1], *above*, may be used by a subpoenaing party to obtain a consumer's consent to the release of his or her personal records by a witness. This form may be used by serving it on the consumer along with the copy of the subpoena duces tecum, supporting affidavit, and notice [*see § 535.69*] served pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)*. If the consumer, or his or her attorney of record, signs the form and returns it to the subpoenaing party, the subpoenaing party should furnish the witness with the form prior to production of the records. The witness may presume that any attorney purporting to sign the authorization on behalf of the consumer acted with the consumer's consent, and that any objection to release of records is waived [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)(2)*].

If written authorization is not obtained from the consumer for the release of his or her personal records, the subpoenaing party must serve or caused to be served on the witness a proof of personal service or of service by mailattesting to compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(c)(1)*; *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

The form may also be adapted for use when seeking production of records containing "personal information" maintained by a state or local agency when the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* apply to those records [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4*]. For discussion of the applicability of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.4* to records maintained by state or local agencies, see the discussion at *§ 535.69*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.71

§ 535.71 Consumer's Authorization for Release of Telephone Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f); Pub. Util. Code § 2891]

[1] FORM Consumer's Authorization for Release of Telephone Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f); Pub. Util. Code § 2891]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	CONSUMER'S CONSENT TO RELEASE OF
Defendant.	)	TELEPHONE RECORDS
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____ [*Name of telephone corporation*]:

The original or any copies of personal records pertaining to _____ [*name of consumer*], which you possess and maintain, may be released to _____ [*name of subpoenaing party*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.

_____ [*date and place*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of written consent to release in [1], *above,* may be used by a subpoenaing party to obtain a consumer's consent to the release of his or her personal records maintained by a telephone corporation that is a public utility, as defined in

Pub. Util. Code § 216. A subpoena duces tecum for personal records maintained by such a telephone corporation is not valid or effective unless it includes a consent to release signed by the consumer whose records are requested, as required by *Pub. Util. Code § 2891* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(f)*]. After it has been signed by the consumer, this form may be used by serving it on the witness along with a copy of the subpoena duces tecum and supporting affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(b), (f)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3*(*l*), 1985.6(k) (when notice to consumer or employee and delivery of documents specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(b)* or *1985.6(b)* is not required); *see generally § 535.21*].

Pub. Util. Code § 2891 generally requires written consent by the consumer prior to releasing information regarding his or her personal calling patterns, credit or other personal financial information, services obtained, or demographic information.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.72

[Reserved]

§ 535.72[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.73

§ 535.73 Employee's Authorization for Release of Employment Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)(2)]

[1] FORM Employee's Authorization for Release of Employment Records [Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)(2)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	EMPLOYEE'S AUTHORIZATION FOR RELEASE
Defendant.	)	OF EMPLOYMENT RECORDS
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____ [*name of witness*]:

The original or any copy of books, documents, or other writings pertaining to _____ [*name of employee*] which you possess and maintain may be released to _____ [*name of subpoenaing party*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[*ADD, if appropriate*]

Attorney of Record for _____ [*name of employee*]

[2] Use of Form

The written authorization in [1], *above*, may be used by a subpoenaing party to obtain an employee's consent to the release of his or her employment records by a witness [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(c)(2)*]. The form is similar to a form of a consumer's authorization for release of personal records [*see § 535.70*]. For a discussion on the use of these forms, see *§ 535.70*, which discusses provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* that are parallel to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.74

§ 535.74 Notice of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Compliance With Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.1, 1987.2]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Compliance With Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.1, 1987.2]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ORDER _____ [QUASHING *or* MODIFYING *or* DIRECTING COMPLIANCE WITH] SUBPOENA [DUCES TECUM] [AND FOR EXPENSES OF THE MOTION]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____

[*name*], the _____ [witness *or* consumer *or* employee *or specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order _____ [quashing *or* modifying *or* enforcing compliance with] the subpoena [duces tecum] issued and served on _____ [*name*], the witness, requiring his/her attendance at _____ [the trial of the above-entitled matter *or* the hearing of the above-entitled matter *or* a deposition] on _____ [*date*] [, and the production of certain records]. [*If reasonable expenses sought, add:* _____ (*name of moving person*) will also move for an order requiring _____ (*specify party who sought subpoena, e.g.,* defendant) _____ (*name*) to pay him/her the reasonable expenses of making the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees.]

[*ADD if reasonable expenses are requested under Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(a):*]

The motion for expenses is made on the ground that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* one or more of the elements of the subpoena is oppressive *or* the motion was made in bad faith or without substantial justification *or* the records sought are personal records pertaining to a _____ (consumer *or* employee *or* (*other person, as applicable*) and release of the records would constitute an unreasonable violation of that person's right of privacy].

[*ADD if reasonable expenses are requested under Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(b):*]

The motion for reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, is made on the ground that the court is required to award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making a motion filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* for an order to _____ [quash *or* modify] a subpoena from the state of California for personally identifying information, as described in *Civil Code Section 1798.79*.8(b), for use in an action pending in another _____ [state *or* territory *or* district of the United States *or* in a foreign nation], and that subpoena has been served on an _____ [Internet service provider *or* on the provider of any other interactive computer service, as defined in *47 United States Code Section 230(f)(2)*], if the moving party prevails and the underlying action arises from the moving party's exercise of free speech rights on the Internet, and the respondent has failed to make a prima facie showing of a cause of action.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented on the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

[a] Generally

The notice of motion for an order to quash, modify, or enforce a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum in [1], *above*, is for use by a party, the witness, any consumer described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3* whose personal records are being sought from a witness, or any employee described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6* whose employment records are being sought. This form also may be used by a person whose personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8 (definition)] is sought in connection with an underlying action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights, from unreasonable or oppressive demands, including unreasonable violations of the right of privacy of the person. The motion may be made with regard to proceedings before a court, at trial, or at the taking of a deposition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)*].

The court may make an order quashing, modifying, or directing compliance with the subpoena on those terms or conditions that it declares, including protective orders. In addition, the court may make any other order as may be appropriate to protect the parties, witnesses, consumer, employee, or person whose personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8 (definition)] is sought in connection with an underlying action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights, from unreasonable or oppressive demands including unreasonable violations of that person's right of privacy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*]. This form can be adapted for use as a notice of motion for a protective order.

The court, in its discretion, may award the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees, if it finds that the motion was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification or that one of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2*]. However, the court *must* award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making a motion filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* for an order to quash or modify a subpoena from the state of California for personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8(b) (definition)], for use in an action pending in another state, territory, or district of the United States, or in a foreign nation, if that subpoena has been served on any Internet service provider, or on the provider of any other interactive computer service [*see 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(2)* (definition)], if the moving party prevails, and if the underlying action arises from the moving party's exercise of free speech rights on the Internet, and the respondent has failed to make a prima facie showing of a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(b)*].

[b] By a Party Consumer or Employee Whose Records Are Sought

A consumer who is a party to the action and whose personal records are being sought by a subpoena duces tecum, or an employee whose employment records are being similarly sought, may use this form to bring a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* to quash or modify the subpoena duces tecum. A motion to quash is the procedurally appropriate method of testing the validity of a subpoena duces tecum, attacking an order made for discovery of documents without showing of good cause, or attacking a request for documents which is not particularized [*see People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Younger (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 575, 579, 86 Cal. Rptr. 237* (prior to adoption of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*); *Pacific Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 61, 67-68, 77 Cal. Rptr. 836* ; *Flora Crane Serv., Inc. v. Superior Court (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 767, 787, 45 Cal. Rptr. 79]* .

The motion must be brought prior to the date for production. Notice of the bringing of the motion must be given to the witness and deposition officer at least five days prior to production. No witness or deposition officer is required to produce the records after receipt of a notice that such a motion has been brought, except on order of the court in which the action is pending or by agreement of the parties, witnesses, consumers, and employees affected [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g), 1985.6(f)*]. The time limit specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)* is designed to guide witnesses concerning when to honor or not honor the subpoena safely, but it does not restrict the jurisdiction of the court [*see Slagle v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1309, 1312, 260 Cal. Rptr. 122]* .

[c] By a Nonparty Consumer or Employee Whose Records Are Sought

A consumer or nonparty employee whose personal or employment records are sought may serve a written objection to the production of the records on the requesting party and the witness [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(f)(1)-(3)*; *see § 535.76* for a form for a written objection]. The party requesting the records may then use the form above to bring a motion to enforce the subpoena [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6(f)(4)*].

[d] By Person Whose Personally Identifying Information Is Sought in Connection With Underlying Action Involving Free Speech Rights

A person whose personally identifying information, as described in *Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8, is sought in connection with

an underlying action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights may used this form to bring a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* to quash or modify the subpoena duces tecum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a), (b)*].

The "personally identifying information" referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)* includes [*Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8]:

- First and last name or last name only.
- Home or other physical address, including, but not limited to, a street name or ZIP Code, other than an address obtained pursuant to the California Safe At Home program or a business mailing address for the victim service provider.
- Electronic mail address or other online contact information, such as an instant messaging user identifier or a screen name that reveals an individual's electronic mail address.
- Telephone number, other than a business telephone number for the victim service provider.
- Social security number.
- Date of birth, with the exception of the year of birth.
- Internet protocol address or host name that identifies an individual.
- Any other information, including, but not limited to, the first and last names of children and relatives, racial or ethnic background, or religious affiliation, that, in combination with any other nonpersonally identifying information, would serve to identify any individual.

[e] By Person Immune From Service of Process

A subpoena is the "process" by which the attendance of a witness is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(a)*]. Certain persons are immune from service of process under specified circumstances [*see, e.g., 22 U.S.C. § 254d* (diplomatic agents); *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 14* (California legislators); *Penal Code § 1555* (person brought into California on or after waiver of extradition based on criminal charge)]. It would thus appear that a person who is immune from service of process, if served with a subpoena, could move to have service of the subpoena quashed. With appropriate modifications, this form may be used to move for an order quashing service of the subpoena on the ground of immunity. For a form for a notice of motion to quash service of summons on this ground which may also be adapted for use to move to quash service of the subpoena and for further discussion, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Inconvenient Forum and Appearances* .

[3] Awarding Expenses

If the court finds that the motion to quash the subpoena was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification, or that one or more of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive, the court may in its discretion award the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(a)*].

However, the court *must* award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making a motion filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* for an order to quash or modify a subpoena from the state of California for personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8(b) (definition)], for use in an action pending in another state, territory, or district of the United States, or in a foreign nation, if that subpoena has been served on any Internet service provider, or on the provider of any other interactive computer service [*see 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(2)* (definition)], if the moving party

prevails, and if the underlying action arises from the moving party's exercise of free speech rights on the Internet, and the respondent has failed to make a prima facie showing of a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(b)*].

If those expenses are requested, include the appropriate paragraph of the form and state the grounds on which the award is requested.

[4] Accompanying Papers

A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), (c), 1010*; *see also* discussion and forms in Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

[5] Cross References

For procedure and forms for use on noticed motions generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For procedure and forms for use in proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For procedure and forms for use in shortening time for notice of motion, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time*

For memoranda for use in supporting a motion to quash or modify a subpoena, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 218, *Subpoena* , Forms 1-7 (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda for use in supporting a motion to compel compliance with a subpoena, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 218, *Subpoena* , Forms 8-11 (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum for use in supporting a motion to award expenses incurred in making or opposing a motion to quash, modify, or compel compliance with a subpoena, see California Points and Authorities , Ch. 218, *Subpoena* , Form 12 (Matthew Bender)

55 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.75

[Reserved]

§ 535.75[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.76

§ 535.76 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Enforcing Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order Quashing, Modifying, or Enforcing Subpoena or Subpoena Duces Tecum and for Expenses of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
vs.	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [QUASHING *or* MODIFY-
Defendant.	)	ING *or* ENFORCING] SUBPOENA [DUCES
	)	TECUM] [AND FOR EXPENSES OF THE MO-
	)	TION]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Dept: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. On _____ [*date*], a subpoena [duces tecum], issued in the above-entitled cause, was served on _____ [*name*], as a witness on behalf of [*specify, e.g.,* defendant] at _____ [the trial of the above-entitled matter *or* the hearing of the above-entitled matter *or* a deposition], on _____ [*date*].

3. _____ [*State reasons why subpoena should be quashed, modified, enforced, e.g.,* Good cause does not exist for the production of the subpoenaed records because they are otherwise available to the plaintiff *or* The subpoenaed records may not be introduced because they are privileged pursuant to _____ (*specify appropriate authority*) *or, to enforce subpoena,* The subpoenaed records are not available from any other source].

[4. *If expenses are requested pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2, state reasons why reasonable expenses of making motion, including reasonable attorney's fees, should be awarded, e.g.,* The requirements of the subpoena were oppressive in that _____ (*specify*), and reasonable expenses of this motion, including attorney's fees, should therefore be awarded to plaintiff _____ (*name*).]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration under penalty of perjury in [1], *above*, is for use in support of a motion to quash, modify, or enforce a subpoena or a subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*].

[3] Showing Required for Subpoena Duces Tecum

The motion to quash may point out the deficiencies of the affidavit or declaration supporting issuance of the subpoena duces tecum. The party at whose instance the subpoena was issued must show good cause for the production of the items and their materiality to the issues in the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*]. The declarant in support of issuance of the subpoena cannot rely merely on the legal conclusion, stated in general terms, that the desired documentary evidence is relevant and material [*People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Younger (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 575, 580, 86 Cal. Rptr. 237]* .

[4] Cross References

For a form for notice of motion for an order quashing or modifying a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum, see *§ 535.74*

For forms for affidavits and declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.77

§ 535.77 Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Conditional Compliance With Subpoena, or Protecting a Party, Witness, Consumer, or Employee From Unreasonable or Oppressive Demands, and Awarding Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM Order Quashing, Modifying, or Directing Conditional Compliance With Subpoena, or Protecting a Party, Witness, Consumer, or Employee From Unreasonable or Oppressive Demands, and Awarding Expenses of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Plaintiff,	)	Date: _____
vs.	)	Time: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Location: _____
Defendant.	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*name of moving party*] for an order _____ [*specify*] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion should be granted,

[*EITHER*]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the subpoena [duces tecum] served on _____ [*name of witness*] on _____ [*date*], to compel the attendance of _____ [*name of witness*] at _____ [the trial of the above-entitled matter *or* the hearing of the above-entitled matter *or* a deposition] on _____ [*date*], [with certain things] be deemed, and is, quashed.

[*OR*]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the subpoena [duces tecum] served on _____ [*name of witness*] on _____ [*date*], to compel the attendance of _____ [*name of witness*] at _____ [the trial of the above-entitled matter *or* the hearing of the above-entitled matter *or* a deposition] on _____ [*date*], [with certain things] be modified in the following respects: _____ [*specify*].

[*OR*]

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the subpoena [duces tecum] served on _____ [*name of witness*] on _____ [*date*], to compel the attendance of _____ [*name of witness*] at _____ [the trial of the above-entitled matter *or* the hearing of the above-entitled matter *or* a deposition] on _____ [*date*], [with certain things] be complied with on the following terms: _____ [*specify*].

[*AND/OR*]

IT IS HEREBY [FURTHER] ORDERED that, in order to protect the _____ [parties *or* witness *or* consumer *or* employee] from unreasonable or oppressive demands, _____ [*specify, e.g.*, only employment records from _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*], need be produced].

[*CONTINUE*]

[*If costs and expenses ordered, add:* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*name of party*) pay to _____ (*name of party or witness*) the sum of $_____ as reasonable costs, expenses, and attorney's fees.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The order in [1], *above*, quashing, modifying, or directing conditional compliance with a subpoena or a subpoena duces tecum is for use when the court grants a motion for an order quashing or modifying the subpoena or directing compliance with it on those terms that the court may declare, including protective orders. In addition, the court may make any other order as may be appropriate to protect the parties, witnesses, consumer, employee, or person whose personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8 (definition)] is sought in connection with an underlying

action involving that person's exercise of free speech rights, from unreasonable or oppressive demands, including unreasonable violations of that person's right of privacy [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1(a)*].] The form includes a provision for a protective order.

[3] Awarding Expenses

If the court finds that the motion to quash the subpoena was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification, or that one or more of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive, the court, in its discretion, may award the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(a)*].

However, the court *must* award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making a motion filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1* for an order to quash or modify a subpoena from the state of California for personally identifying information [*see Civ. Code § 1798.79*.8(b) (definition), for use in an action pending in another state, territory, or district of the United States, or in a foreign nation, if that subpoena has been served on any Internet service provider, or on the provider of any other interactive computer service [*see 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(2)* (definition)], if the moving party prevails, and if the underlying action arises from the moving party's exercise of free speech rights on the Internet, and the respondent has failed to make a prima facie showing of a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2(b)*].

If the above expenses are ordered, include the final paragraph of the form.

[4] Cross References

For a form for a notice of motion for an order quashing, modifying or enforcing a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum, see *§ 535.74*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.78

§ 535.78 Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)]

[1] FORM Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE BEFORE
vs.	)	COURT
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
_____		

To _____ [*name*], attorney for _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] herein:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] herein, is requested to attend before the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*street address of court and city*], on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], at _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], to testify as a witness in this action.

This request is made pursuant to *Section 1987(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure*, which provides that the giving of this notice has the same effect as the service of a subpoena and that, in the event of noncompliance with this notice, the parties will have the rights, and the court may make such orders, including the imposition of sanctions, as in the case of

a subpoena for attendance before the court.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice in [1], *above*, is for use in lieu of a subpoena to compel attendance before a court or at trial of an issue therein [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*; for discussion, *see § 535.24*].

[3] Persons Subject to Notice

This form of notice may be used to compel attendance of any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*]:

- A party to the record of any civil action or proceeding;

- A person for whose immediate benefit an action or proceeding is prosecuted or defended [for discussion, *see § 535.24[2]*]; or

- An officer, director, or managing agent of any such party or person.

[4] Effect of Notice

Giving this form of notice has the same effect as service of a subpoena on the witness, and the parties have such rights, and the court may make such orders, including the imposition of sanctions, as in the case of a subpoena for attendance before the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*].

[5] Service

This form of notice must be served by mail, at least 10 days before the time required for attendance, unless the court prescribes a shorter time, on the attorney for the party who is required to attend [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion, procedure, and forms of notice pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.010* in lieu of subpoena to take deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*

Witkin, California Evidence, vol. 2, ch. IX, *Witnesses*, § 764A (3d ed. 1986)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.79

§ 535.79 Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena Duces Tecum to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court and Bringing of Books, Documents, or Other Things [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)]

[1] FORM Notice to Attorney in Lieu of Subpoena Duces Tecum to Compel Attendance of Party or Party-Related Person Before Court and Bringing of Books, Documents, or Other Things [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE BEFORE
Defendant.	)	THE COURT AND BRINGING OF BOOKS, DOC-
	)	UMENTS, OR OTHER THINGS
	)	

_____

To _____ [*name*], attorney for _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] herein:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] herein, is requested to attend before the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*street address of court and city*], on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], at _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], to testify as a witness in this action.

_____ [*Name*], _____ [*specify party, or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] herein, has in his/her possession or under his/her control the following _____ [*specify type of material, e.g.,* books *or* documents *or other things*]: _____ [*state exact materials or things to be produced*]. _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] herein,

is requested to bring with him the above-described _____ [books *or* documents *or other things*].

This request is made pursuant to Section 1987(b), (c) of the Code of Civil Procedure, which provides that the giving of this notice has the same effect as the service of a subpoena and that, in the event of noncompliance with this notice, the parties shall have such rights, and the court may make such orders, including the imposition of sanctions, as in the case of a subpoena for attendance before the court.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice in [1], *above*, is for use in lieu of a subpoena duces tecum [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*]. Persons subject to the notice, and the effect of the notice, are the same as for a notice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*; *see § 535.78[2]* et seq.].

[3] Time of Service

This form of notice is to be served at least 20 days before the time required for attendance, or within such shorter time as is ordered by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[4] Contents of Notice

The notice must state the exact materials or things desired to be produced and that the named party or person has them under his or her possession or control [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)* has no requirement that the notice contain a showing of materiality or that good cause exists for the production as in an affidavit or declaration supporting a subpoena duces tecum [*see § 535.61[6]*]. However, the party or party-related person to whom the notice is given may object to the request [*see § 535.80*] and thereafter, on noticed motion, the requesting party must make a showing of materiality and good cause to obtain a court order for the production [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*; *see §§ 535.81, 535.82*]. In addition, this procedure applies to consumers and employees, under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3(g)* and *1985.6(f)*, respectively.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.80

§ 535.80 Objections to Request That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court on Notice to Attorney

[1] FORM Objections to Request That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court on Notice to Attorney

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	OBJECTIONS TO REQUEST THAT PARTY PRO-
Defendant.	)	DUCE BOOKS, DOCUMENTS, OR OTHER
	)	THINGS BEFORE COURT
	)	

_____

To _____ [*specify party who gave notice, e.g.,* plaintiff] and _____ [*name*], his/her attorney:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*specify objecting party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] objects to the notice to compel production of _____ [books *or* documents *or other things*], served on _____ [*date*], on the following grounds: _____ [*specify grounds, e.g.,* the documents requested are not material to the issues in this action in that they relate solely to _____ (*describe*)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*name party or party-related person*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of objections in [1], *above*, is for use when the attorney for the party or party-related person described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b)* [*see § 535.79*] has been given notice for that party or person to appear before the court and to bring books, documents, or other things with him or her [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[3] Time for Objecting

This form of objections is to be served and filed within five days after service of the notice to produce, or within such other period as the court may allow [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[4] Requesting Party's Response

After the objections have been served and filed, the requesting party, on noticed motion, accompanied by a showing of good cause and materiality of the items requested to the issues of the case, may obtain a court order for the production of the items, unless the objecting party or party-related person establishes good cause for the nonproduction, or for production under limitations or conditions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*; *see §§ 535.81 -535.83*].

[5] Cross References

For forms of notice to attorney in lieu of subpoena or subpoena duces tecum, to compel attendance of a party or party-related person, see *§§ 535.78*, *535.79*, respectively

Witkin, California Evidence, vol. 2, ch. IX, *Witnesses*, § 764A (3d ed. 1986)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.81

§ 535.81 Notice of Motion for Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION TO PRODUCE
Defendant.	)	_____ [BOOKS *or* DOCUMENTS
	)	*or specify other things*] BEFORE COURT [AND
	)	FOR REASONABLE EXPENSES OF MOTION]

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] and _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard, in _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], of the above-entitled court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California, _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] herein, will move for an order directing _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] herein, to appear before this court on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], to testify as a witness in this action and to bring with him/her the following _____ [books *or* documents *or other things*]: _____ [*state exact materials or things desired*]. [*If reasonable expenses sought, add:* _____ (*specify party, e.g.,*

plaintiff) _____ (*name*) will also move for an order requiring (*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant) _____ (*name*) to pay to him/her the reasonable expenses of making this motion, including reasonable attorney's fees.]

The motion will be made on the grounds that _____ [*specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] has such _____ [books *or* documents *or other things*] in his/her possession or under his/her control, that a notice to produce said items was served on his/her attorney on _____ [*date*], and objections to that notice were served and filed by him/her on _____ [*date*], pursuant to *Section 1987(c) ofthe Code of Civil Procedure*, and that _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] has good cause to request the production of these items and that they are material to the issues in this action, all as is more particularly set forth in the declaration of _____ [*name*] attached hereto. [*If reasonable expenses of motion sought, add:* The motion for expenses is made on the ground that the objections were made _____ (in bad faith *or* without substantial justification).] The motion will be based on this notice of motion, the declaration of _____ [*name*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, the papers and records on file herein, and such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of this motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use by the requesting party after he or she has served the attorney for the person or party whose presence is requested with a notice to produce documents, etc., [§ 535.79] and that attorney has served and filed objections to the production [§ 535.81] under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*.

[3] Accompanying Papers

A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1113(a)*; *see* discussion and forms in Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

[4] Award of Expenses of Motion

In making an order pursuant to a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*, the court may in its discretion award the amount of reasonable expenses incurred in making or opposing the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees, if the court finds the motion was made or opposed in bad faith or without substantial justification or that one or more of the requirements of the subpoena was oppressive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.2*]. Since the form in [1], *above*, would most likely be opposed on the same grounds as those stated in the objections, the request in the form for expenses and attorney's fees is based on the ground that the objections to the notice were made in bad faith or without substantial justification. A moving party seeking the expenses of the motion should include the appropriate optional language in the form.

[5] Cross References

For forms compelling attendance of a party or party-related witness by notice to attorney in lieu of subpoenas and related objections, see *§§ 535.78 -535.80*

For forms of affidavits and declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For procedure and forms of notice to produce documents at a deposition, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions*

For procedure and forms for use in noticed motions generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

Witkin, California Evidence, vol. 2, ch. IX, *Witnesses*, § 764A (3d ed. 1986)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.82

§ 535.82 Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order that Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury in Support of Motion for Order that Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Reasonable Expenses of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Defendant.	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER TO PRO-
	)	DUCE _____ [BOOKS *or* DOCU-
	)	MENTS *or other things*] BEFORE COURT [AND
		FOR REASONABLE EXPENSES OF MOTION]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. A notice to attend _____ [before the court *or* at trial] on _____ [*date*], with _____ [books *or* documents *or other things*] was served on _____ [*name*] on _____ [*date*]. A copy of that notice is attached to this declaration as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

3. _____ [*Name of person on whom notice served*] is _____ [a party to this action *or*

a person for whose immediate benefit this action is _____ (prosecuted *or* defended) *or* a(n) _____ (officer *or* director *or* managing agent) of _____ (*specify name and status of a person who is a party or for whose immediate benefit the action is being prosecuted or defended*)].

4. _____ [*Specify party or party-related person, e.g.,* defendant] has in his/her possession or under his/her control the _____ [*specify the materials or things desired, e.g.,* books *or* documents *or other things*] to be produced.

5. Good cause exists for the production of the above-described materials or things by reason of the following facts: _____ [*state reasons, e.g.,* because they are not otherwise available to _____ (*specify party seeking their production*)].

6. The above-described materials or things are material to the issues involved in the case by reason of the following facts: _____ [*state reasons, e.g.,* they indicate defendant's control of and responsibility for plaintiff's _____ (*goods*)].

[7. *If desired, state reasons why reasonable expenses of making the motion, including reasonable attorney's fees, should be awarded, e.g.,* The party who opposed the motion did so in bad faith or without justification, and reasonable expenses of the motion, including attorney's fees, should therefore be awarded to plaintiff _____ (*name*).]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration under penalty of perjury in [1], *above,* is for use in support of a motion for an order for a party or party-related person to produce books, documents, or other things before the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[3] Showing Required

The party requesting the production of items must show the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*]:

- The party or person requested to bring the items has them in his or her possession or under his or her control;
- Good cause exists for the production of the items; and
- Production of the items is material to the issues in the action.

The objecting party or person can defeat the requesting party by establishing good cause for nonproduction of the items or good cause for limitations or conditions on production [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[4] Cross References

For forms compelling attendance of a party or party-related witness by notice to attorney in lieu of subpoenas, related objections and notice of motion to compel attendance and produce documents and things, see *§§ 535.78 -535.81*

For forms of affidavits and declarations generally, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.83

§ 535.83 Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Expenses of Motion

[1] FORM Order That Party or Party-Related Person Produce Books, Documents, or Other Things Before Court and for Expenses of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER TO PRODUCE _____
Defendant.	)	[BOOKS *or* DOCUMENTS *or other things*] BE-
	)	FORE COURT [AND FOR EXPENSES OF MO-
	)	TION]

_____

The motion of _____ [*name of moving party*] for an order _____ [*specify, e.g.,* requiring _____ (*name*) to produce _____ (*specify items*)] at the trial of this action] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be _____ [granted *or* granted under _____ (limitations *or* conditions)],

[*EITHER*]

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that _____ [*name*],

_____ [*the party or party-related person whose presence is requested*], appear before this court on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], at _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], to testify as a witness in this action and to bring with him/her the following _____ [*state exact materials or things*].

[*OR*]

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, granted and that _____ [*name*], _____ [*the party or party-related person whose presence is requested*] appear before this court on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], at _____ [*department, division, or room number, if any*], to testify as a witness in this action and to bring with him/her the following _____ [*state exact materials or things*]. _____ [*State limitationsor conditions on use of produced items, e.g.,* _____ (*Specify documents*) may only be inspected in camera].

[*CONTINUE*]

[*If expenses awarded, add:* IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*name of party or party-related person*) pay to _____ (*name of moving party*) the sum of $_____ as reasonable expenses and attorney's fees.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants a party's motion for an order to produce to produce books, documents, or other things [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(c)*].

[3] Cross References

For forms compelling attendance of a party or party-related witness by notice to attorney in lieu of subpoenas, related objections, notice of motion to compel attendance and supporting declaration, see *§§ 535.78 -535.82*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.84

§ 535.84 Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum--Order to Attend Court or Provide Documents [Penal Code § 1326; Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664; Cal. Judicial Form CR-125/JV-525]

[1] FORM Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum--Order to Attend Court or Provide Documents [Penal Code § 1326; Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664; Cal. Judicial Form CR-125/JV-525]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of the Judicial Council's subpoena form for use in criminal and juvenile proceedings [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. Use of this form is mandatory [*Gov. Code § 68511*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31*]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

The form may be used to require the attendance and testimony of a witness in criminal or juvenile proceedings before a court or magistrate [*see Penal Code §§ 1326-1332*; *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664*]. It may also be used to require the witness to attend and to bring with him or her books, papers, or documents [*Penal Code § 1327*; *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664*].

[3] Issuance

[a] Criminal Proceedings

The subpoena or subpoena duces tecum may be signed and issued by any of the officials described in *Penal Code § 1326*.

A subpoena issued in a criminal action that requires the custodian of records or other qualified witness of a business to produce books, papers, documents, or records must direct that those items be delivered by the custodian or qualified witness in the manner specified in *Evid. Code § 1560(b)*, within five days after the receipt of the subpoena or within the

time agreed on by the party who served the subpoena and the custodian or other qualified witness [*Penal Code § 1326(b)*; *see § 535.20[1][a]* (discussing *Evid. Code § 1560(b)*)]. The alternative procedure set forth in *Evid. Code § 1560(e)* does not apply to criminal cases [*Penal Code § 1326(b)*; *see § 535.20[1][c]*].

Further, in a criminal action, no party, or attorney or representative of a party, may issue a subpoena requesting the custodian of records or other qualified witness of a business to provide books, papers, documents, or records, or copies of these documents or records, relating to a person or entity other than the subpoenaed person or entity in any manner other than that specified in *Evid. Code § 1560(b)* [*Penal Code § 1326(c)*]. When a defendant has issued a subpoena to a person or entity that is not a party for the production of books, papers, documents, or records, or copies of those documents or records, the court may order an in camera hearing to determine whether the defense is entitled to receive the documents [*Penal Code § 1326(c)*]. The court may not order the documents disclosed to the prosecution, except as required by *Penal Code § 1054.3* [*Penal Code § 1326(c)*; *see Penal Code § 1054.3* (requiring defendant's disclosure to prosecutor of names and addresses of persons to be called as witnesses, relevant written or recorded statements, or reports, of those persons, including experts' reports or statements, and any real evidence defendant intends to offer in evidence)]. This law, however, does not prohibit obtainingbooks, papers, documents, or records with the consent of the person to whom those items relate [*Penal Code § 1326(d)*].

[b] Juvenile Proceedings

The subpoena or subpoena duces tecum must be issued by the court or the clerk of the court on the request of the probation officer, district attorney, the minor, or the minor's parent, guardian, or custodian.

The subpoena or subpoena duces tecum may be issued by the court or the clerk of the court on the court's own motion [*Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664*].

[4] Cross References

For additional general information on subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum, see *§§ 535.60, 535.61*

For a discussion of the use of subpoenas in criminal proceedings, see California Criminal Defense Practice, Ch. 72, *Preparing for Trial* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 46: Settlement and Release thru Subpoena Chs. 520-535
Chapter 535 SUBPOENA
PART V. FORMS

46-535 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 535.85

§ 535.85 Subpoena for Production of Business Records in Action Pending Outside California [Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.100 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-035]

[1] FORM Subpoena and Subpoena Duces Tecum--Order to Attend Court or Provide Documents [Penal Code § 1326; Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 341, 664; Cal. Judicial Form CR-125/JV-525]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a subpoena for production of business records in an action pending outside California. It is a reproduction of Cal. Judicial Council Form SUBP-035, adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appendix, Div. A]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

The form may be used to request production of business records under the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.010 et seq.*]. For a detailed discussion of the Act, see *§ 535.21B*.

Additional Judicial Council forms for use under the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act, including the application, a subpoena for personal appearance only, and a subpoena for personal appearance and production of documents and things, are reproduced and discussed in detail in *Ch. 193, Discovery: Depositions, § 193.180 -193.182*. The Judicial Council subpoena form for the inspection of premises in an action pending outside California is reproduced and discussed in *Ch. 195, Discovery: Inspection of Tangible Evidence, § 195.70*.

[3] Procedure for Obtaining Subpoena

To request issuance of this subpoena, a party must submit the original or a true and correct copy of a foreign subpoena to the clerk of the superior court in the California county in which discovery is sought to be conducted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(a)*]. A request for the issuance of a subpoena in these circumstances does not constitute making an appearance in the California courts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(a)*].

In addition to submitting a foreign subpoena, as described above, a party seeking discovery must do both of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(b)*]:

- Submit an application requesting that the superior court issue a subpoena with the same terms as the foreign subpoena. The application must be on the Judicial Council form [*see* Judicial Council Form SUBP-030, reproduced and discussed in *Ch. 193, Discovery: Depositions, § 193.180*]. No civil coversheet is required.

- Pay the specified fee [*see Gov. Code § 70626*].

When these requirements are satisfied, the court clerk must promptly issue a subpoena for service on the person to which the foreign subpoena is directed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.300(c)*].

[4] Notice to Consumer or Employee and Objection

Paragraph five of this form states that if the person has been served with this subpoena as a custodian of consumer or employee records under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6 and* a motion to quash has also been served on the custodian, then a court order, or agreement of the parties, witnesses, and consumer or employee affected must be obtained before the custodian is required to produce the consumer or employee records [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985.3, 1985.6*]. For further discussion of subpoena duces tecum requiring production of records that contain personal information concerning a consumer or an employee, see *§§ 535.21* and *535.69[2]*.

[5] Proof of Service

The form includes a proof of service to be filled in by the server after service is made. A discovery subpoena issued under the Act must be personally served in compliance with California law, including, without limitation, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2029.400*]. For discussion of service, see *§ 535.17*.

[6] Cross References

For general information on subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum, see *§§ 535.60, 535.61*.

For discussion and forms for subpoenas to compel attendance at a deposition in an action pending in California, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

For discussion and forms for subpoenas to compel appearance at a deposition, or appearance and production of documents and things at a deposition in an action pending outside California, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

For discussion and forms pertaining to subpoenas in discovery proceedings, see also DeMeo, California Deposition And Discovery Practice, Ch. 53, *Deposition of Nonparty* (Matthew Bender).

For in-depth coverage of e-discovery and a step-by-step guide to subpoenaing electronically stored information (ESI) from nonparties, see Matthew Bender(R) Practice Guide: California E-Discovery and Evidence, Ch. 6, *Demanding Production of Electronically Stored Evidence in California Court*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 536.syn

§ 536.syn Synopsis to Chapter 536: SUBROGATION

§ 536.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 536.02 Cross References

§§ 536.03-536.09 [Reserved]

§ 536.10 Governing Law

§ 536.11 Subrogation Defined

§ 536.12 Terminology

§ 536.13 Elements of Subrogation

[1] In General

[2] In Context of Insurance Claims

§ 536.14 Kinds of Subrogation

[1] Legal and Conventional

[2] Common-Law and Statutory

§ 536.15 Subrogation and Assignment Distinguished

[1] In General

[2] Limitations on Subrogation to Nonassignable Cause of Action

[3] Agreement for Reimbursement as Avoiding Nonassignability

§ 536.16 Common Subrogation Actions

[1] By Sureties

[2] By Insurers

[a] Property Insurance

[b] Liability Insurance

[c] Med-Pay Coverage

[3] By Stranger Paying Mortgage at Debtor's Request

[4] By Persons Authorized by Statute

§ 536.17 Doctrine of Superior Equities

[1] As Limitation on Right to Subrogation

[2] Examples of Application of Doctrine

[3] Circumstances Establishing Superior Equity

§ 536.18 Subrogation Actions Against Public Entities

[1] Claims Requirement

[2] Time in Which Claim Must Be Filed

[3] Equitable Indemnity Actions Distinguished

§ 536.19 Partial Subrogation

[1] Terminology

[2] Enforcement of Partial Claims

[3] Splitting Cause of Action

[a] Rule Against

[b] Raising or Waiving Objection

[c] How to Raise Objection That Action Has Been Split

[d] How to Avoid Defense That Action Has Been Split

[e] Prohibition Against Double Liability of Obligor

§ 536.20 Statutes of Limitations

§ 536.21 Defenses Generally

§ 536.22 Effect of Release on Subrogation Rights

§ 536.23 Doctrine of Comparative Negligence

§§ 536.24-536.39 [Reserved]

§ 536.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 536.41 State and Federal Statutes

[1] Banks

[2] California Insurance Guarantee Association

[3] Classes of Insurance

[4] County Retirement Association

[5] Damages

[6] Defenses

[7] Definitions

[8] Director of Corporation

[9] Indemnity

[10] Insurers

[11] Person Liable to Secured Party

[12] Public Employees' Retirement System

[13] Real Estate Commissioner

[14] Redeemer of Property

[15] Remedies

[16] Source of Collateral Benefits

[17] Standard Forms

[18] State Bar

[19] State Compensation Insurance Fund

[20] State of California

[21] State Teachers' Retirement System

[22] Statutes of Limitations

[23] Surety

[24] Vehicle Owner

[25] Vessel Owner

[26] Waiver or Release

[27] Workers' Compensation Insurer

§ 536.42 Decisions

[1] Application of Equitable Principles

[2] Assignment, Subrogation, and Reimbursement Compared

[3] Compliance with Claims Statutes in Actions Against Public Entities

[4] Constitutionality

[5] County Retirement Associations

[6] Cross Complaints

[7] Defenses

[8] Definitions

[9] Doctrine of Superior Equities

[10] Double Liability of Obligor Prohibited

[11] Elements of Subrogation

[12] Estoppel

[13] Indemnity and Subrogation Distinguished

[14] Insurers

[15] Intervention

[16] Issues

[17] Judgments

[18] Jurisdiction

[19] Lessor-Lessee

[20] Lienholders

[21] Nature of Subrogation

[22] Parties

[23] Prerequisites to Equitable Subrogation

[24] Principle on Which Subrogation Is Founded

[25] Public Employees' Retirement System

[26] Small Claims Courts

[27] Splitting Cause of Action

[28] Statute of Limitations

[29] Sureties

[30] Volunteers

[31] Waiver or Release of Subrogation Rights

[32] When Subrogation May Be Sought

[33] Workers' Compensation

§ 536.43 Law Reviews

§ 536.44 Text References

§§ 536.45-536.59 [Reserved]

Scope

§ 536.60 Plaintiff's Right to Be Subrogated to Subrogor's Cause of Action Against Defendant Obligor

§ 536.61 Subrogor's Cause of Action Against Defendant Obligor

§§ 536.62-536.79 [Reserved]

§ 536.80 Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Classes of Insurance

[4] Cross References

§ 536.81 Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 536.82 Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 536.83 Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 536.84-536.99 [Reserved]

§ 536.100 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Casualty Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Property Loss or Damage Covered by Insurance Policy--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Cross References

§ 536.101 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured as Replacement Cost of Destroyed Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.102 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Insured's Former Employee to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Loss Through Employee's Theft or Embezzlement [Civ. Code § 3336]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.103 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Contractor and Subcontractors to Recover Amount of Payment Made by Subrogee for Repairs Made Necessary by Negligent Construction of a Building on Insured's Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.104 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Against Insured's Subcontractors Under Indemnity Agreements [Civ. Code §§ 2772, 2778] to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Plaintiff on Behalf of Insured in Settlement of Action Brought Against It and Subcontractors for Injuries Caused by Negligence of Subcontractors [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.105 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Surety as Subrogee of General Contractor--Against Subcontractor and Its Surety to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Subrogee to Material Suppliers of Defaulting Subcontractor [Civ. Code §§ 2848, 3300, 3302]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.106 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Remainderman as Subrogee of Public Taxing Body [Civ. Code § 2903]--Against Life Tenant to Compel Sale of Real Property, Apportion Proceeds, and Recover Amount Paid by Remainderman to Satisfy Tax Lien

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Subrogation of Person Redeeming Property from Lien

§ 536.107 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured--Against Insured's Certified Public Accountants to Recover Amount of Payments Made to Insured for Losses Resulting From Employee's Defalcations on Grounds of Negligence [Civ. Code § 3333] and Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300] in Conducting Annual Audits and Failing to Discover Defalcations [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 536.108 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--By Fidelity Insurer Against Insured and Bank Paying Forged Check Drawn on Insured's Account--To Declare Rights and Duties of Parties Relating to Reimbursement and Subrogation [Com. Code §§ 3419(1)(c), 4406]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 536.109-536.119 [Reserved]

§ 536.120 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff Was Volunteer in Satisfying Claim

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 536.121 Affirmative Defense--Accident Caused by Subrogor's Negligence

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 536.122 Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 536.123 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Claim Paid by Setoff [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.70]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART I SCOPE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.01

§ 536.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses subrogation and contains forms of capacity allegations [*see §§ 536.80 -536.83*], complaints [*see §§ 536.100 -536.108*], and affirmative defenses [*see §§ 536.120* -536.125]. The affirmative defenses are those most likely to be used in answers to complaints in subrogation.

For other chapters in this set discussing or containing forms relating to specific aspects of subrogation, see *§ 536.02*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART I SCOPE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.02

§ 536.02 Cross References

For discussion and a form of complaint in subrogation for use by a vehicle owner against a negligent operator, see *Ch. 82, Automobiles: Causes of Action, § 82.16*.

For discussion and a form of complaint in subrogation by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured against an uninsured motorist to recover the amount paid under the uninsured motorist provision of its policy, see Ch. 88, *Automobiles: Automobile Insurance* , and Ch. 88A, *Automobiles: Uninsured Motorist Claims* .

For discussion and forms of allegations for use in a complaint in subrogation by a vessel owner against a negligent vessel operator, see Ch. 100, *Boats and Boating* .

For discussion of the right of the Real Estate Commissioner to be subrogated to the rights of the judgment creditor against a broker or salesperson to the extent of payments made from the Real Estate Fund for education, research, and recovery, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and a form of complaint in subrogation for use by a contractor's surety against the property owner to the extent of funds paid to the contractor's creditors, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For discussion and a form of cross complaint in surbrogation for use by a defendant corporate director sued by and liable to the corporation under *Corp. Code § 316* (illegal distribution to shareholders and illegal loan or guaranty) against the shareholders who received the illegal distribution or against the person who received the illegal loan or guaranty, see Ch. 164, *Corporations: Dividends and Reacquisitions of Shares* ,, and Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management* , *§ 167.50* et seq., respectively.

For discussion and forms regarding surety insurance generally, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For a form of complaint by one insurance company against another for a declaration of the rights and duties of the parties, including the right to subrogation, under their respective policies of liability insurance, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For discussion and a form of complaint in subrogation by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured for damages against the insured's tenant to recover the amount paid to the insured for fire damages caused by the tenant's negligence, see *Ch. 334, Landlord and Tenant: Claims for Damages, § 334.95*.

For discussion of the right of the person who redeems from a lien property in which he or she has an interest to be subrogated to all benefits of the lien, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences* .

For discussion of the right of a holder of a reversionary interest in property to succeed, under equitable principles of subrogation, to the lien held by a taxing authority where the holder paid taxes to protect his or her interest in the property after the life tenant failed to do so, see Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .

For discussion of the persons entitled to indemnification under an indemnity agreement as including a subrogee and the subrogation of the insurance company which satisfies the loss or liability incurred by its insured to any right of indemnity for such loss or liability which the insured may have by virtue of the indemnity agreement or implied indemnity, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

For discussion of the right of a surety who has, pursuant to the provisions of its contractor's payment bond, paid claims of valid mechanic lien claimants to be subrogated to the rights of the claimants as against the principal on the bond, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

For discussion of the nonsubrogation of the source of collateral benefits introduced on the issue of damages by the defendant in a personal injury action against a health care provider, see Ch. 415, *Physicians: Medical Malpractice* .

For discussion of the right of the State of California to be subrogated to the rights of the victim of a crime to whom cash payments are granted pursuant to the law governing aid to victims of crime, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersManagement Duties & LiabilitiesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageUninsured MotoristsSubrogationReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral OverviewTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityHealthcare ProvidersTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsRemedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART I SCOPE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.03-536.09

[Reserved]

§§ 536.03[Reserved]

70 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.10

§ 536.10 Governing Law

The right of subrogation is governed by equitable principles developed by the cases and by a number of statutes, most of which apply to particular relationships. For a listing of these statutes, see *§ 536.40*. See also *§ 536.16*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.11

§ 536.11 Subrogation Defined

"To subrogate" is to put in the place of another, to substitute. Subrogation is the substitution of another person (the subrogee) in place of the creditor or claimant (the subrogor) to whose rights the other person succeeds in relation to the debt or claim. The subrogee is equitably subrogated to the subrogor, and succeeds the subrogor's rights against the obligor [*Reliance Nat'l Indem. Co. v. General Star Indem. Co. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1063, 1077, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 627*].

An action in subrogation is an equitable remedy by which a third party is substituted in the place of a creditor when the third party, by reason of some obligation or to preserve an interest, has paid the creditor the debt of the principal debtor; its purpose is to enable the third party to recover from the debtor the amount of the payment made [*see* *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 118, 228 P. 11* ; *Redington v. Cornwall (1891) 90 Cal. 49, 58, 27 P. 40* ; *Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 47, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in* *Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*]. Equitable subrogation has also been defined as a legal device that permits a party who has been required to satisfy a loss created by a third party's wrong to step into the shoes of the loser and recover from the wrongdoer [*Transit Cas. Co. v. Spink Corp. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 124, 132, 156 Cal. Rptr. 360* (disapproved on another point in *Commercial Union Assurance Cos. v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 912, 921, 164 Cal. Rptr. 709, 610 P.2d 1038*)].

For a discussion of the historical development of the doctrine, see *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 120-121, 228 P. 11* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.12

§ 536.12 Terminology

The third party substituted for the creditor is the "subrogee"; the creditor is the "subrogor"; and the debtor or tortfeasor is the "obligor."

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.13

§ 536.13 Elements of Subrogation

[1] In General

Subrogation applies when one person, not a volunteer, pays a debt for which another is primarily answerable and that, in equity and good conscience, should have been discharged by the latter [*Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 83, 230 P.2d 816* ; *Phoenix Ins. Co. v. United States Fire Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1511, 1525-1526, 235 Cal. Rptr. 185* (finding indemnification rather than subrogation)]. The doctrine is liberally applied to promote justice [*St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Murray Plumbing & Heating Corp. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 66, 72, 135 Cal. Rptr. 120*].

The prerequisites for equitable subrogation generally are: (1) payment was made by the subrogee to protect his or her own interest; (2) the subrogee did not act as a volunteer; (3) the debt is one for which the subrogee was not primarily liable; (4) the entire debt has been paid; and (5) subrogation does not work any injustice to the rights of others [*Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Grant v. De Otte (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 724, 728, 265 P.2d 952*].

[2] In Context of Insurance Claims

Subrogation issues commonly arise in connection with insurance claims. With respect to insurance, subrogation takes the form of an insurer's right to be put in the position of the insured to pursue recovery from third parties legally responsible to the insured for a loss that the insurer has both insured and paid [*Reliance Nat'l Indem. Co. v. General Star Indem. Co. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1063, 1077, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 627*]. In this context, the courts have identified the following elements as essential to an insurer's cause of action based on equitable subrogation [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Cas. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1596, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* , *Troost v. Estate of DeBoer (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 289, 294, 202 Cal. Rptr. 47*]:

- The insured has suffered a loss for which the party to be charged is liable, either because the latter is a wrongdoer whose act or omission caused the loss, or because he or she is legally responsible to the insured for the loss caused by the wrongdoer;

- The insurer has wholly or partially compensated the insured for the same loss for which the party to

be charged is liable;

- The insured has an existing, assignable cause of action against the party to be charged, and the insured could have asserted that that cause of action for his or her own benefit if he or she had not been compensated by the insurer for the loss;

- The insurer has suffered damages caused by the act or omission upon which the liability of the party to be charged depends;

- Justice requires that the loss should be entirely shifted from the insurer to the party to be charged; and

- The insurer's damages are in a stated sum, usually the amount it has paid to its insured, assuming the payment was not voluntary and was reasonable.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.14

§ 536.14 Kinds of Subrogation

[1] Legal and Conventional

Subrogation has been said to be of two kinds, "legal" and "conventional." Legal subrogation has its source in equity and arises by operation of law. Conventional subrogation arises by the act of the parties and rests in contract [*Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 638, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 723, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42*].

What is treated as conventional subrogation in other states is to some extent covered by statutes in California. For example, *Civ. Code §§ 2849, 2903, 2904* provide the right of subrogation to a lien on property that is afforded in other states by conventional, that is, contractual, subrogation [*see* 83 C.J.S. Subrogation § 4]. A right to subrogation may not be created by contract, however, if there is an express statutory reservation against assignment of the type of claim involved [*see* *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 639-640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* (involving claim arising from tortious injury to person which was nonassignable under former *Civ. Code § 956* (repealed; *now see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.22*))]. Morever, when a contract, such as an insurance policy, reserves a right of subrogation with respect to claims paid under certain policy coverages (otherwise assignable), it does not have the right to subrogate as to other coverages that do not reserve the right [*Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 724, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42*].

Legal subrogation arises, for example, when a person having a liability or a right or a fiduciary relationship in the premises pays a debt due by another under such circumstances that he or she is in equity entitled to the security or obligation held by the creditors whom he or she has paid. It does not arise from any contractual relationship between the parties, but takes place as a matter of equity with or without an agreement to that effect [*Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 723, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42*]. The doctrine cannot be invoked, however, to override the contract of the parties and, hence, is not applicable when its enforcement would be inconsistent with the terms of the contract or if the contract expressly or by implication forbids its application [*Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 724, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42* (quoting out-of-state case with approval)].

[2] Common-Law and Statutory

Subrogation is also classified as common law or statutory [*see* *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose*

(1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 734, 736-737, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814 ; *Phoenix of Hartford Ins. Cos. v. Colony Kitchens (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 140, 144-145, 128 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *see also County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 875-876* , n.7,]. Common law subrogation may be either nonstatutory or merely confirmed by statute, and arises from common law equitable principles. Statutory subrogation is subrogation that is expressly authorized by statute [*State Bar of Cal. v. Statile (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 650, 662-663, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 72*]. Examples of statutory subrogation include *Gov. Code § 21451*, giving the State Retirement System a cause of action against a person causing a member's injury or death to recover one-half the actuarial equivalent of the benefits for which the system is liable because of that injury or death; *Gov. Code § 31820*, giving a similar right to a County Employees' Retirement System; *Lab. Code § 3852*, subrogating the employer (or the employer's insurer [*see Lab. Code § 3850(b)*]) who has paid worker's compensation to the employee's cause of action against a tortfeasor responsible for the employee's injuries; and *Veh. Code § 17153*, subrogating the owner who is liable for tortious injuries caused by a person operating the owner's vehicle with the owner's consent to the rights of the injured person against the operator. Causes of action for tortious injury to person are not assignable [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.22*] and therefore would not be subject to subrogation without that express statutory authorization [*see Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 639-640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073*]. (Causes of action for tortious damage to property are, however, assignable under *Civ. Code § 954* and are subject to subrogation [*see Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 121, 228 P. 11* ; *Royal Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 64, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858*].)

Business and Professions Code § 6140.5(b) provides, with respect to the Client Security Fund (CSF) of the State Bar:

> Upon making a payment to a person who has applied to the fund for payment to relieve or mitigate pecuniary losses caused by the dishonest conduct of an active member of the State Bar, the State Bar is subrogated, to the extent of that payment, to the rights of the applicant against any person or persons who, or entity that, cause the pecuniary loss. The State Bar may bring an action to enforce those rights within three years from the date of payment to the applicant.

In one case, the attorney and his clients settled a lawsuit concerning the attorney's alleged misappropriation of client trust funds, while preserving the plaintiff's right to seek full reimbursement for their losses from the CSF. As part of the settlement, the attorney agreed not to object to any notice of intent to pay issued by the CSF. After the settlement but before the defendant had paid some of the payments structured in installments, the CSF paid amounts of money to some claimants involved in the matter. When the State Bar filed a subrogation action against the attorney, the issue arose over what subrogation rights the State Bar acquired against the attorney when the CSF paid the claims. The appellate court framed the issue in the following manner: "When an injured party releases a tortfeasor but reserves its right against a party with statutory subrogation rights, is that party later permitted to seek reimbursement from the tortfeasor if it pays money that the tortfeasor owed the injured party?" The court held that neither the statutory scheme nor the settlement agreement in this case limits the State Bar's subrogation rights against the attorney [*State Bar of Cal. v. Statile (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 650, 669, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 72*].

In addition, rules applicable to the two kinds of subrogation may differ in some respects. For example, if the right to subrogation is nonstatutory or is merely confirmed by statute, then the normal rules of equitable subrogation apply; that is, the subrogee succeeds to the rights of the subrogor and may not, for example, recover an amount greater than that which could have been recovered by the subrogor [*see Breesev. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 929, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* (involving employer's right to recover from tortfeasor benefits paid to or on behalf of injured employee); *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 876 n.7, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* (same)]. In addition, the action by the subrogee is subject to the same statute of limitations that applies to the subrogor's action [*see Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 734, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *see also § 536.20*].

However, in the case of statutory subrogation, if the statute providing for subrogation expressly authorizes recovery

from an obligor (for example, a tortfeasor) in an amount necessary to compensate the subrogee for the full amount of payments made by it, and that amount is greater than that which could have been recovered in an action by the subrogor, the action to that extent is in the nature of an action for indemnity. For example, *Lab. Code § 3852* (relating to workers' compensation), to the extent it authorizesrecovery by an employer (or the employer's insurer) of an amount required to be paid to the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4706.5* (death benefits when deceased employee leaves no dependents), subjects the tortfeasor to liability for an amount greater than that for which he or she would have been liable in an action by the deceased employee's estate [*see Associated Indem. Corp. v. Pacific Sw. Airlines (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 898, 907, 180 Cal. Rptr. 685*].

In addition, if an applicable statute expressly so provides, a purely statutory right to subrogation may be subject to a different statute of limitations providing a longer period in which the subrogated action may be brought. In this event the subrogee has a greater right than that of the subrogor [*see Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 736, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *Allstate Ins. Co. v. County of Alameda (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 418, 421, 109 Cal. Rptr. 53* ; *see also § 536.20*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.15

§ 536.15 Subrogation and Assignment Distinguished

[1] In General

Although assignment was once regarded as one form of subrogation, and both subrogation and assignment entail the substitution of a third party for an existing party to prosecute a claim against another, they do have certain technical differences [*see Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073*]. Except as otherwise provided by statute, subrogation presupposes an actual payment and satisfaction of the creditor's claim to which the subrogor is subrogated for the purpose of recovering the payment from the obligor. It operates only to secure recovery to the extent of the payment made. It presupposes that payment was not made officiously but by reason of some obligation or for the protection of some interest. Finally, at least so far as legal subrogation is concerned [*see § 536.14*], it is the act of the law, substituting one party for another, and depends not on contract but on principles of equity [*see Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 638-640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 118, 228 P. 11* ; *Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 586-588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893*].

Assignment, on the other hand, contemplates the continued existence of the claim unpaid at the time of the assignment; it is unconcerned with any officiousness of the assignee; and it is the act of the parties, depending generally on intention [*see Civ. Code § 953-955.1*; *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 639-640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *see also* Ch. 60, *Assignments*].

[2] Limitations on Subrogation to Nonassignable Cause of Action

Nonassignable claims are not subject to subrogation absent statutory authorization [*Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. McDonald, Hecht & Solberg (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1383, 1387, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 424* . Thus, because a tort cause of action for injury to the person normally is not assignable, a right of subrogation to a cause of action for tortious injury to the person is not recognized, except when the right of subrogation has been expressly granted by statute [*Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 639, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* (former *Civ. Code § 956* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.22*))]; *Peller v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 610, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 41*].

Similarly, California law prohibits assignment of most legal malpractice claims. Thus, a liability insurer that pays a claim against its insured that resulted from the negligence of the insured's attorneys has no subrogation rights with respect to the insured's legal malpractice claim against the attorneys [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. McDonald, Hecht & Solberg (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1387, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 424*].

One exception to this prohibition against assignment involved an attorney who sued concurrent counsel for indemnification of malpractice damages. In that case, the attorney's insurer may be subrogated to the attorney's indemnity claim against concurrent counsel [*Musser v. Provencher (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 274, 285-287, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373, 48 P.3d 408*].

[3] Agreement for Reimbursement as Avoiding Nonassignability

While a cause of action to recover damages for personal injuries is not assignable, provisions in a health insurance contract requiring an insured who obtains a settlement or judgment against a third party tortfeasor for personal injuries to reimburse the insurer for medical payments arising out of those injuries are valid and enforceable [*Samura v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan Inc. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1284, 1292, 1297, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20* (involving health maintenance organization); *Lee v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 458, 465-466, 129 Cal. Rptr. 271*]. Enforcement is justified based on the assumption that the recovery from the party at fault will create a fund from which medical costs may be paid without burdening the injured party [*Samura v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan Inc. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1284, 1296, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20*]. Hence, a provision in an insurance policy or health plan requiring the insured to reimburse the insurer or provider for medical payments in the event the insured recovers damages from a third party tortfeasor bars bars an insured who has settled his or claim against the tortfeasor from recovering medical payments from the insurer [*West v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 562, 565, 106 Cal. Rptr. 486*].

However, the doctrine of contract unconscionability may limit the enforceability of such a provision in some fact situations. If the tort victim does not recover enough from the third party to compensate for lost wages, future loss of earning capacity, or uninsured future medical expenses, the victim would also bear the burden of paying medical expenses from the tort recovery. In such a case, enforcement of the medical lien may create a heavy burden on the injured party by reducing recovery of actual economic losses, and the victim may be able to present a defense to enforcement on the ground of unconscionability. Unconscionability involves (1) an inequality of bargaining power resulting in no real negotiation and the absence of meaningful choice and (2) surprise, which occurs if the terms of the bargain are hidden in a printed form drafted by the party seeking to enforce the disputed terms [*Samura v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1284, 1296-1297, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingThird Party StandingCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.16

§ 536.16 Common Subrogation Actions

[1] By Sureties

The most common situation in which the right to subrogation arises is when a surety pays a principal debtor's obligation to a creditor and the surety is subrogated to any causes of action that either the creditor or the debtor has against third parties responsible for the loss, as well as to the creditor's rights to priorities or securities [*see Civ. Code §§ 2848, 2849*; *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 624, 638 n. 6, 147 Cal. Rptr. 486, 581 P.2d 197* ; *Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 247, n. 1, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91*]. A surety or guarantor is defined as one who promises to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another, or hypothecates property as security therefor [*Civ. Code § 2787*]. Surety is a class of insurance defined in *Ins. Code § 105* [*Ins. Code § 100(5)*].

A surety, on satisfying the obligation of the principal, is entitled to enforce every remedy that the creditor then has against the principal to the extent of reimbursing what the surety has expended, and also to require all his or her cosureties to contribute thereto, without regard to the order of time in which they became sureties [*Civ. Code § 2848*]. The question whether the obligation which is satisfied is in fact the obligation of the particular principal is to be decided in accordance with the rules of law and principles of equity [*Painter v. Berglund (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 63, 67, 87 P.2d 360*].

In addition, a surety is entitled to the benefit of every security for the performance of the principal obligation held by the creditor, or by a cosurety at the time of entering into the contract of suretyship, or acquired by him or her afterwards, whether the surety was aware of the security or not [*Civ. Code § 2849*].

Civ. Code §§ 2848 and *2849* are but reenactments of well-settled rules of equity on subrogation [*Title Guar. & Sur. Co. v. Duarte (1921) 54 Cal. App. 260, 265, 201 P. 790*]. *Civ. Code § 2848* is, however, merely declaratory of the common law and controlling only so far as it goes; it is neither comprehensive nor exclusive as to the rights of sureties to subrogation [*Estate of Elizalde (1920) 182 Cal. 427, 432, 188 P. 560* ; *Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 247, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91*]. Hence, the doctrine of subrogation applies, for example, to the creditor's rights against third persons when the surety's equities are superior to those of the third party wrongdoer [

Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 247, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91 ; *see § 536.42[9]*].

The right of subrogation provided for in *Civ. Code §§ 2848* and *2949* is to be distinguished from any right the surety may have for reimbursement from the debtor whose obligation was discharged by the payment [*see Civ. Code § 2847*]. A surety who pays the principal debt extinguishes the obligation and thus cannot sue the debtor as subrogee of the original debt [*Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 624, 637-638, 147 Cal. Rptr. 486, 581 P.2d 197*].

For further discussion of suretyship and forms of complaints for use by a surety to secure reimbursement from a principal and to compel contribution by cosureties, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[2] By Insurers

[a] Property Insurance

Although the principle on which the right of subrogation is founded applies to cases of suretyship, the doctrine of equitable subrogation is broad enough today to include every instance in which one person, not acting as a mere volunteer or intruder, pays a debt for which another is primarily liable, and which in equity and good conscience should have been discharged by the latter [*Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Murray Plumbing & Heating Corp. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 66, 72, 135 Cal. Rptr. 120*].

For example, another common situation, in part confirmed by statute, in which the right to subrogation arises is when an insurer pays a property loss sustained by its insured as a result of the wrongful act of a tortfeasor and the insurer is subrogated to the claim of the insured against the tortfeasor [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* (involving fire insurer); *see Ins. Code §§ 1996* (marine insurance), 2071 (fire and other casualty insurance)]. The right of the insurer against the third party wrongdoer does not arise out of or depend on any contractual relation or of privity between them, but emanates from the nature of the insurance contract as a contract of indemnity [*Automobile Ins. Co. v. Union Oil Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 302, 305* ; *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Murray Plumbing & Heating Corp. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 66, 72, 135 Cal. Rptr. 120*]. The right arises independent of any provision in the insurance contract giving the insurer the right to recover damages from the person responsible for the loss [*Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 118, 228 P. 11*].

The insurer's subrogated right in such case generally is its right to be put in the position of its insured against third parties legally responsible to its insured for the loss which the insurer has both insured against and paid [*Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 733, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* (subrogation of insurer to insured's claim against city for property damage from falling tree branches allegedly caused by city's negligence); *see Travelers Indem. Co. v. Ingebretsen (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 858, 864, 113 Cal. Rptr. 679* (insurer, after paying amount of loss on property insured, stands in place of its insured and is subrogated in like amount to insured's right of action against any other party responsible for that loss)]. Thus, the insurance carrier may recoup a loss inflicted on its policyholder by equitable subrogation to the policyholder's claim [*Transit Cas. Co. v. Spink Corp. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 124, 132, 156 Cal. Rptr. 360 , disapproved on other grounds, Commercial Union Assurance Cos. v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 912, 921, 164 Cal. Rptr. 709, 610 P.2d 1038*].

The doctrine of equitable subrogation applies after the insured has already been made whole by the insurer, and the insurer is proceeding against the individual responsible for the loss. Although some decisions indicate that the doctrine requires no contractual provision, there appears to be no instance in which a court has permitted intervention under this theory while the insured is actually pursuing a lawsuit against a person claimed to be responsible. When the insured is a party plaintiff in an action against a tortfeasor, and no contractual right of subrogation is in evidence or admitted by the

parties, the right of equitable subrogation has been held not to apply [*Continental Ins. Co. v. American Prot. Indus. (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 322, 327, 242 Cal. Rptr. 784* (summary judgment against insurer and in favor of alleged tortfeasor); *Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 725-726, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42*].

Some courts have held that language in an insurance policy that grants the insurance company "all rights of recovery to the extent of its payment" overrides the common law made-whole rule [*see, e.g., Barnes v. Independent Auto. Dealers Ass'n of Cal. Health & Welfare Benefit Plan (9th Cir. 1995) 64 F.3d 1389, 1393, 1396* ; *see also Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 274, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434*]. However, according to the growing trend of California authority, the contractual provision that intends to vitiate this rule must clearly and specifically give the insurer a priority out of proceeds from the tortfeasor regardless of whether the insured was first made whole [*see Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 274-275, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434* ; *Sapiano v. Williamsburg Nat'l Ins. Co. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 533, 538-539, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659*].

In the proper case, a property insurer may intervene in a lawsuit brought by the insured against tortfeasors, to bring a complaint in subrogation. A nonparty has a right to intervene in a pending action if the person seeking intervention claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action and if that person is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede that person's ability to protect that interest, unless that person's interest is adequately represented by existing parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 387(b)*; *Hodge v. Kirkpatrick Dev., Inc. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 540, 547, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 303* ; *see* Ch. 395, *Parties*]. In one case, for example, an insurer had a statutory right to intervene in a construction defect lawsuit brought bythe insureds against third-party tortfeasors, after the insurer obtained partial subrogation rights (by operation of law and pursuant to policy provisions) against the third parties by paying a portion of the insureds' claims for property damage to their house [*Hodge v. Kirkpatrick Dev., Inc. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 540, 550, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 303*].

If the insurance company does not interplead itself into the underlying action, the insurance company's rights to recover any payments received by its insured are limited. Under the made-whole rule, if an insurer does not participate in the insured's action against a tortfeasor, despite knowledge of that action, the insurer cannot recover any funds obtained through settlement of the action unless the full amount received exceeds the insured's actual loss. Furthermore, the insured need not account to the nonparticipating insurer for more than the surplus remaining in the insured's hands, after satisfying the loss in full and reasonable expenses incurred in the recovery. Therefore, if an insurer elects not to participate in the insured's action against a tortfeasor, the insurer is entitled to subrogation only after the insured has recouped the loss and some or all of the litigation expenses incurred in the action against the tortfeasor [*Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 273, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434*].

[b] Liability Insurance

Subrogation issues may arise among insurers covering the same risk. For example, if an insurer of one party indemnifies its insured under a liability policy, it may later bring an equitable subrogation action against an insurer of a co-defendant in the action to recover the second insurer's portion of the sums paid.

In one case, a contractor entered into an indemnity contract for the benefit of its subcontractor on a construction project. The contractor was named as an "additional insured" under the subcontractor's primary commercial general liability policy, which provided aggregate coverage of $2 million. The subcon-tractor was also the sole named insured on a commercial umbrella policy, which provided a general aggregate and "per occurrence" limit of $9 million. The umbrella policy also contained an "other insurance" clause specifying that it was an excess policy to other applicable insurance. The contractor was insured under a primary commercial general liability policy by a different insurer. After a worker was killed while on the job, the worker's family brought a wrongful death action against the contractor, the subcontractor, and others. The subcontractor's primary insurer assumed defense of the action on behalf of both those defendants. Following a verdict for the plaintiff apportioning fault (70%/20% against the subcontractor and contractor, respectively), the parties stipulated to a reduction in the damages award to $4.9 million. The subcontractor's primary

insurer paid $1 million in a 70/20 split. The subcontractor's excess insurer paid $3.9, also split 70/20. The contractor then filed a complaint against the subcontractor and both its insurers, seeking complete indemnity for the full amount of damages awarded, pursuant to the indemnity agreement with the subcontractor; and declaratory relief against the subcontractor's excess insurer regarding indemnity. The subcontractor's excess insurer then filed a cross-complaint for equitable subrogation and equitable indemnity against the contractor's primary insurer, alleging that any obligation it owed under its policy is subject to the terms and conditions of its policy, and that it was entitled under equitable principles of subrogation to reimbursement from the contractor's primary insurer of its settlement payment on behalf of the contractor; and also alleging equitable indemnification rights. With regard to the equitable subrogation claim, the appellate court noted that the contractor was covered by its primary insurer for the damages arising from the accident. Thus, the subcontractor's excess policy was excess to the contractor's primary coverage. Accordingly, having paid a portion of the settlement funds on behalf of the contractor's primary insurer, it was entitled to seek reimbursement from that insurer by way of its cross-complaint for equitable subrogation. The court also found that favoring the subcontractor's excess insurer does not entirely negate the indemnity clause of the subcontract because the contractor was insured by the subcontractor's primary as well as excess insurer. The court therefore held that the contractor's primary insurer is not entitled to indemnification by the subcontractor's excess insurer on the basis of the indemnification clause in the construction contract. Accordingly, the trial court properly awarded summary judgment in favor of the subcontractor's excess insurer on its claim for equitable subrogation against the contractor's primary insurer [*JPI Westcoast Constr., L.P. v. RJS & Assoc., Inc. (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1448, 1463-1466, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 91*].

In another case, the insured landlord owned a shopping center. The insured and one of its tenants were successor parties to two effectively identical leases originally executed by the organizers of the insured's company and a corporation related to the tenant company. The leases each contained provisions requiring the tenant to maintain liability insurance, and requiring the tenant to indemnify the owner regarding damage occurring on the premises arising out of the tenant's failure to perform lease requirements. They also contained a release and waiver of subrogation, providing [*see Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Sizzler USA Real Property, Inc. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 415, 417, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715*]:

> The parties release each other and their respective authorized representatives from any claims for damage to any person or property of either Landlord or Tenant ... about the Premises that are caused by or result from risks insured against under any insurance policies carried by the parties... .
>
> The parties further agree that neither party shall be liable to the other for any damage caused by fire or any of the risks insured against under any insurance policy and each party shall cause each insurance policy obtained by it to provide that the insurance company waives all right of recovery by way of subrogation against either party in connection with any covered damage.

In the underlying suit, the injured patron, who was accosted in the tenant club by assailants who later attacked him in the parking lot, brought suit against the landlord. The landlord sought indemnification and defense from the company that owned the tenant club, which directed the landlord to its insurance. That insurance, however, provided only $750,000 coverage, after a self-insured retention of $250,000, and did not name the landlord as an additional insured on that policy. The landlord turned the case over to its own liability insurer. That insurer tendered the defense to the insurer for the tenant's owner, which stated that it would defend the landlord under a reservation of rights, after its defense and settlement costs exceeded $250,000. The landlord's insurer proceeded to defend the landlord, and settled the underlying suit, expending $300,000 in settlement and $84,000 for defense costs. It then commenced the instant suit against the owner of the tenant club, to recover what it had paid, and attorney's fees under a lease provision. The appellate court upheld judgment for the defendant because the subrogation waiver provision was part of a mutual release of claims and damages that were covered by insurance [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Sizzler USA Real Property, Inc. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 415, 422, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 715*]. The court rejected the insurer's arguments that the defendant's failure to obtain the full amount of required insurance precludes enforcement of the waiver, and that enforcement of the waiver would defeat the parties' intent that defendant be responsible of the club's prior nuisance designation by the city and its consequences [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Sizzler USA Real Property, Inc. (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 415, 420-422, 86*

Cal. Rptr. 3d 715].

[c] Med-Pay Coverage

"Med-pay" is first-party, no-fault medical payment insurance coverage in an automobile policy in case of an accident [*see* 21st *Century Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 515, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972* ; *see* also *Ch. 88, Automobiles: Automobile Insurance, § 88.20*]. Med-pay insurers must seek recovery for personal injury claims through contractual reimbursement rights against their insureds, because they are not allowed to assert subrogation claims directly against third-party tortfeasors. This rule is based on the premise that personal injury claims are not assignable, and therefore a med-pay insurer generally has no right to sue the tortfeasor directly and has no standing to intervene. If insureds must reimburse their insurers once they recover from the tortfeasors, they are prevented from receiving double recovery and the financial responsibility for their loss is placed on the tortfeasor. Med-pay insurance contracts typically contain provisions that grant the insurer a right of reimbursement for certain payments that the third party who caused the insured's losses makes to the insured. These provisions are often interchangeably referred to as reimbursement or subrogation provisions, depending on the context [21st *Century Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 518, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972]* .

In California there is a technical difference between subrogation and reimbursement. While subrogation refers to the right of the insurance company to step into the shoes of the insured and assert the insured's rights against the third party, reimbursement refers to the right to receive payment back of what has been expended by the insurance company. In California, both the subrogation rights and reimbursement rights of the insurance company fall within the rubric of subrogation [21st *Century Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 518 n.3, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972]* .

[3] By Stranger Paying Mortgage at Debtor's Request

The doctrine of subrogation has been extended, by analogy, to one who, having no previous interest and being under no obligation, pays off a mortgage, or advances money for its payment, at the instance of a debtor party and for his or her benefit; such a person is in no true sense a mere stranger and volunteer and, hence, may be subrogated to the right of the mortgagee against the mortgator [*Grand v. De Otte (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 724, 729, 265 P.2d 952*].

[4] By Persons Authorized by Statute

Certain insurers are authorized by statute to subrogate to nonassignable claimsthat otherwise would not be subject to subrogation. These include liability insurers that have paid an uninsured motorist claim under the terms of their policies and workers' compensation insurance carriers (or self-insured employers) who have paid or become obligated to pay claims on behalf on injured employees [*see Ins. Code §§ 11580.2(g)* (uninsured motorist insurers), 11580.26 (same); and *Ins. Code § 11662* and *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864* (workers' compensation insurers)]. For further discussion of subrogation in the context of uninsured motorist insurers, see Ch. 88, *Automobiles: Automobile Insurance* , and Ch. 88A, *Automobiles: Uninsured Motorist Claims* .

Another common form of statutory subrogation is that of a public retirement system to recover a portion of payments made on account of injury to an employee-member by a third party tortfeasor [*see, e.g., Gov. Code §§ 21450-21456* (subrogation of Board of Administration of Public Employees' Retirement System to recover from tortfeasor portion of benefits payable for injury to or death of covered employee-member); *31820-31823* (similar provisions applicable to county employees' retirement associations)].

The State Bar has a statutory subrogation right under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6140.5(b)* (Client Security Fund), after paying a person for pecuniary losses caused by the dishonest conduct of an active member of the State Bar, to bring an action against that attorney [*State Bar of Cal. v. Statile (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 650, 669, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 72* ; *see §*

536.14[2]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageUninsured MotoristsSubrogation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.17

§ 536.17 Doctrine of Superior Equities

[1] As Limitation on Right to Subrogation

In some cases, a wrongdoer (primary obligor) is enabled to complete the wrong only by the act of some third person, for example, by a bank (third person) which pays the wrongdoer, a dishonest employee (primary obligor), the proceeds of a forged check drawn on the account of the employer (subrogor) who is insured and the surety or insurer (subrogee) is required to cover the loss by reason of its policy. Under the normal rules of subrogation, the surety or insurer would be subrogated to the right of the employer against the employee, but the employee has frequently absconded or is insolvent. The question arises whether the surety or insurer can be subrogated to any right the employer may have against the third party, e.g., the payee bank [*see Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Security Pac. Nat'l Bank (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 797, 805-832, 149 Cal. Rptr. 883* ; *Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 545, 550, 34 Cal. Rptr. 23*].

Since subrogation is a creation of equity, it is subject to the limitation that it will not be allowed when it will be inequitable to third persons [*Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*]. Or, as otherwise stated, subrogation will never be enforced when the equities are equal or the rights not clear [*Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 101, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Morse Signal Devices (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 681, 686, 198 Cal. Rptr. 756*]. Consequently, whether the surety or insurer can recover depends on whether the equity in favor of the surety or insurer is superior to the equity in favor of the third party. Put another way, the surety's or insurer's normal right of recovery through subrogation against a third person when a wrongdoer causes loss both to the surety or insurer by reason of its bond or insurance policy and to the third person is limited to situations in which the equity of the surety or insurer is superior to that of the third person [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*].

In any such action, the burden is on the surety to establish its superior equity, and for the purpose of weighing the equities, the negligence or other fault of the insured is imputed to the surety or insurer seeking subrogation [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *see § 536.107*].

[2] Examples of Application of Doctrine

Following the rule of superior equities, a cross complaint by a surety for subrogation in an action by a property owner against a building contractor and its surety arising out of the contractor's default on an agreement to construct a duplex in which the surety cross complained against a bank that had made a construction loan to the owner and had agreed to disburse the funds to the contractor on the basis of work completed was held sufficient where it was alleged that the loss was caused by the bank's negligence in disbursing an excessive amount of the loan proceeds to the contractor [*Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 246-247, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91*].

On the other hand, California decisions have denied the right of subrogation to sureties on employee bonds where the surety has sought to recover from drawee banks the proceeds of payments on checks forged by the bonded employee [*see Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *see also Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 102-103, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *American Alliance Ins. Co. v. Capital Nat'l Bank of Sacramento (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 787, 793, 171 P.2d 449*].

The rule has also been applied to deny recovery in other situations, for example: (1) to deny recovery by a surety on a fidelity bond seeking subrogated recovery against a purchaser of property stolen by the bonded employee from his employer; (2) to deny recovery to the fire insurer of a subcontractor which asserted a claim based on subrogation to its insured's right of action against the prime contractor for failure to procure its own fire insurance; (3) to deny recovery to the insurer of a title company which sought recovery in subrogation from the employers of an employee who had procured illegal releases of liens on property by the use of forged instruments; and (4) to deny recovery to the surety of an employer who sued the purchaser of cotton stolen by the employee from the employer insured by the surety [*see Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602-603, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*]. In a case thatinvolved the theft of some $3 million dollars worth of United States treasury bills, the rule was applied to deny the surety, which had paid the employer its loss, the right to subrogation against the brokerage firm (which had purchased some $500,000 of the bills and resold them) because the negligence of the employer--which was imputed to the surety--permitted, if it did not invite, the theft of the bills [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 604-605, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*].

In another case, the doctrine was applied to deny an insurance company which had paid fire and burglar losses to its insureds to recover the amounts paid from defendant fire and burglar alarm companies [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Morse Signal Devices (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 681, 687-688, 198 Cal. Rptr. 756*]. Each of the defendants had contracted with plaintiff's insureds to maintain burglar or fire alarm systems; the systems failed to function, either because of mechanical failure or because of the failure of defendants' personnel to notify police or fire departments on receiving signals from otherwise properly functioning systems. The court denied subrogation on the grounds that (1) plaintiff paid what it contracted to pay under its insurance policies; (2) while the defendants may have been negligent in the performance of their contractual duties to plaintiff's insureds, their breach of duty did not create the harm; (3) the primary cause of each insured's loss was the creator of the fire or the burglar and that defendants' negligence was secondary to creation of the perils; (4) the insureds were in the best position to place a value on the contents of their premises (and hence to secure insurance in a proper amount); and (5) the insurance company, which charges its premiums based on the extent of insurance coverage, was in the best position to spread the risks assumed. That is, the court held that the insurer did not have a superior equity permitting it to recover from defendants [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Morse Signal Devices (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 681, 687-688, 198 Cal. Rptr. 756*].

The court of appeal has held that the nature of the underlying cause of action is a relevant factor in balancing the respective equities of the parties [*State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1109 n.8, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785]* . In that case, the tenant of an apartment building caused a fire by careless disposal of hot ashes into a plastic trash can, which was the only waste container provided to him. A bank was the executor of the estate that owned the apartment complex, the executor contracted with a property management company, and the management company contracted with a waste management company to service the complex. The insurer that paid out

$2 million in claims arising from damage to adjacent condominiums sought subrogation from the estate, the executor, the property management company, and the waste management company. The trial court granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment. The court of appeal reversed, holding that the defendants were not entitled to judgment as a matter of law, based on the doctrine of superior equities. The court noted that the gravamen of the insurer's subrogation claim was that the defendants negligently permitted a fire to occur and to spread to its insureds' property; and that it would be inequitable to bar the insurer from pursuing its claim solely because the defendants did not place the ignition source in the trash can. The court held that the contest was between an innocent insurance company (which admittedly received premiums for the very loss that occurred) and alleged tortfeasors (who did not physically start the fire, but whose negligence allegedly permitted the fire to be started and to spread by failing to provide for the safe disposal of fireplace ashes) [*State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1117-1119, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785* (remanding case for determination of merits of negligence claim)].

Although the court of appeal questioned the continued vitality of the superior-equities rule, it held that the law in California is that the doctrine of superior equities applies in all cases of subrogation, and therefore the trial court properly applied the doctrine and required the subrogating insurer to establish its superior equity in seeking recovery against the defendants. However, in comparing the relative positions of the parties, a court is required to determine who ultimately ought to bear the loss; and there is no facile formula for determining superiority of equities. If third parties are involved to various degrees of responsibility, courts balance the equities by looking for the party who, in good conscience, ultimately ought to bear the loss. If a third party dealing with a direct wrongdoer is in a better position to avoid the loss, the insurer is said to have superior equities [*State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1110-1114, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785]* . In this case, there was no contractual relationship between the insureds and the defendants. Instead, the insurer's subrogation claim was premised on a tort claim--that the defendants' negligence permitted a fire to occur and spread. The court of appeal held that if the third party is an indirect cause of the loss, because it contributed to or permitted the loss, the court must differentiate between primary and secondary causes of loss to determine whether the third party was in a better position to avoid the loss. The mere fact that the defendants did not start the fire does not automatically mean that they have a superior equitable position over the insurer. A significant factor in weighing the equities is whether a defendant's negligent acts were related to or contributed to the primary cause of loss. The court of appeal concluded that the issue in this case was whether the defendants were in a better position to avoid the loss than the insurer or its insureds. Although arguably an insurer should in fairness bear the loss if the third party's liability is solely contractual, such a result is unfair if the loss has been caused by the third party's tortious conduct [*State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1117-1118, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785* (remanding case for determination of merits of negligence claim)].

[3] Circumstances Establishing Superior Equity

The language of the California cases has not been entirely consistent in defining the circumstances in which a surety has a superior equity which permits recovery [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 603, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*]. To illustrate, the court in *Continental* discussed the following three cases: *Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 98-102, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 129 Cal. Rptr. 91* ; and *Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 545, 34 Cal. Rptr. 23* . In the first of these cases (*Meyers*), the California Supreme Court held that the surety's equity does not become superior to that of the person (a bank that paid checks forged by an employee of the surety's insured) against whom subrogation is asserted merely because that person is guilty of ordinary negligence, but that the person against whom subrogation is sought must have participated in the wrongful act of the primary wrongdoer, be guilty of "culpable negligence," or have notice of the wrongdoing prior to payment. In the second case (*Commercial Standard*), an allegation that a bank had been negligent in disbursing loan proceeds contrary to its obligation to inspect was held by the court of appeal to be sufficient to withstand a general demurrer where the bank was sued by a surety as subrogee of a property owner's rights against a defaulting contractor whose obligation was insured by the surety. In the third case (*Hartford*), the court of appeal, dealing with a nonsuit, held that the superior equities rule did not, as a matter of law, bar subrogated recovery by a surety which had issued a fidelity bond covering

an employee who forged his employer's check where the bank paying the check negligently departed from banking custom and its own rules in not confirming the check's validity.

The apparent discrepancy in the language of the cases is nevertheless explainable and the rule may be stated as follows: fault of the third person which creates the superior equity in the surety suing in subrogation must be related to the "primary cause" of the loss. It is only when the person dealing with the wrongdoer is in a better position than the insured or the surety to avoid the loss that the surety has the superior equity permitting it to recover as subrogee [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 603-604, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*].

Thus, in the case of the check forged by a bonded employee (*Meyers*), the primary cause of the loss was the conduct of the dishonest employee. The action of the bank in paying the check was secondary. Absent some negligent conduct of a character which promotes or encourages the employee's fraud, the bank was not in a better position to avoid the loss than was the insured's employer. In the case of the bank negligently disbursing proceeds of a construction loan (*Commercial Standard*), the action of the bank was related to the primary cause of the loss because the bank undertook a contractual duty to inspect before disbursement, placing itself in a superior position to avoid loss from a false claim to a sum disbursed. In the case of a bank grossly departing from its own and generally accepted practices (*Hartford*), the trier of fact could find that the departure was the primary cause and that the bank failed to avoid the loss where it was in the best position to do so [*Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 604, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.18

§ 536.18 Subrogation Actions Against Public Entities

[1] Claims Requirement

Compliance with the claims statutes (*Gov. Code §§ 900-935.6*) is normally mandatory before suit may be filed against a public entity, and except in the case of a defective but substantial compliance with the filing requirement, failure to file a claim is fatal to the cause of action [*Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 188, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29*].

Moreover, in a tort action against an insured, a subrogee-insurer's right of action is not independent and separate, but is equal to and limited by the insured's right of action, because the subrogee simply stands in the stead of the original claimant. Therefore, if the insured has filed a cross complaint against a public entity, having already satisfied the requirements of the claims statutes, and a subrogee-insurer that paid the injured party was substituted as intervenor in the insured's cause of action, the subrogee assumes the rights of insured and need not file a separate claim against the public entity [*Smith v. Parks Manor (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 872, 881, 243 Cal. Rptr. 256*]. Likewise, in the case of an injured employee suing an alleged third-party tortfeasor, the employee's compliance with the written claim requirements of the Tort Claims Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 911.2, 945.4*] satisfies the employer's compensation carrier's claim filing requirement for the purpose of intervening in the employee's action because the public entity is made aware of the employee's claim by its filing and the carrier's claim is entirely included within the employee's claim [*San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 846-852, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163*].

For a discussion of the procedure for filing a claim, a procedural checklist, and forms for use in filing or amending a claim, applying for leave to present a late claim, and seeking judicial relief from a failure to have filed a claim, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

In addition, any suit brought against a public entity on a cause of action for which a claim is required to be presented must be commenced within the time limits specified in *Gov. Code § 945.6*. For a discussion of the procedure, a procedural checklist, and forms of pleadings, including allegations of the presentation and rejection of the claim, for use in such actions, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

These rules apply to subrogation actions against public entities founded on a tort liability [*see Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 733-735, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 193-194, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29*]. In this connection, it should be noted that the filing of a claim with a public entity by an employer to recover workers' compensation benefits paid on account of the death of its employee [*see Lab. Code § 3852*] does not relieve the widow of the deceased employee from the necessity of filing a claim on her own behalf when she seeks damages from the public entity for wrongful death [*Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 188-192, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29* ; *cf. Smith v. Parks Manor (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 872, 880-881, 243 Cal. Rptr. 256* (rights of subrogee of cross complainant not controlled by *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co.* because not based on separate and distinct injury)].

[2] Time in Which Claim Must Be Filed

A claim relating to a cause of action for death or injury to person must be presented not later than six months after the accrual of the cause of action [*Gov. Code § 911.2*]. For the purpose of computing the six-month time limit, the date of accrual is the date on which the cause of action would be deemed to have accrued within the meaning of the statute of limitations that would be applicable in the absence of the claim-filing requirement [*Gov. Code § 901*]. The statute of limitations normally applicable to the underlying action may be altered, however, by another statute specifying a different period of limitations for a particular subrogation action. For example, although the limitations period normally applicable to an action for personal injury or wrongful death is two years (one year, prior to January 1, 2003) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *see* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*; Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*, § 345.14], *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)* provides that the insurer paying a claim under an uninsured motorist endorsement or coverage is entitled to be subrogated to the rights of the insured to whom the claim was paid against any person legally liable for such injury or death to the extent that payment was made and that such action may be brought within three years from the date that payment was made. Under this statute, the subrogee's cause of action does not accrue until insurance benefits are paid. Hence, the claim of an insurer, as subrogee, against a county was held to have been timely filed under *Gov. Code § 911.2* because it was presented within 100 days after the insurer had paid the insured under the uninsured motorist coverage, even though the injury giving rise to the claim occurred more than 100 days prior to the date the claim was filed and the insured had filed no claim [*Allstate Ins. Co. v. County of Alameda (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423* ; *see People ex rel. Dep't of Transp. v. Superior Court (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 744, 754-755, 163 Cal. Rptr. 585, 608 P.2d 673*].

[3] Equitable Indemnity Actions Distinguished

Actions against public entities based on equitable subrogation are to be distinguished from actions against public entities by tortfeasors seeking equitable indemnity. An action by a tortfeasor for equitable indemnity against a public entity (or any other joint tortfeasor) to recover all or a portion of the amount of any judgment rendered against the tortfeasor in an action by the injured party is separate and distinct from the injured party's action against the tortfeasor. Normally, the time for filing a claim against a public entity does not commence to run until the time the action accrues for statute of limitations purposes [*Gov. Code § 901*]. But an action for equitable or partial equitable indemnity against a public entity accrues on the date on which a defendant is served with the complaint giving rise to the defendant's claim for equitable or partial equitable indemnity against the public entity [*Gov. Code § 901* (in effect repudiating in part the holding of *People ex rel. Dep't of Transp. v. Superior Court (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 744, 747-748, 750-760, 762-763, 163 Cal. Rptr. 585, 608 P.2d 673*); *Smith v. Parks Manor (1987) 197 Cal. App. 3d 872, 880-881, 243 Cal. Rptr. 256*]. For further discussion of equitable indemnity and forms for use in enforcing the right, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral

OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityClaim PresentationTime LimitationsTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsRemedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.19

§ 536.19 Partial Subrogation

[1] Terminology

There may be situations in which the third party (subrogee) pays the creditor (subrogor) only a portion of the principal debtor's or tortfeasor's (obligor's) obligation. In such event the third party is a partial subrogee and the creditor is a partial subrogor [*see Bank of Orient v. Superior Court (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 588, 594, 136 Cal. Rptr. 741*].

[2] Enforcement of Partial Claims

Both the partial subrogee and the partial subrogor have a claim against the obligor and each may sue the obligor [*see Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 43, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*]. That is, each has a *right* of action against the obligor [*see Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 41, 47, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 953, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*].

[3] Splitting Cause of Action

[a] Rule Against

Although both the partial subrogee and the partial subrogor have a right of action against the obligor, there is only one cause of action. Hence, they may not (except to the extent that the rule has been modified by a specific statute), over the objection of the obligor, each sue the obligor in a separate action and recover judgment, thereby subjecting the obligor to two actions instead of one; this would constitute an impermissible splitting of the cause of action, which is condemned as subjecting a defendant to vexatious litigation and as a waste of judicial resources [*Wulfjen v. Dolton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 891, 894-895, 151 P.2d 846*]. This rule applies to subrogated insurers, since the insured and the subrogated insurer are "privies" and the same parties under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1910*, relating to parties concluded by a judgment [*Travelers Indem. Co. v. Ingebretsen (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 858, 867-868, 113 Cal. Rptr. 679*].

[b] Raising or Waiving Objection

The splitting of a cause of action is not a jurisdictional defect but rather an affirmative defense that must be pleaded by the defendant or is waived [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 43-44, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*]. The same is true of the alternative objection that the partial subrogee or partial subrogor has failed to join the other as a party in his or her action against the obligor; the failure is not a jurisdictional defect in the fundamental sense, since it does not deprive the trial court of subject matter jurisdiction [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 44-45, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*]. The omitted party is not an indispensable party but only what would have been classified as a conditionally necessary party under *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* prior to its 1971 amendment [*Peerless Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 358, 362, 85 Cal. Rptr. 679*]. Hence, the objection of nonjoinder is waived if not timely and properly made (usually by demurrer or answer) [*Peerless Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 358, 361, 85 Cal. Rptr. 679*]. A fortiori, the objection may not be raised for the first time on appeal from the judgment [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 44-45, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*].

[c] How to Raise Objection That Action Has Been Split

The defense that the action has been split may be raised by demurrer if the objection appears from the face of the complaint or from matter of which the court must or may take judicial notice, or by answer if the objection does not appear from the face of the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10, 430.30, 431.30(b)(2)*]. The ground of objection is that (1) there is a defect (i.e., nonjoinder) of parties plaintiff [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(d)*], or (2) there is another action pending between the same parties on the same cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(c)*], or (3) the complaint does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(e)*] since the action is barred by the doctrine of res judicata.

Thus, if the partial subrogee and the partial subrogor each sues the obligor in a separate action, the obligor may plead in either action, or in both actions, that there is a defect of parties plaintiff or move to compel joinder of the omitted party [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 389, 430.10(d)*]. Alternatively, the obligor, in the second action, may plead the pendency of the first action in abatement, based on another action pending. If judgment has previously been rendered on the merits in the first action, the obligor in the second action may plead the judgment in the first action in bar, based on res judicata [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 41, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *Phillips v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 444, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451*].

For further discussion and forms of affirmative defenses and demurrers on the above grounds, see Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions* ; Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* ; and Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* . For discussion and forms for use in moving to secure a separate trial of the affirmative defense, see *Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions, § 3.110* et seq.. For discussion, procedural guides, and forms for use in moving to compel joinder of an omitted party or to intervene in an action, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

[d] How to Avoid Defense That Action Has Been Split

To avoid the defense that the cause of action has been split (as well as the issue of nonjoinder of a party), both the partial subrogee and partial subrogor should, each to enforce his or her own claim, join together as plaintiffs in a lawsuit against the debtor or tortfeasor. If either the partial subrogee or partial subrogor is unwilling to be joined as a plaintiff in an action by the other, the other may sue the obligor and name the unwilling plaintiff as a defendant in that action, as authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 382* [*see Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 118-119, 228 P. 11* ; *Phillips*

v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 443, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451]. If this is done, a cross complaint by the unwilling plaintiff as defendant on his or her partial claim against the codefendant (the principal debtor or tortfeasor), does not constitute, but rather prevents, an impermissible splitting of a cause of action [*Phillips v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 445, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451* ; *see Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 42-43, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* (explaining court's holding in *Phillips*)].

[e] Prohibition Against Double Liability of Obligor

An adjunct of subrogation is the rule prohibiting double liability or double recovery of damages, a rule of special importance in the prosecutionof subrogation claims because the proration of damages among those who have shared the costs of personal injuries, for example, increases the possibility of duplicate claims for the same loss. Only one totality of recovery of damages for personal injuries is allowed, and only one totality of liability can be imposed on the tortfeasor. Duplicate recovery of damages is barred, and neither double recovery of the same item of loss nor double liability for the same item of injury is permitted [*Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 952, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*].

The nature of subrogation and its prohibition against double recovery make clear that subrogation involves succession to the rights of others. Rights under subrogation are derivative rights, and succession to another's rights, like water, cannot rise higher than its source [*Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 952, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*]. Thus, regardless of substitution of parties and subrogation of claimants who have borne portions of the costs of, for example, personal injuries, all claims of third parties for damages for personal injuries to an injured person--including the employer which reimburses for lost earnings, the medical service group which provides medical care, the compensation insurance carrier which reimburses for loss of future earnings, the medical insurer which underwrites future medical care, and the pension fund or retirement association which pays benefits for loss of ability to work--derive from the injured person's claims against the tortfeasor for damages for personal injuries. In their own right these claimants possess no claims of their own against the tortfeasor, for the tortfeasor has committed no wrong against them. It is only because they have carried part of the costs of the injured person's losses that they acquire claims against the tortfeasor as subrogees to the injured person's claims for damages for personal injuries [*Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 952, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*].

Thus, the obligor cannot be compelled to pay the entire amount of the partial subrogee's claim plus the full amount of the subrogor's claim without credit for the amount of the claim paid to the partial subrogee. Payment made to the partial subrogor by the partial subrogee is not payment from a "collateral source," within the meaning of that term, and to allow the partial subrogor to collect from the obligor the full amount of the claim without an offset for the amount the obligor must pay the partial subrogee would subject the obligor to double liability on the same claim [*Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 46, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 951, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695* ; *see Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* . For example, if the total amount of an insured's loss from a fire is $100,000, the liability of the torfeasor who caused the fire is $100,000. If the insurer pays the insured the policy limit of $50,000, the tortfeasor is still liable for the full amount of $100,000. $50,000 of this amount would go to reimburse the partial subrogee and the balance would go to the partial subrogor. That is, the tortfeasor would not be liable for the amount of $150,000 ($50,000 to the partial subrogee and $100,000 to the partial subrogor).

This is also true where the obligor has paid the partial subrogor the full amount of its liability. Thus, in the example above, if the tortfeasor-obligor had paid the partial subrogor the full amount of $100,000, the partial subrogee could not

recover its payment of $50,000 from the obligor. The partial subrogee may not, at least where the obligor had no notice of the subrogee's claim, recover the amount of its claim from the obligor, since this would constitute double recovery [*see Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 916, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834*].

Moreover, a workers' compensation carrier (a partial subrogee) which has paid benefits to an injured employee may assign its lien on any recovery that might be obtained by the injured employee in an action against a third party tortfeasor to the third party tortfeasor and his or her liability carrier, who may then set off the face amount of the lien against any recovery by the injured employee, even though the lien was assigned for less than its face value [*Quinn v. Warnes (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 309, 317, 192 Cal. Rptr. 660*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureParties JoinderCompulsory JoinderCivil ProcedureParties JoinderNecessary PartiesCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.20

§ 536.20 Statutes of Limitations

A few statutes relating to subrogation by particular parties expressly provide a longer period of limitations on the subrogated action than that normally applicable to the subrogor's cause of action. For example, *Gov. Code § 21455*, relating to a subrogation action by the Board of Administration on behalf of California's Public Employees' Retirement System against a tortfeasor for injury to or death of a member-employee to recover the authorized portion of benefits paid, requires that the subrogated action be commenced within three years after the liability of the system to pay benefits is fixed. (For the respective obligations of the system, an injured member-employee, and an alleged third party tortfeasor within the context of a personal injury settlement between the tortfeasor and the member-employee and a reimbursement claim by the system against the tortfeasor for disability retirement benefits paid to the member-employee, see *Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 909-919, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* .) A similar provision applies to subrogation actions by county retirement associations to recover the authorized portion of benefits paid for injury to or death of an employee [*Gov. Code § 31823*]. Another example is *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)*, relating to a subrogation action by an insurerto recover the amount it paid in settlement of a claim under the uninsured motorist endorsement in a motor vehicle policy, which requires that the subrogated action be brought within three years from the date payment was made [*see Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Fales (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 712, 716, 106 Cal. Rptr. 21, 505 P.2d 213* ; *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 735-736, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*]. The purpose of these extended periods of limitation is to protect the subrogation rights of the subrogee when the statute of limitations on the subrogor's cause of action might expire before the subrogee's cause of action arises; but in any such action the subrogee may not rely on the statute of limitations applicable to the subrogor's action to cut off the obligor's right to seek affirmative relief by a cross claim [*Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Fales (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 712, 716-717, 106 Cal. Rptr. 21* (construction of *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)*)].

Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, a subrogation action is subject to the same statute of limitations that applies to the subrogor's action against the obligor and commences to run at the same time [*see, e.g., Employers Ins. of Wausau v. Granite State Ins. Co. (9th Cir. 2003) 330 F.3d 1214, 1218* (insurer entitled to same limitations period as insured bringing suit on own behalf; applying four-year limitations period); *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 734, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Automobile Ins. Co. v. Union Oil Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 302, 304-305, 193 P.2d 48*]. For example, if the subrogor's action arises out of injury to real property or to goods or chattels, the action is, unless

otherwise expressly provided by statute, governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)* or *(c)* and, under this statute, must be commenced against the tortfeasor within three years [*Automobile Ins. Co. v. Union Oil Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 302, 306-307, 193 P.2d 48*]. By the same token, if the subrogor's action arises from a personal injury as the result of a wrongful act, the action is, unless otherwise expressly provided by statute, governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1* and, under that statute, must be commenced against the tortfeasor within two years (one year, prior to January 1, 2003) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 869, 871-886, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 947-955, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695* ; *see also* former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*; Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*, § 345.14].

Thus, in a subrogation action under *Lab. Code § 3852* by an employer against a tortfeasor to recover a sum equivalent to the benefits that the employer was required to provide the employee under the Workers' Compensation Law, the Supreme Court pointed out that since 1953 California courts have consistently held that former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*), the statute of limitations that governs actions for injury caused by the wrongful act or neglect of another, governs an employer's action against a third party, just as it would govern an employee's suit against the third party, and that, under these decisions, an employer has one year from the date of the employee's injury in which to bring an action against the third party [*County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 868-869, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *see Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 911-912, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Jordan v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 202, 206, 172 Cal. Rptr. 30*].

For the statute of limitations applicable to an action by an employer for indemnity against a third party tortfeasor to recover money paid for personal injuries to its employee under the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C. §§ 51-60*), which, unlike California's Workers' Compensation Act, has no provisions subrogating the employer to the employee's rights against a third party, see *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 236-238, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63* . For discussion of the Federal Employers' Liability Act, see Ch. 522, *Ships and Shipping* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageUninsured MotoristsSubrogationPensions & Benefits LawGovernmental EmployeesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.21

§ 536.21 Defenses Generally

Except as noted under § 536.20, a subrogee is subject to any defenses the obligor has against the subrogor [*Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 930-931, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 733, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814* ; *Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893*]. In addition, the obligor may raise any defenses he or she has against the subrogee--for example, that the subrogee's payment was voluntary [*see § 536.120*], that the subrogee's action is barred by the statute of limitations [*see § 536.122*], or that the obligor has a money claim against the plaintiff that may be set off against the plaintiff's claim against the obligor [*see § 536.123*]. An insured sued by its own insurer in a subrogation action may raise the affirmative defense that an insurer is barred from suing a third party that it has also insured under a separate policy [*National Union Fire Ins. v. Engineering-Sci. (9th Cir. 1989) 884 F.2d 1208, 1210* ; *see* § 536.124].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.22

§ 536.22 Effect of Release on Subrogation Rights

The general rule is that execution of a valid release extinguishes any subrogation rights against the released party. For example, in the insurance context, when an insured has released a third party, neither the insured nor the subrogated insurer thereafter has any right to recover from the third party [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Cas. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1597, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762*]. This rule derives from the principle that since the subrogated insurer stands in the shoes of its insured, it has no greater rights against the third party than the insuredhad [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Cas. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1597, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* ; *Continental Mfg. Corp. v. Underwriters at Lloyds London (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 545, 556, 8 Cal. Rptr. 276*].

It appears that there is a significant exception to this rule, however. When a tortfeasor obtains a release from the insured with knowledge that the insured already has been indemnified by the insurer, the courts have stated that the release does not bar the insurer's subrogation right [*Conservatorship of Edwards (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1184, 244 Cal. Rptr. 330* ; *see also Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 916, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 952, 957, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*]. However, while courts readily recognize the existence of this exception, it has been applied infrequently, if at all, in the reported cases [*see California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 35, § 35.11[5][b]* (Matthew Bender)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureSettlementsReleasesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.23

§ 536.23 Doctrine of Comparative Negligence

The doctrine of comparative negligence applies to the action of a subrogee against the obligor [*Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 930, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *see § 536.121*]. For example, if a fire caused $100,000 worth of damage to insured property, the insurer, on paying the insured $100,000, would be subrogated to the rights of the insured against the person whose negligence caused the fire [*see Ins. Code § 2071*]. If, in that action, the trier of fact concluded that the defendant was only 60 percent at fault and the insured was 40 percent at fault, the $100,000 recovery would be reduced 40 percent--that is, the insurer would recover judgment for only $60,000 on its subrogated claim.

As another example, if an employee were injured by a third-party tortfeasor and the employer's compensation insurer paid benefits as a result of the injury, either the employee or the employer (or the employer's insurer) could sue the third-party tortfeasor, or they could join in an action against the tortfeasor, or one could intervene in the other's action against the tortfeasor, or, if the employee alone sued, the employer's insurer could secure a lien on any judgment recovered [*see Lab. Code §§ 3852-3856*; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872-873, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363*]. Suppose that, in an action by the employee and the employer's insurer, the jury awards the injured plaintiff-employee total damages in the sum of $550,000 and it finds the tortfeasor was 22 percent negligent, the employee 78 percent negligent, and the employer zero percent negligent. Suppose further that the employer's insurer paid benefits in the sum of $52,423. In this case, the total damages awarded would be reduced by the amount of $429,000 (78 percent attributable to the employee), leaving a difference of $121,000 as the total amount to be paid by defendant tortfeasor. Of this amount, the employer's insurer would recover $52,423, which, subtracted from $121,000, leaves $68,577, which would be the employee's net recovery [*see Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 259, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceGeneral Overview

84 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART II LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.24-536.39

[Reserved]

§§ 536.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.40

§ 536.40 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For a memorandum of points and authorities supporting the contention that an omitted partial assignee or subrogee should be joined as a party to the action, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 168, *Parties*

For additional discussion of subrogation in the insurance context, see *California Insurance Law & Practice, § 35.11*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesJoinderCompulsory JoinderCivil ProcedurePartiesJoinderNecessary PartiesInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.41

§ 536.41 State and Federal Statutes

[1] Banks

Formation of national banking associations. *12 U.S.C.S. §§ 21-40*

Person is not liable on instrument unless his or her signature appears thereon. *Com. Code § 3401(a)*

Unauthorized signature on instrument is inoperative and exceptions. *Com. Code § 3404*

Payment of instrument on forged endorsement is conversion. *Com. Code § 3419(1)(c)*

When bank may charge customer's account. *Com. Code § 4401*

When customer is precluded from asserting against bank that his or her signature on item was unauthorized or that item was altered. *Com. Code § 4406*

Subrogation of payor bank on improper payment of item over stop payment order. *Com. Code § 4407*

Formation of banking corporation. *Fin. Code §§ 350-407*

[2] California Insurance Guarantee Association

Subrogation of California Insurance Guarantee Association with respect to payment or discharge of covered claims. *Ins. Code § 1063.2*

[3] Classes of Insurance

Classes of insurance. *Ins. Code §§ 100-123*

Fire insurance. *Ins. Code §§ 100(2), 102*

Surety insurance. *Ins. Code §§ 100(5), 105*

Liability insurance. *Ins. Code §§ 100(8), 108, 108.1, 122*

Miscellaneous insurance. *Ins. Code §§ 100(20), 120*

[4] County Retirement Association

Subrogation of county retirement association to recover from tortfeasors portion of benefits payable for injury or death of covered member. *Gov. Code §§ 31820-31823*

[5] Damages

Interest on damages. *Civ. Code §§ 3287, 3288*

Measure of damages for breach of contract. *Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302*

Measure of damages for liability not arising from contract. *Civ. Code § 3333*

Prohibition against stating amount of damages in superior court action for personal injuries or wrongful death. *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*

[6] Defenses

Answer must contain statement of any new matter constituting defense. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*

Defenses must be separately stated and refer to causes of action that they are intended to answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*

[7] Definitions

"Insurance" defined. *Ins. Code § 22*

"Insurer" and "insured" defined. *Ins. Code § 23*

[8] Director of Corporation

Subrogation of director of corporation liable to corporation under *Corp. Code § 316*, relating to illegal distributions to shareholders, loans, or guaranties, to rights of corporation against shareholders who received distribution or person who received illegal loan or guaranty. *Corp. Code § 316(f)*

[9] Indemnity

Indemnity. *Civ. Code §§ 2772-2784.5*

[10] Insurers

Subrogation of marine insurer to insured's right of contribution. *Ins. Code § 1996*

Subrogation of fire insurer to insured's right of recovery against person who caused loss. *Ins. Code § 2071*

Subrogation of insurer to right of insured against uninsured motorist to extent of insurer's payment of claim under uninsured motorist coverage; action is required to be commenced within three years from date payment is made. *Ins. Code §§ 11580.2(g)*; *see also Ins. Code § 11580.26*

[11] Person Liable to Secured Party

Secondary obligor acquires rights of, and becomes obligated to perform duties of, secured party after secondary obligor becomes subrogated to rights of secured party with respect to collateral. *Com. Code § 9618(a)(3)*

[12] Public Employees' Retirement System

Subrogation of Board of Administration of state's Public Employees' Retirement System to recover from tortfeasor portion of benefits payable for injury or death of covered member. *Gov. Code §§ 21450-21456*

[13] Real Estate Commissioner

Subrogation of Real Estate Commissioner to rights of judgment creditor for payments made from Real Estate Fund for education, research, and recovery. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10479*

[14] Redeemer of Property

Duty of owner of life estate to pay taxes and other annual charges. *Civ. Code § 840*

Person who redeems property in which he or she has interest from lien is subrogated to all benefits of lien as against all owners of other interests in property, except insofar as he or she was bound to make such redemption for their benefit. *Civ. Code § 2903*

Junior lienor has right to redeem property in same manner that owner might from superior lien and to be subrogated to benefits of superior lien when necessary for protection of his or her interests, on satisfying claim so secured. *Civ. Code § 2904*

Manner of redeeming from lien. *Civ. Code § 2905*

[15] Remedies

Right to recover money by judicial proceeding arising out of violation of right of property or an obligation is assignable by owner. *Civ. Code §§ 953, 954*

[16] Source of Collateral Benefits

Source of collateral benefits which have been introduced by defendant on issue of damages in personal injury action against health care provider pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3333.1(a)* is not subrogated to rights of plaintiff against defendant. *Civ. Code § 3333.1(b)*

[17] Standard Forms

Standard form fire insurance policy. *Ins. Code § 2071*

[18] State Bar

State Bar subrogated to rights of person compensated from Client Security Fund for dishonest conduct of State Bar member. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6140.5(b)*

[19] State Compensation Insurance Fund

Subrogation of State Compensation Insurance Fund to rights of state agencies. *Ins. Code § 11871*

[20] State of California

Subrogation of State of California to rights of victims of crime to whom cash payments are granted under law governing aid to victims (*Gov. Code §§ 13970-13974*), to extent of payments granted. *Gov. Code § 13966.01*

[21] State Teachers' Retirement System

Subrogation of State Teachers' Retirement System to recover from tortfeasor for amounts paid as disability or family allowance for injury or death of covered member. *Educ. Code §§ 24500-24505*

[22] Statutes of Limitations

Pleading bar of statute of limitations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 458*

Court permitted on motion of party or its own motion to order separate trial of defense that action is barred by statute of limitations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 597*

[23] Surety

Suretyship. *Civ. Code §§ 2787-2855*

Construction of surety contracts. *Civ. Code § 2837*

Surety entitled to require creditor, subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440* (motions to enforce liability on bond given in action or proceeding), to proceed against principal or to pursue any other remedy in creditor's power that surety cannot pursue and that would lighten surety's burden. *Civ. Code § 2845*

Liability of principal to reimburse surety that satisfies principal obligation. *Civ. Code § 2847*

Subrogation of surety to creditor's right against principal to extent of payment made on principal's obligation and surety's right to contribution from co-sureties. *Civ. Code §§ 2848*

Surety's right to benefit of security for principal's performance held by creditor or by co-surety. *Civ. Code § 2849*

[24] Vehicle Owner

Subrogation of owner of vehicle, owner's bailee, or decedent's personal representative to rights of person injured or whose property has been injured against negligent operator to extent of judgment recovered against owner, bailee, or personal representative. *Veh. Code § 17153*

Both bailee of vehicle and operator as deemed operators within meaning of *Veh. Code § 17153* when bailee permitted operator to operate owner's motor vehicle. *Veh. Code § 17154*

[25] Vessel Owner

Subrogation of vessel owner to rights of person injured or whose property has been injured against vessel operator to extent of judgment and costs recovered against owner. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 661(d)*

[26] Waiver or Release

Extinction of obligations by release. *Civ. Code § 1541*

Scope of release and effect on unknown claims. Code Cov. Proc. § 1542

[27] Workers' Compensation Insurer

Subrogation of workers' compensation insurer to rights of employer to recover losses paid. *Ins. Code § 11662*

Subrogation of employer or employer's insurer against tortfeasor for payments made under Workers' Compensation Law. *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.42

§ 536.42 Decisions

[1] Application of Equitable Principles

Equitable subrogation enables one who pays, otherwise than as volunteer, an obligation for which another is primarily liable, to be given by equity the protection of any lien or other security for payment of debt to creditor, and to enforce security against principal debtor or collect obligation from debtor. *In re Deuel (9th Cir. 2010) 594 F.3d 1073, 1079*

In application of maxim of jurisprudence that he or she who seeks equity must do equity, court does not create substantive rights under guise of doing equity; that is, court does not confer rights if one who invokes maxim has none. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 82-83, 230 P.2d 816* (denying subrogation to junior lienholder who without obligation to do so paid senior lienholder pursuant to fraudulent scheme to deprive owners of their property)

Right to subrogation is governed by equitable principles. *Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 96-97, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Auto Spring Supply Co. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 860, 865, 131 Cal. Rptr. 211*

While *Civ. Code § 2848* provides that surety, on satisfying obligation of his or her principal, is entitled to be subrogated to that extent to all remedies which creditor has against principal, question whether obligation which is satisfied is in fact obligation of the particular principal is to be decided in accordance with rules of law and principles of equity. *Painter v. Berglund (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 63, 67, 87 P.2d 360*

[2] Assignment, Subrogation, and Reimbursement Compared

Assignment and subrogation distinguished. *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 638-640, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073*

Cause of action for personal injuries is nonassignable and, in absence of statutory authority, is not subject to subrogation. *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 639, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* ; *Lee v. State*

Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 458, 465, 129 Cal. Rptr. 271 ; *Peller v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 610, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 41*

Rights accruing to party entitled to be subrogated to claim of another do not differ from those that would be conferred by assignment of same claim. *Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 94-95, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *Snider v. Basinger (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 819, 824, 132 Cal. Rptr. 637*

Formal written assignment adds nothing to enforceability by assignee of cause of action. *Meyers v. Bank of Am. Nat'l Trust & Sav. Ass'n (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 92, 94, 77 P.2d 1084* ; *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*

California law prohibits assignment of legal malpractice claims, and nonassignable claims generally are not subject to subrogation absent statutory authorization; thus liability insurer that pays claim against its insured that resulted from negligence of insured's attorneys has no subrogation rights with respect to insured's legal malpractice claim against attorneys. *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. McDonald, Hecht & Solberg (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1387, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 424*

Subrogation right assignable. *Bush v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1374, 1381, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 382*

Subrogation operates as equitable assignment. *Allianz Ins. Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1046, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

Although recorded assignment of note and deed of trust vests in assignee all rights and interests of beneficiary, including authority to exercise any power of sale given beneficiary, equitable subrogee of senior lienholder's right does not have identical rights; for example, equitable subrogee is not able to compel written assignment or to foreclose by nonjudicial process as can assignee of such rights by written instrument. *Strike v. Trans-W. Disc. Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 744, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132*

Party entitled to equitable lien by subrogation acquires all rights that would otherwise be acquired by written assignment; insofar as assignment would entitle party to priority senior to that of junior encumbrancers, party is likewise entitled to same priorty as subrogee. *Snider v. Basinger (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 132 Cal. Rptr. 637*

While cause of action to recover damages for personal injuries is not assignable, provisions in insurance contract requiring reimbursement of medical payments under label of subrogation, but providing only access to proceeds of settlement or judgment resulting from exercise of rights of recovery by injured person, were valid and enforceable. *Lee v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 458, 465-466, 129 Cal. Rptr. 271*

Although assignment of cause of action to recover damages for personal injuries is prohibited by *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.20 et seq.* (relating to survivability of actions), as well as at common law, agreement to reimburse insurer in event of recovery of such damages by insured from third party tortfeasor by either judgment or settlement is valid. *West v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 562, 565, 106 Cal. Rptr. 486*

[3] Compliance with Claims Statutes in Actions Against Public Entities

Absent special considerations, insurer's right to recover on insured's cause of action against alleged tortfeasor (city) for damages to insured's property is barred when statutory period under *Gov. Code § 945.6(a)* ran on insured's claim. *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 735, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Compliance with claims statutes is mandatory to suit against public entity and failure to file claim is fatal to cause of

action. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 188, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Demurrer to widow's complaint in intervention for wrongful death filed in action against county by employer, which had properly filed claim prior to suit, to recover benefits paid to survivors under workers' compensation law, was properly sustained because widow had failed to comply with claims statutes; claims filing requirement does not abrogate right of joinder granted by *Lab. Code § 3853*, but merely conditions availability of joinder when third party tortfeasor is governmental entity. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 192-193, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Insurer's claim as subrogee under uninsured motorist coverage (see Gov. Code § 11580.2(g)) against county was timely filed under *Gov. Code § 911.2*, requiring claim for injury to person to be filed within 100 days after accrual of cause of action, when, though injury giving rise to claim occurred more than 100 days prior to filing date and insured had filed no claim, claim was presented within 100 days after insurer had made payment to insured. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. County of Alameda (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 109 Cal. Rptr. 53* (decided prior to January 1, 1988, amendment extending claim period to six months)

[4] Constitutionality

Legislative classification allowing statutory pension or retirement system to pursue subrogation against third party tortfeasor for disabling injuries to employee-member does not violate *equal protection clauses* of state and federal *Constitutions. Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 946, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

Subrogation action by employees' retirement association pursuant to *Gov. Code § 31820* against third party tortfeasor who had caused disabling injuries to employee did not violate constitutional prohibition against impairment of contract [U.S. *Const. art. I, § 10*; *Cal. Const. art. I, § 9*], even though employee had settled her claim against third party and executed general release, where association had not given written consent to general release, as required by *Lab. Code § 3859*, which provision was implicitly incorporated into defendant's general release. *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 946, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

[5] County Retirement Associations

Gov. Code §§ 31820-31822 incorporates employer subrogation provisions of workers compensation law (*Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*) into statutory scheme for county employees' retirement. *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 942, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

[6] Cross Complaints

In action by insured against insurer on fidelity bond to recover indemnity for loss caused by dishonest employee, insurer's cross complaint for declaratory relief against third party (accounting firm), whose negligence was alleged to have permitted or increased amount of insured's loss, for judgment that third party is liable to insurer if insurer is liable to insured, was proper. *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Harris, Kerr, Forster & Co. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1100, 1102-1104, 89 Cal. Rptr. 437*

[7] Defenses

Defendant third party tortfeasor in action by subrogee is entitled to contest both liability and causation of injuries to same extent as if injured subrogor had brought action, and right to contest liability includes right to raise issue of

comparative negligence. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 930, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 943, 945, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

Under settled principles, insurer, in its role as subrogee, has no greater rights than those possessed by its insured, and its claims are subject to same defenses. *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Fales (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 712, 717, 106 Cal. Rptr. 21 505 P.2d 213*

Equitable doctrine of subrogation passes to insurer only those rights that assured had; if rights of assured have been limited by lawful contract, rights of insurer are likewise limited. *Rokeby-Johnson v. Aquatronics Int'l, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1086, 206 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Surety subrogated to rights of principal against third person takes rights subject to all defenses that third person had against principal. *Rokeby-Johnson v. Aquatronics Int'l, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1083, 206 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Illustrations of apportionment of damages based on comparative negligence in workers' compensation carrier's subrogated action. *Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 258-259, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Defendant third party tortfeasor in subrogated action by insurer is usually permitted to assert all defenses available against insured including statute of limitations. *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 733, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Insurer-subrogee of claim of its insured is subject to same defenses applicable to action by insured on that claim. *Phoenix of Hartford Ins. Cos. v. Colony Kitchens (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 140, 144, 128 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Tenant who burns waste in incinerator constructed and maintained in violation of provisions of *Pub. Res. Code § 4446* is negligent as matter of law when unattended fire escapes from incernator and burns landlord's buildings; landlord's insurer, which paid loss, is barred from recovery in subrogation against tenant on ground of landlord's contributory negligence consisting of landlord's having maintained incinerator in violation of law. *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Titus (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 515, 517-518, 71 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Subrogee has no greater rights than subrogor and is subject to same defenses. *Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Any defenses that wrongdoer has against insured are good against insurer in action by insurer as subrogee of insured's claim against wrongdoer. Royal *Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 66, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858*

Wrongdoer in action against it by insurer as subrogee of its insured is entitled to file counterclaim against insurer on unrelated claim it has against insured. *Royal Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 66, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858* (former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437, 438* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 428.80, 431.30(c), 431.70*))

[8] Definitions

Subrogation is substitution of one party in place of another with reference to lawful claim, demand, or right; right of subrogation is derivative, acquired by satisfaction of loss or claim that third party has against another. *Hamada v. Far E. Nat'l Bank (9th Cir. 2002) 291 F.3d 645, 649*

Definition, origin, development, and scope of subrogation. *Redington v. Cornwell (1891) 90 Cal. 49, 58, 27 P. 40* ; *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 119, 228 P. 11*

Subrogation, a legal fiction, is broadly defined as substitution of one person in place of another with reference to lawful claim or right. *State Bar of Cal. v. Statile (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 650, 662, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 72*

Subrogation is substitution of another person in place of creditor or claimant to whose rights he or she succeeds in relation to debt or claim. *Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 690, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232* ; *State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1105, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785* ; *Gulf Ins. Co. v. TIG Ins. Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 422, 430-431, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305*

Subrogation defined. *Bush v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1374, 1381, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 382*

[9] Doctrine of Superior Equities

Subrogation not available when party seeking subrogation was primarily liable on letter of credit; subrogation depends on superiority of equities of party asserting it over equities of one against whom it is sought; defendants, as mere guarantors, bargained for limited exposure. *Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 690-691, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232*

Doctrine of superior equities prevents insurer from recovering against party whose equities are equal or superior to those of insurer; although insurer might have subrogation interest in insured's claim against party that caused loss, it cannot enforce its subrogation rights unless it has equities superior to those of wrongdoer; in California, doctrine of superior equities is critical in determining whether right of subrogation exists. *State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1107-1108, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785*

In subrogation litigation, California follows doctrine of superior equities, which, in action by insurer against third person, requires court to consider negligence of insured and that of third person; burden is on surety to establish its superior equity. *Rokeby-Johnson v. Aquatronics Int'l, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1084, 206 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Insurer which under its policies paid losses resulting from fires and burglaries was unable to recover payments from fire and burglar alarm companies whose alarms failed; surety has superior equity permitting it to recover as subrogee only when person dealing with wrongdoer is in better position to avoid loss than is insured or surety. *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Morse Signal Devices (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 681, 687, 198 Cal. Rptr. 756*

California cases have approved application of doctrine of subrogation to creditor's rights against third persons when surety's equities are superior to those of third party wrongdoer; such surety, on its payment to employer, is subrogated to employer's rights. *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Security Pac. Nat'l Bank (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 797, 805 n. 6, 149 Cal. Rptr. 883*

Doctrine of superior equities explained. *Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602-604, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*

California cases have approved application of doctrine of subrogation to creditor's rights against third persons when surety's equities are superior to those of third party wrongdoer. *Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 247, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91*

Insureds who had recovered judgments against county for earth slippage damage to their homes triggered by county's construction work were unable to defeat subrogation claims of their insurers, which had made payments to them in connection with their losses, on theory that insurers could not have recovered against county on basis of their subrogation rights on ground, among others, that county was innocent party and insurers must prove they have greater "equities" than county; argument is without merit since equities of county, whose actions (whether negligent or not)

caused the damages, were inferior to those of plaintiff insurers. *Travelers Indem. Co. v. Ingebretsen (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 858, 863-864, 113 Cal. Rptr. 679*

Subrogation is creation of equity and subject to limitation that it will not be allowed when it will be inequitable to third persons. *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*

Surety subrogee is able to recover only if it shows an equity superior to that of defendants. *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*

In surety's action arising from its payment of theft claim on employee fidelity bond to recover value of stolen goods from defendants who had purchased them from employee, plaintiff failed to establish superior, or even equal, equity to entitle it to recover when it was shown that defendants had no notice of theft and there were no facts to put them on inquiry, whereas plaintiff had, in effect, vouched for employee's integrity and accepted premium for its agreement to indemnify against employee's defalcations. *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*

[10] Double Liability of Obligor Prohibited

Double recovery from or liability of obligor by reason of subrogation prohibited when obligor is unaware of subrogee's claim. *Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915-916, 918-919, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *Ventura CountyEmployees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 951-952, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

[11] Elements of Subrogation

Equitable assignment or right of subrogation is creature of equity, and is applicable to all cases in which one party involuntarily pays debt for which another is primarily liable and that in equity and good conscience should have been paid by party primarily liable. *Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. v. Miller (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1163, 1174, 264 Cal. Rptr. 17*

[12] Estoppel

Lender is estopped to recover a deficiency judgment against guarantor when it elects remedy (nonjudicial foreclosure) that cuts off guarantor's subrogation rights against debtor. *Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 46, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*

Lender that elects nonjudicial foreclosure and thereby cuts off loan guarantor's subrogation rights against debtor is estopped to recover deficiency judgment against guarantor when waiver language in guaranty agreement did not adequately inform guarantor that destruction of guarantor's subrogation rights gives guarantor an estoppel defense against recovery of a deficiency judgment. *Cathay Bank v. Lee (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1542, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420 , superseded by statute as stated in WRI Opportunity Loans II, LLC v. Cooper (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 525, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 205*

[13] Indemnity and Subrogation Distinguished

When claim must be filed by tortfeasor to secure equitable indemnity against public entity alleged to be joint tortfeasor. *People ex rel. Dep't of Transp. v. Superior Court (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 744, 747-748, 750-751, 163 Cal. Rptr. 585, 608 P.2d 673* (repudiated in part by 1981 amendment of *Gov. Code § 901*)

Right of subrogation and right of indemnity distinguished. *Associated Indem. Corp. v. Pacific Sw. Airlines (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906, 180 Cal. Rptr. 685*

Lab. Code § 3852 (recovery of benefits paid as workers' compensation from third party tortfeasor in action by employer or by employee for damages for injury) provides action for indemnity when action is to recover from defendant "damages" employer is required to pay to State pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4706.5* when employee dies leaving no dependents. *Associated Indem. Corp. v. Pacific Sw. Airlines (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 898, 907, 180 Cal. Rptr. 685*

[14] Insurers

Subrogation lien is not express lien based on agreement, but instead is equitable lien impressed on moneys on ground that they ought to go to insurer. *See Sereboff v. Mid Atl. Med. Servs., Inc. (2006) 547 U.S. 356, 126 S. Ct. 1869, 1877, 164 L. Ed. 2d 612* (ERISA action determining when fiduciary may sue beneficiary for reimbursement of medical expenses paid by ERISA plan; not involving subrogation)

Made-whole rule does not bar automobile insurer from seeking reimbursement for med-pay proceeds that it paid to insured, subject to deduction under common-fund theory for its share of attorney's fees that insured expended to obtain payment from tortfeasor. 21st *Century Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 518, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972* ; see also 21st *Century Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 515, 533-535, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972* (conc. opn. of Werdegar, J.)

If attorney properly sues concurrent counsel for indemnification of malpractice damages, attorney's insurer may be subrogated to attorney's indemnity claim against concurrent counsel. *Musser v. Provencher (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 274, 285-287, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373, 48 P.3d 408*

Under settled principles, insurer in its role as subrogee has no greater rights than those possessed by its insured. *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Fales (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 712, 717, 106 Cal. Rptr. 21, 505 P.2d 213* ; *State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1106, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785*

Good-faith settlement order does not bar nonsettling tortfeasor from asserting indemnification claim against settling defendants based on express contract; because insurer stands in shoes of its insured, insurer can pursue cause of action against settling tortfeasor for breach of express contractual indemnification clause. *Interstate Fire & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Cleveland Wrecking Co. (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 23, 32-33, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 606*

In case involving contractor and subcontractors, in which injured party was employed by one subcontractor and injured by other subcontractor, insurer had right of equitable subrogation against second subcontractor as settling tortfeasor; only first subcontractor indemnified contractor although both were obligated to do so; elements of subrogation are met by following: (1) insured general contractor suffered loss for which defendant is liable; (2) loss was one for which insurer was not primarily liable; (3) insurer compensated insured for loss; (4) insured has cause of action against defendant; (5) insurer suffered damages arising from defendant's act or omission; and (5) insurer's equitable position is superior to defendant's. *Interstate Fire & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Cleveland Wrecking Co. (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 23, 34-49, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 606*

Claim by insurer or claim by right of subrogation is not "covered claim" under California Insurance Guarantee Association (CIGA); under *Ins. Code § 1063.1(c),* CIGA is required to pay only "covered claims," excluding claims for subrogation and claims covered by any other insurance; CIGA has no duty to reimburse solvent workers' compensation carrier for benefits paid to injured employee. *Baur v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1266, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493*

In insurance context, equitable subrogation doctrine permits paying insurer to be placed in shoes of insured and to pursue recovery from third parties responsible to insured for loss for which insurer was liable and paid; because subrogation rights are purely derivative, insurer cannot acquire anything by subrogation to which insured has no right and can claim no right that insured does not have. *Great American Ins. Cos. v. Gordon Trucking, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 445, 451, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*

Because insurer is subject to same defenses as insured, statute of limitations on insurer's cause of action runs from date of accrual of its insured's cause of action. *Great American Ins. Cos. v. Gordon Trucking, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 445, 451, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*

When insured has released third party, subrogated insurer's claims are also released. *Great American Ins. Cos. v. Gordon Trucking, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 445, 452, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*

In insurance context, equitable subrogation generally involves the substitution of insurer in position of its insured to seek reimbursement from responsible third parties for loss paid to insured by insurer. *Crowley Maritime Corp. v. Boston Old Colony Ins. Co. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 1061, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605, 2008 Cal. App. LEXIS 36* , p.7 (involving equitable contribution, not subrogation)

Insurer does not have standing to recover insured's unpaid deductible in subrogation suit; under general law of subrogation, insurer has right to sue only for its subrogated loss, i.e., what it paid its insured. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Superior Court (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 19, 23-24, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199*

Ins. Code § 790.03(h) enumerates unfair claims settlement practices; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2695.7* is part of larger regulatory scheme designed to curtail unfair business practices in insurance business, and concerns settlement of claims, not pursuit of claims in litigation; regulation does not confer standing on insurer to seek its nonparty insured's deductible in lawsuit. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Superior Court (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 19, 24-26, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 199*

Excess insurer cannot maintain subrogation action against primary insurer, based on unreasonable refusal to settle underlying tort claim, if tort claim did not go to trial, and no excess judgment was entered against insured. *RLI Ins. Co. v. CNA Cas. of Cal. (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 75, 82-83, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 667* ; *see also* *Hamilton v. Maryland Cas. Co. (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 718, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 318, 41 P.3d 128* (judgment in excess of policy must be entered before there can be claim for breach of primary insurer's duty to settle); *but see* *Fortman v. Safeco Ins. Co. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1394, 271 Cal. Rptr. 117*

In personal injury actions, insurer may not assert its subrogation claim directly against third-party tortfeasor on its own behalf and may not seek to use policyholder's personal injury attorney as collection agent by suing attorney to pay it any judgment or settlement proceeds from third party recovered by that attorney; to preserve its right of subrogation, insurer must either interplead itself into any action brought by insured against third-party tortfeasor or wait to seek reimbursement under language of its policy from its insured to extent that insured recovers money from third party. *Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 272-273, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434*

If insurer pays out claim on first-party insurance policy to its insured, insurer is subrogated to rights of its insured against any tortfeasor that is liable to insured for insured's damages; subrogation provisions of most insurance contracts typically are general and add nothing to rights of subrogation that arise as matter of law. *Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 272, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434*

Because insurer obtained assignment of insured's claims against nonsettling defendants in underlying defective-construction suit, insurer had option to pursue insured's claims by way of assignment rights, and insurer was

not under obligation to pursue equitable subrogation rights; subrogation is right, not obligation. *Casa Eva I Homeowners Ass'n v. Ani Constr. & Tile, Inc. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 771, 782, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 401*

Pilot who rented and then damaged airplane was not insured on policy issued to airplane-rental company, could not bring bad faith action, and was properly defendant in subrogation action brought by insurer. *McKinley v. XL Specialty Ins. Co. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1572, 1575, 1578, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98*

Insurer entitled to subrogation is in same position as assignee of insured's claim and succeeds only to rights of insured; in insurance context, right to equitable contribution arises if several insurers are obligated to indemnify or defend same loss or claim, and one insurer has paid more than its share of loss or has defended action without any participation by others. *Hartford Cas. Ins. Co. v. Mt. Hawley Ins. Co. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 278, 287, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 128*

Intervening insurer is not subject to same limitation on damages that was imposed on its insured due to jurisdictional flaw in insured's complaint; if insured sued tortfeasor but erroneously capped damages at $25,000, after being paid $130,000 in benefits by his own insurer, his insurer was nevertheless allowed to recover from tortfeasor's insurer full amount of its subrogation judgment of $130,000 plus interest and costs. *Low v. Golden Eagle Ins. Co. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1354, 1363-1364, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 155*

Insurer has no right of equitable subrogation against its own insured with respect to loss or liability for which insured is covered under policy because, as between insurer and insured, insurer assumes responsibility; if policy does not cover insured for particular loss or liability, however, it would neither undermine insured's coverage nor be inequitable to impose loss or liability on insured if insured caused or was otherwise responsible for loss or liability. *Truck Ins. Exch. v. County of Los Angeles (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 13, 21-26, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179* (county, additional insured under hospital liability policy, required to reimburse insurer for defense of malpractice action against hospital because injuries were caused by county's referral of high-risk patient to hospital)

Subrogation takes form of insurer's right to be put in position of insured to pursue recovery from third parties legally responsible to insured for loss that insurer has both insured and paid. *State Farm Gen. Ins. Co. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1106, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 785* ; *Gulf Ins. Co. v. TIG Ins. Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 422, 431, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305*

Elements of insurer's cause of action for equitable subrogation are: (1) insured has suffered a loss for which party to be charged is liable; (2) insurer has compensated for loss; (3) insured has existing, assignable causes of action against party to be charged, which insured could have pursued had insurer not compensated for theloss; (4) insurer has suffered damages caused by act or omission that triggers liability of party to be charged; (5) justice dictates that loss be shifted entirely from insurer to party to be charged; and (6) insurer's damages are in stated sum, which is usually amount paid to insured, assuming payment was not voluntary and was reasonable. *Truck Ins. Exch. v. County of Los Angeles (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 13, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179* ; *United Servs. Auto. Ass'n v. Alaska Ins. Co. (2001) 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 449* ; *Gulf Ins. Co. v. TIG Ins. Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 422, 432, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305*

Insurer that acted as surety on performance bond was not equitably subrogated to principal's rights as insured with respect to principal's commercial general liability (CGL) insurer, because insured did not suffer an injury for which surety paid, such that CGL insurer should be held liable; insurer acting as surety was not equitably subrogated to insured's rights with respect to bad faith claim against CGL insurer because CGL insurer's alleged wrongful conduct did not result in any injury to the insured. *Gulf Ins. Co. v. TIG Ins. Co. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 422, 432, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305*

Lessor's fire insurance provider, which paid fire-damage claim benefits to lessor, was entitled to sue lessees under subrogation theory for negligence and breach of contract, asserting that lessees negligently caused fire; under rental agreement, parties had no reasonable expectation that lessees were exculpated from liability for negligently caused fire

damages or that lessor's policy was for their mutual benefit. *Fire Ins. Exch. v. Hammond (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 313, 321, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 596* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Because equitable subrogation doctrine shifts entire cost burden between insurers, insurer seeking subrogation must show that other insurer was primarily liable for loss and that its own equitable position is inferior to that of second insurer. *Maryland Cas. Co. v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1088, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 374* (applying equitable contribution, rather than equitable subrogation)

Insurer's settlement of lawsuit involving claims for which it had potential liability, without judicial determination of coverage, was not binding concession by insurer that all settlement proceeds were attributable to all damages covered under its policy, and did not preclude insurer from contending settlement proceeds encompassed elements of loss other insurer's policy covered; "other insurance" clause of no application in assigning priorities to policies under facts of case; settling insurer's right to subrogation or indemnity was disputable, precluding summary judgment. *Pines of La Jolla Homeowners Ass'n v. Industrial Indem. (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 714, 726-727, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53*

In equitable subrogation action arising from underlying personal injury action in which primary insurer of one defendant initially refused to settle within primary limits, resulting in ultimate settlement contributed to by excess insurer, and in which jury subsequently found that insured-defendant was totally faultless, injured party is entitled to sue primary insurer after assignment by excess insurer; absence of judgment against insured in excess of primary policy limits does not preclude equitable subrogation action. *Fortman v. Safeco Ins. Co. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1394, 1399-1402, 271 Cal. Rptr. 117* ; *see also* *Hamilton v. Maryland Cas. Co. (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 718, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 318, 41 P.3d 128* (judgment in excess of policy must be entered before there can be claim for breach of primary insurer's duty to settle); *but see* *RLI Ins. Co. v. CNA Cas. of Cal. (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 75, 79, 85, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 667* (declining to follow *Fortman*)

In action by insured against insurer to recover property damage claim that insurer partially denied, damages for which insured had already recovered in action against tortfeasor, insurer has waived right to subrogation, and therefore defense of insured's violation of subrogation clause in contract, by failing to plead breach of subrogation clause at trial. *Kardly v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 479, 488, 255 Cal. Rptr. 40* (recovery limited to amounts not already paid by insurer)

Both subrogee (insurer) and subrogor (insured) have right of action against third-party tortfeasor; subrogated insurer is not limited to intervening in action between insured and third-party tortfeasor but is permitted to bring separate independent action to recover directly from third-party tortfeasor. *Basin Constr. Corp. v. Department of Water & Power (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 245 Cal. Rptr. 178*

California Insurance Guarantee Association is entitled under *Ins. Code § 1063.2(c)(1)* to credit in full amount of claimant's uninsured motorist coverage when claimant has "covered claim" against it; credit also inures to benefit of insureds of insolvent carrier. *California Ins. Guarantee Ass'n v. Liemsakul (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 433, 442, 238 Cal. Rptr. 346*

Premises liability insurer that is obligated to defend personal injury action against its insured, a physician, and settles action is subrogated to insured's claim, if any, against its medical malpractice carrier that had denied coverage and refused to contribute to settlement. *State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Cooperative of Am. Physicians, Inc. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 199, 202-206, 209 Cal. Rptr. 251*

Insurer subrogated to rights of property owner by virtue of insurance policy has standing to maintain action in inverse condemnation against city seeking recovery of claims paid to property owner. *McMahan's of Santa Monica v. City of Santa Monica (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 683, 690-691, 194 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Insurer-subrogee's right to seek recovery in inverse condemnation either in insured's name or in its own name. *McMahan's of Santa Monica v. City of Santa Monica (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 683, 690-691, 194 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Insurer who pays claim by insured whom it is required by contract to indemnify is not subrogated to insured's rights against third parties also contractually liable to indemnify insured unless loss involved is causally related to breach of duty by that third party. *California Food Serv. Corp. v. Great Am. Ins. Co. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 892, 898, 182 Cal. Rptr. 67* (nevertheless holding that equitable contribution doctrine applies when two insurers each insure against same loss)

Excess insurer, on paying insured's liability to injured claimant, is equitably subrogated to rights of insured against primary insurer, including insured's right of action against primary insurer for bad faith failure to settle. *Northwestern Mut. Ins. Co. v. Farmers' Ins. Group (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1031, 1040, 143 Cal. Rptr. 415*

In action seeking declaration of rights and liabilities of three insurers whose policies provided concurrent coverage for accident, each policy containing excess insurance clause providing that policy was excess insurance to other insurance available to insured, trial court properly found under established principles of subrogation that plaintiff insurer's comprehensive general liability policy was excess insurance when defendant insurers' policies covered tortfeasor employee and plaintiff insurer's policy did not. *Argonaut Ins. Co. v. Colonial Ins. Co. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 608, 614-615, 138 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Subrogation as applied to an insurer as right to be put in position of its insured against third parties legally responsible to insured for loss which insurer has both insured and paid. *Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Auto Spring Supply Co. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 860, 864, 131 Cal. Rptr. 211*

Surety for compensation on employee fidelity bond is subrogated to employer's rights on payment of claim under bond. *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*

Equitable subrogation is not permitted to insurers whoses losses are not causally related to breach of duty for which party to be charged may be liable to insured for loss compensated by insurers; hence, liability insurer of permissive driver of car involved in accident is not entitled to reimbursement from car owner's insurance agent for his negligent failure to have had owner's liability policy renewed; plaintiff's loss results from its insured's having negligently caused accident and not from agent's failure to have procured renewal of owner's insurance. *Mid-Century Ins. Co. v. Hutsel (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1065, 1070, 89 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Purpose of provision waiving subrogation against lessee in fire insurance policy issued to lessor. *Sacramento-Yolo Port Dist. v. Cargill of Cal., Inc. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1012, 84 Cal. Rptr. 822*

Under California law, employer who is held derivatively liable for negligent acts of employee has right to recover from that employee for loss caused by negligence, and insurance carrier compelled to pay loss is permitted, having equitable right of subrogation, to recover amount which it has paid by suit against negligent employee. *Transport Indem. Co. v. American Fid. & Cas. Co. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 950, 956, 84 Cal. Rptr. 856*

Employer is permitted to recover from employee for loss to employer caused by employee's negligence which employer neither authorized nor participated in, and employer's insurer is subrogated to employer's right to such recovery. *Pacific Indem. Co. v. Truck Ins. Exch. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 420, 426, 74 Cal. Rptr. 793*

Subrogation agreement assigning insured's cause of action for personal injuries to her insurer to extent of payment made to her by insurer under uninsured motorist coverage does not constitute determination of extent of insured's damages as between her and tortfeasor. *Johnson v. Oliver (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 178, 180-182, 72 Cal. Rptr. 137*

Although insurer who issues fidelity bond is not surety for employer and principal, if any, is unnamed and prospective criminal employee, courts by analogy have held principles of subrogation to be applicable to fidelity bond situation; insurer in such case is permitted to have subrogation against third party, including third party bank, provided its equities are superior to those of third party. *Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 545, 550, 34 Cal. Rptr. 23*

On insurer's payment of insured's loss resulting from employee's forgery of checks, insurer is immediately vested with all rights of employer against drawee bank, subject to priority of equities as between insurer and bank. *Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 545, 550, 34 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Insurer who has indemnified insured for property loss is subrogated to insured's right against person wrongfully causing loss; rule applies whether insured's cause of action is in contract or tort. *Royal Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 65, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858*

[15] Intervention

In action brought by subrogor insured against tortfeasor, complaint in intervention filed by insurer with property subrogation claim is subject to running of five-year dismissal rule (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310, 583.360*) from time when original complaint was filed, if complaint to recover subrogated property loss states essentially same causes of action as original complaint. *Bright v. American Termite Control Co. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1464, 1468-1469, 269 Cal. Rptr. 793*

Injured employee is able to intervene under *Lab. Code § 3853* in action brought by his or her employer's insurer against public transit district to recover workers' compensation paid, even though employee's complaint was not filed within limitation period of California Tort Claims Act when employee had timely filed claim against defendant public entity. *Home Ins. Co. v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 522, 525-527, 241 Cal. Rptr. 858*

Demurrer to widow's complaint in intervention for wrongful death filed in action against county by employer, which had properly filed claim prior to suit, to recover benefits paid to survivors under workers' compensation law, was properly sustained wherewidow had failed to comply with claims statutes; claims filing requirement does not abrogate right of joinder granted by *Lab. Code § 3853*, but merely conditions availability of joinder when third party tortfeasor is governmental entity. *Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. v. County of Riverside (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 183, 192-193, 165 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Motion of health insurer to intervene in personal injury action by one of its subscribers against doctors, hospital, and others, even though insurer's contract provided for lien and reimbursement with respect to benefits provided for tort-caused injuries and subscriber had separately agreed to make good faith effort to recover costs of benefits in pending action was properly denied, since cause of action in tort is not "property" and insurer's contract is not "transaction" which is subject of litigation within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 387(b)*, relating to mandatory intervention. *California Physicians' Serv. v. Superior Court (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 91, 96-97, 162 Cal. Rptr. 266*

[16] Issues

Matters required to be determined by court in action by county employees' retirement association, as subrogee, against third party tortfeasor, to recover portion of disability benefits payable under *Lab. Code §§ 3854, 3855* and *Gov. Code § 31820* to employee-member of association as result of automobile accident (nonservice connected disability). *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 944, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

[17] Judgments

Surety which has satisfied judgment against principal is entitled under doctrine of equitable subrogation to enforce execution against codefendant tortfeasor. *Painter v. Berglund (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 63, 66, 87 P.2d 360* (former *Code Civ. Proc. § 709* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882, 883*))

[18] Jurisdiction

Subrogee (workers' compensation insurer) was assignee within meaning of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 117.5* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420*), relating to small claims courts, and was, under that section, barred from prosecuting action in small claims court. *Allianz Ins. Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1044-1046, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

[19] Lessor-Lessee

Right of lessor to be subrogated to right of lessee under former *Pub. Res. Code § 4702* (*now see Pub. Res. Code § 4852*) to receive damages for injuries to leased premises caused by flood-borne logs to extent lessor has made expenditures in repairing damage done. *Bess v. Wise (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 158, 163, 79 Cal. Rptr. 611*

[20] Lienholders

Contingent remainderman's interest in real property sufficent to entitle him or her to pay delinquent taxes without being considered mere volunteer and, under equitable principles of subrogation, to succeed to lien held by public taxing bodies. *Riley v. Turpin (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 152, 156, 301 P.2d 834*

Rule that holder of junior lien on property who, to protect his or her interest, pays debt secured by senior lien thereby becomes subrogated to rights of senior lienholder as against owner of property, even though he or she takes no assignment of senior lien (see *Civ. Code § 2904*), is subject to rule that person invoking doctrine of subrogation must, in making payment, have had some interest to protect and must not have been a volunteer, that is, an officious intermeddler. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 84, 230 P.2d 816*

Person who discharges lien on another's property mistakenly believed to be his or her own is subrogated to rights of lienholder. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 84, 230 P.2d 816*

[21] Nature of Subrogation

Nature of subrogration and its prohibition against double recovery make it abundantly clear that subrogation involves succession to rights of others; rights under subrogation are derivative rights, succession to another's rights, like water, is not able to rise higher than its source. *Board of Admin. v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *State Bar of Cal. v. Statile (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 650, 663, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 72* ; *Ventura County Employees' Ret. Ass'n v. Pope (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 938, 952, 151 Cal. Rptr. 695*

Equitable subrogation permits party who has been required to satisfy a loss created by third party's wrongful act to "step into the shoes" of loser and pursue recovery from responsible wrongdoer. *Great American Ins. Cos. v. Gordon Trucking, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 445, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65* , p.8

Subrogee's rights are able to rise no higher than those of subrogor. *Transit Cas. Co. v. Spink Corp. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 124, 132, 156 Cal. Rptr. 360 , disapproved on other grounds,* *Commercial Union Assurance Cos. v. Safeway*

Stores, Inc. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 912, 921, 164 Cal. Rptr. 709, 610 P.2d 1038

[22] Parties

Nonjoinder of partial subrogor or partial subrogee in action by one of them against obligor is not jurisdictional defect in fundamental sense and does not deprive court of subject matter jurisdiction. *Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 44-45, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*

[23] Prerequisites to Equitable Subrogation

One who claims to be equitably subrogated to rights of secured creditor must satisfy following prerequisites: (1) payment must have been made by subrogee to protect its own interest; (2) subrogee must not have acted as volunteer; (3) debt paid must be one for which subrogee was not primarily liable; (4) entire debt must have been paid; (5) subrogation must not work any injustice to rights of others. *Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 690, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232*

Actual loss to subrogor is not a prerequisite to equitable subrogation; all that is required is that subrogor would have suffered loss had not subrogee discharged liability or paid loss. *Northwestern Mut. Ins. Co. v. Farmers' Ins. Group (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 1031, 1044, 143 Cal. Rptr. 415*

[24] Principle on Which Subrogation Is Founded

Principle on which subrogation is founded applies if one person, not a volunteer, pays debt for which another is primarily answerable and which, in equity and good conscience, should have been discharged by latter. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 83, 230 P.2d 816* ; *Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 118, 228 P. 11* ; *Meyer Koulish Co. v. Cannon (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 419, 424, 28 Cal. Rptr. 757* (repudiated on another point in *Patent Scaffolding Co. v. William Simpson Constr. Co. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 506, 514-515, 64 Cal. Rptr. 187*)

[25] Public Employees' Retirement System

Gov. Code § 21451 grants Public Employees' Retirement System right to recover against negligent third party who caused member's injury, which subsequently required member's disability retirement and imposed burden of retirement benefits on *System. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Board of Admin. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 766, 769, 153 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Although subrogation rights of Employees' Retirement System are equal to those of employer, System is not bound by releases to which it has not consented. *Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Board of Admin. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 766, 770, 153 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Gov. Code §§ 21453, relating to public employees' retirement system, incorporates subrogation provisions of workers compensation law, including *Lab. Code §§ 3852, 3859*, and *3860*, relating to actions against third-party tortfeasors, release, and settlement respectively. *Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co. v. Board of Admin. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 766, 770, 153 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Gov. Code § 21453 gives Public Employees' Retirement System same right to proceed against third party who settled without its consent as employer who has paid compensation is accorded under *Lab. Code § 3859* (settlement or release by employee with third party without employer's consent is subject to employer's right to proceed to recover

compensation paid). *Board of Admin. v. Kuppens (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 758, 761-764, 122 Cal. Rptr. 856*

Gov. Code § 21451, providing for reimbursement of Public Employees' Retirement System for benefits paid by reason of member's injury or death resulting from third party's act, is inapplicable when member's injury or death is proximate consequence of act of member's employer; hence, system is unable to recover benefits provided in *Gov. Code § 21451* from third party whose act may also be proximate cause of member's injury or death. *McQuillan v. Southern Pac. Co. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 802, 805-806, 115 Cal. Rptr. 418*

[26] Small Claims Courts

Workers' compensation insurer is subrogee of rights of workers' employer against third parties as "assignee" of employer's claims against third parties within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 117.5* and hence barred from filing or prosecuting claims in small claims court. *Allianz Ins. Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1046, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

[27] Splitting Cause of Action

Basis of rule against splitting cause of action. *Wulfjen v. Dolton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 891, 894-895, 151 P.2d 846* ; *Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 41, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77, 2010 Cal. LEXIS 868* ; *Phillips v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 444, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451*

Insured splits cause of action by filing complaint against tortfeasor after insured has been partially reimbursed for loss by insurance benefits and subrogated insurer to amount of such payment. *Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 41-42, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77*

Defense that plaintiff has split cause of action is affirmative defense which is waived if not pleaded by defendant in abatement or in bar. *Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 43, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *see Phillips v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 444, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451*

[28] Statute of Limitations

Action by employer against third party tortfeasor to recover workers' compensation benefits paid to injured employee is governed by former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1* (two-year statute of limitations)), providing one year period of limitation on actions for injury caused by wrongful act or neglect of another. *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 868, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363*

Statute of limitations applicable to action for indemnity for payments made to injured employee under Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C. §§ 51-60*). *Southern Pac. Transp. Co. v. Ohbayashi Am. Corp. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 233, 236-238, 195 Cal. Rptr. 63 .*

Subrogation by insurer to rights of its insured against third party tortfeasor is enforceable in equity only when action is brought within time in which action could have been brought to enforce original obligation to which right of subrogation is sought; same rule is applicable to common law subrogation, as distinguished from indemnity or contribution, and to employer's statutory right to subrogation against tortfeasor for workers' compensation benefits paid

to employee for injuries caused by tortfeasor's negligence. *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 734, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Absent special considerations, insurer's right to recover on insured's cause of action against alleged tortfeasor (city) for damages to insured's property is barred when statutory period of *Gov. Code § 945.6(a)* (time for suit against public entity after denial of claim) ran on insured's claim. *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 735, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Insurer's action under *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)* (subrogation to insured's rights when insurer pays uninsured motorist claim) must be brought within three years after date of payment. *Commercial Union Assurance Co. v. City of San Jose (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 730, 735-736, n. 2, 179 Cal. Rptr. 814*

Disability of minor which tolls statute of limitations (*Code Civ. Proc. § 352(a)*) is personal and not subject to transfer by assignment or subrogation. *Amie v. Superior Court (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 421, 426, 160 Cal. Rptr. 271*

Action by insurer pursuant to *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)* to recover amounts paid under uninsured motorist endorsement in policy is barred if not brought within three years from date payment was made. *Phoenix of Hartford Ins. Cos. v. Colony Kitchens (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 140, 144-145, 128 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Statute of limitations is tolled by filing of declaratory relief action against third person before surety has made payment under its bond for loss caused by dishonesty of insured's employee. *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Harris, Kerr, Forster & Co. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1100, 1104, 89 Cal. Rptr. 437*

Statute of limitations applicable to obligation on which subrogated action is brought applies to subrogated action. *Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893* ; *Automobile Ins. Co. v. Union Oil Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 302, 304-305, 193 P.2d 48*

[29] Sureties

Civ. Code § 2848, relating to sureties, does not comprehensively and exclusively measure surety's rights to subrogation; section is merely declaratory of common law on subject and controlling only so far as it goes. *Estate of Elizalde (1920) 182 Cal. 427, 432, 188 P. 560* ; *Commercial Standard Ins. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 241, 247, 129 Cal. Rptr. 91*

Surety making payment as subrogated to all rights and remedies that were available to creditor to obtain payment from any person or property of any person who, as to surety, is primarily liable for debt; both gratuitous and paid sureties have all rights, remedies, and priorities of party to whom they have paid debt of principal. *Rokeby-Johnson v. Aquatronics Int'l, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1083, 206 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Construction of surety bond is question of law. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 570, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533* ; *see also Civ. Code §§ 1639, 2837*

Bond given for faithful performance of contract to which it refers is binding surety for labor performed and materials furnished thereunder as completely as though surety were party to contract. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 568, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

As general rule, if subcontractor's bond is put up in order to indemnify prime contractor for any claim for which latter may be held liable and for payment of which subcontractor is primarily liable, subcontractor's surety is required to indemnify principal contractor, or latter's surety, for any liability imposed for labor and materials furnished to

subcontractor. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 568, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Failure on part of subcontractor to pay for materials and supplies furnished pursuant to subcontract is breach of subcontract, and bond that undertakes to guarantee faithful performance of subcontract to furnish all necessary labor and materials for specified portion of structure implies promise to pay for such labor and materials furnished. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 569, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Cosureties and successive sureties distinguished. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 570, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

First of two successive sureties forced to pay debt is subrogated to creditor's rights on bond and permitted to enforce it against second surety. *Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 570-571, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

[30] Volunteers

Doctrine of subrogation is inapplicable to one who, in paying another's debt, acts as volunteer or officious intermeddler. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 84, 230 P.2d 816*

Person who discharges another's obligation or lien on another's property or who is induced to make payment by fraud or duress is not officious intermeddler. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 85, 230 P.2d 816*

Premises liability insurer that, with medical malpractice insurer, was, by allegations of complaint, obligated to defend its insured and, in doing so, settled claim against insured was not volunteer with respect to medical malpractice insurer against which it seeks subrogation of amount paid in settlement. *State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Cooperative of Am. Physicians, Inc. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 199, 203, 209 Cal. Rptr. 251*

One who advances money to pay off encumbrance on real property at instance of either owner of property or holder of encumbrance, either on express understanding or under circuimstances from which understanding will be implied, that advance made is to be secured by first lien on property is not mere volunteer; in event new security is for any reason not first lien on property, holder of security, if not chargeable with culpable and inexcusable neglect, is subrogated to rights of prior encumbrancer under security held by him or her, unless superior or equal equities of others would be prejudiced by it. *Katsivalis v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 200, 210, 138 Cal. Rptr. 620*

Person voluntarily paying debt of third person with no promise of repayment by person whose debt is paid is not entitled to reimbursement under doctrine of equitable subrogation. *McMillan v. O'Brien (1934) 219 Cal. 775, 779, 29 P.2d 183*

Subrogation is not applied in favor of one who has officiously and as mere volunteer paid debt of another for which neither payor nor payor's property was answerable and which payor was under no obligation to pay. *Grant v. De Otte (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 724, 728, 265 P.2d 952*

[31] Waiver or Release of Subrogation Rights

Under standard American Institute of Architects (AIA) construction contract (1) requiring owner to maintain property insurance covering interest of owner and contractor; and (2) containing a mutual waiver of owner's and contractor's rights against another for damages covered by that property insurance, owner's insurer could not recover as subrogee for rain damage to interior of facility cause by contractor's alleged negligence; owner's waiver of all claims to extent

covered by insurance barred owner's property insurer from recovering as subrogee, even though damage was outside scope of contractor's work. *Lloyd's Underwriters v. Craig & Rush, Inc. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 1194, 1199-1201, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144*

When insured has released third party, neither insured not subrogated insurer has any right to recover from third party. *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1596-1597, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* (subrogation claim by excess insurer against primary insurer); *Continental Mfg. Co. v. Underwriters at Lloyd's London (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 545, 556, 8 Cal. Rptr. 276*

Guaranty agreement informing guarantor that he might lose subrogation rights, but failing to inform guarantor that loss of subrogation rights gives guarantor immunity from a deficiency judgment in form of estoppel defense, and that guarantor was waiving that defense under terms of guaranty agreement, failed to contain a sufficiently "explicit" or "specific" waiver of estoppel defense. *Cathay Bank v. Lee (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1539-1540, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420 , superseded by statute as stated in WRI Opportunity Loans II, LLC v. Cooper (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 525, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 205*

When tortfeasor obtains release from insured with knowledge that insured has already been indemnified by insurer, release of insured does not bar insurer's subrogation rights. *Conservatorship of Edwards (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1184, 244 Cal. Rptr. 330* ; *see Steigerwald v. Godwin (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 591, 595, 301 P.2d 386* ; *Mitchell v. Holmes (1935) 9 Cal. App. 2d 461, 463-464, 50 P.2d 473*

[32] When Subrogation May Be Sought

Although principle on which right of subrogation is founded applies to cases of suretyship, doctrine of equitable subrogation is broad enough to include every instance in which one person, not acting as mere volunteer or intruder, pays debt for which another is primarily liable, and which in equity and good conscience should have been discharged by latter. *Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 83, 230 P.2d 816*

Equitable subrogation is applicable to holder of three senior encumbrances when holder of fourth encumbrance would not be prejudiced by application of doctrine but be left in same position as before. *Smith v. State Savings & Loan Ass'n (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1092, 1098, 223 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Fact of recording of junior encumbrance is not by itself a bar to equitable subrogation, even though equitable subrogation is denied to new lender who has actual knowledge of junior encumbrance. *Smith v. State Savings & Loan Ass'n (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1092, 1098, 223 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Equitable subrogation was improperly denied on ground that senior encumbrance holder had no interest in property to protect and was "mere volunteer," because holder had advanced money at request of debtor to pay off encumbrance with understanding that advance would be secured by first trust deed, thus was not "mere volunteer." *Smith v. State Savings & Loan Ass'n (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1092, 1098-1099, 223 Cal. Rptr. 298*

Subrogation, although equitable right, is enforceable in court of law, and separate suit in equity is not required. *A.F.C., Inc. v. Brockett (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 40, 42, 64 Cal. Rptr. 771*

Right to subrogation is capable of being established in third party claim proceedings as well as in direct two party actions at law. *A.F.C., Inc. v. Brockett (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 40, 42, 64 Cal. Rptr. 771*

[33] Workers' Compensation

Lab. Code §§ 3850 and *3852* (relating to workers' compensation) are merely codification of judicially created principles of equitable subrogation. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 929, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 876 n. 7, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Allianz Ins. Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1045, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

Substantively, as well as procedurally, employer and employee actions against third party tortfeasor under *Lab. Code § 3852*, relating to workers' compensation, are interchangeable; regardless of who brings action, it is essentially same lawsuit. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 928, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 874, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 826, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455*

Lab. Code § 3854 (if action is prosecuted by employer alone, evidence of any amount which employer has paid or become obligated to pay due to injury or death of employee is admissible; such expenditures or liability to be deemed as proximately resulting from the injury or death in addition to any other items of damage), means only that (1) intervening act of employer's payment to employee of compensation shall not be construed as breaking chain of causation which is essential to plaintiff's recovery under traditional negligence principles, and (2) employer is entitled to full reimbursement if defendant's tort liability, in an amount equal to or in excess of employer's expenditures, is otherwise established. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 929, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987 , disapproving State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Williams (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 218, 112 Cal. Rptr. 226 , and Board of Admin. v. Ames (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 215, 29 Cal. Rptr. 917*

In negligence action against workers compensation insurer, workers' compensation law does not impose duty on carrier to pursue subrogation rights. *New Plumbing Contractors, Inc. v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1088, 1094, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

When employee is injured by third party's tortious act, employer is indirectly injured to extent employer must pay out workers' compensation benefits; by statute employer is entitled to recoup its damages from third party through subrogation, and by definition workers' compensation insurance carrier that has paid benefits has all rights of employer (*see Lab. Code § 3850*); carrier is able to recover its damages by (1) suing third party in its own name (*see Lab. Code § 3852*), (2) intervening in action filed by employee (*see Lab. Code § 3853*), or (3) filing lien claim in suit by employee (*see Lab. Code § 3856(b)*); should employee and carrier file independent suits, suits must be consolidated under *Lab. Code § 3853*. *San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 846, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163*

Lab. Code § 3852, mandating that respective rights of employee's heirs seeking wrongful death damages and of employer seeking recoupment of payment made pursuant to workers' compensation laws against third-party tortfeasor be determined by court, also mandates that court determine apportionment of damage award. *Eli v. Travelers Indem. Co. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 901, 905, 235 Cal. Rptr. 704*

Lab. Code § 3852, authorizing actions against third party tortfeasors who injure employees, is more than a subrogation statute and includes actions under equitable doctrine of indemnity. *Associated Indem. Corp. v. Pacific Sw. Airlines (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 898, 905-906, 180 Cal. Rptr. 685*

Third party tortfeasor is liable, under doctrine of comparative negligence, to injured employee's employer only to extent of tortfeasor's proportional share of responsibility, regardless of amount employer has paid in compensation benefits. *Finney v. Manpower, Inc. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 1066, 1071, 177 Cal. Rptr. 74*

Under *Lab. Code § 3853*, relating to workers' compensation, when action is brought against third party tortfeasor by either employer or employee, the other is permitted at any time before trial on facts to join as party plaintiff, even though statute of limitations may have run on other's claim since complaint was filed. *Jordan v. Superior Court*

(1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 202, 206-210, 172 Cal. Rptr. 30

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsIndemnityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityClaim PresentationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.43

§ 536.43 Law Reviews

Borowitz, *Waiving Subrogation Rights and Conjuring Up Demons in Response to Deprizio, 45 Bus. Law. 2151 (1990)*

Fleming, *The Collateral Source Rule and Contract Damages, 71 Cal. L. Rev. 56, 70 (1983)*

Comment, *Employer Subrogation: The Effect of Injured Employee Negligence in Workers' Compensation/Third Party Actions, 18 San Diego L. Rev. 301 (1981)*

Lasky, *Subrogation Under the California Workmen's Compensation Laws--Rules, Remedies and Side Effects, 12 Santa Clara Lawyer 1 (1972)*

Chadwick and Poche, *California's Uninsured Motorist Statute: Scope and Problems, 13 Hastings L.J. 194 (1961)*

Comment, *Discharge of Contractual Obligation: Liability of a Stranger, 34 So. Cal. L. Rev. 467, 471, 475 (1961)*

Note, *Insurance: Subrogation of an Insurer to an Insured's Collateral Obligation, 11 Hastings L.J. 474 (1960)*

Comment, *Some Aspects of a Fidelity Insurer's Rights by Subrogation, 43 Cal. L. Rev. 85 (1955)*

Fourt, *Right of a Surety to Subrogation After Payment on a Negotiable Instrument, 1 Hastings L.J. 84 (1949)*

Note, *Suretyship: Subrogation: Subrogation of Surety on Appeal Bond Against Surety on Release of Attachment Bond, 22 Cal. L. Rev. 118 (1933)*

Note, *Suretyship: Subrogation to Rights of Creditor Against Third Person, 21 Cal. L. Rev. 176 (1933)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageUninsured MotoristsSubrogationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.44

§ 536.44 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vols. 4, 5, *Pleading*, §§ 107, 113-114, 863; Vol. 9, *Appeal*, § 272 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 4, *Security Transactions in Real Property*, § 111; Vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 183-189 (10th ed. 2005)

83 C.J.S., *Subrogation*, §§ 1-72

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsReal Property LawSecurities RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART III RESEARCH GUIDE

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.45-536.59

[Reserved]

§§ 536.45[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART IV PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-IV California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Scope

Scope

Practice Tip: A complaint in subrogation must both allege and prove (1) the elements establishing the plaintiff subrogee's right to subrogation and (2) the subrogor's cause of action against the obligor [*see Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 926-927, 930-931, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *Knight v. Alefosio (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 716, 725, 205 Cal. Rptr. 42* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 590* (manners in which issues of fact are raised); *Evid. Code §§ 500, 521* (burden of proof)]. These allegations need not be separately grouped but should be integrated so that the complaint sets forth the facts in a logical fashion [*see, e.g., § 536.100*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART IV PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.60

§ 536.60 Plaintiff's Right to Be Subrogated to Subrogor's Cause of Action Against Defendant Obligor

A complaint in subrogation must plead the facts showing the plaintiff's right to subrogation. While the facts giving rise to the right may vary, depending on the particular obligation discharged by the plaintiff, a complaint in subrogation generally should show the following:

1. Payment of an obligation by the plaintiff subrogee [*see Iusi v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 582, 587-588, 28 Cal. Rptr. 893]* ; or, if the subrogee is a state or county retirement system or a workers' compensation carrier, the payment of a liability, or an obligation to pay a liability, or both past payment and an obligation for future payments of a liability, because of injury to or death of a member or employee [*see Gov. Code §§ 21451, 31820*; *Lab. Code § 3852*].

2. Plaintiff, in paying the obligation, was not acting as a mere volunteer [*see Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 84, 230 P.2d 816* ; *McMillan v. O'Brien (1934) 219 Cal. 775, 779-782, 29 P.2d 183]* .

3. The debt paid was one for which the subrogee was not primarily liable [*see Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466]* .

4. An underlying cause of action or statutory basis for subrogation by alleging either:

a. The subrogor had an assignable cause of action to which the subrogee was subrogated [*see, e.g., Offer v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 114, 121, 228 P. 11* ; *Royal Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 64-65, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858]* , or

b. The facts showing that plaintiff comes within the operation of a statute that provides for subrogation to an otherwise nonassignable cause of action for personal injury [*see Gov. Code §§ 21451, 31820* (for benefits paid by state and county retirement associations); *Lab. Code § 3852* (for benefits paid by workers' compensation carriers); *Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)* (for claims paid by an insurer under the uninsured motorist

coverage)].

5. Subrogation will not work any injustice to the rights of others [*see* *Caito v. United Cal. Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 704, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Federal Ins. Co. v. Allen (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 648, 650, 92 Cal. Rptr. 125*].

6. When the action is against a person other than the actual wrongdoer who was the primary cause of the loss, plaintiff's equities are superior to those of the defendant [*see* *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Morse Signal Devices (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 681, 687, 198 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART IV PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.61

§ 536.61 Subrogor's Cause of Action Against Defendant Obligor

A complaint in subrogation must also allege the subrogor's cause of action against the obligor, since it is this cause of action to which the plaintiff is subrogated. The cause of action will, of course, vary, depending on the nature of the obligation discharged by the; plaintiff subrogee. The most common forms of subrogated actions appear to be actions arising from tort and actions arising from contract The elements of these causes of action are set forth below.

1. Subrogated Action in Tort. The complaint in a subrogated tort action (for example, negligence) should plead facts showing the following [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282, 3333*; *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 926-927, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987*]:

a. A duty on the part of the defendant (obligor) to the subrogor.

b. A breach of that duty.

c. Detriment or loss to the subrogor (or a detriment or loss that would have been sustained had it not been paid by plaintiff subrogee).

d. The detriment or loss was proximately caused by the defendant's breach.

e. The measure of damages (amount of money) required to compensate for the detriment sustained. (However, if the action is for personal injuries or wrongful death, the amount of the subrogor's claim must not be stated [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].)

2. Subrogated Action in Contract. The complaint in a subrogated action for breach of contract should allege facts showing the following [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282, 3300, 3302*]:

a. A duty on the part of the defendant to plaintiff's subrogor (the execution of the contract).

b. A breach of the contract by defendant (nonperformance of a contract provision).

c. The breach proximately caused detriment or loss to plaintiff's subrogor (or a detriment or loss would have been sustained had plaintiff not discharged the obligation or paid the loss).

d. The measure of the detriment in terms of money (damages), that is, the amount paid by plaintiff plus interest [*Civ. Code § 3287* (recovery of interest authorized)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART IV PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.62-536.79

[Reserved]

§§ 536.62[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
A. Capacity Allegations

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.80

§ 536.80 Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action
Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, a multiple line, including_____ [surety *or* fire *or* liability *or specify other as appropriate to the action*], insurance business in California.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a complaint on a subrogated claim to allege the capacity of the plaintiff insurer-subrogee as a corporation and its authority to transact a multiple line or, as it is frequently called, a general, insurance business, including the class of insurance involved in the particular case. Many subrogees are insurance companies subrogated to claims of their insureds. Insurers are prohibited from transacting any class of insurance which is not authorized by their charters [*Ins. Code §§ 16, 680*]. The complaint should, therefore, allege the particular class or combination of classes of insurance that the plaintiff is authorized to transact.

[3] Classes of Insurance

No person shall transact any class of insurance business in this state without first being admitted for such class [*Ins. Code § 700(a)*]. There are 22 separate classes of insurance in California [*Ins. Code § 100*] and a large number of possible combinations. Each class is separately defined in *Ins. Code §§ 100 et seq.*

[4] Cross References

For capacity allegations generally, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
A. Capacity Allegations

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.81

§ 536.81 Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM Allegation--Capacity of Plaintiff Insurer Suing as Subrogee of Insured and Authority to Transact Insurance Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action
Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* liability and automobile] insurance business in California.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use when the plaintiff insurer-subrogee is authorized to transact one or more classes of insurance business, but not a general insurance business.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 536.80*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
A. Capacity Allegations

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.82

§ 536.82 Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Multiple Line Insurer Including Particular Class Involved in Action

Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, a multiple line, including_____ [surety *or* fire *or* liability *or specify other as appropriate to the action*], insurance business in California, with its principal place of business in this state situated in _____ County.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a complaint on a subrogated claim against an insurer obligor. Like the allegation in *see § 536.80*, this allegation alleges the insurer's capacity as a corporation and authority to transact a multiple line insurance business, but includes in addition the statement of the insurer's principal place of business in California. For discussion of the county of a corporation's principal place of business, as well as other counties in which corporations may be sued, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* and Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 536.80*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
A. Capacity Allegations

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.83

§ 536.83 Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action

[1] FORM Allegation--Capacity of Defendant Insurer in Subrogation Action, Authority to Transact Insurance Business, and Location of Principal Place of Business--Insurer of Particular Class Involved in Action
Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* liability and automobile] insurance business in California, with its principal place of business in this state situated in _____ County.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a complaint on a subrogated claim against an insurer obligor. This allegation alleges the insurer's capacity as a corporation and authority to transact the particular class or classes of insurance business, but includes in addition the statement of the insurer's principal place of business in California. For discussion of the county of a corporation's principal place of business, as well as other counties in which corporations may be sued, see *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* and.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 536.80*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
A. Capacity Allegations

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.84-536.99

[Reserved]

§§ 536.84[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.100

§ 536.100 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Casualty Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Property Loss or Damage Covered by Insurance Policy--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Casualty Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Property Loss or Damage Covered by Insurance Policy--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAMAGES
	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
[_____ (*specify capacity, if a legal entity*),]	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of

_____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, business in this state as a_____ [*specify particular casualty insured against, e.g.,* fire] insurer.
2. _____ [*Name of plaintiff's insured*] [is, and] at all times herein mentioned was[,] _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the owner and operator of a restaurant, hereinafter "the restaurant," located at _____ (*street address*), _____ (*city and/or county*), _____ (*state*)].
3. At all times herein mentioned,_____ [*specify, e.g.,* the restaurant and its contents were] insured against loss or damage by_____ [*specify casualty covered, e.g.,* fire] under a policy of insurance, hereinafter "the policy," issued by plaintiff to_____ [*name of plaintiff's insured*] as the named insured. [A copy of the policy is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]
4. Defendant_____ [*name*] [is, and] at all times herein mentioned was[,] _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the owner and operator of a service station, hereinafter "the service station," located at _____ (*street address*), _____ (*city and/or county*), _____ (*state*)].
[5. Defendants Doe 1 through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants.)]

[6. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times mentioned in this complaint, each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of that agency and employment.]
7. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant[s, and each of them,] so negligently_____ [*specify, e.g.,* controlled, owned, operated, maintained, serviced, and repaired the service station premises as to allow gasoline to escape from the gas pumps and to cascade to the restaurant premises where it caught fire and exploded].
8. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them,] in_____ [*specify, e.g.,* allowing the gasoline to escape from the gas pumps, to catch fire, and explode], as hereinabove alleged,_____ [*specify damage to plaintiff's insured, e.g.,* the restaurant and all of its contents were totally destroyed].
9. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and of each of them,] and the_____ [*specify damage to plaintiff's insured, e.g.,* destruction of the restaurant and its contents], as hereinabove alleged,_____ [*name of plaintiff's insured*] _____ [*specify damages, e.g.,* was damaged in the sum of $_____ *or* sustained damages in the following amounts: _____ (*specify, e.g.,* $_____), the value of the restaurant building immediately before the fire; $_____, the value of personal property including appliances, furniture, carpets, draperies, curtains, and other furnishings, and uniforms, table linen, towels, dishes, glassware, silverware, supplies, foodstuffs, and other items; and $_____, the cost of removing the burned debris from the premises].
10. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff, in accordance with the terms of the policy paid_____ [*name of plaintiff's insured*] the sum of $_____ in full satisfaction of his/her claim for_____ [*specify, e.g.,* loss of property by fire] [and took from _____ (*name of plaintiff's insured*) an assignment of his/her right of recovery against any party responsible for the loss to the extent that payment therefor was made by plaintiff]. [A copy of the assignment is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]
11. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant_____ [*name*] of the payment and of plaintiff's right to subrogation [and the assignment],and demanded payment in the sum of $_____ [*amount paid*], but defendant_____ [*name*] failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to pay plaintiff the whole or any part thereof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:
1. For the sum of $_____ paid by plaintiff to_____ [*name of plaintiff's insured*] and for interest thereon at the legal rate from and after_____ [*date of payment*];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a casualty insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor) to recover from the defendant obligor (tortfeasor) the amount that plaintiff paid to its insured under an insurance policy covering property damage or loss, which damage or loss was tortiously caused by the defendant obligor. For alternative forms of allegations of the capacity of an insurer, see *§§ 536.80* and *536.81*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in the insurance business as a particular class of insurer (Paragraph 1);

- The identity of the subrogor (Paragraph 2);

- The existence of insurance covering the loss (Paragraph 3);

- The identity of the defendant obligor (Paragraph 4);

- The venue of the action (Paragraphs 2, 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392(1)(a), 395(a), 395.2, 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*];

- The defendants sued by fictitious names (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see also* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];

- Any agency relationship of defendants (Paragraph 6) [*see generally* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*];

- The defendant's duty to the subrogor, that is, the relationship between the parties giving rise to defendant's duty to exercise due care (Paragraphs 2, 4) [*see Civ. Code § 1714(a)*];

- The defendant's breach of that duty (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*];

- Proximate causation and detriment (Paragraphs 8, 9) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3282, 3333*];

- Damages (the measure of the subrogor's loss in terms of money) (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3333*];

- The plaintiff's payment of the subrogor's claim against defendant obligor (Paragraph 10); and

- The plaintiff's notice to and demand for payment from defendant obligor (Paragraph 11).

[4] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the claim is for $25,000 or less and the right to which the subrogee is subrogated is a legal, as opposed to an equitable, right, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 72055*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[6] Cross References

For alternative forms of capacity, residence, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.101

§ 536.101 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured as Replacement Cost of Destroyed Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Tortfeasor to Recover Amount Paid to Insured as Replacement Cost of Destroyed Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAMAGES
	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
[_____ (*specify capacity, if a legal entity*),]	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of

_____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, business in this state as a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* liability] insurer.
2. _____ [*Name of plaintiff's insured*], hereinafter "the insured," is, and at all times herein mentioned was,_____ [*specify, e.g.,* the owner and operator of a service station, hereinafter "the service station property,"] located at_____ [*street or highway address and city or county*], California.
3. At all times herein mentioned, the insured was insured by plaintiff under an insurance policy by the terms of which plaintiff was obligated to indemnify the insured against loss or damage to the_____ [*specify, e.g.,* service station property], including a certain_____ [*specify, e.g.,* pole sign] standing thereon and owned by the insured. [A copy of the policy is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]
[4. Defendants Doe 1 through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacitiesherein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants.)]
5. Defendant,_____ [*name*], is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ with its principal place of business in] _____ County, California.
[6. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times mentioned in this complaint, defendant, _____ (*name*), was the agent of the defendant _____ (*name*), and (in doing the things hereinafter alleged) was acting within the course and scope of that agency and with the permission and consent of his/her/its codefendant.]
7. _____ [*Allege damage to or destruction of property, e.g.,* On or about_____ [*date*], _____ (defendant *or name of defendant's employee*) was operating a certain truck on _____ (*name of highway or street*) at or near the location of the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* service station property). At that time and place, _____ (defendant *or name of defendant's employee*) so negligently operated, maintained, and controlled the truck that as a proximate result it was caused to, and did, leave the highway and collide violently with the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* pole sign) standing on _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the service station property)].
8. As a proximate result of the negligence of_____ [defendant *or name of defendant's employee*] and the collision hereinabove alleged, the_____ [*specify, e.g.,* pole sign] was_____ [*specify, e.g.,* damaged beyond repair].
9. The cost of replacing the_____ [*specify, e.g.,* pole sign] was $_____. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff under the terms of its policy paid the insured the sum of $_____, and plaintiff is therefore subrogated to all rights of the insured against defendant for the damage.
10. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendant_____ [*name*] of the payment and of plaintiff's right to subrogation, and demanded payment in the sum of $_____ [*amount paid*], but defendant_____ [*name*] failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to pay plaintiff the whole or any part thereof].

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor) to recover from the obligor (tortfeasor) the amount plaintiff paid to its insured under a policy providing indemnity insurance for a loss tortiously caused by the defendant and which was covered by the policy [*see Royal Indem. Co. v. Security Truck Lines (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 61, 65, 27 Cal. Rptr. 858*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in the insurance business as a particular class of insurer (Paragraph 1);

- The identity of the subrogor (Paragraph 2);

- The existence of an insurance policy providing indemnity for damaged or destroyed personal property (Paragraph 3);

- The defendants, if any, sued by fictitious names (Paragraph 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see also* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];

- The residence or capacity of the defendant if other than a natural person acting in an individual capacity and the identity of its employee who committed the tort if liability is founded on respondeat superior (Paragraphs 5, 6);

- The tortious act (Paragraph 7);

- Damage (Paragraph 8);

- The cost of repairing the damage and plaintiff's payment of the subrogor's claim against defendant obligor (Paragraph 9); and

- The plaintiff's demand for payment from the obligor and the obligor's failure to pay (Paragraph 10).

Paragraphs 2, 7, and 8, and alternatively Paragraph 5, lay venue [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392, 395(a), 395.2, 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*].

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.102

§ 536.102 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Insured's Former Employee to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Loss Through Employee's Theft or Embezzlement [Civ. Code § 3336]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Insured's Former Employee to Recover Amount Paid to Insured for Loss Through Employee's Theft or Embezzlement [Civ. Code § 3336]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* Califor-	)	
nia]	)	
Corporation,	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAM-
	)	AGES
vs.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
_____ [*name*],	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, business in this state as an admitted surety insurer.
2. Defendant,_____ [*name*], is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.

3. _____ [*Name of plaintiff's insured*], hereinafter "the insured," is, and at all times herein mentioned was,_____ [*specify capacity if other than a natural person, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California and] engaged in business as a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* manufacturer of television sets], with its principal place of business in this state located in _____ County, California.

4. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff was surety on a fidelity bond issued to the insured by the terms of which plaintiff agreed to indemnify the insured against any loss which the insured might sustain through any fraudulent or dishonest act by any one or more employees of the insured, of money or other property, real or personal, belonging to the insured, or in which the insured might have a pecuniary interest, or for which the insured might be legally liable, or which might be held by the insured in any capacity. [A copy of the bond is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof].
5. During the period beginning on or about _____ and continuing until on or about _____, defendant was employed as a_____ [*specify, e.g.,* bookkeeper] by the insured.
6. During the period of employment, defendant stole, embezzled, misappropriated, wrongfully abstracted and willfuly misapplied, and converted to his/her own use_____ [money *or specify other property as appropriate*] belonging to the insured_____ [in the sum *or* having a reasonable value] of $_____.
7. On or about _____, the insured executed and submitted to plaintiff its sworn proof of loss in the above stated sum of $_____ by reason of the acts of defendant as hereinabove alleged and made demand on plaintiff for indemnification in that sum. On or about _____, plaintiff paid to the insured the sum of $_____ under its bond to indemnify for such loss and thereupon became subrogated to all rights, and entitled to enforce all remedies, of the insured against defendant.
8. Plaintiff has made demand on defendant for payment of the sum of $_____, but defendant has failed and refused to pay either all or any part of it.

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor) to recover from the obligor (the insured's former employee) the amount plaintiff paid its insured under a fidelity bond for a loss resulting from the employee's theft or embezzlement of the insured's property or money. For a form of complaint by an insurer against a third party whose acts facilitated the defalcations of a dishonest employee, see *§ 536.107*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in the insurance business as a particular class of insurer (Paragraph 1);

- The residence of the defendant (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*];

- The identity of the subrogor (Paragraph 3);

- The existence of an insurance policy providing indemnity for the fraudulent or dishonest act of any employee (Paragraph 4);

- The employment period of the employee (Paragraph 5);

- The tortious act of the employee (Paragraph 6);

- The filing by the insured of a proof of loss and payment by plaintiff (Paragraph 7); and
- The plaintiff's demand of defendant for payment and defendant's failure to pay (Paragraph 8).

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.103

§ 536.103 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Contractor and Subcontractors to Recover Amount of Payment Made by Subrogee for Repairs Made Necessary by Negligent Construction of a Building on Insured's Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]--Against Contractor and Subcontractors to Recover Amount of Payment Made by Subrogee for Repairs Made Necessary by Negligent Construction of a Building on Insured's Property [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAM-
_____ [*name of contractor*],	)	AGES
[_____ (	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
if a legal entity),] [and]	)	[Amount demanded _____
_____ [*names and capac-*	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
ities of subcontractors]	)	
[, and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	
_____		

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, business in this state as, among other classes, a miscellaneous insurer.
2. _____ [*Name of plaintiff's insured*], hereinafter "the insured," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of certain real property, hereinafter "the property," known as_____ [*street address*], _____ [*city or county*], California, and more particulary described as follows:_____ [*legal description*].

3. At all times herein mentioned, the insured was insured by plaintiff under a policy of property insurance, hereinafter "the policy," by the terms of which plaintiff insured the insured against, among other risks, any loss or damage resulting from any improper construction of a building on the property. [A copy of the policy is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]
4. Defendant_____ [*name*], hereafter "defendant contractor," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, with its principal place of business in _____ County, and engaged in business as a general contractor.
5. Defendants_____ [*names*], hereinafter "defendant subcontractors," are, and at all times herein mentioned were, [*specify capacity, e.g.,* associated together under the assumed name of _____, with their principal place of business in this state located _____ in _____ County], and engaged in business as a specialty contractor performing_____ [*e.g.,* cement and concrete work].

[6. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 536.100[1], Paragraph 5.*]
7. On or about_____ [*date*], the insured entered into a written contract with defendant contractor by the terms of which defendant contractor agreed to construct a_____ [*e.g.,* residence], hereinafter "the building," on the property. [A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]
8. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant contractor employed defendant subcontractors [, and defendants Does 1 to _____, inclusive,] to perform the_____ [*e.g.,* cement and concrete work for the foundation and caissons] for the building.
9. Defendants, and each of them, so negligently performed the work under the contract that_____ [*describe injury, e.g.,* immediately on its completion, the building was caused to and did settle] and was thereby damaged.
10. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendants and each of them and the damage to the building as herein alleged, the insured was required to, and did, have repairs made to the building to put it in proper condition; the cost of the repairs was the sum of $_____, which is the reasonable value thereof and which was paid by the insured.
11. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff, pursuant to the terms of its policy, reimbursed its insured in the sum of $_____ in full payment of the costs of the repairs and thereby became subrogated to all of the insured's rights, and is entitled to enforce all of the insured's remedies, against defendants.
12. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff notified defendants, and each of them, of the payment made and of plaintiff's right to subrogation, and demanded reimbursement in the sum of $_____ [*amount paid*], but defendants, and each of them, failed and refused and continue to fail and refuse to reimburse plaintiff the whole or any part thereof.

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor, property owner) to recover from the obligors (contractor and subcontractors) the amount the insurer paid its insured under an insurance policy in reimbursement of the amount paid by its insured to repair the damage caused by the negligence of the defendants in

constructing the building [*see Firemen's Ins. Co. v. Indermill (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 339, 341-342, 6 Cal. Rptr. 469]* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in the insurance business as a miscellaneous insurer (Paragraph 1);

- The identity of plaintiff's subrogor, a property owner, and if venue is based on the county in which the contract was to be performed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*], the county in which the property is situated (Paragraph 2);

- The fact that the subrogor was insured by plaintiff against the loss alleged in the complaint (Paragraph 3);

- The legal capacity of the defendant contractor (obligor) and, if venue is based on the contractor's residence or place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a), 395.2, 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*], the county of its principal place of business (Paragraph 4);

- The legal capacity of the defendant subcontractors (obligors) and, if venue is based on their residence or place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a), 395.2, 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*], the county of their residence or principal place of business (Paragraph 5);

- The defendants, if any, sued by fictitious names (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see also* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];

- The duty of defendants to use reasonable care in constructing the building, that is, the execution of the contract with defendant contractor and its employment of the subcontractors (Paragraphs 7, 8);

- Breach of duty (Paragraph 9);

- Proximate causation, detriment, and damages (Paragraph 10);

- Payment by the insured of the cost of the repairs (Paragraph 10);

- The plaintiff's reimbursement of the amount paid as required by the terms of its insurance policy (Paragraph 11); and

- The plaintiff's demand for payment and defendants' failure to pay (Paragraph 12).

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.104

§ 536.104 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Against Insured's Subcontractors Under Indemnity Agreements [Civ. Code §§ 2772, 2778] to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Plaintiff on Behalf of Insured in Settlement of Action Brought Against It and Subcontractors for Injuries Caused by Negligence of Subcontractors [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Against Insured's Subcontractors Under Indemnity Agreements [Civ. Code §§ 2772, 2778] to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Plaintiff on Behalf of Insured in Settlement of Action Brought Against It and Subcontractors for Injuries Caused by Negligence of Subcontractors [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAM-
vs.	)	AGES
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
_____ [	)	[Amount demanded _____
of subcontractors],	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact, and transacting, business in this state as a liability insurer.
2. _____ [*Name*], hereinafter "the insured," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a_____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of State of California and] engaged in business as a general contractor.

3. At all times herein mentioned, the insured was insured by plaintiff under a policy of liability insurance by the terms of which plaintiff was obligated to assume and discharge any liability which the insured might incur for any injuries to any person in the course and scope of its business as a general building con tractor. [A copy of the policy is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]
4. Defendant_____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was,_____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and] engaged in business as a specialty contractor concerned with _____ [*e.g.,* furring, lathing, and plastering] [, with its principal place of business in this state _____] [situated in _____ County].
5. Defendant,_____ [*name*], is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ with its principal place of business in _____ County, and engaged in business as a specialty contractor concerned with_____ [*e.g.,* installation of floor covering].
6. On or about_____ [*date*], the insured was awarded a contract for the construction of a building, hereinafter "the building," on the premises known as_____ [*street address, or other common description as appropriate, city, county, and state*], hereinafter "the construction site." [A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]
7. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant_____ [*name of, e.g., furring, lathing, and plastering contractor*] entered into a written contract with plaintiff's insured by the terms of which it promised and agreed, for a consideration, to furnish all necessary labor, materials, tools, and equipment required for_____ [*e.g., metal furring, lathing, and plastering*] in the construction of the building. [A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.]
8. As part of its terms, the contract contains the following indemnity and hold harmless agreement by defendant_____ [*name of, e.g., furring, lathing, and plastering contractor*]: _____ [*quote provisions*].
9. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant_____ [*name of, e.g., terrazzo contractor*] entered into a written contract with plaintiff's insured by the terms of which it promised and agreed, for a consideration, to furnish all necessary labor, materials, tools, and equipment required to_____ [*e.g.,* install terrazzo work] in the construction of the building. [A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.]
10. As part of its terms, the contract contains the following indemnity and save harmless agreement by defendant_____ [*name of, e.g., terrazzo contractor*]:_____ [*quote provisions*].
11. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff's insured, and defendants, and each of them, were engaged in the construction of the building at the construction site. At this time and place, while one_____ [*name*], hereinafter "the injured party," was lawfully present at the construction site, defendants, and each of them, so negligently_____ [*specify acts, e.g.,* operated, maintained, and controlled a certain hoist] that as a proximate result thereof_____ [*specify accident, e.g.,* a board was caused to fall from the hoist and strike] the injured party causing serious personal injuries to his/her_____ [*specify, e.g.,* head and body].
12. By reason of the negligence of defendants and the injuries thereby caused, the injured person instituted an action for damages for personalinjuries against plaintiff's insured and against defendants, and each of them, in the Superior Court of California, [City and] County of _____, entitled_____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs._____ [*names*], Defendants, No. _____, hereinafter "the action."
13. On or about_____ [*date*], after being served with summons, plaintiff's insured [in writing] tendered defense of the action as to it to defendants, and each of them, in accordance with their respective indemnity and hold

harmless agreements, but defendants, and each of them, refused the tender, as a result of which plaintiff's insured was required to undertake its own defense to the action.

14. Concurrently therewith, plaintiff's insured demanded [in writing] of defendants, and each of them, that, in accordance with their respective indemnity and hold harmless agreements, they do all acts necessary to indemnify plaintiff's insured and hold it harmless from all liability, costs, losses, and claims resulting from the action, but defendants, and each of them, failed and refused to do so.
15. Thereafter defendants, and each of them, entered into negotiations with the injured party, who demanded the sum of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $30,000] as the minimum amount he/she would accept in full settlement of the action, and, on or about_____ [*date*], severally entered into agreements with the injured party providing for the payment to him/her of the sum of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $10,000] from each of them in exchange for the execution by the injured party of covenants not to levy execution against them.
16. As a proximate result of the failure and refusal of defendants, and each of them, to so honor their respective indemnity and hold harmless agreements and the making by them of the settlement agreements in partial satisfaction only of the minimum demand of the injured party, plaintiff, as insurer of plaintiff's insured, was required to, and on or about _____, did pay the balance of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $10,000] of the injured party's minimum demand in full settlement of his/her claim in order to avoid the expense of further defense of the action and the risk of a judgment in a larger sum being assessed against plaintiff's insured. As a further proximate result thereof, plaintiff, as such insurer, was required to, and on or about _____, did, pay to_____ [*name*], the attorney for plaintiff's insured, the sum of $_____ for his/her services in the defense of the action and in effecting the full settlement thereof. The sum so paid was the reasonable value of the services rendered by the attorney in the action.

17. By reason of the foregoing, plaintiff has become subrogated to the rights of plaintiff's insured against defendants, and each of them, to the extent of the sums so paid by it. [Prior to the commencement of this action, plaintiff's insured assigned to plaintiff all of its rights against defendants, and each of them.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:
1. For the sum of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $10,000] together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after_____ [*date of payment*].
2. For attorney fees in the sum of $_____ incurred and paid in defense of the action from and after_____ [*date of payment*].

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor, a general contractor) to recover from the obligors (two subcontractors) the amount the insurer paid in settlement of a portion of a cause of action which had been brought against its insured and the obligors on a liability of the obligors arising out of their negligence. The action is founded on a written agreement by the obligors to indemnify and hold harmless plaintiff's insured from any liability, claims, demands, or costs arising out of their negligence in the construction of a building.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in the insurance business as a liability insurer (Paragraph 1);

- The identity of plaintiff's subrogor, a general contractor (Paragraph 2);

- The existence of insurance issued by plaintiff covering its insured (Paragraph 3);

- The legal capacities of the defendants (Paragraphs 4, 5);

- The execution of the general contract (Paragraph 6);

- The execution of the subcontracts and of the indemnity and hold harmless agreements (establishing defendants' duty to plaintiff's insured) (Paragraphs 7-10);

- The injury to the third party, including the allegations of defendants' duty to that party (third party was lawfully on premises [*see Civ. Code § 1714*]) and their breach of that duty (negligence), as well as proximate causation and injury [*see Civ. Code § 3333*] (Paragraph 11);

- The filing of a lawsuit by the injured party against plaintiff and defendants (Paragraph 12);

- The defendants' breach of their indemnity and hold harmless agreements (Paragraphs 13-15);

- The plaintiff's payment on behalf of its insured as a proximate result of defendants' breach of their indemnity and hold harmless agreements (Paragraph 16); and

- The plaintiff's subrogation to the rights of its insured under the indemnity and hold harmless agreements (Paragraph 17).

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

For related forms and alternative forms of complaints on actions arising out of indemnity agreements, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.105

§ 536.105 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Surety as Subrogee of General Contractor--Against Subcontractor and Its Surety to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Subrogee to Material Suppliers of Defaulting Subcontractor [Civ. Code §§ 2848, 3300, 3302]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Surety as Subrogee of General Contractor--Against Subcontractor and Its Surety to Recover Amount of Payments Made by Subrogee to Material Suppliers of Defaulting Subcontractor [Civ. Code §§ 2848, 3300, 3302]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR MONEY
_____ [*name of subcontractor*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
[_____ (	)	[Amount demanded _____
legal entity, e.g., a California Corporation),]	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
and_____	)	
[*name of surety*], a_____	)	
[*e.g.*, California] Corporation,	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity of plaintiff as admitted surety insurer. See § 536.102[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Identity of plaintiff's insured. See § 536.104[1], Paragraph 2.*]
3. Defendant_____ [*name*], hereinafter "defendant subcontractor," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, and engaged in business in this state as a_____ [*specify specialty, e.g.,* plumbing] contractor, with its principal place of business in _____ County].
4. Defendant_____ [*name*], hereinafter "defendant surety," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to transact, and transacting, a surety insurance business in California, with its principal place of business in _____ County].
5. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff's insured entered into a written contract, hereinafter "the contract," with_____ [*name of owner*] for the construction of_____ [*specify, e.g.,* houses], hereinafter"the construction project," in_____ [*city*], _____ County, California. [A copy of the contract is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]
6. Pursuant to the provisions of the contract, plaintiff, as surety, executed and delivered to_____ [*name of owner*], as obligee, a performance bond conditioned on the faithful performance by plaintiff's insured of all work agreed to be performed under the contract and for the payment of all labor and materials furnished to the construction project, including all labor and materials furnished by the subcontractors and suppliers of plaintiff's insured. [A copy of the bond is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]
7. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant subcontractor entered into a written subcontract, hereinafter "the subcontract," with plaintiff's insured by the terms of which defendant agreed to perform certain_____ [*e.g.,* plumbing] work in connection with the construction project and to provide all labor, materials, and supplies necessary to complete the work under the subcontract. [A copy of the subcontract is attached hereto as exhibit C and made a part hereof.]

8. On or about the date the subcontract was executed, defendant insurer, as surety, executed and delivered to plaintiff's insured, as obligee, a bond, incorporating the subcontract, and conditioned on the faithful performance by defendant subcontractor, as principal, of all terms and conditions of the subcontract and the payment in full of all persons supplying labor and materials in connection with the performance of the subcontract. [A copy of the bond is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.]

9. Defendant subcontractor failed to perform the subcontract in that it did not pay and discharge debts incurred by it for materials furnished to it by certain material suppliers and incorporated into the construction project[; defendant subcontractor further failed to perform its subcontract in that it allowed mechanics' liens to be filed against the construction project for the unpaid debts].
10. The indebtednesses incurred by defendant subcontractor to the suppliers of materials to the construction project which defendant subcontractor failed to pay and which plaintiff was obligated to and did pay consist of the following:_____ [*set forth list, identifying each supplier, the materials supplied, and the amount of the supplier's charges*].
11. As a proximate result of defendant subcontractor's failure to pay for materials and supplies, plaintiff[, in order to avoid foreclosure of the mechanics' liens on the construction project,] was obligated under the terms of its bond to, and on or about _____ did, pay and discharge the indebtedness to each of the suppliers in the amounts hereinabove alleged in the total sum of $_____.
12. By reason of the payment of the claims in the total sum of $_____, as herein alleged, plaintiff became subrogated to all of the rights, and is entitled to enforce all of the remedies, of its insured against defendants, and each of them, to the extent of the payment made.

13. Plaintiff has demanded reimbursement from defendants of the amounts paid as herein alleged, but defendants have

failed and refused, and continue to fail and refuse to reimburse plaintiff the amounts paid or any portion thereof.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:
1. For the total sum of $_____ which plaintiff paid to defendant subcontractor's suppliers, with interest thereon as provided by law from the date of payment;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the surety (subrogee) of a general contractor (subrogor) against a subcontractor and its surety (obligors) to recover the amounts plaintiff was required to pay under its bond to the subcontractor's suppliers on the failure of the subcontractor (or its surety) to pay them as it was required to do by the terms of the subcontract which was incorporated by reference in the performance bond executed by defendant surety [*see Continental Cas. Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 570-571, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533]* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in a surety insurance business (Paragraph 1);

- The legal capacity (identity) of plaintiff's subrogor, a general contractor (Paragraph 2);

- The legal capacity and business of the defendant subcontractor (obligor) and its principal place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), 395.2, 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*] (Paragraph 3);

- The legal capacity of defendant surety (obligor), its authority to engage in a surety insurance business, and its principal place of business (Paragraph 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*];

- The execution by plaintiff's subrogor of the construction contract (Paragraph 5);

- The execution of the bond by plaintiff on behalf of its principal obligating it, among other things, to pay for materials and supplies furnished to the construction project on the failure of any of the contractor's subcontractors to do so (Paragraph 6);

- The execution of the subcontract by defendant subcontractor imposing on it the duty, among others, to pay for materials and supplies furnished to it for incorporation in the construction project (Paragraph 7);

- The execution of the bond by defendant surety imposing on defendant surety the duty, among others, to perform the subcontract on the subcontractor's failure to do so (Paragraph 8);

- The breach of the subcontract by defendant subcontractor (Paragraph 9);

- The names of the suppliers who were not paid by defendant subcontractor and the amounts owing to each (Paragraph 10);

- Payment of the suppliers by plaintiff (Paragraph 11);

- The plaintiff's right to be subrogated to the claim of its subrogor under the subcontract and defendant surety's bond against defendants (Paragraph 12); and

- The plaintiff's demand for payment and the failure of defendants to pay (Paragraph 13).

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

For additional forms of complaints by contractors and their sureties relating to construction contracts, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*

For forms of complaints for damages for breach of contract and various allegations for use in such complaints, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For additional forms of complaints by and against sureties relating to bonds, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.106

§ 536.106 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Remainderman as Subrogee of Public Taxing Body [Civ. Code § 2903]--Against Life Tenant to Compel Sale of Real Property, Apportion Proceeds, and Recover Amount Paid by Remainderman to Satisfy Tax Lien

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Remainderman as Subrogee of Public Taxing Body [Civ. Code § 2903]--Against Life Tenant to Compel Sale of Real Property, Apportion Proceeds, and Recover Amount Paid by Remainderman to Satisfy Tax Lien

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*names*],	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION TO ENFORCE
Defendants.	)	LIEN ON REAL PROPERTY
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:
1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of the remainder interest after the life estate in real property, hereinafter "the property," known as_____ [*street address*], _____ [*city and/or county*], California, and more particularly described as follows:_____ [*legal description*].

2. Defendant is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of an estate for life in the property.
3. At all times herein mentioned, defendant, as such the life tenant, had the duty to pay all taxes assessed on the property, but failed to pay the following taxes:_____ [*specify taxing agency, year, and amount*].
4. On or about_____ [*date*], as a proximate result of defendant's failure to have paid the taxes as

hereinabove alleged, the property was sold to the State of California for delinquent taxes.
5. On or about_____ [*date*], and before expiration of the period for redeeming the property from the tax sale, plaintiff made demand in writing on defendant to pay the taxes and penalties on the property, but defendant failed to do so.
6. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff, to prevent a final forfeiture of the property, including plaintiff's remainder interest in it, and to redeem the property from the tax sale, paid the taxes and penalties as follows:_____ [*specify date and amount paid, separately stating amount paid for taxes and amount paid for penalties and total amount of payment, and agency to which paid*].
7. By reason of the payment of the taxes and penalties as hereinabove alleged, plaintiff thereby became subrogated to the rights and remedies of_____ [*name of tax agency*] against defendant to the extent of the payment.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:
1. For sale of the property, apportioning the proceeds between the parties according to the value of their respective estates, and recovery of the sum of $_____ out of defendant's share of the proceeds to reimburse plaintiff for the taxes and penalties paid;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the remainderman, after payment of delinquent taxes and penalties to redeem the property from the lien, as subrogee of the taxing authority, against the life tenant who was obligated but failed to pay the taxes and penalties [*see Riley v. Turpin (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 152, 154-157, 301 P.2d 834*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The identity of the real property involved and its location, thereby laying venue in the county in which the real property is situated [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*] (Paragraph 1);

- The respective interests of the parties in the property (Paragraphs 1, 2);

- The defendant's duty to pay the taxes [*see Civ. Code § 840*] and defendant's breach of that duty by failing to do so (Paragraph 3);

- The sale of the property to the state for delinquent taxes as a proximate result of defendant's failure to have paid the taxes (Paragraph 4);

- The plaintiff's demand that defendant pay the taxes and penalties and defendant's failure to do so (Paragraph 5);

- The plaintiff's payment of the taxes and penalties to redeem the property and prevent a forfeiture [*see Civ. Code § 2903*] (Paragraph 6); and

- The plaintiff's subrogation to the rights of the taxing authority against the life tenant [*see Civ. Code § 2903*] (Paragraph 7).

[4] Subrogation of Person Redeeming Property from Lien

Every person, having an interest in property subject to a lien has the right to redeem it from the lien, at any time after the claim is due and before his or her right of redemption is foreclosed, and, by such redemption, becomes subrogated to all the benefits of the lien as against all owners of other interests in the property, except insofar as he or she was bound to make the redemption for their benefit [*Civ. Code § 2903*; *see Jones v. Gore (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 667, 674, 297 P.2d 474*].

Moreover, one who has a lien inferior to another on the same property has a right (1) to redeem the property in the same manner as its owner might from the superior lien and (2) to be subrogated to all the benefits of the superior lien, when necessary for the protection of his or her interests, on satisfying the claim secured by it [*Civ. Code § 2904*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.107

§ 536.107 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured--Against Insured's Certified Public Accountants to Recover Amount of Payments Made to Insured for Losses Resulting From Employee's Defalcations on Grounds of Negligence [Civ. Code § 3333] and Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300] in Conducting Annual Audits and Failing to Discover Defalcations [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] in Subrogation--By Insurer as Subrogee of Its Insured--Against Insured's Certified Public Accountants to Recover Amount of Payments Made to Insured for Losses Resulting From Employee's Defalcations on Grounds of Negligence [Civ. Code § 3333] and Breach of Contract [Civ. Code § 3300] in Conducting Annual Audits and Failing to Discover Defalcations [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT IN SUBROGATION FOR DAM-
vs.	)	AGES
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
_____ [*names*],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendants.	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insurer as the subrogee of its insured (subrogor) to recover the amount the subrogee was required to pay to its insured under its bond or bonds because of the defalcations of the insured's employee. The action is not against the defaulting employee (obligor) but rather against the insured's accountants whose negligence in performing audits permitted the defalcations to occur. For a form of complaint for use by a subrogee against a defaulting employee, see *§ 536.102*. For a discussion of the doctrine of superior equities, which is applied to determine whether or not a subrogee may recover against a party other than the actual wrongdoer who caused the loss (primary obligor), see *§ 536.42[9]*.

If the loss was in excess of the penalty amount of the bond or bonds and the insured assigned to plaintiff its right to recover the excess amount from the accountants, optional Paragraph 12 should be used [*see Civ. Code §§ 953, 954*]. In the absence of an assignment, both the insurer and insured should join as plaintiffs in the same action, the insurer to recover the amount it paid and the insured to recover the unpaid amount of its loss, to avoid the defense of res judicata based on a splitting of a cause of action [*see Ferraro v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 33, 41, 162 Cal. Rptr. 238 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Goodman v. Lozano (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1327, 1336-1338, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 219, 223 P.3d 77* ; *Phillips v. Western Pac. R.R. Co. (1971), 22 Cal. App. 3d 441, 444, 99 Cal. Rptr. 451*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint sets forth in separate counts alternative theories of liability and alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in a surety insurance business (Paragraph 1);

- The capacity of defendants and their business as certified public accountants, and the place of their principal place of business in California (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.2*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*];

- The legal capacity (identity) of plaintiff's subrogor and the insurance coverage (Paragraph 3);

- The terms of the bonds (Paragraph 4);

- The facts surrounding the discovery of the defalcations, prompt notice to the insurer, and the insured's justifiable reliance on the defendants' audits to discover any dishonesty of its employee (Paragraphs 5-8) (to negate any implication that the loss was caused by the insured's negligence which is imputed to the insurer) [*see Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 602, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57*];

- The defendants' duty (established by contract) to audit the insured's books during the periods in question (Paragraph 7);

- The defendants' breach of duty (negligence) and failure to discover the defalcations (Paragraph 9) [*see Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Harris, Kerr, Forster & Co. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1100, 1102, 89 Cal. Rptr. 437*];

- The loss to the insured as a proximate result of defendants' breach of duty (Paragraph 10);

- The plaintiff's payment to its insured in the penalty amount(s) of the bond(s) (Paragraph 11);

- The insured's assigment to plaintiff of its right to recover from defendants the excess of the amount

embezzled over the amount covered by the bond(s) (Paragraph 12);

- The plaintiff's demand for reimbursement and defendants' failure to pay (Paragraph 13);

- The incorporation of pertinent paragraphs into the second cause of action (Paragraph 14);

- The breach of contract by the defendants (Paragraph 15); and (14) proximate causation and damage to the insured (Paragraph 16).

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 536.100*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.108

§ 536.108 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--By Fidelity Insurer Against Insured and Bank Paying Forged Check Drawn on Insured's Account--To Declare Rights and Duties of Parties Relating to Reimbursement and Subrogation [Com. Code §§ 3419(1)(c), 4406]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--By Fidelity Insurer Against Insured and Bank Paying Forged Check Drawn on Insured's Account--To Declare Rights and Duties of Parties Relating to Reimbursement and Subrogation [Com. Code §§ 3419(1)(c), 4406]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
a_____ [*e.g.*, California]	)	
Corporation,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
_____ [	)	NO. _____
principal],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
[_____ (	)	
legal entity, e.g., a California	)	
Corporation,) and_____	)	
[*name of bank*], [_____	)	
(*specify capacity, e.g.*, a Nation-	)	
al Banking Association,)]	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
_____		

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity of plaintiff as admitted surety insurer. See § 536.102[1], Paragraph 1.*]
2. Defendant_____ [*name of principal*], hereinafter "the insured," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, with its principal place of business in _____ County.
3. The insured is, and at all times herein mentioned was insured by plaintiff under a fidelity bond, hereinafter "the bond," insuring against loss through the dishonest act of any of the insured's employees to a liability limit of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000]. A copy of the bond is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.
4. Defendant_____ [*name of bank*], hereinafter "the bank," is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [a national banking association organized and existing under the laws of the United States of Americaand authorized to transact, and transacting, a banking business in California *or* a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California and authorized to do business as a bank by the Superintendent of the State Banking Department of California], with its principal place of business [in this State] situated in _____ County].
5. At all times herein mentioned, the insured maintained a checking account with defendant_____ [*name of bank*].
6. On or about_____ [*date*], the insured presented plaintiff with a written claim under the bond for loss in the sum of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000], asserting that a certain employee of the insured had forged a check, hereinafter "the check," on the insured's account in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $35,000], that the bank had paid the forged check and charged the full amount to the insured's account, that the bank subsequently credited the insured's account in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $20,000], leaving a loss in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000], that the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000] was a loss occasioned though a dishonest act of an employee, and that the insured looked to plaintiff for payment of the loss under the terms of the bond. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

7. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the check was drawn by an unauthorized person and that the signature of the purported drawer thereon was forged.
8. Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that the bank failed to obtain any identification from the person presenting the check for payment, that it did not examine the purported signature of the payor on the check, that it did not compare the signature with copies of the signatures of those persons authorized to sign checks on the insured's behalf on file with the bank, and that it did not phone or attempt to phone the insured to verify the check, all in direct violation of the customs and practices of the banking industry in the _____ [*e.g.,* County of _____] and in violation of its express instructions to its own employees in force at that time, that the bank was thereby negligent, and that as a proximate result of its negligence it failed to discover the forgery and honored the check, to the insured's damage in the entire amount of the check charged against the insured's account.
8. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff demanded of the insured in writing that the insured proceed against the bank to recover the claimed loss in the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000], but the insured failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to do so. A copy of the demand is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.
9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the bank has refused and continues to refuse to credit the insured's account for the full amount of the check and that the difference between the amount of the check and the amount credited is $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000].

10. By reason of the existence of the bond, the claim of loss made by the insured thereunder, the failure and refusal of the insured to proceed against the bank to recover the loss, and the refusal of the bank to credit the insured's account in the amount of the claimed loss, an actual controversy exists relating to the rights and duties of the respective parties.

11. More specifically, the controversy consists of the following opposing contentions:
a. Plaintiff contends that the bank, by reason of its negligence in having honored a forged check as alleged above, is liable to the insured for the full amount of the check, to wit, $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $35,000], and not just for the amount of the check minus the liability limit of the bond, that the insured has a duty to proceed against the bank to recover the loss, as demanded by plaintiff, and that plaintiff has no present duty under its bond to pay the claimed loss.

b. The insured contends that it has no duty to proceed against the bank and that it is entitled to the penal limit of plaintiff's bond.
c. The bank contends that it has no duty to credit the insured's account with the full amount of the check, that $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000] of the loss was covered by the bond, and that it is the duty of plaintiff to pay the insured this sum under the terms of the bond.
d. Plaintiff contends that if it is obligated to pay the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000] to the insured it is thereby subrogated to all rights of the insured against the bank and entitled to recover such amount from the bank.

e. The bank contends that the insured has no rights against the bank to which plaintiff may be subrogated and that plaintiff is not entitled to recover the claimed loss from it.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment:
1. Declaring the rights and duties of the parties herein, and specifically declaring that the bank is liable to the insured for the full amount of the forged check, that if plaintiff is required to pay the insured the amount of $_____ [*specify amount, e.g.,* $15,000] under the bond, the plaintiff may recover this amount from the bank under the doctrine of subrogation.

2. For costs of suit herein incurred.

3. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a fidelity--that is, a surety (see *Ins. Code § 105*)--insurer against its insured and a drawee bank to secure adeclaration of the respective rights and duties of the parties with respect to a loss arising out of a forged check, including any right plaintiff may have in the event it is required to pay its insured the bond to be subrogated to the insured's right against the bank [*see Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Bank of Am. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 545, 550, 34 Cal. Rptr. 23*]. For a discussion of the doctrine of superior equities, see *§ 536.42[9]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- The plaintiff's legal capacity and its authority to engage in business as a surety insurer (Paragraph 1) [*see Ins. Code § 105*];

- The name and capacity of plaintiff's princi- pal and its status in the action as a defendant (Paragraph 2);

- The insurance contract (bond) between plaintiff and its principal (Paragraph 3);

- The capacity of defendant bank and its authority to transact a banking business in California (Paragraph 4);

- The venue of the action (Paragraph 2 or 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*; *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*];

- The contractual relationship between the principal and the bank (Paragraph 5);

- The making of a claim by the principal against plaintiff for a loss covered by the bond based on defendant bank's cashing a check drawn on the principal's account that was forged by a dishonest employee of the principal and the bank's crediting the principal's account only with the amount of the check in excess of the amount of plaintiff's bond (Paragraphs 6, 7);

- The plaintiff's demand on the principal that the principal take steps to recover the full amount of the check from the bank, and the principal's refusal to do so (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 2845*; *Com. Code §§ 3419(1)(c), 4406*];

- The bank's refusal to credit the principal's account with the full amount of the check (Paragraph 9);

- The existence of an actual controversy among the parties as to their respective duties and liabilities (Paragraph 10) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]; and

- The contentions of the parties with respect to their duties and liabilities, showing that a justiciable controversy exists (Paragraph 11) [*see Alturas v. Gloster (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 46, 48, 104 P.2d 810* (complaint insufficient)].

[4] Cross References

See also *§§ 536.100* and *536.102*

For forms of complaint by a drawer against its bank and by a payee bank against others, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*

For additional forms of complaint for declaratory relief and a more detailed discussion of the requirements of such complaints, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For a form of complaint and related forms of allegations for use in an action by an insured against a fidelity insurer for breach of contract, see Ch. 308, *Insurance*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
B. Complaints

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 536.109-536.119

[Reserved]

§§ 536.109[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.120

§ 536.120 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff Was Volunteer in Satisfying Claim

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff Was Volunteer in Satisfying Claim
AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that plaintiff, in satisfying the claim sued on, acted officiously and as a mere volunteer for his/her own purposes, without any _____ [obligation to _____ (*name of creditor*) *or* interest in the property] and thereby acquired no rights against defendant.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegation is for inclusion in an answer to a complaint in subrogation to raise the defense that the subrogee's payment was made voluntarily and without any obligation by plaintiff to make it.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of the format requirements and complete forms of answers, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.121

§ 536.121 Affirmative Defense--Accident Caused by Subrogor's Negligence

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Accident Caused by Subrogor's Negligence
AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* at the alleged time and place in question, plaintiff's subrogor, _____ (*name*), so negligently drove, operated, maintained, and controlled his/her vehicle as to proximately cause and contribute to the collision complained of and to whatever injury or damage, if any, plaintiff's subrogor claims to have sustained therefrom].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer by the alleged obligor in an action by a subrogee (insurer, workers' compensation carrier, or state or county retirement system) who paid its insured's, employee's, or member's claim for injuries sustained as a proximate result of defendant's alleged negligence. It raises the defense that the subrogor (plaintiff's insured, the injured employee, or the retirement system member) was contributorily negligent in the accident that caused the loss. The defense of comparative negligence may, however, be raised in any action based on negligence [*see Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 828-829, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226*]; hence, the defense may be raised in a subrogated action based on negligence for loss or damage to property as well.

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 536.120*

For an alternative form and further discussion of the doctrine of comparative negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.122

§ 536.122 Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations
AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that the action sued on in the complaint herein is barred by the provisions of Section_____ [*specify, e.g.,* 335.1] of the_____ [*specify, e.g.,* Code of Civil Procedure].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer by the obligor to a complaint by a subrogee when the subrogor's action (or the subrogee's action in the case of a subrogated claim by the state or a county retirement system [*see Gov. Code §§ 21455, 31823*] or by an insurer seeking recovery of the amount it paid to its insured under the uninsured motorist provisions of its policy [*see Ins. Code § 11580.2(g)*]) is barred by the statute of limitations [*see §§ 536.20, 536.21*].

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 536.120*

For further discussion and alternative forms of affirmative defenses, and forms of demurrers to the complaint, based on the statute of limitations, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 536 SUBROGATION
PART V FORMS
C. Affirmative Defenses

47-536 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 536.123

§ 536.123 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Claim Paid by Setoff [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.70]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Claim Paid by Setoff [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.70]
AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that the claim sued on in the complaint has been paid _____ [in full *or* in the amount of $_____] by virtue of the following cross claim that coexisted with the claim of_____ [plaintiff *or name of plaintiff's subrogor*] at a point in time when neither claim was barred by the statute of limitations:_____ [*specify*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer by the obligor to a complaint by a subrogee to raise the defense th

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 537.syn

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.syn Synopsis to Chapter 537: SUMMARY JUDGMENT

§ 537.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 537.02 Cross References

§§ 537.03-537.09 [Reserved]

§ 537.10 Governing Law

§ 537.11 Types of Summary Proceedings

[1] Summary Judgment

[2] Summary Adjudication

§ 537.12 Purpose and Nature of Summary Proceedings

§ 537.13 Summary Proceedings Compared to Other Proceedings

[1] Demurrer or Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

[2] Trial of Special Issues

[3] Motion to Strike

[4] Motion to Enforce Settlement

§ 537.14 Summary Judgment Is Available When Action Has No Merit or No Defense

§ 537.15 No Summary Judgment as to Liability When Damages Must Be Determined

§ 537.16 No Comment When Summary Judgment Granted on Basis That Defendant Was Without Fault

§ 537.17 Summary Adjudication

[1] Available to Dispose of Cause of Action, Affirmative Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty

[2] Cause of Action

[3] Issue of Duty

[4] Punitive Damages

[5] No Comment on Summary Adjudication

§ 537.18 Particular Actions in Which Summary Proceedings Are Limited or Unavailable

[1] Action for Unlawful Detainer, Forcible Entry, or Forcible Detainer

[2] Consumer Class Action

[3] Medical Malpractice Action in Which Defendant Seeks Security for Defense Costs

[4] Action to Terminate Parental Custody

[5] Election Contest

§ 537.19 Strategic Planning for Bringing Motion

[1] Pre-discovery Planning

[2] Effect of "Fast Track" and Other Local Rules

[3] Use of Discovery

[4] Collecting Evidence for Motion

[a] Advance Preparation

[b] Stipulation to Facts

§ 537.20 Timing Requirements for Making Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Motion Permitted If 60 Days Have Lapsed Since Opposing Party's General Appearance

[2] Cutoff for Hearing 30 Days Before Trial

[3] Motion Does Not Extend Time for Filing Responsive Pleading

§ 537.21 Preparing Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment and Accompanying Papers

[1] Notice of Motion

[2] Declarations and Other Supporting Evidence

[3] Statement of Material Facts

[4] Supporting Memorandum

[5] Proposed Order

§ 537.22 Service Requirements

§ 537.23 Filing Requirements

§ 537.24 Preparing the Supporting Evidence

[1] Supporting Affidavits or Declarations

[a] Sufficiency Requirements

[b] Showing Declarant's Competency

[c] Stating Evidentiary Facts

[d] Incorporating Documentary Evidence

[e] Contradicting or Repudiating Prior Testimony or Statements

[2] Admissions

[3] Depositions and Answers to Interrogatories

[4] Matters Subject to Judicial Notice

[a] Supporting or Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment

[b] Mandatory Judicial Notice

[c] Permissive Judicial Notice

§ 537.25 Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Opposing Memorandum

[2] Opposing Statement of Material Facts

[3] Opposing Evidence

[a] Requirement

[b] Sufficiency

[c] Preparation

[d] Defamation and Invasion of Privacy Actions

[4] Procedural and Evidentiary Objections

[a] Nature and Purpose of Objections

[b] Time for Filing Objections

[c] Required Format for Written Objections

[d] Proposed Order and Court's Ruling on Objections

[5] Proposed Order

[6] Motion for Sanctions for Bad-Faith Affidavits

[7] Motion to Continue

[8] Cross Motion for Affirmative Relief

[9] Limitation Concerning Voluntary Dismissal

§ 537.26 Serving and Filing the Opposing Papers

§ 537.27 Reply to Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities

[2] Supplementary Evidence

[3] Motion for Sanctions for Bad-Faith Affidavits

§ 537.28 Serving and Filing the Reply Papers

§ 537.29 Procedure on Motion for Summary Adjudication

§ 537.30 Obtaining Deposition of Expert Witness

§ 537.31 Hearing Requirement

§ 537.32 Trial Court Cannot Delegate Responsibility to Rule on Motion Absent Consent

§ 537.33 Standard for Granting Summary Judgment

[1] No Triable Issue and Moving Party Entitled to Judgment

[2] Evaluation of Evidence to Determine if Triable Issues Exist

[a] All Evidence in Papers Generally Considered

[b] Moving Party's Initial Burden of Persuasion and/or Production

[i] Plaintiff or Cross Complainant

[ii] Defendant or Cross Defendant

[c] Shift of Burden to Opposing Party

[d] Showing Required to Shift Burden of Production

[i] Move Toward Federal Standard

[ii] Showing Required on Defendant's Motion

[A] When Element of Plaintiff's Cause of Action Lacking

[B] For Affirmative Defense

[e] Effect of Heightened Burden of Proof

[f] Construction of Affidavits and Declarations

[g] Weight of Admissions

[i] Admissions Obtained Through Discovery

[ii] Judicial Admissions

[3] Power of Court to Grant Motion on Issue Party Did Not Raise

§ 537.34 Standards for Denying Summary Judgment

[1] Triable Issues Exist or Moving Party Is Not Entitled to Judgment

[2] Contradicted Inferences of Fact

[3] Motion Based on Issues Asserted in Prior Unsuccessful Motion for Summary Adjudication

[4] Discretionary Denial

[a] Material Fact Depends on Sole Witness

[b] Failure to State Legal Ground for Motion

[c] Absence of Statement of Undisputed Facts or Unavailablity of Facts

[5] Denial With Opportunity to Amend Complaint

[6] Denial of Motion to Allow Discovery

[7] Denial Based on Issues Raised Outside of Pleadings

[8] Special Rule in Cases of Public Design Immunity

§ 537.35 Standard for Granting or Denying Summary Adjudication

§ 537.36 Continuance When Opposing Facts Cannot Be Presented

§ 537.37 Statement of Reasons for Ruling

[1] Denying Motion

[2] Granting Motion

[3] Correcting Erroneous Ruling on Motion for Clarification

§ 537.38 Sanctions for Bad Faith or Delay

[1] In Presentation of Affidavits

[2] In Making or Opposing Motion

[3] In Action for Indemnity or Contribution or Under California Tort Claims Act

[4] Review of Order Imposing Sanctions

§ 537.39 Motion for Reconsideration

§ 537.40 Motion for New Trial

§ 537.41 Motion to Vacate Judgment

§ 537.42 Entry of Judgment

§ 537.43 Review of Summary Proceeding on Appeal

[1] Availability of Appeal

[a] When Summary Judgment Is Granted

[b] When Summary Adjudication Is Granted

[c] When Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication Is Denied

[2] Standard of Review

[a] Limited Use of Abuse of Discretion Standard

[b] Independent Review Standard

[3] Scope of Review

[a] Affirmance on Any Legal Basis

[b] Consideration of Legal Arguments Not Presented Below

[c] No Consideration of Evidence or Objections Not Raised Below

[4] When Reviewing Court May Direct Trial Court to Enter Judgment

[5] Lack of Statement of Reasons in Trial Court Opinion

§ 537.44 Review of Summary Proceeding by Peremptory Writ

[1] When Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication Has Been Denied

[2] When Summary Adjudication Has Been Granted

[3] Time Limits for Seeking Review

[4] Reviewing Court to Permit Supplemental Briefs in Certain Situations

§§ 537.45-537.49 [Reserved]

§ 537.50 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 537.51 State Statutes

§ 537.52 California Rules of Court

§ 537.53 Local Court Rules

[1] Los Angeles County

[2] San Francisco City and County

§ 537.54 Decisions

[1] Amendment of Pleadings

[2] Availability of Summary Judgment

[a] On Motion Only

[b] On Stipulation

[c] Procedural Limitations

[d] Antitrust Cases

[e] Mandamus Proceedings

[3] Burden of Proof

[a] In General

[b] Effect of Admissions on Burden of Proof

[c] Effect of Presumption Affecting Burden of Proof

[4] Collateral Estoppel

[5] Constitutionality

[6] Conduct of Hearing

[7] Continuance

[8] Cross Complaints

[9] Discovery Products and Matters Subject to Judicial Notice

[10] Duty of Court

[11] Evidence

[a] Affiant's Credibility

[b] Admissible Evidence Required

[c] Inferences From Evidence

[d] No Reliance on Party's Own Pleadings

[e] Objections to Evidence

[f] Statements in Memorandum

[g] Testimony From Other Cases

[h] Written Documents

[i] Contradiction or Repudiation of Prior Statements

[12] Federal Rule Compared

[12A] Issues Raised in Prior Motion for Summary Adjudication

[13] Local Court Rules

[14] Materiality of Disputed Facts

[15] Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

[16] Motion for New Trial

[17] Nature of Summary Judgment

[18] Purpose of Summary Judgment

[19] Questions of Law

[20] Review by Appeal

[a] Affirmance on Any Legal Basis

[b] Arguments Not Raised in Trial Court

[c] Denial if Triable Issue Exists

[d] Order Denying Summary Judgment

[e] Order Granting Summary Judgment

[f] Standard of Review

[21] Review by Mandate

[22] Ruling on Motion

[22A] Service of Motion

[22B] Setting Aside Summary Judgment

[23] Speaking Motion to Dismiss or Strike Superseded

[23A] Separate Statement of Material Facts

[24] Sufficiency of Pleadings

[25] Summary Adjudication

§ 537.55 Law Reviews

§ 537.56 Text References

§§ 537.57-537.59 [Reserved]

§ 537.60 Moving Party

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Motion Procedure

§ 537.61 Opposing Party

[1] Preliminary Determinations

[2] Opposition Procedure

§ 537.62 Hearing on Motion

§§ 537.63-537.69 [Reserved]

§ 537.70 Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Summary Adjudication

[4] Caption

[5] Supporting Papers

[a] Papers Required

[b] Statement of Undisputed Material Facts

[c] Evidence in Support of Motion

[d] Judicial Notice

[6] Filing and Service of Notice

[7] Time for Filing Responsive Pleading Not Affected

[8] Cross References

§ 537.71 Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Required Supporting Papers; Service Requirements

[4] Summary Adjudication

[5] Proposed Order

[6] Cross References

§ 537.72 Evidence Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)(4), (g)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.73 Declaration in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Sufficiency Requirements

[4] Incorporation of Documentary Evidence

[5] Sanctions

[6] Cross References

[7] Text References

§ 537.74 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Format of Papers

[4] Providing Electronic Version

§ 537.75 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.76 Declaration in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Other Opposing Papers

[4] Cross Motion for Affirmative Relief

[5] Opposition on Grounds of Unavailable Evidence

[6] Service and Filing

[7] Cross References

§ 537.77 Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Format of Papers

[4] Objections to Evidence in Support of the Motion

[a] Manner of Objecting

[b] As Inadmissible

[c] As Declaration by Sole Witness or Affirming Declarant's State of Mind

[d] As Disputed by Evidence Not Then Available

[5] Providing Electronic Version

§ 537.78 Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.79 Evidence Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)(3), (g)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.80 Notice of Motion, Motion, and Supporting Declaration for Order Imposing Monetary Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.81 Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Specification of Reasons

[4] Notice of Order

[5] Cross References

§ 537.82 Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment and Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Entry of Judgment and Notice of Entry

[4] Review After Entry of Judgment

[5] Cross References

§ 537.83 Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 537.84 Order Granting Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Specification of Reasons

[4] Cross References

§ 537.85 Order Denying Motion for Summary Judgment and/or Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action,

Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds for Denial

[4] Notice of Order

[5] Review

[6] Text References

§ 537.86 Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time for Filing and Service

§ 537.87 Order on Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

Hon. Patti S. Kitching
Barbara A. Reeves
Charles Pereyra-Suarez
Contributing Editors n*

FOOTNOTES:
(n97)Footnote *.
Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. **Barbara A. Reeves** is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. **Charles Pereyra-Suarez** is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART I. SCOPE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.01

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses summary judgment proceedings in state trial courts in the following sections:

- An overview of summary judgment proceedings. [*see § 537.10* et seq.]
- The procedural requirements for summary proceedings. [*see § 537.20* et seq.]
- Issues relating to the ruling on a summary motion. [*see § 537.31* et seq.]
- Post-ruling matters. [*see § 537.39* et seq.]

The chapter includes the following forms:

- Notices of motion for summary judgment and summary adjudication [*see §§ 537.70, 537.71*].
- Covers for supporting [*see § 537.72*] and opposing [*see § 537.79*] evidence.
- Supporting [*see § 537.73*] and opposing [*see § 537.76*] declarations.

- Supporting [*see §§ 537.74, 537.75*] and opposing [*see §§ 537.77, 537.78*] statements of facts claimed to be undisputed or disputed.

- Orders granting [*see §§ 537.81, 537.84*] or denying [*see § 537.85*] a motion for summary judgment or for summary adjudication.

- Judgment combined with an order granting a motion for summary judgment [*see § 537.82*], and a separate form of judgment [*see § 537.83*].

- Notice of motion and supporting declaration to seek sanctions against another party who has filed a summary judgment affidavit or declaration in bad faith or solely for purposes of delay [*see § 537.80*].

- Form of written objections to evidence in support of or in opposition to a motion for summary judgment, along with the required proposed order for ruling on the objections [see *§§ 537.86, 537.87*].

This chapter includes a Research Guide [*see § 537.50* et seq.]

This chapter also includes Procedural Checklists for moving [*see § 537.60*] and opposing [*see § 537.61*] parties and for a hearing on motion [*see § 537.62*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentNoticesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART I. SCOPE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.02

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.02 Cross References

For forms and discussion relating to motions for summary judgment in particularactions or proceedings, see specific chapters on substantive topics and the General Index in this set

For further discussion and forms concerning affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For discussion and forms relating to the recovery of costs and fees in general, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

For discussion and forms relating to sanctions, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

For discussion and forms for use in obtaining, amending, enforcing, or attacking judgments in general, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

For further discussion and forms concerning review by extraordinary writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms for use in supporting summary judgment based on the affirmative defense of res judicata or collateral estoppel, see Ch. 491, *Res Judicata* .

For further discussion and forms concerning service of papers and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

For discussion and forms for use in shortening or extending the time requirements in summary judgment proceedings, see Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* .

For discussion and forms relating to stipulations, for use as admissions when the parties do not dispute the facts and seek summary judgment to resolve issues of law, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART I. SCOPE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 537.03-537.09

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

[Reserved]

§§ 537.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.10

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.10 Governing Law

Summary judgment in state trial courts is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350*. In addition, objections to evidence in the papers in a summary judgment proceeding are governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1352* and *3.1354*. Local court rules may also affect summary judgment proceedings [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule § 8.11] although any local rule or policy in conflict with the statute, rule of law, or Judicial Counsel rule is invalid [*Lokeijak v. City of Irvine (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 341, 344, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 429*], and all local rules relating to motions and the form and format of papers are preempted by the Judicial Council unless otherwise permitted or required by statute or Judicial Council Rule [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.20*].

Statutes applicable to specific cases include the following:

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7,* providing for expedited summary judgment procedure in unlawful detainer or forcible entry proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(q), (r)*].

- *Civ. Code § 1781(c),* providing for a hearing similar to and in lieu of summary judgment procedure in consumer class actions brought under that section.

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6(e), (f),* under which a motion to require the plaintiff in a medical

malpractice action to file an undertaking and motions for summary judgment are mutually exclusive.

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038*, allowing recovery of defense costs when granting summary judgment in certain actions.

For further discussion of these sections, see *§ 537.18[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful DetainerTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityHealthcare Providers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.11

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.11 Types of Summary Proceedings

[1] Summary Judgment

Summary judgment is a procedure by which a plaintiff or defendant in an action or proceeding may obtain a judgment without a trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*]. A summary judgment is a final judgment disposing of an entire action or proceeding as to the parties to the motion, granted on the ground that the action has no merit or there is no defense [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 537.14*.

[2] Summary Adjudication

A motion for summary adjudication seeks an order disposing of one or more ofthe following without trial, when they comprise less than the entire action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*]:

- One or more causes of action within an action.
- An affirmative defense to a cause of action.

- A claim for punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294*.
- The issue of whether one or more defendants owed, or did not owe, a duty to one or more plaintiffs.

For further discussion, see *§ 537.17[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.12

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.12 Purpose and Nature of Summary Proceedings

Summary judgment is intended to expedite litigation by preventing unnecessary trials and protect and promote the administration of justice [*Campanano v. California Medical Center (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1322, 1326-1327, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 606* ; *Ferrell v. Southern Nevada Off-Road Enthusiasts, Ltd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 309, 313, 195 Cal. Rptr. 90*].

Two basic aims underlie summary proceedings:

- To penetrate adept pleadings and discover, through the media of affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) whether the parties actually possess evidence requiring the weighing procedures of a trial [*Chern v. Bank of America (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 866, 873, 127 Cal. Rptr. 110, 544 P.2d 1310* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Service Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 851, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *see Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 468, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678*].

- To summarily determine whether the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, if no triable issues of material fact are found to exist [*see Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 874, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* ; *Stationers Corp. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d*

412, 417, 42 Cal. Rptr. 449, 398 P.2d 785].

The purpose of summary judgment is to separate those cases in which there are material issues of fact meriting a trial from those in which there are no such issues [*Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66*].

In ruling on a summary judgment motion the court merely determines if triable issues of material fact exist. The court does not decide the merits of the issues [*Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46*] (in light of 1992 and 1993 amendments of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, *Molko* held to be no longer vital on the issue of the showing required by a moving defendant in *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*); *accord Hayward Area Planning Assn. v. Alameda County Transportation Auth. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 95, 110, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744* .

Notwithstanding the economic benefits of summary judgment, courts generally view it with caution as a drastic procedure that should not beallowed to supplant the open-trial method of determining facts unless clearly appropriate [*see, e.g., Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46* ; *Security Pacific Nat'l Bank v. Bradley (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 89, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220* ; *cf. Alszeh v. Home Box Office (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1460, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* (summary judgment favored remedy in defamation and invasion of privacy cases)]. Moreover, because it is a drastic remedy it is important that all procedural requirements be satisfied before a trial court grants the remedy. Thus, local rules may not provide a shortcut for these requirements [*Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681* (local rule not consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* invalid and judgment resulting from invocation of its procedures reversed)]. Parties must comply with the summary judgment procedures mandated by statute and court rules, and it is improper for parties to enter into a stipulated judgment that the trial court would have granted summary judgment in a matter for purposes of expediting an appeal; it is not the place of the parties, even if assigned to the complex litigation court, to rewrite the Code of Civil Procedure for their own convenience and economic interests [*Magana Cathcart McCarthy v. CB Richard Ellis, Inc. (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 106, 118, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 109]* .

CAUTION:

Highly technical procedure. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* is a complicated statute, and there is little flexibility in its procedural imperatives. Courts have held that a trial court has discretion to forgive such procedural imperfections such as an opposing party's failure to dispute a fact set forth in the separate statement where the other evidence as a whole warrants it. This is based, in large part, on the discretionary language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)*. However, a court may not overlook defects in a party's moving or opposing papers when the evidence and other material submitted do not "alleviate the problems created by the parties' omissions and concessions" [*Zimmerman, Rosenfeld, Gersh & Leeds v. Larson (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1475, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 111*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsNeed for Trial

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.13

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.13 Summary Proceedings Compared to Other Proceedings

[1] Demurrer or Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

A motion for judgment on the pleadings has the purpose and effect of a general demurrer. It may be used after the time to demur has expired to challenge an adversary's pleading on the ground that the pleading fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action or defense [*compare Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)* (demurrer available when ground for objection to complaint, cross complaint, or answer appears on face thereof) *with Code Civ. Proc. § 438* (motion for judgment on the pleadings)].

While a party moving for summary judgment is required to present extrinsic evidence, such as affidavits, declarations, admissions, and the like [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[1][a]* et seq., *below*], a party seeking judgment on the pleadings is confined to presenting defects fully disclosed on the face of the pleadings under attack or matters for which the court may take judicial notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 438(d)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Test of the Pleadings. Unlike a motion for judgment on the pleadings, a summary judgment motion presupposes that the pleadings are adequate to put in issue a cause of action or a defense to a cause of action. Nevertheless, a pleading may be defective in failing to allege an element of a cause of action or in failing intelligibly to identify a defense to it. In such a case, the moving party need not address a missing

element or, obviously, respond to assertions that are unintelligible or make out no recognizable legal claim. The summary judgment proceeding is thereby necessarily transmuted into a test of the pleadings and the summary judgment motion into a motion for judgment on the pleadings. A defendant's motion for summary judgment then necessarily includes a test of the complaint's sufficiency and, as such, is in legal effect a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Similarly, a plaintiff's motion for summary judgment necessarily includes a test of the sufficiency of the answer [*FPI Development, Inc. v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 382, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508* ; *see also American Airlines, Inc. v. County of San Mateo (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 1110, 1117-1118, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251, 912 P.2d 1198* (defendants' summary judgment motion used to test whether complaint stated cause of action treated as motion for judgment on the pleadings because time for demurrer had passed); *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1532, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (motion for summary judgment that argues pleadings do not support claim evaluated as motion for judgment on the pleadings, and tests whether complaint sufficient to state cause of action); *Columbia Casualty Co. v. Northwestern Nat. Ins. Co. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 457, 463, 468-470, 282 Cal. Rptr. 389* (distinguishing motions for summary judgment and motions for judgment on pleadings)].

PRACTICE TIP: Test Sufficiency of Pleadings Before Determining Triable Issues. To avoid unnecessary confusion or delay, the parties and the court, on a motion for summary judgment, should first consider the sufficiency of the pleadings. If the pleadings are not defective, the court may then determine from the evidence supporting and opposing the motion whether the triable issues apparently raised by them are real or merely the product of adept pleadings. If, however, the pleadings are defective, the court has discretion to grant the opposing party leave to amend. In the latter situation, on a subsequent motion the court may rule in favor of the moving party if it determines that (a) the opposing party simply cannot state a cause of action on the theory relied on (in effect a judgment on the pleadings without leave to amend), or (b) there are no triable issues of material fact that would permit recovery on that theory [*Hejmadi v. AMFAC, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 525, 536, 249 Cal. Rptr. 5* ; *see also Taylor v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 472, 479, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 873* (when motion for summary judgment is treated as motion for judgment on pleadings, trial court may give plaintiff opportunity to amend complaint even when no motion to amend has been filed)].

When a motion for summary judgment is in effect a motion for judgment on the pleadings, it is better practice to grant the motion with leave toamend and, after the issues have been properly plead, to renew the motion for summary judgment [*Wood v. Riverside General Hospital (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1113, 1120, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 8* (dicta; affirming summary judgment without returning the case to the trial court to follow the two-step procedure because result would be the same)].

A motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication may revisit issues that were the subject of an earlier demurrer which was overruled. The *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008* restrictions on motions for reconsideration do not apply [*Community Memorial Hospital v. County of Ventura (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 199, 205, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732*].

For discussion relating to motions for judgment on the pleadings, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[2] Trial of Special Issues

The court may, on its own motion or on a party's motion, proceed to the trial of a defense before the trial of any other issue in the case when the answer to a complaint or cross complaint pleads any of the following defenses [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 597*]:

- The action is barred by the statute of limitations [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 597.5* (separate trial of

limitations defense in medical malpractice action)].

- The action is barred by a prior judgment.
- Another action is pending on the same cause.
- Another defense exists not involving the merits of the action but constituting a bar or ground of abatement to its prosecution.

For discussion and forms relating to separate trial of defenses, see *Ch. 3, Abatement, § 3.110* et seq.

[3] Motion to Strike

Any party may serve and file a notice of motion to strike the whole or any part of the following pleadings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 435(a)(2), (b)(1)*]:

- Demurrers.
- Answers.
- Complaints.
- Cross complaints.

A motion to strike must be made within the time allowed to respond to the challenged pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 435(b)(1)*].

Contrasted with a motion for summary judgment, the function of a motion to strike is to raise objections to pleadings on grounds that appear on the face of the pleading or from matters of which the court is required to take judicial notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437(a)*].

For discussion and forms relating to motions to strike, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[4] Motion to Enforce Settlement

If the parties stipulate to a settlement, either in writing signed by the parties outside the presence of the court or orally on the record before the court, the court may entertain a motion to enter judgment pursuant to the terms of the settlement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6*]. The motion may be made only in the action that the agreement is purported to settle [*Viejo Bancorp, Inc. v. Wood (1989) 217 Cal. App. 3d 200, 206-208, 265 Cal. Rptr. 620* .] *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.6* makes it unnecessary to file a motion for summary judgment to enforce an oral settlement agreement. For further discussion of motions to enforce settlement, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40* et seq.

An oral, out-of-court settlement may be enforced by a motion for summary judgment. The motion may be granted only if there is no dispute of material fact [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *Kilpatrick v. Beebe (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1527, 1529-30, 269 Cal. Rptr. 52*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to StrikeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsJudgment on the PleadingsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsEnforcementGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSeparate Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.14

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.14 Summary Judgment Is Available When Action Has No Merit or No Defense

Any party may move for summary judgment in any action or proceeding if it is contended that the action has no merit or that there is no defense thereto [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. Such a contention is well taken when all the papers submitted in connection with the motion show that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *see* discussion in *§ 537.33[1]*].

A cause of action has no merit if either of the following is true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)*]:

- One or more of the elements of the cause of action cannot be separately established, even if the element is separately pleaded.

- If a defendant establishes an affirmative defense to the cause of action.

Parties who agree as to the facts and seek merely to resolve disputed issues of law may also move for summary judgment [*see T.M. Cobb Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 606, 612, 128 Cal. Rptr. 655, 547 P.2d 431* ; *Dixon v. Salvation Army (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 463, 464, 191 Cal. Rptr. 111*]. Nevertheless, the mere fact that both sides move for summary judgment does not establish that there is no triable issue of material fact; the trial court may make an independent determination on this point before proceeding to decide any questions of law [*Coast*

Elevator Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 576, 583-584, 118 Cal. Rptr. 818 (disapproved on another ground in *Culligan Water Conditioning v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 86, 93 n.4, 130 Cal. Rptr. 321, 550 P.2d 593*)].

Summary judgment is available only on motion. Thus, it cannot be granted in favor of a nonmoving party who successfully opposes a motion for summary judgment [*Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363* ; *see also Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London v. Superior Court (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 952, 958, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821* (as amended, *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* expressly precludes California trial judges from entering a summary judgment sua sponte); *but see Conley v. Matthes (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1453, 1459 n.7, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518* (power of reviewing court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 43* to direct trial court to enter summary judgment, when it appears from the record as a matter of law that there is only one proper judgment on undisputed facts)]. Similarly, a trial court cannot grant summary judgment in favor of a party that sought only summary adjudication of certain claims and that had conceded that another claim should go to trial [*Denney v. Universal City Studios, Inc. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1226, 1232, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 170*].

Summary judgment may not be available if there was an earlier motion for summary adjudication [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*; *see § 537.34[3]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofAbsence of Essential Element of ClaimCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofImplausible ClaimsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.15

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.15 No Summary Judgment as to Liability When Damages Must Be Determined

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c does not provide for partial summary judgment as to liability when issues as to the calculation of damages remain. A decision on the issue of liability against a party on whom liability is sought to be imposed does not result in a judgment until the issue of damages is resolved [*see Department of Industrial Relations v. UI Video Stores, Inc. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1097, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457*]. In *Department of Industrial Relations* the court of appeal, after finding that the defendant was liable to the plaintiff, denied the plaintiff's request to order the trial court to enter summary judgment in the plaintiff's favor. The trial court had apparently ordered the plaintiff to move for summary judgment on the issue of defendant's liability, with damages to be determined in a later accounting proceeding. The correct trial court procedure would have been a motion to bifurcate the issue of liability under *Code Civ. Proc, § 598*, which the parties could have tried on the undisputed facts [*Department of Industrial Relations v. UI Video Stores, Inc. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1097, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457*]. Thus, summary judgment should not be granted unless there is no triable issue of material fact as to both the issues of liability and damages [*see, e.g., Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 853, 870-871, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (when summary judgment in legal malpractice action was granted in defendant's favor, additional summary judgment granted in defendant's favor on its cross complaint for unpaid attorney fees was also proper because issue of malpractice had been disposed of on other summary judgment motion and plaintiff was bound by judicial admissions that were binding without further evidence as to the reasonableness of the fees and plaintiff's obligation to pay them)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary JudgmentsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.16

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.16 No Comment When Summary Judgment Granted on Basis That Defendant Was Without Fault

In actions that arise out of an injury to the person or to property, when a motion for summary judgment has been granted on the basis that the defendant was without fault, no other defendant during trial, over plaintiff's objection, may attempt to attribute fault to or comment on the absence or involvement of the defendant who was granted the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(l)*]. Violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(l)*, however, is not reversible error per se [*Knowles v. Tehachapi Valley Hospital Dist. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1083, 1094-1094, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192* (*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 13*, prohibits reversible error per se in civil cases; miscarriage of justice is required to reverse civil judgment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewStandards of ReviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewReversible Errors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.17

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.17 Summary Adjudication

[1] Available to Dispose of Cause of Action, Affirmative Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty

Summary adjudication is available only on a motion for such relief, either by itself or as an alternative to summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*; *see Travelers Indemnity Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co. (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1538, 1542, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 271*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Alternative Notice For Summary Adjudication. If counsel only gives notice of a summary judgment, the court cannot grant a summary adjudication [*see Jimenez v. Protective Life Ins. Co. (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 528, 534-535, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326*]. Consequently, it is usually a good idea to give alternative notice for summary judgment or summary adjudication.

Any party may move for summary adjudication when he or she contends one of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*]:

- That one or more causes of action within an action has no merit.

- That there is no defense to one or more causes of action within an action.
- That there is no merit to an affirmative defense as to any cause of action.
- That there is no merit to a claim for punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294*.
- That one or more defendants either owed or did not owe a duty to the plaintiff or plaintiffs.

A cause of action has no merit if either of the following is true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)*]:

- One or more of the elements of the cause of action cannot be separately established, even if the element is separately pleaded.
- A defendant establishes an affirmative defense to the cause of action.

Summary adjudication can be used only to adjudicate facts or issues that completely dispose of a cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty [*see Code Civ. Proc. 437c(f)(1)*; *Rooz v. Kimmel (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 573, 593-594, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177* (judge had no authority to find no triable issues of fact remained with respect to delineated issues of fact without drawing legal conclusion from those facts that conclusively disposed of a cause of action or an issue of duty); *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1688 n.11, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195* (when plaintiffs pleaded their case by combining causes of action, defendant nonetheless entitled to move for summary adjudication to dispose of allegations that would have formed a single cause of action if properly pleaded)]. As a result of a 1990 amendment to the statute, "facts" of any kind, whether undisputed, underlying, supporting, or subsidiary, are not subject to summary adjudication [*Raghavan v. The Boeing Co. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1136, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397*]. The aim of the procedure is to discover whether the parties possess evidence requiring the weighing procedures of a trial [*Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 337, 344, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*]. If a motion for summary adjudication is granted, any cause of action, defense, claim, or issue of duty as to which the motion was granted is deemed to be established at the trial of the action. The action proceeds to trial only with regard to any remaining cause of action, defense, claim, or issue of duty [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(n)(1)*]. At trial, the grant of summary adjudication will not operate to bar any cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty as to which summary adjudication was not sought or was denied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(n)(2)*].

A motion for summary adjudication is not a reconsideration of a motion overruling a demurrer. The requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*, dealing with reconsideration motions, do not apply to such a motion. Accordingly, a motion for summary adjudication may revisit issues of law raised on a demurrer [*Community Memorial Hospital v. County of Ventura (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 199, 205, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732* (refusing to follow *Gilberd v. AC Transit (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1502, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626* , to the extent it may be read to the contrary)].

Summary judgment, not summary adjudication, is the appropriate remedy when a defendant establishes an affirmative defense to all the claims against that defendant [*24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1216 n.12, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533*].

[2] Cause of Action

A party may move for summary adjudication challenging a separate and distinct wrongful act, even if that act is combined with other wrongful acts alleged in the same cause of action [*Lilienthal & Fowler v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1848, 1854-1855, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 458* ; *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1688 n.11, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* does not specifically define "cause of action," allegations relating to two separate matters involving acts performed at different times, with different and

distinct obligations, involve two separate and distinct causes of action, regardless of how pled in the complaint [*Lilienthal & Fowler v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1848, 1854, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 458* (claim of professional negligence in two transactions pled in same cause of action); *see also Catalano v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 91, 96, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842* (liability based on separate theory as constituting cause of action)].

A party cannot select issues (other than duty and punitive damages) implicated in one or more causes of action, amend its pleading to add a cause of action for declaratory relief as to those issues, and then obtain a summary adjudication of the declaratory relief cause of action [*Nazir v. United Airlines, Inc. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 243, 251, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 296* (defendant's motion improperly sought adjudication of 44 "issues," none of which, taken individually, would dispose of an entire cause of action)]. This would subvert *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*, which restricts the summary adjudication remedy to motions that would adjudicate an entire cause of action or affirmative defense, or the issues of duty or punitive damages [*Hood v. Superior Court (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 319, 321, 323, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*]. When the adjudication of a declaratory relief action does not adjudicate the entirety of any cause of action, it is prohibited by the statute. Failure to deny the motion is an abuse of discretion [*Hood v. Superior Court (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 319, 324, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (declaratory relief cause of action unnecessary and superfluous as issues invoked in that cause of action already fully engaged by other causes of action)]. However, summary adjudication of a properly pled cause of action for declaratory relief is not precluded merely because the issues subject to declaratory relief are present in other causes of action [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Superior Court (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 839, 845-846, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227*]. In *Southern Cal. Edison Co.*, the court distinguished *Hood v. Superior Court* as a case in which the court had recognized that what the party had done was to pluck certain issues out of an existing complaint and cross complaint and put them in a purported declaratory relief cause of action solely for the purpose of moving for summary adjudication on that cause of action and thus making an end run around the restrictions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*. The lesson of *Hood* is that parties will not be permitted to misuse a declaratory relief cause of action in an attempt to subvert the requirement that a summary adjudication must completely dispose of a cause of action [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Superior Court (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 839, 846, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227*].

[3] Issue of Duty

An "issue of duty" for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* is not statutorily defined. It has been held, however, that the phrase "an issue of duty" in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* is not limited to negligence causes of action. If, under the facts and circumstances of a given case, a court finds it appropriate to determine the existence or nonexistence of a duty in the nature of a contractual obligation, it may properly do so by ruling on that issue presented by a motion for summary adjudication [*Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 508, 518-519, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*].

There are conflicting opinions on whether summary adjudication is available under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* when a ruling on an issue of duty would not dispose of an entire cause of action or affirmative defense, or terminate some portion of an action. There is authority that has held that to be consonant with the legislative purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*, a ruling on a summary adjudication which determines an issue of duty must dispose of an entire cause of action or affirmative defense, or terminate some portion of an action [*Regan Roofing Co. v. Superior Court (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 425, 436, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 413 (Fourth Dist., Div. One)*]. This authority, however, has been rejected by another court [*see Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 508, 517-518, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708* (Second Dist., Div. Seven; rejecting *Regan* as controlling precedent)]. In *Linden*, the court noted that the substantive areas which may be challenged under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* are stated in the disjunctive, that is, "a cause of action, an affirmative defense, a claim for damages or an issue of duty." The *Linden* court believed that the plain meaning of this language is that a motion for summary adjudication may be granted or denied as to any of these substantive areas, standing alone, and without reference to the dispositive effect of such ruling on any of the companion substantive issues. A ruling that completely disposes of an issue of duty as required by the last sentence of the section, but which has no dispositive impact on other issues would appear to conform with legislative intent and the straight-forward, unambiguous language of the *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*. Thus, on a motion for summary adjudication,

the court may rule whether a defendant owes or does not owe a duty to plaintiff without regard for the dispositive effect of such ruling on other issues in the litigation, except that the ruling must completely dispose of the issue of duty [*Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 508, 519-522, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*].

[4] Punitive Damages

A claim for punitive damages is one of the substantive areas which is properly the subject of a motion for summary adjudication. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*, however, does not allow piecemeal disposition of some of the asserted facts within a claim for punitive damages, but may only be granted when the entire claim for punitive damages is eliminated. Accordingly, when a claim for punitive damages is based on an interrelated set of facts and circumstances, if any one or more of the facts would support a claim for punitive damages, then summary judgment is not available to eliminate from trial other facts relating to the claim for punitive damages [*Catalano v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 91, 92, 95, 97-98, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842*]. The *Catalano* court, however, did not decide if summary adjudication must eliminate all claims for punitive damages in one action when there are separate and distinct claims for punitive damages, having nothing to do with one another, although contained within one complaint [*Catalano v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 91, 98 n.5, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842*].

[5] No Comment on Summary Adjudication

At trial, neither a party, nor a witness, nor the court may comment on the grant or denial of a motion for summary adjudication to the jury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(3)*]. It is also error for a court, after summary adjudication of certain causes of action, to instruct the jury considering the remaining cause of action that certain facts were established despite the fact that the court did not use the term "summary adjudication" [*Raghavan v. The Boeing Co. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1136, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397*]. For discussion of the *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(l)* prohibition of comment on a defendant whose summary judgment motion was granted in a personal injury or property damage action, see *§ 537.16*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary JudgmentsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.18

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.18 Particular Actions in Which Summary Proceedings Are Limited or Unavailable

[1] Action for Unlawful Detainer, Forcible Entry, or Forcible Detainer

Although summary judgment generally is available in actions for unlawful detainer and forcible entry or detainer on the same basis as a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7*] the following special rules apply:

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* and *(b)* are expressly inapplicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(r)*].

- Notice of a motion for summary judgment must be given in compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1013* and *1170.7* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1351(a)*].

- Opposition to the motion and any reply to that opposition may be made orally at the time of the hearing. Alternatively, if a party seeks to have a written opposition considered in advance of the hearing, the written opposition must be filed and served on or before the court day before the hearing and must be by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail, or other means consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010*, *1011*, *1012* and *1013*, and reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties no later than the close of business on the court day before the hearing. The court, in its discretion, may consider written opposition filed later [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1351(b)*, *(c)*].

- No provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* may be construed to extend the period for trial otherwise provided for the proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.5* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(q)*].

- A motion for summary judgment may be made at any time after the answer is filed on giving five days' notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7*; *compare CodeCiv. Proc. § 437c(a)* (requiring at least 75 days' notice)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Good Cause for Shortening Time. While *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(q)* excludes application of the time requirements for service and filing of any opposition or reply under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)*, Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7 provides no time requirements in their place. In the absence of any other provision, the time for service and filing would normally be nine court days for opposition papers and five court days for a reply [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1177* (unless otherwise provided, general rules of civil practice apply in unlawful detainer and forcible entry actions)]. But in this instance compliance with the normal rules is impractical, if not impossible, in light of the five-day notice of motion period permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7*. Parties seeking to submit an opposition or reply in such cases, including those seeking to submit written objections to evidence under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1352* and *3.1354*, should therefore cite the five-day notice period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7* as good cause for an order permitting the service and filing of the opposition or reply within less time than that normally required.

For discussion of unlawful detainer proceedings, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[2] Consumer Class Action

A motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* will not be granted in any class action under *Civ. Code § 1781(a)* of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act (*Civ. Code § 1750 et seq.*). Nonetheless, any party in such an action may move for a hearing to determine whether the action is without merit or there is no defense to the action. The moving party must give at least 10 days' notice to the other parties to the action and submits supporting affidavits or declarations by any persons having knowledge of the facts [*Civ. Code § 1781(c)*; *see, e.g., Kagan v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 582, 589 n.2, 200 Cal. Rptr. 38, 676 P.2d 1060* (motion under *Code Civ. Proc. 437c* treated as motion under *Civ. Code § 1781(c)(3)*)]. For discussion of these actions, see Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* .

[3] Medical Malpractice Action in Which Defendant Seeks Security for Defense Costs

Any defendant in an action for medical malpractice who moves for an order requiring the plaintiff to post security for defense costs as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6(a)* cannot afterwards move for summary judgment. Similarly, any defendant moving for summary judgment is precluded from subsequently moving for security under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6(a)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6(e), (f)*]. For discussion of *Section 1029.6*, see Ch. 295, *Hospitals* .

[4] Action to Terminate Parental Custody

Summary judgment procedure is inappropriate in a proceeding to terminate a parent's rights of custody and control over his or her child [*Fam. Code § 7800 et seq.*], because these proceedings must be set for trial prior to the time that a motion for summary judgment may be brought [*see Fam. Code § 7870*; *In re Mark K. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 94, 101-104, 205 Cal. Rptr. 393* (applying former *Civ. Code § 232 et seq.*)].

[5] Election Contest

Summary judgment is unavailable in election contests due to incompatibility with time requirements imposed under

Elec. Code § 20020 et seq. [*Anderson v. County of Santa Barbara (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 780, 786-787, 128 Cal. Rptr. 707*].

Pre-election review of a proposed ballot initiative, however, was appropriately carried out and trial court properly granted summary judgment to city and baseball team on their requests for declaratory relief that the proposed initiative was invalid [*City of San Diego v. Dunkl (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 384, 389, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewFamily LawParental Duties & RightsTermination of RightsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsElectionsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsElectionsReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & DetainerTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityHealthcare Providers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.19

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.19 Strategic Planning for Bringing Motion

[1] Pre-discovery Planning

Preparation for a motion for summary judgment should be a major part of the initial evaluation of the case. It can begin before the first responsive pleadings are filed.

Some issues, however, may be best resolved early by demurrer, motion to strike, motion for separate trial of special defenses, motion for judgment on the pleadings, or other grounds for abatement [*see* discussion in *§ 537.13[1]* et seq.]. Other issues, even if they are evident on the face of the complaint might better be resolved after limited discovery.

ILLUSTRATION:

Summary Judgment vs. Demurrer. Defendant identifies an issue that appears on the face of the pleadings but that is not waived if raised later. Strategic considerations regarding demurring include:

- Demurrer sustained without leave to amend: case resolved favorably.
- Demurrer sustained with leave to amend:

- Advantage: limits issues, thus limiting discovery and other costs.

- Disadvantage: strengthens plaintiff's complaint, provides plaintiffwith a preview of expected motion for summary judgment.

Strategic considerations in merely answering the defective pleading, conducting discovery, possibly focused primarily on this issue, include:

- Summary judgment granted:

  - Advantages: final judgment, more time to understand case fully, focuses opponent's attention on his or her case's weaknesses, which may lead to settlement.

  - Disadvantage: costs of discovery incurred.

- Summary judgment denied:

  - Disadvantages: opponent given preview of movant's evidence and legal theories, parties or witnesses will be barred by statements in affidavits or declarations and may be impeached by these statements at trial, expensive, parties assume same risk as going to trial.

A discovery plan is a key part of case strategy and management. Any discovery plan should be developed with an eye toward using discovery in a summary judgment motion as well as in trial preparation. For further discussion of discovery plans, see DeMeo, California Deposition and Discovery Practice, Ch. 2 (Matthew Bender).

[2] Effect of "Fast Track" and Other Local Rules

All courts are required to have "fast-track" procedures to implement the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 68605.5, 68620*]. These procedures may affect the prospective movant's timing and strategy. For example, some courts may require discussion early in the litigation of issues as to which early resolution may be possible [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.6(c), (d) (court to consider at first status conference nature and extent of law and motion proceedings anticipated and whether some or all issues can be arbitrated or should be referred to another form of Alternative Dispute Resolution)].

Some counties have other programs designed to foster early resolution of cases that provide opportunities for testing summary judgment issues [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 4.2 (Voluntary Civil Mediation)]; such programs provide an added incentive for parties to prepare to argue summary judgment issues early in the litigation.

Although the court may for good cause modify the periods within which papers supporting and opposing a motion for summary judgment may be filed, local court rules may not restrict the availability of summary judgment [*see Wells Fargo Bank v. Superior Court (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 918, 923, 254 Cal. Rptr. 68*]. Local rules and practices may not be applied so as to prevent the filing and hearing of a summary judgment motion filed within the time limits of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*Sentry Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 526, 529, 255 Cal. Rptr. 13*]. Mandamus proceedings may be used to challenge local rules in conflict with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*see Wells Fargo Bank v. Superior Court (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 918, 923, 254 Cal. Rptr. 68*].

In complex litigation, a case management order cannot preclude a party from filing a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. §*

437c, for example, by setting up a procedure for resolving choice of law issues involved in dispositive motions before the motions themselves may be filed [*First State Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 324, 330-331, 336, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 104*]. The *First State* court also held, however, that once a *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* motion has been filed, the trial court has inherent power to defer hearing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* motions in order to first decide the myriad choice of law issues potentially involved in the case. The court specifically said that it was not stating that the trial court may establish a procedure for deferred hearing of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* motions in every complex case. Each case must be examined individually to determine the propriety of the case management order issued in that case [*First State Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 324, 331-336, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 104]* .

ILLUSTRATION:

Conflicting Local Court Rule. A local court rule requires that "extensive" or "complicated" motions for summary judgment be filed six months before trial. This increases the time period by which a motion must be heard before trial, well exceeding the 58-day period provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*. Is the local rule enforceable? No. The rule conflicts with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* and is unenforceable and void [*Wells Fargo Bank v. Superior Court (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 918, 923, 254 Cal. Rptr. 68*].

[3] Use of Discovery

Discovery should be conducted keeping in mind, among other things, how the discovery can be used in a summary judgment motion [*see also* discussion in *§ 537.24[2]*, and *537.24[3]*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Refuting the Complaint's Allegations. In an action in which the complaint alleges that certain statements were made and heard, defendant propounds interrogatories requesting identification of all persons, including third parties, who heard the statements. Plaintiff identifies two nonparties. Defendant informally interviews the nonparties to determine whether their depositions are necessary, and obtains favorable testimony that the allegation does not accuratelyreflect what the nonparties heard. The nonparties are not deposed. Defendant incorporates the testimony into declarations supporting a motion for summary judgment. Proof of plaintiff's allegation is undermined. Moreover, plaintiff is precluded from producing contradicting declarations of persons who were not previously identified in the interrogatory response.

PRACTICE TIP: Requests for Admission. Requests for admission are an effective way of generating evidence sufficient to support a motion for summary judgment. This is especially true if counsel has reason to expect that the opposing party (e.g., a plaintiff acting in propria persona) will not respond to the requests and that they are consequently likely to be deemed admitted. Requests should be formulated so that, if admitted, they establish a complete cause of action or defense. For example, in an action in which plaintiff sues on a promissory note, plaintiff may serve requests for admissions asking the defendant to admit defendant signed the promissory note, that no payments have been made on the note, etc. [*see, e.g., Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 576, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (defendant relied on plaintiff's factually insufficient interrogatory answers and admissions as evidentiary basis for its separate statement supporting summary judgment motion, shifting burden to plaintiff to prove existence of triable issue of material fact)].

Counsel for the moving party should be cautious, however, about not tipping the party's hand as to the fact that a summary judgment motion is planned or as to the basis for the motion. In addition to simply denying the admission, the nonmoving party may take the opportunity to make declarations showing how the requested admission is untrue.

[4] Collecting Evidence for Motion

[a] Advance Preparation

Supporting declarations should be drafted well in advance of the service deadline for a motion for summary judgment to accommodate witnesses who may become unavailable. Also, certified copies of documents and any matters to be judicially noticed should be collected with time to spare for unforeseen difficulties in obtaining the material.

Since document assembly for a summary judgment or summary adjudication motion can be extremely time-consuming, as much of the process should be completed in advance as possible. Early preparation also makes drafting of the separate statement of undisputed (or disputed) material facts proceed smoothly. For discussion of the separate statement, see *§ 537.21[3]*.

[b] Stipulation to Facts

Depending on the complexity of the case, it may be clear that summary judgment motions by both sides are required. In that case, the parties may wish to stipulate to certain foundational facts, such as the citizenship of a party or the authenticity of documentary evidence.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to StrikeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsDiscovery MaterialsCivil ProceduresSummary JudgmentTime LimitationsCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersSeparate Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.20

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.20 Timing Requirements for Making Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Motion Permitted If 60 Days Have Lapsed Since Opposing Party's General Appearance

A motion for summary judgment may be made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*]:

- At any time after 60 days have elapsed since the general appearance [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1014* (discussed *below*)] in the action or proceeding of each party against whom the motion is directed.

- At an earlier time after such general appearance as the court, with or without notice and on good cause shown, may direct.

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*], but the statute does gives trial courts authority to shorten the 60-day period after the opposing party's general appearance to file the motion [*McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407* ; *Urshan v. Musicians' Credit Union (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 758, 765, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 839* (court's setting of motion for summary judgment 10 days before trial violated notice requirement; two days to prepare motion denied due process)].

A party has generally appeared if he or she has filed a complaint [*Brown v. Swickard (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 820, 826-827* & n.10] or done any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1014*]:

- Answered.
- Demurred.
- Filed a notice of motion to strike.
- Filed a notice of motion to transfer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*.
- Moved for jurisdictional reclassification under *Code Civ. Proc. § 403.040*.
- Given the plaintiff written notice of appearance.

The acts listed above constituting a general appearance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1014* are not exclusive [*Creed v. Schultz (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 733, 739, 196 Cal. Rptr. 252*]. Any act of a defendant is equivalent to a general appearance when, by that act, the defendant intentionally submits him or herself to thejurisdiction of the court for the purpose of obtaining any ruling or order of the court going to the merits of the case, and the act may reasonably be construed to imply that the court has acquired jurisdiction of the person of the defendant [*Davenport v. Superior Court (1920) 183 Cal. 506, 511, 191 P. 911*].

A motion is deemed "made" on the service and filing of the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*]. Thus, a party seeking summary judgment generally must wait until 60 days after the opponent's general appearance to file or serve the notice of motion. One court, however, upheld a plaintiff's filing of a motion for summary adjudication of the issues less than 60 days after the defendant's general appearance when the hearing on the motion occurred after the 60-day period. The court stated that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5* was not intended to deprive a party of a right to a hearing on a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* if either the filing or hearing at which the motion is made occurs after the 60-day period [*see Sadlier v. Superior Court (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1050, 1053-1054, 229 Cal. Rptr. 374* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5* (providing that its provisions "shall not deprive a party of a hearing of the motion to which he is otherwise entitled") and discussion in *§ 537.29, below*]. If the moving party is the defendant, the 60-day waiting period is computed from the time the action was filed [*see St. Mary Medical Center v. Superior Court (1997) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1531, 1537, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Early Motion Continued for Discovery. If the motion is made within a short time after commencement of the action, the trial court, on request, may grant a continuance to the opposing party giving a reasonable time in which to conduct discovery before deciding the motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*].

For discussion of an exception to the 60-day rule applicable in actions for unlawful detainer and forcible detainer or entry, see *§ 537.18[1]*.

[2] Cutoff for Hearing 30 Days Before Trial

A motion for summary judgment must be heard no later than 30 days before the date of trial, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

The 30-day limit is necessary to permit the completion of discovery and to provide the trial court with sufficient time to consider the motion and any supplemental papers that may be filed. It is calculated based on the trial date in existence

when the motion is noticed [*Green v. Bristol Myers Co. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 604, 609, 609 n.4, 253 Cal. Rptr. 745* ; *see also Sentry Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 526, 529, 255 Cal. Rptr. 13*].

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*], but the statute does gives trial courts authority to shorten the 30-day period before the trial date for hearing on the motion [*Robinson v. Woods (2009) 168 Cal. App. 4th 1258, 1268, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 241* ; *McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Scheduling Hearing. When selecting a date for the hearing, try to avoid a Friday hearing date. Friday tends to be the day on which most motions are heard, because cases normally are assigned a Monday trial date, and the last possible day for the hearing in such cases is the Friday four weeks earlier. Similarly, it can be risky to schedule the hearing for the last possible day; if it turns out that anything is wrong with the motion, there is no time for a continuance to rectify the problem.

[3] Motion Does Not Extend Time for Filing Responsive Pleading

The filing of a motion for summary judgment does not extend the time within which a party must otherwise file a responsive pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsExtensionsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentHearingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.21

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.21 Preparing Notice of Motion for Summary Judgment and Accompanying Papers

[1] Notice of Motion

A party seeking summary judgment must request the order by written notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. The notice of motion must be accompanied by the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*]:

- Supporting declarations or other evidence [*see* [2], *below*].
- A separate statement of material facts [*see* [3], *below*].
- A supporting memorandum [*see* [4], *below*].
- Any additional papers as required by local court rule [*see* [5], *below*].

For forms of notice of motion for summary judgment and summary adjudication, see *§§ 537.70* and *537.71*.

[2] Declarations and Other Supporting Evidence

A motion for summary judgment is a "speaking motion" in that it goes outside the pleadings and must be supported by

extrinsic evidence. Evidence may be presented in the following form [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1), (2)*]:

- Affidavits or declarations [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[1][a]* et seq.].
- Admissions [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[2]*].
- Answers to interrogatories and deposition testimony [*see 537.24[3]*].
- Matters of which the trial court must or may take judicial notice [*see 537.24[4][a]* et seq.].

Neither the moving party nor the opposing party can rely on allegations in their own pleadings in lieu of or in support of these authorized forms of evidence, although each may use, as admissions, allegations pleaded by the other [*Parker v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 176, 181, 89 Cal. Rptr. 737, 474 P.2d 689* ; *see Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1099*]. This rule applies to verified as well as unverified pleadings [*Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 169, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* , disapproved on other grounds in *Strangv. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013* ; *Cornelius v. Los Angeles County Etc. Authority (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1761, 1768, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*].

A motion for summary judgment must be directed to the issues raised by the pleadings [*Laabs v. City of Victorville (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1253, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 372* ; *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1342, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*]. The complaint limits the issues to be addressed in defendant's motion for summary judgment [*Alvis v. County of Ventura (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 536, 548, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494* ; *Laabs v. City of Victorville (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1258, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 372]* . If plaintiff wishes to expand the issues to be considered, plaintiff must seek leave to amend the complaint [*Alvis v. County of Ventura (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 536, 548, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494* ; *Laabs v. City of Victorville (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1258, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 372]* .

The function of supporting and opposing evidence is to establish whether there is any triable issue of fact within the issues delimited by the pleadings. In a properly pleaded case, the pleadings allege the ultimate facts constituting the cause of action or defense, and the evidence in support or opposition to the motion for summary judgment tracks these pleadings by providing evidence of the alleged ultimate facts. Absent an appropriate objection, however, the evidence produced in a summary judgment proceeding may cure some defects in pleading ultimate facts; the pleadings may be read together with that evidence for the purpose of discerning what is in issue [*FPI Development, Inc. v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 381-382, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508* ; *see People ex rel. Dep't of Transportation v. Ad Way Signs, Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 187, 196, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 496*].

For further discussion regarding preparation and evaluation of the supporting and opposing evidence, see *§ 537.24[1][a] et seq., §§ 537.25[3]*, and *537.25[4]*.

[3] Statement of Material Facts

A motion for summary judgment puts in issue the existence of material facts. To assist the court in determining the motion, the supporting papers must include a separate statement setting forth plainly and concisely all material facts which the moving party contends are undisputed. Each of the material facts stated must be followed by a reference to the supporting evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Which Facts Are "Material." Materiality goes to issues [*Monastra v. Konica Business Machines, U.S.A., Inc. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1628, 1635, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d. 528* ; *Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1099*]. Whether a fact is material will depend on the issues

involved as determined from the pleadings and applicable law [*see Billmeyer v. Plaza Bank of Commerce (1995) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1086, 1099* ; *see also Addy v. Bliss & Glennon (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 205, 215, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (pleadings define issues to which summary judgment motion must be directed)]. Materiality is measured by the law applicable to the legal theories put in issue by the complaint [*Teselle v. McLoughlin (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 156, 161, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 696* ; *Anderson v. Heart Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 202, 210, 256 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *see also Kelly v. First Astri Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 470, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (fact to be material must relate to a claim or defense that is in issue and must also be necessary to judgment somehow); *cf.*; *accord Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* , *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (both stating that for practical purposes, issue of material fact is one which in context and circumstances of case warrants time and cost of factfinding by trial)]. Local superior court rules formerly defined the term "material fact" as a fact that is "necessary for the proof of an essential element," to be distinguished from "a fact which, while explanatory, does not tend directly or by inference to prove an essential element." Counsel should use this definition as a guide in assessing which facts to include in a separate statement.

The references to supporting evidence must be specific and supported by citation to exhibit, title, page and line numbers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d), (f)*].

The statement must be prepared as a separate document [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (e)*] with a two-column format, stating in numerical sequence the undisputed material facts in the first column followed by the evidence that establishes those undisputed facts in that same column [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d), (f), (h)*]. The requirement for separately identified issues is required only for supporting and opposing separate statements in a motion for summary adjudication [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(h)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(b), Truong v. Glasser (2009) 181 Cal. App. 4th 102, 118, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 811* (because defendant's motion sought summary judgment, rather than summary adjudication of subissue, his statement, using format contained in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(h)* met requirements of Rule 3.1350 without necessity of separately listing subissues as to which summary adjudication was sought)]. The court's power to deny summary judgment on the basis of failure to comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350* is discretionary, not mandatory [*Truong v. Glasser (2009) 181 Cal. App. 4th 102, 118, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 811]* .

Effective January 1, 2002, a party must provide an electronic version of its separate statement to any other party or the court within 3 days of a request to do so [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*]. The electronic version may be provided in any form on which the parties agree; however, if the parties are unable to agree on the form, the responding party must provide the electronic version of the separate statement that it used to prepare the document filed with the court. Pursuant to this rule, a party is not required to create an electronic version or any new version of any document for the purpose of transmission to the requesting party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*].

The court has discretion to deny a motion for summary judgment if the moving party fails to supply a separate statement, or to grant the motion if the opposing party fails to supply its separate statement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1), (3)*].The prevailing view, however, is that it is only in the truly exceptional case involving a single, simple issue with minimal evidentiary support that a court will consider the merits of a motion unaccompanied by a separate statement [*United Community Church v. Garcin (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 327, 335, 282 Cal. Rptr. 368*]. Usually failure to file a separate statement with the motion will result in a denial of the motionwithout prejudice, a continuance, or an order taking the motion off the calendar.

It has been held to be an abuse of discretion to grant the motion solely on the ground of failure to file a separate statement without affording an opportunity for a pro per party to submit a proper response [*see Security Pacific Nat'l Bank v. Bradley (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 89, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220* . Similarly, one court holds it is an abuse of discretion for a court to grant summary judgment based on deficiency in opposing separate statement where the opposing party's separate statement plainly indicated which proposed material facts were disputed and included general references to

supporting evidence but did not set forth the nature of the dispute or specific citations to the evidence [*Parkview Villas Ass'n, Inc. v. State Farm Fire and Cas. Co. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1197, 1210-1216, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 411*]. The trial court has discretion to overlook procedural errors in the moving and opposition papers, but only if the evidence presented warrants it [*Zimmerman, Rosenfeld, Gersh & Leeds v. Larson (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1478, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 111* (glaring omissions and concessions could not be overlooked)]. However, it was not an abuse of discretion for a court to grant summary judgment based on deficiencies in plaintiffs' amended opposing separate statement when the trial court identified deficiencies in the initial opposing separate statement, identified the precise manner in which the deficiencies could be rectified, and provided plaintiffs ample time to prepare new, compliant papers, yet plaintiffs' opposing separate statement was still not compliant with the applicable rules [*Collins v. Hertz Corp. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 64, 74-75, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149]* .

For forms of statement of undisputed material facts supporting motions for summary judgment or summary adjudication, see *§§ 537.74* and *537.75*.

ILLUSTRATION:

Late Separate Statement. A party serves a motion for summary judgment on October 9, 1984. The motion, originally set for hearing on November 16, 1984, is continued, first to January 14, 1985, and then to January 28, 1985. The motion is actually heard on the latter date. Movant's separate statement is served by mail on December 21, 1984, 38 days before the actual hearing date. Rejecting the opposing party's objection based on this procedural irregularity, the trial court hears and grants the motion. Did the trial court commit an abuse of discretion when it refused to deny the summary judgment motion due to the late separate statement? No. Inasmuch as movant's statement was served 38 days before January 28, 1985, when the motion was actually heard, it cannot be said that the opposing parties were prejudiced or that the trial court abused its discretion by refusing to deny the summary judgment motion on the ground the statement was filed late [*see Michael H. v. Gerald D. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 995, 1004, 236 Cal. Rptr. 810 , aff'd, 491 U.S. 110, 109 S. Ct. 91, 105 L. Ed. 2d 91 (1987)*].

[4] Supporting Memorandum

A supporting memorandum must accompany a notice of motion for summary judgment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1113(a), 3.1350(c), (e)*]. As a general rule, the opening memorandum in support of a summary judgment motion may not exceed 20 pages in length, exclusive of exhibits, declarations, attachments, and a table of contents [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(d)* (also permitting longer memorandum with court approval)]. The 20-page limit applies even when there are multiple plaintiffs opposing a summary judgment motion [*Collins v. Hertz Corp. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149* (court held plaintiffs were not entitled to 60 pages of opposition papers despite the fact there were three opponents)]. It is not required that the memorandum cites to the evidence in the record. It is sufficient that the statement of undisputed facts cites to the record [*Basich v. Allstate Insurance Co. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1118, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153*].

There is no requirement in the rules of court that a memorandum in support of a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication be organized by cause of action [*Hope Int'l Univ. v. Superior Court (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 719, 723, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 643*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Circumvention of Page Limitation Impermissible. Do not attempt to avoid page limitations by using unusually small typewriter print or by inappropriately using single-spacing in the body of the memo. Papers filed with the court must be in type not smaller than 12 points. Lines on each page must be one and one-half spaced or double spaced, with exceptions for the description of real property, footnotes, and quotations [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.104, 2.108*].

The memorandum need not repeat citations to the record in support of the motion when the moving papers include the statement of undisputed material facts as required by *Code Civ. Proc § 437c(b)(1)* and *California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1350(c)* and *(d)* [*see Basich v. Allstate Ins. Co. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1118, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153*].

For discussion of the format and content requirements for memoranda of points and authorities, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[5] Proposed Order

If counsel submits a proposed order in addition to the usual supporting papers, the proposed order must be lodged and served with the moving papers, but is not to be attached to them [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(m)*]. In any case, the prevailing party will be required to submit a proposed order after the ruling on the motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312*]. Preparation of a proposed order ahead of time may facilitate timely compliance with this requirement.

PRACTICE TIP:

Forms of Proposed Order. The form of proposed order *set out in § 537.81* is for use when the court grants a motion for summary judgment and requires counsel to prepare and submit a proposed order. If the court permits the order and judgment to be combined in the same paper, the form *set out in § 537.82* may be used. Otherwise, if the order granting the motion terminates the action as between at least two parties, a separate proposed judgment, such as that set out in the *form in § 537.83*, maybe prepared and submitted to the judge for signature.

For forms of proposed orders, see *§ 537.81* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentNoticesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsAffidavitsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsDiscovery MaterialsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsMemoranda of Law

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.22

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.22 Service Requirements

Effective January 1, 2003, notice of the motion and supporting papers must be served on all other parties to the action at least 75 days before the time appointed for hearing. [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. This marks a significant change in the notice period required for summary judgment motions. Prior to this most recent amendment, the notice period was 28 days.

If the notice is served by mail, this 75-day notice period is increased by [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]:

- Five days if the place of address is within California.
- Ten days if it is outside the state but within the United States.
- Twenty days if it is outside the United States.

If the notice is served by facsimile transmission, Express Mail, or another method of overnight delivery, the 75-day notice period is increased by two court days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. When increasing the 75 days' notice required by two court days for overnight delivery, the two court days are added on at the end of the 75-day period [*Barefield v. Washington Mutual Bank (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 299, 303, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 858*].

For discussion of an exception to these requirements, applicable in actions for unlawful detainer or forcible detainer or entry, see *§ 537.18[1]*.

If the notice is served by electronic service, the period of notice or any right to respond within any period or on a date certain after the service is extended by two court days under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*. This extension applies absent a specific exception provided for by another statute or rule of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(6)* excludes extensions under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005* and *1013*, as of the enactment of section 1010.6, it does not exclude extensions under 1010.6. For discussion of section 1010.6, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*], but the statute does gives trial courts authority to shorten the 60-day period after the opposing party's general appearance to file the motion, and to shorten the 30-day period before the trial date for the hearing on the motion [*McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407*]. A court also cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* by issuing a general order providing for an expedited summary judgment on 60 days' notice [*Boyle v. CertainTeed Corp. (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 645, 655-656, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 501* (general order providing for expedited summary judgment procedure applicable to asbestos cases)].

Proof of service of the notice of motion must be filed no later than five calendar days before the appointed hearing date [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(c)*]. For discussion of the manner of service and forms for proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentNoticesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.23

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.23 Filing Requirements

The notice of motion and supporting papers must be filed 16 court days before the appointed hearing date [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(a)*]. The latest a paper may be filed is at the close of business of the clerk's office on the day the paper is due [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(e)*].

Papers submitted for filing after the time set forth in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300*, will be filed, but the court, in its discretion, may refuse to consider these papers in ruling on the motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(d)*]. If the court refuses to consider the papers, the minutes or order are required to so indicate [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentNoticesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.24

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.24 Preparing the Supporting Evidence

[1] Supporting Affidavits or Declarations

[a] Sufficiency Requirements

The most common method for providing the requisite evidence in support of amotion for summary judgment is by a sworn statement, that is, by affidavit or declaration [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b)(1), 2009, 2015.5*; *Shultz Steel Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 513, 518, 231 Cal. Rptr. 715* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 537.21[2]*]. A supporting or opposing affidavit or declaration must do all of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*]:

- Be based on the affiant's or declarant's personal knowledge, and show affirmatively that the affiant or declarant is competent to testify to the facts stated in the affidavit or declaration [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[1][b]*].

- Set forth admissible evidence [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[1][c]*]. In this respect, the rules governing the admission of evidence apply [*see, e.g., Evid. Code §§ 1100 et seq., 1200 et seq.*].

For discussion of sanctions for filing affidavits or declarations in bad faith, see *§ 537.38*. For a form of supporting declaration, see *§ 537.73*.

For a declaration to comply with the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* in support of or to oppose a summary judgment motion, thedeclaration must either state on its face that it was executed in California or state that it is declared under the laws of the state of California [*Kulshrestha v. First Union Commercial Corp. (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 601, 618, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 793, 93 P.3d 386* (declaration stricken; summary judgment for defendant affirmed)].

The moving party's papers are strictly construed, accepting as fact only those portions that are not contradicted by opposing papers, while the opposing party's papers are liberally construed, all facts therein being accepted as true [*Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* ; for discussion, *see § 537.33[2][a]*].

[b] Showing Declarant's Competency

An affidavit or declaration must affirmatively show that the affiant or declarant is competent to testify to the matters stated within it [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(d)*; *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922*]. The affidavit or declaration need not contain a conclusory statement that the affiant or declarant can competently testify; all that is required is that the affiant or declarant allege facts showing his or her competence [*see Roy Brothers Drilling Co. v. Jones (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 175, 181-182, 176 Cal. Rptr. 449* ; *see also Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 696, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523* (affiant must show that if sworn as witness he or she can testify competently to evidentiary facts contained in affidavit)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c expressly requires that a supporting or opposing affidavit and declaration be based on personal knowledge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*; *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922* ; *see Maltby v. Shook (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 349, 352-354, 280 P.2d 541* (personal knowledge requirement applies even when affiant or declarant is a party's attorney)]. Personal knowledge is essentially an element of the affiant's or declarant's competency to testify [*see Evid. Code § 702*] and therefore must be affirmatively shown. Thus, a conclusory allegation of personal knowledge is by itself insufficient; the affiant or declarant must state facts showing how he or she came to know personally the facts stated [*see Snider v. Snider (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 741, 753, 19 Cal. Rptr. 709*].

For example, a declarant's statement made "to the best of my knowledge" is inadmissible for failure to meet the required showing of personal knowledge [*Bowden v. Robinson (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 705, 719-720, 136 Cal. Rptr. 871* ; *see also Lopez v. University Partners (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1117, 1124, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (declarations based on information and belief insufficient to satisfy burden of either moving or opposing party on motion for summary judgment or adjudication)]. Conversely, statements indicating a declarant's inability to recall facts exactly merely affects the weight of such evidence, and not its admissibility on the basis of personal knowledge [*Buehler v. Oregon-Washington Plywood Corp. (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 520, 528-529, 131 Cal. Rptr. 394, 551 P.2d 1226*].

If the affiant or declarant is stating expert opinion, the affidavit or declaration should establish competency by stating the affiant's or declarant's qualifications to give expert opinion testimony [*see Evid. Code §§ 720, 801, 802*; *Mann v. Cracchiolo (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 18, 37-39, 210 Cal. Rptr. 762, 694 P.2d 1134* ; *see also Tibor v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1364 n.1, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326* (declaration contained no foundational facts showing that declarant had the training, experience or skill that would qualify declarant to render an opinion on the particular matters in controversy)]. An expert's opinion also must lay the foundation for an exception to the hearsay rule if hearsay evidence is used to form the basis of the expert's opinion [*Garibay v. Hemmatt (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 735, 743*].

[c] Stating Evidentiary Facts

A supporting or opposing affidavit or declaration must set forth admissible evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*; *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922* ; *see*

Franklin v. Benevolent etc. Order of Elks (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 915, 930, 159 Cal. Rptr. 131 and discussion in *§ 537.24[1][a]*]. Nonetheless, the mere presence in a supporting declaration of inadmissible evidence concerning an immaterial fact is not a valid ground to deny a motion otherwise well taken [*Overland Plumbing, Inc. v. Transamerica Ins. Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 476, 481, 174 Cal. Rptr. 1*].

The admissible evidence must be stated in the form of evidentiary facts, specifically, all necessary evidentiary facts including those establishing personal knowledge and competency (discussed in *§ 537.24[1][b]*). Affidavits and declarations may not simply state ultimate facts or conclusions [*Krantz v. BT Visual Images (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 164, 173-174, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109* ; *Hayman v. Block (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 629, 638-639, 222 Cal. Rptr. 293* ; *Rodes v. Shannon (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 743, 748, 15 Cal. Rptr. 349*]. These are insufficient when not supported by evidentiary facts based on personal knowledge [*see Colby v. Schwartz (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 885, 889, 144 Cal. Rptr. 624*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Insufficient Conclusionary Statements. Plaintiffs bring an action for wrongful death and emotional distress based on the death at birth of their infant child. Defendant physician moves for summary judgment against both parents, on the theory that there is no cause of action for wrongful death because the baby was stillborn. In his declaration submitted in support of the motions, defendant claims that the child was "a stillborn fetus." Does this statement meet the requirement for evidentiary facts? No. Facts set forth to support a grant of summary judgment must be evidentiary in quality. Conclusionary affidavits are insufficient for this purpose. The doctor's conclusionary statement in this situation did not enlighten the court as to the child's vital signs, such as breathing, heartbeat, signs of cerebration, muscular activities, or lack thereof [*see Sesma v. Cueto (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 108, 113-114, 181 Cal. Rptr. 12*].

Hearsay evidence is not sufficient to raise an issue of fact when the party relying on it fails to lay a proper foundation for it [*Garibay v. Hemmatt (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 735, 743* (failure to lay foundation for business records exception to the hearsay rule rendered expert doctor's opinion inadmissible); *Rochlis v. Walt Disney Co. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 201, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 793* (regarding admission, party failed to show declarant was authorized to speak on behalf of party against whom the statement was offered), *disapproved on other grounds, Turner v. Anheuser-Busch, Inc. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 1238, 1251, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223, 876 P.2d 1022*].

[d] Incorporating Documentary Evidence

Documentary evidence should be incorporated by reference into an affidavit or declaration. Such documents must satisfy applicable rules of evidence [*Dugar v. Happy Tiger Records, Inc. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 811, 815, 116 Cal. Rptr. 412*], which would include authentication [*Evid. Code § 1400 et seq.*] and the Secondary Evidence Rule [*Evid. Code § 1520 et seq.*]. Any incorporation by reference of matter in the court's file must set forth with specificity the exact matter to which reference is being made and may not incorporate the entire file [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(7)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Use of Authenticated Copies. Parties should file authenticated copies of documentary evidence in lieu of originals. Secondary evidence is admissible; however, the Secondary Evidence Rule expressly provides that nothing in the Rule excuses compliance with authentication requirements [*Evid. Code § 1521(a), (c)*]. Be prepared to produce originals of the documents at the hearing on the motion if there is a genuine dispute concerning material terms of the writing or admission of secondary evidence would be unfair [*see Evid. Code § 1521(a)* (grounds for court to exclude secondary evidence)].

[e] Contradicting or Repudiating Prior Testimony or Statements

In reviewing motions for summary judgment or adjudication, courts treat affidavits or declarations repudiating previous

testimony as not constituting substantial evidence of the existence of a triable issue of fact [*Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Great American Surplus Lines Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 791, 800, 245 Cal. Rptr. 44* ; *Jacobs v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1258, 1270, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 906* (rejecting expert's declaration contradicting deposition testimony)]. Courts also will not accept as substantial evidence of a triable issue of fact a declaration that directly contradicts the declarant's prior statement, even when the prior statement was not under oath, when the contradiction is unexplained [*Alvis v. County of Ventura (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 536, 548-549, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494]* .

[2] Admissions

Admissions may be used to support or oppose a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1), (2)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 537.21[2]* and in *§ 537.19[3]*].

Admissions are derived primarily through the use of requests for admissions, in either of the following ways:

- Matters admitted in an answer to a request for admission [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033(f)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.220* operative July 1, 2005)]; *see, e.g.,* *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 9 Cal. Rptr. 896* (decided under prior law)].

- Matters deemed admitted on the motion of the party who served a request for admissions, when the party served with the request has failed to provide a timely response [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033(k)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.280* operative July 1, 2005)] *see, e.g.,* *Swedberg v. Christiana Community Builders (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 138, 144, 220 Cal. Rptr. 544* (affirming summary judgment based on deemed admissions; decided under prior law)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Use of Deemed Admissions. Requests for admissions are a useful and relatively inexpensive means of obtaining the supporting evidence necessary to obtain summary judgment or summary adjudication. They are particularly effective when it is reasonable to expect that the opposing party may not respond, and the matters in the request may thereafter be deemed admitted. In this situation the requests for admission should be framed to elicit admissions that, if admitted, establish all the facts necessary for the cause of action or defense. For example, a personal injury plaintiff appearing in propria persona may well fail to provide timely response to requests for admissions served by the defendant, and defense counsel may thereafter obtain a summary judgment in defendant's favor so long as the matters deemed admitted are sufficient to establish a complete defense.

For discussion of discovery by requests for admissions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2033* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.010-2033.420* operative July 1, 2005], see Ch. 196, *Discovery: Requests for Admissions* .

Admissions may also derived from the following:

- Deposition testimony [*see* *Visueta v. General Motors Corp. (1991) 234Cal. App. 3d 1609, 1613, 286 Cal. Rptr. 402* and discussion in *§ 537.24[3]*].

- Answers to interrogatories [*see* *Mason v. Marriage & Family Center (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 537, 545, 279 Cal. Rptr. 51* , and discussion in *§ 537.24[3]*].

- Pleadings of the opposing party. In this situation the admissions may be either expressly pleaded [*see, e.g.,* *Aim Insurance Co. v. Culcasi (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 209, 213 n.1, 280 Cal. Rptr. 766* (allegations in cross complaint)], or they may result from an ineffective denial [*see, e.g.,* *Oliver v. Swiss*

Club Tell (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 528, 539, 35 Cal. Rptr. 324 (ineffective denial based on information and belief)].

- Factual stipulations entered into by the opposing party [*see Smith v. Walter E. Heller & Co. (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 259, 269, 147 Cal. Rptr. 1*].

For further discussion of the effect of admissions, see *§ 537.33[2][g]*.

[3] Depositions and Answers to Interrogatories

Depositions and answers to interrogatories may be used to support or oppose a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1), (2)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 537.21[2]*, and in *§ 537.19[3]*], subject to admissibility objections that may be made and sustained [*see L&B Real Estate v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1346-1348, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 759* ; *Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523*]. A party responding to interrogatories may not use those responses in support of its own motion or opposition to a motion for summary judgment [*Great American Ins. Companies v. Gordon Trucking, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 445, 450, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 65*].

With regard to deposition testimony, it may in some instances be appropriate simply to recite small portions of relevant testimony within a declaration [*see* discussion in *§ 537.24[1]*]. Usually, however, the party relying on deposition testimony should copy the relevant pages of the deposition transcript and submit these as an exhibit. When deposition testimony is submitted as an exhibit, the following requirements apply [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1116*]:

- Other than the title page, the exhibit must contain only the relevant pages of the transcript. The original deposition transcript page number must be clearly visible at the bottom of each page.

- The relevant portions of any testimony in the deposition must be highlighted or marked in a manner that calls attention to that testimony.

Interrogatories and their answers should be similarly prepared as exhibits.

[4] Matters Subject to Judicial Notice

[a] Supporting or Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment

Matters of which judicial notice shall or may be taken may be used to support or oppose a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1), (2)* and discussion in *§ 537.21[2]*]. Among the more significant matters subject to judicial notice are the following:

- Statutes, case law, and court rules of the United States and California [*see Evid. Code §§ 451(a), (d), 452(a), (e)*].

- Court records [*see Evid. Code § 452(d)*].

- Facts and propositions:

  - Of generalized knowledge that are so universally known that they cannot reasonably be the subject of dispute [*Evid. Code § 451(f)*].

  - That are of such common knowledge within the territorial jurisdiction of the court

that they cannot reasonably the subject of dispute [*Evid. Code § 452(g)*].

- That are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination by resort to sources of reasonable indisputable accuracy [*see Evid. Code § 452(h)*].

Any request for judicial notice must be made in a separate document listing the specific items for which notice is requested and must comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(l)*]. A party requesting judicial notice of material under *Evid. Code § 452* or § 453 must provide the court and each party with a copy of the material.

If the material is part of a file in the court in which the motion is being heard, the party must specify in writing the part of the court file sought to be judicially noticed and make arrangements with the clerk to have that file in the courtroom at the time of the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(b)*]. Local rules may impose additional requirements. For example, in Los Angeles County Superior Court, the party requesting notice must file a request at least five days before the hearing. The request must be filed with the clerk of the department in which the matter is noticed and must include the case name and number. Moreover, the file must be delivered at least two court days before the hearing to give the judge an opportunity to review the file in preparation for the hearing [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.2; *see also* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.9 (similar requirement)]. A copy of the relevant portions of the file should be included with the supporting or opposing papers for the following reasons:

- The court may consider the copy if the file cannot be located in time for the hearing [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.2(b)].

- The requesting party may not incorporate the entire court file by reference and must set out with specificity the exact matter in the file that is soughtto be incorporated by reference [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(7)*].

If the matter subject to permissive notice is contained in another court's file, the party requesting notice must obtain the file for the date of the hearing or, alternatively provide a certified copy of relevant portions of the file with his or her moving or opposing papers [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.2(c) (also providing that this procedure applies when file is in another district of the same court); *see also § 537.24[4][c]*].

For discussion of judicial notice, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* .

[b] Mandatory Judicial Notice

Matters subject to mandatory judicial notice under *Evid. Code § 451* need not be specifically requested, but should be drawn to the court's attention by appropriate reference, as, for example, in the separate statement of material facts and memorandum [*see § 537.21[3]* and *§ 537.21[4]*]. Any failure by the court to notice matters under *Evid. Code § 451* may be deemed harmless or invited error if the matter was not brought to the court's attention [*see* Assembly Committee on Judiciary comment to *Evid. Code § 451*; *Stafford v. Ware (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 227, 231-232, 9 Cal. Rptr. 706*].

[c] Permissive Judicial Notice

Any request for judicial notice of matters subject to permissive notice under *Evid. Code § 452*, as required by *Evid. Code § 453*, should be filed with the papers supporting or opposing the motion for summary judgment. This will satisfy the requirement that "sufficient notice" be given to the adverse parties to enable them to prepare to meet the request [*Evid. Code § 453(a)*; *see* Law Revision Commission comment to *Evid. Code § 453*]. For example, the request may take the form of a reference to the matter sought to be noticed in a declaration filed in support of a motion for summary

judgment [*see* *Stepan v. Garcia (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 497, 500, 117 Cal. Rptr. 919* (reference to contents of court records)].

A request for permissive judicial notice must be accompanied with information sufficient to enable the court to take the notice requested, i.e., a copy of the material to be noticed [*Evid. Code § 453(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsAffidavitsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsDiscovery MaterialsEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.25

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.25 Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Opposing Memorandum

A memorandum is essential to effective opposition; it not only states the opposing points and authorities, but, in presenting opposing argument, serves to coordinate the other opposing papers. Any objections to notice, evidentiary objections, and objections to the sufficiency of supporting declarations should also be discussed fully in the opposing memorandum whenever possible. These objections are waived if not raised at the hearing, and evidentiary objections must be in writing unless arrangements have been made to have a reporter transcribe the hearing [*see* discussion in *§ 537.25[4]*].

As a general rule, the opposing memorandum in a proceeding for summary judgment may not exceed 20 pages in length, exclusive of exhibits, declarations, attachments, and a table of contents [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(d)* (also permitting longer memorandum with court approval)]. For discussion of the required format and content requirements for memoranda, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Opposing Statement of Material Facts

The opposing papers must include a separate statement of material facts that does both of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*]:

- Responds to each of the material facts contended by the moving party to be undisputed (*see* discussion in *§ 537.21[3]*) and indicates whether the opposing party agrees or disagrees that those facts are undisputed.

- Sets forth plainly and concisely any other material facts that the opposing party contends are disputed.

If the opposing party admits any of the facts set out in the moving party's separate statement, the admission should be clearly stated [*Blackman v. Burrows (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 889, 895, 238 Cal. Rptr. 642*]. If the opposing party contends that any of those facts are disputed, this contention must be followed by a reference to the evidence establishing that the facts are disputed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*; *see § 537.25[3]*].

Specific format requirements for preparing the opposing statement are provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)* [*see also § 537.21[3]*]:

- The opposing statement of facts must be prepared as separate document.

- The opposing statement must quote each of the facts in the moving party's statement in the same order in which they appear in the moving party's statement.

- The opposing statement must state whether or not he or she disputes each such fact. If the opposing party disputes a fact set out in the moving party's statement, he or she must cite to the page and paragraph of the exhibit where evidence establishing the dispute can be located.

- After responding to each of the moving party's facts, the opposing party may set out any additional facts claimed to be disputed, with appropriate evidentiary support and references thereto.

- The facts must be listed in a left-hand column, with a correspondingright-hand column that states whether that fact is undisputed or disputed, and, if disputed, sets out specific references to the paragraph and page of each identified exhibit where the supporting evidence can be found.

Effective January 1, 2007, written objections to the moving party's evidence must follow a specific format [see discussion in *§ 537.25[4]*; for forms, see *§§ 537.86* and *537.87*]. Objections to specific evidence may be referenced by the objection number in the right column of the separate statement, but the objections must not be restated or reargued in the separate statement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)*].

A party must provide an electronic version of its separate statement to any other party or the court within 3 days of a request to do so [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*]. The electronic version may be provided in any form on which the parties agree; however, if the parties are unable to agree on the form, the responding party must provide the electronic version of the separate statement that it used to prepare the document filed with the court. Pursuant to this rule, a party is not required to create an electronic version or any new version of any document for the purpose of transmission to the requesting party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*].

The court has discretion to grant the motion for summary judgment if the opposing party fails to comply with this requirement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*]. Some cases have held, however, that unless the moving party has met its initial burden of proof, the court does not have discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)* to grant summary judgment based on the opposing party's failure to file a proper separate statement [*Teselle v. McLoughlin (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 156, 168-173, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 696* ; *Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1086, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575* ; *see Kulesa v. Castleberry (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 103, 111-112* (discretion to grant motion

under section 437c(b) does not override court's *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)* duty to review all papers filed in conjunction with motion); *see also Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1151-1152, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (moving defendant not entitled to summary judgment despite plaintiff's failure to file proper opposing separate statement and untimeliness of opposition papers because defendant did not meet burden in first instance of establishing right to relief defendant sought); *Pepperell v. Scottsdale Ins. Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1055 n.7, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* (although trial court has discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* to grant summary judgment when opposing party fails to comply with statutory requirement of separate statement, appellate court will not affirm granting of summary judgment solely on that basis)].

Other cases have upheld the granting of summary judgment based on the opposing party's failure to file a separate statement as required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)* without specifying any requirement that the moving party first satisfy its burden of proof [*see, e.g., Whitehead v. Habig (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 896, 900-903, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 679* (trial court granted motion for summary adjudication both on substantive grounds and on basis that opposing party failed to file separate statement but court of appeals upheld ruling based solely on failure to file separate statement); *Kaplan v. LaBarbera (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 175, 179, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 903* (failure to submit separate statement in opposition to motion alone is sufficient to uphold trial court's grant of motion; summary judgment for defendant upheld on that and other grounds); *Blackman v. Burrows (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 889, 893, 238 Cal. Rptr. 642* (trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting summary judgment motion based on opposing party's failure to submit separate statement); *see also Gilbertson v. Osman (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 308, 315-316* (trial courts may grant motion if opposing party fails to submit separate statement of material facts if failure significantly interferes with court's mission of seeking truth and justice; under facts of case, however, plaintiff's failure to submit separate statement of disputed facts did not justify order granting summary judgment; disapproved on other grounds in *Woods v. Young (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 315, 328 n.4, 279 Cal. Rptr. 613, 807 P.2d 455*)].

In any event, usually an opposing party's failure to file a responsive separate statement will result in a continuance of the motion to permit the filing of proper papers and an award of fees and costs as a condition of the continuance [*see United Community Church v. Garcin (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 327, 335, 282 Cal. Rptr. 368* ; Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.21(f)].

A summary judgment motion cannot be defeated by attempting to generate a factual dispute as to an immaterial issue. The presence of a factual dispute will not defeat a summary judgment motion unless the fact in dispute is material [*Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*] that is, it relates to a claim or defense in issue which could make a difference in the outcome [*Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1274, 280 Cal. Rptr 831*].

If the opposing party's evidence would show some factual assertion, legal theory, defense or claim not yet pleaded, that party should seek leave to amend the pleadings before the hearing on the summary judgment motion [*Distefano v. Forester (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1264-1265, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813*]. The papers filed in response to the defendant's motion for summary judgment may not create an issue outside the pleadings and are not a substitute for an amendment to the pleadings [*Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 299, 317, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614* ; *Nash v. Fifth Amendment (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1116, 279 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *see also Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 629, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (plaintiff cannot successfully resist summary judgment on theory which is not pleaded in complaint); *Allyson v. Department of Transportation (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1318-1321, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* , and discussion in *§ 537.33[2][c]*].

For further discussion of what constitutes material facts, *see § 537.21[3]*. For a form of opposing statement of disputed and/or undisputed material facts, see *§ 537.77*.

ILLUSTRATION:

Failure to File Response. Plaintiff moves for summary judgment. Defendant, appearing in pro per, does

not file a separate responsive statement. Defendant mistakenly believes that a separate responsive statement he filed to a prior summary judgment motion by plaintiff also applied to the present motion. At the hearing, the trial court points out that *Code Civ. Proc. 437c(b)* requires a separate responsive statement and that none has been filed. It grants the motion based on defendant's failure to file a separate responsive statement. Defendant tells the court, "I don't understand the summary judgment," and the court responds, "Well, I don't give advice, sir. I just rule on cases as they are brought to me." The trial court enters judgment for plaintiff. Has the court abused its discretion in granting the plaintiff's motion? Yes. The court abused its discretion in failing to give defendant a further opportunity to file a separate responsive statement. Defendant's failure to file a separate responsive statement was not a refusal to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, but was rather based on a mistaken belief that the statement was unnecessary. Unless the trial court has reason to believe no responsive statement would be filed even if the respondent was afforded a reasonable opportunity to file one, the respondent should be afforded that opportunity rather than suffer a judgment not supported by a decision on the merits [*see Security Pacific Nat'l Bank v. Bradley (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 89, 94, 98-99, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220*]

ILLUSTRATION: Failure to Include Stipulation in Separate Statement. As litigation progresses plaintiff and defendant enter into a stipulation whereby plaintiff waives punitive damages and all other causes of action except negligence and defendant stipulates to negligence, but expressly reserves the right to dispute the issues relating to causation and damages. Thereafter defendant moves for summary judgment without mentioning the stipulation or even that defendant has conceded negligence. The theory of defendant's motion is that the firefighter's rule is applicable and defeats an element of plaintiff's negligence cause of action. Plaintiff responds by contending that the firefighter's rule does not apply because at the time of plaintiff's injury plaintiff was neither a firefighter nor a policeman. In plaintiff's opposition, plaintiff sets forth the stipulation in full, but makes no argument with respect to it. The trial court grants summary judgment in favor of the defendant based on the defendant having proffered evidence establishing as a matter of law that the firefighter's rule bars plaintiff's claim and that plaintiff in opposition proffered no evidence that raised a substantial controversy as to the applicability of the firefighter's rule. Has the trial court erred in determining by summary judgment that the firefighter's rule barred plaintiff's action for negligence against defendant. Yes. Plaintiff's response in opposition to the motion called the court's attention to the stipulation on the first page and defendant made no objection to the exhibit. The only issues reserved for dispute under the stipulation were the issues relating to damage causation and damages. The applicability of the firefighter's rule, as an issue relevant to the element of duty, was not an issue that defendant expressly reserved to dispute. Moreover, plaintiff as the opposing party complied with plaintiff's obligations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)*. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* required plaintiff as the opposing party to "include a separate statement which responds to each of the material facts contended by the moving party to be undisputed ... ," because defendant as the moving party had not listed the stipulation as an undisputed fact, plaintiff had no obligation to respond with any mention of the stipulation. Plaintiff, however, did respond to defendant's statement of undisputed facts, and thus complied with the first obligation under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)*. In addition, although *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* required plaintiff to list in a separate statement any facts that plaintiff thought to be disputed, because the existence of the stipulation was not in dispute, plaintiff had no obligation to include the stipulation in plaintiff's separate statement and waived nothing by not including it in the statement. Furthermore, the stipulation did not contain facts that were relevant to the theory of defendant's motion for summary judgment. Under the stipulation defendant conceded the elements of duty and breach (or negligence) as a matter of law and only retained the right to raise material factual issues on the elements of causation and damage. Thus, nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* required plaintiff to set forth the stipulation in plaintiff's separate statement of material facts. Plaintiff was only required to place the stipulation in evidence in opposition to the motion which plaintiff did by attaching the stipulation [*Assad v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1609, 1614-1616, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443]* .

[3] Opposing Evidence

[a] Requirement

When appropriate, the opposition to a motion for summary judgment must include opposing evidence. This evidence may be presented in any of the following forms [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(2)*]:

- Affidavits or declarations.
- Admissions.
- Answers to interrogatories and deposition testimony.
- Matters of which the trial court must or may take judicial notice.

It is impossible to raise a triable issue of material fact in opposing a motion for summary judgment unless evidentiary items are filed as part of the opposition [*Arciniega v. Bank of San Bernardino (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 213, 224, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 495* (criticized on another point in *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 726, 737-741, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*); *see also* *Tibor v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1364 n.1, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326* (policy reasons requiring opposing expert declarations in medical malpractice cases appear equally applicable in cases involving alleged malpractice of criminal defense attorney)].

If no affidavits or declarations are filed in opposition to a motion for summaryjudgment, the court is entitled to accept as true the facts alleged in the movant's affidavits and declarations, provided they are within the personal knowledge of the affiant or declarant and are facts to which he or she could competently testify [*Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declarations)].

[b] Sufficiency

Counter affidavits and declarations need not prove the opposition's case. They suffice if they disclose the existence of a triable issue [*McManis v. San Diego Postal Credit Union (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 547, 555, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617*].

The sole declaration of a party opposing a summary judgment motion which raises a triable issue of fact is sufficient to deny the motion [*Estate of Housley (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)* does not allow a trial court to weigh the credibility of a declaration submitted by the party opposing a summary judgment motion and then grant the motion, except where the declaration is facially so incredible as a matter of law that the moving party otherwise would be entitled to summary judgment [*Estate of Housley (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359-360, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*].

An opposing party may not avoid summary judgment based on mere speculation or conjecture [*Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 468-469, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678* ; *see* *Padgett v. Phariss (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1284, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373* ; *see also* *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (responsive evidence that gives rise to no more than mere speculation cannot be regarded as substantial and is insufficient to establish triable issue of material fact); *Andrews v. Foster Wheeler, LLC (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 96, 113, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 229* (speculative expert declarations lacking factual basis and consisting of merely general statements were not sufficient to create a triable issue of material fact)]. An issue of fact cannot be created by speculation, conjecture, imagination or guess-work nor can it be raised by cryptic, broadly phrased, and conclusory assertions, or by mere possibilities. Only a conflict of evidence can create an issue of fact [*accord* *Myricks v. Lynwood Unified School Dist. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 231, 237, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734* ; *Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *see also* *American Golf Corp. v. Superior Court (2000) 79*

Cal. App. 4th 30, 39, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 683 (expert testimony that sports injury would not have occurred if recreation provider had done something differently is not sufficient to establish that provider increased inherent risks of sport, and does not create triable issue of fact on motion for summary judgment based on primary assumption of risk defense); *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (expert's declaration rejected to extent it drew legal conclusions); *Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1462, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54* (expert declarations cannot createtriable question of fact if expert's opinion is based on factors that are remote, speculative, or conjectural); *Garibay v. Hemmatt (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 735, 743* (expert's opinion inadmissible to establish material fact if opinion based on hearsay with no foundation made to establish an exception to the hearsay rule)]. Thus, the opposing party must produce admissible evidence that raises a triable issue of fact [*Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 468-469, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678*]. For example, a mere assertion in the complaint of the party that opposes the motion that such evidence exists is not sufficient to raise a triable issue of material fact that merits a trial [*Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 475-476, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678* ; *see Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*] (issue of fact notraised by allegations in complaint); *see also § 537.33[2][c]*, although the party opposing the motion may rely on allegations pleaded by the moving party to establish facts that are not contained in his or her declarations or affidavits [*Parker v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 176, 181, 89 Cal. Rptr. 737, 474 P.2d 689* ; *24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1211, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533*); *Troche v. Daley (1990) 266 Cal. Rptr. 34* (in summary judgment motions, law allows reliance on adversary's pleadings; judicial admission in pleading conclusively establishes truth of matter); *see also Uram v. Abex Corp. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1425, 1433, 266 Cal. Rptr. 695* (defendant moving for summary judgment may rely on allegations contained in plaintiff's complaint which constitutes judicial admission)].

When the plaintiff carries a clear and convincing burden of proof, the evidence and all inferences that can reasonably be drawn from it must meet that standard [*Rowe v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1711, 1724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 625* ; *see also Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 244, 252, 690 P.2d 610*]

[c] Preparation

The requirements governing the preparation of supporting evidence also apply to the preparation of opposing evidence. For further discussion, see *§ 537.21[2]* and *§ 537.24[1][a]* et seq. For a form of a declaration in opposition to a motion for summary judgment, see *§ 537.76*. For discussion of when deposition of an opposing party's expert may be permitted, *see § 537.30, below*.

[d] Defamation and Invasion of Privacy Actions

Summary judgment is a favored remedy in defamation and invasion of privacy cases due to the chilling effect of protracted litigation on *First Amendment* rights. The courts impose more stringent burdens on one who opposes the motion and require a showing of high probability that the plaintiff will ultimately prevail in the case. Absent such a showing, the courts are inclined to grant the motion and do not permit the case to proceed beyond the summary judgment stage [*Alszeh v. Home Box Office (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1460, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16*].

[4] Procedural and Evidentiary Objections

[a] Nature and Purpose of Objections

When evidentiary objections are in a proper form, a trial court must rule on the objections; it is imperative that a trial court rule on evidentiary objections regardless of whether the motion is denied or granted, and failure to rule on the objections is reversible error [*Vineyard Springs Estates, LLC v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 633, 642, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587*].

Objections to defects in the moving papers are generally waived if the opposing party fails to make a proper objection in

the opposing papers or at the hearing. Specifically, the following rules regarding waiver of objections apply:

- Any objections to a moving party's failure to give proper notice of a motion for summary judgment as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* (for discussion of service requirements, *see § 537.22*) are waived if the responding party appears at the hearing and argues the motion on the merits with no reference to the failure to provide adequate notice or with reference to the failure, but without requesting a continuance or contending that he or she was prejudiced by the inadequate notice or service [*Carlton v. Quint (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 690, 696-698, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 844* (failure to request continuance or claim prejudice); *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 499, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677* (failure to mention)].

- Any objection based on the failure to comply with the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)* regarding the forms and content of a supporting declaration (discussed in *§ 537.24*) must be made at the hearing or will be deemed waived [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*].

- Evidentiary objections not made at the hearing will be deemed waived [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(5)*]. This provision abrogates a former rule that there could be no waiver of the right to object to inadmissible evidence in summary judgment proceedings [*see, e.g.,* *Dugar v. Happy Tiger Records, Inc. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 811, 817, 116 Cal. Rptr. 412*].

- A party opposing a summary judgment motion has the right to waive evidentiary objections. It is therefore error for a trial court to interpose and sustain its own hearsay objection [*Andrews v. Mobile Aire Estates (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 578, 587 n.6, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*].

Any party who desires to make an evidentiary objection must either submit written objections or arrange for a court reporter to be present at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1352*; *see* *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 263-264, 265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781*]. Whenever possible, it is preferable to provide written objections. This assists the court's review of the objections and preserves a clear record for appeal.

[b] Time for Filing Objections

Unless otherwise excused by the court on a showing of good cause, all written objections to evidence in support of a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication must be served and filed at the same time as the objecting party's opposition papers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(a)*].

[c] Required Format for Written Objections

Effective January 1, 2007, the California Rules of Court contain specific format requirements for written objections to evidence in support of or in opposition to summary judgment and summary adjudication motions. All written objections to evidence must be served and filed separately from the other papers in support of or in opposition to the motion. Each written objection must be numbered consecutively and must [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)*]:

- Identify the name of the document in which the specific material objected to is located;

- State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to;

- Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material; and

- State the grounds for each objection to that statement or material.

Additionally, written objections must follow one of two formats provided in Rule 3.1354(b). For a form of written objections to evidence in support of or in opposition to a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, see *§ 537.86*.

[d] Proposed Order and Court's Ruling on Objections

Effective January 1, 2007, a party submitting written objections to evidence must submit with the objections a proposed order. The order must include places for the court to indicate whether it has sustained or overruled each objection and must include a place for the judge's signature. Additionally, the order must follow one of two formats provided [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)*]. For a form of proposed order on evidentiary objections, see *§ 537.87*.

The court cannot consider evidence to which objections have been made and sustained [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*]. Thus, the trial court is required to rule on objections made orally or in writing. If, however, the trial judge does not rule specifically on the objections, but nevertheless considers only legally admissible evidence in making his or her ruling on the summary judgment motion, an appellant has the burden of pointing out any evidentiary errors that prejudiced hisor her position. Failure to do so constitutes a waiver on appeal of any possible error in this respect [*Hayman v. Block (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 629, 640, 222 Cal. Rptr. 293* ; *cf. Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 924 n.2, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874* (record reflected no rulings in trial court on any objections; because neither party appeared to have insisted on ruling, objections were waived and appellate court will consider all evidence set forth in papers); *see also Demps v. San Francisco Housing Authority (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 564, 578-579, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 204* (trial court presented with timely evidentiary objections in proper form must rule on the objections or they are deemed waived and the objected-to evidence will be included in the record; where counsel expressly requests ruling on objections and court fails to do so, objections may not be waived); *City of Long Beach v. Farmers & Merchants Bank (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 780, 783-785, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 140* (evidentiary objections deemed waived on appeal if trial judge failed to rule on them; however, issues preserved for review if it would be fruitless or idle act for attorney to object; to have made third oral request for ruling after filing written objections and having requested judge to rule on them on two separate hearing dates would have been fruitless or idle act); *PMC, Inc. v. Kadisha (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1368, 1378, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663* (parties waived objections by not securing rulings on them and appellate court treats all evidence as having been properly admitted); *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (record did not show trial court ever formally ruled on defendants' evidentiary objections to declaration; thus, all evidence submitted was available for trial court's consideration; nevertheless, presumed on appeal that judge did not rely on irrelevant or incompetent evidence)].

A party's mere reference to evidence in a statement of undisputed facts does not waive an objection, contemporaneously raised in the accompanying points and authorities, that the evidence is inadmissible [*Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 734, 740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710* (distinguishing *Hurley Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 533, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 629* , in which one party had admitted all the facts in the other party's separate statement of undisputed facts)].

[5] Proposed Order

While local court rules often require a proposed order to be submitted by the moving party, there is no similar requirement of the nonmoving party. Counsel for the opposing party may, however, wish to prepare a proposed order to submit at the hearing on the motion, especially if the tentative ruling is in the opposing party's favor. Opposing counsel must prepare and submit a proposed order in any case if the opposing party ultimately prevails on the motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312*]. Preparation of a proposed order ahead of time may facilitate timely compliance with this requirement.

[6] Motion for Sanctions for Bad-Faith Affidavits

If counsel determines that any of the affidavits or declarations submitted in support of the motion were presented in bad faith or solely for the purpose of delay, he or she may wish to include with the opposition a motion to recover reasonable expenses incurred as a result [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*; *see also § 537.38*].

[7] Motion to Continue

Opposing counsel may wish to seek an order denying or continuing the motion on the basis of a declaration or affidavit that shows that facts essential to justify opposition may exist, but cannot be then presented for reasons stated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.36*.

[8] Cross Motion for Affirmative Relief

A cross motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication of issues is necessary before the court may grant such affirmative relief in favor of the opposing party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a), (f)*; *Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363*]. If the moving party has filed its motion on the last day possible before the cutoff, it may be too late for the opposing party to move for affirmative relief.

PRACTICE TIP:

Hearing Cross Motions Simultaneously. In a case involving cross motions for summary judgment, counsel should seek to have the motions heard simultaneously on a mutually convenient date. If such motions are set for different dates, a court will likely order on its own that they be moved to the same date.

PRACTICE TIP: Opposing Papers as Cross Motion. If only one party, defendant, for example, has moved for summary judgment, and if desirable to expedite presenting issues for appellate review, the parties may elect to stipulate that the papers opposing defendant's motion be deemed plaintiff's cross motion for summary judgment, and that defendant's moving papers be deemed opposition to plaintiff's cross motion. If the court accepts this characterization, then a ruling in favor of either party would permit the other to file an appeal [*see, e.g., Jimenez v. Protective Life Ins. Co. (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 528, 534-535, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326*].

[9] Limitation Concerning Voluntary Dismissal

A plaintiff who waits until a motion for summary judgment has been filed, and the time for opposition has passed, to attempt to dismiss his or her complaint, is subject to the trial court's continuing jurisdiction to hear and rule on the pendingmotion. A plaintiff may not frustrate the summary judgment statute by interposing a voluntary dismissal without prejudice in lieu of opposition to a defendant's motion [*Cravens v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 253, 255, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436*]. Thus, a trial court has been held to have the power to grant an unopposed defense motion for summary judgment when the defendants'moving papers met their burden of negating the plaintiff's claims, entitling them to judgment as a matter of law if no issues of disputed fact were raised, and plaintiff, rather than filing opposition papers within the requisite time, filed a request for dismissal without prejudice one day before the scheduled hearing date. At the point that the plaintiff failed to file opposition papers within the requisite time, entry of summary judgment in favor of defendants' became a formality which plaintiff could not avoid by the stratagem of filing a last minute request for dismissal without prejudice [*Cravens v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 253, 255, 257, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* (discretion of court to grant motion if opposition papers including separate statement of disputed fact is not filed)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofNonmovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentCross-MotionsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMemoranda in OppositionCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionSupporting MaterialsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjections

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.26

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.26 Serving and Filing the Opposing Papers

Any opposition to the motion must be served and filed no less than 14 days before the noticed or continued hearing date, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*]. Case law has been strict requiring good cause to be shown before late filed papers will be accepted [*Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 625, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (trial court has broad discretion to regulate submission of materials in connection with pending motions)]. As distinguished from the service of a notice of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* (*see § 537.22*), there is no provision extending the time period for service by mail [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Expedient Service. Effective January 1, 2003, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(c)* expressly applies to method of service for opposition and reply papers under the amended *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(6)*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(c)* provides that all papers opposing a motion and all reply papers shall be served by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail or other means reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties not later than the close of the next business day after the time the opposing papers or reply papers are filed.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMemoranda in OppositionCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionSupporting MaterialsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.27

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.27 Reply to Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment

[1] Reply Memorandum of Points and Authorities

A reply or closing memorandum may not exceed 10 pages in length, excluding exhibits, declarations, attachments, and a table of contents when required [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(d)* (also providing procedure for obtaining permission to file longer memorandum)]. For discussion of the format and content requirements for memoranda, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

In addition to any rebuttal argument, e.g., pointing out any inaccurate points or authorities raised in the opposing memorandum, the reply memorandum should also include any objections to the following:

- The timeliness of filing or service of the opposing papers.
- The form and content of the opposing papers, including objections based on the following defects:
  - A failure to file a responsive statement of facts, or any insufficiency in this responsive statement [for discussion of the requirements for the responsive statement and the effect of failure to file, *see § 537.25[2]*].

- Any insufficiency in the opposing declarations or other opposing evidentiary papers, including objections to the evidence produced by the opposing party based on the rules of evidence [for discussion of the requirements regarding evidentiary papers, *see § 537.24[1][a]* et seq.]. Effective January 1, 2007, a moving party's objections to the opposing party's evidence in opposition to the motion must follow the new format for objections provided in the Rules of Court and must be filed and served at the same time as the reply papers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(a), (b)*]. The objections must also include a proposed order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)*]. For further discussion regarding format requirements for objections and objections in general, see *§ 537.25[4]*. For forms of written objections to evidence and proposed order on objections, see *§§ 537.86* and *537.87*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Substantive vs. Procedural Objections. Because of the drastic nature of a summary judgment or summary adjudication, trial courts are generally reluctant to grant a motion simply because of a technical defect in the opposing party's papers, e.g., a deficiency in the opposing party's separate statement of facts. This is particularly true if there appear to be triable issues of fact. Counsel for the moving party should therefore avoid placing too much reliance on such objections, and focus instead on substantive objections, e.g., the inadmissibility of evidence produced in opposition to the motion.

If the party opposing summary judgment includes facts in its papers that the moving party had failed to address in its moving papers, the moving party may address the point in its reply papers and if appropriate, may adopt the opposing party's own evidence to demonstrate that no triable issue of material fact exists [*see 216 Sutter Bay Associates v. County of Sutter (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 860, 879-881, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492*].

[2] Supplementary Evidence

The court has inherent power to request or consider supplemental or additional declarations submitted by the moving party in reply to the opposing declarations [*Weiss v. Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1094, 1098-1099, 251 Cal. Rptr. 727*]. Any supplemental evidentiary papers should include facts that establish the reasons that such papers are necessary, in view of the fact that supplementary evidentiary papers may be filed only in the discretion of the court [*see Johnson v. Banducci (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 254, 259-260, 27 Cal. Rptr. 764*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Supplementary Statement of Material Facts. When submitting supplemental evidentiary papers, it would also be advisable to prepare a supplementary statement of undisputed facts to accompany such evidence, in the same manner as the statement of material facts in support of the motion [*see § 537.21[3]*].

[3] Motion for Sanctions for Bad-Faith Affidavits

If counsel determines that any of the affidavits or declarations submitted in support of the opposition were presented in bad faith or solely for the purpose of delay, he or she may wish to include with the reply a motion to recover reasonable expenses incurred as a result [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*; *see also § 537.38[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionSupporting MaterialsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral

OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsMemoranda of Law

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.28

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.28 Serving and Filing the Reply Papers

Any reply to the opposition must be served and filed by the moving party no less than five days before the noticed or continued hearing date, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(4)*]. As distinguished from the service of a notice of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* [*see § 537.22*], there is no provision extending the time period for service by mail.

PRACTICE TIP:

Expedient Service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(c)* expressly applies to method of service for opposition and reply papers under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(6). Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(c)* provides that all papers opposing a motion and all reply papers shall be served by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail or other means reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties not later than the close of the next business day after the time the opposing papers or reply papers are filed.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.29

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.29 Procedure on Motion for Summary Adjudication

A motion for summary adjudication must proceed in all procedural respects as a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*; *see Maria D.v. Westec Residential Security, Inc. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 125, 133, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326* ; *Toigo v. Town of Ross (1998) 70 Cal. App. 4th 309, 324, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649*]. In other words, the procedural requirements governing summary judgment motions discussed above in this chapter apply equally to motions for summary adjudication [*see, e.g., Haskell v. Carli (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 124, 130, 240 Cal. Rptr. 439* (applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* and *(c)* in motion for summary adjudication)].

For a form of notice of motion for summary adjudication, see *§ 537.71*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.30

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.30 Obtaining Deposition of Expert Witness

While it is true that motions for summary judgment are heard on affidavits or declarations, contradictions raised by discovery may require the trial court to disregard the declarations or affidavits. This applies equally to party and nonparty deponents. For that reason, even though there has been no exchange of experts pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.010-2034.730* operative July 1, 2005] under the proper circumstances the parties should be allowed to depose an expert who supplies a declaration or affidavit in support of or in opposition to summary judgment or summary adjudication when there is a legitimate question regarding the foundation of the expert's opinion. Whether to grant discovery falls within the sound discretion of the trial court based on all the facts presented. There must be objective facts presented that create a significant question regarding the validity of the affidavit or declaration which, if successfully pursued, will impeach the foundational basis of the affidavit or declaration in question [*St. Mary Medical Center v. Superior Court (1997) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1531, 1540-1541* (cautioning that this process should not be used to turn summary proceedings into mini-trials)]. For discussion of continuances, *see § 537.36*.

An expert's opinion must be based on admissible evidence [*Garibay v. Hemmatt (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 735, 743* (expert's opinion inadmissible to establish material fact if opinion based on hearsay with no foundation made to establish an exception to the hearsay rule)]. For additional discussion of the requirements for an expert opinion as evidence in a summary judgment motion, see *§§ 537.24[1][b], 537.24[1][c], 537.25[3][b],*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsExpert Witness DiscoveryCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMotions for Additional DiscoveryCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsDiscovery Materials

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.31

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.31 Hearing Requirement

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c has been interpreted to require an oral hearing at which time counsel has the opportunity to persuade the court and respond to inquires. This means more than posting a ruling on a locked courtroom door or telephoning litigants with a decision. A "hearing" on summary judgment involves the contemporaneous presence (whether in person or electronically) of the parties and the judge. While judges retain considerable discretion regarding how the hearing is to be conducted, including imposing time limits and adopting tentative ruling procedures [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1308*], they cannot do away with oral argument altogether [*Brannon v. Superior Court (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1203,1208-1212, 8 Cal Rptr. 3d 491* ; *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 259-260, 265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781* . Various court rules regarding hearings, such as *Cal Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1304, 3.1310*, also show an intent to allow for oral hearings. While litigants are not given the right to present testimony at such hearings, there are no restrictions against oral argument [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306*; *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 263, 265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781*].

Despite the appearance of a fairness issue when the trial court fails to allow oral argument, the court of appeal may decline to reverse on that ground when it decides on the merits of the parties arguments that the trial court correctly entered judgment, as the reversal would serve no useful purpose [*Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 244-245, 245 n.18, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466*]. It is questionable whether *Victor* is still good law on this point after

Brannon v. Superior Court (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1203, 1208-1212, 8 Cal Rptr. 3d 491 . *Brannon* did not specifically address whether a court of appeal may decline to reverse based on the failure to allow oral argument, but the *Brannon* court did appear to hold that there is an absolute right to oral argument in summary judgment motions. Until the California Supreme Court rules on this issue, it can still be considered an open question.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewStandards of ReviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentHearingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentHearingsOral Arguments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.32

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.32 Trial Court Cannot Delegate Responsibility to Rule on Motion Absent Consent

Parties on each side of a dispositive motion are entitled to have the issues fully considered and resolved by the trial court and, in the absence of a proper stipulation, the responsibility to decide cannot be delegated irrespective of the burdens imposed by the court's pending caseload [*Jovine v. FHP, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1506, 1509, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 322*]. The court does not have authority to order a nonconsensual reference under *Code Civ. Proc. § 639* for the purpose of hearing and determining summary judgment motions [*Jovine v. FHP, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1506, 1522-1525, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 322*]. For discussion of references, see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersReferencesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.33

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.33 Standard for Granting Summary Judgment

[1] No Triable Issue and Moving Party Entitled to Judgment

A plaintiff may move for summary judgment if he or she contends that there is no defense to the action; a defendant may move for summary judgment if he or she contends that the plaintiff's action has no merit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. A cause of action has no merit if either of the following exists [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)*]:

- One or more of the elements of the cause of action cannot be separately established, even if that element is separately pleaded.
- A defendant establishes an affirmative defense to that cause of action.

A court shall grant a motion for summary judgment if all the papers submitted show both of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*]:

- There is no triable issue as to any material fact.
- The moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

Whether there is a triable issue of material fact does not turn on the trial court's discretion [*Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*, a trial court is required to grant summary judgment if all the papers and affidavits submitted, together with all inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence and uncontradicted by other inferences or evidence, show that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law [*Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 161, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* ; *see Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*]. There is a triable issue of material fact only if the evidence would allow a reasonable trier of fact to find the underlying fact in favor of the party opposing the motion [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*].

The trial court's function in ruling on the motion is merely to determine whether such issues of fact exist, not to decide the merits of the issues themselves [*Furla v. Jon Douglas Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1076-1077, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911* ; *see City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1188, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* ; *see also Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (only when inferences are indisputable may court decide issues as matter of law)]. The court must consider the bare evidence and reasonable inferences deducible from the evidence and determine whether the evidence is sufficient to support a potential judgment in favor of the opposing party [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 840*]. The court seeks to find contradictions in the evidence, or in inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence, that raise a triable issue of material fact [*Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641*].

Whether or not a disputed fact is "material" is determined by the law applicable to the legal theories put in issue by the complaint [*see Anderson v. Heart Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 202, 210, 256 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *see also Kelly v. First Astri Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 470, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (fact to be material must relate to a claim or defense that is in issue and must alsobe somehow necessary to judgment)]. For further discussion of what constitutes a material fact, *see §§ 537.21[3]* and *537.25[2]*.

If the trial court determines that no triable issue of fact exists but only one of law, it is the trial court's duty to determine the issue of law [*Monteleone v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 509, 514* ; *accord Aloha Pacific, Inc. v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 297, 307, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 148* ; *Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294*].

If a defendant's declarations in support of a motion for summary judgment demonstrate the absence of an essential element of plaintiff's case, and plaintiff's declarations submitted in reply do not show that a triable issue of fact exists with respect to that essential element, no amount of factual conflicts on other aspects of the case will affect the result, and the motion for summary judgment should be granted [*see Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294*].

The trial courts and appellate courts use the same three-step analysis to determine if summary judgment is warranted [*see, e.g., Padgett v. Phariss (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1278-1279, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373* ; *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 385, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* ; *Allyson v. Department of Transportation (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1317, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* ; for a statement of this three-step analysis, see *§ 537.43[2][b]*].

For forms of order granting summary judgment, see *§§ 537.81 -537.83*.

[2] Evaluation of Evidence to Determine if Triable Issues Exist

[a] All Evidence in Papers Generally Considered

In determining whether a triable issue of material fact exists, the court is required to consider all the evidence set forth in the papers, except that to which objections have been made and sustained by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *Tchorbadjian v. Western Home Ins. Co. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1217, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* ; *see also § 537.25[4]*]. The court is also required to consider all inferences reasonably deducible from that evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *Assad v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1609, 1612, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* ; *Tchorbadjian v. Western Home Ins. Co. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1217, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* ; *Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415* (court must consider presumptions and draw inferences from facts adduced when an inference is the only reasonable one that may be drawn); *accord Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 841, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12 but see § 537.34[4][a], below*]. The court must therefore consider what inferences favoring the opposing party a factfinder could reasonably draw from the evidence [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*]. However, in the antitrust context an inference that implies conduct equally favoring either party's contentions, without more, is not enough to amount to a triable issue of fact [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 852, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*].

On the other hand, the trial court may not weigh the evidence in the manner of a factfinder to determine whose version is more likely true. Nor may the trial court grant summary judgment based on the court's evaluation of credibility. Moreover, a trial court may not grant summary judgment for a defendant simply on its opinion that plaintiff's claims are "implausible," if a reasonable factfinder could find for plaintiff on the evidence presented [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*]. The court has no power in a summary proceeding to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence [*Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 841, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* ; *Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465-1466, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415*]. Moreover, an assertion based solely on conjecture or speculation is insufficient to avoid summary judgment [*Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1466, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415*].

The court strictly construes the moving party's evidence and liberally construes the opposing party's evidence [*Swat-Fame, Inc. v. Goldstein (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 613, 622, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 556* ; *City of Vista v. Robert Thomas Securities, Inc. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 882, 886, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 237* ; *accord Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 537.33[2][f]*].

The court accepts as undisputed facts only those portions of the moving party's evidence that are not contradicted by the opposing party's evidence, that is, the facts alleged in the opposing party's evidence and the reasonable inferences therefrom must be accepted as true [*Kelsey v. Waste Management of Alameda County (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 590, 594, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510* ; *accord Depew v. Crocodile Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 480, 485, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673* ; *see City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1176, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198*]. Any doubts concerning the propriety of granting the motion must be resolved in favor of the party opposing the motion [*PMC, Inc. v. Saban Entertainment, Inc. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 579, 590, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 877* ; *Tchorbadjian v. Western Home Ins. Co. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1217, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* ; *City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1176, 1188, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198*].

When a motion for summary judgment is made in a case in which the plaintiff's claim carries a clear and convincing burden of proof, the evidence and all inferences that can reasonably be drawn therefrom must meet the higher standard [*Rowe v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1711, 1724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d625*]; *see also Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 244, 252, 208 Cal. Rptr. 137, 690 P.2d 610* .

CAUTION:

Waived Objections. Objections to the evidence cannot be made for the first time on appeal [*see* discussion in *§ 537.43[3][c]*]. Preferably objections to the evidence should be made in writing before the hearing [*see § 537.25[4]*, and *§ 537.27[1]*]. Any objections not already made in the opposing or reply papers must, however, be made at the hearing itself.

If the moving party is otherwise entitled to summary judgment, the court may generally not deny the motion on grounds of credibility or for want of cross-examination of witnesses who furnish affidavits or declarations in support of the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)*; for discussion of exceptions to this rule, *see § 537.34[1]*].

[b] Moving Party's Initial Burden of Persuasion and/or Production

[i] Plaintiff or Cross Complainant

When the moving party is a plaintiff or cross complainant, he or she has the burden of proving each element of the cause of action entitling him or her to judgment on that cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(1)*; *see San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Gallagher (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 501, 503, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30* (plaintiff must produce admissible evidence of each element of the cause of action entitling the party to judgment on that cause); *see also Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 337, 345, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713* (on summary adjudication motion, plaintiff or cross complainant must show there is no material factual dispute with respect to one or more causes of action to prevail)]. In other words, that moving party must show, on the basis of his or her own affidavits and the admissions of the opposing party, every legal element necessary to sustain judgment in his or her favor [*Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 111, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* (decided under prior law); *Harman v. Mono General Hospital (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 607, 613, 182 Cal. Rptr. 570* (decided under prior law; unopposed motion must still meet initial burden); *see Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 585, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (*dicta* in discussion of legislative history in case involving defendant's burden of proof)].

The Supreme Court has characterized the moving party's burden on summary judgment as more properly one of persuasion rather than of proof, since he or she must persuade the court that there is no material fact for a reasonable trier of fact to find, and not prove any such fact to the satisfaction of the court itself as though it were sitting as the trier of fact [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*]. The party moving for summary judgment bears an initial burden of production to make a prima facie showing of the nonexistence of any triable issue of material fact; if he or she carries this burden of production, the moving party causes a shift, and the opposing party is then subjected to a burden of production to make a prima facie showing of the existence of a triable issue of material fact [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850-851, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Burden Despite Lack of Opposition. The opposing party fails to file a counter affidavit. Does this relieve the moving party of the burden of establishing evidentiary facts of every element necessary to entitle him or her to judgment? No [*see Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 169, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* , disapproved on other grounds in *Strang v. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013* ; *see also Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1151-1152, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (moving defendant not entitled to summary judgment despite plaintiff's failure to file proper opposing separate statement and untimeliness of opposition papers because defendant did not meet burden of establishing right to relief defendant sought; until defendant met burden, plaintiff had no burden to produce opposing evidence)]. When no affidavits or declarations are filed in opposition to a motion for summary judgment, however, the court is entitled to accept as true the facts alleged in the movant's affidavits and declarations, provided they are within the personal knowledge of the affiant or declarant and are facts to which he or she could competently testify [*Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declarations)].

[ii] Defendant or Cross Defendant

When the moving party is a defendant or cross defendant, he or she has the burden of showing either of the following [

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)]:

- That one or more elements of the cause of action, even if not separately pleaded, cannot be established.

- There is a complete defense to that cause of action or a defense to it.

The defendant by establishing either of the above has met his or her burden of showing that a cause of action has no merit [*Green v. Ralee Engineering Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 66, 72, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16, 960 P.2d 1046*].

The defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within the reasonable purview of the allegations contained in the complaint is there a material question of fact that requires examination by trial. The moving defendant bears the burden of proving the absence of any triable issue of material fact even though the plaintiff has the burden of proof as to that particular issue at trial. Thedefendant, however, need only demonstrate the absence of a triable issue of material fact as to those bases of liability the plaintiff has pleaded [*Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415* ; *see Jacobs v. Universal Development Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 692, 697-698* ; *62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 446* ; *see also Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (even though plaintiff bears burden of proof at trial, moving defendant bears initial burden of showing lack of any triable factual issue); *Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 95, 98 n.4, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820* (defendant moving for summary judgment need address only issues raised by complaint; plaintiff cannot bring up new, unpleaded issues in his or her opposition papers); *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1342, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (moving defendant need not refute liability on some theoretical possibility not included in pleadings)].

If a plaintiff pleads several theories, the defendant has the burden of demonstrating there are no material facts requiring trial on any of them. The moving defendant whose declarations omit facts as to any theory permits that portion of the complaint to be unchallenged. Even if no opposition is presented, the moving party still has the burden of eliminating all triable issues of fact [*Wright v. Stang Manufacturing Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1218, 1228, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 422* ; *see also Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 397, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (defendant is not entitled to summary judgment unless defendant negates all theories of liability pleaded by plaintiff); *Campbell v. Derylo (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 823, 826, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 519* (moving party bears burden of proving that claims of adverse party are entirely without merit on any legal theory)]. A responding plaintiff has no evidentiary burden unless the moving defendant has first met its initial burden [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* ; *see also Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1151-1152, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (until moving defendant met its initial burden, plaintiff had no burden to produce opposing evidence); *Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1085-1086, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575* (moving party must meet its initial burden of proof before court grants summary judgment, even in absence of opposition)]. Only if the defendant makes the requisite showing does the court need to examine plaintiff's opposing papers to determine if they demonstrate the existence of a triable issue of material fact [*Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* ; *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*].

When a defendant moves for summary judgment based on the plaintiff's inability to establish one or more elements of the cause of action, the defendant does not need to conclusively negate an element of the plaintiff's cause of action. It is enough for the defendant to show that one or more elements of the cause of action cannot be established [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853-854, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *Saelzler v. Advanced Group 400 (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 763, 767-769, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617, 23 P.3d 1143*]. For discussion, see *§ 537.33[2][d]* et seq.

The burden on a defendant moving for summary judgment based on the assertion of an affirmative defense is heavier than the burden to show that one or more elements of plaintiff's action cannot be established [*Anderson v. Metalclad*

Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-290, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331]. Instead of merely submitting evidence to negate a single element of plaintiff's cause of action, or offering evidence, such as vague or insufficient discovery responses, that the plaintiff does not have evidence to create an issue of fact as to one or more elements of his or her case, the defendant has the initial burden to show that undisputed facts support each element of the affirmative defense [*Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-290, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* ; *see Bacon v. Southern Edison Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16]* . If the defendant does not meet this burden, the motion must be denied. Only if the defendant meets this burden does the burden shift to plaintiff to show an issue of fact concerning at least one element of the defense [*Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-290, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* ; *see Huynh v. Ingersoll-Rand (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 825, 830, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*]. Moreover, if, in anticipation of an affirmative defense, the complaint alleges facts to refute it, the pleadings themselves create a material issue that defendant would have to refute to obtain summary judgment [*Bacon v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16*].

[c] Shift of Burden to Opposing Party

Once the moving party presents evidence sufficient to sustain judgment in his or her favor, the burden then shifts to the opposing party to show that a triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to the cause of action or a defense to it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(1), (2)*; *see Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* (burden on opposing party best described as a burden of production of evidence to make a prima facie showing of the existence of a triable issue of material fact); *Green v. Ralee Engineering Co. (1998) 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16, 960 P.2d 1046* (once defendant meets its burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that a triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to cause of action or a defense to it); *Weseloh Family Ltd. Partnership v. K.L. Wessel Const. Co. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 152, 162, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 660* (in professional negligence case, defendants met burden of showing they owed no duty of care to plaintiff; burden then shifted to plaintiff to show either that such a duty existed or that there wasa triable issue of material fact relevant to the determination of the duty issue); *Wagner v. City of South Pasadena (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 943, 947, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91* (once defendant's burden is met, burden shifts to plaintiff to show triable issue of fact exists; plaintiff must set forth specific facts showing triable issue of material facts exist); *Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1543, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101* (when defendant meets its burden, burden of proof shifts to plaintiff to show by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence that triable issues of fact exists)].

The opposing party has no burden to present opposing evidence when the moving party fails to meet the initial burden [*see Weber v. John Crane, Inc. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1433, 1442, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 71* ; *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 83-84, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* ; *Pepperell v. Scottsdale Ins. Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1054, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* ; *Quintilliani v. Mannerino (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 54, 59-60, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* ; *Bacon v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* ; *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 111, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* (decided under prior law)]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* was substantively amended in 1992 and 1993, the initial burden of proof remains with moving party. Prior to adoption of the 1992 amendment, there was no obligation on the opposing party to show that a triable issue of material fact existed unless and until the moving party had met its burden, and nothing in language of 1992 adoption of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(n)(2)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*) abrogates this well established summary judgment requirement that initial burden rests with moving party [*Quintilliani v. Mannerino (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 54, 59-60, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* ; *see Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 70-71, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (amendments did not change fundamental requirement that moving party prove its right to summary judgment; amended *section 437c*, like *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 56*, now places initial burden on moving party)]. Thus, for example, if a moving defendant's showing does not support judgment in the defendant's favor, the burden does not shift to the plaintiff and the motion must be denied without regard to the plaintiff's showing [*Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1534-1535, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (in legal malpractice action, when defendants produced no expert testimony negating duty of care or breach of duty elements of plaintiff's cause of action, defendants' motion for summary judgment should have been denied even though plaintiff did not produce expert testimony)].

In meeting its burden of proof, the opposing party may not rely on the mere allegations or denials of his or her pleadings to show that a triable issue of fact exists but, instead, must set forth the specific facts showing that a triable issue of material fact exists as to that cause of action or a defense to it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(1), (2)*; *see Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* ; *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922* ; *see also Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 69, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* ; *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* ; *Bacon v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16*].

The opposing party is only required to show the existence of a triable issue of fact, not demonstrate its ability to prevail at trial [*Del E. Webb Corp. v. Structural Materials Co. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 593, 608, 176 Cal. Rptr. 824* ; *see Padgett v. Phariss (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1279, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 373* ; *Carleton v. Tortosa (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 745, 752-753, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734*]. On the other hand, he or she cannot rely on contradictions in his or her own opposing evidence to create a triable issue [*State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Eastman (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 562, 573, 204 Cal. Rptr. 827* .]

The opposing party cannot defeat summary judgment by attempting to raise a factual dispute as to immaterial issues [*Ramero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1202-1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*]. A summary judgment motion will not be defeated by the presence of a factual dispute unless the fact in dispute is material [*Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1202-1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*], that is, it relates to a claim or defense in issue which could make a difference in the outcome [*Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1274, 280 Cal. Rptr 831* ; *see also § 537.21[3]*, for what constitutes material facts]. Thus, papers filed in response to the defendant's motion for summary judgment may not create an issue outside the pleadings and are not a substitute for an amendment to the pleadings [*Laabs v. City of Victorville (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1242, 1253, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 372* ; *Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 299, 317, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614* ; Nash v. *Fifth Amendment (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1116, 279 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *see also Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 95, 98 n.4, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820* (plaintiff cannot bring up new, unpleaded issues in his or her opposition papers); *Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 629, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (plaintiff cannot successfully resist summary judgment on theory which is not pleaded in complaint); *Allyson v. Department of Transportation (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1318-1321, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment granted in defendant's favor when none of plaintiff's extensive filings in opposition even remotely addressed the dispositive issue framed by the pleadings; plaintiff's filings all addressed nonissues)].

[d] Showing Required to Shift Burden of Production

[i] Move Toward Federal Standard

The addition of subdivision (n) to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, effective January 1,1993, codified the burden of persuasion and production in summary proceedings [*see* Stats. 1992, ch. 1348]. Now relettered as *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*, it appears to abrogate inconsistent prior case law, for example, requiring a moving party plaintiff to negate any applicable affirmative defenses before the burden shifted to the defendant to raise a triable issue of material fact [*Oldcastle Precast, Inc. v. Lumbermens Mut. Cas. Co. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 554, 564-565, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 363* ; *see Nymark v. Heart Fed. Savings & Loan Assn. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1089, 1095, 283 Cal. Rptr. 53*]. Counsel should exercise caution in citing cases decided under prior law, especially those that hold the moving party to a more stringent initial showing than that now required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p) moves California summary judgment law closer to the federal standard under *Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 56*, as interpreted by the *United States Supreme Court in Celotex Corp. v. Catrett (1986) 477 U.S. 317,*

325, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 91 L. Ed. 2d 265 [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 847-848, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*].

Under the federal standard governing burden of proof on summary judgment motions, although a moving party always initially bears the burden of establishing there is an absence of genuine issue of material fact, when the nonmoving party bears the burden of proof on an issue at trial the moving party need not support its summary judgment motion with evidence negating an essential element of the nonmoving party's case to satisfy its burden. Rather, the moving party may simply point to the absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party's case. The nonmoving party must then set forth specific facts by affidavits, declarations, or admissible discovery material showing that there is a genuine issue for trial [*Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1286, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* (citing federal authority); *but cf. Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* (disapproving Hunter language to effect that moving defendant could satisfy burden simply by pointing out absence of evidence to support an element of plaintiff's action); *see also Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71-72, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (under federal law, moving party has been permitted to simply assert absence of evidence to support claim in order to shift burden to opposing party)].

Although the 1993 amendment was not a "wholesale adoption" of the federal system, as in the federal the parties' burden of persuasion and/or production on summary judgment is dependent on their burden of proofat trial [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 851 n.15, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *see also Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71, 75, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (1992 and 1993 amendments did not change fundamental requirement that moving party prove its right to summary judgment, but did adopt federal mechanism of burden shifting; unlike federal rule, however, California procedure requires moving party to support motion with evidence)].

For discussion of differences between the federal and state standards, see *§ 537.33[2][d][ii]*.

[ii] Showing Required on Defendant's Motion

[A] When Element of Plaintiff's Cause of Action Lacking

The burden-shifting characteristics of the federal procedure are to be applied to California summary judgment motions so that a moving defendant may rely on factually devoid discovery responses to shift the burden of production pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)* [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853-854, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *see also Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* ; *Andrews v. Foster Wheeler, LLC (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 96, 101, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 229*]. Once the burden shifts as a result of the factually devoid discovery responses, the plaintiff must set forth specific facts which prove the existence of a triable issue of material fact [*Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1287-1289, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* ; *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*)]. Thus, the burden to show that there is a triable issue of material fact is placed on the party that bears the burden of proof for that fact at trial [*Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1287, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335*].

Under this view, a moving defendant has two ways to shift the burden of proof under *Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)* to the plaintiff to produce a triable issue of fact [*Brantley v. Pisaro (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1591, 1597-1598, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431*]:

- In accordance with the holding in *Union Bank*, a defendant may rely on a plaintiff's factually insufficient discovery responses to show that a plaintiff cannot establish an essential element of the plaintiff's cause of action.

- Alternatively, the defendant may use the tried and true technique of negating an essential element in

the plaintiff's cause of action.

The California Supreme Court has rejected the view that a moving defendant may shift the burden simply by suggesting the possibility that the plaintiff cannot prove his or her case [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ,]. The Court has held that *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)* requires a defendant to show by evidence and not mere argument that one or more elements ofthe cause of action cannot be established. A defendant must make an affirmative showing. A defendant, although not required to conclusively negate an element in the plaintiff's case, must produce direct or circumstantial evidence that the plaintiff does not possess, and cannot reasonably expect to obtain, a prima facie case. When the defendant makes such a showing, the burden of production to make a prima facie case shifts to the plaintiff [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853-855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*].

A defendant must do more than merely point out that there is an absence of evidence and must produce affirmative evidence to show that the plaintiff cannot establish a prima facie case [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 854, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *see Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 81, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360*]. The defendant may achieve this by, for example, pointing to admissions by the plaintiff following extensive discovery to the effect that the plaintiff has discovered nothing [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001)25 Cal. 4th 826, 854-855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *see Golden Eagle Refinery Co., Inc. v. Associated Intern. Ins. Co. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1300* (defense granted summary adjudication on cause of action for clean up costs of groundwater contamination where lack of evidence on damages shown by plaintiff's interrogatory responses admitting it was unable to attribute damages to any particular cause, event, or time)]. The defendant may also produce affirmative evidence that an element of a cause of action cannot be established by showing after extensive discovery that one of the plaintiff's elements is based on mere speculation *Saelzler v. Advanced Group 400 (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 763, 780-781* (plaintiff sued the owners of an apartment complex after she was criminally assaulted on the premises and claimed that defendant's failure to take proper security precautions was the proximate cause of her damages; motion for summary judgment granted because plaintiff was unable to provide evidence of causation since she had no evidence showing the identity of her assailants, whether they were trespassers or tenants, whether the security gate was broken, or whether defendant could reasonably have warned the public of unspecified dangers from unknown assailants; declaration of plaintiff's security expert based on same evidence was equally speculative since he equally unaware of assailants' identities and his opinion regarding causation was too tenuous to create a triable issue)].

Unlike the federal rule, California procedure requires the moving party to support the motion with evidence. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c), (p)(2)* implies a need for concrete evidence from the moving party and expressly requires the moving party to supply more than bare assertions, whether alleged in a pleading or by way of argument, that the opposing party has no evidence to support a particular claim [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 854, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* , approving *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*]. The court in *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 81, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* attempted to reconcile cases that addressed the required showing prior to *Aguilar*. The *Scheiding* court pointed out that *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* declined to describe the extent to which the Legislature in its amendments may have adopted (or even understood) the test in *Celotex Corp v. Catrett (1986) 477 U.S. 317, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 91 L. Ed. 2d 265* . How, then, was the *Union Bank* opinion able to characterize the plaintiff's interrogatory answers which contained no facts supporting the existence of misrepresentations or a fraudulent conspiracy, as the affirmative evidence required by the statute to shift the burden of proof in connection with the summary judgment? The court concluded it could do so by inferring from the plaintiffs' discovery answers that there was no further evidence to oppose the motion. Because the Civil Discovery Act of 1986 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016 et seq.*; *see now* Civil Discovery Act (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005)] imposed on the *Union Bank* plaintiffs a duty to answer interrogatories as completely as possible, given the information available to them, the *Union Bank* court could presume that the plaintiffs had answered "fully and truthfully," and could infer that they had no other evidence to support their claims. The plaintiffs had not asked for a continuance to obtain further evidence.

Plaintiffs in that case responded to discovery in two ways: by making an admission damaging to their case and also by stating their "belief" that evidence supporting their claims would be later revealed. Later cases, including *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335 (First Dist., Div. Two)* , have concluded that the later category of "empty" discovery response can be enough by themselves to support summary judgment. *Hunter* upheld summary judgment granted in an asbestos case on the issue of causation because the plaintiff's deposition responses failed to tie the defendant to any jobsite where alleged asbestos exposure occurred. The inference drawn by the *Hunter* court was an extension of the one which supported the court's conclusion in the *Union Bank* case: since the plaintiff had a statutory duty to respond fully, plaintiff's "factually devoid" answers showed plaintiff had no facts [*Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71-80, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* .]

Scheiding noted that both *Union Bank* and *Hunter* spoke of a defendant no longer needing to affirmatively negate an element of the plaintiff's case and both relied on the Civil Discovery Act of 1986 to infer an absence of evidence. Neither case, however, held that a moving party can simply argue or allege that the opposing party has no evidence and no California case has concluded that a party moving for summary judgment can simply argue there is an absence of facts to support the opposing party's case. The cases that have read the statutory amendments much less expansively than did the *Union Bank* and *Hunter* opinions generally look beyond themere absence of evidence and ask whether, given the particular circumstances of the case, "factually devoid" discovery responses should be held against the plaintiff. Noting that it may not be fair to say there is an opposing minority view contrary to the logic of *Union Bank* as extended by *Hunter*, the court stated that *Hagen v. Hickenbottom (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 168,186* , which is often cited for its criticism of the expansive boundary delineated by *Hunter* actually argues caution more than disagreement. The *Hagen* court noted in part that (1) a defendant must make an affirmative showing in support of plaintiff's motion which showing connotes something significantly more than simply pointing out to the court that there is an absence of evidence, and (2) before the burden of producing even a prima facie case should be shifted to the plaintiff in advance of trial, a defendant who cannot negate an element of the plaintiff's case should be required to produce direct or circumstantial evidence that the plaintiff not only does not have but cannot reasonably expect to obtain a prima facie case. The *Scheiding* court concluded that it agreed with *Hunter* that the circumstantial evidence which would be required by *Hagen* can consist of "factually devoid" discovery responses from which an absence of evidence can be inferred. The court also agreed with the view in *Hagen* that the burden should not shift without stringent review of the direct, circumstantial and inferential evidence. Reconciliation of the two views is not difficult once the inferential reasoning expressly permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* is considered. However, the court did not decide whether the more cautious view is the better one for the trial court's ruling was incorrect even under the more circumspect approach. In *Scheiding*, the motion was supported by a declaration of counsel stating that plaintiff's responses to discovery did not mention the defendant. However, the defendant conducted no discovery. In plaintiff's deposition, plaintiff was not asked a single question concerning the defendant. The duty to answer completely only extended so far as the reasonable ambit of the questions asked. The plaintiff had no duty to volunteer information that was not requested. Although summary judgment is more obtainable under the amended statute, the initial burden of producing evidence expressly resides with the moving party and cannot be shifted without the "evidence and inferences" described in the statute. Defendant's motion, unlike the motions in *Union Bank* and *Hunter*, relied on argument rather than on evidence. This was insufficient to support a reasonable inference that plaintiffs could not produce further evidence to support an element crucial to their claims [*Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 67, 80-84, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* ; *see also* *Weber v. John Crane, Inc. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 1433, 1442, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 71* (in asbestos exposure case, plaintiff's deposition testimony to the effect that he was unable to recall working with defendant's products did not permit an inference that plaintiff neither possessed, nor reasonably could obtain, evidence that plaintiff was exposed to defendant's products and therefore burden did not shift to plaintiff); *Gulf Ins. Co. v. Berger, Kahn, Shafton, Moss, Figler, Simon & Gladstone (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 114, 133-136, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534* (following *Scheiding* plaintiff's nonresponsive answer to interrogatory did not constitute "factually devoid" discovery to shift burden to plaintiff on question of causation of plaintiff's damages, since discovery did not call for information on that subject, or for other information from which information on that subject could be deduced)].

In any event, the method for establishing a prima facie entitlement to summary judgment requires the moving party to

demonstrate a negative, that is, that there is no evidence to support an element of the opponent'scase [*Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 735, 735 n.1, 739-740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710* (citing *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* , for how prima facie case may be proved, and declining to reach the issue of whether the strict standard of *Addy v. Bliss & Glennon (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 205, 214, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* , is correct)]. This is akin to the burden of an appellant in proving there is no substantial evidence in support of a judgment. It is incumbent on an appellant who claims evidentiary insufficiency to set forth the evidence supporting the judgment and indicate wherein it is insufficient. If a party contends some particular issue of fact has no support in the record, it must set forth all the material evidence on the point and not merely the evidence favorable to it [*Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 739-740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710*]. Thus, on a summary judgment motion in a personal injury action, the defendant was required to include portions of depositions in which parents recounted the purported identification by the real party of the cause of his injury. To have omitted these facts would have put defendant at risk of the accusation of an attempt to mislead the trial court as to the state of the discovery record. Moreover, a moving party's reference to inadmissible evidence in its statement of undisputed facts does not waive a contemporaneously raised objection to that evidence in the accompanying points and authorities [*Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 735, 740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710* (opposing party never asserted in trial court that moving party waived its objection to the evidence and appellate court found no factual basis for imposing doctrine of waiver under circumstances)].

Also, although a plaintiff who has pleaded several causes of action based on the same set of facts need only sustain its burden on one theory to prevail at trial, a defendant who seeks summary judgment must define all of the theories alleged in the complaint and challenge each factually. A defendant as the moving party has the burden to show it is entitled to judgment on all theories of liability asserted by the plaintiff [*see* *Lopez v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 705, 713-714, 717, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821*].

If the defendant claims that the plaintiff cannot establish the cause of action pled because the defendant's affirmative evidence discloses facts that negate the existence of an essential element of the plaintiff's claim by proving the contrary is true, the court should evaluate the defendant's evidence under the same strictstandards which were held to apply to a defendant's attempt to disprove an element of the plaintiff's cause of action before the 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, in order to avoid unjustly depriving the plaintiff of a trial [*Tibor v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1368, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326*].

[B] For Affirmative Defense

The burden on a defendant moving for summary judgment based on the assertion of an affirmative defense is heavier than the burden to show oneor more elements of plaintiff's action cannot be established. Instead of merely submitting evidence to negate a single element of plaintiff's cause of action, or offering evidence, such as vague or insufficient discovery responses, that the plaintiff does not have evidence to create an issue of fact as to one or more elements of his or her case, the defendant has the initial burden to show that undisputed facts support each element of the affirmative defense. The defendant must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there a material factual issue requiring trial. If the defendant does not meet this burden, the motion must be denied. Only if the defendant meets this burden does the burden shift to plaintiff to show an issue of fact concerning at least one element of the defense [*Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-290, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331*]. Even if the plaintiff admits during discovery that it has no evidence to dispute the applicability of an affirmative defense, the moving defendant has the initial burden to show that undisputed facts support each element of the affirmative defense [*Consumer Cause, Inc. v. SmileCare (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 454, 467-468, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 627* (order granting defendant's motion reversed since based on plaintiff's statement and defendant did not prove undisputed facts for each element)].

The submission of evidence which is equivocal, or from which conflicting inferences may be drawn is insufficient to meet the movant's burden [*Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 297, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331*].

[e] Effect of Heightened Burden of Proof

When a motion for summary judgment is made in a case in which the plaintiff's claim carries a clear and convincing burden of proof, the evidence and all inferences that can reasonably be drawn therefrom must meet the higher standard [*Rowe v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1711, 1724, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 625* ; *see also Basich v. Allstate Insurance Co. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1121, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153* ; *Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 244, 252, 208 Cal. Rptr. 137, 690 P.2d 610*].

[f] Construction of Affidavits and Declarations

In determining whether the parties have met their respective burdens of proof, courts construe the affidavits or declarations of the moving party strictly, resolving any doubts in the opposing party's favor [*Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 874, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* ; *Pender v. Radin (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1807, 1813, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36* ; *see Cortez v. Vogt (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 917, 925-926, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* ; *see also Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* (moving party's papers strictly construed, accepting as fact only those portions not contradicted by opposing papers)]. By contrast, they construe the affidavits or declarations of the opposing partyliberally, resolving any doubts in favor of the party opposing the motion [*Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 874, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* ; *Pender v. Radin (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1807, 1813, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36* ; *see Cortez v. Vogt (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 917, 925-926, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* ; *see also Brown v. FSR Brokerage, Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 766, 773, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828* (papers in opposition construed more liberally; doubts resolved against granting motion); *Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* (opposing papers liberally construed, all facts therein being accepted as true); *but see § 537.33[2][g]*]. Nonetheless, despite the construction of affidavits in its favor, the opposing party has the burden of showing the existence of a triable issue of material fact [*Chern v. Bank of America (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 866, 873, 127 Cal. Rptr. 110, 544 P.2d 1310* ; *Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 841, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* ; *see § 537.33[2][c]*].

The sole declaration of a party opposing a summary judgment motion which raises a triable issue of fact is sufficient to deny the motion [*Estate of Housley (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)* does not allow a trial court to weigh the credibility of a declaration submitted by the party opposing a summary judgment motion and then grant the motion, except where the declaration is facially so incredible as a matter of law that the moving party otherwise would be entitled to summary judgment [*Estate of Housley (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359-360, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*].

Courts have been highly critical and must be cautious when an expert offers legal conclusions as to ultimate facts in the guise of an expert opinion [*Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (court rejected retired field training police office's declaration to extent it drew legal conclusions)]. Moreover, expert declarations cannot create a triable question of fact if the expert's opinion is based on factors that are remote, speculative, or conjectural [*Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1462, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54*], or it if lacks foundation or is stated without sufficient certainty [*see Sanchez v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co. (2002) 104Cal. App. 4th 703* (expert affidavit sufficient because it established matters relied upon in expressing the opinion, opinion rested on matters of type reasonably relied upon, and it established bases for opinion)].

If no affidavits or declarations are filed in opposition to a motion for summary judgment the court is entitled to accept as true the facts alleged in the movant's affidavits and declarations, provided they are within the personal knowledge of the affiant or declarant and are facts to which he or she could competently testify [*Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declarations)].

[g] Weight of Admissions

[i] Admissions Obtained Through Discovery

Admissions against interest obtained through discovery are entitled to greater weight than evidentiary allegations in affidavits or declarations [*D'Amico v. Board of Medical Examiners (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 1, 21-22, 112 Cal. Rptr. 786, 520 P.2d 10*]. Thus, admissions made in the course of a party's deposition cannot be contradicted solely by that party's declaration in opposition to summary judgment [*Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 545, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* ; *see Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (party cannot create issue of fact by declaration that contradicts his or her prior discovery responses); *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1191-1192, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (to extent descriptions in plaintiff's declaration submitted in opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment contradicted plaintiff's discovery responses, they must be disregarded)]. A party is bound by admissions made in the course of discovery, and on motion for summary judgment, no further evidence of the matters so admitted is required [*Hejmadi v. AMFAC, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 525, 552-553, 249 Cal. Rptr. 5*].

All admissions elicited in the course of discovery are not created equal under the *D'Amico* rule; and deposition answers are simply evidence and do not constitute incontrovertible judicial admissions as do concessions in a pleading or answers to requests for admissions [*Scalf v. D.B. Log Homes, Inc. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1510, 1522, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 826*]. An opposing party's deposition testimony that he found "nothing wrong" and had no criticisms of moving party's product were not the equivalent of judicial admissions and did not carry the moving party's burden of demonstrating the absence of a factual dispute on express indemnity claim [*Scalf v. D.B. Log Homes, Inc. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1510, 1523, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 826*].

Notwithstanding the above, the extent to which discovery-related admissions are conclusive in a summary judgment proceeding, in the face of contradictory affidavits or declarations by the admitting party, is somewhat unclear. The court of appeal in *Leasman v. Beech Aircraft Corp. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 376, 121 Cal. Rptr. 768 (First Dist., Div. One)* , relying on *D'Amico v. Board of Medical Examiners (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 1, 112 Cal. Rptr. 786, 520 P.2d 10* , stated that when a defendant can establish his or her defense with the plaintiff's admissions sufficient to pass the strict construction test imposed on the moving party (for discussion, *see § 537.33[2][f]*), the credibility of the admissions are valued so highly that controverting affidavits may be disregarded entirely as irrelevant, inadmissible, or evasive [*see Leasman v. Beech Aircraft Corp. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 376, 382, 121 Cal. Rptr. 768]* . Several courts adopted this view [*see Niederer v. Ferreira (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1485, 1503, 234 Cal. Rptr.779 (Second District, Div. One)* ; *Shapero v. Fliegel (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 842, 849, 236 Cal. Rptr. 696 (Second District, Division Two)* ; *see also Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157 (Sixth Dist.)* ; *Wilkins v. National Broadcasting Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1082, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329 (Second Dist., Div. Three)*].

The same district and division of the court that decided *Leasman*, however, subsequently stated that the broad language in *Leasman* should be accepted with caution [*Price v. Wells Fargo Bank (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 465, 482, 261 Cal. Rptr. 735*]. The *Price* court did not interpret *D'Amico* as saying that admissions should be shielded from careful examination in light of the entire record and stated that a summary judgment should not be based on tacit admissions or fragmentary and equivocal concessions that are contradicted by other evidence [*Price v. Wells Fargo Bank (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 465, 482, 261 Cal. Rptr. 735* (First Dist., Div. One; trial court's reliance on admissions upheld only because appellate court found nothing in record that was materially inconsistent with the admissions); *accord Kirby v. Albert D. Seeno Construction Co. (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1066-1067* (First Dist., Div. One; *Price* approved of reliance on admissions made in course of discovery when they are uncontradicted or contradicted by self-serving declarations of party); *see also Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 77-78, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (First Dist., Div. One; court discussed *D'Amico*, noting Supreme Court has consistently refused to allow triable issue of fact to be conjured by submission of affidavit contradicting declarant's prior deposition testimony; however, court, discussing *Price*, viewed record before it with caution); *Wright v. Stang Manufacturing Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1218, 1224 n.2, 1227 n.3, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 422* (plaintiffs mistaken response as "Undisputed" to one of defendants' separate statement of facts held not to be a judicial admission, or an admission, or concession on issues of

liability and causation when such response was not under oath or part of any pleading, and when the response was inconsistent with other responses and evidence submitted in opposition to summary judgment motion); *FPI Development, Inc. v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 396, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508* (stating that "admission is binding unless there is a credible explanation for inconsistent positions taken by a party")]. If an admission is susceptible ofdifferent meanings, trial court must use its discretion to determine admission's scope and effect [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 192 n.15, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (citing *Fredericks v. Kontos Industries, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 272, 277, 234 Cal. Rptr. 395* ; involving requests for admissions)].

A defendant may provide affirmative evidence that the plaintiff lacks any factual support for the plaintiff's claims through an admission by the plaintiff that extensive discovery has yielded nothing [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 854-855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *Tran v. Farmers Group, Inc. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1202, 1215, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728]* .

The court may disregard admissions that are ambiguous, irrelevant, or incomplete [*see Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 192 n.15, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96*].

[ii] Judicial Admissions

Although, as indicated above, a line of cases has developed the rule that when a party has made an admission in discovery that justifies summary judgment in favor of the opponent, that party cannot attempt to defeat a summary judgment motion by submitting a declaration contradicting the admission, the related principle of judicial admission has not been accorded as broad an application [*Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 961, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (judicial admission not involved); *see Kirby v. Albert D. Seeno Construction Co. (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1066-1067, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 604* (court refused to give conclusive effect to ambiguous statement in an unverified complaint when statement was explained in deposition testimony under oath; summary judgment should not be entered based on mistaken legal conclusions in complaint when facts submitted in opposition indicate existence of material factual issue); *see also 24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1211, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533* (admission in complaint will not bind plaintiff on summary judgment if plaintiff offers countervailing evidence in opposition to motion)]. Nevertheless, in an appropriate case, a judicial admission may be deemed binding and dispositive without further evidence [*see, e.g., Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App.4th 853, 870-871, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (judicial admissions in underlying case and related indemnity action were binding and dispositive without further evidence on motion for summary judgment concerning cross complaint). According to *Kurinij*, such admissions are proper on summary judgment and overcome evidence even when the opposing party seeks to contradict the prior admission. The trial court, however, has discretion to disregard the admissions [*Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 853, 871, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (no abuse of discretion when trial court chose not to disregard admissions)]. There is also authority, however, that has held that such admissions are conclusive and limit contradictory evidence [*see Barr v. ACandS, Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1038, 1055-1056, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 494* (defendant moving for summary judgment may rely on allegations in plaintiff's complaint which are judicial admissions; as such, they are conclusive concessions of truth of a matter and remove it from issues; contradictory evidence is limited to that which collaterally attacks the prior judicial admission on the basis of mistake, inadvertence, or lack of authority)].

[3] Power of Court to Grant Motion on Issue Party Did Not Raise

A trial court has discretion to grant summary judgment on an issue that the moving party has not raised if the court notifies the opposing party of its intent to do so and provides an opportunity to respond to the new issue [*Gomez v. Acquistapace (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 740, 744, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821* ; *see Bacon v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 854, 860, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* ; *cf. Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 75, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (Code Civ. Proc. § 473c, unlike *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 56,* does not permit court to enter summary judgment on its own); *Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London v. Superior Court (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 952, 958, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821* (stating that, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a),* which provides that any "party" may

move for summary judgment, California state judges, unlike federal judges, do not have the power to enter summary judgment sua sponte, subject only to giving the losing party notice of a need to come forward with its evidence)].

Notice and providing the opposing party a meaningful opportunity to respond are essential. Thus, for example, when a moving party raised additional facts in a supplemental statement of undisputed material facts, not accompanied by additional legal argument, filed two days before the hearing and after the opposition had been filed, and the plaintiff did not respond to it before the hearing, the trial court erred in granting the motion, not because it relied on a new issue, but because it did so without notice and opportunity to respond [*Gomez v. Acquistapace (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 740, 744, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821*]. Where a defendants' summary judgment motion was based solely on the statute of limitations, and they did not assert that plaintiffs had failed to state a cause of action due to the absence of allegations of physical injury to their buildings, and plaintiffs were given no opportunity to respond to defendants' motion on that unstated ground, it was reversible error for the trial court to grant the motion [*County of Santa Clara v. Atlantic Richfield (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 292, 326, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 313*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofAbsence of Essential Element of ClaimCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofMovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofNonmovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsLegal EntitlementCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsMateriality

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.34

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.34 Standards for Denying Summary Judgment

[1] Triable Issues Exist or Moving Party Is Not Entitled to Judgment

Denial is, by implication, required when a triable issue of material fact has been shown to exist, or when the moving party is nonetheless not entitled to judgmentas a matter of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *see Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 56, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947*]. The latter situation arguably includes cases in which the moving party has not met its initial burden of proof [*see Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 169-170, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* , disapproved on other grounds in *Strang v. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013* ; *see also § 537.33[2][c]*].

For a form of order denying motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, see *§ 537.85*.

[2] Contradicted Inferences of Fact

A court is expressly prohibited from granting summary judgment on the basis of inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence if those inferences are contradicted by other inferences or evidence which raise a triable issue as to any material fact [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*; *see also § 537.33[2][a]*].

The court may not grant defendant's motion based on any evidence from which such inferences are drawn, if so

contradicted. That means that, if the court concludes that plaintiff's evidence or inferences raise a triable issue of material fact, it must conclude its consideration and deny the defendants' motion. If there is a conflict in the inferences such that a triable issue exists, the summary judgment motion must be denied [*Kids' Universe v. In2Labs (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 870, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 158*]

Absent new facts, summary judgment is not to be granted based on issues raised in a previously denied motion for summary adjudication [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*; *see also § 537.34[3]*].

[3] Motion Based on Issues Asserted in Prior Unsuccessful Motion for Summary Adjudication

A party may not move for summary judgment based on issues asserted in a prior motion for summary adjudication and denied by the court, unless that party establishes to the satisfaction of the court the existence of newly discovered facts or circumstances or a change of law supporting the issues reasserted in the summary judgment motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*; *see Bagley v. TRW, Inc. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1092, 1096-1098, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 909* (second motion prohibited)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)* does not apply when the prior motion was for summary judgment, not summary adjudication [*see Nieto v. Blue Shield of California Life & Health Ins. (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 60, 72, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906* (defendant's motion for summary judgment fell outside scope of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*, where prior motion was one for summary judgment rather than summary adjudication)].

For the purposes of this requirement, "change of law" does not include a later enacted statute without retroactive application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(s)*], nor does it include published decisions not cited in connection with the earlier summary adjudication motion that are raised for the first time in connection with the later summary judgment motion [*Bagley v. TRW, Inc. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1092, 1097, 1097 n.4, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 909*] or a nonpublished Superior Court opinion [*Schachter v. Citigroup, Inc. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 726, 738, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 920*]. The trial court is not required to outline the newly discovered facts or circumstances in its order when it allows a party to renew a motion for summary judgment/summary adjudication [*Pender v. Radin (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1807, 1812, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36* (applying former version of subsection (f)(2))].

As an exception, because of the nature of litigation over insurance coverage, an insurer may be able to move for summary adjudication on the duty to defend despite an earlier summary adjudication that an insurer had a duty to defend [*see Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 617, 620-623, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 219*].

[4] Discretionary Denial

[a] Material Fact Depends on Sole Witness

A court has discretion to deny a motion in the following situations [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)*; *see Meighan v. Shore (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1025, 1046, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744* (mental process); *Times-Mirror Co. v. Superior Court (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1430, 244 Cal. Rptr. 556* (sole witness); *Allen v. McMillion (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 211, 215-216, 147 Cal. Rptr. 77* (state of mind)]:

- When the only proof of a material fact offered in support of the motion is an affidavit or declaration made by an individual who was the sole witness to the fact.

- When a material fact is an individual's state of mind, or lack thereof, and the fact is sought to be established solely by that individual's affirmation.

These situations are exceptions to the general rule that a court cannot deny the motion merely on grounds of credibility or for want of cross-examination of witnesses who furnish affidavits or declarations in support of the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)*; *see* discussion in *§ 537.33[2][b][i]* et seq.].

PRACTICE TIP:

Who Is "Sole Witness." The phrase "sole witness" is not expressly defined by statute. It is arguable that it includes not only the sole witness of a fact, but also the sole witness of a fact who is available to testify under *Evid. Code § 240*.

[b] Failure to State Legal Ground for Motion

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c requires the party seeking summary judgment to state with specificity in its moving papers each of the grounds of law on which the moving party is relying in contending the action has no merit or there is no defense to it [*Juge v. County of Sacramento (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 59, 68, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 598*]. If the parties' separate statements of material facts include an undisputed material fact that is dispositive of the action, but the moving party has overlooked its legal significance, the trial court may deny the motion even if the court recognizes the legal significance of the fact and knows it would entitle the party to summary judgment if it had been explicitly raised in the moving papers [*Juge v. County of Sacramento (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 59, 68, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 598* (granting summary judgment when undisputed facts showed no causation)].

The court does, however, have power under these circumstances to grant the motion on a ground not explicitly tendered by the moving party. Before granting the motion, the court must provide the opposing party an opportunity to respond to the ground of law identified by the court and a chance to show the existence of a triable issue of material fact as to that ground of law [*Juge v. County of Sacramento (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 59, 70, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 598*].

[c] Absence of Statement of Undisputed Facts or Unavailablity of Facts

The court may deny a motion in the following additional circumstances:

- It is not supported by the required separate statement of undisputed facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; *see* discussion in *§ 537.21[3]*].

- It is shown that facts justifying opposition may exist but cannot be then presented [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*; *see* discussion in *§ 537.36*]. While a mere continuance is the more likely result in this case, denial may be necessary, for example, when the continued date is less than thirty days before the date set for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

Despite the court's discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)* to deny a motion based on an inadequate separate statement, the court must first consider all the submitted papers as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)* to determine whether there are triable issues of fact and whether the moving party is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law. However, this requirement does not require the court to grope its way through a maze of arguments and reams of documents, searching for obscure traces of triable issues of material fact [*Kulesa v. Castleberry (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 103, 113, 116-117, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669* (reversing trial court's denial of motion where the most cursory review of the papers showed the motion to be utterly without factual or legal merit)].

[5] Denial With Opportunity to Amend Complaint

If summary judgment is granted on the ground that the complaint is legally insufficient, but it appears from the materials submitted in opposition to the motion that the plaintiff could state a cause of action, the trial court should give the plaintiff an opportunity to amend the complaint before entry of judgment [*College Hospital, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 704, 719 n.5, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 898, 882 P.2d 894* ; *Bostrom v. County of San Bernardino (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 1654, 1663, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669*].

However, absent a request to amend, there is no occasion for the court to inquire about possible issues not raised by the

pleadings [*Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848, 885, 164 Cal. Rptr. 510, 610 P.2d 407*].

[6] Denial of Motion to Allow Discovery

Under appropriate circumstances, *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* authorizes the court to deny a motion for summary judgment or make any other order it deems just. For example, in *People v. $4,503 United States Currency (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1743, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467* , a forfeiture proceeding, the defendant, who repeatedly failed to appear for scheduled depositions, moved for summary judgment. The trial court concluded that because defendant was a fugitive from justice it had been impossible for the People to conduct discovery and denied defendant's motion for summary judgment without prejudice to renew the motion after discovery took place. The trial court was held to have authority under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* to fashion the order that it did [*People v. $4,503 United States Currency (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1743, 1746-1749, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467*].

For discussion of continuances, as opposed to denial of the motion, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*, see *§ 537.36*.

[7] Denial Based on Issues Raised Outside of Pleadings

A plaintiff's motion for summary judgment is limited to the causes of action pled in the complaint [*Distefano v. Forester (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1264-1265, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813*]. In *Distefano*, the plaintiff sought recovery for injuries suffered while "off-roading." Defendant contended that plaintiff's action was barred by the doctrine of primary assumption of the risk, in that collisions were an inherent risk in the sport of "off-roading." Plaintiff's complaint pled only that defendant was negligent; it did not allege recklessness. On appeal, plaintiff argued that the evidence supported a claim of recklessness, which would avoid the defense of primary assumption of the risk. The court of appeal held that the trial court was correct in deciding the case based on the pleadings, and held that the plaintiff should have sought leave to amend the complaint prior to the hearing on the summary judgment motion [*Distefano v. Forester (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1264-1265, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813*].

[8] Special Rule in Cases of Public Design Immunity

The normal rules requiring denial of summary judgment if any triable issue of fact appears are not fully applicable in the case of a claim of design immunity under *Gov. Code § 830.6* [*Wyckoff v. State of California (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 45, 50-51, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198*]. In a claim of design immunity, the defendant public entity is not required to prove that the design was a reasonable one. Instead, the defendant must only show some substantial evidence that a reasonable public employee or legislative body could have approved the design. Therefore, on a motion for summary judgment, the existence of a possible conflict in the evidence regarding the reasonableness of the design will not defeat summary judgment, as long as there is substantial evidence of reasonableness, even if contradicted [*Wyckoff v. State of California (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 45, 50-51, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (affirming order granting State's motion for summary judgment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofMovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofNonmovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsLegal EntitlementCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsMateriality

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.35

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.35 Standard for Granting or Denying Summary Adjudication

The court is not to grant a motion for summary adjudication unless it completely disposes of a cause of action, an affirmative defense, a claim for damages, or an issue of duty [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*]. Other than this, *Section 437c(f)* does not expressly provide a standard for granting a motion for summary adjudication, but provides merely that a motion for summary adjudication "shall proceed in all procedural respects as a motion for summary judgment" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*; *see § 537.29*]. It therefore appears the standard for determining a motion for summary judgment [*see § 537.33[1]* (no triable issue) and *§ 537.34[1]* (triable issues exist)] also applies in determining whether to grant a motion for summary adjudication with respect to a cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for punitive damages, or issue of duty owed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*; *Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1507* ; *Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London v. Superior Court (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 952, 956-960, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821* ; *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195* ; *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 385, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* ; and discussion in *§ 537.17[1]* et seq.; *see also Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. Superior Court (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 970, 977-978, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743* (standard applied to summary adjudication motion concerning affirmative defense); *Bed, Bath & Beyond of La Jolla, Inc. v. La Jolla Village Square Venture Partners (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 867, 881, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830* (same burden of proof as for summary judgment applied)].

For a form of order granting summary adjudication, see *§ 537.84*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary JudgmentsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.36

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.36 Continuance When Opposing Facts Cannot Be Presented

If it appears from the affidavits or declarations submitted in opposition to the motion that facts essential to justify opposition may exist but cannot, for reasons stated, then be presented, the court shall deny the motion, or order a continuance to permit affidavits or declarations to be obtained or discovery to be had, or may make such other order as may be just [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*; *see People v. $4,503 United States Currency (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1743, 1746-1749, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467* (court had authority to deny motion without prejudice when moving defendant had repeatedly failed appear for depositions); *see also § 537.34[6]*]. An application to continue the motion to obtain necessary discovery may also be made by ex parte motion at any time on or before the date the opposition is due [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*].

The purpose of the Code Civ. Proc. § 473c(h) affidavit requirement is to inform the court of the outstanding discovery that is necessary to resist the summary judgment motion [*Bahl v. Bank of America (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 389, 396, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 270* ; *Scott v. CIBA Vision Corp. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 307, 325-326, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902*].

There is an added provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* providing that if, after granting a continuance to allow specified additional discovery, the court determines that the party seeking summary judgment has unreasonably failed to allow the discovery to be conducted, the court shall grant a continuance to permit the discovery to go forward or deny the motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(i)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Required Showing for Continuance. If a continuance is sought by the opposing party on the ground that facts justifying opposition may exist but cannot then be presented, this request must be supported by an affidavit or declaration stating the reasons why the opposing party cannot then present that evidence, as well as the estimated time required and the steps proposed to obtain the evidence [*see, e.g.,* *Davis v. Nadrich (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 414* ; *Cooksey v. Alexakis (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 246, 254, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 810* ; *Wachs v. Curry (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 616, 622-624, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 496* ; *see also* *American Continental Ins. Co. v. C & Z Timber Co. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1271, 1280, 241 Cal. Rptr. 466*]. The affidavit or declaration is essential; it is not enough merely to raise the issue in the opposing memorandum [*Hill v. Physicians & Surgeons Exchange (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7-8, 274 Cal. Rptr. 702*].

An attorney's declaration in support of a request for a continuance that merely states that the attorney has not yet deposed the parties is not sufficient to support a continuance. The declaration needs to explain what efforts were made to take the necessary depositions and why they could not have been taken earlier [*see, e.g.,* *Cooksey v. Alexakis (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 246, 254, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 810* (continuance for stated purpose of taking depositions was not warranted when declaration did not explain what efforts had been made to take depositions or why they had not been taken sooner); *Desaigoudar v. Meyercord (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 173, 191, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 408* (showing of discovery diligence is required for continuance); *A & B Painting & Drywall, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 349, 356-357, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 418*]. Moreover, it is incumbent on the party opposing the summary judgment motion to show by affidavit or declaration that the proposed discovery could reasonably lead to facts essential to justify opposition to the motion [*Scott v. CIBA Vision Corp. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 307, 326, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902*]. Thus, if the party opposing the motion seeks a continuance, but fails to submit a supporting affidavit or declaration, the conditions of Code Civ. Proc. § 473c(h) have not been met and a continuance is not mandatory [*Scott v. CIBA Vision Corp. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 307, 313-314, 326, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902* ; *see also* *Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1083, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575* (trial court was not required to continue summary judgment motion because request was not included in timely opposition to summary judgment motion and plaintiffs failed to establish that facts essential to justifying opposition might exist but could not be presented before hearing); *Waisbren v. Peppercorn Productions, Inc. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 246, 263, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 437* (trial court did not abuse discretion in denying plaintiff's request for continuance when plaintiff in opposing motion did not explain how outstanding discovery was related to issues raised by motion and motion was based on issue solely within plaintiff's knowledge so that plaintiff did not need discovery from defendants to dispute or address that issue)].

One court has questioned whether the lack of diligence alone should make or break a continuance request under *Code Civ. Proc § 437c(h)*, while noting that the trial judge may deny the request for continuance of the motion when lack of diligence results in a party's having insufficient information to know if facts essential to justify opposition may exist, and the party is therefore unable to provide the requisite affidavit [*Bahl v. Bank of America (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 389, 396, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 270* (denial of plaintiff's request for continuance abused court's limited discretion where plaintiff provided affidavit informing court of outstanding discovery matters and why essential facts could not be presented at that time, transcripts of depositions essential to justify opposition had not yet been received from court reporter, defendant produced over 600 pages of documentation after plaintiff filed her opposition to motion, defendant did not suggest that it suffered any prejudice on account of plaintiff's due diligence deficit, and parties had provided no indication that there was special reason to protect trial date)].

It has been held that a continuance is not necessarily required simply because the opposing party claims that to file substantive opposition might violate his right against self incrimination; rather, the opposing party must show that his *fifth amendment* rights would in fact be violated and that he was unable to present any other substantive opposition to the motion [*Fisher v. Gibson (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 275, 283-284, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*].

It has been held improper for the trial court to consider as a factor in denying a continuance to a plaintiff opposing a

motion for summary judgment that granting the continuance would permit a disgruntled plaintiff to take a voluntary dismissal in the hope of drawing a more sympathetic judge upon refiling the complaint, since this concern would militate against summary judgment continuances under any circumstances. Moreover this concern has been deemed unfounded because were a plaintiff to dismiss his or her complaint after a *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* continuance had been granted, the court would retain jurisdiction to rule on the summary judgment motion [*Bahl v. Bank of America (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 389, 396, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 270]* .

At least one court has held that the inquiry does not end once the court determines that a continuance is not mandatory under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*. The court must then determine whether the party requesting the continuance has nonetheless established good cause therefor. This determination is within the court's discretion [*Lerma v. County of Orange (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 709, 714, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 609* (court held continuance was clearly necessary when plaintiff's attorney was served with a summary judgment motion on the day he was admitted to the hospital for bladder cancer surgery and was unaware that he had been served with motion until he was released from the hospital, two business days before the response was due)].

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h) has no comparable provision for the moving party. The moving party, however, controls when the motion is brought and, except for expert witnesses, will have had a chance to depose the necessary witnesses prior to noticing the motion [*see St. Mary Medical Center v. Superior Court (1997) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1531, 1539-1540* (case decided in context of defendants noticing the deposition of plaintiff's expert and at same time taking their motion for summary judgment off calendar; *see also § 537.30*)].

For a form of order with optional language granting a continuance, see *§ 537.85*.

When the moving party raises new arguments in its reply papers, given these 12th-hour circumstances, the opposing party has been held entitled to move orally at the hearing for a postponement to give it sufficient time to respond [*Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 264, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781* (new arguments in moving party's papers regarding various coverage exclusions)]. Similarly, the court in *Mediterranean* noted that an oral motion for a continuance can be made at the hearing to allow sufficient time to amend a pleading when it becomes apparent at that time that defects in the pleading can be remedied [*Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 264, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781*].

When an adverse tentative ruling has been announced, hearing commenced, and a continuance has been granted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* for the express and exclusive purpose of permitting the plaintiff an opportunity to produce opposition evidence, the plaintiff cannot voluntarily dismiss the action without prejudice [*Mary Morgan, Inc. v. Melzark (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 765, 768-769, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMotions for Additional DiscoveryCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.37

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.37 Statement of Reasons for Ruling

[1] Denying Motion

If the court denies the motion on the ground that there is a triable issue as to one or more material facts, it must, by written or oral order, specify one or more material facts raised by the motion as to which it has determined that a triable controversy exists [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*; *see Payless Drug Store v. Superior Court (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 277, 279, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 506* (judge orally referred to the opposition papers when asked what facts were in dispute; writ of mandate issued directing trial court to make appropriate order); *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195* (order held to suffice procedurally despite objection that it insufficiently specified what evidence was in conflict given failure to demand greater specificity in the trial court)]. The determination that a triable controversy exists must specifically refer to the evidence in the supporting or opposing papers which indicates the existence of such triable controversy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Specific Reference to Evidence. An order denying a summary judgment motion merely recites the existence of a factual issue and lists evidentiary documents submitted in support and in opposition to the motion. Is the order sufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*? No. The order must refer to specific items of supporting and opposing evidence that show the existence of a factual issue [*see Continental Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1069, 1071-1072, 212 Cal. Rptr. 140*].

ILLUSTRATION: General Statement Insufficient. In its written order denying summary judgment, a court makes a general statement that the liability of the moving party is at issue. Is the order sufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*? No. The order fails to comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* because it does not adequately specify the material facts as to which there is a triable issue and does not in any manner specify the evidence which indicates that such triable controversy exists as required by statute [*Beatrice Cos. v. Superior Court (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 525, 527-528, 227 Cal. Rptr. 316*].

[2] Granting Motion

If the court grants the motion on the ground that there is no triable issue of material fact, the court must [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*]:

- Specify the reasons for its determination.

- Specifically refer in the order to the evidence proffered in support of and, if applicable, in opposition to, the motion that indicates that no triable issue exists.

The court must also state its reasons for any other determination. The court must record its determination by court reporter or written order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*]. A key objective for the statement of reasons under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* is to allow for meaningful appellate review [*Wedeck v. Unocal Corp. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 848, 864, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*]. Although a court's failure to provide a sufficient statement of reasons is not automatic grounds for reversal, since it is the validity of the ruling which is reviewable and not the reasons for it, the trial court's failure to provide a statement of reasons was not harmless error where the issues litigated through the summary judgment motion were complex, and the appellate court was precluded from undertaking a meaningful review of the issues, including a decision of the trial court on credibility issues [*Santa Barbara Pistachio Ranch v. Chowchilla Water Dist. (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 439, 448-449, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (court granted summary judgment to defendant as to cause of action of one plaintiff, and denied it as to another plaintiff; there were facts supporting position of both plaintiffs and defendant, and, at original hearing on motion, court identified contradictions in declarations prepared for motion as compared to testimony given in deposition)]. However, the trial court's statement that it was relying on all the evidence has been treated as harmless error when the appellate court's independent review establishes the validity of the judgment [*see* *Goldrich v. Natural Y Surgical Specialties, Inc. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 772, 782, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 162* ; *see also* *Carnes v. Superior Court (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 915* (in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment, judge merely signed order prepared by defense counsel without stating his own reasons for ruling; although appellate court disapproved of judge's actions, judge technically complied with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* in adopting counsel's order as his own and therefore no reversal was required); *Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. Counter of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 594 n.7, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880* (because appellate court reviews grant of summary judgment de novo, plaintiff's arguments citing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* to fault trial court's decision for failing to distinguish it was ruling on affirmative defense and not on merits of cause of action, and for failing to specify reasons for its ruling and refer to evidence showing no triable issue of fact exist, were of no moment)].

[3] Correcting Erroneous Ruling on Motion for Clarification

Until judgment is entered, the trial court has the power to change its decision as it may determine. On its own motion, or on motion of a party, it may correct an erroneous ruling [*Bernstein v. Consolidated American Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 763, 774, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817*]. Thus, for example, when a trial court in initially denying a motion for summary adjudication failed to articulate the basis for its ruling in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* and the opposing party's proposed order did not rectify these deficiencies, it was held appropriate for the party who had brought the motion to object to the proposed order and move for clarification of the court's minute order. The trial court in

attempting to identify disputed factual issues requiring a trial as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* was unable to do so. Consequently, it corrected its prior erroneous ruling denying the summary adjudication ruling by granting the motion for clarification and motion for summary adjudication and in so doing met the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*. The court in taking this action was not entertaining a motion for reconsideration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*, but was correcting an erroneous ruling on its own motion [*Bernstein v. Consolidated American Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 763, 773-774, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewStandards of ReviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.38

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.38 Sanctions for Bad Faith or Delay

[1] In Presentation of Affidavits

If, at any time, the court determines that any of the affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) are presented in bad faith or solely for purposes of delay, the court must order the party presenting such affidavits to pay the other party the amount of the reasonable expenses which the filing of the affidavits cau sed the other party to incur [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*; *see* Winick Corp. v. County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 *(1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 230 Cal. Rptr. 289*]. "Reasonable expenses" within the meaning of this subsection does not include attorney's fees; rather, it includes recovery of expenses such as expert fees and service fees [*Collins v. State Dept. of Transportation (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 859, 870, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 132*].

Sanctions may not be imposed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* except on notice contained in a party's papers, or on the court's own noticed motion, and after an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*]. A separate noticed motion for sanctions is not required so long as notice is contained in other papers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*].

For a form of motion for order imposing sanctions, see *§ 537.80*.

[2] In Making or Opposing Motion

Parties may also seek to recover reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, on the more general ground that the motion for summary judgment or opposition to the motion was made in bad faith in that it was frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(a)*; *see Winick Corp. v. County Sanitation Dist. No. 2 (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1170, 1176, 230 Cal. Rptr. 289*]. If so, notice must be given in the moving or responding papers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5(c)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* applies only to actions filed prior to January 1, 1995. For actions filed thereafter, *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7* imposes sanctions for improper motions, as defined by that section [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(i), (j)* (providing sanctions for frivolous tactics in actions commenced after January 1, 1995)].

For discussion of sanctions based on these sections, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

[3] In Action for Indemnity or Contribution or Under California Tort Claims Act

In any civil action for indemnity or contribution, or in any civil proceeding under the California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*), at the time that a defendant's motion for summary judgment is granted, and that defendant's motion made prior to the entry of judgment, the court, as fact finder, shall determine whether the complaint defended against was brought with reasonable cause and in good faith. If the court finds in favor of the moving defendant on this issue, it shall further determine and award all reasonable and necessary defense costs incurred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a), (c), (d)*].

An award of defense costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038* can only be made on notice contained in a party's papers and following an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(a)*]. Defense costs include [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(b)*]:

- Attorney's fees.
- Expert witness fees.
- Other fees for expert services or consultation.

A motion on this ground waives any right to seek damages for malicious prosecution [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1038(c)*].

[4] Review of Order Imposing Sanctions

Other than in a limited civil case, an appeal may be taken from a superior court's interlocutory judgment or order directing payment of monetary sanctions by a party or attorney if the amount exceeds $5000 [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(11), (12)*]. Sanction orders or judgments imposing lesser sanctions against a party or an attorney for a party may be reviewed on an appeal by that party after entry of final judgment in the main action, or, at the discretion of the court of appeal, may be reviewed on petition for extraordinary writ [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsAffidavitsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsBad Faith MotionsCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsRemedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.39

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.39 Motion for Reconsideration

Prior to the entry of judgment, a party may move for reconsideration of the order or make a renewed motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, so long as the motion is supported by new or different facts, circumstances, or law [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(f)(2), (s), 1008*; *see Schulze v. Schulze (1953) 121 Cal. App. 2d 75, 83, 262 P.2d 646* ; *cf. Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 617, 619-623, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 219* (second motion based on insurer's duty to defend was not motion for reconsideration)]. The court may properly deny a motion for reconsideration that is based on a witness's second declaration that contradicts the witness's previous deposition testimony [*Nunez v. R'Bibo (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 559, 564, 260 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

The specific requirements of *Cal. Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*, rather than the general provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*, govern a motion for summary judgment based on issues asserted in an earlier summary adjudication motion that was denied [*Le Francois v. Goel (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 1094, 1099, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 249* ; *Schachter v. Citigroup, Inc. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 726, 739, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 920* ; *Bagley v. TRW, Inc. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1092, 1096 n.3, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 909]* . For discussion, see *§ 537.34[3]*. *CCP § 437c(f)(2)* does not, however, restrict the court's ability to reconsider its prior interim rulings on its own motion [*Le Francois v. Goel (2005) 35 Cal 4th 1094, 1105, 29 Cal Rptr. 3d 249]* .

In contrast to the independent review on appeal of the summary judgment motion itself [*see § 537.43, below*], appellate

courts review a trial court's decision to allow a party to file a renewed or subsequent motion for summary judgment for an abuse of discretion [*Nieto v. Blue Shield of California Life & Health Ins. (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 60, 72, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906]* .

For further discussion and forms relating to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*, see Ch. 374, *Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions* . For the distinction concerning a motion for clarification, see *§ 537.37[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.40

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.40 Motion for New Trial

A party may also seek relief from summary judgment in the trial court by moving for a new trial in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 659* [*see, e.g., Wall Street Network, Ltd. v. New York Times Co. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1171, 1192, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6* (order denying motion for new trial affirmed); *Kohan v. Cohan (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 915* (order granting motion for new trial affirmed); *Jacobs v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 1222 (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 959* (summary judgment affirmed after denial of motion for new trial); *see also Doe v. United Airlines (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 1500, 1513, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 541* (motion for new trial denied; plaintiff failed to show newly discovered evidence material to her case); *Tortorella v. Castro (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 853* (order granting new trial after grant of summary judgment upheld if it should have been granted based on any ground raised in motion); *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 245, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (noting authority for motion for new trial following grant of summary judgment, but finding reversal based on trial judge's ruling that motion would not lie after summary judgment would serve no purpose under circumstances); *Zavala v. Arce (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 915, 924, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571* (appeal from order denying new trial treated as appeal from the summary judgment)]. Technically, since there was no trial, there can be no motion for a new trial, and the net result of granting the motion is simply denial of the motion for summary judgment. Nonetheless, in these circumstances, appellate courts have either construed the trial court's order as an appealable order granting new trial or treated the appeal as a petition for mandate [*Waschek v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 640, 643 n.4, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*].

For discussion and forms relating to motions for new trial, see *Ch. 371, Motions After Trial, § 371.60*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.41

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.41 Motion to Vacate Judgment

There may be circumstances that enable a party to move to vacate a summary judgment on the grounds of mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*see, e.g., Uriate v. United States Pipe & Foundry Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 780, 791, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 332* ; *cf. Garcia v. Hejmadi (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 674, 681-685, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228* (type of mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect that might have permitted order granting summary judgment to have been vacated was not present in record)]. However, the mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* that requires a court to vacate a default, default judgment, or dismissal resulting from attorney mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or neglect does not apply to summary judgments because a summary judgment is neither a "default," a "default judgment," nor a "dismissal" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* [*English v. IKON Business Solutions, Inc. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 130, 143-149, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93*]. For discussion and forms relating to motions for relief from a judgment based on mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect, see Ch. 489, *Relief From Judgment and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentExcusable Neglect & MistakesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From

JudgmentMotions to Vacate

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.42

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.42 Entry of Judgment

A judgment is entered in the court's judgment book or as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 668.5* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 668*]. The time for entry of judgment by the clerk is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 664*. While *Code Civ. Proc. § 664* does not expressly apply to a judgment rendered without a trial, it could be applied if a summary judgment proceeding were to be treated as analogous to a trial by the court. In that case, the clerk is required to enter judgment immediately after the court's decision or formal judgment is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 635*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590(f)*].

In any contested action or special proceeding, the party submitting an order or judgment for entry is required to serve notice of entry of judgment on all parties and file the original of the notice with proof of service. This requirement does not apply in proceedings for dissolution of marriage, annulment, or legal separation, small claims actions, or any action or proceeding in which the prevailing party is not represented by counsel [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a)*].

"Judgment," as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5*, is defined as including any judgment, decree, or signed order from which an appeal lies [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(c)*]. "Contested" is not defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5* or in any related statute, but appears to be intended to exclude default cases and not cases that are terminated without trial pursuant to a pretrial proceeding such as summary judgment, which is opposed by the adverse party.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.43

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.43 Review of Summary Proceeding on Appeal

[1] Availability of Appeal

[a] When Summary Judgment Is Granted

A summary judgment entered under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* is an appealable judgment as in other cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)*]. That is, it is appealable when it constitutes a final judgment [*see De Grandchamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 424, 431, 160 Cal. Rptr. 899 Code Civ. Proc. §§ 904.1(a)(1), 904.2(a)*].

A summary judgment cannot be entered as a final judgment unless it terminates the action, except when "a separate judgment may properly be awarded in the action" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(k)*]. A separate judgment may properly be awarded, and an appeal may lie from an otherwise interlocutory summary judgment, when, for example, the summary judgment disposes of all issues to be determined between at least two parties [*see Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 740-741, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 804, 872 P.2d 143* (dicta; holding that appeal may not be taken from a judgment that fails to complete the dispostion of all causes of action pending between parties even if the causes of action have been ordered to be tried separately or may be characterized as "separate and independent" from those remaining, and disapproving cases that had allowed appeal in that situation)].

In the interest of justice and to prevent unnecessary delay, a reviewing court may choose to treat an appeal from the

order granting summary judgment as anappeal from a final judgment when a judgment has been entered, although such an order is technically nonappealable [*Zavala v. Arce (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 915, 924 n.7, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571 (Fourth Dist., Div. One)* ; *Allabach v. Santa Clara County Fair Assn. (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1007, 1010-1011, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 330 (Sixth Dist.)* *Demyer v. Costa Mesa Mobile Home Estates (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 393, 399 n.14, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260 (Fourth Dist., Div. Three)* ; *Knight v. City of Capitola (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 918, 923 n.1, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874 (Sixth Dist.)* ; *Rivera v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 294, 297, 266 Cal. Rptr. 11 (First Dist., Div. One)*]. Moreover, in the interest of justice and judicial economy to obviate possible multiple trials, a reviewing court may exercise its discretion to treat a plaintiff's technically nonappealable notice of appeal from a minute order granting the defendant summary judgment as a petition for writ of mandate when entry of a final appealable judgment against the defendant is prevented because plaintiff's main action is still proceeding against a codefendant and the defendant in whose favor summary judgment was granted has a cross complaint pending against that codefendant [*Johnson v. Superior Court (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 297, 304, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 52* ; *Lopez v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 705, 710 n.1, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821 (Second Dist., Div. Seven)*].

ILLUSTRATION:

Nonappealable Order Deemed Appealable. The trial court issues an "Order Granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and Denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment." May such an order be appealable? Yes. The order may be construed as a judgment. The better practice, however, is to title a judgment as such and to use language specifically stating that judgment "is" entered [*see* *Rogness v. English Moss Joint Ventures (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 190, 192 n.2, 239 Cal. Rptr. 387 (First Dist., Div. 4)* ; *see also* *San Francisco Unified School Dist. v. W.R. Grace & Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1318, 1322 n.1, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* (First Dist., Div. Four; order granting summary judgment not appealable order; however, ordergranting summary judgment purporting to constitute judgment construed as appealable judgment)].

PRACTICE TIP: Trend Toward Requiring Perfected Appeal. Courts have been increasingly reluctant to treat a nonappealable order as appealable or to amend a nonappealable order to make it an appealable judgment of dismissal [*see, e.g.,* *Jordan v. Malone (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 18, 22-23, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 454 (Fifth District panel dismissed purported appeal from tentative written decision)* ; *Modica v. Merin (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1074, 285 Cal. Rptr. 673* (Third District panel dismissed appeal from order granting summary judgment after plaintiff failed to take opportunity to have judgment entered)]. In the case of an unperfected appeal from an order sustaining a demurrer, the Second District Court of Appeal, Division Seven agreed to "save" the appeal, but served notice that it would not "bail out" careless attorneys in the future [*Cohen v. Equitable Life Assurance Society (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 669, 671, 242 Cal. Rptr. 84* ; *see also* *Hill v. City of Long Beach (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1684, 1695-1696, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 125 (Second Dist., Div. Five)*]. This is not a universal development, however, and counsel should be aware of practice in the relevant appellate district. For example, the Fourth District, Division Four, rejected *Modica* on the basis that sending the appellant back to the trial court to have a judgment entered and then to appeal from the judgment was a waste of time [*Francis v. Dun & Bradstreet Inc. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 535, 539, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 361*].

The ultimate responsibility for perfecting an appeal rests with the appealing party [*Jordan v. Malone (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 18, 21, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 454*].

An opposing party that does not file any opposition to a motion for summary judgment may, under the right circumstances, be deemed to waive a right to appeal [*Schumacher v. Worcester (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 376, 379 n.4, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (waiver not found under circumstances of case)].

[b] When Summary Adjudication Is Granted

The one final judgment rule applies in California. Parties will not be allowed to employ the artifice of trying to create an appealable order from an otherwise nonappealable grant of summary adjudication by dismissing the remaining causes of action without prejudice but with a waiver of applicable time bars [*Don Jose's Restaurant, Inc. v. Truck Ins. Exchange (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 115, 116* (summary adjudication disposed of two of eleven cause of action); *see Jackson v. Wells Fargo Bank (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 240, 244, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 679* (following *Don Jose's Restaurant, Inc.*); *see also Four Point Entertainment, Inc. v. New World Entertainment, Ltd. (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 79, 83, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 82* (following *Don Jose's Restaurant, Inc.* and *Jackson*)].

Under the proper factual circumstances, however, an order granting summary adjudication may be appealable. When a trial court's order granting summary adjudication as to one cause of action effectively disposes of the case, appeal is proper [*Belio v. Panorama Optics, Inc. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1101-1102, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 737* ; *see California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*]. For discussion of review by mandate, see *§ 537.44[2]*. It is not the form of the decree but the substance and effect of the adjudication that determines whether a decree is interlocutory and nonappealable, or final and appealable [*Belio v. Panorama Optics, Inc. (1995) 33 Cal. App.4th 1096, 1101, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 737* ; *see Lyon v. Goss (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 659, 669-670, 123 P.2d 11*].

Thus, it was held to be appropriate to allow plaintiff to appeal an order granting summary adjudication for defendant on one cause of action, for involuntary dissolution of a corporation, when the other two causes of action, for an accounting and to preserve corporate assets, were ancillary to the first one [*Belio v. Panorama Optics, Inc. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1099, 1102, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 737*].

[c] When Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication Is Denied

Orders denying a motion for summary judgment or denying a motion for summary adjudication are not appealable [*see Federal Deposit Inc. Corpt. v. Dintino (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 333, 343, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 38* ; *Gaillard v. Natomas Co. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1250, 1255 n.1, 256 Cal. Rptr. 702* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*, which permitted summary adjudication of "issues"); *Mesnick v. Caton (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1248, 1255, 228 Cal. Rptr. 779* ; *Holmes v. California State Auto. Assn. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 635, 640, 185 Cal. Rptr. 521*]. For discussion concerning review of these orders, see *§ 537.44[1]*.

[2] Standard of Review

[a] Limited Use of Abuse of Discretion Standard

The correct standard for reviewing a summary judgment is independent review [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 65-68, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316* ; *Angell v. Peterson Tractor, Inc. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 981, 985-986, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 541* ; *Saldana v. Globe-Weis Systems Co. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1512-1514, 285 Cal. Rptr. 385* (noting that many cases continued to use abuse of discretion standard after Legislature amended Section 437c in 1973 to preclude the use of discretion in most situations, but that the appropriate standard was not a contested issue in those cases); *see also Lindstrom v. Hertz Corp. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 644, 648, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874* (de novo review; standard of review of grant of summary adjudication of issues is same as that applied to summary judgments); *Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1507* (on appeal from judgment after order granting summary adjudication, appellate court independently reviews trial court record)].

Review of a summary judgment has been held to be de novo even when based on a trial court ruling that is normally sustained if supported by substantial evidence [*see Johnson v. Cityof Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 67-68, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316*]. For example, the Supreme Court has held that a court of appeal erred by reviewing a trial court ruling on laches by the abuse of discretion standard when the finding of laches was the basis for an order granting summary judgment [*Johnson v. City of Loma Linda (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 61, 67-68, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316*].

There are very limited circumstances in which the trial court has discretion in ruling on a Section 437c motion. These include granting additional time for discovery under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* and on the sole witness and mental state provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)* [*Krieger v. Nick Alexander Imports, Inc. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 205, 212 n.3, 285 Cal. Rptr. 717* ; *Saldana v. Globe-Weis Systems Co. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1512 n.3, 285 Cal. Rptr. 385* ; *see* *Scott v. CIBA Vision Corp. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 307, 313-314, 326, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902* (when continuance not mandatory because conditions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* not met, appellate court reviews trial court's denial of continuance under abuse of discretion standard); *see also* *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (only rulings under Section 437c(e) are discretionary); *Angell v. Peterson Tractor, Inc. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 981, 985-986, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 541* (only rulings under Section 437c(e) discretionary); for discussion, see *§ 537.34[4][a]* et seq.]. Evidentiary rulings on summary judgment are also reviewed for abuse of discretion [*Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 192 n.15, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (citing *Aguimatang v. California State Lottery (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 769, 798, 286 Cal. Rptr. 57*); *but see* *Nazir v. United Airlines (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 243, 251, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 296* (recognizing split of authority as to the issue and holding that trial court's sustaining of all but one of defendant's 764 objections, without explanation, was abuse of discretion); *Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523* (when trial court sustains objection to deposition transcript based on inadmissible hearsay in connection with summary judgment motion, appellate court independently reviews deposition's admissibility and legal effect of facts properly presented)]. Furthermore, in the limited and exceptional circumstances where a trial court is required to exercise its discretion in passing on a motion for summary judgment, and grants or denies such a motion on the basis of its equitable determination of a question as to which the exercise of judicial discretion is proper, the standard of review on appeal necessarily is whether the trial court's decision amounted to an abuse of discretion [*Dieden v. Schmidt (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 645, 654, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365* (abuse of discretion standard applicable in motions for summary judgment involving determination by trial court of equitable subrogation); *CentennialIns. Co. v. United States Fire Ins. Co. (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 105, 111, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 559* (abuse of discretion standard applicable in motions for summary adjudication involving determination by trial court of appropriate method of allocating defense costs among multiple liability insurance carriers, each insuring same insured); *Prata v. Superior Court (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1128, 1135, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (abuse of discretion standard applicable on review of motion for summary adjudication involving determination by trial court that the cause of action was not suitable as a class action under California Unfair Competition Law pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*)]. In all other circumstances, it is legally and procedurally incorrect to apply an abuse of discretion standard [*Angell v. Peterson Tractor, Inc. (1994) 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 541* ; *Schrader v. Scott (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 1679, 1683, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433]* .

[b] Independent Review Standard

The appellate court conducts a de novo review to determine whether any triable issues exist [*Republic Indemnity Co. v. Schofield (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 220, 225, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 637* ; *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 579, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* ; *Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1595, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* ; *see* *Guz v. Bechtel Nat., Inc. (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 317, 334, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 8 P.3d 1089]* . In so doing, the appellate court considers all of the evidence set forth in the supporting and opposing papers, except that to which objections have been made and sustained by the trial court [*Artiglio v. Corning Inc. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 604, 612, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479, 957 P.2d 1313* ; *see also* *Wilkins v. National Broadcasting Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1074, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* (in conducting de novo review, appellate court considers only facts properly before trial court at time it ruled on motion)]. Because a summary judgment motion raises only questions of law regarding the construction and effect of the supporting and opposing papers, the appellate court independently reviews them on appeal, applying the same analysis required of the trial court [*Barisich v. Lewis (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 12, 15-16, 275 Cal. Rptr. 331* ; *Royster v. Cushman (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 65, 68, 261 Cal. Rptr. 458* ; *see also Aetna Health Plans of Cal., Inc. v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1187, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 672* (appellate court reviews issues of law de novo); *accord* *Suidan v. County of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 916, 921, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 535]* . Conversely stated, although the appellate court must review a summary

judgment motion by the same standards as the trial court, the appellate court independently determines as a matter of law the construction and effect of the facts presented [*Sellery v. Cressey (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 538, 543, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* ; *see also Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (appellate court reviews evidence before trial court and independently determine its effect as matter of law); *Quigley v. First Church of Christ Scientist (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1027, 1036, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (appellate court examines facts presented to trial court and determines their effect as matter of law)].

Thus, the appellate court in practical effect assumes the role of the trial court and redetermines the merits of the motion [*Martin Marietta Corp. v. Insurance Co. of North America (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1113, 1121, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670* ; *see Wolf v. Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1035, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (appellate review follows same analysis required of trial court); *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (appellate court applies same rules that trial court required to apply)]. The appellate court is notbound by the trial court's stated reasons. The appellate court reviews the trial court's ruling, not its rationale [*Bernstein v. Consolidated American Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 763, 769, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* ; *see Harris v. Mothers Against Drunk Driving (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 16, 20, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833* (court considers validity of judgment, not reasons for which it was granted); *see also 537.43[3][a]*]. Moreover, in reviewing the matter de novo, the appellate court grants no particular deference to the trial court's ruling in order to independently determine whether the party was entitled to judgment as a matter of law [*Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421* ; *see Marshak v. Ballesteros (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1517, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* ; *Estate of Brenzikofer (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1466, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401]* .

Examining evidence in light of summary judgment standards is far different from applying the substantial evidence test that often governs an appeal. In the context of judgment after trial, the evidence need only be sufficient to support the judgment for the winning party, even though the evidence might, in another reasonable mind, also have supported the judgment for the losing party. In the context of summary judgment, by contrast, the evidence must by incapable of supporting a judgment for the losing party to validate the summary judgment. Thus, even though it may appear that a trial court took a reasonable view of the evidence, a summary judgment cannot properly be affirmed unless a contrary view would be unreasonable as a matter of law in the circumstances presented [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*].

In determining the propriety of a summary judgment, the appellate court is limited to those facts shown by the evidentiary materials submitted, aswell as those admitted and uncontested in the pleadings [*Spray, Gould & Bowers v. Associated Internat. Ins. Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1266, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552* ; *Aloha Pacific, Inc. v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 297, 307, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 148* (appellate review of summary judgment is limited to facts contained in documents presented to trial court); *see also Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1151 n.10, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (validity of summary judgment is to be determined solely by sufficiency of affidavits before court when motion was heard, and appellate court will consider only facts before trial court at time it ruled on motion)].

The court must reassess the legal significance and effect of the papers that the parties submitted in connection with the motion [*Martin Marietta Corp. v. Insurance Co. of North America (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1113, 1121, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670*]. The moving party's affidavits and declarations are strictly construed whereas the opposing party's affidavits and declarations are liberally construed. All doubts are resolved against the moving party [*Bernstein v. Consolidated American Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 763, 769, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* ; *see Kelly v. First Astri Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 471, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (same rules with regard to moving and opposing party's evidence generally); *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1015, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551* (construction of papers); *Van Dyke v. Dunker & Aced (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 446, 451, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 862* ; *Campanano v. California Medical Center (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1322, 1327, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 606* (doubts about propriety of granting motion resolved in opposing party's favor); *see also § 537.33[2][f]*]. Conversely stated, all doubts whether any triable issues of fact exist are to be resolved in favor of the party opposing summary judgment [*Martinez*

v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 334, 341, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 772 ; *see also Jang v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1295, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* (any doubts regarding propriety of awarding summary judgment are resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment)].

The court seeks to find contradictions in the evidence or in inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence, which raise a triable issue of material fact [*Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 409, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)]. The court must consider the bare evidence and the reasonable inferences deducible from the evidence, and determine whether the evidence is sufficient to support a potential judgment in favor of the opposing party. The court therefore must consider what inferences favoring the opposing party a factfinder could reasonably draw from the evidence [*Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839-840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*].

The court considers uncontradicted inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence. If, however, the record can support competing inferences, or if the facts are not yet sufficiently developed, an ultimate finding cannot be made prior to a hearing on the merits and summary judgment is precluded [*Artiglio v. Corning Inc. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 604, 612, 615, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479, 957 P.2d 1313*]. Thus, the court must consider presumptions and draw inferences from the facts adduced if the inference is the only one that may be drawn. The court, however, has no power in a summary proceeding to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence [*Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 841, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* ; *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1015, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551*].

The court accepts as undisputed facts only those portions of the moving party's evidence that are not contradicted by the opposing party's evidence. In other words, the facts alleged in the evidence by the party opposing summary judgment, and the reasonable inferences drawn therefrom, must be accepted as true [*Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 299, 309, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614* ; *accord Kelsey v. Waste Management of Alameda County (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 590, 594, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510* ; *Cross v. Bonded Adjustment Bureau (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 266, 278, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801* ; *see City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1176, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (court regards facts as undisputed if not contradicted by opposing party's evidence)]. The court, however, does not decide the merits of the factual issue themselves [*Marquez v. Enterprise Rent-A-Car (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 319, 322, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 557* ; *see City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1188, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (court's function is limited to issue finding not issue determination)].

The appellate court applies the same three-step analysis required of the trial court [*Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. Counter of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 587-588, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880* ; *Monteleone v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 509, 515* ; *Sweat v. Hollister (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 603, 607, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399* ; *Katz v. Chevron Corp. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1352, 1364, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681* ; *see also Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 385, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* (same three step analysis for appeal of summary adjudication of issue)]:

- The court identifies the issues framed by the pleadings.

- It determines whether the moving party has established facts sufficient to negate the opponent's claim and justify a judgment in the moving party's favor.

- If so, it determines whether the opposition demonstrates that a triable issue of material fact exists.

Some recent cases have stated the second step in the above analysis to be that the appellate court determines whether:

- The moving party has met its statutory burden of proof [*see, e.g., Renna v. County of Fresno (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1, 5, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 586* ; *Zavala v. Arce (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 915, 926, 68 Cal.*

Rptr. 2d 571 ; *see also* *Miscione v. Barton Development Co. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1324-1325, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 280]* .

- The moving party's showing has established facts which justify a judgment in the movant's favor [*see, e.g.,* *FNB Mortgage Corp. v. Pacific General Group (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1126, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* ; *Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 521, 528, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491]* .

- Whether the moving party's showing has satisfied the moving party's burden of proof and justifies a judgment in the moving party's favor [*see, e.g.,* *Tibor v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1369, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326* ; *Brantley v. Pisaro (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1591, 1602, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431]* .

Although the opinions in these cases did not address the reason for this divergence from the language used in earlier cases, it appears to take into account the unsettled issue of the moving party's burden of proof under the 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*but see* *Arciniega v. Bank of San Bernardino (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 213, 225, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 495* (second step calls for evaluation of the moving defendant's effort to meet its burden of showing that plaintiff's cause of action has no merit or that there is a complete defense to it; this phase has not changed, in practical effect, as a result of the 1992 and 1993 amendments to § 437c); criticized on another point in *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 726, 737-741, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110]* . For discussion of moving party's burden of proof, see *§ 537.33[2][d]*. Other recent appellate decisions, however, continue to state the second step in the analysis as indicated above, that is, the appellate court determines whether the moving party has established facts sufficient to negate the opponent's claim and justify a judgment in the moving party's favor [*see, e.g.,* *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 234, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* ; *City of San Jose v. Department of Health Services (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 35, 40, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 609* ; *Ojavan Investors, Inc. v. California Coastal Com. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 373, 385, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803* ; ; *Bashi v. Wodarz (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1314, 1318, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635]* . The Supreme Court has not directly considered the issue (of what sort of evidence is sufficient to shift the burden under California's summary judgment statute) and has persisted in its use of the terminology of the older cases, thus perpetuating the doubts of the courts still contending that the historic requirement of "proving the negative" continues to burden the moving party [*Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 81-82, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360*]. Not all recent cases, however, are relevant to this question, because summary judgment motions filed and ruled on by a trial court prior to the effective date of the 1992 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* (January 1, 1993) are subjectto the standard of review according to the statute as it stood in 1992, prior to amendment [*see* *Truck Ins. Exchange v. Bennett (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 75, 80, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497*].

In any event, if the defendant claims that the plaintiff cannot establish the cause of action pled because the defendant's affirmative evidence discloses facts that negate the existence of an essential element of the plaintiff's claim by proving the contrary is true, the court should evaluate defendant's evidence under the same strict standards which were held to apply to a defendant's attempt to disprove an element of the plaintiff's cause of action before the 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, in order to avoid unjustly depriving the plaintiff of a trial [*Tibor v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1368, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326*].

Moreover, the standard of independent review on appeal is applicable regardless of which rule for shifting burdens of production of evidence governs at trial. Of course, once a party bears the initial burden of demonstrating entitlement to a judgment as a matter of law, the opposing party cannot defeat summary judgment by attempting to raise a factual dispute as to immaterial issues [*Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1202-1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*]. A summary judgment motion will not be defeated by the presence of a factual dispute unless the fact in dispute is material [*Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1202-1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*], that is, it relates to a claim or defense in issue which could make a difference in the outcome [*Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1274, 280 Cal. Rptr 831* ; *see also* *Allyson v.*

Department of Transportation (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1317-1321, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490 (summary judgment in favor of defendant granted when defendant's filings in support of its motion were sufficient to provide factual basis to make its affirmative defense available and thereby shift burden to plaintiff to demonstrate a triable issue of material fact concerning it and although plaintiff's filings in an effort to carry plaintiff's burden were extensive, none of plaintiff's filings were even remotely addressed to the dispositive issue framed by the pleadings; plaintiff's filings were all addressed to nonissues); *Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 299, 317, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614* (papers filed in response to defendant's motion for summary judgment may not create issue outside the pleadings and are not a substitute for an amendment to the pleadings)].

Furthermore, the appellate court may bypass the three step analysis described above if the appellant does not contend that there are any disputed issues of material fact. When the sole issue raised on appeal is whether the trial court's ruling on an issue on law was erroneous, the appellate court need not address the issue of whether any triable issues of material fact exist [*Henriksen v. City of Rialto (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1612, 1617 n.2, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308* (over dissent)]. The analysis is also unnecessaryif the court need decide de novo only the question of the legal significance of the facts adduced by one party because the trial court sustained an objection to the other party's evidence [*Beane v. Paulsen (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 89, 92-93, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486* (objection to plaintiff's opposing affidavit sustained by trial court; also holding plaintiff cannot challenge this evidentiary ruling for first time in reply brief on appeal)].

[3] Scope of Review

[a] Affirmance on Any Legal Basis

The appellate court should affirm the trial court's judgment if it is correct on any theory of law applicable to the case, including but not limited to the theory the trial court adopted, provided the facts are undisputed [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1595, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* ; *see Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*]. The court must affirm so long as any of the grounds urged either on appeal or in the trial court, entitle the moving party to summary judgment [*Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. v. Maryland Casualty Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 1595, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762* ; *Ochoa v. California State University (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1304, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* (appellate court may affirm grant of summary judgment on any ground properly raised below, whether or not addressed by trial court); *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (if appellate court finds there is no triable issue of material fact, court affirms summary judgment if it is correct on any legal theory whether on not trial court adopted that theory, and whether it was raised in trial court or first addressed on appeal); *cf. Kramer v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 332, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301* (appellate court may affirm on any legally correct theory provided plaintiffs had adequate opportunity to address theory in lower court)]. Even if the trial court granted summary judgment on an incorrect basis, the appellate court must affirm if it would have been proper on another ground [*Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* ; *Barkley v. City of Blue Lake (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 309, 313, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 679* ; *see also Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 521, 528, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (if summary judgment was properly granted on any ground, appellate court must affirm regardless of whether trial court's reasoning correct); *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1187-1188, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (if summary judgment is proper on grounds other those articulated by trial court, appellate court must nevertheless affirm)].

[b] Consideration of Legal Arguments Not Presented Below

An appellate court may consider a matter involving an issue of law on undisputed facts for the first time on appeal even if a party did not raise or argue the issue in the trial court. It makes no difference that the issue was first raised on appeal by the court rather than the parties, so long as the parties have been given a reasonable opportunity to address it [*Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341 n.6, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* ; *see McManis v. San Diego Postal Credit Union (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 547, 559, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617* (rule that Court of

Appeal will not consider points not raised in appellate brief largely for appellate court's convenience); *Barczewski v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 406, 410, 258 Cal. Rptr. 386* (matters of law that will support trial court's ruling may be considered on appeal even if they were not presented in trial court); *see also Neverkovec v. Fredericks (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 337, 347 n.6, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (defendant's objection to plaintiff's reliance on theory that was not raised in plaintiff's summary judgment papers was proper and court had discretion to deem argument waived, but under circumstances choose to address issue, noting that defendant had opportunity to respond to it below); *cf. Renna v. County of Fresno (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1, 6 n.1, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 586* (issues raised for first time in reply brief will not be considered on appeal); *Kramer v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 332, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301* (appellate court may affirm on any legally correct theory provided plaintiffs had adequate opportunity to address theory in lower court); *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1489, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (as general rule, party cannot raise new theory of liability on appeal); *Ochoa v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1480, 1488 n.3, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 232* (arguments not asserted below are waived and will not be considered for first time on appeal; moreover, if issue is not supported by pertinent or cognizable legal argument it may be deemed abandoned and discussion by reviewing court is unnecessary); *216 Sutter Bay Associates v. County of Sutter (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 860, 876, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492* (issue waived for failure to brief it under a separate heading); *Locke v. Warner Bros., Inc. (1997) 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 921* (ordinarily, appellants' failure to raise an issue in their opening brief waives issue on appeal)]. That is, the appellate court examines the facts presented to the trial court and independently determines their effect as a matter of law [*Stratton v. First Nat. Life Ins. Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1083, 258 Cal. Rptr. 721* (reversing summary judgment)]. Nonetheless, review is limited to issues that have been adequately raised and supported in plaintiffs' brief; issues not raised in appellant's brief are deemed waived or abandoned [*Reyes v. Kosha (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 451, 466 n.6, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457* ; *see also ML Direct, Inc. v. TIG Specialty Ins. Co. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 137, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 846* (appellate court declined to reach two arguments raised for first time by appellants in their reply brief)].

In contrast, the appellate court, however, must consider only those facts before the trial court, disregarding any new factual allegations made forthe first time on appeal. Thus, possible theories that were not fully developed, factually presented and argued to the trial court cannot create a triable issue of material fact that may be raised or considered on appeal [*Ashdown v. Ameron Internat. Corp. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 868, 874, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20* ; *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* ; *Havstad v. Fidelity National Title Ins. Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 654, 661, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487* ; *see Barczewski v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 406, 410* (decisions resting on factual matters must first be addressed in trial court)].

[c] No Consideration of Evidence or Objections Not Raised Below

An appellate court may not consider evidentiary objections not raised in the trial court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(5), (d); Weil v. Federal Kemper Life Assurance Co. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 125, 149 n.9, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 316, 866 P.2d 774* ; *see also § 537.25[4]*]. All objections to the form and substance of the moving and opposing papers must first be made in the trial court and not on appeal by the parties or by the appellate court [Stats. 1990, ch. 1561, § 1]. However, in reviewing summary judgment, as in any other appeal, if a party's position depends on patently inadmissible evidence admitted over a proper objection, a reviewing court is empowered, and indeed obliged, to acknowledge the error and disregard the evidence [*Mamou v. Trendwest Resorts, Inc. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 686, 711, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 406]* .

A reviewing court will not consider either additional facts not presented below or issues of law unsupported by the existing evidence [*City of Oakland v. Hassey (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1477, 1489 n.5, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 621* (appellate court may properly decline to take judicial notice under *Evid Code §§ 452* and *459* of a matter that should have been presented to the trial court for its consideration in the first instance); *Green v. Green (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 37, 46, 30 Cal. Rptr. 23*]. The reviewing court is limited to facts shown by the evidentiary material submitted, as well as those admitted and uncontested in the pleadings [*Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1466, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415* ; *see Monteleone v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 509, 514* (appellate court limited to

facts presented in documents submitted to trial court); *Della Zoppa v. Della Zoppa (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1144, 1149, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 901*]. It can consider only those facts before the trial court disregarding any new allegations on appeal [*Uriarte v. United States Pipe & Foundry Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 780, 790, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 332*]. Thus, possible theories that were not fully developed or factually presented to the trial court cannot create a triable issue on appeal [*Zubia v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 790, 799, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 65* ; *American Continental Ins. Co. v. C & Z Timber Co. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1271, 1281, 241 Cal. Rptr. 466* ; *see Waisbren v. Peppercorn Productions, Inc. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 246, 263, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 437* (plaintiff whose opposition papers in trial court did not make legal argument and whose separate statement did not set forth facts in support of that argument waived it as basis for opposing defendants summary judgment motion); *see also Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415* (opposing party may not raise issue for first time on appeal); *Crow v. State of California (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 192, 207, 271 Cal. Rptr. 349* (issues raised and then abandoned in the trial court cannot be considered on appeal)].

[4] When Reviewing Court May Direct Trial Court to Enter Judgment

When it appears from the record as a matter of law that there is only one proper judgment on undisputed facts, the reviewing court may direct the trial court to enter that judgment [*Conley v. Matthes (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1453, 1459 n.7, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518* (trial court directed to enter summary judgment in favor of appellant although they had not brought summary judgment motion in trial court, but only opposed it)].

[5] Lack of Statement of Reasons in Trial Court Opinion

While a trial court's failure to provide a sufficient statement of reasons is not automatic grounds for reversal, an appellate court may reverse a trial court's granting of summary adjudication where the court makes no oral of written statement for the reasons for its decision and the appellate court is prevented from undertaking a meaningful review of the issues [*Santa Barbara Pistachio Ranch v. Chowchilla Water District (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 439, 449, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (defendant's successful motion for summary adjudication reversed)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewAppealabilityCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewStandards of ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewDe Novo Review

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.44

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.44 Review of Summary Proceeding by Peremptory Writ

[1] When Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication Has Been Denied

Any order entered under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, except the entry of summary judgment, may be reviewed by petition to an appropriate reviewing court for a peremptory writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*]. Thus, a petition for a peremptory writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)* is the appropriate means to obtain immediate review of otherwise nonappealable orders denying motions for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*see, e.g., West Shield Investigations & Security Consultants v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 935, 946, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* ; *Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1450, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54* ; *see also Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681* (order denying summary judgment not appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1*; reviewable only by petition for extraordinary writ); *but see Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Dintino (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 333, 343, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 38* (holding order denying summary judgment or summary adjudication may be reviewed on direct appeal from a final judgment entered after trial); *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679-1680, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195* (pretrial writ review of denial of defendant's motion for summary adjudication on various causes of action was appropriate when issues ruled on by trial court contain heart of plaintiffs' case and trial might well be simplified if it is found that trial court erred)].

ILLUSTRATION:

Mandate When Motion Denied. A movant for summaryjudgment submits supporting affidavits that are sufficient to sustain judgment. The opposing party does not by counter-affidavit show facts sufficient to present a triable issue of fact. The trial court denies the motion. Is mandate proper to compel the trial court to grant the motion? Yes [*see Rose v. Fife (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 760, 764-765 n.4, 255 Cal. Rptr. 440*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l) codifies prior decisional law, but does not otherwise change the standards employed by appellate courts in deciding whether or not to entertain a writ of mandate on its merits [*Parsons Manufacturing Corp. v. Superior Court (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1156 n.1, 203 Cal. Rptr. 419*]. The standard of review on a peremptory writ is the same as that applicable on appeal [*see § 537.43[2][a]* (abuse of discretion standard of review); *Parsons Manufacturing Corp. v. Superior Court (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1151, 1156-1157, 203 Cal. Rptr. 419*].

On review of a denial of a motion for summary judgment, the appellate court may compel the trial court to issue an order granting the motion if it determines that such an order is proper [*Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 244, 690 P. 2d 610 ,; see Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1450, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54* (directing trial court to vacate order denying defendants summary adjudication motion and to enter new and different order granting motion as to particular causes of action); *accord Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679-1680, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*]. When the superior court's ruling on summary judgment will result in a trial on nonactionable claims, a writ of mandate will lie to preserve the resources of the court and parties [*Feminist Women's Health Center v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1234, 1238, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187* ; *see West Shield Investigations & Security Consultants v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 935, 946, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612*]. Similarly, a writ of mandate may issue to prevent trial of nonactionable claims after the erroneous denial of a motion for summary adjudication [*Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1450, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54*].

Before issuing a peremptory writ in the first instance, the petitioner or the appellate court must notify the party adversely affected that the issuance of the writ is being sought or considered. In addition, the appellate court, absent exceptional circumstances, should not issue the peremptory without having received or solicited opposition from the party adversely affected [*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893* .]

[2] When Summary Adjudication Has Been Granted

An order granting a summary adjudication is not an appealable order, but it may be reviewed by mandate [*City of Oakland v. Superior Court(1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 750, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120* ; *see, e.g., Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. Superior Court (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 970, 974, 989, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743* ; *Southern Cal. Edison Co. v Superior Court (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 839, 843, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227*]. Review is limited to the facts contained in the documents presented to the trial court [*Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 337, 345, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*]. Usually an interim order must await review on appeal from a final judgment. In cases of significant legal impact, however, an appellate court may consider a petition for an extraordinary writ, with the appellate court having broad discretion to grant or deny the writ [*City of Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 750, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120*].

A trial court has no discretion on a motion for summary adjudication and must either grant the motion if no triable issue of material fact exists, or deny the motion if a triable issue of material fact exists. A trial court that errs has made an error in law which automatically constitutes an abuse of discretion. Under these circumstance it may be proper to obtain relief by means of mandate. If it appears that the trial court has erred, the appellate court may exercise its discretion to entertain the writ to avoid unnecessary trial court proceedings [*City of Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 751, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120*].

If the order granting summary adjudication effectively disposes of the entire case, it may be appealable [*see California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*]. For discussion of when an appeal may be appropriate, see *§ 537.43[1][b]*.

If a case is dismissed for failure to diligently prosecute, the plaintiff cannot, on appeal of the order of dismissal, obtain review of an earlier, nonappealable summary adjudication order that would otherwise have been reviewed on an appeal from a final judgment on the merits [*Vernon v. Great Western Bank (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1007, 1013-1015, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 350* (noting that if the dismissal is reversed, the summary adjudication order would be reviewable later in an appeal from the final judgment)].

[3] Time Limits for Seeking Review

On entry of any order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* except the entry of summary judgment, a party may, within 20 days after service on him or her of a written notice of entry of the order, petition an appropriate reviewing court for a peremptory writ [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*]. This 20-day period is extended as follows [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*]:

- When service is by mail, by five days if the place of address is in California, by 10 days if the place of address is outside California, and by 20 days if outside the United States.

- When service is by facsimile transmission, Express Mail, or another method of overnight delivery, by two court days.

The limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)* is mandatory and jurisdictional [*see Eldridge v. Superior Court (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1350, 1353, 256 Cal. Rptr. 724* ; *see also Sentry Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 526, 529-530, 255 Cal. Rptr. 13* (express statutory time limit does not apply to petition for review of related motions to shorten time for hearing summary judgment motion and to continue trial date to allow for summary judgment hearing; such petition is subject to the defense of laches)].

Ordinarily, counsel for the prevailing party will serve a copy of the notice of entry of the trial court's order on counsel for the adverse party or on the party if he or she has no attorney [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1015, 1019.5(a)*]. However, the mailing of a copy of the court's minute order by the court clerk constitutes written notice of entry of the order and is sufficient to commence the running of the 20-day period under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*. When this is done, an additional notice by counsel is unnecessary to commence the running of the 20-day period [*see Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 60, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827* (decided under prior version of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)* that provided for 10-day, instead of 20-day, initial notice period); *see also Woo v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 169, 173, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20* (date of service by mail by regular trial clerk on all parties of the final signed ruling held to be date of written notice of order denying motion for purpose of computing time under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)* despite earlier service by mail by substitute trial clerk of draft ruling not signed by trial judge together with original proof of service)].

The same is true when the clerk mails a file-stamped copy of an order denying a motion for summary adjudication. Notice by counsel under such circumstances is unnecessary to provide notice of entry of the order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*. Notice by counsel would, however, be necessary under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5*, unless waived by the parties [*Eldridge v. Superior Court (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1350, 1353 n.1, 256 Cal. Rptr. 724*].

If the clerk serves on a party an unfiled copy of the order, or any order that does not indicate that it has been entered, that order does not constitute notice of entry of the order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*(*l*) [*Eldridge v. Superior Court (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1350, 1353, 256 Cal. Rptr. 724*].

The superior court may, for good cause, and prior to the expiration of the initial period, extend the time for one additional period not to exceed 10 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*]. An order granting an extension of time to file is timely if it is issued within the initial period [*Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 61, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827*].

The filing in the trial court of a motion for reconsideration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1008* does not automatically extend the time limit for filing the writ petition [*see Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 61, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827*].

Thus, in light of the above, when a superior court case is transferred to municipal court after a plaintiff's surviving causes of action fall below the superior court's jurisdictional amount, a plaintiff may seek writ of review of any summary adjudication and transfer order within the period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)* in an attempt to retain the matter in superior court. If the plaintiff does not seek a writ, or a writ is denied, and the plaintiff elects to appeal from the superior court's final disposition of the matter, the plaintiff may move the superior court to enter a final judgment as to the summarily adjudicated causes of action if the court has not already entered its final judgment sua sponte. The plaintiff must then timely appeal from that final superior court judgment without waiting for the municipal court's disposition of the remaining causes of action since the courts of appeal ordinarily do not have jurisdiction over municipal court judgments, and thus, there would be no purpose in delay [*Eckhart v. Genuine Parts Distributors (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1345, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487* (rejecting *Uptain v. Duarte (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1258, 254 Cal. Rptr. 150* , which held that a party may file a notice of appeal from a superior court's partial dismissal order when a case is transferred to municipal court despite the absence of an actual final judgment by the superior court, as being and inconsistent with efficient working of judicial system and contrary to the rule that a partial dismissal order is nonappealable and as unecessary given other adequate procedures for appellate review)].

[4] Reviewing Court to Permit Supplemental Briefs in Certain Situations

Effective January 1, 2003, *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(2)* provides that before a reviewing court affirms an order granting summary judgment or summary adjudication on a ground not relied upon by the trial court, the reviewing court shall afford the parties an opportunity to present their views on the issue by submitting supplemental briefs. The statute provides that the supplemental briefing may include an argument that additional evidence relating to the ground exists, but that the party has not had an adequate opportunity to present the evidence or to conduct discovery on the issue. The new code subsection further provides that the court may reverse or remand based upon the supplemental briefing to allow the parties to present additional evidence or to conduct discovery on the issue. If the court fails to allow supplemental briefing, a rehearing shall be ordered upon timely petition of any party.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 537.45-537.49

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

[Reserved]

§§ 537.45[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.50

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.50 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing motions for summary judgment, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 221, *Summary Judgments* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting or opposing motions for summary judgment in particular actions and fact situations, see the *General Index* to California Points and Authorities (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.51

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.51 State Statutes

Summary judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* not available in consumer class action commenced under *Civ. Code § 1781(a). Civ. Code § 1781(c)*

Motions and proceedings for summary judgment and summary adjudication. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*

Motion for summary judgment by defendant as precluding later motion for security under *Code Civ. Proc. 1029.6*, and vice versa. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6(e), (f)*

Recovery of defense costs incurred in opposing bad faith or unreasonable motion for summary judgment in civil actions for indemnity or contribution or actions under California Tort Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 810 et seq.*). *Code Civ. Proc. § 1038*

Motions for summary judgment in actions for unlawful detainer and forcible entry. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1170.7*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p), (q), (r)*

Judicial notice. *Evid. Code §§ 451-453*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsBad Faith MotionsEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & DetainerTortsPublic Entity LiabilityLiabilityState Tort Claims ActsRemedies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.52

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.52 California Rules of Court

Time for filing proof of service. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(c)*

Latest time that paper may be filed; late papers. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(d), (e)*

Place of filing absent local rule as clerk's office. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1302(a)*

Time of hearings in general. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1304*

Restrictions on oral testimony at hearings. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(a)*

Request to present oral testimony. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(b)*

Invoking judicial notice. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)*

Format requirements for summary judgment or summary adjudication. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350*

Form and manner of objecting to evidence in summary judgment proceeding. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1352, 3.1354*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeService of ProcessTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.53

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.53 Local Court Rules

NOTE:

Local Rules Preempted. The California Rules of Court exclusively govern motions and the form and format of papers; local rules concerning these fields, among others, are preempted and should be considered null and void [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.20*].

[1] Los Angeles County

Procedure for invoking judicial notice. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 9.2

[2] San Francisco City and County

Procedure for invoking judicial notice. San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.9

Requirements regarding summary judgment and summary adjudication. San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.11

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.54

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.54 Decisions

[1] Amendment of Pleadings

If either party finds, on hearing of summary judgment motion, that his or her pleading is not adequate, either by way of allegation or denial, court as permitted to, and should, permit party to amend; but absent some request for amendment, no occasion exists to inquire about possible issues not raised by pleadings. *College Hospital, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 704, 719, n.5, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 898, 882 P.2d 894* ; *Bostrom v. County of San Bernardino (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 1654, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669* ; *Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 79, 89 n.4, 266 Cal. Rptr. 767*

To create triable issue of material fact, opposition evidence must be directed to issues raised by pleadings; in negligence action arising from off-road accident, court rejected plaintiff's implied contention that he could seek leave to amend his pleading for first time on appeal and that trial court erred by not considering his allegations outside his complaint that defendant's conduct was reckless, where plaintiff did not assert on appeal, nor did record show, that he sought leave to amend his complaint before hearing on defendant's summary judgment motion; likewise, plaintiff's contention that primary assumption of risk doctrine did not bar his action because dune buggy driver owed him statutory duties of care under *Veh. Code §§ 38305* and *38316* was procedurally defective because he failed to allege in complaint that driver's conduct violated any statutory duties owed to him; although motorcyclist argued in written opposition to

summary judgment motion that driver breached legal duties imposed by *Veh. Code §§ 38305* and *38316*, he made no showing on appeal that he sought leave of court, before summary judgment motion hearing, to amend his complaint to allege such claims. *Distefanov. Forester (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1264-1266, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment must be directed to issues raised by the pleadings; papers filed in response to defendant's motion for summary judgment may not create issues outside pleadings and are not substitute for amendment to pleadings. *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1342, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*

[2] Availability of Summary Judgment

[a] On Motion Only

On appeal from summary judgment, reviewing court as lacking jurisdiction to reverse with instruction to enter judgment for opposing party if latter failed to move for summary judgment. *Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363*

[b] On Stipulation

Proceeding for summary judgment as proper when parties agree on facts and merely seek resolution of issues of law. *T.M. Cobb Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 606, 612, 128 Cal. Rptr. 655, 547 P.2d 431* ; *Dixon v. Salvation Army (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 463, 464, 191 Cal. Rptr. 111* ; *County of Riverside v. Idyllwild County Water Dist. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 655, 657, 148 Cal. Rptr. 650*

Mere fact that both sides move for summary judgment as not establishing that there is no triable issue of material fact; trial court as empowered to make an independent determination on this point before proceeding to decide any questions of law. *Coast Elevator Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 576, 583-584, 118 Cal. Rptr. 818* (disapproved on another ground in *Culligan Water Conditioning v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 86, 93 n.4, 130 Cal. Rptr. 321, 550 P.2d 593*)

[c] Procedural Limitations

Case management order in complex litigation case was invalid to extent it precluded party from filing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* motion by setting up procedure for resolving choice of law issues involved in dispositive motions before motions themselves could be filed, contravened section 437c; once party has filed motion, however, under facts presented, court had inherent power to defer hearing of motion until it first decided myriad choice of law issues potentially involved in case; trial court may not establish procedure for deferred hearing of section 437c motions in every complex case; each case must be examined individually to determine propriety of case management order issued in that case. *First State Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 324, 330-336, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 104*

When court of appeal decided, on the merits of the parties arguments, that trial court correctly entered judgment, held that it would serve no useful purpose at that point for court of appeal to reverse on basis of trial court denial of oral argument at hearing. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 244-245, 245 n.18, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Oral argument required on summary adjudication motions. *Gwartz v. Superior Court (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 480, 482, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865* (following *Mediterranean Construction Co. v State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66*

Cal. App. 4th 257, 265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781)

Local court policy forcing party wishing to make *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* motion for summary judgment to consult first with trial judge and other party and agree on procedure different from that provided by statute improperly interferes with party's right to move for summary judgment or summary adjudication of issue at any time pursuant to established procedures, and is invalid. *Lokeijak v. City of Irvine (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 341, 344, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 429*

Because summary judgment is drastic remedy, it is important that all procedural requirements be satisfied before trial court grants it; thus, local rules may not provide shortcut for these requirements; local court rule allowing court to grant summary judgment to party opposing motion without having made cross motion was inconsistent with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* and thus, invalid. *Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681*

Amended complaint as superseding original complaint; therefore, grant of summary judgment on first complaint after amended complaint had been filed as error and order as void. *Perry v. Atkinson (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 14, 18, 240 Cal. Rptr. 402*

Hearing on motion for summary judgment less than 45 days before trial as not violating statutory time frame of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* when scheduled pursuant to court order based on good cause shown. *Mann v. Columbia Pictures, Inc. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 628, 632-633, 180 Cal. Rptr. 522* (construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* prior to 1983 amendment changing time period to 30 days)

Summary judgment is available before defendant has filed answer, so long as defendant has otherwise made general appearance. *Snider v. Snider (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 741, 746-747, 19 Cal. Rptr. 709*

[d] Antitrust Cases

While summary judgment should be used sparingly in complex antitrust cases, caution does not equal prohibition, and summary judgment remains available to defendants in antitrust cases in appropriate instances. *Fisherman's Wharf Bay Cruise Corp. v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 309, 321, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628*

[e] Mandamus Proceedings

Summary adjudication is not available in mandamus proceedings in which court's review is limited to the evidence contained in the administrative record; court must review all evidence already in record in disposing of claim that agency's decision is not supported by the record. *Dunn v. County of Santa Barbara (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1281, 1292, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316*

[3] Burden of Proof

[a] In General

Burden of persuasion remains with the party moving for summary judgment. When the defendant moves for summary judgment, in those circumstances in which the plaintiff would have the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence, thedefendant must present evidence that would preclude a reasonable trier of fact from finding that it was more likely than not that the material fact was true or the defendant must establish that an elementof the claim cannot be established, by presenting evidence that the plaintiff does not possess and cannot reasonably obtain, needed evidence. *Kahn v. East Side Union High School Dist. (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 990, 1003, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 103, 75 P.3d 30*

Defendant meets burden of persuasion by showing that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to that cause of action; although defense is no longer required to conclusively negate an element of cause of action, defendant must show through evidence and not merely point out, that plaintiff does not possess and cannot reasonably obtain needed evidence; if burden is met, burden shifts to plaintiff to present evidence making out prima facie showing of existence of a triable issue of material fact. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850-855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*

Applicable burden of proof for a summary judgment motion is same as it would be at trial. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 851, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*

Moving plaintiff meets burden if he or she proves each element of the cause of action; moving plaintiff need not disprove any defense asserted by defendant. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* (dicta)

Plaintiff sued the owners of an apartment complex after she was criminally assaulted on the premises and claimed that defendant's failure to take proper security precautions was the proximate cause of her damages; motion for summary judgment granted because plaintiff was unable to provide evidence of causation since she had no evidence showing the identity of her assailants, whether they were trespassers or tenants, whether the security gate was broken, or whether defendant could reasonably have warned the public of unspecified dangers from unknown assailants; declaration of plaintiff's security expert based on same evidence was equally speculative since he equally unaware of assailants' identities and his opinion regarding causation was too tenuous to create a triable issue. *Saelzler v. Advanced Group 400 (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 763, 780-781, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617*

Amended language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* like its federal counterpart, now places initial burden on moving party, and shifts it to opposing party on showing that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established. *Saelzler v. Advanced Group 400 (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 763, 767-768, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d. 617, 23 P.3d 1143* , quoting with approval *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71-72, 83-84, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (reversing judgment of court of appeal with directions to affirm award of summary judgment for defendants)

Defendant adduced, in support of its motion for summary judgment, affirmative evidence which, unless materially contradicted or rebutted, would establish that each of plaintiff's causes of action lacked merit; burden then shifted to plaintiff to show existence of one or more triable issues of material fact and as to each cause of action plaintiff submitted or pointed to evidence which, in plaintiff's view, indicated such triable issues; thus, as to each count of plaintiff's complaint, issue on appellate review is simply whether, and to what extent, evidence submitted for and against motion for summaryjudgment discloses issues warranting trial. *Guz v. Bechtel Nat., Inc. (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 317, 335 n.7, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 8 P.3d 1089* (summary judgment for defendant proper except as to one claim; remanded to court of appeal)

Under 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, defendant moving for summary judgment has met burden of showing that cause of action has no merit if that party has shown that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established; once defendant satisfies this obligation, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that a triable issue of one or more material facts exist to that cause of action or a defense thereto; both trial court and appellate apply these principles in resolving summary judgment motions. *Green v. Ralee Engineering Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 66, 72, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16, 960 P.2d 1046* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Moving defendant meets burden of showing lack of merit of plaintiff's claim by negating one of the elements of plaintiff's cause of action. *Dekens v. Underwriters Laboratories, Inc. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1177, 1185, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699*

For summary judgment purposes, a deposition objection and instruction not to answer are not the equivalent of a factually devoid response, and therefore cannot be used to shift the burden from the moving defendant to the plaintiff. *Gaggero v. Yura (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 884, 892-893, 134 Cal. Rptr.2d 313* .

Moving party's "simply pointing to" absence of evidence supporting plaintiff's position is not in itself enough to obtain summary judgment in its favor and there must be some "affirmative showing" by moving defendant that plaintiff could not obtain such evidence, before summary judgment would be proper; in cases in which opposing party (usually plaintiff) has been thwarted in attempt to obtain evidence that might create issue of material fact, or discovery is incomplete, motion for summary judgment should not be granted; thus conclusory statements in declarations from three attorneys and company executive stating that alter ego and agency allegations of complaint were untrue were insufficient to furnish basis for granting summary judgment to defendants, nor did they shift burden of proof to plaintiff. *Krantz v. BT Visual Images, L.L.C. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 164, 170-175, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 209* (reversing partial summary judgment/summary adjudication for defendants)

Defendant seeking summary judgment bears initial burden of proving cause of action has no merit by showing that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or there is complete defense; once defendant's burden is met, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of fact exists as to that cause of action; in employment discrimination action each of decision makers who decided not to rehire former employee explained in declaration under penalty of perjury specific job-related reasons why he was not qualified for position at issue and why candidate selected for position was better qualified--at this point, to avoid summary judgment, plaintiff had to offer substantial evidence that employer's stated nondiscriminatory reason for adverse action was untrue or pretextual, or evidence employer acted with discriminatory animus, or combination of two,such that reasonable trier of fact could conclude employer engaged in intentional discrimination; employee in this situation cannot simply show employer's decisionwas wrong, mistaken, or unwise but must demonstrate such weaknesses, implausibilities, inconsistencies, incoherencies, or contradictions in employer's proffered legitimate reasons for its action that reasonable factfinder could rationally find them unworthy of credence and, therefore, infer that employer did not act for asserted nondiscriminatory reasons. *Morgan v. Regents of University of California (2000) 88 Cal. App. 4th 52, 74-80, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d. 652* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

If defendant's moving papers establish prima facie showing that justifies judgment, burden then shifts to plaintiff to demonstrate existence of material factual issue; defendant's papers are strictly construed, while plaintiff's papers are liberally construed, and court must be convinced that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of complaint's allegations is there material question of fact that requires examination by trial; if defendant fails to meet this burden, it is unnecessary to examine plaintiff's opposing evidence; motion must be denied. *City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1175-1176, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (summary judgment for defendants reversed as to some defendants and affirmed as to other defendants)

Defendant moving for summary judgment may disprove at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action or show that plaintiff cannot establish an element of cause of action; once moving party has met that burden, opposing party bears burden of presenting evidence that there is triable issue of fact as to any essential element of cause of action. *Martinez v. Bank of America (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 883, 887-888, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing by declarations and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material factual issue requiring trial; when defendant, as moving party, makes that showing, burden of proof shifts to plaintiff, as opposing party, to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 408, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Summary judgment motions are granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; moving defendant meets this burden by negating essential element of plaintiff's case, by establishing complete defense, or by demonstrating absence of evidence to support plaintiff's case; once moving defendant has met this initial burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of one or more material facts exists; thus, until defendant in first instance establishes right to relief defendant sought, plaintiff has no burden to produce evidence or to disprove anything at all. *Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1142, 1152, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of complaint's allegations is there material fact that requires examination by trial; if defendant makes that showing, court must look at plaintiff's papers to determine whether they demonstrate existence of triable, material factual issue. *Dimock v. Emerald Properties (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 868, 873-874, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 255* (summary judgments for defendants reversed)

Moving defendant is not entitled to summary judgment unless he or she negates all theories of liability pleaded by plaintiff. *Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 393, 397, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except for one cause of action against two defendants that was reversed)

Defendant moving for summary judgment meets its burden of proof when it shows there is complete defense to action; once defendant does so, burden shifts to plaintiff to show existence of triable issue of fact with respect to that defense; moving party's affidavits are strictly construed and opposing party's are liberally construed. *Alvarez v. State of California (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 720, 727, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In legal malpractice action, plaintiff's nonresponsive answer to interrogatory did not constitute "factually devoid" discovery to shift burden to plaintiff on question of causation of plaintiff's damages, since discovery did not call for information on that subject, or for other information from which information on that subject could be deduced; to extent nonresponsive information was provided which might have born on question of causation, since it was not called for by interrogatory, it would be speculation to determine what response would have been provided to question squarely asking about plaintiff's damages; court cannot assume that all information was provided to an interrogatory that was not propounded. *Gulf Ins. Co. v. Berger, Kahn,Shafton, Moss, Figler, Simon & Gladstone (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 114, 125, 133-136, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant seeking summary judgment must prove either affirmative defense, disprove at least one element of plaintiff's cause of action, or show that some such element cannot be established; opposing party need not prove his or her case; it is enough to show that a triable issue of material exists. *Government Employees Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 95, 100, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820* (review by writ proceeding; trial court should have granted summary judgment for defendant)

Pleadings define issues to be considered on motion for summary judgment; as to each claim framed by complaint, defendant must present facts to negate essential element or establish defense; only then will burden shift to plaintiff to demonstrate existence of triable, material issue of fact. *American Golf Corp. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 30, 35, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 683* (review by writ proceeding; trial court directed to enter new and different order granting summary judgment for defendant)

Moving defendant must demonstrate through admissible evidence that one or more essential elements of the cause of action cannot be established; once defendant has made such a showing, burden shifts to plaintiff to produce evidence that a triable issue of fact exists as to an essential element of cause of action. *Renna v. County of Fresno (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1, 5, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 586* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing, by declarations and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there

material factual issue requiring trial; when moving party makes that showing, burden shifts to opposing party to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1418, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

To prevail on summary judgment motion, defendant must show that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to that cause of action. *Pardee Construction Co. v. Insurance Co. of the West (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1349 n.3, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* (judgment for three defendants whose motions for judgment on pleadings were granted after summary adjudication in their favor reversed as to two of them with directions that trial court grant plaintiff's motions for summary adjudication; judgment for remaining defendant affirmed)

When plaintiff is moving party, appellate court determines whether plaintiff has met its burden under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437(p)*) of showing there is no defense to cause of action because admissible evidence produced by plaintiff proves each element of cause of action entitling party to judgment on that cause of action; if moving party has met its statutory burden of proof and summary judgment motion prima facie justifies a judgment, burden shifts to opposing party and appellate court determines whether that party has met its burden under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*; when defendants are opposing parties, appellate court determines whether they have met their burden under former Code Civ. Proc.§ 437c(o)(1)(2) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*), of producing admissible evidence showing that a triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to that cause of action or a defense to it. *Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 653, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Defendant moving for summary judgment must demonstrate that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to that cause of action; it is then up to plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact exists as to that cause of action or defense; defendants did not meet their burden on their summary judgment motion with regard to element of duty while plaintiff in plaintiff's motion for summary adjudication met its burden of completely disposing of issue of duty. *Novak v. Low, Ball & Lynch (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 278, 281, 285, 285 n.5, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453* (summary judgment for defendants reversed and trial court directed to grant summary adjudication of issue of duty for plaintiff)

When defendant attorneys' summary judgment motion attempted to show complete defense because plaintiff trust beneficiary was not real party in interest and burden shifted to plaintiff to set forth specific facts showing that triable issue of material fact existed to defense relied on, plaintiff did not have to offer evidence proving claims to establish standing, but rather to establish facts showing that plaintiff was real party in interest for purposes of asserting those claims and seeking those damages. *Wolf v. Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1041, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

With regard to summary adjudication motion, moving party plaintiff had to show there was no evidence to support defendant's unclean hands affirmative defense; once plaintiff met this burden, burden shifted to defendant to set forth specific facts showing triable issue of material fact existed as to defense. *Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. Superior Court (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 970, 978, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743* (summary adjudication in plaintiff's favor overturned on writ of mandate)

In medical malpractice cases, when defendant doctor moves for summary judgment and supports motion with expert declaration that his or her conduct fell within community standard of care, he or she is entitled to summary judgment unless plaintiff comes forward with conflicting expert evidence. *Hanson v. Grode (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 601, 603-604, 607, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

To prevail on motion for summary judgment, defendant must demonstrate plaintiff's cause of action has no merit; this

requirement can be satisfied by showing either one or more of its elements cannot be established or that complete defense exists to it; once defendant meets this requirement, burden shifts to plaintiff to demonstrate a triable issue of material fact exists. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 555, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Even though plaintiff bears burden of proof at trial, moving defendant bears initial burden of showing lack of any triable factual issue; responding plaintiff has no evidentiary burden unless moving defendant has first met its initial burden; only after moving defendant meets its initial burden does burden shift to plaintiff to demonstrate existence of triable issue. *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839-840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Moving party bears burden of proving that claims of adverse party are entirely without merit on any legal theory; opposition must demonstrate only existence of at least one triable issue of fact and all doubts as to propriety of granting motion must be resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Campbell v. Derylo (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 823, 826, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 519* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant moving for summary judgment may establish that an essential element of cause of action is absent by reliance on pleadings, competent declarations, binding judicial admission contained in allegations of plaintiff's complaint, responses or failure to respond to discovery, and testimony of witnesses at noticed depositions; plaintiff may not rely on his or her pleadings alone, but must file opposition to motion, with affidavits setting forth specific facts demonstrating that triable issue of material fact exists as to cause of action or defense; thus, when parties have had sufficient opportunity adequately to develop their factual cases through discovery and defendant has made a sufficient showing that plaintiff's action has no merit, to avert summary judgment plaintiff must produce substantial responsive evidence sufficient to establish existence of triable issue of material fact on issues raised by plaintiff's cause of action. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375-1376, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

To obtain summary judgment on ground that general release has discharged third party from liability, third party must affirmatively show parties intended to release him or her; burden of proof is on third party under both contract law and summary judgment statute; when defendant moved for summary judgment contending general release relieved defendant from liability and plaintiff responded that extrinsic evidence showed parties never intended to release defendant, even if release was sufficient to shift burden of proof to plaintiff, extrinsic evidence before court raised triable issue regarding parties' intent to release defendant. *Neverkovec v. Fredericks (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 337, 341-344, 349, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Under the 1992-1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, defendant seeking summary judgment need only demonstrate plaintiff's case has no merit to shift burden to plaintiff to demonstrate existence of triable issue of material fact. *Myricks v. Lynwood Unified School Dist. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 231, 238, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Moving defendant's burden does not shift until defendant carries initial burden to show essential element of cause of action cannot be established; if moving defendant argues that it has complete defense to plaintiff's cause of action, defendant has initial burden to show undisputed facts support each element of affirmative defense; once it does so, burden shifts to plaintiff to show issue of fact concerning at least one element of defense; in employment discrimination action, once employer makes sufficient showing of legitimate reason for discharge, then discharged employee seeking to avert summary judgment must demonstrate by additional facts or legal argument that defendant's showing was in fact insufficient or by competent evidentiary materialsthat there was triable issue of fact material to defendant's showing; with respect to latter choice, employee must produce substantial responsive evidence that employer's showing was untrue or pretextual; speculation cannot be regarded as substantial responsive evidence. *Hanson v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 215, 223-225, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

If motion for summary judgment is supported by affidavits sufficient to sustain motion, burden shifts to party opposing motion to show triable issue of material fact exists; party cannot avoid summary judgment based on mere speculation and conjecture, but must produce admissible evidence raising a triable issue of material fact. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 672 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving defendant may meet burden of showing cause of action has no merit by proving either (1) one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established, or (2) there is complete defense to cause of action; once that burden has been met, burden shifts to plaintiff to show existence of triable issue of one or more material facts concerning that cause of action or defense; because summary judgment drastic procedure that deprives losing party of trial on merits, defendant moving for summary judgment must conclusively negate the necessary elements of plaintiff's case or demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact. *Smith v. Maldonado (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Burden on defendant moving for summary judgment based on assertion of affirmative defense is heavier than burden to show one or more elements of plaintiff's action cannot be established; instead of merely submitting evidence to negate single element of plaintiff's cause of action, or offering evidence that plaintiff does not have evidence to create issue of fact as to one or more elements of case, defendant has initial burden to show undisputed facts support each element of affirmative defense; defendant must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material factual issue requiring trial; if defendant does not meet this burden, motion must be denied; only if defendant meets this burden does burden shift to plaintiff to show issue of fact concerning at least one element of defense; moreover, submission of evidence that is equivocal, or from which conflicting inferences may be drawn is insufficient to meet movant's burden. *Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-290, 297, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant seeking summary judgment bears initial burden of showing that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or there is complete defense; once defendant's burden has been met, burden shifts to plaintiff to show triable issue of fact exists as to that cause of action; plaintiff alleging discriminatory termination under California's antidiscrimination statutory scheme must be able to survive burden-shifting analysis set forth in *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green (1973) 411 U.S. 792, 802-804, 93 S. Ct. 1817, 36 L. Ed.2d 668* , under which employee must first establish prima facie case of age discrimination, and if successful, employer must offer legitimate non-age-based reason for adverse employment action; if employer does not, employee prevails, but if employer does, burden shifts back to employee to meet ultimate obligation to prove reason for action was age discrimination; California courts have disagreed on exact showing required by employee to avoid summary judgment in face of employer's evidence of non-age-based reason for adverse action; under predominant view, followed by court, to avoid summary judgment, employee must produce substantial evidence that employer's stated nondiscriminatory reason for adverse action was untrue or pretextual or that employer acted with discriminatory animus, or a combination of both, such that reasonable trier of fact could conclude employer engaged in intentional discrimination; to avoid summary judgment, plaintiff had to do more than establish prima facie case and deny credibility of defendant's witnesses; plaintiff needed to produce specific, substantial evidence of pretext, which plaintiff failed to do. *Horn v. Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 798, 805-807, 817* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant who relies on contract terms in moving for summary judgment need not establish contract is not unconscionable, unless plaintiff's complaint alleged facts suggesting unconscionability; thus, when complaint alleged defendant's interpretation of its own contract would violate public policy, but complaint contained no factual allegations of unconscionability, plaintiffs in opposing summary judgment had burden to show unconscionability. *Williams v. California Physicians' Service (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 722, 742, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In action for negligence, premises liability, and negligent infliction of emotional distress, when defendant's only

evidence offered in support of motion for summary adjudication was that injury occurred on public street over which defendant had no control and not on defendant's property, defendant did not satisfy its burden to negate duty of care; defendant did not offer any evidence to show injury was not foreseeable, injury was not actually suffered, or slope of driveway and configuration of sidewalk, play area and driveway was not closely connected to injury, or to negate any of other *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 113, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* factors. *Barnes v. Black (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1473, 1477, 1479, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634* (summary adjudication for defendant reversed)

Under current version of summary judgment statute, moving defendant need not support motion with affirmative evidence negating essential element of responding party's case; moving defendant may, through factually vague discovery responses or otherwise, point to absence of evidence to support plaintiff's case; when that is done, burden shifts to plaintiff to present evidence showing there is triable issue of material fact; if plaintiff is unable to meet his or her burden of proof regarding essential element of case, all other facts are rendered immaterial. *Wilkins v. National Broadcasting Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1074, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Defendant has met burden of showing cause of action has no merit if defendant has shown one or more elements of cause of action, even if not separately stated, cannot be established, or that there is complete defense to that cause of action. *Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294* (summary judgments for defendants affirmed)

Defendant may rely on plaintiff's factually inadequate discovery answers to seek summary adjudication of particular cause of action; if plaintiff fails toadduce evidence during discovery to support factual allegations of complaint, burden shifts to plaintiff and motion may be granted if plaintiff does not set forth specific facts to show triable issue of material fact. *Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1506-1508* (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

On summary judgment, moving defendant may rely on factually devoid discovery responses to shift burden of proof pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)*; once burden shifts as result of factually devoid discovery responses, plaintiff must set forth specific facts that prove existence of triable issue of material fact; if plaintiff fails to do so, summary judgment must be granted; distinguishing cases in which factually devoid discovery responses were not sufficient to shift burden of proof; in this case, by reference to plaintiffs' factually devoid discovery responses, defendant showed plaintiffs could not establish at least one element of their case; plaintiffs failed to present evidence in response sufficient to create triable issue of material fact regarding plaintiff's deceased husband's exposure to asbestos-containing products related to defendant. *Chaknova v. Wilbur-Ellis Co (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 962, 974-978, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 871* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant meets its burden if it negates essential element of plaintiff's case, or establishes complete defense, or if it demonstrates absence of evidence to support plaintiff's case; once moving defendant has met its initial burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show triable issue of one or more material facts exists. *Berry v. Society of Saint Pius X (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 354, 365, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 574* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

What quantum of evidence is needed to trigger the evidentiary burden shifting concerning summary judgment procedure in California is issue of law. *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 70, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Question of what sort of evidence is sufficient to shift burden under California's summary judgment statute said to be unsettled; apparent majority of appellate courts accept proposition that defendant can meet burden of proof by showing plaintiff has no evidence to support case; minority view suggests defendant must do more than merely argue there is absence of evidence and must produce affirmative evidence to show that plaintiff cannot establish prima facie case; cases reviewed and reconciled; court did not decide whether more cautious view is better one because trial court's ruling was incorrect under either approach; moving defendant had conducted no discovery, and in deposition by other

defendants, plaintiff was not asked any question concerning moving defendant, so that, since plaintiff's duty to answer completely only extended so far as reasonable ambit of questions asked, it was possble plaintiff had more information concerning the moving defendant and unlike other cases, the court could not infer from incomplete or evasive responses to discovery that plaintiffs had no other facts to support the case. *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 80-84, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant who is moving party bears burden of showing one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established or there is complete defense; unless defendant meets its burden, plaintiff has no obligation to demonstrate there is triable issue of fact. *LeVine v. Weis (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 758, 763, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 439* (summary adjudication for defendant reversed, but in all other respects judgment affirmed)

When parties had sufficient opportunity adequately to develop their factual cases through discovery and defendant has made sufficient showing to establish prima facie case in defendant's favor, plaintiff, to avert summary judgment, must produce substantial responsive evidence sufficient to establish triable issue of material fact on merits of defendant's showing; for this purpose, responsive evidence that gives rise to no more than mere speculation cannot be regarded as substantial and is insufficient to establish triable issue of material fact. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162-163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

When motion for summary judgment is supported by affidavits sufficient to sustain motion, burden of showing triable issue of fact shifts to party opposing motion; under 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, defendant moving for summary judgment meets burden of showing cause of action has no merit if defendant shows one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action can not be established; once moving defendant satisfies this obligation, burden shifts to plaintiff to demonstrate triable issue of material fact as to existence of element or elements challenged by defendants; to do so, plaintiff may not rely on mere allegations of its pleadings, but must show by specific facts that requisite triable issue of material fact is present; under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) defendant seeking summary judgment has two means to shift burden of proof to plaintiff to produce evidence creating triable issue of fact, i.e., defendant may rely on factually insufficient discovery responses by plaintiff to show plaintiff cannot establish essential element of cause of action, or defendant may use tried and true technique of negating (i.e., disproving) essential element of plaintiff's cause of action; if showing by defendant does not support judgment in defendant's favor, however, burden does not shift and motion must be denied without regard to plaintiff's showing. *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1524, 1533-1535, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

Courts impose more stringent burdens on one opposing motion in defamation and invasion of privacy cases and require showing of high probability that plaintiff will ultimately prevail in case; absent such showing, courts are inclined to grant motion and do not permit case to proceed beyond summary judgment stage. *Alszeh v. Home Box Office (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1460, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing, by declarations and evidence, a complete defense to plaintiff's action or the absence of an essential element of plaintiff's case. *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 141-142, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (peremptory writ issued directing trial court to grant defendants' motions for summary judgment)

Defendant meets burden on motion if that party proved there is complete defense to cause of action; once defendant met that burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of one or more material facts exists. *Crookall v. Davis, Punelli, Keathley & Willard (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1048, 1057, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

To secure summary judgment, moving defendant may prove an affirmative defense, disprove at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action, or show element of cause of action cannot be established; defendant must show

that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of allegations of complaint is there a material question of fact that requires examination by trial. *Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 840, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Case governed by 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, under which defendant's burden could be met only by showing that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established, or there is complete defense to cause of action; once defendant has met burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to cause of action. *First Street Plaza Partners v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 650, 659, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When party subject to claim of collateral estoppel is party moving for summary judgment, it has burden of showing opponent cannot establish prerequisites for collateral estoppel. *Schaefer/Karpf Productions v. CNA Ins. Companies (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1306, 1314 n.2, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing, by declarations and evidence, a complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there a material factual issue requiring a trial; when defendant, as moving party, makes that showing, burden of proof shifts to plaintiff, as opposing party, to show by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1543, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101* (summary judgment in favor of defendant's reversed)

Clear from 1992 amendment that a defendant have "shown that one or more elements of the cause of action ... cannot be established" (§ 437c, former subd. (n)(2), Stats. 1992, ch. 1348, § 1, now subd. (o)), that defendant must make affirmative showing in support of defendants' motion; such a showing connotes something significantly more than simply pointing out to court that there is absence of evidence; before burden of producing even prima facie case should shift to plaintiff in advance of trial, defendant who cannot negate an element of plaintiff's case should be required to produce direct or circumstantial evidence that plaintiff not only does not have but cannot reasonably expect to obtain prima facie case; but when such showing can be made it is both fair to defendant and consistent with efficient administration of justice that plaintiff be called upon, on risk of summary judgment, to make prima facie case. *Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1452, 1453, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54*

Defendant seeking summary judgment has met burden of showing that cause of action has no merit if that party has shown that one or more elements of the cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to cause of action; once defendant's burden met, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that a triable issue of fact exists as to that cause of action. *Depew v. Crocodile Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 480, 485, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

To be entitled to judgment as matter of law, moving party must show by admissible evidence that action has no merit or there is no defense to it; defendant meets this burden by showing that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to action; once defendant meets this showing, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that a triable issue of material fact exists as to that cause of action. *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1187, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving defendant bears burden of establishing, by declaration and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there a material factual issue requiring trial; when moving party makes that showing, burden of proof shifts to opposing party to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Nissel v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1103, 1110, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

If moving defendant does not meet burden, plaintiff need not make any showing at all. *Pepperell v. Scottsdale Ins. Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1054, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* (summary judgment for defendant reversed; remanded for further proceedings)

Defendant is entitled to summary judgment if record establishes as matter of law that none of plaintiff's asserted causes of action can prevail; to succeed, defendant must present facts to negate essential element of each claim as framed by complaint or to establish defense; only then must plaintiff demonstrate existence of triable, material issue of fact. *City of South Lake Tahoe v. Superior Court (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 971, 975, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 146* (summary judgment for plaintiffs overturned by writ of mandate); *Federico v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1207, 1210, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (denial of defendant's motion for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Moving plaintiff, must meet its statutory obligation under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) by producing admissible evidence of each element of cause of action entitling party to judgment on that cause. *San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Gallagher (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 501, 503, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed; remanded for further proceedings)

To secure summary judgment, moving defendant may prove affirmative defense, disprove at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action, or show that element of cause of action cannot be established; defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of allegations of complaint is there material question of fact which requires examination by trial; moving defendant bears burden of proving absence of any triable issue of material fact, even though burden of proof as to a particular issue may be on plaintiff at trial; once moving party has met itsburden, opposing party bears burden of presenting evidence that there is triable issue of fact as to any essential element of cause of action. *Ochoa v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1480, 1485, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 232* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Although appellate court must strictly construe moving party's papers and liberally construe those of the opposing party, latter bears burden of showing triable issues of fact exist. *Leon v. Family Fitness Center (#107), Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1227, 1231* (summary judgment for defendant reversed; remanded for further proceedings)

To secure summary judgment, moving defendant may prove affirmative defense, disprove at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action, or show that element of cause of action cannot be established; notwithstanding strict construction given moving party's evidence and liberal construction given to that of opposing party, opponent has burden of showing triable issues of material fact exist; he or she may not rely on pleadings; complete failure of proof concerning essential element of nonmoving party's case necessarily renders all other facts immaterial. *Montgomery v. Cal. Accountants Mutual Ins. Co. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

For purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, moving defendant is statutorily treated as plaintiff and hence must present sufficient facts to make out prima facie case of nonliability; moving defendant must prove affirmative defense, disprove at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action or show that element of cause of action cannot be established; defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of allegations of the complaint is there material question of fact which requires examination by trial; if defendant makes that showing, court must look to plaintiff's papers to determine whether they demonstrate existence of triable, material issue of fact; counter affidavits and declarations need not prove opposition case; they suffice if they disclose triable issue. *McManis v. San Diego Postal Credit Union (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 547, 554, 558-559, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617* (summary judgment for multiple defendants reversed as to one of them)

Defendant is entitled to summary judgment if record establishes as matter of law that none of plaintiff's asserted causes of action can prevail; when defendant demonstrates that cause of action has no merit because one or more elements of that cause of action cannot be established, burden shifts to plaintiff to show with specific facts that triable issue of one

or more material facts exist as to that cause of action. *Maxwell v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1446, 1448-1449, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 866* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant may meet its burden of establishing plaintiff's cause of action has no merit in one of two ways; by showing that one or more elements of cause of action, even if not separately pleaded, cannot be established, or that there is complete defense to cause of action. *Pensinger v. Bowsmith, Inc. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 709, 718, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 531* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed in part and reversed as to other causes of action)

To defeat defendant's summary judgment motion, when burden shifts to plaintiff to establish existence of genuine issue of material fact as to existence of element challenged by defendant, plaintiff must show specific facts and cannot rely on pleadings. *Snyder v. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 561, 565, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 498* (summary adjudication for defendant reversed in part and affirmed as to other causes of action)

Moving defendant bears burden of proving absence of any triable issue of material fact, even though burden of proof as to particular issue may be on plaintiff at trial; once moving party has met its burden, opposing party bears burden of presenting evidence that there is no triable issue of fact as to any essential element of cause of action. *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1015, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving party's burden on motion for summary judgment is only to negate existence of triable issues of fact in fashion that entitles that party to judgment on issues raised by pleadings; he or she is not required to refute liability on some theoretical possibility not included in pleadings; what issues are material is determined mainly by pleadings, rules of pleading, and substantive law relating to particular kind of case. *Waschek v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 640, 644, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (remanded to trial court for order granting summary judgment to defendant)

Defendant moving party meets its burden of showing that cause of action has no merit if it shows that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established; to do this, party may note that discovery has disclosed no evidence to support one or more of elements of cause of action; although defendant does not address a point in its moving papers, it may in its reply papers adopt the plaintiff's own evidence to demonstrate that no triable issue of material fact exists and defendant is entitled to summary adjudication. *216 Sutter Bay Associates v. County of Sutter (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 860, 875-881, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Moving defendant bears burden of establishing, by declaration and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material factual issue requiring trial; when moving party makes that showing, burden of proof shifts to opposing party to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist; burden of defendant moving for summary judgment only requires that defendant negate plaintiff's theories of liability as alleged in complaint; moving party need not refute liability on some theoretical possibility not included in pleading. *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1342, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendant meets its burden on summary judgment motion if it negates essential element of plaintiff's cause of action, or establishes complete defense, or demonstrates absence of evidence to support plaintiff's case; once moving defendant has met its initial burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show triable issue of one or more material facts exist. *Locke v. Warner Bros., Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 354, 361, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 921* (summary judgment for defendant reversed in part and affirmed as to other causes)

Defendant moving for summary judgment has burden of negating necessary element of plaintiff's case, and demonstrating that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact that requires process of trial; to do that, defendant

may rely either on affirmative evidence or discovery responses of plaintiff showing absence of evidence necessary to establish at least one essential element of plaintiff's case; once defendant carries this substantive burden, burden shifts back to plaintiff to show triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to plaintiff's case; all doubts as to whether there is any triable issue of fact are to be resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment. *Zelda, Inc. v. Northland Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1258-1259, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Moving defendant may rely on factually devoid discovery responses to shift burden of proof pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)*; once burden shifts as result of factually devoid discovery responses, plaintiff must set forth specific facts which prove existence of triable issue of material fact. *Department of Industrial Relations v. UI Video Stores, Inc. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1090, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

For defendant to prevail, it must show that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or that defendant has complete defense to plaintiff's cause of action; if defendant meets that burden, burden of proof shifts to plaintiff to show that a triable issue of one or more material facts exist. *Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 853, 863, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (summary judgment for defendant on complaint and cross complaint affirmed)

Summary judgment on defendant's motion is proper if defendant either proves affirmative defense or disproves at least one essential element of plaintiff's cause of action or if defendant shows that an element of cause of action cannot be established; defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of complaint's allegations is there material question of fact that requires examination by trial. *Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendants have initial burden on summary judgment to show that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established, or there is complete defense to that cause of action; once defendant has met that burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to that cause of action; nothing in language of 1992 amendments of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(n)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) abrogates this well-established summary judgment requirement that initial burden rests with moving party. *Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 956, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed as to one plaintiff and reversed as to another)

Even on motion for summary judgment by insurer, burden remains on insured to prove that its claim falls within scope of basic coverage of policy. *Golden Security Thrift & Loan Assn. v. First American Title Ins. Co. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 250, 255, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 442* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Legislature has given federal flavor to nature of moving party's prima facie case; previously, moving party could establish its prima facie entitlement to judgment only by demonstrating existence of facts which negated element of opponent's case; now moving party may also establish its prima facie entitlement to judgment by demonstrating its opponent's discovery responses are devoid of evidence to support an element of opponent's case. *Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 735, 740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710* (denial of defendant's summary judgment motion overturned on writ of mandate)

Under new method for establishing prima facie entitlement to judgment, moving party must demonstrate a negative, *i.e.*, that there is no evidence to support an element of opponent's case; this is akin to burden of appellant in proving there is no substantial evidence to support judgment; it is incumbent on appellant who claims evidentiary insufficiency to set forth evidence supporting judgment and indicate why it is insufficient; if party contends some particular issue of fact has no support in record, it must set forth all material evidence on point and not merely evidence favorable to it; mere reference in statement of undisputed facts to existence of inadmissible discovery responses does not waive contemporaneously raised objection to that evidence in accompanying points and authorities. *Rio Linda Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 732, 735, 739-740, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 710* (denial of defendant's

summary judgment motion overturned on writ of mandate)

Summary judgment is appropriate if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue of any material fact and that moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law; a defendant seeking summary judgment has met its burden of showing that a cause of action has merit if defendant demonstrates that one or more elements of the cause of action cannot be established; once defendant seeking summary judgment meets this burden, the burden shifts to the plaintiff to show that a triable issue of material exists as to that cause of action; plaintiff may not rely on mere allegations or denials of its pleading, but must set forth the specific facts that demonstrate existence of the triable issue of material fact; issue of fact cannot be created by speculation, imagination, conjecture, or guess work but can only be created by a conflict of evidence. *Lee v. Crusader Ins. Co. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1750, 1756, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant who meets initial burden of establishing that action has no merit is entitled to summary judgment unless plaintiff demonstrates existence of triable issue of material fact; plaintiff generally cannot defeat well-founded summary judgment motion without setting forth specific facts controverting motion. *Mary Morgan, Inc. v. Melzark (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 765, 770, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 4* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Moving defendant bears burden of proving absence of any triable issue of material fact even though plaintiff has burden of proof as to that issue at trial; defendant, however, need only demonstrate absence of triable issue of material fact as to those bases of liability plaintiff has pleaded; once moving party has met its burden, opposing party bears burden of presenting evidence that there is triable issue of fact as to any essential element of causeof action. *Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Defendant must conclusively negate necessary element in plaintiff's case or establish complete defense; when evidence presented by defendant does not support judgment in defendant's favor, motion must be denied without looking at opposing evidence, if any, submitted by plaintiff. *Bashi v. Wodarz (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1314, 1318, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* were not intended to abrogate defendant's burden on summary judgment motion to respond to all of plaintiff's theories of liability reflected in complaint even if not separately pleaded; although plaintiff who has pleaded several causes of action based on same set of facts need only sustain its burden on one theory to prevail at trial, defendant who seeks summary judgment must define all theories alleged in complaint and challenge each factually; defendant as the moving party has burden to show it is entitled to judgment on all theories of liability asserted by plaintiff. *Lopez v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 705, 713-714, 717, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821* (grant of defendant's summary judgment motion overturned on writ of mandate; although holding in *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* , restated as law, court held *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* , line of cases, including *Hunter*, inapplicable because defendant failed to meet its initial burden on summary judgment of addressing plaintiff's primary theory of premises liability)

Defendant moving for summary judgment must conclusively negate element in plaintiff's case or establish complete defense and thereby demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material factual issue requiring trial. *Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 468, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Brown v. California Pension Administrators & Consultants, Inc. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 333, 339, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 788* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*) requirement that a defendant "has shown that one or more elements of the cause of action ... cannot be established," defendant must make affirmative showing to support his or her motion, which showing connotes something significantly more than pointing out to court

that there is an absence of evidence; defendant who cannot negate element in plaintiff's case should be required to produce direct or circumstantial evidence that plaintiff not only does not have but cannot reasonably expect to obtain a prima facie case; when defendant makes such showing, burden to make prima facie case shifts to plaintiff. *Addy v. Bliss & Glennon (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 205, 214, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed; court disagreed with and did not follow *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1287-1289, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335*); *Hagen v. Hickenbottom (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 168, 183-184, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197* (summary judgment for defendant reversed; questioning conclusion in *Hunter*)

Under former *Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*), moving defendant has two means by which to shift the burden of proof to plaintiff to produce a triable issue of fact: (1) defendant may rely on plaintiff's factually insufficient discovery responses to show that plaintiff cannot establish an essential element of plaintiff's cause of action, or (2) defendant may negate, that is, disprove, essential element in plaintiff's cause of action. *Brantley v. Pisaro (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1591, 1598, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 431* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Defendants who moves for summary judgment must prove either that affirmative defense bars every cause of action pleaded in complaint or disprove at least one essential element of each cause of action; moving party must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of allegations in complaint is there material question of fact that requires examination at trial; motion must be denied if defendant as moving party fails to satisfy its burden. *Martin Marietta Corp. v. Insurance Co. of North America (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1113, 1121, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Recent statutory amendments adopted burden-shifting characteristics of federal law for California summary judgment motions; although moving party always initially bears burden of establishing absence of genuine issue of material fact, when nonmoving party bears burden of proof on an issue at trial the moving party need not support its summary judgment motion with evidence negating an essential element of the nonmoving party's case to satisfy its burden; moving party may simply point to absence of evidence to support nonmoving party's case; nonmoving party must then set forth specific facts by affidavits (or declarations) or admissible discovery material showing there is genuine issue for trial; in action for asbestos-related injury enough for defendant to show through factually vague discovery responses that plaintiff lacked any probative evidence on critical element of causation, that is, defendant could effectively show that element of causation could not be established by pointing to an absence of evidence to support that element; burden than shifted to plaintiff to come forward with evidence necessary to prove triable issue of material fact existed with regard to element of causation which plaintiff did not do; summary judgment in defendant's favor affirmed. *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1284, 1286-1288, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *but see Addy v. Bliss & Glennon (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 205, 214, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Hagen v. Hickenbottom (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 168, 183-184, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Close examination of legislative history as suggesting intent was to apply the burden shifting characteristics of *Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 56,* as interpreted in *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett (1986) 477 U.S. 317, 322-328, 106 S. Ct. 2548* , to California summary judgment motions. *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (denial of defendant's summary judgment motion overturned on writ of mandate)

Moving defendant may rely on plaintiff's factually devoid discovery responses to shift burden of proof to plaintiff to set forth specific facts proving existence of triable issue of material fact. *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Fact that prior case law held a moving defendant had duty to negate an essential element of an adversary's cause of action and that Legislature chose not to utilize the term "negate" in amending summary judgment statute reflects intention to change the long-standing duty of a moving defendant. *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 586, n.8, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (dicta; summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Judicial notice or evidentiary admission or concession by pleader/adversary as able to support motion and thrust burden on pleader to come forward with facts in rebuttal. *Columbia Casualty Co. v. Northwestern Nat. Ins. Co. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 457, 468, 282 Cal. Rptr. 389* (prior law; summary judgment for cross defendant reversed)

Only if it can be determined that moving party's declaration, considered in light of issues raised by pleadings, would, standing alone, support summary judgment does court look to any counteraffidavits and counterdeclarations; if court finds that there are no triable issues of fact, determination of motion for summary judgment as then becoming question of law; whenever court must rule on motion for summary judgment, factual issue guidelines for motion as fixed by reference solely to pleadings. *Danieley v. Goldmine Ski Associates, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 111, 118-119, 266 Cal. Rptr. 749* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *see also People v. Van Horn (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1378, 1397, 267 Cal. Rptr. 804* (summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs affirmed)

Opposing party as required to show only existence of triable issue of fact, not ability to prevail at trial. *Del E. Webb Corp. v. Structural Materials Co. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 593, 608, 176 Cal. Rptr. 824* (prior law; summary judgment for defendant affirmed as to some causes of action and reversed as to others)

[b] Effect of Admissions on Burden of Proof

A defendant may provide affirmative evidence that the plaintiff lacks any factual support for the plaintiff's claims through an admission by the plaintiff that extensive discovery has yielded nothing. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 854-855, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* ; *Tran v. Farmers Group, Inc. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1202, 1215, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728*

Admission against interest as entitled to greater weight than evidentiary allegations in affidavits or declarations. *D'Amico v. Board of Medical Examiners (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 1, 21-22, 112 Cal. Rptr. 786, 520 P.2d 10* ; *Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Great American Surplus Lines Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 791, 800, 245 Cal. Rptr. 44*

D'Amico rule is limited to situations where credible discovery admissions are contradicted only by self-serving declarations of a party; there is a vast difference between written discovery admissions and responses given by a lay opponent in a deposition; court erred in granting summary judgment based on statements made by plaintiff in deposition testimony in that court refused to consider evidence that contradicted or shed light on plaintiff's testimony. *Scalf v. D.B. Log Homes, Inc. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1510, 1523, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 826*

Defense granted summary adjudication on cause of action for clean up costs of groundwater contamination where lack of evidence on damages shown by plaintiff's interrogatory responses admitting it was unable to attribute damages to any particular cause, event, or time. *Golden Eagle Refinery Co. v. Associated Internat. Ins. Co. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1311-1312, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834*

California courts do not permit party to defeat summary judgment by declaration contradicting that party's previous deposition testimony; credibility of deposition admissions valued so highly that controverting affidavits may be disregarded as irrelevant, inadmissible or evasive. *Wilkins v. National Broadcasting Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1082, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Party cannot create issue of fact by declaration that contradicts his or her prior discovery responses; in determining whether any triable issue of material facts exists, trial court may, in its discretion, give great weight to admissions made in deposition and disregard contradictory and self-serving affidavits of party; admissions against interest have very high credibility value; this is especially true when admission was obtained not in normal course of human activities and affairs but in context of established pretrial procedure whose purpose is to elicit facts; distinguishing cases that held

declarations that contradict earlier discovery responses may sometimes be considered; trial court did not abuse discretion in ruling contradictory statements in plaintiff's declaration must be disregarded, and therefore those statements failed to raise triable issue of fact. *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860-863, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

D'Amico v. Board of Medical Examiners (1994) 11 Cal. 3d 1, 22, 520 P.2d 10 , recognized admissions against interest have very high credibility value; Supreme Court has consistently refused to allow triable issue of fact to be conjured by submission of affidavit contradicting declarant's prior deposition testimony; *Price v. Wells Fargo Bank (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 465, 482* , however, was first of several cases pointing out that *D'Amico* should be viewed with caution; *Price* court refused to concede that admissions should be shielded from careful examination in light of entire record and held summary judgment should not be based on tacit admissions or fragmentary and equivocal concessions; court viewed record before it with equal caution. *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 77-78, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Admission in complaint that party acted within course and scope of employment will not bind plaintiff on summary judgment if plaintiff offers countervailing evidence in opposition to summary judgment motion; when broad arbitration clause with limited nonpertinent exceptions extended to every type of dispute arising from plaintiff's employment, and defendant employees relied on allegations in plaintiff's complaint that they were acting within course and scope of their employment at all relevant times, employee defendants met their initial burden of showing a defense to plaintiff's claims against them, causing burden to shift back to plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact existed whether arbitration agreement applied. *24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1211, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533* (trial court directed to vacate order denying summary judgment and to grant summary judgment to all but one defendant)

A party cannot evade summary judgment by submitting declaration contradicting that party's prior deposition testimony. *Guthrey v. State of California (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*

To extent descriptions in plaintiff's declaration submitted in opposition to motion for summary judgment are contradicted plaintiff's discovery responses, they must be disregarded; admissions or concessions made duringcourse of discovery govern and control over contrary declarations lodged at hearing on motion for summary judgment. *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1191-1192, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212*

Declaration on summary judgment that is inconsistent with prior deposition testimony can be disregarded. *First Fid. Thrift & Loan Assn. v. Alliance Bank (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1433, 1437 n.2, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 295* (finding declaration was not inconsistent)

Defendant moving for summary judgment may rely on allegations in plaintiff's complaint that are judicial admissions; as such, they are conclusive concessions of truth of a matter and have effect of removing it from issues; contradictory evidence is limited to that which collaterally attacks the prior judicial admission on basis of mistake, inadvertence, or lack of authority. *Barr v. ACandS, Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1038, 1055-1056, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 494*

Judicial admission is binding and dispositive without further evidence; consideration of such admissions is proper on summary judgment and may overcome evidence even when opposing party seeks to contradict prior admission; trial court, however, has discretion to disregard admissions. *Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 853, 871, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324* (summary judgment for defendants on complaint and its cross complaint affirmed)

When party in discovery has made admission that justifies summary judgment in opponent's favor, that party cannot attempt to defeat summary judgment motion by submitting declaration contradicting the admission; judicial admission not accorded as broad an application as admission made in course of discovery. *Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 961-962, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142*

Defendant permitted to rely on plaintiff's form interrogatory answers and admissions, which contained no evidence to support a theory of defendant's liability, as evidentiary basis for its separate statement supporting summary judgment motion, thus shifting burden to plaintiff to prove existence of triable issue of material fact. *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 576, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*

Admission of party as receiving unusual deference in summary judgment proceedings and as binding absent credible explanation of inconsistent position taken by party. *People ex rel. Dept. of Transportation v. Ad Way Signs, Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 187, 200, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 496* ; *FPI Development, Inc. v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 396, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508*

Summary judgment as not based on tacit admissions or ambiguous allegation in unverified complaint that are contradicted by other credible evidence, such as in deposition testimony. *Kirby v. Albert D. Seeno Construction Co. (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1066-1067, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 604*

Statement taken from allegations in party's pleading as constituting admission that may be considered on motion for summary judgment. *Aim Insurance Co. v. Culcasi (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 209, 213 n.1, 280 Cal. Rptr. 766*

Admissions against interest as having very high credibility value, especially when admission is obtained not in normal course of human activities and affairs but in context of an established pretrial procedure whose purpose is to elicit facts; thus, on motion for summary judgment, such admission as entitled to deference not normally accorded evidentiary allegations in affidavits. *Sandoval v. Mercury Ins. Group (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1, 10, 278 Cal. Rptr. 533*

In summary judgment motions, law allows reliance on adversaries' pleadings; defendant may rely on allegation of complaint in addition to his or her declarations, there being no need that defendant's declaration repeat matters already asserted in complaint; judicial admission in pleading, either by affirmative allegation or by failure to deny an allegation, is different from evidentiary admission; judicial admission is not merely evidence of fact, but is conclusive concession of truth of matter that has effect of removing it from issues. *Troche v. Daley (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 403, 409, 266 Cal. Rptr. 34*

Plaintiff who made admission in deposition that defeated cause of action, but who made contrary statement in subsequent answers to interrogatories, as not entitled to rely on contradictions in his own testimony to create triable issue of fact. *Rivera v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 294, 299-300, 266 Cal. Rptr. 11*

When defendant can establish his or her defense with plaintiff's admission sufficient to pass strict construction test imposed on party moving for summary judgment, credibility of admission as valued so highly that any contradicting affidavits may be disregarded as irrelevant, inadmissible, or evasive; no reason as existing to draw distinction between attempt to counter admission by affidavit and attempt to counter admission by changing content of answer given by party directly in deposition, especially when there is no assertion original answer was incorrectly transcribed or question was misleading or ambiguous; in both changed affidavit and changed deposition cases, credibility of parties as held up for examination by contradicting statements, first of which constitutes reliable admission against interest; trial court as permitted to accept first and reject latter of these contrary positions. *Wagner v. Glendale Adventist Medical Center (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1379, 1391, 265 Cal. Rptr. 412*

[c] Effect of Presumption Affecting Burden of Proof

Absent contradictory evidence by nonmoving party, *Evid. Code § 604* presumption establishing fact in favor of moving party as justifying summary judgment. *Security Pac. Nat. Bank v. Associated Motor Sales (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 171, 178-180*

[4] Collateral Estoppel

Summary judgment is appropriate remedy when doctrine of collateral estoppel refutes all triable issues of fact suggested by pleadings and supporting documents. *Kelly v. Vons Companies, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1329, 1335, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 763* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When plaintiff's declaration in support of plaintiff's claim contained statements regarding matters which had been adjudicated administratively against plaintiff collateral estoppel principles applied. *Guthrey v. State of California (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*

Summary judgment as appropriate remedy when principle of collateral estoppel refutes all triable issues of fact suggested by pleadings and supporting documents. *Lewis v. County of Sacramento (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 214, 217, 266 Cal. Rptr. 678*

[5] Constitutionality

Summary judgment procedure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* as not violating constitutional rights to trial by jury, to subpoena witnesses, and to cross examine witnesses. *Scott v. Farrar (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 462, 467, 188 Cal. Rptr. 823* ; Bank of America, etc. v. *Oil Well S. Co. (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 265, 268, 270, 55 P.2d 885*

[6] Conduct of Hearing

Where party opposing summary judgment attempted to argue, at hearing, that deposition testimony created a triable issue of fact, trial court did not abuse its discretion in failing to consider the testimony; deposition had taken place before opposition was due but opposing party failed to include testimony with opposition. *Wall Street Network, Ltd. v. New York Times Co. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1171, 1188-1189, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 6*

When trial court refused to allow counsel to present oral argument at hearing and court of appeal decided, on the merits of the parties arguments, that trial court correctly entered judgment, held that it would serve no useful purpose at that point for court of appeal to reverse on basis of such a claimed deficiency in trial court's handling of motion. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 244-245, 245 n.18, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

On summary judgment motion oral hearing required at which counsel has opportunity to persuade court and respond to inquires; judges have discretion regarding how hearing is to be conducted, but cannot do away with oral argument altogether; although litigants are not given right to present testimony at hearing, there are no restrictions against oral argument (*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306* (formerly Rule 323). *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 259-260, 263-265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781* ; *see Gwartz v. Superior Court (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 480, 482, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865* (following *Mediterranean Construction Co.*)

[7] Continuance

A continuance is not necessarily required simply because the opposing party claims that to file substantive opposition might violate his right against self incrimination; rather, the opposing party must show that his *fifth amendment* rights would in fact be violated and that he was unable to present any other substantive opposition to the motion. *Fisher v. Gibson (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 275, 283-284, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Trial court was not required to continue summary judgment motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* because plaintiff's continuance was not included in timely opposition to summary judgment motion and plaintiffs failed to establish that facts essential to justifying opposition might exist but could not be presented before hearing. *Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1083, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When moving party raises new arguments in its reply papers, opposing party entitled to move orally at hearing for postponement to give it sufficient time to respond; similarly, oral motion for continuance can be made at hearing to allow sufficient time to amend pleading when it becomes apparent at that time that defects in pleading can be remedied. *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 264, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781*

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c requirement that hearing be continued if necessary to obtain facts essential to opposition as not applicable when party presents opposition they consider complete, but in improper format; continuance as in court's discretion, which was not abused by denying motion made at hearing seven weeks after reply papers had objected to form of opposition, and effect of denial was not to terminate party's action on purely procedural grounds. *Lucas v. George T. R. Murai Farms, Inc. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1578, 1586-1587, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436*

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c as mandating continuance of summary judgment hearing on good faith showing by affidavit that continuance is needed to obtain facts essential to justify opposition to motion. *O'Laskey v. Sortino (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 241, 251, 273 Cal. Rptr. 674*

Plaintiff's request for continuance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* as properly denied for purpose of obtaining contract on which complaint was based, when plaintiff should have attached contract to complaint two years prior, and when plaintiff could easily have obtained contract within that two years' time. *Hartenstine v. Superior Court (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 206, 221, 241 Cal. Rptr. 756* ; *cf. Frazee v. Seely (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 627, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780* (request for continuance under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* timely filed, court noting that even if the plaintiff had two years from the time she filed her first amended complaint to the filing of defendant's motion for summary judgment, she was given less than one month to oppose the motion)

[8] Cross Complaints

Cross defendant seeking summary adjudication as required only to offer evidence to disprove allegations of cross complaint; cross complainant who wishes to offer a different factual assertion from that alleged in cross complaint as required to move to amend cross complaint prior to hearing on summary adjudication motion. *580 Folsom Associates v. Prometheus Development Co. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 272 Cal. Rptr. 227*

[9] Discovery Products and Matters Subject to Judicial Notice

Prior judgment subject to judicial notice as sufficient to support motion for summary judgment on ground of collateral estoppel or res judicata. *Comora v. Comprehensive Care Corp. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 369, 373, 189 Cal. Rptr. 538* ; *Columbus Line, Inc. v. Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated, Inc. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630-631, 174 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Reliance on answers to interrogatories and on regulations subject to judicial notice as proper on motion for summary judgment. *Stevens v. Cessna Aircraft Co. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 431, 434, 170 Cal. Rptr. 925*

[10] Duty of Court

Trial court is not required to accept parties' characterization as to what matters constitute issues of fact or law in summary judgment proceeding. *GoodGovernment Group of Seal Beach, Inc. v. Superior Court (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 672, 679 n.3, 150 Cal. Rptr. 258, 586 P.2d 572*

Matter to be determined by trial court in considering motion for summary judgment is whether parties have presented any facts that give rise to triable issue of fact; trial court is not authorized to determine that fact issue itself. *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Service Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 851-852, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *Stationers Corp. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 412, 417, 42 Cal. Rptr. 449, 398 P.2d 785* ; *Crocker Nat. Bank v. Emerald (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 852, 858, 270 Cal. Rptr. 699*

Trial court's primary duty in deciding motion for summary judgment is to determine whether triable issue of fact exists; fact issue finding rather than fact issue determination is pivot on which summary judgment law turns. *Walsh v. Walsh (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 439, 441-442, 116 P.2d 62* ; *Torres v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 325, 329, 257 Cal. Rptr. 211* ; *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 805, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347* ; *Bartlett v. State of California (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 392, 397, 245 Cal. Rptr. 32*

In declaratory relief action to obtain judicial interpretation of rights under insurance policy, trial court must decide if triable issue of fact exists; if none does and sole remaining issue is one of law, it is trial court's duty to determine issue of law. *Northland Ins. Co. v. Briones (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 796, 800, 802, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Trial court must decide if triable issue of fact exists; if none does, and sole remaining issue is one of law, it is duty of trial court to determine issue of law. *Aloha Pacific, Inc. v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 297, 307, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 148* (judgment for defendant entered pursuant to stipulation following denial of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment affirmed)

Court's sole function on motion for summary judgment is to determine from submitted evidence whether there is triable issue as to any material fact. *Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 653, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Defendant's summary judgment motion asks court to determine, based on papers submitted by parties, whether there remains triable issue of material fact or whether undisputed facts warrant judgment as matter of law, either because at least one element of each alleged cause of action cannot be established or because complete defense exists. *Nicole M. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1242, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Trial judge determines whether triable issues exist by examining affidavits and evidence, including any reasonable inferences that may be drawn from facts. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 672 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Court's sole function on motion for summary judgment is to determine from submitted evidence whether there is triable issue of any material fact. *Kelly v. First Astri Corp., (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 470, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Trial court's function in ruling on summary judgment motion is merely to determine whether issues of fact exist and not to decide merits of issues themselves. *Hayward Area Planning Assn. v. Alameda County Transportation Auth. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 95, 110, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 744* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

When there is no material issue of fact to be tried and sole question before court is one of law, it is duty of trial court to hear and determine issue of law. *Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294* (summary

judgments for defendants affirmed)

Whether triable issue of material fact exists does not turn on trial court's discretion; motion for summary judgment shall be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Court focuses on issue finding; it does not resolve fact issues; court seeks to find contradictions in evidence, or in inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, that raise triable issue of material fact. *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Trial court in ruling on motion for summary judgment is merely to determine whether evidence requiring fact-weighing procedures of trial exist, not to decide the merits of the issues themselves. *Kovatch v. California Casualty Management Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1266, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

Summary judgment is granted if all papers submitted show that there is no triable issue of any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; trial court's function in ruling on motion is merely to determine whether triable issues of fact exist, not to decide merits of issues themselves. *Furla v. Jon Douglas Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1076-1077, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911*

Referral to commissioner for report and recommendation on pending motion for summary judgment as inappropriate; commissioner's authority under *Code Civ. Proc. § 259* to take proof and report findings exceeds court's role in summary judgment, which is limited to determining whether factual issues exist. *International Jet Ski Boating Assn., Inc. v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 112, 116, 283 Cal. Rptr. 33*

When there is no factual dispute, function of appellate court in reviewing summary judgment as same as that of trial court: to determine whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Mounts v. Uyeda (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 111, 115, 277 Cal. Rptr. 730*

In ruling on motion for summary judgment, trial court, although it seeks to identify triable issues without engaging in any determinations of fact, as required to some extent to weigh evidence in determining whether factual issues asserted relate to material fact, and as required to determine what inferences are reasonably deducible from evidence. *Price v. Wells Fargo Bank (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 465, 474, 261 Cal. Rptr. 735*

[11] Evidence

[a] Affiant's Credibility

Expert's affidavit directly conflicting with expert's prior report did not constitute substantial evidence of the existence of a triable issue of fact. *Alvis v. County of Ventura (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 536, 549, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494*

A party may not submit a declaration that contradicts a previous statement made under oath in order to create a triable issue of material fact. *Tesco Controls, Inc. v. Monterey Mechanical Co. (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 780, 798 n.6, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 751*

Trial court may not weigh evidence in manner of factfinder to determine whose version is more likely true; nor may trial court grant summary judgment based on court's evaluation of credibility. *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Court as generally unable to resolve questions about declarant's credibility in summary judgment proceeding, unless admissions against interest have been made that justify disregard of any dissimulation. *Magnolia Square Homeowners Assn. v. Safeco Ins. Co. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1056, 271 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Declarant's statement, credibility of which is destroyed by prior admission or other conclusive evidence, as not effective to raise triable issue of fact. *Hoover Community Hotel Development Corp. v. Thomson (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1130, 1137, 213 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Summary judgment as proper, despite question as to credibility of declarant, because denial of motion on such ground was within trial court's discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)* and opposing party failed to show abuse of discretion. *Allen v. McMillion (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 211, 215-216, 147 Cal. Rptr. 77*

[b] Admissible Evidence Required

A declaration that does not comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* is not admissible in support of or to oppose a summary judgment motion; the declaration must either state on its face that it was executed in California or state that it is declared under the laws of the state of California. *Kulshrestha v. First Union Commercial Corp. (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 601, 618, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 793, 93 P.3d 386* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Expert doctor's opinion based solely on his review of medical records had no evidentiary value where records were not authenticated and placed before the court; as a result, defendant's summary judgment motion had no evidentiary basis and was reversed. *Garibay v. Hemmatt (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 735*

Transcripts do not qualify as declarations sufficient to defeat summary judgment because they contain no statement that the information contained therein is based upon personal knowledge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*]. That the transcripts show statements by the interviewees, responding affirmatively to the question whether their statements were true under penalty of perjury, does not convert the statements into admissible affidavits or declarations. Evidence containing hearsay is not admissible evidence and will not raise a triable issue defeating summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*; *Evid. Code § 1200*]. An investigator's declaration cannot convert inadmissible hearsay into admissible evidence. *Stockinger v. Feather River Community College (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1014, 1026-1027, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 385*

Cases dismissing expert declarations in connection with summary judgment motions do so on basis that declarations established that opinions were either speculative, lacked foundation, or were stated without sufficient certainty; not so in this case, however, because expert affidavit established matters relied upon in expressing opinion, opinion rested on matters of type reasonably relied upon, and it established bases for opinion. *Sanchez v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 703, 718, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 529*

Expert opinion is worth no more than reasons on which it rests; opinion unsupported by reasons or explanations does not establish absence of material fact issue for trial, as required for summary judgment. *Golden Eagle Refinery Co. v. Associated International Ins. Co (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1315, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing by declarations and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; moving party must demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material factual issue requiring trial; when moving defendant makes that showing, burden of proof shifts to plaintiff to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 408, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Moving party bears burden of establishing, by declarations and evidence, complete defense to plaintiff's action or absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; when moving party makes that showing, burden shifts to opposing party to show, by responsive separate statement and admissible evidence, that triable issues of fact exist. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1418, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Kelley v. Trunk (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 519, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 122 , which suggests that even on summary judgment, expert's declaration must set forth excruciating detail of factual basis for opinion stated therein, is unsupported; court declined to follow it. *Hanson v. Grode (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 601, 608 n.6, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Trial court committed error in admitting over objection expert's declaration in support of plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment that was conclusory in that it provided no factual data to support expert's opinion; under facts, error deemed harmless. *Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 449, 469-470, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 333* (summary judgment for plaintiffs affirmed except as to two orders that exceeded trial court's jurisdiction)

Party cannot avoid summary judgment based on mere speculation and conjecture, but must produce admissible evidence raising triable issue of material fact. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 672 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1524, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

Courts are highly critical and cautious when expert offers legal conclusions as to ultimate facts in guise of expert opinion; retired field training policeoffice's declaration to extent it drew legal conclusions rejected. *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Regarding motion for summary adjudication concerning taking claim, critical portions of declaration submitted on plaintiff's behalf constituted little more than unsupported conclusions and opinions and did not constitute competent factual proof required to raise issue material fact. *Toigo v. Town of Ross (1998) 70 Cal. App. 4th 309, 324, 329, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649* (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment must be decided on admissible evidence in form of affidavits, declarations, admissions, answers to interrogatories, depositions and matters of which judicial notice can be taken; supporting and opposing affidavits and declarations must show personal knowledge and competency; affidavits and declarations must recite evidentiary facts, not ultimate facts or legal conclusions. *Guthrey v. State of California (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1119-1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*

Declarations based on information and belief are insufficient to satisfy burden of either moving or opposing party on motion for summary judgment or adjudication. *Lopez v. University Partners (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1117, 1124, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*

Issue of fact cannot be created by speculation, imagination, conjecture, or guess work but can only be created by conflict of evidence. *Lee v. Crusader Ins. Co. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1750, 1756, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

Issue of fact cannot be created by speculation, conjecture, imagination or guess-work nor can it be raised by cryptic, broadly phrased, and conclusory assertions, or by mere possibilities, or by allegations in complaint; only conflict of evidence can create issue of fact; moreover when no affidavits or declarations are filed in opposition to motion for summary judgment court is entitled to accept as true facts alleged in movant's affidavits and declarations, provided they are within personal knowledge of affiant or declarant and are facts to which he or she could competently testify. *Lyons v. Security Pacific Nat. Bank (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1001, 1014, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*

Issue of fact as created only by conflict of evidence and as not created by speculation, conjecture, imagination, or guess work; further, issue of fact as not raised by cryptic, broadly phrased, and conclusory assertions, or mere possibilities; thus, although court, in determining motion for summary judgment, does not try case, court as bound to consider competency of evidence presented. *Sinai Memorial Chapel v. Dudler (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 190, 196-197, 282 Cal. Rptr. 263*

Opinions or conclusions in opposing party's declaration as not sufficient to create triable issue of fact so as to defeat motion for summary judgment; opposing party's burden as being to set forth evidentiary facts that disclose existence of triable factual issue. *Barisich v. Lewis (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 12, 22, 275 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Opposition to summary judgment as deemed insufficient when it is essentially conclusionary, argumentative, or based on conjecture and speculation. *Buehler v. Alpha Beta Co. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733, 274 Cal. Rptr. 14*

Although issues are framed by pleadings, motion as required to be decided on admissible evidence in form of affidavits, declarations, admissions, answers to interrogatories, depositions, and matters subject to judicial notice. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 805, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Factually disembodied and hypothetical legal proposition as inappropriate for summary judgment or summary adjudication. *Jones v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 794, 810, 244 Cal. Rptr. 37*

Even though not pleaded by plaintiff, evidence of fraud and undue influence could have been offered at trial to prove vitiation from affirmative defense of release; therefore, to prevail on those issues at summary judgment, plaintiff was required to present by declarations, or reference to other available probative evidence, sufficient factual recitations to make prima facie case on those issues. *Hoffman v. Sports Car Club of America (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 119, 126, 225 Cal. Rptr. 359*

[c] Inferences From Evidence

In legal malpractice action, defendant moving for summary judgment had to show that in underlying premises liability case, plaintiff could not have established the element of causation; court held that plaintiff did present sufficient evidence to create a triable issue of fact with respect to causation based on the fact that the inferences from the circumstantial evidence that were favorable to plaintiff were more reasonable than those against her. *Ambriz v. Kelegian (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1519, 1536, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 700* In antitrust context, inferences drawn from ambiguous evidence implying conduct that is as consistent with permissible competition as with illegal conspiracy does not, without more, meet opposing party's burden. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 852, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*

In determining whether papers show that no triable issue exists as to any material fact, court must consider all evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except that summary judgment shall not be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from evidence if contradicted by other inferences or evidence that raise triable issue as to any material fact. *Martinez v. Bank of America (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 883, 887, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In determining whether moving papers show there is no triable issue as to any material fact, court must consider all evidence set forth in papers and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Culligan v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 429, 433-434, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court considers all evidence set forth in supporting and opposition papers, except that to which objections

have been made and sustained by court, and all uncontradicted inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 234, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Facts alleged in evidence of party opposing summary judgment and reasonableinferences therefrom must be accepted as true; plaintiff opposing summary judgment is entitled to all favorable inferences that may reasonably be derived from plaintiff's expert declaration. *Hanson v. Grode (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 601, 603-604, 607, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Facts alleged in evidence of party opposing summary judgment and reasonable inferences therefrom must be accepted as true. *Kelsey v. Waste Management of Alameda County (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 590, 594, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Court must consider bare evidence and reasonable inferences deducible from evidence and determine whether evidence is sufficient to support potential judgment in favor of opposing party; court must therefore consider what inferences favoring opposing party factfinder could reasonably draw from evidence; while viewing evidence in this manner court must bear in mind that its primary function is to identity issues rather than to determine issues; only when inferences are indisputable may court decide issues as matter of law; if evidence is in conflict, factual issues must be resolved by trial. *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839-840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c) requires trial court to grant summary judgment if all papers and affidavits submitted, together with all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence and uncontradicted by other inferences or evidence, show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; in action for breach of implied-in-fact employment contract, plaintiff's allegations of unspecified representations or understandings about plaintiff's tenure were all conclusory, in that they purported to establish ultimate conclusion by inference without alleging the evidentiary facts necessary actually to demonstrate that conclusion; because conclusory assertions failed to provide factual evidence necessary to overcome presumption of at-will employment, they were insufficient as matter of law either to controvert that presumption, or to support cause of action for breach of implied-in-fact contract. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1374-1375, 1390, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

In determining whether papers show there is no triable issue as to any material fact court must consider all of evidence set forth in papers and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Aetna Health Plans of Cal., Inc. v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1186, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 672* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Submission of evidence that is equivocal, or from which conflicting inferences may be drawn is insufficient to meet movant's burden. *Anderson v. Metalclad Insulation Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 284, 297, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In determining whether moving papers show there is no triable issue of any material fact court must consider all the evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except summary judgment cannot be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, if contradicted by other inferences or evidence, which raise triable issue as to any material fact. *Bardin v. Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 494, 499, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Trial judge determines whether triable issues exist by examining affidavits and evidence, including any reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the facts. *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1524, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

On appeal from grant of summary judgment, appellate court states facts and draws inferences most favorable to party

against whom trial court grantedjudgment. *See Van Dyke v. S.K.I. Ltd. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1313 n.2, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 775* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Court focuses on issue finding; it does not resolve fact issues; court seeks to find contradictions in evidence, or in inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, that raise triable issue of material fact. *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Trial judge determines whether triable issues of fact exist by reviewing affidavits and evidence before him or her and reasonable inferences that may be drawn from those facts; facts alleged in evidence of party opposing summary judgment and reasonable inferences therefrom must be accepted as true. *Kovatch v. California Casualty Management Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1266, 1268, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217* (disapproved in *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 853 n.19, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* , to extent language suggests that the defendant is required to conclusively negate an element of plaintiff's cause of action to meet burden)

Court must consider presumptions and draw inferences from facts adduced where the inference is only reasonable one which may be drawn; court has no power in summary judgment proceeding, however, to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence. *Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 833, 841, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12*

Court must consider presumptions and draw inferences from facts adduced if inference is the only one that may be drawn; court, however, has no power in a summary proceeding to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence. *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1015, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551*

When opposition to motion for summary judgment is based on inferences, those inferences must be reasonably deducible from the evidence, and not derived from speculation, conjecture, imagination, or guesswork. *Waschek v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 640, 647, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* ; *O'Neil v. Dake (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1044, 215 Cal. Rptr. 732*

In determining whether papers show there is no triable issue as to a material fact, court must consider all evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence, except summary judgment cannot be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from the evidence, if contradicted by other inferences or evidence, which raise a triable issue as to any material fact. *Brundage v. Hahn (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 228, 234, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830*

Mere conclusions of law or fact are insufficient to satisfy evidentiary requirements forsummary judgment, and summary judgment based on inferences which are contradicted by other inferences as improper. *Bryant v. Bakshandeh (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1241, 1245, 277 Cal. Rptr. 379*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1856(d)* (parol evidence rule), court's determination whether writing is intended by parties as final expression of their agreement is not necessarily one of fact precluding grant of summary judgment; intent is not subjective mental state of contracting party and question of fact as presented only when there are conflicting inferences about actions of parties. *FPI Development, Inc. v. Nakashima (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 367, 391, 282 Cal. Rptr. 508*

In ruling on motion for summary judgment, trial court is to some extent required to weigh evidence in determining whether factual issues asserted relate to material fact, and as required to determine what inferences are reasonably deducible from evidence. *Woodland Hills Homeowners Organization v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 79, 88, 266 Cal. Rptr. 767*

In ruling on motion for summary judgment, trial court is not limited to a search for facts on particular issue, but may draw inferences regarding that issue from relevant facts set forth in affidavits; trial court is to consider all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, and lack of triable issue of fact may be established by inference if inference is only

reasonable one that can be drawn from evidence for and against motion. *Fidelity National Title Ins. Co. v. Miller (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1163, 1172, 264 Cal. Rptr. 17*

Trial court lacks power to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence in proceeding for summary judgment. *Saylin v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 256, 261, 224 Cal. Rptr. 493* ; *Hooks v. Southern Cal. Permanente Medical Group (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 435, 441-442, 165 Cal. Rptr. 741*

Summary judgment is proper when moving party has made prima facie showing of entitlement thereto, and only triable issues of fact raised by opposition to motion are based on inferences not reasonably deducible from evidence before court. *O'Neil v. Dake (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1044-1045, 215 Cal. Rptr. 732*

Summary judgment is improper when supporting inference contradicted by another inference raising triable issue of fact. *Hepp v. Lockheed-California Co. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 714, 717-718, 150 Cal. Rptr. 408*

[d] No Reliance on Party's Own Pleadings

Opposing party may not rely on mere allegations or denials of pleadings, but must set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 849, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*

Moving party cannot rely on unsupported allegations in his or her own pleadings to prove case, if evidence accompanying the summary judgment motion is otherwise deficient. *Lipson v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 362, 374, 182 Cal. Rptr. 629, 644 P.2d 822* ; *Joslin v. Marin Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 132, 147, 60 Cal. Rptr. 377, 429 P.2d 889*

Plaintiff cannot rely on allegations in verified complaint to controvert defendant's affidavits. *Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 169, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* , disapproved on other grounds in *Strong v. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013*

Parties cannot rely on own pleadings in lieu of or to cure deficient affidavits, but as able to rely on adverse party's pleaded allegations to establish facts not contained in their own affidavits. *Parker v. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 176, 181, 89 Cal. Rptr. 737, 474 P.2d 689* ; *Slobojanv. Western Travelers Life Ins. Co. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 432, 437, 74 Cal. Rptr. 895, 450 P.2d 271*

Plaintiff may not rely on mere allegations or denials of its pleadings to show triable issue of material facts exists. *Culligan v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 429, 434, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*) plaintiff may not rely on mere allegations or denials of its pleadings to show that a triable issue of material fact exists but, instead, must set forth specific facts showing that a triable issue of material fact exists as to cause of action or defense to it. *Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 393, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except for one cause of action against two defendants that was reversed); *City of Oceanside v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 269, 274, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621* (denial of defendants' motion for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Once moving defendant has met his or her burden of showing plaintiff's cause of action has no merit by showing one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established, plaintiff, to demonstrate triable issue of material fact as to existence of element or elements challenged by defendant may not rely on mere allegations of its pleadings and instead

must show by specific facts that requisite triable issue of material fact is present. *Carlton v. Quint (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 690, 698-699, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 844* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Plaintiff opposing summary judgment motion may not rely on his or her pleadings alone, but must file opposition to motion, with affidavits setting forth specific facts demonstrating that triable issue of material fact exists as to cause of action or defense. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

To defeat motion for summary judgment, plaintiff must show specific facts and cannot rely on allegations of the pleadings. *Horn v. Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 798, 805* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Plaintiff may not rely on mere allegations or denials of its pleadings to show triable issue of material fact exists, but must instead set forth specific facts showing that triable issue of material fact exists. *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 69, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Although party cannot rely on its pleadings on summary judgment, party seeking or opposing summary judgment can rely on admissions of material fact in opposing party's pleading. *24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1211, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533* (trial court directed to vacate order denyingsummary judgment and to grant summary judgment to all but one defendant)

Party cannot rely on allegations in his or her own pleadings, even if verified, to make or supplement required evidentiary showing within summary judgment context. *Cornelius v. Los Angeles County Etc. Authority (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1761, 1768, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*

Party opposing summary judgment as unable to rely on its pleadings but must make independent showing by proper declaration or by reference to deposition or other discovery product that there is sufficient proof of matters alleged to raise triable question of fact if moving party's evidence, standing alone, is sufficient to entitle party to judgment. *Buehler v. Alpha Beta Co. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733, 274 Cal. Rptr. 14*

[e] Objections to Evidence

A trial court presented with timely evidentiary objections in proper form must expressly rule on each individual objection or else objections are deemed waived and objected-to evidence is included in record. *Demps v. San Francisco Housing Authority (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 564, 578, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 204*

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(5) and *(d)* give the parties the right to waive evidentiary objections; therefore, the trial court erred in interposing and sustaining its own hearsay objection to the moving party's evidence and on appeal the court considered all of the evidence. *Andrews v. Mobile Aire Estates (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 578, 587 n.6, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*

A trial court must rule on properly made evidentiary objections regardless of whether the motion for summary judgment is granted or denied. *Vineyard Springs Estates, LLC v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 633, 642, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587* (order denying defendant's summary judgment motion vacated and trial court ordered to rule on evidentiary objections proffered by defendant and reconsider motion for summary judgment)

Summary judgment or adjudication evidentiary objections on which trial judge fails to rule are deemed waived on appeal; however, issues are preserved for review when it would be fruitless or idle act for attorney to object; when, after filing written evidentiary objections, counsel on two separate hearing dates requested judge to rule on them, it would

have been fruitless or idle act to have interposed third oral request for ruling, so written objections were preserved for appellate review. *City of Long Beach v. Farmers & Merchants Bank (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 780, 783-785, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 140* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Parties did not secure rulings to evidentiary objections raised in trial court, and as result, objections waived and appellate court treats all evidence as having been properly admitted. *PMC, Inc. v. Kadisha (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1368, 1378, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Litigants who raise evidentiary objections at hearing, as opposed to written objections in advance, must arrange for court reporter to attend hearing to record objections for record (Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 343, 345) (re-numbered Rules *3.1350, 3.1354*). *Mediterranean Construction Co. v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 263-264, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781*

Assuming that trial court, on defendant's motion for summary judgment, should have stricken supporting declaration of defendant's president based on lack of personal knowledge, court's grant of summary judgment was proper based on other relevant evidence, consisting of plaintiff's deposition and parties' written agreement, which was before court and showed plaintiffs had no cause of action. *Korens v. R. W. Zukin Corp. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1054, 1062, 261 Cal. Rptr. 137*

Plaintiff opposing motion for summary judgment waives any claim of error relating to trial court's failure to consider its written objections to admissibility of evidence submitted in support of motion, when plaintiff did not specifyany objection that should have been, but was not, sustained, to plaintiff's prejudice. *Hoover Community Hotel Development Corp. v. Thomson (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1130, 1133-1134, 213 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Party appealing from summary judgment was precluded from claiming that trial court erred in considering certain evidence submitted in support of motion when appellant raised no objection to that evidence in trial court and had himself relied on that evidence in opposing motion. *O'Connor v. Bloomer (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 385, 390 n.2, 172 Cal. Rptr. 128*

[f] Statements in Memorandum

It is not required that the memorandum of points and authorities cites to the evidence in the record; it is sufficient that the statement of undisputed facts cites to the record. *Basich v. Allstate Insurance Co. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1118, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153*

On hearing of motion for summary judgment, counsel's representations of fact in memorandum of points and authorities as not constituting evidence, even if opposing party makes no objection to them; party as having no obligation to object either in writing or orally until actual evidence is submitted, and failure to object as not converting statements into evidence. *Vaughn v. Dame Construction Co. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 144, 146-147 n.2, 272 Cal. Rptr. 261*

[g] Testimony From Other Cases

Although defendants interposed evidentiary objections to expert's declaration, record did not show trial court ever formally ruled on any objections; accordingly, all evidence submitted was available for trial court's consideration; nevertheless, presumed on appeal from summary judgment that judge has not relied on irrelevant or incompetent evidence; courts highly critical and must be cautious when expert offers legal conclusions as to ultimate facts in guise of expert opinion; to extent declaration drew legal conclusions, court rejected declaration. *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 864-865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Testimony from criminal trial (transcript testimony of individual and deposition transcript of investigator) may not be used to support motion for summary judgment when testimony subject *Evid. Code § 1292* objection; following *Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 694, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523* . *L&B Real Estate v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1346-1348, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 759* (writ proceeding seeking to set aside order denying defendants' summary judgment motion denied)

Summary judgment contemplates use of deposition transcripts, subject to admissibility objections made and sustained by the court; deposition excerpt from another case offered by plaintiff in opposition to summary judgment motion held inadmissible under *Evid. Code 1292(a)*, governing admissibility of testimony from another case; such deposition testimony can not be treated as a declaration to avoid requirement of Section 1292(a). *Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692-697, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523* (criticizing *Williams v. Saga Enterprises, Inc. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 142, 149, 274 Cal. Rptr. 901*)

Trial court, in ruling on defendant's motion for summary judgment in action based on automobile accident, did not err in considering partial reporter's transcript, presented by plaintiff, of testimony of witness in criminal prosecution of third party based on same accident. *Williams v. Saga Enterprises, Inc. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 142, 148-152, 274 Cal. Rptr. 901*

[h] Written Documents

Written documents incorporated by reference into affidavit or declaration as required to conform to rules of evidence, including those relating to authentication (*Evid. Code § 1400 et seq.*) and to best-evidence rule (*Evid. Code § 1500 et seq.*). *Dugar v. Happy Tiger Records, Inc. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 811, 815, 116 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Averments in affidavits or declaration that depend on written documents as incompetent evidence without attachment of original document, or certified or authenticated copy of original, unless good cause for nonproduction is shown. *Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Bank of America (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 719, 725, 28 Cal. Rptr. 401*

[i] Contradiction or Repudiation of Prior Statements

In action against county as result of massive landslide after heavy rains, alleging causes of action for a dangerous condition of public property, nuisance, and inverse condemnation, although trial court admitted plaintiff's expert's declaration into evidence over county's objection that opinions expressed in his declaration were without foundation and some of them contradicted his prior statements, trial court properly found declaration did not constitute substantial evidence so as to raise triable issue of fact, where declaration asserted that slide started at bottom of cliff when wall erected by county failed, which directly contradicted his prior statement in report to insurance company that failure started as landslide in upper reaches and then flowed at rapid rate down to developed area below, and earlier statement that slide started in upper reaches of cliff directly undercut premise on which his entire declaration was based without explanation, and where, although prior statement was not in form of testimony under oath, court could not accept as substantial evidence of triable issue of fact declaration that directly contradicted declarant's prior statement, when contradiction was unexplained. *Alvis v. County of Ventura (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 536, 548-549, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 494*

[12] Federal Rule Compared

1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* moved California summary judgment law closer to federal law, and California law nowconforms largely, but not completely, to federal counterpart; California has adopted

burden-shifting characteristics of federal law; however, unlike federal law, California moving defendant must present evidence, not merely point out, that plaintiff does not possess, and cannot reasonable obtain needed evidence; parties' burden of persuasion and/or production on summary judgment is dependent on burden of proof at trial. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 848-849, 851, 853-854, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493*

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c, unlike *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 56*, does not permit court to enter summary judgment on its own motion and requires moving party to support motion with evidence; former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c), (o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) implies need for concrete evidence from moving party and expressly requires moving party to supply more than bare assertions, whether alleged in pleading or by way of argument, that opposing party has no evidence to support particular claim; no California case has concluded that party moving for summary judgment can simply argue there is absence of facts to support opposing party's case. *Scheiding v. Dinwiddie Construction Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 64, 71-76, 80-81, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Recent statutory amendments adopted burden-shifting characteristics of federal law for California summary judgment motions. *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1284-1288, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* ; *but see Addy v. Bliss & Glennon (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 205, 214, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (court disagreed with and did not follow *Hunter v. Pacific Mechanical Corp.*)

Close examination of legislative history as suggesting intent was to apply the burden shifting characteristics of *Fed. R. Civ. Proc., Rule 56*, as interpreted in *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett (1986) 477 U.S. 317, 322-328, 106 S. Ct. 2548* , to California summary judgment motions. *Union Bank v. Superior Court (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590-591, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653* (declining to address other issues concerning how federal rule or *Celotex* analysis may apply to California summary judgments motions)

Standards for summary judgment as basically same under California and federal law; for purposes of summary judgment, California court as required to consider all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence submitted, strictly construe moving party's affidavits, and liberally construe counteraffidavits; similarly, federal court as reading record in light most favorable to nonmoving party. *Buenavista v. City and County of San Francisco (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1168, 1172-1173 n.2, 255 Cal. Rptr. 329*

[12A] Issues Raised in Prior Motion for Summary Adjudication

Trial court properly exercised its discretion in determining that *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)* did not bar summary judgment because operative motion addressed issue not raised by prior motion, where in its order denying prior motion trial court expressly stated that motion's failure to address elements of fraud was basis for its denial and operative summary judgment motion addressed previously omitted issue, asserting that defendant was entitled to judgment because plaintiff committed fraud on application for health insurance and specifically identified elements of fraud established by undisputed evidence. Even assuming operative summary judgment motion did not assert a new issue, trial court had inherent authority to reconsider sua sponte its prior order denying defendant's second motion for summary judgment, and record supported conclusion that trial court effectively sua sponte reconsidered its prior order denying defendant's second motion for summary judgment, where at time it denied second summary judgment motion, trial court had already determined that it would reconsider its order if defendant could demonstrate that there was no triable issue of fact as to each element of fraud, and where that reconsideration may have been prompted by motion filed in violation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)* did not alter trial court's inherent authority to reconsider its prior order denying summary judgment. *Nieto v. Blue Shield of California Life & Health Ins. (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 60, 71-75, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906*

[13] Local Court Rules

Order issued by San Francisco Superior Court providing for expedited summary judgment for asbestos cases was invalid due to conflict with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*; court's order permitted summary judgment on 60 days' notice when statute mandates 75 days' notice; order also impermissibly shifted the burden of producing evidence to the nonmoving party. *Boyle v. CertainTeed Corp. (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 645, 653-655, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 501*

Local rules are valid only if not inconsistent with higher authority such as statutes, state rules of court, or case law; local rule that authorized court to grant summary judgment based solely on absence of opposition, without a preliminary finding that moving party has met its initial burden of proof conflicted with statutory and case law construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* and was invalid as applied to motions for summary judgment. *Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1084-1087, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Local rule or policy in conflict with statewide statute, rule of law, or Judicial Counsel rule is invalid; Orange County Superior Court Department 17's policy of forcing party wishing to make summary judgment motion to consult first with trial judge and other party and agree on procedure different from that provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* improperly interfered with party's right to move for summary judgment or summary adjudication of issue at any time pursuant to established procedures, and thus policy is invalid. *Lokeijak v. City of Irvine (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 341, 344, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 429*

Because summary judgment is drastic remedy important that all procedural requirements be satisfied before trial court grants it; thus, local rules may not provide shortcut for these requirements; local court rule not consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* is invalid and judgment resulting from invocation of its procedures reversed. *Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681*

[14] Materiality of Disputed Facts

To be material for purposes of summary judgment proceeding, fact must relate to some claim or defense in issue under pleadings and must also be essential to judgment in some way. Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 *(1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 653, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

For practical proposes, issue of material fact is one which, in context of circumstances of case, warrants time and cost of factfinding by trial. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Plaintiff cannot defeat summary judgment motion by producing evidence to support claims outside issues framed by pleadings. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 674 n.6, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Party cannot successfully resist summary judgment on theory which is not pleaded in complaint. *Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 629, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In conducting appellate review, complaint measures materiality of facts tendered in defendant's challenge to plaintiff's cause of action. *Marshak v. Ballesteros (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1517, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

It is complaint that measures scope of issues material to summary judgment proceeding. *Williams v. California Physicians' Service (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 722, 728, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Fact to be material must relate to a claim or defense that is in issue and must also be necessary to judgment somehow. *Kelly v. First Astri Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 470, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (summary judgment for defendants

affirmed)

For practical purposes, issue of material fact is one which in context and circumstances of case warrants time and cost of factfinding by trial; in other words, not every issue of fact is worth submission to jury; purpose of summary judgment is to separate cases in which there are material issues of fact meriting trial from those in which there are no such issues. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Material facts are those that relate to issues in case as framed by pleadings. *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1187, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Complete failure of proof concerning an essential element of nonmoving party's case necessarily renders all other facts immaterial. *Montgomery v. Cal. Accountants Mutual Ins. Co. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

What issues are material is determined mainly by the pleadings, rules of pleading, and substantive law relating to particular kind of case. *Waschek v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 640, 644, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (remanded to trial court for order granting summary judgment to defendant)

To prevent summary judgment, disputed facts must be material, that is, to relate to claim or defense in issue that could make a difference in outcome. *Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1274, 280 Cal. Rptr. 831*

Defendant's motion for summary judgment addresses legal question whether there are undisputed material facts that foreclose plaintiff's right to relief; materiality is measured by law applicable to legal theories put in issue by complaint. *Anderson v. Heart Federal Sav. & Loan Assn. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 202, 210, 256 Cal. Rptr. 180*

Summary judgment is proper when opposing party shows existence of conflict only as to facts not material to moving party's showing. *LaRosa v. Superior Court (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 741, 745, 176 Cal. Rptr. 224*

Mere presence of inadmissible evidence concerning immaterial fact in declaration supporting motion for summary judgment is not valid ground to deny motion otherwise well taken. *Overland Plumbing, Inc. v. Transamerica Ins. Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 476, 481, 174 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[15] Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings

Defendants' summary judgment motion used to test whether complaint stated cause of action treated as motion for judgment on the pleadings when time for demurrer had passed. *American Airlines, Inc. v. County of San Mateo (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 1110, 1117-1118, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251, 912 P.2d 1198*

When motion for summary judgment challenges sufficiency of pleadings rather than evidence supporting allegations, it is tantamount to motion for judgment on pleadings and may be treated as such by trial court; practical effect is that in granting judgment on pleadings, trial court may give plaintiff opportunity to amend complaint even when no motion to amend has been filed. *Taylor v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 472, 479, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 873* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed in part and reversed in part)

Court may treat hearing on motion for summary judgment as motion for judgment on the pleadings when complaint on its face shows defect and may grant opposing party leave to file amended complaint correcting defect. *Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 625, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment that argues pleadings do not support claim is evaluated as motion for judgment on the pleadings, and tests whether complaint is sufficient to state cause of action. *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1532, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

Motion for summary judgment as treated as motion for judgment on the pleadings when defendant fails to establish facts supporting grant of summary judgment as uncontroverted; defendant's motion as necessarily testing sufficiency of complaint. *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1291-1292, 286 Cal. Rptr. 855*

[16] Motion for New Trial

Motion for new trial is available in cases in which no issue of fact actually tried. *Carney v. Simmonds (1957) 49 Cal. 2d 84, 88-91, 315 P.2d 305*

There is authority for proposition that motion for new trial will lie following a grant of summary judgment. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 245, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466*

[17] Nature of Summary Judgment

Summary judgment is drastic measure that deprives losing party trial on merits; it should therefore be used with caution, so that it does not become a substitute fortrial. *Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Cortez v. Vogt (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 917, 925-926, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *see Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *cf. Alszeh v. Home Box Office (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1460, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* (summary judgment favored remedy in defamation and invasion of privacy cases)

Because summary judgment denies adverse party trial, it should be granted with caution. *Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 409, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Summary judgment is drastic procedure and should be used with caution. *Jang v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1295, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment process should be used with caution because it is drastic measure depriving losing party of trial on merits. *Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1333 n.2, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except as to improperly awarded attorney fees)

Because summary judgment denies adverse party a trial, it should be granted with caution. *Oliver v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1403, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 641* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Although summary judgment is drastic procedure, should be used with caution, and should be granted only if there is no issue of triable fact, justice requires that a defendant be as much entitled to be rid of unmeritorious lawsuit as plaintiff is entitled to maintain good one. *Leon v. Family Fitness Center (#107), Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1227, 1232* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed); *Aronson v. Kinsella (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 254, 269-270, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Appalachian Ins. Co. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11, 262 Cal. Rptr. 716* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed; denial of summary judgment for defendants on specified grounds also affirmed)

Summary judgment is drastic procedure and should be used with caution. *Murillo v. Rite Stuff Foods, Inc. (1998) 65*

Cal. App. 4th 833, 840, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12 (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1015, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment motion is directed to issues framed by pleadings; moving party must establish he or she is entitled to entry of judgment as matter of law. *Harper v. Wausau Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1084, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 64* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Summary judgment as determination that there is no factual dispute and that one party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; such judgment as being as final and conclusive a determination of merits of lawsuit as a judgment after trial and hence as res judicata once final. *Stuart v. Lilves (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1215, 1219, 258 Cal. Rptr. 780* (reversing denial of motion to vacate foreign judgment based on prior summary judgment in California court on same issue)

Despite enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)* imposing affirmative duty on trial court to grant motion for summary judgment under certain circumstances, Supreme Court as continuing to admonish that summary judgment is "drastic" remedy "to be used with caution." *Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Great American Surplus Lines Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 791, 795, 245 Cal. Rptr. 44* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

[18] Purpose of Summary Judgment

Purpose of summary judgment is to provide courts with mechanism to cut through parties' pleadings in order to determine whether, despite their allegations, trial is in fact necessary to resolve their dispute. *Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 843, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493* (order granting new trial, which effectively operated as denial of defendants' motion for summary judgment reversed and court ordered to enter summary judgment in defendants' favor)

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f) (summary adjudication) was enacted to stop piecemeal adjudication of facts that did not completely dispose of substantive area. *Catalano v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 91, 97, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842* (partial granting of summary adjudication for cross-defendants overturned by writ of mandate)

Summary judgment motions are to expedite litigation and eliminate needless trials. *Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1142, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Purpose of summary judgment motion is to discover whether parties possess evidence requiring fact-weighing procedures of a trial. *City of Oceanside v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 269, 273, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621* (denial of defendants' motion for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Summary judgment process undertakes to expedite litigation and eliminate needless trials. *Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1333 n.2, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except as to improperly awarded attorney fees)

Summary judgment process undertakes to expedite litigation and eliminate needless trials; process, however, should be used with caution because it is drastic measure depriving losing party of trial on merits. *Pardee Construction Co. v. Insurance Co. of the West (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1349 n.3, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* (judgment for three defendants whose motions for judgment on pleadings were granted after summary adjudication in their favor reversed as to two of them with directions that trial court grant plaintiff's motions for summary adjudication; judgment for remaining defendant affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment is to separate those cases in which there are material issues of fact meriting trial from

those in which there are no such issues. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment is to penetrate through pleadings to ascertain, by means of affidavits, presence or absence of triable issues of material fact. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 672 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1524, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

Summary judgment motions are to expedite litigation and eliminate needless trials. *Berry v. Society of Saint Pius X (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 354, 365, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 574* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment is to separate cases in which there are material issues of fact meriting trial from those in which there are no such issues. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 162, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Policy behind summary judgment scheme is to promote and protect administration of justice, and expedite litigation by elimination of needless trials; summary judgment statute plainly contemplates circumstances in which one is defendant entitled to judgment even though others are not. *24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1208, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533* (writ proceeding; trial court directed to vacate order denying summary judgment in defendants' favor and to grant summary judgment to all but one defendant)

Summary judgment procedure aims to discover whether there is evidence requiring fact-weighing procedures of trial. *Kovatch v. California Casualty Management Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1266, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

Summary judgment motions are to expedite litigation and eliminate needless trials. *Locke v. Warner Bros., Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 354, 361, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 921* (summary judgment for defendant reversed in part and affirmed as to other causes)

Policy underlying motions for summary judgment and summary adjudication of issues is to promote and protect administration of justice and expedite litigation by elimination of needless trials. *Brundage v. Hahn (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 228, 234, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment is to permit party to show that material factual claims arising from pleadings are not in dispute and need not be tried; function of pleadings is to delimit scope of issues; function of affidavits and declarations is to disclose whether triable issue of fact exists within the issues as delimited by pleadings. *Fortier v. Los Rios Community College Dist. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 430, 433, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 812* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment procedure as being to penetrate evasive language and adept pleading and ascertain the existence or absence of triable issues of fact, not to determine merits of issues themselves. *Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Chern v. Bank of America (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 866, 873, 127 Cal. Rptr. 110, 544 P.2d 1310* (summary judgment affirmed as to one cause of action and reversed as to another); *St. Mary Medical Center v. Superior Court (1997) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1531, 1538, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* (writ of mandate ordering court to allow expert testimony limited to foundational issues in motion for summary judgment)

Purpose of motion for summary judgment as being to determine if there are any triable issues of material fact or whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Miller v. Bechtel Corp. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 868, 874, 191 Cal. Rptr. 619, 663 P.2d 177* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *see also Starkman v. Mann Theatres Corp. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1491, 1495, 278 Cal. Rptr. 543* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Petersen*

v. Securities Settlement Corp. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1451, 277 Cal. Rptr. 468 (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Violette v. Shoup (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 611, 619, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Aim of summary judgment procedure is to discover, through media of affidavits, whether parties possess evidence requiring weighing procedures of trial. *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Service Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 851, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Stationers Corp. v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 412, 417, 42 Cal. Rptr. 449, 398 P.2d 785* (summary judgment for defendants reversed); *Life v. County of Los Angeles (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 894, 898, 278 Cal. Rptr. 196* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 805, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347* (summary judgment for defendants reversed); *Oakland-Alameda County Coliseum, Inc. v. Oakland Raiders, Ltd. (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1055, 243 Cal. Rptr. 300* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Purpose of summary judgment as expediting litigation by avoiding needless trials. *Troche v. Daley (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 403, 407, 266 Cal. Rptr. 34* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Ferrell v. Southern Nevada Off-Road Enthusiasts, Ltd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 309, 313, 195 Cal. Rptr. 90* (summary judgment for defendants reversed); *see also Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1274, 280 Cal. Rptr. 831* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

[19] Questions of Law

Plaintiff's negligence claims involved initial issue of whether defendants owed plaintiff duty of care--question of law for court. *Paz v. State of California (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 550, 557, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703, 994 P.2d 975* (summary judgment for defendants upheld)

In action for negligence, while precise nature and extent of duty is question of law, it depends on nature and extent of act undertaken, a question of fact, so if record can support competing inferences or if facts are not yet sufficiently developed, ultimate finding on existence of duty cannot be made prior to hearing on merits and summary judgment is precluded; record in case would not support finding of duty. *Artiglio v. Corning Inc. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 604, 615, 617, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479, 957 P.2d 1313* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In a negligence action where an unlicensed roofer sued the homeowner who employed him, the only issue in defendant's summary judgment motion was whether a particular section of the Labor Code excluded plaintiff as an employee for purposes of worker's compensation law; because a different Labor Code section operated to allow the tort action, the evidentiary burden never shifted to plaintiff and the trial court erred in granting defendant's motion. *Mendoza v. Brodeur (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 72, 81, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 310* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In secondary assumption of risk case, comparing relative fault of plaintiff and defendants is question of fact that must be resolved by trier of fact and cannot be resolved by way of summary judgment motion. *Sanchez v. Hillerich & Bradsby Co. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 703, 715, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 529*

Generally, statute of limitations issues raise questions of fact that must be tried; however, when uncontradicted facts are susceptible of only one legitimate inference, summary judgment is proper. *Kline v. Turner (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1369, 1374, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Where trial court grants summary judgment solely on basis of its interpretation of statutory and case law, it is well settled that interpretation and application of statutory scheme to undisputed set of facts is question of law that is subject to de novo review on appeal; in such case, appellate court is not bound by trial court's interpretation of statutory scheme. *City of San Diego v. Dunkl (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 384, 395, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269* (summary judgment for plaintiffs

affirmed)

Summary judgment is properly granted if there is no triable issue of material fact and issues raised by pleadings may be decided as matter of law; challenge to subject matter jurisdiction of court may properly be brought on summary judgment; likewise, interpretation of statute, including its preemptive effect, is question of law that may be considered on summary judgment. *Garofalo v. Princess Cruises, Inc. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1068, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 754* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Construing and applying language of insurance policy presents pure issue of law. *Peerless Lighting Corp. v. American Motorists Ins. Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1005-1006, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed)

Concerning alleged misrepresentations and fraudulent concealment, question of materiality and justifiable reliance constitutes questions of fact that cannot be resolved by summary adjudication, unless undisputed facts leave no room for reasonable difference of opinion. *West Shield Investigations & Security Consultants v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 935, 957, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* (denial of defendants' motions for summary adjudication overturned by writ of mandate)

Court determines whether duty of care exists as matter of law. *Martinez v. Bank of America (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 883, 894, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Operative facts were undisputed and dispositive issue was purely legal issue involving statutory interpretation and application of statute to undisputed facts which appellate court reviews de novo. *Manibog v. MediaOne of Los Angeles, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1366, 1369, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Interpretation of insurance policy is question of law. *Northland Ins. Co. v. Briones (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 796, 802, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed); *Pardee Construction Co. v. Insurance Co. of the West (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1351, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* (judgment on pleadings for defendants granted after summary adjudication in their favor reversed as to two defendants with directions to grant plaintiff's motions for summary adjudication; judgment for remaining defendant affirmed); *Williams v. California Physicians' Service (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 722, 728, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed; citing *Waller v. Truck Ins. Exchange, Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 1, 18, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370, 900 P.2d 619*); *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 142, 156, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (denial of defendants' motions for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate); *Nissel v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1103, 1110, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Lebas Fashion Imports of USA, Inc. v. ITT Hartford Ins. Group (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 548, 555, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Whether legal duty is present in particular case is question of law for court; in general, issue of defendant's negligence presents question of fact for jury; defendant's negligence may be determined as matter of law if reasonable jurors following law could draw only one conclusion from evidence presented; in appropriate case, defendant's lack of negligence may be determined as matter of law. *Lindstrom v. Hertz Corp. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 644, 648, 652, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed)

While it is province of jury, as trier of fact, to determine whether unreasonable risk of harm was foreseeable under particular facts of given case, trial court must still decide as matter of law whether there was duty in first place, even if that determination includes consideration of foreseeability. *Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 402, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except for one cause of action against two defendants that was reversed)

In action for damages based on dangerous condition of public property, whether each element of design immunity

exists is question of law. *Alvarez v. State of California (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 720, 727-728, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment motion raises only questions of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers. *Hernandez v. California Hospital Medical Center (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 498, 502, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 97* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Barisich v. Lewis (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 12, 15, 275 Cal. Rptr. 331* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Whether duty of care exists is question of law for court. *Butcher v. Truck Ins. Exchange (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1451, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Issue of fact becomes one of law and loses its triable character if undisputed facts leave no room for reasonable difference of opinion. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1418, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 142, 156, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (denial of defendants' motions for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate); *Nissel v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1103, 1110, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1543, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Whether defense of res judicata applies under facts of case poses question of law which court considers de novo on appeal. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Mel Rapton, Inc. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 901, 907, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 151* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

With regard to *Evid. Code § 669(a)(3), (4)*, whether death or injury involved in action resulted from occurrence of nature statute was designed to prevent and whether plaintiff was one of class of persons for whose protection statute was adopted are questions of law. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 235, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Duty, being question of law, is particularly amenable to resolution by summary judgment. *Nicole M. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1243, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 922* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Quigley v. First Church of Christ Scientist (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1027, 1036, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Resolution of statute of limitations defense normally is factual question for trier of fact; summary judgment is proper, however, if court can draw only one legitimate inference from uncontradicted evidence regarding the limitation question. *FNB Mortgage Corp. v. Pacific General Group (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1126, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

If facts are undisputed and admit only one conclusion, summary judgment may be entered on issues that otherwise would be submitted to the jury; thus, issue of existence of implied-in-fact contract not to terminate except for good cause may appropriately be resolved as matter of law given undisputed facts of particular case. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1386-1387, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

As matter of constitutional law, media statements on matters of public interest, including statements of opinions which reasonably imply knowledge of facts, must be provable as false before there can be liability under state defamation law; whether statement contains provable false factual assertions is question of law for trial court to decide; it is essential element of defamation that publication be of false statement of fact rather than opinion; issue whether communication was statement of fact or opinion is question of law to be decided by court. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers,Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1382-1383, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

When facts are undisputed, issue is one of law and appellate court is free to draw its own conclusions of law from undisputed facts. *Ziman v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1382, 1387, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In negligence action, existence of duty of care owed by defendant to plaintiff is legal issue that is particularly amenable to resolution by summary judgment. *Vournas v. Fidelity Nat. Tit. Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 672 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Because determining whether primary assumption of risk doctrine applies resolves question of whether duty of care exists, it is legal question for court to decide. *Record v. Reason (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 472, 479, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547*

When facts are undisputed, determination whether activity is "hazardous recreational activity" under *Gov. Code § 831.7* is question of law for court. *Ochoa v. California State University (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1306-1307, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Question whether statement is reasonably susceptible to defamatory interpretation is question of law for trial court; only once court has determined statement is reasonably susceptible to defamatory interpretation does it become question for trier of fact whether or not it was so understood. *Smith v. Maldonado (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Question of existence of legal duty of care in given factual situation presents question of law to be determined by court alone. *Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294* (summary judgments for defendants affirmed)

Existence of duty is question of law; whether police owed duty to plaintiffs was question of law for trial court. *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 859, 865, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Whether or not to apply judicial estoppel is question of law for trial court that can be made in context of summary judgment motion when none of facts material to court's decision to apply judicial estoppel disputed. *Drain v. Betz Laboratories, Inc. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 950, 959 n.8, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Whether an enactment is intended to impose mandatory duty within meaning of *Gov. Code § 815.6* is question of law for court. *Becerra v. County of Santa Cruz (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1450, 1458, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Probable cause element of malicious prosecution action requires objective judicial determination of reasonableness of defendant's prior lawsuit and existence or absence of probable cause is question of law to be determined by court from facts; question for trial court is whether on basis of facts known to defendant prosecution of prior action was tenable. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 164, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment defendants favor affirmed)

Whether published material is reasonably susceptible of interpretation that implies a provable false assertion of fact, which is dispositive question in defamation action, is a question of law for court. *Alszeh v. Home Box Office (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1456, 1461, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16* (summary judgment for defendant favor affirmed)

In context of primary assumption of risk, determination of what constitutes inherent risk is legal question for court. *Van Dyke v. S.K.I. Ltd. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1315, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 775* (summary judgment for defendants

reversed)

Insurance policy interpretation is generally question of law; duty to defend is contractual in nature and determination of duty is matter of law appropriate for summary adjudication. *Fidelity & Deposit Co. v. Charter Oak Fire Ins. Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1080, 1086-1087, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 429* (summary judgment for defendant favor affirmed)

Application of manager's privilege is most amenable to resolution by summary judgment. *Halvorsen v. Aramark Uniform Services, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1383, 1392, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 383* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Formulation of standard of care is question of law for court; once court has formulated standard, its application to facts of case is task for trier of fact if reasonable minds might differ as to whether defendants' conduct conformed to standard; only if circumstances permit no reasonable doubt about whether attorney's conduct did or did not violate standard of care, may court as matter of law resolve question whether attorney breached duty to clients. *Crookall v. Davis, Punelli, Keathley & Willard (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1048, 1067, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

With regard to causes of action based on negligence or negligent misrepresentation, trial court erroneously resolved disputed issues instead of merely spotting them when it concluded that defendant had reasonable grounds to believe house was 5,500 square feet, defendant breached no duty to plaintiff in failing to discover house was not that size, and plaintiff did not justifiably rely on defendants' representations. *Furla v. Jon Douglas Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1077, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

With regard to negligence per se, whether injury resulted from occurrence of nature statute was designed to prevent and whether plaintiff was one of persons for whose protection statute was adopted are questions of law; whether party to action violated statute is generally question of fact; similarly, question whether violation proximately caused or contributed to plaintiff's injury usually matter for jury decision. *Reyes v. Kosha (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 451, 462-463, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457*

Interpretation of statutes and administrative regulations presents question of law which is subject to independent review on appeal. *Farm Sanctuary, Inc. v. Department of Food & Agriculture (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 495, 501, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 75* (denial of plaintiff's summary judgment motion, and based on parties' stipulation entry of judgment in defendant's favor, affirmed)

Ordinarily, determination whether employee acted within scope of employment presents question of fact; it becomes question of law, however, when facts are undisputed and no conflicting inferences are possible. *Depew v. Crocodile Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 480, 489, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Existence of dangerous condition usually is question of fact, but may be resolved as question of law if reasonable minds can come to but one conclusion. *City of South Lake Tahoe v. Superior Court (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 971, 979, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 146* (summary judgment for plaintiffs overturned by writ of mandate)

Existence and scope of duty is question of law for court. *Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 508, 518, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708* (summary adjudication for plaintiffs affirmed)

Interpretation and application of statutory scheme to undisputed set of facts is question of law that is subject to de novo review on appeal; accordingly, appellate court is not bound by trial court's interpretation. *Lenane v. Continental Maritime of San Diego, Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1079, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 121* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Generally, whether defendant was negligent constitutes fact for jury to decide; however, when reasonable jurors could draw only one conclusion from evidence presented, lack of negligence may be determined as matter of law, and summary judgment granted. *Federico v. Superior Court (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1207, 1214, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (denial of defendant's motion for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Question of whether agreement has been integrated, and thus whether parol evidence doctrine applies, is whether parties intended their writing to serve as exclusive embodiment of their agreement; question is one of law. *Wedeck v. Unocal Corp. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 848, 862-863, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Issue of fact becomes one of law and loses its triable character if the undisputed facts leave no room for a reasonable difference of opinion. *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1342, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Whether duty of care exists is question of law for courts; question of whether person reasonably relied on another's representations normally question of fact, although in some instances it can be decided as matter of law; when insured alleged agent mislead him regarding extent of coverage for losses of business personal property provided by insurance policy he purchased, genuine issues of triable fact existed whether agent made representations, and if so, whether they were sufficient to impose special duty on insurer. *Paper Savers, Inc. v. Nacsa (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1092, 1095, 1103, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547*

In first party claim alleging bad faith of insurer, reasonableness of insurer's claims handling conduct while ordinarily question of fact becomes question of law when evidence is undisputed and only one inference can be drawn from evidence. *Lee v. Crusader Ins. Co. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1750, 1757, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

While resolution of statute of limitation issue normally question of fact, when uncontradicted facts established through discovery are susceptible of only one legitimate inference, summary judgment proper. *Romano v. Rockwell Internat., Inc. (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 479, 487, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20, 926 P. 2d 1114*

It is pure question of law when only dispute is over legal effect and significance of undisputed facts. *Schaefer Dixon Associates v. Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 524, 531, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698*

On motion for summary judgment concerning libel action, issue whether communication was a statement of fact or opinion and whether plaintiff was a public figure were questions of law to be determined by court. *Copp v. Paxton (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 829, 837, 845, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 831*

When facts are undisputed, court can resolve question of law in accordance with general summary judgment principles; absent factual dispute as to meaning of policy language, the interpretation, construction and application of insurance contract is strictly issue of law. *Homestead Ins. Co. v. American Empire Surplus Lines Ins. Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1297, 1300-1301, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268*

Since interpretation of statutes is a matter of law, usual rules of summary judgment on appeal do not apply. *Massa v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1217, 1220, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164*

Because existence of primary assumption of risk is dependent on existence of legal duty, and because duty is issue of law to be decided by court, applicability of that defense is amenable to resolution by summary judgment. *Bushnell v. Japanese-American Religious & Cultural Center (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 525, 528, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 671*

Trial court's determination of whether ambiguity exists in contract is question of law subject to independent review on appeal; trial court's resolution of ambiguity is also question of law if no parol evidence admitted or if parol evidence not in conflict; if, however, parol evidence is in conflict, trial court's resolution of conflict is question of fact that must be

upheld if supported by substantial evidence; if parol evidence contradictory, factual question arises that should not be decided by summary judgment. *WYDA Associates v. Merner (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1702, 1710, 1713, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 323*

When material facts are not in dispute in summary judgment motion, but parties simply disputed legal significance of material facts, that is, whether defendant's conduct came within meaning of phrase "causes to be sold, any alcoholic beverage, to any obviously intoxicated minor" as used in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25602.1*, liability turned on question of statutory interpretation which was question of law to be decided in summary judgment motion. *Hernandez v. Modesto Portuguese Pentecost Assn. (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1274, 1279, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 229* ; *see Monastra v. Konica Business Machines, U.S.A., Inc. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1628, 1635, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d. 528* (when facts undisputed, whether, and how, bulk sales and fraudulent transfer statutes applies to facts is question of law which court reviews independently)

Motions for summary judgment raise only questions of law; construction of Unruh Civil Rights Act (*Civ. Code § 51*), that is, whether Mothers Against Drunk Driving is a business entity under the act, raised question of law for court to decide. *Harris v. Mothers Against Drunk Driving (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 16, 20, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833*

Trial court must decide if triable issue of fact exists; if none exists and sole remaining issue is one of law, it is trial court's duty to determine issue of law. *City of South El Monte v. Southern Cal. Joint Powers Ins. Authority (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1629, 1645, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 729*

When operative facts are undisputed, question of application of statute of limitations as matter of law, and summary judgment as proper if facts show that action is time barred as matter of law. *Love v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1136, 1142-1143, 271 Cal. Rptr. 246*

Whether duty exists is legal question. *City of El Segundo v. Bright (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1376, 269 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Since construction of statute and question of whether it applies present solely question of law, that question is appropriately determined on motion for summary judgment. *Neighbours v. Buzz Oates Enterprises (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 325, 329, 265 Cal. Rptr. 788*

[20] Review by Appeal

[a] Affirmance on Any Legal Basis

Trial court's stated reasons supporting its ruling do not bind appellate court as appellate court reviews ruling, not its rationale; consequently, if summary judgment was properly granted on any ground, appellate court must affirm regardless of whether trial court's reasoning correct. *Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 521, 528, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Because appellate review is de novo, if summary judgment was proper, even if granted for incorrect reasons, appellate court affirms. *Deschene v. Pinole Point Steel Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 33, 39, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 15* (summary judgment for defendant reversed as to two causes of action and otherwise affirmed)

Appellate court is not bound by trial court's stated reasons, if any, supporting its ruling; appellate court reviews ruling, not the rationale. *Hanson v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 215, 223, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Prilliman v. United Air Lines, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 935, 951, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed as to one plaintiff and reversed as to other)

Appellate court reviews trial court's ruling, not its rationale; accordingly, if trial court's decision is correct on any legal theory, judgment will be affirmed. *Marshak v. Ballesteros (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1517, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court may affirm grant of summary judgment on any ground properly raised below, whether or not addressed by trial court. *Ochoa v. California State University (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1300, 1304, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When there is sufficient legal ground to support granting of motion, order will be upheld regardless of grounds relied on by trial court *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 859, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Becerra v. County of Santa Cruz (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1450, 1457, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When there is no genuine issue of material fact, appellate court should affirm trial court's judgment if it is correct on any theory of law applicable to case. *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court may affirm summary judgment for reasons different from trial court's reasons. *Bunnell v. Department of Corrections (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1360, 1367, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58*

If summary judgment is proper on grounds other those articulated by trial court, appellate court must nevertheless affirm. *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1187-1188, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal, reviewing court examines facts and independently determines their effect as matter of law; although trial court may grant summary judgment on one basis, appellate court may affirm judgment under another; appellate court is not bound by trial court's stated reasons, if any, supporting its ruling; it reviews ruling, not rationale; only if defendant makes requisite showing does the appellate court need to examine plaintiff's opposing papers to determine if they demonstrate existence of triable issue of material fact. *Salazar v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1370, 1376, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522*

Summary judgment is affirmed on appeal if there was any legal basis on which trial court may have granted it, even if trial court used incorrect ground for its decision. *Hine v. Dittrich (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 59, 62, 278 Cal. Rptr. 330* ; *Perez v. 222 Sutter St. Partners (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 938, 943 n.4, 272 Cal. Rptr. 119* ; *Troche v. Daley (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 403, 407-408, 266 Cal. Rptr. 34* ; *Mosher v. Mayacamas Corp. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1, 4, 263 Cal. Rptr. 373*

Summary judgment based on erroneous determination that issue was moot as nonetheless upheld if correct on any theory of law applicable to case. *Farron v. City and County of San Francisco (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1074, 265 Cal. Rptr. 317*

[b] Arguments Not Raised in Trial Court

Appellate court will only consider those facts that were before the trial court when it ruled on the motion; this in turn means the facts contained in the parties separate statement. If the fact is not set forth in the separate statement, it does not exist. *Mills v. Forestex Co. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 625, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 273*

A judgment granting or denying summary judgment may be affirmed on any correct legal theory provided opposing

party had opportunity to address it below. *Vallely Investments, L.P. v. BancAmerica Commercial Corp. (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 816, 821, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 689* (reversing summary judgment for assignee of lease with directions that judgment for lessor be entered in action by lessor seeking declaratory judgment as to terms of lease)

Plaintiff sought recovery for injuries suffered while "off-roading;" defendant contended that plaintiff's action was barred by the doctrine of primary assumption of the risk, in that collisions were an inherent risk in the sport of "off-roading;" plaintiff's complaint pled only that defendant was negligent; it did not allege recklessness; on appeal, plaintiff argued that the evidence supported a claim of recklessness, which would avoid the defense of primary assumption of the risk; court of appeal held that the trial court was correct in deciding the case based on the pleadings, and held that the plaintiff should have sought leave to amend the complaint prior to the hearing on the summary judgment motion. *Distefano v. Forester (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1264-1265, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813*

If, in deciding appeal, court finds there is no issue of material fact, court affirms summary judgment if it is correct on any legal theory applicable to case, whether or not that theory was adopted by trial court, and whether it was raised by defendant in trial court or first addressed on appeal. *Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 409, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Appellate court declined to reach two arguments raised for first time by appellants because they were not raised until appellants filed their reply brief. *ML Direct, Inc. v. TIG Specialty Ins. Co. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 137, 146, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 846*

Issues raised for first time in reply brief will not be considered on appeal. *Renna v. County of Fresno (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1, 6 n.1, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 586* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court may affirm on any legally correct theory provided plaintiffs had adequate opportunity to address theory in lower court. *Kramer v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 332, 336, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant's objection to plaintiff's reliance on theory that was not raised in plaintiff's summary judgment papers was proper, and court had discretion to deem argument waived, but under circumstances choose to address issue, which had been raised in two principal authorities cited by defendant on appeal and issue had also been briefed in motion papers of another plaintiff, not party to appeal, which had given plaintiff opportunity to respond to it below. *Neverkovec v. Fredericks (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 337, 347 n.6, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

As general rule, party cannot raise new theory of liability on appeal; further, on appeal, plaintiff cannot properly raise new theory in reply brief. *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1489, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court may consider only those facts that were before trial court, and disregard any new factual allegations made for first time on appeal; potential theories that could theoretically create triable issues of material fact may not be raised or considered on appeal unless they were factually presented, fully developed and argued to trial court. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Although review of summary judgment is de novo, it is limited to issues that have been adequately raised and supported in plaintiffs' brief; issues not raised in appellant's brief are deemed waived or abandoned. *Reyes v. Kosha (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 451, 466 n.6, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 457*

Appellate court may consider matter involving issue of law on undisputed facts for first time on appeal notwithstanding party did not raise or argue issue in trial court; it makes no difference that issue was first raised on appeal by court rather than parties, so long as parties given reasonable opportunity to address it. *Tsemetzin v. Coast Federal Savings & Loan*

Assn. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341 n.6, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726 (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court declined to address plaintiff's contention concerning recognition of new cause of action raised for first time on appeal; complaint did not plead such theory of liability, and issue was not addressed during summary judgment proceedings; motion for summary judgment must be directed to issues raised by pleadings; papers filed in response to defendant's motion for summary judgment may not create issue outside pleadings and are not substitute for amendment of pleadings; defendant is not required to refute liability on some theoretical possibility not included in pleadings. *Sutherland v. Barclays American/Mortgage Corp. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 299, 317, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 614*

When trial court granted defendant's motion for summary judgment based on statute of limitations in case turning on when plaintiff became aware of construction defect involving drainage, plaintiff as unable to switch on appeal to rely on different defect; precluded by waiver, theory of trial, and failure to mention that different defect in separate statement of disputed fact. *North Coast Business Park v. Nielsen Construction Co. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 22, 28-32, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 104*

Because moving party's burden on motion for summary judgment is only to negate existence of triable issues of fact in fashion that entitles it to judgment on issues raised by pleadings, rule forbidding raising new issue for first time on appeal as taking on added significance in summary judgment proceedings; moving party as not required to refute liability on some theoretical possibility not included in pleadings; accordingly, it would be unfair to party who successfully moved for summary judgment to permit opposing party on appeal to raise new theory not included in pleadings. *Munro v. Regents of University of California (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 977, 989, 263 Cal. Rptr. 878*

[c] Denial if Triable Issue Exists

Task of reviewing court as being to determine, in light of general rules governing summary judgment procedure in trial court, whether evidence discloses triable issue. *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Service Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953*

In reviewing summary judgment, appellate court as determining whether facts shown by parties give rise to triable issue of fact; in making this determination, court as strictly construing moving party's papers, while liberally construing those of opposing party. *Jacobs v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 584, 589, 278 Cal. Rptr. 52* ; *see also Farley v. El Tejon Unified School Dist. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 371, 375, 274 Cal. Rptr. 780*

On appeal from summary judgment, reviewing court as required to liberally construe facts in light most favorable to party who opposed motion; in examining evidence, appellate court as not determining if evidence is strong or weak, but only if sufficient evidence has been presented to raise triable issues of fact. *Ralph Andrews Productions, Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 679, 682, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797*

Function of appellate court on review of summary judgment ruling as essentially same as that of trial court, whose function is merely to determine whether triable issues of fact exist, and not to decide merits of issues themselves. *Guardianship of Ethan S. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1403, 1415, 271 Cal. Rptr. 121*

Possible theories not fully developed or factually presented to trial court as not creating triable issue of fact on appeal from summary judgment. *City of Oceanside v. McKenna (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1432, 264 Cal. Rptr. 275*

[d] Order Denying Summary Judgment

Order denying summary judgment not appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1*; reviewable only by petition for extraordinary writ. *Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr.*

2d 681

Order denying motion for summary judgment as nonappealable. *Los Angeles Nat. Bank v. Bank of Canton (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1269 n.2, 280 Cal. Rptr. 831*

Rule as axiomatic that, to review order on motion for summary judgment, reviewing court must have copy of actual order and not proposed order; having copy as particularly important in connection with review of denial of motion, because trial court is required to state basis for denial and evidence that shows facts are controverted. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1455, 1464, 264 Cal. Rptr. 512*

[e] Order Granting Summary Judgment

While a trial court's failure to provide a sufficient statement of reasons is not automatic grounds for reversal, an appellate court may reverse a trial court's granting of summary adjudication where the court makes no oral of written statement for the reasons for its decision and the appellate court is prevented from undertaking a meaningful review of the issues. *Santa Barbara Pistachio Ranch v. Chowchilla Water District (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 439, 449, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856*

Order granting summary judgment is not appealable order or judgment; in interest of justice and to avoid delay, court construed plaintiff's appeal as having been taken from summary judgment rather than from order. *Zavala v. Arce (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 915, 924 n.7, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Order granting summary judgment is not itself appealable; appeal lies only from ensuing judgment of dismissal; thus, order granting *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* motion to vacate order granting summary judgment was reviewable on appeal from posttrial judgment. *Garcia v. Hejmadi (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 674, 680, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228* (reversing judgment on basis that order granting summary judgment was improperly vacated)

Order granting summary judgment is nonappealable; however, in interests of justice and to avoid delay, court treated order as summary judgment in favor of defendant. *United Fidelity Life Ins. Co. v. Emert (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 941, 944-947, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14*

On appeal from summary judgment when no formal judgment was entered but order granting motion for summary judgment was obviously intended as final disposition, and matter has been fully briefed on appeal, appellate court may, in interest of judicial economy, treat order as incorporating final judgment. *Amstone v. Peninsular Fire Ins. Co. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1019, 1022, n.2, 277 Cal. Rptr. 260*

Appeal from order granting motion for summary judgment, rather than from judgment itself, as improper. *Buehler v. Alpha Beta Co. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 729, 731 n.1, 274 Cal. Rptr. 14* ("generously" treating appeal from order as appeal from subsequently filed judgment)

Order granting motion for summary judgment as nonappealable, but when judgment has in fact been entered, appellate court as empowered to honor appeal as one taken from judgment itself. *Rivera v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 294, 297, 266 Cal. Rptr. 11*

Order granting or denying motion for summary judgment as not appealable; appeal as lying only from judgment entered following such order. *Rogness v. English Moss Joint Venturers (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 190, 192 n.2, 239 Cal. Rptr. 387*

Order granting summary judgment as not appealable when judgment never entered; however, plaintiff's appeal treated

as petition for writ of mandate because Code Civ. Proc. § 473c provides that decision is reviewable by mandate, issues were fully briefed and argued, and no protest to appeal was made by defendants. *Witchell v. De Korne (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 965, 969 n.1, 225 Cal. Rptr. 176*

Order granting motion for partial summary judgment as appealable when one of several parties seeks review of disposition that as to him or her leaves no issue to be determined. *Etienne v. DKM Enterprises, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 487, 489, 186 Cal. Rptr. 321*

[f] Standard of Review

On appeal after motion for summary judgment is granted, appellate court reviews record de novo, considering all evidence set forth in moving and opposing papers except that to which objections have been made and sustained; defendant adduced, in support of its motion for summary judgment, affirmative evidence which, unless materially contradicted or rebutted, would establish that each of plaintiff's causes of action lacked merit; burden then shifted to plaintiff to show existence of one or more triable issues of material fact and as to each cause of action plaintiff submitted or pointed to evidence which, in plaintiff's view, indicated such triable issues; thus, as to each count of plaintiff's complaint, issue on appellate review is simply whether, and to what extent, evidence submitted for and against motion for summary judgment discloses issues warranting a trial. *Guz v. Bechtel Nat., Inc. (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 317, 334, 335 n.7, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 8 P.3d 1089* (summary judgment for defendant proper except as to one claim; remanded to court of appeal)

Appellate court reviews moving papers independently to determine whether there is triable issue as to any material fact and whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Galanty v. Paul Revere Life Ins. Co. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 368, 374, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 67, 1 P.3d 658* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's decision de novo, considering all evidence parties offered in support or against motion, and uncontradicted inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except that to which court sustained objections. *Paz v. State of California (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 550, 557, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 703, 994 P.2d 975* (summary judgment for defendants upheld)

Rulings on summary judgments motions are examined de novo, including rulings granting such motions. *Peatros v. Bank of America (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 147, 176, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 659, 990 P.2d 539* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Rulings on summary judgments motions are examined de novo, including rulings granting such motions; thus, court of appeal did not err when it reviewed superior court's order granting defendant's summary judgment motion independently. *Norgart v. Upjohn Co. (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 383, 404, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 453, 981 P.2d 79* (summary judgment for defendant reversed on statute of limitation issue; remanded for proceedings consistent with Supreme Court's opinion)

On appeal appellate court conducts independent review of trial court's resolution of questions of law. *Green v. Ralee Engineering Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 66, 72, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16, 960 P.2d 1046* (summary judgment for defendant reversed; remanded for proceedings consistent with Supreme Court's decision)

Appellate court reviews trial court's decision de novo, considering all the evidence set forth in supporting and opposing papers, except that to which objections have been made and sustained, and all uncontradicted inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Artiglio v. Corning Inc. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 604, 612, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 479, 957 P.2d 1313* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal, reviewing court exercises independent judgment deciding whether moving party established undisputed facts that negate opposing party's claim or state complete defense. *Romano v. Rockwell Internat., Inc. (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 479, 487, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20, 926 P. 2d 1114* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Abuse of discretion standard is applicable in motions for summary judgment involving determination by trial court of equitable subrogation. *Dieden v. Schmidt (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 645, 654, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365*

Trial court ruling on motion for summary judgment is subject to de no review; appellate court review is limited to facts shown in affidavits supporting and opposing motion and uncontested factual affidavits set forth in pleadings; moving party's affidavits are strictly construed, and opponent's affidavits are liberally construed; due to drastic nature of summary judgment, any doubts about granting propriety of motion must be resolved in favor of party opposing motion; appellate court independently determines construction and effect of facts presented to trial court as matter of law. *Kolodge v. Boyd (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 349, 355-356, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 749* (reversing summary judgment for defendant)

On appeal, appellate court reviews trial court's decision to grant or deny summary judgment motion de novo, on basis of examination of evidence before trial court and by independent determination of its effect as matter of law; appellate court is not bound by trial court's stated reasons or rationale, but reviews summary judgment without deference to trial court'sdetermination of questions of law; appellate court must consider all evidence properly identified in papers submitted, except that to which objections have been made and sustained by court. *Jennifer M. v. Redwood Women's Health Center (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 81, 86-86, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed)

Trial court order granting summary judgment is subject to de novo review, and appellate court was not bound by trial court's ruling that statute of limitations was tolled in attorney malpractice action. *Carlson v. Blatt (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 646, 649, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed on grounds that action was barred by statute of limitations; trial court had granted summary judgment on alternate collateral estoppel grounds)

Rulings on motions for summary judgment are reviewed de novo. *Grover v. Bay View Bank (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 452, 455, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 677* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Trial court ruling on summary judgment is subject to de novo review, and appellate court must strictly construe moving papers and liberally construe materials offered in opposition; evidence in support of and in opposition to motion must be viewed in light most favorable to party against whom summary judgment was entered; due to drastic nature of procedure, all doubts about propriety of granting motion must be resolved in favor of its denial. *Asplund v. Selected Investments in Financial Equities, Inc. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 26, 36-37, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

As summary judgment motion raises only questions of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers, appellate court independently applies same three-step analysis required of trial court, thus appellate court: (1) identifies issues framed by pleadings; (2) determines whether moving party's showing established facts that negate opponent's claim and justifies judgment in moving party's favor; and (3) if it does, determines whether opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue. *Garofalo v. Princess Cruises, Inc. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1068, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 754* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment motion is appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c* and *904*; because summary judgment raises only questions of law, appellate court exercises de novo review to determine whether defendant has negated necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that there is no triable issue of material fact; in doing so, appellate court views evidence in light most favorable to opposing party and resolves any doubts as to granting motion in opposing party's favor. *Schooler v. State of California. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1004, 1008-1009, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 343* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal, reviewing court exercises its independent judgment; appellate court's function in summary proceeding is limited to issue finding, not issue determination. *City of Santa Cruz v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1175-1176, 1188, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 198* (summary judgment for defendants reversed as to some defendants and affirmed as to other defendants)

Appellate court reviews grant of summary judgment de novo by examining pleadings parties presented to trial court in support of, and in opposition to, motion; because there was no dispute as to relevant facts, appellate court exercises its independent judgment as to their legal effect; thus, appellate court's sole task in case before it was to construe and apply language of insurance policy, which presents pure question of law. *Peerless Lighting Corp. v. American Motorists Ins. Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1005, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed)

Because motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication involves only questions of law, standard of review is de novo; first, appellate court reviews motion to determine whether defendant has met its initial burden to establish that one or more causes of action in complaint has no merit, by showing that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established, or that there is complete defense to it; second, if defendant has met this initial burden, court examines whether plaintiff has shown, by setting forth specific facts, that triable issue of facts exists as to that cause of action or defense; in making its review, appellate court need not defer to trial court's decision; appellate court not bound by trial court's stated reasons, if any, supporting its reasons; court reviews ruling, not its rationale. *West Shield Investigations & Security Consultants v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 935, 946, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* (peremptory writ of mandate issued directing trial court to vacate order denying defendants' motions for summary adjudication and to issue new order granting summary adjudication as to various causes of action; in all other respects, petitions for relief denied)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court; appellate court must determine whether facts as shown by parties give rise to triable issue of material fact; in making this determination, moving party's affidavits are strictly construed while those of opposing party are liberally construed; court accepts as undisputed facts only those portions of moving party's evidence that are not contradicted by opposing party's evidence; in other words, facts alleged in evidence of party opposing summary judgment and reasonable inferences therefrom must be accepted as true. *ECC Construction, Inc. v. Ganson (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 572, 575, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

After examining documents supporting summary judgment motion in trial court, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law; as summary judgment motion raises only questions of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers, appellate court independently applies same three-step analysis as required of trial court; appellate court identifies issues framed by pleadings, determines whether moving party's showing establishes facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in moving party's favor, and, if it does, court finally determines whether opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue; declarations of moving party are strictly construed, those of opposing party are liberally construed, and doubts as to whether summary judgment should be granted must be resolved in opposing party's favor; court focuses on issue finding; it does not resolve issues of fact; court seeks to find contradictions in evidence or in inferences reasonable deducible from evidence, which raise triable issue of material fact; if, in deciding appeal, court finds there is no issue of material fact, court affirms summary judgment if it is correct on any legal theory applicable to case, whether ornot that theory was adopted by trial court, and whether it was raised by defendant in trial court or first addressed on appeal. *Assilzadeh v. California Federal Bank (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 399, 408-409, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Appellate court reviews motion for summary judgment de novo, applying same standard as trial court. *Manibog v. MediaOne of Los Angeles, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1366, 1369, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Trial Court's stated reasons for its ruling do not bind appellate court, appellate court reviews ruling, not its rationale; after examining facts before trial judge on summary judgment motion, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law; validity of summary judgment is to be determined solely by sufficiency of affidavits before court when motion was heard, and appellate court will consider only facts before trial court at time it ruled on motion. *Rubenstein v. Rubenstein (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1143, 1151 n.10, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court reviews record de novo. *Dimock v. Emerald Properties (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 868, 874, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 255* (summary judgments for defendants reversed)

On appeal from summary judgment, reviewing court is not bound by trial court's construction of contract when that construction was not based on credibility of conflicting extrinsic evidence as to which trial court was in better position to form a judgment; thus, when there is no extrinsic evidence, when the extrinsic evidence is not conflicting or when conflicting evidence is of a written nature only, reviewing court is not bound by rulings of trial court but rather must make its own independent interpretation of written contract; on appeal, appellate court must conduct de novo review to determine whether there are any triable factual issues; likewise, because interpretation of insurance policy is question of law, appellate court must make independent determination of language used in contract under consideration. *Northland Ins. Co. v. Briones (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 796, 802, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Trial court's ruling on motion for summary judgment is subject to de novo review. *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 732, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110* (summary judgment for defendants reversed); *Gulf Ins. Co. v. Berger, Kahn, Shafton, Moss, Figler, Simon & Gladstone (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 114, 125, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Standard of review of grant of summary adjudication of issues is same as that applied to summary judgments; because defendant obtained summary adjudication in its favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine if defendant conclusively negated a necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is there a material fact that requires process of trial. *Lindstrom v. Hertz Corp. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 644, 648, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed)

On review of summary judgment in defendant's favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine whether defendant has conclusively negated necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is there material issue that requires process of trial; because trial court's determination is one of law based on papers submitted, appellate court must make its own independent determination regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers; appellate court applies same three-step analysis required of trial court; court begins by identifying issues framed by pleadings, then determines whether moving party's showing has established facts that justify judgment in movant's favor; when motion prima facie justifies judgment, final step is to determine whether opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue; because appellate court reviews trial court's grant of summary judgment de novo, plaintiff's arguments citing *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* to fault trial court's decision for failing to distinguish it was ruling on an affirmative defense and not merits of first cause of action, and for failing to specify reasons for its ruling and refer to evidence showing no triable issue of fact exist, were of no moment. *Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. Counter of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 587-588, 594 n.7, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Summary judgment rulings are reviewed de novo including those granting motion; appellate court independently interprets written contract when no extrinsic evidence and related credibility questions were presented below; interpretation of written instrument is essentially judicial function to be exercised according to generally accepted canons of interpretation so that purposes of instrument may be given effect; possibility that conflicting inferences can be drawn from uncontroverted evidence does not relieve appellate court of its duty independently to interpret instrument.

Culligan v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 429, 434, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656 (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's ruling on defendant's motion for summary judgment under independent review standard; appellate court must independently determine construction and effect of facts presented to trial judge as matter of law. *Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 393, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except for one cause of action against two defendants that was reversed)

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*, motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; appellate court conducts de novo review to determine if there are any genuine issues of material fact; appellate court makes its own independent determination of construction and effect of papers submitted, and validity of ruling is reviewable irrespective of reasons stated; court strictly construes moving party's papers and liberally construes opposing party's papers; doubts as to propriety of summary judgment should be resolved against moving party. *City of Oceanside v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 269, 273, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621* (petition for peremptory writ of mandate seeking reversal of order denying defendants' motion for summary judgment granted)

Appellate court reviews de novo trial court's award of summary judgment; any doubts regarding propriety of awarding summary judgment are resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment. *Jang v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1295, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews de novo trial court's decision to grant summary judgment. *Alvarez v. State of California (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 720, 727, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Carlton v. Quint (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 690, 699, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 844* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Hanson v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 215, 223, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate review of summary judgment is limited to facts contained in documents presented to trial court; appellate court exercises independent judgment as to legal effect of undisputed facts disclosed by parties' papers. *Aloha Pacific, Inc. v. California Ins. Guarantee Assn. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 297, 307, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 148* (judgment for defendant entered pursuant to stipulation following denial of plaintiff's motion for summary judgment affirmed)

In reviewing order granting summary judgment, appellate court must assume role of trial court and redetermine merits of motion; while appellate court must review summary judgment motion by same standards as trial court, it must independently determine as matter of law construction and effect of facts presented. *ML Direct, Inc. v. TIG Specialty Ins. Co. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 137, 141, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 846* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews orders granting or denying summary judgment motion de novo; appellate court exercises independent assessment of trial court's ruling, applying same legal standard as trial court in determining whether there are any genuine issues of material fact or whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *American Golf Corp. v. Superior Court (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 30, 35, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 683* (denial of defendant's motion for summary judgment overturned on writ of mandate)

In determining whether defendant has satisfied his or her initial burden of proof under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*), appellate court decides de novo whether issue of material fact exists and whether moving party was entitled to summary judgment as matter of law; in other words, appellate court must assume role of trial court and reassess merits of motion; in doing so, appellate court will consider only facts properly before trial court at time it ruled on motion; court carries out its appellate function by applying same three-step analysis required of trial court; first, appellate court identities issues framed by pleadings; second, appellate court determines whether moving party's showing has satisfied his or her burden of proof and justifies judgment in movant's favor; when summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, third and final step is to determine whether opposition

demonstrates existence of triable issue of material fact. *Inter Mountain Mortgage, Inc. v. Sulimen (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1439, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

On review of motion for summary judgment in defendant's favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine if defendant has conclusively negated necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact that requires process of trial; evidence of moving party is strictly construed and that of opponent is liberally construed, and any doubts as to propriety of granting motion are resolved in favor of party opposing motion; mindful that summary judgment motion raises on questions of law, appellate court independently reviews parties supporting and opposing papers and applies same standard as trial court in determining whether triable issue of material fact exists. *Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1333 n.2, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except as to improperly awarded attorney fees)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court; court must determine whether facts shown by parties give rise to triable issue of material fact. *Wagner v. City of South Pasadena (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 943, 947, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal from summary judgment, appellate court conducts independent review, applying same three-step process as trial court; appellate court first looks to pleadings to identify elements of cause of action for which relief is sought; court then examines moving party's motion to see whether it shows that one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to that cause of action; if moving party has made requisite showing, burden shifts to party opposing motion to set forth specific facts to show that a triable issue of one or more material facts exists as to that cause of action or defense thereto; if opposing party fails to sustain this burden, summary judgment is proper. *Burroughs v. Precision Airmotive Corp. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 681, 688, 93 Cal. Rptr.2d 124* (judgment for defendant, entered after summary adjudication motion granted, affirmed)

On appeal from grant of summary judgment, appellate court reviews record de novo and independently determines if motion was properly granted; appellate court uses same standards and rules as trial court in deciding propriety of motion; three-step analysis is used in reviewing motion for summary judgment; first, appellate court must identity issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party has met its statutory burden of proof; third step is to determine if opposing party has demonstrated that triable issue of fact exists as to cause of action. *Renna v. County of Fresno (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1, 5, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 586* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

After examining documents supporting summary judgment motion in trial court, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1418, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

On review of summary judgment in favor of defendant, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine if defendant has conclusively negated a necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact that requires process of trial; appellate court independently reviews parties's supporting and opposing papers and applies same standard as does trial court to determine if a triable issue of material fact exists; first step in reviewing summary judgment in favor of defendant is to identify issues framed by pleadings since it is those allegations to which motion must respond by establishing complete defense or otherwise showing there is no factual basis for relief on any theory reasonably contemplatedby complaint. *Pardee Construction Co. v. Insurance Co. of the West (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1349 n.3, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* (judgment for three defendants whose motions for judgment on pleadings were granted after summary adjudication in their favor reversed as to two of them with directions that trial court grant plaintiff's motions for summary adjudication; judgment for remaining defendant affirmed)

In reviewing grant of summary judgment appellate review is de novo, and appellate court independently reviews record before trial court; in practical effect, appellate court assumes role of trial court and applies same rules and standards that

govern trial court's determination of motion for summary judgment; because granting of summary judgment motion involves pure questions of law, appellate court is required to reassess legal significance and effect of papers presented by parties in connection with motion; appellate court applies same three-step analysis required of trial court in ruling on motion for summary judgment; first, court identities issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party has met its statutory burden of proof; finally, if moving party has met its statutory burden of proof and summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, burden shifts to opposing party and court determines whether that party has met its burden under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*. Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 *(1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 653, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed); *Kelly v. First Astri Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 462, 470-471, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 810* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Granting of summary judgment motion by superior court is subject to independent review; appellate court considers all evidence set forth in supporting and opposition papers, except that to which objections have been made and sustained by court, and all uncontradicted inferences reasonable deducible from evidence; appellate court applies same three-step analysis required of trial court; first, court identifies issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party's showing has established facts that negate the opponent's claim and justify judgment in movant's favor; when a summary judgment motion prima facie justifies a judgment, third step is to determine whether the opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue. *Victor v. Hedges (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 229, 234, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 466* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Because trial court's determination is one of law based on papers submitted, appellate court must make its own independent determination regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers; appellate court applies same three-step analysis required of trial court; court begins by identifying issues framed by pleadings; court then determines if moving party's showing has established facts that justify judgment in movant's favor; when summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, final step is to determine if opposition demonstrates existence of a triable, material factual issue. *FNB Mortgage Corp. v. Pacific General Group (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1125-1126, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed); *Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 521, 528, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Trial court's determination of summary judgment motion is reviewed do novo; this review follows same analysis required of trial court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*. *Wolf v. Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1035, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court; appellate court must determine whether facts as shown by parties gives rise to triable issue of fact. *Hanson v. Grode (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 601, 603-604, 606-607, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

In reviewing propriety of a summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court. *Kelsey v. Waste Management of Alameda County (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 590, 594, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's decision de novo, independently examining both the evidence and its legal effect. *Brinton v. Bankers Pension Services, Inc. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 550, 555, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court independently reviews lower court's determinations that no triable issue of fact existed and that defendant was entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Kramer v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 332, 336, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Examining evidence in light of summary judgment standards is far different from applying substantial evidence test that often governs appeal; in context of judgment after trial evidence need only be sufficient to support judgment for

winning party, even though evidence might, in another reasonable mind, also have supported judgment for losing party; in context of summary judgment, by contrast, evidence must by incapable of supporting judgment for losing party in order to validate summary judgment; thus, even though it may appear that trial court took reasonable view of evidence, summary judgment cannot properly be affirmed unless contrary view would be unreasonable as matter of law in circumstances presented. *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838-840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

On appeal from order granting summary judgment, appellate court conducts de novo examination of record to determine whether moving party was entitled to summary judgment as matter of law or whether genuine issues of material fact remain; appellate court independently reviews party's papers supporting and opposing motion, using same method of analysis as trial court. *Campbell v. Derylo (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 823, 826, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 519* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

On appeal, appellate court exercises its independent judgment in determining whether there are no triable issues of material fact and moving party thus is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Bennett v. Shahhal (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 384, 388, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal, appellate court reviews trial court's decision to grant or deny summary judgment de novo, on basis of examination of evidence before trialcourt and appellate court's independent determination of its effect as matter of law; appellate court also independently reviews trial court's determinationof questions of law. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1376, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's ruling de novo, assuming role of trial court and redetermining merits of motion. *Neverkovec v. Fredericks (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 337, 344, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court to determine whether the facts as shown by parties give rise to triable issue of material fact. *DiLoreto v. Board of Education (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 267, 275, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 791* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

After examining facts before trial judge on a summary judgment motion, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law. *Myricks v. Lynwood Unified School Dist. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 231, 237, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

After examining facts before trial judge on summary judgment motion, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law; when facts are undisputed, issue is one of law and appellate court is free to draw its own conclusions of law from undisputed facts. *Ziman v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1382, 1387, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court, in reviewing trial court's grant of summary judgment motion, makes de novo determination of whether there is triable issue of fact and whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Westoil Terminals Co. v. Harbor Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 634, 638, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 636* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

On review of summary judgment in defendant's favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine whether there is material issue of fact that requires trial; court examines record and determines appeal according to rules of appellate review for grant of summary judgment; because determining whether primary assumption of risk doctrine applies resolves question of whether duty of care exists, it is legal question for court to decide; appellate court determines de novo scope of duty. *Record v. Reason (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 472, 479, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547*

In reviewing grant of summary judgment, appellate court determines de novo whether there is genuine issue of material fact and whether moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; trial court's determination is accorded no deference; in conducting review, complaint measures materiality of facts tendered in defendant's challenge to plaintiff's cause of action. *Marshak v. Ballesteros (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1517, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's ruling on motion for summary judgment de novo; appellate court reviews trial court's ruling and not its reasoning. *Mitroff v. United Services Automobile Assn. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1230, 1237, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 759* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court exercises independent judgment as to legal effect of undisputed facts disclosed by parties' papers; in so doing, appellate court applies same three-step analysis required by trial court; first appellate court identifies issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party has established facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in movant's favor; finally, if summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, court determines whether opposition demonstrates existence of a triable, material factual issue; appellate court reviews issues of law de novo. *Aetna Health Plans of Cal., Inc. v. Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School Dist. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1175, 1186-1187, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 672* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews trial judge's decision to grant summary judgment de novo; trial judge's stated reason for granting summary judgment is not binding on appellate court because appellate court reviews its ruling, not its rationale; moreover, appellate court reviews unambiguous terms of insurance agreement de novo. *Reliance Nat. Indemnity Co. v. General Star Indemnity Co. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1063, 1073-1075, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 627* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Appellate court examines facts presented on superior court's summary judgment/summary adjudication motion and independently determines their effect as matter of law; appellate court also conducts independent review of trial court's determination of questions of law; court not bound by trial court's stated reasons, if any supporting ruling; court reviews ruling, not its rationale. *Suidan v. County of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 916, 921, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 535* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court reviews de novo trial court's decision to grant summary judgment and is not bound by trial court's stated reasons or rationales; appellate court reviews determination of trial court, not its rationale. *Horn v. Cushman & Wakefield Western, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 798, 805, 807* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On appeal, court reviews trial court's decision to grant summary judgment de novo, on basis of court's independent examination of evidence and determination of its effect as matter of law; appellate court not bound by trial court's stated reasons or rationale, and reviews summary judgment without deference to its determinations of questions of law. *Smith v. Maldonado (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Appellate court reviews summary judgment de novo; appellate court reviews ruling, not rationale, and is not bound by trial court's reasons supporting ruling; review in appellate court, however, limited to issues raised on appeal. *City of Burbank v. Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 366, 373, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

On appeal of grant of summary adjudication, appellate court examines facts presented to trial court and determine their effect as matter of law; court independently assesses correctness of trial court's ruling, applying same legal standard as trial court; court construes moving party's affidavits strictly and opponent's affidavits liberally, and resolve any doubts as to propriety of granting motion in favor of opponent. *Barnes v. Black (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1473, 1477, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634* (summary adjudication for defendant reversed)

In determining propriety of summary judgment, appellate court is limited to facts shown by evidentiary materials submitted, as well as those admittedand uncontested in pleadings; appellate court exercises independent judgment in determining whether there are no triable issues of material fact and moving party thus entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Spray, Gould & Bowers v. Associated Internat. Ins. Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1266, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

When reviewing trial court's decision to grant summary judgment, appellate court must identify issues framed by pleadings and determine if moving party established facts that negate opposing party's facts and justify judgment in moving party's favor; when moving party's facts justify judgment, appellate court determine's if opposing party demonstrated existence of triable issue of material fact. *City of Morgan Hill. v. Brown (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1121, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 361* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Review of summary judgment involves pure matters of law which appellate court reviews independently; in conducting this de novo review, appellate court considers only facts properly before trial court at time it ruled on motion; because summary judgment motion raises only issues of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers, court of appeal independently applies same three-step analysis required by trial court; appellate court identifies issues framed by pleadings, determines whether moving party's showing established facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in moving party's favor, and if it does, appellate court finally determines whether opposition demonstrates existence of a triable, material factual issue; basic question raised on defense motion for summary judgment and on review of such judgment is same in privacy action against media defendants as in other cases; does motion record demonstrate existence of triable issue of facts, or was defense entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Wilkins v. National Broadcasting Co. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1074, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Since summary judgment motions raise only questions of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers, appellate court independently reviews them on appeal, applying same three-step analysis required by trial court; first, appellate court identifies issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party's showing has negated opponent's claim, justifying judgment in movant's favor; if so, third and final step is to determine whether opposition has demonstrated existence of triable, material factual issue. *Langer v. Redevelopment Agency (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 998, 1002, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *City of San Jose v. Department of Health Services (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 35, 40, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 609* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed); *Pepperell v. Scottsdale Ins. Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1045, 1054, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Waschek v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 640, 644, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296* (remanded to trial court for order granting summary judgment to defendant)

In reviewing grant of summary judgment, appellate court must make its own independent determination of construction and effect of papers submitted. *Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294* (summary judgments for defendants affirmed)

Because summary judgment motion raises only questions of law, appellate court reviews supporting and opposing papers independently to determine whether there is triable issue of fact as to any material fact; in so doing, appellate court applies same analysis required of trial court; first, appellate court identifies issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party's showing has established facts that negate opponents' claim and justify judgment in movant's favor; third and final step is to determine whether opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue; when there is sufficient legal ground to support granting motion, order will be upheld regardless of grounds relied on by trial court. *Benavidez v. San Jose Police Dept. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 853, 859, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 157* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed); *Becerra v. County of Santa Cruz (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1450, 1457, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court applies de novo standard of review to summary judgment by analyzing construction and effect of supporting papers in same manner as does trial court. *California Pacific Homes, Inc. v. Scottsdale Ins. Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 1191, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 328* (summary adjudication for plaintiff affirmed)

When construction of statute at issue on review of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews statute to determine validity of judgment. *Wilson, McCall & Daoro v. American Qualified Plans, Inc. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1035, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192* (summary judgment on defendants' cross complaints for cross-defendant affirmed; summary judgment on cross complainant's cross complaint for cross defendant reversed)

On appeal from judgment after order granting summary adjudication, appellate court independently reviews trial court's record to determine if triable issue of material fact exists; court accepts as fact only those portions of defendants's evidence that is not contradicted by plaintiff's evidence; thus, court deems facts alleged by plaintiff, the party opposing summary judgment, and reasonable inferences court can make from those facts to be true; court reviews those facts and independently determines their effect as matter of law; appellate court's task is to determine whether alleged facts provide any basis for liability on defendant's part, regardless of nature of cause of action; defendant entitled to summary adjudication if record establishes plaintiff's cause of action cannot succeed as matter of law.

Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1506-1508, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 368 (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

On appeal, appellate court independently assesses correctness of trial court's ruling; appellate court construes moving party's affidavits strictly, opponents affidavit's liberally, and resolve doubts about propriety of granting motion in favor of party opposing it. *Bardin v. Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 494, 500, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Motion for summary adjudication proceeds in all respects as motion for summary judgment; on appeal, appellate court review is de novo. *Toigo v. Town of Ross (1998) 70 Cal. App. 4th 309, 324, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649* (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

Trial court's summary judgment ruling is subject to independent review; only exception to independent review standard applies when appellate courtreviews trial court's exercise of discretion as allowed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e). Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In determining whether defendant satisfied burden of proof under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2)*), appellate court assumes role of trial court and reassesses merits of motion; in so doing, appellate court considers only facts properly before trial court at time it ruled on motion; appellate court independently reviews admissibility of testimony. *L&B Real Estate v. Superior Court (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1346, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 759* (writ proceeding seeking to set aside order denying defendants' summary judgment motion denied)

Appellate court independently reviews trial court's judgment when all relevant facts are undisputed. *Martell v. Antelope Valley Hospital Medical Center (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 978, 980-981, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record before trial court; appellate court must determine whether facts as shown by parties give rise to triable issue of material fact. *Cheyanna M. v. A.C. Nielsen Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 855, 861, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 335* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Depew v. Crocodile Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 480, 485, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 673* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

After examining documents supporting summary judgment motion in trial court, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law. *Old Republic Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 128, 141, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642* (denial of defendants' motions for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Whether papers raise triable issue of material fact reviewed de novo by appellate court, unbound by trial court's decision; trial court erroneously resolved issues instead of spotting them. *Furla v. Jon Douglas Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1076-1077, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court reviews trial court's decision to grant defendant summary judgment de novo; appellate court reviews the ruling, not rationale; appellate court applies same three-step analysis used by superior court; court identifies the issues framed by pleadings, determines whether moving party has negated opponent's claim, and determines whether opposition has demonstrated existence of triable, material factual issue. *Silva v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 256, 261, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 382* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

After examining documents supporting summary judgment motion in trial court, appellate court independently determines their effect as matter of law; as summary judgment motion raises only questions of law regarding construction and effect of supporting and opposing papers, appellate court independently applies the same three-step analysis required by trial court; court identifies issues framed by pleadings, determines whether moving party's showing establishes facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in moving party's favor, and, if it does, appellate court finally determines whether opposition demonstrated existence of triable, material factual issue. *Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1543, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

When trial court sustains hearsay objection to deposition transcript in connection with summary judgment motion, appellate court independently reviews deposition's admissibility and legal effect of facts properly presented. *Gatton v. A.P. Green Services, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 688, 692, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523*

When reviewing trial court's decision to grant summary judgment, appellate court must identify issues framed by pleadings, and determine whether moving party has established facts which negate opposing party's facts and justify judgment in moving party's favor; when moving party's facts prima facie justify judgment, appellate court determines whether opposing party has demonstrated the existence of triable issue of material fact. *Odello Brothers v. County of Monterey (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 778, 785, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 903* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed as to one cause of action and reversed as to another)

Because summary judgment involves pure matters of law, appellate court reviews summary judgment ruling de novo; if summary judgment is proper on grounds other those articulated by trial court, appellate court must affirm. *Barton v. Elexsys Internat., Inc. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1182, 1187-1188, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 212* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

On review of summary judgment in defendant's favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine whether defendant has conclusively negated necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact that requires process of trial; review begins with pleadings that define issues to be considered; as to each claim as framed by complaint, defendant must present facts to negate essential element or to establish defense; only then does burden shift to plaintiff to demonstrate existence of triable, material issue of fact; if burden has shifted, final step in appellate court's review is to determine if filings in opposition raise triable issue of material fact; if they do, motion must be denied and if they do not, motion must be granted. *Quintilliani v. Mannerino (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 54, 59-60, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed in part and affirmed as to other causes of action)

On review of summary judgment in defendant's favor, appellate court reviews record de novo to determine whether defendant has conclusively negated necessary element of plaintiff's case or demonstrated that under no hypothesis is

there material issue of fact that requires process of trial; although appellate court must strictly construe moving party's papers and liberally construe those of opposing party, latter bears burden of showing triable issues of fact exist; all doubts resolved in favor of party opposing judgment. *Leon v. Family Fitness Center (#107), Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1227, 1231-1232* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In evaluating propriety of grant of summary judgment, appellate court review is de novo and appellate court independently reviews record before trial court; in practical effect, appellate court assumes role of trial court and applies same rules and standards which govern trial court's determination of summary judgment motion; interpretation and application of statutoryscheme to undisputed set of facts is question of law which is subject to de novo review on appeal; accordingly, appellate court is not bound by trial court's interpretation. *Lenane v. Continental Maritime of San Diego, Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1079, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 121* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In determining propriety of summary judgment, reviewing court is limited to facts shown by evidentiary materials submitted, as well as those admitted and uncontested in the pleadings; reviewing court exercises its independent judgment in determining whether there are no triable issues of material fact and moving party thus is entitled to judgment as matter of law; reviewing court must uphold judgment if it is correct on any ground, regardless of reason trial court gave. *Montgomery v. Cal. Accountants Mutual Ins. Co. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 854, 858-859, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Appellate court is not bound by trial court's reasons for its judgment; appellate court is required to consider de novo all papers submitted as it reviews ruling. *Maxwell v. Fire Ins. Exchange (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1446, 1450, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 866* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

When reviewing motion for summary judgment on appeal, appellate court determines de novo whether issue of material fact exists and whether moving party was entitled to summary judgment as matter of law; in other words, appellate court must assume role of trial court and redetermine merits of motion; in so doing, court must strictly scrutinize moving party's papers; declarations of party opposing summary judgment, however, are liberally construed to determine existence of triable issues of fact; all doubt whether any material, triable issues of fact exist are resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment; appellate review is limited to determine if there is evidence requiring fact weighing procedures of trial; court does not decide merits of issues themselves; review is limited to facts contained in documents presented to trial court; court exercises independent judgment as to legal effect of undisputed facts disclosed by parties' papers; in so doing court applies same three-step analysis required in trial court; first, court identifies issues framed by pleadings; second, court determines whether moving party's showing establishes facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in moving party's favor; finally, if motion prima facia justifies judgment, court determines whether opposition demonstrates existence of triable, material factual issue. *Pensinger v. Bowsmith, Inc. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 709, 717-718, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 531* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed in part and reversed as to other causes)

Typically, plaintiff's theory of liability determines analysis to be applied on summary judgment motion. *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 180, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In reviewing propriety of summary judgment, appellate court independently reviews record that was before trial court; court must determine if facts as shown by parties give rise to triable issue of material fact. *Jackson v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 171, 178-179, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 96* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Mercury Casualty Co. v. Hertz Corp. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 414, 418-419, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 9* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *A-H Plating, Inc. v. American National Fire Ins. Co. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 427, 434-435, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 113* (summary judgment for defendants reversed); *Derderian v. Dietrick (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 892, 897, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 800* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

In determining propriety of summary judgment, reviewing court is limited to facts shown by evidentiary materials submitted, as well as those admitted and uncontested in pleadings; trial court must consider all evidence set forth in parties' papers, and summary judgment granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue of material fact in action, thereby entitling moving party to judgment as matter of law; appellate court exercises independent judgment in determining whether there are no triable issues of material fact and moving party thus is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1016, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Review of grant of summary judgment is de novo and appellate court independently reviews record before the trial court; because granting of summary judgment motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* involves pure question of law, appellate court is required to reassess legal significance and effect of papers parties presented in connection with motion; court applies same three-step analysis required by trial court in ruling on motion for summary judgment; first, court identifies issues framed by pleadings because court's sole function on motion for summary judgment is to determine from submitted evidence whether there is a triable issue as to any material fact; fact to be material must relate to a claim or defense that is in issue; second, court determines whether moving party met its statutory burden of proof (1) under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) if plaintiff or cross complainant is the moving party, in which case he or she must produce admissible evidence of each element of the cause of action entitling the party to judgment on that cause of action, or (2) under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(o)(2)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)*) if defendant or cross-defendant is the moving party, in which case he or she must produce admissible evidence showing that one or more elements of the cause of action, even if not separately pleaded, cannot be established, or that there is a complete defense to that cause of action; finally, if moving party has met its statutory burden of proof and summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, appellate court determines whether opposing party has met its burden of demonstrating existence of triable issue of one or more material facts as to that cause of action or defense thereto; in making this determination, appellate court strictly construes evidence of moving party and liberally construes that of opponent, and any doubts as to propriety of granting motion should be resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Zavala v. Arce (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 915, 925-926, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 571* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

In reviewing order granting summary judgment, reviewing court must assume role of trial court and redetermine merits of motion; although appellate court must review summary judgment motion by same standard as trial court, it must independently determine as matter of law construction and effect of facts presented. *Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed); *Podolsky v. First Healthcare Corp. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 632, 642, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89* (summary judgment for defendant reversed); *Sellery v. Cressey (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 538, 543, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706*

Trial court's grant of summary judgment is reviewed de novo for error; although trial court is required to specify reasons for its ruling, appellate court will treat trial court's failure to specify reasons for its ruling as harmless error because appellate court reviews trial court's ruling, not its rationale. *Conley v. Matthes (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1453, 1459-1460, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed and remanded to enter judgment in defendant's favor)

Appellate court reviews trial judge's decision to grant summary judgment de novo; trial judge's stated reason for granting summary judgment not binding on appellate court because appellate court reviews its ruling, not its rationale. *Harper v. Wausau Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1085, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 64* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Appellate court makes its own independent determination of the construction and effect of papers submitted; court guided by traditional rules of summary judgment which direct that court construe evidence of moving party strictly and that of opposing party liberally. *Kurinij v. Hanna & Morton (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 853, 863-864, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324*

Review of order granting summary adjudication is limited to facts contained in documents presented to trial court; reviewing court accepts as true facts alleged in affidavits against whom summary adjudication was ordered and exercises independent judgment as to legal effect of undisputed facts disclosed by parties' papers. *Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 337, 344-345, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*

In appellate court, first step is an analysis of pleadings, i.e., complaint and answer, including affirmative defenses it may contain; next step calls for evaluation of defendant's effort to meet burden of showing that plaintiff's cause of action has no merit or that there is complete defense to it; this showing can rely on filings by plaintiff in opposition; once prima facie showing is made and hence burden has been met, it shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact exists within framework fixed by pleadings; once burden has shifted, it must next be determined if filings in opposition succeeded in raising a triable issue of material fact; if they did, motion must be denied; if they did not, motion must be granted; appellate court's review precisely mirrors what occurs in trial court, i.e., court makes a de novo evaluation which, after it be shown that there are no disputed issues of material facts, requires legal determination of moving party's entitlement to judgment. *Allyson v. Department of Transportation (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1316-1318, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490*

On appeal from trial court's grant of defendant's motion for summary judgment, appellate court reviews trial court's decision de novo, applying rule that defendant is entitled to summary judgment if record establishes as matter of law that none of plaintiff's asserted causes of action can prevail; first step of review begins with appellate court's analysis of pleadings; court next evaluates defendant's effort to meet its burden of showing that plaintiff's cause of action has no merit or that there is a complete defense to it; once defendant has met that burden, burden shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact exist as to its complaint; if filings in opposition raise triable issues of fact motion must be denied; if they do not, motion must be granted. *Miscione v. Barton Development Co. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1324-1325, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 280*

Appellate review of motion for summary adjudication is de novo and appellate court reviews only ruling, not its rationale; on appeal from motion for summary judgment, appellate court conducts its own independent review of the moving and opposition papers and applies same standard as trial court in determining whether motion was properly granted. *Bed, Bath & Beyond of La Jolla, Inc. v. La Jolla Village Square Venture Partners (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 867, 873, 881, 884, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830*

Standard of review has been variously recited in literally hundreds of cases before 1992 and 1993 amendments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*; these amendments did not change certain aspects of standard of review; review is same as that prescribed by trial court, i.e., appellate court determines de novo whether moving party was entitled to summary judgment as matter of law; first step in review begins with analysis of pleadings, next step calls for evaluation of moving defendant's effort to meet its burden of showing that plaintiff's cause of action has no merit, or that there is complete defense to it; once defendant has met that burden, it shifts to plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact exists as to its cause of action or defense to it; final step if burden has shifted is to determine if filings in opposition raise triable issue of material fact; if they do, motion must be denied and if they do not, motion must be granted. *Arciniega v Bank of San Bernardino (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 213, 224, 225, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 495* (criticized on another point in *Rice v. Crow (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 725, 726, 737-741, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 110*)

When construction of statute at issue, appellate court independently reviews statute to determine validity of judgment. *County of Alameda v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1691, 1698, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 187*

When trial court concluded that because defendant was fugitive from justice it had been impossible for the People to conduct discovery and under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* denied defendant's motion for summary judgment without prejudice allowing defendant to renew his motion after discovery took place, appellate court must evaluate validity of order denying summary judgment on basis of record as it existed at time trial court considered motion. *People v.*

$4,503 United States Currency (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1743, 1746-1749, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467

In evaluating correctness of ruling under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*, appellate court must independently review record before trial court; because grant or denial of motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* involves pure questions of law, appellate court is required to reassess legal significance and effect of papers that parties submitted in connection with motion; appellate court applies same three-step analysis required by trial court; first, court determines issues framed by the pleadings; second, court determines if moving party's showing has established facts that negate opponent's claim and justify judgment in movant's favor; third, if summary judgment motion prima facie justifies judgment, court determines if opposition demonstratesexistence of triable material factual issue; court in practical effect assumes trial court's role and redetermines motion's merits; in doing that, court must rigidly scrutinize moving parties' papers. *Ranchwood Communities Limited Partnership v. Jim Beat Construction Co. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1408, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 386*

Parties arguments and evidence considered de novo on appeal; no deference given to trial court's ruling. *Estate of Brenzikofer (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1466-1468, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401* (summary judgment for respondent estate reversed in proceedings under *Prob. Code § 9860* seeking specific performance of agreement to convey property)

Although moving party has burden of proving its right to summary judgment in trial court, on appeal from summary judgment, appellant bears burden of showing error; absent such showing, appellate court presumes judgment is correct; moreover, under *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 13*, to obtain reversal, appellant must establish error resulted in miscarriage of justice. *Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 474, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678*

Appellate court will only reverse superior court judgment if it is based on erroneous conclusion of law; when facts do not conflict and issues involve proper application of statute or administrative regulation, reviewing court is not bound by trial court's determination. *Suzuki v. City of Los Angeles (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 263, 269, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880*

Appellate court in reviewing order granting summary judgment de novo gives no particular deference to trial court's ruling in order to independently determine if defendants are entitled to judgment as matter of law; standard of independent review applies despite shifting burdens of production of evidence that govern at trial; of course, once party bears initial burden of demonstrating entitlement to judgment as matter of law, opposing party cannot defeat summary judgment by attempting to raise factual dispute as to immaterial issues; summary judgment motion will not be defeated by factual dispute unless fact in dispute is material one. *Romero v. American President Lines, Ltd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1202-1203, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*

When continuance is not mandatory because conditions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)* not met, appellate court reviews trial court's denial of continuance under abuse of discretion standard. *Scott v. CIBA Vision Corp. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 307, 313-314, 326, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 902*

Motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication involves no form of discretion; if trial court errs in ruling on motion, error is one of law; to claim that court has abused its discretion under those circumstances is procedurally and legally incorrect. *Street v. Superior Court (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1397, 1402, 274 Cal. Rptr. 595*

To extent appellate court (1) reviews judgment granting summary adjudication of issues as a matter of law, review is de novo; and (2) reviews decision of trial court as to disputed question of fact, decision must be sustained on appeal if there is any substantive evidence to support decision. *Lough v. Coal Oil, Inc. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1525, 266 Cal. Rptr. 611*

[21] Review by Mandate

Before issuing peremptory writ in first instance after review of order denying summary judgment, petitioner or appellate court must notify party adversely affected that issuance of writ is being sought or considered, and appellate court, absent exceptional circumstances, is required to receive or solicit opposition to petition for writ. *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 180, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893* ; *Homestead Savings v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 494, 499, 224 Cal. Rptr. 554*

Order denying motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication may be reviewed by petition for writ of mandate; when trial court's erroneous denial of motion will result in trial on nonactionable claims, writ of mandate will issue. *West Shield Investigations & Security Consultants v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 935, 946, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* (denial of defendants' motions for summary judgment overturned by writ of mandate)

Order denying summary judgment is not appealable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1*; reviewable only by petition for extraordinary writ. *Sierra Craft, Inc. v. Magnum Enterprises, Inc. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1256, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681*

When trial court's denial of motion for summary judgment will result in trial of nonactionable claims, writ of mandate will issue; similarly, writ of mandate may issue to prevent trial of nonactionable claims after erroneous denial of motion for summary adjudication. *Travelers Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1450, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54*

Pretrial writ review of denial of defendant's motion for summary adjudication on various causes of action held appropriate, even though some causes will remain and trial will go forward even if writ granted by appellate court, when issues ruled on by trial court contain heart of plaintiffs' case and trial might well be simplified if it is found that trial court erred. *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679-1680, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*

Mandate is available to review denial of summary judgment recommended by commissioner to whom motion was referred; commissioner is authorized under *Code Civ. Proc. § 259* to take proof and report findings on matters of fact, but court's function on summary judgment motion is limited to determining whether triable issues exist, which is question of law; thus, referral of motion to commissioner for that purpose, absent stipulation of parties, is inappropriate. *International Jet Ski Boating Assn., Inc. v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 112, 116, 283 Cal. Rptr. 33*

When plaintiff does not file pleadings or exhibits in opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment, does not appear at hearing on motion, does not file preliminary opposition to petition for writ of mandate arising from denial of motion, and, when notified that appellate court was considering issuing peremptory writ in first instance, does not take advantage of court's invitation to file opposition, appellate court takes as undisputed facts set forth in defendant's summary judgment motion and supporting documents. *Gilmore v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 416, 418, 281 Cal. Rptr. 343*

When trial court grants summary adjudication, reviewing court views supporting affidavits narrowly and opposing affidavits broadly; doubts as to propriety of granting motion are resolved in favor of party opposing motion; toextent reviewing court reviews judgment granting summary adjudication as matter of law, review is de novo. *Monte Vista Development Corp. v. Superior Court (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1681, 1684-1685, 277 Cal. Rptr. 608*

Argument requiring resolution of factual issues must be raised in trial court first, but former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(l)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(1)*) does not require motion for reconsideration to be made before seeking mandate review, and making motion as not tolling time prescribed by former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(l)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(1)*) for seeking writ review. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 604, 610-611, 258 Cal. Rptr. 413* ; *Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 61, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827*

Service by court clerk of copy of order on motion for summary adjudication of issues constitutes written notice of entry

of order within meaning of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*(*l*) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(1)*) and commences period in which to petition for writ review under that statute; additional service of notice of entry of order by counsel is unnecessary in that case to start running of section 437c(*l*) limitation period. *Eldridge v. Superior Court (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1350, 1353, 1353 n.2, 256 Cal. Rptr. 724* (service of file-stamped copy of order); *Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 60, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827* (service of copy of minute order; both cases decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*)

Trial court's order extending time for petitioning for writ review that states that it appears to court that good cause exists to extend time for filing petition for peremptory writ to court of appeal, absent any contrary evidence, is sufficient against contention that order was invalid because petitioner failed to make showing of good cause on the record. *Schmidt v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 56, 62, 254 Cal. Rptr. 827*

Petition for writ of mandate to review order granting summary judgment not subject to time limitations of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*(*l*) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(1)*). *City of Fresno v. Superior Court (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1137, 1142, 202 Cal. Rptr. 313*

[22] Ruling on Motion

While resolution of statute of limitation issue normally question of fact, when uncontradicted facts established through discovery are susceptible of only one legitimate inference, summary judgment is proper. *Romano v. Rockwell Internat., Inc. (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 479, 487, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20, 926 P. 2d 1114*

In ruling on motion for summary judgment, any doubts as to propriety of granting motion are resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46* ; *Pender v. Radin (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1807, 1813, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36* ; *Violette v. Shoup (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 611, 619, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358* ; *Hohe v. San Diego Unified Sch. Dist. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1568, 274 Cal. Rptr. 647* ; *Ralph Andrews Productions, Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 682, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797*

Court did not improperly rule on defendant's second motion for summary judgment where court denied first motion for summary judgment on grounds that defendant had a duty to plaintiff; second motion was based on separate legal theory relating to assumption of risk to negate claim of duty; additionally, there was a change of law following the ruling on the first motion. *Patterson v. Sacramento City Unified School Dist. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 821, 827, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 337*

Wording of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)* imposes *mandatory* duty on trial court to grant motion for summary judgment if there is no triable issue of material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; although former statute gave trial court discretion to deny motion, this discretion is now abrogated. *Jennifer M. v. Redwood Women's Health Center (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 81, 86-86, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed)

Trial court may properly grant summary judgment when evidence in support of moving party establishes there is no issue of fact to be tried and that party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; if trial court determines there is no triable issue of fact, it determines legal issues in case. *Peerless Lighting Corp. v. American Motorists Ins. Co. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 995, 1005, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753* (summary judgment for plaintiff reversed)

Trial court must grant summary judgment motion if all papers submitted show no triable issue as to any material facts exist and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter law; in determining whether papers show that no triable issue exists as to any material fact, court must consider all evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except that summary judgment will not be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, if contradicted by

other inferences or evidence, that raise triable issue as to any material fact. *Martinez v. Bank of America (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 883, 887, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; defendant must show that under no possible hypothesis within reasonable purview of complaint's allegations is there material fact that requires examination by trial; if defendant makes such showing, court must look at plaintiff's papers to determine whether they demonstrate existence of triable, material factual issue. *Dimock v. Emerald Properties (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 868, 873-874, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 255* (summary judgments for defendants reversed)

Summary judgment motion must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; defendant is entitled to summary judgment if necessary element of plaintiff's case cannot be established or there is complete defense to cause of action. *Tahoe Vista Concerned Citizens v. Counter of Placer (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 577, 587, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 880* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; in determining whether moving papers show there is no triable issue as to any material fact court must consider all evidence set forth in papers and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Culligan v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 429, 433-434, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Defendant is not entitled to summary judgment unless that moving party negates all theories of liability pleaded by plaintiff. *Juarez v. Boy Scouts of America, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 377, 397, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 12* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except for one cause of action against two defendants that was reversed)

Summary judgment is proper only where there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; moving papers are strictly construed while opposing papers are liberally construed; any doubts regarding propriety of awarding summary judgment are resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment. *Jang v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1295, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment is properly granted when papers show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Alvarez v. State of California (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 720, 727, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Summary judgment is granted when all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *PMC, Inc. v. Kadisha (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1368, 1372, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663* (summary judgment for defendants reversed)

Summary judgment should be granted only when moving party entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Campbell v. Scripps Bank (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1333 n.2, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 635* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed except as to improperly awarded attorney fees)

Summary judgment may only be granted when no triable issue exists as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1417-1418, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

To prevail on summary judgment motion, defendant must show that one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or that there is complete defense to that cause of action; summary judgment should only be

granted when moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; moving party's evidence is strictly construed and opponent's evidence is liberally construed, and any doubts as to propriety of granting motion are to be resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Pardee Construction Co. v. Insurance Co. of the West (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1349 n.3, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443* (judgment for three defendants whose motions for judgment on pleadings were granted after summary adjudication in their favor reversed as to two of them with directions that trial court grant plaintiff's motions for summary adjudication; judgment for remaining defendant affirmed)

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*, motion for summary judgment shall be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving is entitled to judgment as matter of law; court strictly construes evidence of moving party and liberally construes that of opponents, and any doubts as to propriety of granting motion should be resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 653, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (summary judgment for plaintiff affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment properly granted if papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; defendant entitled to summary judgment if necessary element of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or if complete defense to cause of action exists. *FNB Mortgage Corp. v. Pacific General Group (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1125, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841* (summary judgment for cross-defendant affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment properly granted if papers show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; defendant is entitled to summary judgment if a necessary element of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established or if complete defense to the cause of action exists; summary judgment appropriate when discovery has produced admission or concession on part of party opposing summary judgment that demonstrates there is no factual issue to be tried. *Oliver v. AT&T Wireless Services (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 521, 528, 536, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Court must consider bare evidence and reasonable inferences deducible from evidence and determine whether evidence is sufficient to support potential judgment in favor of opposing party; court must consider what inferences favoring opposing party factfinder could reasonably draw from evidence; while viewing evidence in this manner court must bear in mind that its primary function is to identity issues rather than to determine issues; only when inferences are indisputable may court decide issues as matter of law; if evidence is in conflict, factual issue must be resolved by trial; trial court may not weigh evidence in manner of factfinder to determine whose version is more likely true; nor may trial court grant summary judgment based on court's evaluation of credibility; moreover, trial court may not grant summary judgment for defendant simply on its opinion that plaintiff's claims are "implausible," if reasonable factfinder could find for plaintiff on evidence presented *Binder v. Aetna Life Ins. Co. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 832, 839-840, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c) requires trial court to grant summary judgment if all papers and affidavits submitted, together with all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence and uncontradicted by other inferences or evidence, show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Eisenberg v. Alameda Newspapers, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1374-1375, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Summary judgment appropriate only when no material issue of fact exists or when record establishes as matter of law that cause of action asserted against party cannot prevail. *Myricks v. Lynwood Unified School Dist. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 231, 237, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Summary judgment is appropriate only when no material issue of fact exists or when record establishes as matter of law that cause of action asserted against party cannot prevail. *Ziman v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1382, 1387, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party entitled to judgment as matter of law; in determining whether moving papers show there is no triable issue of any material fact court must consider all evidence set forth in papers and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence. *Hobson v. Raychem Corp. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 614, 622, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Cause of action cannot be established if undisputed facts presented by defendant prove the contrary of plaintiff's allegations as matter of law. *Marshak v. Ballesteros (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1518, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* (summary judgment for defendant affirmed)

Trial court must grant summary judgment when all papers and affidavits submitted, together with all inferences reasonable from evidence that are not contradicted by other inferences or evidence, show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Smith v. Maldonado (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 397* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

If defendant's declarations in support of motion for summary judgment demonstrate absence of essential element of plaintiff's case, and plaintiff's declarations submitted in reply do not show triable issue of fact as to that element, no amount of factual conflicts on other aspects of case will affect result and motion for summary judgment should be granted. *See Armato v. Baden (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 885, 893, 84 Cal. Rptr 2d 294* (summary judgments for defendants favor affirmed)

Motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; in determining whether moving papers show there is no triable issue of any material fact court must consider all the evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except summary judgment cannot be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, if contradicted by other inferences or evidence, which raise triable issue as to any material fact. *Bardin v. Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Co. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 494, 499, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Whether triable issue of material fact exists does not turn on trial courts discretion; motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1490, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359* (summary judgment for defendant reversed)

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*, trial court required to grant summary judgment if all papers and affidavits submitted, together with all inferences reasonable deducible from evidence and uncontradicted by other inferences or evidence, show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that moving party entitled to judgment as matter of law. *Sangster v. Paetkau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 151, 163, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66* (summary judgment for defendants affirmed)

Trial judge determines whether triable issues exist by examining affidavits and evidence, including any reasonable inferences that may be drawn from facts; evidence of moving party is strictly construed and evidence of opposing party is liberally construed; doubts as to propriety of granting motion must be resolved in favor of party opposing motion. *Crouse v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1509, 1524, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 94* (summary judgments for defendants both affirmed and reversed)

Trial court in ruling on motion for summary judgment is merely to determine issues of fact exist, not to decide the merits of issues themselves; trial judge determines whether triable issues of fact exist by reviewing affidavits and evidence before him or her and reasonable inferences that may be drawn from those facts; facts alleged in evidence of party opposing summary judgment and reasonable inferences therefrom must be accepted as true. *Kovatch v.*

California Casualty Management Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1266, 1268, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217

Summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show that there is no triable issue of any material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law; trial court's function in ruling on motion for summary judgment is merely to determine existence of such issues of fact, not to decide the merits of the issues themselves. *Furla v. Jon Douglas Co. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1069, 1076-1077, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 911*

Motion for summary judgment must be granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue as to any material fact and moving party entitled to judgment as matter of law; moving party's affidavits are strictly construed, opponents affidavits are liberally construed, and doubts about propriety of granting motion are resolved in favor of party opposing it. *Crookall v. Davis, Punelli, Keathley & Willard (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1048, 1057, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250*

Defendant is entitled to summary judgment if record establishes as matter of law that none of plaintiff's asserted causes of action can prevail; to succeed, defendant must conclusively establish complete defense or negate necessary element of plaintiff's case and demonstrate that under no hypothesis is there material issue of fact that requires process of trial. *Molko v. Holy Spirit Assn. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1092, 1107, 252 Cal. Rptr. 122, 762 P.2d 46* ; *Johnson v. Stratlaw, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1160, 274 Cal. Rptr. 363* ; *McGough v. University of San Francisco (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1577, 1581, 263 Cal. Rptr. 404*

Granting motion for summary judgment is error if any triable issue of fact exists. *Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 56, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947*

Trial court must consider all evidence set forth in parties' papers, and summary judgment granted if all papers submitted show there is no triable issue of material fact in the action, thereby entitling moving party to judgment as matter of law. *Pieper v. Commercial Underwriters Ins., Co. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1008, 1016, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551*

Court has inherent power to grant summary judgment on ground not explicitly tendered by moving party when parties' separate statements of material facts and supporting evidence demonstrate absence of triable issue of fact, and opposing party has had chance to respond to legal ground and show there is triable issue of material fact. *216 Sutter Bay Associates v. County of Sutter (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 860, 875-881, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492*

In determining whether papers show there is no triable issue as to material fact, court must consider all evidence and all inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, except summary judgment may not be granted on inferences reasonably deducible from evidence, if contradicted by otherinferences or evidence, that raise triable issue as to any material fact. *Brundage v. Hahn (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 228, 234, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830*

All doubts as to whether there is any triable issue of fact are to be resolved in favor of party opposing summary judgment. *Zelda, Inc. v. Northland Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1252, 1259, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356*

Sole declaration of party opposing summary judgment motion which raises triable issue of fact is sufficient to deny motion; *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)* does not allow trial court to weigh credibility of declaration submitted by party opposing summary judgment motion and then grant motion, except where declaration is facially so incredible as matter of law that moving party otherwise would be entitled to summary judgment. *Estate of Housley (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 342, 359-360, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 628*

Although defendant initially complained that trial court order did not meet requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* in that it insufficiently specified what evidence was in conflict, reviewing court believed that absent demand for greater specificity in trial court, offer sufficed procedurally. *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1679, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*

Appellate court in reviewing summary judgment must consider only facts before court disregarding any new allegations on appeal; possible theories not fully developed or factually presented to trial court cannot create triable issue on appeal. *Uriarte v. United States Pipe & Foundry Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 780, 790, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 332*

If trial court determines that no triable issue of fact exists, but only one of law exists, it is trial court's duty to determine the issue of law. *Monteleone v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 509, 514*

Because summary judgment is drastic procedure and should be used with caution, moving party's papers strictly construed, while opposing party's papers liberally construed; court must consider presumptions and draw inferences from facts adduced when inference only reasonable one that may be drawn; court, however, has no power in summary proceeding to weigh one inference against another or against other evidence; moreover, assertion based solely on conjecture or speculation is insufficient to avoid summary judgment. *Sanchez v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1461, 1465-1466, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 415*

Court views evidence on sham guaranty defense in light most favorable to party opposing motion for summary adjudication; factual question whether person is true guarantor or principal obligor in guarantor's guise. *River Bank America v. Diller (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1400, 1420-1424, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Whenever court must rule on motion for summary judgment, factual issue guidelines for motion as precisely fixed by reference solely to pleadings. *Kishida v. State of California (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 329, 334, 280 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Denying or granting motion for summary judgment as not involving exercise of discretion; if pleadings and evidence before court demonstrate that there is no triable issue of fact, denial of motion as error in law. *Marriage & Family Center v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1647, 1649, 279 Cal. Rptr. 475*

Trial court's obligation in ruling on summary judgment motion as being to determine whether issues of fact exist, not to decide merits of issues; when making that determination, trial court as required to strictly construe affidavits of moving party, and liberally construe those of opponent. *Jackson v. Deft, Inc. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1305, 1313, 273 Cal. Rptr. 214* ; *see also Buehler v. Alpha Beta Co. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733, 274 Cal. Rptr. 14*

Issue that is abstractly one of fact as resolved by summary judgment if moving party's declarations fully establish claim or defense and opponent's declarations fail to rebut it; otherwise stated, issue of fact as becoming one of law and losing its triable character if undisputed facts leave no room for reasonable difference of opinion. *People v. Van Horn (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1378, 1397, 267 Cal. Rptr. 804*

Trial court as erring in granting summary judgment on ground some facts underlying allegations in complaint did not exist when complaint was filed if they did exist when motion was heard; defect in pleading as disregarded if it no longer exists when summary judgment motion is made. *Virgin v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1375-1376, 267 Cal. Rptr. 704*

In ruling on motion for summary judgment, trial court as not required to limit its decision to analysis of specific argument presented; if another valid and legal reason to support summary judgment motion exists, trial court as permitted to rely on it when it can do so without depriving responding party of fair hearing. *Barczewski v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 406, 413, 258 Cal. Rptr. 386*

[22A] Service of Motion

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice period required for a motion for summary judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)* by issuing a general order providing for an expedited summary judgment on 60 days' notice. *Boyle v.*

CertainTeed Corp. (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 645, 653-655, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 501

When increasing the 75 days' notice required for a summary judgment motion by two court days for overnight delivery, the two court days are added on at the end of the 75-day period. *Barefield v. Washington Mutual Bank (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 299, 303, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 858*

A court cannot shorten the 75-day notice requirement for summary judgment motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a),* but the statute does give the court the authority to shorten the 60-day period after the opposing party's general appearance to file the motion, and to shorten the 30-day period before the trial date for hearing on the motion. *McMahon v. Superior Court (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 112, 115-118, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407*

[22B] Setting Aside Summary Judgment

The court may not set aside summary judgment under the authority of the mandatory portion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b),* which requires that the court set aside a default if the attorney files an affidavit stating the default was the result of the attorney's mistake, inadvertence, surprise or neglect; mandatory provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* only empowers a court to set aside a default judgment or a dismissal and not a summary judgment. Prieto v. Loyola Marymount University *(2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 290, 295, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 639*

[23] Speaking Motion to Dismiss or Strike Superseded

Nonstatutory "speaking motion," based on trial court's inherent right to strike or dismiss a complaint made to appear by extraneous evidence as sham or based on false allegations, as wholly superseded by summary judgment procedure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*. *Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 167-168, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151* , disapproved on other grounds, *Strang v. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013*

[23A] Separate Statement of Material Facts

Trial court did not abuse its discretion by declining to reject defendant's summary judgment motion based on absence of headings within separate statement of material facts on ground that separate statement of material facts did not separately identify each cause of action, claim, issue of duty, or affirmative defense, and each supporting material fact claimed to be without dispute with respect to the cause of action, claim, issue of duty, or affirmative defense, where defendant used format contained in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(h)* and requirement for separately identified issues was required only for supporting and opposing separate statements in a motion for summary adjudication and defendant's motion sought summary judgment, rather than summary adjudication of subissue. Even if some additional headings had been required, court's power to deny summary judgment on basis of failure to comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350* was discretionary, not mandatory, and facts critical to ruling were adequately identified, and plaintiffs did not explain how any alleged deficiency in defendant's separate statement of material facts impaired their ability to marshal evidence to show that material facts were in dispute as to proper application of statute of limitations. *Truong v. Glasser (2009) 181 Cal. App. 4th 102, 118, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 811*

[24] Sufficiency of Pleadings

Purpose of summary procedure as not being to test sufficiency of pleadings, but to determine if triable issues raised by them are real or merely the product of adept pleading. *Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 595-597, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Coyne v. Krempels (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 257, 262, 223 P.2d 244*

Defendant's motion for summary judgment as necessarily including test of sufficiency of complaint; when motion is used to test whether complaint states cause of action, court as applying rule applicable to demurrers and accepting allegations of complaint as true. *Valdez v. City of Los Angeles (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1055, 282 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Motion by defendant for summary judgment as necessarily including test of sufficiency of pleadings; when pure issue of law is raised, motion aseffectively one for judgment on pleadings. *Taylor v. California State Auto Assn. Inter-Ins. Bureau (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1214, 1223, 240 Cal. Rptr. 107*

[25] Summary Adjudication

Ruling that denies or grants summary adjudication is subject to independent review by appellate court; such order resolves pure question of law: whether there is any triable issue as to any material fact and, if not, whether moving party is entitled to adjudication in his or her favor as matter of law. *Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London v. Superior Court (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 945, 972, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 672* (appellate court judgment directing trial court to vacate its order denying insurers' motion for summary adjudication on issue of duty to indemnify and make new order granting summary adjudication for insurers affirmed)

Summary adjudication in malicious prosecution action was improper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* where defendant sought summary adjudication of the issue of whether it had probable cause to bring one of two claims in the underlying lawsuit. Although there were two causes of action in the underlying lawsuit, the malicious prosecution action involved only one "primary right" for purposes of summary adjudication. *Hindin v. Rust (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1247, 1258, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 668* (appellate court reversed trial court's order of summary adjudication of malicious prosecution action as to one of two causes of action in underlying lawsuit).

Summary adjudication motion is subject to same rules and procedures as summary judgment motion, and both are reviewed de novo; specifically, appellate court independently reviews order granting summary adjudication of insurer's duty to defend and resulting judgment; interpretation of insurance policy as applied to undisputed facts is question of law for appellate court, which is not bound by trial court's construction. *Lomes v. Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 127, 131, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 471* (order granting plaintiff summary adjudication of declaratory relief claim regarding defendant insurer's duty to defend reversed and remanded for entry of judgment for insurer)

Insurer's motion for summary adjudication of issue of punitive damages was not procedurally defective due to failure to repeat citations to record in support of its motion in its memorandum of points and authorities, where insurer submitted comprehensive statement of undisputed material facts, which separately identified punitive damages claim and each supporting material fact claimed to be without dispute with respect to that claim, and separate statement of undisputed material facts specifically identified evidence in support of each undisputed fact with appropriate citation to record; if, in fact, trial court viewed evidence submitted by insured in opposition to motion for summary adjudication with clear-and-convincing standard in mind, it did so properly; if plaintiff is going to prevail on punitive damage claim, he or she can only do so by establishing malice, oppression or fraud by clear and convincing evidence, and thus, any evidence submitted in response to motion for summary adjudication must necessarily meet that standard. *Basich v. Allstate Ins. Co. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1112, 1118-1121, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153* (order granting insurer's motion for summary adjudication of issues concerning punitive damages affirmed, judgment of nonsuit reversed and remanded on other grounds)

Summary adjudication motion is subject to same rules and procedures as summary judgment motion and both are reviewed de novo; summary adjudication is properly granted when evidence in support of moving party establishes that there is no issue of fact to be tried as to particular cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for damages or issue of duty; aim of procedure is to discover whether parties possess evidence requiring weighing procedures of trial; for

plaintiff or cross-complainant to prevail, such party must show there is no material factual dispute with respect to one or more causes of action; trial court must decide if triable issue of fact exists--if none does, and sole remaining issue is one of law, it is trial court's duty to determine issue of law. *6 Angels, Inc. v. Stuart-Wright Mortgage, Inc. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1279, 1283, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 711* (summary adjudication for plaintiff affirmed)

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f) does not allow piecemeal adjudication of claim for punitive damages; basic concept of summary adjudication is meant to dispose of entire substantive area; summary adjudication is not properly granted as a piecemeal disposition of some of asserted facts within claim for punitive damages, but may only be granted when entire claim for punitive damages is eliminated; court, however, did not decide if summary adjudication must eliminate all claims for punitive damages in one action when there are separate and distinct claims for punitive damages, having nothing to do with one another, yet contained within one complaint. *Catalano v. Superior Court (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 91, 92, 95, 97-98* & n.5, *97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 842* (partial granting of summary adjudication for cross-defendants overturned on writ of mandate)

Summary adjudication of affirmative defense is properly granted when there is no triable issue of material fact as to defense and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; moving party plaintiff had to show there was no evidence to support defendant's unclean hands affirmative defense; once plaintiff met this burden, burden shifted to defendant to set forth specific facts showing triable issue of material fact existed as to defense; on review, appellate court independently assesses correctness of trial court's ruling applying same legal standards as trial court; appellate court construes moving plaintiff's papers strictly and defendant's liberally and resolves any doubt as to propriety of granting motion in favor of defendant. *Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. Superior Court (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 970, 977-978, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743* (summary judgment in plaintiff's favor overturned on writ of mandate)

Grant of summary adjudication is reviewed de novo; appellate review guided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* which provides in *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* and *(f)* that a motion for summary adjudication of a cause of action may only be granted when, considering all the evidence set forth in papers and inferences reasonably deducible therefrom, it has been demonstrated that there is no triable issue as to any material fact as to that cause of action; appellate court first looks to pleadings and decides whether defendant has presented facts to negate essential element of, or to establish a defense to, each cause of action sought to be adjudicated; if so, appellate court then determines whether plaintiff has demonstrated existence of triable, material issue offact. *Casey v. Overhead Door Corp. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 112, 118, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 603* (summary adjudication for defendant affirmed but judgment for defendant after nonsuit reversed concerning dismissal of cross complaint for indemnity)

Summary adjudication properly granted when there is no triable issue of material fact as to cause of action and moving party is entitled to judgment as matter of law; defendant entitled to summary adjudication when it shows one or more elements of plaintiff's cause of action cannot be established. *Barnes v. Black (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 1473, 1477, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 634* (summary adjudication for defendant reversed)

Oral argument required on summary adjudication motions. *Gwartz v. Superior Court (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 480, 482, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865* (following *Mediterranean Construction Co. v State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 257, 265, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 781* ; writ of mandate issued commanding trial court to vacate order denying defendants' motion for summary adjudication and to hear and decide motion)

To establish entitlement to summary adjudication, moving party must establish that cause of action is without merit by negating essential element or by establishing complete defense; motion for summary adjudication proceeds in all respects as motion for summary judgment. *Toigo v. Town of Ross (1998) 70 Cal. App. 4th 309, 324, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649* (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

Defendant is entitled to summary adjudication if defendant meets burden of showing cause of action is meritless because one or more elements of cause of action cannot be established; once defendant has met burden, burden shifts to

plaintiff to show that triable issue of material fact actually exists about cause of action; on motion for summary adjudication, defendant may rely on plaintiff's factually inadequate discovery answers to seek summary adjudication of particular cause of action; if plaintiff fails to adduce evidence during discovery to support factual allegations of complaint, burden shifts to plaintiff and motion may be granted if plaintiff does not set forth specific facts to show a triable issue of material fact; defendant is entitled to summary adjudication if record establishes plaintiff's cause of action cannot succeed as matter of law. *Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1506-1507* (summary adjudication for defendants affirmed)

Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g) requires statement of triable issues of fact when court denies motion for summary judgment and statement of reasons when motion granted; subdivision, however, does not purport to apply to motions for summary adjudication (*but see Bernstein v. Consolidated American Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 763, 774, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* , applying section to denial of summary adjudication). *Van Dyke v. S.K.I. Ltd. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 1310, 1319 n.12, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 775* (summary judgment for defendants reversed with direction to hear motion for summary adjudication)

Summary judgment, not summary adjudication, is appropriate remedy when defendant establishes affirmative defense to all claims against defendant. *24 Hour Fitness, Inc. v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1199, 1216 n.12, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533* (writ proceeding; trial court directed to vacate order denying summary judgment in defendants' favor and to grant summary judgment to all but one defendant)

On motion for summary adjudication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*, court may rule whether defendant owes or does not owe duty to plaintiff without regard for dispositive effect of that ruling on other issues in the litigation, except that ruling must completely dispose of issue of duty. *Linden Partners v. Wilshire Linden Associates (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 508, 519-522, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*

Law and motion judge had no authority under new statute to find no triable issues of fact remained with respect to delineated issues of fact without drawing legal conclusion from those facts that conclusively disposed of cause of action or issue of duty; moreover under former versions of Code *Civ. Proc. § 437c*, courts have held that when summary of issues granted by one judge and remaining issues are tried by different judge, second judge is bound by first judge's determination, and losing party may not seek relitigation of decided issues before second judge; assuming without deciding this is still law, however, this rule does not relieve appellant of his or her usual duty to raise issue at trial to preserve if for appeal. *Rooz v. Kimmel (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 573, 592-594, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 177*

On motion for summary adjudication trial court must decide if triable issue of fact exists; if none does, and sole remaining issue is one of law, it is trial court's duty to determine issue of law. *Federal Deposit Ins. Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 337, 344-345, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*

When plaintiffs pleaded their case by combining causes of action, defendant remained entitled to present summary adjudication motions that disposed of allegations that would have formed single cause of action if properly pleaded. *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1688 n.11, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*

Trial court must grant summary adjudication when moving party establishes right to entry of judgment as matter of law; summary judgment mandatory when no triable issue as to material fact exists and if documentation submitted on motion entitles moving party to judgment as matter of law; when defendants seek summary judgment, their supporting documentation must either establish complete defense to plaintiff's action or demonstrate absence of essential element of plaintiff's case; if defendants do so, and plaintiffs opposing documentation does not show either a triable issue of fact with respect to defense or that essential element exists, summary judgment should be granted; these principles apply to appellate court's review of summary judgment ruling, which is conducted de novo; for summary judgment to be granted, moving party must show that under no possible hypothesis within the reasonable purview of the complaint's allegations is there material fact that requires examination by trial. *Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App.*

4th 1672, 1679, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195

Ordinarily, order granting summary adjudication is reviewable on appeal from judgment entered after trial; however, on appeal from order dismissing case for failure to diligently prosecute, there can be no review of earlier, nonappealable summary adjudication orders that would otherwise be reviewed on appeal from final judgment on merits. *Vernon v. Great Western Bank (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1007, 1013-1015, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 350*

Appeal is proper when order granting summary adjudication as to one cause of action effectively disposes of entire case. *Belio v. Panorama Optics, Inc. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 737* ; *see California Ass'n of Psychology Providers v. Rank (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 1, 9, 270 Cal. Rptr. 796, 793 P.2d 2*

Abuse of discretion to grant summary adjudication of declaratory relief action that consisted of issues selected from other causes of action and that did not adjudicate the entirety of any cause of action. *Hood v. Superior Court (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 319, 324, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 296*

Review of order granting summary adjudication of issues as bound by rules applicable to review of summary judgments. *McDaniel v. Gile (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 363, 371, 281 Cal. Rptr. 242*

Matters summarily adjudicated as utilizing same procedural rules as summary judgment motions. *Starkman v. Mann Theatres Corp. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1491, 1495, 278 Cal. Rptr. 543*

Requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* and *(c)* regarding evidentiary objections as applicable to motions for summary adjudication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*. *Haskell v. Carli (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 124, 130, 240 Cal. Rptr. 439* (decided under prior law)

Summary adjudication as improperly granted when notice of motion was for summary judgment only. *Gonzales v. Superior Court (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1542, 1546, 235 Cal. Rptr. 106* (decided under prior law)

Trial court as permitted to adjudicate only those issues specified by motion for summary adjudication. *Homestead Savings v. Superior Court (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 494, 498-499, 224 Cal. Rptr. 554* (decided under prior law)

Trial court judge subsequently assigned to action as precluded from reviewing issues already determined by summary adjudication. *Conway v. Bughouse, Inc. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 194, 202-203, 164 Cal. Rptr. 585* (decided under prior law)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentAppellate ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentHearingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentMotions for Summary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary JudgmentsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.55

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.55 Law Reviews

Karnow, *Archeology of Error: Tracing California's Summary Judgment Rule, 24 Pac. L.J. 1845 (1993)*

Schwarzer & Hirsch, *Summary Judgment after Eastman Kodak, 45 Hastings L.J. 1 (1993)*

Note, *A Genuine Ground in Summary Judgment for Rule 11, 99 Yale L.J. 411 (1989)*

Brunet, *The Use and Misuse of Expert Testimony in Summary Judgment, 22 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 93 (1988)*

Nelken, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back: Summary Judgment After Celotex, 40 Hastings L.J. 53 (1988)*

Note, *Summary Judgment and Circumstantial Evidence, 40 Stan. L. Rev. 491 (1988)*

Comment, *Liberalizing Summary Adjudication: A Proposal, 36 Hastings L.J. 419 (1985)*

Weil and Brown, *Braces for the Tiger's New Teeth*, 4(7) Cal. Law. 20 (1984)

Review of Selected 1982 California Legislation, *Civil Procedure; Summary Judgment and Nonsuit, 14 Pac. L.J. 506 (1983)*

Gardner, *Summary Judgment and Dismissal Motions in Dissolution of Marriage Proceedings*, 15 Bev. Hills B.J. 373 (1980)

David, *The Summary Judgment in California: The Case for Judicial Reform, 25 Hastings L.J. 119 (1973)*

Zack, *The 1973 Summary Judgment Act-- New Teeth for an Old Tiger*, 48 Cal. St. B.J. 654 (1973)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentEvidenceCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentPartial Summary Judgments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.56

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.56 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 190-195 (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 537.57-537.59

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

[Reserved]

§§ 537.57[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.60

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.60 Moving Party

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Evaluate sufficiency of the pleadings and determine whether alternatives to summary judgment or adjudication might be more appropriate, e.g.:

- ☐ Demurrer.
- ☐ Motion to strike all or part of a pleading.
- ☐ Motion for judgment on the pleadings.
- ☐ Motion for separate trial of special defenses.

☐ Determine whether any issue of law is susceptible of resolution on summary judgment.

☐ Evaluate discovery to date to determine whether further evidence is needed.

☐ Determine that no genuine issue of material fact remains disputed.

☐ Evaluate strategic advantages and disadvantages, chances of success, timing, and costs of moving for summary judgment.

☐ Attempt to obtain a stipulation of undisputed facts pertinent to the motion.

[2] Motion Procedure

☐ Papers to be prepared:

☐ Notice of motion and motion [FORMS: *§§ 537.70, 537.71*].*§ 537.72*

☐ Evidence in support of motion [FORM: *§ 537.72*]:

☐ Supporting affidavits or declarations [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; FORM: § *537.73*].

☐ Include all necessary facts for summary judgment or summary adjudication, stated as evidentiary facts, not ultimate facts or conclusions. Attach as exhibits copies of any additional documentary evidence or discovery.

☐ Include facts showing declarant's personal knowledge of and competency to testify to the evidentiary facts stated.

☐ Separate statement of undisputed material facts [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; FORMS: §§ *537.74, 537.75*].

☐ Request for judicial notice, if appropriate [for a form, *see, Ch. 321, § 321.60*]:

☐ Include a copy of the material. If it is part of the court's file, include a statement specifying the part of the file to be judicially noticed, and arrange with the clerk to have the file in the courtroom at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(b)*].

☐ Include a copy of the material. If it is part of the court's file, include a statement specifying the part of the file to be judicially noticed, and arrange with the clerk to have the file in the courtroom at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)*].

☐ Supporting memorandum.

☐ Proposed order, if required by local rule [FORMS: §§ 537.81, 637.84].

☐ Declaration or certificate re proof of service of moving papers [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*].

☐ Copies of papers to be prepared:

☐ Original to be filed with court.

☐ One office copy.

☐ One copy for service on each party who has appeared in case.

☐ Additional copies as required by local court rule.

☐ Service:

☐ Select hearing date for motion, allowing sufficient time for service. Hearing date must be no later than 30 days before date of trial, unless court for good cause orders otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. Some courts require that the hearing date be cleared with the calendar or law and motion clerk.

☐ Attach declaration or certificate re proof of service to each copy of papers served.

☐ Do not serve notice and other papers until 60 days have elapsed since opposing party's general appearance, unless court issues order allowing earlier service [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(a), 1005.5*].

☐ Serve copies of notice of motion and supporting papers at least 75calendar days before scheduled hearing, unless otherwise ordered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*];

☐ Service may be by regular mail [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1012, 1013(a), (b)*], Express Mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(c), (d)*], by delivery in person or substituted personal service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*], or in some instances by Fax [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010.5, 1012.5, 1013(e), (f)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.304(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. or electronic service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*].

☐ The 75-day notice period is increased when service is mail, by five days if address is within California, by 10 days if address is within U.S., or by 20 days if address is outside U.S. [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

☐ The 75-day notice period is increased by two court days when service is by Fax, express mail, or overnight delivery [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*] or electronic service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.6(a)(6)*].

☐ Filing:

☐ Submit original of notice of motion and supporting papers to court clerk for filing.

☐ File notice of motion and supporting papers at least 16 court days before hearing, unless otherwise ordered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*].

☐ Submit office copy to clerk to be stamped together with the original. Office copy may thus serve as check on the contents of the papers, if any filed originals are lost; it may also provide ready resolution of any dispute over the file date.

☐ Pay motion filing fee [*see Gov. Code § 26830*].

☐ File proof of service of the moving papers no later than five calendar days before the hearing date [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1300(c)*].

☐ Reply papers:

☐ If opposition papers are served and filed, moving party determines whether to submit reply papers, e.g.:

☐ Reply memorandum and,

☐ If appropriate, supplemental evidence and statement of material facts.

☐ If reply is desirable, prepare reply papers in as many copies as original papers.

☐ Include any objections to opposing papers or opposing party's evidence.

☐ File original papers directly with clerk of appropriate department at least five days before hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(4)*]. Have office copy stamped together with original to serve as check of contents and file date.

☐ Reply papers must be served by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail or other means reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties not later than the close of the next business day after the time the opposing papers or reply papers are filed [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b)(4), 1005(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentBurdens of Production & ProofMovantsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentNoticesCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentStandardsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentSupporting MaterialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.61

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.61 Opposing Party

[1] Preliminary Determinations

☐ Evaluate moving papers to determine whether it may be desirable to submit opposing papers, e.g., opposing memoranda of points and authorities and opposing declarations or other evidence.

☐ Determine whether moving papers were timely filed and served.

☐ Check sufficiency of supporting papers, e.g., statement of material facts, as possible ground for continuance.

☐ Determine whether any material fact is in dispute.

☐ Evaluate whether further discovery is needed to oppose motion; if so, consider request for continuance.

[2] Opposition Procedure

☐ If opposition is not desirable, consider serving and filing a Notice of Nonopposition. This may be required in some local courts.

☐ If opposition is desirable, prepare opposing papers in as many copies as original papers.

☐ Opposing memorandum.

☐ Include any objections to moving papers or moving party's evidence [*see § 537.25[4]*; Forms: §§ 537.86, 537.87].

☐ Separate statement of disputed and undisputed material facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*; FORMS: *§§ 537.77, 537.78*].

☐ Evidence in opposition to motion, if appropriate [FORM: *§ 537.79*]:

☐ Declarations or other evidence [*see § 537.60[2]* and FORM: *§ 537.76*].

☐ Request for judicial notice, if notice is to be requested [for a form, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice*].

☐ Include a copy of the material. If it is part of the court's file, include a statement specifying the part of the file to be judicially noticed, and arrange with the clerk to have the file in the courtroom at the hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)*].

☐ File original papers directly with clerk of appropriate department not less than 14 days before scheduled or continued hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(2)*]. Have office copy stamped together with original to serve as check of contents and file date.

☐ Serve copies not less than 14 days before scheduled or continued hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(2)*]. Opposition papers must be served by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail or other means reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties not later than the close of the next business day after the time the opposing papers or reply papers are filed. [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b)(2), (6), 1005(c)*].

☐ Evaluate reply papers, if any, for timeliness, sufficiency, etc. Prepare to argue in rebuttal to any points raised in reply.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMemoranda in OppositionCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionMotions for Additional DiscoveryCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentOppositionSupporting MaterialsCivil ProcedureSummary JudgmentTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.62

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.62 Hearing on Motion

☐ If a party desires to submit motion without an appearance, prepare, serve, and file a notice of nonappearance in same number of copies as notice of motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1304(c)*].

☐ If possible, obtain any tentative ruling [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1308*],

☐ Consult local rules for procedure, if any, for appearing at hearing and stipulating to or contesting the tentative ruling.

☐ If a party desires to appear by telephone, arrange for telephone appearance [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 367.5*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.1 *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.670*].

☐ If appropriate, attend hearing.

☐ After the ruling:

☐ Unless the parties waive notice or court orders otherwise, the prevailing party must mail or deliver the proposed order to the other party for approval as conforming to the court's order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312(a)*].

☐ Within five days after the mailing or delivery of proposed order, the other party must notify prevailing party as to whether the proposed order is approved, stating any reasons for disapproval. Failure to provide timely notification to the prevailing party constitutes approval. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*, extending time requirements when service is by mail, does not apply [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312(a)*].

☐ On expiration of the 5-day approval period, the prevailing party must "promptly" transmit the proposed order to the court, together with a summary of any responses of other parties or a statement that no responses were received [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312(b)*]. Any other party may prepare and submit a proposed order if the prevailing party fails to do so as required by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312(a)* and *(b)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1312(c)*].

☐ After the order is signed, unless court orders otherwise, request conformed copies of original order, and serve these copies, with proof of service, on all parties or their attorneys, unless each party has waived such notice of order and waiver was noted in court's minutes [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*].

☐ File proof of service of notice.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSummary JudgmentHearingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLIST

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 537.63-537.69

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

[Reserved]

§§ 537.63[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.70

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.70 Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY
vs.	)	_____ [*name*] FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [SUMMARY JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	*or* SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR ALTERNAT-
	)	IVELY, FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION][, SEP-
	)	ARATE STATMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS,
	)	SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM (AND) SUP-
	)	PORTING EVIDENCE (AND REQUEST FOR JU-
		DICIAL NOTICE)]
		Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Location: _____

Judge: _____
Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order that judgment be entered in favor of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] and against _____ [*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*)] as prayed for in _____ [*specify pleading, e.g.,* plaintiff's First Amended Complaint]. The motion is made on the grounds that _____ [there is no defense to the action *or* the action has no merit], there is no triable issue of material fact and _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. [In the alternative, _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) will, and hereby does, move for an order granting summary adjudication in favor of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) and against _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*)) as to _____ (*specifically state cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for punitive damages, or issue of duty, e.g.,* plaintiff's First Cause of Action and defendant's First and Second Affirmative Defenses to the First Cause of Action). The alternative motion is made on the grounds that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* as to plaintiff's First Cause of Action, there is no defense thereto; as to defendant's First and Second Affirmative Defenses to the First Cause of Action of the Complaint, there is no merit).]

The motion [and alternative motion] is/are based on this notice of motion, the attached declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*], [the affidavit(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the admission(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the deposition(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the answers to interrogatories by _____ (*name(s)*),] [the attached request for judicial notice], the attached separate statement of undisputed material facts, the attached supporting memorandum the papers, records, and file herein, and such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The notice of motion and motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a party to give notice and move for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. The form includes optional language for use to move in the alternative for summary adjudication of one or more causes of action within an action, an affirmative defense, a claim for punitive damages, or the issue of whether one or more defendants owed a duty to one or more plaintiffs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*].

[3] Summary Adjudication

A party moving for and giving notice of a motion for summary judgment should consider whether summary adjudication of some part of the action would be desirable if the summary judgment motion is denied. The court may grant such alternative relief only when it has been specifically sought by the moving party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*; *see Motevalli v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist.(2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 97, 114, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 562* ; *Gonzales v. Superior Court (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1542, 1545-1546, 235 Cal. Rptr. 106* (decided under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*)].

Summary adjudication may be requested in the alternative with respect to one or more causes of action within an action, an affirmative defense, a claim for punitive damages, or the issue of whether one or more defendants owed a duty to one or more plaintiffs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*]. For further discussion and a form of notice ofmotion for summary adjudication alone, see *§ 537.71*.

[4] Caption

The title of the paper in the caption includes an optional phrase to be included if the motion seeks summary adjudication in the alternative to summary judgment.

If other documents are attached to the notice of motion and motion, the title in the caption must list the nature or title of all of the attached papers [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1110(b)*]. Thus, the caption also includes optional language to use if other papers that must accompany the motion are combined in the same document [*see* § [5][a], *below*]. If the supporting evidence exceeds 25 pages, it must be separately bound [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(g)* (documents supporting motion)].

[5] Supporting Papers

[a] Papers Required

Except as provided in Code Civ. Proc. § 537c(r) and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1351*, the papers required on a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, or both, are as follows [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)*]:

- Separate statement of undisputed material fact [for forms, *see §§ 537.74* and *537.75*].
- Memorandum in support of the the motion [for forms, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 221, *Summary Judgments* (Matthew Bender)].
- Evidence in support of the motion [for a form, *see § 537.72*].
- Request for judicial notice, if appropriate [for forms, *see* Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice*].

[b] Statement of Undisputed Material Facts

The supporting papers must include a separate statement setting forth plainly and concisely all material facts which the moving party contends are undisputed, with a reference following each fact to the supporting evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*]. For further discussion and a form of statement of undisputed fact, see *§ 537.21[3]* and *§§ 537.74* and *537.75*.

[c] Evidence in Support of Motion

In addition to the memorandum, the notice of motion and motion must be accompanied by and based on supporting evidence in the form of declarations, affidavits, admissions, depositions, answers to interrogatories or matters subject to judicial notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*]. For a form of supporting declaration, see

§ 537.73. For a form of cover sheet for the evidence, see *§ 537.72*.

For further discussion as to evidentiary requirements in general, see *§ 537.24[1][a] et seq., and § 537.25[3]*.

[d] Judicial Notice

If judicial notice is sought of any matter under *Evid. Code § 452*, a separate request for judicial notice in support of the motion must be included in the moving papers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(l)*]. Copies of any matter subject to judicial notice under *Evid. Code § 452* must accompany the notice of motion and motion, unless the matter is part of a file in the court in which the motion will be heard. In the latter instance, the moving party should attach a writing specifying the part of the court file sought to be judicially noticed, and arrange with the clerk to have the file in the courtroom when the motion is heard [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1306(c)*; *see Evid. Code § 453(b)(1)*].

Any incorporation by reference of matter in the court's file must set forth with specificity the exact matter to which reference is being made and may not incorporate the entire file [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(7)*].

For discussion and forms of request for judicial notice, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* .

[6] Filing and Service of Notice

A motion for summary judgment may be made, i.e., filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*], at any time after 60 days have elapsed since the general appearance in the action or proceeding of each party against whom the motion is directed, or at such earlier time after such general appearance as the court, with or without notice and on good cause shown, may direct [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.23*.

The notice and motion and supporting papers must be served on all other parties to the action at least 75 days before the appointed hearing date, which must be no later than 30 days before the date of trial, unless the court for good cause orders otherwise. When service is by mail, the 75-day notice period is increased by five days if the place of address is within California, 10 days if outside California but within the United States, or 20 days if outside the United States. If service is by facsimile transmission, Express Mail, or other overnight delivery, the 75-day period is extended by two days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.22*.

For discussion and forms relating to manner and proof of service, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Different time requirements apply if the underlying action is for unlawful detainer or forcible entry, or for consumer-class relief under *Civ. Code § 1781(a)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(q), (r), 1170.7*; *Civ. Code § 1781(c)*]. For further discussion see *§ 537.18[1]*.

[7] Time for Filing Responsive Pleading Not Affected

Filing of the notice of motion and motion does not extend the time within which a party must otherwise file a responsive pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*].

[8] Cross References

For forms and discussion relating to motions for summary judgment in particular actions or proceedings, see specific chapters and the General Index in this set

For further discussion and forms relating to noticed motions in general, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.71

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.71 Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION BY
vs.	)	_____ [*name*] FOR SUMMARY
_____ [*name*],	)	ADJUDICATION[, SEPARATE STATMENT OF
Defendant.	)	UNDISPUTED FACTS, SUPPORTING MEMOR-
	)	ANDUM (AND) SUPPORTING EVIDENCE (AND
	)	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE)]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Location: _____
		Judge: _____

Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order granting summary adjudication in favor of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* defendant] and against _____ [*specify opposing party, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name*)] with respect to _____ [*specifically state cause or causes of action, affirmative defense, claim for punitive damages, or issue of whether one or more defendants owed a duty to one or more plaintiffs, e.g.,* the First and Fifth Causes of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint, the claim for punitive damages set out in the Second Cause of Action of plaintiff's FirstAmended Complaint]. The motion is made on the grounds that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* there is no merit to the First and Fifth Causes of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and no merit to the claim for punitive damages set out in the Second Cause of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint.]

The motion is based on this notice of motion, the attached declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*], [the affidavit(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the admission(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the deposition(s) of _____ (*name(s)*),] [the answers to interrogatories by _____ (*name(s)*),] [the attached request for judicial notice], the attached separate statement of undisputed material facts, the attached supporting memorandum, the papers, records, and file herein, and such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The notice of motion and motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a party to move for summary adjudication with respect to one or more causes of action within an action, an affirmative defense, a claim for punitive damages, or the issue of whether one or more defendants owed a duty to one or more plaintiffs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*]. A motion may be made by itself or as an alternative to a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)*]. For a form of notice of motion and motion for summary adjudication as an alternative to summary judgment, see *§ 537.70*.

[3] Required Supporting Papers; Service Requirements

For discussion of required supporting papers and of service and filing requirements, see *§ 537.70[5]* et seq.

[4] Summary Adjudication

If any party contends that one or more causes of action within an action has no merit or that there is no defense thereto or that there is no merit to an affirmative defense as to any cause of action, or both, or that there is no merit to a claim

for damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* (that is, a claim for punitive damages), or that one or more defendants either owed or did not owe a duty to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, then he or she may move for summary adjudication as to that cause or causes of action, that affirmative defense, that claim for damages, or that issue of duty [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(1)*].

For discussion of availability of summary adjudication, see *§ 537.17[1]*.

A motion for summary adjudication proceeds in all procedural respects as a motion for summary judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)*]. For discussion of that procedure, see *§ 537.20* et seq.

A number of trial courts have adapted recommendations and requirements regarding motions for summary adjudication. Local rules should therefore be consulted in all cases.

[5] Proposed Order

In addition to the usual supporting papers, local rules may require or recommend that any motion for summary adjudication be accompanied by a proposed order [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.11]. For further discussion and a form of such order, see *§ 537.84*.

[6] Cross References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 229, 230, 239-249 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.72

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.72 Evidence Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)(4), (g)]

[1] FORM Evidence Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)(4), (g)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF
vs.	)	_____ [*moving party's*] MOTION
_____ [*name*],	)	FOR _____ [SUMMARY JUDG-
Defendant.	)	MENT *or* SUMMARY ADJUDICATION *or* SUM-
	)	MARY JUDGMENT OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE
	)	SUMMARY ADJUDICATION]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Location: _____
		Judge: _____

Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[*List contents*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used as the cover sheet for the evidence in support of a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)(4), (g)*].

If the supporting evidence execceds 25 pages, the evidence must be separately bound and must include a table of contents [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(g)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.73

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.73 Declaration in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Declaration in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUM-
Plaintiff,	)	MARY _____ [JUDGMENT *or*
vs.	)	ADJUDICATION *or*
_____ [*name*],	)	JUDGMENT OR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____

Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the plaintiff in the above-entitled action *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Here and in subsequent paragraphs state evidentiary facts with particularity, to establish in whole or in part each element necessary to support an order for summary judgment and/or summary adjudication, as desired*].

3. _____ [*Here state evidentiary facts with particularity, to establish that the declarant has personal knowledge of the foregoing facts and is competent to testify to such facts under oath*].

[4. I have personal knowledge of the foregoing facts, and if called as a witness can and will competently testify to them under oath.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to support a notice of motion and motion for summary judgment, summary adjudication, or summary judgment or adjudication in the alternative [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b)(1), (f), 2015.5*; for forms of notice of motion and motion, *see §§ 537.70* and *537.71*]. Evidence must be presented in support of the motion. In addition to presenting evidence by means of declarations, it may be presented by affidavits, answers to interrogatories, depositions, admissions, and matters subject to judicial notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*].

One of the required documents on a motion for summary judgment is the "Evidence in support of [*moving party's*] motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication or both" [*Cal. Rules Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)(4)*]. In that a declaration supporting the motion is evidence, the declaration should be included under the evidence cover sheet [for a form of cover sheet for the evidence, *see § 537.72*].

[3] Sufficiency Requirements

Declarations must be based on personal knowledge, set forth admissible evidence, and affirmatively show that the declarant is competent to testify to the facts stated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*]. They must state evidentiary facts; unsupported ultimate facts or conclusions are insufficient [*Guthrey v. State of California (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27* ; *Colby v. Schwartz (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 885, 889, 144 Cal. Rptr. 624]* . Evidentiary facts showing the declarant's personal knowledge and competency must be stated [*Roy Brothers Drilling Co. v. Jones (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 175, 181-182, 176 Cal. Rptr. 449* ; *Dixon v. Grace Lines, Inc. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 278, 289, 103 Cal. Rptr. 595* ; *see Guthrey v. State of California (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1108, 1120, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 27*]. The conclusion that the declarant has personal knowledge and is competent to testify need not be stated [*Roy Brothers Drilling Co. v. Jones (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 175, 182, 176 Cal. Rptr. 449*]. If desired, Optional

Paragraph 4 in the form provides such a statement. If, however, it appears from the declaration that it is unlikely the declarant has personal knowledge of the statements he or she avers to be true, the declaration may not be salvaged by a conclusionary statement that the declarant has personal knowledge of the statements. For further discussion, see *§ 537.24[1][a]* et seq.

[4] Incorporation of Documentary Evidence

Documentary evidence should be incorporated by reference into a declaration, and must otherwise conform to the rules of evidence [*Dugar v. Happy Tiger Records, Inc. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 811, 815, 116 Cal. Rptr. 412* ; *Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Bank of America (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 719, 725, 28 Cal. Rptr. 401*]. Any incorporation by reference of matter in the court's file must set forth with specificity the exact matter to which reference is being made and may not incorporate the entire file [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(7)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 537.24[1][d]*.

[5] Sanctions

If at any time the court determines that an affidavit (or declaration) has been presented in bad faith or solely for the purpose of delay, the court shall order the party presenting such affidavit to pay the other party the amount of reasonable expenses which the filing of the affidavit caused such other party to incur [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.38[1]*.

Sanctions will not be imposed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* except on notice contained in a party's papers, or on the court's own noticed motion, and after an opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*]. The *form in § 537.80* may be used to provide the notice required for recovery of reasonable expenses under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*. Alternatively, this form of declaration may be modified to incorporate such notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* (separate noticed motion not expressly required)].

[6] Cross References

For further discussion and forms concerning affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

[7] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 196, 200, 202-205, 208, 211, 213, 215, 218, 220, 221 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.74

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.74 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF _____'S [*moving party*] MOTION FOR SUMMARY _____ [JUDGMENT *or* JUDGMENT OR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____

Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

_____ [*Identify moving party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] _____ [*name*] in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] submits the following undisputed material facts pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 437c(b)(1)* in support of plaintiff's motion for _____ [summary judgment *or* summary judgment or in the alternative summary adjudication with respect to _____ (*specifically state cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty verbatim as stated in notice of motion*)].

[*If the motion involves more than one cause of action or affirmative defense, organize the material facts into sections accordingly, identifying the source of each section, e.g.:*]

I. As to the First Cause of Action, alleged in plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and denied by defendant's Amended Answer thereto:

Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence:
1. _____ [*Give reference to the evidence submitted in support of the motion which supports the contention that such fact is undisputed, e.g.,* Defendant Smith answer at 2:3-4. Jones declaration, 2:1-13; contract, Ex. A to Jones declaration.]	
2. Jones declaration, 3:1-15. Smith deposition, 31:4-14.	[2]
[3. *Set forth any additional material facts contended to be undisputed in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs*].	[3]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*name/title*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, outlines the format for a statement of undisputed facts for use by a party moving for summary judgment. It must set forth these facts plainly and concisely, followed in each case by a clear reference to the evidence supporting the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; *Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h)*]. For a form to use if the motion is for summary adjudication, see *§ 537.75*.

The "separate statement" requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)* does not expressly require that the statement be prepared as a separate document or paper, as distinguished from a statement that is merely separate from and in addition to the supporting evidence. Nevertheless, one court of appeal has held that this requirement is not satisfied by a memorandum, and that the statement must be a totally discrete section separate and apart from the memorandum itself. Ideally, it should be in a separately bound or filed document not physically attached to the memorandum [*Blackman v. Burrows (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 889, 894-895, 238 Cal. Rptr. 642* ; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c)*].

A simple notice of joinder in a motion for summary judgment is insufficient to satisfy the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; each moving party must support their motion for summary judgment with a separate statement responding to each of the material facts contended by the moving party to be undisputed, and indicating whether the opposing party agrees or disagrees that those facts areundisputed [*Frazee v. Seely (2001) 95 Cal. App. 4th 627, 636, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780*].

[3] Format of Papers

This form reflects the specific guidelines regarding the format of separate statements that are found in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d), (h)*. The statement must separately identify each cause of action, claim, issue of duty or affirmative defense, and each supporting material fact claimed to be without dispute with respect to the cause of action, claim, issue of duty, or affirmative defense [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d)*]. Effective January 1, 2008, *Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d)* still requires a two-column format, but now requires the moving party to state in numerical sequence the undisputed material facts in the first column followed by the evidence that establishes those undisputed facts in that same column. Citation to the evidence in support of each fact must include reference to the exhibit, title, and page, and line numbers [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(d)*]. *Rule 3.1350(h)* provides an example of this format.

[4] Providing Electronic Version

A party must provide an electronic version of its separate statement to any other party or the court within 3 days of a request to do so [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*]. The electronic version may be provided in any form on which the parties agree; however, if the parties are unable to agree on the form, the responding party must provide the electronic version of the separate statement that it used to prepare the document filed with the court. Pursuant to this rule, a party is not required to create an electronic version or any new version of any document for the purpose of transmission to the requesting party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*].

171 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.75

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.75 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h), (i)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF _____'S [*moving party*] MOTION FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

_____ [*Identify moving party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] _____ [*name*] in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] submits the following undisputed material facts pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 437c(b)(1)* in support of plaintiff's motion for summary adjudication with respect to _____ (*specifically state cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty verbatim as stated in notice of motion*)].

[*Specify cause of action, defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty that is subject of motion, e.g.:*]
ISSUE 1--THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE IS BARRED BECAUSE PLAINTIFF EXPRESSLY ASSUMED THE RISK OF INJURY

Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Opposing Party's Response and Supporting Evidence:
1. _____ [*Set forth plainly and concisely each material fact contended to be undisputed, separately numbered, e.g.,* Plaintiff was injured while mountain climbing on a trip with Any Company USA.]	[1]
2. _____ [*Give reference to the evidence submitted in support of the motion which supports the contention that such fact is undisputed, e.g.,* Plaintiff's deposition, 12:3-4.]	[2]
3. [*Set forth additional facts, separately numbered, e.g.,* Before leaving on the mountain climbing trip, plaintiff signed a complete waiver of liability.	[3]
4. Smith declaration, 5:4-5; waiver of liability, Ex. A to Smith declaration.	
[5. *Set forth any additional material facts contended to be undisputed in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs*].	[5]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*name/title*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, outlines the format for a statement of undisputed facts for use by a party moving for summary adjudication. It must set forth these facts plainly and concisely, followed in each case by a clear reference to the evidence supporting the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*; *Cal Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(c), (d), (h)*].

For additional discussion of the format requirements for a separate statement of undisputed facts, and the requirements of providing an electronic version to another party or the court, see *§ 537.74[2]* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.76

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.76 Declaration in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Declaration in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] OPPOSING MOTION FOR SUMMARY
Plaintiff,	)	_____ [JUDGMENT *or*
vs.	)	ADJUDICATION *or* JUDGMENT OR SUMMARY
_____ [*name*],	)	ADJUDICATION]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____

Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the defendant in the above-entitled action *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Here and in subsequent paragraphs state evidentiary facts with particularity, to show either triable issue of material fact or triable controversy as to specified issues which would justify denial of motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, respectively*].

3. _____ [*Here state evidentiary facts with particularity, to establish that the declarant has personal knowledge of the foregoing facts, and that the declarant, if called as a witness, is competent to testify to such facts under oath*].

[4. I have personal knowledge of the foregoing facts, and if called as a witness can and will competently testify to them under oath.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

CAUTION:
Sanctions may be imposed for filing a declaration in bad faith or solely for purposes of delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*].

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to oppose a notice of motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b), 2015.5*]. The opposition may also, when appropriate, consist of evidence set forth in affidavits, answers to interrogatories, depositions, admissions, and matters subject to judicial notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(2)*].

One of the required documents on a motion for summary judgment is the "[*Opposing party's*] evidence in opposition to [moving party's] motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication or both" [*Cal. Rules Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)(3)*]. In that a declaration opposing the motion is evidence, the declaration should be included under the evidence cover sheet [for a form of cover sheet for the evidence, *see § 537.79*].

[3] Other Opposing Papers

Except as provided in Code Civ. Proc. § 537c(r) and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1351*, the opposition must include a separate statement which responds to the moving party's statement of facts claimed to be undisputed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)*]. For further discussion and a form of such statement, see *§§ 537.77* and *537.78*.

A memorandum opposing the motion must also be included [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1113, 3.1350(e)*].

[4] Cross Motion for Affirmative Relief

The form relates only to opposition on the ground that a triable issue of fact exists. Opposing counsel should be aware that a cross motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication of issues is necessary before the court may grant such affirmative relief in favor of the opposing party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a), (f)*; *Dvorin v. Appellate Dep't of Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 648, 650-651, 125 Cal. Rptr. 771, 542 P.2d 1363*]. The forms in *§§ 537.70 -537.74* may be adapted for this purpose.

[5] Opposition on Grounds of Unavailable Evidence

Opposing counsel may wish to seek an order denying or continuing the motion on the basis of a declaration or affidavit that shows that facts essential to justify opposition may exist, but cannot then be presented for reasons stated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*]. For discussion of the required showing, see *§ 537.36*].

[6] Service and Filing

The opposition must be filed and copies served at least 14 days before the time appointed for the hearing unless the court for good cause orders otherwise. Effective January 1, 2003, opposition papers must be served by personal delivery, facsimile transmission, express mail or other means reasonably calculated to ensure delivery to the other party or parties not later than the close of the next business day after the time the opposing papers or reply papers are filed [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(b)(2), 1005(c)*]. Exceptions to these time requirements, applicable in some actions for unlawful detainer or forcible entry, are discussed in *§ 537.18[1]*.

[7] Cross References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 197-199, 201, 203-206, 212-216 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.77

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.77 Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	_____'S [*opposing party*] SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN OPPOSITION TO _____'S [*moving party*] MOTION FOR SUMMARY _____ [JUDGMENT *or* JUDGMENT OR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____

Judge: _____
Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

_____ [*Identify opposing party, e.g.,* Defendant] _____ [*name*] in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] submits this separate statement in opposition to the separate statement of undisputed material facts of _____ [*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name*)] pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. Section 437c(b)(3)*:

[*Respond separately to each material fact that the moving party contends to be undisputed, indicating agreement or disagreement with contention as to undisputed nature of each fact, and indicating ground for any disagreement, as in the following example*]

Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Alleged Supporting Evidence:	Opposing Party's Response and Evidence:
1. _____ [*Set forth verbatim and in same order each material fact said by moving party to be without substantial controversy and the alleged supporting evidence, e.g.,* Plaintiff Jones and defendant Smith reached an agreement whereby Smith would construct a house for Jones in exchange for Jones' payment to Smith of $130,000. The contract called for Smith to complete construction of the house by March 11, 1999. Defendant Smith answer at 2:3-4. Jones declaration, 2:1-13; contract, Ex. A to Jones declaration].	_____ [*Respond opposite the opposing party's contention; if disputed, state nature of dispute and admissible evidence that supports position that fact is controverted, e.g.,* Undisputed].
2. _____ [*Set forth additional facts and evidence, e.g.,* On December 15, 1997, prior to completion of the house's exterior framing, Smith stopped all construction on the house. Jones declaration, 3:1-15. Smith deposition, 31:4-14]	_____ [*Respond opposite the opposing party's contention; if disputed, state nature of dispute and admissible evidence that supports position that fact is controverted, e.g.,* Disputed. Plaintiff's evidence was taken out of context. Later portions of the Smith deposition show that Smith began to complete the exterior framing on December 18, 1997, but was instructed by plaintiff to leave the property and not return. Deposition of Smith, Ex. 2(a) at 31:15-27, 32:1-15]. _____ [Reference objection number if written objection has been submitted to the evidence in support of this fact, e.g., See Objection No. 1. Do not restate or reargue evidentiary objections].

[3. *Set out any additional responses to moving party's facts in this and successively numbered paragraphs in the same two column format.*]

[*ADD if raising additional issues*]

_____ [*Identify opposing party, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*)] also contends that the following material fact(s) is/are disputed:

1. _____ [*Set forth plainly and concisely additional material facts not mentioned by moving party, if any, that opposing party contends are disputed*].	_____ [*Refer to admissible evidence that shows existence of triable dispute regarding that fact*].

[2. *Set forth any additional disputed facts in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs*].

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*name/title*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, outlines a format for a statement of disputed and undisputed material facts for use by a party opposing a motion for summary judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (h)*]. The opposing party must respond to every fact in the moving party's separate statement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)*]. For a form to use if the motion is for summary adjudication, see *§ 537.78*.

In accordance with the prescribed two column format, the opposing separate statement must set out the moving party's alleged undisputed facts and evidence and state whether the fact is disputed or undisputed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)*]. Any disputed facts must be followed by a reference to supporting evidence that indicates the existence of a triable dispute as to that fact [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)*]. For example, if one of the material facts stated by the moving party is supported by an inference reasonably deducible from the supporting evidence, opposing counsel might dispute that fact if reference can be made to a contradictory inference [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*]. Alternative means of expressing disagreement reflected in this form are discussed in [4], *below*.

In addition to the response, the opposing party must include any additional material facts that he or she contends are disputed, stating each one plainly and concisely, followed by a reference to supporting evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*].

The opposing party preferably should quote each of the facts set forth in the moving papers. If the opposing party admits any of the statements set forth in the moving separate statement, the admission should be clearly stated [*Blackman v. Burrows (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 889, 895, 238 Cal. Rptr. 642*].

For discussion of the court's discretion under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)* [*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*] to grant summary judgment based on opposing party's failure to file a proper separate statement [*see Thatcher v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1086, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 575*], see *§ 537.25[2]*.

[3] Format of Papers

The two column format must be used and the opposing party must respond to every fact claimed to be undisputed by the moving party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f), (h)*]. The opposing separate statement must set out each of the moving party's alleged undisputed facts verbatim on the left side of the page, with the evidence said by the moving party to establish that fact, complete with moving party's references to exhibits set out below each fact. On the right side of the page directly opposite the moving party's facts and evidence, the opposing party's response must state whether the fact is disputed or undisputed and, if disputed, state the nature of the dispute and describe the evidence that supports the position that the fact is controverted. That evidence must be supported by citation to exhibit, title, and page, and line numbers in the evidence submitted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3), Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)*]. Counsel is required to follow that format in filling out this form.

[4] Objections to Evidence in Support of the Motion

[a] Manner of Objecting

The requirement of a responding statement appears to be designed to provide the court with a summary, with references, of evidence that shows the existence of a triable dispute. Objections to the sufficiency of the moving party's evidence, as distinguished from objections to the contention that it is undisputed, should be fully discussed in the memorandum [*see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 221, *Summary Judgments*]. However, counsel may also wish to include a brief reference to the following types of objections in the responding statement, particularly when these objections apply to a material fact that is asserted as undisputed by the moving party and as to which no disputing evidence exists.

[b] As Inadmissible

The court cannot consider evidence to which objections have been made and sustained [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(c)*]. Objections to the admissibility of supporting evidence will be deemed waived if not made in the opposing papers or orally at the hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(5)*]. The better practice is to submit written objections. Effective January 1, 2007, the Rules of Court contain specific format requirements for written objections. The written objections must be served and filed separately from other papers in opposition to the motion. Objections on specific evidence may be referenced by the objection number in the right column of a separate statement in opposition to a motion, but the objections must not be restated or reargued in the separate statement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.25[3]*. For further discussion, see *§ 537.25[3]*.

[c] As Declaration by Sole Witness or Affirming Declarant's State of Mind

The court has discretion to deny a motion when the only proof of a material fact offered in support of the motion is an affidavit or declaration made by an individual who was the sole witness to the fact, or when a material fact is an individual's state of mind, or lack thereof, and the fact is sought to be established solely by that individual's affirmation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)*]. This form includes optional language that disputes a given fact on the ground that it is based solely on such proof. For further discussion, see *§ 537.34[4][a]*.

[d] As Disputed by Evidence Not Then Available

The court may deny or continue a motion if opposing declarations or affidavits show that disputing evidence may exist but cannot be then presented [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*]. An opposing party's statement of disputed facts asserting lack of knowledge and claiming that fact is "disputed" is insufficient when opposing party hasnot requested continuance to conduct further discovery or otherwise explained its ignorance [*City of Hope Nat. Medical Center v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 633, 636 n.1, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465*]. This form includes optional language that disputes a given fact on the ground that it may be disputed by evidence that cannot be presently submitted. For further discussion, see *§ 537.76[5]*.

[5] Providing Electronic Version

Effective January 1, 2002, a party must provide an electronic version of its separate statement to any other party or the court within 3 days of a request to do so [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*]. The electronic version may be provided in any form on which the parties agree; however, if the parties are unable to agree on the form, the responding party must provide the electronic version of the separate statement that it used to prepare the document filed with the court. Pursuant to this rule, a party is not required to create an electronic version or any new version of any document for the purpose of transmission to the requesting party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(i)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.78

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.78 Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

[1] FORM Statement of Disputed and/or Undisputed Material Facts Opposing Motion for Summary Adjudication [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b); Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e), (f), (h), (i)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	_____'S [*opposing party*] SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY ADJUDICATION
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

_____ [*Identify opposing party, e.g.,* Defendant] _____ [*name*] in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] submits this separate statement in opposition to the separate statement of undisputed material facts of _____ [*identify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name*)] pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. Section 437c(b)*:

[*Respond separately to each material fact that the moving party contends to be undisputed, indicating agreement or disagreement with contention as to undisputed nature of each fact, and indicating ground for any disagreement, as in the following example*]

[*Specify cause of action, defense, claim for damages, or issue of duty that is subject of motion, e.g.:*]
ISSUE 1--THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE IS BARRED BECAUSE PLAINTIFF EXPRESSLY ASSUMED THE RISK OF INJURY

Moving Party's Undisputed Material Facts and Alleged Supporting Evidence:	Opposing Party's Response and Evidence:
1. _____ [*Set forth verbatim and in same order each material fact said by moving party to be without substantial controversy and the alleged supporting evidence, e.g.,* Plaintiff was injured while mountain climbing on a trip with Any Company USA. Plaintiff's deposition, 12:3-4].	_____ [*Respond opposite the opposing party's contention; if disputed, state nature of dispute and admissible evidence that supports position that fact is controverted, e.g.,* Undisputed].
2. _____ [*Set forth additional facts and evidence, e.g.,* Before leaving on the mountain climbing trip, plaintiff signed a complete waiver of liability. Smith declaration, 5:4-5; waiver of liability, Ex. A to Smith declaration.]	_____ [*Respond opposite the opposing party's contention; if disputed, state nature of dispute and admissible evidence that supports position that fact is controverted, e.g.,* Disputed. Plaintiff did not sign the waiver of liability; his signature on the waiver is forged. Jones declaration, 3:6-7].

[3. *Set out any additional responses to moving party's facts in this and successively numbered paragraphs in the same two column format.*]

[*ADD if raising additional issues*]

_____ [*Identify opposing party, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*)] also contends that the following material fact(s) is/are disputed:

1. _____ [*Set forth plainly and concisely additional material facts not mentioned by moving party, if any, that opposing party contends are disputed*].	_____ [*Refer to admissible evidence that shows existence of triable dispute regarding that fact*].

[2. *Set forth any additional disputed facts in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs*].

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*name/title*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, outlines a format for a statement of disputed and undisputed material facts for use by a party opposing a motion for summary adjudication [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(3)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350, (h)*]. The opposing party must respond to every fact in the moving party's separate statement [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(f)*]. For a form to use if the motion is for summary judgment, see *§ 537.77*.

For additional discussion of the format requirements for a separate statement of undisputed facts by the party opposing a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, and the requirements of providing an electronic version to another party or the court, see *§ 537.77[2]* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.79

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.79 Evidence Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)(3), (g)]

[1] FORM Evidence Opposing Motion for Summary Judgment or Adjudication--Cover [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)(3), (g)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	_____ [*opposing party's*] EVID-
vs.	)	ENCE IN OPPOSITION TO _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*moving party's*] MOTION FOR
Defendant.	)	_____ [SUMMARY JUDGMENT
	)	*or* SUMMARY ADJUDICATION *or* SUMMARY
	)	JUDGMENT OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE SUM-
	)	MARY ADJUDICATION]
	)	Date: _____
		Time: _____
		Location: _____

Judge: _____
Date Action Filed: _____
Trial Date: _____

_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[*List contents*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used as the cover sheet for the evidence in opposition to a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(e)(3), (g)*].

If the evidence in oppostion to the motion execceds 25 pages, the evidence must be separately bound and must include a table of contents [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1350(g)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.80

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.80 Notice of Motion, Motion, and Supporting Declaration for Order Imposing Monetary Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion, Motion, and Supporting Declaration for Order Imposing Monetary Sanctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF EXPENSES AS SANCTIONS, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____

Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order awarding reasonable expenses in the amount of $_____, to be paid by _____ [*identify party presenting affidavits or declarations, e.g.,* defendant, _____ (*name*)]. The motion is made on the ground that _____ [*describe action that is basis of motion for sanctions, e.g.,* the declaration filed by defendant in this case on July 1, 1997, was presented in bad faith].

The motion is based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the supporting memorandum served and filed with it, on the records and file in this action, and on any evidence that may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Specify party who presented affidavit(s), e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*)] _____ [*specify conduct, e.g,* presented the declaration of _____ (*name*) on July 1, 1994, in support of a motion for summary judgment in the above-entitled action with knowledge that statements contained in paragraphs 3 and 5 of that declaration were untrue. Defendant's attorney _____ (*name*) admitted to the court that there was no factual basis for these statements at the hearing on the motion for summary judgment on _____ (*date*)].

3. As a result of this conduct, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] has incurred expenses in the sum of $_____ as follows _____ [*itemize expenses showing that each was incurred as a result of the specified conduct*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion*.]

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion, motion, and supporting declaration in [1], *above*, is for use by a party seeking an order imposing monetary sanctions against another party for expenses incurred as a result of that other party's presentation, in bad faith or solely for purposes of delay, of an affidavit or declaration in connection with a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*].

A separate noticed motion for sanctions is not required so long as notice is contained in other papers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*]. This form may therefore be modified for inclusion in other papers.

A memorandum must be filed and a copy served with the foregoing notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 537.38[1]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.81

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.81 Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING _____'S
vs.	)	[*moving party*] MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDG-
_____ [*name*],	)	MENT
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion(s) of _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] [and _____ (*specify opposing party making cross-motion, e.g.,* defendant)] for summary judgment was/were heard by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

Having considered all the evidence set forth in the papers submitted, and the inferences reasonably deducible therefrom, except that to which objection was sustained, the Court determines that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that _____ (*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff) is entitled to judgment as a matter of law, for the following reasons:

1. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in support of his/her/its motion, proffered evidence that _____ [established each element necessary to sustain judgment in his/her/its favor *or* (refuted a necessary element of plaintiff's cause of action *and/or* established an affirmative defense to plaintiff's cause of action)], as follows: _____ [*specify material facts claimed by moving party with reference to their location in the supporting papers*].

2. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in opposition to _____ [defendant's *or* plaintiff's] motion, _____ [proffered no evidence *or* proffered evidence as follows: _____ (*specify facts claimed by opposing party with reference to their location in the opposing papers*)]. [This evidence proffered in opposition to _____ (defendant's *or* plaintiff's) motion, is not sufficient to raise a triable issue of fact in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* it constitutes inadmissible hearsay, to which objection at the hearing was duly made and sustained).]

[*ADD, if the court is also denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication*]

The Court further determines that the cross motion of _____ [*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant] for an order granting _____ [summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication] should be denied for the following reasons: _____ [*state reasons for denial as required under Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g); for examples of reasons, see the form in § 537.85*].

[The Court further determines that the _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s)) of _____ (*name(s)*) presented by _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) _____ was/were presented _____ (in bad faith *and/or* solely for the purpose of delay).]

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion of _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] for summary judgment be, and hereby is, granted and that judgment be entered providing that _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*specify judgment, e.g.,* recover from defendant the sum of $_____, with (interest thereon _____ (*specify rate, e.g.,* at the legal rate) from and after _____ (*date*), and) his/her costs in the sum of $ _____].

[*ADD, if the court is also denying an alternative motion for summary adjudication by the prevailing party, and/or is denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ [the alternative motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary adjudication *and/or* the cross-motion of _____ (*specify opposing party making cross-motion, e.g.,* defendant) for an order granting _____ (summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication)] be, and hereby is, denied.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) pay _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) the sum of $ _____ as the amount of reasonable expenses incurred by _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) as a result of the filing of the _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s)) referred to above.]
Dated: _____.

_____[*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants a motion for summary judgment and requires counsel to prepare and submit aproposed order. If the court permits the order and judgment to be combined in the same paper, the *form in § 537.82* should be used. Otherwise, if the order granting the motion terminates the action as between at least two parties, as illustrated in this form, a formal judgment should be prepared and submitted to the judge for signature [for a form of formal judgment, *see § 537.83*; *see also § 537.82[2]* et seq.].

The form includes optional language for use when the court denies an alternative motion by the prevailing party, a cross motion by the opposing party, or both. It also includes optional language for use when the court imposes sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* [*see* discussion in *§ 537.38[1]*.

For a form for use when the motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication is denied, see *§ 537.85*.

[3] Specification of Reasons

On granting a motion for summary judgment, on the ground that there is no triable issue of material fact, the court is required, by written or oral order, to specify the reasons for its determination. The order must specifically refer to the evidence proffered in support of, and if applicable in opposition to, the motion that indicates that no triable issue exists [Code Civ. Proc. 473c(g); *see § 537.37[2]*].

[4] Notice of Order

The prevailing party must give notice of the court's order granting or denying the motion to all other parties or their attorneys in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.*, unless notice is waived by all parties in open court and is entered in the minutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*]. For further discussion and forms of notice and proof of service, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[5] Cross References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, § 227 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.82

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.82 Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment and Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment and Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY
Defendant.	)	JUDGMENT AND JUDGMENT
	)	
	)	

The motion(s) of _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] [and _____ (*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant)] for summary judgment was/were heard by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by

counsel _____ [*name*].

Having considered all the evidence set forth in the papers submitted, and the inferences reasonably deducible therefrom, except that to which objection was sustained, the Court determines that there is no triable issue as to any material fact and that _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] is entitled to judgm ent as a matter of law, for the following reasons:

1. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in support of his/her/its motion, proffered evidence that _____ [established each element necessary to sustain judgment in his/her/its favor *or* (refuted a necessary element of plaintiff's cause of action *and/or* established an affirmative defense to plaintiff's cause of action)], as follows: _____ [*specify material facts claimed by moving party with reference to their location in the supporting papers*].

2. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in opposition to _____ [defendant's *or* plaintiff's] motion, _____ [proffered no evidence *or* proffered evidence as follows: _____ (*specify facts claimed by opposing party with reference to their location in the opposing papers*)]. [This evidence proffered in opposition to _____ (defendant's *or* plaintiff's) motion is not sufficient to raise a triable issue of fact in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* it constitutes inadmissible hearsay, to which objection at the hearing was duly made and sustained).]

[*ADD, if the court is also denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication*]

The Court further determines that the cross motion of _____ [*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant] for an order granting _____ [summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication] should be denied for the following reasons: _____ [*state reasons for denial as required under Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g); for examples of reasons, see the form in § 537.85*].

[The Court further determines that the _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s)) of _____ (*name(s)*) presented by _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) _____ was/were presented _____ (in bad faith *and/or* solely for the purpose of delay).]

Accordingly,

[*ADD, if the court is denying an alternative motion for summary adjudication by the prevailing party, and/or is denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication* :]

IT IS ORDERED that _____ [the alternative motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary judgment *and/or* the cross motion of _____ (*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant) for an order granting _____ (summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication)] be, and hereby is, denied.

IT IS [FURTHER] ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the motion of _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] be, and hereby is, granted [and, further, that _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) pay _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) the sum of $_____ as the amount of reasonable expenses incurred by _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) as a result of the filing of the hereinabove referred to _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s))].

IT IS [FURTHER] ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that _____ [*specify judgment rendered, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*plaintiff's full name*) shall recover from defendant _____ (*defendant's full name*) the principal sum of $ _____, plus interest at the rate of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* eight percent) from _____ (*date*) to date hereof in the sum of $_____, for a total sum of $ _____].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The combined form of order and judgment in [1], *above*, is for use when the trial court grants a motion for summary judgment, requires the preparation of a formal order granting the motion, and does not require that the order and judgment be set forth in separate papers [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(k)*, and discussion in [3], *below*]. In this event, it would appear that the better practice would be to use the combined form to avoid unnecessary duplication and to avoid any possibility of conflict between the order and the judgment. If the order and judgment are combined, the paper should, as in the caption of the form, be clearly identified as a judgment [*see Rogness v. English Moss Joint Venturers (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 190, 192 n.2, 239 Cal. Rptr. 387*].

If the court requires presentation of a formal order granting the motion separate from the judgment, use the *forms in §§ 537.81* and *537.83*.

The form includes optional language for use when the court denies an alternative motion by the prevailing party, a cross motion by the opposing party, or both. It also includes optional language for use when the court imposes sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* [*see* discussion in *§ 537.38[1]*].

[3] Entry of Judgment and Notice of Entry

Except when a separate judgment may be awarded properly in the action, no final judgment can be entered on a motion for summary judgment prior to the termination of the action, but the final judgment must, in addition to any matters determined in the action, award judgment as established by the summary judgment proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(k)*]. For situations in which a separate judgment may properly be awarded, see discussion in *§ 537.43[1]*. In most contested actions or special proceedings, the party submitting a judgment for entry must prepare and mail a copy of the notice of entry of judgment to all parties who have appeared in the action or proceeding and must file with the court the original notice of entry of judgment together with the proof of service by mail [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a)*].

For further discussion of entry of judgment and notice of entry of judgment, see *§ 537.42*.

[4] Review After Entry of Judgment

A summary judgment, once entered, is appealable [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 437c(m), 904.1(a)(1), 904.2*]. For further discussion relating to appeal, see *§ 537.43[1]* et seq. For discussion of post-judgment challenges in the trial court, see *§ 537.40*.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms concerning notice and entry of judgments generally, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 227, 232, 233, 235, 229, 248 (4th ed. 1997).

179 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.83

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.83 Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Summary Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

On _____ [*date*], the court granted the motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] made under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 437c* on the ground that _____ [there is no defense to the action *or* the action has no merit] for an order that judgment be entered for _____ [

specify moving party, e.g., plaintiff] and against _____ [*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant]. In accordance with that order,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that _____ [*specify judgment rendered, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*plaintiff's full name*) shall recover from defendant _____ (*defendant's full name*) the principal sum of $_____, plus interest at the rate of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* eight percent) from _____ (*date*) to date hereof in the sum of $ _____, for a total sum of $ _____].
Dated:_____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of proposed judgment in [1], *above*, is for use by a party whose motion for summary judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* has been granted and the judgment either terminates the entire action or is a separate judgment that may be awarded properly [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(k)* and § 537.82[2] et seq.]. For a form of formal order granting the motion for summary judgment, see *§ 537.81*. For a combined form of order granting the motion and the summary judgment, see *§ 537.82*.

180 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.84

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.84 Order Granting Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Order Granting Motion for Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] for an order granting summary adjudication

[and, alternatively, for an order granting summary judgment], [and the motion of _____ (*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant) for an order granting _____ (summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication)] was/were heard by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On consideration of all the evidence set forth in the papers submitted, and the inferences reasonably deducible therefrom, except that to which objection was sustained, the Court makes the following determinations for the reasons specified:

1. There is no triable issue as to any material fact and _____ [*specify prevailing party, e.g.,* plaintiff] is entitled as a matter of law to summary adjudication in his/her/its favor and against _____ [*identify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] on _____ [*specify first matter on which summary adjudication is granted, e.g.,* the First Cause of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint] for the following reasons:

a. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in support of his/her/its motion for summary adjudication on this _____ [cause of action *or* affirmative defense *or* claim for punitive damages *or* issue of duty], proffered evidence that established each necessary element of this _____ [cause of action *or* affirmative defense *or* claim for punitive damages *or* issue of duty] as follows: _____ [*specify material facts claimed by moving party with reference to their location in the supporting papers*].

b. _____ [Plaintiff *or* Defendant], in opposition to _____ [defendant's *or* plaintiff's] motion, _____ [proffered no evidence *or* proffered evidence as follows: _____ (*specify facts claimed by opposing party with reference to their location in the opposing papers*)]. [Theforegoing evidence proffered in opposition to _____ (defendant's *or* plaintiff's) motion is not sufficient to raise a triable issue of fact in that _____ (*specify, e.g.,* it constitutes inadmissible hearsay, to which objection at the hearing was duly made and sustained).]

[2. *Set out any additional matters on which summary adjudication is granted, if any, in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs.*]

[*ADD, if the court is also denying summary adjudication of additional matters that were included in the prevailing party's motion, and/or is denying an alternative motion for summary judgment by the prevailing party, and/or is denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication*]

The Court further determines that _____ [the motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary adjudication with respect to _____ (*specify additional matter included in the motion, e.g.,* the claim for punitive damages set out in the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint) *and/or* the alternative motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary judgment *and/or* the cross motion of _____ (*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant) for an order granting _____ (summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication)] should be denied for the following reasons: _____ [*state reasons for denial as required under Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g); for examples of reasons, see the form in § 537.85[1]*].

[The Court further determines that the _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s)) of _____ (*name(s)*) presented by _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) _____ was/were presented _____ (in bad faith *and/or* solely for the purpose of delay).]

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion for an order granting summary adjudication be, and hereby is, granted in favor of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] and against _____ [*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*)] with respect to _____ [*specify matter(s) on which summary adjudication is granted, e.g.,* the First and Fifth Causes of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint], and that this adjudication shall be carried into any final judgment subsequently entered in this _____ [action *or* proceeding].

[*ADD, if the court is also denying summary adjudication of additional matters that were included in the prevailing party's motion, and/or is denying an alternative motion for summary judgment by the prevailing party, and/or is denying the opposing party's cross motion(s) for summary judgment and/or adjudication*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ [the motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary adjudication with respect to _____ (*specify additional matter included in the motion, e.g.,* the claim for punitive damages set out in the Fourth Cause of Action of plaintiff's First Amended Complaint) *and/or* the alternative motion of _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) for an order granting summary judgment *and/or* the cross motion of _____ (*specify opposing party making cross motion, e.g.,* defendant) for an order granting _____ (summary judgment *and/or* summary adjudication)] be, and hereby is, denied.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant) pay _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) the sum of $ _____ as the amount of reasonable expenses incurred by _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) as a result of the filing of the _____ (declaration(s) *and/or* affidavit(s)) referred to above.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use when the court grants a motion for summary adjudication under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)* [for forms of notice of motion and motion, *see §§ 537.70* and *537.71*] and directs counsel to prepare and submit a proposed order.

The form includes optional language for use when the court denies the motion for summary adjudication with respect to certain matters, or denies the prevailing party's alternative motion for summary judgment, or denies cross motions by the opposing party. It also includes optional language for use when the court imposes sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)* [*see* discussion in *§ 537.38[1]*].

Some trial courts require or recommend that a proposed order be submitted with any motion for summary adjudication [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.11]. A proposed order should be framed as if the motion were granted with respect to all causes of actions, defenses, claims for punitive damages, or issues of duty sought to be adjudicated.

[3] Specification of Reasons

On the grant of a motion for summary judgment, on the ground that there is no triable issue of material fact, the court is required, by written or oral order, to specify the reasons for its determination. The order must specifically refer to the

evidence proffered in support of, and if applicable in opposition to, the motion that indicates that no triable issue exists [Code Civ. Proc. 473c(g); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)* (motion for summary adjudication to proceed in all procedural respects as a motion for summary judgment); *see § 537.37[2]*].

[4] Cross References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial,* §§ 156-157 (4th ed. 1997)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.85

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.85 Order Denying Motion for Summary Judgment and/or Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

[1] FORM Order Denying Motion for Summary Judgment and/or Summary Adjudication of Cause of Action, Defense, Claim for Punitive Damages, or Issue of Duty [Code Civ. Proc. § 437c]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] for an order granting

_____ [summary judgment *or* summary adjudication *or* summary judgment or, in the alternative, summary adjudication] was heard by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On consideration of all the evidence set forth in the papers submitted, and the inferences reasonably deducible therefrom, except that to which objection has been sustained, the Court determines that the motion should be denied for the reason(s) that:

[*EITHER*]

A triable controversy exists with respect to the following material fact(s), as indicated:

1. _____ [*Specify all material fact(s) presenting a triable controversy and refer specifically to supporting and opposing evidence that indicates the existence of such controversy, e.g.,* That the defendant knew, or had reason to know, of defective condition of furnace when she rented the premises to plaintiff. (Declaration of _____ (*name*), pp 13:23-19:7; Declaration of _____ (*name*), pp 2:15-8:4)].

[2. *Specify additional triable controversies in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs; if denying motion for summary adjudication of cause of action, defendant's duty, punitive damages claim, or affirmative defense in its entirety, specify the matter for which summary adjudication is sought (i.e., cause of action, affirmative defense, claim for punitive damages, or issue of duty) as to which the controversy exists*.]

[*OR*]

The evidence submitted by _____ [*specify moving party, e.g., plaintiff*] in support of the motion is insufficient to show that he/she is entitled tojudgment as a matter of law, in that: _____ [*specify insufficiency, e.g.,* The supporting Declaration of _____ (*name*) includes no admissible evidence, and the remaining Declaration of Plaintiff alone fails to establish that the defendant proximately caused the injury suffered by plaintiff].

[*OR*]

_____ [*Specify moving party, e.g.,* Plaintiff] failed to comply with the requirement of a separate statement, and the Court exercises its discretion to deny the motion on this ground.

[*OR*]

It appears from the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)], submitted in opposition to the motion, that facts essential to justify opposition may exist but could not, for good cause shown, be presented at the hearing. The Court exercises its discretion to deny the motion on this ground.

[*OR*]

_____ [*Specify any other reasons for the determination, e.g.,* One of the material facts contended to be undisputed by _____ (*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff) is the negligent conduct of defendant

estate's decedent, and the only evidence of this fact is stated in the declaration of plaintiff, the sole remaining witness to that fact. The Court exercises its discretion to deny the motion on this ground.

[*CONTINUE*]

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion of _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] for an order granting _____ [summary judgment *or* summary adjudication *or* summary judgment or, in the alternative, summary adjudication] be denied.

[*OPTIONAL*]

The Court further determines that the _____ [declaration(s) *or* affidavit(s)] of _____ [*name(s*)] presented by _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ was/were presented _____ [in bad faith *or* solely for the purpose of delay].

Accordingly,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.,* plaintiff] pay _____ [*specify opposing party, e.g.,* defendant] the sum of $ _____ as the amount of reasonable expenses incurred as a result.
Dated:_____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of proposed order in [1], *above*, is for use by the party opposing summary judgment or summary adjudication if the motion is denied. Local rules should be consulted, insofar as some courts require the prevailing party to submit a proposed order, while others may not [*see, e.g.,* San Francisco Uniform Local Ct. Rules, Rule 8.11]. It is recommended that opposing counsel prepare and submit a proposed order of denial in any case, to assist the court in stating the reasons for its decision on denial of a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication, as required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)* [*see* Weir and Brown, *Braces for the Old Tiger's New Teeth*, 4(7) Calif. Law. 20, 22 (1984)]. Optional language is included for use when the court, on its own or the opposing party's motion, imposes sanctions for filing a declaration in bad faith [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(j)*]. For further discussion of sanctions, including additional statutory grounds to recover costs, fees, and expenses, see *§ 537.38[1]*.

[3] Statement of Grounds for Denial

On the denial of a motion for summary judgment on the ground that there is a triable issue with respect to one or more material facts, the court is required to state each issue determined to be triable and refer specifically to the evidence supporting and opposing the motion that indicates the existence of the controversy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*; *see § 537.37[1], above; see also Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(f)(2)* (motion for summary adjudication shall proceed in all procedural respects as a motion for summary judgment)].

The court must also state its reasons for any other determination [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(g)*]. Thus, this form includes

alternate language suggesting other, less common grounds for denial. For example, the court has discretion to deny a motion not supported by the required separate statement of undisputed facts [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(b)(1)*]. It may also deny a motion when the only proof of a material fact is the declaration of a sole witness, or an affirmation by a person as to his or her own mental state [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(e)*]. A third discretionary ground for denial is a showing that facts justifying opposition may exist but cannot be then presented [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(h)*]. While a mere continuance is the more likely result in this case, denial may be necessary, for example, when the continued date is less than thirty days before the date set for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(a)*]. Another suggested ground for denial is simply the moving party's failure to meet his or her burden of proof [*see Vesely v. Sager (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 153, 170, 95 Cal. Rptr. 623, 486 P.2d 151 , disapproved on other grounds in Strang v. Cabrol (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 720, 724, 209 Cal. Rptr. 347, 691 P.2d 1013*]. For further discussion concerning the various grounds for denial, see *§ 537.34[1]* et seq.

[4] Notice of Order

The prevailing party must serve notice of the order on all other parties, unless the court orders otherwise or notice is waived by all parties in open court and is entered in the minutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*]. For further discussion and forms of such notice and proof of service, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[5] Review

An order denying a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication of issues is not appealable, but may be reviewed by petition for writ of mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(m)(l)*]. A motion for reconsideration is also available in the trial court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1008*]. For further discussion, see *§ 537.39* et seq.

[6] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 6, *Proceedings Without Trial*, §§ 223-236, 248 (4th ed. 1997)

182 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.86

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.86 Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)]

[1] FORM Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____[name],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff, vs. _____[name],	)	_____'S [moving party or opposing party] WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO _____'S [moving party or opposing party] EVIDENCE IN_____ [SUPPORT OF or OPPOSITION TO] MOTION FOR SUMMARY_____ [JUDGMENT OR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY ADJUDICATION]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____

Time: _____
Location: _____
Judge: _____
Date Action Filed:_____
Trial Date: _____

_____

_____ [*Identify party making written objections, e.g.,* Plaintiff] _____ [*name*] submits the following written objections to _____'s [*identify party whose evidence is objected to, e.g.,* Defendant] evidence _____ [in support of *or* in opposition to] _____'s [*identify party filing motion, e.g.,* Defendant] motion for _____ [summary judgment or summary judgment *or* in the alternative summary adjudication] pursuant to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b).*

[EITHER]
Objections to _____[*Identify document in which specific material objected to is located, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration dated April 1, 2007]

Objection Number 1
[Objections must be numbered consecutively]

"_____." [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material,e.g.,* Johnson told me that no widgets were ever received]. (_____, page _____, lines _____.) [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 3, lines 7-8].

Grounds for Objection 1: _____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Hearsay (*Evid. Code § 1200*); lack of personal knowledge (*Evid. Code § 702(a)*)].

Objection Number 2

"_____." [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g.,* A lot of people find widgets to be very useful]. (_____, page _____, lines _____.) [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 17, line 5].

Grounds for Objection 2: _____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Irrelevant (*Evid. Code §§ 210, 350-351*)].

[OR]

Objections to _____
[*Identify document in which specific material objected to is located, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration dated April 1, 2007]

Material Objected to: Grounds for Objection:

1. _____, page _____, lines _____ [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 3, lines 7-8]: "_____." [Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g., Johnson told me that no widgets were ever received].	_____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Hearsay (Evid. Code § 1200); lack of personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702(a))].
2. _____, page _____, lines _____ [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 17, line 5]: "_____" [Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g., A lot of people find widgets to be very useful].	_____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Irrelevant (Evid. Code §§ 210, 350-351)].

_____[signature]
_____[name/title]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], above, outlines the required format for written objections to the moving or opposing party's evidence in support of or in opposition to a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication. Effective January 1, 2007, written objections to evidence must follow one of the above formats and must [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)*]:

- Identify the name of the document in which the specific material objected to is located;
- State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to;
- Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material; and
- State the grounds for each objection to that statement or material.

The objections also must be numbered consecutively [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(b)*]. A party submitting written objections to evidence must submit with the objections a proposed order. For additional discussion of the format requirements for written evidentiary objections, see *§ 537.25[4][b]*. For a form of proposed order on written objections, see *§ 537.87*.

[3] Time for Filing and Service

Unless otherwise excused by the court on a showing of good cause, all written objections to evidence in support of or in opposition to a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication must be and filed at the same time as the objecting party's opposition or reply papers are served and filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(a)*].

183 of 183 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 537 SUMMARY JUDGMENT
PART V. FORMS

47-537 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 537.87

AUTHOR: Hon. Patti S. Kitching Barbara A. Reeves Charles Pereyra-Suarez Contributing Editors Justice Kitching, an Associate Justice of the California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three, was formerly a Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, where her assignments included the law and motion department. Barbara A. Reeves is a partner with Morrison & Foerster, Los Angeles, California. Her areas of litigation expertise include intellectual property, securities, fraud, contract, international trade, antitrust, environmental coverage, and white-collar criminal defense. Charles Pereyra-Suarez is a partner in McKenna & Cuneo and heads the Litigation Department in the Los Angeles office. He also has served as a judge pro tem of the Los Angeles County Municipal and Superior Courts since 1986. This chapter was adapted from California Practice Handbook: Pretrial Disposition (Matthew Bender), Litigation Section, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Handbook Editor; Hon. Patti S. Kitching, Barbara A. Reeves, Charles Pereyra-Suarez, Contributing Editors.

§ 537.87 Order on Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)]

[1] FORM Order on Written Objections to Evidence in Support of or in Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment or Summary Adjudication [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____[name],	)	
Plaintiff, vs. _____[name],	)	NO. _____ ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

[EITHER]
Objections to _____
[*Identify document in which specific material objected to is located, e.g.,*

Jackson Declaration dated April 1, 2007]

Objection Number 1
[*Objections must be numbered consecutively*]

"_____." [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g.,* Johnson told me that no widgets were ever received]. (_____, page _____, lines _____,) [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 3, lines 7-8].

Grounds for Objection 1: _____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Hearsay (*Evid. Code § 1200*); lack of personal knowledge (*Evid. Code § 702(a)*)].

Court's Ruling on Objection 1: Sustained: _____

Overruled: _____

Objection Number 2

"_____." [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g.,* A lot of people find widgets to be very useful]. (_____, page _____, lines _____.) [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 17, line 5].

Grounds for Objection 2: _____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Irrelevant (*Evid. Code §§ 210, 350-351*)].

Court's Ruling on Objection 2: Sustained: _____

Overruled: _____

[OR]

Objections to _____
[*Identify document in which specific material objected to is located, e.g.,*
Jackson Declaration dated April 1, 2007]

Material Objected to:	Grounds for Objection:	Ruling on the Objection
1. _____, page _____, lines _____ [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 3, lines 7-8]:	_____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Hearsay (Evid. Code § 1200); lack of personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702(a))].	Sustained: _____
"_____." [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g.,*		Overruled: _____

Johnson told me that no widgets were ever received]		
2. _____, page _____, lines _____ [*State the exhibit, title, page, and line number of the material objected to, e.g.,* Jackson Declaration, page 17, line 5]:	_____ [*State the grounds for the objection, along with a citation to the evidentiary rule, e.g.,* Irrelevant (Evid. Code §§ 210, 350-351)].	Sustained: _____
"_____" [*Quote or set forth the objectionable statement or material, e.g.,* A lot of people find widgets to be very useful].		Overruled: _____

Date: _____ _____

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], above, is for use when a party submits written objections to another party's evidence. Effective January 1, 2007, a party submitting written objections to evidence must submit with the objections a proposed order following one of the above formats [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1354(c)*]. The ordermust include places for the court to indicate whether it has sustained or overruled each objection and it must include a place for the judge's signature.

For additional discussion of the format requirements for proposed orders on evidentiary objections, see *§ 537.25[4][d]*. For a form of written objections, see *§ 537.86*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 538.syn

§ 538.syn Synopsis to Chapter 538: SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS

§ 538.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 538.02 Cross References

§§ 538.03-538.09 [Reserved]

§ 538.10 Governing Statutes

§ 538.11 Definitions

[1] Surety and Guarantor Interchangeable

[2] Surety, Creditor, and Principal

§ 538.12 Nature of Suretyship

[1] In General

[2] Guaranty of Promissory Note

[3] Distinguished From Endorsement of Negotiable Instruments

[4] Distinguished From Indemnity

[5] Distinguished From Letter of Credit

§ 538.13 Types of Suretyship Obligation

[1] Unconditional

[2] Conditional

[3] Limited

[4] Guaranty of Collectibility

[5] Continuing

[a] Defined

[b] Unconditional or Limited

[c] Revocation by Surety

§ 538.14 Creation of Suretyship

[1] By Contract

[2] Consideration

[3] Statute of Frauds

§ 538.15 Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990

[1] Guarantor Must Be Provided With Copy of Guaranty

[2] Liability; Evidence for Rescission

[3] Definitions

§ 538.16 Interpretation of Suretyship Contracts

[1] In General

[2] "Principal" May Prove to Be Surety

§ 538.17 Liability of Surety

[1] When Liability Arises

[a] Unconditional Obligation

[b] Conditional Obligation

[c] Principal's Obligation on Installment Plan

[d] Guaranty of Collectibility

[2] Extent of Surety's Obligation

[a] Determined by Contract

[b] Attorney's Fees and Costs as Obligations

[c] Interest as Obligation

[d] Liability for Deficiency After Nonjudicial Foreclosure of Security Interest in Debtor's Real Property

[3] Security Held by Surety

[4] Effect of Disability of Principal

[5] Effect of Discharge of Principal by Operation of Law

[6] Effect of Delay by Creditor

[7] Effect of Indemnification by Principal

§ 538.18 Creditor's Judgment Against Principal Alone Is Not Conclusive Against Surety

§ 538.19 Termination of Surety's Liability

[1] Affirmative Defense

[2] Change in Contract

[3] Acceptance of Part Performance

[4] Performance or Offer of Performance

[5] Expiration of Statute of Limitations

§ 538.20 Rights of Surety Against Creditor

[1] In General

[2] Requiring Proceedings Against Principal

[3] Benefit of Security Given by Principal

[a] In General

[b] On Limited Continuing Guaranty

[c] Principal's Security Applied Before Surety's Security

[d] Effect of Creditor's Failure to Preserve Security

[e] Demand Made of Creditor

§ 538.21 Rights of Surety Against Principal

[1] Compel Performance

[2] Quia Timet

[3] Reimbursement

[4] Subrogation

[5] Conclusiveness on Principal of Judgment Against Surety

[6] Payment of Attorney's Fees

§ 538.22 Contribution Among Cosureties

§ 538.23 Procedure for Seeking Rights After Judgment

[1] Statutory Authority for Repayment

[2] Statutory Authority for Contribution

[3] Noticed Motion After Judgment

§§ 538.24-538.39 [Reserved]

§ 538.40 Governing Statutes

§ 538.41 Public Entities and Officers Exempted From Bond Requirements

§ 538.42 Reduction in or Waiver of Bond by Beneficiary

§ 538.43 Waiver of Bond in Case of Indigency

§ 538.44 Procedural Requirements Under Bond and Undertaking Law

[1] Contents

[2] Number of Sureties; Execution

[3] Filing

[4] Service on Beneficiary

[5] Registration

[6] Approval

§ 538.45 When Bond Becomes Effective

§ 538.46 Withdrawing Bond From Court File

§ 538.47 Term of Bond

[1] In General

[2] For License or Permit

§ 538.48 Premium on Bond Recoverable as Costs

§ 538.49 Defect in Bond

§ 538.50 Evidence of Bond

§ 538.51 Sufficiency of Personal Sureties

§ 538.52 Admitted Surety Insurers

[1] In Lieu of Personal Surety

[2] Two or More Sureties for Aggregate Amount of Bond

[3] Conditions for Acceptance or Approval of Admitted Surety Insurer

[4] Issuance of Certificate of Authority by County Clerk

§ 538.53 Corporate Sureties: Acceptance or Approval

§ 538.54 Deposit in Lieu of Bond

[1] Authorized

[2] Amount of Deposit

[3] Terms of Deposit

[4] Property That May Be Used for Deposit

[5] Interest Paid on Deposit

[6] Return of Deposit

[7] Payment of Amount of Liability on Deposit

§ 538.55 Bonds to the State of California

[1] In General

[2] Official Bonds

[3] Beneficiary Not Specified

§ 538.56 Objections to Bonds

[1] In General

[2] Grounds

[3] Objection to Sufficiency of Bond Based on Market Value

[4] Procedure for Making Objection

[5] Waiver of Objection

[6] Hearing on Objection

[7] Determination of Sufficiency of Bond by Court

[8] Objection to Sufficiency of Admitted Surety Insurer

§ 538.57 Subsequent Insufficiency of Bond or Sureties

[1] Given in Action or Proceeding

[2] Given Other Than in Action or Proceeding

§ 538.58 Reduction of Excessive Bond

§ 538.59 New, Additional, and Supplemental Bonds

[1] When Given

[2] Form and Contents

[3] Applicable Provisions

[4] Effect of New Bond

[5] Effect of Additional or Supplemental Bond

§ 538.60 Release and Substitution of Sureties on Bond Given in Action or Proceeding

[1] Application

[2] Hearing on Application

[3] Effect of Release and Substitution

[a] Liability of Substitute Surety

[b] Liability of Released Surety

[4] Failure to Give Sufficient Substitute Surety

[5] No Release Without Court Order

§ 538.61 Cancellation of Bond or Withdrawal of Sureties Other Than in Action or Proceeding

[1] Applicability

[2] Notice of Cancellation or Withdrawal

[3] Effective Date of Cancellation or Withdrawal

[4] Effect of Cancellation or Withdrawal

[5] When New Bond Not Required

[6] Liability of Surety on Cancellation or Withdrawal

§§ 538.62-538.79 [Reserved]

§ 538.80 Governing Statutes

§ 538.81 Liability of Principal

[1] Not Limited to Amount of Bond

[2] Application of Deposit to Liability of Principal

§ 538.82 Liability of Sureties

§ 538.83 Voluntary Payment by Surety

§ 538.84 Enforcement of Liability on Bond

[1] Jurisdiction Over Surety

[2] By Beneficiary

[3] By Injured Beneficiaries When Bond Is to State of California

[4] By Motion

[5] By Civil Action

[a] Parties

[b] Jurisdiction

[c] Statute of Limitations

§ 538.85 Judgment of Liability on Bond

§ 538.86 Enforcement of Judgment

[1] In General

[2] On Bond to State of California by Enforcement Lien

[a] Establishing Lien

[b] Effect of Lien on Pending Sale of Property

§ 538.87 Effect of Payment

§§ 538.88-538.99 [Reserved]

§ 538.100 California Points and Authorities

§ 538.101 California Legal Forms

§ 538.102 State Statutes

§ 538.103 Decisions

[1] Apparent Principal as Surety

[2] Assignability of Suretyship Contracts

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Consideration Required

[5] Continuing Guaranty

[6] Defenses of Surety

[7] General or Special Guaranty

[8] Interpretation of Suretyship Contracts

[a] Rules of Contract Apply

[b] Integration of Documents

[9] Liability of Surety

[10] Liability of Person Signing Guarantee--Under Principle of Descriptio Personae

[11] Notice Requirements

[12] Prospective in Nature

[13] Remedies of Surety Against Cosureties

[14] Remedies of Surety Against Creditor

[15] Remedies of Surety Against Principal

[a] Generally

[b] Reimbursement

[16] Subrogation

[17] Surety's Liability for Fees, Costs, and Interest

[18] Termination of Liability

[a] In General

[b] Alteration of Obligation

[c] Exoneration

[19] Waiver of Civ. Code § 2809 Defense

§ 538.104 Law Reviews

§ 538.105 Text References

§§ 538.106-538.119 [Reserved]

§ 538.120 California Points and Authorities

§ 538.121 California Legal Forms

§ 538.122 California Real Estate

§ 538.123 State Statutes

[1] Acknowledgements

[2] Admitted Surety Insurer

[3] Approval of Bonds

[4] Bond and Undertaking Law

[a] General Provisions

[b] Exemptions and Waivers

[c] Execution and Filing of Bond

[d] Approval and Effect of Bond

[e] Qualifications of surety

[f] Admitted Surety Insurers

[g] Deposit in Lieu of Bond

[h] Bonds to State of California

[i] Objections to Bonds

[j] Subsequent Insufficiency or Excessiveness of Bonds

[k] Release and Substitution of Surety

[l] New, Additional, or Supplemental Bonds

[5] Cancellation of Bond or Withdrawal of Sureties

[6] Service

[7] Filing

[8] Papers

[9] Definition

§ 538.124 California Rules of Court

§ 538.125 Local Court Rules

§ 538.126 Decisions

§ 538.127 Law Reviews

§ 538.128 Text References

§§ 538.129-538.139 [Reserved]

§ 538.140 California Points and Authorities

§ 538.141 California Real Estate

§ 538.142 State Statutes

[1] Affidavits

[2] Costs

[3] Enforcement of Judgment

[a] General

[b] Enforcement Lien in Proceeding Against Bond to State of California

[4] Enforcement of Liability

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Liability

[7] Notices

[8] Statutes of Limitation

[9] Summary Judgment

§ 538.143 Decisions

[1] Action or Proceeding

[2] Appeal Bonds

[a] Accrual of Right of Action

[b] Appeal from Order on Appeal Bond

[c] Liability of Surety

[d] Statute of Limitations

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Banker's Blanket Bond

[5] Commencement of Cause of Action

[6] Common Law Bonds

[7] Conditions Precedent to Suit

[8] Construction of Bonds

[9] Fraudulent Promise by Surety

[10] Notary Public's Bond

[11] Period Covered by Bond

[12] Preliminary Injunction Bond

[13] Proration of Losses and Costs

§ 538.144 Statute of Limitations

§ 538.145 Law Reviews

§ 538.146 Text References

§§ 538.147-538.159 [Reserved]

§ 538.160 Notice by Surety to Creditors of Revocation of Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2815]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 538.161 Notice by Surety to Creditor to Proceed Against Principal [Civ. Code § 2845]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 538.162 Complaint by Surety Against Principal to Compel Performance [Civ. Code § 2846; Code Civ. Proc. § 1050]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Creditor May Be Codefendant

[4] Allegations

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction

[7] State Statutes

§ 538.163 Complaint by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--General Form With Common Count

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] Cross References

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

§ 538.164 Affirmative Defense to Action by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--Express Agreement to Reimburse from Specific Funds

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 538.165 Complaint by Surety Against Cosurety for Contribution [Civ. Code § 2848]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 538.166 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] California Points and Authorities

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

§ 538.167 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Declaration in Support of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.168 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 538.169 Complaint by Creditor Against Surety--On Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

§ 538.170 Complaint by Creditor Against Guarantor of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor--Guaranty of Collectibility [Civ. Code § 2800]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Prior Legal Proceedings Prerequisite

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

§ 538.171 Allegations--Guaranty of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

§ 538.172 Notice by Surety to Principal of Action Against Surety on Principal's Obligation [Code Civ. Proc. § 1912]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statute

§ 538.173 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Manner of Payment Altered

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 538.174 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Extension of Time for Payment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

[4] Cross References

§ 538.175 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Creditor Failed After Demand to Proceed Against Principal Debtor [Civ. Code § 2845]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

§ 538.176 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety on Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]--Nonreliance on Guaranty

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§§ 538.177-538.189 [Reserved]

§ 538.190 Statutory Form of Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.320, 995.330]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Bond

[4] Declaration of Qualifications

[5] Stipulations Limiting Liability

[6] California Legal Forms

[7] State Statutes

§ 538.191 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Qualifications of Personal Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Declaration

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 538.192 Notice of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Form of Objection

[4] Time for Objection

[5] Cross References

[6] State Statutes

§ 538.193 Declaration in Support of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§

995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.194 Order Determining Sufficiency or Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.195 Notice of Motion for Order--Determining Bond or Undertaking Has Become Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(a), (b)] and for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Determining Bond or Undertaking Is Excessive and Reducing Amount [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

§ 538.196 Declaration Showing Bond or Undertaking is Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.020(a)] or Excessive [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.197 Order to Appear and Show Cause Why Determination of Insufficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)] or Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)] of Bond or Undertaking Should Not Be Entered--Bond or Undertaking Given in Other Than Action or Proceeding

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service

[4] Failure to Appear

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 538.198 Order for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Reducing the Amount of the Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Failure to Give Sufficient Bond

[4] Reduced Bond

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 538.199 Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] Statutes

§ 538.200 Notice of Hearing on Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 538.201 Application by Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.202 Notice of Hearing on Application By Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice Period

[4] Cross References

§ 538.203 Order for Substitution of Sufficient Surety Within Reasonable Time [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.204 Order Granting Application for Release and/or Substitution of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.205 Notice of Cancellation of or Withdrawal of Surety From Bond or Undertaking Given Other Than in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.310, 996.320]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statutes

§§ 538.206-538.219 [Reserved]

§ 538.220 Notice of Motion for Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Sale of Bearer Bonds or Bearer Notes

[4] Cross References

[5] Statutes

§ 538.221 Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.222 Notice of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time for Making Motion

[4] Service

[5] Entry of Judgment

[6] Cross References

[7] Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 538.223 Declaration in Support of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.224 Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 538.225 Complaint for Enforcement of Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Official Bond

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Jurisdiction

[4] Standing to Sue

[5] Allegations

[6] Statute of Limitations

[7] Tolling of Statute of Limitations

[8] Verification

[9] State Statutes

[10] Decisions

[11] Cross References

§ 538.226 Complaint by Employer to Enforce Liability of Surety on Blanket or Fidelity Bond [Fin. Code § 215; 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10.3513, 10.4462, 10.14182]--Blanket Bond Covering Employee Embezzling Funds

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 538.227 Allegations--Fidelity Bond Given by Individual Employee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 538.228 Complaint to Enforce Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] Against Surety Based on Bond or Undertaking Guaranteeing Performance of Personal Representative [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410, 996.460]--By Heir or Devisee for Failure of Personal Representative to Pay Distributive Share of Estate [Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605, 11750]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Related Points and Authorities

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 538.229 Allegations--By Personal Representative to Recover Assets Charged to Former Personal Representative [Prob. Code § 9822]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 538.230 Allegations--By Creditor of Estate to Recover Claim Ordered Paid [Prob. Code § 11424]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 538.231 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages to Enforce Liability of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Bond or Undertaking Given to Support Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 529]--By Person Enjoined

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Attorney's Fees

[5] Surety's Right to Indemnity

[6] Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] Cross References

§ 538.232 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] and for Declaratory Relief--By Surety Against Claimants on Statutory Bond and Against Principal's Indemnitor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] Statutes

§ 538.233 Cross Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Surety to Compel Public Agency to Exhaust Collateral Security Deposited by Licensee [Civ. Code § 2850] in Action by Creditor and Public Agency Against Surety on Licensee's Bond

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 538.234 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] by Plaintiff for Issuance of Enforcement Lien [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520]--In Proceedings for the Benefit of the State to Enforce Liability on a Bond

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546

Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS

PART I. SCOPE

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.01

§ 538.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses suretyship contracts generally, addressing the rights and duties of all three parties involved [*see § 538.10* et seq.]. It includes forms to be used by the surety to provide notices to the creditor revoking a continuing guaranty [*see § 538.160*] and demanding that the creditor proceed against the principal [*see § 538.161*]. A form of notice by the surety to the principal of an action of the principal's obligation is also included [*see § 538.172*]. In addition, this chapter includes forms of complaints for the surety to compel performance or reimbursement by the principal [*see §§ 538.162* and *538.163*] and to seek contribution from cosureties [*see § 538.165*]. Also included are forms of notice of motion, supporting declaration, and order to determine the liability of a joint judgment debtor [*see §§ 538.166 -538.168*]. This chapter also contains forms of complaints against the surety by the creditor on a continuing guaranty [*see § 538.169*] and on a guaranty of collectibility [*see § 538.170*], and allegations for use in a complaint based on a guaranty of accounts receivable [*see § 538.171*]. In addition, there are forms to be used by the surety as affirmative defenses based on material alteration of the principal obligation [*see §§ 538.173*, *538.174*], failure to proceed against principal on demand [*see § 538.175*], and nonreliance on the guaranty [*see § 538.176*].

For discussions and forms relating to surety insurance, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* . For discussion, procedures, and forms relating to indemnity based on express agreements and contribution, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* . For discussion and forms concerning contractors and their sureties, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* . For discussion of promissory notes and endorsements and accommodation parties to them, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

This chapter also discusses the procedural rules relating to executing and objecting to statutory bonds and undertakings, and to substituting sureties and releasing sureties, as well as to deposits in lieu of bond [*see § 538.40* et seq.]. These rules are generally applicable to all statutory bonds and undertakings. Additional procedural requirements of statutes that provide for bonds or undertakings in particular proceedings are discussed in the chapters relating to those proceedings (*see, e.g.,* Ch. 43, *Appeal: Stay of Proceedings* , Ch. 283, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Bonds* , and Ch. 446, *Probate: Bonds--Increase and Decrease During Administration*).

This analysis includes the following forms:

- Statutory bond or undertaking [*see § 538.190*].

- Declaration of personal surety's qualifications [*see § 538.191*].

- Notice of motion objecting to the sufficiency of a bond or undertaking [*see § 538.192*] and supporting declaration [*see § 538.193*].

- Order determining the sufficiency of a bond or undertaking [*see § 538.194*].

- Notice of motion for order determining that a bond or undertaking has become insufficient or is excessive [*see § 538.195*], and supporting declaration [*see § 538.196*].

- Order to show cause why an order for a new, additional, or supplemental bond should not issue [*see § 538.197*], and order for a new, additional, or supplemental bond or reducing bond [*see § 538.198*].

- Application [*see § 538.199*] and notice of hearing on an application [*see § 538.200*] to release a surety from a bond.

- Application [*see § 538.201*] and notice of hearing on an application [*see § 538.202*] for an order substituting sureties.

- Orders for releasing and substituting sureties [*§§ 538.203, 538.204*].

- Notice of cancellation or withdrawal of surety from a bond [*see § 538.205*].

This chapter also deals with the enforcement of liability on statutory bonds [*see § 538.80* et seq.]. It includes a notice of motion [*see § 538.220*] and order [*see § 538.221*] directing sale of bearer bonds or notes that were deposited in lieu of bond, and a notice of motion, supporting declaration, and judgment to enforce liability on a bond that was given in an action or proceeding [*see §§ 538.222 -538.224*]. It also includes forms of complaints and allegations to enforce the liability of a surety on an official bond [*see § 538.225*], on a fidelity bond [*see §§ 538.226* and *538.227*], on an executor's or administrator's bond [*see §§ 538.228 -538.230*], and on a bond given to support a preliminary injunction for damages that might be suffered by the person who was enjoined [*see § 538.231*]. It includes a complaint by a surety for declaratory relief against claimants on a statutory bond and against the principal's indemnitor [*see § 538.232*] and a form of cross complaint by a surety to compel an agency to exhaust security in an action on a licensee's bond [*see § 538.233*]. It also includes a declaration for an enforcement lien [*see § 538.234*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART I. SCOPE

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.02

§ 538.02 Cross References

For forms of complaint against contractors and their sureties, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For a discussion of and forms relating to express indemnity agreements and contribution among joint obligors and debtors, see Ch. 299, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

For forms of complaint against an insurer to compel performance on the surety insurance contract, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For a discussion of and forms for use in promissory notes and endorsers, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

For a discussion relating to the jurisdiction of small claims court over guarantor defendants, see Ch. 526, *Small Claims* .

For discussion and forms of acknowledgment, see Ch. 9, *Acknowledgments* .

For discussion and a procedural guide relating to filing an undertaking to stay execution of trial court proceedings by perfecting an appeal, see Ch. 43, *Appeal: Stay of Proceedings* .

For discussion of the procedure for and forms relating to the filing of an undertaking in attachment proceedings, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

For discussion and forms relating to performance bonds, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to filing of an undertaking and exception to sureties in a claim and delivery action, see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery* .

For discussion relating to an undertaking given in contempt proceedings, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

For discussion and forms relating to bonds given for removal of a civil action, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction*

and Removal .

For discussion relating to the transferee giving an undertaking in an action by a creditor to set aside a fraudulent conveyance, see Ch. 270, *Fraudulent Conveyances* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to bonds given by guardians and conservators, see Ch. 283, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Bonds* , and Ch. 290D, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Actions Against Guardians, Conservators, and Sureties* .

For discussion and forms relating to rights of indemnified after adverse judgment for performing acts for which was indemnified, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to giving undertakings for temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to surety insurance, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

For discussion and form of notice of motion to expunge notice of lis pendens from record on giving of undertaking, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

For discussion of the release of the surety of a notary, see Ch. 390, *Notaries Public* .

For discussion and forms relating to the increase and decrease of administrator's bonds, see Ch 446, *Probate: Bonds--Increase and Decrease During Administration* .

For discussion and a procedural guide regarding the filing of an undertaking in a quo warranto action, see Ch. 483, *Quo Warranto* .

For discussion and form of bond given by receiver, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

For discussion and forms relating to a surety's right to subrogation, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions on performance bonds, see Ch. 104, *Building Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to bonds given by guardians and conservators, see Ch. 283, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Bonds* , and Ch. 290D, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Actions Against Guardians, Conservators, and Sureties* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to enforcement of undertakings given in proceedings for temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions on payment bonds for private works, see Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms regarding actions on public works payment bonds, see Ch. 481, *Public Works* .

For discussion and forms relating to a surety's right to subrogation, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)Party LiabilitiesAccommodationContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART I. SCOPE

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.03-538.09

[Reserved]

§§ 538.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.10

§ 538.10 Governing Statutes

Suretyship is governed by *Civ. Code §§ 2787-2856*. The statute of limitations for an action against a surety is contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 359.5*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050* allows an action by a surety to compel the principal to perform. The effect of a judgment against an officer or other person who has received a bond or covenant of indemnity against liablity for an act on the persons who executed a bond or covenant is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1055*. The binding effect of a judgment against a surety on the principal is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*. Procedures for requiring contribution from joint judgment debtors are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 881-883*. The rights and obligations of accommodation parties to negotiable instruments are governed by *Com. Code § 3419* and, depending on whether the accommodation party signs as a maker or endorser, *Com. Code § 3412* or *3415*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.11

§ 538.11 Definitions

[1] Surety and Guarantor Interchangeable

The terms "surety" and "guarantor" are used interchangeably in this part. Any former distinctions between the terms were abolished by the statute that now defines them [*Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 685, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232* ; *Wiener v. Van Winkle (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 774, 786, 78 Cal. Rptr. 761]* . They are defined as one who promises to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another or who hypothecates property as security therefor [*Civ. Code § 2787*; *but see Com. Code § 3419(d)* (with respect to negotiable instruments, rights of "guarantor," who guarantees collection rather than payment, as different from those of ordinary accommodation party)].

[2] Surety, Creditor, and Principal

The tripartite relationship in suretyship involves parties known as "surety," "creditor," and "principal." The creditor is the one to whom the obligation is owed. The surety agrees to answer for the debt of the "principal" or "principal debtor" who is the person that owes the original debt [*First National Insurance Co. v. Cam Painting, Inc. (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1364-1365, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808* ; *Josephian v. Lion (1924) 66 Cal. App. 650, 661, 227 P. 204* ; *cf. Com. Code § 3419(a)* (negotiable instrument terminology: "accommodation party" and "party accommodated")].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.12

§ 538.12 Nature of Suretyship

[1] In General

Suretyship contracts are collateral to the original contract binding the principal debtor and creditor and give rise to a separate and independent obligation [*Palm Springs S. & S. Inc. v. Bering (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 177, 181, 28 Cal. Rptr. 526]* . The suretyship relation arises when two persons are under an obligation to the same creditor, but one of them bears the ultimate burden of the obligation. The obligor ultimately responsible for the debt is the principal and the other is the surety. Whether one is the surety depends not on the relation with the creditor so much as his or her relation with the principal debtor. If asked to pay, the surety may bring an action against the principal for indemnification. The creditor views them both as primarily liable [*Matthews v. Hinton (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 736, 740-741, 44 Cal. Rptr. 692]* .

When a principal obligor purports to take on additional liability as guarantor, nothing is added to the primary obligation [*Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 308, 319-320, 282 Cal. Rptr. 354]* . For example, when individual trustees purported to guarantee a note payable by the trust, the court found substantial identity between the individual guarantors and the debtor trust. There was in fact no guarantee, and the trustees were deemed primary obligors [*Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 308, 320-321, 282 Cal. Rptr. 354* (case decided prior to enactment of *Prob. Code § 18000* and governed by prior case law under which trustees are personally liable on a contract unless the contract stipulated otherwise)]. The correct inquiry is whether the purported debtor is anything other than an instrumentality used by the purported guarantor and whether that instrumentality actually removed the individuals from their status as obligors under another name [*Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 308, 320, 282 Cal. Rptr. 354]* .

[2] Guaranty of Promissory Note

A guarantor of a negotiable instrument is a type of accommodation party, defined as one who signs as maker, drawer, acceptor, or endorser for the benefit of another, although a guarantor may become one by signing an instrument that includes language indicating that the signer is acting as guarantor or surety. An accommodation party is obligated to pay the instrument in the capacity in which he or she signs [*Com. Code § 3419(a)-(c)*]. For further discussion and forms

relating to accommodation parties to negotiable instruments, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

If the guarantor's signature on a negotiable instrument is accompanied by language indicating unambiguously that he or she is guaranteeing collection rather than payment of the obligation of another party to the instrument, the guarantor is obliged to pay the amount due on the instrument to a person entitled to enforce the instrument only if (1) execution of judgment against the principal has been returned unsatisfied, (2) the principal is insolvent or is in an insolvency proceeding, (3) the principal cannot be served with process, or (4) it is otherwise apparent that payment cannot be obtained from the principal [*Com. Code § 3419(d)*].

A guarantor or accommodation party who pays the instrument is entitled to reimbursement from the principal ("accommodated party") and is entitled to enforce the instrument against the principal [*Com. Code § 3419(e)*].

[3] Distinguished From Endorsement of Negotiable Instruments

Suretyships differ from endorsements of negotiable instruments. Endorsement is primarily a means of transferring or negotiating an instrument [*see Com. Code §§ 3201(b), 3204, 3205(a), (b)*]. If the maker or drawer does not pay the instrument when due, the endorser is liable to the person entitled to enforce the instrument [*see Com. Code § 3415(a)*]. Unlike sureties, endorsers must be given notice of dishonor (or notice must be waived or excused) before they are liable to pay the instrument [*Com. Code §§ 3415(c), 3503(a)*].

The obligation of one who endorses a negotiable instrument for purposes of becoming an accommodation party (surety) is the same as that of one who endorses the instrument simply to transfer or negotiate it [*Com. Code § 3419(b)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to negotiable instruments, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

[4] Distinguished From Indemnity

California law recognizes a distinction between an agreement to indemnify and a guaranty. Indemnity is a contract by which one engages to save another from a legal consequence of the conduct of one of the parties, or of some other person [*Civ. Code § 2772*]. A surety or guarantor is one who promises to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another, or hypothecates property as security therefor [*Civ. Code § 2787*]. A guarantor makes a direct promise to perform the principal's obligation in the event that the principal fails to perform. An indemnitor does not make a direct promise to perform the principal's obligation; the indemnitor promises to reimburse the indemnitee for losses suffered or to hold the indemnitee harmless [*Trust One Mortgage Corp. v. Invest America Mortgage Corp. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1302, 1309, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 83]* .

Another distinction is that the promise in an indemnity contract is an original and not a collateral undertaking, whereas a surety contract is secondary and can only exist if there is some principal liability to which it is collateral [*Somers v. United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (1923) 191 Cal. 542, 547, 217 P. 746]* . For further discussion and forms relating to indemnity, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution* .

[5] Distinguished From Letter of Credit

A letter of credit [*see Com. Code § 5103(a)* (definition)] is not a form of suretyship obligation [*Civ. Code § 2787*]. Generally, a surety's liability for an obligation is secondary to, and derivative of, the liability of the principal for that obligation. By contrast, the liability of the issuer of a letter of credit to the letter's beneficiary is direct and independent of the underlying transaction between the beneficiary and the issuer's customer [*see Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 246-247, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P. 2d 507* ; *Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 685-686, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232* ; *DBJJJ, Inc. v. National City Bank (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 530, 534, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 904]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)Party LiabilitiesAccommodationCommercial Law (UCC)Letters of Credit (Article 5)IssuersObligationsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.13

§ 538.13 Types of Suretyship Obligation

[1] Unconditional

A suretyship obligation is to be deemed unconditional unless its terms import some condition precedent to the liability of the surety [*Civ. Code § 2806*]. If there is nothing in the terms of the guaranty or in the facts and circumstances of the case to import any condition precedent to the liability of the surety, the surety's obligations are unconditional [*Cooke v. Mesmer (1912) 164 Cal. 332, 342, 128 P. 917]* . In an unconditional suretyship, the surety's liability is coextensive with that of the principal [*Standard Oil Co. v. Houser (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 480, 488, 225 P.2d 539]* .

[2] Conditional

Any matter can be made a condition precedent to the surety's liability [*see Schwab v. Bridge (1915) 27 Cal. App. 204, 206-207, 149 P. 603]* . For example, a guaranty for payment "provided that the amount may be due and presented" by a specified date is a conditional guaranty [*Schwab v. Bridge (1915) 27 Cal. App. 204, 205, 207, 149 P. 603]* .

Conditions precedent are not favored by the law and are strictly construed against one seeking to rely on them. If the terms employed in the contract are clear and certain, however, and there is nothing to show a contrary intention, the liability of a surety cannot be extended by implication beyond the terms of the contract [*Schwab v. Bridge (1915) 27 Cal. App. 204, 207, 149 P. 603]* .

Although conditions precedent will not be implied, when they are present, they are adhered to strictly. Any conditions must be precisely fulfilled without regard to whether or not prejudice results. Thus, a surety who was entitled by contract to immediate notice of any act or omission that might cause liability was not liable when notice was not received for five weeks [*Union Indemnity Co. v. Lang (9th Cir. 1934) 71 F.2d 901, 906]* .

[3] Limited

The suretyship contract defines the obligation of the surety. A surety may limit the amount for which he or she will be liable, or the time for which the guaranty will run, or may limit liability to a single transaction between the principal

debtor and the creditor, as distinguished from a continuing guaranty [*Berg Metals Corp. v. Wilson (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 559, 569, 339 P.2d 869]* . The limitations in the contract will be upheld. For example, a clause in which the surety agreed to pay an amount not exceeding $75,000 was interpreted by the court to mean that the liability of the surety was limited to that amount under any circumstance [*Bank of America National Trust and Savings Ass'n v. Sage (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 171, 175, 56 P.2d 565]* .

A continuing guaranty may be limited as to the amount guaranteed [*Berg Metals Corp. v. Wilson (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 559, 569-570, 339 P.2d 869* ; *see also § 538.13[5][b]*].

[4] Guaranty of Collectibility

A guaranty to the effect that an obligation is good or collectible imports that the debtor is solvent and that the demand is collectible by the usual legal proceedings [*Civ. Code § 2800*]. This type of guaranty is distinct because the liability of the surety does not arise at the same time as that of the principal debtor. A guarantor of collectibility does not become liable until after the creditor, by the use of due and reasonable diligence, has become unable to collect the debt from the principal debtor [*Ohio Electric Car Co. v. LeSage (1920) 182 Cal. 450, 455, 188 P. 982* ; *see § 538.143[2][c]*].

[5] Continuing

[a] Defined

A guaranty relating to a future liability of the principal under successive transactions that either continue his or her liability or from time to time renew it after it has been satisfied is a continuing guaranty [*Civ. Code § 2814*]. A continuing guaranty contemplates a succession of liabilities for which, as they accrue, the guarantor becomes liable. It is prospective in operation and is generally intended to provide security in respect to future transactions, within certain limits [*Goldman v. Dangerfield (1929) 101 Cal. App. 67, 75, 281 P. 400]* .

Whether or not a guaranty is continuing is determined from the surrounding circumstances. When the suretyship agreement provides a standing credit to the principal, to be used either indefinitely or for a given period, it is deemed a continuing guaranty. Unless the terms fairly imply that the guarantor's liability is to be limited, the guaranty is seen as continuing until it is revoked. A continuing guaranty need not be a guaranty of a specific contract, but can arise when the surety guarantees all the principal's charges incurred through a succession of transactions with the creditor [*Standard Oil Co. v. Houser (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 480, 487, 225 P.2d 539]* . For example, when the principals of a corporation executed personal guarantees of payment on the corporation's commercial lease, the guaranty agreements were continuing guaranties of performance under the lease that also applied to lease amendments [*Central Building, LLC v. Cooper (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1055, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212]* .

[b] Unconditional or Limited

Civ. Code § 2814 contains no restriction concerning the conditional or unconditional nature of a continuing guaranty. A continuing guaranty for all the charges made by the principal without regard to the terms of the sales, is a continuing unconditional guaranty [*see Standard Oil Co. v. Houser (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 480, 487-488, 225 P.2d 539* ; *see also Central Building, LLC v. Cooper (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1059-1060, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212* (principals' personal guarantees of payment on corporation's commercial lease held to be continuing guaranties that applied to lease amendments in absence of limiting language in agreements)].

A continuing guaranty subject to a dollar limitation is not conditional so as to limit the amount of credit to be given to the debtor and to relieve the surety of liability in the event the limit is exceeded. Rather, it limits only the amount of the surety's liability, and the surety may still be liable for that amount even though the principal debtor has at various times contracted and paid debts equal to or greater than the amount of the guaranty [*Berg Metals Corp. v. Wilson (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 559, 569-571, 339 P.2d 869]* .

[c] Revocation by Surety

A continuing guaranty may be revoked at any time by the guarantor, in respect to future transactions, unless there is a continuing consideration as to such transactions that he or she does not renounce [*Civ. Code § 2815*; *see § 538.160*]. The guarantor cannot revoke the guaranty once it has been acted on and benefited the principal [*Nielsen v. Davidson (1924) 66 Cal. App. 442, 444, 226 P. 835]* . A continuing guaranty does not cover renewals, after revocation, of obligations that were covered by the guaranty at the time of revocation [*Southern Cal. First Nat. Bank v. Olsen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 234, 240, 116 Cal. Rptr. 4]* .

The legislative intent implicitly underlying *Civ. Code § 2815* was to protect guarantors from seemingly unending continuing guarantees of loans to debtors that were frequently beyond the control of the guarantors. *Civ. Code § 2815* allows a guarantor to effectively limit his or her losses by "freezing" his or her liability for only those advances made up to the time of the revocation. Thus, a guarantor who learns that the debtor's financial condition has drastically changed for the worse, can exercise the right to revoke his or her continuing guaranty under *Civ. Code § 2815* [*Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1030, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805]* .

A guarantor may waive the protections of *Civ. Code § 2815*, but the waiver must be specific and clear, so that a guarantor knows on execution of the document that he or she will not have any right to revoke the guaranty as to any future advances, and thus, that the guarantor may essentially have no control over his or her ultimate responsibility for the debtor's borrowings [*Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1031, 1032, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805]* . The language that *Pearl* held insufficient to waive the guarantor's right of revocation was in the pledge agreement that secured the guaranty and stated that the agreement "shall remain in full force and effect until all obligations owing to Pledgee by Borrowers have been satisfied" and that the agreement would terminate on satisfaction of all such obligations. The court found the quoted language unclear as to whether it was intended to preclude other means of termination or revocation of the agreement. It could mean that the pledge (and guaranty) would remain effective as to all advances made to the borrower prior to any termination under *Civ. Code § 2815* [*Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1032, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.14

§ 538.14 Creation of Suretyship

[1] By Contract

Unless notice of acceptance is expressly required, an offer to become a surety may be accepted by acting on it or by acceptance on other consideration. An unconditional suretyship obligation is binding on the surety without notice of acceptance [*Civ. Code § 2795*]. The creation of a suretyship does not require the knowledge or consent of the principal debtor [*Civ. Code § 2788*].

[2] Consideration

The requirement of consideration can be satisfied in either of two ways. If a suretyship is created at the same time as the original obligation or with the acceptance of the creditor and forms a part of the consideration of the original obligation, no separate consideration is needed. In all other suretyships, there must be a consideration distinct from that of the original contract [*Civ. Code § 2792*].

[3] Statute of Frauds

Civ. Code § 2794 lists cases in which the promise to answer for the obligation of another is deemed an original obligation and does not require a writing. All other suretyship obligations must be in writing and signed by the surety. Although suretyships require consideration, the writing need not express the consideration [*Civ. Code §§ 1624(a)(2), 2793*; *see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawConsiderationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.15

§ 538.15 Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990

[1] Guarantor Must Be Provided With Copy of Guaranty

Except as otherwise provided in *Civ. Code § 1799.206(b)* (multiple guarantors), a seller must deliver a copy of a consumer contract guaranty to the guarantor at the time the consumer contract guaranty is signed by the guarantor at the seller's place of business. If the consumer contract guaranty is not signed by the guarantor at the seller's place of business and the seller has not provided a copy of the consumer contract guaranty for the guarantor that the guarantor is able to keep, the seller must mail or deliver a copy of the consumer contract guaranty to the guarantor within 10 calendar days after the seller receives the signed consumer contract guaranty. In any case, the copy of the contract provided to the guarantor must not contain any blank spaces to be completed after the guarantor signs the guaranty, must contain the signature of the seller if it provides for such signature, and may also contain the signature of the guarantor [*Civ. Code § 1799.206(a)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1799.201(a), (b), (g)* (defining "consumer," "consumer contract," and "guarantor")].

If more than one guarantor has signed the consumer contract guaranty, the seller may comply with *Civ. Code § 1799.206(a)* by mailing or delivering the copy to any one of the guarantors who reside at the same address. A copy must also be mailed or delivered to any other guarantor who has signed the consumer contract guaranty and who does not reside at the same address [*Civ. Code § 1799.206(b)*].

[2] Liability; Evidence for Rescission

A seller who fails to comply with *Civ. Code § 1799.206* is liable to the guarantor for any actual damages suffered by the guarantor as a result of that failure. This remedy is nonexclusive and is in addition to any other remedies or penalties available under other California laws [*Civ. Code § 1799.206(c)*]. Failure to comply with *Civ. Code § 1799.206* does not create a new basis for rescission, but is admissible to establish a basis for the rescission of the consumer contract guaranty otherwise authorized by law [*Civ. Code § 1799.206(d)*].

[3] Definitions

A "consumer contract guaranty" within the meaning of the Consumer Contract Awareness Act of 1990 is a writing prepared by the seller and signed, or to be signed, by a guarantor that guarantees the obligation of a natural person under a consumer contract [*Civ. Code § 1799.201(c)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1799.201(a), (h)* (defining "consumer" and "seller")].

A "consumer contract" within the meaning of the Act is a writing prepared by a seller and, except as provided in *Civ. Code § 1799.202(c)* (signature cards and safe deposit or safekeeping agreements), signed, or to be signed, by a consumer that provides (1) for the sale or lease of goods or services that are purchased or leased primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, or (2) for extension of credit, the proceeds of which are used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, except that a consumer credit application is not considered a consumer contract for purposes of this provision [*Civ. Code § 1799.201(b)*].

"Services" within the meaning of the Act means work, labor, and services, including depository services and other banking services [*Civ. Code § 1799.201(i)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionDeceptive Acts & PracticesState RegulationContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.16

§ 538.16 Interpretation of Suretyship Contracts

[1] In General

In interpreting the terms of a contract of suretyship, the same rules are to be observed as in the case of other contracts. Except as provided in *Civ. Code § 2794* (promises to answer for obligation of another that are deemed original obligations of promisor), the position of a surety to whom consideration moves is the same as that of one who is gratuitous [*Civ. Code § 2837*]. For a discussion of *Civ. Code § 2794, see* Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds* .

If the terms of the assumption of liability are not settled, it will be implied that the surety has assumed no greater risk than other sureties in similar contracts in the same locale [*Civ. Code § 2799*; *see Schmitt v. Insurance Co. of North America (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 245, 255-262, 281 Cal. Rptr. 261* (differentiating insurance contract and suretyship agreement in context of statutory bond)].

[2] "Principal" May Prove to Be Surety

One who appears to be a principal, whether by the terms of a written instrument or otherwise, may show that he or she is in fact a surety, except as against persons who have acted on the faith of his or her apparent character of principal [*Civ. Code § 2832*; *see Caito v. United California Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 701, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* ; *Quality Wash Group V LTD. v. Hallak (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1687, 1700-1701, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 592]* . It is not necessary for the surety to show that the creditor accepted him or her as surety [*Civ. Code § 2832*]. For example, property owners who executed a deed of trust in favor of a developer's construction lender sufficiently pleaded that they were sureties rather than principal obligors when their allegations included the fact that the bank's officer considered them third parties, the construction loan agreement and note were signed by the developer alone, and the deed of trust identified the secured obligation as that of the developer and expressly provided that the owners had no personal liability for debt [*Mead v. Sanwa Bank California (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 561, 570-572, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 625* (declining to follow *Matthews v. Hinton (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 736, 44 Cal. Rptr. 692* due to Matthews reliance on cases abrogated by 1939 legislation)]. This doctrine has been applied in cases in which there was evidence that, to the knowledge of the creditor, the third party (claimed to be the principal in fact) had agreed with the maker of the promissory note to pay the obligation to the creditor [*Beverly Hills Nat. Bank v. Glynn (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 859,*

869, 73 Cal. Rptr. 808] .

Even though the apparent principal may establish an equitable lien against the actual principal, however, a purchaser or encumbrance in good faith for value and without actual or constructive notice will take priority over such an undisclosed lien [*see Caito v. United California Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 701-702, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.17

§ 538.17 Liability of Surety

[1] When Liability Arises

[a] Unconditional Obligation

A surety who has assumed liability for payment or performance is liable to the creditor immediately on the default of the principal and without demand or notice [*Civ. Code § 2807*; *but see Com. Code §§ 3415(c), 3503(a)* (contra rule for accommodation endorser of negotiable instrument)]. Thus, if the guaranty is absolute and unconditional, the liability of the guarantor is fixed when the principal obligation matures. It is not predicated on exhaustion by the creditor of his or her remedies against the debtor or on the exhaustion of other security for the debt; it is immaterial whether the debtor can or cannot pay the debt [*Bank of America National Trust & Savings Assn. (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d, 1, 7, 81 Cal. App. 2d 1, 183 P.2d 385]* . Notice of the default is not a condition precedent to the liability of the surety, and the bringing of an action against the surety, with its attendant process, consititutes sufficient notice of the default [*Bloom v. Bender (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 793, 799-800, 313 P.2d 568]* . However, notice may be made a condition precedent to a surety's liability [*see* *Schwab v. Bridge (1915) 27 Cal. App. 204, 206-207, 149 P. 603* (guaranty for payment "provided that the amount may be due and presented" by a specified date is a conditional guaranty)]. Otherwise, *Civ. Code § 2807* (and *Civ. Code § 2808*) places the primary burden on the surety to discover whether a default has occurred [*Baralat Development Co. v. Lichter (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 933, 936, 236 Cal. Rptr. 701]* .

[b] Conditional Obligation

When one assumes liability as surety on a conditional obligation, his or her liability is commensurate with that of the principal [*Civ. Code § 2808*; *see, e.g.,* *First National Insurance Co. v. Cam Painting, Inc. (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1355, 1367, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808* (surety liable for fees for which principal would have been liable); *National Technical Systems v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 415, 423-424, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465* (finding that surety's liability on stop notice release bond extended to attorney fees to which subcontractor was entitled under subcontract)].

A surety on a conditional obligation is not entitled to notice of the principal's default unless the surety is unable, through reasonable diligence, to acquire information of the default and the creditor has actual notice thereof [*Civ. Code § 2808*].

[c] Principal's Obligation on Installment Plan

If the payment guaranteed is to be paid on an installment plan, the surety's liability for each monthly payment becomes fixed and unconditional as each payment becomes due. For example, a surety of payment of alimony and child support obligations became liable as each payment became due, without regard to the creditor's remedies against the principal debtor [*Glickman v. Collins (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 852, 862, 120 Cal. Rptr. 76]* .

[d] Guaranty of Collectibility

A guaranty to the effect that an obligation is good or is collectible imports that the debtor is solvent and that the demand is collectible by the usual legal proceedings, if taken with reasonable diligence [*Civ. Code § 2800*]. A guaranty of collectibility is unlike other suretyships because it requires that the creditor must first proceed against the principal and provide notice to the surety. It is equivalent to a guaranty that the obligation is collectible by due course of law, and the surety is bound only on condition that the creditor uses due diligence to collect the debt from the principal debtor and gives the surety notice of the principal's default [*see Citizens' Nat'l Trust & Sav. Bank v. Seaboard Surety Corp. (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 766, 768-769, 41 P.2d 956* ; *cf. Com. Code § 3419(d)* (guaranty of collection of negotiable instrument)].

A guaranty that an obligation is good or collectible is not discharged by failure to proceed against the principal debt or any collateral security for its payment, however, if no part of the debt could have been collected by these means [*Civ. Code § 2801*; *see Com. Code § 3419(d)(4)* (guaranty of collection of negotiable instrument)]. The removal of the principal from California, leaving no property in the state from which the obligation may be satisfied, is equivalent to the insolvency of the principal in its effect on the rights and obligations of the guarantor [*Civ. Code § 2802*; *cf. Com. Code § 3419(d)(1), (3)* (guaranty of collection of negotiable instrument)]. Thus, if the usual legal proceedings are not taken, the surety is discharged unless no part of the debt could have been collected thereby or unless the principal debtor has moved from the state leaving no property therein from which the obligation may be satisfied [*Ohio Electric Car Co. v. LeSage (1920) 182 Cal. 450, 454, 188 P. 982]* . For a complaint by a creditor against a surety on a guaranty of collectibility, *see § 538.170*.

[2] Extent of Surety's Obligation

[a] Determined by Contract

The surety will be held liable on the terms of the surety contract, and not the principal contract. The courts cannot impose on the sureties another or different contract from that which the parties made [*De Luca v. Budke (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 565, 568, 292 P.2d 298]* . Although the express terms of the surety contract control, they are tempered by the rules of contract law, which will be applied in construing the suretyship agreement [*Southern Cal. First Nat. Bank v. Olsen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 234, 241, 116 Cal. Rptr. 4]* . However, if the surety so elects and is permitted, either by the contract itself or by permission of the creditor, to step into the place of the principal and perform on the contract after breach by the principal, the surety will be subject to the principal's liabilities [*Caron v. Andrew (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 402, 411, 284 P.2d 544]* . For complaints and allegations for use by the creditor against the surety, *see §§ 538.169 -538.171*. The obligation of a surety must be neither larger in amount nor in other respects more burdensome than that of the principal; if, in its terms, it exceeds it, it is reducible in proportion to the principal obligation [*Civ. Code § 2809*]. Because the liability of the surety is commensurate with that of the principal, if the principal is not liable on the obligation, neither is the surety [*U. S. Leasing Corp. v. DuPont (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 275, 290, 70 Cal. Rptr. 393, 444 P.2d 65* (surety that guaranteed lessee's performance under equipment lease held not liable for lessor's losses in buying equipment pursuant to lease commitment letter because principal's liability under the lease itself never accrued)].

A surety contract is not a contract of indemnity (or a liability insurance policy), since the undertaking of a contract of indemnity against loss is not to answer for the debt, default, or misconduct of another, as is the undertaking of a surety contract, but rather to make good the loss resulting to the indemnitee from that debt. The two types of contracts are

conceptually and legally distinct [*Washington International Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 981, 989, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 282* ; *Airlines Reporting v. U.S. Fidelity (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1458, 1463-1465, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 563]* .

[b] Attorney's Fees and Costs as Obligations

Attorneys' fees are not recoverable as costs, damages, or otherwise unless there is express statutory or contractual authority for them [*Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 379, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . A provision in a guaranty calling for the surety to pay reasonable attorney's fees and all other costs and expenses incurred in the enforcement of the guaranty will be enforced [*Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. Land Dynamics (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 966, 979, 163 Cal. Rptr. 348]* . A surety cannot be held liable for attorney's fees, however, on the basis of an attorney's fees clause contained in an agreement that is ancillary to the contract that is guaranteed [*see Chinn v. Penn (1918) 179 Cal. 153, 155-156, 175 P. 687* ; *Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 379-380, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . For example, a guaranty of a promissory note cannot be extended by implication to cover an obligation for attorney's fees that is contained only in the mortgage that secures the note [*Chinn v. Penn (1918) 179 Cal. 153, 155-156, 175 P. 687* ; *but cf. McConnell v. Herbert (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 66, 70-71, 38 P.2d 781* (finding that guaranty was made in relation to both note and deed of trust)]. Furthermore, a surety cannot be liable for an award of attorney's fees in addition to the fixed penal sum of its bond unless the contract provision in the undertaking specifically so provides [*Lawrence Tractor Co., Inc. v. Carlisle Ins. Co. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 949, 953-954, 249 Cal. Rptr. 150]* .

[c] Interest as Obligation

A surety may be held liable for interest, even if it increases the surety's total liability to an amount in excess of the bond [*Burns v. Massachusetts etc. Ins. Co. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 972, 975, 146 P.2d 29]* . A fundamental distinction is made, however, in the computation of interest when the total amount will exceed the amount of the bond. For interest that does not bring the total liability beyond the penalty of the bond, the surety is liable under the bond obligation for the principal's debt. In that case, the interest runs the same as it does against the principal, usually from the date the principal violates the obligation that the surety is securing [*Burns v. Massachusetts etc. Ins. Co. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 972, 975, 146 P.2d 29]* . For interest in excess of the penalty of the bond, the surety is liable only for its own default and not for the default of the principal. Thus, in that case, the surety may be liable for the full amount of the bond plus interest from the time performance became due from the surety itself, as damages for its own failure to pay the penalty when payment was due [*Burns v. Massachusetts etc. Ins. Co. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 972, 975-976, 146 P.2d 29]* .

[d] Liability for Deficiency After Nonjudicial Foreclosure of Security Interest in Debtor's Real Property

If the creditor first resorts to nonjudicial foreclosure of a security interest in the debtor's real property, then ordinarily the creditor is estopped from suing the surety to recover a deficiency [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 46-47, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64* ; *see § 538.21[4]*]. However, the surety may explicitly waive, or could be found to have waived, this estoppel defense against an action by the creditor to recover a deficiency [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 48, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*].

When the surety can be liable for a deficiency after nonjudicial foreclosure of a security interest in the debtor's real property, California's antideficiency statutes [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a et seq., 726*] do not protect the surety. Those statutes are concerned solely with actions for recovery of deficiency judgments on the principal obligation [*Bank of Am. v. Hunter (1937) 8 Cal. 2d 592, 598, 67 P.2d 99* ; *Mariners Sav. Loan Assn. v. Neil (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 232, 234, 99 Cal. Rptr. 238*], and have no application in an action against a surety [*Talbott v. Hustwit (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 148, 151-152, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703* (surety who provided loan guaranty could not complain when, in lender's suit against surety for deficiency after lender's nonjudicial foreclosure sale of debtor's real property collateral, trial court refused to apply *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* for surety's benefit)].

[3] Security Held by Surety

A creditor is entitled to the benefit of everything that a surety has received from the debtor by way of security for the performance of the obligation and may, on the maturity of the obligation, compel the application of such security to its satisfaction [*Civ. Code § 2854*].

[4] Effect of Disability of Principal

A surety is liable, notwithstanding any mere personal disability of the principal, even though the disability is such as to make the contract void against the principal. The surety is not liable if for any other reason there is no liability on the part of the principal at the time of the execution of the contract or if the liability of the principal thereafter ceases, unless the surety has assumed liability with knowledge of the existence of the defense [*Civ. Code § 2810*; *see, e.g., WRI Opportunity Loans II, LLC v. Cooper (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 525, 542-544, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 205* (insofar as guaranteed debt for interest is unenforceable on ground of usury, guarantor's contract cannot be construed or enforced so as to waive guarantor's right to raise that defense, since promise to pay usurious interest is illegal and therefore cannot be enforced on any theory)].

To avoid double recovery by the creditor, *Civ. Code § 2810* further provides that, if the principal is not liable because of mere personal disability, recovery back by the creditor of any res that formed all or part of the consideration for the contract shall have the effect on the liability of the surety that is attributed to the recovery back of such a res under the law of sales generally.

[5] Effect of Discharge of Principal by Operation of Law

A surety is not exonerated by the discharge of his or her principal by operation of law, without the intervention or omission of the creditor [*Civ. Code § 2825*]. The expiration of the statute of limitations on the principal's obligation, however, may also exonerate the surety [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 359.5*; *see also § 538.19[5]*].

[6] Effect of Delay by Creditor

Mere delay by the creditor to proceed against the principal, or to enforce any other remedy, does not exonerate a surety [*Civ. Code § 2823*]. For example, under *Civ. Code § 2823*, a creditor holding a note with an optional acceleration clause is not required to bring an action to have the entire amount declared due, because forbearance alone does not release a surety [*Oleson v. Tellson (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 671, 674, 98 Cal. Rptr. 668]* .

[7] Effect of Indemnification by Principal

A surety who has been indemnified by the principal is liable to the creditor to the extent of the indemnity, notwithstanding that the creditor, without the assent of the surety, may have modified the contract or released the principal [*Civ. Code § 2824*].

Civ. Code § 2819, relating to exoneration of the surety by modification of the principal obligation, also provides that the surety is not exonerated to the extent that the surety has been indemnified by the principal. In construing *Civ. Code § 2819*, a federal court has held that, for the surety to be indemnified and thus still bound after a modification, the surety must have received the indemnified amount, physical collateral, or a lien on property [*Texaco Refining & Marketing v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. (9th Cir. 1990) 895 F.2d 637, 640]* . A mere promise that the principal will indemnify the surety is not sufficient. That promise is already imposed by law by *Civ. Code § 2847* [*see § 538.163*]. Any other interpretation would create an exception that swallows the rule and thus would make every suretyship relation one in which the surety was indemnified [*Texaco Refining & Marketing v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. (9th Cir. 1990) 895 F.2d 637, 640]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.18

§ 538.18 Creditor's Judgment Against Principal Alone Is Not Conclusive Against Surety

Code Civ. Proc. § 1912 articulates the way in which the principal on a suretyship contract may be bound by a judgment against the surety; it says nothing about binding the surety when the principal has alone been sued on the contract for the faithful performance of which the surety has executed and given the bond. This is due to the intrinsic characteristic of a suretyship undertaking. The surety is bound only by the terms of the contract and is entitled to stand on the letter of the undertaking [*Mahana v. Alexander (1927) 88 Cal. App. 111, 119-123, 263 P. 260]* . A judgment against the principal is not conclusive in a separate action against the surety [*Kane v. Mendenhall (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 749, 751, 56 P.2d 498* ; *see National Technical Systems v. Superior Court (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 415, 421-422, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465* (concluding that surety was not bound by judgment subcontractor obtained against general contractor)].

Similarly, if the principal and the surety are sued in the same action and the principal allows a default judgment to be entered against it, the surety still has the opportunity to be heard in defense, at least when the particular terms of the undertaking do not bind the surety to any judgment entered against the principal or permit the principal to conduct the defense [*All Bay Mill & Lumber Co. v. Surety Co. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 11, 17-18, 255 Cal. Rptr. 790]* .

For a discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912* as it applies to judgment against surety, see *§ 538.21[5]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.19

§ 538.19 Termination of Surety's Liability

[1] Affirmative Defense

Termination of liability is an affirmative defense that must be pleaded by the surety [*Standard Oil Co. v. Houser (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 480, 488, 225 P.2d 539* ; *see §§ 538.173, 538.175*, and 22 for affirmative defense allegations that the surety has been exonerated from liability].

[2] Change in Contract

A surety is exonerated, except as provided in *Civ. Code § 2822(b)* (discussed, under *§ 538.19[3]*) and except insofar as he or she may be indemnified by the principal, if, by any act of the creditor, without the consent of the surety, the original obligation of the principal is altered in any respect or the remedies or rights of the creditor against the principal, in respect thereto, are in any way impaired or suspended [*Civ. Code § 2819*; *see §§ 538.173, 538.175*]. A change or minor alteration unrelated to the original obligation or the creditor's remedies or rights will not dictate exoneration; it is an alteration of the obligation or of the remedies that controls [*Newhouse v. Getz (1935) 8 Cal. App. 2d 113, 114, 47 P.2d 306* ; *see FM Conner v. Conner (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 646, 650-652, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687* (nothing creditor did or failed to do in bankruptcy proceeding rose to level of prejudicing surety or exonerating surety on guarantee)]. Any alteration of these elements will exonerate the surety, even if they are to the surety's advantage [*Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 378, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . It follows that the surety need not be prejudiced by material changes in the principal's obligation to be exonerated [*Texaco Refining & Marketing v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. (9th Cir. 1990) 895 F.2d 637, 639-640* (applying California law; relying on *First Congregational Church of Christ v. Lowrey (1917) 175 Cal. 124, 126, 165 P. 440* ; distinguishing *Roberts v. Security Trust & Sav. Bank (1925) 196 Cal. 557, 565, 238 P. 673* , as only applicable to guarantees of construction contracts that allow for modification or changes in the work as it progresses; and distinguishing *United States v. Reliance Ins. Co. (9th Cir. 1986) 799 F.2d 1382, 1385* , as based not on California law but on federal common law)].

The surety is exonerated under Com. Code § 2819 by "cessation of the principal's liability" when some act of the creditor impairs or bars a remedy [*see R.P. Richards, Inc. v. Chartered Construction Corporation (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 146, 154-155, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425* (subcontractor's negotiated release of general contractor from claim for payment

under bonded obligation and acceptance of unbonded obligation under settlement agreement, without surety's consent, fully extinguished general's bonded obligation to subcontractor which constituted impairment of subcontractor's rights and remedies against surety; under Com. Code § 2819, this had legal consequence of exonerating surety on bonded obligation)].

The surety is not exonerated by an alteration of the principal's original obligation or by the impairment or suspension of any of the creditor's rights or remedies against the principal, if the surety agrees to the alteration. The surety's consent may be given before, at the time of, or after the alteration [*Bloom v. Bender (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 793, 801, 313 P.2d 568* ; *State Bd. of Equalization v. Carleton (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1607, 1610-1611, 273 Cal. Rptr. 436]* . The surety is not obligated to inform the creditor that it will not consent to a proposed modification of the principal obligation, nor can it be estopped from relying on its failure to consent to a modification unless the creditor reasonably relied on some act or misrepresentation by the surety [*Texaco Refining & Marketing v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. (9th Cir. 1990) 895 F.2d 637, 640-641* (applying California law; surety specifically warned creditor not to rely on continued guarantee if proposed modification was executed)].

That a promise by a creditor is for any cause void or voidable at his or her option will not prevent it from altering the obligation or suspending or impairing the remedy within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 2819* [*Civ. Code § 2820*].

Civ. Code §§ 2819 and *2820* must be read together. Decisions in California have followed the common law rule and held that an agreement to extend time does not exonerate a surety unless the extension is for a definite period. Thus, before an extension can be deemed a material alteration that, without a showing of detriment or prejudice, operates to discharge the surety as a matter of law, the agreement to extend time, though void or voidable at the option of the creditor, must be for a definite period [*Wise v. Clapper (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 770, 775-776, 65 Cal. Rptr. 231]* .

Rescission of an agreement altering the original obligation of a debtor or impairing the remedy of a creditor does not restore the liability of a surety who has been exonerated by the agreement [*Civ. Code § 2821*].

[3] Acceptance of Part Performance

The creditor's acceptance of anything in partial satisfaction of an obligation reduces the obligation of the surety in the same measure as that of the principal, but does not otherwise effect it [*Civ. Code § 2822(a)*].

Similarly, for purposes of *Civ. Code §§ 2819* and *2822*, if the creditor agrees to accept from the principal debtor a sum less than the balance owed on the original obligation, without the surety's prior consent and without any other change in the underlying agreement between the creditor and the principal debtor, the surety remains obligated for the lesser sum agreed on by the principal and the creditor [*Civ. Code § 2822(b)*]. *Civ. Code § 2822(b)*, enacted as an urgency measure effective July 19, 1993, is declaratory of existing law [Stats. 1993, ch. 149, §§ 3, 4].

[4] Performance or Offer of Performance

Performance of the principal obligation, or an offer of such performance duly made as provided in the Civil Code, exonerates a surety [*Civ. Code § 2839*; *see also Civ. Code §§ 1473-1505* (extinction of obligations by performance or offer of performance)]. The surety has the legal right to pay the debt and then proceed against the principal. Thus, if the creditor refuses a tender of money by the surety, the surety is exonerated from liability [*O'Conor v. Morse (1896) 112 Cal. 31, 35-36, 44 P. 305]* .

The Restatement of Security notes that the tender of performance can be by either the principal or the surety. However, if, at the time of the tender, the creditor reasonably believes that the surety is a principal, there is no discharge [Restatement of Security § 116]. The offer must be made to the creditor or to a person authorized by the creditor to receive what is due under the obligation [*Civ. Code § 1488*]. If the offer of performance is accepted and performance

occurs, the obligation of all persons liable is extinguished [*Civ. Code § 1474*]. If the offer is not accepted, only the surety is discharged. The principal is not discharged by tender [Restatement of Security § 116, comment a; for a further discussion of offer of performance, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*].

[5] Expiration of Statute of Limitations

If the obligations under a surety bond are conditioned on performance of the principal, the expiration of the statute of limitations with respect to the obligations of the principal, other than the obligations of the principal under the bond, will also bar an action against the principal or surety under the bond, unless the terms of the bond provide otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 359.5*; note that *Regents of University of Cal. v. Hartford Acci. & Indem. Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 624, 639, 147 Cal. Rptr. 486, 581 P.2d 197* , which held that the running of the statute of limitations on the principal obligation did not exonerate the surety under *Civ. Code § 2825*, was decided prior to the enactment of *Code Civ. Proc. § 359.5*]. Nevertheless, a written waiver of the limitation period executed by the surety before the expiration of the applicable limitation period will extend the limitation period for four years from the date it would ordinarily expire [*Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5*; *California First Bank v. Braden (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 672, 676-677, 264 Cal. Rptr. 820]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawDefensesStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.20

§ 538.20 Rights of Surety Against Creditor

[1] In General

The law governing suretyships is statutory in nature, reflecting common law rules or a reaction to the common law. The protections afforded the surety against the creditor are the enactment of rules developed in equity to give relief from the common law doctrine that permitted the creditor to enforce remedies against the surety without reference to his or her rights against the principal [*State Ath. Com. v. Mass. Bonding etc. Co. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 823, 829, 117 P.2d 75]* .

A surety may also hold the creditor to the requirement of *Com. Code § 1309*, which provides that acceleration under and agreement that allows the creditor to accelerate payment or performance "at will" or "when it deems itself insecure" is only proper when the creditor in good faith believes that the prospect of payment or performance is impaired [*United States v. Grayson (9th Cir. 1989) 879 F.2d 620, 623* (interpreting California law for guidance and finding that, even though collection officer received bonus for collection, debtor's failure to make installment payments for over one year and projection of substantial losses required finding of reasonable belief that prospect of repayment was impaired)]. The burden of establishing lack of good faith is on the party against whom the power has been exercised, usually the debtor [*Com. Code § 1309*].

[2] Requiring Proceedings Against Principal

A surety may require the creditor, subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440* (enforcement of liability on bond given in action or proceeding by motion without independent action), to proceed against the principal or to pursue any other remedy in the creditor's power that the surety cannot pursue and that would lighten the surety's burden; if the creditor neglects to do so, the surety is exonerated to the extent to which the surety is thereby prejudiced [*Civ. Code § 2845*; *see § 538.161*]. For a discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*, see *§ 538.84[4]*.

As a prerequisite to exoneration under [Code Civ. Proc. § 2845], the surety must make a demand that the creditor proceed against the principal. In the absence of such demand, the creditor may maintain an action against the surety [*see United California Bank v. Maltzman (1974) 44 Cal. App. 3d 41, 54, 118 Cal. Rptr. 299]* . A surety who demands that

the creditor foreclose on security for the debt may, however, not be exonerated under *Civ. Code § 2845* if the surety has ample resources to satisfy the obligation to the creditor and pursue foreclosure directly against the principal [*see Katz v. Haskell (1961) 196 Cal. App. 2d 144, 152, 16 Cal. Rptr. 453]* .

A knowing waiver of the protection of this enforcement statute is not against public policy and is allowed [*American Guaranty Corp. v. Stoody (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 390, 395, 41 Cal. Rptr. 69]* .

[3] Benefit of Security Given by Principal

[a] In General

A surety is entitled to the benefit of every security for the performance of the principal obligation held by the creditor or by a cosurety at the time of entering into the contract of suretyship or acquired by him or her afterwards, whether or not the surety was aware of the security [*Civ. Code § 2849*]. Thus, after noting the provisions of *Civ. Code § 2809* (surety's obligation commensurate with principal's), the primary liability of the principal, and *Civ. Code § 2849*, a surety company was held entitled to have a cash deposit made by the principal applied in reduction of its liability on the bond [*State Ath. Com. v. Mass. Bonding etc. Co. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 823, 828-829, 117 P.2d 75]* .

Civ. Code § 2849 is frequently linked with *Civ. Code § 2845* and the protections of both may be waived, frequently using the same language [*Brunswick Corp. v. Hays (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 134, 138, 93 Cal. Rptr. 635* ; *see also § 538.20[2]*].

If a surety has waived *Civ. Code §§ 2845* and *2849* in a limited guaranty contract, the proceeds from the sale of property that is repossessed on default only exonerates the surety to the extent that the proceeds of the sale exceed that amount of the original debt that was not covered by the limited guaranty [*Brunswick Corp. v. Hays (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 134, 139, 93 Cal. Rptr. 635]* .

[b] On Limited Continuing Guaranty

In the case of a limited continuing guaranty, the surety is not relieved of liability when the creditor receives more than the amount of the limited guaranty from the sale of securities, because a continuing guaranty limited as to amount is not exhausted even though the prinicpal contracts and pays debts equal to or greater than the sum stipulated in the guaranty [*Bank of America Nat'l Trust & Savings Asso. v. Hunter (1937) 8 Cal. 2d 592, 596-597, 67 P.2d 99]* .

[c] Principal's Security Applied Before Surety's Security

Whenever property of a surety is hypothecated with property of the principal, the surety is entitled to have the property of the principal first applied to the discharge of the obligation [*Civ. Code § 2850*].

[d] Effect of Creditor's Failure to Preserve Security

The Restatement of Security provides that, if the creditor has security from the principal and knows of the surety's obligation, the surety's obligation is reduced pro tanto if the creditor surrenders or releases the security, willfully or negligently harms it, or fails to take reasonable action to preserve its value at a time when the surety does not have an opportunity to take such action [Restatement of Security § 132]. Restatement of Security § 132 may provide some guidance in California, but no reported opinion in California has applied this rule, and its relevance may be tempered by Restatement of Security § 131, which provides that a creditor with a security interest in principal's property may compel performance by the surety before resorting to that security, except under narrowly prescribed circumstances [Restatement of Security § 131]. This is a very different rule from California law, which allows the surety to compel the creditor proceed against the principal's security first [*Civ. Code §§ 2849* (surety entitled to benefit of securities held), *2850* (property of surety applied first); *see also § 538.20[3]*]. On the other hand, the California rule does not seem to be

incompatible with Restatement of Security § 132.

[e] Demand Made of Creditor

A demand is required to compel a creditor to enforce the obligation against security given by the principal before pursuing the surety [*Sukut-Coulson, Inc. v. Allied Canon Co. (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 648, 655, 149 Cal. Rptr. 711* ; *see Garrett v. Bomash (1935) 10 Cal. App. 2d 288, 291, 51 P.2d 1100* (dicta)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawSecured TransactionsDefaultCreditor ObligationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.21

§ 538.21 Rights of Surety Against Principal

[1] Compel Performance

A surety may compel his or her principal to perform the obligation when due [*Civ. Code § 2846*]. Once the obligation becomes payable, the surety, before paying the obligation and whether or not he or she has been sued by the creditor, may maintain an action against the principal debtor to compel performance or payment, the creditor being made a codefendant, provided the creditor can himself or herself enforce performance and neglects or refuses to do so [*Eastin v. Roberts, Carpenter & Co. (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 567, 571, 66 P.2d 224]* .

If the creditor sues the surety to recover the obligation, the surety may cross complain against the principal to compel the principal to perform [*Eastin v. Roberts, Carpenter & Co. (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 567, 571, 66 P.2d 224* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050* (surety's action to compel principal's performance)]. For a form for a complaint for use by the surety against the principal to compel performance, *see § 538.162*.

[2] Quia Timet

The common law prejudgment remedy of quia timet (literally, "because he fears") is still available to a surety. It is an action for equitable relief in the nature of a writ of prevention [*Archbishop of S.F. v. Shipman (1886) 69 Cal. 586, 589, 11 P. 343* ; *Escrow Agents' Fidelity Corp. v. Superior Court(1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 491, 493-494, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698]* . Statutory remedies such as injunction, lis pendens, attachment, and claim and delivery have replaced quia timet in most areas except the fidelity and insurance industry. After the debt for which it is liable has become due, without paying or being called on to pay it, the surety may file a bill in the nature of quia timet to compel the principal to exonerate it from liability by payment or performance, provided no rights of the creditor are prejudiced thereby [*see Civ. Code § 2846*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050*; *Escrow Agents' Fidelity Corp. v. Superior Court (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 491, 495, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698* ; *see also Fireman's Fund Insurance Co. v. S.E.K. Construction Co. (10th Cir. 1971) 436 F.2d 1345, 1349* (denying relief because principal was not in default under completion bond)]. The action allows the surety to prevent the principal from dissipating the funds necessary to pay or perform the bonded obligation if the surety knows it will be called on to pay the debt or to perform the obligation on bond, suspects that the principal has some or all of the necessary funds to do so, and fears that the principal may abscond with those funds [*Escrow Agents' Fidelity*

Corp. v. Superior Court (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 491, 495-496, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698] .

Code Civ. Proc. § 1050 incorporates some aspects of quia timet, but not all of them [*see Gagossian v. Arakelian (1908) 9 Cal. App. 571, 573, 99 P. 1113* (dealing with portion of section relating to adverse claim on property, quia timet did not lie without allegation that plaintiff apprehended danger to property)]. Similarly, a guarantor who has a contract with the principal may obtain a writ of attachment in an action to compel the principal to perform its obligation to the creditor [*see Karn v. Wills (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 604, 606-609, 123 P.2d 640* (attachment in action under *Civ. Code § 2846*)], but a surety whose bond does not take the form of a contract with the principal may not.

[3] Reimbursement

If a surety satisfies the principal obligation, or any part of it, whether with or without legal proceedings, the principal is bound to reimburse what he or she has disbursed, including necessary costs and expenses. However, the surety has no claim for reimbursement against other persons, though they may have been benefited by his or her act, except as prescribed by *Civ. Code § 2848* (contribution by cosureties) [*Civ. Code § 2847*; *Top Cat Productions, Inc. v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 478, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553* ; *see § 538.22*].

The principal will not be required to reimburse the surety for costs and expenses in defending an unsuccessful suit by the creditor on a bond in the absence of an agreement between the surety and the principal for those costs and expenses. *Civ. Code § 2847* presupposes the existence of a legal obligation against the principal, and the subsequent satisfaction or discharge of some part of that obligation by the surety before necessary costs and expenses of the latter may be recovered [*Pacific Indemnity Co. v. Harper (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 379, 386, 94 P.2d 586]* .

Reimbursement is not dependent on legal proceedings, but it will only be allowed if it can be shown that liability was clearly established and that a suit would have been a mere formality [*Ragghianti v. Sherwin (1961) 196 Cal. App. 2d 345, 351, 16 Cal. Rptr. 583]* . The payments must have been made under a legal obligation and not on a mere voluntary basis [*Schlitz v. Thomas (1923) 61 Cal. App. 635, 638, 216 P. 51]* .

Full payment and performance by the surety extinguishes the primary obligation. The parties involved then have new rights and liabilities. The principal is to reimburse the surety for the moneys expended, with legal interest, though not according to the terms of the primary obligation. The surety then has the right to an action in assumpsit on the implied promise of the principal to make him or her whole [*Berrington v. Williams (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 130, 134, 52 Cal. Rptr. 772]* .

For a complaint by a surety seeking reimbursement from the principal, *see § 538.163*.

[4] Subrogation

A surety, on satisfying the obligation of the principal, is entitled to enforce every remedy that the creditor then has against the principal to the extent of reimbursing what he or she has expended [*Civ. Code § 2848*].

The principle on which this right of subrogation is founded applies when one person, not a volunteer, pays a debt for which another is primarily answerable and that, in equity and good conscience, should have been discharged by the latter. This doctrine is applied liberally to promote justice [*Meyer Koulish Co. v. Cannon (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 419, 423-424, 28 Cal. Rptr. 757]* . The right to subrogation is not prospective and will not require assets to be held in reserve pending subrogation. A person is not entitled to be subrogated to the rights of the creditor until the claim of the creditor has been paid [*Hausmann v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 611, 615, 29 Cal. Rptr. 75]* . For further discussion and forms relating to subrogation, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation* .

One of the creditor's rights, which the surety can acquire through subrogation by paying the debt, is the right to pursue

judicial foreclosure of a security interest in the debtor's real property that stands as collateral for the debt. In a judicial foreclosure action, the surety can obtain a deficiency judgment against the debtor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]; thus, the surety will have an opportunity to be made whole. However, if the creditor first resorts to nonjudicial foreclosure of a security interest in the debtor's real property, without allowing the surety to pay the debt and become subrogated to the creditor's rights, the surety becomes unable to acquire any rights by subrogation from the creditor, because the nonjudicial sale both eliminates the security interest (leaving nothing to support a judicial foreclosure action) and, under *Code of Civ. Proc. § 580d*, precludes the possibility of a deficiency judgment against the debtor [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 45, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64* ; *see generally Western Sec. Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 248, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* (explaining *Gradsky* holding)]. Because the creditor has an implicit duty not to impair the surety's remedies against the debtor, the creditor is estopped from suing the surety for a deficiency after electing nonjudicial foreclosure [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 46-47, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*]. The estoppel is raised as a matter of law, to prevent the creditor from recovering from the surety after the creditor has exercised an election of remedies that destroys the surety's subrogation rights against the principal debtor [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 41, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*]. However, the surety may explicitly waive, or can be found to have waived, this estoppel defense against an action by the creditor to recover a deficiency from the surety [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 48, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64* ; *see Civ. Code § 2856* (waivers by sureties); California Legal Forms, Ch. 79, *Suretyship, Guaranty, and Indemnity* (Matthew Bender), § 79.20].

[5] Conclusiveness on Principal of Judgment Against Surety

Whenever, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908-1911*, a party is bound by a record and that party stands in the relation of a surety for another, the latter is also bound from the time that he or she has notice of the action or proceeding and an opportunity at the surety's request to join in the defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1912* (referring to "the last four sections," which would literally be *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908.5-1911*; however, when *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912* was enacted, "the last four sections" were *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1908-1911* and, when *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908.5* was subsequently added, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912* was not amended, so it appears that the reference refers back to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1908*)]. For a form for giving notice, *see § 538.172*.

[6] Payment of Attorney's Fees

Attorney's fees are not recoverable as costs, damages, or otherwise unless there is express statutory or contractual authority for them [*Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 379, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . A surety will be entitled to recover attorney's fees and expenses incurred in defending its liability, as well as in an action against the principal to collect them, if these costs are specified in the contract between the surety and principal. This provision will be upheld even if the principal is discharged from liability to the creditor [*Maurice Merc. Co. v. American Emp. Ins. Co. (1934) 140 Cal. App. 354, 359-360, 35 P.2d 1047]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.22

§ 538.22 Contribution Among Cosureties

A surety, on satisfying the principal obligation, is entitled to require all his or her cosureties to contribute thereto, without regard to the order of time in which they became cosureties [*Civ. Code § 2848*].

When one of several joint judgment debtors pays more than his or her proportionate share of the judgment, he or she is entitled to obtain a proportionate contribution from those jointly liable and may bring suit against one or more of his or her codefendants on the implied contract of each obligor to the other so that they will share the burden equally. This basic principle of contribution applies to cosureties who are jointly and severally liable to pay the principal obligation. The right to contribution against cosureties is an obligation implied by law and is governed by equitable principles [*Overholser v. Glynn (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 800, 807, 73 Cal. Rptr. 628]* . The right to contribution is acquired as soon as a surety pays more than his or her share but not until then [*Jackson v. Lacy (1940) 37 Cal. App. 2d 551, 559, 100 P.2d 313]* .

Equitable contribution between sureties allows for loss sharing among co-obligors that share the same level of liability on the same risk as to the same principal. The principle of equity on which the right of contribution is founded applies only when the parties are under a common burden of liability. Under fundamental principles of equity, a person who has paid no more than his or her just proportion of a debt cannot obtain contribution from a co-debtor, even if the co-debtor has paid nothing. A corrollary to this rule is that equality of liability among persons whose respective situations are not equal is inequitable [*Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 684-685, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232]* . For example, a party that provided an unconditional letter of credit as security and then paid the promised amount could not then compel contribution from sureties that provided guaranties, because liabilities inherent in those two kinds of security are markedly different. In order to recover, "plaintiff has to be able to allege it shared the same level of liability with defendants ... in order to sue them for contribution" [*Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 689, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232]* .

Persons may be cosureties for the same debt and may be required to share the loss, even if their liabilities originate in separate contracts. Their obligations will be controlled by contract law. However, if equity demands that one should bear the ultimate burden rather than the other, they stand in the position of successive sureties. Their exact relationship

will depend on the inferences to be drawn from their contracts and the circumstances of the case [*Continental Casualty Co. v. Hartford Acci. & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 570, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533]* . For a form of complaint by a surety against a cosurety for contribution, *see § 538.165*. For forms for use in a proceeding seeking an order for repayment from joint judgment debtors, *see §§ 538.166 -538.168*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.23

§ 538.23 Procedure for Seeking Rights After Judgment

[1] Statutory Authority for Repayment

If two or more judgment debtors are jointly liable on a money judgment and if the judgment is based on an obligation of one judgment debtor as surety for another and the surety satisfies all or any part of the judgment, whether voluntarily or through enforcement procedures, the surety may compel repayment from the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 882(b)*].

[2] Statutory Authority for Contribution

If two or more judgment debtors are jointly liable on a money judgment, a judgment debtor who has satisfied more than his or her due proportion of the judgment, whether voluntarily or through enforcement procedures, may compel contribution from another judgment debtor who has satisfied less than his or her due proportion of the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 882(a)*].

[3] Noticed Motion After Judgment

A judgment debtor entitled to compel repayment or contribution may apply on noticed motion to the court that entered the judgment for an order determining liability for contribution or repayment. The application shall be made at any time before judgment is satisfied in full or within 30 days thereafter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 883(a)*]. The proper interpretation of the phrase "the judgment is satisfied in full" means complete satisfaction of the entire judgment [*Borba Farms, Inc. v. Acheson (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 597, 604, 606, 242 Cal. Rptr. 880]* . Thus, a motion for contribution made by a joint judgment debtor more than 30 days after his or her partial satisfaction of the judgment is considered timely filed, absent a showing that partial satisfaction of the judgment is accepted by the plaintiff as full payment of the judgment [*see Borba Farms, Inc. v. Acheson (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 597, 604, 606, 242 Cal. Rptr. 880* (decided before 1998 amendment of section 883(a) to increase 10 day period to 30 days)].

The order determining liability for repayment or contribution entitles the judgment debtor to the benefit of the judgment to enforce the liability, including every remedy that the judgment creditor has against the persons liable, to the extent of the liability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 883(b)*]. Nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 883(a)* or *(b)* limits any other remedy that a

judgment debtor entitled to repayment or contribution may have [*Code Civ. Proc. § 883(c)*].

In the notice of motion for an order determining liability, the judgment debtor seeking relief should allege payment of more than his or her proportionate share, what his or her proportion is, and what the proportion of the joint codebtor is. The defendant should then have an opportunity to meet this issue of fact by affidavit or evidence, and, after a hearing in which the evidence is heard, the court should determine from the evidence how much more than his or her proportion one judgment debtor has paid, issue an order so determining, and order execution issued thereon [*Stowers v. Fletcher (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 845, 190 P.2d 338]* . This remedy afforded a joint judgment debtor is not exclusive, but cumulative, and the joint judgment debtor may instead choose to take an assignment from the judgment creditor [*Tucker v. Nicholson (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 427, 430, 84 P.2d 1045]* . The cases cited above involved former *Code Civ. Proc. § 709*, which has been replaced by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 881-883*. Because no substantive changes were made in this area, the results should be the same under the new statutes. For forms for use in seeking an order against a joint judgment debtor, *see §§ 538.166 -538.168*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty ContractsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.24-538.39

[Reserved]

§§ 538.24[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.40

§ 538.40 Governing Statutes

Statutory bonds and undertakings are regulated by the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*). The execution, filing, approval, effect, and sufficiency of sureties are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.310-995.670*. Bonds to the State of California are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.810-995.850*. Objections to bonds are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-996.030*, and the substitution and release of sureties, including the giving of a new, additional, or supplemental bond, are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.110-996.360*. Deposits in lieu of bond are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.710-995.770*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.41

§ 538.41 Public Entities and Officers Exempted From Bond Requirements

Notwithstanding any other statute, if a statute provides for a bond in an action or proceeding, including but not limited to a bond for issuance of a restraining order or injunction, appointment of a receiver, or stay of enforcement of a judgment on appeal, the following public entities and officers are not required to give the bond and have the same rights, remedies, and benefits as if the bond were given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.220*]:

- The State of California or the people of the state, a state agency, department, division, commission, board, or other entity of the state, or a state officer in an official capacity or on behalf of the state.

- A county, city, or district, or public authority, public agency, or other political subdivision in California, or an officer of the local public entity in an official capacity or on behalf of the local public entity.

- The United States or an instrumentality or agency of the United States, or a federal officer in an official capacity or on behalf of the United States or an instrumentality or agency of the United States.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsFederal GovernmentClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.42

§ 538.42 Reduction in or Waiver of Bond by Beneficiary

The beneficiary of a bond given in an action or proceeding may in writing consent to the bond in an amount less than the amount required by statute or may waive the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.230*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.43

§ 538.43 Waiver of Bond in Case of Indigency

If the court determines that the principal is unable to give a bond because the principal is indigent and is unable to obtain sufficient personal sureties or sufficient admitted surety insurers, the court may waive a provision for a bond and make the appropriate orders as if the bond were given. In exercising its discretion to waive the bond, the court shall consider all factors it deems relevant, including but not limited to the character of the action or proceeding, the nature of the beneficiary, whether public or private, and the potential harm to the beneficiary if the provision for the bond is waived [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.240*; *see also Conover v. Hall (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 842, 846-847, 852, 114 Cal. Rptr. 642, 523 P.2d 682* ; *Roberts v. Superior Court (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 235, 241, 70 Cal. Rptr. 226* (superior court as having authority to waive mandatory bond requirement of *Gov. Code § 947* for indigents); *County of Sutter v. Superior Court (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 770, 775, 53 Cal. Rptr. 424* (common law authority of courts to waive security for indigents)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsProceedings in Forma PauperisGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.44

§ 538.44 Procedural Requirements Under Bond and Undertaking Law

[1] Contents

The bond must be written, signed by the sureties under oath, and must include all of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320(a)*]:

- A statement that the sureties are jointly and severally liable on the obligations of the statute providing for the bond.

- The address at which the principal and sureties may be served with notices, papers, and other documents under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*.

- If the amount of the bond is based on the value of property or an interest in property, a description of the property or interest, and the principal's estimate of the value of the property or interest, (or if given pursuant to the estimate of the beneficiary or court, the value as so estimated).

The sureties on the bond or undertaking are liable to the extent provided by statute. Nonessential language in a statutory bond is surplusage and without effect. Conditions in the bond that exceed the statutory requirements may be disregarded and the bond otherwise sustained [*Lewin v. Anselmo (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 694, 699, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682* (relying in part on *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.380(a), discussed under § 538.49*].

For a form for a statutory bond or undertaking, *see § 538.190*.

[2] Number of Sureties; Execution

Unless the statute providing for the bond requires execution by an admitted surety insurer, a bond must be executed by two or more sufficient personal sureties or by one sufficient admitted surety insurer or by any combination of sufficient personal sureties and admitted surety insurers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.310*]. The bond must be signed by the sureties

under oath [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320(a)*].

A bond executed by personal sureties must be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of qualifications of each surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(a)*; for a discussion of those qualifications, *see § 538.51*; for form of declaration of qualifications of personal surety, *see § 538.191*].

[3] Filing

A bond given in an action or proceeding must be filed with the court unless the statute providing for the bond requires that the bond be given to another person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.340(a)*]. If the statute providing for the bond requires that the bond be given to an officer, the officer must file the bond with the court unless the statute provides otherwise [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.340(b)*]. A bond filed with the court is preserved in the office of the clerk of the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.340(c)*].

[4] Service on Beneficiary

At the time a bond is given, the principal must serve a copy of the bond on the beneficiary. An affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of service must be given and filed with the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.370*]. Service must be made in the same manner as service of process in civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030*; *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

[5] Registration

When a bond given in an action or proceeding is filed with the court, the clerk must enter the date and amount of the bond and the names of the sureties on the bond in the register of actions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.350(a)*].

[6] Approval

Approval of a bond is not necessary for the bond to become effective unless the statute providing for the bond requires that the bond be approved by the court or officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.410(a)*]. If approval of the bond is required by statute, the court or officer may approve or disapprove the bond on the basis of the affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) or certificate of the sureties or may require the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence and may examine the sureties under oath regarding their qualifications [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.410(b)*]. If court approval of a bond is required in a superior court case, the judge, at chambers, may approve a bond or undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 166(a)(5)*]. A court commissioner may also take and approve, subject to supervision of the court, bonds and undertakings in actions or proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 259(c)*]. A bond in an amount greater than that required by statute may be approved [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.410(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.45

§ 538.45 When Bond Becomes Effective

Unless the statute providing for a bond provides that the bond becomes effective at a different time, a bond is effective at the time it is given, or if the statute requires that the bond be approved, at the time it is approved [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.420(a)*].

The surety can not add surplusage to the bond language that would give them time to rescind the bond unilaterally [*Lewin v. Anselmo (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 694, 700, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682* (language handwritten on appeal bond purported to give sureties 15 days to rescind was ineffective and sureties were bound)].

If the statute providing for a bond states that the bond becomes effective at a time other than the time it is given or approved, the bond is effective at the time provided unless an objection is made to the bond before that time, in which case the bond becomes effective when the court makes an order determining that the bond is sufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.420(b)*; for discussion of objection and court determination of sufficiency of bonds, *see § 538.123[4][i]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.46

§ 538.46 Withdrawing Bond From Court File

A bond given in an action or proceeding may be withdrawn from the file and returned to the principal on order of the court only if either the beneficiary so stipulates or the bond is no longer in force and effect and the time during which the liability on the bond may be enforced has expired [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.360*]. If the bond or undertaking is the original one, it may be withdrawn from the files and delivered to the party by whom it was filed on order of the court only if all parties interested in the obligation so stipulate, or on a showing that the purpose for which it was filed has been abandoned without any liability having been incurred [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1130(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.47

§ 538.47 Term of Bond

[1] In General

A bond remains in force and effect until the earliest of the following events [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.430*]:

- The sureties withdraw from or cancel the bond or a new bond is given in place of the original bond.
- The purpose for which the bond was given is satisfied or the purpose is abandoned without any liability having been incurred.
- A judgment of liability on the bond that exhausts the amount of the bond is satisfied.
- The term of the bond expires.

Unless the statute providing for a bond prescribes a fixed term, the bond is continuous [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.430(d)*].

[2] For License or Permit

The term of a bond given as a condition of a license or permit is continuous. The bond remains in full force and effect and runs concurrently with the license or permit period and any and all renewals, or until cancellation or withdrawal of the surety from the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.440*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.48

§ 538.48 Premium on Bond Recoverable as Costs

If a statute allows costs to a party in an action or proceeding, the costs shall include all of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.250*]:

- The premium on a bond reasonably paid by the party pursuant to a statute that provides for the bond in the action or proceeding.

- The premium on a bond reasonably paid by the party in connection with the action or proceeding, unless the court determines that the bond was unnecessary.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.49

§ 538.49 Defect in Bond

If a bond does not contain the substantial matter or conditions required by the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) or by the statute providing for the bond, or if there are any defects in the giving or filing of the bond, the bond is not void so as to release the principal and sureties from liability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.380(a)*].

The beneficiary, in proceedings to enforce the liability on the bond, may suggest the defect in the bond, or its giving or filing, and enforce the liability against the principal and the persons who intended to become and were included as sureties on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.380(b)*]. For discussion and forms relating to liability of principals and sureties on bond and enforcement of that liability, see *§ 538.80* et seq. (discussion) and § 538.220 et seq. (forms).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.50

§ 538.50 Evidence of Bond

If a bond is recorded pursuant to a statute, a certified copy of the record of the bond with all affidavits, acknowledgments, endorsements, and attachments may be admitted in evidence in an action or proceeding with the same effect as the original, without further proof [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.260*]. If a bond is lost, the entries in the register of actions are prima facie evidence of the giving of the bond in the manner required by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.350(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.51

§ 538.51 Sufficiency of Personal Sureties

A personal surety on a bond is sufficient if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.510(a)*]:

- The surety is a person other than the principal, and is not an officer of the court nor a member of the State Bar.

- The surety is a resident, and either an owner of real property or householder, within California.

- The surety is worth the amount of the bond in real or personal property, or both, situated in California, over and above all debts and liabilities, exclusive of property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment.

If the amount of the bond exceeds $10,000 and is executed by more than two personal sureties, the worth of a personal surety may be less than the amount of the bond, as long as the aggregate worth of all sureties executing the bond is twice the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.510(b)*].

A bond executed by personal sureties must be accompanied by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of qualifications of each surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(a)*; for form of declaration of qualifications of personal surety, *see § 538.191*].

Nothing in the Bond and Undertaking Law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.010 et seq.*] prohibits a transfer of property to create a personal surety [*see Buzgheia v. Leasco Sierra Grove (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 766, 771, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 144* (husband's nonfraudulent transfer of his separate property to wife as her separate property so wife would have sufficient assets to act as surety did not violate Bond and Undertaking Law)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.52

§ 538.52 Admitted Surety Insurers

[1] In Lieu of Personal Surety

If a statute provides for a bond with any number of sureties, one sufficient admitted surety insurer may become and must be accepted as sole surety on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.610(a)*]. The admitted surety insurer is subject to all the liabilities and entitled to all the rights of personal sureties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.610(b)*].

[2] Two or More Sureties for Aggregate Amount of Bond

Two or more admitted surety insurers may be sureties on a bond by executing the same or separate bonds for amounts aggregating the required amount of the bond, and each admitted surety insurer is jointly and severally liable to the extent of the amount of the liability assumed by it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.620*; for statutory form of bond or undertaking, *see § 538.190*].

[3] Conditions for Acceptance or Approval of Admitted Surety Insurer

An admitted surety insurer will be accepted or approved by the court or officer as surety on a bond without further acknowledgment if the bond is executed in the name of the surety insurer under penalty of perjury or the fact of the bond's execution is duly acknowledged before an officer authorized to take and certify acknowledgments, and either one of the following conditions, at the surety insurer's option, is satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.630*]:

- A copy of the transcript or record of the unrevoked appointment, power of attorney, bylaws, or other instrument that entitles or authorizes the person who executed the bond to do so for and in behalf of the insurer, is filed in the office of the clerk of the county in which the court or officer is located. The entitling instrument must be duly certified by the proper authority and attested by the seal of the insurer.

- A copy of a power of attorney is attached to the bond. For form of statutory bond, *see § 538.190*.

There is no requirement that the officer taking the acknowledgment be an officer of California. An acknowledgment taken outside of California is sufficient in California as long as it was taken in accordance with the laws of the place where the acknowledegment was made [*see Civ. Code § 1189(b)*].

[4] Issuance of Certificate of Authority by County Clerk

On request by any person, the county clerk of any county must issue any of the following certificates, based on the clerk's review of the Department of Insurance web site (www.insurance.ca.gov) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.640*]:

- A certificate stating whether a surety is admitted or if the certificate of authority of an admitted surety insurer, issued by the Insurance Commissioner and authorizing the insurer to transact surety insurance has been surrendered, revoked, canceled, annulled, or suspended, and in the event that it has, whether or not renewed authority has been granted. In issuing the certificate, the county clerk must rely solely on the information furnished by the Insurance Commissioner pursuant to *Ins. Code §§ 12070-12073* (requirement that Insurance Commissioner provide clerk with information regarding identity and status of all admitted surety insurers in state and that clerk maintain index of such information).

- A certificate stating whether a copy of the transcript or record of the unrevoked appointment, power of attorney, bylaws, or other instrument, duly certified by the proper authority and attested by the seal of an admitted surety insurer, entitling or authorizing the person who executed a bond to do so for and on behalf of the insurer, is on file in the office of the clerk.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.53

§ 538.53 Corporate Sureties: Acceptance or Approval

A corporation will not be accepted or approved as surety on a bond or undertaking unless the following conditions are met [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1130(a)*]:

- The Insurance Commissioner has certified the corporation as being admitted to do business in California as a surety insurer;

- There is filed in the office of the clerk a copy, duly certified by the proper authority, of the transcript or record of appointment entitling or authorizing the person or persons purporting to execute the bond or undertaking for and in behalf of the corporation to act in the premises; and

- The bond or undertaking has been executed under penalty of perjury as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.630*, or the fact of execution of the bond or undertaking by the officer or agent of the corporation purporting to become surety has been duly acknowledged before an officer of California authorized to take and certify acknowledgements. For the statutory form for a bond or undertaking, *see § 538.190*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.54

§ 538.54 Deposit in Lieu of Bond

[1] Authorized

A principal, instead of giving a bond, may deposit money or certain property with the officer except to the extent the statute providing for the bond precludes a deposit in lieu of bond or limits the form of deposit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(a)*; for a listing of the property that may be used, see *§ 538.54[4]*]. Deposit in lieu of bond is not available for deposits with the Secretary of State [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(a), (e)*]. Any principal who made a deposit with the Secretary of State pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710* prior to January 1, 1999, may continue to utilize that deposit in lieu of a bond pursuant to section 995.710 and the statute that prescribes a bond; however, the deposit will not be renewable pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc.§ 995.710* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(e)*].

[2] Amount of Deposit

The deposit must be in an amount or have a face value, or in the case of bearer bonds or bearer notes have a market value, equal to or in excess of the amount that would be required to be secured by the bond if the bond were given by an admitted surety insurer. Notwithstanding any other provision of the Bond and Undertaking Law, in the case of a deposit of bearer bonds or bearer notes other than in an action or proceeding, the officer may, in the officer's discretion, require that the amount of the deposit be determined not by the market value of the bonds or notes but by a formula based on the principal amount of the bonds or notes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(b)*].

[3] Terms of Deposit

The deposit must be accompanied by an agreement executed by the principal authorizing the officer to collect, sell, or otherwise apply the deposit to enforce the principal's liability on the deposit. The agreement shall include the address at which the principal may be served with notices, papers, and other documents under this chapter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(c)*].

The officer may prescribe terms and conditions to implement *section 995.710* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(d)*].

[4] Property That May Be Used for Deposit

The principal may use any of the following property for a deposit in lieu of a bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(a)*]:

- Lawful money of the United States. The money must be maintained by the officer in an interest-bearing trust account.

- Bearer bonds or bearer notes of the United States or the State of California.

- Certificates of deposit payable to the officer, not exceeding the federally insured amount, issued by banks or savings associations authorized to do business in this state and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

- Savings accounts assigned to the officer, not exceeding the federally insured amount, together with evidence of the deposit in the savings accounts with banks authorized to do business in this state and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

- Investment certificates or share accounts assigned to the officer, not exceeding the federally insured amount, issued by savings associations authorized to do business in this state and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

- Certificates for funds or share accounts assigned to the officer, not exceeding the guaranteed amount, issued by a credit union, as defined in *Fin. Code § 14002*, whose share deposits are guaranteed by the National Credit Union Administration or guaranteed by any other agency approved by the Department of Financial Institutions.

[5] Interest Paid on Deposit

If no proceedings are pending to enforce the liability of the principal on the deposit, the officer must do the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.740*]:

- Pay quarterly to the principal, on demand, any interest on the deposit, when earned in accordance with the terms of the account or certificate.

- Deliver to the principal, on demand, any interest coupons attached to bearer bonds or bearer notes as the interest coupons become due and payable, or pay annually any interest payable on the bonds or notes.

[6] Return of Deposit

A deposit given in lieu of a bond must be returned to the principal at the earliest of the following times [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.770*]:

- On substitution of a sufficient bond for the deposit. The bond will be in full force and effect for all liabilities incurred, and for acts, omissions, or causes existing or which arose during the period the deposit was in effect.

- The time provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.360* for return of a bond.

- The time provided by statute for return of the deposit.

[7] Payment of Amount of Liability on Deposit

The principal must pay the amount of the liability on the deposit within 30 days after the date on which the judgment of liability becomes final [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.750(a)*].

If the deposit was given to stay enforcement of a judgment on appeal, the principal must pay the amount of the liability on the deposit, including damages and costs awarded against the principal on appeal, within 30 days after the filing of the remittitur from the appellate court in the court from which the appeal is taken [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.750(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.55

§ 538.55 Bonds to the State of California

[1] In General

Bonds to the State of California are bonds executed to, in favor of, in the name of, or payable to the State of California or the people of the state, including but not limited to official bonds [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.810*]. A bond given in an action or proceeding to the State of California must be approved by the court and any party for whose benefit the bond is given may object to the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.840*].

[2] Official Bonds

Except as otherwise provided by statute, a bond given by an officer of the court for the faithful discharge of the officer's duties and for obedience to the orders of the court must be given to the State of California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.820*].

[3] Beneficiary Not Specified

If a statute providing for a bond or a court order pursuant to the statute does not specify the beneficiary of the bond, the bond must be to the State of California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.830*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.56

§ 538.56 Objections to Bonds

[1] In General

The procedure for objecting to bonds is limited to bonds given in an action or proceeding, in which there are adversary parties and a court to resolve disputes. In other situations the officer required to approve a bond or undertaking must do so without the objection procedure [*see* Law Revision Commission comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.910*].

If the amount of the bond is increased voluntarily or by agreement of the parties to satisfy an objection to the bond made in an action or proceeding, and the bond is given in an amount greater than the amount required by statute or by order of the court or officer pursuant to statute, the liability of the surety on the bond will not be limited, as it otherwise would be, to the amount required by statute or by order of the court or officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(b)*].

[2] Grounds

The beneficiary may object to a bond on the grounds that the sureties are insufficient, the amount of the bond is insufficient, or the bond, from any other cause, is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920*; for forms for noticed motion and declaration in support of motion objecting to sufficiency of bond, *see §§ 538.192* and *538.193*].

[3] Objection to Sufficiency of Bond Based on Market Value

If a ground for objection is that the value of property or an interest in property on which the amount of the bond is based exceeds the value estimated in the bond, the objection must state the beneficiary's estimate of the market value of the property or interest in property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.940(a)*; *see § 538.192*]. If the principal accepts the beneficiary's estimate of the market value and immediately files an increased bond based on the estimate, no hearing will be held on that ground for the objection, and the beneficiary will be bound by the estimate of the market value of the property or interest in property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.940(b)*].

[4] Procedure for Making Objection

The objection must be made within 10 days after service of a copy of the bond on the beneficiary or such other time as is required by the statute providing for the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(b)*]. Service on the principal of the notice of motion and proof of service are made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1013a* [*see* Recommendation Relating to Statutory Bonds and Undertakings, 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 501, 537 (1982)]. The amount of notice required is less than that for notices of motion in general [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*]. Unless the parties otherwise agree, the hearing on an objection must be held not less than two or more than five days after service of the notice of motion on the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.950(a)*].

[5] Waiver of Objection

If no objection is made within the time required by statute, the beneficiary is deemed to have waived all objections to the bond except on a showing of good cause for failure to make the objection within the time required by statute or of changed circumstances [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(c)*].

[6] Hearing on Objection

The hearing must be conducted in the manner that the court determines is proper. The court may permit witnesses to attend and testify and evidence to be procured and introduced as in the trial of a civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.950(b)*]. If the value of property or an interest in property is a ground for the objection, the court will estimate its value. The court may appoint one or more disinterested persons to appraise property or an interest in property for the purpose of estimating its value [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.950(c)*]. A court commissioner is also empowered to determine any objections to a bond or undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 259(c)*].

[7] Determination of Sufficiency of Bond by Court

After the hearing on the objection, the court will make an order determining the sufficiency or insufficiency of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960(a)*; for a form for an order determining the sufficiency of a bond, *see § 538.194*].

If the court determines that the bond is insufficient, it must specify in what respect the bond is insufficient, and order that a bond with sufficient sureties and in a sufficient amount be given within five days. If a sufficient bond is not given within the required time, the court will on ex parte motion order that all rights obtained by giving the original bond immediately cease [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960(b)(1)*]. If a bond is in effect, and the court determines that the bond is insufficient, the bond remains in effect until a sufficient bond is given in its place, or until the time in which to give a sufficient bond expires, whichever occurs first. If the time in which to give a sufficient bond expires, the original bond remains in full force and effect for (1) all liabilities incurred before expiration, and (2) acts, omissions, or causes existing or that arose before expiration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960(b)(2)*]. In the case of a bond that becomes effective at a time other than the time it is given or approved (*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 3449, Code Civ. Proc. § 720.610 et seq.*), the bond will not become effective if objection is made to it before the effective date, and will become effective only at the time following the hearing on the objection when the court makes an order determining that the bond is sufficient [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.420(b)*]. If the court determines that such a bond is insufficient, there is no bond in effect until a sufficient bond is given in its place.

If the court determines that a bond is sufficient, no future objection to the bond may be made except on a showing of changed circumstances [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960(c)*].

[8] Objection to Sufficiency of Admitted Surety Insurer

A person who objects to the sufficiency of an admitted surety insurer must attach to and incorporate in the objection one or both of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.650*]:

- The certificate of the clerk of the county in which the court is located stating that the insurer is not listed as an admitted surety insurer on the web site of the Department of Insurance or that the insurer's certificate of authority has been surrendered, revoked, canceled, annulled, or suspended and has not been renewed.

- An affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) stating facts that establish the insufficiency of the insurer. For a declaration in support of the motion objecting to the sufficiency of a bond, *see § 538.193*.

If an objection is made to the sufficiency of an admitted surety insurer on a bond or if the bond of an admitted surety insurer is required to be approved, the insurer must submit to the court or officer the following documents [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.660(a)*]:

- The original, or a certified copy, of the unrevoked appointment, power of attorney, bylaws, or other instrument entitling or authorizing the person who executed the bond to do so, within 10 calendar days of the insurer's receipt of a request to submit the instrument.

- A certified copy of the certificate of authority of the insurer issued by the Insurance Commissioner, within 10 calendar days of the insurer's receipt of a request to submit the copy.

- A certificate from the clerk of the county in which the court or officer is located stating that the certificate of authority of the insurer has not been surrendered, revoked, canceled, annulled, or suspended, or, in the event that it has, that renewed authority has been granted, within 10 calendar days of the insurer's receipt of the certificate.

- Copies of the insurer's most recent annual statement and quarterly statement filed with the Department of Insurance pursuant to *Ins. Code § 900 et seq.*, within 10 calendar days of the insurer's receipt of a request to submit the statements.

If the above documents are submitted in compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.660(a)*, and if it appears that the bond was duly executed, that the insurer is authorized to transact surety insurance in California, and that its assets exceed its liabilities in an amount equal to or in excess of the amount of the bond, the insurer is sufficient and shall be accepted or approved as surety on the bond. The approval or acceptance is subject to the limitation set forth in *Ins. Code § 12090* (admitted surety insurer may not become surety on undertaking when its liability amounts to more than 10 percent of its capital) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.660(b)*].

No public agency may require an admitted surety insurer to comply with any requirements other than those in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.660*, described above, whenever an objection is made to the sufficiency of the admitted surety insurer on the bond or if the bond is required to be approved [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.670(a)* (applicable to bond executed, filed, posted, furnished, or otherwise given as security pursuant to California statute or any law or ordinance of a public agency)]. "Public agency," for these purposes, refers to the state, any agency or authority, city, county, city and county, district, municipal or public corporation, or any instrumentality of them [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.670(b)*].

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.660* and 995.970, however, the California Integrated Waste Management Board, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the Department of Toxic Substances Control may require, in order to comply with Subtitle C or D of the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 [*see 42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.*], an admitted surety insurer to be listed in Circular 570 issued by the United States Treasury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.675*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.57

§ 538.57 Subsequent Insufficiency of Bond or Sureties

[1] Given in Action or Proceeding

If a bond is given in an action or proceeding, the court may determine that the bond is or has from any cause become insufficient because the sureties are insufficient or because the amount of the bond is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(a)*]. The court determination is made on motion supported by affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) or on the court's own motion. The motion is deemed to be an objection to the bond, and notice of motion is given and the motion is heard in the same manner as an objection to the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(b)*; for form of noticed motion for order determining bond has become insufficient, *see § 538.195*; for discussion of the procedure for determining an objection to bond, *see § 538.123[4][i]*].

If the court determines that the bond is insufficient, the court shall order that a sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond be given within a reasonable time but not less than five days after the hearing. The court order is subject to any limitations in the statute providing for the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)*; for form of order for sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond, *see § 538.198*].

If a sufficient bond is not given within the time required by court order, all rights obtained by giving the original bond immediately cease and the court on ex parte motion will so order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(d)*].

[2] Given Other Than in Action or Proceeding

If a bond is given other than in an action or proceeding and it is shown by affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of a credible witness or it otherwise comes to the attention of the officer that the bond is or has from any cause become insufficient because the sureties are insufficient or because the amount of the bond is insufficient, the officer may serve an order on the principal to appear and show cause why the officer should not make a determination that the bond is insufficient. The hearing on the order to show cause must be not less than three or more than 10 days after service of the order on the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)*; for form of declaration showing bond has become insufficient, *see § 538.196*; for form of order to appear and show cause why a determination that the bond is

insufficient should not be made, *see § 538.197*].

If the principal fails to appear or show good cause on the date of the hearing, the officer may determine that the bond is insufficient and order a sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond to be given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(b)*; for form of order for sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond, *see § 538.198*].

If a sufficient bond is not given within 10 days after the order, the officer shall make an order vacating the rights obtained by giving the original bond, including declaring vacant any office and suspending or revoking any license or certificate for which the bond was given. Any office vacated, license suspended or revoked, or any other rights lost will not be reinstated until a new, additional, or supplemental bond is given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjections

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.58

§ 538.58 Reduction of Excessive Bond

The court, if a bond is given or ordered in an action or proceeding, or the officer, if a bond is given or ordered other than in an action or proceeding, may determine that the amount of the bond is excessive. If so, the court or officer may order the amount reduced to an amount that in the discretion of the court or officer appears proper under the circumstances. The order is subject to any limitations in the statute providing for the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)*; for form of order determing bond is excessive and reducing bond, *see § 538.198*].

The determination as to whether or not a bond is excessive is made on motion or affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of the principal in the same manner as a motion or affidavit or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020* that a bond is insufficient [for discussion of procedure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010*, *see* Subsequent Insufficiency of Bond or Sureties--Given in Action or Proceeding, *above*; for discussion of procedure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020*,--Given in Other Than Action or Proceeding, *above*]. The notice of motion or the order to show cause made pursuant to affidavit or declaration must be served on the beneficiary [for declaration showing bond is excessive, *see § 538.196*; for form of notice of motion for order determining bond is excessive and reducing bond, *see § 538.195*]. The determination of the court or officer is made in the same manner and pursuant to the same procedures as a determination under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020* that a bond is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)*; for form of order reducing bond on determination of excessiveness, *see § 538.198*; for procedure for determination of subsequent insufficiency of bond, *see § 538.123[4][i]*].

If the court or officer determines that the bond is excessive, the principal may give a new bond for the reduced amount. The sureties may be the same sureties as on the original bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProcedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.59

§ 538.59 New, Additional, and Supplemental Bonds

[1] When Given

The principal must give a new, additional, or supplemental bond if the court or officer orders that a new, additional, or supplemental bond be given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.210(a)*; for form of order for sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond, *see § 538.198*].

The principal may give a new bond if a surety withdraws from or cancels the original bond or to obtain the release of sureties from liability on the original bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.210(b)*].

[2] Form and Contents

A new, additional, or supplemental bond must be in the same form and have the same obligation as the original bond. It must be in all other respects the same as the original bond, and be in the amount necessary for the purpose for which the new, additional, or supplemental bond is given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.220(a)*; for statutory form of bond or undertaking, *see § 538.190*].

In addition to any other requirements, a supplemental bond must recite the names of the remaining original sureties, the name of the new surety, and the amount for which the new surety is liable. The supplemental bond must be for the amount for which the original surety was liable on the original bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.220(b)*].

[3] Applicable Provisions

A new, additional, or supplemental bond is subject to all the provisions applicable to the original bond, and to the provisions of the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) including, but not limited to, the provisions governing giving and objecting to a bond and liabilities and enforcement procedures [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.230*; for discussion of objecting to bond, *see* discussion under Objections to Bond,].

[4] Effect of New Bond

If a new bond is given in place of the original bond, the original bond remains in full force and effect for liabilities incurred before, and for acts, omissions, or causes existing or which arose before, the new bond became effective [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.240(a)*].

The sureties on the original bond are not liable for any act, default, or misconduct of the principal or other breach of the condition of the bond that occurs after, or for any liabilities on the bond that arise after, the new bond becomes effective [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.240(b)*].

[5] Effect of Additional or Supplemental Bond

An additional or supplemental bond does not discharge or affect the original bond. The original bond remains in full force and effect as if the additional or supplemental bond had not been given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250(a)*].

After an additional or supplemental bond is given, the principal and sureties are liable on either or both bonds for injury caused by breach of any condition of the bonds. Subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250(c)*, the beneficiary may enforce the liability on either bond or may enforce the liability separately on both bonds and recover separate judgments of liability on both [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250(b)*].

If the beneficiary recovers separate judgments of liability on both bonds for the same cause of action, the beneficiary may enforce both judgments. The beneficiary may collect, by execution or otherwise, the costs of both proceedings to enforce the liability on the bonds and the amount actually awarded to the beneficiary on the same cause of action in only one of the proceedings. No double recovery is allowed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250(c)*].

If the sureties on either bond have been compelled to pay any sum of money on account of the principal, they are entitled to recover from the sureties on the remaining bond a distributive part of the sum paid in the proportion that the amounts of the bonds bear one to the other and to the sums paid [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.60

§ 538.60 Release and Substitution of Sureties on Bond Given in Action or Proceeding

[1] Application

A surety on a bond given in an action or proceeding may at any time apply to the court for an order to be released from liability on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)*; for form of application for release, *see § 538.199*].

If a surety applies for release from liability on a bond, the principal on the bond may then apply to the court for an order that another surety be substituted for the original surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)*; for forms of application and notice of hearing on application for substitution of sureties, *see §§ 538.201* and *538.202*].

The applicant must serve on the principal or surety (other than the applicant) and on the beneficiary a copy of the application and a notice of hearing on the application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*]. Service is made in the same manner as service of process in civil actions generally (*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030*]. Service must be made not less than 15 days before the date set for hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*].

[2] Hearing on Application

On the hearing of the application, the court will determine whether or not injury to the beneficiary would result from substitution or release of the surety. If the court determines that release would not reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond, substitution of a sufficient surety is not necessary and the court must order the release of the surety. If the court determines that no injury would result from substitution of the surety, the court must order the substitution of a sufficient surety within a reasonable time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*].

At the time of substitution of a sufficient surety, the court must order the release of the original surety from liability on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*].

[3] Effect of Release and Substitution

[a] Liability of Substitute Surety

If a substitute surety is given, the substitute surety is subject to all the provisions of the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*), including but not limited to the provisions governing insufficient and excessive bonds [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(a)*].

[b] Liability of Released Surety

If a surety is released from liability on a bond, the bond remains in full force and effect for all liabilities incurred before, and for acts, omissions, or causes existing or which arose before, the release. Legal proceedings may be had therefor in all respects as though there had been no release [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150(a)*].

The surety is not liable for any act, default, or misconduct of the principal or other breach of the condition of the bond that oc curs after, or for any liabilities on the bond that arise after, the release [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150(b)*].

[4] Failure to Give Sufficient Substitute Surety

If the principal does not give a sufficient substitute surety within the time ordered by the court, or within a longer time consented to by the surety, all rights obtained by giving the original bond immediately cease. On ex parte motion the court will issue an order to that effect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.140*].

The release of a surety does not affect the bond as to the remaining sureties, or alter or change their liability in any respect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150(c)*].

[5] No Release Without Court Order

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110* a court order is required to effectively release a surety on a statutory bond. A release of a surety voluntarily signed by the beneficiary of the bond does not release the surety [*Snyder v. Untied States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 561, 569, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 498* (release of guardianship bond ineffective)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.61

§ 538.61 Cancellation of Bond or Withdrawal of Sureties Other Than in Action or Proceeding

[1] Applicability

The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.310-996.360* govern cancellation of or withdrawal of a surety from a bond given other than in an action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.310*].

[2] Notice of Cancellation or Withdrawal

A surety may cancel or withdraw from a bond by giving a notice of cancellation or withdrawal to the officer to whom the bond was given, notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030* (service to be made in same manner as service of process in civil actions generally). At the same time the surety gives notice of cancellation or withdrawal, the surety must mail or deliver a copy of the notice of cancellation or withdrawal to the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.320*; for form of notice of cancellation or withdrawal of surety, *see § 538.205*].

[3] Effective Date of Cancellation or Withdrawal

Cancellation or withdrawal of a surety is effective at the earliest of the following times [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.330*]:

- 30 days after notice of cancellation or withdrawal is given.
- If a new surety is substituted for the original surety, the date the substitution becomes effective.
- If a new bond is given, the date the new bond becomes effective.

[4] Effect of Cancellation or Withdrawal

If the principal does not give a new bond within 30 days after notice of cancellation or withdrawal is given, all rights obtained by giving the original bond immediately cease, any office for which the bond is given is vacant, any

commission for which the bond is given is revoked, and any license or registration for which the bond is given is suspended [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.340(a)*].

A person whose license or registration is suspended cannot operate or carry on business pursuant to the license or registration during the period of suspension. A license or registration that is suspended may be revived only by the giving of a new bond during the license or registration period in which the cancellation or withdrawal occurred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.340(b)*].

[5] When New Bond Not Required

If the withdrawal of a surety does not reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond, no new bond is required or necessary to maintain the original bond in effect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.350*].

[6] Liability of Surety on Cancellation or Withdrawal

If a surety cancels or withdraws from a bond, the bond remains in full force and effect for all liabilities incurred before, and for acts, omissions, or causes existing or which arose before, the cancellation or withdrawal. Legal proceedings may be had therefor in all respects as though there had been no cancellation or withdrawal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.360(a)*].

The surety is not liable for any act, default, or misconduct of the principal or other breach of the condition of the bond that occurs after, or for any liabilities on the bond that arise after, the cancellation or withdrawal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.360(b)*].

The cancellation or withdrawal does not affect the bond as to the remaining sureties, or alter or change their liability in any respect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.360(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.62-538.79

[Reserved]

§§ 538.62[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.80

§ 538.80 Governing Statutes

Statutory bonds and undertakings are regulated by the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*; for a discussion of the applicability of that law, *see* the discussion in the General Introduction to this Part under Applicability of Bond and Undertaking Law). Actions and motions to enforce statutory bonds are governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410-996.560*. Liability of sureties and principals is regulated by *Civ. Code §§ 2806-2811* and by *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.81

§ 538.81 Liability of Principal

[1] Not Limited to Amount of Bond

Except as otherwise provided by statute, the liability of the principal is not limited to the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(a)*; *e.g., Franke v. BAM Bldg. Co. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 224, 230-231, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212* (principal's liability on undertaking given pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 720.260(c)* for enforcement of judgment was not limited by statute; principal's letter purporting to limit liability as provided in obsolete language of superseded statute was ineffectual)].

[2] Application of Deposit to Liability of Principal

If the principal does not pay the amount of the liability on the deposit within the time prescribed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.750*, the deposit will be collected, sold, or otherwise applied to the liability, on order of the court that entered the judgment of liability. The order will be made on five days' notice to the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(a)*].

Bearer bonds or notes without a prevailing market price will be sold at public auction. Notice of sale must be served on the principal. Bearer bonds or notes having a prevailing market price may be sold at private sale at a price not lower than the prevailing market price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(b)*].

The deposit must be distributed in the following order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(c)*]:

- First, to pay the cost of collection, sale, or other application of the deposit.
- Second, to pay the judgment of liability of the principal on the deposit.
- Third, the remainder, if any, must be returned to the principal.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.82

§ 538.82 Liability of Sureties

Notwithstanding any other statute other than *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480* (discussed in *§ 538.83*), the aggregate liability of a surety to all persons for all breaches of the condition of a bond is limited to the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(a)* ; *see Franke v. BAM Building Co. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 224, 230-231, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212* (analyzing statute)]. A surety's liability may be further limited by the statute providing for the bond or undertaking [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 7071.11(a)* (liability on claim for wages and fringe benefits on contractor's bond, other than a bond required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7071.8*, limited to $4,000)]. Nothing in the Bond and Undertaking Law is intended to limit the liability of a surety pursuant to any other statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.475*]. Thus, a surety may be liable for costs of suit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1032*], in addition to the amount of the bond, when the surety is a losing party to litigation determining that the principal breached a condition of the bond [*Harris v. Northwestern National Ins. Co. (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1061, 1064-1066, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 234]* .

However, the bond's language read in light of the applicable statutes determines the rights and liabilities under a surety bond. If a surety makes a contract with the law before him or her, the law enters into and becomes a part of the agreement. Moreover, a surety can raise all defenses that the principal can raise and must pay on the bond only if the claimant establishes, without reference to the bond, the principal's legal obligation to pay. Under *Civ. Code § 2809* a surety is not liable on the obligation if the principal is not liable on the obligation [*Royster Construction Co. v. Urban West Communities (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1158, 1168-1169, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684]* . Thus, for example, when an owner of land subject to a mechanic's lien posts bonds pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3143* to release the property from the lien and the bonds do not provide for the recovery of attorney fees, recovery of attorney fees, whether as damages or costs, has been held barred against the surety on the *Civ. Code § 3143* mechanic's lien release bonds because attorney fees are not recoverable in mechanic's lien foreclosure actions and by law the obligation of a surety on a *Civ. Code § 3143* mechanic's lien release bond is the same as that of the principal/property owner [*Royster Construction Co. v. Urban West Communities (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1158, 1171, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684* (holding in case did not determine whether attorney fees were recoverable against mechanic's lien release bond pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480*, which provides special rules when principal's liability previously established by a final judgment, time for appeal has expired and separate suit thereafter brought against surety, as that procedure not employed in case)].

If a bond is given in an amount greater than the amount required by statute or by order of the court or officer pursuant to statute, the liability of the surety on the bond is limited to the amount required by statute or by order of the court or officer, unless the amount of the bond has been increased voluntarily or by agreement of the parties to satisfy an objection to the bond made in an action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(b)*].

If a bond contains a stipulation pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(d)* that the liability of a personal surety is limited to the worth of the surety, the liability of the surety is limited to the amount stipulated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(c)(1)*]. The surety's liability is also limited to the amount stipulated when the bond contains a stipulation that the liability of the surety is an amount less than the amount of the bond given pursuant to a statute that provides that the liability of sureties in the aggregate amount need not exceed the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(c)(2)*].

A subcontractor may recover from a surety any attorney's fees provided for in a subcontract, and ordered by a court, as long as the total recovery against the surety does not exceed the penal sum of the bond [*T&R Painting Constr. v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 738, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 199]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.83

§ 538.83 Voluntary Payment by Surety

If the nature and extent of the liability of the principal is established by final judgment of a court and the time for appeal has expired or, if an appeal is taken, the appeal is finally determined and the judgment is affirmed, a surety may make payment on a bond without waiting for enforcement of the bond. The amount of the bond will be reduced to the extent of any payment made by the surety in good faith [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480(a)(1)*]. If the beneficiary makes a claim for payment on a bond given in an action or proceeding after the liability of the principal has been so established, and the surety fails to make payment, the surety is liable for costs incurred in obtaining a judgment against the surety, including a reasonable attorney's fee and interest on the judgment from the date of the claim, notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470* (limitation of amount of surety's liability) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480(a)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.84

§ 538.84 Enforcement of Liability on Bond

[1] Jurisdiction Over Surety

A surety on a bond given in an action or proceeding submits itself to the jurisdiction of the court in all matters affecting its liability on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420(a)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420(a)* does not, however, apply to a bond of a public officer or fiduciary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420(b)*].

[2] By Beneficiary

The beneficiary may enforce the liability on a bond against both the principal and the sureties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410(a)*]. If the beneficiary is a class of persons, any person in the class may enforce the liability on a bond in the person's own name, without assignment of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410(b)*].

[3] By Injured Beneficiaries When Bond Is to State of California

The liability on a bond to the State of California or the people of California may be enforced by or for the benefit of, and in the name of, any and all persons for whose benefit the bond is given, who are damaged by breach of the condition of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(a)*]. A person described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(a)* may, in addition to any other remedy, enforce the liability on the bond in the person's own name, without assignment of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(b)*].

[4] By Motion

If a bond is given in an action or proceeding, the liability on the bond may be enforced on motion made in the court without the necessity of an independent action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(a)*; for a form of notice of motion, *see § 538.222*]. Any attempt to enforce a right, for example, enforcement of payment of a judgment, constitutes an action or proceeding for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440* [*see Mark Briggs & Associates Inc. v. Kinestar, Inc. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 483, 486, 192 Cal. Rptr. 21]* . Common law bonds as well as statutory bonds may be enforced by

motion [*see Mark Briggs & Associates Inc. v. Kinestar, Inc. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 483, 488, 192 Cal. Rptr. 21* ; for discussion and forms relating to common law bonds, *see* Part I, *above*]. The motion may not be made until after entry of the final judgment in the action or proceeding in which the bond is given and the time for appeal has expired or, if an appeal is taken, until the appeal is finally determined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)*; *see, e.g., Satinover v. Dean (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1298, 1301, 249 Cal. Rptr. 277* (motion premature when action still pending for trial)]. The motion may not be made or notice of motion served more than one year after the later of the preceding dates [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)*].

Notice of motion must be served on the principal and sureties at least 30 days before the time set for hearing of the motion. The notice must state the amount of the claim and must be supported by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) setting forth the facts on which the claim is based [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*]. The supporting affidavits or declarations must conform to the standards prescribed for an affidavit or declaration made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* (supporting and opposing affidavits or declarations to be made on personal knowledge, set forth admissible evidence, and show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.040*]. The notice and affidavits or declarations shall be served in accordance with any procedure authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*; for discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020, see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

Judgment will be entered against the principal and sureties in accordance with the motion unless the principal or sureties serve and file affidavits or declarations in opposition to the motion showing such facts as may be deemed by the judge hearing the motion to be sufficient to present a triable issue of fact. If such a showing is made, the issues to be tried shall be specified by the court. Trial is by the court and must be set for the earliest date convenient to the court, allowing sufficient time for such discovery proceedings as may be requested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(d)*]. The requirement for a court trial should not be construed to deny the right to a jury trial on a bond or undertaking executed pursuant to prior law to the extent constitutionally required [*see* Law Revision Commission comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*].

The principal and sureties cannot obtain a stay of the proceedings pending determination of any conflicting claims among beneficiaries [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(e)*].

[5] By Civil Action

[a] Parties

The liability on a bond may also be enforced by an independent civil action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*; for forms of complaints, *see §§ 538.225 -538.231*]. Both the principal and the sureties must be joined as parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*].

A cause of action on a bond may be transferred and assigned as other causes of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(c)*].

[b] Jurisdiction

If the bond was given in an action or proceeding, the action is commenced in the court in which the action or proceeding was pending. If the bond was given other than in an action or proceeding, the action is commenced in any court of competent jurisdiction, and the amount of damage claimed in the action, not the amount of the bond, determines the jurisdictional classification of the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)* (case in which demand is $25,000 or less is limited civil case)].

[c] Statute of Limitations

The general statute of limitations for an action on a bond or undertaking is four years [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337*]. However, specific statutes may provide for different limitation periods [*see, e.g., Fin. Code § 12212* (2 years)].

Any provision in a bond that attempts by contract to shorten the limitation period prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 337* or other statute for the commencement of an action on the bond, or the one-year period prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)* for a motion to enforce a bond, is not valid unless the principal, beneficiary, and surety accept the shorter provision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.450*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.85

§ 538.85 Judgment of Liability on Bond

A judgment of liabilty on a bond, notwithstanding *Civ. Code § 2845* (surety can require creditor to proceed against principal), will be in favor of the beneficiary and against both the principal and sureties, and will obligate each of them jointly and severally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(a)*].

The amount of the judgment is determined by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(b)*]. To recover the full amount of the bond, the evidence must show that the plaintiff is damaged in that amount [*see Oakdale Irr. Dist. v. Beard (1920) 47 Cal. App. 66, 69, 190 P. 224]* .

The beneficiary can recover only the penal sum of the bond from the surety but may recover more from the principal [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470(a)*]. The judgment will include costs to the extent provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021 et seq.* [*see* Law Revision Commission comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460*]. The judgment may not include an award of attorney's fees on account of the bond-enforcement proceedings unless attorney's fees are authorized by a contract (such as the bond) or a statute other than the bond-enforcement statutes (which do not authorize fees) [*Franke v. BAM Bldg. Co. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 224, 236-237, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212]* . A judgment that does not exhaust the full amount of the bond decreases the amount of the bond but does not discharge the bond. The liability on the bond may be enforced thereafter from time to time until the amount of the bond is exhausted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(c)*].

The judgment may be enforced by the beneficiary directly against the sureties. Any right of subrogation of a surety against the principal or any right of a surety to compel the principal to satisfy the judgment is not affected [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil

ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.86

§ 538.86 Enforcement of Judgment

[1] In General

A judgment of liability on a bond may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as other money judgments [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.495*].

[2] On Bond to State of California by Enforcement Lien

[a] Establishing Lien

In a proceeding for the benefit of the state, if the person enforcing the liability on a bond executed to, in favor of, or payable to the State of California or the people of the State of California, including but not limited to an official bond, desires a lien against defendant's property on judgment of liability, he or she may file an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) with the court for a lien on real property of defendant [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.510, 996.520, 996.550*].

The affidavit or declaration must state the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520*]:

- The bond was executed by the defendant or one or more of the defendants and designating whom.
- The bond is one to which *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.510-996.560* applies.
- The defendant or defendants have real property or an interest in real property and designating the county or counties in which the real property is situated.
- The liability is being enforced for the benefit of the state.

The clerk receiving the affidavit must certify to the recorder of the county in which the real property is situated all of the

following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.530*]:

- The names of the parties.
- The court in which the proceedings are pending.
- The amount claimed.
- The date of commencement of the proceedings.

On receiving the certificate, the county recorder will endorse on it the time of its receipt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.540(a)*]. The certificate must be filed and recorded in the same manner as notice of the pendency of an action affecting real property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.540(b)*; for discussion and forms relating to giving notice of a pending action affecting real property, *see* Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*].

Any judgment recovered is a lien on all real property belonging to the defendant situated in any county in which the certificate is filed, dating from the filing of the certificate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.550(a)*]. The lien is for the amount for which the owner of the real property is liable on the judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.550(b)*].

[b] Effect of Lien on Pending Sale of Property

If an agreement to sell real property affected by the lien, created by the filing of the certificate, was made before the filing of the certificate, the purchase price under the agreement was not due until after the filing of the certificate, and the purchaser is otherwise entitled to specific performance of the agreement, the court, in an action to compel specific performance of the agreement, must order the purchaser to pay the purchase price, or so much of the purchase price as may be due, to the State Treasurer, and to take the State Treasurer's receipt for payment. On payment, the purchaser is entitled to enforcement of specific performance of the agreement. The purchaser takes the real property free from the lien created by the filing of the certificate. The State Treasurer must hold the payment pending the proceedings referred to in the certificate. The payment is subject to the lien created by the filing of the certificate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.560*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & RightsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensJudgment Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.87

§ 538.87 Effect of Payment

Payment by a surety of the amount of a bond constitutes a full discharge of all the liability of the surety on the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.490(a)*]. Each surety is liable for contribution to cosureties who have made payment in proportion to the amount for which each surety is liable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.490(b)*].

Partial payment of a claim by a surety is not considered satisfaction of the claim and the beneficiary may enforce the liability on the bond. If a right is affected or a license is suspended or revoked until payment of a claim, the right continues to be affected and the license continues to be suspended or revoked until the claim is satisfied in full [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.88-538.99

[Reserved]

§§ 538.88[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.100

§ 538.100 California Points and Authorities

For forms of memoranda supporting and opposing complaint for contribution among joint obligors, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 115, *Indemnity and Contribution* (Matthew Bender)

For forms of memoranda supporting and opposing a general demurrer to a complaint against surety by creditor on principal obligation, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 222, *Suretyship* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.101

§ 538.101 California Legal Forms

For forms of license, permit, and miscellanceous bonds and guaranty agreements, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 79, *Suretyship, Guaranty, and Indemnity* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.102

§ 538.102 State Statutes

Definition of suretyship. *Civ. Code §§ 2787, 2788*

Creation and interpretation of suretyship. *Civ. Code §§ 2792-2802*

Liability of surety. *Civ. Code §§ 2806-2811*

Continuing guaranty. *Civ. Code §§ 2814, 2815*

Exoneration of surety. *Civ. Code §§ 2819-2825*

Position of surety. *Civ. Code §§ 2832-2856*

Statute of limitations on principal's obligation in conditional surety as affecting surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 359.5*

Good faith release, dismissal, or covenant not to sue or not to enforce judgment as discharging coobligor to whom it was given from liability for any contribution to coobligors. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877(b)*

Determination that settlement was made in good faith as barring any further claims of coobligors against settling coobligor for equitable comparative contribution or for partial or comparative indemnity, based on comparative negligence or comparative fault. *Code Civ. Proc. § 877.6(c)*

Contribution among joint obligors. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 881-883*

Action by surety to compel principal to pay. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050*

Indemnified public officer's rights. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1055*

Time of notice binding surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.103

§ 538.103 Decisions

[1] Apparent Principal as Surety

Owners of property who executed deed of trust in favor of developer's construction lender sufficiently pleaded that they were sureties rather than principal obligors; allegations included fact that bank's officer considered them third parties, construction loan agreement and note were signed by developer alone, and deed of trust identified secured obligation as being that of developer and expressly provided that owners had no personal liability for debt. *Mead v. Sanwa Bank California (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 561, 571-572, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 625*

Knowledge of creditor that funds lent to principal will be lent to third persons as not making principal surety for third person borrowers. *Beverly Hills Nat. Bank v. Glynn (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 859, 869, 73 Cal. Rptr. 808*

One who appears to be principal as able to show that is surety except as against persons who acted in good faith belief. *Josephian v. Lion (1924) 66 Cal. App. 650, 661, 227 P. 204*

Parol evidence as available to show apparent principal is surety. *Josephian v. Lion (1924) 66 Cal. App. 650, 661, 227 P. 204*

One who signed furniture sale agreement as cosigner, who neither bought nor possessed furniture, and who only agreed to pay should purchaser be unable to pay as allowed to invoke *Civ. Code § 2832*. *Wexler v. McLucas (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 9, 121 Cal. Rptr. 453*

[2] Assignability of Suretyship Contracts

Assignability of surety agreement as assumed unless there is plain intent to restrict guarantor's liability to original creditor. *Champion Home Builders Co. v. Sipes (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422, 269 Cal. Rptr. 75*

Assignment of personal guaranty as not required to be in writing to be enforceable. *Champion Home Builders Co. v. Sipes (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422-1423, 269 Cal. Rptr. 75*

Creditor's assignment of debt as also transferring guarantor's obligation on debt because, under *Civ. Code § 1084*, transfer of thing also transfers incidents of thing. *Champion Home Builders Co. v. Sipes (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1423-1424, 269 Cal. Rptr. 75*

[3] Attorney's Fees

Guarantors under agreement that contained attorney's fee provision as entitled to recover attorney's fees expended to vacate out-of-state judgment domesticated to California judgment; guarantors as prevailing parties, and basis of recovery as underlying contract, not judgment. *Rainier National Bank v. Bodily (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 83, 86, 282 Cal. Rptr. 926*

[4] Consideration Required

Present or future lending of money as sufficient consideration to support guaranty of loan made before execution of continuing guaranty. *Oakland Bank of Commerce v. Washington (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 793, 796, 86 Cal. Rptr. 276*

Written guaranty as implying consideration. *Bank of America v. Granger (1931) 115 Cal. App. 210, 219*

[5] Continuing Guaranty

Because each extension of credit based on revocable continuing guaranty of credit creates new suretyship contract, creditor as owing continuing duty of disclosure to surety. *Sumitomo Bank of Cal. v. Iwasaki (1968) 70 Cal. 2d 81, 93, 73 Cal. Rptr. 564, 447 P.2d 956*

Limitation as to amount of guarantor's liability without limitation of liability to specific transaction or series of transactions as continuing guaranty. *Berg Metals Corp. v. Wilson (l959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 559, 570, 339 P.2d 869*

Limitation on amount of guarantor's continuing guaranty as not applying to dealings between creditor and principal; their exceeding of that amount as not breach of suretyship agreement. *Berg Metals Corp. v. Wilson (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 559, 570, 339 P.2d 869*

[6] Defenses of Surety

Frustration of purpose doctrine were not applicable to payee's acceleration of note after payor's default; guarantors were not able to claim their purpose was frustrated because their purpose in extending guaranty was to obtain loan for their company, which they did; occurrence of default is basic assumption on which contract was made. *United States v. Grayson (9th Cir. 1989) 879 F.2d 620, 624* (interpreting California law for guidance)

Defense of impossibility unavailable to guarantors; that defense is never available merely because supervening events deprive promisor of ability to perform; fact that payee was unable to pay loan when accelerated is not objective impossibility. *United States v. Grayson (9th Cir. 1989) 879 F.2d 620, 624*

[7] General or Special Guaranty

Special guaranty names definite person as obligee and is only enforceable by that person; general guaranty does not name specific obligee and passes with transfer of note. *Niederer v. Ferreira (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1485, 1501, 234 Cal. Rptr. 779*

[8] Interpretation of Suretyship Contracts

[a] Rules of Contract Apply

Loan guarantee is not contract of adhesion if there was no evidence of unequal bargaining power and borrower/guarantor was not in distress at time terms were negotiated and had opportunity to "shop around" for different arrangement. *Stevenson v. Oceanic Bank (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 306, 318-319, 272 Cal. Rptr. 757*

Guaranty agreement including waiver of limitation period to extent permitted by law as not ambiguous so as to require construction against drafter if only ambiguity was in statute describing permissible extent of waiver. *California First Bank v. Braden (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 672, 675-676, 264 Cal. Rptr. 820*

All applicable laws in existence when agreement is made are part of agreement as fully as if incorporated in it; thus, statute describing permissible extent of waiver of limitation period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5*] is not to be excluded as inadmissible extrinsic evidence in interpreting guaranty agreement. *California First Bank v. Braden (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 672, 675-676, 264 Cal. Rptr. 820*

Guaranty properly interpreted as legal obligation to pay all sums due on promissory note and not as mere guarantee as to creditworthiness of maker, if language clear and unambiguous. *Niederer v. Ferreira (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1485, 1499, 234 Cal. Rptr. 779*

Suretyship contracts are governed by rules applicable to contracts. *Top Cat Productions, Inc. v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 477, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553* ; *Superior Wholesale Elec. Co. v. Cameron (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 488, 492, 70 Cal. Rptr. 636* ; *White v. Indemnity Ins. Co. (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 160, 162, 54 Cal. Rptr. 630*

If intent of parties cannot be determined from instrument, rule of construction allows resort to surrounding circumstances. *Superior Wholesale Elec. Co. v. Cameron (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 488, 492, 70 Cal. Rptr. 636*

Any uncertainty or ambiguity in contract prepared by guarantor is interpreted and construed in other party's favor. *Superior Wholesale Elec. Co. v. Cameron (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 488, 493, 70 Cal. Rptr. 636*

Suretyship contract is read to give effect to mutual intent of parties, to every part of contract, and to favor operation and effectivenes. *White v. Indemnity Ins. Co. (1966) 246 Cal. App. 2d 160, 162, 54 Cal. Rptr. 630*

[b] Integration of Documents

Loan agreement and guarantee were separate; term from loan agreement requiring purchase orders or letters of credit to support advances under line of credit was not to be incorporated into guarantee agreement when it would have been inconsistent with specific term of guarantee agreement that allowed lender to change terms of indebtedness without notice or demand to guarantor. *Stevenson v. Oceanic Bank (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 306, 317-318, 272 Cal. Rptr. 757*

Bond given for faithful performance of contract, to which it refers, binds surety for labor and materials as if surety was party to original contract, and provisions of original contract become provisions of bond. *Culbertson v. Cizek (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 451, 467, 37 Cal. Rptr. 548*

Physical attachment of original contract as not required at time surety signs surety agreement when surety agreement expressly refers to contract and surety has knowledge of contents of original contract. *Davenport v. Stratton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 232, 243, 149 P.2d 4*

When guaranty for lease is made while extension agreement on lease is in effect, all three instruments must be considered as one for purpose of interpretation. *Davenport v. Stratton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 232, 244, 149 P.2d 4*

[9] Liability of Surety

Principal's default referred to in *Civ. Code §§ 2807* and *2787* (surety's liability without demand or notice; surety, guarantor defined) is principal's default on underlying obligation, not at trial because of legal disability having nothing to do with underlying obligation. *Kalfountzos v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1655, 1659-1660* (fact that contractor's corporate status had been suspended, causing contractor to default on subcontractor action against it, did not preclude contractor's surety from raising contractor's defenses and set-offs)

Under *Civ. Code § 2807*, liability of surety accrues immediately on default of principal. *ITT Diversified Credit Corp. v. Highlands Insurance Co. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 301, 307, 236 Cal. Rptr. 433*

Subcontractor's negotiated release of general contractor from claim for payment under bonded obligation and acceptance of unbonded obligation under settlement agreement, without surety's consent, fully extinguished general's bonded obligation to subcontractor, constituting impairment of subcontractor's rights and remedies against surety; under *Civ. Code § 2819*, this had legal consequence of exonerating surety on bonded obligation. *R.P. Richards, Inc. v. Chartered Construction Corporation (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 146, 154-155, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 425*

Civ. Code § 2819 (exonerating surety when creditor, without surety's consent, alters original obligation of principal or impairs remedies or rights of creditor against principal) was not applicable to discharge liability of surety on ground that stipulated judgment extended time for debtor to make certain payments, because extension applied only to payment of amounts other than those guaranteed by surety's redelivery bond under *Code Civ. Proc. § 515.020*. *ITT Diversified Credit Corp. v. Highlands Insurance Co. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 301, 304-310, 236 Cal. Rptr. 433*

Suretyship is among classes of businesses intended by legislature to be regulated under Insurance Code; obligee under surety bond was able to bring action against its surety for engaging in unfair claims settlement practices in violation of *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*. *General Ins. Co. v. Mammoth Vista Owners' Assn. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 810, 824-827, 220 Cal. Rptr. 291* ; *but see* *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* (prospectively abrogating private third-party standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03*)

Express terms of suretyship contract limits the liability of surety. *U. S. Leasing Corp. v. DuPont (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 275, 289, 70 Cal. Rptr. 393, 444 P.2d 65* ; *Bloom v. Bender (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 793, 803, 313 P.2d 568*

Guaranty of performance of lease does not include guaranty of performance of related lease agreeement even when guaranty required by lease. *U. S. Leasing Corp. v. DuPont (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 275, 287, 70 Cal. Rptr. 393, 444 P.2d 65*

Suretyship contract limits surety's obligations which cannot be changed after execution unless allowed by contract. *U. S. Leasing Corp. v. DuPont (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 275, 289, 70 Cal. Rptr. 393, 444 P.2d 65*

Actual payment of obligation by principal, distinguished from release by creditor with consent of surety or discharge by operation of law, exonerates surety. *Durgin v. Kaplan (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 81, 89, 65 Cal. Rptr. 158, 436 P.2d 70*

Surety remains liable even though statute of limitations had run on principal debt. *Bloom v. Bender (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 793, 798, 313 P.2d 568*

Bar of remedy against principal debtor does not prevent creditor's right of recovery against guarantor. *Gottschalk v. Draper Companies (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 828, 831, 100 Cal. Rptr. 434*

Recovery barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* does not bar action against surety. *Gottschalk v. Draper Companies (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 828, 831, 100 Cal. Rptr. 434*

Surety of second guaranty on purchase agreement who knew that was guaranteeing balance due on original note was prohibited from later changing nature of guaranty. *Elster's Sales v. Longo (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 216, 222, 84 Cal. Rptr. 83*

Surety remains fully liable when obligation of principal discharged in bankruptcy. *Superior Wholesale Elec. Co. v. Cameron (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 488, 494, 70 Cal. Rptr. 636*

Surety is not liable on any contract not within terms of surety agreement. *Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 378, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690*

Liability of surety accrues at same time as principal. *Brock v. Western Nat. Indem. Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 10, 16, 281 P.2d 571*

Surety's inability to designate how payment of judgment shall be applied allows partial payment of judgment to be applied to part of judgment for which surety is not liable when payment is not specifically designated for any part of judgment. *Giordano v. American Fidel. & Cas. Co. (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 309, 313, 217 P.2d 444*

Prepayment of sums by principal to surety does not invoke application of *Civ. Code § 2824* when principal was released from further liability and obligation to pay never arose. *Maurice Merc. Co. v. American Emp. Ins. Co. (1934) 140 Cal. App. 354, 359, 35 P.2d 1047*

Offer of performance by surety does not exonerate surety when time for performance fixed by contract, and offer not within specified time. *Garvey School Dist. v. Paul (1920) 50 Cal. App. 75, 81, 194 P. 711*

[10] Liability of Person Signing Guarantee--Under Principle of Descriptio Personae

Court required to interpret document consistent with expressed intent of parties under objective standard; addition of "Pres." after defendant's signature did not change legal effect of document as defendant's personal guaranty; to interpret document as a guaranty by corporate general partner was objectively unreasonable because corporation was already liable without guaranty and that interpretation would render guaranty a nullity. *Home Federal Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ramos (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1609, 1613-1614, 284 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Under principle of descriptio personae, which is well recognized in California law, corporate officer who signed guaranty of sublease, which referred to him by name as "guarantor" and specified that he jointly, severally, unconditionally, and irrevocably guaranteed corporation's rental obligations, was individually liable under guaranty for corporation's unpaid rent; words "vice president," added to defendant's signature in guaranty of sublease agreement, were merely descriptive and, as a matter of law under principle of descriptio personae (term descriptive of person rather than relationship in which agreement is signed), did not alter his personal obligation under guaranty agreement. *Sebastian International, Inc. v. Peck (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 803, 808, 240 Cal. Rptr. 911*

[11] Notice Requirements

Notice to surety of principal's default is not expressly or impliedly required under *Civ. Code § 2807* as condition precedent to recovery on guaranty. *Baralat Development Co. v. Lichter (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 933, 936, 236 Cal. Rptr. 701*

Surety guaranteeing payment of sales and use taxes is not required to receive notice of default from government; surety could have required principal, who received direct notice of default to so inform surety. *American Fidelity Fire Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 51, 56, 109 Cal. Rptr. 545 , cert. denied, 415 U.S. 990 (1974)*

Unconditional guaranty is binding on guarantor without notice of acceptance. *Davenport v. Stratton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 232, 243, 149 P.2d 4*

Guarantor is not entitled to receive notice of principal's default, especially when contract specifies notice not required. *Davenport v. Stratton (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 232, 244, 149 P.2d 4*

[12] Prospective in Nature

When suretyship concerns matter usually contemplated as arising in future, it is interpreted prospectively, not retrospectively, unless subject of guaranty is past transaction and language of surety is broad enough to allow retrospective application. *People v. Great American Ins. Co. (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 552, 560, 35 Cal. Rptr. 267*

All guaranties are prospective in operation as general rule, although parties may provide otherwise. *Steiner Lumber Co. v. Sapp (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 800, 803, 31 Cal. Rptr. 276*

Guaranties are prospective and not retrospective in operation, unless parties expressly or impliedly indicate otherwise. *Bank of America Nat'l Trust & Sav. Asso. v. Kelsey (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 346, 44 P.2d 617*

[13] Remedies of Surety Against Cosureties

Obligation of cosurety is unaffected by surety entitled to contribution having foregone or postponed payment by another cosurety. *Overholser v. Glynn (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 800, 809, 73 Cal. Rptr. 628*

Payment by first of two successive sureties subrogates that surety to creditor's rights on bond and enabling him or her to enforce it against second surety. *Continental Casualty Co. v. Hartford Acci. & Indem. Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 565, 571, 52 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Sureties last in time on successive sets of sureties on different bonds given in judicial proceedings are primarily liable. *Hickey v. Santos (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 418, 419, 3 Cal. Rptr. 840*

Successive sureties are liable in inverse order of their undertaking. *Hickey v. Santos (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 418, 419, 3 Cal. Rptr. 840*

Surety on appeal bond who paid judgment does not have right to contribution from surety on release of attachment bond when original surety has no knowledge and did not participate in proceedings after trial court's judgment. *Hickey v. Santos (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 418, 419, 3 Cal. Rptr. 840*

[14] Remedies of Surety Against Creditor

Protection afforded debtor under antideficiency laws or estoppel is not available to surety who waived enforcement protections in cases where creditor proceeds against surety first on action compelling payment on surety debt and later elects to sell secured property through nonjudicial foreclosure. *Krueger v. Bank of America (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 204, 213, 193 Cal. Rptr. 322*

Guarantor is able by express contract to either waive or be estopped to raise the "no deficiency judgment" provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*. *Aruba Bonaire Curacao Trust Co. v. United California Bank (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 281, 285, 107 Cal. Rptr. 924* ; *Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 48, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*

Surety is permitted to waive rights under *Civ. Code §§ 2845* and *2849* in suretyship contract. *Brunswick Corp. v. Hays (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 134, 138, 93 Cal. Rptr. 635* ; *Wiener v. Van Winkle (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 774, 787, 78 Cal. Rptr. 761* ; *American Guaranty Corp. v. Stoody (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 390, 395, 41 Cal. Rptr. 69*

Surety's waiver of his or her rights under *Civ. Code §§ 2809* and *2845* forecloses him or her from asserting them against creditor after creditor had chosen course of action not in surety's best interests. *Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 44, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64*

Creditor is obligated not to release to prejudice of indemnitor, any property which comes under its control and which can be used to satisfy liability of surety. *Massachusetts Bonding Etc. Co. v. Osborne (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 648, 663, 43 Cal. Rptr. 761*

Creditor is required to resort to security when claim is secured by trust deed. *Hartman v. Smith (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 415, 417, 33 Cal. Rptr. 147*

Subrogee acquires same right as creditor and will be required to resort to security if creditor is. *Hartman v. Smith (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 415, 417, 33 Cal. Rptr. 147*

[15] Remedies of Surety Against Principal

[a] Generally

Materialman named on joint check who endorsed it is unable to collect from surety when unpaid by general contractor since this would penalize principal by requiring a double payment. *Post Bros. Constr. Co. v. Yoder (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 1, 8, 141 Cal. Rptr. 28, 569 P.2d 133*

Rights of guarantor to compel payment by debtor are available only when relationship is that of guarantor-principal. *Goodman v. Severin (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 885, 894, 79 Cal. Rptr. 555*

Writ of attachment is available to surety against principal in suretyship relationship. *Karn v. Wills (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 604, 609, 123 P.2d 640*

[b] Reimbursement

Surety could seek reimbursement only from party that applied for bond, not all parties that benefitted from bond in underlying action. *Top Cat Productions, Inc. v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 478, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*

Surety is unable to pay claim against principal and purchase it, because payment extinguishes it, leaving nothing to

purchase. *Berrington v. Williams (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 130, 135, 52 Cal. Rptr. 772*

Surety has ability to assign right to reimbursement to assignee who takes subject to defenses available to principal obligor. *Berrington v. Williams (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 130, 135, 52 Cal. Rptr. 772*

Deficiency judgment against surety is not prevented by *Civ. Code § 2847* and as not allowing reimbursement from principal. *Heckes v. Sapp (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 549, 555, 40 Cal. Rptr. 485*

Surety who deposited funds in blocked account from which there were no disbursements is not allowed to charge interest. *Burge v. Michael (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 780, 785, 29 Cal. Rptr. 290*

Surety has right to reimbursement only, no right to recover interest on surety deposit unless agreed otherwise. *Burge v. Michael (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 780, 785, 29 Cal. Rptr. 290*

[16] Subrogation

In action between insured and third-party tortfeasors, in which surety is party, settlement between insured and tortfeasor that derogates rights of surety is not permitted; determination of surety's rights against tortfeasors is required prior to settlement. *Conservatorship of Edwards (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1183-1185, 244 Cal. Rptr. 330*

Person primarily liable on obligation is unable to plead absence of any negligence or wrongdoing to escape subrogation. *Meyer Koulish Co. v. Cannon (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 419, 425, 28 Cal. Rptr. 757*

Surety's discharge of claim against principal discharges any lien that secures that claim. *United States Fid. & Guar. Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 231, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Owner's premature payment to contractor in disregard of stop notice relieves surety from protecting owner pro tanto and entitling surety to receive from owner amount which owner has contributed to contractor's default, which amount surety would not have been required to pay had owner complied with stop notice. *United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. v. Oak Grove Union School Dist. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 226, 232-233, 22 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Absent owner's fraud in bringing about issuance of bond, surety who has paid claims of valid lien claimants is subrogated to rights of former lien claimants as against principal but not as against property. *Filippi v. McMartin (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 135, 139, 10 Cal. Rptr. 180*

Surety on fidelity bond does not have right of subrogation unless equities in favor of surety are superior to those of third party who participated in wrongful act against principal. *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Kleinman (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 404, 406, 308 P.2d 347*

[17] Surety's Liability for Fees, Costs, and Interest

Interest on principal amount is proper when principal amount due was definite and fixed and consisted merely of charges for items in excess of amount earned by subcontractor. *Glens Falls Indem. Co. v. Basich Bros. Const. Co. (9th Cir. 1948) 165 F.2d 649, 652 , cert. denied, 334 U.S. 833*

Guarantors of promissory note providing for attorneys' fees secured by deed of trust are liable for attorneys' fees during trial and appeal. *Heckes v. Sapp (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 549, 555, 40 Cal. Rptr. 485*

Words "promissory notes" contained in guaranty agreement do not imply an obligation to pay attorney's fees.

Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 380, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690

Guarantor of rental payments is required to pay attorney's fees when lease provided for attorney's fees and guaranty contract stated that guarantor would pay any rent due and perform any covenants in event principal failed to do so. *Grace v. Croninger (1922) 56 Cal. App. 659, 667-668, 206 P. 130*

[18] Termination of Liability

[a] In General

Creditor's acceptance of release from principal, in mistaken belief that only surety was liable, terminated surety's liability. *Schmitt v. Insurance Co. of North America (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 245, 259, 281 Cal. Rptr. 261* ; see *Civ. Code § 2810*

Civ. Code § 2822 (reduction of surety's obligation by creditor's acceptance of anything in partial satisfaction of principal's obligation) requires creditor to clearly exercise cash-in-lieu of securities option at time of confirmation of bankruptcy plan or else be charged with acceptance of stock received; forced option as necessary to protect surety from being insurer of creditor's speculative holding of stock. *Durgin v. Kaplan (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 81, 83, 65 Cal. Rptr. 158, 436 P.2d 70*

Creditor's knowledge of guarantor's death revokes continuing guaranty with respect to future advances. *American City Bank v. Tourtelot (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 585, 590, 150 Cal. Rptr. 361*

[b] Alteration of Obligation

Changes in performance required because of poor workmanship do not alter surety contract for performance. *City of Sacramento v. Trans Pacific Industries, Inc. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 389, 400, 159 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Stipulated agreement between creditor and principal after default on promissory note is not alteration of original note, but creation of new and independent agreement. *Impac Imported Parts & Accessories Corp. v. Rattray (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 792, 797, 157 Cal. Rptr. 226*

Stipulated judgment reducing amount of debt, thereby changing surety's exposure, is not alteration because surety's obligation remained unchanged. *V.I.P. Agency of No. Cal., Inc. v. Duffy Electronics, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 849, 852, 155 Cal. Rptr. 45*

Stipulated judgment transforming immediate obligation to pay into schedule of deferred payments is alteration of obligation of principal and of rights and remedies of creditor. *V.I.P. Agency of No. Cal., Inc. v. Duffy Electronics, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 849, 853, 155 Cal. Rptr. 45*

No difference between extension of time of payment and renewal as concerning rights of guarantor in continuing guaranty. *American City Bank v. Tourtelot (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 585, 591, 150 Cal. Rptr. 361* ; *Rodabaugh v. Kauffman (1921) 53 Cal. App. 676, 682, 200 P. 747*

In surety contract which had clause allowing changes without notice to surety and clause not allowing additional indebtedness after notice of revocation, revocation by surety controls clause. *Southern Cal. First Nat. Bank v. Olsen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 234, 241, 116 Cal. Rptr. 4*

Extension of time is one of more technical defenses, but still valid. *Wise v. Clapper (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 770,*

774, 65 Cal. Rptr. 231

Extension of time for payment is material alteration of guaranty contract. *Wise v. Clapper (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 770, 774, 65 Cal. Rptr. 231* ; *Mortgage Finance Corp. v. Howard (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 569, 572, 26 Cal. Rptr. 917*

Attempt by creditor to charge surety with items for which surety was not liable is not alteration. *Ralston-Purina Co. v. Carter (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 372, 378, 26 Cal. Rptr. 690*

Contract provisions allowing changes and substitutions determine that no alterations result. *American Trust Co. v. Jones (1933) 130 Cal. App. 651, 655, 20 P.2d 346*

[c] Exoneration

Nothing creditor did or failed to do in bankruptcy proceeding rose to level of prejudicing surety or exonerating surety on guarantee; creditor not required to waive claim if it would jeopardize enforcement of personal guarantee. *FM Conner v. Conner (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 646, 650-652, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687*

Lessor's settlement and general release of partners of sublessee exonerated guarantors of lease and sublease because creditor, and thus guarantors, would no longer have any rights against sublessee. *Bennett v. Leatherby (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 449, 452-453, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340* ; *see Civ. Code § 2819*

[19] Waiver of Civ. Code § 2809 Defense

Civ. Code § 2809 (obligation of a surety may be neither larger in amount nor in other respects more burdensome than that of principal) is not only waivable but could be waived on basis of very vague clause in guaranty agreement; nothing in rule prevents surety from agreeing that its liability will remain even though some future event eliminates principal's obligation. *Bloom v. Bender (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 793, 802-804, 313 P.2d 568* ; *River Bank America v. Diller (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1400, 1414-1415, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.104

§ 538.104 Law Reviews

Note, " *Regents of the University of California v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co.:* Running of Statute of Limitations in Favor of a Principal Does Not Exonerate a Surety," *67 Cal. L. Rev. 563 (1979)*

Comment, "Exonerating the Surety: Implications of the California Antideficiency Scheme," *57 Cal. L. Rev. 218 (1969)*

Rintala, "California's Anti-Deficiency Legislation and Suretyship Law: The Transversion of Protective Statutory Schemes," *17 UCLA L. Rev. 245 (1969)*

Johns and Steffen, "The After-Acquired Surety: Commercial Paper," *59 Cal. L. Rev. 1459 (1971)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)Party LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesTypes of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.105

§ 538.105 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions,* § 504 et seq.; Vol. 8, *Enforcement of Judgment,* § 479 et seq.; Vol. 9, *Appeal,* § 269 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 1, *Contracts,* §§ 217, 372, 111; vol. 4, *Negotiable Instruments,* §§ 51, 68-72; vol. 4, *Security Transactions in Real Property,* §§ 194, 195, 202; vol. 13, *Equity,* §§ 183-185 (10th ed. 2005)

Restatement Security §§ 82-164

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)General OverviewReal Property LawSecurities RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.106-538.119

[Reserved]

§§ 538.106[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.120

§ 538.120 California Points and Authorities

For a memorandum of points and authorities relating to an objection to an undertaking given for attachment, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 23, *Attachment* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities relating to the modification of a bond in a shareholder's derivative suit, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 52, *Corporations* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to bonds as costs and to the relief of an indigent plaintiff from bond requirements, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 60, *Costs* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum of points and authorities relating to the validity of a preliminary injunction granted without an undertaking, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.121

§ 538.121 California Legal Forms

For discussion and forms relating to bonds and undertakings generally, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 79, *Suretyship, Guaranty and Indemnity* (Matthew Bender)

For legal forms of public works payment bonds and labor and material payment bonds, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 31, *Construction Contracts and Financing* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.122

§ 538.122 California Real Estate

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 112, *Guaranty and Suretyship* ; Ch. 453, *Payment Bonds* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.123

§ 538.123 State Statutes

[1] Acknowledgements

Out of state acknowledgment; requirements. *Civ. Code § 1189*

[2] Admitted Surety Insurer

Certification of admitted surety insurers. *Ins. Code §§ 12070-12073*

Admitted surety insurer as prohibited from being surety when liability thereon is more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus. *Ins. Code § 12090*

[3] Approval of Bonds

Judge's power to approve bonds and undertakings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 166(a)(5), 995.410*

Court commissioner's power to approve bonds and undertakings. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 259(c), 995.410*

[4] Bond and Undertaking Law

[a] General Provisions

Applicability of Bond and Undertaking Law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.020*

Manner of service. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030*

Definitions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.110-995.190*

Interchangeability of bonds and undertakings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.210*

Evidence of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.260, 995.350(b)*

[b] Exemptions and Waivers

Bond not required of public entity or officer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.220*

Waiver of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.230, 995.240*

[c] Execution and Filing of Bond

Execution. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.310*

Contents. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320*

Form of bond in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.330*

Filing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.340*

Registration. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.350(a)*

Withdrawal from court file. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.360*

Service of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.370*

Defect in bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.380*

[d] Approval and Effect of Bond

Approval. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.410*

Effective date. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.420*

Term of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.430, 995.440*

[e] Qualifications of surety

Qualifications of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.510*

Declaration of personal surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520*

[f] Admitted Surety Insurers

Admitted surety insurer in lieu of personal sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.610*

Joint and several liability. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.620*

Approval of admitted surety insurer's bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.630*

Certificate of authority. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.640*

Objection to sufficiency of admitted surety insurer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.650*

Determination of sufficiency of admitted surety insurer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.660*

Additional agency requirements prohibited. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.670*

Specific state agencies that may impose additional requirement on admitted surety insurer for compliance with federal law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.675*

[g] Deposit in Lieu of Bond

Deposit of money, certificates of deposit, investment certificates, savings accounts, and bearer bonds or notes in lieu of bonds. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710(a)*

Value of deposit. Code Civ. Proc. § 996.710(b)

Agreement for collection, sale, or other application of deposit. Code Civ. Proc. § 996.710(c)

Valuation of market value of bearer bonds or notes. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.720*

Effect of deposit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.730*

Interest on deposit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.740*

Payment of liability on deposit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.750*

Enforcement against deposit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760*

Return of deposit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.770*

[h] Bonds to State of California

Applicability of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.810-995.850*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.810*

Bond by officer of the court as to State of *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 995.820*

Bond without specified beneficiary as to State of *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 995.830*

Court approval. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.840(a)*

[i] Objections to Bonds

Party, for whose benefit bond is given, as permitted to object to bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.840(b)*

Applicability of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960* as limited to bonds given in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.910*

Grounds for objection. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920*

Procedure. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930*

Objection to sufficiency of bond based on market value. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.940*

Hearing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.950*

Determination of sufficiency. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960*

[j] Subsequent Insufficiency or Excessiveness of Bonds

Subsequent insufficiency of bond or undertaking in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010*

Subsequent insufficiency of bond or undertaking other than in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020*

Excessive bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030*

[k] Release and Substitution of Surety

Application for release of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)*

Application for substitution of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)*

Service of application for release and substitution of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*

Hearing on application for release and substitution of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*

Effect of substitition on substitute surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(a)*

Order for release of original surety on substitution of sufficient surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*

Consequences of failure to give substitute surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.140*

Liability of released surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150*

[l] New, Additional, or Supplemental Bonds

When given. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.210*

Contents. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.220*

All provisions applicable to original bond as applying. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.230*

Effect of new bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.240*

Effect of additional or supplemental bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250*

[5] Cancellation of Bond or Withdrawal of Sureties

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.310-996.360 as applicable to bond given other than in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.310*

Notice of cancellation or withdrawal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.320*

Effective date. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.330*

Effect. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.340*

New bond as not required when surety withdraws unless amount of bond or number of sureties reduced below minimum required by state providing for bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.350*

Liability of surety on cancellation or withdrawal from bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.360*

[6] Service

Service of summons. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*

Service of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1013a*

[7] Filing

Time for filing notice of motion; accompaning papers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*

[8] Papers

Declaration in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

Corporate officers certificate. *Corp. Code § 173*

[9] Definition

Credit union defined. *Fin. Code § 14002*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityCivil

ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProceduresGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.124

§ 538.124 California Rules of Court

Prerequisites to acceptance of corporate sureties. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1130(a)*

Officers of court and attorneys as not allowed to be sureties. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1130(b)*

Withdrawal of bonds and undertakings. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1130(c)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesProcedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.125

§ 538.125 Local Court Rules

Exparte order increasing bond of personal representative in probate proceeding. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 10.57

Bonding on petition for authority to borrow money in probate proceeding. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 10.77

Bond on sale of real property in probate proceeding. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 10.92

Inventory and appraisment to show sufficiency of bond in probate proceeding. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 10.57, 10.105

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbateProcedures in ProbateGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.126

§ 538.126 Decisions

Failure to object to sufficiency of surety within 10 days as constituting waiver of right to do so on appeal from trial court's order granting stay of enforcement of judgment on giving undertaking. *Chodos v. Insurance Co. of North America (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 81, 84-85, 178 Cal. Rptr. 829*

Undertaking as not expressly required for temporary restraining order, but called for by better practice. *Biasca v. Superior Court (1924) 194 Cal. 366, 368, 228 P. 861*

Undertakings and bonds as treated same by statute. *Canfield v. Bates (1859) 13 Cal. 606, 608*

For purposes of waiving bond for indigents, distinction as existing between inability to pay court fees and inability to obtain sureties on undertaking. *Fuller v. State of California (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 664, 666, 82 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Surety bond given pursuant to requirements of particular statute as incorporating statutory provisions which become part of it. *Frank Curran Lbr. Co. v. Eleven Co. (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 175, 182, 76 Cal. Rptr. 753*

Bond as binding obligation in writing to pay specified sum of money either on date certain or on happening of specified future event. *Karsh v. Fidelity Union Casualty Co. (1932) 119 Cal. App. 543, 546, 6 P.2d 980*

Attachment undertaking as constituting original, independent, and absolute contract on part of sureties. *Heine v. Wright (1926) 76 Cal. App. 338, 344, 244 P. 955*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsProceedings in Forma PauperisGeneral OverviewCivil

ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil
ProcedureRemediesBondsObjectionsGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.127

§ 538.127 Law Reviews

Review of Selected 1982 California Legislation, "Civil Procedure; Statutory Bonds and Undertakings," *14 Pacific L.J. 466 (1983)*

Moss, "Bond Practices," 44 State B.J. 537 (1969) (discussing contractors' performance bonds)

Note, "Insurance--Fidelity Bonds--Interpretation--Extent of Coverage--Cumulative or Non-Cumulative," *20 So. Cal. L. Rev. 226 (1947)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutory Remedies & Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.128

§ 538.128 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 9, *Appeal*, § 237 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.129-538.139

[Reserved]

§§ 538.129[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.140

§ 538.140 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda relating to actions against a surety, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 222, *Suretyship*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.141

§ 538.141 California Real Estate

California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 112, *Guaranty and Suretyship* ; Ch. 453, *Payment Bonds*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawThird PartiesJoint & Several ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsGuaranty Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.142

§ 538.142 State Statutes

[1] Affidavits

Standards for affidavit under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.040*

[2] Costs

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021 et seq.*

[3] Enforcement of Judgment

[a] General

Enforcement of judgment of liability on bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.495*

[b] Enforcement Lien in Proceeding Against Bond to State of California

Applicability of enforcement lien provisions (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.510-996.560*). *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.510*

Affidavit filed in proceedings for benefit of state to enforce liability on bond to State of *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520*

Certification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.530*

Recordation of certificate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.540*

Judgment of liability on bond to State of California as lien on real property belonging to defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.550*

Agreement to sell real property made before filing of certificate creating lien as enforceable by buyer on payment of purchase price to State Treasurer; payment as subject of lien. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.560*

[4] Enforcement of Liability

Persons entitled to enforce liability on bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850*

Beneficiary as entitled to enforce liability against principal and sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410*

Enforcement of liability on bond by civil action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*

Enforcement of liability on bond by noticed motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*

Judgment of liability. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460*

Voluntary payment by surety after judgment against principal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480*

Surety's payment of amount of bond as fully discharging all liability of surety; surety liable for contribution to cosureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.490*

[5] Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction over surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420*

[6] Liability

Limitation on liability on contractor's bond. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7071.11*

Stipulation in bond exceeding $10,000 limiting liability of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(d)*

Limitation on liability of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.470*

Bond and Undertaking Law as not intended to limit liability of surety pursuant to any other statute. Code Civ. Proc. § 995.475

[7] Notices

Requisites of notices, filing and service of papers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*

[8] Statutes of Limitation

Statute of limitation for contracts. *Code Civ. Proc. § 337*

Provisions in bond attempting to shorten applicable statute of limitation as invalid unless principal, beneficiary, and surety accept provision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.450*

Statute of limitation for action on bond of licensed casher or seller of checks as two years. *Fin. Code § 12212*

[9] Summary Judgment

Summary judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensJudgment Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.143

§ 538.143 Decisions

[1] Action or Proceeding

Any enforcement of right as constituting "action or proceeding" for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*. *Mark Briggs & Associates, Inc. v. Kinestar, Inc. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 483, 486, 192 Cal. Rptr. 21*

[2] Appeal Bonds

[a] Accrual of Right of Action

Right of action on undertaking on appeal to stay execution as accruing on affirmance of judgment to which action relates. *Charles F. Harper Co. v. DeWitt Mortg. & Realty Co. (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 467, 470, 75 P.2d 65* ; *Clark v. Smith (1885) 66 Cal. 645, 646, 4 P. 689*

Action for enforcement of liability on undertaking given to obtain stay as not available while supersedeas or order staying execution of judgment is in force. *Parnell v. Hancock (1874) 48 Cal. 452, 454*

Sureties on appeal bond as parties to original action but in different position than defendants, and plaintiff as not able to execute judgment against sureties without motion to enter judgment against them. *Charles F. Harper Co. v. DeWitt Mortg. & Realty Co. (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 467, 469, 75 P.2d 65* (bond given under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 942*; now see *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 917.1, 996.440*)

[b] Appeal from Order on Appeal Bond

Order denying motion to enter judgment against surety based on appeal bond as appealable order. *Merritt v. J.A. Stafford Co. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 619, 623, 68 Cal. Rptr. 447, 440 P.2d 927*

Judgment against surety on appeal bond as not appealable by surety because judgment against surety is consent judgment. *Hood v. Verdugo Lumber Co. (1933) 219 Cal. 558, 560, 27 P.2d 897*

[c] Liability of Surety

Surety as liable on appeal bond even though bond is for inadequate amount to stay execution under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 942* (now see *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.1*) when judgment creditor does not seek execution prior to affirmance of judgment; parties as able to agree to stay in consideration of posting bond for less than statutory amount. *Merritt v. J.A. Stafford Co. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 619, 625, 68 Cal. Rptr. 447, 440 P.2d 927*

Appeal bond posted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.1* does not automatically obligate surety to pay all postjudgment interest and costs awarded on appeal, together with amount of judgment, if total payout would exceed face amount of bond; respondent, however, is entitled to move under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010* to increase amount of bond if it fails to cover interest and costs accruing during long appeal. *Grant v. Superior Court (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 929, 935, 939, 275 Cal. Rptr. 564*

Former *Code Civ. Proc. § 942*, now *Code Civ. Proc. § 917.2*, providing for stay of money judgment pending appeal on giving of undertaking by corporate surety for one and one half times amount of judgment or order, as obligating surety to pay only that part of judgment covered by insurance policy and not more. *Merritt v. J. A. Stafford Co. (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 822, 825-826, 88 Cal. Rptr. 630*

[d] Statute of Limitations

Obligation of sureties on appeal bond as accruing from affirming of judgment to which it relates and as subject to limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 337*, relating to actions on instruments in writing. *Charles F. Harper Co. v. DeWitt Mortg. & Realty Co. (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 467, 470, 75 P.2d 65*

[3] Attorney's Fees

Attachment and injunction bonds as permitting recovery of attorney fees and costs when defense of primary action is only effective way to secure relief against attachment or injunction. *Reachi v. National Auto. & Cas. Co.,(1951) 37 Cal. 2d 808, 812-813, 236 P.2d 151* ; *Byard v. Nat. Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 622, 624, 32 Cal. Rptr. 613* ; *Russell v. United Pacific Ins. Co. (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 78, 88-89, 29 Cal. Rptr. 346*

Surety on *Civ. Code § 3143* mechanic's lien release bonds that do not provide for the recovery of attorney's fees is not liable for attorney's fees, either as damages or costs, because attorney's fees are not recoverable in mechanic's lien foreclosure actions, and, by law, obligation of surety on section 3143 mechanic's lien release bond is same as that of principal/property owner; not deciding whether attorney's fees are recoverable against mechanic's lien release bond pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480*, which provides special rules when principal's liability was previously established by final judgment, time for appeal has expired and separate suit is thereafter brought against surety. *Royster Construction Co. v. Urban West Communities (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1158, 1169 n.9, 1171, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 684*

Attorney's fees and court costs are damages within meaning of former Code Civ. Proc. § 1190.1(h) (now see *Civ. Code § 3083*), requiring bond for damages arising from attachment of funds by stop payment notice. *Systems Inv. Corp. v. National Auto. & Cas, Ins. Co. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1057, 1061, 102 Cal. Rptr. 378*

[4] Banker's Blanket Bond

Insurance company was not liable on Banker's Blanket Bond, insuring loss due to extension of credit by bank in good faith based on forged instrument, for loss suffered by bank because bank did not rely on credit of person whose signature was forged but on credit and guarantee of others involved in transaction, and forgery was not proximate cause of loss. *Continental Bank v. Phoenix Ins. Co. (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 909, 913, 101 Cal. Rptr. 392*

Surety liable on Banker's Blanket Bond when evidence shows beyond possible contradiction that bank extended credit in reliance on guaranty and forgery was proximate cause of bank's loss. *Jones v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 779, 784, 76 Cal. Rptr. 97*

[5] Commencement of Cause of Action

Action to recover on bond given to obtain temporary restraining order commences when motion filed under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 535* (now see *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*) in lieu of common law independent lawsuit. *Allen v. Pitchess (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 321, 329, 111 Cal. Rptr. 658*

[6] Common Law Bonds

Undertaking to secure stay of execution of summary judgment is common law rather than statutory bond. *Moore v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 988, 992-993, 189 Cal. Rptr. 829*

[7] Conditions Precedent to Suit

Appropriate judicial decree in equity case or by probate court establishing fact of breach by principal (guardian, executor, or administrator) and amount due is necessary before surety can be held liable on guardians', executors', or administrators' bond. *Richardson v. Royal Indemnity Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 557, 560, 134 P.2d 1*

Surety on bonds to ensure payment of sales and use taxes required by State Board of Equalization is liable for penalties assessed against defaulting taxpayers even though surety was not given advance notice which would enable it to pay tax before penalty imposed. *American Fidelity Fire Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 51, 55-56, 109 Cal. Rptr. 545*

Gov. Code § 4209, requiring written notice within 90 days as condition precedent to suit against surety on prime contractor's bond, is not applicable to state. *State of California ex rel. Dept. of Employment v. General Ins. Co. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 853, 861, 96 Cal. Rptr. 744*

[8] Construction of Bonds

Doubts as to meaning of provisions in Banker's Blanket Bond are resolved against insurer. *Jones v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 779, 784, 76 Cal. Rptr. 97*

[9] Fraudulent Promise by Surety

Plaintiff, beneficiary of undertaking given pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 540* (now see *Code Civ. Proc. § 489.310*) to release assets attached by Plaintiff, had no cause of action for fraud against surety, which failed to pay

subsequent judgment against defendants to whom assets were released. *Bezaire v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 888, 892-893, 91 Cal. Rptr. 142*

[10] Notary Public's Bond

Surety on notary public's bond was liable for official misconduct and neglect of notary when notary certified to person being present who was in fact absent for purposes of perpetrating fraud on plaintiffs. *Lewis v. Agricultural Ins. Co. (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 285, 292, 82 Cal. Rptr. 509*

Surety bond of notary public is official bond (*Gov. Code § 8212*) on which liability of surety is no greater than that of notary (*Gov. Code § 8214*), and when primary obligation on official bond is barred or in any legal way was extinguished, surety is relieved. *Breckenridge v. Mason (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 121, 130, 64 Cal. Rptr. 201*

[11] Period Covered by Bond

Fidelity bond covering losses discovered during bond period does not cover losses resulting from employees' acts known to employer prior to effective date of bond even though employer failed to understand dishonest or fraudulent nature of acts or that acts came within policy provisions until after effective date of bond. *USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 344-345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393*

Surety on statutory sales tax bond guaranteeing payment to state of sales and use taxes is liable for interest, penalties, and costs based on sales ransactions resulting in unpaid taxes occurring prior to but assessed after cancellation of bond. *People v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300, 111 Cal. Rptr. 350*

[12] Preliminary Injunction Bond

When corporate surety issued preliminary injunction bond based on application and promise of indemnity issued by one of several plaintiffs, defendants prevailed and sought judgment on bond, and surety claimed right to indemnity against all plaintiffs, the only plaintiff liable to surety was the one who applied for bond; surety's indemnity rights are matter of contract. *Top Cat Productions v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 476, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*

[13] Proration of Losses and Costs

When each of two bonds covering same risk purport to be excess insurance to other insurance, neither excess clause is given effect, but loss is prorated in proportion to coverage; and defense costs required under bonds to be paid by insurer are required to be shared between them pro rata in proportion to respective coverage. *Continental Ins. Co. v. Morgan, Olmstead, Kennedy & Gardner, Inc. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 593, 608, 148 Cal. Rptr. 57* (involving brokers' blanket bonds)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.144

§ 538.144 Statute of Limitations

Claimant under subcontractor's bond to which he or she is not a party as bound by one-year period of limitation contained in bond which by its terms extended to "any claimant." *Sanders v. American Casualty Co. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 306, 308-309, 74 Cal. Rptr. 634*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.145

§ 538.145 Law Reviews

Review of Selected 1982 California Legislation, "Civil Procedure; Statutory Bonds and Undertakings," *14 Pacific L.J. 466 (1983)*

Moss, "Bond Practices," 44 State B.J. 537 (1969) (discussing contractors' performance bonds)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.146

§ 538.146 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 9, *Appeal*, § 237 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.147-538.159

[Reserved]

§§ 538.147[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.160

§ 538.160 Notice by Surety to Creditors of Revocation of Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2815]

[1] FORM Notice by Surety to Creditors of Revocation of Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2815]

TO: _____, [*specify name and address*]

Please take notice that I, the undersigned, hereby revoke the written agreement of continuing guaranty of the credit of _____ [*name of principal*]. The guaranty was made pursuant to the agreement signed by me on _____ [*date*]. This revocation shall be effective _____ [immediately *or* on _____ (*date*)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice is for use by a surety on a continuing guaranty to give notice to creditors of the principal that the surety is revoking the guaranty and will no longer guarantee the principal's credit [*see Civ. Code § 2815*]. Unless the suretyship agreement says that notice of revocation must be in writing, no specific form is required, but it is advisable to provide written notice prior to the date revocation becomes effective.

See the discussion in *§ 538.13[5][c]*.

The fact that a guaranty agreement is secured by a pledge of personal property does not mean that application of *Civ. Code § 2815* is precluded by Division 8 of the Commercial Code [*Com. Code § 8101 et seq.*], relating to investment securities, or by Division 9 [*Com. Code § 9101 et seq.*]. The pledge of stock or personal property is subject to Division 8 or 9, but the Commercial Code is not the exclusive source of applicable statutory provisions. Under *Com. Code § 1103(b), Civ. Code § 2815* is not displaced but is a "supplemental body of law" that continues to apply [*Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805]* .

[3] State Statutes

Revocation of continuing guaranty. *Civ. Code § 2815*

[4] Decisions

Former *Com. Code § 9201* (*now see Com. Code § 9201*), setting forth rules for effectiveness of security agreement, did not preclude exercise of guarantor's rights under *Civ. Code § 2815* with respect to continuing guaranty that was secured by pledge of stock. *Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805*

Former *Com. Code § 9204(3)* (*now see Com. Code § 9204(c)*) did not preclude revocation of pledge agreement (and continuing guaranty that it secured) under *Civ. Code § 2815* with respect to future advances, but merely enabled provision that authorized future advances under security agreement. *Pearl v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1033, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 805*

Guaranty contract clause that provides that revocation is not effective until creditor receives written notice is not binding when purpose of guaranty no longer exists and circumstances so indicate. *Bank of America v. Waters (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 635, 637-638, 26 Cal. Rptr. 9*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.161

§ 538.161 Notice by Surety to Creditor to Proceed Against Principal [Civ. Code § 2845]

[1] FORM Notice by Surety to Creditor to Proceed Against Principal [Civ. Code § 2845]

TO: _____ [*name*], creditor of _____, [*name of principal*].

Please take notice that the undersigned is unwilling to continue as surety on the obligation of _____ [*name*] as principal. The terms of the guaranty are as follows: [*set out description of obligation*].

You are hereby requested and required to proceed against the principal for the satisfaction of this obligation on which the undersigned is surety, and you are advised that your failure to do so may relieve the undersigned of any obligation as surety.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice is for use by the surety to require the creditor to proceed against the principal before looking to the surety for satisfaction of the obligation [*see Civ. Code § 2845*]. This demand is no mere formality, for implicit in the demand is recognition by the surety of its obligation, and, in effect, its admission of liability to the creditor. If the surety elects not to make this demand, that election is binding and the surety may not make the demand at the time of trial [*Sukut-Coulson, Inc. v. Allied Canon Co. (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 648, 655, 149 Cal. Rptr. 711]* . The surety's demand under *Civ. Code § 2845* is subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*, which allows the creditor to enforce the surety's liability on the bond on a motion to the court without the necessity of an independent action [*see Civ. Code § 2845*].

[3] State Statutes

Surety may require creditor to proceed against principal. *Civ. Code § 2845*

[4] Decisions

Creditor is required to proceed against principal before proceeding against surety, if surety has so demanded. *Moffett v. Miller (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 712, 713-714, 260 P.2d 215*

Clause of contract waived benefits of *Civ. Code § 2845*. *Brunswick Corp. v. Hays (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 134, 138-139, 93 Cal. Rptr. 635*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.162

§ 538.162 Complaint by Surety Against Principal to Compel Performance [Civ. Code § 2846; Code Civ. Proc. § 1050]

[1] FORM Complaint by Surety Against Principal to Compel Performance [Civ. Code § 2846; Code Civ. Proc. § 1050]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT OF SURETY TO COMPEL PER-
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FORMANCE
Defendant[s].	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

[3. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of that agency and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendants.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], defendant and _____ [*name of creditor*] entered into a written agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a written suretyship agreement[, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference].

6. By the terms of the contract between defendant and _____ [*name of creditor*], defendant promised to _____ [*set forth what defendant promised to do or the terms of payment if it was a promisssory note, e.g.,* pay to _____ (*name of creditor*) $5000 at _____ per cent interest on or before _____ (*date*)].

7. By the terms of the suretyship agreement plaintiff undertook to satisfy defendant's obligation on the contract with _____ [*name of creditor*] in the event of defendant's default thereon.

[8. _____ (*Allege satisfaction of any conditions to defendant's liability to the creditor, e.g.,* (*name of creditor*) delivered merchandise to defendant on or before _____ [*date*], as required by the contract between them).]

9. Defendant has defaulted on his/her contractual obligations with _____ [*name of creditor*], in that _____ [*set out facts showing default, e.g.,* payment of defendant's note is past due and a balance of $5700 remains unpaid, $5500 of which is principal and $200 is interest].

[10. _____ (*Allege satisfaction of any conditions precedent to plaintiff's liability, if suretyship agreement was conditional, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of creditor*) gave plaintiff notice of principal's failure to pay the $5700 within 5 days after it became due on _____ (*date*), as required by the suretyship agreement).]

11. As a result of defendant's failure to perform, and unless defendant is compelled to perform his/her contractual obligations, plaintiff _____ [may *or* will] be compelled to pay _____ [*name of creditor*] $_____, for the sum owed to _____ [*name of creditor*] by defendant [*allege any additional liabilities, e.g.,* plus the creditor's attorney's fees as provided for in the underlying obligation].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For an order compelling defendant to perform the obligations of the contract with _____ [*name of creditor*], the performance of which plaintiff guaranteed;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by the surety to compel the principal to perform on the original contract, the performance of which is guaranteed by the surety. An action may be brought by one person against two or more persons for the purpose of compelling one to satisfy a debt due to the other for which plaintiff is bound as surety [*see Civ. Code § 2846*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050*]. The surety can maintain the action to compel performance after the obligation has become due, before the surety has paid, and whether or not the creditor has sued the surety [*see also Karn v. Wills (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 604, 606-609, 123 P.2d 640* (action under *Civ. Code § 2846*; guarantor who has contract with principal can obtain writ of attachment in action against principal to compel performance of its obligation to creditor)]. For situations in which prejudgment relief ancillary to an injunction or imposition of constructive trust may be available to sequester funds of an obligor that may be necessary to perform the bonded obligation, see discussion in *§ 538.21[2]*.

With appropriate modifications, the form may be used by the surety as a cross complaint against the principal when the surety has been sued on the obligation by the creditor [*see Eastin v. Roberts, Carpenter & Co. (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 567, 571, 66 P.2d 224]* .

[3] Creditor May Be Codefendant

The surety may name the creditor as a codefendant in the action against the principal if the creditor can enforce the principal's performance and neglects or refuses to do so [*Eastin v. Roberts, Carpenter & Co. (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 567, 571, 66 P.2d 224]* .

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Defendant's residence or place of business for purposes of venue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].
- The execution of a suretyship agreement (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 2793*].
- An original obligation on the part of the principal (Paragraph 4).
- The terms of the suretyship agreement and the obligation for which the surety became liable (Paragraphs 6, 7).

- The damages that will occur if relief is not granted (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*].

- The principal's default (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 2846*].

The form also includes paragraphs for optional use to allege:

- Fictitious names of defendants (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474* and Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];

- The agency relationship of defendants (Paragraph 3) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*]; and

- The existence and satisfaction of any conditions precedent to the principal's liability (Paragraph 8) and, if the suretyship agreement was conditional, to the surety's liability (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code §§ 2807, 2808, 2846*].

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 1128.7(a)], Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*]. The governing statutes do not expressly specify whether or not an action by a surety under *Civ. Code § 2846* to compel a principal to perform an obligation can be a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 88*]. Such an action is equitable in nature [*see Josephian v. Lion (1924) 66 Cal. App. 650, 657, 227 P. 204]* , however, and since relief under *Civ. Code § 2846* is not included in the list of cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b)*], such an action will be an unlimited civil case unless it comes within one of the categories of cases in equity that are specifically designated as limited civil cases. These categories are the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]:

- Cases to try title to personal property when the amount involved is not more than $25,000.

- Cases when equity is pleaded as a defensive matter in any case that is otherwise a limited civil case.

- Cases to vacate a judgment or order of the court obtained in a limited civil case through extrinsic fraud, mistake, inadvertence, or excusable neglect.

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[7] State Statutes

Surety's right to compel principal to perform obligations. *Civ. Code § 2846*

Action by surety to compel principal to pay. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1050*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.163

§ 538.163 Complaint by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--General Form With Common Count

[1] FORM Complaint by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--General Form With Common Count

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT BY SURETY AGAINST PRINCIP-
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	AL FOR REIMBURSEMENT
through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant[s].	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Reimbursement)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 538.162, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 3.*]

[*EITHER*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], _____ [*name of defendant*] and _____ [*name of creditor*] entered into a written agreement[, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a written suretyship agreement[, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof]. By the terms of the suretyship agreement plaintiff undertook to satisfy the obligation of _____ [*name of principal*] on the contract with _____ [*name of creditor*] in the event of default by _____ [*name of principal*] thereon.

6. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff received from _____ [*name of creditor*] notice of default by defendant and demand for payment of the amount of defendant's liability thereunder. [A copy of the demand and notice is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.] As surety for defendant, plaintiff was required to, and did, pay the sum of $_____ to _____ [*name of creditor*] on or about _____ [*date*], in full satisfaction of the amount due. [A copy of the receipt is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference.]

[*OR, if suretyship arises out of promissory note*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], _____ [*name of defendant*] executed a promissory note in favor of _____ [*name of creditor*] in the amount of $_____, due on _____ [*date*], and bearing interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum. [A copy of the note is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

5. Plaintiff wrote _____ [*set forth words by which plaintiff guaranteed payment of the note, e.g.,* "payment guaranteed"] and signed his/her name on the reverse side of the promissory note as guarantor and became liable as a guarantor thereon.

6. Defendant failed to pay the note when it became due on _____ [*date*], in accordance with its terms, after demand for payment had been made by _____ [*name of creditor*]. By reason of the guaranty thereon, plaintiff was compelled to, and did on _____ [*date*], pay to _____ [*name of creditor*] the sum of $_____ in full payment of the note, that amount being the principal amount and interest then due thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum in the sum of $_____.

[*OR, if suretyship arises out of bond obligation*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], _____ [*name of defendant*] and _____ [*name of obligee*] entered into a written agreement[, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference]. That agreement contains provisions setting forth the requirement that _____ [*name of principal*] obtain a bond as security for performance.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff became surety for defendant on a _____ [*type*

] bond in favor of _____ [*name of creditor*], and in consideration therefor defendant agreed and promised in writing to indemnify plaintiff and save him/her harmless from all damages, costs, and charges which he/she might sustain by reason of becoming surety for defendant. [A copy of the bond is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.]

6. Plaintiff executed and delivered the bond and duly performed all the conditions in the indemnity agreement, and on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff under and pursuant to the terms of the bond, was compelled to and did pay, by reason of the bond, the sum of $_____ in satisfaction and discharge thereof.

[*CONTINUE*]

[7. Plaintiff has demanded that defendant repay this sum to plaintiff, but defendant has failed and refused to repay any part of this amount. (A copy of the demand is attached as Exhibit E and incorporated by reference.)]

SECOND COUNT

(Common Count)

8. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-3 of the First Count.

9. _____ [Within the last _____ (two *or* four) years *or* On or about _____ (*date*)], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant became indebted to plaintiff in the sum of $_____ for money paid, laid out, and expended for defendant at his/her instance and request.

10. Neither the whole nor part of this sum has been paid, [except the sum of $_____,] although demand therefor has been made, and there is now due, owing, and unpaid the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the above named sum at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a surety in seeking reimbursement for what he or she has disbursed on behalf of the principal, including necessary costs and expenses [*see Civ. Code § 2847*]. To be entitled to reimbursement, the surety must have made his or her payments under compulsion or a legal obligation and not merely voluntarily [*Schlitz v. Thomas (1923) 61 Cal. App. 635, 638, 216 P. 51]* . The complaint includes a common count for money lent or paid, based on the equitable notion that money be refunded to a plaintiff when the defendant repudiates the contract. One who is compelled by reason of a legal liability, to pay an obligation which another in equity and good conscience should pay, may recover from that other person the money so paid; the law implies a request on the part of that other person and a promise to pay [*Pioneer Title Ins. Co. v. Guttman (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 116, 120, 345 P.2d 577* ; for further discussion of common counts, *see* Ch. 121, *Common Counts*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint sets forth two counts as a basis for recovering money owed by defendant to plaintiff. The First Count specifically alleges:

- The original obligation between the principal and the creditor (alternative Paragraphs 4).

- The plaintiff's status as guarantor of the defendant's performance of original obligation (alternative Paragraphs 5).

- The defendant's default and the amount paid by plaintiff (alternative Paragraphs 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2847*; *Schlitz v. Thomas (1923) 61 Cal. App. 635, 638, 216 P. 51]* .

The complaint may also allege that a demand has been made of and refused by defendant (Paragraph 7).

The Second Count alleges:

- The amount of defendant's indebtedness to plaintiff (Paragraph 9).

- There has been no payment by defendant (Paragraph 10).

[4] Statute of Limitations

The indebtedness of the principal accrues at the time of payment by the surety [*Davies v. Torrance (1922) 188 Cal. 179, 180, 204 P. 820]* . An action for reimbursement, as well as the common count for money paid, must be brought within four years from the time the cause of action arises [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337*].

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to promissory notes in general, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*

For discussion and forms relating to the pleading of common counts, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts*

For discussion and forms relating to express and implied contractual indemnity, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

[6] State Statutes

Surety's right to reimbursement for disbursements on principal's behalf. *Civ. Code § 2847*

Surety subrogated to rights of creditor on payment of principal's obligation. *Civ. Code § 2848*

Amount due, plus interest, of detriment caused by breach of obligation to pay money. *Civ. Code § 3302*

Four-year statute of limitations in actions on written obligation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 337*

[7] Decisions

Accommodation maker [*now see Com. Code § 3419(a)*] who pays negotiable instrument has same rights under former *Com. Code § 3415(5)* [*now see Com. Code § 3419(e)*] as guarantor to enforce note against principal ("party accommodated") in accordance with its terms, including right to recover attorney's fees and interest at note rate rather than legal rate. *Flojo Internat., Inc. v. Lassleben (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 713, 721-722, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99* (payee assigned note to accommodation maker after payment)

One who is not volunteer, who pays debt for which another is primarily liable, is entitled to subrogation. *Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 83, 230 P.2d 816*

Surety could sue only party that applied for bond, not all parties covered by bond in underlying action for injunction. *Top Cat Productions, Inc. v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 478, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*

Assignment to surety of creditor's rights against principal is not condition precedent to reimbursement of surety. *Ingalls v. Bell (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 356, 367-368, 110 P.2d 1068*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.164

§ 538.164 Affirmative Defense to Action by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--Express Agreement to Reimburse from Specific Funds

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Action by Surety Against Principal for Reimbursement [Civ. Code § 2847]--Express Agreement to Reimburse from Specific Funds

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was, and now is, the owner of _____ [*describe asset which was to be used to reim burse plaintiff e.g.,* certain real property located in _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ (*set forth legal description of property*)].

2. At all times herein mentioned, the reasonable value of that _____ [*specify asset, e.g.,* real property] was, and now is, $_____.

3. After the execution of the contract between _____ [*name of creditor*] and defendant and _____ [at the time of *or* after] the guaranty thereof by plaintiff, [on or about _____ (*date*),] plaintiff and defendant agreed that plaintiff would pay the obligation on the principal contract to _____ [*name of creditor*] when it became due, and that defendant would sell the above-described property _____ [within a reasonable time *or* a stated period] and reimburse plaintiff from the proceeds of the sale [with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum.] [A copy of that agreement is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

4. _____ [A reasonable period *or* That specified period of time] has not yet elapsed, and the _____ [*specify asset, e.g.,* real property] has not yet been sold. Defendant has at all times since the agreement exerted his/her best efforts to sell the _____ [*specify asset, e.g.,* real property], and continues to do so by _____ [*set forth methods employed by defendant in selling the asset, e.g.,* listing

it with the largest real estate agent in the area].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use by a principal in an answer to a complaint by the surety seeking reimbursement for money paid on behalf of principal [*see Civ. Code § 2847*]. Although this defense is based on an agreement involving the sale of an asset as the source of reimbursement, with appropriate modifications, the form can be used when there has been any type of agreement made between the surety and principal concerning the source of reimbursement.

[3] State Statutes

Surety's right to reimbursement for disbursements on principal's behalf. *Civ. Code § 2847*

[4] Decisions

Express agreement concerning reimbursement is controlling between surety and principal. *Berrington v. Williams (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 130, 135, 52 Cal. Rptr. 772*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.165

§ 538.165 Complaint by Surety Against Cosurety for Contribution [Civ. Code § 2848]

[1] FORM Complaint by Surety Against Cosurety for Contribution [Civ. Code § 2848]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR CONTRIBUTION
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	[Amount demanded _____
through _____,]	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Defendant[s].	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 538.162, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*] _____ [*name of principal*] and _____ [*name of creditor*] entered into a written agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

[*EITHER*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], plaintiff and defendant entered into a written suretyship agreement with _____ [*name of principal*], a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

[*OR*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff entered into a written suretyship agreeement with _____ [*name of principal*], a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant entered into a written suretyship agreeement with _____ [*name of principal*], a copy of which is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. By the terms of the suretyship agreement[s] plaintiff and defendant undertook to satisfy the obligation of _____ [*name of principal*] on the contract with _____ [*name of creditor*] in the event that _____ [*name of principal*] defaulted thereon.

8. _____ [*Name of principal*] did default on his/her contractual obligations with _____ [*name of creditor*], in that _____ [*set out facts showing default, e.g.,* payment of defendant's note is past due and a balance of $5700 remains unpaid, $5500 of which is principal and $200 is interest].

9. On or about _____ [*date*], and by reason of the default of _____ [*name of principal*], plaintiff was required to pay, and did pay, $_____, the entire amount due to _____ [*name of creditor*] under his/her/its contract with _____ [*name of principal*].

10. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff demanded payment from defendant of his/her share of the amount plaintiff had paid on the obligation of _____ [*name of principal*] to _____ [*name of creditor*]. Defendant has made no payments to plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the above named sum at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a surety who has paid the principal's obligation to the creditor to obtain contribution from a cosurety [*see Civ. Code § 2848*]. The surety can maintain the action to require contribution after the surety has paid the amount due. A surety who has paid nothing cannot recover from the cosureties for their share of the debt [*Hosking v. Spartan Properties, Inc. (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 152, 157, 79 Cal. Rptr. 893]* . The procedure provided under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 881-883* (contribution among joint judgment debtors) is also available to the surety if the obligation for which the surety seeks contribution was reduced to a judgment before the surety paid it [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 882(a)*].

A common count for money lent or paid may be added to the complaint. For a further discussion of the use of common counts, see Ch. 121, *Common Counts* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The existence of the principal's obligation to the creditor (Paragraph 4).

- The execution of the suretyship agreement (first alternative Paragraph 5) or agreements (second alternative Paragraph 5 and Paragraph 6) by which plaintiff and defendant became liable [*see Civ. Code § 2793*].

- The terms of the suretyship agreement (Paragraph 7).

- The default by the principal and the payment of the obligation by plaintiff (Paragraphs 8, 9) [*see Civ. Code § 2848*; *Hosking v. Spartan Properties, Inc. (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 152, 157, 79 Cal. Rptr. 893]* .

- Plaintiff's demand of defendant's share of the obligation (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 2848*].

For discussion of and forms relating to contribution among joint judgment debtors, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

[4] State Statutes

Right to contribution from cosureties. *Civ. Code § 2848*

Right to contribution from joint judgment debtor. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 881-883*

[5] Decisions

Letter of credit applicant has different level of liability from guarantors, and therefore has no viable claim for contribution against guarantors. *Morgan Creek Residential v. Kemp (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 675, 687-689, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 232*

Equal liability of guarantors of corporate indebtedness. *Booth v. Friedman (1927) 82 Cal. App. 174, 179, 255 P. 222*

Right of guarantor to contribution against coguarantors is an obligation implied by law and governed by equitable principles. *Overholser v. Glynn (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 800, 807, 73 Cal. Rptr. 628*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.162*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.166

§ 538.166 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
Plaintiff,	)	DER DETERMINING LIABILITY OF JOINT
vs.	)	JUDGMENT DEBTOR FOR REPAYMENT
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name of principal*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of surety*)] will, and hereby does, move for an order determining

the liability of defendant _____ [*name of principal*] for repayment to defendant _____ [*name of surety*] on the joint judgment rendered herein in the sum of $_____. The motion will be made on the grounds that _____ [defendant _____ (*name of surety*) paid the sum of $_____ to plaintiff in (partial) satisfaction of the judgment *or* pursuant to a writ of execution and levy, _____ (*describe property*) owned by defendant _____ (*name of surety*) was sold and the sum of $_____ was applied to the satisfaction of the judgment]; and that defendant _____ [*name of surety*] is liable for this amount only as surety for defendant _____ [*name of principal*].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____[*name(s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the papers, records, and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

CAUTION:

A supporting memorandum must be filed and a copy served with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by a surety in proceedings to compel repayment from the principal when the principal and surety are jointly liable on a money judgment and the surety has satisfied the judgment or any part of it [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 882(b)*]. With appropriate modifications in the description of the parties, this form can also be used by a surety seeking contribution from a cosurety when the cosureties are jointly liable on a money judgment and the surety has satisfied the judgment or any part of it [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 882(a)*]. The motion is made to the court that entered the judgment, and may be made at any time before the judgment is satisfied in full or within 10 days thereafter [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 883*]. For a further discussion of this right of the surety, see *§ 538.23*.

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of and forms relating to contribution among joint judgment debtors, see Ch. 300, *Indemnity and Contribution*

[4] California Points and Authorities

For a discussion of and forms for use in motions supporting or opposing contribution, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 115, *Indemnity and Contribution* (Matthew Bender)

[5] State Statutes

Surety's right to repayment of partial or total satisfaction of judgment against cosurety. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882(a), 883*

Surety's right to repayment of partial or total satisfaction of judgment against principal. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882(b), 883*

[6] Decisions

Joint judgment debtor's motion for contribution made more than number of days specified by statute after partial satisfaction of judgment was timely filed, absent showing that plaintiff accepted partial satisfaction of judgment as full payment of judgment, because phrase "the judgment is satisfied in full" under *Code Civ. Proc. § 883(a)* means complete satisfaction of entire judgment. *Borba Farms, Inc. v. Acheson (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 597, 604, 606, 242 Cal. Rptr. 880*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.167

§ 538.167 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Declaration in Support of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment--By Surety Against Principal [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Declaration in Support of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____
vs.	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER
_____ [*name*],	)	DETERMINING LIABILITY OF JOINT JUDG-
Defendant.	)	MENT DEBTOR FOR REPAYMENT
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*) in the above-entitled action *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. On _____ [*date*], a judgment in the sum of $_____ was rendered against

defendants _____ [*names*] _____ [*set forth nature of obligation, e.g.,* for failure to pay a promissory note].

On _____ [*date*], _____ [I paid the sum of $_____ to plaintiff in (partial) satisfaction of the judgment *or* pursuant to a writ of execution and levy, _____ (*describe property*) owned by me was sold, and the sum of $_____ therefrom was applied to the satisfaction of the judgment].

I am liable for the amount _____ [paid *or* applied from the proceeds of the sale of my property] only as surety for defendant _____ [*name of principal*] because _____ [*specify facts giving rise to suretyship relationship, e.g.,* _____ (*name of principal*) was the maker of the promissory note, and I endorsed it as a surety only, with the inscription "payment guaranteed by" preceding my name, and I am therefore entitled to repayment].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration is for use by a surety to support a notice of motion for an order determining the liability of a principal or cosurety who is a joint judgment debtor with the surety [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882, 883*].

[3] State Statutes

Surety's right to contribution for partial or total satisfaction of judgment against cosurety. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882(a), 883*

Surety's right to repayment for partial or total satisfaction of judgment against principal. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882(b), 883*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.166*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.168

§ 538.168 Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Order Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Determining Liability of Joint Judgment Debtor for Repayment [Code Civ. Proc. § 883]--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION DETERMINING
Defendant.	)	LIABILITY OF JOINT JUDGMENT DEBTOR FOR
	)	REPAYMENT
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of surety*)] for an order determining liability for repayment came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*defendant surety*] appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; _____ [*defendant principal*] appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and defendant _____ [*name of principal*] is determined to be liable for repayment to defendant _____ [*name of surety*] in the sum of $_____, including $_____ interest on the obligation in favor of defendant _____ [*name of surety*].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This order is for use when the court grants a motion by a surety for an order determining the liability of a principal or cosurety who is a joint judgment debtor with the surety [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 882, 883*].

The order determining liability for contribution or repayment entitles the judgment debtor to the benefit of the judgment to enforce the liablity, including every remedy that the judgment creditor has against the persons liable, to the extent of the liability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 883(b)*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.166*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.169

§ 538.169 Complaint by Creditor Against Surety--On Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]

[1] FORM Complaint by Creditor Against Surety--On Continuing Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT BY CREDITOR AGAINST SURETY
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	ON CONTINUING GUARANTY
through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant[s].	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 538.162, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], _____ [*name of surety*] made, executed, and delivered to plaintiff an instrument designated a continuing guaranty[, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference].

5. _____ [*Allege pertinent part of agreement, e.g.,* In the guaranty defendant unconditionally

guaranteed all present and future obligations of _____ (*name of principal*), including all indebtedness and liability of every nature then owing, or thereafter to be incurred by _____ (*name of principal*)].

6. The purpose of this guaranty was to induce plaintiff to _____ [*set forth reason for guaranty, e.g.,* extend credit to _____ (*name of principal*)].

7. Plaintiff acted in reliance on the guaranty and _____ [*name of principal*] is now indebted to plaintiff in the sum of $_____ for _____ [*set forth the reason for the indebtedness, e.g.,* the extension of credit in the amount of $5000 on _____ (*date*), at 15 percent interest per annum]. This sum is now due, owing, and unpaid.

8. No part of this sum has been paid by _____ [*name of principal*]. Defendant has not paid any of the sum due under the provisions of the guaranty. There is now due, owing, and unpaid from defendant the principal sum of $_____, plus interest thereon, at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*].

[9. It is provided in the guaranty that should any action be brought to enforce the guaranty, defendant will pay additional sums for costs of suit, including reasonable attorney's fees. Plaintiff has been obliged to institute and prosecute this action to enforce the guaranty. (The sum of $_____ is a reasonable attorney's fee to be allowed herein.)]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the above named sum at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*];

[3. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ (of $_____ *or* according to proof);]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a creditor against the surety to enforce a continuing guaranty [*Civ. Code § 2814*]. The form can be used for a continuing guaranty on an extension of credit, goods on credit, or services rendered on credit.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The execution of a continuing guaranty by defendant and its relevant terms (Paragraphs 4, 5) [*see Civ. Code § 2814*; *see also Central Building, LLC v. Cooper (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1055, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212* (principals' personal guarantees of payment on corporation's commercial lease held to be continuing guaranties that also applied to lease amendments)].

- The purpose of the guaranty (Paragraph 6).

- Plaintiff's reliance on the guaranty and the amount now owing (Paragraph 7) [*see Bank of America v. Waters (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 635, 639, 26 Cal. Rptr. 9* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10*].

- That the amount owed remains unpaid (Paragraph 8).

The complaint includes an optional paragraph for use if the agreement provides for the recovery of attorney's fees (Paragraph 9). Use of this paragraph may be unnecessary as such fees are recoverable as part of costs [*see Civ. Code § 1717*].

[4] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[5] State Statutes

Continuing guaranty defined. *Civ. Code § 2814*

Liability of guarantors, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 2806-2811*; *Com. Code § 3419*

[6] Decisions

Writ of attachment may issue on guaranty regardless of whether principal obligation is secured, if guarantor has waived right to require creditor to proceed first against security given for principal obligation. *United Cent. Bank v. Superior Court (Chang) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 212, 215, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 395* (guarantor expressly waived right to require lender to proceed first against real property security for loan; lender was entitled to writ of attachment against guarantor's real property, if lender satisfied requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 484.090*)

Personal guaranty agreements on corporation's commercial lease given by principals of corporation were continuing guarantee of performance under lease that also applied to lease amendments. *Central Building, LLC v. Cooper (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1055, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212*

Complaint alleging (1) guaranty, (2) principal's default, (3) creditor's notification to surety of that default, and (4) surety's failure to remit funds in payment of guaranty was sufficient against affirmative defense of failure to state cause of action. *Torrey Pines Bank v. Superior Court (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 813, 819, 265 Cal. Rptr. 217* (mandating grant of summary judgment in favor of creditor)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.170

§ 538.170 Complaint by Creditor Against Guarantor of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor--Guaranty of Collectibility [Civ. Code § 2800]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint by Creditor Against Guarantor of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor--Guaranty of Collectibility [Civ. Code § 2800]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT ON GUARANTY OF COLLECTIB-
_____ [*name*],	)	ILITY
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant[s].	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 538.162, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Doe allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 538.162, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal*] entered into a contract, by which plaintiff agreed to purchase and

_____ [*name of principal*] agreed to sell _____ [*describe contract for sale of business, e.g.,* for $_____, payable on consummation of the sale, the business known as _____ (*name*) located at _____ (*address*), _____ County, California]. [A copy of that contract is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

5. The contract provided that the assets of the business to be sold included _____ [*describe accounts receivable included in sale, e.g.,* all accounts receivable of the business not more than 90 days old appearing on the books of the business on the date of the contract].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], defendant _____ [*name of surety*] made, executed, and delivered to plaintiff a written guaranty[, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference]. In the guaranty _____ [*name of surety*] expressly guaranteed to plaintiff that all the above described accounts receivable were good and collectible.

7. Plaintiff has fully performed all the provisions of the contract which he/she was to perform and the sale of the business was consummated on _____ [*date*].

8. _____ [*Specify the account receivable included within the contract which is the subject of the action, e.g.,* an account receivable not more than 90 days old and appearing on the books on the contract date was the account owing by _____ (*name*) in the sum of $_____ for goods, wares, and merchandise before that time sold and delivered to him/her by defendant in the usual course of the business].

9. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff gave _____ [*name of debtor*] notice of the assignment of the account and demanded payment thereof. _____ [*Name of debtor*] failed and refused, and still fails and refuses, to pay any part of that debt.

10. On _____ [*date after demand*] plaintiff commenced an action against _____ [*name of debtor*] in the _____Court of _____, No. _____, entitled _____ v. _____, for the recovery of that account and $_____ as damages.

11. _____ [*Set forth reasons why plaintiff was unable to collect the debt through the usual legal proceedings, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of debtor*) filed in the United States District Court for the _____ District of California, _____ Division, his/her voluntary petition in bankruptcy, proceeding In Bankruptcy Number _____ of that court. Plaintiff and defendant were listed as unsecured creditors for the ammount of the account receivable and no assets that were not exempt from execution were listed on the schedules of assets and liabilities].

[12. Plaintiff duly and properly filed a creditor's claim in those bankruptcy proceedings for the amount of that account receivable. No part of that claim has been paid, and on _____ (*date*), the United States District Court granted _____ [*name of debtor*] a discharge in bankruptcy.]

13. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], plaintiff demanded payment by defendant of that account receivable. No part of this has been paid and there is now due, owing, and unpaid from defendant to plaintiff $_____ on that account receiveable and the guarantee thereof.

[14. The guaranty executed by defendant provides that any expense, legal or otherwise, incurred by the plaintiff in enforcing payment of the accounts by reason of any dispute between principal and its customers shall be chargeable to, and payable by, defendant. Plaintiff has incurred legal expense in retaining an attorney to enforce payment of the accounts receivable assigned to him/her by principal. Additional attorney's fees and enforcement expenses will be incurred. The full amount of these fees and expenses is unknown at this time. Plaintiff will ask leave of court to amend

his/her complaint to conform with the proof offered at the time of trial with respect to the losses sustained through these fees and expenses.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on the above-named sum at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*];

[3. For reasonable attorney's fees and costs according to proof;]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a creditor to recover damages from a surety who has guaranteed that accounts receivable assigned to the creditor in connection with the sale of a business are good or collectible [*see Civ. Code § 2800*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint sets forth facts demonstrating the creditor's inability to recover the debt as a basis for recovery of money from the guarantor. The complaint specifically alleges that:

- The plaintiff and the principal entered into a contract for the sale of a business, including accounts receivable (Paragraphs 4, 5).

- The defendant executed a guaranty which guaranteed that the accounts receivable were good and collectible (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2800*].

- The plaintiff performed on the contract (Paragraphs 7, 8, and 9).

- Facts demonstrating that no part of the debt could be collected, using bankruptcy of the debtor as an example (Paragraphs 10, 11, 12, and 13) [*see Civ. Code § 2800*; *Ohio Electric Car Co. v. LeSage (1920) 182 Cal. 450, 455, 188 P. 982]* .

An optional allegation for attorney's fees for enforcement of the guaranty is included for use if the guaranty included a provision for them (Paragraph 14) [*see Civ. Code § 1717*].

[4] Prior Legal Proceedings Prerequisite

A complaint on a guaranty of collectibility is required to allege legal proceedings were taken against the debtor [*Ohio Electric Car Co. v. LeSage (1920) 182 Cal. 450, 455, 188 P. 982]* . An allegation merely that an unsuccessful attempt

was made to collect the accounts is not sufficient. There must also be an allegation that the accounts were not good or collectible or that the claims had been reduced to judgment, and execution thereon returned unsatisfied, or that the debtors were insolvent and it would be futile to prosecute them [*Nimmo v. Fitzgerald (1927) 202 Cal. 565, 567, 261 P. 1015]* .

[5] State Statutes

Guaranty that obligation is good or collectible imports that it is collectible by usual legal proceedings taken with reasonable diligence. *Civ. Code § 2800*

Failure to institute legal proceedings does not bar recovery if no part of debt could have been recovered thereby. *Civ. Code § 2801*

Removal of principal and property from State does not excuse guarantor. *Civ. Code § 2802*

[6] Decisions

Guaranty of collectibility is distinct from guaranty of payment. *Pierce v. Merrill (1900) 128 Cal. 464, 471, 61 P. 64* ; *Menefee v. Robert A. Klein & Co. (1932) 121 Cal. App. 294, 295-296, 9 P.2d 219*

Complaint on guaranty of collectibility must allege legal proceedings were taken. *Ohio Electric Car Co. v. LeSage (1920) 182 Cal. 450, 454-455, 188 P. 982*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.171

§ 538.171 Allegations--Guaranty of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor

[1] FORM Allegations--Guaranty of Accounts Receivable Sold to Creditor

1. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], plaintiff and defendant _____ [*name of principal*] entered into a written contract, by which plaintiff agreed to purchase all accounts for merchandise sold by _____ [*name of principal*], on the terms and conditions set forth therein. A copy of that contract is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made part hereof.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], defendant _____ [*name of surety*] made, executed, and delivered to plaintiff a written guaranty, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof. In the guaranty _____ [*name of surety*] guaranteed to plaintiff prompt and faithful performance of all the promises, warranties, and representations made by _____ [*name of principal*] in the sales agreement, or to be made in the bills of sale of the accounts receivable.

3. Between _____ [*date*], and _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of principal*], under the terms of the contract, executed and delivered to plaintiff bills of sale of accounts receivable, representing and warranting that merchandise had been sold and delivered, and that accounts receivable were due, owing, and payable to _____ [*name of principal*], in the sum of $_____, for which plaintiff paid him/her the sum of $_____, after deducting a factoring fee of $_____.

4. Those accounts receivable are not collectible because _____ [*specify reason why accounts are not collectible, e.g.,* they were false, fictitious, and nonexistent in that _____ (*name of principal*) did not sell or deliver merchandise to the persons named in the bills of sale, and no accounts receivable were due, owing, and payable as set forth in those bills of sale], and by reason thereof plaintiff has sustained a loss and damage in the sum of $_____, plus (*e.g.,* a factoring fee of $_____)].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a complaint by the creditor against the surety of a contract for the sale of accounts receivable. By guaranteeing the contract, the surety promises to answer for the debt, de fault, or miscarriage of the principal [*see Civ. Code § 2787*]. The allegations may be inserted in place of Paragraphs 4-9 in *see § 538.170*. Because these allegations deal with a general suretyship, unlike *see § 538.170* which involves a guaranty of collectibility, the creditor need not allege that legal proceedings were first taken against the principal debtor, and Paragraphs 10-13 of *see § 538.170* may be omitted [*see § 538.17[2][b]*]. This form is adapted from the facts in *Refinance Corp. v. Northern Lbr. Sales (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 73, 329 P.2d 109* .

[3] Allegations

These allegations allege:

- An agreement between the principal and plaintiff (Paragraph 1).
- That defendant is guarantor for the principal (Paragraph 2) [*see Civ. Code § 2806*].
- Performance of the contract (Paragraph 3).
- Fraud by the principal leading to damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 4) [*see Civ. Code § 2807*].

[4] State Statutes

Definition of surety. *Civ. Code § 2787*

Liabilities of surety. *Civ. Code §§ 2806-2810*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.172

§ 538.172 Notice by Surety to Principal of Action Against Surety on Principal's Obligation [Code Civ. Proc. § 1912]

[1] FORM Notice by Surety to Principal of Action Against Surety on Principal's Obligation [Code Civ. Proc. § 1912]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL OF ACTION ON OB-
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	LIGATION
through _____,]	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*]
Defendant[s].	)	
	)	

_____

TO: _____ [*name of principal debtor*],

Please take notice that on _____ [*date*], you _____ [*set out agreement guaranteed by surety, e.g.,* executed a promissory note in the amount of $_____ payable to _____ (*name of creditor*) at _____ percent interest per annum by _____ (*date*)].

I/We hereby give you notice that the above-entitled action has been commenced by _____ [*name of creditor*] against me/us as your _____ [guarantor *or* surety] based on your failure to perform your obligation in that agreement. The action claims you are in default through your failure to _____ [*set out default, e.g.,* pay the promissory note].

You are hereby given notice of the pendency of this action and are requested and required by the undersigned to appear and defend this action on your own behalf and on behalf of the undersigned. In the event you fail to do so you will be bound by the record in this action pursuant to *Section 1912 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.*

Summmons in the above-entitled action was served on the undersigned on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. Accordingly, appearance will be due by _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice for use by a surety to inform the principal that the creditor has instituted legal proceedings against the surety based on the principal's obligations. The principal who receives notice of the creditor's action against the surety and is given the opportunity to join in the defense is bound by the results of that action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*]. For further discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*, see *§ 538.21[5]*.

[3] State Statute

Notice by surety to principal of action on obligation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1912*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.173

§ 538.173 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Manner of Payment Altered

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Manner of Payment Altered

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. The agreement between plaintiff as creditor and _____ [*name*] as the principal debtor [, attached to plaintiff's complaint as Exhibit A,] provided that _____ [*describe manner of payment prescribed in original agreement, e.g.,* (*name of principal debtor*), when he/she sold products supplied by plaintiff, was to invoice all its customers for the products, with each invoice bearing a notation that it was assigned to plaintiff and that payment was to be made to plaintiff].

2. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] agreed _____ [orally *or* in writing] to modify the agreement by changing the method of payment _____ [*specify new manner of payment, e.g.,* to a simple open book account payable within 30 days after delivery to principal obligor of each item of merchandise by plaintiff].

3. At all times herein mentioned subsequent to the making of the second agreement, plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] acted pursuant thereto _____ [*specify actions taken, e.g.,* by treating all obligations thereafter incurred by _____ (*name of principal debtor*) with plaintiff as an open book account payable 30 days after delivery of each item therein contained].

4. The second agreement was made and the subsequent acts of plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] pursuant thereto were performed without defendant's consent.

[5. The indebtedness alleged in plaintiff's complaint was incurred by _____ (*name of principal debtor*) subsequent to the making of the second agreement and was treated by plaintiff and _____ (*name of principal debtor*) as _____ (*e.g.*, items on an open book account due and payable within 30 days after delivery).]

6. By reason of the second agreement and the acts of the parties pursuant thereto the original obligation guaranteed by defendant has been materially altered, and defendant is discharged from all liability thereon.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use by a surety in an answer to a complaint by a creditor when the original obligation of the principal has been altered by changing the mannner of payment. The surety is exonerated, except so far as he or she may be indemnified by the principal, or except to the extent of any accord as provided in *Civ. Code § 2822(b)*, if by any act of the creditor, without the surety's consent, the principal's original obligation is altered in any respect [*Civ. Code § 2819*; for further discussion, see *§ 538.19[2]*]. Exoneration is a matter to be pleaded and proved as an affirmative defense [*City of Sacramento v. Trans Pacific Industries, Inc. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 389, 399, 159 Cal. Rptr. 514]* .

For use when a continuing guaranty is involved, this foregoing form of affirmative defense includes the allegation that the debt sued on was incurred after the principal obligation was modified (Paragraph 5) [*see Hill & Morton, Inc. v. Coughlan (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 545, 549-550, 29 Cal. Rptr. 550]* .

[3] State Statutes

Acts of creditor altering principal obligation of his/her rights or remedies against principal debtor discharges surety. *Civ. Code § 2819*

[4] Decisions

Payment wired from debtor to creditor day before execution of modification agreement but not applied until after execution and without which creditor would not have agreed to modification was part of modification, not part of original obligation; thus, when payment was set aside as preference and creditor had to disgorge it to debtor's trustee in bankruptcy, surety was not obligated to pay disgorged amount. *Texaco Refining & Marketing v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. (9th Cir. 1990) 895 F.2d 637, 640* (applying California law)

Change in method of payment from assignment of invoices to open account is material change exonerating surety from liability. *Hill & Morton, Inc. v. Coughlan (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 545, 549-550, 29 Cal. Rptr. 550*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.174

§ 538.174 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Extension of Time for Payment

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Surety Exonerated by Material Alteration of Principal Obligation [Civ. Code § 2819]--Extension of Time for Payment

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that

1. The agreement between plaintiff as creditor and _____ [*name*] as the principal debtor [, attached to plaintiff's complaint as Exhibit A,] provided that _____ [*describe time of payment prescribed in orginal agreement, e.g.,* (*name of principal debtor*) was to make installment payments of $_____ on the first of each month every month until _____ (*date*), when the account would be paid in full].

2. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city and state*], plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] entered into a _____ [written *or* oral] agreement, [a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof,] extending the time for payment by _____ [*name of principal debtor*] of the obligation guaranteed by defendant from the final payment date of _____ [*date*], to _____ [*date*], in consideration of _____ [*specify consideration, e.g.,* the sum of $_____].

3. At all times herein mentioned subsequent to the making of the second agreement, plaintiff and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] acted pursuant thereto _____ [*describe actions, e.g.,* having a final payment due date of _____ (*date*)].

4. [*Second agreement was made without defendant's knowledge or consent. See § 538.173, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Second agreement as material alteration. See § 538.173, Paragraph 6.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a surety in an answer to a complaint by a creditor when the original obligation of the principal has been altered by changing the time of payment [*see Civ. Code § 2819*].

[3] Decisions

Taxpayer's execution of waivers, which allowed SBE to issue deficiency determination beyond the statutory deadline, was material alteration. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Carleton (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1607, 1610, 273 Cal. Rptr. 436* (surety was not exonerated because original suretyship agreement consented to waivers)

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.173*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.175

§ 538.175 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Creditor Failed After Demand to Proceed Against Principal Debtor [Civ. Code § 2845]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety--Creditor Failed After Demand to Proceed Against Principal Debtor [Civ. Code § 2845]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. On _____ [*date*], at _____, _____ County, California, defendant served on plaintiff a written demand, [a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof,] requiring plaintiff to proceed against _____ [*name of principal debtor*], who is the person primarily liable on the obligation alleged in plaintiff's complaint and the person for whom defendant was surety on that obligation.

2. At the time the demand was served on plaintiff, the obligation was due and payable, and _____ [*name of principal debtor*] [was present in California and] had sufficient assets over and above those exempt from execution to discharge that obligation.

3. Plaintiff disregarded that demand, and failed to commence action against _____ [*name of principal debtor*] on the obligation or in any other way to proceed against _____ [*name of principal debtor*] to satisfy the obligation.

4. _____ [*Specify reasons why defendant surety has been prejudiced by plaintiff's failure to pursue the principal debtor, e.g.,* _____ (*name of principal debtor*) has, since the time of the demand, (left the State of California,) disposed of his/her assets, and, defendant is informed and believes and on such information and belief alleges, become insolvent].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a surety in an answer to a complaint by a creditor when the creditor has failed to proceed against the principal after being requested to do so by the surety. The surety may require the creditor to proceed against the principal or pursue any other remedy in the creditor's power which the surety cannot pursue, and which would lighten the surety's burden; and if the creditor fails to do so, the surety is exonerated to the extent to which the surety is prejudiced [*Civ. Code § 2845*; for further discussion, *see § 538.20[2]*].

[3] State Statutes

Removal of principal from state leaving no property is equivalent to insolvency in its effect on rights and obligations of one who is guarantor that obligation is good or collectible. *Civ. Code § 2802*

Surety is exonerated to extent he or she is prejudiced by creditor's failure to proceed against principal debtor after demand to do so has been made. *Civ. Code § 2845*

[4] Decisions

Creditor must proceed against principal debtor before being able to secure judgment against surety after surety has demanded that creditor proceed against principal. *Moffett v. Miller (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 712, 713, 260 P.2d 215*

Surety who demands that creditor foreclose on security for debt is not exonerated under *Civ. Code § 2845* if surety has ample resources to satisfy obligation to creditor and pursue foreclosure directly against principal. *Katz v. Haskell (1961) 196 Cal. App. 2d 144, 152, 16 Cal. Rptr. 453*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.176

§ 538.176 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety on Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]--Nonreliance on Guaranty

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Creditor's Action Against Surety on Guaranty [Civ. Code § 2814]--Nonreliance on Guaranty

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. _____ [*Set forth circumstances showing that the plaintiff did not rely on compliance with the conditions attached to the contract e.g.,* The contract between plaintiff and _____ (*name of principal*), (a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made part hereof,) provided that, as security for the performance, _____ (*name of principal*) would deliver to plaintiff duly executed instruments of security or guaranty, and would comply with all terms, conditions, and provisions set forth in such instruments. Immediately following this printed portion of the contract plaintiff typed the words "-Not Applicable-."]

2. In fact plaintiff did not rely on the written guaranty dated _____ [*date*], executed by defendant, in performing the contract with _____ [*name of principal*].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use by a surety in an answer to a complaint by a creditor when the principal contract specifies that there is to be a guaranty of performance and the creditor's actions indicate nonreliance on the duly executed guaranty. Since a creditor's right to enforce a contract of guaranty is dependent on credit being extended in reliance on the guaranty, nonreliance should serve as a valid defense [*see Bank of America v. Waters (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 635, 639, 26 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

[3] State Statutes

Continuing guaranty defined. *Civ. Code § 2814*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Suretyship

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.177-538.189

[Reserved]

§§ 538.177[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.190

§ 538.190 Statutory Form of Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.320, 995.330]

[1] FORM Statutory Form of Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.320, 995.330]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	_____ [BOND *or*
_____ [*name*],	)	UNDERTAKING]
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

WHEREAS the _____ [*identify party*, e.g., plaintiff] desires to give _____ [a bond *or* an undertaking] for _____ [*state purpose*] as provided by _____ [*specify code sections requiring bond or undertaking*];

[*EITHER, if sureties and principal are jointly and severally liable*]

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned principal, _____ [*name of principal*] and _____ [surety *or* sureties], _____ [*name(s) of surety or sureties*] hereby obligate ourselves, jointly and severally, to _____ [*name of beneficiary*] under the statutory obligations, in the amount of $_____.

[*OR, if principal is not signing bond*]

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned _____ [surety *or* sureties], _____ [*name(s) of surety or sureties*] hereby obligate(s) myself/ourselves [, jointly and severally,] to _____ [*name of beneficiary*] under the statutory obligations, in the amount of $_____.

[*ADD, if surety limits liability*]

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned surety, _____ [*name of surety with limited liability*], hereby obligates itself to _____ [*name of beneficiary*] under the statutory obligations, in the amount of $_____ [*amount less than amount of bond or undertaking*].

[*ADD, if amount of bond is based on value of property or interest in property*]

The [interest in] property on which the amount of this _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is based, and which is relied on by the _____ [surety *or* sureties] as qualifying them on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is as follows: _____ [*describe the property or properties or interest in property*].

The estimate of the _____ [principal *or* beneficiary *or* court] as to the fair market value of the above-described [interest in] property is as follows: _____ [*specify fair market value of each property or interest*].

[*CONTINUE*]

The addresses at which the principal and sureties may be served with notices, papers, and other documents are:

_____ [*name of surety*] _____ [*address*]

_____ [*name of surety*] _____ [*address*]

_____ [*name of principal*] _____ [*address*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*] _____ [*signature of surety*]

_____ [*date*] _____ [*signature of surety*]

_____ [*date*] _____ [*signature of principal*]

[*ADD, if surety limits liability*]

STIPULATION LIMITING LIABILITY OF SURETIES

The aggregate worth of all sureties executing the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] herein is $_____, which is twice the amount of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking]. Therefore, pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 995.520(d)*;

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the [principal and] sureties hereto, that the liability of _____ [*name of surety*] on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] herein is limited to the worth of _____ [*name of surety*] as stated in the accompanying declaration of _____ [*name of surety*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature of surety*]
_____ [*signature of surety*]
_____ [*signature of surety*]
_____ [*signature of principal*]

[2] Use of Form

The foregoing form of bond or undertaking is for use when a statute requires a bond or undertaking to be filed in action or proceeding. It is substantially in the form set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.320* and *995.330*. For additional or superseding requirements for a bond or undertaking filed in a particular proceeding see the specific statute providing for the bond or undertaking.

[3] Contents of Bond

A bond must be in writing signed by the sureties under oath. It must include a statement that the sureties are jointly and severally liable on the obligations of the statute providing for the bond, and the address at which the principal and sureties may be served with notices, papers, and other documents under the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320(a)(1), (2)*]. If the amount of the bond is based on the value of property or an interest in property, a description of the property or interest, and either the principal's estimate of the value of the property or interest, or, if given pursuant to the estimate of the beneficiary or court, the value as so estimated, must also be given in the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320(a)(3)*].

[4] Declaration of Qualifications

A bond that is given by personal sureties must be accompanied by a declaration of qualifications of each surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520*; *see § 538.191*].

[5] Stipulations Limiting Liability

If the amount of the bond exceeds $10,000 and is executed by more than two personal sureties, the affidavit may state that a personal surety is worth less than the amount of the bond and the bond may stipulate that the liability of the surety is limited to the worth of the surety stated in the affidavit, so long as the aggregate worth of all sureties executing the bond is twice the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(d)*].

[6] California Legal Forms

For forms of bonds and undertakings for use in other than an action or proceeding, e.g., license or workers compensation bonds, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 79, *Suretyship, Guaranty, and Indemnity*

[7] State Statutes

Bond and Undertaking Law. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*

Contents of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.320*

Form of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.330*

Bond and undertaking interchangeable. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.210*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.191

§ 538.191 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Qualifications of Personal Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520]

[1] FORM Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] of Qualifications of Personal Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
_____ [*name*],	)	OF
Defendant.	)	QUALIFICATIONS OF SURETY
	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.520, 2015.5*]
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am one of the personal sureties who executed the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] pursuant to _____ [*specify code sections requiring bond or undertaking*] in the above-entitled matter and make this declaration in support of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking].

2. I am not an officer of the court or a member of the State Bar of California and am a resident and _____ [an owner of real property *or* householder] in California. My occupation is: _____ [*specify*]. My residence address is: _____ [*street address and city*]; my business address is: _____ [*street address and city*].

[*EITHER*]

3. I am worth $_____, the amount of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], in _____ [real *and/or* personal] property situated in California, over and above all my debts and liabilities, exclusive of property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment.

[*OR, if the amount of the bond exceeds $10,000, is executed by more than two sureties, and the aggregate worth of all sureties executing the bond is twice the amount of the bond*]

3. I am worth $_____, which is an amount less than the amount of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], as provided in Sec tions 995.510(b) and *995.520(d) of the Code of Civil Procedure*, in _____ [real *and/or* personal property] situated in California, over and above all my debts and liabilities, exclusive of property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment.

[*AND, if the amount of the bond exceeds $5,000*]

4. The property belonging to me and relied on by me as qualifying me on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], and my best estimate of the fair market value of each item of property, is as follows: _____ [*describe sufficiently for identification of each item, and estimate fair market value of each item*].

5. The nature of my interest in each item of property is _____ [*specify, e.g.*, owner in fee].

[*EITHER*]

6. The property is subject to no charges or liens, of public record or otherwise, known to me. Nor is the property subject to any impediment or cloud known to me on the free right of possession, use, benefit, or enjoyment.

[*OR*]

6. The property is subject to the following charges and/or liens: _____ [*specify, giving amounts*]. Other than the foregoing charges and/or liens, the property is not subject to any other impediments or cloud known to me on the free right of possession, use, benefit, or enjoyment.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of surety*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration of qualifications is for use by a personal surety giving a bond or undertaking. Any bond or undertaking given by personal sureties must be accompanied by a declaration of the qualifications of each surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520*].

[3] Contents of Declaration

The affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) must contain all of the following information [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(b)*]:

- The name, occupation, residence address, and business address (if any) of the surety.

- A statement that the surety is a resident, and either an owner of real property or householder, within California.

- A statement that the surety is worth the amount of the bond in real or personal property, or both, situated in California, over and above all debts and liabilities, exclusive of property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment.

If the amount of the bond exceeds $5,000, the affidavit or declaration must contain, in addition to the information required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(b)*, all of the following information [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(c)*]:

- A description sufficient for identification of real and personal property situated in California, and the nature of the surety's interest therein that qualifies the surety on the bond.

- The surety's best estimate of the fair market value of each item of property.

- A statement of any charge or lien and its amount, known to the surety, whether of public record or not, against any item of property.

- Any other impediment or cloud known to the surety on the free right of possession, use, benefit, or enjoyment of the property.

If the amount of the bond exceeds $10,000 and is executed by more than two sureties, the affidavit or declaration may state that the surety is worth less than the amount of the bond and the bond may stipulate that the liability of the surety is limited to the worth of the surety stated in the affidavit or declaration, as long as the aggregate worth of all sureties executing the bond is twice the amount of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520(d)*].

[4] State Statutes

Worth of personal surety may be less than amount of bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.510(b)*

Declaration of qualification of personal surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.520*

Declarations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[5] Cross References

For general forms for declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For a related form, *see § 538.190*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.192

§ 538.192 Notice of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION OBJECTING TO SUFFICIENCY OF BOND OR UNDERTAKING
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name of principal*] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California,

_____ [*specify party, e.g.*, defendant], _____ [*name of beneficiary*] will, and hereby does, move for an order determining the sufficiency of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] given for _____ [*state purpose*] as provided by _____ [*specify code sections requiring bond or undertaking*]; and _____ [*specify relief desired, e.g.*, increasing the amount of the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) from $_____ to $_____, which _____ (*specify party, e.g.*, defendant) estimates would be a sufficient amount for the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) *and/or* requiring that sufficient sureties on the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) be provided]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____ [_____(*name(s*)), the _____ (surety *or* sureties) on the above-mentioned _____ (bond *or* undertaking) is/are insufficient because _____ (*specify reason(s) for insufficiency of sureties*) *and/or* the amount of the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) is insufficient because _____ (*specify why amount is insufficient*) *and/or* the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) is insufficient because _____ (*specify any other cause for insufficiency*)].

[*ADD, if a ground for objection is that the value of property or an interest in property on which the amount of the bond is based exceeds the value estimated on the bond*]

The estimate of _____ [*name of beneficiary*], of the fair market value of the _____ [property *or* interest in the property] on which the amount of the above-mentioned _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is based is $_____.

[*CONTINUE*]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] [, on the attached certificate of the county clerk], on the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the papers and records, and file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented on the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:
A supporting memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; see *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by the beneficiary of a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding to object to the sufficiency of the bond or undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910, 995.920*]. The beneficiary may object to a bond on the grounds that the sureties are insufficient, that the amount of the bond is insufficient, or that the bond, from any other cause is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920*].

The form may be used to object to the sufficiency of personal sureties or admitted surety insurers, but an objection to

the sufficiency of an admitted surety insurer must include one or both of the following: (1) the county clerk's certificate stating that the insurer is not listed as an admitted surety insurer on the web site of the Department of Insurance or (2) an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) stating facts that establish insufficiency of the insurer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.650*]. For further discussion of objecting to sufficiency of admitted surety insurer, see *§ 538.56[8]*.

[3] Form of Objection

The objection must be in writing and must be made by noticed motion. The notice of motion must specify the precise grounds for the objection, and if a ground for the objection is that the amount of the bond is insufficient, the notice of motion must state the reason for the insufficiency and include an estimate of the amount that would be sufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(a)*].

Although the statute requires objections to be made by "noticed motion," a court of appeal has held that an ex parte motion constitutes substantial compliance if the principal and the court had actual notice of the objection and the other requirements of the statute were met [*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 11-13, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

[4] Time for Objection

The objection must be made within 10 days after service of a copy of the bond on the beneficiary or such other time as is required by the statute providing for the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(b)*]. Service on the principal of the objection and notice of motion and proof of service are made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1013a* [*see* Law Revision Commission comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930*; for discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to service of summons and proof of service, *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. Unless the parties otherwise agree, the hearing on the objection will be held not less than two or more than five days after service of the notice of motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.950(a)*].

[5] Cross References

For general forms for notices of motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

[6] State Statutes

Objections to bonds and undertakings generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960*

Objection to sufficiency of admitted surety insurers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.650*

Time within which to object to sufficiency of sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930(b)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.193

§ 538.193 Declaration in Support of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

[1] FORM Declaration in Support of Motion Objecting to Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960]--Amount of Bond or Undertaking Insufficient or Sureties Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.920]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____
vs.	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION OBJECTING
_____ [*name*],	)	TO SUFFICIENCY OF BOND OR UNDERTAK-
Defendant.	)	ING
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the defendant and beneficiary] on a _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the amount of $_____ given by plaintiff as principal in the above-entitled

action.

[*EITHER, if objecting to amount of bond or undertaking*]

2. That $_____, the amount of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] given for _____ [*state purpose*] as provided by _____ [*state code sections requiring bond or undertaking*], is insufficient because _____ [*state reason bond is insufficient*]. A _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the amount of $_____ would be sufficient.

[*AND/OR, if objection is made to value of property on which bond is based*]

2. That the property on which the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is based has a value of $_____. The value estimated in the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] was $_____. The true value of the property therefore exceeds the value estimated in the _____ [bond *or* undertaking].

[*AND/OR, if objecting to sufficiency of a surety*]

2. That _____ [*name of surety*], the surety on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], is insufficient because _____ [*state reason surety is insufficient, e.g.,* the assets of _____ (*name of surety*) do not exceed his/her/its liabilities in an amount equal to or in excess of the amount of the _____ (bond *or* undertaking)].

[*AND/OR, if objecting to sufficiency of admitted surety insurer on ground of non-certification*]

2. That the clerk of the above-entitled Court issued to me a certificate [, which is attached hereto,] stating that the certificate of authority of _____ [*name of admitted surety insurer*] issued by the Insurance Commissioner authorizing the insurer to transact surety insurance has been _____ [surrendered *or* revoked *or* canceled *or* annulled *or* suspended] and that renewed authority has not been granted.

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of declarant*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration is for use by the beneficiary for submission to the court when objecting to the sufficiency of the amount of the bond or undertaking or to the sufficiency of the sureties giving the bond or undertaking [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.930*]. The declaration includes the grounds for the objection [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.650, 995.920*]. If the ground for objection is that the value of property or an interest in property on which the amount of the bond is based exceeds the value estimated in the bond, the declaration must include a statment of the beneficiary's estimate of the market value of the property or interest in property [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.940(a)*].

An affidavit or declaration made under the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) must conform to the standards prescribed for an affidavit made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.040*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)* requires that supporting and opposing affidavits or declarations must be made by any person on personal knowledge, must set forth admissible evidence, and must show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*].

[3] State Statutes

Declaration in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[4] Cross References

For general forms for affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For a related form, *see § 538.192*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.194

§ 538.194 Order Determining Sufficiency or Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960]

[1] FORM Order Determining Sufficiency or Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER DETERMINING SUFFICIENCY OR IN-
Plaintiff,	)	SUFFICIENCY OF BOND OR UNDERTAKING
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name of beneficiary*] objecting to the sufficiency of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] for _____ [*state purpose of bond or undertaking*] as provided by _____ [*specify code sections requiring bond or undertaking*] came on regularly for hearing before this court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] and defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

The court, having considered the objection of _____ [*moving party*], and the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)], and other documents in support of and in opposition to the

motion, having heard the arguments of counsel, and being fully advised in the matter, finds that the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is _____ [sufficient and is _____ (approved *or* accepted) by the Court *or specify in what respect the bond is insufficient, e.g.*, insufficient in amount)].

[*AND, if the court determines the bond is sufficient*]

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, denied.

[*OR, if the court determines the bond is insufficient*]

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, granted and that a _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the amount of $_____ and with sufficient sureties be given by _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name of principal*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all rights obtained by giving the original _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the above-entitled action shall immediately cease unless the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] herein required shall be executed and filed on or before _____ [*date within 5 days after date order made*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to determine the sufficiency of the bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding. If the court determines that the bond or undertaking is insufficient, it court must specify in what respect the bond or undertaking is insufficient and order that a bond with sufficient sureties and in a sufficient amount be given within five days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960(b)(1)*].

[3] State Statutes

Order determining sufficiency of bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.960*

Order defined. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1064*

[4] Cross References

For general forms for orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For related forms, *see §§ 538.192* and *538.193*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.195

§ 538.195 Notice of Motion for Order--Determining Bond or Undertaking Has Become Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(a), (b)] and for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Determining Bond or Undertaking Is Excessive and Reducing Amount [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order--Determining Bond or Undertaking Has Become Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(a), (b)] and for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Determining Bond or Undertaking Is Excessive and Reducing Amount [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ORDER AND MOTION _____ [FOR SUFFICIENT NEW, ADDITIONAL, OR SUPPLEMENTAL *or* REDUCING] _____ [BOND *or* UNDERTAKING]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	[_____ (*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(a)-(c) or Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)*)]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] and his/her attorney of record:

[*EITHER, if bond is insufficient*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division)] _____ of this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.*, defendant _____ (*name*)] will, and hereby does, move for an order determining that the amount of the bond given in the above-entitled action _____ [is *or* has become] insufficient so that a new, additional, or supplemental bond may be required. The motion will be made on the grounds that the _____ [surety *or* amount of the bond] is insufficient because _____ [*specify precisely changed circumstances causing insufficiency, e.g.*, one of the sureties filed for bankruptcy on _____ [*date*].

[*OR, if bond is excessive*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division)] _____ of this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California, _____ [*specify moving party, e.g.*, defendant _____ (*name*)] will move for an order determining that the amount of the bond given in the above-entitled action _____ [is *or* has become] excessive so that a new bond may be required. The motion will be made on the grounds that the amount of the bond is excessive because _____ [*specify precise grounds for objection to amount of bond, e.g.*, defendant's estimate of expenses which may be incurred in connection with the action is unreasonably high].

[*CONTINUE*]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(s)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:

A supporting memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* . The motion must also be supported by affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 1005, 1010*; for a form of declaration, *see § 538.196*].

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by a beneficiary when a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding has from any cause become insufficient [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010*]. The form may also be used by the principal to move for an order reducing the amount of the bond or undertaking [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030*]. The motion is heard and notice of motion is given in the same manner as an objection to a bond or undertaking pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.030(b)*]. The motion may be brought when circumstances have changed making the bond or undertaking insufficient or excessive or when good cause can be shown for having failed to make an objection to the bond or undertaking within 10 days after service of a copy of the bond on the beneficiary or as is required by the statute providing for the bond [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.930(b), (c), 996.010*].

Since the motion is deemed to be an objection to the bond and notice is given in the same manner as an objection to the bond, the grounds for the motion should be specified precisely, and if a ground is that the amount of the bond is insufficient, the reason for the insufficiency and an estimate of the amount that would be sufficient should be stated [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.930(a), 996.010(b)*].

[3] Cross References

For general forms of noticed motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

[4] State Statutes

Objections to bonds. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.910-995.960*

Insufficient bond in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010*

Excessive bonds. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.196

§ 538.196 Declaration Showing Bond or Undertaking is Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.020(a)] or Excessive [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)]

[1] FORM Declaration Showing Bond or Undertaking is Insufficient [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.020(a)] or Excessive [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] SHOWING _____
Plaintiff,	)	[BOND *or* UNDERTAKING]
vs.	)	_____
_____ [*name*],	)	[INSUFFICIENT *or* EXCESSIVE]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [the defendant and beneficiary *or* the plaintiff and principal] on a _____ [bond or undertaking] in the amount of $_____ given in the above-entitled action.

2. That _____ [*specify the reason that the bond has become insufficient or that the bond is excessive, e.g.*, _____ (*name*), one of the sureties, filed for bankruptcy on _____ (*date*) *or* defendant's estimate of expenses which may be incurred in connection with the action is unreasonably high in that _____ (*specify supporting facts*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of declarant*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration is for use in support of a motion for an order determining that a bond or undertaking given or ordered in an action or proceeding has become insufficient or is excessive [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010, 996.030*]. This declaration may also be used to show that the bond or undertaking given other than in an action or proceeding has from any cause become insufficient because the sureties are insufficient or because the amount of the bond or undertaking is insufficient, or when the amount of the bond or undertaking is excessive [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.020(a), 996.030(b)*].

An affidavit or declaration made under the Bond and Undertaking Law (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.010-996.560*) must conform to the standards prescribed for an affidavit made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.040*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)* requires that supporting and opposing affidavits or declarations must be made by any person on personal knowledge, must set forth admissible evidence, and must show affirmatively that the affiant is competent to testify to the matters stated therein [*Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(d)*].

[3] State Statutes

Affidavit showing bond or undertaking became insufficient. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.020(a)*

Affidavit showing bond or undertaking excessive. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)*

Declarations in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[4] Cross References

For general forms of affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For a related form, *see § 538.195*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.197

§ 538.197 Order to Appear and Show Cause Why Determination of Insufficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)] or Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)] of Bond or Undertaking Should Not Be Entered--Bond or Undertaking Given in Other Than Action or Proceeding

[1] FORM Order to Appear and Show Cause Why Determination of Insufficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)] or Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)] of Bond or Undertaking Should Not Be Entered--Bond or Undertaking Given in Other Than Action or Proceeding

ORDER FOR _____ [PRINCIPAL *or* BENEFICIARY] TO APPEAR AND SHOW CAUSE WHY DETERMINATION OF _____ [INSUFFICIENCY *or* EXCESSIVENESS] OF _____ [BOND *OR* UNDERTAKING] SHOULD NOT BE ENTERED

To: _____ [*name of person required to appear*]:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that you appear before _____ [*specify officer to whom the bond was given or with whom a copy of the bond is filed or who is required to determine the sufficiency of the sureties or to approve the bond*], at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], California, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, then and there to show cause, if any, why _____ [*specify same officer as above*] should not make a determination that the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] you gave for _____ [*state purpose*] pursuant to _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*] is _____ [insufficient *or* excessive].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*title of officer*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use when a bond has been given or ordered in other than an action or proceeding, to order the principal to appear and show cause why a determination that the bond is insufficient should not be made, or to order the beneficiary to appear and show cause why a determination that the bond is excessive should not be made. The form is used by the officer to whom the bond was given or with whom a copy of the bond is filed or who is required to determine the sufficiency of the sureties or approve the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.160, 996.020(a), 996.030(a), (b)*]. The officer may serve an order to determine insufficiency of a bond if it is shown by the affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of a credible witness or it otherwise comes to the attention of the officer that the bond is or has become insufficient because the sureties are insufficient or because the amount of the bond is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)*]. A determination that a bond is excessive is made on affidavit or declaration of the principle in the same manner as an affidavit or declaration for a determination under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010-996.030* that a bond is insufficient [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)*].

The order to show cause must name a day not less than three or more than 10 days after service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)*].

[3] Service

An order to show cause why a determination that the bond or undertaking is insufficient should not be made is served on the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)*]. An order to show cause why a determination that the amount of the bond or undertaking is excessive should not be made is served on the beneficiary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)*]. Service is made in the same manner as service of process in civil actions generally [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40*].

[4] Failure to Appear

If, on the day named, the principal fails to appear or fails to show good cause why a determination that the bond or undertaking is insufficient should not be made, the officer may determine that the bond is insufficient and order a sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond to be given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)* (determination of excessiveness of bond to be made in same manner and pursuant to same procedure as determination of insufficiency)].

[5] State Statutes

Affidavit of credible witness showing that bond or undertaking given in other than action or proceeding has become insufficient. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020(a)*

Affidavit of principal showing that bond or undertaking is excessive. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(b)*

Declaration in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[6] Cross References

For general forms of orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For a related form, *see § 538.196*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.198

§ 538.198 Order for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Reducing the Amount of the Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

[1] FORM Order for Sufficient New, Additional, or Supplemental Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Insufficiency of Bond or Undertaking [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c)] or Reducing the Amount of the Bond or Undertaking on Determination of Excessiveness [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER _____ [FOR SUFFICIENT NEW, ADDITIONAL, OR SUPPLEMENTAL *or* REDUCING AMOUNT OF] _____ [BOND *or* UNDERTAKING] [_____ (*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(c) or Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)*)]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] for an order _____ [requiring a sufficient new, additional, or supplemental *or* reducing the amount of the] _____ [bond *or* undertaking] came on regularly for hearing before this court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] and defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

The court, having considered the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)], and other documents in support of and in opposition to the motion, having heard the arguments of counsel, and being fully advised in the matter finds that the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] filed by _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] is _____ [insufficient *or* excessive].

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, granted.

[*EITHER*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a _____ [new *or* additional *or* supplemental] _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the amount of $_____, and with sufficient sureties, be executed and filed on or before _____ [*date within a reasonable time not less than five days after date of order*], and that all rights obtained by giving the original _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the above-entitled action shall immediately cease unless the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] herein required is executed and filed on or before _____ [*date mentioned above*].

[*OR*]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] on file in the above-entitled action be reduced to the amount of $_____, and that in order to comply with this order, _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name of principal*], may give a new bond for the reduced amount, and that the sureties may be the same sureties as on the original bond.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to grant a motion to require a new, additional, or supplemental bond or undertaking or to reduce the amount of the bond or undertaking when the bond or undertaking has become insufficient or has been determined to be excessive. When the bond is given or ordered in an action or proceeding, the court determination is made on noticed motion of a party [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(b), 996.030(b)*; *see § 538.195*]. The determination that a bond or undertaking has become insufficient or is excessive may also be made by the court on its own motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(b)*].

This form may be modified for use when the bond has been given or ordered in other than an action or proceeding and the officer to whom the bond is given or with whom a copy of the bond is filed or who is required to determine the sufficiency of the sureties or approve the bond makes a determination of insufficiency or excessiveness on an order to show cause [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.160, 996.020(a), 996.030(a), (b)*; *see § 538.197*].

[3] Failure to Give Sufficient Bond

If a sufficient bond is not given within the time required by the court order, all rights obtained by giving the original bond immediately cease. The court will issue an order to that effect on ex parte motion by the beneficiary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010(d)*; for general forms of ex parte application, *see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*]. If the bond or undertaking was given in other than an action or proceeding and an officer issued an order for a sufficient new, additional, or supplemental bond and a sufficient bond is not given within 10 days after the order, the officer will make an order vacating the rights obtained by giving the original bond, including declaring vacant any office and suspending or revoking any license or certificate for which the bond was given [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.020*].

[4] Reduced Bond

If the bond is determined to be excessive, the principal may give a new bond for the reduced amount. The sureties may be the same as on the original bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(c)*].

[5] State Statutes

Insufficient and excessive bonds. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010-996.030*

New, additional, and supplemental bonds. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.210-996.250*

Order determining insufficiency and for sufficient new, additional or supplemental bond. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.010(c), 996.020(b)*

Order determining excessiveness and reducing amount. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030(a)*

Order defined. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1064*

[6] Cross References

For general forms of orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For related forms, *see §§ 538.195 -538.197*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.199

§ 538.199 Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)]

[1] FORM Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	APPLICATION FOR ORDER RELEASING
_____ [*name*],	)	SURETY [AND SUPPORTING DECLARATION
Plaintiff,	)	OF _____
vs.	)	(*name*)]
_____ [*name*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a)*]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

_____ [*Name of surety to be released*], surety on the bond of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*], hereby applies for an order, to be made after hearing, to be released from liability on the bond filed in this _____ [action *or* proceeding]. This application is made on the grounds that _____ [*specify reason for seeking release*] and that _____ [release would not reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond *or* no injury would result to the beneficiary from substituttion of a

sufficient surety].

[DECLARATION]

[1. _____ (*In this and successively numbered paragraphs, set out the facts supporting the application*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:
A notice of hearing on the application must be served with it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110*; *see § 538.200*]. A supporting memorandum should also be served and filed with this notice of application [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005, 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

[2] Use of Form

This application is for use by a surety on a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding who applies for release from liability on the bond or undertaking. The surety may apply for release at any time and must serve on the principal and the beneficiary a copy of the application and a notice of hearing on the application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a), (c)*; for form of notice of hearing on the application, *see § 538.200*]. Release of the surety does not relieve the surety of liability arising prior thereto [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150(a)*]. As a matter of practice, the supporting affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) may be included in the application. If not included, for a general form of declaration in support of a motion or application, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to applications for orders generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[4] Statutes

Service as to be in same manner as in civil actions generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030*

Release of surety from bond or undertaking given in action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110*

Hearing on application. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*

Order of release on substitution of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*

Liability of released surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.150*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.200

§ 538.200 Notice of Hearing on Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a), (c)]

[1] FORM Notice of Hearing on Application by Surety for Order Releasing Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a), (c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER RELEASING SURETY
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(a), (c)*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]
_____		

To _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name*], and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record, and to _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant], _____ [*name*], and to _____ [*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*moving party*] has filed an application for an order to be

released as surety, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, and that a hearing on the application will be held in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice of hearing is for use by a surety on a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding who applies for re lease from liability on the bond or undertaking to give notice to the principal and the beneficiary that an application for release from liability on the bond or undertaking has been filed and will be heard on the date and at the time specified. The notice of hearing on the application is served on the principal and beneficiary together with a copy of the application not less than 15 days before the date set for hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40, 995.030* (manner of service); for a discussion of potential confict between the notice period required for this application and the notice period on a principal's application for an order substituting a new surety, *see § 538.202[3]*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 538.199, 538.201 -538.204*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.201

§ 538.201 Application by Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)]

[1] FORM Application by Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	APPLICATION FOR ORDER SUBSTITUTING SURETIES [AND SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ (*name*)] [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)*]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

_____ [*Identify party who is principal, e.g.*, Plaintiff] _____ [*name*], hereby applies for an order, to be made after hearing, substituting _____ [*name of proposed surety*] for _____ [*name of original surety*], surety on the bond of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*]. This application is made on the ground that the surety has sought release from the bond or undertaking.

[DECLARATION]

[1. _____ (*In this and successively numbered paragraphs, set out the facts supporting the application*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:
A notice of hearing on the application must be served with it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110*; *see § 538.202*]. A supporting memorandum should also be served and filed with this notice of application [*see* Code *Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1005, 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*].

[2] Use of Form

This application is for use by a principal to apply for the substitution of sureties. The principal may apply for substitution if a surety has applied for release from the bond or undertaking and must serve on the surety and the beneficiary a copy of the application and a notice of hearing on the application [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b), (c)*; for form of notice of hearing on the application, *see § 538.202*].

[3] Statutes

Application by principal for substitution of sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)*

Hearing on application. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*

Liability of substitute surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(a)*

Failure to give substitute surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.140*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 538.199, 538.200, 538.202 -538.204*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.202

§ 538.202 Notice of Hearing on Application By Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b), (c)]

[1] FORM Notice of Hearing on Application By Principal for Order Substituting Sureties [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b), (c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER SUBSTITUTING SURETIES
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b), (c)*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name*], and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record, and to _____ [*name of surety*] and to _____ [*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that _____ [*moving party*] has filed an application for an order to substitute another surety for the original surety on the bond or undertaking filed in this action or proceeding, a copy of

which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, and that a hearing on the application will be held in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], on _____ [*date*], at _____ _____ [*time*],
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of hearing on the application for substitution of sureties is for use by a principal to give notice to the surety and the beneficiary that an application for substitution of sureties has been filed and that it will be heard on the date and time specified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*].

[3] Notice Period

The notice of hearing on the application is served on the surety and beneficiary together with a copy of the application not less than 15 days before the date set for hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10-417.40, 995.030* (manner of service)].

The requirement that both the surety applying for release and the principal applying for an order substituting a new surety must give at least 15 days notice of hearing makes for an apparent potential conflict [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110*]. Since the principal's application is made in response to the surety's application for release [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110(b)*], it would be possible that the principal's application for substitution could not be timely served in order to be decided at the time of the hearing on the surety's application for release. This is an anomolous situation, in that *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*, relating to the order the court may make "upon the hearing of the application," requires the court to consider factors relating to both release and substitution, and thus seems to contemplate a single hearing. It is not clear how this conflict would be resolved when it arises. However, since the two applications may be complementary, counsel for the surety may desire to give enough notice of the hearing on the application for release so that the principal's application for substitution can be heard at the same time.

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.201*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.203

§ 538.203 Order for Substitution of Sufficient Surety Within Reasonable Time [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]

[1] FORM Order for Substitution of Sufficient Surety Within Reasonable Time [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER FOR SUBSTITUTION OF SUFFICIENT
Plaintiff,	)	SURETY
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The application of _____ [*name of applicant*] for an order _____ [releasing him/her/it from liability on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] filed in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name of surety*] appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; _____ [*name(s) of principal and/or beneficiary or beneficiaries*] appeared by counsel _____ [*name(s)*].

On proof made to the court, the court has determined that release of the surety would reduce the _____

[amount of the bond *or* number of sureties] below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond, and that substitution of a sufficient surety is necessary, therefore

IT IS ORDERED that _____ [*name of principal*], the principal on the bond, shall provide a sufficient surety to be substituted for _____ [*name of surety requesting release*] within _____ [*specify reasonable time period*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use to order the substitution of a sufficient surety within such time as appears reasonable when a surety applies for release from liability on a bond, and the principal has not applied for substitution of another surety for the original surety [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.110*].

If the court determines that release of the surety would not reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond, substitution is not necessary and the court must order release of the surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*]. If the court determines that no injury would result from substitution of the surety, the court must order the substitution of a sufficient surety within a reasonable time [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*]. The surety requesting release will not be released until a sufficient surety is substituted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*]; *see also § 538.204* for an order releasing the surety].

[3] State Statutes

Order for substitution of sufficient surety within reasonable time. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*

Release of surety on substitution of sufficient surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 538.199 -538.202, 538.204*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.204

§ 538.204 Order Granting Application for Release and/or Substitution of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]

[1] FORM Order Granting Application for Release and/or Substitution of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION(S) FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	_____ [RELEASE *and/or*
Plaintiff,	)	SUBSTITUTION OF SURETY]
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The application(s) of _____ [*name(s) of applicant(s)*] for an order _____ [releasing _____ (*name of surety requesting release*) from liability *and/or* substituting _____ (*name of surety to assume liability*) for _____ (*name of surety requesting release*) as surety] on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____ [*name*] filed in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name(s) of surety and/or principal*] appeared by counsel _____ [*name(s)*]; _____ [*name(s) of beneficiary or*

beneficiaries] appeared by counsel _____ [*name(s*)].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the application(s) ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the application(s) be, and it/they hereby is/are, granted and _____ [_____ (*name of surety requesting release*) is released from liability *and/or* (*name of surety assuming liability*) is substituted for _____ (*name of surety requesting release*)] on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*] filed in this _____ [action *or* proceeding].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use to order the release of a surety and/or the substitution of a sufficient surety [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*]. It appears that an application for release of a surety and an application for substitution of sureties may be heard either separately or at the same time [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.110, 996.120*].

The court will only order release of the surety if no injury to the beneficiary would result from release of the surety. The court will order release of the surety without requiring substitution of a sufficient surety if release would not reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond. If the court determines that (1) the release of the surety would reduce the amount of the bond or the number of sureties below the minimum required by the statute providing for the bond and (2) no injury would result from substitution of the surety, and the principal has applied for substitution of sureties, the court will order both the release of the surety and the substitution of sureties. If, however, the principal has not applied for substitution of sureties under these circumstances, the court will first order substitution of sureties within such time as appears reasonable [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*; *see § 538.203*]. On substitution of a sufficient surety, the court will order the release and substitution of the surety [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.130(b)*].

[3] State Statutes

Order of release and/or substitution of surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.120*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 538.199 -538.203*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.205

§ 538.205 Notice of Cancellation of or Withdrawal of Surety From Bond or Undertaking Given Other Than in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.310, 996.320]

[1] FORM Notice of Cancellation of or Withdrawal of Surety From Bond or Undertaking Given Other Than in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.310, 996.320]

TO: _____ [*specify board, officer, or other person authorized to approve or receive bond*]:

The undersigned is [a] surety on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [licensee *or* permittee], given on _____ [*date*], pursuant to Section _____ of the _____ Code.

Please take notice that the undersigned _____ [cancels *or* withdraws from] the bond and thus hereby terminates all liability under said bond.
Dated: _____

_____ [*signature of surety*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a surety to cancel or withdraw from a bond or undertaking given other than in an action or proceeding. The notice of cancellation or withdrawal is given to the officer to whom the bond was given in the same manner that the bond was given, notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.030* (manner of service of papers under Bond and Undertaking Law). The surety shall at the same time mail or deliver a copy of the notice of cancellation or withdrawal to the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.320*].

Cancellation or withdrawal of a surety is effective at the earliest of the following times: (1) 30 days after notice of cancellation or withdrawal is given, (2) if a new surety is substituted for the original surety, the date the substitution becomes effective, or (3) if a new bond is given, the date the new bond becomes effective [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.330*].

[3] Statutes

Notice of cancellation or withdrawal of surety from bond or undertaking given in other than action or proceeding. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.320*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
1. Statutory Bonds And Undertakings

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 538.206-538.219

[Reserved]

§§ 538.206[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.220

§ 538.220 Notice of Motion for Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
vs.	)	_____ [COLLECTION OF
_____ [*name*],	)	DEPOSIT *or* SALE OF DEPOSIT *or* APPLICA-
Defendant.	)	TION OF DEPOSIT TO LIABLITY]
	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon

thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order to _____ [collect *or* sell *or* apply to _____ (*specify party who is principal, e.g.*, defendant's) liability] the _____ [*specify items deposited in lieu of bond or undertaking, e.g.*, bearer bonds] that _____ [*specify party who is principal, e.g.*, defendant] deposited in lieu of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] that he/she was required to file pursuant to _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*]. The motion will be made on the ground that 30 days have expired from _____ [*date*], the date the _____ [judgment of liability became final *or* remittitur from the appellate court was filed in this court] and _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, defendant] has not paid the judgment.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:

A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with the foregoing notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; see *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by the beneficiary of a deposit made in lieu of a bond or undertaking to apply for an order directing the collection, sale, or other application of the deposit to the liability when the principal has not paid the amount of liability on the deposit within 30 days after the date on which a judgment of liability becomes final or if the deposit was given to stay enforcement of a judgment on appeal, within 30 days after the filing of the remittitur from the appellate court in the court from which the appeal was taken [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.750, 995.760(a)*].

Notice must be given to the parties at least five days before an order can issue. Application for the order is made to the court that entered the judgment of liability against the principal [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(a)*]. For a general form of declaration in support of a motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[3] Sale of Bearer Bonds or Bearer Notes

Bear bonds or notes without a prevailing market price are required to be sold at public auction, with notice of the sale being served on the principal. Bearer bonds or notes having a prevailing market price may be sold at private sale at a price not lower than the prevailing market price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(b)*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to notices of motions generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[5] Statutes

Noticed motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Motion for order directing colection, sale, or other application of deposit to liability. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.221

§ 538.221 Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

[1] FORM Order Directing Collection, Sale, or Other Application of Deposit to Principal's Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	ORDER DIRECTING _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[COLLECTION OF
Plaintiff,	)	DEPOSIT *or* SALE OF DEPOSIT *or* APPLICA-
vs.	)	TION OF DEPOSIT TO LIABILITY]
_____ [*name*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760*]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] for an order to _____ [collect *or* sell *or* apply to _____ (*specify party who is principal, e.g.*, defendant's) liability] the _____ [*specify items deposited in lieu of bond or undertaking, e.g.*, bearer bonds] that _____ [*specify party who is principal, e.g.*, defendant] deposited in lieu of the

_____ [bond *or* undertaking] that he/she was required to file pursuant to _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*], came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that the _____ [*specify items deposited in lieu of bond or undertaking, e.g.,* bearer bonds] be _____ [collected *or* sold *or specify other method of application to liability*] and the proceeds be distributed as provided in *Section 995.760(c) of the Code of Civil Procedure.*
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use to order the collection, sale, or other application a deposit made in lieu of a bond or undertaking to the liability on the bond. The order is made by the court that entered the judgment of liability [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760(a)*].

For discussion of the sale of bearer bonds or notes and the distribution of the deposit, see *§ 538.81[2]*.

For discussion of payment by the principal of liability on a deposit, see *§ 538.54[7]*.

[3] Statutes

Order directing sale of bearer bonds or notes deposited in lieu of bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.760*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.220*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.222

§ 538.222 Notice of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ENFOR-
_____ [*name*],	)	CING LIABILITY ON _____
Plaintiff,	)	[BOND *or* UNDERTAKING]
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*name(s)*], _____ [surety *or* sureties] on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff], and to _____ [*name*] his/her/their attorney(s) of record, and to _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] and to _____ [*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in _____ [(Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] will move for an order for judgment against _____ [*name(s)*], as _____ [surety *or* sureties], and _____ [*name of principal*] in the sum of $_____, based on your liability on the bond of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] _____ [*name*], that was filed in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] as provided by _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*]. The motion will be made on the ground that judgment has been entered in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding], and that _____ [the judgment is final and the time for appeal expired *or* appeal of the judgment was finally determined on _____ (*date*)].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*], and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the papers and records on file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

CAUTION:
A supporting memorandum and supporting affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) are required to be served and filed with the foregoing notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.440(c), 1005, 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For a form of supporting declararion, *see § 538.223*.

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use by a beneficiary to enforce the liability on a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*]. The notice is required to state the amount of the claim and to be supported by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) setting forth the facts on which the claim is based [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*; for a general form of declaration in support of a motion, *see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

If the original bond or undertaking was found to have become insufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010* or to be excessive under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030* and a new bond was given or ordered, the enforcement may be had on the original bond for all acts, omissions, or causes that arose up until the time the new bond was issued. Enforcement may be had on the new bond for all acts, omissions, or causes that arose after the new bond was filed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.240*]. If the original bond was found to have become insufficient under *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010* and an additional or supplemental bond was given, the beneficiary may seek enforcement of either or both the original bond and the additional or supplemental bond [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250*].

[3] Time for Making Motion

The motion cannot be made until after entry of the final judgment in the action or proceeding in which the bond is given and the time for appeal has expired, or, if an appeal is taken, until the appeal is finally determined. The motion shall not be made more than one year after the later of the preceding dates [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)*]. No provision in a bond is valid that attempts by contract to shorten the period prescribed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)* unless the principal, beneficiary, and surety accept a provision for a shorter period in a bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.450*].

[4] Service

The notice of motion must be served on the principal and sureties at least 30 days before the time set for hearing. The notice and accompanying affidavits or declarations shall be served in accordance with any procedure authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*; *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. Notice of motion may not be served more than one year after the later of entry of the final judgment in the action or proceeding in which the bond is given and the time for appeal has expired, or, if an appeal is taken, after the appeal is finally determined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(b)*].

[5] Entry of Judgment

Judgment will be entered against the principal and sureties in accordance with the motion unless the principal or sureties serve and file opposing affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) sufficient to present a triable issue of fact, in which case the court will specify issues to be tried by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(d)*].

[6] Cross References

For forms of notice of motion and judgment enforcing liability on a bond or undertaking given on a preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms of noticed motion generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

[7] Statutes

Subsequent insufficiency of bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.010*

Excessive bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.030*

Effect of new bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.240*

Effect of additional or supplemental bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.250*

Beneficiary as entitled to enforce liability on bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410*

Jurisdiction over surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420*

Motion to enforce liability on bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*

Judgment of liability. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460*

[8] Decisions

Motion to enforce liability on deposit posted in lieu of bond was brought prematurely because action in which undertaking was granted was still pending for trial. *Satinover v. Dean (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1298, 1301, 249 Cal. Rptr. 277*

Common law bonds and statutory bonds in action or proceeding as enforceable by motion. *Mark Briggs & Associates Inc. v. Kinestar, Inc. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 483, 488, 192 Cal. Rptr. 21*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.223

§ 538.223 Declaration in Support of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM Declaration in Support of Motion for Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
_____ [*name*],	)	IN
Plaintiff,	)	SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR JUDGMENT EN-
vs.	)	FORCING LIABILITY ON _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[BOND *or* UNDERTAKING]
Defendant.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, the defendant] and beneficiary on a _____

[bond *or* undertaking] in the amount of $_____ given by plaintiff as principal in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] pursuant to _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*].

2. _____ [*Describe condition of bond or undertaking or damages against which bond or undertaking was to protect beneficiary*].

3. _____ [*Set forth facts showing breach of condition of bond or undertaking or how beneficiary incurred damages within coverage of bond or undertaking*].

4. Judgment in the above-entitled _____ [action *or* proceeding] has been entered in favor of _____ (*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant), _____(*name*).

[*EITHER, if no appeal was taken*]

5. The judgment is final and the time for appeal expired on _____ [*date*].

[*OR, if an appeal was taken*]

5. The appeal of the judgment has been finally determined in favor of _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant, _____ (*name*)], on _____ [*date*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of declarant*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration is for use by the beneficiary to support a motion a judgment enforcing liability of plaintiff and the surety on the bond or undertaking filed in the action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*]. The declaration is served with the notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*].

[3] State Statutes

Affidavit supporting notice of motion to enforce bond or undertaking as required. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(c)*

Declaration in lieu of affidavit. Code Civ. Proc. § 1015.5

[4] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.222*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.224

§ 538.224 Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

[1] FORM Judgment Enforcing Liability on Bond or Undertaking Given in Action or Proceeding [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	JUDGMENT ENFORCING LIABILITY ON
_____ [*name*],	)	_____
Defendant.	)	[BOND *or* UNDERTAKING]
	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*]
	)	

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] for a judgment enforcing the liability of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff] and of _____ [*name(s)*], _____ [surety *or* sureties] on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] of _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff], which was filed on _____ [*date*], in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] as provided by _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*] came on regularly for hearing by this court this date. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; _____ [*name(s)*], _____ [surety *or* sureties], appeared by counsel _____ [*name(s)*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfection of the court, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ADJUDGED, ORDERED, AND DECREED that _____ [*identify party who is beneficiary, e.g.*, defendant], _____ [*name*], recover $_____ on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] given by _____ [*name of principal*] as principal in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] pursuant to _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*], [together with _____ ($_____ in interest from _____ [*date*], to the date of this judgment *and/or* $_____ for attorney's fees *and/or* $_____ for costs)], from _____ [*identify party who is principal, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name*], and from his/her _____ [surety *or* sureties], _____ [*name(s) of surety or sureties*], who are jointly and severally liable therefor.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the [Superior] Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of judgment is for use to order the enforcement of the principal's and surety's liability on a bond or undertaking given in an action or proceeding after a final judgment has been entered in that action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440*].

Judgment will be entered against the principal and sureties in accordance with the motion unless the principal or sureties serve and file opposing affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) sufficient to present a triable issue of fact, in which case the court will specify issues to be tried by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.440(d)*].

[3] State Statutes

Judgment in favor of beneficiary as to be for joint and several liability of principal and sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(a)*

Judgment as to be in amount determined by court *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460(b)*

Recovery of interest, attorney's fees, and costs against surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480(a)(2)*

Enforcement of judgment as in same manner and extent as other money judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.495*

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to judgment and to notice of entry of judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to enforcement of money judgments, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

For a related form, *see § 538.222*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.225

§ 538.225 Complaint for Enforcement of Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Official Bond

[1] FORM Complaint for Enforcement of Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Official Bond

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT OF LIABIL-
_____ [*name(s)*], [and DOES I	)	ITY ON OFFICIAL BOND
through _____,]	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*]
Defendants.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name of surety*] is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____County, California [, in the _____ (name) _____ (Municipal Court *or* Judicial) District.

[*OR*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name of surety*] is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ [*specify state*], authorized to engage and engaged in the surety insurance business in the State of California with its principal place of business in _____County, California.

2. During all times mentioned herein defendant _____ [*name of principal*] was, and still is, _____ [a *or* the] duly _____ [elected *or* appointed], qualified, and acting _____ [*describe official title or capacity, e.g.*, notary public] of _____ [*specify public entity*], and is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____County, California [, residing at _____ (*street address and if any, city*)].

[3. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is liable on the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) herein described.)]

[4. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times therein mentioned defendant _____ (*name*) was the agent (and employee) of defendant _____ (*name*), and (in doing the things hereinafter alleged,) was acting within the course and scope of such agency (and employment) and with permission and consent of his/her codefendant.]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name of principal*], and defendant(s) _____ [*name of surety or sureties*], as surety, duly executed a _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the sum of $_____, conditioned on the faithful discharge of the official duties of _____ [*name of defendant principal*]. _____ [A copy of the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and is by reference made a part hereof *or* The _____ (bond *or* undertaking) provides "_____" (*set forth terms of bond in full*)].

6. At all times herein mentioned, the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] was in full force and effect.

7. _____ [*Name of principal*] breached the conditions of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] by _____ [*state facts showing principal's failure to faithfully discharge his/her official duties in breach of the bond or undertaking, e.g.*, forging the name of _____ (*fictitious name*) to the jurat on a certificate of business fictitious firm name, using his/her official seal. The certificate stated that defendant _____ (*name of principal*) was the owner of _____ (*name of business*), when in fact he/she was an employee of _____ (*name of business*), which was owned by _____ (*name of real buisness owner*). By use of the certificate of business fictitious firm name, bearing the forgery, _____ (*name of principal*) was able to open a bank account with the plaintiff in the name of _____ (*name of business*) and to process checks aggregating to $_____ payable to _____ (*name of business*) through the bank account.]

8. As a proximate result of defendant's breach _____ [*specify damages suffered, e.g.*, plaintiff guaranteed the validity of the endorsements on the checks, and became liable to _____ (*name of business owner*) in the amount of $_____ (*specify aggregate amount of checks*)].

[9. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff presented to _____ (*name of public entity*) by _____ (delivering *or* mailing) a claim to the _____ (clerk *or* secretary *or* auditor) for the damages suffered by him/her by reason of the above-described occurence, all in compliance with the requirements of *Section 905 of the Government Code*. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a

part hereof.]

[10. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ [*name of public entity*] _____ [rejected the claim in its entirety *or* allowed the claim in the amount of $_____ and rejected it as to the remainder *or* failed to act on the claim within 45 days after its presentation, so that the claim was thus deemed rejected under the terms of *Section 912.4 of the Government Code*.]

11. Defendants _____ [*name of sureties*], before the commencment of this action, on _____ [*date*], were notified of plaintiff's claim for damages suffered as above stated, and were then and there requested by the plaintiff to pay said damages, or so much of said damages as were covered by their _____ [bond *or* undertaking].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against the defendant(s) and each of them, as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____.

2. For costs; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by persons who are injured or aggrieved by the wrongful act or default of an officer whose performance is the subject of a bond or undertaking to enforce liability on the bond or undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*].

Both the principal and the sureties must be joined as parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*].

The fact situation used for illustration in this form is adapted from *Bank of America v. Dowdy (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 690, 9 Cal. Rptr. 779* .

[3] Jurisdiction

If the bond was given in an action or proceeding, the action must be commenced in the court in which the action or proceeding was pending. If the bond was given other than in an action or proceeding, the action shall be commenced in any court of competent jurisdiction, and the amount of damage claimed in the action, not the amount of the bond, determines the jurisdictional classification of the case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)* (case in which demand is $25,000 or less is limited civil case)].

[4] Standing to Sue

Liability on the bond may be enforced by the beneficiary against both the principal and sureties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410(a)*]. If the beneficiary is a class of persons, any person in the class may enforce the liability on the bond in the

person's own name, without assignment of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410(b)*].

Liability on a bond to the State of California may be enforced by or for the benefit of, and in the name of, any and all persons for whose benefit the bond is given who are damaged by breach of the condition of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(a)*]. A person described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(a)* may in addition to any other remedy the person has, enforce the liability on the bond in the person's own name, without assignment of the bond [*Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850(b)*].

[5] Allegations

This complaint alleges the followoing:

- The residence and capacity of defendant surety as either a personal or corporate surety (Paragraphs 1);

- The defendant principal's residence and status as a public official (Paragraph 2);

- The execution and delivery of the bond to secure the defendant principal's performance, incorporating the attached bond by reference (Paragraph 5) [*see Mendocino County v. Morris (1867) 32 Cal. 145, 148* ; *Ghiradelli v. Bourland (1867) 32 Cal. 585, 589* ; *San Francisco S. Co. v. Aetna I. Co. (1907) 7 Cal. App. 98, 98-99, 93 P. 888]* ;

- The term of the bond (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.420, 996.360*];

- Breach of the conditions of the bond (Paragraph 7) [*see Mendocino C. v. Morris (1867) 32 Cal. 145, 148]* ;

- Damages resulting from the breach (Paragraph 8) [*Vilhac v. S. & I.R.R. Co. (1878) 53 Cal. 208, 212]* ; and

- The surety's refusal to pay (Paragraph 11). Optional paragraphs are included to allege fictitious defendants (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*]; and agency (Paragraph 4) [*see generally* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

Optional allegations for use if the action is subject to a claims requirement are also included (Paragraphs 9, 10) [for a discussion of claims against public entities and officers, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*].

[6] Statute of Limitations

The action must be commenced within four years [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 337*].

[7] Tolling of Statute of Limitations

The statute of limitations may be tolled during pendency of an interrelated administrative proceeding in cases in which the administrative proceeding may be dispositive of essential elements of the cause of action. The cause of action does not accrue for statute of limitations purposes until the final determination of the interrelated administrative proceeding [*Olson v. County of Sacramento (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 958, 965, 113 Cal. Rptr. 664]* .

[8] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification also will preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[9] State Statutes

Statute of limitations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 337*

Enforcement of liability on bond given to State of *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 995.850*

Standing to sue. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.850, 996.410*

Joinder of parties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*

Jurisdiction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.420*

Liability of principal and sureties. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410-996.495*

Action on bond or undertaking. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*

[10] Decisions

One who is injured or aggrieved by the wrongful act or default of a public officer in his or her official capacity may bring suit on the officer's official bond. *Fernelius v. Pierce (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 226, 242-245, 138 P.2d 12* ; *Mendocino C. v. Morris (1867) 32 Cal. 145, 148* .

Complaint need not be solely on bond. *Kane v. Mendenhall (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 749, 752-753, 56 P.2d 498*

Sufficiency of complaint on official bond is determined by reference to provisions of statute under which suit is brought and not by resort to principles of common law. *People v. Love (1864) 25 Cal. 520, 529*

Notary's signing of fictitious name to jurat is official misconduct covered by bond given under *Gov. Code §§ 8212-8214*. *Bank of America v. Dowdy (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 690, 693-694, 9 Cal. Rptr. 779*

[11] Cross References

For form relating to action on public payment bond, see Ch. 481, *Public Works*

For a related form, *see § 538.222*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.226

§ 538.226 Complaint by Employer to Enforce Liability of Surety on Blanket or Fidelity Bond [Fin. Code § 215; 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10.3513, 10.4462, 10.14182]--Blanket Bond Covering Employee Embezzling Funds

[1] FORM Complaint by Employer to Enforce Liability of Surety on Blanket or Fidelity Bond [Fin. Code § 215; 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10.3513, 10.4462, 10.14182]--Blanket Bond Covering Employee Embezzling Funds

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	COMPLAINT FOR ENFORCEMENT OF LIABIL-
through _____,]	)	ITY ON BOND
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 538.225, Paragraphs 2.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 4.*]

[3. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 5.*]

4. On _____ [*date*], defendant made, executed, and delivered to Plaintiff, as beneficiary, defendant's _____ [bond *or* undertaking] in the penal sum of $_____, whereby defendant

agreed to pay any direct financial loss that plaintiff might sustain by reason of _____ [*specify acts insured against, e.g.*, any act of larceny, embezzlement, theft, or any other fraudulent or dishonest act, wrongful abstraction or willful missapplication] committed during the term of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] by any of plaintiff's employees listed on a schedule entitled "Covered Employees" attached to the _____ [bond *or* undertaking]. A copy of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hereof.

5. At all times herein mentioned, the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] was in full force and effect.

6. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of employee*] was employed by plaintiff as _____ [*title of position*] at _____ [*name and address of company*], _____ County, California.

7. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of employee*] was one of plaintiff's employees listed on the schedule entitled "Covered Employees" attached to the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] and covered thereby.

8. During the term of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], _____ [*specify time period, e.g.*, from on or about _____ (*date*), to on or about _____ (*date*)], _____ [*name of employee*] wrongfully, fraudulently, and dishonestly took, withheld, and willfully misapplied to his/her own use certain sums of money belonging to plaintiff in the approximate amount of $_____.

9. By reason of the wrongful, fraudulent, and dishonest acts of _____ [*name of employee*] and the willful misapplication of those sums by him/her, plaintiff has sustained a direct financial loss in the sum of $_____.

[*If bond requires that defendant be notified within a specified period after discovery of the loss, add*]

10. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff acquired knowledge of the loss and promptly thereafter, on _____ [*date*], notified defendant thereof in writing. A copy of the notice is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hereof.]

[*CONTINUE*]

11. Plaintiff has fully performed all provisions of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] to be performed on its part and on _____ [*date*], demanded in writing that defendant reimburse him/her/it for the full amount of the loss. A copy of said demand is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hereof. Notwithstanding said demand, defendant failed and refused, and still fails and refuses, to do so, and no part of the claimed sum has been paid.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against the defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____ [, together with interest thereon at the legal rate (from and after _____ (*date*))].

2. For costs; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper. f

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by an employer that is a bank against a surety insurer on a blanket bond for enforcement of the surety's liability on the bond when a covered employee has embezzled funds from the employer and the loss was discovered during the period of the bond [*see Fin. Code § 215*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10.3513(a), 10.4462(a), 10.14182(a)* (blanket bond requirement)]. The action is subject to the Bond and Undertaking Law, which applies to bonds given pursuant to any California statute except to the extent the statute prescribes a different rule or is inconsistent [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 995.020*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 995.180* (defining statute to include administrative regulation promulgated pursuant to statute)].

Both the principal and the sureties must be joined as parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges in pertinent part:

- The execution of a bond to ensure plaintiff against financial loss (Paragraph 4).

- The period of time during which the bond was in full force and effect (Paragraph 5).

- Employment by the plaintiff of the person causing plaintiff's financial loss (Paragraph 6).

- Coverage of the person causing plaintiff's financial loss under the bond (Paragraph 7) [*Piggly Wiggly Yuma Co. v. Indemnity Co. (1931) 116 Cal. App. 541, 544, 3 P.2d 15]* .

- The wrongful acts of the employee consitituing a breach of the conditions covered by the bond during the term of the bond (Pargraph 8).

- Loss suffered by plaintiff employer (Paragraph 9) [*Piggly Wiggly Yuma Co. v. Indemnity Co. (1931) 116 Cal. App. 541, 544, 3 P.2d 15]* .

- The plaintiff's discovery of the loss caused by the employee (Paragraph 10) [*Pacific Coast A. Bureau v. Insurance Co. (1931) 115 Cal. App. 583, 586-587, 2 P.2d 218]* .

- Plaintiff notification of the surety regarding the loss (Paragraph 11) [*USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 344-345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393]* .

[4] Decisions

Insured under blanket employee's fidelity discovery bond not bound to give notice to insurer until knowledge of some specific fraudulent or dishonest act committed by its employees is acquired. *USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 344-345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393*

When insured learns of facts constituting alleged dishonesty suspicions are converted to knowledge which cannot be ignored and constitute discovery for purposes of notifying insurer. *USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393*

Ignorance of policy provisions as not an excuse for failing to notify insurer when employer has discovered dishonest or fraudulent act of employee. *USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393*

Fidelity bond, covering losses discovered during bond period, as not covering losses resulting from employees' acts known to employer prior to effective date of bond even though employer failed to understand dishonest or fraudulent nature of acts or that acts came within policy provisions until after effective date of bond. *USLIFE Savings & Loan Assn. v. National Surety Corp. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 336, 344-345, 171 Cal. Rptr. 393*

Essential allegations in action by employer against surety on employee' indemnity bond. *Piggly Wiggly Yuma Co. v. Indemnity Co. (1931) 116 Cal. App. 541, 544, 3 P.2d 15*

Discovery of misappropriation by employer as necessary. *Pacific Coast A. Bureau v. Insurance Co. (1931) 115 Cal. App. 583, 586-587, 2 P.2d 218*

[5] Cross References

For discussion of recovery of interest in actions on contracts, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For a related form, *see § 538.225*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.227

§ 538.227 Allegations--Fidelity Bond Given by Individual Employee

[1] FORM Allegations--Fidelity Bond Given by Individual Employee

1. As a condition of employment _____ [*name of employee*] was required by plaintiff to and, at all times herein mentioned did, maintain on deposit with plaintiff payable to plaintiff a fidelity bond duly executed by _____ [*name of employee*] as principal and defendant as surety in the penal sum of $_____ conditioned on the faithful performance by the employee of the duties of _____ [*state title of position, e.g.*, cashier] and guaranteeing repayment to plaintiff of any direct financial loss incurred by reason of the wrongful, unlawful, fraudulent, or dishonest acts of the employee.

2. Plaintiff discovered the loss and the wrongful, fraudulent, and dishonest acts of the employee on or about _____ [*date*], and on _____ [*date*], sent defendant a written notice demanding that defendant reimburse it for the full amount of the loss. A copy of the notice is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hereof. Notwithstanding the notice, defendant failed and refused, and still fails and refuses to pay the same, or any part thereof, and no part of said sum has been paid.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in this form may be used in a complaint to enforce the liability of a surety on a fidelity bond when the bond is guaranteeing the performance of an individual employee. The first allegation should be substituted for Paragraph 4 in *see § 538.226*, Paragraph 7 of *see § 538.226* should be deleted, and the second allegation should be substituted for Paragraphs 9 and 10 of *see § 538.226*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 538.225* and *538.226*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.228

§ 538.228 Complaint to Enforce Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] Against Surety Based on Bond or Undertaking Guaranteeing Performance of Personal Representative [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410, 996.460]--By Heir or Devisee for Failure of Personal Representative to Pay Distributive Share of Estate [Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605, 11750]

[1] FORM Complaint to Enforce Liability [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] Against Surety Based on Bond or Undertaking Guaranteeing Performance of Personal Representative [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.410, 996.460]--By Heir or Devisee for Failure of Personal Representative to Pay Distributive Share of Estate [Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605, 11750]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	(Suretyship)
through _____,]	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity of and/or residence of defendant surety. See § 538.225, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant principal. See § 538.225, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 4.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 5.*]

[*EITHER*]

5. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of decedent*] died a resident of _____ County, California, leaving a last will and testament, a copy of which is attached, marked Exhibit "_____," and made a part of this complaint by reference, whereby _____ [*specify distribution of estate, e.g.*, all the residue of her estate was devised and bequeathed to plaintiff].

[*OR*]

5. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of decedent*] a resident of _____County, California, died intestate, leaving as his/her only surviving heirs at law _____ [*list names and relationship to deceased of all heirs, e.g.*, Jane Doe, her mother, Sally Smith, her sister], and Plaintiff, _____ [*state relationship of plaintiff to deceased, e.g.*, her brother].

[*CONTINUE*]

6. On _____ [*date*], on application duly made, the Superior Court of _____ County, California, in probate proceedings NO. _____, entitled "Estate of _____, deceased," duly made its order admitting the _____ [will *or* estate] to probate and ordering that letters _____ [testamentary *or* of administration] issue to _____ [*name*] as personal representative on his/her taking the oath required by law and giving a bond or undertaking in the amount of $_____ if executed by an authorized surety, or in twice that amount if executed by personal sureties.

7. Pursuant to that order, _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], as principal, and _____ [*name of defendant surety*], as surety, duly executed, acknowledged, and filed with the clerk of that Court on _____ [*date*] their bond in the sum of $_____, conditioned on the faithful performance by _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], and letters _____ [testamentary *or* of administration] were then and there duly issued to _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], as _____ [executor *or* administrator]. A copy of the bond is attached, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part of this complaint.

8. On issuance of the letters _____ [testamentary *or* of administration] _____ [*name*], as personal representative, commenced performing his/her duties and collecting and receiving the assets of the estate.

9. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], the Court made and entered its decree of distribution in the estate, whereby the sum of $_____ was distributed to plaintiff as his/her distributive share of the estate. A certified copy of the decree is attached, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part of this complaint.

10. Plaintiff has demanded that _____ [*name*], the personal representative, pay to him/her the sum of $_____ so distributed to him/her by the decree of distribution, but the personal representative failed and refused, and still fails and refuses, to so do, and the whole sum remains unpaid.

11. Subsequently, plaintiff demanded that _____ [*name of surety*], as surety on the performance bond

of _____ [*name*], the personal representative, pay to him/her the sum of $_____ ordered to be distributed to him/her by the decree of distribution, and which the personal representative failed and refused to pay, but _____ [*name of surety*] also failed and refused, and still fails and refuses, to so do, and the whole sum remains unpaid.

12. As a direct and proximate result of defendant's actions, plaintiff has been caused to incur attorney's fees [according to proof *or* in the sum of $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For interest at the legal rate [from and after _____ (*date*)];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred;

4. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ [according to proof *or* in the sum of $_____]; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by an heir or devisee to recover damages from a surety based on a bond or undertaking guaranteeing the performance of a personal representative who fails to pay the distributive share of the estate [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 995.020, 996.430*; *Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605* (decree of distribution), 11750]. With specified exceptions, persons to whom letters testamentary or of administration are issued must execute a bond for the benefit of interested persons guaranteeing that he or she will faithfully perform the duties of the personal representative [*Prob. Code § 8480(a), (b)*]. If two or more persons are appointed, the court may require either a separate bond from each, or a joint and several bond. If a joint bond is furnished, the liability on the bond is joint and several [*Prob. Code § 8480(a)*].

The action is to be commenced in the court in which the application for probate of the will was filed and which issued the letters testamentary or of administration [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(b)*]. Before an action can be maintained against a surety on the bond or undertaking, however, the liability of the personal representative must be finally determined by the Probate Court [*Nickals v. Stanley (1905) 146 Cal. 724, 726, 81 P. 117* ; *Estate of Dwyer (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 264, 268, 335 P.2d 718]* .

Both the principal and the sureties must be joined as parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges in pertinent part:

- The death and disposition of the estate of decedent (Paragraphs 5).

- Probate of the estate (Paragraph 6) [*see Richardson v. Royal Indemnity Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 557, 560, 134 P.2d 1]* .

- The execution and delivery of the bond and issuance of letters testamentary or letters of administration (Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 8480(a), (b)*; *Evans v. Gerken (1894) 105 Cal. 311, 312, 38 P. 725]* .

- Collection of assets of the estate (Paragraph 8).

- The court order for distribution of the estate (Paragraph 9) [*see Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605*].

- Failure to distribute plaintiff's share of the estate and plaintiff's demand that the executor or administrator distribute the share (Paragraph 10) [*see Prob. Code § 11750*].

- Plaintiff's demand that the surety make payment on the bond and incurring of attorney's fees to obtain judgment against the surety (Paragraphs 11, 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 996.480(a)(2)*].

[4] Related Points and Authorities

For points and authorities relating to guardian's or conservator's bond, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 106, *Guardianship and Conservatorship* (Matthew Bender)

[5] State Statutes

Liability on bond is enforceable by beneficiary against both principal and surety. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.410*

Action to enforce liability on bond. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*

Principal and surety are jointly and severally liable. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.460*

Action against sureties on guardian's or conservator's bond is barred unless commenced within four years after discharge or removal of guardian or conservator, or within four years from date order surcharging guardian or conservator becomes final, whichever is later. *Prob. Code § 2333(b)*

In any case, action on guardian's or conservator's bond is barred unless commenced within six years from date judgment under *Prob. Code § 2103* or later of the orders under *Prob. Code § 2333(b)* becomes final, notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 2103(b)* (nonfinality of judgment or order obtained by fraud, conspiracy, or misrepresentation). *Prob. Code § 2333(c)*

Bond of personal representative required for issuance of letters testamentary or letters of administration. *Prob. Code § 8480*

Court decree naming persons and proportions of estate each entitled to; right of those persons to sue for respective shares. *Prob. Code §§ 11603(b), 11605, 11750*

[6] Decisions

Action against surety on guardians', executors', and administrators' bonds is not maintainable until liability of principal (guardian, executor, or administrator) has been judicially determined in estate proceedings by *Probate Court. Richardson v. Royal Indemnity Co. (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 557, 560, 134 P.2d 1* ; *Nickals v. Stanley (1905) 146 Cal. 724, 726, 81 P. 117* ; *Price v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1536, 1540-1541, 239 Cal. Rptr. 158*

Allegations regarding approval of bond by judge, filing or recordation of bond, and attachment of certificate of justification is not required for complaint to stand up against general demurrer when complaint alleges executor's appointment, issuance of letters testamentary on execution of bond according to law, and fact that executor and appellants duly made and executed bond as required by order. *Evans v. Gerken (1894) 105 Cal. 311, 312, 38 P. 725*

Action against surety does not exist until liability of executor or administrator has been finally determined by Probate Court. *Estate of Dwyer (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 264, 268, 335 P.2d 718*

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to bonds by executor or administrator, see Ch. 446, *Probate: Bonds--Increase and Decrease During Administration* .

For discussion, procedure, and forms relating to bonds given by guardians and conservators, see Ch. 283, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Bonds* , and Ch. 290D, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Actions Against Guardians, Conservators, and Sureties*

For a related form, *see § 538.225*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.229

§ 538.229 Allegations--By Personal Representative to Recover Assets Charged to Former Personal Representative [Prob. Code § 9822]

[1] FORM Allegations--By Personal Representative to Recover Assets Charged to Former Personal Representative [Prob. Code § 9822]

1. On _____ [*date*], the Court made an order revoking the letters _____ [testamentary *or* of administration] issued to _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], the personal representative, and ordering him/her to render a full final report and accounting of his/her administration of the estate.

2. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], plaintiff was duly appointed and on _____ [*date*], duly qualified and entered on the duties of administrator of the estate [with the will annexed] as successor to _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*].

3. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], the personal representative, filed his/her final account and report with the Court. After hearings on the account, the Court, on _____ [*date*], made an order adjudging _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], the personal representative, to be chargeable with assets of the estate remaining in his/her hands of the value of $_____, and ordering that he/she pay and deliver these assets to plaintiff as administrator of the estate. A copy of the order is attached, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part of this complaint.

4. No part of the assets[, except assets listed on the accounting as having a value of $_____,] have been paid or delivered to plaintiff by _____ [*name of defendant personal representative*], and there is now due, owing, and unpaid from him/her to plaintiff as administrator the sum of $_____.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in this form are for use in a complaint against the surety on a personal representative's bond. The

allegations are for use by a successor administrator to plead the liability of the personal representative for the assets of the estate [*see Prob. Code § 9822*]. The allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 9 and 10 of *see § 538.228*. The complaint sufficiently alleges nonpayment of the predecessor personal representative when it alleges that neither the predecessor nor anyone on his or her behalf has accounted for the sum or any part of it [*Moody v. Pacific Surety Co. (1919) 41 Cal. App. 287, 289, 182 P. 802]* .

[3] Allegations

The allegations in the form allege that:

- The personal representative's authority to administer the estate has been revoked and that the court ordered a full accounting (Paragraph 1) [*Prob. Code §§ 8500-8505, 8873*].

- A successor administrator has been given the authority to administer the estate (Paragraph 2) [*Prob. Code § 8522*].

- The original personal representative has submitted an accounting and has been found liable for estate assets (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 10952*].

- The original personal representative has failed of to pay over these assets to the successor administrator (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code §§ 8525, 9822, 10952*].

[4] Statutes

Interested person defined. *Prob. Code § 48*

Personal representative defined. *Prob. Code § 58*

Liability of former personal representative or surety as continuing until accounting and delivery of all property to successor administrator. *Prob. Code § 8525*

Personal representative as permitted to maintain action on bond of former personal representative for benefit of interested persons. *Prob. Code § 9822*

Former personal representative as required to file account not later than 60 days after termination of authority, unless court extends time. *Prob. Code § 10952*

[5] Decisions

Previous action against estate of deceased administrator as not required for maintaining action in equity for accounting against surety on bond. *Slater v. McAvoy (1899) 123 Cal. 437, 439, 56 P. 49*

Failure to pay over to successor for three years all of funds of estate in possession at time of removal as administrator as ample evidence of flagrant breach of trust. *Moody v. Pacific Surety Co. (1919) 41 Cal. App. 287, 290, 182 P. 802*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.228*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.230

§ 538.230 Allegations--By Creditor of Estate to Recover Claim Ordered Paid [Prob. Code § 11424]

[1] FORM Allegations--By Creditor of Estate to Recover Claim Ordered Paid [Prob. Code § 11424]

1. The notice of decedent's death and of the petition to administer the estate was duly published in _____ [*name of newspaper*], a newspaper of general circulation printed and published in _____ [*specify city or county*], the _____ [city *or* county] in which _____ [decedent resided at the time of his/her death *or* decedent's property is located]. The first publication thereof was made on _____ [*date*].

2. Plaintiff _____ [did *or* did not] receive notice of the administration of decedent's estate from the personal representative.

3. During his/her lifetime, decedent _____ [*name of decedent*] became indebted to plaintiff in the sum of $_____, together with interest on that amount, at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*].

[*EITHER*]

4. On _____ [*date*], within four months after the first issuance of letters, plaintiff duly filed a claim with the court for $_____, the full amount of the aforementioned debt.

[*OR*]

4. On _____ [*date*], within 60 days after the date notice of administration was given to Plaintiff, plaintiff duly filed a claim with the court for $_____, the full amount of the aforementioned debt.

[*CONTINUE*]

5. On _____ [*date*], the personal representative served written notice on plaintiff of the rejection of his/her claim. Plaintiff, on _____ [*date*], filed an action in the _____ Court of _____ County, No. _____, entitled _____, for recovery of the claim.

6. On _____ [*date*], the Court in that action rendered its judgment[, which was on _____ (*date*) duly entered in Judgment Book _____ at page _____ of the records of _____ Court,] awarding plaintiff $_____ [, the full amount of the claim].

7. A certified copy of the judgment was duly filed in the probate proceedings. On _____ [*date*], the Superior Court of _____ County, in which probate was pending, made an order whereby it settled [first and] final account of the personal representative and ordered, among other things, that the personal representative pay to plaintiff the amount of the judgment, to wit, the sum of $_____. A copy of the order is attached, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part of this complaint.

8. Plaintiff has demanded that the personal representative pay to him/her the sum of $_____ as provided in the order settling the personal representative's [first and] final account, but the personal representative has failed and refused to do so and no part of the sum [except for the sum of $_____] has been paid to plaintiff.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in this form are for use in a complaint against the surety on a personal representative's bond. The allegations in the foregoing form may be used to plead the liability of a personal representative to a creditor of the estate for the recovery of a claim that has been ordered to be paid [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430*; *Prob. Code § 11424*]. The allegations may be substituted for Paragraphs 9-10 of *see § 538.228*.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- That notice was given to creditors and whether or not plaintiff received notice from the personal representative (Paragraphs 1, 2) [*see Prob. Code §§ 8100-8125, 9001, 9050-9054*].

- That a debt was owed to plaintiff from decedent (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code §§ 9000, 11401(a)*].

- That the creditor filed a timely claim for payment of the debt (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code §§ 9100 et seq., 9351*].

- That plaintiff's claim was rejected by the personal representative and an action was filed by plaintiff (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code §§ 9250-9256, 9353, 9354*].

- That judgment was entered against the personal representative for the debt (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code § 11420*].

- That copy of the judgment was submitted to the Probate Court, which ordered the personal representative to pay the judgment (Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 11429*].

- That the personal representative failed to pay the judgment (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code § 11424*].

[4] State Statutes

Definition of personal representative. *Prob. Code § 58*

Notice to creditors. *Prob. Code § 9050 et seq.*

Priority of payment of claims. *Prob. Code § 11420*

Individual liability of personal representatives and sureties on claims ordered paid. *Prob. Code § 11424*

Conclusiveness of order for payment of debts and distribution after settlement of final account. *Prob. Code § 11429*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.228*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.231

§ 538.231 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages to Enforce Liability of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Bond or Undertaking Given to Support Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 529]--By Person Enjoined

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages to Enforce Liability of Surety [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430] on Bond or Undertaking Given to Support Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 529]--By Person Enjoined

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*names*], [and DOES I	)	(Suretyship)
through _____,]	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity of plaintiff. See § 538.225, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant surety. See § 538.225, Paragraphs 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 4.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 5.*]

5. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of defendant principal*] filed a complaint against plaintiff in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of _____, No. _____, entitled _____, wherein _____ [*name of defendant principal*] prayed for preliminary and permanent injunctions restraining plaintiff from _____ [*specify what plaintiff was to be restrained from doing*].

6. On _____ [*date*], an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction, restraining plaintiff from _____ [*specify what plaintiff was to be restrained from doing*] and ordering plaintiff to show cause, if any, before the court on _____ [*date*], why a preliminary injunction should not be issued in the action enjoining plaintiff from committing the above acts during the pendency of the action. A copy of the order to show cause is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hereof.

7. On _____ [*date*], the Court heard the order to show cause, and after receiving evidence and arguments thereon, made an order that on filing with it by _____ [*name of defendant principal*] of a written undertaking as provided in *Section 529 of the Code of Civil Procedure* in the penal sum of $_____ a preliminary injunction as prayed for in the complaint would be granted.

8. Pursuant to the order, on _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of defendant principal*] filed in the court the written undertaking of _____ [*name of defendant surety*] guaranteeing payment to plaintiff of any damages, not exceeding the sum of $_____, that plaintiff might sustain by reason of the preliminary injunction if the court finally decided that _____ [*name of defendant principal*] was not entitled thereto. A copy of the undertaking is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hererof.

9. On the filing of the undertaking above described, the court issued a preliminary injuction restraining plaintiff during the pendency of the action from _____ [*specify what plaintiff was restrained from doing*]. A copy of the preliminary injunction is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hererof.

10. Thereafter, _____ [*date*], _____ the court rendered a judgment, duly entered on _____ [*date*], in Judgment Book _____ at page _____ of the records of the court, discharging the preliminary injunction and adjudging that _____ [*name of defendant principal*] take nothing by reason of the complaint on file in the action. A copy of the judgment is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and is by reference made a part hererof.

11. By reason of the preliminary injunction, plaintiff was _____ [*specify manner in which plaintiff was damaged, e.g.*, prevented from occupying or renting his/her dwelling house located at _____ [*address*] California, having a reasonable rental value of $_____ per month for a period of 15 days] to his/her damage in the sum of $_____.

12. By reason of the preliminary injunction, plaintiff has incurred attorney's fees and expenses in the sum of $_____ in procuring a final decision dissolving the preliminary injunction, that sum being the reasonable value of such services.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in the sum of $_____; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a beneficiary of a bond or undertaking that was given on the granting of a preliminary injunction to recover from the surety damages sustained by reason of the injunction after the court has finally decided that the applicant was not entitled to the injunction [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 529, 996.430*].

Both the principal and the sureties shall be joined as parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.430(a)*].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges in pertinent part:

- The filing of an action in which preliminary injunctive relief was granted (Paragraph 5).
- The acts that were sought to be restrained (Paragraph 6) [*Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 614-615, 22 P. 327]* .
- he making of an order requiring an undertaking with specified conditions (Paragraph 7) [*Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 614, 22 P. 327]* .
- he giving of the undertaking in compliance with the order (Paragraph 8) [*Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 614, 22 P. 327]* .
- Issuance of the preliminary injunction, including a statement of the acts it restrained (Paragraph 9).
- Adjudication of the action and discharge of the preliminary injunction (Paragraph 10).
- Damages incurred by the plaintiff as a result of the preliminary injunction (Paragraph 11) [*Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 618-619, 22 P. 327]* .

[4] Attorney's Fees

Attorney's fees and costs incurred by the plaintiff in resisting the prior action may be recovered (Paragraph 12) [*Russell v. United Pacific Ins. Co. (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 78, 88-89, 29 Cal. Rptr. 346]* . However, since the bond or undertaking pertains only to the preliminary injunction, plaintiff cannot recover attorney's fees accruing after a permanent injunction is entered, such as fees incurred on appeal from the final decree. In addition, the fees recoverable are not those expended for the defense of the suit, but only those expended solely or principally in procuring dissolution of the injunction [*see* *Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 622-624, 22 P. 327]* .

[5] Surety's Right to Indemnity

In one case, a corporate surety issued a preliminary injunction bond based on the application and promise of indemnity issued by one of several plaintiffs. The defendant prevailed and sought judgment on the bond, and the surety claimed a right to indemnity against all of the plaintiffs and demanded a judgment in which all of the plaintiffs were made jointly and severally liable with the surety. The appellate court held that the surety's indemnity rights were a matter of contract, and therefore the only plaintiff liable to the surety was the one who applied for the bond [*Top Cat Productions v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 476, 478, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553* (under *Code Civ. Proc. § 529(a)*, "applicant" does not include all named plaintiffs without regard to which of them applied for undertaking)].

[6] Statutes

Grounds for issuance of provisional injunctions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Bond required prior to grant of preliminary injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 529*

[7] Decisions

Attorney's fees and costs recoverable as damages from sureties on injunction bond. *Russell v. United Pacific Ins. Co. (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 78, 88-89, 29 Cal. Rptr. 346*

Final judgment denying permanent injunction was prima facie final decision that preliminary injunction should not have issued. *Rice v. Cook (1891) 92 Cal. 144, 147-148, 28 P. 219*

It is necessary to allege acts sought to be restrained, pendency of injunction suit with specified conditions, making of order requiring undertaking, giving of undertaking in complainace with order, conditions of liability, and damages. *Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 614-619, 22 P. 327*

Profits which would have been made during time business was closed due to injunction found to be recoverable. *Lambert v. Haskell (1889) 80 Cal. 611, 618-619, 22 P. 327*

In indemnity action, surety could sue only party that applied for undertaking, not all parties covered by undertaking. *Top Productions, Inc. v. Michael's Los Feliz (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 474, 478, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 553*

[8] Cross References

For forms for notices of motion and judgments enforcing liability on a bond or undertaking given on a preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For a related form, *see § 538.225*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.232

§ 538.232 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] and for Declaratory Relief--By Surety Against Claimants on Statutory Bond and Against Principal's Indemnitor

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] and for Declaratory Relief--By Surety Against Claimants on Statutory Bond and Against Principal's Indemnitor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
through _____,]	)	AND DAMAGES
Defendants.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name of surety*] is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.

[*OR*]

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name of surety*] is now, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____ [*specify state*], authorized to engage and engaged in the surety insurance business in the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. Defendant _____ (*name*) is (, and at all times mentioned herein was,) _____ (*state capacity, if other than individual, and residence of defendant, e.g.*, a resident of *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ with its principal place of business in) _____ County, California (, at _____ (*street address, and if any, city*))].

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 4.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 538.225, Paragraph 5.*]

5. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of principal*] applied to plaintiff for the execution of a _____ [bond *or* undertaking] to _____ [*name of person or entity receiving bond, e.g.*, the State of California] covering _____ [*set out coverage of bond*].

6. In order to assist _____ [*name of principal*] in obtaining the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], and in consideration of the execution of the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] by Plaintiff, defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*], on _____ [*date*], made, executed, and delivered to plaintiff a general indemnity agreement. [A copy of the agreement is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and made a part hereof by reference.]

7. In consideration of the execution of the application by _____ [*name of principal*], and the execution of the indemnity agreement by defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*], Plaintiff, as surety, executed and delivered to _____ [*name of public agency requiring the bond or undertaking*], on _____ [*date*], a _____ [bond *or* undertaking] as requested by the application. [A copy of the _____ (bond *or* undertaking) is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and made a part hereof by reference.]

8. An actual controversy has arisen relating to the legal rights and duties of plaintiff and defendants under the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] and the indemnity agreement.

9. Claims under the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] have been made against the plaintiff by defendants _____ [*names of claimants*] based on the alleged failure of the principal _____ [*name of principal*] to _____ [*specify acts for which principal was bonded and failed to do*].

10. The claims made by defendants are as follows: _____ [*specify names of claimants and the claim of each*]. The total amount of the claims made by defendant claimants is $_____, and the limit of the liability of plaintiff to all defendant claimants and to all other persons who may have claims under the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is $_____.

11. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of the liability of plaintiff to the defendants who have made claims against the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], and of the rights and duties of the defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*] under the indemnity agreement; and that the court determine and declare the amounts, if any, of

plaintiff's liability to each of the defendants who have made claims against it under the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], and the liability, if any, of the defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*] to the plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for a declaratory judgment declaring and adjudicating the respective rights and duties of the plaintiff and the defendants under the above-described _____ [bond *or* undertaking] and indemnity agreement.

If the court determines that the plaintiff is indebted to any of the defendants who have made claims against plaintiff under the _____ [bond *or* undertaking], that the court determine the amount to be paid to each of the defendants, and that plaintiff's liability to all defendants be limited to the sum of $_____.

If the court determines that the defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*] is liable to the plaintiff under the indemnity agreement, that plaintiff have judgment against said defendant _____ [*name of indemnitor*] for the amount of plaintiff's liability to the other defendants; together with plaintiff's costs and expenses and reasonable attorney's fees to be fixed by the court.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a surety to obtain declaratory relief adjudicating the rights and duties, under a bond or undertaking and an indemnification agreement, of the surety, the principal's creditors, and a third party who has agreed to indemnify the surety for losses related to the surety's bond or undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges in pertinent part [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*]:

- The principal's application to plaintiff for a bond or undertaking (Paragraph 5).
- Execution of the indemnity agreement (Paragraph 6).
- Execution of the bond or undertaking (Paragraph 7).
- Existence of an actual controversy over creditors' claims against plaintiff (Paragraphs 8-10).
- Desire for judicial adjudication (Paragraph 11).

[4] Cross References

For forms relating to declaratory relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

[5] Statutes

Declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.233

§ 538.233 Cross Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Surety to Compel Public Agency to Exhaust Collateral Security Deposited by Licensee [Civ. Code § 2850] in Action by Creditor and Public Agency Against Surety on Licensee's Bond

[1] FORM Cross Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Surety to Compel Public Agency to Exhaust Collateral Security Deposited by Licensee [Civ. Code § 2850] in Action by Creditor and Public Agency Against Surety on Licensee's Bond

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	
through _____],	)	NO. _____
Defendants.	)	CROSS COMPLAINT TO COMPEL AGENCY TO
_____ [*name*],	)	EXHAUST COLLATERAL SECURITY
Cross Complainant,	)	[*Civ. Code § 2850*]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Cross Defendant.	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Cross complainant _____ [*name of beneficiary*] is the beneficiary on the _____

[bond *or* undertaking] given by _____ [*name of principal*] for _____ [*state purpos*
e] required to be filed as provided by _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*].

2. At all times herein mentioned, cross defendant was, and now is, a public agency of the State of California authorized to license, regulate, and supervise persons and entities in this State engaged in the business of _____ [*specify business agency regulates, e.g.*, wrestling clubs].

3. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of principal*] was a person engaged in the business of _____ [*specify type of business, e.g.*, wrestling clubs] in California and duly licensed as such by cross defendant.

4. Rule _____, duly adopted by cross defendant, provides that each person licensed to conduct business California as a _____ [*specify type of business, e.g.*, wrestling club] must at all times maintain with cross defendant a surety bond in a penal sum equal to _____ [*specify sum, e.g.*, one-half of the annual gross receipts of the club] to guarantee the payment by such person of _____ [*specify what bond is to guarantee, e.g.*, all damages arising from faulty management].

5. At all times herein mentioned, there was, and now is, on deposit and in full force and effect with cross defendant a surety bond in the penal sum of $_____ executed by cross complainant as surety and _____ [*name of principal*], as principal, guaranteeing the payment by _____ [*name of principal*] of _____ [*specify what bond is to guarantee, e.g.*, all damages arising from faulty management].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], cross defendant notified _____ [*name of principal*] that, pursuant to Rule _____, the above-mentioned bond was no longer adequate in amount and that unless _____ [*name of principal*] deposited with cross defendant additional security in the sum of $_____, his/her license to conduct business in California as a _____ [*specify type of business, e.g.*, wrestling club] would be revoked.

7. Pursuant to such notice and demand, _____ [*name of principal*] deposited with the cross defendant on _____ [*date*], the sum of $_____ cash, lawful money of the United States, for the purpose of guaranteeing payment by him/her of _____ [*specify what deposit is to guarantee, e.g.*, all damages arising from faulty management] and received a receipt therefor. A copy of the receipt is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "_____," and made a part hereof by reference.

8. On _____ [*date*], subsequent to the deposit, cross defendant and _____ [*name of creditor*] filed a complaint herein against cross complainant as surety on the above-mentioned bond alleging that _____ [*name of principal*] had breached the condition of the bond and that there is now due, owing, and unpaid from _____ [*name of principal*] to _____ [*name of creditor*] the sum of $_____ [*state amount*] in payment of _____ [*specify obligation for which payment was guaranteed in bond, e.g*, damages arising from faulty management].

9. The sum of $_____ deposited by _____ [*name of principal*] on _____ [*date*], remains on deposit with cross defendant and has not been applied by cross defendant toward the discharge of any obligation owed by _____ [*name of principal*] for the payment of _____ [*specify what bond is to guarantee, e.g.*, all damages arising from faulty management] or otherwise.

WHEREFORE, cross complainant prays:

1. That if judgment be rendered on the complaint herein against defendant and cross complainant, cross defendant be required and directed to pay and apply said sum of $_____ deposited with it together with interest thereon in pro tanto exoneration of the liability of defendant and cross complainant on such judgment; and

2. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 538.162.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a surety to cross complain in an action by a creditor and public agency against the surety on a licensee's bond to have the money deposited by the principal applied toward the liability of the surety [*see Civ. Code §§ 2849, 2850*].

[3] Allegations

This cross complaint alleges in pertinent part [*State Ath. Com. v. Mass. Bonding etc. Co. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 823, 828-829, 117 P.2d 75]* :

- The capacity of the cross defendant as a public agency (Paragraph 2).
- That the principal is engaged in a business regulated by cross defendant (Paragraph 3).
- The cross defendant's requirement that a bond be deposited with it in order to conduct the regulated business (Paragraph 4).
- That the principal deposited with cross defendant a bond on which cross complainant was surety (Paragraph 5).
- That the principal increased the deposit on cross defendant's demand (Paragraphs 6, 7).
- The instigation of a suit against the cross complainant by the cross defendant and the creditors for a specified sum (Paragraph 8).
- The cross defendant's retention of the deposit and failure to pay the principal's creditors from the deposit (Paragraph 9).

[4] Statutes

Surety as entitled to benefit of any security given to creditor by principal. *Civ. Code § 2849*

Surety as entitled to have property of principal hypothecated to creditor applied in discharge of obligation. *Civ. Code § 2850*

[5] Decisions

Additional security deposited by principal with state regulatory agency as applied to reduce liability of surety. *State Ath. Com. v. Mass. Bonding etc. Co. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 823, 828-829, 117 P.2d 75*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 538.225*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 538 SURETYSHIP, BONDS, AND UNDERTAKINGS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Bonds And Undertakings
2. Enforcement Of Liability On Statutory Bonds

47-538 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 538.234

§ 538.234 Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] by Plaintiff for Issuance of Enforcement Lien [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520]--In Proceedings for the Benefit of the State to Enforce Liability on a Bond

[1] FORM Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] by Plaintiff for Issuance of Enforcement Lien [Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520]--In Proceedings for the Benefit of the State to Enforce Liability on a Bond

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	PLAINTIFF'S DECLARATION FOR ISSUANCE
vs.	)	OF ENFORCEMENT LIEN
_____ [*name*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520*]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. The _____ [bond *or* undertaking] for _____ [*state purpose of bond or undertaking*] as provided by _____ [*specify code section requiring bond or undertaking*] was executed by _____ [*name(s) of defendant(s*)], _____ [the defendant(s) *or* one of the defendants *or* some of the defendants] in the above-entitled action for enforcement of liability on the bond.

2. The _____ [bond *or* undertaking] was executed _____ [to *or* in favor of *or*

payable to] the (People of the) State of California.

3. _____ [*Name of defendant(s*)] has/have _____ [real property *or* an interest in real property] in _____ [County *or* Counties].

4. The liability on the _____ [bond *or* undertaking] is being enforced for the benefit of the State of California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of surety*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration is for use by a person enforcing the liability on a bond or undertaking executed to, in favor of, or payable to the State of California or the People of the State of California, including but not limited to an official bond, to obtain a lien against defendant's property on judgment of liability [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 996.510, 996.520*]. For a discussion of enforcement of judgments and obtaining an enforcement lien, see *§ 538.86[2]*.

[3] Cross References

For general forms of declarations, see Ch. 16, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

[4] Statutes

Affidavit for enforcement lien. *Code Civ. Proc. § 996.520*

Declarations in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

127 of 127 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 539 [RESERVED]

47-539 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 539

[RESERVED]

Chapter 539[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 540.syn

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.syn Synopsis to Chapter 540: TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

§ 540.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 540.02 Cross References

§§ 540.03-540.09 [Reserved]

§ 540.10 Power to Tax

§ 540.11 Limitations on the Power to Tax

[1] Discrimination

[2] Imports and Exports

[3] Interstate Commerce

[4] Foreign Commerce

§ 540.12 Anti-Injunction Provisions

§ 540.13 Information Practices Act

§ 540.14 Limitation On Damages Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983

§ 540.15 Federal Practice

§§ 540.16-540.29 [Reserved]

§ 540.30 Governing Law

§§ 540.31-540.49 [Reserved]

§ 540.50 Structure of California Property Tax System

[1] Operation

[2] Administration

[a] Local and State Functions

[b] Tax Rolls and Tax Rates

[3] In Lieu Taxes

§ 540.51 Proposition 13

[1] Limitation on Property Tax

[2] U.S. Supreme Court Approval of Disparities Created by Proposition 13

[3] Prohibition Against Imposition of New Taxes to Avoid Limits of Proposition 13

[a] Exception for Taxes Approved by Two-Thirds Vote

[b] Local Agencies Considered Special Districts Subject to Two-Thirds Vote Requirement

[c] Distinction Between General and Special Tax

§ 540.52 Exemptions

[1] Sources and Types of Exemptions

[2] Exemption Procedures

[3] Proving Entitlement to Exemption

§ 540.53 Assessment Procedures

[1] Taxpayer Reporting

[2] Change in Ownership Statements

[3] Change in Ownership Defined

[4] Assessor Powers and Audits

[5] Valuation

[a] Interest Valued

[b] Personal Property

[c] Real Property

[d] Transfers of Base Year Value

[e] Methods of Valuation

§ 540.54 Tax Certificates

[1] Sale of Right to Receive Delinquent Taxes

[2] No Effect on Taxpayer's Rights or Liability

§ 540.55 Temporary Payment Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

§§ 540.56-540.69 [Reserved]

§ 540.70 Application to Reduce Assessment

[1] Availability

[2] Time for Filing

[a] Statutory Period

[b] Supplemental Assessments

[c] Escape Assessments

[d] Stipulation to Assessment Error

[3] Application Procedure

[a] Forms and Verification

[b] Agent Authorization

[c] Request for Findings

[d] Information Required of Applicant

[e] Application as Claim for Refund

[4] Prehearing Discovery

[a] Availability of Records and Market Data

[5] Exchange of Information

[a] Availability

[b] Information That Must Be Exchanged

[c] Effect of Exchange of Information

[6] Prehearing Conference

[7] Notice of Hearing

[8] Board's Failure to Grant Timely Hearing

[a] Taxpayer's Reduced Value Becomes Assessed Value

[b] Change in Value Once Board Makes Final Determination

[9] Burden of Proof

[10] Valuation

[11] Necessity for Appearance at Hearing

[a] Exception for Stipulations

[b] Requirements for and Effect of Stipulation

[c] Waiver of Appearance

[12] Hearing Before Assessment Hearing Officer

[13] Hearing Before County Board of Equalization

[a] Record of Proceedings

[b] Evidence and Witnesses

§ 540.71 Claim for Refund

[1] Final Administrative Remedy

[2] Prerequisites to Filing Claim

[3] Grounds for Refund by Board of Supervisors

[4] Content and Filing of Claim

[5] Refunds by Tax Collector or County Auditor

[6] Statute of Limitations Applicable to Refund Claim

[7] Denial of Refund Claim

§§ 540.72-540.89 [Reserved]

§ 540.90 Suits for Refund of Taxes

[1] Available Remedy

[2] Who May Bring Suit

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[a] Prerequisite to Suit

[b] Application for Reduction of Assessment Required

[c] Application for Reduction in Assessment Not Required

[i] Valuation Issues Not Involved

[ii] Assessment a Nullity as Matter of Law

[4] Payment of Taxes

[a] Prerequisite to Suit

[b] Exception for Installment Redemption Plans

[c] Exception for First Installment Paid Under Installment Plan for Payment of Escape Assessment

[5] Claim for Refund as Limiting Issues

[6] Jurisdiction and Priority

[7] Defendants

[8] Service of Summons Within One Year

[9] Statute of Limitations Applicable to Refund Suit

[10] Scope of Judicial Review

[a] Presumption of Correctness

[b] Substantial Evidence Rule Applies to Application of Sound Valuation Method

[c] Soundness of Valuation Method as Question of Law

[d] Ambiguities in Applying Substantial Evidence Rule

[e] Board Procedural Deficiencies

[11] Judgment by Court

[a] Relief Granted

[b] Remand to Board of Equalization

[c] Interest

[d] Attorney's Fees

[i] Arbitrary and Capricious Action by Board of Equalization

[ii] Assessor's Failure to Seek Declaratory Relief in Lieu of Making Assessment

§ 540.91 Other Judicial Remedies to Contest Assessments

[1] Limited Availability

[2] Writ of Mandate

[3] Writ of Certiorari

[4] Injunction

[5] Declaratory Relief

[6] Federal Relief

[a] When Available

[b] Equitable Relief

§ 540.92 Suits to Quiet Title

[1] Default and Sale of Property for Unpaid Tax

[2] Who May or Should Bring Quiet Title Action

[3] General Quiet Title Action by Owner

[a] Actions and Time Limits

[b] Reimbursement Costs

[4] Quiet Title Action by Purchaser

[5] Suit by Purchaser to Determine Adverse Claims

[a] Requirements

[b] Special Assessments

[c] Whether Purchaser of Tax-Defaulted Property at Tax Sale Limited to Remedies Provided by Revenue and Taxation Code

[6] Action by Good-Faith Improver of Property

§§ 540.93-540.109 [Reserved]

§ 540.110 Governing Law

§§ 540.111-540.129 [Reserved]

§ 540.130 Nature and Structure of California Sales and Use Taxes

[1] Sales Tax

[2] Use Tax

[3] Application to Bankruptcy Liquidation Sale

§ 540.131 Local Sales, Use, and Licensing Taxes

[1] Local Sales and Use Taxes

[2] Licensing Taxes

§ 540.132 Administration of State Sales and Use Tax

[1] Permits and Registration

[2] Resale Certificate

[3] Direct Payment Permit

[4] Exemptions

[5] Successor's Liability

[6] Security

[7] Returns and Records

[8] Recordkeeping Requirements

[9] Audits and Investigations

[10] Managed Audit Program

[11] Rules and Regulations

[12] Recomputation of Tax by SBE

§§ 540.133-540.149 [Reserved]

§ 540.150 Deficiency Assessments

[1] Audit

[2] Formal Deficiency Notice Requirements

[a] Service

[b] Notice to Successors in Interest

[c] Notice to Sureties

[d] Notice Regarding Estates

[3] Determination if No Return Is Filed

[4] Finality of Deficiency Determination

§ 540.151 Jeopardy Determination

[1] Notice

[2] Finality of Jeopardy Determinations

[3] Application for Administrative Hearing

[a] Procedure

[b] Conduct of Administrative Hearing

[c] Notice and Conduct of SBE Hearing

[d] Administrative Hearing Determination and Notices

§ 540.152 Statute of Limitations on Notice of Deficiency Determinations

[1] If Return Is Filed

[2] If No Return Is Filed

[3] Fraud or Intent to Evade Tax

[4] Extension of Period of Limitation

[5] Effect of Notice of Deficiency of Other Tax

§§ 540.153-540.169 [Reserved]

§ 540.170 Interest

[1] When Applied

[2] Statutory Rate of Interest

[3] Interest on Jeopardy Determinations

[4] Interest on Overpayments

[5] Disaster Relief From Payment of Interest

[6] Estoppel

§ 540.171 Penalties

[1] Imposition

[2] Relief for Reasonable Cause

§ 540.172 Relief From Taxes, Interest, and Penalties for Reliance on SBE Advice

§§ 540.173-540.189 [Reserved]

§ 540.190 Petition for Redetermination

[1] In General

[2] Time to File

[3] Form and Contents

[4] Hearings

[a] Informal Appeals Conference

[b] Formal Hearings

[5] Decision of SBE

[6] When Decision Becomes Final

[7] Petition for Rehearing

§§ 540.191-540.209 [Reserved]

§ 540.210 SBE's Collection Remedies

[1] Remedies Other Than Lawsuit

[2] Suit for Tax

§§ 540.211-540.229 [Reserved]

§ 540.230 Taxpayers' Remedies for Tax Overpayment

[1] Situations Generating Overpayment

[2] Intervention of Local Entity in Refund Process

[3] Refunds and Credits

[a] In General

[b] Issued to Retailer and Returned to Purchaser

[c] Interest on Refunds and Credits

§ 540.231 Claim for Refund

[1] Time for Filing

[2] Procedure for Filing and Determination

[3] Class Claims

§ 540.232 Suit for Refund

[1] Sole Judicial Remedy

[2] Prerequisites to Suit

[3] Statute of Limitations

[4] Class Actions

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Grounds and Burden of Proof

[7] Applicability of Doctrine of Equitable Setoff

[8] Judgment for Taxpayer and Interest

[9] Litigation Costs

[a] Under Revenue and Taxation Code

[b] Under Code of Civil Procedure

§§ 540.233-540.249 [Reserved]

§ 540.250 Governing Law

§§ 540.251-540.269 [Reserved]

§ 540.270 Personal Income Tax

[1] Who Must File Returns

[2] Time for Filing Returns

[3] Amended Returns

§ 540.271 Corporation Tax

[1] Who Must File Returns

[2] Time for Filing Returns

[3] Amended Returns

§ 540.272 Overview of Audits and Assessments

[1] Audits

[2] Assessments

[a] Grounds and Procedures

[b] Presumption of Correctness of Assessment

[c] More Than One Assessment for Year

[d] Time Limitation on Assessments

§ 540.273 Estimated Assessments if No Return or False or Fraudulent Return Filed

[1] Issuance

[2] Basis of Estimate

[3] Form of Assessment

§ 540.274 Proposed Deficiency Assessment if Return Filed

[1] Issuance and Contents

[2] Definition of "Deficiency"

[3] When and to Whom Notice of Proposed Assessment Must Be Sent

[4] Finality of Assessment

§ 540.275 Jeopardy Assessments

[1] Authorized if Collection or Assessment in Jeopardy

[2] Authorized for Possession of Large Sums of Cash

[3] Limitation Concerning Jeopardy Assessment and Levy

[4] Notice of Jeopardy Assessment

[5] Collection and Stay of Collection Before Finality

[6] Petition for Review

[a] As Not Staying Collection

[b] Burdens of Proof on Review

[c] Administrative Appeal to SBE of FTB's Determination on Review

[i] Time for Filing

[ii] Effect of Appeal

[iii] Procedures for Appeal

[d] Judicial Review of FTB's Decision on Administrative Appeal

[i] In General

[ii] Time for Court's Decision

§ 540.276 Estoppel

§ 540.277 Protest and Appeal of Deficiency Assessment

[1] Filing of Protest by Taxpayer

[2] Action by FTB

[3] Appeal of FTB's Decision to SBE

[4] Payment of Protested Deficiency During Protest and Appeal Process

§ 540.278 Claim for Refund

[1] Requirements

[2] FTB's Action on Claim

[3] Effect of Claim on Suit for Refund

§ 540.279 Carryovers

§§ 540.280-540.299 [Reserved]

§ 540.300 Jurisdiction of Superior Court

[1] Limitations

[2] Closing Agreements

§ 540.301 Federal Court Jurisdiction

[1] District Courts

[2] Removal Jurisdiction

[3] U.S. Supreme Court

§ 540.302 Residency Determinations

§ 540.303 Suit for Refund

[1] In General

[2] Prerequisites to Suit

[3] Statute of Limitations

[4] Grounds for Suit

[5] Service

[6] Venue

[7] Who Defends Suit

[8] Res Judicata and Other Defenses

[9] General Civil Procedure Rules Apply

§ 540.304 Interest on Judgments Against FTB

§ 540.305 Litigation Costs

§ 540.306 Application of Credits and Refunds

§ 540.307 Illegal Taxes

§§ 540.308-540.319 [Reserved]

§ 540.320 Remedies to Collect Tax

[1] In General

[2] Suit to Collect Taxes

[3] Withholding Orders

§§ 540.321-540.339 [Reserved]

§ 540.340 Allocation and Apportionment

§ 540.341 Unitary Business Doctrine

§ 540.342 Criteria to Determine Whether Entities Are Unitary

[1] Two California Tests

[2] U.S. Supreme Court's Test

[3] Burden on Taxpayer

§ 540.343 Worldwide Combined Reporting

[1] Required by California

[2] Domestic-Parent Corporations

[3] Foreign-Parent Corporations

§ 540.344 Water's-Edge Election

[1] As Alternative to Worldwide Combined Reporting

[2] Making Water's-Edge Election

§ 540.345 Use of Method Other Than Unitary Method or Water's-Edge Election

§§ 540.346-540.359 [Reserved]

§ 540.360 Governing Law

§§ 540.361-540.379 [Reserved]

§ 540.380 Purpose of Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

§ 540.381 Property Taxpayers' Advocate

[1] Designation and Responsibilities

[2] Specific Duties

[a] Education and Information

[b] Review of Tax Forms and Statements

[c] Review of Complaints and Identification of Areas of Conflict

[d] Performance Evaluation of Employees

[e] Recommending Standardization of Interest Rates and Statute of Limitations

§ 540.382 Relief From Penalties and Interest if Taxpayer Relied on Assessor's Written Advice

§§ 540.383-540.399 [Reserved]

§ 540.400 Purpose of Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

§ 540.401 Taxpayer Education and Information

§ 540.402 [Reserved]

§ 540.403 Improvement and Reform of Tax Administration

[1] Taxpayers' Rights Advocates

[2] Performance Evaluation of Employees

[3] Delay Reduction in Processing Taxpayer Claims and Petitions

[4] Prohibition Against Nontax Surveillance and Investigation

[5] Procedural Safeguards

[a] Relating to Protest Hearings

[b] Relating to Suspension or Revocation of Sales Tax Permit or Corporate Privileges

[6] Settlement of Civil Tax Matter Disputes by FTB

[7] Settlement of Civil Tax Matter Disputes by SBE

[8] Compromise of Final Tax Liability by FTB

[a] Reduction in Tax Liability $7,500 or Less

[b] Reduction in Tax Liability in Excess of $7,500

[c] Final Tax Liability Defined

[d] Conditions Required for Compromise

[e] Notification of Action

[f] Effect on Spouse's Liability

[g] Rescission of Compromise

[9] Compromise of Final Sales and Use Tax Liability by SBE

§ 540.404 Administrative Remedies

[1] Relief Based on Taxpayer's Reasonable Reliance on Written Advice From FTB

[a] Extent of Relief

[2] Conditions for Relief

[a] Procedure for Obtaining Relief

[3] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to SBE Hearings Involving Sales and Use Taxes

[4] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to Appeal Before SBE

[5] Relief From Recording of Tax Lien

[a] Preliminary Notice

[b] Notice of Filing and Recording of Lien; Administrative Review

[i] Operative Date

[ii] Notice

[iii] Independent Administrative Review

[c] Release of Lien

[i] Request By Owner Who Is Not Person Whose Unsatisfied Liability Gave Rise to Lien

[6] Relief From Tax Levy

[a] Notice Before Levy

[b] Independent Departmental Administrative Review

[c] Release of Levy

[d] Return of Property or Proceeds from Sale

[e] Notice of Exemptions From Levy Prior to Sale

[f] Claim to Recover Consequential Charges

[i] Reimbursement by FTB

[ii] Reimbursement by SBE

§ 540.405 No Levy on Principal Residence of Innocent Investor

§ 540.406 Cause of Action for Reckless Disregard of Published Procedures

§ 540.407 Cause of Action Against State for Settlement or Compromise in Exchange for Disclosure of Information

§ 540.408 Attorney-Client Privilege Extends to Taxpayer-Practitioner Communications

§§ 540.409-540.419 [Reserved]

§ 540.420 California Legal Forms

§ 540.421 California Real Estate

§ 540.422 Federal Constitution

§ 540.423 California Constitution

[1] Property Subject to Tax

[2] Proposition 13 and Other Constitutional Limitations

[3] Reassessment Exclusions

[4] Transfer of Base Year Values

§ 540.424 Federal Statutes

§ 540.425 State Statutes

[1] Actions by Owners and Purchasers of Tax-Defaulted Property

[2] Information to Assessor

[3] Change in Ownership

[4] Property Taxpayer's Bill of Rights

[5] Proposition 62

[6] Reduction of Assessment

[7] Refunds

[8] Transfer of Base Year Value

§ 540.426 Decisions

[1] Administrative Procedures

[2] Change in Ownership

[a] Corporations

[b] Leases as Change in Ownership

[c] Limited Liability Companies; Partnerships

[d] Requirements

[e] Sale and Leaseback

[f] Sale of Development Rights

[g] Trusts

[3] Characterization of Property as Personal or Real

[4] Escape Assessments

[5] Exemptions

[6] Federal Law and Jurisdiction

[7] Interest and Attorney's Fees

[8] Interests Valued

[9] Methods of Valuation

[10] Other Judicial Remedies to Contest Assessments

[11] Property Valuation

[12] Proposition 13

[a] Application

[b] Previously Approved Indebtedness

[c] Special Assessments

[d] Special Tax

[13] Publicly Owned Land

[14] Redemption

[15] Refund

[16] Request for Reduction in Assessment

[a] When Not Required

[b] When Required

[17] Restrictions on Property and Valuation

[18] Scope of Judicial Review

[19] Situs for Taxation of Personal Property

[20] Statute of Limitations

[21] Supplemental Assessments

[22] Structure of California Property Tax System

[23] Tax Sales

§ 540.427 Attorney General Opinions

§ 540.428 Law Reviews

§ 540.429 Text References

§§ 540.430-540.449 [Reserved]

§ 540.450 Federal Constitution

§ 540.451 California Constitution

§ 540.452 Federal Statutes

§ 540.453 State Statutes

[1] Audits and Administration

[2] Claim for Refund

[3] Duties of Retailers

[4] Exemptions

[5] Imposition and Collection of Tax

[6] License Taxes

[7] Local Sales and Use Taxes

[8] Penal Provisions

[9] Petition for Redetermination

[10] SBE's Remedies for Collection

[11] Suit for Refund

§ 540.454 Administrative Regulations

§ 540.455 Decisions

[1] Administrative Regulations

[2] Assumption of Liabilities

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Basis of Tax

[a] Leases; Sales and Leasebacks

[b] Services and Labor

[c] Tangible Personal Property

[d] What Constitutes Sales Price and Gross Receipts

[5] City Gross Receipts and Licensing Taxes

[a] Apportionment

[b] Basis and Rate of Tax

[c] Constitutional Issues (Commerce, Discrimination, Equal Protection, Free Speech, Import-Export)

[d] In Lieu Tax on Insurance Companies

[e] Preemption by State or Federal Law

[f] Proposition 13 Restriction on Special Taxes

[g] Proposition 62 Restriction on Special Taxes

[h] Remedies

[i] Statute of Limitations on Collection

[j] Who Is Taxed

[6] Consideration Required for Taxable Sale

[7] Delegation of Taxing Power

[8] Exemptions From Tax

[a] Burden on Taxpayer to Establish Eligibility for Exemptions

[b] Charitable Organizations

[c] Common Carriers

[d] Containers

[e] Drugs and Medicines

[f] Exemption Certificates

[g] Federal Constitutional Provisions

[h] Food and Meals

[i] Fuel

[j] Lottery Tickets

[k] Marketing Aids

[l] Master Records and Tapes

[m] Sales to Federal Government

[n] Watercraft

[9] Federal Law and Entities

[10] Personal Liability for Unpaid Taxes of Entity

[11] Occasional Sales

[12] Remedies

[a] Available to SBE

[b] Available to Taxpayer

[c] Doctrine of Equitable Setoff

[13] Retention of Title to Property

[14] Use or Delivery of Property in California

[15] Who Is Seller

§ 540.456 Law Reviews

§ 540.457 Text References

§§ 540.458-540.469 [Reserved]

§ 540.470 California Family Law

§ 540.471 California Legal Forms

§ 540.472 California Constitution

§ 540.473 Federal Statutes

§ 540.474 State Statutes

[1] Corporation Tax

[2] Personal Income Tax

[3] Provisions Common to Personal Income Taxes and to Corporation Taxes

§ 540.475 Decisions

[1] Attorney's Fees

[2] Bankruptcy

[3] Constitutional Issues

[4] Credits

[5] Deductions

[6] Employer's Liability for Withholding

[7] FTB's Remedies

[8] Jeopardy Assessments

[9] Mandamus Relief

[10] Privacy of Income Tax Returns

[11] Privacy of Personal Association

[12] Unitary Business

§ 540.476 Law Reviews

§ 540.477 Text References

§§ 540.478-540.489 [Reserved]

§ 540.490 Federal Income Tax

§ 540.491 State Statutes

[1] Cause of Action Based on Settlement or Compromise in Exchange for Disclosure of Information

[2] Cause of Action for Disregard of Published Procedures

[3] Compromise of Final Tax Liability

[4] FTB's Burden of Producing Reasonable and Probative information Concerning Amount Assessed

[5] Investigation and Surveillance

[6] Notice and Release of Tax Liens and Tax Levys

[7] Notice of Suspension or Revocation

[8] Protest Hearing Procedures

[9] Reimbursement of Expenses Relating to SBE Hearing

[10] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to Appeal Before SBE

[11] Relief Based on Reliance on Written FTB Advice

[12] Settlement of Minor Tax Disputes

[13] Taxpayers' Rights Advocate

§§ 540.492-540.509 [Reserved]

§ 540.510 Claim for Refund of Illegally Collected Taxes Filed With Board of Supervisors [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096(b), 5097]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Other Refunds Available

[4] Application for Reduction of Assessment

[5] Requirements of Claim

[6] Statute of Limitations

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 540.511 Claim for Refund of Taxes Filed With County Auditor [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5097.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 540.512 Complaint for Refund of Property Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Jurisdiction, Venue, and Service

[7] Mandatory Dismissal for Failure to Serve Summons Within One Year

[8] Interest

[9] Attorney's Fees

[10] Cross References

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[a] Dismissal for Failure to Return Summons Within One Year

[b] Interest and Attorney's Fees

[c] Payment Required to Contest Tax

[d] Scope of Judicial Review

§§ 540.513-540.529 [Reserved]

§ 540.530 Petition to State Board of Equalization for Redetermination of Sales or Use Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code §§

6538, 6561, 6561.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Service of Petition

[6] Statute of Limitations

[7] Hearing and Determination

[8] State Statutes

§ 540.531 Claim for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6902, 6904]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Signature

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Interest and Penalties

[7] Cross References

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

§ 540.532 Complaint for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction, Venue, and Service

[6] Statute of Limitations

[7] Application of Judgment and Interest

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

§§ 540.533-540.549 [Reserved]

§ 540.550 Complaint for Determination of Residency to Avoid Liability for California Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Verification

[8] Collection of Tax During Pendency of Action

[9] Attorney's Fees and Costs

[10] State Statutes

[11] Decisions

[12] Law Reviews

§ 540.551 Complaint for Refund of Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Service

[8] Interest and Attorney's Fees

[9] State Statutes

[10] Decisions

[11] Text References

[12] Cross References

§ 540.552 Complaint for Refund of Corporation Taxes Assessed by FTB [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382] Against Unitary Business [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25120-25141]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Interest and Attorney's Fees

[8] California Constitution

[9] State Statutes

[10] Decisions

[11] Cross References

§§ 540.553-540.569 [Reserved]

§ 540.570 Complaint for Damages Based on Reckless Disregard of SBE or FTB Published Procedures [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099, 21021]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Plaintiff's Negligence Considered in Calculating Damages

[7] Plaintiff Penalized for Frivolous Position

[8] Cross References

[9] Administrative Regulations

Robert D. Schindewolf
Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D. n*

FOOTNOTES:
(n99)Footnote *. Robert D. Schindewolf, Contributing Author. Updating contributed by and Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.01

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the administrative and judicial remedies available for contesting three types of taxes:

- Local ad valorem property taxes and assessments, including discussion of:
  - The structure and administration of the state property tax system.
  - Taxpayers' administrative remedies for contesting taxes and assessments, including claims for refunds.
  - Judicial remedies available to taxpayers (including suits for refunds) and to purchasers.
  - Suits to perfect title in property acquired by tax deeds and sales.

Forms include forms for refund claims [*§§ 540.510, 540.511*], and a general form for refund suit [*§ 540.512*].

- State and local sales and use taxes and local business license taxes based on gross receipts, including discussion of:
  - Sales and use taxes imposed by the State of California and local entities.
  - Local business taxes based on gross receipts.
  - Administrative and judicial remedies available to contest determinations and overpayment of tax.

- The nature and administration of sales and use taxes.
- Deficiency and jeopardy determinations.
- Interest and penalties, petitions for redetermination of proposed assessments.
- The remedies used by the State Board of Equalization (SBE) to collect delinquent sales and use taxes.
- Taxpayer's remedies for overpayment of sales and use taxes.

Forms include a petition for redetermination of sales and/or use tax [*§ 540.530*], a claim for refund [*§ 540.531*], and a complaint seeking refund of sales and use taxes [*§ 540.532*].

- California personal income taxes and corporation taxes, including discussion of:
  - Tax returns.
  - Tax assessments.
  - The administrative and judicial remedies available to individual and corporate taxpayers for challenging personal income tax and corporation tax determinations of the Franchise Tax Board.
  - The collection methods and judicial remedies available to the FTB is also included.

Forms include complaints for a determination of residency to avoid California personal income tax [*§ 540.550*], a refund of personal income taxes [*§ 540.551*], and a refund of franchise taxes assessed against a unitary business [*§ 540.552*].

This chapter also discusses administrative and judicial remedies available under the Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* and Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights*, including the following:

- The remedies available under the various Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* acts enacted to protect California taxpayers.
- The Morgan Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5900 et seq.*], which is applicable to local ad valorem property taxes.
- The Harris-Katz California Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7080 et seq.*], applicable to sales and use taxes.
- The Katz-Harris Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* Act [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21001 et seq.*], applicable to personal income taxes and corporation taxes.
- Portions of the Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* Act of 1999, enacted by Stats. 1999, ch. 931 (including *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19226* and *19443*), applicable to personal income taxes and corporation taxes, and other related sections enacted by Stats. 1999, ch. 348 (including *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225*), also applicable to personal income taxes and bank and corporation taxes.

- A form for a complaint for damages resulting from the reckless disregard of published procedures by an officer or employee of the State Board of Equalization (hereinafter referred to as the SBE) or the Franchise Tax Board (hereinafter referred to as the FTB) [*§ 540.570*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.02

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.02 Cross References

For discussion and a form for a complaint by a good-faith improver, see Ch. 279, *Good Faith Improver of Real Property*

For discussion and forms for complaints for use in seeking a declaration of theillegality of a tax, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For a form for a complaint alleging breach of lease covenant by failure to pay taxes, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy*

For discussion and form for a complaint to foreclose lien by remainderman against life tenant who failed to pay taxes, see Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders*

For discussion and forms relating to taxpayers' actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 526a* to enjoin unlawful expenditure of public funds, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayers's Actions*

For discussion of the immunity of public entities and employees from liability under *Gov. Code § 860.2* for injury caused by the institution of proceedings incidental to the assessment or collection of a tax or to the interpretation or application of any tax law, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For discussion of city license taxes other than those based on gross receipts, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies*

For a general form for a quiet title complaint and a form for a quiet title complaint for use by a purchaser of tax-defaulted property, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For discussion and forms relating to taxpayers' actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 526a* to enjoin unlawful expenditure of public funds, see Ch. 466, *Public Entities and Officers: Taxpayer's Actions*

For a general form of quiet title complaint, and for a form of quiet title complaint for use by a purchaser of tax-defaulted property, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For discussion and forms relating to attachment, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , Ch. 276, *Garnishment*

For discussion and forms relating to executions, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

For a discussion and forms relating to enforcement of judgments, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.90* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to liens, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

For forms for use in seeking declaratory relief in challenging local licensing ordinances, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies*

For discussion and forms of claims against public entities, other than those provided by the Revenue and Taxation Code, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For discussion and forms relating to bonds and undertakings, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

For discussion and forms relating to attachment, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* , and Ch. 276, *Garnishment*

For discussion of tax issues involved in dissolution of marriage, see Ch. 227, *Dissolution of Marriage: Tax Effects of Dissolution*

For discussion and forms relating to executions, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

For a discussion and forms relating to enforcement of judgments, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.90* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to liens, see Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

For discussion and forms relating to estate taxes, see Ch. 452, *Probate: Proration of Estate and Generation-Skipping Transfer Taxes* , and Ch. 453, *Probate: Estate Tax*

For discussion and forms relating to bonds and undertakings, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

For discussion relating to levies generally, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.40* et seq.

For discussion relating to liens in general, see *Ch. 342, Liens and Wage Preferences, § 342.10* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to invasion of privacy and collection of information by state agencies generally, see *Ch. 429, Privacy, § 429.60* et seq.

For discussion relating to access of information in public agency files, see Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act* , and Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies*

For discussion relating to service of summons and complaint on the State of California, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsSuretiesLiabilityFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportTaxationGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawEstatesFuture InterestsRemaindersReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesEstate & Gift TaxEstate TaxGeneral Overview

4 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART I. SCOPE

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.03-540.09

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.03[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.10

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.10 Power to Tax

A tax is a charge on persons, property, or activities to raise money for public purposes [*City of Glendale v. Trondsen (1957) 48 Cal. 2d 93, 103, 308 P.2d 1* ; *Perry v. Washburn (1862) 20 Cal. 318, 350]* . To be valid, a tax need not be expended for purposes particularly beneficial to the taxpayer. It is enough that the taxpayer receive the benefit of living in an organized society established by the devotion of taxes to public purposes [*see Carmichael v. Southern Coal & Coke Co. (1936) 301 U.S. 495, 521, 57 S. Ct. 868, 81 L. Ed. 1245* ; *Barwise v. Sheppard (1936) 299 U.S. 33, 39, 57 S. Ct. 70, 81 L. Ed. 23* ; *Modern Barber Col. v. Cal. Emp. Stab. Com. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 720, 724, 192 P.2d 916]* . All taxes must be levied for a public purpose. A tax, or an act providing for a tax, for a private purpose is unconstitutional [*see City of Los Angeles v. Lewis (1917) 175 Cal. 777, 779-780, 167 P. 390]* .

The California tax system is set forth in the California Constitution, mainly Articles XIII, XIII A, XIII B, XIII C, and XIII D, and in the Revenue and Taxation Code. The Legislature cannot delegate the power to tax to a private entity, nor may the power to tax be surrendered or suspended by grant or contract [*Cal. Const., art. XI, § 11, art. XIII, § 31*; *see Howard Jarvis Taxpayers' Assn. v. Fresno Metropolitan Projects Authority (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269* (construing and discussing history of *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 11*)]. The Legislature cannot impose taxes for local purposes but may authorize local governments to impose them [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 24*]. Local governments have no inherent taxing power; they have only such power as granted by the state Constitution or by the Legislature [*Sacramento Mun. Utility Dist. v. County of Solano (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1163, 1166, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286]* . Article XIII of the California Constitution provides the basic framework, including some exemptions, for property taxes and income taxes and delegates to the Legislature other powers necessary to carry out the specified provisions [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 1-21, 26, 33*]. Actions for tax refunds must be brought in the manner prescribed by the Legislature [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *see Woosley v. State of California (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 789, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758* ; *Flying Dutchman Park, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 1129, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 690]* .

Article XIII A of the California Constitution was added by Proposition 13 in June 1978, and places limitations on

certain taxes. Article XIII B of the California Constitution was added by Proposition 4 in November 1979, and places spending limitations on state and local government. Articles XIII C and XIII D of the California Constitution were added by Proposition 218in November, 1996, and together constitute the Right to Vote on Taxes Act, and restrict the power of local governments to impose both general and special taxes without voter approval [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2*; *see also Gov. Code § 53720 et seq.*, added by Proposition 62 in 1986 on voter approval of taxes] and to require a procedure that precludes the imposition of taxes, assessments, fees, and charges on any parcel of property or on any person as an incident of property ownership over the protest of a majority of affected property owners [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII D, §§ 3, 4*]. Although *Gov. Code § 53724*, as part of Proposition 62, requires that a taxing ordinance first be approved by a two-thirds vote of all members of the legislative body of the local government or district before it is submitted to voters for their approval, a court has held that a charter city's constitutional authority over the conduct of its own elections overrides that provision. Therefore, the court held valid a gross receipts tax on the sale of firearms that had been submitted to the voters after only a majority vote of the City Council, in accordance with the city's charter and municipal code [*Trader Sports, Inc. v. City of San Leandro (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 37, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 677]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawIncome TaxGovernmentsLegislationSpecial ActsTax LawState & Local TaxesGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & Refunds

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.11

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.11 Limitations on the Power to Tax

[1] Discrimination

The power of state and local governments to tax is not without limitations. No taxpayer or group of taxpayers can be singled out for discriminatory treatment that would amount to a violation of the *equal protection clause* [*Hillsborough Township v. Cromwell (1946) 326 U.S. 620, 623, 66 S. Ct. 445, 90 L. Ed. 358* ; *City of Alameda v. Premier Communications Network, Inc. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 148, 154, 202 Cal. Rptr. 684* , *cert. denied, 469 U.S. 1073* (invalidating tax that was "differentially burdensome" on instrumentalities of speech or press, such as subscription television services, as interference with *First Amendment* rights); *Ferran v. City of Palo Alto (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 374, 378, 122 P.2d 965]* .

[2] Imports and Exports

State and local governments are prohibited from imposing any tax on exports or from taxing instrumentalities of the federal government without the consent of Congress [U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10*, cl. 2, art. VI; McColloch v. Maryland (1819) 17 U.S. 316, 425-438, 4 L. Ed. 579 ; *see also TRW Space & Defense Sector v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1703, 1710-1714, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (improper tax on property owned by federal government distinguished from constitutionally permissible use tax on private party using tax exempt real or personal property owned by federal government for party's own beneficial personal use and advantage)]. The original package doctrine was abrogated in 1976, allowing a nondiscriminatory local personal property tax to beimposed on imports,but California has since exempted business inventories from taxation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 219*; *Michelin Tire Corp. v. Wages (1976) 423 U.S. 276, 296-301, 96 S. Ct. 535, 46 L. Ed. 2d 495* ; *see American Smelting etc. Co. v. County of Contra Costa (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 437, 469-481, 77 Cal. Rptr. 570* (upholding nondiscriminatory property tax on imports stored in bonded warehouse); *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. Durham County (1986) 479 U.S. 130, 143-155, 107 S. Ct. 499, 93 L. Ed. 2d 449 (North Carolina property tax)]* .

[3] Interstate Commerce

The commerce clause and the *Fourteenth Amendment due process clause of the Federal Constitution* limit the imposition of state and local taxes. State or local taxes may not place an undue burden on interstate commerce [U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*]. In addition, the due process clause requires some minimum contact between the taxing entity and the transaction [*see Allied-Signal v. Director, Tax Div. (1992) 504 U.S. 768, 112 S. Ct. 2251, 119 L. Ed. 2d 533, 545]* . These constitutional limitations are separate but may overlap. However, a tax that meets the minimum contacts requirement may not have the substantial nexus that is required under the commerce clause [*Quill Corporation v. State of North Dakota (1992) 504 U.S. 298, 112 S. Ct. 1904, 119 L. Ed. 2d 91, 102* (state use tax on out-of-state mail order business with no physical presence in state does not violate due process clause but does violate commerce clause by unduly burdening interstate commerce)].

For property taxation, the commerce clause requires apportionment of the tax based on the amount of time the property is in the county [*Standard Oil Co. v. Peck (1952) 342 U.S. 382, 384, 72 S. Ct. 309, 96 L. Ed. 427, 63 Ohio Law Abs. 559* ; *Flying Tiger Line, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 314, 317-318, 333 P.2d 323* ; *GeoMetrics v. County of Santa Clara (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 940, 947-948, 179 Cal. Rptr. 850]* .

For sales and use taxes, the commerce clause and the due process clause require that the transaction taxed have sufficient nexus with the taxing state [*Quill Corporation v. State of North Dakota (1992) 504 U.S. 298, 305-313, 112 S. Ct. 1904, 119 L. Ed. 2d 91* (nexus requirements imposed by due process and commerce clause not identical); *National Geographic v. Cal. Equalization Bd. (1977) 430 U.S. 551, 554, 97 S. Ct. 1386, 51 L. Ed. 2d 631* ; *cf. Rev. & Tax. Code § 6203(c)-(e)* (when retailer deemed doing business in California for purpose of collecting use tax); *Borders Online v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1195, 1201, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 176* (internet bookseller that promoted sales by allowing books to be returned for credit or exchange at California stores of affiliated company was doing business in California for purposes of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6203(c)(2)*, and that conclusion was consistent with commerce clause nexus requirement)].

In addition to requiring sufficient nexus, the commerce clause prohibits state taxes that discriminate against interstate commerce by imposing a greater tax burden on an out-of-state transaction than on a local transaction. Thus, a use tax on out-of-state purchases violates the interstate commerce clause if it imposes a greater tax burden than a sales tax imposes on local purchases [*Woosley v. State of California (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 780, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758* (discriminatory license feesand use tax on passenger vehicles originally sold outside California); *see also General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 451-454, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (business tax that discriminates between in-city manufacturers and out-of-city manufacturers violates state and federal commerce protections); *Ceridian Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 875, 887-888, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611* (statute providing deduction for insurance subsidiary dividends only to corporations domiciled in California and limiting the amount of the deduction according to a formula based on the subsidiary's gross receipts, payroll and property within the state held to violate the Commerce Clause)]. For both income taxes and sales and use taxes, a four-pronged test determines the validity of a tax on interstate commerce. The tax must [*Complete Auto Transit, Inc. v. Brady (1977) 430 U.S. 274, 287, 97 S. Ct. 1076, 51 L. Ed. 2d 326* ; *see Quill Corporation v. State of North Dakota (1992) 504 U.S. 298, 311-314, 112 S. Ct. 1904, 119 L. Ed. 2d 91* ; *Jordan v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 449, 460, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 333]* :

- Be applied to an activity with a substantial nexus with the taxing state;
- Be fairly apportioned;
- Not discriminate against interstate commerce; and
- Be fairly related to the services provided by the state.

[4] Foreign Commerce

The U.S. Constitution provides limits on a state's taxation of foreign commerce that are similar to the restrictions on interstate commerce [U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*]. In determining the validity of a tax on foreign commerce, a court must consider the four factors set forth in *Complete Auto* [*Complete Auto Transit, Inc. v. Brady (1977) 430 U.S. 274, 287, 97 S. Ct. 1076, 51 L. Ed. 2d 326* ; *see § 540.11[3]*], plus two additional factors. That is, in addition to deciding whether a tax is valid because it meets the nexus, apportionment, nondiscrimination, and relation-to-state-services requirements presented in *Complete Auto*, a court must ask whether the tax avoids either of the following [*Japan Line, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1979) 441 U.S. 434, 451-453, 99 S. Ct. 1813, 60 L. Ed. 2d 336]* :

- Creating a substantial risk of international multiple taxation, notwithstanding apportionment; or

- Preventing the federal government from speaking with one voice whenregulating commercial relations with foreign governments.

The California Supreme Court has held that formula (payroll, property, and sales) apportionment of the income of a foreign-parent unitary business does not violate the foreign commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution. Various tax treaties and agreements indicate the federal government's intent not to prohibit states from using this method of taxing multinational enterprises. The Court reversed a court of appeal's decision holding that the formula was unconstitutional under the foreign commerce clause, but remanded the case for further proceedings to consider whether the cost of furnishing the financial data required by the formula violated the taxpayer's constitutional rights to due process and nondiscrimination [*Barclays Bank Internat., Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 708, 742, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31, 829 P.2d 279* ; *see Barclays Bank Internat. Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Board (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1742, 1766, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 537* (holding on remand that burden of complying with worldwide combined reporting regulations, properly applied, does not violate rights to due process or nondiscrimination); *see § 540.11[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseCommerce With Other NationsConstitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseInterstate CommerceGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawEqual ProtectionFull & Equal BenefitTax LawState & Local TaxesGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFederal Preemption

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.12

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.12 Anti-Injunction Provisions

Both federal and California law contain anti-injunction provisions prohibiting injunctions to restrain collection of state or local taxes. Under federal law, federal district courts cannot enjoin, suspend or restrain the assessment, levy or collection of any tax under state law when a plain, speedy and efficient remedy may be had in state court [*28 U.S.C. § 1341*]. Although not explicit, *28 U.S.C. § 1341* bars actions for declaratory as well as injunctive relief [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Alcan Aluminum (1990) 493 U.S. 331, 338, 110 S. Ct. 661, 107 L. Ed. 2d 696]* . Moreover, neither federal nor state courts may award injunctive or declaratory relief against a state tax under 28 U.S.C. § 1983 when an adequate remedy at law exists absent extraordinary circumstances. For example, equity might be invoked if the enforcement of the tax would lead to a multiplicity of suits (only in case of real risk of numerous suits between the same parties involving the same issues of law or fact), or produce irreparable injury or throw a cloud on title. A state may, of course, authorize state courts to issue injunctions and declaratory judgments even when a legal remedy exists [*National Private Truck Council, Inc. v. Oklahoma Tax Comm'n (1995) 515 U.S. 582, 588-592, 591 n.6, 115 S. Ct. 2351, 132 L.Ed 2d 509* ; *see also Writers Guild of America, West, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 475, 478-480, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 603* (rule prohibiting injunctive and declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. § 1983 applied to city tax; no multiplicity of suit situation or irreparable injury shown); *General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 458, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (an adequate state remedy precludes equitable relief under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* in every court and thus precludes associated recovery of attorney fees)].

Under state law, a court cannot issue legal or equitable process against the state or any officer of the state to prevent or enjoin collection of any tax [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*]. This constitutional rule applies only to actions against the state or an officer of the state; it does not apply to an action against a local governmental entity, such as a city, or an officer of a local entity [*City of Anaheim v. Superior Court (Priceline.com, Inc.) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 825, 828, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171* (when city attempted to collect transient-occupancy tax from numerous on-line travel companies, city could not invoke constitutional pay-first rule, and could not point to any ordinance or other legal ground for pay-first requirement, in support of city's demurrer to companies' petition for writ of mandate and declaratory judgment, which sought to prevent collection of that tax)]. Numerous state statutes concerning specific taxes also contain anti-injunction

provisions [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4807* (property taxes), *6931* (sales and use taxes), *19381* (personal income and bank and corporation tax)]. Some of these provisions also prohibit suits for declaratory relief [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; *Casey v. Bonelli (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 253, 254, 208 P.2d 723]* .

Generally, the only remedy available to the taxpayer is to pay the tax and sue for refund [*but see Brown v. County of Los Angeles (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 665, 670, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 414* (regarding payment of documentary transfer taxes, despite availability of action at law for refund, declaratory judgment in taxpayer's favor upheld when taxpayer frequently purchased property at trustee's sales and without declaratory judgment, county could continue to tax taxpayer at wrong rate; *Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 32*, applies to actions against state, not local governments; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4807* applies to actions when taxpayer attacks property tax, not to actions involving excise tax); *American President Lines, Ltd. v. Zolin (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 910, 919-921, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (although *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, requires payment of tax before challenging it, it does not require suit for refund when legislature has provided procedures for challenging tax; administrative mandamus appropriate procedure under *Veh. Code § 8202* for contesting DMV's fleet registration fees)]. Similarly, an entity that controls the taxpayer, such as a parent corporation, even if it has a separate injury, has no remedy but to cause the taxpayer to pay the tax and claim and sue for refund [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Alcan Aluminium, Ltd. (1990) 493 U.S. 331, 338-341, 110 S. Ct. 661, 107 L. Ed. 2d 696* (result might be different if California courts held, as none have yet done, that only foreign parent had standing to raise foreign commerce clause challenges)]. In all cases, a claim for refund is a prerequisite to a suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5140, 6933, 19382*]. In addition, if a property tax refund is based on a valuation error, the taxpayer must first apply to the local board of equalization for a reduction of assessment [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. Quinn (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 507, 509-510, 6 Cal. Rptr. 545, 354 P.2d 1] , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* . For discussion of when it is or is not necessary to seek a reduction of an assessment, see *§ 540.90[3]*.

If a state penalizes taxpayers for failure to remit taxes in timely fashion, thus requiring them to pay a tax before obtaining review of the tax's constitutionality, federal due process principles require that the postdeprivation procedure provide a clear and certain remedy [*McKesson Corp. v. Division of Alcoholic Beverages & Tobacco (1990) 496 U.S. 18, 45, 110 S. Ct. 2238, 110 L. Ed. 2d 17* (reversing Florida Supreme Court, which had enjoined future collection of discriminatory tax but did not provide refund); *see General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (plaintiff's remedy for city's imposition of unconstitutional tax was refund of all taxes illegally collected; *McKesson* discussed)]. *McKesson* specifies three ways in which a state may provide a clear and certain remedy. They are [*see Ceridian Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 875, 888, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611]* :

- Refunding the discriminatory portion of the tax to the taxpayer;
- Imposing a retroactive assessment on other taxpayers previously favored by a discriminatory tax; or
- A combination of refund and retroactive assessment.

If the retroactive assessment cannot lawfully be collected because the statute of limitations has run, a refund is the appropriate remedy [*Ceridian Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 875, 889, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction ActGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.13

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.13 Information Practices Act

The Franchise Tax Board is subject to the requirements and remedial provisions of the Information Practices Act [*Civ. Code § 1798 et seq.*], under which every state agency (with limited exceptions) is required to limit the collection and retention of personal information to what is necessary to accomplish the agency's specific purpose. Damages can be recovered, in an appropriate case, for a violation of the act (provided the notice requirement of the Government Claims Act is met). Injunctive relief against violation of the act is available, and the legal prohibitions against enjoining the collection of taxes [*see § 540.12*] do not prevent giving effect to the act's provision for injunctive relief in an action against the FTB [*Bates v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 367, 373, 387, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 285]* . For discussion and forms for use in actions under the Information Practices Act, see *Ch. 429, Privacy, § 429.60* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationAgency RequirementsInformation CollectionAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationAgency RequirementsNoticeAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationEnforcementRemediesDamagesAdministrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationEnforcementRemediesInjunctive ReliefTax LawState & Local TaxesFranchise TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.14

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.14 Limitation On Damages Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Actions under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* challenging state taxation are barred, whether the action seeks damages or equitable relief, and whether brought in federal or state court, if adequate state remedy exists [*General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 460, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* ; for discussion of prohibition against injunctive and declaratory relief against state taxes under section 1983 when an adequate state remedy exists, *see § 540.12*]. Similarly, an action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* challenging municipal taxation may not be maintained when an adequate state remedy exists [*General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 460-461, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544* (taxpayer entitled to full refund, which is adequate remedy, precluding any relief or attorney fees under federal civil rights law); *accord Union Oil Co. v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 383, 392-395, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 81* ; *see also Writers Guild of America, West, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 475, 478-480, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 603* (court without jurisdiction to hear plaintiff's claims insofar as they were based on 28 U.S.C. § 1983)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawImmunity From LiabilityGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawSection 1983 ActionsGovernment ActionsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.15

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.15 Federal Practice

This chapter does not purport to deal with federal taxation. For comprehensive treatment of that subject, see Rabkin and Johnson, Federal Income, Gift and Estate Taxation (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawGeneral OverviewTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesGeneral OverviewTax LawFederal Income Tax ComputationGeneral OverviewTax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureGeneral OverviewTax LawFederal Taxpayer GroupsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. IN GENERAL

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.16-540.29

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.30

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.30 Governing Law

Taxation of real and personal property is governed by Cal. Const., arts. XIII, XIII A, and XIII B, *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1-5911*, and 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1-1051.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.31-540.49

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.31[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.50

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.50 Structure of California Property Tax System

[1] Operation

Generally, all property in California is subject to property tax in proportion to its full value [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 1*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 201, 401*]. Intangible property is exempt [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 2*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 212*]. Taxable property includes possessory and ownership interests, both legal and equitable, in real property and ownership interests in personal property [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 103-107, 115*; *General Dynamics Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 59, 64-65, 330 P.2d 794* ; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 2188.4*; *American Airlines, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 325, 328-329, 135 Cal. Rptr. 261* ("mere expectation" without option to renew lease required tax to be based only on remaining lease term)].

A taxable possessory interest includes a leasehold interest in exempt property [*Tilden v. County of Orange (1949) 89 Cal. App. 2d 586, 588, 201 P.2d 86]* .Damages may be recoverable by the lessee if a state or local public entity lessor fails to disclose in the lease contract that the interest created may be taxable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 107.6*].

[2] Administration

[a] Local and State Functions

Property taxes are administered, assessed, and collected by county governments and charter cities, except for certain state functions [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 121, 128, 404*]. The state's functions are limited to equalizing the assessment rolls among the counties, assessing publicly owned property subject to local taxation and property of railroad, telephone, electric generation facilities, and utility companies, providing regulatory and advisory services for counties, and performing certain appellate functions [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 11, 19*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 100, 108, 109, 401.5, 721-868*]. Equalization among counties refers to uniformity of appraisal practices and assessed values throughout the state [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 401.5*].

[b] Tax Rolls and Tax Rates

Each county assessor must complete the assessment roll for the county and deliver it to the county auditor by July 1 of each year [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 616, 617*]. Thereafter, each county board of equalization meets to equalize the values of all property on the local assessment roll by adjusting individual assessments [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 16*].

Real and personal property are assessed separately, but the rate for personal property cannot be higher than that for real property in the same jurisdiction [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 2, 13*]. Assessed property is placed on a secured or unsecured tax roll [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.10, 75.11, 107, 109, 134*]. The tax rate for the secured roll is set by the county or city every budget year. That rate is also the rate for the unsecured roll for the next year [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 12*; *Gov. Code § 29100*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.41(a), 109, 134, 2151*].

Taxes are assessed to the person having the interest in the property on the lien date. If the owner cannot be determined, the property is assessed to unknown owners [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 401, 401.3, 405(a), 611*].

[3] In Lieu Taxes

Certain types of property are subject to in lieu taxes rather than to property taxes because the property involved has been subject to nonuniform or inequitable taxation under the local property tax system [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5701*]. The primary in lieu taxes are the racehorse tax, motor vehicle license fees, the private railroad car tax, and the timber yield tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5701-5790* (racehorse tax), *10701-11108* (vehicle license fee), *11201-11702* (railroad car tax), *38101-38908* (timber yield tax)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxExempt PropertyGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxIntangible PropertyGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.51

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.51 Proposition 13

[1] Limitation on Property Tax

In June 1978, California voters passed Proposition 13, which added Article XIIIA to the California Constitution and limited the power of cities, counties, and special districts to levy ad valorem real property taxes. The combined maximum of ad valorem taxes that may be levied on real property by all taxing agencies is one percent of the property's full cash value [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1(a)*]. The one-percent limitation does not apply to ad valorem property taxes or special assessments levied either to pay indebtedness that was approved by the voters prior to July 1, 1978, or to make annual payments for the principal and interest on any bonded indebtedness for acquisition or improvement of real property if that indebtedness was approved after June 4, 1986 by a two-thirds vote [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1(b)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 93(c), 95(c)*].

Under Proposition 13, assessors must assess all taxable property at 100% of its full value [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 401*]. Section 2(a) of article XIII A requires a rollback of values to the assessor's appraisal of full cash value as shown on the 1975-76 tax rolls. The assessed value of real property may only be increased by an inflation factor of not more than two percent per year. However, real property may be reassessed if the property is purchased, newly constructed, or changes ownership [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a), (b)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 110.1(f), 2212* (establishing inflator)]. For the purpose of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)*, the term "purchased," "newly constructed," and "change in ownership," however, has exclusions [*see, e.g., Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a), (c), (d), (g), (h)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 60-74.6* for definitions and exclusions and discussion *§ 540.53[3]*].

[2] U.S. Supreme Court Approval of Disparities Created by Proposition 13

Proposition 13 creates disparities in property tax assessment in neighborhoods because full reassessments are limited to properties that are purchased, are newly constructed, or change ownership. However, the U.S. Supreme Court held that these disparities were not unconstitutional under the *Equal Protection Clause* because they were justified by two

rational policy considerations. First, the state has a legitimate interest in local neighborhood preservation, continuity, and stability. Therefore, the state can legitimately decide to structure its property tax system to discourage rapid turnover in ownership of homes and businesses to inhibit displacement of lower income families and to prevent newer chain operations from replacing established businesses. Second, the state can legitimately conclude that a new owner at the time of acquiring property does not have the same reliance interest as an existing owner in protection against higher taxes. Unlike an existing owner, who has vested expectations in existing tax levels, a new owner is aware of the scope of future tax liability and can decide not to buy if the tax liability is too high. An existing owner does not have the option not to buy and may be forced to sell or divert income to pay higher taxes [*Nordlinger v. Hahn (1992) 505 U.S. 1, 112 S. Ct. 2326, 120 L. Ed. 2d 1, 13-14* ; *see Northwest Financial, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 198, 202-203, 280 Cal. Rptr. 24* ; *R.H. Macy & Co. v. Contra Costa County (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 352, 360-366, 276 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

[3] Prohibition Against Imposition of New Taxes to Avoid Limits of Proposition 13

[a] Exception for Taxes Approved by Two-Thirds Vote

To prevent the imposition of new taxes to make up for the decrease in property taxes resulting from Sections 1 and 2 of Article XIII A, Sections 3 and 4 prohibit new ad valorem real property taxes and new sales or transaction taxes on real property sales and place other restrictions on state or local taxes.

Section 3 restricts state taxes by providing that any changes in state taxes enacted for the purpose of increasing revenues collected pursuant to them, whether by increased rates or changes in methods of computation, must be imposed by not less than two-thirds of all members of the Legislature and by forbidding any new ad valorem taxes on real property, or sales or transaction taxes on the sale of real property [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 3*; *see Sinclair Paint Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 866, 870, 872-875, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 447, 937 P.2d 1350* (regulatory fee imposed under police power distinguished from tax requiring two-third majority vote)].

Section 4 contains a similar restriction for local entities by providing that cities, counties, and special districts, by a two-thirds vote of the qualified electors of the district, may impose special taxes on the district, except ad valorem taxes on real property or a transaction tax or sales tax on the sale of real property within the city, county or special district [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*; *see Sinclair Paint Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 866, 872-873, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 447, 937 P.2d 1350* ; *see also Gov. Code §§ 53722, 53723* (enacted as part of Proposition 62 in 1986: no local government or district may impose any special tax without approval by two thirds of voters voting in election on issue; majority voter approval is required for all new general taxes); *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225* (upholding constitutionality of Proposition 62)].

In additon, Cal. Const., art. XIII D, also limits the power of local governments and special districts to assess any tax, assessment, fee, or charge on a parcel of property or on a person as an incident of property ownership without approval of the property owners other than as allowed by Article XIII A or by exceptions within Article XIII D itself [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII D, §§ 2, 3*; *see also* Cal. Const., art. XIII C (election required for local government general and special taxes); *Silicon Valley Taxpayers' Assn. v. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 431, 448, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 312, 187 P.3d 37* (underlying purpose of Proposition 218 was to limit government's power to exact revenue as well as to curtail traditional deference accorded legislative enactments regarding fees, assessments, and charges; therefore, burden-to-demonstrate provision in *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 4(f),* is to be liberally construed in light of other provisions in Proposition 218, and courts should exercise their independent judgment in reviewing local agency decisions that have determined whether benefits are special and whether assessments are proportional to special benefits within meaning of Proposition 218)].

The question of who are the "qualified electors" mentioned in Section 4 of Article XIII A is not answered specifically in

that article or elsewhere in the constitution, or in any statute. The issue implicates the rights of nonresident property owners since, if they are not "qualified electors" and so are not able to vote, they could be powerless to avoid the burden of a tax. A California court of appeal concluded that the constitutional requirement is for approval by two thirds of the registered voters--who necessarily must be residents--of the "district" (that is, the city, county, or special district) where the election is held, who vote in the election. Moreover, while such a requirement disenfranchises nonresident property owners, it passes the rational basis test for equal protection under both the federal constitution and the state constitution [*Neilson v. City of California City (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1296, 1312-1317, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453*].

[b] Local Agencies Considered Special Districts Subject to Two-Thirds Vote Requirement

Under Proposition 218, enacted in the November 1996 election, no local government may impose, extend, or increase a general tax without a majority vote of the electorate or impose, extend, or increase a special tax without a two-thirds vote of the electorate [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2*].

Local government is expansively defined to include cities, counties, city and county, including a chartered city or county, or any special district, or any other local or regional governmental entity [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 1(b)*]. "Special district" is in turn defined to mean an agency of the state, formed pursuant to general law or special act, for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited geographic boundaries, including, but not limited to, school districts and redevelopment agencies [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 1(c)*].

Under Proposition 218, all taxes are either general (for general governmental purposes) or special (for specific purposes, including any tax for specific purposes that is placed in general fund) [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 1(a), (d)*], and special districts have no power to impose a general tax [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2*]. However, *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*, does authorize special districts to impose special taxes with a two-thirds vote.

Proposition 218 also enacted Cal. Const., art. XIII D, under which no agency (defined the same as a local govenment is in Article XIII C) may assess any tax,assessment, fee, or charge on a parcel of property or on a person as an incident of property ownership without approval of the property owners other than as allowed by Article XIII A or by exceptions within Article XIII D itself [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII D, §§ 2-4*].

Even before enactment of Proposition 218, a line of cases had held that a local agency is a special district that cannot impose a special tax without the approval of two thirds of its qualified electors, if the agency was created to replace revenues lost by reason of the restrictions of Proposition 13 [*Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 11, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* (discussing factors to consider in determining whether agency was so created)].

Moreover, under Proposition 62, a statutory initiative adopted by the voters in1986 that added *Gov. Code §§ 53720-53730* requiring voter approval of all new local taxes, no local government or district may impose any special tax without the approval of two thirds of the voters voting in an election on the issue [*Gov. Code § 53722*], nor may they impose any general tax without the approval of a majority of the voters voting in an election on the issue [*Gov. Code § 53723*]. Unlike Proposition 13, Proposition 62 does not use the term "special district," but uses the broader term "district" throughout. Thus, Proposition 62 applies not just to "special districts," but to any "district" [*Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 235, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225]* . For the purpose of Proposition 62, "district" is defined to mean an agency of the state, formed pursuant to general law or special act, for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries [*Gov. Code § 53720(b)*] and "local government" is defined to mean any county, city, city and county, including a chartered city or county, or any public or municipal corporation [*Gov. Code § 53720(a)*; *but see Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 260-261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225* (in holding *Gov. Code § 53722* constitutional court assumed arguendo that Proposition 62 is constitutionally inapplicable to charter cities)]. Accordingly, when a challenged tax is held invalid under *Gov. Code § 53722*, the court need not reach the question whether it is also invalid under Proposition 13 [*Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v.*

Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225] . The continued imposition of a tax that has not been approved by voters may be challenged under Proposition 62 at any time. Suits are not restricted to challenging only the enactment of the tax itself, but may be brought at any time to challenge the continued imposition of a tax. The validity of a tax may be challenged within three years after the collection of the tax, even if more than three years have passed since the tax measure was adopted [*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of La Habra (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 809, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 369, 23 P.3d 601]* .

Proposition 218 added Cal. Const., arts. XIII C, XIIID, which are similar to the statutory amendments made by Proposition 62, to ensure that voter approval requirements would apply to charter cities as well as other local taxing authorities [*McBrearty v. City of Brawley (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1441, 1449 n.9, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 862* ; *see Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority v. City of Burbank (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1217, 1226-1227, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297* (until 1996, *Gov. Code § 53723* did not apply to general taxes imposed by charter cities; in practical effect, Cal. Const., art. XIII C added by Proposition 218 in November 1996 requires charter cities to obtain voter approval of general taxes first imposed or increased after January 1, 1995)].

Proposition 218 buttresses Proposition 13's limitations on ad valorem property taxes and special taxes by placing analogous restrictions on assessments, fees, and charges so that a special assessment cannot be imposed without a two-thirds vote [*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn v. City of Riverside (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 679, 682, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 592* (Street Light Assessment District held exempt from Proposition 218 under *Cal.Const., art. XIII D, § 5(a)*); *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Salinas (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228* (storm drainage fee was not for sewer or water services and was therefore subject to taxpayer approval under Proposition 218 before it could be imposed)].

A business improvement district assessment to fund property-related improvements and activities imposed on business owners within a business improvement district established under the Parking and Business Improvement Area Law of 1989 [*Sts. & Hy. Code § 36500 et seq.*] has been held not subject to Proposition 218 because it did not constitute an assessment as defined in *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 2(b),* which is limited to real property assessments [*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 230, 235-238, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 804]* .

Similarly, a city ordinance imposing an inspection fee on private landlords is not subject to the procedural requirements of Proposition 218 because the fee is imposed on landlords not in their capacity as landowners, but in their capacity as business owners; the exaction is more in the nature of a fee for a business license than a charge against property [*Apartment Assn. of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 830, 840, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719, 14 P.3d 930]* .

[c] Distinction Between General and Special Tax

Proposition 13 does not define the term "special taxes." Proposition 218, however, provides that all taxes are either general (for general governmental purposes) or special (for specific purposes), and specifically provides that even if a tax for specific purposes is placed in the general fund, it is nonetheless a special tax [*Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 1(a), (d)*; *see also Gov. Code § 53721* (similar, but not identical, Proposition 62 definitions of general and special taxes); *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 224-234, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225* (local agency's proposed sales tax to fund certain transportation projects held to be special tax)].

Proposition 218 has been applied so that the hallmark of special taxes is the specification of the purposes for which the revenue will be used. If a city, for instance, proposes a flat rate parcel tax--that is, a property-based tax that is not an ad valorem tax (therefore, the burden is not limited by Proposition 13)--in order to raise money for specified purposes; for example, "to pay for police, fire and recreational services, and to repair streets, parks, water line replacement and repair, and building maintenance," and at an election the proposal receives the prescribed two-thirds approval vote, then the tax is a "special tax" because it was proposed for "specific purposes" [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 1(d)* (definition)], and it

is a valid tax because two thirds of the voters in the election approved it [*Neilson v. City of California City (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1296, 1308, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453* ; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2(d)* (approval requirement)]. Moreover, whether a single purpose is specified or numerous purposes are specified, the tax is a "special tax" by virtue of the specification of how the revenue will be used [*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Roseville (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1178, 1185, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1]* . Even if so many purposes are specified that the list verges on comprising most of the functions of government, that would not necessarily make the tax in effect a "general tax" since the intent behind Proposition 218 was to enable voters to control how property tax revenue is to be spent if the tax is not an ad valorem tax [*see Neilson v. City of California City (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1296, 1310-1312, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453]* .

Case law prior to the passage of Proposition 218 has construed the term "special taxes." In *City and County of San Francisco v. Farrell (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 47, 57, 184 Cal. Rptr. 713, 648 P.2d 935* , the term "special taxes" as used in Proposition 13 was construed to mean taxes that are levied for a special purpose rather than a levy placed in the general fund to be used for general governmental purposes [*see Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 233-234, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225]* . *Thereafter, in Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 15, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* , which involved a sales tax imposed by the San Diego County Regional Facility Financing Agency for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of criminal detention and courthouse facilities in the county, the term "special taxes" as used in Proposition 13 was construed to mean a tax leviedto fund a specific governmental project or program, such as the construction and financing of the county's justice facilities [*see Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 234, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225]* . It has been noted that *Rider* did not effectively overrule *Farrell*, but that *Rider* simply carved out an exception to the "general funds rule" set forth in *Farrell*. Under both *Farrell* and *Rider*, the essence of a special tax is that its proceeds are earmarked or dedicated in some manner to a specific project or projects. That is not the case with funds placed in a city's general fund, which are available for use by any of the city's legitimate functions and are allocated during the general budgeting process in light of changing priorities and conditions [*Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 956, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266]* . The court in *Neecke* concluded that when a tax is levied by a general purpose agency (unlike in *Rider*) and the proceeds are deposited into a general fund, the tax is not a special tax subject to the two-thirds voter approval requirement of Proposition 13, § 4 (*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*) [*Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 959, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266* (municipal services tax, to be used for any and all municipal purposes levied on privilege of occupying real property) *see Coleman v. County of Santa Clara (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 662, 669-670, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516* (involving sales tax said to be indistinguishable from tax in *Neecke*)]. Note that the tax involved in *Neeke* may be in violation of the later-enacted *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 6(b)(5).*

Moreover, under *Gov. Code § 50076*, which was enacted to implement the authorization granted by Proposition 13, § 4, to cities, counties and special districts to impose special taxes [*Beaumont Investors v. Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water Dist. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 227, 235, 211 Cal. Rptr. 567]* , a special tax does not include any fee that does not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service or regulatory activity for which it is charged and that is not levied for general revenue purposes. Thus, any fee that falls within the definition of a service or regulatory fee under *Gov. Code § 50076* is not a special tax under Proposition 13 and is exempt from its two-thirds voter approval requirement [*Beaumont Investors v. Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water Dist. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 227, 235, 211 Cal. Rptr. 567]* . The levying entity has the burden of establishing that the fee does not exceed the cost of the service, facility, or regulatory activity for which it is imposed [*Beaumont Investors v. Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water Dist. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 227, 235-236, 211 Cal. Rptr. 567* ; *see Gov. Code § 66017(a)* (development fees), (b) (other requirements to contest development fees); *but see Brydon v. East Bay Mun. Utility Dist. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 178, 191, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 128* (noting that *Knox v. City of Orland (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 132, 146-147, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 159, 841 P.2d 144* cast substantial doubt about propriety of shifting burden of proof to agency)].

Furthermore, an assessment on behalf of a business improvement district established under the Parking and Business Improvement Area Law of 1989 (*Sts. & Hy. Code § 36500 et seq.*), against business owners within the district, has been held not to constitute a special tax within the meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4* [*Evans v. City of San Jose (1992)*

3 Cal. App. 4th 728, 737-739, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601 (although not a true special assessment, same reasons for exempting regulatory and development fee cases and special assessment cases from reach of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4* applied); *see Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 230, 238-240, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 804* (same holding concerning Proposition 218)].

Because of the close interlocking relationship between the various sections of Cal. Const., art. XIII A, the "special tax" case concerning Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4, may be helpful, though not conclusive, in deciding whether fees imposed by a statute enacted by the state Legislature are in legal effect taxes enacted for the purpose of increasing revenue under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 3*, and therefore subject to a two-thirds majority vote. The reasons why particular fees are, or are not, "special taxes" under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*, may apply equally to *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 3*, cases [*Sinclair Paint Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 866, 873, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 447, 937 P.2d 1350]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawEqual ProtectionFull & Equal BenefitGovernmentsLegislationInitiative & ReferendumGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationAssessment Methods & Timing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.52

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.52 Exemptions

[1] Sources and Types of Exemptions

The California Constitution expressly exempts some property from taxation and permits the Legislature to provide for the exemption of other property [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 3, 4*]. Statutory exemptions are governed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 201 et seq.* Although not true exemptions, property tax assistance or postponement of payment of property tax is available to taxpayers who are over the age of 62 or blind or disabled [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 20501 et seq.*]. This chapter does not cover the substance of specific property exemptions.

Property tax exemptions are basically of two types: (1) those based on the status of the property itself, and (2) those based on the status of the property owner and the use to which the property is put. Affidavits of exemption are required for exemptions based on the status of the owner [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 252, 253.5* (homeowners' exemption), *254.5* (welfare and veterans' organization exemptions)]. Property tax exemptions based on the status of the property do not require affidavits of exemption. For example, affidavits of exemption are not required for growing crops, business inventories, or householder's personal property [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 3(h)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 219*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 134*].

[2] Exemption Procedures

Procedures for claiming exemptions are governed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 251 et seq.* Filing deadlines vary for different exemptions. Many counties have their own required forms for each type of exemption. Counsel should check with the local assessor's office to determine if the county has its own exemption forms. The writ of mandate procedure may be used to compel the county assessor to allow inspection of a claim of exemption filed by another taxpayer and the assessor's ruling thereon [*Gallagher v. Boller (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 482, 492-493, 41 Cal. Rptr. 880]* .

[3] Proving Entitlement to Exemption

The burden is on the taxpayer to prove entitlement to an exemption [*Stewart v. United States (9th Cir. 1939) 106 F.2d 405, 407-408 , rev'd on other grounds, 311 U.S. 60* ; *Sterigenics Internat. v. County of Orange (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1541, 1545, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 319* ; *Smith-Rice Heavy Lifts, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 190, 195, 63 Cal. Rptr. 841]* . Any doubt as to whether an exemption comes within the terms of the exemption is resolved against the right to an exemption [*Sterigenics Internat. v. County of Orange (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1541, 1545, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 319]* . Ambiguities in statutory language, however, are resolved in favor of the taxpayer [*United States v. Merchants Nat'l Trust & Sav. Bank (9th Cir. 1939) 101 F.2d 399]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxExempt PropertyGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxExempt PropertyLimitationsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxExempt PropertyRequirements for Exempt StatusTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.53

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.53 Assessment Procedures

[1] Taxpayer Reporting

Anyone who owns taxable personal property, other than a manufactured home subject to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5800 et seq.*, having an aggregate cost of $100,000 or more for any assessment year must file a property statement showing property and values as of the lien date. Anyone who is not otherwise required to file a property statement must file a statement if requested by the assessor [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 441(a), 448*]. The assessor may also require any person in the county to file an affidavit showing his or her name, place of residence or business, and whether he or she is the owner of any taxable property, or to provide a real property description [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 453, 456*]. With limited exceptions, all information requested by the assessor or furnished in the property statement is confidential [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 408, 451*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 408.3* (availability to public of property characteristics information)]. There are penalties for failure to provide property statements and requested information [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 441(b), 463, 506, 531*]. There are also provisions allowing for amendment of the statement without penalty [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 441 (i), (j)*]. Assessors may also accept the filing of property statements by electronic media, including (but not limited to) computer modem, magnetic media, optical disk and fax machine. In lieu of signature and penalty of perjury declarations otherwise required [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(a), (b)*], property statements filed using electronic media must be authenticated pursuant to methods specified by the assessor and approved by the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(k)*].

[2] Change in Ownership Statements

Buyers or transferees of real property or mobile homes subject to local property taxes must file change in ownership statements under penalty of perjury with the recorder when the transfer document is recorded [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 480*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 480.5* (reporting by owner of tax-exempt property), 480.6 (holder of possessory interest in real property owned by state or local government entity not required to report with respect to renewal of that interest; rather, state or local governmental entity fee owner in which taxable possessory interest created is required to do

reporting), 480.7 (reporting by insurance companies regarding real estate held in separate account established pursuant to *Ins. Code § 10506*)].

There is no penalty for failure to file a change in ownership statement. However, there is a penalty for failure to file the statement within 45 days after a written request to do so by the assessor [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 482(a)*].

[3] Change in Ownership Defined

A change in ownership is any transfer of a present interest, the value of which is substantially equal to the value of the fee. A change in ownership includes the creation of any lease for more than 35 years, including renewal options [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 60, 61(c)*; *see Steinhart v. County of Los Angeles (2010) 47 Cal. 4th 1298, 13201322, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d. 195, 223 P.3d 57* (when grantor trust became irrevocable on grantor's death, and grantor's beneficial interest passed to life tenant and remainder beneficiaries, grantor's original "transfer of bare legal title to [herself] as trustee" did not constitute change in ownership, but post-death transfer of beneficial interest was change in ownership even though trust would continue to hold title during existence of life estate); *Reilly v. City & County of San Francisco (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 480, 498, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 291* (with respect to real property held in trust, change of ownership occurs when one income beneficiary who is not entitled to exclusion from change-in-ownership treatment is succeeded by another such beneficiary); *Leckie v. County of Orange (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 334, 337-339, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 426* (life estate transferred to nonspouse third party constituted change of ownership; conversely, no change of ownership when instrument creating life estate reserves life estate in transferor or transferor's spouse); *Empire Properties v. County of Los Angeles(1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 781, 785-789, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 69* (change of ownership occurred when family trust became irrevocable, not when family revocable trust created; construing *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 60, 61(g)* and *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 462.001, 462.160*); *E. Gottschalk & Co., Inc. v. County of Merced (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1378, 242 Cal. Rptr. 526* (reassessment not prohibited by fact that initial lease term was for only 30 years, excluding renewal options)]. A change in control of a corporation or other legal entity is a change in ownership and must be reported to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 64, 480.1, 480.2*].

When an exclusion to the definition of "change in ownership" applies, failure to file a timely claim for exemption from reassessment when required has been held to bar a claim for a tax refund [*see Empire Properties v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 781, 789-791, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 69* (taxpayer who filed untimely claim for exemption from reassessment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 63.1* based on parent/child exclusion not entitled to exclusion, or to refund of property taxes)].

[4] Assessor Powers and Audits

Assessors have subpoena and audit powers [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 468-470*]. The assessor must annually conduct a significant number of audits of the books and records of taxpayers engaged in a profession, trade, or business who own, claim, possess, or control locally assessable trade fixtures and business tangible personal property in the county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 469(a)*]. Half of the audits must be performed on taxpayers selected from a pool of taxpayers that have the largest assessments of locally assessable trade fixtures and business tangible personal property in the county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 469(b)(1)*]. The other half must be selected in a manner that is fair and equitable to all taxpayers and may be based on evidence of under-reporting as determined by the assessor [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 469(b)(2)*]. The assessor is not required to audit a taxpayer that is fully exempt from property taxation, however [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 469(a)(2)*].

[5] Valuation

[a] Interest Valued

Property generally is appraised at the value of the unencumbered fee simple interest. Thus, easements, leases, and other separate ownership interests in the property are disregarded and interest holders are left to agree privately about the division of property taxes [*City of Desert Hot Springs v. County of Riverside (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 441, 452-454,*

154 Cal. Rptr. 297 ; County of Sacramento v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 *(1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 654, 665-666, 108 Cal. Rptr. 434* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 2188-2188.2, 2188.4, 2821* (application by owner of interest for separate valuation)].

The following types of property are not appraised based on the unencumbered fee simple interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 104(b), 107-107.6, 107.8*; *De Luz Homes, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 546, 563, 290 P.2d 544* ; *City of Desert Hot Springs v. County of Riverside (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 441, 449-452, 154 Cal. Rptr. 297* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 2188.3, 2188.5-2188.10* (valuing interests in condominiums, cooperatives, timeshares, etc.)]:

- Taxable possessory interests of nonexempt parties in lands owned by exempt entities.
- Possessory interests in the extraction of oil, gas, and minerals.
- Prescriptive or appropriative rights to divert water for nonriparian or nonoverlying uses.

[b] Personal Property

The taxable value of personal property, determined annually, is its market value or the price for which the property could be sold on the lien date. The value of property in the course of production or distribution must include trade level adjustments [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 10*; *Xerox Corp. v. County of Orange (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 746, 752-756, 136 Cal. Rptr. 583]* .

Moveable personal property can acquire a tax situs in a state other than the domicile state, and in such cases, the property tax must be fairly apportioned between the two states [*Auerbach v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1415, 1423, 1426, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118* (aircraft established taxable situs in Nevada during relevant tax year, and some tax apportionment between California and Nevada was appropriate; apportionment resulting in aggregate taxes that were based on more than 100 percent of value was not unconstitutional; Los Angeles County assessor's apportionment method was rationally related to opportunities, benefits, and protections conferred on or afforded to taxpayer based on presence of its aircraft in California during tax year)].

[c] Real Property

The taxable value of real property is the lesser of the "factored base year value," the full cash value determined on the lien date, or the valuedetermined under the disaster relief provisions [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 51*; *see § 540.53[5][d]*]. The "base year value" compounded annually by the inflation factor is the "factored base year value" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 51(a)(1)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 110* (defining "full cash value" or "fair market value"), *170, 181-191* (disaster relief provisions)]. The "base year value" is either (1) the fair market value on March 1, 1975, or (2) for property that has been purchased, newly constructed, or subject to a change of ownership after March 1, 1975, the fair market value as of the date of purchase, change in ownership, or completion of construction [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75-75.13, 110.1*; *see Shafer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 423, 426-432, 220 Cal. Rptr. 59* (upholding validity of (1) 1983 amendments to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.10, 75.11* (changing timing of supplemental assessments), and (2) *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.12* (governing assessment of new construction)); *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.10(b)* ("new construction" includes removal of structure from land)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Application for Reassessment and Disaster Relief. A county board of supervisors, by ordinance, may allow a taxpayer to apply for reassessment of property that was damaged or destroyed without the taxpayer's fault. Property is eligible for reassessment, if the damage or destruction was caused by any of the following events:

- A major misfortune or calamity in an area or region subsequently proclaimed by the governor to be in a state of disaster;

- A misfortune or calamity; or

- With respect to a possessory interest in land owned by the state or federal government, a misfortune or calamity that has caused the permit or other right to enter upon the land to be suspended or restricted.

The taxpayer must file the application for reassessment within the time specified in the ordinance, or, if no time is specified, within 12 months after the misfortune or calamity. The taxpayer must deliver a written application to the assessor that is executed under the penalty of perjury and shows the condition and value of the property immediately after the damage or destruction and the dollar amount of damage.

If the assessor determines that within the preceding 12 months a property has suffered damage caused by misfortune or calamity that may qualify the property owner for relief under an adopted ordinance, but no one has filed an application for reassessment of the property, the assessor must provide the last known owner of the property with an application for reassessment. The property owner must file the completed application within 60 days after notification by the assessor, but in no case more than 12 months after the occurrence of the damage. If the property owner does not apply for reassessment after being notified, the assessor may, with the approval of the board of supervisors, reassess the property and notify the last owner of the reassessment [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 170(a)-(l)*].

[d] Transfers of Base Year Value

Transferring property's base year value to replacement property is permitted in two situations [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 69, 69.5*]. First, taxpayers who are eligible for the homeowner's exemption and who are either over the age of 55 or severely and permanently disabled may transfer the base year value of their principal residence to a replacement dwelling. The replacement property must be of equal or lesser value, purchased or newly constructed within two years of the sale or substantial damage or destruction of the original property, and located in the same county as the original property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5(a)(1), (b)*]. If the replacement dwelling purchased in part and newly constructed in part, then for the purpose of determining whether it is of "equal or lesser value" compared with the original property, the date the replacement dwelling "is purchased or newly constructed" is either the date of purchase or the date of completion of construction, whichever is later [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5(g)(5)*]. Therefore, when a replacement dwelling has been newly constructed on land that the taxpayer purchased many years earlier--land that, therefore, has an artificially low base-year value because of Proposition 13--the land and the structure must be valued, as a unit, as of the date of completion of construction [*Wunderlich v. County of Santa Cruz (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 680, 686, 696, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . That valuation does not deprive the taxpayer of the protection of Proposition 13 for the land; the land retains its low base-year value for property tax purposes. However, the taxpayer cannot gain the additional tax relief provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5* if, when the land and the structure are valued together as of the completion of construction, the replacement dwelling's value does not meet the "equal or lesser value" test of the statute [*Wunderlich v. County of Santa Cruz (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 680, 699, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* .

Additionally, replacement dwellings purchased or constructed in a different county may qualify for this transfer of base year value if the county in which the replacement dwelling is located has adopted an ordinance permitting the transfer [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5(a)(1), (2), (b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5(g)(2)* (base year value defined if owner does not rebuild on original property after substantial damage or destruction)].

The second situation in which base year value may be transferred involves the base year value of property substantially damaged or destroyed by a disaster declared by the Governor. In this situation, the property's base year value may be

transferred to comparable replacement property acquired or newly constructed in the same county within five years after the disaster [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69(a)*]. This five-year period applies to any comparable replacement property that is acquired or newly constructed as a replacement for property substantially damaged or destroyed by a disaster occurring on or after July 1, 2003, and to the determination of base year values for the 2003-2004 fiscal year and fiscal years thereafter [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69(d)(3)*; Stats. 2006, ch. 317]. A three-year replacement period applied to any comparable replacement property that was acquired or newly constructed as a replacement for property substantially damaged or destroyed by a disaster occurring on or after October 20, 1991, and to the determination of base year values for the 1991-1992 fiscal year and fiscal years thereafter until the 2003-2004 fiscal year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69(d)(2)*; Stats. 1993, ch. 1053], except that a five-year period applied in the case of the Northridge earthquake [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 69(a)*], which occurred January 17, 1994. The approval of Proposition 171 in 1993 now allows the transfer of base year value of property destroyed in a disaster to replacement property outside the county where the original property was located, under conditions similar to those applying to transfers by taxpayers who are over 55 or disabled [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(e), (f)*, as amended by Proposition 171].

[e] Methods of Valuation

Real property is appraised at its full value, which is its fair market value or its full cash value [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 1(a), art. XIII A, § 2*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 110, 110.1, 110.5, 401*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)* (presumptions regarding purchase price as fair market value); *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1135-1136, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116* (applying *Section 110(b)* presumption that value of improvements financed by special assessment is included in purchase price to place burden on assessor to rebut presumption that purchase price reflects fair market value); *Mola Development Corp. v. Orange County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 309, 311 & n.1, 312, 316-318, 327, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546* (determining assessed valuation for vacant, functionally unimproved contaminated commercial property generating no income on lien date)]. Value depends on the property's highest and best use [*Dressler v. County of Alpine (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 557, 567, 134 Cal. Rptr. 554]* . With few exceptions, such as restricted timberland, wildlife habitat, oil and gas properties, and historical property, no specific methods of ascertaining value are prescribed by law, although the SBE has established regulations governing appraisals [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 401.8, 401.10, 401.13, 423, 423.3, 423.5, 423.7, 423.8, 434.5, 435, 439.2, 439.3*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2-4, 6, 8, 20, 21, 27-29, 41, 51-58*; *see generally* on valuation *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 401.6, 402.1,402.2, 402.5, 402.9, 403*]. The SBE regulations require assessors to consider one or more of the following approaches: the comparative sales approach, the cost approach, and the income approach [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 3(a), (c), (e)*]. Appraisals are invalid only if appraisers use arbitrary methods, abuse their discretion, or fail to follow standards prescribed by law [*Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 14, 23, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154, 544 P.2d 1354* ; *see Exxon Mobil Corporation v. County of Santa Barbara (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 1347, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 751* (county erred in not valuing oil and gas production facilities using special valuation method set forth in *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 468*); *Mitchell v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 497, 503-506, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476* (assessor's failure to abide by *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)* requiring adjustments to comparable sales data made assessor's evidence legally incompetent)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationAssessment Methods & TimingTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.54

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.54 Tax Certificates

[1] Sale of Right to Receive Delinquent Taxes

Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4501 et seq.*, a county may sell tax certificates that entitle the buyer to receive all amounts in respect of a delinquency in connection with secured roll property or property on the supplemental roll [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4505, 4511, 4521*]. The objective is to allow counties the option of selling outstanding secured roll property tax accounts receivable to realize immediate cash to meet the ongoing services required for county government [1995 Stats., ch. 189, § 10]. When the tax collector receives payment of the tax, whether by payment, redemption, or sale, the tax collector in turn pays the holder of the tax certificate [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4524*].

[2] No Effect on Taxpayer's Rights or Liability

Nothing in the law governing Tax Certificates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4501 et seq.*; *see § 540.54[1]*] reduces, changes, affects, or otherwise alters the rights of any property owner or taxpayer that exist in the absence of that law. Under no circumstance may the property owner or taxpayer be required to paymore than would have been owed if the sale of a tax certificate had not occurred [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4513*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionMethods & Timing

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.55

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.55 Temporary Payment Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

Temporary relief from property tax liability is available under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* to a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard called to active duty as a result of the Iraq conflict pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 [Pub. L. No. 107-243] or the Afghanistan conflict pursuant to Presidential Order No. 13239. Such a service member is called a "reservist" in the statutes [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 803*].

In addition to any other benefits provided by law and to the extent permitted by federal law, any member of the U.S. military reserve or the California national guard who is called to active duty after February 9, 2005, as a part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts may defer, while serving on active duty, any payment of property tax or any special assessment of in-lieu property tax imposed on real property that is assessed on residential property owned by the reservist and used as that reservist's primary place of residence on the date the reservist was ordered to active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(a)(6)*; *see Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(b),(d)* (procedure to obtain deferment; deferment period)].

Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq. will not apply to any active duty voluntarily served after the close of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts or to any reservist on active duty as part of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts before January 1, 2006 [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 809*]. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* will apply only to an obligation that was incurred prior to the date a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard was called to active duty as part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 811*].

During the deferment period, the reservist may defer the payment of principal and interest. No penalties may be imposed on the nonpayment of principal or interest during this period. No interest may be charged or accumulated on the principal or interest on which the payment was delayed. No foreclosure or repossession of property on which payment has been deferred may take place during the period [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 804*].

A stay, postponement, or suspension under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq* of the payment of any tax liability of a person in military service may not provide the basis for affecting credit ratings, denial or revocation of credit, or a change by a lender in the terms of an existing credit arrangement [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 805*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Military & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersU.S. National GuardTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

20 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
2. Structure and Administration of Property Tax System

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.56-540.69

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.56[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
3. Taxpayers' Administrative Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.70

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.70 Application to Reduce Assessment

[1] Availability

Taxpayers may apply to the county board of equalization or assessment appeal board for a reduction in assessment value, including both base year value and current taxable value [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 80, 1603*; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 16, , Rev. & Tax. Code § 1620* (assessment appeals boards)].

The application to reduce an assessment satisfies the due process requirement that a tax statute must provide an opportunity for the taxpayer to be heard before the tax becomes final [*see Nickey v. Mississippi (1934) 292 U.S. 393, 396, 54 S. Ct. 743* ; *Midstate Theatres, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 208, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894]* .

A decline in the value of real property after the purchase may lead to a successful application [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 51* (taxable value as lesser of base year value factored for inflation or fair market value on lien date)].

The county board of equalization, or, if provided by ordinance, the assessment appeals board, must also hear applications for reduction of assessment if the issue is whether a change in ownership has occurred or whether the property is newly constructed within the meaning of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 70-74.6*. The availability ofthis administrative procedure does not alter, modify, or eliminate the right of a taxpayer to a trial de novo in the superior court with regard to the legal issue of whether or not the property has undergone a change of ownership or been newly constructed so as to require reassessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.5*].

If an audit of the books and records of any profession, trade, or business pursuant to *Rev. & Tax Code § 469* [*see § 540.53[4]*] discloses property subject to an escaped assessment for any year, then the original assessment of all property of the assessee at the location of the profession, trade, or business for that year is subject to review, equalization, and

adjustment by the county board of equalization or assessment appeals board [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605(e)*; *e.g., County of Los Angeles v. Raytheon Co. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 27, 36-38, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 788* (escape assessment directed to property of long-term lessee of real property allows lessee or its successor in interest to reopen prior assessments not only with respect to its own property but also as to leased property)]. The right to administrative review exists when an audit discloses underassessments that are offset against overassessments, so that no escape assessment is actually levied (i.e., enrolled) [*Heavenly Valley v. El Dorado County Bd. of Equalization (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1323, 1342, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 591]* .

[2] Time for Filing

[a] Statutory Period

Applications for reduction of an assessment must be filed during the period from July 2 to September 15, inclusive. An application mailed and postmarked by September 15 is considered timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)(1)*]. If September 15 falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, an application mailed and postmarked on the next business day is deemed to have been timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)(4)*]. If the county's offices are closed for business on September 15 before 5 p.m., or for that entire day, that day is considered a legal holiday for purposes of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)(4)*]. In addition, the filing period is extended to November 30 if the county assessor does not provide, by August 1, the required statutory notice [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 619*] to all assessees of real property on the local secured roll of the assessed value of their real property on the completed local roll. That assessed value must include the annual increases in assessed value caused solely by Constitutionally permitted inflation increases [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)(3)*].

There may be situations, however, when the periods specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)* are not controlling [*see, e.g., Metropolitan Culinary Services, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 935, 940-942, 944-948, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859* (when county incorrectly computed base year value for 1992-1993 resulting in overtaxation for 1992-1993 and all subsequent years and corrected method of calculation effective for 1995-1996 assessment, but not as to 1992-1993 or 1993-1994 assessments, and taxpayer filed applications for reductions of 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 assessments and s for both of those years, limitation periods of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 51.5(b)* and *80* rather than that of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603* applied)].

The period during which assessment protests will be accepted and the place where they may be filed must be disclosed to the taxpayer on the assessment notice [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 619*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.31(d)* (supplemental assessments); *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 621* (when alternative published lists of assessments in newspapers authorized), *1601(c)* (publication in newspaper)]. An application is timely filed if the taxpayer does not receive the notice of assessment described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 619* at least 15 calendar days before the deadline for filing the application for reduction, and the taxpayer files the application within the earlier of either 60 days after receiving the notice of assessment or 60 days after the tax bill was mailed. An application filed during this extended period must be accompanied by an affidavit declaring under penalty of perjury that the the taxpayer did not receive the notice of assessment at least 15 calendar days before the deadline for filing the application for reduction [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(b)(2)*].

On the recommendation of the assessor and the clerk of the county board of equalization, the board of supervisors may adopt a resolution providing that an application may be filed within 60 days of the mailing of the notice of the assessor's response to a request for reassessment pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 51(a)(2)*, if all of the following conditions are met [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(d)(1)-(6)*]:

- The request for reassessment was submitted in writing to the assessor in the form prescribed by the SBE and includes all the information that is prescribed by the SBE.

- The request for reassessment was made on or before the immediately preceding March 15.

- The assessor's response to the request for reassessment was mailed on or after September 1 of the calendar year in which the request for reassessment was made.

- The assessor did not reduce the assessment in question in the full amount as requested.

- The application for changed assessment is filed on or before December 31 of the year in which the request for reassessment was filed.

- The application for reduction in assessment is accompanied by a copy of the assessor's response to the request for reassessment.

[b] Supplemental Assessments

Supplemental assessments are designed to allow for adjustment of taxes resulting from changes in assessed value due to changes in ownership and completion of new construction at the time they occur [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75, 75.11*].

Generally, a taxpayer must file an appeal of a supplemental assessment (that is, an application for reduction) within 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the notice of assessment, or the postmark date of the notice, whichever is later. However, in the case of Los Angeles County or a county in which the board of supervisors has adopted the provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605(c)* (under which a board of supervisors may by resolution require that an application under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(a)* befiled with the clerk no later than 60 days after the date of mailing printed on the tax bill, or the postmark date of the tax bill, whichever is later), taxpayers must file an appeal of the supplemental assessment within 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the tax bill, or the postmark date of the bill, whichever is later [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.31(c)(2)*]. In either case, for purposes of equalization proceedings, the supplemental assessment is considered an assessment made outside the regular assessmentperiod as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.31(c)(1), (2)*].

If the taxpayer does not receive notice in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.31* at least 15 days before the deadline to file the application described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603*, the taxpayer, or his or her agent,may file an application within 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the tax bill, or the postmark date of the bill, whichever is later along with an affidavit declaring under penalty of perjury that the notice was not timely received [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.31(c)(3)(A)*].

[c] Escape Assessments

Escape assessments apply to property that escaped assessment altogether or was undervalued and captures the taxes that were lost and, depending on the reason for the escape, potential penalties and interest [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 531*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 51.5, 501 et seq.*].

For escape assessments made under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 501 et seq.*, or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 531 et seq.*, an application for reduction must be filed with the clerk no later than 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the notice of assessment, or the postmark of the notice, whichever is later. However, for counties in which the board of supervisors has adopted a resolution in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605(c)*, and Los Angeles County [*see Gov. Code §§ 28020, 28022*], such an application must be filed within 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the tax bill or the postmark of the tax bill, whichever is later [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605(b)*].

If the taxpayer does not receive notice of assessment described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 534* at least 15 days before the deadline to file the application described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603*, the taxpayer, or his or her agent, may file the

application within 60 days of the date of mailing printed on the tax bill or the postmark date of the tax bill, whichever is later, along with an affidavit declaring under penalty of perjury that the notice was not timely received [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605(b)*].

[d] Stipulation to Assessment Error

A taxpayer may file an application for reduction of an assessment within 12 months after the month in which the taxpayer is notified of the assessment, if the taxpayer or his or her agent and the assessor stipulate that there is an error in the assessment as a result of the exercise of the assessor's judgment in determining the full cash value of the property. In addition, a written stipulation in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1607* regarding the full cash value and the assessed value must be filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.31(c)(3)(B)* (supplemental assessment), *1603(c)* (assessment), *1605(b)* (escape assessment); *see § 540.70[11][b]*].

[3] Application Procedure

[a] Forms and Verification

A taxpayer must submit an application for reduction of an assessment in the form prescribed by the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(a)*; *see Rev.& Tax. Code § 1605(b)* (supplemental and escape assessments); *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(g)* (clerk of county board of equalization may accept electronically filed application for changed assessment containing electronic signature)]. The county must provide the application form free of charge [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(c)*]. The application must be made by the taxpayer or by his or her agent [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(a)*] and signed under penalty of perjury [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(f)* (required statutory language for signature block); *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(b)*].

Although the terms "taxpayer" or "agent" are used in this text, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(a)* refers to the party affected or agent making the application. Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(f)*, the person signing the application certifies or declares that he or she is either (1) owner of property or a person affected (that is, a person having direct economic interest in the payment of taxes on that property)--"The Applicant"; (2) an agent authorized by applicant; or (3) a retained and authorized California attorney [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(f)*; *see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(a)* (application is filed by person affected or person's agent, or relative mentioned in *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 317*, *i.e.*, taxpayer's spouse, child, or parent); *see also 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 301(g)* (defining person affected or party affected), *317* (persons who can appear on applicant's behalf at hearing); for requirements when an agent makes the application, *see* discussion *§ 540.70[3][b]*].

If a duplicate application for reduction in assessment is filed with the county board, the clerk may accept only the first application for reduction filed by or on behalf of the taxpayer, and may reject any duplicate application for reduction [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603.5(a)*]. For this purpose, "duplicate application for reduction" means an application for reduction filed by an applicant, or the applicant's attorney or agent on his or her behalf, subsequent to an application for reduction previously filed by or on behalf of the same applicant, that seeks the same relief with respect to the same property for the same year in issue. A subsequent application for reduction that seeks to amend a previously filed application for reduction is not considered a duplicate application for reduction for this purpose [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603.5*].

[b] Agent Authorization

When the application is made by an agent, other than an authorized attorney licensed to practice law in California who has been retained and authorized by the taxpayer to file the application, written authorization to so act must be filed with the application. An agent is deemed to have been duly authorized by the taxpayer to file an application if the taxpayer's written authorization is on the application or attached to each application at the time it is filed with the board [*18 Cal. CodeReg. § 305(a)(1)* (also specifying required content of authorization)].

If the taxpayer is a corporation, limited partnership, or limited liability company, the agent authorization must be signed by an officer or authorized employee of the business entity [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(a)(3)*; *see also 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(b)(1)* (person signing application for corporate taxpayer states under penalty of perjury, among other things, that person is officer of corporation, or employee of corporation who has been designated in writing by board of directors or corporate officers to represent corporation on property tax matters)].

If a photocopy of the original authorization is attached to the application, the agent must be prepared to submit an original signed authorization if requested by the board. The application form must show that the agent's authorization was attached to the application [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(a)(2)*].

An agent must have authorization to file an application at the time the application is filed. Retroactive authorizations are not permitted [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(a)(2)*].

None of following persons may represent an applicant for compensation on any application for equalization filed pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603*, in the county in which the person serves or is employed: any current member or alternate member of the assessment appeals board; any current assessment hearing officer; any current employee of the office of the clerk of the county board of equalization or assessment appeals board; any current employee of the county counsel who advises the assessment appeals board or represents the assessor before the assessment appeals board; any current employee of the assessor's office, if representing the applicant would be a conflict of interest under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1365* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1612.5*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1624.3, 1636.2* (same, for current or alternate member of assessment appeals board or current assessment hearing officer)].

[c] Request for Findings

The application for a reduction in assessment must contain a notice that written findings of fact established in the hearing on the application are available on written request at the requester's expense. The application form must provide an appropriate place for the taxpayer to request findings [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603(e)*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(c)(2)*]. A taxpayer requesting findings must pay, before conclusion of the hearing, any reasonable fee or deposit required by the county to cover the expenses of preparing the findings [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611.5*]. A taxpayer waives the right to obtain findings if the taxpayer does not request written findings either on the application or in a separate written request made before the hearing begins [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1603(e), 1611.5*].

[d] Information Required of Applicant

A taxpayer applying for a reduction in assessment must provide all of the following information [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(c)(1)(A)-(G)*]:

- The taxpayer's name and address.
- The name and address of the taxpayer's agent, if any.
- If the taxpayer is represented by an agent, both the taxpayer's actual mailing address and the agent's mailing address.
- The taxpayer's written authorization for an agent, if any, to act on the taxpayer's behalf.
- A description of the property involved that is sufficient to identify it on the assessment roll.
- The taxpayer's opinion of the property's value on the valuation date of the assessment year in issue.

- The roll value on which the assessment of the property is based.

- The facts the taxpayer relies on, other than merely the amount of the tax or the amount of the assessed value increase, to support the claim that the board should change the assessed value, base year value, or classification of the property.

An application that does not contain all the required information is invalid and cannot be accepted by the board. The clerk must promptly notify the taxpayer and, if applicable, the taxpayer's agent, that the application is invalid, and the taxpayer or taxpayer's agent must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct any errors or omissions [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(c)(4)*]. The taxpayer, or the taxpayer's agent, may not amend the application after the filing deadline if the effect of the amendment is to request relief additional to or different in nature from the relief originally requested [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(e)(2)(B)*; *see Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 124, 129-132, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31* (validity of *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(e)* upheld); *see also 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305(e)(2)* (when application can be amended after filing period has expired; procedure)]. An application is adequate if the board can determine from the application the nature of the claim, for the purpose of investigating the claim prior to the hearing [*Midstate Theatres, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 209, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894* ; *see Metropolitan Culinary Services, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 935, 944-945, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859* (notice sufficient); *cf. Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 124, 129-132, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31* (applications that only stated challenges to escape assessments of personal property and fixtures inadequate to challenge to underlying real property assessments)].

The value of the property established for purposes of determining the amount of documentary transfer tax due will not be binding on the determination of the value of that property for property tax purposes by the county assessor, by an assessment appeals board, or by a court of law reviewing property tax values established by an assessment appeals board--whether the amount of documentary transfer tax is determined by an administrative appeal process or established by a court [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 11935(b)*].

[e] Application as Claim for Refund

A taxpayer who applies for a reduction of an assessment may elect to have the application for reduction treated as a claim for refund. The taxpayer makes the election simply by stating in the application that it is intended to be a claim forrefund. Making such an election means that the taxpayer does not have to file a later claim for refund. A taxpayer that does not make the election will have to file a timely claim for refund as a prerequisite to bringing a suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(b)*]. Counsel should exercise caution, however, in making this election and relying solely on the application for reduction, because no recovery in ajudicial action is allowed for a ground not stated in the claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(a)*; *see § 540.90[5]*].

If the taxpayer makes the election, the claim for refund is deemed denied, and the six-month limitations period for filing a suit for refund begins running, on the later of either (1) the date the final installment of the assessment becomes delinquent or (2) the date the board of equalization makes its final determination on the taxpayer's application for reduction [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(c)*; *see § 540.90[9]*].

[4] Prehearing Discovery

[a] Availability of Records and Market Data

Prehearing discovery for an application for reduction of an assessment is limited. The assessment rolls, records of transfers and certain market data may be all that a taxpayer can obtain [*see § 540.70[5]*]. The taxpayer cannot obtain a subpoena to take depositions, and the board of equalization does not consider depositions for any purposes. However, if

the assessor proposes to introduce evidence to support a higher assessed value than was placed on the roll, he or she must inform the taxpayer of the higher assessed value and the supporting evidence at least 10 days before the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1609.4*].

The local assessment roll or a copy of the roll is available for review during regular business hours [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1602*]. Records of all transfers in the county during the preceding two years are available for inspection for a modest fee (lesser of actual costs or $10) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 408.1*]. The assessor must provide any market data in his or her possession to the taxpayer and permit the taxpayer or the taxpayer's representative to inspect at the assessor's office any information and records relating to the appraisal and assessment of the taxpayer's property. For this purpose, "market data" means any information in the assessor's possession, whether or not required to be kept or prepared by the assessor, relating to the sale of any property, if the assessor has based the assessment, in whole or in part, on that sale [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 408(d), (e)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 408.3* (availability of information on property characteristics)].

[5] Exchange of Information

[a] Availability

Because prehearing discovery is so limited, counsel should, if the taxpayer's property qualifies, request an exchange of information [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 408, 1606, 1609.4*; *see Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 92, 95-98, 77 Cal. Rptr. 832* (denying request to order taking of depositions)]. Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606*,any taxpayer may initiate an exchange of information regardless of the amount of the assessment. An assessor can also request an exchange of information, however, only if the value of the property at issue as shown on the current assessment roll, without regard to exemptions, is more than $100,000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606(a)*; *see State Bd. of Equalization v. Ceniceros (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 122, 127, 130, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539]* . A request for exchange of information may be made at any time up to 30 days before the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606(a)*].

There may also be local rules governing exchange of information [*see, e.g.*, Riverside County's Rule 10, concerning requests for the production of information directed by the assessor to the taxpayer and vice versa, which although conflicting with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606* was upheld in *State Bd. of Equalization v. Ceniceros (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 122, 130, 133, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539* , as not being preempted by state law, because counties are expressly authorized to adopt rules governing assessment appeal hearings and Rule 10 is consistent with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 441*].

[b] Information That Must Be Exchanged

The party who requests an exchange of information under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606* must submit the following information to the other party in writing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606(a)*]:

- The basis of the requesting party's opinion of the property's value.

- If the opinion of value is to be supported by evidence of comparable sales, information identifying the property sold with sufficient certainty (for example, by an assessor's parcel number, street address, or legal description), the approximate date of the sale, the applicable zoning, the price paid, and the terms of the sale, if known.

- If the opinion of value is to be supported by evidence based on an income study, information relating to income, expenses, and the capitalization method.

- If the opinion of value is to be supported by evidence of replacement costs, information relating to the date of construction, type of construction, replacement cost of construction, obsolescence, allowance for extraordinary use of machinery and equipment, and depreciation allowances.

If the requesting party supplies the above information within the specified time,the other party must provide the requesting party with similar information pertaining to the other party's opinion of value. The other party must provide this information within 15 days before the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606(b)*].

For discussion of local rules governing exchange of information, see *§ 540.70[5]*.

[c] Effect of Exchange of Information

If an exchange of information has occurred under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606*, neither party may introduce evidence in the hearing on matters not exchanged without the consent of the other party. A party may introduce new material at the hearing relating to information obtained from the other party, but doing so entitles the other party to a continuance [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1606*; *see Bank of America v. County of Fresno (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 295, 307, 179 Cal. Rptr. 497]* .

[6] Prehearing Conference

A county board of supervisors may establish prehearing conferences. If the board does so, it must also adopt rules of procedure for the conferences. A prehearing conference may be set by the clerk at the request of a taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent, the assessor, or at the direction of the appeals board [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305.2(a)*].

The purpose of a prehearing conference is to resolve issues such as, but not limited to [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305.2(a)*]:

- Clarifying and defining the issues.
- Determining the status of exchange of information requests.
- Stipulating to matters on which agreement has been reached.
- Combining applications into a single hearing.
- Bifurcating the hearing issues.
- Scheduling a date for a hearing officer or the board to consider evidence on the merits of the application.

The clerk of the board must set the matter for a prehearing conference and notify the taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent and the assessor of the time and date of the conference. Notice of the time, date, and place of the conference must be given not less than 30 days before the conference, unless the assessor and the taxpayer stipulate orally or in writing to a shorter notice period [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305.2(b)*].

[7] Notice of Hearing

The clerk of the county board of equalization must give the taxpayer, or the taxpayer's designated representative, notice of the time, date and place of the hearing not less than 45 days prior to the hearing, unless the assessor and the taxpayer, or the taxpayer's designated representative, stipulate orally or in writing to a shorter notice period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.6*].

If for any reason the hearing on the application is vacated, the board must give the taxpayer, or the taxpayer's designated representative, notice of the new time, date and place of the hearing not less than 10 days prior to the new hearing date, unless the assessor and the taxpayer, or thetaxpayer's designated representative, stipulate orally or in writing to a shorter

notice period, or the application has been heard by a hearing officer in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1636-1641.2* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.6*; *see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 307* (specifying circumstances in which shorter notice may be given); *but see Aerospace Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1300, 1311, 267 Cal. Rptr. 685* (agency has no discretion to promulgate regulation inconsistent with statute; regulation that alters or amends statute or enlarges or impairs its scope is void); *Purdue Frederick Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1021, 1028, 267 Cal. Rptr. 482* (regulation promulgated to implement statute cannot change statute contrary to Legislature's intent)].

A notice of hearing also must warn the taxpayer that the finding of assessed value at the hearing may result in a higher value being assessed to the property than the value being contested [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 307*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 1610.8*].

At the option of the county board of equalization, the *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.6* notice may be electronically transmitted, if requested in writing by the taxpayer, to an electronic address designated by the taxpayer. The clerk may also opt to electronically transmit the *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.6* notice to the assessor, if requested by the assessor, to an electronic address designated by the assessor [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.6*].

[8] Board's Failure to Grant Timely Hearing

[a] Taxpayer's Reduced Value Becomes Assessed Value

If the board fails to hear evidence and make a final determination on an application for reduction within two years after its timely filing, the taxpayer's opinion of value set forth in the application becomes the property's assessed value [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)*; *see United Enterprises, LTD v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 152, 164-165, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 279* (taxpayer's opinion of value became assessed value due to county's failure to act on application for reduction within two years pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604*)]. This two year period may be extended either by mutual agreement of the parties in writing, or on the record, to the extension of the time for the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)(1)*], or by consolidation for hearing of the taxpayer'sapplication with another application by the same taxpayer with respect to which an extension of time for the hearing has been granted pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)(1)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)(2)*]. However, an application cannot be consolidated without the taxpayer's written consent after the two-year period has expired or after a previously agreed upon extension has expired [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)(2)*]. Moreover, when the parties mutually attempt to extend the two year period, there may be circumstances that estop a taxpayer from claiming the benefit of the two year rule [*see, e.g., Stocker Resources, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 391, 393, 397-400, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28* (taxpayer estopped from claiming benefit of two year rule due to intentionally misleading manner in which taxpayer's attorney modified board's standardized waiver form)].

The two-year period is extended by 90 days if, within 90 days of its expiration, a taxpayer or his or her agent objects to an assessment appeals board member pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1624.4* or applies for a hearing officer's recommendation to be heard before the county board pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1641.1* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1641.2*].

The two-year period is also extended if the assessor is granted a continuance at an assessment appeals board hearing on the basis that the taxpayer introduced information at the hearing that the taxpayer had failed to provide to the assessor when the assessor requested it under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(d)*. The extension is for a period equal to the continuance [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(h)*].

The two-year period also is extended if the taxpayer is granted a continuance at an assessment appeals board hearing on the basis that the assessor introduced information at the hearing that the assessor had failed to provide to the taxpayer when the taxpayer requested it under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 408(d)* or *(e)*. The extension is for a period equal to the

continuance [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 408(f)(3)*].

The taxpayer's opinion of value does not need to be adopted when the board has held a hearing and made a final decision on jurisdictional grounds. Thus, the requirements of a hearing and determination are met even if the board makes an erroneous determination that it lacks jurisdiction to hear the merits of the administrative appeal, such that no hearing on the merits is held within the two-year period [*Heavenly Valley v. El Dorado County Bd. of Equalization (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1344-1347, 1342, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 591]* .

The board remains empowered to decide the application after expiration of the two-year period (as extended) [*cf. Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(d)(1)*, discussed in *§ 540.70[8][b]*]. The two-year period is not a "limitation period" (except in the sense of limiting the board's power to impose a different valuation than the applicant's until the board decides the application for reduction). Expiration of the period does not prevent the board from acting on an application; rather, it operates as a milestone to encourage completion of the process. Accordingly, if reinstatement of a procedurally terminated application is necessary in order for the board to make a determination on the merits, the board may reinstate the application after expiration of the two-year period [*Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 40, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658]* . Nevertheless, the taxpayer could be subject to an estoppel rule, as in *Stocker Resources* [*Stocker Resources, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 391, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 28]* , cited *above* [*Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658* ("As in *Stocker*, these facts manifest a 'wrongful misleading silence' by [the taxpayer] with respect to its failure to satisfy the board's conditions for reinstatement, as well as ignorance by the board of that refusal, justifying recognition of an estoppel to claim the benefits" of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)*].

The reduction in assessment does not apply if the the taxpayer has failed to provide full and complete information or if litigation relating to the issues in the application is pending. The reduction in value does not take effect until two years after the close of the filing period during which the application was made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)*].

[b] Change in Value Once Board Makes Final Determination

The applicant's opinion of value is to be placed on the assessment roll when the county board fails to act on the application within two years [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(d)*].

- If the application requests a reduction of the base-year value for real property, then the applicant's opinion of value remains on the roll until the county board makes a final determination on the application. No increased or escape taxes may be levied for the tax years during which the county board has failed to act, except those required by a purchase, a change in ownership, new construction, or application of the inflation factor to the taxpayer's opinion of value [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(d)(1)*].

- If the application is based on anything else, then the applicant's opinion of value is placed on the assessment roll for the tax year or years covered by the application [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(d)(2)*]. (Therefore, a new application would have to be filed respecting any subsequent tax year.)

[9] Burden of Proof

The assessor is presumed to have properly performed his or her duties and assessed all property on a fair and equal basis. Therefore, the burden of proof generally is on the taxpayer to prove that the property has been incorrectly assessed [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 321(a)*; *American Airlines, Inc. v. County of San Mateo (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 1110, 1127, 1135, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251, 912 P.2d 1198* ; *Fujitsu Microelectronics, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1126, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465* ; *Bank of America v. County of Fresno (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 295, 312, 179 Cal. Rptr. 497* ; *Griffith v. County of Los Angeles (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 837, 842, 73 Cal. Rptr. 773* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 1610.8*].

The presumption does not apply, and the assessor therefore bears the burden of supporting the assessment, if the application involves an owner-occupied single-family dwelling and the taxpayer has supplied all the information required in the application for reduction [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 167*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 321(d)*; *Mitchell v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 497, 500, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)* (presumptions regarding purchase price as fair market value); *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1135-1136, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116* (applying *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)* presumption that value of improvements financed by special assessment is included in purchase price, placing burden on assessor to rebut presumption that purchase price reflects fair market value); *see also 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 321(e)* (in hearing involving change of ownership, except as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110*, purchase price is rebuttably presumed to be full cash value; party seeking to rebut presumption bears burden of proof)].

The assessor also bears the burden of establishing the basis for imposition of any penalty assessment [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 321(a)*].

[10] Valuation

County assessors generally are required to participate in equalization hearings challenging any individual assessment. At an equalization hearing, the board is bound by the same principles of valuation that are legally applicable to the assessor [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 18, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715]* . Moreover, the county board of equalization, rather than the courts, are the proper tribunal for exercising judgment on valuation questions concerning individual assessments on the local roll [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 23, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* ; for discussion of when the court will remand to board of equalization, see *§ 540.90[11][b]*)].

A taxpayer seeking a reduction of the assessed value of real property cannot limit the equalization board's inquiry and decision to just one of the two components--land value and improvements value--making up the full value for assessment purposes [*see 18 Cal. Code Regs. § 324(b)* (board's authority to determine full value of property is not limited by applicant's request for relief)]. Since the board's legal duty is to equalize the assessment of real property on the local roll by determining the full value of each parcel [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1610.8*], including both land and improvements [*18 Cal. Code Regs. § 324(a)*], a taxpayer cannot complain when that is what the board does, regardless of whether the taxpayer wished to limit consideration to the value of the land only or the value of improvements only [*Schoenberg v. County of Los Angeles Assessment Appeals Bd. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1347, 1353-1354, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 86]* .

[11] Necessity for Appearance at Hearing

[a] Exception for Stipulations

The taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent must appear at the hearing and answer under oath all questions pertinent to the inquiry unless the taxpayer and assessor have stipulated to the value of the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1607*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 317* (also specifying who may appear at hearing on taxpayer's behalf and procedure)]. Generally, no reduction of an assessment may be granted without such an appearance by the taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1607*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 316*]. This rule has been held not to impair any right of the taxpayer [*Williamson v. Payne (1938) 25 Cal. App. 2d 497, 503-505, 77 P.2d 900]* .

[b] Requirements for and Effect of Stipulation

A stipulation as to the value of the property in question, which may allow a reduction of assessment without the personal appearance of the taxpayeror the taxpayer's agent, must be signed by the assessor and the county legal officer on behalf of the county and by the taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent. It must stipulate as to the full cash value and the

assessed value of the property and set forth facts on which the reduction in value is premised.

At the hearing, the board may accept the stipulation, waive the appearance of the taxpayer or the taxpayer's agent, and change the assessed value, or it may reject the stipulation and reschedule the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1607, 1610.8*].

[c] Waiver of Appearance

If the board has previously considered the issues raised by the application and the taxpayer so requests, the board may waive the taxpayer's appearance. In this situation, the board must give the taxpayer written notice of its decision promptly after its decision is made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1608*].

[12] Hearing Before Assessment Hearing Officer

A taxpayer may request a hearing before a hearing officer if the application for reduction involves property that either (1) has a total assessed value of less than $500,000; or (2) is a single-family dwelling, condominium, cooperative, or multiple-family dwelling of four units or less, regardless of value [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1637*]. A taxpayer may be represented in the hearing by an attorney. The assessor may be represented by an attorney only if the taxpayer is represented [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1638*]. Other procedural and evidentiary rules are the same as those in a hearing before the board [*see § 540.70[13]*], except that hearings before an assessment officer are conducted in an informal manner [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1637, 1638*]. Whether the hearing officer's recommendation must be accepted by the board or whether the assessor may file a protest requesting a new hearing by the board is a matter of county option [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1640.1, 1641.1, 1641.5*; *but see 64 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 690 (1981)* (opinion that *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1641* requiring adoption of hearing officer's recommendation is inconsistent with *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 16*)].

[13] Hearing Before County Board of Equalization

[a] Record of Proceedings

Equalization hearings before a county board of equalization generally are open to the public, although the board may deliberate in private. Taxpayers who fear the exposure of trade secrets may seek to have the portion of the hearing relating to those matters closed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.4*]. The board must make a record of the hearing. It must provide a transcript or an audio recording of the hearing to any party, at the party's expense, if requested within 60 days after the board's final determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611*]. If the county does not regularly employ a public stenographer, the taxpayer may request one at his or her own expense [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 312(c)*].

[b] Evidence and Witnesses

Equalization hearings are not required to be conducted in accordance with the technical rules of evidence [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1609*]. The taxpayer may request the board to issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnessess and production of evidence at the hearing [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 322*]. Records and information in the assessor's office relating to other taxpayers may not be compelled to be produced except on court order [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 408(e)(3)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 408.3* (availability of property characteristics information)]. Either the taxpayer or the assessor can subpoena an employee of the SBE to appear, but must pay $200 for each day the employee's attendance is required [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1609.5(b)*]. If the taxpayer subpoenaed the employee and the taxpayer prevails, the board may reimburse the taxpayer for this witness fee [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1609.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency

AdjudicationPrehearing ActivityGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
3. Taxpayers' Administrative Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.71

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.71 Claim for Refund

[1] Final Administrative Remedy

After a taxpayer has exhausted the assessment appeals process [*see § 540.70*], generally the only action available to the taxpayer is payment of the taxes and filing a claim for refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096-5099*]. No injunction, writ of mandate, or other legal or equitable process is available to prevent or enjoin collection of property taxes by local authorities [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4807*]. Federal injunctive relief is seldom available [*28 U.S.C. § 1341*; *see § 540.91[6]*].

The process of obtaining a refund is distinct from the process of seeking a reduced assessment by filing an application for equalization. However, an application for a reduction in an assessment filed pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603* serves as a claim for refund under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097* if the taxpayer stated in the application that the application is intended to constitute a claim for refund [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 34, 34 n.20, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* (for discussion of electing to have an application for reduction treated as a claim for refund, see *§ 540.70[3][e]*)]. The timely filing of a proper claim for refund is a statutory prerequisite to a refund action [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 34, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* (for discussion of the period for filing refund claim generally, see *§ 540.71[6]*)].

[2] Prerequisites to Filing Claim

A taxpayer may file a claim for refund against a board of supervisors after payment of a contested assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096*]. However, a taxpayer need not have filed an application for reduction of assessment if an assessor's audit discloses that an assessment is erroneously high and there is no proposed escape assessment against which the excess tax can be offset. In this situation, the assessor must notify the taxpayer of the amount of the excess and that the taxpayer may file a claim for cancellation or refund with the county under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096* or *5096.7*, and the claim for refund can be paid without further valuation proceedings [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 533(b)*; *Focus Cable of Oakland, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 519, 526-528, 219 Cal. Rptr. 95]* .

[3] Grounds for Refund by Board of Supervisors

The grounds for a refund by a board of supervisors of taxes paid before or after delinquency are limited to the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096*]:

- Taxes were paid more than once.
- Taxes were erroneously or illegally collected.
- Taxes were illegally assessed or levied.
- Taxes were incorrect because of clerical error by the assessor or incorrect information about the property supplied by the taxpayer.
- Taxes were paid on assessed improvements that did not exist on the lien date.
- Taxes were paid on assessments in excess of the property's equalized value as determined by the county board of equalization.
- Taxes were paid on assessments of trade fixtures and tangible business personal property in excess of the value of the property as determined in certain audits.

County tax collectors or auditors may grant refunds based on grounds not listed above [*see § 540.71[5]*].

A suit for refund of taxes is limited to the grounds stated in the claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(a)*; *see § 540.90[5]*]. Therefore, any refund claim should state every possible ground of recovery to preserve the availability of those grounds should the taxpayer later decide to initiate a refund suit. The current statutory refund procedure does not specifically provide for retroactive amendment of a refund claim to include new grounds that the taxpayer wishes to allege in a refund suit, but judicial interpretation of prior refund procedures indicates that a refund claim may be amended [*see Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Butte (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 461, 476-477, 112 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . Therefore, the practitioner should consider attempting to amend the initial claim if new grounds are discovered.

[4] Content and Filing of Claim

A refund claim must be in writing, must specify whether all or only part of the assessment is being contested, must state the grounds of the claim, and must be verified by the taxpayer or by the taxpayer's guardian, conservator, executor, or administrator [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5097.02*; *see Prob. Code § 1490*; *see also* discussion *§ 540.71[3]*]. The claim must be filed with the board of supervisors. Several counties provide their own refund claim forms that must be used. Otherwise, *see § 540.510* for a sample refund claim form.

[5] Refunds by Tax Collector or County Auditor

The refund claim requirements discussed in *§ 540.71[3]* apply to claims filed with a board of supervisors. In addition, a tax collector or county auditor may make a refund in limited circumstances. The tax collector or the auditor may refund any taxes paid either before or after delinquency within four years after the date of payment in any of the following cases [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097.2*]:

- The taxes were paid more than once.
- The amount paid exceeds the amount due on the property as shown on the roll.

- The amount paid exceeds the amount due as a result of corrections to the roll or cancellations after the taxes were paid.

- The claim for refund (made under penalty of perjury) is for less than $10.

- The amount paid exceeds the amount due as a result of a reduction attributable to a hearing before an assessment appeals board or an assessment appeals officer.

Several counties provide their own refund claim forms that must be used. Otherwise, see *§ 540.511* for a sample refund claim form.

[6] Statute of Limitations Applicable to Refund Claim

A trial court has no authority to order a refund of tax payments for which a claim was not timely filed [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 34-36, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* ; *accord, JPMorgan Chase Bank v. City & County of San Francisco (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1201, 1213-1214, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 906* (state court may not apply judicial doctrine of equitable tolling so as to extend limitation period specified in statute respecting state tax-refund procedures)].

When an application for a reduction in an assessment or for equalization of an assessment has been duly filed [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603*; § 540.70] in which the applicant does not state that the application is intended to constitute a claim for a refund, the applicant may file a separate claim for refund, which is timely if filed within whichever of the following time periods is applicable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(b)*]:

- If the board of supervisors makes a final determination on the application, and mails a written notice of its determination to the applicant, in which the board advises the applicant to file a claim for refund within six months after the date of the board's final determination, then the claim must be filed within that period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(3)(B)*]. If the notice does not advise the applicant to file a claim for refund, then the claim must be filed within one year after the date of the board's final determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(3)(A)(i)*].

- If the board of supervisors fails to hear evidence and fails to make a final determination on the application, then the claim must be filed not later than one year after expiration of the two-year period starting when the application was filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(3)(A)(ii)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 1604(c)* (reference period of two years)].

When the applicant does state, in the duly filed application, that the application for a reduction in an assessment or for equalization of an assessment is intended to constitute a claim for a refund, the claim is timely if the application is filed within the last-ending of the following periods [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(2), (b)*; *see Hanjin Int'l Corp. v. Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Auth. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1109, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 373* (four-year limitation period of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(2)* applied to special benefits assessments)]:

- Four years after making the payment sought to be refunded;

- One year after the tax collector's mailing of a notice of overpayment [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 2635*];

- The period specified by the applicant and the assessor in an agreement to extend the limitation period regarding an escape assessment [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 532.1*]; or

- 60 days after the date of a notice by the auditor that a correction in the assessment roll will result in a reduction of an assessment that would entitle the assessee to a refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4836(a)*].

If the applicable period is the four-year period after making the payment sought to be refunded, and the taxpayer paid the tax in installments, the determinative date is the date of payment of the last installment. If a court is unable to ascertain the actual date of payment from the record, it is assumed to be the date the unpaid taxes become delinquent, rather than the date the taxes are due [*McDougall v. County of Marin (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 65, 69-70, 25 Cal. Rptr. 107*].

If a retroactive constitutional amendment provides an exemption from tax that did not exist when taxes were collected, a taxpayer must file a claim for refund based on the constitutional amendment within four years after the date the amendment becomes effective [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096.5*].

For a discussion of the statute of limitations applicable to refund claims relating to assessments whose validity was determined by an assessor's declaratory relief judgment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 538*, see *§ 540.91[5]*.

[7] Denial of Refund Claim

If the board of supervisors denies a claim for refund, the taxpayer may file a suit for refund within six months after the denial [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(a)*]. The taxpayer may treat a claim for refund as denied if the board does not act on the claim within six months after the claim is filed, but the taxpayer is not required to do so. The statute of limitations for filing a suit for refund does not begin to run if the board does not act on the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(b)*; *see § 540.90[9]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

23 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
3. Taxpayers' Administrative Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.72-540.89

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.72[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
4. Judicial Remedies Available to Taxpayers and Purchasers

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.90

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.90 Suits for Refund of Taxes

[1] Available Remedy

Generally, the only judicial remedy available to recover property taxes after a refund claim has been denied is a suit for refund of taxes [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*]. Other remedies may be available if unusual circumstances exist [*see § 540.426[10]*]. For a sample complaint for a suit for refund of property taxes, *see § 540.512*.

[2] Who May Bring Suit

Only the "person who paid the tax" (or, if that person was an individual, his or her guardian or conservator, the executor of his or her will, or the administrator of his or her estate) may sue for a refund. "No other person may bring such an action; but if another should do so, judgment shall not be rendered for the plaintiff" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*]. Thus, if the tax (or penalty) in question was paid for the benefit of the "taxpayer" by someone other than the taxpayer, then that other person, who actually paid the tax, has standing to sue for a refund, and the taxpayer (even though being a real party in interest) has no standing to sue for a refund [*IBM Personal Pension Plan v. City & County of San Francisco (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1304, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 656]* . For example, when the trustee of a corporate pension plan actually paid tax, the plan itself had no standing to sue for refund; only trustee had standing [*IBM Personal Pension Plan v. City & County of San Francisco (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1304, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 656]* .

However, in some instances, a class action may be appropriate [*Thomas v. City of East Palo Alto (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1095, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 185* (action could be maintained as class action when individual taxpayers who were parties to action had filed separate administrative claims for tax refunds with city, all making the same legal claim against the city; distinguishing *Woosley v. State of California (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 788-789, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758* and *Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 960-965, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266* , which precluded proceeding by way of class action when not every member of the proposed class had filed a separate administrative refund claim); *see State of California Ex Rel Dept. of Motor Vehicles v. Superior Court (1998) 66 Cal.*

App. 4th 421, 432-433, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 88 (implementing *Woosley*; *Woosley* recognized validity of class actions to seek refunds of sales and use taxes; *Neecke* did not address requirements of class actions on behalf of taxpayers who filed individual claims)].

[3] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[a] Prerequisite to Suit

A taxpayer must have exhausted administrative remedies before seeking judicial relief [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987-988, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. Quinn (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 507, 509-510, 6 Cal. Rptr. 545, 354 P.2d 1 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 29-33, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* ; *C. H. B. Foods, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 821, 823-826, 241 Cal. Rptr. 18]* .

A taxpayer has exhausted administrative remedies if the taxpayer has filed both an application for reduction of assessment [*but see § 540.90[3][c]*] and a claim for refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code§ 5142(a), (b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 5148* (different procedures for state-assessed property); *cf. CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1079-1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652* (policies underlying exhaustion requirement were fully satisfied even though one of taxpayers was not a formal applicant to proceeding before assessment appeals board; to conclude under facts that taxpayer failed to exhaust administrative remedies would exalt form over substance and require court to ignore reality of what happened before assessment appeals board)].

A taxpayer has the burden of establishing that he or she has exhausted administrative remedies [*Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 32, 37, 116 Cal. Rptr. 742]* . For discussion of the procedures for filing an application for reduction or a claim for refund, see § None.

[b] Application for Reduction of Assessment Required

If the valuation of property is at issue, the taxpayer must have sought a reduction of the contested assessment from the county board of equalization before filing suit [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 619, 1601(c), 1603(b)*; *Stenocord Corp. v. San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ;*see § 540.70*]. This prerequisite to suit applies even if the taxpayer challenges the assessment as "arbitrary" or void on constitutional grounds [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 988, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. Quinn (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 507, 511, 6 Cal. Rptr. 545, 354 P.2d 1 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *but see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(b)* (stipulation as satisfying application requirement for exhaustion of administrative remedies if valuation is not at issue)]. It also applies even if it is obvious from the circumstances that the taxpayer will lose before the board of equalization. Thus, reduction must be sought if the assessment ratio is discriminatory and an appeal to the board is certain to be fruitless because of its decisions in prior cases [*Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 32, 39-40, 116 Cal. Rptr. 742* ; *Virtue Bros. v. County of Los Angeles (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 220, 230-231, 48 Cal. Rptr. 505 , cert. denied, 385 U.S. 820]* .

[c] Application for Reduction in Assessment Not Required

[i] Valuation Issues Not Involved

Although a taxpayer usually must seek a reduction in any contested assessment as part of exhausting administrative remedies prior to filing suit [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *see § 540.90*], this rule does not necessarily apply to a suit involving nonvaluation issues. In this situation, counsel should consider an application for reduction

combined with a stipulation with the assessor to avoid the necessity of going through the entire application and hearing process. The taxpayer and assessor must stipulate that the application involves only nonvaluation issues, indicate the assessment values based on the taxpayer's and assessor's respective opinions, and submit the stipulation to the board. If board accepts the stipulation, then the taxpayer is deemed to have exhausted administrative remedies with respect to the application for reduction. However, the taxpayer must still file a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(b)*].

[ii] Assessment a Nullity as Matter of Law

A taxpayer does not need to seek a reduction in assessment before bringing a suit for a refund if the taxpayer claims that the assessment in issue is a nullity as a matter of law. An assessment is null as a matter of law, and a request for reduction in assessment is excused, in any of the following situations:

- The property is tax exempt (county boards do not have jurisdiction to grant or deny exemptions or to consider allegations that claims for exemption were improperly denied) [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 302(b)*; *Exchange Bank v. County of Sonoma (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 608, 610, 131 Cal. Rptr. 216* ; *Japan Food Corp. v. County of Sacramento (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 891, 895-897, 130 Cal. Rptr. 392* (no factual issue existed with respect to valuation in both cases)].

- The property is nonexistent [*Associated Oil Co. v. County of Orange (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 5, 9-11, 40 P.2d 887* (erroneous assessment did not relate to overvaluation of property actually owned, but to property that did not exist); *but see El Tejon Cattle Co. v. County of San Diego (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 449, 456, 60 Cal. Rptr. 586* (appeal to county board of equalization required if question existed as to extent of personal property that had been assessed)].

- The property is located outside the jurisdiction [*Parrott & Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 332, 336-337, 280 P.2d 881* ; *see Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966] , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* .

- The taxpayer does not own the property on which the tax is levied [*Parr-Richmond Industrial Corp. v. Boyd (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 157, 165, 272 P.2d 16]* .

- The statute under which the tax is levied is unconstitutional [*Star Kist Foods, Inc. v. Quinn (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 507, 511, 6 Cal. Rptr. 545, 354 P.2d 1* ; *cf. Security-First Nat. Bk. v. County of L.A. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 319, 321, 217 P.2d 946 , cert. denied, 340 U.S. 891* (reduction application is required when property misclassified and tax on property as misclassified was claimed to be unconstitutionally discriminatory)].

- The taxpayer is contesting inherent deficiencies in assessment procedures for which administrative remedies are not provided by statute; this exception usually arises if taxpayers in a class action seek a writ of mandamus requiring an assessor to increase or correct the assessments of other property owners, and judicial relief may be granted without first requesting a review of assessments by the board of equalization [*TRIM, Inc. v. County of Monterey (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 539, 544-545, 150 Cal. Rptr. 351* (class action); *Knoff v. City and County of San Francisco (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 184, 199, 81 Cal. Rptr. 683* (taxpayer suit)].

- The assessor has nullified the original assessment by arriving at a new assessed value in the course of an audit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 533(a)*; *Focus Cable of Oakland, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 519, 526-528, 219 Cal. Rptr. 95]* .

However, even if one of the above situations applies, a taxpayer still must file a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(b)*; *see § 540.453[2]*]. Moreover, although an application for reduction of assessment is not required in the above situations, counsel should consider having the taxpayer file the application nevertheless. The distinction between a question of law, which is reviewable by a court without exhaustion of administrative remedies, and a question of fact orvaluation, which requires exhaustion, is unclear in some cases. Exhausting administrative remedies by applying for a reduction of assessment prevents dismissal of the suit if the court finds that a question of valuation is indeed involved.

[4] Payment of Taxes

[a] Prerequisite to Suit

In addition to exhausting administrative remedies [*see § 540.90[3]*], a taxpayer must pay contested property taxes in full before initiating a suit for refund [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *Sherman v. Quinn (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 661, 665, 192 P.2d 17* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096, 5140*]. Except in the case of a redemption plan [*see § 540.90[4][b]*], payment of only one installment does not meet this requirement [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5140, 5145*; *Faix, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1000-1003, 127 Cal. Rptr. 182]* . Although no cases interpret this issue under the current refund action statute, cases interpreting prior law hold that delinquent payment of taxes is not a bar to a refund suit, provided payment is in full [*McHugh v. County of Santa Cruz (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 533, 542-543, 109 Cal. Rptr. 149]* .

If contesting only a portion of the assessment, the taxpayer still should make timely payment of any uncontested portion. Even if the taxpayer receives a favorable judgment regarding the contested portion of an assessment, the taxpayer is liable for penalties and interest for delinquent payment of any portion of the assessment not found to be void [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5144*].

[b] Exception for Installment Redemption Plans

An owner of property who has entered into an installment redemption plan pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4216 et seq.* to pay delinquent taxes may begin a refund suit without paying all taxes due, if a claim for the first installment paid under the plan of redemption is rejected [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(a)*] and if all of the following requirements are met:

- The taxpayer files suit within six months after the date the claim for the paid installment is rejected [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(a)*].

- The taxpayer keeps the installment redemption plan current [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(b)*].

- The taxpayer makes the first installment payment of the delinquent taxes under the plan within six months after the date of delinquency [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(a)(1)*].

- The taxpayer files a bond or other security (including pledged property) with the county tax collector if the unpaid tax liability remaining after the first installment payment, including interest and penalties to the date of filing, exceeds two-thirds of the full value of the property on which the taxes are a lien, as of the last equalized assessment roll. Alternatively, the taxpayer may pledge other property with the county tax collector as security; the value of the bond or security must equal the excess unpaid tax liability [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(a)(2)*].

If the owner does not recover the disputed taxes in the suit, the taxpayer must pay additional interest to the city or county equal to the difference between the amount of interest paid under the installment plan and the amount of interest that would have been earned by the city or county in the impound account on the entire amount of taxes determined to be due had the taxes been paid on the regular delinquency dates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 26906.1*

(providing for impound of taxes subject to claim or suit for refund)].

[c] Exception for First Installment Paid Under Installment Plan for Payment of Escape Assessment

With regard to installment plans initiated by written requests filed with the tax collector, notwithstanding that all taxes on a property have not been paid in full, the property owner may bring an action in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140* at any time within six months after the rejection of a claim for the refund of the first installment that is paid under an installment plan for payment of escape assessments that is entered pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4837.5* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145.5(a), (d)(2)*]. The right to maintain such an action, however, terminates if the assessee defaults with respect to any obligation in the installment plan for payment of the escape assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145.5(b)*]. Moreover, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145.5* does not apply in cases where the penalty pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 503* has been added to the escape assessment and upheld by the appeals board or the county board of equalization [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145.5(d)(1)*].

If the owner does not recover the amount of taxes in dispute in the suit, the owner must pay additional interest to the county or city in an amount equal to the difference between the amount of interest he or she has paid under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 506* and the amount of interest that the county or city would have earned in the impound account in connection with the entire amount of tax determined by the court to be due if that amount has been paid prior to delinquency [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145.5(c)*].

[5] Claim for Refund as Limiting Issues

A taxpayer's claim for refund limits the issues that may be considered in the refund suit. Recovery is limited to the grounds specified in the refund claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5140, 5142(a)*; *see Mission Housing Development Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 522, 527* ; *see also Metropolitan Culinary Services, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 935, 946, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859* (claims for refunds with attached exhibits were detailed enough to put county on notice of ground); *cf. Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 124, 129-132, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31* (applications for tax reductions that only stated challenges to escape assessments of personal property and fixtures held not to include challenges to underlying real property assessment)]. The defendant in the refund suit can be expected to assert that the plaintiff's complaint alleges a ground not specified in the filed claim for refund. In that event, the court should liberally construe the claim for refund, and should find the complaint sufficient when it alleges a ground that is logically implied by the statements in the claim for refund, even if that ground is not explicitly stated in the claim for refund [*Korean Air Lines Co., Ltd. v. Countyof Los Angeles (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 552, 557 n.3, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 26*].

If the claim for refund relates only to a portion of the assessment, the suit may be based only on that portion [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5143*; *see Mission Housing Development Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 522, 527, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 8* (reading *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5142* and *5143* together, taxpayer who files refund action can recover no more than amount taxpayer sought in underlying claim)]. If the claim and suit contest only a portion of the assessment, the taxpayer must pay the uncontested portion of the assessment before delinquency to avoid penalty and interest [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5144*; [4][a], *above*]. For discussion of the trial court's lack of authority to order a refund for tax payments when a claim was not timely filed, see *§ 540.90[6]*.

[6] Jurisdiction and Priority

A refund suit must be commenced in the superior court (but not in the small claims division) of the county in which the property is located [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*]. A refund suit is entitled to scheduling priority in the civil action docket [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5148*].

In a tax refund action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141 et seq.*, the filing of a timely claim for refund is a precondition to

the court's exercise of jurisdiction. Thus, a trial court has no authority to order a refund for taxpayments for which a claim was not timely filed [*Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 34-36, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715]* .

[7] Defendants

The proper defendant in a suit for refund is the county or the city that levied the taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*]. If a county collected the taxes in question for a city, the action must be brought against the county for recovery of those taxes. After the county receives the summons and complaint, it must notify the city within 30 days. The taxpayer must pay the county a fee to cover the county's cost of notifying the city. This fee is not recoverable by the taxpayer, and no judgment entered in favor of a taxpayer may provide for recovery of this fee. The city has the option of intervening in the action. Whether or not the city intervenes, any judgment for the taxpayer is rendered exclusively against the county. The county can recover from the city or other tax entity the amount of any city or other refunds required by the judgment. The county may also postpone payment of the judgment and interest on it until the next apportionment of property tax revenue following the date of the judgment. Interest accrues during this deferral period unless the county and the taxpayer agree otherwise [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5146* ("county" includes a city and county)].

The SBE is the appropriate defendant in suits for refunds of taxes on state-assessed property, property that has been found ineligible for the welfare exemption, and on certain property owned by local California government entities outside their boundaries [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5146*; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 11*].

[8] Service of Summons Within One Year

A summons must be served and returned within one year after the filing of a suit for refund to avoid dismissal, either on the court's own motion or on the motion of a defendant. Dismissal may be avoided by the filing of a written stipulation extending time. Dismissal may also be avoided if the county either (1) performs an act constituting a general appearance or answers within the one-year period, or (2) after the one-year period, answers and participates in discovery without raising the objection [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5147*; *Southern Pac. Transportation Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 438, 441-444, 221 Cal. Rptr. 12* (rejecting reasoning of *Ford Motor, below*); *Synanon Foundation, Inc. v. County of Marin (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 607, 614-615, 184 Cal. Rptr. 129* ; *but see Ford Motor Co. v. County of Tulare (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 688, 692-694, 193 Cal. Rptr. 511* (dismissal proper for failure to return summons though service had been made and answer filed within one year)].

Rev. & Tax. Code § 5147, the statute requiring service of summons within one year to avoid dismissal, does not violate equal protection or due process, does not deprive a taxpayer of his or her day in court, and does bear a reasonable relationship to a legitimate state interest, namely, requiring persons seeking refunds to proceed expeditiously [*Emberton v. County of San Diego (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 268, 270-272, 230 Cal. Rptr. 572]* .

[9] Statute of Limitations Applicable to Refund Suit

The statute of limitations for filing a suit for refund, other than one brought under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5148* (state-assessed property), is six months from the date the refund claim is denied in whole or in part [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(a)*]. A taxpayer may treat a claim as denied if the board of supervisors fails to act on the claim within six months after the date the claim is filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(b)*]. There is no statutory limit on the time within which a taxpayer may initiate suit if the board of supervisors has not acted on a claim for refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141*].

If a taxpayer's application for reduction of assessment is also a claim for refund [*see § 540.70[3][e]*], the claim for refund is deemed denied on later of either (1) the date the final installment of the assessment becomes delinquent (April 10 for secured roll) or (2) the date on which the board of equalization makes its final determination on the application [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 2705, 5141(c)*].

[10] Scope of Judicial Review

[a] Presumption of Correctness

In reviewing a property tax assessment, the court must presume the assessor properly performed his or her duty and that, consequently, the assessment was both regularly and correctly made. Thus, the taxpayer has the burden of proving the property was improperly assessed [*Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1046, 1051, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433* ; for further discussion of presumption and burden of proof, see *§ 540.70[9]*].

The scope of judicial review in a suit for refund varies, depending on whether the challenge is to the result reached by a county board of equalization after applying a sound valuation method or to the validity of the valuation method itself.

[b] Substantial Evidence Rule Applies to Application of Sound Valuation Method

In a taxpayer's suit for refund, if the challenge is merely one of incorrect application of a sound valuation method, a court may overturn the board's decision only if no substantial evidence supports it [*Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 14, 23, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154, 544 P.2d 1354* ; *Fujitsu Microelectronics, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1126, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465* (valuation supported by substantial evidence); *Hunt-Wesson Foods, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 163, 168-169, 177, 116 Cal. Rptr. 160* (reversing trial court for using improper standard); *see Madonna v. County of San Luis Obispo (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 61, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916* (valuation not supported by substantial evidence)].

A trial court's review in such a case is restricted to the record presented to the board, and the court cannot independently weigh evidence of valuation [*Bank of America v. Mundo (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 1, 5, 229 P.2d 345* ; *Pacific Grove-Asilomar Operating Corp. v. County of Monterey (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 675, 681, 117 Cal. Rptr. 874* ; *see also Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 852, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766]* . The taxpayer has no right to a trial de novo in the superior court to resolve conflicting issues of fact concerning the taxable value of the property [*Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1047, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433]* .

[c] Soundness of Valuation Method as Question of Law

If a taxpayer's suit for refund does not merely challenge the correctness of the board's application of a sound method of validation [*see § 540.90[10][b]*] but instead challenges the soundness of the method of valuation itself, the suit presents a question of law. In this situation, a court may review the board's decision for arbitrariness, abuse of discretion, or failure to follow standards prescribed by law. [*Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 14, 23, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154, 544 P.2d 1354* ; *Exxon Mobil Corporation v. County of Santa Barbara (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 1347, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 751* (using *de novo* standard of review, appellate court affirmed superior court's finding that the county erred in not valuing oil and gas production facilities using special valuation method set forth in *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 468*); *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1134, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116* (if underlying valuation methodology is challenged, issue is one of law subject to de novo review both by superior court and on appeal); *Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1046-1047, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433* ; *Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 852, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766]* . In this case, the trial court may take evidence on the validity of the valuation method [*Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 852, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766]* .

[d] Ambiguities in Applying Substantial Evidence Rule

The distinction between an inappropriate application of a sound method of valuation (in which case a reviewing court is limited by the substantial evidence rule) and an illegal method of valuation (in which case a reviewingcourt may freely admit new evidence) is unclear. In addition, this issue may not be clarified in a particular case until the appellate court renders its decision [*see Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142,*

1143-1148, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869 ; *see also American Sheds, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 384, 392, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58* (characterization of issue presents subtle if not semantic question)]. Therefore, although both types of challenges may be combined in a suit for refund, counsel should be prepared to make a complete record before the board of equalization and consider that hearing the final forum.

[e] Board Procedural Deficiencies

Taxpayers may challenge procedural deficiencies in a board's action in a reviewing court on constitutional grounds, and the reviewing court is not restricted by the substantial evidence rule. The following procedural deficiencies may invalidate a board of equalization determination:

- Hearings by less than a majority of the board [*Universal Consol. Oil Co. v. Byram (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 353, 360-364, 153 P.2d 746]* ;

- Taking of evidence outside the presence of the taxpayer [*Bandini Estate Co. v. Los Angeles (1938) 28 Cal. App. 2d 224, 231, 82 P.2d 185 , disapproved on other grounds in Universal Consol. Oil Co. v. Byram (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 353, 363, 153 P.2d 746]* ; or

- Refusal to admit relevant evidence [*Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Butte (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 461, 475-476, 112 Cal. Rptr. 327]* .

[11] Judgment by Court

[a] Relief Granted

The relief granted by a reviewing court in a refund suit depends on the proceedings and findings of fact. If the court finds an assessment void in whole or in part, it may render a judgment for the taxpayer for the amount of taxes paid on the portion of the assessment that is void. If the taxes recovered, and any interest, penalties, or costs thereon, were paid after delinquency, the portion of penalties, interests, or costs allocable to the recovered taxes is also recoverable. Any portion of the assessment not found void, if paid after delinquency, still carries penalties, interests, and costs [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5144, 5149.5*].

[b] Remand to Board of Equalization

If the court finds an assessment void in whole or in part, no remand of the case to the board of equalization is necessary because no question of valuation remains to be decided. A reviewing court also need not remand a case if uncontradicted evidence at the board hearing establishes any of the following: (1) the valuation of the property, (2) the taxpayer does notown the property, (3) the property does not exist, or (4) the assessment is due to a mathematical error, evident from the board's transcript, that can easily be recalculated [*Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 14, 26-27, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154, 544 P.2d 1354* ; *Parr-Richmond IndustrialCorp. v. Boyd (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 157, 165, 272 P.2d 16* ; *see CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1088-1089, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652* (remand unnecessary when recalculation did not involve factual questions, but essentially just subtracting improper portion and adjusting resulting figures)].

Remand to the county board of equalization for rehearing is the proper relief if the board has used an invalid method of valuing property, procedural due process has been denied, or there is an unresolved issue of property valuation [*Simms v. County of Los Angeles (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 303, 318, 217 P.2d 936* ; *Universal Cons. Oil Co. v. Byram (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 353, 363-364, 153 P.2d 746* ; *Norby Lumber Co. v. County of Madera (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1352, 1366-1367, 249 Cal. Rptr. 646* ; *see CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1088, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652* (remand generally required if refund determination depends on exercise of valuation functions and does not simply involve mathematical computations; remand unnecessary under facts of case); *Mitchell v. County of Los*

Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 497, 503-506, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476 (remand required when comparable sales evidence on which assessor relied was held to be legally incompetent)]. The reviewing court may retain jurisdiction to render an appropriate judgment in conformity with the board of equalization's ruling [*Simms v. County of Los Angeles (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 303, 318, 217 P.2d 936]* .

[c] Interest

A taxpayer is entitled to interest of nine percent per year on taxes ordered refunded, and the accured interest is included in the judgment. Interest accrues from the later of either (1) the date the claim for refund is filed or (2) the date the taxes or the installments in question are paid, to the date judgment is entered [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5150*]. If the taxpayer recovers penalties in a refund suit, interest is paid at the same rate for refunded taxes from the date the refund claim is filed to the date judgment is entered [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5150.5*]. Only simple interest, not compounded interest, is recoverable [*Lilli Ann Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 162, 198-199, 138 Cal. Rptr. 759]* .

[d] Attorney's Fees

[i] Arbitrary and Capricious Action by Board of Equalization

In addition to other relief granted, a taxpayer who prevails in a refund suit may collect attorney's fees up to $7,500 under the statutory provision granting costs in civil actions resulting from administrative proceedings.This relief is available only if (1) it is shown that the board of equalization's decision was the result of arbitrary and capricious action or conduct and (2) the taxpayer is personally obligated to pay the attorney's fees [*see Gov. Code § 800(a)*].

Whether action is arbitrary and capricious depends on the facts in each case [*see American President Lines, Ltd. v. Zolin (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 910, 934, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (decision under *Gov. Code § 800* essentially one of fact within trial court's sound discretion); *Reeves v. City of Burbank (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 770, 776, 156 Cal. Rptr. 667* (arbitrary and capricious finding essentially one of fact)]. The board's action is arbitrary and capricious if, for example, the board's assessment is unsubstantiated by any evidence in the transcript, or the board's procedures in handling applications for reduction in assessment are constitutionally deficient [*Midstate Theatres Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 211-212, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894* ; *Madonna v. County of San Luis Obispo (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 61, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916]* . If the board fails to make findings on request or if findings made are found by a reviewing court to be so deficient that remand to the board is ordered to secure reasonable compliance with the elements of findings required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611.5*, the board's action will be deemed arbitrary and capricious so as to support an award of attorney's fees against the county for the services necessary to obtain proper findings [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611.6*]. If attorney's fees are allowed under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611.6*, the dollar limitation of Rev. & Tax. Code § 800 will not apply [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 1611.6*].

An award of attorney's fees must be requested in the prayer of the complaint and supported by appropriate allegations of arbitrary and capricious action.

[ii] Assessor's Failure to Seek Declaratory Relief in Lieu of Making Assessment

Reasonable attorney's fees may also be awarded in a successful recovery suit if the court finds all of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 538, 5152*; *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1157-1159, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869* ("void" in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* as having ordinary meaning of invalid, erroneous); *see § 540.91[5]*]:

- The assessment or a portion of it is void;
- The assessment or a portion of it was made in violation of a specific provision of the California

constitution, of a Revenue and Taxation Code provision pertaining to property taxation, or of a rule or regulation of the board; and

- The assessor should have sought a declaratory judgment in lieu of making the assessment.

If attorney's fees could be awarded under both *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* and *Gov. Code § 800*, the award should be made under *Rev. & Tax. Code§ 5152* in accordance with the rule that when two statutes govern a particular subject, application of the specific one over the general one is favored [*Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1160-1161, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial Review

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
4. Judicial Remedies Available to Taxpayers and Purchasers

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.91

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.91 Other Judicial Remedies to Contest Assessments

[1] Limited Availability

Only in very limited circumstances are judicial remedies other than a refund suit available to taxpayers seeking to contest property valuation or assessment and collection of property taxes. Injunctions, writs of mandate, or other legal or equitable processes generally are not available to prevent or enjoin collection of property taxes by local authorities [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4807*], because the availability of a suit for refund after payment of contested taxes is deemed to be a speedy and adequate remedy at law [*Star-Kist Foods Inc. v. Quinn (1960) 54 Cal. 2d507, 512, 6 Cal. Rptr. 545, 354 P.2d 1 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *Security-First Nat. Bk. v. Bd. of Supervisors (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 323, 327, 217 P.2d 948* ; *Mystery Mesa Mission Christian Church, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 37, 39-40, 133 Cal. Rptr. 565]* . The general prohibition against equitable process to restrain collection of taxes also extends to state-assessed property [*Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 277, 281-283, 165 Cal. Rptr. 122, 611 P.2d 463* ; *see Western Oil & Gas Ass'n v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 44 Cal. 3d 208, 242 Cal. Rptr. 334, 745 P.2d 1360* (judicial intervention granting prepayment relief limited to those situations in which it is clear that under no circumstances can government prevail)].

[2] Writ of Mandate

Mandate is available only if the taxpayer has no adequate remedy at law, such as improper application of assessment procedures by the officials involved [*Bunker v. County of Orange (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 542, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825* (suit seeking order to direct county to comply with property tax collection statutes and adopt valuations set forth in applications for reduction of assessment, and to send notices required by statutes); *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Roseville (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 637, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91* ; *TRIM, Inc. v. County of Monterey (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 539, 545-546, 150 Cal. Rptr. 351* (class action to require all properties in jurisdiction to be assessed at fair market value); *Midstate Theatres Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 213, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894*

(proceeding to require board of equalization to accept and set for hearing proper amended application for reduction of assessment); *Knoff v. City and County of San Francisco (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 184, 195-197, 81 Cal. Rptr. 683* (taxpayer suit to require cessation of fraudulent assessment practices)]. Mandate may also be sought to challenge the continued imposition of a tax that has not been properly approved by the voters [*Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn v. City of La Habra (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 809, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 369, 23 P.3d 601]* .

Mandate is the appropriate remedy to compel disclosure by the assessor of nonconfidential records such as another taxpayer's claim of exemption and the assessor's ruling thereon [*Gov. Code §§ 6250-6259*; *Gallagher v. Boller (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 482, 494, 41 Cal. Rptr. 880]* . For discussion and forms relating to writs of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

If a local board refuses to provide a fact-finding hearing when the taxpayer duly requests one and is entitled to one, or if a local board conducts a flawed fact-finding hearing (for instance, relevant evidence is improperly excluded or cannot with reasonable diligence be produced), the appropriate judicial remedy is a proceeding for administrative mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see, e.g., Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bds. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 29, 37, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 658]* . For discussion of that proceeding, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

[3] Writ of Certiorari

A writ of certiorari or review is available to contest the decision of a board of equalization only if the board has exceeded its jurisdiction, there is no appeal, and the taxpayer has no speedy and adequate remedy at law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1068(a)*]. It extends only to acts in excess of jurisdiction and to procedural deficiencies such as fraud, not to errors in exercising valid jurisdiction. Therefore, claims of incorrect valuation are not reviewable by a writ of certiorari unless they assert jurisdictional defects [*McClelland v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 124, 129-130, 180 P.2d 676* ; *Delucia v. County of Merced (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 620, 622-623, 65 Cal. Rptr. 177* ; *Rickard v. Council of Santa Barbara (1920) 49 Cal. App. 58, 62, 192 P. 726]* . If no such defects are asserted, the existence of a refund suit with recovery of interest provides an adequate remedy at law, thereby precluding issuance of the writ [*Jillson v. Board of Supervisors (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 192, 194-195, 34 Cal. Rptr. 419* ; *see Birch v. Board of Supervisors (1923) 191 Cal. 235, 235, 215 P. 903]* . For discussion and forms relating to writs of certiorari, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

[4] Injunction

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 526a* provides an injunctive remedy for taxpayers seeking to prevent illegal expenditure of tax funds, the availability of a refund suit, the specific statutory prohibition of injunction to challenge the tax collection process, and strong public policy against enjoining tax collection prevent the use of this type of injunction to restrain purportedlyillegal tax collection [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 4807, 5140*; *Daar v. Alvord (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 480, 485-486, 161 Cal. Rptr. 658* ; *see California v. Grace Brethren Church (1982) 457 U.S. 393, 411-416 n. 10, 102 S. Ct. 2498, 73 L. Ed. 2d 93, 108-111* (review of California provisions)].

[5] Declaratory Relief

Although declaratory relief generally is unavailable to contest property tax assessments and collections, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4808* allows a taxpayer to seek a declaration that locally assessed or collected property taxes are illegal or unconstitutional [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 4808*; *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Roseville (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 637, 647-650, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91* (Proposition 218 applied to city's in-lieu franchise fee for water, sewer, and refuse collection; fee violated Proposition 218 because revenue from fee was placed in city's general fund, rather than being used only for purpose for which it was imposed, and because there was no evidence that fee reasonably represented cost of providing services); *Faix, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1004, 127*

Cal. Rptr. 182 ; *Montgomery Ward & Co. v. Welch (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 127, 131-134, 61 P.2d 790]* . The taxpayer must bring the action within 30 days after the delinquency date of a property tax bill or installment, in the superior court in the county in which the property is located. Relief is limited to a declaration that the taxes in question are unconstitutional or invalid. The judgment is obtained through the same procedure as that used to obtain a writ of mandate. Payment of taxes cannot be postponed while the suit is pending [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4808*; *see Oneto v. City of Fresno (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 460, 186 Cal. Rptr. 299]* . A declaratory relief action is given precedence on the court's calendar [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5149*].

In addition, an assessor is required to seek declaratory relief if the assessor believes a tax provision is invalid or will result in denial of an exemption to five or more taxpayers. Potential taxpayers and other assessors are allowed to intervene to the greatest extent practicable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 538(a)*; *see Shafer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 423, 426, 220 Cal. Rptr. 59* (procedure employed by 51 assessors to determine validity of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.10-75.12*)]. If the validity of an assessment is upheld, a taxpayer assessed pursuant to this provision may file a claim for refund within 60 days after notice of the assessment, regardless of the time limit otherwise provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097* for refund claims [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 538(c)*; *see § 540.71[6]*].

[6] Federal Relief

[a] When Available

Although the Tax Injunction Act (*28 U.S.C. § 1341*) requires federal courts generally to abstain from exercising equitable jurisdiction in statetax matters, federal court jurisdiction may be invoked in a refund suit for property taxes. Jurisdiction may be based on diversity of citizenship or on the existence of a federal question [*28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332*; *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Mendocino (N.D. Cal. 1972) 340 F. Supp. 1061, 1064-1065 , aff'd sub nom. International Paper Co. v. County of Siskiyou (9th Cir. 1974) 515 F.2d 285* ; *see Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Mendocino (1973) 357 F. Supp. 380* (supplemental decision)]. The federal court looks to California law to decide issues presented and considers how the California Supreme Court would determine the issues [*Commissioner v. Bosch (1967) 387 U.S. 456, 464, 87 S. Ct. 1776, 18 L. Ed. 2d 886* ; *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Mendocino (N.D. Cal. 1972) 340 F. Supp. 1061, 1066 , aff'd sub nom. International Paper Co. v. County of Siskiyou (9th Cir. 1974) 515 F.2d 285]* .

A federal court may also address constitutional issues, and may prohibit state taxation of property owned by the United States or its instrumentalities [McCulloch v. Maryland (1819) 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 425-438, 4 L. Ed. 579 ; *United States v. Boyd (1964) 378 U.S. 39, 44, 84 S. Ct. 1518, 12 L. Ed. 2d 713]* .

[b] Equitable Relief

Equitable relief under federal law is rarely available to contest property tax collections and assessments. The Federal Tax Injunction Act (*28 U.S.C. § 1341*)and the principle of comity bar federal courts from granting injunctive and declaratory relief in state property tax cases. Generally, the principle of comity also bars damages relief under the Civil Rights Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1983*) in claims of allegedly unconstitutional administration of state tax systems. The availability of relief in state courts also precludes federal equitable relief [*Fair Assessment in Real Estate Ass'n v. McNary (1981) 454 U.S. 100, 102 S. Ct. 177, 70 L. Ed. 2d 271]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesDeclaratory JudgmentsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesInjunctive ReliefAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction ActCivil ProcedureU.S. Supreme Court ReviewState Court DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local

TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
4. Judicial Remedies Available to Taxpayers and Purchasers

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.92

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.92 Suits to Quiet Title

[1] Default and Sale of Property for Unpaid Tax

Default and sale of property is one method to collect unpaid property taxes. "Tax-defaulted property" [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 126(a), (b), 3371-3375*] that has been in default for five years is subject to a power of sale for nonpayment of taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 126(c), 3691-3731.1*]. The property may be redeemed until the close of business on the last day prior to the date the sale begins. Redemption requires payment of all taxes, penalties and costs due [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3707(a)(1), 4101, 4102*; *see also Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 39, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* (owners right to redeem terminates at close of business on last business day before sale set)]. The right of redemption revives if the property is not sold [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3707(d)*].

[2] Who May or Should Bring Quiet Title Action

A person redeeming tax-defaulted property, or anyone claiming through the redemptioner, may maintain a quiet title action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4113*]. In addition, an owner may bring an action to quiet title against the lien of taxes, if the taxes have been cancelled [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 4990.3*]. Because the process of collecting unpaid property either by sale or redemption clouds the title of the property, owners of property that has gone through this process, either as purchasers or redeemers, may need to file suit to quiet title [*see § 540.92[3]*]. Purchasers of tax-defaulted property have the additional option of a suit to determine adverse claims *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950 et seq.*; *see also § 540.92[5]*].

[3] General Quiet Title Action by Owner

[a] Actions and Time Limits

An original owner's remedy for an alleged invalidity or irregularity in the default and sale of property for unpaid taxes may be a quiet title action under the general provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.* or an action to set aside a

deed [*see Johnson v. Alma Investment Co. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 155, 120 Cal. Rptr. 503* (quiet title); *Banas v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 845, 848, 852, 184 Cal. Rptr. 262* (cancellation of deed)].

Any action based on an alleged invalidity of a deed issued to a taxing agency because of delinquent property taxes or assessments must be brought within one year after the date of execution of the deed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 175*; *see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 54, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* . The statute of limitations for any action based on the alleged invalidity or irregularity of any proceeding for the sale of tax-deeded property to a private party by a taxing authority under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691-3731.1* is within one year after the date of execution of the tax collector's deed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3725*; *see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 40, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* . The tax collector's deed presumably is the deed from the taxing authority to the purchaser and not the deed by which the taxing authority received title from the defaulting original owner [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3708-3711*].

The limitation period for a quiet title action making a jurisdictional attack on a tax deed (based on the alleged invalidity or irregularity of any proceeding for the sale) cannot begin to run while the plaintiff is in undisturbed possession of the property [*Kaufman v. Gross & Co. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 750, 755, 153 Cal. Rptr. 577, 591 P.2d 1229]* and is without adequate notice that title to the property has been transferred for nonpayment of taxes [*McCaslin v. Hamblen (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 196, 199, 231 P.2d 1]* . Therefore, when the statute of limitations is asserted in defense of the action, the crucial issue is determination of the date on which the plaintiff's possession of the property was disturbed by actual or constructive receipt of adequate notice of the tax sale. In order for the crucial date to be the date the plaintiff received any material notice from the tax collector, it is necessary at least for the notice to show the plaintiff's name (not some other person's name) as the owner of the property [*Mayer v. L&B Real Estate (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 1231, 1240, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 62, 185 P.3d 43* (also suggesting that tax collector's notice could be ineffective for limitation purposes if stated amount of unpaid tax on annual basis does not reasonably agree with plaintiff's yearly tax bill or if legal description does not apparently apply to plaintiff's property)].

Rev. & Tax. Code § 177(a) allows a property owner to begin a proceeding based on the alleged invalidity or irregularity of any deed issued on the sale of property by any taxing agency in the enforcement of delinquent property taxes or assessments, or a proceeding based on the alleged invalidity or irregularity of any proceedings leading up to such a deed. The owner must commence either proceeding within one year after the date of recording the deed rather than the date of its execution [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 177(a)*]. However, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 177* does not extend the time to bring an action for proceedings governed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3725* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 177(d)*].

For discussion regarding whether one must have legal title to maintain a quiet title action and for a form of complaint to quiet title, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* . For a form of complaint to cancel a deed and quiet title, see Ch. 184, *Deeds* .

[b] Reimbursement Costs

A property owner who successfully brings a quiet title action must reimburse a good faith purchaser or successor in interest under a void tax deed for taxes, penalties, and costs incurred in securing title under the tax deed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3728*; *see Newcomb v. City of Newport Beach (1938) 12 Cal. 2d 235, 238-239, 83 P.2d 21* ; *Johnson v. Alma Investment Co. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 155, 163, 120 Cal. Rptr. 503* ; *Roma v. Elbert, Ltd. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 338, 341, 166 P.2d 294]* . In addition, the owner must reimburse a purchaser or successor for any permanent improvements made that increase the value of the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3728*]. If the ownerfails to pay the purchaser or successor in interest the amounts ordered by the court within six months after the court's order, a new tax deed to the property is issued, and the court quiets title to the purchaser or successor in interest. The new title is conclusively presumed valid against future claims of parties to the lawsuit and their successors in interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3728.1*].

[4] Quiet Title Action by Purchaser

One who has purchased tax-defaulted property from the tax collector or a successor in interest may bring a quiet title action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3727*; *see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 40, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* (purchaser at tax sale or other person in privity may bring suit to quiet title to property)]. Service of process must be made on the tax collector of the county in which the real property is located [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 160*]. If the action is unsuccessful and the tax deed is held void, the purchaser is entitled to be reimbursed by the owner of the property for taxes, penalties, and costs of acquiring title, as well as for any permanent improvements made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3728*]. The purchaser is also entitled to recover from the county any amount paid as purchase price in excess of the amounts reimbursed by the owner of the property. The purchaser must present his or her claim against the county within one year after the judgment holding the tax deed void [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3729*]. The more common action by a purchaser of tax-defaulted property is a suit to determine adverse claims to, or clouds on, the title to the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*; *see § 540.92[5]*].

[5] Suit by Purchaser to Determine Adverse Claims

[a] Requirements

One who purchases tax-defaulted property from the tax collector or a successor in interest may bring an action to determine adverse claims to, or clouds on, the title to the property. Before bringing the action, the purchaser must have paid all subsequent taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3950*]. All persons with known interests in the property arising before the date of the deed from the tax collector must be joined as defendants [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3951*]. Unknown defendants and the tax collector may also be added as defendants [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3951-3955*]. Notice of the suit must be filed in the county recorder's office within 10 days after the filing of the complaint, and a copy of the summons must be posted on the property within 30 days of issuance of the summons [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3956, 3958*].

In the suit, the court may determine the rights of all the parties to the action, but no decree may be granted by default unless the court receives proof of alleged facts [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3962, 3963*]. If the defendants are found to have no interest in the property, the purchaser is entitled to a decree quieting title that is conclusive against the served defendants and successors in interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3967, 3968*]. The court may order sale or partition of the property, if the court finds that the defendants have an interest in the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3965*]. The purchaser in this situation is entitled to be reimbursed by the owner of the property for taxes, penalties, and costs of acquiring title, as well as for any permanent improvements made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3728*].

[b] Special Assessments

In a suit by a purchaser to determine adverse claims that involves special assessments, the payee on any bond representing an assessment, the owner of the special assessment shown by the treasurer's records, and the treasurer who is custodian of the funds of the special assessment must be made defendants in the suit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3955*]. Persons claiming any other type of special assessment lien may be made defendants [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3951, 3954*].

If the court determines that none of the defendants has any interest in the property, the title of the purchaser under the tax deed is quieted, and the decree directs that the treasurer cancel the special assessment on his or her records [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3967*]. If the court determines that any of the defendants has an interest in the property, it may order a sale or partition of the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3964*]. If the interest of a defendant is based on a special assessment, the court decree establishing the rights of the defendant must also order the treasurer to cancel the special assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3966*]. If a sale of property is ordered, proceeds of the sale belonging to unknown special assessment owners or persons claiming an interest in the special assessment must be paid to the treasurer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3965*].

[c] Whether Purchaser of Tax-Defaulted Property at Tax Sale Limited to Remedies Provided by Revenue and Taxation Code

Authority is split as to whether a purchaser of tax-defaulted property from a public entity at a tax sale is limited to the remedies provided for in the Revenue and Taxation Code. One line of authority has held that the purchaser's remedies provided by the Revenue and Taxation Code are exclusive [*Van Petten v. County of San Diego (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 43, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 816 (Fourth Dist., Div. One)* ; *Craland, Inc. v. State of California (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1400, 1407-1408, 263 Cal. Rptr. 255 (Second Dist., Div. One)* ; *see People v. Chambers (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 552, 561-562, 233 P.2d 557* ; *see also Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 40, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* (stating rule); *Routh v. Quinn (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 488, 490-491, 127 P.2d 1* ; *Bell v. County of Los Angeles (1928) 90 Cal. App. 602, 605-606, 266 P. 291 (Third Dist.)]* . Under this line of authority, common law contractual remedies are not available to a purchaser of tax-defaulted real property at a public tax sale [*Van Petten v. County of San Diego (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 43, 51, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 816* (purchaser at tax sale entitled to refund of purchase money paid only when court determines tax deed void (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3729*) or property should not have been sold (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 3731*); there is no statutory remedy of rescission or refund based on misrepresentation and breach of contract theories); *Craland Inc. v. State of California (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1400, 1407-1408, 263 Cal. Rptr. 255* (state and county not subject to contractual liability)]. There is contrary authority, however, that has held that a purchaser's statutory remedies arenot exclusive [*Schultz v. County of Contra Costa (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 242, 245, 203 Cal. Rptr. 760* (First Dist., Div. Five; judgment of rescission in favor of purchaser based on mutual mistake of fact affirmed; purchaser bought parcel with intention of building residence, but subsequently discovered parcel unbuildable)].

[6] Action by Good-Faith Improver of Property

A person who makes an improvement on land in the mistaken belief that he or she owns the land may bring an action or file a cross complaint in a pending action for relief based on the improvements made. The court may adjust the rights, equities, and interests of the good-faith improver, the owner of the land, and other interested parties in order to bring "substantial justice" to the parties under the circumstances. The intent of the statute is to protect the owner of the property from pecuniary loss while at the same time avoiding unjust enrichment from the improvement made by the good-faith improver [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 871.1-871.7*; *Kaufman v. Gross & Co. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 750, 760-761, 153 Cal. Rptr. 577, 591 P.2d 1229]* .

If a person is barred by the statute of limitations from bringing a quiet title action, the only available remedy may be an action to recover as a good-faith improver of the property. An action as a good-faith improver may also be the sole available remedy against a subsequent owner of the property if there is no jurisdictional defect arising from lack of notice in earlier proceedings granting a deed to the subsequent owner. The statute of limitations for such a suit is one year after the date the good-faith improver discovers that he or she is not the owner of the land on which the improvements have been made [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 340(e), 871.1-871.7*]. For further discussion and a form for a complaint by a good-faith improver, see Ch. 279, *Good Faith Improver of Real Property* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawDeedsTypesTax DeedsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax SalesTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
4. Judicial Remedies Available to Taxpayers and Purchasers

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.93-540.109

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.93[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.110

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.110 Governing Law

The California Sales and Use Tax Law is contained in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6001 et seq.* Sales and use taxes imposed by California cities, counties, county regional justice facilities financing agencies, redevelopment agencies, and transit districts are governed by *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7200 et seq.* and *7251 et seq.* City ordinances relating to the licensing of businesses for purposes of revenue and regulation are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 37100-37101.7*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.111-540.129

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.111[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
2. Nature and Administration of Sales and Use Taxes

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.130

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.130 Nature and Structure of California Sales and Use Taxes

[1] Sales Tax

Sales and use taxes are excise or privilege taxes [*City of Pomona v. State Bd. of Equalization (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 305, 309, 1 Cal. Rptr. 489, 347 P.2d 904* ; *Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc. v. Johnson (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 545, 551-554, 90 P.2d 572* ; *Ingels v. Riley (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 154, 156, 53 P.2d 939* ; *see Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 338, 347, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362]* .

A sales tax is not imposed on the sale itself or on the transaction, but on the retailer's gross receipts from retail sales for the privilege of makingthose sales within the state [*Standard Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 91, 94-95, 42 Cal. Rptr. 543* ; *Roth Drug, Inc. v. Johnson (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 720, 730, 57 P.2d 1022* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6006, 6007, 6011, 6012* (definitions of sale, sales price, retail sale, and gross receipts)].

The sales tax is the direct obligation of the retailer, even though the retailer may pass it on to the consumer [*Civ. Code § 1656.1*; *Yosemite Park & Curry Co. v. Johnson (1938) 10 Cal. 2d 770, 771, 76 P.2d 1191* ; *Roth Drug, Inc. v. Johnson (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 720, 730, 57 P.2d 1022* ; *but see Diamond National v. State Equalization Bd. (1976) 425 U.S. 268, 96 S. Ct. 1530, 47 L. Ed. 2d 780 (California sales tax is tax on purchaser)]* .

A sale for resale is excluded from the definition of a retail sale [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6007*]. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6001 et seq.* include many narrow provisions addressing transactions that do or do not consititute sales under the Sales and Use Tax Law [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6010.4, 6010.6* (both relating to motion picture production), 6010.9 (relating to certain custom computer programs)].

[2] Use Tax

The use tax is an excise tax imposed on any taxpayer who purchases tangible personal property from any retailer for

storage, use, or other consumption in California [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6201, 6202*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6008-6010, 6015, 6019* (definitions of storage, use, purchase, and retailer)]. Sales and use taxes are mutually exclusive but complementary, and are designed to exact equal tax based on the percentage of the purchase price of the property in question [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 315 n.3, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6401*]. Use tax is intended to supplement sales tax by imposing an equivalent tax burden on salesnot subject to the California sales tax. One of the chief purposes of the use tax is to help California retailers, who are subject to the sales tax, to compete on an equal footing with their out-of-state competitors, who are exempt from the sales tax [*Rivera v. City of Fresno (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 132, 138, 98 Cal. Rptr. 281, 490 P.2d 793* ; *Atchison etc. Ry. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 411, 422, 294 P.2d 181* ; *see Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 338, 347, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362]* .

The purchaser is primarily liable for payment of the tax, and remains liable until the tax is paid or until the seller provides a receipt indicating that the seller has paid the tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6202*]. Every retailer, at the time of making a sale, must collect the use tax from the purchaser and provide a receipt indicating that the tax has been collected [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6203*]. Although this provision makes the retailer an agent of the state for collection of the tax, it does not shift the direct burden of the tax from the purchaser to the retailer, nor does it relieve the purchaser of theprimary liability for the tax [*Brandtjen & Kluge v. Fincher (1941) 111 P.2d 979* ; *see Felt & Tarrant Mfg. Co. v. Gallagher (1939) 306 U.S. 62, 66, 59 S. Ct. 376, 83 L. Ed. 488]* .

The use tax does not apply to property that is to be resold or to property that is subject to California sales tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6007, 6202, 6401*; *In re Los Angeles Lumber Products Co. (S.D. Cal. 1942) 45 F. Supp. 77, 85-86* ; *Hawley v. Johnson (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 232, 238-239, 136 P.2d 638]* . In calculating the use tax, credit is generally allowed for sales and use taxes imposed by other states [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6406*].

[3] Application to Bankruptcy Liquidation Sale

Although the Ninth Circuit had held for 30 years that the state of California could not impose a sales or use tax on a bankruptcy liquidation sale, the United States Supreme Court has abrogated that rule and held that the tax may be imposed [*California State Board of Equalization v. Sierra Summit (1989) 490 U.S. 844, 109 S. Ct. 2228, 104 L. Ed. 2d 910, 917-920* (abrogating rule of *California State Board of Equalization v. Goggin (9th Cir. 1957) 245 F.2d 44* , *cert. denied, 353 U.S. 961*) (*Goggin II*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawLiquidationsGeneral OverviewTax LawExcise TaxesDefinitionTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxDefinitionsTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxDefinitions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
2. Nature and Administration of Sales and Use Taxes

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.131

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.131 Local Sales, Use, and Licensing Taxes

[1] Local Sales and Use Taxes

Local government entities, such as cities, counties, and districts, may impose local sales and use taxes and transactions and use taxes. These taxes are in addition to the state sales and use tax law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7200 et seq., 7251 et seq., 7285 et seq.*]. A county may levy a utility user tax on the consumption of electricty, gas, water, sewer, telephone, and cable television services in the unincorporated area of the county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284.2*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284.4*]. A city, county, or city and county may impose a graffiti prevention tax on the privilege of selling at retail within its jurisdiction aerosol paint containers, containers of any other marking substance, certain felt tip markers, and other marking instruments. The taxing entity must use the proceeds of the tax to remove and prevent graffiti [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7287 et seq.*].

However, the authority of a local entity to levy transactions and use taxes may be subject to the restrictions of Proposition 13 even though the entity does not have the authority to levy property taxes [*see Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 18, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* ; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*; *see also § 540.451[3]*]. The Supreme Court has held that a local agency was a special district within the meaning of section 4 of Proposition 13 [*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*], and therefore a sales tax adopted by the agency was invalid because it was not adopted by a two-thirdsmajority of the voters, as required for special taxes by section 4 [*Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 18, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* (prospective application to other agencies to be determined on case-by-case basis)].

Moreover, under Proposition 218, adopted by the voters in 1996, which added Cal. Const., art. XIII C, and Proposition 62, adopted by the voters in 1986, which added *Gov. Code §§ 53720-53730*, all new local general and special taxes must be approved by a vote of the local electorate [*Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 233, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225* ; *see also McBrearty v. City of Brawley (1997) 59*

Cal. App. 4th 1441, 1449 n.5, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 862 (Proposition 218 added Cal. Const., arts. XIII C, XIII D, which are similar to statutory amendments created by Proposition 62, to ensure voter approval requirements apply to charter cities)]. No local government or district may impose any special tax without the approval of two thirds of the voters voting in an election on the issue [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2(d)*; *Gov. Code § 53722*; *see Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 233-238, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225]* , nor may they impose any general tax without the approval of a majority of the voters voting in an election on the issue [*see Cal. Const., art. XIII C, § 2(b)*; *Gov. Code § 53723*; *see Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport Authority v. City of Burbank (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1217, 1226-1227, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 297* (Cal. Const., art. XIII C, requires charter cities to obtain voter approval of general taxes first imposed or increased after January 1, 1995); for further discussion, *see § 540.51[3][b], [c]*].

Any local sales and use tax must be enacted in accordance with a uniform state standard and include provisions such as incorporation of the state sales and use tax laws into the local sales and use tax ordinances and contracting with the SBE for the administration of the tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7202, 7203*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7204, 7204.3* (collection and administration by SBE)]. If a county adoptsa sales tax ordinance, it must adopt a complementary use tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7203*]. A local sales and use tax must exclude from the amount subject to tax any state sales or use tax imposed on the retailer or consumer [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7202(f), 7203(d)*].

[2] Licensing Taxes

Cities may license, for regulation and for revenue, every lawful business transacted within the city, including shows, games, and exhibitions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16000*; *Gov. Code § 37101*]. Similarly, a county may license, for revenue and regulation, and impose a license tax on, every kind of lawful business transacted in the unincorporated areas of the county."Business" includes shows, exhibitions, and games [*Gov. Code § 37101(b)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284*]. However, the performance of a governmental function by a public agency does not constitute the transaction of business within the meaning of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284* so as to authorize the licensing and taxation of that business and thus *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284* does not authorize taxation of governmental functions performed by public entities [*Sacramento Mun. Utility Dist. v. County of Solano (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1163, 1165, 1170 n.3, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 286* (Solano County precluded from imposing business license tax against Sacramento Municipal Utility District for electrical energy produced by District's power plant in Solano County)].

Business license taxes based on gross receipts taxes must be limited to receipts attributable to activity within the city [*Volkswagen Pacific, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 48, 57-59, 101 Cal. Rptr. 869, 496 P.2d 1237* ; *General Motors Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 229, 238, 95 Cal. Rptr. 635, 486 P.2d 163* ; *but see City of Los Angeles v. Belridge Oil Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 823, 830, 271 P.2d 5* (tax upheld although only negotiations took place in city)]. Any license tax imposed on a business operating both within and outside the taxing jurisdiction must be fairly apportioned to reflect the portion of the taxed activity actually carried on within the taxing jurisdiction [*Gov. Code § 37101(b)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284*]. If a noncomplying license tax ordinance were amended so as to provide for necessary and sufficient apportionment, the amendment would effect a substantive (rather than procedural) change, and normally it could not be applied retroactively; therefore, any taxes that were not collected in past years under the former ordinance would remain uncollectible under the amended ordinance [*City of Modesto v. National Med, Inc. (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 518, 526-530, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 215]* . "Differentially burdensome" taxation of instrumentalities of speech or press, such as subscription television services, is prohibited as an interference with *First Amendment* rights [*Minneapolis Star v. Minnesota Comm. of Rev. (1983) 460 U.S. 575, 581-583, 103 S. Ct. 1365, 75 L. Ed. 2d 295* ; *City of Alameda v. Premier Communications Network, Inc. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 148, 157, 202 Cal. Rptr. 684* ; *but see City of Corona v. Corona etc. Independent (1953) 115 Cal. App. 2d 382, 389-390, 252 P.2d 56* (tax upheld)].

The state Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control is granted exclusive power under the California Constitution to collect license fees or occupational taxes related to alcoholic beverage sales [*Cal. Const., art. XX, § 22*; *see City of*

Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 759, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120] . Liquor licenses are not subject to local license or occupational taxes *City of Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 759, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120]* . Courts have recognized a distinction, however, between municipal revenue taxes that may be preempted by state law and fees that a city may properly impose pursuant to its regulatory authority to control and supervise a business that poses an unusual burden on the local entity for services. Thus, a city's ordinance addressing nuisance problems associated with alcoholic beverage sales establishments and requiring existing alcoholic beverage retailers to pay a fee to administer enforcement of the ordinance's requirements has been construed as a regulatory ordinance and the ordinance's fees have been heldnot to constitute a license tax prohibited by *Cal. Const., art. XX, § 22* [*City of Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 759-767, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
2. Nature and Administration of Sales and Use Taxes

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.132

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.132 Administration of State Sales and Use Tax

[1] Permits and Registration

Every person who desires to conduct business as a seller in California must obtain a seller's permit from the SBE for each place of business [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6066*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1699*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6006.5, 6007, 6014, 6015, 6019* (definitions of occasional sale, retail sale, seller, and retailer)]. A person or entity making more than two retail sales of tangible personal property in any 12-month period is a retailer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6019*]. The SBE interprets these provisions to require a seller's permit if a person or entity makes either three or more sales for substantial amounts in any 12-month period or a substantial number of sales for relatively small amounts. [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6006.5(a), 6019*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1595(a)*].

Every retailer selling tangible personal property in California for use, storage or other consumption in California must register with the SBE, giving the name and address of all agents and offices in California [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6226*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1684*]. Retailers are deemed to be doing business in California for purposes of registration and use tax collection if they have a sufficient nexus with California [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1620(b), 1684*; *National Geographic v. Cal. Equalization Bd. (1977) 430 U.S. 551, 555-556, 97 S. Ct. 1386, 51 L. Ed. 2d 631* (maintenance of advertising office); *Scripto v. Carson (1960) 362 U.S. 207, 210-212, 80 S. Ct. 619, 4 L. Ed. 2d 660* (traveling salespeople)]. Sales to residents of a state solicited by mailing catalogues and flyers, advertisements in nationalperiodicals, and telephone calls and delivered by common carrier or by mail from out of state are an insufficient nexus to impose a duty on seller to collect use tax [*Quill Corporation v. State of North Dakota (1992) 504 U.S. 298, 311-314, 112 S. Ct. 1904, 119 L. Ed. 2d 91]* .

The use of a computer server on the internet to create or to maintain a world wide web page or site by an out-of-state retailer will not be considered a factor in determining whether the retailer has a substantial nexus with California. No internet service provider, on-line service provider, internetwork communication service provider, or other internet

access service provider, or world wide web hosting services is deemed the agent or representative of any out-of-state retailer as a result of the service provider maintaining or taking orders via a web page or site on a computer server that is physically located in California [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1684(a)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Procedures For Application For Permit. A prospective seller must apply for a seller's permit for each place of business on the formprescribed by the SBE by providing the name under which the applicant transacts or intends to transact business, the location of his or her place or places of business, and any other information as the board may require. The application must be authenticated in a form or pursuant to methods as may be prescribed by the SBE. The application must state that the applicant will actively engage in or conduct business as a seller of tangible personal property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6066(a)*]. The application may be filed using electronic media as prescribed by the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6066(b), (c)*].

A nonprofit organization selling for its own account must obtain a permit, unless the organization is otherwise exempt from permit requirements by specific stipulations of statutory or regulatory law [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1597*].

The SBE can revoke or suspend a seller's permit for failure to comply with the Sales and Use Tax Law. Revocation requires that the permit holder be afforded a hearing on 10 days' notice requiring the holder to show cause why the permit should not be revoked [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6070*].

[2] Resale Certificate

It is generally presumed that all gross receipts from sales are subject to sales tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6091*]. It is also presumed that tangible personal property sold for delivery in California is sold for storage, use, or other consumption in this state [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6241*]. These presumptions do not apply if the seller takes a resale certificate from the purchaser. A seller taking a resale certificate in good faith is relieved from liability for sales tax or from the duty of collecting use tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6091-6095, 6241-6249*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1668(a)*].

A purchaser who gives a resale certificate for property that is not going to be resold is liable for the amount of sales tax that would otherwise be due and could also be subject to penalties for intentional disregard of rules, fraud, or intent to evade tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6094.5, 6484, 6485*; *see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1668(g)*].

A wholesaler who has notice of the suspension or revocation of a retailer's seller's permit and continues accepting the retailer's resale certificate is also liable for the sales tax *[62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 336 (1979)]* .

[3] Direct Payment Permit

A person who holds a valid seller's permit may obtain a direct payment permit. Holders of direct payment permits need not pay sales tax to retailers from whom they make purchases. Direct payment permit holders instead report and pay the retailer's liability directly to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7051.1, 7051.2*].

[4] Exemptions

A variety of exemptions allow a seller or purchaser to exclude the sales price of the exempt item from computations of sales or use tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6351 et seq.*]. The exemptions are based on various constitutional or public policy grounds [*see, e.g., Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 289, 295-296, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 608* (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6396*, which exempts from California sales taxes gross receipts from the sale of personal property if the property is delivered outside the state, designed to accommodate federal constitutional restrictions on state taxation of sales in interstate commerce; for discussion of impact of various provisions of the

Federal Constitution on state and local governments power to tax, *see § 540.11*)]. Some require issuance and presentation of an exemption certificate by the purchaser, whereas others do not [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1521.4, 1570, 1587, 1590, 1594, 1598, 1603, 1614, 1621, 1668, 1805, 1823.5, 1825*].

Some of the more significant exemptions from sales and use tax include the following:

- Gross receipts from sales, use, storage, or consumption whose taxation is prohibited by either federal law or the California Constitution [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6352*].

- Gross receipts from sales, use, storage, or consumption of gas, electricity, and water delivered to consumers, and liquefied petroleum gas used for household or agricultural purposes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6353*].

- Food and farm products, but not prepared meals [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6358, 6359, 6359.1-6359.7*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1602-1603*].

- Medicine and other specified medical products [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6369-6369.5, 6371*].

- Tangible personal property other than certain fuel and petroleum products sold to common carriers for out-of-state use, and, until 2014, the sale of fuel and petroleum products to a water common carrier for immediate shipment outside California [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6385*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1621*].

- Certain aircraft fuel [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6357-6357.1*].

- Gross receipts from sales, use, storage, or consumption of vehicles, vessels, and any related equipment used to provide public transportation services, until January 1, 2004 [Rev. & Tax. Code § 6368.6].

[5] Successor's Liability

A successor in interest of a retailer must withhold enough of the purchase price to cover the amount of sales or use tax due until the former owner produces either a receipt from the SBE showing that the tax hasbeen paid or a certificate showing that no tax is due [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6811*; *see also 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1702(a)* (when duty to withhold arises)]. The SBE issues the certificate that no tax is due after taxes have been paid or after security has been given for their payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6813*].

The SBE must either issue the certificate or mail notice of the amount of tax due within 60 days after the latest of the following dates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6812(b)*]:

- The date it receives a written request from the purchaser for a certificate.

- The date of the sale of the business or stock of goods.

- The date the former owner's records are made available for audit.

Failure of the SBE to mail the notice within that time releases the successor from further liability to withhold the purchase price [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6812(c)*; *see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1702(c)* (purchaser released from further obligation if purchaser (1) obtains certificate from SBE stating no taxes, interest or penalties due from predecessor, or (2) makes written request to SBE for certificate and, within time specified in regulation, SBE does not either issue it or mail to purchaser notice of amount of tax, interest and penalties that must be paid as condition for certificate's

issuance)].

A successor who fails to withhold is liable, to the extent of the purchase price, for all taxes, interest, and penalties owing by the predecessor even though they may not have been determined against the predecessor at the time of the sale [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6812(a)*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1702(b)*].

[6] Security

The SBE may require a seller to deposit security if it is necessary to insure compliance with sales and use tax provisions [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701*]. The SBE must hold in trust any security in the form of cash, government bonds, or insured deposits in banks or savings and loan institutions and use it solely to ensure compliance with sales and use tax provisions [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701*]. The SBE fixes the amount of the security. However, the security cannot exceed a maximum amount. For persons filing returns for quarterly periods, that maximum is the lesser of twice the person's average liability or $50,000. For persons filing returns for monthly periods, that maximum is the lesser of three times the person's average liability or $50,000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701* (different maximum amounts apply if SBE has revoked seller's permit)]. Security held by the board must be released after a three-year period in which the person has filed all returns and paid all tax to the state or any amount of tax required to be collected and paid to the state within the time required [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701*].

The surety and its principal, the taxpayer, may contract for any commencement date for the surety's bond covering payment of sales and use tax, and the bond's effectiveness is not dependent on receipt of evidence of the bond by the SBE or the SBE's approval of the bond [*People v. Great American Ins. Co. (1973) 222 Cal. App. 2d 552, 556-557, 35 Cal. Rptr. 267]* . Due process does not require that the SBE give notice of the taxpayer's default to the surety, even if notice would have allowed the surety to minimize its exposure by paying the tax before any penalty was imposed [*American Fidelity Fire Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 51, 55, 109 Cal. Rptr. 545]* .

[7] Returns and Records

Sellers and others liable for tax generally must file sales and use tax returns showing gross receipts, the amount of tax, and any other information the SBE deems necessary, and pay the tax due quarterly, on or before the last day of the month succeeding each quarterly period [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6451-6454*].

The SBE may grant extensions of up to one month for filing the return and paying the tax due if the extension is applied for before the original due date for the return and payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6459(a)*]. The SBE may grant extensions of more than one month to creditors of the State of California who have not been paid because of the state's failure to adopt a budget in a timely manner, if the state has not adopted a budget by July 1 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6459(b)*]. Interest is charged on the "late" tax if the SBE grants an extension [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6459(a), 6591.5*]. However, for extensions granted to creditors of the state, no interest is due on the portion of tax payment equal to the amount owed the creditor by the state on the due date of the tax payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6459(b), 6591.5*]. If a taxpayer's estimated measure of tax liability averages $17,000 or more per month, the SBE may require prepayments. If the taxpayer's estimated tax liability averages $20,000 or more per month, prepayment by electronic funds transfer under procedures prescribed by the board mayapply [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6470-6479.5*].

A person who is not otherwise required to hold a seller's permit or register with the SBE [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(i)(1)*] may elect to report "qualified use tax" on that person's California income tax return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(a), (b)*, effective for purchases of tangible personal property made on or after 1/1/03 in tax years beginning on or after that date, and on or before 12/31/09 (*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(i)(2)*)]. The election is irrevocable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(c)*]. The return must be the person's timely filed original return [Rev. & Tax. Code § 5452.1(d)(1)]. "Qualified use tax" means the California use tax imposed that has not been paid to a retailer holding a seller's permit or certificate of registration [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(d)(2)(A)*]. The term does not include use tax that is imposed on a

lessee of tangible personal property. It also does not includeuse tax that applies to mobilehomes, registered commercial coaches, certain trailers, or to vehicles, vessels, or aircraft [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(d)(2)(B)*]. The qualified use tax must be reported on and remitted with the person's California income tax return that is required to be filed for the tax year in which the liability for the qualified use tax was incurred [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(e)*]. Sales and use tax penalties, refund, and credit provisions apply to use tax reported as qualified use tax on an income tax return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1(f)*].

[8] Recordkeeping Requirements

Sellers, retailers, lessors and lessees of tangible personal property for use in California, and persons storing, using, or otherwise consuming in California tangible personal property from a retailer must maintain for four years records showing all of the following information [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7053*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1698*]:

- Gross receipts from sales or rental payments, including services that are part of the sale or lease, made within California.
- Supporting documentation for all deductions claimed.
- The total purchase price of the property purchased for sale, consumption, or lease in California.

In addition, these records must include normal accounting books and supporting documents such as bills of lading, receipts, invoices, and cash register tapes, as well as all schedules or work papers used in connection with the preparation of the returns. All records must be available on request by the SBE and failure to maintain them is considered evidence of negligence or intent to evade tax. Microfilm of primary ledgers and journals is not acceptable, although microfilm of supporting documents, such as invoices, is acceptable if verification standards are met. Taxpayers using automated data processing systems for tax accounting must have systems that meet SBE requirements [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1698*].

[9] Audits and Investigations

The SBE has broad statutory authority to enforce the sales and use tax and to adopt rules and regulations relating to its administration and enforcement [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7051*]. In conjunction with this power, the SBE may conduct investigations to verify the accuracy of a tax return or to determine the amount of tax liability if no return has been filed. The SBE may examine the books, papers, records, and equipment of any person selling tangible personal property and any person liable for the use tax. The character of a taxpayer's business may also be investigated [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7054*].

The SBE's examination and investigation power extends to persons other than the taxpayer that is being audited and to examinations and investigations outside California. For example, the SBE can require a person otherthan the taxpayer to submit the names and addresses of purchasers of tangible personal property, the sales price of the property, the dates of sale, and other relevant information [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7054, 7055*].

However, under the Harris-Katz California Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights*, an officer or employee of the SBE may not knowingly authorize or conduct an investigation or surveillance for a purpose that is not related to tax administration [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7092*; for further discussion, *see* § *540.360* et seq.].

[10] Managed Audit Program

Taxpayers with relatively simple sales and used tax returns may, but are not required to [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076(b)*], participate in a managed audit program [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076 et seq.*]. Taxpayers that meet statutory

criteria [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076.1*] are allowed to participate in the program. If an SBE identifies an underpayment of tax during any audit under the program, interest on the underpayment is imposed at a rate that is one-half the rate of interest that would otherwise be charged for the underpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076.4*]. A taxpayer may participate in the program only if all the following criteria are met [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076.1*]:

- The taxpayer's business involves few or no statutory exemptions.
- The taxpayer's business involves a single or small number of clearly defined taxability issues.
- The taxpayer is taxed under the Sales and Use Tax Law and agrees to participate in the managed audit program.
- The taxpayer has the resources to comply with the managed audit instructions provided by the board.

[11] Rules and Regulations

The SBE has the power to adopt and enforce rules and regulations relating to the administration and enforcement of the sales and use tax laws. The SBE also has the discretion to apply retroactively the rules and regulations it adopts [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7051*]. Rules and regulations promulgated by the SBE are subject to the procedural requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 11346-11347.5* [*Pacific Southwest Airlines v. State Bd. of Equalization (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 32, 35-37, 140 Cal. Rptr. 543]* .

The SBE has no authority to promulgate a regulation that is inconsistent with the governing statute. Regulations that alter or amend the statute or enlarge or impair its scope are void, and courts not only may, but must, strike them down [*Aerospace Corp.v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1300, 1311, 267 Cal. Rptr. 685* (holding invalid former version of *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1618*, which specifies when title to overhead materials passes to government)].

[12] Recomputation of Tax by SBE

If the SBE determines that the tax due shown on a return is incorrect, it may compute and determine what it believes is the correct amount of tax on the basis of whatever information is in its possession. It may make one or more deficiency determinations of the amount due for one or more periods [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6481*].

If the SBE concludes that the taxpayer's books and records are inadequate, it may determine the tax liability using what it considers the best available information and method. The burden is on the taxpayer to establish that the books and records are adequate or that a different method of calculating the tax would be better [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6481, 7053, 7054*; *18 Cal. Code Reg § 1698*; *Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-7, 221 P.2d 241]* . The SBE is not limited to a review of books and records in conducting an audit, but may also look behind the books and review original records, such as purchase invoices, sales slips, cash register tapes, and inventory records [*People v. Schwartz (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 59, 64, 187 P.2d 12* ; *Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-7, 221 P.2d 241* ; *Rathjen Bros. v. Collins (1942) 50 Cal. App. 2d 765, 768-773, 123 P.2d 925]* .

A complete set of books and records that are internally consistent may not be sufficient to overcome the presumption of correctness that attaches to the SBE's determination of deficiency. The burden is still on the taxpayer to explain any discrepancy between the books and records and the SBE's determination. The SBE is authorized to compute and determine the amount of tax due on the basis of any information within its possession [*Riley B's, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 610, 614-617, 132 Cal. Rptr. 520]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxExemptionsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
2. Nature and Administration of Sales and Use Taxes

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.133-540.149

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.133[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
3. Deficiency and Jeopardy Determinations

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.150

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.150 Deficiency Assessments

[1] Audit

The first stage of a deficiency assessment is an audit of the taxpayer. In the audit, the SBE may review books, papers, records, equipment, and other data in determining whether a taxpayer has correctly determined sales and use tax liability [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7054*]. At the conclusion of the audit, the auditor will usually give the taxpayer an informal explanation of the proposed adjustments. If no agreement is reached at that time, the taxpayer has two other opportunities for informal review and negotiation: (1) the taxpayer can request a conference with the auditor's supervisor; and (2) when the taxpayer receives the audit report, the SBE invites the taxpayer to meet with a local Board representative, usually the principal auditor in the district, before the proposed deficiency audit is assessed and billed [*see* Audits, SBE Publication 76 (September 2007)]. SBE Publication 76 is available online at www.boe.ca.gov/pdf/pub76.pdf.

[2] Formal Deficiency Notice Requirements

[a] Service

If the SBE makes a deficiency determination, it must give the taxpayer written notice within the applicable period of limitations [*see § 540.152*]. The SBE's Notice of Determination may be personally served, but typically it is served by mail. The giving of notice of the deficiency is complete at the time of mailing. The SBE's established practice is to have the date on the notice coincide with the date of actual mailing. The notice must be addressed to the retailer or user at the address that appears in the records of the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6486, 6487*].

If the party being served is a corporation, a notice is sufficient if it is addressed to the corporation. The notice need not be directed to particular individuals acting on behalf of the corporation in the specific matter involved, even if the SBE has knowledge of those individuals [*Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d*

149, 152-153, 285 P.2d 305] . Personal service of a notice on a corporation may be made by delivering the notice to any person designated in the Corporations Code or the Code of Civil Procedure to receive service of a summons and complaint in a civil action [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10, 416.20*].

[b] Notice to Successors in Interest

The SBE enforces the obligation of a successor in interest for unpaid taxes [*see § 540.132[5]*] by serving a Notice of Successor Liability on the successor. This not ice is served in the same manner as prescribed for service of a Notice of Deficiency Determination and must be served not later than three years after the date the SBE is notified of the purchase of the business or the stock of goods [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6486, 6814(a)*; *see People v. Gabriel (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 788, 791-794, 135 P.2d 378* (decided under prior law)].

[c] Notice to Sureties

The statutes requiring notice of deficiency determinations [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code § 6486*] do not provide for notice to sureties who write bonds as security for taxes [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701*; *see also § 540.132[6]*]. The lack of such notice is constitutional, even though notice to a surety would allow the surety to pay the asserted liability, avoid penalties, and reduce the amount of interest due [*American Fidelity Fire Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 51, 55, 109 Cal. Rptr. 545]* .

The form of suretyship agreement used by the SBE contains the surety's advance consent to waivers or modifications of the liability negotiated between the taxpayer and the SBE. Thus, the surety will not be exonerated pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2819* if the taxpayer waives the statutory deadline for issuance of a deficiency determination [*State Bd. of Equalization v. Carleton (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1607, 1610-1611, 273 Cal. Rptr. 436]* .

[d] Notice Regarding Estates

If a taxpayer dies, the SBE is required to issue a Notice of Determinations for anydeficiency arising before death within four months after receiving a written request, in the form required by the SBE, from a fiduciary of the taxpayer's estate or trust or any other person liable for any portion of the tax [*Prob. Code § 9201(b)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.1*]. The statutory requirement that creditors file claims against decedents within four months after the publication of notice does not apply to the audit and assessment of sales and use tax liabilities [*People v. Hochwender (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 181, 183-184, 124 P.2d 823]* .

[3] Determination if No Return Is Filed

If a taxpayer who is liable for sales or use tax fails to file a tax return, the SBE may estimate either the taxpayer's gross receipts (for sales tax) or (2) the total sales price of tangible personal property (for use tax). The estimate is made for those periods for which no return is filed, and may be based on any information in the SBE's possession. The SBE must compute and determine the amount of tax due based on its estimate. In addition, the SBE must impose a penalty equal to 10 percent of the tax due [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6511*]. If the taxpayer's failure to file is due to fraud or to an intent to evade tax, an additional penalty of 25 percent of the tax due is added to the 10 percent penalty [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6514*].

In making its determination, the SBE may offset any overpayments the taxpayer has made for other periods and any interest on those overpayments against the underpayments, penalties, and interest on the underpayments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6512*].

Promptly after making its determination, the SBE must give the taxpayer written notice of the estimate, determination, and penalty. The notice must be served personally or by mail in the same manner as service of the notice of a deficiency determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6515*; *see § 540.150[2]*].

[4] Finality of Deficiency Determination

The SBE's determination becomes final 30 days after service of the notice of determination, unless the person against whom it is made or another person directly interested files a petition for redetermination during that 30-day period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561*; *see § 540.453[9]*; *see also § 540.530*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to File ReturnTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
3. Deficiency and Jeopardy Determinations

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.151

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.151 Jeopardy Determination

[1] Notice

The SBE may determine a taxpayer's sales and use tax liability and declare the tax due immediately whenever it believes collection of the tax will be jeopardized by delay. The SBE must note on the face of the determination that collection will be jeopardized by delay [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6536*]. The SBE must give the taxpayer notice of a jeopardy determination by either personal service or service by mail in the same manner as a notice of a deficiency determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6539*; *see § 540.150[2]*].

[2] Finality of Jeopardy Determinations

A jeopardy assessment is due and payable immediately [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6536*]. Jeopardy determinations not paid within 10 days after service of notice become final and subject to interest and penalties, unless during that 10-day period the taxpayer has filed a petition for redetermination and posted security in the amount required by the SBE. Except for the shorter filing period and the requirement of posting security, the procedures applicable to redetermination of a jeopardy assessment are the same as those for redeterminations of deficiency determinations [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6537, 6538*; *see § 540.453[9]*; *see also § 540.530*].

[3] Application for Administrative Hearing

[a] Procedure

A taxpayer against whom a jeopardy determination has been made may, with or without complying with the requirements of *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5222.4* (which concerns a petition for redetermination), apply for an administrative hearing [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5225*]. Thus, for example, if the jeopardy determination becomes final because the taxpayer either does not timely file a petition for redetermination or fails to post adequate security, an alternative

procedure for an administrative hearing is available. Under this alternative procedure, a taxpayer served with notice of a jeopardy determination may apply for an administrative hearing for one or more of the following purposes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538.5*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5225(a); *see Dupuy v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 410, 415-416, 124 Cal. Rptr. 900, 541 P.2d 540*]:

- To establish that the determination is excessive;
- To establish that the sale of property that may be seized after issuance of the jeopardy determination or any part thereof should be delayed, pending the administrative hearing, because the sale would result in irreparable injury to the taxpayer;
- To request the release of all or a part of the seized property to the taxpayer;
- To request a stay of collection activities; or
- To request administrative review of any other issue raised by the jeopardy determination.

The application for an administrative hearing must be in writing, be filed within 30 days after service of the notice of jeopardy determination, and state the specific factual and legal grounds on which it is founded. The taxpayer does not have to post security to file the application and to obtain a hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538.5*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5228(a)]. However, if the taxpayer does not deposit security within the 10-day period for filing a petition for redetermination, the filing of the application will not stay collection activities except sale of the seized property. The seized property cannot be sold without the owner's consent during the first 30 days after service of the notice of jeopardy determination nor while a timely application for an administrative hearing is pending [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6538, 6538.5*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5227, 5228(b), (c)]. Storage of the property during the period the application is pending is at the applicant's expense [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5228(b)*].

If the taxpayer fails to file a timely application but can show reasonable cause for the failure, the SBE may nevertheless allow the late filing of an application and grant an administrative hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538.5*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5226(c)].

The filing of an application does not affect the finality date of the determination, the penalty, or interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6537, 6538.5*].

[b] Conduct of Administrative Hearing

On receipt of an application for administrative hearing, SBE staff will promptly acknowledge its receipt, assign the application to the Appeals Division for an appeals conference, schedule an appeals conference, and notify the applicant regarding the date, time, and location of the appeals conference [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5229(a)*]. For discussion of the appeals conference and procedures, see *§ 540.190[4]*.

[c] Notice and Conduct of SBE Hearing

On completion of the appeals conference, Appeals Division staff will notify the applicant of the issuance of a decision and recommendation [*see § 540.151[3][d]*]. If the applicant disagrees with the decision and recommendation in whole or in part, the applicant may request an oral hearing before the SBE. If an oral hearing is granted, the matter will be scheduled for hearing as soon as practicable [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5229(c)*]. For discussion of the oral hearing before the SBE, see *§ 540.190[4]*.

[d] Administrative Hearing Determination and Notices

On completion of the appeals conference, Appeals Division staff will promptly issue a determination as to each issue raised in the application and provide notice of the determination to the applicant in a document called a decision and recommendation. Appeals Division staff may find that the applicant is not entitled to the requested relief, or may issue one or more of the following orders [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5229(b)*]:

- That the sale of the property will irreparably damage the applicant and that the property shall not be sold.

- That the property, or a portion of it, be released to the applicant or to the person from whom it was seized.

- That the tax as determined is excessive and that the amount of the determination be reduced.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
3. Deficiency and Jeopardy Determinations

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.152

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.152 Statute of Limitations on Notice of Deficiency Determinations

[1] If Return Is Filed

The SBE must mail notices of deficiency determinations with respect to quarterly returns within the later of either (1) three years after the end of the calendar month following the quarterly period or (2) three years after the return is filed. For returns filed on an annual basis, the SBE must mail notices within the later of either (1) three years after the end of the calendar month following the end of the year or (2) three years after the filing of the return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.2* (special rules for determinations issued to individuals who are general partners in partnership, whose withdrawal from partnership causes change in ownership, and who fail to notify SBE of withdrawal); *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.3* (special limitations rules for taxpayers that elect to report qualified use tax on their California income tax returns in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1*)]. These time periods are computed by excluding the first day and including the last. If the last day of the specified number of days falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, an action is timely if it is taken on the first following day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday [STC Rul. 465.0142 (2/17/77) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 63-510.76].

Although the SBE usually does not permit a statute of limitations to run in the course of an audit, taxpayers should take the statute of limitations into account before making a voluntary payment if a notice of deficiency has not been issued. A voluntary payment may stop imposition of interest on taxes due, but any voluntary payment made cannot be recovered even if the statute of limitations runs before the SBE issues a notice of deficiency [*Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 532, 536, 114 Cal. Rptr. 515]* .

The taxpayer must file a return or the three-year period of limitations does not begin to run [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487(a), (b)*]. An early attorney general opinion held that the filing of a blank return or a return that fails to include any information concerning sales that are potentially subject to the sale or use tax does not start the running of the statute of limitations. To start the running of the statute of limitations, the return must disclose facts that enable the SBE to

determine the taxpayer's sales and use tax liability *[2 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 335, 336 (1943)]* . Completion in good faith of only the sales tax portion of the combined Sales and Use Tax Return, leaving blanks in the use tax portion, is a sufficient return to start the running of the statute of limitations against the SBE [*People v. Universal Film Exchanges (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 649, 655-656, 213 P.2d 697* (overruling *9 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 269, 271 (1947)* , which required affirmative entry such as "none" or "0," or line or cross on use tax portion of return); *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6453* (contents of returns)].

A special rule applies if a purchaser satisfies all of the following conditions [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.06(b)*]:

- The purchaser voluntarily files an individual use tax return for tangible personal property purchased from a retailer outside California for storage, use, or other consumption in California.

- The purchaser resides or is located in California and has not previously registered with the SBE or filed an individual use tax return with the SBE or reported an amount on his or her individual California income tax return.

- The purchaser is not engaged in business in California as a retailer.

- The purchaser has not been contacted by the SBE regarding failure to report the use tax.

- The SBE has determined that the purchaser's failure to file an individual use tax return or to otherwise report, or pay the use tax, was due to reasonable cause and was not caused by reason of negligence, intentional disregard of the law, or an intent to evade use taxes.

If the above conditions apply, then, notwithstanding *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487*, theperiod during which a deficiency determination may be mailed to the purchaser is limited to three years after the last day of the calendar month following the quarterly period for which the amount is proposed to be determined [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.06(a)*]. However, this does not apply to purchases of vehicles, vessels, or aircraft [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.06(d)*]. If the SBE makes a determination that the purchaser's failure to timely report or remit the tax is due to reasonable cause or to circumstances beyond the purchaser's control, the purchaser may be relieved of any penalties imposed under the Sales and Use Tax Law. A purchaser seeking relief from penalties must file a statement, signed under penalty of perjury, setting forth the facts that form the basis for the claim for relief [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.06(c)*].

[2] If No Return Is Filed

If the taxpayer has failed to file a return for a particular period, the SBE may mail a notice of deficiency determination within eight years after the end of the month following either the quarterly period or the one-year period, depending on whether the taxpayer files quarterly or annual returns [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487(a)*].

[3] Fraud or Intent to Evade Tax

None of the periods of limitation governing service of a notice of deficiency apply if the deficiency is based on fraud or on an intent to evade sales and use tax statutes or regulations. Fraud is an actual, intentional wrongdoing, and an intent to evade requires a specific purpose to evade a tax that is believed to be owed. The SBE has the burden of proving fraud [*Marchica v. State Board of Equalization (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 501, 509, 237 P.2d 725]* .

[4] Extension of Period of Limitation

The period within which the SBE is required to mail a notice of deficiency determination can be extended if the SBE obtains the taxpayer's consent in writing. The SBE can also obtain subsequent agreements to extend the time further.

However, the taxpayer's consent must be obtained before the time has otherwise expired. Once the period of limitation has expired, it cannot be reopened [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6488*].

[5] Effect of Notice of Deficiency of Other Tax

Neither the three-year nor the eight-year limitation period begins to run on a sales tax deficiency, even if the SBE has issued a timely use tax determination for the same property. Likewise, neither period of limitation begins to run on a use tax deficiency, even if the SBE has issued a timely sales tax determination for the same property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Avoidance & EvasionTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
3. Deficiency and Jeopardy Determinations

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.153-540.169

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.153[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
4. Interest and Penalties

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.170

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.170 Interest

[1] When Applied

Both the taxpayer and the SBE must pay interest on certain amounts. Taxpayers must pay interest on sales and tax deficiencies that arise from the following:

- Failure to timely pay tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 6592.5* (prepayments)].
- Deficiency determinations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6482*].
- Determinations after failure to file returns [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6513*].
- Jeopardy determinations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6537*].
- Extensions of time [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6459*].

The SBE must pay the taxpayer interest on overpayments of sales and use tax that arise from the following:

- Offsets [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6512*].
- Refunds and credits [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6907, 6908*].
- Refund judgments for taxpayers [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6936*].

[2] Statutory Rate of Interest

The statutory rate of interest on deficiencies is an adjusted annual rate, which is based on the rate of interest imposed on underpayments of federal income taxes [*I.R.C. § 6621*], plus three percentage points. The adjusted annual rate is redetermined every six months [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591.5(a)-(c)*]. The statutory rate of interest on overpayments also changes every six months, based on the bond equivalent rate of 13-week treasury bills established at the first auction held during either January or July [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591.5(d)*]. The amount of interest, or any other amount determined by reference to that amount of interest, is computed as simple interest, not compound interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591.5(e)*].

Deficiency determinations other than penalties, whether arising from an examination of a return or from a determination made by the SBE without a return, bear interest at the statutory rate from the last day of the month following the quarterly period in which the tax deficiency should have been included in a return until the date of payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6481, 6482, 6511, 6513, 6591.5(b)*].

If the SBE grants the taxpayer an extension of time to file a return and pay tax, interest at the statutory rate accrues from the date on which the tax would have been due and payable had the SBE not granted the extension [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6459*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1703(b)(4)*]. However, if the SBE has granted an extension to a creditor of the state of California who has not been paid because of the state's failure to adopt a budget, no interest is due on the portion of tax payment equal to the amount owed the creditor by the state on the due date of the tax payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6459(b)*; *see § 540.132*].

Taxpayers with an underpayment who are participating in an audit under the managed audit program are subject to interest on the underpayment at a rate that is one-half the rate of interest that would otherwise be charged for the underpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7076.4*; *see § 540.132[10]*].

[3] Interest on Jeopardy Determinations

If the SBE makes a jeopardy determination and the tax determined to be due is notpaid within 10 days after service of the notice, interest atthe statutory rate on both the tax and the 10 percent penalty for failure to timely pay tax accrues from the date the tax would ordinarily have been due [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6537, 6591, 6591.5*; *see also § 540.151*].

[4] Interest on Overpayments

If a taxpayer has paid more sales and use tax than is due, the SBE must pay the taxpayer interest on the overpayment at the statutory rate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6907*]. If a determination covers several tax periods, some of which involve overpayments to be offset against the underpayments, the interest is computed separately on the overpayments and the underpayments [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6483, 6512*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6591, 6907* (interest on underpayments, overpayments, respectively)]. However, if the SBE determines that the taxpayer has made any overpayment intentionally or by reason of carelessness, the SBE cannot pay interest on that overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6908(a)*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1703(b)(5)(B)*; *see also § 540.230[3][c]*].

[5] Disaster Relief From Payment of Interest

The SBE may relieve a taxpayer of the payment of interest if the SBE finds that the failure to make a return or pay tax due is caused by a disaster and occurred notwithstanding the exercise of ordinary care and the absence of willful neglect [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6593*]. Although the original purpose of this statute was to provide relief for those who suffered damage from the rains, floods and mudslides caused by the storms of early 1980, the statutory language now applies to all disasters [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6593*]. This relief from payment of interest applies only to interest imposedon the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6593*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6459, 6480.4, 6513, 6591, 6592.5*]:

- Taxpayers that have received extensions of time to pay tax or file a return.

- Motor vehicle fuel distributors, brokers, or retailers that fail to timely remit prepayments and credits to the SBE.

- Taxpayers for whom a determination is made because they failed to file returns.

- Taxpayers that have failed to pay taxes.

- Taxpayers that have been relieved of the penalties for failure to make timely prepayments.

Taxpayers are not relieved of interest added with respect to deficiency determinations [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6482, 6593*]. A taxpayer seeking relief from payment of interest must set forth the facts on which the claim for relief is based in a statement under penalty of perjury filed with the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6593*].

[6] Estoppel

Although the conduct of representatives of the SBE cannot estop the state from collecting taxes that are properly due and owing, the SBE can be estopped from collecting interest imposed on a deficiency [*Fischbach & Moore, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 627, 632, 172 Cal. Rptr. 923* ; *Market St. Ry. Co. v. State Board of Equalization (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 87, 103, 290 P.2d 20]* . In *Fischbach & Moore*, the taxpayer had relied on a specific, published legal interpretation by the SBE, and the court considered it inequitable and unjustifiable to impose interest on the deficiency. Whether other courts estop the collection of interest on acknowledged deficiencies may well depend on the conduct by the SBE that created the potential estoppel [*Fischbach & Moore, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 627, 632-633, 172 Cal. Rptr. 923* ; *but see King v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1016, 99 Cal. Rptr. 802* (taxpayer's estoppel argument rejected)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
4. Interest and Penalties

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.171

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.171 Penalties

[1] Imposition

A taxpayer may be subject to penalties for any of the following:

- Failure to timely pay tax or the amount of a deficiency or jeopardy determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6476-6478, 6487, 6511, 6514, 6514.1, 6537, 6565, 6591*, 6597].

- Failure to file a return [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6511, 6591*].

- Negligence, intentional disregard of laws or regulations, fraud, or intent to evade tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6484, 6485*].

- Evasion of tax by registering vehicles, vessels, or aircraft outside California [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6485.1*].

- Evasion of taxes by failure to obtain a seller's permit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7155*].

Most penalties are 10 percent of the tax due [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6484, 6511, 6537, 6591*], with three important exceptions. Failure to file a return or pay tax that is due to fraud incurs a 25 percent penalty [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6485, 6514*]. Failure to make timely remittance of sales tax collected from buyers incurs a 40 percent penalty [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6597(a)*]. Evasion of tax either by registration of an aircraft, vessel, or vehicle outside California or by failure to obtain a seller's permit in any period for which tax liability exceeds $1000 incurs a 50 percent penalty [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6485.1, 6514.1, 7155*].

[2] Relief for Reasonable Cause

If the SBE finds that a taxpayer's failure to file a return or pay tax is due to reasonable cause and circumstances beyond the taxpayer's control and occurs notwithstanding the exercise of ordinary care and the absence of willful neglect, it can relieve a taxpayer of various penalties involving failure to pay or collect tax due, untimely tax payments, or failure to file returns [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6592(a), 6597(a)(2)(b)*; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1703(c)(8)*]. This relief is not available for either (1) the 10 percent penalty imposed if any part of a deficiency determination is due to negligence or intentional disregard of statutes and regulations, or the 25 percent penalty imposed if any part of a deficiency determination is due to fraud or intent toevade statutes or regulations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6592(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6484, 6485*].

A taxpayer seeking relief from penalties must file a statement with the SBE setting forth under penalty of perjury the facts on which the claim for relief is based. These facts should show that the failure was due to reasonable cause and circumstances beyond the taxpayer's control, and was not a result of the taxpayer's willful neglect [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6592(b), 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1703(c)(8)*]. The SBE usually grants first requests for relief, but subsequent, repetitive requests for relief require a strong showing by the taxpayer. The SBE must establish criteria that provides for efficient resolution of requests for relief under *Rev. & Tax Code § 6592* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6592(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to File ReturnTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Avoidance & EvasionTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
4. Interest and Penalties

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.172

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.172 Relief From Taxes, Interest, and Penalties for Reliance on SBE Advice

Taxpayers who fail to file a timely tax return or pay tax due because of their reasonable reliance on written advice from the SBE may be relieved from taxes, interest, and penalties. Relief is available if the SBE finds that (1) the taxpayer requested advice from the SBE in writing regarding whether a particularly described activity or transaction was subject to tax; (2) the SBE responded in writing advising the taxpayer whether the activity or transaction was subject to tax or stating the conditions under which it could be subject to tax; (3) in reliance on the SBE's written advice, the taxpayer either failed to charge or collect sales or use tax from a customer or failed to pay use tax; and (4) the tax liability applies to a transaction or activity that occurred before the SBE either rescinded or modified its original advice or before a change in the law. A taxpayer seeking relief must file with the SBE a copy of the taxpayer's written request, a copy of the SBE's written advice, a statement under penalty of perjury of the facts on which the claim for relief is based, and any other information the SBE requires [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6596*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to File ReturnTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
4. Interest and Penalties

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.173-540.189

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.173[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
5. Petition for Redetermination

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.190

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.190 Petition for Redetermination

[1] In General

The procedures discussed here apply to redeterminations of both jeopardy determinations and deficiency determinations, although there are additional important procedural requirements applicable only to jeopardy determination discussed in *§ 540.151[3]*.

A person against whom a California sales or use tax determination has been made or any person directly interested may challenge the determination by filing with the SBE a written petition for a redetermination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5210(a); *see § 540.530*]. A taxpayer cannot bypass the petition for redetermination by seeking a judicial determination that no tax is payable because of the prohibition against injunction and other processes to prevent collection of the sales and use tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; *Casey v. Bonelli (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 253, 254-255, 208 P.2d 723*]. The only other way a taxpayer can contest a deficiency is to pay the tax and file a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*; *see § 540.231*].

Although no statute explicitly requires a petition for redetermination as a prerequisite to suit, case law considers the filing of a petition for redetermination one of the administrative remedies that taxpayers must exhaust before filing suit to contest an assessment or seek a refund [*People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 87-88, 216 P.2d 441*].

The SBE has the power to conduct a second examination after a petition for redetermination has been filed, and there is no limitation on the amount that it can assert as a deficiency. Thus, a taxpayer that files a petition for redetermination risks a second audit that may increase the amount of the asserted deficiency. [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6481, 6563*; *Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5-8, 221 P.2d 241*].

[2] Time to File

A petition for redetermination of a deficiency determination must be filed within 30 days after service of the notice of determination. If it is not filed within the 30-day period, the SBE's determination becomes final [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561*]. A petition for redetermination of a jeopardy determination must be filed and security posted within 10 days, rather than 30 days, after service of the SBE's notice [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5222.6(a); *see § 540.151[2]*].

[3] Form and Contents

The petition must be in writing and set forth the specific grounds relied on [*see § 540.530[1]*]. The petition may, however, be amended to set forth additional grounds at any time before the SBE issues its order or decision on the petition [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561.5*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5212.5]. No particular form of petition is prescribed; it can be in the form of letter. The SBE provides a simple form, which can be downloaded from, or completed on-line at, the SBE's web site at http://www.boe.ca.gov/pdf/boe416.pdf. That form may be used but is not required [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5212(c)*].

The petition must be signed by the petitioner or the petitioner's authorized representative [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5212(a)(4)*]. A request for an appeals conference or an oral hearing, or both, should be included in the petition [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5212(b)*].

Once a petition for redetermination is assigned to the appropriate section or group based on the type of tax or fee at issue [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5216*], SBE staff from the assigned section or group will promptly send the petitioner a letter acknowledging receipt of the petition for redetermination and providing the contact information for the assigned section or group [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5217(b)*]. The SBE must give the petitioner 10 days' notice of the time and place of hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6562*].

[4] Hearings

[a] Informal Appeals Conference

If the petition for redetermination is referred to the Appeals Division for an appeals conference, SBE staff will contact the petitioner to verify and update the petitioner's contact information and to inquire as to whether the petitioner would prefer that the appeals conference be held at a specific location. Unless the petitioner indicates a preference, the appeals conference will be held in the district office where the SBE's initial action occurred, which ultimately generated the petition for redetermination [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5260*]. Staff will prepare and mail to the petitioner a notice that will include the date, time, and location of the appeals conference. The notice will be accompanied by a response form, which the petitioner should complete and return within 15 days of the date the notice was mailed to the petitioner. Also within that 15-day period, the petitioner should submit any arguments and documentary evidence, not previously submitted, on which the petitioner will rely [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5261(a)-(c)*].

Appeals conferences are not recorded by the SBE. If the petitioner intends to record the appeals conference, the petitioner must check the appropriate box on the response form and agree to provide a copy of any recording or transcript to the Appeals Division on request [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5261(d)*].

The appeals conference can be (but will not necessarily be) rescheduled or postponed on the petitioner's request [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5262*]. Also, the petitioner can arrange to expedite the appeals conference [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5263*].

The appeals conference will be held by an Appeals Division staff person having no prior involvement in the matter being discussed at the appeals conference. It is the responsibility of that staff person to take a fresh look at the law and the facts and make his or her own objective recommendation [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5264(a)*; *see generally 18 Cal. Code*

Reg. § 5264(b)-(f) (nature and conduct of conference; parties; petitioner's failure to appear)]. Within 90 days, usually, after the conference, the staff person will send, to all parties, a report (called "Decision and Recommendation") that contains the following: a concise statement of each issue raised by the petitioner, the position of SBE staff in the appropriate department on each issue raised by the petitioner, a statement of the relevant law applicable to each issue raised by the petitioner, a clear application of the relevant law to all the relevant information presented to the Appeals Division staff person, the staff person's conclusions and recommendations after applying the relevant law to all of the relevant information, and a summary of any additional information or documentation that was not presented to the staff person but which might be relevant to a resolution of the issues raised by the petitioner [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5265(a),(c)*].

The petitioner or another party may obtain a reconsideration of an adverse decision and recommendation or may obtain an oral hearing before the SBE respecting the petitioner's or other party's disagreement with the decision and recommendation [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5266*].

[b] Formal Hearings

If the taxpayer requests an oral hearing before the SBE, a notice of the hearing setting forth the date, time, and place is sent to the taxpayer at least 10 days before the hearing date [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6562*]. The SBE is required to hold regular meetings each month at times and places within the state as the chairperson directs--but at least one regular meeting must be held in Sacramento each quarter--and may hold special meetings at such times and places as the chairperson directs [*Gov. Code § 15609*]. In practice, the SBE's workload fluctuates throughout the year, with the number of cases scheduled in the Los Angeles area significantly exceeding the number of cases heard in Sacramento or elsewhere; therefore, the board has flexibility to hold hearings in other locations in the state, which may be necessary to better serve taxpayers or to balance the workload for both staff and board members in preparations for those meetings. The SBE tries to accommodate a taxpayer's request that the hearing take place at a particular meeting location. In any event, the taxpayer should promptly complete the portion of the notice entitled "Response to Notice of Hearing" indicating whether or not the taxpayer will make an appearance at the time and place designated.

The hearing is recorded, but the record is not transcribed unless the taxpayer requests that it be transcribed [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5572(c)(1)*]. The taxpayer's written request may be submitted by fax or e-mail (one of those methods is preferred by SBE staff) or by regular mail or hand delivery [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5572(c)(2), (4)*]. The taxpayer bears the expense for preparing the transcript [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5572(c)(3)*].

Although rules of evidence are not strictly applied at SBE hearings, the evidence the taxpayer presents should be relevant and as direct as possible. The SBE's counsel may cross-examine witnesses, and individual members of the SBE may also question witnesses [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5523.5(a), 5523.6*]. The SBE can also issue subpoenas compelling the attendance of witnesses or the production of books, records, accounts, and other papers [*Gov. Code § 15613*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5523.5(b)]. The SBE may continue the hearing from time to time as necessary [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6562*].

[5] Decision of SBE

The SBE may either decrease or increase the amount of the determination, although the SBE may increase the amount only if it asserts a claim for the increase at or before the formal SBE hearing on the taxpayer's petition for redetermination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563*; STC Rul. 465.0020 (1/5/61) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 63-510.71]. Thus, the SBE may increase the amount of an asserted deficiency after the preliminary hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563*]. The SBE must specify the information on which it bases any increase [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(c)*], and, unless the determination or the increase is based on fraud or an intent to evade, must assert the increase within the following limitation periods:

- For any taxpayer whose taxable base is less than $10 million in each calendar quarter to which the determination applies, within the later of either three years after the first deficiency determination or three years after records requested by the SBE were made available [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(a)(1)*];

- For any other taxpayer, within the later of either eight years after the first deficiency determination or eight years after records requested by the SBE were made available [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(a)(2)*]; or

- For all taxpayers, any period mutually agreed on by the taxpayer and the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(b)*].

[6] When Decision Becomes Final

The SBE's order or decision on a petition for redetermination becomes final 30 days after it is served on the petitioner [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6564*], unless a timely petition for rehearing is filed [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. 5561(a)*; § 540.190[7]].

Service of the notice of the order or decision of the SBE can be made personally or in the same manner as prescribed for notices of deficiency determinations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6566*; *see § 540.150[2]*].

[7] Petition for Rehearing

A petition for rehearing may be filed within 30 days of the date on which notice of the SBE's decision is mailed to the taxpayer. The petition must either identify an irregularity in the proceedings that prevented the fair consideration of the matter, identify an accident or surprise that occurred, which ordinary caution could not have prevented, identify newly discovered, relevant evidence, which the taxpayer could not have reasonably discovered and provided prior to the SBE's decision, or demonstrate that there is insufficient evidence to justify the decision or that the decision is contrary to law [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5561(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
5. Petition for Redetermination

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.191-540.209

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.191[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
6. SBE's Remedies to Collect Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.210

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.210 SBE's Collection Remedies

[1] Remedies Other Than Lawsuit

The SBE has a variety of remedies, including the imposition of liens, available to it for the collection of sales and use tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6701-6830*]. All these remedies are cumulative and no action taken by either the attorney general or the SBE constitutes an election to pursue one remedy to the exclusion of any others [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6827*]. These remedies include the following:

- The SBE may serve a notice to withhold on any person or entity having possession of personal property or credits of the taxpayer, requiring the person served to freeze the responsible party's assets for 60 days or until the SBE consents to a transfer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6702*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 706.070-706.084* (earnings withholding orders for taxes)].

- The SBE may serve a notice of levy on any person or entity having possession or control of any credits or other personal property belonging to a retailer or other person liable for tax, requiring the party served to withhold from the credits or personal property the amount of any tax, interest, or penalties due or liability incurred, and to transmit the amount to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6703*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 688.010-688.050* (enforcement of state tax liability pursuant to warrant or notice of levy)].

- The SBE can obtain a judgment in favor of the state by filing a certificate with the office of the Clerk of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, or any county and requesting entry of judgment; the certificate shows the amount of tax, interest, and penalty due and the name and address of the person liable, the judgment is enforceable in the same manner as other judgments, and a recorded abstract constitutes a lien for 10 years that may be extended by rerecording [*Gov. Code § 7172*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6736-6740*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 688.110* (enforcement of judgment for taxes)].

- The amount of taxes owed, including interest, penalties, and costs, becomes a perfected and enforceable lien on the real and personal property of the person liable at the time the obligation becomes due and payable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6757(a)*]; this lien may be accorded priority over other claims if, for real property, the SBE has recorded it or if, for personal property, the SBE has filed a notice of lien with the Secretary of State [*Gov. Code §§ 7170, 7171*].

- The SBE may issue a warrant for enforcement of any liens and collection of any amounts owing; the warrant is directed to a sheriff, marshal, or the California Highway Patrol, and has the same effect and is levied in the same manner as a writ of execution [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6776*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 688.010-688.050* (enforcement of state tax liability pursuant to warrant or notice of levy)].

- The SBE may seize and sell at public auction any nonexempt property of a retailer [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6796-6799*].

For a discussion of a sales and use taxpayer's rights relating to a tax lien or levy, see *§ 540.404*.

[2] Suit for Tax

The SBE may bring an action in the name of the people of the State of California for the collection of delinquent taxes, penalties, and interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6711*]. The SBE may bring its suit (1) within three years after the tax becomes due and payable, (2) within three years after the tax becomes delinquent, or (3) while a lien is in force as the result of either the recording of an abstract under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6738* or the recording or filing of a notice of state tax lien under *Gov. Code § 7171* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6711*; *see § 540.210*]. If either of the three-year periods has passed, the SBE may no longer bring an action against the taxpayer personally, whether or not a recorded lien exists. If a recorded lien exists, the SBE can, of course, bring an action to enforce the lien [*People v. Garg (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 357, 362-364, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80]* .

The SBE may bring its action in the courts of California or any other state or in federal court, and may obtain a writ of attachment as provided in the Code of Civil Procedure [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6711-6713*; for discussion of writs of attachment,*see* Ch. 62, *Attachment*]. In the action, the SBE's certificate showing the delinquency is prima facie evidence of the determination of the tax or the amount of the tax, of the delinquency of the amounts set forth, and of the compliance by the SBE with all provisions relating to the computation and determination of amounts owed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6714*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
6. SBE's Remedies to Collect Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.211-540.229

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.211[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
7. Taxpayers' Remedies for Overpayment of Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.230

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.230 Taxpayers' Remedies for Tax Overpayment

[1] Situations Generating Overpayment

There are generally two situations in which a taxpayer may seek to recover overpayments of sales and use taxes, penalties, and interest. First, a taxpayer may erroneously overassess its tax liability, and on discovery of the error seek to recover the overpayment from the SBE. To do so, the taxpayer must first file a claim for refund with the SBE. If the SBE denies any part of the claim or fails to act on it within six months after it is filed, the taxpayer may commence a suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6932-6934*].

In the second situation, a taxpayer may receive a notice of determination from the SBE and challenge the alleged deficiency by petitioning for a redetermination [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561*; *see § 540.453[9]*]. If the taxpayer is unsuccessful or if the determination becomes final without the taxpayer's having petitioned for redetermination, the taxpayer must pay the deficiency and file a claim for refund. As in the first situation, the taxpayer may then begin a suit for refund if the SBE denies the claim or fails to act on it within six months [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6564, 6565, 6932-6934*].

Claims for refunds are discussed in *§ 540.231*. Suits for refund are discussed in *§ 540.232*.

[2] Intervention of Local Entity in Refund Process

A local entity for which the SBE has collected and administered local sales and use taxes must repay to the SBE the local tax portion of any refund allowed by SBE to a taxpayer. Nevertheless, the local entity has no right to notice of, or to participate or intervene in, refund proceedings initiated by retailer-taxpayers within the local entity's jurisdiction. It also has no right to seek to vacate the SBE's decision to grant a refund [*City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 602-605, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723]* .

However, the local entity may initiate proceedings for declaratory relief, injunction, or writ of mandate with respect to future collection of the tax [*City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 605-610, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723* ; *County of Sonoma v. State Board of Equalization (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 982, 989-990, 241 Cal. Rptr. 215]* . Similarly, a local entity has standing to bring proceedings for declaratory relief, injunction, or writ of mandate with respect to any attempts by the SBE to collect the local portion of any refund granted, which the SBE usually accomplishes by withholding offsets from current local taxes collected [*City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 605-610, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723]* .

Because of the dual functions of the SBE in administering the sales and use tax program at both the state and local level, the doctrine of collateral estoppel does not bar proceedings by a local entity brought after a refund determination is final to the taxpayer [*City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 605-607, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723]* . Although privity is usually found if an agent is party to the original proceeding, and the SBE essentially functions as the local entity's agent in collecting the tax, the SBE's function with respect to refund determinations is not to advocate or advance the local entity's position but to ascertain the facts and determine the correct application of the law [*City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 606-607, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723]* .

[3] Refunds and Credits

[a] In General

The SBE may issue refunds and credits on finding an overpayment of taxes, penalties, or interest. Refunds are distinguished from credits in that refunds are direct payments to taxpayers, whereas credits are offsets against taxes due and payable. Overpayments of taxes, penalties, or interest must be credited against any amounts due and payable by the taxpayer. Any remaining balance is then refunded [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 6935* (providing for similar offset in judgments against SBE); *see* discussion *§ 540.170[4]*, and *§ 540.232[7]*]. If an overpayment is in excess of $50,000, the SBE must obtain approval of the State Board of Control before issuing either a credit or refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*].

[b] Issued to Retailer and Returned to Purchaser

Credits and refunds are issued only to the taxpayer or to his or her successors, administrators, or executors [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*]. Because the retailer is the taxpayer of sales tax, refunds of sales tax are made to retailers [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6051, 6901*; *Decorative Carpets, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 252, 254-255, 23 Cal. Rptr. 589, 373 P.2d 637]* . If a retailer collects an excessive amount of sales tax from its customers and pays it over to the SBE, the SBE must issue a refund to the retailer, but the refund is conditioned on satisfactory proof that the retailer has returned or will return the refunded amount to the retailer's customers [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1700(b)(2), (3)*; *Decorative Carpets, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 252, 255-256, 23 Cal. Rptr. 589, 373 P.2d 637]* . One exception to this rule is that interstate airline carriers are treated as the retailer, and have standing pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6385* and *6421* to seek and sue for refunds of sales taxes paid by the seller with respect to fuel purchased by the carrier and apportioned between intrastate and extrastate use [*Delta Air Lines v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 518, 525-528, 262 Cal. Rptr. 803* (amount of sales tax retailer collects is based on estimates provided by carrier of fuel used to reach first out-of-state destination)].

A retailer is under a statutory duty to return excessive sales tax reimbursements to customers once the SBE has notified the retailer or the customer that it has ascertainedan excess. A customer may, under certain circumstances, bring an action against a retailer to compel the retailer to seek a refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901.5*; *Javor v. State Bd. of Equalization (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 790, 802-803, 117 Cal. Rptr. 305, 527 P.2d 1153 (SBE joined as defendant with retailers)* , *disapproved on other grounds*, *Woosley v. State (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 792* ; *but see State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (Petroleum Contractors) (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 568, 570-571, 169 Cal. Rptr. 3* (SBE not joined because administrative remedies not exhausted)].

The purchaser is primarily liable for the use tax and may pay the tax either directly to the SBE or through the retailer [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6202, 6203*]. If a purchaser overpays use tax to a retailer who is required to collect the tax and who gives the purchaser a receipt, the SBE credits or refunds the overpayment directly to the purchaser [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*].

[c] Interest on Refunds and Credits

The SBE must pay interest on overpayments of tax from the last day of the calendar month following the quarterly period for which the overpayment was made. However, a taxpayer is not entitled to a refund or credit of any interest that the taxpayer paid with respect to the credited or refunded amount [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6907*]. Because a taxpayer receives interest from the close of the taxable period, regardless of when the taxpayer actually made the payment, a refund of any interest paid by the taxpayer would, in effect, compensate the taxpayer for the period prior to actual payment of the disputed amount. Therefore, a taxpayer is entitled to interest only for the period commencing with the actual payment [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6482, 6907*].

Interest on refunds runs to the earlier of either (1) the last day of the calendar month following the date on which the SBE notifies the taxpayer, if the taxpayer has not already filed a claim, that a claim may be filed, or (2) the date on which the SBE approves the taxpayer's claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6907(a)*]. Interest on credits runs for the same period as does the interest computed on the amount against which the credit is applied, exactly offsetting interest on underpayments due from the taxpayer with interest on overpayments due to the taxpayer for the same taxable periods [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6907(b)*; *see § 540.512[8]*].

The SBE cannot allow interest if it determines that the taxpayer has intentionally or carelessly made an overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code§ 6908(a)*]. Otherwise, taxpayers would use the state as an investment vehicle when the statutory interest rate is attractive. For the same reason, if a taxpayer who has filed a claim for refund requests the SBE to defer action on the claim, the SBE may condition any deferral of action on a waiver of interest during the deferral period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6908(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
7. Taxpayers' Remedies for Overpayment of Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.231

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.231 Claim for Refund

[1] Time for Filing

Timely filing of a claim for refund, either on discovery of an erroneously self-assessed overpayment or after payment of a deficiency or jeopardy determination which has become final [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)*], is a jurisdictional prerequisite to bringing a suit for refund after denial of the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6932*]. Failure to file a timely claim is a waiver of the right to a refund or a credit of the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6905*]. Furthermore, the SBE may not approve a refund or credit unless the taxpayer has filed a timely claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902*]. A claim is timely if filed if within the latest of the following three periods [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)*]:

- Three years after the last day of the month following the close of the taxable period for which the overpayment was made;

- Six months after the date that the overpayment was made; or

- If the claim is for amounts paid pursuant to an SBE deficiency or jeopardy determination or a determination after a failure to file a return, six months from the date the determination becomes final [*see §§ 540.150[4], 540.151[2]*].

If taxes are paid in installments or by a combination of involuntary collections and installments, the six-month limitation commences with each partial payment. If the taxpayer waits until all payments are made to file a claim for refund, only payments made during the six months before the filing date may be claimed [*Chahine v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 485, 489-490, 272 Cal. Rptr. 56* ; *but see State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 633, 638-643, 217 Cal. Rptr. 238, 703 P.2d 1131* (suit for refund as not maintainable on basis of partial payment but only after entire amount is paid)].

In an audit, the taxpayer may agree to extend the time during which the SBE may issue a deficiency determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6488*]. In exchange, that person receives additional opportunities to obtain credits and refunds for the taxable periods covered by the extension. The SBE may approve a credit for a taxable period covered by the extension without a formal claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)(2)* (for taxpayers filing annually)]. In the typical case, the SBE credits overpayments found in such a taxable period against underpayments found in other audited periods. If overpayments exceed underpayments or the SBE fails to properly credit the overpayments, the taxpayer may obtain a refund, but only if the taxpayer files a refund claim before the extension expires [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(b)*].

A taxpayer must protect the right to any overpayments uncovered in an audit. Regardless of whether the taxpayer has executed an extension, the taxpayer should take care to file refund claims for any taxable period in which an overpayment is found before the limitations period expires. Taxpayers should consider executing an extension to obtain additional time to file a refund claim. If the audit uncovers overpayments for any taxable period, some additional time to file refund claims may be valuable [*see Holland Furnace Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 672, 674-675, 2 Cal. Rptr. 606* (refund claim for erroneously self-assessed overpayments discovered during audit as time-barred because provision barring claims not filed within six months from finality of determination does not apply to self-assessed overpayments)].

[2] Procedure for Filing and Determination

A claim for refund must be in writing and must specify the grounds on which theclaim is founded [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904*; *18* Cal. Code Reg. § 5232(a)(1)]. The claim must be carefully drafted and must assert all possible grounds for recovery because any subsequent refund suit will be limited to the grounds set forth in the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*]. It must be signed by the taxpayer or the taxpayer's authorized representative [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5232(a)*; *see § 540.531*]. A taxpayer who disagrees with the SBE staff's denial of a refund claim may request an appeals conference or a formal hearing [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5235(d)(3)*]. Requests will be liberally granted; however, a request may be denied if the taxpayer has already been provided with an appeals conference and oral hearing on the same issue, and the taxpayer does not submit any additional arguments or evidence [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5236*]. The conference and hearing procedures are the same as for redetermination requests [*see § 540.190[4]*].

The SBE must notify a claimant within 30 days of its disallowance of a refund claim in the manner prescribed for service of notice of a deficiency determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6906*; *see § 540.150[2]*]. If the SBE fails to mail notice of action on a claim within six months after the claim is filed, the claimant may, prior to the mailing of notice, consider the claim denied and bring a court action for refund of the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6934*; *see § 540.232[1]*].

[3] Class Claims

A claim filed for or on behalf of a class of taxpayers must meet all of the following requirements [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904(b)*]:

- Be accompanied by written authorization from each taxpayer sought to be included in the class;
- Be signed by each taxpayer or taxpayer's authorized representative; and
- State specific grounds on which the claim is founded.

Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904 does not create an express or implied duty to disclose the names and addresses of a class of taxpayers. It is the class representatives' responsibility to identify the class members and provide evidence of each member's consent to representation before filing a class action [*McCabe v. Snyder (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 337,*

340-341, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 315] . Thus, the Department of Motor Vehicles had no duty to disclose the names and addresses of those who paid a smog impact fee in order to facilitate a class claim [*McCabe v. Snyder (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 337, 345, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 315* (even if there were implied duty to disclose the names and addresses, disclosure would be prohibited under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7056(a)(1)*)].

The SBE has developed special procedures for handling class claims. The representative claiming a refund on behalf of himself or herself and other members of a class must establish the following [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5239(b)*]:

- The benefits of a class proceeding;

- The existence and composition of the class including a description of the members sufficient to identify the persons making up the class, the approximate number of persons in the class, and the manner in which and time when the class members shall be identified and notified of the pendency of the combined claim;

- The issues of law and fact common to all class members and those that are not, and the appropriate number of class members affected by each issue that is not common to all;

- The representative's written authority to act for each class member, including authorization for the Board staff to release to the representative any confidential information in the Board's files that may be required in connection with the claim, and which may include a separate claim for refund by the class member or may state that the class member joins in the combined claim;

- That the representative is a member of the class and when and how the representative became a member with any unique legal or factual issues pertaining to the representative's claim and any differences between the representative's status as a class member and that of any other class member being described;

- The ability of the representative to protect fairly and adequately the interest of each class member. and that the representative's interests are not antagonistic to members of the class; and

- When requested by the Board staff, that each class member has been notified of the pendency of the claim and each member has had a reasonable opportunity to join in or be excluded from the combined claim.

If the Board staff finds that the claim is a proper combined claim, it must act on the claim in the same manner, to the greatest extent possible, as on any other claim. If the Board staff finds that the claim is not a proper combined claim, it must act only on claims by individual members and notify the representative that the claim is not valid as to others [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5239(c)(1)*]. Before the SBE issues a refund to any class member, the amount of that member's overpayment must be established. The representative or member must furnish or make available to the Board's staff all contracts, documents, or records (or copies of them) necessary to verify the overpayment and the amount of overpayment. If all contracts, documents, or records are not presented to or made available to the Board's staff, the representative or member is deemed to have failed to exhaust the administrative remedies [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5239(c)(2)*].

Failure to commence a court action within 90 days after the mailing of a notice of the Board's action on a refund claim as provided in the tax law pursuant to which the claim was filed constitutes a waiver of any demand against the state on account of alleged overpayments, except as to persons who have not been previously notified of the claim and persons who have notified the Board staff that they desire to be excluded from the combined claim. Moreover, a waiver does not apply with respect to persons involved in a claim to the extent it has been declared invalid as distinguished from persons

as to whom a claim has been denied [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5239(d)(1)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
7. Taxpayers' Remedies for Overpayment of Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.232

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.232 Suit for Refund

[1] Sole Judicial Remedy

No injunction, writ of mandate, or other process may be issued to prevent or enjoin the collection of sales and use taxes, nor may a taxpayer obtaina declaratory judgment that a tax should not be collected [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; *Casey v. Bonelli (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 253, 254-255, 208 P.2d 723* ; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32* (court may not issue legal or equitable process against state or any officer of state to prevent or enjoin collection of tax)]. Thus, a refund action pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6931-6937* is a taxpayer's only state judicial remedy.

The federal courts may not enjoin, suspend, or restrain the assessment, levy, or collection of a state tax if a plain, speedy, and efficient remedy is available in the state courts [*28 U.S.C. § 1341*; *see Jerron West, Inc. v. California State Bd. of Equalization (9th Cir. 1997) 129 F.3d 1334, 1337-1339]* . Except in bankruptcy proceedings, a taxpayer's right to claim and to sue for a refund of sales and use taxes is an adequate remedy and federal relief must be denied [*California State Board of Equal. v. Coast Radio Prod. (9th Cir. 1955) 228 F.2d 520, 523-524* ; *Corbett v. Printers & Publishers Corporation (9th Cir. 1942) 127 F.2d 195, 196-197* ; *see Jerron West, Inc. v. California State Bd. of Equalization (9th Cir. 1997) 129 F.3d 1334, 1337-1339* ; *see also Arkansas v. Farm Credit Servs. (1997) 520 U.S. 821, 823-824, 117 S. Ct. 1776, 138 L. Ed. 2d 34* (under exception to section 1341 established by case law, statute does not constrain power of federal courts if United States sues to protect itself or its instrumentalities; exception not applicable under facts)].

[2] Prerequisites to Suit

The timely filing of a refund claim with the SBE is a prerequisite to a refund suit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6932*]. Failure to file a timely refund claim is a waiver of any right to recover the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6905*]. Furthermore, failure to exhaust administrative remedies such as filing a timely refund claim and assisting the SBE when necessary in evaluating it is a jurisdictional bar to court proceedings. For example, a court may refuse to hear a case in which a refund claim was timely filed if the claimant refuses to provide the SBE with necessary facts [*Barnes v. State Bd. of*

Equalization (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 994, 1001-1002, 173 Cal. Rptr. 742] .

A taxpayer cannot bring a refund suit until the disputed tax has been paid in full. A suit for a refund cannot be maintained on the basis of partial payment of the tax or deficiency [*State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 633, 638-643, 643 n.10, 217 Cal. Rptr. 238, 703 P.2d 1131* (disapproving *Snoozie Shavings, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1975) 97 Cal. App. 3d 771, 158 Cal. Rptr. 866* , and *Schaffer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 574, 241 P.2d 46* , to extent inconsistent)].

The payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refundof taxes [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to consideration of challenge directed only to an interest assessment)].

Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest and need not be paid before either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268]* .

In any event, the taxpayer should consider paying any assessed penalty and interest before or at the time of filing a claim for refund to foreclose the possibility of any collection activity being commenced by the SBE to collect them.

[3] Statute of Limitations

To be timely, a suit for refund must be filed within 90 days after the mailing of the notice of the SBE's action on a refund claim. Failure to bring an action within this period constitutes a waiver of any right to the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*]. If the SBE fails to mail notice of action on a claim within six months after the claim is filed, the claimant may consider the claim denied and may file suit at any time before the SBE mails the notice [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6934*].

[4] Class Actions

A class action can be used to obtain refunds of sales and use taxes [*Javor v. State Board of Equalization (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 790, 797, 117 Cal. Rptr. 305, 527 P.2d 1153* (class action against retailers and SBE by purchasers of motor vehicles and equipment based on sales tax overcharge), *disapproved on other grounds*, *Woosley v. State (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 792*]. The class would comprise persons who timely filed valid claims for refunds [*see Woosley v. State (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 788, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758* ; State *ex rel. Dept. of Motor Vehicles v. Superior Court (Woosley) (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 421, 434, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 88*].

A class action for tax refunds cannot be based on a class claim for refunds if the statutes governing the tax in question do not authorize the filing of a class claim for refunds [*Woosley v. State (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 788, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30, 838 P.2d 758]* . The statutes governing sales and use taxes, however, do authorize the filing of a class claim for refunds [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904(b)*].

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

A suit against the SBE for refund of sales and use tax may be filed in the superior court in any city in which the attorney general has an office (San Francisco,Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*; *see People v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300, 111 Cal. Rptr. 350* ; *Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Citizens etc. Bk. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 915, 916-917, 167 P.2d 752]* . The action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(1)*].

[6] Grounds and Burden of Proof

An action for a refund is limited to the grounds set forth in the refund claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*; *see Swaggart v. Calif. Equalization Bd. (1990) 493 U.S. 378, 110 S. Ct. 688, 107 L. Ed. 2d 796, 814-815* (refusingto determine Commerce and Due Process Clauses issues because not stated in claim); *Atari, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 665, 671-673, 216 Cal. Rptr. 267* ; *but see Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 206-207, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148* (courts may consider contention that is intertwined with contentions expressly raised in refund claim); *see § 540.532*].

A refund suit is a proceeding de novo and not an appeal from the denial of a refund claim [*Marchica v. State Board of Equalization (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 501, 512-513, 237 P.2d 725]* . The taxpayer has the burden of proof [*Riley B's, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 610, 616, 132 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 8, 221 P.2d 241]* . If the SBE asserts taxpayer fraud in order to avoid the bar of the statute of limitations on the issuance of notices of determination, the SBE has the burden of proving fraud [*Marchica v. State Board of Equalization (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 501, 510, 237 P.2d 725* ; *see § 540.152[3]*].

[7] Applicability of Doctrine of Equitable Setoff

In a suit for a refund of taxes, the SBE may raise the doctrine of equitable setoff to defeat or reduce the taxpayer's refund. Thus, when a taxpayer files a timely claim for a refund of overpayment of use taxes for a stated period, notwithstanding that the statute of limitations has run barring a deficiency against the taxpayer concerning underpayments of use taxes on other transactions, the SBE has the power to set off, against any refund due, that taxpayer's time-barred underpayments of use tax for the same period [*Sprint Communications Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1259-1262, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399]* . The SBE can properly credit and set off underpayment of taxes barred by the statute of limitations in one quarter against an overpayment of taxes in another quarter, so long as both setoffs and overpayments occurred during the period put in issue by the taxpayer's refund request [*Sprint Communications Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1264, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399]* . A taxpayer's agreement extending the SBE's statutory time to mail notice of use tax deficiencies for the period encompassing both its claim period and a stated additional period does not, however, subject that taxpayer's overpayment refunds to setoff for underpayment of time-barred use taxes occurring thereafter [*Sprint Communications Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1257, 1264-1265, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399* (with regard to exposing refund claim to setoff for underpayments occurring during extension periods, without deciding court noted that it was difficult to see why same equitable setoff principles applicable to refund claim period would not apply)]. For limitation on the SBE's right to setoff, see *§ 540.305*.

[8] Judgment for Taxpayer and Interest

A judgment may not be rendered for an assignee or anyone other than the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6937*]. If judgment is rendered for the taxpayer, the amount of the judgment is first credited against any outstanding sales or use tax liability, and the balance is directly refunded [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6935*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901* (providing for similar offset for refund claims); *but see Javor v. State Bd. of Equalization (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 939, 950-951, 141 Cal. Rptr. 226* (SBE not permitted to credit overpayments of sales taxes against retailers' current liabilities if overpayments are to be refunded to customers), *disapproved on other grounds, Woosley v. State (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 758, 792]* .

Interest is allowed at the statutory rate on any amount illegally collected, and runs from the date the overpayment was made to the date that credit is allowed or, in the case of a refund, to a date determined by the SBE not more than 30 days preceding the date of the refund warrant [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6936*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591.5* (interest rate); *see § 540.512[8]*].

[9] Litigation Costs

[a] Under Revenue and Taxation Code

In any civil proceeding brought in a court of record in California by or against the State of California in connection with the determination, collection, or refund of any tax, interest, or penalty, the prevailing party may be awarded a judgment for reasonable litigation costs including reasonable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(a), (c)(1)*]:

- Court costs;

- Expert witness expenses (rate of compensation not to exceed a rate in excess of the highest rate of compensation for expert witnesses paid by the state of California);

- Cost of any study, analysis, engineering report, test, or project which is found by the court to be necessary for the preparation of the party's case; and

- Attorney fees (rate of compensation not to exceed $75 per hour unless the court finds that a cost of living increase or a special factor, such as the limited availability of qualified counsel for the proceeding, justifies a higher rate).

To recover litigation costs, the taxpayer must have exhausted all administrative remedies prior to suit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(b)(1)*]. The taxpayer must also show that the position of the State of California was not substantially justified and substantially prevail either as to the amount in controversy or with respect to the most significant issue or set of issues presented [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(c)(2)(A)*].

Litigation costs may not be awarded with respect to any portion of the civil proceeding during which the prevailing party has unreasonably protracted that proceeding [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(b)(4)*]. Moreover, noaward of litigation costs may be made with respect to any declaratory relief proceeding [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(b)(3)*].

The term "prevailing party" does not include the State of California or any creditor of the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(c)(2)(A)*].

Litigation expenses awarded to a taxpayer under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* are not subject to an offset by the state under *Gov. Code §§ 12419.4* and *12419.5* against taxes owed, or claimed to be owed, by the taxpayer. A contrary rule would effectively nullify *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* and would thereby undermine an important mechanism for the enforcement of the citizen protections created by the Harris-Katz California Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* (*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7080-7099*) [*Garg v. People ex rel State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 199, 202-203, 215, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 376]* . The Harris-Katz California Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* is discussed in *§§ 540.360* and *540.400 -540.407*.

[b] Under Code of Civil Procedure

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, when the state is a party, costs must be awarded against it on the same basis as against any other party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1028*]. Since *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028* applies notwithstanding "any other provisions of law," its application is not foreclosed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* [*see § 540.232[9][a]*] in an action against the state under the Revenue and Taxation Code [*Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 899, 912, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* . In a taxpayer's suit for a refund, for instance, even if the taxpayer cannot recover costs under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156*, it is possible that the taxpayer could recover costs under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1028*. Among possibly applicable statutes in this context are *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 998* and *1032*:

- Except as otherwise expressly provided by statute, a prevailing party is entitled as a matter of right to

recover costs in any action or proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*]. The "prevailing party" includes the party with a net monetary recovery, a defendant in whose favor a dismissal is entered, a defendant when neither plaintiff nor defendant obtains any relief, and a defendant as against those plaintiffs who do not recover any relief against that defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(a)(4)*].

- The costs allowed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032* must be withheld or augmented as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 998* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(a)*].

If an offer made by a plaintiff is not accepted, and the defendant fails to obtain a more favorable judgment or award in any action or proceeding, then the court or arbitrator has discretion to require the defendant to pay a reasonable sum to cover costs of the services of expert witnesses, who are not regular employees of any party, actually incurred and reasonably necessary in the preparation for trial or arbitration of the case or during trial or arbitration, or both, by the plaintiff, in addition to plaintiff's costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 998(d)*]. In a taxpayer's suit for a refund, if the taxpayer offered to settle, and the state rejected the offer but failed to obtain a more favorable judgment, then the taxpayer may invoke this provision so as to recover expert witness costs in addition to other costs [*Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 899, 912-913, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* .

Costs are recoverable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)* unless some other statute expressly provides otherwise. There is no such express exception in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156*, which therefore does not preclude the application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*. Indeed, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* complements, rather than supplants, the more general cost statutes of the Code of Civil Procedure. Under the cost-shifting provision of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156*, a prevailing taxpayer in a refund action is eligible for attorney's fees in addition to costs and expenses. However, if a prevailing taxpayer fails to meet the requirements of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* [*see § 540.232[9][a]*], the taxpayer would be entitled to an award of costs only, under the general rule of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*, with possible augmentation under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998(d)* [*Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 899, 913-915, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction ActCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. SALES AND USE TAXES
7. Taxpayers' Remedies for Overpayment of Tax

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.233-540.249

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.233[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.250

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.250 Governing Law

The California Personal Income Tax Law is contained in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17001-18180*. The California Corporation Tax Law is contained in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23001-25141*. Administration of franchise and income tax laws, including the Personal income Tax Law and the Corporation Tax Law, is governed by *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18401-19802*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesFranchise TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.251-540.269

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.251[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.270

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.270 Personal Income Tax

[1] Who Must File Returns

California individual income tax returns must be filed with the FTB by persons who have any of the following items of income [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18407, 18501*]:

- Adjusted gross income (from all sources) over $8,000 if single or $16,000 if married.
- Gross income over $10,000 if single or $20,000 if married, regardless of adjusted gross income.

The amounts noted above are to be indexed for inflation for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1996 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18501(d)*]. Fortaxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1999, the FTB must also recompute the above amounts to take into account the senior exemption credit under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17054(c)* and the dependent credit under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17054(d)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18501(c), (e)*].

If an individual is unable to make a return required under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18501*, the return of that individual must be made by a duly authorized agent, his or her committee, guardian, fiduciary, or other person charged with the care of the person or property of the individual. This requirement, however, does not apply in the case of a receiver of property appointed by authority of law in possession of only a part of an individual's property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18505.6*].

The executor or administrator of a deceased taxpayer, or other person charged with the property of that decedent, must file a California income tax return on behalf of the decedent for (1) the year of death, regardless of the amount of the decedent's income, and (2) any prior years for which the decedent should have, but did not, file returns [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18505(g), 18505.3*]. Minors are subject to the same minimum income filing guidelines as adults. The earnings of a child must be reported on a separate income tax return and included in the child's gross income, regardless of

whether the child receives the income [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 17081*; *see I.R.C. § 73*].

[2] Time for Filing Returns

A California income tax return for a calendar year is generally due by April 15 of the following year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18566*]. A fiscal year return must be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the fourth month following the close of the fiscal year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18566*]. The returns are filed with the FTB in Sacramento. If a taxpayer fails to file a return within 60 days after the FTB issues a notice and demand for the return, the FTB may petition the courts for a writ of mandate to require the taxpayer to file a return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19710*].

Taxpayers filing individual tax returns are given an automatic six-month extension of time to file a return without submitting a written request for an extension, if the taxpayer files the return within six months of its original due date [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567*; F.T.B. Notice 91-3 (Nov. 1, 1991); FTB Form 3519 (automatic extension)]. An extension of time to file is not an extension of time for payment of tax owed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567(b)*; *see* FTB Form 3519]. Taxpayers who are residing or traveling abroad on the ordinary due date of the return are given automatic extensions until June 15 for filing, and members of the United States armed forces or the merchant marine who are outside the United States on the ordinary due date (and their spouses) are given a 180-day extension after returning to the United States [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18567(a), 18570, 18571* (adopting federal provisions in *I.R.C. § 7508* regarding return filing extensions for certain military personnel and their spouses)].

[3] Amended Returns

A taxpayer may file an amended return as a claim for refund or credit for taxes overpaid within the later of [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*; *18 Cal. Code Reg § 19322*]:

- Four years from the date the original return was filed (if filed within the time prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567* or *18604*, whichever is applicable);

- Four years after the last day prescribed for filing the original return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the return); or

- One year after the date of the overpayment.

A taxpayer must file an amended California return within six months after filing an amended federal return, but only if the changes would increase the amount of California tax owed by the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(b)*].

Similarly, if (1) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or other officer of the United States or other competent authority corrects or changes any item required to be shown on a federal tax return for any year or (2) a renegotiation of a contract or subcontract with the United States results in a change in gross income or dedu Notice 91-3 (Nov. 1, 1991) Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567(b) Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18567(a) 18571 I.R.C. § 7508 Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306 18 Cal. Code Reg § 19322 Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567 18604 Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(b)ctions, the taxpayer must report to the FTB each change or correction, or the results of a negotiation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*]. This report is normally made as an amended return, and the taxpayer must file it within six months after the final federal determination of each change, correction, or renegotiation [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*]. The date of each final federal determination is the date on which each adjustment or resolution resulting from an IRS examination is assessed under *I.R.C. § 6203* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(d)*]. However, the taxpayer need not report changes or corrections unless they increase the amount of tax payable [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*].

The discussion of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622* above reflects amendments to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622* by Stats. 1999, ch. 987, § 56. These amendments apply to federal determinations that become final as defined in *Rev. & Tax. Code §*

18622(d), on or after January 1, 2000 [Stats. 1999, ch. 987, § 105]. As amended, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*, requires the taxpayer to a change or correction to any item required to be shown on a federal tax return; formerly the reporting requirement extended only to changes or corrections to the gross income or deductions reported on the federal return.

If a taxpayer required to report a change or correction to the FTB under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)* does so within six months after the final federal determination, or the IRS reports that change or correction within that period, the FTB has within two years from the date the notice was filed with the FTB by the taxpayer or IRS, or within the period specifiedin *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19057, 19058*, or *19065*, whichever period expires later, to make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from those adjustments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19059(a)*]. The date of each final federal determination is the date on which each adjustment or resolution resulting from an IRS examination is assessed under *I.R.C. § 6203* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(d)*].

Similarly, if a taxpayer required to file an amended return with the FTB under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(b)* does so within six months of filing an amended return with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the FTB has within two years from the date the amended return was filed with the FTB by the taxpayer, or within the period specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19057, 19058*, or *19065*, whichever period expires later, to make a proposed deficiency assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19059(b)*].

If, however, the taxpayer fails to report a change or correction or fails to file an amended return as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622*, the FTB may make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from the adjustments at any time. Moreover, if a taxpayer or the IRS reports a change or correction or files an amended return as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622* after the six month periods specified in that section have elapsed, the FTB has within four years from the date the change or correction was reported by the taxpayer or IRS, or the amended return was filed, to make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from the proposed adjustment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19060(a), (b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(c)* (content of taxpayer's notification to FTB)].

Although the time periods specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19059* and *19060* may have been complied with, for individual taxpayers concerning taxable years ending after October 10, 1999, however, including those required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)* to report a change or correction by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or other officer of the United States or other competent authority, under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19116* the FTB must suspend the imposition of interest, penalty, addition to tax, or additional amount if the FTB fails to give notice as specified in that section within the appropriate period [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19116(a), (b), (e), (g)*]. The suspension will be applied selectively, however [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19116(c),(d)* (item-by-item application; amounts not subject to suspension)], and the suspension is not required for taxpayers with taxable income greater than $200,000 that have been contacted by the FTB regarding the use of a potentially abusive tax shelter [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19116(f)*, effective for notices sent after January 1, 2004].

In affording the FTB a four year limitation period in which to notify a taxpayer of a state tax deficiency assessment, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19057* by its terms does not establish an outer time limit for notification by the FTB in all circumstances. Instead, an alternative limitation period applies when, after the taxpayer files a tax return, the IRS intervenes and finally determines that the taxpayer's federal taxable income and tax liability are greater than reported in the federal return for a particular tax year, with resulting increases in state taxable income and the amount of state income tax computed on it for the same period. In the event of such an intervention by the IRS, either *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19059* or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19060* provides the alternative period during which the FTB may notify the taxpayer of a deficiency assessment. The duration of that period depends on whether and when the taxpayer reported to the FTB the final results of the IRS examination of the taxpayer's return [*Ordlock v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 897, 902, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212, 135 P.3d 628]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.271

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.271 Corporation Tax

[1] Who Must File Returns

Every taxpayer who is subject to any tax under the Corporation Tax Law must file a tax return [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18407, 18601(a)*]. Taxes imposed under the Corporation Tax Law include:

- The corporation franchise tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23151*].
- The corporation income tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23501*].
- The corporation alternative minimum tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23400*]
- The tax on unrelated business income of otherwise-exempt nonprofit organizations [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23731*].
- The tax on income of an otherwise-exempt political organization from sources other than contributions, dues, and political fund-raising events [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23701r*].
- The tax on income of an otherwise-exempt homeowners' association from sources other than membership dues, fees, and assessments [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23701t* (includes time-share association)].

A principal officer of the taxpayer must sign any required return under penalty of perjury. If a receiver, bankruptcy trustee, or assignee is operating the property or business of a bank or corporation, that person must make the return [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18606(a), 18621*].

[2] Time for Filing Returns

A taxpayer subject to the income or franchise tax is required to file an annual return on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of its "taxable year" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18601(a)*]. For purposes of the franchise tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23101 et seq.*], the term "taxable year" means the calendar year, or the fiscal year for which the tax is payable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(a), (c)*]. For purposes of the tax on limited partnerships [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23081 et seq.*], the corporation income tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23501 et seq.*], or the tax imposed on exempt corporations [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23701 et seq.*], the term "taxable year" is the calendar year or the fiscal year upon the basis of which the net income is computed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(b), (c)*].

A "taxable year" can also be a period of less than 12 months [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(d)*]. When referring to a calendar or fiscal year beginning before January 1, 2000, upon the basis of which the net income is computed, the term "taxable year" means "income year" [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(e)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23042(a)* for a definition of "income year"; a legislative change in terminology enacted in 2000 gave "income year" and "taxable year" the same meaning for calendar and fiscal years beginning on or after January 1, 2000, but under a transitional rule, for the first taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2000, the term "taxable year" had two meanings, as explained at Stats. 2000, ch. 862, § 227].

For taxpayers required to file a return for a short period under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 24634*, however, the due date for the short period return is the same as the due date of the federal tax return that includes the taxpayer's net income for that short period, or the due date specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18601(a)* if no federal return is required to be filed that would include the net income for that short period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18601(c)*]. Moreover, farmers' or fruit growers', or like associations organized and operated in whole or in part on a co-operative or mutual basis must file returns on or before the 15th day of the ninth month following the close of their taxable year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18601(b)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 24404*].

The FTB may grant a reasonable extension of time, of up to seven months from the return's original due date, for filing any return required under the Bank and Corporation Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18604(a)*]. The grant of an extension of time to file a return, however, does not extend the time for payment of taxes due beyond the original due date for the return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18604(b)*].

[3] Amended Returns

A bank and corporation taxpayer must file an amended California return if the taxpayer files an amended federal income tax return. The amended California return must be filed within six months after the amended federal return is filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(b)*]. Similarly, if (1) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or other officer of the United States or other competent authority corrects or changes any item required to be shown on a federal tax return, or (2) a renegotiation of a contract or subcontract with the United States results in a change in gross income or deductions, the taxpayer must report to the FTB each change or correction, or the results of a negotiation, within six months after each final federal determination of the change or correction or renegotiation and either concede the accuracy of the determination or state why it is erroneous [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*]. The date of each final federal determination is the date on which each adjustment or resolution resulting from an IRS examination is assessed under *I.R.C. § 6203* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(d)*].

If a taxpayer required to report a change or correction to the FTB under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)* does so within six months after the final federal determination, or the IRS reports that change or correction within that period, the FTB has within two years from the date the notice was filed with the FTB by the taxpayer or IRS, or within the period specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19057, 19058*, or *19065*, whichever period expires later, to make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from those adjustments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19059(a)*].

Similarly, if a taxpayer required to file an amended return with the FTB under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(b)* does so within six months of filing an amended return with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the FTB has within two years from the date the amended return was filed with the FTB by the taxpayer, or within the period specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19057*, *19058*, or *19065*, whichever period expires later, to make a proposed deficiency assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19059(b)*].

If, however, the taxpayer fails to report a change or correction or fails to file an amended return as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622*, theFTB may make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from the adjustments at any time. Moreover,if a taxpayer or the IRS reports a change or correction or files an amended return as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622* after the six month periods specified in that section have elapsed, the FTB has within four years from the date the change or correction was reported by the taxpayer or IRS, or the amended return was filed, to make a proposed deficiency assessment resulting from the proposed adjustment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19060(a)*, *(b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(c)* (content of taxpayer's notification to FTB); Appeal of Pullman Company (SBE, 3/28/72) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 204-749 (after reporting period expired, inadequate notice by taxpayer to FTB of IRS changes treated as failure to report change or correction; applying prior law); Appeal of Market Lessor's Inc. (SBE, 9/12/68) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 203-962 (before reporting period expired, inadequate notice by taxpayer to FTB of IRS changes treated as insufficient compliance with reporting requirement; applying prior law)].

The discussion of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18622*, *19059* and *19060* above reflects the amendments to those sections by Stats. 1999, ch. 987, §§ 56, 71 and 72. The amendments apply to federal determinations that become final as defined in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(d)*, on or after January 1, 2000 [Stats. 1999, ch. 987, § 105]. As amended, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(a)*, requires the taxpayer to a change or correction to any item required to be shown on a federal tax return; formerly the reporting requirement extended only to changes or corrections to the gross income or deductions reported on the federal return. The amendments also added subdivision (d) defining "final federal determination." Also, under the former version of the section, a bank or corporate taxpayer did not have to report changes or corrections if they did not increase the amount of tax payable for any year. Before *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19059* and *19060* were amended, there were no provisions for IRS reporting as specified in those sections. Thus, with regard to final federal determinations as defined in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622(d)*, on or after January 1, 2000, if the IRS reports to the FTB as specified in those sections, those reports have the same effect as if the taxpayer had done so.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.272

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.272 Overview of Audits and Assessments

[1] Audits

The FTB has broad authority to audit taxpayer records to determine correct tax liability [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19504*]. It has the power (1) to examine any books, papers, records, or other data relevant to tax liabilities, (2) to require the attendance of the taxpayer or the taxpayer's agents for an audit examination, and (3) to issue subpoenas to any person in connection with any facts or records relevant to the determination of tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19504*; *see Franchise Tax Board v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 878, 881, 151 Cal. Rptr. 460]* . When examining a return, the FTB may not use financial status or economic reality examination techniques to determine the existence of unreported income of any taxpayer unless the FTB has a reasonable indication that there is a likelihood of unreported income [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19504(e)*]. If the FTB examines the taxpayer's return and determines that additional tax is due, the FTB is empowered to assess the taxpayer for that tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19032 et seq.*].

[2] Assessments

[a] Grounds and Procedures

The FTB may make an assessment of additional tax, along with any applicable interest and penalties, if (1) the taxpayer's computation of tax liability is mathematically incorrect [*see* FTB Leg. Rul. 384 (4/1/75) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 205-236]; (2) a state or federal audit results in a redetermination of tax liability [*see* Appeal of Schneider (SBE, 8/1/80) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-482; *cf. Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 965-966, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (deficiency assessment after IRS adjusted taxpayers' federal return)]; (3) the taxpayer fails to file a return; or (4) the taxpayer files an incomplete or false return [*see* Appeal of Hahn (SBE, 11/16/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-031].

The FTB generally proceeds to assess the tax due by (1) notifying the taxpayer of a mathematical error and requesting

payment, (2) notifying the taxpayer of a proposed deficiency assessment, or (3) making an estimated assessment [*see §§ 540.273, 540.274*].

[b] Presumption of Correctness of Assessment

The findings of the FTB in assessing taxes are prima facie correct [*see* Appeal of Livingston (SBE, 12/13/71) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 204-711; *see also Todd v. McColgan (1949) 89 Cal. App. 2d 509, 514, 201 P.2d 414* (burden on taxpayer to establish error)]. Taxpayers, therefore, have the burden of producing sufficient evidence to overcome the resulting presumption of correctness [Appeal of Mason (SBE, 3/30/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-604; Appeal of Nesbit (SBE, 12/11/79) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-277; *see also Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 966, 975-976, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (presumption of regularity overcome when deficiency notice showed FTB did not comply with requirement that when taxpayer's return is available taxing agency must review return before issuing deficiency notice); *cf.* Stats. 2000, ch. 414, §§ 1, 2 (amending *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033* to clarify FTB's powers to issue deficiency assessments after *Wertin* holding)]. The presumption is not overcome by the unsupported statements of the taxpayer [Appeal of Cookston (SBE, 9/29/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-046]. Constitutional arguments are generally not sufficient to rebut the presumption [*see* Appeal of Bagley (SBE, 11/18/80) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-452].

This presumption of correctness applies to assessments based on either FTB audits or federal audit reports [Appeal of Durso (SBE, 11/18/80) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-454; Appeal of Castillo (SBE, 3/4/80) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-298; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 18622*].

[c] More Than One Assessment for Year

The FTB is not barred from proposing more than one timely deficiency assessment for the same taxable year, even if the taxpayer paid the first assessment [Appeal of Pyle (SBE, 9/25/79) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-257; *see also* FTB Leg. Rul. 265 (9/17/64) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 202-555].

[d] Time Limitation on Assessments

Generally, the FTB may not assess or collect a deficiency for a taxable year unless it mails notice of a deficiency assessment to the taxpayer within four years after the date on which the return for the year in question was filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19057*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 19066*]. If the taxpayer consents during this four-year period to extend the period for assessment beyond the applicable period, the FTB may make an assessment at any time during the extended period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19067(a)*].

Effective January 1, 2001, the FTB must notify the taxpayer of the taxpayer's right to refuse to extend the expiration of the time prescribed for the mailing of a notice of a proposed deficiency assessment, or to limit that extension to a particular period of time, on each occasion when the taxpayer is requested to provide the taxpayer's consent [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19067(b), (c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.273

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.273 Estimated Assessments if No Return or False or Fraudulent Return Filed

[1] Issuance

If a taxpayer has not filed a complete return or has filed a false or fraudulent return with an intent to evade tax, the FTB may require the taxpayer to file a complete return, estimate the taxpayer's income from any available information, and issue an estimated assessment of tax based on that information [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19087(a)*; Appeal of Hesbon (SBE, 11/16/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-084; *see* Appeal of Ramfjeld & Co., Inc. (SBE, 1/6/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-491; *see also* Appeal of Rose (SBE, 10/27/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-695].

[2] Basis of Estimate

An estimated assessment of tax may be based on any available information concerning the amount of a taxpayer's income [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19087(a)*]. The most frequently used sources of information are federal audit reports and W-2 information returns [*see* Appeal of McCaw (SBE, 3/3/82) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-140; Appeal of Means (SBE, 5/19/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-625].

[3] Form of Assessment

An estimated assessment is issued in the form of a notice of proposed deficiency assessment. The procedural rules applicable to deficiency assessment, including the rights of protest and appeal, apply equally to estimated assessments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19087(b)*; *see § 540.274*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration &

ProceedingsFailure to File ReturnTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Avoidance & EvasionTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsFailure to File Return

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.274

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.274 Proposed Deficiency Assessment if Return Filed

[1] Issuance and Contents

The FTB may issue a notice of a proposed deficiency assessment (hereinafter referred to as an NPA) if the tax reported on the original return is less than the tax disclosed by the FTB's examination of the return [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19033(a), 19034(a)*]. Effective January 1, 2000, each notice must include the date determined by the FTB as the last day on which the taxpayer may file a written protest under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041*. Failure to include this date, however, does not invalidate a notice that is otherwise valid [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19034(b), (c)*]. The NPA contains both the reasons for the proposed assessment and the computation of additional tax due [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19033(a), 19034*]. In no case can the determination of the deficiency be arbitrary or without foundation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(a)*]. If an NPA is based on a federal audit report, a statement on the NPA to that effect is considered sufficient notice to the taxpayer of the basis of the assessment [Appeal of Crosno (SBE, 1/9/79) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 206-083; *cf. Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 973-976, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (notwithstanding IRS adjustment to taxpayers' federal return, when taxpayers' state return is available FTB must comply with requirement that taxing agency review return before issuing deficiency notice)].

For NPA's issued on or after January 1, 2001, if the original or amended return or related electronically stored return data has been destroyed or cannot be located after reasonable effort, the taxpayer on request from the FTB must provide to the FTB a paper or electronic copy of the return in question. If the taxpayer fails to provide the return within 30 days, which may be extended an additional 30 days for reasonable cause, from the date of the request, the *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(b)(1)* requirement that the FTB examine the original or amended return or related electronically storedreturn data in connection with the determination of a proposed deficiency assessment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(a)* does not apply [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(b)(2), (d)*]. For definition of "electronically stored return data" as used in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033, see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(c)*.

For NPA's issued on or after January 1, 2008, the notice of proposed deficiency must be mailed in a manner that includes a postmark, that is, a postal marking made on a letter, package, or postcard indicating the date on which the item is delivered to the U.S. Postal Service [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033(e), (f)*].

[2] Definition of "Deficiency"

A "deficiency" is defined as the difference between the correct tax due and the amount shown on the return, plus prior assessments, less any rebates, credits, refunds, or other repayments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19043*].

[3] When and to Whom Notice of Proposed Assessment Must Be Sent

Generally, the FTB must send an NPA within four years after the date on whichthe return was filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19057*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 19066*]. A certificate of mailing of an NPA by the FTB or State Board of Equalization (hereinafter referred to as the SBE) is prima facie evidence of the assessment of the deficiency and notice thereof [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19050*; *see* Appeal of Anderson (SBE, 9/29/81) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-066]. The FTB is required to send only one joint NPA to a married couple who have filed a joint return unless either spouse notifies the FTB that the couple has established separate residences. In that case, the FTB must mail duplicate originals of the joint NPA to each spouse [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19035*].

[4] Finality of Assessment

A deficiency assessment becomes final 60 days after the NPA is issued unless the taxpayer files a protest with the FTB within that time [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19042*; *see § 540.277*]. When an assessment has become final, it is due and payable within 15 days of the date the FTB issues its notice and demand for payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19049* as amended by Stats. 1997, ch. 600, § 5 (amendments made by act adding subdivision operative for notices issued on or after January 1, 1998)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.275

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.275 Jeopardy Assessments

[1] Authorized if Collection or Assessment in Jeopardy

The FTB is authorized to issue a jeopardy assessment whenever it determines that the assessment or collection of tax, including deficiencies, for any current or past year will be jeopardized in whole or in part. The notice of jeopardy assessment constitutes a demand for payment and, if no deficiency assessment has been previously issued, it also constitutes an NPA pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081*; *see* Appeal of Marshak (SBE, 3/31/82) CCH Cal. Tax Rptr. P 400-183]. A finding of jeopardy by the FTB is presumptive evidence in subsequentproceedings that the assessment or collection of tax or deficiency was in jeopardy when the finding was made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19086*].

The FTB also has authority, in the case of tax for a current period, to find that the assessment or collection of that tax will be jeopardized in whole or in part by the delay and therefore to (1) declare the taxpayer's taxable period immediately terminated, and (2) make immediate demand for payment of the tax for the terminated period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19082*].

[2] Authorized for Possession of Large Sums of Cash

If a person in physical possession of cash in excess of $10,000 does not claim the cash as his or hers, or as belonging to another person who acknowledges ownership, the FTB may presume that the cash represents gross income and may issue a jeopardy assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19093(a)*].

[3] Limitation Concerning Jeopardy Assessment and Levy

For taxes assessed and levies made after October 10, 1999, unless the Chief Counsel of the FTB (or the Chief Counsel's delegate) personally approves in writing the assessment or levy, no jeopardy assessment can be made under *Rev. & Tax.*

Code §§ 19081-19093 and no levy can be issued less than 30 days after the earlier of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(1)(A), (d)* (subdivisions added by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 16); *see* Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 40 (effective date)]:

- A notice and demand is mailed or issued for payment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081*.
- Notice and demand for a return and payment is mailed or issued under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19082*.

[4] Notice of Jeopardy Assessment

Within five days after the date the FTB mails or issues a jeopardy assessment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081* or a demand for payment of tax for any terminated period under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19082*, the FTB must mail or issue the taxpayer a written statement of the information on which it relies in issuing the jeopardy assessment or demand [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(1)(B)*].

[5] Collection and Stay of Collection Before Finality

A jeopardy assessment is immediately due and payable, and the FTB may commence collection proceedings when it issues the assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083(a)*]. Although the FTB may initiate collection procedures and seize the taxpayer's property without administrative hearing, it cannot sell the taxpayer's property without a prior administrative hearing, evenif the taxpayer cannot post security [*Dupuy v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 410, 415-418, 124 Cal. Rptr. 900, 541 P.2d 540* (sale without prior administrative hearing violative of due process)].

A taxpayer may stay collection of a jeopardy assessment until it becomes final by filing a bond with the FTB in an amount equal to the amount of tax and interest the taxpayer desires to have stayed [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19083(b)*]. The taxpayer may file security other than a bond in an amount determined necessary by the FTB, but this amount cannot be more than double the amount of tax and interest assessed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083(b)*]. Once the taxpayer has filed the bond or other security, collection is stayed to the extent of the amount covered by the security, and the period of limitation on any action to collect the tax is tolled during the stay [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083(c), (e)*].

The FTB may itself stay collection of the assessment if it finds that jeopardy nolonger exists [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083(d)*]. However, the taxpayer can waive the stay of collection by payment of any part of the assessment, and, to the extent the assessment is abated, the FTB must proportionately reduce the bond or other security at the taxpayer's request [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083(c)*].

[6] Petition for Review

[a] As Not Staying Collection

A taxpayer issued a jeopardy assessment may petition the FTB to review whether its findings pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19081* (assessment or collection jeopardized) or 19082 (termination of current taxable period) are reasonable under the circumstances. The taxpayer must file the petition within 30 days after the date on which the taxpayer is furnished with the written statement required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(1)(B)* [*see § 540.475[8]*], or 30 days after the last day of the period within which the FTB must furnish that statement. The petition for review must state the grounds on which it is based and does not operate as a stay of collection. Collection can be stayed only by the bond or security procedure described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(2)*; *see § 540.275[5]*]. A petition for review is considered a protest pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(2)*; *see § 540.277*]. If the petition for review requests an oral hearing, the FTB must grant an oral hearing to the taxpayer or the taxpayer's authorized representative [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(4)*]. If the taxpayer does not file a petition for review within the 30-day period, the finding of jeopardy becomes final [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(3)*].

[b] Burdens of Proof on Review

On a petition for review of a jeopardy assessment, the FTB must consider all relevant factors, including, but not limited to, the likelihood thatcollection will be jeopardized, the assets of the taxpayer, and the amount of the assessment as it relates to whether jeopardy exists [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(6)*]. The FTB has the burden of proving whether a jeopardy exists as to collection of the tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(4)*]. The taxpayer has the burden of proving the correct amount of the assessment for purposes of determining jeopardy status [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(6)*].

[c] Administrative Appeal to SBE of FTB's Determination on Review

[i] Time for Filing

The FTB must make its determination on review within 90 days after the filing of the petition for review unless the taxpayer makes a written request for additional time [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(5)*]. The taxpayer may appeal the FTB's determination on review to the SBE within 60 days after whichever of the following is earlier: (1) the day the FTB notifies the taxpayer of its determination on review, or (2) one day after the 90-day period prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(5)* within which the FTB is required to make its determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19046*, 19085; *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5410 et seq.* (SBE procedure)].

[ii] Effect of Appeal

If the taxpayer does not file an appeal within the applicable 60-day period, the FTB's determination is final. Filing of a notice of appeal does not operate to stay collection. Collection can be stayed only by the bond or security procedure described by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19083* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(2)*; *see § 540.275[5]*].

[iii] Procedures for Appeal

The appellant may request an oral hearing, but in the absence of a request, the appeal will be decided without a hearing [*18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5440, 5441*]. The burdens of proof and relevant factors are the same on review by the SBE as at the FTB review [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(3), (5)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(4), (6)*; *see § 540.275[6][b]*].

The SBE must determine within 60 days after the filing of an appeal whether the issuance of the jeopardy assessment, or the demand pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081* (assessment or collection jeopardized) or 19082 (termination of current taxable period) is reasonable under the circumstances [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(3)*]. If either party requests an extension of the 60-day period and establishes reasonable grounds for the extension, the SBE can grant an extension of not more than 30 days [*Rev.& Tax. Code § 19084(b)(6)*]. The SBE's failure to make its determination within the 60-day period or any extended period is deemed denial of the taxpayer's appeal [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(4)*]. If the SBE determines that jeopardy status does not apply to any part of the assessment, it may modify the amount of the assessment to which the jeopardy attaches [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(4)*].

The SBE's decision becomes final if neither the FTB nor the taxpayer begins a civil action within the 60-day period provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(1)* [*see § 540.275[6][d]*]. The filing of a civil action does not operate to stay collection [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(2)*].

[d] Judicial Review of FTB's Decision on Administrative Appeal

[i] In General

Either the taxpayer or the FTB may bring a civil action against the other in thesuperior court for a judicial determination as to whether the issuance of the jeopardy assessment, or the demand pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081* (assessment or collection jeopardized) or 19082 (termination of current taxable period) is reasonable under the circumstances. The civil action must be brought within 60 days after whichever of the following is earlier: (1) the day

the SBE notifies the taxpayer of its determination, or (2) if the SBE fails to make a timely determination, one day after the 60-day period prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(b)(3), (6)* for the SBE to make its determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(1)*].

These civil actions must be filed in superior court in the counties of Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, or Sacramento [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(7)*]. The requirements of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19387* (service) and 19389 (Attorney General as counsel for FTB) apply [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(7)*].

The burdens of proof and relevant factors are the same in the civil action as in administrative appeals before the FTB and SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(3), (5)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(a)(4), (6)*; *see § 540.275[6][b]*].

[ii] Time for Court's Decision

Within 60 days after proper service is made, the superior court must determine whether issuance of the jeopardy assessment or the demand pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081* (assessment or collection jeopardized) or 19082 (termination of current taxable period) is reasonable under the circumstances [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(3)*]. If either the taxpayer or the FTB requests an extension of the 60-day period and establishes reasonable grounds for the extension, the superior court can grant an extension of not more than 30 days [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19084(c)(6)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.276

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.276 Estoppel

A taxpayer may argue that the FTB should be estopped from imposing tax because the taxpayer acted on incorrect or misleading information provided by the FTB. However, the FTB cannot be estopped from imposing tax, although estoppel may prevent imposition of interest and penalties if grave injustice would otherwise result [*Fischbach & Moore, Inc., v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 627, 632, 172 Cal. Rptr. 923* ; *Market S. R. Co. v. California State Board of Equalization (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 87, 100-101, 290 P.2d 20* ; *but see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012* (relief from tax liability if taxpayer reasonably relied on written advice from FTB); *see § 540.404[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.277

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.277 Protest and Appeal of Deficiency Assessment

[1] Filing of Protest by Taxpayer

Taxpayers may contest a proposed deficiency assessment of either personal income tax or bank or corporation tax by filing a protest with the FTB. The protest must be in writing, specify the grounds on which it is based, and be mailed to the FTB within 60 days after the date the proposed deficiency assessment was mailed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041(a)*]. With regard to any notice of proposed deficiency assessment mailed after December 31, 1999, any protest filed with the FTB on or before the last date specified for filing that protest by the FTB in the notice of proposed deficiency assessment (according to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19034*) must be treated as timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041(b), (c)*].

The rights of protest and appeal do not apply to assessments involving only a mathematical error [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19051*].

[2] Action by FTB

Once a protest is filed, the FTB must reconsider its assessment of the deficiency and, if the taxpayer requests it, grant the taxpayer an oral hearing. The FTB may make a decision on only a part of the protest, and the remaining part continues to be under protest until the FTB acts on it [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19044*].

[3] Appeal of FTB's Decision to SBE

The FTB's action on a protest, whether in whole or in part, becomes final 30 days after the FTB mails its notice of action, unless the taxpayer appeals to the SBE within the 30-day period beginning on the date the FTB mails its notice of action to the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19046, 19047* and 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5010-5012, 5070-5087 on appeal procedure]. With regard to any FTB notice of action on theprotest mailed after December 31, 1999, any appeal to the SBE by the taxpayer on or before the date for filing an appeal specified in the

notice (under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(b)(1)*) must be treated as timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(b)(2)*].

If the taxpayer appeals to the SBE, the SBE's decsion becomes final 30 days after its determination unless the taxpayer seeks a rehearing during that period. If the taxpayer seeks a rehearing, the SBE's determination on the rehearing is final 30 days after the SBE issues it [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19048*]. Once the SBE's decision is final, the tax must be paid. Payment is a prerequisite to the filing of a claim for refund and eventually an action for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19042, 19049, 19306, 19382*; *see § 540.71*; see also *§ 540.300* et seq.].

[4] Payment of Protested Deficiency During Protest and Appeal Process

If the taxpayer decides to pay the protested deficiency assessment before theSBE issues its decision (for example, with or after the filing of the protest or after filing the appeal to the SBE), the protest or appeal is treated as a claim for refund or an appeal from the denial of a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19335*]. In this situation, a taxpayer is bound in a subsequent suit for refund by the grounds stated in the protest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer ProtestsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsFailure to Pay Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.278

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.278 Claim for Refund

[1] Requirements

A taxpayer must file a written claim for refund with the FTB before the taxpayer may file a suit for refund. The claim must be in writing, signed by the taxpayer or the taxpayer's authorized representative, and must state the grounds on which it is based. There are additional requirements for class claims [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19322, 19382*; *see Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; *Shiseido Cosmetics (America) Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 478, 488-492, 286 Cal. Rptr. 690* (written claim for refund must be filed even if only ground on which refund is sought is constitutional and therefore beyond jurisdiction of FTB, and even if ground is well known to FTB because of lengthy protest negotiations and stipulations)]. The purpose of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19322* is to put FTB on notice of a claim [*Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 976-977, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (letter to FTB clearly stating that letter constituted claim for refund complied with statute, which requires no particular form)].

A claim for refund generally must be filed within the later of (1) four years from the date the original return was filed (if filed within the time prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567* or *18604*, whichever is applicable), (2) four years after the last day prescribed for filing the original return (determinedwithout regard to any extension of time for filing the return), or (3) one year after the date of the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*; *cf. Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19307* (filed return as claim for refund concerning withholding and estimated taxes if filed in specified period), *19311* (period for filing claim for credit or refund when change or correction was made or allowed by IRS)]. However, a claim for credit or refund based on worthless debts may be filed within seven years after the due date of the return for the year for which the claim is filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19312*]. For an individual taxpayer, the period for filing a claim for refund may be extended during the period that the taxpayer is unable to manage financial affairs due to a physical or mental impairment that is terminal or expected to last at least 12 continuous months [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19316*].

A claim for refund that meets the requirements of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19322*, but that is made when the entire tax

assessed or asserted has not been paid, constitutes a claim only for purposes of tolling the time periods in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*. For all other purposes, such a claim is deemed to be filed on the date that the full amount of the tax is paid. However, no credit or refund may be made or allowed for any payment made more than seven years before the date that the full amount of the tax is paid [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19322.1*].

Notwithstanding any other provision in the Personal Income Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 17001 et seq.*] or the Bank and Corporation Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*], the provisions of *I.R.C. § 6603*, relating to deposits made to suspend the running of interest on potential underpayments, will apply, except as otherwise provided [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041.5(b)* (how to construe reference to "30-day letter" in federal statute)]. A deposit will not be considered a payment of tax for purposes of filing an amended return as a claim for a refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*], converting a protest to an action on a claim for a refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19335*], or filing an action for a refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19384*], until either of the following occurs [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041.5(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041.5(c)* (treatment of amount held by FTB as deposit in nature of cash bond prior to October 7, 2005)]:

- The taxpayer provides a written statement to the FTB specifying that the deposit is a payment of tax for purposes of the applicable code section.

- The deposit is used to pay a final tax liability.

[2] FTB's Action on Claim

The FTB is required to notify the taxpayer if it disallows the taxpayer's claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19323(a)*] and effective 180 days after October 10, 1999, must provide an explanation for the disallowance [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19323(a), (b)* (as amended by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 24; *see* Stats. 1999, ch. 931 § 40 (effective date)]. If the taxpayer does not receive a notice of action on a refund claim within six months after filingit, the taxpayer may treat the claim as denied and either appeal to the SBE or file suit for a refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19331, 19385*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19332, 19333, 19334* and 18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5010-5012, 5070-5087 on SBE appeal procedure]. If the FTB disallows a claim, the taxpayer may appeal the disallowance to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19324, 19333, 19334*].

[3] Effect of Claim on Suit for Refund

A taxpayer's suit for refund is limited to the grounds stated in the claim for refund. Therefore, a claim for refund should raise all possible grounds for the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*; *but see Montgomery Ward & Co. v. Franchise Tax Board (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 149, 85 Cal. Rptr. 890* (grounds not in claim considered because intertwined)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.279

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.279 Carryovers

If the Franchise Tax Board determines that the amount of a carryover disclosedby a taxpayer on an original or amended return is more than the amount of the carryover disclosed by its own examination, it may mail a notice to the taxpayer of the proposed carryover adjustment. For this purpose, "carryover" is defined as the amount of a credit, loss, deduction, or other item that is shown on an original or amended return for carry forward to a subsequent taxable year. Procedures similar to those that apply to a proposed deficiency assessment apply to carryovers, including protest and appeal rights. The proposed adjusted carryover amount, which becomes final after the Board makes a determination, is binding and conclusive, and the taxpayer must report that final amount on an original or amended return for any subsequent year [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19043.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer ProtestsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
2. Administrative Procedures

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.280-540.299

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.280[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.300

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.300 Jurisdiction of Superior Court

[1] Limitations

The superior court has jurisdiction of tax assessment and collection disputes if the taxpayer has first exhausted administrative remedies and paid the disputed tax [*Cal. Const, art. XIII, § 32*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19382*; *see Milhous v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 640* ("pay first, litigate later" rule embodied in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* does not affect court's fundamental jurisdiction and can be waived); *see also Agnew v. State Bd. of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 333, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (adjudication of validity of tax is not barred until interest, as well as tax, is paid); *California Logistics, Inc. v. State of Cal. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 242, 250, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 825* (doctrine of collateral estoppel cannot take precedence over *Cal. Const, art. XIII, § 32,* and require courts to provide relief which that constitutional provision specifically prohibits)]. Such an action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(1)*]. The single exception to the exhaustion of administrative remedies rule is the jurisdiction of the superior courts of Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Francisco to determine the issue of the taxpayer's residency and to dismiss an assessment of personal income tax based on alleged California residence without a taxpayer first having to pay the assessed tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see* discussion *§ 540.302*].

A superior court may not hear actions to prevent or enjoin assessment or collection of any tax and does not have the power to set aside a closing agreement between the taxpayer and the FTB [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19441*; *see § 540.300[2]*]. Taxpayers cannot attempt to circumvent this rule by seeking a declaratory judgment that a tax is not legally collectible [*Casey v. Bonelli (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 253, 255, 208 P.2d 723]* . The superior court also does not have jurisdiction to order the return of property seized pursuant to a tax claim by the state that is prima facie valid. The taxpayer's only remedy is to exhaust administrative remedies challenging the tax assessment [*Mason v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 175 Cal. Rptr. 462]* . The prohibition against injunction actions has been held constitutional on the ground that the refund procedures are a

plain, speedy, and efficient remedy at law [*Aronoff v. Franchise Tax Board (9th Cir. 1965) 348 F.2d 9, 10* ; *see 28 U.S.C. § 1341*].

Moreover, mandamus relief has been denied based on a refund action being deemed an adequate remedy at law [*Nast v. State Bd. of Equalization (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 343, 346-348, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 592]* .

[2] Closing Agreements

Superior court jurisdiction does not extend to any issue that is included in a closing agreement between the taxpayer and the FTB. A closing agreement is a written agreement that settles any matter arising under the California tax laws. Once made, an approved closing agreement may not be reopened or modified by the state, nor may the state or the taxpayer bring any suit, action, or proceeding to annul, modify, or set it aside except on a showing of fraud, malfeasance, or misrepresentation of a material fact [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19441(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityJurisdiction & VenueCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsSettlementsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.301

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.301 Federal Court Jurisdiction

[1] District Courts

United States district courts may hear state tax questions involving federal issues, but may not enjoin, suspend, or restrain the assessment, levy, or collection of any state tax unless the taxpayer does not have a plain, speedy, and efficient remedy in the state courts [*28 U.S.C. § 1341*; *Rosewell v. La Salle Nat'l Bank (1981) 450 U.S. 503, 512, 101 S. Ct. 1221, 67 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *see also Arkansas v. Farm Credit Servs. (1997) 520 U.S. 821, 823-824, 117 S. Ct. 1776, 138 L. Ed. 2d 34* (under another exception to jurisdictional bar of *28 U.S.C. § 1341* established by cases applies when United States sues to protect itself or its instrumentalities; exception inapplicable under facts)]. The California refund procedures relating to both the California Personal Income Tax Law and the Bank and Corporation Tax Law have been found to be adequate remedies at law, thereby precluding federal injunctive relief for those taxes [*Capitol Industries-EMI, Inc. v. Bennett (9th Cir. 1982) 681 F.2d 1107, 1112-1118* ; *Aronoff v. Franchise Tax Board (9th Cir. 1965) 348 F.2d 9, 11]* .

California administrative procedures and suits for refunds, however, are available only to California taxpayers [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19382*]. These remedies are not available to nontaxpayers who may be indirectly harmed by a tax assessment. Nevertheless, an action for declaratory or injunctive relief by an entity other than the taxpayer is barred by *28 U.S.C. § 1341* (federal anti-injunction provision) if the plaintiff has discretion over and controls thetaxpayer. Thus, a foreign parent corporation that was an indirect sole shareholder of a company against which the FTB assessed California bank and corporation taxes could not maintain an action for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to imposition of those taxes [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Alcan Aluminum (1990) 493 U.S. 331, 110 S. Ct. 661, 107 L. Ed. 2d 696, 705-707]* . Moreover, even if the taxpayer can overcome the anti-injunction provision, the federal court may hold the action in abeyance under the abstention doctrine if a state court resolution of the law would render the federal grounds moot [*see Capitol Industries-EMI, Inc v. Bennett (9th Cir. 1982) 681 F.2d 1107, 1121 n.34*].

[2] Removal Jurisdiction

Removal jurisdiction to federal court from state courts is also restricted. A federal defense, such as preemption of federal law over state law, will not allow a taxpayer to remove to a federal court an action by the FTB in a state court to collect taxes, even if the federal defense is anticipated in the FTB's complaint [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Laborers Vac. Trust (1983) 463 U.S. 1, 13-14, 103 S. Ct. 2841, 77 L. Ed. 2d 420]* .

[3] U.S. Supreme Court

Apart from suits brought in federal district courts, federal court jurisdiction is limited to U.S. Supreme Court review of suits for refund that have been prosecuted to the California Supreme Court [*see 28 U.S.C. § 1341*; *Container Corporation of America v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 463 U.S. 159, 103 S. Ct. 2933, 77 L. Ed. 2d 545* ; *Complete Auto Transit Inc. v. Brady (1977) 430 U.S. 274, 97 S. Ct. 1076, 51 L. Ed. 2d 326]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityJurisdiction & VenueCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction ActCivil ProcedureU.S. Supreme Court ReviewGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.302

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.302 Residency Determinations

Individual taxpayers receiving notice of a deficiency assessment based on alleged California residency may seek a judicial declaration of residency or nonresidency without first paying the tax assessed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5*]. However, before bringing the suit, the taxpayers must first exhaust their administrative remedies [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see § 540.550*]. The taxpayer must first (1) timely file a written protest with the FTB and (2) timely appeal the FTB's denial of the protest to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19041, 19045, 19381*; *see* discussion in Subpart B under Protest and Appeal of Deficiency Assessment].

The taxpayer must file a suit for determination of residency within 60 days after the SBE's determination of the taxpayer's appeal becomes final [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236* (dismissal of deficiency assessment as not authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5* or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381* in action for determination of residency)]. The determination of the SBE becomes final 30 days after the date of determination unless the taxpayer or the FTB files a petition for rehearing during that time, in which case the SBE's determination becomes final 30 days after issuance of its opinion on the petition for rehearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19048*]. Collection of all except jeopardy assessed taxes is stayed during the pendency of the suit for residency determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*].

Although collection of any tax is postponed until completion of an action for determination of residency, actions for residency determination are not barred by *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, which prohibits any injunction delaying payment of any tax. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, only prohibits issuance of legal or equitable process in any proceeding in any court to prevent or enjoin collection of tax. The postponement or prevention of collection involved in a residency determination is valid because it is granted by the statute, not the court [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1346-1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236]* . However, a judgment against the FTB dismissing a deficiency assessment cannot be granted in a residency determination, because that relief is not authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5* or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381* [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1349, 261*

Cal. Rptr. 236] .

The superior courts of Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Francisco counties have jurisdiction to hear suits for determination of residency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*]. An action for determination of residency is entitled to preference on the trial calendar [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3*; *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer ProtestsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.303

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.303 Suit for Refund

[1] In General

After paying the tax and receiving the FTB's denial of a claim for refund, any taxpayer claiming that the tax computed and assessed is void in whole or in part may bring suit against the FTB for the recovery of any part of the amount paid [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19382*]. A taxpayer may also bring a suit for refund if the taxpayer's claim for refund is deemed disallowed because of the FTB's failure to mail a notice of action on the claim [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19385*; *see § 540.552[4]*]. If the taxpayer's suit seeks a refund of a tax liability satisfied by the credit of an overpayment, the credit is treated as a payment at the time the credit is allowed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19383*].

At trial, the taxpayer has the burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the taxpayer is entitled to the refund claimed. The trial court determines "de novo" whether the taxpayer has met this burden [*Tenneco West, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1510, 1520, 286 Cal. Rptr. 354]* .

[2] Prerequisites to Suit

The primary prerequisites for challenging an assessment of additional personal income or bank and corporation tax are [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19382*; *see* discussion in *§ 540.71*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041.5(a)(1), (2)* discussed in *§ 540.552[5]*]:

- The payment of the tax at issue; and
- The submission of a claim for refund to the FTB.

However, the "pay first, litigate later" rule embodied in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* does not affect a court's fundamental jurisdiction and can be waived. Therefore, if the FTB fails to raise the issue in the trial court, the taxpayer's suit may

continue to judgment; the FTB may not raise the issue for the first time on appeal [*Milhous v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1267B* 1268, *32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 640]* .

A suit contesting a personal income tax assessment based on an individual residency determination, however, may be heard without the taxpayer first having to pay the tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see § 540.302*].

Payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (construing *Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; SBE's prepayment policy may not be enforced insofar as it requires prepayment of interest before tax refund claim will be considered; court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to consideration of challenge directed only to an interest assessment); *see Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1113-1114, 1117-1124, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* (given plain language of *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* and definition of tax in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23036*, word "tax" does not include interest and therefore payment of accrued interest is not jurisdictional prerequisite to action for refund of franchise axes paid; court did not reach question of whether penalties must be paid before refund action will lie)]. Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest in this regard and need not be paid before an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* ; *but see* FTB Notice, No. 97-8 (9/4/97), CCH Cal. Tax Rptr., 1995-1999 Transfer Binder, P 402-940 (providing for consideration of claim when tax principal, additions to tax and penalties has been paid in full before or together with claim for refund)]. In any event, depending on circumstances, the taxpayer may desire to make payment of interest and any penalty assessed before or at the time of filing a claim for refund, or before suit if not done earlier, to stop the accrual of interest. Moreover, payment of such amounts will thereafter avoid the possibility of any collection activity being commenced by the FTB.

An amount set forth in a notice of proposed assessment is not an assessed tax that is due, and a taxpayer need not pay such an amount before seeking a refund after payment of a tax claimed to be illegal [*City Nat'l Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1046, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 411]* . The Revenue and Taxation Code provides a procedure by which a proposed assessment becomes a final assessment that is due and payable [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041 et seq.*; *see also § 540.274* et seq.], including [*City Nat'l Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1045-1046, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 411]* :

- A notice of proposed assessment;
- A protest period;
- A response to a taxpayer's protest;
- An administrative appeal period;
- A decision on an appeal;
- A rehearing notice period;
- Possibly a rehearing; and
- A grace period, after determination (and appeal and rehearing), before the proposed assessment becomes a final assessment.

Payment then becomes due 15 days after notice to the taxpayer and a demand for payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19049(a)*].

[3] Statute of Limitations

A taxpayer must file a suit for refund against the FTB within the latest of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19384*]:

- Four years after the date prescribed for filing the return;
- One year after the date the tax was paid;
- 90 days after notice of action by the FTB on a claim for refund; or
- 90 days after the determination (including the issuance of a decision, opinion, or dismissal) by the SBE on appeal from the action of the FTB on a claim for refund becomes final under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19334*.

Failure to bring suit within the applicable time limit acts as a complete bar to the recovery of any taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19390*].

Notwithstanding any other provision in Personal Income Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax.Code § 17001 et seq.*), the Bank and Corporation Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*) or Part 10.2 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18401 et seq.*), relating to the administration of franchise and income tax laws, any amount paid as a tax or in respect of a tax that is paid after the mailing of a notice of deficiency assessment and designated by the taxpayer as a deposit in the nature of a cash bond made to stop the running of interest, is not considered a paymentof tax for purposes of filing a claim for refund under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*, or an action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19384*, until either of the following occur [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041.5(a)(1), (2)*; *e.g., Fujitsu IT Holdings, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 459, 486, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 473]* :

- The taxpayer provides to the FTB a written statement specifying that the deposit will be a payment of tax for purposes of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306, 19335*, or *19384*.
- The deficiency assessed becomes due and payable in accordance with *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19049*.

[4] Grounds for Suit

A taxpayer's suit for refund is limited to the grounds stated in the claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*; *but see Montgomery Ward & Co. v. Franchise Tax Board (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 149, 85 Cal. Rptr. 890* (grounds not in claim considered because intertwined)].

For complaints for refunds of personal income tax and for bank and corporation tax based on impermissible application of the unitary method, *see §§ 540.551* and *540.552*, respectively.

[5] Service

The summons and complaint of a suit for refund must be served on the FTB or its executive officer. A second copy of both must be delivered to the FTB, but this requirement is not jurisdictional [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19387*]. The summons must notify the person served that he or she is being served on behalf of the FTB under " *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50* (public entity)" [*see* box number 3 on face of Judicial Council summons form].

[6] Venue

Taxpayers may file suit against the FTB in the superior court of any county in California where the California Attorney General maintains an office. [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19388*]. This includes San Francisco, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego counties.

[7] Who Defends Suit

The FTB is represented by the State Attorney General or its own staff counsel in a refund action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19389*].

[8] Res Judicata and Other Defenses

In any suit for refund, the doctrine of res judicata applies only if the tax liability involved is for the same year that was involved in a previously decided case [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19802(a)*]. The FTB may assert in defenseonly those unpaid liabilities of the taxpayer for the same year that are evidenced by (1) a final proposed assessment, (2) a notice of tax due, or (3) a final notice of action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19802(b)* (specifically overruling *Pope Estate Company v. Johnson (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 170, 173-175, 110 P.2d 481*)]. These unpaid liabilities may be asserted in addition to the defenses or relief sought in the action. The taxpayer need not assert any refund claim for the same year, if the claim resulted from a federal audit adjustment that was made after the taxpayer filed the suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19802(b)*].

The FTB, the courts, and other administrative officers are not bound by determinations made by other state officers or agencies in determining any issue of law or fact involving personal income or bank and corporations tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19801*; *see also Lennane v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1186 n.3, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* .

[9] General Civil Procedure Rules Apply

Once the complaint is filed and set for hearing in the appropriate court, all the normal rules of court under the Code of Civil Procedure apply [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19413*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer ProtestsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.304

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.304 Interest on Judgments Against FTB

Any judgment in favor of a taxpayer for an overpayment of tax includes interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19391*] at the statutory rate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19521*].

Interest accrues from the date the overpayment of tax was paid or collected to the date it is credited to the taxpayer's account [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19391*]. Alternatively, if the FTB issues a refund check, interest accrues from the date the tax was paid or collected to a date no more than 30 days before the check is issued. The FTB determines the cutoff date within this 30-day period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19391*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment InterestGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.305

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.305 Litigation Costs

In any civil proceeding brought in a court of record in California by or against the State of California in connection with the determination, collection, or refund of any tax, interest, or penalty, the prevailing party may be awarded a judgment for reasonable litigation costs [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(a)*; *but see Northwest Energetic Servs., LLC v. California Franchise Tax Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 841, 869-875, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 642* (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717* is not exclusive means of recovering attorney's fees in tax refund suit; on appropriate facts, fees could be recovered under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1021.5, 1032*, and *1033.5*); *accord, Ventas Fin. I, LLC v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1207, 1234-1235, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 823] . Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717* was amended in 1999 by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 33. Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(g)*, the amendments are operative for costs incurred and services performed more than 180 days after October 10, 1999, the effective date of the amendments. Citations in the discussion below indicates which provisions were amended or added by that legislation.

The recoverable costs are:

- Reasonable court costs [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(A)*].

- Expert witness expenses (rate of compensation not to exceed the highest rate of compensation for expert witnesses paid by the state of California) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(i)*].

- Cost of any study, analysis, engineering report, test, or project which is found by the court to be necessary for the preparation of the party's case [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(ii)*].

- Attorney fees, with the rate of compensation not to exceed $125 per hourunless the court finds that a cost of living increase or a special factor, such as the limited availability of qualified counsel for the proceeding, the difficulty of the issues presented in the case, or the local availability of tax expertise,

justifies a higher rate, with the $125 rate to be adjusted annually for increases in cost of living beginning with calendar year 2001 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(iii)* (specific dollar amount and annual adjustment provision as amended by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 33)]. Moreover, the court may award reasonable attorney fees in excess of the attorney fees paid or incurred if the fees are less than the reasonable attorneys' fees because the attorney is representing the prevailing party for no fee or for a fee which, taking into account all the facts and circumstances, is no more than a nominal fee [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(iv)* (subdivision added by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 33)]. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(iv)* applies only if the award is paid to the attorney or the attorney's employer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(1)(B)(iv)*].

To recover litigation costs, the taxpayer must have exhausted all administrative remedies prior to suit, including the filing of an appeal as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19324* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(b)(1)*; *see also Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 979, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* (appeal requirement not retroactive to refund action commenced before requirement was mandated)]. Any failure to agree to an extension of the time for the assessment of any tax will not be taken into account for purposes of determining whether the prevailing party meets the requirements of the preceding sentence [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(b)(1)*].

The taxpayer almost must substantially prevail with respect to either (1) the amount in controversy, or (2) the most significant issue or set of issues presented [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(A)*]. However, if the lawsuit consists of related claims, and the taxpayer has won substantial relief, the trial court has discretion to award the taxpayer attorney's fees for discrete issues, even if the issues for which fees are awarded do not represent the bulk of the amount in controversy or the most significant issues in the case [*Fujitsu IT Holdings, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 459, 488, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 473]* .

A party is not treated as the prevailing party if the State of California establishes that its position in the proceeding was substantially justified [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(B)(i)*]. In determining whether the state'sposition was substantially justified, the court must take into account whether the FTB has lost in any California Court of Appeal in another district on substantially similar issues, as reflected in a decision certified for publication [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(B)(iv)* (subdivision added by Stats. 1999, ch. 931, § 33)]. Moreover, "substantially justified" has been defined to mean justified to a degree that would satisfy a reasonable person, or that has a reasonable basis both in law or fact. This is an objective standard that does not depend on an analysis of the subjective motivations of the government in taking the position it did [*Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 977, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* ; *see, e.g., Fujitsu IT Holdings, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Board (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 459, 487-488, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 473* (FTB's position was not substantially justified)]. The State's position is presumed not to be substantially justified if the FTB did not follow its "applicable published guidance" in the administrative proceeding. This presumption may be rebutted [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(B)(ii)*]. "Applicable published guidance" means either (1) a regulation, legal ruling, notice, information release, or announcement, or (2) any chief counsel ruling or determination letter issued to a taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(B)(iii)*]. Any determination under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(B)* as to whether a party is a prevailing party must be made either by the court or an agreement of the parties [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(C)*].

Litigation costs may not be awarded with respect to any portion of the civil proceeding during which the prevailing party has unreasonably protracted that proceeding [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(b)(3)*].

The term "prevailing party" does not include the State of California or any creditor of the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(c)(2)(A)*].

Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717 contemplates dual determinations for trial and appeal as to the right to litigation costs. Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717(e)*, an order granting or denying an award in whole or in part must be incorporated as part of the decision or judgment in the case and so becomes subject to appeal in the same manner as the decision or

judgment. This implies that an award is applied for and determined first at the trial level, even though an appeal may follow. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717* also impliedly envisions a second award being determined after appeal proceedings, for litigation costs incurred on appeal. On a reapplication for costs following appeal, a court in the second determination is not bound by the determination of substantial justification made in connection with the first application. Therefore, if a taxpayer is awarded litigation costs at the close of trial proceedings (*e.g.*, summary judgment on the merits), it having been determined that the FTB's position was not substantially justified, a court after an appeal may deny the taxpayer litigation costs incurred on appeal finding that the FTB's position was substantially justified [*Lennane v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1180, 1188, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.306

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.306 Application of Credits and Refunds

The FTB first applies the full or any partial amount of a judgment for refund of taxes and interest to any other taxes or interest owed by the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19392*]. In addition, refunds and overpayments may be applied to anyamount owed by the taxpayer to any state agency [*see Gov. Code §§ 12419.3-12419.5*; *see also Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 890, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582* ; *Tyler v. California (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 973, 975-976, 185 Cal. Rptr. 49* (refund applied against welfare payments made on behalf of taxpayer's minor child)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.307

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.307 Illegal Taxes

The FTB must cancel a tax levied against a taxpayer that is later found to be illegal. The FTB, however, will maintain a record of the assessment and the reason the assessment was made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19431*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
3. Taxpayers' Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.308-540.319

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.308[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
4. FTB's Administrative and Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.320

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.320 Remedies to Collect Tax

[1] In General

The FTB has a variety of remedies for the collection of personal income and bank and corporation taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18631 et seq., 19201 et seq., 19371 et seq.*], including the following:

- Orders to withhold delinquent taxes served on any person or employer in control of a delinquent taxpayer's assets [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18670, 18672* (failure to transmit taxes to FTB makes person served liable for those amounts); *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 706.070-706.084* (earnings withholding order for taxes); *see § 540.320[3]*].

- Bringing suit to collect delinquent taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19371*; *see § 540.320[2]*].

- Contracting with private debt collection agencies to recover delinquent taxes and bring tax recovery suits in the FTB's name [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19376*].

- Obtaining a judgment in favor of the state by filing a certificate with any county clerk and requesting entry of judgment; a recorded abstract constitutes a lien for 10 years, which may be extended by rerecording [*Gov. Code § 7172*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19201-19209*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 688.110* (enforcement of judgment for taxes)].

- A perfected and enforceable lien on the real and personal property of the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19221*], which may be accorded priority over other claims by recording (for real property) or by filing a notice of lien with the Secretary of State (for personal property) [*Gov. Code §§ 7170-7174*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 19253* (regarding priorities)].

- After recording a lien or obtaining a judgment by certificate, issuing a warrant for collection that has the force and effect of a writ of execution and directs law enforcement officials to attach and sell the property subject to the lien [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19231-19235*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 688.010-688.050* (enforcement of state tax liability pursuant to warrant or notice of levy); for further discussion and forms relating to enforcement of judgments, *see* Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*].

- Bringing suit to recover amounts erroneously issued as refunds or allowed as credits, including interest accruing from the date of the refund or allowance [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19411*].

- Seeking a writ of mandate to compel a taxpayer to file a return [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19710*].

- After a determination has become final, seizing a taxpayer's personal property and selling it at public auction [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19262, 19263*].

All these remedies are cumulative. An election by the FTB to pursue a particular remedy for collection does not preclude the use of any other remedy [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19251*].

For a discussion of a personal income or bank and corporation taxpayer's rights relating to a tax lien or levy, see *§ 540.404*.

[2] Suit to Collect Taxes

The FTB may bring an action to recover any taxes, penalties, and interest from any taxpayer owing taxes to the state [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19371*]. The suit may be brought in any California court, courts of another state, federal court, or courts of a foreign country [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19371, 19375*]. The action is prosecuted by the Attorney General or by counsel for the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19372, 19375*]. Any suit brought in the California courts is tried in Sacramento County unless the court, with the consent of the prosecutor, orders a change of venue [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19372, 19411, 19412*].

The FTB must bring the suit within 10 years after the tax liability is determined, or within the period during which a lien is in force as the result either of recording an abstract of judgment or of recording or filing a notice of state tax lien under *Gov. Code § 7171* [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19203, 19371*].

In the action, a certificate issued by the FTB showing the tax delinquency isprima facie evidence of the levy of the tax, of its delinquency, and of compliance by the FTB with all provisions of the tax laws concerning computation and levy of the tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19374*]. A writ of attachment may be issued ex parte as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 485.010* without a showing of great or irreparable injury to the plaintiff otherwise required for such a writ [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19373*].

[3] Withholding Orders

The FTB may serve a notice to withhold, *i.e.*, a withholding order on a person in control of that taxpayer's assets without any prior notification to the taxpayer that a certain amount of taxes are due. The only prerequisite for a withholding order is that the taxpayer owe taxes, interest, or penalties [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18670*; *Bradbury v. Kaiser (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1260, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325* (decided under former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18817*, now *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18670*)].

A tax lien and a withholding order are not the same and are governed by different articles and sections of the Revenue

and Taxation Code. Unlike the section governing tax liens [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19221*], withholding orders [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 18670*] are not subject to the Government Code, including *Gov. Code § 7170* [*Bradbury v. Kaiser (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1260, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325* (construing former *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18817, 18881, 18931*, now *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18670, 19221, 19251*)]. Thus, although a judgment lien on personal property has priority over a state tax lien when the judgment lien is perfected before the FTB files a notice of tax lien with the Secretary of State (as provided for in *Gov. Code §§ 7170(c)(2), 7171*), an FTB withholding order served prior to the perfection of the judgment lien has priority over the judgment lien [*Bradbury v. Kaiser (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1260, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325]* .

When the FTB seeks to collect taxes by directing a notice to withheld pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18670* to a person or entity in possession of monies owed to a taxpayer, the taxpayer may not claim the exemptions available to a judgment debtor. *Code Civ. Proc. § 688.030* does not authorize a tax debtor to claim exemptions when the tax is being sought pursuant to a notice to withhold [*Hepner v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1475, 1476, 1485, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Offers in Compromise. A taxpayer who is unable to pay the entire tax liability may make an offer in compromise to the FTB. If the FTB approves the offer, the taxpayer is relieved of the taxpayer's current outstanding tax liability [*see § 540.403*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
4. FTB's Administrative and Judicial Remedies

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.321-540.339

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.321[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.340

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.340 Allocation and Apportionment

The taxation of corporations by a state is generally restricted to source taxation. A state may tax corporate income only to the extent income can be assigned to sources within that state's boundaries. For a corporation doing business in a single state, the source of its income is restricted to the single state. If a corporation does not restrict its activities to a single state, however, the states are required to determine what portion of the corporation's income is derived from or attributable to sources within each state's boundaries. This determination is made through the process of allocation and apportionment [*see* Keesling and Warren, *The Unitary Concept in the Allocation of Income, 12 Hastings L.J. 42 (1960)*].

"Allocation" refers to the direct assignment of income to a particular jurisdiction [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25123-25127*]. This concept presupposes that an activity can be isolated and is separate and distinct from other activities, and that the income from that activity may also be isolated and determined separately from other income.

"Apportionment" refers to the assignment of income through the use of a mathematical formula [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 25123-25128*]. A ratio or percentage is calculated to represent a taxpayer's presence within each state. The income attributable to a state is determined by multiplying the taxpayer's total income from all sources (other than that which can be directly allocated to a single jurisdiction) by this ratio or percentage. California has adopted a four factor apportionment formula using the taxpayer's property factor, the taxpayer's payroll factor, and twice the taxpayer's sales factor [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25128-25140*], except for an apportioning trade or business that derives more than 50 percent of its gross business receipts from conducting one or more qualified business activities specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25128(c)*, such as agricultural activities or activities relating to the production, refining, or processing of oil, natural gas, or mineral ore. These taxpayers must use three factor formula (property factor, payroll factor, and sales factor) that all taxpayers were required to use before 1993 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25128(b), (c), (d)*; *see* former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25128*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 25141* (three factor formula for professional athletic team)].

Corporate income is business income subject to allocation and apportionment if it is income arising from transactions and activity in the regular course of the corporation's trade or business, including income from tangible and intangible property if the acquisition, management, and disposition of the property constituteintegral parts of the corporation's regular trade or business operations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25120(a)*]. California-taxable business income is determined by applying both a transactional test and a functional test. Under the transactional test, income is business income if it arises from transactions and activity in the regular course of a trade or business. Under the functional test, income is business income if the acquisition, management, and disposition of property are integral parts of the taxpayer's regularbusiness operations. The reversion of surplus pension plan assets did not meet the transactional test because it was an extraordinary occurrence. However, it met the functional test because it constituted property maintained and operated by the taxpayer to retain an attract employees, and was therefore integral to the taxpayer's business operations [*Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 508, 535, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 22 P.3d 324]* . The gain from the sale of all of the stock of a subsidiary is properly considered business income under the functional test if the parent corporation's control and use of the subsidiary contributed materially to the parent corporation's production of business income prior to the sale [*Jim Beam Brands Co. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 514, 524-530, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 874]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.341

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.341 Unitary Business Doctrine

Apportioning the business income of a single corporate taxpayer deriving income from sources both within and outside of California is a process of applying the mathematical formula to the taxpayer's total income. Nevertheless, many corporations doing business in more than one state or country do so through subsidiary companies or other related entities. The unitary business doctrine allows a taxing authority to treat a business that is conducted by related taxpayers and that earns income from both within and outside the state as a single unit in determining the income attributable to the state. A finding that a business is unitary may require the related taxpayers to file a combined report showing their combined income for the purposes of apportionment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25102, 25104*; *see generally Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1410, 1411* & n.5, 1412, *100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 509* (discussing definition of unitary business and statutory apportionment formula, although after tax years in question statutory apportionment formula changed in ways not relevant to case)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.342

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.342 Criteria to Determine Whether Entities Are Unitary

[1] Two California Tests

The existence of a unitary business is established if all three of the following characteristics are present [*Butler Brothers v. McColgan (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 664, 667-668, 111 P.2d 334* ; *Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757* ; *see Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1411 n.5, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 509]* :

- Unity of ownership;
- Unity of operation evidenced by central purchasing, management, advertising, and accounting departments; and
- Unity of use in the centralized executive force and general system of operations.

A unitary business also exists if the operation of the portion of the business conducted in California is dependent on or contributes to the operation of the business outside California [*Edison California Stores v. McColgan (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 472, 481, 183 P.2d 16* ; *Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757* ; *see Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1411 n.5, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 509]* . These two tests (three unities versus contribution and dependency) are not mutually exclusive, and application of either to a particular set of facts should result in the same conclusion [*Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757]* .

Suggesting that there may be some conflict in the case law regarding the relationship of the three-unities test and the dependency-or-contribution test, one California court chose to follow cases indicating that the two tests are alternatives.

The court reasoned that while the presence of the three unities definitely establishes that a business is unitary, the California Supreme Court had not held, in *Butler Brothers* [*see Butler Brothers v. McColgan (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 664, 111 P.2d 334* , cited *above*] that unity cannot exist if one of the three factors is absent [*A.M. Castle & Co. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1805, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340* (citing cases implying that three-unities test is essential part of more general dependency-or-contribution test)]. In the case before it, that court concluded that three businesses were unitary because two of the three unities clearly existed, indicating that the businesses were unitary under the dependency-or-contribution test [*A.M. Castle & Co. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1794, 1807, 1809-1810, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340]* .

[2] U.S. Supreme Court's Test

In determining whether a unitary business exists, the U.S. Supreme Court uses a test of "functional integration, centralization of management, and economies of scale" [*see generally MeadWestvaco Corp. v. Illinois Dep't of Revenue (2008)553U.S.16, 128 S. Ct. 1498, 170 L. Ed. 2d 404, 412-416* (explaining "the principles that we have developed for determining whether a multistate business is unitary")]. However, California is not required to adopt this test because the two tests used by the California courts and taxing authorities do not infringe the constitutional rights of out-of-state businesses [*Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757]* .

[3] Burden on Taxpayer

Whether businesses are unitary is a question of law. The taxpayer has the burden of showing that the FTB's decision was incorrect [*Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757* ; *see also Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1415, 1427, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 509* (when unitary business is established, taxpayer challenging FTB's apportionment method must show formula allocation method wasarbitrary and unreasonable; proper characterization of nature of income, however, is primarily factual issue)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.343

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.343 Worldwide Combined Reporting

[1] Required by California

Use of the unitary concept to apportion the business income of businesses involved in worldwide activities has long been permitted under the U.S. Constitution [*Matson Nav. Co. v. SBE (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 1, 5-6, 43 P.2d 805 , aff'd, 297 U.S. 441, 56 S. Ct. 553, 80 L. Ed. 791 (1936)]* , and California requires foreign subsidiaries of domestic corporations [*Anaconda Co. v. FTB (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 15, 24-25, 181 Cal. Rptr. 640]* and foreign-country parent corporations and their subsidiaries [Appeal of Ito Cariani Sausage Co., Inc., 3 SBE 954 (SBE Apr. 5, 1983)] to file under the unitary method. The Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act (UDITPA) defines "state" to include foreign countries and political divisions of foreign countries [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25120(g)*].

[2] Domestic-Parent Corporations

The United States Supreme Court has upheld worldwide combined reporting by domestic parent corporations. The Court held that California's three-factor formula apportionment may require domestic parent corporations to include factors from foreign subsidiaries in their combined reports, even though multiple taxation may result [*Container Corporation of America v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 463 U.S. 159, 187-189, 103 S. Ct. 2933, 77 L. Ed. 2d 545]* .

[3] Foreign-Parent Corporations

Several foreign parent corporations have challenged in federal court the FTB's right to include their operations in a combined report prepared for their subsidiaries. In all but one case, their efforts have been rejected because they are not the taxpayer and therefore have no standing [*Shell Petroleum N.V. v. Graves (N.D. Cal. 1983) 570 F. Supp. 58, 61-62 , aff'd, 709 F.2d 593 (9th Cir. 1983)]* . One federal court did hold that the foreign parent corporations had alleged injuries to themselves, both independently and as stockholders of their subsidiaries, and that these injuries were sufficient to confer standing [*Alcan Aluminum v. Franchise Tax Bd. (7th Cir. 1989) 860 F.2d 688, 699-700]* . The U.S.

Supreme Court has brought an end to this conflict among the federal circuits by ruling that these foreign parent corporations may not bring their challenges in the federal courts. Instead, they must seek relief in the California courts, which offer them a plain, speedy, and efficient remedy [*Franchise Tax Bd. v. Alcan Aluminum (1990) 493 U.S. 331, 339-340, 110 S. Ct. 661, 107 L. Ed. 2d 696]* .

However, these corporations have not been successful in the California courts. The California Supreme Court has held that application of the worldwide unitary method of taxation (referred to by the court as formula pportionment) to a unitary group with a foreign parent corporation does not violate the Foreign Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The Court, after analyzing United States Supreme Court opinions from the last 70 years, concluded that the formula apportionment method was not inherently inequitable, that both this method and the arm's-length/separate accounting method have their advantages and drawbacks, that neither method is technically superior to the other, and that the U.S. Supreme Court has not announced any theoretical constitutional preference for either method. Either of the two methods is constitutionally permissible as long as the chosen method does not unreasonably and arbitrarily attribute to the taxing state a percentage of the taxpayer's income that is completely disproportionate to the amount of business the taxpayer transacts in that state [*Barclays Bank Internat., Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 708, 720, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31, 829 P.2d 279]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawIncome TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.344

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.344 Water's-Edge Election

[1] As Alternative to Worldwide Combined Reporting

Taxpayers that have income from activities both within and outside California must pay a tax measured by their net income derived from or attributable to sources within California [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25101*]. If the taxpayer is part of a unitary business, the income of the entire business is considered when applying this measure of tax. Business income of the unitary enterprise is apportioned using a formula based on the taxpayer's property, payroll, and sales [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25120 et seq.*]. This method of taxation, known as the worldwide combined reporting method, had engendered considerable controversy, and, beginning in 1988, California has offered corporations subject to worldwide combined reporting who meet the criteria specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25110(b)(2)* an alternative method of computing their California tax liability known as the water's-edge election [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25110 et seq.*].

The California water's-edge election does not eliminate California's unitary taxation concepts, does not replace the concept of worldwide combined reporting, and does not allow taxpayers to limit their unitary combined group to include only U.S. corporations. This method permits a group of corporations to elect to exclude from the unitary group any foreign-nation or foreign-possessions corporation having less than 20 percent of its business activity within the United States [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25110(a)*] and permits a partial deduction of dividends received by members of the water's-edge group from certain excluded foreign corporations and a complete deduction of dividends received from certain specified construction projects [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 24411*; *see* Stats. 1996, ch. 954, Legislative Counsel's Digest, no. (27)].

[2] Making Water's-Edge Election

A water's-edge election is made on an original, timely filed return for the year of the election [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(a)*, effective for tax years beginning on or after 1/1/03]. The election is considered valid if the tax is computed in a manner consistent with a water's-edge election, and a written notification of election is filed with the return on a form

prescribed by the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(a)*]. Under regulations, the FTB may also accept the filing of other objective evidence that supports the conclusion that a water's-edge election was intended in lieu of notification on the designated form [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(a)(2)*]. In general, a water's-edge election is effective only if it is made by every member of the self-assessed combinedreporting group that is subject to taxation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(b)*].

A water's-edge election remains effective until terminated [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(c)(12)*]. The election may be terminated without the consent of the FTB after it has been in effect for at least 84 months. The termination must be made on an original, timely filed return for the first year in which the water's-edge election is to be terminated. To be effective, the termination must be made in a specified manner by every taxpayer that is a member of the water's-edge group [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(c)(9)*]. A water's-edge election may be terminated before the 84-month period has elapsed, but only with the consent of the FTB. A request for termination must be made at the time and in the manner specified by the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(c)(10)*]. Except for certain deemed elections [*see* Reg § 25113(c)(2), (c)(4), (c)(5)], if a water's-edge election is terminated, another election may not be made for any taxable year that begins within the 84-month period following the last day of the election period that was terminated. The FTB, however, may waive this prohibition for good cause [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113(c)(11)*].

For years beginning before January 1, 2003, the water's-edge election was made by contract with the FTB for a rolling 84-month term [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25111(a)*]. To the extent that a taxpayer would have been required to file on a water's-edge basis in its first taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2003, pursuant to a water's-edge election made in a prior year, the terms of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25111* may not apply and the election is deemed to have been made under the terms of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25113*. However, the commencement date of the election made in a prior year under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25111* continues to be treated as the commencement date of the water's-edge election period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25111(f)*].

A water's-edge election obligates the taxpayer to comply with a multitude of procedural criteria, most of which are aimed at ensuring that dealings with unitary corporations excluded from the water's-edge group are conducted at arm's length and that income and factors are not artificially shifted to entities that are outside of the water's-edge group [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25110(b), 25112(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.345

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.345 Use of Method Other Than Unitary Method or Water's-Edge Election

A taxpayer may petition the FTB under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25137* for authorization to use a method other than the unitary method for reporting and assesssment of business income. The taxpayer must establish that the unitary method does not fairly represent the extent of the taxpayer's business activity in California [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25137*; *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 506, 512, 72 Cal. Rptr. 465, 468, 446 P.2d 313]* .

The FTB may require a separate accounting in respect to all or any part of the taxpayer's business activity, if reasonable; the exclusion of any one or more of the factors; the inclusion of one or more additional factors which will fairly represent the taxpayer's business activity in California; or the employment of any other method to effectuate an equitable allocation and apportionment of the taxpayer's income [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25137*]. In that event, the FTB has the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that (1) the approximation provided by the standard formula is not a fair representation, and (2) its proposed alternative is reasonable [*Microsoft Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 750, 764-765, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 216, 139 P. 3d 1169]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. INCOME TAX
5. State Taxation of Corporate Income

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.346-540.359

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.346[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.360

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.360 Governing Law

The Morgan Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5900-5911*] sets out taxpayers' rights with respect to property taxes. This act is referred to in this chapter as the "Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights*."

The Harris-Katz California Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7080-7099*] sets out taxpayers' rights with respect to sales and use taxes, whereas the Katz-Harris Taypayers' *Bill of Rights* Act [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21001 et seq.*] sets out taxpayers' rights with respect to personal income taxes and corporation taxes. These latter two acts are substantively very similar. Accordingly, when discussed collectively in this chapter, they are sometimes referred to as simply "The Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights*."

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

82 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
1. In General

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.361-540.379

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.361[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
2. Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.380

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.380 Purpose of Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

The Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* is intended to promote the proper assessment and collection of property taxes throughout California by advancing, to the extent feasible, uniform practices of property tax appraisal and assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5901(d)*]. It is also intended to provide taxpayers with fair and understandable explanations of their rights and duties with respect to property taxation, prompt resolution oflegitimate questions and appeals regarding their property taxes, and prompt corrections of errors in property tax assessments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5911(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
2. Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.381

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.381 Property Taxpayers' Advocate

[1] Designation and Responsibilities

The Property Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* requires the executive officer of the SBE to designate a Property Taxpayers' Advocate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5904(a), (b)*], hereinafter referred to as "the advocate." The advocate reports directly to the executive officer of the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5904(b)*], and is responsible for reviewing the adequacy of procedures for both (1) the distribution of information regarding property tax assessment matters among the SBE, assessors, and taxpayers, and (2) the prompt resolution of inquiries from assessors, the SBE, and taxpayers, and taxpayer complaints and problems [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5904(a)*].

[2] Specific Duties

[a] Education and Information

The advocate is responsible for reviewing the adequacy of (1) educational and informational programs on property tax assessment matters for the benefit of the SBE, assessors, local boards of equalization and assessment appeals boards, and taxpayers, and (2) property tax informational pamphlets and other written materials that explain, in simple and nontechnical language, various matters related to property taxation such as exemptions and appeal procedures [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5905*].

If requested to do so by a county assessor, the advocate must assist the assessor in providing education and instruction to the assessor's staff and to local taxpayers for the purpose of promoting both taxpayer understanding of and compliance with the property tax laws and also, to the extent feasible, statewide uniformity in the application of property tax laws [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5908*].

[b] Review of Tax Forms and Statements

The advocate must periodically review property tax statements and forms prescribed by the SBE to determine whether the forms and statements and their instructions promote or discourage taxpayer compliance and whether they are necessary or germane to assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5906(a)*].

[c] Review of Complaints and Identification of Areas of Conflict

Another of the advocate's duties involves reviewing taxpayer complaints and identifying areas of recurrent conflict between taxpayers and assessment officers. The review must include, but is not limited to, (1) theadequacy and timeliness of responses to taxpayers' written complaints and requests for information, (2) the adequacy and timeliness of corrections to the assessment rolls and issuance of refunds, (3) the timeliness, fairness, and accessibility of hearings and decisions by the SBE and by county boards of equalization or assessment appeals boards, and (4) the application of penalties and interest that result from the assessor's failure to request information or the taxpayer's reliance on advice from the SBE or the assessor [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5906(b)*].

[d] Performance Evaluation of Employees

The evaluation of state and local officers and employees who are responsible for the appraisal or assessment of property cannot be based solely on the dollar value of assessments enrolled or property taxes collected. However, their evaluation may be based on the propriety and application of the methodology they use in arriving at a value determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5907*].

[e] Recommending Standardization of Interest Rates and Statute of Limitations

The advocate must make recommendations to the SBE regarding standardizing the interest rates applicable to escape assessments and property tax refunds [*see § 540.71*] and statutes of limitations. These standardizations are to put property taxpayers on an equal basis with taxing authorities [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5910*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
2. Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.382

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.382 Relief From Penalties and Interest if Taxpayer Relied on Assessor's Written Advice

Taxpayers may send written requests to county assessors for written rulings regarding the property tax consequences of an actual or planned transaction or the property tax liability of a specific property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5909(a)*]. If a taxpayer's failure to report information timely or to pay amounts of tax when due directly results from the taxpayer's reasonable reliance on the county assessor's written ruling, the taxpayer is relieved of any penalties and any interest assessed or accrued with respect to the property taxes not timely paid. A taxpayer's failure directly results from the taxpayer's reasonable reliance on the assessor's written ruling only if (1) the taxpayer's written request for advice fully described all the relevant facts and circumstances pertaining to the property or transaction, and (2)the county assessor's written ruling specifically stated the property tax consequences of the transaction or the property tax liability of the property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5909(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
2. Property Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.383-540.399

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.383[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.400

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.400 Purpose of Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

The Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* is intended to ensure that the rights, privacy, and property of California taxpayers are adequately protected during the process of tax assessment and collection. It is also intended to promote improved self-assessment by clarifying tax laws and by better informing the public of the proper application of those laws. Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* provisions apply to the FTB with respect to its administration of the Personal Income Tax Law and Corporation Tax law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 21001-21027*]. Separate, but similar, Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* provisions also exist with respect to property taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5900-5911*], and to various taxes administered by the SBE, including Sales and Use Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7081-7099*] the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 8260-8277*], the Use Fuel Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 9260-9277*], the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 30458-30459.7*], the Alcoholic Beverage Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 32460-32476*], the Energy Resources Surcharge Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 40200-40216*] the Emergency Telephone Users' Surcharge Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 41160-41176*], the Hazardous Substances Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 43511-43527*], the Solid Waste Disposal Site Cleanup and Maintenance Fee Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 45856-45872*], the Oil Spill Response Prevention and Administration Fees Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 46611-46627*], the Underground Storage Tank Maintenance Fee Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 50156.1-50156.18*] and the Fee Collection Procedures Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 55321-55337*].

The following discussion covers the taxes for which the Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* comes up the most often--for the FTB with respect to its administration of the Personal Income Tax Law and Corporation Tax Law, and for the SBE with respect to its administration of the Sales and Use Tax Law.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome

TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.401

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.401 Taxpayer Education and Information

The SBE, with respect to its administration of sales and use taxes, and the FTB are required to implement taxpayer education programs that target taxpayer or industry groups identified in an annual survey relating to recurrent taxpayer noncompliance [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7084, 7085, 21005, 21006*]. They must also prepare brief but comprehensive statements that explain procedures, remedies, rights, and obligations of the SBE or FTB and taxpayers and provide these statements with the initial notice of audit, the notice of proposed additional taxes, any subsequent notice of tax due, or other substantive notices, and with the tax return booklets that are mailed annually to individuals and corporations [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7086, 21007*]. Additionally, the FTB must include an appropriate statement in tax booklets informing taxpayers they may berequested by the FTB to furnish a copy of California or federal tax returns that are subject of or related to a federal audit [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21007*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.402

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§ 540.402[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.403

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.403 Improvement and Reform of Tax Administration

[1] Taxpayers' Rights Advocates

The Taxpayers' *Bill of Rights* requires both the SBE, with respect to its administration of sales and use taxes, and FTB to establish a position of Taxpayers' Rights Advocate (referred to hereinafter as "the advocate") [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7083(a), 21004(a)*]. These advocates report directly to the executive officer of their respective regulatory board [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7083(b), 21004(a)*].

The advocates are responsible for coordinating or facilitating the resolution of taxpayer complaints and problems, including complaints regarding unsatisfactory treatment of taxpayers by employees of their respective regulatory boards [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7083(a), 21004(a)*]. They must give highest priority to reviewing and taking prompt action, including stayingactions, if taxpayers have suffered or will suffer irreparable loss as the result of SBE or FTB action [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7083(a), 21004(b)* (also providing that applicable statutes of limitation are tolled during pendency of stay and that any penalties and interest that would otherwise accrue are not affected by granting of stay)].

Until January 1, 2012, the FTB advocate may review and grant an application for relief from any penalty, fee, addition to tax, or interest assessed on a taxpayer because of any of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)(1)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(g)* (sunset date)]:

- Erroneous action or erroneous inaction by the FTB in processing documents filed or payments made by taxpayers;

- Unreasonable delay caused by the FTB; or

- Erroneous written advice that does not qualify for relief under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012* [*see §*

540.404[1]].

The advocate may act on any application for relief received by the advocate after 2008, regardless of the tax year involved [2008 Stats., ch. 305, § 13].

Relief may be granted by the FTB advocate only if (1) no significant aspect of that error or delay can be attributed to the taxpayer involved and (2) relief is not available under any other provision of the Personal Income Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 17001 et seq.*] or the Corporation Tax Law [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*], including any relief granted under any regulation or other administrative pronouncement of the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)(2)*]. A refund may not be paid as a result of relief granted by the advocate unless the applicable statute of limitations, with respect to filing a claim for refund, remains open as of the date the basis for providing relief is reflected in a written communication received by the advocate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)(4)*]. When relief is granted, it will be made a matter of public record in the office of the executive officer of the FTB, including the taxpayer's name, the totalamount involved, the amount payable or refundable due to the error or delay, and a summary of why the relief is warranted [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)(3)(B)*].

The chief counsel of the FTB must concur in the granting of relief by the advocate in any case in which the aggregate amount of relief exceeds $500, and the chief counsel must notify the FTB in any case in which the aggregate amount exceeds $7,500 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)(3)(A)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(e)* (annual cost-of-living adjustments of those amounts)]. No other entity may participate in the grant or denial of relief pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(d)*]. Notwithstanding any other law or rule of law, all determinations made under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(c)* are not subject to review in any administrative or judicial proceeding [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21004(f)*].

In addition, the SBE and FTB are required to consult with the advocate in specified instances [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7088(a), 21009(a)* (development and implementation of performance evaluation programs); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21005* (development and implementation by FTB of taxpayer education and information program)].

[2] Performance Evaluation of Employees

The SBE, with respect to its administration of sales and use taxes, and FTB are each required to develop and implement programs that evaluate the performance of individual officers or employees with respect to their contact with taxpayers. Each board must develop its program in coordination with its advocate [*see § 540.403[1]*] and must report to the Legislature on implementation of the program [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7088, 21009*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7087, 21008* (prohibiting use of tax revenues to evaluate individual officers or employees or to impose or suggest production quotas or goals)].

[3] Delay Reduction in Processing Taxpayer Claims and Petitions

The SBE, with respect to its administration of sales and use taxes, and FTB are required to develop and implement plans, in cooperation with the advocate and with other specified agencies and groups, to reduce the time required by the SBE to resolve petitions for redetermination and s and the time required by the FTB to resolve, protests, and appeals. These plans must include a determination of standard time frames and a special review of cases that take more time than the appropriate standard time frame [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7089, 21010*].

[4] Prohibition Against Nontax Surveillance and Investigation

Officers or employees of either the SBE or FTB who are acting in connection with any law administered by their respective board are prohibited from knowingly authorizing, requiring, or conducting any investigation of or surveillance over any person for purposes not connected with tax administration [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092(a),*

21014(a)]. A person violating this prohibition is subject to disciplinary action under the State Civil Service Act (*Gov. Code § 18500 et seq.*), including dismissal from office or discharge from employment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092(b), 21014(b)*; for further discussion regarding disciplinary proceedings in general, *see* Ch. 118, *Civil Service*]. For the purposes of this prohibition, "investigation" refers to any oral or written inquiry directed to any person, organization, orgovernmental agency, whereas "surveillance" refers to monitoring of people, places, or events by means of electronic interception, overt or covert observations or photography, and the use of informants [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092(e), 21014(e)*].

The prohibition against investigation or surveillance for purposes not connected with tax administration does not apply to any otherwise lawful investigation concerning organized crime activities [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092(c), 21014(c)*]. The prohibition is also not intended to restrict, prohibit, or prevent the exchange of information if a person is being investigated for multiple violations that include sales and use, personal income, or bank and corporations tax violations [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092(d), 21014(d)*]. Additionally, the provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21014* may not be construed to prohibit FTB audits on behalf of the Fair Political Practices Commission for purposes of enforcing the Political Reform Act of 1974 (*Gov. Code §§ 81000-81016*) or to prohibit the FTB from carrying out its duties with respect to laws other than tax laws [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21014(f)*].

[5] Procedural Safeguards

[a] Relating to Protest Hearings

Protest hearing procedural safeguards of the SBE with respect to its administration of sales and use taxes, and of the FTB, are similar. Procedures before SBE hearing officers or before FTB audit or legal staff must include all of the following safeguards [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7090, 21011*]:

- Any hearing must be held at a reasonable time at an FTB or SBE office that is convenient to the taxpayer ("when possible," in the case of FTB hearings).

- The hearing may be recorded only if prior notice is given to the taxpayer and the taxpayer is entitled to receive a copy of the recording.

- The taxpayer must be informed prior to any hearing that he or she has a right to have his or her designated agent present at the hearing.

[b] Relating to Suspension or Revocation of Sales Tax Permit or Corporate Privileges

The SBE may not suspend or revoke a seller's permit under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6070* (failure to comply with sales tax provisions, rules, and regulations), or under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6072* (not actively conducting business as a seller of tangible personal property), unless the SBE has mailed a notice preliminary to suspension or revocation indicating that the permit will be suspended or revoked by a certain date under the applicable section. The SBE must mail the notice to the taxpayer at least 60 days before the date specified for suspension or revocation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7098*; *see also § 540.132*].

Similarly, the FTB may not suspend a taxpayer's corporate powers, rights, and privileges under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23301* (failure to pay taxes, penalties, or interest), *23301.5* (failure to file a return), or *23775* (failure of exempt corporation to file required returns or statements or to pay amounts due), unless the FTB has maileda notice preliminary to suspension indicating that the taxpayer will be suspended by a certain date under the applicable section. The FTB must mail the notice at least 60 days before the date specified for suspension [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 21020, 23302(b)*].

[6] Settlement of Civil Tax Matter Disputes by FTB

The executive officer and the chief counsel of the FTB may jointly approve a settlement of any civil tax matter in dispute involving a disputed tax liability of $7,500 or less [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(b)(3), (h)*]. The $7,500 figure is subject to inflation adjustments after 2003 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(b)(3)*]. Before 2003, the limit was $5,000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(b)(3)*, before amendment by 2002 Cal. Stats., ch. 258].

Settlements entered into pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442* are final and nonappealable, except on a showing of fraud or misrepresentation with respect to a material fact [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(f)(1)*]. A settlement may include any matters that may be included in a closing agreement [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(f)(2)*], and a settlement approved by the FTB is final and conclusive to the same extent as a closing agreement [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(g)(4)*]. A settlement does not preclude assessments or refunds related to federal adjustments [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19442(f)(3)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19059, 19060, 19311*].

[7] Settlement of Civil Tax Matter Disputes by SBE

Except as provided for in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.5(b)(3)*, the executive director of the SBE, or chief counsel if authorized by the executor director, may recommend to the SBE settlement of any civil tax matter dispute involving sales and use taxes, if the executive director or chief counsel submits the recommendation to the Attorney General [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.5(b)(1), (2), (h)*]. Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.5(b)(3)*, a settlement of any civil sales and use tax matter in dispute involving a reduction of tax or penalties in settlement, the total of which reduction of tax and penalties in settlement does not exceed $5,000, may be approved by the executive director and chief counsel jointly. The executive director must notify the SBE, itself, of any settlement approved under this subdivision [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.5(b)(3)*]. The SBE has similar settlement authority under other taxes as well [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 9271* (Use Fuel Tax); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 30459.1* (Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 32471* (Alcoholic Beverage Tax); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 40211* (Energy Resources Surcharge); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 41171* (Emergency Telephone Users' Surcharge); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 43522* (Hazardous Substances Tax); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 45857* (Solid Waste Disposal Site Cleanup and Maintenance Fee); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 46622* (Oil Spill Response Prevention and Administration Fees); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 50156.11* (Underground Storage Tank Maintenance Fee); *Rev. & Tax. Code § 55323* (Fee Collection Procedures Law)].

[8] Compromise of Final Tax Liability by FTB

[a] Reduction in Tax Liability $7,500 or Less

The executive officer and chief counsel of the FTB, jointly, or their delegates, may compromise any final tax liability in which the reduction of tax is $7,500 or less [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(a)(1)*].

[b] Reduction in Tax Liability in Excess of $7,500

Except as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(a)(3)*, the FTB, on recommendation by its executive officer and chief counsel, jointly, may compromise a final tax liability involving a reduction in tax in excess of $7,500. Any recommendation for approval of an offer in compromise that is not either approved or disapproved by the FTB, itself, within 45 days of the submission of the recommendation is deemed approved [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(a)(2)*].

The FTB, itself, may by resolution delegate to the executive officer and the chief counsel, jointly, the authority to compromise a final tax liability in which the reduction of tax is in excess of $7,500 but less than $10,000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(a)(3)*].

[c] Final Tax Liability Defined

"Final tax liability" for this purpose means any final tax liability arising under Personal Income Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax.*

Code § 17001 et seq.) or the Corporation Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23001 et seq.*) or related interest, additions to tax, penalties, or other amounts assessed under Part 10.2 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18401 et seq.*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(b)*].

[d] Conditions Required for Compromise

For an amount to be compromised under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443*, the following conditions must exist [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(c)(1)(A), (B), (2)*]:

- The taxpayer must establish that:
  - The amount offered in payment is the most that can be expected to be paid or collected from the taxpayer's present assets or income; and
  - The taxpayer does not have reasonable prospects of acquiring increased income or assets that would enable the taxpayer to satisfy a greater amount of the liability than the amount offered, within a reasonable period of time.
- The FTB must determine that acceptance of the compromise is in the best interest of the state.

A determination by the FTB that it would not be in the best interest of the state to accept an offer in compromise in satisfaction of a final tax liability is not subject to administrative appeal or judicial review [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(d)*].

[e] Notification of Action

The FTB must notify the taxpayer in writing when an offer of compromise is either accepted or rejected, or the terms and conditions of a compromise agreement are fulfilled [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(e)*].

[f] Effect on Spouse's Liability

In cases of joint and several liability, the acceptance of an offer of compromise fromone spouse does not relieve the other spouse of liability, but does reduce the amount of the liability by the amount of the accepted offer [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(f)*].

[g] Rescission of Compromise

Several grounds exist for rescinding a compromise under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443* [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(h)*]. If the compromise is rescinded, the liability is restored without regard to any statute of limitations that might otherwise apply. No portion of the amount offered in the compromise will be refunded [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443(h)*].

[9] Compromise of Final Sales and Use Tax Liability by SBE

After 2002, the executive director and chief counsel of the SBE, or their delegates, may compromise any final tax liability in which the reduction of tax $7,500 or less [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(a)(1)*]. In general, the SBE, upon recommendation by its executive director and chief counsel, jointly, may also compromise a final tax liability involving a reduction in tax in excess of $7,500. Any recommendation for approval of an offer in compromise that is not either approved or disapproved within 45 days of the submission of the recommendation is deemed approved [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(a)(2)*]. The SBE, itself, may by resolution delegate to the executive director and the chief counsel, jointly, the authority to compromise a final tax liability in which the reduction of tax is in excess of $7,500, but less than

$10,000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(a)(3)*].

Ordinarily, offers in compromise may be considered only for liabilities that were generated from a business that has been discontinued or transferred, when the taxpayer making the offer no longer has a controlling interest or association with the transferred business or has a controlling interest or association with a similar type of business as the transferred or discontinued business [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(c)(1)*]. Until January 1, 2013, the offers-in-compromise program is extended also to owners of businesses that may otherwise have to sell or discontinue their businesses because of their inability to pay in full a final tax liability that arose from transactions in which the taxpayers did not collect that tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(c)(2), (3), (d)-(g), (p)*].

Compromises are available only if the taxpayer establishes that the amount offered in payment is the most that can be paid or collected from the taxpayer's present assets or income, and that the taxpayer does not have reasonable prospects of acquiring increased income or assets that would enable the taxpayer to satisfy a greater amount of the liability than the amount offered, within a reasonable period of time [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(h)*]. When more than one taxpayer is liable for the debt, such as with spouses or partnerships or other business combinations, the acceptance of an offer in compromise from one liable taxpayer does not relieve the other taxpayer(s) from paying the entire liability. However, the amount of the liability must be reduced by the amount of the accepted offer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(k)*].

Any compromise may be rescinded, all compromised liabilities reestablished (without regard to any statute of limitations that otherwise may be applicable), and no portion of the amount offered in compromise refunded, if any person has concealed from the SBE any property belonging to the estate of any taxpayer or other person liable for the tax, or received, withheld, destroyed, mutilated, or falsified any book, document, or record or made any false statement, relating to the estate or financial condition of the taxpayer or other person liable for the tax. Rescission also can occur of a taxpayer fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions relative to the offer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(m)*]. Criminal penalties may also apply [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093.6(n)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsSettlements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.404

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.404 Administrative Remedies

[1] Relief Based on Taxpayer's Reasonable Reliance on Written Advice From FTB

[a] Extent of Relief

A personal income tax taxpayer or a corporation tax law taxpayer may be relieved of taxes assessed or any interest, additions to tax, and penalties, if the taxpayer's failure to make a timely return or payment is due to reasonable reliance on written advice from the FTB [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012*; for discussionof incorrect or misleading information giving rise to a defense of estoppel, *see § 540.276*].

If the failure is due to reasonable reliance on a legal ruling by the chief counsel of the FTB, relief is available for taxes assessed as well as any added interest, additions to tax, or penalties [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(a)(1)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(h)* (rulings of chief counsel must be issued as provided in published guidelines)]. However, if the failure is due to reasonable reliance on written advice other than a chief counsel ruling, relief is available only for interest, additions to tax, or penalties, not for taxes [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(a)(2)*]. In either case, relief is available only if the FTB finds that certain conditions are satisfied [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(a)*; *see* discussion *§ 540.404[2]*].

The FTB may waive only the portion of the tax, penalties, interest, and additions to tax that is attributable to actions that the taxpayer (1) takes after receipt of the written advice of the FTB, and (2) makes in reasonable reliance on the advice [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(g)*].

[2] Conditions for Relief

To obtain relief under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(a)* for taxes, interest, additions to tax, and penalties resulting from a taxpayer's reasonable reliance on written advice from the FTB [*see § 540.404*], all of the following conditions must be met:

- The taxpayer, or the taxpayer's representative, requests in writing that the FTB advise whether a particular activity or transaction is subject to tax under the tax laws administered by the FTB, and the request fully describes the specific facts and circumstances of the activity or transaction, specifically states if it is a request for a legal ruling, and does not contain a misrepresentation or omission of any material fact [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b), (f)*].

- The FTB responds in writing to the taxpayer's request, stating whether or not the described activity or transaction is subject to tax, or stating the conditions under which the activity or transaction is subject to tax; if the advice is a chief counsel ruling, the ruling is signed by the chief counsel or his or her designee [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b)(2)*].

- In reasonable reliance on the FTB's written advice, the taxpayer does not remit the tax due [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b)(3)*].

- The liability for taxes applies to a particular activity or transaction that occurred before the FTB rescinded or modified the advice given to the taxpayer by sending written notice to the taxpayer of the rescinded or modified advice [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b)(4)*].

- The tax consequences expressed in the FTB's written advice are not subsequently changed by any of the following: (1) a change in statutory or case law, (2) a change in federal interpretation in cases where the FTB's written advice is predicated on federal interpretation, or (3) a change in material facts or circumstances relating to the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b)(5)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(e)*(written advice issued under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012* must include declaration that tax consequences expressed therein are subject to change for any reason set out in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(b)(5)* and that taxpayer has duty to be aware of possible changes)].

[a] Procedure for Obtaining Relief

A taxpayer seeking relief for reliance on FTB written advice must file with the FTB a copy of the taxpayer's written request, a copy of the FTB's written advice, a statement signed under penalty of perjury setting forth the facts on which the claim is based, and any other information required by the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(c)*]. Only the taxpayer making the written request is entitled to rely on the FTB's written advice to that taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012(d)*].

[3] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to SBE Hearings Involving Sales and Use Taxes

Every taxpayer is entitled to be reimbursed for any reasonable fees and expenses related to a hearing before the SBE, involving sales and use taxes if all of the following conditions are met [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091(a)*]:

- The taxpayer files a claim for fee and expenses with the SBE within one year of the date the decision of the SBE becomes final.

- The SBE, in its sole discretion, finds that the action taken by the SBE staff was unreasonable.

- The SBE decides that the taxpayer be awarded a specific amount of fees and expenses related to the hearing, in an amount determined by the SBE in its sole discretion.

In making its determination whether staff action was unreasonable, the SBE is required to consider whether the taxpayer has established that the position of the staff was not substantially justified [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091(b)*].

Reimbursement is limited to the fees and expenses incurred after the date of the notice of determination, jeopardy determination, or a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091(c)(1)*]. However, if the the SBE finds that the SBE staff was unreasonable with respect to certain issues and reasonable with respect to others,the amount of reimbursed fees and expenses are limited to those that relate to the issues concerning which the staff was unreasonable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091(c)(2)*]. Any proposed award by the SBE pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091* must be available as a public record for at least 10 days before the effective date of the award [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091(d)*].

Regulations on reimbursement claim procedure and the deadline for filing reimbursement claim are set out in *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5600 et seq.*

[4] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to Appeal Before SBE

A taxpayer may appeal the FTB's decision on a protest involving the Personal Income Tax Law or the Corporation Tax Law to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(a)*].

Every taxpayer is entitled to be reimbursed for any reasonable fees and expenses related to such an appeal before the SBE if all of the following conditions are met [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(a)(1)(A), (B)*]:

- The taxpayer files a claim for fees and expenses with the SBE.
- The SBE, in its sole discretion, finds that the action taken by the FTB staff was unreasonable.

Fees and expenses incurred in cases in which an appeal has been filed, but resolved before the FTB's written statement of its position has been submitted to the SBE, are not reimbursible under *Rev. & Tax Code § 21013* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(a)(2)(A)*].

Fees may be awarded in excess of the fees paid or incurred if the fees are less than the reasonable fees because an individual representing the taxpayer is entitled to be reimbursed for no fee or for a fee which, taking into account all the facts and circumstances, is no more than a nominal fee. [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(a)(2)(B), (e)*].

To determine whether the FTB staff has been unreasonable, the SBE must consider whether the FTB has established that its position in the appeal was substantially justified [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(b)(1)*]. The FTB's position shall be presumed not to be substantially justified if its staff did not follow its applicable published guidance in the appeal. This presumption may be rebutted. [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(b)(2)*]. The term "applicable published guidance" means either (1) a regulation, legal ruling, notice, information release, announcement, or (2) any chief counsel ruling or determination letter issued to a taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(b)(3)*].

The SBE is required to determine the amount of reimbursed fees and expenses [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(c)*]. Reimbursement is limited to fees and expenses incurred after the date of filing an appeal of a notice of action with respect to a deficiency assessment, a jeopardy assessment, or a denial of a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(c)(1)*]. However, if the SBE finds that the FTB staff was unreasonable with respect to certain issues and reasonable with respect to others, the amount of reimbursed fees and expenses are limited to those that relate to the issues concerning which the staff was unreasonable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(c)(2)*].

Any proposed determination by the SBE under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013* must be available as a public record for at least 10 days before the effective date of the determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013(d)*].

Regulations on reimbursement claim procedure and the deadline for filing a reimbursement claim are set out in *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5600 et seq.*

[5] Relief From Recording of Tax Lien

[a] Preliminary Notice

The SBE and the FTB are required to mail a preliminary notice to the taxpayer at least 30 days prior to the filing or recording of state tax liens under *Gov. Code § 7150 et seq.* The notice must specify the statutory authority for filing or recording the lien, indicate the earliest date that the lien may be filed or recorded, and state the remedies available to the taxpayer to prevent the filing or recording. If tax liens are filed for the same liability in multiple counties, only one preliminary notice is required [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7097(a), 21019(a)*]. These provisions do not apply, however, to jeopardy assessments under sales and use tax, personal income tax, or bank and corporation tax provisions [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7097(b), 21019(b)*].

The FTB may not file or record the lien if the taxpayer, within 30 days after receiving the preliminary notice, demonstrates to the FTB by substantial evidence that a filing or recording of a lien would be in error [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(b)*].

[b] Notice of Filing and Recording of Lien; Administrative Review

[i] Operative Date

The amount of any unpaid California personal income tax or corporation tax becomes a perfected and enforceable state tax lien [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19221(a)*]. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225* specifies notice requirements and administrative review for those liens.

[ii] Notice

Section 19225 requires the FTB to notify in writing the person whose failure to pay a liability under the Personal Income Tax Law or Corporation Tax Law of the filing or recording of a notice of state tax lien as provided for in GovernmentCode, Title 1, Division 7, Chapter 14 (*Gov. Code § 7150 et seq.*) or Chapter 14.5 (*Gov. Code § 7220 et seq.*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19221, 19225(a)(1)*]. The notice must be mailed in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2885* no later than five business days after the filing of the notice of lien [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(2)*]. The notice must specify, in simple nontechnical terms, all of the following:

- The amount of unpaid tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(A)*].

- The person's right to request a review during the 15-day period beginning on the day after the five-day period described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(2)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(B)*].

- The independent departmental administrative review available to the taxpayer regarding the lien and the procedures to obtain that review [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(C)*].

- The procedures relating to the release of liens on property [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(D)*].

[iii] Independent Administrative Review

An independent departmental administrative review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)* must be conducted by an officer or employee, or officers or employees, that have had no prior involvement with respect to the unpaid tax specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(A)* before the first review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225* or *21015.5* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(3)*]. A taxpayer may waive this requirement [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(3)*].

Administrative review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(3)* is not subject to the administrative adjudication

provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(3)*].

To the extent practicable, a review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225* must be held in conjunction with a review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(4)*. For purposes of *section 19225, Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c),* which relates to matters that may be considered in the review, applies [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(c)*]. For discussion of *Rev. & Tax Code § 21015.5, see § 540.404[6]*)].

A person is entitled to only one review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225* with respect to the taxable period to which the unpaid tax specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(a)(3)(A)* relates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225(b)(2)*].

[c] Release of Lien

If the SBE determines that a lien was filed in error, it must mail a release to the taxpayer and the entity recording the lien as soon as possible, but no later than seven days, after the determination of error and receipt of the lien recording information. The release must contain a statement that the lien was filed in error. If the erroneous lien is obstructing a lawful transaction, the SBE must immediately issue a release of the lien to the taxpayer and the entity recording the lien [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7097(c)*]. When the SBE releases a lien erroneously filed, it must mail notice of that fact to the taxpayer, and on the taxpayer's request, it must mail a copy of the release to the major credit reporting companies in the county where the lien was filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7097(d)*]. Moreover, the SBE may release or subordinate a lien if the board determines that the release or subordination will facilitate the collection of the tax liability or will be in the state's and taxpayer's best interest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7097(e)*].

If the FTB determines that a lien was filed or recorded in error, it must mail a release to the taxpayer and the entity recording the lien as soon as possible, but no later than seven *working* days, after the later of either the determination of error or the receipt of the lien recording information. The release must contain a statement that the lien was filed in error. If theerroneous lien is obstructing a lawful transaction, the FTB must immediately issue a release of the lien to the appropriate party. On the request of the taxpayer, the FTB must mail a copy of the release to the major credit reporting companies in the county where the lien was filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(c)*].

Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(d) provides that the procedures described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(c)* do not apply to liens that are filed or recorded either:

- Not in accordance with administrative procedures, or

- After the taxpayer has entered into an installment payment agreement under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19008* to satisfy the tax liability for which the lien was filed or recorded, unless the agreement provides for the filing or recording of the lien.

Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(e) provides that if the FTB determines that a release of lien will facilitate the collection of the tax liability or will be in the taxpayer and state's best interest, the FTB must mail a release of that lien to the taxpayer and the entity recording the lien. Subsection (e) further provides that if the lien is obstructing a lawful transaction and its release will facilitate the collection of the tax liability, or will be in the taxpayer and state's best interest, the FTB must:

- Issue a release of lien to the appropriate party, and

- On the taxpayer's request, mail a copy of the release to the credit reporting companies, financial institutions, or any creditor whose name and address is provided by the taxpayer.

Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(f) establishes that *Section 21019* does not limit the circumstances in which the FTB may release a lien, and provides that the FTBmay release a lien under any circumstances to facilitate the collection of the tax liability or, if that release is in the taxpayer and state's best interest, and take action associated with the release of that lien it deems appropriate.

[i] Request By Owner Who Is Not Person Whose Unsatisfied Liability Gave Rise to Lien

Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226 was enacted in 1999, operative October 10, 1999 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(g)*; Stats. 1999, ch. 931, §§ 21, 40]. Under section 19226, at the request of the owner whose property is subject to any lien under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19221*, the FTB must issue a release of lien from that property if the owner is not the person whose unsatisfied liability gave rise to the lien and the owner either [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(a)(1)(2)*]:

- Deposits with the FTB an amount of money equal to the value of the state's interest (as determined by the FTB) in the property.

- Furnishes a bond acceptable to the FTB in a like amount.

The FTB must refund the amount so deposited, pay interest at the overpayment rate under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19521*, and release the bond, to the extent the FTB determines that either of the following apply [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(b)(1)(2)*]:

- The unsatisfied liability giving rise to the lien can be satisfied from a source other than the property for which the deposit or bond is made.

- The value of the state's interest in the property is less than the FTB's prior determination of the value.

If a release is issued under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226*, the owner may, within 60 days after the day on which the release is issued, request the FTB for an independent administrative review as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)* to determine whether the value of the state's interest, if any, is less the FTB's prior determination of the value. No other action may be brought by the owner for a determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(d)(1)(2)*].

The administrative review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)*, is not subject to the administrative adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)*].

If the review determines that the FTB's previous determination of value of the state's interest in the property for purposes of section 19226 exceeds the actual value of the state's interest, the board must provide a refund of the amount deposited and a release of the bond, to the extent that the aggregate of the amounts thereof exceeds the value so determined [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)*]. In the case of a refund issued under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)*, interest must be allowed at the rate prescribed for overpayments from the date the FTB receives the amount to the date of the refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(f)*].

If no request is made under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(d)* within the period prescribed, the FTB must do both of the following within 60 days after the expiration of the period [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(c)*]:

- Apply the amount deposited or collected on the bond, to the extent necessary to satisfy the unsatisfied liability secured by the lien.

- Refund, with interest at the overpayment rate under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19521*, any portion of the amount deposited which is not used to satisfy the liability.

Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226 does not limit the circumstances in which the FTB may release a lien under any circumstances to facilitate the collection of the tax liability or, if that release is in the best interest of the taxpayer and the state, take any action associated with the release of that lien it deems appropriate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226(e)*].

[6] Relief From Tax Levy

[a] Notice Before Levy

Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5 was enacted in 1999, operative for any collection action initiated 180 days after January 1, 2000 [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(g)*, Stats. 1999, ch. 348, § 2].

Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5*, no levy may be made on any property or property right of any person unless the FTB has notified the person in writing of his or her rights as described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(C)* before the levy is made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)*]. Except as provided in *Rev. & Tax. Code 21015.5(f)*, the notice is required only once for the taxable period to which the unpaid tax specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(A)* relates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)*]. The notice is not required, however, if the unpaid tax for which notice would otherwise be required under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)* is consolidated for collection purposes with a preexisting unpaid tax for which notice has been given under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)*].

If the FTB holds in abeyance the collection of a liability, imposed under the Personal Income Tax Law (*Rev. & Tax. Code 17001 et seq.*) or Part 10.2 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code(*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18401 et seq.*), relating to the administration of franchise and income tax laws, that is final and otherwise due and payable, for a period in excess of six months from the date the hold is first placed on the account, the FTB must thereafter mail to the taxpayer a notice before issuing a levy or filing or recording a notice of state tax lien [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(f)*].

The notice must be made by first-class mail to the address of record not less than 30 days before the day of the first levy with respect to the amount of the unpaid tax for the taxable period. Notice under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(1)* is not required if previous mail to the same address was returned undelivered with no forwarding address [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(2)*].

The notice must specify, in simple and nontechnical terms, all of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)*]:

- The amount of unpaid tax.
- A telephone number to call in the event of any questions.
- The right of the person to request a review during the 30-day period described *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(2).*
- The proposed action or actions that may be taken by the Franchise Tax Board and the rights of the person with respect to the action or actions, including a brief statement that sets forth all of the following:
    - The provisions of California law relating to levy and sale of property.
    - The procedures applicable to the levy and sale of property under California law.
    - The independent departmental administrative review available to the taxpayers with

respect to the levy and sale and the procedures to obtain that review (for discussion of this review, see *§ 540.404[6][b][i]*).

- The alternatives available to taxpayers that could prevent levy on property, including installment agreements under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19008*.

- California legal requirements and procedures with respect to the release of levy.

If review is requested under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(C)*, the levy actions that are the subject of the requested review must be suspended while the review is pending. In no event shall any period expire before the 15th day after the day on which there is a final determination in the review [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(d)*].

Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5 does not apply if the board has made a finding under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081* or *19082* that the collection of tax is in jeopardy except that the taxpayer must be given the opportunity for the review described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5* within a reasonable period of time after the levy [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(e)*].

[b] Independent Departmental Administrative Review

When a taxpayer has requested a review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(C)*, an independent departmental administrative review must be conducted by an officer or employee, or officers or employees, who have had no prior involvement with respect to the unpaid tax specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(A)* before the first review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5* or *§ 19225* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(b)(3)*]. A taxpayer may waive the requirement of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(b)(3)*. Administrative review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(b)(3)* is not subject to the administrative adjudication provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (*Gov. Code § 11400 et seq.*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(b)(3)*].

The person or persons conducting the independent departmental administrative review must obtain verification that the requirements of any applicable law or administrative procedures have been met by the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(1)*].

The taxpayer may raise during the review any relevant issue relating to the unpaid tax or the lien, including any of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(2)(A)-(C)*]:

- Appropriate spousal defenses.

- Challenges to the appropriateness of collection actions.

- Offers of collection alternatives, that may include the posting of a bond, the substitution of other assets, an installment agreement, or an offer-in-compromise.

The determination of the person or persons conducting the review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)* must take into consideration all of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(3)(A)-(C)*]:

- The verification presented under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(1)*.

- The issues raised by the taxpayer under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(2)*.

- Whether any proposed collection action balances the need for the efficient collection of taxes with the legitimate concern of the person that any collection action not be more intrusive than necessary.

An issue may not be raised during the review if (1) the issue was raised and considered at a previous review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5* or in any other administrative or judicial proceeding, in which the person seeking to raise the issue participated meaningfully [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(4)(A), (B)*]. This restriction does not apply to any issue with respect to a change incircumstances of that person that affects the determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(c)(4)*].

A person is entitled to only one review under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5* with respect to the taxable period to which the unpaid tax specified *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(a)(3)(A)* relates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5(b)(2)*].

[c] Release of Levy

The SBE must release any levy or notice to withhold issued pursuant to sales and use tax provisions (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6001 et seq.*) on any property if the expense of the sale process exceeds the liability for which the levy is made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7094(a)*]. Similarly, the Taxpayers' Rights Advocate may order the release of any lien or notice to withhold issued pursuant to the sales and use tax provisions or, within 90 days from the receipt of funds pursuant to a levy or notice to withhold, order the return of any amount up to $1,500 of moneys received, on his or her finding that the levy or notice to withhold threatens the health or welfare of the taxpayer or the taxpayer's spouse, dependents, or family [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7094(b)*].

With regard to the Personal Income Tax Law [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 17001 et seq.*] and the Bank and Corporation Tax Law [*see* Rev. & Tax. Code § 23100 et seq.], the FTB must release any levy issued pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Part 10.2 (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 18401 et seq.*) on any property in the event of any circumstances deemed appropriate by the FTB, including but not limited to the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)*]:

- The expense of the sale process to the state exceeds the liability for which the levy is made [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(1)*].

- The Taxpayers' Rights Advocate orders the release of the levy upon his or her finding that the levy threatens the health or welfare of the taxpayer, or the taxpayer's spouse, dependents, or family [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(2)*].

- The proceeds from the sale would not result in a reasonable reduction of the debt [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(3)*].

- The levy was issued not in accordance with administrative procedures [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(4)*].

- The taxpayer has entered into an installment payment agreement under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19008* to satisfy the tax liability for which the levy was made, unless that or another agreement allows for the levy [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(5)*].

- The release of the levy will facilitate the collection of the tax liability or will be in the best interest of the taxpayer and the state [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(a)(6)*].

The release provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7094* and *21016* do not apply, however, to the seizure of any property as a result of a jeopardy assessment [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7094(d), 21016(c)*].

In the case of a levy on salary or wages payable to or received by the taxpayer, in accordance with The Wage Garnishment Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 706.010 et seq.*), on agreement with the taxpayer that the tax is not collectible, the FTB must release the levy as soon as practicable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(d)* (subdivision added by Stats. 1999, ch.

931, § 35); *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(e)* (1999 amendments operative for salary or wages subject to levy on or after October 10, 1999)]. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(d)*, however, does not apply if the debt for which the levy is issued has been discharged from collectibility under *Gov. Code § 16301.6*, except if the debt is satisfied [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21016(d)*].

[d] Return of Property or Proceeds from Sale

Except in cases in which the board finds collection of the tax to be in jeopardy, if any property has been levied on, the property or the proceeds from the property's sale must be returned to the taxpayer if the board determines any one of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7094.1(a)(1)-(3)*]:

- The levy on the property was not in accordance with the law.

- The taxpayer has entered into and is in compliance with an installment payment agreement pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6832* to satisfy the tax liability for which the levy was imposed, unless that or another agreement allows for the levy.

- The return of the property will facilitate the collection of the tax liability or will be in the state's and taxpayer's best interest.

Property returned under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7094.1(a)(1), (2)* is subject to the provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7096* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7094.1(b)*; for discussion of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7096*; *see § 540.404[6][f]*)].

[e] Notice of Exemptions From Levy Prior to Sale

The SBE and FTB are not permitted to sell seized property until the taxpayer is first notified in writing of the exemptions provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq.* [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7094(b), 21016(b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7095, 21017* (exemptions must be adjusted to reflect changes in California Consumer Price Index that are more than 5 percent higher than any previous adjustment)].

[f] Claim to Recover Consequential Charges

[i] Reimbursement by FTB

A person may file a claim with the FTB for reimbursement of charges or fees imposed on the person by an unrelated business entity as the direct result of an erroneous levy, erroneous processing action, or erroneous collection action by the FTB. Charges that may be reimbursed include an unrelated business entity's usual and customary charge for complying with the levy instructions and reasonable charges for overdrafts that are a direct consequence of the erroneous levy, erroneous processing action, or erroneous collection action, and are paid by the person and not waived by the unrelated business entity or otherwise reimbursed. Each claimant applying for reimbursement must file a claim in the form prescribed by the FTB. In order to grant a claim, the FTB must determine that all of the following conditions have been satisfied [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21018(a)*]:

- The erroneous levy, erroneous processing action, or erroneous collection action was caused by an error made by the FTB.

- Prior to the erroneous levy, erroneous processing action, or erroneous collection action, the person responded to all contacts by the FTB and provided any requested information or documentation sufficient to establish the person's position. The SBE may waive this provision for reasonable cause.

- The charge or fee has not been waived by the unrelated business entity or otherwise reimbursed.

A claim must be filed within 90 days from the date of the erroneous levy, erroneous processing action, or erroneous collection action. Within 30 days from the date the claim is received, the FTB must respond to the claim. If the FTB denies the claim, the claimant must be notified in writing of the reasons for denial of the claim. The FTB may extend the period for filing a claim under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21018* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21018(b)*].

Charges and fees that may be reimbursed under the authority of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21018* are limited to the usual and customary charges and fees imposed by a business entity in the ordinary course of business [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21018(c)*].

[ii] Reimbursement by SBE

A taxpayer may file a claim with the SBE for reimbursement of bank charges and any other reasonable third-party check charge fees incurred by the taxpayer as the direct result of an erroneous levy or notice to withhold by the SBE. Bank and third-party charges include a financial institution's or third party's customary charge for complying with the levy or notice-to-withhold instructions and reasonable charges for overdrafts that are a direct consequence of the erroneous levy or notice to withhold. The charges are those paid by the taxpayer and not waived or reimbursed by the financial institution or third party. Each claimant applying for reimbursement must file a claim in the form prescribed by the SBE. In order to grant a claim, the SBE must determine that both of the following conditions have been satisfied [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7096(a)*]:

- The erroneous levy or notice to withhold was caused by the SBE's error.

- Prior to the levy or notice to withhold, the taxpayer responded to all contacts by the SBE and provided any requested information or documentation sufficient to establish the taxpayer's position. The SBE may waive this provision for reasonable cause.

A claim under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7096* must be filed within 90 days from the date of the levy or notice to withhold. Within 30 days from the date the claim is received, the SBE must respond to the claim. If the SBE denies the claim, the taxpayer must be notified in writing of the reasons for denial of the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7096(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.405

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.405 No Levy on Principal Residence of Innocent Investor

No levy is to be made on the principal residence or proceeds from a transaction involving the principal residence of an innocent investor, if the basis for the levy is an underpayment for any taxable year beginning on or before December 31, 2000, and is attributable to an abusive tax shelter. In addition, a lien on that property, or the proceeds of the sale of that property, must be released on notification to the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.6*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawNonmortgage LiensTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Avoidance & EvasionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.406

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.406 Cause of Action for Reckless Disregard of Published Procedures

If an officer or employee of the SBE or FTB recklessly disregards procedures published by the respective board, a taxpayer aggrieved by the action or omission may bring an action for damages in superior court against the State of California [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(a), 21021(a)*]. For a form of complaint based on reckless disregard of a published procedure, *see § 540.570*.

If the state is found liable, the taxpayer may recover actual and direct monetary damages sustained as a result of the actions or omissions [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(b)(1), 21021(b)(1)*]. The state is also liable to the taxpayer for reasonable litigation costs, as defined by applicable Revenue and Taxation Code cost provisions [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(b)(2), 21021(b)(2)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7156* (costs in sales and use tax proceedings), *19717* (costs in personal income tax and bank and corporation tax proceedings)].

In awarding damages for reckless disregard of published procedures, the courtis required to take into consideration any negligence or omissions by the taxpayer that contributed to the damages [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(c), 21021(c)*]. Moreover, if it appears to the court that the taxpayer's position in an action for reckless disregard of published procedures is frivolous, the court may impose a penalty against the taxpayer of up to $10,000. The penalty must be paid on notice and demand from the SBE or FTB, as applicable, and is collected as if it were sales and use tax, personal income tax, or bank and corporation tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 7099(d), 21021(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.407

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.407 Cause of Action Against State for Settlement or Compromise in Exchange for Disclosure of Information

If any officer or employee of the FTB intentionally settles the determination or compromises the collection of any tax due from an attorney, certified public accountant, or tax preparer (as defined in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19169(b)*) representing a taxpayer, in exchange for information conveyed by the taxpayer to the attorney, certified public accountant, or tax preparer for purposes of obtaining advice concerning the taxpayer's tax liability, the taxpayer may bring a civil action for damages against the State of California in superior court [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(g)* (section operative for actions files on or after January 1, 1998)]. The civil action is the exclusive remedy for recovering damages from the acts described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)*]. As an exception to this rule, the civil action is not available with respect to information conveyed to an attorney, certified public accountant, or tax preparer for the purpose of perpetrating a fraud or crime [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(f)*].

If the defendant is found liable, the liability to the plaintiff is the lesser of $500,000 or the sum of the actual direct economic damages sustained by the plaintiff as a proximate result of the information disclosure, and the costs of the action [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(b)(1)(2)*]. Damages, however, do not include the taxpayer's liability for any civil or criminal penalties or other losses attributable to incarceration or the imposition of other criminal sanctions [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(c)*].

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an action to enforce liability created under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)* may be brought without regard to the amount in controversy, and may be brought only within two years after the date the actions creating the liability would have been discovered by the exercise of reasonable care [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(d)*].

On certification of the executive officer of the FTB, or the executive officer's delegate, that criminal charges have been

filed against the taxpayer, the court before which an action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)* is pending must stay all proceedings with respect to the action, pending the resolution of those criminal charges [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(e)*]. Certification authorized by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(a)* must comply with the requirements of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19542* (restriction on disclosure of amount of income and other particulars) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21022(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.408

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.408 Attorney-Client Privilege Extends to Taxpayer-Practitioner Communications

The same statutory protections of confidentiality that apply to a communication between a taxpayer and an attorney [*see Evid. Code § 950 et seq.*] apply also to a communication between a taxpayer and a federally authorized tax practitioner (see below) with respect to tax advice (see below), to the extent that the communication would be considered a privileged communication if it were between a client and an attorney. A federally authorized tax practitioner has the legal obligation and duty to maintain confidentiality with respect to such a communication [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(a)(1), 21028(a)(1)*]. The privilege is effective with regard to communications made on or after January 16, 2009 [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(c), 21028(c)*] and, under previously enacted temporary versions of the governing code sections, also with regard to communications made from September 13, 2000, until January 16, 2009 [*see* Stats. 2000, ch. 438; Stats. 2003, ch. 654, 656; Stats. 2004, ch. 412].

"Federally authorized tax practitioner" means any individual who is authorized under federal law to practice before the IRS [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(a)(3)(A), 21028(a)(3)(A)*; *see 31 U.S.C. § 330*; *31 C.F.R. § 10.3* (persons who may become federally authorized tax practitioners include certified public accountants, enrolled agents, and enrolled actuaries)]. "Tax advice" means advice given by an individual with respect to a state tax matter, including federal tax advice related to a state tax matter; and "federal tax advice" means advice given by individuals within the scope of their authority to practice before the IRS on noncriminal matters [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(a)(3)(B), 21028(a)(3)(B)*].

The privilege may be asserted, in noncriminal tax proceedings only, before the Board of Equalization or the Franchise Tax Board [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(a)(2), 21028(a)(2)*]. However, the privilege does not apply to written communications between tax practitioners and certain corporate representatives regarding the promotion of corporate tax shelters [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(b), 21028(b)*; *see Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(a)(3)(c), 21028(a)(3)(c)* ("tax shelter" defined)]. In addition, the privilege may not be asserted to prevent the disclosure of information in any proceeding to discipline the holder of any license or right to practice by any governmental agency [*Rev. & Tax Code §§ 7099.1(b), 21028(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS
3. Taxpayers' Bill of Rights

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.409-540.419

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.409[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.420

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.420 California Legal Forms

For discussion and exemption applications forms relating to welfare, charitable, and educational exemptions, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 13C, *Nonprofit Corporations and Associations*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxExempt PropertyGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.421

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.421 California Real Estate

For a discussion of the tax implications of acquiring and disposing of real property, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 130, *Acquisition and Basis* ; Ch. 131, *Depreciation* ; Ch. 132, *Disposition*

For a more detailed discussion of the valuation methods and assessment process, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 401, *Valuation and Assessment*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawProperty ValuationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationAssessment Methods & TimingTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.422

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.422 Federal Constitution

State and local taxes prohibited from placing undue burden on interstate commerce. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*

States prohibited from taxing exports. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10, cl. 2*

Federal government and instrumentalities are exempt from state taxation. U.S. Const., art. VI

State and local taxes that unduly burden free press or free speech are prohibited. *U.S. Const., amend. I*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseInterstate CommerceGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawRelations Among GovernmentsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFederal Preemption

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.423

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.423 California Constitution

[1] Property Subject to Tax

All property in California is subject to property tax at full value unless exempt. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 1*

Real and personal property must be assessed separately; rate for personal property as not permitted to be higher than that for real property in same jurisdiction. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 2, 13*

Values of all property on local roll must be equalized. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 16*

Court action to enjoin or prevent collection of tax prohibited; action to recover tax claimed to have been illegally collected, with interest, authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*

[2] Proposition 13 and Other Constitutional Limitations

Combined maximum of ad valorem taxes that may be levied on real property by all taxing agencies is one percent of property's full cash value; one percentlimitation is not applicable to ad valorem property taxes or special assessments levied to pay indebtedness approved by voters prior to July 1, 1978, or to bonded indebtedness for acquisition or improvement of real property approved on or after July 1, 1978 by two-thirds vote. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, §§ 1(a), (b)*

After rollback to assessor's appraisal of full cash value as shown on the 1975-1976 tax rolls, assessed value of real property may be increased only (1) by inflation factor not to exceed 2 percent per year or (2) if property is purchased, newly constructed, or changes ownership after March 1, 1975. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2*

Ability of cities, counties, and "special districts" to impose special taxes is limited by requiring two-thirds voter

approval. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*

Cities, counties, and special districts are prohibited from imposing new ad valorem real property taxes and sales or transaction taxes on real property. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*

Limitations on local governments concerning special and general taxes. Cal. Const., art. XIII C

Restrictions concerning property taxes, assessments, fees or charges and procedures for assessments and new or increased fees or charges. Cal. Const., art. XIII D

[3] Reassessment Exclusions

Exclusions from definition of "newly constructed," "purchases," and "change in ownership" that trigger reassessment. *Cal Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a), (c), (d), (g), (h)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 60-74.6*

[4] Transfer of Base Year Values

Legislature is empowered to allow persons over age 55 or with severe and permanent disability to transfer base year value of principal residence to replacement dwelling. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5*

Legislature is authorized to provide for transfer of base-year value of property destroyed or damaged by disaster to comparable replacement property. *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(e), (f)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 69*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesPersonal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationAssessment Methods & TimingTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.424

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.424 Federal Statutes

Imposition of property tax on national banks is authorized. *12 U.S.C. § 548*

Federal court diversity and federal question jurisdiction. *28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332*

Tax Injunction Act prohibits federal courts from enjoining assessment, levy, or collection of state tax if plain, speedy, and efficient remedy available in state courts. *28 U.S.C. § 1341*

Lands owned or held in trust for American Indians is exempt from state or local taxation. *28 U.S.C. § 1360(b)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesState TaxCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsAnti-Injunction ActGovernmentsNative AmericansTaxationTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.425

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.425 State Statutes

[1] Actions by Owners and Purchasers of Tax-Defaulted Property

Quiet title action by owner. *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*

Action by good faith improver of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 871.1-871.7*

Quiet title action by purchaser of tax-defaulted property. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 160, 3727-3729*

Suit by purchaser to determine adverse claims. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3950-3972*

Owner's action to contest validity of deed to taxing agency because of delinquency of property taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 175*

Original owner's action alleging invalidity of or irregularity in proceedings for sale of tax-defaulted property by taxing agency to private party. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3725*

Authority of board of supervisors to rescind erroneous tax sale. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3731*

Redemptioner's quiet title action. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 4113*

[2] Information to Assessor

Information requested by or furnished to assessor is confidential. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 408, 451, 481*; *but see Rev. & Tax. Code § 408.3* (property characteristic information is public record)

Property statements are required. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 441, 448, 453, 456*

Penalties for failure to provide statements and requested information. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 441(b), 463, 482, 506, 531*

Electronic filing of property statements. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(k)*

Simplified procedure for manager in control of fleet of fractionally owned aircraft to file statement covering all aircraft that have acquired situs in California, at all airport locations. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(l)*

Simplified procedure for commercial air carriers to file statements covering their taxable personal property (including aircraft) and fixtures at all airport locations. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 441(m)*

[3] Change in Ownership

Definitions of and exclusions from change in ownership triggering reassessment. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 60-68*

Change in ownership statements are required. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 480-480.6*

[4] Property Taxpayer's Bill of Rights

The Morgan Property Taxpayer's *Bill of Rights*, creating Property Taxpayer's Advocate. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5900 et seq.*

[5] Proposition 62

Requirement that local taxes be approved by vote of local electorate. *Gov. Code §§ 53720-53730*

Two-thirds voter approval requirement for a local government or district to impose a special tax. *Gov. Code § 53722*

Majority voter approval requirement for a local government or district to impose a general tax. *Gov. Code § 53723*

[6] Reduction of Assessment

Applications to county board of equalization for reduction of assessment. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1601-1721*

Damages as authorized for failure of state or local public entity lessor to disclose in lease that leasehold interest is taxable. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 107.6*

Taxpayers' redemption rights. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3707, 4101-4379*

Assessment and collection of assessments on floating homes. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 2189.7, 2189.8*

Tax collector is required to send notice of removal of invalid lien for recording after owner presents evidence of erroneously recorded lien; recorder as required to forward to owner. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 2196*

[7] Refunds

Interest and attorney's fees are authorized on certain refunds. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1611.6, 5150-5152*

Suits for refund of real property taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5140-5149.5*

[8] Transfer of Base Year Value

Transfer of base year value of property destroyed or damaged in disaster. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 69*

Transfer of base year value for principal residence of person over 55 years of age or with severe and permanent disability to replacement dwelling. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 69.5*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawDeedsTypesTax DeedsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax Sales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.426

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.426 Decisions

[1] Administrative Procedures

18 Cal. Code Reg. § 468 requires assignment of base year value on lien date following acquisition of lease to develop geothermal sources rather than treating geothermal steam project as ongoing new construction. *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. County of Lake (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 180, 193, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 765*

State Board of Equalization's notice to taxpayer of findings (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 744(a)*) after hearing of petition for reassessment must specify method of valuation used; if more than one method is used, criteria for weighting methods must also be set forth. *Southern Pac. Transportation Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 938, 949-952, 959, 237 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 1603, 1605 and *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 305* do not limit term "regular assessment period" to specific tax year; thus, escape assessments for prior tax years issued on June 20 are made within regular assessment period and application for equalization of those escape assessments filed on September 14 is timely. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. County of Orange (1985) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1141, 1150-1151, 232 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Validity of escape assessments was properly before assessment appeals board even though taxpayer's application for equalization did not furnish unsecured bill number in space provided but only gave parcel number. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. County of Orange (1985) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1141, 1149-1150, 232 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Assessment appeals board has right to determine its own jurisdiction. *Focus Cable of Oakland, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 519, 525, 219 Cal. Rptr. 95*

[2] Change in Ownership

[a] Corporations

Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(c), defining changes in ownership of corporate property for purposes of tax reassessment under Cal. Const., art. XIII A, applies to subsidiaries of acquired corporations notwithstanding legislature's failure to use term "subsidiary" in statute; acquisition of subsidiary's parent corporation effects indirect change in ownership of subsidiary's real property, rendering property subject to reassessment. *Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. County of Riverside (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 84, 91-99, 255 Cal. Rptr. 670, 767 P.2d 1148*

Corporation obtaining control of another corporation is change in ownership; fact that majority shareholders of acquired corporation own majority of acquiring corporation was irrelevant. *Kraft, Inc. v. County of Orange (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1104, 1107-1109, 268 Cal. Rptr. 643*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(b) unambiguously requires affiliation from beginning until end of transaction to qualify as reorganization excluded from reassessment; thus, corporate reorganization not involving entities affiliated after reorganization constitutes change in ownership under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(c)* that was properly reassessed. *Pueblos Del Rio South v. City of San Diego (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 893, 907-908, 257 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Change in ownership under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(c)* occurs, and reassessment is proper, on merger of parent holding company if original parent's shareholders became minority shareholders of surviving parent. *Sav-On Drugs, Inc. v. County of Orange (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1611, 1617-1621, 236 Cal. Rptr. 100*

Although merger was nontaxable event under both federal and California income tax law, exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(c)* was not applicable because all merged entities were not members of affiliated group prior to merger. *Sav-On Drugs, Inc. v. County of Orange (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1611, 1617-1621, 236 Cal. Rptr. 100*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 64(c) is not unconstitutional denial of equal protection to corporations. *Sav-On Drugs, Inc. v. County of Orange (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1611, 1623-1626, 236 Cal. Rptr. 100*

[b] Leases as Change in Ownership

Although leases generally are not taxable under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 11911*, 35-year lease has sufficient longevity to approximate transfer in fee constituting taxable change in ownership under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 61(c)*; however, same rule is applicable to 20-year lease with 10-year option to renew. *Thrifty Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 881, 884-886, 258 Cal. Rptr. 585*

Lease providing for automatic extension of term of lease if city passes charter amendment and city's passage of amendment does not constitute change in ownership triggering revaluation of possessory interest in tax-exempt property. *Wrather Port Properties, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 517, 522, 257 Cal. Rptr. 266*

[c] Limited Liability Companies; Partnerships

When member of limited liability company satisfies company-funding obligation by conveying real property to LLC, that change in ownership is, for property tax purposes, a 100 percent change in ownership because entire "beneficial use" of property [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 60*] has been transferred from member to LLC; consequently, entire property can be reassessed. *Fashion Valley Mall, LLC v. County of San Diego (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 871, 885-887, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 327*

Majority partner's two-step acquisition of full fee interest in general partnership's sole asset, parcel of real property, was change in ownership under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 61*; acquisition consisted of majority partner's purchase of interests of minority partners, followed by partnership's transfer of title to sole remaining partner. *Zapara v. County of Orange (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 464, 470, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 555*

[d] Requirements

Change in ownership allowing reassessment of apartment building occurs at time of transaction between owner and buyer if buyer was unable to convert to cooperative on time to make payments when they were due, sale documents were absolute on their face, buyer sold fractional interests to individual investors, one of whom subsequently conveyed interest to third party, and seller initiated foreclosure proceedings. *Cal-American Income Property Fund II v. County of Los Angeles (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 109, 114-116, 256 Cal. Rptr. 21*

Transfer of bare legal title from record lessee of property to its beneficial owner is not a change in ownership triggering reassessment. *Parkmerced Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1091, 1094-1095, 197 Cal. Rptr. 401*

[e] Sale and Leaseback

Sale and leaseback of property is change in ownership; sale-leaseback is transfer of present interest in property, including beneficial use of it, value of which is substantially equal to value of fee interest. *Pacific Southwest Realty Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 155, 162-165, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 536, 820 P.2d 1046*

Corporation's sale of property, subject to three 50-year leases to corporation's subsidiary that were not in existence at time of sale but were made a condition of sale, constitutes change in ownership; transaction is subject to property tax reassessment under step transaction doctrine if each step was taken to achieve ultimate result of sale and leaseback. Crow-Winthrop Operating Partnership v. *County of Orange (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1848, 1856-1858, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696*

True sale-leaseback that is not a financing transaction constitutes change in ownership; sale and leaseback are two separate transfers. *Industrial Indemnity Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 999, 1004-1006, 267 Cal. Rptr. 445*

[f] Sale of Development Rights

Sale of transferable development rights is transfer of present interest in real property and thus as taxable change in ownership. *Mitsui Fudosan (U.S.A.), Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 525, 529-530, 268 Cal. Rptr. 356*

[g] Trusts

Change of ownership occurred when family trust became irrevocable, not when family revocable trust was created. *Empire Properties v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 781, 785-789, 52 Cal Rptr. 2d 69*

Termination of trust does not constitute change in ownership of real property triggering reassessment under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)*. *Allen v. Sutter County Bd. of Equalization (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 887, 890-892, 189 Cal. Rptr. 101*

[3] Characterization of Property as Personal or Real

Item is fixture and thus real property if reasonable person would consider item to be permanent part of property taking into account annexation, adaptation, and other objective manifestations of permanence. *Crocker National Bank v. City and County of San Francisco (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 881, 885-888, 264 Cal. Rptr. 139, 782 P.2d 278*

General-purpose fungible data processing equipment that was plugged in and readily moveable is personal property because it is not a fixture. *Crocker National Bank v. City and County of San Francisco (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 881, 889-891, 264 Cal. Rptr. 139, 782 P.2d 278*

Franchise right to locate cable on public streets and right of way is possessory interest in real property and assessment is governed by principles set forth in *California Constitution. CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

Computer systems not attached to property, except to power source by standardized plugs and cables, is personal property despite major alterations to real property to accommodate computer system. *Allstate Ins. Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 877, 890-892, 207 Cal. Rptr. 888*

[4] Escape Assessments

Escape assessments are deficiency assessments, assessed retroactively to remedy omissions or errors in original assessment of taxable property; property on assessment roll that has escaped assessment is assessed on discovery at its value on lien date for year which it escaped assessment; if taxpayer seeks review of both escape assessment and valuation of other property at location, taxpayer must so state in application; applications for tax reductions which only stated challenges to escape assessments of personal property and fixtures held not to include challenges to underlying real property at business location; issue was not failure to identify precise legal basis for reduction, but rather failure to seek reduction of values of roperty other than escape assessments. *Helene Curtis, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 124, 128 n.1, 129-132, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 31*

Although county delayed too long in seeking supplemental assessments under 1993 version of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.11* for the 1988-1989 assessment year, county not barred from changing properties' base year values and from seeking escape assessments; 1992 legislation setting limitation period on assessor's right to recover supplemental assessments in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.11*, did not affect limitations period for levying escape assessments established in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 532* and interpreted in *Blackwell Homes v. County of Santa Clara (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 277 Cal. Rptr. 251* ; base-year values not involving assessor's exercise of judgment as to value can be corrected at any time under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 51.5*; escape assessments, however, can be levied only within time limits specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 51.5(a), (b), 532*; under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 532* in effect in 1993, escape assessments not subject to penalty had to be made within four years after July 1 of assessment year, as defined in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 118*, in which property escaped taxation or was underassessed; if interpretation in *Dreyer's Grand Ice Cream, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 1174, 1180, 224 Cal. Rptr. 285 (First Dist.)* , prevailed, no escape assessments could have been levied because, under *Dreyer's* interpretation, only timely escape assessments are those made within four years of year when new base year value determined; however, court applied language of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 532* and its interpretation in *Blackwell Homes*, which disagreed with *Dreyer's* interpretation of Section 532, in holding that escape assessments for last four years were timely because they did not involve assessor's judgment as to value and because they were made within four years of July 1 of assessment years involved; 1994 and 1995 amendments to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 532* inapplicable to case; when assessor has taken no action to adjust base value year, he or she has not exercised judgment as to value; escape assessments also not barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*. *Montgomery Ward & Co. v. County of Santa Clara (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1132-1139, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 261*

Four-year limitation period of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 532* governing period within which escape assessments can be made commences on lien date as of which original (base year) assessment was determined, not from discovery or from end of tax year in which property escaped assessment; escape assessment made on February 26, 1981, based on incorrect assessments for 1976-1977 through 1980-1981 is barred, because limitation period commenced on March 1, 1976. *Dreyer's Grand Ice Cream, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 1174, 1180-1182*

[5] Exemptions

Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 3(b) exempts property owned by public entities from both regular property taxation and special assessments; water district user fee is special assessment within exemption, because proceeds used for capital improvements. *San Marcos Water Dist. v. San Marcos Unified School Dist. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 154, 163-165, 228 Cal. Rptr. 47, 720 P.2d 935*

Former Rev. & Tax. Code § 225 (exempting personal property manufactured or produced (1) outside California for transhipment out of U.S. or (2) outside U.S. for transhipment out of state) is void for discriminating against domestic companies operating wholly within U.S.; undue burden on interstate commerce is violation of *commerce clause*. *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 1, 15-16, 227 Cal. Rptr. 391, 719 P.2d 987*

Replacement parts that computer company kept for use in fulfilling its maintenance and repair duties under flat-fee extended service contracts with its customers (both those that bought computers and those that leased computers) could not be exempted from property taxation under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 219* (exemption for business inventories) because those replacement parts, which company held in what computer industry denotes as "rotable pool" (because parts are swapped out and replaced by salvageable parts removed from customers' computers), were not goods intended for sale or lease in ordinary course of business [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 129* (definition of business inventories); *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 133* (same)]; moreover, company had treated those parts as capital assets, not as inventory, for income tax purposes. *Amdahl Corp. v. County of Santa Clara (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 604, 613-614, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 486*

While statutes granting property tax exemptions are generally construed strictly, words describing exemption need not be given their narrowest possible meaning; property of nonprofessional service enterprises constitutes exempt business inventory under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 129* and *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 133* if it is delivered incidental to rendition of service, whether goods are delivered to customer or to third party designated by customer; form letters sent by collection service to debtors held to qualify as exempt business inventory, and were not excludable office supplies under *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 133(b)*. *Transworld Systems, Inc. v. County of Sonoma (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 713, 715-718, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165*

Under *Cal. Const. art. XIII, §§ 1, 2*, only Legislature, with two-thirds of membership of each housing concurring, may classify personal property for exemption; had SBE, in 1996 amendment of *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 152*, concerning taxability of computer programs, created exemption where none existed, or adopted rule inconsistent with Legislature's intent, regulation would be invalid; however, SBE merely clarified *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 995* and *995.2*; thus, SBE acted properly to enforce state property tax law and prescribe regulations to govern assessors; amendment of regulation enjoys presumption of correctness and burden is on assessor to demonstrate its invalidity. *Hahn v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 985, 996-997, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 282*

Statutes granting exemption from taxation are to be strictly construed to avoid enlarging or extending the concession beyond the plain meaning of the language used granting it; burden is on party claiming exemption to show it clearly comes within terms authorizing exemption and any doubt must be resolved against right to an exemption; cobalt 60 held not to come within business inventory exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 219*. *Sterigenics Internat. v. County of Orange (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1541, 1543, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 319*

Request for parent/child exemption from reassessment of real property was untimely under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 63.1(e)(1)* when not filed within three years after October 5, 1987, the date the family trust became irrevocable; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 63.1(e)(1)* applicable to transfers between parents and their children occurring before September 30, 1990. *Empire Properties v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 781, 789-791, 52 Cal Rptr. 2d 69*

Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 4(c) and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 203.5*, which grant exemption to specified museums and do not require property to be used for specified purpose, were applicable during time property devised to museum was subject to probate administration; interest in property passed to exempt entity on testator's death. *California Academy of Sciences v. County of Fresno (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1436, 1440-1442, 238 Cal. Rptr. 154*

Neither exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 33* for blood, blood products, and human tissue, nor welfare exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 214* exempt personal property of commercial supplier of blood and derivative pharmaceutical products used to store blood or to manufacture derivatives. *Alpha Therapeutic Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 265, 270-273, 224 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 214 (exemption for property owned and operated for charitable purposes) applies to leasehold interests whether or not underlying fee is owned by public entity. *Tri-Cities Children's Center, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 589, 592-593, 212 Cal. Rptr. 541*

[6] Federal Law and Jurisdiction

State may not impose real estate taxes in manner that discriminates against interstate commerce; otherwise generally applicable state property tax violates Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const., art. 1, § 8, cl. 3*) when exemption for property owned by charitable institutions excludes organizations operated principally for benefit of nonresidents; although camp does not make profit, it is engaged in commerce not only as purchaser, but also as provider of goods and services. *Camps Newfound/Owatonna v. Harrison (1997) 520 U.S. 564, 117 S. Ct 1590, 137 L. Ed. 2d 852, 859, 861-864, 869-874*

Federal district court has jurisdiction under former *49 U.S.C. § 11503* (*now 49 U.S.C. § 11501*) to determine claim of overvaluation of railroad property even if overvaluation not alleged to result from discriminatory intent. *Burlington No. R. Co. v. Okla. Tax Comm'n (1987) 481 U.S. 454, 460-464, 107 S. Ct. 1855, 95 L. Ed. 2d 404*

Whether tax is within now-repealed exemption of former 49 U.S.C. § 1513(d)(3) is question of federal law; tax on airline flight property, imposed to exclusion of any other tax on that property and proceeds of which are wholly used for airport and aeronautical purposes, is within now-repealed exemption of former 49 U.S.C. § 1513(d)(3). *Western Air Lines, Inc. v. Board of Equalization (1987) 480 U.S. 123, 107 S. Ct. 1038, 94 L. Ed. 2d 112, 119, 121-123*

When ownership of government contractor's overhead property vested in government pursuant title-passing clauses included in the government contracts, property was not subject to a county's ad valorem property tax. *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. County of Orange (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 540, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601*

[7] Interest and Attorney's Fees

If attorney's fees can be awarded under both *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* and *Gov. Code § 800*, award is made under more specific statute (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152*). *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1160-1161, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

"Void" as used in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* has ordinary meaning of invalid, erroneous; judicial finding of voidness is

not required in order to award attorney's fees for application of improper valuation method. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1157-1159, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 5151 does not violate due process or equal protection by paying interest on refunds due to reduction of assessed value only if interest of $10 or more is owed. *Cohan v. Alvord (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 176, 184, 186, 208 Cal. Rptr. 421*

Only simple interest, not compound interest, is recoverable. *Lilli Ann Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 162, 198-199, 138 Cal. Rptr. 759*

Assessment unsubstantiated by any evidence is so arbitrary and capricious as to warrant award of attorney's fees. *Madonna v. County of San Luis Obispo (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 61-62, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916*

[8] Interests Valued

Ownership interest rather than possessory interest in personal property is taxable. *General Dynamics Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 59, 65-66, 330 P.2d 794*

Intangibles associated with realty, such as zoning, permits, and licenses, may not be taxed as real property, but may, to extent they affect real property's value, properly contribute to assessment of fair market value. *American Sheds, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 384, 392, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58*

Franchise right to do business is valuable but nonassessable portion of franchise; franchise right to locate cable on public streets and right of way is possessory interest in real property and their assessment is governed by principles set forth in *California Constitution. CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

Right to engage in cable television business is intangible asset not subject to taxation; value of intangible interest is properly considered in valuing tangible possessory interests. *County of Stanislaus v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1445, 1453-1455, 262 Cal. Rptr. 439*

Commercial rafting company's exclusive and profitable use of river pursuant to permit issued by county constitutes taxable possessory interest; taxation of possessory interest, together with additional taxation of land underlying river, do not constitute double taxation. *Scott-Free River Expeditions, Inc. v. County of El Dorado (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 896, 904-913, 250 Cal. Rptr. 504*

Cable television company's easement allowing it to construct improvements along, under, or over city streets and rights-of-way are a taxable possessoryinterest, even though city's interest not taxable. *Cox Cable San Diego, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 368, 383-388, 229 Cal. Rptr. 839*

Option of seller to repurchase property for failure of owner/purchaser to construct improvements as not allowing discounted appraisal; property are required to be appraised as unencumbered fee simple. *Carlson v. Assessment Appeals Bd. I (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1013, 213 Cal. Rptr. 555*

Entire burglar alarm system properly taxable as real property of seller although minor components, title to which passed to subscribers, were permanently attached to subscribers' real property and major components were removable improvements; assessment of entire burglar alarm systems to seller despite assessment of virtually identical fire alarm systems to subscribers was not arbitrary or discriminatory. *Morse Signal Devices v. County of Los Angeles (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 570, 579-582, 207 Cal. Rptr. 742*

"Mere expectation" without option to renew lease requires tax to be based only on remaining lease term. *American Airlines, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 325, 326-328, 135 Cal. Rptr. 261*

Appropriative and prescriptive water rights are assessed separately and therefore as exception to fee valuation practice. *Faix, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 992, 998-999, 127 Cal. Rptr.182*

[9] Methods of Valuation

Airlines alleging that their property was assessed at higher ratio to true market value than ratio applying to other commercial and industrial property in county stated claim for de facto assessment ratio discrimination in violation of former 49 U.S.C. App. § 1513(d) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (now see *49 U.S.C. § 40116(d)*); to prevail on claim, airlines must demonstrate that any unassessed and underassessed personal property results from practice or policy on assessor's part that is either targeted to disadvantage or that has an unreasonable disparate effect on the airlines. *American Airlines, Inc. v. County of San Mateo (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 1110, 1116, 1132-1136, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251, 912 P.2d 1198*

Method of valuation of leasehold interests in tax exempt property as proper. *Forster Shipbuilding. Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 450, 455-456, 6 Cal. Rptr. 24, 353 P.2d 736, 12 O.&G.R. 1213 De Luz Homes, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 546, 562-563, 290 P.2d 544*

Writ of mandate granted to assessor to require appraiser, in applying band-of-investment method in valuing Section 515 low-income housing, to use a 1 percent interest rate in computing debt portion of capitalization rate, which was actual interest rate paid by property owners, even though promissory notes stated a different interest rate. *Bontrager v. Siskiyou County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2001) 97 Cal. App. 4th 325, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182*

How pollution cleanup costs are to be handled in property tax valuations is essentially question of methodology, that is, one of law. *Mola Development Corp. v. Orange County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 309, 316, 327, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546*

Possessory interest to sell food in municipal stadium was not properly valued byincome capitalization method if entire income was capitalized and notjust income attributable to value of possessory interest. *Service America Corp. v. County of San Diego (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1232, 1240, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165*

At equalization hearing, board bound by same principles of valuation that are legally applicable to assessor. *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 18, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

When market data is available, preferred method of valuing real property is by reference to sales prices of comparable properties; however, due to unique nature of oil and gas property interests, specialized appraisal techniques are required; thus, modified capitalization of income approach is most commonly accepted valuation method; assessor's experts properly valued subject property using both comparable sales and discounted future income. *Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1035-1036, 1045, 1051, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433*

Preferred method of valuing cable television possessory interest is income method, capitalized to annual rent, using appropriate capitalization rate; in determining fair market value, enforceable restrictions on property may be taken into account; enforceable restrictions include virtually any governmental restriction designed to serve interest of public health, safety, morals and/or general public welfare; only enforceable governmental restrictions affect fair market value. *CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1081-1087, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

There are three basic methods of determining full cash value of property: (1) market data method, (2) income method, and (3) cost method. *Fujitsu Microelectronics, Inc. v. Assessment Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1124, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465*

Valuation on basis of particular use owner is making of property is contrary to law; valuation on basis of highest and best use as required. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. County of Orange (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1141, 1148-1148, 232 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Reproduction or replacement cost method is not proper method for valuation of office building if sales and income data is available; income approach is preferred. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. County of Orange (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1141, 1146, 1148-1148, 232 Cal. Rptr. 233* (building was substantial over-improvement and suffered from considerable functional obsolescence)

Historical cost is not proper method for valuation of railroad property if industry regulating railroad does not use historical cost as rate base. *Southern Pacific Transportation Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 938, 957, 237 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Assessor may use discretion in method of valuation of property as long as assessor is subject to requirements of uniformity and fairness. *ITT World Communications, Inc. v. County of Santa Clara (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 246, 251-252, 162 Cal. Rptr. 186*

Valuation formula used in assessing timberlands is proper. *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. County of Butte (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 461, 469-472, 112 Cal. Rptr. 327*

Method of valuation of right to appropriate water is proper. *County of Tuolumne v. State Board of Equalization (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 352, 367-368, 24 Cal. Rptr. 113*

[10] Other Judicial Remedies to Contest Assessments

Fire protection district lacked standing to seek writ of mandate against county assessment appeals board decision upholding lower assessed valuation of taxpayer's real property; district could not assert standing as beneficially interested party or on public interest ground of being governmental entity charged with enforcing a particular statute. *Sacramento County Fire Protection Dist. v. Sacramento County Assessment Appeals Bd. (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 327, 331, 333-336, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

Assessor may seek writ review of adverse equalization decision. *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 18, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

Trial court properly ruled that action could be maintained as class action when individual taxpayers who were parties to the action had filed separate administrative claims for tax refunds with the city, all making the same legal claim against the city. *Thomas v. City of East Palo Alto (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1095, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 185* (distinguishing *Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 960-965, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266*)

Class action held precluded in tax refund case brought pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5140*; filing administrative claim under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097* is prerequisite for bringing action for refund under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*; neither of these statutes provide for class claim or suit. *Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 960-965, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266*

Although *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32* requires payment of tax before challenging it, it does not require suit for refund

when legislature has provided procedures for challenging tax; administrative mandamus appropriate procedure under *Veh. Code § 8202* for contesting DMV's fleet registration fees. *American President Lines v. Zolin (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 910, 919-921, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370*

Peremptory writ of mandate to command assessment appeals board to conduct further hearings on taxpayer's request for award of attorney's fees. *Main & Von Karman Associates v. County of Orange (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 337, 344, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432*

Mandate to change assessments is unavailable even though tax refund is not sought, because effect of changing assessment would be lower taxes in future. *Merced County Taxpayers' Assn. v. Cardella (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 396, 400-401, 267 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Trial court improperly denied building industry association's petition for writ of mandate against school district boards that had invalidly imposed exactions on developers of new residential housing as special taxes or development fees. *California Bldg. Industry Assn. v. Governing Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 212, 232-240, 253 Cal. Rptr. 497*

Trial court properly granted writ of mandate setting aside local agency formationcommission resolution relieving certain homeowners of property taxes as condition of detachment from local water agency, because resolution was contrary to controlling state law. *Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency v. Local Agency Formation Com. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 990, 994-996, 251 Cal. Rptr. 593*

Availability of relief in state courts precludes federal equitable relief under Civil Rights Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1983*) in claims of allegedly unconstitutional administration of state tax systems. *Fair Assessment in Real Estate v. McNary (1981) 454 U.S. 100, 116, 102 S. Ct. 177, 70 L. Ed. 2d 271*

Petition for writ of mandate is proper method for county to review assessment board's improper finding that property was valueless. *County of San Diego v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 548, 553-558, 195 Cal. Rptr. 895*

Mandate to order revaluation of property or reassessment of taxes generally is not available, because suit for refund constitutes speedy and adequate remedy at law. *Malibu West Swimming Club v. Flournoy (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 161, 164-165, 131 Cal. Rptr. 279* ; *County of Sacramento v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 654, 672-673, 108 Cal. Rptr. 434*

Mandate is issuable to compel assessor to exercise discretion to appraise property lawfully, but not to compel board of equalization to increase assessment after it had already exercised its discretion with respect to assessment in question. *Stevens v. Fox Realty Corp. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 199, 205-206, 100 Cal. Rptr. 63*

[11] Property Valuation

Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.12(a)(3), referring to new construction that cannot be functionally used or occupied when it becomes available for use, logically can never be applied in determining date of completion for purpose of setting value of new construction that is subject to property tax; however, State Board of Equalization regulation on determining date of completion in that situation [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 463.500*] can be applied. *Georgiev v. County of Santa Clara (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1428, 1438-1440, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 752*

Statutory presumption that purchase price in arm's length sale is rebuttably presumed to be property's fair market value for purposes of property tax valuation [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)*] applies to sealed bid purchases, as well as to actively negotiated prices. *Maples v. Kern County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 172, 126 Cal*

Rptr 2d 585

Favorable contract agreement that gave an independent power producer above-market prices for its electricity output from a cogeneration power facility could be taken into account in valuing facility, because property may be assessed and valued by assuming presence of intangible assets or rights necessary to put property to beneficial or productive use. *Watson Cogeneration Company v. County of Los Angeles (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 421*

Under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2* and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 50*, county must reassess real property at new base year value when property is subject to change in ownership or new construction; under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110.1*, base year value is determined by fair market value of property, as of date of transfer or completion of construction; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)* creates rebuttable presumption that amount of improvement bond is included in purchase price placing burden on assessor to rebut presumption that purchase price reflects fair market value; 1998 amendment of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110(b)* adding presumption applied to plaintiff's claim, which was pending when amendment was enacted. *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1135-1137, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116*

For vacant, functionally unimproved contaminated commercial property generating no income on lien date, assessed valuation is price at which willing buyer and willing seller would consummate open market sale of property considering its polluted condition; deducting cleanup costs is acceptable surrogate to gauge true open market value of property where propertyis vacant and not generating income; dispositive question is not who has liability for cleanup costs, but whether, and to what extent property value was affected by contamination; thus, open market value of this unimproved property for tax valuation was best approximated by subtracting present value of cost of cleanup, without adding expected contributions from third parties back into cleanup costs; simple present value cost-of-cure deduction from fair market value of nonincome producing land as if uncontaminated is not only way to approximate open market value of contaminated property for tax purposes; adequate comparables for contaminated property would be another way, if assessor could ever find one. *Mola Development Corp. v. Orange County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 309, 311, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 546 & n.1, 312, 316-318, 327*

Property subject to general property taxation is assessed at its full value, i.e., price at which property would transfer if exposed for sale on open market between knowledgeable parties in equal bargaining positions; *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2-8* set forth various approaches assessor is to use in estimating this full value. *Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1035, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433*

Intangibles associated with realty, such as zoning, permits, and licenses, may, to extent they affect real property's value, properly contribute to assessment of fair market value. *American Sheds, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 384, 392, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58*

In determining fair market value, enforceable restrictions on property may be taken into account; enforceable restrictions include virtually any governmental restriction designed to serve interest of public health, safety, morals and/or general public welfare; assessment appeals board erred in taxing certain rate protection provisions included as part of cable operators' franchise agreements with local governments because rate protection agreements were enforceable restrictions not subject to taxation. *CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1075-1076, 1082-1088, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

When assessor relies on comparable sales approach to value, assessor must comply with *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 4* to ensure statewide uniformity in appraisal practices and to assure property is assessed at its full value. *Mitchell v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 497, 503, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476*

Oil and gas leases, which involve income-producing property, are ordinarily evaluated based on income capitalization method of appraisal; environmental protection statutes which require oil and gas lease operator to take measures to prevent or repair contamination can be restrictions on land use that affect value within meaning of *Rev. & Tax. Code §*

402.1; existence of specific enforcement order is not prerequisite under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 402.1* to taxpayer's showing that land is subject to restrictions imposed by government which affect its value. *Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 854, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766*

Property tax value of oil and gas rights on federal land is not reducible by value ofroyalties absent a showing that royalties could not be renegotiated on subsequent renewals because of specific lease provisions. *Oryx Energy Co. v. County of Kern (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 48, 59, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 221*

Assessor properly recognized and valued gas storage rights on lien date following their discovery. *Tenneco West, Inc. v. County of Kern (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 596, 239 Cal. Rptr. 612*

18 Cal. Code Reg. § 4 requires obligation at other than market rate assumed as part of purchase price to be adjusted to its cash equivalent. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1149-1155, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Sales tax is element of value of equipment, whether leased or sold to consumers, under trade level theory of property tax assessment. *County of San Diego v. Assessment Appeals Bd. No. 2 (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 548, 553-558, 195 Cal. Rptr. 895*

Acquisition value of real property provided for in Cal. Const., art. XIII A (Proposition 13) for purposes of property taxation do not exceed fair market value of property under *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 1(a)*. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Board of Supervisors (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 813, 823, 164 Cal. Rptr. 739*

[12] Proposition 13

[a] Application

Proposition 13 prohibits county from levying property taxes in excess of one percent to pay a money judgment under *Harb. & Nav. Code § 6361* (tax levy to raise sum required by port district for all purposes) and *Gov. Code §§ 970-971* (provision of funds to pay judgments). *Ventura Group Ventures, Inc. v. Ventura Port Dist. (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 1089, 1101-1102, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53*

Fees imposed under *Health & Safety Code § 105310* (part of Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Act of 1991), enacted by simple majority vote of Legislature, held to be bona fide regulatory fees, not taxes that required enactment by two-thirds majority vote under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 3*, because Legislature imposed the fees to mitigate actual or anticipated adverse effects of fee payers' operations, and under the Act the fees must bear reasonable relationship to those effects. *Sinclair Paint Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 866, 870, 873-881, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 447, 937 P.2d 1350*

When challenged tax held invalid under *Gov. Code § 53722*, court need not reach question whether it is also invalid under Proposition 13. *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225*

Valuation limitations of Proposition 13, Cal. Const., art. XIII A, apply to taxable lands of public entity located outside its jurisdictional boundaries. *City and County of San Francisco v. County of San Mateo (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 554, 559, 574, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888, 896 P.2d 181*

Public utility property, which is not taxed as real property or as personal property by local authority but which is subject to "unit tax" assessed and apportioned by SBE, is not within Cal. Const., art. XIII A and therefore not subject to

assessment rollback to 1975-76 level. *ITT World Communications, Inc. v. City & County of San Francisco (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 859, 865-871, 210 Cal. Rptr. 226, 693 P.2d 811*

Even if constitutional provision may be self executing, reasonable legislation enacted to facilitate its operation is valid; legislature has power to enact statutes providing for reasonable regulation and control of rights granted under constitutional provisions. *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 28, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

Under facts, utility lien imposed by ordinance was neither special tax nor special assessment and thus not governed by Cal. Const., art. XIII A; however, ordinance violated California statutory law and was not exempt under municipal affairs doctrine. *Isaac v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 586, 595-601, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 752*

Surcharge on landfill deposits that did not exceed the reasonable cost of the program was not a special tax subject to Proposition 13 requirement of two-thirds voter approval. *City of Dublin v. County of Alameda (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 264, 284, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845*

City's increase of real estate transfer tax from 0.75 percent to 0.95 percent was not barred by *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4* because it was general tax. *Cohn v. City of Oakland (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 261, 263-264, 272 Cal. Rptr. 714*

Emissions-based formula adopted by air pollution control district to recover indirect costs by apportioning them among stationary pollution sources required to obtain operating permits was regulatory fee for reasonable cost of providing necessary services, and not special tax prohibited by *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*. *San Diego Gas & Electric Co. v. San Diego County Air Pollution Control Dist. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1132,1145-1149, 250 Cal. Rptr. 420*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 50 (providing that reassessed value reflecting change in ownership is not entered on tax roll until lien date next following date of actual transfer) did not violate of Cal. Const., art. XIII A; later enactment of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75* (providing for supplemental assessment to avoid delay) did not render *Rev. & Tax. Code § 50* invalid. *Vacu-Dry Co. v. County of Sonoma (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 947, 951-952, 235 Cal. Rptr. 712*

Although complaint was filed in 1979, relief on claim that improper method was used to determine "rollback" 1975 lien date base year value was barred by requirement of former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 110.1(b)* [*see now Rev. & Tax. Code § 110.1(c)*] that all rollback values be determined by June 30, 1980. *Swicegood v. Rush (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 119, 125-127, 223 Cal. Rptr. 627*

Property occupied but not completed on 1975-1976 lien date is still within *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)* and not properly assessable at then current market value; for purposes of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 2(a)*, date of completion is date property or portion thereof is available for use. *Frederick v. County of Sonoma (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 1243, 1244-1245, 222 Cal. Rptr. 684*

1983 amendments to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 75.10, 75.11* only changed timing of supplemental assessments, and did not impose new tax, and therefore is valid. *Shafer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 423, 426-429, 220 Cal. Rptr. 59*

Cal. Const., art. XIII A, §§ 1, 2 neither revoked nor conflicted with *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 10* and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 52(c)*, exempting golf courses fromvaluation at highest and best use; nonprofit golf courses qualifying for exemption are entitled to both assessment based on actual use and rollback to 1975-76 valuation. *Los Angeles Country Club v. Pope (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 278, 285-288, 220 Cal. Rptr. 584*

18 Cal. Code Reg. § 468 method for valuation of oil and gas reserves, which treats additions to proved reserves the same as newly constructed additions to real property, and which allows reduction of appraised value to account for

annual depletion, is constitutional and not in violation of Cal. Const., art. XIII A. *Lynch v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 94, 114-118, 210 Cal. Rptr. 335*

City incorporated after effective date of Proposition 13 is entitled to share county's documentary real property transfer tax revenues; sharing is not "new tax" within meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*. *City of Cathedral City v. County of Riverside (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 960, 964-965, 210 Cal. Rptr. 60*

[b] Previously Approved Indebtedness

City library tax based on 1937 charter provision is previously-approved indebtedness within exception of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1(b)* and therefore is permissible ad valorem tax exceeding one percent limitation. *Patton v. City of Alameda (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 41, 44-48, 219 Cal. Rptr. 1, 706 P.2d 1135*

School district override assessments under former *Educ. Code § 42244* (repealed July 24, 1979) is not previously-approved indebtedness within exception of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1(b)*. *Arvin Union School Dist. v. Ross (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 189, 199-201, 221 Cal. Rptr. 720*

[c] Special Assessments

Port district did not have independent authority to impose assessment under *Harb. & Nav. Code § 6365(d)(2)* to raise funds needed to satisfy judgment obtained against district because the assessment would not specially benefit parcels on which it would be imposed. *Ventura Group Ventures, Inc. v. Ventura Port District (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 1089, 1106-1107, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53, 16 P.3d 717*

City ordinance imposing inspection fee on private landlords is not subject to Proposition 218's procedural requirements because it is imposed on landlords in their capacity as business owners, not as landowners, exaction is more in nature of fee for business license than charge against property. *Apartment Assn. of Los Angeles County, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 830, 840, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719, 14 P.3d 930*

Assessment for park maintenance was valid special assessment and not special tax subject to Proposition 13 limitations. *Knox v. City of Orland (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 132, 142, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 159, 841 P.2d 144*

Supplemental assessment to cover increased costs of placing overhead utility lines underground failed to satisfy proportionality requirement imposed by *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 4(a)*, which mandates that no assessment shall exceed reasonable cost of proportional special benefit conferred on parcel. *Town of Tiburon v. Bonander (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1057, 1063, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485*

Minimum charge imposed on parcels with connections to water district's utility systems, for basic cost of providing water or sewer service regardless of actual use, was not special assessment and did not require ballot approval by affected owners because it was charge for immediately available property-related water or sewer service as defined in *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 6(b)(4)*. *Paland v. Brooktrails Township Community Services Dist. Bd. of Directors (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1358, 1362, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 270*

Storm drainage fee was not for sewer or water services and therefore was subject to taxpayer approval under Proposition 218 before it could be imposed. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Salinas (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228*

Proposition 218 applied to city's in-lieu franchise fee for water, sewer, and refuse collection; fee violated Proposition 218 because revenue from the fee was placed in city's general fund, rather than being used only for purpose for which it

was imposed, and because there was no evidence that fee reasonably represented cost of providing the services. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Roseville (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 637, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 91*

Special assessment is lien imposed on real property by public entity to finance public improvement; local governments commonly form special assessment districts that sell tax-exempt improvement bonds to investors; bond proceeds pay for onsite improvements, such as streets and utility services, that enhance land value; purchaser of parcel generally assumes outstanding improvement bond balance associated with his or her parcel. *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1135 n.2, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116*

Proposition 218, which added Cal. Const., arts. XIII C, XIII D in November 1996, changed rule that special assessment was not special tax that could be imposed without two-thirds vote; preexisting assessments must subject to exemptions comply with Proposition 218 by July 1, 1997; exemptions include, under *Cal. Const., art. XIII D, § 5(a),* assessment imposed exclusively to finance maintenance and operation expenses for sidewalks or streets; preexisting streetlighting assessment is exempt under Proposition 218; although Proposition 218 did not expressly exempt streetlighting assessments, it does not violate evident intent to hold that streetlighting assessment is exempt as an expense of operation of streets and sidewalks. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn v. City of Riverside (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 679, 682, 684-686, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 592*

Business improvement district assessment to fund property-related improvements and activities imposed on business owners within district established under the Parking and Business Improvement Area Law of 1989 (*Sts. & Hy. Code § 36500 et seq.*) treated as special assessment not subject to two thirds voter approval requirement of Proposition 218. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 230, 235-238, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 804*

Special assessments are made to complete specific public improvement in designated district and are compulsory charges placed on specific real property; they are made under express legislative authority for purpose of defraying cost of proposed local public improvements; because local improvement will benefit only certain properties, general public is not required to subsidize it through general tax levy; thus, special assessment is not really tax but benefit to specific property financed through public credit; in contrast, although special taxes are also taxes levied for special purpose, they need not be earmarked to benefit particular property; special taxes are prohibited by *Cal. Const., art. XIII A § 4* unless approved by two-thirds vote of qualified electors of entity seeking to impose tax; special assessments are exempt from limitations on special taxes because Proposition 13 is aimed at general government tax levies and overspending; amount of special assessment may not exceed benefit accruing to affected property; thus, if property assessed receives no special benefit, levy is prohibited special tax. *Isaac v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 586, 595-596, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 752*

School district override assessments under former *Educ. Code § 42244* (repealed July 24, 1979) are not permissible special district assessment under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4,* because based on value of real property. *Arvin Union School Dist. v. Ross (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 189, 198-199, 221 Cal. Rptr. 720*

Special assessment to finance local improvements, unlike special tax, is not subject to *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4* requirement of two-thirds voter approval; special assessment is distinguished by fact that improvements financed thereby specially benefit property assessed. *City of Larkspur v. Marin County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 947, 955-956, 214 Cal. Rptr. 689*

[d] Special Tax

Levy imposed by city primarily for purpose of recovering cost of collecting and administering city's general business tax was not "fee" or "special tax" but was general tax, which was subject to Proposition 218's majority-vote limitation, and was void under Proposition 218 because it was imposed without approval by majority vote of qualified voters in

city. *Weisblat v. City of San Diego (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1022, 1045, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366*

City-imposed "fee," which ordinance required to be paid by every subscriber to telephone service within city, was not actually user fee but was special tax, and so was subject to Proposition 218 requirement for validation by local election, because persons who paid so-called fee received no benefit that was not received by everyone who did not pay (and thus by general public), negating single distinguishing feature of user fee. *Bay Area Cellular Tel. Co. v. City of Union City (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 686, 690, 695, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 839*

Charges imposed for water services are not special taxes that require voter approval under Proposition 218. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 79, 83, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905*

Amounts levied by community facilities district under Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982 (*Gov. Code § 53311 et seq.*) were special taxes, not special assessments, within meaning of Act as matter of law; any doubts as to whether Legislature intended provisions of Act to prevail over existing case law and other authorities was dispelled by 1986 enactment of *Gov. Code § 53312*, providing for provisions of Act to prevail over other provisions of law. *Riverside County Community Facilities Dist. v. Bainbridge 17 (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 644, 654-659, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

Assessment on behalf of business improvement district established under the Parking and Business Improvement Area Law of 1989 (*Sts. & Hy. Code § 36500 et seq.*), against business owners within the district held not to constitute special tax and thus not subject to Proposition 218. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn. v. City of San Diego (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 230, 238-240, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 804*

Term "special taxes" under Proposition 13 construed in *City and County of San Francisco v. Farrell (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 47, 57, 184 Cal. Rptr. 713, 648 P.2d 935* , to mean taxes levied for special purpose rather than levy placed in general fund to be used for general governmental purposes, whereas, in *Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 15, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* , "special taxes" as used in Proposition 13 construed to mean tax levied to fund a specific governmental project or program, such as construction and financing of county's justice facilities; under Proposition 62, all taxes are either special or general; special taxes are taxes imposed for specific purposes whereas general taxes are taxes imposed for general governmental purposes; local agency's proposed sales tax to fund certain transportation projects held to be special tax under Proposition 62. *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 226-227, 231-234, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225* ; *Gov. Code § 53721*

Tax is not saved from being special tax by being deposited in agency's general fund and not earmarked for special purpose within agency, if agency has special and limited governmental purpose. *Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* (constructing and operating county's justice facilities)

Although special taxes are taxes levied for special purpose, they need not be earmarked to benefit particular property; special taxes prohibited by *Cal. Const., art. XIII A § 4* unless approved by two-thirds vote of qualified electors of entity seeking to impose tax. *Isaac v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 586, 595-596, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 752*

Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000 , construed not to have effectively overruled *City and County of San Francisco v. Farrell (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 47, 184 Cal. Rptr. 713, 648 P.2d 935* , but simply to have carved out exception to "general funds rule" set forth in *Farrell*; under both cases, essence of special tax is that its proceeds are earmarked or dedicated in some manner to specific project or projects; that is not case with funds placed in city's general fund, which are available for use by any of the city's legitimate functions and are allocated during the general budgeting process in light of changing priorities and conditions; tax levied by general purpose agency (unlike in *Rider*) with proceeds deposited into general fund is not special tax subject to two thirds voter approval requirement of Proposition 13, § 4 (*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*). *Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal.*

App. 4th 946, 956, 959, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266

Special taxes are collected and earmarked for special purpose, not general fund; although county may deduct costs of collecting special tax pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 53340, 53340.5*, county cannot withhold delinquency penalties. *City of Camarillo v. County of Ventura (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1356, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 920*

Real estate transfer tax is general tax rather than special tax subject to Proposition 13 two-thirds voter approval requirement. *Fisher v. County of Alameda (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 120, 125, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 384*

Landfill fee is special assessment and not special tax subject to Proposition 13 two-thirds voter approval requirements. *Kern County Farm Bureau v. County of Kern (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1416, 1420, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 910*

Real estate transfer tax increase is increase of general tax rather than special tax subject to Proposition 13 two-thirds voter approval requirement. *Fielder v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 137, 142, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 630*

Special tax for fire and police protection levied under authority of *Gov. Code § 53978* after approval by two-thirds of voters is not prohibited ad valorem tax in excess of maximum rate because fee was not based on value of property but on type of zone property was in. *Heckendorn v. City of San Marino (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 481, 487-489, 229 Cal. Rptr. 324, 723 P.2d 64*

Library district empowered by *Educ. Code § 19600* to levy taxes on property is "special district" within meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*; two-thirds majority voter approval requirement of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4* does discriminate against education, nor as abridging fundamental right to education. *Altadena Library Dist. v. Bloodgood (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 585, 588-592, 237 Cal. Rptr. 649*

Under ordinance requiring owner who demolishes or converts residential hotel units to provide equal number of replacement units or to pay "in lieu" fee to city for construction of replacement units, neither construction costs nor "in lieu" fee werespecial tax because neither exceeded reasonable cost of regulatory land use activity or became part of general revenues. *Terminal Plaza Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 892, 906-907, 223 Cal. Rptr. 379* (ordinance invalid on other grounds)

To bring fee within scope of *Gov. Code § 50076*, burden of proof is on water district to establish that fee was reasonably related to services for which it was imposed; if reasonable relationship is not proved, fee is "special tax" under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*, requiring two-thirds vote. *Beaumont Investors v. Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water Dist. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 227, 234-235, 238, 211 Cal. Rptr. 567*

Gate fees imposed by county on school districts for use of county's solid waste disposal site were neither special tax nor special assessment. *Anaheim City School District v. County of Orange (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 697, 700-701, 210 Cal. Rptr. 722*

If school district could not pay special assessment levied for street improvements, county's levy of "pass-through" tax under *Sts. & Hy. Code § 5302.5* on private property owners in school district to pay school's assessment violated one-percent limitation of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1*, and required two-thirds voter approval under *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*. *City of San Marcos v. Board of Supervisors (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 355, 357-358, 205 Cal. Rptr. 566*

[13] Publicly Owned Land

City's interest in nuclear power plant is taxable because construction occured prior to acquisition; under terms of agreement, acquisition date of city's interest was date when participation agreement was signed, not date on which

agreement in principal was reached or that appeared on agreement. *City of Anaheim v. County of San Diego (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 695, 701-703, 235 Cal. Rptr. 572*

Improvements owned by local government outside its boundaries was taxable if taxable when acquired by local government or if constructed by local government to replace improvements that were taxable when acquired; improvements that were newly constructed after acquisition and they were not substitute or replacement for taxable improvement were not taxable. *City of Anaheim v. County of San Diego (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 695, 697, 235 Cal. Rptr. 572*

[14] Redemption

On redemption of property in redevelopment area, community redevelopment agency is entitled to share in penalties and interest in same proportion as it shared in taxes. *Community Redevelopment Agency v. Bloodgood (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 342, 345-345, 226 Cal. Rptr. 924*

[15] Refund

Reading *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5142* and *5143* together, taxpayer who files refund action can recover no more than amount taxpayer sought in his orher underlying claim; thus, when taxpayers did not seek refund based on lower property values they had originally sought in application for reduction of assessment, but based on somewhat higher values submitted at hearing before assessment appeals board, taxpayers could only file suit to recover, and court could only award, amount taxpayers submitted in claim for refund; correction of base-year figure does not automatically entitle taxpayer to refund; refunds are governed by separate provisions of code, and taxpayer may only recover refund by complying with those provisions. *Mission Housing Development Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 522, 527-528, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 8*

Process of obtaining refund is distinct from process of seeking reduced assessment by filing application for equalization; however, application for reduction in assessment filed pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603* serves as claim for refund under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097* if taxpayer stated in application that application was intended to constitute claim for refund; timely filing of proper claim for refund statutory prerequisite to refund action. *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 34, 34 n.20, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

When county incorrectly computed base year value for 1992-1993 resulting in overtaxation for that and subsequent years and corrected method of calculation effective for 1995-1996 assessment, but not as to 1992-1993 or 1993-1994 assessments, and taxpayer filed applications for reductions of 1992-1993 and 1993-1994 assessments and s for both of those years, although taxpayer's applications were timely filed under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 51.5*, under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 80* taxpayer can only receive refund for year in which appeal was made, and thereafter. *Metropolitan Culinary Services, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 935, 942-944, 946-948, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859*

Right to refund is applicable only to tax year for which application was made, although changed base-year value was established in prior year. *Osco Drug, Inc. v. County of Orange (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 189, 193-195, 272 Cal. Rptr. 14*

[16] Request for Reduction in Assessment

[a] When Not Required

Claim for refund is substitute for request for reduction in assessment if assessment is void on basis of attempting to tax

property not subject to taxation. *Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 987, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298*

Exhaustion of administrative remedies is fundamental prerequisite of judicial jurisdiction in all California administrative agency matters; under circumstances of case, policies underlying exhaustion requirement were fully satisfied even though one of taxpayers was not formal applicant to proceeding before assessment appeals board. *CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1079-1081, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

No application for reduction of assessment is needed if assessor's audit discloses overassessment and notice of overassessment is required to begiven to taxpayer pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 533*. *Focus Cable of Oakland, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 519, 526-528, 219 Cal. Rptr. 95*

[b] When Required

Administrative remedies must be exhausted before commencement of suit for refund. *Security-First Nat. Bk. v. County of L.A. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 319, 320-321, 217 P.2d 946 , cert. denied, 340 U.S. 891*

Ordinarily, taxpayer seeking relief from erroneous assessment must exhaust administrative remedies before resorting to court. *Metropolitan Culinary Services, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 935, 943, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859*

Reduction in assessment due to assessment appeal operates only for year in which appeal is taken and prospectively thereafter under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 80(a)(5)*; that appeal reveals error in determining base value in earlier year does not entitle taxpayer to refund for prior year for which taxpayer did not file timely request for refund; court declines to exercise equitable powers to correct unquestioned overassessment when taxpayer failed to meet statutory conditions for obtaining specific legal remedies provided by Legislature. *Sea World, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1390, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194*

Entitlement to four-percent valuation under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 227* (documented vessel used only for commercial fishing) is determinable by assessment appeal; failure to seek reduction of assessment by appeal to assessment appeals board was fatal; application for reduction of supplementary assessment do not relate back to include appeal of original escape assessment. *County of San Diego v. Lafayette Steel Co. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 690, 694-696, 210 Cal. Rptr. 493*

Taxpayer has burden of establishing that administrative remedies have been exhausted. *Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 32, 37, 116 Cal. Rptr. 742*

[17] Restrictions on Property and Valuation

Environmental protection statutes which require oil and gas lease operator to take measures to prevent or repair contamination can be restrictions on land use that effect value within meaning of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 402.1*; existence of specific enforcement order is not prerequisite under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 402.1* to taxpayer's showing that land is subject to restrictions imposed by government which affect its value. *Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 853-854, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766*

Valuation of restricted property without considering restrictions was proper if restrictions did not affect property's highest and best use for aviation industrial purposes. *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. County of Los Angeles (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 715, 725-728, 268 Cal. Rptr. 294*

Assessor properly basing assessment on fair market value rents if existing rents of purchased property were below market rate. *Dennis v. County of Santa Clara (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1019, 1026-1030, 263 Cal. Rptr. 887*

Property subject to below-market lease was properly assessed by treating it as if taxpayers had not given up their right to possession or had negotiated going rent. *Clayton v. County of Los Angeles (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 390, 392-393, 102 Cal. Rptr. 687*

[18] Scope of Judicial Review

Any factual determinations made by administrative agency are binding on appellate court if supported by substantial evidence; when issues involve proper application of statute or administrative regulation, trial court's legal conclusions are not binding on appellate court; when assessor uses an approved valuation method, his or her findings and determinations of value based on the appropriate assessment method are presumed correct and will be sustained if supported by substantial evidence; if underlying valuation methodology is challenged, however, issue is one of law subject to de novo review both by superior court and on appeal. *Huson v. County of Ventura (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1131, 1134, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116*

Challenge to valuation method if no disputed facts exist as question of law subject to de novo review in superior court. *Service America Corp. v. County of San Diego (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1232, 1235, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165*

If taxpayer claims only that assessor and Board of Equalization erroneously applied valid method of determining full cash value, trial court may review only record presented to board; trial court may overturn board's decision only when no substantial evidence supports it, in which case actions by board are deemed so arbitrary as to constitute deprivation of property without due process; if taxpayer challenges validity of valuation method itself, trial judge is faced with question of law whether challenged method of valuation is arbitrary, in excess of discretion, or in violation of standards prescribed by law; when reviewing equalization determination properly before it in refund action, court may correct assessment and grant tax refund if value calculable as matter of law without remanding to county board of equalization; however, if judgment must still be exercised as to value, remand to local board of equalization is required; thus, when stipulated judgment entered into between Board of Supervisors acting on county's behalf and taxpayer, to extent it represented an exercise of judgment as to value, it improperly invaded constitutional authority of Board of Equalization and granted relief that court had no authority to grant under any circumstances. *Plaza Hollister Ltd. Partnership v. County of San Benito (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1, 24-26, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

In reviewing property tax assessment, court must presume assessment regularly and correctly made; taxpayer has burden of proving property was improperly assessed; if taxpayer claims valid appraisal method erroneously applied, trial court is limited to reviewing administrative record and may overturn assessment appeals board's decision only if there is no substantial evidence in administrative record to support it; taxpayer has no right to trial de novo in superior court to resolve conflicting issues of fact concerning taxable value of property; if taxpayer challenges validity of valuation method tself, court faced with question of law and need not determine if there was substantial evidence to support assessment appeals board's decision, but rather must inquire whether challenged valuation method is arbitrary, in excess of discretion, or in violation of standards prescribed by law. *Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1046-1047, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433*

If plaintiff claims only that assessor or board erroneously applied valid method of determining full cash value, trial court may review only record presented to boardand may overturn board's decision only when no substantial evidence supports it; if taxpayer challenges validity of valuation method itself, trial judge faced with question of law as to whether method of valuation is arbitrary, in excess of discretion, or in violation of standards prescribed by law; claim that board improperly included intangibles in valuation raised only claim of error in applying correct calculation method. *American Sheds, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 384, 392-394, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 58*

(distinguishing cases in which treatment of intangibles presented question of law)

Appellate court reviews question of fact resolved in administrative proceeding under substantial evidence standard; questions of law are subject to de novo review; assessment appeals board's selection of valuation method must be sustained unless it is arbitrary, in excess of discretion, or in violation of law. *CAT Partnership v. County of Santa Cruz (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 1071, 1079, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652*

Whether assessor failed to comply with State Board Equalization rules requiring adjustments to comparable sales data (under *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 4(d)*) was question of law with de novo review. *Mitchell v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 497, 500, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476*

Taxpayer's challenge on ground assessor's method of valuation of oil and gas lease violated *Rev. & Tax. Code § 402.1* held to present question of law for de novo review; if taxpayer claims assessor and assessment appeals board erroneously applied valid appraisal method, trial court is limited to reviewing administrative record and may overturn board's decision only if there is no substantial evidence in record to support it; if taxpayer challenges validity of valuation method itself, trial judge is faced with question of law and may take evidence on validity of method and may overturn assessment if challenged method of valuation is arbitrary, in excess of jurisdiction, or in violation of standards prescribed by law. *Dominguez Energy v. County of Los Angeles (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 839, 852-853, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766*

While court may have no jurisdiction to establish land value of property for assessment purposes, it does have power to review specific valuations and methods of valuation employed where it is alleged there was failure to follow standards prescribed by *Legislature. People ex rel Dept. of Conservation (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 233, 256, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 610*

Question when "change in ownership" occurred so as to trigger reassessment mechanisms of Proposition 13 is question of law. *Empire Properties v. County of Los Angeles (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 781, 785, 52 Cal Rptr. 2d 69*

When validity of valuation method is reviewed to determine whether method is arbitrary, in excess of discretion, or in violation of standards prescribedby law, issue is question of law; appellate court can examine these matters de novo. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1161, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99*

Independent review rather than substantial evidence is applicable standard of review to be applied to question of whether tax in issue is special tax for purpose of Proposition 13, § 4 (*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*). *Neecke v. City of Mill Valley (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 946, 953, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266*

Trial court erred in weighing evidence and entering judgment establishing taxable value of subject property, resulting in refund of taxes; trial court was required to remand matter to local board of equalization for further proceedings if local board has used improper method of value or has failed to use proper criteria in valuing property, and there is no evidence or there is conflict in evidence from which proper value can or should be made. *Norby Lumber Co. v. County of Madera (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1352, 1366-1367, 249 Cal. Rptr. 646*

Court of appeal not allowed to determine amount of tax due, but, after determining proper method to be used for valuation, was required to remand to board of assessment appeals for determination of fair market value. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1161-1162, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Scope of review in superior court is limited to determining if substantial evidence supports assessment; if it does not, taxpayer is not entitled to trial de novo in superior court, but is entitled to remand to board of assessment appeals for consideration of additional evidence. *Kaiser Center, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 978, 982-984, 234 Cal. Rptr. 603*

If challenge is merely one of incorrect valuation of property, board's decision may be overturned only if no substantial evidence supports it. *Cochran v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 85 Cal. App.3d 75, 80, 149 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Challenge to valuation method is question of law not invoking "substantial evidence" standard in trial court's review of board's decision; challenge to the method of valuation is reviewable for arbitrariness, abuse of discretion, or failure to follow standards prescribed by law, with new evidence admissible in superior court to establish deficiencies in board's determination. *Meyers v. County of Alameda (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 799, 804, 139 Cal. Rptr. 165*

Substantial evidence supported board's decision accepting assessor's valuation despite assessor's using only six comparative sales whereas taxpayer's appraiser used 17. *Westlake Farms, Inc. v. County of Kings (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 179, 185-186, 114 Cal. Rptr. 137*

Trial court's review is restricted to record presented to the board; board's determination of merits is conclusive if supported by substantial evidence; court is not permitted to independently weigh evidence of valuation. *Glidden Company v. County of Alameda (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 371, 378-379, 85 Cal. Rptr. 88*

[19] Situs for Taxation of Personal Property

County's refusal to prorate or apportion taxpayer's tax liability based on actual time property was located in state did not violate due process, equalprotection, and commerce clauses of United States Constitution when taxpayer's business property was located in county as of statutory lien date and taxpayer sought partial refund of ad valorem property taxes because taxpayer relocated entire business and inventory to State of Nevada 38 days after commencement of fiscal tax year; under California law, taxing agency's right to taxes becomes fixed as of lien date of fiscal year to which they relate; tax lien date is simply practical method for determining that taxpayer enjoyed benefit of governmental services during year preceding assessment; taxpayer's property was permanently situated in and had its sole taxsitus in California as of lien date. *Seegmiller v. County of Nevada (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1397, 1400-1404, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 238*

Ship with home port in Alaska, under repair in county for 11 months of year but outside county on lien date, is properly taxable by county. *County of San Diego v. Lafayette Steel Co. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 690, 694, 210 Cal. Rptr. 493*

[20] Statute of Limitations

When three-year limitations period for actions on a liability created by statute applied [*see Code Civ. Proc. 338(a)*], validity of utility users' fee that was not approved by voters could be challenged under Proposition 62 within three years after collection of tax, even if more than three years had passed since tax measure was adopted. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Assn v. City of La Habra (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 809, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 369, 23 P.3d 601*

[21] Supplemental Assessments

Although county delayed too long in seeking supplemental assessments under 1993 version of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.11(d)(1)*, county not barred from changing properties' base year values and from seeking escape assessments pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 51.5*. *Montgomery Ward & Co. v. County of Santa Clara (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1132-1138, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 261*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.12, delaying supplemental assessment of newly constructed property, is valid legislative shift of timing of tax burden from contractors' inventory to buyer, and as not creating impermissible distinctions, nor taxing similar properties at different rates, nor violative of equal protection. *Shafer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 423, 429-432, 220 Cal. Rptr. 59*

Exclusion of fixtures from supplemental assessments under former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 75.5* does not create impermissible exemption but as only affecting timing of full assessments, which is proper exercise of legislative power. *Shafer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 423, 432-433, 220 Cal. Rptr. 59*

[22] Structure of California Property Tax System

City held to have unconstitutionally imposed and collected property tax not apportioned according to value as required by *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 1*, when new parcel tax was imposed on all real property by ordinance passedby majority rather than two-thirds vote of city voters, and tax was not levied on assessed value or appraised value of parcels, but imposed flat fee per parcel of land depending on type of parcel; valid excise tax distinguished. *Thomas v. City of East Palo Alto (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1084, 1088-1095, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 185*

City "parcel tax" falling due annually at fixed times. not apportioned by type and extent of municipal services, approved by just over 50 percent of city voters, and designed to raise revenue for enhancement and maintenance of municipal services, was non-ad valorem general property tax invalid under *Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 1*. *City of Oakland v. Digre (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 99, 104-111, 252 Cal. Rptr. 99*

[23] Tax Sales

Authority for tax collector to sell tax defaulted property, effect of tax deed, owners right to redemption, right of purchaser at tax sale or person in privity to bring quiet title action, and various limitation periods discussed; cases holding that where tax statute provides remedy that remedy is exclusive also discussed. *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 39-41, 52-53, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513*

County's sole reliance on lot report, which would not provide notice of documents recorded after creation of a lien, did not constitute reasonable effort to obtain last known mailing address of parties of interest under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3701*; once county became aware bank had not received notice regarding tax sale, it knew that mailing notice to defunct post office address was futile; at that time, county should have made reasonable efforts to notify bank about tax sale at alternate address; effort would have been minimal as bank's address could be easily obtained; because county failed to make any effort at all to renotify bank about tax sale, bank's due process rights were violated and it had right to set aside tax sale. *Bank of America v. Giant Inland Empire R.V. Center, Inc. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1267, 1272-1273, 1275-1276, 1281, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 626*

Common law contractual remedies not available to purchaser of tax-defaulted real property at public tax sale; purchaser of tax-defaulted property from public entity at tax sale limited to remedies provided for in *Revenue and Taxation Code. Van Petten v. County of San Diego (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 43, 51, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 816*

Statutory remedies for relief from tax sale as exclusive; purchaser does not have contractual cause of action for failure of state and county to disclose physical defects in property purchased. *Craland Inc. v. State of California (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1400, 1404-1408, 263 Cal. Rptr. 255*

Tax sale is subject to rescission by buyer for mistake if buyer, after having made reasonable investigation. did not know that property was undevelopable. *Schultz v. County of Contra Costa (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 242, 245-249, 203 Cal. Rptr. 760*

Partial owner and claimant of excess proceeds of tax sale is entitled only to proportionate amount even though other partial owners made no claim. *First Corporation Inc. v. County of Santa Clara (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 841, 844-847, 194 Cal. Rptr. 752*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 2951, authorizing seizure and sale of taxpayer's property to pay unsecured taxes, deprived taxpayer of due process for failure to provide administrative hearing prior to sale. *T.M. Cobb Co. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 606, 613-616, 128 Cal. Rptr. 655, 547 P.2d 431*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationAssessment Methods & TimingTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuationTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax Sales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.427

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.427 Attorney General Opinions

Members of public have right to address SBE at taxpayers' appeal hearing; public agency employee on behalf of agency may address SBE at taxpayer's appeal hearing. *80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 247 (1997)*

When property owner applies to assessment appeals board for reduction in propety taxes, assessor audits property and agrees to reduction, issues refund, and adjusts assessment roll so that valuation dispute between owner and assessor is resolved, board may still increase audit valuation. *80 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 225 (1997)*

Nonprofit hospital earning excessive surplus revenue nonetheless qualified for welfare exemption under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 214*. *71 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 107 (1988)*

County assessor is required to produce information contained in property tax records otherwise confidential under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 408, 451,* and *481,* pursuant to IRS summons if federal interest in disclosure outweighs state interest in confidentiality. *68 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 209 (1985)*

County tax collector is prohibited from accepting for current expenditure voluntarily prepaid property tax to be applied against future tax liability. *68 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 223 (1985)*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 1641 requiring setting of values recommended by assessment hearing officer, is inconsistent with *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 16* provisions for equalizing assessed values. *64 Ops.Cal. Att'y Gen. 690 (1981)*

County assessor is not allowed to enter private property against will of owner nor to obtain administrative inspection warrant to assess property. *61 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 524 (1978)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.428

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.428 Law Reviews

Smith, *Constitutional Reform Gone Awry: The Apportionment of Property Taxes in California After Proposition 13, 23 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 829 (1990)*

Doherty, *Judicial Review of Property Tax Disputes, 24 U.S.F. L. Rev. 155 (1989)*

Henke and Woodlief, *The Effect of Proposition 13 Court Decisions on California Local Government Revenue Sources, 22 U.S.F. L. Rev. 251 (1988)*

Martinez, *Tax Collection and Populist Rhetoric: Shifting the Burden of Proof in Tax Cases, 29 Hastings L.J. 239 (1988)*

Pope and Goodrich, *California Property Tax Exemptions, Exclusions, Immunities and Restrictions on Fair Market Value--Or, Whatever Became of Full Value Assessment? 18 Pac. L.J. 57 (1987)*

Note, *Fairness and Tax Avoidance in the Taxation of Installment Sales, 100 Harv. L. Rev. 403 (1986)*

Howe, *What to Look for in Contesting Clients' Property Tax Assessments*, 31(7) Prac. Law. 79 (1985)

Comment, *Recognizing the Limits of California's Possessory Interest Tax, 19 U.S.F. L. Rev. 159 (1985)*

Bloom, *Tax Valuation of Condominiums and Cooperatives: Fiction vs Reality,* 11 Real Estate L.J. 240 (1983)

Kroll, *California Cities vs Prop 13, 3 No. 6 Cal. Lawyer 28 (1983)*

Rosen, *Computer Software Classed as Intangible Property is Exempt from State Property Taxes, 58 J. Tax'n 114 (1983)*

Ehrman, *Estate Planning Aspects of the California Property Tax,* 34 Major Tax Plan 16-1 (1982)

Note, *Police and Fire Service Special Assessments Under Proposition 13, 16 U.S.F. L. Rev. 781 (1982)*

Doerr, *The California Legislature's Response to Proposition 13, 53 So. Cal. L. Rev. 77 (1979)*

Unkel & Cromwell, *California's Timber Yield Tax,* 6 Ecol. L.Q. 831 (1978)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.429

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.429 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 9, *Taxation*, § 163 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.430-540.449

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.430[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.450

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.450 Federal Constitution

State and local taxes as prohibited from placing undue burden on interstate commerce. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*

States as prohibited from taxing exports. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10, cl. 2*

Federal government and instrumentalities as exempt from state taxation. U.S. Const., art. VI

Prohibition on state taxes which unduly burden free press or free speech. *U.S. Const., amend. I*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseInterstate CommerceGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawRelations Among GovernmentsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.451

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.451 California Constitution

Limitations on taxation of banks and insurance companies. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, §§ 27, 28*

Cities and counties, in accordance with legislative authority, are empowered to contract regarding apportionment of sales and use taxes imposed by them. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 29*

Court action to enjoin or prevent collection of tax is prohibited; action to recover tax claimed to have been illegally collected is authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.452

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.452 Federal Statutes

Tax Injunction Act prohibits federal courts from enjoining assessment, levy, or collection of state tax when a plain, speedy, and efficient remedy may be had in the state courts. *28 U.S.C. § 1341*

Public Law 86-272 restricts state taxation of income from the sales of tangible personal property in interstate commerce when taxpayer's activities in the state are limited to solicitation of orders for tangible personal property. *15 U.S.C. § 381*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction ActTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxExemptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.453

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.453 State Statutes

[1] Audits and Administration

Returns and payments generally are due quarterly, on or before last day of month succeeding each quarterly period. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6451-6454*

Extensions are available for filing return and payment of tax; interest payable on "late" return. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6459, 6591.5*

Election to report qualified use tax on individual's California income tax return. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6452.1*

SBE is authorized to determine correct tax and issue deficiency determinations on available information. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6481*

Deficiency determinations are subject to three-year limitation when return is filed or, if no return filed, to eight-year limitation. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487*

Deficiency determinations for taxpayers that elect to report qualified use tax on their California income tax returns is generally three years, or six years if there is a gross understatement of qualified use tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487.3*

Penalty applicable to deficiency determinations for intentional or fraudulent failure to file returns. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6511, 6514*

SBE is authorized to require seller to deposit security. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6701*

SBE's broad authority includes power to adopt rules and regulations, to employ accountants, auditors, investigators,

assistants, and to conduct hearings and investigations. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7051-7055*

Information on sales and use tax return are privileged. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7056*

Special audit rules under managed audit program. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7076-7076.5*

[2] Claim for Refund

Interest is recoverable on unintentional overpayments. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6591.5, 6907, 6908*

Credits and refunds are issued only to taxpayer or taxpayer's successors, administrators, or executors. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*

Limitation period for refund claim is latest of three years from end of month following close of the taxable period, six months from date of overpayment, or, for recovery of amounts paid pursuant to SBE determination, six months from date determination becomes final. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)*

Credit or refund on ground that storage, use, or other consumption of property is exempt from use tax is not allowed unless person establishes that vendor has paid state sales tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6903*

Form and content of refund claim. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904*

Effect of failure to timely file refund claim. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6905*

Service of notice of disallowance of claim by SBE. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6906*

[3] Duties of Retailers

Every retailer, at time of making sale, is required to collect use tax from purchaser and provide receipt indicating that use tax has been collected. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6203*

Every retailer selling tangible personal property in California for use, storage, or other consumption in California is required to register with SBE. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6226*

Successor in interest of retailer is required to withhold enough of purchase price to cover amount of sales or use tax due. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6811*

[4] Exemptions

Acquisition sale and leaseback executed after 1990 and before 1995 is neither sale nor purchase for purposes of sales and use tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6010.65*

Exemptions from sales and use tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6351 et seq.*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, use, storage, or consumption of items taxation of which is prohibited by federal law or California Constitution. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6352*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc. of gas, electricity, and water to consumers through mains, and liquefied

petroleum gas used for household or agricultural purposes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6353*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc., of farm equipment and machinery used primarily for agricultural purposes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6356.5*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc., of equipment and machinery for off-road use in commercial timber harvesting operations. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6356.6*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc., of diesel fuel used in farming and food processing. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6357.1*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc., of racehorse breeding stock. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6358.5*

Exemption of gross receipts from sales, etc. of food products other than prepared meals. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6359-6359.2, 6359.4, 6359.7*

Exemptions for gross receipts from sales, etc. of medicines and medical products. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6369-6369.5, 6371*

Exemptions for gross receipts from sales, etc. of items sold to common carriers for out-of-state use. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6385*

[5] Imposition and Collection of Tax

Sales tax is direct obligation of retailer, although retailer may pass it on to consumer. *Civ. Code § 1656.1*

Retailer is any person or entity making more than two retail sales of tangible personal property in any 12-month period. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6019*

Sales tax is excise tax on privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail in *California. Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6051, 6051.5*

Presumptions of taxability are inapplicable when seller takes a resale certificate from purchaser in good faith. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6091-6095, 6241-6249*

Use tax is excise tax imposed on any taxpayer who purchases tangible personal property from any retailer for storage, use, or other consumption in *California. Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6201, 6201.5, 6202*

Distributors of motor vehicle fuel subject to motor vehicle fuel license tax law (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 7301 et seq.*) is required to collect prepayment of sales and use tax from person to whom fuel is first distributed. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6471.4, 6480 et seq.*

[6] License Taxes

City imposing license tax is required to apportion tax on business operating both within and outside city to fairly reflect proportion of taxed activity taking place within city. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16000*; *Gov. Code § 37101(b)*

To protect taxpayer's privacy, receipt for business license tax based on gross receipts is not permitted to include amount of gross receipts or cost of tax. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16110-16112*

City is required to pay prejudgment interest from date of payment of tax to taxpayer who prevails on claim that tax is illegal. *Civ. Code § 3287*

Cities are authorized to license, for regulation and for taxation, every lawful business transacted within city, including shows, games, and exhibitions. *Gov. Code § 37101(a)*

[7] Local Sales and Use Taxes

City sales or use tax must be imposed in same manner and on same tax base as prescribed under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7200-7212*, relating to uniform local sales and use taxes. *Gov. Code § 37101*

Local sales and use taxes are limited to 1.25 percent of gross receipts or sales prices, respectively. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7202(a), 7203*

Local sales and use tax ordinances are required to incorporate state sales and use tax laws and to provide for administration by SBE. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7202(b)-(d), 7203(a), (b)*

Local sales and use tax ordinance is required to exclude any state sales or use tax from amount subject to tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7202(f), 7203(d)*

County adopting sales tax ordinance is required to adopt complementary use tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7203*

Refunds of unconstitutional taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7275 et seq.*

County is authorized to levy utility user tax (electricity, gas, water, sewer, telephone, and cable television) on services in unincorporated areas. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284.2*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284.4* (voter approval required if required by other law)

County is authorized to impose license tax on business transacted in unincorporated areas if tax on business operating both within and outside those areas fairly reflects portion of taxed activity taking place within taxing jurisdiction. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7284(b)*

Transactions and use tax are leviable by county or authority established by board of supervisors, with voter approval, at rate of 0.25 percent or multiple thereof. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7285, 7285.5*

Combined rate of transactions and use taxes in any county is limited to 2 percent. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7251.1*

Any city is authorized to levy, increase, or extend a transactions and use tax for general purposes at rate of 0.25 percent or a multiple thereof. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7285.9-7285.92*

If approved by two thirds of electors, city or county or city and county is permitted to impose graffiti prevention tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7287 et seq.*

Two-thirds voter approval requirement for local government or district to impose special tax. *Gov. Code § 53722*

Majority voter approval requirement for local government or district to impose general tax. *Gov. Code § 53723*

[8] Penal Provisions

Engaging in business as seller without permit or after permit has been suspended or revoked is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6071*

Providing resale certificate for property not being resold in regular course of business is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6094.5*

Failure of retailers to collect use taxes from purchasers and give receipts is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6203, 6205-6207*

Alteration, unauthorized issuance or use, or forgery of exemption certificate is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6422.1*

Failure to make return or making false or fraudulent return is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6452(c), 7152, 7153*

Violation of Sales and Use Tax Law is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7153, 7154*

Violation with intent to defeat or evade determination of $25,000 or more of tax due within 12-month period is felony. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7153.5*

False statement by person selling vehicle is misdemeanor, subjecting person to liability for tax and to penalty. Veh. Code § 12112

[9] Petition for Redetermination

Petition for redetermination after jeopardy determinations is required to be filed within 10 days and to be accompanied by security. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6537, 6538*

Administrative hearing after jeopardy determinations is required to be filed within 30 days; security as not required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538.5*

Petition for a redetermination is authorized and required to be filed within 30 days after service of notice of determination; petitioner who so requests is entitled to hearing. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6561-6562*

[10] SBE's Remedies for Collection

Tax lien is authorized and entitled to priority when recorded (real property) or filed (personal property) with Secretary of State. *Gov. Code §§ 7170, 7171*

Lien on all real property of person liable within county of recording lasts 10 years and may be extended by rerecording in any county. *Gov. Code § 7172*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6738, 6757*

SBE may obtain information available in records of Department of Industrial Relations that indicates retail establishment is operating without seller's permit. *Lab. Code § 64.5*

SBE is authorized to issue notice to withhold, requiring any person having possession or control of credits or personal property of delinquent taxpayer to freeze assets for 60 days or until prior consent to transfer is received from SBE. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6702(a)*

SBE is authorized to levy on credits or other personal property of person liable for tax equal to amount of tax, interest, or penalties due. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6703*

SBE is empowered to bring action for collection of amounts owed. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6711-6713*

In action for tax, SBE certificate is prima facie evidence of deliquency and of compliance by SBE with all provisions relating to computation and determination of amounts owed. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6714*

Judgment for state is obtained by filing certificate with the office of the Clerk of the Superior Court of Sacramento County, or any county, and requesting entry within 10 years after tax is due. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6736-6740*

SBE is authorized to issue warrant for amounts owing; warrant as levied in same manner and having same effect as a writ of execution. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6776*

SBE is authorized to seize and sell at public auction any nonexempt property of retailer. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6796-6799*

SBE's remedies are cumulative; no action taken by Attorney General or SBE as election of one remedy to exclusion of others. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6827*

[11] Suit for Refund

Injunction or other legal or equitable process to prevent collection of tax is prohibited. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*

Refund claim is required. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6932*

Suit for refund is authorized after denial of refund claim or if SBE fails to act on claim within six months of its filing. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6932-6934*

Statute of limitations applicable to suit for refund is 90 days from SBE's mailing of notice of its action on claim for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*

Judgment for taxpayer is first credited against taxes owing, with refund of remainder. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6935*

Allowance of interest in refund suit. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6936*

Judgment is only rendered in favor of taxpayer. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6937*

Litigation costs including expert witness and attorney's fees. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsDeficienciesTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxExemptionsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.454

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.454 Administrative Regulations

Registration requirements. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1684*

Record maintenance requirements. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1698*

Successor liability for sales and use taxes. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1702*

Refund claim requirements. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5230 et seq.*

Class refund claim requirements. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5239*

Administrative hearings for persons against whom jeopardy determinations have been made. *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5221 et seq., 5260 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.455

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.455 Decisions

[1] Administrative Regulations

Legislature properly delegated some discretion to SBE to adopt rules and regulations relating to sales and use tax; if statute gives administrative agency power to adopt regulations, regulations as required to be consistent with statute and reasonably necessary to effect its purpose. *Engs Motor Truck Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1466, 235 Cal. Rptr. 117*

In interpreting statute and testing validity of regulation, administrative agency's construction is entitled to great weight and should be upheld if it is reasonable. *Engs Motor Truck Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1466, 235 Cal. Rptr. 117*

Validity of SBE's interpretation of regulation is question of law for appellate court; validity of regulation itself is presumed, and appellate review is limited to determination whether regulation is arbitrary, capricious, or without reasonable or rational basis. *Parfums-Corday, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 630, 636, 232 Cal. Rptr. 56*

[2] Assumption of Liabilities

Transfer of encumbered property to commencing partnership is taxable sale to extent of liability assumed by partnership. *Cal-Metal Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 759, 765-769, 207 Cal. Rptr. 783*

Transaction in which purchaser assumes loans owed by seller on property subject to outstanding leases is subject to use tax. Newco Leasing, Inc. v. State Bd. of *Equalization (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 120, 126-127, 191 Cal. Rptr. 588*

[3] Attorney's Fees

Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156 did not support award of attorney's fees in favor of life insurance companies who filed suit challenging authority of SBE to impose new insurance premiums tax rates under Gov. Code § 12202.1 and challenging method of calculation that SBE used to determine new tax rates for those years; although court concluded method used by SBE in computing tax rate was invalid, *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156* pertains only to suits involving sales and use taxes; moreover, plaintiffs were not entitled to attorney's fees under private attorney general statute, *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*, because plaintiffs brought suit for their own strong personal economic interests; and award of attorney's fees is not justified under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* if public benefit gained from suit and important public right enforced by suit are coincidental to plaintiff's personal monetary gain. *Pacific Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1165, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(e) (sale and use tax only) requires order granting or denying attorney's fees (usually separate post-trial order on motion for costs) to be reflected in judgment (amendment of judgment may be required), and, to avoid separate appeals, creates exception to *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(2)* in that postjudgment order on issue is not separately appealable. *Tetra Pak, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1751, 1761-1762, 286 Cal. Rptr. 529*

To overcome denial of attorney's fees requested under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7156(a)(2), (c)(1)(A)* (sale and use tax only), taxpayer must establish that trial court abused its discretion in finding that SBE's position was not substantially justified by proving that trial court exceeded bounds of reason on record with all reasonable inferences against actions of Board and ruling of trial court. *Tetra Pak, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1751, 1763-1764, 286 Cal. Rptr. 529*

[4] Basis of Tax

[a] Leases; Sales and Leasebacks

Sale of leased equipment to lessee prior to end of lease term is sale rather than modification of lease. *Framingham Acceptance Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 461, 463-464, 236 Cal. Rptr. 771*

Sale and leaseback of cargo cranes was transfer of tangible personal property subjecting seller/lessee to sales tax; character of asset in hands of seller at time of sale is determinative; installation of property by seller on buyer's real property so that it becomes fixture does not altering result for sales tax purposes; fact that buyer is subject to ad valorem tax on property is irrelevant for sales tax purposes. *United States Lines, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 529, 535-540, 227 Cal. Rptr. 347* (distinguishing *Cedars-Sinai Medical Center v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1182, 1189, 208 Cal. Rptr. 837* as involving two sales, only one of which was subject to sales tax)

Sales of equipment by hospital to equipment leasing companies and leaseback was financing device not subject to sales or use tax. *Cedars-Sinai Medical Center v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1182, 1188-1190, 208 Cal. Rptr. 837* (sales tax was paid on sale from vendor to hospital)

[b] Services and Labor

Mixed sale in which computer and optional service contract were sold at same time for single undifferentiated price on invoice, was only partially taxable; computer sale was taxable, while service-contract sale was not taxable. *Dell, Inc. v. Superior Court (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 911, 930, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 905*

Sales of sandpaper, masking tape, and paint thinner to auto repair shops were not sales for resale exempt from sales tax under *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1546*, because sale requires property to be furnished, and supplies at issue were consumed in repair service rather than being furnished to customer. *Modern Paint and Body Supply, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 703, 709, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 784*

Signs permanently affixed or attached to realty, structures, or buildings were fixtures under *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1521* if they did not lose their identity as signs when installed and could be removed without damaging or destroying the structure to which they were attached. *Richard Boyd Indus. v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 706, 717-718, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520*

No sales tax was due on income from rental of paging devices because "true object" of transaction was to provide paging service; customers paid flat fee even though Public Utility Commission required company to book income separately for service, maintenance, and equipment rental, *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1501* contains no provision for allocating incidental rental income from services, so no tax could be imposed on rental portion. *MCI Airsignal, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1527, 1530-1532, 1532-1533, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 746*

Charges imposed by water conditioning company for replacing depleted water purification tanks with regenerated tanks was taxable sale under *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1546* (receipt of repaired or reconditioned property identical to property repaired or reconditioned constitutes taxable sale). *Continental Water Conditioning Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 783, 785-787, 255 Cal. Rptr. 98*

Under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6011(a)(2), (b)(1), (c)(3)* and *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1521(b)(2)(B), (c)(6),* contractor is retailer of fixtures it installs and is subject to sales tax on price of components plus labor for preinstallation assembly and fabrication (including jobsite fabrication), but not including installation labor. *Coast Elevator Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 206, 208-213, 230 Cal. Rptr. 376*

[c] Tangible Personal Property

Transfers of tangible artwork are taxable transfers of tangible property and constitute taxable leases under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6006(g)* and *6006.3*; the tangible artwork was physically useful and essential in ultimate production of books and rubber stamps incorporating the copyright in the artwork, and without physical artwork, contracts transferring that artwork were essentially useless. *Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 211-212, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*

Agreements transferring artwork to be reproduced in books and used on rubber stamps are technology transfer agreements under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6011(c)(10)* and *6012(c)(10),* so that only portion of artist's income attributable to temporary transfer of tangible artwork is taxable. Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) *25 Cal. 4th 197, 213-214, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148*

Completed film negatives and master recordings are tangible personal property for sales tax purposes if physically useful in manufacturing process, despite being valued in part for intellectual content. *Simplicity Pattern Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 900, 912, 167 Cal. Rptr. 366, 615 P.2d 555*

For purposes of Sales and Use Tax Law, electricity is tangible personal property; however, coal that is burned to generate electricity is not thereby physically incorporated into that electricity, and when that electricity is sold to consumers, that coal does not become resold in those sales; therefore, power-generating companies are liable for usetax on coal bought outside California for use in *California. Searles Valley Minerals Operations, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 514, 523-526, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 857*

[d] What Constitutes Sales Price and Gross Receipts

Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6011, 6012, defining "sales price" and "gross receipts," do not authorize either deduction or exclusion from original sales price forsubsequent "adjustment" of sales price; refunds of sales and use taxes to utility companies that received price adjustments in settlement of antitrust litigation were erroneous. *Southern California Edison Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 652, 658-662, 102 Cal. Rptr. 766, 498 P.2d 1014*

Contractor-manufacturer was not permitted to recover sales tax paid pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6011* and 6151 on self-manufactured components because assessment was based on calculated retail price for components that was properly determined by examining bid sheets and calculating all anticipated contract costs and profits. *Montgomery Elevator Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 887, 890-892* *Northrup Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 132, 137, 167 Cal. Rptr. 707*

[5] City Gross Receipts and Licensing Taxes

[a] Apportionment

Apportionment was not required to reflect fact that employment agency placed worker, as independent contractor, with company outside of city where agency maintained its office because all of agency's receipts under that contract were attributable to work it did from its office in city. *Programming-Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 281, 289-292, 263 Cal. Rptr. 558*

Apportionment of gross receipts tax on finance charge income from retail credit sales on basis that 50 percent of finance charge income was attributable to retail sale at out-of-city stores and 50 percent was attributable to in-city accounting office functions, was arbitrary, capricious, and unconstitutional, because far more finance charge activity occurred at out-of-city stores than at accounting center. *May Dept. Stores Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1368, 1376, 251 Cal. Rptr. 873*

Licensee who challenges method of apportionment has burden to show, by clear and convincing evidence, that extraterritorial values are being taxed; objective of apportionment is avoidance of multiple taxation. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1210-1211, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Apportionment is not necessary if parking lot was within city, parking was only service for which licensee charged customers, and no charge was made for shuttle service from lot to airport despite fact that shuttle services accounted for 67 percent of business expenses. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1211-1212, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

[b] Basis and Rate of Tax

Contracts terms made employment agency not true agent and therefore imposition of gross receipts tax on all sums collected by agency from company (as opposed to net retained after payment to worker) was proper. *Programming-Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 281, 288-289, 263 Cal. Rptr. 558*

Gross receipts tax imposed on licensee that operated parking lot, charged customers only for parking, and operated free shuttle service from lot to airport was not a subterfuge for per-acre tax because tax was based on gross receipts from taxable transaction. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1215, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Services performed after passage of title of component parts to U.S. government were part of sale and therefore taxable at lower rate for selling and manufacturing business rather than at higher rate for "other trade or occupation not specifically taxed." *ITT Gilfillan, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 421, 429-430, 140 Cal. Rptr. 193*

City tax on baseball game tickets to finance renovations to stadium was valid despite provision in stadium lease that baseball team cannot be required to pay for alterations or improvements to stadium. *National Exhibition Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 1, 6-11, 100 Cal. Rptr. 757*

[c] Constitutional Issues (Commerce, Discrimination, Equal Protection, Free Speech, Import-Export)

City was not empowered to impose license tax (calculated on annual business activity) on federal savings bank; nondiscriminatory treatment of state-chartered and federally chartered financial institutions is matter of statewide concern that requires prohibition on local taxation of financial institutions [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23182* (uniform "in lieu" tax on financial corporations)]. *California Fed. Savings & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 1, 19-25, 283 Cal. Rptr. 569, 812 P.2d 916*

Imposition of gross receipts tax on company storing goods in customs-bonded warehouse for sale to airlines and ships travelling to foreign locations did not violate Import-Export Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10, cl. 2*) because tax did not prevent federal government from collecting customs duties and did not single out imports for tax; tax did not violate Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*) because tax met four factors (nexus, fair apportionment, nondiscrimination, and fair relation to services provided) of *Complete Auto Transit, Inc. v. Brady (1977) 430 U.S. 274, 97 S. Ct. 1076, 51 L. Ed. 2d 326, 331* . *City of Los Angeles v. Marine Wholesale/Warehouse Co. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1834, 1844, 1846, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 664*

Business tax that discriminates between in-city manufacturers and out-of-city manufacturers violates state and federal commerce protections. *General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 451-454, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544*

Equal protection rights of employment agency were not violated by imposing gross receipts tax at higher rate than that imposed on temporary help agencies because agency gave its workers choice of being its employee or independent contractor. *Programming-Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 281, 292-293, 263 Cal. Rptr. 558*

City tax on movie theaters and adult bookstores impermissibly burdened activities protected by *U.S. Const., amend. I*, and thus was unconstitutional as applied; although tax appears to apply to broad range of businesses, in reality burden falls disproportionately on businesses engaged in free speech, thus discriminating against those engaged in protected speech. *United Artists Communications, Inc. v. City of Montclair (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 245, 252-253, 257 Cal. Rptr. 124*

Gross receipts tax is neither discriminatory nor confiscatory even though only two companies were in class and taxpayer accounted for 16 percent of city's total business license tax revenue; differing rates of tax may be imposed on different classes provided classification is reasonable; tax is not discriminatory if burden falls equally on all members of same class. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1213-1215, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

Local tax on admission prices of sporting events, movie theaters, concerts, shows, museums, performances, displays, and exhibitions within city limits was invalid and violated of rights of free speech and equal protection if plaintiffs' movie theaters were only existing or contemplated entities subject to tax. *Festival Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Pleasant Hill (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 960, 963-966, 227 Cal. Rptr. 601*

[d] In Lieu Tax on Insurance Companies

Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 28(f) prohibited city from imposing tax on income from rental properties or parking lot operated by insurance company and tax on use of electrical power in company's building; under *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 28(f)*, insurance companies (except those issuing title and marine insurance) pay tax on gross premiums in lieu of all other taxes and licenses except taxes on real estate and motor vehicles. *Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 402, 406, 417, 267 Cal. Rptr. 589, 787 P.2d 996*

[e] Preemption by State or Federal Law

Cal. Const., art. XX, § 22, grants state Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control exclusive power to collect license fees or occupational taxes related to alcoholic beverage sales and to tax those sales; liquor licenses are not subject to local license or occupational taxes, and local tax on alcoholic beverage sales is preempted by state law; however, municipality may impose fees pursuant to its police powers if business imposes unusual burden on city services; city ordinance addressing nuisance problems associated with alcoholic beverage sales establishments and requiring existing alcoholic beverage retailers to pay fee to administer enforcement of ordinance construed as regulatory ordinance and fees held not to constitute prohibited license tax; fee also held not to be impermissible tax imposed to pay general revenue to city, but regulatory fee intended to defray cost of providing and administering hearing process set out in ordinance. *City of Oakland v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 740, 759-767, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 120*

Imposition of gross receipts tax on company storing goods in customs-bonded warehouse was not preempted by federal law governing customs-bonded warehouses because tax does not defeat purpose of federal law (giving importers flexibility to sell goods domestically or reexport them without prepaying customs duties) and taxpayer not type of importer federal law waspassed to assist; taxpayer's goods were sold to airlines and ships to be consumed during travel outside U.S. and taxpayer therefore had no domestic market. *City of Los Angeles v. Marine Wholesale/Warehouse Co. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1834, 1843, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 664*

Municipal ordinance imposing excise tax on purchase of alcoholic beverages sold by retailer for consumption on premises was invalid because state has preempted field of alcoholic beverage consumption. *Century Plaza Hotel Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 616, 620-626, 87 Cal. Rptr. 166*

[f] Proposition 13 Restriction on Special Taxes

When challenged tax is held invalid under *Gov. Code § 53722* (Proposition 62), court need not reach the question of whether it is also invalid under Proposition 13. *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225*

Validity of sales tax increase approved by simple majority of voters in 1996 general elections upheld; tax was general tax not subject to supermajority voter approval requirements applicable to special taxes under Proposition 13 (*Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*) and Proposition 62 (*Gov. Code § 53722*). *Coleman v. County of Santa Clara (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 662, 669-672, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516*

Gross receipts tax imposed on car rental companies that serviced airport was not "special tax" within meaning or requirements of *Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 4*, or *Gov. Code § 50076*, but as authorized by *Gov. Code §§ 50474, 26360*; amount of tax (nine percent) was fair and reasonable apportionment of general operation of airport and differential recognizes disadvantages of off-site location. *Alamo Rent-A-Car, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 198, 205, 207-208, 272 Cal. Rptr. 19*

[g] Proposition 62 Restriction on Special Taxes

Gov. Code § 53722, part of Proposition 62, which requires two-thirds voter approval of voters voting in election on issue for local government or district to impose a special tax, held constitutional. *Santa Clara County Local Transportation Authority v. Guardino (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 220, 238, 261, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 902 P.2d 225*

Validity of sales tax increase (Measure B tax) approved by simple majority of voters in 1996 general elections upheld; Measure B was general tax not subject to supermajority voter approval requirements applicable to special taxes under *Cal. Const., art. XIIIA, § 4* (Proposition 13), and its statutory counterpart *Gov. Code § 53722* (Proposition 62). *Coleman v. County of Santa Clara (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 662, 669-672, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516*

[h] Remedies

Taxpayer suit to claim refund of city business taxes is subject to prior filing of claim for refund and is subject to six-month limitation of *Gov. Code § 945.6*. *Volkswagen Pacific, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 48, 60-63, 101 Cal. Rptr. 869, 496 P.2d 1237*

Civ. Code § 3287(a) is only basis for payment of interest on retailer's judgment for refund of gross receipts tax; thus, retailer is entitled to interest at legal rate, not at rate city charged on delinquent gross receipts taxes. *May Dept. Stores Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1368, 1378-1379, 251 Cal. Rptr. 873*

Licensee is required to exhaust administrative remedies for reclassification but is entitled to maintain action for declaratory relief challenging constitutionality of ordinance if administrative remedy did not provide forum for raising constitutional issues. *Park'N Fly of San Francisco, Inc. v. City of South San Francisco (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1207-1209, 234 Cal. Rptr. 23*

If taxpayer pays tax by mistake, prejudgment interest provided by *Civ. Code § 3287* does not begin to accrue until taxpayer discovers mistake and demands refund. *Todd Shipyards Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 222, 227, 181 Cal. Rptr. 652*

Trial court was in error by issuing alternative writ of mandate and determining absence of another adequate remedy in suit to compel SBE to transmit to petitioner city sales taxes erroneously distributed to another city. *City of Culver City v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 404, 409-412, 105 Cal. Rptr. 602*

[i] Statute of Limitations on Collection

Period within which city must commence action to collect business tax is three-year limitation period of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(1)* (*now see Code of Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*); period begins on date cause of action accrues, which is date taxes become delinquent. *City of Los Angeles v. Belridge Oil Co. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 823, 833-834, 271 P.2d 5* ; *City of Los Angeles v. A.E.C. Los Angeles (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 933, 941, 109 Cal. Rptr. 519*

[j] Who Is Taxed

Numerous partnerships and corporations, each consisting of same two individuals and formed to take title to single real estate investment, were properly disregarded; for purpose of municipal gross receipts tax, single entity was partnership encompassing all real estate lending and investment activity of two individuals. *Roscoe Terrace v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 559, 565-569, 216 Cal. Rptr. 237*

City is prohibited from assessing gross receipts of commercially inseparable and integrated activity because two businesses each taxable at different rates. *ITT Gilfillan, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 421, 429, 140 Cal. Rptr. 193*

[6] Consideration Required for Taxable Sale

No consideration, and therefore no sale, is involved if parent corporation remained jointly liable for divisions' liabilities after transfer of divisions to subsidiaries. *Macrodyne Industries, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 579, 582-583, 237 Cal. Rptr. 537*

Consideration for sale is not required to be money. *United States Lines, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 529, 539-540, 227 Cal. Rptr. 347*

[7] Delegation of Taxing Power

Retail transactions and use tax authorized by former Fresno Metropolitan Projects Act (former *Gov. Code § 68056 et seq.*) violated *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 11(a)*, restriction against delegation to private person or body of power to levy tax; Fresno Metropolitan Projects Authority, created under Act constituted "private body" to which Legislature unlawfully delegated power to levy tax, and therefore, tax was unconstitutional. *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers' Assn. v. Fresno Metropolitan Projects Authority (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1359, 1363, 1375, 1389, 1396, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269*

[8] Exemptions From Tax

[a] Burden on Taxpayer to Establish Eligibility for Exemptions

Statutes granting exemption from taxation must be reasonably, but strictly, construed against taxpayer; taxpayer has burden of showing that taxpayer clearly comes within exemption; exemption will not be inferred from doubtful statutory language; when statute contains express enumeration of exemptions, additional exemptions should not be presumed; plaintiff corporation failed to meet burden of establishing that *Rev. & Tax. Code § 33* afforded it exemption from franchise taxes. *Alpha Therapeutic Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1, 3 n.1, 5-8, 12, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548*

Burden is on taxpayer to show entitlement to exemption; rule of strict construction for exemption statutes is not applicable to exemption created by *U.S. Constitution. McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1413, 1420, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399* (finding exemption under import-export clause of U.S. Constitution (U.S. Const., art. I, § 10, *cl. 2*))

Burden is on taxpayer to show that activity falls within exemption; exemption statutes are strictly construed so as not to enlarge exemption beyond plain meaning of statute. *Parfums-Corday, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 630, 637, 232 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Taxpayer is required to maintain records to support asserted exemption. *Paine v. State Bd. of Equalization (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 438, 443-444, 187 Cal. Rptr. 47*

[b] Charitable Organizations

Charitable organization that does not qualify for property tax exemption under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 214* is eligible for

sales tax exemption under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6375* if it meets statutory requirements. *Good Shepherd Lutheran Home v. State Bd. of Equalization (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 876, 883-886, 189 Cal. Rptr. 242*

[c] Common Carriers

State tax on air fuel sold to foreign charter carrier is neither violative of commerce clause nor inconsistent with U.S.-Canada agreement regulating air charter service; agreement governs only imposition of federal taxes. *Wardair Canada v. Florida Dep't of Revenue (1986) 477 U.S. 1, 3-5, 8-13, 106 S. Ct. 2369, 91 L. Ed. 2d 1* ; *cf. Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6357, 7389(a)* (excepting carrier licensed by California, U.S., or foreign government from definition of aircraft jet fuel user)

Taxpayer's use of aircraft as unscheduled air taxi qualified taxpayer as common carrier under regulatory definition [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1593(a)(2), (c)*], even though it was not commercial aircraft used for scheduled airline operations; based on its use by common carrier, that aircraft was exempt from sales tax; therefore, sales tax on that aircraft should not have been taken into account by county assessor for purpose of property taxation. *Auerbach v. Los Angeles County Assessment Appeals Bd. (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1428, 1431, 1432 n.3, 1441, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 105*

18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1621(d)(1), as implemented from and after January 1, 1978, prohibiting application of overpayments as offsets to underpayments and requiring corrected bills of lading to be timely filed by sellers seeking exemption for common carriers, is valid. *Delta Air Lines v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 518, 530-531, 262 Cal. Rptr. 803*

Exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6385* is inapplicable to freight car wheel sales by wholly-owned subsidiary to common carrier parent if wheels not transported directly outside of state. *Southern Pacific Equip. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 302, 307-308, 94 Cal. Rptr. 107*

[d] Containers

Sales and use tax exemption for returnable containers (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6364(c)*) does not apply to manufacturer's original sale of returnable containers to bottler that purchases bottles to use and reuse in presenting its product for resale; *section 6364(c),* as specific statute, takes precedence over general exemption for sales for resale, so that sale is not exempt under either specific or general provision. *Associated Beverage Co. v. Board of Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 192, 216, 273 Cal. Rptr. 639*

Vending machine operator is exempted by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6364(a)* from sales or use tax on nonreturnable cups it purchased from supplier and sold with beverages dispensed from machines; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6359.4* neither precludes vending machine operator from being seller nor abolishes exemption provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6364(a*); *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1574(b)(2)(B)* held invalid to extent it would render vending machine operator liable for use tax on cups. *Canteen Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 952, 957-963, 220 Cal. Rptr. 306*

[e] Drugs and Medicines

Antiseptic skin scrub used by physicians and hospital personnel is "medicine" within exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6369(a)* and *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1591,* even if it is not used directly on patients, because it is used to mitigate and prevent disease and to benefit patients. *Purdue Frederick Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 218 Cal.App. 3d 1021, 1026-1029, 267 Cal. Rptr. 482*

[f] Exemption Certificates

Rev. & Tax. Code § 6421 (statement of buyer to seller that property will be used in manner to exempt gross receipts from tax) does not shift liability for tax to buyer if basis of claimed exemption was delivery outside California because retailer is able to know and control place of delivery; failure to apply *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6421* to this situation as not depriving retailer of due process. *Engs Motor Truck Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1472-1476, 235 Cal. Rptr. 117*

[g] Federal Constitutional Provisions

Tennessee sales tax on leases of cargo containers used exclusively in international commerce did not violate federal Import-Export Clause or Foreign Commerce Clause because it was generally applicable sales tax that bore no relation to importation and did not divert import revenues from federal government or create risk of multiple taxation. *Itel Containers v. Huddleston (1993) 507 U.S. 60, 74-78, 113 S. Ct. 1095, 122 L. Ed. 2d 421*

Imposition of sales and use taxes on sales of religious books, tapes, records, and other merchandise by religious organization does not violate Free Exercise or *Establishment Clause of First Amendment*. *Swaggart v. Calif. Equalization Bd. (1990) 493 U.S. 378, 110 S. Ct. 688, 107 L. Ed. 2d 796, 807-811, 814*

California sales tax is unconstitutional as to leases of tangible personal property to United States if legal incidence of tax is on United States. *United States v. California Bd. of Equalization (9th Cir. 1981) 650 F.2d 1127, 1132*

Subjecting gifts to California's use tax did not contravene dormant commerce clause when taxpayer in business of selling musical instruments purchased instruments outside California without paying taxes, placed instruments in resale inventory, and later delivered them to common carrier for transportation to donees outside California as promotional gifts; taxation of gifts to out-of-state donees did not violate fair apportionment prong of four prong test stated in for validity of state tax levied on property in interstate commerce. *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 338, 365-369, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362*

Aircraft parts sold to Mexican airline to service its airplanes are exempt from state sales tax under import-export clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10, cl. 2*); exemption applies to article manufactured and sold for export to foreign country if certainty of foreign destination is plain at time title passes. *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1413, 1420-1425, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399*

Denial of exemption from sales tax conferred on regularly published newspapers and periodicals under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6362* to publisher of shopping guide devoted primarily to advertising is constitutionally permissible. *Redwood Empire Publishing Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1334, 1339-1344, 255 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Sales of religious literature by nonprofit religious corporation is exempt from sales tax under *Free Exercise Clause* of *U.S. Const., Amend. I*, but organization, as consumer of materials used to make literature, remains liable for use tax unless receipts for materials could be produced. *Institute in Basic Youth Conflicts, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1106-1107, 1109, 213 Cal. Rptr. 98*

[h] Food and Meals

Sale of nonreusable menus to hospitals is not within exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6363.6* for meals and food products sold to hospitals, even though *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1503*, defining that exemption, extended to straws, napkins, and similar nonreusable paper products. American Hospital Supply Corp. v. State Bd. of *Equalization (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1091-1094, 215 Cal. Rptr. 744*

Denying exemption to all food products sold for immediate consumption on or near location where parking facilities provided as constitutional. *Henry's Restaurants of Pomona, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1016-1021, 106 Cal. Rptr. 867*

[i] Fuel

Petroleum coke from manufacturing used as fuel source in lieu of coal in industrial facility as "waste byproduct" within exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6358.1*, even if it has minimal commercial value. *Union Oil Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 665, 672, 274 Cal. Rptr. 76*

[j] Lottery Tickets

Sale of tickets by printer to Lottery Commission is subject to sales tax; before sale by retailer to participant who pays for chance to win prize, printed matter is not "lottery ticket" within meaning of *Gov. Code § 8880.68*. *City of Gilroy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 589, 598-599, 602-604, 260 Cal. Rptr. 723*

[k] Marketing Aids

Former 18 Adm C § 1670(c) (*now see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1670(b)*) and its limitation of exemption to marketing aids for which separate charge is made, or for which price of other merchandise is increased, is valid. *Wallace Berrie & Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 60, 67-71, 219 Cal. Rptr. 142, 707 P.2d 204* ; *Parfums-Corday, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 630, 636-637, 232 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Catalogue sealed inside game cartridge package which contained no directions is not exempt as marketing aid under former 18 Adm C § 1670(c) (*now see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1670(b)*); finding that catalogue was advertisement was supported by evidence. *Atari, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 665, 673-675, 216 Cal. Rptr. 267* ; *but see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6379.5* (added by Stats. 1986, ch. 1515)

[l] Master Records and Tapes

Exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6362.5* for master record tapes is not retroactive. *Capitol Records, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 582, 592, 204 Cal. Rptr. 802*

[m] Sales to Federal Government

Electrical contractor did not qualify for exemptions from sales tax under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6381* or *6384* (property purchased in performance of contract for, or sales of personal property to, United States Government) if uninterruptible power supply systems and generators used to perform government contract were fixtures rather than machinery. *Overhead Electric Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1230, 1236, 278 Cal. Rptr. 112*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 6381, exempting gross receipts from sale of tangible personal property to United States, is applicable to overhead materials purchased by contractor for performance of research contract pursuant to provision in contract regarding time title passes. *Aerospace Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1300, 1309-1313, 267 Cal. Rptr. 685*

Sales of equipment, instruments, and piping used in modification of gas tank setting facilities owned by United States are constituted taxable sales of fixtures under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6384* (applying tax to sales of property to United

States if contract is for improvements on or to real property in California) and *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 1521* (dividing personal property in construction between "materials" and "fixtures"). *C.R. Fedrick, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 252, 258-270, 251 Cal. Rptr. 305*

Gross receipts of sales to national banks are taxable because incidence of tax falls on retailer, not on bank; during period for which state was prohibited from taxing gross receipts of sales to national banks, state is able to impose tax on gross receipts of sales to state banks. *Hibernia Bank v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 393, 399-400, 403, 212 Cal. Rptr. 556*

[n] Watercraft

Gross receipts from sale of ferry boats that carried primarily intrastate passengers are not within exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6368*; principal use for interstate passengers is required to qualify for exemption. *Campbell Industries v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 863, 868-870, 213 Cal. Rptr. 533*

[9] Federal Law and Entities

Federal government had no grounds for recovering state sales and use taxes it claims were wrongfully assesed against indemnified federal contractor. *United States v. California (1993) 507 U.S. 746, 113 S. Ct. 1784, 123 L. Ed. 2d 528*

State tax on gross receipts received by non-Indian construction company from tribal school board for construction of Indian school on reservation was preempted by federal regulatory scheme and express federal policy. *Ramah Navajo School Board, Inc. v. Bureau of Revenue (1982) 458 U.S. 832, 846, 102 S. Ct. 3394, 73 L. Ed. 2d 1174*

Non-Indian building contractor that bought construction materials from non-Indian vendors and had those materials delivered to construction site on Indian land was not exempt from California sales tax on those transactions; tribe's interest in obtaining construction services from non-Indians at competitive discount, by strategy to circumvent state sales tax, did not outweigh California's interest in raising general funds for its treasury. *Barona Band of Mission Indians v. Yee (9th Cir. 2008) 528 F.3d 1184, 1186, 1193-1194*

Sales or solicitations of sales of tangible personal property in state on behalf of taxpayer by independent contractor do not subject taxpayer to state taxation, nor does maintenance of an office in state by independent contractor whose activities on behalf of taxpayer in state consist solely of making sales, or soliciting orders for sales, of tangible personal property [*15 U.S.C.§ 381(c)*]; subsidiary of taxpayer that is an integral part of taxpayer's business, and that does not hold itself out as independent contractor, is not considered an independent contractor for this purpose. *Reader's Digest Assn. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1240, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53* (interpreting *15 U.S.C. § 381(d)(1)*)

[10] Personal Liability for Unpaid Taxes of Entity

Personal liability for unpaid sales taxes may be imposed on responsible persons who are no longer with a terminating entity that owes sales and use tax at time of termination, including corporate officers who resigned and sold their corporate stock more than one year before corporation's termination. *S.B.E. v. Wirick (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 411, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 919*

[11] Occasional Sales

Liquidating industrial corporation's sale of its engineering division's assets, including its software library, was not

exempt from sales tax under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6006.5(a)* (occasional sales) and 6010.9 (computer program sales and purchases); division of corporate entity engaging in number of substantially similar sales during preceding 12 months into unincorporated departments or divisions did not transform the departments or divisions into separate legal entities for tax purposes; computer programs, once created and in possession of original customer, constituted tangible personal assets, the subsequent sale of which cannot be characterized as a "service" transaction exempt from tax. *Touche Ross & Co., v. State Bd. of Equalization (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1057, 1061-1067, 250 Cal. Rptr. 408*

In determining whether series of sales occurred, seller includes subdivisions, divisions, regions, and departments of seller. *Chemed Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 967, 974-975, 237 Cal. Rptr. 627*

Single sale, concededly "at retail," of substantially all assets is not exempt occasional sale; if assets sold were suited to retail sale, seller is required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6066* to obtain seller's permit; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6006.5(a)* limits occasional sales to sales of property not held or used by seller in course of activities for which permit is required. *Santa Fe Energy Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 176, 179-182, 206 Cal. Rptr. 499*

Occasional sale exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6006.5* is unavailable if sale in question is one in series of sales made sufficient in number, scope, and character to require holding of seller's permit. *Hotel Del Coronado Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 612, 619, 92 Cal. Rptr. 456*

Single transaction constituting occasional sale is not subject to sales tax. *Glass-Tite Industries, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 691, 694, 72 Cal. Rptr. 244*

[12] Remedies

[a] Available to SBE

Rev. & Tax. Code § 19714, in empowering SBE to impose penalty if taxpayer started or maintained proceedings primarily for delay, or if taxpayer's position was frivolous or groundless, or if taxpayer unreasonably failed to pursue available administrative remedies, does not violate constitutional right of free speech. *Neufeld v. State Bd. of Equalization (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 1471, 1473, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 423*

Marital agreement transmuting community property earnings to separate property for each spouse in attempt to avoid one spouse's tax debt held fraudulent and unenforceable under *Fam. Code § 851* and *Civ. Code § 3439.04(a)* so as not to defeat earnings withholding order for taxes. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Woo (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 481, 483-484, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 206*

Action against surety is timely filed if commenced within period during which lien was in force; surety is liable whether or not named on certificate; demand of surety by SBE is not condition precedent to surety's liability. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Balboa Ins. Co. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 499, 503-505, 155 Cal. Rptr. 205*

Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6811, 6812, relating to successor's liability for sales and use taxes, as interpreted and applied to transaction between parent and subsidiary corporations. *Knudsen Dairy Products Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 47, 53-58, 90 Cal. Rptr. 533*

Sales taxes, pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6756*, and state disability and unemployment insurance taxes, pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 986, 1701*, is entitled to priority in payment if insolvency is involved. *Stewart v. State of California (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 345, 350, 77 Cal. Rptr. 418*

Purchaser of business is liable for due and unpaid sales tax liabilities of seller even if determinations are not issued

until after purchase. *People v. Buckles (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 76, 78-81, 134 P.2d 8*

[b] Available to Taxpayer

Failure to provide jeopardy-assessed taxpayer who does not post security a presale administrative hearing violates due process; sale of seized property is enjoined until taxpayer's administrative hearing. *Dupuy v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 410, 417-418, 124 Cal. Rptr. 900, 541 P.2d 540*

Payment of accrued interest on tax deficiency is not prerequisite to administrative refund claim or subsequent action for refund of taxes (disapproving contrary language in *Garg v. People ex rel. State Bd. of Equalization (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 199, 208, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 376*); thus, SBE's prepayment policy may not be enforced insofar as it requires prepayment of interest before tax refund claim will be considered; court, however, did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest when challenge is directed only to an interest assessment. *Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52*

Actions for damages or equitable relief under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* challenging state or municipal taxation are barred, whether brought in federal or state court, if adequate state remedy exists; although business tax that discriminates between in-city and out-of-city manufacturers violates state and federal commerce protections, taxpayer barred from maintaining section 1983 action for damages in state court because taxpayer entitled to fullrefund; tax refund provides adequate remedy precluding any relief or attorney's fees under federal civil rights law. *General Motors Corp. v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 448, 451, 460-461, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544*

Sales tax offset is inappropriate method for disbursing invalidly collected supplemental sales taxes; SBE is required to retain these invalidly collected tax revenues to meet refund claims, if any. *Rider v. County of San Diego (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1410, 1421, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 885* (on remand following Supreme Court invalidation in *Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 18, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* of supplemental sales tax designed to fund county regional justice financing agency)

Taxpayers, but not agency, are entitled to attorneys's fees under common fund theory in suit successfully challenging supplemental sales tax under Proposition 13. *Rider v. County of San Diego (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1410, 1423, 1426, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 885* (on remand following Supreme Court invalidation in *Rider v. County of San Diego (1991) 1 Cal. 4th 1, 13-15, 18, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490, 820 P.2d 1000* of supplemental sales tax designed to fund county regional justice financing agency)

[c] Doctrine of Equitable Setoff

In suit for refund of taxes, SBE may raise doctrine of equitable setoff to defeat or reduce taxpayer's refund. *Sprint Communications Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1254, 1259-1262, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 399*

[13] Retention of Title to Property

If tooling was used in shipment of airplane parts and manufacturer expected to be compensated for it by buyer, sales tax as properly assessed on transfer even though contract provided that seller was to retain legal title as security for purchase. *Northrop Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 132, 137, 167 Cal. Rptr. 707*

[14] Use or Delivery of Property in California

Subjecting gifts to California's use tax did not contravene dormant commerce clause when taxpayer in business of selling musical instruments purchased instruments outside California without paying taxes, placed instruments in resale inventory, and later removed them from inventory to make promotional gifts and delivered them to common carrier for transportation to donees outside California; no impermissible risk of multiple taxation resulted from Board's interpretation of use tax statutes that gifts of personal property be deemed made in California and subject to California use tax if (a) that property was purchased without payment of sales tax, and (b) delivered to common carrier for transportation to donee inside or outside California. *Yamaha Corp. of America v. State Bd. of Equalization (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 338, 365, 368-369, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362*

Retailer is liable for tax, and exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6396* (delivery outside of California) is not applicable to trucks delivered in California even though buyers filed statements with DMV stating they took delivery in other states; actual delivery outside California as necessary for exemption. *Engs Motor Truck Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1458, 1464-1472, 235 Cal. Rptr. 117*

No tax is due under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6009.1* if property only moves through California for consumption elsewhere; however, if property has some functional purpose in California, even if substantially consumed in interstate commerce outside California, use tax as payable. *Parfums-Corday, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 630, 638, 232 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Storage of marketing aids in California is sufficient use to subject purchaser/wholesaler, which then packaged them in displays and forwarded them outside California, to tax. *Parfums-Corday, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1987) 187 Cal. App. 3d 630, 638, 232 Cal. Rptr. 56*

Sales of goods to common carrier for use out-of-state are subject to sales tax if contract provides for delivery in *California. Satco, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 12, 16-19, 192 Cal. Rptr. 449*

Use tax does not depend on duration of use in California but on fact of any substantial use in *California. Western Contracting Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 568, 574, 71 Cal. Rptr. 472*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 6246 establishes presumption that property brought to California by purchaser was purchased for use in this state; presumption as overcome if purchaser demonstrates that property was purchased with intention to use it elsewhere, but not overcome by showing that purchaser had no intention to use specific property in California if nature of purchaser's business shows that property might be used in *California. Western Contracting Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 568, 575, 71 Cal. Rptr. 472*

[15] Who Is Seller

Sales taxes was properly imposed on soft drink bottler for its sales to vending machine customers who failed to furnish bottler with valid resale certificates; vending machine operators as agents of seller, who is "distributor" under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6015*. *Associated Beverage Co. v. Board of Equalization (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 192, 208, 273 Cal. Rptr. 639*

Status of seller within meaning of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6014* is determined solely by suitability of product for retail salability, not by intent of purchaser; fact that goods have not actually been sold at retail is of no consequence; if assets sold are suited to retail sale, seller is required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6066* to obtain seller's permit. *Santa Fe Energy Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 176, 180-182, 206 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; *Davis Wire Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 761, 764-765, 132 Cal. Rptr. 133, 553 P.2d 229*

California corporation was liable for sales tax as distributor when it received and warehoused boxes of greeting cards in

California and shipped cards to various salespeople based on orders it received from its parent corporation. *Sunshine Art Studios of California, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 223, 227-228, 114 Cal. Rptr. 24*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxExemptionsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.456

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.456 Law Reviews

Nowak and Rotunda, *Sales and Use Tax Credits, Discrimination Against Interstate Commerce, and the Useless Multiple Tax Concept, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 273 (1987)*

Stetson, *The California Sales Tax: An Analysis of the "Occasional Sale," 7 Pac. L.J. 30 (1976)*

Note, *Constitutional Limitations on the Power to Tax: Alco Parking Corp. v. Pittsburg, 26 Hastings L.J. 215 (1974)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersSpending & TaxationTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesSales TaxImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesUse TaxImposition of Tax

115 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.457

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.457 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 9, *Taxation* (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.458-540.469

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.458[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.470

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.470 California Family Law

For discussion of tax issues involved in dissolution of marriage, see Kirkland, Lurvey & Richmond, California Family Law Practice and Procedure, Ch. 160, *Tax Effects of Dissolution* (Matthew Bender 2d ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Family LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportTaxation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.471

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.471 California Legal Forms

For discussion, exemption applications, and annual information return forms relating to welfare, charitable and educational exemptions, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 13C, *State and Federal Taxes: Applications for Exemptions and Annual Returns* (Matthew Bender)

For forms for marital agreements, including provisions with respect to taxes, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 108, *Antenuptial Agreements* ; Ch. 109, *Postnuptial Agreements* ; and Ch. 110, *Marital Settlement Agreements* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Family LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportTaxationTax LawFederal Income Tax ComputationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.472

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.472 California Constitution

Court action to enjoin or prevent collection of tax is prohibited; action to recover tax claimed to have been collected illegally is authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.473

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.473 Federal Statutes

Federal courts are prohibited from enjoining assessment, levy, or collection of state tax if plain, speedy, and efficient remedy available in state courts. *28 U.S.C. § 1341*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsAnti-Injunction ActsTax Anti-Injunction Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.474

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.474 State Statutes

[1] Corporation Tax

Returns generally. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 18601 et seq., 18621 et seq.*

Estimated tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19021 et seq.*

Deductions. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 24341 et seq.*

Business income derived from California sources is taxable under unitary method or water's-edge election. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25110 et seq.* (water's-edge election), *25120 et seq*. (unitary method)

Petition for alternative formula for assessing business income. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25137*

[2] Personal Income Tax

Computation of taxable income. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17071 et seq.*

Deductions generally. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17073, 17073.5, 17076, 17201 et seq.*

Standard deduction. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17073(c), 17073.5*

California incorporation of portions of Internal Revenue Code regarding deductions. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17201*

Estates, trusts, beneficiaries, and decedents. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17731 et seq.*

Partners and partnerships. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17851 et seq.*

Limited partnerships. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17935 et seq.*

Limited liability companies. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17941 et seq.*

Registered limited liability partnerships and foreign limited liability partnerships. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17948 et seq.*

Taxation of nonresidents. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17951 et seq.*

Returns generally. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18501 et seq., 18621 et seq.*

Signing spouse's name on personal income tax return is misdemeanor. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19701.5*

[3] Provisions Common to Personal Income Taxes and to Corporation Taxes

Filing of returns by electronic technology permitted. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18621.5*

Withholding. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18631 et seq.*

Payment of tax by check or credit card. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19005*

Assessments and closing agreements. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19031 et seq.*

Jeopardy assessments. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081 et seq.*

Interest, penalties, and additions to tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19131 et seq., 19701 et seq.*

Penalties for paying tax with bad check. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19134* (adopting *I.R.C. § 6657*)

Lien of tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19221 et seq.*

Warrant for collection of tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19231 et seq.*

State's remedies cumulative. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19251*

Priorities of tax claims. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19253*

Seizure and sale of taxpayer's property. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19262, 19263*

Claim for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19301 et seq.*

Interest on judgment for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19340, 19391, 19521*

Suit for tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19371 et seq.*

No injunction or writ of mandate is issuable to enjoin state or any its officer fromassessing or collecting tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*

Suit for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381 et seq.*

Action by FTB for erroneous refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19120, 19411 et seq.*

Litigation costs. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717*

Res judicata binds FTB only on determinations involving taxpayer's liability for same year. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19802*

Burden of FTB to produce reasonable and probative information for appeals filed under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045* (deficiency assessments) or § 19324 (refund claims).*Rev. & Tax. Code § 21024*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCollectionTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsCredits, Overassessments & RefundsTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.475

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.475 Decisions

[1] Attorney's Fees

Attorney's fees properly granted to taxpayers when Franchise Tax Board's position not substantially justified; when taxpayer's return available, Franchise Tax Board may not assess or collect deficiency without relying on return. *Wertin v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 961, 976-978, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 644* ; *see* Stats. 2000, ch. 414, §§ 1, 2 (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19033* amended to clarify FTB's powers to issue deficiency assessments after *Wertin* holding)

Attorney's fees properly denied to taxpayer who prevailed against the Franchise Tax Board when Board's position was substantially justified; trial court did not abuse discretion in denying attorney's fees to prevailing taxpayer. *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1994) 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129* (applying *Rev. & Tax. Code § 26491*)

[2] Bankruptcy

Assessment of personal income taxes is final for bankruptcy purposes when Notice of Proposed Assessment becomes final, which occurs 60 days after mailing if taxpayer does not file protest. *In re King (9th Cir. 1992) 961 F.2d 1423, 1424-1425, 1427*

Income taxes that are assessed within 240 days of filing of bankruptcy petition or are assessed after petition filed are not dischargeable in bankruptcy; 240-day period increased if offer in compromise with respect to tax made within 240 days after assessment is pending; state income tax deficiency assessed for bankruptcy discharge purposes when assessment contained in notice of proposed deficiency assessment becomes final, either through passage of time or at end of an appeal period; this is point at which state, the taxing sovereign, has formally acted to finally fix tax liability. *Schatz v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 595, 597, 600, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719*

[3] Constitutional Issues

Rev. & Tax. Code § 17043, which imposes additional 1 percent tax on any personal taxable income exceeding $1 million, for purpose of maintaining funding of mental health services for all Californians at 2003 levels [*see* Prop. 63 (Nov. 4, 2004)], does not arbitrarily discriminate against wealthy individuals, since income tax may be rationally based on taxpayer's income level and ability to pay, and there is no need to show that particular taxpayer personally benefits from tax assessed for public good; taxpayers earning more than $1 million annually do not compose "suspect class" for purpose of determining whether issue requires strict-scrutiny constitutional analysis. *Jensen v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 426, 431, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 408*

Rev. & Tax. Code § 24410, which allows only corporations that are domiciled in California to deduct certain insurance company dividends, and limits the deduction to dividends paid from California sources, violated Commerce Clause and was therefore unconstitutional. *Ceridian Corp. v. F.T.B. (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 875, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

[4] Credits

Statutory provisions for income tax credits are narrowly construed against taxpayer. *William Lyon Co. v. Franchise Tax Board (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 267, 275-277, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*

[5] Deductions

Deduction under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 24405* (for organization operated as cooperative or on mutual basis) is not conditioned on taxpayer's actual issuance of refunds, rebates, or dividends to its members, but is available to nonprofit service corporation that uses its capital surplus consistent with nonprofit motive to keep dues and service costs as low as possible. *California State Auto. Assn. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1253, 1262, 237 Cal. Rptr. 44*

[6] Employer's Liability for Withholding

Drivers who drove trucks owned and leased by carrier were employees, not independent contractors, even though permitted to select their own routes, times, and speeds; employer's good faith belief was insufficient under former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18815* (*now see Rev. & Tax. Code § 18668(a)*) to absolve penalty for failure to withhold. *In re Brown (9th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 664, 666-670*

Damages awarded in wrongful termination action are not wages subject to withholding, because no ongoing employment relationship existed and plaintiffs did not seek and were not awarded back pay. *Lisec v. United Airlines, Inc. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1500, 1507, 11 Cal Rptr. 2d 689*

[7] FTB's Remedies

Order to withhold (former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18817*; *now see Rev. & Tax. Code § 18670*) served on police department after seizure of property have priority over fraudulent assignment of those items to attorney and over forfeiture of seized items; service of order to withhold deprives court of jurisdiction to make any other disposition of property specified in order. *Franchise Tax Board v. Superior Court (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 970, 975-978, 215 Cal. Rptr. 36*

[8] Jeopardy Assessments

Statutory provisions [former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18641 et seq.*; *now see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19081 et seq.*] violate due process for failure to provide presale administrative hearing to jeopardy-assessed taxpayer who does not post security; sale of seized property enjoined until taxpayer's administrative hearing. *Dupuy v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 410, 417, 124 Cal. Rptr. 900*

After administrative hearing on jeopardy assessment, sale of taxpayer's seized assets no longer enjoinable. *Hunter-Reay v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 875, 880, 189 Cal. Rptr. 810*

[9] Mandamus Relief

Mandamus relief denied because refund action deemed adequate remedy at law; trial court properly sustained demurrer to petition for writ of mandate filed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* without leave to amend. *Nast v. State Bd. of Equalization (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 343, 346-348, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 592*

[10] Privacy of Income Tax Returns

Public policy exception to privilege against disclosure of tax return information permits party to marriage dissolution proceeding to discover both corporate tax returns of closely-held corporation in which spouse was 30 percent shareholder and corporation's payroll tax returns for spouse, but not corporation's payroll tax returns for other employees. *Schnabel v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 704, 723, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200, 854 P.2d 1117*

Privilege against requiring disclosure of income tax returns or information contained in them [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19542*] is not limited to adversarial proceedings and is not waived by property owner who made administrative application for rent increase. *King v. Mobile Home Rent Review Bd. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1532, 1537-1539, 265 Cal. Rptr. 624*

[11] Privacy of Personal Association

Anti-injunction provision (*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*) does not prevent court from asserting limited jurisdiction in action by FTB to enforce administrative subpoena under former *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19254* (*now see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19504*) even though such a subpoena is first step in collection of tax and integral part of tax collection process; court allowed to consider private club's associational privacy defense to producing membership lists. *Pacific Union Club v. Superior Court (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 60, 70, 283 Cal. Rptr. 287* .

[12] Unitary Business

Unitary business is one that receives income from or attributable to sources both within and without state; unitary business is generally defined as two or more business entities that are commonly owned, and integrated in way that transfers value among affiliated entities; if unitary business exists, taxesare apportioned by formula to allocate to California for taxation its fair share of taxable values of taxpayer; in calculating corporate franchise taxes of unitary business, FTB apportions income generated by unitary business based on relationship of combined income to income derived from California sources; computing income of unitary business that is allocable to one state by use of reasonable formula does not result in impermissible tax on extraterritorial values; although constitutional limits on state's ability to tax interstate businesses exist, they allow states wide latitude to choose method of apportionment; main restrictions on state's ability to tax are (1) a minimal connection between activities of business and taxing state, and (2) income attributed to state for tax purposes must be rationally related to values connected to taxing state; thus, when state's method of apportionment represents rough approximation of corporation's income that is reasonably related to

activities conducted within taxing state, no violation exists; when state's methods appear to reach only profits earned in state, and taxpayer failed to show method of apportionment was inherently arbitrary, or that its application produced an unreasonable result, state's action is within constitutional bounds. *Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1411 & n.5, 1415, 1426*

Majority ownership of affiliated corporations held by family, rather than by single individual or entity, satisfies "unity of ownership" prerequisite for application of unitary business classification of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25105*. *Rain Bird Sprinkler Mfg. Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 784, 788-790, 280 Cal. Rptr. 362*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationPersonal InformationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAssessmentsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsJudicial ReviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsImposition of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.476

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.476 Law Reviews

Lobenhofer, *The Income Taxation of Exchanges of Property for Private Annuities: History and a Proposal*, *21 Pac. L.J. 271 (1990)*

Strand, *Periodicity and Accretion Taxation: Norms and Implementation*, *99 Yale L.J. 1817 (1990)*

Bankman, *The Case Against Passive Investments: A Critical Appraisal of the Passive Loss Restrictions*, *42 Stan. L. Rev. 15 (1989)*

Rands, *Incorporation Under the Federal Tax Laws*, *22 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 985 (1989)*

O'Kelley, *Tax Policy for Post-Liberal Society: A Flat-Tax-Inspired Redefinition of the Purpose and Ideal Structure of a Progressive Income Tax*, *58 S. Cal. L. Rev. 727 (1985)*

Keesling, *A Current Look at the Combined Report and Uniformity in Allocation Practices*, *42 J. Tax'n 106 (1975)*

Lohr-Schmidt, *Developing Jurisdictional Standards for State Taxation of Multistate Corporate Net Income*, *22 Hastings L.J. 1035 (1971)*

Keesling and Warren, *California's Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act, Part II*, *15 UCLA L. Rev. 655 (1968)*

Keesling and Warren, *California's Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act, Part I*, *15 UCLA L. Rev. 156 (1967)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxCorporations & Unincorporated AssociationsImposition of TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesIncome TaxIndividuals, Estates & TrustsGeneral Overview

124 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.477

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.477 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 9, *Taxation* (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawState & Local TaxesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.478-540.489

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.478[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.490

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.490 Federal Income Tax

For discussion of procedures for obtaining an extension of time for filing a federal income tax return, see J. Rabkin & M. Johnson, Federal Income, Gift and Estate Taxation, Ch. 71, *Returns, Deficiencies, and Refunds*, § 71.01A[7] (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureAdministrationTax Payment & Tax Return Requirements (IRC secs. 6071-6091, 6151-6167)Extensions of Time

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.491

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.491 State Statutes

[1] Cause of Action Based on Settlement or Compromise in Exchange for Disclosure of Information

Cause of action against state of California based on settlement or compromise in exchange for disclosure of information provided to taxpayer's attorney, certified public accountant, or tax preparer. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21023*

[2] Cause of Action for Disregard of Published Procedures

Cause of action in superior court is available against state for damages resulting from reckless disregard of published SBE or FTB procedures by SBE or FTB staff; penalty for frivolous action. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099, 21021*

[3] Compromise of Final Tax Liability

Compromise of final tax liability by executive officer and chief counsel of FTB, jointly, or by FTB. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19443*

[4] FTB's Burden of Producing Reasonable and Probative information Concerning Amount Assessed

For appeals filed under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045* (deficiency assessments) or 19324 (s), FTB has burden of producing reasonable and probative information, in addition to information described in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21024(a)*, concerning amount assessed if taxpayer complies with specified conditions. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21024*

[5] Investigation and Surveillance

Investigation and surveillance for purpose not related to tax administration is prohibited; exceptions. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7092, 21014*

[6] Notice and Release of Tax Liens and Tax Levys

Circumstances requiring release of levy. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7094(a), (b), (d), 21016(a), (c)*

Notice and adjustment of levy exemptions under Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7094(b), 7095*, 21016(b), *21017*

Reimbursement of bank and third-party charges as result of erroneous tax levy. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7096, 21018*

Preliminary notice of tax liens. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7097(a), (b), 21019(a), (c), (d), (e), (f)*

FTB notice of filing and recording of lien and independent departmental administrative review. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19225*

Request for release of lien by owner who is not person whose unsatisfied liability gave rise to lien. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19226*

FTB notice before levy and independent departmental administrative review. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21015.5*

Release of tax lien filed in error. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(c), (d), (e), (f)*

FTB as not permitted to file or record lien if taxpayer demonstrates by substantial evidence that filing or recording of lien would be in error. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21019(b)*

[7] Notice of Suspension or Revocation

Preliminary notice of revocation or suspension of permit or of suspension of taxpayer under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6070* (failure to comply with sales tax provisions, rules, and regulations), *6072* (not actively conducting business as a seller of tangible personal property), *23301* (failure to pay bank and corporation taxes, penalties, interest), *23301.5* (failure to file bank and corporation tax return), or *23775* (failure of exempt corporation to file required returns or statements, or to pay amounts due). *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7098, 21020, 23302(b)*

[8] Protest Hearing Procedures

Protest hearings are required to be held at reasonable time and convenient place; recording of hearing as permitted only if prior notice to taxpayer and taxpayer entitled to receive copy of recording; and taxpayer as required to be informed of right to have attorney, accountant, or other designated agent present. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7090, 21011*

[9] Reimbursement of Expenses Relating to SBE Hearing

Taxpayer is entitled to reimbursement of reasonable fees and expenses relating to hearing before SBE if SBE in its sole discretion finds the action taken by FTB staff was unreasonable. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7091*

[10] Reimbursement of Expenses Related to Appeal Before SBE

Taxpayer entitled to reimbursement of reasonable fees and expenses relating to appeal before SBE if SBE in its sole discretion finds that action taken by FTB staff was unreasonable. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21013*

[11] Relief Based on Reliance on Written FTB Advice

Availability of and procedure for obtaining relief from tax, interest, additions to tax, and penalties based on taxpayer's reasonable reliance on written advice of FTB. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 21012*

[12] Settlement of Minor Tax Disputes

SBE is permitted to settle matters involving disputed tax liability within amount set by statute, on approval of State Board of Control. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7093*

[13] Taxpayers' Rights Advocate

Taxpayers' Rights Advocate within SBE and FTB is responsible for coordinating or facilitating resolution of taxpayer complaints and problems, and is required to give priority to reviewing and taking prompt action, including staying actions, if taxpayers have suffered or will suffer irreparable loss as the result of SBE or FTB action. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7083, 21004*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsAudits & InvestigationsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsSettlementsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTaxpayer Protests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.492-540.509

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.492[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.510

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.510 Claim for Refund of Illegally Collected Taxes Filed With Board of Supervisors [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096(b), 5097]

[1] FORM Claim for Refund of Illegally Collected Taxes Filed With Board of Supervisors [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096(b), 5097]

TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, [CITY AND] COUNTY OF _____, CALIFORNIA:
CLAIM FOR REFUND OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES

Claimant alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. I am the owner of the following described real property situated in _____ County, California:_____ [*give legal description or otherwise describe*].

[*OR*]

1. I am the duly appointed_____ [guardian *or* conservator *or* executor *or* administrator of the estate] of_____ [*name*], who [is and] was at all times herein mentioned the owner of the following described real property situated in _____ County, California:_____ [*give legal description or otherwise describe*].

[*CONTINUE*]

[2. On or about_____ [*date*], I(, on behalf of the owner,) filed a _____ (declaration *or* affidavit) of exemption for the above-described property with, and in the form provided by, the Office of the Assessor of _____ County, California, as required by Section _____ of the Revenue and Taxation Code. A copy of the _____ (declaration *or* affidavit) is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.]

3. On or about_____ [*date*],_____ [*name*], Assessor of _____County, assessed taxes against_____ [me *or* the owner] on the above-described property in the amount of $_____ for the fiscal year _____. The assessment is evidenced by a tax bill that_____ [I *or* the owner] received in the U.S. mail from the office of the assessor. A copy of the bill is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

4._____ [I *or* The owner] paid the taxes in full by check(s) dated _____ [and _____] in the amount(s) of $_____ [and $_____]._____ [A copy *or* Copies] of the cancelled check(s)_____[is *or* are] attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

5. I hereby claim a refund of real property taxes levied against the above-described property for the fiscal year ending_____ [*date*], _____ [in full *or* in the amount of $_____] on the ground that _____ [*describe factual and legal bases for claim of refund of assessment, e.g.,* the above-described real property is, and at all times herein mentioned was held and used exclusively by _____ (me *or* the owner) as a cemetery for the burial and other permanent deposit of human dead and as such is exempt from taxation under the provisions of *Article XIII, Section 3, subdivision (g) of the Constitution* of the State of California and of *Section 204 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*.]

6. No refund of the taxes, or any part thereof, has previously been made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of claimant*]

CAUTION:

Before using this form counsel should consult the clerk of the board of supervisors in the county in which the property is located. Many counties have printed refund claim forms that must be used. This form may be used if the county does not provide refund claim forms.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a taxpayer, by the executor or administrator of the taxpayer's estate, or by the taxpayer's conservator or guardian, to claim a refund of real property taxes from the board of supervisors of the county in which the real property is situated [*Prob. Code § 1490*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(a)(1)*]. Optional Paragraph 2 should be used if one of the grounds for claiming a refund is that the property is exempt under a provision that requires the filing of declaration or affidavit or exemption [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code § 254* (church)]. Illegality of an assessment due to the property's qualifying for an exemption is one of the seven possible grounds for claiming a refund and is illustrated by the factual example in Paragraph 5 of the form [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096(c)*]. For further discussion of the possible grounds for claiming a refund, see the Introduction, Subpart C, *§ 540.71[3]*.

[3] Other Refunds Available

A county tax collector or county auditor can refund taxes without an order of the board of supervisors [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097.2*; *see also § 540.511*]. A county board of supervisors has authority to order a refund of city or revenue district taxes collected by county officers [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5099, 5101*]. Although no statute authorizes a claim for refund made to a city's governing body, the statute authorizing a suit for refund refers to denial of a refund by a city council [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096, 5140*].

[4] Application for Reduction of Assessment

If a claim for refund involves an issue of valuation (improper assessment), the taxpayer must have sought a reduction of the assessment prior to bringing a suit for a refund [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 988, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; *see § 540.70[1]*]. An application for reduction of assessment filed under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1603* in which the taxpayer states that the application is intended to be a claim for refund is a sufficient claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097(b)*].

[5] Requirements of Claim

A refund claim must be in writing, specify whether all or only part of the assessment is being contested, state the grounds of the claim, and be verified [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5097.02*; *see Prob. Code § 1490*]. The claim should list all possible grounds because a later suit for refund may be maintained only on the grounds set forth in the claim [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(a)*; *see § 540.90[5]*].

[6] Statute of Limitations

With certain exceptions, a refund claim against a board of supervisors must be filed within four years after the date of the payment sought to be refunded [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096, 5097(a)(2)*; *see § 540.71[6]*]. Some cities may have adopted shorter claim periods, however [*see Pasadena Hotel Development Venture v. City of Pasadena (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 412, 414-415, 174 Cal. Rptr. 52]* .

[7] State Statutes

Authorization of and grounds for presentation to board of supervisors of claim for refund of property taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096*

Contents and formalities of refund claims. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097*, 5079.02

Suit for refund is maintainable only on grounds specified in claim for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142(a)*

Recovery of interest, and applicable interest rate, on refund exceeding $10. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5151*

[8] Decisions

Payment of contested taxes and claim for refund were required before court could consider whether *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 2191.3, 2191.4* allowed recordation ofcertificates of delinquency of personal property taxes more than 10 years after tax was assessed and extension of original lien by second recording more than 10 years after original certificate was recorded. *McKendry v. County of Kern (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1165, 1168-1170, 226 Cal. Rptr. 45*

Claim for refund reciting facts of discovery of original overassessment in course of new audit and appraisal regarding, and hearing on reduction of, escape assessment sufficiently set forth basis of claim even though *Rev. & Tax. Code § 533*

was never mentioned therein as statutory ground for refund; taxpayer was entitled to refund without application for reduction of original assessment. *Focus Cable of Oakland, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 519, 526-528, 219 Cal. Rptr. 95*

City ordinance requiring claims for tax refunds to be filed within one year after accrual of cause of action is proper and bars action for refund of personal property taxes if claim is not timely filed. *Pasadena Hotel Development Venture v. City of Pasadena (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 412, 414-415, 174 Cal. Rptr. 52*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.511

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.511 Claim for Refund of Taxes Filed With County Auditor [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5097.2]

[1] FORM Claim for Refund of Taxes Filed With County Auditor [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5097, 5097.2]

TO THE COUNTY AUDITOR, [CITY AND] COUNTY OF _____, CALIFORNIA:
CLAIM FOR REFUND OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES

Claimant alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. I am the owner of the following described real property situated in _____ County, California:_____ [*give legal description or otherwise describe*].

[*OR*]

1. I am the duly appointed_____ [guardian *or* conservator *or* executor *or* administrator of the estate] of_____ [*name*], who [is and] was at all times herein mentioned the owner of the following described real property situated in _____County, California:_____ [*give description of property*].

[*CONTINUE*]

2. On or about_____ [*date*],_____ [*name*], Assessor of _____County, assessed taxes against_____ [me *or* the owner] on the above-described property in the amount of $_____ for the fiscal year _____. The assessment is evidenced by a tax bill that_____ [I *or* the owner] received in the U.S. mail from the office of the assessor. A copy of the bill is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

3. _____ [I *or* The owner] paid the taxes in full by check(s) dated _____ [and _____] in the amount(s) of $_____ [and $_____]._____ [A copy *or* Copies] of the cancelled check(s)_____ [is *or* are] attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

4. I hereby claim a refund of real property taxes levied against the above-described property for the fiscal year ending_____ [*date*], _____ [in full *or* in the amount of $_____] on the ground(s) that_____ [the taxes were paid more than once *and/or* the amount paid exceeds the amount due on the property as shown on the roll *and/or* the amount paid exceeds the amount due on the property as the result of correction to the roll or cancellations ordered by the board of supervisors after the taxes were paid *and/or* the amount paid exceeds the amount due on the property as the result of a reduction attributable to a hearing before an assessment appeals board orassessment hearing officer *and/or* the amount claimed as a refund is less than $10.00], as follows:_____[*state facts that demonstrate each ground being asserted for refund*].

5. No refund of the taxes, or any part thereof, has previously been made.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature of claimant*]

CAUTION:

Before using this form counsel should consult the county auditor or county tax collector in the county in which the property is located. Many counties have printed refund claim forms that must be used. This form may be used when the county does not provide refund claim forms.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a taxpayer, by the executor or administrator of the taxpayer's estate, or by the taxpayer's conservator or guardian, to claim a refund of property taxes from the county auditor or county tax collector in the county in which the real property is situated. The grounds alleged in Paragraph 4 are the only grounds on which a county auditor can refund taxes without an order of the board of supervisors [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5097.2*]. *see § 540.510* for a form of claim for use if a refund is sought from the board of supervisors.

[3] Cross References

See also Comments and References to *§ 540.510*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.512

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.512 Complaint for Refund of Property Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140]

[1] FORM Complaint for Refund of Property Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____ [Sacramento *or* Los Angeles *or* San Francisco *or* San Diego]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	NO. _____
[CITY AND] COUNTY OF	)	COMPLAINT FOR REFUND OF
_____, [STATE	)	_____ [PROPERTY]
BOARD OF	)	TAXES
EQUALIZATION],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the state of California [*or allege other capacity, e.g.,* a nonprofit corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of California for the sole purpose of providing emergency and transitional shelter to women and children who are the victims of domestic violence].

2. Defendant_____ [City *and/or* County *and/or relevant taxing agencies*] is and at all times mentioned herein has been a _____ [*specify, e.g.,* political subdivision *or* municipal corporation existing under the laws *or* municipal corporation duly chartered under the _____ (statutes *or* constitution)] of the State of California.

[3. Defendant State Board of Equalization is, and at all times herein mentioned was, an agency of the State of California charged by law with the duty of determining the eligibility of applicants for welfare exemptions.]

4. The property herein described is, and at all times herein mentioned was, irrevocably dedicated to and exclusively used for charitable purposes as follows: _____ (*describe charitable purpose, e.g.,* to provide emergency and transitional shelter to women and children who are the victims of domestic violence). Plaintiff's duly adopted articles of incorporation and bylaws provide for plaintiff's charitable purposes and provide that plaintiff's property is irrevocably dedicated only to those purposes. Copies of the articles and bylaws are attached as Exhibits A and B, respectively, and incorporated by reference.]

5. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff timely filed with_____[*name*], Assessor of defendant county, an annual affidavit, a claim for the welfare exemption, [and] a valid organizational clearance certificate, as required by *Sections 254, 254.5, 254.6,* and *259.5 of the Revenue and Taxation Code* (*add if applicable:*, and financial statements as requested in writing by the assessor under *Section 254.5(a) of the Revenue and Taxation Code*). Copies of the annual affidavit, the claim for exemption, and the valid organizational clearance certificate are attached as Exhibits C, D, and E respectively, and incorporated by reference. (*Add if applicable:* Copies of all financial statements requested in writing by the assessor are attached as Exhibit F and incorporated by reference).]

6. On or about_____ [*date*],_____ [*name*], Assessor of defendant county, assessed taxes to plaintiff on the following described real property situated in defendant county:_____ [*give legal description or otherwise describe*]. Taxes were assessed in the amount of $_____ for the tax year(s) _____. The assessment is evidenced by a tax bill, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit G, and incorporated by reference. In making the assessment on the described real property, the assessor _____ [*state grounds on which claim for refund is based, i.e., one of the grounds enumerated in Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096, but limited to those grounds previously stated in the claim for refund, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096* assessed the described real property at a full cash value of $_____. The equalized value of the property as determined pursuant to *Section 1610.8 of the Revenue and Taxation Code* by the county board of equalization is $_____]. The_____ [*describe erroneous act, e.g.,* overvaluation of the property] resulted in an_____ [overassessment *or* overpayment] of taxes in the sum of $_____.

7. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff, pursuant to *Section 1603 of the Revenue and Taxation Code,* timely filed a verified application for a reduction in the assessment with the_____ [board of supervisors *or* assessment appeals board]. A copy of the verified application is attached as Exhibit H and incorporated by reference. The application was denied on or about_____ [*date*]. A copy of the findings of fact made by the board in denying the application is attached as Exhibit I and incorporated by reference.]

8. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff paid the taxes in full by check(s) dated_____ [*date*][, and_____ [*date*],] in the amount(s) of $ _____ [and $_____]._____[A copy *or* Copies] of the cancelled check(s)_____ [is *or* are] attached as Exhibit(s) J and K and incorporated by reference.

9. Thereafter, on or about_____ [*date*], which was within_____ [*describe applicable limitation period, e.g.,* four years after making the payment sought to be refunded], plaintiff, pursuant to *Section 5097 of the Revenue and Taxation Code,* timely filed with the_____ [board of supervisors *or* county tax

collector *or* county auditor] a written and verified claim for refund of $_____, which represents the_____ [overassessment *or* overpayment] of property taxes resulting from the_____ [*describe error, e.g.*, overassessment]. A copy of the claim for refund is attached as Exhibit L and incorporated by reference. The claim for refund _____ [was denied on or about _____ (*date*) *or* has not been acted on by the _____ (board of supervisors *or* county auditor *or* county tax collector) for six months since its filing and plaintiff elects to consider the inaction as a rejection of the claim].

9. Plaintiff stated in his/her application for reduction of assessment, Exhibit _____, above, that the application was intended as a claim for refund.

10. No refund of the taxes, or any part thereof, has previously been made to, or applied for the benefit of, plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant county as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, or such larger amount as provided by law;

2. For interest as provided by law;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by the taxpayer, the taxpayer's guardian or conservator, or the executor or administrator of the taxpayer's estate,against a county, city, or other relevant taxing agency to recover a refund of real property taxes under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*. The grounds for refund that may be stated in this complaint are limited to the grounds stated in the claim for refund. In addition to stating the grounds for refund, the complaint must allege that a claim for refund was filed, and that taxes have been paid in full [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096*]. If an error in valuation is the basis for the refund, the complaint must also allege that an application for reduction of assessment was filed and denied [*Stenocord Corp. v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 988, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966 , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* ; for further discussion, *see § 540.70[1]*]. If the claim for refund challenged the validity of only a portionof the assessment, only that portion of the assessment may be the subject of the suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5143*].

The county is the proper defendant for recovery of city taxes collected by that county [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5146*]. Refunds of assessments of various improvement or service districts are governed by a variety of specific statutory provisions. Counsel should consult the relevant governing statutes to determine which entities must be named as defendants [*see, e.g., Gov. Code § 53978*; *Health & Safety Code §§ 13899, 13911-13915* (fire districts)]. If the State Board of Equalization (SBE) reviewed the assessment pursuant to *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 11*, the SBE must be joined in the action. The SBE must also be joined if the refund claimed is based on the denial by the SBE of the welfare exemption of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 254.5* (optional Paragraph 3) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5146*].

If an exemption is the ground for the refund, allegations should be added setting forth the facts establishing entitlement to the exemption (optional Paragraph 4). If the exemption is one that must be applied for, the complaint must allege timely submission of the claim for exemption and any documents that must accompany the claim, including a valid organizational clearance certificate (optional Paragraph 5) [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 254*, 254.4, *254.5, 254.6, 259.5*; *see § 540.52[2], [3]*].

[3] Allegations

Besides the allegations of capacity (Paragraphs 1-3), the complaint alleges all of the following:

- The error claimed and the amount of overpayment caused by the error (Paragraph 6) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 5096, 5140, 5142*].

- If an error in valuation is the basis of the refund claim, the filing of an application for reduction of assessment and denial of that application (optional Paragraph 7) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5142*; *Stenocord Corp.v. City etc. of San Francisco (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 984, 88 Cal. Rptr. 166, 471 P.2d 966] , superseded by statute as stated in 47 Cal. 4th 1298* .

- The payment of the taxes in question (Paragraph 8) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5096*].

- The filing of a claim for refund and the denial or rejection through inaction of the claim (first alternative Paragraph 9) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(a), (b)*] or the plaintiff's application for reduction of assessment constituting a claim for refund (second alternative Paragraph 9).

- The fact that no refund has been paid to or applied for the benefit of plaintiff (Paragraph 10).

[4] Verification

A public entity need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. However, the verification of a complaint against a public entity in superior court does preclude a general denial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[5] Statute of Limitations

A suit for refund, other than one brought under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5148* (state-assessed property), must be commenced within six months after the denial, in whole or in part, of a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(a)*]. If no notice of action on a claim for refund, other than an application for reduction of assessment intended to be a claim, is mailed within six months after the filing of the claim, the taxpayer may consider the claim rejected and bring a suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(b)*]. If the taxpayer has filed an application for reduction of assessment intended as a claim for refund, the claim is deemed denied on the later of either (1) the date that the final installment of taxes on the assessment becomes delinquent or (2) the date the final determination is made on the application [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5141(c)*].

[6] Jurisdiction, Venue, and Service

An action for refund is brought in the superior court (but not in the small claims division) in the county or city and county that is the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5140*]. If a county is named as a defendant because it collected the taxes in question for a city, the county is the defendant to be served. When the county receives the summons and complaint, it must notify the city within 30 days. The taxpayer must pay the county a fee to cover the county's cost of notifying the city. The city may intervene in the action or not [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5146*].

[7] Mandatory Dismissal for Failure to Serve Summons Within One Year

Summons in an action for refund of property taxes must be served and returned within one year after the date of the filing of the complaint. Otherwise, the action must be dismissed on the court's own motion or on the motion of the defendant. The time for service and return of summons may be extended by the filing of a written stipulation [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5147*]. The county's right to dismissal is waived if the county performs an act constituting a general appearance or answers within the one-year period or if, after the one-year period has passed, the county answers and participates in discovery without raising the objection [*Southern Pac. Transportation Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 438, 441-444, 221 Cal. Rptr. 12* ; *Synanon Foundation, Inc. v. County of Marin (1980) 133 Cal. App. 3d 607, 614-615,184 Cal. Rptr. 129* ; *but see Ford Motor Co. v. County of Tulare (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 688, 692-694, 193 Cal. Rptr. 511]* .

[8] Interest

A taxpayer generally is entitled to interest on taxes recovered in a suit forrefund, and the interest accrued is included in the judgment, if the amount of interest is at least $10. Interest is generally paid at the greater of 3 percent or the county pool apportioned rate [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5151(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 5153* (differing method of interest computation if auditor impounds revenue)]. Interest accrues from the later of either (1) the date the claim for refund is filed or (2) the date the taxes or the installments in question are paid [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5151(c)(1)*]. Interest is paid through the date that is 30 days before the date of mailing or personal delivery of the refund payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 5151(d)*].

[9] Attorney's Fees

In addition to other relief granted, a taxpayer who prevails in a refund suit in which the board's decision was the result of arbitrary and capricious action or conduct may collect attorney's fees of up to $7,500 under the statutory provision granting costs in civil actions resulting from administrative proceedings. This relief is available only if the taxpayer is personally obligated to pay the attorney's fees [*Gov. Code § 800(a)*]. Arbitrary and capricious action is not defined and depends on the facts in each case [*see Reeves v. City of Burbank (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 770, 776, 156 Cal. Rptr. 667* (city ordinance itself "arbitrary and capricious")].

[10] Cross References

For discussion and allegations of attorney's fees under *Gov Code § 800*, see *Ch. 474C, Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions, § 474C.13[6]*

[11] State Statutes

Court finding assessment void in whole or in part is empowered to render judgment for taxpayer for amount of taxes paid on void portion of assessment; portion of assessment not found void carries interest, penalties, and costs if paid after delinquency *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5144*

Owner of property that entered into installment redemption plan to pay delinquent taxes is entitled to commence refund suit, without paying all taxes due, when claim for first installment paid under plan of redemption is rejected. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5145*

Refund suit is entitled to scheduling priority. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5149*

[12] Decisions

[a] Dismissal for Failure to Return Summons Within One Year

Rev. & Tax. Code § 5147 does not violate of equal protection or due process, does not deprive refund-seeker of day in court, and bears reasonable relationship to legitimate state interest of requiring persons seeking refunds to proceed expeditiously. *Emberton v. County of San Diego (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 268, 270-272, 230 Cal. Rptr. 572*

Dismissal held proper; county's filing of motion to transfer almost simultaneously with filing of answer dos not lull plaintiff into failing to comply with return requirement and did not provide basis for estoppel. *Emberton v. County of San Diego (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 268, 272-273, 230 Cal. Rptr. 572*

Two-month delay between expiration of year and county's filing of motion for dismissal under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5147* was not unreasonable and was not reason to deny dismissal. *Emberton v. County of San Diego (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 268, 273, 230 Cal. Rptr. 572*

[b] Interest and Attorney's Fees

If attorney's fees can be awarded under both *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* and *Gov. Code § 800*, award should be made under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152*. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1160-1161, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

"Void" as used in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 5152* has ordinary meaning of invalid or erroneous; judicial finding of voidness is not required to award attorney's fees for application of improper valuation method. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1157-1159, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Failure to set reduction of assessment applications for hearing is possible basis for award of attorney's fees. *Midstate Theatres Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 204, 212, 119 Cal. Rptr. 894*

Assessment unsubstantiated by any evidence was so arbitrary and capricious as to warrant award of attorney's fees. *Madonna v. County of San Luis Obispo (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 62, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916*

[c] Payment Required to Contest Tax

In addition to exhausting administrative remedies, taxpayer is required to pay contested property taxes in full before initiating suit for refund. *Sherman v. Quinn (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 661, 665, 192 P.2d 17*

Payment requirement is unsatisfied by payment of only one installment. *Faix, Ltd. v. County of Los Angeles (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1001, 127 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Delinquent payment of taxes is no bar to refund suit. *McHugh v. County of Santa Cruz (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 533, 540, 109 Cal. Rptr. 149*

[d] Scope of Judicial Review

Challenge to valuation method is question of law not restricting trial court by "substantial evidence" standard from reviewing board's decision; challenge to method of valuation is reviewable for arbitrariness, abuse of discretion, or failure to follow standards prescribed by law; new evidence is admissible in superior court to establish deficiencies in board's determination. *Bret Harte Inn, Inc. v. San Francisco (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 14, 22, 127 Cal. Rptr. 154, 544 P.2d*

1354 ; *De Luz Homes, Inc. v. County of San Diego (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 546,*

Court of appeal is not authorized to determine amount of tax due, but, after determining proper method to be used for valuation, must remand to board of assessment appeals for determination of fair market value. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1142, 1161-1162, 236 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Scope of review in superior court is limited to determining whether substantial evidence supports assessment; if it does not, taxpayer is not entitled to trial de novo in superior court but to remand to board of assessment appeals for consideration of additional evidence. *Kaiser Center, Inc. v. County of Alameda (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 978, 982-984, 234 Cal. Rptr. 603*

Taxpayer is successful in challenging board's valuation of property if no evidence supports board's valuation. *Madonna v. County of San Luis Obispo (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 57, 61, 113 Cal. Rptr. 916*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.513-540.529

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.513[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.530

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.530 Petition to State Board of Equalization for Redetermination of Sales or Use Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6538, 6561, 6561.5]

[1] FORM Petition to State Board of Equalization for Redetermination of Sales or Use Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6538, 6561, 6561.5]
TO: Petitions Section, MIC:38

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
P.O. Box 942879
Sacramento, CA 94279-0038
Attention: Petition Unit.
PETITION FOR REDETERMINATION OF _____ [SALES *and/or* USE] TAX

Re: Determination_____ [*insert any numbers or symbols from SBE's notice of determination*] dated _____

Regarding liability of
_____
_____
_____
[*taxpayer name and address*]

Petitioner alleges:

1. On_____ [*date*], petitioner was served with a notice of deficiency of_____ [sales *and/or* use] taxes determined against him/her/it pursuant to *Section 6481 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*.

1. On_____ [*date*], petitioner was served with a notice of estimate, determination, and penalty

resulting from nonpayment of California_____ [sales *and/or* use] taxes, determined against him/her/it pursuant to *Section 6511 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*.

1. Petitioner is a person directly interested in the tax determination made against_____ [*name of person against whom determination was made*] on_____ [*date*], pursuant to Section_____ [*6481 or 6511*] of the Revenue and Taxation Code in that _____ [*state reason petitioner is directly interested, e.g.*, petitioner is a successor in interest to the business formerly owned by _____ (*name of person against whom determination was made*) and therefore is liable for outstanding taxesincurred during the operation of the business by its predecessor during the period covered by the determination].

2. The determination was, and is, erroneous in that _____ [*set forth facts and legal theory in detail, e.g.*, the good faith acceptance of a resalecertificate from the purchaser relieves the seller of liability for sales tax under *Section 6092 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*. At the time of the sale of the property that is the subject of the determination, _____ (Petitioner *or* Petitioner's predecessor) in good faith accepted a valid resale certificate from _____ (*name of purchaser*), who was then engaged in the business of selling tangible personal property and held a valid state seller's permit. _____ (Petitioner *or* Petitioner's predecessor) has retained this certificate for inspection by the State Board of Equalization].

3. Petitioner requests that an appeals conference and a hearing on this petition be scheduled and that the determination be _____ [annulled *or* revised as follows: _____].

[4. Petitioner tenders herewith _____ (*describe security or bond, e.g.*, the bond of _____ (*name of surety*) in the penal sum of $_____ in favor of the State of California) to stay collection of amounts determined by the State Board of Equalization to be in jeopardy during the pendency of this redetermination.]

Dated: _____.
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition is for use by a person against whom a deficiency determination has been made, or by a person directly interested in a deficiency determination made against another person, to initiate a redetermination [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6538, 6561*]. Although no statute explicitly requires a petition for redetermination as a prerequisite to suit, case law considers the filing of a petition for redetermination one of the administrative remedies that taxpayers must exhaust before filing suit to contest an assessment or seek a refund [*People v. West Publishing Co. (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 80, 87-88, 216 P.2d 441]* .

It should be noted that a taxpayer that files a petition for redetermination risks a second audit. The SBE has the power to conduct a second examination after the petition is filed, and there is no limitation on the amount that the SBE can assert as a deficiency [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6481, 6563*; *Maganini v. Quinn (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 1, 5-7, 221 P.2d 241* ; *see § 540.530[7]*].

[3] Allegations

The petition must be in writing and must set forth the specific grounds on which it relies. The petition may be amended to set forth additionalgrounds at any time before the SBE issues its order or decision on the petition [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561.5*; *see also* Appeals Procedures, Sales and Use Taxes and Special Taxes, SBE Publication 17, p. 2-3 (July 1999) (petition can be in form of simple letter; it must identify amounts wished to be contested and state specific grounds or reasons why tax or fee not owed; petition should also include tax or fee program account number)].

The form alleges:

- The taxpayer's name and address and the date and any symbols set forth on the notice of determination (caption).

- Either the service of a notice of deficiency determination (first alternative Paragraph 1) or a notice of determination of nonpayment of taxes (second alternative Paragraph 1), or petitioner's standing as a person directly interested (third alternative Paragraph 1) [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6481, 6511, 6561*].

- A statement of the relevant facts and the legal argument showing the determination to be erroneous (Paragraph 2) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561.5*].

- A request for an appeals conference and a hearing (Paragraph 3) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6562* (oral hearing shall be granted if requested in petition)].

- The posting of security, which is an optional allegation that is necessary if the determination involves jeopardy assessments (Paragraph 4) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538*].

[4] Verification

The petition need not be verified, but should be signed by the petitioner or the petitioner's account or attorney [*see 18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5212(a)(4)* (signed by petitioner or petitioner's "authorized representative")]. If the person representing the taxpayer is neither an attorney nor a certified public accountant, the SBE in practice requires written proof of authority. Apparently, the proof may be a formal power of attorney or a letter from the petitioner confirming the representative's authority.

[5] Service of Petition

The SBE encourages the use of electronic means (facsimile, e-mail, etc.) for the filing of petitions and related documents. Instructions are provided on the SBE website at http://www.boe.ca.gov [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5216(a)*]. The petition may instead be hand-delivered to the SBE headquarters in Sacramento or mailed to Petitions Section, MIC:38, State Board of Equalization, P.O. Box 942879, Sacramento, California 94279-0038 [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5216(b)(1)*]. The use of certified mail with a return receipt requested, date stamped at the post office, is recommended.

[6] Statute of Limitations

A petition for redetermination that does not involve a jeopardy assessment mustbe filed within 30 days after service of the notice of determination [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6561*]. A petition for redetermination of a deficiency determination concerning payment for cigarette tax stamps or meter register settings, however, must be filed within 10 days, rather than 30 days, after service of the notice of determination and security must be deposited at the time of filing the petition [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 30174, 30175*]. In the case of a determination involving a jeopardy assessment (which must be noted on the face of the determination), the petition for redetermination must be filed within 10 days after service of the notice of determination, and, within that 10 days, the petitioner must deposit with the SBE whatever security the SBE deems necessary [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6538*].

[7] Hearing and Determination

The SBE must consider a timely filed petition and, if requested in the petition, grant an oral hearing on 10 days' notice of the time and place of the hearing. The SBE may continue the hearing from time to time as necessary [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6562*]. In practice, the SBE generally holds an informal preliminary appeals conference [*see § 540.190[4]*].

The SBE is authorized to increase or decrease the amount of the determination before it becomes final, but the amount may be increased only if the SBE asserts a claim for the increase at or before the hearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(a)*; *see § 540.190[5]*]. The SBE must specify the information on which it bases its increase [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6563(c)*].

The SBE's order on the petition becomes final 30 days after service of notice of the order on the petitioner, at which time the determination becomes due and payable [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6564, 6565*].

[8] State Statutes

Service of notice of deficiency determination. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6486*

Determination when no return is filed. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6511-6515*

Jeopardy determinations. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6536-6539*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.531

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.531 Claim for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6902, 6904]

[1] FORM Claim for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6902, 6904]

To: Refunds Section, MIC:39
State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 942879
Sacramento, California 94279-0039

CLAIM FOR REFUND

Re: Account No. _____

_____ [*name of person required to file the return*] hereby claims a refund of_____ [sales *and/or* use] taxes and interest [and penalties] thereon, in the total amount of $_____[, which sum represents _____ (partial payments *and/or* involuntary collections) _____ (made *and/or* effected) between _____ (*date within past six months*) and the date of this claim on liability,] for the following:

(1) Overpayment of taxes for the taxable period _____, to_____ [*dates*], in the amount of $_____; [and]

[(2) _____ percent penalty for _____ (*specify applicable penalty, e.g.,* fraud or evasion) in the amount of $_____; (and)]

[(3) Interest on the _____ (overpayment *and/or* penalty) in the amount of $_____.]

The specific grounds on which the claim is founded are as follows: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* The gross receipts from the sale of hot prepared food products sold by caterers to air carriers engaged in interstate or foreign commerce for consumption by passengers of the air carrier are exempt from sales and use taxes under *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6359.1*. The overpayment referred to above results from the inclusion in gross receipts of $_____ representing sales by claimant of hot prepared food products to _____ (*names*), air carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, for consumption by their passengers].

Date: _____.
_____ [*authorized signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a taxpayer (or a person required to file a return) as a first step in seeking a refund of state and/or local sales or use taxes [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6902, 6904(a), 7202(b)-(d), 7203(a)*]. A suit for refund of sales and usetax may not be maintained until a claim for refund has been filed and the SBE has either denied the claim or failed to act on it for six months [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6932, 6934*]. The bracketed text in the first paragraph is for use if the tax or a deficiency assessment has been partially paid in installments or by a combination of involuntary collections and installments. The six-month limitation of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)* (*see § 540.552[5]*) commences with each partial payment. If the taxpayer waits until all payments are made to file a claim for refund, only payments made during the six months before the filing date may be refunded [*Chahine v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 485, 489-490, 272 Cal. Rptr. 56* ; *cf.* *State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 633, 638-643, 217 Cal. Rptr. 238, 703 P.2d 1131* (suit for refund as not maintainable on basis of partial payment but only after entire amount is paid)].

The payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see* *Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 323-330, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to challenge directed only to an interest assessment)]. Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest in this regard and need not be paid before an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see* *Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268]* . In any event, the taxpayer should consider paying any assessed penalty and interest before or at the time of filing a claim for refund to foreclose the possibility of any collection activity being commenced by the SBE to collect them.

This form is not sufficient for a claim filed for or on behalf of a class of taxpayers [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904(b)*].

Many city charters or ordinances make the filing of a claim a prerequisite to suit against the city to recover business taxes on gross receipts [*see* *Cal. Cigarette Concessions v. City of Los Angeles (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 865, 868, 3 Cal. Rptr. 675, 350 P.2d 715]* . If the city or county ordinance makes no provisions for the filing of claims, a claim is nontheless required and is governed by *Gov. Code § 900 et seq.* [*Volkswagen Pacific, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 48, 60-63, 101 Cal. Rptr. 869, 496 P.2d 1237]* . The foregoing form can be adapted for use as a claim against a city.

The SBE has a form of refund claim, but its use is not mandatory [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904*].

[3] Allegations

A refund claim must state the specific grounds on which the claim is founded [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6904(a)*]. All of the facts and legal arguments on which the taxpayer relies must be carefully presented because a subsequent refund suit is

limited to the grounds presented in the claimfor refund [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*; *see Swaggart v. Calif. Equalization Bd. (1990) 493 U.S. 378, 110 S. Ct. 688, 107 L. Ed. 2d 796, 814-815* (refusing to determine Commerce and Due Process Clauses issues because not stated in claim); *Chahine v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 485, 488, 272 Cal. Rptr. 56* (refusing to consider due process issues not raised in claim); *but see Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 206-207, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148* (courts may consider contention that is intertwined with contentions expressly raised in refund claim)]. A statement that the tax was "erroneously and illegally" collected and computed is insufficient [*King v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1014-1015, 99 Cal. Rptr. 802]* .

[4] Signature

A claim for refund must be signed by the taxpayer or the taxpayer's authorized representative [*18 Cal. Code Reg. § 5232(a)*]. If a corporate or fictitious business name is appropriate, it should be used and followed by an authorized signature.

[5] Statute of Limitations

A claim for refund must be filed with SBE by the latest of the following dates [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6902(a)*; *see § 540.231*]:

- Three years after the last day of the month following the close of the taxable period for which the overpayment was made;

- Six months after the date that the overpayment was made; or

- If the person required to file the return is seeking recovery of amounts paid pursuant to an SBE determination (including jeopardy determinations), six months from the date the determination became final.

[6] Interest and Penalties

Penalties are discussed in *§ 540.320[1]*. The provisions for interest on refunds are discussed in *§§ 540.170[2], 540.230[3][a]*.

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms of claims against public entities, other than those provided by the Revenue and Taxation Code, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

[8] State Statutes

Approval of State Board of Control as required before SBE can refund in excess of $50,000. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6901*

Failure to file timely claim for refund as waiver. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6905*

Person claiming exemption from use tax based on payment of sales tax as required to prove that vendor paid sales tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6903*

SBE as required to serve notice of disallowance of claim for refund within 30 days of its action on claim. *Rev. & Tax.*

Code § 6906

[9] Decisions

Taxpayer who fails to provide SBE with adequate documentation for determination of claim for refund is barred by failure to exhaust administrative remedies from bringing suit for refund. *Duffy v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1174-1175, 199 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Barnes v. State Bd. of Equalization (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 994, 1001-1002* ;

Notice of disallowance of claim is not required to be directed to particular individuals acting on behalf of corporation in specific matter involved, even if SBE has knowledge of those individuals; notice addressed to corporation is sufficient. *Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 149, 152-153, 285 P.2d 305*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.532

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.532 Complaint for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933]

[1] FORM Complaint for Refund of Sales or Use Taxes [Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____ [Sacramento *or* Los Angeles *or* San Francisco *or* San Diego]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION,	)	COMPLAINT FOR REFUND OF
Defendant.	)	_____ [SALES *and/or* USE]
	)	TAXES
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, plaintiff was and is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of California [*or other appropriate allegations of residence and capacity*].

2. Defendant State Board of Equalization is, and at all material times herein was, an agency of the State of California charged by law with the duty of administering the California Sales and Use Tax Law. This action is brought against defendant under authority of *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 6933*.

3. Plaintiff filed California Sales and Use Tax returns with defendant when due for all quarters of each calendar year

since_____ [*date*], reported taxes payable on each such return, and paid the taxes so reported to defendant when due.

4. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant audited certain records of plaintiff, and sent plaintiff a Notice of Determination under the Sales and Use Tax Law, dated_____ [*date*], stating that a deficiency in sales and use taxes in the amount of $_____, [a _____ percent penalty for _____ (*specify, e.g.,* fraud or evasion) in the amount of $_____,] and interest in the amount of $_____ as of the date of the Notice of Determination were due, for the period commencing _____, and ending_____ [*dates*].

5. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff timely filed a Petition for Redetermination with defendant, requesting a hearing. On_____ [*date*], a hearing before defendant was held. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff received a Notice of Action on Petition for Redetermination from defendant denying the petition and assessing a deficiency in the amounts as follows:

a. Deficiency in sales and use taxes for the period _____, to _____ [*dates*]	$_____
b. Interest on the deficiency at _____ percent to _____ [*date*]	$_____
[c. _____ percent penalty for _____ (*specify, e.g.,* fraud or evasion)	$_____]
Total Assessment:	$_____

6. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff paid the amount of $_____ [*specify the amount and what it represents e.g.,* representing the assessed tax, penalty and interest under the deficiency assessment].

[7. No part of the deficiency determined by defendant was due to fraud or to intentional disregard of or intent to evade the Sales and Use Tax Law or any rules and regulations adopted under the law. The fraud penalty of $_____ was erroneously and unlawfully imposed.]

[8. Of the total asserted deficiency in taxes of $_____, $_____ was imposed for the period commencing _____, and ending_____ [*dates*]. That portion of the deficiency ($_____) is, and was, barred by the three-year statute of limitations under *Section 6487 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*. Interest, which was paid by plaintiff on that amount to_____ [*date*], totals $_____.]

9. The asserted deficiency of $_____ for the period commencing _____, and ending_____ [*dates*], was erroneously and illegally determined by defendant in that_____ [*briefly state reason, e.g.,* exempt transactions as well as transactions for which plaintiff had accepted resale certificates in good faith were included in the gross receipts on which taxes were imposed], as is more fully set out in the Claim for Refund, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A," and incorporated herein as if set out in full.

10. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff discovered that it had erroneously assessed its sales and use tax liability for the period _____, to_____ [*date*], and had made an overpayment of $_____ on_____ [*date*]. The error was occasioned by_____ [*briefly state reason, e.g.,* the inclusion in the sales base on which taxes were calculated of exempt transactions and transactions for which plaintiff had accepted resale certificates in good faith], as is more fully set out in the Claim for

Refund, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A," and incorporated herein as if set out in full.

11. The claim for refund of the amounts_____ [paid *or* overpaid] as alleged in Paragraph_____ [6 *or* 10] above was timely filed with defendant on_____ [*date*]. The claim for refund _____ [was denied on or about_____ [*date*] *or* has not been acted on by defendant for six months since its filing and plaintiff elects to consider the inaction as a rejection of the claim]._____ [*Further allege nature and adverse results of any other hearing held. Show that all administrative remedies that were available to plaintiff were exhausted and that plaintiff cooperated with SBE in providing information necessary for the evaluation of the claim, resulting in a denial of plaintiff's claim for refund.*]

12. Neither the whole, nor any portion of the amounts paid by plaintiff as alleged above have been refunded to, or applied for the benefit of plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, or such larger amount as provided by law;

2. For interest as provided by law; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a taxpayer to recover state and/or local sales and use taxes, plus any applicable penalties and interest, from the SBE [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6933, 7202(b), (d), 7203(a)*]. It can be adapted for use either if the assessment was the result of an audit and deficiency determination [*see* Paragraphs 4-9] or if taxes were erronously self-assessed [*see* Paragraph 10]. Counsel should choose the appropriate paragraphs according to the facts involved and renumber the remaining paragraphs accordingly.

[3] Allegations

The complaint contains allegations of residence and of capacity of both plaintiff and defendant (Paragraphs 1, 2) and allegations that returns have been filed and taxes paid for the taxable periods at issue (Paragraph 3). The following allegations of receipt of a Notice of Determination from the SBE are appropriate only in situations involving deficiency determination. They allege:

- Interest and penalty for fraud or evasion (Paragraph 4).

- Timely filing of a Petition for Redetermination; of hearing on the petition for redetermination; of receipt of a Notice of Action on Petition for Redetermination unfavorable to plaintiff specifying the amount of tax, interest, and penalty determined (Paragraph 5).

- That plaintiff paid the tax, and other amounts if paid (Paragraph 6).

- That the determination for the contested period was illegally imposed (Paragraph 9). It is not

sufficient simply to state that taxes were erroneously imposed. However, the grounds specified in the claim for refund limit the relief which can be granted in the action, and therefore a brief statement of those grounds and incorporation of the claim is sufficient [*King v. State Bd. of Equalization (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1015, 99 Cal. Rptr. 802* ; *see Preston v. State Bd. of Equalization (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 197, 206-207, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407, 19 P.3d 1148* (court may consider contention that is intertwined with contentions expressly raised in refund claim)].

Optional allegations are also included pertaining to the bar of the statute of limitations on the assessment of the deficiency (optional Paragraph 8) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6487*], and to the assessment of a penalty for fraud or evasion (portions of Paragraphs 4 and 5 and optional Paragraph 7).

If the overpayment was erroneously self-assessed, Paragraph 10 should be used in place of Paragraphs 4-9. Paragraph 10 alleges discovery of the erroneously self-assessed taxes in the amount and for the period specified.

The form includes allegations, which must be used in either situation, of the timely filing of the claim for refund and cooperation in its evaluation, including incorporation of the claim into the complaint, of the denial of the claim or election to deem the SBE's inaction on the claim for six months as a denial (Paragraph 11), and that no part of the overpaid tax or assessment has been refunded to plaintiff or applied to other liabilities of plaintiff (Paragraph 12) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6932-6935*; *see also Honeywell, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 897, 906, 122 Cal. Rptr. 237* (failure to allege election to deem six months' inaction as a denial resulted in trial court's erroneous determination that suit for refund was premature)].

With regard to Paragraph 6, it has been held that payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (construing *Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; SBE's prepayment policy may not be enforced insofar as it requires prepayment of interest before a tax refund claim will be considered; court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to consideration of challenge directed only to an interest assessment)]. Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest in this regard and need not be paid before an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268]* . In any event, the taxpayer should consider paying any assessed penalty and interest before or at the time of filing a claim for refund to foreclose the possibility of any collection activity being commenced by the SBE to collect them.

[4] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required. A public entity or officer need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. However, verification of a complaint does preclude a general denial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[5] Jurisdiction, Venue, and Service

The action may be brought in the superior court in any city or city and county in which the State attorney General has an office [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*]. The action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(1)*]. The Attorney General maintains offices in Sacramento, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco counties.

Personal service of the summons and complaint may be made by delivering a copy of them to the Chairperson of the Board, or to the Executive Director or Acting Executive Director in his or her absence, or to any person designated to accept service by the Executive Director, at 450"N" Street, Sacramento, California 95814 [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*

]. Service by mail may be made by mailing a copy of the summons and complaint along with two copies of a notice of acknowledgement and a return envelope, postage prepaid, to the above-named persons [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.30*].

[6] Statute of Limitations

A suit for refund must be filed within 90 days after the date of mailing of the SBE's Notice of Action on the Claim for Refund or all are deemed waived [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6933*]. If the SBE fails to mail notice of action on the claim within six months after the date of filing of the claim, the taxpayer may treat the nonaction as a denial and file suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6934*]. In this situation, the taxpayer could also, after the six-month period had elapsed, wait for the SBE to mail notice and then bring an action within 90 days of the mailing [*see* Code Commission Notes to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6934*].

[7] Application of Judgment and Interest

If judgment is rendered for the taxpayer, the amount of the judgment is first credited against any outstanding sales or use tax liability of thetaxpayer, with the balance being directly refunded to the taxpayer [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6935*].

Interest is allowed at the rate and for the period discussed in *§ 540.232[8]* [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 6936*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 6591.5* (modified adjusted rate);*see §§ 540.170[1], [2], [4]*; *540.230[3][c]*].

[8] State Statutes

Prohibition against injunction or other process to prevent collection of tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*

[9] Decisions

Standard of court's review of challenge to validity of regulation is whether regulation is arbitrary, capricious, or without rational basis. *Wallace Berrie & Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 60, 66, 219 Cal. Rptr. 142, 707 P.2d 204* ; *Delta Air Lines v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 518, 524-525, 528-529, 262 Cal. Rptr. 803*

Although refund claim only indirectly raised challenge to validity of regulation, SBE'S failure to raise alleged jurisdictional defect at trial and proffer of proposed finding that regulation was not arbitrary, capricious, or patently unreasonable estopped SBE from asserting on appeal that taxpayer failed to exhaust administrative remedies. *Wallace Berrie & Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 60, 66 n.2, 219 Cal. Rptr. 142, 707 P.2d 204*

Suit for refund cannot be maintained on basis of partial payment of disputed tax; entire amount must be paid prior to suit. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 633, 638-643, 217 Cal. Rptr. 238, 703 P.2d 1131* (disapproving *Snoozie Shaving, Inc. v. State Board of Equalization (1975) 97 Cal. App. 3d 771, 158 Cal. Rptr. 866* , and *Schaffer v. State Bd. of Equalization (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 574, 241 P.2d 46* to extent inconsistent); *but see Chahine v. State Bd. of Equalization (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 485, 489-490, 272 Cal. Rptr. 56* (as required to be filed within six months of each partial payment)

Standard of court's review of validity of SBE regulation is whether regulation was arbitrary or capricious or had no reasonable or rational basis; SBE interpretation of regulation is question of law and thus subject to broader review standard. *Culligan Water Conditioning v. State Bd. of Equalization (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 86, 92-93, 130 Cal. Rptr. 321, 550 P.2d 593* ; *Cal-Metal Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 759, 763-764, 207 Cal. Rptr. 783*

Interstate airline carriers have standing pursuant to *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6385, 6421* to seek and sue for refunds of sales

taxes paid by seller of fuel purchased by carrier and apportioned, on basis of estimate provided by carrier to retailer, between intrastate and extrastate use. *Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 518, 525-528, 262 Cal. Rptr. 803*

Purchaser who can reach refund to vendor who has claim pending has remedy and thus lacks standing to sue for refund of sales tax if vendor was actual taxpayer. *State Bd. of Equalization v. Superior Court (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 568, 571, 169 Cal. Rptr. 3*

Voluntary payment is not recoverable even if deficiency determination was issued after limitation period runs. *Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 532, 536-538, 114 Cal. Rptr. 515*

SBE is barred from retention of deficiency assessed after limitation period if it did not meet its burden of proof regarding fraud, which would have extended limitation period. *Marchica v. State Board of Equalization (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 501, 512-513, 237 P.2d 725*

Failure to file correct return and omission of items that should have been included held insufficient to establish fraud. *Marchica v. State Board of Equalization (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 501, 507-510, 237 P.2d 725*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. SALES AND USE TAXES

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.533-540.549

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.533[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.550

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.550 Complaint for Determination of Residency to Avoid Liability for California Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381]

[1] FORM Complaint for Determination of Residency to Avoid Liability for California Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF
_____ [SACRAMENTO *or* LOS ANGELES *or* SAN FRANCISCO]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR DETERMINATION OF RESID-
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD,	)	ENCY TO AVOID LIABILITY FOR CALIFORNIA
Defendant.	)	PERSONAL INCOME TAX
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, plaintiff _____ [*name*] was and is a resident of the State of _____ [*state of residence*].

2. Defendant Franchise Tax Board is and at all times mentioned herein was an agency of the State of California, organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the state, particularly *Government Code Sections 15700-15702*. Defendant is empowered to assess and collect taxes under the Personal Income Tax Law of the State of California.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this court to hear and determine this suit for determination of residency against defendant by the provisions of *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 19381* and of *Code of Civil Procedure Section 401*.

4. During the calendar year _____, plaintiff was a resident of the State of _____. Plaintiff has been a resident of the State of _____ since_____ [*date*]. During the calendar year _____, plaintiff _____ [*give specific facts establishing residency in state other than California, e.g.,* maintained a home in _____ (*state*), and all of his/her family, including plaintiff's children, their families, and plaintiff's grandchildren resided in that state. Plaintiff maintained all of his/her business interests in _____ (*state*) during this period, including his/her investment interests, checking and savings accounts, and real property investments. Plaintiff maintained the majority of his/her social contacts in _____ (*state*) during this period, including his/her membership in various professional associations, including, but not limited to, _____ (*specify*). In addition,plaintiff's long-standing personal physician, attorney, and stock broker are professionals licensed by the State of _____, and plaintiff's automobile was and is registered and insured in that state]. Plaintiff also filed a resident personal income tax return for the calendar year _____ in the State of _____.

5. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff traveled to _____, California for purposes of _____ [*give reason for being in California demonstrating intention that the stay was temporary, e.g.,* vacation and visiting friends who reside in the area. Plaintiff rented a house located at _____ Street, _____, California. Plaintiff also opened a bank account, numbered _____, with _____ (*name and location of bank*), for use in paying expenses during his/her visit in California]. Plaintiff's intention was to remain in California _____ [*specify period of time plaintiff intended to stay in state, e.g.,* for _____ months, or until _____ (*date*)]. During the time plaintiff remained in California, plaintiff engaged in no income-earning activities, made no investments in California, established no business or professional ties in California, formed no important social ties in this state, and engaged in no acts or transactions inconsistent with his/her intention of being in California as a visitor.

6. On_____ [*date*], defendant issued to plaintiff a Notice of Deficiency Assessment, No. _____, which determined that plaintiff owed California personal income tax of $_____ for the calendar year _____, plus interest of $_____, for a total balance due of $_____, on the basis that plaintiff was a resident of the State of California during the calendar year. A copy of the Notice of Deficiency Assessment is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

7. On_____ [*date*], pursuant to *Sections 19041* and *19381 of the Revenue and Taxation Code*, plaintiff filed a Protest of Deficiency Assessment with defendant. A copy of the Protest is attached as Exhibit B, and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff by this reference hereby expressly realleges each and every allegation and fact made or stated in the Protest of Deficiency Assessment and all exhibits attached thereto.

8. Defendant denied plaintiff's Protest of Deficiency Assessment by a Notice of Action on Cancellation, Credit, or Refund dated _____. The Notice of Action is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

9. Plaintiff appealed the action of defendant by filing a Notice of Appeal with the California State Board of Equalization dated _____. A copy of the Notice of Appeal is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference.

On_____ [*date*], the California State Board of Equalization rejected plaintiff's appeal from the defendant's determination.

10. This action is brought against defendant on the grounds that its ruling of_____ [*date*], disallowing in its entirety plaintiff's Protest of Deficiency Assessment for calendar year _____ based on plaintiff's alleged California residency is erroneous, unconstitutional, and without authorityof law. By these reasons, plaintiff alleges that the whole, and every part, of the proposed deficiency assessment for personal income tax for calendar year _____ is illegal.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For a declaration that plaintiff has been a nonresident of California for the calendar year _____, and

2. For reasonable attorney's fees;

3. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a resident of a state other than California for a determination of residency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236* (dismissal of deficiency assessment as not authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5* or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381* in action for determination of residency)]. The FTB is the proper defendant. A suit for determination of residency is the only lawsuit a taxpayer may file under the California Personal Income Tax Law without first having paid the disputed tax involved [*see Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1346-1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236* (postponement of collection of tax is valid and constitutional; *see § 540.302*]. The form is for use in determining residency and tax liability for only a single year [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*]. The complaint may be modified for use if tax liability of more than one year is contested. If the suit involves determinations for more than one year, the facts regarding each year's residency should be set forth in a separate Cause of Action. Each should follow the format of this form, either incorporating matters alleged in the first cause of action or alleging specific facts regarding the residency determination for that year.

An action for determination of residency is entitled to preference on the trial calendar [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3*; *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236]* .

[3] Allegations

A determination of residency is made on the basis of all the facts and circumstances in each case. Besides the usual allegations as to plaintiff'sresidency and the FTB's status, capacity, and jurisdiction (Paragraphs 1-3) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*], a cause of action must include allegations of all the facts that support plaintiff's status as a resident of another state (Paragraph 4), and allegations that show that plaintiff's purpose for being in California was temporary or transitory (Paragraph 5). The factual material in the foregoing complaint is a narrow example, and facts alleged in any

particular cause of action must be adapted to fit the facts and circumstances of each individual plaintiff.

Other essential allegations are the FTB's issuance of a Notice of Deficiency Assessment and the plaintiff's protest of same (Paragraphs 6, 7) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*], the FTB's denial of the protest (Paragraph 8) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*], plaintiff's appeal of the denial of the protest to the SBE, the SBE's decision adverse to plaintiff, and plaintiff's institution of this action within 60 days after the SBE's adverse decision became final (Paragraph 9) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*]. The grounds addressed in the suit are limited to the grounds specified in the original protest [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*].

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

Although a nonresident does not have to pay a deficiency before commencing suit to determine residency, he or she must first exhaust available administrative remedies [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*], which include the following:

- Filing a written protest with the FTB within 60 days after the date the deficiency assessment was mailed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041(a)*], and

- Appealing the FTB's denial of the protest to the SBE within 30 days after the date the FTB's action on the protest is mailed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(a)*].

The FTB must include the deadline for filing a protest in notices of proposed deficiency assessment mailed after December 31, 1999. Any protest filed with the FTB on or before that deadline must be treated as timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19034(b)-(c), 19041(b), (c)*]. Similarly, with regard to any FTB notice of action on the protest mailed after December 31, 1999, any appeal to the SBE by the taxpayer on or before the date for filing an appeal specified in the notice (under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(b)(1)*) must be treated as timely filed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19045(b)(2)*].

[5] Statute of Limitations

A suit for determination of residency must be commenced within 60 days afterthe determination of the SBE becomes final [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*]. The determination of the SBE becomes final 30 days after the date of determination unless the taxpayer or the FTB files a petition forrehearing during that time, in which case the SBE's determination becomes final 30 days after issuance of its opinion on the petition for rehearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19048*].

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

Suits for determination of residency may be brought only in the superior courts of San Francisco, Sacramento, and Los Angeles counties as unlimited civil cases [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 1060.5*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*].

[7] Verification

A public entity need not verify its answer even though the complaint is verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. However, the verification of a complaint against a public entity in an unlimited civil case in superior court does preclude a general denial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[8] Collection of Tax During Pendency of Action

No tax based solely on the residence of an individual may be collected until 60 days after the SBE's action on the individual's appeal becomes final. If the individual commences an action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381* during that 60-day period, no tax can be collected during the pendency of that action unless collection as a jeopardy assessment would otherwise be proper [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*; *see Franchise Tax Bd. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1343, 1346-1349, 261 Cal. Rptr. 236* (postponement of collection of tax as valid and constitutional; *see § 540.302*)].

[9] Attorney's Fees and Costs

Litigation costs including attorney fees are payable to a taxpayer who is a prevailing party [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19717*; *see § 540.305*].

[10] State Statutes

Nonresidents and part-year residents, except those defined as heads of household, are required to pay tax on income derived from sources in *California. Rev. & Tax. Code § 17041(b), (i)*

Head of household defined. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17042*

Certain credits are proportionally available to part-year residents and nonresidents. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 17055*

Gross income of nonresidents. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17951-17955*

Nonresidents are entitled to certain credits for taxes paid to state of residence. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18002*

[11] Decisions

California resident who intended to move to Colorado at time he sold securities but who had not actually moved as of date of sale was still California resident for purpose of being taxed on gain from sale. *Noble v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 560, 569, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 363* (detailing facts supporting that conclusion)

[12] Law Reviews

Note, *Personal Income Tax--Vacation Homeowners in State for Transitory Purpose Retain Nonresident Status Despite Spending More Time In California Than in Home State-- Klemp v. Franchise Tax Board, 45 Cal. App. 3d 870, 119 Cal. Rptr. 821 (1975) , 16 Santa Clara L. Rev. 176 (1975)*

138 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.551

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.551 Complaint for Refund of Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382]

[1] FORM Complaint for Refund of Personal Income Tax [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF
_____ [LOS ANGELES *or*
SAN FRANCISCO *or* SACRAMENTO *or* SAN DIEGO]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR REFUND OF PERSONAL IN-
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD,	)	COME TAXES
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, plaintiff_____ [*name*] was and is a resident of the State of California.

2. [*Allegation of status and capacity of defendant Franchise Tax Board. see § 540.550, Paragraph 2.*]

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this court to hear and determine this suit for refund of taxes against defendant as a case of

unlimited jurisdiction by the provisions of *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 19382* and of *Code of Civil Procedure Sections 86(a)* and *401*. Venue is proper pursuant to *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 19388* in that the Attorney General maintains an office in this county.

4. During calendar year _____, plaintiff _____ [*allege facts and circumstances supporting plaintiff's claim for refund, whether based on entitlement to deduction or credit, or to have income taxed as capital gain rather than ordinary income, e.g.,* incurred expenses totaling $_____, which amounts were personally spent by plaintiff in the course of his/her business, and which were ordinary and necessary automobile, advertising, travel, and entertainment expenses. The amounts were entered in the books of the business]. A schedule detailing these amounts is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff kept records and receipts for the amounts_____ [spent *and/or* contributed *and/or* lost]. A copy of these records and receipts is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

5. On or about_____ [*date*], pursuant to the California Personal Income Tax Law, plaintiff filed with defendant a return of income for the calendar year ending_____ [*date*]. In that return, _____ [*describe parts of return about which defendant has proposed a deficiency assessment, e.g.,* plaintiff took as a deduction from gross income the amount of $_____ as ordinary and necessary business expenses, under the circumstances and in the manner alleged in Paragraph 4 above]. The return was accompanied by a remittance payable to the order of defendant in the amount of $_____, which sum constituted the full amount of personal income tax shown on the return to be due from plaintiff to defendant for the calendar year.

6. On_____ [*date*], defendant issued to plaintiff a Notice of Proposed Deficiency Assessment, No. _____, which determined that plaintiff owed California personal income tax of $_____ for calendar year _____, plus interest of $_____, for a total balance due of $_____. The notice was based on_____ [*specify basis for alleged deficiency, e.g.,* defendant's proposed disallowance of the deductions from gross income taken by plaintiff in the calendar year for ordinary and necessary business expenses] in the manner and amounts as set forth above. A copy of the Notice of Proposed Deficiency Assessment is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

[7. On _____ (*date*), within 60 days after the mailing of the Notice of Proposed Deficiency Assessment, plaintiff filed a protest with defendant against the additional tax proposed to be assessed. A copy of the protest is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff by this reference hereby expressly realleges each and every allegation and fact made or stated in the protest and all exhibits attached to it.]

[8. Defendant denied plaintiff's protest by a Notice of Action on Cancellation, Credit, or Refund dated _____. The Notice of Action is attached as Exhibit E and incorporated by reference.]

[9. Plaintiff appealed the action of defendant by filing a Notice of Appeal with the California State Board of Equalization dated _____. A copy of the Notice of Appeal is attached as Exhibit F and incorporated by reference. On _____ (*date*), the State Board of Equalization rejected plaintiff's appeal from the determination of defendant. A copy of the State Board of Equalization's notice of determination of the appeal is attached as Exhibit G and incorporated by reference.]

10. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff mailed a remittance payable to the order of defendant in the full amount of the proposed deficiency assessment [, together with interest,] in the total sum of $_____.

11. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff filed with defendant its Claim for Refund in the amount of $_____, plus interest, and in the Claim for Refund set forth the grounds on which plaintiff rests its claim for the recovery ofthat amount. A copy of the Claim for Refund and the exhibits attached to it is attached as

Exhibit H and incorporated by reference. Plaintiff by this reference hereby expressly realleges, without setting forth at length herein, each and every allegation and fact made or stated in the Claim for Refund and the exhibits attached to it.

[12. On _____ (*date*), defendant denied plaintiff's Claim for Refund. A copy of the denial of the Claim for Refund by defendant is attached as Exhibit I and incorporated by reference.]

[12. Defendant took no action on the Claim for Refund within six months after the date of its filing, and plaintiff has elected to deem the claim denied.]

[13. Within _____ (*either* 90 days after receipt of defendant's denial of the refund claim *or* six months after the claim was filed and deemed disallowed because of defendant's failure to send a notice of action on the claim), plaintiff appealed the denial of the claim to the State Board of Equalization. A copy of the Notice of Appeal is attached as Exhibit J and incorporated by reference. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff received a notice of determination from the State Board of Equalization upholding the defendant's denial of the claim. A copy of the State Board of Equalization's notice of determination of the appeal is attached as Exhibit K and incorporated by reference.]

14. This action is brought against defendant on the grounds that the proposed additional deficiency assessment of_____ [*date*], and the disallowance in its entirety of plaintiff's claim for refund of the amount so paid by plaintiff to defendant on_____ [*date*], is erroneous, illegal, and without authority of law for the reasons stated in the claim.

15. No refund of the amounts paid by plaintiff as alleged above, or any part thereof, has been made to or applied for the benefit of plaintiff or anyone acting on his/her behalf.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For interest on that sum from and after_____ [*date of payment of assessed tax and penalties, if any*];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees;

4. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by an individual taxpayer to obtain a refund of personal income tax from the FTB [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*]. Thefacts illustrated in the form involve the denial of deductions for business expenses. The form also contests tax liability for only a single year, but may be modified for use if tax liability of more than one year is contested. If the suit involves a refund for more than one year, the suit for each year's refund should be set forth in a separate cause of action. Each cause of action should follow the format of this form and either incorporate matters alleged in the first cause of action or allege specific facts regarding the refund for that year. With appropriate changes, this form can be used to seek a refund of bank and corporation taxes.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges the following:

- Plaintiff's status and residency (Paragraph 1).
- Defendant's status and statutory authority (Paragraph 2) [*see Gov. Code §§ 15700-15702*].
- Jurisdiction and venue (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 401*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].
- The facts and circumstances supporting plaintifff's position on the amount of tax owed (Paragraph 4).
- Plaintiff's filing of a return and payment of tax claimed by plaintiff as the proper amount due (Paragraph 5).
- Issuance by the FTB of a Notice of Proposed Deficiency (Paragraph 6).
- Payment by plaintiff of all taxes, and if paid, interest, demanded by the FTB (Paragraph 10).
- Plaintiff's timely filing of a claim for refund and incorporation of the grounds stated in the claim (Paragraph 11) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].
- The FTB's denial of that claim or inaction on the claim for more than six months (optional Paragraphs 12).
- The illegality of the FTB's deficiency assessment (Paragraph 14).
- That no refund has been made to or applied for the benefit of plaintiff (Paragraph 15).

The form also includes optional allegations that plaintiff filed a written protest of the assessment, that the protest was denied by the FTB, and that plaintiff filed an appeal with the SBE that was also rejected (Paragraphs 7-9) [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19041, 19045, 19046*]. It also includes an optional allegation that plaintiff appealed the FTB's denial of the claim for refund to the SBE (Paragraph 13) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19324, 19331*]. These administrative remedies do not have to be exhausted prior to filing a suit for refund, because the statutes governing protests and appeals from denied protests or claims are not mandatory [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19041, 19045, 19324(a)*], and because the only prerequisites for a refund suit are the payment of tax and the denial of a claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*; *see § 540.552[4]*].

With regard to Paragraph 10, dealing with payment of a penalty and interest, *see § 540.90[4][a]*.

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

Unless a notice of deficiency is based on an individual's alleged California residency, a taxpayer must pay all taxes demanded by the FTB and file a claim for refund before a refund suit may be brought [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19381, 19382*; *but see Milhous v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1267-1268, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 640* ("pay first, litigate later" rule embodied in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* does not affect court's fundamental jurisdiction and can be waived)]. Payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency, however, is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (construing *Cal. Const. art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; SBE's prepayment policy may not be enforced insofar as it requires prepayment of interest before tax

refund claim will be considered; court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to consideration of challenge directed only to an interest assessment); *see Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1113-1114, 1117-1124, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* (given plain language of *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* and definition of tax in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23036*, word "tax" does not include interest and therefore payment of accrued interest is not jurisdictional prerequisite to action for refund of franchise taxes paid; court did not reach question of whether penalties must be paid before refund action will lie)]. Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest in this regard and need not be paid before an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* ; *but see* FTB Notice, No. 97-8 (9/4/97), CCH Cal. Tax Rptr., 1995-1999 Transfer Binder, P 402-940 (providing for consideration of claim when tax principal, additions to tax and penalties has been paid in full before or together with claim for refund)]. In any event, depending on circumstances, the taxpayer may desire to make payment of interest and any penalty assessed before or at the time of filing a claim for refund, or before suit if not done earlier, to stop the accrual of interest. Moreover, payment of such amounts will thereafter avoid the possibility of any collection activity being commenced by the FTB. For further discussion concerning prerequisites to suit, *see § 540.303[2]*.

The grounds for recovery by suit are limited to the grounds raised in the claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*]. If the FTB does not mail a notice of action on a refund claim within six months after the taxpayer files the claim, the taxpayer may deem the claim denied and file suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19385*].

For a form for a complaint for determination of residency and a description of the administrative remedies required to be exhausted before seeking such a determination, *see § 540.550*.

[5] Statute of Limitations

A suit for refund against the FTB must be filed within the latest of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19384*]:

- Four years after the last date prescribed for the filing of the return;
- One year after the date the tax was paid;
- Ninety days after notice of action by the FTB on a claim for refund; or
- Ninety days after the determination (including the issuance of a decision, opinion, or dismissal) by the SBE on appeal from the action of the FTB on a claim for refund becomes final under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19334* (as amended by Stats. 1999, ch. 605, § 3); *see* Stats. 1999, ch. 605, § 4 (amendment operative for SBE determinations that become final under *Rev. & Tax. Code 19334* on or after January 1, 2000; before amendment this period was 90 days after a final notice of action by the SBE on an appeal from the FTB's decision).

The claim for refund itself must be filed within the later of [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*]:

- four years from the date the original return was filed (if filed within the time prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567* or *18604*, whichever is applicable);
- four years after the last day prescribed for filing the original return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the return); or
- one year after the date of the overpayment.

The FTB's determination on the claim for refund is final 90 days after the FTB's mailing of notice of its action unless the taxpayer appeals within this period to the SBE [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19324 et seq.*]. If the taxpayer appeals to the SBE, the SBE's determination is final 30 days after its decision, unless within that period a rehearing is sought. If a rehearing is sought, the determination is final 30 days after the decision on the petition for rehearing [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19334*].

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

Taxpayers may file suit against the FTB in the superior court of any county in California where the California Attorney General maintains an office; i.e., in the counties of San Francisco, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19388*]. The action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(1)*].

[7] Service

The summons and complaint of a suit for refund must be served on the FTB or its executive officer. Personal service on the FTB is not necessary, and the FTB will acknowledge receipt of the summons and complaint. A second copy of both must be delivered to the FTB, but this requirement is not jurisdictional [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19387*]. The summons must notify the person served that they are being served on behalf of the FTB under *Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50* (public entity) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 416.50*].

[8] Interest and Attorney's Fees

Interest and attorney's fees are payable to a taxpayer who is the prevailing party [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19391, 19521, 19717*; *see* §§ *540.304, 540.305*].

[9] State Statutes

Deductions generally. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17073, 17073.5, 17076, 17201 et seq.*

Standard deduction. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17073(c), 17073.5*

Deductions for trade or business expense. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 17201, 17222, 17224*

Protest of assessment and appeal. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19041-19048*

Claim for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19301 et seq.*

Interest on judgment for refund. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19340, 19521*

[10] Decisions

Taxpayers could not maintain class action suit without complying with requirement of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19322* that administrative claim be accompanied by written authorization from each class member; provision allowing taxpayer to file suit if FTB fails to mail timely notice of action on refund claim (*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19385*) does not require FTB to notify taxpayer that administrative claim is defective; doctrine of substantial compliance is unavailable to cure defect. *Farrar v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 10, 21, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611* (affirming trial court denial of class certification in tax refund action).

"Protest" letter in writing that states position on overpayment satisfies statutory requirements for refund claim.

Newman v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 972, 979-980, 256 Cal. Rptr. 503

Refunds and overpayments are first applied to any amount owed by taxpayer to any state agency. *Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 890, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582* ; *Tyler v. California (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 973, 975-976, 185 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Superior court is without jurisdiction to order return of property seized pursuant to tax claim by state that is prima facie valid; taxpayer mustexhaust administrative remedies challenging tax assessment. *Mason v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1981) 121 Cal. App. 3d 876, 882, 175 Cal. Rptr. 462*

Taxpayer cannot circumvent rule that superior courts may not hear actions to prevent or enjoin assessment or collection of any tax by seeking declaratory judgment that tax is not legally collectible. *Casey v. Bonelli (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 253, 255, 208 P.2d 723*

Taxpayers have burden of producing sufficient evidence to overcome presumption of correctness of FTB's findings; presumption not overcome by unsupported statements of taxpayer. Appeal of Cookston (SBE, 9/29/81) CCH Cal. Tax. Rptr. P 400-046; Appeal of Mason (SBE, 3/30/81) CCH Cal. Tax. Rptr. P 206-604

[11] Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 9, *Taxation* (10th ed. 2005)

[12] Cross References

See also Comments and References to *§ 540.550*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.552

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.552 Complaint for Refund of Corporation Taxes Assessed by FTB [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382] Against Unitary Business [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25120-25141]

[1] FORM Complaint for Refund of Corporation Taxes Assessed by FTB [Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382] Against Unitary Business [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25120-25141]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF
_____ [LOS ANGELES *or*
SAN FRANCISCO *or* SACRAMENTO *or* SAN DIEGO]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR REFUND OF CORPORATION
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD,	)	TAX
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, plaintiff was and is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____, with its principal offices in the State of California [*or allege other capacity*

and extent of business operations in California].

2. Defendant Franchise Tax Board is and at all times mentioned herein was an agency of the State of California, organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws thereof, particularly *Government Code Sections 15700-15702*. Defendant is empowered to assess and collect taxes under the Corporation Tax Law of California and to make refund of overpayment of such taxes and interest.

3. Jurisdiction is conferred on this court to hear and determine this suit for refund of taxes and interest against defendant as a case of unlimited jurisdiction by the provisions of *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 19382* and of *Code of Civil Procedure Sections 86(a)* and *401*.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 19388* in that the Attorney General maintains an office in this county.

5. Plaintiff appeals from an assessment of tax for_____ [*allege amounts and the calendar or fiscal years to which they pertain*]. These amount(s), plus any and all interest and penalties, have been paid by plaintiff in full.

6. During the_____ [calendar *or* fiscal] year(s)_____ [*specify year(s)*], plaintiff owned a controlling interest in subsidiary corporation located in_____ [*specify state(s)*]. With respect to each subsidiary, stock not owned by plaintiff is owned by _____ [*specify, e.g.*, othermajor stockholders and individual investors]. A schedule of the subsidiaries, including the amount of stock of each subsidiary owned by plaintiff, is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof. These subsidiaries are hereinafter referred to collectively as the "foreign subsidiaries."

7. During the_____ [calendar *or* fiscal] year(s)_____ [*specify year(s)*], plaintiff was engaged in the_____ [*describe plaintiff's business enterprises*]. All of plaintiff's_____ [*describe all divisions of plaintiff's business enterprises, e.g.,* manufacturing, production, research, and sales facilities, as well as all administrative and executive offices,] were located in_____ [*name of city and/or county*], California. All operations and facilities of plaintiff were entirely separate, distinct, and independent from those of the foreign subsidiaries. [*Include additional allegations such as no sales or loans between plaintiff and foreign subsidiaries, etc., as appropriate* .]

8. During the_____ [calendar *or* fiscal] year(s)_____ [*specify year(s)*], the foreign subsidiaries operated as self-sustaining operational units, in the business of _____ [*describe business enterprises of foreign subsidiaries, e.g.,* manufacturing and selling _____ (*describe product*)]. Each foreign subsidiary in each state operated as an integrated unit from_____ [*describe divisions of enterprise, e.g.,* production through sales]. _____ [*Specify locations where sales were made or services provided, e.g.,* Sales of finished products were made within the state where they were manufactured by the foreign subsidiaries or were exported to Japan, and sales operations were performed as a part of the total operation within _____ (*state(s)*)]. All operations and facilities of the foreign subsidiaries, including_____ [*describe divisions of foreign subsidiaries, e.g.,* manufacturing, research, executive, administrative, and sales functions], were entirely separate, distinct, and independent from those of plaintiff. There was no mutual dependence or contribution between plaintiff and the foreign subsidiaries, nor was plaintiff in any way unitary with or a part of the business activities of the foreign subsidiaries.

9. On_____ [*dates*], plaintiff made estimated_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax payments in the amounts of $_____, $_____, $_____, and $_____, respectively, for the taxable year _____. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff timely filed with defendant a_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax return for the taxable year _____ and included a payment of

$_____. A copy of this tax return is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof.

10. On_____ [*date*], defendant issued to plaintiff a Notice of Additional Tax Proposed to Be Assessed, No. _____, which determined that plaintiff owed additional_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax of $_____ for the taxable year _____, on the basis that plaintiff was engaged in a unitary business with respect to the foreign subsidiaries[*include any other matters included in notice, if any*]. A copy of the notice is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "C," and made a part hereof.

[11. (*Protest filed by plaintiff against proposed assessment, including exhibit. see § 540.551, paragraph 7.*)]

[12. (*Allege, if appropriate, receipt of a request for additional information from the Franchise Tax Board on specified date and the submission of the requested additional information on specified date; include exhibit.*)]

[13. (*Denial of plaintiff's protest by defendant, including exhibit. See § 540.551, paragraph 8.*)]

[14. (*Appeal by plaintiff of denial to State Board of Equalization and rejection of appeal, including exhibits. see § 540.551, paragraph 9.*)]

15. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff paid to defendant additional_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax for taxable year _____ in the amount of $_____, plus interest of $_____, for a total payment of $_____. A copy of the check, the letter of plaintiff's counsel accompanying payment, and the receipt of defendant is attached, marked Exhibit "H," and made a part hereof.

16. On_____ [*date*], plaintiff filed with defendant its Claim for Refund in the amount of $_____[, plus interest,] and in the claim set forth the grounds on which plaintiff rests its claim for the recovery of the amount. A copy of the Claim for Refund, including exhibits attached to it, is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "I," and made a part hereof. Plaintiff by this reference hereby expressly realleges, without setting them forth at length herein, each and every allegation and fact made or stated in the Claim for Refund and exhibits attached to it.

17. Defendant denied plaintiff's Claim for Refund by a Notice of Action on Cancellation, Credit, or Refund dated _____. The Notice of Action is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "J," and made a part hereof.

18. This complaint contests the inclusion of the foreign subsidiaries in the unitary base for apportionment purposes. Attached hereto, marked Exhibit "K," and made a part hereof, is a summary sheet setting forth plaintiff's computations of_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax for the taxable year(s) _____, based on the exclusion of the foreign subsidiaries from the unitary base.

19. Defendant has purported to determine that the business of plaintiff was unitary with the businesses of the foreign subsidiaries for_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax purposes. Accordingly, defendant has required, under *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 25101*, that the income of plaintiff be combined with the income of the foreign subsidiaries and that the apportionment factors (property, payroll, and sales) of plaintiff and the foreign subsidiaries be used in apportioning combined income to California for_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax purposes. [*Include other allegations of actions by defendant with regard to subsidiaries, as appropriate, such as inclusion of foreign dividends or capital gains.*]The direct and proximate result of the determination of defendant has been to apportion a greater amount of plaintiff's income to California, including income that has no relationship to plaintiff's activities in California. The determination increased the total California_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax payable by plaintiff for the taxable year(s) in question by the amount of the refund claimed by plaintiff in this cause of action.

20. By virtue of the proceedings described in Paragraphs 9 through 17, defendant has, on the theory set forth in Paragraph 19 above, imposed, collected, and retained_____ [franchise *or* corporation income] tax [and interest] exceeding that which was legally due in the amount of $_____. The State of California is not authorized or permitted to impose, collect, or retain the $_____, or any part thereof, for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 19, above, [and in Paragraphs 21 and 22, below,] which are more fully set forth in the Claim for Refund, Exhibit "I," above.

21. Neither the provisions of *Revenue and Taxation Code Section 25101* nor any other statutory provisions permit the use of the apportionment formula proposed by defendant, described in Paragraph 19, above. On the contrary, the determination of defendant, as described above, and the imposition, collection, or retention of the amount of refund, or any part of it, claimed by plaintiff was and is entirely unauthorized by law.

22. Neither the Constitution of the State of California nor the Constitution of the United States authorizes or permits the State of California to impose, collect, or retain the amount of refund, or any part thereof, claimed by plaintiff in this cause of action. Without limiting the general application of the foregoing allegations of this paragraph, (a) the apportionment formula proposed by defendant, as described above, violates the rights and privileges of plaintiff under the *due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution* and the due process clause of *Section 13 of Article I of the California Constitution*, in that, among other things, under the apportionment formula, defendant is taxing property and income from business activities not situated within its boundaries; (b) the proposed apportionment formula, as describedabove, violates the rights and privileges of plaintiff under the *equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution* and the principles of equal protection as implied in *Article I, Sections 7* and *20, of the California Constitution* in that, among other things, under the apportionment formula, defendant is applying a different apportionment formula to plaintiff than it is applying to other taxpayers similarly situated; and (c) the application of the proposed formula to plaintiff, as described above, a corporation extensively engaged in interstate operations, also imposes a prohibitive burden on interstate and foreign commerce in violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____, or such larger amount as provided by law;

2. For interest on that sum as provided by law, from and after_____ [*date(s) of payment of assessed deficiency*];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees;

4. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a corporate taxpayer doing business in California to seek a refund of additional taxes assessed against it as a result of the FTB's application of the worldwide unitary method of taxation after the plaintiff has filed a tax return based on only its California business operations [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §*

25120 et seq. (unitary method)]. The taxpayer is alleging that it is not unitary with its out-of-state subsidiaries and that its income and loss and that of the subsidiary companies should not be combined for apportionment purposes. The term "foreign" in the complaint refers to companies that are not organized and operating under the laws of the State of California. It may be used to refer to companies that are organized and operating under the laws of another state, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and territory or possession of the United States, to companies based outside of the United States, or to both [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 25120(g)*].

A corporate taxpayer may wish to be treated as completely separate and distinct from its subsidiaries for tax purposes or it may wish to be treated as a single unitary business (for example, to take advantage of losses from another part of the business) [*see Dental Ins. Consultants, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 343, 348, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757]* . To modify the form for use if the taxpayer and its subsidiaries wish to be treated as a unitary business, the allegations in Paragraphs 7 and 8 should be changed to describe the unitary factors, contribution and dependency, and interrelationship of the plaintiff and the other entities claimed to comprise the unitary group. Paragraphs 18 through 22 must also be amended to allege the opposite of the allegations used in this example.

For purposes of the franchise tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23101 et seq.*], the term "taxable year" means the calendar year, or the fiscal year for which the tax is payable [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(a), (c)*]. For purposes of the tax on limited partnerships [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23081 et seq.*], the corporation income tax [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23501 et seq.*], or the tax imposed on exempt corporations [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23701 et seq.*],the term "taxable year" is the calendar year or the fiscal year upon the basis of which the net income is computed [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(b), (c)*]. A "taxable year" can also be a period of less than 12 months [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(d)*]. When referring to a calendar or fiscal year beginning before January 1, 2000, upon the basis of which the net income is computed, the term "taxable year" means "income year." [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 23041(e)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 23042(a)* for a definition of "income year"; a legislative change in terminology enacted in 2000 gave "income year" and "taxable year" the same meaning for calendar and fiscal years beginning on or after January 1, 2000, but under a transitional rule, for the first taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2000, the term "taxable year" had two meanings, as explained at Stats. 2000, ch. 862, § 227].

This form contests a unitary assesment for only one taxable year, but may be modified for use if tax liability for more than one taxable year is contested. If the suit involves a refund for more than one year, the suit for each year's refund should be set forth in a separate cause of action. Each cause of action should be separately labeled and follow the format of the cause of action alleged in the form. Pertinent facts from the first cause of action may be incorporated by reference into the following causes of action [*see* sample forms of incorporation by reference in Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*].

To modify the form for use when affiliated entities other than plaintiff's subsidiaries are claimed to comprise the unitary business, the allegations in Paragraph 6 should be changed to describe the nature of plaintiff's business relationship to all of the other members of the unitary business. If the unitary business is not a manufacturing enterprise, Paragraph 7 should be changed to describe the nature and separate operation of the plaintiff's own business and Paragraph 8 should be changed to describe the nature and separate operation ofthe businesses of the other entities claimed by the FTB to comprise the unitary business.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's status and residency (Paragraph 1).
- Defendant's status and statutory authority (Paragraph 2).

- Jurisdiction and venue (Paragraphs 3, 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].

- Plaintiff's ownership of foreign subsidiaries (Paragraph 6).

- Facts demonstrating the separate nature of plaintiff's California business activity (Paragraph 7).

- Facts demonstrating the separate nature of the foreign subsidiaries' business activities outside California (Paragraph 8).

- Plaintiff's filing of appropriate returns and payment of California estimated and annual taxes (Paragraph 9).

- The issuance of a Notice of Proposed Assessment by the FTB based on a determination that plaintiff and its subsidiaries comprised a unitary business (Paragraph 10).

- Plaintiff's protest of the Notice of Proposed Assessment (*see* optional Paragraph 7 in *§ 540.551*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041*].

- The FTB's denial of the protest (*see* optional Paragraph 8 in *§ 540.551*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19044, 19045*].

- Plaintiff's optional appeal to the SBE and the SBE's subsequent determination (*see* optional Paragraph 9 in *§ 540.551*) [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19045, 19047, 19048*].

- Plaintiff's payment of the additional tax, and if paid, interest (Paragraph 15). On payment of penalty and interest, see discussion in *§ 540.552[4]*.

- Plaintiff's filing of a claim for refund (Paragraph 16) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19322*].

- The FTB's denial of the claim for refund (Paragraph 17) [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].

- Plaintiff's contention as to how its tax liability should have been calculated (Paragraph 18).

- The FTB's contentions as to how the tax should be calculated and the illegality and impropriety of the FTB's calculations (Paragraphs 19, 21),

- The amount of tax, and if paid, interest, claimed to be excessive (Paragraph 20).

- Constitutional objections to the FTB's method of assessment as violative of plaintiff's due process and equal protection rights and unlawfully burdening foreign and interstate commerce (Paragraph 22) [U.S. Const., art. I, § 8; *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*; *Cal. Const., art. I, §§ 7, 13, 20*].

[4] Prerequisites to Suit

A taxpayer must pay all taxes claimed by the FTB, file a claim for refund with the FTB, and await denial of the claim before instituting a suit for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*; *but see Milhous v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1267-1268, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 640* ("pay first, litigate later" rule embodied in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* does not affect court's fundamental jurisdiction and can be waived)]. If the FTB fails to mail a notice of action on any refund claim within six months after the claim is filed, the taxpayer may consider the claim disallowed and bring an action against the FTB [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19385*]. The grounds for recovery by suit are limited to those grounds

raised in the claim for refund [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382*].

Payment of accrued interest on a tax deficiency is not a prerequisite to either an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 314-315, 321 n.8, 333-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* (construing *Cal.Const. art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 6931*; SBE's prepayment policy may not be enforced insofar as it requires prepayment of interest before tax refund claim will be considered; court did not consider whether SBE may require prepayment of interest as precondition to consideration of challenge directed only to an interest assessment); *see Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1113-1114, 1117-1124, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* (given plain language of *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*, and *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19382* and definition of tax in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 23036*, word "tax" does not include interest and therefore payment of accrued interest is not jurisdictional prerequisite to action for refund of franchise taxes paid; court did not reach question of whether penalties must be paid before refund action will lie)]. Presumably a penalty is treated in the same way as interest in this regard and need not be paid before an administrative refund claim or a subsequent action for refund of taxes [*see Agnew v. State Board of Equalization (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 310, 323-334, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423, 981 P.2d 52* ; *Chen v. Franchise Tax Board (1998) 75 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 1119-1120, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 268* ; *but see* FTB Notice, No. 97-8 (9/4/97), CCH Cal. Tax Rptr., 1995-1999 Transfer Binder, P 402-940 (providing for consideration of claim when tax principal, additions to tax and penalties has been paid in full before or together with claim for refund)]. In anyevent, depending on circumstances, the taxpayer may desire to make payment of interest and any penalty assessed before or at the time of filing a claim for refund, or before suit if not done earlier, to stop the accrual of interest. Moreover, payment of such amounts will avoid the possibility thereafter of any collection activity being commenced by the FTB.

An amount set forth in a notice of proposed assessment is not an assessed tax that is due, and a taxpayer need not pay such an amount before seeking a refund after payment of a tax claimed to be illegal [*City Nat'l Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1046, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 411]* . The Revenue and Taxation Code provides a procedure by which a proposed assessment becomes a final assessment that is due and payable [*see Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041 et seq.*; *see also § 540.274* et seq.], including [*City Nat'l Corp. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1045-1046, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 411]* :

- A notice of proposed assessment;
- A protest period;
- A response to a taxpayer's protest;
- An administrative appeal period;
- A decision on an appeal;
- A rehearing notice period;
- Possibly a rehearing; and
- A grace period, after determination (and appeal and rehearing), before the proposed assessment becomes a final assessment.

Payment then becomes due 15 days after notice to the taxpayer and a demand for payment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19049(a)*].

A written claim for refund must be filed even if the only ground on which the refund is sought is constitutional and

therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the FTB [*see Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; *Shiseido Cosmetics (America) Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Board (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 478, 488-491, 286 Cal. Rptr. 690]* , and even if the ground is well known to the FTB because of lengthy protest negotiations and stipulations [*Shiseido Cosmetics (America) Ltd. v. Franchise Tax Board (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 478, 492, 286 Cal. Rptr. 690* (negotiations and stipulations for over 6 years)].

[5] Statute of Limitations

A suit against the FTB for refund of bank and corporation tax must be filed within the latest of the following [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19384*]:

- Four years after the last date prescribed for filing the return;
- One year after the date the tax was paid;
- Ninety days after notice of action by the FTB on a claim for refund; or
- Ninety days after the determination (including the issuance of a decision, opinion, or dismissal) by the SBE on appeal from the action of the FTB on a claim for refund becomes final under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19334* (as amended by Stats. 1999, ch. 605, § 3); *see* Stats. 1999, ch. 605, § 4 (amendment operative for SBE determinations that become final under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19334* on or after January 1, 2000; before amendment this period was 90 days after a final notice of action by the SBE on an appeal from the FTB's decision).

The claim for refund itself must have been filed within the later of (1) four years from the date the original return was filed (if filed within the time prescribed by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 18567* or *18604*, whichever is applicable), (2) four years after the last day prescribed for filing the original return (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing the return), or (3) one year after the date of the overpayment [*Rev. & Tax. Code § 19306*].

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

Taxpayers may file suit against the FTB in the superior court of any county in California where the California Attorney General maintains an office; that is, in the counties of San Francisco, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19388*]. The action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(a)(1)*].

[7] Interest and Attorney's Fees

Interest and attorney's fees are payable to a taxpayer that is the prevailing party [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19391, 19521, 19717*; *see §§ 540.304, 540.305*].

[8] California Constitution

Court action to enjoin or prevent collection of tax is prohibited; action to recover tax claimed to have been illegally collected is authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*

[9] State Statutes

Business income derived from California sources is taxable under unitary method or water's-edge election. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 25110 et seq.* (water's-edge election), 25120, 25140 (unitary method)

Deficiency assessment is final if no written protest filed by taxpayer within 60 days after mailing of Notice of Proposed Assessment by FTB. *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 19041(a), 19042*

Protest filed with FTB on or before last date FTB specified for filing that protest in notice of proposed deficiency assessment (according to *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19034*) to be treated as timely filed. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19041(b), (c)* (effective January 1, 2000)

No injunction or writ of mandate is issuable to enjoin state, or any state officer, from assessing or collecting tax. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19381*

[10] Decisions

Foreign-based companies are unable to bring challenges against California's worldwide combined reporting method in federal courts; relief must be sought in California courts, which offer plain, speedy, and efficient remedy. *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Alcan Aluminium, Ltd. (1990) 493 U.S. 331, 339-340, 110 S. Ct. 661, 107 L. Ed. 2d 696*

California's three-factor formula apportionment, which requires worldwide reporting, donot violate constitutional prohibitions, despite fact that it would sometimes result in multiple taxation. *Container Corporation of America v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 463 U.S. 159, 170-171, 103 S. Ct. 2933, 77 L. Ed. 2d 545*

Fact that same business is operated in several jurisdictions is indicia of unitary business. *Container Corporation of America v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 463 U.S. 159, 178, 103 S. Ct. 2933, 77 L. Ed. 2d 545*

Increase of 14 percent in taxation under unitary formula from result under separate accounting method is not sufficient to constitute violation of Commerce Clause. *Container Corporation of America v. Franchise Tax Board (1983) 463 U.S. 159, 184, 103 S. Ct. 2933, 77 L. Ed. 2d 545*

Foreign parent of Delaware subsidiary operating in California has no standing to protest unitary assessment against its subsidiary. *EMI, Ltd. v. Bennett (9th Cir. 1984) 738 F.2d 994, 998* ; *Shell Petroleum, N.V. v. Graves (9th Cir. 1983) 709 F.2d 593, 595-596*

Unitary business is one that receives income from or attributable to sources both within and without state; unitary business is generally defined as two or more business entities that are commonly owned, and integrated in a way that transfers value among affiliated entities; if unitary business exists, taxes are apportioned by formula to allocate to California for taxation its fair share of taxable values of taxpayer; in calculating corporate franchise taxes of unitary business, FTB apportions income generated by unitary business based on relationship of combined income to income derived from California sources. *Citicorp North American Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1411 & n.5*

Application of worldwide unitary tax method resulting in apportionment of 70 percent more business income to California than separate accounting does not violate foreign commerce clause of U.S. Constitution or *Rev. & Tax. Code § 25137*. *Colgate-Palmolive Co. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1768, 1787, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 761*

Income from installment sales must be apportioned according to factors in year of sale, not year in which income was received. *Tenneco West, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1510, 1538, 286 Cal. Rptr. 354*

If business's operation within state is dependent on or contributes to business's operation outside state, enterprise is unitary. *Tenneco West, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1510, 1519, 1525, 286 Cal. Rptr. 354*

Unitary nature of business is definitely established by presence of unity of ownership, unity of operation, and unity of use. *Tenneco West, Inc. v. Franchise Tax Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1510, 1525, 286 Cal. Rptr. 354*

Family companies operated in California and Colorado and involved in two distinct types of business were unitary because single, functional, integrated unit created by having all managerial control, accounting, payroll, insurance, pension, primary banking, major purchasing, and advertising in California for both lines of business. *Mole-Richardson Co. v. Franchise Tax Board (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 889, 895, 269 Cal. Rptr. 662* .

[11] Cross References

See also Comments and References to *§ 540.551*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
C. INCOME TAX

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 540.553-540.569

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

[Reserved]

§§ 540.553[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 540 TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS
PART IV. FORMS
D. TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

47-540 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 540.570

AUTHOR: Robert D. Schindewolf Lawrence M. Freiser, J.D.

§ 540.570 Complaint for Damages Based on Reckless Disregard of SBE or FTB Published Procedures [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099, 21021]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages Based on Reckless Disregard of SBE or FTB Published Procedures [Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099, 21021]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
THE STATE OF	)	(Reckless Disregard of Published Procedures)
CALIFORNIA,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [*Allege identity and capacity of plaintiff, e.g.,* Plaintiff _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), _____ (*county*)].

2. Defendant State of California is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a sovereign state of the United States of America. This action is brought against defendant under authority of Section _____ [*7099 or 21021*] of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

3. At all times mentioned herein, _____[*name*] was an _____ [officer *or* employee] of the _____ [State Board of Equalization *or* Franchise Tax Board] (hereinafter "the Board"), an agency of defendant State of California charged by law with the duty of administering the California _____ [Sales and Use Tax Law *or* Bank and Corporation Tax Law *or* Personal Income Tax Law].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], the Board published procedures _____ [*set forth the source and nature of procedures that are the subject of the litigation, e.g.,* under *Section 17000.30 of Title 18 of the Code of Regulations* that prohibit designated employees from making any government decision that he/she knows or has reason to know will have a reasonably material financial effect on the official].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of officer or employee*] recklessly disregarded the procedure hereinabove set forth by_____[*specify reckless act or omission*].

6. As a proximate result of the recklessness of_____[*name of officer or employee*], plaintiff has sustained actual and direct monetary damages in that_____ [*set forth the nature of the monetary damages*]. Plaintiff has been damaged, therefore, in the sum of $_____.

7. _____ [*Allege compliance with appropriate claim provisions, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff presented to the State Board of Control by _____ (delivering *or* mailing) a claim to said board for the injuries, losses, and damages suffered and incurred by him/her by reason of the above-described occurrence, all in compliance with the requirements of *Section 905 of the Government Code*. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.]

8. _____ [*Set forth board action on the claim, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), the State Board of Control rejected the claim in its entirety *or* allowed the claim in the amount of $_____ and rejected it as to the remainder *or* failed to act on the claim within the period of 45 days after its presentation, and the claim was thus deemed rejected, under the provisions of *Section 912.4 of the Government Code*, at the expiration of the 45-day period, on _____ (*date*)].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For actual and direct damages in the sum of $_____;

2. For reasonable litigation costs pursuant to Section _____ [*7099(b)(2) or 21021(b)(2)*] of the Revenue and Taxation Code, according to proof; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By:_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff_____[*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a taxpayer to allege a cause of action for damages under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7099* or *21021*

. The basis for the causeof action is that plaintiff has suffered injury as the result of conduct by an officer or employee of either the SBE or FTB that constitutes reckless disregard of procedures published by that particular agency. For further discussion, see *§ 540.406*.

Depending on the particular facts giving rise to plaintiff's damages, the plaintiff may consider alleging a companion cause of action against the public employee under an independent tort theory. For a discussion of actions against public employees generally, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[3] Allegations

This includes an initial paragraph alleging the plaintiff's identity and capacity as appropriate (Paragraph 1). This paragraph may be used to identify the plaintiff's status as taxpayer, for example, as a retailer under sale and use tax provisions [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6051, 6201-6203*], or as a nonexempt corporation, bank, or financial corporation under corporation tax law [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 23151, 23181-23182*]. The complaint also alleges the capacity of the defendant State of California and the statutory basis for the state's liability (Paragraph 2) [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(a)* (action is properly brought against state if based on conduct of officer or employee of SBE), 21021(a) (action is properly brought against state if based on conduct of officer or employee of FTB); *see also Gov. Code § 815(a)* (public entity is not liable except as provided by statute)].

The complaint then alleges the essential elements of a cause of action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7099* or *21021*:

- The offending person is an officer or employee of either the SBE or the FTB (Paragraph 3).
- the SBE or FTB published a certain procedure (Paragraph 4).
- the officer or employee recklessly disregarded that procedure (Paragraph 5).
- the reckless act or omission of the officer or employee caused plaintiff to incur actual and direct monetary damages (Paragraph 6).

The complaint also includes an essential allegation that the plaintiff has complied with government claim provisions (Paragraphs 7 and 8). Claims for money or damages against the state for an injury for which the state is liable must be presented in accordance with *Gov. Code §§ 900-915.4* [*Gov. Code § 905.2*]. The sample allegations in the form refer to presenting a claim in accordance with *Gov. Code § 905*. Care should be taken to comply with any other applicable claims provisions [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 6932* (claim for refund or credit of sales or use taxes), 19382 (payment of tax and denial of claim for refund of personal income and bank and corporation tax)].

[4] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required. A public entity need not verify its answer even if the complaint is verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*].However, verification of complaint precludes a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 7099* or *21021* is brought in the superior court [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(a), 21021(a)*].

In actions against the state, generally, the state attorney general may demand that the place of trial be changed to Sacramento County [*Gov. Code §§ 955* (also stating exception if property takenfor public use), *955.2* (stating exception

if injury to person or personal property occurred)]. However, the action against the state may be commenced in any city or city and county in which the attorney general has an office [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1)*]. Hence, the proper venue is either Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, or Los Angeles [*see Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 766, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151* ; *see also McPheeters v. Board of Med. Examiners (1946) 74 Cal. App. 2d 46, 49, 168 P.2d 65]* .

[6] Plaintiff's Negligence Considered in Calculating Damages

In awarding damages under *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(b)(1), 21021(b)(1)*, the court must take into consideration any negligence or omissions on the part of the plaintiff that contributed to the damages [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(c), 21021(c)*].

[7] Plaintiff Penalized for Frivolous Position

The court may impose a penalty of up to $10,000 if it finds that the plaintiff's position in the proceedings is frivolous. The penalty is collected as a tax [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 7099(d), 21021(d)*].

[8] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to actions against public entities generally, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[9] Administrative Regulations

SBE hearing procedure. *18 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 5260 et seq., 5510 et seq.*

Conflict of Interest Code for FTB. *18 Cal. Code Reg. § 17000.30*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapters 541-543 [RESERVED]

47-541 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 541-543

[RESERVED]

Chapters 541[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 544.syn

§ 544.syn Synopsis to Chapter 544: TAXICABS

§ 544.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 544.02 Cross References

§§ 544.03-544.09 [Reserved]

§ 544.10 Governing Law

§ 544.11 Taxicab as Common Carrier

§ 544.12 Taxicab as Public Utility

[1] In General

[2] Licensing and Regulation by Local Authority

[a] Power to Regulate

[b] Multi-City Carriers

[c] Taxicab Permit as License or Privilege

[d] Regulation as Not Antitrust Violation

[e] Location of Taxicab Stands

[f] Judicial Review of Regulatory Decisions

§ 544.13 Duty to Passenger

[1] Highest Degree of Care

[2] Creation of Carrier-Passenger Relationship

[3] Duration of Carrier-Passenger Relationship

§ 544.14 Passenger's Reciprocal Obligations

§ 544.15 Proof of Ownership

§ 544.16 Negligence Actions by Passenger

[1] Injury While Boarding or Alighting

[2] Injury From Violation of Traffic or Safety Rule

[3] Injury From Sudden Movement of Taxicab

[4] Concurrent Negligence of Taxicab Driver and Other Motorist

[5] Res Ipsa Loquitur

§ 544.17 Assault Actions

§ 544.18 Requirement of Owner's Ability to Respond in Damages

[1] Statutory Requirement

[2] No Uninsured Motorist Coverage Requirement

§§ 544.19-544.29 [Reserved]

§ 544.30 Related Texts from LexisNexis

§ 544.31 State Constitution

§ 544.32 State Statutes

[1] General Provisions

[2] Equipment

[3] Miscellaneous

[4] Regulation

§ 544.33 Decisions

[1] Duty of Care to Passengers

[2] Negligence

[3] Regulation

§ 544.34 Law Reviews

§ 544.35 Text References

§§ 544.36-544.39 [Reserved]

§ 544.40 Essential Allegations

§§ 544.41-544.49 [Reserved]

§ 544.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a), 2100]--By Passenger Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Jurisdiction

[4] Allegations

[5] Specifying Amount of Damages

[6] Verification

[7] Cross References

§ 544.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Passenger [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Entitled Person(s) Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Wrongful Death Actions

[5] Cross References

§ 544.52 Allegation--Injury to Passenger While Boarding or Alighting Taxicab

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Examples of Negligent Acts

§ 544.53 Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Sudden Stop

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 544.54 Allegations--Injury to Passenger Before Boarding Taxicab But After Initiation of Driver-Passenger Relationship

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 544.55 Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Violation of Traffic or Safety Rule by Driver

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Examples of Negligent Acts

§ 544.56 Allegations--Injury to Passenger Caused by Failure to Provide Seat Belts

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.01

§ 544.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the duties and liabilities of taxicabs as common carriers, the licensing and regulation of taxicabs, and contains forms for use by passengers injured or killed by the negligent operation of taxicabs.

It includes forms of complaint for use by passengers for personal injury and wrongful death against a taxicab company and its driver, and a third party automobile driver involved in a collision with the taxicab [*see §§ 544.50* and *544.51*].

It also includes allegations that can be used in the complaint set out in *§ 544.50* for passengers injured:

- While boarding or alighting from a taxicab [*see § 544.52*].
- By a sudden stop of a taxicab [*see § 544.53*].
- Before boarding [*see § 544.54*].
- When a cab driver violates a traffic or safety rule [*see § 544.55*].
- Because of the failure to provide seatbelts in a taxicab [*see § 544.56*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local RegulationTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesLicensing & Registration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.02

§ 544.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in actions involving injuries caused by common carriers of persons generally, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* . For discussion of actions involving automobile collisions and automobile passengers generally, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* to Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Trial* .

For more general discussion and forms regarding negligence and wrongful death generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* ; and Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* , respectively.

Other coverage that may be of interest includes:

- For a form of complaint to bring an action by a passenger for assault and battery against a carrier of persons for reward, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

- For discussion and forms related to licensing generally, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies*

- For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 544.03-544.09

[Reserved]

§§ 544.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.10

§ 544.10 Governing Law

The regulation of public utilities generally is governed by *Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 1-9*. The duties of carriers of persons for reward are set out in *Civ. Code §§ 2100-2104*. The definition of common carrier is set out in *Civ. Code § 2168*, and the general duties of common carriers of persons are set out in *Civ. Code §§ 2180-2191*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.11

§ 544.11 Taxicab as Common Carrier

Everyone who offers to the public to carry persons, property, or messages, excepting only telegraphic messages, is a common carrier of whatever he or she thus offers to carry [*Civ. Code § 2168*]. A taxicab company that holds itself out to serve those who apply for transportation is a common carrier, and as such is held to the highest degree of care [*Bezera v. Associated Oil Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 139, 143, 3 P.2d 622]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.12

§ 544.12 Taxicab as Public Utility

[1] In General

Private corporations and persons that own, operate, control, or manage a line, plant, or system for the transportation of people or property, directly or indirectly to or for the public, and common carriers, are public utilities subject to control by the legislature [*Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3*; *see People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 923, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . A taxicab company, because it is a common carrier [*see § 544.11*], is a public utility [*see Pub. Util. Code § 216(a)*].

[2] Licensing and Regulation by Local Authority

[a] Power to Regulate

Municipalities have the power to license, regulate, and set rates for taxicabs operating within their boundaries [*People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 921-925, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319* ; *Veh. Code § 21100(b)* (conferring power on local authorities to license and regulate vehicles for hire and drivers of passenger vehicles for hire); *but see People v. Levering (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 19, 176 Cal. Rptr. 297* (ordinance requiring city permit for vehicles for hire as unconstitutional legislation in area preempted by state law)]. As common carriers, taxicabs may be subject to rate regulation by the state legislature through the Public Utilites Commission [*see Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 3-8*]. However, in *People ex rel. Freitas*, the court stated that the legislature had not claimed jurisdiction over this area, nor had it sought control of it, and that absent an assertion by the state of its authority to regulate taxicab rates, cities have the power to do so [*People ex rel. Freitas v. City and County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 924, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . The *Freitas* court based its decision in part on a previous holding, *In re Martinez* [*In re Martinez (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 259, 262, 138 P.2d 10* , *overruled on other grounds, People v. Western Air Lines, Inc. (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 621, 268 P.2d 723]* , which held that the legislature intended to exempt taxicabs from state regulation [*People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 924, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . The court also stated that the legislature manifested its intention not to give the Public Utilities Commission the power to regulate taxicab fares if they are already licensed and regulated by a city, by exempting taxicabs from regulation under the Passenger Charter-Party Carriers' Act [*see Pub. Util. Code §§ 5351-5419*; *Pub. Util. Code § 5353(g)*; *People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 923,*

155 Cal. Rptr. 319] .

[b] Multi-City Carriers

When license and permit fees are imposed by a city on multi-city carriers that do business both within and outside of the city imposing the fee, the fee must be apportioned in a manner that fairly reflects that proportion of the activity that is actually carried on within the jurisdiction imposing the fee [*City of Los Angeles v. Shell Oil Co. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 108, 124, 93 Cal. Rptr. 1, 480 P.2d 953* ; *People ex rel. Flournoy v. Yellow Cab Co. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 41, 46, 106 Cal. Rptr. 874]* .

[c] Taxicab Permit as License or Privilege

The use of streets by taxicabs is a privilege that may be granted or withheld without violating either due process or equal protection. The privilege may be granted exclusively or nonexclusively to render public services [*In re Petersen (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 177, 182-183, 331 P.2d 24* ; for discussion, *see* [e], *below*]. A license or permit to engage in the taxicab business, issued by the city pursuant to its police power, does not convey a vested property right [*O'Connor v. Superior Court (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 107, 114, 153 Cal. Rptr. 306]* . Thus, in one case, a police commission decision to grant 110 new taxicab permits was upheld because it was for the purpose of public convenience and necessity and presented no controversy touching on the impairment of vested rights [*Luxor Cab Co. v. Cahill (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 551, 558, 98 Cal. Rptr. 576]* . Similarly, a measure adopted by popular vote that required all existing taxicab permitees to surrender their permits in exchange for new permits that were nonassignable and nontransferable was held not to impair unconstitutionally the obligation of contracts or take property without just compensation because the permitees did not possess a vested right in the taxicab permits generally, or in the transferability of those permits [*O'Connor v. Superior Court (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 107, 114-115, 153 Cal. Rptr. 306]* .

[d] Regulation as Not Antitrust Violation

A city sued by a taxicab company for antitrust violations resulting from the city's regulation and licensing of taxicab operations is exempt from liability under the Sherman Antitrust Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1*] if the city has met the test for the state action exemption under the Sherman Act [*Golden State Transit Corp. v. City of Los Angeles (CD Cal. 1983) 563 F. Supp. 169, 171-172]* . The two-fold test requires a showing that (1) the state has a policy to displace competition with regulation; and (2) the state has actively supervised the implementation of the restraint. In the case of taxicab regulation, California has an affirmative policy of displacing competition, as shown by the authorization of state regulation and licensing of taxicabs under the Constitution and the Public Utiltity Code, and the delegation of that power to municipalities [*Golden State Transit Corp v. City of Los Angeles (CD Cal. 1983) 563 F. Supp. 169, 171-172* ; see *Cal Const. art. XII, § 4*; *Pub. Util. Code §§ 5353(g), 5360*].

A city may not be sued under the California antitrust law, the Cartwright Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750-16761*], for violations regarding the regulation and licensing of taxicab companies because a city, as a political subdivision of the state, does not meet the definition of "person" for purposes of being sued as a defendant under the Act [*People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 920-921, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319* ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 16702*].

[e] Location of Taxicab Stands

Local authorities may by ordinance license and regulate the location of stands on streets and highways for use by taxicabs and other public carriers for hire in their respective jurisdictions. No such ordinance is effective as to any state highway until approved in writing by the Department of Transportation, but that approval is not required if maintenance of a state highway is delegated by the Department to a city [*Veh. Code § 21112*].

A city ordinance allowing exclusive cabstands to be designated to permitee companies has been constitutionally upheld

against due process and equal protection challenges on the grounds (1) that it could promote the constant availability of cabs while avoiding the traffic obstruction and disorderly solicitation of one customer by competitors that could result from an excessive supply of cabs and (2) that the use of the highways by a common carrier is merely a privilege. Further, the government has power to grant exclusive rights to engage in services of a public character as contrasted with an ordinary business or profession [*In re Petersen (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 177, 182-183, 331 P.2d 24* , appeal dism. *360 U.S. 314, 79 S. Ct. 1294, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1259* (ordinance giving police chief discretion to designate and issue permits for the exclusive use of specified cabstands by a single taxicab company)]. The power to establish exclu sive stands has also been upheld as a regulation conducive to the general welfare comparable to the granting of an exclusive franchise [*In re Petersen (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 177, 182-183, 331 P.2d 24* , appeal dism. *360 U.S. 314, 79 S. Ct. 1294, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1259* ; *People v. Galena (1937) 24 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 770, 70 P.2d 724]* .

[f] Judicial Review of Regulatory Decisions

The procedure for review of a municipality's decision regarding the issuance, revocation, or denial of taxicab permits is by writ of mandate [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1084-1087*; *O'Connor v. Superior Court (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 107, 110, 153 Cal. Rptr. 306]* or, for review of the decision of an administrative agency, by administrative mandamus [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1094.5, 1094.6*; *Luxor Cab Co. v. Cahill (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 551, 558, 98 Cal. Rptr. 576]* . For forms for use in preparing a traditional writ of mandate, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* . For forms for use in preparing a writ of mandate to review an administrative proceeding, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawSherman ActCoverageExemptionsEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local RegulationTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesLicensing & Registration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.13

§ 544.13 Duty to Passenger

[1] Highest Degree of Care

Every one who offers to the public to carry persons, property, or messages (except for telegraphic messages), is a common carrier of whatever he or she offers to carry [*Civ. Code § 2168*]. Thus, a taxicab operator as a common carrier of passengers is subject to the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 2168-2191* regarding, among other things, the handling of baggage and payment of fares.

A carrier of persons for reward must provide vehicles that are safe for the purposes for which they are used, and the carrier will not be excused for default in this respect by any degree of care [*Civ. Code § 2101*]. The carrier must also avoid overloading or overcrowding of the vehicle [*Civ. Code § 2102*]. Passengers must be given all usual and reasonable accommodations by the carrier, and they must be treated with civility and given a reasonable degree of attention [*Civ. Code § 2103*]. The carrier must also travel at reasonable rates of speed, and without any unreasonable delay or deviation from the proper route [*Civ. Code § 2104*].

A taxicab company, as a common carrier, is subject to the highest degree of care [*Bezera v. Associated Oil Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 139, 143, 3 P.2d 622* ; *see § 544.11*]. In addition, any carrier of persons for reward must use the utmost care and diligence for their safe carriage, must provide everything necessary for that purpose, and must exercise to that end a reasonable degree of skill [*Civ. Code § 2100*; *see Butigan v. Yellow Cab Co. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 652, 657, 320 P.2d 500]* .

The standard of care for a common carrier, that is a carrier that customarily and daily cruises the streets for patronage and awaits calls of the public for transportation, is to provide the utmost care and diligence for the safety of the passenger [*Civ. Code § 2100*; *Butigan v. Yellow Cab Co. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 652, 657, 320 P.2d 500* ; *Hopkins v. Yellow Cab Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 394, 396-398, 250 P.2d 330]* . That standard is distinguished from the standard for private carriers, which is to provide only ordinary care for the passenger's safety. A common carrier becomes a private carrier when the common carrier contracts to render a special service for a group of individuals or a public agency [*Hopkins v. Yellow Cab Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 394, 397-398, 250 P.2d 330]* .

For discussion of duty of common carrier of persons for reward generally, see Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars* .

[2] Creation of Carrier-Passenger Relationship

The relationship of carrier and passenger may begin before the passenger actually enters the taxicab. The relationship is established when a person who intends in good faith to become a passenger goes to a depot, waiting room, or other place designated as the site of departure, and by some action taken by the carrier, the carrier indicates acceptance of the passenger as a traveler. Additionally, if the carrier assumes the responsibility of conducting the person who has become a passenger to the point of departure of the transporting vehicle, then the relation of passenger and carrier exists during that period [*Grier v. Ferrant (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311, 144 P.2d 631]* .

[3] Duration of Carrier-Passenger Relationship

The rule requiring a common carrier to provide the passenger with the highest degree of care pertains to the contract of carriage and remains in effect until the passenger reaches a place outside the sphere of any activity of the carrier that might reasonably constitute a mobile or animated hazard to the passenger. The rule applies to disputes over the fare between a cab driver and a passenger. While they remain in each other's presence actively carrying on the dispute, the passenger is not discharged under the contract of carriage, and the carrier, its agents, and employees are still bound to exercise the highest degree of care in refraining from initiating conduct that would jeopardize the passenger's safety [*Dayton v. Yellow Cab Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 740, 745, 193 P.2d 959]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.14

§ 544.14 Passenger's Reciprocal Obligations

Passengers have a reciprocal obligation to use all reasonable care within their power for their own safety and to accord the same civility to the carrier, its agents, and employees as is required from the carrier to the passengers. Thus, a cab driver who is attacked by an aggressor passenger, whether in a dispute over the fare or otherwise, has the same right to self-protection as would anyone else [*Dayton v. Yellow Cab Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 740, 745-746, 193 P.2d 959]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsIntentional TortsDefensesDefense of Self & OthersTortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.15

§ 544.15 Proof of Ownership

In a case in which the ownership of the taxicab is in dispute, evidence that the company's name was painted on the cab is sufficient proof of ownership [*Tieman v. Red Top Cab Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 40, 45, 3 P.2d 381]* . Thus, in a case involving an accident, it was held that a taxicab painted with the distinctive colors of the taxicab company and bearing the name of the company on its sides was sufficient proof of ownership of the cab by the company that used those distinctive signs and markings, despite the company's contrary evidence that it had no franchise in the city in which the accident occurred, that it owned no taxicabs, that it had no stands from which cabs were dispatched, and that the driver of the cab was not a member of the company's drivers' association [*Smith v. Deutsch (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 419, 420-421, 200 P.2d 802]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesLicensing & Registration

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.16

§ 544.16 Negligence Actions by Passenger

[1] Injury While Boarding or Alighting

A cab driver does not breach his or her duty to the passengers when he or she discharges them from the taxicab away from the curb, when there is no danger of either the passengers being hit by passing vehicles or of injury to them due to the condition of the street. Neither is there a duty to assist passengers as they get out of a taxi [*Bua v. G.I. Taxi Co. (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 612, 615-616, 9 Cal. Rptr. 118]* . However, depending on the particular facts and circumstances, a taxicab operator may be found negligent for the manner in which he or she picks up or discharges passengers. For example, a jury verdict holding a cab driver liable for injuries incurred by the passenger when the driver parked the taxicab diagonally to the curb without warning the passenger that the cab was not parallel to the curb was upheld on appeal [*Healy v. Yellow Cab Co. (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 479, 480-481, 90 P.2d 116]* .

The carrier can also be held liable for injuries incurred by a passenger who is on the way to the cab but who has not yet boarded, in certain circumstances. If the relationship of carrier and passenger has already been established [*see § 544.13[2]*], the carrier may be held liable to a passenger who is injured on his or her way to boarding the taxicab while being escorted or conducted by the carrier or the carrier's agent. For example, a handicapped man who went to a waiting room designated for loading and discharging taxicab passengers was injured while en route to the taxicab. The passenger was not taken to the usual site for boarding, which was directly in front of the waiting room, but was escorted, without physical assistance, down a wet, slippery sidewalk 150 feet or more to a waiting cab. The court held that the passenger-carrier relationship existed and that the award to the passenger was proper [*Grier v. Ferrant (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311-313, 144 P.2d 631]* .

For a form of allegation that a passenger was injured by the taxicab driver's negligence while boarding or alighting the taxicab, see *§ 544.52*.

[2] Injury From Violation of Traffic or Safety Rule

It is proper for a court to instruct the jury that the violation of a traffic ordinance or statute raises a presumption that the one committing the violation was negligent. For example, in a case in which a city ordinance prohibited the parking of vehicles more than eighteen inches from the curb, a verdict of negligence was upheld against a taxicab driver and the

cab company for injuries to a passenger and her husband, who was not a passenger, when the cab was hit by a car while the cab was parked across a driveway, sticking out several feet into the street [*Sipperly v. San Diego Yellow Cabs, Inc. (1949) 89 Cal. App. 2d 645, 649-652, 201 P.2d 543]* .

Negligence can also be shown by the fact that a driver is driving at an excessive speed in a situation in which care and caution should be exercised. A taxicab company was found concurrently liable with a railway company for injuries to a passenger when the taxicab was hit by a train because, although the railroad should have had warning signals at the crossing, the cab driver did not stop before crossing and instead proceeded at an excessive rate of speed across the tracks [*Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 231, 300 P.2d 910]* . Similarly, a taxicab driver was found negligent for injuries incurred by a passenger in a collision at an intersection because the cab driver had been driving at an excessive rate of 50 miles per hour, and additionally because, in violation of the law, he had not yielded the right of way to the other driver [*Roy v. Mission Taxi Co. (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 438, 447-449, 225 P.2d 920]* .

For a form of allegation that a passenger was injured by the taxicab driver's negligence in violating a traffic or safety rule, see *§ 544.55*.

[3] Injury From Sudden Movement of Taxicab

If a taxicab makes a sudden jerk or lurch or moves while the driver is still in his or her seat at the wheel, and a passenger who is exercising due care in the act of leaving the cab is injured because of the movement, the court may find that the proximate cause of the injuries was the driver's negligence [*Pedrow v. Federoff (1926) 77 Cal. App. 164, 171, 247 P. 212]* . Likewise, a driver may be found negligent for suddenly moving the door that the passenger is holding while being assisted into the taxicab, causing the passenger to lose his or her balance and fall [*Riis v. Yellow Cab Co. (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 25, 26, 83 P.2d 959]* .

For related forms of allegations, see *§§ 544.52 -544.54*.

[4] Concurrent Negligence of Taxicab Driver and Other Motorist

Concurrent liability may be imposed on both the taxicab company and its driver and the driver of another vehicle involved in an accident for injuries incurred by the taxicab passenger, if both drivers are concurrently negligent and each is a proximate cause of the accident [*Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 231, 300 P.2d 910]* .

For example, both the cab driver and the driver of the vehicle that hit it from behind were found liable to the taxicab passengers in a case in which the cab driver failed to signal and the other motorist failed to stop and avoid the collision [*Stark v. Yellow Cab Co. (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 217, 218-219, 202 P.2d 802]* . In another case a truck driver and the taxicab driver were found concurrently negligent for failing to exercise due care in entering an intersection and avoiding a collision between the two vehicles [*Roy v. Mission Taxi Co. (1950) 101 Cal. App. 2d 438, 444-445, 225 P.2d 920]* .

For a forms of complaint against a cab driver and the driver of another vehicle, see *§§ 544.50* (personal injury) and *544.51* (wrongful death).

[5] Res Ipsa Loquitur

The doctrine of res ipsa loquitur may be used by a passenger to raise a presumption of negligence on the part of the carrier in a case in which the passenger is uncertain as to what occurred to cause the injury, the taxicab was under the exclusive management and control of the carrier and its agents at the time of the injury, and the accident would not have occurred if those in control of the vehicle used proper care [*see* *Taylor v. Luxor Cab Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 46,*

52-53, 246 P.2d 45] . The fact that the accident involved another vehicle not under the control of the carrier does not prevent the use of the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur [*Stark v. Yellow Cab Co. (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 217, 220-221, 202 P.2d 802]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceProofRes Ipsa LoquiturElementsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofRes Ipsa LoquiturElementsControlTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawSafety CodesTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.17

§ 544.17 Assault Actions

A carrier owes to the passenger the highest degree of care in refraining from initiating conduct that would jeopardize the passenger's safety. The rule of utmost care and diligence set forth in *Civ. Code § 2100* includes the case of a dispute over the fare between a cab driver and a passenger [*Dayton v. Yellow Cab Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 740, 745, 193 P.2d 959* ; *see Civ. Code § 2100*; *see also* discussions in *§ 544.13*]. The carrier also has a duty to provide the highest degree of care to protect the passenger from the unprovoked assaults of the other passengers [*see* *Lewis v. South S.F. Yellow Cab Co. (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 849, 852, 210 P.2d 62]* .

A taxicab company that employs a driver who has assaulted a passenger is liable as a principal if the assault takes place in the course of the driver-agent's employment. It is immaterial whether or not the assault was authorized by the employer if it is committed by the driver in the course of his or her employment [*Connell v. Clark (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 941, 944-945, 200 P.2d 26]* .

For a form of complaint for damages for assault and battery brought by a passenger against an agent of a common carrier that may be adapted for use by a taxicab passenger, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* . For a form of complaint for damages for assault and battery brought by a passenger against a carrier of persons for reward, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.18

§ 544.18 Requirement of Owner's Ability to Respond in Damages

[1] Statutory Requirement

Every owner of a vehicle used in the transportation of passengers for hire, including taxicabs, when the operation of the vehicle is not subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission, must maintain, whenever he or she may be engaged in conducting those operations, proof of financial responsibility resulting from the ownership or operation of the vehicle and arising by reason of personal injury to, or death of, any one person, of at least $15,000, and subject to the limit of $15,000 for each person injured or killed, of at least $30,000 for such injury to, or death of, two or more persons in any one accident, and for damages to property of at least $5,000 resulting from one accident [*Veh. Code § 16500*].

Proof of financial responsibility may be maintained by any of the following methods [*Veh. Code § 16500*]:

(1) being insured under a motor vehicle liability policy against such liability;

(2) obtaining a bond of the same kind and containing the same provisions as bonds specified in *Veh. Code § 16434*;

(3) depositing $35,000 with the Department of Motor Vehicles, to be deposited in a special deposit account with the State Controller; or

(4) qualifying as a self-insurer under *Veh. Code § 16503*.

A taxicab owner may not use or give permission to another to use any vehicle used in the transportation of persons or property in the conduct of a business without maintaining proof of financial responsibility as required by *Veh. Code §§ 16500-16503* [*Veh. Code § 16502*]. All vehicles used in the transportation of persons or property in the conduct of a business, except vehicles subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commmission, that are registered in the name of any person convicted of violating *Veh. Code § 16502* must be suspended from registration until the owner maintains proof of financial responsibility [*see Veh. Code § 16503*].

Veh. Code §§ 16500-16503 do not prevent local authorities, within the reasonable exercise of their police power, from adopting rules and regulations, by ordinance or resolution, licensing and regulating the operation of any vehicle for hire and the drivers of passenger vehicles for hire [*Veh. Code § 16501*].

[2] No Uninsured Motorist Coverage Requirement

Taxicab companies are not required to include uninsured motorist coverage in their liability insurance policies. Although taxicab companies, as common carriers, have the duty to use the utmost care and diligence for the safety of their passengers under *Civ. Code § 2100*, that duty does not include securing and carrying uninsured motorist coverage. The risk of injury to a passenger in a taxi cab by an uninsured motorist may be foreseeable, but the legislature, under *Ins. Code § 11580.2(b)*, expressly exempted automobiles used as public conveyances from the requirement of carrying uninsured motorist insurance. Thus, a taxicab company that procures a liability insurance policy pursuant to *Veh. Code § 16500*, but intentionally waives uninsured motorist coverage, is not liable to an injured passenger based on failure to carry that coverage [*Brown v. All Am. Cab Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 896, 897-898, 129 Cal. Rptr. 495]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageCompulsory CoverageProof of Financial ResponsibilityInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceCoverageUninsured MotoristsGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART I. Introduction

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 544.19-544.29

[Reserved]

§§ 544.19[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.30

§ 544.30 Related Texts from LexisNexis

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving carriers, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 33, *Carriers* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving assault actions generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 21, *Assault and Battery* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving negligence actions generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

For forms of interrogatories for use in actions involving carriers, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, *Carriers* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.31

§ 544.31 State Constitution

Regulation of public utilities generally. *Cal. Const. art. XII, §§ 1-9*

Classification of public utilities subject to control by Legislature. *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 3*

Control of rates, regulations by Public Utilities Commission. *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 4*

Local regulation of public utilities. *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 8*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsRatemakingEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.32

§ 544.32 State Statutes

[1] General Provisions

Carriers, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 2085-2090*

Carriage of persons for reward, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 2100-2104*

Higher duty of carriers of persons for reward. *Civ. Code §§ 2100*

Common carriers, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 2168-2178*

Common carrier defined. *Civ. Code § 2168*; *Pub. Util. Code § 211*

Common carriers of persons, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 2180-2191*

[2] Equipment

Rule prohibiting operation of private passenger motor vehicle on highway unless all passengers sixteen years of age or older are restrained by safety belt as inapplicable to operator of taxicab, as defined, when driving on a city street; operator of taxicab as not permitted to operate taxicab unless passengers six years of age or older or weighing 60 pounds or more in front seat are properly restrained by safety belt. *Veh. Code § 27315(d)(1),(3)*

Operator of limousine for hire as not permitted to operate vehicle unless passengers six years of age or older or weighing 60 pounds or more in front seat are properly restrained by safety belt. *Veh. Code § 27315(d)(2)*

Owner or operator of taxicab or limousine for hire as required to maintain safety belts in good working order for use of occupants. *Veh. Code § 27315(f)*

[3] Miscellaneous

Taxicab driver misdirecting hotel guest to other accommodations as guilty of misdemeanor. *Penal Code § 649*

[4] Regulation

Definition of public utility. *Pub. Util. Code § 211, 216(a)*

Exclusion of taxicabs from provisions of Charter-Party Carriers' Act (*Pub. Util. Code §§ 5351-5412*). *Pub. Util. Code § 5353(g)*

Power of local authorities to regulate and license passenger vehicles for hire. *Veh. Code § 21100(b)*

Power of local authorities to regulate taxicab stands. *Veh. Code § 21112*

Exceptions to rules against stopping, standing, or parking for taxicabs and other carriers. *Veh. Code § 22500(b),(e)*

Power of peace officer, public officer, or employee to impound and retain possession of taxicab when officer arrests person for unlicensed operation of taxicab and when offense occurred at public airport, within 100 feet of public airport, or within two miles of California/Mexico international border. *Gov. Code § 53075.6*

Authority of local governments to investigate and sanction taxicab services operating without a valid license, certificate, or permit. *Gov. Code §§ 53075.7-53075.9*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.33

§ 544.33 Decisions

[1] Duty of Care to Passengers

Person who rented limousine and who was abandoned while drunk, clad only in swim suit, and without personal effects or any way to get home, as not stating cause of action for tortious breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, but as able to state causes of action for breach of contract (possibly including damages for emotional distress), for conversion, and for breach of statutory obligations imposed by *Civ. Code § 2100* and *Pub. Util. Code §§ 2106, 5360, 5382*. *Rogoff v. Grabowski (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 624, 633-634, 246 Cal. Rptr. 185*

[2] Negligence

Taxicab, as carrier of persons for reward, must use utmost care and diligence for their safe carriage and to provide everything necessary for that purpose. *Butigan v. Yellow Cab Co. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 652, 657, 320 P.2d 500* ; *Hopkins v. Yellow Cab Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 394, 396-398, 250 P.2d 330*

Evidence that company's name was painted on cab as sufficient proof of ownership. *Smith v. Deutsch (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 419, 420-421, 200 P.2d 802* ; *Tieman v. Red Top Cab Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 40, 45, 3 P.2d 381*

Question of taxicab company's liability for failure to provide visible seat belts to passenger, and whether that constituted a proximate cause of passenger's injuries was question for jury. *McNeil v. Yellow Cab Co. (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 116, 147 Cal. Rptr. 733*

Res ipsa loquitur applies in case in which plaintiff taxicab passenger was unaware of circumstances of accident between taxicab and other vehicle. *Formosa v. Yellow Cab Co. (1939) 31 Cal. App. 2d 77, 85-86, 87 P.2d 716*

Plaintiff taxicab passenger, although aware of many circumstances of occurrence of accident, may rely on duty of utmost care and res ipsa loquitur. *Dieterle v. Yellow Cab Co (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 97, 100, 93 P.2d 171*

Taxicab, as common carrier, as owing highest degree of care to passengers. *Bezera v. Associated Oil Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 139, 143, 3 P.2d 622*

[3] Regulation

Grounds of complaint to recover overcharges allegedly made by defendant taxicab company constituted proper class action. *Daar v. Yellow Cab Co. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 695, 715, 63 Cal. Rptr. 724, 433 P.2d 732*

Ordinance allowing police chief discretion to designate and issue permits to certain taxicab companies for use of exclusive cabstands is permissible. *In re Petersen (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 177, 182-183, 331 P.2d 24* , appeal dism. *360 U.S. 314, 79 S. Ct. 1294, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1259*

Incentives for drivers of clean air taxicabs adopted by city in furtherance of its goal of cleaner air at the airport were part of a pilot program and were regulatory acts pursuant to the city's police power. A government entity may not contract away its right to exercise the police power in the future, and the city was free to subsequently adjust incentives downward where the facts did not show that the city promised not to amend the incentive program. *Cotta v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1550, 1561* , Cal. Rptr. 3d 612

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local RegulationTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.34

§ 544.34 Law Reviews

Strachan, *Taxi Law,* 118 Sol. J. 176 (1974)

Eckert, *The Los Angeles Taxi Monopoly: An Economic Inquiry, 43 So. Cal. L. Rev. 407 (1970)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawMonopolizationGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.35

§ 544.35 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Insurance*, §§ 180, 181, 187-189, 200-204, 212, 315 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART II. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 544.36-544.39

[Reserved]

§§ 544.36[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART III. ESSENTIAL ALLEGATIONS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.40

§ 544.40 Essential Allegations

Complaints by passengers against taxicab owners and their operators should include the following allegations:

- Status or business of defendant as carrier of persons for reward and common carrier in order to establish the highest duty of care [*see Civ. Code §§ 2100, 2168*; *Bezera v. Associated Oil Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 139, 143, 3 P.2d 622]* ;

- Status of the injured person as a person carried for reward (paying passenger) at the time of injury [*see Dayton v. Yellow Cab Co. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 740, 744, 193 P.2d 959* ; *Grier v. Ferrant (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311, 144 P.2d 631]* .

- Ownership of taxicab [*see Smith v. Deutsch (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 419, 420-421, 200 P.2d 802* ; *Tieman v. Red Top Cab Co. (1931) 117 Cal. App. 40, 45, 3 P.2d 381]* .

- Agency or employee status of driver or others who acted negligently [*see Smith v. Deutsch (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 419, 424-425, 200 P.2d 802]* .

- Breach of duty by the carrier, its agents, and employees (e.g., negligent operation, maintenance, etc., of taxicab) that was a proximate cause of injury to the passenger [*see Butigan v. Yellow Cab Co. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 652, 659, 320 P.2d 500]* .

NOTE:

Although some pleaders have attempted in carrier-passenger cases to state causes of action for breach of contract as well as in tort, it appears that if the complaint sets out a breach of duty and consequent injury as the gravamen of the action, the carrier's violation of its obligation to safely carry arises out of tort and not contract [*see* *Basler v. Sacramento Elec., Gas & Ry. Co. (1913) 166 Cal. 33, 36, 134 P. 993* ; *Williamson v. Pacific Greyhound Lines (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 250, 256, 153 P.2d 990]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART III. ESSENTIAL ALLEGATIONS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 544.41-544.49

[Reserved]

§§ 544.41[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.50

§ 544.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a), 2100]--By Passenger Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code § 1714(a), 2100]--By Passenger Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR PERSONAL
_____ [*names*], [and DOES 1	)	INJURY [AND PROPERTY DAMAGE]
through _____,]	)	(Negligence)
Defendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name of cab driver*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ [*city*] _____ County, California.

[*EITHER*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation

duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

[*OR*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ (partnership *or* unincorporated association), doing business as _____ [*fictitious name*], with its partners conducting business in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. [Defendants _____ (*names*) are, and at all times herein mentioned were, members of that _____ (partnership *or* unincorporated association) (and are, and at all times herein mentioned were, residents of _____ County, California)].

[*OR*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a sole proprietorship, owned by _____ [*name*], who at all times herein mentioned conducted business in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

3. Defendant _____ [*name of automobile driver*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

[4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by that negligence.]

[5. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting in the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

6. Defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a common carrier of passengers for reward, and as such offered the use of taxicabs owned by him/her/it with drivers employed by him/her/it to the public for hire.

7. Defendant _____ [*name of cab driver*] was at all times herein mentioned an employee of defendant _____ [*name of cab company*], and in the commission of the acts here alleged was acting in the scope and course of his/her employment and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendant(s).

8. Defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] is, and at all times herein mentioned, was the owner of a taxicab known as _____ [*name of taxi company, e.g.,* Blue & White] Cab No. _____ [*specify*], bearing California license No. _____ [*specify*], hereafter referred to as "the taxicab."

9. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s) of owner(s) of other car*] [, and each of them], was/were the owner(s) of a certain _____ [*year, make, model of vehicle*] motor vehicle, California license No. _____ [*specify*], hereafter referred to as _____ [*make of vehicle, e.g.,* "the Chrysler"].

[*EITHER*]

10. Defendant _____ [*name of owner*] was driving and operating _____ [*make of vehicle, e.g.*, "the Chrysler"] at the time of the collision alleged in this complaint.

[*OR*]

10. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [A]t the time of the collision herein alleged defendant _____ [*name of driver*] was driving and operating _____ [*make of vehicle, e.g.*, "the Chrysler"] [with the knowledge, permission, and consent of _____ (*name of owner*)].

11. On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants _____ [*name of cab company*] and _____ [*name of cab driver*] were transporting plaintiff as a passenger for hire in the taxicab, and defendant _____ [*cab driver*] was driving the taxicab in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*] in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. At or about that same time, defendant _____ [*name of automobile driver*] was driving _____ [*specify vehicle, e.g.*, the Chrysler] in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*]. Both drivers operated, entrusted, controlled, and maintained their vehicles so negligently that as a proximate result of that negligence, the vehicles collided at _____ [s *pecify intersection or location of collision*], causing plaintiff to suffer severe personal injuries, as hereafter alleged.

12. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff was injured as follows: _____ [*describe injuries incurred by plaintiff*]. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

13. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has been required to and has in curred [and will continue to incur] expenses for services of physicians and surgeons, hospital care, and other medical services and supplies.

14. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and in the present.

[15. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, plaintiff's _____ (*describe personal property*) was _____ (damaged *or* destroyed), all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. For loss of earnings according to proof;

[4. For damage to personal property _____ (according to proof *or* in the sum of

$_____);]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a passenger to bring an action for personal injuries against a taxicab owner and driver and the owner and driver of another vehicle for injuries sustained by the passenger in a collision between the taxicab and the other automobile. The carrier and driver of other vehicle involved in an accident are concurrently liable if both drivers are at fault [*see Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 231, 300 P.2d 910* ; *Stark v. Yellow Cab Co. (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 217, 218-220, 202 P.2d 802* ; *see § 544.16[4]*]. It includes optional allegations to seek damages for property damage in addition to personal injury.

The allegations set forth in *§§ 544.52 -544.56*, which refer to specific circumstances under which the injury occured, may be added to this complaint, if appropriate.

[3] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The defendants' residence and capacity (Paragraphs 1-3).

- The responsibility of fictitiously named defendants sued pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* (optional Paragraph 4).

- That the defendants are agents of one another (optional Paragraph 5).

- That defendant cab company is a common carrier, which gives rise to the legal duty to provide passengers with a high degree of care pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2100* (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2168* (every one who offers to public to carry persons is common carrier)].

- That the cab driver was an agent of the cab company, acting within the course of his or her employment, for purposes of applying vicarious liability to the cab company (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 2338* (responsibility of principal for agent's negligence)].

- That the cab company was the owner of the cab involved in the collision (Paragraph 8).

- That the other automobile involved in the collision was owned by the other named defendant (Paragraph 9).

- That the owner or a third person was driving the other automobile involved in the collision (alternative Paragraphs 10).

- That defendant automobile driver was negligent with regard to plaintiff, and that defendants cab owner and driver were negligent and breached the duty owed to passengers for hire by their negligence (Paragraph 11).

- That defendants' negligence was the proximate cause of injuries suffered by plaintiff (Paragraph 12).

- That plaintiff incurred damages and expenses as a proximate result of defendants' negligence (Paragraphs 13, 14, and optional Paragraph 15).

[5] Specifying Amount of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages must for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the

complaint, see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*].

[6] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and ficticious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms illustrating format of complaints generally, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For a discussion of the law and forms relating to damages recoverable in tort actions, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.51

§ 544.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Passenger [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Entitled Person(s) Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Wrongful Death of Passenger [Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60] Based on Negligence [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Entitled Person(s) Against Owner and Driver of Taxicab and Owner and Driver of Another Vehicle--Collision

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*], [as _____ (*specify capacity*, *e.g.*, Personal Representative of the Estate of _____ (*name*), Deceased,] Plaintiff(s), vs. _____ [*names*], [and DOES 1 through _____,] Defendants.	)))))))	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES (Wrongful Death) [LIMITED CIVIL CASE] [Amount demanded _____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

Plaintiff(s) alleges/allege:

1. _____ [Plaintiff(s) *or* The person(s) listed below] is/are entitled to bring an action for the wrongful death of _____ [*name of decedent*] (hereinafter, "decedent") pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure Section 377.60*, based on his/her/their relationship to decedent, as follows:

Name(s)	Relationship to Decedent
_____	_____
___	
_____	_____
___	
_____	_____
___	

[_____ (*If one or more persons are required to establish additional facts, such as that there is no surviving spouse, domestic partner, child, or issue of deceased child, or that the person was dependent on decedent, in order to be entitled to bring a wrongful death action under Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60, specify facts that satisfy applicable requirement.*)]

[*ADD, if decedent's personal representative is maintaining action on behalf of one or more entitled persons*]

Plaintiff _____ [*name*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting personal representative of the estate of decedent, and brings this action on behalf of _____ [all of the above-listed persons entitled to bring a cause of action for the wrongful death of decedent *or* the following person(s) entitled to bring an action for the wrongful death of decedent: _____ (*specify person(s) on whose behalf personal representative is maintaining action*)].

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 544.50[1], Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 4.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 5.*]

5. [*Allegation that defendant cab company is common carrier. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 6.*]

6. [*Agency allegation. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 7.*]

7. [*Allegation that defendant cab company owned and controlled cab involved in accident. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 8.*]

8. [*Allegation that other named defendant owned automobile involved in accident. See § 544.50[1], Paragraph 9.*]

9. [*Allegation identifying operator or other automobile. See § 544.50[1], alternative Paragraphs 10.*]

10. On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants _____ [*name of cab company*] and _____ [*name of cab driver*] were transporting decedent as a passenger for hire in the taxicab, and defendant _____ [*cab driver*] was driving the taxicab in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*]. At or about that same time, defendant _____ [*name of automobile driver*] was driving _____ [*specify vehicle, e.g.*, the Chrysler] in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*]. Both drivers operated, entrusted, controlled, and maintained their vehicles so negligently that as a proximate result of that negligence, the vehicles collided at _____ [*specify intersection or location of collision*], and decedent sustained severe injuries from which he/she thereafter died.

11. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, decedent died on _____ [*date*].

12. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, and the death of decedent, plaintiff(s) has/have sustained pecuniary loss resulting from the loss of the society, comfort, attention, services, and support of decedent.

13. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant, and each of them, and the death of decedent, plaintiff _____ [*name of person incurring expense*] has incurred funeral and burial expenses.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) prays/pray judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For funeral and burial expenses for _____ [*name of person incurring expense*] according to proof;

3. For loss of earnings according to proof;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*party's status*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 544.50[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by persons entitled by statute to bring a wrongful death action, or by the decedent's personal representative on their behalf, based on the death of a decedent who had been a passenger in defendants' taxicab, against a taxicab owner and driver and the owner and driver of another vehicle for the wrongful death of decedent caused by a collision between the taxicab and the other automobile [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*].

There is a presumption in a wrongful death action that the decedent exercised due care at time of death. The presumption applies unless the testimony of a person offering evidence is totally irreconcilable with the presumption [*Brandelius v. City & County of San Francisco (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 729, 736, 306 P.2d 432* (cable cars); *Wahrenbrock v. Los Angeles Transit Lines (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 236, 241-242, 190 P.2d 272* (buses)].

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The identity of persons entitled under the statute to bring a wrongful death cause of action and their relationship to the decedent and, if the action is brought by the personal representative of the decedent's estate on behalf of these entitled persons, the capacity of the personal representative to do so (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*].

- That defendant automobile driver was negligent with regard to plaintiff and that defendants cab owner and driver were negligent and breached the duty owed to passengers for hire by their negligence, proximately causing the death of decedent (Paragraphs 10, 11) [*Civ. Code § 1714(a)*].

- That plaintiffs incurred pecuniary damages, including expenses for decedent's burial (Paragraphs 12, 13) [*Krouse v. Graham (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 59, 67, 137 Cal. Rptr. 863, 562 P.2d 1022* (damages limited to pecuniary loss); *Francis v. Sauve (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 102, 124, 34 Cal. Rptr. 754* (funeral expenses)].

[4] Wrongful Death Actions

When the death of a person is caused by the wrongful act of negligence of another, certain persons, or the decedent's personal representative on their behalf, may bring an action for damages against the person causing the death and any other person responsible (or against the personal representatives of such persons) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60* permits decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, and issue of deceased children to bring a wrongful death action without qualification and permits others to bring an action under specified circumstances. For forms of allegations establishing that specific classes of persons are entitled to bring a wrongful death action, including allegations that are required of plaintiffs who are not the decedent's surviving spouse, domestic partner, children, or issue of deceased children, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

If a plaintiff is a minor, a guardian ad litem must be appointed for the purposes of the action, unless the minor already has a guardian [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 372*]. For discussion and forms relating to appointment of a guardian ad litem generally, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* .

In a wrongful death action, damages may be awarded that, under all the circumstances of the case, may be just, but may not include damages recoverable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.34* (survival actions). The court must determine the respective rights in an award of the persons entitled to assert the cause of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.61*]. An action under *Code Civ. Proc § 377.30* (survival actions) may be joined with a wrongful death action arising out of the same wrongful act or neglect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.62(a)*]. In addition, a wrongful death action and a survival action under *Code Civ. Proc § 377.31* (survival of pending actions) arising out of the same wrongful act or neglect may be consolidated for trial as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1048* (consolidation of actions) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 377.62(b)*].

[5] Cross References

For general information and cross references relating to complaints, see *§ 544.50[2]* et seq.

For alternative complaints and allegations for use in wrongful death actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to appointment of a guardian ad litem generally, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*

For forms of interrogatories for use in wrongful death actions generally, see Bender' s Forms of Discovery, *Death Actions* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.52

§ 544.52 Allegation--Injury to Passenger While Boarding or Alighting Taxicab

[1] FORM Allegation--Injury to Passenger While Boarding or Alighting Taxicab

On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants _____ [*name of cab company*] and _____ [*name of cab driver*] were in the process of receiving plaintiff as a passenger for hire in their taxicab, operated by defendant _____ [*name of cab driver*]. On that date, as plaintiff was in the process of _____ [boarding *or* alighting] the taxicab, defendant _____ [*name of cab driver*] so negligently and carelessly managed, maintained, operated, drove, and controlled the taxicab and the equipment thereon that plaintiff was caused to be thrown to the ground, sustaining severe personal injuries as hereinafter set forth.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint seeking damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*] for personal injury and property damage [*Civ. Code 1714(a), 2100*] by a passenger against a taxicab company and its driver for injuries caused by the driver's negligence while the passenger was boarding or alighting the taxicab [*see Healy v. Yellow Cab Co. (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 479, 480-481, 90 P.2d 116* ; *Riis v. Yellow Cab Co. (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 25, 26, 83 P.2d 959* ; for further discussion, *see § 544.16[1]*].

The allegation should be inserted in place of Paragraph 11 in the form in *§ 544.50[1]*. Paragraphs 3, 9, and 10 should be deleted from that form because they refer to a third party defendant automobile driver, which is not relevant to this allegation against the taxicab company and its driver.

[3] Examples of Negligent Acts

Examples of negligence that may underlie this form include:

- Starting a vehicle while a passenger is boarding it [*Spearman v. California S. R. Co. (1881) 57 Cal. 432* ; *Nilson v. Oakland Traction Co. (1909) 10 Cal. App. 103, 101 P. 413]* .

- Failing to warn an alighting passenger that the cab is not parallel to curb when the driver parked the taxicab diagonally to curb. *Healy v. Yellow Cab Co. (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 479, 480-481, 90 P.2d 116*

- Suddenly moving the door that the passenger is holding while being assisted into the taxicab, causing the passenger to lose balance and fall. *Riis v. Yellow Cab Co. (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 25, 26, 83 P.2d 959*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.53

§ 544.53 Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Sudden Stop

[1] FORM Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Sudden Stop

On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants _____ [*name of cab company*] and _____ [*name of cab driver*] were transporting plaintiff as a passenger for hire in the taxicab, and defendant _____ [*cab driver*] was driving the taxicab in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*]. On that date, defendant _____ [*name of cab driver*] so negligently and carelessly managed, maintained, operated, drove, and controlled the taxicab and the equipment thereon, that it stopped suddenly, proximately causing plaintiff to be thrown in and about the taxicab, and proximately causing plaintiff to sustain severe personal injuries as hereinafter set forth.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint seeking damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*] for personal injury and property damage [*Civ. Code 1714(a), 2100*] by a passenger against a taxicab company and its driver for injuries caused by the driver's negligence in suddenly stopping the taxicab, while the passenger was being transported in the taxicab [*see Acosta v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 19, 27-28, 84 Cal. Rptr. 184, 465 P.2d 72* (sudden, violent jerk of bus caused injury to passenger); *Pedrow v. Federoff (1926) 77 Cal. App. 164, 171, 247 P. 212* (sudden movement or jerk of taxicab while passenger was alighting caused injury to passenger)].

The allegation should be inserted in place of Paragraph 11 in the form in *§ 544.50[1]*. Paragraphs 3, 9, and 10 should be deleted from that form because they refer to the liability of a third party defendant automobile driver, which is not relevant to this allegation against the taxicab company and its driver.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.54

§ 544.54 Allegations--Injury to Passenger Before Boarding Taxicab But After Initiation of Driver-Passenger Relationship

[1] FORM Allegations--Injury to Passenger Before Boarding Taxicab But After Initiation of Driver-Passenger Relationship

1. On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], plaintiff presented himself/herself at the place provided by defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] designated as a place of departure for taxicabs belonging to defendant _____ [*name of cab company*] for the purpose of becoming a passenger in defendant's taxicab. At that time, defendant _____ [*name of cab company*], through its duly authorized agent _____ [*name of agent or cab driver*], indicated acceptance of plaintiff as a passenger for hire.

2. At that time, while en route to the taxicab for the purpose of boarding the taxicab as a passenger for hire, defendants negligently caused plaintiff to suffer severe personal injuries in that _____ [*specify defendants' negligence, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of agent or cab driver*), parked the taxicab too far away from the boarding area and undertook to assist and conduct plaintiff to the site of departure of the taxicab, but so negligently and carelessly assisted and conducted plaintiff as to cause plaintiff to _____ (*specify negligent act, e.g.,* slip and fall on icy pavement, thereby incurring severe personal injuries).]

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above,* are for use in a complaint seeking damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*] for personal injury and property damage [*Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100*] by a passenger against a taxicab company and its driver for injuries caused by the negligence of the company and the driver while the passenger was en route to board the taxicab [*see Grier v. Ferrant (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311-313, 144 P.2d 631* ; for further discussion, *see 544.13[2]*].

The allegations should be inserted in place of Paragraph 11 in the form in *§ 544.50[1]*. Paragraphs 3, 9, and 10 should be deleted from that form because they refer to the liability of a third party defendant automobile driver, which is not relevant to this allegation against the taxicab company and its driver.

171 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.55

§ 544.55 Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Violation of Traffic or Safety Rule by Driver

[1] FORM Allegation--Injury to Passenger Caused by Violation of Traffic or Safety Rule by Driver

On or about _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time*], defendants _____ [*name of cab company*] and _____ [*name of cab driver*] were transporting plaintiff as a passenger for hire in the taxicab, and defendant _____ [*cab driver*] was driving the taxicab in a general _____ [*specify*] direction on _____ [*name of street*]. At that time, defendant _____ [*cab driver*] _____ [*describe traffic or safety rule violation, e.g.,* drove the taxicab in excess of the posted speed limit of 25 miles per hour]. Defendants operated, entrusted, controlled, and maintained the taxicab so negligently that as a proximate result of that negligence, the taxicab _____ [*specify accident that occurred, e.g.,* went out of control, hitting a tree], causing plaintiff to suffer severe personal injuries, as hereafter alleged.

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above,* is for use in a complaint seeking damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*] for personal injury and property damage [*Civ. Code 1714(a), 2100*] by a passenger against a taxicab company and its driver for injuries caused by the driver's negligence caused by driving the taxicab in violation of a traffic or safety rule, while the passenger was being transported in the taxicab [*see Sipperly v. San Diego Yellow Cabs, Inc. (1949) 89 Cal. App. 2d 645, 649-652, 201 P.2d 543* ; for further discussion, *see § 544.16[2]*].

The allegation should be inserted in place of Paragraph 11 in the form in *§ 544.50[1]*. Paragraphs 3, 10, and 11 should be deleted from that form if the resulting accident did not involve a negligent third party automobile driver.

[3] Examples of Negligent Acts

Examples of negligence that may render the cab driver and company liable to a passenger as contemplated by this form include:

- Failing to stop before crossing railroad tracks and proceeding at an excessive rate of speed across the

tracks [*Deshotel v. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 224, 231, 300 P.2d 910]* .

- Parking across a driveway, sticking out several feet into a street, in violation of a city ordinance prohibiting the parking of vehicles more than eighteen inches from curb [*Sipperly v. San Diego Yellow Cabs, Inc. (1949) 89 Cal. App. 2d 645, 649-652, 201 P.2d 543* (liable for injuries to passenger and her husband, who was not a passenger, when improperly parked cab was hit by car)].

172 of 172 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 544 TAXICABS
PART IV. FORMS

47-544 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 544.56

§ 544.56 Allegations--Injury to Passenger Caused by Failure to Provide Seat Belts

[1] FORM Allegations--Injury to Passenger Caused by Failure to Provide Seat Belts

1. The taxicab was not equipped with [visible] passenger seat belts.

2. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendants, and each of them, in failing to equip the taxicab with [visible] seat belts for the protection of passengers, the injuries incurred by plaintiff in the collision were aggravated in that plaintiff was not restrained from being thrown forward and tossed about the cab, resulting in plaintiff's sustaining severe personal injuries [_____ *specify particular injuries resulting from lack of seat belt restraint, e.g.*, and specifically causing plaintiff's head to strike the dashboard, resulting in plaintiff's incurring a fractured skull and numerous lacerations].

[2] Use of Form

The allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint seeking damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*] for personal injury and property damage [*Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100*] by a passenger against a taxicab company and its driver for injuries caused by the failure to provide the passenger with sealtbelt restraints or for failure to provide the passenger with seatbelt restraints that are visible for his/her use.

This allegation is based on a case that held that whether or not the failure of a taxicab company to provide visible seat belts to a passenger constituted a proximate cause of his injuries was a question of fact for the jury to decide [*McNeil v. Yellow Cab Co. (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 116, 118, 147 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

The owner or operator of a taxicab or limousine for hire must maintain safety belts in good working order for use of occupants of the vehicle [*see Veh. Code § 27315(f)*]. Moreover, the operator of a taxicab or limousine is not permitted to operate taxicab or limousine unless passengers four years of age or older or weighing 40 pounds or more in front seat are properly restrained by safety belt [*see Veh. Code § 27315(f)*]. Violation of these requirements does not establish negligence as a matter of law or negligence per se for comparative fault purposes, but negligence may be proven as a fact without regard to the violation [*see Veh. Code § 27315(j)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 545.syn

§ 545.syn Synopsis to Chapter 545: TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION

§ 545.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 545.02 Cross References

§ 545.03 Governing Law

§§ 545.04-545.09 [Reserved]

§ 545.10 Duty of Care in Provision of Services and Equipment

[1] Duties

[2] Liability for Breach

§ 545.11 Liability for Service Delay

[1] Subscriber Notification Requirements

[2] Small Claims Action for Damages

[3] Waiver Void

[4] Defenses

§ 545.12 Duty to Transmit or Deliver Messages

[1] By Telegraph Company

[a] General Rule

[b] Transmission of Defamatory Telegrams

[c] Transmission of False Telegraph Messages

[2] By Company Other Than Telegraph

[3] Communications From Other Telegraph and Telephone Corporations

[4] Damages and Penalty for Failure to Transmit Message

[5] Exceptions to Duty

§ 545.13 Standard of Care in Transmitting Messages

§ 545.14 No Strict Liability or Implied Warranty for Provision of Services

§ 545.15 Duty of Care in Preparation of Directory

[1] General Rule

[2] Regulation of Telephone Directories

§ 545.16 Limitation of Damages Under Tariff Provisions

[1] General Rule

[a] Tariff Provisions

[b] Contract Theory

[c] Force and Effect of Law

[d] Binding on Public

[e] Questions of Reasonableness

[f] Liability for Intentional or Illegal Conduct

[2] Procedure for Asserting Limitation of Liability Provisions

§ 545.17 Liability for Personal Injuries or Property Damage

[1] General Rule

[2] Exception to Liability for Removal of Obstructions

[3] Wrongful Death Actions

[4] No Liability for Act Compelled by Commission Order

§ 545.18 Liability for Discrimination

[1] In Rates, Services, and Other Respects

[2] In Employment

§ 545.19 Jurisdiction of State Courts

§§ 545.20-545.29 [Reserved]

§ 545.30 Liability of Third Parties to Telephone or Telegraph Company

[1] Intentional Damage

[2] Negligent Damage

[3] Underwater Cables

§ 545.31 Liability for Unlawful Use of Automated Telephone Equipment

§§ 545.32-545.39 [Reserved]

§ 545.40 Related Titles From LEXIS Publishing

§ 545.41 State Constitution

§ 545.42 State Statutes

[1] Crimes Involving Telephone Systems

[2] Definitions

[3] Discrimination

[4] Electronic Eavesdropping

[5] Jurisdiction and Regulation

[6] Telephone and Telegraph Company Property

[a] Construction and Maintenance

[b] Injury to Property

[7] Telegraph Messages

[8] Termination of Telephone Service

§ 545.43 Administrative Regulations

§ 545.44 Decisions

[1] Duty of Care in Provision of Services and Equipment

[2] Duty to Transmit Messages

[3] Jurisdiction of State Courts

[4] Liability of Third Persons for Injuring Telephone or Telegraph Company Property

[5] Limitation of Damages Under Tariff Provisions

[6] Regulation of Obscene or Indecent Calls

§ 545.45 Law Reviews

§§ 545.46-545.59 [Reserved]

§ 545.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] Based on Unlawful Conduct of Public Utility [Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure or Refusal to Transmit Telegram [Civ. Code §§ 2207, 2209]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Corporation

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Limitation of Damages in Negligence Actions

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Specification of Damages

[7] Verification

[8] Cross References

§ 545.61 Allegation--Errors or Omissions in Telegram [Civ. Code § 2162]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Company

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 545.62-545.69 [Reserved]

§ 545.70 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure of Telegraph or Telephone Corporation to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code §§ 451, 2106]--Maintaining Defective Pole

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specifying Amount of Damages

[5] Venue

[6] Wrongful Death Actions

[7] Cross References

§ 545.71 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligently Installed or Maintained Telephone Lines

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 545.72 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Telephone Booth Improperly Sited in Dangerous Location

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 545.73 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligent Maintenance of Telephone Switchboard

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART I. SCOPE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.01

§ 545.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides discussion and forms relating to the duties and rights of telephone and telegraph corporations in connection with the provision of services. Topics discussed include causes of action available against a corporation for breach of these duties, as well as limitations on their liability [*see §§ 545.10 -545.19*], actions that the corporation may have against third parties for damages to corporate property [*see § 545.30*], and liability for the unlawful use of automated telephone equipment [*see § 545.31*].

The chapter also provides a Research Guide [*see § 545.40* et seq.] and the following forms:

- Complaint for damages from the failure or refusal to send a telegram [*see § 545.60*] and an allegation relating to errors or omissions in a telegram [*see § 545.60*].

- Complaint for damages based on negligence from the failure of the telegraph or telephone corporation to properly construct or maintain a pole [*see § 545.70*] and alternative allegations relating to negligent construction or maintenance of:

  - Wires [*see § 545.71*].

  - Telephone booth in a dangerous location [*see § 545.72*].

  - Telephone switchboard [*see § 545.73*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsBusiness TortsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART I. SCOPE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.02

§ 545.02 Cross References

Additional information regarding tort actions involving telephone and telegraph communication may be found in the following chapters:

- For discussion and forms relating to actions based on negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the duty of care owed invitees by owners and possessors of property, and premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the vicarious liability of an employer for the wrongful acts of employees, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* .

- For discussion and forms relating to actions for intentional or negligent infliction of emotional distress, see Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress* .

- For discussion and forms relating to actions involving negligently manufactured equipment and products generally, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

For discussion and forms relating to the negligence of an electrical company in constructing and maintaining poles and wires, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .

Information relating to the regulation of telephone communication, may be found in the following chapters:

- For discussion and forms relating to the jurisidiction of and proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the termination of public utility service generally, see Ch. 277, *Gas Electricity* .

- For discussion regarding the regulation of telephonic sellers by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17511 et seq.* and the regulation of information-access service businesses under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17539.5 et seq.*, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

- For discussion relating to limitations on a telephone or telegraph corporation's disclosure of personal information regarding its residential customers or subscribers, and on wrongful interception of telephonic or telegraphic communications, see Ch. 429, *Privacy* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral OverviewTortsProducts LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART I. SCOPE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.03

§ 545.03 Governing Law

Telephone corporations and lines and telegraph corporations and lines are defined in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 233-236*. Rights and obligations of public utilities in general are set forth in *Pub. Util. Code §§ 451-632*. The duty to transmit messages and the priority in transmission is governed by *Civ. Code §§ 2207-2209*. The liability of a utility in small claims court for delay of service connection or repair is governed by *Civ. Code § 1722*. A general duty of care by a carrier of messages for reward is covered by *Civ. Code § 2162*.

The power to regulate telephone and telegraph services is conferred on the legislature, and by the legislature on the Public Utilities Commission (hereinafter the Commission) by *Cal. Const., art. XII, §§ 3, 5, 6,* and *8* and *Pub. Util. Code §§ 216, 233-236, 701*. Judicial review of Commission decisions is governed by *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756-1767*. *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* authorizes civil actions by individuals or corporations against any public utility based on the utility's unlawful activity. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 7951* and *7952* authorize actions by a telephone or telegraph corporation for both willful and negligent injury to corporate property. *Pub. Util. Code § 453(a)-(c)* prohibits discrimination by public utilities as to rates, deposit amounts, charges, service, facilities, or in any other respect. Criminal penalties against a party for failure to relinquish a party line in an emergency are set forth in *Penal Code § 384*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsJudicial ReviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiability

5 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART I. SCOPE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 545.04-545.09

[Reserved]

§§ 545.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.10

§ 545.10 Duty of Care in Provision of Services and Equipment

[1] Duties

Every public utility is required to furnish and maintain such adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities as are necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public [*Pub. Util. Code § 451*].

A telephone company owes a duty of care to persons rightfully using telephone equipment to maintain the equipment in a reasonably safe condition, and to exercise reasonable care to protect the user from injury [*see Jaehne v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 683, 688, 234 P.2d 165]* .

A telephone company also has a duty to make a reasonable inspection of its poles to see that they are safe and able to withstand the strain of normal weather conditions or other ordinary tests of strength [*Keller v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 513, 519, 38 P.2d 182]* .

[2] Liability for Breach

By furnishing an appliance for the use of others, the company ordinarily assumes a duty to furnish a proper and reasonably safe appliance. The company is liable for breach of this duty when injury results to one using the appliance. This doctrine is based on the duty to exercise ordinary care that is due to everyone under the principles declared in the Civil Code [*Jaehne v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 683, 688, 234 P.2d 165* ; *see Civ. Code §§ 1708, 1714(a), 3281*].

For example, improper siting of a telphone booth in a potentially dangerous location can amount to actionable negligence against the telephone company; similarly, defective design and maintenance of the booth may also give rise to tort liability [*Bigbee v. Superior Court (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 451, 454, 155 Cal. Rptr. 545 , appeal after remand, Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsProducts LiabilityDesign DefectsTortsProducts LiabilityNegligence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.11

§ 545.11 Liability for Service Delay

[1] Subscriber Notification Requirements

Utilities must inform their subscribers of their right to service connection or repair within a four-hour period, if the subscriber's presence is required, by offering the four-hour period at the time the subscriber calls for service connection or repair. Whenever a subscriber contracts with a utility for a service connection or repair, the parties have agreed that the subscriber must be present, and the subscriber has requested a four-hour appointment, the utility and the subscriber must agree, prior to the date of service connection or repair, on the time for the commencement of the four-hour period for the service connection or repair [*Civ. Code § 1722(c)(1)*].

[2] Small Claims Action for Damages

If the service connection or repair is not commenced within the specified four-hour period, except for delays caused by unforeseen or unavoidable circumstances beyond the control of the utility, the subscriber may bring an action in small claims court against the utility for lost wages, expenses actually incurred, or other actual damages not exceeding a total of $600 [*Civ. Code § 1722(c)(2)*].

In the action, logs and other business records maintained by the utility or its agents in the ordinary course of business are prima facie evidence of the time period specified for the commencement of the service connection or repair and of the time that the utility attempted to make the service connection or repair, or of a diligent attempt by a utility to notify the subscriber of delay caused by unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences [*Civ. Code § 1722(c)(4)*].

[3] Waiver Void

Any provision of a delivery or service contract in which the consumer or subscriber agrees to modify or waive any of the rights afforded under *Civ. Code § 1722* are void as contrary to public policy [*Civ. Code § 1722(d)*].

[4] Defenses

No action is considered valid if the subscriber was not present when, within the specified period, the utility attempted to make the service connection or repair or made a diligent attempt to notify the subscriber by telephone or in person of its inability to do so because of unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences beyond its control. If notification is by telephone, the utility or its agent must leave a telephone number for a return telephone call by the subscriber to the utility or its agent, to enable the subscriber to arrange a new two-hour period for service connection or repair [*Civ. Code § 1722(c)(3)*].

It is also a defense to the action if a diligent attempt was made by the utility to notify the subscriber of delay caused by unforeseen or unavoidable occurrences beyond the control of the utility and if the utility commenced service within a newly agreed on two-hour period [*Civ. Code § 1722(c)(5)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.12

§ 545.12 Duty to Transmit or Deliver Messages

[1] By Telegraph Company

[a] General Rule

A carrier of messages by telegraph must, if it is practicable, transmit every such message immediately on its receipt. If this is not practicable, and several messages accumulate, the carrier must transmit them in the following order [*Civ. Code § 2207*]:

- Messages from public agents of the United States or California, on public business.
- Messages intended in good faith for immediate publication in newspapers, and not for any secret use.
- Messages giving information relating to the sickness or death of any person.
- Other messages in the order in which they were received.

Every agent, operator, or employee of any telegraph or telephone office, who willfully postpones the transmission out of its order, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Pub. Util. Code § 7904*].

[b] Transmission of Defamatory Telegrams

Telegraph companies have no right of censorship except in specific instances enumerated in *Pub. Util. Code § 7904* (discussed under [2], *below*), and do not have the right to refuse to transmit telegrams that may allegedly be libelous [*see Mason v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 429, 439, 125 Cal. Rptr. 53]* . Even if the required transmission of the message is held to be a publication, it would be privileged under *Civ. Code § 47(c)*, which states that a privileged publication or broadcast is one made in a communication, without malice, to a person interested therein, by one who is also interested, or by one who stands in such relation to the person interested as to afford a reasonable ground for supposing the motive for the communication innocent, or who is requested by the person interested to give

the information. In the absence of actual knowledge to the contrary, the telegraph company has a right to presume that both the sender and the addressee of telegrams submitted for transmission are interested persons as defined by *Civ. Code § 47(c)* and that, in transmitting such telegrams, it is engaging in a privileged act [*Mason v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 429, 438, 125 Cal. Rptr. 53* (construing prior version of *Civ. Code § 47*)].

Telegraph companies are also shielded from liability for intentional infliction of emotional distress arising from transmission of a defamatory telegram. Because transmission is required by law, the company's conduct in sending the message cannot be held to be unreasonable, and will therefore not support an action for intentional infliction of emotional distress. Nor will transmission of defamatory telegrams support an action for invasion of privacy, since, again, transmission is required by law, and no communication is made to the public in general [*see Mason v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 429, 440, 125 Cal. Rptr. 53]* .

[c] Transmission of False Telegraph Messages

A telegraph company and its agents must exercise ordinary care and prudence to prevent the transmission of a false telegram and any damages that may result. When a telegraph message requesting the payment of funds from a bank to a particular person is sent, the agent of the telegraph company has a duty to exercise ordinary care and prudence in determining the identity of the sender, and the recipient has a right to rely on this duty. The company will be held liable if the agent is guilty of negligence in failing to ascertain that identity [*see Bank of Cal. v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1877) 52 Cal. 280, 288]* .

The telegraph company is also liable for the wilful and fraudulent transmission of a dispatch by the agent in the name of another [*see Bank of Cal. v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1877) 52 Cal. 280, 288]* . The agent has a duty to prevent an unauthorized person from using telegraph equipment to perpetrate a fraud, and the company will be held liable for any such fraud whether the agent acted wilfully or negligently in allowing the unauthorized use [*see Bank of Cal. v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1877) 52 Cal. 280, 291-292]* .

[2] By Company Other Than Telegraph

A common carrier of messages other than by telegraph must transmit messages in the order received, except messages from agents of the United States or California on public business, which must always be given priority. However, the carrier may fix on certain times for the simultaneous transmission of messages previously received [*Civ. Code § 2208*].

[3] Communications From Other Telegraph and Telephone Corporations

Every telephone and telegraph corporation operating in California must receive, transmit, and deliver, without discrimination or delay, the conversations and messages of every other such corporation with whose line a physical connection has been made [*Pub. Util. Code § 558*].

[4] Damages and Penalty for Failure to Transmit Message

Every person whose message is refused or postponed, contrary to the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 2168-2209*, is entitled to recover from the carrier his or her actual damages, plus $50 [*Civ. Code § 2209*; *see also Pub. Util. Code § 7904* (willfully refusing or neglecting to send or to deliver message as misdemeanor)].

[5] Exceptions to Duty

Pub. Util. Code § 7904 is not to be construed to require a message to be received, transmitted, or delivered, unless the charges have been paid or tendered. Nor does it require the sending, receiving, or delivery of any message counseling, aiding, abetting, or encouraging treason against the government of the United States or of California, or other resistance to lawful authority, or any message calculated to further any fraudulent plan or purpose, or to instigate or encourage the

perpetration of any unlawful act, or to facilitate the escape of any criminal or person accused of crime [*Pub. Util. Code § 7904*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesDefamationCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsIntentional TortsDefensesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.13

§ 545.13 Standard of Care in Transmitting Messages

A carrier of messages for reward has a statutory duty to use great care and diligence in the transmission and delivery of messages [*Civ. Code § 2162*]. Great care and diligence include the employment of proper instruments and competent operators [*Hart v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1885) 66 Cal. 579, 582, 6 P. 637]* . However, damages for breach of this duty of care is likely to be restricted to an amount authorized under the limitation of liability tariff provisions filed by the company with the Commission [*see Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 11-12, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161* ; *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 556, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361* ; *Stern v. General Tel. Co. (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 538, 541, 123 Cal. Rptr. 373]* . These provisions are discussed in *§ 545.16*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.14

§ 545.14 No Strict Liability or Implied Warranty for Provision of Services

There is no strict liability or implied warranty liability for damages incurred in connection with the provision of telephone or telegraph services. The general rule that those who sell services for the guidance of others in their economic, financial, and personal affairs are not liable for breach of implied warranty in the absence of negligence or intentional misconduct applies to companies providing communications services [*see Stuart v. Crestview Mut. Water Co. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 802, 811, 110 Cal. Rptr. 543* ; *Gautier v. General Tel. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 302, 306, 44 Cal. Rptr. 404]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsImplied WarrantiesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsProducts LiabilityBreach of WarrantyTortsStrict LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.15

§ 545.15 Duty of Care in Preparation of Directory

[1] General Rule

The preparation and delivery of telephone directories is not considered related to the business of transmitting and delivering messages but is an established convenience and service for those of the public who use the facilities furnished for transmission by themselves of their own messages. As to these messages, the telephone company is not a common carrier, and is charged in the preparation of the directory with the exercise of ordinary care and is liable as a public service corporation for the breach of its contract to include its subscriber's name in the directory [*Riaboff v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 775, 102 P.2d 465]* .

When damages are sought for negligent omissions or errors in a directory advertisement, however, liability is likely to be limited by the particular tariff provision filed by the company. Tariff liability limitations are discussed generally in *§ 545.16*. In a typical situation, damages are limited to a pro rata abatement of the charge for the listing in such a degree as the error or omission affects the entire advertisement, and in the case of omission of an entire advertisement, the credit allowance is an abatement of the entire charge [*see Davidian v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 750, 753-754, 94 Cal. Rptr. 337* ; *Cole v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 416, 417, 246 P.2d 686]* .

[2] Regulation of Telephone Directories

Except as provided by *Pub. Util. Code § 728.2(b)* (considering advertising revenues and expenses as part of rate-making for other services), the Commission has no jurisdiction or control over classified telephone directories or commercial advertising included as part of the corporation's alphabetical telephone directories. In particular, the Commission does not have jurisdiction over the form and content of the advertising in the alphabetical and classified directories, or over the form and content of the directories in which the advertising appears, or over directory advertising practices. Neither does the Commission have jurisdiction over the determination of the geographic areas served by those directories, or over complaints by any corporation or person regarding directory advertising [*Pub. Util. Code § 728.2(b)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.16

§ 545.16 Limitation of Damages Under Tariff Provisions

[1] General Rule

[a] Tariff Provisions

Recovery of damages against a telephone or telegraph company may be limited in certain instances by tariff provisions filed with the Commission. In order to determine whether a provision limiting liability applies to a particular case and if so, what the specific limitations are, counsel should consult the tariff provisions filed with the Commission by the particular utility as part of its franchise.

[b] Contract Theory

Prior to creation of the Commission in California, courts considered the issue of limitation of liability on the basis of contract theory [*see Coit v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1900) 130 Cal. 657, 661 63 P. 83* ; *Hart v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1885) 66 Cal. 579, 580-581, 584 6 P. 637]* . Due to the Commission's present use of liability limitation provisions contained in the tariff schedules filed by each utility, however, the contract theory is no longer applicable to determination of the limitation issue [*see Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 553 n.5, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361]* . Currently all telephone and telegraph corporations must file schedules with the Commission showing all rates, tolls, rentals, charges, and classifications collected or enforced, or to be collected or enforced, together with all rules, contracts, privileges, and facilities which in any manner affect or relate to rates, tolls, rentals, classifications, or service [*Pub. Util. Code § 489*]. These schedules include provisions limiting a corporation's liability in instances of negligence in the provision of services to specified credit allowances. The tariff provisions limiting liability may apply to acts of gross negligence as well as to ordinary negligence [*Stern v. General Tel. Co. (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 538, 542, 123 Cal. Rptr. 373]* .

[c] Force and Effect of Law

The limitation of liability provisions, when applicable, have the force and effect of law [*Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 549-550, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361]* . The subject of limitations on liability has long been

considered a proper subject for Commission regulation and supervision, and the use of a credit allowance provision as a means of limiting liability is taken into account in setting reasonable rates for service by the utility. Although actions for damages against utilities for unlawful acts are authorized by *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, claims for damages for particular classes of actions in excess of the credit allowances contained in the tariff provisions are barred [*Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 4-6, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161* ; for discussion of *Pub. Util. Code § 2106, see 545.19*].

[d] Binding on Public

The limitation of liability provisions are binding on the public generally, and on the recipient as well as the sender of a message. The fact that a person might not have been aware of the provisions as filed does not affect their application [*Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 552-553, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361]* .

[e] Questions of Reasonableness

Questions of reasonableness regarding the tariff provisions must first be directed to the Commission. If a party is dissatisfied with the Commission's decision, he or she is free to invoke the extraordinary remedy of a writ of mandamus from the court of appeal or California Supreme Court to the Commission [*Cole v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co., (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 416, 420, 246 P.2d 686* ; *see Pub. Util. Code §§ 1756, 1759*].

[f] Liability for Intentional or Illegal Conduct

The Commission has ordered by rule that tariffs expressly provide for liability for willful misconduct, fraud, or violations of law [P.U.C. Decision No. 77406; *see Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Commc'ns Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 413, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392]* . Although the terms of a filed tariff will generally govern a utility's liability for damages, a utility cannot shield itself from liability for such intentional or illegal conduct simply by failing to include the mandated language in the tariff [*Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Commc'ns Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 413-415, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392]* .

[2] Procedure for Asserting Limitation of Liability Provisions

Limitation of liability provisions, when applicable, may be asserted by a telephone or telegraph corporation either in a motion for partial summary judgment limiting damages to the specified credit allowance, or in a motion for nonsuit if the plaintiff waives the allowance [*see Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 5-6, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161]* . The provisions may also be relied on in a demurrer to the complaint [*see Davidian v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 750, 751-752, 757, 94 Cal. Rptr. 337]* , or, if damages are awarded by a jury, in seeking a motion for judgment notwithstanding the verdict [*see Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 553-554, 558, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.17

§ 545.17 Liability for Personal Injuries or Property Damage

[1] General Rule

A telephone or telegraph company will be held liable for personal injuries or property damage caused by the negligence of its agent or employee occurring during the discharge of his or her job duties [*see Rabe v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1926) 198 Cal. 290, 293, 301, 244 P. 1077]* . For discussion and forms relating to liability of an employer for the negligence of employees generally, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* , and Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[2] Exception to Liability for Removal of Obstructions

A telephone or telegraph company may remove from the streets used in the exercise of their franchise any object or thing that will, if permitted to exist, prevent proper and efficient service by them to the public. Thus, a telegraph company may trim trees if necessary for safe and proper transmission of messages over its wires passing through the trees without liability to the owner of the trees unless it is shown that the telegraph company destroyed more branches and limbs than necessary [*Altpeter v. Postal Tel.-Cable Co. (1917) 32 Cal. App. 738, 741-742, 747, 164 P. 35]* .

[3] Wrongful Death Actions

A wrongful death action against a utility is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*, and *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* does not provide independent authority for an action that would allow recovery of punitive damages, which are not recoverable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60* [*Vander Lind v. Superior Court (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 358, 367, 194 Cal. Rptr. 209* ; for further discussion and forms relating to wrongful death actions, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*].

[4] No Liability for Act Compelled by Commission Order

A telephone utility will be shielded from liability in tort if the injury resulted from acts by the utility under compulsion of a Public Utilities Commission order [*Brian T. v. Pacific Bell (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 894, 904, 258 Cal. Rptr. 707]* . For example, if a telephone company permits sexually explicit "976" telephone information services in compliance with a Commission decision barring the company from disconnecting such services, the utility cannot be held liable in

tort for providing such services [*Brian T. v. Pacific Bell (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 894, 904-909, 258 Cal. Rptr. 707]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceDefensesGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.18

§ 545.18 Liability for Discrimination

[1] In Rates, Services, and Other Respects

No public utility may, as to rates, charges, service, facilities, or in any other respect, make or grant any preference or advantage to any corporation or person or subject any corporation or person to any prejudice or disadvantage [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(a)*; *see also* Pub. Util. Code § 429 (misdemeanor for intentional failure to collect or remit specified fees and surcharges)]. In addition, no public utility may prejudice, disadvantage, or require different rates or deposit amounts from a person because of ancestry, medical condition, marital status or change in marital status, or any other characteristic listed or defined in *Gov. Code § 11135*, [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(b)*]. Also, no public utility may establish or maintain any unreasonable difference as to rates, charges, service, facilities, or in any other respect, either between localities or between classes of service [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(c)*].

The Commission may determine any question of fact arising under *Pub. Util. Code § 453* [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(e)*]. A person who has exhausted all administrative remedies with the Commission may institute a suit for injunctive relief and reasonable attorney's fees in cases of an alleged violation of *Pub. Util. Code § 453(b)*. If successful in litigation, the prevailing party will be awarded attorney's fees [*Pub. Util. Code § 453(b)*].

[2] In Employment

Pub. Util. Code § 453(a) is not limited to a prohibition of rate or service-oriented discrimination, but also extends to the employment practices of a public utility [*see Gay Law Students Assn. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 458, 478, 156 Cal. Rptr. 14, 595 P.2d 592]* . Arbitrary exclusion of qualified individuals from employment opportunities by a state protected public utility also violates the state constitutional rights of the victims of the discrimination. Such arbitrary discrimination will support an action for damages against the utility under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* (discussed in *§ 545.19*), in which an ancillary request for injunctive relief may also be maintained. It may also be the basis for a cause of action against the utility for interfering with its employees' political rights in violation of *Lab. Code §§ 1101, 1102* [*see Gay Law Students Assn. v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 458, 486-487, 156 Cal. Rptr. 14, 595 P.2d 592]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawGeneral OverviewCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesRatesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.19

§ 545.19 Jurisdiction of State Courts

Any public utility which does, causes to be done, or permits any act, matter, or thing prohibited or declared unlawful, or which omits to do any act, matter, or thing required to be done either by the Constitution, state law, or Commission order or decision, will be liable to the persons or corporations affected thereby for all resulting loss, damages, or injury. If the court finds that the act or omission was wilful, it may also award exemplary damages. An action to recover for such loss, damage, or injury may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any corporation or person [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*].

To harmonize *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* with *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*, which restricts courts from interfering with the Commission, *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* has been held to only authorize actions which will not interfere with or obstruct the Commission in carrying out its own policies. Thus, actions for damages in excess of specified credit allowances as set forth in approved tariff schedules are barred by *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*. For example, in an action for negligent failure to provide adequate telephone service, the trial court properly granted the defendant telephone company's motion for partial summary judgment to limit damages awarded to plaintiff to the fixed service charges for the period involved, as provided in the defendant's tariff schedule approved by the Commission [*Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 4, 11-12, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161]* .

On the other hand, when the Commission has not expressed any policy against suits of a particular nature, such as suits based on the fraud or wilful misconduct of the utility, an action for damages may be maintained in court pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* [*see* *Empire W. v. Southern Cal. Gas Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 805, 811, 811 n. 4, 117 Cal. Rptr. 423, 528 P.2d 31* (fraudulent misrepresentations by gas utility regarding matters not covered in published tariffs made to induce business of prospective customer as actionable; citing Commission decision involving telephone utility); *Koponen v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 345, 358, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22* (suit against electric utility for unauthorized use of right-of-way on plaintiffs' property not barred when commission had made no determination that utility had complied with private right-of-way agreements or easements); *Pink Dot, Inc. v. Teleport Commc'ns Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 407, 418, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392* (claims brought in court against telephone utility alleging fraud and false representations permitted under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*)]. Conversely, claims brought under the unfair competition statute or the False Advertising Act must be adjudicated in court and may not be

adjudicated by the Commission [*Greenlining Inst. v. Public Utils. Comm'n (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1329, 1333, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 736* ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17204, 17535*].

If the PUC does not possess exclusive regulatory authority over a matter, district attorneys are authorized to initiate actions against public utilities that have violated the law, even while an action is pending with the PUC based on the same factual allegations [*People ex rel. Orloff v. Pacific Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1151, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201]* . If the case concerns consumer fraud, such as a case brought under the unfair competition statute, district attorneys are authorized to prosecute the action in court if disclosure of investigative materials by the PUC would not jeopardize its own investigation or authority. If disclosure of those materials would impede the PUC's own investigation, the district attorney is required to await disclosure pending further PUC action [*People ex rel. Orloff v. Pacific Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1151, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201]* . In addition, if relief awarded by a trial court would render ineffective or moot the relief, orders, or policies previously rendered by the PUC, such an action would interfere with the regulatory powers of the PUC and would be precluded [*People ex rel. Orloff v. Pacific Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1151, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201]* . However, the mere potential for inconsistent finding of fact or conclusions of law, without evidence that those inconsistencies would impede or interfere with the efforts of the PUC, does not rob a trial court of jurisdiction over a suit brought against a utility, especially if coordination of efforts between the PUC and the district attorney could avoid any actual conflict [*People ex rel. Orloff v. Pacific Bell (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 1132, 1153, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 315, 80 P.3d 201]* .

No recovery under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* will in any manner affect a recovery by the state of the penalties provided by *Pub. Util. Code §§ 201-2115* [*Pub. Util. Code § 2106*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesAvailabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Duties, Liabilities, and Limitations on Liability of Telephone and Telegraph Corporations

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 545.20-545.29

[Reserved]

§§ 545.20[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Liability of Third Parties

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.30

§ 545.30 Liability of Third Parties to Telephone or Telegraph Company

[1] Intentional Damage

Any person who wilfully and maliciously does any injury to telegraph or telephone property is liable to the corporation for three times the amount of actual damages sustained thereby, to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction [*Pub. Util. Code § 7951*].

[2] Negligent Damage

Any person who injures or destroys, through want of proper care, any necessary or useful facility or equipment of any telegraph or telephone corporation, is liable to the corporation for all damages sustained thereby. The measure of damages to the injured or destroyed facility or equipment is the cost to repair or replace the property injured or destroyed including direct and allocated costs for labor, materials, supervision, supplies, tools, taxes, transportation, administrative and general expense, and other indirect or overhead expenses, less credit, if any, for salvage, as determined by the telephone or telegraph corporation in conformity with a system of accounts established by the Commission. The specifying of the measure of damages for the facility or equipment does not preclude the recovery of such other damages occasioned thereby as may be authorized by law [*Pub. Util. Code § 7952*]. Depreciation is not to be considered in measuring damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 7952* [*see Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Alexander (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 253, 256-257, 153 Cal. Rptr. 319* ; *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Mounteer (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 809, 812-813, 136 Cal. Rptr. 280]* .

[3] Underwater Cables

Any vessel which, by dragging its anchor or otherwise breaks, injures, or destroys any underwater cable of a telegraph or telephone corporation, subjects its owner to liability for the damages sustained thereby [*Pub. Util. Code § 7952*]. The corporation cannot recover for such damage, however, unless it previously placed a marker on the bank of the waters under which the cable is placed, indicating the place where the cable lies [*Pub. Util. Code § 7953*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesProperty DamageAward Calculations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Liability of Third Parties

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.31

§ 545.31 Liability for Unlawful Use of Automated Telephone Equipment

Under state law, the use of an automatic dialing-announcing device, which randomly or sequentially dials telephone numbers and plays prerecorded messages, has been prohibited between specified hours. Withexceptions, persons who violate the provision are subject to disconnection of phone service and a fine [*see Pub. Util. Code §§ 2871, 2872, 2876*].

These provisions have been preempted, however, by more restrictive provisions under the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (*47 U.S.C.S. § 227*) [*see 47 U.S.C.S. § 227(e)*]. The Act, effective December 20, 1991, prohibits certain practices involving the use of telephone equipment. It includes a provision that makes it unlawful for any person within the United States, or any person outside the United States if the recipient is within the United States, to initiate any telephone call to any residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the called party [*47 U.S.C.S. § 227(b)(1)(B)* (exception applies when call is initiated for emergency purposes or is exempted by rule or order by FCC relating to specified classes of calls)]. The Act also provides for a private action in state court to enjoin the violation or, either additionally or as an alternative, to recover the greater of the amount of actual monetary loss or $500 in damages. A court may also award up to three times the amount of the monetary loss or damages if it finds the violation to be willful or knowing [*47 U.S.C.S. § 227(b)(3)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawPrivacyTelephone Consumer Protection ActCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Liability of Third Parties

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 545.32-545.39

[Reserved]

§§ 545.32[Reserved]

20 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.40

§ 545.40 Related Titles From LEXIS Publishing

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to actions for negligence generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to the general liability of an owner or possessor of public property, as well as to the intervention of third persons in causing injuries to users of the property, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 190, *Premises Liability* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.41

§ 545.41 State Constitution

Authority of municipalities to provide public works for furnishing communication services. *Cal. Const., art. XI, § 9*

Providers of telephone and telegraph facilities as public utilities subject to regulation by legislature. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 3*

Limitation on municipality's power to regulate matters over which Legislature grants regulatory power to Commission. *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 8*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsDuties & Powers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.42

§ 545.42 State Statutes

[1] Crimes Involving Telephone Systems

Publication of telephone number for facsimile machine in commercial directory of telephone numbers without written consent of subscriber as infraction punishable by fine. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22600(d)*

Sale of cordless telephone, manufactured after January 1, 1992, without increased protection from unintentional line seizure and dialing, and protection from unintentional ringing, as defined, as unlawful. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22760*

Penalty for failure to relinquish party line. *Penal Code § 384*

Willful sending of false or forged telegraph or telephone message with intent to deceive, injure, or defraud. *Penal Code § 474*

Fraud in obtaining telephone or telegraph services. *Penal Code § 502.7*

Destruction or removal of telephone poles and wires as misdemeanor. *Penal Code § 591*

Altering meaning of message as malicious mischief. *Penal Code § 620*

Invasion of privacy by electronic eavesdropping. *Penal Code §§ 630-637.2*

Making obscene, threatening, or annoying telephone calls. *Penal Code § 653m*

Telephone corporation as permitted to list telephone number as number for facsimile machine in its alphabetical or classified directory only if requested to do so by subscriber. *Pub. Util. Code § 728.4*

Criminal sanctions for use or appropriation for profit or advantage of information derived from private message. *Pub. Util. Code § 7903*

Making obscene or harassing calls in interstate or foreign telephone communication. *47 U.S.C.S. § 223*

[2] Definitions

Telephone line. *Pub. Util. Code § 233*

Telephone corporation. *Pub. Util. Code § 234*

Telegraph line. *Pub. Util. Code § 235*

Telegraph corporation. *Pub. Util. Code § 236*

[3] Discrimination

Discrimination by utility prohibited. *Pub. Util. Code § 453(a)-(c)*

[4] Electronic Eavesdropping

Interception of wire, electronic digital pager, or electronic cellular telephone communications. *Penal Code § 629.50 et seq.*

Records of discovery of devices installed for purpose of overhearing communications. *Pub. Util. Code § 7905*

Investigation of measures taken to insure privacy of communications. *Pub. Util. Code § 7906*

[5] Jurisdiction and Regulation

Commission as having general power to regulate public utilities, including telegraph and telephone companies. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 216(a), 701*

Public adviser to assist persons testifying before Commission. *Pub. Util. Code § 321*

Annual work plan access guide to scheduled ratemaking proceedings and other commission decisions. *Pub. Util. Code § 321.6*

Establishing rates for telephone or telegraph corporation. *Pub. Util. Code § 461.2*

Commission jurisdiction over telephone directories. *Pub. Util. Code § 728.2(b)*

Provision of telephone service by nonpublic utility. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 741.2, 741.3*

Billing and collection services. *Pub. Util. Code § 742.5*

Judicial review by Supreme Court or court of appeal of Commission decisions. *Pub. Util. Code § 1756 et seq.*

Prohibition of interference with performance of Commission duties by courts. *Pub. Util. Code § 1759*

Award of fees and expenses for public utility customers that intervene in commission hearings for purpose of modifying or influencing rates. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1808*

Actions against utilities for damages. *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*

Required provision of equipment and devices for disabled and deaf or severely hearing impaired. *Pub. Util. Code § 2881*

Mobile telephony carriers required to provide Commission with information regarding service quality and customer complaints. *Pub. Util Code § 2885.6(a)*

Commission's revocation or suspension of mobile telephony carrier's authority for failure to supply information regarding service quality and customer complaints. *Pub. Util. Code § 2885.6(b)*

Establishment of pricing system for mobile telephony service. *Pub. Util. Code § 2886*

Telephone companies required to provide pricing and service information, access to live operators, quality standards, and information regarding regulatory process under Telecommunications Customer Service Act of 1993. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 2895-2897*

Retention or surrender of powers over utility corporations by municipalities to Commission. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 2901-2907*

Authority of Attorney General to seek forfeiture of local franchise for noncompliance. *Pub. Util. Code § 6016*; *see Gov. Code § 12527* (appointment of receiver in action by Attorney General in name of people of state of California)

[6] Telephone and Telegraph Company Property

[a] Construction and Maintenance

Authority of telephone or telegraph corporation to condemn private property. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 233, 235, 616, 617*

Access to utility facilities by disabled persons; duty to furnish and maintain equipment and facilities as necessary to promote public safety.. *Civ. Code § 54.1(a)*; *Pub. Util. Code § 451*

Duty of telephone corporation to give public notice before removing public telephone. *Pub. Util. Code § 728.3*

Required construction and maintenance of connecting lines. *Pub. Util. Code § 766*

Issuance of certificates of convenience. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1001, 1002*

Authority of telegraph or telephone corporation to construct lines along public roads, highways, or waterways. *Pub. Util. Code § 7901*

[b] Injury to Property

Treble damages for malicious injury to telegraph or telephone property. *Pub. Util. Code § 7951*

Liability for negligent injury or destruction of telegraph or telephone property or facility; measure of damages. *Pub. Util. Code § 7952*

Marking of underwater telegraph and telephone lines as prerequisite to recovery of money damages. *Pub. Util. Code § 7953*

Regulations governing electric wires or cables on poles used to conduct electricity. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 8026-8038*

[7] Telegraph Messages

Duty of proper delivery by carrier of messages for reward. *Civ. Code § 2161*

Care and diligence required by carrier of messages for reward. *Civ. Code § 2162*

Priority and preferences in order of transmission of messages. *Civ. Code §§ 2207, 2208*

Damages for delaying or refusing messages. *Civ. Code § 2209*

Refusal to transmit messages as misdemeanor. *Pub. Util. Code § 7904*

[8] Termination of Telephone Service

Disconnection of telephone service required if person has received order to correct unlawful advertising of work covered by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7085 et seq.* (governing contractors) in alphabetical or classified directory and person has failed to comply. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7099.10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawPrivacyGeneral OverviewCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesIndecency & ObscenityCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudWire FraudGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthority

23 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.43

§ 545.43 Administrative Regulations

Safety and health standards for telecommunication centers and field operations. *8 Cal. Code Reg §§ 8600-8618*

Commission rules of practice and procedure. *20 Cal. Code Reg § 1.1 et seq.*

Forms of proceedings before Commission. *20 Cal. Code Reg § 18.1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsAuthorityEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawOccupational Safety & HealthGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.44

§ 545.44 Decisions

[1] Duty of Care in Provision of Services and Equipment

Commission orders pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 8037*, to enforce *Pub. Util. Code § 8001 et seq.*, as not applicable to nonutilities such as those owned by *United States. Henderson v. United States (9th Cir. 1986) 827 F.2d 1233, 1237-1238 , amended, 846 F.2d 1233*

In personal injury action based on negligence and strict liability for injuries plaintiff sustained when telephone booth he was using was hit by drunk driver, question whether or not risk that car might crash into phone both located near street and injure individual in booth was reasonably foreseeable as triable issue of fact precluding summary judgment. *Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 52-55, 57, 59-60, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947*

Complaint alleging cause of action for personal injuries for improper siting of telephone booth in potentially dangerous location as capable of amounting to actionable negligence and as withstanding demurrer; classification of whether or not intervening act (drunk driver striking booth) consituted superseding cause as presenting question of fact. *Bigbee v. Superior Court (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 451, 453-454, 456, 155 Cal. Rptr. 545 , appeal after remand, Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947*

Absent showing that tree trimmer had actual knowledge that telephone lines were not sufficiently secured, trimmer as not charged with assuming risk that fallen tree trunk would fly into air as result of tension in wires. *Carr v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 537, 543, 103 Cal. Rptr. 120*

Wilful refusal or neglect to send message or postponement of transmission in violation of *Pub. Util. Code § 7904* as not requiring evil intent, but as implying purpose or willingness to commit act and knowledge of nature of act; allegations of negligence as insufficient to support civil cause of action for nuisance based on *Pub. Util. Code § 7904*. *Gautier v. General Tel. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 302, 308, 44 Cal. Rptr. 404* (dicta)

Supplier of chattel for another to use for supplier's business purposes as having duty to exercise reasonable care to make chattel safe for use for which it is supplied, including duty to reasonably inspect. *Garner v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co.*

(1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728, 21 Cal. Rptr. 352

Duty of telephone corporation to maintain telephone switchboard in reasonably safe condition. *Jaehne v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 683, 687, 234 P.2d 165*

Transit company maintaining poles along heavily traveled highway as having duty to select and maintain poles sufficiently strong to withstand ordinary weather conditions and other tests of strength likely to be encountered along busy highway; demurrer as improperly sustained to complaint by pedestrian alleging that she was struck by rotten pole which broke off when hit by automobile negligently driven by third party. *Gibson v. Garcia (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 681, 683, 687, 216 P.2d 119*

Telephone company as liable for damages when negligently maintained telephone pole fell and injured plaintiffs' decedent; question whether reasonable person should have anticipated that old telephone pole with six inches of sound timber in center but decayed at surface, near ground, to depth of one and one half inches, was in dangerous condition as issue for jury. *Keller v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 513, 519, 38 P.2d 182*

Telephone company as liable in wrongful death action when decedent was swept from top of trailer by low telephone wire. *Zurich Ins. Co. v. Coachella Valley Home Tel. & Tel. Co. (1931) 119 Cal. App. 65, 67-68, 5 P.2d 943*

Person maintaining telephone wires as having duty to exercise ordinary care in their construction and maintenance in reasonably safe condition to permit of ordinary travel; party claiming wire was too low as requried to show that it is usual and customary for vehicles of equal or greater height to pass under it. *Schleif v. Grigsby (1927) 88 Cal. App. 174, 179, 263 P. 255*

Placing and maintaining guy wire securing telephone pole within line of travel without anything to attract attention or observation of person approaching in darkness as negligence. *Grant v. Sunset Tel. & Tel. Co. (1908) 7 Cal. App. 267, 269-273 94 P. 368*

[2] Duty to Transmit Messages

Limitation of liability provisions as applicable to false report of delivery of telegram. *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 556, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361*

Wilful refusal or neglect to send message or postponement of transmission as implying purpose or willingness to commit act and knowledge of nature of act; evil intent as not required. *Gautier v. General Tel. Co. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 302, 308, 44 Cal. Rptr. 404*

[3] Jurisdiction of State Courts

California trial court had jurisdiction over consumers' action against phone company alleging that company deceived plaintiffs into paying monthly equipment rental fee for telephones that plaintiffs did not have or for telephones whose values were much less than the cumulative amount of rentals paid, without adequately telling plaintiffs what fee actually covered. *Cundiff v. GTE Cal. Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395, 1406-1407, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445*

Writ of mandamus to Supreme Court, rather than motion for injunction in superior court, as appropriate method for seeking injunctive relief calling for Public Utilities Commission to modify previous decision, made pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 2884*, regarding public access to sexually explicit telephone information messages. *Brian T. v. Pacific Bell (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 894, 900-901, 258 Cal. Rptr. 707*

Jurisdiction of superior court as limited to situations in which relief sought would not hinder or frustrate Public Utility Commission's declared supervisory and regulatory policies. *Brian T. v. Pacific Bell (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 894, 900-901, 258 Cal. Rptr. 707*

[4] Liability of Third Persons for Injuring Telephone or Telegraph Company Property

When negligent driver damages utility pole, depreciation as not conisidered in determining damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 7952*. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Alexander (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 253, 256-257, 153 Cal. Rptr. 319* ; *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Mounteer (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 809, 812-813, 136 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Road building contractor as having duty to ascertain existence of underground communications cable on side of public road and to protect utilities, and contractor as liable for damages to cable resulting from negligent disregard of plans and specifications. *Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Granite Constr. Co. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 765, 768-769, 37 Cal. Rptr. 727*

[5] Limitation of Damages Under Tariff Provisions

"Violation of law" exception to tariff limitation on liability as interpreted to apply to intentional torts, not to negligent compliance with PUC order. *Pacific Bell v. Colich (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1225, 1243-1244, 244 Cal. Rptr. 714*

Tariff provision limiting telephone utility's liability for negligence as barring third-party defendant from seeking equitable indemnity or contribution from concurrently negligent utility for damages arising out of interruption of plaintiff's telephone service. *Pacific Bell v. Colich (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 1225, 1230, 1234-1235, 244 Cal. Rptr. 714*

Limitation of liability provisions filed with Commission by telegraph company, as inherent part of rates established in company's tariff, as having force and effect of law, and as binding on public generally, including senders, recipients, and addressees of telegrams, whether or not such persons have knowledge of provisions; tlegraph company as liable only to extent of tariff provisions to recipient of telegram notifying him of job opportunity when telegram was negligently delivered to wrong address. *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 551, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361*

Jurisdiction of complaints regarding limitation of liability provisions as vested in *Commission. Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 4, 4 n. 1, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161*

Rule filed with Commission by telephone company limiting liability for omissions in advertisments or directory listings, if reasonable, as binding on subscribers and other persons. *Riaboff v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 775, 102 P.2d 465*

Tariff provision limiting telephone company's liability for interruption of service to credit allowance as applicable to gross as well as ordinary negligence. *Stern v. General Tel. Co. (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 538, 541-542, 123 Cal. Rptr. 373*

Limitation of liability by tariff for negligent deletion of customer's professional listing from classified directory as not unlawful. *Hall v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 953, 954-955, 98 Cal. Rptr. 128* ; *Davidian v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 750, 752-757, 94 Cal. Rptr. 337* Liability of telegraph company for errors in telegraph message. *Hart v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1885) 66 Cal. 579, 581-582, 6 P. 637* (decided prior to creation of PUC in California; limitation of damages on contract theory held inapplicable by *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 553 n.5, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361*)

[6] Regulation of Obscene or Indecent Calls

47 U.S.C.S. § 223(b), banning indecent and obscene interstate commercial telephone messages, as unconstitutional insofar as statute bans messages that are indecent, but not obscene. *Sable Communications of California, Inc. v. FCC (1988) 492 U.S. 115, 109 S. Ct. 2829, 106 L. Ed. 2d 93, 108*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesIndecency & ObscenityCommunications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsPublic Utility CommissionsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.45

§ 545.45 Law Reviews

Private Damage Actions Against Telephone Companies For Inadequate Service (1975) *9 U.S.F. L. Rev. 561*

Baum, Statutory Controls of Damages In Commercial Transactions. (1960) *12 Hast. L.J. 191*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawTelephone ServicesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesLiabilityTortsBusiness TortsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 545.46-545.59

[Reserved]

§§ 545.46[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.60

§ 545.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] Based on Unlawful Conduct of Public Utility [Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure or Refusal to Transmit Telegram [Civ. Code §§ 2207, 2209]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Corporation

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] Based on Unlawful Conduct of Public Utility [Pub. Util. Code § 2106]--Failure or Refusal to Transmit Telegram [Civ. Code §§ 2207, 2209]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Corporation

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*names*], [and DOES 1	)	[Amount demanded _____
through _____,] Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
_____		

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a telegraph corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to do business, and doing business in the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ [*city*], _____ County, California.

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as

herein alleged were proximately caused by such defendants.)]

[3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein defendant(s) _____ (*name(s)*) (and DOES 1-_____,) was/were the agent(s) and employee(s) of defendant _____ (*name*), and [in doing the things hereinafter alleged] was/were acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at approximately _____ [*time*], _____ [*name of sender of message*] delivered the following telegram to defendants's office located at _____ [*street address and if any, city*], _____County, California, for transmission to _____ [*name of recipient*]: _____ [*set out pertinent text of telegram*].

5. Defendant[s, and each of them], accepted this telegram for transmission in return for the standard compensation demanded and paid, and thereby undertook the obligation to use great care and diligence in the transmission and delivery of the telegram, as required by *Sections 2162, 2207*, and *2208 of the Civil Code*.

6. Defendant[s, and each of them,] _____ [failed to transmit and deliver *or* delayed transmission and delivery of] the telegram, in that _____ [*allege facts showing intentional failure or delay in transmission or delivery of telegram, e.g.,* the messenger wilfully forged the addressee's name to the receipt acknowledging delivery of the telegram], which was _____ [not received until _____ (*time*), on _____ (*date*) *or* never received].

7. The _____ [failure *or* refusal] to transmit the telegram was without justification and constitutes a violation of defendants' duty to transmit messages immediately on receipt as required by *Section 2207 of the Civil Code*.

8. As a proximate result of defendant's violation of its/their duty, plaintiff suffered mental anguish and emotional and physical distress, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

[9. As a further result of defendants' violation of its/their duty, plaintiff has sustained damage to his/her goodwill and business reputation, and was deprived of the opportunity to practice his/her usual livelihood, and thereby lost earnings to his/her damage].

[10. Defendants' refusal to transmit the telegram was wilfull, wanton, and malicious, and justifies the awarding of exemplary damages]. WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For _____ [*specify special damages, e.g.,* damages for loss of earnings] according to proof;

[3. For exemplary damages;]

4. For payment of the penalty authorized by *Section 2209 of the Civil Code* in the sum of $50;

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use to seek damages under *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* for a telegraph corporation's intentional failure or refusal to transmit a telegram.

The action may be brought in any court of competent jurisdiction by any corporation or person to recover for loss, damage, or injury caused by a public utility's unlawful conduct or failure to comply with Constitutional provisions, state statutes, or Commission orders or decisions [*see Pub. Util. Code § 2106*].

The ground for the complaint is the telegraph company's failure or refusal to transmit the telegram as required by statute [*see Civ. Code § 2207*; *Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 549-556, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361* (damages limited by tariff when action is merely based on negligence; dicta that limitation also applies in case of gross negligence)].

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The defendant corporation's capacity and principal place of business (Paragraph 1), which may be the basis for venue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

- Doe defendants, if applicable (Paragraph 2).

- The requisite agency/employee relationship between defendants in order to establish vicarious liability, if applicable (Paragraph 3) [*see generally* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

- The submission of the message to be delivered at defendants' business office, which may also be the basis for venue (Paragraph 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

- Facts establishing defendants' duty to transmit the telegram (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 2207*].

- Facts establishing defendant's negligent or wilful breach of its duty to plaintiff (Paragraphs 6 and 7).

- Plaintiff's damages resulting from defendants' conduct (Paragraphs 8 and 9) [*see Pub. Util. Code § 2106*].

- For optional use if plaintiff seeks exemplary damages, the wilful, wanton, and malicious conduct of defendants warranting exemplary damages (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 3294*].

[4] Limitation of Damages in Negligence Actions

Recovery of damages by a plaintiff in a negligence action brought pursuant to *Pub. Util. Code § 2106* is likely to be limited by provisions in approved tariff schedules filed by the utility with the Commission that set a specific amount of credit or damages to be paid for negligence. Although actions for damages against utilities for unlawful acts are authorized by *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*, claims for damages in excess of the credit allowances contained in the tariff provisions are barred [*Waters v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 1, 4, 6, 114 Cal. Rptr. 753, 523 P.2d 1161* ; *see Trammell v. Western Union Tel. Co. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 538, 549, 129 Cal. Rptr. 361]* .

In order to ascertain whether a provision exists to limit a defendant's monetary liability in a negligence action, counsel should consult the tariff schedule filed by the particular utility with the Commission.

[5] Jurisdiction

Dual jurisdiction over actions involving all public utilities is vested in the Commission and state courts. Courts generally have jurisdiction over tort actions against public utilities, unless the Commission has passed on the very matter asserted by the action [*see City of Union City v. Southern Pac. Co. (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 277, 280-281, 67 Cal. Rptr. 816]* . Once the Commission has assumed jurisdiction over a public utility for the purpose of administering the law applicable to the activities of the utility, the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction [*Citizens Utils. Co. v. Superior Court (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 399, 407, 128 Cal. Rptr. 582* ; *but see Stepak v. American Tel. & Tel. Co. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 633, 635, 641-646, 231 Cal. Rptr. 37* (court as not divested of jurisdiction if Commission exceeds its jurisdiction)].

[6] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[7] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[8] Cross References

For an allegation relating to a mistake or omission in a telegram, that may be used in the form of complaint in [1], *above*, see *§ 545.61*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For alternative allegations of damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to actions for intentional or negligent infliction of emotional distress, see Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress*

For alternative forms of prayers and verifications, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* and Ch. 572, *Verification* , respectively

For discussion and forms relating to complaints before the Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to negligence actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to determining the proper amount of damages in tort actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 65, *Damages* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.61

§ 545.61 Allegation--Errors or Omissions in Telegram [Civ. Code § 2162]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Company

[1] FORM Allegation--Errors or Omissions in Telegram [Civ. Code § 2162]--By Sender or Recipient Against Telegraph Company

6. Defendant[s, and each of them], negligently _____ [omitted certain text from *or* caused an error in the text of] the telegram so as to cause the telegram to read as follows: _____ [*set out pertinent text of telegram*].

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use by a sender or recipient of a telegram in a negligence action against a telegraph corporation based on errors or omissions in a telegram [*Civ. Code § 2162*; *Pub. Util. Code § 2106*]. To complete the complaint, this allegation should be inserted in place of form in Paragaph 6 of the *§ 545.60*. Paragraphs 7 and 10 should be also omitted from the form in *§ 545.60*.

For discussion of a telegraph corporation's liability for errors or omissions in telegrams, see *§§ 545.13* and *545.16*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 545.62-545.69

[Reserved]

§§ 545.62[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.70

§ 545.70 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure of Telegraph or Telephone Corporation to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code §§ 451, 2106]--Maintaining Defective Pole

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Failure of Telegraph or Telephone Corporation to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code §§ 451, 2106]--Maintaining Defective Pole

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR PERSONAL INJURY AND
_____ [*name(s)*], [and DOES 1	)	PROPERTY DAMAGE
through _____], Defendant(s).	)	(Negligence)
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ [telephone *or* telegraph] corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to do business, and doing business, in the State of California with its principal place of business at _____ [*street address and if any, city*], _____ County, California.

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names

and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is negligently responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by that negligence.)]

[3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned defendant(s) _____ (*name(s)*) (and DOES 1-_____,) was/were the agent(s) and employee(s) of defendant _____ (*name*), and in doing the things hereinafter alleged was/were acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them], owned, maintained, controlled, and managed a telephone pole located _____[*describe location of pole, e.g,* one foot from the North _____ (curb *or* edge) of _____ (*street*) twenty feet East of the intersection of _____ and _____ (*streets*)] in _____ [*city and/or county*], California.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was _____ [*allege facts showing status and activity of plaintiff placing him/her in class of persons to whom defendant owed duty of care, e.g.,* parking his/her car in a spot lined on the street for parking _____ (*specify distance*) from defendant's telephone pole on the _____ (*compass direction*) side of _____ (*street*). As plaintiff was parking, the accelerator on his/her car jammed, propelling the car into defendant's telephone pole, which broke off at the ground and snapped at another point near the top. One piece of the pole struck plaintiff's automobile, damaging it and injuring plaintiff].

6. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them] negligently constructed and maintained the above-described telephone pole in such weak and defective condition, as to cause it to fall and strike _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff's car], proximately causing the injuries and damages described below.

7. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

8. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff has incurred [, and will continue to incur,] medical and related expenses.

9. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and present.

10. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff's _____ [*describe personal property*] was _____ [damaged *or describe damage, e.g.,* destroyed beyond repair, all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____]. [*If property was not destroyed, add:* Plaintiff _____ (has expended *or* must expend) $_____ for repair of the damaged property, which is a reasonable sum for the repair.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. For loss of earnings according to proof;

4. For damage to personal property _____ [according to proof *or* in the sum of $_____];

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

The form of complaint in [1], *above*, is for use in seeking damages for personal injury and property damage proximately caused by defendant's negligent maintenance of a defective telephone pole, which it should have anticipated would be likely to endanger persons or property. A telephone company has a duty to select and maintain sound poles which may be reasonably expected to withstand ordinary strain of weather conditions or other ordinary tests of strength, and to make reasonable inspection of its poles to ascertain that they are safe [*Keller v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1934) 2 Cal. App. 2d 513, 519, 38 P.2d 182]* .

Depending on the facts of the case, counsel may wish to delete paragraphs of the complaint that do not apply. For instance, if no property damage is involved, Paragraph 10 of the complaint, as well as Paragraph 4 of the prayer, would be omitted.

[3] Allegations

The complaint in [1], *above*, alleges:

- The defendant corporation's capacity and principal place of business, which may be the basis for venue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), 395.5*].

- Facts regarding defendant's ownership and control over the telephone pole and plaintiff's status and activity that establish defendant's duty of care toward plaintiff, as well as the location of the accident, which may also be the basis for venue (Paragraphs 4 and 5).

- Acts or omissions of defendant constituting a breach of the duty owed plaintiff and causing injury to plaintiff (Paragraph 6).

- Plaintiff's damages (Paragraphs 7-10) [*see Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 513-514, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851* (general allegations of negligence, proximate causation, and resulting injury and damages are sufficient)].

The form also includes paragraphs for optional use to allege fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 2) [*see* Ch. 20,

Allegations Commonly Used] and the requisite agency relationship in order to establish vicarious liability, if applicable (Paragraph 3) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

[4] Specifying Amount of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[5] Venue

In an action for injury to person or personal property or for death from wrongful act or negligence, either the county in which the injury occurs or the county in which the defendants, or some of them, reside at the commencement of the action is a proper county for trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. A corporation may be sued in the county where its obligation or liability arises, or the breach occurs, or in the county where the principal place of business of the corporation is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

[6] Wrongful Death Actions

In an appropriate case, the allegations in this form regarding defendant's duty of care and breach may be used in a complaint for wrongful death arising from a telephone or telegraph corporation's negligence in constructing or maintaining a telephone pole. For discussion and forms relating to wrongful death actions generally, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[7] Cross References

For alternative forms of allegations for use in this form, see *§§ 545.71 -545.73*.

For further discussion of other related subjects, see *§ 545.60*.

For discussion and forms relating to liability for negligently locating utility poles and wires so as to create a hazard, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity*

For discussion and forms relating to actions based on negligence generally, as well as on the vicarious liability of an employer for the wrongful acts of employees, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For discussion and forms relating to products liability, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to actions for negligence generally, see California Points and

Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.71

§ 545.71 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligently Installed or Maintained Telephone Lines

[1] FORM Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligently Installed or Maintained Telephone Lines

4. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of street or other roadway*], was, and now is, a public thoroughfare running in a general _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* North and South] direction in _____ [*city and/or county*], California.

5. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them], owned, maintained, controlled, managed, and operated certain telephone lines over and across the above-mentioned public thoroughfare at or near _____ [*specify location*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*allege facts showing status and activity of plaintiff placing him/her in class of persons to whom defendant owed duty of care, e.g.,* was operating riding on top of a load of hay in the back of a truck which was traveling in a northerly direction along the above-mentioned public thoroughfare].

7. At this time and place, defendant[s, and each of them] so negligently owned, maintained, and controlled the telephone lines _____ [*allege condition creating hazard, e.g.,* that the lines ran only _____ (*specify height of lines above roadway*) above the roadway], so as to cause _____ [*allege the result of defendants' negligence, e.g.,* the lines to strike plaintiff and knock him/her to the pavement], proximately causing the injuries and damages described below.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegations in [1], *above,* is for use in a complaint seeking damages for personal injury against a telephone company for failure to properly construct or maintain equipment or facilities, when the plaintiff has been injured by low telephone lines [*see Schleif v. Grigsby (1927) 88 Cal. App. 174, 179, 263 P. 255* ; *see also Pub. Util. Code § 8026 et seq.* (regulations governing electric wires or cables on poles used to conduct electricity)]. The allegations should be

inserted in place of Paragaphs 4-6 in the *form in § 545.70*, and the remaining Paragraphs of that form renumbered accordingly.

[3] Allegations

The allegations set forth [*see Schleif v. Grigsby (1927) 88 Cal. App. 174, 179-181, 263 P. 255]* :

- The public nature of the thoroughfare across and along which defendant's lines are located (Paragraph 4).

- Defendant's ownership, construction, and maintenance of the telephone lines (Paragraph 5).

- Facts regarding plaintiff's status and activities which establish the duty owed by defendant to plaintiff (Paragraph 6).

- The actions or omissions of defendant that constituted the breach of duty and that proximately caused plaintiff's injuries (Paragraph 7).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.72

§ 545.72 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Telephone Booth Improperly Sited in Dangerous Location

[1] FORM Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Telephone Booth Improperly Sited in Dangerous Location

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them], owned, maintained, controlled, managed, and operated a public telephone booth located at _____ [*street address or location*], _____ [*city and/or county*], California, for the purpose of inviting members of the public to use the facility to place telephone calls.

5. Defendant[s, and each of them], failed to exercise due care and diligence in locating and constructing the above-mentioned telephone booth in that _____ [*allege facts demonstrating the dangerous location of the booth, e.g.,* it is located in a parking lot fifteen feet from the curb of a major thoroughfare on which traffic habitually travels at a high rate of speed, creating an unreasonable risk of harm to anyone using the telephone booth. No physical barrier exists between the booth and the street in order to protect persons using the booth].

[6. Further, defendant[s, and each of them], so defectively designed and/or manufactured the above-mentioned telephone booth, or so negligently installed or maintained it, that the door to the booth jammed and stuck, trapping plaintiff inside so that he/she could not escape from the booth.]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff, as a member of the public invited to use defendant's facilities, entered the above-mentioned telephone booth to make a call.

8. After plaintiff entered the booth, and as a result of defendant's negligent siting [, design, manufacturing, installation, and maintenance] of it, plaintiff suffered physical injuries described below when a vehicle operated by _____ [*name*] crashed into the booth. [Plaintiff would have been able to escape from the path of the vehicle if the telephone booth door had not jammed and trapped him/her inside the booth.]

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegations in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint seeking personal injury damages against a telephone

company for negligently placing a telephone booth in a dangerous location. The allegations should be inserted in place of Paragaphs 4-6 in the form in *§ 545.70*, and the remaining Paragraphs of that form renumbered accordingly.

[3] Allegations

The allegations set forth [*see Bigbee v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 49, 52-53, 57-58, 192 Cal. Rptr. 857, 665 P.2d 947* ; *Bigbee v. Superior Court (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 451, 453-456, 155 Cal. Rptr. 545]* :

- The defendant's ownership, construction, and maintenance of the telephone booth (Paragraph 4).
- Defendant's negligence in placement of the booth in a dangerous location (Paragraph 5).
- Facts showing plaintiff's status and activities which establish the duty owed by defendant to plaintiff (Paragraph 7).
- The actions or omissions of defendant that constituted the breach of duty and that proximately caused plaintiff's injuries (Paragraphs 6, 8).

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to actions against automobile drivers and owners, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* to Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Trial*

For discussion and a form of complaint relating to negligent siting of utility poles, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity*

For discussion and forms relating to the duty of care owed invitees by owners and possessors of property, and premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to the general liability of an owner or possessor of public property, as well as the intervention of third persons in causing injuries to users of the property, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 178, *Premises Liability* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 545 TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMMUNICATION
PART IV. FORMS

47-545 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 545.73

§ 545.73 Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligent Maintenance of Telephone Switchboard

[1] FORM Allegations--Telephone Corporation's Failure to Properly Construct or Maintain Equipment or Facilities [Pub. Util. Code § 451]--Negligent Maintenance of Telephone Switchboard

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant[s, and each of them], provided and installed a telephone switchboard in _____ [*specify location*], for use by _____ (*name of person or business to use switchboard*) pursuant to a _____ (*specify arrangement, e.g.,* leasing agreement) with _____ (*name of person or business to use switchboard*)].

5. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them], owned, maintained, and repaired the above-mentioned telephone switchboard pursuant to the _____ (*specify arrangement, e.g.,* lease).

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was [*allege facts showing status and activity of plaintiff placing him/her in class of persons to whom defendant owed duty of care, e.g.,* employed by _____ (*name of person or business to use switchboard*) to operate the above-mentioned telephone switchboard].

7. At all times herein mentioned, defendant[s, and each of them] negligently inspected, repaired, and maintained the telephone switchboard so as to cause _____ [*allege the result of defendants' negligence, e.g.,* the switchboard to short-circuit and give plaintiff an electrical shock], proximately causing the injuries and damages described below.

[2] Use of Form

The allegations in [1], *above*, are for use in a complaint seeking personal injury damages against a telephone company for negligently installing, inspecting, repairing, and maintaining a telephone switchboard. The allegations should be inserted in place of Paragaphs 4-6 in the form in *§ 545.70*, and the remaining Paragraphs of that form renumbered accordingly.

[3] Allegations

The allegations set forth [*see Jaehne v. Pacific Tel. & Tel. Co. (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 683, 685-687, 234 P.2d 165* (duty of telephone corporation to maintain telephone switchboard in reasonably safe condition); *see also Garner v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728, 21 Cal. Rptr. 352* (supplier of chattel for another to use for supplier's business purposes as having duty to exercise reasonable care to make chattel safe for use for which it is supplied, including duty to reasonably inspect)]:

- The furnishing of the switchboard equipment by defendant under an arrangement pursuant to which defendant continued to own and maintain the equipment (Paragraphs 4,5).

- Facts regarding plaintiff's status and activities which establish the duty owed by defendant to plaintiff (Paragraph 6)

- The actions or omissions of defendant that constituted the breach of duty and that proximately caused plaintiff's injuries (Paragraph 7).

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to workers' compensation claims by employees injured while operating an employer's equipment, see Ch. 577, *Workers' Compensation*

34 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 47: Subrogation thru Telephone and Telegraph Communication-Chs. 536-546
Chapter 546 [RESERVED]

47-546 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 546

[RESERVED]

Chapter 546[RESERVED]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 547.syn

§ 547.syn Synopsis to Chapter 547: THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES

§ 547.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 547.02 Cross References

§§ 547.03through 547.09 [Reserved]

§ 547.10 Governing Law

§ 547.11 Regulation of Theaters

§ 547.12 Obscene Films as Public Nuisance

§ 547.13 Possessor's Liability to Entrants

§ 547.14 Duty to Enforce MPAA Film Ratings Runs Only to Parents

§ 547.15 Detention by Movie Theater Owner for Operating Unauthorized Video Device

§ 547.16 Access to Places of Public Amusement

[1] All Persons

[2] Physically Disabled Persons

[3] Persons Carrying in or Operating Video Recording Devices

§ 547.17 Standard of Care for Amusement Rides

§§ 547.18through 547.29 [Reserved]

§ 547.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] Bender's Forms of Discovery

§ 547.31 State Statutes

[1] Access to Places Open to Public

[2] Crimes

[3] Damages

[4] Employment Regulations

[5] Government Regulations

[6] Health and Safety Regulations

[7] Proprietor's Liability

[8] Statutes of Limitations

[9] Venue

§ 547.32 Decisions

[1] Amusement Rides

[2] Fairs and Resorts

[3] Movie Theaters

[a] Access

[b] Attracting Violence

[c] Premises

§ 547.33 Text References

§§ 547.34through 547.49 [Reserved]

§ 547.50 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises to Audition Against One in Control of Premises--Negligent Management, Control, and Operation of Premises

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specification of Damages

[5] Cross References

§ 547.51 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises Against Owner of Place of Amusement and Concessionaire--Negligent Control, Supervision, and Operation of Premises

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 547.52 Allegation--Personal Injury Caused By Defendants' Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Defective Amusement Park Device

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART I. SCOPE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.01

§ 547.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms for use in actions against owners or operators of theaters, amusement parks, and other resort facilities. Included are a complaint for personal injury and property damage due to negligent management, control, and operation of premises [*see § 547.50*], a complaint for personal injury and property damage due to negligent control, supervision, and operation of premises [*see § 547.51*], and an allegation of personal injury caused by a defective amusement park device [*see § 547.52*].

For discussion and forms relating to negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For forms and discussion relating to the general liability of the owner of premises, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* . For discussion and forms relating to the liability of the owner of other types of recreational premises, see Ch. 273, *Games, Sports, and Athletics* . For discussion and forms specific to injuries caused by slipping and falling, see Ch. 525, *Slip and Fall* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceActionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART I. SCOPE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.02

§ 547.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to outdoor and billboard advertising standards, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

For discussion and forms relating to liquor licensing and abatement of unlawful selling of alcohol, see Ch. 18, *Alcoholic Beverage Licenses* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions for assault and battery, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* .

For discussion and forms relating to personal injury actions alleging negligence of carriers of persons for reward, see Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars* .

For discussion and forms relating to discrimination in business establishments, see Ch. 116, *Civil Rights: Discrimination in Business Establishments* .

For discussion and forms relating to liability of premises with elevators, see Ch. 244, *Elevators and Escalators* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions for false imprisonment, see Ch. 257, *False Imprisonment* .

For discussion and forms relating to liability of operators of parks and stadiums to participants and spectators, see Ch. 273, *Games, Sports, and Athletics* .

For discussion and forms relating to maintenance of hotel premises, see Ch. 297, *Hotels and Motels* .

For discussion and forms relating to a public entity's power to require a license to operate a business, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to production and distribution of motion pictures, see Ch. 370, *Motion Pictures* .

For discussion and forms relating to negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

For discussion and forms relating to obscenity as a public nuisance, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

For discussion and forms relating to premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

For discussion and forms relating to a public entity's power to require a license to operate a business, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

For discussion and forms relating to injury to student due to negligent maintenance or dangerous condition of school property, see Ch. 514, *Schools: Injuries to Students* .

For discussion and forms relating to slips and falls, see the Ch. 525, *Slip and Fall* .

For discussion and forms relating to the regulation of property use for specific purposes, see Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning* .

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor Carriers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART I. SCOPE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 547.03through 547.09

[Reserved]

§§ 547.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.10

§ 547.10 Governing Law

The liability for harm caused by want of ordinary care or skill in the management of property and person is governed by *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*. As proprietor of the premises, the operator's liability to entrants on those premises is governed by the principles enunciated in *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 119, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* . *Civ. Code §§ 51-52* provide that all persons shall have equal privileges in business establishments. Special provisions regarding access to premises by the physically disabled are contained in *Civ. Code §§ 54-55.1* and *Health & Safety Code §§ 19952-19959*. Entities operating amusement rides must comply with the safety provisions codified in *Lab. Code §§ 7900-7915*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawProtection of Disabled PersonsGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPublic FacilitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesReasonable CareTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.11

§ 547.11 Regulation of Theaters

Expression through a motion picture is within the free speech and press guarantees of the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution*. Those guarantees are not diminished if a business for profit is involved. This protection is not a blanket immunity, however, and a municipality may impose reasonable regulations on the conduct of an economic enterprise, including a motion picture theater. Even if *First Amendment* rights are being exercised on the premises, a commercial entrepreneur must comply with reasonable regulations under the police power. The requirement of obtaining a license to engage in the motion picture business is a reasonable means of assuring compliance with police power regulations [*Burton v. Municipal Court (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 684, 689-690, 68 Cal. Rptr. 721, 441 P.2d 281]* . For further discussion of a public entity's power to license, see Ch. 471B, *Licensing by Public Agencies* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechFree PressGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsPolice Power

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.12

§ 547.12 Obscene Films as Public Nuisance

A state may restrain the exhibition of obscene material, including films, by application of public nuisance statutes (*Civ. Code §§ 3479, 3480*; *Penal Code §§ 370, 371*) [*People ex rel. Busch v. Projection Room Theater (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 42, 49-55, 130 Cal. Rptr. 328, 550 P.2d 600]* . For discussion of abatement of obscene films as a public nuisance, and the inapplicability of the Red Light Abatement Law (*Penal Code §§ 11225-11235*) to their exhibition in theaters, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesIndecency & ObscenityConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechObscenityReal Property LawTortsNuisanceRemediesSummary AbatementReal Property LawTortsNuisanceTypesPublic Nuisance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.13

§ 547.13 Possessor's Liability to Entrants

The fundamental test of a possessor's liability to an entrant on the land in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1714(a)* is whether in the management of the property the possessor has acted as a reasonable person in view of the probability of injury to others. Although the status of the entrant may have some bearing on the liability, it is not determinative [*Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 119, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* ; *Jamison v. Mark C. Bloome Co. (1980) 112 Cal. App. 3d 570, 575, 169 Cal. Rptr. 399]* . For further discussion of the liability of the possessor to entrants for injuries sustained on the premises, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* . For further discussion of the liability of owners of stadiums for injuries to spectators of athletic events, see Ch. 273, *Games, Sports, and Athletics* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesReasonable CareTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesSports Facilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.14

§ 547.14 Duty to Enforce MPAA Film Ratings Runs Only to Parents

The voluntary film-rating system of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) is intended to provide parents with assistance in determining whether a particular film would be appropriate viewing for their child. Therefore, the duty of a movie theater to enforce these ratings is a duty owed to parents of children who view films at a theater, rather than to the public at large. Based on this rationale, the court of appeal held that a theater owed no duty to the murder victim of a child who was allowed to see a violent R-rated film without being accompanied by a parent, even though the child shot his victim immediately after leaving the theater and was apparently inspired by the violence in the movie [*Delgado v. American Multi-Cinema, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1405-1407, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 838]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawContent RegulationGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.15

§ 547.15 Detention by Movie Theater Owner for Operating Unauthorized Video Device

The owner or operator of a movie theater (as well as the agents, employees, consignees, lessees and officers of the owner or operator) may detain a person for a reasonable time to conduct an investigation, in a reasonable manner, if the owner or operator has probable cause to believe that the person has been attempting to operate a video recording device in the theater without the authority of the owner or operator [*Penal Code § 490.5(f)(1),(g)(3)*]. The theater owner or operator may use a reasonable amount of nondeadly force, if necessary for self-protection and to prevent the person's escape or the loss of property [*Penal Code § 490.5(f)(2)*]. During the period of detention, the theater owner or operator may examine any item in plain view that the theater owner or operator has probable cause to believe was recorded on the theater premises, may request the person detained to surrender the item voluntarily, and, if the person refuses, may search packages, shopping bags, handbags, or other property (but not clothing) in the person's immediate vicinity to recover the item [*Penal Code § 490.5(f)(4)*].

In any civil action brought by the detained person because of the detention, the defendant may raise as a defense that the theater owner oroperator (or the agents, employees, consignees, lessees and officers of the owner or operator) who detained that person has probable cause to believe that the person was attempting to operate a video recording device without the authority of the theater owner or operator [*Penal Code § 490.5(f)(7), (g)(3)*]. For discussion of civil actions for assault or false imprisonment, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* , and Ch. 257, *False Imprisonment* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureSearch & SeizureWarrantless SearchesPrivate SearchesTortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsDefensesDefense of PropertyTortsIntentional TortsFalse ImprisonmentGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.16

§ 547.16 Access to Places of Public Amusement

[1] All Persons

The Unruh Civil Rights Act provides that all persons are entitled to the full and equal accommodations and services in all business establishments of every kind [*Civ. Code § 51*]. For a further discussion of the Unruh Civil Rights Act, see Ch. 116, *Civil Rights: Discrimination in Business Establishments* .

[2] Physically Disabled Persons

Any person or public or private entity who owns or manages places of public amusement and resort must provide seating or accommodations for physically disabled persons in a variety of locations within the facility. The extent of that variety must comply with fire and panic safety requirements of the State Fire Marshall and must provide the physically disabled with a choice of admission prices otherwise available to the general public. Readily removable seats may be installed in wheelchair spaces when the spaces are not required to accommodate wheelchair users [*Health & Safety Code § 19952*]. Actions to enjoin violations of *Health & Safety Code § 19952* may be brought by any aggrieved or potentially aggrieved person or a district attorney, a city attorney, a county counsel if the district attorney does not bring an action, the Department of Rehabilitation acting through the Attorney General, or the Attorney General [*Health & Safety Code §§ 19953, 19954*]. Physically disabled persons are also entitled to full and equal access to places of public accommodation, amusement or resort, and other places to which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law or regulation, and applicable alike to all persons [*Civ. Code §§ 54-55.1*].

Beginning in 2004, a violation of these provisions also subjects the offender to a civil penalty of $2,500 for each violation, with additional amounts imposed for those offenders who remain in violation for more than 90 days [*see Health & Safety Code § 19958.6*].

[3] Persons Carrying in or Operating Video Recording Devices

The owner or operator of a movie theater (as well as the agents, employees, consignees, lessees and officers of the owner or operator) may refuse admission to any person who refuses or fails to surrender possession of a video recording device that the person has brought into the theater. The theater owner or operator may also request that any person

operating a video recording device in the theater leave the premises and offer to refund the price paid for admission [*Penal Code § 490.5(f)(5)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawProtection of Disabled PersonsGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPublic FacilitiesScopeCommunications LawRelated Legal IssuesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.17

§ 547.17 Standard of Care for Amusement Rides

The owner and operator of a roller coaster in an amusement park is subject to the liabilities of a common carrier that has accepted passengers for hire. Thus, a jury is properly instructed that an operator and owner of an amusement ride is charged with the utmost care and diligence required of a common carrier of persons under *Civ. Code § 2100* [*Barr v. Venice Giant Dipper Co., Ltd. (1934) 138 Cal. App. 563, 564, 32 P.2d 980* ; see *Pontecorvo v. Clark (1928) 95 Cal. App. 162, 176-177, 272 P. 591* (conceding without deciding that roller coaster was common carrier)]. If passengers for hire in a transportation and amusement facility are injured, the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur can be applied because of the special relationship existing between the plaintiff as passenger and the defendant as carrier [*Kohl v. Disneyland, Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 780, 783-784, 20 Cal. Rptr. 367]* . For further discussion of the standard of care imposed on a carrier by *Civ. Code § 2100*, see Ch. 106, *Buses and Streetcars* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Communications LawRelated Legal IssuesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 547.18through 547.29

[Reserved]

§§ 547.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.30

§ 547.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to general principles and measures of damages in tort actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 65, *Damages*, § 177.40 et seq.

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in negligence actions generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence*

For memoranda of points and authorities relaing to premises liability, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 178, *Premises Liability*

[2] Bender's Forms of Discovery

For forms of interrogatories relating to actions involving carriers, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, *Carriers*

For forms of interrogatories relating to actions involving injuries occuring on recreatonal areas, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, *Parks, Playgrounds and Other Recreational Areas*

For forms of interrogatories relating to actions involving personal injuries, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, *Personal Injuries*

For forms of interrogatories relating to actions for injuries due to falls on possessor's premises, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, *Slip and Fall*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsSlip & Fall InjuriesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.31

§ 547.31 State Statutes

[1] Access to Places Open to Public

All persons are entitled to full accommodations in all business establishments. *Civ. Code §§ 51-52*

Physically disabled persons have same right of access to and use of public places. *Civ. Code §§ 54-55.1*

Access to places of public amusement by physically handicapped persons. *Health & Safety Code §§ 19952-19954*

Access to public accommodations by physically handicapped persons. *Health & Safety Code §§ 19955-19959*

Theater owner has right to refuse admission to person unwilling to surrender video recording device, and to request person operating device on premises to leave. *Penal Code § 490.5*

[2] Crimes

Ticket scalping is misdemeanor. *Penal Code § 346*

Discharge of injurious substance in amusement place is unlawful. *Penal Code § 375*

[3] Damages

Compensatory damages for tort. *Civ. Code § 3333*

[4] Employment Regulations

Security required of employers in theatrical productions. *Lab. Code § 271*

Employment of minors, including specific provisions regarding appearances in entertainment activities. *Lab. Code §§ 1308.7, 1390-1399*

Responsibilty of employer to provide safe place of employment. *Lab. Code §§ 6400-6413.5*

[5] Government Regulations

County and city licensing authority for businesses, including shows and exhibitions. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16000-16104*

Licensing and regulating ticket sellers. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22500 et seq.*

Authority of nonprofit theater company to sell alcholic beverages under specified conditions. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 23039, 24045.7*

Authority of nonprofit symphony association to sell alcholic beverages under specified conditions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 24045.85*

Authority for county to operate schools for presentation and instruction in theatrical arts. *Pub. Res. Code §§ 5140, 5141.1*

[6] Health and Safety Regulations

Sanitation requirements for drinking water at public places. *Health & Safety Code §§ 3700-3704*

Fire prevention requirements specific to places of public assemblage. *Health & Safety Code §§ 13115-13120, 13143*

Manufacturer's license not necessary for pyrotechnic-licensed person to use fireworks in theater production. *Health & Safety Code § 12603*

Smoking prohibited except in lobby of publicly owned buildings to which general public is admitted for entertainment purposes. *Health & Safety Code § 25943*

Sanitary conditions required in theaters. *Lab. Code §§ 2260-2263*

Amusement Rides Safety Law. *Lab. Code §§ 7900-7915*

[7] Proprietor's Liability

Liability for injury to another caused by lack of ordinary care. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Liability as carriers of persons. *Civ. Code §§ 2100-2104*

Movie theater owner who detains person has defense to civil action brought by detained person, if theater owner had probable cause to believe that detained person was attempting unauthorized operation of video recording device on theater premises. *Penal Code § 490.5*

[8] Statutes of Limitations

Two-year statute of limitations for personal injury resulting from negligence. *Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*; *see* former Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3) (one-year period prior to 2003)

Four-year statute of limitations for injury caused by deficient planning or construction of improvement to real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 337.1*

Three-year statute of limitations for injury to personal property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338*

[9] Venue

Venue for negligence action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawProtection of Disabled PersonsGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawPublic FacilitiesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsPolice PowerTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.32

§ 547.32 Decisions

[1] Amusement Rides

Proprietor or operator of amusement park is liable to patron for injuries resulting from negligence of concessionaire if it is shown that failure to exercise supervision proximately resulted in injuries. *McCordic v. Crawford (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 1, 6-7, 142 P.2d 7* (defective strap on ride); *Basye v. Craft's Golden State Shows (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 782, 788-789, 111 P.2d 746* (man's eye injured in shooting gallery accident)

Proprietor of amusement park has duty to use reasonable care both in original letting of space and in subsequent inspection and supervision of concession. *Johnstone v. Panama Pac. Int'l Exposition Co. (1921) 187 Cal. 323, 329, 202 P. 34* (woman hit by electric car operated by patron of concessionaire)

Doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is applicable if transportation and amusement ride caused injuries to passengers. *Kohl v. Disneyland, Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 780, 782-783, 20 Cal. Rptr. 367*

Common carrier standard of care is applicable to amusement facility horse and buggy ride if passengers are accepted for hire. *Kohl v. Disneyland, Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 780, 782-784, 20 Cal. Rptr. 367*

Common carrier burden of care is met if defendant proved exercise of due care in all areas that reasonably might have been cause of negligence. *Kohl v. Disneyland, Inc. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 780, 782-784, 20 Cal. Rptr. 367*

Jury instructions on assumption of risk, followed by instructions regarding age, experience, and capacity to understand and know danger, were appropriate in personal injury action by 9-year-old passenger injured on astro jet amusement ride, if defendant had presented evidence indicating accident was unlikely to occur without some action by passenger. *Lyle v. Disneyland, Inc. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 18, 22-23, 2 Cal. Rptr. 704* (decided prior to *Li v. Yellow Cab Co.*

(1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226 , which established comparative negligence)

Res ipsa loquitur as applicable to amusement device causing injury when it is under management of defendant and accident is such as in ordinary course of things does not happen if those who had management used proper care. *Davidson v. Long Beach Pleasure Pier Co. (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 384, 388, 221 P.2d 1005*

Public amusement park proprietor as owing duty of using reasonable care to see that patrons are not injured. *Potts v. Crafts (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 83, 84, 42 P.2d 87*

Patron of amusement device as assuming any risk naturally and obviously arising from proper use and operation of device if it is properly designed, constructed, and maintained; patron as not obliged to make critical examination to determine saftey of device, but has right to assume that those in charge have exercised due care in inspection. *Chardon v. Alameda Park Co. (1934) 1 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21, 23, 36 P.2d 136*

Operator of roller coaster in amusement park as subject to liabilities of common carrier when paid passengers are accepted. *Barr v. Venice Giant Dipper Co., Ltd. (1934) 138 Cal. App. 563, 564, 32 P.2d 980*

Proprietor of amusement park is responsible for negligence of concessionaires. *Szasz v. Joyland Co. (1927) 84 Cal. App. 259, 263, 257 P. 871* (boy lost eye in shooting gallery accident)

[2] Fairs and Resorts

Owner is required to use ordinary care for safety of entrants and give reasonable notice or warning of danger arising from condition not readily apparent; owner is entitled to assume that entrant will perceive that which would be obvious to ordinary use of entrant's own senses, and is not required to give entrant notice or warning of obvious danger. *Curland v. Los Angeles County Fair Ass'n (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 691, 695-696, 258 P.2d 1063* (entrant's tripping over axle bracing light standard was not caused by defendant's negligence)

Resort owner was liable for tree falling on automobile parked in driveway used for ingress and egress to resort; dangerous condition of tree was apparent to owner from obvious decay and disintegration over lengthy period of time. *Harvey v. Machtig (1925) 73 Cal. App. 667, 672-674, 239 P. 78*

[3] Movie Theaters

[a] Access

Movie theater's refusal to allow person in wheelchair to sit in aisle in violation of fire regulations, and offering choice of being lifted into standard theater seat or sitting close to screen, was not actionable discrimination. *Marsh v. Edwards Theatres Circuit, Inc. (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 881, 889-892, 134 Cal. Rptr. 844*

Civ. Code § 54.1 requires operator to open its doors on equal basis to all that can avail themselves of facilities without violation of other valid laws and regulations; *Civ. Code § 54.1* alone does not require modification of facilities to allow for use of handicapped persons. *Marsh v. Edwards Theatres Circuit, Inc. (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 881, 892, 134 Cal.*

Rptr. 844

Gov. Code § 4450 and *Health & Safety Code §§ 19955, 19956,* and *19959* express legislative intent that affirmative conduct is required of proprietor only if new facilities are constructed or existing facilities are altered. *Marsh v. Edwards Theatres Circuit, Inc. (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 881, 888, 134 Cal. Rptr. 844*

Theater manager's refusal to admit African-American patron into seating area of theater was actionable under *Civ. Code §§ 51, 52*. *Prowd v. Gore (1922) 57 Cal. App. 458, 460-461, 207 P. 490*

[b] Attracting Violence

Film producers were not negligent in failing to warn movie theater patrons that allegedly violent movie would attract persons who were prone to violence and carried weapons. *Bill v. Superior Court (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1011-1014, 187 Cal. Rptr. 625*

[c] Premises

Owner is required to have either actual or constructive knowledge of dangerous condition or by exercise of ordinary care must have been able to discover condition before liability for dangerous condition brought about by third persons will be imposed; negligence is founded on failure to exercise ordinary care in discovering and remedying defect. *Beal v. Blumenfeld Theatres, Inc. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 192, 193-194, 2 Cal. Rptr. 110*

Theater's rule requiring its ushers to illuminate patrons' way was indicative of its recognition of standard of care required by dim lighting. *Beal v. Blumenfeld Theatres, Inc. (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 192, 194-195, 2 Cal. Rptr. 110*

Trial court properly found no negligence in action brought by 82-year-old woman knocked down, while waiting in ticket line, by boys playing in theater lobby. *McIntyre v. Doe & Roe (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 285, 286-287, 270 P.2d 21*

Drive-in theater had duty to use reasonable care in installation, inspection, and maintenance of portable electric heaters provided for its customers; theater was not responsible for defective condition of interior switch of heater apparent only through use of special screwdriver possessed only by manufacturer. *Post v. Alameda Amusement Co. (1953) 117 Cal. App. 2d 588, 592, 256 P.2d 580*

Movie theater was negligent for failing to take reasonable precautions for safety of patrons; failure to exercise diligence in knowing condition of every part of premises and every object in theater with which patron might reasonably be expected to come in contact and probability that patrons will not discover invisible or concealed hazards in darkness of theater were factors indicating negligence. *Mattox v. Isley (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 774, 778, 245 P.2d 664*

Theater operator was required to possess and reasonably exercise superior knowledge of dangers incident to facilities and premises and to have sufficient personnel to maintain theater in reasonably safe condition. *Travis v. Metropolitan Theatres Corp. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 664, 667, 205 P.2d 475*

Theater operator had duty to anticipate and guard against lurking perils, inspect premises and facilities, and keep aisles and other passageways free from substances that might cause person to slip, especially if theater is open to persons at all times of day and night. *Travis v. Metropolitan Theatres Corp. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 664, 667, 205 P.2d 475*

Theater was negligent for slip and fall caused by vomit on floor adjacent to seat if exercise of ordinary care would have revealed its presence. *Travis v. Metropolitan Theatres Corp. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 664, 668, 205 P.2d 475*

Slip and fall on theater restroom floor caused by water and paper towels was negligence if manager had knowledge of dangerous condition and provided neither remedy nor warning. *Newman v. Fox W. Coast Theatres (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 428, 432-433, 194 P.2d 706*

Theater operator was required to use reasonable care to keep premises in reasonably safe condition and give warning of concealed perils; operator was not liable for injury resulting from obvious danger. *Matherne v. Los Feliz Theatre (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 660, 665-667, 128 P.2d 59*

Theater maintaining parking lot for patrons was required to exercise reasonable care in providing for safety of patrons; maintenance of subsurface ramp adjacent to parking lot without warning of its existence or otherwise protecting patrons unable to see in dark was substantial proof of negligence. *Martin v. Fox W. Coast Theatres Corp. (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 925, 929-930, 108 P.2d 29*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawProtection of Disabled PersonsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareCommon CarriersTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityActivities & ConditionsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.33

§ 547.33 Text References

3 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Amusements and Exhibitions*, §§ 6-17

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityPremisesRecreational FacilitiesAmusement Parks

52 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 547.34through 547.49

[Reserved]

§§ 547.34[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART IV. FORMS

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.50

§ 547.50 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises to Audition Against One in Control of Premises--Negligent Management, Control, and Operation of Premises

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises to Audition Against One in Control of Premises--Negligent Management, Control, and Operation of Premises

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR PERSONAL
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	INJURY [AND PROPERTY DAMAGE]
through _____],	)	(Negligence)
Defendant[s].	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____[*name*] is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges that each of the fictitiously named

defendants is negligently responsible in some manner for the occurrences alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries as alleged were proximately caused by that negligence.)]

[3. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

4. On or about _____[*date*], plaintiff was auditioning _____ [*specify purpose and location of audition, e.g.,* for a role as a dancer in a show at defendant's nightclub located at _____[*city and county*], California].

5. At said time and place, defendant[s, and each of them], _____[*allege facts showing defendant's ownership, possession, or control of the premises and the instrumentality causing the accident, e.g.,* was the owner and operator of the nightclub and was conducting the auditions on a dimly lit stage which could be raised and lowered through use of a switch accessible only to defendant and his/her employees].

6. At the above-mentioned time and place, defendant[s, and each of them,] negligently and carelessly maintained, controlled, and operated the premises by _____[*allege acts or omissions of defendant, e.g.,* allowing the stage to remain in a lowered position when plaintiff was entering the stage to perform her audition] so as to cause _____[*allege the result of defendant's negligence constituting breach of duty owed plaintiff, e.g.,* plaintiff to fall from the club floor level to the basement level when she stepped from the stairs to the expected location of the stage] and to proximately cause the injuries and damages described below.

7. As a proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them,] plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that such injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of such injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

8. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses.

9. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff's earning capacity has been greatly impaired, both in the past and present.

[10. As a further proximate result of the negligence of defendant(s, and each of them), plaintiff's _____ (*describe personal property*) was _____ (damaged *or describe damges, e.g.,* destroyed beyond repair, all to plaintiff's damages in the sum of $_____). (*If property was not destroyed, add:* Plaintiff _____ (has expended *or* must expend) $_____ for repair of such (damaged) _____ (describe personal property), which is a reasonable sum for such repair.)]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them], as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

3. For loss of earnings according to proof;

[4. For damage to personal property _____ (in the sum of $_____);]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____[*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date and place*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint may be used by a person auditioning on the premises of another against the one in control of the premises to obtain damages for personal injuries and property damage proximately caused by negligence in the maintenance, management, or operation of the premises. The basis of liability is *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*, which provides that every one is responsible for injuries occasioned by the lack of ordinary care or skill in the management of his or her property. This form is adapted from the fact situation in *Gastine v. Ewing (1944) 65 Cal. App. 2d 131, 150 P.2d 266* . For discussion of the liabilty of those who control premises to persons entering the premises, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges all of the following:

- The residence of defendant (Paragraph 1) and the place of the accident (Paragraphs 4, 5), either of which may be the basis for venue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*];

- The negligence and fictitious names of defendants sued pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* [*see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];

- The requisite agency relationship in order to establish vicarious liability, if applicable (Paragraph 3) [*see* Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*];

- Facts showing a legal duty of care owed by defendant controller of the premises to plaintiff entrant (Paragraphs 4, 5);

- The act or omission by defendant constituting a breach of the duty owed plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 1714(a)*]; and

- The plaintiff's damages, consisting of general damages (Paragraph 7), as well as medical expenses (Paragraph 8), loss of earnings and earning capacity (Paragraph 9), and property damage (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3333*].

For a discussion of the elements of actionable negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[4] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included--for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint, see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*].

[5] Cross References

For a discussion of the law and forms relating to damages recoverable in tort actions, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For a discussion of the law and forms relating to negligence, generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For a discussion of the law and forms relating to duties and liabilities of possessors or owners of land to others coming on the premises, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

For a discussion of the law and forms relating to slips and falls due to dangerous condition of premises, see Ch. 525, *Slip and Fall*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART IV. FORMS

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.51

§ 547.51 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises Against Owner of Place of Amusement and Concessionaire--Negligent Control, Supervision, and Operation of Premises

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury (and Property Damage) Based on Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--By Person on Premises Against Owner of Place of Amusement and Concessionaire--Negligent Control, Supervision, and Operation of Premises

[*Caption. See § 547.50[1].*]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. At all times herein mentioned defendant _____[*name of owner of place of amusement*] was the _____[*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner and operator] of _____[*specify type of amusement, e.g.,* a carnival] business _____[*specify name and the location of the business when venue is based on this fact*].

5. At all times herein mentioned defendant _____[*name of concessionaire*] was the _____[*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner and operator] of the concession known as _____[*specify name of concession, e.g.,* Sharp Eye Shooting Gallery] in the above-named place of amusement.

6. At all times herein mentioned, defendants invited members of the general public, including plaintiff, to enter the

premises known as _____[*name of place of amusement*] as participants and spectators of the activities thereon.

7. On or about _____[*date*], plaintiff _____[*allege facts showing plaintiff's status as patron, e.g.,* paid the required admission price, and walked through the arcade area, stopping to watch the shooting at Sharp Eye Shooting Gallery].

8. At said time and place, defendant _____[*name of owner of amusement place*] and defendant _____[*name of concessionaire*] negligently and carelessly operated, supervised, controlled, and maintained _____[*name of concession*] so as to cause _____[*allege the result of defendants' negligence constituting breach of duty owed plaintiff, e.g.,* a fragment of a bullet fired by a patron of the shooting gallery to strike plaintiff in the eye and to proximately cause the injuries and damages described below].

9. [*General damages allegation. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 7.*]

10. [*Allegation of medical expenses. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 8.*]

11. [*Allegation of impairment of earning capacity. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 9.*]

12. [*Allegation of property damages, if appropriate. See § 547.50[1], Paragraph 10.*]

[*Prayer, signature, and, if desired, verification. See § 547.50[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use if the plaintiff, as a patron on defendant's premises, sustains personal injuries and property damage proximately caused by the negligence of a concessionaire on defendant's property. Both the proprietor of the premises and the concessionaire may be held liable for damages. The duty of exercising care, and the responsibility for the negligence of independent concessionaires, are extended by law to the owner, the occupier, or the one in possession of the premises on which the amusement is being operated [*McCordic v. Crawford (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 1, 6-7, 142 P.2d 7* ; *Basye v. Craft's Golden State Shows (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 782, 788-789, 111 P.2d 746]* .

Although this complaint involves a patron of an amusement place, it may be modified for use in a similar setting or by a person with a different status. Even though the status of plaintiff as an invitee, a licensee, or a trespasser no longer determines the issue of duty, the facts surrounding the status are relevant in assessing defendant's liability [*Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 119, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561]* . For discussion of the principles of liability owed by owners of premises to entrants generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* . This form is adapted from the fact situation in *Basye v. Craft's Golden State Shows (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 782, 111 P.2d 746* . For discussion of the liabilty of property owners for the negligence of independent contractors, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges all of the following:

- The location of the accident and the ability of defendant owner of the place of amusement to supervise the premises (Paragraph 4) [*McCordic v. Crawford (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 1, 6-7, 142 P.2d 7* ; see *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* as possible basis of venue];

- The responsibility of defendant concessionaire to operate the concession in a safe manner (Paragraph 5) [*Basye v. Craft's Golden State Shows (1941) 43 Cal. App. 2d 782, 788-789, 111 P.2d 746]* ;

- Facts showing a legal duty of care owed by defendants as controllers of the premises to plaintiff entrant (Paragraphs 6, 7) [see *McCordic v. Crawford (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 1, 6-7, 142 P.2d 7]* ; and

- The act or omission by defendants constituting a breach of the duty owed to the plaintiff (Paragraph 8) [see *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*].

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 547.50*

55 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 547 THEATERS, SHOWS, AND AMUSEMENT PLACES
PART IV. FORMS

48-547 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 547.52

§ 547.52 Allegation--Personal Injury Caused By Defendants' Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Defective Amusement Park Device

[1] FORM Allegation--Personal Injury Caused By Defendants' Negligence [Civ. Code § 1714(a)]--Defective Amusement Park Device

1. At the above-mentioned time and place, defendant _____[*name of concessionaire*] and defendant _____[*name of owner of amusement place*] operated an amusement ride known as _____[*specify name of amusement ride, e.g.,* Tilly's Tilt A Whirl]. The device for this ride was defective in that _____[*allege facts indicating the nature of the defect, e.g.,* the safety bar holding passengers secure did not remain stable, but was released while the ride was in motion]. A reasonable inspection would have revealed this defect.

2. As a proximate result of the defective nature of this device, it _____[*allege the result of the defective device which caused injury to plaintiff, e.g.,* released the safety bar on the car in which plaintiff was a passenger and allowed plaintiff to be thrown from the car before the car was stationary, proximately causing the injuries and damages described below].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by plaintiff if plaintiff, as a patron on defendant's premises, sustains personal injuries proximately caused by a defective device on an amusement ride. The proprietor of a public place of amusement is required to maintain in a reasonably safe condition, every contrivance used in its premises, and to properly inspect and supervise the same [*Davidson v. Long Beach Pleasure Pier Co. (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 384, 387, 221 P.2d 1005]* . If through failure to perform that legal duty any devices are allowed to become in fact unsafe, which results in injury to a patron, the proprietor's knowledge or ignorance of the defect is immaterial [*Chardon v. Alameda Park Co. (1934) 1 Cal. App. 2d 18, 21-22, 36 P.2d 136]* . This allegation is adapted from the fact situation in *Davidson v. Long Beach Pleasure Pier Co. (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 384, 221 P.2d 1005* .

When appropriate, this allegation can be used in § 547.51 and may be substituted for Paragraph 8. For discussion of the application of strict liability, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

[3] Cross References

See also *§ 547.51*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 548.syn

§ 548.syn Synopsis to Chapter 548: TITLE INSURANCE

§ 548.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 548.02 Cross References

§§ 548.03-548.09 [Reserved]

§ 548.10 Governing Statutes

§ 548.11 Definitions

§ 548.12 Regulation of Title Insurance

§ 548.13 Policy Forms

[1] In General

[2] Basic Nature of Coverage

[3] CLTA Standard Coverage Policy

[4] ALTA Loan Policy

[5] ALTA Owner's Policy

§ 548.14 Policy Protection for Owners and Lenders

[1] Vesting

[2] Defects, Liens, or Encumbrances

[3] Unmarketability of Title

[4] Lack of Access

§ 548.15 Policy Protection for Lenders Only

[1] Invalidity of Mortgage

[2] Prior Liens or Encumbrances

[3] Invalidity of Assignment

[4] ALTA Coverage for Labor and Material Liens

[5] ALTA Coverage for Street Improvement Assessments

§ 548.16 Exclusions

[1] In General

[2] Governmental Regulations and Police Power

[3] Eminent Domain

[4] Defects Agreed to by Insured

[5] Defects Not Disclosed to Insurer

[6] Defects Resulting in No Loss or Damage

[7] Defects Arising After Date of Policy

[8] Loss Suffered Because Insured Did Not Pay Value

[9] Failure to Comply With "Doing Business Laws"

[10] Violation of Usury or Truth-in-Lending Laws

[11] Claims Arising Out of Creditors' Rights Laws

[12] Mechanics Liens

§ 548.17 Exceptions

[1] In General

[2] Taxes or Assessments Not Shown as Liens

[3] Facts That Could Be Ascertained by Inspecting Land

[4] Easements, Liens, or Encumbrances Not Shown by Public Records

[5] Mining Clams, Reservations in Patents, Water Rights

[6] Variable Exceptions

§ 548.18 Notice to Insurer

[1] Policy Requirement

[2] Prejudice to Insurer

[3] Proof of Loss or Damage

[4] Waiver of Prompt Notice Condition

§ 548.19 Construction Against Insurer

§ 548.20 Insurer's Duty to Indemnify

[1] Action Under Policy

[2] Absolute Liability of Insurer

[3] Amount of Indemnification

[a] Reduction in Value of Interest

[b] Physical Interference Not Required

[c] Cost of Removing Defect

[d] Other Damages

[4] Establishment of Title by Insurer

§ 548.21 Insurer's Duty to Defend or Secure Title

[1] Duty to Defend

[2] Affirmative Action to Clear Title

[3] When Duty Arises

[a] Defect Arguably Covered

[b] Risks Clearly Not Covered by Policy

[3A] Burden of Proof

[4] Continuing Duty After Settlement Reached

[5] Liability for Damages During Litigation

[6] Liability for Wrongful Refusal to Defend

[a] General Damages

[b] Liability Limited to Actual Loss

§ 548.22 Cross Complaint Against Insurer by Insured Defendant

§ 548.23 Tort Action for Insurer's Bad Faith Breach

[1] In General

[2] Damages for Emotional Distress

§ 548.24 Liability to Third Party for Negligent Recording

§ 548.25 No Liability to Incidental Beneficiaries

§ 548.26 Statute of Limitations

§ 548.27 Subrogation

§ 548.28 Negligent Misrepresentation of Title

[1] No Liability Based on Title Policy

[2] No Liability for Preliminary Title Report

[3] Liability for Abstract of Title

[4] Preliminary Report and Abstract of Title Distinguished

§ 548.29 Title Insurer's Liability for Refusal to Insure Property Acquired by Tax Deed

§§ 548.30-548.39 [Reserved]

§ 548.40 Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] California Legal Forms

[3] California Real Estate

[4] California Insurance Law and Practice

§ 548.41 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Definitions

[3] Preliminary Title Searches

§ 548.42 Decisions

§ 548.43 Law Reviews

§ 548.44 Text References

§§ 548.45-548.49 [Reserved]

§ 548.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Indemnity

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Exemplary Damages

[7] Cross References

§ 548.51 Allegations--Examples of Particular Risks Covered by Policy

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 548.52 Allegations--Insurer Delayed Unreasonably in Perfecting Title

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 548.53 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Failure to Defend Title

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 548.54 Cross Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] by Insured Against Title Insurer for Declaration of Insurer's Duty to Defend and Indemnify Insured Against Quiet Title Action Brought by Third Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 548.55 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Failed to Give Timely Written Notice of Adverse Claim of Loss

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 548.56 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Known to Insured Not Disclosed to Insurer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 548.57 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Ascertainable by Inspection or Inquiry

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] ALTA Standard Policies

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

§ 548.58 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Alleged Reduction in Value of Land Not Due to Title Defect

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 548.59 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Not Obligated to Defend Action--Litigation Based on Insured's Tortious Acquisition of Title Rather Than on Title Itself

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.01

§ 548.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms dealing with actions between title insurers and title insurance policy holders relating to the insurer's liability under title insurance policies.

The forms included are:

- Complaints and allegations for use in an action by a title insurance policyholder for indemnification under the policy [*see* §§ 548.50-548.52].

- Complaints and cross complaint for use by a title insurance policyholder to enforce the insurer's obligation to defend, on the policyholder's behalf, an action impugning the insured title [*see* §§ 548.53-548.54].

- Affirmative defense allegations for use by a title insurer in an action against it by a policy holder to enforce alleged obligations under the policy [*see* §§ 548.55-548.59].

Title insurance policies may insure title to personal as well as real property [*see Ins. Code §§ 104, 12340.1*]. However, this chapter is limited to the discussion of policies insuring title to real property.

For discussion and forms relating to escrow, see Ch. 253, *Escrows* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.02

§ 548.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .
- For discussion, forms, and allegations relating to damages generally, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .
- For discussion and forms relating to declaratory relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .
- For discussion and forms relating to escrow, see Ch. 253, *Escrows* .
- For discussion and forms relating to insurance generally, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .
- For discussion relating to joint tenancy and life estates, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common* , and Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .
- For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .
- For discussion relating generally to defects in or encumbrances on real estate titles, see the following chapters:

Ch. 240, *Easements*

Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewInsurance LawGeneral OverviewReal Property LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 548.03-548.09

[Reserved]

§§ 548.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.10

§ 548.10 Governing Statutes

Title insurance is generally governed by *Ins. Code § 12340 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.11

§ 548.11 Definitions

"Insurance" is defined as a contract whereby one undertakes to indemnify another against loss, damage, or liability arising from a contingent or unknown event [*Ins. Code § 22*]. "Title insurance" is defined as a contract insuring, guaranteeing, or indemnifying owners of real or personal property, or the holders of liens or encumbrances on the property, or others interested in the property against loss or damage suffered by reason of the following [*Ins. Code §§ 104, 12340.1*; *see King v. Stanley (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 584, 590, 197 P.2d 321 , overruled in part, Patel v. Liebermensch (2008) 45 Cal. 4th 344, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 366, 197 P.3d 177* ; *Radian Guar., Inc. v. Garamendi (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1280, 1289, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464]* .

- Liens or encumbrances on or defects in the title to the property.
- Invalidity or unenforceability of any liens or encumbrances on the property.
- Incorrectness of searches relating to the title to real or personal property.

A "title policy" is defined as any written instrument by means of which title insurance liability is assumed [*Ins. Code § 12340.2*]. A "title insurer" is defined as any company issuing title policies as insurer, guarantor, or indemnitor [*Ins. Code § 12340.4*; *see Ins. Code § 12340.3* (defining business of title insurance)]. An "underwritten title company" is defined in the Insurance Code as any corporation engaged in the business of preparing title searches, title examinations, title reports, certificates, or abstracts of title on the basis of which a title insurer writes title policies [*Ins. Code § 12340.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.12

§ 548.12 Regulation of Title Insurance

Ins. Code §§ 12340-12417 generally govern the title insurance industry. For a detailed discussion of these regulations, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 92 (Matthew Bender). Apart from these provisions, title insurance is substantially unregulated by statute in California.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawIndustry RegulationState Insurance Commissioners & DepartmentsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.13

§ 548.13 Policy Forms

[1] In General

Although California law does not prescribe the terms of title insurance policies [*see Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App.2d 113, 122, 253 P. 2d 116]* , it does require that every licensed title insurer file copies of all of its regularly issued policies with the California Insurance Commissioner [*Ins. Code § 12401.1*]. Regularly issued title policies used California today are prepared and recommended by the American Land Title Association (ALTA) and the California Land Title Association (CLTA). These are voluntary associations of title insurers that prepare and recommend standard policy forms for the use of title insurance companies. CLTA publishes the *CLTA Policy & Indorsement Forms Book* (Revised ed. 1971), a loose-leaf compendium that includes all of the CLTA-recommended title insurance reports, guarantees, policies, and indorsements, and many of the ALTA-recommended forms. The compendium corresponds to the master file of ALTA and CLTA standard forms on file in the office of the California Insurance Commissioner. It is widely used by title insurers and underwritten title companies throughout the state. Copies may be purchased from the CLTA at its offices in Sacramento.

The discussion and forms in this chapter are based primarily on the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92). These standard title insurance policies are commonly used in California, and are approved for use by members of the California Land Title Association (CLTA). The most widely used title insurance policy in California is the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy--1990. This is a joint-protection policy that is issued to owners of real property and to noninstitutional lenders. The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) is widely used to offer extended coverage to institutional lenders on real property, while the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) is used to offer extended coverage to commercial landowners. These forms are published in the CLTA's *Policy & Indorsement Forms Book* (Revised ed. 1971). In addition, the full text of each of these forms appears (with analyis) in California Legal Forms, Ch. 26A (Matthew Bender). These three forms, as well as other title insurance forms used in California) are also discussed at length in California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 92 (Matthew Bender), and California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39 (Matthew Bender).

[2] Basic Nature of Coverage

The coverage provided by the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy--1990, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the

ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) is based primarily on matters that are shown by the public records. The policies define "public records" to mean records established under state statutes at the date of policy for the purpose of imparting constructive notice of matters relating to real property to purchasers for value and without knowledge [Conditions and Stipulations, P 1(h)]. In effect, the policies insure against loss or damage that may be suffered as a result of any inaccuracy in the title information that they report, which information is derived primarily from the public records. However, the policies also affordprotection through their vesting and defects, liens, and encumbrances clauses [*see § 548.14[1], [2]*] against important off-record losses, such as forgery of a deed or the incapacity of a party to execute or deliver a deed [*see generally* California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39 (Matthew Bender)].

Title insurance protects only against liens, defects, and encumbrances that are already in existence at the time the policy is issued, and does not protect against defects that may arise later [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1501, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* . Thus, for example, in one case a bankrupt developer obtained, with the bankruptcy court's permission, a "priming lien loan" in order to finish its construction project. The loan was secured by trust deeds that took priority over the original construction loan lender's trust deeds. After the developer defaulted on the priming loan and the priming loan lender began foreclosure proceedings, the original lender brought an action for a declaration that the priming loan lender's trust deeds should be subordinated to the bank's trust deeds. The action was based on the developer's failure to use the priming loan proceeds in accordance with the bankruptcy court's order, and the priming loan lender's negligent failure to monitor the developer's use of the loan funds. The appellate court found that the priming loan lender's title insurer had no duty to defend the declaratory judgment action, because the conduct giving rise to the action, the priming loan lender's alleged negligence, occurred only after the title policy was issued [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1497-1501, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* .

[3] CLTA Standard Coverage Policy

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) is a "joint protection policy" that is widely used to protect the titles of owners of and noninstitutional lenders on real property. Although the policy insures principally against title defects revealed in the public records, it also affords important protection against off-record title risks [*see, e.g., Elysian Inv. Group v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 315, 317, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 372* (standard CLTA policy of title insurance, insuring against loss or damage sustained by insured by reason of title being vested other than in insured, any defect in or lien or encumbrance on title, unmarketability of title, and lack of right of access to and from the land); *see also* California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39 (Matthew Bender)].

[4] ALTA Loan Policy

The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) is widely used to provide title insurance for mortgage and trust deed liens in California. This policy can be issued to provide "extended coverage" by eliminating five exceptions that are routinely included in the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I; *see § 548.17*] but are optional in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92). By eliminating these exceptions, the insurer is in effect accepting responsibility of inspecting (and in some cases surveying) the land [*see California Insurance Law and Practice, § 39.41* (Matthew Bender)]. When an insurer is willing to issue an ALTA Loan Policy without these exceptions, the policy provides valuable coverage that is not available under the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990).

[5] ALTA Owner's Policy

The ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) is an "extended coverage" policy for owners of land rather than lenders. Its terms are substantially identical to those of the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), with the exception of provisions in the latter policy that are appropriate only for lenders on real property. When an insurer is willing to issue the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) without the five exceptions routinely included in the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) [*see* [4], *above*], the policy will give the insured valuable additional title insurance protection [*see Elysian Inv. Group v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 315, 318 n.1, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 372* (ALTA additionally insures

against off-record defects, including rights of parties in possession and not shown on public records, water rights, and discrepancies or conflicts in boundary lines and shortages in areas not reflected in public record); *see also* California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39 (Matthew Bender)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawIndustry RegulationPolicy FormsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawIndustry RegulationState Insurance Commissioners & DepartmentsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.14

§ 548.14 Policy Protection for Owners and Lenders

[1] Vesting

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) insure against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of title to the estate or interest described in the policy being vested other than as stated in the policy [Insuring Clause, P 1]. This provision was held to cover resulting loss when a policy erroneously described the insured property as being held by the insured as joint tenants when it was in fact held by them as tenants in common [*Hall v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 421, 423-424, 430, 342 P.2d 362* (surviving cotenant not required to show that deceased cotenant would have left his one-half property interest to her had he been aware of true status of title)].

[2] Defects, Liens, or Encumbrances

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) insure against loss or damage, notexceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of any defect in or lien or encumbrance on the title [Insuring Clause, P 2].

Defects, liens, and encumbrances covered by this provision include mortgages [*Macfarlane v. Faulkner (1934) 1 Cal. App. 2d 722, 723-724, 37 P.2d 161]* , easements [*Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 116, 253 P.2d 116]* , abstracts of judgment [*Lang v. Klinger (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 987, 991-993, 110 Cal. Rptr. 532]* , tax liens [*National Holding Co. v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 215, 220-222, 113 P.2d 906]* , and declarations of homestead [*Viotti v. Giomi (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 730, 739, 41 Cal. Rptr. 345]* . If the deed conveying the insured property to the policy holder is shown to be a forgery which invalidates the transfer of title, the resulting loss also constitutes an indemnifiable defect under the policy [*Coast Mut. Building-Loan Asso. v. Security Title Ins. & Guarantee Co. (1936) 14 Cal. App. 2d 225, 230, 57 P.2d 1392* (forgery of deed not covered by policy exception for off-record defects)]. A recorded notice of default on a senior trust deed listed as an exception in the policy is not a defect in or lien on the title of a junior lienholder and is not covered [*Glavinich v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 263, 269-270, 209 Cal. Rptr. 266]* .

Title insurance policies do not insure against defects that reduce the value of land, unless those defects are related to the title. Thus, approval by a local municipality of a subdivision map that effectively rendered the land unimprovable and therefore valueless was held not to be covered under the policy when the insured title to the land was not itself affected [*Hocking v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 644, 652, 234 P.2d 625]* . Similarly, a title insurer was not obligated to defend on the insured's behalf a lawsuit alleging that the insured had acquired title in a tortious manner, but not impugning the title itself [*Safeco Title Ins. Co. v. Moskopoulos (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 658, 665-666, 172 Cal. Rptr. 248]* .

Title insurance policies insure only against liens, defects, and encumbrances in existence at the time the policy is issued, and do not insure against any changes in the condition of title after the policy is issued. For example, a title insurer has no duty to defend an action to subordinate an insured lender's trust deeds, based on conduct occurring after the title insurance policy has issued [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1493-1502, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* .

[3] Unmarketability of Title

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) insure against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of unmarketability of the title [Insuring Clause, P 3]. A marketable title is a title that a reasonable buyer of real property, well-informed as to the facts and their legal consequences and willing and anxious to perform the contract, would, in the exercise of the prudence that business persons ordinary bring to bear on such transactions, be willing to accept [*Hocking v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 644, 649, 234 P.2d 625]* . A marketable title must be sufficiently free from defects to enable the holder to retain the property, to possess it in peace, and, when the time comes to sell it, to be reasonably sure that no flaw or doubt will arise to disturb its market value [*Mertens v. Berendsen (1931) 213 Cal. 111, 113, 1 P.2d 440]* . A marketable title must embrace both the legal and equitable estates, be free from unknown encumbrances, and be defensible and salable [*Palos Verdes Corp. v. Housing Auth. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 827, 838, 21 Cal. Rptr. 225]* .

The concept of marketable title is distinct from the market value of land. The marketability of a title does not depend on the marketability (or value) of the land, but on the condition of the title. One can hold perfect title to land that is valueless or have marketable title to land that is itself worthless [*Hocking v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 644, 651, 234 P.2d 625]* . Conditions that affect the physical condition or usability of land (such as the presence of hazardous substances) do not affect the marketability of the title, even though they may adversely affect the market value of the land. This is the case even when purchasers of the land could be held liable for the costs of cleaning up the hazardous materials, or when a governmental agency could at some future time impose a lien against the land as security for payment of those costs. Since the purpose of title insurance is to protect the insured against defects in the title to the land and not against loss arising from physical damage to the land, the insured can never recover for a problem merely relating to the physical condition of the land [*Lick Mill Creek Apartments v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1654, 1662-1664, 283 Cal. Rptr. 231]* . If, however, a governmental agency imposes a lien on the land to enforce payment of the cleanup costs for hazardous materials, coverage for that lien will be afforded by the policy, unless it is listed as an exception [*see* *Lick Mill Creek Apartments v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1991) 231 Cal. App.3d 1654, 1662-1664, 283 Cal. Rptr. 231]* .

[4] Lack of Access

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) insure against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of lack of a right of access to and from the land [Insuring Clause, P 4]. The right of access is the right of a landowner to get into the street on which his or her property abuts and, from there, in a reasonable manner, to the general system of public streets [*Breidert v. Southern Pac. Co. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 659, 663, 39 Cal. Rptr. 903, 394*

P.2d 719] . The policies do not cover lack of access if the lack is not shownby the public records and could be ascertained by inspecting the land [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 2; *see* discussion under *§ 548.17[3]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleDefects & Encroachments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.15

§ 548.15 Policy Protection for Lenders Only

[1] Invalidity of Mortgage

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) insures against certain losses that can be suffered only by insured lenders. For example, it insures against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of the invalidity or unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage upon the title [Insuring Clause, P 5]. The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), which is issued only to lenders, insures against the same risk [Insuring Clause, P 5]. For purposes of these policies, a mortgage also includes a deed of trust, trust deed, or other security instrument [Conditions and Stipulations, P 1(e)].

[2] Prior Liens or Encumbrances

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) and the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) insure against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that an insured lender may sustain or incur by reason of the priority of any lien or encumbrance over the lien of the insured mortgage [Insuring Clause, P 6].

A title policy does not *guarantee* against an undisclosed senior lien or other defect. It merely *indemnifies* against those liens; that is, it covers those instances when the lender cannot recoup the amount of its loan because of the senior lien [*Karl v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 972, 979, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 912 , citing Cale v. Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107* , and *Lawrence v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 70, 237 Cal. Rptr. 264* ; see *Title Ins. Co. v. XWarehouse Lending Corp. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 106, 113, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 801* (compensable loss limited by terms and conditions of policy)]. Thus, "loss" does not include diminution of profits potentially obtainable from the resale of property [*Karl v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 972, 977-983, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 912]* . For example, a lender who paid a tax lien in order to preserve its junior security interest during foreclosure did not suffer a loss because the price it obtained in selling the foreclosed property covered both its loan and the amount paid on the tax lien. There was no coverage under the title policy for the undisclosed tax lien because it did not reduce the amount available to cover the insured's secured loan, even though the insured did not make as much profit on the resale because it paid the lien [*Karl v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 972, 977-983, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 912]* .

A title policy does not protect a senior lienholder against the possibility that an existing junior lien will gain court-ordered priority after the title policy has been issued, if the priority is granted because of acts that occurred after the title policy was issued [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1493-1502, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* .

[3] Invalidity of Assignment

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) insures against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that an insured lender may sustain or incur by reason of the invalidity or unenforceability of any assignment of the insured mortgage or deed of trust shown in Schedule B of the policy, or the failure of an assignment shown in Schedule B to vest title to the insured mortgage or deed of trust in the named insured assignee free and clear of all liens [Insuring Clause, P 7]. The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) insures against the identical risk [Insuring Clause, P 9].

[4] ALTA Coverage for Labor and Material Liens

The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) insures against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of lack of priority of the lien of the insured mortgage over any statutory lien for services, labor, or material arising from an improvement or work related to the land which was (a) contracted for or commenced before the date of the policy or (b) commenced after the date of the policy and financed in whole or part by proceeds of the indebtedness secured by the insured mortgage which at the date of the policy the insured had advanced or was obligated to advance [Insuring Clause, P 7].

[5] ALTA Coverage for Street Improvement Assessments

The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) insures against loss or damage, not exceeding the amount of insurance stated in the policy, that the insured may sustain or incur by reason of any assessments for street improvements under construction or completed at the date of policy which as of or after that date had gained priority over the lien of the insured mortgage or deed of trust [Insuring Clause, P 8].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' LiensReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensTax LiensReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.16

§ 548.16 Exclusions

[1] In General

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy--1990, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all contain a list of Exclusions from Coverage. The exclusions, which are matters for which the insurer will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees or expenses, generally consist of defects, liens, or encumbrances that are not shown by the public records. If an occurrence is clearly not within a policy's coverageclause, it need not be specifically excluded [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1497, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714]* .

Exclusions are not the same as exceptions [*see § 548.17*]. Exclusions are standardized matters that the insurer elects in all cases to exclude from the coverage of the particular policy, while exceptions are recitations of matters that the insurer elects not to cover under the particular policy. Exclusions generally do not require any title search of the insured property; they are the same for all policies of the same type issued by the same insurer. Exceptions, on the other hand, are often (although not always) matters that are discovered through a title search and that the insurer elects to except from the policy coverage. When exceptions are listed in a title insurance policy, they are tailored to the circumstances of the particular policy [*see* Burke, *Law of Title Insurance*, 2d ed. (Little, Brown & Co., 1993), §§ 3.1, 16.1].

[2] Governmental Regulations and Police Power

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of any law, ordinance, or governmental regulation (including building or zoning laws) restricting, regulating, prohibiting, or relating to [Exclusions from Coverage, P 1(a)]:

- The occupancy, use, or enjoyment of the land.
- The character, dimensions, or location of any improvements on the land.
- A separation in ownership or change in the dimensions or area of the land.

- Environmental protection laws, ordinances, or governmental regulations.

This exclusion also applies to the effect of any violation of any of the above laws, except to the extent that a notice of the enforcement of any of these laws or a notice of a defect, lien, or encumbrance resulting from a violation or alleged violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at the date of policy. The policies also exclude coverage for any governmental police power not excluded by the rules stated above, except to the extent that a notice of the exercise of the power or a notice of a defect, lien, or encumbrance resulting from a violation affecting the land has been recorded in the public records at the date of policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 1(b)]. For discussion, see *California Insurance Law and Practice, § 39.40[8][a]* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Eminent Domain

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (1990) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of rights of eminent domain, unless notice of the exercise of those rights has been recorded in the public records at the date of policy. This exclusion does not apply to any taking that has occurred before the date of policy and that would be binding on the rights of a purchaser for value without knowledge [Exclusions from Coverage, P 2].

[4] Defects Agreed to by Insured

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters suffered, assumed, or agreed to by the insured claimant, whether or not they are recorded in the public records at the date of policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(a)]. A defect is not "created" by the insured for this purpose unless it was intentionally created and the insurer had no reasonable opportunity to discover it [*Hansen v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 531, 535-536, 33 Cal. Rptr. 668]* .

[5] Defects Not Disclosed to Insurer

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters not known to the insurer and not recorded in the public records at the date of policy, but known to the insured and not disclosed in writing to the insurer before the date the insured became an insured under the policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(b)].

This exclusion applies only if the insured knew of the defect, lien, or other matter complained of before the policy was issued, and only if the insured's knowledge was actual rather than constructive [Conditions and Stipulations, § 1(e) ("knowledge" and "known" defined as actual knowledge)]. If the policy was procured for the insured by an agent, however, the agent's actual knowledge concerning defects in the title may be imputed to the insured [*Vernon v. Title Guar. & Trust Co. (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 171, 174, 46 P.2d 191]* . The standard policy exception for defects known to the insured has been held to be sufficiently unambiguous and to correspond sufficiently with the expectations of the insured so as not to require or permit interpretation in favor of the insured [*Stearns v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 162, 170, 95 Cal. Rptr. 682]* .

[6] Defects Resulting in No Loss or Damage

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters resulting in no loss or damage to the insured claimant [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(c)]. This exclusion is consistentwith the principle that a title insurance policy is a contract of indemnity and that the insurer's duty to indemnify the insured arises only after the insured has suffered loss or damage covered by the policy [*Cale v.*

Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 425-426, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107] . If no loss or damage has been suffered, the insurer has no duty to indemnify the insured [*Hawkins v. Oakland Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 116, 122-123, 331 P. 2d 742]* .

[7] Defects Arising After Date of Policy

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters attaching or created after the date of policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(d)]. This exclusion is consistent with the rule that a title insurance policy insurers a title only as of a given instant of time (a specified time on the date of policy) [*see* *Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1499, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714* ; *see also* Schedule A].

[8] Loss Suffered Because Insured Did Not Pay Value

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters resulting in loss or damage that would not have been sustained if the insured had paid value for the insured mortgage or deed of trust, or for the estate or interest insured by the policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(e)]. This exclusion is based on the California rule that recording protects only purchasers and encumbrances for good faith and for valuable consideration [*see Civ. Code § 1214*]. The effect of this exclusion is to limit the protection of the policy to persons who are also entitled to the protection of the recording laws [*see* Rooney, *Title Insurance: A Primer for Attorneys, 14 Real. Prop., Prob. & Tr. J. 608, 615 (1979)*].

[9] Failure to Comply With "Doing Business Laws"

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) and the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage or deed of trust because of the inability or failure of the insured at the date of policy, or the inability or failure of any subsequent owner of the indebtedness, to comply with applicable doing business laws of the state in which the land is situated [Exclusions from Coverage, P 4].

[10] Violation of Usury or Truth-in-Lending Laws

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) and the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) exclude coverage for loss or damage arising by reason of any invalidity or unenforceability of the lien of the insured mortgage or deed of trust that arises out of the transaction evidenced by the insured mortgage or deed of trust and that is based upon usury or any consumer credit protection or truth in lending law [Exclusions from Coverage, P 5].

[11] Claims Arising Out of Creditors' Rights Laws

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excludes coverage for any claim arising by reason of the operation of federal bankruptcy, state insolvency, or similar creditors' rights laws. However, this exclusion applies only if the claim arises out of the transaction vesting the insured estate or interest in the insured or, if the insured is a lender, creating the lender's insured interest [Exclusions from Coverage, P 6]. The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) contains a substantially identical exclusion [Exclusions from Coverage, P 7].

[12] Mechanics Liens

The ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) contains one exclusion that is not found in the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990). This is for mechanics liens arising from improvement or work contracted for and commenced after the date of policy and not financed in whole or in part by proceeds of the insured indebtedness which the insured has advanced or

is obligated to advance at the date of policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 6].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle Insurance ExclusionsReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.17

§ 548.17 Exceptions

[1] In General

The CLTA standard Coverage Policy--1990, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all contain a list of exceptions from coverage [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage]. Exceptions, like Exclusions [*see § 548.16, above*], are matters as to which the insurer does not insure against loss or damage and for which it will not pay costs, attorneys's fees or expenses.

[2] Taxes or Assessments Not Shown as Liens

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excepts from coverage taxes or assessments that are not shown as existing liens by the records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the public records [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 1]. The same policy excepts proceedings by a public agency that may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of the agency or the public records [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 1].

This exception is not routinely included in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) or the Alta Owner's Policy (10-17-92). However, those forms give the insurer the option of including the exception if it chooses [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 1].

A previous owner's payment under protest of taxes owned on the property does not extinguish the tax lien; consequently a subsequent reassessment imposed on the land will be deemed to be covered because it appears on the public record by virtue of the preexisting tax lien [*National Holding Co. v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 215, 221-222, 113 P.2d 906]* .

[3] Facts That Could Be Ascertained by Inspecting Land

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excepts from coverage any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the public records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the land [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 2]. Although this exception is not

routinely included in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) or the Alta Owner's Policy (10-17-92), it can be included at the option of the insurer [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 2]. This exception would appear to be sufficient to deny coverage for loss of title due to adverse possession or prescription by third parties [*see Bothin v. California Title Ins. Co. (1908) 153 Cal. 718, 722-723, 96 P. 500* (interpreting similar language in nonstandard policy)].

[4] Easements, Liens, or Encumbrances Not Shown by Public Records

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excepts from coverage easements, liens, or encumbrances, or claims thereof, that are not shown by the public records [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 3]. This exception is not routinely included in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) or the Alta Owner's Policy (10-17-92), although the insurer has the option of including it if it chooses to do so [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 3].

[5] Mining Clams, Reservations in Patents, Water Rights

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excepts from coverage unpatented mining claims, reservations or exceptions in patents or in acts authorizing the issuance of patents, and water rights and claims or title to water, whether or not any of these matters are shown by the public records [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 4]. This exception is not routinely included in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) or the Alta Owner's Policy (10-17-92). However, those forms give the insurer the option of including it if it chooses to do so [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 4].

[6] Variable Exceptions

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all provide space for listing particular matters that will not be covered under the policy. These generally consist of tax liens, encumbrances, covenants, conditions, restrictions, and similar matters that are discovered in the course of searching the title and that the insurer chooses not to insure against. Generally, these matters will have been reviewed by the prospective insured before the policy is issued (by inspecting a preliminary report), and the prospective insured will have agreed to accept the title subject to these exceptions.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle Insurance ExclusionsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.18

§ 548.18 Notice to Insurer

[1] Policy Requirement

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy--1990, the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) containdetailed requirements as to notices that must be given by the insured to the insurer.

The policies require the insured to promptly notify the insurer in writing in case of any litigation in which a third party asserts a claim adverse to the insured title that is insured against by the policy [Conditions and Stipulations, PP 3, 4(a)]. Prompt written notice is also required whenever knowledge comes to the insured of any claim of title or interest adverse to the title to the estate or interest, or the lien of the insured mortgage, and for which the insurer might be liable under the policy [Conditions and Stipulations, P 3]. The same notice is required if title to the estate or interest, or the lien of the insured mortgage, is rejected as unmarketable [for discussion, *see § 548.14[3]*].

[2] Prejudice to Insurer

If prompt written notice is not given as required by the policy, and if the failure to give the required notice prejudices the insurer, the insurer's liability will terminate with regard to the matter or matters for which the notice was required [Conditions and Stipulations, P 3]. However, actual prejudice to the insurer must be shown before failure to give notice will excuse the insurer from fulfilling its obligations under the policy [*Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 302, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547]* . The insurer has the burden of showing actual prejudice [*Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 302, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547]* . The lack of prejudice may be established by showing that even though the insured did not give notice as required by the policy, the insurer had actual or constructive knowledge of the facts giving rise to the insured loss [*Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 302, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547]* or that it is the insurer's routine practice to take no immediate action on matters reported to it by its policy holders even when written notice is given as required by the policy [*Hall v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 421, 423-424, 430, 342 P.2d 362]* .

[3] Proof of Loss or Damage

In addition to written notice, the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the

ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all require the insured to furnish the insured with a proof of loss or damage within 90 days after the insured ascertains facts giving rise to loss or damage covered by the policy. The proof of loss must be signed and sworn to by each insured claimant. It must describe the defect, lien, encumbrance, or other matter that constitutes the basis of loss or damage and must state, to the extent possible, the basis of calculating the amount of the loss or damage. If the insurer is prejudiced by the failure of an insured to furnish the required proof of loss or damage, the insurer's obligation to that insured under the policy, including any liability or obligation to defend, prosecute, or continue any litigation with regard to the matter or matters requiring proof of loss or damage, will terminate [Conditions and Stipulations, P 5].

The insurer may also require the insured to submit to reasonable examination under oath by an authorized representative of the insurer and to produce records, books, ledgers, checks, correspondence, and memoranda for examination at reasonable times and places designated by any authorized representative of the insurer. The insured may also be required to grants its written permission for an authorized representative of the insurer to examine, inspect, and copy records, books, ledgers, checks, correspondence, and memoranda in the custody or control of a third party. If an insured fails with respect to any claim to submit to oath, to produce records, or to grant permission for inspection of records held by a third party as required by the policy, the insured's liability under the policy will terminate with respect to that claim, unless the insured's failure is sanctioned by law or governmental regulation [Conditions and Stipulations, P 5].

[4] Waiver of Prompt Notice Condition

All defects in a notice of loss or in a preliminary proof of loss, which the insured might remedy, and which the insurer omits to specify to the insured without unnecessary delay as grounds of objection, are waived [*Ins. Code § 553*]. Moreover, a delay in presenting a notice or proof of loss to an insurer is waived if it is caused by the insurer's own act, or if the insurer fails to object promptly and specifically on that ground [*Ins. Code § 554*]. Thus, the prompt notice provision in a title insurance policy is waived when the insured provides the insurer with oral notice of loss or damage and the insurer does not promptly inform the insured that the notice is not adequate [*Lagomarsino v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 455, 459-460, 3 Cal. Rptr. 80* (objection not raised until trial five years after claim)].

An insurer may also waive the prompt notice requirement by denying liability under the policy on substantive grounds [*Lagomarsino v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 455, 459-460, 3 Cal. Rptr. 80]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawClaims & ContractsNotice to InsurersActual Knowledge & NoticeInsurance LawClaims & ContractsNotice to InsurersPrejudice to InsurerInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsLossesInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsNotice RequirementsInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle Insurance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.19

§ 548.19 Construction Against Insurer

Title insurance policies are subject to the general rule of insurance contract construction requiring that doubts as to the reading of policy provisions are to be resolved against the insurer, and that when semantically possible the insurance contract is to be given a reading that will fairly achieve the policy's object of indemnifying the insured for losses relating to the insurance. [*White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 881, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309]* . Under this rule of construction, a title policy that ambiguously referred to two monuments in describing the insured property's boundaries was interpreted to favor liability under the policy [*Lagomarsino v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 455, 463-464, 3 Cal. Rptr. 80]* . Similarly, a "small print" clause located inconspicuously in the body of a policy that provided for termination of coverage on full payment of the insured trust deed was interpreted to apply only when the payment was final and unconditional, which in fact terminated the risks insured by the policy [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 569, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* .

Clauses relating to exclusions from or exceptions to the insurer's underlying obligations under the policy are construed strictly against the insurer and liberally in favor of the insured [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 569, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* . However, an unambiguous exception will not be defeated by this rule of construction [*Stearns v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 162, 170, 95 Cal. Rptr. 682]* . The court in *Stearns* questioned the appropriateness of the rule of construction in the case of standard title insurance policy exceptions. An insured who has purchased a standard coverage policy excluding certain risks can also purchase, for an additional cost, extended coverage to include the excepted risks. In other words, standard title insurance coverage does not have the earmarks of a contract of adhesion that is the usual basis for applying the rule of construction [*Stearns v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 162, 170, 95 Cal. Rptr. 682]* .

The rule does not require extension of coverage to risks not covered by the policy when no reasonable construction of the policy would yield such a result [*Safeco Title Ins. Co. v. Moskopoulos (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 658, 665-666, 172 Cal. Rptr. 248* (coverage not extended to lawsuit alleging that insured title was acquired by intentionally tortious means)].

For discussion concerning the construction of insurance policies generally, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* ; see also *California*

Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 8, The Insurance Contract, § 8.02 (Matther Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawClaims & ContractsPolicy InterpretationAmbiguous TermsConstruction Against InsurersInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.20

§ 548.20 Insurer's Duty to Indemnify

[1] Action Under Policy

If the insured title proves defective, the insured has a right to bring a contract action to recover on the policy [*see Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Los Angeles (1923) 61 Cal. App. 232, 236, 214 P. 667]* . For discussion of an additional action that the insured may bring for violation of an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, see *§ 548.23*.

[2] Absolute Liability of Insurer

The insurer's liability under a title insurance policy is based on its undertaking to indemnify the insured for the defect rather than on any lack of skill or negligence on the part of the insurer in failing to discover the defect [*J. H. Trisdale, Inc. v. Shasta County Title Co. (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 831, 836-837, 304 P.2d 832* ; see *Hawkins v. Oakland Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 116, 127, 331 P.2d 742* (indemnification clause in policy as not constituting representation that title not defective)]. Thus, it appears that negligence of the insured in failing to discover a defect in the title is not a bar to an action on the title insurance policy [see *J. H. Trisdale, Inc. v. Shasta County Title Co. (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 831, 836-837, 304 P.2d 832]* . However, the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) excepts from coverage any facts, rights, interests, or claims that are not shown by the public records but that could be ascertained by an inspection of the land or that may be asserted by persons in possession of the land [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 2]. This exception is not routinely included in the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) or the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92), although those forms give the insurer of including it [Schedule B, Exceptions from Coverage, Part I, P 2; for discussion, *see § 548.17[3]*].

If the policy mistakenly describes a title more valuable than the one actually held by the insured, the insurer is held to guarantee the title as written in the policy. The insured need not show that the loss resulting from the title company's mistaken reporting of the title in the policy and preliminary title report would not have occurred had the true title been known [*Hall v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 421, 428-429, 342 P.2d 362]* .

[3] Amount of Indemnification

[a] Reduction in Value of Interest

An insured owner is entitled to recover an amount equivalent to the diminution in the market value of the property caused by the title defect insured against by the title insurance policy, up to the limits of coverage stated in the policy. The proper time for evaluating this diminution in value is the time when the defect is discovered. The diminution must be measured by how the property was being used at the time the defect was discovered [*Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 130, 253 P.2d 116]* .

An insured lender is entitled to recover for any part of the insured lien that it is unable to collect because of the title defect insured against. If, for example, the defect insured against is a senior lien that the insurer failed to disclose in the policy, the insured is entitled to recover any part of the insured lien that cannot be collected because of the existence of the senior lien [*Cale v. Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 426-428, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107]* . However, the insured must prove that the undisclosed senior lien made it impossible to collect (or to collect fully) on the insured lien [*Cale v. Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 426-428, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107]* . The mere existence of the senior lien does not automatically prove that the insured will not be able to collect the junior lien, as it may be possible to collect that lien even after the discovery of the senior lien. If the value of the land is great enough to satisfy both liens, and if the insured is able to collect the insured lien after the senior lien has been satisfied, the insured will not have suffered a loss covered by the policy. This rule recognizes the fundamental difference between recovery under an owner's policy and recovery under a lender's policy. Under an owner's policy, the insured owner is entitled to recover any diminution in the value of the insured land that is ascribable to the undisclosed defect; under a lender's policy, however, the insured is entitled to recover only that part of the insured lien that is not repaid because of the undisclosed defect [*Cale v. Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 426-428, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107]* .

[b] Physical Interference Not Required

Actual physical interference with the use of the property need not be shown if a cloud on the insured's title created by the defect causes a diminution in market value [*Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 127, 253 P.2d 116]* .

[c] Cost of Removing Defect

As an alternative to determining an insured's damages by the reduction in the property's market value caused by a title defect, the damages may be measured by the cost to the insured of removing the title defect [*see National Holding Co. v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 215, 225, 113 P.2d 906]* .

[d] Other Damages

An insured who is compelled to pay expenses for maintenance or improvements on the insured property but is prevented from collecting rents or evicting existing tenants because of a defect in the insured title is entitled to resulting damages even if there is no evidence that the defect in the title prevented the insured from selling the property [*Nebo, Inc. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 222, 227-228, 98 Cal. Rptr. 237]* .

Damages such as carrying costs are only recoverable if they were caused by the title defect. They are not recoverable if the delay was caused by the assertion of uncovered claims [*Native Sun Inv. Group v. Ticor Title Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1273-1274, 235 Cal. Rptr. 34]* .

[4] Establishment of Title by Insurer

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all give the insurer the option of instituting and prosecuting any action or proceeding or doing any other act which in its opinion may be necessary or desirable to establish the title to the estate or interest or the lien of the insured mortgage, as insured, or to prevent or reduce loss or damage to an insured. Any action taken must be at the insurer's

own cost [Conditions and Stipulations, P 4(a)].

The title may be established by removing an alleged defect, lien or encumbrance, curing the lack of a right of access to or from the land, or curing any claim of unmarketability of title. If any of these actions are taken in a reasonably diligent manner, the insurer will avoid any liability for loss or damage under the policy [Conditions and Stipulations, PP 4(b), 8(a)]. What constitutes a reasonably diligent manner is a question of fact, depending on the situation of the parties, the nature of the transaction, and the facts of the particular case. The trial court is entitled to consider expenses and financial hardship suffered by the insured in the period before title was perfected in determining whether title was established within a reasonable time [*Nebo, Inc. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 222, 228, 98 Cal. Rptr. 237* (time found not reasonable when insurer delayed over three years in order to wait for appeal in related litigation, with knowledge that insured was suffering hardship as consequence)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityInsurance LawProperty InsuranceCoverageReal PropertyGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.21

§ 548.21 Insurer's Duty to Defend or Secure Title

[1] Duty to Defend

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all obligate the insurer to provide for the defense of the insured in any litigation in which a third party asserts a claim adverse to the insured title or interest. The defense must be provided upon written request of the insured, at the insurer's own cost, and without unreasonable delay [Conditions and Stipulations, P 4(a); *see Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746* (enforcing duty to defend)]. The insurer has the right to select counsel of its choice, subject to the right of the insured to object for reasonable cause [Conditions and Stipulations, P 4(a)].

[2] Affirmative Action to Clear Title

A title insurer may be required to take affirmative action to remove a possible cloud on the insured title even though the party making a claim adverse to the title chooses not to litigate it. Affirmative action may consist of filing an action to quiet title or of compromising the claim with the third party [*see Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 941-942, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . *Jarchow* interpreted a pre-1973 version of CLTA Standard Policy that specifically obligated the insurer either to provide a defense for the insured in any litigation against the insured title or to take appropriate action to establish the title. The current standard policies contain only the requirement that the insurer provide a defense and do not also require the insurer to take such action as may be appropriate to establish the title. However, *Jarchow* stated that the obligation to defend and the obligation to take other appropriate action are kindred duties designed to achieve the same objective, both of which must be equally accessible to the insured [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 941-942, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . Moreover, in reaching its conclusion the *Jarchow* court applied the rule that insurance policies must be construed to give the insured the protection that he or she reasonably had a right to expect [*see § 548.19*]. The court stated that the insured had a reasonable expectation that the insurer would file a quiet title action in accordance with to its policy obligations [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 941, 944, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . Thus, although it is not clearly established by case law, it may be argued that the insurer's obligation to take affirmative action applies under the present version of the standard policies.

If the insurer's obligation to take affirmative action does apply, the rules applicable to the insured's duty to defend also apply to the duty to take affirmative action [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 941-942, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *see* discussion under [3], *below*].

[3] When Duty Arises

[a] Defect Arguably Covered

An insurer's duty to defend arises whenever the insurer ascertains facts that raise the possibility that the insurer is liable under the policy. In the case of title insurance, this requirement is met when the insurer is notified of pending litigation based on an alleged title defect that is arguably covered by the policy [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746* ; *see* *Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 944, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470* (duty to quiet title matures when insurer notified of existence of covered defect)]. The duty to defend is fixed by facts that the insurer learns not only from the insured, but also from the complaint in the pending litigation and from other sources as well [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 944, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . The nature of the pleadings in the pending litigation is not determinative of whether or not the insurer is potentially liable so as to give rise to a duty to defend [*see* *Stearns v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 162, 167-169, 95 Cal. Rptr. 682* (holding no duty to defend on facts)].

[b] Risks Clearly Not Covered by Policy

The nature and kind of risk covered by the policy is a limitation on the duty to defend. Thus, the insurer has no duty to defend if the defect on which the suit is based is clearly outside the scope of the policy [*Barczewski v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 406, 410-413, 258 Cal. Rptr. 386* ; *SafecoTitle Ins. Co. v. Moskopoulos (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 658, 664-665, 172 Cal. Rptr. 248]* . There also is no duty to defend if the alleged defect clearly comes within one of the exceptions set out in the policy [*Stearns v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 162, 167-169, 95 Cal. Rptr. 682* (suit clearly fell into standard exceptions for off-record boundary disputes and off-record defects known to insured but not disclosed to insurer); *but see* *Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746* (insurer not excused from duty when facts known to it did not clearly show whether alleged defect excepted from coverage)]. A title insurer does not have a duty to provide a defense against an off-record claim based on alleged fraudulent activities of its insured [*Barczewski v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co, (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 406, 410-412, 258 Cal. Rptr. 386]* .

[3A] Burden of Proof

In an action based on the insurer's refusal to provide a defense, the burden is on the insured to bring a claim within the basic scope of coverage. To prevail, the insured must prove that a potential for coverage exists, while the insurer must prove the absence of such a potential [*Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1497, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714* (quoting *Montrose Chem. Corp. v. Superior Court (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 287, 300, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 467, 861 P. 2d 1153*)].

[4] Continuing Duty After Settlement Reached

The insurer's duty to defend continues to apply even if the insured has, in the proper exercise of its duty, reached a settlement with the party asserting a title defect, if that party subsequently attempts to abrogate the settlement to the detriment of the insured [*see* *Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 569, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* .

[5] Liability for Damages During Litigation

Policy provisions permitting the insurer, at its own expense and without undue delay, to litigate defects in title to final

determination in a court of last resort do not relieve the insurer from liability for actual damages resulting from the defect while litigation proceeds [*Nebo, Inc. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 222, 228, 98 Cal. Rptr. 237]* .

[6] Liability for Wrongful Refusal to Defend

[a] General Damages

The rules generally governing an insurer's obligation to defend an insured are applicable to title insurance [*see* *Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* . Thus, a title insurer defaulting on its duty to defend under the title policy becomes liable for the expenses properly incurred by the insured in defending the title on its own [*Paramount Props. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571-572, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* . It appears that a title insurer's wrongful refusal to defend also automatically renders the insurer liable for any adverse judgment, even when the judgment was rendered on a theory not within the policy coverage [*see Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* . A title insurer who has wrongfully refused to defend is bound not only by the judgment, but also as to all material findings of fact relating to the issue of coverage [*see* *Geddes & Smith, Inc. v. St. Paul Mercury Indem. Co. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 558, 561, 334 P.2d 881* ; *see also* *Hogan v. Midland Nat'l Ins. Co. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 553, 565, 91 Cal. Rptr. 153, 476 P.2d 825* ; *Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* .

[b] Liability Limited to Actual Loss

A policy provision limiting the insurer's liability to the actual loss suffered by the insured may limit the insurer's liability for wrongful refusal to defend [*see* CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92), Conditions and Stipulations, P 7 (actual monetary loss or damage sustained or incurred by insured claimant)]. For example, an insurer refused to defend in a bankruptcy proceeding in which the federal court found that the insured held only a mortgage on the insured property rather than a fee title as recited in the policy. In a subsequent state action based on the insurer's refusal to defend, the court of appeal held that under the federal court's ruling the insured's actual loss resulting from the bankruptcy was limited to loss of the mortgage interest. Citing the title policy clause limiting the insurer's liability to actual loss, the court declined to impose liability for loss of the purported fee interest on the insurer [*Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 654, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsDefenseInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.22

§ 548.22 Cross Complaint Against Insurer by Insured Defendant

An insured under a title insurance policy who is sued in a quiet title action based on defects or other conditions insured against in the policy may cross complain against the insurer for a declaration that the insurer is obligated to defend the action on the insured's behalf or to indemnify the insured for any losses stemming from the quiet title action [*Hansen v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 531, 33 Cal. Rptr. 668]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsDefenseInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.23

§ 548.23 Tort Action for Insurer's Bad Faith Breach

[1] In General

If a title insurer wrongfully fails to fulfill its obligations under the policy, the insured may have a tort action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing that is implied by law in every insurance policy [*White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 885-890, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309]* . For example, an insurer's wrongful refusal to quiet title when notified of a potential defect covered by the policy may constitute a bad faith breach [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 940-941, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . Since the *Jarchow* court spoke of the duty to act affirmatively to cure a title defect as being virtually identical with the duty to defend the title in a litigation, it appears that refusal to defend the title may also be a bad faith breach [*see* *Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 941-942, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *see* discussion under *§ 548.21[2]*].

A title company's general duty of good faith and fair dealing extends beyond the commencement of litigation, and a title insurer can be liable for breach of that duty by failing to make reasonable settlement offers and failing to appraise the loss until the issue of liability has been settled. Settlement offers are admissible to establish such liability. The damages recoverable may include litigation expenses in obtaining policy benefits [*White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 883-884, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309]* .

[2] Damages for Emotional Distress

An insured may recover for any emotional distress suffered as a result of an insurer's bad faith breach of a title insurance policy [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 940, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* .

One court has suggested that a bad faith breach of a title insurance agreement must result in substantial damages apart from those due to emotional distress before damages for emotional distress may be awarded [*see* *Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 945, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470* (citing cases relying on general insurance law)]. This requirement may be satisfied by expenses and demands on time and energy incurred by an insured in prosecuting a quiet title action after the insurer wrongfully refused to bring the action. The substantial damages required need not themselves be compensable in order to enable compensation for emotional injury [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 945, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawBad Faith & Extracontractual LiabilityGeneral OverviewInsurance LawBad Faith & Extracontractual LiabilityRemediesEmotional Distress DamagesInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.24

§ 548.24 Liability to Third Party for Negligent Recording

A title insurance company is liable to a third party for negligently recording an unrecordable document that slanders the title of the third party. Thus, a title company was held liable for recording a memorandum of lease, at the request of the purported lessee, even though it had not been signed by the purported lessor. The applicable bases for liability were present in that the recording was intended to affect the purported lessor, it was foreseeable that the purported lessor would be damaged, the purported lessor was injured, the title insurer's act and the harm were closely connected, the title company's action was deserving of moral blame, and the imposition of liability will serve the public interest by making title companies more accountable [*Seeley v. Seymour (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 844, 860-862, 237 Cal. Rptr. 282]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyForeseeability of Injury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.25

§ 548.25 No Liability to Incidental Beneficiaries

A title insurer has no liability under a title policy to an incidental beneficiary on whom the parties did not intend to confer a benefit. Since the sole purpose of a title insurance policy is to ensure that the insured's title is free of any defects or other specified risks, it is unlikely that anyone except a named insured under a title insurance policy would ever be entitled to recover under the policy [*see Kenny v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 557, 561-562, 169 Cal. Rptr. 808* ; *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 33, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* . Thus, the seller of an insured property is not entitled to recover as a third-party beneficiary under a title insurance policy issued to the buyer, regardless of whether occurrence of the condition insured against caused harm to the seller [*see Kenny v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 557, 561-562, 169 Cal. Rptr. 808* ; *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 33, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* .

Similarly, title companies are normally liable under a tort theory for negligently providing title information only if the injured party is the person for whose guidance the information was prepared [*Smith v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 625, 630-631, 223 Cal. Rptr. 339]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawThird PartiesBeneficiariesClaims & EnforcementInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.26

§ 548.26 Statute of Limitations

The Code of Civil Procedure provides that an action founded on a contract evidenced by a policy of title insurance or an abstract or guaranty of title must be filed within two years of accrual of the action, provided that such an action shall not be deemed to have accrued until discovery of the loss or damage suffered by the aggrieved party under the policy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 312* (civil actions as required to be commenced within periods after accrual of action as specified in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 312-365*)]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*, the limitation period runs from actual discovery of loss or damage, not from a point in time when loss or damage could have been discovered [*Hansen v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 531, 538, 33 Cal. Rptr. 668* (dating limitations period from filing of claim adverse to title by third party); *see also Herbert A. Crocker & Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1722, 1728-1730, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 313* ("actual harm" was discovered in 1970 when owners first expressed concern over possible existence of municipal rights in property, not in 1989 when city claimed ownership of portion or property)].

When a claim is based on failure to defend, the limitation period accrues when the insurer refuses the tender of defense. However, the period is equitably tolled until the underlying action is terminated by final judgment, at which time the insured has two years to bring the action for failure to defend [*Lambert v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1072, 1076-1080, 282 Cal. Rptr. 445, 811 P.2d 737]* . If the insured does not make a demand under the policy or commence an action against the title insurer within two years after the underlying action is initiated, however, the underlying action does not toll the statute of limitations. Thus, an insured who did not notify the title insurer until more than two years after the underlying action was commenced, but who commenced an action within nine months after the title insurer ultimately denied coverage, was barred by the statute of limitations [*Tabachnick v. Ticor Title Ins. Co. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 70, 77, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 59]* .

The two-year statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* is equitably tolled while the insurer determines whether to honor or reject a timely filed claim under the policy [*Forman v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 998, 999-1000, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsDefenseInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleAbstracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.27

§ 548.27 Subrogation

Under the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92), an insured who has settled and paid a claim under the policy is subrogated to and entitled to all of the rights and remedies that the insured claimant would have had against any person or property in respect to the claim had the policy not been issued [Conditions and Stipulations, P 12(a)]. If payment on account of a claim does not fully cover the insured's loss, the insurer is subrogated as to a part of the loss. If the insured claimant is an owner, the insurer is subrogated to the insured in the proportion that the insurer's payment bears to the whole amount of the loss. If the insured is a mortgagee or a beneficiary under a deed of trust, the insurer is subrogated to all of the insured's rights and remedies after the insured has recovered its principal, interest, and costs of collection [Conditions and Stipulations, P 12(a)].

The insurer is not automatically entitled on subrogation to recover the full amount of any settlement that it has made with the insured, but is limited to recovering the amount that the insured would have been entitled to recover on direct action. The amount of the settlement is only presumptive evidence, subject to rebuttal by contrary evidence and proof, of the amount to which the insured would have been entitled in a direct action. The presumptive evidentiary character of the settlement does not relieve the insurer of the burden of establishing the basis of the settlement in order to fix the amount of damages to be awarded in a subrogation action [*American Title Co. v. Anderson (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 255, 260-261, 125 Cal. Rptr. 24]* . For discussion of subrogation generally, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawClaims & ContractsSubrogationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.28

§ 548.28 Negligent Misrepresentation of Title

[1] No Liability Based on Title Policy

The title insurance policy itself is not a representation that the contingencies insured against will not occur. Thus, a title insurer cannot be liable for negligent misrepresentation on the basis of recitations in the title insurance policy [*Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18-19, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655]* . One court has suggested a contrary view, imposing liability on a title insurer for negligent failure to report a title defect in the policy [*Banville v. Schmidt (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 92, 104-105, 112 Cal. Rptr. 126]* . However, the court in *Banville* also stated that it was of significance to the controversy before it that the premium paid for the policy was imposed for a title search and examination as well as for title insurance [*Banville v. Schmidt (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 92, 105, 112 Cal. Rptr. 126]* . Thus, it appears that the *Banville* opinion may be read as imposing liability for the insurer's negligent performance as an abstractor rather than as an insurer [*Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18-19, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655* (distinguishing *Banville* on this ground)].

[2] No Liability for Preliminary Title Report

A preliminary title report is a document that is prepared by a title company for the purpose of showing the condition of a particular title as a preliminary to the issuance of a title insurance policy. The report lists all of the matters that would be excepted from coverage if a title policy were issued on the date of the report. It thus apprises prospective purchasers or lenders of any defects, liens, encumbrances, or other matters that should be considered when dealing with the property. It also gives the owner (who is often seeking to either sell or borrow on the property) an opportunity to remove or otherwise resolve any matters that the purchase or lender finds unacceptable [*see* California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39, *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender)].

Before 1981, the California courts had developed a cause of action for negligence in making the title search, on the theory that the preliminary title report constituted an abstract of title on which the insured may rely and for which the insurer is liable apart from any liability assumed through the title insurance policy. This cause of action was independent of the contract of action on the title policy [*see* *J. H. Trisdale Inc. v. Shasta County Title Co. (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 831, 837, 304 P.2d 832]* . In 1981, however, the Legislature enacted *Ins. Code § 12340.11*, which defines "preliminary reports," "commitments," or "binders" as reports furnished in connection with an application for title

insurance and as offers to issue a title policy subject to the stated exceptions set out in the reports and other matters that may be incorporated by reference in the reports. The reports defined in *Ins. Code § 12340.11* are not abstracts of title, nor are any of the rights, duties, or responsibilities applicable to the preparation and issuance of an abstract of title applicable to the issuance of any report. Any such report may not be construed or constitute a representation as to the condition of title to real property, but shall constitute a statement of terms and conditions on which the issuer is willing to issue its title policy if the offer is accepted [*Ins. Code § 12340.11*]. On request, however, a title insurance company may provide coverage against loss or damage under the terms, conditions, and stipulations of the title insurance policy for any monetary lien set forth in the preliminary report [*Ins. Code § 12414.30(b)*; *see Ins. Code § 12340.11(c)* (*Ins. Code § 12414.30* does not modify any provisions of *Ins. Code § 12340.11*)].

The effect of the Legislature's distinction between abstracts of title and preliminary reports in *Ins. Code §§ 12340.10* and *12340.11* is that title insurance companies are not liable for negligence in the preparation of preliminary reports. The preliminary report is merely reflective of the terms on which the insurer is willing to issue a policy. A customer may not rely on a preliminary report and is insured only by the issued policy [*Southland Title Corp. v. Superior Court (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 530, 536-538, 282 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . But note that *Ins. Code § 12340.11* is not applicable to preliminary reports procured before its effective date of January 1, 1982 [*White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 884, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309]* .

[3] Liability for Abstract of Title

An "abstract of title" is a written representation, provided pursuant to contract, whether written or oral, that is intended to be relied on by the person who has contracted for the receipt of the representation, listing recorded conveyances, instruments, or documents which, under the laws of California, impart constructive notice with respect to the chain of title to the real property described in the abstract. An abstract of title is not a title policy as defined in *Ins. Code § 12340.2* (defining title policy) [*Ins. Code § 12340.10*]. An abstract of title may be furnished by a title insurance company or title company as a service above and apart from issuance of a title insurance policy [*see* 4 California Real Estate Law and Practice, ch. 92, *Title Insurance*].

An abstractor is hired because of his or her professional skill, and must use the degree of care commensurate with the professional skill. Unlike a title insurer who can define the extent of its liability under the insurance policy, the abstractor must report all matters that could affect its client's interests and that are readily discoverable from those public records ordinarily examined when a reasonably diligent title search is made [*Contini v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 536, 545-546, 115 Cal. Rptr. 257]* .

An abstractor may be held liable only for those damages that are proximately caused by his or her failure to abstract the title properly [*Garton v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 365, 380, 165 Cal. Rptr. 449]* . Proximate cause of damagesto the buyer who contracted for an abstract of title exists when escrow on the sale would not have closed if the true state of the title had been reported, and when there are no legal causes supervening [*Contini v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 536, 545-546, 115 Cal. Rptr. 257* ; *Banville v. Schmidt (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 92, 104-105, 112 Cal. Rptr. 126* (forseeable intervening causes not superseding)]. Whether a title abstractor's negligence is the proximate cause of resulting damages is ordinarily a question of fact [*Garton v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 365, 380, 165 Cal. Rptr. 449]* .

[4] Preliminary Report and Abstract of Title Distinguished

Before the enactment of *Ins. Code § 12340.11* in 1981 [*see* [2], *above*], it could be difficult to distinguish between a preliminary title report and an abstract of title, and the courts sometimes treated the two reports identically [*see Garton v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 365, 380-381, 165 Cal. Rptr. 449]* . However, the enactment of that section, together with extensive revisions in the standard preliminary report form approved by the California Land Title Association, have more sharply delineated the differences between these documents.

The CLTA Preliminary Report Form (Rev. 1-1-95) states on its face that it is issued solely for the purpose of facilitating the issuance of a policy of title insurance and that no liability is assumed by the report. It also states that if it is desired that liability be assumed before the issuance of a title insurance policy, a binder or commitment should be requested [California Land Title Association, Policy & Indorsement Forms Book (Revised ed. 1971), Section E, Form 1]. This language makes it all but impossible to treat a properly drafted preliminary title report as an abstract of title, or to impose liability for abstractor's negligence on a title company who prepares and issues such a report [*see* California Insurance Law and Practice, Ch. 39, *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender); California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 92. *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsDisclosureInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleAbstractsTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationNegligent MisrepresentationGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.29

§ 548.29 Title Insurer's Liability for Refusal to Insure Property Acquired by Tax Deed

The California Supreme Court has held that under certain circumstances, a title insurer could incur liability for the categorical refusal to issue title insurance with respect to property acquired by tax deed, that is, property that defaults to the state for failure to pay assessed taxes, then is transferred to a private buyer. Reversing a court of appeal decision sustaining demurrers in favor of the title insurance companies, the Supreme Court held that the buyer of property pursuant to a tax-sale deed could possibly state causes of action against title insurers for unfair competition and intentional interference with contractual relations based on this conduct [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 42, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* .

Insurers who conspire to deny title insurance for tax-defaulted parcels may be in violation of the Cartwright Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720*) for restraint of trade. Although the Supreme Court acknowledged that an insurer has no duty to do business with, or to issue a policy of insurance to any applicant, a title insurer may incur liability for conspiring with other title insurers to deny title insurance on titles derived from tax deeds [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 48-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* .

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720 prohibits a "trust," defined as "acts by two or more persons... to create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce." Insurance is commerce within the meaning of that statute. Although refusing to sell a product to a consumer does not itself violate the Cartwright Act, when that refusal is the result of a combination, agreement, or conspiracy to make that product unavailable in a given market, a prohibited restraint of trade may be found [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 48-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* . The Court noted that among other complaint allegations in this case, an allegation that the title insurers "manipulated" the market by first representing that insurance is necessary, and then refusing to issue it on tax-deeded parcels, implies a purpose to restrain trade in, and depress the market of that property [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 50, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* .

In so holding, the Supreme Court reaffirmed its decision that the Unfair Insurance Practices Act (*Ins. Code § 790 et seq.*) is not the exclusive remedy against insurers for unfair business practices, and that rights and remedies applicable to businesses generally, including the Cartwright Act, apply to insurance companies [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar.Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 42-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see Manufacturers Life Ins. Co. v.*

Superior Court (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 257, 267, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220, 895 P.2d 56] . The exclusivity provisions applicable specifically to title insurance companies on which the court of appeal erroneously relied, are relevant only to rate-making activities [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 42-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see Ins. Code §§ 12414.26, 12414.29*].

The Supreme Court also held that a title insurer may incur liability for false advertising by representing that it will issue title insurance on any property with title, and then refusing to insure tax deeds [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 54-55, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500-17581*].

Furthermore, a cause of action for intentional interference with an existing contract may be stated by pleading the following elements [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 45, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see also* California Torts, Ch. 40, *Fraud, Deceit and Other Business Torts* (Matthew Bender)]:

- A valid contract between plaintiff and a third party;
- Defendant's knowledge of that contract;
- Defendant's intentional acts designed to induce a breach or disruption of the contractual relationship;
- Actual breach or disruption of the contractual relationship; and
- Resulting damage.

The California Supreme Court has held that a plaintiff (in this case, a financial institution) may state a cause of action for this tort against a title insurer by alleging that: (1) the plaintiff had a contract with a prospective purchaser regarding tax-deeded property; (2) the defendant had knowledge of the contract (in this case, impliedly, by refusing to issue a title insurance policy unless the purchaser initiated a quiet title action); (3) the purchaser then failed to complete payment for the property, i.e., that disruption of the contractual relationship occurred; (4) the plaintiff incurred damages in the lost benefits of the transactions and related legal costs; and (5) specifically, that "defendants ... have deliberately, willfully, and intentionally interfered with the contractual relations of purchasers of land and sellers who are members of the public owning land purchased through a tax sale, including, but not limited to, Plaintiffs herein" [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 56 57, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* .

The Supreme Court, however, refused to hold that a title insurer may be liable for negligence for the categorical refusal to provide insurance with respect to tax-defaulted property. The Court noted that no special relationship exists between the property owner and the title insurer giving rise to a duty to issue a policy of title insurance to a member of the public purchasing that property. Further, the insurers have no duty to the property owner to ensure that it does not suffer financial losses in its efforts to sell the property [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 59 60, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see also* California Torts, Chs. 1, 4 (Matthew Bender)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawPrivate ActionsCosts & Attorney FeesState RegulationInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionTax Deeds & Tax Sales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 548.30-548.39

[Reserved]

§§ 548.30[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.40

§ 548.40 Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to contracts generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 50, *Contracts*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to damages in contract actions generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 65, *Damages*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to decalaratory relief, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 67, *Declaratory Relief*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to actions involving insurance, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 120, *Insurance*

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to actions involving defects in or encumbrances on real estate titles, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 198, *Quieting Title* , and Ch. 230, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*

[2] California Legal Forms

For discussion and forms relating to title insurance, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 26A, *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender)

[3] California Real Estate

For discussion and forms relating to title insurance, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 92, *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender)

[4] California Insurance Law and Practice

For discussion and forms relating to title insurance, see California Insurance Law & Practice, Ch. 39, *Title Insurance* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewInsurance LawGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.41

§ 548.41 State Statutes

[1] In General

Buyer's Choice Act. *Civ. Code § 1103.20, et seq.*

Seller of residential property (four or fewer dwellings) prohibited from requiring as condition of selling property, that title insurance covering property or escrow service be purchased by buyer from particular title insurer or escrow agent. *Civ. Code § 1103.22*

General provisions governing business of title insurance. Ins. Code. §§ 12340-12418

[2] Definitions

Title insurance. *Ins. Code § 12340.1*

Title insurance policy. *Ins. Code § 12340.2*

Business of title insurance. *Ins. Code § 12340.3*

Title insurer. *Ins. Code § 12340.4*

Abstract of title. *Ins. Code § 12340.10*

Preliminary title report, commitment, or binder. *Ins. Code § 12340.11*

[3] Preliminary Title Searches

Abstract of title distinguished from preliminary title report, commitment, or binder. *Ins. Code §§ 12340.10, 12340.11*

Preliminary title report, commitment, or binder does not represent condition of title. *Ins. Code § 12340.11*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawClaims & ContractsBindersInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleAbstracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.42

§ 548.42 Decisions

Title insurer that categorically refuses to issue title insurance with respect to property acquired by tax deed may, depending on its business practices, be liable to purchaser of tax-deeded property for unfair competition and intentional interference with contractual relations. *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 42, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513*

Title insurance policy that excluded water rights excluded only unrecorded water rights and not recorded water rights. *White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 880-882, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309*

Ambiguities in title insurance policy are construed against insured, and policy is to be construed so as to fulfill reasonable expectations of insured. *White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 880-882, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309*

Provisions of *Ins. Code § 12340.1* defining preliminary report are inapplicable to preliminary reports issued before statute's effective date of January 1, 1982. *White v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 870, 883-884, 221 Cal. Rptr. 509, 710 P.2d 309*

Clauses relating to exclusions from or exceptions to title insurance policy construed strictly against insurer and liberally in favor of insured so as to satisfy public's and insured's reasonable expectations under policy. *Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 569, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746*

Title insurance insures losses suffered by reason of liens or encumbrances on, or defects in title to property; invalidity or unenforceability of liens or encumbrances on land; or incorrectness of searches relating to title. *First American Title Ins. Co. v. XWarehouse Lending Corp. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 106, 113, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 801*

In California, domestic title insurers may issue title policies and may also insure: (1) identity, due execution, and validity of any note or bond secured by mortgage; (2) identity, due execution, validity, and recording of any mortgage; or (3) identity, due execution, and validity of evidences of indebtedness issued by California, or by any political

subdivision or district, or by any private or public corporation. *Title Ins. Co. v. XWarehouse Lending Corp. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 106, 113 n.5, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 801* (citing *Ins. Code § 12390*)

Title insurance is contract for indemnity under which insurer is obligated to indemnify insured against losses sustained in event that specific contingency, e.g., discovery of lien or encumbrance affecting title, occurs; when contingency insured against under policy occurs, title insurer is not, by that fact alone, liable to insured for damages in contract or tort, but rather is obligated to indemnify insured under terms of policy. *Title Ins. Co. v. XWarehouse Lending Corp. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 106, 113, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 801*

When insured is defined as owner of indebtedness secured by insured mortgage, and each successor to ownership of indebtedness, there must have been valid underlying indebtedness in existence for title insurer to be liable under policy; because there was no transfer of funds between mortgage group and named borrowers that created indebtedness secured by insured mortgage, victim of mortgage group's fraud did not meet definition of insured under title insurance policies. *Title Ins. Co. v. XWarehouse Lending Corp. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 106, 116-117, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 801*

Arbitration clause in title insurance policy unenforceable if arbitration was not mentioned in preliminary title report and if that report referred to policy different than one actually issued by insurer; arbitration clause not incorporated by reference into preliminary report and not binding on insured; however, remaining provisions of policy that were included in preliminary report are valid. *Kleveland v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 761, 765, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 314*

"Lien protection" insurance, offered by mortgage guaranty carrier as "less expensive alternative to title insurance" protecting lenders from borrower's default for range of losses, including "losses due to undisclosed liens," was actually title insurance, which only title insurance carriers permitted to sell. *Radian Guar., Inc. v. Garamendi (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1280, 1288-1293, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 464*

Recording of "notice of buildings, structures, or premises classified as either hazardous, substandard or a nuisance" did not constitute defect in or lien or encumbrance on title, nor did it cause title to be unmarketable under CLTA standard policy. *Elysian Inv. Group v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 315, 321-324, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 372*

Title insurance policy issued to mortgage lender providing coverage for losses caused by dishonest or fraudulent acts of employees, but requiring that those employees gain financial benefit of at least $2,500, did not provide coverage for losses to lender based on employees' fraud because lender provided no proof of $2,500 minimum gain; losses also not covered bysecond title insurer covering only defect in title. *Mortgage Assocs., Inc. v. Fid. & Deposit Co. of Md. (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 28, 33-38, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365*

Title policy insuring lack of right of access to insured's property did not cover lack of physical or practical access; because insured owned parcels adjacent to parcel in question, insured had access from adjacent parcels, although insured had no easement through third-party's property, which provided the only vehicular access to and from public street. *Magna Enters. v. Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 122, 125-127, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 681*

Title insurer had no duty to defend action to quiet title in private road used by insured as means of ingress and egress to their lots, because policy applied only to land described in policy, road was not included in description, and policy explicitly did not cover any interest in abutting streets or roads. *Havstad v. Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 654, 658-661, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487*

Title insurer had no duty to defend action brought by junior lienholder for declaration that its trust deeds had priority over insured's trust deeds, because action arose out of events occurring after title insurance policy was issued. *Rosen v. Nations Title Ins. Co. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1493-1502, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 714*

Two-year statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* is equitably tolled while insurer determines whether to honor or reject timely filed claim under policy. *Forman v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 998, 999-1000, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Cause of action for abstractor's negligence accrued in 1970 when property owners sent letter to title insurance company expressing concern that then-recent title policy indicated possible existence of municipal rights in property that did not appear in previous policy, not in 1989 when city claimed ownership of portion of property. *Herbert A. Crocker & Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1722, 1728-1730, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 313*

Purchaser's cause of action against title insurance company accrued when purchaser of New Jersey condominium unit discovered that tenant of property had protected status under New Jersey law (when underlying New Jersey suit was filed), and statute of limitations began to run at that time; purchaser's failure to make demand under policy or commence action against title insurer within two years thereafter resulted in action being barred by applicable statute of limitations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*; subsequent commencement of action within nine months after title insurer ultimately denied coverage did not preserve cause of action. *Tabachnick v. Ticor Title Ins. Co.(1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 70, 77, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 59*

Recorded conditional use permit not excluded from coverage as zoning because conditional use permit is not law of general application and only applies to specific property. *Delaware v. Continental Land Title Co. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 992, 1001-1002, 20 Cal. Rptr 2d 438*

Title insurer liable for bad faith denial of coverage without investigation, when insurer's recordation of wild deed caused necessity of litigation. *Stalberg v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1223, 1223, 282 Cal. Rptr. 43*

When lender is insured, damages are incurred only when property is sold and security is inadequate to repay lender. *Cale v. Transamerica Title Ins. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 422, 426-428, 275 Cal. Rptr. 107*

Title insurance company that failed to report prior lien held liable only for payment of difference between amount insured received at foreclosure sale and full amount of loan, interest, and costs. *Lawrence v. Chicago Title Ins. Co. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 70, 75, 237 Cal. Rptr. 264*

Title insurance company not liable for punitive damages for negligently disbursing funds in breach of fiduciary duty, when evidence failed to show conscious disregard for plaintiff's rights. *Flyer's Body Shop Profit Sharing Plan v. Ticor Title Ins. Co. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1149, 1153-1155, 230 Cal. Rptr. 276*

Title insurer not liable for negligence to person whom insurer did not intend to influence by policy. *Smith v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 625, 631, 223 Cal. Rptr. 339*

Ins. Code §§ 12340.10, 12340.11 are prospective only and are not applicable to title insurance policy issued prior to their effective date. *Glavinich v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 263, 271-272, 209 Cal. Rptr. 266*

Title insurance policy covering junior trust deed does not cover loss due to subsequent nonjudicial foreclosure of senior trust deed; recordation of notice of default and notice of sale under senior trust deed neither makes junior trust deed unmarketable nor constitutes defect in, or encumbrance on junior trust deed. *Glavinich v. Commonwealth Land Title Ins. Co. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 263, 269-270, 209 Cal. Rptr. 266*

Insurer has no duty to defend if defect on which suit is based is clearly outside scope of policy. *Safeco Title Ins. Co. v. Moskopoulos (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 658, 664-665, 172 Cal. Rptr. 248* (suitrelating to tortious manner of acquiring

insured title rather than to title itself)

Third parties not named in policy as third party beneficiaries are not entitled to recover under policy. *Kenny v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 557, 561-562, 169 Cal. Rptr. 808* ; *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 33, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655*

Insured has tort action for breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing when insurer breached policy; wrongful refusal to quiet title when notified of potential defect is bad faith breach. *Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 940, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470*

Insured entitled to recover diminution in market value of property caused by title defect, up to policy limits; diminution in value measured at time when defect is discovered. *Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 130, 253 P.2d 116*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawClaims & ContractsPolicy InterpretationGeneral OverviewInsurance LawProperty InsuranceObligationsDefenseInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle Insurance ExclusionsReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.43

§ 548.43 Law Reviews

Note, *Common-Law Bad Faith in White v. Western Title Insurance Co: The Duty Continues, 21 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 399 (1987)*

Comment, *Title Insurance and Railroad Rights of Way: Caveat Emptor! 12 Pac. L.J. 1099 (1981)*

Curtis, *Title Assurance in Sales of California Residential Realty: A Critique of Title Insurance and Title Covenants With Suggested Reforms, 7 Pac. L.J. 1 (1976)*

Tuohey, *Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress Arising From a Breach of Contract: Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Insurance Company, 8 Sw. U. L. Rev. 655 (1976)*

Note, *Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Insurance Company: A Trend Toward Strict Liability for Emotional Distress in the Insurance Industry, 12 Cal. W. L. Rev. 591 (1976)*

Egan, *Title Insurance for Condominiums, 14 Hastings L.J. 210 (1963)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawBad Faith & Extracontractual LiabilityRemediesEmotional Distress DamagesInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsIntentional Infliction of Emotional DistressRemedies

85 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.44

§ 548.44 Text References

Miller & Starr, Current Law of California Real Estate, Vol. 2, Ch. 12, *Title Insurance and Escrows*, §§ 12:1-12:82

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 12, *Real Property*, §§ 352-368 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Insurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

86 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 548.45-548.49

[Reserved]

§§ 548.45[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.50

§ 548.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Indemnity

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3300, 3302]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Indemnity

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____[*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Breach of Insurance Contract)
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant_____[*name*] is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, [with its principal place of business in this state situated in _____ County,] and authorized [by the California Insurance Commissioner] to engage in and engaging in the business of insuring title to real property in the State of California.

[2. Defendants Doe 1 through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged,

and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants.)]

3. On_____[*date*], in _____ County, California, defendant, for a valuble consideration, issued to plaintiff its written policy of title insurance No. _____, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

4. By the express terms of the above-mentioned policy, defendant insured plaintiff against any loss or damage sustained or incurred by plaintiff, not exceeding $_____, by reason of _____ [*specify pertinent risks covered by policy, e.g.* any defect in, lien or encumbrance on, orunmarketablility of the title] to a _____ [*specify nature of estate or interest insured, e.g.*, fee estate in] the real property described in the policy held at the date of the above mentioned policy by plaintiff['s mortagagee]. The real property referred to in the policy is located in _____ County, California, and is more particularly described in the policy as follows:_____[*give description of property*].

5. [*Allege occurrence of contingency insured against. See § 548.51 for choice of appropriate allegations that may be inserted here*.]

6. The occurrence of the above-described _____ [defect *or specify other covered risk*] is covered by the above-described policy pursuant to_____[*specify provisions of policy showing coverage*] of the policy.

7. Plaintiff discovered the facts giving rise to the loss, as described below, by reason of the above-described _____ [defect *or specify other covered risk*] on or about_____[*date*].

[*EITHER*]

8. On_____[*specify date showing prompt notification of insurer after discovery of defect or substantial damage*], plaintiff notified defendant in writing of the loss as required by the above-described policy.

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*Specify facts showing waiver of prompt notice requirement by defendant, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiff orally informed defendant of the above-mentioned loss and the facts giving rise to it and defendant did not at this or any subseqent time inform plaintiff that the oral notification was inadequate].

[*CONTINUE*]

9. Plaintiff has performed each and every act and thing required by plaintiff to be performed under the terms and conditions of the above-mentioned policy.

[*EITHER*]

10. At the time when plaintiff discovered the above-described _____ [defect *or specify other covered risk*], plaintiff's interest in the above-described property had a reasonable value of $_____. As a proximate result of the existence of the above-described _____ [defect *or specify other covered risk*], the value of plaintiff's interest in the property has been reduced to $_____.

[*OR*]

10. Plaintiff was compelled to pay out a sum of $ _____ in order to _____ [*specify action to remove defect, e.g.*, satisfy the tax lien against the insured property].

[*CONTINUE*]

11. At the time of the filing of this action, defendant has not quieted or perfected plaintiff's title to the above-described property so as to eliminate or mitigate plaintiff's losses as described above, and defendant has refused to indemnify plaintiff for plaintiff's above-described losses under the terms of the above-mentioned policy.

[12. In refusing to fulfill its obligations under the above-described policy, defendant acted in violation of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing that is implied by law in the above-mentioned policy.]

[13. In committing the acts described in this complaint, defendant(s), and each of them, acted in conscious disregard of the rights of plaintiff(s) and others and were guilty of _____ (malice *and/or* oppression *and/or* fraud) in that _____ (*specify facts constituting malice, oppression, or fraud*). The conduct of defendant(s) warrants an assessment of punitive damages in an amount appropriate to punish defendant(s) and deter others from engaging in similar wrongful conduct.]

[14. As a proximate result of defendant's conduct, plaintiff has suffered emotional distress in that _____ (*describe nature of emotional distress*), all to plaintiff's damage.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____[*specify amount of insured's covered losses, up to policy limit*] with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after_____[*specify date on which plaintiff became entitled to indemnity*], until paid;

[2. For general damages;]

[3. For exemplary or punitive damages;]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I,_____[*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an insured under a real property title insurance policy in an action against the title insurer to recover under the policy when a defect in the title or other contingency covered by the policy has been discovered and the insurer has refused to indemnify the insured for the loss. For discussion of coverage under the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92), see *§§ 548.14* and *548.15*. Counsel should insert the specific pertinent risks insured against by the policy into Paragraph 4 of this form. For sample allegations of such title defects or other facts giving rise to covered losses, see *§ 548.51*.

If the insurer ultimately perfected the insured title, this form may be combined with a form of allegation stating that the insurer delayed unreasonably in perfecting title [*see § 548.52*]. If the insurer has refused to defend the insured title as required by the policy, this form may also be combined with a form of complaint against a title insurer for breach of its duty to defend [*see § 548.53*].

[3] Allegations

The form alleges:

- Capacity and location of defendant (Paragraph 1).
- Fictitious defendant allegation (Paragraph 2).
- The issuance of a title insurance policy (Paragraph 3).
- The coverage of the policy and the policy limits (Paragraph 4).
- The occurrence of a defect or other contingency insured against (Paragraph 5).
- That the alleged contingency is covered by the policy (Paragraph 6).
- The date on which plaintiff discovered facts giving rise to the claimed loss (Paragraph 7).
- Plaintiff's compliance with conditions of policy (Paragraphs 8 and 9) [*Wilson v. Pacific Coast Title Ins. Co. (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 599, 603, 235 P.2d 431]* .
- The losses resulting from the occurrence of the covered defect or other contingency (Paragraph 10) [*see Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 130, 253 P.2d 116]* .

- Defendant's failure to perfect title or indemnify plaintiff for the losses (Paragraph 11).

As an optional allegation, for use if plaintiff is seeking damages for bad faith breach, punitive damages, or damages for emotional distress, the form also alleges:

- Defendant's violation of an implied-in-law covenant of good faith and fair dealing (optional Paragraph 12) [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 940, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* .

- Malice, fraud, or oppression by defendant (optional Paragraph 13) [*Civ. Code § 3294*].

- Emotional distress resulting from defendant's conduct (optional Paragraph 14) [*Jarchow v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 917, 940, 122 Cal. Rptr. 470]* .

[4] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which is classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it is classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

In a breach of contract action, proper venue is in the county where the defendant resides, where the contract was to be performed, or where the contract was entered into. The county in which the obligation was incurred shall be deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed unless there is a special contract writing to the contrary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If the defendant in the contract action is a corporation, the action may also be brought in the county in which the corporation has its principal place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

[6] Exemplary Damages

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of thenature of the case or whether it is a limited civil case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, as well as fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to insurance generally, see Ch. 308, *Insurance*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

For discussion relating generally to defects in or encumbrances on real estate titles, see the following chapters:

Ch. 240, *Easements*

Ch. 342, *Liens and Wage Preferences*

Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.51

§ 548.51 Allegations--Examples of Particular Risks Covered by Policy

[1] FORM Allegations--Examples of Particular Risks Covered by Policy

[*EITHER, if recorded defect, lien, or encumbrance exists that is not excepted by policy*]

1. On_____[*date*],[*specify date of policy's issuance*], there was of record in the Office of the Recorder of _____ County, California, recorded on_____[*date*], in Book _____ at page _____ of the Official Records of the above-named county, a[n] _____ [*specify defect, lien, or encumbrance on record, e.g.,* deed conveying to Acme Gas and Electric Corporation, an electrical power company, an easement for the erection of power lines and towers across the insured property described in this complaint].

[*OR, if defect, lien, or encumbrance excepted to in policy does not exist as described*]

1. The title insurance policy described in this complaint excepts from coverage in Schedule B a[n] _____ [*specify defect, lien, or encumbrance excepted from coverage, e.g.,* easement for the erection of telephone transmission lines owned by Beta Telephone Corporation, a telephone transmission company]. However, the _____ [*specify defect, lien, or encumbrance excepted from coverage, e.g.,* easement] does not in fact exist as described in the policy, but instead is _____ [*describe how defect, lien, or encumbrance is held differently than as excepted in the policy, e.g.,* owned by Acme Gas and Electric Corporation, for the purpose of erecting power lines and towers across the insured property, as recorded in the Office of the Recorder of _____ County, California, on_____[*date*], in Book _____ at page _____ of the Official Records of the above-named county].

2. The _____ [*specify defect, lien, or encumbrance not excepted from coverage, e.g.,* easement owned by Acme Gas and Electric Corporation], as described above, constitutes a greater detriment to the value of plaintiff's

interest in the property described in this complaint than would the _____ [*specify defect, lien, or encumbrance excepted from coverage, e.g.,* easement for the erection of telephone lines owned by Beta Telephone Corporation] in that _____ [*describe greater detriment, e.g.,* use of the easement by Acme Gas and Electric Corporation for construction of high power electrical transmission lines would constitute a greater impediment to plaintiff's use of the property than would use of the easement by Beta Telephone Corporation for construction of low power telephone transmission lines].

[*OR, if title not vested as described in policy*]

1. The title insurance policy mentioned in this complaint describes the title to be insured as _____ [*specify title described in policy, e.g.,* a joint tenancy held by plaintiff together with _____ (*name of cotenant*)]. Unbeknownst to plaintiff at the time of issuance of the policy mentionedin this complaint, plaintiff's title _____ [is *or* was] in fact _____ [*specify true title, e.g.,* a tenancy in common, held together with _____ (*name of cotenant*)].

[2. As a result of the fact that plaintiff held the above-described property as _____ (*specify true title, e.g.,* a tenant in common) rather than as _____ (*specify title described in policy, e.g.,* a joint tenant), _____ (*specify any loss resulting from title not being vested as described in the policy, e.g.,* one half of the interest in the property failed to pass to plaintiff on the death of _____ (*name of cotenant*), thus causing plaintiff to suffer damges in the sum of $ _____).]

[*OR, if all or part of insured property owned by another person*]

1. At the time of the issuance of the title policy mentioned in this complaint, [a portion of] the insured property described in the policy, as mentioned in this complaint, was in fact and unbeknownst to plaintiff owned by_____[*name of true owner of all or part of property*]. At the time the policy was issued, this defect was a matter of public record, having been recorded on_____[*date*], in Book _____ at page _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the Recorder of _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

This form alleges examples of specific title defects, liens, encumbrances, or the occurrence of other contingencies covered the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (10-17-92), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) [for discussion, *see §§ 548.14* and *548.15*]. The sample allegations included in this form may be inserted, when appropriate, into Paragraph 5 of the general form of complaint for indemnification under a title insurance policy [*see § 548.50[1]*].

If the second alternative set of allegations is used, alleging that the title actually held is not vested as described in the policy, optional Paragraph 2 of this set concerning a resulting loss should be substituted for Paragraph 10 of the form in *§ 548.50[1]*.

For discussion of possible title defects or contingencies other than those set out in the form, see *§§ 548.14* and *548.15*. For discussion of risks excepted from coverage under the standard title insurance policies, see *§ 548.17*.

[3] Allegations

The first alternative set of allegations alleges the existence of a recorded defect, lien, or encumbrance that is not

excepted to by the policy (Alternative Paragraph 1) [*J. H. Trisdale, Inc. v. Shasta County Title Co (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 831, 835-836, 304 P.2d 832]* .

The second alternative set of allegations alleges the existence of a defect, lien, or encumbrance that is excepted to by the policy but that is, in fact, different from the policy description (Alternative Paragraph 1) [*see Overholtzer v. Northern Counties Ins. Co. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 113, 116, 253 P.2d 116]* , and alleges the greater detriment resulting from this difference (Alternative Paragraph 2) [*J. H. Trisdale, Inc. v. Shasta County Title Co. (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 831, 835-836, 304 P.2d 832]* .

The third alternative set of allegations alleges that the insured title is, in fact, vested differently than as described in the policy (Alternative Paragraph 1), and alleges the losses incurred by the insured as a result (Alternative Paragraph 2) [*see Hall v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 421, 423-424, 430, 342 P.2d 362]* .

The fourth alternative set of allegations alleges that all or part of the insured property is owned by another person (Alternative Paragraph 1) [*see Lagomarsino v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 455, 3 Cal. Rptr. 80]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.52

§ 548.52 Allegations--Insurer Delayed Unreasonably in Perfecting Title

[1] FORM Allegations--Insurer Delayed Unreasonably in Perfecting Title

1. Defendant did not remove the above-described impediment in plaintiff's title until_____[*date*], _____ [*specify time elapsed since notice given of defect, e.g.,* over three years] after plaintiff notified defendant in writing of the existence of the impediment. During this period plaintiff incurred losses, which defendant had knowledge of, in the sum of $_____ as a result of the continued existence of the impediment in that _____ [*specify circumstances showing losses, e.g.,* plaintiff was compelled to pay maintenance expenses and taxes on improvements on the insured property but was prevented from collecting rents from the tenants or evicting the tenants for nonpayment of rent]. Defendant's delay in removing the impediment to plaintiff's title was not reasonable under the circumstances.

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a policy holder in an action against a title insurer to allege that the policy holder suffered loss as a result of an unreasonable delay by the title insurer in removing an impediment to the insured's title [*see Nebo, Inc. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 222, 228, 98 Cal. Rptr. 237* ; for further discussion, *see § 548.20[4]*]. It may be incorporated into the form in *§ 548.50[1]*, the general form of complaint for indemnification under a title insurance policy, by replacing the allegation set forth in Paragraph 11 with this allegation, and by deleting the allegation set forth in Paragraph 10 to the extent that it is inconsistent with this allegation.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.53

§ 548.53 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Failure to Defend Title

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Breach of Insurance Policy Agreement--Action by Insured Against Insurer for Failure to Defend Title

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Breach of Insurance
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	Contract)
through_____,]	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Status and location of defendant. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Fictitious defendant allegation. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Issuance of title insurance policy by defendant. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Terms of title insurance policy. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. The above-described policy provides that, upon written request by the insured, the defendant shall, at its own cost and

without unreasonable delay, provide for the defense of the plaintiff in litigation in which any third party asserts a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured, but only as to those stated causes of action alleging a defect, lien, or encumbrance or other matter insured against by the policy.

6. On_____[*date*],_____[*name of third party that filed action against insured*] filed an action against plaintiff herein, asserting a claim adverse to the _____ [title *or* interest] as insured by the above-described policy and alleging that_____[*specify allegations based on defect in defendant's title to, or lien or encumbrance on, the insured property*]. Summons and a copy of_____[*name of third party that filedaction*]'s complaint were served on plaintiff herein on_____[*date*]. A copy of the complaint is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof.

7. On_____[*date*] [*specify date within notification period set out in policy*], in accordance with the terms of the above-described policy, plaintiff notified defendant in writing of the action by_____[*name of third party suing plaintiff*] and requested that defendant defend the action.

8. The facts alleged in above-described complaint[, together with additional facts provided to defendant by plaintiff,] were sufficient, at the time when plaintiff made its demand to defendant that it defend the action, to raise the possibility that defendant is obligated by the above-described policy to defend plaintiff's title, in that _____ [*specify facts and circumstances showing possiblity of defendant's obligation to defend, e.g.,* the title defect alleged in the above-described complaint is covered by the policy, pursuant to _____ (*specify applicable policy provisions*), and the defect is not definitely within any exception to coverage set out in the policy].

9. Plaintiff has performed each and every act and thing required to be performed by plaintiff under the terms and conditions of the above-described policy.

10. _____ [On _____ (*date*), defendant informed plaintiff that it would not *or* Defendant has not responded to plaintiff's request that it] defend the above-described action on plaintiff's behalf. Defendant has taken no steps towards defending the above-described action on plaintiff's behalf.

11. As a proximate result of defendant's failure to defend the above-described action on plaintiff's behalf, plaintiff has had to defend the action on his/her own behalf, and has in doing so incurred $ _____ in reasonable and necessary legal fees and costs.

[12. After defending the above-described action in his/her own behalf, plaintiff has sustained a judgment against himself/herself in the above-described action, causing plaintiff to suffer damages in the sum of $ _____.]

[13. *Allegation of bad faith breach. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 12.*]

[14. *If plaintiff is alleging bad faith breach and is seeking punitive damages, allegation of malice, fraud, or oppression. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 13.*]

[15. *Allegation of emotional distress damages. See § 548.50[1], Paragraph 14.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For general damages in the sum of the sum of $ _____;

[2. For exemplary or punitive damages in the sum of $ _____;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____[*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 548.50[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the holder of a real property title insurance policy in an action against the title insurer for damages when the insurer has refused to defend the insured's title in an action by a third party. A title insurer has a duty to defend an action against the insured if (1) the action involves an alleged defect, lien, encumbrance, or other matter insured against by the policy; and (2) the insurer ascertains facts that raise the possibility that it is liable under the policy [CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92), Conditions and Stipulations, P 4(a); *see Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746* (duty to defend applies when question as to whether policy exception applies to defect raised by third-party action)]. A title insurer that defaults on its duty to defend under the title policy becomes liable for the expenses properly incurred by the insured in defending the title on its own [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571-572, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* . It also appears that a title insurer's wrongful refusal to defend automatically renders the insurer liable for any adverse judgment, even when the judgment was rendered on a theory not within the policy coverage [*see Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* .

This form may also be combined, when appropriate, with a form of complaint for indemnification pursuant to a titleinsurance policy for damages resulting from a cloud on the insured title [for a form, *see § 548.50*].

[3] Allegations

The form alleges:

- That the policy provides for the insured's duty to defend the insured title (Paragraph 5).
- An action by a third party alleging a defect in plaintiff's title (Paragraph 6).
- Plaintiff's written request that defendant defend the title (Paragraph 7).
- Facts known to defendant that raise the possibility of defendant insurer's obligation to defend under the policy (Paragraph 8) [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* .

- Plaintiff's compliance with all conditions and terms of the policy (Paragraph 9).

- Defendant's refusal to defend the action (Paragraph 10).

- Expenses incurred by plaintiff in defending the action on its own behalf as damages (Paragraph 11) [*Paramount Props. Co. v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 562, 571-572, 83 Cal. Rptr. 394, 463 P.2d 746]* .

When appropriate, an optional allegation may be used to allege damages resulting from an adverse judgment against plaintiff after defending the third-party action on his or her own behalf (Paragraph 12) [*see Kapelus v. United Title Guar. Co. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 648, 653, 93 Cal. Rptr. 278]* .

[4] Cross References

For general references relating to complaints, see *§ 548.50[6]*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.54

§ 548.54 Cross Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] by Insured Against Title Insurer for Declaration of Insurer's Duty to Defend and Indemnify Insured Against Quiet Title Action Brought by Third Party

[1] FORM Cross Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] by Insured Against Title Insurer for Declaration of Insurer's Duty to Defend and Indemnify Insured Against Quiet Title Action Brought by Third Party

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant,	)	NO. _____
_____	)	CROSS COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RE-
_____[*name*],	)	LIEF
Cross Complainant,	)	(Breach of Insurance
vs.	)	Contract)
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	
through_____,]	)	
Cross Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Defendant and cross complainant alleges:

1. Cross defendant_____[*name*] is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation duly

organized and existing under the laws of the State of California[, with its principal place of business in this state situated in _____ County,] and authorized [by the California Insurance Commissioner] to engage in and engaging in the business of insuring title to real property in the State of California.

[2. Defendant and cross complainant is ignorant of the true names and capacities of cross defendants sued herein as DOES 1- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Defendant and cross complainant will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities whenthese are ascertained. Defendant and cross complainant is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each of the above-mentioned fictitiously named cross defendants is responsible in some manner, whether directly or by imputation, for the damages herein alleged.]

3. On_____[*date*], in _____ County, California, cross defendant, for a valuable consideration, issued to defendant and cross complainant its written policy of title insurance No. _____, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

4. By the express terms of the above-mentioned policy, cross defendant insured defendant and cross complainant against any loss or damage sustained or incurred by cross complainant, not exceeding $ _____, by reason of _____ [*specify pertinent risks covered by policy, e.g.,* any defect in, lien or encumbrance on, or unmarketablility of the title] to _____ [*specify nature of estate or interest insured, e.g.,* a fee estate in] the real property described in the policy held at the date of the above-mentioned policy by defendant and cross complainant['s mortagagee]. The real property referred to in the policy is located in _____ County, California, and is more particularly described in the policy as follows:_____[*specify description of property*].

5. The above-mentioned policy provides that upon written request by the insured, the defendant shall, at its own cost and without unreasonable delay, provide for the defense of the plaintiff in litigation in which any third party asserts a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured, but only as to those stated causes of action alleging a defect, lien, or encumbrance or other matter insured against by the policy.

6. On_____[*date*] _____[*name*], plaintiff herein, filed the above entitled action to quiet title against defendant and cross complainant, asserting a claim adverse to the _____ [title *or* interest] as insured by the above-described policy and alleging that _____ [*specify allegations based on defect in defendant and cross complainant's title to, or lien or encumbrance on, the insured property, e.g.,* plaintiff is the real owner of the above-mentioned property]. Summons and a copy of plaintiff's complaint were served on defendant and cross complainant on_____[*date*].

7. On_____[*date*] [*specify date within notification period set out in policy*], in accordance with the terms of the above-mentioned policy, defendant and cross complainant notified cross defendant in writing of the above entitled action and requested that cross defendant defend the action.

8. Cross complainant has performed each and every act and thing required to be performed by him/her under the terms and conditions of the policy.

9. _____ [On _____ (*date*), cross defendant informed cross complainant that it would not *or* Cross defendant has not responded to cross complainant's request that it] defend the above entitled action on defendant and cross complainant's behalf. Cross defendant has taken no steps towards defending the above entitled action on cross complainant's behalf.

10. A controversy exists between cross complainant and cross defendant relative to their legal rights and duties under the above-mentioned policy as to the following points: _____ [*state facts showing controversy, e.g.,*

Cross Complainant contends that the cause of action alleged in plaintiff's complaint herein is founded on an alleged defect, lien, or encumbrance insured against by the policy, and that therefore cross defendant is obligated to defend this action and indemnify cross complainant for any loss or damage that he/she may sustain in the action. Cross defendant contends that the cause of action alleged by plaintiff is not founded on an alleged defect, lien, or encumbrance insured against by the policy and that cross defendant is therefore not obligated to defend the action or indemnify cross complainant for any loss or damage that he/she may sustain in the action].

11. Cross complainant desires a judicial determination of his/her rights and duties and a declaration as to whether cross defendant is obligated under the above-mentioned policy to defend the action herein or to indemnify cross complainant for any losses resulting from the action.

12. A judicial determination of cross complainant's rights under the above-mentioned policy is necessary and appropriate at this time in order to avoid circuity and multiplicity of action that will otherwise result if cross defendant must defend the above entitled action and then bring a separate action against cross defendant on the policy.

WHEREFORE, defendant and cross complainant prays judgment against cross defendant as follows:

1. For a declaration of cross complainant's rights under the title insurance policy;

2. For a declaration that cross defendant is obligated to defend the action herein on behalf of cross complainant and to indemnify cross complainant for any loss or damage cross complainant may sustain in the action;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant

and Cross Complainant

VERIFICATION

I,_____[*name*], am the cross complainant in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing cross complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____[*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of cross complaint is for use by a defendant in a quiet title action to bring, as cross complainant, a cross action against his or her title insurer for a judicial determination that the title insurer is obligated to defend the principal action on the defendant's behalf and to indemnify the defendant for any loss suffered in the action [*see, e.g., Hansen v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 531, 532, 33 Cal. Rptr. 668]* .

[3] Allegations

The form alleges:

- The capacity of cross defendant (Paragraph 1).
- A fictitious cross defendant allegation (Paragraph 2).
- The issuance of a title insurance policy by cross defendant to cross complainant (Paragraph 3).
- The coverage of the title insurance policy (Paragraph 4).
- The policy provision obligating cross defendant to defend the action on cross complainant's behalf (Paragraph 5).
- The filing of the action to quiet title against cross complainant's title (Paragraph 6).
- That cross complainant gave proper notice of the filing of the action to cross defendant and gave proper request to cross defendant that it defend the action on cross complainant's behalf (Paragraph 7).
- Cross complainant's performance of all duties and conditions under the policy (Paragraph 8).
- Cross defendant's refusal to defend the action on cross complainant's behalf (Paragraph 9).
- The existence of actual controversy as to whether cross defendant is required to defend action on cross complainant's behalf and to indemnify cross complainant for damages sustained in the action (Paragraph 10) [*see City of Alturas v. Gloster (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 46, 48, 104 P.2d 810* (actual controversy required for declaratory relief)].
- That cross complainant desires a declaration of his or her rights and duties under the policy (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].
- That a present declaration of plaintiff's rights and duties is necessary and appropriate (Paragraph 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to declaratory relief actions generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For additional references relating to complaints generally, see *§ 548.50[6]*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.55

§ 548.55 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Failed to Give Timely Written Notice of Adverse Claim of Loss

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Failed to Give Timely Written Notice of Adverse Claim of Loss

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. The policy of title insurance issued to plaintiff by defendant provides that all of its provisions are subject to the Conditions and Stipulations set forth in the policy. A true and correct copy of that policy is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

[*INCLUDE plaintiff failed to provide written notice:*]

2. Paragraph _____ [*number, e.g.,* 3] of the Conditions and Stipulations of that policy provides that _____ [*specify provisions requiring prompt written notice, e.g.,* the insured shall notify the insurer promptly in writing (i) in case of litigation in which a third party asserts a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured, (ii) in case the insured learns of any adverse claim or interest which might cause loss or damage for which the insurer might be liable under the policy, or (iii) if title to the estate or interest or the lien of the insured mortgage is rejected as unmarketable].

[*INCLUDE if plaintiff failed to provide proof of loss or damage:*]

3. Paragraph _____ [*number, e.g.,* 5] of the Conditions and Stipulations of that policy provides that _____ [*specify provisions requiring proof of loss or damage, e.g.,* each insured claimant must furnish a proof of loss or damage signed and sworn to by each insured within 90 days after the insured claimant ascertains facts

giving rise to the loss or damage. The proof of loss or damage must describe the defect in, or lien or encumbrance on the title, or other matter insured against by the policy that constitutes the basis of the loss or damage and must state, to the extent possible, the basis of calculating the amount of the loss or damage].

[*INCLUDE if plaintiff failed to provide written notice:*]

4. [Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [P]plaintiff became aware on or about_____[*date*] that _____ [*specify facts requiring plaintiff to give prompt written notice, e.g.,* John J. White had initiated litigation asserting a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured *or* William R. Brown had asserted an adverse claim or interest to the title or interest as insured, which adverse claim might cause loss or damage for which the defendant might be liable under the policy *or* title to the estate or interest as insured was rejected as unmarketable]. Plaintiff did not provide defendant with written notice of this _____ [litigation *or* adverse claim or interest *or* rejection] until_____[*date*], or _____ [*specify time, e.g.,* more than 180 days] after becoming aware of it.

[*INCLUDE if plaintiff failed to provide proof of loss or damage:*]

5. [Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [P]plaintiff ascertained the facts giving rise to the loss or damage complained of in the complaint on or about_____[*date*], in that plaintiff learned on or about that date that _____ [*specify facts requiring plaintiff to give prompt written notice, e.g.,* John J. White had initiated litigation asserting a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured *or* William R. Brown had asserted an adverse claim or interest to the title or interest as insured, which adverse claim might cause loss or damage for which the defendant might be liable under the policy *or* title to the estate or interest as insured was rejected as unmarketable]. Plaintiff did not provide defendant with a proof of loss or damage as required by the policy until[*date*] , or _____ [*specify length of time, e.g.,* more than 180 days] after ascertaining the facts giving rise to the loss or damage.

[*INCLUDE if plaintiff purported to provide oral notice:*]

6. When plaintiff purported to provide defendant with oral notice _____ [*specify facts of purported oral notice, e.g.,* that litigation had been commenced asserting a claim adverse to the title or interest as insured *or* that William R. Brown had asserted an adverse claim or interest to the title or interest as insured *or* that title to the estate or interest as insured had been rejected as unmarketable], defendant's _____ [employee *or* agent] promptly informed plaintiff that oral notice did not comply with the requirements of the policy and was not satisfactory to defendant.

[*CONTINUE:*]

7. Plaintiff's failure to provide defendant with _____ [written notice *or* proof of loss or damage *or* written notice and proof of loss or damage] as required by the policy has prejudiced defendant, in that _____ [*specify facts, e.g.,* defendant was thereby prevented from promptly investigating the facts of the matters alleged in the complaint and taking necessary action to establish the title].

[2] Use of Form

This form is an affirmative defense to a complaint by a title insurance policy holder against a title insurer for failure to

fulfill its obligations under the policy. The defense alleges that the plaintiff failed to comply with the written notice and proof of loss or damage requirements of the policy.

The CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) all require the insured to promptly notify the insurer in writing in case of any litigation in which a third party asserts a claim adverse to the insured title that is insured against by the policy [Conditions and Stipulations, PP 3, 4(a)]. Prompt written notice is also required whenever knowledge comes to the insured of any claim of title or interest adverse to the title to the estate or interest, or the lien of the insured mortgage, and for which the insurer might be liable under the policy [Conditions and Stipulations, P 3]. Similarly, prompt written notice is required if title to the estate or interest, or the lien of the insured mortgage, is rejected as unmarketable. For discussion of these requirements, *§ 548.18*.

The policies also require the insured to furnish the insurer with a proof of loss or damage within 90 days after the insured ascertains facts giving rise to loss or damage covered by the policy. The proof of loss must be signed and sworn to by each insured claimant. It must describe the defect, lien, encumbrance, or other matter that constitutes the basis of loss or damage and must state, to the extent possible, the basis of calculating the amount of the loss or damage [Conditions and Stipulations, P 5]. For further discussion of these requirements, see *§ 548.18[3]*.

If the insurer is prejudiced by the failure of an insured to give prompt written notice or to furnish the required proof of loss or damage, the insurer's obligation to that insured under the policy, including any liability or obligation to defend, prosecute, or continue any litigation with regard to the matter or matters requiring proof of loss or damage, will terminate [Conditions and Stipulations, PP 3, 5].

If more than one affirmative defense is set out in the answer, each defense must be separately stated and numbered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)* (separate statement); *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.112* (separate numbering)]. If the complaint set out more than one cause of action, the affirmative defense must refer to the cause of action it is intended to answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- That the policy is subject to the Conditions and Stipulations set forth in it (Paragraph 1).
- The terms of the policy requirement for prompt written notice (Paragraph 2).
- The terms of the policy requirement for proof of loss or damage (Paragraph 3).
- That plaintiff failed to give the required prompt writtennotice (Paragraph 4).
- That the plaintiff failed to furnish the required proof of loss or damage (Paragraph 5).
- If plaintiff purported to give oral notice, that the plaintiff was advised that oral notice was inadequate (Paragraph 6).
- That defendant was prejudiced by plaintiff's failure to give the required notice and/or proof of loss or damage (Paragraph 7).

It may be appropriate in some cases to allege both failure to give written notice and failure to furnish proof of loss. In other cases, it may be appropriate to allege failure to give notice or failure to furnish proof of loss, but not both. The form may be modified as appropriate to the circumstances of the case. The allegations relating to oral notice should be

made only when the conforms to the facts of the case [*see Lagomarsino v. San Jose Abstract & Title Ins. Co. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 455, 459-460, 3 Cal. Rptr. 80* ; *§ 548.18[4]*].

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.56

§ 548.56 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Known to Insured Not Disclosed to Insurer

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Known to Insured Not Disclosed to Insurer

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. _____ [*Specify applicable policy provisions, e.g.,* Paragraph 3(a) of the Exclusions from Coverage] of the policy of title insurance issued by defendant to plaintiff expressly excludes from coverage, and provides that defendant will not pay loss or damage, costs, attorneys' fees or expenses which arise by reason of, any defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims or other matters not known to the defendant, not recorded in the public records at date of policy, but known to the plaintiff and not disclosed in writing to the defendant by the plaintiff prior to the date the plaintiff became an insured under the policy.

2. The _____ [defect *or* lien *or* encumbrance *or describe other matter*] alleged in Paragraph _____ of the complaint was notknown to the defendant and was not recorded in the public records at the date of policy,_____[*date*].

3. [Defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [T]he _____ [defect *or* lien *or* encumbrance *or describe other matter*] alleged in Paragraph _____ of the complaint was known to the plaintiff and not disclosed in writing to the defendant by the plaintiff prior to the date the plaintiff became an insured under the policy (Paragraph 3).

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense allegation is for use by a title insurer to include in an answer to a complaint by its policy holder based on the insurer's alleged failure to fulfill its obligations under the policy. The defense is based on the language of the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92), and the ALTA Owner's

Policy (10-17-92), all of which exclude coverage for defects, liens, encumbrances, adverse claims, or other matters not known to the insurer, not recorded in the public records at the date of policy, but known to the insured claimant and not disclosed in writing to the insurer by the insured claimant prior to the date the insured claimant became an insured under the policy [Exclusions from Coverage, P 3(b)]. If the title insurance policy was procured for the insured by an agent, the form may be adapted to allege the agent's knowledge of and failure to communicate existence of the recorded title impediment [*see Vernon v. Title Guar. & Trust Co. (1935) 7 Cal. App. 2d 171, 174, 46 P.2d 191]* .

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The terms of the applicable policy exclusion (Paragraph 1).

- That the defect, lien, encumbrance, adverse claim, or other matter complained of was not known to the insurer and was not recorded in the public records at the date of policy (Paragraph 2).

- That the defect, lien, encumbrance, adverse claim, or other matter was known to the plaintiff and not disclosed in writing to the defendant prior to the date the plaintiff became an insured under the policy.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.57

§ 548.57 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Ascertainable by Inspection or Inquiry

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Off-Record Defect Ascertainable by Inspection or Inquiry

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. _____ [*Specify provision of policy setting out exclusion of known defects, e.g.,* Schedule B] of the policy of title insurance issued by defendant to plaintiff expressly excludes from coverage any title defects not included in a public record that are ascertainable by inspection of the insured property or inquiry of the parties in possession. [_____ (*Specify part of policy containing definitions, e.g.,* Paragraph 1(h) of the Conditions and Stipulations of)] [T]he policy defines the term "public record" for purposes of the policy to mean those records that by law impart constructive notice of matters relating to the land.

2. As of_____[*date*],the date on which the alleged policy was issued, the _____ [*specify defect, e.g.,* adverse possession claim of _____ (*name of third party adverse possessor*)] did not appear in any public record that by law imparts constructive notice of its existence and was ascertainable by an inspection of the insured property.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense allegation is for use by a title insurer for inclusion in an answer to a complaint by its policy holder based on the insurer's alleged failure to fulfill its obligations under the policy. The basis for the defense is that the alleged defect in title for which the policy holder claims indemnification is excluded from coverage because it is not part of any public record and is ascertainable by inspection of the insured property or inquiry of the parties in possession of it [*see Bothin v. California Title Ins. Co. (1908) 153 Cal. 718, 722-723, 96 P. 500* (claim of adverse possessor excluded from coverage]. It is assumed that the underlying policy is based on the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990) or is an ALTA-based policy that excepts coverage for off-record defects [*see* [3], *below*].

[3] ALTA Standard Policies

In contrast to the CLTA Standard Coverage Policy (1990), the ALTA Loan Policy (10-17-92) and the ALTA Owner's Policy (10-17-92) do not automatically except off-record defects ascertainable by inspection or inquiry. Rather, the exception of these defects is optional, and therefore not all ALTA policies may contain such an exception [for discussion, *see §§ 548.13[4]* and *548.17*; *see also Kenny v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 557, 560-562, 169 Cal. Rptr. 808]* .

[4] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The policy exclusion of off-record defects ascertainable by an inspection of the property or by inquiry (Paragraph 1); and

- The fact that the alleged defect was off-record and was ascertainable by inspection of the property or by inquiry of the parties in possession (Paragraph 2).

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.58

§ 548.58 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Alleged Reduction in Value of Land Not Due to Title Defect

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Alleged Reduction in Value of Land Not Due to Title Defect

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. The title insurance policy alleged by plaintiff contains no provisions insuring the value of the land itself, but only insures against loss or damage sustained or incurred by reason of defects, liens, encumbrances, or other matters affecting plaintiff's title to the land.

2. The loss alleged by plaintiff in his/her complaint is the result of the independent conduct of _____ [*name of third party; e.g,* the municipality of _____ (*name*)] in _____ [*specify conduct of third party that rendered plaintiff's land valueless, e.g.,* approving a subdivision map without assessing costs for road building against property owners, thus rendering plaintiff's land valueless without street access]. This conduct does not constitute a defect, lien, encumbrance, or other matter affecting plaintiff's title to the land and thus is not covered by the title insurance policy.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense allegation is for use by a title insurer for inclusion in an answer to a complaint by its policy holder based on the insurer's alleged failure to fulfill its obligations under the policy. The basis for the defense is that the alleged loss, for which the policy holder claims indemnification, is not covered because it is not a defect, lien, encumbrance, or other matter affecting plaintiff's title to the land [*Hocking v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 644, 652, 234 P.2d 625]* .

[3] Allegations

This affirmative defense alleges:

- That a reduction in land value for reasons other than a defect in the insured title is not covered by the policy (Paragraph 1).

- That the loss complained of by plaintiff was a loss of value in the land itself, caused by actions of third parties and not by a defect in title (Paragraph 2).

[4] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 548 TITLE INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS

48-548 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 548.59

§ 548.59 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Not Obligated to Defend Action--Litigation Based on Insured's Tortious Acquisition of Title Rather Than on Title Itself

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Insured Not Obligated to Defend Action--Litigation Based on Insured's Tortious Acquisition of Title Rather Than on Title Itself

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that the action against plaintiff described in the complaint does not raise the possibility that defendant may be liable under the title insurance policy that defendant issued to plaintiff because the action is based on plaintiff's alleged tortious conduct in acquiring the property, not on any alleged defect in title that is insured by the policy.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense allegation is for use by a title insurer for inclusion in an answer to a complaint by its policy holder based on the insurer's alleged refusal to defend an action against the policy holder pursuant to the terms of the policy. The basis for the defense is that the insurer is not obligated to defend an action on the policy holder's behalf when the action is based on the policy holder's alleged tortious conduct in acquiring title to the property and is not directed against the insured title itself [*Safeco Title Ins. Co. v. Moskopoulos (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 658, 664-665, 172 Cal. Rptr. 248]* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers generally, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 549.syn

§ 549.syn Synopsis to Chapter 549: TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES

§ 549.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 549.02 Cross References

§§ 549.03-549.09 [Reserved]

§ 549.10 Governing Law

§§ 549.11-549.19 [Reserved]

§ 549.20 Lanham Act

[1] Coverage

[2] Definitions

[a] Trademark

[b] Service Mark

[c] Certification Mark

[d] Collective Mark

[e] Trade Name

[f] Mark

[g] Registered Mark

[h] Person

[i] Applicant

[j] Registrant

[k] Use in Commerce

§ 549.21 Subject Matter of Marks

[1] Purpose

[2] Strength of Mark

[3] Generic Marks

[4] Descriptive Marks

[a] When Registrable

[b] Secondary Meaning

[5] Suggestive Marks

[6] Distinction Between Descriptive and Suggestive Marks

[7] Arbitrary or Fanciful Marks

§ 549.22 Ownership of Marks

[1] Personal Property

[2] Transfer

[a] In General

[b] Licensor's Duty to Maintain Quality Control

[3] Tacking Doctrine

[4] Standing to Sue for Infringement

§ 549.23 Registration of Marks

[1] Purpose

[2] Principal and Supplemental Registers

[3] Evidentiary Effect of Registration

[4] Application

[a] Based on Actual or Intended Use of Mark

[b] Constitutes Constructive Use of Mark

[5] Contested Proceedings Objecting to Application

[6] Certificate of Registration

[a] Issuance

[b] Evidentiary Effect of Certificate

[c] Duration

[7] Affidavit of Incontestability (Section 15 Affidavit)

[8] Cancellation

[a] In General

[b] Time Limits

[c] Grounds for Cancellation

[d] Procedure

[9] Administrative Appeal

[10] Judicial Review

[11] Renewal

[12] Nonregistrable Marks

[a] Statutory Exclusions

[b] Color

§ 549.24 Infringement of Registered Marks

[1] Confusion, Mistake, or Deception

[2] Likelihood of Confusion

[a] Marks Used in Commerce Generally

[b] Marks Used in Internet Marketing

[3] Innocently Infringing Printer, Publisher, or Distributor

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Monetary Relief

[a] In General

[b] Counterfeit Mark

[6] Injunctive Relief

[7] Seizure of Goods and Counterfeit Marks

[8] Equitable Relief

[a] Destruction of Goods

§ 549.25 Remedy for Fraudulent Registration

§ 549.26 Action Under Lanham Act Section 43(a) for Improper Use of Mark or False Description, Representation, or Designation of Origin (Unfair Competition)

[1] General Statutory Prohibition Against Conduct Likely to Cause Confusion, Mistake, or Deception

[a] In General

[b] Passing Off or Reverse Passing Off

[c] Infringement of Unregistered Marks

[d] Infringement of Trade Dress

[2] False Advertising

[3] Remedies

[a] Monetary Relief

[b] Injunction

[c] Other Equitable Relief

[d] Against Innocently Violating Printer, Publisher, or Distributor

[4] Statute of Limitation and Laches

§ 549.27 Action to Prevent Dilution of Famous Mark

[1] What Is Famous Mark

[2] Famous Mark Owner's Action

[a] Right to Injunction

[b] Similar California Law

[c] Bar of Action Against Owner of Valid Registration

[d] Additional Remedies

[e] Burden of Proof for Trade-Dress Dilution

[3] Dilution by Blurring

[4] Dilution by Tarnishment

[5] Required Identity of Plaintiff's and Defendant's Marks

[6] Immunity for Certain Uses of Famous Marks

[a] Fair Use

[b] News Reporting and Commentary

[c] Noncommercial Use

[d] First-Sale Doctrine

§ 549.28 Defenses

[1] In General

[2] Registration or Incontestable Right to Use Fraudulently Obtained

[3] Abandonment

[4] Misrepresentation

[5] Fair Use

[6] Prior Use

[7] Prior Registration and Use

[8] Mark Use Violates Federal Antitrust Laws

[9] Mark Is Functional

[10] Equitable Defenses

[11] First Amendment Rights

[12] Statutory Exemption From Liability for Skipping Portions of Movies Viewed at Home

[a] Household Viewer's Right to Skip Objectionable Video and Audio Portions

[b] Manufacturer, Licensee, or Licensor of Technology to Skip Portions

§ 549.29 Remedies for Internet-Related Infringement

[1] Governing Law

[2] Civil Action to Suppress Cybersquatting

[a] Basis of Liability

[b] Relief

[c] Limitation of Remedy Against Domain Name Registrar

[3] In Rem Action

§§ 549.30-549.49 [Reserved]

§ 549.50 Governing Law

[1] Model State Trademark Law; Trademarks and Service Marks Unit

[2] Other Statutory Protections

[3] Common Law

§ 549.51 Definitions

[1] Trademark

[2] Service Mark

[3] Mark

[4] Trade Name

[5] Person

[6] Applicant

[7] Registrant

[8] Use

[9] Abandoned

§ 549.52 Registration of Mark

[1] Application

[2] Certificate of Registration

[a] Issuance and Content of Certificate

[b] Evidentiary Effect

[c] Term of Registration

[3] Public Access to Records

§ 549.53 Impediments to Registration

[1] Marks That Cannot Be Registered

[a] Immoral, Deceptive, or Scandalous Matter

[b] Disparaging Matter

[c] Government Flag, Emblem, or Insignia

[d] Living Individual's Identity

[e] Confusing Mark

[2] Nondistinctive Mark

§ 549.54 Denial of Application

[1] Right to Amend and Resubmit Application

[2] Judicial Review

§ 549.55 Procedures After Registration

[1] Renewal of Term

[2] Cancellation of Registration

[a] Request by Registrant or Assignee

[b] Unrenewed Term

[c] Judicial Order or Finding

[d] Check for Fee Is Dishonored

[e] Confusing Mark

[3] Fraudulent Registration

[4] Assignment of Registration

§ 549.56 Infringement of Mark

[1] Mark Must Be Registered in California

[2] Causes of Action

[a] Infringing Use of Mark

[b] Reproduction and Application of Mark That Results in Infringement

[c] Facilitation of Infringing Use of Mark

[3] Judicial Remedies

[a] In General

[b] Injunction, Compensation, and Penalties

[c] Destruction of Counterfeits

[d] Pre-Judgment Seizure of Counterfeits

[e] Damages for Wrongful Seizure of Goods

[f] Nuisance Abatement Action Targeting Place Where Counterfeiting Occurred

[4] Limitation of Remedies Against Innocent Infringers

[a] In General

[b] Commercial Printers

[c] Publishers and Distributors of Periodicals and Electronic Communications

§ 549.57 Dilution of Famous Mark

[1] Definitions

[a] Famous Mark

[b] Dilution

[2] Cause of Action and Remedy

[3] Defenses

[a] Fair Use

[b] Ornamental Use on Goods

§§ 549.58-549.69 [Reserved]

§ 549.70 Registration

[1] Trade Name Registration and Presumptions

[a] Fictitious Business Name Statement

[b] Corporate Name

[c] Conflict Between Corporation and Registrant of Fictitious Business Name

[2] Farm Name Registration

§ 549.71 Judicial Remedy

[1] Infringement of Trade Name

[2] Infringement as Unfair Competition

§ 549.72 Loss of Rights by Abandonment

§§ 549.73-549.79 [Reserved]

§ 549.80 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

§ 549.81 Federal Constitution

§ 549.82 Federal Statutes

[1] Actions

[2] Criminal Offenses

[3] Importation of Goods

[4] Incontestability of Right to Use Mark

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue in Federal Court

[6] Patent and Trademark Office Procedure

[7] Registration of Marks

[8] Supplemental Register

[9] Treaties and Conventions

§ 549.83 State Statutes

[1] Trademarks and Service Marks

[2] Trade Names

[3] Miscellaneous

[a] In General

[b] Unfair Competition

§ 549.84 Federal Administrative Regulations

[1] Registration

[2] Contested Proceedings

§ 549.85 Decisions

[1] Abandonment

[2] Attorney's Fees

[3] Cancellation of Mark Registration

[4] Collective Mark

[5] Color

[6] Common Law Rights

[7] Composite Mark

[8] Contributory Infringement

[9] Defenses

[10] Descriptive Marks

[11] Dilution of Mark or Name

[a] In General

[b] Cybersquatting

[12] Discovery

[13] False Advertising

[14] False Descriptions and Designations of Origin

[15] Geographic Terms

[16] Gray Market Goods

[17] Incontestability

[18] Infringing Acts

[19] Likelihood of Confusion

[20] Misappropriation

[21] Prior Use

[22] Profits

[23] Purpose of Trademark Law

[24] Remedies

[a] In General

[b] Damages

[c] Injunctive Relief

[25] Review

[26] Secondary Meaning

[27] Service Marks

[28] Settlement Agreements

[29] Trade-Dress Infringement

[30] Transfer of Mark or Name

[31] Unfair Competition

[32] Unregistered Trademarks

§ 549.86 Law Reviews

§ 549.87 Text References

§§ 549.88-549.89 [Reserved]

§ 549.90 Cease and Desist Letter Demanding That Infringer Stop Using Owner's Trademark or Service Mark on Goods Provided or in Connection With Services Rendered by Infringer--From Owner's Attorney to Infringer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 549.91 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(a); Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [15 U.S.C. § 1117] and Injunctive Relief [15 U.S.C. §§ 1116, 1118; Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] in Action for Trademark and Service Mark Infringement [15 U.S.C. § 1114]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Proof of Infringement

[5] Injunctive Relief

[6] Verification in State Court

[7] Verification in Federal Court

[8] Signing of Pleadings in Federal Court

[9] Federal Jurisdiction and Venue

[10] Pendent Jurisdiction Over State Claim

[11] State Jurisdiction

[12] Statute of Limitations

[13] Cross References

§ 549.92 Affirmative Defense--Registration or Incontestable Right to Use Mark Obtained Fraudulently [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 549.93 Affirmative Defense [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(c)]--Abandonment of Mark by Registrant [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.94 Affirmative Defense--Misrepresentation of Source of Goods or Services [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.95 Affirmative Defense--Fair Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.96 Affirmative Defense--Prior Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(5)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.97 Affirmative Defense--Prior Registration and Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(6)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.98 Affirmative Defense--Use of Plaintiff's Trade or Service Mark Violates Federal Antitrust Laws [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(7)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.99 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Trademark or Service Mark Is Functional [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(8)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.100 Affirmative Defense--Laches, Estoppel, or Acquiescence [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(9)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 549.101 Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using

Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)] Ex Parte Application for Order [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Content of Application

[4] Content of Affidavit

[5] Requirement of Notice to United States Attorney

[6] Requirement of Posting of Security

[7] Cross References

§ 549.102 Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)]--Order Granting Ex Parte Application [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Content of Order

[4] Grounds for Issuance of Order

[5] Time for Seizure

[6] Confidentiality of Seizure and Information Seized

[7] Protective Order With Respect to Discovery of Seized Records

[8] Postseizure Hearing

[9] Cross References

§ 549.103 Complaint for Damages, Profits, and Injunctive and Other Equitable Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527; Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)]--Action for Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245] and Dilution [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247] of Service Mark Registered Under Model State Trademark Law [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Cross References

§ 549.104 [Reserved]

§ 549.105 Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)]--Ex Parte Application for Order

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Waiver of Requirement of Notice to Defendant

[4] Required Showing of Good Cause and Probable Success on the Merits

[5] Requirement That Plaintiff Post Undertaking

[6] Cross References

§ 549.106 Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Ex Parte Application

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Order

[4] Cross References

§ 549.107 Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14402; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] for Unfair Competition and Trade Name Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Elements of Cause of Action

[a] In General

[b] Secondary Meaning

[c] Similar Name or Design

[d] Public Confusion

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART I. SCOPE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.01

§ 549.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms relating to infringement, dilution, and unfair competition involving trademarks, service marks, and trade names. The introduction is divided into three parts. The first part discusses federal law; the second part discusses California law on trademarks and service marks; the third part discusses California law on trade names. For discussion and forms relating to other aspects of unfair competition, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* . For discussion and forms covering torts relating to appropriation of a person's name or likeness under common law or *Civil Code § 3344*, see Ch. 429, *Privacy* .

The chapter contains forms relating to infringement actions seeking equitable and monetary relief, including:

- A cease and desist letter [*see § 549.90*].
- A complaint for infringement of a federally registered trademark [*see § 549.91*].
- Federal statutory affirmative defenses to an infringement suit [*see §§ 549.92 -549.100*].
- Ex parte applications for an order to seize goods bearing and used in the production of counterfeits of a federally registered trademark [*see §§ 549.101, 549.102*] or a trademark registered under the California trademark law [*see §§ 549.105, 549.106*].
- A complaint [*see § 549.103*] for use in an action for infringement of a service mark registered under the California trademark law.
- A complaint for statutory infringement of a trade name and for unfair competition based on confusion of source [*see § 549.107*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Trademark LawDilution of Famous MarksGeneral OverviewTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsRemediesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSpecial MarksTrade NamesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSpecial MarksTrade NamesInfringement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART I. SCOPE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.02

§ 549.02 Cross References

For jurisdictional allegations in complaints filed in federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and forms relating to injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms relating to literary property and copyright, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright*

For discussion and forms relating to patents, see Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions*

For discussion and forms covering torts relating to appropriation of a person's name or likeness under common law or *Civil Code § 3344*, see Ch. 429, *Privacy*

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to unfair competition, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawTrade Practices & Unfair CompetitionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCopyright LawGeneral OverviewPatent LawGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsInvasion of PrivacyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART I. SCOPE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.03-549.09

[Reserved]

§§ 549.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.10

§ 549.10 Governing Law

The ownership, protection, and registration of trademarks and trade names are governed on the federal level by the Trademark Act of 1946, commonly called the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*; *see § 549.20*], and on the state level by the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*; *see § 549.50*] and by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.*, concerning trade names and other designations [*see § 549.70*]. Actions based on the unfair imitation of a name or designation that is not susceptible to exclusive use are governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* and common law unfair competition principles [*see, e.g., Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300-302, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228*]. For a listing of additional statutes protecting a variety of trade, product, and association names, labels, and devices, see *§ 549.83[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawTrade Practices & Unfair CompetitionGeneral OverviewTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawLanham ActGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationFederal RegistrationTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationState RegistrationTrademark LawSpecial MarksTrade NamesRegistration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.11-549.19

[Reserved]

§§ 549.11[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.20

§ 549.20 Lanham Act

[1] Coverage

The Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*] is the exclusive source of federal law governing infringement of trade, service, collective, and certification marks registered on the principal and supplemental registers of the United States Patent and Trademark Office [*Intern. Order of Job's Daughters v. Lindeburg & Co. (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 912, 915-916*]. The objectives of trademark law are to protect consumers from being misled as to the source of products, to prevent impairment of a trademark's value to its owner, and to achieve the preceding objectives in a manner consistent with free competition [*E-Systems, Inc. v. Monitek, Inc. (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 604, 607*]. To this end, the intent of the Lanham Act is to regulate commerce within the control of Congress by making actionable the deceptive and misleading use of marks, to protect registered marks used in commerce from interference by state or territorial legislation, and to protect persons engaged in commerce against unfair competition. Furthermore, the act is intended to prevent fraud and deception in commerce by the use of reproductions, copies, counterfeits, or colorable imitations of registered marks. Finally, the act is intended to provide rights and remedies stipulated by treaties and conventions respecting trademarks, trade names, and unfair competition entered into between the United States and foreign nations [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[2] Definitions

[a] Trademark

"Trademark" means any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof, used by a person, or which a person has a bona fide intention to use in commerce and applies to register on the principal register established by the Lanham Act, to identify and distinguish his or her goods, including a unique product, from those manufactured or sold by others and to indicate the source of the goods, even if that source is unknown [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[b] Service Mark

"Service mark" means any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof, used by a person, or which a

person has a bona fide intention to use in commerce and applies to register on the principal register established by the Lanham Act, to identify and distinguish the services of one person, including a unique service, from the services of others and to indicate the source of services, even if that source is unknown. Titles, character names, and other distinctive features of radio or television programs may be registered as service marks notwithstanding that they, or the programs, may advertise the goods of the sponsor [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[c] Certification Mark

"Certification mark" means any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof, used by a person other than its owner, or which its owner has a bona fide intention to permit a person other than the owner to use in commerce and files an application to register on the principal register established by the Lanham Act, to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of that person's goods or services; or to certify that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

Certification marks differ from trademarks in a number of significant ways. Certification marks are subject to cancellation if the owner produces or markets goods on which the mark appears, permits use of the mark for purposes other than to certify, or discriminately refuses to certify the goods of anyone meeting the standards the mark denotes [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(5)*]. The mark holder's duty to license all who qualify makes certification a form of limited compulsory licensing. The Lanham Act makes clear that certification marks serve other public interests in addition to the prevention of public confusion. The provisions for certification-mark cancellation illustrate the legislative intent to protect a further public interest in free and open competition among producers and distributors of the certified product. By requiring certification mark holders to license all persons meeting the certification criteria, the Lanham Act ensures that the market will include as many participants as can produce conforming goods. By preventing mark holders from becoming market participants, the Act removes incentives for mark holders to engage in anti-competitive conduct. The Lanham Act's cancellation provisions thus appear designed to promote free competition in the market for certified products [*Idaho Potato Comm'n v. G&T Terminal Packaging, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 425 F.3d 708, 716-717*].

[d] Collective Mark

"Collective mark" means a trademark or service mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association, or other collective group or organization or which a cooperative, association, or other collective group or organization has a bona fide intention to use in commerce and applies to register on the principal register established by the Lanham Act. It includes marks used to indicate membership in a union, association, or other organization [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[e] Trade Name

"Trade name" means any name used by a person to identify his or her business or vocation [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*]. The term "commercial name" means "trade name," and the two terms are used interchangeably [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[f] Mark

"Mark" means any trademark, service mark, collective mark, or certification mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[g] Registered Mark

"Registered mark" means a mark registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office under *15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.* The term "marks registered in the Patent and Trademark Office" means "registered mark," and the two terms are used interchangeably [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[h] Person

"Person" means the applicant or other natural person entitled to a benefit or privilege or rendered liable under the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*, and includes a firm, corporation, union, association, or other organization capable of suing and being sued in a court of law [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

"Person" also includes the United States, all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and all individuals, firms, corporations, other persons acting for the United States and with the authorization and consent of the United States, and any State, any instrumentality of a State, and any officer or employee of a State or instrumentality of a State acting in his or her official capacity [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1)(b), 1127*]. Any State, and any such instrumentality, officer, or employee, is subject to the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*(trademarks) in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity.

[i] Applicant

"Applicant" includes the applicant's legal representatives, predecessors, successors, and assigns [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[j] Registrant

"Registrant" includes the registrant's legal representatives, predecessors, successors, and assigns [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

[k] Use in Commerce

"Commerce" means all commerce that may lawfully be regulated by Congress [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*]. "Commerce" includes intrastate commerce that affects interstate commerce [*Thompson Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Thompson (9th Cir. 1982) 693 F.2d 991, 993*].

"Use in commerce" means the bona fide use of a mark in the ordinary course of trade and does not include use made merely to preserve a right in a mark. A mark on goods is deemed in use in commerce when (1) it is placed in any manner on the goods or their containers or the displays associated with them, or on the tags or labels affixed to them, or if the nature of the goods make such placement impracticable, then on documents associated with the goods or their sale; and (2) the goods are sold or transported in commerce. A mark on services is deemed in use in commerce when it is used or displayed in the sale or advertising of services and the services are rendered in commerce, or the services are rendered in more than one state or in the United States and a foreign country and the person rendered the services is engaged in commerce in connection with the services [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawLanham ActGeneral OverviewTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawLanham ActScopeTrademark LawSpecial MarksCertification MarksTrademark LawSpecial MarksCollective MarksTrademark LawSpecial MarksService MarksGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSpecial MarksTrade NamesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.21

§ 549.21 Subject Matter of Marks

[1] Purpose

The function of a trade or service mark is twofold: (1) to identify the goods or services of one person, and (2) to distinguish those goods or services from those of another. If, therefore, a word, name, symbol, or device does not identify or distinguish, it is not registrable under the Lanham Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1127*; *Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 768, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615*].

[2] Strength of Mark

The validity and degree of protection a mark will be accorded is determined by its strength and distinctiveness [*Saratoga Vichy Spring Co., Inc. v. Lehman (N.D.N.Y. 1979) 491 F. Supp. 141, 148]* . The relative strength of a mark is especially important in actions for infringement of a trade or service mark, because the strength or weakness of a plaintiff's mark is one factor courts consider in determining whether a likelihood of confusion, as between plaintiff's mark and defendant's allegedly infringing mark, exists in the minds of the relevant purchasing public [*see Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (N.D. Cal. 1977) 437 F. Supp. 956, 963]* . For discussion of the role of the likelihood of confusion in actions for trade and service mark infringement, see *§ 549.24[2]*.

Courts have devised classification schemes for determining the relative strength or weakness of a given mark for the purpose of determining eligibility for trademark status and the degree of protection afforded the mark against infringement [*Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (N.D. Cal. 1977) 437 F. Supp. 956, 963-964*]. In the Ninth Circuit, marks are categorized, in ascending order of strength, as generic, descriptive, suggestive, and arbitrary or fanciful [*Surgicenters of America, Inc. v. Medical Dental Surgeries, Co. (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011, 1014*]. The United States Supreme Court has also followed this categorization scheme for evaluating the strength of marks under the Lanham Act [*see Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 768, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615*].

The theory behind the differentiation between strong and weak marks is that weak marks consist of terms in common usage and have meaning (other than as trademarks) in the English language. Additionally, weak marks consist of terms

in widespread use as marks for many different products and services [*Alpha Industries, Inc. v. Alpha Steel Tube & Shapes, Inc. (9th Cir. 1980) 616 F.2d 440, 445-446*]. The likelihood that a consumer will identify a mark with the products or services of only one producer is extremely low when the mark in issue is comprised of terms commonly and frequently used throughout the consumer's field of linguistic and commercial experience [*see, e.g., Carter-Wallace, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co. (9th Cir. 1970) 434 F.2d 794, 802* (upholding defendant's use of the word "sure," which was part of both plaintiff's trademarked slogan and slogans used by others in advertising related products)]. A mark may be strengthened by extensive advertising, length of time in business, public recognition, and uniqueness [*Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1179*].

A strong mark is an inherently distinctive mark and will be afforded the widest ambit of protection from infringing uses [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 , abrogated in part on other grounds, Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*]. A strong mark is one that is used only in a fictitious, arbitrary, or fanciful manner. Because of this unique usage, it is entitled to greater protection than a weak mark [*J. B. Williams Co. v. Le Conte Cosmetics, Inc. (9th Cir. 1975) 523 F.2d 187, 192*]. "Dutch Boy" is an example of a strong mark when not used geographically or descriptively but in a fictitious, arbitrary, and fanciful manner as the trademark for paint products [*National Lead Co. v. Wolfe (9th Cir. 1955) 223 F.2d 195, 199]* . The fact that the origin of a word is unknown, coupled with an absence of evidence that the word has any meaning of its own, is evidence of a strong mark [*see J. B. Williams Co. v. Le Conte Cosmetics, Inc. (9th Cir. 1975) 523 F.2d 187, 192*]. If a name is truly arbitrary, strange, and fanciful, it is more specially and peculiarly significant and suggestive of one person's goods than when it is used frequently by many and in different kinds of businesses [*Sunbeam Lighting Co. v. Sunbeam Corp. (9th Cir. 1950) 183 F.2d 969, 972-973*].

The differentiation between strong and weak marks turns on whether the word in issue is general or fanciful. General, non-fanciful words applied to, used, and registered as trademarks for a large number and variety of products by numerous manufacturers are deemed weak and are narrowly protected [*Sunbeam Furniture Corp. v. Sunbeam Corp. (9th Cir. 1951) 191 F.2d 141, 144*]. A mark is deemed weak if it is a word meaningful in common usage or if, pictorially, it is a common decoration [*Sid Berk, Inc. v. Uniroyal, Inc. (C.D. Cal. 1977) 425 F. Supp. 22, 30*].

[3] Generic Marks

No incontestable right can be acquired in a mark that is the generic name for all or part of the goods or services for which the mark is registered [*15U.S.C § 1065(4)*; *e.g., Kendall-Jackson Winery, Ltd. v. E. & J. Gallo Winery (9th Cir. 1998) 150 F.3d 1042, 1048* (plaintiff's grape-leaf design for its wine bottle label was generic, and defendant was entitled to judgment as matter of law on plaintiff's trademark infringement claims)]. In addition, a registered mark may be canceled at any time if the mark becomes the generic name for all or part of the goods or services for which it is registered [*15 U.S.C § 1064(3)*]. If the mark becomes the generic name for only a portion of all of the goods or services for which the mark is registered, the cancellation extends only to those goods or services for which the mark has become the generic name [*see 15 U.S.C § 1064(3)*].

At common law, generic terms normally are not subject to appropriation as trademarks, although a strong showing of secondary meaning may be sufficient to grant a right to exclusive use. When federal registration has been canceled because a mark is found to be generic, it is almost impossible to establish the secondary meaning required for common law trademark protection [*Keebler Co. v. Rovira Biscuit Corp. (1st Cir. 1980) 624 F.2d 366, 374, 376* ; *but see Self-Realization Fellowship Church v. Ananda Church of Self-Realization (9th Cir. 1995) 59 F.3d 902, 913* (federal registration restored)].

The test for determining whether a registered mark has become the generic name of goods or services in connection with which it has been used is based on the primary significance of a registered mark to the relevant public, not on purchaser motivation [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)* (overruling the reasoning of *Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. General Mills Fun Group (9th Cir. 1982) 684 F.2d 1316*); *see also Kellogg Co. v. National Biscuit Co. (1938) 305 U.S. 111, 118, 59 S.*

Ct. 109, 83 L. Ed. 73].

A registered mark will not be deemed to be the generic name of goods or services solely because the mark is also used as a name of or to identify a unique product or service [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)*; *see also 15 U.S.C. § 1127* (definitions of "trademark" and "service mark")]. Neither is a registered mark invalidated merely because it is composed of generic words [*see Self-Realization Fellowship Church v. Ananda Church of Self-Realization (9th Cir. 1995) 59 F.3d 902, 912*].

A trademark can be attacked as generic either offensively, as in an action for declaratory judgment [*Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. General Mills Fun Group (9th Cir. 1982) 684 F.2d 1316*], or defensively, as an affirmative defense to an action for infringement [*Surgicenters of America, Inc. v. Medical Dental Surgeries, Co. (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011*].

There is a presumption in favor of the validity of a registered trademark, and the burden of proof is on one who attacks a mark as generic. The presumption can be overcome by a showing of a preponderance of the evidence that the term was or has become generic [*see Vuitton et Fils S.A. v. J. Young Enterprises, Inc. (9th Cir. 1981) 644 F.2d 769, 775-776* (burden of proof) and *Coca-Cola Co. v. Overland, Inc. (9th Cir. 1982) 692 F.2d 1250, 1253* (generic nature of mark)]. Acceptable evidence of the genericness of a term in the minds of the consuming public includes dictionary definitions, consumer surveys, and responses to cease and desist letters [*see, e.g., Surgicenters of America, Inc. v. Medical Dental Surgeries, Co. (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011, 1017*].

Moreover, against a claim that a mark is or has become generic, the validity of the mark is to be determined by viewing it as a whole, rather than focusing on its components. The composite mark may be a distinguishing mark even though its components individually could not be registered [*Reno Air Racing Ass'n v. McCord (9th Cir. 2006) 452 F.3d 1126, 1135]* .

[4] Descriptive Marks

[a] When Registrable

A descriptive mark describes the qualities or characteristics of a good or service. Only by acquiring a secondary meaning, that is, by becoming distinctive of the applicant's goods or services, can a descriptive mark become registrable [*Park'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 194, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582* ; *15 U.S.C. § 1052(e)*]. An example of a descriptive (or merely descriptive) mark is the service mark "Park'N Fly" as applied to airport parking and shuttle bus service [*Park'N Fly v. Dollar Park & Fly (9th Cir. 1983) 718 F.2d 327, 331*]. Once secondary meaning is established, the protection afforded to a descriptive mark should be commensurate with the degree of consumer association proven [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 n.12*].

[b] Secondary Meaning

Secondary meaning, a term that is not found in the Lanham Act, is achieved when a mark has become distinctive of an applicant's goods in commerce. It is the means by which descriptive (or deceptively misdescriptive) and primarily geographically descriptive (or deceptively misdescriptive) marks, together with marks that are primarily merely surnames, are registrable on the principal register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(e),(f)*; *Park'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 183-194, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582*].

An otherwise descriptive mark may achieve protectable status whenever the quality of distinctiveness has been acquired through a demonstrated secondary meaning [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 107, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794*]. Protection is extended when, in addition to the literal meaning of the words used, a subsequent significance is added and becomes in the marketplace its usual and primary significance.

Secondary meaning is said to attach when the descriptive words used in connection with a product have acquired a general understanding in the relevant marketplace area identifying that product with a unique or particular source. The crucial element is the mental association in the buyer's mind between the mark used in connection with the product or service, and a single source of origin. The buyer need not actually know the name of the source, but must directly associate the mark with but one, though anonymous, source [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 108, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794*]. As long as the primary significance of the descriptive term in the minds of the buying public is shown to be the product source rather than the product, then trademark protection will be available under the secondary meaning doctrine [*see* *Kellogg Co. v. National Biscuit Co. (1938) 305 U.S. 111, 118, 59 S. Ct. 109, 83 L. Ed. 73*].

Whether a descriptive term or mark has acquired a secondary meaning is a question of fact [*Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 778 F.2d 1352, 1355*]. To determine whether a descriptive mark has secondary meaning, the finder of fact considers the following [*Transgo, Inc. v. AjacTransmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1015* ; *see, e.g.,* *Yellow Cab Co. v. Yellow Cab of Elk Grove, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 419 F.3d 925, 930* ("Here, Yellow Cab of Sacramento presented to the district court various declarations detailing the history of the Yellow Cab of Sacramento, customer confusion concerning the companies, advertising data and other evidence addressing the *Levi Strauss* factors.")]:

- Whether actual purchasers of the product bearing the claimed trademark associate the trademark with the producer.
- The degree and manner of advertising under the claimed trademark.
- The length and manner of use of the claimed trademark.
- Whether use of the claimed trademark has been exclusive.

[5] Suggestive Marks

A suggestive mark suggests rather than describes an ingredient, quality, or characteristic requiring imagination, thought, and perception to determine the nature of the goods or services [*Park'N Fly. v. Dollar Park & Fly (9th Cir. 1983) 718 F.2d 327, 329*]. The Ninth Circuit considers that the imagination test is the primary criterion for evaluating distinctiveness in this context [*Zobmondo Entm't, LLC v. Falls Media, LLC (9th Cir. 2010) 602 F.3d 1108, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 8559, at *17]* . The legal standard is whether "a mental leap is required" to understand the mark's relationship to the product. The issue is one of fact, namely, what consumers will understand the mark to mean (by making that mental leap). Generally, the application of the imagination test will be "informed by expert testimony offered at trial suggesting how consumers will view" the mark [*Zobmondo Entm't, LLC v. Falls Media, LLC (9th Cir. 2010) 602 F.3d 1108, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 8559, at *18-*20* (noting that "comprehensive consumer surveys" would be helpful evidence)].

An example of a suggestive trademark is "Slickcraft," as applied to boats [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 , abrogated in part on other grounds,* *Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*]. A suggestive term is entitled to registration on the principal register without proof of secondary meaning [*Surgicenters of America, Inc. v. Medical Dental Surgeries, Co. (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011, 1015*]. Because a suggestive mark is, by definition, less distinctive than an arbitrary or fanciful mark, it is a comparatively weak mark [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 , abrogated in part on other grounds,* *Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*]. As such, it is entitled to a restricted range of protection from infringement. Thus, only if a weak mark and an alleged infringing mark are quite similar and the goods that both identify closely related, will infringement be found [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 350 , abrogated in part on other grounds,* *Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir.*

2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19].

[6] Distinction Between Descriptive and Suggestive Marks

The line separating descriptive marks from suggestive marks is not a bright one, and thus courts have devised criteria for defining the two. These criteria include the imaginativeness of the suggestion; for example, how immediate and direct the thought process is from mark to product or service; whether granting the trademark owner a limited monopoly will, in fact, inhibit legitimate use of the mark by other sellers; whether the mark is actually viewed by the public as an indication of the product's origin or as a self-serving description of it [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 , abrogated in part on other grounds, Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19* ; *see GoTo.com, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co. (9th Cir. 2000) 202 F.3d 1199, 1207* (logo comprising words "Go" and "To" in white letters enclosed in green circle with ".com" in black letters trailing over circle's edge was suggestive trademark for search-engine web site)].

This is sometimes called the "competitors' needs" test (or simply the needs test). If competitors have a great need to use a mark, the mark is probably descriptive; on the other hand, if the suggestion made by the mark is "so remote and subtle that it is really not likely to be needed by competitive sellers" to describe their goods or services, that tends to indicate that the mark is suggestive. This test is related to the imagination test because the more imagination is required to associate the mark with a product or service, the less likely is it that the mark will be needed by competitors to describe their products or services [*Zobmondo Entm't, LLC v. Falls Media, LLC (9th Cir. 2010) 602 F.3d 1108, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 8559, at *21-*22]* .

Whether a mark is suggestive or merely descriptive is often a crucial question in a trademark case and can present complex issues of fact. Therefore, "summary judgment is ordinarily disfavored" in that context [*Zobmondo Entm't, LLC v. Falls Media, LLC (9th Cir. 2010) 602 F.3d 1108, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 8559, at *34]* .

[7] Arbitrary or Fanciful Marks

An arbitrary or fanciful term is usually applied to words invented or coined solely for their use as trademarks. Such terms enjoy all the rights accorded to suggestive terms without the need for debating whether the term is merely descriptive [*Surgicenters of America, Inc. v. Medical Dental Surgeries (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011, 1015*]. Because a coined term is inherently distinctive, it is a strong mark and as such will be afforded the widest ambit of protection from infringing uses [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 349 , abrogated in part on other grounds, Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*].

For example, the trademark "Black & White" as applied to Scotch whiskey is arbitrary and fanciful because it is not descriptive and indicates nothing having the qualities of black and white [*Fleischmann Distilling Corp. v. Maier Brewing Co. (9th Cir. 1963) 314 F.2d 149, 154*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawSpecial MarksService MarksGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSubject MatterDescriptive & Laudatory TermsDeterminationsTrademark LawSubject MatterDistinctivenessDeterminationsTrademark LawSubject MatterNamesGeneric NamesTestsTrademark LawSubject MatterStrengthTrademark LawSubject MatterSuggestive Terms

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.22

§ 549.22 Ownership of Marks

[1] Personal Property

As a type of intellectual property, trademarks have long been recognized as intangible personal property [*Beech-Nut Packing Co. v. P. Lorillard Co. (1927) 273 U.S. 629, 47 S. Ct. 481, 71 L. Ed. 810*]. A trademark is a form of business property, and a trademark owner has a property right only insofar as is necessary to prevent consumer confusion as to who produced the goods, and to facilitate differentiation of the trademark owner's goods [*International Order of Job's Daughters v. Lindeburg & Co. (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 912, 919*].

It is possible, but would be unusual, for two or more persons to own a trademark jointly and use the trademark in separate businesses [*see generally Iskenderian v. Iskenderian (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 1162, 1170-1172, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 163]* .

[2] Transfer

[a] In General

Any registered mark, or any mark for which a registration application has been filed, is assignable with the goodwill of the business in which the mark is used or with that part of the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark. Nevertheless, no application to register a mark under *15 U.S.C. § 1051(b)* (application based on bona fide intention to use mark) is assignable prior to the filing of the verified statement of use under *15 U.S.C. § 1051(d)*, except to a successor to the business of the application, or portion thereof, to which the mark pertains, if that business is ongoing and existing. In any assignment authorized by *15 U.S.C. § 1060*, it is not necessary to include the goodwill of the business which is connected with the use of any other mark used in the business and which is symbolized by that mark or by the name or style under which the business is conducted [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1060(a)(1)*].

Because a property right in trademark exists only as a right appurtenant to the business in connection with which a mark is used, there are no rights in trademark that can be transferred apart from the business with which the mark is associated [*Mister Donut of America, Inc. v. Mr. Donut, Inc. (9th Cir. 1969) 418 F.2d 838, 842*].

The seller of a mark has a special duty to avoid confusion with a name that he or she has sold [*Plough, Inc. v. Kreis Laboratories (9th Cir. 1963) 314 F.2d 635, 639*].

[b] Licensor's Duty to Maintain Quality Control

A trademark may be licensed, but when it is, the trademark licensor owes an affirmative duty to the public to assure that, in the hands of a licensee, the mark continues to represent goods or services of the same pre-license quality. The major purpose of this duty, known as "quality control," is to protect the public [*Edwin K. Williams & Co. v. Edwin K. Williams & Co.-East (9th Cir. 1976) 542 F.2d 1053, 1059]* .

A finding of insufficient control by a licensor over its licensee essentially effects a forfeiture of the licensing agreement, although the amount of control required varies with the circumstances. A person asserting insufficient control must meet a high burden of proof, and a licensee should not be permitted to resist quality control and then assert lack of quality control to invalidate a license [*Edwin K. Williams & Co. v. Edwin K. Williams & Co.-East (9th Cir. 1976) 542 F.2d 1053, 1059-1060]* .

In a case of so-called "naked licensing," in which the trademark owner failed to exercise adequate quality control over the licensee--for instance (taking an extreme example), by failing to provide for quality control in the license agreement at all or by relinquishing that duty in the licensing agreement, and failing to attempt any actual quality control--a court may find that the owner has abandoned the trademark. In such a case, the owner would be estopped from asserting rights to the trademark. Such an abandonment is purely involuntary, a forfeiture of trademark rights, since it need not be shown that the trademark owner had any subjective intent to abandon the mark. Accordingly, the proponent of a naked-license theory of abandonment faces a "stringent standard" of proof [*Barcamerica Int'l USATrust v. Tyfield Imps., Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 289 F.3d 589, 598* ("what matters is that Barcamerica played no meaningful role in holding the [product] to a standard of quality--good, bad, or otherwise")].

[3] Tacking Doctrine

The Ninth Circuit recognizes that a trademark owner may claim priority in a mark based on the first-use date of a similar, but technically distinct, mark--but only if consumers consider both as the same mark. This "constructive use" theory is known as the "tacking doctrine" because the trademark owner essentially seeks to tack the first-use date in the earlier mark onto the subsequent mark. Tacking should be allowed if two marks are so similar that consumers generally would regard them as essentially the same. In such a case, the new mark serves the same identification function as the old mark. Giving the trademark owner the same rights in the new mark as in the old mark helps to protect source identifying trademarks from appropriation by competitors and thus furthers the trademark law's objective of reducing the costs that customers incur in shopping and making purchasing decisions. Without tacking, a trademark owner's priority in the mark would be reduced each time the owner made the slightest alteration to the mark, which would discourage altering the mark in response to changing consumer preferences, evolving aesthetic developments, or new advertising and marketing styles [*Brookfield Communications, Inc. v. West Coast Entertainment Corp. (9th Cir. 1999) 174 F.3d 1036, 1047-1048]* .

Thus, the tacking doctrine enables the owner of a mark to maintain a prior right to use the mark even though the appearance of the mark has been changed over time. When the tacking doctrine applies, the various changes in the mark's appearance over time will not support an infringer's defense of abandonment [*see § 549.28[3]*], and the date of first use of the original mark will be carried forward to establish priority for each version of the mark over time.

The standard for allowing tacking is considerably stricter than the standard for determining the likelihood-of-confusion element of an infringement claim [*see § 549.24[2]*]. The two marks must create the same, continuing commercial impression, and the later mark must not materially differ from or alter the character of the earlier mark. The earlier mark

must be the legal equivalent of the later mark: they must be so indistinguishable that the consumer would consider them to be the same mark [*Brookfield Communications, Inc. v. West Coast Entertainment Corp. (9th Cir. 1999) 174 F.3d 1036, 1048* ; *see One Indus., LLC v. Jim O'Neal Distrib. (9th Cir. 2009) 578 F.3d 1154, 1162* (cases in which tacking was not allowed, and one case in which it was allowed)].

The Ninth Circuit holds that whether tacking applies should be analyzed as a question of fact--bearing in mind that a question of fact may be resolved as a matter of law when reasonable minds cannot differ and the evidence permits only one conclusion [*Quiksilver, Inc. v. Kymsta Corp. (9th Cir. 2006) 466 F.3d 749, 759]* .

[4] Standing to Sue for Infringement

The standard test of ownership in trademark law is priority of use. To acquire ownership of a trademark, it is not enough to have invented the mark first or even to have registered it first; the party claiming ownership must have been the first to actually use the mark in the sale of goods or services [*Sengoku Works v. RMC Int'l (9th Cir. 1996) 96 F.3d 1217, 1219* (registrant merely has advantage of presumption of ownership, which can be rebutted by nonregistrant's proof of prior use); *see § 549.20[2]* (definitions of trademark, service mark, and like terms in Lanham Act)]. Accordingly, ownership of an unregistered trademark, as well as ownership of a registered mark, is sufficient to establish standing under the Lanham Act [*Halicki Films v. Sanderson Sales & Mktg. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1213, 1226*].

The plaintiff need only show ownership of the mark for any class of products; it is not necessary to show ownership of the mark for a class of products competing directly with the defendant's products. Indeed, competition between the parties' products is not an issue at all, since the crux of an infringement claim is the likelihood of confusion as to the source or sponsorship of products [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1), 1125(a)(1)*; *see also §§ 549.24[2], 549.26[1][a]*], and competition is just one factor to be weighed in determining that issue [*Halicki Films v. Sanderson Sales & Mktg. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1213, 1228*]. The question of whether the products on which the allegedly infringing mark appears are sufficiently related to goods sold by the plaintiff, such that the defendant's actions qualify as infringement, goes to the merits of the plaintiff's claim, not the plaintiff's standing to sue [*Halicki Films v. Sanderson Sales & Mktg. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1213, 1227-1228*].

In addition, a third possible basis for Lanham Act standing is that the plaintiff is a nonowner with a cognizable commercial interest in the allegedly infringed mark, such as merchandising rights respecting trademarked products. If a court determines that the plaintiff in an infringement action cannot establish ownership of the mark through prior use (and therefore does not have standing on that basis), the court must then consider the plaintiff's argument that the plaintiff is a nonowner with a commercial interest in the allegedly misused mark that is likely to be harmed [*Halicki Films v. Sanderson Sales & Mktg. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1213, 1227*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawConveyancesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawConveyancesLicensesTrademark LawProtection of RightsConveyancesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsPriorityTacking

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.23

§ 549.23 Registration of Marks

[1] Purpose

The purpose of trademark registration laws is twofold: to protect the interests not only of those who own and use registered names and marks, but also those of consumers who rely on representations in purchasing goods or services [*Finance Co. of America v. BankAmerica Corp. (D. Md. 1980) 493 F. Supp. 895, 903*].

The Lanham Act provides for the registration of trademarks [*15 U.S.C. § 1051*], service marks [*15 U.S.C. § 1053*], collective marks, and certification marks [*15 U.S.C. § 1054*]. The right to register a mark flows from either actual use of the mark in commerce or a "bona fide intention to use" the mark in commerce [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1051(b)*; *see* [4][a], *below*].

[2] Principal and Supplemental Registers

A mark may be registered on either or both of two registers: the principal register and the supplemental register [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051-1054, 1091*-1096]. The procedural and substantive rights discussed in this chapter relate to marks registered on the principal register, and most of these rights are expressly limited to marks registered on the principal register [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1094*]. Registration of a mark on the supplemental register does not enlarge the substantive rights of the registrant and does not add anything to the common law rights which the registrant owns [*Gilson, Trademark Protection and Practice, Ch. 3, Establishing Trademark Rights, § 3.04[2]* (Matthew Bender); *15 U.S.C. § 1094*]. Registration of a mark on the supplemental register does not preclude registration on the principal register. In addition, registration of a mark on the supplemental register does not constitute an admission that the mark has not acquired distinctiveness [*15 U.S.C. § 1095*].

[3] Evidentiary Effect of Registration

Registration of a mark on the principal register (or under either the Trademark Act of 1881 or the Trademark Act of 1905) and owned by a party to an action is admissible prima facie evidence of the validity of the registered mark and of the registration of the mark, of the registrant's ownership of the mark, and of the validity of the registrant's exclusive

right to use the mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the registration, subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)*].

To the extent that the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under *15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)* [*see* [7], *below*] the registration is conclusive, not merely prima facie, evidence of the validity of the registered mark and of the registration of the mark, of the registrant's ownership of the mark, and of the validity of the registrant's exclusive right to use the mark in commerce. The conclusive evidence relates to the exclusive right to use the mark on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the affidavit of incontestability [*see* [7], *below*] or in the renewal application filed under *15 U.S.C. § 1059* [*see* [11], *below*] if the goods or services specified in the renewal are fewer in number, subject to any conditions or limitations in the registration or affidavit or renewal application. Conclusive evidence of the right to use the registered mark is subject to proof of infringement, as defined in *15 U.S.C. § 1114*, and is subject to the affirmative defenses or defects enumerated in *15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)*; *see § 549.28[1]*].

[4] Application

[a] Based on Actual or Intended Use of Mark

An application to register a trademark is made to the Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(a)(1)*]. Service marks, collective marks, and certification mark are registrable in the same manner and with the same effect as are trademarks [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1053, 1054*].

The owner of a trademark used in commerce may apply to register the trademark by filing a verified application, together with a drawing of the mark and the required number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark, paying the prescribed fee, and complying with any applicable rules or regulations [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(a)*]. The mark must have been in lawful use in commerce [*CreAgri, Inc. v. USANA Health Sciences, Inc. (9th Cir. 2007), 474 F.3d 626, 630* (using mark in commerce, but in violation of FDA-enforced label requirements, could not count as use in commerce sufficient for registration on principal register)].

As an alternative procedure, a person who has a bona fide intention, under circumstances showing the person's good faith, to use a trademark in commerce may apply to register the trademark by filing an application and verified statement paying the prescribed fee, and complying with any applicable rules or regulations [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(b)*]. The applicant must intend to use the mark in the ordinary course of trade and not merely reserve a right in the mark [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1127* ("use in commerce" defined)]. The application must specify, among other things, the goods in connection with which the applicant has a bona fide intention to use the mark, the applicant's domicile and citizenship, and a drawing of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(b)(2)*]. The verified statement must make specified declarations about the legitimacy of the applicant's rights to use the mark and the bona fides of any intention to do so [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(b)(3)*]. Unless the registration is successfully opposed [*see* [5], *below*], a notice of allowance is issued to the applicant. Within six months after issuance of the notice of allowance, the applicant must file a verified statement, containing specific information required by statute, that the mark is in use in commerce, together with the prescribed fee and the number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark required by the Commissioner [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(d)(1)*]. Failure to file a timely statement of use results in abandonment of the application, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unintentional, in which case the time for filing may be extended for a period not to exceed the period specified for filing a statement of use [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(d)(4)*]. However, the Commissioner must, on written request from the applicant before the six-month period expires, extend by an additional six months the time for filing the statement of use. Thereafter, the Commissioner may further extend the time for filing, based on a showing of good cause and satisfaction of other statutory requirements, for additional periods aggregating not more than 24 months [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(d)(2)*]. Subject to examination and acceptance of the statement of use, a certificate of registration is issued [*15 U.S.C. § 1051(d)(1)*; *see* [6][a], *below*].

[b] Constitutes Constructive Use of Mark

Contingent on the registration of a mark on the principal register, the filing of the application to register the mark constitutes constructive use of the mark, conferring a right of priority, nationwide in effect, on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the registration against any other person, except for a person whose mark has not been abandoned and who, prior to filing, has (1) used the mark, (2) filed an application to register the mark that is pending or has resulted in registration of the mark, or (3) filed a foreign application to register the mark on the basis of which he or she has acquired a right of priority, and files an application in a timely manner under *15 U.S.C. § 1126(d)* to register the mark that is pending or has resulted in registration of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(c)*].

[5] Contested Proceedings Objecting to Application

There are three different types of contested trial-type administrative proceedings before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board in connection with an application to register a mark in which the applicant's right to the exclusive use of a mark or the extent of the right to use a mark may be determined. They are opposition, interference, and concurrent use proceedings [*see 15 U.S.C. §§ 1052(d), 1063, 1066, 1067*]. Opposition and interference proceedings are usually based on the likelihood of confusion with other goods or services bearing a mark that has already been federally registered or previously used in the United States or for the registration of which another has previously applied. A mark that when used would cause dilution under 15 U.S.C. § 115(c) may be refused registration only pursuant a proceeding brought under *15 U.S.C. § 1063* [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(a)*]. In each proceeding, the issue is normally priority of use, but the rights of the parties to registration may also be determined [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1063, 1066*; *see Wells Fargo & Co. v. Stagecoach Properties, Inc. (9th Cir. 1982) 685 F.2d 302, 305, 306* ; *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.91(a), 2.96*]. In concurrent use proceedings, concurrent registrations may be issued to more than one person using the same or similar marks if confusion is not likely to result, or if a court has made a final determination that more than one person is entitled to use the same or similar marks [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(d)*]. For a discussion of practice and procedure in these proceedings, see *Gilson, Trademark Protection and Practice, § 3.05* (Matthew Bender).

[6] Certificate of Registration

[a] Issuance

When a mark is registered on the Principal Register, the Patent and Trademark Office issues a certificate of registration to the registrant [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(a)*; *37 C.F.R. § 2.151*]. A record of the registration is kept in the Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(a)*]. On fulfillment of statutorily specified conditions, a certificate may issue to the assignee of an applicant or registrant [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(d)*]. Certificates may be canceled, amended, disclaimed, or corrected [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(e), (g), (h)*; *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.171-2.176*].

[b] Evidentiary Effect of Certificate

The certificate of registration is prima facie evidence of the validity of the registered mark and of the registration of the mark, of the registrant's ownership of the mark, and of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions and limitations stated therein [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(b)*]. Copies of the certificate, as well as copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the Patent and Trademark Office and relating to marks, are evidence when duly authenticated and certified by the Patent and Trademark Office in all cases in which the originals would be evidence [*15 U.S.C. § 1057(f)*].

[c] Duration

A certificate of registration remains in effect for 10 years, except that the registration of any mark will be canceled by the Commissioner for failing to comply with *15 U.S.C. § 1058(b)* on the expiration of the following time period, as applicable:

- For registrations issued pursuant to the Trademark Act of 1946, at the end of six years following the date of registration.

- For registrations published under *15 U.S.C. § 1062(c)* pertaining to registrations under prior laws, at the end of six years following the date of publication.

- For all registrations, at the end of each successive 10-year period following the date of registration.

During the one-year period immediately preceding the end of the applicable time period set forth in *15 U.S.C. § 1058(a)*, the owner of the registration should pay a prescribed fee and file in the Patent and Trademark Office an affidavit setting forth those goods or services recited in the registration on or in connection with which the mark is, alternatively, in use in commerce and such number of specimens or facsimiles showing current use of the mark as may be required by the Commissioner, or not in use in commerce and showing that any such nonuse is due to special circumstances that excuse the nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1058(b)*]. The owner may make the required submissions within a grace period of six months after the end of the applicable time period [*15 U.S.C. § 1058(c)(1)*], and if a submission is deficient, the deficiency may be corrected after the statutory time period and within the time prescribed after notification of the deficiency [*15 U.S.C. § 1058(c)(2)*], provided in each instance a surcharge prescribed by the Commissioner is paid.

15 U.S.C. § 1058, as amended by Pub. L. No. 105-330, § 105, applies to a registration for trademark issued or renewed for a 20-year term if the expiration date of the registration is on or after the effective date of that amendment [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1058*].

[7] Affidavit of Incontestability (Section 15 Affidavit)

Under certain conditions and for certain purposes, a registrant's right to exclusive use of a registered mark may become incontestable. However, a registrant's incontestable right to exclusive use of a registered mark does not preclude cancellation of the mark on any grounds enumerated in *15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)* or *(5)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1065*; *see* [8], *below*]. Incontestability also does not preclude the assertion of the following defenses [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)*]:

- The registration or incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently.

- The mark has been abandoned.

- The registered mark is being used, by or with the permission of the registrant or a person in privity with the registrant, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services on or in connection with which the mark is used.

- The name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is used as other than a trade or service mark (for example, fair use).

- The mark charged to be an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been used continuously from a date prior to (1) the date of constructive use of the mark established pursuant to *15 U.S.C. § 1057(c)* [*see* [4][b], *above*]; (2) the registration of the mark under the Lanham Act if the application of registration is filed before November 16, 1989; or (3) publication of the registered mark under *15 U.S.C. § 1062(c)*.

- The mark charged to be an infringement was registered and used before registration or publication under *15 U.S.C. § 1062(c)* of the registrant's mark and has not been abandoned.

- The mark has been or is being used to violate federal antitrust laws.
- Equitable principles, including laches, estoppel, and acquiescence, are applicable.

A registrant initiates this statutory benefit by filing an affidavit with the Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1065(3)*; *see 37 C.F.R. § 2.167* (contents of affidavit)].

The affidavit may be filed within the year following any period of five consecutive years subsequent to registration during which the mark has been, and still is, continuously used in commerce in connection with the goods or services specified in the registration [*15 U.S.C. § 1065(3)*].

In addition to filing the affidavit, there must be no final decision adverse to the registrant's claim of ownership in the mark as to the goods or services for which incontestability is sought, or adverse to the registrant's right to either register or keep its mark on the register [*15 U.S.C. § 1065(1)*; *see Robi v. Five Platters, Inc. (9th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 1439, 1444*]. Additionally, there must be no proceeding pending involving these rights in either the Patent and Trademark Office or in a court and not finally disposed of [*15 U.S.C. § 1065(2)*]. No right of incontestability can be acquired in a generic mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1065(4)*].

Any false statements made in the affidavit may jeopardize not only the incontestability claim but also the underlying registration. Filing a fraudulent incontestability affidavit provides a basis for canceling the registration itself [*Robi v. Five Platters, Inc. (9th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 1439, 1444*].

A descriptive mark that has become incontestable is conclusively presumed to have acquired secondary meaning [*see § 549.21[4][b]* (discussion of effect of secondary meaning)]. In other words, a defendant in a trademark infringement action cannot assert that an incontestable mark is invalid because it is descriptive and lacks secondary meaning. Moreover, when the holder of an incontestable mark is complaining that the most salient feature of its mark (but not the mark itself) is being imitated and that a likelihood of confusion may result, the holder of the mark does not have to show that the salient feature, apart from the mark, has acquired secondary meaning. Rather, the conclusive presumption that the mark has acquired secondary meaning extends to the most salient feature of the mark [*KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 408 F.3d 596, 606*].

[8] Cancellation

[a] In General

Any person who believes that he or she is or will be damaged by registration of a mark on the Principal Register may petition to cancel registration of a mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1064*]. Cancellation is available only within certain time limits and against certain marks [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1064*].

The legal issue in a cancellation proceeding is the right to register a mark [*Flavor Corporation of America v. Kemin Industries, Inc. (8th Cir. 1974) 493 F.2d 275, 279*]. A trademark owner who misses the opportunity to institute opposition proceedings against a pending registration may still avail itself of the remedy of cancellation of the offending registered mark [*Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. v. Commissioner of Patents (D.D.C. 1965) 238 F. Supp. 509, 511*].

The Lanham Act requires only that, in order to establish standing, the petitioner must plead and prove facts showing a real interest in the proceeding. No simple test can be applied for what must be proved. The petitioner must be more than an intermeddler with a personal interest, and there must be a real controversy between the parties. Allegations alone do not establish standing. The petitioner must show a real and rational basis for believing that, unless the registration in question is canceled, harm will ensue to the petitioner, stemming from an actual commercial or pecuniary interest in the

petitioner's own mark. Interest assertions will vary with the facts surrounding each cancellation dispute; therefore, a petitioner's standing must be scrutinized case by case [*Halicki Films v. Sanderson Sales & Mktg. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1213, 1229-1230*].

[b] Time Limits

Cancellation of a mark registered under the Lanham Act is available only within five years of the date of registration of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(1)*].

If the mark was registered under a prior trademark act, cancellation is available only within five years of the date of publication of the mark, but if the mark has not been published or its registration was obtained in any manner contrary to statute, cancellation is available at any time [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1062(c), 1064(2)*-(4)].

[c] Grounds for Cancellation

Cancellation of any mark registered under either the Lanham Act or prior trademark acts, including a mark that has achieved incontestability status, is available at any time on the following grounds [*15 U.S.C. § 1064*; *Sterling Brewers, Inc. v. Schenley Industries, Inc. (C.C.P.A. 1971) 441 F.2d 675, 677*]:

- The mark becomes generic [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)*].

- The mark is abandoned [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)*].

- The mark's registration is obtained fraudulently [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)*; *see Robi v. Five Platters, Inc. (9th Cir. 1990) 918 F.2d 1439, 1444* (required showing for cancellation of registered mark on basis of fraud)].

- The mark's registration is obtained contrary to the provisions for registration of collective and certification marks [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1054, 1064(3)*].

- The mark consists of immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter, or of matter that may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons (living or dead), institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into disrepute [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1052(a), 1064(3)*].

- The mark consists of (or any simulation of) the flag, coat of arms, or other insignia of the United States, any state or municipality, or of any foreign nation [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1052(b), 1064(3)*].

- The mark consists of a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual without the individual's written consent [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1052(c), 1064(3)*].

- The mark consists of the name, signature, or portrait of a deceased president of the United States during the life of his or her surviving spouse without the written consent of the surviving spouse [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1052(c), 1064(3)*].

- The mark is being used by or with the permission of the registrant so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used [*15 U.S.C. § 1064(3)*].

- The mark would be likely to cause dilution of a famous mark by blurring or tarnishment under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(f)*].

[d] Procedure

A cancellation proceeding is commenced by the timely filing of a petition for cancellation together with the required fee in the Patent and Trademark Office [*37 C.F.R. § 2.111*]. A cancellation proceeding is a contested, trial-type, administrative proceeding conducted before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board [*15 U.S.C. § 1067*]. For a discussion of practice and procedure in cancellation proceedings, see *Gilson, Trademark Protection and Practice, §§ 3.05, 8.12* (Matthew Bender).

In any action involving a registered mark, a court may order the cancellation of a mark's registration, in whole or in part [*15 U.S.C. § 1119*; *see Gracie v. Gracie (9th Cir. 2000) 217 F.3d 1060, 1066* (trial court is required to order cancellation of registered mark if court does not reject jury verdict that mark was invalid)]. The registration may be canceled by direct attack, or by collateral attack in any action in which the validity of a mark is properly in issue [*Dymo Industries, Inc. v. Tapeprinter, Inc. (9th Cir. 1964) 326 F.2d 141, 143* ; *see Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. P.J. Rhodes & Co. (9th Cir. 1984) 735 F.2d 346, 348* ; *Duggan's Funeral Service, Inc. v. Duggan's Serra Mortuary, Inc. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 151, 158-159, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 253* (federally registered trademark was properly ordered to be canceled in superior court action based on trademark infringement and unfair competition)].

[9] Administrative Appeal

Any applicant may appeal a final decision of the examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board [*15 U.S.C. § 1070*; *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.141-2.144*].

[10] Judicial Review

Any applicant, party to an inter partes proceeding, registrant who has filed a Section 8 affidavit of continuous use or excusable nonuse [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1058*], or applicant for registration renewal may, if dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner or the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, appeal either to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or commence a civil action in U.S. district court [*15 U.S.C. § 1071(a),(b)*]. If a party opts for appeal and an adverse party then elects to have all further proceedings conducted in a civil action in the district court, the appeal must be dismissed, and the appellant then has 30 days within which to file an action in district court, in default of which the decision appealed from governs further proceedings in the case [*15 U.S.C. § 1071(a)(1)*]. Venue in the district court action lies in accordance with general statutory provisions for venue in the federal courts, unless there are adverse parties residing in a plurality of districts not embraced by the same state, or an adverse party residing in a foreign country, in which case venue lies in the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia [*15 U.S.C. § 1071(b)(4)*; *Besuner v. Faberge, Incorporated (N.D. Ohio 1974) 379 F. Supp. 278, 279* ; *see 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b),(c)* (venue in federal courts)].

[11] Renewal

A registration may be renewed for successive 10-year periods on payment of a prescribed fee and filing of a verified renewal application [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1059, 1113*]. A renewal application may be filed at any time within one year before the end of each successive 10-year period, or it may be made within a six-month grace period after the end of each such period on payment of a fee and surcharge [*15 U.S.C. § 1059(a)*]. Any deficiency in an application may be corrected within the time prescribed, after notification and on payment any surcharge. If the renewal of a registration is refused, the registrant must be notified as to the reasons [*15 U.S.C. § 1059(b)*]. Department of Commerce regulations provide for the renewal of registrations granted under previous trademark acts [*37 C.F.R. § 2.181*]. The regulations also provide detailed instructions as to the contents of renewal applications and for procedure on refusal of a renewal application [*37 C.F.R. §§ 2.183, 2.184*].

[12] Nonregistrable Marks

[a] Statutory Exclusions

The Lanham Act prohibits registration on the principal register of the following types of marks:

- Any mark consisting of immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter; or of matter that may disparage, bring into contempt or disrepute, or falsely suggest a connection with persons (living or dead), institutions, beliefs, or national symbols [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(a)*].

- Any mark consisting of, or any simulation of, the flag, coat of arms, or other insignia of the United States, any state or municipality, or any foreign nation [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(b)*].

- Any mark consisting of a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual, except by his or her written consent; or the name, signature, or portrait of a deceased U.S. President during the life of his or her surviving spouse, if any, except by the written consent of the surviving spouse [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(c)*].

- Any mark, other than one for which concurrent registrations have issued, so resembling either a mark previously registered or a mark or trade name previously used in the United States by another, not abandoned in either case, as to be likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception when used on or in connection with the applicant's goods [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1052(d)*; *see § 549.23[5]*].

- Any mark that, when used on or in connection with the applicant's goods, has no secondary meaning and is merely a surname, merely descriptive (or deceptively misdescriptive) of those goods, or primarily geographically descriptive of those goods [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1052(e)(1), (2), (4), (f)*; *see also § 549.21[4]*].

- Any mark that, when used on or in connection with the applicant's goods, is "primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive," unless the mark became distinctive of the applicant's goods in commerce (that is, acquired secondary meaning) before December 8, 1993 [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1052(e)(3), (f)*].

An applicant for registration on the principal register may be required to, or may voluntarily, disclaim an unregistrable component of a mark otherwise registrable [*15 U.S.C. § 1056(a)*]. The effect of this disclaimer is to disavow any exclusive right to the use of a specified word, phrase, or design outside of its use within a composite mark [*In re Franklin Press, Inc. (C.C.P.A. 1979) 597 F.2d 270, 273*]. Disclaimer does not otherwise prejudice or affect an applicant's present or future rights in the disclaimed material [*15 U.S.C. § 1056(b)*].

A mark that would be likely to cause dilution of a famous mark by blurring or by tarnishment under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)* (definitions)] may be refused registration, but only pursuant to an opposition proceeding brought under *15 U.S.C. § 1063* [*15 U.S.C. § 1052(f)*].

[b] Color

While the courts have traditionally held that color alone cannot be registered as a trademark, the Lanham Act permits the registration of color alone as a trademark if that color has attained a secondary meaning [*Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Products Co. (1995) 514 U.S. 159, 163-164, 115 S. Ct. 1300, 131 L. Ed. 2d 248* ; *see In re Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp. (Fed. Cir. 1985) 774 F.2d 1116, 1127-1128* (color pink could be registered as trademark for insulation when trademark applicant had invested large sums in advertising its pink insulation and when there was no competitive need for others to use that color)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationFederal RegistrationTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationIncontestabilityGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationPower of CourtsTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationPrincipal RegisterTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationSupplemental RegisterTrademark LawU.S. Trademark Trial & Appeal Board ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.24

§ 549.24 Infringement of Registered Marks

[1] Confusion, Mistake, or Deception

Any person who, without the registrant's consent, uses in commerce any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a registered mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, or advertising of any goods or services, which in connection with that use is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception, is liable in a civil action for infringement by the mark's owner [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a)*].

Any person who, without the registrant's consent, reproduces, counterfeits, copies, or colorably imitates a registered mark and applies the reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation to labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles or advertisements intended to be used in commerce in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, or advertising of goods or services and which, used in those connections is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception, is liable in a civil action for infringement by the mark's owner [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(b)*]. However, the registrant may not recover profits or damages in such an action unless the infringing acts are committed with knowledge that the imitation is intended to be used to cause confusion, mistake, or deception [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(b)*].

Usually an infringement action is commenced by the holder of a well-known trademark in order to squelch an opportunistic use of a lesser-known similar mark. However, in an appropriate case, the plaintiff may be the holder of the lesser-known (but senior) trademark and be motivated by a genuine anxiety about the possible deleterious effects of confusion of the marks in the minds of potential customers [*see, e.g., Dreamwerks Production Group, Inc. v. SKG Studio (9th Cir. 1998) 142 F.3d 1127, 1128-1132* (plaintiff, which conducted relatively small convention-management business using science-fiction and adventure themes under senior trademark "Dreamwerks," had viable cause of action against major entertainment company doing business under junior trademark "DreamWorks SKG," and district court erred in granting defendant's motion for summary judgment)]. Thus, in the Ninth Circuit, courts will recognize two distinct kinds of claims in the trademark infringement context: claims based on "forward confusion" and claims based on "reverse confusion." Forward confusion occurs when consumers believe that goods bearing the junior mark came from, or were sponsored by, the senior mark holder. In the senior mark holder's infringement action on a forward

confusion claim, therefore, to avoid an adverse summary judgment, the senior mark holder must raise a material question of fact regarding whether the buying public thought that the senior mark holder was either the source of, or was sponsoring, the junior mark holder's product line. Reverse confusion occurs when consumers dealing with the senior mark holder believe that they are doing business with the junior one. Therefore, to survive a summary judgment motion on a reverse confusion claim, the senior mark holder would have to raise a question of material fact as to whether consumers believed that the junior mark holder was either the source of, or was a sponsor of, the senior mark holder's wares [*Surfvivor Media, Inc. v. Survivor Prods. (9th Cir. 2005) 406 F.3d 625, 630*]. In reverse confusion cases, the inquiry focuses on the strength of the junior mark, which is closely related to how much the market is saturated by the junior mark [M2 *Software, Inc. v. Madacy Entm't (9th Cir. 2005) 421 F.3d 1073, 1089*].

For a complaint asserting a cause of action for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark, see *§ 549.91*.

[2] Likelihood of Confusion

[a] Marks Used in Commerce Generally

The test in an infringement suit under the Lanham Act is whether defendant's use of a given mark creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source of the goods or services offered in the mind of the average consumer [*15 U.S.C. § 1114*; *Westinghouse Elec. v. Gen. Circuit Breaker & Elec. (9th Cir. 1997) 106 F.3d 894, 899-900* (copying of mark is not necessary element of infringement claim, which may be based on defendant's confusing use of plaintiff's actual mark); *Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (N.D. Cal. 1977) 437 F. Supp. 956, 963 , aff'd, 646 F.2d 347 (9th Cir. 1980)*]. In determining whether likelihood of confusion exists, courts in the Ninth Circuit should consider the following, non-exclusive factors [*Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 1385, 1391* ; *see Mallard Creek Industries, Inc. v. Morgan (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 426, 434-438, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 461* (identical factors are applied under California law)], which are commonly known as the *Sleekcraft* factors [*see AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341* , 348-349, *abrogated in part on other grounds, Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*]:

- The strength of the plaintiff's mark.
- The proximity of the plaintiff's and defendant's goods or services.
- The similarity of the marks.
- Any evidence of actual confusion.
- The types of marketing channels used--and particularly whether the Internet is a marketing channel [*see § 549.24[2][b]*].
- The type of goods and degree of care likely to be exercised by purchasers.
- The defendant's intent in selecting the mark.
- The likelihood of expansion of product lines.

Unless properly used, this long list of factors has the potential to befuddle the inquiry. The list of factors is not a scorecard--whether a party "wins" a majority of the factors is not the point. Nor should the factors be rigidly weighed. Some factors are much more helpful than others, and the relative importance of each individual factor will be case-specific. It is often possible to reach a conclusion with respect to likelihood of confusion after considering only a subset of the factors [*Thane Int'l, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 305 F.3d 894, 901*]. However, while a

likelihood-of-confusion determination ultimately may rest on a subset of factors, evidence of relatively important factors must be considered as part of that set. In the context of two subjectively dissimilar marks, evidence of actual confusion and evidence defining the context in which the goods are sold is particularly relevant [*Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 518 F.3d 628, 632-633, 637*]. Although it may be true that very dissimilar marks will rarely present a significant likelihood of confusion, dissimilarity alone does not obviate the need to inquire into evidence of other important factors. Only on such an inquiry may a court ensure that its judgment as to the likelihood of confusion is fully informed and without error [*Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 518 F.3d 628, 633-634*].

The Lanham Act's "likelihood of confusion" standard is predominantly factual in nature. Therefore, summary judgment for the defendant (junior mark holder) would be inappropriate when a jury could reasonably conclude that most of the *Sleekcraft* factors weigh in favor of the plaintiff (senior mark holder). Granting a motion for summary judgment based on only one factor (or fewer than most of the factors) would be an abuse of discretion [*Wendt v. Host Int'l, Inc. (9th Cir. 1997) 125 F.3d 806, 812*]. On the other hand, a court may properly grant a motion for summary judgment in favor of the defendant if, in opposing the motion for summary judgment, the plaintiff fails to produce any admissible evidence tending to show a likelihood of confusion, or fails to address any of the *Sleekcraft* factors required for a likelihood-of-confusion analysis [*Applied Info Scis. Corp. v. Inc. (9th Cir. 2007) 511 F.3d 966, 973*], or if an analysis of the *Sleekcraft* factors supports the conclusion that there is no triable issue as to the likelihood of confusion [*M2 Software, Inc. v. Madacy Entm't (9th Cir. 2005) 421 F.3d 1073, 1080*].

Likelihood of confusion, and thus infringement, is established when the competing marks are similar in appearance, sound, or meaning; the marketing channels and trade areas overlap; plaintiff's mark is relatively strong; and the class of goods or services involved is similar. Evidence of actual confusion is strong evidence that future confusion is likely, but the absence of such evidence is not dispositive [*Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 1385, 1393*]. For discussion of the classification of marks according to relative strength or weakness, see *§ 549.21[2]*.

Although intent is not a required element of proof in an infringement suit, when an infringer knowingly adopts a mark similar to another's, reviewing courts presume that defendant can accomplish its purpose and that the public will be deceived [*Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 1385, 1394* ; *Pacific Telesis v. International Telesis (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1364, 1369* ; *AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 354* , *abrogated in part on other grounds, Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 810 n.19*].

The rubric "likelihood of confusion" encompasses what is called initial-interest confusion, that is, customer confusion that creates initial interest in a competitor's product. Although it might be dispelled before an actual sale occurred, initial interest confusion impermissibly capitalizes on the goodwill associated with a mark and is therefore actionable trademark infringement [*Playboy Enters. v. Netscape Communs. Corp. (9th Cir. 2004) 354 F.3d 1020, 1025*].

[b] Marks Used in Internet Marketing

When the plaintiff and the defendant both use the Internet as a marketing channel, case law in the Ninth Circuit holds that three of the *Sleekcraft* factors [*see § 549.24[2][a]*] predominate, namely (1) the similarity of the parties' marks, (2) the relatedness (or proximity) of the parties' goods or services, and (3) the parties' simultaneous use of the Internet as a marketing channel. Therefore, if the two marks are confusingly similar, and the goods or services offered by the plaintiff and defendant are related, and both the plaintiff and the defendant use the Internet as a marketing channel, then the trier of fact should find that the plaintiff has proved a likelihood of confusion, unless the remaining factors weigh strongly in the defendant's favor [*Internet Specialties West, Inc. v. Milon-Digiorgio Enters. (9th Cir. 2009) 559 F.3d 985, 989]* . In the Ninth Circuit, those three factors sometimes are called the "Internet troika" in cases in which the Internet is used as a marketing channel.

[3] Innocently Infringing Printer, Publisher, or Distributor

If an infringer is engaged solely in the business of printing the mark for others and establishes that he or she was an innocent infringer, the owner of the right infringed may only obtain an injunction against future printing, and not monetary relief, against that particular infringer [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(A)*].

Moreover, if the infringement complained of is contained in or is part of paid advertising matter in a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, or in an electronic communication as defined in *18 U.S.C. § 2510(12)* (radio, television, and other transmissions affecting interstate or foreign commerce), the remedies of the owner of the right infringed as against the innocently infringing publisher or distributor is limited to an injunction against the presentation of the advertising matter in future issues of the periodical or in future transmissions of the electronic communication. In addition, injunctive relief in respect of an issue of a periodical or transmission of an electronic communication is not available if it would delay the delivery of the particular issue or transmission after its regular time of delivery, when the delay would be due to the method by which the publication and distribution is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not due to any method adopted to evade *15 U.S.C. § 1114* or to prevent or delay issuance of an injunction or restraining order with respect to the infringing matter [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(B),(C)*].

[4] Jurisdiction

The U.S. district courts and the state courts have concurrent jurisdiction in all actions arising under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1121*; *28 U.S.C. § 1338(a)*]. Thus, an action may, but need not, be brought in U.S. district court. Neither diversity of citizenship nor a specific amount in controversy is required for federal court jurisdiction of Lanham Act cases [*15 U.S.C. § 1121*].

The United States, all agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and all individuals, firms, corporations or other persons acting for the United States with authorization and consent, are not immune from suit in federal or state courts by any person for a violation of the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1122(a)*]. States, their instrumentalities, and officers or employees acting within the scope of official duty, also are not immune from suit in federal court [*15 U.S.C. § 1122(b)*], whether under the *Eleventh Amendment* or any other doctrine of sovereign immunity.

A plaintiff in an infringement suit bears the burden both of making an initial prima facie showing of jurisdictional facts at the pleading stage and of proving those facts by a preponderance of the evidence at trial [*Wells Fargo & Co. v. Wells Fargo Exp. Co. (9th Cir. 1977) 556 F.2d 406, 430 n.24*].

A district court generally should not decline to accept jurisdiction of a trademark declaratory relief action, on primary jurisdiction grounds, pending the completion of related proceedings before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (TTAB). Some situations might justify declining to accept jurisdiction of a declaratory-relief action when related TTAB proceedings are pending; specifically, when the district-court action involves only the issue of whether a mark is entitled to registration, it might make more sense to resolve the registration claims at the TTAB first. On the other hand, if the purpose of the declaratory relief action is to preclude a potential infringement claim, that situation would require the district court to resolve many or all of the related registration issues, and it would waste everyone's time not to settle the registration issues in district court. The deciding factor should be efficiency; the district court should accept jurisdiction if that course is more efficient [*Rhoades v. Avon Prods. (9th Cir. 2007) 504 F.3d 1151, 1162, 1164-1165*].

In the event of a trademark infringement claim against a member of an Indian tribe, a question could arise regarding whether a tribal court might have jurisdiction. The jurisdictional issue could be difficult to resolve if the infringing activity occurred entirely on land within the tribe's reservation. However, when the holder of a federally registered trademark asserted a claim against a member of an Indian tribe for trademark infringement through worldwide Internet sales and off-reservation sales--that is, when the infringement claim was based on activities beyond the reservation boundary--the tribal court was held not to have jurisdiction [*Philip Morris USA, Inc. v. King Mt. Tobacco Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 552 F.3d 1098, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 907, at *27-*32* (tribe members, acting through corporation created under tribal law, produced cigarettes in packages similar to famous Marlboro brand's packaging, which were sold and

shipped to off-reservation buyers through websites and by mail)].

[5] Monetary Relief

[a] In General

The prevailing plaintiff in an infringement action must be awarded, subject to the provisions of *15 U.S.C. §§ 1111* and *1114* and subject to the principles of equity, defendant's profits, plaintiff's damages, and costs of the action [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*]. *15 U.S.C. § 1111* provides that if a registrant does not display along with its mark, notice that the mark is registered, the registrant cannot recover profits or damages unless the defendant has actual notice of the registration [*15 U.S.C. § 1111*]. For discussion of *15 U.S.C. § 1114*, see *§ 549.24[1]* and *[3]*.

In assessing profits, plaintiff need only prove defendant's sales. In assessing damages, the court may award an amount up to three times the amount of plaintiff's actual damages. Plaintiff is entitled to its costs in the action if it prevails [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*]. The fact that the defendant did not profit from an infringement does not preclude the plaintiff from recovering damages [*Intel Corp. v. Terabyte Int'l (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 614, 621*]. The court may also award damages pursuant to the Lanham Act in addition to damages provided under other statutes [*Nintendo of America, Inc. v. Dragon Pacific Int'l (9th Cir. 1994) 40 F.3d 1007, 1011*] (treble damages awarded under the Lanham Act in addition to statutory damages under copyright law for sales which simultaneously infringed plaintiff's copyright and trademark).

In exceptional cases, a court may award reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing party [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*]. An award of attorney's fees has been generally considered discretionary even if the award fits within the statutory standard of an exceptional case. Although *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* contains no definition of "exceptional cases," in the Ninth Circuit, these cases involve conduct that is extraordinary, malicious, fraudulent, deliberate, willful, wanton, or oppressive [*Intel Corp. v. Terabyte Int'l (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 614, 621* ; *International Olympic Committee v. San Francisco Arts & Athletics (9th Cir. 1986) 781 F.2d 733, 738 , aff'd on other grounds, 483 U.S. 522 (1987)* (action for injunctive relief under former *36 U.S.C. § 380*, now *36 U.S.C. § 220506*, and seeking attorney's fees under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*); *Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1026* (action for injunctive relief and damages for false designation of origin under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* and seeking attorney's fees under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*)]. Additionally, in assessing an award under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*, a court should examine both the reasonableness of and the necessity for time spent in a given case [*Intel Corp. v. Terabyte Int'l (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 614, 623* ; *International Olympic Committee v. San Francisco Arts & Athletics (9th Cir. 1986) 781 F.2d 733, 739 , aff'd on other grounds, 483 U.S. 522 (1987)* ; *see, e.g., Earthquake Sound Corp. v. Bumper Indus. (9th Cir. 2003) 352 F.3d 1210, 1220* (district court did not abuse discretion in awarding attorney's fees to plaintiff after successful motion for summary judgment; also, plaintiff was entitled to award of further fees after successfully responding to defendant's appeal from district court's order awarding fees)].

In a case involving both Lanham Act claims and non-Lanham Act claims, the prevailing party can recover fees under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* only for work related to the Lanham Act claims. Apportionment of the total fees requested, between the Lanham Act work and the non-Lanham Act work, is required--even though the result could be somewhat inexact, depending on the relevant facts--unless the Lanham Act claims and non-Lanham Act claims are inextricably intertwined and the court finds that even an estimated adjustment would be meaningless [*Gracie v. Gracie (9th Cir. 2000) 217 F.3d 1060, 1069-1070* (case was remanded for apportionment as well as development of adequate record to establish reasonableness of total fee award)].

When the complaint alleges facts sufficient to support the conclusion that the defendant's conduct was extraordinary, malicious, fraudulent, deliberate, willful, wanton, or oppressive, then if the court enters the defendant's default and awards attorney's fees to the plaintiff, the plaintiff's entitlement to attorney's fees (but not the appropriate amount) is thus established, because in consequence of the default, all well-pleaded allegations in the complaint must be taken as true [*Derek Andrew, Inc. v. Poof Apparel Corp. (9th Cir. 2008) 528 F.3d 696, 702*].

[b] Counterfeit Mark

When a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a)* (counterfeit marks) or *36 U.S.C. § 220506* (relating to use of Olympic name and logos) consists of intentionally using a mark or designation, knowing that the mark or designation is a counterfeit mark (as defined in *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)*; *see § 549.24[7]*), in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods or services, the court, unless it finds extenuating circumstances, must enter judgment for three times the defendant's profits or plaintiff's damages, whichever is greater, together with a reasonable attorney's fee in assessing damages under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*. An offer to sell is sufficient, without more, to establish liability, and such an offer could not be protected under the *First Amendment* as legitimate commercial speech because the underlying transaction (selling counterfeit goods) would be unlawful [*Levi Strauss & Co. v. Shilon (9th Cir. 1997) 121 F.3d 1309, 1312-1313* (plaintiff obtained injunction together with award of attorney's fees and investigation costs; defendant had offered to produce and sell, but never actually possessed, counterfeit goods)]. The court may award prejudgment interest on the amount [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(b)*]. At any time before final judgment is rendered, the plaintiff may elect for the court to award statutory damages instead of the actual damage and profits awardable under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)*]. If the court finds that the use of the counterfeit mark was willful, the court may award up to $2 million for each type of goods sold or offered for sale under each counterfeit mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)(2)*].

[6] Injunctive Relief

In an infringement action, a court has discretion to grant an injunction according to equitable principles, and on such terms as it deems reasonable to prevent the violation of any right of the registrant, or to prevent a violation under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* or *(c)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*]. However, whereas the scope of an injunction is initially left to the discretion of the trial court, an injunction will not be awarded if any lesser relief will protect the owner of the mark [*International Olympic Committee v. San Francisco Arts & Athletics (9th Cir. 1986) 781 F.2d 733, 737 , aff'd on other grounds, 483 U.S. 522 (1987)*]. Any injunction may include a provision directing defendant to file with the court and serve on plaintiff a report in writing and under oath setting forth the manner and form in which defendant has complied with the terms of the injunction. Any injunction so issued is enforceable by proceedings to punish for contempt, or otherwise [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*].

Once a court has enjoined the infringement of a trademark--for example, if the court ordered the defendant to cease and desist from making, distributing, selling, or advertising any product that was a simulation, reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the plaintiff's trademarked design--the court may enforce its decree in a contempt proceeding. The plaintiff, having already obtained a judgment establishing that the defendant infringed the plaintiff's trademark, is not required to muster all of the evidence that would be needed to make out an original infringement case, in order to prove contempt. For example, in order to establish a violation of the decree based on the defendant making and selling a colorable imitation, the plaintiff need not prove the same likelihood of consumer confusion that would be required in an original infringement case. The defendant cannot be allowed to make minimal changes in the offending product in order to test the outer boundaries of the judgment; the defendant has a duty to stay well away from the plaintiff's trademark. If the defendant crosses that line, the court would not abuse its discretion by holding the defendant in contempt [*Wolfard Glassblowing Co. v. Vanbragt (9th Cir. 1997) 118 F.3d 1320, 1322-1323*].

[7] Seizure of Goods and Counterfeit Marks

As used in *15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*, a "counterfeit" is a spurious mark that is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a mark registered on either the principal or the supplemental register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*]. As used in *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)*, the term "counterfeit mark" is further defined to mean either of the following:

- A counterfeit of a mark that is registered on the principal register for goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed and that is in use, whether or not the person against whom relief is sought knew

the mark was registered [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(B)(i)*].

- A spurious designation that is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a symbol, emblem, trademark, trade name, or insignia of the U.S. or International Olympic Committee [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(B)(ii)*; *36 U.S.C. § 220506*].

However, the term "counterfeit mark" does not include any mark or designation used on or in connection with goods or services if the manufacturer or producer was, at the time of manufacture or production, authorized to use the mark or designation for the type of goods or services so manufactured or produced, by the holder of the right to use the mark or designation [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(B)*].

A court, on ex parte application by a plaintiff in an infringement action under *15 U.S.C. § 1114(1)(a)* or an action under *36 U.S.C. § 220506*, involving use of a counterfeit mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods or services, may grant an order providing for the seizure of goods and counterfeit marks involved, together with the means of making the marks, and records documenting the manufacture, sale, or receipt of items involved in the actions [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*]. The application for the order must be based on an affidavit or on the verified complaint establishing facts sufficient to support the findings of fact and conclusions of law required for the order [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(3)(A)*; *see §§ 549.101, 549.102*].

A U.S. district court's denial of a motion for an ex parte seizure order would not be appealable under *28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1)* (appeal from interlocutory orders) because it would be neither an automatically appealable literal refusal of an injunction nor a practical denial of ultimate injunctive relief [*In re Lorillard Tobacco Co. (9th Cir. 2004) 370 F.3d 982, 983* (seizure order cannot be characterized as injunction)].

A person who suffers damage by reason of a wrongful seizure has a cause of action against the applicant for the order under which seizure was made and is entitled to recover appropriate relief, including damages, punitive damages, and reasonable attorney's fees [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(11)*].

[8] Equitable Relief

[a] Destruction of Goods

A court may order delivery to the court and destruction of any material in defendant's possession bearing the registered mark or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of mark. The court also may order that all means of making the mark, or reproductions, counterfeits, copies, and imitations be delivered to the court and destroyed [*15 U.S.C. § 1118*]. The party seeking an order under *15 U.S.C. § 1118* for destruction of articles seized under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)* must give 10 days notice to the United States attorney for the judicial district in which the order is sought (unless good cause is shown for lesser notice). If destruction may affect evidence of an offense against the United States, the United States attorney may seek a hearing on destruction or participate in any hearing otherwise to be held with respect to the destruction [*15 U.S.C. § 1118*; for discussion of *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)*, *see §§ 549.101, 549.102*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawInfringement ActionsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsJurisdictionGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsRemediesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawLikelihood of ConfusionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.25

§ 549.25 Remedy for Fraudulent Registration

Any person who procures registration of a mark by a false or fraudulent declaration or representation, oral or written, or by any false means, is liable in a civil action by any person injured thereby for any damages sustained [*15 U.S.C. § 1120*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationFraudulent Registration

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.26

§ 549.26 Action Under Lanham Act Section 43(a) for Improper Use of Mark or False Description, Representation, or Designation of Origin (Unfair Competition)

[1] General Statutory Prohibition Against Conduct Likely to Cause Confusion, Mistake, or Deception

[a] In General

Lanham Act Section 43(a) (*15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*) provides, in part, that any person who uses in commerce any word, term, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof, or any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact on or in connection with any goods, services, or container for goods is liable in a civil action if the use is likely to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the user with another person, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of his or her goods, services, or commercial activities by another person. The action may be brought by any person who believes he or she is likely to be damaged by such use [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(A)*]. It is evident from the plain language of the statute, in its definition of the term "any person," that Congress intended to authorize suits against state officials, as well as suits against private persons, under the Lanham Act [*Sofamor Danek Group, Inc. v. Brown (9th Cir. 1997) 124 F.3d 1179, 1185* ; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(2)* ("As used in this subsection, the term 'any person' includes any State, instrumentality of a State or employee of a State or instrumentality of a State acting in his or her official capacity. Any State, and any such instrumentality, officer, or employee, shall be subject to the provisions of this chapter in the same manner and to the same extent as any nongovernmental entity.")].

In a complaint under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)* seeking to hold a defendant liable for representing to others that someone (such as the plaintiff) infringed the defendant's patent, the plaintiff must show, in addition to the circumstances contemplated by the statute, that the defendant's representation was made in bad faith. The purpose of this bad-faith requirement is to permit a patent holder to assert rights in good faith without fear that doing so might violate the Lanham Act or state tort laws. This requirement for a showing of bad faith has been held to apply not only to the patent holder but also to persons who act in concert to enforce the patent holder's rights, such as attorneys who draft letters and wholesale distributors who forward those letters to retailers on the patent holder's behalf [*Fisher Tool Co. v. Gillet Outillage (9th Cir. 2008) 530 F.3d 1063, 1068-1069* (at defendant's direction, attorney prepared letters, addressed "To Whom It May Concern," expressing attorney's "strong opinion" that plaintiff's pliers infringed defendant's patent and

threatening that defendant would sue anyone who sold plaintiff's pliers; defendant's U.S. distributor forwarded these letters to its customers; plaintiff alleged that patent infringement claim was false but failed to allege that it was made in bad faith)].

Lanham Act Section 43(a) encompasses a broader range of unfair practices than does an action for trademark infringement under *15 U.S.C. § 1114* [*Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623*]. As further discussed below, it encompasses common-law unfair competition actions for "passing off" and "reverse passing off" [*see Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1437*], as well as actions for infringement of unregistered trademarks and "trade dress" [*see Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623, 625*].

However, Section 43(a) does not have boundless application as a remedy for unfair trade practices. It is not a codification of the law of unfair competition, but can apply only to the kinds of unfair trade practices prohibited by its text [*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 27* ; *see, e.g., Freecycle Network, Inc. v. Oey (9th Cir. 2007) 505 F.3d 898, 904-905* ("trademark disparagement" is not actionable under Section 43(a), although *product* disparagement or trademark *infringement* could be actionable)].

The Lanham Act contains no provision preventing the use of a trademarked term in its generic sense, nor does the Lanham Act prevent an individual from expressing an opinion that a mark should be considered generic or from encouraging others to use the mark in its generic sense. Rather, the use of a mark in its generic sense is actionable under the Lanham Act only when that use also satisfies the elements of a specified cause of action (such as infringement, false designation of origin, false advertising, or dilution). A mark owner's mere disagreement with an individual's opinion that the mark should be considered generic and frustration with the individual's activities in support of that opinion would not render the individual liable under the Lanham Act [*Freecycle Network, Inc. v. Oey (9th Cir. 2007) 505 F.3d 898, 906*].

[b] Passing Off or Reverse Passing Off

The statutory references to the "origin" of goods or services or commercial activities [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1152(a)*] covers the origin of production as well as geographic origin [*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 27*]. Thus, the cause of action for false designation of origin under Lanham Act Section 43(a) encompasses the common law action for passing off [*Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1021*]. Regardless of the type of activity sought to be remedied, the actionable conduct must be not only unfair but also, in some discernible way, competitive [*see Halicki v. United Artists Communications, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 812 F.2d 1213, 1214*].

The most natural understanding of the phrase "origin of goods" as used in Section 43(a) is that it connotes the source of wares; therefore, the phrase refers to the person who is the producer of some tangible product sold in the marketplace. Moreover, the phrase is incapable of connoting a person or entity that originated whatever ideas or communications the goods may embody or contain [*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 28-29* ("such an extension [to an originator of embodied ideas] would not only stretch the text, but it would be out of accord with the history and purpose of the Lanham Act and inconsistent with precedent.")]. "The consumer who buys a branded product does not automatically assume that the brand-name company is the same entity that came up with the idea for the product, or designed the product, and typically does not care whether it is. The words of the Lanham Act should not be stretched to cover matters that are typically of no consequence to purchasers" [*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 30*]. The law of copyright, rather than trademark law, protects whatever property interests a person may have in the kinds of goods (such as books, video tapes, audio tapes, films, and so on) that embody intellectual products [*see Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 30-33*].

Passing off may be either express or implied [*Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1403, 1406*]. Express passing off occurs when a person or enterprise labels goods with a mark identical to that of another person or enterprise, or otherwise expressly misrepresents that the goods originated with another person or enterprise [*Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1020*]. Implied passing off occurs when a person or enterprise uses a competitor's advertising material, or a sample or photograph of the competitor's product, to impliedly represent that the product being sold is made by the competitor [*Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1403, 1406*].

The language of Section 43(a) with respect the "origin" of goods or services or commercial activities is amply inclusive, moreover, of "reverse passing off" [*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. (2003) 539 U.S. 23, 123 S. Ct. 2041, 156 L. Ed. 2d 18, 27*]. A person may incur liability under Section 43(a) for express or implied reverse passing off. Express reverse passing off occurs when one person removes the name or mark on another party's product and sells that product under a name chosen by that person [*see Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1437* ; *Litchfield v. Spielberg (9th Cir. 1984) 736 F.2d 1352, 1357-1358*]. Implied reverse passing off occurs when the wrongdoer removes or obliterates the name of the source from another party's product and sells the product in an unbranded state [*Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1403, 1406* (prior law)]. A party may also be guilty of reverse palming off when he or she sells or offers for sale another's product that has been modified slightly and then labeled with a different name [*Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1437*].

A claim for reverse palming off requires the plaintiff to establish that the defendant made a "bodily appropriation" of the plaintiff's product and then sold it under defendant's name or some other name. Mere "substantial similarity" between the plaintiff's product and the defendant's is not sufficient to establish reverse palming off [*see Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1438* ; *see also Shaw v. Lindheim (9th Cir. 1990) 919 F.2d 1353, 1364-1365*]. However, a finding that the products were *not* substantially similar necessarily compels the conclusion that there was no bodily appropriation [*see Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1438*].

[c] Infringement of Unregistered Marks

Lanham Act Section 43(a) also protects qualifying unregistered trademarks against infringement [*Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623* ; *see Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1013*]. The principles for determining whether an unregistered mark qualifies for protection and has been infringed are generally the same as those that apply to actions for infringement of a registered mark [*see Two Pesos, Inc.v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623* ; *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1178*]. For discussion of principles determining the protectability of marks, see *§ 549.21[2]*. For discussion of what constitutes infringement of a registered mark, see *§ 549.24[1],[2]*.

[d] Infringement of Trade Dress

"Trade dress" refers to the total image of a product or service and may include such features as size, shape, color, color combinations, texture, or graphics [*International Jensen v. Metrosound U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 819, 822* ; *see Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 621 n.1*]. Federal courts have held that a seller's adoption of a trade dress that is confusingly similar to a competitor's constitutes a form of unfair competition that is actionable under Lanham Act Section 43(a) [*International Jensen v. Metrosound U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 819, 822* ; *see Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623-628*].

To recover for trade dress infringement under Section 43(a), the plaintiff must establish that its trade dress (1) is

non-functional, (2) is either inherently distinctive or has acquired secondary meaning, and (3) is likely to be confused with a competitor's products by members of the consuming public [*International Jensen v. Metrosound U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 819, 823* ; *see Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 624-625*]. Trade dress is functional if it is essential to the product's use or affects the cost or quality of the product [*International Jensen v. Metrosound U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 819, 823* ; *HWE, Inc. v. JB Research, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 694, 696*]. For trade dress not registered on the principal register, the person who asserts trade-dress protection has the burden of proving that the matter sought to be protected is not functional [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(3)*; *see TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc. (2001) 532 U.S. 23, 121 S. Ct. 1255, 1260, 149 L. Ed. 2d 164* (expired utility patent that covered features now claimed as trade dress has vital significance in resolving trade-dress infringement claim because utility patent is strong evidence that features claimed in it are functional)].

In an action for infringement of unregistered trade dress under Section 43(a), a product's *design* (which is not the same as *packaging*) is distinctive, and therefore protectable, only on a showing of secondary meaning [*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Samara Bros. (2000) 529 U.S. 205, 216, 120 S. Ct. 1339, 146 L. Ed. 2d 182* ; *see Art Attacks Ink, LLC v. MGA Entm't Inc. (9th Cir. 2009) 581 F.3d 1138, 1145-1146* (reasonable jury could not have found secondary meaning based on plaintiff's evidence and arguments respecting purchaser perception, advertising, extent and exclusivity of use, and actual confusion); *Leatherman Tool Group v. Cooper Indus. (9th Cir. 1999) 199 F.3d 1009, 1014* (overall appearance of product is not protectable as trade dress, at least as against competitor that clearly marks its own very similar product with distinct name and uses distinct packaging)].

Regarding defenses to claims of infringement of trade dress, the Ninth Circuit holds that the fair use defense, as it applies in the trademark context, is equally applicable in the trade dress context. In particular, the Ninth Circuit's distinction between classic fair use and nominative fair use [*see § 549.28[5]*] would apply. A defendant's use is classic fair use where the defendant has used the plaintiff's trade dress to describe or identify the defendant's own product and not at all to describe or identify the plaintiff's product. Likewise, a defendant's use is nominative where he or she used the plaintiff's trade dress to describe or identify the plaintiff's product, even if the defendant's ultimate goal is to describe or identify his or her own product [*Mattel, Inc. v. Walking Mountain Prods. (9th Cir. 2003) 353 F.3d 792, 809*].

[2] False Advertising

Lanham Act Section 43(a) also provides that any person who uses in commerce any false designation of origin, false or misleading description of fact, or false or misleading representation of fact on or in connection with any goods, services, or container for goods is liable in a civil action if the designation, description, or representation occurs in commercial advertising or promotion and misrepresents the nature, characteristics, qualities, or geographic origin of his or her goods, services, or commercial activities. Liability also results when the designation, description, or representation misrepresents the goods, services, or commercial activities of another person, such as a competitor [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(B)*; *see, e.g., Southland Sod Farms v. Stover Seed Co. (9th Cir. 1997) 108 F.3d 1134, 1139-1140*].

Only commercial competitors have standing to sue for a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(B)*. In order to have standing pursuant to the false advertising prong of Section 43(a), a plaintiff must show not only a commercial injury based on a misrepresentation about a product, but also that the injury is "competitive," meaning harmful to the plaintiff's ability to compete with the defendant [*Jack Russell Terrier Network v. American Kennel Club, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 407 F.3d 1027, 1037* (regional club of dog owners had no standing to sue national club with which it was affiliated because it was not commercial competitor of national club); *Barrus v. Sylvania (9th Cir. 1995) 55 F.3d 468, 470* (consumer did not have standing)].

A prima facie case requires a showing of all of the following facts [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 835 n.4* ; *Southland Sod Farms v. Stover Seed Co. (9th Cir. 1997) 108 F.3d 1134, 1139* ; *see, e.g., Newcal Indus. v. Ikon Office Solution (9th Cir. 2008), 513 F.3d 1038, 1054* ("[t]he complaint sufficiently alleges all elements of a Lanham Act violation, including several false statements of fact that were allegedly disseminated to

the relevant market's consumers. The district court correctly held that statement (a) constitutes puffery, but statements (b)-(e) should have survived the motion to dismiss and must therefore be remanded for evidentiary development.")]:

- The defendant made a false statement about either the plaintiff's product or the defendant's own product.
- The statement was made in a commercial advertisement or promotion.
- The statement actually deceived or has the tendency to deceive a substantial segment of its audience.
- The deception is material, in that it is likely to influence the purchasing decision.
- The defendant caused its false statement to enter interstate commerce.
- The plaintiff has been or is likely to be injured as a result of the false statement, either by direct diversion of sales from the plaintiff to the defendant or by a lessening of goodwill associated with the plaintiff's product.

The defendant may raise laches as a defense, and for that purpose, the applicable limitation period under California law [*see* [4], *below*] is the three-year period for fraud under *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 838*]. The plaintiff may counter with evidence of the defendant's unclean hands; however, the plaintiff can escape laches under the unclean hands doctrine only if the court is left with a firm conviction that the defendant acted with a fraudulent intent in making the challenged claim [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 842*].

[3] Remedies

[a] Monetary Relief

The prevailing plaintiff in an action for a violation under Lanham Act Section 43(a) (*15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*) must be awarded, subject to the provisions of *15 U.S.C. § 1111* (owner of registered mark cannot recover damages absent legal or actual notice of registration) and *15 U.S.C. § 1114* (printer, publisher, or distributor committing innocent violation not liable for damages) and subject to the principles of equity, defendant's profits, plaintiff's damages, and costs of the action. In assessing profits, plaintiff need only prove defendant's sales. In assessing damages, the court may award an amount up to three times the amount of plaintiff's actual damages. Plaintiff is entitled to its costs in the action if it prevails. In addition, a court may award reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing party in "exceptional cases" [*15 U.S.C. 1117(a)*].

In a suit for damages under Lanham Act Section 43(a), actual evidence of some injury resulting from the defendant's conduct is an essential element of the plaintiff's case [*Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 889 F.2d 197, 210*]. Thus, even though the amount of damages can be presumed when incapable of exact determination, and even though the Ninth Circuit accepts surrogate measures of damages in cases of palming off [*see Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 889 F.2d 197, 209, 209 n.8*], the plaintiff may not recover any damages if he or she fails to prove that the defendant's actions caused the claimed harm [*Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 889 F.2d 197, 209*].

15 U.S.C. § 1117(a) became effective November 16, 1989 [for discussion of amendments contained in the Trademark Law Revision Act of 1988, *see § 549.20[1]*]. Before that date, the provisions for monetary relief contained in former *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* appeared on their face only to apply cases involving registered trademarks [*see Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1025* ; *see also § 549.24[5][a]*]. However, several circuits

held that the remedies authorized by *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* applied to Lanham Act Section 43(a) [*see Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1026* ; *see also Rickard v. Auto Publisher, Inc. (11th Cir. 1984) 735 F.2d 450, 457-458* (attorney's fees)].

[b] Injunction

A court has discretion to grant an injunction according to equitable principles and on such terms as it deems reasonable to prevent a violation under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*]. For discussion of the permissible scope of injunctive relief under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*, see *§ 549.24[6]*.

Because of the possibility that a competitor may suffer future injury, and in furtherance of the rationale of consumer protection underlying Lanham Act Section 43(a), a competitor need not prove injury when suing to enjoin conduct that violates Section 43(a) [*Harper House, Inc. v. Thomas Nelson, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 889 F.2d 197, 210*]. This is in contrast to the rule applicable in a suit for damages under Section 43(a) that injury must be proved [*see* [3][a], *above*].

[c] Other Equitable Relief

A court may order delivery to the court and destruction of any material in defendant's possession bearing the word, term, name, symbol, device, combination thereof, designation, description, or representation that is the subject of a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*. The court may also order that all means of making them be delivered to the court and destroyed [*15 U.S.C. § 1118*].

[d] Against Innocently Violating Printer, Publisher, or Distributor

If a person liable under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* is engaged solely in the business of printing the violating matter for others and establishes that he or she was an innocent violator, the person bringing the action may only obtain an injunction against future printing, and not monetary relief, against that particular violator [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(A)*]. For further discussion of the limitations on injunctions obtained under *15 U.S.C. § 1114*, which before November 16, 1989, applied only to infringement actions, see *§ 549.24[3]*.

[4] Statute of Limitation and Laches

It is uncertain whether Congress intended to allow a statute of limitations defense in an action under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*. There is no limitation provision in the Lanham Act. It is possible that the legislative intent was for courts to borrow the limitation period from the most closely analogous action under state law; it is also possible that Congress intended for laches to be the only defense based on untimeliness. (Relief for a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* is "subject to the principles of equity" [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*].) While the question remains undecided, the Ninth Circuit, in accord with several other circuits, follows the rule that if a claim under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* is filed within the limitation period for the most closely analogous action under state law, there is a strong presumption that laches is not applicable; if the claim is filed after that analogous limitation period has expired, the presumption is that laches is a bar to suit [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 837*].

The presumption that laches applies is triggered if any part of the claimed wrongful conduct occurred beyond the borrowed limitation period. That period runs from the time the plaintiff knew or should have known about the cause of action under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 837*]; *accord, Magic Kitchen LLC v. Good Things Int'l, Ltd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1144, 1159, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713* (conclusion that laches presumptively barred plaintiff's claim of trade dress infringement was not affected by fact that complaint demanded prospective injunctive relief)]. Even if the plaintiff alleges that a family of products infringed on the plaintiff's trademark or trade dress, the delay still is measured, for the purpose of laches, from the time the plaintiff became aware of the conduct that is claimed to be infringement, not from the introduction of each individual product [*Magic Kitchen LLC v. Good Things Int'l, Ltd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1144, 1159-1160, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713*].

When laches presumptively applies (and if the defendant duly raised laches as a defense), the defendant is entitled to show that the plaintiff's delay in filing suit was unreasonable, and the defendant would suffer prejudice caused by the delay if the suit were to continue [*see Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 838*]. The plaintiff is then entitled to rebut the evidence by showing that the defendant has unclean hands [*see Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 842*].

On the other hand, because laches is an equitable defense, laches will not bar a suit if the public has a strong interest in having the suit proceed. Indeed, the public's interest is of overriding importance, and as such, should be considered apart from any presumption of laches [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 840*]. Nevertheless, in order to ensure that laches remains a viable defense to Lanham Act claims, the public's interest will trump laches only when the suit concerns allegations that the product is harmful or otherwise a threat to public safety and well being [*Jarrow Formulas, Inc. v. Nutrition Now, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 829, 841*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingLanham ActAntitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionLikelihood of ConfusionFalse Designation of OriginGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawFalse AdvertisingElementsTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawFalse Designation of OriginElementsTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawFalse Designation of OriginPalming OffTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawFalse Designation of OriginReverse Palming OffTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawLanham ActRemediesTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawTrade Dress ProtectionGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.27

§ 549.27 Action to Prevent Dilution of Famous Mark

[1] What Is Famous Mark

A mark is famous if it is widely recognized by the general consuming public of the United States as a designation of source of the goods or services of the mark's owner [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)*]. In determining whether a mark possesses the requisite degree of recognition, the court may consider all relevant factors, including the following [*see, e.g., Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 518 F.3d 628, 635* ("[h]ere, a reasonable trier of fact could conclude that the HOT WHEELS mark is famous: it has been in use for over thirty-seven years; 350 million dollars have been expended in advertising the mark; three billion HOT WHEELS units have been sold since the inception of the mark; and HOT WHEELS are sold in all fifty states and throughout the world.")]:

- The duration, extent, and geographic reach of advertising and publicity of the mark, whether advertised or publicized by the owner or third parties [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)(i)*];

- The amount, volume, and geographic extent of sales of goods or services offered under the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)(ii)*];

- The extent of actual recognition of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)(iii)*]; and

- Whether the mark was registered under the Trademark Act of March 3, 1881, or the Trademark Act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)(iv)*].

To meet the requirement that the mark be famous for purpose of protection under the anti-dilution statute, a mark must be "truly prominent and renowned" [*Avery Dennison Corp. v. Sumpton (9th Cir. 1999) 189 F.3d 868, 875]* . The limitation on dilution protection created by this narrow definition, like the "identical or nearly identical" requirement [*see § 549.27[5]*], is critical because dilution protection is the most potent form of trademark protection and could lead to over-protecting trademarks [*Thane Intern., Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 305 F.3d 894, 908]* . Nevertheless, marks famous in only a limited geographic area or a specialized market segment can be famous for

purposes of the anti-dilution statute. The statute protects a mark that is famous within a niche market, insofar as the alleged diluter uses the mark within that market [*Avery Dennison Corp. v. Sumpton (9th Cir. 1999) 189 F.3d 868, 877]* .

[2] Famous Mark Owner's Action

[a] Right to Injunction

Subject to the principles of equity, the owner of a famous mark [*see § 549.27[1]*] that is distinctive, inherently or through acquired distinctiveness, may obtain an injunction against another person who, at any time after the owner's mark has become famous, commences use of a mark or trade name in commerce that is likely to cause dilution by blurring [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)* (definition); § 549.27[3]] or dilution by tarnishment [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(C)* (definition); § 549.27[4]] of the famous mark, regardless of the presence or absence of actual or likely confusion, or of competition, or of actual economic injury [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(1)*; *but see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(7)* (nothing in *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* impairs, modifies, or supersedes applicability of U.S. patent laws)].

[b] Similar California Law

California law is similar [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247 et seq.*] and can be applied to both registered marks and common law marks [*see § 549.57*]. For a form of complaint under California law, see *§ 549.103*.

[c] Bar of Action Against Owner of Valid Registration

The ownership by a person of a valid registration under the Trademark Act of March 3, 1881, or the Trademark Act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register under the current Trademark Act is a complete bar to an action against that person, with respect to that mark, that is brought by another person under the common law or a statute of a state and seeks to prevent dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(6)(A)*]. It also is a complete bar to an action against that person, with respect to that mark, that asserts any claim of actual or likely damage or harm to the distinctiveness or reputation of a mark, label, or form of advertisement [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(6)(B)*].

[d] Additional Remedies

In an action brought under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)*, the owner of the famous mark is entitled to injunctive relief as set forth in *15 U.S.C. § 1116* [*see § 549.24[6], [7]*]. The owner of the famous mark also is entitled to the remedies set forth in *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* [*see § 549.24[5]* (recovery of the defendant's profits, damages and costs, and attorney's fees)] and *15 U.S.C. § 1118* [*see § 549.24[8]* (destruction of infringing articles)], subject to the discretion of the court and the principles of equity, if the following conditions are satisfied [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(5)*]:

- The mark or trade name that is likely to cause dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment was first used in commerce by the person against whom the injunction is sought after the date of enactment of the Trademark Dilution Revision Act of 2006 [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(5)(A)*].

- In a claim arising under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* by reason of dilution by blurring, the person against whom the injunction is sought willfully intended to trade on the recognition of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(5)(B)(i)*].

- In a claim arising under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* by reason of dilution by tarnishment, the person against whom the injunction is sought willfully intended to harm the reputation of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(5)(B)(ii)*].

[e] Burden of Proof for Trade-Dress Dilution

In a civil action for trade-dress dilution under the Trademark Act, for trade dress not registered on the principal register, the person who asserts trade-dress protection has the burden of proving that the claimed trade dress, taken as a whole, is not functional and is famous. If the claimed trade dress includes any mark or marks registered on the principal register, the person who asserts trade-dress protection has the burden of proving that the unregistered matter, taken as a whole, is famous separate and apart from any fame of the registered marks [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(4)*].

[3] Dilution by Blurring

Dilution by blurring is association arising from the similarity between a mark or trade name and a famous mark that impairs the distinctiveness of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)*]. In determining whether a mark or trade name is likely to cause dilution by blurring, the court may consider all relevant factors, including the following [*see, e.g., Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 518 F.3d 628, 636*]:

- The degree of similarity between the mark or trade name and the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(i)*];

- The degree of inherent or acquired distinctiveness of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(ii)*];

- The extent to which the owner of the famous mark is engaging in substantially exclusive use of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(iii)*];

- The degree of recognition of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(iv)*];

- Whether the user of the mark or trade name intended to create an association with the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(v)*]; and

- Any actual association between the mark or trade name and the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(B)(vi)*].

[4] Dilution by Tarnishment

Dilution by tarnishment is association arising from the similarity between a mark or trade name and a famous mark that harms the reputation of the famous mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(C)*].

[5] Required Identity of Plaintiff's and Defendant's Marks

The defendant must have used essentially the same mark that the plaintiff claims to have been diluted, not just a similar one. The parties' marks "must be identical or close thereto" [*Thane Int'l, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 305 F.3d 894, 905]* . For marks to be nearly identical, they must be similar enough that a significant segment of the target group of customers will see the two marks as essentially the same [*see, e.g., Jada Toys, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc. (9th Cir. 2007) 496 F.3d 974, 982* (28 percent of respondents in one consumer survey, and 7 percent in another survey, believed that defendant's product was made or at least licensed by plaintiff; reasonable trier of fact could conclude that this evidence was sufficient to establish the existence of actual dilution)]. A dilution claim alleges a form of appropriation and so implies the defendant's adoption of the plaintiff's mark itself, not the use of a similar mark. A dilution action protects the distinctiveness of a particular mark whether or not the parties' products compete or consumer confusion exists [*Thane Int'l, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 305 F.3d 894, 906]* .

Looking at the matter from the other side of the equation, when the two marks are not identical, the mere fact that

consumers mentally associate the junior user's mark with the famous mark is not sufficient to establish actionable dilution. Such mental association will not necessarily reduce the capacity of the famous mark to identify the goods of its owner, which is the statutory requirement for dilution [Moseley v. V Secret Catalogue, Inc. (2003) 537 U.S. 418, 433, 123 S. Ct. 1115, 155 L. Ed. 2d 1] .

[6] Immunity for Certain Uses of Famous Marks

[a] Fair Use

Any fair use is not actionable as dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment under *15 U.S.C. § 1125*. Fair use includes a nominative or descriptive fair use, or facilitation of such fair use, of a famous mark by another person other than as a designation of source for the person's own goods or services, including use in connection with either (1) advertising or promotion that permits consumers to compare goods or services or (2) identifying and parodying, criticizing, or commenting on the famous mark owner or the goods or services of the famous mark owner [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(3)(A)*].

[b] News Reporting and Commentary

All forms of news reporting and news commentary are not actionable as dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment under *15 U.S.C. § 1125* [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(3)(B)*].

[c] Noncommercial Use

Any noncommercial use of a mark is not actionable as dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment under *15 U.S.C. § 1125* [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(3)(C)*].

Noncommercial use refers to a use that consists entirely of noncommercial, or fully constitutionally protected, speech [*Mattel, Inc. v. MCA Records, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 894, 905* ; *see, e.g., Nissan Motor Co. v. Nissan Computer Corp. (9th Cir. 2004) 378 F.3d 1002, 1007* (injunction prohibiting Nissan Computer Corporation from linking its website visitors to other websites that presented disparaging or negative commentary about Nissan Motor Company because of ongoing trademark dispute was content-based restriction on noncommercial speech and thus was inconsistent with *First Amendment*)].

[d] First-Sale Doctrine

Repackaging a trademarked product for resale without removing the trademark is lawful under the so-called first-sale doctrine [*see generally Sebastian Intern. v. Longs Drug Stores (9th Cir. 1995) 53 F.3d 1073, 1074]* , as long as the repackaged product bears an appropriate notice to inform buyers that the reseller, not the trademark owner, packaged the product for sale [*Enesco Corp. v. Price/Costco, Inc. (9th Cir. 1998) 146 F.3d 1083, 1085-1086]* . However, the first-sale doctrine might not provide a defense in a case where, once the defendant's product is in the hands of customers, there is a likelihood that members of the public who then see the product in use will confuse the product's originator with the trademark owner [*Au-Tomotive Gold, Inc. v. Volkswagen of Am., Inc. (9th Cir. 2010) 603 F.3d 1133, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 9277, at *5-*6* (seller of marquee license plates, to which seller affixed genuine Volkswagen badges that seller had acquired lawfully but without permission for that use, could not rely on first-sale doctrine because there was likelihood of "post-purchase confusion among observers who see the plates on purchasers' cars")].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawDilution of Famous MarksBlurringTrademark LawDilution of Famous MarksEvidenceTrademark

LawDilution of Famous MarksFactorsTrademark LawDilution of Famous MarksFederal Trademark Dilution ActTrademark LawDilution of Famous MarksState Antidilution Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.28

§ 549.28 Defenses

[1] In General

The Lanham Act establishes defenses available in infringement actions, depending on the status of the mark in question [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1115*]. Any mark issued on the principal register that has not become incontestable, or any mark issued under prior trademark acts, is subject to any legal or equitable defenses or claims of defects that might have been asserted if the mark had not been registered [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)*].

Marks that have achieved incontestability status are ostensibly subject only to those defenses expressed by statute and discussed below [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)*]. These defenses are, of course, also valid against any mark of which the right to use is not incontestable [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)*].

Registration is prima facie evidence of the validity of the registered mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)*]. Cases may equate "prima facie evidence" with a "presumption" of validity of the mark or of the registrant's protected right to use the mark, and may also speak in terms of shifting an evidentiary burden (whether the burden of proof or the burden of producing evidence) from the registrant to a person that is allegedly infringing the mark. The plaintiff in an infringement action with a registered mark is given the prima facie or presumptive advantage on the issue of validity, thus shifting the burden of production defendant to prove otherwise [*Tie Tech, Inc. v. Kinedyne Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 778, 783*]. The defendant then bears the burden with respect to invalidity. The presumption of validity is "a strong one," and the burden on the defendant to overcome the presumption is "heavy" [*Zobmondo Entm't, LLC v. Falls Media, LLC (9th Cir. 2010) 602 F.3d 1108, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 8559, at *15]* . Once the presumption of validity is overcome, however, the mark's registration is merely evidence "of registration," nothing more. This approach can be characterized as rebutting the prima facie case or "piercing the presumption" [*Tie Tech, Inc. v. Kinedyne Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 778, 783* ; *see Vuitton et Fils S.A. v. J. Young Enterprises, Inc. (9th Cir. 1981) 644 F.2d 769, 775*].

A descriptive mark that has become incontestable is conclusively presumed to have acquired secondary meaning. In other words, a defendant in a trademark infringement action cannot assert that an incontestable mark is invalid because it is descriptive and lacks secondary meaning. Moreover, when the holder of an incontestable mark is complaining that

the most salient feature of its mark (but not the mark itself) is being imitated and that a likelihood of confusion may result, the holder of the mark does not have to show that the salient feature, apart from the mark, has acquired secondary meaning. Rather, the conclusive presumption that the mark has acquired secondary meaning extends to the most salient feature of the mark [*KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 408 F.3d 596, 606*].

The trial court should award reasonable attorney's fees to the defendant [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* (court "in exceptional cases may award reasonable attorney fees" to prevailing party)] if the plaintiff's case was either groundless, unreasonable, vexatious, or pursued in bad faith [*see Cairns v. Franklin Mint Co. (9th Cir. 2002) 292 F.3d 1139, 1156*].

[2] Registration or Incontestable Right to Use Fraudulently Obtained

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that registration of the mark was fraudulently obtained. In addition, that the incontestable right to use a mark was fraudulently obtained is an affirmative defense that may be asserted against an incontestable mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(1)*].

[3] Abandonment

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that the registrant has abandoned the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(2)*].

A mark is deemed abandoned when its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume. Intent not to resume may be inferred from circumstances. Nonuse for three consecutive years is prima facie abandonment. "Use" of a mark means the bona fide use of that mark made in the ordinary course of trade, and not made merely to reserve a right in a mark. A mark is also deemed abandoned when any course of conduct of the owner causes the mark to become the generic name for the goods or services on or in connection with which it is used, or otherwise to lose its significance as a mark. However, purchaser motivation is not a test for determining abandonment of a mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

To show abandonment by nonuse, the party claiming abandonment must prove both the trademark owner's discontinuance of trademark use and the owner's intent not to resume such use [*Grocery Outlet, Inc. v. Albertson's Inc. (9th Cir. 2007) 497 F.3d 972]* .

Because "trademark" is defined under *15 U.S.C. § 1127* in part by the "bona fide intention to use [it] in commerce," and because both "use in commerce" and "use" for the purposes of abandonment mean "bona fide use ... in the course of ordinary trade," the meaning of "use" for the purposes of abandonment necessarily signifies "use in commerce" and thus includes the placement of a mark on goods sold or transported. Thus *15 U.S.C. § 1127* provides that "use" of a trademark defeats an allegation of abandonment when the use (1) includes placement on goods sold or transported in commerce, (2) is bona fide, (3) is made in the ordinary course of trade, and (4) is not made merely to reserve a right in the mark [*Electro Source, LLC v. Brandess-Kalt-Aetna Group, Inc. (9th Cir. 2006) 458 F.3d 931, 936* (trademark holder was small, troubled business that continued to transport and sell trademarked goods in ordinary course of trade as part of good faith effort to deplete inventory; trademark was not abandoned during time that effort was underway)].

[4] Misrepresentation

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that the mark is being used, by or with the permission of the registrant or a person in privity with the registrant, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services on or in connection with which the mark is used [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(3)*].

[5] Fair Use

Use by one person of the registered mark of another as other than a trade or service mark is known as fair use. Use of a party's individual name in his or her own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with that party, is a fair use when the name is used as other than a trade or service mark and, as such, is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status. Use of a term or device charged to be an infringement, as other than a trade or service mark, that is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe goods or services or their geographic origin is also fair use and an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)*].

The Ninth Circuit denotes the fair use defense outlined in *15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)* as classic fair use, in order to distinguish a defense that the court calls "nominative fair use" [*see Cairns v. Franklin Mint Co. (9th Cir. 2002) 292 F.3d 1139, 1150*]. To establish a nominative fair-use defense, the defendant must prove that (1) the plaintiff's product or service in question is not readily identifiable without use of the plaintiff's trademark, (2) the defendant used only as much of the mark as was reasonably necessary to identify the plaintiff's product or service, and (3) the defendant did nothing that would, in conjunction with using the mark, suggest sponsorship or endorsement of the defendant's product by the plaintiff [*see New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 971 F.2d 302, 308*]. What is reasonably necessary to identify the plaintiff's product differs from case to case. If the description of the defendant's product depends on the description of the plaintiff's product, more use of the plaintiff's trademark is reasonably necessary to identify the plaintiff's product than in cases in which the description of the defendant's product does not depend on the description of the plaintiff's product [*Cairns v. Franklin Mint Co. (9th Cir. 2002) 292 F.3d 1139, 1151*].

The nominative fair use analysis is appropriate when the defendant used the plaintiff's mark to describe the plaintiff's product, even if the defendant's ultimate goal is to describe the defendant's own product. (This is in fact the standard case of nominative fair use. Only rarely, if ever, will a defendant choose to refer to the plaintiff's product unless that reference ultimately helps to describe the defendant's own product.) The classic fair use analysis is appropriate when the defendant has used the plaintiff's mark only to describe the defendant's own product, and not at all to describe the plaintiff's product [*Cairns v. Franklin Mint Co. (9th Cir. 2002) 292 F.3d 1139, 1151*].

The defendant asserting fair use has no burden to prove the absence of a likelihood of confusion because the plaintiff, alleging infringement, has the burden to prove that confusion is likely--that is, likelihood of confusion is part of the plaintiff's prima facie case [*KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc. (2004) 543 U.S. 111, 125 S. Ct. 542, 551, 160 L. Ed. 2d 440*]. Likelihood of confusion exists when consumers viewing the mark would probably assume that the goods it represents are associated with the source of a different product identified by a similar mark [*Clicks Billiards, Inc. v. Sixshooters, Inc. (9th Cir. 2001) 251 F.3d 1252, 1265*]. A finding of likelihood of confusion requires that confusion be probable, not just a possibility [*Murray v. Cable NBC (9th Cir. 1996) 86 F.3d 858, 861*]. The Ninth Circuit generally relies on an eight-factor test in determining whether a likelihood of confusion exists [*see § 549.24[2]*].

The strength of the plaintiff's mark and the extent of likely or actual confusion are important factors in determining whether a use is fair. Surveys and other evidence relating to the perceptions of prospective purchasers therefore are relevant to the application of the defense, and a use that is likely to create substantial confusion ordinarily will not be considered a fair use [*see KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 408 F.3d 596, 608* (invoking section of restatement that Supreme Court cited with approval)]. However, surveys in trademark cases are admissible only if conducted according to accepted principles [*Prudential Ins. Co. v. Gibraltar Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1982) 694 F.2d 1150, 1156*]. Evidence of a survey should be excluded if the survey's creator does not qualify as an expert on designing or analyzing consumer surveys [*M2 Software, Inc. v. Madacy Entm't (9th Cir. 2005) 421 F.3d 1073, 1087*] or if the proponent fails to show that the survey was conducted in accordance with generally accepted survey principles and that the results were used in a statistically correct manner [*Keith v. Volpe (9th Cir. 1988) 858 F.2d 467, 480*].

Additional factors for consideration in determining the fairness of the use are the descriptive nature of the term for the product or service being offered by the defendant, the availability of alternative descriptive terms, the extent of the use of the term prior to the registration of the trademark, and any differences among the times and contexts in which the defendant has used the term [*KP Permanent Make-Up, Inc. v. Lasting Impression I, Inc. (9th Cir. 2005) 408 F.3d 596, 609*].

[6] Prior Use

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that an alleged infringing mark was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use, and used continuously by the alleged infringer, or those in privity with it, from a date prior to (A) the date of constructive use of the mark established pursuant to *15 U.S.C. § 1057(c)* [*see § 549.23[4][b]*]; (B) the registration of the mark under the Lanham Act if the application of registration is filed before November 16, 1989; or (C) publication of the registered mark under *15 U.S.C. § 1062(c)*. This defense is applicable only in the geographical area in which prior continuous use is proved [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(5)*]. This defense is akin to the common law "innocent use" defense. However, unlike the common law defense, this statutory defense does not include a remoteness element. It is not necessary that the area where the defendant's mark enjoyed recognition based on the defendant's reputation, advertising, and sales--the defendant's "zone of reputation" as the Ninth Circuit calls it--must have been remote from the area where the plaintiff's mark was in use (the plaintiff's zone of reputation) [*Quiksilver, Inc. v. Kymsta Corp. (9th Cir. 2006) 466 F.3d 749, 761-762]* .

[7] Prior Registration and Use

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that an alleged infringing mark was registered and used prior to registration, or publication under *15 U.S.C. § 1062*, of the plaintiff's mark, and not abandoned. This defense is applicable only in the geographical area in which the mark was used prior to registration and publication of plaintiff's mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(6)*].

[8] Mark Use Violates Federal Antitrust Laws

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered mark, regardless of whether it has achieved incontestable status, that a plaintiff's mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(7)*].

[9] Mark Is Functional

It is an affirmative defense to an action for infringement of a registered trademark that a plaintiff's mark is functional [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(8)*; *Tie Tech, Inc. v. Kinedyne Corp. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 778, 782*]. A trademark is functional when it is essential to the use or purpose of the defendant's product or when it affects the cost or quality of the product [*TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc. (2001) 532 U.S. 23, 33, 121 S. Ct. 1255, 149 L. Ed. 2d 164*]. To determine whether a product feature is functional, a court in the Ninth Circuit typically considers the following four factors [*see Disc Golf Ass'n, Inc. v. Champion Discs, Inc. (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1002, 1006*]:

- Whether advertising touts the utilitarian advantages of the design.

- Whether the particular design results from a comparatively simple or inexpensive method of manufacture.

- Whether the design yields a utilitarian advantage.

- Whether alternative designs are available.

Once functionality is established, there is no need to engage in speculation about other design possibilities [*TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc. (2001) 532 U.S. 23, 33, 121 S. Ct. 1255, 149 L. Ed. 2d 164*]. Therefore, the existence of alternative designs cannot negate a trademark's functionality [*Talking Rain Beverage Co. v. South Beach Beverage Co. (9th Cir. 2003), 349 F.3d 601, 603* (district court correctly found that trademark was functional and therefore invalid)]. But the existence of alternative designs may indicate whether the trademark itself embodies functional or merely ornamental aspects of the product [*see TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc. (2001) 532 U.S. 23, 34, 121 S. Ct. 1255, 149 L. Ed. 2d 164*].

There is a so-called doctrine of aesthetic functionality, which holds that if the plaintiff's trademark, placed on the defendant's goods, is actually what consumers wish to purchase--in other words, a purely aesthetic feature of the plaintiff's product (the trademark) is "functional," in trademark-law context, when placed on the defendant's product--it is, therefore, unprotected by trademark law in the circumstances of the defendant's use. The Ninth Circuit has concluded that this theory does not provide a defense in an action to enforce the trademark against such poaching. The fact that consumers tend to like the plaintiff's trademark or find it aesthetically pleasing does not justify the defendant's placing of that trademark on the defendant's goods for the purpose of appealing to consumers' fancy. The defendant will have to make a case for functionality by showing that maintaining trademark protection (that is, disallowing the defendant's use of the trademark) would impose on the defendant a "significant non-reputation-related competitive disadvantage" [*Au-Tomotive Gold, Inc. v. Volkswagen of Am., Inc. (9th Cir. 2006) 457 F.3d 1062, 1064, 1072* (defendant sold key rings and license plate holders bearing car makers' famous trademarks)].

[10] Equitable Defenses

Defenses based on equitable principles, including laches, estoppel, and acquiescence, are available in an action to enforce an incontestable mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(9)*]. Under prior law, the Ninth Circuit allowed equitable defenses, despite the apparently limiting language of the former statute [*see Pyrodyne Corp. v. Pyrotronics Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1398, 1402*].

Unclean hands is a defense to a Lanham Act infringement suit [*see Worden v. Cal. Fig Syrup Co. (1903) 187 U.S. 516, 528, 23 S. Ct. 161, 47 L. Ed. 282* ("it is essential that the plaintiff should not in his trade mark, or in his advertisements and business, be himself guilty of any false or misleading representation")]. To make out an unclean hands defense, a trademark defendant must demonstrate that the plaintiff's conduct was inequitable and that the conduct related to the subject matter of the plaintiff's claims. To show that a trademark plaintiff's conduct was inequitable, the defendant must show that the plaintiff used the trademark to deceive consumers [*Japan Telecom, Inc. v. Japan Telecom America, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 287 F.3d 866, 870*].

The defense of laches can defeat an otherwise valid claim under the Lanham Act. The court must balance the following six factors to determine whether the trademark owner's delay in filing suit was unreasonable and that, therefore, the suit is barred [*Tillamook Country Smoker, Inc. v. Tillamook County Creamery Ass'n (9th Cir. 2006) 465 F.3d 1102, 1108* ; *E-Systems, Inc. v. Monitek, Inc. (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 604, 607]* :

- The strength and value of the trademark rights asserted.
- The senior user's diligence in enforcing the mark.
- The harm to the senior user if relief is denied.
- Whether the junior user acted in good faith ignorance of the senior user's rights.

- The degree of competition between the senior and junior user.

- The extent of harm suffered by the junior user because of the senior user's delay in asserting its rights.

[11] First Amendment Rights

Trademark rights do not entitle the owner to quash an unauthorized use of the mark by another who is communicating ideas or expressing points of view. Were courts to ignore the expressive value that some marks assume, trademark rights would grow to encroach on the zone protected by the *First Amendment*. The trademark owner does not have the right to control public discourse whenever the public imbues the mark with a meaning beyond its source-identifying function [*Mattel, Inc. v. MCA Records, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 894, 900*].

The use of a trademark in the title or content of an artistic (literary, musical, pictorial, etc.) work, by a person having no right to do so as owner or licensee of the mark, does not violate the Lanham Act unless the mark as used has no artistic relevance to the work whatsoever or, if it has some artistic relevance, unless the mark as used explicitly misleads as to the source or the content of the work [*E.S.S. Entm't 2000, Inc. v. Rock Star Videos, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008), 547 F.3d 1095, 1099-1100* (extending rule from *MCA Records* to cover content as well as title of artistic work); *Mattel, Inc. v. MCA Records, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 296 F.3d 894, 902* (use of mark in title)]. The threshold test, whether use of the mark has no artistic relevance to the work whatsoever, sets the bar to a *First Amendment* defense extremely low: the defense is available unless the artistic contribution of the mark to the work can be said to be nothing at all [*E.S.S. Entm't 2000, Inc. v. Rock Star Videos, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 547 F.3d 1095, 1100* ("In other words, the level of [artistic] relevance merely must be above zero.")].

[12] Statutory Exemption From Liability for Skipping Portions of Movies Viewed at Home

[a] Household Viewer's Right to Skip Objectionable Video and Audio Portions

The Family Movie Act of 2005 [Pub. L. No. 109-9, § 201 et seq. (Apr. 27, 2005)] authorizes a household viewer of a movie (whether the movie is being broadcast on television or is being played from a videotape or disc) to use any suitable technology for the purpose of skipping objectionable video and audio portions of the movie [*see 17 U.S.C. § 110(11)*]. For discussion, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property* . Any person who engages in such conduct [*see 17 U.S.C. § 110(11)*] and who complies with the requirements set forth in that provision is not liable on account of that conduct for a violation of any right under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(A)*].

This exemption does not preclude liability, nor may it be construed to restrict the defenses or limitations on rights granted under the Lanham Act, of a person for conduct not described in *17 U.S.C. § 110(11)*, even if that person also engages in conduct described in that provision [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(A)*].

[b] Manufacturer, Licensee, or Licensor of Technology to Skip Portions

A manufacturer, licensee, or licensor of technology that enables the skipping of limited portions of audio or video content of a motion picture as described in § 549.28[12][a] is not liable on account of that manufacture or license for a violation of any right under the Lanham Act, if the manufacturer, licensee, or licensor ensures that the technology provides a clear and conspicuous notice at the beginning of each performance that the performance of the motion picture is altered from the performance intended by the director or copyright holder of the motion picture. This limitation on liability is inapplicable to a manufacturer, licensee, or licensor of technology that fails to comply with the foregoing provision [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(B)*].

The requirement to provide notice applies only with respect to technology manufactured after the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Family Movie Act of 2005 [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(C)*], that is, after

October 24, 2005 [*see § 549.28[12][a]*].

Any failure by a manufacturer, licensee, or licensor of technology to qualify for the exemption noted in this subsection or in § 549.28[12][a] [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(A),(B)*] may not be construed to create an inference that any such person engaged in conduct described in *17 U.S.C. § 110(11)* [*see § 549.28[12][a]*] is liable for trademark infringement by reason of that conduct [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(3)(D)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesArtistic RelevanceTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesFair UseGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesFirst UseTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesLachesTrademark LawProtection of RightsAbandonmentGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationIncontestabilityEffects

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.29

§ 549.29 Remedies for Internet-Related Infringement

[1] Governing Law

The Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act [Pub. L. 106-113, app. I, § 3001 et seq. (Nov. 29, 1999)] added *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)* [*see* Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) (Nov. 29, 1999)] to the Lanham Act and created a cause of action to suppress a practice known as cybersquatting [*see § 549.29[2], [3]*]. Cybersquatting has been described as "the Internet version of a land grab" [*Interstellar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 936, 946*]. Cybersquatters register well known brand names as Internet domain names in order to force the rightful owners of the marks to pay for the right to engage in electronic commerce under their own name. Congress enacted the ACPA because cybersquatting threatened the continued growth and vitality of the Internet as a platform for communication, electronic commerce, education, entertainment, and countless yet-to-be-determined uses [*Interstellar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 936, 946* (quoting S. Rep. No. 106-140, at 8 (1999))].

[2] Civil Action to Suppress Cybersquatting

[a] Basis of Liability

A person is liable in a civil action by the owner of a mark, including a personal name that is protected as a mark under *15 U.S.C. § 1125*, if, without regard to the goods or services of the parties, that person (1) has a bad faith intent to profit from that mark, including a personal name that is protected as a mark under *15 U.S.C. § 1125*, and *(2)* registers, traffics in, or uses a domain name that either [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(A)*]:

- In the case of a mark that is distinctive at the time of registration of the domain name [*see* Lahoti v. VeriCheck, Inc. (9th Cir. 2009) 586 F.3d 1190, 1200 (finding of distinctiveness can be based, in part, on fact that similar mark, which is used for same or similar goods or services, is registered in U.S. Patent and Trademark Office)], is identical or confusingly similar to that mark;

- In the case of a famous mark that is famous at the time of registration of the domain name, is identical or confusingly similar to or dilutive of that mark; or

- Is a trademark, word, or name protected by reason of *18 U.S.C. § 706* (Red Cross sign or insignia) or *36 U.S.C. § 220506* (names, seals, emblems, and badges connected with Olympic games and similar games).

The person is liable for using the domain name only if the person is the domain name registrant or the registrant's authorized licensee [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(D)*].

Liability under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)* exists regardless of whether the domain name [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1127* (definition)] was registered before, on, or after the date of enactment of the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act [Pub. L. 106-113, app. I, § 3010 (Nov. 29, 1999)], which added *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)* [*see* Pub. L. 106-113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) (Nov. 29, 1999)]. (However, see *§ 549.29[2][b]* regarding a time limitation on damages.) On the other hand, nothing in the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act affects any defense available to a defendant under the Lanham Act, including any defense under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(3)* [Pub. L. 106-113, app. I, § 3008 (Nov. 29, 1999); *see § 549.27[6][a] -[c]*].

Trafficking in domain names refers to transactions that include, but are not limited to, sales, purchases, loans, pledges, licenses, exchanges of currency, and any other transfer for consideration or receipt in exchange for consideration [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(E)*].

In determining whether a person has a bad faith intent, the court may consider factors such as, but not limited to, the following [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(B)(i)*; *see Interstellar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 936, 946-947* (quoting Second and Fourth Circuits to effect that the most important grounds for finding bad faith are the unique circumstances of the case, which do not fit neatly into the specific factors enumerated by Congress)]:

- The trademark or other intellectual property rights of the person, if any, in the domain name.

- The extent to which the domain name consists of the legal name of the person or a name that is otherwise commonly used to identify that person.

- The person's prior use, if any, of the domain name in connection with the bona fide offering of any goods or services.

- The person's bona fide noncommercial or fair use of the mark in a site accessible under the domain name.

- The person's intent to divert consumers from the mark owner's online location to a site accessible under the domain name that could harm the goodwill represented by the mark, either for commercial gain or with the intent to tarnish or disparage the mark, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site.

- The person's offer to transfer, sell, or otherwise assign the domain name to the mark owner or any third party for financial gain without having used, or having an intent to use, the domain name in the bona fide offering of any goods or services, or the person's prior conduct indicating a pattern of such conduct [*see, e.g., Panavision Intern., L.P. v. Toeppen (9th Cir. 1998) 141 F.3d 1316, 1323*].

- The person's provision of material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of the domain name, the person's intentional failure to maintain accurate contact information, or the person's prior conduct indicating a pattern of such conduct.

- The person's registration or acquisition of multiple domain names which the person knows are identical or confusingly similar to marks of others that are distinctive at the time of registration of such domain names, or dilutive of famous marks of others that are famous at the time of registration of such domain names, without regard to the goods or services of the parties.

- The extent to which the mark incorporated in the person's domain name registration is or is not distinctive and famous within the meaning of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)* [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(2)(A)*; § 549.27[1] (what is famous mark)].

For example, a bad faith intent was properly found when the defendant never used the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, but instead earned income if customers clicked on links when visiting the domain name website, some of which directed them to the plaintiff's competitors; the defendant then asked for as much as $72,500 to sell the domain name to the plaintiff even though the defendant had no interests associated with the name, and it was undisputed that the defendant was a repeat cybersquatter who had registered hundreds of domain names resembling distinctive or famous trademarks and had been admonished by judicial bodies for doing so [Lahoti v. VeriCheck, Inc. (9th Cir. 2009) 586 F.3d 1190, 1202-1203] .

However, bad faith intent may not be found in any case in which the court determines that the person believed and had reasonable grounds to believe that the use of the domain name was a fair use or otherwise lawful [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(B)(ii)*]. This safe harbor defense is not available to a defendant who was previously declared to be a cybersquatter in a judicial proceeding in which the defendant advanced, unsuccessfully, the same defenses he or she is asserting in the present case, who used the domain name to send potential customers to the plaintiff's competitors, and who was willing to sell the domain name only for an exorbitant profit. Such a defendant is unlikely to have had a legitimate belief that the use of the domain name in the present case was wholly lawful [Lahoti v. VeriCheck, Inc. (9th Cir. 2009) 586 F.3d 1190, 1203] .

[b] Relief

In a civil action involving the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)*, the court may order the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)(C)*], and the plaintiff may obtain injunctive relief [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*], the same as for a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* [*see § 549.26[3][b]*]. Only upon proving the rigorous elements of cybersquatting under the ACPA have plaintiffs successfully forced the transfer of an infringing domain name. Even in egregious cases of cybersquatting, however, the district court retains discretion to fashion appropriate relief, and it need not force the transfer of the offending domain name [*Interstellar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 936, 948* (stating that injunction crafted by district court was "particularly proper")].

The plaintiff is entitled as well to recover profits, damages, costs, and attorney's fees [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*], the same as for a violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* [*see § 549.26[3][a]*]. The plaintiff may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered by the trial court, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits, an award of statutory damages in the amount of not less than $1,000 and not more than $100,000 per domain name, as the court considers just [*15 U.S.C. § 1117(d)*; *see Office Depot, Inc. v. Zuccarini (9th Cir. 2010) 596 F.3d 696, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 4052, at *11-*16* (judgment for damages can be enforced through writ of execution and levy on defendant's inventory of domain names, if any, since domain name is property subject to execution; for purposes of levying on domain name, it is located where registry is located and also where registrar located)]. However, neither actual damages nor statutory damages can be recovered with respect to the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name that occurred before the date of enactment of the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act [Pub. L. 106-113, app. I, § 3010 (Nov. 29, 1999)].

The civil action authorized by *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)* and any remedy available in the action are in addition to any other

civil action or remedy otherwise applicable [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(3)*; *see Interstellar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix, Inc. (9th Cir. 2002) 304 F.3d 936, 948* (court has discretion to fashion any remedy which alleviates plaintiff's grievance)].

[c] Limitation of Remedy Against Domain Name Registrar

A domain name registrar, a domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority is not liable for monetary relief or, except as stated below, for injunctive relief, to any person, regardless of whether the domain name is finally determined to infringe or dilute the mark, on account of refusing to register, removing from registration, transferring, temporarily disabling, or permanently canceling a domain name in compliance with a court order under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)* or in the implementation of a reasonable policy by the registrar, registry, or authority prohibiting the registration of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of another's mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(D)(i)(I),(ii)*].

If the registrar, registry, or other registration authority takes an action described above based on a knowing and material misrepresentation by any other person that a domain name is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of a mark, then the person making the knowing and material misrepresentation is liable for any damages, including costs and attorney's fees, incurred by the domain name registrant as a result of that action. The court may also grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant, including the reactivation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the domain name registrant [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(D)(iv)*].

A domain name registrant whose domain name has been suspended, disabled, or transferred under a policy described above, on notice to the mark owner, may file a civil action to establish that the registration or use of the domain name by the registrant is not unlawful under the Lanham Act. The court may grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant, including the reactivation of the domain name or transfer of the domain name to the domain name registrant [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(D)(v)*]. Otherwise, the domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority may be subject to injunctive relief only if the registrar, registry, or other registration authority has either [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(D)(i)(II)*]:

- Not expeditiously deposited with a court, in which an action has been filed regarding the disposition of the domain name, documents sufficient for the court to establish the court's control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name;

- Transferred, suspended, or otherwise modified the domain name during the pendency of the action, except on order of the court; or

- Willfully failed to comply with any such court order.

A domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority is not liable for damages under *15 U.S.C. § 1114* [*see § 549.24*] for the registration or maintenance of a domain name for another, absent a showing of bad faith intent to profit from that registration or maintenance of the domain name [*15 U.S.C. § 1114(2)(D)(iii)*].

[3] In Rem Action

The owner of a mark may file an in rem civil action against a domain name in the federal judicial district in which the domain name registrar, domain-name registry, or other domain-name authority that registered or assigned the domain name is located if the domain name violates any right of the owner of a mark registered in the Patent and Trademark Office, or protected under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* or*(c)*, and the court finds that the owner either [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(2)(A)*]:

- Is not able to obtain in personam jurisdiction over a person who would have been a defendant in a civil action; or

- Through due diligence was not able to find a person who would have been a defendant in a civil action by both (1) sending a notice of the alleged violation and intent to proceed in rem to the registrant of the domain name at the postal and e-mail address provided by the registrant to the registrar and also (2) publishing notice of the action as the court may direct promptly after filing the action.

The circumstances enumerated above will be deemed to constitute service of process [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(2)(B)*].

In an in rem action, a domain name is deemed to have its situs in the federal judicial district in which either (1) the domain name registrar, registry, or other domain name authority that registered or assigned the domain name is located, or (2) documents sufficient to establish control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name are deposited with the court [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(2)(C)*].

The remedies in an in rem action are limited to a court order for the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark. On receipt of written notification of a filed, stamped copy of a complaint filed by the owner of a mark in a proper U.S. district court, the domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain-name authority must [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(2)(D)(i)*]:

- Expeditiously deposit with the court documents sufficient to establish the court's control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name to the court; and

- Not transfer, suspend, or otherwise modify the domain name during the pendency of the action, except upon order of the court.

The domain name registrar or registry or other domain name authority is not liable for injunctive or monetary relief in the in rem action, except in the case of bad faith or reckless disregard, which includes a willful failure to comply with the court's order [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(2)(D)(ii)*].

The in rem action authorized by *15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(1)* and any remedy available in the action are in addition to any other civil action or remedy otherwise applicable [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(3)*]. The in rem jurisdiction established as described above is in addition to any other jurisdiction that otherwise exists, whether in rem or in personam [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(d)(4)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Computer & Internet LawTrademark ProtectionCivil Infringement ActionsDeterminationsComputer & Internet LawTrademark ProtectionCivil Infringement ActionsJurisdiction & VenueComputer & Internet LawTrademark ProtectionCivil Infringement ActionsRemediesDamagesComputer & Internet LawTrademark ProtectionCivil Infringement ActionsRemediesInjunctive ReliefComputer & Internet LawTrademark ProtectionProtection of RightsInternet Domain Names

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Federal Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.30-549.49

[Reserved]

§§ 549.30[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559

Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.50

§ 549.50 Governing Law

[1] Model State Trademark Law; Trademarks and Service Marks Unit

California's former Trademark Law [former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*] was superseded, effective January 1, 2008, by the Model State Trademark Law, codified at *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.* If any provision of the Model State Trademark Law, or the application of any provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Model State Trademark Law is not to be affected by that holding [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14265*]. The Model State Trademark Law does not affect any suit, proceeding, or appeal pending on January 1, 2008 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14270*].

The intent of the Model State Trademark Law is to provide a system of state trademark registration and protection substantially consistent with the federal system of trademark registration and protection under the federal Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.; see § 549.20*]. To that end, the construction given the Lanham Act should be examined as nonbinding authority for interpreting and construing the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14272*].

The Model State Trademark Law is administered by the Trademarks and Service Marks Unit in the Secretary of State's office [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(j)*], which is referred to in this chapter as the Trademarks Unit. It has a web site at http://www.sos.ca.gov/business/ts/.

[2] Other Statutory Protections

California law also offers protection for container brands [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14427*], laundry supply designations [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14482*], and association insignia [*see Corp. Code § 21301*].

[3] Common Law

Nothing in the Model State Trademark Law adversely affects the rights or the enforcement of rights in marks acquired in good faith at any time within common law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14259*].

Although registration of a trademark constitutes presumptive evidence of ownership, registration is not a required condition to establish a protectable proprietary interest under common law rules [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 106-107 n.5, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.51

§ 549.51 Definitions

[1] Trademark

"Trademark" means any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination of those, used by a person to identify and distinguish the goods of that person, including a unique product, from those manufactured or sold by others, and to indicate the source of the goods, even if that source is unknown [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(a)*].

A trademark is intangible personal property [*see Civ. Code §§ 655, 658, 663*].

[2] Service Mark

"Service mark" means any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination of those, used by a person to identify and distinguish the services of that person, including a unique service, from the services of others, and to indicate the source of the services, even if that source is unknown. Titles, character names used by a person, and other distinctive features of radio or television programs may be registered as service marks notwithstanding that they, or the programs, may advertise the goods of the sponsor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(b)*].

[3] Mark

"Mark" includes any trademark or service mark entitled to registration under the Model State Trademark Law, whether registered or not [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(c)*].

[4] Trade Name

"Trade name" means any name used by a person to identify a business or vocation of that person [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(d)*]. A trade name cannot be registered as such under the Model State Trademark Law, but a trade name that qualifies as a trademark or service mark may be registered as a mark.

A trade name is personal property [*Balesteri v. Holler (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 717, 722, 151 Cal. Rptr. 229*].

California law offers special protection for trade names, including farm names [*see § 549.70* et seq.].

[5] Person

The term "person" and any other word or term used to designate the applicant or other party entitled to a benefit or privilege or rendered liable under the provisions of the Model State Trademark Law includes a juristic person as well as a natural person. The term "juristic person" includes a firm, partnership, corporation, union, association, or other organization capable of suing and being sued in a court of law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(e)*].

[6] Applicant

"Applicant" means the person filing an application for registration of a mark under the Model State Trademark Law, and the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of the person [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(f)*].

[7] Registrant

"Registrant" means the person to whom the registration of a mark under the Model State Trademark Law is issued, and the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of the person [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(g)*].

[8] Use

"Use" means the bona fide use of a mark in the ordinary course of trade, and not made merely to reserve a right in a mark. For the purposes of the Model State Trademark Law, a mark is deemed to be in use if it is used on either of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(h)*]:

- On goods when it is placed in any manner on the goods or other containers or the displays associated with the goods or on the tags or labels affixed to the goods, containers, or displays or, if the nature of the goods makes that placement impracticable, on documents associated with the goods or their sale, and the goods are sold or transported in commerce in California; or

- On services when it is used or displayed in the sale or advertising of services and the services are rendered in California.

[9] Abandoned

"Abandoned" means that either of the following has occurred [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(i)*]:

- Use of a mark has been discontinued with intent not to resume that use. Intent not to resume the use may be inferred from circumstances. Nonuse for two consecutive years constitutes prima facie evidence of abandonment.

- Any course of conduct of the owner, including acts of omission as well as commission, that causes the mark to lose its significance as a mark.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.52

§ 549.52 Registration of Mark

[1] Application

Subject to the limitations set forth in the Model State Trademark Law, any person who uses a mark may file with the Trademarks Unit an application for registration of that mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14207(a)*]. However, a mark by which the goods or services of any applicant for registration may be distinguished from the goods or services of others cannot be registered if it meets any of the criteria specified in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205* [*see § 549.53[1]*].

[2] Certificate of Registration

[a] Issuance and Content of Certificate

On compliance by the applicant with the requirements of the Model State Trademark Law, the Trademarks Unit must cause a certificate of registration to be issued and delivered to the applicant. The certificate of registration must be issued under the signature of the Secretary of State and the seal of the state, and show the following information [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14215(a)*]:

- The name and business address and, if a corporation, the state of incorporation, or if a partnership, the state in which the partnership is organized and the names of the general partners, as specified by the Trademarks Unit, of the person claiming ownership of the mark.

- The date claimed for the first use of the mark anywhere and the date claimed for the first use of the mark in California.

- The class of goods or services and a description of the goods or services on or in connection with which the mark is used.

- A reproduction of the mark.

- The registration date and the term of the registration of the mark [*see* [c], *below*].

[b] Evidentiary Effect

Any certificate of registration issued by the Trademarks Unit under the provisions of the Model State Trademark Law, or a copy of a certificate duly certified by the Trademarks Unit, is admissible in evidence as competent and sufficient proof of the registration of the mark in any action or judicial proceeding in any California court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14215(b)*; *Cytanovich Reading Center v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 111, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*].

[c] Term of Registration

A registration of mark pursuant to the Model State Trademark Law is effective for a term of five years from the date of registration, and may be renewed for successive periods of five years [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14217(a), (b)*; *see § 549.55[1]*].

Any registration in force under the former law when the Model State Trademark Law became effective, January 1, 2008, was automatically extended for the unexpired term of the registration under the former law, becoming eligible for renewal under the Model State Trademark Law on expiration of that term [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14217(c)*].

[3] Public Access to Records

The Trademarks Unit is required to keep for public examination a record of all marks registered or renewed under the Model State Trademark Law, as well as a record of all related documents recorded pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14220* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14225*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.53

§ 549.53 Impediments to Registration

[1] Marks That Cannot Be Registered

[a] Immoral, Deceptive, or Scandalous Matter

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of or comprises immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(a)*].

[b] Disparaging Matter

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of or comprises matter that may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt or disrepute [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(b)*].

[c] Government Flag, Emblem, or Insignia

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of or comprises the flag or coat of arms or other insignia of the United States of America, of any state or municipality, or of any foreign nation, or any simulation of any of those [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(c)*].

[d] Living Individual's Identity

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of or comprises the name, signature, or a portrait identifying a particular living individual, except by the individual's written consent [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(d)*]. For discussion of *Civ. Code § 3344.1*, governing rights to the use of a deceased person's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness, see *Ch. 429, Privacy, § 429.30* et seq.

[e] Confusing Mark

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of or comprises a mark that so resembles a mark registered in California or a mark or trade name previously used by another and not abandoned, as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods or services of the applicant, to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(f)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(i)* (definition of "abandoned"); § 549.51[9]].

[2] Nondistinctive Mark

A mark cannot be registered if it consists of a mark that is any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(e)*; *Cytanovich Reading Center v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 111, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*]:

- When used on or in connection with the goods or services of the applicant, is merely descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them.

- When used on or in connection with the goods or services of the applicant, is primarily geographically descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them.

- Is primarily merely a surname, provided, however, that this will not prevent the registration of a mark used by the applicant that has become distinctive of the applicant's goods or services.

Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(e) does not prevent the registration of a mark that, as used in California by the applicant, has become distinctive of the applicant's goods or services, that is, has acquired secondary meaning [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 107, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794*]. The Trademarks Unit may accept as evidence that the mark has become distinctive, as used on or in connection with the applicant's goods or services, proof of continuous use of it as a mark by the applicant in California for the five years before the date the claim of distinctiveness is made [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(e)*].

Marks are often classified by the courts in five categories of increasing distinctiveness: generic, descriptive, suggestive, arbitrary, and fanciful [*Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623-624* ; *Park'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 194, 196, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582*]. These categories are discussed (in the context of the Lanham Act) at § 549.21.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.54

§ 549.54 Denial of Application

[1] Right to Amend and Resubmit Application

If an applicant is found not to be entitled to registration, the Trademarks Unit must advise the applicant of that fact and state the reasons why. The applicant has a reasonable period of time, as specified by the Trademarks Unit, in which to reply or to amend the application, in which event the application must be re-examined. This procedure may be repeated until the Trademarks Unit finally refuses registration of the mark or the applicant fails to reply or amend within the specified period, whereupon the application will be deemed to have been abandoned [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14209(e)*].

[2] Judicial Review

If the Trademarks Unit finally refuses registration of the mark, the applicant may seek a writ of mandamus to compel registration. A writ may be granted, but without costs to the Trademarks Unit, on proof that all statements in the application are true and that the mark is otherwise entitled to registration [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14209(f)*].

Actions in mandamus to compel registration of a mark pursuant to the Model State Trademark Law must be brought in the superior court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254(a)*]. The proceeding must be based solely on the record before the Trademarks Unit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254(b)*].

For discussion of, and forms for use in, an action for a writ of mandamus to compel registration of a mark, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.55

§ 549.55 Procedures After Registration

[1] Renewal of Term

On application filed within six months before the expiration of the current term of registration, in a manner complying with the requirements of the Trademarks Unit, the registration may be renewed for a term of five years from the end of the expiring term [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14217(a)*], and may be renewed for successive periods of five years in like manner [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14217(b)*].

[2] Cancellation of Registration

[a] Request by Registrant or Assignee

The Trademarks Unit must cancel a registration concerning which the Trademarks Unit receives a voluntary request for cancellation from the registrant or the assignee of record [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(a)*]. See [4], *below*, for discussion of assignments.

[b] Unrenewed Term

The Trademarks Unit must cancel a registration granted under the Model State Trademark Law and not renewed in accordance with the provisions of the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(b)*]. See [1], *above*, for discussion of renewal.

[c] Judicial Order or Finding

An action to require cancellation of a mark registered pursuant to the Model State Trademark Law may be brought in the superior court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254(a)*].

In an action for cancellation, the Secretary of State must not be made a party to the proceeding but must be notified of the filing of the complaint by the clerk of the court in which it is filed and must be given the right to intervene in the

action [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254(b)*].

In any action brought against a nonresident registrant, service may be effected on the Secretary of State as agent for service of the registrant in accordance with the procedures established for service on nonresident corporations and business entities under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 416.10-416.40* and *Corp. Code §§ 2110, 2111*, and *2114* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254(c)*].

The Trademarks Unit must cancel a registration if cancellation is ordered on any ground by a court of competent jurisdiction [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(d)*], and must cancel a registration concerning a mark with regard to which a court of competent jurisdiction finds any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(c)*]:

- The registered mark has been abandoned [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(i)* (definition of "abandoned"); § 549.51[9]].

- The registrant is not the owner of the mark.

- The registration was granted improperly.

- The registration was obtained fraudulently.

- The mark is or has become the generic name for the goods or services, or a portion of them, for which it has been registered.

- The registered mark is so similar to a mark registered by another person in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office before the date of the filing of the application for registration by the registrant under the Model State Trademark Law as to be likely to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive, and has not been abandoned [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(i)* (definition of "abandoned"); § 549.51[9]]. However, should the registrant prove that the registrant is the owner of a concurrent registration of a mark in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office covering an area including California, the registration under the Model State Trademark Law may not be canceled for that area of the state.

[d] Check for Fee Is Dishonored

The Trademarks Unit must cancel a registration or renewal if a check or other remittance accepted in payment of the filing fee is not paid on presentment. However, the Trademarks Unit must give written notice to the registrant before cancellation for this reason, and then must allow 30 days from the date of the notification letter for payment by cashier's check or the equivalent [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(e)*].

[e] Confusing Mark

Within six months of the date of registration, the Trademarks Unit must cancel a registration issued in violation of the proscription of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205(f)* against registration of a confusing mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230(f)*]. See *§ 549.53[1][e]* for discussion of that proscription.

[3] Fraudulent Registration

Any person who, either for himself or herself or on behalf of another person, procures the filing or registration of any mark pursuant to the Model State Trademark Law by knowingly making any false or fraudulent representation or declaration, either orally or in writing, or by any other fraudulent means, is liable to pay all damages sustained as a consequence of the filing or registration, to be recovered by or on behalf of the person injured, in any court of

competent jurisdiction [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14240*].

[4] Assignment of Registration

Any mark and its registration under the Model State Trademark Law can be assigned along with the goodwill of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14220(a)*]. An application may be filed with the Trademarks Unit for recordation of the assignment. When an assignment has been recorded by the Trademarks Unit, the record is prima facie evidence of the execution of the assignment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14220(d)*]. An assignment of any registration under the Model State Trademark Law is void as against any subsequent purchaser for valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded with the Trademarks Unit within three months after the date of assignment or before the subsequent purchase [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14220(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.56

§ 549.56 Infringement of Mark

[1] Mark Must Be Registered in California

Under the Model State Trademark Law, causes of action and judicial remedies [*see* [2], [3], *below*] based on infringement of a mark are limited to cases of infringement of marks that are registered under the California law. However, the owner of a mark not registered in California could have a common law remedy if the mark owner is harmed by infringement [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14259* (nothing in Model State Trademark Law adversely affects rights or enforcement of rights in marks acquired in good faith at any time within common law)].

Provisions in the Model State Trademark Law regarding infringement of marks reflect provisions in the Lanham Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1114*], which are discussed in *§ 549.24*.

[2] Causes of Action

[a] Infringing Use of Mark

A person is subject to a civil action by the owner of a mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law [*see* [3][a], *below*] if the person uses, without the consent of the registrant, any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the mark in connection with the sale, distribution, offering for sale, or advertising of any goods or services on or in connection with which the use is likely to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive, as to the source of origin of such goods or services [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(1)*].

[b] Reproduction and Application of Mark That Results in Infringement

A person is subject to a civil action by the owner of a mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law [*see* [3][a], *below*] if the person reproduces, counterfeits, copies, or colorably imitates the mark and applies the reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation to labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, or advertisements intended to be used on or in connection with the sale or other distribution in California of any goods or services. The owner of the mark is not entitled to recover profits or damages [*see* [3][b], *below*] unless the acts have been committed

with knowledge that the mark is intended to be used to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(2)*].

[c] Facilitation of Infringing Use of Mark

A person is subject to a civil action by the owner of a mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law [*see* [3][a], *below*] if the person knowingly facilitated, enabled, or otherwise assisted a person to manufacture, use, distribute, display, or sell any goods or services bearing any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the mark, without the consent of the owner of the mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(3)*].

Any act by that person is presumed to have been taken knowingly following delivery to that person, by personal delivery, courier, or certified mail return receipt requested, of a written demand to cease and desist that is accompanied by all of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(3)*]:

- A copy of the certificate of registration;
- A copy of the reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of the registered mark; and
- A statement, made under penalty of perjury, by the owner of the registered mark, or by an officer of the corporation that owns the registered mark or by legal counsel for the owner of the registered mark, that includes all of the following:
  - The name or description of the infringer;
  - The product or service and mark being or to be infringed;
  - The dates of the infringement; and
  - Any other reasonable information to assist the recipient to identify the infringer.

This presumption does not affect the mark owner's burden of showing that there was infringement in violation of the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(4)*].

A landlord or property owner that provides, rents, leases, or licenses the use of real property where any goods or services bearing any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of a mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law are sold, offered for sale, or advertised, is liable on the facilitation theory if the landlord or property owner had control of the property and knew, or had reason to know, of the infringing activity [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(5)*].

[3] Judicial Remedies

[a] In General

A person who is subject to a civil action by the owner of a registered mark because of infringement of the mark as provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)* [*see* [2], *above*] is thus subject to the remedies provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)*]. Those remedies are described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250* as being remedies for harm resulting from infringement by counterfeiting of a mark, which is but one of the kinds of infringing activity proscribed in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)*.

"Counterfeit" in this context means a spurious trademark, service mark, collective mark, or certification mark that is

identical to, or substantially indistinguishable from, a registered mark that is used on or in connection with goods or services or any labels or packaging or components [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(n)*]. (Collective marks and certification marks are types of marks defined in the Lanham Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1127*]; for definitions, see *§ 549.20[2][c], [d]*.)

The legislative intent appears to be as follows:

- For infringement of any kind proscribed in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)* [*see* [2], *above*], the owner of the infringed mark may sue for an injunction together with damages and an order for disgorgement of illicitly gained profits, plus penalties [*see* [b], *below*].

- Additionally, for infringement by counterfeiting:

  - The owner of the infringed mark may obtain an order for the destruction of goods and other things bearing the counterfeit mark [*see* [c], *below*].

  - The owner of the infringed mark may also obtain an order for the pre-judgment seizure of goods and other things bearing the counterfeit mark [*see* [d], *below*].

  - In the event of a wrongful pre-judgment seizure, the owner of the infringed mark can be liable for damages [*see* [e], *below*].

For a form for a complaint by a mark owner based on infringement of a service mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law, see *§ 549.103*.

[b] Injunction, Compensation, and Penalties

Any owner of a mark registered under the Model State Trademark Law may proceed by suit to enjoin the manufacture, use, display, or sale of any counterfeits; in a case not involving a counterfeit mark, to enjoin whatever infringing activity is the cause of action [*see* [a], *above*]. Any court of competent jurisdiction also may grant injunctions to restrain the manufacture, use, display, or sale (or other infringing activity). The court may require the defendants to pay to the owner up to three times the profits from, and up to three times all damages suffered by reason of, the wrongful manufacture, use, display, sale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)*], or other infringing activity.

[c] Destruction of Counterfeits

If, in any action brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250*, the court determines that any goods in the possession of or services offered by a defendant bear or consist of a counterfeit mark [*see* [a], *above*], the court must order the destruction of any goods, labels, packaging or components, bearing the counterfeit mark and of all instrumentalities used in the production of the counterfeit goods, including, but not limited to, any items, objects, tools, machines, or equipment. Alternatively, after obliteration of the counterfeit mark, the court may dispose of those materials by ordering their transfer to the state, a civil claimant, an eleemosynary institution, or any appropriate private person other than the person from whom the materials were obtained [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)*].

[d] Pre-Judgment Seizure of Counterfeits

The court, on motion or ex parte application by a plaintiff in a suit to enjoin the manufacture, use, display, or sale of counterfeits, may order seizure of any goods, labels, packaging or any components bearing the counterfeit mark [*see* [a], *above*], and all instrumentalities used in the production of the counterfeit goods, including, but not limited to, any items, objects, tools, machines, or equipment, from persons manufacturing, displaying for sale, or selling the goods, on a showing of good cause and a probability of success on the merits and on the posting of an undertaking pursuant to *Bus.*

& Prof. Code § 14250(e) [*see below*]. If it appears from the ex parte application that there is good reason for proceeding without notification to the defendant, the court, for good cause shown, may waive the requirement of notice for the ex parte proceeding. The order of seizure must specifically set forth all of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*]:

- The date or dates on which the seizure is ordered to take place.
- A description of the counterfeit goods to be seized.
- The identity of the persons or class of persons to effect seizure.
- A description of the location or locations at which seizure is to occur.
- A hearing date, not more than 10 court days after the last date on which seizure is ordered, at which any person from whom goods are seized may appear and seek release of the seized goods.

Any person from whom seizure is effected must be served with the order at the time of seizure [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*].

For an ex parte application and an order, see *§§ 549.105*, *549.106*.

The court must set the amount of the undertaking required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)* in accordance with the probable recovery of damages, costs, and expenses under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c)* [*see § 549.56[3][e]*], if it is ultimately determined that the goods seized were not counterfeit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(e)*]. Any person entitled to recover under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c)* may object, within 30 days after the date of seizure, to the undertaking on the ground that the surety is insufficient or the amount of the undertaking is insufficient [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(f)*].

The motion or application filed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)* must include a statement advising the person from whom the goods are seized that the undertaking has been filed, informing that person of the right to object to the undertaking on the ground that the surety is insufficient or the amount of the undertaking is insufficient, and advising that person that an objection to the undertaking must be made within 30 days after the date of seizure [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(g)*].

[e] Damages for Wrongful Seizure of Goods

Any person who causes seizure of goods that are not counterfeit [*see § 549.56[3][a]*], *above*] is liable in an amount equal to the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c)*]:

- Any damages proximately caused, to any person having a financial interest in the seized goods, by the seizure of goods that are not counterfeit.
- Costs incurred in defending against seizure of noncounterfeit goods.
- On a showing that the person causing the seizure to occur acted in bad faith. expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees expended in defending against the seizure of any noncounterfeit or noninfringing goods.
- Punitive damages, if warranted.

A person entitled to recover pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c)* may seek a recovery by cross-claim or motion made in the trial court and served pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1011*. The person may join any surety on an

undertaking posted pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)* [*see § 549.56[3][d]*], and any judgment of liability will bind both the person directly liable and the surety, jointly and severally, but the liability of the surety is limited to the amount of the undertaking [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(d)*].

[f] Nuisance Abatement Action Targeting Place Where Counterfeiting Occurred

Until January 1, 2015, if there is a conviction for a violation of *Penal Code § 350(a)(2)* (willfully manufacturing, intentionally selling, or knowingly possessing for sale, 1,000 or more articles bearing any counterfeit of a mark registered with the Secretary of State or registered on the Principal Register of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office), then a nonresidential building or place used by the convicted person in committing that violation is deemed a nuisance which may be enjoined, abated, and prevented, and for which damages may be recovered, whether it is a public or private nuisance [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17800(a),(c)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17802* (sunset provision)]. The district attorney of the county where the nuisance exists, or any city attorney in the county, or any citizen of California who resides in the county, may maintain an action to abate and prevent the nuisance and to perpetually enjoin the person conducting or maintaining it, and the owner, lessee, or agent of the building or place, in or on which the nuisance exists, from directly or indirectly maintaining or permitting it. The complaint must be verified unless filed by the district attorney or a city attorney [*Penal Code § 11226*]. An owner must be provided with 30 days' notice prior to the filing of an action to abate the nuisance [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17800(a)*]. For discussion and forms for use in an action to abate a nuisance, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

[4] Limitation of Remedies Against Innocent Infringers

[a] In General

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Model State Trademark Law, the remedies given to the owner of a mark because of infringement proscribed in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)* [*see § 549.56[2], [3]*] are limited when the defendant is deemed to be an innocent infringer or violator [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(b)*].

An innocent infringer or innocent violator is a person who is described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(b)* [*see § 549.56[4][b], [c]*] and whose acts were committed without knowledge that the infringing mark was intended to be used to cause confusion or mistake, or to deceive [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(c)*].

[b] Commercial Printers

If an infringer or violator is engaged solely in the business of printing the mark or violating matter for others and establishes that he or she was an innocent infringer or innocent violator, the owner of the right infringed is entitled only to an injunction against future printing of the mark by the innocent infringer or innocent violator [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(b)(1)*].

[c] Publishers and Distributors of Periodicals and Electronic Communications

If the infringement complained of is contained in, or is part of, paid advertising matter in a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, or in an electronic communication as defined in *18 U.S.C. § 2510(12)*, the remedies of the owner of the right infringed against the publisher or distributor of the newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical or electronic communication are confined to an injunction against the presentation of the advertising matter in future issues of the newspapers, magazines, or other similar periodicals or in further transmissions of the electronic communication. This limitation applies only to innocent infringers and innocent violators, however [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(b)(2)*].

Injunctive relief is not available to the owner of the right infringed with respect to an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical or electronic communication containing infringing matter if restraining the dissemination of the

infringing matter in any particular issue of the periodical or in an electronic communication would delay the delivery of the issue or transmission of the electronic communication after the regular time for delivery and the delay would be due to the method by which publication and distribution of the periodical or transmission of the electronic communication is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice, and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245* or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order with respect to the infringing matter [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(b)(3)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.57

§ 549.57 Dilution of Famous Mark

[1] Definitions

[a] Famous Mark

A mark is "famous" for purposes of California law if it is widely recognized by the general consuming public of California, or a geographic area of California, as a designation of the source of the goods or services purveyed the mark's owner. In determining whether a mark is famous, a court may consider factors including, but not limited to, all of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247(a)*]:

- The duration, extent, and geographic reach of advertising and publicity of the mark in California, whether advertised or publicized by the owner or third parties;

- The amount, volume, and geographic extent of sales in California of goods or services offered under the mark;

- The extent of actual recognition of the mark in California; and

- Whether the mark is the subject of a state registration in California, or a federal registration under the Act of March 3, 1881, or under the Act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register under the Trademark Act of 1946 (the Lanham Act), as amended [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*; *see § 549.23[2]*].

A mark can be famous and subject to actionable dilution whether or not it is registered under California law or federal law.

[b] Dilution

"Dilution" means dilution by blurring or dilution by tarnishment, regardless of the presence or absence of any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(k)*]:

- Competition between the owner of the famous mark and other parties;
- Actual or likely confusion, mistake, or deception; or
- Actual economic injury.

"Dilution by blurring" means association arising from the similarity between a mark or a trade name and a famous mark that impairs the distinctiveness of the famous mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(l)*]. "Dilution by tarnishment" means association arising from the similarity between a mark or a trade name and a famous mark that harms the reputation of the famous mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(m)*].

This concept of dilution and a judicial remedy [*see § 549.57[2]*] and fair use defenses [*see* [3], *below*] reflect provisions in the Lanham Act [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)*], which are discussed in *§ 549.27*.

[2] Cause of Action and Remedy

Subject to the principles of equity, an owner of a mark that is famous and distinctive, whether inherently or through acquired distinctiveness, is entitled to an injunction against another person's commercial use of a mark or trade name if that use begins after the mark has become famous and is likely to cause dilution of the famous mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247(a)*]. The owner of the famous mark is entitled to injunctive relief throughout the geographic area in which the mark is found to have become famous prior to commencement of the junior use, but not beyond the borders of California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247(b)*].

If the person against whom injunctive relief is sought willfully intended to cause dilution of the famous mark, the owner also is entitled to the relief set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250* [*see* discussion in *§ 549.56[4]*], subject to the discretion of the court and the principles of equity [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247(b)*].

[3] Defenses

[a] Fair Use

The following acts do not constitute causes of action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247(b)*]:

- Any fair use, including a nominative or descriptive fair use, or facilitation of such fair use, of a famous mark by another person other than as a designation of source for the person's own goods or services, including use in connection with either of the following:
    - Advertising or promotion that permits consumers to compare goods or services [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(o)* (definition of "comparative commercial advertising" as use of competitor's trademark in advertising to compare relative qualities of competitive goods)]; or
    - Identifying and parodying, criticizing, or commenting on, the famous mark owner or the goods or services of the famous mark owner.
- Noncommercial use of the mark.
- All forms of news reporting and news commentary.

[b] Ornamental Use on Goods

The former version of the California Trademark Law provided that "[a]ny person who uses or unlawfully infringes upon a mark registered under this chapter or under Title 15 of the United States Code, other than in an otherwise noninfringing manner, either on the person's own goods or services or to describe the person's own goods or services, *irrespective of whether the mark is used primarily as an ornament, decoration, garnishment, or embellishment on or in products, merchandise, or goods,* for the purpose of enhancing the commercial value of, or selling or soliciting purchases of, products, merchandise, goods, or services, without prior consent of the owner of the mark, shall be subject to an injunction against that use by the owner of the mark" [former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14335(a)* (emphasis added)].

The same provision was originally in the bill for enactment of the Model State Trademark Law, assigned to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245* as subdivision (d) [*see* AB 1484, 2007-2008 Reg. Sess.]. However, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported: "Numerous parties have expressed concern about the lack of an ornamental use exemption in this bill. In fact, the current language appears to make the ornamental use of a mark actionable. Ornamental use refers to the use of a trademark as a design, rather than as an identifier. Consumers may, in turn, purchase goods containing that trademark based upon the aesthetic nature of the mark, not any representation that the mark is making about the quality of the goods" [Senate Judiciary Cmte., Analysis of AB 1484, 2007-2008 Reg. Sess., p. 17 (July 11, 2007)]. Subsequently, the provision was removed, and no such provision was in the bill as finally adopted. This legislative history could be cited as indicating an intent that mere ornamental use of a registered mark should not be a cause of action (and that it should be a defense against a charge of infringement) under the Model State Trademark Law.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. California Trademark Law

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.58-549.69

[Reserved]

§§ 549.58[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Protection of Trade Names

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.70

§ 549.70 Registration

[1] Trade Name Registration and Presumptions

[a] Fictitious Business Name Statement

Filing a fictitious business name statement, when required pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17910*, creates a rebuttable presumption that the registrant has the exclusive right to use as a trade name, in the county of filing, that fictitious business name and any other confusingly similar trade name [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411*]. To avail itself of this presumption, the registrant must be both the first to file the fictitious name in the county and actually engaged in business or trade using that fictitious business name, or a confusingly similar name, in that county. This presumption is one affecting the burden of producing evidence [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411*]. It is applicable until the fictitious business name is abandoned or otherwise expires, and the registrant files no new fictitious business name statement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14412*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17920, 17922* (duration, expiration, and abandonment of fictitious business name statements)]. In the case of assignment or transfer, the presumption does not apply unless the assignee or transferee files an original fictitious business name statement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14412*]. Nothing in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.* (trade names and designations) is to be construed as requiring or prohibiting the filing of any fictitious business name statement if one is not required or prohibited by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17910* (persons required to file fictitious business name statements) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14414*].

The filing of a fictitious business name statement pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17910* does not, of itself, authorize the use in California of a fictitious name in violation of the rights of another established under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.*, or under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1501 et seq.*]or common law, including rights in a trade name [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14418*].

[b] Corporate Name

A rebuttable presumption that a corporation has the exclusive right to use as a trade name, in California, the corporate name as contained in the articles or certificate, as well as any confusingly similar trade name, arises from any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14415*]:

- A domestic corporation's filing of articles of incorporation pursuant to *Corp. Code § 200*;

- A foreign corporation's obtaining of a certificate of qualification pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 2105* and *2106*; or

- The continuing authority of a foreign corporation pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2102* to transact business in California.

A corporation may avail itself of the above presumption if the corporation is the first to file articles or to obtain a certificate containing the corporate name and also is actually engaged in business using that corporate name or one confusingly similar. The presumption thus created affects the burden of producing evidence [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14415*].

[c] Conflict Between Corporation and Registrant of Fictitious Business Name

If, as to the same or a confusingly similar trade name in a given county, both a corporation entitled to the rebuttable presumption created by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14415* [*see § 549.70[1][b]*] and a registrant entitled to the benefit of the presumption created by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411* [*see § 549.70[1][a]*] seek, each for itself, to avail itself of its respective presumption of exclusive use as against the other, then the party filing or obtaining a certificate of qualification first in time and being actually engaged in business using the name is entitled to the presumption of exclusive use as against the other in that county [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14416*].

The mere filing of articles of incorporation does not authorize the use in California of a corporate name in violation of the rights of another, including rights in a trade name, under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*], the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*], the fictitious business name law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17900 et seq.*], or the common law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14417*].

[2] Farm Name Registration

Any farm owner or lessee in California, on payment of a fee to the Secretary of State, may have the name of the farm registered in a register kept by the Secretary of State for that purpose. The owner or lessee is entitled to receive a certificate of registration [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14461*].

The registration has the same effect as the registration of a trademark under the Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14463*]. Thus, any person selling or marketing products grown on the farm may use the name of the farm as a trademark on the farm's products, in the same manner as provided for other trademarks and subject to the same rights and duties [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14462*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Protection of Trade Names

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.71

§ 549.71 Judicial Remedy

[1] Infringement of Trade Name

Trade name infringement is broadly defined as any use of a trade name in violation of the rights defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.* [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14402*]. It is not per se unlawful to use a name similar to that of an established business. The test for determining whether use of that name may be enjoined is whether the similarity between the two names will deceive or confuse the public. Proof of actual deception is not required; probability or likelihood is sufficient [*In re Marriage of Shelton (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 811, 814-815, 173 Cal. Rptr. 629*].

[2] Infringement as Unfair Competition

Under the common law of unfair competition, the equitable doctrine of secondary meaning protects any trade name or design that may not be exclusively appropriated as a trademark, if it has nonetheless become associated in the public mind with one person's business as the source of goods or services [*see Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300-304, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *Family Record Plan, Inc. v. Mitchell (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 235, 242-243, 342 P.2d 10*]. In other words, when one person adopts and uses a trade name or design that acquires this secondary meaning or association in the public mind, any subsequent imitation of that name or design by another, with the effect of confusing or deceiving buyers as to the origin of goods or services, may be enjoined as unfair competition, even though the original name is unprotected by trademark, copyright, or patent [*see Cytanovich Reading Center v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 113, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*].

The common law defenses of abandonment and laches are available in trade name infringement actions [*California Western School of Law v. California Western University (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1006, 1011, 178 Cal. Rptr. 685*].

For a complaint for unfair competition and trade name infringement, see *§ 549.107*. For further discussion of actions for unfair competition, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Protection of Trade Names

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.72

§ 549.72 Loss of Rights by Abandonment

A person may relinquish ownership of a trade name by abandoning it [*California Western School of Law v. California Western University (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1011, 178 Cal. Rptr. 685*]. Trade name abandonment is not defined by statute in California. However, the California Supreme Court has defined abandonment in this context as meaning general abandonment to the public. Abandonment, in the sense of forfeiture of the name, must be strictly proved, and must be shown affirmatively and positively as affecting the interests of the public. Use of a trade name is not abandoned by temporary disuse, absent a showing of general abandonment to the public [*Nolan Bros. Shoe Co. v. Nolan (1900) 131 Cal. 271, 276, 63 P. 480* ; *cf. Carter-Wallace, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Company (9th Cir. 1970) 434 F.2d 794, 804* (single instance of use of mark is sufficient against claim of abandonment)].

The declaration of bankruptcy by the corporate owner of a trade name is some evidence of intent to abandon the name, but is not conclusive [*Leventhal v. Ollie Morris Equip. Corp. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 553, 560, 7 Cal. Rptr. 911*]. The use of other trade names for a short period of time in connection with one used continuously for a long period of time does not, in itself, prove abandonment or weaken the effect of the name used for the longer period [*Nolan Bros. Shoe Co. v. Nolan (1900) 131 Cal. 271, 276, 63 P. 480*]. Conducting business continuously under several fictitious names containing one or more of the words or names in a trade name does not constitute abandonment of the trade name [*Weatherford v. Eytchison (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 379, 386, 202 P.2d 1040*].

126 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Protection of Trade Names

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.73-549.79

[Reserved]

§§ 549.73[Reserved]

127 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.80

§ 549.80 Related Texts From LEXIS Publishing

For memoranda supporting an application for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction restraining trademark and trade name infringement, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

Gilson on Trademarks (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Jury Instruction, Ch. 33A, Matthew Bender Unfair Competition Instructions, MB 3300A.60 et seq. (Matthew Bender)

For forms and instructions relating to applications for, and renewal and assignment of, California trademark and service mark registrations, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 103B, *Trademarks* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsRemediesEquitable ReliefPreliminary InjunctionsTrademark LawInfringement ActionsRemediesEquitable ReliefTemporary Restraining OrdersTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationRenewal

128 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.81

§ 549.81 Federal Constitution

Commerce clause as basis for federal trademark legislation. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersCommerce ClauseGeneral OverviewTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.82

§ 549.82 Federal Statutes

[1] Actions

Display of mark registration symbol is prerequisite to recovery of profits and damages in infringement suits. *15 U.S.C. § 1111*

Infringement of marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1114*

Affirmative defenses. *15 U.S.C. § 1115*

Injunctive relief for infringement of marks or false representations. *15 U.S.C. § 1116*

Injunctions enforceable by proceedings to punish for contempt, or otherwise. *15 U.S.C. § 1116(a)*

Seizure of goods bearing counterfeit marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)*

Cause of action for wrongful or attempted wrongful seizure of goods. *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(11)*

Attorney's fees recoverable, in exceptional cases, by prevailing party in suits for infringement or false representation. *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*

Costs recoverable in suits for infringement or false representation. *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*

Defendant's profits and treble damages recoverable in suits for infringement or false representation. *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)*

Attorney's fees recoverable in infringement suits involving use of counterfeit marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1117(b)*

Treble damages or defendant's profits recoverable in infringement suits involving use of counterfeit marks. *15 U.S.C. §*

1117(b)

Statutory damages recoverable in infringement suits involving use of counterfeit marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)*

Destruction of infringing marks and materials. *15 U.S.C. § 1118*

Power of court, in action involving registered mark, to determine right to registration, order cancellation of registration, restore canceled registration, and otherwise rectify register as to registrations of any party to action. *15 U.S.C. § 1119*

False or fraudulent procurement of registration is basis for civil action for damages. *15 U.S.C. § 1120*

Federal court jurisdiction. *15 U.S.C. § 1121*

False designations of origin and false descriptions of goods or services is basis for civil action. *15 U.S.C. § 1125*

Injunction and other remedies obtainable against dilution of famous marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)*

Use, without consent of U.S. Olympic Committee, of specified words and symbols adopted for exclusive use by USOC is subject to civil action by USOC for remedies in Lanham Act. *36 U.S.C. § 220506*

[2] Criminal Offenses

Trafficking in goods or services using counterfeit marks is criminal offense. *18 U.S.C. § 2320*

[3] Importation of Goods

Prohibition against importation of goods bearing infringing mark or name. *15 U.S.C. § 1124*

Prohibition against importation of goods bearing false designations of origin or false descriptions. *15 U.S.C. § 1125*

Importation, without mark owner's consent, of foreign-made merchandise bearing registered trademark owned by United States citizen or entity is prohibited. *19 U.S.C. § 1526(a)*

[4] Incontestability of Right to Use Mark

Incontestability. *15 U.S.C. § 1065*

Affirmative defenses valid against incontestable mark. *15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)*

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue in Federal Court

Jurisdiction over appeals from and civil actions arising out of decisions of Trademark Trial and Appeal Board and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks. *15 U.S.C. § 1071*

Federal court subject matter jurisdiction in actions arising under the Lanham Act. *15 U.S.C. § 1121*

General federal question jurisdiction. *28 U.S.C. § 1331*

Federal district court has original jurisdiction of any civil action for unfair competition when joined with substantial and related claim under federal trademark laws. *28 U.S.C. § 1338*

Original jurisdiction in federal district court in any action arising under any act of Congress relating to trademarks. *28 U.S.C. § 1338*

Venue generally in actions commenced in federal court. *28 U.S.C. §§ 1391, 1392*

[6] Patent and Trademark Office Procedure

Verification and acknowledgment of documents under *15 U.S.C. §§ 1051-1127*. *15 U.S.C. § 1061*

Inter partes proceedings. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1067-1069*

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board authorized to conduct inter partes proceedings and hear ex parte appeals. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1067, 1070*

Judicial review and ex parte appeals. *15 U.S.C. § 1071*

Fees and charges assessed by Patent and Trademark Office. *15 U.S.C. § 1113*

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks obligated to make rules and regulations for conduct of proceedings in Patent and Trademark Office. *15 U.S.C. § 1123*

[7] Registration of Marks

Application for registration of marks. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, 1091*

Concurrent registration of marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1052*

Subject matter of registrable marks. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1052, 1091*

Service marks are registrable. *15 U.S.C. § 1053*

Collective and certification marks are registrable. *15 U.S.C. § 1054*

Related companies. *15 U.S.C. § 1055*

Disclaimer of unregistrable portions of marks. *15 U.S.C. § 1056*

Certificates of registration. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1057, 1093*

Application to register mark constitutes constructive use of mark; rights of priority. *15 U.S.C. § 1057(c)*

Duration of registration; affidavit of continued use or excusable nonuse. *15 U.S.C. § 1058*

Cancellation proceedings. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1058, 1064, 1067, 1092*

Renewal of registration. *15 U.S.C. § 1059*

Assignment of marks and registrations. *15 U.S.C. § 1060*

Publication of marks. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1062, 1092*

Opposition proceedings. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1063, 1067*

Interference proceedings. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1066, 1067*

Concurrent use proceedings. *15 U.S.C. § 1067*

Constructive notice of mark ownership. *15 U.S.C. § 1072*

Notice of mark registration. *15 U.S.C. § 1111*

Classification of goods and services for registration. *15 U.S.C. § 1112*

Evidentiary effect of registration on principal register. *15 U.S.C. § 1115*

[8] Supplemental Register

Registration on supplemental register. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1091-1096*

Marks registered on supplemental register is subject to cancellation. *15 U.S.C. § 1092*

Marks registered on supplemental register is not subject to opposition. *15 U.S.C. § 1092*

Registration on supplemental register does not preclude registration on principal register. *15 U.S.C. § 1095*

[9] Treaties and Conventions

International treaties and conventions. *15 U.S.C. § 1126*

Provisions implementing Madrid Protocol (concerning international registration of marks), which are in force in United States on and after November 2, 2003. *15 U.S.C. § 1141 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesCounterfeitingGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsDefensesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsJurisdictionGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsRemediesGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationFederal Registration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.83

§ 549.83 State Statutes

[1] Trademarks and Service Marks

Model State Trademark Law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*

Definitions. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202*

Marks that may not be registered. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14205*

Application for registration of mark. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14207*

Application procedures in Secretary of State's office. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14209*

Issuance of certificate of registration. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14215*

Renewal of registration. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14217*

Assignment of registration; change of registrant's name; recordation of related instruments. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14220*

Records to be kept in Secretary of State's office. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14225*

Cancellation of registration. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14230*

Classification of goods and services for purposes of registration of marks. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14235*

Fraudulent registration. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14240*

Causes of action and defenses respecting counterfeit goods or services. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245*

Causes of action and defenses respecting dilution of famous marks. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247*

Injunctive relief, damages, and seizure of goods in case of counterfeit goods or services. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250*

No effect on criminal law. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14252*

Judicial proceedings to require cancellation or compel registration of mark. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14254*

Preservation of common law rights. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14259*

Fees paid to Secretary of State are not refundable. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14260*

Provisions of law are severable. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14265*

Pending suits and proceedings are not affected. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14270*

[2] Trade Names

"Trade name" defined. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(d)*

Transfer of trade name. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401*

Infringement of trade name is basis for injunctive relief. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14402*

Misuse of container bearing trade name of another with intent to defraud or deceive is misdemeanor. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14403*

Removal, concealment, destruction, or defacement of trade name of another with intent to defraud or deceive is misdemeanor. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14404*

Registration of trade name. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411 et seq.*

[3] Miscellaneous

[a] In General

Geographical name as trademark or brand on milk product is not prohibited in certain circumstances. *Food and Agric. Code § 37224*

Container labeling requirements for pharmaceutical products. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 4047.5*

Labeling of petroleum products. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 13480 et seq.*

Container brands. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14425 et seq.*

Farm name as trademark. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14460 et seq.*

Laundry supply designations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14480 et seq.*

Names of associations other than trade names. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14492 et seq.*; *Corp. Code § 21300 et seq.*

Effect of mark or label on articles of American Indian labor. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17569 et seq.*

Quality marks applied to precious metal products. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22100 et seq.*

Fees for registering trademark or service mark. *Gov. Code § 12193*

Labor organizations have exclusive right to ownership, use, and control of labels or trademarks on adoption and registration in *California. Lab. Code § 1014-1016*

Motor vehicles required to bear trademarks in certain circumstances. *Veh. Code §§ 24006, 27900*

[b] Unfair Competition

Action for injunctive relief and for civil penalties based on unfair competition. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesCounterfeitingGeneral OverviewTrademark LawDilution of Famous MarksState Antidilution StatutesTrademark LawInfringement ActionsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationState RegistrationTrademark LawSpecial MarksTrade NamesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.84

§ 549.84 Federal Administrative Regulations

[1] Registration

Application for registration of trade or service mark. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.6, 2.21*-2.58, 2.61-2.69, 2.99

Publication. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.80-2.84, 2.153*-2.156

Classification of goods and services. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.85-2.87, 6.1*-6.4

Certificate of registration. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.151, 2.171*-2.176

Reregistration of marks registered under prior trademark acts. *37 C.F.R. § 2.158*

Affidavit of continued use or excusable nonuse. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.160-2.166, 2.168(a)*

Affidavit of incontestability. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.167-2.168*

Duration and renewal of registration. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.181-2.184*

Assignment of trade or service mark. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.185-2.187*

[2] Contested Proceedings

Interference proceedings. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.91-2.98, 2.116*

Concurrent use proceedings. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.99, 2.116(b)*

Opposition proceedings. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.101-2.107*

Cancellation of registration. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.111-2.115*

Procedure. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.116-2.136*

Appeals and judicial review. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.141-2.145*

Petitions to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks. *37 C.F.R. §§ 2.146-2.148*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationFederal RegistrationTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationIncontestabilityAffidavit RequirementTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationPower of CourtsTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationPublicationTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationRenewal

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.85

§ 549.85 Decisions

[1] Abandonment

Singing group was entitled to exclusive use of name "The Platters" to exclusion of former group member who dropped out. *Robi v. Reed (9th Cir. 1999) 173 F.3d 736*

Mark-licensor's exercise of sufficient quality control over licensee's use of mark in connection with licensee's product or service defeated claim of abandonment of licensor's rights in mark. *Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1017-1018*

Abandonment of trademark, being in nature of forfeiture, requires strict proof. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. Gibraltar Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1982) 694 F.2d 1150, 1156*

[2] Attorney's Fees

Plaintiff's election, in case based on counterfeit mark, to receive statutory damages under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(c)* precludes award of attorney's fees under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(b)*. *K & N Eng'g, Inc. v. Bulat (9th Cir. 2007) 510 F.3d 1079, 1083*

Award of attorney fees under Lanham Act was required to include finding that hours expended were reasonable and that hourly rates were customary. *Intel Corp. v. Terabyte Int'l (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 614, 623*

Trial court's omission to award attorneys' fees and treble damages under *15 U.S.C. § 1117* was proper under circumstances. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 982 F.2d 1400, 1409*

Attorneys' fees available under *15 U.S.C. § 1117(a)* in exceptional cases were available when jury awarded punitive damages on common law voice appropriation claim based on specific finding that defendants had acted with oppression, fraud, or malice. *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1093, 1111*

Case was exceptional within meaning of *15 U.S.C. § 1117*, thus warranting award of attorney fees, when defendants' conduct was flagrant and wilful and compounded by refusal to provide discovery. *Playboy Enterprises, Inc. v. Baccarat Clothing Co., Inc. (9th Cir. 1982) 692 F.2d 1272, 1276-1277*

Attorneys' fees were not available when legal issues presented were novel and auto-accessory manufacturer's use of auto manufacturer's marks, while deliberate, was but without intent to deceive public. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1350 , vacated, due to settlement of parties, see 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

[3] Cancellation of Mark Registration

Cancellation of mark registration is proper when there is valid ground why mark should not be registered and petitioner for cancellation has standing; proof of actual damage is only relevant, not requisite, to establish standing. *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. P.J. Rhodes & Co. (9th Cir. 1984) 735 F.2d 346, 348*

[4] Collective Mark

Trademark protection of collective mark does not extend past first sale of product; purchaser who resells genuine products under producer's true trademark violates no provisions of Lanham Act. *Sebastian Int'l v. Longs Drug Stores Corp. (9th Cir. 1995) 53 F.3d 1073, 1076*

[5] Color

Color alone may be entitled to trademark registration and protection when color has attained secondary meaning. *Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Products Co. (1995) 514 U.S. 159, 115 S. Ct. 1300, 131 L. Ed. 2d 248, 254*

[6] Common Law Rights

Issue of material fact, namely whether electronic manufacturer's advertising using Vanna White robot had appropriated celebrity's name or likeness to defendant's advantage, precluded summary judgment in favor of manufacturer on celebrity's common law right-of-publicity claim. *White v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 971 F.2d 1395, 1397*

[7] Composite Mark

Validity and distinctiveness of composite mark is determined by viewing trademark as whole as it appears in marketplace; not by reviewing validity of its component parts. *Self-Realization Fellowship Church v. Ananda Church of Self-Realization (9th Cir. 1995) 59 F.3d 902, 912*

Composite mark must be examined in its entirety, rather than piece-by-piece. *Rodeo Collection, Ltd. v. West Seventh (9th Cir. 1987) 812 F.2d 1215, 1218*

[8] Contributory Infringement

Credit card company is not contributorily or vicariously liable for trademark infringement by owners of web sites that

use wrongly appropriated trademarks, when company merely processes credit card payments to those web sites by internet users. *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Visa Int'l Serv. Ass'n (9th Cir. 2007) 494 F.3d 788, 806-808*

Sale of generic replacement parts that fit only "Rolex" watches constituted contributory trademark infringement. *Rolex Watch, U.S.A., Inc. v. Michel Co. (9th Cir. 1999) 179 F.3d 704, 712*

Manufacturer or distributor who intentionally induces another to infringe trademark or who continues to supply product to one it knows or has reason to know is engaging in infringement is contributorily responsible for any harm resulting from such deceit. *Inwood Laboratories, Inc. v. Ives Laboratories, Inc. (1982) 456 U.S. 844, 854, 102 S. Ct. 2182, 72 L. Ed. 2d 606* ; *Sealy, Inc. v. Easy Living, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 1378, 1382*

Determination of contributory infringement turns on defendant's intent and knowledge of its distributors' wrongful activities; manufacturer can escape liability for contributory infringement of trademark by taking effective measures to prevent infringing uses by its distributors. *Sealy, Inc. v. Easy Living, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 1378, 1382*

[9] Defenses

Presumption of laches arose when plaintiff's infringement action was commenced more than four years after plaintiff became aware that both parties offered same services (Internet access, e-mail, and web hosting) in same geographic area under remarkably similar names; since prudent business person should recognize likelihood of confusion to consumers in such circumstances, plaintiff was not entitled to wait until defendant's business grew large enough to constitute real threat, and then sue for trademark infringement; however, plaintiff's suit was not barred by laches because defendant could not show prejudice, having failed to prove either efforts at building its business around its asserted trademark or important reliance on publicity of its mark. *Internet Specialties West, Inc. v. Milon-Digiorgio Enters. (9th Cir. 2009) 559 F.3d 985, 991-992*

Woman who was former *Playboy* magazine "Playmate of the Year" made permissible, nominative fair use of that label and publisher's associated trademarks because her uses implied no current sponsorship or endorsement by publisher but only served to identify her truthfully as former "Playmate of the Year"; however, use of "PMOY" as watermark image on her web site could have been infringement or dilution of trademark. *Playboy Enters. v. Welles (9th Cir. 2002) 279 F.3d 796, 803, 805*

Neutral principles of trademark infringement such as regular factors courts employ to determine infringement, and neutral defenses such as prior use of marks, were available to enable district court to decide dispute in religious order over rights to intellectual property without violating *First Amendment*. *Maktab Tarighe Oveyssi Shah Maghsoudi, Inc. v. Kianfar (9th Cir. 1999) 179 F.3d 1244, 1249*

Parabolic chain design of disc-golf target was functional thus precluding trademark or trade dress protection. *Disc Golf Association, Disc Golf Ass'n v. Champion discs, Inc. (9th Cir. 1998) 158 F.3d 1002*

Parody defense was unavailable in action under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* for ad spoofing Vanna White and "Wheel of Fortune" TV show to sell *Samsung VCRs. White v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 971 F.2d 1395, 1401*

Commercial user is entitled to nominative fair use defense when it uses trademark to describe plaintiff's product, rather than its own, and meets three-part test. New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 308 (newspapers conducted popularity polls of musical group by asking readers to call 900 telephone lines; that was nominative fair use of group's trademark)

Functionality defense is unavailable unless alleged violator uses most effective method reasonably available for eliminating likelihood of confusion consistent with functional use of mark. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1339 , vacated,* due to settlement by parties, see *767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

Lanham Act defenses are not available to plaintiff in action under *36 U.S.C. § 380* for unauthorized use of words or symbols of U.S. Olympic Committee, despite availability of Lanham Act remedies. *International Olympic Committee v. San Francisco Arts & Athletics (9th Cir. 1986) 781 F.2d 733, 736 , aff'd, 483 U.S. 522 (1987)*

Significant delay in seeking preliminary injunctive relief was merely factor bearing on irreparable injury and did not bar relief. *Nutro Products, Inc. v. Cole Grain Co. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 860, 866, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 41*

Factors in determining whether laches will bar relief in suits for injunctive relief for trademark infringement under the Lanham Act are: (1) strength and value of trademark rights asserted, (2) plaintiff's diligence in enforcing mark, (3) harm to senior user if relief denied, (4) good faith ignorance by junior user, (5) competition between senior and junior users, and (6) extent of harm suffered by junior user because of senior user's delay. *E-Systems, Inc. v. Monitek, Inc (9th Cir. 1983) 720 F.2d 604, 607*

Laches is available as equitable defense in suit for injunctive relief for trademark infringement under the Lanham Act. *Prudential Ins. Co. v. Gibraltar Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1982) 694 F.2d 1150, 1152*

[10] Descriptive Marks

There is no magic formula for distinctiveness, thus every case must be decided on its facts; substantial evidence supported finding that product name was suggestive rather than descriptive and therefore protectable. *Nutro Products, Inc. v. Cole Grain Co. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 860, 867-868, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 41*

[11] Dilution of Mark or Name

[a] In General

Even if plaintiff's mark was distinctive and incontestible within five years of registration, it must also have become famous before defendant's first commercial use in order to be entitled to protection against dilution; first use for purposes of Federal Trademark Dilution Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)*] is that use which is arguably offending, because any commercial use of famous mark is diluting regardless of whether it is confusing or combined with other identifiers. *Nissan Motor Co. v. Nissan Computer Corp. (9th Cir. 2004) 378 F.3d 1002, 1007*

Finding by trial court that "FRUIT OF THE LOOM" trademark was not diluted by FRUIT CUPS or FRUIT FLOPS, and finding that "FRUIT" apart from "FRUIT OF THE LOOM" was not strong enough mark to be protected under state antidilution law, were not clearly erroneous. *Fruit of The Loom, Inc. v. Ken Girouard (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1359, 1362*

Likelihood of confusion was not element of cause of action for injunctive relief under former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14330* (*now see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14202(k), 14247*). *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 778 F.2d 1352, 1362* ; *Monte Carlo Shirt, Inc. v. Daewoo International (America) (9th Cir. 1983) 707 F.2d 1054, 1058*

Auto manufacturer failed to introduce evidence that auto-accessories manufacturer's use of its marks on auto floor mats diluted distinctive quality of those marks. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F.*

Supp. 1329, 1344 vacated due to settlement by parties, (*granting summary judgment on counterclaim for dilution; see Plasticolor Molded Products, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co. (1991) 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

Federal trademark law does not preempt California's dilution statute. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1346* (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see Plasticolor Molded Products, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co. (1975) 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

Manufacturer of animal identification tags that advertised plaintiff's tags as its own was possibly liable for unfair competition or trademark infringement but was not liable for tort of disparagement (which would exclude insurance coverage). *Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Centennial Ins. Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 838 F.2d 346, 351-352* (action between primary and excess insurance carriers with underlying action alleging dilution)

Dilution doctrine grants protection to strong, well-recognized marks absent likelihood of confusion if defendant's use is such as to tarnish, degrade, or dilute distinctive quality of plaintiff's mark. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (C.D. Cal. 1982) 550 F. Supp. 1056, 1061*

[b] Cybersquatting

District court erred in granting injunction when findings that trademarked names "Avery" and "Dennison" were famous and use of avery.net and dennison.net was commercial were erroneous as matter of law. *Avery Dennison Corporation v. Sumption (9th Cir. 1999) 189 F.3d 868*

[12] Discovery

Discovery by defendant that reveals other potential infringers is irrelevant under law of Ninth Circuit and California in federal and state actions for trademark infringement and dilution. *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1181*

[13] False Advertising

Consumers do not have standing to bring action for false advertising under *Lanham Act. Barrus v. Sylvania (9th Cir. 1995) 55 F.3d 468, 470*

[14] False Descriptions and Designations of Origin

Inherently distinctive trade dress is protected under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*; secondary meaning is not required. *Two Pesos, Inc. v. Taco Cabana, Inc. (1992) 505 U.S. 763, 112 S. Ct. 2753, 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 623* (affirming lower court rulings that one fast-food Mexican restaurant chain infringed on trade dress of another by using similar motif)

Action under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(B)*, on claim that defendant made false and deceptive statements in commercial advertisement about defendant's product, cannot be maintained on allegation that defendant's statements violated federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in absence of conclusion by FDA that alleged violation occurred. *PhotoMedex, Inc. v. Irwin (9th Cir. 2010) 601 F.3d 919, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 7640, at *9*

Claim for reverse passing off under *15 U.S.C. § 1125* requires that defendant made "bodily appropriation" of plaintiff's product; bodily appropriation was necessarily precluded when trial court found that defendant's product was not substantially similar to plaintiff's. *Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1438*

Factual findings by district court supported legal conclusion that defendant had violated federal trademark law by using plaintiff's registered service mark in connection with offering of services so as to falsely describe or represent mark. *Pacific Telesis Group v. International Telesis Communications (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1364, 1369*

15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) does not require actual competition in traditional sense in false endorsement claim based on unauthorized use of celebrity's identity. *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1093, 1107* (action against manufacturer that imitated voice of well-known singer in radio commercial)

False endorsement claims, including those premised on unauthorized imitation of entertainer's distinctive voice, were cognizable under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* both before and after 1988 amendments. *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1093, 1107* (action against manufacturer that imitated voice of well-known singer in radio commercial)

Genuine issue of material fact as to whether electronic manufacturer's advertising using Vanna White robot created likelihood of confusion as to celebrity's endorsement of product precluded summary judgment in favor of manufacturer on celebrity's action under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*. *White v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 971 F.2d 1395, 1401*

Musical group had no cause of action against newspapers for violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*, forbidding use of false designations of origin and false advertising, when newspapers conducted popularity polls of musical group by asking readers to call 900 telephone lines; newspapers' nominative fair use of group's trademark did not imply endorsement by musical group. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 971 F.2d 302, 308* (affirming summary judgment in favor of defendant newspapers)

Advertisers' unauthorized use of imitation of professional singer's distinctive voice in song used in product advertisement was not unfair competition under former *15 U.S.C. § 01125* when advertisers were not in competition with singer. *Midler v. Ford Motor Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 849 F.2d 460, 462-463*

Licensees were liable under former *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* for either affixing incomplete designation of authorship to goods or services or, with knowledge of false designation of origin, causing goods or services to be transported or used in interstate commerce. *Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1403, 1408*

In releasing sheet music in which music and lyrics were attributed solely to one of three coauthors and thereby depriving remaining two authors of recognition and profits, defendant was engaged in express reverse palming off actionable as false designation of origin under former *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*. *Lamothe v. Atlantic Recording Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1403, 1407-1408*

Theaters' advertisement of PG-rated film as R-rated was not actionable false description of goods under former *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* when film producer allegedly injured by advertisement could not show that injury was linked to competition. *Halicki v. United Artists Communications, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 812 F.2d 1213, 1214*

15 U.S.C. § 1125(a) is applicable not only to cases of palming off, passing off, or economic equivalent, but also to false advertising regarding goods and services of advertiser in interstate commerce. *U-Haul International, Inc. v. Jartran, Inc. (9th Cir. 1982) 681 F.2d 1159, 1160-1162*

Actor states cause of action against film distributors for violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*, forbidding use of false

designations of origin and false descriptions or representations in advertising and sale of goods and services, when film distributors allegedly removed actor's name from both film credits and advertising material in connection with film. *Smith v. Montoro (9th Cir. 1981) 648 F.2d 602, 607*

Mark registration not required for recovery, under *15 U.S.C. § 1125*, for false designation of origin because dispositive question is whether party has reasonable interest in protection from false advertising. *New West Corp. v. NYM Co. of California, Inc. (9th Cir. 1979) 595 F.2d 1194, 1198*

[15] Geographic Terms

Geographic term ordinarily are not subject to exclusive ownership, but injunction available to prevent use of composit marks employing geographic term. *Cebu Association of California, Inc. v. Santo Nino de Cebu USA, Inc. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 129, 135, 137, 157 Cal. Rptr. 102*

In trade name infringement action, plaintiff is required to show that its geographical name has taken on, in public mind, something more than strict geographical meaning, so that when name is used member of public would not think primarily of any hospital in Tustin, but of plaintiff's hospital in particular. *Tustin Community Hospital, Inc. v. Santa Ana Community Hospital Assn. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 889, 906, 153 Cal. Rptr. 76*

[16] Gray Market Goods

Gray market goods are foreign-manufactured goods, bearing valid U.S. trademarks, that are imported into United States without consent of U.S. trademark holder. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc. (1988) 486 U.S. 281, 285, 108 S. Ct. 1811, 100 L. Ed. 2d 313*

Prohibition of *19 U.S.C. § 1526(a)* against importation, without mark owner's consent, of foreign-made merchandise bearing registered trademark owned by U.S. citizen or entity is inapplicable when same person or entity owns both foreign and domestic trademarks or when foreign and domestic trademark owners are subject to common ownership or control. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc. (1988) 486 U.S. 281, 291, 294, 108 S. Ct. 1811, 100 L. Ed. 2d 313* (construing *19 C.F.R. § 133.21(c)(1), (2)*)

Prohibition of *19 U.S.C. § 1526(a)* against importation, without mark owner's consent, of foreign-made merchandise bearing registered trademark owned by U.S. citizen or entity is applicable to prohibit importation of merchandise when mark owner consents to use of mark on, but not to importation of, merchandise. *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc. (1988) 486 U.S. 281, 291, 294, 108 S. Ct. 1811, 100 L. Ed. 2d 313*

Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, after seizing imported merchandise on ground that it bore counterfeit mark, may impose civil penalty on importer of that merchandise [*19 U.S.C. § 1526(e), (f)*] even though owner of registered mark does not manufacture or sell same type of merchandise. *United States v. Able Time, Inc. (9th Cir. 2008) 545 F.3d 824, 826-827*

[17] Incontestability

Court's equitable powers do not encompass substantive challenges to validity of incontestable marks on grounds that marks lack secondary meaning. *Park 'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582, 593*

Infringement of federally registered incontestable mark is not defensible on grounds that mark is merely descriptive,

and holder of mark is able to rely on incontestability of mark to enjoin infringement. *Park 'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582, 594*

Power of courts to cancel registrations and otherwise rectify register under *15 U.S.C. § 1119* is subject to specific Lanham Act provisions concerning incontestability. *Park 'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly, Inc. (1985) 469 U.S. 189, 105 S. Ct. 658, 83 L. Ed. 2d 582, 593*

Equitable defenses are available in action to enforce incontestable mark. *Pyrodyne Corp. v. Pyrotronics Corp. (9th Cir. 1988) 847 F.2d 1398, 1402* (laches and estoppel; former law); *Prudential Ins. Co. v. Gibraltar Financial Corp. (9th Cir. 1982) 694 F.2d 1150, 1153* (laches; former law)

[18] Infringing Acts

Defendant's sale of computer chips manufactured by plaintiff with plaintiff's trademark on them, after falsely relabelling them as "fast" chips, constituted infringement of plaintiff's trademark. *Intel Corp. v. Terabyte Int'l (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 614, 620*

[19] Likelihood of Confusion

In action under *36 U.S.C. § 380* for unauthorized commercial or promotional use of "Olympic" and various Olympic symbols, U.S. Olympic Committee and International Olympic Committee are not required to prove that contested use is likely to cause confusion. *San Fran. Arts & Athletics v. United States Olympic Committee (1987) 483 U.S. 522, 107 S. Ct. 2971, 97 L. Ed. 2d 427, 444*

Automobile-related advertising on website of Nissan Computer Corporation (owned by individual named Uzi Nissan) constituted infringement of Nissan Motor Company's trademark because of initial-interest confusion (that is, use of "Nissan" mark in automobile-related advertising captured attention of consumers interested in Nissan-brand vehicles), but non-automobile-related advertising did not. *Nissan Motor Co. v. Nissan Computer Corp. (9th Cir. 2004) 378 F.3d 1002, 1007*

Use of confusingly similar logo on web site is actionable under Lanham Act. *GoTo.com, Inc. v. Walt Disney Co. (9th Cir. 2000) 202 F.3d 1199, 1209*

Use of confusingly similar mark in web site metatags or domain name is actionable under *Lanham Act. Brookfield Communications, Inc. v. West Coast Entertainment Corp. (9th Cir. 1999) 174 F.3d 1036, 1055*

Use of second-level domain name in web-site address is trademark infringement if web-site operator uses name confusingly similar to valid, protectable trademark. *Intersetllar Starship Services, Ltd. v. Epix Incorporated (9th Cir. 1999) 184 F.3d 1107*

Application of eight-factor test for likelihood of confusion supported trial court's finding of likelihood of confusion as to only one of defendant's uses of plaintiff's arbitrary mark. *Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 1385, 1395*

Factual findings by trial court supported legal conclusion that defendant had violated federal trademark law by using plaintiff's registered service mark in connection with offering of services that was likely to cause confusion. *Pacific Telesis Group v. International Telesis Communications (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1364, 1369*

Finding by trial court that no likelihood of confusion existed between clothing manufacturer's marks and use of FRUIT

CUPS and FRUIT LOOPS by manufacturer of boutique items was not clearly erroneous. *Fruit of The Loom, Inc. v. Ken Girouard (9th Cir. 1993), 994 F.2d 1359, 1362*

Ninth Circuit eight-factor test for assessing likelihood of confusion in trademark infringement cases is guide that is neither exhaustive nor conclusive. *Metro Pub. Ltd. v. San Jose Mercury News (9th Cir. 1993) 987 F.2d 637, 640*

Trial court was not required to consider all factors relative to likelihood of confusion in granting preliminary injunctive relief in trademark infringement action. *MAI Systems Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 991 F.2d 511, 523*

Evidence was sufficient to support jury finding that consumers were likely to be misled by radio commercial into believing that well-known singer endorsed SalsaRio Doritos. *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1093, 1111*

Manufacturer of computer video game, not competitor, was responsible for consumer confusion when its trademark was imbedded in functional device available to and used by competitor in manufacture of compatible video game programs. *Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 977 F.2d 1510, 1528* (dissolving preliminary injunction in favor of manufacturer)

Likelihood of confusion can be found whenever consumers are likely to assume that mark is associated with another source or sponsor because of similarities between two marks; and it may be established by showing that 70 percent of infringing mark's target population associated both marks with one product. *Academy of Motion Picture Arts v. Creative House (9th Cir. 1991) 944 F.2d 1446, 1456*

Surveys demonstrating absence of actual confusion among specified segment of population did not necessarily defeat likelihood of confusion when defendant franchisee lawfully operated under plaintiff franchisor's name before operating under subsequent infringing name. *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1181*

Neither actual confusion nor intent is necessary to finding of likelihood of confusion in federal trademark infringement action. *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1178*

Finding of likelihood of confusion is not automatic, even though more readily made, when goods compete in same markets and marks are very similar, because additional factors must be considered in determining likelihood of confusion. *Lindy Pen Co. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1986) 796 F.2d 254, 255*

Postsale inspection does not negate or cure initial similarity between trademarks of pens sold through telephone order market, absent evidence in trial court showing that postsale inspection is likely to uncover and rectify prior confusion of marks. *Lindy Pen Co. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1986) 796 F.2d 254, 256*

Whether confusion is likely is factual determination woven into law and routinely treated as issue of fact in various procedural contexts. *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 778 F.2d 1352, 1356*

Showing of likely buyer confusion as to source, origin, or sponsorship of goods is part of cause of action for common law infringement of trademark. *Monte Carlo Shirt, Inc. v. Daewoo Internatonal (America) (9th Cir. 1983) 707 F.2d 1054, 1058*

Factors for consideration in determination of likelihood of confusion. *Lindy Pen Co. v. Bic Pen Corp. (C.D. Cal. 1982) 550 F. Supp. 1056, 1060-1061*

Infringement not shown when no evidence is produced to show customer was misled about origin, sponsorship, or endorsement of jewelry when evidence showed that other jewelers sold unlicensed jewelry bearing emblem of women's

fraternal organization. *International Order of Job's Daughters v. Lindeburg & Co. (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 912, 920*

Trademark infringement established "as a matter of hornbook law" when defendant's mark was likely to and did cause confusion, mistake, and deception as to origin of product, when appearance of plaintiff's product had acquired secondary meaning identifying plaintiff as source, and when defendant deliberately intended to pass off his goods as those of plaintiff. *Tveter v. AB Turn-O-Matic (9th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 831, 838*

Mixed use of trademark, both as source indication and as functional element, was infringement when likelihood of confusion existed as to source or sponsorship at point of sale or when alleged infringer did not take reasonable steps to eliminate likelihood of confusion after sale. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1333-1339* (lawsuit by plastic products manufacturer seeking declaratory judgment of right to use Ford Motor Company trademarks on auto accessories it produces) (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

[20] Misappropriation

Country-western singer had no claim of misappropriation against television producer whose use of singer's name for one of television show's characters was totally unrelated to singer's notoriety. *Newton v. Thomason (9th Cir. 1994) 22 F.3d 1455, 1461*

Musical group had no cause of action against newspapers for commercial or common law misappropriation when newspapers conducted popularity polls of musical group by asking readers to call 900 telephone lines. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 308* (affirming summary judgment in favor of defendants)

Newspapers had complete defense under *Civ. Code § 3344(d)* to commercial and common law misappropriation when they used name of musical group in connection with news, public affairs, or sports broadcast or account that was materially true. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 308* (newspaper popularity poll asking readers to call 900 telephone line with follow-up story on results)

When commercial liability insurance policy covers liability for "advertising injury" resulting from "misappropriation of advertising ideas or style of doing business" but excludes injury arising out of "oral or written publication of material whose first publication took place before the beginning of the policy period," that exclusion embraces trademark infringement if it began before policy went into force. *Kim Seng Co. v. Great Am. Ins. Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1037-1039, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 537*

Standard commercial liability insurance policy's explicit coverage of liability for "advertising injury" resulting from "misappropriation of advertising ideas or style of doing business" can be construed as extending to insured's liability for trademark infringement. *Lebas Fashion Imports of USA, Inc. v. ITT Hartford Ins. Group (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 548, 565, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 36*

[21] Prior Use

Even though mere advertising, absent more, is insufficient to establish priority of use, totality of defendant's actions surrounding use and adoption of mark prior to advertising product bearing mark was sufficient to show prior use. *New West Corp. v. NYM Co. of California, Inc. (9th Cir. 1979) 595 F.2d 1194, 1200*

On dissolution of partnership formed by franchisor and franchisee under agreement that did not grant, assign, or sell

any name to partnership, franchisee was permitted to continue using partnership name; unregistered name was not thing of value bestowed by franchisor, but franchisor was entitled to money compensation for contributions that enhanced name. *Neptune Society Corp. v. Longanecker (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1233, 1245-1246, 240 Cal. Rptr. 117*

[22] Profits

Appellate court order for accounting of profits on remand did not entitle defendant to accounting when trial court found award of profits was not appropriate because defendant's infringement was innocent and without intent to capitalize on plaintiff's trade name. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 982 F.2d 1400, 1405-1407*

In trademark infringement action, defendant was required to pay to successful plaintiff amount earned on sale of counterfeit goods at cost, even though amount was not strictly "profit," in order to remove incentive for defendant to ship goods after discovering they were counterfeit. *Polo Fashions, Inc. v. Dick Bruhn, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 793 F.2d 1132, 1135*

Trial court abused discretion in denying award of profits to plaintiff when defendants' profits were established at trial as $120,000 and court awarded damages of only $12,750. *Playboy Enterprises, Inc. v. Baccarat Clothing Co. (9th Cir. 1982) 692 F.2d 1272, 1275*

Auto manufacturer was entitled to accounting of profits from sales of auto floor mats bearing its trademarks before mats were re-packaged to eliminate consumer confusion. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1349-1350* (lawsuit by plastic products manufacturer seeking declaratory judgment of right to use Ford Motor Company trademarks on auto accessories it produces) (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinsk's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

[23] Purpose of Trademark Law

Historical and modern purpose of trademark law is to identify manufacturer or sponsor of goods or provider of service and prevent products from free-riding on rivals' marks; infringement laws do not apply to non-trademark use of mark. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 305* (affirming summary judgment in favor of defendant newspapers conducting telephone polls on popularity of plaintiff musical group)

[24] Remedies

[a] In General

Trademark remedies are guided by tort law principles, including general rule that damages must be established with reasonable certainty. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 982 F.2d 1400, 1407* (trademark infringement action by one pen manufacturer against another)

Trial court has broad discretion within which to fashion remedy for federal trademark law violation. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 982 F.2d 1400, 1411*

Purpose of trademark is to identify manufacturer or sponsor of product; trademark law protects features that identify product source but not features that serve as functional components of product. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1339* (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see Plasticolor Molded Products, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co. (1991) 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal.*

1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400 (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

Distinction between source identification and function is blurred when mark and product come from same or similar industries and can serve both elements simultaneously. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1333* (lawsuit by plastic products manufacturer seeking declaratory judgment of rights to use Ford Motor Company trademarks on auto accessories it produces) (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

[b] Damages

Plaintiff is required to establish damages by presenting competent evidence of its lost profits or defendant's unjust enrichment arising from infringement. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 982 F.2d 1400, 1409*

Damages awarded under *15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)* are duplicative of damages awarded on common law misappropriation claim for fair market value of services. *Waits v. Frito-Lay, Inc. (9th Cir. 1992) 978 F.2d 1093, 1107* (vacating duplicative damages award)

[c] Injunctive Relief

Injunction prohibiting Nissan Computer Corporation from linking its website visitors to other websites that presented disparaging or negative commentary about Nissan Motor Company (because of on-going trademark dispute) was content-based restriction on noncommercial speech and thus was inconsistent with *First Amendment*. *Nissan Motor Co. v. Nissan Computer Corp. (9th Cir. 2004) 378 F.3d 1002, 1007*

Likelihood of confusion is sufficient ground for injunction under federal trademark law. *Pacific Telesis Group v. International Telesis Communications (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1364, 1369*

Showing of irreparable harm, required for injunctive relief, is ordinarily presumed once plaintiff in trademark infringement case has demonstrated likelihood of confusion. *Metro Pub. Ltd. v. San Jose Mercury News (9th Cir. 1993) 987 F.2d 637, 640*

In trademark infringement action in which plaintiff seeks preliminary injunction, plaintiff's showing of likelihood of confusion ordinarily raises presumption that plaintiff will suffer irreparable harm if injunctive relief is not granted. *Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 888 F.2d 609, 612 n.3*

Injunctive relief is remedy of choice for federal and state trademark infringement actions, since there is no adequate remedy at law for injury caused by defendant's continuing infringement; broad injunction is especially appropriate when infringing use is for similar service. *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1180* (upholding injunction in state and federal infringement actions)

Even though plaintiff in trademark infringement action is unable to introduce concrete evidence that defendants are likely to infringe again, grant of injunction is proper when defendants willfully violated plaintiff's trademark rights and refused to stop doing so until plaintiff brought suit. *Polo Fashions, Inc. v. Dick Bruhn, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 793 F.2d 1132, 1135-1136*

Injunction that provides defendant with fair and well-defined notice of prohibited conduct does not violate *U.S. Const., amend. I*, because commercial speech may be regulated when content is otherwise false or misleading. *Transgo, Inc. v.*

Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1022

Plaintiff entitled to preliminary injunction in trademark case when he or she demonstrates either probable success on merits and possibility of irreparable injury or existence of serious questions going to merits and that balance of hardships tips sharply in plaintiff's favor; probability of success on merits of cause of action for mark infringement is shown by existence of likelihood of confusion as to source of goods or services. *Sardi's Restaurant Corp. v. Sardie (9th Cir. 1985) 755 F.2d 719, 723*

[25] Review

Trademark infringement and antidilution cases are fact-driven; findings of trial court are reversible only if appellate court has firm and definite conviction that trial court erred. *Fruit of The Loom, Inc. v. Ken Girouard (9th Cir. 1993), 994 F.2d 1359, 1361* ; *Pacific Telesis Group v. International Telesis Communications (9th Cir. 1993) 994 F.2d 1362, 1367*

Appellate court reviewing summary judgment for defendants in trademark infringement action is required to consider viability of state claims and avoid reaching constitutional issues, if possible. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 305* (action by musical group against newspapers that conducted popularity polls of musical group by asking readers to call 900 telephone lines)

In Ninth Circuit, trial court's preliminary injunction is reversible only if trial court abused its discretion, based its decision on erroneous legal standard, or based its decision on clearly erroneous findings of fact. *Vision Sports, Inc. v. Melville Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 888 F.2d 609, 612*

In Ninth Circuit, standard of review in granting summary judgment on state trademark infringement claim is same as for corresponding federal claim: questions of state law are reviewed de novo, and conclusions regarding likelihood of confusion are reviewed under clearly erroneous standard. *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1180*

In Ninth Circuit, trial court's finding of likelihood of confusion in federal trademark infringement action is reviewed under clearly-erroneous standard. *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 778 F.2d 1352, 1355*

[26] Secondary Meaning

Factors considered in determining whether secondary meaning was achieved. *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 778 F.2d 1352, 1358* ; *Transgo, Inc. v. Ajac Transmission Parts Corp. (9th Cir. 1985) 768 F.2d 1001, 1015*

Registration on supplemental register does not bar registrant from establishing secondary meaning in subsequent litigation against alleged infringers using mark at time of registration. *California Cooler, Inc. v. Loretto Winery, Ltd. (9th Cir. 1985) 774 F.2d 1451, 1452, 1454*

Plaintiff's trademark acquired secondary meaning in marketplace and as distinctive of garments in commerce so that defendant's use of projecting label in edge of rear patch pocket of its pants would likely cause confusion, mistake, or deception as to proper source. *Levi Strauss & Co. v. Blue Bell, Inc. (9th Cir. 1980) 632 F.2d 817, 820-821, 822*

Basic element of secondary meaning is mental recognition in buyers' and potential buyers' minds that products connected with symbol or device emanate from or are associated with same source. *Lindy Pen Co., Inc. v. Bic Pen Corp. (C.D. Cal. 1982) 550 F. Supp. 1056, 1062*

Defendants' assertion that plaintiff acquired no protectible secondary meaning, because words were identified with multiple sources, was only relevant to factual determination and was not adequate basis for sustaining demurrer to well-pleaded complaint. *Lutz v. De Laurentiis (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1317, 1323-1324, 260 Cal. Rptr. 106*

[27] Service Marks

Even though rights in service mark may be acquired by use of mark in advertising alone, it does not follow that test for determining infringement must differ from that applied to trademarks or service marks acquired by more than advertising alone, and courts consistently interpret *15 U.S.C. § 1053* (same protection to trademarks and service marks) to mean that identical standards govern trademark and service mark infringement cases. *Nutri/System, Inc. v. Con-Stan Industries, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 809 F.2d 601, 604*

Neither telephone number that alphanumerically represents word "READ" nor alphanumeric representation of "READ" in conjunction with numerical prefix constituted trade or service mark of reading improvement service under former *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14206* and *14207* (*now see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(a)* and *(b)*). *Cytanovich Reading Center v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 112, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Person appearing in chicken costume was not equivalent to service mark because only stationary and unchanging marks are entitled to trademark or service mark protection. *KGB, Inc. v. Giannoulas (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 844, 856-857, 164 Cal. Rptr. 571*

[28] Settlement Agreements

Under settlement agreement by which one party acknowledges validity of other party's trademark and agrees not to infringe mark in return for other party's promise to waive past damages for infringement, party acknowledging mark's validity is estopped from raising defense of mark's invalidity in subsequent infringement litigation involving mark. *MWS Wire Industries, Inc. v. California Fine Wire (9th Cir. 1986) 797 F.2d 799, 803-804*

[29] Trade-Dress Infringement

Whether color per se qualifies for trademark protection is legal question to be reviewed de novo. *Qualitex Co. v. Jacobson Products, Inc. (9th Cir. 1994) 13 F.3d 1297, 1301*

Use of the same color in sound speaker component did not infringe plaintiff's trade dress when there was no likelihood of confusion on the part of consumers. *International Jensen v. Metrosound U.S.A. (9th Cir. 1993) 4 F.3d 819, 825*

Trade-dress infringement is not found when all elements of massage table are essential to use of table and, therefore, functional. *HWE, Inc. v. JB Research, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 993 F.2d 694, 696*

Claim of trade-dress infringement may be sufficient basis to invoke duty of defendant's liability insurer to defend under policy provision covering advertising injury. *El-Com Hardware, Inc. v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Co. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 205, 219, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670*

[30] Transfer of Mark or Name

Trade name was specifically transferred for limited period of time only or, alternatively, until purchase price was paid

when bill of sale for business transferred trade name for period of 10 years or until amount due and owing was paid. *Balesteri v. Holler (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 717, 723, 151 Cal. Rptr. 229*

[31] Unfair Competition

Mere possibility that consumer may be misled by television producer's use of singer's name was not enough to establish cause of action for unfair competition under Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)*]. *Newton v. Thomason (9th Cir. 1994) 22 F.3d 1455, 1461-1462*

State unfair competition laws that seek to prevent reverse palming off are not preempted by federal copyright or patent law. *Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Systems (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1441*

Musical group had no cause of action against newspapers for unfair competition when newspapers conducted popularity polls of musical group by asking readers to call 900 telephone lines; newspapers are entitled to nominative fair use defense to allegations of trademark infringement. *New Kids on the Block v. News America Pub., Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 971 F.2d 302, 308* (affirming summary judgment in favor of defendant newspapers)

Judgment for plaintiff on common law unfair competition claim was upheld on evidence in record supporting establishment of product's secondary meaning in relevant market and defendant's copying of nonfunctional aspects of product. *Lifshitz v. Walter Drake & Sons, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 806 F.2d 1426, 1430*

Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208 provide cause of action substantially parallel to federal trademark law. *Plasticolor Molded Products v. Ford Motor Co. (C.D. Cal. 1989) 713 F. Supp. 1329, 1341* (denying summary judgment on cross-claims for unfair competition and deceptive trade practices in action by plastics manufacturer for declaratory relief regarding right to use Ford Motor Company marks in auto accessories it produces) (vacated due to settlement by parties, *see Plasticolor Molded Products, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co. (1991) 767 F. Supp. 1036*); *see Sega Enterprises Ltd. v. Accolade, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 785 F. Supp. 1392, 1400* (Judge Kosinski's discussion in *Plasticolor* was "enlightened authoritative commentary" although opinion has been vacated)

Use of similar alphanumeric telephone number that is likely to confuse potential customers as to source of services is possible basis of unfair competition claim. *Cytanovich Reading Center v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 114, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Laches available as defense in action to enjoin unfair competition based on confusion of source of goods or services. *Tustin Community Hospital, Inc. v. Santa Ana Community Hospital Assn. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 889, 894, 153 Cal. Rptr. 76* ; *McCord v. Plotnick (1951) 108 Cal. App. 2d 392, 395-396, 239 P.2d 32*

Elements of cause of action for injunctive relief for unfair competition in use of trade name. *Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc. v. Elysium, Inc. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 731, 733, 63 Cal. Rptr. 507*

[32] Unregistered Trademarks

Federal trademark law applies to unregistered trademarks. *Metro Pub. Ltd. v. San Jose Mercury News (9th Cir. 1993) 987 F.2d 637, 640*

Title of newspaper column can acquire trademark status and protection under federal trademark law. *Metro Pub. Ltd. v. San Jose Mercury News (9th Cir. 1993) 987 F.2d 637, 640*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawDilution of Famous MarksGeneral OverviewTrademark LawInfringement ActionsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawLikelihood of ConfusionGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSubject MatterGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.86

§ 549.86 Law Reviews

Dittersdorf & Richard, *A Teamwork Approach to Trademark Protection,* 41(8) Prac. Law. 73 (1995)

Friscia & Cohen, *Trademark Use of Corporate Names,* 41(2) Prac. Law. 19 (1995)

Comment, *The Trouble With Trademark, 99 Yale L.J. 759 (1990)*

Note, *"Do You Want to Dance" Around the Law? Learn the Latest Steps From the Ninth Circuit in Midler v. Ford Motor Company, 23 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 601 (1990)*

Note, *K Mart Corp. v. Cartier, Inc.: The Gray Market Controversy Becomes Black and White, 19 Sw. U.L. Rev. 141 (1990)*

Burgunder, *Trademark and Copyright: How Intimate Should the Close Association Become? 29 Santa Clara L. Rev. 89 (1989)*

Hawes, *Trademark Licensing Can Lead to Product Liability*, 34(3) Prac. Law. 23 (1988).

Comment, *Monetary Relief for False Advertising Claims Arising Under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 34 UCLA L. Rev. 953 (1987)*

Burgunder, *Trademark Registration of Product Colors: Issues and Answers, 26 Santa Clara L. Rev. 581 (1986)*

Comment, *Guarding the Olympic Gold: Protecting the Marketability of Olympic Trademarks Through Section 110 of the Amateur Sports Act of 1978, 16 Sw. U. L. Rev. 461 (1986)*

Comment, *Incontestability: The Park'N Fly Decision, 33 UCLA L. Rev. 1149 (1986)*

Bauer, *A Federal Law Of Unfair Competition: What Should Be The Reach Of Section 43(a) Of The Lanham Act?, 31 UCLA L. Rev. 671 (1984)*

Comment, *Anti-Monopoly, Inc. v. General Mills Fun Group, Inc.: Ending the Monopoly on 'Monopoly', 17 Loyola L Rev 1021 (1984)*

Heneghan and Wamsley, *The Service Mark Alternative to Right of Publicity: Estate of Presley v. Russen, 14 Pacific L.J. 181 (1983)*

Folsom and Teply, *A Comparative View of the Law of Trademarked Generic Words, 6 Hastings Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 1 (1982)*

Bramson, *Intellectual Property as Collateral-- Patents, Trade Secrets, Trademarks and Copyrights,* 36 The Business Lawyer 1567 (1981)

Osborne, *How to Prevent Trademarks from Becoming Generic,* 27(3) The Practical Lawyer 81 (1981)

Weinstein, *How to: Acquiring and protecting trademark rights,* 56 S. Bar J. 314 (1981)

Evenson and Osborne, *When Should a Mark Be Registered?* 26(3) The Practical Lawyer 81 (1980)

Folsom and Teply, *Trademarked Generic Words, 89 Yale L.J. 1323 (1980)*

Comment, *Trademark Preliminary Injunctive Relief, 16 Cal. West. L. Rev. 90 (1980)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Trademark LawGeneral OverviewTrademark LawFederal Unfair Competition LawLanham ActGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationGeneral OverviewTrademark LawProtection of RightsRegistrationIncontestabilityGeneral OverviewTrademark LawSubject MatterColors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.87

§ 549.87 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, § 741, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 733, 735, 736, 785, 786, Vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 312 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Personal Property*, §§ 81-89, Vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 78-80, 98-104 (10th ed. 2005)

Restatement Torts, §§ 711-756

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGeneral OverviewTortsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 549.88-549.89

[Reserved]

§§ 549.88[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.90

§ 549.90 Cease and Desist Letter Demanding That Infringer Stop Using Owner's Trademark or Service Mark on Goods Provided or in Connection With Services Rendered by Infringer--From Owner's Attorney to Infringer

[1] FORM Cease and Desist Letter Demanding That Infringer Stop Using Owner's Trademark or Service Mark on Goods Provided or in Connection With Services Rendered by Infringer--From Owner's Attorney to Infringer

Re: Use of the _____ [trademark *or* service mark *or both*] _____ [*describe client's mark*]

Dear _____ [*infringer's name or name of officer, member, etc., of infringing entity*]:

This firm represents _____ [*client's name*]. It has recently come to our attention that _____ [you *or name of infringing entity*] _____ [have *or* has] _____ [*specify infringing act, e.g.,* recently opened a bakery] in _____ [*city*], _____ [*state, if client's mark is federally registered*], using the term _____ [*describe infringing term*].

You may be unaware that our client _____ [*specify nature of goods and/or services with which client's mark is identified, e.g.,* has owned and operated a bakery] under the _____ [*specify type of client's mark, e.g.,* service mark] _____ [*describe client's mark*] in _____ [*city and, if client's mark is federally registered, state*], for _____ [*specify length of time, e.g.,* the past 25 years]. Our client also owns the _____ [*specify type of client's mark, e.g.,* service] mark _____ [*describe client's mark*], which is registered in the _____ [*specify location of registration, e.g.,* United States Patent and Trademark Office *or* Office of the Secretary of State of California *or both*] under Registration No[s]. _____ [and _____, respectively].

Our client advertises and promotes the _____ [*specify type of client's mark, e.g.,* service mark] _____ [*describe client's mark*] _____ [*specify territorial extent of client's advertising and promotion of mark, e.g.,* _____ nationwide *or* statewide *or* throughout California, western Nevada, and Arizona]. As a direct result of these efforts, together with favorable patron recommendations and media

reviews, our client has developed extensive and valuable goodwill in the mark. Your use of the term _____ [*describe infringing term*], however innocent, for services that are in direct competition with those of our client _____ [*describe effect of infringer's use of its term on client's business, e.g.,* (is likely to cause *or* has caused) _____ (confusion *or* deception *or* mistake, *or a combination of both*) among our client's patrons (and _____ *specify others, if any, e.g.,* suppliers)]. [_____ *set forth specific examples of clientele confusion, deception, or mistake, if applicable.*]

Your continued use of the term _____ [*describe infringing term*] in connection with your _____ [*specify infringing activity, e.g.,* bakery] _____ [will result *or* has resulted] in the dilution and loss of our client's goodwill, thereby violating enforceable trademark rights acquired by our client's prior adoption, use, and registration of the mark _____ [*describe client's mark*]. Accordingly, in order to protect these rights, on behalf of our client we demand that you immediately cease and desist from any and all further use of the term _____ [*describe infringing term*] in connection with your _____ [*specify nature of infringer's goods and/or services, e.g.,* bakery].

If you give us your immediate written assurance that you will change your term to one which is not _____ [an imitation of *or* confusingly similar to] our client's mark, our client is willing to afford you sufficient time in which to phase out your existing term and phase in a new one. If you are not willing to make this change, we must assume that your selection of the term _____ [*describe infringing term*] is a deliberate, intentional attempt to trade on the goodwill of our client.

We look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible in anticipation of an amicable resolution of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for _____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The letter in [1], *above,* is for use by the owner of a registered trade or service mark to request a party whose use of the mark infringes the owner's rights to cease and desist from the infringing activity. While a cease and desist letter may resolve the dispute, it may also be a tactical first step in an infringement suit.

If, in a complaint for infringement of a federally registered mark [*see § 549.91*], it is pleaded that plaintiff sent defendant such a letter and that the letter informs defendant that plaintiff's mark is registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, this is tantamount to an allegation of actual notice of registration [*15 U.S.C. § 1111*].

If it is additionally pleaded that defendant continues to infringe plaintiff's mark despite defendant's receipt of such a letter, the allegation may tend to show the ongoing nature of defendant's infringement and plaintiff's resultant lack of an adequate remedy at law for defendant's infringing activities [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1116, 1118*]. Such an allegation may also tend to show that defendant's infringement is intentional, wilful, or deliberate. While such a showing is not required in order to prevail on a claim of infringement, it is probative of the likelihood of confusion [*see AMF Inc.v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 354]* . Deliberate or wilful infringement constitutes some of the exceptional circumstances necessary for recovery of attorney fees in infringement suits under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1117*; *Sealy, Inc. v. Easy Living, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 743 F.2d 1378, 1384]* .

[3] Cross References

Responses to cease and desist letters as evidence of consuming public's perception of genericness of mark.
Surgicenters of America v. Medical Dental Surgeries (9th Cir. 1979) 601 F.2d 1011, 1017

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.91

§ 549.91 Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(a); Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [15 U.S.C. § 1117] and Injunctive Relief [15 U.S.C. §§ 1116, 1118; Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] in Action for Trademark and Service Mark Infringement [15 U.S.C. § 1114]

[1] FORM Complaint [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(a); Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [15 U.S.C. § 1117] and Injunctive Relief [15 U.S.C. §§ 1116, 1118; Civ. Code § 3422; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] in Action for Trademark and Service Mark Infringement [15 U.S.C. § 1114]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____ [*name*],

[*OR*]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
_____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*]	)	
Plaintiff, vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCT-
Defendant[s].	)	IVE RELIEF
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, _____ (*state capacity and residence of plaintiff, or other basis of venue, for example*, a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation duly incorporated and existing under the laws of the State of _____ (*for example*, Pennsylvania), with its principal place of business in _____ (*city and state, for example*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)).]

[2. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, _____ (*state capacity and residence of plaintiff, or other basis of venue, for example*, a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation duly incorporated and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California).]

[3. This action arises under the Lanham Act, Act of July 5, 1946, 60 Stat. 427, *USC, Title 15, Sections 1051-1127*. Jurisdiction is vested in this Court by virtue of 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and *28 U.S.C. § 1338*.]

[4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend the complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries herein alleged were proximately caused by their conduct.)]

[5. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that at all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

6. At all material times herein, plaintiff has been and is engaged in _____ [*describe goods produced or services rendered in interstate commerce, for example*, the manufacture and interstate wholesale distribution of boys' and young men's clothing] under the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*].

7. Plaintiff first adopted and used the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] to identify its _____ [goods *or* services] on or about _____ [*date of plaintiff's first adoption and use of the mark*].

8. Plaintiff registered "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] as its _____ [trade *or* service] mark in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on _____ [*date of registration*], under United States _____ [Trade *or* Service] Mark Registration No. _____ [*registration number*]. Plaintiff owns the registration, which is and continues to be in full force and effect. Plaintiff displays _____ [*describe how plaintiff provides notice of its mark registration, for example*, the registration symbol (R) *or* the words "Registered in U.S. Patent and Trademark Office" *or* "Reg. U.S. Pat. & Tm. Off."] with its trademark. A certified copy of plaintiff's certificate of registration is attached as Exhibit "A" and incorporated by reference.

9. Plaintiff has used the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] continuously since _____ [*date*], to identify _____ [*describe plaintiff's goods or services, for example*, its suits, sport coats and other garments in the boys' and young men's size range 13 to 20, and its sport coats in men's sizes 36 to 42]. In this connection, plaintiff uses its _____ [trade *or* service] mark _____ [*describe plaintiff's use of its mark, for example*, on labels in the garments that it manufactures and distributes]. A specimen of _____ [*describe specimen, for example*, one of plaintiff's

garment labels] on which its _____ [trade *or* service] mark appears is attached as Exhibit "B" and incorporated by reference.

10. Plaintiff has been _____ [*identify areas in which plaintiff engages in business using the mark, for example*, selling its boys' and men's garments to various retail outlets in _____ (*describe location of store or areas served by plaintiff*) since _____ [*date*]. In addition, plaintiff has had a permanent sales representative in _____ (*describe representative's territory*) promoting the sale of the full line of products bearing plaintiff's _____ (trade *or* service) mark "_____" (*specify plaintiff's mark*), since _____ [*date*].]

11. Plaintiff's _____ [*goods or services, for example*, garments] have been and continue to be extensively advertised and sold throughout _____ [*identify geographical area in which plaintiff engages in business using the mark*], including _____ [*forum state*], under the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*]. By virtue of advertising and sales, together with consumer acceptance and recognition, plaintiff's mark identifies plaintiff's garments only, and distinguishes them from garments manufactured and sold by others. Plaintiff's mark has thus become and is a valuable asset symbolizing plaintiff, its quality _____ [goods *or* services] and its goodwill.

12. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that] [d]efendant, with at least constructive notice of plaintiff's ownership of the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*], _____ [*describe goods or services provided by defendant, for example*, owns and has operated a retail men's clothing store] under the name "_____" [*specify name*] in _____ [*describe location of store or areas served by defendant*] since _____ [*date of defendant's first use of the name*].

13. _____ [*Allege specific manner in which defendant uses the name, for example*, (Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that) [d]efendant uses the name "_____" (*specify name*) on its store-front, merchandise bags, and sales receipts. It also uses the name on labels attached to suits, sport coats, and other garments sold by it to the public. It is applied generally to men's garments and particularly to men's suits and sport coats in the same size range and with the same type of styling as the men's suits and sport coats manufactured and distributed by plaintiff under plaintiff's trademark.] A specimen _____ [*describe specimen, for example*, of one of defendant's garment labels] on which the name "_____" [*specify name*] appears is attached as Exhibit "C" and incorporated by reference.

14. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that] [d]efendant's name, "_____" [*specify name*], is _____ [*describe infringing nature of defendant's name, for example*, a colorable imitation] of plaintiff's registered _____ [trade *or* service] mark. Defendant uses the name "_____" [*specify name*] in _____ [interstate commerce *or* a manner substantially affecting interstate commerce] in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, and advertising of its _____ [*specify defendant's goods or services, for example*, men's garments]. As such, defendant's use of the name "_____" [*specify name*], is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception among consumers as to the source, quality, and nature of defendant's goods.

[15. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff, by letter, advised defendant of plaintiff's ownership of both the _____ [trade *or* service] mark "_____" (*specify plaintiff's mark*) and the registration therefor, and requested defendant to immediately cease and desist from further use of the name "_____" (*specify defendant's name*) as either a trade name or a _____ [trade *or* service] mark. Defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with plaintiff's request.]

16. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [a]s a proximate result of advantage accruing to

defendant's business from plaintiff's nationwide advertising, sales, and consumer recognition, and as a proximate result of _____ [confusion *or* deception *or* mistake *or combination thereof*] caused by defendant's wrongful advertising and sale of its goods, as hereinabove alleged, bearing the name "_____" [*describe defendant's name*], defendant has made substantial _____ [sales *and/or* profits] in the approximate amount of $_____.

17. As a proximate result of advantage accruing to defendant's business from plaintiff's nationwide advertising, sales, and consumer recognition, and as a proximate result of _____ [confusion *or* deception *or* mistake *or combination thereof*] caused by defendant's wrongful advertising and sale of its goods, as alleged above, bearing the name "_____" [*describe defendant's name*], _____ [*allege plaintiff's damages, for example*, plaintiff has been deprived of substantial sales of its _____ (*describe goods or services, for example*, garments) in the approximate amount of $ _____, and has been deprived of the value of its trademark as a commercial asset, in the approximate amount of $ _____].

18. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [u]nless restrained by this Court, _____ [*specify grounds for permanent, and if desired preliminary, injunctive relief, for example*, defendant will continue to infringe plaintiff's registered _____ (trade *or* service) mark, thus engendering a multiplicity of judicial proceedings, and pecuniary compensation will not afford plaintiff adequate relief for the damage to its _____ (trade *or* service) mark in the public perception].

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

[1. For an order requiring defendant[s] to show cause, if they have any, why they should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action;]

2. For a [temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a] permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant[s, and each of them,] and his/her/their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for him/her/them from:

> (a) Using the name "_____" [*specify name*] in connection with _____ [*describe defendant's business, for example*, its retail men's clothing business] in _____ [*location of defendant's store or geographical area in which defendant does business*], and from using the name "_____" [*specify name*] _____ [on *or* in connection with] any _____ [*specify goods or services, for example*, garments] _____ [sold *or* rendered] in such business;
>
> (b) Otherwise infringing plaintiff's _____ [trade *or* service] mark;
>
> (c) Causing likelihood of confusion, deception, or mistake as to the source, nature, or quality of defendant's _____ [goods *or* services];

3. For an order directing defendant[s, and each of them,] to file with this Court and serve on plaintiff within _____ [*number, for example*, 30] days after service of an injunction, a report in writing under oath, setting forth in detail the manner and form in which defendant[s] has/have complied with the injunction;

4. For an order requiring defendant[s, and each of them,] to deliver up and destroy all _____ [*infringing materials, for example*, garment labels, literature, advertising, and other material] bearing the infringing designations;

5. For all of defendant's profits derived from its infringement of plaintiff's _____ [trade *or* service]

mark;

6. For three times the amount of plaintiff's actual damages caused by defendant's infringement of plaintiff's _____ [trade *or* service] mark;

7. For plaintiff's reasonable attorney fees expended in this action;

8. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

_____ [*address*]

[*ADD, if verification desired in action in state court*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[*ADD, if verification desired in action in federal court*]

VERIFICATION

State of _____) ss.:
County of _____)

_____

_____ [*Name of plaintiff*], being duly sworn, deposes and says that he/she resides at _____ [*plaintiff's residence*], that he/she is the plaintiff herein, and that he/she has read the foregoing complaint and knows the contents thereof and that the same are true of his/her own knowledge except as to the matters therein stated to be alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters he/she believes them to be true.

_____ [*signature of plaintiff*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____.

_____ [*signature of notary*]

[*seal of notary*]

[2] Use of Form

The complaint in [1], *above*, is for use by a plaintiff in a suit filed in federal or state court for damages and injunctive relief for infringement of a trademark or service mark that has been registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office [*15 U.S.C. § 1114*].

This form is adapted from the facts in *Chips'N Twigs, Inc. v. Prives (N.D. Cal. 1963) 226 F. Supp. 529* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes optional allegations to identify the capacity and residence of plaintiff and defendant (Paragraphs 1, 2) [*see Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 9* (unnecessary to aver the capacity of a party to sue or be sued or the legal existence of an organized association of persons that is made a party, except to the extent required to show jurisdiction); *see* [9], *below*]. It also contains optional paragraphs for use to allege fictitious names of unknown defendants (Paragraph 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*], and an agency relationship between the defendants (Paragraph 5) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

If the complaint is filed in federal court, it must include an allegation of the court's jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action (Paragraph 3) [*Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(a)(1)*; *15 U.S.C. § 1121*; *28 U.S.C. § 1338*]. Local court rule may govern the allegation of federal jurisdiction. For further discussion, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

This complaint also alleges:

- Plaintiff and defendant's production of goods or rendition of services in interstate commerce or in commerce substantially affecting interstate commerce (Paragraphs 6 and 14) [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1127*; *Wells Fargo & Co. v. Wells Fargo Express Co. (9th Cir. 1977) 556 F.2d 406, 427* ; *Ronson Art Metal Works, Inc. v. Hilton Lite Corp. (N.D. Cal. 1953) 111 F. Supp. 691, 693]* .

- The fact and date of plaintiff's first adoption and use of its trade or service mark to establish

ownership of the mark (Paragraph 7) [*15 U.S.C. § 1051*; *Tillamook County Creamery Asso. v. Tillamook Cheese & Dairy Asso. (9th Cir. 1965) 345 F.2d 158, 160 , cert. denied, 382 U.S. 903, 86 S. Ct. 239, 15 L. Ed. 2d 157]* .

- Plaintiff's registration of its mark (Paragraph 8) [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, 1114*].

- That plaintiff gave notice of registration when using the mark so as to give defendant constructive notice of plaintiff's ownership of the mark (Paragraph 8) [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1072, 1111, 1117*].

- Defendant's use of plaintiff's mark (Paragraphs 12 and 13) [*15 U.S.C. § 1114*].

- Facts to establish likelihood of confusion (Paragraphs 9-14) [*15 U.S.C. § 1114*].

- Defendant's profits and plaintiff's damages (Paragraphs 16 and 17) [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1116, 1117*].

- Grounds for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 18) [*15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1116*; *Civ. Code § 3422* (permanent relief); *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (preliminary relief); *see § 549.91[5], below*].

The complaint provides for the inclusion of three exhibits:

- A certified copy of plaintiff's certificate of trademark or service registration (Paragraph 8).

- A specimen of plaintiff's trademark or service mark (Paragraph 9).

- A specimen of defendant's name or mark (Paragraph 11) [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 10(c)*].

The complaint includes an optional allegation of defendant's failure and refusal to cease and desist using its infringing mark or name, despite plaintiff's request that it do so (Paragraph 15). For a discussion of the effect of such a letter in an infringement suit, see *§ 549.90*.

[4] Proof of Infringement

While a plaintiff need not show actual cases of confusion to prevail on a claim of infringement, the likelihood of confusion or mistake must be demonstrated by more than a showing of a mere trace of confusion [*Everest & Jennings, Inc. v. E & J Mfg. Co. (9th Cir. 1959) 263 F.2d 254]* . For a discussion of factors considered by courts in assessing likelihood of confusion and infringement, see *§ 549.24[2]*.

In the Ninth Circuit, courts will recognize two distinct kinds of claims in the trademark infringement context: claims based on "forward confusion" and claims based on "reverse confusion." Forward confusion occurs when consumers believe that goods bearing the junior mark came from, or were sponsored by, the senior mark holder. In the senior mark holder's infringement action on a forward confusion claim, therefore, to avoid an adverse summary judgment, the senior mark holder must raise a material question of fact regarding whether the buying public thought that the senior mark holder was either the source of, or was sponsoring, the junior mark holder's product line. Reverse confusion occurs when consumers dealing with the senior mark holder believe that they are doing business with the junior one. Therefore, to survive a summary judgment motion on a reverse confusion claim, the senior mark holder must raise a question of material fact as to whether consumers believed that the junior mark holder was either the source of, or was a sponsor of, the senior mark holder's wares. The senior mark holder may sue on both kinds of claims if both are supported by the evidence [*see Surfvivor Media, Inc. v. Survivor Prods. (9th Cir. 2005) 406 F.3d 625, 630-631]* .

[5] Injunctive Relief

When seeking a preliminary injunction in a trademark infringement action, the plaintiff must establish all of the following [*Marlyn Nutraceuticals v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 571 F.3d 873, 876*]:

- The plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. In considering the likelihood of success on the merits, the trial court must apply the rule that to be liable for trademark infringement, the defendant must have (1) used in commerce (2) any word, false designation of origin, false or misleading description, or representation of fact, which (3) was likely to cause confusion or misrepresented the characteristics of the defendant's or another person's goods or services. The court should consider the *Sleekcraft* factors [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 348-349* ; *see § 549.24[2]*] in determining whether there a likelihood of confusion. Once the plaintiff has carried the burden of showing a likelihood of success on the merits, the burden shifts to the defendant to show a likelihood that a affirmative defense will succeed [*Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc. (9th Cir. 2007) 508 F.3d 1146, 1158]* .

- The plaintiff is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary injunctive relief. Irreparable injury may be presumed from a showing of likelihood of success on the merits [*El Pollo Loco, Inc. v. Hashim (9th Cir. 2003) 316 F.3d 1032, 1038]* .

- The balance of equities tips in the plaintiff's favor.

- A preliminary injunction is in the public interest.

Ordinarily a preliminary injunction will be solely prohibitive, that is, will order the defendant merely to cease and desist with respect to infringing activities. Rarely the injunction may be mandatory as well, that is, may order the defendant to take some affirmative action, which in an appropriate case could be to effectuate a product recall so as to retrieve infringing goods that were distributed to resellers and end-users. To justify ordering a recall, the trial court must first be satisfied that the usual standards for a prohibitory preliminary injunction have been met; then, in addition, the court must consider three factors: (1) whether the infringement by the defendant was willful or intentional; (2) whether the risk of confusion to the public and injury to the plaintiff is greater than the burden of the recall to the defendant; and (3) whether there is a substantial risk of danger to the public because of the defendant's infringing activity. If the court finds that leaving the infringing product in the hands of resellers and end-users will cause a substantial risk of danger to the public, the court should order a recall [*Marlyn Nutraceuticals v. Mucos Pharma GmbH Co. (9th Cir. 2009) 571 F.3d 873, 878-879*].

Local court rules should be consulted with respect to the procedure for obtaining injunctive relief in the federal district courts.

[6] Verification in State Court

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[7] Verification in Federal Court

Pleadings in federal court need not be verified or accompanied by affidavit unless specifically provided by rule or statute [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11*]. Thus, a verified pleading does not thereby automatically require an opposing party to verify subsequent or responsive pleadings unless specifically required by rule or statute [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11*].

However, an applicant for an ex parte temporary restraining order must proceed by either verified complaint or affidavit [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65(b)*]. In such an action, the applicant must present verified facts, by either complaint or separate supporting affidavit(s) showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage to the applicant will result before the adverse party or its attorney can be heard in opposition to the application [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65(b)*]. Additionally, the applicant must certify to the court, in writing, both the applicant's efforts, if any, to give notice to the opposing party, and reasons supporting the applicant's claim that notice should not be required [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65(b)*].

Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65(b) does not expressly require a verified complaint when accompanied by supporting affidavits [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 65(b)*]. An unverified complaint, coupled with a supporting affidavit stating the affiant's source of information for the complaint and the fact that affiant prepared the complaint has been held to be sufficient to meet the requirements of the rule [*Brown v. Bernstein (M.D. Pa. 1943) 49 F. Supp 497, 499*].

[8] Signing of Pleadings in Federal Court

Every pleading of a party represented in federal court must be signed by at least one attorney of record in the attorney's individual name, or by the party, if not represented by an attorney [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*]. Every paper must state the signer's address and telephone number, if any [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(a)*]. The party signing the pleading is representing to the court that, to the best of his or her knowledge, information and belief, there is good ground to support the pleading and it is not being presented for an improper purpose [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(b)*]. If a pleading is signed in violation of *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(b)*, the court may impose sanction to deter such conduct [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 11(c)*].

[9] Federal Jurisdiction and Venue

Both the United States district courts and the state courts have concurrent, original subject matter jurisdiction in all actions arising under the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1121*; *28 U.S.C. § 1338(a)*]. Thus, an action may, but need not, be brought in United States District Court. Neither diversity of citizenship nor a specific amount in controversy is required for federal court jurisdiction of Lanham Act cases [*15 U.S.C. § 1121*].

In an action arising under the Lanham Act, venue is in [*28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)*; *see also 28 U.S.C. § 1392*]:

- A judicial district where any defendant resides if all defendants reside in the same state;

- A judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or

- A judicial district in which any defendant may be found if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.

For venue purposes, a defendant corporation's residence is any judicial district in which it is subject to personal jurisdiction at the time the action is commenced. In a state that has more than one judicial district and in which the defendant corporation is subject to personal jurisdiction, the corporation is deemed to reside in any district in that state where it has sufficient contacts to subject it to personal jurisdiction were that district a separate state. If there is no such district, the corporation is deemed to reside in the district within which it has the most significant contacts [*28 U.S.C. §*

1391(c)]. An alien defendant may be sued in any judicial district [*28 U.S.C. § 1391(d)*].

[10] Pendent Jurisdiction Over State Claim

A cause of action for infringement or dilution of a trade or service mark registered in California may also be included, under principles of pendent jurisdiction, in a complaint in federal court for infringement of a federally registered mark [*Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (N.D. Cal. 1977) 437 F. Supp. 956, 962 , aff'd, (9th Cir. 1980) 646 F.2d 347]* .

[11] State Jurisdiction

Concurrent with the United States district courts, the superior court has original subject matter jurisdiction of trademark infringement actions [*Shores v. Chip Steak Co. (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 620, 625, 279 P.2d 591]* . The superior court has jurisdiction whether the trademark in question is registered under the laws of California or under the Lanham Act [*Shores v. Chip Steak Co. (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 620, 626, 279 P.2d 591]* .

The case will not qualify as a limited civil case because the relief sought (a permanent injunction) is not exclusively of a type described in any statute either classifying an action or special proceeding as a limited civil case or providing that an action or special proceeding is within the original jurisdiction of the former municipal court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 85*].

[12] Statute of Limitations

The Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq.*] contains no statute of limitations. Therefore, a federal court considering the question must look to the law of the forum state for a statutory limitation period that best effectuates federal trademark policy. In so doing, the court may look to the local statute bearing the closest resemblance to the federal statute involved, and may then apply that state limitation period to the federal statute in issue [*Griffin v. Pacific Maritime Association (9th Cir. 1973) 478 F.2d 1118, 1119*].

The Model State Trademark Law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*] also contains no statute of limitations, and California courts do not appear to have determined which limitation period applies. While it is unclear, therefore, which limitation period applies to the tort of trademark infringement, the two-year period of limitations in *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* applies to the tort of conversion or of misappropriation of intangible interests [*Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n (N.D. Cal. 1981) 525 F. Supp. 566, 584]* .

[13] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion of jurisdictional allegations in federal courts, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

Gilson, Trademark Protection and Practice, Ch. 8, *Trademark Infringement Litigation* Ch. 10, *Appendix* , § 10.06 (Matthew Bender)

Moore, Frumer, and Hall, Moore's Manual--Federal Practice Forms, Ch. 10, *Plaintiff's Pleading* , Forms 10:89.1, 10:89.3, 10:89.5, 10:89.6, 10:90.1D, 10:90.1F (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.92

§ 549.92 Affirmative Defense--Registration or Incontestable Right to Use Mark Obtained Fraudulently [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Registration or Incontestable Right to Use Mark Obtained Fraudulently [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that plaintiff obtained the _____ [registration of *or* incontestable right to use] the _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe plaintiff's mark*] fraudulently.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in *§ 549.92[1], above* , is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark. The defense raises the issue that the plaintiff obtained the mark or obtained the incontestable right to use the mark, or both, fraudulently [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(1)*]. The plaintiff's right to exclusive use of its mark may be rebutted by the preponderance of evidence showing a specific defect in the registration of plaintiff's mark [*Keebler Co. v. Rovira Biscuit Corp. (1st Cir. 1980) 624 F.2d 366, 373]* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to answers in general, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.93

§ 549.93 Affirmative Defense [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(c)]--Abandonment of Mark by Registrant [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(2)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 8(c)]--Abandonment of Mark by Registrant [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(2)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that plaintiff has intentionally abandoned its _____ [trademark *or* service mark], _____ [*describe plaintiff's mark*].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense that the plaintiff has abandoned the mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(2)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1127* (abandonment defined)].

The burden of proof rests with the defendant claiming abandonment of a trademark [*Exxon Corp. v. Humble Exploration Co., Inc. (N.D. Tex. 1981) 524 F. Supp. 450, 464]* .

To prove abandonment of trademark there must be proof of intent to abandon [*Tillamook County Creamery Asso. v. Tillamook Cheese & Dairy Asso. (9th Cir. 1965) 345 F.2d 158, 162* ; *Airwick Industries, Inc. v. Alpkem Corp. (D. Ore. 1974) 384 F. Supp. 1027, 1033* (intent required)]. The Lanham Act requires two elements for an abandonment: nonuse and a concurrent intent to abandon [*McCabe-Powers Auto Body Co. v. American Truck Equipment Co. (D. Ore. 1957) 150 F. Supp. 194, 199* ; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

Nonuse for three consecutive years is prima facie evidence of abandonment [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*; *see*. *Star-Kist Foods, Inc. v. P.J. Rhodes & Co. (9th Cir. 1985) 769 F.2d 1393, 1396* (prima facie case is also presumption that may be rebutted by showing valid reasons for nonuse or by proving lack of intent to abandon); *Saratoga Vichy Spring Co. v. Lehman (2d Cir. 1980) 625 F.2d 1037, 1043]* . Abandonment of trademark, being in the nature of a forfeiture, must be strictly proved [*P. A. B. Produits Et Appareils de Beaute v. Satinine Societa in Nome Collettive di S.A. e M. Usellini*

(C.C.P.A. 1978) 570 F.2d 328, 332-333] . A single instance of use is sufficient against a claim of abandonment of mark if the use is made in good faith [*Carter-Wallace, Inc. v. Procter & Gamble Co. (9th Cir. 1970) 434 F.2d 794, 804]* . Intent not to resume use is inferable from circumstances [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

A mark is also deemed abandoned if the owner, by any course of conduct, including acts of omission as well as commission, causes the mark to become a generic name or otherwise to lose its significance as a mark. Purchaser motivation is not test for determining this type of abandonment [*15 U.S.C. § 1127*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.94

§ 549.94 Affirmative Defense--Misrepresentation of Source of Goods or Services [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(3)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Misrepresentation of Source of Goods or Services [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(3)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that _____ [plaintiff *and/or* (*name(s), if known, and relationship to plaintiff of person(s) who have used mark with plaintiff's permission or are in privity with plaintiff, for example*, John Doe, a licensee of plaintiff's mark)] has/have misrepresented the source of the _____ [goods *or* services] in connection with which the _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe plaintiff's mark*] is used.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense of misrepresentation of the source of goods or services in connection with which the mark is used [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(3)*; *see § 549.28[4]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.95

§ 549.95 Affirmative Defense--Fair Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Fair Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that its use of _____ [*specify name, term, or device charged to be an infringement*] is a use as other than a trade or service mark in that

[*EITHER*]

_____ [*specify term, or device charged to be an infringement*] is descriptive of, and is used by defendant fairly and in good faith only to describe its _____ [goods *or* services *or* the geographic origin of its goods or services] to its users.

[*OR*]

_____ [*specify name alleged to be an infringement*] is the individual name of _____ [defendant *and/or* (*name(s), if known, and relationship to defendant of person(s) who are in privity with defendant, for example*, John Doe, defendant's partner)] and is used as such by defendant in his/her own business.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense of fair use [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(4)*; for a discussion of what constitutes fair use, *see § 549.28[5]*].

In a trademark infringement suit, defendant has the burden of establishing the validity of a fair use defense [*King-Size, Inc. v. Frank's King Size Clothes, Inc. (S.D. Tex. 1982) 547 F. Supp. 1138, 1164]* . In proving fair use, defendant must

show that it is making good faith, non-trademark use of the name, term, or device in issue, and is therefore using it only to describe its product rather than to associate it with a manufacturer [*Sierra On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1415, 1423]* . The defense, in essence, forbids a trademark registrant from appropriating a descriptive term for its exclusive use and preventing others from accurately describing a characteristic of their goods or services [*Soweco, Inc. v. Shell Oil Co. (5th Cir. 1980) 617 F.2d 1178, 1185]* . By its terms, this statutory defense applies only to registered trademarks that have become incontestable through the passage of time [*Sierra On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1415, 1423]* . However, the statutory defense has been held to be simply a restatement of the common law defense of fair use; which, by virtue of *15 U.S.C. § 1115(a)*, is available in actions not involving marks that have achieved incontestability status [*M. B. H. Enterprises, Inc. v. WOKY, Inc. (7th Cir. 1980) 633 F.2d 50, 52 n.2* ; *see also Sierra On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc. (9th Cir. 1984) 739 F.2d 1415, 1423]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.96

§ 549.96 Affirmative Defense--Prior Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(5)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Prior Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(5)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. Defendant first adopted the _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark, use of which is charged as an infringement*] to identify its _____ [goods *or* services] on _____ [*date*] without knowledge of plaintiff registrant's prior use thereof. The date of defendant's adoption of its _____ [trademark *or* service mark] is prior to _____ [*date*] the registration date of plaintiff's _____ [trademark *or* service mark].

2. Defendant has used its _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark*] _____ [on its goods *or* in connection with its services] continuously since the date of first adoption, hereinabove alleged.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense of prior use. This defense applies only for the geographic area in which such continuous prior use as alleged by defendant is proved [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(5)*; *AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 346 n.4* ; *Mister Donut of America, Inc. v. Mr. Donut, Inc. (9th Cir. 1969) 418 F.2d 838, 843]* . The defense applies if defendant can establish that it adopted its mark without knowledge of plaintiff's prior use, and that it has used its mark continuously from a date prior to plaintiff's registration of plaintiff's mark [*Casual Corner Associates, Inc. v. Casual Stores of Nevada, Inc. (9th Cir. 1974) 493 F.2d 709, 714]* . It is the defendant's burden to raise and prove this defense [*AMF, Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats (9th Cir. 1979) 599 F.2d 341, 346 n.4*].

If the defendant establishes innocent pre-registration use of a federal mark, a federal injunction will not issue to restrain use of the mark in the geographical area where prior use was proven [*Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (9th Cir. 1980) 646*

F.2d 347, 351] .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.97

§ 549.97 Affirmative Defense--Prior Registration and Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(6)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Prior Registration and Use [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(6)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that it adopted, registered, and used the trademark [*or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark, use of which is charged as an infringement*] prior to the registration of plaintiff's _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe plaintiff's mark*]. Defendant first adopted the _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark*] to identify its _____ [goods *or* services] on _____ [*date*]. Defendant first used the _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark*] to identify its _____ [goods *or* services] on _____ [*date*]. Defendant registered its _____ [trademark *or* service mark] _____ [*describe defendant's mark*] on the Principal Register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on _____ [*date*] under United States Trade Mark Registration No. _____. A certified copy of defendant's certificate of registration is attached as Exhibit "_____" and incorporated by reference.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense of prior registration and use. This defense applies only for the geographic area in which defendant's mark was used prior to plaintiff's registration of its mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(6)*]. This defense is permitted only when defendant's mark is also registered [*United States Jaycees v. Chicago Junior Asso. of Commerce & Industry (N.D. Ill. 1981) 505 F. Supp. 998, 1001 n.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.98

§ 549.98 Affirmative Defense--Use of Plaintiff's Trade or Service Mark Violates Federal Antitrust Laws [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(7)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Use of Plaintiff's Trade or Service Mark Violates Federal Antitrust Laws [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(7)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example*, FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example*, SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that plaintiff _____ [is using *or* has used] its _____ [trademark *or* service mark] to violate the antitrust laws of the United States.

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above*, is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the defense that the mark has been or is being used to violate the antitrust laws of the United States [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(7)*].

The essential element of an antitrust misuse defense is proof that the mark itself is the basic and fundamental vehicle required and used to accomplish the alleged antitrust violation [*Helene Curtis Industries, Inc. v. Church & Dwight Co. (7th Cir. 1977) 560 F.2d 1325, 1337]* . It is not enough merely to prove that merchandise bearing the mark has been used in furtherance of antitrust violations [*Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. V.E.B. Carl Zeiss, Jena (S.D.N.Y. 1969) 298 F. Supp. 1309, 1315]* .

Plaintiff's registration of multiple marks for its products, mass advertising, massive sales, and bringing of a trademark infringement suit based on colorable similarity rather than on exact identity, did not constitute an antitrust violation because these activities comprise aggressive competition and promotion that antitrust laws seek to protect [*Drop Dead Co. v. S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc. (9th Cir. 1963) 326 F.2d 87, 96]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.99

§ 549.99 Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Trademark or Service Mark Is Functional [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(8)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Plaintiff's Trademark or Service Mark Is Functional [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(8)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, for example,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, for example,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that plaintiff is not entitled to exclusive use in commerce of the alleged _____ [trademark *or* service mark] because it is functional, that is, _____ [*set forth brief factual description of nature of functionality that serves as basis of defense*].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* may be pleaded in an action for infringement of a federally registered trademark or service mark, when the plaintiff is not entitled to the exclusive use of the mark in commerce because the mark is functional [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(8)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.100

§ 549.100 Affirmative Defense--Laches, Estoppel, or Acquiescence [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(9)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Laches, Estoppel, or Acquiescence [15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(9)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that plaintiff _____ [*specify, e.g.,* consented to defendant's use of the (trade *or* service) mark during the period _____ to _____ (*dates*)], and therefore plaintiff's action is barred by the equitable principle(s) of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* laches].

[2] Use of Form

The affirmative defense in [1], *above,* is for use in an answer to a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trade or service mark to raise the equitable defenses of laches, estoppel, or acquiescence [*15 U.S.C. § 1115(b)(9)*: for discussion, *see § 549.28[10]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.101

§ 549.101 Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)] Ex Parte Application for Order [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)] Ex Parte Application for Order [Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(b)(1)]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
_____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER FOR
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	SEIZURE OF GOODS BEARING AND USED IN
Defendant(s).	)	THE PRODUCTION OF COUNTERFEIT MARKS
	)	
	)	

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] hereby applies for an order of seizure of all _____ [*specify goods, e.g.,* shirts, blouses, and any other articles of clothing] bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] _____ [trademark *or* service mark], together with all _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plates and molds] used in making the counterfeit marks, and all records documenting the manufacture, sale, or receipt of things involved in defendant's use of counterfeits of plaintiff's mark in

connection with defendant's _____ [sale *and/or* offering for sale *and/or* distribution of] _____ [*specify goods or services, e.g.,* shirts and blouses], as more particularly appears from the _____ [verified complaint *or* affidavit(s) of _____ (*name(s) of affiant*(*s*)], attached hereto.

2. The above-described matter is located at _____ [*provide street address and particular description of premises at which matter is to be seized*].

3. Seizure of the above-described matter is to occur on _____ [*date*].

4. Plaintiff has posted $_____ as security pursuant to Title *15 of United States Code, Section 1116(d)(4)(A)*.

5. Plaintiff requests the court to set the postseizure hearing required under Title *15 of United States Code, Section 1116(d)(10)* for _____ [*date*] [*specify date within 5 days of date that this application is to be heard*].

6. Plaintiff bases its application on the ground that plaintiff has a civil action against defendant arising under _____ [Title *15 of United States Code, Section 1114(1) or* Title *36 of United States Code, Section 380*], with respect to a violation that consists of using a counterfeit mark in connection with the _____ [sale *or* offering for sale *or* distribution *or any combination thereof*] of goods and that the relief sought is authorized by Title *15 of United States Code, Section 1116(d)*.

7. In making this application, plaintiff relies on the _____ [verified complaint *or* affidavit(s) of _____ (*name(s) of affiant(s)*)], attached hereto[, and his/her/its memorandum of points and authorities attached hereto] [, and the papers filed with the court in the above-entitled action].

8. Plaintiff's proposed order is attached hereto.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

_____ [*address of attorney*]

[2] Use of Form

The ex parte application in [1], *above*, is for use to apply for an ex parte order, without notice, for the seizure of goods bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's trademark or service mark, the means of making those counterfeits, and records documenting the manufacture, sale, or receipt of things involved in the use of the counterfeit marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*]. The form may be adapted for use when the counterfeits are used in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of services [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*].

The remedy of seizure of goods bearing counterfeit marks is available in infringement actions arising under *15 U.S.C. § 1114*, and in actions arising under *36 U.S.C. § 220506* (prohibiting unauthorized use of symbols, emblems, trademarks, trade names, or insignia of the United States Olympic Committee or of the International Olympic Committee), when the

infringement consists of the defendant's use of counterfeits of plaintiff's trade or service mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*]. The remedy is only available when plaintiff's mark is registered on the principal register in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, when plaintiff's mark is in use, and when defendant uses the counterfeit on the same goods or in connection with the same services for which plaintiff uses the genuine mark [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(B)*].

The application for an order of seizure must be based on an affidavit or the verified complaint [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(3)(A)*]. Thus, if the material statements required to support the petition are included in the complaint and the compliant was verified, the affidavit is not necessary. For a complaint for infringement of a federally registered trademark, see *§ 549.91*. For an order to seize goods bearing and used in the production of counterfeit marks, see *§ 549.102*.

Procedure on ex parte applications will be affected by local court rules, which should be consulted.

[3] Content of Application

Plaintiff's application must contain the following information, which is also required to be set forth in the seizure order [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(3)(B), (5)(B)*-(E)]:

- A particular description of the matter to be seized, and a description of each place at which the matter is to be seized.

- The time period, ending no later than seven days after the date on which the order is issued, during which the seizure is to be made.

- The amount of security required to be provided by plaintiff under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(4)(A)*.

- A date for the hearing, required under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(10)*, at which time plaintiff must prove that the facts supporting the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law necessary to support the seizure order are still in effect.

In federal court, an application for any order must be by motion which, unless made during a hearing or trial, must be made in writing, must state with particularity the grounds therefor, and must set forth the relief or order sought [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(b)(1)*]. The rules applicable to captions, signing, and other matters of form of pleadings apply to all motions and other papers provided for by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [*Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 7(b)(2)*].

[4] Content of Affidavit

The affidavit (or verified complaint) must establish facts sufficient to support the findings of fact and conclusions of law required for an order of seizure of goods and counterfeit marks [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(3)(A)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(4)(B)*; *see 15 U.S.C. § 1061* (acknowledgments and verifications of papers required under *15 U.S.C. §§ 1051-1127*)]. For an enumeration and discussion of the findings of fact and conclusions of law that the seizure order must contain, see *§ 549.102*.

[5] Requirement of Notice to United States Attorney

The court has no power to receive an application for a seizure order unless the applicant has given such notice of the application as is reasonable under the circumstances to the United States attorney for the judicial district in which the seizure order is sought. The United States attorney for that district may participate in the proceedings arising under the application if the proceedings may affect evidence of an offense against the United States. The court may deny the

application if it determines that the public interest in a potential prosecution so requires [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(2)*].

[6] Requirement of Posting of Security

The court has no power to grant the application for a seizure order unless the applicant provides security, which the court determines to be adequate, for the payment of such damages as any person may be entitled to recover as a result of a wrongful seizure or wrongful attempted seizure under *15 U.S.C. 1116(d)* [*15 U.S.C. 1116(d)(4)(A)*]. Because counsel for plaintiff will not know, at the time of drafting the application or motion for the seizure order, the amount at which the court will set the security required by *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(4)(A)*, counsel should leave the amount blank and fill in the blank when the court sets the amount and orders the seizure.

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms for affidavits, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For discussion and forms for ex parte motions or applications for orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.102

§ 549.102 Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)]--Order Granting Ex Parte Application [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seize Goods Bearing and Used in Production of Counterfeit Marks From Persons Using Counterfeit Marks in Connection With Sale, Offering for Sale, or Distribution of Goods [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)]--Order Granting Ex Parte Application [15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
_____ DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING EX PARTE APPLICATION
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FOR ORDER FOR SEIZURE OF GOODS BEAR-
Defendant(s).	)	ING AND USED IN THE
	)	PRODUCTION OF COUNTERFEIT MARKS
	)	

The ex parte application of plaintiff for an order of seizure of goods bearing and used in the production of counterfeit marks was heard by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] [; the United States appeared by the United States attorney for the _____ District of California, _____ (*name*)].

The court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. An order, other than an ex parte seizure order is not adequate to achieve the purposes of Title *15 of United States Code, Section 1114*.

2. Plaintiff has not publicized the requested seizure.

3. Plaintiff is likely to succeed in showing that defendant _____ [*name*] used counterfeits of plaintiff's "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] _____ [trademark *or* service mark] in connection with the _____ [sale *and/or* offering for sale *and/or* distribution of _____ (*specify goods bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's mark, e.g.,* shirts and blouses)].

4. An immediate and irreparable injury will occur to plaintiff as a result of defendant's _____ [sale *and/or* offering for sale *and/or* distribution of _____ (*specify goods bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's mark, e.g.,* shirts and blouses)] if seizure is not ordered.

5. The harm to plaintiff of denying the application for this order outweighs the harm to the legitimate interests of defendant _____ [*name*] of granting the application.

6. Defendant _____ [*name*] [, or persons acting in concert with him/her/it,] will _____ [*specify manner in which defendant will make material inaccessible to court, e.g.,* destroy, move, hide, or otherwise make this matter inaccessible to the court] if plaintiff proceeds on notice to defendant.

Application having been made, and the court having made the foregoing findings of fact and conclusions of law,

IT IS ORDERED that the application be, and it hereby is, granted and ordered that the United States Marshal, or other federal, state, or local law enforcement officer, serve a copy of this order on defendant _____ [*name*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Marshal, or other federal, state, or local law enforcement officer, seize all _____ [*specify goods bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's mark, all items used in making the counterfeit marks, and all records documenting the manufacture, sale, or receipt of things involved in defendant's use of counterfeits of plaintiff's mark*]. These items are located at _____ [*describe each place at which matter is to be seized*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the United States Marshal, or other federal, state, or local law enforcement officer, in the company of plaintiff's counsel, seize the above described matter on or before _____ [*specify date no later than seven days after the date on which the order is issued*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above-described matter, when seized, be individually tagged for identification.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above-described matter, when seized, be impounded in the custody [and control] of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff] until further order of the court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all matter seized and impounded be accessible to all parties and their counsel for _____ [*specify reasons why parties are to be allowed access, e.g.,* inspection and inventory] during regular business hours.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff post $_____ as security for issuance of this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that hearing is set for _____ [*specify date no sooner than 10, and not*

later than 15, days after the order is issued], when plaintiff shall appear and bear the burden of proving that the facts supporting these findings of fact and conclusions of law are still in effect.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this order, together with all supporting documents, be sealed until such time as defendant _____ [*name*] has an opportunity to contest this order, except that defendant _____ [*name*] shall have access to this order and supporting documents after the seizure has been carried out.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Court

[2] Use of Form

The order in [1], *above*, is for use to order seizure of goods bearing counterfeits of plaintiff's trademark or service mark, the means of making those counterfeits, and records documenting the manufacture, sale, or receipt of things involved in the use of the counterfeit marks in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*]. The form may be adapted for use when the counterfeit are used in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of services [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(1)(A)*].

[3] Content of Order

The order must set forth [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(5)*]:

- The findings of fact and conclusions of law required for the order.
- A particular description of the matter to be seized, and a description of each place at which the matter is to be seized.
- The time period, which must end no later than seven days after the date on which the order is issued, during which the seizure is to be made.
- The amount of security required to be provided under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(4)(A)*.
- A date for the post-seizure hearing required under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(10)*.

The court must order a United States marshal or other federal, state, or local law enforcement officer to serve a copy of the order and then to carry out the seizure under the order. Any materials seized under *15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)* must be taken into the custody of the court [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(7)*]. However, for practical storage reasons, they may be remanded to the custody of plaintiff or plaintiff's agent.

The opening paragraph of the form includes an optional statement to be used if the United States attorney for the judicial district in which the order is sought appeared at the hearing on the application [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(2)*].

Local rules should be consulted.

[4] Grounds for Issuance of Order

The court has no power to grant the application for the seizure order unless the following clearly appears from specific facts [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(4)(B)*]:

- An order other than an ex parte seizure order is not adequate to achieve the purposes of *15 U.S.C. § 1114* (action for infringement of registered mark);

- The applicant has not publicized the requested seizure;

- The applicant is likely to succeed in showing that the defendant used a counterfeit mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of the same goods or services in connection with which the applicant uses the genuine mark;

- An immediate and irreparable injury will occur to the applicant if the seizure is not ordered;

- The matter to be seized will be located at the place identified in the application;

- The harm to the applicant of denying the application outweighs the harm to defendant's legitimate interests of granting the application; and

- Defendant, or persons acting in concert with him, her, or it, would destroy, move, hide, or otherwise make the matter inaccessible to the court, if the applicant were to proceed on notice to defendant.

[5] Time for Seizure

The order must specify the time period within which the seizure is to be made. That time period must end no later than seven days after the date on which the order is issued [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(5)(C)*]. A United States marshal or other federal, state, or local law enforcement officer serves a copy of order and then carries out the seizure [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(9)*]. The seized materials are taken into the custody of court [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(7)*].

[6] Confidentiality of Seizure and Information Seized

The court must take appropriate action to protect defendant from publicity, by or at the behest of plaintiff, about the order and any seizure thereunder [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(6)*]. The seizure order, together with the supporting documents, must be sealed until defendant has an opportunity to contest the order. However, defendant must have access to the order and supporting documents after the seizure has been carried out [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(8)*].

When appropriate, the court must issue orders to protect defendant from undue damage from the disclosure of trade secrets or other confidential information during the course of the seizure, including orders restricting the applicant's access (or any agent or employee of the applicant) to the trade secrets or confidential information [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(9)*].

[7] Protective Order With Respect to Discovery of Seized Records

The court must enter an appropriate protective order with respect to discovery and use of any records or information seized. The protective order must provide for appropriate procedures to ensure that confidential, private, proprietary, or privileged information contained in such records is not improperly disclosed or used [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(7)*].

[8] Postseizure Hearing

The court must hold a hearing, unless hearing is waived by all the parties, on the date set in the order of seizure. That date must be not sooner than 10 and not later than 15 days after the order is issued, unless the applicant shows good cause for another date, or unless defendant consents to another date for hearing. At the hearing, the party obtaining the order must prove that the facts supporting the findings of fact and conclusions of law necessary to support the order are

still in effect. If that party fails to meet that burden, the court must dissolve or appropriately modify the order [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(10)(A)*]. In connection with the hearing, the court may make such orders modifying the time limits for discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as may be necessary to prevent frustration of the purposes of the hearing [*15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(10)(B)*].

A person damaged by wrongful seizure or attempted wrongful seizure has a cause of action for the resulting damages and expenses [*see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d)(11)*].

[9] Cross References

See also *§ 549.101*

For discussion and forms relating to orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.103

§ 549.103 Complaint for Damages, Profits, and Injunctive and Other Equitable Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527; Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)]--Action for Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245] and Dilution [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247] of Service Mark Registered Under Model State Trademark Law [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14340(a)], Profits [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14340(a)], and Injunctive and Other Equitable Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527; Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14330, 14335(a), 14340(a)]--Action for Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14320, 14330(b)] and Dilution [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14330(a)] of Service Mark Registered Under the California Trademark Law [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14200-14342]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, PROFITS, AND
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF
Defendant(s).	)	(Service Mark Infringement and Dilution)
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT

(Infringement of Mark)

[1. *Plaintiff's capacity and residence, if appropriate. See § 549.91, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Defendant's capacity and residence, if appropriate. See § 549.91, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious defendant allegation, if appropriate. See § 549.91, Paragraph 4.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 549.91, Paragraph 5.*]

5. At all material times, plaintiff was and is engaged in _____ [*describe services rendered, e.g.,* the operation of a residential health and beauty spa, the sale of health and fitness services, and beauty counseling, including hair styling] in California under the service mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*].

6. Plaintiff first adopted and used the service mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] to identify his/her/its services on _____ [*date*].

7. Plaintiff registered "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] as his/her/its service mark in the Office of the Secretary of State of the State of California on _____ [*date*], under State of California Service Mark Registration No. _____. Plaintiff owns the registration, which is and continues to be in full force and effect. A certified copy of plaintiff's certificate of registration is attached as Exhibit "_____" and incorporated by reference.

8. Plaintiff has used the mark continuously since _____ [*date*], to identify his/her/its _____ [*describe plaintiff's services, e.g.,* health and beauty spa services]. In this connection, plaintiff uses his/her/its mark _____ [*describe plaintiff's use of the mark, e.g.,* in the advertising and promotion, throughout California, of health and beauty services]. A specimen of _____ [*describe specimen, e.g.,* one of plaintiff's advertisements] on which his/her/its service mark appears is attached as Exhibit "_____" and incorporated by reference.

9. Defendant _____ [*describe services rendered and geographical market served by defendant, e.g.,* owns and has operated two beauty salons in _____ (*city*)], California, under the name "_____" [*specify name*], since _____ [*date*]. A specimen _____ [*describe specimen, e.g.,* of one of defendant's advertisements] on which the name "_____" [*specify name*] appears is attached as Exhibit "_____" and incorporated by reference.

10. Defendant's name is _____ [*describe infringing nature of defendant's name, e.g.,* a colorable imitation of] plaintiff's registered service mark. Defendant uses the name "_____" [*specify name*] in connection with the sale, offering for sale, and advertising of his/her/its _____ [*specify defendant's services, e.g.,* hair cutting and styling services]. As such, defendant's use of the name "_____" [*specify name*] is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception among consumers as to the source or origin of plaintiff's services.

11. [Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that] [D]efendant uses the name "_____" [*specify name*] _____ [*describe specific uses of the name, e.g.,* on store-fronts and doors, appointment cards, and sales receipts. Defendant uses the name, as well, in promotional materials and advertisements in connection with the sale of hair cutting and styling services].

12. There exists an overlap in plaintiff's and defendant's trade areas, in that both plaintiff's and defendant's services are

advertised and rendered in the same market(s) in California. [Additionally, plaintiff draws patrons from defendant's trade area.]

13. There exists an overlap in the nature of services rendered by plaintiff and defendant, in that both plaintiff and defendant are engaged in _____ [*specify similarity of services rendered, e.g.,* the sale of hair cutting and styling services].

14. Plaintiff's services have been and are extensively advertised, publicized, and sold throughout California, including _____ [*specify location of defendant's business*], under his/her/its service mark. By virtue thereof, together with consumer acceptance and recognition of the service mark "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*], plaintiff's mark identifies plaintiff's services only, and distinguishes them from those of others.

15. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [A]s a proximate result of advantage accruing to defendant's business from plaintiff's statewide advertising, sales, and consumer recognition, and as a proximate result of _____ [confusion *or* deception *or* mistake, *or any combination thereof*] caused by defendant's advertising and sale of his/her/its services bearing the name "_____" [*specify defendant's name*], defendant has made profits in the approximate amount of $_____.

16. As a proximate result of advantage accruing to defendant's business from plaintiff's statewide advertising, sales, and consumer recognition, and as a proximate result of _____ [confusion *or* deception *or* mistake, *or any combination thereof*] caused by defendant's advertising and sale of his/her/its services bearing the name "_____" [*specify defendant's name*], plaintiff has been deprived of substantial sales of his/her/its services in the approximate amount of $ _____.

[17. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff advised defendant in writing of plaintiff's ownership of the service mark "_____" (*specify plaintiff's mark*), and the registration therefor, and requested defendant to immediately cease and desist from further use of the name "_____" (*specify defendant's name*) as either a trade name or service mark. Defendant has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with plaintiff's request.]

18. Defendant's use of the name "_____" [*specify defendant's name*], is an infringement of plaintiff's registered mark, to plaintiff's general damage.

[19. *Allegation of grounds for injunctive relief. See § 549.91, Paragraph 18.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Dilution of Famous Mark)

20. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates herein Paragraphs 1 through _____ of its First Count.

21. Plaintiff's mark is, and since _____ [*date before defendant's infringing use began*] continuously has been, widely recognized by the general consuming public of California as a designation of the source of plaintiff's services. Association arising from the similarity between defendant's mark and plaintiff's famous mark is likely to impair the distinctiveness _____ [*add, if appropriate:* and to harm the reputation] of plaintiff's mark.

[22. Defendant willfully intended to cause dilution of plaintiff's famous mark.]

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause why he/she/it should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action.

2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant and his/her/its agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for him/her/it from using or displaying the name "_____" [*specify defendant's name*], or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of plaintiff's "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] service mark, in connection with _____ [*specify services, e.g.,* hair cutting and styling services] in California.

3. For an order declaring plaintiff to be the exclusive owner, in the State of California, of the "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] service mark.

4. For an order declaring plaintiff's registration, under the Model State Trademark Law, of the "_____" [*specify plaintiff's mark*] service mark to be valid.

5. For an order requiring defendant to deliver up and destroy all _____ [*specify infringing materials, e.g.,* stationery, promotional literature, advertising and other material] bearing the infringing [and diluting] designations.

6. For three times the amount of defendant's profits derived from infringement of plaintiff's mark.

7. For three times the amount of plaintiff's actual damages suffered by reason of defendant's infringement of plaintiff's mark.

8. For costs of suit incurred herein.

9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 549.91.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use in a California state court by a plaintiff who is seeking to recover damages, the defendant's profits, and injunctive and other equitable relief for infringement of a service mark registered in California [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14245, 14250*].

The complaint includes a count seeking injunctive relief for the dilution of the plaintiff's mark, which may be included if the plaintiff's mark is a famous mark [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247*]. The cause of action in this count is available to protect a mark either registered in California or valid at common law.

The form may be adapted for use in cases involving only trademarks or both trademarks and service marks.

Each of the counts in this complaint may be included, under principles of pendent jurisdiction, in a complaint filed in

federal court for infringement of a federally registered trademark or service mark [*Golden Door, Inc. v. Odisho (N.D. Cal. 1977) 437 F. Supp. 956, 962 , aff'd, (9th Cir. 1980) 646 F.2d 347* ; *see § 549.91*]. Each of the counts in this form also may be combined with a state claim of unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* For a complaint for unfair competition and infringement of trade name under California law, see *§ 549.107*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's and defendant's rendition of services and use of their respective marks or names in connection with their businesses in California (Paragraphs 5, 8, and 9) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14202(h), 14245* and discussion in *§ 549.56[2][a]*].

- Plaintiff's ownership of its service mark, through allegations of the fact and date of plaintiff's first adoption and use of its mark (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14202(h)*].

- The fact and date of plaintiff's registration of its mark, and the registration number issued for it (Paragraph 7) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14215, 14245* and discussion in *§ 549.52[2]*].

- Defendant's infringement of plaintiff's mark (Paragraph 10) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245* and discussion in *§ 549.56[2]*].

- The likelihood of confusion resulting from infringement (Paragraphs 11-13) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)* and discussion in *§ 549.56[2]*].

- Defendant's profits and plaintiff's damages (Paragraphs 15 and 16) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)* (up to three times defendant's profits and three times plaintiff's damages can be recovered in infringement suit) and discussion in *§ 549.56[3][b]*].

- Grounds for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 19) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)* and discussion in *§ 549.56[3][b]*; *Civ. Code § 3422* (permanent relief); *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (preliminary relief)].

The complaint provides for attaching three exhibits: a certified copy of plaintiff's certificate of registration of the mark (Paragraph 7) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14215* and discussion in *§ 549.52[2]*]; a specimen of plaintiff's mark (Paragraph 8); and a specimen of defendant's name or mark (Paragraph 9).

The complaint includes an optional allegation of defendant's failure and refusal to cease and desist using its infringing mark or name, despite plaintiff's request that it do so (optional Paragraph 17) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14245(a)(3)* and discussion in *§ 549.56[2][c]*]. This allegation also serves to show the ongoing nature of defendant's infringement and plaintiff's resulting lack of an adequate remedy at law for defendant's infringing activities [*see Civ. Code § 3422(1), (3)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(4), (6)*].

As part of the relief, the complaint prays for destruction of all counterfeit marks, the means of making them, and any matter bearing them [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)* and discussion in *§ 549.56[3][c]*].

In the second count, the complaint adds allegations to support a claim of dilution of plaintiff's mark, assuming it qualifies as a famous mark (Paragraphs 21 and 22) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14247* and discussion in *§ 549.57*].

[4] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Cross References

See also *§ 549.91*

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving false advertising, see Ch. 14, *Advertising*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.104

[Reserved]

§ 549.104[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.105

§ 549.105 Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)]--Ex Parte Application for Order

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14340(b)]--Ex Parte Application for Order

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER OF
_____ [*name*],	)	SEIZURE OF COUNTERFEIT GOODS AND SUP-
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	PORTING DECLARATION OF
Defendant(s).	)	_____ [*name*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] applies for an order of seizure of _____ [*specify all goods, articles, or other matter bearing counterfeit marks and/or all means of making the marks*] in the possession or control of defendant.

2. Good reason exists for proceeding without notification to defendant in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant's prior acts have shown that defendant would destroy, move, hide, or otherwise make the goods sought to be seized inaccessible to the court if plaintiff proceeded on notice].

3. Plaintiff makes this application on the grounds that good cause exists for the seizure, and that plaintiff has the probability of success on the merits in the above-entitled action to enjoin defendant from manufacturing, using, displaying, or selling counterfeits.

4. Defendant is hereby advised, pursuant to *Business and Professions Code Section 14250(g)*, that plaintiff has filed an undertaking in the amount of $_____ with the Court.

5. Defendant is further advised, pursuant to *Business and Professions Code Section 14250(g)*, that he/she has the right to object to the undertaking on the grounds that either the surety or the amount of the undertaking is insufficient. If defendant objects to the undertaking, he/she must do so on or before _____ [*specify date within 30 days after date of seizure of goods*].

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Declaration in support of ex parte application for order of seizure, if necessary*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am the _____ [*identify declarant's relationship to the action, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.

_____ [*State, in as many paragraphs as necessary, facts establishing (1) that defendant manufactures, uses, displays, or sells counterfeits of plaintiff's mark; (2) defendant's means of making counterfeit marks, goods, articles, and/or other matter bearing counterfeit marks; (3) defendant's possession or control of counterfeit goods; and (4) that defendant's activities constitute infringement of plaintiff's mark, likelihood of injury to plaintiff's business reputation, and/or dilution of distinctive quality of plaintiff's mark*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a plaintiff seeking an order of seizure of counterfeits of trade or service marks registered under the Model State Trademark Law, the means of making the counterfeit marks, and all goods, articles, or other matter bearing the marks, collectively known as "counterfeit goods" [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a), (b)*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(n)* ("counterfeit" defined)]. The counterfeit goods may be seized from persons manufacturing, displaying for sale, or selling the goods. Plaintiff may proceed either on motion or ex parte application, in a suit to enjoin the manufacture, use, display, or sale of counterfeits of its mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*]. For discussion and forms relating to motions and supporting declarations, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[3] Waiver of Requirement of Notice to Defendant

If it appears from plaintiff's ex parte application that there is good reason for proceeding without notification to defendant, the court may, for good cause shown, waive the requirement of notice for the ex parte proceeding [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*].

For discussion and forms relating to the requirement that an affidavit or declaration showing notice or attempted notice to opposing party or counsel or reason why notice should not be required to be submitted with ex parte application for order under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

[4] Required Showing of Good Cause and Probable Success on the Merits

Plaintiff must make a showing of both good cause for the order and a probability of success on the merits of its suit to enjoin the manufacture, use, display, or sale of counterfeits of its mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*]. By verified complaint and/or declaration, plaintiff should therefore set forth facts showing the following:

- Defendant's manufacture, use, display, or sale of counterfeits of plaintiff's registered trade or service mark [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*].

- Defendant's means of making the counterfeit marks, goods, articles, and/or other matter bearing the counterfeit marks [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)*].

- Defendant's possession or control of the counterfeit goods [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(a)*].

- Defendant's activities constitute infringement of plaintiff's mark, likelihood of injury to plaintiff's business reputation, and/or dilution of the distinctive quality of plaintiff's mark [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14245, 14247*].

[5] Requirement That Plaintiff Post Undertaking

Before obtaining the seizure order, plaintiff must post an undertaking [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*]. The court must set the amount of the undertaking in accordance with the probable recovery of damages, costs, and expenses in an action by any person having a financial interest in the seized goods and who is damaged by the seizure of goods that are not counterfeit, if it is ultimately determined that the goods seized are not counterfeit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c), (e)*]. Because counsel for plaintiff will not know, at the time of drafting the application or motion for the seizure order, the amount at which the court will set the undertaking, counsel should leave the amount blank and fill in the blank when the court sets the amount and orders the seizure.

A person entitled to recover damages for wrongful seizure of the goods [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(c)*] may object

to the undertaking within 30 days of the seizure [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(f)*], and the motion or application for the seizure order must advise defendant of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(g)*]:

- That the undertaking has been filed.

- That defendant has the right to object to the undertaking on the grounds that the surety or the amount of the undertaking is insufficient.

- That the objection to the undertaking must be made within 30 days after the date of seizure of the goods.

For a discussion of an action for damages for wrongful seizure, see *§ 549.57[c]*.

[6] Cross References

For discussion of procedures applicable to undertakings, see *Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.106

§ 549.106 Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Ex Parte Application

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seize Counterfeit Goods From Persons Manufacturing, Displaying for Sale, or Selling Counterfeit Goods [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Ex Parte Application

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR ORDER OF
vs.	)	SEIZURE OF COUNTERFEIT GOODS
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	Time: _____
Defendant[s].	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The application of _____ [*identify party*, *e.g.*, plaintiff] for an order of seizure of counterfeit goods was heard by the court ex parte _____ [*date*], good cause being shown why defendant should not be notified, and the court having therefore waived the requirement of notice of the proceeding to defendant. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made, together with good cause and plaintiff's probability of success on the merits shown to the satisfaction of the court that the application ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the application be, and it hereby is, granted and ordered that all counterfeit marks, all means of making them, and all goods, articles, or other matter bearing the counterfeits that are in the possession or control of defendant shall be seized.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the seizure shall take place on _____ [*date*]. The goods to be seized are more particularly described as follows: _____ [*description of counterfeit goods to be seized*]. The _____ [*identity of the persons or class of persons to effect seizure*] shall effect seizure of the counterfeit goods described above. The location(s) at which seizure is to occur is/are particularly described as follows: _____ [*describe location(s) at which seizure is/are to occur*]. Defendant shall be served with a copy of this order at the time of seizure.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that hearing is set for _____ [*date not more than 10 court days after the last date on which seizure is ordered*], at which time defendant may appear before this court and seek release of the above-described seized counterfeit goods.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to order seizure of counterfeits of trade or service marks registered under the Model State Trademark Law, the means of making the counterfeit marks, and all goods, articles, or other matter bearing the marks [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*].

[3] Contents of Order

The order must specifically set forth [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*]:

- The date or dates on which the seizure is ordered to take place.
- A description of the counterfeit goods to be seized.
- The identity of the persons or class of persons to effect seizure.
- A description of the location or locations at which seizure is to occur.
- A hearing date not more than 10 court days after the last date on which seizure is ordered, at which any person from whom goods are seized may appear and seek release of the seized goods.

Any person from whom seizure is effected must be served with the order at the time of seizure [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14250(b)*].

[4] Cross References

See also *§ 549.104*

For discussion and forms relating to orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

153 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 549 TRADEMARKS AND TRADE NAMES
PART IV. FORMS

48-549 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 549.107

§ 549.107 Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14402; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] for Unfair Competition and Trade Name Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.]

[1] FORM Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14402, 17203; Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] for Unfair Competition [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208] and Trade Name Infringement [Bus. & Prof. Code § 14401 et seq.]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	(Unfair Competition and Trade Name Infringement)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Identity and capacity of plaintiff. See § 549.91, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See § 549.91, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See 549.91, Paragraph 4.*]

4. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein has been, engaged in the _____ [business *or* nonprofit activity] of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* selling and renting snow skis and skiing equipment].

5. Plaintiff has continuously done business under the [corporate and] trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Western Ridge, Inc.] since _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff has built up valuable goodwill in this trade name, and it has come to be associated exclusively with plaintiff's business by the public generally throughout _____ [*specify market, marketing area, or territory, e.g.,* Northern California], as reflected by _____ [*allege facts showing that plaintiff's trade name has acquired secondary meaning, e.g.,* extensive advertising and promotion in this area from _____ [*date*], to the present time, resulting in approximately _____ individual sales and rentals to customers during that period].

6. Defendant _____ [*name*] is engaged in the business of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* selling backpacking, camping, and skiing equipment], [with its principal place of business] located at _____ [*specify address and city*], _____ County, California. After plaintiff's adoption and use of the trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Western Ridge, Inc.], defendant, on or about _____ [*date*], began doing business under the trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* West Ridge Supplies]. Defendant's trade name is substantially similar to that of plaintiff, and defendant's use of that name creates a likelihood that plaintiff's customers, potential customers, and the public generally will be confused or misled as to the source of goods or services in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* they are likely to believe that defendant's business is identical to or affiliated with that of plaintiff].

7. Defendant threatens to [and unless restrained will] continue to use the trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* West Ridge Supplies], as a result of which the public generally will be misled and deceived into believing that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant's business is identical to or affiliated with that of plaintiff], all to the irreparable injury of plaintiff's business and goodwill and to the unjust enrichment of defendant]. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* it is extremely difficult to ascertain the amount of damages to plaintiff's business and goodwill].

8. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*allege facts raising presumption of plaintiff's right of exclusive use of the trade name under Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411 et seq., e.g.,* filed articles of incorporation under *Section 200 of the Corporations Code* containing its corporate and trade name _____ (*specify, e.g.,* Western Ridge, Inc.)].

9. Defendant's continuing use of the confusingly similar trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Western Ridge, Inc.], constitutes an infringement and violation of plaintiff's rights in his/her/its trade name.

10. Unless restrained by this Court, defendant threatens to and will continue to use the trade name _____ [*specify, e.g.,* West Ridge Supplies] in violation of plaintiff's rights.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any they have, why he/she/it should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action.

2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* continuing to use the name West Ridge Supplies as his/her/its trade name].

3. For his/her costs incurred.

4. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 549.91*.]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a plaintiff to state a cause of action for injunctive relief for common law unfair competition based on defendant's use of a trade name that is confusingly similar to plaintiff's trade name and for trade name infringement [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14401, 14402*]. This form may be combined, when appropriate, with federal or state claims for trademark or service mark infringement, as an alternate ground for injunctive relief [*see §§ 549.91, 549.103*].

For further discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief in general, including the procedure and additional forms for obtaining preliminary injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint for injunctive relief alleges the following [Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc. v. Elysium, Inc. (1967) 255 Cal. All. 2d 731, 733, *255 Cal. App. 2d 731, 63 Cal. Rptr. 507*]:

- Plaintiff's prior adoption and use of a trade name that has acquired secondary meaning with the public (Paragraphs 4 and 5) [*see* [4][a], [b], *below*].

- Subsequent adoption and use of a confusingly similar trade name by the defendant, creating the likelihood of public confusion (Paragraph 6) [*see* [4][c], [d], *below*].

- Injury to the plaintiff unless defendant is enjoined from further use of the confusingly similar trade name (Paragraph 7).

- The basis of plaintiff's presumptive right to exclusive use of that name [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 14411 et seq.*; *see § 549.70*] and defendant's infringement or violation of plaintiff's right (Paragraphs 8 and 9) [*see § 549.71*], as a basis for injunctive relief [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 14402*].

[4] Elements of Cause of Action

[a] In General

An action for trade name infringement as unfair competition must allege [*see Sunset House Distributing Corp. v. Coffee Dan's Inc. (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 50 Cal. Rptr. 49* ; *Dino, Inc. v. Boreta Enterprises, Inc. (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 336, 338-339, 38 Cal. Rptr. 167*]:

- Prior adoption and use of the plaintiff's trade name such that it has acquired secondary meaning;

- Subsequent use of a confusingly similar name by the defendant;
- The likelihood of public confusion; and
- That the plaintiff has been or is likely to be damaged by the defendant].

Despite the phrase "unfair competition," direct competition between the parties is not a necessary element; the emphasis is on "unfair" use of a confusingly similar name [*see Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 303, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228*].

It is not necessary to show fraud or an otherwise culpable mental state on the defendant's part if only injunctive relief is sought [*Tomlin v. Walt Disney Productions (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 226, 235-236, 96 Cal. Rptr. 118* ; *see Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 303-304, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228*]. On the other hand, if damages are sought, they must be specifically pleaded and proved and must be coupled with a showing that they are the result of (1) the defendant's failure to take reasonable precautions to prevent public confusion, (2) with the intent to deceive the public as to the source of the goods of service [*see Tomlin v. Walt Disney Productions (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 226, 235-236, 96 Cal. Rptr. 118* ; *Gordon v. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 31, 39, 74 Cal. Rptr. 499*].

[b] Secondary Meaning

"Secondary meaning" is established by showing that one person has adopted and used a particular name in reference to his or her goods and services with the result that the name has come to be identified exclusively with those goods or services by the relevant branch of the purchasing public. The existence of secondary meaning is a question of fact determined under all the circumstances; mere priority of use or use for a particular period of time is not in itself determinative [*Gordon v. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 31, 36-37, 74 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; *Family Record Plan, Inc. v. Mitchell (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 235, 243, 342 P.2d 10* ; *see Dino, Inc. v. Boreta Enterprises, Inc. (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 336, 341, 38 Cal. Rptr. 167* (noting cases in which 27 years' use was held insufficient and five months' use was sufficient for secondary meaning to attach)]. However, the duration and continuity of prior use is a relevant factor, as are the extent of advertising and promotion of the original name, sales figures showing the number of people who have purchased goods or services associated with the original name, and identification of the parties' respective markets or marketing areas [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 109-110, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794* ; *Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc. v. Elysium, Inc. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 731, 735, 63 Cal. Rptr. 507*]. Proof of secondary meaning is sufficient if it is shown that a substantial segment of the buying population associates the name or design with a single source, even if that source is anonymous [*North Carolina Dairy Foundation, Inc. v. Foremost-McKesson, Inc. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 98, 108, 110, 154 Cal. Rptr. 794*].

Common, generic, geographic, or descriptive words that cannot be exclusively appropriated as a trademark may nonetheless acquire secondary meaning [*see California Western School of Law v. California Western University (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1009, 178 Cal. Rptr. 685*]. However, fanciful or arbitrary words are entitled to stronger protection, because it is easier for subsequent users to adopt a dissimilar name [*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc. v. Lee (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 23, 31, 27 Cal. Rptr. 833*].

Determining the relevant "public" is material in establishing secondary meaning. Generally, it must be a segment of the population that comprises enough people to contradistinguish them from a few [*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc. v. Lee (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 23, 31, 27 Cal. Rptr. 833* ; *see Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 308, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* (segment of public relevant to determine public confusion distinguished from smaller segment of public relevant to establish secondary meaning)].

[c] Similar Name or Design

The similarity of names is intertwined with the likelihood of confusion. In other words, the names need not be identical so long as they are sufficiently similar to create a likelihood of confusion or deception [*Hair v. McGuire (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 348, 353, 10 Cal. Rptr. 414*]. Similarity is determined on the basis of the total effect of the name, rather than on comparison of individual words [*Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 303-304, 306, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *see, e.g.,* *Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc. v. Elysium, Inc. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 731, 737-738, 63 Cal. Rptr. 507* ("Nude Look" is not per se confusingly similar to "Look" when both words in former name are given equal emphasis)].

[d] Public Confusion

Proof of actual confusion is not required, as long as a probability or likelihood of confusion is shown. The likelihood of public confusion, in turn, ordinarily is a factual question to be determined under all the circumstances [*Ball v. American Trial Lawyers Assn. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 289, 308, 310, 92 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *see* *Schwartz v. Slenderella Systems of California, Inc. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 107, 112, 271 P.2d 857*]. The test is essentially whether a person of ordinary intelligence could reasonably be deceived or confused [*Hair v. McGuire (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 348, 353, 10 Cal. Rptr. 414*].

Close similarity between names or actual instances of public confusion are not necessarily determinative, although each will support a finding of likelihood of confusion [*Schwartz v. Slenderella Systems of California, Inc. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 107, 112, 271 P.2d 857* ; *Hair v. McGuire (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 348, 353, 10 Cal. Rptr. 414*].

Although direct competition is not an element of the action in itself [*see* [a], *above*], the likelihood of confusion is most strongly shown by the fact that the parties are in direct competition in the same locality or that they deal in articles or services so similar that the public might reasonably conclude that the plaintiff had merely enlarged the scope of his or her basic operations. In other situations, the plaintiff must plead and prove special circumstances peculiar to the two businesses involved, from which confusion would be likely to result [*Tomlin v. Walt Disney Productions (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 226, 235, 236, 96 Cal. Rptr. 118*].

[5] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see* *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Cross References

See also*§§ 549.91, 549.103*

For further discussion concerning actions for unfair competition in general, see Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*

For memoranda supporting an application for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction restraining unfair competition based on trade name infringement, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 3, *Actions*, § 741; vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 735, 786; vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 312 (4th ed. 1996-1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity* (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 550.syn

§ 550.syn Synopsis to Chapter 550: TRESPASS

§ 550.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 550.02 Cross References

§§ 550.03through 550.09 [Reserved]

§ 550.10 Governing Law

§ 550.11 Trespass as Tort

§ 550.12 Trespass as Crime

§ 550.13 Distinguished From Conversion

§ 550.14 Encroachment as Form of Trespass

§ 550.15 Nature of Trespass Act

[1] Generally

[2] Intentional

[3] Result of Ultrahazardous Activity

§ 550.16 Nature of Injury

[1] Direct or Indirect

[2] Placing or Leaving Foreign Matter on Land

[3] Causing Entry of Tangible Matter on Land

[4] Causing Entry of Intangible Matter on Land

§ 550.17 Subsurface Trespass

§ 550.18 Trespass of Airspace

§ 550.19 Action for Trespass

[1] Jurisdiction and Venue

[2] Proper Person to Bring Action

[3] Election of Remedies

[a] One or Successive Actions

[b] Damages or Ejectment

[4] Injunctive Relief

[a] Availability

[b] Discretion to Grant Relief

§ 550.20 Statutes of Limitations

[1] Period of Limitation

[2] Accrues

[a] Generally

[b] Permanent Trespass

[c] Continuing Trespass

[d] Isolated Incident Trespass

§ 550.21 Compensatory Damages

[1] Statutory Authority

[2] Recovery of Prospective Damages

[3] Measurement

[a] Generally

[b] Permanent Versus Temporary Damage

[c] Cost of Restoration or Depreciation in Value of Real Property

[d] Damage to Fixtures

[e] Damage to Building

[f] Lost Profits

[g] Other Consequential Damages

[h] Mental Distress

[4] Exemplary Damages

§ 550.22 Defenses

[1] Consent

[a] Express

[b] Consent Included in Conditional Sale Contract

[c] Implied Consent

[d] Exceeding Limited Consent

[2] Necessity

[3] Entry Under Color of Authority

[4] Entry to Abate Nuisance

[5] Entry to Care for Animal

[6] Entry by Landlord to Enforce Liens

[7] Immunity of Decedent's Personal Representative

[8] Constitutional Right to Free Expression of Ideas in Public Forum

[9] Entry by Tenants' Rights Activist

§§ 550.23through 550.29 [Reserved]

§ 550.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] California Real Estate

§ 550.31 State Statutes

[1] Attorney's Fees

[2] Crimes

[3] Damages

[4] Injunctive Relief

[5] Objections to Complaint

[6] Public Emergency

[7] Statutes of Limitations

[8] Venue

§ 550.32 Decisions

[1] Abortion Clinic

[2] Adjoining Land

[3] Consent

[4] Damages

[a] Generally

[b] Compensatory

[c] Mental Distress

[d] Nominal Damages

[e] Punitive

[5] Defenses

[a] Consent

[b] Necessity

[c] No Trespass

[6] Easements

[7] Extrahazardous Activity

[8] Intent to Trespass

[9] Possession

[10] Statute of Limitations

[11] Trespass Above Land

§ 550.33 Law Reviews

§ 550.34 Text References

§§ 550.35through 550.39 [Reserved]

§ 550.40 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specification of Damages

[5] Verification

[6] Pleading Possession

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

[8] Attorney's Fees

[9] Cross References

§ 550.41 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property Easement and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Cross References

§ 550.42 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Conversion of Personal Property [Civ. Code § 3336]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Venue

[5] Damages

[6] Verification

[7] Attorney's Fees

[8] Cross References

§ 550.43 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Personal Property

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 550.44 Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Possession When Not in Actual Possession and Not Owner of Property

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 550.45 Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Cost of Restoration That Exceeds Diminution in Value

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 550.46 Allegation--Defendant Acted With Knowledge That Trespass Was Substantially Certain Result

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 550.47 Allegation--Plaintiff Entitled to Cost of Damages Plus Costs to Prevent Further Harm

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 550.48 Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 550.49 Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Express Consent

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 550.50 Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Implied Consent

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 550.51 Affirmative Defense--Entry for Necessity

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 550.52 Affirmative Defense--Constitutional Right to Free Expression of Ideas in Public Forum

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

155 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART I. SCOPE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.01

§ 550.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions for trespass to real property. The chapter contains the following forms:

- Forms of complaint for damages for trespass [*see* §§ 550.40-550.43].
- Forms of allegation for use by the plaintiff [*see* §§ 550.44-550.47].
- Forms of affirmative defenses [*see* §§ 550.48-550.52].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART I. SCOPE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.02

§ 550.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms pertaining to encroachments on adjoining land, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Landowners* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to trespassing animals, see Ch. 23, *Animals: Civil Liability* .

- For an affirmative defense that an act was committed to protect land from trespasser, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to boundary disputes, see Ch. 101, *Boundaries* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to recovery of possession of personal property, see Ch. 119, *Claim and Delivery* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to conversion of personal property, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to pleading the nature and extent of tort damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to the existence and obstruction of easements, see Ch. 240, *Easements* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to actions to recover possession of real property, see Ch. 241, *Ejectment* .

- For forms of complaint for damages to real property resulting from blasting, see Ch. 256, *Explosives* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to trespass to the person, see Ch. 257, *False Imprisonment* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to encroaching fences, see Ch. 266, *Fences* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to property damage caused by negligence in allowing a fire to spread, see Ch. 267, *Fires* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to injuries to person or property from gas or electricity, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to procedures for seeking injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to property damage involving irrigation systems, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to actions to regain possession of real property and actions against forcible entry and forcible detainer, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

- For a form of complaint for damages suffered by remainderman by life tenant's injury to inheritance, see Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to the removal of timber, see Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to actions involving trespass to the person, see Ch. 357, *Malicious Prosecution and Abuse of Process* .

- For forms of complaint for damages suffered by trespass involving mines and mining, see Ch. 363, *Mining* .

- For discussion and forms for use in nuisance actions involving real property, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

- For a form of complaint for subsurface trespass from slant drilling of well, see Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to pollution as a trespass, see Ch. 418, *Pollution and Environmental Matters* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to actions against possessors of real property, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

- For discussion and forms relating to damage caused by flood waters, surface waters, and the escape of impounded waters, see Ch. 575, *Waters* .

- For discussion and forms pertaining to actions for trespass of personal privacy rights resulting from unlawful search and seizure, see Ch. 429, *Privacy* .

- For a form of complaint against a public entity for nuisance which may include trespass, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

- For discussion and forms for use in resolving questions of title to real property, see Ch. 482,

Quieting Title .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawAdjoining LandownersGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsConversionRemediesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART I. SCOPE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 550.03through 550.09

[Reserved]

§§ 550.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.10

§ 550.10 Governing Law

Trespass and its resultant liability is defined by case law [*see Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922* ; *Girard v. Ball (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 772, 178 Cal. Rptr. 406]* .

The statute of limitations on trespass actions is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)*. The period applicable to trespass on oil or gas wells is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 3493*/4, and on timber by *Civ. Code § 3346(c)*.

Compensatory damages for trespass are governed by *Civ. Code § 3333*. Punitive damages may be awarded for trespass under *Civ. Code § 3294(a)*. Damages for the wrongful occupation of land, under some circumstances, are governed by *Civ. Code § 3334*.

Crimes relating to trespass are set out in *Penal Code §§ 552-558.1*, and *602-603*.

Prob. Code § 9651 establishes immunity from both civil and criminal liability for a decedent's personal representative who takes possession of real or personal property in the good faith belief that it is part of decedent's estate.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesProperty CrimesBurglary & Criminal TrespassCriminal TrespassGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesStatutes of LimitationsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.11

§ 550.11 Trespass as Tort

Trespass is an unlawful interference with possession of property [*Girard v. Ball (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 772, 788, 178 Cal. Rptr. 406]* . The essence of trespass is an unauthorized entry onto the land of another [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915* ; *Miller & Desatnik Mgmt. Co. v. Bullock (1990) 270 Cal. Rptr. 600]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.12

§ 550.12 Trespass as Crime

Trespass under statutorily described circumstances may be a misdemeanor. Unauthorized entry on industrial property which has posted signs, unauthorized entry on prescribed areas belonging to the University of California, and placement of advertisements on public property are misdemeanor trespasses [*Penal Code §§ 552-558.1*]. In addition to these very specific activities and those that parallel tort trespass (for example, *Penal Code § 602(m)* includes entry and occupation without the owner's consent as a misdemeanor), misdemeanor trespass activities include, but are not limited to, refusing to leave a public building of a public agency after hours, wilfully obstructing attendance at college classes, intentionally interfering with a lawful business by obstructing or intimidating those attempting to carry on the business or their customers, and peddling without permission at publicly owned airports [*Penal Code §§ 602-603*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesProperty CrimesBurglary & Criminal TrespassCriminal TrespassGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesProperty CrimesBurglary & Criminal TrespassCriminal TrespassElementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesProperty CrimesBurglary & Criminal TrespassCriminal TrespassPenalties

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.13

§ 550.13 Distinguished From Conversion

Conversion is any act of dominion wrongfully exerted over another's personal property in denial of or inconsistent with his or her rights therein. It requires the plaintiff to show an intention or purpose to convert the goods and to exercise ownership over them, or to prevent the owner from taking possession of the property [*Zaslow v. Kroenert (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 541, 549-550, 176 P.2d 1]* . If the conduct does not amount to a substantial interference with the possession or the right thereto, but consists of intermeddling with or use of or damages to the personal property, the owner has a cause of action for trespass. For example, a person who has removed personal property from an apartment and placed it in storage in the owner's name, without any attempt to claim any ownership interest in the property, may be charged with trespass to the property, but not conversion, which requires an assertion of ownership right [*Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 597, 610, 12 Cal. Rptr. 488, 361 P.2d 20]* .

Although a lesser interference may be actionable as a trespass to personal property, or trespass to chattels, than would be actionable as a conversion, some actual injury must have occurred to state an action for trespass to chattels. There must be some interference with the possessor's use or possession of the personal property or interference with some other legally protected interest in that property [*Intel Corp. v. Hamidi (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1342, 1351, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32, 71 P.3d 296]* . In one case, for example, the California Supreme Court held that the tort did not encompass the mass sending of e-mails to the employees of a large corporation because the e-mails neither damaged nor impaired the functioning of the corporation's computer system [*Intel Corp. v. Hamidi (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1342, 1347, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32, 71 P.3d 296* (loss of employee time spent reading and responding to messages was insufficient to support recovery)]. The Court distinguished cases in which mass e-mails actually adversely effected the performance of a computer system, or threatened to do so, which might support a cause of action for trespass to chattels [*see Intel Corp. v. Hamidi (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1342, 1353-1356, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32, 71 P.3d 296]* .

For a further discussion of conversion, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* . For a form of complaint for conversion combined with trespass, see *§ 550.42*; see *§ 550.43* for a form of complaint for trespass to personal property.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsIntentional TortsConversionElementsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.14

§ 550.14 Encroachment as Form of Trespass

A trespass on a neighbor's property may involve an encroachment, or a gradual entrance that is continuing; most frequently occurring throughthe intrusion of structures or trees. For a further discussion of encroachments, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Landowners* . An encroachment or other trespass that obstructs the free use of the property and interferes with the comfortable use of that property may also constitute a nuisance [*see Civ. Code § 3479*]. For a further discussion of nuisance, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawAdjoining LandownersEncroachmentsReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.15

§ 550.15 Nature of Trespass Act

[1] Generally

There is no liability for a trespass unless the trespass is intentional, the result of recklessness or negligence, or the result of engaging in an extrahazardous activity [*Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922* ; *Gallin v. Poulou (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 638, 645, 295 P.2d 958]* . The essence of a cause of action for trespass is an unauthorized entry onto the land of another [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915]* .Peaceable entry on land by consent is not trespass [*Girard v. Ball (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 772, 788, 178 Cal. Rptr. 406* ; for further discussion, *see § 550.22[1]*]. For discussion of recovery of damages for trespass or injury to property caused by negligence, see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[2] Intentional

Every unauthorized entry on another's property is a trespass and any person who makes such an entry is a trespasser. A trespasser is one who goes on the premises of another without invitation, express or implied, and does so out of curiosity, or for his or her own purposes or convenience, and not in the performance of any duty to the owner. It is not necessary that one making such an entry should have any unlawful intent [*Bauman v. Beaujean (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 384, 389, 53 Cal. Rptr. 55* ; *Miller v. National Broad. Co. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1480-1481, 232 Cal. Rptr. 668]* . Although intent to trespass is an essential element of a cause of action for trespass, intent to cause damage is not, and the trespasser is liable for the damage caused even though that damage was neither intended nor foreseen [*Meyer v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 321, 326, 43 Cal. Rptr. 542]* . Even a child of tender years may be a trespasser [*Fullerton v. Conan (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 354, 355-356, 197 P.2d 59* (five-year-old girl)].

The doing of an act that will, to a substantial certainty, result in the entry of foreign matter on another's land suffices for an intentional trespass to land on which liability may be based. An intent to harm is not required [*Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530-531, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519* ; Restatement of Torts § 158].

[3] Result of Ultrahazardous Activity

Liability for trespass may be the result of engaging in an extrahazardous activity [*see* *Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co.*

(1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922] . An activity is ultrahazardous when it necessarily involves a risk of serious harm that cannot be eliminated by the exercise of the utmost care, and is not a matter of common usage [*Luthringer v. Moore (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 489, 498-499, 190 P.2d 1]* . The ultrahazardous nature of the activity may be used to support the intent necessary for an action in trespass, but trespass is not the exclusive remedy for one sustaining injury from such an activity. An action for strict liability directly based on the ultrahazardous activity would be a likely remedy to pursue in such a case [*see* *Smith v. Lockheed Propulsion Co. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 774, 56 Cal. Rptr. 128* (action for damages based on negligence and strict liability)].

An early case found liability for trespass without any negligence on the part of the defendant, essentially the result of an ultrahazardous activity, in an action involving the blow-out of an oil well [*Green v. General Petroleum Corp. (1928) 205 Cal. 328, 331-335* , (deposit of oil, sand, mud, and rocks on the plaintiff's land)]. This type of strict liability extends to invasions caused by vibrations resulting from dynamite blasting because there is no reason for differentiating between responsibility for damages done by physical projectiles or missiles and responsibility for damage done by vibration or concussion [*McKenna v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1930) 104 Cal. App. 538, 543, 286 P. 445]* .

Blasting in urban areas and diversion of water are two activities for which landowners can be held strictly liable for their actions [*see* *Alonso v. Hills (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 778, 783, 214 P.2d 50* , and *Parker v. Larsen (1890) 86 Cal. 236, 238* ; *Smith v. East Bay Mun. Util. Dist. (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 613, 622-623, 265 P.2d 610* , respectively]. For further discussion and forms relating to ultrahazardous activities, see Ch. 256, *Explosives* , Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsInherently Dangerous ActivitiesReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElementsTortsStrict LiabilityAbnormally Dangerous ActivitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.16

§ 550.16 Nature of Injury

[1] Direct or Indirect

Trespasses may be committed by consequential and indirect injuries as well as by direct and forcible injuries [*Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280]* . Thus, home owners may recover for damages caused by vibrations and noises emanating from a nearby plant, even though the defendant did not cause the direct entry of matter onto their land [*McNeill v. Redington (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 315, 320, 154 P.2d 428]* , and a negligent invasion by fire which causes damage to real property constitutes a trespass [*Elton v. Anheuser-Busch Beverage Group, Inc. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1301, 1305, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303]* .

There is no distinction between trespass by forcible injury and trespass committed by consequential and indirect injury [*Smith v. Lockheed Propulsion Co. (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 774, 784, 56 Cal. Rptr. 128]* . However, without an injury or entry with the requisite intent it appears that there will not be an actionable trespass [*Gallin v. Poulou (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 638, 641-644, 295 P.2d 958* ; for further discussion of actionable trespass, *see § 550.15[1]*]. For discussion and forms relating to the primary means of redressing these wrongs, see Ch. 256, *Explosives* , Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[2] Placing or Leaving Foreign Matter on Land

Trespass may be the result of the defendant's personally intruding on the plaintiff's land and leaving objects behind. For example, entry by abuilding contractor and unauthorized dumping of building materials is a trespass, not just by the person, but by the deposited materials [*Dandoy v. Oswald Bros. Paving Co. (1931) 113 Cal. App. 570, 571, 298 P. 1030]* . Trespass may also occur by allowing items to remain on property beyond the time they were authorized to be left there; there is no requirement that the original entry of either the person or the material be a trespass [*Herond v. Bonsall (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 152, 155-156, 140 P.2d 121* (restaurant equipment left by tenant after expiration of lease)].

A trespass may be committed by the continued presence on the land of a structure, chattel, or other thing that a person has tortiously placed there, whether or not that person has the ability to remove it [*Newhall Land & Farming Co. v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 334, 345, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 377* ; *Mangini v. Aerojet-Gen. Corp. (1991) 230*

Cal. App. 3d 1125, 1148, 281 Cal. Rptr. 827 ; *Restatement (Second) of Torts § 161(1)*]. Therefore, a property owner who discharges hazardous waste on or otherwise pollutes his or her own property has committed a continuing trespass against later owners because causing a public nuisance by contaminating soil and groundwater is tortious conduct [*Newhall Land & Farming Co. v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 334, 346-347, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 377* ; *see also Mangini v. Aerojet-Gen. Corp. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1125, 1148, 281 Cal. Rptr. 827* ; *but see Capogeannis v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 668, 675, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 796* (no trespass because creating public nuisance not "tortious" conduct if no special injury to plaintiff differing in kind from injury to general public)]. For discussion of torts, including trespass, based on pollution, see Ch. 418, *Pollution and Environmental Matters* .

[3] Causing Entry of Tangible Matter on Land

Trespass may occur without a personal physical entry by the trespasser. For example, fumes, vapors, dust, dirt, sediment, lint, and waste materials emitted into the atmosphere by the defendant, resulting in an injurious coating on the plaintiff's property constitute a trespass and injury to real property [*Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 273, 288 P.2d 507* ; for discussion of the obstruction of another's comfortable enjoyment of his or her property, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance*].

Not every entry of matter on the land of another constitutes an actionable trespass. However, the doing of an act that will to a substantial certainty result in the entry of foreign matter on another's land suffices to establish an intentional trespass to land on which liability may be based [*Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530-531, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519]* .

[4] Causing Entry of Intangible Matter on Land

Trespass may be predicated on the intrusion of noise, odor, or light only if it is accompanied by the deposit of particulate matter on the plaintiff's property or actual physical damage to the plaintiff's property [*San Diego Gas & Elec. Co. v. Superior Court (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 893, 936, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 724* (electromagnetic fields); *Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 232-233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922]* . All intangible intrusions alone, such as noise, odor, or light, are dealt with as nuisance cases, not trespass [*Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 232-233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922]* . For a further discussion of nuisance generally, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.17

§ 550.17 Subsurface Trespass

An invasion of a person's interest in the subsurface level of the property constitutes an actionable trespass. The plaintiff may recover damages for the trespass and wrongful removal of ore from an underground mine by the defendant [*Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 692-693, 120 P. 771* ; *Whittaker v. Otto (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 666, 674-675, 56 Cal. Rptr. 836]* . It is also a trespass for the lessee to a mineral lease to inject waste water into its wells without the lessor's permission, if the waste water spreads into and damages the lessor's reserved mineral estate [*Cassinos v. Union Oil Co. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1770, 1778]* . Similarly, wastewater produced through use of unlined percolation ponds during oil extraction can constitute a continuing trespass if it seeps into the groundwater of an adjacent landowner [*Starrh & Starrh Cotton Growers v. Aera Energy LLC (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 583, 595-596, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165]* .

The slant drilling of a well and extraction of oil from beneath the surface of another's land is a trespass for which damages can be collected [*Union Oil Co. v. Domengeaux (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 266, 270]* . Actions for trespass resulting from slant drilling are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 3493*/4 and have a much shorter statute of limitations than other types of trespass. For further discussion, see Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawExploration, Discovery & RecoveryGeophysical TrespassReal Property LawAdjoining LandownersOil & GasReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.18

§ 550.18 Trespass of Airspace

Land includes free or occupied space for an indefinite distance upwards, subject to limitations on the use of airspace imposed and rights in the use of airspace granted by law [*Civ. Code § 659*]. A temporary invasion of airspace by aircraft over the land of another is privileged, however, as long as it does not unreasonably interfere with persons or property on the land [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Peterson (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 434, 438, 75 Cal. Rptr. 673]* . Unreasonable interference has not been defined, and there is no definite yardstick that may be used in determining how low an airplane may fly over the property of others in landing or taking off; however, flying at low altitudes incident to landing and taking off may constitute trespass, as it may cause more than mere apprehension of injury. Extensive low flying may be a substantial interference with the occupant's enjoyment ofthe land and injunctive relief may be appropriate [*Anderson v. Souza (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 825, 839-840, 243 P.2d 497]* . For further discussion of overflight, see Ch. 16, *Airplanes and Airports* , and Ch. 391, *Nuisance*].

A proper and beneficial use of the airspace above an owner's land may not be interfered with except for necessary police regulation in the interest and for the safety and protection of the public [*Strother v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 525, 536, 211 P.2d 624* (action for personal injuries due to plane crash into high power wires, court noting that plane was trespassing and defendant was not negligent)]. Even if a landowner may, in fact, reasonably anticipate an invasion of the property, in law the landowner is entitled to assume that possession will not be interfered with and that his or her right to the use of the property is paramount [*Strother v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 525, 529, 211 P.2d 624]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElementsTortsTransportation TortsAir TransportationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.19

§ 550.19 Action for Trespass

[1] Jurisdiction and Venue

The proper county for an action in trespass is the county where the real property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392*]. In limited civil cases, a court may issue only temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions. Therefore, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. If the issue of title or the right of possession is so involved that it must be decided in order to determine the case, the case would be an unlimited civil case, whether or not the involvement may be merely incidental [*Morrissey v. Morrissey (1923) 191 Cal. 782, 784* (holding under prior law that superior court has original jurisdiction)].

[2] Proper Person to Bring Action

The proper party plaintiff in an action for trespass to real property is the person in actual possession [*Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 694-695, 120 P. 771* ; *Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 509, 116 Cal. Rptr. 200]* . Whether or not the plaintiff's relationship to the land amounts to possession is a question of fact to be determined by the jury, unless it can be said as a matter of law that the evidence on that issue is palpably insufficient to support a verdict for the plaintiff [*Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 509, 116 Cal. Rptr. 200]* .

A tenant's possession, while it continues, is as complete for all purposes of redress against wrongdoers as is the possession of the owner [*Strohlburg v. Jones (1889) 78 Cal. 381, 383]* . Even though not in possession, a person with a vested future possessory interest may bring an action for damages resulting from trespass. For example, one who had executed a lease for future possession of the land, as well as the right to harvest the crop then growing on the land, was entitled to bring an action for trespass when the defendant's trespass damaged the crop prior to the plaintiff's taking possession of the land [*Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 642-644, 198 P.2d 1] , disapproved on other grounds, Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263* . For an allegation for use by one not in actual possession, see *§ 550.44*.

The plaintiff in a trespass action must prove the fact of possession of the premises, but need not prove the right to possession, unless the defendant raises it as an issue [*Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 508, 116 Cal.*

Rptr. 200] . Furthermore, a defendant who is a mere stranger to the title will not be allowed to question the title of a plaintiff in possession of the land. It is only when the trespasser claims title, or claims under the real owner, that he or she is allowed to attack the title of the plaintiff whose peaceable possession has been disturbed [*Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 695, 120 P. 771]* . Moreover, a plaintiff in peaceable possession may even be entitled to an award of at least nominal damages for trespass against the owner of the property even though the plaintiff's possession is wrongful, because the owner is not entitled to regain the property by self-help [*Allen v. McMillion (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 211, 218-219, 147 Cal. Rptr. 77* ; *see* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

[3] Election of Remedies

[a] One or Successive Actions

If the trespass is permanent, all damages, past and prospective, are recoverable in one action [*Rankin v. DeBare (1928) 205 Cal. 639, 641, 271 P. 1050]* . If from the character of the trespass it is not to be presumed that the wrongful conduct will be continued, successive trespasses give rise to separate causes of action, and an action may be brought at any time to recover the damages that have accrued within the statutory period. In doubtful cases the plaintiff should have an election to treat the trespass as either permanent or not [*Polin v. Chung Cho (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 673, 678, 87 Cal. Rptr. 591* ; for further discussion, *see § 550.20[2][b]-[d]*].

[b] Damages or Ejectment

Ejectment is the action used to recover possession of the land when the plaintiff in possession has been ousted by the defendant [*Fuller v. Fuller (1917) 176 Cal. 637, 638, 169 P. 369]* . A plaintiff suing for ejectment must claim damages for withholding possession in the same action or will be deemed to have waived his or her claim to damages [*McCaffrey v. Wiley (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 621, 623-624, 230 P.2d 152* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 740* (action for recovery of property); for further discussion and forms, see Ch. 241, *Ejectment* , and Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*].

When the defendant has allegedly invaded and occupied the plaintiff's property, the plaintiff can either sue for trespass and recover damages, or in ejectment and have a judgment of ouster and damages, or for an injunction to restrain the continued occupation [*Slater v. Shell Oil Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 864, 869, 137 P.2d 713]* . If the plaintiff elects to sue for both past and prospective damages, however, he or she is deemed to have waived the invasion and consented to the continued occupancy of the land [*Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 269, 288 P.2d 507* ; *Slater v. Shell Oil Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 864, 869, 137 P.2d 713]* .

If a plaintiff brings an action to recover damages to personal or real property resulting from trespassing on lands either under cultivation or intended or used for the raising of livestock, and the plaintiff prevails, he or she is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees in addition to other costs, and in addition to any liability for damages imposed by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.9*]. Attorney fees may be recovered even for a subsurface trespass to a right that runs appurtenant to cultivated surface land [*Starrh & Starrh Cotton Growers v. Aera Energy LLC (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 583, 606-608, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165* ; *see § 550.17*]. Evidence that plaintiff had used the property for livestock purposes in the past may be probative of plaintiff's intended use for the same purposes in the future, even if the property was not under cultivation or being used for livestock purposes at the time the damage was sustained [*Kelly v. CB&I Constructors, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 442, 465, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32]* .

For a general form of complaint seeking damages for trespass, see *§ 550.40[1]*.

[4] Injunctive Relief

[a] Availability

The general rule is that an injunction will not lie to restrain mere trespasses on the land, for the simple reason that an

action at law will ordinarily afford an ample and adequate remedy for the wrong. Nor is it the usual practice to permit an action for injunctive relief to be substituted for an action of ejectment [*see Harmon v. DeTurk (1917) 176 Cal. 758, 761-762, 169 P. 680]* .

An act of trespass that is neither continuous nor threatened to be continuous will not give rise to injunctive relief [*Church of Christ of Long Beach v. Harper (1927) 83 Cal. App. 41, 46]* . An injunction will issue, however, to enjoin continuing trespasses for which monetary or other legal remedies are inadequate [*Reitz v. Wollwert (1933) 217 Cal. 406, 409-410, 19 P.2d 3]* . An injunction is also appropriate if the wrongful acts, if continuous, would give rise to an easement or servitude [*Fairrington v. Dyke Water Co. (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 198, 201, 323 P.2d 1001]* . A continuing trespass occurs if the entry onto the land of another is not permanent in character. For example, when the maintenance of an encroachment is abatable, the law does not presume that the encroachment will be permanently maintained. The maintenance of that encroachment is a continuing trespass or nuisance [*Kafka v. Bozio (1923) 191 Cal. 746, 750-751, 218 P. 753]* . If the action constituting trespass may be discontinued at any time, it is considered continuing in character [*Phillips v. City of Pasadena (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 104, 107, 162 P.2d 625]* . For further discussion of continuing trespasses and the statute of limitations, see *§ 550.20[2][c]*.

For a discussion of the effect of zoning ordinances on the availability of injunctive relief, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

[b] Discretion to Grant Relief

The court has some discretion in determining whether to grant or to deny an injunction. In exercising that discretion, the court considers and weighs the relative hardships. To deny an injunction, the following factors must be present [*Christensen v. Tucker (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 554, 562-563, 250 P.2d 660]* :

- The defendant must be innocent; the plaintiff's conduct will be examined to ascertain any responsibility for the situation.

- Although the injunction will be granted regardless of the injury to the defendant if the plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury by the encroachment, it may not be granted when the rights of the public will be adversely affected.

- The hardship to the defendant by the granting of the injunction must be greatly disproportionate to the hardship caused by the plaintiff by the continuance of the encroachment. If an encroachment is an intentional trespass, the court cannot deny a mandatory injunction and has no right to weigh and balance the conveniences of the parties [*Strodel v. Wilcox (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 781, 785, 291 P.2d 95]* .

For a further discussion of the forms and procedures used in injunctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* . For a complaint for trespass that includes injunctive relief, see *§ 550.40[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesInjunctionsTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionSubject Matter JurisdictionTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionVenue

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.20

§ 550.20 Statutes of Limitations

[1] Period of Limitation

The time for bringing an action for trespass on or injury to real property is three years [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)*]. An action involving the drilling of oil or gas wells from a surface location on land not owned by the aggrieved party must be brought within 180 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349*3/4; *see* Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas*]. The time limitation for wrongful injuries to timber, trees, or underwood arising from any trespass committed while acting in reliance on an improper boundary line is five years from the date of trespass [*Civ. Code § 3346*; *see* Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber*].

The time limitation is the same whether the plaintiff seeks an injunction or damages, since it is the nature of the cause of action, and not the form of the action, that determines the applicability of the statute of limitations [*Williams v. Southern P. R. Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 624, 628, 89 P. 599]* . For an affirmative defense based on the running of the statute of limitations, see *§ 550.48*.

[2] Accrues

[a] Generally

The period of limitation runs from the date the cause of action accrues, which is the time of injury, not from the time the plaintiff discovered who caused the injury [*Gale v. McDaniel (1887) 72 Cal. 334, 335, 13 P. 871* ; *Polin v. Chung Cho (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 673, 676-677, 87 Cal. Rptr. 591]* . Neither is the running of the statute affected by the plaintiff's ignorance of the trespass [*Castelletto v. Bendon (1961) 193 Cal. App. 2d 64, 65, 13 Cal. Rptr. 907]* . A cause of action for consequential damages resulting from an underground trespass does not arise, however, until there is surface damage that would put a reasonable person on notice of the trespass [*Oakes v. McCarthy Co. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 231, 254-255, 73 Cal. Rptr. 127]* .

[b] Permanent Trespass

If the trespass is permanent in nature, all damages, past and prospective, are recoverable in one action, and the entire cause of action accrues when the trespass is committed [*Rankin v. DeBare (1928) 205 Cal. 639, 641, 271 P. 1050* ;

Williams v. Southern P. R. Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 624, 626, 89 P. 599] . An example of a permanent trespass is the construction and operation of a railroad [*Williams v. Southern P. R. Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 624, 626, 89 P. 599]* .

[c] Continuing Trespass

The statute of limitations for trespass begins to run from the time of entry, but in a continuing trespass, all damages incurred within the three years immediately prior to filing the action may be recovered; the date of the original entry does not serve to totally bar recovery [*Lindberg v. Linder (1933) 133 Cal. App. 213, 217-218, 23 P.2d 842* (continued storage of rubbish on lot despite repeated requests to remove it)]. When a continuing or recurring injury results from a continuing trespass, there is not only a cause of action for the original wrong, arising when the wrong is committed, but also separate and successive causes of actions because the consequential damages arise as and when they are sustained; therefore, so long as the cause of the injury exists and the damages continue to occur, the plaintiff is not barred from recovering for those damages that have accrued within the statutory period beyond the action, even though a cause of action based solely on the original wrong may be barred [*Kafka v. Bozio (1923) 191 Cal. 746, 751-752, 218 P. 753]* . For further discussion of encroachments and other continuing trespasses, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Landowners* and Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

[d] Isolated Incident Trespass

A trespass that is not permanent and presumed not to be continuing provides a new cause of action at each moment of continuance and successive actions may be brought, provided that the plaintiff has not permitted a right by prescription to vest in the defendant [*Williams v. Southern P. R. Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 624, 626, 89 P. 599]* . For example, the defendant's sporadic rather than continuous use of a road that the defendant did not build, maintain, or use for long periods of time has been held not to be a permanent trespass [*Carbine v. Meyer (1954) 126 Cal. App. 2d 386, 390-391, 272 P.2d 849]* . The courts are inclined to resolve any doubts as to the permanency of the trespass in favor of the right to successive actions [*Carbine v. Meyer (1954) 126 Cal. App. 2d 386, 390, 272 P.2d 849]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesStatutes of LimitationsTortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsContinuous TortsTortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsOccurrence of Tort

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.21

§ 550.21 Compensatory Damages

[1] Statutory Authority

Compensation for the damages resulting from the tort of trespass is governed by *Civ. Code § 3333* [*Linforth v. San Francisco Gas & Elec. Co. (1909) 156 Cal. 58, 62, 63, 103 P. 320]* . *Civ. Code § 3333* provides that the measure of damages for the breach of an obligation not arising from contract, except when otherwise expressly provided by the Civil Code, is the amount that will compensate for all the detriment proximately caused, whether it could have been anticipated or not [*Civ. Code § 3333*].

The detriment caused by the wrongful occupation of real property, in cases not embraced by the statutes governing eminent domain, holdover tenant, or unlawful detainer, is deemed to include the value of the use of the property for the time of occupation, not exceeding five years next preceding the commencement of the action to enforce the right to damages, the reasonable cost of repair or restoration of the property to its original condition, and the costs of recovering possession [*Civ. Code § 3334(a)*]. For these purposes, the value of the use of the property is the greater of either: (1) the reasonable rental value of that property, or (2) the benefits obtained by the person wrongfully occupying the property by reason of that wrongful occupation [*Civ. Code § 3334(b)*]. However, if the wrongful occupation of real property is the result of a mistake of fact by the wrongful occupier, the value of the use of the property is deemed to be the reasonable rental value of the property [*Civ. Code § 3334(c)*]. Constructive notice of the true facts to a defendant who lacks actual notice is sufficient to defeat a finding that defendant acted under a mistake of fact [*Bailey v. Outdoor Media Group (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 778, 794, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 322* (lis pendens put defendant on constructive notice as to true status of right to leasehold)]. Restoration costs may be recovered under *Civ. Code § 3334* only if restoration is possible and economically feasible in light of all the competing interests [*Starrh & Starrh Cotton Growers v. Aera Energy LLC (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 583, 599-602, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165]* .

For purposes of determining the benefits obtained by the person wrongfully occupying the property under *Civ. Code § 3334(b)*, "benefits" are not obtained unless the trespass provided the trespasser with a financial or business advantage [*Watson Land Co. v. Shell Oil Co. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 69, 77, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 343]* . The avoidance of remediation costs by a trespasser who dumps some material on the property cannot be recovered as a "benefit obtained" by the trespasser, although the remediationcosts themselves can be recovered under *Civ. Code § 3334(a)*, which allows

recovery for the reasonable cost of repair or restoration [*Watson Land Co. v. Shell Oil Co. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 69, 78, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 343]* . Profits obtained by the trespasser by virtue of the decision to trespass may be recovered as a "benefit obtained," although the plaintiff must provide evidence specifically linking the profits to the decision to trespass [*Starrh & Starrh Cotton Growers v. Aera Energy LLC (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 583, 602-604, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 165]* . If the defendant presents credible evidence of the expenses incurred, the trial court may offset those amounts against the gross income generated to determine gross profits. However, if the defendant does not present evidence of appropriate expenses, the trial court may award damages based on gross revenue as the benefit obtained by the trespass [*Bailey v. Outdoor Media Group (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 778, 788, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 322]* .

For a further discussion and forms relating to the nature and extent of tort damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* . For further discussion of unlawful detainer, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[2] Recovery of Prospective Damages

If a trespass is of a permanent nature, the plaintiff may recover all damages, past and prospective, in one action, but when the trespass is temporary in character, the plaintiff may recover only those damages that have accrued up to the time of the commencement of the action, since it is not to be presumed that the trespass will continue [*Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 269, 288 P.2d 507]* .

[3] Measurement

[a] Generally

There is no fixed, inflexible rule for determining the measure of damages for injury to, or destruction of, property; whatever formula is most appropriate to compensate the injured party for the loss sustained in the particular case will be adopted [*Heninger v. Dunn (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 858, 862, 162 Cal. Rptr. 104]* . An early case described the measure of damages as an amount of money that will fully compensate for all detriment proximately caused [*Empire Co. v. Bonanza Co. (1885) 67 Cal. 406, 408, 7 P. 810]* . Among the measures used to compensate damages are: the difference in the value of the real property immediately before and immediately after the injury; the cost of making repairs; the loss of use of the property; lost profits; loss of prospective profits; increased operating expenses pending repairs; and present and prospective damages that are the natural, necessary, or reasonable incident of the taking of the property [*Frustuck v. City of Fairfax (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 345, 367, 28 Cal. Rptr. 357]* .

[b] Permanent Versus Temporary Damage

When the injury to real property is permanent, damages are measured by the depreciation in the market value of the property, but when the injury is temporary in character the general measure of damages is the difference in the rental or usable value of the premises before and after the injury [*Guttinger v. Calaveras Cement Co. (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 382, 387, 233 P.2d 914]* .

[c] Cost of Restoration or Depreciation in Value of Real Property

The measure of damages is the cost of restoring the property to its prior condition unless the cost of restoration exceeds the value of the property prior to the trespass, in which case the value of the property is the proper measure [*Green v. General Petroleum Corp. (1928) 205 Cal. 328, 336, 270 P. 952* (deposit of debris)]. The value of the use of the premises for the period during which the owner is deprived of use is frequently awarded in addition to the cost of repair [*Natural Soda Prod. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 193, 201, 143 P.2d 12]* . When the plaintiff establishes damages as the depreciation in the value of his or her property caused by acts of the defendant, unless the defendant can show that the cost of restoration would be less than the depreciation in value, depreciation will be the measure of damages [*Herzog v. Grosso (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 219, 226, 259 P.2d 429* (destruction of roadway easement by owner of servient tenement)].

Restoration costs may be awarded even though they exceed the decrease in market value if there is a reason personal to the owner for restoring the original condition. Destruction of shade or ornamental trees that were of personal value to the owner comes within the personal reason exception and if a restoration could be achieved at a cost that was not unreasonable in relation to the damage inflicted and the value of the land prior to the trespass, the court should exercise its discretion and award these restoration costs [*Heninger v. Dunn (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 858, 863-866, 162 Cal. Rptr. 104]* .

The reasonableness of the restoration costs must be decided on a case-by-case basis and cannot be determined through a mechanical comparison of damage awards in other cases [*Kelly v. CB&I Constructors, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 442, 453, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32]* . In one case, for example, even though the pre-damage value of the property was estimated at no more than $1.8 million, restoration costs of almost $3 million were upheld on appeal when that was the amount that would be required to allow plaintiff to make the property safe and habitable by his family, and the property was unmarketable in its current condition due to damage caused by the defendant [*Kelly v. CB&I Constructors, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 442, 454, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32]* . For a form alleging a personal reason justifying restoration costs, see *§ 550.45*.

[d] Damage to Fixtures

If the thing destroyed, although it is part of the realty, has a value that can be accurately ascertained without reference to the soil on which it stands or out of which it grows, the recovery may be the value of the thing thus destroyed or the cost of its repair [*Menzies v. Geophysical Serv., Inc. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 419, 423, 254 P.2d 51* (damage to well)].

[e] Damage to Building

When a building is injured by a trespasser, the measure of damages is the cost of repairing or restoring the building to its former condition if the injury is of a character that this may be done at a reasonable cost, an allowance also being made for loss of rental during the reasonable time required to make these repairs [*Linforth v. San Francisco Gas & Elec. Co. (1909) 156 Cal. 58, 62, 63, 103 P. 320]* .

[f] Lost Profits

Damages for loss of profits will depend on whether there is a satisfactory basis for estimating what the probable earnings would have been had there been no tort. If there has been operating experience sufficient to permit a reasonable estimate of probable income and expense, damages for loss of prospective profits are awarded [*Natural Soda Prod. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 193, 199, 143 P.2d 12]* .

[g] Other Consequential Damages

Civ. Code § 3333 has been interpreted to hold the trespasser liable for all damages proximately caused by the trespass [*Hawthorne v. Siegel (1891) 88 Cal. 159, 163, 25 P. 1114]* . A trespasser is liable for all injurious consequences flowing from the trespass which are the natural and proximate result of the trespassing conduct [*Duval v. Rowell (1954) 269 P.2d 142]* . If the court finds that an intentional trespass occurred, the trespasser is liable for all the consequences,whether or not they were intentional or foreseeable [*Meyer v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 321, 326, 43 Cal. Rptr. 542]* . As long as there is factual support for the injuries, there is considerable discretion allowed in fixing the amount of consequential damages [*Skupen v. Imperial Irrigation Dist. (1939) 33 Cal. App. 2d 392, 395, 91 P.2d 910]* .

[h] Mental Distress

Regardless of whether the occupant of land has sustained physical injury, the occupant may recover damages for the

discomfort and annoyance of the occupant and the members of the occupant's family and for mental suffering occasioned by fear for the safety of the occupant and his or her family when such discomfort or suffering has been proximately caused by a trespass [*Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 272-275, 288 P.2d 507* ; *Acadia, Cal., Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 337, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686]* .

Annoyance and discomfort damages intended to compensate a plaintiff for the loss of peaceful occupation and enjoyment of real property may only be awarded to a plaintiff who was an occupant, that is, a resident on the property, at the time the damage was sustained. A person who was merely storing personal property on the premises is not entitled to damages for annoyance and discomfort [*Kelly v. CB&I Constructors, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 442, 456-459, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 32]* .

[4] Exemplary Damages

A tort, such as trespass, committed by mistake, in the assertion of a supposed right, or without any wrong intentions, and without such recklessness as evinces malice or a conscious disregard of the rights of others, does not warrant punitive damages [*Lyles v. Perrin (1897) 119 Cal. 264, 266, 51 P. 332* ; *Roth v. Shell Oil Co. (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 676, 682, 8 Cal. Rptr. 514]* . An award of exemplary damages cannot be based on mere speculation; it depends instead on a definite showing of a willingness to vex, harass, or injure consistent with a wrongful intent to injure [*Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 650, 198 P.2d 1 , disapproved on other grounds, Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263* ; *Roth v. Shell Oil Co. (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 676, 682, 8 Cal. Rptr. 514]* .

For example, exemplary damages were held to be appropriate in a trespass action when the defendant had painted out advertising signs and harassed the plaintiff by soliciting actions by the district attorney and the city planning commission, all of which were dismissed [*Brenner v. Haley (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 183, 188, 8 Cal. Rptr. 224]* . Exemplary damages were also properly awarded when the defendant had bulldozed and removed roadbed over which the plaintiff had the right to travel and for which a temporary restraining order forbidding interference had been obtained [*Donnell v. Bisso Bros. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 38, 45, 88 Cal. Rptr. 645]* . For a further discussion of exemplary damages and when they are available, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesAward CalculationsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesPunitive Damages

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.22

§ 550.22 Defenses

[1] Consent

[a] Express

Trespass involves an unauthorized entry. When there is a consensual entry, there is no tort, because lack of consent is an element of the wrong [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16-17, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915]* . There is no specified form of consent required. For an affirmative defense based on express consent, see *§ 550.49*.

[b] Consent Included in Conditional Sale Contract

A clause in a conditional sale contract allowing the seller to take possession of equipment by process of law or otherwise has been deemed a consent to enter the premises for the purposes of repossession [*Williams v. General Elec. Credit Corp. (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 527, 532-533, 323 P.2d 1046]* . Consent obtained in this manner may be subject to constitutional limitations, however, since prejudgment replevin statutes which allowed a deprivation of property without a hearing prior to repossession have been held invalid [*Fuentes v. Shevin (1972) 407 U.S. 67, 96, 92 S. Ct. 1983, 32 L. Ed. 2d 556]* .

[c] Implied Consent

Every person, by implication invites others to come to his or her house as they may have proper occasion either of business or courtesy or information or other purpose. Custom must determine what the limit is of that implied invitation [*Duval v. Rowell (1954) 269 P.2d 142]* . The circumstances and habits of the vicinity may imply an invitation to enter. For example, an invitation was implied when the owner of the only telephone within 12 miles, who was in the habit of delivering messages to people, entered the premises to deliver a message [*Duval v. Rowell (1954) 269 P.2d 142]* . For an affirmative defense based on implied consent, see *§ 550.50*.

[d] Exceeding Limited Consent

A trespass may occur if the person entering pursuant to a limited consent proceeds to exceed those limits by divergent

conduct on the land of another. A conditional or restricted consent to enter land creates a privilege to do so only in so far as the condition or restriction is complied with [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 17, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915]* . Consent may be limited as to purpose or place. A consent for entry to secure collateral and sell it was exceeded when the defendantentered the premises, ejected the employees, and changed the locks [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 17, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915]* . Another example of a consent which was exceeded was the dumping of 5,000 cubic yards of earth and rocks over the entire unoccupied portion of a lot after viewing a sign for "dirt wanted--dump on fill" [*Hancock v. George R. Curtis Paving Co. (1931) 114 Cal. App. 624, 627, 300 P. 65]* .

Trespass may also result by exceeding a consent that is limited as to time. The trespass occurs the moment the privilege is abused or any act hostile to the interests of the owner is committed. For example, one who continued to graze sheep on property after the date given to remove them was a trespasser [*Rogers v. Duhart (1893) 97 Cal. 500, 506]* .

[2] Necessity

One is privileged to enter and remain on land in the possession of another if it reasonably appears to be necessary to prevent serious harm to the land or chattels of the other party, unless the actor has reason to know that the one for whose benefit the actor enters is unwilling that he or she shall take such action [*People v. Parra (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 729, 732-733, 106 Cal. Rptr. 531]* . Necessity often justifies an action that would otherwise constitute a trespass, as where the act is prompted by the motive of preserving life or property and reasonably appears to the actor to be necessary for that purpose [*People v. Roberts (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 374, 377, 303 P.2d 721]* . Although both *Parra* and *Roberts* involved entry by police officers, nothing in the language used in those cases indicated that the necessity privilege is limited to police officers. An early case involved a mayor who trespassed, acting in good faith and under necessity, to prevent the spread of fire. In finding him not liable, the court spoke in general terms and in no way based its holdings on public authority, rather it was the emergency nature of the situation that was determinative [*Surocco v. Geary (1853) 3 Cal. 69, 73* , 58 Amer. Dec. 385].

Restatement (Second) of Torts divides necessity into two parts: public (threat to the general public) and private (threat to an individual). *People v. Parra (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 729, 732-733, 106 Cal. Rptr. 531* , uses language parallel to *Restatement (Second) of Torts § 197*, which is the private necessity provision. The public necessity provision is broader in its scope, and contains no language regarding reasonableness in time or manner or unwilling beneficiary, but subjects the actor to liability for any harm done [*Restatement (Second) of Torts §§ 196, 197*].

[3] Entry Under Color of Authority

The entry of a law enforcement officer on the land of another in the lawful discharge of his or her duties, as a general rule, is not wrongful and, therefore, not actionable as a trespass [*Uptown Enters. v. Strand (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 45, 52, 15 Cal. Rptr. 486]* . A good faith and reasonable belief that there is a felon on the premises is recognized as a defense to a trespass action for entry without a warrant [*Williams v. Gould (9th Cir. 1973) 486 F.2d 547, 548]* . Entry to business premises for the purpose of harassing the owner, giving the business a bad reputation, compelling the owner to change a lawful business policy, or unjustifiably interfering with the business relations between the owner and patrons is unauthorized, wrongful, and actionable as a trespass [*Uptown Enters. v. Strand (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 45, 52, 15 Cal. Rptr. 486]* .

[4] Entry to Abate Nuisance

If a private nuisance results from a mere omission of the wrongdoer, and cannot be abated without entering on the land, reasonable notice must be given to the wrongdoer before entering to abate it [*Civ. Code § 3503*]. Although the statute does not state that the entry to abate is privileged, and no trespass will occur from so doing, this interpretation appears logical, and is supported by *Restatement (Second) of Torts § 201*. Notice will be deemed given in a case of continuing,

visible public nuisance, and no specific notice to abate is necessary when there have been protests and notices before the suit is commenced [*City of Turlock v. Bristow (1930) 103 Cal. App. 750, 755-756, 284 P. 962* (irrigation ditch was overgrown and obstructed flow of water)].

[5] Entry to Care for Animal

In case any domestic animal is at any time impounded and continues to be without necessary food and water for more than 12 consecutive hours, it is lawful for any person, as may be necessary, to enter into and on any area in which the animal is confined and supply it with necessary food and water as long as it remains so confined. This person is not liable for the entry [*Penal Code § 597e*].

[6] Entry by Landlord to Enforce Liens

Keepers of furnished and unfurnished apartment houses, apartments, cottages, or bungalow courts have a lien on the baggage and other property belonging to their tenants for the proper charges due from these tenants or guests. The lien may be enforced only after final judgment, but during the pendency of the proceeding, the landlord may take possession of the baggage and property on a court order. On this order, the landlord shall have the right to enter peaceably the quarters used by the tenant without liability, including any possible claim of liability for conversion, trespass, or forcible entry [*Civ. Code § 1861a*].

[7] Immunity of Decedent's Personal Representative

A personal representative who in good faith takes into possession real or personal property, and reasonably believes that the property is part of the decedent's estate, is neither criminally nor civilly liable for doing so [*Prob. Code § 9651(a)*]. However, the personal representative must make reasonable efforts to determine the true nature of and title to the property taken into possession [*Prob. Code § 9651(b)*].

During his or her possession, the personal representative is entitled to receive all rents, issues, and profits of the property. If the personal representative determines later that the property is not part of the decedent's estate, the personal representative must deliver the property, or cause it to be delivered, to the person legally entitled to it, together with all rents, issues, and profits of the property received by the personal representative, less any expenses incurred in protecting and maintaining the property and in collecting the rents, issues, and profits. The personal representative may request court approval before delivering the property [*Prob. Code § 9651(c)*].

For a form of affirmative defense based on *Prob. Code § 9651*, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

[8] Constitutional Right to Free Expression of Ideas in Public Forum

The California Constitution [*Cal. Const., art. I, §§ 2, 3*] guarantees the right of free speech and prohibits any law abridging this right. This right may be exercised in any public forum, which includes not only public streets and shopping areas, but also large private shopping centers that are open to the public and are the functional equivalent of the traditional town center. Therefore, persons who engage in such constitutionally protected free speech activities as leafletting, picketing, or soliciting signatures on petitions are not trespassing if their activities occur in a public forum, are orderly and reasonable, and do not interfere with normal business operations [*see Robins v. Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. (1979) 23 Cal.3d 899, 910-911, 153 Cal. Rptr. 854, 592 P.2d 341 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 74, 81, 100 S. Ct. 2035, 64 L. Ed. 2d 741 (1980)]* .

However, public forums do not include the property of individual homeowners or retail establishments that are more modest than large suburban shopping malls [*Robins v. Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. (1979) 23 Cal.3d 899, 910, 153 Cal. Rptr. 854, 592 P.2d 341 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 74, 81, 100 S. Ct. 2035, 64 L. Ed. 2d 741 (1980)]* . Private parking areas of relatively small medical facilities are not the equivalent of a public forum because the medical center's tenants offer

services only to specific clientele, rather than inviting members of the public to congregate, relax, seek out entertainment, browse, and shop. Moreover, unlike even a modest retail establishment, medical centers serve mainly prearranged clientele, are not fully open to the local community, and do not provide services that are essential to all community members. Consequently, the owners and the tenants of this type of private property may exclude anti-abortion picketers, as trespassers, from the parking areas [*Allred v. Harris (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1386, 1391-1392, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 530* ; *see also Planned Parenthood v. Wilson (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1668, 286 Cal. Rptr. 427* ; *Allred v. Shawley (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1489, 1501-1502, 284 Cal. Rptr. 140]* .

[9] Entry by Tenants' Rights Activist

A person entering onto residential real property, on the occupant's invitation, during reasonable hours or because of emergency circumstances, for the purpose of providing information regarding tenants' rights or to participate in a tenants' association, is not liable in any criminal or civil action for trespass [*Civ. Code § 1942.6*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesConsentTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesConstitutional ConsiderationsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesPrivilege

171 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 550.23through 550.29

[Reserved]

§§ 550.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.30

§ 550.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in proceedings involving tort damages, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 65, *Damages* , Pt. I (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in support of and opposition to injunctions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in trespass actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 225, *Trespass* (Matthew Bender)

[2] California Real Estate

For discussion of the substantive and procedural aspects of trespass, see 11 California Real Estate Law and Practice, ch. 384, *Trespass and Waste*, §§ 384.01-384.04 (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.31

§ 550.31 State Statutes

[1] Attorney's Fees

Prevailing plaintiff as entitled to attorney's fees in action to recover damages to personal or real property resulting from trespassing on lands either under cultivation or intended or used for the raising of livestock. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.9*

[2] Crimes

Trespass as criminal act. *Penal Code §§ 552-558.1, 602-603*

[3] Damages

Damages for vandalism. *Civ. Code § 1721*

Punitive. *Civ. Code § 3294*

Compensatory. *Civ. Code § 3333*

Wrongful occupation of land. *Civ. Code § 3334*

Wrongful holdover by tenant. *Civ. Code § 3335*

Conversion of personal property. *Civ. Code §§ 3336, 3337*

Statement reserving right to recover punitive damages in default judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.115*

[4] Injunctive Relief

Grounds for issuing injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Procedure for obtaining preliminary injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 527*

[5] Objections to Complaint

Grounds for objection to complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10*

When objections made by demurrer or answer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30*

[6] Public Emergency

Local authority as allowed on private road without permission to make necessary repairs after declaration of local emergency. *Sts. & Hy. Code § 969.5*

[7] Statutes of Limitations

Injuries to timber. *Civ. Code § 3346(c)*

Trespass or injury to real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)*

Conversion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b), (c)*

Trespass to oil or gas wells. *Code Civ. Proc. § 349*3/4

[8] Venue

Actions involving real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 392*

Tort actions. *Code Civ. Proc. 395(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesProperty CrimesBurglary & Criminal TrespassCriminal TrespassGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesStatutes of LimitationsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesInjunctionsTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionVenue

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.32

§ 550.32 Decisions

[1] Abortion Clinic

Injunction against anti-abortion picketers trespassing in private parking area of small medical center as proper because property was not public forum. *Allred v. Harris (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1386, 1391-1392, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 530*

[2] Adjoining Land

Defendant's compliance with zoning code does not preclude recovery for damages for trespassory invasions of another's property caused by manufacturing or commercial use. *Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 271, 288 P.2d 507* ; *Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 529, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519*

Adjoining landowner injured by encroaching tree limbs and roots allowed to cut off intruding parts or to sue for damages and abatement, but not allowed to trespass and cut down trees. *Fick v. Nilson (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 683, 685, 220 P.2d 752*

Vibrations from defendant's plant operations causing injuries to nearby residences constitutes cause of action for invasion of property. *McNeill v. Redington (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 315, 319, 154 P.2d 428*

[3] Consent

Dumping of oil and waste products from oil wells by lessee in lease for mining and removing oil and gas is continuing trespass without right, giving rise to separate and successive causes of action. *Bourdieu v. Seaboard Oil Corp. (1940) 38 Cal. App. 2d 11, 21-22, 100 P.2d 528*

[4] Damages

[a] Generally

Civ. Code § 2224 (involuntary trust) is applicable to cases of trespass; imposition of constructive trust on proceeds of trespass is allowed when trespasser removes something of value from land on which defendant trespassed. *Santa Clarita Water Co. v. Lyons (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 450, 460-463, 207 Cal. Rptr. 698*

Trespass and injury to property is not inextricably linked; both actionable injury to real property with no trespass on it and actionable trespass on real property without injury to property as possible. *Polin v. Chung Cho (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 673, 676, 87 Cal. Rptr. 591*

Jury verdict finding trespass but no damages, either nominal or compensatory, is incomplete verdict and judgment thereon is nullity; nominal damages as implied in trespass and finding trespass without any damages is inconsistent. *Costerisan v. Melendy (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 57, 60, 62 Cal. Rptr. 800*

[b] Compensatory

Discomfort and annoyance suffered by plaintiffs is injury directly and proximately caused by defendant's invasion in form of fumes, dust, and waste material. *Kornoff v. Kingsburg Cotton Oil Co. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 265, 272, 288 P.2d 507*

Costs of reasonable efforts in avoiding and preventing further injuries from trespass is recoverable. *Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Granite Constr. Co. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 765, 769, 37 Cal. Rptr. 727*

Award of compensatory damages remains intact and not reversible by the appellate court unless award suggests at first blush, passion, prejudice, or corruption on part of jury. *Brenner v. Haley (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 183, 188, 8 Cal. Rptr. 224*

Rental value of premises is measure of damages in case of trespass by lessee leaving restaurant equipment after expiration of lease. *Herond v. Bonsall (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 152, 156*

Person owning land on which soil was dumped is entitled to recover costs of removal even if value of land was not affected by trespass. *Dandoy v. Oswald Bros. Paving Co. (1931) 113 Cal. App. 570, 572*

Costs of restoration is recoverable even if plaintiff has not restored land to its prior condition. *Dandoy v. Oswald Bros. Paving Co. (1931) 113 Cal. App. 570, 572*

Damages for trespass and destruction of pasturage used for grazing, when grass cannot be severed and marketed separately from land, is measured by reasonable rental value. *Miller & Lux Inc. v. Pinelli (1927) 84 Cal. App. 42, 51*

Damages from trespass and destruction of crops is measured by market value of estimated crop, taking into consideration condition of maturity of product at time of injury. *Miller & Lux Inc. v. Pinelli (1927) 84 Cal. App. 42, 47*

[c] Mental Distress

Damages for mental suffering caused by fear for safety of family members and visitors after defendant caused grade of easement road to be dangerously steepened is recoverable in action for trespass. *Herzog v. Grosso (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 219, 225-226, 259 P.2d 429*

[d] Nominal Damages

Nominal damages are presumed for every trespass on real property. *Empire Co. v. Bonanza Co. (1885) 67 Cal. 406, 409, 7 P. 810*

Trespass without injury justifies only nominal damages. *Cornell v. Sennes (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 126, 136, 95 Cal. Rptr. 728*

[e] Punitive

Officer has no authority to break into dwelling for service of process and as able to be liable for trespass for doing so; innocent superior is not responsible for malice of officer and not liable for punitive damages unless he or she has ratified conduct of officer. *Foley v. Martin (1904) 142 Cal. 256, 260-261*

Malice supporting punitive damages found when trespasser acted with unmistakably conscious disregard for property rights of another by persisting in trespassing activities after being told to desist, building permanent improvements after being warned that they would be encroachments, destroying survey monument, and repeatedly asserting right to do as he wished on other's land. *Goshgarian v. George (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 1214, 1224-1226, 208 Cal. Rptr. 321* (amount of punitive damages reduced on appeal due to jury passion and prejudice)

Punitive damages awardable if trespass is committed from wanton or malicious motives, or reckless disregard of rights of others, or under circumstances of great hardship or oppression. *Krieger v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 137, 148, 173 Cal. Rptr. 751* ; *Haun v. Hyman (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 615, 620*

Punitive damages in action for trespass justified by evidence showing that defendant repainted gasoline pumps, painted out company colors on building, and removed lighting without any notice or any communication withplaintiffs. *Roth v. Shell Oil Co. (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 676, 683, 8 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Punitive damages in action for trespass justified by evidence showing that plaintiff had posted three "no trespassing" signs with his name and address on property, that defendants entered without permission and maintained powder magazine within 200 feet of plaintiff's cabin, and injured his personal property. *Smpardos v. Piombo Constr. Co. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 415, 420-423, 244 P.2d 435*

[5] Defenses

[a] Consent

Consent for landlord to enter and make necessary repairs does not allow landlord to make extensive alterations requiring much longer time; landlord's exceeding consent is act of trespass. *Dwyer v. Carroll (1890) 86 Cal. 298, 302-304, 24 P. 1015*

Peaceable entry on land with consent of owner and possessor is not trespass. *Girard v. Ball (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 772, 788, 178 Cal. Rptr. 406*

Entry to repossess personal property allowed by contract is consensual entry, not trespass. *Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 17, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915*

Entry of premises to repossess equipment sold without permission or consent of the buyer is trespass; unauthorized entry is trespass even if made to effect valid recovery of personal property. *Cornell v. Sennes (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 126, 136, 95 Cal. Rptr. 728*

Agreement to neighbor's construction of improvement that would incidentally result in detriment to both properties and violation of Health and Safety Code is implied consent to trespass by building additional encroachment to remedy detrimental condition. *Strodel v. Wilcox (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 781, 783-786, 291 P.2d 95*

Revoking of temporary permit of occupation withdraws consent to occupation and continued occupation is trespass. *Red Bluff v. Southern Pac. Co. (1919) 44 Cal. App. 667, 674*

[b] Necessity

Necessity justifies action which would otherwise be trespass; necessity is act which reasonably appears necessary for preserving life or property. *People v. Roberts (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 374, 377, 303 P.2d 721* ; *People v. Neth (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 883, 888, 86 Cal. Rptr. 12*

[c] No Trespass

Actions by immigration officers in approaching plaintiff's ranch, calling to workers, asking them if they were in country illegally, and arresting them without entering plaintiff's land is not even theoretical trespass. *Taylor v. Fine (S.D. Cal. 1953) 115 F. Supp. 68, 70*

Coowner of real property is not liable for trespass committed by other coowner, unless actively participating in or ratifying it. *Daly v. Smith (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 592, 604, 33 Cal. Rptr. 920*

[6] Easements

Owner of servient tenement allowed to make any use of land that does not interfere unreasonably with easement; interference with use of easement is actionable. *Herzog v. Grosso (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 219, 224-225, 259 P.2d 429*

[7] Extrahazardous Activity

Construction of garage in apartment house without evidence of unusual methods is not extrahazardous activity for which actor may be liable in trespass. *Gallin v. Poulou (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 638, 645, 295 P.2d 958*

Blasting in populated areas is ultrahazardous activity for which actor is held strictly liable in damages. *Alonso v. Hills (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 778, 783, 214 P.2d 50*

Blasting in remote areas where there is little danger of injury is not ultrahazardous activity and negligence or tortious intent must be shown before actor will be held liable. *Alonso v. Hills (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 778, 783, 214 P.2d 50*

[8] Intent to Trespass

Intentional character of actions as essential element of trespass; intent to cause damage irrelevant. *Meyer v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co. (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 321, 326, 43 Cal. Rptr. 542*

Using land in way that causes intrusion of flood waters and sediment on land of others is trespass for which defendant is liable only if it is intentional, result of recklessness or negligence, or resulting from ultrahazardous activity. *Dufour v. Henry J. Kaiser Co. (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 26, 30, 29 Cal. Rptr. 871*

Doing of act which will to substantial certainty result in entry of foreign matter on another's land is sufficient intent for trespass. *Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530-531, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519*

Mistake in location of boundary line is not relieving actor of liability for trespass. *Youdall v. Kaufman (1921) 55 Cal. App. 363, 367*

[9] Possession

Possessor with right to possession is allowed to use reasonable means to repel trespasser. *Jensen v. Shadburne (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 624, 626-627, 302 P.2d 824*

[10] Statute of Limitations

Action for trespass is required to be brought within three years of act. *Robinson v. Southern Cal. Ry. Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 8, 11, 61 P. 947* ; *Gale v. McDaniel (1887) 72 Cal. 334, 335, 13 P. 871*

Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b) (statute of limitations for trespass or injury to real property) applies to acts of trespass that do not involve taking or damaging private property for public use; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 318* and *319* (time limitations for action for possession or title) applies when inverse condemnation or taking or damaging valuable property right for public use occurs. *Garden Water Corp. v. Fambrough (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 324, 328, 53 Cal. Rptr. 862* ; *Frustuck v. City of Fairfax (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 345, 374, 28 Cal. Rptr. 357*

Encroachment of permanent building is permanent trespass, and action for all damages suffered, past as well as prospective, must be brought within three years of time of trespass. *Tracy v. Ferrera (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 827, 828, 301 P.2d 905* ; *Bertram v. Orlando (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 506, 509, 227 P.2d 894*

Successive entries on different parcels of land when original entry does not affect all land constitutes new and different cause of action for damages. *Bourdieu v. Seaboard Oil Corp. (1940) 38 Cal. App. 2d 11, 17-20, 100 P.2d 528*

[11] Trespass Above Land

Entry into immediate reaches of airspace next to land and entry that is substantial interference with owner's actual use and enjoyment of land are both necessary to support a claim of trespass resulting from flight in airspace above another's land. *Drennen v. County of Ventura (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 84, 87-88, 112 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Temporary invasion of airspace by aircraft over land of another is privileged as long as it does not unreasonably interfere with persons or property on land. *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Peterson (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 434, 438, 75 Cal. Rptr. 673* ; *Sneed v. County of Riverside (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 205, 210, 32 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawAdjoining LandownersEncroachmentsReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassElementsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.33

§ 550.33 Law Reviews

Comment, *Remedies for Intangible Intrusions: The Distinction Between Trespass and Nuisance Actions Against Lawfully Zoned Businesses in California, 17 U.C. Davis. L. Rev. 389 (1983)*

Comment, *Liability for the Invasion of a Landowner's Rights by Geophysical Exploration, 18 Cal. West L. Rev. 460 (1982)*

Evans, Marjorie and Kratter, L.M., *A New Tort: Mass Trespass by Air Pollution*, 8 C.T.L.J. 33 (1970)

Vogel, Charles, *Student Demonstrations, Trespass Laws, Private Colleges, 43 L.A. Bar Bull. 457 (1968)*

Note, *Privileged Entry Onto Farm Property for Union Organizers, 19 Hastings L.J. 413 (1968)*

Note, *The Use of Trespass Laws to Enforce Private Policies of Discrimination, 16 Hastings L.J. 445 (1965)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawExploration, Discovery & RecoveryGeophysical TrespassReal Property LawAdjoining LandownersEncroachmentsReal Property LawTortsNuisanceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesConstitutional ConsiderationsTortsPremises Liability & PropertyTrespassDefensesPrivilege

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.34

§ 550.34 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 548-556; vols. 4 & 5, *Pleading*, §§ 48-49, 590-592, 968; vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, §§ 305-306 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 5, *Torts*, §§ 693-698, vol. 6, *Torts*,, §§ 1588, 1726-1737 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesGeneral OverviewTortsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 550.35through 550.39

[Reserved]

§§ 550.35[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.40

§ 550.40 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES[, TEMPORARY
_____ [*name*],	)	RESTRAINING ORDER, AND PRELIMINARY
Defendant.	)	(AND PERMANENT) INJUNCTION(S)]
	)	(Trespass)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner] and in possession of certain real property consisting of land [and _____ (*describe improvements, if any, e.g.,* a single family house)] at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the

fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's injuries as herein alleged were proximately caused by such defendants.)]

[3. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendants.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], [and continuing to the present time], defendant[s, and each of them] without plaintiff's consent _____ [*specify the act of trespass, e.g.,* entered the above described land of which plaintiff is the owner and possessor, leveled a portion of the premises, constructed a powder magazine 200 feet from plaintiff's dwelling, and used the premises for general construction purposes].

5. As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* defendant's entry onto the plaintiff's land, leveling of a portion of the premises, construction of a powder magazine 200 feet from plaintiff's dwelling, and use of the premises for general construction purposes], _____ [*specify injury and appropriate measure of damages, e.g.,* plaintiff's property was damaged to such an extent that repairs were necessary to restore the land (and _____ (*describe improvements, if any, e.g.,* a single family house) to _____ (its *or* their) prior condition all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____)].

[6. As a (further) proximate result of the _____ (*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* defendant's entry onto plaintiff's land, maintenance of a construction headquarters there, construction and maintenance of a powder magazine 200 feet from plaintiff's dwelling), plaintiff _____ (*specify physical injury and/or mental distress experienced by plaintiff, e.g.,* suffered discomfort and annoyance and experienced mental suffering caused by fear for his safety). (*If plaintiff has experienced physical manifestations of this distress, allege and specify the personal injuries suffered, e.g.,* Plaintiff sustained injuries to his/her nervous system (and person), all of which injuries have caused (, and continue to cause,) plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering.) As a result of _____ (*specify nature of plaintiff's injury, e.g.,* this mental distress), plaintiff has suffered general damages.]

[7. As a further proximate result of the _____ (*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* defendant's entry onto plaintiff's land, maintenance of a construction headquarters there, construction and maintenance of a powder magazine 200 feet from plaintiff's dwelling), _____ (*allege any special damages, e.g.,* plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses.)]

[8. The aforementioned acts of the defendant were willful and _____ (oppressive *or* fraudulent *or* malicious *or any combination thereof*) in that _____ (*allege facts indicating presence of oppression, fraud, malice, or any combination thereof, e.g.,* defendant constructed and maintained the powder magazine 200 feet from plaintiff's dwelling with knowledge that plaintiff resided there, and despite plaintiff's warnings that the defendant was trespassing, and in conscious disregard of plaintiff's physical safety and mental well being). Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages.]

[9. Defendant's wrongful conduct _____ (*describe conduct, e.g.,* in maintaining the powder magazine construction site), unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will _____ (*specify particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g.,* causegreat and irreparable injury through the ongoing injury to the property and will deprive plaintiff of peace of mind and a safe and secure dwelling).]

[10. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries _____ (currently being suffered *or* which are threatened) in that _____ (*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.,* defendant will continue to maintain the powder magazine and construction site on plaintiff's land unless restrained and plaintiff would be required to maintain a multiplicity of judicial proceedings to protect his

interests.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For general damages for property damage in the sum of $_____;

[2. For general damages for _____ (personal injury *and/or* mental distress) according to proof;]

[3. For special damages _____ (*specify, e.g.,* for medical and related expenses) according to proof;]

[4. For punitive damages;]

[5. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if he/she has any, why he/she should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;]

[6. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all requiring defendant and his/her agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for him/her:

a. To refrain from _____ (*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendants are to be prohibited from doing, commencing, continuing, or maintaining, e.g.,* continuing to trespass on plaintiff's land and from maintaining a powder magazine or construction headquarters thereon);

b. To _____ (*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendants are to be commanded to do or undertake, e.g.,* remove the powder magazine and construction headquarters from plaintiff's property and restore the property to its original condition prior to the entrance of defendant);]

7. For costs of suit herein incurred;

[8. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ (of $_____ *or* according to proof); and]

9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a general form of complaint for use by a plaintiff who is seeking damages for trespass to real property and can be used to obtain preliminary and permanent injunctive relief as well [*see Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)*]. An action in trespass may be brought by the person in possession, whether or not that person is the owner [*Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 508, 116 Cal. Rptr. 200* (resident watchman's action in trespass for personal injuries caused by trespassing bull was proper); *see § 550.19[2]*]. It is not clear, however, to what extent a possessor who is not the owner may recover for damages to the real property, as opposed to personal injury caused by the trespass. Actionable trespass may be based on the defendant's entry or on his or her causing another person or foreign matter to enter on the property, but there will be no liability unless the trespass is intentional, the result of recklessness or negligence, or the result of engaging in an extrahazardous activity [*see Gallin v. Poulou (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 638, 645, 295 P.2d 958* ; for a form alleging trespass by causing the entry of foreign matter, *see § 550.46*].

With appropriate modifications, this form can be used in actions seeking a variety of damages and forms of relief. When the trespass involves occupation of the land, the plaintiff can sue for damages, or in ejectment and have a judgment of ouster and damages, or for an injunction to restrain the continued occupation [*Slater v. Shell Oil Co. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 864, 869, 137 P.2d 713* ; *see § 550.19[3]*].

The form can include a request for damages to a building or other improvement on the land. If a business is involved, damages may include lost profits [*Natural Soda Prod. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 193, 199, 143 P.2d 12* ; *see § 550.21*]. This form is adapted from the fact situation in *Smpardos v. Piombo Constr. Co. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 415, 244 P.2d 435* .

[3] Allegations

A complaint for damages for trespass must allege facts showing the following:

- Plaintiff's possession of the real property and a description of the real property [*Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 694-695, 120 P. 771* ; *Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 509, 116 Cal. Rptr. 200]* .

- The nature and circumstances of the trespass [*Gomez v. Reed (1918) 178 Cal. 759, 763, 174 P. 658]* .

- The damages proximately caused by the trespass [*Gomez v. Reed (1918) 178 Cal. 759, 763, 174 P. 658]* .

This complaint alleges (1) facts showing plaintiff's protectible right or interest (Paragraph 1) [*see Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 694-695, 120 P. 771* ; *see § 550.19[2]*], (2) the actions by the defendant constituting a trespass on the plaintiff's property (Paragraph 4) [*see Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922]* , and (3) damages proximately caused by the defendant's trespass (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*].

The complaint includes optional paragraphs for use to allege (1) fictitious names of defendants (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*], and (2) the agency relationship of defendants (Paragraph 3) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*].

Optional paragraphs are also included to allege (1) that plaintiff suffered personal injury or mental distress or both as a result of the trespass (Paragraph 6) [*see Acadia, Cal., Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 337, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686* ; *see* Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress*], (2) special damages (Paragraph 7), and (3) facts showing that punitive damages are appropriate (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 3294*].

Optional paragraphs for use to obtain injunctive relief allege (1) facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1]* , and (2) any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *see* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

[4] Specification of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], see Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[5] Verification

Verification [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. Otherwise, verification of a complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], but verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . Although a court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions in a limited civil case, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the action is classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85(b), 86(a)(8)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[6] Pleading Possession

The proper party plaintiff in an action for trespass to real property is the person in actual possession. No averment of title in the plaintiff is necessary [*Lightner Mining Co. v. Lane (1911) 161 Cal. 689, 694-695, 120 P.771* ; *Smith v. Cap Concrete, Inc. (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 769, 774, 184 Cal. Rptr. 308* ; *see Allen v. McMillion (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 211, 218-219, 147 Cal. Rptr. 77* (plaintiff in wrongful, peaceable possession may recover nominal damages against the owner for trespass)]. If the complaint alleges only plaintiff's ownership or actual possession or right of possession and no more, the allegation would be good against demurrer and the defendant would be required to set up ownership in itself as a defense. However, if a complaint, in addition to alleging ownership, alleges facts on which the purported ownership rests, the general allegation of ownership becomes a mere conclusion of law and the plaintiff is bound by any weakness in the specific facts alleged [*Shusett, Inc. v. Home Sav. & Loan Ass'n (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 146, 150, 41 Cal. Rptr. 622]* .

For example, a complaint alleging that the plaintiff had actual possession pursuant to a lease, with the lease attached to the complaint, did not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action for trespass because there was no allegation that the plaintiff had performed his obligations under the lease so as to establish his right of possession under it [*Nichols v. Drew (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 301, 302-303, 198 P.2d 707]* . Thus, counsel should exercise care if making any specific allegations as to the plaintiff's right to possession. However, more recent case law suggests that a peaceable but wrongful possessor may be entitled to recover at least nominal damages even against the rightful owner [*see Allen v. McMillion (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 211, 218-219, 147 Cal. Rptr. 77]* . For further discussion of the possessory interest necessary to maintain an action for trespass, see *§ 550.19[2]*.

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

For a discussion of jurisdiction and venue, see *§ 550.19[1]*

[8] Attorney's Fees

If the action is to recover damages to personal or real property resulting from trespassing on lands either under cultivation or intended or used for the raising of livestock, a prevailing plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees in addition to other costs, and in addition to any liability for damages imposed by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.9*]. An optional prayer for attorney's fees is provided in the form for the purpose of requesting these fees (Paragraph 8).

[9] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions to recover possession of real property, see Ch. 241, *Ejectment* .

For forms of complaint for damages to real property resulting from blasting, see Ch. 256, *Explosives* .

For discussion, a procedural guide, and forms relating to the procedures for seeking injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter* .

For discussion and forms relating to the removal of timber, see Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber* .

For discussion and forms for use in nuisance actions involving real property, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* .

For forms of complaints for damages resulting from trespassing waters, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to general principals and measure of damages in tort actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 65, *Damages* , Pt. I (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in support of and opposition to injunctions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender).

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in trespass actions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 225, *Trespass* (Matthew Bender).

179 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.41

§ 550.41 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property Easement and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property Easement and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]

[*Caption. See § 550.40[1].*]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner] and in possession of certain real property consisting of land [and _____ (*describe improvements, e.g.,* a single family dwelling)] at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

2. _____ [*Name of defendant*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of certain real property located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

3. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner] and in possession of an easement appurtenant to his/her real property described above. This easement consists of _____ [*describe easement, e.g.,* a six-foot wide right of way over the Northeast corner of defendant's lot for use as an access road to plaintiff's lot)], and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

[4. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[5. *Agency allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 3.*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], [and continuing to the present time,] defendant[s, and each of them] unreasonably _____ [interfered with *or* obstructed] plaintiff's easement by _____ [*specify the act affecting easement, e.g.,* altering the roadway and using it for the passage of trucks and other heavy equipment necessary for logging operations]. The act of the defendant[s, and each of them] _____ [has resulted *or* if allowed to continue, will result] in the obstruction of the plaintiff's easement right by _____ [*specify the manner in which obstruction has or will occur, e.g.,* the construction of a dirt and gravel fill over a creek and maintenance of that fill in such a way that it has become soft, full of deep ruts and impassable for plaintiff's use].

7. As a proximate result of _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* the excessive use and alteration of the roadway by the defendant], plaintiff sustained damages _____ [*specify damages, e.g.,* by being forced to make road repairs in the sum of $_____ to avoid damage to his/her vehicles *and/or* has been deprived of ingress and egress from his/her real property during the time the road is impassible].

[8. *Mental distress allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 6.*]

[9. *Special damages allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 7.*]

[10. *Punitive damage allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 8.*]

[11. *Continuing trespass causing great and irreparable allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 9.*]

[12. *Inadequate legal remedy allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 10.*]

[*Prayer. See § 550.40[1].*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 550.40[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a general form of complaint for use by a plaintiff to seek damages for trespass to an easement and can be used to obtain preliminary and permanent injunctive relief as well [*see Civ. Code § 3333*]. This form is adapted from the fact situation in *Roth v. Cottrell (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 621, 246 P.2d 958* . For further discussion and forms relating to actions for interference with easements, and to quiet title to easements, see Ch. 240, *Easements* .

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges (1) the plaintiff's proprietary interest in, and possession of easement and the land appurtenant to the easement (Paragraphs 1, 3) [*see Roth v. Cottrell (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 621, 623, 246 P.2d 958]* ; (2) the

defendant's ownership of the servient tenement (Paragraph 2) [*see Ames v. Prodon (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 94, 100, 60 Cal. Rptr. 183]* ; (3) facts showing the defendant's interference or obstruction with the easement (Paragraph 6); and (4) damages proximately caused by the defendant's trespass (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*].

[4] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff tothe relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* .Although a court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions in a limited civil case, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the action is classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85(b), 86(a)(8)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to actions involving easements, see Ch. 240, *Easements* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.42

§ 550.42 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Conversion of Personal Property [Civ. Code § 3336]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Real Property and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Conversion of Personal Property [Civ. Code § 3336]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES[, TEMPORARY
_____ [*name*],	)	RESTRAINING ORDER, AND PRELIMINARY
Defendant.	)	(AND PERMANENT) INJUNCTION(S)]
	)	(Trespass and Conversion)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Trespass)

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner] and in possession of certain real property consisting of land and _____ [*describe*

improvements, e.g., a sawmill with various items of milling equipment, including 300 feet of conveyor chain, pulleys, shafts, sprockets and assorted pieces of iron] at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], [and continuing to the present time], defendant[s, and each of them] wrongfully and unlawfully _____ [*specify the act of trespass, e.g.,* entered the above described land, removed boards from the mill building, entered the mill, and removed several items of equipment, severing some of the items from their foundation within the mill].

5. As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* entry onto the plaintiff's land, entry of and damage to the mill building, and forcible removal of equipment], plaintiff's property was damaged to such an extent that repairs were necessary to restore the land and _____ [*specify improvements, e.g.,* the sawmill] to their prior condition_____ [in the sum of $_____, which is the cost of restoring the land and the _____ (*specify improvements, e.g.,* sawmill) to their original condition].

[6. *Mental distress allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 6.*]

[7. *Special damages allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 7.*]

[9. *Continuing trespass causing great and irreparable injury allegation. See Form 1, Paragraph 9.*]

[10. *Inadequate legal remedy allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 10.*]

SECOND COUNT
(Conversion)

11. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-5 and Paragraph 7 of the First Count.

12. _____ [*Allege defendant's capacity and residence, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.]

13. On or about _____ [*date*], and at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, the _____ [*specify items mentioned above which were removed from plaintiff's property, e.g.,* 300 feet of conveyor chain, pulleys, shafts, sprockets and assorted pieces of iron] had a value of $_____.

14. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*set forth the details of defendant's conversion of the property, e.g.,* trespassed on plaintiff's property, entered the sawmill, removed the items from the sawmill, installed those items for use in his plant and] converted the same to his/her own use.

[*EITHER*]

15. As a proximate result of defendant's conversion, plaintiff has sustained a loss of $_____ [*specify an amount equal to the value of the property converted, plus interest*].

[*OR*]

15. As a proximate result of defendant's conversion, plaintiff _____ [*set forth injuries suffered which are the natural, reasonable, and proximate results of the conversion, e.g.,* has suffered from the loss of use of the equipment, including lost profits due to an inability to mill without the essential equipment], all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____.

[*CONTINUE*]

[16. Between the time of defendant's conversion of the above mentioned property to his/her own use and the filing of this action, plaintiff _____ (*specify time and money properly expended in pursuit of the converted property, e.g.,* spent three hours in contacting the sheriff and accompanying officers to the site of defendant's plant to identify the equipment and spent $_____ on gasoline and long distance telephone calls), all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows

On the FIRST COUNT:

1. For general damages [for property damage] in the sum of $_____;

[2. For general damages for personal injury _____ (according to proof *or* in the sum of $_____);]

[3. For special damages _____ (*specify, e.g.,* for medical and related expenses _____ (according to proof or in the sum of $_____);]

[4. For punitive damages;]

[5. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any he/she has, why he/she should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;]

[6. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant and his/her agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for him/her from _____ (*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendants are to be prohibited from doing, commencing, continuing, or maintaining, e.g.,* continuing to trespass on plaintiff's land and mill and removing equipment from the mill);]

On the SECOND COUNT:

[7. For the value of the property converted in the sum of $_____;]

[8. For interest at the legal rate on this sum pursuant to *Section 3336 of the Civil Code*, from and after _____ (*date*);]

[9. For damages for the proximate and foreseeable loss resulting from defendant's conversion in the sum of $_____;]

[10. For damages for time and money properly expended in pursuit of the converted property in the sum of $_____;]

[11. For punitive damages;]

On all COUNTS:

12. For costs of suit herein incurred;

[13. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ (of $_____ *or* according to proof); and]

14. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 550.40[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a general form of complaint for use by a plaintiff to seek damages for trespass to real property and damages for the removal and conversion of property from that real property [*see Civ. Code § 3333*]. It can be used to obtain preliminary and permanent injunctive relief for the trespass in addition to the damages. This form is adapted from the fact situation in *Holm Timber Indus. v. Plywood Corp. (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 492, 51 Cal. Rptr. 597* . For a further discussion of conversion, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

[3] Allegations

The first cause of action of the complaint alleges (1) the plaintiff's proprietary interest in, and possession of the real property and improvements and personal property thereon (Paragraph 1); (2) the nature of the defendant's wrongful conduct (Paragraph 4) [*see Wilson v. Interlake Steel Co. (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 229, 233, 185 Cal. Rptr. 280, 649 P.2d 922]* ; and (3) damages proximately caused by the defendant's trespass (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*].

The second cause of action of the complaint incorporates by reference the paragraphs setting forth the nature of the plaintiff's interest, the wrongful conduct of the defendant, and the optional paragraphs alleging fictitious names, agency, and punitive damages. The second cause of action alleges (1) the defendant's capacity (Paragraph 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395*]; (2) the value of the property (Paragraph 13) [*see Oakes v. Suelynn Corp. (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 271, 279, 100 Cal. Rptr. 838]* ; and (3) the defendant's conversion of the property (Paragraph 14) [*see Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 597, 610, 12 Cal. Rptr. 488, 361 P.2d 20]* . It also includes alternate allegations for the measure of damages (Paragraph 15) [*see Civ. Code § 3336*]; and (2) compensation for the expenditures made in pursuit of the property (Paragraph 16) [*see Civ. Code § 3336*].

[4] Venue

Actions for trespass to real property are properly held in the county in which the property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

392]. The residence of the defendant, however, is the proper place for trial in tort actions, including conversion [*Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. Thus, when these causes of action are combined, a conflict over the place of venue may result. When a personal cause of action is joined with one that is local in nature, the defendant is entitled to have the proceeding transferred to the county of his or her residence [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953]* . Thus, in drafting the complaint, counsel should be aware of any potential conflict relating to venue and prepare accordingly. For a further discussion of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[5] Damages

The usual measure of damages in a trespass action is the cost to restore the property, although the cases have allowed recovery of a variety of damages [*Green v. General Petroleum Corp. (1928) 205 Cal. 328, 336, 270 P. 952* ; for a further discussion of damages in trespass cases, see *§ 550.21*]. The measure of damages for conversion is ordinarily the value of the property converted at the time and place of conversion with interest from that time. The alternative measure is an amount sufficient to indemnify the party injured for the loss that is the natural, reasonable, and proximate result of the wrongful act and that a proper degree of prudence on the plaintiff's part would not have avoided [*In re Brian S. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 523, 530, 181 Cal. Rptr. 778* ; *see Civ. Code § 3336*]. This alternative measure of damages is appropriate when damages based on the value of the property would be unjust [*Myers v. Stephens (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 104, 116, 43 Cal. Rptr. 420]* .

[6] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* .Although a court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions in a limited civil case, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the action is classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85(b), 86(a)(8)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[7] Attorney's Fees

If the action is to recover damages to personal or real property resulting from trespassing on lands either under cultivation or intended or used for the raising of livestock, a prevailing plaintiff is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees in addition to other costs, and in addition to any liability for damages imposed by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.9*]. An optional prayer for attorney's fees is provided in the form for the purpose of requesting these fees when appropriate.

[8] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to conversion of personal property, see ch. 150, *Conversion* .

For discussion and forms relating to issues and procedures of venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For memoranda of points and authorities in support of and opposition to motions for change of venue, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 238, *Venue* (Matthew Bender).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.43

§ 550.43 Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Personal Property

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Trespass to Personal Property

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES[, TEMPORARY
_____ [*name*],	)	RESTRAINING ORDER, AND PRELIMINARY
Defendant.	)	(AND PERMANENT) INJUNCTION(S)]
	)	(Trespass to Personal Property)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* owner] and in possession of certain personal property more particularly described as _____ [*set forth a description of the property which was the object of the trespass, e.g.,* a 1965 Bonanza Beechcraft airplane, Model No. K-25 bearing FAA Registration No. _____].

2. _____ [*Allege defendant's capacity and residence, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California].

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 2.*]

[4. *Agency allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 3.*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant[s, and each of them,] without plaintiff's consent _____ [*specify the act of trespass, e.g.*, took possession of the airplane while it was on a runway at _____ Airport in _____ County, California, attempted to fly it, hit two levees, and crashed the airplane in a dump], thereby intermeddling with plaintiff's use of _____ [*specify the property, e.g.*, the airplane].

[*EITHER, if property destroyed*]

6. On or about _____ [*date of the trespass*] the _____ [*specify the property trespassed on, e.g.,*. airplane] had a value of $_____. The acts of the defendant[s, and each of them] caused the total destruction of the _____ [*specify the property trespassed on, e.g.*, airplane], the replacement cost of which is $_____.

[*OR, if property damaged*]

6. As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.*, intermeddling without plaintiff's consent to plaintiff's possession of the airplane and the damage done to the airplane], _____ [*set forth damages proximately caused by the trespass, e.g.*, the plaintiff expended $_____ to repair the airplane and lost profits by not having use of the airplane in his/her business as a private air charter service].

[*CONTINUE*]

[7. *Punitive damage allegation. See § 550.40[1], Paragraph 8.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For general damages _____ [according to proof *or* in the sum of $_____];

[2. For punitive damages;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 550.40[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a general form of complaint for use by a plaintiff to seek damages for trespass to personal property [*see Civ. Code § 3333*]. This complaint is adapted from the fact situation in *Fresno Air Serv. v. Wood (1965) 232 Cal. App.*

2d 801, 43 Cal. Rptr. 276 .

The tort of trespass to personal property is very similar to conversion, although there are important differences which make proper usage of the appropriate tort claim imperative. Trespass to personal property involves intermeddling with the property of another rather than interfering with ownership or possession, which is conversion [*see Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 597, 610, 12 Cal. Rptr. 488, 361 P.2d 20* ; *see § 550.13*]. Damages in actions for trespass to personal property are the actual damages suffered by reason of the impairment of the property or the loss of its use [*Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 597, 610, 12 Cal. Rptr. 488, 361 P.2d 20]* . Damages for conversion are statutorily defined and may, in some circumstances, merit a greater recovery [*see Civ. Code § 3336* (damages for conversion)].

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§§ 550.40[2]-[9], 550.42[2]-[5]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges (1) facts showing the plaintiff's interest in the property (Paragraph 1); (2) the capacity of the defendant, which may be a basis of venue (Paragraph 2); (3) the nature of the defendant's wrongful conduct (Paragraph 5); and (4) proximately caused damages (alternative Paragraphs 5) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*; *see Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 597, 610, 12 Cal. Rptr. 488, 361 P.2d 20]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.44

§ 550.44 Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Possession When Not in Actual Possession and Not Owner of Property

[1] FORM Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Possession When Not in Actual Possession and Not Owner of Property

Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the _____ [*specify proprietary interest, e.g.,* lessee under a lease from _____ (*name of owner*), the owner of the real property, dated _____ and was entitled to actual possession of that land commencing on _____ [*date*]. (A copy of that lease is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.)] _____ [*Specify the future possessory interest under an existing and valid obligation, e.g.,* By the terms of that lease, plaintiff possessed a future possessory interest in the crop in cultivation on the land on the date the lease was executed]. The real property described in the _____ [*specify the form of existing obligation, e.g.,* lease] is located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*give legal description*].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by the plaintiff in a complaint for trespass to real property to allege the plaintiff's protectible interest in the property when the plaintiff is not in possession of the property. The person in actual possession of the property is the proper party plaintiff in an action for trespass to real property [*Williams v. Goodwin (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 496, 509, 116 Cal. Rptr. 200]* . One complaining of trespass who is not in possession of the land should allege the reason for the interest possessed which dictates allowing the action to go forward [*see Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 642-643, 198 P.2d 1] , disapproved on other grounds, Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263* . When using this allegation, it should replace Paragraph 1 in § 550.40[1].

The allegation is adapted from the fact situation in *Wolfsen v. Hathaway (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 632, 198 P.2d 1 , disapproved on other grounds, Flores v. Arroyo (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 492, 15 Cal. Rptr. 87, 364 P.2d 263* .

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion of rights of remainderman to prevent injury to the reversionary interest or waste by life tenant and form of complaint for damages suffered, see Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .

183 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.45

§ 550.45 Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Cost of Restoration That Exceeds Diminution in Value

[1] FORM Allegation--Plaintiff's Right to Cost of Restoration That Exceeds Diminution in Value

As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* bulldozing and building a rough road on the plaintiff's land], plaintiff's land was damaged to such an extent that repairs would be necessary to restore the land to its prior condition because _____ [*specify manner of damages to land, e.g.,* 225 trees were killed or damaged and the surrounding undergrowth was destroyed]. The cost of restoring the land to its original state is [$_____, an amount that is] reasonable and not excessive in relation to the prior value of the land[, which was $_____]; the acts of defendant[s, and each of them,] diminished the value of plaintiff's land by [$_____, which is] an amount less than the amount required for restoration. Plaintiff has a personal reason for restoring the original condition of the land in that _____ [*specify the personal reason, e.g.,* plaintiff enjoyed the land and the natural forest and had purposely kept the land in its natural state].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by the plaintiff in a complaint for trespass to real property to allege that he or she should recover the cost of restoration of the property even though that cost exceeds the diminution of the value of the property. The general rule is that if the cost of restoration exceeds the diminution in value, the value of the property is the proper measure of damages [*Green v. General Petroleum Corp. (1928) 205 Cal. 328, 336, 270 P. 952]* . As an exception to this rule, restoration costs in excess of the decrease in value may be recovered if there is a reason personal to the owner for restoring the original condition. The cost of restoration must be reasonable and not excessive in relation to the damage inflicted on the land or its value prior to the trespass. If the costs are excessive, the court may allow costs for the reasonable approximation of the land's former condition rather than restoration to the identical condition [*Heninger v. Dunn (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 858, 865, 162 Cal. Rptr. 104* ; *see § 550.21[3][c]*].

The allegation is adapted from the fact situation in *Heninger v. Dunn (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 858, 162 Cal. Rptr. 104* . When appropriate, this allegation can be used in *§ 550.40[1]* and may be substituted for Paragraph 5. Counsel may wish to include a statement alleging the dollar amount of the diminution in value to make the complaint more specific.

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to pleading the nature and extent of tort damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.46

§ 550.46 Allegation--Defendant Acted With Knowledge That Trespass Was Substantially Certain Result

[1] FORM Allegation--Defendant Acted With Knowledge That Trespass Was Substantially Certain Result

On or about _____ [*date*], [and continuing to the present time], defendant[s, and each of them,] _____ [*specify act that resulted in the entry of foreign matter on plaintiff's land, e.g.,* operated his/her cement plant and quarry in such a manner that dust and other substances escaped therefrom and settled on plaintiff's property]. The act of defendant[s, and each of them,] was done with the knowledge that that act would, to a substantial certainty, result in _____ [*set forth results of the actions that constituted trespass, e.g.,* dust and other substances being deposited on plaintiff's property].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by the plaintiff in a complaint for trespass to real property to allege that the defendant caused foreign material to enter on the plaintiff's property. The doing of an act that will to a substantial certainty result in the entry of foreign matter on another's land suffices for an intentional trespass to land on which liability may be based [*Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530-531, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519]* .

The allegation is adapted from the fact situation in *Roberts v. Permanente Corp. (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 526, 530-531, 10 Cal. Rptr. 519* . When appropriate, this allegation can replace Paragraph 4 in *§ 550.40[1]*.

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.47

§ 550.47 Allegation--Plaintiff Entitled to Cost of Damages Plus Costs to Prevent Further Harm

[1] FORM Allegation--Plaintiff Entitled to Cost of Damages Plus Costs to Prevent Further Harm

As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify trespassory conduct, e.g.,* defendant's acts in road construction that trespassed on plaintiff's underground communications cable, and damaged the cable in three different locations], plaintiff's property was damaged to such an extent that repairs were necessary to restore _____ [*specify the property damaged, e.g.,* the cable] to its prior condition, in the sum of $_____, which is the cost of restoring it to its original state. Plaintiff incurred additional costs _____ [*specify the actions taken by plaintiff to avert further harm, e.g.,* in relocating the cables] in the sum of $_____, which is the reasonable cost of _____ [*specify act taken to prevent further harm, e.g.,* relocating the cable].

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by the plaintiff in a complaint for trespass to real property to allege that the defendant caused injury to plaintiff's property and that the plaintiff should recover damages for costs incurred to prevent further harm in addition to the damages directly caused by the defendant's actions. A person who has already suffered injury by the tort of another is entitled to recover for expenditures reasonably made or harm suffered in a reasonable effort to avert further harm. There must be reasonable grounds for believing that further injury would result [*Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Granite Constr. Co. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 765, 769, 37 Cal. Rptr. 727]* .

The allegation is adapted from the fact situation in *Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Granite Constr. Co. (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 765, 37 Cal. Rptr. 727* . When its use is appropriate, this allegation can be used instead of Paragraph 5 in *§ 550.40[1]*.

For further discussion pertaining to an action for trespass, see *§ 550.40[2]-[9]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.48

§ 550.48 Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Action Barred by Statute of Limitations

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that the cause of action set forth in the complaint herein appears from the allegations thereof, and particularly from the allegations of Paragraph[s] _____ thereof, to be barred by the provisions of *Section 338(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of trespass to real property when the statute of limitations has run on the trespassing act. If it appears on the face of the complaint that the statute has run, a demurrer may be made, using the same language [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30*]. The time for bringing an action for trespass on or injury to real property is three years [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)*; *see § 550.20*]. Actions involving the drilling of oil or gas wells from a surface location on land not owned by the aggrieved party must be brought within 180 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 349*3/4; *see* Ch. 393, *Oil and Gas*]. The time limitation for wrongful injuries to timber, trees, or underwood arising from any trespass committed while acting in reliance on an improper boundary line is five years from the date of trespass [*Civ. Code § 3346*; *see* Ch. 350, *Logs and Timber*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and additional forms relating to limitations of actions, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.49

§ 550.49 Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Express Consent

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Express Consent

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. _____ [*Describe the consent given, e.g.,* On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff executed a security agreement to secure notes given to defendant(, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof). Paragraph _____ of that security agreement provides that in the event of a default by plaintiff, defendant has the right to enter onto plaintiff's premises, take possession of the assets designated as collateral by the security agreement, and remain on the premises in order to sell the collateral to satisfy the debt].

2. _____ [*Describe how defendant acted consistently with the consent, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], plaintiff failed to make payment and defaulted on the note. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], and in accordance with the terms and consent to entry given by plaintiff in the security agreement, defendant entered plaintiff's premises and took possession of the collateral].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of trespass to real property when the plaintiff expressly consented to the defendant's entry. When there is a consensual entry, there is no tort of trespass, because lack of consent is an element of the wrong. A conditional or restricted consent to enter land creates a privilege to do so only in so far as the condition or restriction is complied with [*Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 17, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915* ; *see § 550.22[1]*]. The form is adapted from the fact situation in *Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915* .

Although consent to enter has been deemed given in a conditional sales contract allowing repossession by the seller [*see Williams v. General Elec. Credit Corp. (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 527, 532-533, 323 P.2d 1046]* , this type of consent may be an unconstitutional deprivation of property [*see Fuentes v. Shevin (1972) 407 U.S. 67, 96, 92 S. Ct. 1983, 32*

L. Ed. 2d 556 ; *see also § 550.22[1][b]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.50

§ 550.50 Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Implied Consent

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Consensual Entry--Implied Consent

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. An implied consent to enter plaintiff's property existed because _____ [*set forth the circumstances giving rise to implied consent, e.g.,* it is the custom of residents in the locale to accept the defendant's courtesy, as the owner of the only telephone within many miles, of receiving telephone messages and delivering them to the residents of the area].

2. _____ [*Describe defendant's actions consistent with the implied consent, e.g.,* On or about _____ [*date*], when defendant entered on plaintiff's farm, it was to deliver such a message to a tenant on the farm in accordance with the custom and habit in the locale].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of trespass to real property when there was an implied consent to enter. Every person, by implication invites others to come to his or her house as they may have proper occasion either of business, or courtesy, or information, or some other purpose. Custom must determine what the limit is of that implied invitation [*Duval v. Rowell (1954) 269 P.2d 142* ; *see § 550.22[1][c]*]. This affirmative defense is adapted from the fact situation in *Duval v. Rowell (1954) 269 P.2d 142* .

For further discussion of affirmative defense, see *§ 550.49[2]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.51

§ 550.51 Affirmative Defense--Entry for Necessity

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Entry for Necessity

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. _____ [*Describe the details of the necessity involving the preservation of life or property, e.g.,* Defendant was outside the apartment of the plaintiff and heard several moans and groans from within the apartment indicating that someone might be in distress].

2. _____ [*Set forth defendant's response to this threat to life or property, e.g.,* Defendant entered the apartment to look for the person in distress].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of trespass to real property when defendant's trespass was prompted by a necessity to preserve life or property. Necessity often justifies an action that would otherwise constitute a trespass, as where the act is prompted by the motive of preserving life or property and reasonably appears to the actor to be necessary for that purpose [*People v. Roberts (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 374, 377, 303 P.2d 721* ; *see § 550.22[2]*]. The form is adapted from the fact situation in *People v. Roberts (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 374, 377, 303 P.2d 721* .

190 of 190 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 550 TRESPASS
PART IV. FORMS

48-550 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 550.52

§ 550.52 Affirmative Defense--Constitutional Right to Free Expression of Ideas in Public Forum

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Constitutional Right to Free Expression of Ideas in Public Forum

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that he/she was not trespassing on plaintiff's property because the defendant was exercising his/her constitutional right to free expression of ideas by [*describe the details of the defendant's activities, e.g.,* handing out leaflets to passing pedestrians]. Defendant was entitled to exercise his/her right on plaintiff's property, which is a public forum because [*set forth facts showing that plaintiff's property is a public forum, e.g.,* the property is a large regional shopping center containing 65 shops, 10 restaurants, and a movie theater, that is open to the public, draws large numbers of people, and has a largely public character].

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be set forth in the answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30*] to a complaint for trespass to real property if the plaintiff's property is a public forum and the defendant was exercising the constitutional right to free expression of ideas. This defense applies only if the expression was reasonable, orderly, and did not interfere with the normal business operations at the plaintiff's property. Private property is a public forum only if it is the functional equivalent of such traditional public forums as the public streets and sidewalks of a town's or city's business center. The property of individual homeowners or retail establishments that are more modest than large suburban shopping malls are not public forums [*Robins v. Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. (1979) 23 Cal.3d 899, 910, 153 Cal. Rptr. 854, 592 P.2d 341 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 74, 81, 100 S. Ct. 2035, 64 L. Ed. 2d 741 (1980)]* , and neither are the private parking areas of relatively small medical facilities [*Allred v. Harris (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1386, 1391-1392, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 530* ; *see also Planned Parenthood v. Wilson (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1668, 286 Cal. Rptr. 427* ; *Allred v. Shawley (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 1489, 1501-1502, 284 Cal. Rptr. 140]* .

For discussion of this defense, see *§ 550.22[8]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 551.syn

§ 551.syn Synopsis to Chapter 551: TRIAL

§ 551.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 551.02 Cross References

§§ 551.03-551.09 [Reserved]

§ 551.10 Governing Law

[1] Notice and Conduct of Trial

[2] Evidence

[3] Witnesses

[4] Oaths and Affirmations

[5] Motions During Trial

§ 551.11 Oral Motions

§ 551.12 "Trial" Defined

§§ 551.13-551.19 [Reserved]

§ 551.20 When Required

§ 551.21 Notice by Court Clerk or Party

§ 551.22 Mail Service Does Not Extend Time in Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

§ 551.23 Shortening Time

§ 551.24 Effect of Failure to Give Notice

§ 551.25 Proof of Notice

§ 551.26 Resumption of Trial Following Continuance

§ 551.27 Notice When Trial Date Is Advanced

§§ 551.28-551.39 [Reserved]

§ 551.40 Conduct of Conference

§ 551.41 Matters Covered

[1] Generally

[2] Specific Matters

[3] Examples of Specific Matters

[4] Settlement

[5] Additional Matters in Jury Trials

[6] Stipulations Relating to Jury, Substitute Judge, and Stay of Execution of Judgment

§§ 551.42-551.49 [Reserved]

§ 551.50 Jury Trial

[1] In General

[2] Legal, Equitable, and Factual Issues

[3] Opening Statement

§ 551.51 Court Trial

[1] In General

[2] Opening Statement

[3] Reopening Case

§§ 551.52-551.59 [Reserved]

§ 551.60 Definitions

[1] "Shall" and "May"

[2] Other Evidence Code Terms

§ 551.61 "Evidence" Defined

§ 551.62 "Direct Evidence" and "Circumstantial Evidence" Distinguished

§ 551.63 Judicial Notice

§ 551.64 View of Property, Scene, Object, Demonstration, or Experiment

§ 551.65 Order of Presenting Evidence

§ 551.66 Admissibility of Evidence

[1] Relevant Evidence

[2] Evidence Admitted for Limited Purpose

[3] Part of Evidence Only Presented by Party

[4] Letter Read Into Evidence

[5] Detached Evidence

[6] Polygraph Test Results

[7] Photographs

[8] Videotapes

[9] Experimental Evidence

[10] Scientific Evidence

[11] Witness's State of Mind

[12] Character or Character Traits

[13] Habit or Custom

[14] Other Accidents

§ 551.67 Stipulations of Parties

§ 551.68 Exclusion of Evidence

[1] Irrelevant Evidence

[2] Probative Value Outweighed by Undue Prejudice, Confusion, or Delay

[3] Relevant Evidence Objectionable on Other Grounds

[4] Specific Evidence

[a] Subsequent Safety Measures

[b] Offer to Compromise or Offer From Humanitarian Motives

[c] Evidence and Documents in Mediation of Dispute

[i] Admissibility and Discovery in General

[ii] Exception by Agreement

[iii] Written Settlement Agreement

[iv] Oral Agreement

[v] End of Mediation for Purposes of Confidentiality

[vi] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[vii] Sanctions for References During Subsequent Trial

[d] Offer to Discount Claim

[e] Offer for Civil Resolution of Criminal Matter

[f] Guilty Plea

[g] Liability Insurance

[h] Evidence Obtained by Illegal Eavesdropping or Recording

[5] Morbidity or Mortality Studies and Proceedings and Records of Health Care Committees

[6] Testimony of Particular Witness

§ 551.69 Evidence of Market Value of Property

§ 551.70 Opinion Evidence

[1] Lay Witness

[2] Expert Witness

[a] Limitation on Opinion Evidence

[i] General Parameters

[ii] Scientific Techniques

[iii] Experimental Evidence

[iv] Opinion on Issue of Law

[b] Opinion Based in Whole or in Part on Opinion or Statement of Another Person

[3] Basis of Opinion and Exclusion When Improperly Based

[4] Opinion of Sanity

[5] Opinion Embracing Issue to Be Decided by Trier of Fact

[6] Effect of Failure to Object to Opinion or Conclusion

§ 551.71 Hearsay Evidence

[1] In General

[2] Hearsay Rule and Result of Failure to Object

[3] Exceptions to Hearsay Rule

[4] Hearsay Statement Consisting of One or More Statements Within Hearsay Exception

[5] Evidence of Hearsay Declarant's Credibility

[6] Examination of Hearsay Declarant

§ 551.72 "Unavailable as a Witness" Defined

§ 551.73 Writings

[1] "Writing," "Original," and "Duplicate" Defined

[2] Authentication of Writings

[3] Presumptions Affecting Writings

§ 551.74 Proof of Contents of Writings

[1] Repeal of Best Evidence Rule and Enactment of Secondary Evidence Rule

[2] Proof of Content by Original Writing

[3] General Rules for Proof of Content Under Secondary Evidence Rule

[4] Proof of Content by Oral Testimony

[5] Proof of Content by Official Records

[6] Proof of Content by Photographic Copies and Printed Representations

[a] Business Records

[a.1] Criminal Justice Documents

[b] Lost or Destroyed Records

[c] Computer Information or Programs

[d] Video or Digital Images

§ 551.75 Parol Evidence Rule

§ 551.76 Determination of Preliminary Fact

[1] When Required

[2] Hearing and Ruling

[3] Procedure

[a] Generally

[b] Relevancy, Personal Knowledge, Authenticity, or Statement or Conduct of Person

[c] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

[d] Determinations in Other Cases

§ 551.77 Objections to Evidence

[1] Manner of Objecting

[2] Argument on Objection

[a] When Allowed

[b] Out of Jury's Hearing

[3] Offer of Proof

[4] Ruling on Objection

[5] Exception to Court's Ruling or Order

§§ 551.78-551.89 [Reserved]

§ 551.90 Burden of Proof

[1] Defined

[2] General Rule: Burden of Proving Each Essential Element of Claim or Defense

[3] Specific Issues

[a] Accusation of Crime or Wrongdoing

[b] Degree of Care

[c] Insanity

[d] Estoppel

[e] Insurance Coverage

§ 551.91 Burden of Producing Evidence

[1] Defined

[2] With Respect to Particular Fact

§ 551.92 Standard of Proof in Civil Proceedings

[1] One of Three Standards of Proof May Apply

[2] Standard Requiring Proof by Preponderance of the Evidence Applies as General Rule

[3] Standard Requiring Proof by Clear and Convincing Evidence

[4] Standard Requiring Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt

§ 551.93 Weight of Evidence

[1] Sufficiency of Evidence of One Witness

[2] Weak Evidence Offered When Stronger Evidence Available

[3] Inferences Drawn From Party's Failure to Explain or Deny Adverse Evidence or From Suppression of Evidence

§§ 551.94-551.99 [Reserved]

§ 551.100 "Presumption" and "Inference" Defined

§ 551.101 Conclusive Presumptions

§ 551.102 Rebuttable Presumptions

[1] Defined and Classified

[2] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Producing Evidence

[3] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Proof

§§ 551.103-551.109 [Reserved]

§ 551.110 "Witness" Defined and Credibility

§ 551.111 Qualifications

§ 551.112 Witness Fees

§ 551.113 Particular Persons

[1] Person Unable to Express Self or Understand Duty to Tell Truth as Disqualified

[2] Attorneys

[3] Judges, Arbitrators, and Mediators

[4] Jurors

[5] Experts

§ 551.114 Compelling Attendance

[1] Power of Court

[2] Procedure

[3] Exemption of Out-of-State Witness From Arrest or Process While Obeying Criminal Subpoena

§ 551.115 Interpreters

[1] When Required; Applicability of Laws Relating to Witnesses

[2] Procedure

[3] Qualifications and Standards of Professional Conduct of Interpreters

[4] Oath of Interpreter; Instructions

§ 551.116 Translators

[1] When Required; Applicability of Laws Relating to Witnesses

[2] Oath of Translator

§ 551.117 Compensation of Interpreters and Translators

[1] Fees and Payment

[2] Indigent Litigants

§ 551.118 Privileges

§ 551.119 Confrontation

§ 551.120 Exclusion of Witnesses From Courtroom

§ 551.121 Examination of Witnesses

[1] Oath or Affirmation

[2] Personal Knowledge

[3] Court's Control Over Mode of Interrogation of Witnesses

[4] Calling and Examination by Court

[5] Direct, Cross, Redirect, and Recross-Examination

[a] Defined

[b] Order of Examination

[c] Order and Scope of Cross-Examination

[d] Reexamination

[e] Recall of Witness

[6] Leading Questions

[7] Responsive Answers

[8] Writings

[9] Prior Inconsistent Statements or Conduct

[10] Refreshing Memory

[11] Calling Adverse Party or Person Identified With Adverse Party

[a] Examination

[b] "Person Identified With Party" Defined

[c] Cross-Examination

[12] Expert Witnesses

§ 551.122 Factors Considered in Determining Witness's Credibility

§ 551.123 Supporting or Attacking Witness's Credibility

[1] By Whom

[2] Methods

[3] Impeachment of Expert Witnesses

[4] Appointment and Payment of Expert Witnesses

[5] Inadmissible Evidence

§§ 551.124-551.139 [Reserved]

§ 551.140 Right of Counsel to Argue Case

§ 551.141 Content of Argument

[1] Proper Argument

[2] Improper Argument

§§ 551.142-551.149 [Reserved]

§ 551.150 Governing Law

§ 551.151 Mistrial and New Trial Distinguished

§ 551.152 Grounds for Declaring Mistrial

[1] Overlap With Grounds for New Trial

[2] Misconduct of Counsel

[a] In General

[b] Inquiry Regarding Insurance

[c] Determining Whether Misconduct Is Prejudicial

[3] Misconduct of Juror

[4] Misconduct of Judge

[5] Testimony by Presiding Judge or by Juror

[6] Failure to Complete Trial of Short Cause on Time

[7] Mandatory vs. Discretionary Mistrial

§ 551.153 Timely Objection to Misconduct Required

[1] Requirement and Purpose

[2] Multiple Objections Not Necessarily Required

[3] Objection to Judicial Misconduct

§ 551.154 Procedure for Requesting Mistrial

[1] Oral Motion During Trial

[2] Timing of Motion

§ 551.155 Order Denying or Declaring Mistrial

§ 551.156 Procedure Following Order Declaring Mistrial

[1] Short Causes

[2] Retrial After Mistrial

[3] Dismissal for Failure to Prosecute

§ 551.157 Appellate Review

[1] Order Declaring or Denying Mistrial Nonappealable

[2] Effect of Failure to Object

[3] Standard of Review

§§ 551.158-551.169 [Reserved]

§ 551.170 Civil Proceedings Generally Open to Public

§ 551.171 Civil Proceedings Closed by Law

§ 551.172 Criteria for Closing Proceedings Otherwise Open to Public

§ 551.173 Procedure for Sealing Otherwise Public Records

[1] Purpose and Applicability

[2] "Record," "Sealed Record," and "Lodged Record" Defined

[3] Court Order Required to Seal Records

[4] Grounds for Order Sealing Records

[5] Noticed Motion Procedure for Order Sealing Records

[6] Redacted and Complete Versions of Moving and Opposing Papers

[7] Referee to Examine Voluminous Records

[8] Lodging Records to Be Sealed and Not to Be Sealed

[9] Order Sealing Records

[10] Disclosure of Sealed or Conditionally Sealed Records Prohibited

[11] Custody of Sealed Records

[12] Motion to Unseal Records

§ 551.174 Confidential Proceedings In Camera

§§ 551.175-551.199 [Reserved]

§ 551.200 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 551.201 California Constitution

§ 551.202 State Statutes

[1] Affidavits and Declarations

[2] Burden of Proof and Producing Evidence

[3] Exhibits

[4] Experts

[5] Evidence

[6] Interference With Court Proceedings

[7] Judicial Notice

[8] Jury Instructions and Verdicts

[9] Motion Practice

[10] Motions During Trial

[11] Notice of Trial

[12] Oaths and Affirmations

[13] Orders

[14] Privileges

[15] Presumptions and Inferences

[16] Separate Trial of Issues and Defenses

[17] Stipulations

[18] Trial

[19] Trial by Jury

[20] Trial by Court

[21] Trier of Fact

[22] Witnesses

[23] Writings

§ 551.203 California Rules of Court

[1] Complex Litigation

[2] Continuances

[3] Counsel

[4] Destruction, Preservation, or Transfer of Trial Court Records

[5] Interpreters

[6] Judges

[7] Jurors

[8] Jury Instructions and Verdicts

[9] Photographing, Recording, and Broadcasting

[10] Statement of Decision and Judgment

[11] Submitted Matters

[12] Trial

§ 551.204 Local Court Rules

[1] Contra Costa County

[2] Los Angeles County

[3] Orange County

[4] San Diego County

[5] Santa Clara County

[6] Ventura County

§ 551.205 Rules of Professional Conduct

§ 551.206 Decisions

[1] Argument

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

[4] Evidence

[a] Agreement of Parties to Exclude

[b] Character and Habit

[c] Criminal Convictions

[d] Discretion of Court Under Evid. Code § 352

[e] Expert Opinion

[f] Failure to Object

[g] Hearsay and Exceptions

[i] General Rules

[ii] Admissions and Confessions

[iii] Declarations Against Interest

[iv] Former Testimony

[v] Infliction or Threat of Infliction of Injury

[vi] Prior Statement

[vii] Spontaneous Declarations

[viii] State of Mind

[ix] Statements and Writings That Are Not Hearsay

[x] Evidence Not Qualifying for Admission Over Hearsay Objection

[xi] Unavailable Witness

[xii] Business Records

[xiii] Dying Declarations

[xiv] Implied Assertions

[xv] Official Records

[h] Lay Opinion

[i] Liability Insurance

[j] Objections to Evidence

[i] Manner of Objecting

[ii] Offer of Proof

[k] Preliminary Fact Determination

[l] Prior Conduct

[m] Privileges

[i] Attorney-Client Privilege

[ii] Private Investigator-Client Privilege

[iii] Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege

[iv] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

[n] Quality

[o] Relevance

[p] Rule of Limited Admissibility

[q] Scientific Evidence

[r] Settlement Negotiations

[s] Sufficiency

[t] View of Scene

[u] Writings

[5] Judicial Misconduct

[6] Mistrial

[7] Order of Proceedings

[8] Order of Proof

[9] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Proof

[10] Rebuttal

[11] Refreshing Memory

[12] Witnesses

[a] Generally

[b] Children

[c] Credibility

[d] Experts

[i] Appointments

[ii] As Subject to Contempt

[iii] Basis of Opinion

[iv] Fees

[v] Impeachment and Rebuttal

[vi] Qualifications

[vii] Testimony

[viii] Witness List

[e] Lay Witnesses

[f] Person Unable to Express Self

§ 551.207 Law Reviews

§ 551.208 Text References

§ 551.209 Internet References

§§ 511.210-511.219 [Reserved]

§ 551.220 Proceedings Before Trial

[1] Notice of Trial

[1A] Motion to Advance, Specially Set or Reset Case for Trial

[2] Preparation for Trial

[3] Day of Trial

§ 551.221 General Matters Concerning Trial

[1] Behavior and Dress

[2] Courtroom Arrangements

[3] Selection of Jury

[4] Province of Court and Jury in Jury Trial

[5] Admissibility of Evidence

§ 551.222 Objections and Motions to Exclude Evidence or to Strike Testimony

[1] Common Grounds for Objecting to Evidence

[2] Common Motions to Exclude Evidence or to Strike Testimony

§ 551.223 Common Motions During Trial

[1] Motions Relating to Trial

[2] Motions Relating to Witnesses

[3] Miscellaneous Motions

§ 551.224 Order of Trial Proceedings

[1] Opening Statements

[2] Proposed Jury Instructions Based on Pleadings

[3] Production of Evidence

[4] Rebutting Evidence [see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(6), 631.7]

[5] Proposed Jury Instructions Based on Evidence [see Code Civ. Proc. § 607a]

[6] Argument

[7] Instructing Jury

§§ 551.225-551.249 [Reserved]

§ 551.250 Notice of Time Set for Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.250A Motion to Advance, Specially Set or Reset Case for Trial

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

§ 551.251 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Statutory Authority

[5] Cross References

§ 551.252 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.253 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.254 Documentary Evidence--Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] for Use of Photocopies

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.255 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Setting Aside Submission and Reopening

§ 551.256 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 551.257 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] Opposing Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 551.258 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 551.259 Request for Return of Exhibits, Depositions, and Administrative Records, Order Granting Request, and Receipt [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1952.2, 2015.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Judge May Order Exhibits Returned

§ 551.260 Media Request to Photograph, Record, or Broadcast and Proposed Order [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e); Cal. Judicial Council Forms MC-500, MC-510]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 551.261 Proceedings to Seal Records--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.262 Proceedings to Seal Records--Cover Sheet for Lodged Records Conditionally Under Seal [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 551.263 Proceedings to Seal Records--Order Sealing Records [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550(d), (e), 2.551(a), (e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART I. SCOPE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.01

§ 551.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses generally the rules applicable to civil trials and those proceedings before trial closely related to the trial.

Part II discusses the law and procedure relating to trial's and is divided into subparts as follows:

- The notice of trial [Subpart B; *§ 551.20 et seq*.].
- The chambers conference with the judge immediately before trial [Subpart C; *§ 551.40 et seq*.].
- The order in which the trial proceeds [Subpart D; *§ 551.50 et seq*.].
- Evidence [Subpart E; *§ 551.60 et seq*.].
- The burden of proof and of producing evidence [Subpart F; *§ 551.90 et seq*.].
- Presumptions and inferences [Subpart G; *§ 551.100 et seq*.].
- Witnesses [Subpart H; *§ 551.110 et seq*.].
- Argument to the jury [Subpart I; *§ 551.140 et seq*.].
- Mistrial [Subpart J; *§ 551.150 et seq*.].
- Closing proceedings and sealing records [Subpart K; § 551.160 et seq.].

Part III contains five procedural checklists noting matters counsel should consider in preparing for trial and trying a case:

- Checklist of pretrial proceedings [*§ 551.220*].
- Checklist of general matters concerning trial [*§ 551.221*].
- Checklist of objections and motions to exclude evidence or to strike testimony [*§ 551.222*].
- Checklist of common motions during trial [*§ 551.223*].
- Checklist of the order in which trial proceeds [*§ 551.224*].

The chapter also includes the following forms:

- A notice of time set for trial [*§ 551.250*].
- A notice of motion for an order appointing an expert witness, a supporting declaration, and an order granting the motion [*§§ 551.251-551.253*].
- A stipulation by counsel for the use at trial of photocopies of writings in lieu of the originals [*§ 551.254*].
- A notice of motion for an order setting aside the submission of a case and reopening it for additional evidence, a supporting declaration, an opposing declaration, and an order granting the motion [*§§ 551.255-551.258*].
- A combined request for the return of exhibits, depositions, and administrative records introduced or filed in the trial of an action, an order granting the request, and a receipt for their return [*§ 551.259*].
- The Judicial Council form of request to conduct film and electronic media coverage of an action and an order on the request [*§ 551.260*].
- A form of motion and related forms for use in proceedings to seal otherwise public court records [*§ 551.261-551.263*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialEvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART I. SCOPE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.02

§ 551.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to separate trial of affirmative defenses, Ch. 3, *Abatement of Actions, § 3.110 et seq.*

- For discussion and forms for use in contractual arbitration, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration , et seq.*

- For discussion and forms for use in judicial arbitration, Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* .

- For discussion and forms relating to trial by referees, see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

- For discussion and forms relating to contempt of court, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

- For discussion and forms relating to continuances of trial, see Ch. 136, *Continuances* .

- For discussion and forms for use in making a pretrial exchange of lists of expert witnesses and their reports and writings pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.210 et seq.*, effective July 1, 2005), see Ch. 198, *Discovery: Exchange of Expert Witness Information* .

- For discussion and forms relating to motions for judgment on the pleadings, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

- For discussion of when case must be brought to trial or retrial, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

- For discussion and forms for use in securing appointment of a guardian ad litem for a minor or incompetent party, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* .

- For discussion and forms relating to trial by court commissioners and temporary judges, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

- For discussion and forms for use in disqualifying a judge from trying a case, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

- For discussion and forms relating to juries, see Ch. 322, *Juries and Jury Selection* .

- For discussion and forms relating to jury instructions, see Ch. 326, *Jury Instructions* .

- For discussion and forms relating to jury verdicts and directed verdicts, see Ch. 326A, *Jury Verdicts* .

- For discussion and forms relating to motions for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, new trial, and vacating a judgment and entering a new and different judgment, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

- For discussion and forms relating to motions in limine, see Ch. 373, *Motions in Limine* .

- For discussion and forms relating to motions for nonsuit and judgment, see Ch. 389, *Nonsuit and Motions for Judgment* .

- For discussion and forms relating to pretrial proceedings, including trial setting and settlement conferences in superior court, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

- For discussion of and forms for use for bifurcation of trial, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the judge's statement of decision in a court trial, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

- For discussion and forms for use in securing the presence of witnesses and evidence by subpoena, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

- For other discussion and forms relating to litigation, see Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* , Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* , Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* , Ch. 190-200, *Discovery* , Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* , Ch. 318, *Judgments* , Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter* , Ch. 520, *Settlement and Release* , Ch. 524, *Shortening and Extension of Time* , Ch. 534, *Submitted Controversy (Agreed Case*), Ch. 537, *Summary Judgment* , Ch. 571, *Venue* .

- For a trial-organizing tool containing suggested voir dire questions, opening statements, motions, objections to evidence, responses to objections, and closing argument, all supported by extensive authority and including quotations setting forth the courts' rationales, see California Trial Guide (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART I. SCOPE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.03-551.09

[Reserved]

§§ 551.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Governing Law

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.10

§ 551.10 Governing Law

[1] Notice and Conduct of Trial

Notice of trial is required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 594* [*see § 551.250*].

Trial by jury is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. § 607 et seq.* The qualification of persons to act as jurors and excuses from jury service are governed by *Cal. Const., art. I, § 4, Code Civ. Proc. §§ 203,* 204, and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1008*. The selection of jurors and the formation of the jury are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 190 et seq.* and Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.25. Jury instructions are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 224, 607a-609, 612.5,* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1050 et seq*. The province of the court and jury is governed by *Evid. Code §§ 310-312*.

Trial by the court is governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. § 631 et seq.* The court's statement of decision is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 632* and *634* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1590*.

Except as otherwise provided by law, the order in which a trial is required to proceed is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607, 631.7*]. The order of proof is governed by *Evid. Code § 320*. The burden of proof and the burden of producing evidence are governed by *Evid. Code § 500 et seq.*

[2] Evidence

The admission, exclusion, and weight of evidence are governed by *Evid. Code § 350 et seq.* and presumptions and inferences by *Evid. Code § 600 et seq.* Privileges arising out of various relationships that affect the admissibility of evidence are governed by *Evid. Code § 900 et seq.* and evidence affected or excluded by extrinsic policies by *Evid. Code § 1100 et seq.* Witnesses, including their competency, the method and scope of their examination, and their credibility, as well as interpreters and translators are governed by *Evid. Code § 700 et seq.* Expert and other opinion testimony and blood tests to determine paternity are governed by *Evid. Code § 800 et seq.* and *Fam. Code § 7550 et seq.* Hearsay evidence and exceptions to the hearsay rule are governed by *Evid. Code § 1200 et seq.* The authentication and proof of writings, the admissibility of secondary evidence of writings, and the admissibility and effect of official

writings affecting property are governed by *Evid. Code § 1400 et seq.* Judicial notice is governed by *Evid. Code § 450 et seq.*; see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* ; *see also 1 California Trial Guide, § 20.60* (Matthew Bender). The Evidence Code also contains rules for its construction and defines various words and phrases used in the code [*see Evid. Code §§ 1-12, 100-260*, respectively].

Other codes also include statutes that govern evidence. The statute of frauds is set forth in *Civ. Code § 1624* and additional statutes of frauds governing particular transactions are *Code Civ. Proc. § 1974* and *Com. Code §§ 2201, 2326(3)*, and *9203(b)*. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2074-2077* contain miscellaneous provisions relating to evidence in particular cases. Other provisions relating to evidence include the following:

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 1856* (the parol evidence rule) [*see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1857-1866* (construction of writings); *Com. Code § 2202* (parol evidence rule applicable to contracts for sale of goods)].

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 1950*, which prevents the removal from the office in which it is kept of the record of a conveyance of real property, or any other record, a transcript of which is admissible in evidence, except on a court order in cases in which inspection of the record is essential to the just determination of the cause.

- *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1952-1952.3*, relating to the retention, destruction, and return of exhibits by the court.

- *Com. Code § 1206*, providing that whenever the Commercial Code creates a presumption with respect to a fact or provides that a fact is "presumed," the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact unless and until evidence is introduced that supports a finding of its nonexistence.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1932 abolishes the distinction between sealed and unsealed private writings.

Code Civ. Proc. § 651 authorizes a view during trial of the property that is the subject of the litigation, or the place where any relevant event occurred, or any object, demonstration, or experiment a view of which is relevant and admissible in evidence.

[3] Witnesses

The term "witness" is defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1878*. The definition includes an interpreter [*People v. Lem Deo (1901) 132 Cal. 199, 201, 64 P. 265* ; *see Evid. Code § 750*].

The three modes in which the testimony of witnesses may be taken are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2002*, and *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003-2005* define the three modes. Additional provisions relating to witnesses are set forth under [2], *above*. The state constitution provides that a person is not incompetent to be a witness because of his or her opinions on religious beliefs [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 4*].

[4] Oaths and Affirmations

Persons who may administer an oath or affirmation and the form of oral oaths and affirmations administered to witnesses are set out in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2093, 2094*. The form of the oath administered to jurors is set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 232*. Affidavits, declarations under penalty of perjury, and written affirmations in lieu of an oath are covered by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 17, 2002(1), 2003*, and *2009-2015.6*, and *Evid. Code §§ 165* and *710*. For discussion and forms see Ch. 392, *Oaths and Affirmations* , and Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

[5] Motions During Trial

Motions that may be made during trial are governed by a variety of statutes, court rules, and case law. For governing law relating to motions for mistrial, see *§ 551.150*. For statutes governing motions during trial, see *§ 551.202[10]* [*see also §§ 551.206[3]*, *551.223*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyAffirmations & OathsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Governing Law

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.11

§ 551.11 Oral Motions

Motions made at trial are normally made orally without notice and need not be supported by affidavits, declarations, or points and authorities. Counsel should, of course, be prepared to submit authorities supporting or opposing the motion, as the case may be, if the court requests them or if they are necessary to establish or oppose the ground of the motion.

A form of oral motion is as follows: "If it please the court, I move _____ [*specify order sought, e.g.,* for (an order of) mistrial *or* that the witness's answer be stricken (from the record)] on the ground(s) _____ [*specify, e.g.,* of prejudicial misconduct of counsel *or* it is nonresponsive (to the question asked)]."

If the motion is made in a jury trial and is one that should be made out of the jury's hearing (for example, a motion for nonsuit), the motion should be prefaced by the following: "If it please the court, may counsel approach the bench for the purpose of making a motion." If permission is granted, counsel will approach the side bench where counsel may make the motion. If argument is required and permitted, the judge may withdraw with counsel to chambers to hear it.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProceduresTrialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Governing Law

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.12

§ 551.12 "Trial" Defined

The word "trial" is not defined by statute in California, although "new trial" is defined as a reexamination of an issue of fact in the same court after a trial and decision by a jury, court, or referee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 656*]. A judicial definition of trial first pronounced by the California Supreme Court in 1881 and often repeated in whole or in part defines a trial as "the examination before a competent tribunal, according to the law of the land, of the facts or law put in issue in a cause for the purpose of determining such issue. When a court hears and determines any issue of fact or of law for the purpose of determining the rights of the parties, it may be considered a trial" [*Tregambo v. Comanche M. and M. Co. (1881) 57 Cal. 501, 505* ; *see, e.g., Enterprise Ins. Co. v. Mulleague (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 528, 538, 241 Cal. Rptr. 846* ; *Venzor v. Santa Barbara Elks Lodge (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 209, 213-214, 128 Cal. Rptr. 353]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Governing Law

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.13-551.19

[Reserved]

§§ 551.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.20

§ 551.20 When Required

Either party may bring an issue to trial or to a hearing and, in the absence of the adverse party, proceed with the case and take a dismissal of the action, or a verdict, or judgment, as the case may require, unless the court for good cause otherwise directs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*]. However, if the issue to be tried is an issue of fact, proof shall first be made to the satisfaction of the court that the adverse party had 15 days' notice of the trial (or five days' in an unlawful detainer proceeding) as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)*, discussed in *§ 551.21* If the adverse party served the notice of trial on the party seeking the dismissal, verdict, or judgment at least five days prior to the trial, the adverse party is deemed to have had such notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*; *see Berris & Seaton v. Meyers (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 54, 59-60 , 210 Cal. Rptr. 444]* .

The purpose of this notice provision is to enable the parties to prepare for trial, and to prevent the possibility of a judgment by default being taken against a party who has been unable to appear by reason of insufficient notice of the time of trial. No matter how thoroughly the parties prepare for trial *before* a trial date is set, there are certain preparations that can occur only *after* a trial date is set, such as subpoenaing and scheduling the availability of witnesses, scheduling the availability of counsel, and making any necessary arrangement for the transportation of witnesses, parties, counsel, and exhibits. *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* reflects a legislative determination that 15 days is the minimum period parties should be allowed for these preparations, and that the court lacks authority to proceed in the absence of a party who has not received this minimum period for preparation [*Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 962-963, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697* ; *see also Bird v. McGuire (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 702, 715, 31 Cal. Rptr. 386* (purpose is to protect parties against trials, judgments, or dismissals in their excusable absence)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJudgment as Matter of LawGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.21

§ 551.21 Notice by Court Clerk or Party

The court clerk is required to serve the notice of trial on all the parties by mail not less than 20 days prior to the date set for trial (or 10 days in an unlawful detainer proceeding). If the clerk fails to serve the notice, the notice of trial may be served by mail by any party on the adverse party not less than 15 days prior to the date set for trial (or 10 days in an unlawful detainer proceeding) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)*; *see § 551.250*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.22

§ 551.22 Mail Service Does Not Extend Time in Unlawful Detainer Proceeding

Code Civ. Proc. § 1013 (relating to extensions of time when service is by mail) does not extend the notice of trial requirements under *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*, discussed in *§ 551.20*, for unlawful detainer proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & DetainerReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful Detainer

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.23

§ 551.23 Shortening Time

A court may not shorten the length of time for notice prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)*, discussed in *§ 551.20*, although the period may be shortened by waiver or by the consent of the parties [*Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 963, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697* ; *Campanella v. Takaoka (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 504, 511, 206 Cal. Rptr. 745 , overruled on other grounds,* *Salas v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 342, 346, 228 Cal. Rptr. 504, 721 P.2d 590]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.24

§ 551.24 Effect of Failure to Give Notice

Code Civ. Proc. § 594, requiring service of notice of trial and, when the adverse party fails to appear, proof of service, is mandatory [*Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 963, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697]* .

A failure to give notice is a proper ground for granting a new trial either on the theory that there has been an "error in law" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657(7)*] or that lack of notice constituted an "[i]rregularity in the proceedings of the court by which either party was prevented from having a fair trial" [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657(1)*; *Gordon v. Gordon (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 231, 233-234, 302 P.2d 355* ; *see Campanella v. Takaoka (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 504, 511, 206 Cal. Rptr. 745* , *overruled on other grounds, Salas v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 342, 346, 228 Cal. Rptr. 504, 721 P.2d 590* (compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 594* is mandatory and jurisdictional)].

Although the minimum notice requirement is mandatory, a showing that the absent party had at least 15 days' *actual* notice of the time set for trial is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 594* [*Parker v. Dingman (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1016, 122 Cal. Rptr. 309* ; *People ex rel. Dept. Pub. Wks. v. Busick (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 744, 748, 66 Cal. Rptr. 532]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsConstitutional LimitsCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.25

§ 551.25 Proof of Notice

The party seeking to proceed with trial in the absence of the opposing party has the burden of proving compliance with the mandatory 15-day notice requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* [*Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 963, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b) provides that if notice is served by the clerk, proof thereof may be made by introduction into evidence of the clerk's certificate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)* or other competent evidence; if notice is served by a party, proof may be made either by the introduction into evidence of an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) or certificate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(1)* or *(2)*, or by other competent evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)*; for discussion of service of papers and a form of proof of service by mail, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*].

Other competent evidence that would prove service would include, for example, a party's admission that he or she had actual notice of trial for the required period coupled with documentary evidence before the trial court showing conclusively that due and regular notice of trial had been given [*see Kalmus v. Kalmus (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 405, 418, 230 P.2d 57 , cert. denied, 342 U.S. 903 (1952)* ; *see also City etc. of San Francisco v. Carraro (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 509, 520-521, 33 Cal. Rptr. 696* (oral stipulation of counsel in open court setting case for trial)].

If no competent evidence that notice of trial was served on defendant as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* is actually introduced before the court at the time set for trial, a judgment for plaintiff will be reversed, because proof that defendant was given statutory notice is essential to the trial court's jurisdiction to proceed in the defendant's absence [*Irvine National Bank v. Han (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 693, 694, 697, 181 Cal. Rptr. 864* (plaintiff failed to place notice of trial in evidence at trial or to request court to take judicial notice of file in case which contained notice of trial)]. A judgment entered after a trial held in a party's absence without the notice prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* is not merely error, but is an act in excess of the court's jurisdiction [*Irvine National Bank v. Han (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 693, 697, 181 Cal. Rptr. 864* ; *Wilson v. Goldman (1969) 274 Cal. App. 2d 573, 577, 79 Cal. Rptr. 309]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.26

§ 551.26 Resumption of Trial Following Continuance

Code Civ. Proc. § 594 does not apply to the resumption of trial following a continuance, and when the case is continued to a specified day, no further notice, written or oral, is necessary. The general rule in such a case is that after notice of trial in the first instance has been properly given, it becomes the duty of all interested parties to keep themselves informed by diligent inquiry of subsequent continuances of the hearing [*In re Phillip F. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 250, 256-257, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693* ; *City of San Diego v. Walton (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 206, 212-213, 181 P.2d 424]* .

Trial counsel have a duty to use reasonable diligence to ascertain the date to which a partial trial is continued when it is necessary to continue the further trial to a date other than the date that counsel agreed on or have been advised of in open court. But when counsel does act diligently, but to no avail, to ascertain the date to which trial has been continued, the failure to give counsel some form of notice of the trial date and the resumption of the trial in his or her absence is a denial of due process of law [*Parker v. Dingman (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1016-1018, 122 Cal.Rptr. 309]* . The resumption of a continued matter without some proof that the absent party has been notified is an abuse of discretion, and due process requires that the manner and content of the renotice provide some reasonable assurance that the party is informed of the continued trial date within a reasonable period prior to resumption of trial [*In re Phillip F. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 250, 257, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of Protection

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.27

§ 551.27 Notice When Trial Date Is Advanced

When a trial is "trailed" or continued to later date, the 15-day notice of *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* is not required because the absent party's opportunities to plan and prepare for trial are unlikely to be harmed by the continuance. That party will have had sufficient time to compete trial preparations by the original date, and will have learned of the continued date either on appearing at the original trial date or through reasonable diligence [*see Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 965, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697* and discussion in *§ 551.26*]. These considerations do not apply, however, when a trial date is *advanced*. In the latter situation, a failure to comply with the 15-day notice requirement *is* likely to result in prejudice to the absent party's trial preparations and planning. Thus, a party who obtains an order advancing the trial date must comply with *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(a)* by giving the opposing party 15 days' notice of the new trial date [*see Au-Yang v. Barton (1999) 21 Cal. 4th 958, 965, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227, 987 P.2d 697]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Notice of Trial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.28-551.39

[Reserved]

§§ 551.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Before-Trial Conference

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.40

§ 551.40 Conduct of Conference

Immediately before trial, the judge normally meets informally with counsel to confer about the case, although some courts otherwise requiring a before-trial conference may dispense with the conference in a nonjury short cause. The meeting is normally held in the judge's chambers, but may be held in open court if that is the preference of the judge or counsel. Normally, the judge's courtroom clerk will be present to take notes, but whether a court reporter is present and reports the entire proceedings depends on the judge and the rules or policies of the court in which the trial is held. Some judges prefer that the entire proceedings be reported. Other judges prefer to cover the preliminary matters informally without a reporter present, and to call in the reporter only after the parties have agreed to admit or stipulate to certain matters and the judge is prepared to rule on other matters [*see, e.g.*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.9(d)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesPretrial Conferences

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Before-Trial Conference

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.41

§ 551.41 Matters Covered

[1] Generally

The general purposes of the conference are to enable the judge (1) to become familiar with the nature of the case, (2) to acquaint counsel with the court's ground rules, (3) to secure agreements and stipulations of the parties that may better define or narrow the issues to be tried, (4) to resolve in advance any procedural problems that may arise in the course of the trial, and (5) to rule on any matters that should be disposed of before the commencement of the trial [*see generally* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.2 (CJER 1981); as to court's ground rules and trial management, *see generally* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20].

Ordinarily, the judge will seek to obtain from counsel arrangements, admissions, and stipulations that will permit the trial to proceed in an orderly, expeditious, and fair manner with a minimum risk of error.

[2] Specific Matters

The specific matters covered at the conference will depend on the nature of the case, the complexity of the issues, and the number of parties [*see* discussion in [3], *below*]. In all cases, the conference will normally cover [*see generally* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, §§ 3.2, 3.6, 3.9(1), (3)-(5), (7), 3.12 (CJER 1981); as to court's ground rules and trial management, *see generally* Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20]:

- The identity of the parties and counsel.

- The number and names of witnesses to be called for purposes other than impeachment.

- Whether the judge is acquainted with any of the parties or witnesses or is disqualified from trying the case for any cause listed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1* or under the Code of Judicial Conduct [for a discussion of the disqualification of judges for cause, *see* Ch. 317, *Judges* , Pt. III].

- The court's ground rules.
- Whether the issues in the case may be narrowed or modified by stipulations, admissions, or motions.

[3] Examples of Specific Matters

Specific matters that may be considered or covered in any given case include the following [*see generally* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, §§ 3.7-3.15 (CJER 1981); as to court's ground rules and trial management, *see generally* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20]:

(1) (*Continuance*) Any requests for a continuance [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 595-596, 1024*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1332*; California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(2) (CJER 1981); *see also* Ch. 136, *Continuances*].

(1A) (*Motions Affecting Trial Date*) A motion to advance, specially set, or reset a case for trial [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335*].

(2) (*Guardian ad Litem*) Whether there is any need to appoint a guardian ad litem for any minor or incompetent party [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 373*; *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(5) (CJER 1981)]. For discussion and forms for use in securing appointment of a guardian ad litem for a minor or incompetent party, see Ch. 291, *Guardians Ad Litem* .

(3) (*Parties*) The status of named or fictitiously named parties [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*], that is, whether they have all been served, whether any have been dismissed from the action, whether they have answered and/or are in default, and whether any defaults have been entered [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(5) (CJER 1981)].

(4) (*Pleadings*) (a) Whether any causes of action have been dismissed; (b) whether any law and motion, discovery, or summary judgment proceedings have resulted in the dismissal or the striking of any pleading or portion of a pleading or the adjudication of any factual or legal issues; and (c) the status and effect of any pending cross complaints, setoffs, credits against judgment, liens, or pleadings in intervention [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(6), (7)(b), (d) (CJER 1981)].

(5) (*Reduction of Issues*) Whether the number of issues to be tried can be reduced by dismissal of one or more causes of action by request of a party, whether stipulations can be reached as to those issues about which there is no controversy, and whether stipulations can be reached as to facts not in controversy or waiving a foundation, or other objections, as to the admissibility of testimony, tests, or experiments [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(7)(a)-(c) (CJER 1981)].

(6) (*Unusual Legal Issues or Fact Determinations*) Whether any unusual legal issues are anticipated, whether any unusual evidentiary fact determinations are likely to arise during trial, and whether there are any other anticipated evidentiary problems [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(14) (CJER 1981)].

(7) (*Severance or Consolidation of Actions*) Whether any actions should be severed or other actions consolidated with the present case [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.62(b)* (consolidation of wrongful death and survival cases), *379.5* (severance of permissively joined parties), 1048 (severance and consolidation of actions generally); *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(9) (CJER 1981) (adding that these matters, however, should usually have

been raised at the pretrial or trial setting conference)]. For additional statutes authorizing severance or consolidation, a discussion of the grounds, and a procedural checklist, *see* Ch. 125, *Consolidation, Severance, and Coordination of Actions* .

(8) (*Bifurcation of Trial*) Whether good cause exists to try (a) a special defense, such as the statute of limitations, a prior judgment, another action pending, or other defense not involving the merits of the action but constituting a bar or ground of abatement before the other issues in the case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 597, 597.5*]; (b) equitable issues, such as the equitable defenses of laches, unclean hands, waiver, and equitable estoppel, before the legal issues in the case; or (c) an issue or part of an issue before the other issue, part of an issue, or issues in the case, for example, to try the issue of liability before the issue of damages [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 598*; *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(9) (CJER 1981); discussion of bifurcation in Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

(9) (*Interpreters and Translators*) Whether an interpreter for any witness or translator to translate or decipher a writing will be required [*see Evid. Code § 750 et seq.*; California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(10)(d) (CJER 1981); *see also* discussion in *§§ 551.115* and *551.116*].

(10) (*Expert Witnesses*) (a) Whether counsel have exchanged lists of the names, reports, and writings of expert witnesses [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2034*(*Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.210 et seq.* effective July 1, 2005); *see also Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 917-919, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393]* ; (b) whether there is to be any limitation on the number of expert witnesses [*see Evid. Code § 723*; and *(c)* whether any of the parties plan to propound hypothetical questions to any expert witness and, if so, whether the question should be prepared in writing and submitted in advance to the trial judge [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(10)(b) (CJER 1981)].

(11) (*Exhibits*) Whether counsel have complied with any local court rules or policies (a) requiring counsel to exchange lists of exhibits (except those they anticipate in good faith will be used for impeachment or tactical surprise); (b) requiring counsel to furnish copies of critical documents to the court and counsel; (c) requiring counsel to make available before trial to parties requesting themcopies of other documents on the exhibit list; (d) relating to the procedure to be followed in the case of dangerous or bulky exhibits; (e) relating to organizing and pretrial marking of exhibits; (f) concerning the marking of exhibits; and (g) relating to the uniform method of marking exhibits [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(11)(b) (CJER 1981)].

(12) (*Additional Matters Relating to Exhibits*) (a) Whether a copy or other substitute for an original exhibit may or should be used (for example, a copy of an original document that has been lost or a substitute for an inherently dangerous exhibit); (b) whether counsel will stipulate to the admissibility of any exhibits; and (c) whether any special arrangements are required for special exhibits (for example, for showing X-rays, or playing video or audiotapes), maps, or diagrams, or for handling dangerous or bulky exhibits, or for protecting trade secrets [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(11)(c)-(e) (CJER 1981)].

(13) (*Stipulations re Return of Exhibits*) Whether the parties will stipulate as to the return of the exhibits [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 283(1), 1952(a)*; *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(11)(f) (CJER 1981)].

(14) (*View of Scene, Property, or Demonstration*) Whether the court should during trial order a view by the trier of fact of (1) the property that is the subject of the litigation; (2) the place where any relevant

event occurred; or (3) any relevant object, demonstration, or experiment that is admissible in evidence and cannot with reasonable convenience be viewed in the courtroom [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 651*; *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(12) (CJER 1981)].

(15) (*Depositions*) Whether depositions are to be used during trial. If so, whether they are subject to any objection, and, if they are, whether the ground of objection has been waived by failure to make a timely objection or motion to suppress or can be cured by the opponent's waiver of the objection [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2025(m)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.460* effective July 1, 2005) (waivers of errors and irregularities for failure to object or move to suppress in a timely manner), (u) (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.620* operative July 1, 2005) (use of depositions at trial)]. In addition, what the effect is, if any, on the admissibility of the contents of a deposition because of any failure of the proponent to have complied with any rule or policy of the court requiring notification to the other parties of any changes made in a deposition by the deponent [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(13) (CJER 1981)].

(16) (*Opening Statements and Presentation of Evidence in Multiple Party Cases*) In a case having multiple plaintiffs or multiple defendants represented by different counsel, the order in which counsel will make their opening statements and present their evidence if counsel do not agree among themselves [*see Code Civ.Proc. § 607(8)* (referring expressly to multiple defendants); *Evid. Code § 320* (judge as regulating order of proof)].

(17) (*Limitations on Examination*) Any limitations on the examination of a witness [*see, e.g., Evid. Code §§ 352* (exclusion of time-consuming, prejudicial, confusing, or misleading evidence), 721(b) (limitation on cross-examination of expert witness), 765 (control of court over interrogation of witness), 773 (scope of cross-examination and rule applicable to cross-examination of witness by party whose interest is not adverse to party calling witness), 787 (evidence of specific instances of conduct tending only to prove character trait as inadmissible on issue of credibility), and 788 (admissibility of felony conviction and inadmissibility of expunged felony conviction to attack credibility); *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(10)(f), 3.12; ch. 8, *Witnesses*, §§ 8.31, 8.32, 8.34, 8.57, 8.65, 8.66 (CJER 1981)]. For a discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for use in making motions in limine, see Ch. 373, *Motions in Limine* .

(18) (*Order of Cross Examination in Multiple Party Cases*) The order of cross-examination in multiple party cases [*see Evid. Code §§ 320* (power of court to regulate order of proof), *776(b)* (cross-examination by other parties of party called and examined by adverse party); *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(10)(e) (CJER 1981)].

(19) (*Daily Transcripts*) Whether counsel intend to request a daily transcript of the trial, and if so the number of copies to be prepared and who will pay for them [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(16) (CJER 1981)].

(20) (*Other Special Arrangements*) Whether any special arrangements, other than those already mentioned, are required for counsel, parties, or witnesses [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(19) (CJER 1981)].

(21) (*Estimate of Trial Length*) What each counsel's estimate is of the length of the trial [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, §§ 3.9(15), 3.10(5)(c) (CJER 1981)].

(22) (*Time Problems*) Whether there are any time problems that are likely to occur during trial because of other commitments of the court, counsel, or witnesses [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials,

ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(15) (CJER 1981)].

(23) (*Preliminary Motions*) Whether any preliminary motions will be made, such as a motion to exclude witnesses from the courtroom [*see Evid. Code § 777*; *see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.9(17) (CJER 1981)].

(24) (*Time limits*) Reasonable time limits [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(b)(2)].

(25) (*Time of commencement and hours set for trial*) The time trial will start each day and the number of hours set each day for the trial [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(b)(3), (4), (6)].

(26) (*Use of technology*) Technology that may be used in the presentation of evidence and managing the trial [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(b)(5)].

(27) (*Scheduling arguments on legal issues*) Whether arguments on legal issues will be scheduled at the beginning or end of the day, so as not to interrupt the presentation of evidence [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(b)(7)].

(28) (*Sidebar conferences*) When sidebar conferences will be permitted and their length [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(b)(8)].

[4] Settlement

Another matter that may arise is whether settlement should be further explored [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.7 (CJER 1981)]. However, to avoid a motion to disqualify, the judge should not engage in settlement discussion unless the parties consent. The policy of the Los Angeles County Superior Court in this regard is as follows: Although the trial court may request counsel to further explore settlement, it should not itself engage in settlement discussions if any party objects. If all counsel and parties agree to settlement discussion with the trial judge and to waive any right to assert any disqualification that they might otherwise allege from it, such agreements and waivers should be sufficiently broad to expressly permit the trial judge to discuss the anticipated evidence and dollar amounts offered and demanded, not only with all counsel present, but also with counsel and the litigants separately and in confidence. If a settlement is not reached, the trial court may proceed to trial unless it believes its disqualification is required by law or its impartiality might reasonably be questioned. If a settlement is reached, ordinarily the terms of the settlement and the parties' consent to it, as well as the consent of counsel, should be stated on the record [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.21]. For a discussion of settlement generally, see Ch. 520, *Settlement and Release* . For a discussion of the pretrial settlement conference with the judge, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

[5] Additional Matters in Jury Trials

Additional matters that may be covered when a jury trial has been requested include the following [*see, generally*, Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.25(b); Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20; California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.10 (CJER 1981)]:

- Whether a jury trial has been properly demanded and fees timely posted [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20; for a discussion of when trial by jury may be had, a form of demand and a form of waiver of jury trial, and forms for use in moving for a jury trial, or vacating the setting of a jury trial, when the right is not guaranteed, *see* Ch. 322, *Juries and Jury Selection*].

- Whether the parties will waive a jury trial.

- Whether there are any motions in limine that must be ruled on before voir dire examination and opening statements by counsel [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.92; for a discussion of motions in limine, *see* Ch. 373, *Motions in Limine*]. Some judges may require any motion in limine to be presented in writing with a proposed order [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, ch. 3, *Conference Before Trial*, § 3.14 (CJER 1981)].

- Whether counsel will stipulate to trial by fewer than 12 jurors [*see Cal. Const., art. I, § 16*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 220*; Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(c)].

- The number of alternate jurors, if any, to be called [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 234*; Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(d)].

- Whether counsel will stipulate to excuse jurors who express a desire not to sit because of potential length of the trial running beyond expiration of their jury service term [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(e)].

- The text of a brief statement of the case suitable to be read by the trial judge to the panel of prospective jurors [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(b)].

- The areas of proposed voir dire interrogation to be directed to prospective jurors and any limits to be imposed by the judge on voir dire examination by counsel [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(a)]. Some courts may require that any party requesting the trial judge to voir dire the prospective jurors with questions that are not set forth in Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. I, § 8(c) and (d) prepare and submit to the court the proposed questions in writing and furnish copies for the other parties [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(h)].

- Whether any part of the voir dire should be conducted by written questions (for example, questions that might be embarrassing to a juror).

- Whether any counsel contends the case is one of "unusual circumstances" or contains "unique or complex elements, legal or factual" within the meaning of Cal. Rules of Ct., Appen., Div. I, § 8 (relating to examination of prospective jurors in civil cases), such that usually improper voir dire questions may be asked [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(a)]. If so, the judge might require prior submission to him or her in writing of the questions to be asked.

- In multiple-party cases, the order in which counsel will conduct their supplemental voir dire examination of prospective jurors [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.25(a)(2)].

- In multiple-party cases, whether there are issues as to the number of "sides" and allocation of peremptory challenges within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 231* and, if so, whether stipulations may be reached with regard to them [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(f)].

- Whether there should be a limited preinstruction of the jury [*see Westover v. Los Angeles (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 635, 639, 128 P.2d 350* ; *Kelly v. Trans Globe Travel Bureau, Inc. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 195, 203-204, 131 Cal. Rptr. 488]* .

- Whether in longer trials trial days will be scheduled to permit jurors time for personal business. When a trial involves a jury, the trial judge should manage proceedings with particular emphasis upon the needs of the jury [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.20(a), (b)(9)].

[6] Stipulations Relating to Jury, Substitute Judge, and Stay of Execution of Judgment

The parties may also be encouraged to stipulate in writing to the following [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.20(g)]:

- Unless called to the attention of the court, all jurors shall be deemed to be in the jury box and in their proper places on court's reconvening after e ach recess and adjournment.

- After having given the admonition required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 611* (admonition required when jury is permitted to separate), the court at each subsequent recess or adjournment need not repeat or remind the jury of the admonition given.

- The court, in the absence of any counsel, may do any of the following:

  - On the jury's request, read to the jury any or all instructions previously given, have read to the jury any portions of the evidence given in the trial, or supply the jury with any of the exhibits received in evidence;

  - Call the jury into the courtroom to ascertain whether or not a verdict is probable, to receive the verdict of the jury, and to poll the jury; and

  - In the event of the jury's failure to reach a verdict, permit the jurors to separate and resume their deliberations on the morning of the next court day or such other time as may be fixed by the court.

- In the absence of the trial judge after the original submission of the case to the jury, any judge of the court may act in the place and stead of the absent trial judge to and including the time the jury is discharged.

- In the event judgment is for plaintiff, a stay of execution may be issued to be effective for a period of 10 days after any motion for new trial is determined or the time to file a notice of intention to move for a new trial has expired.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsSettlement AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesPretrial ConferencesCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Before-Trial Conference

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.42-551.49

[Reserved]

§§ 551.42[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Order of Proceedings

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.50

§ 551.50 Jury Trial

[1] In General

The order of proceedings after the jury has been sworn is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* and is to be followed unless the court in its discretion rules otherwise [*Reely v. Chapman (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 260, 263, 2 Cal. Rptr. 188* ; see *McLellan v. McLellan (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 343, 353, 100 Cal. Rptr. 258* ; *see also Evid. Code § 320* (court has discretion to "regulate order of proof," except as otherwise provided by law)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* provides that when the jury has been sworn, the trial must proceed in the following order, unless the court, for special reasons, otherwise directs:

- The plaintiff may state the issue and plaintiff's case (commonly known as giving an opening statement).
- The defendant may then state the defense if he or she so wishes, or wait until after plaintiff has produced his or her evidence.
- The plaintiff must then produce the evidence on his or her part.
- The defendant may then open the defense if he or she has not done so previously.
- The defendant may then produce the evidence on his or her part.
- The parties may then respectively offer rebutting evidence only, unless the court, for good reason, in furtherance of justice, permits them to offer evidence on their original case.
- When the evidence is concluded, unless the case is submitted to the jury on either side or on both sides without argument, the plaintiff must commence and may conclude the argument.

- If serveral defendants having separate defenses appear by different counsel, the court must determine their relative order in the evidence and argument.

- The court may then charge the jury.

[2] Legal, Equitable, and Factual Issues

There are two rules of precedence that are generally followed with respect to issues. They are: (1) in a jury trial, issues of law should be tried by the court before issues of fact [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 592*; *Evid. Code § 310(a)*]; and (2) if a case involves both legal and equitable issues, the equitable issues are tried first [*see, e.g., Jaffe v. Albertson Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 592, 609, 53 Cal. Rptr. 25* ; *Dills v. Delira Corp. (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 124, 129, 302 P.2d 397* ; *see also People v. Bestline Prod., Inc. (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 879, 916, 132 Cal. Rptr. 767* (whether case is tried by court or jury when legal and equitable issues cannot be severed as depending on whether the relief sought is essentially equitable or legal in nature); and discussion in Subpart C, *above*]. If the decision on the trial of equitable issues is determinative of the legal issues, a jury trial on the legal issues is obviated. If not, the jury trial on the remaining issues will follow [*Jaffe v. Albertson Co. (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 592, 609, 53 Cal. Rptr. 25]* .

For further discussion of the order of proceedings, see *551.224*.

[3] Opening Statement

In a jury trial, *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* confers the right to make an opening statement. The trial court has discretion only as to control of the order and timing of the opening statement. It is an abuse of the court's discretion to prohibit parties from making any opening statement [*see Shippy v. Peninsula Rapid Transit Co. (1925) 197 Cal. 290, 294, 240 P. 785* (abuse of discretion to allow jurors to vote on whether they wanted to hear closing argument)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsProvince of Court & JuryCivil ProcedureTrialsOpening StatementsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Order of Proceedings

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.51

§ 551.51 Court Trial

[1] In General

Ordinarily, unless the court otherwise directs, the trial of a civil action tried by the court without a jury is required to proceed in the order specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* for jury trials, discussed in *§ 551.50* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 631.7*].

[2] Opening Statement

In a nonjury trial, the action proceeds in the order specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* "unless the court otherwise directs" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 631.7*]. The court thus has discretion to refuse to hear opening statements [*cf. Gunn v. Superior Court (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 203, 205, 173 P.2d 328* (amount of time parties are allowed for closing argument before court sitting without a jury, or whether argument is allowed at all, are matters within trial court's discretion)].

[3] Reopening Case

In a trial by the court, the court has broad discretion to reopen the matter before final judgment in order to receive additional evidence. It may do so even over the objection of the litigants and does not violate their rights when adequate notice is given [*Howard Contracting, Inc. v. G.A. MacDonald Construction Co. (1998) 71 Cal. App. 4th 38, 59, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 590]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureTrialsOpening StatementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Order of Proceedings

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.52-551.59

[Reserved]

§§ 551.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.60

§ 551.60 Definitions

[1] "Shall" and "May"

As used in the Evidence Code, "shall" is mandatory and "may" is permissive [*Evid. Code § 11*].

[2] Other Evidence Code Terms

For the purposes of the Evidence Code, the following words and phrases have the meanings indicated unless the provision or context otherwise requires [*Evid. Code § 100*]:

"Action" includes a civil and a criminal action [*Evid. Code § 105*].

"Civil action" includes civil proceedings [*Evid. Code § 120*].

"Conduct" includes all active and passive behavior, both verbal and nonverbal [*Evid. Code § 125*].

"Declarant" is a person who makes a statement [*Evid. Code § 135*].

"The hearing" means the hearing at which a question under the Evidence Code arises and not some earlier or later hearing [*Evid. Code § 145*]. The definition includes not only a trial, but also other hearings, such as preliminary hearings and posttrial proceedings [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 145* in annotated codes].

"Law" includes constitutional, statutory, and decisional law [*Evid. Code § 160*].

"Oath" includes affirmation or declaration under penalty of perjury [*Evid. Code § 165*].

"Perceive" means to acquire knowledge through one's senses [*Evid. Code § 170*].

"Person" includes a natural person, firm, association, organization, partnership, business trust, corporation, limited liability company, or public entity [*Evid. Code § 175*].

"Personal property" includes money, goods, chattels, things in action, and evidences of debt [*Evid. Code § 180*].

"Proof" is the establishment by evidence of a requisite degree of belief concerning a fact in the mind of the trier of fact or the court [*Evid. Code§ 190*]. The disjunctive reference to the trier of fact or the court is needed because even when the jury is the trier of fact the court is required to determine preliminary questions of fact on the basis of proof [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 190* in annotated codes].

"Property" includes both real and personal property [*Evid. Code § 185*].

"Public employee" means an officer, agent, or employee of a public entity [*Evid. Code § 195*].

"Public entity" includes a nation, state, county, city and county, city, district, public authority, public agency, or any other political subdivision or public corporation, whether foreign or domestic [*Evid. Code § 200*].

"Real property" includes lands, tenements, and hereditaments [*Evid. Code § 205*].

"State" means the State of California, unless applied to the different parts of the United States. In the latter case, it includes any state, district, commonwealth, territory, or insular possession of the United States [*Evid. Code § 220*].

"Statement" means either an oral or written verbal expression or nonverbal conduct of a person intended by him or her as a substitute for oral or written verbal expression [*Evid. Code § 225*].

"Statute" includes a treaty and a constitutional provision [*Evid. Code § 230*].

"Trier of fact" includes (a) the jury and (b) the court when the court is trying an issue of fact other than one relating to the admissibility of evidence [*Evid. Code § 235*; *see, e.g., People v. Rodriguez (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 545, 552-556, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 886* (under *Evid. Code § 235*, jury, as trier of fact, could, under *Evid. Code § 1417*, compare exemplar of criminal defendant's handwriting with handwriting on disputed documents to compare signatures and, based on comparison, reasonably conclude, beyond reasonable doubt, and without benefit of testimony from handwriting expert, that questioned signatures were made by defendant)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.61

§ 551.61 "Evidence" Defined

The Evidence Code defines "evidence" as meaning testimony, writings, material objects, or other things presented to the senses that are offered to prove the existence or nonexistence of a fact [*Evid. Code § 140*]. The word is broadly defined to include not only testimony of witnesses and tangible objects, but also sights (such as a jury or court view of a place or the appearance of a person), sounds (such as a voice demonstrated for the jury), and any other thing that may be presented as a basis of proof [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 140* in annotated codes; *see also, e.g., Gates v. McKinnon (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 179, 182-183, 114 P.2d 576* (view of accident scene)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.62

§ 551.62 "Direct Evidence" and "Circumstantial Evidence" Distinguished

Evidence may be direct or circumstantial. "Direct evidence" is evidence that directly proves a fact, without an inference or presumption, and that in itself, if true, conclusively establishes that fact [*Evid. Code § 410*; *see California Shoppers, Inc. v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1, 44, 221 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *People v. Crawford (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 524, 529, 61 Cal. Rptr. 472 , cert. denied, 390 U.S. 1006 (1968)]* .

"Circumstantial evidence" is that which is applied to the principal fact indirectly, or through the medium of other facts, from which the principal fact is inferred [*People v. Crawford (1967) 253 Cal. App. 2d 524, 529-530, 61 Cal. Rptr. 472 , cert. denied, 390 U.S. 1006 (1968)]* . Thus, circumstantial evidence is evidence that has influenced the minds of the jury (or other trier of fact) in arriving at the belief that a certain matter is a fact although no witness has testified directly that it is a fact [*People v. Castellano (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 844, 860, 145 Cal. Rptr. 264]* .

The fact that evidence is circumstantial does not mean it cannot be substantial. Relevant circumstantial evidence is admissible in California (see discussion in *§ 551.66[1]*), and the jury is entitled to accept persuasive circumstantial evidence even when contradicted by direct testimony [*Hasson v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 530, 548, 138 Cal. Rptr. 705, 564 P.2d 857 , disapproved on other grounds in Soule v. General Motors Corp. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 548, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 607, 882 P.2d 298]* .

For a related jury instruction on direct and indirect evidence, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 202* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsCircumstantial & Direct Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.63

§ 551.63 Judicial Notice

Judicial notice is governed by *Evid. Code § 450 et seq.* For discussion of judicial notice, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* ; *see also California Trial Guide, § 20.60* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.64

§ 551.64 View of Property, Scene, Object, Demonstration, or Experiment

If the court finds a view would be proper and would aid the trier of fact in its determination of the case, it may, on its own motion or the motion of a party, order a view of any of the following [*Code Civ. Proc. § 651(a)*]:

- The property that is the subject of litigation.
- The place where any relevant event occurred.
- Any object, demonstration, or experiment, a view of which is relevant and admissible in evidence in the case and that cannot with reasonable convenience be viewed in the courtroom.

On such occasion, the entire court, including the judge, jury if any, court reporter if any, and any necessary officers shall proceed to the place, property, object, demonstration, or experiment to be viewed. The court shall be in session throughout the view. At the view, the court may permit testimony of witnesses, and the proceedings at the view shall be recorded to the same extent as the proceedings in the courtroom [*Code Civ. Proc. § 651(b)*].

The view constitutes evidence in the case and may be used alone or with other evidence to support a judgment [*see Hutcherson v. Alexander (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 126, 131, 70 Cal. Rptr. 366* ; *Smith v. Smith (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 100, 105, 286 P.2d 1009]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.65

§ 551.65 Order of Presenting Evidence

Except as otherwise provided by law, the trial regulates the order of proof in its discretion [*Evid. Code § 320*]. Such discretion includes, for example, ordering a separate trial of an affirmative defense [*Finley v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1162, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 128* ; *see also* further discussion and forms in *Ch. 3, Abatement of Actions, § 3.110* et seq.].

For discussion of the general order of presenting evidence in a jury trial, as provided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 607*, see Subpart E, "Order of Proceedings," under *§ 551.50[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSeparate TrialsCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.66

§ 551.66 Admissibility of Evidence

[1] Relevant Evidence

No evidence is admissible except relevant evidence [*Evid. Code § 350*]. "Relevant evidence" is evidence, including evidence relevant to the credibility of a witness or hearsay declarant, having any tendency in reason to prove or disprove any disputed fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action [*Evid. Code § 210*]. Except as otherwise provided by statute, all relevant evidence is admissible [*Evid. Code § 351*]. Thus, a party is entitled to have received in evidence all relevant evidence that tends to prove or disprove any material issue raised by the pleadings. Although it is within the sound discretion of the trial court to define the issues and direct the order of proof (*see Evid. Code § 320*), this may not be done so as to preclude a party from adducing relevant evidence that tends to prove or disprove any material issue [*Foster v. Keating (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 435, 451, 261 P.2d 529]* .

In sum, only relevant evidence is admissible and it must tend logically, naturally, and by reasonable inference to establish a material fact. The substantive law of the case primarily determines what constitutes a material, disputed fact. The law vests wide discretion in the trial court to decide the relevance of proffered evidence, and the appellate courts traditionally defer to a trial court's determination unless there appears to be a clear abuse of discretion on a matter of such significance that an injustice has occurred [*Mesnick v. Caton (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1248, 1262-1263, 228 Cal. Rptr. 779* ; *see also Cal. Const., art. VI, § 13*; *see, e.g.,* *Kardly v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1746, 1752-1753, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* (in insured's action against insurer for bad faith in denying claim, reversible error for trial court to exclude clearly relevant evidence of why insurer closed claim file)].

In civil cases, otherwise relevant evidence is not rendered inadmissible because it was illegally seized or obtained. There is no exclusionary rule for such evidence in civil cases [*Ecker v. Raging Waters Group, Inc. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1320, 1329, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 320* (no legal impediment to trial court's consideration of relevant videotape seized by private citizen)].

[2] Evidence Admitted for Limited Purpose

In a jury trial, when evidence is admissible as to one party or for one purpose and is inadmissible as to another party or

another purpose, the court on request shall restrict the evidence to its proper scope and instruct the jury accordingly [*Evid. Code § 355*; for related jury instructions, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 206, 207* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions]. The request for a limiting instruction (or a more limiting instruction if the one given is insufficient) should be made at the time the evidence is offered [*see Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 580, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

[3] Part of Evidence Only Presented by Party

When part of an act, declaration, conversation, or writing is given in evidence by one party, the whole on the same subject may be inquired into by an adverse party [*Evid. Code § 356*; *see Gallaher v. Superior Court (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 666, 672, 162 Cal. Rptr. 389]* .

[4] Letter Read Into Evidence

When a letter is read in evidence, the answer may be given [*Evid. Code § 356*].

[5] Detached Evidence

When a detached act, declaration, conversation, or writing is given in evidence, any other act, declaration, conversation, or writing that is necessary to make it understood also may be given in evidence [*Evid. Code § 356*; *see Gallaher v. Superior Court (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 666, 672, 162 Cal. Rptr. 389]* .

[6] Polygraph Test Results

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the results of a polygraph examination, the opinion of a polygraph examiner, or any reference to an offer to take, failure to take, or taking of a polygraph examination, cannot be admitted into evidence in any criminal proceeding, including pretrial and post-conviction motions and hearings, or in any trial or hearing of a juvenile for a criminal offense, whether in juvenile or adult court, unless all parties stipulate to the admission of the results [*Evid. Code § 351.1(a)*; *see People v. Wilkinson (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 821, 842-852, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 420, 94 P.3d 551* (because of categorical prohibition of *Evid. Code § 351.1*, trial court did not err in refusing to conduct *Kelly-Frye* hearing on proposed evidence regarding polygraph test)].

Polygraph tests are not considered by the California courts to have achieved such a high degree of reliability that they may be received in evidence without the stipulation of the parties. But they are admissible pursuant to the stipulation of the parties [*Robinson v. Wilson (1974) 44 Cal. App. 3d 92, 103, 118 Cal. Rptr. 569* (paternity case)]. See general discussion in [10], *below*.

[7] Photographs

Photographic evidence in a proper case may be used as substantive evidence [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Hacienda Mobile Home Park (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 519, 530, 119 Cal. Rptr. 559* (holding photographs properly excluded because relevance not shown)].

[8] Videotapes

A videotape of a plaintiff's daily activities is admissible as relevant to the plaintiff's medical needs and the extent of the plaintiff's pain and suffering [*Jones v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 436, 445, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 528]* .

A videotaped reconstruction of an automobile accident is admissible when the conditions shown on the tape are "substantially similar" to those that existed when the accident took place [*see DiRosario v. Havens (1987) 196 Cal.*

App. 3d 1224, 1231-1233, 242 Cal. Rptr. 423] . Even if a dramatized reconstruction not meeting this standard is admitted into evidence, the error is harmless when the videotape affords visual confirmation of the testimony of other witnesses [*DiRosario v. Havens (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1224, 1233, 242 Cal. Rptr. 423]* .

[9] Experimental Evidence

Experimental evidence is admissible when it (1) is relevant, (2) was obtained under conditions substantially similar to those to which it is sought to be applied, and (3) will not cause undue delay in the trial or confusion for the jury [*Hasson v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 530, 548-549, 138 Cal. Rptr. 705, 564 P.2d 857]* . A test or experiment is not admissible as evidence if it is based on a theory that contradicts unrebutted testimony or assumes a fact that has no support in the record [*Ehrhardt v. Brunswick, Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 734, 740, 231 Cal. Rptr. 60]* .

[10] Scientific Evidence

Evidence based on a new scientific technique, theory, or process is admissible if the technique, theory, or process meets a test commonly termed the " *Kelly/Frye*" test, based on the California Supreme Court's decision in *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 37, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144* , and the germinal case of *Frye v. United States (D.C.Cir. 1923) 293 F. 1013, 1014* [, *People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321* (citing *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 37, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144, 549 P.2d 1240*)]. Under the *Kelly/Frye* test, scientific evidence is admissible when the following three prongs are satisfied:

- The technique must have gained general acceptance in its field (the technique is generally accepted by a typical cross-section of the relevant scientific community).

- The testimony regarding the technique and its application must be offered by a properly qualified expert.

- Correct scientific procedures must have been used in the particular case.

The first prong of the test--general acceptance--is satisfied once a trial court's decision to admit evidence based on a new scientific technique has been affirmed on appeal by a published appellate decision, at least until new evidence is presented reflecting a change in the attitude of the scientific community [*People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 32, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144, 549 P.2d 1240* ; *see, e.g, People v. Williams (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1767, 1778-1779, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 521* ("segmentation" process of enhancing photographic images to create more discernible image is reliable)].

A *Kelly/Frye* hearing is not required for new devices for already established scientific methods; it only applies to new methodologies [*People v. Nolan (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1210, 1215, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* (urinalysis); *People v. Bury (1996) 41 Cal. App. 4th 1194, 1202, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 107* (breath testing for alcohol)].

For additional discussion of the *Kelly/Frye* analysis as it relates to expert testimony, see *§ 551.70[2][a][ii]*.

[11] Witness's State of Mind

A witness may competently testify to his or her own state of mind when the witness's state of mind is relevant to any issue in the case [*Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 583, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

[12] Character or Character Traits

Except as otherwise provided by statute, any otherwise admissible evidence (including evidence in the form of an opinion, evidence of reputation, and evidence of specific instances of conduct) is admissible to prove a person's character or a character trait [*Evid. Code § 1100*]. But evidence of a person's character or a character trait is not

admissible in a civil action when offered to prove the person's conduct on a specified occasion, except as otherwise provided by statute [*Evid. Code § 1101(a)*; *see* *Blackburn v. Superior Court (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 414, 430, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 204]* . Nor is evidence of a person's character trait with respect to care or skill admissible to prove the quality of the person's conduct on a specified occasion [*Evid. Code § 1104*; *see* *Stafford v. United Farm Workers (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 319, 325, 188 Cal. Rptr. 600, 656 P.2d 564* ; *Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 851, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888]* . It is a fundamental rule of evidence that one cannot prove the commission of an act by showing the commission of similar acts by the same person at other times and under other circumstances; such evidence is simply not relevant [*Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 851, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888* ; *Larson v. Larsen (1925) 72 Cal. App. 169, 172, 236 P. 979]* .

This does not prevent the admission of evidence that a person committed a crime, civil wrong, or other act when relevant to prove some fact (such as motive, opportunity, intent, preparation, plan, knowledge, identity, absence of mistake or accident, or whether a defendant in a prosecution for an unlawful sexual act or attempted unlawful sexual act did not reasonably and in good faith believe that the victim consented) other than the person's disposition to commit such acts [*Evid. Code § 1101(b)*; *see* *Rufo v. Simpson (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 573, 584-587, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492* (evidence of defendant's prior abuse of spouse whom he allegedly killed was admissible in wrongful death action brought by her heirs as relevant to motive, intent, and identity); *Andrews v. City and County of San Francisco (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 938, 944-945, 252 Cal. Rptr. 716* (prior episodes of abusive misconduct by police officer as tending to show that plaintiff's injuries were product of officer's intent and malice)]. Nor does it affect the admissibility of evidence offered to support or attack the credibility of a witness [*Evid. Code § 1101(c)*; *see* discussion in *§ 551.123*].

Evidence of a person's character or a character trait that does not relate to the person's conduct or the quality of the conduct on a specific occasion [*see Evid. Code §§ 1101, 1104*] is relevant in three situations: (1) when offered on the issue of the person's credibility as a witness; (2) when offered as circumstantial evidence of the person's conduct in conformity with his or her character or character trait; and (3) when the person's character or a trait of his or her character is an ultimate fact in dispute in the action [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 1100* in annotated codes; *see also* *Carr v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 537, 544, 103 Cal. Rptr. 120]* .

[13] Habit or Custom

Any otherwise admissible evidence of habit or custom is admissible to prove conduct on a specified occasion in conformity with the habit or custom [*Evid. Code § 1105*].

[14] Other Accidents

Evidence of other accidents is admissible to prove a defective condition, knowledge, or the cause of an accident, provided that the circumstances of the other accidents are similar and not too remote [*Ault v. International Harvester Co. (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 113, 121-122, 117 Cal. Rptr. 812, 528 P.2d 1148* ; *see also* *Brake v. Beech Aircraft Corp. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 930, 937-938, 229 Cal. Rptr. 336* (computer analysis and accident report on prior performance and malfunction of product properly excluded as hearsay)]. Moreover, the court may admit evidence regarding the absence of prior similar claims in cases concerning negligence or strict products liability [*Benson v. Honda Motor Co. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 1344]* . See also the discussion in *§ 551.68[4][a]*.

For further discussion of negligence and products liability actions, see respectively Ch. Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDemonstrative EvidencePhotographsEvidenceDemonstrative EvidenceVisual

FormatsEvidenceRelevanceGeneral OverviewEvidenceScientific EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceScientific EvidencePolygraphs

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.67

§ 551.67 Stipulations of Parties

In the course of a trial, counsel may stipulate to a number of matters for a variety of reasons. Common stipulations include those in which counsel agree to the authenticity of an exhibit, the qualifications of an expert, that certain alleged or asserted facts are true, that certain testimony would be given if a particular witness were called to testify, and so forth [*see, e.g., Linsk v. Linsk (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 272, 277, 74 Cal. Rptr. 544, 449 P.2d 760]* .

Some courts require that oral offers to stipulate in jury trials be made outside the hearing of the jurors. Any stipulation reached by counsel is then stated in its exact terms to the jury, and the court advises the jury that any stipulated fact is conclusively presumed to be true as to the party or parties entering into the stipulation [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.43, 8.44].

For further discussion and forms of stipulations, including a form of stipulation of facts, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceJudicial AdmissionsAdmissions During Trials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.68

§ 551.68 Exclusion of Evidence

[1] Irrelevant Evidence

Irrelevant evidence should be excluded [*see Evid. Code § 351*; *see also* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.89 (court should exclude irrelevant evidence on its own motion)]. Evidence is relevant if it has any tendency in reason to prove a material disputed fact [*People v. Waidla (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 690, 718, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396, 996 P.2d 46* ; *see Evid. Code § 210* and discussion in *§ 551.66[1]*].

[2] Probative Value Outweighed by Undue Prejudice, Confusion, or Delay

Moreover, the court in its discretion may exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will (1) necessitate undue consumption of time or (2) create substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing the issues, or of misleading the jury [*Evid. Code § 352*; *see People v. Holt (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 343, 353, 104 Cal. Rptr. 572 , cert. denied, 413 U.S. 921 (1973)* (undue prejudice; disapproved on another point in *Evans v. Superior Court (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 617, 625 n. 6, 114 Cal. Rptr. 121, 522 P.2d 681*); *see also Hrnjak v. Graymar, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 725, 728-734, 94 Cal. Rptr. 623, 484 P.2d 599* (weighing probative value against prejudicial impact)].

Evidence is substantially more prejudicial than probative, and therefore subject to exclusion under *Evid. Code § 352*, when it poses an intolerable risk to the fairness of the proceedings or the reliability of the outcome [*People v. Waidla (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 690, 724, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396, 996 P.2d 46]* .

Evid. Code § 352 gives the trial court broad discretion to exclude otherwise admissible evidence [*Garfield v. Russell (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 275, 279, 59 Cal. Rptr. 379]* . The court may exclude the evidence on its own initiative, but if it fails to do so, counsel must, if the evidence is to be excluded, request the court to do so; the objection that the court failed to exclude the evidence cannot be raised for the first time on appeal [*Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 581, 582, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

A trial court, in making a determination whether certain evidence is substantially more prejudicial than probative, need

not expressly weigh prejudice against probative value, or even expressly state that it had done so [*People v. Waidla (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 690, 724 n.6, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396, 996 P.2d 46* (stating that this is the current rule and language to the contrary in any of its other decisions is no longer valid)].

In the Los Angeles County Superior Court, the court on its own motion should exclude evidence excludable under *Evid. Code § 352* [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.89 (court should also exclude irrelevant evidence on its own motion but ordinarily should not exclude evidence on its own motion when inadmissible on other grounds)].

[3] Relevant Evidence Objectionable on Other Grounds

Particular testimony that is relevant may be excluded on other specific grounds enumerated in the Evidence Code, for example:

- The witness is not competent to testify to a particular matter (e.g., witness lacks personal knowledge) [*see Evid. Code § 702*; *Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 582, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330* (witness's speculation regarding another person's state of mind absent proper evidence, such as declarations or conduct, is both incompetent and irrelevant and properly excluded by court on its own initiative); see also discussion in *§ 551.121[2]*].

- The question calls for the opinion of a nonexpert witness or of an expert witness beyond the area of his or her expertise [*see Evid. Code §§ 800, 801*, and discussion in *§ 551.70*].

- The answer is privileged [*see Evid. Code §§ 900-1070*; and discussion in *§ 551.118*].

- The answer is hearsay [*see Evid. Code § 1200(b)*; and discussion in *§ 551.71*].

- The evidence is cumulative [*see Evid. Code § 765*; discussed in *§ 551.121[3]*].

An agreement between parties that evidence will not be admissible at trial, such as evidence of settlement negotiations, is enforceable so long as the agreement was not obtained by fraud, misrepresentation, mistake of fact, or excusable neglect, there is no substantial change in circumstances making enforcement of the agreement unfair to a party, and the agreement does not violate public policy [*Tower Acton v. Los Angeles County Waterworks Dist. No. 37 (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 590, 600-602, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 640* (agreement enforceable)].

[4] Specific Evidence

[a] Subsequent Safety Measures

When, after the occurrence of an event, remedial or precautionary measures are taken, which, if taken previously, would have tended to make the event less likely to occur, evidence of the subsequent measures is inadmissible to prove negligence or culpable conduct in connection with the event [*Evid. Code § 1151*].

Evid. Code § 1151 by its own terms excludes evidence of subsequent remedial or precautionary measures only when the evidence is offered to prove negligence or culpable conduct. Thus it does not apply to an action based on strict liability in tort [*Ault v. International Harvester Co. (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 113, 117-121, 117 Cal. Rptr. 812, 528 P.2d 1148* ; *Magnante v. Pettibone-Wood Mfg. Co. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 764, 766-767, 228 Cal. Rptr. 420* ; for further discussion of products liability, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability* [*see also* California Products Liability Actions (Matthew Bender) and *California Trial Guide, § 50.30* (Matthew Bender)].

If remedial measures are taken by someone not a party to the action, *Evid. Code § 1151* still operates to exclude any

evidence of those measures if the nonparty's negligence is an issue in the action, if no strict liability theory has been asserted against the nonparty, and if a determination that the nonparty was negligent will have a direct effect on the amount of damages that the nonparty will be required to pay [*Santilli v. Otis Elevator Co. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 210, 214, 263 Cal. Rptr. 496* (nonparty employer's workers' compensation lien against employee's jury award would be reduced by percentage of responsibility that jury allocates to employer for employee's injury)].

Evid. Code § 1151 refers to subsequent actions taken to repair or correct a problem, as distinguished from subsequent factual inquiries undertaken to determine whether repair or correction is necessary. Consequently, hospital peer review committee inquiries, undertaken to investigate physician misconduct, do not constitute subsequent remedial measures that would be subject to exclusion in a malpractice action under *Evid. Code § 1151*, particularly since such inquiries are addressed by the more specific disclosure and admissibility restrictions of *Evid. Code § 1157* [*Fox v. Kramer (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 531, 544, 548, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497, 994 P.2d 343* ; for discussion of *Evid. Code § 1157, see* Ch. 295, *Hospitals*].

[b] Offer to Compromise or Offer From Humanitarian Motives

Evidence that a person has, in compromise or from humanitarian motives, furnished, offered, or promised to furnish money or any other thing, act, or service to another who has, or claims to have, sustained or claims that he or she will sustain loss or damage, as well as any conduct or statements made in negotiation thereof, is inadmissible to prove the person's liability for the loss or damage or any part of it [*Evid. Code § 1152(a)*; for related jury instruction on evidence of settlement, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 217* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions]. However, this does not affect the admissibility of evidence of (1) partial satisfaction of an asserted claim or demand without questioning its validity when the evidence is offered to prove the validity of the claim, or (2) a debtor's payment or promise to pay all or a part of his or her preexisting debt when the evidence is offered to prove the creation of a new duty on his or her part or a revival of the preexisting duty [*Evid. Code § 1152(c)*].

The purpose of *Evid. Code § 1152* is to avoid deterring parties from making offers of settlement and to facilitate candid discussion that may lead to settlement of disputes [*Fieldson Associates, Inc. v. Whitecliff Labs., Inc. (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 770, 773, 81 Cal. Rptr. 332]* . The section does not apply, however, to statements that are in no way connected with any attempt of compromise or are statements of fact independent of an offer of compromise. Accordingly, evidence relative to the issue of whether there has been an accord and satisfaction is not subject to the objection that it violates the rule excluding offers of compromise. Moreover, the statements of a party against whom a claim is made that he or she is willing to settle the claim, when not connected with an offer of compromise, may be proved as an admission against interest [*Moving Picture etc. Union v. Glasgow Theaters, Inc. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 395, 402, 86 Cal. Rptr. 33]* .

Evid. Code § 1152(a) does not bar evidence of settlement if the evidence is offered to establish a fact other than the liability of the settling party. Therefore, for example, if a codefendant sends a letter of apology to plaintiff under the terms of a settlement agreement in a libel action, the letter is admissible in the trial against a nonsettling codefendant as evidence that the allegedly libelous statements made about plaintiff were false [*Carney v. Santa Cruz Women Against Rape (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1023-1024, 271 Cal. Rptr. 30]* .

If an offer to compromise is admitted in an action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing or for violation of *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, then at the request of the party against whom the evidence is admitted, or at the request of the party who made the admitted compromise offer, evidence relating to any other offer or counteroffer to compromise the same or substantially the same claimed loss or damages also is admissible for the same purpose as the initial evidence regarding settlement. Other than as may be admitted in an action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing or violation of *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, evidence of settlement offers is not admissible in a motion for a new trial, in any proceeding involving an additur or remittitur, or on appeal [*Evid. Code § 1152(b)*; *but see*

Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58 (prospectively abrogating private third-party standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03*); *see also* discussion in *Ch. 308, Insurance, § 308.10 et seq.*]. For a form of complaint alleging a violation of *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, see *Ch. 308, Insurance, § 308.10 et seq.* For discussion and forms relating to a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* , General Introduction and Pt. I.

[c] Evidence and Documents in Mediation of Dispute

[i] Admissibility and Discovery in General

Except as otherwise provided in *Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*, when persons engage in a mediation or a mediation consultation [*see Evid. Code § 1115(a), (c)*], evidence of anything said, any admission made, or any writing [*see Evid. Code § 250*] prepared for, during, or pursuant to the mediation or mediation consultation is not admissible or subject to discovery. Disclosure of such evidence or writing may not be compelled in any proceeding in which, pursuant to law, testimony can be compelled to be given. All communications, negotiations, or settlement discussions by participants in the course of a mediation or a mediation consultation are confidential [*Evid. Code § 1119*].

Evidence otherwise admissible or subject to discovery outside of a mediation or a mediation consultation is not inadmissible or protected from disclosure solely by reason of its introduction or use in a mediation or a mediation consultation. The mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*] do not limit any of the following [*Evid. Code § 1120*:

- The admissibility of an agreement to mediate a dispute.

- The effect of an agreement not to take a default or an agreement to extend the time within which to act or refrain from acting in a pending civil action.

- Disclosure of the mere fact that a mediator has served, is serving, will serve, or was contacted about serving as a mediator in a dispute.

No one may submit to a court or other adjudicative body, nor may a court or other adjudicative body consider, any report, assessment, evaluation, recommendation, or finding of any kind by the mediator concerning the mediation, other than a report that is mandated by court rule or other law and that states only whether an agreement was reached, unless all parties to the mediation expressly agree otherwise, either in writing or orally in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118* [*Evid. Code § 1121*].

[ii] Exception by Agreement

A communication or a writing, as defined in *Evid. Code § 250*, that is made or prepared for the purpose of, or in the course of, or pursuant to, a mediation or a mediation consultation is not made inadmissible, or protected from disclosure, by the mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*] if either:

- All persons who participate in the mediation expressly agree in writing, or orally in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*, to its disclosure.

- It was prepared by or on behalf of fewer than all the mediation participants, and those participants expressly agree in writing, or orally in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*, to its disclosure, and it does not disclose anything said or done or any admission made in the course of the mediation.

The agreement of the mediator to disclosure binds any person who the mediator designated to assist in the mediation or

to communicate with the participants in preparation for the mediation [*Evid. Code § 1122*].

[iii] Written Settlement Agreement

A written settlement agreement prepared in the course of or pursuant to a mediation is not made inadmissible, or protected from disclosure, by the mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*] if the agreement is signed by the settling parties and either [*Evid. Code § 1123*]:

- The agreement provides that it is admissible or subject to disclosure, or words to that effect.
- The agreement provides that it is enforceable or binding, or words to that effect.
- All parties to the agreement expressly agree in writing, or orally in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118* to its disclosure.
- The agreement is used to show fraud, duress, or illegality that is relevant to an issue in dispute.

[iv] Oral Agreement

An oral agreement made in the course of or pursuant to a mediation is not made inadmissible, or protected from disclosure, by the mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*] if either [*Evid. Code § 1124*:

- The agreement is in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*.
- The agreement is in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118(a)*, *(b)*, and *(d)* and all parties to the agreement expressly agree, in writing, or orally in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*, to disclosure of the agreement.
- The agreement is in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118(a)*, *(b)*, and *(d)* and the agreement is used to show fraud, duress, or illegality that is relevant to an issue in dispute.

[v] End of Mediation for Purposes of Confidentiality

For purposes of confidentiality under the mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*], if a mediation *fully* resolves a dispute, the mediation ends when either:

- The parties execute a written settlement agreement that fully resolves the dispute.
- An oral agreement that fully resolves the dispute is reached in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*.
- The mediator, consistent with *Evid. Code § 1121*, signs and provides the mediation participants with a writing that states the mediation is terminated, or words to that effect.
- A party, consistent with *Evid. Code § 1121*, provides the mediator and the other mediation participants with a writing stating that the mediation is terminated, or words to that effect.
- For 10 calendar days, unless that time is shortened or extended by agreement of the mediator and the parties, there is no communication between the mediator and any of the parties to the mediation relating to the dispute.

In a mediation involving more than two parties, the mediation may continue as to the remaining parties or may be terminated in accordance with this procedure [*Evid. Code § 1125(a)*]. Additionally, if a mediation *partially* resolves a dispute, the mediation ends when either [*Evid. Code § 1125(b)*:

- The parties execute a written settlement agreement that partially resolves the dispute.

- An oral agreement that partially resolves the dispute is reached in accordance with *Evid. Code § 1118*.

These provisions do not preclude a party from ending a mediation without reaching an agreement, nor do they otherwise affect the extent to which a party may terminate a mediation [*Evid. Code § 1125(c)*]. Anything said, any admission made, or any writing that is inadmissible, protected from disclosure, and confidential under the mediation provisions [*Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*] before a mediation ends remains inadmissible, protected from disclosure, and confidential to the same extent after the mediation ends [*Evid. Code § 1126*].

[vi] Costs and Attorney's Fees

If a person subpoenas or otherwise seeks to compel a mediator to testify or produce a writing, as defined in *Evid. Code § 250*, and the court or other adjudicative body determines that the testimony or writing is inadmissible or protected from disclosure under *Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*, the court or adjudicative body making the determination must award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the mediator against the person seeking the testimony or writing [*Evid. Code § 1127*].

[vii] Sanctions for References During Subsequent Trial

Any reference to a mediation during any subsequent trial is an irregularity in the proceedings of the trial for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 657*. Any reference to a mediation during any other subsequent noncriminal proceeding is grounds for vacating or modifying the decision in that proceeding, in whole or in part, and granting a new or further hearing on all or part of the issues, if the reference materially affected the substantial rights of the party requesting relief [*Evid. Code § 1128*].

For further discussion of mediation, including enforcement of settlements reached through mediation, see Ch. 31, *Mediation* .

[d] Offer to Discount Claim

Evidence that a person has accepted, offered, or promised to accept a sum of money or any other thing, act, or service in satisfaction of a claim, as well as any conduct or statements in negotiation thereof, is not admissible to prove the invalidity of the claim or any part of it [*Evid. Code § 1154*].

[e] Offer for Civil Resolution of Criminal Matter

Evidence of an offer for civil resolution of a criminal matter pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 33*, relating to civil actions resulting from crimes against property, or admissions made in the course of or negotiations for the offer are not admissible in any action [*Evid. Code § 1153.5*].

[f] Guilty Plea

Evidence of a guilty plea, later withdrawn, or of an offer to plead guilty to a crime charged or any other crime, by the defendant in a criminal action is not admissible in any action or any proceeding of any nature [*Evid. Code § 1153*].

[g] Liability Insurance

Evidence that a person was, at the time a harm was suffered by another, insured wholly or partially against loss arising from liability for that harm is not admissible to prove negligence or other wrongdoing [*Evid. Code § 1155*]. The purpose of this exclusion is to prevent the prejudicial use of evidence of liability insurance in an action against the insured. Based on an assumption that a private cause of action could be brought against insurers for violation of the Unfair Practices Act [*Ins. Code § 790 et seq.*], it was once held that a joint trial against the insured for negligence and against the insurer for violating its duties under the Unfair Practices Act would violate both the letter and spirit of *Evid. Code § 1155* [*Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 880, 891, 153 Cal. Rptr. 842, 592 P.2d 329* , overruled prospectively in *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* (final October 17, 1988) (no private right of action exists against insurers for violation of Unfair Practices Act)]. Notwithstanding the reasoning behind this rule, one suing an insured for injuries suffered as a result of an insured's alleged negligence may properly join the insured's liability insurer in a cause of action for fraud and conspiracy in obtaining from plaintiff a release freeing the insured from all claims arising out of the incident, provided the issues are bifurcated and the jury trying the issue of liability is afforded no knowledge of the tortfeasor's insurance coverage [*Johnson v. Threats (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 287, 290-291* ; *see* *Ahmed v. Peterson (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 374, 377, 230 Cal. Rptr. 636* (cause of action against tortfeasor's insurer for breach of oral contract)].

[h] Evidence Obtained by Illegal Eavesdropping or Recording

Evidence obtained as a result of eavesdropping on or recording a confidential communication in violation of *Penal Code § 632* is not admissible in an action, except as proof in an action or prosecution for violation of the criminal statute [*Penal Code § 632(d)*]. *Penal Code § 632* is violated by intentionally eavesdropping on or recording a confidential communication by means of any electronic amplifying or recording device, without the consent of all parties [*Penal Code § 632(a)*]. A confidential communication generally includes any communication carried on in circumstances that may reasonably indicate that any party to the communication desires it to be confined to the parties thereto [*see Penal Code § 632(c)*].

Penal Code § 632 applies to participatory monitoring of confidential communications, such as the tape recording of a telephone conversation by one conversant without the consent of the other [*Frio v. Superior Court (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1480, 1485, 1498, 250 Cal. Rptr. 819]* . Illegal recordings, as well as any notes prepared from illegal recordings, are not admissible [*Frio v. Superior Court (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1480, 1492, 250 Cal. Rptr. 819]* . However, *Penal Code § 632(d)* does not exclude the *independent present recollection* of the tape-recording party. Further, use of an illegal recording merely to refresh the recollection of the tape-recording party does not render the refreshed testimony inadmissible [*Frio v. Superior Court (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1480, 1498, 250 Cal. Rptr. 819]* . For further discussion of refreshing the recollection of a witness, see Subpart G.

If the tape-recording party's testimony is admitted, the illegally obtained evidence may not be used to impeach the witness who was recorded. However, if the testimony is excluded, the tape-recording party may not use the *Penal Code § 632(d)* sanction as a license to lie, and the illegally obtained evidence can be used for impeachment purposes [*Frio v. Superior Court (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1480, 1496-1497, 1498-1499, 250 Cal. Rptr. 819]* .

[5] Morbidity or Mortality Studies and Proceedings and Records of Health Care Committees

Although subject to discovery, morbidity and mortality studies of an in-hospital medical or medical-dental staff committee of a licensed hospital or of a mental health quality assurance committee established in compliance with *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 4070* and *5624* are admissible in evidence only as provided in *Evid. Code §§ 1156(c)* (relating to original medical or dental records of a patient) and 1156.1(c) (relating to original medical or psychiatric records of a patient) [*Evid. Code §§ 1156(a), 1156.1(a)*].

Welf. & Inst. Code § 4070 was amended and *Welf. & Inst. Code § 5624* was repealed by 1991 legislation [Stats. 1991, ch. 89, §§ 32 and 108, respectively]. The cross reference to those sections in *Evid. Code § 1156.1(a)* was not corrected. The changes to section 4070 and repeal of section 5624 will become inoperative if the Commission on State Mandates determines (and the Director of Finance does not appeal from the determination) or a California appellate court determines that any provision of Stats. 1991, ch. 89, is a state-mandated local program requiring state reimbursement to a local agency or school district.

For when the records and proceedings of hospital staff committees responsible for evaluating and improving the quality of care, or of specified medical, and other health related, society review committees, or of an organized committee of a nonprofit medical care foundation or professional standards review organization, are admissible in evidence, see *Evid. Code §§ 1157, 1157.5* and Ch. 295, *Hospitals* [*see also Evid. Code §§ 1157.6* (relating to mental health quality assurance committees) and *1157.7* (relating to committees established by local government agency to monitor, evaluate, and report necessity, quality, and level of specialty health services)].

[6] Testimony of Particular Witness

A particular witness may be excluded from testifying on grounds other than those enumerated above. For example, a party who failed to exchange his or her list of expert witnesses pursuant to a pretrial demand may be prohibited from calling any expert witnesses to testify, except for purposes of impeachment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.300*; *see also Muller v. Fresno Community Hospital & Medical Center (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 887, 906, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 617* (effect of failure to designate witness or include in designation all information required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.260*)] or percipient testimony [*Province v. Center for Women's Health & Family Birth (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1673, 1684, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 667]* . "Impeachment" in this context means to call in question the veracity of a witness by means of evidence adduced for such purpose or the adducing of proof that a witness is unworthy of belief; it does not mean calling an expert witness to express an opinion contrary to that expressed by another expert witness [*Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 921-922, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393* (distinguishing impeachment from general rebuttal; for further discussion, see Ch. 198, *Discovery: Exchange of Expert Witness Information*]. As another example, the court may exclude the testimony of a witness at trial if the witness's name was willfully excluded from an answer to an interrogatory seeking the names of all witnesses [Thoren v. Johnston & Washer (197 *29 Cal. App. 3d 270, 273-274, 105 Cal. Rptr. 276]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsMediation EvidenceEvidenceRelevanceGeneral OverviewEvidenceRelevanceCompromise & Settlement NegotiationsEvidenceRelevanceConfusion, Prejudice & Waste of TimeEvidenceRelevanceSubsequent Remedial Measures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.69

§ 551.69 Evidence of Market Value of Property

The manner of showing the market value of real property or of any interest in it or of personal property valued as a unit is set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 810-824*. For a discussion of these statutes, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsValuation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.70

§ 551.70 Opinion Evidence

[1] Lay Witness

Unless a witness is testifying as an expert, his or her testimony in the form of an opinion is limited to an opinion that is (1) rationally based on the witness's perception and helpful to a clear understanding of his or her testimony or (2) otherwise permitted by law [*Evid. Code § 800*].

An example of an opinion permitted by law is the opinion of a property owner or the owner's spouse of the value of the property or of the property interest being valued [*see Evid. Code § 813(a)(2)*]. A lay witness may also express an opinion that a person was "drunk," that people engaged in a discussion were "angry," that an impact was strong enough to jar a passenger from a seat, or that someone appeared to be "trying to break up a fight" [*see Osborn v. Mission Ready Mix (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 104, 113, 273 Cal. Rptr. 457]* . Lay opinions of this type are admissible when matters observed by the witness are too complex or subtle to be conveyed accurately without resorting to conclusory descriptions or when the facts underlying the witness's opinion cannot be made sufficiently palpable to the jury so that the jury's means of forming an opinion based on those facts are practically equal to those of the witness [*Osborn v. Mission Ready Mix (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 104, 112-113, 273 Cal. Rptr. 457]* .

The credit and weight to be given such evidence and its effect, as well as the resolution of any conflicts between the testimony of an owner as to value and that of an expert witness, is for the trier of fact [*Windeler v. Scheers Jewelers (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 844, 853, 88 Cal. Rptr. 39]* . For another example, see discussion in [4], *below*.

Although permissible opinion testimony based on the witness's perception is admissible, a question asking a lay witness to testify to facts the witness has not personally perceived or to give an opinion not based on the witness's perception calls for an answer based on speculation or conjecture and is objectionable on that ground [*see, e.g., People v. Glancy (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 669, 680, 299 P.2d 18]* .

[2] Expert Witness

[a] Limitation on Opinion Evidence

[i] General Parameters

As to when expert witnesses may be called to testify, see discussion in *§ 551.121[12]*. The opinion testimony of an expert is limited to an opinion that is related to a subject sufficiently beyond common experience that an expert's opinion would assist the trier of fact [*Evid. Code § 801(a)*; *see, e.g.,* *Soule v. General Motors Corp. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 548, 567, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 607, 882 P.2d 298* (where minimum safety of product is within common knowledge of lay jurors, expert witnesses may not be used to demonstrate what ordinary consumer would or should expect); *Carney v. Santa Cruz Women Against Rape (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1009, 1025, 271 Cal. Rptr. 30* (expert evidence of rape trauma syndrome was not admissible to explain type of behavior lay juror normally would associate with sexual assault); *Box v. California Date Growers Assn. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 266, 274, 129 Cal. Rptr. 146]* . In addition, the opinion must be one that is based on matter (including the expert's special knowledge, skill, experience, training, and education) perceived by or personally known to the expert or made known to the expert at or before the hearing, whether or not admissible, that is of a type that reasonably may be relied on by an expert in forming an opinion on the subject to which his or her testimony relates, unless the expert is precluded by law from using such matter as a basis for his or her opinion [*Evid. Code § 801(b)*; *see* *People v. Mickey (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 612, 685-688, 286 Cal. Rptr. 801, 818 P.2d 84* , *cert. denied,* *121 L. Ed. 2d 32]* . Thus, an expert must base his or her opinion either on facts personally observed or on hypotheses that find support in the evidence. An expert may not base his or her opinion on conjecture, but may, for example, identify a causative force by a process of eliminating other causes [*People v. Sundlee (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 477, 484, 138 Cal. Rptr. 834* (cause of fire); *see* *People v. Bassett (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 122, 143 n. 21, 70 Cal. Rptr. 193, 443 P.2d 777* , and *McGuire v. Baird (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 353, 354-356, 70 P.2d 915* (on use of hypothetical questions in examining an expert)].

An expert's opinion may be based on matter that is not admissible as evidence, such as hearsay [*Evid. Code § 801(b)*; *Notrica v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 911, 932-933, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89* (expert witness, who gave opinion as to why insurance carrier had changed its reserve guideline, based opinion, in part, on interview with insurer's president that appeared in trade publication); *In re Marriage of LaBass & Munsee (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1338, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 393* (hearsay)]. If hearsay, it must be of a type reasonably relied upon by professions in the field in forming an opinion on the subject [*People ex rel. Dept. of Transportation v. Caluser/Wells Partnership (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1066, 1085, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 240* ; *Korsak v. Atlas Hotels, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1516, 1524, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833]* . However, when the opinion is based in part on inadmissible hearsay statements, it is improper for the proponent of the testimony to solicit evidence of the substance of the statements on direct examination [*Korsak v. Atlas Hotels, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1516, 1525-1527, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833* (error to permit expert witness to testify about informal survey he took regarding hotel maintenance practices to prove that hotel had failed to meet standard of care owed to its guests)]. When an expert has relied on matter that constitutes a proper basis for an opinion but is otherwise inadmissible, the court on request must at least instruct the jury that the matter is admitted only for the limited purpose of showing the basis for the expert's opinion [*People v. Coleman (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 69, 92, 211 Cal. Rptr. 102, 695 P.2d 189]* .

For a related jury instruction on expert witness testimony, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 219* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions.

[ii] Scientific Techniques

The witness's testimony may be based upon scientific techniques if those techniques are generally accepted by a typical cross-section of the relevant scientific community. This test is known as the *Kelly/Frye* foundational showing [*People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321* (citing *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 37, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144, 549 P.2d 1240*); *see also* discussion in *§ 551.66[10]*]. The *Kelly* rule does not apply to the personal opinions of an expert [*People v. McDonald (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 351, 372-373, 208 Cal. Rptr. 236, 690 P.2d 709* ; *Arreola v. County of Monterey, 99 Cal. App. 4th 722, 750, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 38* ; *Wilson v. Phillips (1999) 73*

Cal. App. 4th 250, 254-256, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 204] .

An absolute unanimity of views, however, is not required; it is sufficient that a clear majority of the members of that community support the technique [*People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321* (citing *People v. Guerra (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 385, 418, 208 Cal. Rptr. 162, 690 P.2d 635]* . Although it is questionable whether the testimony of a single witness can represent the views of an entire community, published writings in scholarly treatises and journals can be used in lieu of live testimony [*People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 611, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321* (citing *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 37, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144, 549 P.2d 1240* and *People v. Shirley (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 18, 55-56, 181 Cal. Rptr. 243, 723 P.2d 1354 , cert. denied, 459 U.S. 860*)].

Although the United States Supreme Court discarded the " *Frye*" rule, on which California's " *Kelly-Frye"* rule is based [*Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc. (1993) 509 U.S. 579, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L. Ed. 2d 469* (admissibility of scientific evidence in federal courts should be determined under broader standards contained in Fed. R. *Evid. 702*), the California Supreme Court rejected the *Daubert* analysis for purposes of determining the admissibility of evidence of *new scientific techniques* and reaffirmed the " *Kelly-Frye*" analysis [*People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 598-605, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P. 2d 321]* . The court did not, however, address the question of whether *Daubert* factors could be used in determining the *reliability* of an expert's testimony under *Evid. Code § 801(b)*. The United States Supreme Court subsequently expanded *Daubert* to "testimony based on 'technical' and 'other specialized' knowledge," i.e., to all expert testimony, holding that a trial court may consider *Daubert* factors when doing so will help determine the reliability of an expert's testimony [*Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999) 526 U.S. 137, 119 S. Ct. 1167, 143 L. Ed. 2d 238, 246]* . Whether the *Kumho* decision may have an impact on the admissibility of expert testimony in California remains to be seen.

[iii] Experimental Evidence

On the admissibility of an expert's conclusions based on an experiment conducted by him or her that lacked adequate foundation and was not conducted under substantially similar conditions to those involved in the lawsuit, see *Solis v. Southern Cal. Rapid Transit Dist. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 382, 390, 164 Cal. Rptr. 343* .

[iv] Opinion on Issue of Law

Expert opinion on an issue of law is, as a general rule, prohibited in a jury trial. The manner in which the law should apply to particular facts is a legal question and is not subject to expert opinion. Expert opinions as to the application of the law to particular facts usurps the duty of the trial court to instruct the jury on the law as applicable to the facts [*see, e.g., Summers v. A.L. Gilbert Co. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1155, 1160, 1185, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 162* (trial court erred in admitting lawyer's opinion on whether defendant had nondelegable duty and other legal issues); *Cooper Companies v. Transcontinental Ins. Co. (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1094, 1100, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 508* (meaning of insurance policy is question of law about which expert opinion testimony is inappropriate)].

[b] Opinion Based in Whole or in Part on Opinion or Statement of Another Person

If an expert testifies that his or her opinion is based in whole or in part on the opinion or statement of another person, the adverse party may call and examine the other person as if under cross examination. But this does not apply if the person on whose opinion or statement the expert relied is (1) a party, (2) a person identified with a party within the meaning of *Evid. Code § 776(d)* (discussed in *§ 551.121[11]*), or (3) a witness who has testified in the action concerning the subject matter of the opinion or statement on which the expert relied [*Evid. Code § 804(a), (b)*]. *Evid. Code § 804* neither makes admissible an expert opinion that is inadmissible because it is based in whole or in part on the opinion or statement of another person nor makes inadmissible an otherwise admissible expert opinion because it is based on the opinion or statement of a person who is unavailable for examination pursuant to *Evid. Code § 804(a)* [*Evid. Code § 804(c), (d)*]. If an expert does rely in part on the opinions of others, the expert may be cross-examined as

to the content of those opinions, but it is improper to solicit the information on direct examination if the statements are inadmissible [*Mosesian v. Pennwalt Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App.3d 851, 864, 866, 236 Cal. Rptr. 778* (objection to admission of inadmissible hearsay was waived and was otherwise not prejudicial)].

[3] Basis of Opinion and Exclusion When Improperly Based

A witness testifying in the form of an opinion may, on direct examination, state the reasons for the opinion and the matter on which it is based unless the witness is precluded by law from using such reasons or matter as a basis for the opinion [*Evid. Code § 802*]. In addition, an expert may read to the jury excerpts of the material relied upon when context is needed to understand it [*Notrica v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 911, 933, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89* (expert witness, who gave opinion as to why insurance carrier had changed its reserve guideline, based opinion, in part, on interview with defendant's president that appeared in trade publication; expert read portions of article to jury)]. The court may require that a witness testifying in the form of an opinion be first examined concerning the matter on which the opinion is based [*Evid. Code § 802*; *see* discussion in *§ 551.76*].

If an expert's opinion is based on considerations that are partially proper and partially improper, the trial court has discretion to admit or exclude the evidence [*Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 578, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330]* . However, the court may, and on the objection of a party must, exclude testimony in the form of an opinion based in whole or significant part on matter that is not a proper basis for the opinion. In that case, the witness may, if there remains a proper basis for the opinion, state the opinion after excluding from consideration the matter determined to be improper [*Evid. Code § 803*].

[4] Opinion of Sanity

A witness may state his or her opinion as to the sanity of a person when (1) the witness is an intimate acquaintance of the person whose sanity is in question; or (2) the witness was a subscribing witness to a writing, the validity of which is in dispute, signed by the person whose sanity is in question and the opinion relates to the sanity of the person at the time the writing was signed; or (3) the witness is qualified to testify in the form of an opinion under *Evid. Code § 800*, discussed in [1], *above*, or *Evid. Code § 801*, discussed in [2][a], *above* [*Evid. Code § 870*].

[5] Opinion Embracing Issue to Be Decided by Trier of Fact

The fact that otherwise admissible opinion testimony embraces the ultimate issue to be decided by the trier of fact does not make it objectionable [*Evid. Code § 805*; *see* *People v. Doss (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1585, 1596, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 590* ; *Miller v. Los Angeles County Flood Control Dist. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 689, 702, 106 Cal. Rptr. 1, 505 P.2d 193* (involving expert witness); *see also* *Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 184 Cal. Rptr. 393* (holding trial court did not err in precluding expert witness from testifying on ultimate issue of fact when jurors were fully capable of deciding that fact on basis of their own experience)].

[6] Effect of Failure to Object to Opinion or Conclusion

Incompetent testimony, such as a conclusion, if received without objection, takes on the attributes of competent proof when considered on the question of sufficiency of the evidence to support a judgment or verdict. Technically incompetent evidence admitted without objection must be given as much weight in the reviewing court in reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence as if it were competent [*see* *Berry v. Chrome Crankshaft Co. (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 324 P.2d 70]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonyExpertsAdmissibilityEvidenceTestimonyExpertsKelly-Frye

ProcessEvidenceTestimonyExpertsUltimate IssueEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesOpinion TestimonyGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesOpinion TestimonyPersonal Perceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.71

§ 551.71 Hearsay Evidence

[1] In General

"Hearsay evidence" is evidence of a statement that was made other than by a witness while testifying and that is offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted [*Evid. Code § 1200(a)*]. For the meaning of "statement," see definitions under *§ 551.60[2]*.

Implied assertions are hearsay. For example, while executing a search warrant for evidence of possession of a controlled substance for sale, an officer answers the phone and hears the caller ask to buy drugs. The caller's questions and statements are hearsay, but case law, recognized and accepted when the Evidence Code was adopted and continuing thereafter, has created an exception to the hearsay rule for this reliable type of evidence [*People v. Morgan (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 935, 940-947, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 224]* .

The admissibility or inadmissibility of hearsay evidence is governed by *Evid. Code § 1200 et seq.* However, these sections are not to be construed as repealing by implication any other statute relating to hearsay evidence [*Evid. Code § 1205*].

[2] Hearsay Rule and Result of Failure to Object

Except as provided by law, hearsay evidence is inadmissible. This is known as "the hearsay rule" [*Evid. Code § 1200(b), (c)*]. The rule embraces both written and oral expressions, and applies to electronic sound and video recordings, which are included in the definition of "writings" under *Evid. Code § 250*, discussed in *§ 551.73* [*People v. Sundlee (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 477, 483, 138 Cal. Rptr. 834]* .

Inadmissible hearsay evidence that is admitted without objection is nevertheless competent and sufficient to sustain a judgment [*see Taylor v. Hizer (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 846, 850, 106 Cal. Rptr. 603 , disapproved on other grounds in Busching v. Superior Court (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 44, 115 Cal. Rptr. 241, 524 P.2d 369* ; *Berry v. Chrome Crankshaft Co. (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 549, 552, 324 P.2d 70]* . For the distinction between hearsay and nonhearsay evidence, see California Trial Guide, Unit 40, *Hearsay* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Exceptions to Hearsay Rule

The following are excepted from the hearsay:

- Confessions and admissions [*Evid. Code §§ 1220-1228*].

- Declarations against interest [*Evid. Code § 1230*].

- Prior statements of witnesses [*Evid. Code §§ 1235-1238*; *see Sherrell v. Kelso (1981) 172 Cal. Rptr. 667]* .

- Spontaneous, contemporaneous, and dying declarations [*Evid. Code §§ 1240-1242*].

- Statements of mental or physical state [*Evid. Code §§ 1250-1252*].

- Statements relating to wills and to claims against estates [*Evid. Code §§ 1260, 1261*].

- Business records [*Evid. Code §§ 1270-1272*].

- Official records and other official writings [*Evid. Code §§ 1280-1284*].

- Former testimony [*Evid. Code §§ 1290-1293*].

- Judgments [*Evid. Code §§ 1300-1302*].

- Family history [*Evid. Code §§ 1310-1316*].

- Reputation and statements concerning community history, property interests, and character [*Evid. Code §§ 1320-1324*].

- Dispositive instruments and ancient writings [*Evid. Code §§ 1330, 1331*].

- Commercial, scientific, and similar publications [*Evid. Code §§ 1340, 1341*].

- Statements of the infliction or threat of physical injury upon the declarant made at or near the time of the infliction or threat of physical injury to a physician, nurse, paramedic, or to a law enforcement official [*Evid. Code § 1370*; *see People v. Pantoja (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-15, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 492]* . "At or near" denotes a time close to the infliction of the injury, which in most circumstances will be within hours or days, rather than weeks or months [*People v. Quitiquit (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1, 9-10, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 674* (statement about physical injury made almost two months after its infliction did not satisfy statutory time limit)].

- Elder and dependent adults exception (if declarant is unavailable as a witness) [*Evid. Code § 1380*; *see People v. Tatum (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 288, 295-300, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 267* ; *but see People v. Pirwani (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 770, 782-787, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 673* (*Evid. Code § 1380* as applied in criminal action was unconstitutional, because out-of-court testimonial statements by witnesses to law enforcement officials were barred by *Sixth Amendment's Confrontation Clause* even if there had been judicial determination that statement bore particularized guarantees of trustworthiness, unless defendant had prior opportunity to cross-examine witness and witness was unavailable to testify at trial)].

Exceptions to the hearsay rule are not limited to those enumerated in the Evidence Code but also may be found in other codes and decisional law. Even if a statute does not explicitly create a hearsay exception, an implicit exception may exist if the hearsay evidence is sufficiently competent, reliable, and trustworthy and if there is an indication that the Legislature intended to admit the evidence and to allow a court to rely on it in reaching a decision [*see In re Malinda S. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 368, 376-378, 382, 272 Cal. Rptr. 787, 795 P. 2d 1244]* .

For a discussion of the exceptions to the hearsay rule, see *California Trial Guide, § 40.20 et seq.* (Matthew Bender).

[4] Hearsay Statement Consisting of One or More Statements Within Hearsay Exception

A statement within the scope of an exception to the hearsay rule is not inadmissible on the ground that evidence of the statement is hearsay evidence if the hearsay evidence consists of one or more statements that each meets the requirements of an exception to the hearsay rule [*Evid. Code § 1201*]. Thus, use of two or more exceptions to the hearsay rule to make double or multiple hearsay evidence admissible is proper [*People v. Perez (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 718, 730, 148 Cal. Rptr. 90]* .

[5] Evidence of Hearsay Declarant's Credibility

Evidence of a statement or other conduct by a declarant that is inconsistent with a statement by the declarant received in evidence as hearsay evidence is admissible for the purpose of attacking the credibility of the declarant, even though he or she is not given and has not had an opportunity to explain or to deny the inconsistent statement or other conduct [*Evid. Code § 1202*]. The purpose of this provision is one of fairness to the party against whom the hearsay evidence was admitted without opportunity to cross-examine or impeach the unavailable hearsay declarant; it merely permits impeaching evidence without the necessity that the declarant be given an opportunity to explain or to deny the inconsistency [*see People v. Ross (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 391, 406, 154 Cal. Rptr. 783]* .

In addition, any other evidence offered to attack or support the credibility of the declarant is admissible if it would have been admissible had the declarant been a witness at the hearing [*Evid. Code § 1202*]. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that the unavailability of a hearsay declarant will not prevent introduction of relevant evidence that would have been admissible had the declarant been in court [*People v. Marquez (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 993, 998, 152 Cal. Rptr. 200]* .

For the purposes of this rule, the deponent of a deposition taken in the action in which it is offered is deemed to be a hearsay declarant [*Evid. Code § 1202*].

Evid. Code § 1202 deals with the impeachment of a declarant whose hearsay statement is in evidence and does not apply to the impeachment of a witness who has testified [*People v. Williams (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 663, 668, 128 Cal. Rptr. 888, 547 P.2d 1000* ; on impeachment of witness based on prior inconsistent statement, see discussion in *§ 551.121[9]*].

[6] Examination of Hearsay Declarant

The declarant of a statement admitted as hearsay evidence may be called and examined by any adverse party as if under cross-examination concerning the statement [*Evid. Code § 1203(a)*]. But this does not apply if the declarant is a party, a person identified with a party within the meaning of *Evid. Code § 776(d)* (discussed in *§ 551.121[11]*), or a witness who has testified in the action concerning the subject matter of the statement [*Evid. Code § 1203(b)*]. Nor does it apply if the statement is one described in *Evid. Code §§ 1220-1228* (confessions and admissions), *1235-1238* (prior statements of witnesses), or *1300-1302* (judgments) [*Evid. Code § 1203(c)*].

However, a statement otherwise admissible as hearsay evidence is not made inadmissible by *Evid. Code § 1203* because

the declarant who made the statement is unavailable for examination pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1203(a)* [*Evid. Code § 1203(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceHearsayGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayCredibility of DeclarantsGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayExceptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayHearsay Within HearsayEvidenceHearsayRule ComponentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.72

§ 551.72 "Unavailable as a Witness" Defined

Several Evidence Code provisions use the term "unavailable as a witness" when referring to statements made by a nonwitness declarant, that is, to the admissibility or use of hearsay evidence [*see, e.g., Evid. Code §§ 804(d)* (expert opinion testimony based on statements of others), *1230* (declaration against interest as exception to hearsay rule), *1310* (statement of declarant concerning his or her own family history as exception to hearsay rule)]. The phrase is defined as meaning a declarant who is any of the following [*Evid. Code § 240(a)*]:

- Exempted or precluded on the ground of privilege from testifying concerning the matter to which his or her statement is relevant [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(1)*]. For a discussion of privileges, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* .

- Disqualified from testifying to the matter [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(2)*].

- Dead or unable to attend or to testify at the hearing because of then-existing physical or mental illness or infirmity [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(3)*]. Expert testimony establishing that physical or mental trauma resulting from an alleged crime has caused harm to a witness of sufficient severity that the witness is physically unable to testify or is unable to testify without suffering substantial trauma may constitute a sufficient showing of "unavailability" within the meaning of *Evid. Code § 240(a)(3)* [*Evid. Code § 240(c)*]. Appellate courts should independently review a trial court's determination that a witness is unavailable due to then existing mental illness or infirmity or because crime-induced mental trauma renders the witness unable to testify without suffering substantial trauma [*People v. Winslow (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 464, 469-473, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872]* .

- Absent from the hearing and the court is unable to compel his or her attendance by its process [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(4)*].

- Absent from the hearing and the proponent of his or her statement has exercised reasonable diligence but has been unable to procure his or her attendance by the court's process [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(5)*].

> Whether reasonable diligence is shown is a factual question and what constitutes reasonable diligence to secure the presence of a witness depends on the facts of the individual case [*see Gordon v. D & G Escrow Corp. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 616, 624, 122 Cal. Rptr. 150* (using "due" diligence as synonymous with "reasonable" diligence and holding trial court did not err in excluding declarations against interest when all efforts to find declarant were "stale" with possible exception of telephone directory check)].

A declarant is not unavailable as a witness if the exemption, preclusion, disqualification, death, inability, or absence of the declarant was brought about by the procurement or wrongdoing of the proponent of his or her statement for the purpose of preventing the declarant from attending or testifying [*Evid. Code § 240(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceHearsayUnavailabilityAbsence of DeclarantsEvidenceHearsayUnavailabilityInability to TestifyGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayUnavailabilityInability to TestifyDeathEvidenceHearsayUnavailabilityInability to TestifyDisabilityEvidenceHearsayUnavailabilityPrivileges

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.73

§ 551.73 Writings

[1] "Writing," "Original," and "Duplicate" Defined

A "writing" is defined as meaning handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostating, photographing, and every other means of recording on any tangible thing any form of communication or representation, including letters, words, pictures, sounds, or symbols, or any combination of these [*Evid. Code § 250*]. Hence, properly authenticated tape recordings are admissible in evidence as "writings" [*Darley v. Ward (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 257, 261, 168 Cal. Rptr. 481, 617 P.2d 1113* ; *Jones v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 436, 441-442, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 528* (videotape of plaintiff's daily activities in personal injury action); *People v. Archer (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 197, 207-209, 263 Cal. Rptr. 486* (videotapes)] provided they do not violate the hearsay rule, discussed *above* [*People v. Sundlee (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 477, 483, 138 Cal. Rptr. 834]* . *Evid. Code § 250* does not, however, apply to the recording and reporting of depositions. The procedural aspects of recording and reporting depositions are governed by the Code of Civil Procedure [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 17, 2004,* and *2025(l)* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.340* effective July 1, 2005); *Bailey v. Superior Court (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 970, 974, 976, 140 Cal. Rptr. 669, 568 P.2d 394]* .

"Original" means the writing itself or any counterpart intended to have the same effect by a person executing or issuing it. An "original" of a photograph includes the negative or any print made from it. If data are stored in a computer or similar device, any printout or other output readable by sight, shown to reflect the data accurately, is an "original" [*Evid. Code § 255*]. Additionally, if a writing of any sort has been damaged or destroyed by "explosion, conflagration, earthquake, disaster or other public calamity," an interested person may petition a court for an order "establishing, reciting, or declaring the existence, substance, genuineness or authenticity" of the writing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1953.10*; for discussion, *see* Ch. 356, *Lost Papers* ; *see also § 551.74[6]*]. The order will be deemed in lieu of the original and have the same effect as if the original had not been damaged, destroyed or otherwise rendered wholly or partly illegible [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1953.13*].

A "duplicate" is a counterpart produced by the same impression as the original, or from the same matrix, or by means of photography, including enlargements, miniatures, or by mechanical or electronic recording, or by chemical reproduction, or by other equivalent technique that accurately reproduces the original [*Evid. Code § 260*].

[2] Authentication of Writings

A writing must be authenticated before it is received in evidence or before secondary evidence of its content may be received in evidence [*Evid. Code § 1401*]. Any alteration or apparent alteration in the writing must be accounted for [*Evid. Code § 1402*]. A writing is authenticated when (1) evidence has been introduced sufficient to sustain a finding that it is the writing that the proponent of the evidence claims it is, or (2) such facts are established by any other means provided by law [*Evid. Code § 1400*; *see Osswald v. Anderson (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 812, 819-820, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 23* (trial court erred in finding sufficient evidence of authenticity); *McAllister v. George (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 258, 262, 140 Cal. Rptr. 702]* .

The manner of authenticating writings is set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 1410-1421* (authentication) and *Evid. Code § 645.1* (newspaper or periodical presumption), although nothing in these sections is to be construed to limit the means by which a writing may be authenticated or proved [*Evid. Code § 1410*]. The means of authentication set forth in *Evid. Code § 1410 et seq.* are not exclusive. Circumstantial evidence, content and location are all valid means of authentication [*People v. Gibson (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 371, 383, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 809]* . The parties may also stipulate to the authenticity of any particular writing, or admit it in the pleadings, in which event evidence authenticating the writing normally may be dispensed with [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 1400*]. Otherwise, the proponent of the evidence has the burden of complying with the authentication requirements of *Evid. Code § 1410* [*Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1094, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835]* .

[3] Presumptions Affecting Writings

Presumptions affecting acknowledged writings, seals, and signatures of public employees, notaries public, and foreign officials are set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 1450-1454*. Presumptions relating to copies of writings in the custody of a public entity and to official records of writings are set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 1530* and *1532*, respectively. Presumptions relating to photographic copies and printed representations of business records, lost or destroyed records, computer information or programs, and video or digital images are set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 1550-1553*. A presumption that a regularly issued newspaper or periodical is that newspaper or periodical is set forth in *Evid. Code § 645.1*.

These presumptions affect the burden of producing evidence [*Evid. Code §§ 630, 1450, 1532(b)*]. For the effect of such presumptions, see discussion in *§ 551.102[2]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceAuthenticationGeneral OverviewEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.74

§ 551.74 Proof of Contents of Writings

[1] Repeal of Best Evidence Rule and Enactment of Secondary Evidence Rule

Provisions of the Evidence Code pertaining to proof of the contents of writings were repealed and replaced with new sections in 1998, effective January 1, 1999. The "Best Evidence" Rule [former *Evid. Code § 1500*] and its exceptions [former *Evid. Code §§ 1500.5-1511*] were repealed and replaced by a new "Secondary Evidence Rule" [*Evid. Code § 1521*] and related sections [*Evid. Code §§ 1520-1523, 1552-1553*, effective January 1, 1999].

[2] Proof of Content by Original Writing

The content of a writing may be proved by an otherwise admissible original [*Evid. Code § 1520*].

[3] General Rules for Proof of Content Under Secondary Evidence Rule

The content of a writing may be proved by otherwise admissible secondary evidence [*Evid. Code § 1521(a)*]. This rule is known as the "Secondary Evidence Rule" [*Evid. Code § 1521(d)*]. A corollary of the rule that the contents of lost documents may be proved by secondary evidence is that the law does not require that the contents be proved verbatim [*Dart Industries, Inc. v. Commercial Union Ins. Co. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 1059, 1069, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142, 52 P.3d 79]* . Courts have admitted many types of secondary evidence to prove the contents of a missing instrument, including:

- Oral testimony [*see* *Dart Industries, Inc. v. Commercial Union Ins. Co. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 1059, 1068-1071, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142, 52 P.3d 79* (oral testimony to establish contents of lost insurance policy); *Kenniff v. Caulfield (1903) 140 Cal. 34, 43, 73 P. 803* (only evidence of contents of lost and unrecorded deed to parcel of real property was testimony of conveyancer who drafted it); *Posten v. Rassette (1855) 5 Cal. 467, 469-470* (testimony sufficient to establish existence, loss, and contents of power of attorney); *Rogers v. Prudential Ins. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1132, 267 Cal. Rptr. 499* (proof of contents of lost insurance policy through testimony of insurer's employees or copies of other policies sold at same time utilizing similar provisions); *Robinson v. Thornton (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 605, 611-612, 76 Cal. Rptr. 835* (testimony of contracting party to lost contract to repurchase gas lease);

Guardianship of Levy (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 237, 249, 290 P.2d 320 (testimony of recipient of lost letters); *Clendenin v. Benson (1931) 117 Cal. App. 674, 4 P.2d 616* (testimony of insurer's employees and insurer's records to lost insurance policy); *Seaboard National Bank v. Ackerman (1911) 16 Cal.App. 55, 57, 116 P. 91* (testimony establishing record of judgment destroyed by fire); *Hedstrom v. Union Trust Co. (1908) 7 Cal. App. 278, 286, 94 P. 386* (testimony of drafter of lost lease). *See* [4], *below*].

- Standard form of the lost document [*see* *Kenniff v. Caulfield (1903) 140 Cal. 34, 43, 73 P. 803* (blank form used in drafting lost deed)].

- Evidence of a routine practice of a party [*see* *Amoco Production Co. v. United States (10th Cir. 1980) 619 F.2d 1383, 1389-1390* (lost deed; grantor's routine practice of reserving mineral interest in all property deeded); *see also* *Rogers v. Prudential Ins. Co. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1132, 267 Cal. Rptr. 499* (proof of contents of lost insurance policy through testimony of insurer's employees or copies of other policies sold at same time utilizing similar provisions)].

Secondary evidence of the content of a writing is inadmissible if the court determines either [*Evid. Code § 1521(a)*]:

- A genuine dispute exists concerning material terms of the writing and justice requires its exclusion; or

- Admission of the secondary evidence would be unfair.

In criminal actions, additional grounds for exclusion of secondary evidence apply [*Evid. Code § 1522*].

Secondary evidence includes both writings and oral testimony [*see* former *Evid. Code § 1509* ("Secondary evidence, whether *written or oral*, of the content of a writing" (emphasis added)); *People v. Crosby (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 713, 726-727, 25 Cal. Rptr. 847, 375 P.2d 839* (testimony as to contents of writing was "secondary evidence"); *Stenseth v. Wells Fargo Bank (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 457, 463, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192* (former *Evid. Code § 1505* permitted oral testimony as secondary evidence of contents of writing, but only if witness had personal knowledge of original)].

The proponent of the evidence still must comply with the authentication requirements [*Evid. Code § 1521(c)*]. *Evid. Code § 1401(b)* provides: "Authentication of a writing is required before secondary evidence of its content may be received in evidence" [*see* discussion in *§ 551.73[2]*].

If oral testimony to prove the content of a writing is inadmissible under *Evid. Code § 1523* (oral testimony of content of writing; see discussion in [4], *below*), nothing in the "Secondary Evidence Rule" makes such testimony admissible [*Evid. Code § 1521(b)*].

Particular provisions govern the proof of the contents of writings through oral testimony, official records, and photographic copies and printed representations of business records, lost or destroyed records, computer information and programs, and video or digital images, as discussed in [4]-[6], *below*.

[4] Proof of Content by Oral Testimony

Oral testimony is not admissible to prove the content of a writing except as otherwise provided by statute [*Evid. Code § 1523(a)*].

Oral testimony of the content of a writing is not made inadmissible by this rule if:

- The proponent does not have possession or control of a copy of the writing and the original is lost or has been destroyed without fraudulent intent on the part of the proponent of the evidence [*Evid. Code § 1523(b)*].

- The proponent does not have possession or control of the original or a copy of the writing and either of the following conditions is satisfied [*Evid. Code § 1523(c)*]:

  - Neither the writing nor a copy of the writing was reasonably procurable by the proponent by use of the court's process or by other available means;

  - The writing is not closely related to the controlling issues and it would be inexpedient to require its production.

- The writing consists of numerous accounts or other writings that cannot be examined in court without great loss of time, and the evidence sought from them is only the general result of the whole [*Evid. Code § 1523(d)*].

Evid. Code § 1523 follows the approach of former *Evid. Code §§ 1505* and *1508*, not allowing the proponent to elect to offer either a copy or oral testimony of a writing, but rather requiring proof by a copy whenever the proponent has possession or control of a copy.

When oral testimony as to the contents of a writing is admissible, the witness must have personal knowledge of the original [*see, e.g., Stenseth v. Wells Fargo Bank (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 457, 463, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 192* (decided under former *Evid. Code § 1505*)].

[5] Proof of Content by Official Records

A purported copy of a writing in the custody of a public entity, or of an entry in such a writing, is prima facie evidence of the existence and content of such writing or entry if [*Evid. Code § 1530(a)*]:

- The copy purports to be published by the authority of the nation or state, or public entity therein, in which the writing is kept;

- The office in which the writing is kept is within the United States or specified territories, and the copy is attested or certified as a correct copy of the writing or entry by a public employee, or a deputy thereof, having the legal custody of the writing; or

- The office in which the writing is kept is not within the United States or any of the specified territories and the copy is attested as a correct copy of the writing or entry by a person having authority to make attestation. The attestation must be made according to the requirements specified in *Evid. Code § 1530(a)(3)*.

For purposes of admissibility, whenever a copy of a writing is attested or certified, the attestation or certificate must state in substance that the copy is a correct copy of the original, or of a specified part thereof, as the case may be [*Evid. Code § 1531*].

The official record of a writing is prima facie evidence of the existence and content of the original recorded writing if [*Evid. Code § 1532(a)*]:

- The record is in fact a record of an office of a public entity; and

- A statute authorized such a writing to be recorded in that office.

The presumption established by *Evid. Code § 1532(a)* is a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence [*Evid. Code § 1532(b)*].

The admissibility of certain abstracts of title or certified instruments affecting title to prove the contents of the official record of any writing lost or destroyed by conflagration or other public calamity is governed by *Evid. Code § 1601*.

[6] Proof of Content by Photographic Copies and Printed Representations

[a] Business Records

Certain copies or reproductions of a writing are as admissible as the writing itself if the copy or reproduction was made and preserved as a part of the records of a business (as defined by *Evid. Code § 1270*) in the regular course of that business [*Evid. Code § 1550*]. The permitted copies or reproductions are:

- A nonerasable optical image reproduction, provided that additions, deletions, or changes to the original document are not permitted by the technology;

- A photostatic, microfilm, microcard, miniature photographic, or other photographic copy or reproduction, or an enlargement thereof.

The introduction of the copy, reproduction, or enlargement does not preclude admission of the original writing if it is still in existence. A court may require the introduction of a hard-copy printout of the document [*Evid. Code § 1550*].

The production and transmission of business records pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum and their admissibility are governed by *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566*.

[a.1] Criminal Justice Documents

Reproductions of files, records, writings, photographs, fingerprints, or other instruments in the official custody of a criminal justice agency that were microphotographed or otherwise reproduced in a manner that conforms with the provisions of *Pen. Code §§ 11106.1*, *11106.2* or *11106.3* are admissible to the same extent and under the same circumstances as the original file, record, writing, or other instrument would be admissible [*Evid. Code § 1550.1*].

Pen. Code § 11106.1 provides that any system of microphotography, optical disk, or reproduction by other techniques that do not permit additions, deletions, or changes to the original document, may be used by the Department of Justice as a photographic reproduction process to record some or all instruments, papers, photographs, and notices that are required or permitted by law to be recorded or filed. All storage media must comply with minimum standards of quality approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. *Pen. Code § 11106.2* permits any criminal justice agency to cause any or all files or records in its official custody to be microphotographed or otherwise reproduced pursuant to *Pen. Code § 11106.1*, as in the case of original filings or recordings, or both. Every reproduction is deemed and considered an original, and as a transcript, exemplification or certified copy, as the case may be, of the original. *Pen. Code § 11106.3* allows fingerprints to be stored or created in an electronic format that does not permit additions, deletions, or changes to the original fingerprints so long as the storage medium complies with the minimum standards of quality approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

[b] Lost or Destroyed Records

Certain reproductions of destroyed or lost writings are admissible as the original writing itself. Those reproductions are

[*Evid. Code § 1551*]:

- A print from a photographic film of an original writing, made after the film was taken, whether or not the print was enlarged; photographic film includes a photographic plate, microphotographic film, photostatic negative, or similar reproduction;

- A reproduction from an electronic recording of video images on magnetic surfaces.

Such a reproduction is admissible as the original writing itself if, at the time of its taking, the person under whose direction and control it was taken attached thereto, or to the sealed container in which it was placed and has been kept, or incorporated in the film or electronic recording, a certification complying with the provisions of *Evid. Code § 1531* and stating the date on which, and the fact that, it was so taken under his or her direction and control.

Alternatively, if a writing has been damaged or destroyed by an explosion, fire, or other public calamity, a court may be requested to issue an order establishing the existence and contents of the writing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1953.10*; for discussion, *see* Ch. 356, *Lost Papers*]. The order has the same effect as the original document [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1953.13*]. In such cases, the secondary evidence rule is not implicated; the court's order is the best evidence of the writing [*Daddario v. Snow Valley (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1325, 1337-1338* (decided under former *Evid. Code § 1500*)].

[c] Computer Information or Programs

A printed representation of computer information or a computer program is presumed to be an accurate representation of the computer information or computer program that it purports to represent [*Evid. Code § 1552(a)*]. This presumption is a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence. If a party to an action introduces evidence that a printed representation of computer information or computer program is inaccurate or unreliable, the party introducing the printed representation into evidence has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of evidence, that the printed representation is an accurate representation of the existence and content of the computer information or computer program that it purports to represent.

These provisions do not apply to computer-generated official records certified in accordance with *Evid. Code §§ 452.5* or *1530* [*Evid. Code § 1552(b)*].

Although admissible, computer printouts must qualify under some hearsay exception, such as the business records exception [*see Evid. Code § 1271*; *but see, People v. Hawkins (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1428, 1448-1450, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 627* (true test for admissibility of printout reflecting computer's internal operations is not whether printout was made in regular course of business, but whether computer was operating properly at time of printout, and trial court did not err in rejecting hearsay objection and admitting printouts into evidence); for discussion of photographic copies and printed representations of business records, *see § 551.74[6][a]*], if the printouts are offered to prove their contents [*Aguimatang v. California State Lottery (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 769, 797, 286 Cal. Rptr. 57]* .

[d] Video or Digital Images

A printed representation of images stored on a video or digital medium is presumed to be an accurate representation of the images it purports to represent [*Evid. Code § 1553*]. This presumption is a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence. If a party to an action introduces evidence that a printed representation of images stored on a video or digital medium is inaccurate or unreliable, the party introducing the printed representation into evidence has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of evidence, that the printed representation is an accurate representation of the existence and content of the images that it purports to represent.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDocumentary EvidenceBest Evidence RuleEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.75

§ 551.75 Parol Evidence Rule

The parol evidence rule prohibits the introduction of extrinsic evidence to vary the terms of an integrated written instrument [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1856*; *Com. Code § 2202* (contracts for sale of goods)]. For a discussion of this rule, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* , Introduction, Subpt. B, and Ch. 500, *Sales and Secured Transactions* , Pt. I, Subpt. B.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceParol EvidenceEvidenceRelevanceParol Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.76

§ 551.76 Determination of Preliminary Fact

[1] When Required

The admissibility or inadmissibility of proffered evidence may depend on the existence or nonexistence of a preliminary fact [*see Evid. Code § 401*]. A "preliminary fact" is a fact that must exist in order for evidence to be admissible [*Evid. Code § 400*]. Preliminary facts include the relevancy of proffered evidence, a witness's knowledge, the authenticity of a writing, and the existence of a privilege [*see Evid. Code §§ 400, 403(a)*; *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Hacienda Mobile Home Park (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 519, 530,119 Cal. Rptr. 559]* . For privileges, see discussion in *§ 551.118*. When the existence of a preliminary fact is disputed, its existence or nonexistence must be determined as provided in *Evid. Code §§ 400-406* [*Evid. Code §§ 310, 402(a)*]. *Evid. Code §§ 400-406* do not, however, limit the right of a party to introduce evidence relevant to weight or credibility [*Evid. Code § 406*].

[2] Hearing and Ruling

The court may hear and determine the question of the admissibility of evidence out of the presence or hearing of the jury [*Evid. Code § 402(b)*]. *Evid. Code § 402(b)* has, however, been construed to give the court discretion to decide the admissibility of evidence within the presence of the jury [*People v. Mattison (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 177, 187, 93 Cal. Rptr. 185, 481 P.2d 193* (admissibility of dying declaration); *Mize v. Atchison, T. & S.F. Ry. Co. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 436, 448, 120 Cal. Rptr. 787* (preliminary facts in support of claim of lawyer-client and work-product privilege)]. Nevertheless, when there is a danger that hearing evidence of the preliminary fact will have a prejudicial effect on the jury, the court should conduct the hearing outside its presence [*see People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Glen Arms Estate, Inc. (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 841, 863-864, 41 Cal. Rptr. 303* (determination of whether statement constituted offer of compromise or was admission against interest)].

A ruling on the admissibility of evidence implies whatever finding of fact is prerequisite to it, and a separate or formal finding is unnecessary unless required by statute [*Evid. Code § 402(c)*].

[3] Procedure

[a] Generally

The procedure for determining preliminary facts is set forth in *Evid. Code §§ 403*, *404*, and *405*, discussed *below*. Each of these sections applies to different kinds of preliminary facts. *Evid. Code § 403* applies to preliminary facts going to relevancy, personal knowledge, authenticity, or the statement or conduct of another person. *Evid. Code § 404* applies to the privilege against self-incrimination, and *Evid. Code § 405* applies to all other preliminary facts.

[b] Relevancy, Personal Knowledge, Authenticity, or Statement or Conduct of Person

The proponent of the proffered evidence has the burden of producing evidence as to the existence of the preliminary fact, and the proffered evidence is inadmissible unless the court finds there is evidence sufficient to sustain a finding of the existence of the preliminary fact when [*Evid. Code § 403(a)*]:

- The relevance of the proffered evidence depends on the existence of the preliminary fact;

- The preliminary fact is the personal knowledge of a witness concerning the subject matter of his or her testimony;

- The preliminary fact is the authenticity of a writing; or

- The proffered evidence is of a statement or other conduct of a particular person and the preliminary fact is whether that person made the statement or so conducted himself or herself.

Subject to *Evid. Code § 702*, which requires a witness to have personal knowledge of the matter to which he or she testifies (discussed in *§ 551.121[2]*), the court may conditionally admit the proffered evidence, subject to evidence of the preliminary fact being supplied later in the course of the trial [*Evid. Code § 403(b)*].

If the court admits the proffered evidence, the court (1) may, and on request must, instruct the jury to determine whether the preliminary fact exists and to disregard the proffered evidence unless the jury finds the preliminary fact does exist, and (2) must instruct the jury to disregard the proffered evidence if the court subsequently determines that a jury could not reasonably find that the preliminary fact exists [*Evid. Code § 403(c)*]. Thus, under *Evid. Code § 403*, the court decides merely whether there has been a prima facie showing of the existence of the preliminary fact; the final decision as to its existence or nonexistence is made by the jury.

[c] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

Whenever the proffered evidence is claimed to be privileged under *Evid. Code § 940* (privilege against self-incrimination; for discussion of privileges, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons*), the person claiming the privilege has the burden of showing that the proffered evidence might tend to incriminate him or her. The proffered evidence is inadmissible unless it clearly appears to the court that the proffered evidence cannot possibly have a tendency to incriminate the person claiming the privilege [*Evid. Code § 404*].

[d] Determinations in Other Cases

With respect to preliminary fact determinations not governed by *Evid. Code § 403* or *404*, if the existence of a preliminary fact is disputed, the court must indicate which party has the burden of producing evidence [*Evid. Code § 110*] and the burden of proof [*Evid. Code § 115*, also discussed in Subpart F] on the issue as implied by the rule of law under which the question arises. The court must determine the existence or nonexistence of the preliminary fact and admit or exclude the proffered evidence as required by the rule of law under which the question arises [*Evid. Code § 405(a)*].

If the preliminary fact is also a fact in issue, the jury must not be informed of the court's determination as to the existence or nonexistence of the preliminary fact and, if the proffered evidence is admitted, the jury must not be instructed to disregard the evidence if its determination of the fact differs from the court's determination of the preliminary fact [*Evid. Code § 405(b)*].

Thus, under *Evid. Code § 405*, as distinguished from the determination of a preliminary fact under *Evid. Code § 403*, discussed in *§ 551.76[3][b]*, the court alone decides the foundational question.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsAdmissibility of EvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsAdmissibility of EvidenceExistence of PrivilegesEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsHearings Out of Jury's PresenceEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsPreliminary QuestionsWeight & Credibility of Evidence

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.77

§ 551.77 Objections to Evidence

[1] Manner of Objecting

Objections to evidence should be addressed to the court and not to opposing counsel [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.14]. An objection to proffered evidence need not be in any particular form but it must be timely made and clearly state the specific ground on which it is made [*see Evid. Code § 353(a)*; *see also Rodriguez v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 626, 660, 151 Cal. Rptr. 399* ; *People v. Gibson (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 119, 137, 128 Cal. Rptr. 302]* . The failure to object at all waives any claim of error [*Coit Drapery Cleaners, Inc. v. Sequoia Ins. Co. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1595, 1611, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 692]* . Arguments should be brief and few and, whether at the side bench or in chambers, should be reported [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.41].

Although counsel may properly phrase the objection and ground in the form of a complete sentence, e.g., "Your Honor, I object on the ground the question calls for hearsay," frequently, the objection need be no more complicated than stating the word "objection" followed by the ground, e.g., "Objection--hearsay." Merely stating "I object," without specifying the ground, however, is insufficient and does not preserve the point for review on appeal [*see Evid. Code § 353(a)*]. Unlike argument on the objection, which normally should be heard out of the jury's hearing (see discussion under [2][a], *below*), an evidentiary objection and a statement of the legal grounds ordinarily may be made within the hearing of the jury. But the court will not normally allow counsel to argue the case or make gratuitous remarks under the guise of stating an objection [*see Continental Dairy Equip. Co. v. Lawrence (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 378, 384, 94 Cal. Rptr. 887]* .

Whether counsel objects to an otherwise objectionable question is frequently a matter of trial tactics and a weighing of the effect of the objection on the jury. However, an objection is mandatory if the point is to be considered on appeal [*see Evid. Code § 353(a)*; *Jackson v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 730, 738, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 712* ; *Haskell v. Carli (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 124, 129, 240 Cal. Rptr. 439* (party seeking to preserve issue for appeal must not only object but secure ruling on objection)]. Moreover, certain otherwise inadmissible evidence will support a judgment if it comes in without objection. The most notable examples are opinion evidence, hearsay evidence, and secondary evidence. Consequently, proper objections should be made to any inadmissible evidence that would be

adverse to the party's claim or defense. In addition, counsel should object if the evidence is admissible as to one party or for one purpose and is inadmissible as to another party or for another purpose (*see Evid. Code § 355*) and this is not made clear by the party proffering it. The objecting counsel should request the court to restrict the evidence to its proper scope and, in a jury trial, to instruct the jury accordingly [*see Evid. Code § 355*].

For a listing of common objections and their grounds, see *§ 551.222*.

[2] Argument on Objection

[a] When Allowed

Unless the court instructs otherwise, counsel may argue on an objection before the court rules but not afterwards [*see Bennett v. Superior Court (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 203, 216, 166 P.2d 318]* . Hence, to avoid an admonishment from the court or a possible mistrial, counsel should request the court's permission before arguing an objection. This is expressly required by some courts [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.41].

[b] Out of Jury's Hearing

In a jury trial, any argument on an objection normally should be made out of the jury's hearing at the side bench or in the judge's chamber, and this is expressly required by some courts [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.41].

[3] Offer of Proof

In response to an objection that a question, for example, is irrelevant, counsel may wish to make an offer of proof before the court rules [*see Evid. Code § 354(a)*]. However, counsel first should request permission to make an offer of proof, and offers of proof normally should be made out of the jury's hearing [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.42]. The purpose of an offer of proof is not only to persuade the trial court that the evidence is admissible but to preserve a record on appeal in the event the court sustains the objection [*see Evid. Code § 354*].

An offer of proof must make known to the court the substance, purpose, and relevance of the evidence offered [*see Evid. Code § 354(a)*]. For example, an offer is inadequate if it shows only the substance of facts sought to be proved instead of the substance of the evidence offered [*see McCleery v. City of Bakersfield (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1072-1075, 216 Cal. Rptr. 852]* .

An offer of proof is not required when:

- When the question itself makes known to the court the substance, purpose, and relevance of the excluded evidence [*Evid. Code § 354(a)*].

- The rulings of the court make an offer of proof futile [*Evid. Code § 354(b)*; *see Castaneda v. Bornstein (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1818, 1827* (no offer of proof required after court bars introduction of entire class of evidence or of all evidence on particular issue); *Reely v. Chapman (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 260, 263, 2 Cal. Rptr. 188* (generally necessary to make formal offer of proof except when the rulings are such as would exclude the testimony altogether)].

- The question was asked during cross or recross-examination [*Evid. Code § 354(c)*].

[4] Ruling on Objection

On occasion, courts will conditionally admit evidence to which an objection has been made by either reserving its ruling

on the objection or by admitting the evidence subject to a subsequent motion to strike [*see Evid. Code § 403(b)* (conditional admission of evidence subject to evidence of preliminary fact being supplied later in course of trial); *Gribaldo, Jacobs, Jones & Associates v. Agrippina Versicherunges A.G. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 434, 443 n. 6, 91 Cal. Rptr. 6, 476 P.2d 406]* . Thus, a court could allow potentially inadmissible evidence to be introduced subject to the opponent's motion to strike if the proponent of the evidence subsequently failed to lay a foundation for it [*Douglass v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 645, 658, 190 Cal. Rptr. 506]* . If the court subsequently fails to rule, counsel must be sure to remind it that it reserved ruling. If the evidence was conditionally admitted subject to a subsequent motion to strike, counsel must make the subsequent motion if the testimony is to be stricken [*see Ault v. International Harvester Co. (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 113, 123, 117 Cal. Rptr. 812, 528 P.2d 1148* (objection to conditionally admitted evidence waived by failure to move to strike); *see also Mosesian v. Pennwalt Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 851, 856-865, 236 Cal. Rptr. 778* (objection to conditionally admitted evidence and other evidence waived by failure to move to strike and failure to state correct ground)].

[5] Exception to Court's Ruling or Order

An exception is an objection on a matter of law to a decision made and normally must be taken at the time the decision is made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 646*]. However, a ruling sustaining or overruling an objection and an order granting or denying a motion to strike evidence or testimony are both deemed excepted to, and no express exception is required [*Code Civ. Proc. § 647*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for ReviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofOffers of ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofTimelinessEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRulings on Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
E. Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.78-551.89

[Reserved]

§§ 551.78[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Burden of Proof and of Producing Evidence and Weight of Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.90

§ 551.90 Burden of Proof

[1] Defined

"Proof" is defined in *Evid. Code § 190* [*see* discussion in *§ 551.60[2]*]. "Burden of proof" means the obligation of a party to establish by evidence a requisite degree of belief concerning a fact in the mind of the trier of fact or the court [*Evid. Code § 115*; for related jury instruction on burden of proof, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 200* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions].

The burden of proof may require a party to raise a reasonable doubt concerning the existence or nonexistence of a fact, or require the party to establish the existence or nonexistence of a fact by a preponderance of the evidence, by clear and convincing proof, or by proof beyond a reasonable doubt [*Evid. Code § 115*]. For further discussion of these standards of proof, see *§ 551.92*.

[2] General Rule: Burden of Proving Each Essential Element of Claim or Defense

Except as otherwise provided by law, a party has the burden of proof as to each fact the existence or nonexistence of which is essential to the claim for relief or defense that he or she is asserting [*Evid. Code § 500*].

As to a plaintiff, this means the definitional elements of the plaintiff's cause of action describe the minimum showing the plaintiff must make to support a favorable judgment. Accordingly, in order for a plaintiff to prevail, the record must contain sufficient evidence to support a finding in its favor on each and every element that the law requires to support recovery [*Beck Dev. Co. v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1205, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518]* .

As to a defendant, this "traditional allocation of burden of proof" applies to facts that are essential to an affirmative defense [*see* *Samuels v. Mix (1999) 22 Cal. 4th 1, 7-9, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 273, 989 P.2d 701* (facts indicating time when plaintiff reasonably should have discovered wrongdoing so as to commence running of one-year statutory period of limitation)].

The general rule of *Evid. Code § 500* applies "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law." The exception includes a recognition of the fact that the allocation of the burden of proof is sometimes at variance with the general rule. In determining whether the normal allocation of the burden of proof should be altered, courts consider a number of factors [*Samuels v. Mix (1999) 22 Cal. 4th 1, 19, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 273, 989 P.2d 701]* :

- The knowledge of the parties concerning a particular fact.
- The availability of evidence to the parties.
- The most desirable result in terms of public policy in the absence of proof of the particular fact.
- The probability of the existence or nonexistence of the fact.

The courts have not, however, routinely found exceptions to the general rule on the basis of the parties' relative access to evidence. For example, the allegations required of a plaintiff in a tort or contract action relate to the defendant's acts or omissions, and so might be thought, almost by definition, to describe matters peculiarly within the defendant's knowledge or control. That circumstance has nevertheless not occasioned a wholesale departure from the ordinary allocation of proof burdens in such actions [*Samuels v. Mix (1999) 22 Cal. 4th 1, 19, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 273, 989 P.2d 701]* . In a false advertising claim, the burden under state law, unlike federal law, does not shift to the defendant to prove that the advertising claims are true once the plaintiff proffers evidence of the claims [*National Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1347-1351, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207]* .

The normal allocation of the burden of proof has also been shifted in spoliation of evidence cases [*see McGee v. Cessna Aircraft Co. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 179, 187, 188 Cal. Rptr. 542]* , negligence per se actions [*see McGee v. Cessna Aircraft Co. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 179, 190, 188 Cal. Rptr. 542]* , and product liability cases based on design defect [*Barker v. Lull Engineering Co. (1978) 20 Cal.3d 413, 431, 143 Cal. Rptr. 225, 573 P.2d 443]* .

Even in cases in which the normal allocation of the burden of proof shifts, however, the plaintiff has the burden of producing some evidence before the burden of proof is shifted to the defendant [*National Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharmaceuticals (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1346, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207]* . In spoliation of evidence cases, for example, the plaintiff must produce evidence that the defendant failed to preserve the evidence and establish a substantial probability of causation before the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove the failure to preserve the evidence did not cause damage to the plaintiff [*Galanek v. Wismar (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1417, 1426, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 236]* . In negligence per se actions, the plaintiff must produce evidence of a violation of a statute and a substantial probability that the plaintiff's injury was caused by the violation of the statute before the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove the violation of the statute did not cause the plaintiff's injury [*Haft v. Lone Palm Hotel (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 756, 772 , 478 P.2d 465]* . In design defect cases, the plaintiff must produce evidence that his or her injury was caused by the design of the product, before the burden of proof shifts to the defendant to prove the design of the product was not defective [*Barker v. Lull Engineering Co. (1978) 20 Cal.3d 413, 431, 143 Cal. Rptr. 225, 573 P.2d 443]* . In no case does the burden of proof shift to the defendant on the filing of the complaint [*National Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharmaceuticals (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1347, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207* ; *see Jones v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 396, 406, 209 Cal. Rptr. 456]* .

The burden of proving a fact is satisfied when the requisite evidence has been introduced or the persuasion accomplished, and it is of no consequence whether the evidence was introduced by one party rather than the other or whether the persuasion was due to the evidence or to the argument of either counsel [*People v. Belton (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 516, 524, 153 Cal. Rptr. 195, 591 P.2d 485]* .

For discussion of presumptions that affect the burden of proof, see *§ 551.102[3]*.

[3] Specific Issues

[a] Accusation of Crime or Wrongdoing

The party claiming a person is guilty of crime or wrongdoing has the burden of proof on that issue [*Evid. Code § 520*]. The quantum of proof required is a preponderance of the evidence unless otherwise required by law, a preponderance of the evidence [*see Evid. Code § 115*, discussed in [1], *above*; *see also, e.g.,* *Liodas v. Sahadi (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 278, 287-291, 137 Cal. Rptr. 635, 562 P.2d 316* (involving fraud); *Rosener v. Sears Roebuck & Co. (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 740, 756, 168 Cal. Rptr. 237 , appeal dismissed,* *450 U.S. 1051, 101 S. Ct. 1772, 68 L. Ed. 2d 247 (1981)* (same); *Sierra Nat'l Bank v. Brown (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 98, 105-106, 95 Cal. Rptr. 742* (same)].

Evid. Code § 520 does not apply when a specific statute places the burden of proof on another [*see Evid. Code § 300* (Evidence Code inapplicable when "otherwise provided by statute"); *see also* *Fillmore v. Irvine (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 649, 661-662, 194 Cal. Rptr. 319* (construing former version of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7031*)].

[b] Degree of Care

The party claiming a person did not exercise a requisite degree of care has the burden of proof on that issue [*Evid. Code § 521*; *see* *Mize v. Atchison, T. & S.F. Ry. Co. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 436, 454, 120 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *see also Evid. Code §§ 669, 669.1*, discussed in *§ 551.102[3]*].

[c] Insanity

The party claiming any person, including himself or herself, is or was insane has the burden of proof on that issue [*Evid. Code § 522*; *see* *Albertson v. Schmidt (1932) 128 Cal. App. 344, 346, 17 P.2d 158]* .

[d] Estoppel

The existence of an estoppel is a question of fact and the burden of proof is on the party asserting it [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Hacienda Mobile Home Park (1975) 45 Cal. App. 3d 519, 531, 119 Cal. Rptr. 559]* .

[e] Insurance Coverage

A party seeking coverage under an insurance policy has the burden of proving a loss covered within the agreement [*Collin v. American Empire Ins. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 787, 803, 808, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofBurden ShiftingEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofInitial Burden of PersuasionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofUltimate Burden of Persuasion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Burden of Proof and of Producing Evidence and Weight of Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.91

§ 551.91 Burden of Producing Evidence

[1] Defined

"Burden of producing evidence" means the obligation of a party to introduce evidence sufficient to avoid a ruling against that party on the issue [*Evid. Code § 110*].

[2] With Respect to Particular Fact

The burden of producing evidence as to a particular fact is on the party against whom a finding on that fact would be required in the absence of further evidence [*Evid. Code § 550(a)*; *see, e.g.*, *People v. Belton (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 516, 523, 153 Cal. Rptr. 195, 591 P.2d 485]* .

The burden of producing evidence as to a particular fact is initially on the party with the burden of proof as to that fact [*Evid. Code § 550(b)*]. If that party fails to produce sufficient evidence to make a prima facie case, it risks nonsuit or other unfavorable determination. But once that party produces evidence sufficient to make its prima facie case, the burden of producing evidence shifts to the other party to refute the prima facie case [*Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1667-1668, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279]* .

Evid. Code § 550 deals with the allocation of the burden of producing evidence. At the outset of the case, the burden coincides with the burden of proof. However, during the course of the trial, the burden may shift from one party to another, irrespective of the incidence of the burden of proof [*see* *Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1667, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279* (unlike burden of proof, burden of producing evidence may shift between plaintiff and defendant throughout trial)]. For example, if the party with the initial burden of producing evidence establishes a fact giving rise to a presumption, the burden of producing evidence will shift to the other party, whether or not the presumption is one that affects the burden of proof. In addition, a party may introduce evidence of such overwhelming probative force that no person could reasonably disbelieve it in the absence of countervailing evidence, in which case the burden of producing evidence would shift to the opposing party to produce some evidence [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission's Comment to *Evid. Code § 550* in annotated codes].

Even though the burden of producing evidence shifts to the other party, that party need not offer evidence in reply. However, failure to do so risks an adverse verdict. Once the party having the burden of producing evidence makes a prima facie showing, the trier of fact determines whether the crucial and necessary facts have been established [*Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1668, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279]* .

For discussion of presumptions that affect the burden of producing evidence, see *§ 551.102[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofAllocationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofBurden ShiftingEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofInitial Burden of PersuasionEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofUltimate Burden of Persuasion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Burden of Proof and of Producing Evidence and Weight of Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.92

§ 551.92 Standard of Proof in Civil Proceedings

[1] One of Three Standards of Proof May Apply

In meeting the burden of proof as to the existence or nonexistence of a particular fact, one of three standards of proof will apply. These three standards are enumerated in the Evidence Code as follows [*Evid. Code § 115*; *see also Evid. Code § 502*; *Lillian F. v. Superior Court (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 314, 320, 206 Cal. Rptr. 603]* :

- Proof beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Clear and convincing proof.
- Proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

The application by law of these standards of proof reflects the degree to which society seeks to balance public and private interests and allocate the risk of an error by the trier of fact. The function of a standard of proof is to instruct the fact finder concerning the degree of confidence our society deems necessary in the correctness of factual conclusions for a particular type of adjudication, to allocate the risk of error between the litigants, and to indicate the relative importance attached to the ultimate decision [*Conservatorship of Wendland (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 519, 546, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 28 P.3d 151]* . Thus, in civil proceedings, one of the two less stringent standards will normally apply. The least stringent standard, proof by a preponderance of the evidence, applies generally in civil actions involving civil disputes over monetary damages, where it is deemed fair that the disputants bear the risk of error in roughly equal fashion. In contrast, the more exacting standard of clear and convincing proof applies in civil proceedings in which the risk of error by the fact finder has a more serious impact on fundamental rights [*see Cynthia D. v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 242, 251, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 698, 851 P.2d 1307* ; *Conservatorship of Wendland (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 519, 546-548, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 28 P.3d 151* (clear and convincing standard applied to determination of conservator's petition to remove nutrition and hydration from conscious but severely disabled conservatee)].

[2] Standard Requiring Proof by Preponderance of the Evidence Applies as General Rule

The "preponderance of the evidence" standard is the one that applies as a general rule. In other words, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law," the burden of proof required in any given situation is proof by a preponderance of the evidence [*Evid. Code § 115*]. Proof by a preponderance of the evidence simply requires the trier to believe that the existence of a fact is more probable than its nonexistence [*Lillian F. v. Superior Court (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 314, 320, 206 Cal. Rptr. 603* (citing *In re Winship (1970) 397 U.S. 358, 371, 90 S. Ct. 1068, 25 L. Ed. 2d 368*)].

[3] Standard Requiring Proof by Clear and Convincing Evidence

"Clear and convincing" evidence requires a finding of high probability; the evidence must be so clear as to leave no substantial doubt [*In re Brian P. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 616, 624, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 326* ; *In re Jerome D. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1200, 1205, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 449* ; for related jury instruction on clear and convincing proof, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 201* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions].

The "clear and convincing proof" standard applies in a number of situations as an express statutory exception to the general rule. For example, under the provisions for recovery of punitive damages, the clear and convincing proof standard applies when seeking to prove that a defendant has been guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice [*Civ. Code § 3294(a)*; *see Shade Foods, Inc. v. Innovative Products Sales & Marketing, Inc. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 847, 890-893, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 364* (evidence that was sufficient to find insurer bad faith under preponderance of the evidence standard was not sufficient to find insurer guilty of oppression or malice under clear and convincing proof standard)]. Other statutory exceptions require clear and convincing proof to support the findings necessary to terminate parental rights [*Fam. Code § 7821*], to appoint a conservator [*Prob. Code § 1801*], or to rebut a presumption that legal title to property encompasses full beneficial title [*Evid. Code § 662*].

In other situations, constitutional or decisional law, rather than express statute, is the law that provides an exception to the general rule [*see Evid. Code § 160*; *Conservatorship of Wendland (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 519, 546-548, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 28 P.3d 151* ; *Lillian F. v. Superior Court (1984)160 Cal. App. 3d 314, 320, 206 Cal. Rptr. 603]* . For example, constitutional privacy rights require a conservator to show by clear and convincing proof that a conservatee lacks the capacity to consent to or refuse an intrusive medical treatment (electroconvulsive therapy), when that finding is necessary for an order sought by the conservator authorizing such treatment [*Lillian F. v. Superior Court (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 314, 322-324, 206 Cal. Rptr. 603]* . Similarly, the clear and convincing standard applies to a determination under *Prob. Code § 2355* of a petition by a conservator to withdraw nutrition and hydration from a conservatee, since the decision to withdraw nutrition and hydration is not reversible, and the high evidentiary standard in that case plays the role of adjusting the risk of error to favor the less perilous result [*Conservatorship of Wendland (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 519, 546-548, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412, 28 P.3d 151]* . *First Amendment* rights require that a plaintiff in an action for libel show a defendant's actual malice by clear and convincing proof [*see Tague v. Citizens for Law & Order, Inc. (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 16, 26 , 142 Cal. Rptr. 689]* .

When the clear and convincing proof standard applies, a greater quantum of proof is needed to satisfy the burden of proof than under the preponderance of the evidence standard. Clear and convincing proof requires a finding of high probability; the evidence must be sufficiently clear to leave no substantial doubt and sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind [*Shade Foods, Inc. v. Innovative Products Sales & Marketing, Inc. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 847, 890, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 364* (citing *In re Angelia P. (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 908, 919, 171 Cal. Rptr. 637*)].

[4] Standard Requiring Proof Beyond a Reasonable Doubt

The most stringent standard of proof, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, generally applies only in criminal proceedings [*see Evid. Code § 501* (assignment of burden of proof in criminal actions subject to *Penal Code § 1096*); *Penal Code § 1096* (state's burden of proof in prosecuting criminal action is to prove criminal defendant's guilt of crime beyond

reasonable doubt; reasonable doubt defined)]. In at least one situation however, the California Supreme Court has required the application of this standard in noncriminal proceedings, that is, when involuntary commitment to a mental hospital is involved. In such a situation the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt is implicated because the result, although in a civil proceeding, is functionally equivalent to the loss of freedom and reputation suffered by an incarcerated criminal defendant [*Conservatorship of Roulet (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 219, 223-230, 152 Cal. Rptr. 425, 590 P.2d 1* (also requiring unanimous jury verdict)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofPreponderance of EvidenceEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofProof Beyond Reasonable Doubt

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Burden of Proof and of Producing Evidence and Weight of Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.93

§ 551.93 Weight of Evidence

[1] Sufficiency of Evidence of One Witness

Except where additional evidence is required by statute, the direct evidence of one witness who is entitled to full credit is sufficient for proof of any fact [*Evid. Code § 411*]. This applies even though the witness is a party to the action [*DeMiglio v. Mashore (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1270, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 267* ; *Bank of Costa Mesa v. Losack (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 287, 291, 141 Cal. Rptr. 550* ; *see Clark Equipment Co. v. Wheat (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 503, 518, 154 Cal. Rptr. 874* ("Substantial evidence may consist of the testimony of a single witness or even the testimony of a party")]. For the meaning of "direct evidence," see discussion in *§ 551.62*.

[2] Weak Evidence Offered When Stronger Evidence Available

If weaker and less satisfactory evidence is offered when it was within the power of the party to produce stronger and more satisfactory evidence, the evidence offered should be viewed with distrust [*Evid. Code § 412*; for related jury instruction, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 203* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions]. Thus, when a party fails to produce evidence that he or she might reasonably be expected to produce, an inference is permitted that such evidence would be unfavorable to that party [*Lumpkin v. Friedman (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 450, 456, 182 Cal. Rptr. 378]* . However, to justify a jury instruction to this effect, it must be shown that a party was in fact in possession of or had access to better and stronger evidence than was presented [*see People v. Taylor (1977) 67 Cal. App. 3d 403, 411-412, 136 Cal. Rptr. 640* ; *Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 480, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* .

[3] Inferences Drawn From Party's Failure to Explain or Deny Adverse Evidence or From Suppression of Evidence

In determining what inferences to draw from the evidence or facts in the case against a party, the trier of fact may consider, among other things, the party's failure to explain or deny any adverse evidence or facts in the case or any willful suppression by the party of evidence relating to them [*Evid. Code § 413*; *see Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 480, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786* ; for related jury instructions, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury*

Instructions, CACI No. 204, 205 (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions]. Thus, when the evidence tends to prove a material fact that imposes a liability on a party, and the party has it in his or her power to produce evidence which from its very nature must overthrow the case made against him or her if it is not founded on fact, and the party refuses to produce such evidence, the presumption arises that the evidence, if produced, would operate to the party's prejudice and support the case of the party's adversary [*Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 482, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* .

However, in general, there is no duty on either party to call any particular witness in the absence of a showing of some special circumstances [*Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 481, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* . Hence, a party is not guilty of willful suppression of evidence by merely failing to call a potential witness to the stand. Counsel for a party to a civil action has not only the right but the duty to exercise discrimination in selecting witnesses for whom his or her client vouches. Assuming the attorney's honesty and good faith, the attorney, in declining to call a potential witness, may not, for example, believe the potential witness's account of the matter, or may think the potential witness is inaccurate or prejudiced, or that the potential witness is otherwise disqualified to testify [*Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 481-482, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* . Similarly, no inference may be drawn from the failure of a party to produce evidence that is privileged [*see, e.g., Evid. Code § 913(a)*; *Maggio, Inc. v. Neal (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 745, 750-751, 241 Cal. Rptr. 883* (referee's comment on failure to introduce tax returns was harmless error); for related jury instructions on the exercise of privilege, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 215, 216* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsInferencesEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsWeight & Sufficiency

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
F. Burden of Proof and of Producing Evidence and Weight of Evidence

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.94-551.99

[Reserved]

§§ 551.94[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
G. Presumptions and Inferences

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.100

§ 551.100 "Presumption" and "Inference" Defined

A presumption is an assumption of fact the law requires to be made from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not evidence [*Evid. Code § 600(a)*]. A presumption is either conclusive or rebuttable [*Evid. Code § 601*].

An inference is a deduction of fact that may logically and reasonably be drawn from another fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action [*Evid. Code § 600(b)*; *see Nazir v. United Airlines (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 243, 273, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 296* (distinguishing between inference and presumption)]. An inference that an essential fact to be proven by a party cannot be drawn when there is no evidence as to the fact; to do so would be mere conjecture. The absence of critical evidence does not give rise to an inference that the missing evidence exists; rather, it indicates a failure of proof [*Collin v. American Empire Ins. Co. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 787, 808, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391* (inference that conversion of personal property from rental house was "accident" within meaning of insurance policy was error in absence of any evidence as to how property disappeared)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsInferencesEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
G. Presumptions and Inferences

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.101

§ 551.101 Conclusive Presumptions

The presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 622-624, below*, and all other presumptions declared by law to be conclusive, are conclusive presumptions [*Evid. Code § 620*]. The following are the presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 622-624*:

- The facts recited in a written instrument are conclusively presumed to be true as between the parties or their successors in interest [*Evid. Code § 622*; *see Sanders Construction Co. v. San Joaquin First Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 387, 395, 186 Cal. Rptr. 218* (acknowledgment by tenant in Notice and Acknowledgment of Lease Assignment that lease was in full force and effect)]. But the rule does not apply to the recital of a consideration [*Evid. Code § 622*].

- Whenever a party has, by his or her own statement or conduct, intentionally and deliberately led another to believe a particular thing true and to act on that belief, the party is not, in any litigation arising out of the statement or conduct, permitted to contradict it [*Evid. Code § 623*]. For the meaning of the terms "statement" and "conduct," see discussion in *§ 551.60[2]*. For example, once a party has gained an advantage through specific representations to the trial court, he or she may not disavow them [*Alling v. Universal Mfg. Corp. (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 1412, 1442-1443, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718* (party in contract dispute who represented to trial court that certain claims applied only to purchase agreement was estopped from asserting those claims with respect to licensing agreement)]. In this respect, it may be noted that an estoppel may be invoked against a governmental agency when justice and right require it [*Hartway v. State Board of Control (1976) 69 Cal. App. 3d 502, 504-505, 137 Cal. Rptr. 199* ; *see Middleton v. Imperial Ins. Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 134, 139, 193 Cal. Rptr. 144, 666 P.2d 1]* . For the elements of estoppel, see *Rankin v. Frebank Co. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 75, 85-86, 121 Cal. Rptr. 348* , and *Varela v. Wells Fargo Bank (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 741, 748, 93 Cal. Rptr. 428* .

- A tenant is not permitted to deny the title of his or her landlord at the time of the commencement of the relation [*Evid. Code § 624*].

Additionally, the child of a wife cohabiting with her husband, who is not impotent or sterile, is conclusively presumed to be a child of the marriage, except as provided in *Fam. Code § 7541* (if blood tests show husband is not father) [*Fam. Code § 7540*; *see Estate of Cornelious (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 461, 464-467, 198 Cal. Rptr. 543, 674 P.2d 245* , (decided under former *Evid. Code § 621(a)*)]. For discussion of this presumption and exceptions to it, see Ch. 412, *Paternity* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsCreation of PresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of Presumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
G. Presumptions and Inferences

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.102

§ 551.102 Rebuttable Presumptions

[1] Defined and Classified

A statute providing that a fact or group of facts is prima facie evidence of another fact establishes a rebuttable presumption [*Evid. Code § 602*; *see, e.g., Evid. Code § 1451*, relating to presumptions with respect to acknowledged writings]. Presumptions which the Legislature does not specify as con clusive are rebuttable [*People v. Dubon (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 944, 952, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 914]* .

Every rebuttable presumption is either a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or a presumption affecting the burden of proof [*Evid. Code § 601*; *see Fillmore v. Irvine (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 649, 660, 194 Cal. Rptr. 319]* .

[2] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Producing Evidence

A presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence is a presumption established to implement no public policy other than to facilitate the determination of the particular action in which the presumption is applied [*Evid. Code § 603*]. The effect of the presumption is to require the trier of fact to assume the existence of the presumed fact unless and until evidence is introduced that would support a finding of its nonexistence. In this latter event, the trier of fact must determine the existence or nonexistence of the presumed fact from the evidence and without regard to the presumption. But this does not prevent the drawing of any inference that may be appropriate [*Evid. Code § 604*].

The presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 631-647* (set out below) and all other rebuttable presumptions established by law that fall within the criteria of *Evid. Code § 603* are presumptions affecting the burden of producing evidence [*Evid. Code § 630*]. The following are the presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 631-645* and *647*:

- Money delivered by one to another is presumed to have been due to the latter [*Evid. Code § 631*].
- A thing delivered by one to another is presumed to have belonged to the latter [*Evid. Code § 632*].

- An obligation delivered up to the debtor is presumed to have been paid [*Evid. Code § 633*].

- A person in possession of an order on himself or herself for the payment of money, or delivery of a thing, is presumed to have paid the money or delivered the thing accordingly [*Evid. Code § 634*].

- An obligation possessed by the creditor is presumed not to have been paid [*Evid. Code § 635*].

- The payment of earlier rent or installments is presumed from a receipt for later rent or installments [*Evid. Code § 636*].

- The things that a person possesses are presumed to be owned by the person [*Evid. Code § 637*].

- A person who exercises acts of ownership over property is presumed to be the owner [*Evid. Code § 638*].

- A judgment, when not conclusive, is presumed to correctly determine or set forth the rights of the parties, but there is no presumption that the facts essential to the judgment have been correctly determined [*Evid. Code § 639*].

- A writing is presumed to have been truly dated [*Evid. Code § 640*].

- A letter correctly addressed and properly mailed is presumed to have been received in the ordinary course of the mail [*Evid. Code § 641*].

- A trustee or other person, whose duty it was to convey real property to a particular person, is presumed to have actually conveyed to the person when the presumption is necessary to perfect title of the person or the person's successor in interest [*Evid. Code § 642*].

- A deed or will or other writing purporting to create, terminate, or affect an interest in real or personal property is presumed to be authentic if it (a) is at least 30 years old; (b) is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity; (c) was kept, or if found was found, in a place where the writing, if authentic, would be likely to be kept or found; and (d) has been generally acted on as authentic by persons having an interest in the matter [*Evid. Code § 643*].

- A book, purporting to be printed or published by public authority, is presumed to have been so printed or published [*Evid. Code § 644*].

- A book, purporting to contain reports of cases adjudged in the tribunals of the state or nation where the book is published, is presumed to contain correct reports of the cases [*Evid. Code § 645*].

- Printed materials, purporting to be a particular newspaper or periodical, are presumed to be that newspaper or periodical if regularly issued at average intervals not exceeding three months [*Evid. Code § 645.1*].

- The return of a registered process server on process or notice establishes a presumption, affecting the burden of producing evidence, of the facts stated in the return [*Evid. Code § 647*].

Evid. Code § 646 provides that the judicial doctrine of res ipsa loquitur is a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence and that the word "defendant," as used in the section, includes any party against whom the presumption operates [*Evid. Code § 646(a), (b)*]. *Evid. Code § 646(c)* sets forth the instructions the court may, and on

request shall, give the jury if the evidence, or facts otherwise established, would support a res ipsa loquitur presumption and the defendant has introduced evidence that would support a finding that he or she was not negligent or that any negligence on his or her part was not a proximate cause of the occurrence.

Other statutory presumptions affecting the burden of producing evidence are found in *Evid. Code §§ 1451-1454* (relating to presumptions affecting acknowledged writings and official writings [*see Evid. Code § 1450*]); *Evid. Code § 1552* (presumption that printed representations of computer information and computer programs are accurate representations); *Evid. Code § 1530* (presumption that purported copy of writing in custody of public entity or an entry in such a writing is authentic and accurate); *Evid. Code § 1532* (presumption that official record of writing accurately reflects existence and content or original recorded writing); *Evid. Code § 1600* (record of recorded instrument or document affecting an interest in property as prima facie evidence); and *Evid. Code § 1603* (presumption from deed executed pursuant to legal process that property has been conveyed). *Evid. Code § 1604* provides that a certificate of purchase, or of location, of any lands in California issued or made pursuant to law is prima facie evidence that the holder of the certificate is the owner of the land and sets forth how the evidence may be overcome.

[3] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Proof

A presumption affecting the burden of proof is a presumption established to implement some public policy other than to facilitate the determination of the particular action in which the presumption is applied, such as the policy in favor of establishment of a parent and child relationship, the validity of marriage, the stability of titles to property, or the security of those who entrust them selves or their property to the administration of others [*Evid. Code § 605*]. The effect of the presumption is to impose on the party against whom it operates the burden of proof as to the nonexistence of the presumed fact [*Evid. Code § 606*].

The presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 662-669.5* (set out below) and all other rebuttable presumptions established by law that fall within the criteria of *Evid. Code § 605* are presumptions affecting the burden of proof [*Evid. Code § 660*; *see also Haycock v. Hughes Aircraft Co. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1473, 1488-1489, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 248* (*Lab. Code § 2922* presumption of at-will employment is based on public policy and affects burden of proof)]. The following are the presumptions established by *Evid. Code §§ 662-668*:

- The owner of the legal title to property is presumed to be the owner of the full beneficial title. This presumption may be rebutted only by clear and convincing proof [*Evid. Code § 662*; *see* discussion in *§ 551.92[3]*].

- A ceremonial marriage is presumed to be valid [*Evid. Code § 663*].

- Official duty is presumed to have been regularly performed. But this presumption does not apply to an issue on the lawfulness of an arrest if it is found or otherwise established that the arrest was made without a warrant [*Evid. Code § 664*].

- A person is presumed to intend the ordinary consequences of his or her voluntary act [*Evid. Code § 665* (also stating when presumption is inapplicable in criminal action to establish specific intent)].

- Any California or United States court, or any court of general jurisdiction in any other state or nation, or any judge of such a court, acting as such, is presumed to have acted in the lawful exercise of its jurisdiction. This presumption applies only when the act of the court or judge is under collateral attack [*Evid. Code § 666*].

- A person not heard from in five years is presumed to be dead [*Evid. Code § 667*].

- An unlawful intent is presumed from the doing of an unlawful act [*Evid. Code § 668* (also stating when presumption is inapplicable in criminal action to establish specific intent)].

Evid. Code § 669 sets out when the failure of a person to exercise due care is presumed from the person's violation of a statute, ordinance, or regulation of a public entity. For causes of action arising out of facts occurring on or after January 1, 1988, *Evid. Code § 669.1* excludes from the presumption a rule, policy, manual, or guideline of state or local government setting forth standards of conduct or guidelines for its employees in the conduct of their public employment, unless it has been formally adopted as a statute, ordinance, or agency regulation. For further discussion of these provisions, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

Evid. Code § 669.5 relates to the burden of proof in an action challenging the validity of a city or county ordinance limiting the number of building permits that may be issued for residential construction or buildable lots that may be developed for residential purposes.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsCreation of PresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsEffectsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of Presumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
G. Presumptions and Inferences

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.103-551.109

[Reserved]

§§ 551.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.110

§ 551.110 "Witness" Defined and Credibility

A witness is a person whose declaration under oath is received as evidence for any purpose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1878*]. The declaration may be made on oral examination, by deposition, by affidavit, or by declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1878, 2002, 2015.5*].

When referring to a witness in the context of a trial, a witness is a person whose declaration under oath is made in person before the trier of fact [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1878, 2002, 2005, 2094*; *Evid. Code § 710*]. The "oath" is given in one of the forms of oath, affirmation, or declaration set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2094* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2094(a)*], or, in the alternative, in some other form administered by the court in a manner calculated to awaken the witness's conscience and impress that person's mind with the duty to tell the truth [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2094(b)*; *see also Evid. Code § 710* (witness who is child under age of 10 or dependent person with substantial cognitive impairment may be required in the court's discretion only to promise to tell the truth)].

The credibility of witnesses is determined by the trier of fact [*McAllister v. George (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 258, 265, 140 Cal. Rptr. 702]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceCompetencyAffirmations & OathsEvidenceTestimonyGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.111

§ 551.111 Qualifications

Except as otherwise provided by statute, every person, irrespective of age, is qualified to be a witness and no person is disqualified to testify to any matter [*Evid. Code § 700*]. The California Constitution expressly provides that a person is not incompetent to be a witness because of his or her opinions on religious beliefs [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceCompetencyGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyDisabilityChildrenEvidenceCompetencyDisabilityReligious Beliefs

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.112

§ 551.112 Witness Fees

Ordinary witness fees are covered by *Gov. Code § 68093* and advance payment for travel and one day's attendance by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(a)*. The compensation of expert witnesses is covered by *Evid. Code §§ 730-731, 733* and *Gov. Code § 68092.5*. The witness fees of specified law enforcement officers, fire fighters, and other specified government employees and the payment of one day's fee in advance are covered by *Gov. Code § 68097 et seq.*. For further discussion of witness fees, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* . For the statutes governing the fees of interpreters and translators, see discussion in *§ 551.117[1]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsCourt-Appointed ExpertsCompensationEvidenceTestimonyLay WitnessesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.113

§ 551.113 Particular Persons

[1] Person Unable to Express Self or Understand Duty to Tell Truth as Disqualified

A person is disqualified to be a witness if the person is incapable of expressing himself or herself concerning the matter so as to be understood, either directly or through an interpreter, or incapable of understanding the duty of a witness to tell the truth [*Evid. Code § 701(a)*]. These matters are determined by the court [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 701* in annotated codes]. The trial court has the discretion to exclude a witness on this basis if, because of health problems, the witness has memory difficulties, hallucinations, confusion, and the tendency to make up a story when memory is missing [*Stanchfield v. Hamer Toyota, Inc. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 1495, 1506-1507]* . However, physical limitations on a witness's ability to communicate do not necessarily render the witness incompetent to testify [*People v. Tran (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 759, 770, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905* (where witness unable to speak, but could answer yes-or-no questions by tapping once for yes and twice for no, defense not deprived of meaningful opportunity to cross-examine)].

The party challenging the witness's competency has the burden of proving the witness's incompetency to testify [*People v. Augustin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 444, 447, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171]* .

In any proceeding held outside the presence of a jury, the court may reserve challenges to the competency of a witness until the conclusion of the direct examination (discussed in *§ 551.121[5]*) of that witness [*Evid. Code § 702(b)*].

A witness's competence to testify must be challenged at the trial level [*People v. Lewis (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 334, 360, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272* ; *People v. Cudjo (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 585, 622, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 390, 863 P.2d 635]* . Failure to object at trial waives the issue on appeal [*People v. Augustin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 444, 447, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171* (defense counsel's belated motion to strike victim's testimony on ground prosecutor should not be permitted to ask leading questions to clarify her testimony did not constitute objection to her competency)].

[2] Attorneys

Attorneys are not disqualified to be witnesses and are, therefore, competent under *Evid. Code § 700* (discussed in *§*

551.111) to testify in the trial of a case as a witness for any party. This is also true when the lawyer is counsel of record for a party in the case, even though to testify may be unethical. Thus, a lawyer who has relevant information may be compelled to testify even if it is detrimental to his or her client unless the information is privileged [*Romeo v. Jumbo Market (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 817, 820-821, 56 Cal. Rptr. 26* ; *see also People v. Stokley (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 930, 936, 72 Cal. Rptr. 513* , *cert. denied, 395 U.S. 914 (1969)* (claim of violation of Canon of Ethics as raising no objection to inadmissability of attorney's testimony)].

Under *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-210*, a State Bar member has an ethical obligation to refrain from acting as an advocate before a jury that will hear testimony from him or her unless the testimony relates to an uncontested matter, the testimony relates to the nature and value of legal services rendered in the case, or the member has the informed, written consent of the client [*Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-210*]. The member is required to withdraw if he or she knows or should know that continued employment will result in violation of this rule [*see Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 3-700(B)(2)*]. Apparently, the trial court can disqualify testifying counsel against the client's wishes only if it is confronted with manifest interest that it must protect from palpable injustice [*see Lyle v. Superior Court (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 470, 482, 175 Cal. Rptr. 918* (decided under prior version of Rules of Professional Conduct)].

A party seeking to disqualify opposing counsel on the ground that opposing counsel ought to be called as a witness in the case must proceed at the first reasonable opportunity by proper motion to achieve that end and, on failing to do so, it is an abuse of discretion for the trial court to grant the motion [*White v. Superior Court (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 51, 55-56, 159 Cal. Rptr. 278]* . For forms that may be adapted for use in moving for an order of disqualification, see *Ch. 72, Attorney Practice and Ethics, § 72.30 et seq.*

[3] Judges, Arbitrators, and Mediators

Like attorneys, trial judges are not disqualified to be witnesses and are, therefore, competent under *Evid. Code § 700* (discussed in *§ 551.111*) to testify in the trial of a case as a witness for any party. However, a judge is disqualified to decide a proceeding if he or she has personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding, and the judge is deemed to have personal knowledge if to his or her knowledge he or she is likely to be a material witness in the proceeding [*Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(1)*]. The procedure for disqualifying a judge on this ground is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.3*. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

On the other hand, the Evidence Code permits the trial judge to testify if none of the parties objects [*Evid. Code § 703(d)*]. Before the judge may be called to testify, however, the judge shall, in proceedings held out of the presence and hearing of the jury, inform the parties of the information he or she has concerning any fact or matter about which he or she will be called to testify [*Evid. Code § 703(a)*]. If a party objects, the judge may not testify in the trial as a witness, and on the objection, the judge is required to declare a mistrial and order the action assigned for trial before another judge [*Evid. Code § 703(b)*]. Calling the judge to testify is deemed a consent to the granting of a motion for mistrial, and an objection to the calling of the judge is deemed a motion for mistrial [*Evid. Code § 703(c)*].

No person presiding at any judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding, and no arbitrator or mediator, is competent to testify in any subsequent civil proceeding as to any statement, conduct, decision, or ruling occurring at or in conjunction with the prior proceeding, except as to a statement or conduct that could (1) give rise to civil or criminal contempt, (2) constitute a crime, (3) be the subject of investigation by the State Bar of California or the Commission on Judicial Performance, or (4) give rise to disqualification proceedings under *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1(a)(1)* or *(6)* [*Evid. Code § 703.5*; *see Merritt v. Reserve Ins. Co. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 858, 883, 110 Cal. Rptr. 511* (decided prior to enactment of *Evid. Code § 703.5*; a trial judge committed prejudicial error in allowing another judge to testify as an expert witness on behalf of one party with respect to matters that took place before the testifying judge in his judicial capacity in a prior trial of the action)]. Section 703.5 does not apply, however, to a mediator with regard to any mediation of visitation or custody issues under *Fam. Code § 3160 et seq.* [*Evid. Code § 703.5*].

[4] Jurors

Jurors are not disqualified to be witnesses and are, therefore, competent under *Evid. Code § 700* (discussed in *§ 551.111*) to testify in the trial of a case as a witness for any party. But it would be unusual for a juror sworn and impaneled to try a case to have personal knowledge of facts involved in that case to which he or she could testify as a witness. One of the questions asked prospective jurors on voir dire is whether the juror has heard of, or has any knowledge of, the facts or events, or is familiar with the places or property mentioned, in the case [*see* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.25(c)(7)]. If the prospective juror were to answer in the affirmative, it would seem further voir dire would disclose the juror's knowledge of the facts and that he or she would be challenged for cause under *Code Civ. Proc. § 602(7)* or *(8)*.

Nevertheless, as in the case of the trial judge, a juror sworn and impaneled in the trial of an action may be compelled to testify in that trial as a witness in the absence of objection by a party [*Evid. Code § 704(d)*]. But before the juror may be called to testify, the juror must, in proceedings conducted by the court out of the presence and hearing of the remaining jurors, inform the parties of the information he or she has concerning any fact or matter about which he or she will be called to testify [*Evid. Code § 704(a)*]. Against the objection of a party, the juror may not testify, and on that objection, the court must declare a mistrial and order the action assigned for trial before another jury [*Evid. Code § 704(b)*]. The calling of a juror to testify is deemed a consent to the granting of a motion for mistrial, and an objection to the calling of the juror is deemed a motion for mistrial [*Evid. Code § 704(c)*].

[5] Experts

If the matter in issue is one within the knowledge of experts only and not within the common knowledge of laypersons, it is necessary for the plaintiff to introduce expert opinion evidence in order to establish a prima facie case [*Miller v. Los Angeles County Flood Control Dist. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 689, 702, 106 Cal. Rptr. 1, 505 P.2d 193* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 551.70[2][a]*]. A person is qualified to testify as an expert if he or she has special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education sufficient to qualify him or her as an expert on the subject to which his or her testimony relates. Against the objection of a party, the special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education must be shown before the witness may testify as an expert [*Evid. Code § 720(a)*]. For the procedure for determining a preliminary fact, see discussion in *§ 551.76* . The test applied in making the determination is simply whether the witness possesses the special knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education sufficient to qualify him or her as an expert on the subject to which his or her testimony relates [*Chadock v. Cohn (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 205, 208, 157 Cal. Rptr. 640* ; *see McCleery v. City of Bakersfield (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1059, 1066, 216 Cal. Rptr. 852* (trial court's disqualification of expert witness erroneous to extent it was based on witness's lack of prior experience in testifying and on irrelevance of his proposed testimony, rather than on determination of his special expertise)]. The showing may be made by any otherwise admissible evidence, including the witness's own testimony [*Evid. Code § 720(b)*]. The witness's degree of knowledge goes to the weight and not to the admissibility of his or her testimony [*Mann v. Cracchiolo (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 18, 38, 210 Cal. Rptr. 762, 694 P.2d 1134]* . If the witness's testimony is based upon scientific techniques, those techniques must be generally accepted by a typical cross-section of the relevant scientific community [*People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 612, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321* (citing *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 37, 130 Cal. Rptr. 144, 549 P.2d 1240*); *see* discussion in *§ 551.70[2][a]*]. It is for the trial court, in the exercise of sound discretion, to determine the competency and qualification of an expert witness to give his or her opinion in evidence, and its ruling will not be disturbed on appeal unless a manifest abuse of that discretion is shown [*Miller v. Los Angeles County Flood Control Dist. (1973) 8 Cal. 3d 689, 701, 106 Cal. Rptr. 1, 505 P.2d 193* ; *Douglas v. Ostermeier (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 729, 738, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 594]* . However, the refusal to qualify a witness as an expert is an abuse of discretion if the witness disclosed sufficient knowledge of the subject to entitle his or her opinion to go to the jury [*Mann v. Cracchiolo (1985) 38 Cal. 3d 18, 39, 210 Cal. Rptr. 762, 694 P.2d 1134]* .

For a discussion of the evolving status of a consultant-expert who possibly may be called as a witness at trial, see *Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 916, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393* . For a discussion of the effect on

the "work product rule" of the knowledge, opinions, and report of a consultant-expert when the expert becomes a witness in the action, see *Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 857-858, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888* .

The court may, at any time before or during the trial, limit the number of expert witnesses to be called by any party [*Evid. Code § 723*]. The court may also on its own motion or the motion of a party appoint one or more expert witnesses to investigate a fact or matter, render a report to the court, and testify at the trial. The court may also fix the compensation to be paid [*Evid. Code § 730*; for manner of payment of experts appointed by court, see *Evid. Code § 731(b), (c)*]. This does not prevent any party to the action from producing other expert evidence on the same fact or matter, but if other expert witnesses are called by a party, their fees are paid by the party calling them and only ordinary witness fees are taxed as costs [*Evid. Code § 733*].

For related jury instructions on expert witness testimony, see Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 219-221 (Matthew Bender), also available in *LexisNexis(R) Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceCompetencyGeneral
OverviewEvidenceCompetencyAttorneysEvidenceCompetencyJudgesEvidenceCompetencyJurorsGeneral
OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsQualifications

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.114

§ 551.114 Compelling Attendance

[1] Power of Court

The court has inherent power to compel the attendance of persons to testify in an action or proceeding, including a party whose physical presence is required as a witness [*Code Civ. Proc. § 128(a)(6)*; *Taylor v. Bell (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1008, 98 Cal. Rptr. 855 , cert. denied, 408 U.S. 923, 92 S. Ct. 2493, 33 L. Ed. 2d 334 (1972)* (court as lacking power to order party to appear other than as witness)]. However, the court does not have the power to compel attendance of any witness who is not a California resident at the time of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*; *Amoco Chemical Co. v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 554, 555* (limitation applies to nonresident parties)].

[2] Procedure

The process for compelling the attendance of a nonparty to testify as a witness or to produce books, documents, or other things is a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*]. A person present in court may be required to testify in the same manner as if he or she were in attendance on a subpoena issued by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1990*].

A party to the action or proceeding may also be served with a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum. But the more common procedure for securing the presence of a party or a person for whose immediate benefit an action is prosecuted or defended, or an officer, director, or managing agent of the party or person, is through service of a notice to appear. The giving of the notice has the same effect as service of a subpoena [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1987(b), (c)*].

For a detailed discussion, a procedural checklist, and forms of subpoenas and notices to appear, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

[3] Exemption of Out-of-State Witness From Arrest or Process While Obeying Criminal Subpoena

The exemption from arrest or service of process, civil or criminal, of a witness coming into California, or passing through California on his or her way to another state, in response to a subpoena or order to attend and testify in a

criminal action or grand jury investigation pursuant to the Uniform Act to Secure the Attendance of Witnesses from Without the State in Criminal Cases is provided for in *Penal Code §§ 1334.4* and *1334.5*. For a discussion of persons who are immune to civil process, and for forms for use in moving to quash service of a summons, which, with appropriate modifications, may also be used to move to quash service of a subpoena, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenas

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.115

§ 551.115 Interpreters

[1] When Required; Applicability of Laws Relating to Witnesses

Judicial proceedings must be conducted in the English language [*Code Civ. Proc. § 185*]. Consequently, an interpreter is required when a witness is incapable of hearing or understanding the English language or is incapable of expressing himself or herself in the English language so as to be understood directly by counsel, the court, and the jury. In such event, an interpreter must be sworn to interpret for the witness [*Evid. Code § 752(a)*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.10(a)(1) (interpreter also to be appointed if court finds that party is unable to understand and speak English sufficiently to comprehend proceedings and to assist counsel in conduct of case)].

Separate interpreters may be needed for each non-English speaking party. An additional interpreter may be needed to interpret witness testimony for the court [Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.10(a)(2)].

Whether an interpreter should be called rests in the discretion of the trial court [*People v. Augustin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 444, 451, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171]* . But if there is uncontradicted evidence that the witness does not speak or understand English, it would be an abuse of discretion to fail to appoint an interpreter [*Gardiana v. Small Claims Court (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 412, 418-419, 130 Cal. Rptr. 675]* .

Evid. Code § 754 covers the appointment of an interpreter in any civil or criminal action for an "individual who is deaf or hearing impaired" to the point that hearing loss is so great that the individual cannot understand language spoken in a normal tone and thus is unable to fully participate in the proceedings, and the use of an assistive listening system or other appropriate equipment, if provided, would not aid in the individual's participation. The provision for appropriate equipment for an "individual who is hearing impaired" but able to fully participate in the proceedings with sufficient assistive listening or computer-aided transcription equipment is covered in *Civ. Code § 54.8*.

A person who serves as an interpreter is subject to all the rules of law relating to witnesses [*Evid. Code § 750*].

An interpreter must be present in certain family law proceedings involving domestic violence when a party who does

not proficiently speak or understand the English language is present. The interpreter must both interpret the proceedings so that the party understands and assist communication between the party and his or her attorney [*Evid. Code § 755(a)*]. If an interpreter is required under this section, the court must generally not commence proceedings until the appointed interpreter is present and situated near the party and his or her attorney [*Evid. Code § 755(a), (c)*].

[2] Procedure

There are no formal requirements as to the manner of requesting an interpreter, and hence the request may be made orally or in writing. However, if made orally, the request should be made in the presence of a reporter so that a record is made of the request. The Judicial Council has recommended that on request by a party or counsel, or whenever it appears that a party's or witness's primary language is not English or that a party or witness may not speak and understand English sufficiently to participate fully in the proceedings, the court should conduct an examination on the record to determine whether a court interpreter is needed [Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.10(b)]. Matters to be included in the examination are set forth in Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.10(c). After the examination, the court should state its conclusion on the record, and the file in the case should be clearly marked to ensure that an interpreter will be present when needed in any subsequent proceeding [Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.10(d)].

For a form of motion for an order appointing an interpreter, along with related declaration and order, see *Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Trial and Post-Trial Civil Procedure, Ch. 8, Interpreters, 8.33 -8.35*.

[3] Qualifications and Standards of Professional Conduct of Interpreters

The competence of the interpreter is ordinarily for the trial court to determine and the manner of selection of an interpreter is within the discretion of the trial court [*Hsu v. Mt. Zion Hospital (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 562, 582, 66 Cal. Rptr. 659*].

Any person who interprets in a court proceeding using one of the designated languages [*see Gov. Code § 68562(a)* (designation made by Judicial Council)] must be a certified court interpreter for the language used [*Gov. Code § 68561(a)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 68560.5(a)* ("court proceeding" defined), *68566* ("certified court interpreter" defined)]. However, a court may for good cause, and following the good cause and qualification procedures and guidelines adopted by the Judicial Council, appoint an interpreter for a designated language who is not certified [*Gov. Code § 68561(a), (c)*]. Interpreters named and maintained on the list of recommended court interpreters previously established by the State Personnel Board, or established by an entity provisionally approved under *Gov. Code § 68562(b)*, are deemed certified until January 1, 1996. After that date, those interpreters are not deemed certified and must comply with the new procedures for certification as adopted by the Judicial Council. Interpreters approved by the State Personnel Board or any other agency or entity for use in administrative hearings or nonjudicial settings may not be deemed certified as court interpreters. These interpreters also may not be used in court proceedings unless they are qualified by the court under *Gov. Code § 68562(c)* or *(d)* [*Gov. Code § 68561(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 68562(c), (d)*].

Any person who interprets in a court proceeding using a nondesignated language must be qualified by the court under the qualification procedures and guidelines adopted by the Judicial Council. If this qualified interpreter also passes an English fluency examination offered by a testing entity approved by the Judicial Council, this person will be designated a "registered interpreter" [*Gov. Code § 68561(d)*].

Interpreters must establish to the court that they meet the qualification requirements and the record must show that the interpreter is certified or was qualified by the court [*see Gov. Code § 68561(e)*].

There are mandatory Judicial Council forms to present the qualifications of an noncertified or nonregistered interpeter [Judicial Council Form INT-110] and to certify the unavailability of a certified or registered interpreter [Judicial

Council Form INT-120]. For copies of these forms, see *Matthew Bender Practice Guide: California Trial and Post-Trial Civil Procedure, Ch. 8, Interpreters, 8.36, 8.37*.

[4] Oath of Interpreter; Instructions

The interpreter must take an oath that he or she will make a true interpretation to the witness in a language that the witness understands and that he or she will make a true interpretation of the witness's answers to questions to counsel, court, or jury, in the English language, with his or her best skill and judgment [*Evid. Code § 751(a)*]. When a deaf or hard-of-hearing person is testifying under oath [*see* [1], *above*], an interpreter certified pursuant to *Evid. Code § 754(f)* must advise the court whenever he or she is unable to comply with his or her oath taken pursuant to *Evid. Code § 751(a)* [*Evid. Code § 751(b)*]. An interpreter regularly employed by the court and certified or registered in accordance with *Gov. Code § 68560 et seq.*, relating to court interpreter services, may file an oath as prescribed by *Evid. Code § 751(a)* with the clerk of the court, and the filed oath serves for all subsequent court proceedings until the appointment is revoked [*Evid. Code § 751(d)*].

The instructions to be given to interpreters and to counsel are set forth in Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.11(a) and (b), respectively.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureTrialsExamination of WitnessesGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyInterpretersEvidenceTestimonyExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsCourt-Appointed ExpertsAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.116

§ 551.116 Translators

[1] When Required; Applicability of Laws Relating to Witnesses

A translator is required when the written characters in a writing offered in evidence are incapable of being deciphered or understood directly. In such event, a translator must be sworn to decipher or translate the writing [*Evid. Code § 753(a)*].

A person who serves as a translator is subject to all the rules of law relating to witnesses [*Evid. Code § 750*].

[2] Oath of Translator

The translator must take an oath that he or she will make a true translation in the English language of any writing he or she is to decipher or translate [*Evid. Code § 751(c)*]. A translator regularly employed by the court may file an oath as prescribed by *Evid. Code § 751(c)* with the clerk of the court, and the filed oath serves for all subsequent court proceedings until the appointment is revoked [*Evid. Code § 751(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsTranscripts &
TranslationsTranslationsEvidenceTestimonyExpertsCourt-Appointed ExpertsAppointments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.117

§ 551.117 Compensation of Interpreters and Translators

[1] Fees and Payment

Interpreter and translator fees are covered by *Evid. Code §§ 730-733, 752(b),* and *753(b),* and *Gov. Code §§ 26806(c)* and *(d)* (interpreters employed by county clerk for trial courts in counties of 900,000 or more), and *68092(b)*. The interpreter or translator may be compensated as provided in *Evid. Code §§ 730-733*, relating to compensation of expert witnesses [*Evid. Code §§ 752(b), 753(b)*].

Evid. Code § 730 authorizes the court to appoint experts and to fix their compensation, and *Evid. Code § 731(c)* provides that in all civil actions, the compensation fixed under *Evid. Code § 730* must, in the first instance, be apportioned and charged to the several parties in such proportion as the court may determine and may thereafter be taxed and allowed in like manner as other costs [*see* also *Gov. Code § 68092(b)*].

[2] Indigent Litigants

Although *Evid. Code § 752* [*see § 551.115[1]*] provides for court appointment of an interpreter for a witness, no statutory basis exists for appointing of an interpreter at public expense to assist non-English-speaking litigants in civil cases, and, because language assistance to indigent but represented litigants appears available, there is no need for courts to require appointment of interpreters to assist litigants at public expense [*Jara v. Municipal Court (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 181, 183, 185, 145 Cal. Rptr. 847, 578 P.2d 94 , cert. denied, 439 U.S. 1067 (1979)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsProceedings in Forma PauperisGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyInterpretersEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsTranscripts & TranslationsTranslationsEvidenceTestimonyExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsCourt-Appointed ExpertsCompensation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.118

§ 551.118 Privileges

For a discussion of privileges, including a newsperson's immunity from a contempt citation and his or her qualified privilege not to divulge unpublished information, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryPrivileged MattersGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesJournalist's PrivilegeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.119

§ 551.119 Confrontation

At the trial of an action, a witness can be heard only in the presence and subject to the examination of all the parties to the action if they choose to attend and examine [*Evid. Code § 711*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonyExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExaminationDirect Examination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.120

§ 551.120 Exclusion of Witnesses From Courtroom

The court may exclude from the courtroom any witness not at the time under examination so that the witness cannot hear the testimony of other witnesses [*Evid. Code § 777(a)*]. However, the court may not exclude a party to the action, and, if the party is a person other than a natural person, an officer or employee designated by its attorney is entitled to be present [*Evid. Code § 777(b), (c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonySequestration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.121

§ 551.121 Examination of Witnesses

[1] Oath or Affirmation

Before testifying every witness is required to take an oath or make an affirmation or declaration in the form provided by law, except that a court in its discretion may require that a child less than 10 years old or a dependent person with a substantial cognitive impairment only promise to tell the truth [*Evid. Code § 710*; for definition of "dependent person," *see Evid. Code § 177*]. For further discussion and forms for oath and affirmation, see Ch. 392, *Oath and Affirmation* .

[2] Personal Knowledge

Subject to *Evid. Code § 801* (relating to opinion testimony of expert witnesses and discussed in *§ 551.70*), the testimony of a witness is inadmissible unless the witness has personal knowledge of the matter [*Evid. Code § 702(a)*]. This includes the requirement that the witness have the capacity to perceive the facts through his or her own senses and to recollect those facts [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 701* in annotated codes; see also *Evid. Code § 170*, defining "perceive" as meaning to acquire knowledge through one's senses].

If a party objects to a witness's testimony on the ground the witness lacks personal knowledge, personal knowledge must be shown before the witness may testify concerning the matter [*Evid. Code § 702(a)*]. The procedure for determining this preliminary fact is set forth in *Evid. Code § 403* (see discussion in *§ 551.76[3][b]*). A witness's personal knowledge of a matter may be shown by any otherwise admissible evidence, including his or her own testimony [*Evid. Code § 702(b)*; *Cassel v. Kolb (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 568, 580, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878]* .

[3] Court's Control Over Mode of Interrogation of Witnesses

The court is required to exercise reasonable control over the mode of interrogation of a witness so as (1) to make the interrogation as rapid, as distinct, and as effective for the ascertainment of the truth as may be, and (2) to protect the witness from undue harassment or embarrassment [*Evid. Code § 765(a)*]. The court must take special care to protect a witness under the age of 14 or a dependent person with a substantial cognitive impairment from undue harassment or embarrassment and to restrict any unnecessary repetition of questions [*Evid. Code § 765(b)*; for definition of "dependent

person," *see Evid. Code § 177*]. The court also must take special care to ensure that questions are stated in a form that is appropriate to the age or cognitive level of the witness. The court may, in the interests of justice, on objection by a party, forbid the asking of a question in a form that is not reasonably likely to be understood by a person of the age or cognitive level of the witness [*Evid. Code § 765(b)*].

[4] Calling and Examination by Court

The court, on its own motion or the motion of any party, may call witnesses and interrogate them the same as if they had been produced by a party to the action. The parties may object to the questions and the evidence the same as if the witnesses had been called and examined by an adverse party. The witnesses may be cross-examined by all parties to the action in such order as the court directs [*Evid. Code § 775*].

The trial judge may examine a witness called by a party, but in so doing should not become an advocate for either party or cast aspersions or ridicule on the witness [*see, e.g., McCartney v. Commission on Judicial Qualifications (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 512, 533, 116 Cal. Rptr. 260, 526 P.2d 268* ; see also *Gonzalez v. Commission on Judicial Performance (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 359, 371 n.6, 188 Cal. Rptr. 880, 657 P.2d 372]* .

With respect to questioning by the judge, the Los Angeles County Superior Court has adopted the following policy: The trial judge ordinarily should not examine a witness until the parties have completed their questioning of the witness. If a witness is referring to graphic evidence (e.g., pointing to "here" and "there" on a map), the trial judge should make such inquiries and give such direction that the record is complete and intelligible as to the points of reference. When the judge completes such questions, all parties should have the opportunity to examine on the matters touched on by the judge [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.88].

[5] Direct, Cross, Redirect, and Recross-Examination

[a] Defined

There are four kinds of examination of witnesses, each of which is referred to as a "phase" [*see Evid. Code § 772(a)*]. They are (1) direct examination, (2) cross-examination, (3) redirect examination, and (4) recross-examination [*Evid. Code § 772(a)*; see *Evid. Code §§ 760-763*].

Direct examination is the first examination of a witness on a matter that is not within the scope of a previous examination of a witness [*Evid. Code § 760*].

Cross-examination is the examination of a witness by a party other than the direct examiner on a matter that is within the scope of the direct examination of the witness [*Evid. Code § 761*].

Redirect examination is an examination of a witness by the direct examiner subsequent to the cross-examination of the witness [*Evid. Code § 762*].

Recross-examination is an examination of a witness by a cross-examiner subsequent to a redirect examination of the witness [*Evid. Code § 763*].

[b] Order of Examination

The examination of a witness proceeds as follows: direct examination, cross-examination, redirect examination, recross-examination, and continuing thereafter by redirect and recross-examination [*Evid. Code § 772(a)*].

Each phase of the examination of a witness must be concluded before the succeeding phase begins unless for good cause the court otherwise directs [*Evid. Code § 772(b)*]. But in a civil case a party may in the court's discretion interrupt

his or her cross-examination, redirect examination, or recross-examination in order to examine the witness on a matter not within the scope of a previous examination of the witness [*Evid. Code § 772(c)*].

[c] Order and Scope of Cross-Examination

A witness examined by one party may be cross-examined by each other party to the action in such order as the court directs [*Evid. Code § 773(a)*]. The order of cross-examination by the parties in multiple-party cases sometimes is resolved by the judge at the chambers conference before trial [*see* discussion in Subpart C].

The witness may be cross-examined on any matter within the scope of the direct examination [*Evid. Code § 773(a)*]. However, the cross- examination need not be confined to a mere categorical review of matters, dates, or times mentioned in the direct examination. Rather, the scope of proper cross-examination may extend to the whole transaction of which the witness has testified, or it may be employed to elicit any matter that may tend to overcome, qualify, or explain the testimony given by a witness on his or her direct examination. Moreover, the witness can be cross examined with respect to facts or denials that are necessarily implied from his or her testimony in chief, as well as with respect to facts that the witness expressly states or that are connected with them [*Gallaher v. Superior Court (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 666, 671, 162 Cal. Rptr. 389]* . And the cross-examiner, unlike the direct examiner, may ask leading questions [*see Evid. Code § 767(a)(2)* and discussion under [6], *below*].

Notwithstanding the above, the cross-examination of a witness by any party whose interest is not adverse to the party calling the witness is subject to the same rules that apply to the direct examination [*Evid. Code § 773(b)*]; that is, leading questions may not be asked except under special circumstances where the interests of justice otherwise require [*see Evid. Code § 767(a)*].

[d] Reexamination

A witness once examined cannot be reexamined as to the same matter without leave of court, but the witness may be reexamined as to any new matter on which he or she has been examined by another party to the action. Leave may be granted or withheld in the court's discretion [*Evid. Code § 774*].

[e] Recall of Witness

After a witness has been excused from giving further testimony, he or she cannot be recalled without leave of the court. Leave may be granted or withheld in the court's discretion [*Evid. Code § 778*].

[6] Leading Questions

A leading question is one that suggests to the witness the answer the examining party desires [*Evid. Code § 764*]. Except under special circumstances when the interests of justice otherwise require, a leading question may not be asked of a witness on direct or redirect examination, but a leading question may be asked of a witness on cross-examination or recross-examination [*Evid. Code § 767*].

Under the "special circumstances" exception, a leading question may be asked on direct examination of a witness when there is little danger of improper suggestion or when the question is necessary to obtain relevant evidence. This would permit leading questions on direct examination to establish preliminary matters or to refresh recollection, and in examining handicapped witnesses, expert witnesses, and hostile witnesses [*see* Assembly Committee on Judiciary's Comment to *Evid. Code § 767* in annotated codes; *see also People v. Augustin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 444, 449-450, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171* (use of leading questions provided more efficient and less biased way for victim who suffered from cerebral palsy to communicate her testimony); *Gore v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance (1980) 110 Cal. App. 3d 184, 191, 167 Cal. Rptr. 881* (damaging testimony by expert medical witness against petitioner at administrative hearing, some of which was elicited by leading questions); *People v. Campbell (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 38, 44, 43*

Cal. Rptr. 237] . Leading questions also may be asked (1) in examining an adverse party or a witness identified with an adverse party [*see Evid. Code § 776(a)*, and discussion in [11][a], *below*]; and (2) to identify exhibits [*see People v. Campbell (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 38, 44, 43 Cal. Rptr. 237]* . By the same token, the court may forbid the asking of leading questions on cross-examination when the witness is biased in favor of the cross-examiner and would be unduly susceptible to the influence of questions that suggested the desired answer [*see* Assembly Committee on Judiciary's Comment to *Evid. Code § 767* in annotated codes].

[7] Responsive Answers

A witness must give responsive answers to questions. Answers that are not responsive must be stricken on the motion of a party [*Evid. Code § 766*].

[8] Writings

In examining a witness concerning a writing, it is not necessary to show, read, or disclose to the witness any part of the writing [*Evid. Code § 768(a)*]. If a writing is shown to the witness, all parties to the action must be given an opportunity to inspect it before any question concerning it may be asked of the witness [*Evid. Code § 768(b)*].

[9] Prior Inconsistent Statements or Conduct

A witness may be impeached by prior statements that are inconsistent with the witness's express or implied testimony [*see Evid. Code § 780(h)* (discussed in *§ 551.122*)]. However, certain prior statements may be inadmissible, even for impeachment. For example, a witness's testimony from a judicial arbitration is not admissible to impeach his or her testimony at a subsequent trial [*Jimena v. Alesso (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1028, 1031, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 18* ; *see* Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration*]. In examining a witness about a statement or other conduct of the witness that is inconsistent with any part of his or her testimony, it is not necessary to disclose any information concerning the statement or other conduct [*Evid. Code § 769*].

However, if evidence of a prior inconsistent statement is subsequently sought to be introduced, a foundational showing under the provisions of *Evid. Code § 770* is required. *Evid. Code § 770* provides that unless the interests of justice otherwise require, extrinsic evidence of a statement made by a witness that is inconsistent with any part of his or her testimony must be excluded unless (1) the witness was so examined while testifying as to give the witness an opportunity to explain or deny the statement, or (2) the witness has not been excused from giving further testimony in the action [*see Bossi v. State of California (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 313, 324, 174 Cal. Rptr. 93]* . To meet the requirements of the first alternative, the witness should be asked whether or not he or she made the specific inconsistent statement. It is insufficient opportunity for a witness to explain or deny a prior inconsistent statement, for example, by handing the witness a copy of a 60-page transcript of a deposition, which was taken some 18 months before, and asking the witness if at that time and place all of these questions were asked and all of these answers given [*Bossi v. State of California (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 313, 325, 174 Cal. Rptr. 93* (holding that witness, who answered "yes" was not provided with any "realistic opportunity to explain or deny any specific statement contained" in transcript)].

[10] Refreshing Memory

If a witness, either before or while testifying, uses a writing to refresh his or her memory with respect to any matter about which he or she testifies, the writing must be produced at the request of an adverse party [*Evid. Code § 771(a)*].

If the writing is produced, the adverse party may inspect it, cross-examine the witness concerning it, and introduce in evidence such portion of it as may be pertinent to the witness's testimony [*Evid. Code § 771(b)*]. However, the rights granted by this provision are not unlimited. For example, a traffic accident report used to refresh the recollection of the officer who made it is not admissible in evidence under *Evid. Code § 771(b)* in an action arising out of the accident [*see Veh. Code § 20013*; *Box v. California Date Growers Assn. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 266, 270, 129 Cal. Rptr. 146* ; cf.

Sherrell v. Kelso (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 22, 27-35, 172 Cal. Rptr. 667 (contents of traffic accident report may, however, be read into evidence as a past recollection recorded under *Evid. Code § 1237* when proper foundation is laid)].

[11] Calling Adverse Party or Person Identified With Adverse Party

[a] Examination

A party or a person identified with a party (*see Evid. Code § 776(d)*, discussed in [b], *below*) may be called and examined as if under cross-examination by any adverse party at any time during the presentation of evidence by the party calling the witness [*Evid. Code § 776(a)*; see Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 776* in annotated codes]; that is, leading questions may be asked except under special circumstances where the interests of justice otherwise require [*see Evid. Code § 767(a)(2)* and discussion under [6], *above*]. For the purposes of this rule, parties represented by the same counsel are deemed to be a single party [*Evid. Code § 776(c)*].

The purpose of the foregoing provisions is to enable a party to call his or her adversary and elicit testimony without making that party his or her own witness. The examination often is exploratory and requires no offer of proof [*Murry v. Manley (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 364, 366, 338 P.2d 976* (involving former *Code Civ. Proc. § 2055*, the predecessor to *Evid. Code § 776*)]. But the examination may prevent counsel's cross-examining the same party on the same matter when called by another party [*see Evid. Code § 774*, discussed in [5][d], *above*].

[b] "Person Identified With Party" Defined

A person is identified with a party if he or she is (1) a person for whose immediate benefit the action is prosecuted or defended by the party; or (2) a director, officer, superintendent, member, agent, employee, or managing agent of the party or person, or an employee of a public entity that is the party, or (3) a person who was in any of the relationships specified in (2) either at the time of the act or omission giving rise to the cause of action or at the time he or she obtained knowledge of the matter concerning which he or she is to be examined under *Evid. Code § 776* [*Evid. Code § 776(d)*].

[c] Cross-Examination

A witness so examined by an adverse party may be cross-examined by all other parties in such order as the court directs [*Evid. Code § 776(b)*]. However, subject to *Evid. Code § 776(e)*, the cross-examination is to be conducted as if the witness were under redirect examination (that is, under *Evid. Code § 767(a)* leading questions may not be asked except under special circumstances where the interests of justice otherwise require) when the examination is by: (1) if the witness is a party, his or her own counsel or counsel for a party who is not adverse to the witness; and (2) if the witness is not a party, by counsel for the party with whom the witness is identified or counsel for a party who is not adverse to the party with whom the witness is identified [*Evid. Code § 773(b)*]. But in the latter case (witness who is not a party), counsel for the party with whom the witness is identified and counsel for a party who is not adverse to the party with whom the witness is identified are not required to examine the witness as if under redirect examination if the party who called the witness is either (1) also a person identified with the same party with whom the witness is identified or (2) the personal representative, heir, successor, or assignee of a person identified with the same party with whom the witness is identified [*Evid. Code § 776(e)*].

The introductory portion of *Evid. Code § 776(b)* states the general rule that a witness examined under the section may be cross-examined by all other parties to the action in such order as the court directs. For example, a party whose interest in the action is identical with that of the party who called the witness for examination under the section has a right to cross-examine the witness fully because he or she, too, has the right to call the witness for examination under the section. Similarly, a party whose interest in the action is adverse to the party who called the witness for examination under the section has the right to cross-examine the witness fully unless he or she is identified with the witness as

described in *Evid. Code § 776(b)(1)* and *(2)*. *Evid. Code § 776(b)(1)* and *(2)* restrict the nature of the cross examination permitted of a witness by a party with whom the witness is identified and by parties whose interest in the action is not adverse to the party with whom the witness is identified. These parties are limited to examination of the witness as if under redirect examination. In essence, this means that leading questions cannot be asked of the witness by these parties [*see Evid. Code § 767(a)*]. Although the examination must proceed as if it were a redirect examination, under *Evid. Code § 761* it is in fact a cross-examination and limited to the scope of the direct examination [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to *Evid. Code § 776* in annotated codes].

Evid. Code § 776 permits a party calling as a witness an employee of an adverse party (or someone similarly identified in interest with an adverse party) to examine the witness as if under cross-examination, that is, to use leading questions in the examination. The section requires the party whose employee was thus called and examined to examine the witness as if under redirect examination, that is, to refrain from the use of leading questions. If a party is able to persuade the court that the usual rule prescribed by *Evid. Code § 776* is not in the interest of justice in the particular case, the court may enlarge or restrict the right to use leading questions as provided in *Evid. Code § 767*. These rules are based on the premise that ordinarily the witness will have a feeling of identification in the lawsuit with his or her employer rather than with the other party to the action. But the premise on which *Evid. Code § 776* is based does not necessarily apply when the party calling the witness is also closely identified with the adverse party. In such a case, *Evid. Code § 776(e)* entitles the adverse party to the usual rights of a cross-examiner when examining the witness. For example, when an employee sues his or her employer and calls a coemployee as a witness, there is no reason to assume the coemployee-witness will be adverse to the employee-party and in sympathy with the employer-party. The reverse may be the case. *Evid. Code § 776(e)* permits the employer in such a case, as a general rule, to use leading questions in its cross-examination of the coemployee-witness called to testify by the employee party under *Evid. Code § 776*. However, if the party calling the witness can satisfy the court that the coemployee witness is in fa identified in interest with the employer or for some other reason is amenable to suggestive questioning by the employer, the court may limit the employer's use of leading questions during its examination of the witness pursuant to *Evid. Code § 767* [*see* Cal. Law Revision Commission Comment to 1967 Amendment of *Evid. Code § 776* in annotated codes].

[12] Expert Witnesses

A witness testifying as an expert may be cross-examined to the same extent as any other witness. The witness also may be fully cross-examined as to (1) his or her qualifications, (2) the subject to which his or her expert testimony relates, and (3) the matter on which his or his opinion is based and the reasons for the opinion [*Evid. Code § 721(a)*]. However, a witness who testifies in the form of an opinion may not be cross-examined in regard to the content or tenor of any scientific, technical, or professional text, treatise, journal, or similar publication unless (1) the witness referred to, considered, or relied on the publication in arriving at or forming the opinion, or (2) the publication has been admitted in evidence, or (3) the publication has been established as a reliable authority by the testimony or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony or by judicial notice. If admitted, relevant portions of the publication may be read into evidence but may not be received as exhibits [*Evid. Code § 721(b)*]. The purpose of *Evid. Code § 721(b)* is to prevent the cross-examiner from putting the views of an absent expert (inadmissible hearsay) before the jury. The term "similar publication" is, therefore, broadly construed. For example, a written report that was not published for mass consumption may be excluded as a "similar publication" [*McGarity v. Department of Transportation (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 677, 682-684, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344]* .

A treating physician is a percipient expert, but his or her testimony is not limited to personal observations. Like any other expert, the treating physician may provide both fact and opinion testimony. Further, for a treating physician, no expert witness declaration is required, and the physician may testify as to any opinions formed on the basis of facts independently acquired and informed by training, skill, and experience, which could include opinions regarding causation and standard of care, because those issues are inherent in a physician's work [*Schreiber v. Estate of Kiser (1999) 22 Cal. 4th 31, 35, 49, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 293, 989 P.2d 720]* .

Any expert appointed by the court under *Evid. Code § 730* (discussed in *§ 551.113[5]*) may be called and examined by the court or by any party to the action. When the witness is called and examined by the court, the parties have the same right to cross-examine the witness and to object to the questions asked and the evidence adduced as expressed in *Evid. Code § 775* (discussed in [4], *above*) [*Evid. Code § 732*].

For the manner of impeaching the testimony of an expert, see discussion in *§ 551.123[3]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExaminationDirect ExaminationEvidenceTestimonyExaminationJudicial InterrogationEvidenceTestimonyExaminationLeading QuestionsEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.122

§ 551.122 Factors Considered in Determining Witness's Credibility

Except as otherwise provided by statute, the court or jury, in determining a witness's credibility, may consider any matter that has any tendency in reason to prove or disprove the truthfulness of the witness's testimony, including but not limited to the following [*Evid. Code § 780*]:

- The witness's demeanor while testifying and the manner in which he or she testifies [*Evid. Code § 780(a)*; *see Meiner v. Ford Motor Co. (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 127, 140, 94 Cal. Rptr. 702* (trier of fact is sole and exclusive judge of credibility of witnesses as determined by their demeanor); *see also Linsk v. Linsk (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 272, 278-279, 74 Cal. Rptr. 544, 449 P.2d 760* (right of party to have trier of fact observe his or her demeanor and that of adversary and other witnesses during examination and cross-examination is incontrovertible)].

- The character of the testimony [*Evid. Code § 780(b)*; *see Estate of Baker (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 471, 483, 182 Cal. Rptr. 550* (trier of fact's determination will be interfered with on appeal only when it appears witness's testimony is inherently so improbable as to be unworthy of belief); *Wilson v. State Personnel Bd. (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 865, 877, 130 Cal. Rptr. 292* (same)].

- The extent of the witness's capacity to perceive, to recollect, or to communicate any matter about which he or she testifies [*Evid. Code § 780(c)*].

- The extent of the witness's opportunity to perceive any matter about which he or she testifies [*Evid. Code § 780(d)*].

- The witness's character for honesty or veracity, or their opposites [*Evid. Code § 780(e)*].

- The existence or nonexistence of a bias, interest, or other motive [*Evid. Code § 780(f)*; *see Grudt v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 575, 591-592, 86 Cal. Rptr. 465, 468 P.2d 825* (manner of showing bias)].

- A statement previously made by the witness that is consistent with his or her testimony [*Evid. Code § 780(g)*].

- A statement previously made by the witness that is inconsistent with any part of his or her testimony [*Evid. Code § 780(h)*; *see Rodriguez v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 626, 647, 151 Cal. Rptr. 399* (prior statements inconsistent with express or im plied testimony of witness are admissible for impeachment); *see also Marocco v. Ford Motor Co. (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 84, 94, 86 Cal. Rptr. 526* (party may not secure admission of otherwise inadmissible evidence for purpose of subsequently impeaching it); and *discussion under § 551.121[9]*].

- The existence or nonexistence of any fact testified to by the witness [*Evid. Code § 780(i)*; *see Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 923-924, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393]* .

- The witness's attitude toward the action or the giving of testimony [*Evid. Code § 780(j)*].

- The witness's admission of untruthfulness [*Evid. Code § 780(k)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentBad Character for TruthfulnessGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentBias, Motive & PrejudiceEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentContradictionEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentPrior Inconsistent Statements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.123

§ 551.123 Supporting or Attacking Witness's Credibility

[1] By Whom

The credibility of a witness may be attacked or supported by any party, including the party calling the witness [*Evid. Code § 785*].

[2] Methods

Evid. Code § 780 (discussed in *§ 551.122*) recites most of the commonly used methods of impeaching the credibility of a witness [*Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 921, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393]* .

[3] Impeachment of Expert Witnesses

An expert witness, like a lay witness, may be impeached on any of the grounds set forth in *Evid. Code § 780* (discussed in *§ 551.122*). Thus, a party may impeach an expert witness by evidence showing the nonexistence of any fact testified to by the expert [*see Evid. Code § 780(i)*]. This can be done either by cross-examination of the expert or by calling other witnesses to offer evidence showing the nonexistence or error in the data on which the first expert based his or her opinion. The rationale of the rule is that by showing the falsity of a fact asserted by the expert, the expert's entire testimony is brought into question [*Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 922-923, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393]* .

To impeach an expert witness by showing the nonexistence of any fact testified to by the expert [*Evid. Code § 780(i)*], a distinction must be made between the expert's opinion and the foundational facts on which the opinion is based. When the facts underlying the expert's opinion are proved to be false or nonexistent, not only is the expert's opinion destroyed but the falsity permeates his or her entire testimony; it tends to prove the expert's untruthfulness as a witness [*Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 923-924, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393]* . On the other hand, an expert witness is not impeached merely by producing another expert who testifies to a different opinion. That is simply rebuttal and suggests only that the first expert may have reasoned incorrectly, not that the first expert is untruthful [*Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 923, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393* ; *Fish v. Guevara (1993) 12*

Cal. App. 4th 142, 146, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329] .

An expert cannot be cross-examined as to the content or tenor of any scientific, technical, or professional publication that he or she did not consider in forming an opinion unless the publication has been admitted into evidence or the publication has been established as a reliable authority by the testimony or admission of the witness or by other expert testimony or by judicial notice [*Evid. Code § 721(b)*; *McGarity v. Department of Transportation (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 677, 681, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 344]* . An expert may be cross-examined about his or her compensation or expenses [*Evid. Code § 722(b)*].

[4] Appointment and Payment of Expert Witnesses

When an expert witness is appointed by the court, that fact may be revealed to the jury [*Evid. Code § 722(a)*].

The compensation and expenses paid or to be paid to an expert witness by the party calling the witness are a proper subject of inquiry by any adverse party as relevant to the credibility of the witness and the weight of the witness's testimony [*Evid. Code § 722(b)*].

[5] Inadmissible Evidence

The following evidence is inadmissible to support or attack a witness's credibility:

- Evidence of the witness's character traits other than honesty or veracity, or their opposites [*Evid. Code § 786*; *see People v. Jones (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 153, 184, 202 Cal. Rptr. 162]* . However, evidence that a witness has been convicted of a felony is admissible to show bias under *Evid. Code § 786* without regard to the nature of the underlying crime, since it relates to the character traits of honesty and truthfulness [*Piscitelli v. Salesian Society (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1, 6-10, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 139*].

- Evidence of specific instances of conduct tending to prove only a character trait of the witness, unless it is evidence of an unexpunged felony conviction [*Evid. Code §§ 787, 788*; *see Grudt v. City of Los Angeles (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 575, 591-592, 86 Cal. Rptr. 465, 468 P.2d 825* (*Evid. Code §§ 787* and *788* cannot be circumvented under the guise of showing the bias of the witness under *Evid. Code § 780(f)*, discussed in *§ 551.122*; evidence of prior arrests inadmissible to show bias in wrongful death action against city and police officers); for related jury instruction on use of a prior conviction of a felony, see *Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, CACI No. 211* (Matthew Bender), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions]. However, the admission of felony convictions for impeachment is not automatic. On proper objection to the admission of a felony conviction for impeachment in a civil case, the trial judge is required to weigh the probative value of the conviction against its prejudicial effect under *Evid. Code § 352* [*Robbins v. Wong (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 261, 274* (criminal decisions may be used to guide weighing process)]. However, the enactment of *Cal. Const., art. I, § 28(d)* supersedes all California restrictions on the admission of relevant evidence except those preserved or permitted by the express words of section 28(d) itself [*People v. Wheeler (1992) 4 Cal.4th 284, 291, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 418, 841 P.2d 938]* . Among those provisions superseded is *Evid. Code § 787* [*In re Freeman (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 630, 640 n.5, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 850, 133 P.3d 1013]* .

- Evidence of the witness's religious beliefs or lack of them [*Evid. Code § 789*; *see also Drake v. Dean (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 915, 933, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325* (relevant inquiry whether witness's membership in religious sect or tenet of faith might tend to bias witness as not prohibited)].

- Evidence of the witness's good character unless evidence of the witness's bad character has been

admitted for the purpose of attacking his or her credibility [*Evid. Code § 790*].

Evidence of a previous consistent statement made by a witness also is inadmissible to support the witness's credibility unless it is offered after (1) evidence of an inconsistent statement has been admitted for the purpose of attacking the witness's credibility and the consistent statement was made before the alleged inconsistent statement, or (2) an express or implied charge has been made that the witness's testimony was recently fabricated or influenced by bias or other improper motive and the statement was made before the bias, motive for fabrication, or other improper motive is alleged to have arisen [*Evid. Code § 791*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceRelevanceCharacter EvidenceEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityImpeachmentConvictionsInadmissibilityEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityOne's Own WitnessesGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyCredibilityRehabilitation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
H. Witnesses

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.124-551.139

[Reserved]

§§ 551.124[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
I. Argument to Jury

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.140

§ 551.140 Right of Counsel to Argue Case

When the evidence is concluded, unless the case is submitted without argument, the parties may present their argument or summation [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(7), 631.7*; *see § 551.50* et seq.]. The right to argue the case is absolute in a jury trial, but in a case tried without a jury, the right to argue is a privilege accorded the parties by the court in its discretion [*Gillette v. Gillette (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 777, 781, 4 Cal. Rptr. 700]* . If the right to argue is granted in a nonjury trial, the court may limit the length of the summation [*Guardianship of Baby Boy M. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 254, 278, 135 Cal. Rptr. 866]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsCivil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
I. Argument to Jury

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.141

§ 551.141 Content of Argument

[1] Proper Argument

In summing up, counsel may indulge in all fair arguments in favor of his or her client's case but may not assume facts not in evidence or, in a jury trial, invite the jury to speculate as to unsupported inferences [*Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 479, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* . However, counsel may argue all reasonable inferences from the evidence and may with propriety comment on the demeanor of a witness indicating recalcitrance [*Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 860-861, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888]* . While the trial judge may properly insist that counsel not undertake to tell the jury what the judge will say, counsel is not precluded from discussing the pertinent law and its application to the facts. The right of discussing the merits of the cause, both as to the law and facts, is unabridged. The range of discussion is wide and counsel may be heard in argument on every question of law, provided his or her statement of the law is correct [*Neumann v. Bishop (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 451, 479-480, 130 Cal. Rptr. 786]* .

[2] Improper Argument

On the other hand, the following have been held to be improper argument [*Garden Grove School Dist. v. Hendler (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 141, 143, 45 Cal. Rptr. 313, 403 P.2d 721* (reversing judgment in eminent domain proceeding because of prejudicial misconduct of plaintiff's counsel in remarks during trial and in summation to jury)]:

- Counsel's alluding to his or her personal knowledge in summation to the jury.
- Resorting to insulting and derogatory characterizations of the adverse party.
- Appealing to the jurors' economic self-interest and provinciality.
- By innuendo impugning the adverse party's motives and purpose.

Other matters held to be improper include [*Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 859-862, 139 Cal.*

Rptr. 888 (action for damages arising out of one-vehicle accident caused by failure of defective part of vehicle)]:

- Making a "golden rule" argument (that is, asking jurors in calculating damages to place themselves in plaintiff's shoes and award amount they would charge to undergo equivalent disability, pain, and suffering) or a variant of the rule.

- Making an appeal to the sympathy of the jury based on defendant's size and corporate status.

- Making an appeal to the self-interest of the jurors as taxpayers.

- Arguing a matter not in evidence and contrary to all of the pertinent expert testimony.

In addition, it has been held prejudicial error to overrule a party's objection to the comments and arguments of the adverse party's counsel on the failure of the objecting party to call certain witnesses when the witnesses were equally available to subpoena by either party [*Smith v. Covell (1980) 100 Cal. App. 3d 947, 956-957, 161 Cal. Rptr. 377]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsImproper RemarksCivil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsObjections

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
I. Argument to Jury

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.142-551.149

[Reserved]

§§ 551.142[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.150

§ 551.150 Governing Law

Motions for mistrial, although recognized by statute (see, for example, *Evid. Code §§ 703(c), 704(c)*) and inferentially authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 616*, are nonstatutory and governed primarily by case law [*see, e.g., Reimer v. Firpo (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 798, 801, 212 P.2d 23 ; see also* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials, Ch. 10, *Mistrials*, § 10.2 (CJER 1981); *California Trial Guide, § 3.32* (Matthew Bender)].

Motions for mistrial on the ground that the presiding judge or a juror is called as a witness are governed by *Evid. Code §§ 703* (judge) and 704 (juror). The declaration of a mistrial for failure to complete the trial of a short cause on time is governed by *Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 3.735(c)*. The retrial of an action after declaration of a mistrial is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 616*. Dismissal for failure to prosecute after declaration of a mistrial is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.320(a)(1), 583.420(a)(3)(A)* and is discussed in Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for Mistrial

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.151

§ 551.151 Mistrial and New Trial Distinguished

A mistrial and a new trial differ in both name and effect. A mistrial is the termination of a trial before its conclusion and is the equivalent of no trial [*see Estate of Bartholomae (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 839, 842, 68 Cal. Rptr. 332]* . When a trial is incomplete, the trial court's power is limited to declaring a mistrial and resetting the cause for trial. For example, the successor of a trial judge has no authority to decide or to make a statement of decision in a case not tried by him or her. Thus, when material issues are not passed on and disposed of in the trial, it is deemed a mistrial and another trial must be held. A motion for new trial under these circumstances would be premature [*see Reimer v. Firpo (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 798, 801, 212 P.2d 23]* .

In contrast, a new trial recognizes a completed trial that for sufficient reasons has been set aside [*Estate of Bartholomae (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 839, 842, 68 Cal. Rptr. 332]* . Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 656*, a new trial is a reexamination of an issue of fact in the same court after a trial and decision by a jury, court, or referee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 656*; *see Stoumen v. Munro (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 302, 319, 33 Cal. Rptr. 305* (when findings, now statement of decision under *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*, required, case was not complete but still in process of determination until findings signed and filed)].

It is not presumed that the trial court intended to grant a motion for new trial when no power to grant the motion existed. Thus, a premature motion for a new trial will be interpreted as a motion for a declaration of a mistrial [*Estate of Bartholomae (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 839, 842, 68 Cal. Rptr. 332* ; *see Reimer v. Firpo (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 798, 801-802, 212 P.2d 23* ; *see also Barendregt v. Downing (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 733, 736, 346 P.2d 870* (order purporting to grant new trial when there is no completed trial will be interpreted as order for mistrial)]. For additional discussion of motions for new trial, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions for New Trials

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.152

§ 551.152 Grounds for Declaring Mistrial

[1] Overlap With Grounds for New Trial

Some of the grounds for granting a mistrial and ordering a new trial are the same. For example, the court may grant either motion based on the misconduct of counsel or the judge [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657(1)*; *Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Spencer (1960) 181 Cal. App. 2d 171, 172, 5 Cal. Rptr. 75* ; *see also* [2], [4], *below*]. In addition, a mistrial may be declared or a new trial may be ordered because of misconduct of the jury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657(2)*; *see also* [3], *below*].

This overlap, however, is not complete. A new trial may be granted because of insufficiency of the evidence to justify the verdict or other decision, but a mistrial may not be declared on this ground [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 657(6)*; *Heavy Duty Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Superior Court (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 116, 119, 89 Cal. Rptr. 598]* . For additional discussion of the grounds for granting a new trial, see § 72.73.

[2] Misconduct of Counsel

[a] In General

A mistrial may be granted when counsel deliberately engages in misconduct [*see Hartman v. Gordon H. Ball, Inc. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 779, 783, 75 Cal. Rptr. 618]* . Although aggressive advocacy is not only proper but desirable, there is a limit. Thus, when the misconduct is intentional, blatant, and continuous from opening statement throughout the trial to closing argument, and is committed by a seasoned and experienced trial lawyer, reversal of the judgment is proper [*see Love v. Wolf (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 378, 393-394, 38 Cal. Rptr. 183]* .

Counsel commits misconduct when he or she makes improper references to the financial ability of defendant to respond in damages in a personal injury case [*see Hoffman v. Brandt (1966) 65 Cal. 2d 549, 553-555, 55 Cal. Rptr. 417, 421 P.2d 425]* . Thus, in an action for damages against a public employee, disclosure of the possibility that a public entity may pay the punitive damage portion of the judgment when it is alleged that the public employee is liable for punitive or exemplary damages is grounds for a mistrial [*Gov. Code § 825(b)*]. In addition, personal attacks on the character or

motives of the adverse party, the party's counsel or witnesses are misconduct. Likewise, attempts to appeal to the prejudice, passions, or sympathy of the jury are misconduct [*Stone v. Foster (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 334, 355, 164 Cal. Rptr. 901]* .

[b] Inquiry Regarding Insurance

Counsel may commit misconduct by raising the issue of insurance coverage. Generally, on voir dire counsel may inquire about insurance companies by asking questions that are reasonably necessary to ascertain whether prospective jurors are free from a bias or interest that may affect their verdict. The questions, however, must be propounded in good faith. The test of good faith is whether the questions are asked in such a manner as to necessarily convey the impression that a defendant is in fact insured [*Elford v. Hiltabrand (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 65, 70, 146 P.2d 510* ; *see Evid. Code § 1155* (evidence that person was insured against loss arising from liability inadmissible to prove negligence or other wrongdoing)].

Thus, in a personal injury action, counsel may, in good faith, ask prospective jurors whether they are interested in a particular insurance company so long as the question does not unnecessarily convey the impression that defendant is in fact insured [*Hart v. Wielt (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 224, 230, 84 Cal. Rptr. 220* ; *but see Scally v. Pacific Gas & ElectricCo. (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 806, 814, 100 Cal. Rptr. 501* (when insurance company not party, improper to ask prospective jurors questions about ownership of stock or other financial interest in insurance companies)].

[c] Determining Whether Misconduct Is Prejudicial

After finding that counsel committed misconduct, the court must determine whether it was prejudicial. Generally, the trial court's judgment has been affirmed, despite the misconduct, when the question of liability was not a close one and when the damages awarded were not disproportionate to the injuries received. A close question of liability, however, indicates that any misconduct might well have played a definite part in improperly influencing the jury, and the conduct must be treated as prejudicial. For example, counsel's line of examination that suggests to the jury that the defendant is indemnified against any judgment for damages is highly prejudicial to the defendant's rights, especially in a closely balanced case in which the evidence otherwise would be easily sufficient on appeal to support a verdict either for the plaintiff or for the defendant [*see Robinson v. Wada (1935) 10 Cal. App. 2d 5, 9, 10, 51 P.2d 171]* .

In a closely balanced case, whether counsel's improper action constitutes prejudicial misconduct that cannot be cured by the court's admonition is determined by the court's view of the overall record, taking into account the nature and seriousness of the remarks, the good faith of counsel, whether the misconduct consisted of a single utterance or repeated, persistent reiteration, the judge's control of the trial, and the likelihood of prejudicing the jury [*Scally v. Pacific Gas & Electric (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 806, 814, 100 Cal. Rptr. 501* ; see *Sabella v. Southern Pacific Co. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 311, 318, 320-321, 74 Cal. Rptr. 534, 449 P.2d 750* , *cert. denied, 395 U.S. 960* (dicta)].

[3] Misconduct of Juror

A motion for mistrial may be made for improper conduct of a juror. For example, counsel may make the motion when opposing counsel communicates with a juror during a recess in the proceedings [*see Garden Grove School Dist. v. Hendler (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 141, 144, 45 Cal. Rptr. 313, 403 P.2d 721* (motion for mistrial denied, but error could have been corrected by replacing juror with alternate under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 605* (*now Code Civ. Proc. §§ 233-234*))]. For additional discussion of juror misconduct as grounds for a new trial, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

The failure of counsel to move for a mistrial immediately after learning about juror misconduct, however, may constitute a waiver of the right to complain later [*see Schouten v. Crawford (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 59, 65, 257 P.2d 88* (failure to object to juror's examination of matters outside evidence when counsel knew about incident before jury returned verdict); *see also § 551.153*].

[4] Misconduct of Judge

Misconduct by a judge may also be grounds for a mistrial. For example, a trial judge cannot justify being discourteous to counsel, witnesses, parties, or jurors. A judge presiding at a trial should conduct it in a fair and impartial manner and refrain from making unnecessary comments during the course of the trial that may tend toward a prejudicial result to a litigant. Thus, a judge commits misconduct when his or her remarks indicate to the jury that a party was not telling the truth or that counsel was trying to keep the facts from being presented to the jury [*Etzel v. Rosenbloom (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 758, 762, 189 P.2d 848* (grounds for new trial)].

It is also misconduct for a judge to make comments that indicate more than a slight leaning to one side [*Newman v. First California Co. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 60, 68, 120 Cal. Rptr. 494 , cert. denied, 423 U.S. 928* (misconduct not prejudicial)]. In addition, the judge should avoid, in the presence of the jury, any utterance that may be construed as an intimation of his or her opinion on the issues of fact that are to be determined by the jury [*Berguin v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1928) 203 Cal. 116, 121, 263 P. 220* (judge remarked on plaintiff's ability to walk unassisted)].

Any misconduct on the part of the trial judge from which it may be rightfully deduced that the jury was influenced in rendering its verdict constitutes prejudicial error. Counsel must object to the misconduct, but apparently need not request an admonition in order to preserve the error for appeal [*see Delzell v. Day (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 349, 351, 223 P.2d 625* ; *Berguin v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1924) 203 Cal. 116, 121-122, 263 P. 220* ; *but see Miller v. Western P. R. Co. (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 581, 607, 24 Cal. Rptr. 785* (counsel must both object and request admonishment unless futile); *Etzel v. Rosenbloom (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 758, 761-762, 189 P.2d 848]* . For additional discussion of objecting to judicial misconduct, see *§ 551.153[3]*.

[5] Testimony by Presiding Judge or by Juror

The judge presiding at the trial of an action may not testify in that trial as a witness, against the objection of a party. On the party's objection, the judge must declare a mistrial and order the action assigned for trial before another judge [*Evid. Code § 703(b)*]. Calling the judge presiding at a trial to testify in that trial as a witness is deemed a consent to the granting of a motion for mistrial, and an objection to the calling of a judge is deemed a motion for mistrial [*Evid. Code § 703(c)*]. In the absence of objection by a party, however, the presiding judge may testify in the trial as a witness [*Evid. Code § 703(d*); *see Evid. Code § 703.5* (presiding judge or arbitrator prohibited from testifying in subsequent civil proceeding)]. When the presiding judge is called as a witness, the parties must be informed of the proposed testimony [*see Evid. Code § 703(a)*].

Similarly, a juror sworn and impaneled in the trial of an action may not testify before the jury in that trial as a witness, against the objection of a party. On the party's objection, the court must declare a mistrial and order the action assigned for trial before another jury [*Evid. Code § 704(b)*]. Calling a juror to testify before the jury as a witness is deemed a consent to the granting of a motion for mistrial, and an objection to calling a juror is deemed a motion for mistrial [*Evid. Code § 704(c)*]. In the absence of objection by a party, however, a juror sworn and impaneled in the trial of an action may be compelled to testify in that trial as a witness [*Evid. Code § 704(d)*]. When a juror is called as a witness, the parties must be informed of the proposed testimony [*see Evid. Code § 704(a)*].

[6] Failure to Complete Trial of Short Cause on Time

If a short cause is not completely tried within five hours of trial time, including time necessary for reading transcripts, depositions, and other documentary evidence, the judge may complete the trial or in the interest of justice may declare a mistrial. A short cause is a case in which the time estimated for trial by all parties is five hours or less [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.735(a)*]. For discussion of the effect of failure to complete trial of a short cause within the required time, *see § 551.156[1]*. For discussion of trial setting procedures, see Ch 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

[7] Mandatory vs. Discretionary Mistrial

In certain instances a mistrial must be granted; otherwise it is discretionary. The situations in which a mistrial must be declared are as follows:

- The trial judge is called to testify as a witness and a party objects [*Evid. Code § 703(b), (c)*; *see also Evid. Code § 703.5*; *Merritt v. Reserve Ins. Co. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 858, 882-883, 110 Cal. Rptr. 511*) (impropriety of the trial judge's permitting an arbitrator, mediator, or another judge to testify as an expert witness as to events that occurred at or in conjunction with an earlier proceeding over which the witness judge, mediator, or arbitrator presided)].

- A juror sworn and impaneled to try the case is called to testify as a witness, and a party objects [*Evid. Code § 704(b), (c)*].

- The jury is discharged without having rendered a verdict or is prevented from giving a verdict by accident or other cause and judgment is not entered as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 630(f)* (judgment for party entitled to directed verdict) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 616*]. A partial mistrial may be declared when a jury returns special verdicts on some, but not all, causes of action. The trial court may accept those verdicts, enter them in the minutes as the conclusive adjudication of those causes of action, render judgment on the verdicts where appropriate or reserve judgment on those causes of action pending entry of final judgment upon termination of the case, declare a partial mistrial as to the remaining causes of action, and order a limited retrial [*Valentine v. Baxter Healthcare Corp. (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1475, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 252* (case of first impression)].

A mistrial is also mandatory in a nonjury trial when the judge is unable to complete the trial, for example when the judge dies or becomes otherwise disabled [*see, e.g.*, *Linsk v. Linsk (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 272, 275, 74 Cal. Rptr. 544, 449 P.2d 760* (disability of judge); *Reimer v. Firpo (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 798, 800-801, 212 P.2d 23* (termination of trial judge's term by appointment to appellate court)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsMisconductCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialCivil ProcedureSanctionsMisconduct & Unethical BehaviorGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsJudicial Conduct

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.153

§ 551.153 Timely Objection to Misconduct Required

[1] Requirement and Purpose

Counsel must timely and properly object to alleged misconduct and, in a jury trial, request that the jury be admonished. The rule requiring making timely objections is remedial in nature, and seeks to give the court the opportunity to admonish the jury, instruct counsel, and forestall the accumulation of prejudice through repeated improprieties, thus avoiding the necessity of a retrial. It is only in extreme cases that the court, when acting promptly and speaking clearly and directly on the subject, cannot by instructing the jury to disregard the matters, correct the impropriety of counsel's act, and remove any effect that his or her conduct or remarks would otherwise have [*see Horn v. Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 602, 610, 39 Cal. Rptr. 721, 394 P.2d 561 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 909 (1965)* ; *Atkins v. Bisigier (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 414, 427, 94 Cal. Rptr. 49]* .

Thus, a motion for mistrial at the conclusion of plaintiff's closing argument, based on numerous statements in the argument, was not a timely objection, especially when defendant's counsel did not request that the jury be admonished to disregard the allegedly improper statements made by plaintiff's counsel. At that point, the claimed damage could not be forestalled. In the absence of a timely objection, the offended party is deemed to have waived the claim of error on appeal [*see Horn v. Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 602, 610, 39 Cal. Rptr. 721, 394 P.2d 561 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 909 (1965)* ; *Nelson v. Gaunt (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 623, 644, 178 Cal. Rptr. 167* ; *Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 860, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888* ; *see also Whitfield v. Roth (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 874, 891-893, 112 Cal. Rptr. 540, 519 P.2d 588* (misconduct waived because of counsel's failure to object when any effect on jury could have been entirely removed by admonishing instruction); *see also § 551.157[2]*].

[2] Multiple Objections Not Necessarily Required

Multiple objections to alleged misconduct are not necessarily required. Moreover, multiple objections may have a tendency to alienate a jury's good will, especially when the judge fails to rule on objections. In addition, while it may be possible to cure error by admonishing a jury when the error is isolated and unemphasized, an attempt to rectify repeated and resounding misconduct by admonition is futile [*see Love v. Wolf (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 378, 392, 38 Cal. Rptr. 183* ; *see also Simmons v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 341, 355-359, 133 Cal. Rptr. 42*

(misconduct was grounds for new trial)].

[3] Objection to Judicial Misconduct

Although a request for an instruction, in addition to an assignment of error, is generally necessary as the basis for an appeal on the ground of misconduct of counsel, there is no such requirement when appellant alleges that rights were prejudiced by improper action of the trial judge. It appears that counsel must merely object to alleged judicial misconduct [*see Delzell v. Day (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 349, 351, 223 P.2d 625* ; *see Berguin v. Pacific Elec. Ry. Co. (1924) 203 Cal. 116, 121-122, 263 P. 220* ; *see also Etzel v. Rosenbloom (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 758, 761-762, 189 P.2d 848* (when judge's admonition to jury to disregard judge's misconduct would not remove prejudicial effect of misconduct, not prerequisite to urging error on appeal for appellant to have objected and requested that jury be instructed); *Estate of Golden (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 300, 311, 48 P.2d 962]* .

Some courts have stated that counsel must both object and request an instruction with respect to alleged misconduct of a trial judge, unless it is apparent that an admonition would not remove the prejudicial effect of the judge's conduct [*see Miller v. Western P. R. Co. (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 581, 607, 24 Cal. Rptr. 785* ; *Etzel v. Rosenbloom (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 758, 761-762, 189 P.2d 848]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsObjectionsCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsMisconductCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialCivil ProcedureSanctionsMisconduct & Unethical BehaviorGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.154

§ 551.154 Procedure for Requesting Mistrial

[1] Oral Motion During Trial

Generally, counsel requests a mistrial by making an oral motion during trial and outside the presence of the jury [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.47 (motion for mistrial should be made and argued outside hearing of jurors)]. The motion may be made, for example, during voir dire for counsel's improper questioning of prospective jurors [*see, e.g., Stevenson v. Link (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 564, 568, 275 P.2d 782]* . Counsel may also move for mistrial at any other stage of the action up until the court or jury renders a decision [*see Estate of Bartholomae (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 839, 842, 68 Cal. Rptr. 332* ; *Schouten v. Crawford (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 59, 65, 257 P.2d 88* (counsel should have moved for mistrial before jury sent back for further deliberation); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 656* (new trial is reexamination of issue of fact after trial and decision by jury, court, or referee); *§ 551.151*].

[2] Timing of Motion

The motion must be made at the proper time or the claimed error will be considered waived. The mistrial motion, and, when required, a request for admonishment of the jury, should be made when the claimed damage could be forestalled by appropriate court action [*see Horn v. Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 602, 610, 39 Cal. Rptr. 721, 394 P.2d 561 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 909* (motion untimely when counsel did not interrupt opening or closing arguments to object to claimed misconduct); *Gimbel v. Laramie (1960) 181 Cal. App. 2d 77, 83, 5 Cal. Rptr. 88* (claim of surprise or prejudice waived when counsel failed to move for mistrial after alleged surprise testimony); *see also § 551.153*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeContent & FormCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsObjectionsCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for Mistrial

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.155

§ 551.155 Order Denying or Declaring Mistrial

An order determining a motion for mistrial may be made orally by the court and entered in the minutes [*see Vitimin Milling Corp. v. Superior Court (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 116, 118, 33 P.2d 1016]* . Alternatively, a written order denying or declaring a mistrial may be signed and entered [*see Barendregt v. Downing (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 733, 735, 346 P.2d 870]* .

When a motion is granted or denied, unless the court otherwise orders, notice of the court's decision or order must be given by the prevailing party to all other parties or their attorneys, in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020*, unless notice is waived by all parties in open court and is entered in the minutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*].

A trial court may declare a partial mistrial and reserve judgment on some, but not all, causes of action pending a second trial [*Valentine v. Baxter Healthcare Corp. (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1467, 1475-1478, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 252]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsMotions for Mistrial

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.156

§ 551.156 Procedure Following Order Declaring Mistrial

[1] Short Causes

A "short cause" case is a civil case in which the time estimated for trial by all parties or the court is five hours or less. All other civil cases are "long cause" cases [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.735(a)*]. On the stipulation of all parties or the court's own motion, the court may order that a case is a short cause case exempted from the requirements of case management review and set the case for trial [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.735(b)*].

If a short cause case is not completely tried within five hours, the judge may declare a mistrial or, in the judge's discretion, may complete the trial. In the event of a mistrial, the case will be treated as a long cause case and must promptly be set either for a new trial or for a case management conference [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.735(c)*].

[2] Retrial After Mistrial

When the jury is discharged without having rendered a verdict, or is prevented from giving a verdict by reason of accident or other cause during the progress of the trial or after the cause is submitted to them, the action may be tried again immediately or at a future time as the court may direct. This does not apply when the court directs a verdict under *Code Civ. Proc. § 630* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 616*].

[3] Dismissal for Failure to Prosecute

When in any action a trial has commenced but no judgment has been entered because of a mistrial or because a jury is unable to reach a decision, the action is subject to mandatory or discretionary dismissal unless it is brought to trial within three or two years, respectively, after entry of the order declaring the mistrial or disagreement by the jury [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.320(a)(1), 583.360, 583.410, 583.420(a)(3)(A)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.140, 583.330-583.350, 583.420(b)* (pertaining to extensions or excuses)]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 212, *Dismissal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for Mistrial

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.157

§ 551.157 Appellate Review

[1] Order Declaring or Denying Mistrial Nonappealable

An order granting a mistrial is nonappealable and may only be reviewed on appeal from the judgment [*Reimer v. Firpo (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 798, 802, 212 P.2d 23* ; see *Heavy Duty Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Superior Court (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 116, 119, 89 Cal. Rptr. 598* ; *Estate of Bartholomae (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 839, 842, 68 Cal. Rptr. 332]* . An order denying a motion for mistrial is also nonappealable, but may also be reviewed on appeal from the judgment [*Warner v. O'Connor (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 770, 774, 18 Cal. Rptr. 902]* .

[2] Effect of Failure to Object

Generally, a claim of counsel's misconduct is entitled to no consideration on appeal unless the record shows a timely and proper objection and a request that the jury be admonished [*Horn v. Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Ry. Co. (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 602, 610, 39 Cal. Rptr. 721, 394 P.2d 561 , cert. denied, 380 U.S. 909 (1965)* ; *see Whitfield v. Roth (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 874, 891-893, 112 Cal. Rptr. 540, 519 P.2d 588* ; *Stevens v. Parke, Davis & Co. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 51, 70, 107 Cal. Rptr. 45, 507 P.2d 653* (applying general rule to motion for new trial); *Sabella v. Southern Pacific Co. (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 311, 318, 74 Cal. Rptr. 534, 449 P.2d 750 , cert. denied, 395 U.S. 960* ; *see also § 551.153*].

Although a request for an instruction, in addition to an assignment of error, is generally necessary as the basis for an appeal on the ground of misconduct of counsel, there is no such requirement when appellant alleges that rights were prejudiced by the improper action of the trial judge [*Delzell v. Day (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 349, 351, 223 P.2d 625* ; *see also § 551.153[3]*].

[3] Standard of Review

The discretion of a trial judge in granting or refusing motions for mistrial is very broad, and the court's decision will be left undisturbed on appeal unless manifest and unmistakable abuse of discretion clearly appears [*Warner v. O'Connor (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 770, 776, 18 Cal. Rptr. 902]* . For detailed discussion of the abuse of discretion standard of review, see Ch. 41, *Appeal: Review Standards and Appellate Rules of Law* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsReviewabilityPreservation for ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of Discretion

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
J. Mistrial

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.158-551.169

[Reserved]

§§ 551.158[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.170

§ 551.170 Civil Proceedings Generally Open to Public

The sitting of every court shall be public, except as otherwise provided under *Fam. Code § 214* or any other provision of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 124*; for discussion of *Fam. Code § 214* and other exceptions, *see § 551.171*].

Pursuant to the "open court" policy codified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 124*, as well as constitutional protections under the *First Amendment*, substantive courtroom proceedings in ordinary civil cases are "presumptively open" to the public [*NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1212, 1217-1218, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomGovernmentsCourtsCreation & Organization

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.171

§ 551.171 Civil Proceedings Closed by Law

Although proceedings in ordinary civil cases are "presumptively open," some civil proceedings are closed on the basis of an express provision of law. These exceptions occur chiefly with respect to proceedings under the Family Code. For example, proceedings under the Family Code to terminate parental rights or to adopt a minor child are required to be closed [*see Fam. Code §§ 7884, 8611*; *see also Fam. Code § 1818(a)* (family conciliation court proceedings)]. The judge in a proceeding under the Family Code also has general discretion to direct that the trial of any issue of fact joined in the proceeding be closed, if it considers this necessary in the interests of justice and the persons involved [*Fam. Code § 214*]. In this event the court may exclude all persons from the proceeding except the officers of the court, the parties, their witnesses, and counsel [*Fam. Code § 214*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 124* (general "open court" statute expressly excepting proceedings directed to be private under *Fam. Code § 214*)].

For examples of when court records, as distinguished from proceedings, that are sealed by express provision of law, see *§ 551.173[1]*.

For discussion of procedures to be followed when a court holds *in camera* proceedings from which a party is excluded, see *§ 551.174*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomFamily LawGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsCreation & Organization

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.172

§ 551.172 Criteria for Closing Proceedings Otherwise Open to Public

As articulated by the California Supreme Court, a trial court must do all of the following before closing a proceeding that is not otherwise closed by an express statutory exception to the general rule requiring open proceedings [*NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1212, 1217-1218, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337]* :

- The court must provide notice to the public of the contemplated closure. When an oral motion seeking closure is made, adequate notice is provided if the court announces in open court that it plans to hold or consider holding a particular proceeding in closed session. When a written motion seeking closure is filed, public docketing of that motion reasonably in advance of the court's determination provides adequate notice.

- Before proceedings are closed or transcripts are ordered sealed, the court must hold a hearing and expressly find that there exist an overriding interest supporting the closure or sealing, there is a substantial probability that this interest will be prejudiced absent closure or sealing, the proposed closure or sealing is narrowly tailored to the interest, and there is no less restrictive means of achieving the overriding interest.

Quite apart from its power to restrict public access in order to protect an "overriding interest," a court may properly deny or regulate public access by reasonable restrictions relating to time, place, or manner, in order to maintain dignity and decorum, or when courtroom capacity precludes entry by every person who wishes to attend [*NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1222 n.46, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsJudicial & Legislative RestraintsTime,

Place & MannerGovernmentsCourtsCreation & Organization

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.173

§ 551.173 Procedure for Sealing Otherwise Public Records

[1] Purpose and Applicability

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550-2.551 set out the procedure for courts to follow when a request is made to seal records that are otherwise public [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(a)(1)*]. This procedure recognizes the *First Amendment* right of access to documents used at trial or as a basis of adjudication, and is based on the standards articulated by the California Supreme Court in *NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court(1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337* [Advisory Committee Comment to former *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550*; *see* discussion of *NBC Subsidiary* under *§ 551.172*].

The procedure for sealing records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550 et seq.* applies only to records that are otherwise deemed public, that is, they do not apply to records that are to be sealed or kept confidential pursuant to statute or rule [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(a)(2)*]. Examples of records that are sealed by law are records of the family conciliation court [*see Fam. Code § 1818(b)*] and applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct. Rule 3.50 et seq.*]. Similarly, records and the fact of filing may be made temporarily unavailable to the public by a plaintiff preparing for prejudgment attachment proceedings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 482.050*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.580*; for discussion and a form of declaration under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.580* to be used by a plaintiff in this situation, *see* Ch. 62, *Attachment*].

This procedure does not apply to discovery motions and records filed or lodged in connection with discovery motions or proceedings. However, it does apply to discovery materials when they are used at trial or submitted as a basis for adjudication of matters other than discovery motions or proceedings [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(a)(2)*; *see also* Advisory Committee Comment to former Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 243.1, citing *NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1208-1209 n.25, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337]* .

[2] "Record," "Sealed Record," and "Lodged Record" Defined

With respect to the procedures for sealing otherwise public records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550 et seq.*, the following definitions apply [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(b)*]:

- A "record" means all or a portion of any document, paper, exhibit, transcript, or other thing filed or lodged with the court, unless the context indicates otherwise.

- A "sealed" record is a record that by court order is not open to inspection by the public.

- A "lodged" record is a record that is temporarily placed or deposited with the court but not filed.

[3] Court Order Required to Seal Records

A record must not be filed under seal without a court order. The court must not permit a record to be filed under seal based solely the agreement or stipulation of the parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(a)*].

[4] Grounds for Order Sealing Records

Unless confidentiality is required by law, court records are presumed to be open [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(c)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(b)(1)* ("record" is all or a portion of any document, paper, exhibit, transcript, or other thing filed or lodged with the court)].

A trial court may order that a record be filed under seal only if it expressly finds all of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(d)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(b)(2)* ("sealed records" is one that by court order is not open to inspection by the public)]:

- There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the record.

- The overriding interest supports sealing the record.

- A substantial probability exists that the overriding interest will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed.

- The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored.

- No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest.

The findings required under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(d)* reflect the test articulated by the *Supreme Court in NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337* , which applies to the sealing of records [Advisory Committee Comment to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550*, citing *NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1217-1218, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337* ; *see* discussion of this test under *§ 551.172*].

The Supreme Court in *NBC Subsidiary* provides various examples of "overriding interests" recognized by case law. Specifically, courts have found that, under appropriate circumstances, various statutory privileges, trade secrets, and privacy interests, when properly asserted and not waived, may constitute "overriding interests" [*see NBC Subsidiary (KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1222 n.46, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337* (also assuming that civil litigant's right to fair trial would constitute overriding interest, and noting additional overriding interests such as binding contractual obligation not to disclose and protection of witnesses from extreme embarrassment or intimidation)]. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(d)* does not attempt to define this term, but leaves such definition to developing case law [Advisory Committee Comment to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550*].

Although protection of trade secrets may be a valid reason for restricting access, the mere presence of claimed trade

secrets does not mandate confidentiality. The court is required to keep those records confidential only in actions initiated pursuant to the Uniform Trade Secrets Act for misappropriation of trade secrets [*In re Providian Credit Card Cases (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 298-300* ; *see Civ. Code § 3426.5*; for discussion of trade secrets, *see* Ch. 565, *Unfair Competition*].

[5] Noticed Motion Procedure for Order Sealing Records

As discussed in [3], *above*, the parties may not stipulate to sealing records but must seek a court order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(a)*].

A party requesting that a record be filed under seal must file a noticed motion for an order sealing the record. This motion must be accompanied by a memorandum and a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify the sealing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(1)*]. For a form of noticed motion to seal records, see *§ 551.261*. For discussion of the findings necessary to justify sealing, see [4], *above*. For discussion of the procedural requirements governing noticed motions generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

A party moving for order directing that a record be filed under seal must lodge that record with the court pursuant *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)* at the time of making the motion, unless good cause exists for not lodging it [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(2)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(b)(3)* (a "lodged" record is one temporarily placed or deposited with the court but not filed); for discussion of the procedure for lodging records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)*, see [8], *below*]. Pending the determination of the motion, a record so lodged will be conditionally under seal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(4)*]. If the court denies the motion to seal, the clerk is required to return the lodged record to the submitting party and may not place that record in the case file unless that party notifies the clerk in writing within 10 days after the order denying the motion or application that the record is to be filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(6)*].

[6] Redacted and Complete Versions of Moving and Opposing Papers

If necessary to prevent disclosure, the motion, any opposition, and any supporting documents must be filed in a public redacted version and lodged in a complete version conditionally under seal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(5)*; for discussion of procedure for lodging documents conditionally under seal, *see* [8], *below*].

[7] Referee to Examine Voluminous Records

If the records that a party is requesting be placed under seal are voluminous, the court may appoint a referee and fix and allocate the referee's fees among the parties, consistent with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 639* and *645.1* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(2)*]. For discussion of the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 639* and *645.1* (relating respectively to order directing reference and payment of referee fees), see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

[8] Lodging Records to Be Sealed and Not to Be Sealed

A party requesting that a record be filed under seal must put it in a envelope or other appropriate container, seal the envelope or container, and lodge it with the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(1)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(b)(3)* ("lodged" record is one temporarily placed or deposited with the court but not filed)].

The envelope or container must be labeled as follows [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(2)*]:

"CONDITIONALLY UNDER SEAL."

When lodging a record, the submitting party must, in addition, affix to the envelope or container a cover sheet that includes the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)*]:

- All the information required on a caption page under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111* [for general discussion of caption-page requirements under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111, see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

- A statement that the enclosed record is subject to a motion to file the record under seal.

For a form of cover sheet to affix to an envelope or container of records that are to be lodged under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)*, see *§ 551.262*.

On receipt of a record lodged under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)*, the clerk must endorse the affixed cover sheet with the date of its receipt and retain the lodged record but not file it unless the court orders it filed [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(4)*].

If the court denies the motion to seal a record lodged with the court, the clerk must return the lodged record to the submitting party and must not place it in the case file [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(6)*].

Alternately, if the court grants the motion to seal a record lodged with the court, the clerk must substitute for the label required under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551* (set out *above*), a replacement label on the envelope or container that prominently states the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(e)(1)*]:

"SEALED BY ORDER OF THE COURT ON (DATE)."

In addition, the clerk must replace the cover sheet that was affixed to the envelope or container pursuant to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)* (described *above*) with a file-endorsed copy of the court's order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(e)(1)*].

A party that files or intends to file with the court records produced in discovery, for the purposes of adjudication or to use at trial, that are subject to a confidentiality agreement or protective order, and that does not intend to request to have the records sealed, must do each of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(3)(A)*]:

- Lodge the unredacted records and any pleadings, memorandums, declarations, and other documents that disclose the contents of the records, in the manner stated in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)*.

- File copies of the documents that are redacted so that they do not disclose the contents of the records subject to the confidentiality agreement or protective order.

- Give written notice to the party that produced the records that the records and the other documents will be placed in the public court file unless that party files a timely motion or application to seal the records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551*.

If the party that produced the documents and was served with notice fails to file a motion or an application to seal the records within 10 days or to obtain a court order extending the time to file a motion or an application, the clerk must promptly remove all the documents from the envelope or container where they are located and place them in the public file. If the party files a motion or an application to seal within 10 days, or a later time the court orders, the documents are to remain conditionally under seal until the court rules on the motion or application and thereafter are to be filed as ordered by the court [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(3)(B)*].

[9] Order Sealing Records

An order sealing records must specifically set forth the factual findings that support the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(1)(A)*; *see* discussion of these findings in [4], *above*].

The order must also direct the sealing of only those documents and pages, or, if reasonably practicable, only those portions of documents and pages, that contain the material that needs to be placed under seal. All other documents and pages, or portions of each documents or page, must be included in the public file [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(1)(B)*]. This accords with the requirement articulated by the Supreme Court in *NBC Subsidiary*, that any order directing closure of proceedings or sealing of records be narrowly tailored to the interest to be protected, and be the least restrictive means possible of protecting that interest [*see NBC Subsidiary(KNBC-TV), Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1178, 1212, 1217-1218, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 980 P.2d 337* and discussion in [4], *above*].

When an order sealing records relates to a record that has been lodged but not filed under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)* [discussed in [8], *above*], the order must direct that not only that the record be sealed but that it be filed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(d)(4)* (lodged record not filed unless court orders it filed); *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(6)* (lodged record not filed but returned if court denies motion to seal lodged record)]. The order must also state whether, in addition to the lodged record, the order itself, the register of actions, any other court records, or any other records relating to the case are also to be sealed [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.552(e)(2)].

An order sealing records must state whether any person other than the court is authorized to inspect the sealed record [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.552(e)(3)].

In reviewing an order to seal records, the appellate court proceeds in two stages [*In re Providian Credit Card Cases (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 301-302, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833]* :

- The court examines the express findings of fact required by *Cal. Rules Ct., Rule 2.550(d)* to determine if they are supported by substantial evidence on the basis of the entire record.

- The court then decides whether, in light of and on the basis of the findings, the trial court abused its discretion in ordering a record sealed.

For a form of order sealing records, see *§ 551.263*.

[10] Disclosure of Sealed or Conditionally Sealed Records Prohibited

A record filed publicly in the court must not disclose material contained in a record that is sealed, conditionally under seal, or subject to a pending motion to seal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(c)*].

[11] Custody of Sealed Records

Sealed records must be securely filed and kept separately from the public file in the case [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(f)*].

If records to be placed under seal are voluminous and are in the possession of a public agency, the court may by written order direct the agency instead of the clerk to maintain custody of the original records in a secure fashion. If the records are requested by a reviewing court, the trial court must order the public agency to deliver the records to the clerk for transmission to the reviewing court under these rules [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(g)*; for general discussion of the rules relating to the transmission of records to a reviewing court, *see* Ch. 44, *Appeal: Preparing and Filing the Record* (appeal of unlimited civil case to court of appeal)].

[12] Motion to Unseal Records

A sealed record may not be unsealed except by court order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(h)(1)*]. A party or member of the public, or the court on its own motion, may move to unseal a record. Notice of a motion to unseal must be filed and served on the parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(h)(2)*]. The motion, opposition, reply, and supporting documents must be filed in a public redacted version and a sealed complete version, if necessary to comply with *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(c)* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(h)(2)*; for discussion of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(c), see* [10], *above*; *see also* discussion in [6], *above*].

It is recommended that any motion to unseal records be accompanied not only by a supporting memorandum but also a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify the new order [*cf. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(1)*]. A motion to unseal records will necessarily be made on the ground that justification no longer exists for the original order sealing the records. The party making the original motion to seal records was required to establish this justification by means of sufficient facts set out in a supporting declaration [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(1)*, discussed in [5], *above*], and this justification was embodied in the express findings required to support the original order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(1)(A)*, discussed in [4], *above*]. So, too, a motion to unseal records will need a supporting declaration that establishes the new or different facts, circumstances, or law that render nonexistent the justification for the original order [*cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 1008(a), (b)* (motion to reconsider or renewed motion based on "new or different facts, circumstances, or law"), discussed in Ch. 374, *Motions to Reconsider and Renewed Motions*].

Motions to unseal records are governed by *Cal. Rules Ct., Rule 2.551(h)*, which does not impose a requirement of express findings [*In re Providian Credit Card Cases (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 302, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833]* . Lacking express written findings by the trial court, the scope of appellate review of an order to unseal begins by determining whether appropriate findings the reviewing court may infer in support of the order that exhibits be unsealed have the support of substantial evidence, which is made on the basis of the entire record, including exhibits the trial court refused to unseal [*In re Providian Credit Card Cases (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 302-303, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833]* .

For a form of motion to seal records that may be modified for use as a subsequent motion to unseal records, see *§ 551.261*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechScope of FreedomGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.174

§ 551.174 Confidential Proceedings *In Camera*

If a confidential *in camera* proceeding is held, in which a party is excluded from being represented, the clerk must include in the minutes the nature of the hearing and only such references to writings or witnesses as will not disclose privileged information [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.585(a)*].

Records examined by the court in confidence under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.585(a)*, or copies of them, must be filed with the clerk under seal and may not be disclosed without court order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.585(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationFreedom of InformationEnforcementIn Camera InspectionsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
K. Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.175-551.199

[Reserved]

§§ 551.175[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.200

§ 551.200 Related Matthew Bender Publications

California Trial Guide (Matthew Bender)

Baum, Art of Advocacy, *Preparation of the Case* (Matthew Bender)

Wagner, Art of Advocacy, *Jury Selection* (Matthew Bender)

Decof, Art of Advocacy, *Opening Statement* (Matthew Bender)

Baldwin, Art of Advocacy, *Direct Examination* (Matthew Bender)

Habush, Art of Advocacy, *Cross Examination of Nonmedical Experts* (Matthew Bender)

Houts, Art of Advocacy, *Cross Examination of Medical Experts* (Matthew Bender)

Smith, Art of Advocacy, *Summation* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsSelectionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsOpening StatementsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExaminationCross-ExaminationGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExaminationDirect Examination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.201

§ 551.201 California Constitution

Newsperson's immunity from contempt citation. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 2(b)*

Due process, equal protection, privileges and immunities. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*

Prohibition against unreasonably detaining witnesses and imprisonment for debt or tort in civil action. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 10*

Right to trial by jury. *Cal. Const., art. I, § 16*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsTrial by Jury in Civil ActionsConstitutional LawSubstantive Due ProcessGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawEqual ProtectionGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawPrivileges & Immunities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.202

§ 551.202 State Statutes

[1] Affidavits and Declarations

Affidavit as one of three modes of taking testimony of witnesses. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2002(1)*

"Affidavit" defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*

Use of affidavits on a motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*

Use of declaration under penalty of perjury in lieu of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[2] Burden of Proof and Producing Evidence

"Burden of producing evidence" defined. *Evid. Code § 110*

"Burden of proof" defined. *Evid. Code § 115*

"Proof" defined. *Evid. Code § 190*

Who has burden of proof. *Evid. Code §§ 500-522*

Who has burden of producing evidence. *Evid. Code § 550*

[3] Exhibits

Retention or destruction of exhibits, depositions, and administrative records. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1952, 1952.3*

Return of exhibits, depositions, and administrative records to attorneys by court order after judgment has become final. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1952.2*

[4] Experts

Motion for order appointing expert witness. *Evid. Code § 730*

Payment of expert's compensation. *Evid. Code § 731*

Compensation of expert witness in civil action. *Gov. Code §§ 68092.5, 68096*

[5] Evidence

View of property, place, object, demonstration, or experiment outside courtroom. *Code Civ. Proc. § 651*

Record of conveyance of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1950*

Miscellaneous provisions relating to evidence in particular cases. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2074-2077*

"Evidence" defined. *Evid. Code § 140*

"Relevant evidence" defined. *Evid. Code § 210*

Admissibility, exclusion, and weight of evidence. *Evid. Code §§ 350-413*

Evidence of character, habit, or custom. *Evid. Code § 1100 et seq.*

Evidence affected or excluded by extrinsic policies. *Evid. Code § 1150 et seq.*

Hearsay evidence. *Evid. Code § 1200 et seq.*

[6] Interference With Court Proceedings

Unlawful interference with court proceedings as contempt of court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1209(a)(8)*

[7] Judicial Notice

Limitation on judicial notice. *Evid. Code § 450*

Mandatory judicial notice. *Evid. Code 451*

Permissive judicial notice. *Evid. Code §§ 452, 453*

Determination of propriety of judicial notice. *Evid. Code § 454*

Presentation of information to court. *Evid. Code § 455*

Procedure on denial of request for judicial notice. *Evid. Code § 456*

Instruction to jury re judicially noticed matter. *Evid. Code § 457*

Judicial notice in subsequent proceedings. *Evid. Code §§ 458, 459*

Appointment of experts to enable court to take judicial notice. *Evid. Code § 460*

[8] Jury Instructions and Verdicts

Proposed instructions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 607a*

Court's instructions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 608*

Duty of court with respect to requested instructions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 609*

Verdicts. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 624-628*

[9] Motion Practice

Application for order as a motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1003*

When notice must be given, extensions of time when service is by mail, and serving of supporting papers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(b)*

Motion as deemed made on serving and filing notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*

Contents of notice of motion. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Service of papers. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1011-1020*

[10] Motions During Trial

Motion for nonsuit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 581c*

Motion for continuance or postponement. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 595-596*

Motion for judgment when jury discharged without verdict. *Code Civ. Proc. § 630(f)*

Motion for judgment in nonjury trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8*

Motion for out-of-court view by trier of fact of property, place, object, demonstration, or experiment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 651(a)*

Motion to exclude or strike evidence. *Evid. Code § 353(a)*

Motion to appoint expert witness. *Evid. Code § 730*

Motion to strike answer of witness as nonresponsive. *Evid. Code § 766*

Motion to produce writing used by witness to refresh recollection. *Evid. Code § 771(a)*

Motion to reexamine witness as to same matter. *Evid. Code § 774*

Motion that court call witness as its own. *Evid. Code § 775*

Motion to exclude witnesses from courtroom. *Evid. Code § 777*

Motion to recall witness. *Evid. Code § 778*

Motion to exclude privileged information. *Evid. Code § 916*

[11] Notice of Trial

Notice required. *Code Civ. Proc. § 594*

[12] Oaths and Affirmations

Jurors' acknowledgment and agreement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 232(b)*

Form of oath or affirmation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2094*

Witness' oath or affirmation required. *Evid. Code § 710*

[13] Orders

Every direction of a court or judge made or entered in writing and not included in a judgment as an order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1003*

[14] Privileges

Private investigator-client privilege. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7539(a)*

General provisions. *Evid. Code §§ 900-920*

Particular privileges. *Evid. Code §§ 930-1060*

Newsperson's immunity from contempt citation. *Evid. Code § 1070*

[15] Presumptions and Inferences

Definitions. *Evid. Code § 600*

Kinds and effects of presumptions. *Evid. Code § 601 et seq.*

[16] Separate Trial of Issues and Defenses

Issue of child custody. *Fam. Code § 3023(b)*

Issue of child support. *Fam. Code § 4003*

Special defense not going to merits of action but constituting bar or ground of abatement to prosecution. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 597, 597.5*

Issue or part of issue before other issue or part of issue in case. *Code Civ. Proc. § 598*

[17] Stipulations

Power of attorney to bind client by stipulation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 283*

[18] Trial

Order of trial. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607, 631.7*

Province of court and jury. *Evid. Code §§ 310-312*

Regulation of order of proof. *Evid. Code § 320*

[19] Trial by Jury

Formation of jury. *Code Civ. Proc. § 190 et seq.*

Conduct of trial and verdict. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607-630*

[20] Trial by Court

Conduct of trial and judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 631-636*

[21] Trier of Fact

Defined. *Evid. Code § 235*

[22] Witnesses

"Witness" defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1878*

Power of court to compel attendance of witnesses. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1989*

Modes in which testimony of witnesses may be taken. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2002*

"Oral examination" defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2005*

Pretrial exchange of expert witness information. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.210 et seq.* effective July 1, 2005)

"Unavailable as a witness" defined. *Evid. Code § 240*

Qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be witnesses. *Evid. Code §§ 700-704*

Requirement that witness have personal knowledge of matter to which he or she is testifying unless witness is testifying as expert witness. *Evid. Code § 702*

Oath and confrontation. *Evid. Code §§ 710-712*

Expert witnesses. *Evid. Code §§ 720-733*

Interpreters and translators. *Evid. Code § 750 et seq.*

Method and scope of examination. *Evid. Code §§ 760-778*

Credibility of witnesses. *Evid. Code §§ 780-791*

Expert and other opinion testimony. *Evid. Code §§ 800-870*

[23] Writings

"Parol Evidence Rule." *Code Civ. Proc. § 1856*; *Com. Code § 2202*

Distinction between sealed and unsealed writings as abolished. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1932*

"Writing," "original," and "duplicate" as used in Evidence Code defined. *Evid. Code §§ 250-260*

Ancient documents. *Evid. Code § 643*

Books by public authority. *Evid. Code § 644*

Books containing reports of cases. *Evid. Code § 645*

Newspapers or periodicals. *Evid. Code § 645.1*

Authentication and proof of writings. *Evid. Code §§ 1400-1454*

Proof of content of writing. *Evid. Code §§ 1520-1523*

Proof of contents of writing by original writing. *Evid. Code § 1520*

Proof of contents of writing by secondary evidence. *Evid. Code § 1521*

Proof of contents of official record by copy. *Evid. Code §§ 1530-1532, 1601*

Proof of contents of business records by photographic copies and printed representations. *Evid. Code §§ 1550, 1560-1566*

Proof of contents of lost or destroyed records by photographic copies and printed representations. *Evid. Code § 1551*

Proof of contents of computer information or programs by printed representations. *Evid. Code § 1552*

Proof of images stored on video or digital medium by printed representations. *Evid. Code § 1553*

Production of business records. *Evid. Code §§ 1560-1566*

Official writings affecting property. *Evid. Code §§ 1600-1605*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceJudicial NoticeGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.203

§ 551.203 California Rules of Court

[1] Complex Litigation

Handling of complex litigation. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.400 et seq.* (complex cases); 3.501 et seq. (coordination of complex actions)

[2] Continuances

Motions and grounds for continuance. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1332*

[3] Counsel

Counsel pro hac vice. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 9.40*

Availability of court reporting services in civil cases; when party may procure reporter. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.956*

Assessing fee for reporting services. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.958*

[4] Destruction, Preservation, or Transfer of Trial Court Records

Preservation and archiving of all superior court records filed before 1911; preservation and archiving of all superior court records filed from 1911 through 1949, if practicable; preservation and archiving of selected sample of superior court records filed after December 31, 1910. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.855*

Destruction of superior court records not designated for preservation; transfer of possession of records to requesting entity in lieu of destruction; notice requirements and forms of notice. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.856*

[5] Interpreters

Periodic review of court interpreter skills. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.891*

Guidelines for approval of certification programs for interpreters for deaf and hard-of-hearing persons. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.892*

Standards of professional conduct for court interpreters. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.890*

Standards for determining need for court interpreter; instructing participants. Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Stds. 2.10, 2.11

[6] Judges

Duties of presiding judges. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 10.603*

Duties of all trial court judges. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.608*

Assignment of case to one judge for all or limited purposes. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.734*

[7] Jurors

Examination of prospective jurors. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1540*; Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 3.25

Excuses from jury service. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1008*

[8] Jury Instructions and Verdicts

Proposed jury instructions. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1055*

Request for special findings by jury. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1580*

Judicial Council jury instructions (CACI). *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1050*

Judicial comment on verdict or mistrial. Cal. Rules of Ct., Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. Jud. Admin., Std. 2.30

[9] Photographing, Recording, and Broadcasting

"Media coverage" defined. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(b)(1)*

"Media" and "media agency" defined. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(b)(2)*

Proceedings for order permitting media coverage; power of court to refuse, limit, or terminate media coverage; prohibited media coverage; media equipment and personnel; media pooling arrangements. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e)*

Use of personal recording devices. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(d)*

Photographing, recording, or broadcasting of court proceedings prohibited except as provided under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150*. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(c)*

Violation of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150* or of court order made under that rule is unlawful interference with court and may be basis for order terminating media coverage, contempt sanction, monetary or other sanction. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(f)*

[10] Statement of Decision and Judgment

Procedure. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1590*

Bifurcated trial. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1591*

[11] Submitted Matters

Notice of determination. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1109*

[12] Trial

Assigned case to be tried or dismissed. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.910*

Motion to advance, specially set, or reset case for trial. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.204

§ 551.204 Local Court Rules

[1] Contra Costa County

Motions affecting master calendar. Contra Costa Co. Local Ct. Rules, Rule 4(d)

Number of counsel participating in examination of witness. Contra Costa Co. Local Ct. Rules, Rule 19

Jurors. Contra Costa Co. Local Ct. Rules, Rule 21

[2] Los Angeles County

Procedure governing civil trials. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.0 et seq.

Selection of Jurors. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.0

Session hours and opening of session. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 4.0

[3] Orange County

Jury instructions. Orange Co. Coordinated Trial Ct. Rules, Rule 362

[4] San Diego County

Request for daily transcripts. San Diego Co. Coordinated Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 11.7

[5] Santa Clara County

Civil Case Management. Santa Clara Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 1.1

[6] Ventura County

Court interpreters. Ventura Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 20.00

Removal of papers and return of exhibits. Ventura Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.02

Removal of exhibits. Ventura Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.04

Jury fees and expenses. Ventura Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 19.08

Jury instructions. Ventura Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 19.09

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.205

§ 551.205 Rules of Professional Conduct

Threatening to present criminal, administrative, or disciplinary charges to obtain advantage in civil dispute. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-100*

Trial conduct. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-200*

Attorney as witness. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-210*

Suppression of evidence. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-220*

Contact with witnesses. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-310*

Contact with jurors. *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 5-320*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewEvidenceCompetencyAttorneysLegal EthicsProfessional ConductOpposing Counsel & PartiesLegal EthicsProfessional ConductTribunals

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.206

§ 551.206 Decisions

[1] Argument

Misconduct of counsel is ground for new trial and often takes form of improper argument to jury, such as urging facts not justified by record, suggesting jury may resort to speculation, informing jury that injured party has been compensated by codefendant, and by informing jury of offer of settlement and compromise. *City of Los Angeles v. Decker (1977) 18 Cal. 3d 860, 870, 135 Cal. Rptr. 647, 558 P.2d 545*

Party on whom burden of proof rests has right to open and close argument subject to reasonable discretion on part of court to regulate time and manner of presenting arguments. *Orient Handel v. United States Fid. & Guar. Co. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 684, 700, 237 Cal. Rptr. 667*

Results of polygraph test properly excluded from jury argument when neither procedural foundation for test nor results mentioned in course of trial, and only reference thereto was testimony that defendant did not request test until shortly before trial. *Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1094, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835 , cert. denied, 486 U.S. 1036*

Request for appropriate admonition to jury regarding improper argument is required by law in order to obtain relief on appeal. *Troensegaard v. Silvercrest Industries, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 218, 229, 220 Cal. Rptr. 712*

Defense counsel's statement during argument that peace had been made between plaintiffs and dismissed defendant, objected to on ground it implied settlement, did not constitute prejudicial misconduct requiring reversal of defense verdict. *Tobler v. Chapman (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 568, 573-579, 107 Cal. Rptr. 614*

[2] Burden of Proof

In action by insurer under *Ins. Code § 1871.7* against doctors for fraud based on false claims submitted in violation of *Pen. Code § 550*, trial court properly instructed jury under *Evid. Code § 115* that burden of proof was by preponderance

of the evidence; defendants' analogy to punitive damages was flawed, because *Ins. Code § 1871.7(c)* explicitly provides that penalties set forth in *Ins. Code § 1871.7(b)* are intended to be remedial rather than punitive. *People ex rel. Allstate Ins. Co. v. Muhyeldin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 604, 609-610, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 492*

In action for misappropriation under Uniform Trade Secrets Act, although burden of producing evidence may have shifted to defendant if plaintiff established prima facie case, burden of proof to demonstrate use of trade secret through improper means remained with plaintiff; thus, trial court properly refused to give burden-shifting jury instruction. *Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1668-1673, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279*

In false advertising claim, burden under state law, unlike federal law, does not shift to defendant to prove that claims are true once plaintiff proffers evidence of claim. *National Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharmaceuticals (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1347-1351, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207*

[3] Closed Proceedings and Sealed Records

In class action alleging that defendants had improperly assessed fees and charges to holders of credit cards, trial court did not abuse its discretion in deciding to unseal records over objection that materials constituted proprietary trade secrets, when court found that telemarketing scripts were not trade secrets because they had been disclosed to public; memoranda of marketing strategies and proposals that included blunt criticisms of personnel and management decision-making procedures did not constitute trade secrets because defendants' failure to give them heightened security treatment that was given to other confidential documents reasonably could be deemed by trial court as circumstantial evidence that defendants had not previously treated them as trade secrets. *In re Providian Credit Card Cases (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 292, 303-310, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 833*

[4] Evidence

[a] Agreement of Parties to Exclude

Written agreement between property owners and waterworks district that no materials or discussions from their settlement negotiations could be used in subsequent litigation was enforceable and trial court erred in admitting evidence of settlement negotiations on plaintiffs' request, when there was no evidence agreement was obtained by fraud, misrepresentation, mistake of fact, or excusable neglect, there was substantial change in circumstances that would make enforcing agreement unfair to plaintiffs, particularly as plaintiffs could have unilaterally terminated agreement at any time, and public policy does not militate against enforcing agreement, since California's public policy is to encourage settlement and settlement is encouraged by allowing parties to communicate freely, without fear their communications may be used against them if settlement negotiations are not successful. *Tower Acton v. Los Angeles County Waterworks Dist. No. 37 (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 590, 600-602, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 640*

[b] Character and Habit

Evidence of person's character or trait of character is relevant in three situations: (1) when offered on issue of his or her credibility as witness; (2) when offered as circumstantial evidence of his or her conduct in conformity with such character or trait of character; and (3) when his or her character or trait of character is ultimate fact in dispute in action. *People v. Ramos (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 1133, 1179, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892, 938 P.2d 950* (citing *Carr v. Pacific Tel. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 537, 544, 103 Cal. Rptr. 120*)

In action by child against dentist alleging assault, battery, and professional negligence, trial court erroneously concluded that testimony of other patients about unrelated treatment by dentist was admissible under *Evid. Code § 1101*

, where evidence did not establish common design, because neither context of other incidents nor acts complained of shared requisite common features with incident plaintiff alleged to have happened, and in context of defendant's testimony that he treated as many as 45,000 patients in his career, testimony about nine incidents was highly selective and could not be considered representative; and where evidence also was not admissible to demonstrate intent, because intent was not at issue. Uncharged acts were not admissible under *Evid. Code § 1105* to demonstrate that defendant acted in accordance with his usual custom or habit, where defendant's conduct, occurring in different circumstances, toward nine of 45,000 patients, did not qualify as custom or habit. Finally, even if proffered evidence was proper under *Evid. Code § 1101*, trial court abused its discretion under *Evid. Code § 352* in permitting testimony of former patients, where probative value was slight, but it had great potential for prejudice, confusion, and consumption of time. *Bowen v. Ryan (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 916, 923-927, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 128*

Evid. Code § 1101(a) prohibits evidence of person's character, in form of specific instances of conduct, to prove person's conduct on specific occasion; thus, in sexual harassment case, evidence that other women had been sexually harassed by defendants, to extent offered to show defendants committed conduct at issue because they did same thing before, went to propensity and was correctly excluded. *Beyda v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 511, 518-519, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547*

[c] Criminal Convictions

Guilty plea in prior criminal action is admissible in subsequent civil action as admission. *State Farm Fire & Casualty Co. v. Bomke (9th Cir. 1988) 849 F.2d 1218, 1220*

Trial court erred in excluding evidence of defendant's nolo contendere plea to felony grand theft of automobile which was subject of action for fraud, conversion and negligent misrepresentation, when defendant's plea of nolo contendere to offense punishable as felony, regardless of whether it is ultimately so punished, is admissible as party admission in civil action based on or growing out of act on which criminal prosecution is based. *Rusheen v. Drews (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 279, 283-288, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769*

[d] Discretion of Court Under Evid. Code § 352

In capital murder and torture prosecution, trial court did not abuse its discretion under *Evid. Code § 352* in admitting several photographs of victim's body, taken at site where body was found and during subsequent autopsy, where photographs were highly relevant to proof of how, when, and where victim was tortured and murdered and his personal property burned, and simply showed what had been done to victim; revulsion photographs induced was attributable to acts done, not to photographs themselves. *People v. Brasure (2008) 42 Cal. 4th 1037, 1053-1055, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 675, 175 P.3d 632*

In capital murder prosecution involving sodomizing and rape of young child, trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting photographs of genitals of child after she sustained her injuries but before she died, when central factual dispute was how child received fatal injuries, and with exception of radiologist, each medical professional who testified regarding her treatment was asked to describe what her genitals looked like, so jury was entitled to see for itself condition of her body to determine whether testimonial evidence did or did not support prosecution's theory that she was sexually abused, and when, although photographs were disturbing, they were not particularly gruesome, and their probative value far outweighed any prejudicial effect. *People v. Benavides (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 69, 96, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 507, 105 P.3d 1099*

In capital murder prosecution in which defendant burned victim, trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting photographs of victim before and after fire, when photograph before fire was relevant to torture-murder and murder by torture special circumstances, and photographs after fire were relevant to show condition of victim's body as it related to

intent to inflict extreme pain, as well as to prove commission of kind of act calculated to cause such pain; although photographs were unquestionably unpleasant, they were not unduly gruesome or inflammatory and they were sufficiently different as not to be cumulative. *People v. Cole (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1158, 1197-1199, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532, 95 P.3d 811*

In capital murder prosecution, trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting relatively small color photographs of crime scene and autopsy photographs objected to on ground they were gruesome, inflammatory, cumulative of each other or of testimony, and that defendant should have been allowed to stipulate to facts to avoid presentation of photographs. Although many were unpleasant, most were, given subject matter, quite unexceptional and had probative value in proving contested issues such as defendant's use of gun, state of mind, premeditation, and motive. *People v. Stewart (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 425, 479-481, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 656, 93 P.3d 271*

In prosecution for first degree murder, witness's testimony that murder victim had told witness that if witness did not hear from victim in two weeks to send police was relevant [*Evid. Code § 210*] because it was evidence of victim's state of mind to explain her conduct concerning going with defendant, and was not unduly prejudicial [*Evid. Code § 352*] because testimony was probative on whether victim's disappearance was of her own volition; its evidentiary value was not substantially outweighed by danger of undue prejudice because statement followed witness's nonresponsive answer that victim said she feared defendant and evidence of victim's fear of defendant was introduced independent of statement by witness. *People v. Crew (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 822, 840, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733, 74 P.3d 820*

In prosecution for attempted first-degree murder, trial court did not abuse its discretion under *Evid. Code § 352* in admitting reality television show videotape showing police successfully rescuing defendant's estranged girlfriend from defendant during course of his attempt to strangle her, when videotape corroborated prosecution testimony and its probative value far outweighed any potential that its dramatic nature would mislead, distract or inflame the jury. *People v. Ibarra (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1145, 1150-1151, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22*

In action based on alleged exposure to mycotoxins through mold in home and workplace, trial court properly granted defendants' motion in limine to exclude environmental sampling data pursuant to *Evid. Code § 352*, when probative value of data was minimal because at most it showed that mold spores, not mycotoxins, were present at residence and workplace, and trial court could have reasonably concluded that minimal probative value of data was substantially outweighed by probability that its admission would create substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing issues, or of misleading jury. *Geffcken v. D'Andrea (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 1307-1309, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80*

In personal injury case in which defendants conceded liability and contested only damages, trial court abused its discretion in granting defendants' motion to exclude evidence that plaintiff had paid his own medical bills, after which jury ultimately awarded plaintiff less in economic damages than he had already paid out of pocket for medical expenses, when evidence that plaintiff had paid his medical expenses was manifestly relevant to his claim for damages, collateral source rule was inapposite because exclusion of evidence of plaintiff paying his own bills did not further any policy judgment that people should buy insurance, trial court's finding that evidence would be unduly prejudicial to defendants was untenable because evidence did not run risk of emotionally inflaming jury against defendants on immaterial point, reasonable person was unlikely to run up thousands of dollars in medical bills and pay them out of pocket on mere gamble he might someday obtain reimbursement from tortfeasor, and evidence did not raise substantial danger of confusing issues or misleading jury. *Smalley v. Baty (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 977, 984-987, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 575*

Trial court may not exclude in-court testimony of witness simply because it does not believe witness, except in rare instances of demonstrable falsity, notwithstanding that testimony is damaging to other party; "prejudice" referred to in *Evid. Code § 352* is not synonymous with "damaging." *Vorse v. Sarasy (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 998, 1008, 1012-1013, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 164*

Trial court did not properly exercising discretion by excluding evidence under *Evid. Code § 352* (undue consumption

of time) without inquiring of plaintiff's attorney regarding how many incidents are to be offered and nature of proof for each incident. *Andrews v. City and County of San Francisco (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 938, 947-948, 252 Cal. Rptr. 716*

Trial court has broad discretion in deciding relevance of proffered evidence and in ruling on admissibility of evidence; weighing process under *Evid. Code § 352* depends on trial court's consideration of unique facts and issues of each case rather than on mechanically automatic rules. *Smith v. Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 503, 519-520, 241 Cal. Rptr. 916*

Evidence must be relevant to be admissible in discretion of trial court under *Evid. Code § 352*. *Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1093, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835*

Evid. Code § 352 (exclusion of time-consuming, prejudicial, confusing, or misleading evidence) does not impose any requirement on trial judge to make sua sponte affirmative finding on record to effect that probative value of proffered evidence outweighs its prejudicial effect. *People v. Holt (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 343, 353, 104 Cal. Rptr. 572 , cert. denied, 413 U.S. 921 (1973)* (overruled on another point in *Evans v. Superior Court (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 617, 625, 114 Cal. Rptr. 121, 522 P.2d 681*)

[e] Expert Opinion

In capital murder prosecution, after defendant's common-law wife testified that she did not attempt to prevent murder and did not abandon defendant after murder and report crime to police because he physically and mentally abused her and threatened to harm her and members of her family, trial court properly allowed prosecution to call expert witness to testify concerning Battered Woman Syndrome in response to hypothetical question paralleling wife's testimony that her actions were consistent with "battered woman accommodation syndrome," where there was no requirement defendant explicitly challenge witness's credibility on basis that might be explained by BWS evidence before evidence could be introduced; and where expert BWS testimony was relevant to explain that it is common for people who have been physically and mentally abused to act in ways that may be difficult for layperson to understand as authorized by *Evid. Code § 1107*, and there was adequate foundation and BWS evidence was highly relevant. *People v. Riggs (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 248, 292-294, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 648, 187 P.3d 363*

In capital murder prosecution resulting from two murders in course of robbery, testimony of board-certified forensic pathologist and deputy medical examiner employed by county coroner's office concerning probable respective positions of shooter and two victims at time of shootings asserting that although each of three described posture scenarios was possible, first two, in which shooter was standing next to victim, were less likely than third theory, that victim was kneeling next to shooter, who would have been standing and holding gun in somewhat natural position at waist level, was properly admitted under *Evid. Code § 801(a)* as subject of expert opinion evidence. *People v. Robinson (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 592, 629-633, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 760, 124 P.3d 363*

In capital murder prosecution resulting from sodomizing and strangulation of child, trial court properly admitted expert testimony regarding experiences of child sexual assault victims, when only fraction of general population, and presumably none of jurors, had been personally victimized, and while juror could try to imagine what it would be like for child to experience assault, this kind of imagining did not substitute for expert testimony. *People v. Smith (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 334, 363, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554, 107 P.3d 229*

In prosecution relating to domestic violence, trial court properly admitted testimony offered by prosecution from expert witness to explain that domestic violence victims often later deny or minimize assailant's conduct even though only one incident of abuse occurred; evidence was admissible under *Evid. Code § 801* to assist trier of fact in evaluating credibility of victim's trial testimony and earlier statements to police. *People v. Brown (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 892,*

898-908, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 447, 94 P.3d 574

Qualification of expert witnesses, including foundational requirements, rests in sound discretion of trial court; absent manifest abuse, court's determination will not be disturbed on appeal. *People v. Ramos (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 1133, 1175, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892, 938 P.2d 950*

Trial court has considerable discretion to control form in which expert is questioned to prevent jury from learning incompetent hearsay and also has discretion to weigh probative value of inadmissible evidence relied on by expert witness. *People v. Gardeley (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 605, 612, 619, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356, 927 P.2d 713* (upholding admission of hearsay evidence to show basis for expert's opinion about street gang activity)

Expert testimony may be based on material that is not admitted into evidence so long as material is of type that is reasonably relied on by experts in particular field in forming their opinions. *People v. Gardeley (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 605, 618, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356, 927 P.2d 713*

Trial court properly set aside information charging defendant with being ex-felon in possession of body armor, when crime charged consisted of elements incapable of determination by trier of fact without assistance of expert because proscribed body armor was required to be certified based on its ballistic resistance to penetration of test ammunition, and whether vest seized met such certification standards involved concepts beyond common experience and thus was proper subject for expert testimony, but not for lay opinion; and when knowledge and experience of police officer who testified at preliminary hearing regarding body armor were insufficient to qualify him as expert. *People v. Chapple (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 540, 545-549, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 680*

In action based on alleged exposure to mycotoxins through mold in home and workplace, trial court properly granted defendants' motion in limine to exclude testimony of plaintiffs' expert witness, when irrespective of whether he had requisite qualifications, trial court did not abuse its discretion in impliedly finding there was no reasonable basis for his opinion that exposure to mycotoxins had caused plaintiffs' ailments in view of absence of any reliable evidence plaintiffs had been exposed to mycotoxins at properties in question, so that witness's opinions were speculative and conjectural. *Geffcken v. D'Andrea (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 1310-1312, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80*

In products liability action against automobile and tire manufacturers, based on personal injuries suffered by driver resulting from accident in which right rear tire tread separated from tire, alleging automobile and tire were defectively designed, trial court properly precluded testimony by plaintiff's tire expert and substantially limited testimony by plaintiff's directional stability expert, resulting in granting of defendants' motions for nonsuit, when plaintiff's theory about tire failure was based on tire's chemical characteristics and supposedly defective recipe used in manufacturing process, which was plainly beyond common experience of both judges and jurors; tire was not examined by tire expert or anyone else, and no forensic photographs were taken, so that tire expert relied on supposedly similar tire failures and amateur photographs taken by insurance adjuster and plaintiff's boyfriend, and plaintiff failed to show there was substantial similarity between tire failures relied on by tire expert and plaintiff's tire failure, and failed to establish that amateur photographs were sufficient to support expert's conclusions, so that expert's opinions and conclusions were mere speculation; although trial court did not exclude all references to directional stability expert's testimony regarding "hopping," "tramping," or "skating" of automobile as result of detreading, trial court properly ruled that expert could not give opinion that tramping or hopping or skating could result from tread separation because there was no foundation for opinion about causation. *Stephen v. Ford Motor Co. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1363, 1367-1376, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 9*

California Highway Patrol Officer was qualified and testifying as expert witness in determining accuracy of preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) devices, including one used on defendant, even though officer was never expressly declared by court to be expert witness on accuracy of PAS device, when record amply supported conclusion he was so testifying and parties and court so understood. *People v. Hallquist (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 291, 295-297, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 621*

In personal injury action by passenger sleeping in sleeping berth in big rig truck when it was struck by defendant's vehicle, expert testimony was not necessary to support jury's finding that plaintiff was 50 percent liable for failure to wear sleeping restraint. *Lara v. Nevitt (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 454, 457-460, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 865*

Under *Civ. Code § 43.92*, psychotherapist may be held liable for failure to warn third party of serious risk of infliction of grave bodily injury by therapist's client only if jury is persuaded therapist actually believed or predicted his or her client posed serious risk of inflicting grave bodily injury on identifiable victim; thus, because there was no need for expert guidance on standard of care for psychotherapists' statutory duty to warn, trial court erred when it found, as matter of law, that parents of murder victim could not establish their claim against hospital based on therapist's alleged failure to warn them or their son of threat against son by client without presenting expert testimony. *Ewing v. Northridge Hospital Medical Center (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1289, 1297-1304, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591*

In prosecution for crimes related to sex offenses against minors, after prosecution was allowed to present expert testimony on child sexual abuse and child sexual abuse accommodation syndrome, trial court did not abuse its discretion in precluding expert testimony offered by defense that one victim did not exhibit emotional reaction one would expect from petite girl who had been raped by large man, and, based on her experience working with trauma victims, expert believed victim's demeanor was inconsistent with having suffered trauma. *People v. Wells (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 179, 186-191, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 762*

In murder prosecution based on defendant's driving while intoxicated and killing person, trial court properly excluded one expert's testimony about conclusion of another expert, who had died prior to trial, as to defendant's speed, when court could exclude from expert's testimony any hearsay matter whose irrelevance, unreliability, or potential for prejudice outweighs its proper probative value. *People v. Vanegas (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 592, 597-598, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398*

Exclusion of expert's testimony on ground that study provided no reasonable basis for opinion that plaintiffs' alleged exposure to chemicals supplied by defendants resulted in increased risk of cancer was not abuse of discretion, when evidence that expert reasonably relied on epidemiological studies in forming opinions on causation was of no assistance to plaintiffs when study on which expert relied provided no reasonable basis for his opinion and trial court could determine whether there was reasonable basis for expert opinion by examining opinion and matters on which expert relied and not requiring evidence from second level of experts in making determination. *Lockheed Litigation Cases (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 558, 563-566, 115 Cal. App. 4th 621, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34*

In employment discrimination action, trial court committed prejudicial error under *Evid. Code § 801* by allowing human resources management expert to opine that certain facts in evidence were "indicators" that employer discharged plaintiff for retaliatory reasons; testimony improperly invaded province of jury to draw conclusions from evidence and testimony lacked any reliable foundation in expert's professional experience and expertise. *Kotla v. Regents of University of California (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 283, 290-295, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 898*

Trial court erroneously admitted opinions of police officer testifying at trial of gang member as prosecution's expert witness going to subjective knowledge and intent of occupants of cars that when one gang member in car possesses a gun, every other gang member in car knows of gun and will constructively possess gun, when trial court failed to apply law to facts and opinions offered by witness and instead concluded under *Gardeley* without analysis that all officer opinions on gangs are admissible, and when testimony was not type of culture and habit testimony found in reported cases, none of which permitted testimony that specific individual had specific knowledge or possessed specific intent; trial court abused its discretion by allowing expert to testify at great length about whether also individuals were members of specific gangs based on hearsay material and based on material that inflamed jury's passions and had little or no probative value. *People v. Killebrew (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 644, 651-660, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 876*

Trial court properly sustained objection to receipt in evidence of declaration of expert regarding broker-dealer's breach of duty to supervise registered representative of broker-dealer, when question of duty is one of law, not fact, which is within province of court to decide. *Asplund v. Selected Investments in Financial Equities, Inc. (2000) 86 Cal. App. 4th 26, 49-50, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34*

Expert opinion may be based on hearsay as long as it is reasonably reliable. *In re Marriage of LaBass & Munsee (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1339, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 393*

Rule as well settled that conjectural and speculative matters may not be relied on by expert in forming opinion on subject to which his or her testimony relates. *Tilem v. City of Los Angeles (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 694, 707, 191 Cal. Rptr. 229*

Opinion of qualified expert witness as itself evidence. *Andersen v. Howland (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 380, 384, 83 Cal. Rptr. 308*

[f] Failure to Object

Failure of counsel to secure ruling on objection waives objection; objection on ground different than that urged on appeal is insufficient. *Haskell v. Carli (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 124, 129, 240 Cal. Rptr. 439*

Failure to object to testimony waives objections. *Orient Handel v. United States Fid. & Guar. Co. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 684, 700, 237 Cal. Rptr. 667*

[g] Hearsay and Exceptions

[i] General Rules

In first-degree murder prosecution, trial court did not err in denying defendant's pretrial motion to admit evidence of statement purportedly made by deceased former police officer to officer investigating murder, in which deceased former officer told investigating officer that she had met a man other than defendant in bar and during their conversation, the man admitted that he committed the robbery and homicide, and in not holding evidentiary hearing to determine if circumstances under which statement was made provided some level of assurance of its reliability; even assuming error, it would have been harmless beyond reasonable doubt. *People v. Garcia (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 521, 534-540, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 181*

Evidence of preliminary alcohol screening (PAS) test administered by California Highway Patrol, involving use of test solution with label on container that content was.10 percent alcohol was hearsay, because officer was relying on truth of assertion in making determination whether PAS device was functioning accurately, but however, trial court properly admitted evidence, since officer was testifying as expert and could base his opinion on any matter known to him, including hearsay not otherwise admissible, on which officer could reasonably rely for that purpose. *People v. Hallquist (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 291, 295-296, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 621*

Proper authentication of documents does not overcome hearsay rule; in action by community college student for personal injury based on negligence in planning and supervising assignment to map route for class trip, trial court did not err in excluding transcripts of telephone conversations between plaintiff's investigator and witnesses, during which witnesses verbally declared their statements were true under penalty of perjury and which plaintiff's investigator authenticated via her own declaration attesting transcripts were true reproductions of her conversations, since transcripts were hearsay and plaintiff made no argument on appeal as to what possible exception to hearsay rule would apply. *Stockinger v. Feather River Community College (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1014, 1025-1027, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 385*

[ii] Admissions and Confessions

On retrial of defendant, trial court did not err in admitting statements defendant made in closing argument in his first trial, in which defendant represented himself, as party admissions under *Evid. Code § 1220*. *People v. Kiney (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 807, 812-816, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168*

Trial court properly found that defendant made adoptive admission of truth of prior sentencing court's description of injuries of victim who had been struck by defendant to enable trial court to use prior conviction as "strike" for sentencing purposes, when a reasonable person in defendant's situation would have disputed court's description of victim's injuries, which impliedly, if not expressly, accused defendant of inflicting great bodily injury on victim, if description had been false, and since defendant was required to make restitution for injuries, he had interest in assuring that court did not exaggerate them. Representation by counsel did not preclude application of adoptive admission exception to hearsay rule, because description of injuries was given in defendant's presence, and he had opportunity to respond either personally or through counsel if description was inaccurate. *People v. Thoma (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 676, 682-685, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 309*

In murder prosecution, pretrial statements by defendants during joint interview were properly admitted against each defendant under hearsay exception for party admissions and against co-defendants under hearsay exception for adoptive admissions. *People v. Castille (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 469, 478-486, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 489*

[iii] Declarations Against Interest

Trial court properly excluded videotaped statement of victim's wife that she, rather than defendant, had killed victim, because it failed to meet threshold requirement of trustworthiness, when statement was inconsistent with another statement in which she told police she knew nothing of her husband's death and with subsequent statement blaming defendant and another man for her husband's murder; trial would have devolved into inquiry into conflicting statements, so that questionable value of evidence would have been substantially outweighed by probability its admission would have necessitated undue consumption of time or confused issues and misled jury. *People v. Geier (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 555, 584-585, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 580*

In capital murder prosecution resulting from defendant's hiring of daughter's boyfriend to kill her husband and then arranging boyfriend's murder, trial court properly admitted boyfriend's statement to acquaintance that he and another man had killed defendant's husband, defendant had paid him, boyfriend had skimmed money off top for himself and then paid balance to other man, and that he paid other man in cocaine in lieu of money as declaration against penal interest, since facially incriminating comments were in no way exculpatory, self-serving, or collateral, and admission that defendant paid him, volunteered to acquaintance, was specifically disserving to boyfriend's interests in that it intimated he had participated in contract killing, which was particularly heinous type of murder, and in conspiracy to commit murder. *People v. Samuels (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 96, 120-121, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 105, 113 P.3d 1125*

Statement by man that he entered murder victim's truck on passenger side was admissible as statement against penal interest, when, although he did not admit to firing fatal shot, he knew he was being charged with murder, admitted to hearing gunshot, and admitted to participating in stealing victim's truck; denial of having been shooter did not absolve him of crimes to which he admitted. *People v. Brown (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 518, 535-537, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 145, 73 P.3d 1137*

Co-defendant's statements to his girlfriend describing circumstances of murder was not admissible as declaration against interest, since statements laid blame for killing squarely on other defendant, and, to extent statement implied that other defendant went to victim's room to rob her, it was not specifically disserving of co-defendant. *People v. Smith*

(2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 914, 922, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1

Wife's statement to her husband shortly before he committed murder that she committed adultery with man he killed not long afterward was properly admitted under social interest exception to hearsay rule under *Evid. Code § 1230* and was sufficiently trustworthy to satisfy *confrontation clause*. *People v. Wheeler (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1423, 1426-1431, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 916*

[iv] Former Testimony

In prosecution for possession of check with intent to defraud and second degree burglary, after jury deadlocked at first trial, during second trial court properly allowed prosecution to read defendant's testimony from first trial, including defendant's admission of prior convictions, to jury after defendant elected not to testify and invoked *Fifth Amendment*; once defendant made himself unavailable by invoking his *Fifth Amendment* privilege, admission of his former testimony in second trial under *Evid. Code § 1291(a)* was proper. *People v. Malone (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1241, 1244-1245, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 741*

Trial court properly denied admission of deposition testimony of expert witness in earlier case, when, although underlying claims in earlier case were substantially identical to instant case, defendant in earlier case did not have similar motive to cross-examine witness as did defendant in this case, because expert in earlier case was defendants' expert witness and his testimony was given in deposition so that defendant in that case had no incentive or motive to cross-examine him or bring out facts favorable to its defense as defendant in this action would have had if plaintiff proffered expert as expert witness. *Byars v. SCME Mortgage Bankers, Inc. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1134, 1150, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 796*

[v] Infliction or Threat of Infliction of Injury

In murder and spousal abuse prosecution, trial court erred in admitting evidence of victim's statements to her doctor and police officer that defendant had caused her neck injury seven weeks earlier, pursuant to physical injury exception to hearsay rule for statements made at or near time of injury [*Evid. Code § 1370(a)(3)*], when statements were not made at or near time of injury and statements to officer were not made under circumstances indicating their trustworthiness. *People v. Quitiquit (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-12, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 674*

In murder prosecution, trial court erred in admitting application for restraining order filed by victim days before she was killed under *Evid. Code § 1370*, when, although statement purported to narrate, describe, or explain infliction or threat of physical injury on victim by defendant, declarant was unavailable as witness at trial, and statement was made in writing, was electronically recorded, or made to physician, nurse, paramedic, or to law enforcement official. *People v. Pantoja (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1, 8-15, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 492*

[vi] Prior Statement

In prosecution for assault and infliction of corporal injury on spouse, trial court did not violate defendant's *Sixth Amendment* confrontation right by admitting hearsay statement by defendant's victim-spouse to police officer as sufficiently trustworthy, when, under *Evid. Code § 1370*, statement narrated infliction of physical injury on spouse, spouse was unavailable at trial as witness because she refused to testify about events, statement was made at or near time of infliction of injury, it was made to police officer, and it was made under circumstances indicating its trustworthiness because defendant had opportunity to cross-examine spouse at preliminary hearing about statement she gave to police officer and he vigorously exercised opportunity and later presented preliminary hearing testimony to jury in support of his defense. *People v. Price (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 224, 237-239, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 229*

In murder prosecution, trial court erred in admitting statement by nontestifying accomplice to police as statement of identification under *Evid. Code § 1235*, when witness neither testified nor was given opportunity to explain or to deny statement or was not excused from giving further testimony. Statement also was not admissible under *Evid. Code § 1294* as prior inconsistent statement, when recording of statement was not first introduced into evidence at preliminary hearing, but instead accomplice was asked to review specific excerpts of transcript of his interview with police to see if it refreshed his recollection and prosecutor read from portions of transcript to impeach accomplice; while transcript of preliminary hearing testimony was properly admitted at trial due to accomplice's unavailability [*Evid. Code § 1291*], court erred in allowing jury to hear actual recording of his statement. However, portions of statement implicating defendant were covered by accomplice's and another witness's preliminary hearing testimony, error in admitting statement was harmless beyond reasonable doubt. *People v. Martinez (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 400, 407-409, 410-411, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 49*

Evidence of previous statement by witness is admissible under prior consistent statement exception to hearsay rule if there has been express or implied charge that witness's testimony is recently fabricated and prior consistent statement was made before motive for fabrication is alleged to have arisen [*Evid. Code §§ 1236, 791*]; in evaluating admissibility of prior consistent statements, focus is on specific agreement or other inducement suggested by cross-examination as supporting witness's improper motive. *People v. Crew (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 822, 840, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733, 74 P.3d 820*

[vii] Spontaneous Declarations

In capital murder and attempted murder prosecution, trial court properly allowed police officer to testify to attempted murder victim's identification of defendant just after crimes occurred in response to officer's question as to who did it as spontaneous declaration, when victim's spontaneous statement of names as to "who did it" described event she perceived, and she made identifying remarks while under stress of excitement caused by experiencing crime. *People v. Morrison (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 698, 718-720, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 682, 101 P.3d 568*

In capital murder prosecution, trial court properly allowed testimony that witness heard her brother-in-law implicate defendant in murder under spontaneous utterance exception to hearsay rule, since declarant was crying, shaking, and visibly upset when he made statement, explaining that he was still reacting to events himself, and when, although statement was made about 2.5 hours after crime, facts available to trial court justified its conclusion declarant continued to labor mightily under emotional influence of disturbing events he perceived, and there was substantial evidence to support trial court's decision that declarant purported to be describing events he had personally seen. *People v. Brown (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 518, 540-542, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 145, 73 P.3d 1137*

Spontaneous declaration exception applies only if statement is both spontaneous and made in state of excitement; California does not recognize "present sense" exception to hearsay rule for statement describing or explaining event or condition made while declarant was perceiving event or condition or immediately thereafter. *People v. Hines (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 997, 1034, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 594, 938 P.2d 388*

In spousal abuse prosecution, police officer's testimony that wife told officer she had been assaulted by defendant 30 minutes earlier, that she and defendant got into argument at home and during argument, defendant choked her from behind, pushed her, hit her and threatened her, and that she had come to police station because she was frightened by his death threat was admissible as spontaneous utterance; mere passage of time was insufficient to deprive statement of spontaneity, evidence showed that wife was distraught when making statement, and there was no evidence that statement lacked spontaneity. *People v. Saracoglu (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1584, 1588-1590, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 418*

In murder prosecution based on husband's burning of his wife, statements of wife to police officers in response to their questions were admissible under *Evid. Code § 1240* hearsay exception for spontaneous declarations, when two officers

encountered victim and asked only what happened and then followed up by asking how she was burned, officer estimated he spoke to victim for approximately 10 to 15 seconds and other officer said he was with her for few seconds, and victim's response, given minutes after she had sustained severe burns and while she was still suffering from resulting intense pain suggested her statements were product of stress of moment, not deliberation; and although third officer spoke to victim for about five minutes and asked more questions than other officers, evidence supported trial court's finding victim's answers were nonetheless spontaneous. *People v. Pedroza (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 784, 791-792, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 636*

Statements made by stabbing victim to 911 operator and first police officer on scene were admissible as spontaneous statements. *People v. Brenn (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 166, 171-173, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 830*

Co-defendant's statement to his girlfriend describing circumstances of murder was admissible as spontaneous declaration; girlfriend's testimony about co-defendant's demeanor provided substantial evidence of preliminary facts showing his statements were spontaneous. *People v. Smith (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 914, 922-923, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

In murder and attempted murder prosecution, out-of-court statements by attempted murder victim to prosecution witness were admissible as spontaneous statements under *Evid. Code § 1240,* when statements described event victim personally perceived, *i.e.,* being shot in ankle during gunfight immediately before traveling to witness' home, and when there was sufficient evidence to show victim spoke to witness while under stress of excitement caused by shooting. *People v. Rincon (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 738, 751-754, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 844*

In prosecution for corporal injury to spouse, trial court properly admitted, under spontaneous statements exception to hearsay rule, statements by victim-spouse made immediately after incident to 911 operator that her husband had hit her, which she repeated to police officer and medical personnel who responded to 911 call, because statements described her perception of recent events while stress dominated her reflective powers. *People v. Corella (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 461, 465-469, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770*

In prosecution for crimes related to defendant's discharging firearm at occupied vehicle but hitting pedestrian, trial court properly admitted hearsay statement of driver of vehicle at which defendant shot that defendant was trying to shoot vehicle's occupants but they ducked as spontaneous declaration because requirements for excitement and spontaneity were met; when witness to shooting who was with pedestrian testified driver acted "real excited" and spoke quickly and in high-pitched tone which she demonstrated for court, and that car arrived approximately one minute after shooting, which was well within time frame for spontaneous declaration. *People v. Riva (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 981, 994-996, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 649*

In prosecution based on defendant's alleged theft of money from resident of residential intermediate care facility for physically dependent adults at which defendant worked, trial court erred in admitting statement by resident to social worker about her dealings with defendant as spontaneous declaration, when although at time she first telephoned social worker, resident was tearful and evidently quite shaken by news she was about to be evicted from care facility for non-payment of rent, two days elapsed before substantive discussion between the two women and circumstances surrounding statement showed ample opportunity for deliberation and reflection. *People v. Pirwani (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 770, 787-791, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 673*

[viii] State of Mind

Statements of murder victim accusing defendant of sexually molesting her were properly admitted to explain defendant's state of mind, motive, and conduct, where defendant's wife and victim's mother testified that after victim, who was defendant's daughter, told her about defendant's abuse, she had numerous conversations with defendant during which she confronted him with details of victim's accusations, so there was no dispute defendant was aware of

accusations before he went to murder site, and where prosecutor contended defendant's anger about allegations and their effect on his family led him to murder victim and other children, so that veracity of accusations was immaterial to their relevance in explaining defendant's motive and prosecutor made clear statements were only being offered to explain defendant's conduct. *People v Mendoza (2006) 42 Cal. 4th 686, 695-698*

Under state of mind exception, trial court properly permitted testimony regarding murder victim's statement that she preferred African-American men, because there was evidence defendant had sexual relations with her on night she was killed, and testimony was relevant to issue of consent, i.e., given her preferences, she would not have consented to sexual relations with defendant, who was white. *People v. Geier (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 555, 585-587, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 580*

In capital murder prosecution, trial court did not err by admitting under state of mind exception in prosecution case in aggravation at penalty phase retrial, victim's statement that defendant had been fondling her for some time and she intended to confront him if he continued to do so; statement reflected her mental state, that is, her intent to confront defendant, even though occurrence of confrontation itself depended on defendant's continued fondling; fact that statement may have been inadmissible to prove defendant's past fondling did not render it inadmissible; since it was admissible to prove victim's state of mind and defendant did not request limiting instruction. *People v. Griffin (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 536, 578-579, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 743, 93 P.3d 344*

In prosecution for first degree murder, witness's testimony that murder victim had told her that if witness did not hear from victim in two weeks to send police was not inadmissible hearsay; since even if viewed as hearsay, statement was within state-of-mind exception to hearsay rule [*Evid. Code § 1250(a)(2)*] to explain victim's conduct, since defense presented theory that victim disappeared of her own accord because she was a troubled person suffering from stress and depression. *People v. Crew (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 822, 840, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 733, 74 P.3d 820*

In murder prosecution of man accused of fatally stabbing his lover, trial court did not err in permitting friend to testify, under hearsay exception in *Evid. Code § 1250* for statement of declarant's then-existing state of mind, emotion, or physical sensation, that victim had told him that defendant would kill him if he found him with another man or knew that he had been with another man; in light of defendant's reliance on self-defense, victim's statements about threats defendant made were clearly admissible under *Evid. Code § 1250*, and statements appeared to have been entirely spontaneous and in company of someone victim was comfortable with and trusted, so there did not appear to be anything in record that undermined trustworthiness of statement. *People v. Romero (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 29, 39, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 678*

In action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy, trial court should have considered statement by plaintiff's supervisor's supervisor about her alleged desire to seek revenge on those who participated in investigation of her allegedly sexually inappropriate behavior in ruling on employer's summary judgment motion; when statement was admissible for nonhearsay purposes, since apart from truth, i.e., that she would get revenge, statement showed her mental state that she felt she had been wronged and harbored ill will toward those she held responsible; and when, although supervisor's supervisor was not named defendant, she was involved each step of way in process leading to plaintiff's termination, rendering her remark admissible as statement of party. Statement also was admissible as prior inconsistent statement since she denied making it in her deposition. *Colarossi v. Coty US Inc. (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1142, 1149-1151, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 131*

When the reasonableness of a person's conduct is at issue, statements of others on which the person acted are admissible. *Silva v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 256, 265, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 382* (in wrongful discharge case, recorded interviews of other employees, made as part of employer's investigation of misconduct before termination decision, were admissible to establish that termination decision was reasonable based on materials generated during employer's investigation)

[ix] Statements and Writings That Are Not Hearsay

Hearsay rule does not apply to evidence of oral or written statements offered to prove existence of contract. *In re Marriage of LaBass & Munsee (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1338, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 393* (want ads admissible for nonhearsay purpose of showing that offers to bargain existed)

Promissory note was admissible not as business record but rather as operative contractual document, admissible merely on adequate evidence of authenticity. *Remington Investments, Inc. v. Hamedani (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1033, 1042-1043, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 376*

Out-of-court statements offered as "operative facts" or "verbal acts," not to prove truth of matter asserted in statements, are not hearsay; in proving existence of oral contract, words uttered by offerer in making offer are admissible as nonhearsay to prove essential element of contract. *People v. Dell (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 248, 260-262, 283 Cal. Rptr. 361*

[x] Evidence Not Qualifying for Admission Over Hearsay Objection

Trial court erred in granting summary judgment to plaintiff based on declaration of plaintiff's general manager averring that defendant's accounts were delinquent as reflected in bills sent to defendant as detailed statements of what he owed, when declaration explicitly recapitulated contents of second writing consisting of table summarizing plaintiff's claimed damages, which was not incorporated in declaration or even vouched for, but was merely described as "attached," therefore was not given under oath and did not fall within implicit hearsay exception for affidavits and declarations, and when declaration explicitly described amount owed as being derived from third level of documentary hearsay; while original bills might have been admissible over hearsay objection as business records or official records, there was no showing of time and circumstances of documents' creation. Secondary evidence rule [*Evid. Code § 1521*] would permit introduction of otherwise admissible secondary evidence to prove contents of writing, but did not excuse complying with hearsay rule. *Pajaro Valley Water Management Agency v. McGrath (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1106-1108, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 741*

Forensic alcohol analysis submitted by Department of Motor Vehicles in support of suspension of driving privilege was not sufficiently competent evidence to support suspension because it would not have been admissible over hearsay objection in civil action under *Evid. Code § 1280* exception to hearsay rule in conjunction with *Evid. Code § 664* presumption that official duty had been regularly performed, when DMV, as proponent of document, failed to establish it had been prepared by person with official duty. *Furman v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 416, 420-423, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 520*

[xi] Unavailable Witness

In criminal prosecution, trial court did not err in determining that victim was unavailable to testify at trial because of mental illness or infirmity and because he was unable to testify without suffering substantial trauma [*Evid. Code § 240(a)(3), (c)*] and in admitting his preliminary hearing testimony, when substantial evidence supported trial court's factual findings that requiring victim, who was teenager who suffered from cerebral palsy and learning deficiencies, and who had been abducted by defendant, to testify at trial would substantially be likely to result in an increased level of harm to him and would further aggravate already serious psychological problem that he was suffering *People v. Winslow (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 464, 469-473, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 872*

[xii] Business Records

In sex discrimination action by female former police officer, trial court did not err in refusing to admit exit questionnaires prepared by departing female officers, as well as summaries of exit interviews prepared by city personnel who conducted them, where questionnaires were not business records within hearsay exception, since, although it may have been city's practice to require departing employees to complete exit questionnaire and to keep questionnaires with exit interview summaries prepared by city personnel, departing officers were neither employees acting on behalf of police department nor acting in ordinary course of their own business when they completed exit questionnaires, and because two officers were leaving to join other police departments, their exit questionnaires were not inherently trustworthy; and where exit interview summaries prepared by city employees, although prepared in ordinary course of business, did not qualify as business records because the employees who prepared them did not have firsthand knowledge of events recorded and officers, who did have firsthand knowledge, were not under business duty to accurately report facts pertaining to their departure. *Zanone v. City of Whittier (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 174, 190-192, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 439*

Trial court did not err in accepting on summary judgment motion copies of correspondence and contract, with affidavit of claims analyst, in action between insured and insurer regarding settlement of earthquake claim, because analyst was qualified witness under *Evid. Code § 1271* to identify documents, and there was no business records hearsay issue because copies of settlement agreement and release and correspondence documents were themselves direct evidence of their undisputed contents and contents, and their undisputed delivery to insured, were relevant. *Rosenblum v. Safeco Ins. Co. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 847, 863, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 427*

In prosecution for spousal abuse, trial court erred in admitting portion of crisis intervention log and client intake data form maintained by organization that assists abused women under business records exception to hearsay rule, when forms contained multiple layers of hearsay because they contained statements by allegedly abused women to organization employees as first layer, and employee's recordation of statements as second layer; although testimony sufficiently established that employees who recorded information were obligated to do so in accurate manner, testimony did not establish trustworthiness of abused woman's statements to employees. Forms were only admissible to establish that woman had telephoned hotline on specified date and that she had visited shelter on another date; forms were inadmissible multiple hearsay to when offered prove circumstances of alleged abuse incident. *People v. Ayers (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 988, 994-996, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 242*

[xiii] Dying Declarations

Statements by murder victim that he had been robbed and shot and that shooter was short Mexican male who had arrived in car were properly admitted at trial as dying declaration, even though victim survived for several more days before dying, when prosecution established objective severity of victim's fatal wounds as well as his subjective awareness of those wounds based on victim's statements, demeanor, and conduct, as well as his evident injuries. *People v. Monterroso (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 743, 762-763, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1, 101 P.3d 956*

[xiv] Implied Assertions

In prosecution for possession of methamphetamine for sale, statements by telephone caller asking to buy drugs to officer executing search warrant for evidence of possession of controlled substance for sale, and some statements in response to questions by officer were hearsay; however, case law, recognized and accepted when Evidence Code was adopted and continuing thereafter, created exception to hearsay rule for this reliable type of evidence. *People v. Morgan (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 935, 940-947, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 224*

[xv] Official Records

In proceeding to require DMV to aside suspension of driver's license, trial court did not abuse its discretion by finding results of driver's blood alcohol test were not timely recorded as required by *Evid. Code § 1280(b)*, forensic report was prepared one week later and, although it was only five working days after arrest, memory was subject to erosion with every day that passed, whether working or nonworking; record was silent as to DMV's recordation policies and procedures, any automatic recording capability of testing equipment used, and average number of tests performed by analyst each day; and *Evid. Code § 664* did not create presumption analysts timely recorded test results, because regulations requiring laboratories to maintain records specified no deadlines or time periods or timeliness requirements governing recordation. *Glatman v. Valverde (2006) 146 Cal. App. 4th 700, 703-706, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 319*

On petition for writ of mandate challenging DMV administrative suspension of driving privileges on grounds that driver was intoxicated while driving, observations of fire captain who assisted driver from his car contained in police officer's sworn statement and in his unsworn arrest report were admissible as public records to prove driver was driving, since in reporting his personal observations to police officer, fire captain was acting pursuant to his duty to observe facts and report them correctly. *Hildebrand v. Dept. of Motor Vehicles (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 1562, 1569-1572, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 234*

In mandamus proceeding reviewing findings of audit of dentist, who was Denti-Cal provider, by fiscal intermediary for Department of Health Services' Denti-Cal/Medi-Cal program, Medi-Cal dental patients' claim detail reports (CDRs), showing services rendered to patient and amount paid for each service by Denti-Cal, which information was taken from claim forms submitted by provider to Denti-Cal, were admissible in administrative hearings challenging audit findings under *Evid. Code § 1280* exception to hearsay rule for official documents. *Bhatt v. State Dept. of Health Services (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 923, 928-931*

[h] Lay Opinion

In eminent domain action, trial court properly held that property owner's proposed testimony as to value of goodwill lacked foundation, when it was based on nothing more than informal discussions with brokers whose names she could not recall and few store owners, and there was no showing she had any expertise in various methods of valuing goodwill. *Redevelopment Agency of San Diego v. Attisha (2005) 128 Cal. App. 4th 357, 378, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 126*

In prosecution for attempted murder, trial court properly allowed police officer who took photographs of shoeprints at crime scene and compared tread with shoes seized from defendant's bedroom to testify that he found similarities between shoeprints and shoes, leading him to believe defendant's shoes possibly left prints as lay opinion under *Evid. Code § 800*, when comparison of shoes and footprints was rationally based on witness's perception and officer's opinion was helpful to clear understanding of his testimony, since jury would otherwise have to make its own tedious comparison of shoes and prints. *People v. Maglaya (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1604, 1608-1609, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 155*

In action against real estate broker for intentional and negligent misrepresentation to buyers for whom broker acted as agent, trial court did not err in refusing to allow plaintiffs to reopen their case-in-chief to present one owner's testimony as to value of property, when, although *Evid. Code § 813(a)* allows owner's opinion testimony with regard to value of property, offer of proof failed to provide basis for opinion on market value of house as affected by code violations and structural defects, which was point to be proven, only that, at some time after plaintiffs purchased house and before trial, owner obtained information on value of comparable houses in neighborhood. *Fragale v. Faulkner (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 229, 240-241, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 616*

[i] Liability Insurance

Because permitting joint trial of causes of action against insured and insurer would contravene legislative intent

underlying *Evid. Code § 1155*, causes of action against insurer should be bifurcated. *Ahmed v. Peterson (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 374, 377, 230 Cal. Rptr. 636*

Suing of insured for negligence and insurer for bad faith in same lawsuit violated both letter and spirit of *Evid. Code § 1155*, which precludes use of evidence that tortfeasor has insurance for alleged injury; severance of action against tortfeasor from action against tortfeasor's insurer is within discretion of trial court. *Omaha Indemnity Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1266, 1271, 258 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Evidence of defendant's insurance coverage is properly excluded under *Evid. Code § 352* when limited probative value of evidence is exceeded by prejudice inherent in its admission. *Staples v. Hoefke (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1397, 1411, 235 Cal. Rptr. 165*

Evidence of defendant's insurance coverage, unless coupled and admitted along with other relevant evidence, is irrelevant and prejudicial to defendant, and thus not admissible to prove defendant's negligence or other wrongdoing. *Blake v. E. Thompson Petroleum Repair Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 823, 830, 831, 832, 216 Cal. Rptr. 568*

Under "collateral source rule," evidence of payments to plaintiff by defendant's insurer, unless coupled and admitted along with other relevant evidence, is not admissible to mitigate damages plaintiff otherwise would recover from defendant when evidence of payments, absent showing of their source, would cause jury to speculate, to plaintiff's prejudice, on source of payments. *Blake v. E. Thompson Petroleum Repair Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 823, 830, 831, 832, 216 Cal. Rptr. 568*

In negligence action for, among other things, property damage and lost business profits, evidence of payments to plaintiff by defendant's insurer was relevant to show that plaintiff (1) received partial compensation for alleged damages; (2) had financial ability to defray cost of repairing equipment and relocating business; and (3) may have intentionally delayed regeneration of business. *Blake v. E. Thompson Petroleum Repair Co. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 823, 832, 216 Cal. Rptr. 568*

[j] Objections to Evidence

[i] Manner of Objecting

While no particular form of objection is required, objection must be made in such a way as to alert trial court to nature of anticipated evidence and basis on which exclusion is sought, and to afford proponent opportunity to establish its admissibility. *People v. Holt (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 619, 666-667, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 782, 937 P.2d 213*

Plaintiff did not preserve error in admission of release as evidence, when although counsel objected, neither reporter's transcript nor clerk's transcript revealed grounds for objection or confirmed he objected on grounds of relevancy, and plaintiff was required to show error by adequate record affirmatively. However, even if appellate court assumed plaintiff preserved his evidentiary objection for consideration on appeal, release was relevant to issue of whether defendant was grossly negligent, when, among other things, it described inherent risks of skiing and using ski lifts, so that trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting release into evidence. *Platz v. Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1253, 1260-1261, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 885*

[ii] Offer of Proof

Counsel's failure to describe substance of anticipated testimony, cite hearsay exception, or argue any nonhearsay purpose waived issue of wrongful exclusion of testimony. *People v. Ramos (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 1133, 1178, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 892, 938 P.2d 950*

[k] Preliminary Fact Determination

Evid. Code § 405 is designed to allow trial judge to withhold evidence from jury when rule mandating its exclusion is based on public policy considerations. *Jutzi v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 637, 647, 242 Cal. Rptr. 74*

[l] Prior Conduct

In wrongful death and survival action brought against former spouse by heirs of spouse whom former spouse allegedly murdered, trial court properly admitted evidence of former spouse's prior abuse of spouse as relevant to motive, intent and identity; fact that prior instances occurred several years before killing did not preclude admission. *Rufo v. Simpson (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 573, 585-587, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 492*

In suit for sexual harassment against former landlord in which trial court admitted evidence of uncharged misconduct (landlord's sexual advances toward others), court did not properly weigh probative value of evidence against extreme prejudice of "bad acts" evidence, since it failed to consider extent to which evidence had independent source and fact that there were no other tort judgments or criminal convictions arising out of landlord's conduct. *Brown v. Smith (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 767, 792, 795, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301*

Prior episodes of abusive misconduct by police officer tended to show plaintiff's injuries suffered during booking were product of officer's intent and malice, and therefore were admissible under *Evid. Code § 1101(b)* (evidence relevant to prove fact other than disposition). *Andrews v. City and County of San Francisco (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 938, 945, 252 Cal. Rptr. 716*

[m] Privileges

[i] Attorney-Client Privilege

Common-law attorney-client privilege does not cease with death of client. *Swidler & Berlin v. United States (1998) 524 U.S. 399, 408-411, 118 S. Ct. 2081, 141 L. Ed. 2d 379*

In prosecution for making false workers' compensation claim, admission of photographs of defendant taken by investigator for defendant's former attorney in previous personal injury claim was error; photographs were privileged because they were taken to convey confidential information from defendant to his attorney, and they would have been privileged had defendant filed lawsuit based on previous personal injury claim, since personal injury claim that waives physician-patient privilege does not waive attorney-client privilege with respect to discussions or communications about that injury. *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 162-163, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

Attorney-client privilege only protects disclosure of communications, not disclosure of underlying facts that are referenced within qualifying communication; accordingly, knowledge of practices and procedures or existence of documents normally used in business operations is not privileged, nor is it violation of privilege to divulge that such documents exist but were not produced in response to discovery request. *State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 625, 643-644, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834* (declarations from former employee of insurer, who had worked in unit that handled suits against insurer, and who collected information from attorneys to convey to insurer's executives and from insurer's employees to convey to its attorneys)

Insurer could not assert attorney-client privilege when services of counsel were sought or obtained with intent to commit fraud on plaintiffs and court; wrongful discovery tactics by insurer in defending litigation fell within

crime/fraud exception because they continued original fraud that formed basis for underlying suit and also constituted fraud on court. *State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Superior Court (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 625, 639-641, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 834* (withholding of documents and information sought in discovery requests)

[ii] Private Investigator-Client Privilege

Although licensed private investigator has privilege not to disclose information acquired during investigation, except for divulging certain information to law enforcement officer or district attorney [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7539(a)*], identity of private investigator's employer does not fall within scope of statute. *Flynn v. Superior Court (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 990, 994, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491*

[iii] Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege

Confidentiality of communications between patients and psychotherapists does not depend solely on statutory psychotherapist-patient privilege; communications also are protected by constitutional right of privacy. *People v. Hammon (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 1117, 1127, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 938 P.2d 986*

Psychotherapist-patient privilege concerns confidential communications during their professional relationship; privilege continues after termination of relationship, but communication between former patient and psychotherapist would not constitute privileged communication under statute. *Poliak v. Board of Psychology (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 342, 362, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 866*

[iv] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

In light of *Evid. Code § 913*, to put witness on stand for purpose of having witness invoke privilege against self-incrimination would only invite jury to make improper inference; California law makes no distinction between civil and criminal litigation concerning adverse inferences from witness's invocation of privilege. *People v. Holloway (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 96, 129-131, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212, 91 P.3d 164*

[n] Quality

No degrees of quality of evidence exist apart from its relevancy; hence, when "preponderance" of evidence is required to support a finding, there is no further requirement that it be "clear and convincing." *Barrett v. Bank of America (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1362, 1371, 229 Cal. Rptr. 16*

[o] Relevance

In capital murder prosecution, trial court properly admitted evidence of defendant's gang membership, when evidence was more than merely tangentially relevant to premeditation, which was at issue as to both murder and attempted murder charges, because gang's name itself, 211 187 Hard Way Gangster Crips, was evidence of premeditation, since 211 and 187 were put in name with reference to *Pen. Code §§ 211* (robbery) and 187 (murder). *People v. Jones (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1084, 1114-1115, 70 P.3d 359*

Testimony of employer regarding reasons for terminating employee was relevant in action for insurance bad faith alleging insurer's failure to indemnify employer's defense in third party's action arising out of employee's dishonesty, because evidence related to insurer's inadequate investigation of reasons for employee's termination. *Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1091, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835*

Evidence is required to be relevant to be admissible in discretion of trial court under *Evid. Code § 352*. *Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1093, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835*

[p] Rule of Limited Admissibility

Procedure for invoking rule of limited admissibility (*Evid. Code § 355*); rule applies properly only when evidence is admissible for one purpose but inadmissible for another purpose and not when evidence is admissible for all purposes. *Foreman & Clark Corp. v. Fallon (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 875, 887-888, 92 Cal. Rptr. 162, 479 P.2d 362*

[q] Scientific Evidence

In capital murder prosecution, trial court did not err in admitting results of electrophoretic testing of stains on tennis shoes found in defendant's garage under *Kelly/Frye* test; electrophoretic testing of dried bloodstains is generally accepted; mere variations in technique or procedure went to weight of evidence, not its admissibility; defendant made no showing that variations amounted to material scientific distinction or material failure to use correct, scientifically accepted procedures; and criminologist was fully qualified to perform electrophoretic testing and relate results. *People v. Cook (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1334, 1344-1348, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 340, 157 P.3d 950*

Kelly-Frye test has three prongs: (1) "reliability" of new scientific technique must be established by showing it has gained general acceptance in particular field to which it belongs; (2) any witness testifying on general acceptance must be properly qualified as expert on subject; (3) proponent of evidence must demonstrate that correct scientific procedures were used in particular case. *People v. Venegas (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 47, 78, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 262, 954 P.2d 525*

Although *Frye* rule no longer is followed in federal courts when superseded by federal rules [*see* *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc. (1993) 509 U.S. 579, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L. Ed. 2d 469]* , *Kelly* rule remains law in California. *People v. Leahy (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 587, 591, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663, 882 P.2d 321*

In action based on alleged exposure to mycotoxins through mold in home and workplace, trial court properly granted defendants' motion in limine to exclude results of mycotoxin antibody test and blood serology test; plaintiffs failed to show mycotoxin antibody test had gained general acceptance in relevant scientific community because laboratory that did test was only laboratory in United States conducting test, and other doctors testified that test was unreliable and not generally accepted in scientific community as valid technique to determine human exposure to mycotoxins; plaintiffs failed to show blood serology test had gained general acceptance in relevant scientific community as valid diagnostic technique for assessing human exposure to toxigenic mold, because laboratory conducting test was only laboratory in United States performing test, had not been evaluated or approved by FDA, and publication from California Department of Health Services concluded that test could not be used to imply presence of specific mold within home or workplace environment or be used to prove patient exposure to specific mold or its toxins. *Geffcken v. D'Andrea (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 1309-1310, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80*

In murder prosecution, trial court erred in admitting evidence of dog scent identification of defendant because dog scent evidence did not meet *Kelly* requirements, when scent transfer unit was novel device used in furtherance of a new technique and subject to *Kelly* analysis, it was not obvious that vacuum device could properly transfer scent to gauze pad from object, that scent would not degrade or become contaminated, or that scent would not remain in unit after it was cleaned with alcohol; when dog handler who testified for prosecution was not scientist or engineer and was not qualified to testify about characteristics of unit or unit's acceptance in scientific community, and when there was no proof dog handler used correct scientific procedures while employing unit. Further, there was foundational weakness in dog identification evidence because dog was not tracking suspect but rather was given scent from gauze pad some length of time after incident and watched to see if dog showed interest in various locales frequented by defendant, and

there was no proof defendant ever touched matchbook from which scent was collected. Prosecution was required to lay foundation from academic or scientific sources regarding how long scent remains on object or at location; whether every person has scent so unique it provides accurate basis for scent identification, such that it can be analogized to human DNA; whether particular breed of dog is characterized by acute powers of scent and discrimination; and adequacy of certification procedures for scent identifications. However, there was no prejudice in admission of evidence because there was abundant evidence pointing to defendant's guilt. *People v. Willis (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 379, 385-388, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 235*

In action by minor alleging that his autism was caused by application of pesticide, trial court erred in granting motion in limine by applying admissibility test of *People v. Kelly* to exclude plaintiff's expert opinion testimony that pesticide caused autism because California distinguishes between expert medical opinion and scientific evidence, and medical opinion is not subject to special admissibility rule of *Kelly*; nor did defendant demonstrate that methodology used in studies relied on by plaintiff's experts, including use of animal studies to extrapolate to effects of substance on humans, was in any way novel or unaccepted in scientific community, requiring application of *Kelly* test. *Roberti v. Andy's Termite & Pest Control, Inc. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 893, 899-903, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 827*

In prosecution for murder, forcible lewd or lascivious act on a child under age 14, and forcible rape, DNA evidence was not admissible to prove defendant's identity as perpetrator because it was unreliable and untrustworthy, when prosecution failed to carry its burden of demonstrating that FBI used proper scientific procedure to determine perpetrator's D2 genotype, reference to defendant's genotype to prove perpetrator's genotype was improper, and use of band-intensity analysis to prove perpetrator's genotype required first-prong scrutiny of that method under *People v. Kelly (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 24, 130 Cal. Rptr.144, 549 P.2d 1240* , so that FBI's method of discerning perpetrator's D2 genotype constituted improper procedure under *Kelly's* third prong; and when use of improperly discerned genotype to declare defendant match at D2 locus and calculate profile frequency was also improper procedure under *Kelly's* third prong, because D2 genotype, offered to prove match with defendant, in essence had two-out-of-three chance of exonerating defendant, and inclusion of D2 genotype in statistical calculation made perpetrator's profile rarer and defendant's possession of it more incriminating. Further, match and profile frequency evidence relied on perpetrator's genotype as preliminary fact and thus was admitted without adequate foundation under *Evid. Code § 403*. *People v. Pizarro (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 530, 554-622, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 21*

Trial court properly admitted expert testimony indicating that use of methamphetamine affected criminal defendant's ability to operate vehicle safely, when testimony concerning effects of methamphetamine on human behavior and opinion that person with concentration of methamphetamine in his blood that defendant had and who demonstrated symptoms like defendant's would not have ability to drive safety were based on method of research generally accepted in scientific community. *People v. Bui (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1187, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 908*

Ratios used by county assessor's office to determine value of oil-producing property were neither "new" nor "scientific techniques;" not new because expert witnesses testified methods they used were commonly used in oil and gas industry for valuation purposes; not scientific because they did not purport to provide some "definitive truth." *Texaco Producing, Inc. v. County of Kern (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1029, 1048-1049, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 433*

Testimony based on alleged memories brought forth through use of sodium amytal ("truth serum") is unreliable and inadmissible under *Kelly-Frye*. *Ramona v. Superior Court (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 107, 116-123, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 766* (rejecting attempt to distinguish prior cases on ground that sodium amytal was used on witness for therapeutic purposes and two-year interval existed between administering drug and some of witness's allegedly recovered memories)

Psychological "syndrome" or "profile" evidence does not per se require screening procedures applicable to new scientific evidence not previously accepted in court; evidence is admissible when traditional standards for competent expert opinion are met. *People v. Harlan (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 439, 448-449, 271 Cal. Rptr. 653* (reactions of sexually abused children)

Admissibility of expert testimony based on new scientific technique involves (1) establishment of reliability of method, usually by expert testimony, and (2) qualification of testifying witness as expert who can give opinion on subject; expert testimony in child dependency action is inadmissible when lacking foundational proof that "child molest syndrome" is generally accepted in scientific psychological community. *In re Sara M. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 585, 592-594, 239 Cal. Rptr. 605*

Evidence based on new scientific method of proof is admissible only on showing that method has been generally accepted as reliable in scientific community in which it was developed. *In re Amber B. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 682, 687-692, 236 Cal. Rptr. 623* ; *In re Christine C. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 676, 679-680, 236 Cal. Rptr. 630*

[r] Settlement Negotiations

In personal injury action resulting from multi-vehicle accident, trial court erred in excluding from evidence as settlement negotiations two letters written by plaintiff to insurance company concerning different motor vehicle accident in which he was later involved, where, although letters were part of settlement negotiations, they were not proffered for purpose of proving either liability or invalidity of claim with respect to later accident. However, it was not reasonably probable defendants would have achieved more favorable result in absence of error, so error was harmless. *Zhou v. Unisource Worldwide (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1471, 1476-1481, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 273*

Trial court did not err in excluding evidence of e-mail sent by one party regarding ownership of some shares of stock pursuant to *Evid. Code § 1152*, when e-mail was one of numerous e-mails sent among parties while they were attempting to resolve several interrelated disputes and issue of ownership of all shares of company, which was closely held family company, would be critical information in evaluating one party's buyout offer and resolving parties' many interrelated disputes. *Caira v. Offner (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 12, 30-36, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 233*

[s] Sufficiency

Testimony of single witness, even a party, is sufficient to establish a fact. *Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 227, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470*

[t] View of Scene

Law is clear that when view of scene of accident is made by trier of facts, conditions observed and properly bearing on case as independent evidence that may be considered by trier of facts in arriving at its decision. *Gates v. McKinnon (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 179, 182-183, 114 P.2d 576*

[u] Writings

In action involving insurance policy lost or destroyed without fraudulent intent on insured's part, claimant has burden of proving fact that he or she was insured under lost policy during period in issue and the substance of each policy provision essential to particular coverage insured claims; insurer has burden of proving the substance of any policy provision that functions to defeat insured's claim; there is no evidentiary requirement to prove material provisions by introducing evidence of specific language used in those provisions. *Dart Industries, Inc. v. Commercial Union Ins. Co. (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 1059, 1068-1074, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 142, 52 P.3d 79*

Deposition testimony of witness alleged to be unavailable under *Evid. Code § 240(a)(3)* requires proper foundation of

unavailability; physician's letter dated two months before hearing concerning medical inadvisability of appearance was not reliable and timely foundation and admission based on that foundation was improper. *Ritter v. State Bar (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 595, 601, 221 Cal. Rptr. 134, 709 P.2d 1303*

[5] Judicial Misconduct

Judicial misconduct deprived plaintiffs of fair trial, when judge made improper ex parte contact by viewing videotape offered by defendants with defense counsel present but not did not inform plaintiff's counsel, and when exchanges between court and counsel were antithesis of required judicial decorum and courtesy; because average person could entertain doubt whether judge was impartial, appellate court could reverse without speculating whether bias was actual or apparent, or whether result would have been same had evidence been impartially considered and matter dispassionately decided. *Haluck v. Ricoh Electronics, Inc. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 994, 1002-1009, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 542*

[6] Mistrial

Insufficiency of evidence to justify verdict is ground for motion for new trial, not for mistrial. *Heavy Duty Truck Leasing, Inc. v. Superior Court (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 116, 119, 89 Cal. Rptr. 598*

[7] Order of Proceedings

When several defendants, each having separate defenses, appear by separate counsel, court is required to determine their relative order of presentation (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 607(8)*; *Evid. Code § 320*). *Diamond Springs Lime Co. v. American River Constructors (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 581, 602, 94 Cal. Rptr. 200*

[8] Order of Proof

Power of trial court to control order of proof is elemental and court's rulings as not disturbed on appeal unless there is abuse of discretion. *Gherman v. Colburn (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 544, 584, 140 Cal. Rptr. 330*

[9] Presumptions Affecting Burden of Proof

Report of independent commission on conduct of police department is presumed trustworthy, shifting burden to party opposing its introduction to prove otherwise. *Montiel v. City of Los Angeles (9th Cir. 1993) 2 F. 3d 335, 341-342*

Effect of rebuttable presumption created by *Evid. Code § 664* that official duty is presumed to have been regularly performed is merely to impose on party against whom it operates burden of proof as to nonexistence of presumed fact. *California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform v. Bonta' (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 498, 505, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 823*

Penal Code Section 1016.5, providing that absent record that court advised criminal defendant of immigration consequences of plea of guilty or nolo contendere, establishes rebuttable presumption affecting burden of proof rather than burden of producing evidence, since section clearly states that its purpose is to promote fairness by requiring appropriate warnings to defendants and Legislature intended to implement public policy of mandating administration of advisements; People rebutted presumption by preponderance of evidence by minute order indicating defendant was advised of possible effects of plea on "alien/citizenship/probation/parole status," coupled with testimony by judge as to his practice to advise criminal defendants of immigration consequences personally. *People v. Dubon (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 944, 953-956, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 914*

[10] Rebuttal

Rebuttal and impeachment of expert witness distinguished. *Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 921-922, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393*

[11] Refreshing Memory

Rule that writing used by witness before or while testifying to refresh memory of any matter about which he or she testifies must be produced at request of adverse party (*Evid. Code § 771(a)*) is inapplicable to writing consisting of transcript of tape-recorded conference between attorney and client regarding events surrounding basis of client's cause of action, recorded with client's permission, and protected by attorney client privilege (*see Evid. Code § 954*). *Sullivan v. Superior Court (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 64, 67-74, 105 Cal. Rptr. 241*

[12] Witnesses

[a] Generally

In capital murder prosecution, after granting defendant's motion under *Evid. Code § 777* to exclude from courtroom any witness not then testifying to prevent witness from hearing testimony of others, trial court did not abuse its discretion in granting prosecution motion to permit presence of victim's mother, who was defendant's wife, and victim's sister pursuant to former *Pen. Code § 1102.6*, which allowed victim and victim's family to be present and seated at trial unless trial court found that their presence would pose substantial risk of influencing or affecting content of any testimony. Nothing before trial court suggested that victim's mother's or sister's presence posed substantial risk that either woman would craft or shape her own testimony, or cause any other witness to do so, as result of her presence. *People v. Griffin (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 536, 570-574, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 743, 93 P.3d 344*

Remedy for litigant who believes witness is trying to improve testimony is to question witness and, if necessary, impeach witness with prior testimony; thus, criminal defendant who had full opportunity to cross-examine prosecution witnesses at retrial suppression hearing was not denied due process by any changes in their testimony. *People v. Holloway (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 96, 122, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 212, 91 P.3d 164*

Objection to adequacy of witness's oath must be raised in proceeding in which witness is testifying at time when defect can be easily remedied or objection is waived. *People v. Haeberlin (1969) 272 Cal. App. 2d 711, 716, 77 Cal. Rptr. 553*

[b] Children

Child who is incompetent to be witness at given time by virtue of young age resulting in inability to understand duty to tell truth is reasonably presumed to have been incompetent also at earlier time; thus, child's hearsay statements in earlier social study report are inadmissible unless presumption is rebutted. *In re Daniel Z. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1009, 1018-1020, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 139*

Competency of very young witness depends only on witness's ability to perceive, recollect, and communicate, or to understand duty to tell truth; inconsistent or exaggerated statements by child do not indicate incompetence to testify but are questions of credibility for trier of fact. *Adamson v. Department of Social Services (1988) 207 Cal. App. 3d 14, 20, 254 Cal. Rptr. 667* (five-year-old witness)

[c] Credibility

On writ of habeas corpus after conviction resulting in imposition of death penalty, there was more than substantial evidence to support referee's finding that character and reputation for honesty and integrity of district attorney who had prosecuted case and later executed affidavit and testified that judge had improperly colluded with him during jury selection was poor, relying in part on testimony concerning specific instances of prosecutor's dishonesty in violation of *Evid. Code §§ 787, 1101(a)*; when enactment of *Cal. Const., art. I, § 28(d)* superseded all California restrictions on admission of relevant evidence except those expressly preserved or permitted under that section, and among superseded provisions was *Evid. Code § 787*; referee did not err under *Evid. Code § 1101* inasmuch as *Evid. Code § 1101(c)* stated explicitly that nothing in *Evid. Code § 1101* affected admissibility of evidence offered to support or attack credibility of witness. *In re Freeman (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 630, 640, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 850, 133 P.3d 1013* ,

In capital murder prosecution, trial court did not abuse its discretion in admitting detective's testimony of out-of-court statement of man who participated in crime to impeach eyewitness testimony as relevant, when eyewitness had testified he saw one man, slightly built Hispanic, go to driver's side of victim's truck while other man stated that he went to passenger side door of same truck, and eyewitness's ability accurately to perceive and recall was called into question if, from distance of at most two car lengths he did not see second man. *People v. Brown (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 518, 533-535, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 145, 73 P.3d 1137*

In capital murder prosecution, trial court properly admitted consistent statements of accomplice/witnesses because they were made before plea bargains were struck and thus before existence of one ground alleged in defendant's charge that their trial testimony was biased, even though statements were made after another ground for challenging them arose. *People v. Jones (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1084, 1106-1107, 70 P.3d 359*

Evidence that witness has been convicted of felony is admissible to show bias under *Evid. Code § 786* without regard to nature of underlying crime, since it relates to character traits of honesty and truthfulness. *Piscitelli v. Salesian Society (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1, 6-10, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 139*

Competency of very young witness depends only on witness's ability to perceive, recollect, and communicate, or to understand duty to tell truth; inconsistent or exaggerated statements by child do not indicate incompetence to testify but are questions of credibility for trier of fact. *Adamson v. Department of Social Services (1988) 207 Cal. App. 3d 14, 20, 254 Cal. Rptr. 667* (five-year-old witness)

Except for proof of felony conviction, specific instances of wrongdoing are not proper basis for attacking witness's credibility, pursuant to *Evid. Code §§ 787, 788*. *Downey Savings & Loan Assn. v. Ohio Casualty Ins. Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1072, 1092-1093, 234 Cal. Rptr. 835*

[d] Experts

[i] Appointments

Appointment of expert witnesses is within discretion of court. *People v. Gorg (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 776, 780, 291 P.2d 469* ; *People v. McCracken (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 336, 350, 246 P.2d 913* ; *Pink v. Slater (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 816, 817-818, 281 P.2d 272* ; *Laguna Salada, etc. Dist. v. Pac. Dev. Co. (1953) 119 Cal. App. 2d 470, 474, 259 P.2d 498*

Constitutionality of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1871* (predecessor to *Evid. Code § 730*), authorizing appointment by court of expert witnesses. *Estate of Hastings (1929) 206 Cal. 524, 525-526, 274 P. 973*

Power of court under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1871* (predecessor to *Evid. Code § 730*) to appoint independent and disinterested expert on its own motion to provide court with impartial report. *Durst v. Superior Court (1963) 222 Cal.*

App. 2d 447, 451, 35 Cal. Rptr. 143

[ii] As Subject to Contempt

Nonparty expert witness in personal injury action is subject to contempt for failure to appear at deposition proceeding to which he had been validly subpoenaed. *In re Morelli (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 819, 826, 91 Cal. Rptr. 72*

[iii] Basis of Opinion

In personal injury case arising from automobile accident, trial court's order granting defendant's motion in limine to prohibit plaintiffs' treating physician from testifying at trial as expert and limiting him to testifying as percipient witness because at his deposition, physician conceded he had not reviewed any of plaintiffs' records regarding prior medical treatment, was wrong as matter of law and court had reasonable alternatives to gutting plaintiffs' case; for example, to extent order reflected trial court's belief physician "sandbagged" defense counsel by not being fully prepared for his deposition, court could have ordered physician to submit to further deposition on appropriate terms and conditions. *Fatica v. Superior Court (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 350, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 904*

Evid. Code § 801(b) permits expert to rely on inadmissible evidence if it is of type that reasonably may be relied on by expert in forming opinion on subject to which testimony is related, but witness is not allowed to testify regarding details of such matters if they are otherwise inadmissible. *Genrich v. State of California (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 221, 229, 248 Cal. Rptr. 303*

Experts may properly rely on hearsay in forming opinions, but may not properly relate out-of-court opinion by another expert as independent proof of fact. *Mosesian v. Pennwalt Corp. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 851, 860, 236 Cal. Rptr. 778*

Trial court's refusal to allow plaintiffs' accident reconstruction expert to rely on training records of pilot and observer pilot involved in plane crash in explaining conclusion that they became confused following decision to switch runways for landing was reversible error when paucity of direct evidence entitled expert to reasonably rely on training records in forming opinion and to explain that reliance to jury, as training records indicated similar confusion on part of defendants during previous landing approaches. *Buckwalter v. Airline Training Center (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 547, 551-554, 184 Cal. Rptr. 659*

[iv] Fees

Fee of expert accountant appointed by and acting under court's direction is a chargeable cost. *ABC Egg Ranch v. Abdelnour (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 12, 19, 35 Cal. Rptr. 487* (involving action for dissolution of partnership)

[v] Impeachment and Rebuttal

Impeachment of expert witness and rebuttal distinguished. *Fish v. Guevara (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 142, 146, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329* ; *Kennemur v. State of California (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 907, 921-925, 184 Cal. Rptr. 393*

[vi] Qualifications

Trial court's determination that witness is qualified to testify as expert witness is required to be upheld on appeal absent abuse of discretion, which will be found only if evidence shows that witness clearly lacks qualification as expert. *Jutzi*

v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 637, 653, 242 Cal. Rptr. 74

Court did not abuse its discretion in allowing plaintiff's expert witness to testify on direct examination as to his prior employment with defendant and circumstances of his termination by defendant, because such testimony established expert's background and qualifications and went to issue of defendant's malice for purposes of punitive damages claim. *Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 757, 786, 174 Cal. Rptr. 348*

Determination of person's qualification as expert is matter for trial court, and trial court's determination to accept witness's expertise is not subject to being overturned on appeal if founded on reasonable basis. *Dean W. Knight & Sons, Inc. v. First Western Bank & Trust Co. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 560, 567, 148 Cal. Rptr. 767*

Exercise of trial court's discretion as to whether one qualifies as expert witness is reversible on appeal only for clear abuse. *Putensen v. Clay Adams, Inc. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 1062, 1081, 91 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Traffic officers whose duties include investigations of automobile accidents are qualified experts who may properly testify concerning their opinions as to various factors involved in such accidents, based on their own observations. *Hart v. Wielt (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 224, 229, 84 Cal. Rptr. 220*

[vii] Testimony

In capital murder prosecution, trial court properly excluded defense's offer of expert witness testimony on eyewitness identification, when witness's identification of defendant was corroborated by testimony of five other witnesses, including accomplices, even though all five witnesses could be impeached by proof of bias or prior inconsistent statements, because cumulative corroborative effect of testimony of defendant's admissions was sufficient to give independent reliability to eyewitness identification. *People v. Jones (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1084, 1111-1112, 70 P.3d 359*

General rule declaring that if trier of fact does not act arbitrarily, he or she may reject in toto testimony of a witness, even though witness is uncontradicted, applies equally to expert witnesses. *Foreman & Clark Corp. v. Fallon (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 875, 890, 92 Cal. Rptr. 162, 479 P.2d 362*

Opinion of expert witness cannot be based on facts that have no support in evidence or on irrelevant or speculative matters; expert's testimony was not speculative when record clearly shows opinion was based on expert's experience and was in line with his expertise, qualifications, and foundation that was laid for testimony. *Williams v. Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 1244, 1262-1263, 226 Cal. Rptr. 306*

Reactions of rape victims and varying motivations and personality characteristics of rapists are not subjects within common knowledge of jurors, and are proper subject of expert testimony in civil action for battery to provide background against which jury may assess plaintiff's reaction to alleged rape, and to demonstrate that prestige or community standing did not eliminate individual from motivation and profile of rapist. *Delia S. v. Torres (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 471, 478-480, 184 Cal. Rptr. 787 , overruled on other grounds in Christensen v. Superior Court (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 868, 905 fn. 28, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79, 820 P. 2d 181*

Expert testimony is not required to be necessary to be admissible, but only to be helpful. *People v. Cramblit (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 437, 446 n. 3, 148 Cal. Rptr. 440*

Testimony of expert witness (attorney) is admissible in legal malpractice case to establish negligence. *Starr v. Mooslin (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 988, 996-999, 92 Cal. Rptr. 583*

Although no California statute disqualifies lawyer from testifying in trial to which lawyer's client is a party, prospective

characteristic of trial created appropriate occasion for exercise of trial court's inherent power over proceedings to give criminal defendant and defendant's attorney pretrial choice between latter's withdrawing as counsel and his withdrawal as witness. *People v. Smith (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 897, 904, 907-909, 91 Cal. Rptr. 786*

Testimony of experts is admissible to show recognized and accepted safety standards and practices in profession, trade, or business. *People v. Glass (1968) 266 Cal. App. 2d 222, 226-227, 71 Cal. Rptr. 858 , overruled on other grounds in People v. Superior Court (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 757, 765 n. 7, 100 Cal. Rptr. 281, 493 P. 2d 1145*

Use of hearsay as part of expert's testimony. *Board of Trustees v. Porini (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 784, 792-795, 70 Cal. Rptr. 73*

[viii] Witness List

In medical malpractice action against podiatrist, trial court prejudicially erred in denying plaintiff's motion to strike defendant's "second designation" of expert witnesses under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034*; defendant had no right to simply delay his designation of retained experts until after he had opportunity to view expert designation timely served by plaintiff, and trial court should have granted motion and left defendant to rely exclusively on treating professionals listed in his initial designation. *Fairfax v. Lords (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1019, 1025-1028, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 850*

Under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 2037* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.310* effective July 1, 2005), expert witness not included on proposed expert witness list is permitted to testify only for impeachment purposes; expression of opinion contrary to that expressed by opponent's expert did not constitute impeachment under statute. *Ellenberger v. Karr (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 423, 427, 179 Cal. Rptr. 583*

Court did not abuse its discretion in allowing testimony of plaintiff's expert witness when, although defendant may not have known of witness before testimony and did not have opportunity to depose him, plaintiff acquired witness after defendant's last request for list of experts and defendant had ample opportunity through pretrial discovery to learn of his identity. *Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Co. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 757, 782, 174 Cal. Rptr. 348*

[e] Lay Witnesses

Evid. Code § 800, limiting admissibility of opinion testimony by lay witness, merely requires that witnesses express themselves at lowest possible level of abstraction; however, witness is permitted to state his or her general impression when details observed, even though recalled, are too complex or subtle for concrete description by witness. *Bartlett v. State of California (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 392, 400, 245 Cal. Rptr. 32*

[f] Person Unable to Express Self

In prosecution based on defendant's assaults against her roommate, who suffered from cerebral palsy, defendant failed to show victim was incompetent as witness because victim was incapable of expressing herself, when, although she may have been more difficult to understand than typical witness, record reflected that she was quite intelligent and at trial was both alert and able to express herself concerning assaults, even though, read directly from reporter's transcript, some of her testimony was indecipherable, and when bulk of victim's recorded testimony was comprehensible even without prosecutor's use of leading questions. Trial court did not abuse its discretion by refusing to appoint interpreter for victim, when victim's recorded testimony as whole demonstrated adequate ability to communicate her perceptions in English language so as to be understood by court, counsel, and jury without interpretation; victim spoke English, notwithstanding defense counsel's attempt to compare her to Spanish-speaking witness; victim had completed high school and some college courses; victim's mental capacity was evident in her recorded testimony; defense counsel

understood victim well enough to interject several evidentiary objections to her testimony; and all of her testimony was recorded in reporter's transcript. *People v. Augustin (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 444, 448, 451, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171*

Physical limitations on witness's ability to communicate do not necessarily render witness incompetent to testify. *People v. Tran (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 759, 770, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 905* (when witness was unable to speak, but could answer yes-or-no questions by tapping once for yes and twice for no, defense not deprived of meaningful opportunity to cross-examine)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for MistrialEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsTranscripts & TranslationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayExceptionsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceRelevanceCharacter EvidenceEvidenceTestimonyGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyExpertsKelly-Frye Process

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.207

§ 551.207 Law Reviews

Kettles, *Ancient Documents and the Rule Against Multiple Hearsay, 39 Santa Clara L. Rev. 719 (1999)*

Gross, *Make-Believe: The Rules Exluding Evidence of Character and Liability Insurance, 49 Hastings L.J. 843 (1998)*

Nance, *Evidential Completeness and the Burden of Truth, 49 Hastings L.J. 621 (1998)*

Faigman, *Appellate Review of Scientific Evidence Under Daubert and Joiner, 48 Hastings L.J. 969 (1997)*

Kanovitz, Kanovitz & Bloch, *Witnesses With Multiple Personality Disorder, 23 Pepp. L. Rev. 387 (1996).*

Rosenthal, *Voices From Darkness: The Evidentiary Admissibility of Sleep Talk, 30 U.S.F. L. Rev. 509 (1996)*

Salman, *A Trial Testimony Guide for Witnesses*, 43(8) Prac. Law 15 (1997)

Shacter, *To Ligitate or Not?-- Time for A.D.R.*, 28 Bev. Hills B. Ass'n J. 30 (Winter 1994)

Nizer, *Address, The Art of a Jury Trial, 20 Pepp. L. Rev. 407 (1993)*

Sanders, *From Science to Evidence: The Testimony on Causation in the Bendectin Cases, 46 Stan. L. Rev. 1 (1993)*

Beisman, *How to Choose a Construction Expert, 37(7) Prac. Law. 19 (1991)*

Friedman, *Character Impeachment Evidence: Psycho-Bayesian Analysis and a Proposed Overhaul, 38 UCLA L. Rev. 637 (1991)*

Kanner, *Welcome Home Rambo: High-Minded Ethics and Low-Down Tactics in the Courts, 25 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 81 (1991)*

Note, *Contingent Expert Witness Fees: Access and Legitimacy*, *64 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1363 (1991)*

Shaviro, *Statistical-Probability Evidence and the Appearance of Justice*, *103 Harv. L. Rev. 530 (1989)*

Myers, *The Child Witness: Techniques for Direct Examination, Cross-Examination, and Impeachment*, *18 Pac. L.J. 801 (1987)*

Swift, *A Foundation Fact Approach to Hearsay*, *75 Cal. L. Rev. 1339 (1987)*

Comment, *The Discovery and Use of Computerized Information: An Examination of Current Approaches*, *13 Pepp. L. Rev. 405 (1986)*

Brown and Tachna, *Dealing With the Lawyer as Expert Witness*, *31(7) Prac. Law. 11 (1985)*

Hanauer, *Choosing a Medical Expert*, *5(5) Cal. Law. 53 (1985)*

Survey, *Women and California Law: Part II. A., Evidence*, *16 Golden Gate U. L. Rev. 555 (1986)*

Note, *Expert Legal Testimony*, *97 Harv. L. Rev. 797 (1984)*

Kaufman, *Video in the Courtroom*, *3 Cal. Law. 41 (1983)*

Taylor, *Obtaining Immunity for Defense Witnesses*, *29 Prac. Law. 75 (1983)*

Wydick, *Trial Counsel as Witness: The Code and the Model Rules*, *15 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 651 (1982)*

Cavalieri, *Science as Technology*, *51 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1153 (1978)*

Saltzburg, *A Special Aspect of Relevance: Countering Negative Inferences Associated With the Absence of Evidence*, *66 Cal. L. Rev. 1011 (1978)*

Alexander & Alexander, *The Authentication of Documents Requirements: Barrier to Falsehood or to Truth?* *10 San Diego L. Rev. 266 (1973)*

Bernacchi and Larsen, *Philosophy, Data Processing, and the Rules of Evidence*, *48 L.A. Bar Bull. 374 (1973)*

Kornblum, *Videotape in Civil Cases*, *24 Hastings L.J. 9 (1972)*

Forkosch, *The Nature of Legal Evidence*, *59 Cal. L. Rev. 1356 (1971)*

Karcher, *The Closing Argument*, *15(3) Prac. Law. 49 (1969)*

Comment, *Res Judicata and the Bifurcated Negligence Trial*, *16 UCLA L. Rev. 203 (1968)*

Weiner, *The Civil Nonjury Trial and the Law-Fact Distinction*, *55 Cal. L. Rev. 1020 (1967)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

EvidenceAuthenticationSelf-AuthenticationEvidenceCompetencyDisabilityMental IncapacityEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceCompletenessEvidenceHearsayHearsay Within HearsayEvidenceScientific EvidenceDaubert Standard

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.208

§ 551.208 Text References

California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials (CJER 1981)

Jefferson, California Evidence Benchbook, vols. 1, 2 (CJA-CEB 2d ed. 1982)

Witkin, California Evidence (3d ed. 1986)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 1, *Attorneys*, §§ 273-276, 289-310 (4th ed. 1996); vol. 7, *Trial*, § 1 et seq. (4th ed. 1997)

Brosnahan, Trial Handbook for California Lawyers (1974)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewEvidenceGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.209

§ 551.209 Internet References

California Courts. This site includes links to sites of most trial courts, with most trial court sites including local court rules, forms, calendars, and other information relating to local practices and operations. This site also includes general information about state court organization, text of recently filed appellate opinions, text of California Rules of Court and online versions of the Judicial Council forms, and links to related sites including state agencies and organizations, federal courts and federal organizations, and other sources of legal information. http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov

California Legislative Information. This site includes: text of constitution, codes, and statutes; and information concerning pending legislation. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov

LEXIS-NEXIS. This site includes state and federal court rules, codes, cases, and other primary authority, public records, legal treatise materials including Matthew Bender publications, and Shepard's citation service. http://www.lexis.com

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 511.210-511.219

[Reserved]

§§ 511.210[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.220

§ 551.220 Proceedings Before Trial

NOTE:

For discussion and forms for use in securing appointment of a guardian ad litem for a minor or incompetent party, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem* . For procedure and forms for use in pretrial, trial setting, and settlement conferences, for having a case set for trial, or for bifurcation, and for discussion and forms for establishing a precedence or preference in trial setting, or to move to specially set a case for trial, see Ch. 425, ***Pretrial Proceedings*** . For discussion and forms for use in securing the appointment of a temporary judge to try the case, or for disqualification for cause of the judge designated to try the case, see Ch. 317, ***Judges*** . For discussion and forms for use in moving for a postponement or continuance of a trial, see Ch. 136, ***Continuances*** . For discussion and forms for use in contempt proceedings arising out of a trial, see Ch. 135, ***Contempt*** . For discussion and forms for use in making a pretrial exchange of lists of expert witnesses and their reports and writings pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 2034.210 et seq.*, see Ch. 198, ***Discovery: Exchange of Expert Witness Information*** . For a discussion of special verdicts and special findings, see Ch. 326A, ***Jury Verdicts*** .

[1] Notice of Trial

☐ Prepare a notice of trial and serve a copy of it on the adverse party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 594*; *see § 551.250*].

NOTE:

The notice of trial may be served by either party on the adverse party. However, it is only when the clerk fails to serve the notice that it must be served by a party [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)*; *see also* *§ 551.22 et seq*.]. For a discussion of service by mail and when service is to be made on a party's attorney in lieu of a party, as well as a form for proof of service by mail, see Ch. 518, ***Service of Summons and Papers*** .

☐ Execute a proof of service and file the original and proof of service with the court.

NOTE:

There appears to be no statutory requirement that the notice of trial and proof of service be filed. It is, nevertheless, good practice to do so. But if the notice and proof of service are filed and the adverse party fails to appear at the trial, the appearing party must be sure to point out to the court that the proof of service is in the file and ask that it be introduced into evidence [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)* (requirement that proof of service be introduced into evidence); ***see also*** *§ 551.25*].

[1A] Motion to Advance, Specially Set or Reset Case for Trial

☐ Prepare a motion to advance, specially set or reset the case for trial and serve a copy of it on the adverse party [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335*; *see § 551.250A*].

[2] Preparation for Trial

☐ Court rules, policies, and facilities.

☐ Secure a copy of the court's written rules and policies and of any written policies of the judge in whose department the case will be tried (in a court utilizing a master calendar, the trial judge's identity will not normally be known until the time the case is assigned for trial).

NOTE:

The court's written rules and policies may normally be purchased from the court clerk or the court's designated official publisher [***see*** *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.613(b), (c)*]. Current local rules from all jurisdictions in the state are also available for public examination in the office of each superior court clerk or in the county law library [***see*** *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.613(b), (e)*]. Trial court rules for most counties are available at the Internet site for the California Judiciary, http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov. Any written policies of the judge in whose department the case will be tried may normally be obtained from the judge's courtroom clerk. Counsel should also ascertain any unwritten policies or preferences of the trial judge. This information might be obtained from the judge's courtroom clerk or bailiff. Matters that counsel may wish to discuss with the courtroom clerk or bailiff, if not covered by the court's written rules and policies, would include, for example, (1) the manner in which the judge conducts the before trial conference (***see*** [3], ***below***); (2) how exhibits are to be marked (***see*** checklist, ***below***); and (3) the availability of courtroom facilities that might be needed during the trial (***e.g.,*** electrical outlets for any electrical equipment such as a slide projector or a tape or video recorder) and whether the court provides projectors, stands for exhibits, a blackboard, storage files for exhibits, or other equipment for counsels' use, or whether these should be provided by counsel, and if the latter the procedure for bringing them to or installing them in the courtroom).

☐ Issues and evidence.

☐ Prepare an outline of the case.

NOTE:

Although not required by law, as a matter of good practice counsel will normally find it helpful substantially in advance of trial to prepare an outline of the issues and evidence, including the exhibits to be introduced at trial. This outline will aid counsel not only at trial, but at various stages of the proceedings as well, for example, in

preparing for the before trial, or chambers, conference with the judge (*see* [3], ***below***) or in a jury trial in drafting the proposed jury instructions (***see*** checklist, ***below***).

The list should include every element necessary on plaintiff's part to establish each cause of action or necessary on defendant's part to establish each defense. The main issues of fact (ultimate facts) are framed by the pleadings [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 590*]. Legal issues may also arise from the pleadings, for example, the meaning of an unambiguous contract pleaded in haec verba.

The outline should list each ultimate fact and each evidentiary fact that will establish the ultimate fact and the manner in which the evidentiary fact will be proved, for example, the testimony of a percipient witness or documentary evidence. If the evidentiary fact is to be established by the testimony of a percipient witness, counsel should include the witness's name (for who may be a witness, *see* *Evid. Code §§ 700-704*; *§§ 551.111* and *551.113*); if it will be established by documentary evidence, the outline should identify the document and the name of any witness, if different from the percipient witness, whose testimony may be required to authenticate it (foundational witness; see *Evid. Code §§ 1400-1421*). The outline should include citations to appropriate legal authority that may be helpful to counsel or to the court, for example, authorities setting forth the elements of the cause of action or defense, the manner in which the elements may be proved, and the admissibility of the evidence. For a suggested form of outline, see California Trial Guide (Matthew Bender), Trial Book Vol., Trial Plan Tab, ***Trial Planning Checklist*** and ***Case Analysis Sheet***.

For the weight to be given evidence generally, see discussion in *§ 551.93*.

☐ Consider and determine whether any evidence is protected against disclosure by a privilege.

NOTE:

Privileges are enumerated in *Evid. Code §§ 940-1060*. For a discussion of privileges, including a newsperson's immunity from a contempt citation (*see Cal. Const., art. I, § 2*; *Evid. Code § 1070*) and his or her qualified privilege not to divulge unpublished information, see Ch. 191, *Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitaitons* .

☐ Secure attendance of witnesses.

NOTE:

For a discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for use in securing the attendance of witnesses or production of evidence at trial, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* . For a discussion, procedural guide, and forms for use on a noticed motion, see Ch. 372, ***Motions and Orders*** . For discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see Ch. 518, ***Service of Summons and Papers*** .

☐ Judicial notice.

NOTE:

For a discussion of when the court must or may take judicial notice of a matter, the matter that may be judicially noticed, and the procedure, see Ch. 321, *Judicial Notice* **.**

☐ Determine whether any matter may be judicially noticed.

☐ Counsel should ascertain any matter of which he or she will request the court to take judicial notice [*see Evid. Code § 453*].

NOTE:
Matter of which the court must or may take judicial notice is listed in *Evid. Code §§ 451* and *452*, respectively.

☐ Give notice of request for judicial notice.

☐ Give each adverse party sufficient notice of the request, through the pleadings or otherwise, to enable the adverse party to prepare to meet the request [*Evid. Code § 453(a)*].

☐ Provide information for court.

☐ Obtain the information necessary to be furnished to the court to enable the court to take judicial notice of the matter [*Evid. Code § 453(b)*].

☐ Make a motion for appointment of learned person.

☐ If the advice of persons learned in the subject matter is required to enable the court to take judicial notice of a matter, prepare, serve, and file a notice of motion for an order appointing such a person, together with a supporting affidavit or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* and a memorandum [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; for discussion and a procedural guide relating to noticed motions generally, including time requirements, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*].

NOTE:
Appointment of one or more persons learned in the subject matter to provide the court with advice necessary to enable the court to take judicial notice of a matter may be made on the court's own motion or on the motion of a party [*Evid. Code § 460*]. Although *Evid. Code § 460* does not expressly require that the motion by a party be made on notice, it would appear that if the motion is made before trial (as opposed to a motion made at trial in the presence of the adverse counsel), the better, if not required, practice is to make it on notice.

☐ Exhibits.

☐ Prepare a list of the exhibits counsel intends to offer in evidence.

☐ Although not required by statute, it is a matter of good practice for counsel to prepare a list of the exhibits he or she intends to offer in evidence, particularly if there are numerous exhibits. Counsel must do so if local court rule or policy requires it or requires

a pretrial exchange of lists of exhibits. The list should briefly describe each exhibit. If an exchange of exhibit lists is required, counsel should make a copy of the list for opposing counsel. Counsel may exclude from the list any exhibit he or she anticipates in good faith will be used for impeachment or tactical surprise and which has not been disclosed to adversaries.

☐ Make copies of all documents listed on the exhibit list.

☐ Although not required by statute, the better practice is for counsel to have copies made of all documents on the list of exhibits and make them available prior to the commencement of the trial for examination and copying by any other party requesting them. This may be expressly required by local court rule or policy. Local rule or policy may also require each proponent of critical documents or extracts of critical documents to furnish sufficient copies so that a copy may be presented to each counsel, as well as to the court.

NOTE:
Although it is not necessary to show, read, or disclose any part of a writing to a witness being examined at trial concerning the writing, if the writing is shown to the witness, all parties to the action must be given an opportunity to inspect it before the witness may be asked any question concerning it [*Evid. Code § 768*]. To avoid any negative reaction from the court or jury resulting from the time-consuming process of having the parties inspect the writing, the furnishing of copies to the other parties should be done in advance of the examination of the witness out of open court.

☐ Exchange of lists and evidence.

☐ In advance of trial, exchange with opposing counsel exhibit lists, copies of documentary evidence to be introduced, and witness lists, if required by local court rule or policy (*see* checklist, *above*).

☐ Organizing and premarking exhibits.

☐ Counsel should organize his or her exhibits before trial, and follow any local court rules, policies, or department rules for premarking them and having them marked for identification. In Los Angeles County, for example, each party will be assigned a block of arabic numbers to be used sequentially in marking exhibits [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.62]. The manner of marking exhibits varies widely among the courts, and counsel should, if unaware of the local practice, check with the court clerk or the judge's courtroom clerk.

☐ Dangerous or bulky exhibits.

☐ Prepare substitutes, such as photographs, technical reports, or dummies, if possible, for use in lieu of any dangerous or bulky exhibits.

NOTE:
Local court rule or policy may expressly prohibit bringing any dangerous or bulky

exhibit into the courtroom without first, out of the jury's hearing, securing the court's permission to do so [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.59].

Even in the absence of a court rule, this is a wise policy to follow. Dangerous or bulky exhibits may not only disrupt the trial but might subject persons in attendance to a risk of serious harm as well. Dangerous exhibits would include explosives, such as T.N.T.; corrosives, such as sulfuric acid; and flammables, such as gasoline. Bulky exhibits would include any large and cumbersome exhibit, such as a ladder, a part of an automobile chassis, a table, and so forth.

☐ If a substitute would not do, out of the hearing of the jury, request the court's permission to bring the exhibit in.

☐ Move the court for an order for the court and jury to view the exhibit outside the courtroom at a place and under conditions that will secure the safety of those present if permission to bring the exhibit in is denied [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 651(a)(3)*; and *§ 551.64*].

☐ Maps, plans, and diagrams.

☐ Indicate on any map, plan, or diagram to be offered in evidence whether it was drawn to scale and, if so, the scale used. If it was not drawn to scale, that fact should be pointed out to the trier of fact [*see, e.g.*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.75].

☐ Graphic devices used in argument.

☐ It is good practice before commencement of the argument to show opposing counsel any graphic device, such as a chart, summary, or model, that is not in evidence and is to be used for illustration only in argument. This may be expressly required by local court rule or policy [*see, e.g*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.74].

☐ Trial brief.

☐ Prepare a trial brief, if desired.

☐ Many lawyers find it a good practice in any significant case to prepare a trial brief to present to the judge (with a copy to the adverse party). The purpose of the brief is to familiarize the trial judge with the client's factual and legal claims. The brief should normally (1) contain a summary of the case, (2) outline the facts counsel expects to prove (and a statement and rebuttal of the adverse party's factual contentions), and (3) set forth the legal arguments with proper citations to appropriate authorities. Since the effect of the brief on the judge may depend on when it is submitted, counsel should deliver the brief to him or her as early as possible. The chambers conference with judge and counsel present, which is held immediately before trial in many courts (*see* [3], *below*), provides a good opportunity for personally delivering the brief to the judge. In other courts, counsel might

ascertain from the judge's courtroom clerk the best time and manner for delivering the trial brief.

☐ Proposed jury instructions.

☐ In a jury trial, draft proposed jury instructions covering the law as disclosed by the pleadings. Deliver the original to the court and serve a copy on counsel for the adverse party before the first witness is sworn [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 607a*; *see also* Cal. Rules of Ct., *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.1050* (Judicial Council jury instructions)]. For discussion and a general form of jury instruction, see Ch. 326, *Jury Instructions* . For when additional proposed instructions on questions of law developed by the evidence and not disclosed by the pleadings may subsequently be delivered to the judge and served, *see § 551.224[5]*.

[3] Day of Trial

☐ Appear for trial.

☐ Appearance.

☐ Appear in the court's master calendar department or the department of the judge supervising the master calendar at the time and place set for the assignment of the case to a department, or, if the court does not have a master calendar (which would include one-judge and two-judge courts, appear in the courtroom of the trial judge at the time and place set for trial.

NOTE:
In a court employing a master calendar, each case transferred to a trial department must be tried, ordered off the calendar, or dismissed unless, for good cause arising after the commencement of the trial, the judge of the trial department continues the case for further hearing or, with the consent of the judge supervising the master calendar, reassigns the case to the judge supervising the master calendar for further disposition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 10.910*]. For further discussion of courts having master calendars, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

☐ Trailing of cases.

☐ To minimize the expense and inconvenience to counsel, parties, and the witnesses, counsel should ascertain in advance of the trial date the practices of the local court with respect to trailing cases and any local court rules that may apply.

☐ Motions in master calendar department or at trial.

☐ Be prepared to make any motion that may appropriately be made in the master calendar department or at trial if the court does not have a master calendar department. Such motions may include the following:

☐ Motion for continuance or postponement of trial.

NOTE:
The court may condition the granting of the motion on the moving party's paying the adverse party the costs occasioned by the postponement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1024*]. Costs are not limited to taxable costs but may include certain expenses incurred in preparing for the trial [*De Cesare v. Lembert (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 20, 25, 192 Cal. Rptr. 354* ; *see* *Inman v. Fremont Medical Center (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 169, 172, 122 Cal. Rptr. 372* (fees of jury panel); *Wilkin v. Tadlock (1952) 110 Cal. App. 2d 156, 157-158, 241 P.2d 1066* (transportation costs of out of state adverse parties and taxable costs)]. However, the term does not include attorney fees or lost income [*see* *De Cesare v. Lembert (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 20, 23-26, 192 Cal. Rptr. 354* (discussing earlier contrary authorities on the issue of attorney fees, including *McFaddin v. H. S. Crocker Co. (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 585, 594, 33 Cal. Rptr. 389* , and holding them repudiated by subsequent case law)]. For further discussion, a procedural checklist, and forms for use in moving for a continuance, see Ch. 136, ***Continuances* .

☐ Motion to disqualify judge.

☐ A motion to disqualify a judge for cause under *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1* or peremptorily under *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.6* may be made if timely [for discussion, a procedural guide, and forms for use in moving to disqualify, see Ch. 317, *Judges*].

NOTE:
Obtain as much information as possible in advance of trial about the judge who will or may try the case. Local attorneys and bar associations are often the best source of this information. In addition, there are some published sources that counsel should check. The most comprehensive of these is Arnold, California Courts and Judges Handbook (4th ed, 1985), published by Law Book Service Co., 369 Harvard St., San Francisco, CA 94134. This book contains biographical data on all judges of the California courts, as well as federal court judges in California. If the case is pending in a southern California court, counsel may also wish to check the Judicial Profile series of the *Los Angeles Daily Journal* to see if the particular judge has been profiled in that series.

☐ Before trial conference, motions in limine, and stipulations.

☐ Accept the judge's invitation, if any, to join him or her and counsel for the adverse party in a before trial chambers conference.

NOTE:
At the conference, counsel should be prepared to familiarize the judge with the case (and personally deliver to the judge the trial brief, if one has been prepared (*see* [2], *above*)), to make any motions in limine that should be ruled on before the first witness is examined, to make any stipulations that may narrow the issues to be tried, and so forth. For the purposes of the conference and the matters that may be covered, see discussion in Part II, Subpart C.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.221

§ 551.221 General Matters Concerning Trial

[1] Behavior and Dress

☐ Ascertain prior to the trial date any local court rule, policy, or practice, as well as any requirements of the judge who will be presiding at trial that relate to behavior and dress.

NOTE:
In the Los Angeles County Superior Court, for example, policy provides that persons in the courtroom shall not converse, read newspapers, smoke, chew gum, or eat food while court is in session, that they should not dress in a bizarre manner such as to be distracting to others of usual sensibilities, that counsel shall so instruct the parties they represent, the witnesses they call, and persons accompanying them, and that attorneys should ordinarily be dressed in accordance with current customs as to their business attire [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 8.1, 8.2].

[2] Courtroom Arrangements

☐ Seating of counsel.

☐ Ascertain any local court rule, policy, or practice relating to the seating of counsel [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.4 (plaintiff's counsel to be seated adjacent to jury box)].

☐ Addressing court.

☐ In addressing the trial judge in court, counsel should use the term "Your Honor." In referring to the trial judge in court, counsel should use the term "His Honor" or "Her Honor," as the case may be. Contrary to the practice in an appellate court, it is not proper

to address or refer to the trial judge in court as "Judge" or "Judge" followed by the judge's name. In making a motion or request, counsel may use the term "If it please the Court," or "If the Court pleases," followed by the motion or request [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.5].

☐ Restricted areas.

☐ Ascertain any restrictions with respect to moving about the courtroom [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.3 (area between bench and counsel table not to be traversed except with court's approval)].

☐ Examination of witnesses.

☐ Counsel should be familiar with any local court rule, policy, or practice concerning the examination of witnesses [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.9 (remain at or behind counsel table when examining a witness)].

NOTE:

Local court rule, policy, or practice may also prohibit counsel from approaching a witness on the witness stand without the prior permission of the court [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.10 (unless court otherwise directs, counsel need not request permission to approach witness for the purpose of showing witness a document or other object, but before approaching witness for any other purpose, a party must request court's permission)].

☐ Unseemly conduct or mugging.

☐ Counsel should normally avoid any unseemly conduct or mugging in response to a witness's testimony [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.91 (persons in courtroom, including the parties and counsel, shall not indicate by facial expression, shaking of head, gesturing, shouts, or other conduct disagreement with or approval of testimony or other evidence being given; counsel is required to so instruct parties they represent, witnesses they call, and any accompanying persons)].

[3] Selection of Jury

☐ If trial is to be by jury, participate in the selection of the jurors from the jury panel.

NOTE:

The qualifications a person must have to be eligible for jury service are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 203*. The California Constitution expressly provides that a person is not incompetent to be a juror because of his or her opinions on religious beliefs [*Cal. Const., art. I, § 4*]. The amount of jurors' fees is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 215*.

In a jury trial, the court selects jurors from a jury panel in the voir dire process. Eligible jurors may be excused from jury service only for undue hardship [*Code Civ. Proc. § 204(b)*]. Prospective jurors may be challenged by a party peremptorily or for cause [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 225(b),*

226-231]. For a discussion of the procedure for selecting a jury, including voir dire and challenges, ***see*** Ch. 322, ***Juries and Jury Selection*** . When the jury selection is completed, the court obtains an acknowledgment and agreement that the jurors will well and truly try the matter in issue and render a verdict according to the evidence and the court's instructions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 232(b)*].

[4] Province of Court and Jury in Jury Trial

☐ Questions of law.

☐ Questions of law are decided by the court [*Evid. Code § 310(a)*].

NOTE:
Questions of law include the construction of statutes and other writings, the admissibility of evidence, and the rules of evidence [*Evid. Code § 310(a)*; *see* *Evid. Code § 160* ("law" includes constitutional, statutory, and decisional law); *Evid. Code § 250* ("writings" defined)].

☐ Foreign law.

☐ The law of an organization of nations, a foreign nation, or a public entity in a foreign nation is a question of law determined as provided in *Evid. Code §§ 450-460* (relating to judicial notice) [*Evid. Code § 310(b)*; *see § 551.220[2]*].

NOTE:
If the law of an organization of nations, a foreign nation, or a state other than California, applies and cannot be determined, the court may either apply the law of California if it can do so consistently with the United States and California Constitutions, or dismiss the action without prejudice [*Evid. Code § 311*].

☐ Determination of preliminary facts.

☐ Determination of fact issues preliminary to the admission of evidence are decided by the court as provided in *Evid. Code §§ 400-406* [*Evid. Code § 310(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 551.76*].

☐ Questions of fact.

☐ Except as otherwise provided by law, all questions of fact are decided by the jury [*Evid. Code § 312(a)*].

☐ Credibility of witnesses.

☐ Except as otherwise provided by law, the jury, subject to the court's control, determines the effect and value of the evidence addressed to it, including the credibility of witnesses and hearsay declarants [*Evid. Code § 312(b)*].

[5] Admissibility of Evidence

☐ Relevant evidence.

☐ All relevant evidence is normally admissible [*Evid. Code § 351*].

NOTE:
Only relevant evidence is admissible, and all relevant evidence is admissible in a civil case unless its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will either (a) necessitate undue consumption of time or (b) create a substantial danger of undue prejudice, of confusing the issues, or of misleading the jury [*Evid. Code §§ 350, 351, 352*]. *See* discussion in *§§ 551.66* and *551.68*.

☐ Opinion evidence.

☐ Opinion evidence is normally inadmissible [*see Evid. Code § 800*].

NOTE:
Opinion evidence is inadmissible unless (a) the witness is testifying as an expert and the opinion is within the area of the witness's expertise [*see* *Evid. Code § 801*]; or (b) the witness is a layperson and the opinion is rationally based on the witness's perception and helpful to a clear understanding of the witness's testimony [***see*** *Evid. Code § 800*]; or (c) the opinion is otherwise permitted by law [*Evid. Code § 800*]. Opinions otherwise permitted by law include an owner's opinion as to the value of his or her property [***see*** *Evid. Code § 813(a)(2)*] and a witness's opinion as to the sanity of a person when certain prerequisites are met [***see*** *Evid. Code § 870*]. ***See*** discussion in *§ 551.70*.

☐ Hearsay evidence.

☐ Hearsay evidence is inadmissible unless it falls within one of the numerous exceptions to the hearsay rule [*Evid. Code § 1200(b)*].

NOTE:
Exceptions to the hearsay rule are set forth in *Evid. Code § 1220 et seq.* See discussion in *§ 551.71*.

☐ Authentication of writings.

☐ Before a writing may be introduced in evidence, it must be authenticated [*see Evid. Code § 1401(a)*].

NOTE:
"Writing" as used in the Evidence Code is defined in *Evid. Code § 250* [*see* discussion in *§ 551.73*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsSelectionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsProvince of Court & JuryEvidenceAuthenticationGeneral OverviewEvidenceHearsayGeneral OverviewEvidenceRelevanceGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.222

§ 551.222 Objections and Motions to Exclude Evidence or to Strike Testimony

[1] Common Grounds for Objecting to Evidence

NOTE:

The following are common objections that may be made in the course of the trial. For statutory grounds on which specific evidence may be objected to as inadmissible, see discussion in *§ 551.68*. For a discussion of the manner of objecting to evidence, argument on the objection, and offers of proof, *see* discussion in *§ 551.77*. For further discusion of the grounds for the objections, ***see*** Jefferson, California Evidence Benchbook (2d ed) (CJA-CEB 1982) and California Trial Objections (2d ed) (Cal. CEB 1984).

The general objection that evidence is "incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial" is insufficient unless the evidence is objectionable from every standpoint and on its face there appears no purpose whatsoever for which the evidence asked could be admissible [*Short v. Frink (1907) 151 Cal. 83, 86, 90 P. 200]* .

☐ Objection to the introduction of any evidence by a party.

☐ This is a device for attacking the sufficiency of a pleading and may be directed against the plaintiff or cross complainant or against the defendant or cross defendant. The ground of objection is that the complaint or cross complaint fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action or that the answer fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a defense, as the case may be [*see McFaddin v. H. S. Crocker Co. (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 585, 588 n. 1, 33 Cal. Rptr. 389]* .

☐ The question is irrelevant [*see Evid. Code § 350*].

☐ Other factors outweigh the relevance of the question.

☐ Probative value substantially outweighed by probability that admission will necessitate undue consumption of time [*Evid. Code § 352*].

☐ Probative value substantially outweighed by probability that admission will create substantial danger of undue prejudice [*Evid. Code § 352*].

☐ Probative value substantially outweighed by probability that admission will create substantial danger of confusing the issues [*Evid. Code § 352*; *see Kinney v. County of Contra Costa (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 761, 771, 87 Cal. Rptr. 638]* .

☐ Probative value substantially outweighed by probability that admission will create substantial danger of misleading the jury [*Evid. Code § 352*; *see Kinney v. County of Contra Costa (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 761, 771, 87 Cal. Rptr. 638]* .

☐ The witness is incompetent to testify to the matter.

☐ Witness does not possess the qualifications required to be a witness in the case [*see Evid. Code §§ 700-704*].

☐ Witness has no personal knowledge of the matter [*see Evid. Code § 702(a)*].

☐ No foundation has been laid showing that the witness has personal knowledge of the facts [*see Evid. Code § 403(a)(2)*].

☐ The question calls for an opinion or conclusion of the witness (and the witness is not competent to give an opinion or conclusion) [*see Evid. Code §§ 800, 1416* (lay witness), *Evid. Code §§ 720, 801, 1418* (expert witness).

☐ No foundation has been laid for the witness to testify to an expert opinion [*see Evid. Code §§ 720, 801, 1418*].

☐ The question calls for speculation by the witness [*see People v. Glancy (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 669, 680, 299 P.2d 18]* .

☐ The question is leading [*see Evid. Code § 767(a)(1)* (question asked on direct or redirect examination)].

☐ The question calls for privileged information [*see Evid. Code §§ 950-1060*].

☐ The answer would tend to incriminate the witness [*Evid. Code § 940*].

☐ The question calls for hearsay [*see Evid. Code § 1200(b)*].

☐ The question calls for inadmissible secondary evidence to prove the content of a writing [see *Evid. Code §§ 1521-1523*].

☐ The question calls for evidence that violates the parol evidence rule [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1856, Com. Code § 2202*].

☐ No foundation has been laid with respect to a writing or other exhibit sought to be introduced [*see Evid. Code § 1401*].

☐ No foundation has been laid with respect to introduction in evidence of witness's prior inconsistent statement [*see Evid. Code § 770*].

☐ No foundation has been laid to assure trustworthiness of "past recollection recorded" sought to be introduced in evidence as an exception to hearsay rule [*see Evid. Code § 1237*; *Sherrell v. Kelso (1981) 172 Cal. Rptr. 667]* .

☐ The question assumes facts not in evidence [*see Evid. Code § 765*; and, e.g., *Brokopp v. Ford Motor Co. (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 841, 859, 139 Cal. Rptr. 888]* .

☐ The question has been asked and answered [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ The question is uncertain, ambiguous, or unintelligible [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ The question is complex (i.e., long and involved) [*see Evid. Code § 765*; *Bennett v. Superior Court (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 203, 217, 166 P.2d 318]* .

☐ The question is compound (that is, it joins two or more questions, either disjunctively or conjunctively) [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ Objection that the question is too general [*see Evid. Code § 765*; see also Johnson, *California Trial Guide, Unit 20, Procedural Rules for Presentation of Evidence, § 20.15[3]* (Matthew Bender); Jefferson, California Evidence Benchbook; (2d ed) (CJA-CEB 1982), Vol. 1, § 27.6; and California Trial Objections (2d ed) (Cal CEB 1984), Ch. 9, *Question Is Too General*].

☐ The question calls for a narrative answer [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ The question misstates the evidence or misquotes a witness [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ The question is argumentative [*see Evid. Code § 765*].

☐ The evidence is cumulative, that is, the evidence is repetitive of evidence already introduced and its probative value is substantially outweighed by the probability that its admission will necessitate an undue consumption of time or create a substantial danger of undue prejudice [*see Evid. Code § 352*].

☐ The question (on cross-examination for a purpose other than impeachment) exceeds the scope of the direct examination [*see Evid. Code § 761*].

[2] Common Motions to Exclude Evidence or to Strike Testimony

NOTE:

A motion to exclude or to strike evidence must be timely made and so stated as to make clear the specific ground of the motion [*see* *Evid. Code § 353(a)*]. Failure to make a timely motion to strike inadmissible evidence waives the right to complain of the erroneous admission of evidence [*Rodriguez v. McDonnell Douglas Corp. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 626, 659-660, 151 Cal. Rptr. 399]* . Motions to exclude evidence (motions in limine) are normally made before trial at the before-trial conference, if any, but may be made during trial [for further discussion, ***see*** Ch. 373, ***Motions in Limine***]. It is essential that the motion to exclude be made as early as possible if counsel wishes to avoid opposing counsel's reference to the evidence in the voir dire examination of the jurors or in opposing counsel's opening statement. Some judges may require that the motion be presented in writing with a proposed order [***see*** discussion in *§ 551.41[5]*]. A copy of the motion and order should then be delivered to the adverse party. This will circumvent any possibility of a misunderstanding on the part of counsel as to what evidence has been ordered excluded.

☐ Motion to exclude evidence on ground that other factors outweigh its probative value [*see Evid. Code § 352*; [1], *above*].

☐ Motion to exclude reference to specified inadmissible evidence [*see*, as examples of inadmissible evidence, *Evid. Code §§ 1151-1157.7*, discussed in Part II, Subpart E].

☐ Motion to exclude privileged information [*Evid. Code 916*].

☐ Motion to strike nonresponsive answer [*Evid. Code § 766*].

☐ Motion to strike witness's answer to objectionable question made before counsel has time to object.

NOTE:

Like all motions to exclude or to strike, this motion should be timely, clearly state the ground on which it is made, and specify the matter to be stricken [*see* *Evid. Code § 353(a)*; *Lucy v. Davis (1912) 163 Cal. 611, 615, 126 P. 490* (motion to strike denied as too vague and general)]. If the motion is granted, counsel should request the court to admonish the jury to ignore the stricken testimony if the court does not do so when it grants the motion.

☐ Motion to strike testimony of witness on failure to produce writing that witness used to refresh

recollection with respect to matter about which he or she testified [*see Evid. Code § 771(a)*].

☐ Motion to strike testimony on any other ground.

NOTE:
In such event, the motion to strike must be directed with precision to the particular testimony sought to be stricken, especially when only part of it is objectionable [*see* *Orange County Flood Control Dist. v. Sunny Crest Dairy, Inc. (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 742, 752, 143 Cal. Rptr. 803*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedurePretrial Motions & ProceduresMotions in LimineEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofObjectionsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofOffers of ProofEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsObjections & Offers of ProofTimeliness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.223

§ 551.223 Common Motions During Trial

NOTE:

Motions to exclude evidence or to strike testimony are listed in *§ 551.222[2]*. Motions at trial are made orally. For common after trial motions, see Ch. 371, *Motions After Trial* .

Except motions to strike testimony [discussed in *§ 551.222[2]*], motions in jury trials should normally be made out of the hearing of the jury but in the presence of adverse counsel. Before trial, counsel should check any local court rules with respect to the making of motions during trial and check further with the trial judge's courtroom clerk to ascertain any requirements of the judge with respect to specific motions not covered by local court rules.

[1] Motions Relating to Trial

☐ Motion for continuance [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 594a-595.4*; *see* Ch. 136, *Continuances*].

☐ Motion for judgment on the pleadings [*see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

NOTE:

If made at trial, the motion can be oral and without prior notice [*MacBeth v. West Coast Packing Corp. (1947) 83 Cal. App. 2d 96, 99, 187 P.2d 815]* . The motion is normally made in open court, although any argument on the motion should be out of the jury's hearing. Nevertheless, some courts require that both the motion and the argument be made out of the jury's hearing [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.47].

☐ Motion for nonsuit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 581c(a)*].

NOTE:
Normally, the motion and any argument on it should be made out of the hearing of the jury to avoid a mistrial if the motion or the argument would prejudice the jury. This may be required, if not by local court rule, by the trial judge.

☐ Motion for judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8*; for discussion, *see* Ch. 389, *Nonsuit and Motions for Judgment*].

☐ Motion for mistrial [*see* discussion in Part II, Subpart J, *§ 551.150 et seq.*].

NOTE:
Unless otherwise required by local court rule or by the trial judge, a motion for mistrial may be made orally in open court at the time the misconduct or irregularity occurs, but any argument on the motion should be out of the jury's hearing [*see* California Judges Benchbook--Civil Trials (CJER 1981), Ch. 10, ***Mistrials***, §§ 10.19, 10.20]. Some courts, however, require that both the motion and the argument be out of the jury's hearing [***see, e.g.,*** Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 8.47; ***see also, e.g.,*** *Tobler v. Chapman (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 568, 573, 107 Cal. Rptr. 614* (action in Mendocino County Superior Court)].

☐ Motion to amend pleading to conform to proof [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 469, 473* (first paragraph), 576; and Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings*].

☐ Motion for directed verdict [*see Frisk v. Merrihew (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 319, 325, 116 Cal. Rptr. 781* ; and Ch. 326A, *Jury Verdicts*].

NOTE:
The motion may be oral, but both the motion and any argument on the motion should normally be out of the jury's hearing; this is expressly required by some courts [*see, e.g.*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 8.47].

[2] Motions Relating to Witnesses

NOTE:
Motions to strike testimony or to exclude evidence are listed in *§ 551.222[2]* .

☐ Motion to exclude witnesses from courtroom [*see Evid. Code § 777(a)*].

NOTE:
The motion may be made by either party and would normally be made at the before-trial chambers conference with the judge [*see* discussion in *§ 551.41[3]*].

☐ Motion to appoint expert to investigate, report, and testify [*see Evid. Code § 730*].

NOTE:
An order appointing an expert may be made on the court's own motion or the motion of any party [*Evid. Code § 730*; for further discussion, *see* *§ 551.113[5]*].

☐ Motion that court call witness [*see Evid. Code § 775*].

NOTE:
The court may call witnesses and interrogate them on its own motion or the motion of any party [*Evid. Code § 775*; *see* discussion in *§ 551.121[4]*].

☐ Motion or request to produce writing used by witness to refresh recollection [*see Evid. Code § 771(a)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 551.121[10]*].

☐ Motion to reexamine once examined witness on same matter [*see Evid. Code § 774*].

NOTE:
Leave may be granted or withheld in the court's discretion [*Evid. Code § 774*].

☐ Motion to recall excused witness [*see Evid. Code § 778*].

NOTE:
Leave may be granted or withheld in the court's discretion [*Evid. Code § 778*].

[3] Miscellaneous Motions

☐ Motion to view property, place, or other thing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 651(a)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 551.64*].

NOTE:
The motion is normally made at the before-trial chambers conference with the judge or thereafter as soon as the motion is contemplated [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 8.93; ***see also*** *§ 551.41[3]*].

☐ Motion to exclude privileged information [*see Evid. Code § 916(a)*].

NOTE:
The presiding officer is required to exclude the information on his or her own motion or the motion of a party [*Evid. Code § 916(a)*; *see* *Evid. Code § 905* ("presiding officer" is that person authorized to rule on claim of privilege in proceeding in which claim is made)]. However, the information must not be excluded if the presiding officer is otherwise instructed by a person authorized to permit disclosure or the proponent of the evidence establishes that there is no person in existence authorized to claim the privilege [*Evid. Code § 916(b)*]. For a discussion of privileges, ***see*** Ch. 191, ***Discovery: Privileges and Other Discovery Limitations*** .

☐ Motion in paternity case for blood test [*see Fam. Code § 7551*]. For a form of notice of motion, supporting declaration, and order granting the motion, *see* Ch. 412, *Paternity* .

☐ Noticed motion for judgment when jury discharged without verdict [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 630*]. For discussion, a procedural guide, and requirements of noticed motions generally, *see* Ch. 372, *Motions*

and Orders .

NOTE:

The order may be made by the court on its own motion or on the motion of a party when notice is given within 10 days after discharge of the jury. The failure of the court to order judgment within 30 days, subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 12a* (relating to holidays), after the jury was discharged constitutes a denial of the motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 630*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJudgment as Matter of LawGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsMotions for Mistrial

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.224

§ 551.224 Order of Trial Proceedings

NOTE:

This checklist discusses the general order of the trial. The trial proceeds in the order set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 607* unless the court for special reasons otherwise directs [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607, 631.7*]. The order of trial in an eminent domain proceeding, however, is varied by statute [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 1260.210(a)* (defendant presents his or her evidence on the issue of compensation first, then commences and concludes the argument)].

Photographing, recording, and broadcasting in the courtroom are governed by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 1.150, 2.952, 2.954*.

[1] Opening Statements

NOTE:

Opening statements are expressly authorized by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 607(1), (2)* (jury trials), *631.7* (nonjury trials)]. But these statements are not evidence, and in a jury trial the court will so instruct the jury.

The purpose of the opening statement is to outline the facts of the case and the legal theories of the parties. Counsel should, in advance of trial, ascertain any local court rule or policy, department policy, or policy of the trial judge relating to the manner of delivering the opening statement. For example, whether counsel is expected to remain seated at the counsel table or stand, and whether counsel may move about. Practice among the courts and judges of the same court varies widely.

☐ Plaintiff's statement [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(1), 631.7*].

☐ The facts stated must be sufficiently complete to establish a cause of action. If they are not, defendant may, in either a jury or nonjury trial, on completion of the statement

move for a judgment of nonsuit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 581c(a)*; *Addison v. Susanville Lumber, Inc. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 394, 398, 120 Cal. Rptr. 737* ; discussion in *§ 551.223[1]*]. For an outline of matters to be covered in plaintiff's opening statement, see California Civil Procedure During Trial (Cal CEB), Vol. 1 (1982), Ch. 8, *Opening Statement*, §§ 8.19-8.31.

☐ Defendant's statement.

☐ After the plaintiff has completed his or her opening statement, make opening statement outlining the defense if desired, or wait until plaintiff has presented his or her evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(2), 631.7*]. For an outline of matters to be covered in defendant's opening statement, see California Civil Procedure During Trial (Cal CEB), Vol. 1 (1982), Ch. 8, *Opening Statement*, §§ 8.20-8.31.

[2] Proposed Jury Instructions Based on Pleadings

☐ Before the first witness is sworn in a jury trial, deliver to the judge presiding at the trial and serve on opposing counsel all proposed instructions to the jury covering the law as disclosed by the pleadings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 607a*; *§ 551.220[2]*].

[3] Production of Evidence

NOTE:
For a discussion of the admissibility of evidence, see Part II, Subpart E, *§ 551.60 et seq.* For a discussion of the qualification of witnesses, the appointment of interpreters, and the order of examination, see *§ 551.110* et seq. [*see also* California Civil Procedure During Trial (Cal CEB 1982), Vol. 1, Ch. 9, ***Examining Witnesses***].

☐ Plaintiff's case.

☐ After the opening statement or statements, if any, produce evidence to establish plaintiff's case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(3), 631.7*].

NOTE:
In a jury trial, if plaintiff's evidence fails to establish plaintiff's right to recover, defendant may move for a judgment of nonsuit [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 581c(a)*; *§ 551.223[1]*]. In a nonjury trial, defendant may, after plaintiff has completed his or her evidence, move for judgment [***see*** *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8(a)*; *§ 551.223[1]*].

☐ Defendant's case.

☐ After plaintiff has produced his or her evidence, defendant may make an opening statement if he or she did not do so after plaintiff's opening statement [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(5), 631.7*].

☐ If several defendants having separate defenses appear by different counsel, the court must

determine their relative order in presenting evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(8), 631.7*]. This is normally determined at the before chambers conference, if any [*see* discussion in *§ 551.41[3]*].

NOTE:

In a nonjury trial, after defendant has completed his or her evidence, plaintiff may move for judgment [*see* *Code Civ. Proc. § 631.8(a)*; and *§ 551.223[1]*].

[4] Rebutting Evidence [*see* Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(6), 631.7]

☐ After the parties have produced their evidence, they may then respectively offer rebutting evidence only, unless the court, for good reason, in furtherance of justice, permits them to offer evidence on their original case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(6), 631.7*].

[5] Proposed Jury Instructions Based on Evidence [*see* Code Civ. Proc. § 607a]

☐ Before the commencement of the argument in a jury trial, counsel may deliver to the judge and serve on opposing counsel proposed jury instructions on questions of law developed by the evidence and not disclosed by the pleadings [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 607a*; see also *Finn v. G. D. Searle & Co. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 691, 701, 200 Cal. Rptr. 870, 677 P.2d 1147]* . These instructions are in addition to those previously delivered to the judge and served on opposing counsel before the first witness was sworn [*Code Civ. Proc. § 607a*; *see* [2], *above*].

☐ After submission of all proposed jury instructions (and verdict and findings forms), the trial judge may hold a chambers conference with counsel outside the presence of the jurors to discuss the instructions. This may be expressly required by local court rule or policy [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 8.24].

[6] Argument

☐ Time for and content of argument.

☐ Be prepared to argue the case on conclusion of the presentation of evidence or at such time thereafter as the court may specify [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(7), 631.7*; *§ 551.140 et seq.*].

☐ Use of graphic devices.

☐ Ascertain before argument any rule, policy, or practice of the court in which the case is tried relating to the use of diagrams or graphic devices in argument, such as any requirement that the device be shown to adversaries in advance [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 8.74].

☐ Plaintiff's argument.

☐ The plaintiff must commence and may conclude the argument [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(7), 631.7*].

☐ Defendant's argument.

☐ After plaintiff has completed his or her opening argument, defendant may present his or her argument [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(7), 631.7*]. If several defendants having separate defenses appear by different counsel, the court must determine their relative order in presenting their arguments [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 607(8), 631.7*].

[7] Instructing Jury

☐ In a jury trial, the court may, after the completion of argument, charge the jury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 607(9)*; *see also, e.g.*, Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct., Rules, Rule 8.51 (when instructions to be read to jury)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsClosing ArgumentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureTrialsOpening StatementsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceTestimonyPresentation of Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART IV. PROCEDURAL CHECKLISTS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 551.225-551.249

[Reserved]

§§ 551.225[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.250

§ 551.250 Notice of Time Set for Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)]

[1] FORM Notice of Time Set for Trial [Code Civ. Proc. § 594(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF TIME SET FOR TRIAL
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

To _____ [*party, e.g.,* plaintiff] and to _____ [*name*], his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that this action has been set for trial on _____ [*date*], at _____[*time*] in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a party to an action to give the other party notice of the trial date [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 594*; and discussion in *§ 551.21*]. Many courts provide their own form of notice of trial, and if provided, it should be used.

[3] Cross References

For points and authorities in support of motion for new trial when defendant's nonappearance resulted from failure to receive notice of trial, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 70, *Defaults and Default Judgments* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of pretrial proceedings, including the setting of a case for trial, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings*

For forms relating to bifurcation of trial, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.250A

§ 551.250A Motion to Advance, Specially Set or Reset Case for Trial

[1] FORM Motion to Advance, Specially Set or Reset Case for Trial

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION TO
vs.	)	_____ [ADVANCE
_____ [*name*],	)	*or* SPECIALLY SET
Defendant(s).	)	*or* RESET] TRIAL
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____[*name*] his/her/its attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____[*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order _____ [advancing *or* specially setting *or* resetting] the trial of this cause to _____[*specify date*]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____[*specify*

grounds showing good cause for advancing, specially setting or resetting the trial].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____[*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a party prior to trial to move the court for an order advancing, specially setting or resetting the trial. The motion may be made by noticed motion or ex parte [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335(a)*]. The motion must show good cause for the request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335(b)*].

[3] Accompanying Papers

A memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005, 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For general discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

A declaration must be filed with the motion showing good cause. The court may only grant the request on an affirmative showing by the moving party of good cause based on a declaration served and filed with the motion or application [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1335(b)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.251

§ 551.251 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ORDER APPOINTING
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*],	)	EXPERT WITNESS
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	Date: _____
Defendant(s).	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____[*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____[*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order appointing an expert witness, to wit, an impartial _____ [*specify, e.g.,* medical and psychiatric] expert, _____ [*specify matters for which expert is required, e.g.,* (1) to examine the plaintiff herein for the

purpose of determining whether plaintiff has a psychosis, and, if so, whether (a) the psychosis is the result of a sickness or of the injuries sustained by plaintiff in the automobile accident that occurred on _____ [*date*], (b) the psychosis has totally disabled the plaintiff; and (c) the disability is permanent; (2) to render a written report to the court; and (3) if necessary, to testify at the trial of this action on the issue(s) of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the cause, effect, and prognosis of plaintiff's disability, if any)]. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the impartial examination of an independent expert witness appointed by the court is required to help resolve the hopeless conflict in the conclusions of the medical and psychiatric experts employed by the parties to this action, and that the examination and report may help to bring about a pretrial settlement of this case, thereby saving both the court and the parties unnecessary expenditure of time and money in the trial of this action and, further, sparing the parties the additional expense that would be incurred in employing yet additional experts whose opinions may be equally conflicting after examining the plaintiff].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a party prior to trial to move the court for an order appointing an expert witness to investigate, render a report, and testify at the trial. The motion may, however, be made at any time before or during the trial [*see* [4], *below*]; however, a motion during trial is normally made orally. The motion may also be made at the before-trial conference [*see* discussion in Part II, Subpart C].

[3] Accompanying Papers

A memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005, 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For general discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Statutory Authority

When it appears to the court, at any time before or during the trial of an action, that expert evidence is or may be required by the court or by any party to the action, the court on its own motion or on motion of any party may appoint one or more experts to investigate, to render a report as may be ordered by the court, and to testify as an expert at the trial of the action relative to the fact or matter as to which the expert evidence is or may be required [*Evid. Code § 730*].

A court-appointed expert must hold the appropriate license in order to perform any act for which a license is required [*see Evid. Code § 730*].

[5] Cross References

For discussion and format requirements of notice of motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.252

§ 551.252 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness--Declaration in Support of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff, vs.	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	OF MOTION FOR ORDER
Defendant(s).	)	APPOINTING EXPERT WITNESS
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
	)	

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

[*SET FORTH, in successively numbered paragraphs, facts within declarant's personal knowledge establishing the ground(s) of the motion, e.g.:*]

2. As shown by the complaint herein, this is an action by an insured to recover disability benefits under the personal disability provisions of policies issued by the defendant insurer.

3. Under the terms of the policy, plaintiff is entitled to monthly benefits for a maximum of five years if the disability results from a sickness, but if it results from an accident then the benefits may be payable for the remainder of plaintiff's life.

4. The basis of plaintiff's claim is that plaintiff has been totally disabled by a psychosis developed as the result of injuries sustained in an automobile accident which occurred on _____ [*date*].

5. Defendant's position is that plaintiff has not been permanently disabled, or, in the alternative, if the plaintiff did develop a disabling psychosis it is not the result of the accident, but rather of sickness, thereby limiting the benefits payable to five years.

6. To date, plaintiff has been examined by a total of 13 doctors, including psychiatrists, each of whom has rendered a report. Eight of these made their examinations at plaintiff's request and five were selected by defendant.

7. The examining doctors did not agree. Some concluded that the plaintiff is malingering; others reported that plaintiff has a disabling psychosis which may or may not have resulted from the accident.

8. An independent examination and report by an impartial medical and psychiatric expert appointed by the court may assist the parties in reaching a pretrial settlement of this case and, if it does not, the expert's testimony will at least assist the trier of facts in reaching a just decision.

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to support a motion for an order appointing an expert witness to investigate, report to the court, and, if necessary, testify as an expert in the trial of an action [*see Evid. Code § 730*; for a form of notice of motion, *see § 551.251*]. The fact situation illustrated in the form is adapted from *Durst v. Superior Court (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 447, 35 Cal. Rptr. 143* , which involved a predecessor statute and in which the court appointed an independent medical expert on its own motion.

[3] Cross References

For further discussion of a motion to appoint an expert witness in general, see *§ 551.251*

For discussion and general format of affidavits and declarations, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.253

§ 551.253 Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness [Evid. Code § 730]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Appointment of Expert Witness--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO APPOINT EX-
Plaintiff, vs.	)	PERT WITNESS
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant(s).	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name*)] for an order appointing _____ [*specify, e.g.,* an independent medical and psychiatric] expert to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* examine the plaintiff, render a written report to the court, and, if necessary, testify in this action] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____[*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and _____ [*name and title*], whose

business address is _____ [*specify*], is appointed as a _____ [*specify field, e.g.,* medical and psychiatric] expert.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the _____ [*specify field, e.g.,* medical and psychiatric] expert:

[*SPECIFY, in successively numbered subparagraphs, all actions expert is to take, e.g.:*]

1. Examine the plaintiff herein, that the examination be of such medical and psychiatric scope as shall be determined by the medical and psychiatric expert, including such tests, if any, as he/she shall deem advisable, that no one be present or within hearing distance during the examination, except the plaintiff and the medical and psychiatric expert and his/her assistants, if any, and that neither plaintiff nor defendant nor their agents shall record the examination;

2. Complete the examination on or before _____ [*date*];

3. Forthwith give the court written notification of the completion of the examination;

4. Make a written report to the court on or before _____ [*date*], and set forth in the report the expert's opinion respecting the following: the nature, extent, duration, and causes of the disabilities, if any, from which the plaintiff is suffering, including the opinion as to whether the plaintiff is suffering from a psychosis or other psychiatric disturbance, and, if so, the nature, duration, extent, and cause thereof, and the prognosis with respect thereto; the relationship, if any, between any such psychiatric disturbance and the accident of _____ [*date*]; whether the plaintiff is totally disabled from engaging in his/her occupation of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* attorney) and, if so, the duration and cause of such disability, and the prognosis as to the continuation of any such disability; and

5. If necessary, testify as an expert at the trial of this action [on the issues of the cause, effect, and prognosis of plaintiff's disability, if any].

[*CONTINUE*]

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff appear at such times and places as specified by the expert for the examination, and that plaintiff submit to the examination.]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT_____ [*name of expert witness*] be allowed the sum of $_____ as compensation for his/her services in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* examining the plaintiff] and preparing his/her [notification and] report to the court and the further sum of $_____ for his/her services as a witness at the trial, if required, which sums shall be paid _____ [*specify, e.g.,* by defendant] and taxed as costs.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the motion under *Evid. Code § 730* for appointment of an expert witness is granted. The fact situation illustrated in the order is adapted from *Durst v. Superior Court (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 447, 35 Cal. Rptr. 143* , which involved a predecessor statute and in which the court appointed an independent

medical expert to examine plaintiff on its own motion.

[3] Cross References

For further discussion of a motion to appoint an expert witness in general, see *§ 551.251*

For a discussion and forms of orders, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.254

§ 551.254 Documentary Evidence--Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] for Use of Photocopies

[1] FORM Documentary Evidence--Stipulation for Use of Photocopies

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION FOR USE OF PHOTOCOPIES IN
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	LIEU OF ORIGINALS
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

IT IS STIPULATED between the parties, by and through their respective counsel, that photocopies of the following described writing(s) may be introduced in evidence at the trial herein, in lieu of the original(s): _____ [*describe writings*].

All other objections to the introduction of the writing(s), including those going to the competency and relevancy thereof, are reserved.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the parties to a lawsuit to stipulate to the introduction in evidence of photocopies of writings in lieu of the originals. The purpose of the stipulation is to avoid an objection to the use of photocopies under the "Secondary Evidence Rule" [*see Evid. Code § 1521*; *see also § 551.74[3]*].

With appropriate modifications, the form may be used for any written stipulation entered into by the parties.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and alternative forms of stipulations, see Ch. 533, *Stipulations*

For discussion of the secondary evidence rule, see California Trial Guide, Unit 31, *Secondary Evidence of Writings: Best Evidence Rule* (Matthew Bender); Cotchett, California Courtroom Evidence, Ch. 23, *Secondary Evidence* (Matthew Bender)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.255

§ 551.255 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING
vs.	)	ASIDE SUBMISSION AND REOPENING CASE
_____ [*name*],	)	FOR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	Date: _____
Defendant(s).	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____[*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____[*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order setting aside the

submission and reopening the case for the reception of additional evidence. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____ [*set forth ground(s), such as inadvertent omission of evidence, surprise, availability of previously unavailable evidence, or newly discovered evidence*].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use to move for an order setting aside the submission of a case and reopening it for the reception of additional evidence. A motion to reopen a case prior to its submission would normally be made orally in open court.

A motion to reopen a case may inferentially be authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 607(6)* providing that after the parties have presented their evidence, they may offer rebutting evidence only unless the court, for good cause and in furtherance of justice, permits them to offer evidence on their original case, and by *Evid. Code § 320*, providing that except as otherwise provided by law, the court in its discretion shall regulate the order of proof.

For a discussion of the order of proof and the order of the proceedings, see Part II, Subpart D.

[3] Accompanying Papers

Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a) generally requires a notice of motion to be accompanied by a supporting memorandum. It is not clear, however, whether this motion is a law and motion matter as defined in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1103* to which *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)* would apply. Nevertheless, good practice would dictate that whenever a court has discretion to deny a motion, points and authorities be served and filed with the notice of motion. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Setting Aside Submission and Reopening

When a matter is tried to a court, the trial judge has broad discretion to reopen the matter after an oral ruling but before final judgment is entered, even over the objection of litigants, if adequate notice is given to parties [*Coit Drapery Cleaners, Inc. v. Sequoia Ins. Co. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1595, 1610-1612, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 692* ; *see also Hughes Tool Co. v. Max Hinrichs Seed Co. (1980) 112 Cal. App. 3d 194, 201, 169 Cal. Rptr. 160* (decision to allow party to reopen trial after case has been submitted for decision is within discretion of trial court); *Baker v. City of Palo Alto (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 744, 755, 12 Cal. Rptr. 425* (reopening case by court on its own motion on theory conceived by court is not an abuse of discretion); *Johnston v. Johnson (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 464, 471, 274 P.2d 1* (reopening of case for further evidence is entirely within discretion of trial court; reopening at any time before final decision is favored if reopening will tend to promote justice by bringing all facts before court); *Foster v. Keating (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 435, 448-452, 261 P.2d 529* (denial of motion to reopen case when introduction of relevant evidence was prevented by ruling of trial court was reversible error)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.256

§ 551.256 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration in Support of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
vs.	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING
_____ [*name*],	)	ASIDE SUBMISSION AND REOPENING CASE
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FOR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE
Defendant(s).	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

[*SET FORTH, in successively numbered paragraphs, facts within declarant's personal knowledge establishing the grounds of the motion, e.g.:*]

2. There is material oral and documentary evidence relevant to the issues in this case which _____ [*moving party*] was prevented from presenting at the trial because _____ [*specify reasons such as newly discovered evidence, inadvertence, rulings of the trial court, or other as appropriate, with particulars*].

3. The oral evidence pertains to, and tends to _____ [prove *or* disprove] the issue of _____ [*specify*]. It consists of the testimony of _____ [*name*], who will testify in substance as follows: _____ [*specify*].

4. The documentary evidence pertains to, and tends to _____ [prove *or* disprove] the issue of _____ [*specify*]. It consists of the following: _____ [*describe*].

5. The foregoing evidence is available for immediate introduction with the permission of the court.

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to support a motion for an order setting aside the submission and reopening the case for the reception of further evidence [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*; for a form of notice of motion, *see § 551.255*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.257

§ 551.257 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] Opposing Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Declaration Opposing Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
vs.	)	OPPOSING MOTION FOR ORDER SETTING
_____ [*name*],	)	ASIDE SUBMISSION AND REOPENING CASE
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	FOR ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE
Defendant(s).	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*opposing party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. I oppose the motion of _____ [*moving party*] for an order setting aside the submission of this case and reopening the trial on the ground(s) that _____ [*set forth facts within declarant's personal knowledge negating the grounds of the motion, e.g.*, all the evidence mentioned in the declaration of _____ (*name*) was available to the _____ (*moving party*) at the trial of this action, in that _____ (*set forth evidentiary facts showing that moving party knew and could have produced the evidence at trial*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to oppose a motion to set aside the submission and reopen the case for reception of further evidence [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. For discussion of the motion in general, *see § 551.255*.

The illustrative fact situation assumes that the motion to reopen was made on the grounds of newly discovered evidence that could not, in the exercise of due diligence, have been discovered before. The ground of opposition is that the evidence was not newly discovered, but was known and available to the moving party at the time of trial.

111 of 154 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.258

§ 551.258 Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Order Setting Aside Submission and Reopening Case for Additional Evidence--Order Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER SETTING ASIDE SUBMISSION AND
vs.	)	REOPENING CASE FOR ADDITIONAL EVID-
_____ [*name*],	)	ENCE
Defendant(s).	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] for an order setting aside the submission of this case and reopening the trial for the reception of further evidence came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____[*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that the submission of this case is set aside, and that the trial is reopened for the reception of additional evidence.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the motion for an order setting aside the submission of a case and reopening it for further evidence is granted. For discussion of the motion in general, *see § 551.255*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.259

§ 551.259 Request for Return of Exhibits, Depositions, and Administrative Records, Order Granting Request, and Receipt [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1003, 1952.2, 2015.5]

[1] FORM Request for Return of Exhibits, Depositions, and Administrative Records, Order Granting Request, and Receipt

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	REQUEST FOR RETURN OF EXHIBITS AND
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	DEPOSITIONS [AND ADMINISTRATIVE RE-
Defendant(s).	)	CORDS], ORDER GRANTING REQUEST, AND
	)	RECEIPT
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], request return of the exhibits and depositions hereinafter described and in support of this request declare:

1. I am the attorney of record for the _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff], herein, who is [the owner and] lawfully entitled to the possession [and administrative record(s)] of the following described exhibits and depositions which were introduced into evidence or filed at the trial of this action: _____ [*describe, giving exhibit identification number or letter*].

2. The exhibits and depositions [and administrative record(s)] were introduced or filed in the trial of this action by _____ [*identify party whose attorney is seeking their return*].

3. The judgment herein became final on _____ [*date*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the clerk return the exhibits and depositions [and administrative record(s)] herein described to _____ [*name*], the attorney of record for _____ [*party*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

RECEIPT

Receipt of the exhibits and depositions [and administrative record(s)] herein described is acknowledged.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the attorney for a party after the judgment has become final to request the court to order the return of exhibits, depositions, and administrative records introduced or filed by the party in the trial of a civil action when the trial judge fails on his or her own motion to order their return. The form also includes an order granting the request, and the attorney's signed receipt for their return [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1952.2*].

[3] When Judge May Order Exhibits Returned

When a judgment becomes final and no appeal is pending, the court in its discretion and on its own motion by a written order signed and filed in the action or proceeding, and an entry of it made in the register of actions, may order the clerk to return all of the exhibits, depositions, and administrative records introduced or filed in the trial to the attorneys for the parties who introduced or filed them [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1952.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.260

§ 551.260 Media Request to Photograph, Record, or Broadcast and Proposed Order [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e); Cal. Judicial Council Forms MC-500, MC-510]

[1] FORM Media Request to Photograph, Record, or Broadcast and Proposed Order

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The forms in [1], *above*, are illustrative reproductions of Judicial Council Form MC-500 and Judicial Council Form MC-510, adopted by the Judicial Council for mandatory use [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.31(2)*; Cal. Rules of Ct., This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

Judicial Council Form MC-500 is for use by a media agency to request an order permitting photographing, recording, or broadcasting of court proceeding by media using television, radio, photographic, or recording equipment [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e)*; *see also Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(b)* (defining "media coverage," "media," and "media agency")]. This includes media coverage in the courtroom in issue but also in the courthouse and its entrances and exits [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(b)(3)*]. The request must be signed by a person in a supervisory position in the media agency.

Judicial Council Form MC-510 is for use as a proposed order granting the request. It must be completed by the media agency and attached to the request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e)(1)*].

The request may be made in either a civil or criminal trial, and must be filed at least five court days before the portion of the proceeding to be covered unless good cause is shown. It is submitted to the judge assigned to the case, or, if a judge has not yet been assigned, to the judge supervising the calendar department. The court clerk is required promptly to inform the parties of the request [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.150(e)(1)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.261

§ 551.261 Proceedings to Seal Records--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seal Records--Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ORDER SEALING RECORDS, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND MEMORANDUM
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

[*EITHER*]

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff _____ (*name*)] and to _____[*name*] his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____[*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order directing that the following records be sealed pursuant to *California Rules of Court, Rule 2.550 et seq.*: _____[*specify*]. The motion will be made on the grounds that the facts, as established in the accompanying declaration of _____[*specify*], are sufficient to justify sealing the specified records pursuant to *California Rules of Court, Rule 2.550 et seq.*

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for plaintiff in the above-described action].

2. This motion to seal records pertains to the following records[, which have been lodged with court in connection with this motion on _____ (*date*)]: _____[*specify documents, papers, exhibits, transcripts, or other things, or portions of these, filed or lodged with the court*].

3. The sealing of these records is necessary to an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to these records. This overriding interest is _____[*specifiy overriding interest, which may consist of but is not necessarily limited to statutory privileges, trade secrets, privacy rights, contractual obligation of nondisclosure, and right of civil litigant to fair trial*].

4. There is a substantial probability that this overriding interest will be prejudiced if these records are not sealed, in that _____[*explain probably prejudice to overriding interest in the event that the records are not sealed*].

5. The following measures have been taken to ensure that the proposed sealing is narrowly tailored and no less restrictive means exist to protect the overriding interest: _____[*specify measures taken, e.g., documents proposed for sealing were specified only after selective analysis leaving other documents subject to public access*].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion.*]

Respectfully submitted,
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of notice of motion and motion is for use by a party seeking an order sealing records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550* and *2.551*. Court records that are not confidential by law are deemed open to the public and may not be sealed from public access by stipulation of the parties, but only by a court order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550(a), (c), 2.551(a)*]. A party seeking an order sealing records must do so by noticed motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(b)(1)*].

The motion must be accompanied by a supporting memorandum and by a declaration containing facts sufficient to justify the sealing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.551(b)(1)*]. If the records sought to sealed are not already filed with the court, they must be lodged with the court pursuant to *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.551(d)*, absent a showing of good cause for not lodging the records [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.551(b)(2)*]. If necessary to prevent disclosure, the motion and accompanying papers are to be filed in a redacted version, with the complete version lodged conditionally under seal [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.551(b)(2)* (requirement also applicable to opposing papers)].

For further discussion of the procedures for sealing records, including the records to which the procedures apply, the procedures for lodging materials conditionally under seal, and the facts that must be established to support the issuance of an order sealing records, see *§ 551.173*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating generally to declarations under penalty of perjury or affidavits, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For detailed discussion of format requirements and procedures governing noticed motions generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For discussion and forms relating to memoranda of points and authorities, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.262

§ 551.262 Proceedings to Seal Records--Cover Sheet for Lodged Records Conditionally Under Seal [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seal Records--Cover Sheet for Lodged Records Conditionally Under Seal

_____[*Name of attorney*]
_____[*Street address*]
_____[*city, state, and zip*]
_____[*telephone phone number*]
_____[*fax number, if provided*]
_____[*e-mail address, if provided*]
_____[*State Bar membership number of attorney*]

Attorney for _____ [*moving party, e.g.*, Defendant] _____[*name*]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*]	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COVER SHEET FOR RECORDS LODGED CON-
_____ [*name*]	)	DITIONALLY UNDER SEAL
Defendant.	)	[REFEREE _____ (*name*)]
	)	
	)	

_____

THE ENCLOSED RECORD[S] IS/ARE LODGED WITH THE COURT CONDITIONALLY UNDER SEAL AND IS/ARE SUBJECT TO A MOTION FOR AN ORDER DIRECTING THAT THE ENCLOSED RECORD[S] BE FILED UNDER SEAL

[2] Use of Form

This form of cover sheet is for use by a party when lodging records with the court in connection with a motion that the records be filed under seal. Such records are to be enclosed in an envelope or other container that is labeled "CONDITIONALLY UNDER SEAL" [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(2)*]. This cover sheet, in turn, is to be affixed to the envelope or container [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)*].

The cover sheet must contain all the information required on a caption page under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)(A)*]. Thus, this form set outs, in the required format, the information required to be placed on the first page of all papers that are not pleadings, that is, attorney information, title of the court and the case, case number, nature of the paper, and, if applicable, the name of the referee before whom the case is pending when one has been appointed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 638* or *639* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(1)-(8)*].

This form also states, as required under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(3)(B)*, that the records enclosed in the envelope or container are subject to a motion to file the records under seal.

For further discussion of the procedures for lodging records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)*, see *§ 551.173[8]*.

[3] Cross References

For further discussion of the general format requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111*, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 551 TRIAL
PART V. FORMS

48-551 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 551.263

§ 551.263 Proceedings to Seal Records--Order Sealing Records [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550(d), (e), 2.551(a), (e)]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Seal Records--Order Sealing Records

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER _____ [*specify subject of order*]
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____[*name*] for an order sealing records under *California Rules of Court, Rule 2.550 et seq.,* came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____[*name*].

The Court, having considered the declaration of _____[*name*] and other documents in support of and in opposition to the motion, having heard the arguments of counsel, and being fully advised in the matter, finds as follows:

1. There exists an overriding interest that overcomes the right of public access to the records specified below, in that _____[*specify overriding interest*].

2. This overriding interest support sealing the records specified below.

3. A substantial probability exists that this overriding interest will be prejudiced if the records specified below are not sealed, in that _____[*specify overriding interest*].

4. The records specified below have been tailored to limit narrowly the overall records to be sealed.

5. No less restrictive means exist to achieve the overriding interest than to seal the records specified below.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the motion be, and hereby is, granted and that the following records be _____ [sealed *or* filed underseal]: _____[*specify records and/or portions of records to be sealed; if the specified records are lodged with the court, specify also whether, in addition to the lodged, the order itself, the register of actions, any other court records, or any other records relating to the case are also to be sealed*].

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, other than the court, only the following person[s] is/are authorized to inspect the records sealed by this order: _____ (*names of person(s) other than court authorized to inspect sealed records*)].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in granting a motion to seal records under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550* and *2.551*.

The form of order specifically sets out the findings necessary to support the order, as required under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(1)(A)* [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550(d)* (findings required to seal records)]. By specifying the sealing of particular records only, it also directs the sealing of only those records, or portions or records, that contain material that needs to be placed under seal, as required under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.550(e)(1)(B)*. The order also includes optional language which must be included when any person or persons other than the court are to be authorized to inspect the records sealed by the order [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(e)(3)*].

When an order seals records lodged with the court, it should include directions that the lodged records be filed under seal [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.551(d)(4)* (lodged records not filed unless court orders them filed)], and whether materials other than the lodged records are also to be sealed, such as the order itself, the register of actions, or any other court records or records relating to the case [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.551(e)(2)*].

This form may be modified to include the appointment of a referee and directions allocating the referee's fees, when this is necessary to handle voluminous records to be placed under seal [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.550(e)(2)*; for further discussion and forms relating to the appointment of referees and the allocation of fees under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 639* and *645.1, see* Ch. 38, *Reference*].

For further discussion of orders in motion proceedings to seal otherwise public trial court records, see *§ 551.173[9]*.

[3] Cross References

For detailed discussion of orders in noticed motion proceedings generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 552.syn

§ 552.syn Synopsis to Chapter 552: TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION

§ 552.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 552.02 Cross References

§ 552.03 Governing Law

§§ 552.04-552.09 [Reserved]

§ 552.10 Matters Excluded From Trial Court Delay Reduction Programs

§ 552.11 Local Trial Court Delay Reduction Rules

§ 552.12 Differential Case Management Rules

§ 552.13 Common Time Limits Under Trial Court Delay Reduction Rules

[1] Service of Pleadings

[a] Complaint

[b] Service of Responsive Pleadings

[2] Service of Notices and Other Papers

[3] Stipulated Continuance

[4] First Status Conference

[5] Discovery

[6] Referral to Arbitration or Mediation

[7] Dismissal of Fictitious Defendants

[8] Peremptory Disqualification of Judge

[9] Time to Enter Default

[10] Additional Forms

§ 552.14 Effect of Statutory Trial Preferences

§ 552.15 Trial Court's Discretionary Power to Manage Cases

[1] Exercise of Discretion

[a] Exercise of Discretion in General

[b] Dismissal Without Prejudice of Case Subject to Bankruptcy Stay

[2] Sanctions

§§ 552.16-552.29 [Reserved]

§ 552.30 State Statutes

§ 552.31 Decisions

[1] Constitutionality

[2] Due Process

[3] Rules of Court

[4] Discretion of Trial Court

[5] Standard of Appellate Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART I. SCOPE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.01

§ 552.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter summarizes the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) and local rules adopted under it. Trial Court Delay Reduction Act considerations are also addressed throughout this publication in connection with procedures to which they commonly relate.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesCivil ProcedureTrialsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART I. SCOPE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.02

§ 552.02 Cross References

For discussion of arbitration and mediation, see Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* , and Ch. 37, *Judicially Mandated Civil Action Mediation* .

For discussion of discovery, see Ch. 190-200: *Discovery* .

For discussion relating to the time for service of notices or other papers under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005* and *1013*, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

For discussion of the statutory trial preferences, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

For discussion of references, see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

For discussion of sanctions generally, and impositions of sanctions during pretrial proceedings, specifically, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* , and Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* , respectively.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersReferencesCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionMandatory ADRCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART I. SCOPE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.03

§ 552.03 Governing Law

The Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*) requires all superior and municipal courts in California to eliminate delay in the progress and ultimate resolution of litigation [*Gov. Code §§ 68605.5, 68607, 68620(a)*].

Exemplary delay reduction programs adopted by local courts are often referred to as "fast track," and cases assigned to the program are referred to as "fast-track cases" [*see Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* .

Also, the Judicial Council has adopted standards of timely disposition of actions, guided by the principle that from commencement to resolution, litigation should require only that time reasonably necessary for pleadings, discovery, preparation, and court events; any additional time is delay and should be eliminated [Cal. Rules of Ct., Stds. of Jud. Admin., Stds. 2.1, 2.2].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

121 of 154 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART I. SCOPE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 552.04-552.09

[Reserved]

§§ 552.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.10

§ 552.10 Matters Excluded From Trial Court Delay Reduction Programs

Trial court delay reduction programs do not apply to the following:

- Small claims [*Gov. Code § 68620(b)*].
- Unlawful detainer [*Gov. Code § 68620(b)*].
- Juvenile cases [*Gov. Code § 68608(a)*].
- Probate cases [*Gov. Code § 68608(a)*].
- Domestic relations cases [*Gov. Code § 68608(a)*].

A court's local rules may exclude from the court's delay reduction program cases that are assigned, based on subject matter, to a judge or judges for all purposes [*Gov. Code § 68608(a)*].

Local rules may identify additional cases or stages of cases that are not covered by that court's Trial Court Delay Reduction program. For example, Los Angeles excepts, among other things, small claims matters, name change petitions, eminent domain pretrial proceedings, pretrial proceedings in asbestos exposure cases, cases stayed by a bankruptcy, writs of mandate, uninsured motorist cases, and other cases as may be designated by the Presiding Judge or Supervising Judge of a district [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.2(b)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase Management

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.11

§ 552.11 Local Trial Court Delay Reduction Rules

Local court rules implementing the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act govern much of the procedure, particularly impacting on time requirements [*see Gov. Code §§ 68607, 68612, 68616*].

The local rules are restricted by *Gov. Code § 68616*, which provides some minimum time standards. Local rules cannot impose shorter time limits than authorized by *Section 68616*. These limits are discussed under *§ 552.13*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.12

§ 552.12 Differential Case Management Rules

Each court is required to adopt differential case management rules [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.710*]. These rules apply to general civil cases, as defined [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.712* (exceptions include probate, family law, and civil petitions)].

Civil cases assigned the case management rules in Ch. 3, Div 7, Tit. 3 of the Cal. Rules of Ct. for review under should be managed so as to achieve the following goals [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.714(b)*]:

- Unlimited civil cases. The goal of each trial court should be to manage unlimited civil cases from filing so that: 75% are disposed of within 12 months; 85% percent are disposed of within 18 months; and 100% are disposed of within 24 months.

- Limited civil cases. The goal of each trial court should be to manage limited civil cases from filing so that: 90% are disposed of within 12 months; 98% are disposed of within 18 months; and 100% percent are disposed of within 24 months.

- Individualized case management. The goals above are guidelines for the court's disposition of all unlimited and limited civil cases filed in that court. In managing individual civil cases, the court must consider each case on its merits. To enable the fair and efficient resolution of civil cases, each case should be set for trial as soon as appropriate for that individual case consistent with Rule 3.729.

The court must evaluate each case on its own merits as provided in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.715*, under procedures adopted by local court rules. After evaluation, the court must: (1) assign the case to the case management program for review under *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.720 et seq.* for disposition under the case disposition time goals in Rule 3.714(b); (2) or exempt the case as an exceptional case under Rule 3.714(c) from the case disposition time goals and monitor it with the goal of disposing of it within three years; or (3) assign the case under Rule 3.714(d) to the a local case management plan for disposition within six to nine months after filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.714(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.715* (case evaluation factors)].

In Los Angeles Superior Court, this evaluation is done at the first status conference or at an earlier time deemed appropriate by the court [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.6(c)(1)].

In San Francisco Superior Court, all cases are assigned to Plan 1 on filing and remain in Plan 1 unless a showing of good cause for reassignment is timely made [San Francisco Uniform Trial Ct. Rules, Rule 3.1]. In Sacramento Superior Court, cases are also deemed Class I cases unless otherwise requested in a Designation Statement, which if the parties are not in agreement, or if the court does not agree, may result in a hearing on the question of designation [Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 11.06].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.13

§ 552.13 Common Time Limits Under Trial Court Delay Reduction Rules

[1] Service of Pleadings

[a] Complaint

Local trial court delay reduction rules cannot require service of a complaint to be made within less than 60 days after filing. Rules may, however, provide for granting exceptions for longer periods of time as authorized by local rule [*Gov. Code § 68616(a)*]. Local court rules most commonly track this provision, for example:

- San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.5 (also requiring filing of Certificate of Progress if service has not been made and providing an exception for service by publication).

- San Francisco Uniform Trial Ct. Rules, Rule 3.3.

[b] Service of Responsive Pleadings

Local trial court delay reduction rules cannot require service of responsive pleadings to be made within less than 30 days after filing. Rules may, however, provide for granting exceptions for longer periods of time as authorized by local rule [*Gov. Code § 68616(b)*]. Consistent with this limitation, local rules cannot shorten the time to plead after service of summons under *Code Civ. Proc. § 412.20* (30 days) [*Gov. Code § 68616(c)*].

Local court rules most commonly track this provision. See, for example, the following:

- San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.6 (also requiring filing of Certificate of Inability to Respond if not able to respond).

- Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 11.04(A) (within time required by law or stipulation, but in no event more than 75 days after filing of action).

[2] Service of Notices and Other Papers

Local trial court delay reduction rules cannot shorten the time for service of notices or other papers under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005* and *1013* [*Gov. Code § 68616(c)*; for discussion of these provisions, *see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* , respectively].

[3] Stipulated Continuance

Local trial court delay reduction rules must allow the parties, within 30 days of service of the responsive pleadings, to stipulate to a single continuance not to exceed 30 days [*Gov. Code § 68616(d)*].

Beyond this continuance, continuances are strongly disfavored in trial court delay reduction [*see Gov. Code § 68607(g)*].

Los Angeles encourages counsel to grant first requests for extensions of time to respond to litigation deadlines as a matter of courtesy unless time is of the essence. Additional requests, however, should be dealt with by balancing the need for expedition against deference one should ordinarily give to an opponent's schedule, the reasonableness of the length of the requested continuance, the opponent's willingness to grant reciprocal extensions, the time actually needed for the task, and the likelihood of the court granting the extension if asked to do so [Los Angeles Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.12(a)].

[4] First Status Conference

Local trial court delay reduction rules cannot require a status conference, or similar event other than a challenge to the court's jurisdiction, to be conducted within less than 30 days after service of the first responsive pleadings or if there is a 30-day stipulated continuance under *Gov. Code § 68616(d)*, within less than 30 days of the expiration of the continuance [*Gov. Code § 68616(e)*].

Local rules differ a great deal on when the first status conference is to be held. See, for example, the following:

- Los Angeles Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.9(a) (not more that 180 days after the complaint is filed, subject to *Gov. Code § 68616(d), (e)* and *(g)* (*see* [3], *above*; [6], *below*)).

- San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.9(A) (to be set approximately 150 days after filing of complaint).

- San Francisco Uniform Trial Ct. Rules, Rule 3.4(A) (clerk designates time on face of complaint when complaint is filed; plaintiff is responsible for notifying all defendants of the date).

[5] Discovery

The Civil Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.*] governs discovery in cases subject to trial court delay programs, except in arbitration proceedings. Local rules are not allowed to shorten time periods set forth in the Discovery Act [*Gov. Code § 68616(f)*]. Nonetheless, the local court rules may provide that the court will regulate all discovery, consistent with these laws, and at status conferences may inquire of the parties as to the nature and extent of discovery remaining [Los Angeles Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.6(d)].

For discussion of discovery, see Ch. 190-200: *Discovery* .

[6] Referral to Arbitration or Mediation

No case may be referred to arbitration prior to 210 days after the filing of the complaint, exclusive of the stipulated

period provided for in *Gov. Code § 68616(d)* [*Gov. Code § 68616(g)*; *see* [3], *above*]. For discussion of arbitration, see Ch. 36, *Judicial Arbitration* .

No trial court delay reduction rule may contravene *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 638* and *639*, relating to reference by stipulation and grounds for ordering reference of a case, respectively [*Gov. Code § 68616(g)*; for discussion of references, *see* Ch. 487, *Reference*].

[7] Dismissal of Fictitious Defendants

Local trial court delay reduction rules cannot provide for dismissal or severance of fictitious (Doe) defendants prior to the conclusion of the introduction of evidence at trial, except on the stipulation or motion of the parties [*Gov. Code § 68616(h)*]. In Los Angeles County Superior Court, the court, at the final status conference before trial, will consider severing for trial any unserved or recently served fictitiously named parties [Los Angeles Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.9(h)].

[8] Peremptory Disqualification of Judge

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.6*, in direct calendar courts, challenges pursuant to that section must be exercised within 15 days of the party's first appearance. Master calendar courts must be governed solely by Section 170.6 [*Gov. Code § 68616(i)*].

A case is not to be removed from a delay reduction program because a Section 170.6 challenge has been filed [*Gov. Code § 68607.5*].

Local rule may discourage "judge shopping" by providing that if a case is dismissed and subsequently the same or essentially the same claims are alleged in another action, the later-filed actions will be, absent good cause, assigned to the same judge to whom the first-filed case had been assigned [Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 7.3(d)].

[9] Time to Enter Default

Trial court delay reduction rules commonly require plaintiffs to request the clerk to enter default promptly after the defendant fails to timely respond. For example, see the following:

- San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rules 2.1.7, 2.1.8 (45 days after Certificate of Service required by rule is filed unless Certificate of Inability to Default is filed; and requiring default judgment to be taken within 60 days of entry of default, with exceptions).

[10] Additional Forms

Trial Court Delay Reduction rules commonly require local forms to be used in the course of the proceeding. For example, see the following:

- In Sacramento County Superior Court, the clerk of the court will provide a Program Case Notice, which the plaintiff must serve with the summons and complaint [Sacramento Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 11.01(C)].

- In San Diego Superior Court, the clerk will attach a Notice of Case Assignment to the complaint when it is filed, which the plaintiff must serve with the complaint [San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rule 2.1.3]. Thereafter, a number of forms are required, including a Certificate of Service, or alternatively a Certificate of Progress, and a Certificate of Inability to Respond [San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. II, Rules 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.7].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.14

§ 552.14 Effect of Statutory Trial Preferences

The statutory trial preference in *Code Civ. Proc. § 36(a)*, entitling a civil case to preference on the motion of any interested party to the action who has reached the age of 70 years and meets certain other requirements (*see generally* Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings*), is fully applicable in jurisdictions with a fast-track program [*see Miller v. Superior Court (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1200, 1211-1212, 270 Cal. Rptr. 766]* . If a case not assigned to a fast-track program is entitled to trial preference under *Code Civ. Proc. § 36(a)*, a trial court may not subordinate the time of trial of the case to that of nonpreference civil cases assigned to the delay reduction program [*Miller v. Superior Court (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1200, 1208, 270 Cal. Rptr. 766]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase Management

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.15

§ 552.15 Trial Court's Discretionary Power to Manage Cases

[1] Exercise of Discretion

[a] Exercise of Discretion in General

In administering a fast-track program, a trial court must exercise its discretion at each stage of a lawsuit in the process of bringing a case to trial, or alternatively, imposing sanctions such as dismissal. Since trial management is a discretionary area, the proper standard of review for a challenge to trial management orders is abuse of discretion [*Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* . In exercising its discretion, the trial court does not have absolute and unlimited power; it must act with an impartial discretion guided and controlled in its exercise by fixed principles. A reviewing court will not disturb this exercise of discretion unless it appears that the trial court's order was a clear abuse or a miscarriage of justice. Discretion is abused whenever the trial court exceeds the bounds of reason, all of the circumstances before it being considered [*Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296]* .

[b] Dismissal Without Prejudice of Case Subject to Bankruptcy Stay

Dismissal of a case without prejudice when some of the defendants are subject to a bankruptcy stay is not an appropriate method to dispense with the need for periodic court monitoring of the case under trial court delay reduction rules. This is true even if the court expressly states that the dismissal will be set aside if the bankruptcy stay is lifted or if the plaintiff elects to proceed against nonbankrupt defendants. The nonbankruptcy trial court must stay the action, not dismiss it [*Traweek v. Finley, Kumble, etc., Myerson & Casey (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1128, 1134-1136, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 185]* .

[2] Sanctions

A trial court may enforce fast-track program requirements on the basis of the following statutory or other authority:

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.1* (authority of court to enact rules for pretrial case management);

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2* (authority to impose sanctions on failure of counsel or client to comply with local rules regulating supervision and management of actions); *see Cooks v. Superior Court (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 723, 727, 274 Cal. Rptr. 113* (restricting use of denial of jury trial in fast-track case is sanction under *Code Civ. Proc. § 575.2(b)*);

- *Code Civ. Proc. § 177.5* (authority to impose reasonable monetary sanctions, payable to the county, for any violation of lawful order);

- *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.30* (authority to impose sanctions for failure to comply with the California Rules of Court, local rules, and court orders); and

- *Gov. Code § 68608(b)* (providing that trial courts in enforcing fast-track requirements have all the powers to impose sanctions authorized by law, including dismissal) [*see Intel Corp. v. USAIR, Inc. (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1559, 1566, 279 Cal. Rptr. 569* (dismissal of fast-track case under former *Gov. Code § 68609(d)* (*now see Gov. Code § 68608(b)*) upheld in light of previous lack of compliance in case and ineffectiveness of previous sanctions)].

These provisions provide a comprehensive statewide scheme for regulating fast-track matters. Local court rules providing for imposition of sanctions in specific situations, for example, for failure to file a Joint At-Issue Memorandum, supplement the above statewide scheme [*Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 499-500, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296* ; *see also Laborers' Internat. Union of North America v. El Dorado Landscape Co. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 993, 999, 1004, 1008-1009, 256 Cal. Rptr. 632]* . In addition, the discovery statutes in the Code of Civil Procedure authorizing sanctions for discovery misconduct apply with full force in fast-track matters [*see Laguna Auto Body v. Farmers Ins. Exchange (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 481, 490, 282 Cal. Rptr. 530* (upholding dismissal in fast-track case based on party's failure to obey court's discovery order); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 2023* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 2023.010 et seq.* operative July 1, 2005) (sanctions for misuse of discovery process)].

For discussion of sanctions, see Ch. 510, *Sanctions* . For further discussion of the imposition of sanctions during pretrial proceedings, see Ch. 425, *Pretrial Proceedings* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesSanctions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 552.16-552.29

[Reserved]

§§ 552.16[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.30

§ 552.30 State Statutes

Responsibilities of judges. *Gov. Code § 68607*

Policy against continuances. *Gov. Code § 68607(g)*

No removal from delay reduction program due to peremptory challenge of judge. *Gov. Code § 68607.5*

Authority to impose sanctions. *Gov. Code § 68608(b)*

Shortest time periods permissible for service of pleadings, for status conference or similar event, for exercise of peremptory challenge, or for reference to arbitration. *Gov. Code § 68616*

Single continuance by stipulation permitted within 30 days of service of responsive pleadings. *Gov. Code § 68616(d)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsTime LimitationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesSanctionsCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 552 TRIAL COURT DELAY REDUCTION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-552 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.31

§ 552.31 Decisions

CAUTION:
The cases listed below that were decided before 1992 construed the Trial Court Delay Reduction of 1986 (former *Gov. Code §§ 68600-68619*), before it was superseded on January 1, 1991, by the Trial Court Delay Reduction Act (*Gov. Code § 68600 et seq.*). The legal points for which the cases listed below are cited appear to remain valid under the new Act, which contains many of the provisions of the 1986 Act. Caution should be exercised in using those cases, however, in that certain provisions in the 1986 Act have been either renumbered or deleted.

[1] Constitutionality

As Legislature has clearly laid down its broad policy and plan in statutes governing delay reduction and authorized Judicial Council and trial courts to experiment and work out procedures to carry out that plan and set limits on their authority, this delegation by Legislature to courts and Judicial Council as proper and as not violating constitutional separation of powers. *Laborers' Internat. Union of North America v. El Dorado Landscape Co. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 993, 999, 1001-1002, 256 Cal. Rptr. 632*

[2] Due Process

Although judicially declared standards for trial court's exercise of discretion in enforcing fast-track time limits adopted under Trial Court Delay Reduction Act as necessarily evolving along with changes in statutory law in trial court delay reduction field, important objectives of fast-track system as able and required to be achieved in manner consistent with traditional dueprocess standards. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 494, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296*

Assignment of cases into pilot project under Trial Court Delay Reduction Act and adoption of rules to govern that project as acts that are more legislative than adjudicatory in nature and as exempt from procedural due process requirements (reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard). *Lawrence v. Superior Court (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 611, 615, 618-619, 253 Cal. Rptr 748*

[3] Rules of Court

Counsel as bearing professional responsibility to be aware of local fast track rules. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 499, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296* ; *Beverly Union Co. v. Superior Court (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 40, 43, 253 Cal. Rptr. 359*

[4] Discretion of Trial Court

Gov. Code § 68608(b) merely gives the trial court the power to sanction, including the power of dismissal, for failure to abide by the Delay Reduction Act rules. It does not mandate such dismissals. Where the sole responsibility for failure to comply with the rules is upon counsel, rather than upon the party, the trial court may not dismiss the action as a sanction, either as a matter of law or based upon public policy. *Drum v. Superior Court (2006) 139 Cal. App. 4th 845, 853, 43 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279* , citing *Garcia v. McCutchen (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 469, 471, 475-476, 478-480, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 319, 940 P.2d 906*

In administering fast-track system, trial court as required to exercise its discretion at each stage of lawsuit in process of bringing case to trial, or, alternatively, to impose sanctions such as dismissal; in exercising its discretion, court as not having absolute and unlimited power, but as required to act with an impartial discretion guided and controlled in its exercise by fixed legal principles. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296*

[5] Standard of Appellate Review

Appellate standards for review of trial court discretion in area of trial court delay reduction rules as necessarily gradually evolving to adapt to reality of statewide pilot projects and innovations, and trial courts as required to be accorded maximum flexibility in calendar management to extent consistent with due process requirements. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 499, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296*

Because trial management is discretionary area, proper standard of review for challenge to trial management orders as being abuse of discretion; discretion as abused whenever trial court exceeds bounds of reason, all circumstances before it being considered. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296*

Reviewing court as not disturbing trial court's exercise of discretion unless it appears its order was clear abuse or miscarriage of justice. *Moyal v. Lanphear (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 491, 498, 256 Cal. Rptr. 296*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionGovernmentsCourtsRule Application & Interpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 553.syn

§ 553.syn Synopsis to Chapter 553: TRUCKS

§ 553.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 553.02 Cross References

§ 553.03 Governing Law

§§ 553.04- 553.09 [Reserved]

§ 553.10 Definitions

[1] Motor Truck

[2] Truck Tractor

[3] Trailer and Semitrailer

[4] Tractor-Trailer

§ 553.11 Accidents on the Road

[1] Negligence in Operating Vehicle

[a] Parties

[b] Statutory Cause of Action Against Owner of Motor Vehicle

[c] Standard of Care in General

[d] Excessive Speed

[i] General Rule

[ii] Trucks

[iii] Truck and Trailer Combination

[e] Causing Truck to Jack-Knife

[i] "Jack-Knifing" Defined

[ii] Driver Liability

[iii] Owner Liability

[iv] Comparative Negligence and Last Clear Chance

[f] Whipping or Swerving of Trailer

[g] Crossing Opposing Traffic

[2] Injury to Riders

[a] Effect of Negligence of Plaintiff Riders

[b] Riding in Part of Vehicle not Intended for Passengers or Load

[3] Liability of Trailer Owner

[a] To Driver

[b] To Third Parties

[c] Nonapplicability of Statutory Cause of Action Against Owner

§ 553.12 Loading and Unloading Trucks

[1] Duty to Participants and Others

[a] General Rule

[b] Person Purchasing Truck's Cargo

[c] Employees of Party Contracting for Truck Services

[d] Truck Owner and Employees

[e] Volunteers

[f] Passersby

[2] Assumption of Risk of Obvious Danger

§ 553.13 Towing of Vehicles

[1] Towing Not Negligence Per Se

[2] Coupling Requirements

[a] Safety Chain

[b] Strength of Hitch and Other Coupling Devices

[3] Duty of Driver of Towed Vehicle

[4] Towing of Vehicle Parked on Private Property

[a] When Towing Allowed

[i] General Rule

[ii] Notice

[iii] Authorization

[b] Liability for Injurious or Wrongful Towing

[i] Recovery for Damage

[ii] Liability of Towing Company

[c] Liability for Charging Vehicle Owner Excessive Rate

[d] Limitations Regarding Certain Private Property

[e] Liability for Towing Vehicle off Private Property

§§ 553.14-553.29 [Reserved]

§ 553.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 553.31 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

[2] Owner's Statutory Liability

[3] Regulation

[a] Length, Width, and Height

[b] Safe Loading and Transportation of Particular Cargos

[c] Safety

[4] Speed Limits

[5] Towing Equipment

[6] Towing of Parked Vehicle by Law Enforcement Officers

[7] Towing of Parked Vehicle by Private Property Owner

[8] Towing of Parked Vehicle Off Another's Private Property

[9] Towing Trailer

[10] Transportation Services

§ 553.32 Federal Regulations

§ 553.33 Administrative Regulations

§ 553.34 Decisions

[1] Crossing Opposing Traffic

[2] Excessive Speed

[3] Expert Testimony

[4] Injuries Suffered by Riders

[5] "Jack-Knifing" of Trailer

[6] Liability Policies

[7] Loading and Unloading

[8] Negligence

[9] Standard of Care in General

[10] Trailer Owner's Liability

[11] Towing

[12] Whipping or Swerving of Trailer

§ 553.35 Attorney General Opinions

§ 553.36 Law Reviews

§§ 553.37-553.49 [Reserved]

§ 553.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner and Driver of Truck or Towing Vehicle

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specifying Amount of Damages

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 553.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Driver of Towing Vehicle Against Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle--Accident Resulting From Negligence of Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§§ 553.52-553.59 [Reserved]

§ 553.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner of Truck and/or Loading Facilities--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 553.61 Allegation--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck--Defendant Moved Truck Without Look-Out or Warning

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART I. SCOPE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.01

§ 553.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter provides discussion and forms relating to negligence actions involving trucks, trailers, and the towing of vehicles. Topics covered include the negligence and liability of both drivers and owners of such vehicles for accidents on the road [*see § 553.11*], the loading and unloading of trucks [*see § 553.12*], and the towing of vehicles and liability associated with it [*see § 553.13*].

This chapter also provides a Research Guide and the following forms:

- General complaint for damages for personal injury and property damages [*see § 553.50*].

- Complaint for damages by driver of a towing vehicle for an accident resulting from the negligence of the owner or driver of a towed vehicle [*see § 553.51*].

- Complaint for damages against owner of truck or loading facilities for an accident while loading or unloading a truck [*see §§ 553.60* and *553.61*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesPersonal VehiclesTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART I. SCOPE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.02

§ 553.02 Cross References

Additional information regarding trucks and similar vehicles and negligence involving these may be found in the following chapters:

- For discussion and forms relating to personal injury and damages actions involving motor vehicles generally, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* , through Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Trial*.

- For discussion of and forms relating to damage to personal property during storage, see Ch. 93, *Bailments*

- For discussion and forms relating to common carriers of persons and freight generally, and relating to consignor or consignee liability to motor carriers for railroad and steamship storage and equipment rental charges caused by delay of consignor or consignee, see Ch. 109, *Carriers* .

- For discussion and forms relating to bills of lading, see Ch. 213, *Documents of Title* .

- For discussion of and forms relating to actions based on respondeat superior, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* .

- For discussion of and forms relating to actions based on work done on vehicles in garages, see Ch. 274, *Garages and Gas Stations* .

- For discussion and forms relating to automobile insurance, see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

- For discussion and forms relating to causes of action in negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

- For discussion of and forms relating to premises liability, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

- For discussion of and forms relating to streets and highways, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

- For discussion of and forms relating to trespass to personal property, see Ch. 550, *Trespass* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsBailmentsInsurance LawMotor Vehicle InsuranceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART I. SCOPE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.03

§ 553.03 Governing Law

Civ. Code § 1714(a) sets forth the general standard of care required of every person.

Evid. Code § 669 creates a rebuttable presumption of negligence for the violation of a statute, ordinance, or regulation under certain conditions. Trucks and trailers are subject to the statutory regulations governing all vehicles [*see Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470]* . Civil liability of owners and operators of motor vehicles is governed by *Veh. Code §§ 17000-17463*.

The rules of the road governing motor vehicles generally are set out in *Veh. Code § 21000 et seq.* Right of way in cross traffic is governed by *Veh. Code §§ 21800-21807* and the permissible speed of motor vehicles is governed by *Veh. Code §§ 22348-22413*.

Regulations governing the maximum size of vehicles are set out in *Veh. Code §§ 35250, 35251* (height), 35100-35112 (width), 35400-35414 (length), and 35550-35655 (weight).

Regulations governing towing equipment are set out in *Veh. Code § 29000-29008*.

Federal regulations for motor carriers generally are governed by *49 C.F.R. §§ 301-325*. Federal safety regulations for motor carriers are governed by 49 C.F.R. §§ 350-399.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesTraffic RegulationTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART I. SCOPE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 553.04- 553.09

[Reserved]

§§ 553.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.10

§ 553.10 Definitions

[1] Motor Truck

A "motor truck" or "motortruck" is a motor vehicle designed, used, or maintained primarily for the transportation of property [*Veh. Code § 410*; *see Veh. Code §§ 415* (defining "motor vehicle") and 670 (defining "vehicle")].

[2] Truck Tractor

A "truck tractor" is a motor vehicle designed and used primarily for drawing other vehicles, and not so constructed as to carry a load other than a part of the weight of the vehicle and load so drawn [*Veh. Code § 655(a)*]. However, a truck tractor may be equipped with a cargo container to transport exclusively explosives or munitions-related security material if the owner is licensed by the California Highway Patrol to transport explosives [*Veh. Code § 655(b)*].

[3] Trailer and Semitrailer

A "trailer" is a vehicle for carrying persons or property on its own structure and for being drawn by a motor vehicle, and so constructed that no part of its weight rests on any other vehicle [*Veh. Code § 630*]. A "semitrailer" is a vehicle designed for carrying persons or property, used in conjunction with a motor vehicle, and so constructed that some part of its weight and that of its load rests on, or is carried by, another vehicle [*Veh. Code § 550*]. As used in *Veh. Code §§ 35000-35795* (regulating size, weight, and load for vehicles on highways), "trailer" includes a semitrailer when used in conjunction with an auxiliary dolly, if the auxiliary dolly is of a type constructed to replace the function of the drawbar and the front axle or axles of a trailer [*Veh. Code § 630*].

[4] Tractor-Trailer

Throughout this chapter, a truck tractor pulling a semitrailer or a trailer will be referred to as a tractor-trailer [*see* discussion under *§ 553.10[2], [3]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.11

§ 553.11 Accidents on the Road

[1] Negligence in Operating Vehicle

[a] Parties

Actions for negligence in the operation of trucks, trailers, and the towing of vehicles may be brought against the owners or operators of thosevehicles by an injured party to whom a duty is owed; for example, a pedestrian, highway worker, train company, the driver and passenger of another vehicle, or the administrator of the estate of a decedent who drove another vehicle [*see Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 171, 203 Cal. Rptr. 626, 681 P.2d 893* ; *Horn v. Oh (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 1094, 195 Cal. Rptr. 720* ; *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe R.R. Co. v. Flintkote Co. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 764, 64 Cal. Rptr. 675* ; *Arroyo v. Arden Farms Co. (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 332, 48 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *Foss v. Anthony Indus. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 794, 189 Cal. Rptr. 31* , respectively].

Actions by the owner or operator of a truck, trailer, or towed vehicle may be brought against the parties whose negligence and breach of duty caused injury or damage [*see Harris v. Irish Truck Lines, Inc. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 373, 113 Cal. Rptr. 489, 521 P.2d 481* (action by driver of half-ton pickup truck against driver and owner of five-ton truck), and *Strait v. Hale Constr. Co. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 941, 103 Cal. Rptr. 487* (action by truck driver and owner against owner and operator of earthmover and road builder)].

For discussion of actions regarding automobiles brought by owners, operators, and passengers; pedestrians; and property owners, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* , to Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Tria l.*

[b] Statutory Cause of Action Against Owner of Motor Vehicle

A statutory cause of action against vehicle owners is created by *Veh. Code § 17150*, which states that every owner of a motor vehicle is liable and responsible for death or injury to person or property resulting from a negligent or wrongful act or omission in the operation of the motor vehicle, in the business of the owner or otherwise, by any person using or operating the same with the permission, express or implied, of the owner [*Soils v. Oilfields Trucking Co. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 349, 352-353, 153 Cal. Rptr. 371]* . Bringing a cause of action under *Veh. Code § 17150*, however, without proving agency and common laws grounds for imputation of negligence, limits the recoverable damages [*Soils v.*

Oilfields Trucking Co. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 349, 353, 153 Cal. Rptr. 371] ; *see Veh. Code § 17151* (limitations on liability)]. *Veh. Code § 17150* governs commercial and private vehicles; its application is not limited to automobiles, and extends, for example, to trucks [*Soils v. Oilfields Trucking Co. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 349, 353, 153 Cal. Rptr. 371]* . *Veh. Code § 17150* is directed primarily at motivating vehicle owners who allow others to use their vehicles within California to exercise care in the selection and supervision of such permissive users, and at protecting persons using California roadways [*Castro v. Budget Rent-A-Car System, Inc. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1162, 1182, 65 Cal.Rptr. 3d 430]* . For further discussion of a vehicle owner's statutory liability, see *Ch. 82, Automobiles: Causes of Action, § 82.31*.

[c] Standard of Care in General

Everyone is responsible for any injury occasioned to another by his or her want of ordinary skill or in the management of his property or person [*Civ. Code § 1714(a)*]. In addition, the failure of a person to exercise due care is presumed if he or she violated a statute, ordinance, or regulation of a public entity [*Evid. Code § 669(a)(1)*]. The presumption may be rebutted by proof that the person violating the statute, ordinance, or regulation did what might reasonably be expected of a person of ordinary prudence, acting under similar circumstances, who desired to comply with the law [*Evid. Code § 669(b)(1)*]. For discussion and forms relating to the general duty of due care, and also to presumptive negligence based on violation of a statute, ordinance, or regulation, see Ch. 180, *Negligence* , and California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender).

The rules and standards governing the driving of trucks are primarily the same as those governing motor vehicles generally [*see Veh. Code § 410* (defining truck as type of motor vehicle); *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470]* . However, the courts have recognized that the size, weight, and special operating requirements of trucks create hazards that are unique to trucks. Thus, a driver's duty to operate his or her vehicle safely under existing conditions may create special responsibilities under the special conditions created by the operation of a truck [*see, e.g.,* *Gigliotti v. Nunes (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 85, 92, 286 P.2d 809* (turning into oncoming traffic); *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470* (determining excessive speed in trucks)]. Some common circumstances under which a truck driver may be required to exercise special caution to avert dangers unique to trucking are discussed below. For a discussion of the rules and standard of care governing motor vehicles generally, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* , through Ch. 82, *Automobiles: Causes of Action* .

Although state law will usually provide the standard of care applicable to a motor vehicle driver, federal law may provide a higher standard of care for commercial vehicles. The federal Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 31101 et seq.*] does not specifically preempt state law standards, but regulations issued under the Act may impose a higher standard to which commercial motor vehicles must adhere [*see 49 C.F.R. § 392.2*]. For example, one federal regulation issued under the Act requires a commercial motor vehicle driver to use extreme caution and to reduce speed if hazardous conditions, such as rain or snow, exist [*49 C.F.R. § 392.14*]. The California court of appeal has held that this is a higher standard of care than the reasonable care standard imposed by state law, and that this higher federal standard may be used to determine the negligence of a commercial vehicle driver during hazardous driving conditions [*Weaver v. Chavez (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1354-1355, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 514]* . For purposes of determining the applicability of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act, a "commercial motor vehicle" is a self-propelled or towed vehicle used on the highways in commerce principally to transport passengers or cargo, if the vehicle also: (1) has a gross vehicle weight rating or gross vehicle weight of at least 10,001 pounds, whichever is greater; (2) is designed to transport more than 10 passengers, including the driver; or (3) is used in transporting material found by the Secretary of Transportation to be hazardous under *49 U.S.C.S. § 5103* and transported in a quantity requiring placards under that statute [*49 U.S.C.S. § 31101(1)*].

[d] Excessive Speed

[i] General Rule

No person may drive any of the following vehicles on a highway at a speed in excess of 55 miles per hour [*Veh. Code § 22406*]:

- A motor truck or truck tractor having three or more axles or a motortruck or truck tractor drawing any other vehicle.
- A passenger vehicle or bus drawing any other vehicle.
- A school bus transporting any school pupil.
- A farm labor vehicle transporting passengers.
- A vehicle transporting explosives.
- A trailer bus, as defined in *Veh. Code § 636*.

Any person who operates a commercial motor vehicle, as defined in *Veh. Code § 15210*, on a highway at a speed exceeding a maximum speed limit by 15 miles per hour or more, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Veh. Code § 22406.1(a)*]. Such a violation will also be considered a serious traffic violation under *Veh. Code § 15210* and subject to sanctions under *Veh. Code § 15306* or *Veh. Code § 15308* [*Veh. Code § 22406.1(c)*]. Violation of the speed limit set out in *Veh. Code § 22406* is negligence per se [*Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 752, 216 P.2d 470* ; *Wood v. Moore (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 144, 149, 148 P.2d 91]* .

[ii] Trucks

Trucks, like all motor vehicles, are also required to obey prima facie speed limits, which are statutory limits set at less than the maximum speed set out in the Vehicle Code [*see Veh. Code § 22351(b)*; *see, e.g., Veh. Code § 22352* (reduced speed limits at intersections and railway crossing with obscured view, in alleys, business and residential districts, senior citizens' and school zones); *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 752, 216 P.2d 470]* . However, driving in excess of the prima facie limits is not negligence per se, as long as the maximum limit set out in *Veh. Code § 22406* is not violated [*Wood v. Moore (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 144, 149, 148 P.2d 91]* .

Trucks are also subject to the basic speed law, which provides that no person may drive a motor vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for the surface and width of the highway and the traffic on it, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property [*Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 216 P.2d 470* (interpreting former *Veh. Code § 510, now see Veh. Code § 22350*); *see Veh. Code § 22350* (basic speed law)].

As noted elsewhere [*see § 553.11[1][c]*] , the driver of a truck that meets the definition of a "commercial motor vehicle" under the federal Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 31101(1)*] may also be held to an arguably higher standard of care under safety regulations promulgated under that Act, including the duty to use extreme caution and to reduce speed if hazardous conditions, such as rain or snow, exist [*49 C.F.R. § 392.14*; *see Weaver v. Chavez (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1354-1355, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 514]* .

[iii] Truck and Trailer Combination

The fact that slowing down a truck and trailer combination creates the danger of jack-knifing (*see* [e], *below*) is a consideration for the jury in determining whether or not a truck driver was negligently traveling at a speed that

endangered life or property [*see Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470]* .

[e] Causing Truck to Jack-Knife

[i] "Jack-Knifing" Defined

"Jack-knifing" is a condition in which a trailer or semitrailer coupled to a tractor-trailer combination swings out from its position behind the tractor and hurtles down the road sideways, out of control.

"Jack-knifing" may occur when the driver of the tractor-trailer slows the tractor portion of the vehicle too soon or too roughly or when the tractor-trailer is turned too abruptly to either side [*see Sims v. Phillips (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 793, 797, 331 P.2d 174* ; *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470]* .

[ii] Driver Liability

The driver may be liable for negligence in the jack-knifing of a tractor-trailer resulting from the excessive speed at which the tractor-trailer was traveling when the driver was forced to brake [*Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 754, 216 P.2d 470]* .

[iii] Owner Liability

Jack-knifing is not always a result of the driver's negligence, however. For example, jack-knifing may also be caused by inadequate brakes on the trailer so that the negligence of the owner of the trailer is the proximate cause of the accident [*see Hupp v. Griffith Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 63, 67, 15 P.2d 211]* . Also, a jury may find that jack-knifing was not caused by the driver's negligence, but was due to the driver abruptly turning to avoid hitting another vehicle driving in the wrong lane [*see Sims v. Phillips (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 793, 797, 331 P.2d 174* (reversing judgment on unrelated grounds); for further discussion and a form relating to the defense of avoiding an imminent peril or emergency, *see Ch. 84, Automobiles: Responding to the Action, §§ 84.30(4)(e),* 84.68].

[iv] Comparative Negligence and Last Clear Chance

A driver who failed to stop or swerve his tractor trailer to avoid hitting another vehicle a few seconds before colliding with it was held not to have had the last clear chance to prevent the collision, because stopping or swerving in so short a time would have incurred the danger of jack-knifing or overturning [*Hickambottom v. Cooper Transp. Co. (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 489, 492, 329 P.2d 609* (decided before the adoption of comparative negligence in *Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226*)].

For discussion of comparative negligence and its effect on contributory negligence and the last clear chance rule, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[f] Whipping or Swerving of Trailer

No person may operate a train of vehicles when any vehicle being towed whips or swerves from side to side or fails to follow substantially in the path of the towing vehicle [*Veh. Code § 21711*]. A "train" of vehicles apparently means a combination of towing and towed vehicles, for example, a truck towing another truck, or a truck towing a trailer [*see Rayner v. Ramirez (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 372, 379, 324 P.2d 83* , and *Risley v. Lenwell (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 608, 639, 277 P.2d 897* respectively (both involving former Veh. Code § 701; *now see Veh. Code § 21711*)]. Violation of *Veh. Code § 21711* may be the basis of liability for resulting damages [*see Risley v. Lenwell (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 608, 637-638, 277 P.2d 897* (citing former Veh. Code § 701)]. A tractor-trailer driver may be liable fordamage caused

by a swerving trailer when the swerving was caused by excessive speed under the circumstances [*Wells Truckways v. Cebrian (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 666, 670, 680, 265 P.2d 557* (excessive speed in rainy weather while moving downhill on unbanked curve)]. The driver may not be liable, however, if the swerving was caused by a sudden turn to avoid collision with another object [*Patterson v. Delta Lines, Inc. (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 160, 161-162, 304 P.2d 842* ; for further discussion and a form relating to the defense of avoiding an imminent peril or emergency, see *Ch. 84, Automobiles: Responding to the Action, §§ 84.30(4)(e),* 84.68].

[g] Crossing Opposing Traffic

All motor vehicles making a left turn or a U-turn on a highway or crossing an intersection with a stop sign are required to yield to any vehicle that is approaching so closely from the opposing direction as to constitute a hazard [*see Veh. Code §§ 21801* (left turn) and *21802* (stop sign)]. In applying *Veh. Code § 21801* to tractor-trailers, the courts have noted that a left turn by a slowly moving vehicle in the face of oncoming traffic is one of the most hazardous of all traffic maneuvers [*Gigliotti v. Nunes (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 85, 92, 286 P.2d 809* ; *Colla v. Beaver Lumber Co. (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 271, 276-277, 338 P.2d 553]* . The slow acceleration of a tractor-trailer is a major factor that the jury may consider in determining whether oncoming vehicles were so close as to constitute a hazard [*see Gigliotti v. Nunes (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 85, 92, 286 P.2d 809* ; *Hutchison v. Elliot (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 263, 270, 7 Cal. Rptr. 77]* . Distances of approach of 100 feet to as much as 500 and 1,000 feet have been held to be sufficently close to permit a jury to find that opposing traffic was so close as to constitute a hazard, depending on the speed of the approaching vehicles and the conditions existing at the time [*see Colla v. Beaver Lumber Co. (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 271, 273, 338 P.2d 553* (distance of 100 feet when making left turn); *Hutchison v. Elliott (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 263, 270, 7 Cal. Rptr. 77* (distance of 500 to 1,000 feet when crossing major road from side road at night)].

[2] Injury to Riders

[a] Effect of Negligence of Plaintiff Riders

For a discussion of comparative negligence and the effect of contributory negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For discussion of the contributory negligence of passengers and riders in motor vehicles generally, see *Ch. 84, Automobiles: Responding to the Action, §§ 84.30(4)(c), 84.65*.

[b] Riding in Part of Vehicle not Intended for Passengers or Load

The Vehicle Code prohibits persons from riding on any vehicle or on any portion thereof not designed or intended for use of passengers [*Veh. Code§ 21712(b)*]. In addition, the Vehicle Code provides that no person driving a motor vehicle shall knowingly permit any person to ride on any vehicle or on any portion thereof not designed or intended for the use of passengers [*Veh. Code § 21712(a)*]. However, *Veh. Code § 21712(a)* and *(b)* do not apply to any employee engaged in the necessary discharge of his or her duty, or in the case of persons riding completely within or on vehicle bodies in space intended for any load on the vehicle [*Veh. Code § 21712(f)*]. In addition, a person cannot legally ride in the trunk of a motor vehicle, and a driver cannot legally permit a person to do so [*Veh. Code § 21712(c), (d)*].

The Vehicle Code prohibits persons from riding in or on the back of a pickup truck or a flatbed motortruck on a highway [*Veh. Code § 23116(b)*]. In addition, the Vehicle Code prohibits any person driving a pickup truck or a flatbed motortruck on a highway from transporting another person in or on the back of the truck [*Veh. Code § 23116(a)*].

These provisions do not apply if the person riding in the back of the truck is secured by a restraint system that meets or exceeds federal motor vehicle safety standards [*Veh. Code § 23116(c)*]. These provisions also do not apply to any person transporting one or more persons in the back of a truck or flatbed motor truck owned by a farmer or rancher, if that vehicle is used exclusively within the boundaries of lands owned or managed by that farmer or rancher, including the incidental use of that vehicle on not more than one mile of highway between one part of the farm or ranch to another part of that farm or ranch [*Veh. Code § 23116(d)*]. A person may ride in or on the back of a truck if that person is being

transported in a parade that is supervised by a law enforcement agency and the speed of the truck while in the parade does not exceed eight miles per hour [*Veh. Code § 23116(f)*]. Neither the general prohibition nor the restraint requirements apply if a person is being transported in an emergency response situation by a public agency or pursuant to the direction or authority of a public agency. In this context, "emergency response situation" means instances in which measures are needed to prevent injury or death to person or to prevent, confine, or mitigate property damage or destruction [*Veh. Code § 23116(e)*].

Whether or not an employee was engaged in his or her duty when riding on a truck is a question of fact. For example, an employee standing on the hitch of a trailer in order to warn the driver of overtaking traffic and to help the driver learn to drive better has been found to be engaged in the necessary discharge of a duty [*Espinoza v. Rossini (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 40, 48, 55 Cal. Rptr. 205]* .

[3] Liability of Trailer Owner

[a] To Driver

The owner of a trailer may be liable to the driver for the driver's personal injuries if negligence on the owner's part, such as maintaining inadequate brakes on the trailer, caused the truck to jack-knife [*see Hupp v. Griffith Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 63, 67, 15 P.2d 211]* . Whether the jack-knifing of a truck was proximately caused by inadequate brakes or by the driver's negligence in operating the truck or in unreasonably choosing an unsafe route is a question of fact [*Hupp v. Griffith Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 63, 68-72, 15 P.2d 211]* .

[b] To Third Parties

If the trailer in a tractor-trailer combination is owned separately from the tractor, the negligence of the tractor owner cannot be imputed to the trailer owner if the tractor owner was acting gratuitously or as an independent contractor of the trailer owner. Negligence can be imputed only if the tractor owner was acting as an agent or employee of the trailer owner. The determinative issue in deciding the status of the tractor owner is whether or not the trailer owner controlled or had the right to control the activities of the tractor owner [*Flores v. Brown (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 622, 628, 248 P.2d 922]* .

For purposes of determining the trailer owner's right of control, the position of the trailer owner is analagous to that of a passenger in a motor vehicle. Thus, it may not be inferred that the trailer owner had control of or the right to control the tractor merely because the trip was undertaken for the trailer owner's benefit or because the trailer owner selected the destination [*see Flores v. Brown (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 622, 629, 248 P.2d 922]* . A contract providing for control by the tractor owner of all matters except designation of the load and its destination is proof that the tractor owner is an independent contractor and not an employee or agent [*Gaskill v. Calaveras Cement Co. (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 120, 122-123, 226 P.2d 633]* .

[c] Nonapplicability of Statutory Cause of Action Against Owner

As discussed in *§ 553.11[1][b]*, a statutory cause of action exists against the owner of a motor vehicle for negligence in its use and operation [*Veh. Code § 17150*]. An unconnected trailer, however, is a "vehicle" and not a "motor vehicle" under the Vehicle Code [*see Veh. Code §§ 415* ("motor vehicle"), *550* ("semitrailer"), *630* ("trailer"); *see also Miller v. Berman (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 569, 571, 572, 131 P.2d 18* ; *but see Ins. Code § 383.6* (defining trailer as a motor vehicle for purposes of *Ins. Code § 383.5*, which governs insurance contracts)]. A semitrailer joined to a truck tractor forms one motor vehicle. However, the owner of a semitrailer is not considered to be a joint owner of a motor vehicle for purposes of statutory liability imposed on an owner [*Miller v. Berman (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 569, 571, 572, 131 P.2d 18* ; *but see Mission Ins. Co. v. Hartford Ins. Co. (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 1199, 1209, 202 Cal. Rptr. 635* (construing joint ownership of a truck/tractor and semitrailer according to *Ins. Code §§ 11580.8, 11580.9*, which govern the application of multiple liability insurance policies covering the same loss)]. For discussion and forms relating to the

responsibility of a principal for an agent's torts generally, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareSpecial CareGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesTraffic RegulationTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.12

§ 553.12 Loading and Unloading Trucks

[1] Duty to Participants and Others

[a] General Rule

Particular duties owed by persons involved in truck loading and unloading operations to other participants or persons in the vicinity are discussedbelow. For discussion of vicarious liability in the operation of automobiles, see *Ch. 82, Automobiles, §§ 82.16, 82.31(5)* For discussion of an employer's vicarious liability for acts of its employees generally, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts* . For discussion of comparative negligence, including its effect on the doctrines of contributory negligence and assumption of the risk, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* . For discussion of premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[b] Person Purchasing Truck's Cargo

The owner of a truck, as an owner of "premises," may be liable for a dangerous condition existing on the truck, according to the rules of premises liability [*see Squillante v. Barr (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 175, 177-179, 280 P.2d 216]* . For example, a truck owner owes a duty to a potential buyer of goods who is invited onto the truck to keep the truck free from known dangerous conditions [*see Squillante v. Barr (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 175, 178-179, 280 P.2d 216* (truck owner not liable under facts)].

[c] Employees of Party Contracting for Truck Services

An employee of a party contracting for truck services who assists in loading or unloading has been held to be an invitee on the truck, to whom the truck owner owes the highest category of duty [*Lamar v. John & Wade, Inc. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 806, 809, 161 P.2d 970]* .

A truck owner may be vicariously liable if an employee's negligent unloading causes injury to an employee of the contracting party [*see Scott v. Gallot (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 421, 425-426, 138 P.2d 685* (plaintiff's evidence concerning custom and habit on premises of warning workers of approaching truck is admissible under res gestae doctrine)]. For example, a truck owner may be liable if an employee injures a worker while negligently driving a cement

truck down a ramp in order to pour concrete for the worker's employer [*Huber v. Henry J. Kaiser Co. (1945) 71 Cal. App. 2d 278, 287, 162 P.2d 693]* .

A truck owner may be held liable for negligent loading instructions given by its employee to the contracting company's employee if the latter is injured while following unsafe directions [*see Williams v. Field Transp. Co. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 696, 171 P.2d 722]* . Moreover, a truck owner owes a duty to maintain safe equipment that may otherwise cause injury to workers in the unloading area [*see Manhattan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Travelers Ins. Co. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 794, 800, 136 Cal. Rptr. 400* (finding that use of concrete pump with the truck constituted continuing operation of concrete unloading for purposes of insurance coverage)].

[d] Truck Owner and Employees

A premises owner owes a duty to provide safe conditions for loading and unloading to the owner and employees of a truck company with which itcontracts. For example, an oil company owes a duty to provide safe means for the employees of a truck company contracting to haul crude oil to load the oil; and the truck owner's contributory negligence in failing to prevent an imminent fire is a question of fact for the jury [*Lunsford v. Standard Oil Co. (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 459, 464-465, 191 P.2d 82]* .

A company that contracts for a truck's services owes a duty to the truck company's employees to use due care while assisting or directing the unloading of cargo [*see Foster v. Pestana (1947) 77 Cal. App. 2d 885, 889, 177 P.2d 54]* . A construction company, for example, owes a duty to the employees of a truck company and its subcontractors to exercise care in carrying out loading operations [*see Argonaut Ins. Co. v. Colonial Ins. Co. (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 608, 614, 138 Cal. Rptr. 855* (defendant employee's loading was "use" of vehicle for purposes of insurance policy coverage)].

[e] Volunteers

A nonemployee who voluntarily helps unload a truck on the premises of the receiver of the cargo at the informal request of the truck driver, who was not an employee of the receiver, has been held to be at least a licensee as to the receiver, so that the receiver is liable for active negligence in unloading that injures the nonemployee [*Church v. Headrick & Brown (1951) 101 Cal. App. 2d 396, 398-402, 405, 408, 225 P.2d 558]* . For discussion of the extent to which the plaintiff's status is relevant since *Rowland v. Christian (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 108, 70 Cal. Rptr. 97, 443 P.2d 561* , see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[f] Passersby

A truck's owner and driver owe a duty to passersby who might foreseeably be harmed, to use reasonable care in loading and unloading cargo [*see American Auto. Ins. Co. v. Transport Indem. Co. (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 543, 551, 19 Cal. Rptr. 558* (construction company employee's helping to unload concrete blocks off transportation company's truck constituted "use" of truck for purposes of insurance coverage)]. The duty extends to the party contracting for truck services and its employees if that party or its employees undertake to supervise the operation. For example, if a contracting company's foreman assumes supervision of unloading operations, and knows or should know that persons using a public street adjacent to the loading site might be injured by the activity, the foreman has a duty to post a guard and warn passersby of the danger. Moreover, employees of the contracting company who actively participate in the unloading owe a duty to passersby to use reasonable care [*American Auto. Ins. Co. v. Transport Indem. Co. (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 543, 551, 19 Cal. Rptr. 558]* .

[2] Assumption of Risk of Obvious Danger

A property owner is not required to warn one who comes onto the property of a dangerous condition on the property when the condition was obvious to the person coming onto the property. This rule applies to the owner of a truck that is being unloaded as well as to the owner of the premises on which the truck is being unloaded [*see Squillante v. Barr*

(1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 175, 177-179, 280 P.2d 216 ; for more detailed discussion of the general rules relating to obvious dangers, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*]. However, a person loading a truck may be held not to have assumed the risk of resulting damages even though he or she knew of the general condition which caused the damages, when the danger represented by the condition was not known to the person doing the loading, and the negligent acts with which the defendants were charged occured after any assumption of the risk regarding known conditions by the plaintiff [*Lunsford v. Standard Oil Co. (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 459, 467-468, 191 P.2d 82* (employees of defendant premises owner failed to take action when fumes from oil that plaintiff was loading came close to nearby boiler without plaintiff's knowledge)]. The jury may consider the lack of expertise and experience of the person unloading, as compared to the experience and knowledge of the person responsible for creating the dangerous condition in determining whether the person unloading assumed the risk. Moreover, a subordinate employee has the right to place some reliance in the judgment of a supervisor in doing his or her work [*Lamar v. John & Wade Inc. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 806, 810, 161 P.2d 970]* .

The application of assumption of the risk as either a defense to liability, or a factor in apportioning fault, must presently be evaluated in light of the comparative negligence doctrine, as set forth in *Li v. Yellow Cab* [*Li v. Yellow Cab (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226]* . For further discussion see Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceCommon Law ConceptsAssumption of RiskTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Premises LiabilityDuties of CareDuty on PremisesInviteesGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTortsVicarious LiabilityEmployersGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.13

§ 553.13 Towing of Vehicles

[1] Towing Not Negligence Per Se

Towing one vehicle by means of another is not negligence per se, but the towing must be done with due consideration for the safety of others [*Weddle v. Loges (1971) 52 Cal. App. 2d 115, 124, 125 P.2d 914]* .

[2] Coupling Requirements

[a] Safety Chain

There are detailed statutory requirements governing the manner in which towed vehicles are to be connected to towing vehicles, including ageneral requirement that every towed vehicle be coupled to the towing vehicle by means of a safety chain, cable, or equivalent device in addition to the regular drawbar, tongue or other connection [*Veh. Code §§ 29003(c), 29004(a)*; *see Veh. Code § 29004(c)* (amount of slack, connection to drawbar)].

Failure to use a safety chain in violation of *Veh. Code § 29004* may be the basis of liability if the towed vehicle breaks loose and goes out of control [*Lehmuth v. Long Beach Unified Sch. Dist. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 544, 552-553, 2 Cal. Rptr. 279, 348 P.2d 887* (relying on former Veh. Code § 701, *now see Veh. Code § 29004*]. There are exceptions to the safety chain requirement of *Veh. Code § 29004* [*Veh. Code §§ 29004(c), 29007* (towed vehicle being steered by licensed driver; fifth-wheel-type connections); *see Veh. Code §§ 29001, 29002* (requirements for fifth-wheel devices); *see also Veh. Code § 29009* (dolly used with construction equipment)].

[b] Strength of Hitch and Other Coupling Devices

Every hitch or coupling device used as a means of attaching the towed and towing vehicles is required to be mounted properly and securely and to be structurally adequate for the weight drawn, including sufficient reinforcement or bracing of the frame to provide sufficient strength and rigidity to prevent undue distortion of the frame [*Veh. Code § 29003(a)*]. The drawbar, tongue, or other connection between the towing and towed vehicles must also be securely attached and structurally adequate for the weight drawn [*Veh. Code § 29003(b)*]. Violation of the standards of former *Veh. Code § 29003(a)* in mounting a trailer hitch may be the basis of liability for negligence [*see Douglass v. Webb*

(1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 290, 294-295, 304-305, 26 Cal. Rptr. 60 (construing former Veh. Code § 701(d))].

Additional requirements apply when towing is to be done on a freeway, except when a disabled motor vehicle is being towed from the point of disablement to the nearest and most accessible exit from the freeway [*Veh. Code § 29006*].

[3] Duty of Driver of Towed Vehicle

Despite the limited ability of the person at the wheel of a towed vehicle to control its travel, he or she has the duty to exercise ordinary care in watching for traffic and railroad trains, in controlling the car to a reasonable extent, in sounding the horn to warn the driver of the towing vehicle if that appeared necessary, and under slow speed conditions, in leaving the towed car if reasonably necessary [*Conner v. Southern Pac. Co. (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 633, 638, 241 P.2d 535* (plaintiff's decedent in towed vehicle found contributorily negligent); *but cf. Fairman v. Mors (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 216, 219-220, 130 P.2d 448* (person behind the wheel of a towed vehicle considered utterly helpless in directing the course or conductof the car; holding that driver of towing vehicle was also driver of towed vehicle for purposes of guest statute)].

The driver of a towed vehicle may be liable for damages resulting from an accident caused by his or her own conduct in arranging and during the towing [*Barnett v. Garrison (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 553, 556, 209 P.2d 426* (defendant caused his heavier car to be towed by a lighter one over a winding, hilly road, chose the manner in which he tied the cars together, let his car coast in neutral, and continued that manner of towing even though his car rested against the towing car on every downgrade, and at the fatal moment turned wheels to separate the cars)].

[4] Towing of Vehicle Parked on Private Property

[a] When Towing Allowed

[i] General Rule

The owner or person in lawful possession of private property, including an association of a common interest development as defined in *Civ. Code § 1351*, may cause the removal of a vehicle parked on the property to a storage facility meeting the requirements of *Veh. Code § 22658(n)* under any of the following circumstances [*Veh. Code § 22658(a)*; *see Veh. Code § 22658(n)*; *see also Veh. Code § 22658(f)* (requiring person causing removal to contact local traffic law enforcement within one hour)]:

- There is displayed, in plain view at all entrances to the property, a sign not less than 17 by 22 inches in size, with lettering not less than 1 inch in height, prohibiting public parking and indicating that vehicles will be removed at the owner's expense, and containing the telephone number of the local traffic law enforcement agency and the name and telephone number of each towing company that is a party to a written general towing authorization agreement with the owner or possessor of the property (the sign may also indicate that a citation may also be issued for the violation).

- The vehicle has been issued a notice of parking violation, and 96 hours have elapsed since the issuance of that notice.

- The vehicle is on private property and lacks an engine, transmission, wheels, tires, doors, windshield, or any other major part or equipment necessary to operate safely on the highways, the owner or person in lawful possession of the private property has notified the local traffic law enforcement agency, as appropriate, and 24 hours have elapsed since that notification.

- The lot or parcel on which the vehicle is parked is improved with a single-family dwelling.

Veh. Code § 22658 does not limit or affect any rights or remedies that the owner or person in lawful possession of private property may have by virtue of other provisions of law authorizing the removal of a vehicle parked on private property [*Veh. Code § 22658(c)*].

On the request of the owner of the vehicle, or that owner's agent, the towing company or its driver is required to immediately and unconditionally release any vehicle that is not yet removed from the private property and in transit [*Veh. Code § 22658(g)(1)(B)*; *see also Veh. Code § 22658(g)(1)(C)* (failure to comply with request is misdemeanor)]. If a vehicle is released to a person in compliance with this provision, the vehicle owner or authorized agent is required to move the vehicle to a lawful location immediately [*Veh. Code § 22658(g)(2)*].

[ii] Notice

If the tow truck operator removing the vehicle knows, or is able to ascertain from the property owner, the person in lawful possession of the property, or the registration records of the Department of Motor Vehicles, the name and address of the registered and legal owner of the removed vehicle, the tow truck operator must immediately give, or cause to be given, written notice to the registered and legal owner of the fact and grounds of the removal, the place to which the vehicle has been removed, the mileage on the vehicle at the time of removal, and the time of removal. If the vehicle is stored in a storage facility, a copy of the notice must be given to the proprietor of the facility. If the tow truck operator does not know and is unable to ascertain the name of the owner of the vehicle, or for any other reason is unable to give the prescribed notice to the owner, that person must comply with the requirements of *Veh. Code § 22853(c)* relating to notice in the same manner as applicable to an officer removing a vehicle from private property [*Veh. Code § 22658(b)*].

[iii] Authorization

A towing company is not permitted to remove or commence the removal of a vehicle from private property, without first obtaining written authorization from the property owner or lessee, or an employee or agent of the property owner or lessee. In addition, the property owner, lessee, employee, or agent must generally be present on the property at the time of removal and verify the alleged violation, although the person does not have to be physically present at the exact specified location on the property where the vehicle to be towed is located [*Veh. Code § 22658(l)(1)(A)*]. In addition, presence and verification is not required if the person authorizing the tow is the property owner, or the owner's agent who is not a tow operator, of a residential rental property of 15 or fewer units that does not have an onsite owner, owner's agent, or employee, and if a tenant has verified the violation, requested the tow from that tenant's assigned parking space, and provided a signed request or electronic mail, or has called and provides a signed request or electronic mail within 24 hours, to the property owner or owner's agent, which the owner or agent must provide to the towing company within 48 hours after authorizing the tow [*Veh. Code § 22658(l)(1)(A)*; *see also Veh. Code § 22658(l)(1)(B)* (contents of written authorization specified)].

General authorization to remove or commence the removal of a vehicle at the towing company's discretion cannot be delegated to a towing company or its affiliates except in the case of a vehicle unlawfully parked within 15 feet of a fire hydrant or in a fire lane, or in a manner that interferes with any entrance to, or exit from, the private property [*Veh. Code § 22658(l)(1)(E)(i)*; *see also Veh. Code § 22658(l)(2)* (requiring towing company to photograph vehicle removed under these circumstances and keep copy for presentation to vehicle owner)]. In those cases in which general authorization is granted to a towing company or its affiliate to undertake or commence the removal of a vehicle that is unlawfully parked within 15 feet of a fire hydrant or in a fire lane, or that interferes with an entrance to, or exit from, private property, the towing company and the property owner, the owner's agent, or the person in lawful possession of the private property must have a written agreement granting that general authorization [*Veh. Code § 22658(l)(1)(E)(ii)*].

[b] Liability for Injurious or Wrongful Towing

[i] Recovery for Damage

The owner of a vehicle removed from private property pursuant to *Veh. Code § 22658(a)* may recover for any damage to the vehicle resulting from any intentional or negligent act of person causing the removal of, or removing, the vehicle [*Veh. Code § 22658(d)*]. In addition, an owner or person in lawful possession of any private property, or an association of a common interest development causing the removal of a vehicle parked on that property is liable for double the storage or towing charges whenever there has been a failure to comply with *Veh. Code § 22658(a)(1), (2)* or *(3)* (*see* [a], *above*) or a failure to state the grounds for the removal of the vehicle if requested by the legal or registered owner of the vehicle as required by *Veh. Code § 22658(f)* [*Veh. Code § 22658(e)*].

[ii] Liability of Towing Company

Any towing company that removes a vehicle pursuant to *Veh. Code § 22658(a)* is responsible for [*Veh. Code § 22658(f)*]:

- Any damage to the vehicle in the transit and subsequent storage of the vehicle.

- The removal of a vehicle other than the vehicle specified by the owner or other person in lawful possession of the private property.

A person who removes a vehicle without the proper authorizations and without following the proper procedures as provided in *Veh. Code § 22658(l)* [*see § 553.13[4][a][iii]*], is liable to the owner of the vehicle for four times the amount of the towing and storage charges, in addition to any applicable criminal penalty [*Veh. Code § 22658(l)*].

However, towing company that removes a vehicle from private property with the proper authorization of the property owner or the property owner's agent will *not* be held responsible in any situation relating to the validity of the removal [*Veh. Code § 22658(f)*; *see § 553.13[4][a][iii*]

For discussion and forms relating to damage incurred during the storage of personal property, see Ch. 93, *Bailments* . For discussion and forms relating to the tort of conversion, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* . For discussion and forms relating to trespass to personal property, see Ch. 550, *Trespass* .

[c] Liability for Charging Vehicle Owner Excessive Rate

Any person who charges a vehicle owner a towing, service, or storage charge at an excessive rate is liable to the vehicle owner for four times the amount charged [*Veh. Code § 22658(j)(1)*; *see also Veh. Code § 22658(j)(2)* (criminal penalties for knowingly charging excessive fees)]. A charge for towing or storage, or both, is excessive if the charge exceeds the greater of the following amounts [*Veh. Code § 22658(i)(1)(A)*]:

- The amount that would have been charged for that towing or storage, or both, made at the request of a law enforcement agency under an agreement between a towing company and the law enforcement agency that exercises primary jurisdiction in the city in which is located the private property from which the vehicle was, or was attempted to be, removed, or if the private property is not located within a city, then the law enforcement agency that exercises primary jurisdiction in the county in which the private property is located.

- The amount that would have been charged for that towing or storage, or both, under the rate approved for that towing operator by the California Highway Patrol for the jurisdiction in which the private property is located and from which the vehicle was, or was attempted to be, removed.

If a request to release a vehicle is made within 24 hours from the time the vehicle is brought into the storage facility,

regardless of the calendar date, the storage charge must be for only one day. Not more than one day's storage charge may be required for vehicle released the same day it was stored [*Veh. Code § 22658(i)(2)*].

[d] Limitations Regarding Certain Private Property

An owner or person in lawful possession of private property that is held open to the public, or a discernible portion thereof, for parking of vehicles at no fee, or an employee or agent of the owner or possessor, cannot tow or remove, or cause the towing or removal of, any vehicle within one hour of the vehicle being parked [*Veh. Code § 22953(a)*]. *Veh. Code § 22953(a)* does not apply to a vehicle illegally parked within 15 feet of a fire hydrant, in a fire lane, in a manner that interferes with an entrance to or exit from the private property, or in a parking space or stall legally designated for disabled persons [*Veh. Code § 22953(b)*]. The statute also does not apply to parking spaces at residential property or at a hotel or motel where the parking stalls or spaces are clearly marked for a specific room [*Veh. Code § 22953(c)*].

A person who violates *Veh. Code § 22953(a)* is civilly liable to the vehicle owner, or to the vehicle owner's agent, for two times the amount of the towing and storage charges [*Veh. Code § 22953(e)*].

[e] Liability for Towing Vehicle off Private Property

Any towing company that, in removing a vehicle, cuts, removes, otherwise damages, or leaves open a fence without the prior approval of the property owner or the person in charge of the property must at that time either locate and notify the owner or person in charge of the property of the damage or condition; the name and address of the towing company; and the license, registration, or identification number of the removed vehicle; or the towing company must leave that information in a conspicuous place and notify the appropriate law enforcement agency [*Veh. Code § 22658.1(a)*]. Failure to comply with the provisions of *Veh. Code § 22658.1* constitutes an infraction [*Veh. Code § 22658.1(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceStandards of CareReasonable CareGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesRates & TariffsTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 553.14-553.29

[Reserved]

§§ 553.14[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.30

§ 553.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving carriers, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 33, *Carriers*

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in actions involving negligence generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence*

For forms of transactional documents relating to this chapter, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 54, *Shipment of Property*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.31

§ 553.31 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

Motor truck. *Veh. Code § 410*

Motor vehicle. *Veh. Code § 415*

Semitrailer. *Veh. Code § 550*

Tow truck. *Veh. Code § 615(a)*

Tow dolly. *Veh. Code § 617*

Trailer. *Veh. Code § 630*

Trailer coach. *Veh. Code § 635*

Truck tractor. *Veh. Code § 655*

Vehicle. *Veh. Code § 670*

[2] Owner's Statutory Liability

Liability for negligence by driver using vehicle with permission. *Veh. Code § 17150*

Limitation of liability for statutory cause of action. *Veh. Code § 17151*

[3] Regulation

[a] Length, Width, and Height

Width regulations for all vehicles on highways. *Veh. Code § 35100 et seq.*

Height regulations for all vehicles on highways. *Veh. Code §§ 35250, 35251*

Length regulations for all vehicles on highways. *Veh. Code §§ 35400 et seq., 35401.3*

Length regulations for combinations of vehicles. *Veh. Code §§ 35401, 35401.5, 35411*

Length regulations for semitrailers or dollies. *Veh. Code § 35414*

[b] Safe Loading and Transportation of Particular Cargos

Hazardous materials. *Veh. Code §§ 31301-31308, 31600 et seq.*

Transportation of workers, including farm labor vehicles. *Veh. Code §§ 31400-31404*

Removable or collapsible freight van or tank containers. *Veh. Code § 31540*

[c] Safety

Highway Patrol regulation of safe operation of vehicles and tour buses. *Veh. Code §§ 34500-34513*

Requirement by motor carrier that driver exceed applicable maximum hours of service as punishable by fine. *Veh. Code § 34501.3(a)(2),(c)*

Commission as required, on Department's recommendation, to suspend registration of private carrier that has failed to maintain its vehicles in safe condition, if failure is either consistent or presents imminent danger to public safety, or if carrier has failed to enroll its drivers in pull notice system. *Veh. Code § 34505.7*

[4] Speed Limits

Driving at unsafe speed prohibited. *Veh. Code § 22350*

Prima facie speed limits for all vehicles. *Veh. Code § 22352*

Speed limits for trucks and towing vehicles. *Veh. Code § 22406*

[5] Towing Equipment

Towing Equipment. *Veh. Code §§ 29000-29008*

Coupling Requirements. *Veh. Code §§ 29003-29006*

Requirement that towing arrangement be secure and structurally adequate. *Veh. Code § 29003*

Safety chain requirement. *Veh. Code § 29004*

Requirements for coupling when towing motor vehicle. *Veh. Code § 29006*

[6] Towing of Parked Vehicle by Law Enforcement Officers

Vehicle illegally parked in disabled persons' space. *Veh. Code §§ 22511.8, 22652*

Vehicle illegally or hazardously parked. *Veh. Code §§ 22651, 22654*

Vehicle in which alarm device activated. *Veh. Code § 22651.5*

Vehicle on private property and that was stolen, embezzled, or involved in accident. *Veh. Code § 22653*

Vehicle involved in hit-and-run accident. *Veh. Code § 22655*

Vehicle located in railroad right-of-way. *Veh. Code § 22656*

Vehicle wrongfully parked on state property. *Veh. Code § 22659*

Abandoned vehicle. *Veh. Code § 22669*

[7] Towing of Parked Vehicle by Private Property Owner

Vehicle wrongfully parked in disabled persons' space. *Veh. Code §§ 22511.8, 22652.5*

Vehicle wrongfully parked on private property. *Veh. Code §§ 22658, 22953*

[8] Towing of Parked Vehicle Off Another's Private Property

Notification requirements; criminal penalties for noncompliance. *Veh. Code § 22658.1*

[9] Towing Trailer

Towing trailer that swerves out of normal path as prohibited. *Veh. Code § 21711*

[10] Transportation Services

Discrimination prohibited in transportation services contract. Pub. Util. Code § 3542

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesTraffic RegulationTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral Overview

143 of 154 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.32

§ 553.32 Federal Regulations

General federal motor carrier regulations. *49 C.F.R. §§ 301-325*

Safety regulations for federal motor carriers. 49 C.F.R. §§ 350-399

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesMotor CarriersTransportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

144 of 154 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.33

§ 553.33 Administrative Regulations

Loading regulations. *13 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1300-1425*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local RegulationTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.34

§ 553.34 Decisions

[1] Crossing Opposing Traffic

Left turn by slow moving vehicle in face of oncoming traffic is one of most hazardous of all traffic maneuvers; slow acceleration of tractor-trailer is major factor in determining if oncoming vehicles were so close as to constitute hazard. *Gigliotti v. Nunes (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 85, 92, 286 P.2d 809*

[2] Excessive Speed

Exceptional difficulty in braking truck is factor for trier of fact to consider in determining whether truck driver was traveling at speed which endangered life or property. *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470*

Trucks are subject to law that no person may drive motor vehicle on highway at speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for relevantconditions, and in no event at speed which endangers safety of persons or property. *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 216 P.2d 470*

Violation of speed limit for trucks set out in *Veh. Code § 22406* is negligence per se. *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 752, 216 P.2d 470* ; *Wood v. Moore (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 144, 149, 148 P.2d 91*

Driving in excess of specific prima facie speed limits set out in *Veh. Code § 22352* is not negligence per se. *Wood v. Moore (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 144, 149, 148 P.2d 91*

[3] Expert Testimony

Expert witnesses is properly used to aid jury in determining from circumstantial evidence how defendant's trailer was

positioned at time of accident. *Wells Truckways v. Cebrian (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 666, 676, 265 P.2d 557*

[4] Injuries Suffered by Riders

Whether or not truck driver was negligent in relation to death of small boy who was riding in open truck, when driver knew of habit of boys to play and climb on sides of truck and drove through area creating hazard for one who did such climbing and playing, is question for jury. *Christiana v. Rattaro (1947) 81 Cal. App. 2d 597, 599, 184 P.2d 682*

[5] "Jack-Knifing" of Trailer

Jury properly exonerates tractor-trailer driver liability for jack-knifing if it finds that jack-knifing was not caused by driver's negligence, but by driver turning abruptly to avoid hitting another improperly located vehicle. *Sims v. Phillips (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 793, 797, 331 P.2d 174* (reversing judgment for defendant on unrelated grounds)

Driver who failed to stop or swerve tractor trailer to avoid hitting another vehicle few seconds before colliding with it did not having last clear chance to prevent collision, because of danger of jack-knifing or overturning from sudden stop or swerve. *Hickambottom v. Cooper Transp. Co. (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 489, 492, 329 P.2d 609*

Truck driver was liable for jack-knifing of tractor trailer resulting from excessive speed when driver was forced to brake. *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 754, 216 P.2d 470*

[6] Liability Policies

Pub. Util. Code § 3651, requiring regulated highway carriers to provide liability protection for personal injuries and property damage, was enacted to protect public against reckless operation of vehicles by financially irresponsible owners and to provide means of recovery for those injured in their person or property by such operation, and does not require vehicle liability policies to cover work-related injuries sustained by vehicle owner's employees. *Chong v. Fremont Indem. Co. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1097, 1101-1102, 249 Cal. Rptr. 264*

[7] Loading and Unloading

Method of loading selected, materials used, and directions given to plaintiff who was helping load truck by defendant who planned and supervised loading of truck are factors to be considered in determining negligence. *Williams v. Field Transp. Co. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 696, 699, 171 P.2d 722*

When plaintiff, who was familiar with unloading procedures, climbed on truck at invitation of defendant employee of packing plant that was receiving shipment and without knowledge of defendant truck driver or defendant truck owner, and was injured when truck driver loosened ropes to begin unloading, jury verdict in favor of defendants was upheld. *Squillante v. Barr (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 175, 177-179, 280 P.2d 216*

Lumber company that hired independent contractor to haul lumber was liable for damages caused by accident on highway resulting from negligent loading of cargo on contractor's truck by contractor's employees, when lumber company employees knew or should have known of faulty loading equipment and techniques. *Risley v. Lenwell (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 608, 625, 277 P.2d 897*

When defendant employee of defendant buyers of large steel girder was experienced rigger and directed unloading of girder with crane and sling in negligent manner, defendants were liable to volunteer who was riding with truck driver

and lacked knowledge of dangers involved in unloading girder, when volunteer was injured while helping to unload girder. *Church v. Headrick & Brown (1951) 101 Cal. App. 2d 396, 401, 408, 410, 225 P.2d 558*

Owner of loading premises was liable for negligence of its employees in failing to remedy nonobvious dangerous condition caused by loading truck that employees observed to develop during loading. *Lunsford v. Standard Oil Co. (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 459, 467-468, 191 P.2d 82* (fumes from gas being loaded on truck together with preexisting fumes on premises reached furnace and exploded)

Negligence of fellow unloading employee in dropping heavy object over side of truck without proper look-out established liability for injuries caused by dropped object. *Foster v. Pestana (1947) 77 Cal. App. 2d 885, 888-889, 177 P.2d 54*

Plaintiff employee of company receiving cargo who enters truck to unload it is invitee; truck owner was liable for plaintiff's injuries caused by falling cargo when truck driver was experienced as compared to plaintiff, was in charge of unloading, and parked truck at angle so as to create dangerous condition. *Lamar v. John & Wade, Inc. (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 806, 809, 161 P.2d 970*

Evidence of custom at loading place to warn persons around truck before moving it is admissible to counter charges that plaintiff was contributorily negligent in assuming position which could become dangerous if parked truck moved. *Scott v. Gallot (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 421, 425-426, 138 P.2d 685*

Person moving vehicle in loading place without giving sufficient warning or maintaining proper look-out for persons in vicinity of vehicle is liable for injuries caused by truck's movement. *Burke v. John E. Marshall, Inc. (1940) 42 Cal. App. 2d 195, 200-201, 108 P.2d 738*

[8] Negligence

Negligence may be properly alleged in general terms; allegation that act was negligently done without stating particular omission which rendered it negligent is sufficient. *Brooks v. E.J. Willig Truck Transp. Co. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 669, 680, 255 P.2d 802*

[9] Standard of Care in General

Driver's general duty to operate vehicle safely under existing conditions creates special responsibilities under special conditions created by operation of heavy truck with cumbersome and dangerous braking mechanism. *Fortier Transp. Co. v. Union Packing Co. (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753-754, 216 P.2d 470*

[10] Trailer Owner's Liability

Negligence of tractor owner or driver is imputable to trailer owner only if tractor owner was acting as agent or employee of trailer owner, with control or right to control over activities of tractor owner; control is not inferable from mere fact that trip was undertaken for trailer owner's benefit or that trailer owner selected destination. *Flores v. Brown (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 622, 628-629, 248 P.2d 922*

[11] Towing

Improper coupling without safety chain, in violation of former Veh. Code § 701 (*now see Veh. Code § 29004*)

(coupling requirements for towed vehicles), is basis of liability if towed vehicle breaks loose. *Lehmuth v. Long Beach Unified Sch. District (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 544, 552-553, 2 Cal. Rptr. 279, 348 P.2d 887*

To extent *Veh. Code § 22658* governs charges for nonconsensual vehicle towing and subsequent storage fees, enforcement of statute is not preempted by Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994, *49 U.S.C.S. § 14501(c)*. *CPF Agency Corp. v. Sevel's 24 Hour Towing Serv. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 1034, 1052-1053, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 120* ; *CPF Agency Corp. v. R&S Towing (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 1014, 1030-1032, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 106*

Enforcement of *Veh. Code § 22658*, regulating removal of vehicles from private property by towing services, is not preempted by Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994. *People ex rel. Renne v. Servantes (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1088-1092, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 870* ; *see 49 U.S.C.S. § 14501(c)*

Enforcement of *Veh. Code § 22658*, regulating removal of vehicles from private property by towing services, is not preempted by Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994. *People ex rel. Renne v. Servantes (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 1081, 1088-1092, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 870* ; *see 49 U.S.C.S. § 14501(c)*

Highway Patrol has no duty, absent existence of special relationship, to remove stranded automobile from highway; driver of truck on highway is unable to cross-complain against state in tort action resulting from truck's collision with motorhome parked to aid stranded automobile. *Bonds v. State of California ex rel. Cal. Highway Patrol (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 314, 187 Cal. Rptr. 792*

Towing one vehicle by means of another is not negligence per se, but towing must be done with due consideration for safety of others. *Weddle v. Loges (1971) 52 Cal. App. 2d 115, 124, 125 P.2d 914*

Person, including one in business of renting trailers, who mounts or attaches trailer to insufficiently reinforced or braced frame contrary to standards of former Veh. Code § 701(d) (*now see Veh. Code § 29003(a)*) is negligent. *Douglass v. Webb (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 290, 294-295, 304-305, 26 Cal. Rptr. 60*

Evidence establishing that defendant caused his heavier car to be towed by a lighter one over a winding, hilly road, choose the manner in which he tied the cars together, let his car coast in neutral, and continued that manner of towing even though his car rested against the towing car on every downgrade, and at fatal moment turned wheels to separate the cars was sufficient to support finding of negligence. *Barnett v. Garrison (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 553, 556, 209 P.2d 426*

Owner of trailer was negligent with respect to driver of truck that was towing it when nonoriginal brakes on trailer were inadequate to control it. *Hupp v. Griffith Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 63, 66, 67, 15 P.2d 211*

[12] Whipping or Swerving of Trailer

Tractor trailer driver was properly exonerated from liability when swerving of trailer was caused by sudden turn to avoid collision with another object. *Patterson v. Delta Lines, Inc. (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 160, 161-162, 304 P.2d 842*

Violation of former Veh. Code § 701(e) (*now see Veh. Code § 21711*), prohibiting towing of trailer that swerves out of normal path, as basis of liability for resulting damages. *Risley v. Lenwell (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 608, 637-638, 277 P.2d 897*

Tractor trailer driver may be liable for damage caused by swerving of trailer due to excessive speed under circumstances. *Wells Truckways v. Cebrian (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 666, 670, 680, 265 P.2d 557* (rainy weather

while moving down hill on unbanked curve)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsTransportation TortsMotor VehiclesGeneral OverviewTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesTraffic RegulationTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesSafety StandardsGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.35

§ 553.35 Attorney General Opinions

Trailer coach coming within statutory definition of semitrailer may have same length as that prescribed for semitrailers under former Veh. Code § 697(b) (*now see Veh. Code § 35400*). *26 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 134 (1955)*

Implements of husbandry being incidentally towed over highway by pick-up truck are exempt from overall height and weight limits for combination vehicles. *26 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 224 (1955)*

Tractor-trailers and other specified special equipment are not exempt form maximum width regulations set out in *Veh. Code § 35100* when suchvehicles are transported as loads on other vehicles. *28 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 272 (1956)*

County speed ordinance that is not in direct conflict with state maximum speed law applies to all vehicles without exception. *29 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 20 (1957)*

County has authority to set speed limits applicable to all vehicles on roads under its jurisdiction; but not authority to set reduced speed limits for trucks only. *35 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 29 (1960)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawCarrier Duties & LiabilitiesState & Local RegulationTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesMaintenance & SafetyTransportation LawCommercial VehiclesTraffic Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.36

§ 553.36 Law Reviews

Review of Selected 1983 California Legislation, *Transportation and Motor Vehicles; search and removal of vehicles, 15 Pac. L.J. 704 (1984)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Transportation LawCommercial VehiclesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 553.37-553.49

[Reserved]

§§ 553.37[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART IV. FORMS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.50

§ 553.50 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner and Driver of Truck or Towing Vehicle

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner and Driver of Truck or Towing Vehicle

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	(Negligence)
through _____,] Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name of driver*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ [*city and/or county*], California.

[*ADD, if defendant driver is not also the owner*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name of owner*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ [corporation *or* partnership *or* unincorporated association][, doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)], with its _____ [principal place of *or* partners doing] business in _____ [*city and/or county*], California.

[3. Defendants _____ (*names of partners*) are, and at all times herein mentioned were, members of defendant _____ (partnership *or* unincorporated association) and are and at all times herein mentioned were, residents of _____ (*city and/or county*), California.]

4. Defendant _____ [*name of driver*] was at all times herein mentioned an agent and employee of defendant(s) _____ [*name of owner and any individual partners*] and was acting within the scope of his/her authority as defendant _____'s [*name of owner and any individual partners*] agent and employee and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendant(s).

[*CONTINUE*]

[5. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____ (*numeral, e.g.,* 15), inclusive, and thereforesues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when these are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the above mentioned fictitiously names defendants is responsible in some manner, whether by direct negligence or by imputation, for the occurence and resulting injuries herein alleged.]

[6. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned defendants DOE 1 through DOE _____ (*number, e.g.,* 10) were the agents and employees of each of their codefendants, and in doing the things herein alleged, were acting within the course and scope of their authority as the codefendants' agents and employees and with the permission and consent of their codefendants.]

7. Defendant _____ [*name of owner*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of a certain _____ [*year, make, and model of vehicle*] _____ [*describe vehicle, e.g.,* tractor unit], referred to herein as _____ [*describe vehicle briefly, e.g.,* tractor unit].

8. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [a]t the time of the accident described below, defendant _____ [*name of driver*] was driving and operating the _____ [*describe defendant's vehicle, e.g.,* tractor unit] [in combination with a _____ (*describe towed vehicle, e.g.,* trailer) which was being pulled by the _____ (*describe defendant's vehicle, e.g.,* tractor unit)] [*add, if the driver and owner are not the same,* with the knowledge, permission, and consent of defendant _____ (*name of owner)*].

9. On _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time of accident*], plaintiff was _____ [*specify situation and conduct of plaintiff, e.g.,* operating his/her motor vehicle in a generally southerly direction along the right lane of _____ Street (at or near its intersection with _____ Street) in _____ (*city, if any, and county*)]. At the same time, defendant _____ [*name of driver*] was driving the _____ [defendant's vehicle *or* vehicle combination described above] in a generally _____ [*specify, e.g.,* northerly] direction along _____ [*describe location, e.g.,* _____ Street (at or near its intersection with _____ Street)].

10. At that time and place defendant[s, and each of them,] so negligently entrusted, [loaded,] managed, maintained, drove, and operated the _____ [defendant's vehicle *or* vehicle combination described above], as to proximately cause _____ [*describe accident, e.g.,* the trailer of the vehicle combination described above to swerve to the left out of its normal path as it was passing plaintiff's vehicle and enter the lane in which plaintiff was properly driving, striking plaintiff's vehicle] and causing plaintiff the damages and injuries as described below.

11. As a proximate result of the negligence of the defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person. All of these injuries have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plaintiff is informed and believed and thereon alleges that these injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of these injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages.

12. As a further proximate result of the negligence the defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff has been compelled to incur and has incurred [and will continue to be compelled to incur] expenses for physicians and surgeons, hospital care, and other medical services and supplies.

[13. As a further proximate result of the negligence of the defendant(s, and each of them), _____ (*allege any additional special damages, e.g.,* plaintiff was prevented from attending to his/her usual occupation as a _____ (*state occupation*) for _____ (*specify amount of time away from work*)) and thereby lost earnings.]

[14. As a further proximate result of the negligence of the defendant[s, and each of them], plaintiff's _____ (*describe personal property, e.g.,* automobile) was destroyed. (On _____ (*date of accident*), this _____ (*describe personal property, e.g.,* automobile) had a fair and reasonable market value of $_____; plaintiff was therefore damaged in the sum of $_____.)]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For general damages according to proof;

2. For medical and related expenses according to proof;

[3. For _____ (*specify any additional special damages, e.g.,* loss of earnings) according to proof;]

[4. For damage to personal property (in the sum of $_____);]

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to bring an action for personal injuries and property damage against the driver and owner of a truck for damages sustained by the plaintiff in an accident caused by the driver or owner of the truck or both.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The residence and capacity of the defendant driver (Paragraph 1).
- The identity of the owner of the truck involved in the accident (Paragraph 7).
- Facts establishing that defendant driver owed a duty of exercising reasonable care towards plaintiff at the time of the accident (Paragraphs 8, 9).
- Defendants' breach of duty toward plaintiff, including an optional allegation that defendants' negligent loading of cargo caused an accident on the highway (Paragraph 10) [*see Risley v. Lenwell (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 608, 616-620, 277 P.2d 897* (liability of lumber company that hired independent contractor, independant contractor who owned truck, truck owner's employee who hired driver, and driver, for accident caused by negligent loading of cargo)].
- A description of personal injury suffered by plaintiff as a proximate result of defendant's negligence (Paragraph 11).
- Grounds for compensatory damages for medical expenses incurred by plaintiff (Paragraph 12).
- Grounds for compensatory damages for loss of wages incurred by plaintiff (Paragraph 13).
- An optional allegation for use if plaintiff also suffered property damages (Paragraph 14).

The form also includes the following options:

- Optional allegations for use when the defendant driver is not the owner of the truck that was involved in the accident to allege the capacity of the truck owners and relationship of the defendants (Paragraphs 2-4).
- Optional paragraphs alleging fictitious defendants sued pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* (Paragraph 5) and that the fictitious defendants are employees and agents of the other defendants (Paragraph 6).

[4] Specifying Amount of Damages

In an action to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual

or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages for anything other than personal injury or wrongful death (for example, property damage) must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*], *see* Ch. 177, *Damages* , and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion *see* Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For discussion and forms relating to motor vehicle collisions generally, see Ch. 80, *Automobiles: Overview* to Ch. 87A, *Automobiles: Post Trial*

For discussion and forms relating to insurance, see Ch. 88, *Automobiles: Automobile Insurance* , Ch. 88A, *Automobiles: Uninsured Motorist Claims* , and Ch. 308, *Insurance*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion of and forms relating to actions based on respondeat superior, see Ch. 248, *Employer's Liability for Employee's Torts*

For discussion and forms relating to negligence actions generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART IV. FORMS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.51

§ 553.51 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Driver of Towing Vehicle Against Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle--Accident Resulting From Negligence of Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--By Driver of Towing Vehicle Against Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle--Accident Resulting From Negligence of Owner or Driver of Towed Vehicle

[*Caption. See § 553.50[1].*]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name of owner of towed vehicle*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business located at _____ (*street address and if any, city*), _____ County, California].

[2. Defendant(s) _____ (*names of any employee defendants*) is/are, and at all times herein mentioned was/were, residents of _____ County, California, and was/were at all times herein mentioned employees and agents of _____ (*name of defendant owner*), and was/were acting within the scope of his/her/their authority as defendant _____'s (*name of defendant owner*) agent(s) and employee(s) and with the permission and consent of _____ (*name of defendant owner*).]

[3. *Fictitious defendant allegation. See § 553.50, Paragraph 5.*]

[4. *Agency allegation relating to fictitious defendants. See § 553.50, Paragraph 6.*]

5. Defendant _____ [*name of defendant owner*] is the owner of a certain _____

[trailer *or* semitrailer *or specify other vehicle*], hereinafter referred to as the "towed vehicle," [and is engaged in the business of renting such vehicles to the general public, to be towed by a motor vehicle provided and driven by the renter].

6. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ (*name*) was the _____ [owner and driver of a certain _____ (*identify towing vehicle*) *or* driver of a certain _____ (*identify towing vehicle*) owned by plaintiff _____ (*name*)].

[*EITHER*]

7. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff rented and hired from defendant _____ [*name of owner*], acting by and through his/her/its agents and employees, defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*], a certain _____ [*make or model, e.g.,* four-wheel] trailer bearing California trailer license number _____ and paid defendants the specified rental fee for the trailer of $_____. As part of the rental arrangement, defendant _____ [*name of defendant who coupled the vehicles*], attached the rented trailer to plaintiff's above-described vehicle.

[*OR*]

7. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe circumstances resulting in plaintiff towing defendant's vehicle, e.g.,* plaintiff, at defendant's request, drove his/her above-described vehicle to _____ (*specify location*), where defendant's car was disabled, to render assistance to defendant. After defendant tied the vehicles together with a rope, plaintiff proceeded to tow defendant's car to _____ (*specify destination*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

8. On _____ [*date*], at or about _____ [*time of accident*], plaintiff was operating _____ [*identify plaintiff's vehicle*], attached to the defendant's _____ [trailer *or* semitrailer *or identify other vehicle*], with the consent and permission of defendant, in a generally _____ [*specify direction*] along _____ [*describe location, e.g.,* Street at or near its intersection with _____ Street], in _____ County, California.

9. At that time and place defendant[s, and each of them], so negligently managed, maintained, [drove,] and attached the _____ [*describe towed vehicle, e.g.,* trailer] to plaintiff's vehicle, as to proximately cause _____ [*describe accident, e.g.,* the trailer to jack-knife and slide out of control], with resulting damages and injuries to plaintiff, as described below].

10. [*General damages. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 11.*]

11. [*Special damages for medical expenses. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 12.*]

[12. *Additional special damages. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 13.*]

[13. *Property damage. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 14.*]

[*Prayer. See § 553.50[1].*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 553.50[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by the driver of a vehicle that was towing another vehicle against the owner or driver of the towed vehicle for damages caused by the negligence of the owner or driver of the towed vehicle when the accident was proximately caused by the defendant's negligent maintenance of the towed vehicle or negligence in attaching the towed and towing vehicles to one another.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The capacity and residence of defendants (Paragraphs 1 and 2).
- Either rental of the towed vehicle by defendant to plaintiff or defendant's arrangement to have plaintiff tow defendant's vehicle (Paragraph 7).
- Defendant's ownership of towed vehicle (Paragraph 5).
- Plaintiff's driving of towing vehicle at time of accident (Paragraph 8).
- The occurrence of the accident as the proximate result of defendants' negligence (Paragraph 9) [*see Hupp v. Griffith Co. (1932) 127 Cal. App. 63, 67, 15 P.2d 211]* .

The form also includes an optional paragraph for use to allege plaintiff's ownership of the towing vehicle if the plaintiff is suing for damages to it (Paragraph 6).

[4] Cross References

For discussion and cross references relating to complaints generally, see *§ 553.50[2] et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART IV. FORMS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 553.52-553.59

[Reserved]

§§ 553.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART IV. FORMS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.60

§ 553.60 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner of Truck and/or Loading Facilities--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Personal Injury and Property Damage [Civ. Code §§ 1714(a), 2100]--Against Owner of Truck and/or Loading Facilities--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck

[*Caption. See § 553.50[1].*]

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. Defendant _____ [*name of truck driver or other individual involved in loading or unloading operation*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ County, California.

[*AND/OR*]

[2. *Capacity and location of person or entity owning truck and residence and capacity of partners or members, if any, of entity owning truck. See § 553.50[1], Paragraphs 2-3.*]

[3. *Ownership of truck by defendant truck owner. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 7.*]

[4. *Status of truck driver as employee of truck owner. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 4.*]

[*AND/OR*]

[5. Defendant _____ (*name of owner of loading premises*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a _____ (corporation *or* partnership *or* unincorporated association)(, doing business as _____ (*fictitious name*)), with its _____ (principal place of *or* partners doing) business in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California.]

[6. Defendants _____ (*names*) are, and at all times herein mentioned were, members of defendant _____ (partnership *or* unincorporated association) and are and at all times herein mentioned were, residents of _____ County, California.]

7. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of _____ [*describe premises on which truck was being loaded or unloaded*] located in _____ [*city, if any, and county*], California.

[8. Defendant _____ (*name of individual involved in loading or unloading operation*) was at all times herein mentioned an agent and employee of defendant(s) _____ (*name of owner loading premises and any individual partners*) and was acting within the scope of his/her authority as defendant _____'s [*name of owner and any individual partners*] agent and employee and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendant(s).]

[*CONTINUE*]

[9. *Fictitious defendant allegations. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 5.*]

[10. *Agency allegation relating to fictitious defendants. See § 553.50[1], Paragraph 6.*]

11. On _____ [*date*], _____ [the above-mentioned *or* a certain _____ (*year, make, and model*)] truck was parked on _____ [the above-described premises belonging to defendant _____ (*name of loading premises owner*) *or describe location at which truck was parked*] for purposes of _____ [loading *or* unloading] a cargo that consisted of _____ [*specify cargo, e.g.,* lengths of pipe]. At about _____ [*specify time*] plaintiff was _____ [on *or* near] the above-described truck and was _____ [*specify plaintiff's activity, e.g.,* helping to unload it], [in the course and scope of his/her employment by _____ (*specify plaintiff's employer*) and] was acting with the knowledge and permission of defendant[s, and each of them].

[*EITHER*]

12. The _____ [loading *or* unloading] operation described above was directed by defendant _____ [*name*], who was at all times herein mentioned an employee of _____ [*specify truck owner or owner of loading premises*].

[*AND/OR*]

13. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s) of individual(s) participating in loading or unloading*] participated in the _____ [loading *or* unloading] operation described above, and were at all times herein mentioned employees of _____ [*specify truck owner or owner of loading premises*].

[*CONTINUE*]

14. The loading operation was so negligently entrusted, planned, managed, and carried out by defendant[s, and each of them] as to proximately cause _____ [*describe accident, e.g.*, one length of pipe to roll from the truck and strike plaintiff], causing plaintiff damages and injuries as described below.

[15. *Damages suffered by plaintiff as a result of the accident. See § 553.50[1], Paragraphs 12-15.*]

[*Prayer. See § 553.50[1].*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 553.50[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a person injured while a truck is being loaded or unloaded to bring an action for damages against the owner of the truck, the owner of the premises on which the loading or unloading was taking place, or both [*see Williams v. Field Transp. Co. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 696, 697, 699, 171 P.2d 722]* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- Location of the truck for purposes of being loaded or unloaded (Paragraph 11).

- Plaintiff's activities, engaged in with the knowledge and permission of all relevant defendants, in the vicinity of the truck (Paragraph 11) [*see Squillante v. Barr (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 175, 178-179, 280 P.2d 216]* .

- Responsibility of individuals and their employers for planning and carrying out the loading operation (Paragraphs 12, 13).

- The improper carrying out of the loading operation by defendants (Paragraph 14) [*see Williams v. Field Transp. Co. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 696, 699, 171 P.2d 722]* .

[4] Cross References

For discussion and cross references relating to complaints generally, see *§ 553.50[2] et seq.*

For discussion of and forms relating to actions based on work done on vehicles in garages, see Ch. 274, *Garages and Gas Stations*

For discussion of and forms relating to premises liability, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 553 TRUCKS
PART IV. FORMS

48-553 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 553.61

§ 553.61 Allegation--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck--Defendant Moved Truck Without Look-Out or Warning

[1] FORM Allegation--Accident While Loading or Unloading Truck--Defendant Moved Truck Without Look-Out or Warning

12. On _____ [*date*], _____ [the above-mentioned *or* a certain _____ (*year, make, and model*)] truck was parked in _____ [the above-described premises belonging to defendant _____ (*name of loading premises owner*) *or describe location at which truck was parked*] for purposes of _____ [loading *or* unloading] cargo. At or about _____ [*time*], plaintiff was _____ [*describe plaintiff's situation of hazard in relation to truck, e.g.,* working next to defendant's truck with his/her leg protruding into the path of the truck's tire].

13. At that time and place defendant[s, and each of them], so negligently entrusted, managed, maintained, drove, and operated the _____ [defendant's vehicle *or* vehicle combination described above], as to proximately cause _____ [*describe accident, e.g.,* to hit and run over plaintiff, causing plaintiff damages and injuries as described below.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegations is for use in a complaint for damages for personal injuries sustained while a truck is being loaded or unloaded. The allegations should be inserted in place of Paragraphs 12-14 in the form in *§ 553.60[1],* to state a cause of action for negligently moving the vehicle without warning of the impending movement when others are known to be in the vicinity of the vehicle [*see Scott v. Gallot (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 421, 422-423, 427-428, 138 P.2d 685]* . The remaining Paragraphs of that form should be renumbered accordingly.

[3] Allegations

The allegations set forth:

- The plaintiff's situation of hazard in relation to the truck.

- The negligent entrusting, managing, maintaining, driving, and operating of the defendant's vehicle as to proximately cause the accident.

[4] Cross References

For discussion and cross references relating to complaints generally, see *§ 553.50[2]* et seq.

154 of 154 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 554 RESERVED

48-554 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 554

RESERVED

Chapter 554RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 555.syn

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.syn Synopsis to Chapter 555: TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES

§ 555.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 555.02 Cross References

§§ 555.03-555.09 [Reserved]

§ 555.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

[2] Foreclosure

[3] Collection of Rents and Profits

[4] Injury to Security

§ 555.11 Terminology Used in This Chapter

§ 555.12 Mortgage and Trust Deed Compared

[1] Mortgage

[a] Lien of Mortgage

[b] Equitable Mortgage Distinguished

[c] Parties and Form

[2] Trust Deed

[a] Conveyance of Title to Secure Debt

[b] Distinction From Mortgage Lien

[c] Functional Similarity to Mortgage Lien

[d] Elements

[i] Formalities

[ii] Standard Provisions

[iii] Status of Trustee

§ 555.13 Property Interest Encumbered

[1] Nature of Interest

[2] After-Acquired or Reacquired Title

[3] Fixtures and Personal Property

[4] Transfer of Encumbered Property

[a] In General

[b] Manner and Effect of Assumption

[5] Insurance of Encumbered Property

§ 555.14 Obligation Secured

[1] Necessity for and Nature of Obligation

[2] Usurious Loan

[3] Loan Secured by Dragnet or Future Advance Clause

[a] In General

[b] Pre-existing or Concurrent Debts

[c] Subsequent Loan or Future Advance

[4] Statutory Regulation of Loans

§ 555.15 Modification of Agreement

[1] Assignment of Debt

[a] In General

[b] Position of Assignee

[c] Recordation of Assignment

[2] Extension or Renewal

[a] In General

[b] Effect on Third Party Interests

[3] Acceleration on Default

[a] In General

[b] Manner and Effect of Election to Accelerate

[c] Waiver of Right to Accelerate

[4] Acceleration on Sale or Encumbrance

[a] In General

[b] Enforcement Under Federal Law

[i] Garn Act

[ii] Application to Due-on-Encumbrance Clauses

[iii] Effect of Waiver or Estoppel

[iv] Window Period Limitation

[c] State Law

[i] Statutes

[ii] Decisions

[5] Substitution of Trustee

§ 555.16 Priorities of Liens

[1] General Rules

[a] Priority Determined By Time of Creation

[b] Legal Lien Has Priority Over Equitable Lien

[2] Effect of Recording Laws

[3] Statutory Exceptions

[4] Subordination Agreements

[a] In General

[b] Enforceability

[c] Statutory Regulation

§ 555.17 Notice of Transfer of Servicing of Secured Debt

§ 555.18 Extinction or Expiration of Security

[1] Performance or Discharge of Obligation

[2] Illegality

[3] Merger of Interests

[4] Lapse of Time

[a] Effect of Statute of Limitations

[b] Expiration of Ancient Trust Deeds

[5] Foreclosure of Senior Lien

§ 555.19 Discharge of Obligation

[1] Clearing Title of Record

[2] Reconveyance of Title

[a] Trustee's Duty

[b] Beneficiary's Duty

[c] Release by Title Insurance Company

[3] Mortgagee's Duty to Record Certificate of Discharge

[4] Fee for Performing Duty

[5] Breach of Duty

[a] Damages and Penalty

[b] Other Relief

[6] Special Rules Concerning Application of Provisions

[a] Costs and Actual Damages

[b] Fees and Recording

§ 555.20 Reconveyance After Posting Bond

[1] In General

[2] Reconveyance or Discharge

§ 555.21 California Residential Mortgage Lending Act

[1] License Requirements

[2] Licensee's Financial Condition and Loan Transactions

[3] Additional Statutory Requirements

[4] Violations of Act

§ 555.21A Regulation of Certain Secured Consumer Loans

[1] Loans and Real Property Covered

[2] Prohibited Acts and Limitations for Covered Loans

[a] Prepayment Fee or Penalty

[b] Permissible Payment Schedules

[c] Prohibited Terms and Provisions

[3] Lender's Reasonable Belief in Recipient's Ability to Repay Loan

[4] Other Limitations on Lender and Loans

[5] Required Disclosure Statement

[6] Enforcement and Penalties for Violations of Law

[7] Preemption of Local Regulation

§ 552.21B Temporary Payment Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

[1] Eligibility for Deferment of Payments

[2] Procedure to Obtain Deferment

[3] Relief During Deferment Period

[4] Limitations on Relief

[5] Effect on Holder in Due Course

[6] No Adverse Effect on Creditworthiness

[7] Continuation of Credit Disability Insurance

§ 555.21C Restrictions on Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans

[1] Overview

[2] Lenders Making Higher-Priced Loans

[3] Lenders Acting as Mortgage Brokers

§ 555.21D Mortgage Brokers as Fiduciaries

§ 555.22 Deed Absolute As Mortgage

[1] When Given As Security

[2] Effect of Establishing Deed Absolute As Mortgage

[3] Action to Establish Deed Absolute As Mortgage

[a] By Grantor

[b] By Grantee

[c] Proof

[4] Equitable Mortgage Compared

§ 555.23 Equitable Mortgage

[1] Written Agreement Showing Intent

[2] Other Equitable Liens Compared

[3] Action to Establish Equitable Mortgage

[a] Foreclosure

[b] Proof of Intent

§§ 555.24-555.29 [Reserved]

§ 555.30 Foreclosure

[1] Private Sale or Foreclosure Action

[2] Methods Compared

[3] Right to Foreclose Is Triggered by Default

[4] Deed in Lieu of Foreclosure

[5] Foreclosure on Real Property Sales Contracts

§ 555.31 Effect of One-Form-of-Action Rule

[1] In General

[2] Waiver of Protection

[3] Action on Debt

[a] Barred Until Security Exhausted

[i] Operation of Rule

[ii] Pursuit of Attachment Not an Action

[iii] Exception for Fraud Action

[b] When Security Is Rendered Worthless

[i] Action on Debt Permitted; Sold-Out Junior Lienholder as Creditor

[ii] Other Types of Creditors

[4] All Interests to Be Foreclosed in Single Action

[5] Enforceability of Letters of Credit

[6] Effect of Setoff

[a] Creditor's Improper Setoff

[b] Equitable Setoff

§ 555.32 Effect of Antideficiency Statutes

[1] Bar or Limitation on Personal Judgment

[a] Applicability

[b] Waiver

[i] Advance Waiver

[ii] Subsequent Waiver

[c] Rent Skimming

[2] Private Sale

[a] Deficiency Judgment Generally Barred

[i] Single Security Instrument and Note

[ii] More Than One Security Instrument or Note

[iii] Related Obligations

[iv] Successive Loans By Lender

[b] Allowable Deficiency Judgments

[c] Fair-Value Limitation

[3] Foreclosure Action

[a] Fair-Value Limitation

[b] Purchase-Money Trust Deed

[i] Deficiency Judgment Generally Barred

[ii] When Deficiency Judgment May Be Recovered

[iii] Standard Purchase Money Transactions

[iv] Variations on Standard Transactions

[4] Junior Lienholders

[5] Guarantors

[a] Not Protected From Deficiency Judgment

[b] Estoppel of Creditor After Nonjudicial Sale

[i] Basis for Defense

[ii] Unavailability of Defense

[iii] Post-1996 Waiver of Defense

[iv] Pre-1997 Waiver of Defense

[6] Transactions Involving Letters of Credit

[a] Exemption From Antideficiency Statutes

[b] Legislative Intent Behind Exemption

[7] Actions Not Seeking Deficiency

[a] In General

[b] Statutory Exemption

§ 555.33 Effect of Federal Legislation

[1] Federally Guaranteed or Insured Loans

[2] Trustor in Active Military Service

[3] Bankruptcy

§ 555.34 Notice of Delinquency

[1] Junior Lienholder's Request

[2] Effect of Proper Request

[a] Period of Effectiveness; Successors in Interest

[b] Requirements Governing Notice

[c] Discharge of Junior Obligation

[3] Liability for Failure to Give Notice

§ 555.35 Beneficiaries' Agreement to Be Governed by Majority Beneficiary

[1] Agreement and Disclosure

[2] Majority Action Affidavit

§ 555.36 Regulation of Foreclosure Consultants and Home Equity Purchasers

§§ 555.37-555.49 [Reserved]

§ 555.50 Validity and Regulation

§ 555.51 Preliminary Steps

§ 555.51A Foreclosure Protection

[1] Foreclosure Crisis

[2] Contacting Borrowers

[3] Loan Modifications

[4] Notice of Foreclosure to Residents

[5] Maintenance of Vacated Property

[6] Notice to Quit

§ 555.52 Notice of Default

[1] Filing Notice for Record

[a] Filing Requirement; Exceptions

[b] Privileged Communications

[2] Request for Notice

[3] Mailing Copies of Notice

[a] To Trustor and Persons Requesting Notice

[b] To Other Persons

[i] Potential Recipients

[ii] Conditions Precedent

[4] Publication or Posting of Notice

[5] No Duty to Give Actual Notice

[6] Warning to Buyer Under Secured Retail Installment Contract

§ 555.53 Status of Secured Debt

[1] Duty to Provide Statement

[a] Request for Statement

[b] Delivery; Fee; Failure to Furnish

[2] Beneficiary Statement

[3] Payoff Demand Statement

[4] Short-Sale Transactions

§ 555.54 Reinstatement of Accelerated Obligation

[1] Power to Reinstate: Extent and Exercise

[a] Power to Effect Reinstatement

[i] Persons Entitled to Reinstate

[ii] Payment of Amount Due

[b] Reinstatement Periods

[c] Duty to Accept Payment

[d] Effect of Tendering Payment

[e] When Reinstatement Is Not Available

[f] Extraordinary Extension of Time

[2] Costs and Fees

[a] Statutory Limitations on Chargeable Costs

[b] Trustee's or Attorney's Fees

[3] Notice of Rescission of Default

§ 555.55 Equity of Redemption

[1] Right to Redeem

[2] Waiver

[3] Amount Payable for Redemption

§ 555.56 Notice of Sale

[1] In General

[a] Basic Notice Requirement

[b] Failure to Give Notice; Privileged Communications

[c] No Liability for Good Faith Error

[2] Notice Procedure

[a] Posting

[b] Publishing

[c] Recording

[3] Copies of Notice

[4] Special Notice for State and Federal Tax Liens

[a] State Tax Liens

[b] Federal Tax Liens

[c] Impact of Tax Liens on Duration of Process

§ 555.57 Conduct of Sale

[1] In General

[a] Trustee's Duty

[b] Time and Place of Sale

[2] Disclosure of Property Defects

[3] Multiple Parcels

[4] Postponement of Sale

[a] When Authorized

[b] New Notice of Sale and New Fees

[c] Notice By Public Declaration; Seven-Day Holding Period; Sale

[5] Bidding Requirements

[a] Irrevocable Offer; Cancellation

[b] Requirement for Cash or Financial Institution's Check

[i] Acceptable Forms

[ii] Special Handling Requirements; Finality of Sale

[c] Beneficiary's Full-Credit Bid

[d] High Bidder's Duty to Complete Sale

[e] Proscription of Collusive Bidding

[6] Completion of Sale

[a] When Sale is Complete

[b] Form and Delivery of Deed

[7] Notice of Rescission

§ 555.58 Expenses of Sale

§ 555.59 Application of Proceeds

§ 555.60 Notice of Sale Proceeds

[1] General Requirements

[2] Priority of Claims; Conflicting Claims

[a] Duty and Failure to Investigate; Payment in Absence of Dispute; Unclaimed Property Law

[b] Deposit With Court for Unresolved Claims

[c] Notice of Deposit

[d] Court Determination

[e] Interpleader Not Restricted

[3] Costs of Distribution

§ 555.61 Effect of Sale

§ 555.62 Purchaser's Title and Rights

[1] Title

[2] No Redemption Rights; Exception for IRS

[3] Right of Immediate Possession

[4] Acquisition and Subsequent Sale by Mortgagee or Trust Deed Beneficiary

§ 555.63 Challenging Private Sale

[1] Action to Enjoin Pending Sale

[2] Action to Set Aside Sale

[a] Equitable Action

[b] Grounds

[c] Balancing of Equities

[d] Effect of Recitals in Trustee's Deed

[3] Action for Damages

[4] Attorney's Fees

§ 555.64 Trustee's Declaration of Nonmonetary Status

§§ 555.65-555.69 [Reserved]

§ 555.70 Foreclosure Action

[1] Judicial Foreclosure

[2] Parties

[a] In General

[b] Joinder of Parties With Recorded Interest

[i] Subordinate Interest or Lien

[ii] Interests Not Subject or Subordinate to Trust Deed

[iii] Unrecorded Interests

[3] Recordation of Lis Pendens

[4] Appointment of Receiver

[5] Defenses

[a] Overview

[b] Statute of Limitations

[c] One-Form-of-Action Rule

[d] Antideficiency Statutes

[e] Lack of Notice

[f] Fraud

[6] Reinstatement and Equity of Redemption

[7] Foreclosure Decree

[8] Protection from Foreclosure for Active Duty Service Members

[a] State Provisions

[b] Federal Provisions

§ 555.71 Judicial Sale

[1] Writ of Sale

[2] Absolute Sale When No Deficiency Allowed

[3] Redemption When Deficiency Allowed

§ 555.72 Statutory Redemption

[1] By Judgment Debtor

[2] By United States

§ 555.73 Deficiency Judgment

[1] In General

[2] Motion for Judgment

[3] Appointment of Probate Referee As Appraiser

[4] Hearing and Judgment

[a] Evidence; Issue to Be Determined

[b] Amount of Deficiency Judgment

[c] Enforcement of Deficiency Judgment

§ 555.74 Attorney's Fees and Costs

§§ 555.75-555.79 [Reserved]

§ 555.80 Right to Possession, Rents, and Profits

§ 555.81 Assignment of Rents and Profits

[1] Creation of Security Interest

[2] Recordation and Perfection

[3] Enforcement on Assignor's Default

[a] Enforcement Steps

[b] Application of Money Received by Assignee

[4] Demand for Turnover of Rents, Issues, and Profits

[a] Execution and Receipt

[b] Tenant's Obligations

[5] Appointment of Receiver

[6] Effect of Enforcement Action and Limitations

[a] In General

[b] Distribution of Cash Proceeds

[c] Costs of Protecting Property

[7] Rents, Issues, or Profits Collected Before Enforcement

[8] Pre-1997 Law

[a] Applicability; General Rules

[b] Absolute Assignment

§ 555.82 Mortgagee in Possession

§§ 555.83-555.89 [Reserved]

§ 555.90 Waste

[1] Trustor's Duty Not to Impair Security by Waste

[2] What Constitutes Waste

[3] Foreclosure Based on Waste

[4] Injunctive Relief Against Waste

[5] Action for Damages for Waste

[a] Amount of Recovery; Timing of Action

[b] Requirement of Bad Faith Waste

§ 555.91 Impairment of Security by Third Party

[1] Tortious Impairment

[2] Recovery by Trustor As Substitute Security

§ 555.92 Environmentally Impaired Security

[1] Lender's Remedies Generally

[2] Lender's Election to Waive Lien or Rely on Security

[a] When Election Is Available

[b] Definitions

[i] Borrower and Related Party

[ii] Environmentally Impaired

[iii] Real Property and Affected Parcel

[iv] Release of Hazardous Substance

[c] Notice of Default and Action to Confirm Impaired Status

[d] Foreclosure Against Additional Collateral

[e] Other Contractual Rights Not Impaired

[3] Contract Action for Violation of Environmental Provision

[a] In General

[i] When Lender May Bring Action

[ii] "Environmental Provision" Defined

[b] Limitation on Damages

[c] Items Not Recoverable

§ 555.93 Inspection Regarding Hazardous Substance Release

[1] Lender's Right to Enter for Inspection

[2] Required Notice of Intent to Enter

[3] Petition for Entry and Inspection

§ 555.94 Rent Skimming

[1] Definition; Overview of Action; No Waiver

[2] Action for Damages

[a] By Vendor As Lienholder

[b] By Other Lienholder

[c] By Tenant

[3] Vendor's Motion to Clear Reacquired Interest of Judgment Liens

[4] Criminal Penalties for Multiple Acts

[5] Defense

§§ 555.95-555.99 [Reserved]

§ 555.100 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] California Legal Forms

[3] California Real Estate Law & Practice

§ 555.101 Federal Statutes

§ 555.102 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Civil Actions

[a] In General

[b] Antideficiency Statutes and One-Form-of-Action Rule

[3] Liens in General

[4] Mortgages and Trust Deeds

[5] Recordation of Mortgage or Trust Deed

[6] Statutory Regulation of Loans

[a] In General

[b] Residential Mortgage Loans

§ 555.103 Federal Administrative Regulations

§ 555.104 Local Court Rules

[1] Contra Costa County

[2] Los Angeles County

§ 555.105 Decisions

[1] Antideficiency Statutes

[2] Availability of Foreclosure

[3] Collection of Rents and Profits

[4] Creation of Mortgage or Trust Deed

[5] Deed or Mortgage

[6] Emotional Distress

[7] Equitable Mortgage

[8] Foreclosure Action

[9] Fraud

[9A] Home Equity Purchasers

[9B] Insurance on Encumbered Property

[10] Obligation Secured

[11] Priority of Liens

[12] Private Sale

[13] Property Encumbered

[14] Reconveyance

[15] Subordination Agreements

[16] Substitution of Trustee

§ 555.106 Attorney General Opinions

§ 555.107 Law Reviews

§ 555.108 Text References

§§ 555.109-555.119 [Reserved]

§ 555.120 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020] and for Damages and Penalty [Civ. Code §§ 2941(d), 3281]--Nonperformance of Statutory Duty on Discharge of Secured Obligation [Civ. Code § 2941(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Quiet Title Actions

[7] Cross References

§§ 555.121-555.124 [Reserved]

§ 555.125 Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020]--By Mortgagor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Verification

§ 555.126 Judgment Declaring Deed to Be Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2888, 2924(a), 2925] and Quieting Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 555.127 Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Foreclose [Code Civ.

Proc. § 726(a)]--By Mortgagee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 555.128 Complaint to Establish and Foreclose Equitable Mortgage on Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 555.129 Judgment Establishing and Foreclosing Equitable Mortgage [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 555.130-555.134 [Reserved]

§ 555.135 Declaration of Trustee's Nonmonetary Status [Civ. Code § 2924 l]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Service; Objections; Subsequent Demand to Participate

[5] Filing of Answer

§ 555.136 Statutory Substitution of Trustee [Civ. Code § 2934a]--By All Beneficiaries

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Statutory Methods

[4] Notice Requirements

[5] Format Requirements

[6] Cross References

§ 555.137 Statement by Beneficiaries Holding More Than 50 Percent of Specified Interests [Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)(B), (2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.138 Petition for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Relief From Installment Contract or Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Purchase of Real Property by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407(a), (b), 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Court's Authority to Provide Relief for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.139 Application for Stay in Response to Attempt to Collect Real Property Taxes or Assessments on Property Owned by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2; 50 U.S.C. App. § 561]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Court's Authority to Provide Relief for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.139A Order for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Remedy of Court in Relation to Obligation Secured by Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Protections for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.140 Declaration of Trustor's Nonmilitary Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.141 Request for Copy of Notice of Default and Copy of Notice of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents, Acknowledgment, and Recordation of Request

[4] Format Requirements

§ 555.141A Request by Homeowners' Association to Receive Copy of Trustee's Deed [Civ. Code § 2924b(f)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.142 Notice of Default [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(1), 2924c(b)(1)]--By Beneficiary, Trustee, Mortgagee, or Agent

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[a] Standard Requirements; Actual and Potential Defaults

[b] Reinstatement

[c] Failure to Comply

[4] Recording, Mailing, and Publishing Notice

§ 555.143 Notice of Rescission of Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale [Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice of Rescission As Mandatory

§ 555.144 Notice of Sale [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924f(b), 2924g(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Typeface and Heading

[4] Contents of Notice

[a] In General

[b] Property Description

[c] Amount Due

[d] Unified Sale Including Personal Property or Fixtures

§ 555.145 Declaration of Mailing Notices of Default and Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents and Effect of Declaration

§ 555.146 Deed by Trustee Pursuant to Exercise of Power of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924(a), (c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Deed

[4] Cross References

§ 555.147 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] and for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.]--To Prevent Private Sale Based on Alleged Breach of Obligation Secured by Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3367(3)]--By Trustor or Successor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.148 Petition and Declaration Regarding Unresolved Claims and Deposit of Undistributed Surplus Proceeds of Trustee's Sale--Judicial Council Form MC-095

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Information, Allegations, and Accompanying Documents

[4] Notice of Conflicting Claims Mailed to Entitled Persons

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

§§ 555.149-555.159 [Reserved]

§ 555.160 Complaint for Foreclosure of Deed of Trust Based on Monetary Default [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Defendants

[5] Appointment of Receiver

[6] Deficiency Judgment

[7] Verification

[8] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.161 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Civ. Code § 2911(1); Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

§ 555.162 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Senior Lien of Another Trust Deed [Civ. Code §§ 1214, 1215]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.163 Judgment of Foreclosure and Order of Sale [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a), (b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Entry of Judgment and Notice of Entry

[5] Enforcement

§ 555.164 Notice of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Jurisdiction and Venue

[4] Cross References

§ 555.165 Declaration in Support of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

§ 555.166 Notice of Motion for Appointment of Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.167 Order Appointing Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice of Order

§ 555.168 Judgment for Deficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.169 Stipulation and Deficiency Judgment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.170 Complaint on Promissory Note Secured by Junior Trust Deed--Security Rendered Valueless by Foreclosure of Senior Lien

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Cross References

§§ 555.171-555.179 [Reserved]

§ 555.180 Complaint for Specific Performance of Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3384 et seq.]--Beneficiary to Take Possession After Default and Collect Rents, Issues, and Profits [Civ. Code § 2927]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Appointment of Receiver

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

[7] Cross References

§ 555.181 Notice of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Ex Parte Application for Appointment of Receiver

§ 555.182 Declaration in Support of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.183 Order Appointing Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice of Order

§ 555.184 Order to Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-300]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice of Hearing

[4] Nomination of Receiver

[5] Service and Briefing Schedule

§ 555.185 Order Appointing Receiver After Hearing and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-310]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Order Appointing Receiver

[a] Who May Be Receiver

[b] Prohibited Arrangements

[c] Inventory

[d] Monthly Reports

[e] Interim Fees

[f] Employment of Attorney

[g] Final Account and Report on Noticed Motion or Stipulation

§ 555.186 Ex Parte Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Application

[4] Notice of Hearing

[5] Order Appointing Receiver

[a] Who May Be Receiver

[b] Receiver's Bond and Oath

[c] Prohibited Arrangements

[d] Applicant's Bond

[e] Inventory

[f] Monthly Reports

[g] Interim Fees

[h] Employment of Attorney

[i] Final Account and Report on Noticed Motion or Stipulation

[6] Service and Briefing Schedule

§ 555.187 Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-210]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.188 Additional Orders

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 555.189 Demand for Turnover of Rents, Issues, or Profits [Civ. Code § 2938(j)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Delivery and Effectiveness

§ 555.190 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Cross References

§ 555.191 Complaint for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.] Based on Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] Cross References

§ 555.192 Complaint for Damages for Rent Skimming [Civ. Code § 891]--By Lienholder

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Other Relief

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 555.193 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Rental Revenue Used for Emergency Medical Treatment or Necessary Repairs [Civ. Code § 893]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Burden of Proof

§ 555.194 Notice of Motion for Order Declaring That Interest Reacquired by Vendor Is Not Encumbered by Another Lien [Civ. Code § 891(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice to Interested Parties

[4] Order Granting Motion

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

William M. Hensley
Editorial Consultant n*

FOOTNOTES:
(n101)Footnote *.
Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART I. SCOPE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.01

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions related to secured transactions involving trust deeds or real property mortgages.

The legal background begins by covering the general characteristics of mortgages and trust deeds, their purpose as security for the performance of an underlying obligation, and the effect that some common provisions may have on that performance [*see § 555.10 et seq.*]. It also covers deeds as mortgages [*see § 555.22*] and equitable mortgages [*see § 555.23*].

Other subparts of the legal background cover foreclosure [*see § 555.30 et seq.*], including both nonjudicial [*see § 555.50 et seq.*] and judicial [*see § 555.70 et seq.*] foreclosures, the collection of rents and profits [*see § 555.80 et seq.*], and injury to the security [*see § 555.90 et seq.*].

The chapter includes the following forms:

- A complaint to quiet title for failure to reconvey title after satisfaction of the secured obligation [*see § 555.120*].

- Complaints and judgments for use in actions concerning the establishment of a deed as a mortgage and equitable mortgages [*see* §§ 555.125-555.129].

- A declaration of a trustee's nonmonetary status [*see § 555.135*], as well as alternative forms to substitute the trustee of a trust deed [*see §§ 555.136, 555.137*].

- Forms for use in connection with conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale [*see § 555.140 et seq.*], including a complaint to prevent the sale [*see § 555.147*].

- Complaints and other forms for use in foreclosure actions and proceedings for deficiency judgments [*see § 555.160 et seq.*].

- A complaint and related forms for use in actions to enforce an assignment-of-rents clause in a trust deed [*see § 555.180 et seq.*].

- Complaints, an affirmative defense, and a notice of motion for use in actions for impairment of the value of the security by waste or injury to the property or to recover damages for rent skimming [*see § 555.190 et seq.*].

The chapter also includes a Research Guide [*see § 555.100 et seq.*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsEquitable MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART I. SCOPE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.02

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.02 Cross References

- For discussion and forms relating to grant deeds, including discussion and forms relating to breach of the implied covenant against encumbrances, see Ch. 184, *Deeds* .

- For discussion and forms relating to the sale of judicially foreclosed real property by writ of sale, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments.*

- For discussion and forms relating to redemption of foreclosed real property, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments.*

- For discussion and forms relating to rights and remedies of tenants generally, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy* .

- For discussion and forms relating to unlawful detainer proceedings by a purchaser at a foreclosure sale against a trustor or mortgagor who remains in possession, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

- For discussion and forms relating to impressing and foreclosing equitable liens on real property, see *Ch. 342, Liens and Wage Preferences.*

- For discussion and forms relating to quiet title actions generally, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

- For discussion and forms relating to receivership generally, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

- For discussion and forms relating to secured transactions involving personal property, see Ch. 503,

Sales: Secured Transactions .

- For discussion and forms relating to installment land sale contracts, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensEquitable LiensReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful Detainer

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART I. SCOPE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.03-555.09

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.10

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

Trust deeds and mortgages are governed generally by (1) *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*, which contain detailed requirements relating to trust deeds and mortgages, including provisions for nonjudicial foreclosure sales, and (2) *Civ. Code § 2872 et seq.*, which are generally applicable to all liens.

Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925, and *2950* govern actions to establish a deed, absolute on its face, as a mortgage.

Actions to establish an equitable mortgage are governed by nonstatutory equitable principles [*see Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 313-314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds in *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*); *Holder v. Williams (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 313, 316, 334 P.2d 291]* .

Other provisions generally affecting trust deeds and mortgages include *Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq.*, providing for the expiration of ancient trust deeds and mortgages, and *Civ. Code § 1169 et seq.*, setting forth the general recording provisions affecting the priority of multiple trust deeds, mortgages, or other liens on the same property.

[2] Foreclosure

Nonjudicial foreclosure sales are governed generally by *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*

Foreclosure actions are governed generally by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580c* and *725a et seq.*

Provisions governing deficiency judgments following foreclosure are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d,*

and *726*.

[3] Collection of Rents and Profits

Civ. Code § 2938 governs written assignments of interests in leases, rents, issues, or profits of real property made in connection with obligations secured by real property.

Code Civ. Proc. § 564 sets forth the grounds for the appointment of a receiver to take possession of encumbered property on behalf of a trust-deed beneficiary, either to protect the property or to collect rents and profits. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*, specifically govern appointmentof a receiver (in any circumstances, not limited to receivership for rents, issues, and profits).

12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3, known as the Garn Act, applies when a party seeks to enforce a due-on-sale clause. Federal regulations supplementing this statute are set forth chiefly in 12 C.F.R. Pt. 591, with others appearing in 12 C.F.R. Pts. 30 and 701.

[4] Injury to Security

Civ. Code § 2929 and *Code Civ. Proc. § 745* govern actions for waste to property subject to a trust deed or mortgage.

Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1) and *(2)* govern the appointment of a receiver when property is in substantial danger of being destroyed.

Civ. Code § 2929.5 governs a secured lender's right of entry and inspection based on the borrower's environmental impairment of real property security.

Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5 governs a secured lender's election of remedies when the real property is environmentally impaired and the borrower is in default, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 736* governs a secured lender's right of action regarding the borrower's breach of an environmental provision relating to the real property.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensEquitable LiensReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.11

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.11 Terminology Used in This Chapter

Because of the prevailing use of trust deeds in California and their functional similarity to mortgages [*see § 555.12[4][c]*], this chapter generally uses, for convenience, terminology applicable to trust deeds in reference to both trust deeds and mortgages, except when a distinction is necessary. "Borrower" or "debtor" (instead of "trustor") and "lender" or "creditor" (instead of "beneficiary") may sometimes be used in discussions of authorities that use those terms [*see, e.g., 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(a)(2), (d)(5)*-(8)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.12

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.12 Mortgage and Trust Deed Compared

[1] Mortgage

[a] Lien of Mortgage

A real property mortgage is a contract by which specified real property (including an estate for years in real property) is hypothecated for the performance of an act, without necessitating a change in possession [*Civ. Code § 2920(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2920(b)* (for purposes of applying *Civ. Code §§ 2924-2924h* [governing nonjudicial foreclosures], "mortgage" includesany instrument other than trust deed, including real property sale contract, that has power of sale affecting real property)]. It imposes a lien on the property independent of possession, which, in the absence of any contrary agreement, is a special lien that may be enforced only as security for the performance of the particular act or obligation specified in the contract [*Civ. Code § 2923*; *see Civ. Code §§ 2874, 2875*]. The lien of a mortgage involves no passage of title or other incidents of ownership [*Civ. Code §§ 2877, 2888*]. On default by the mortgagor, the mortgagee must first attempt to enforce the lien by a foreclosure action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 725a et seq.*] or by a private sale (that is, nonjudicial foreclosure) if the mortgage includes a power of sale [*see Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*].

[b] Equitable Mortgage Distinguished

Some instruments fail to qualify as a legal mortgage or trust deed, such as a promise to give a mortgage or trust deed as security, or a defectively executed trust deed or mortgage. This type of instrument may be declared to be an equitable mortgage in an action brought for that purpose, if the parties intended to create a security interest [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds in *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*)]. For discussion, see *§ 555.23*.

A grant deed absolute on its face, if given solely as security for the performance of a continuing obligation, may

sometimes be referred to as an equitable mortgage [*see, e.g., Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 477, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91]* , although this type of transfer is actually deemed to be a mortgage by statute [*see Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925*]. For discussion, see *§ 555.22*.

[c] Parties and Form

The mortgage contract involves two parties: the mortgagor, who as owner hypothecates the property, and the mortgagee, who as creditor or obligee receives the lien and is entitled to performance of the secured obligation. The mortgagor is usually the debtor or obligor but occasionally may act as a surety, giving the mortgage to secure the performance of another [*see Bechtel v. Wier (1907) 152 Cal. 443, 444, 93 P. 75]* . The effect of a merger of the interests of the mortgagor and the mortgagee in one person is discussed in *§ 555.18[3]*.

The form of the mortgage contract must generally conform to the formalities required of a grant of real property [*Civ. Code § 2922*]. It may be executed in substantially the form set forth in *Civ. Code § 2948*. For further discussion of the formalities required for effectiveness of a mortgage, see *§ 555.12[2][d][i]*.

[2] Trust Deed

[a] Conveyance of Title to Secure Debt

A trust deed (or deed of trust) is a conveyance of real property to secure payment of a debt [*Hohn v. Riverside County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 605, 611, 39 Cal. Rptr. 647]* , which is usually evidenced by a separate promissory note. Like a mortgage, a trust deed is a contract and is to be interpreted together with the note and any other document that is part of the transaction, such as an agreement of sale [*Huckell v. Matranga (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 471, 481, 160 Cal. Rptr. 177]* . Pursuant to this contract, the trustor, usually the debtor, conveys title to a trustee, usually a neutral third party, solely for the purpose of securing the debt owed to the beneficiary, who is the creditor or obligee [*see Huckell v. Matranga (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 471, 481, 160 Cal. Rptr. 177* ; *Wasco Creamery etc. Co. v. Coffee (1931) 117 Cal. App. 298, 300-301, 3 P.2d 588]* . The effect of a merger of the interests of the trustor and the beneficiary in one person is discussed in *§ 555.18[3]*.

[b] Distinction From Mortgage Lien

The transfer of title to the trustee, commonly referred to as the title theory of trust deeds, in legal effect distinguishes a trust deed from the lien of a mortgage. This legal distinction is now given little emphasis but does result in a few differences in the treatment given to trust deeds and mortgages [*see Bank of Italy etc. Assn. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 655, 20 P.2d 940]* . The most significant difference in treatment is that the lapse of the statute of limitations on the principal debt will extinguish a mortgage, including one with a power of sale, while the power of sale in a trust deed is not affected [*Faxon v. All Persons (1913) 166 Cal. 707, 715-717, 137 P. 919* (mortgage); *Carson Redevelopment Agency v. Adam (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 608, 610-612, 186 Cal. Rptr. 615* (trust deed)]. This distinction is further discussed in *§ 555.18[4][a]*.

[c] Functional Similarity to Mortgage Lien

Although the title theory of trust deeds is sometimes emphasized [*see* [b], *above*], a trust deed is generally considered to be practically and substantially the same as a mortgage with a power of sale, because the conveyance of legal title to the trustee carries neither possession nor any other incident of ownership except the power to sell the property on default. The trustor is regarded as the legal owner except as to the trustee, and the trustee holds only the title needed to convey the property to a purchaser on the trustor's default [*Bank of Italy etc. Assn. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 655-656, 20 P.2d 940* ; *Wasco Creamery etc. Co. v. Coffee (1931) 117 Cal. App. 298, 300-301, 3 P.2d 588]* . Because of this functional similarity,a trust deed is often treated like a mortgage lien in spite of the title theory. The same rules that are applied to mortgages are generally applied to trust deeds [*Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d*

543, 553, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529] . As a result, mention is often made of the "lien of a trust deed" [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 882.020(a)*], although technically neither a lien nor a mortgage includes a transfer in trust [*see Civ. Code §§ 2872,* 2924(a)]. This similarity of treatment is illustrated by the following cases:

- The beneficiary of a trust deed secretly executed by a joint tenant contended that when the joint tenant died, the surviving joint tenant took the property subject to the trust deed. The beneficiary argued that, under the title theory of trust deeds, the transfer of title destroyed the joint tenancy's unity of title, converting the interest secured by the trust deed into that of a tenant in common, which survived the tenant's death. However, the court held that the trust deed was analogous to a mortgage lien and did not affect the unity of title, so that the secured interest remained a joint tenancy interest and was extinguished by the trustor's death, leaving no interest to which the trust deed could attach [*Hamel v. Gootkin (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 27, 28-30, 20 Cal. Rptr. 372* ; *see People v. Nogarr (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 591, 594, 330 P.2d 858* (same rule applied to mortgage)].

- The Supreme Court held that on the default of a trustor, the beneficiary of a trust deed, like the mortgagee of a mortgage, was required first to exhaust the property given as security. At the time, *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* (security-first rule) on its face referred only to mortgages, but the court reasoned that the functional similarity of trust deeds to mortgages justified applying the rule to trust deeds as well, notwithstanding the formal distinction between a trust deed's "title" and a mortgage's "lien" [*Bank of Italy etc. Assn. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 648-649, 653-658, 20 P.2d 940]* .

[d] Elements

[i] Formalities

The formal elements of a trust deed correspond to those of a mortgage. Although there is no statutory form of trust deed, as there is for a mortgage, the same general requirements as to formalities apply [*see Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 553, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529]* . Both a trust deed and a mortgage must conform to the formalities required of a grant of real property, that is, generally they must be in writing, include a description of the property, and be signed by the trustor or mortgagor [*Civ. Code § 2922*; *see Civ. Code § 1091 et seq.*]. The property description must be sufficient to identify the property [*Sepulveda v. Apablasa (1938) 25 Cal. App. 2d 381, 387, 77 P.2d 526* ; *Scott v. Woodworth (1917) 34 Cal.App. 400, 408-410, 167 P. 543]* . Additionally, there must be sufficient information concerning the obligation secured so as to indicate the extent of the encumbrance [*D'Oyly v. Capp (1893) 99 Cal. 153, 157, 33 P. 736]* . These elements are all present in the statutory form for a mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2948*].

After execution of the trust deed or mortgage, there must be a valid delivery to the beneficiary or mortgagee, before the instrument can be effective [*see Stirton v. Pastor (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 232, 234, 2 Cal. Rptr. 135* ; *Hahn v. Hahn (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 97, 101, 266 P.2d 519* ; *see also Burns v. Peters (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 619, 623, 55 P.2d 1182* (delivery of trust deed to trustee is not required)].

Acknowledgment and recording are not strictly necessary in order for the trust deed or mortgage to be effective as to the parties and persons with actual notice [*Civ. Code § 1217*]. However, acknowledgment is a prerequisite to recording [*Gov. Code § 27287*], and a trust deed or mortgage that is not recorded will be void as against any subsequent purchaser or lienholder lacking actual notice, whose interest is first recorded [*Civ. Code § 1214*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.16*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Acknowledgment/Recordation Beats Unrecorded Interests. Acknowledgment and recordation are essentials to preservation of priorities under California's "race notice" scheme. Without them, the parties to an unrecorded trust deed or mortgage will lose to a bona fide purchaser or encumbrancer recording

after the secret lien was created. Observation of these formalities are prerequisites to winning priority contests in "first in time" schemes, such as that adopted in California. *By William M. Hensley*

Acknowledgment and recording may be accomplished in the same manner as a grant of real property [*Civ. Code § 2952*]. Certain additional requirements may apply before a trust deed or mortgage may be recorded. In particular, a trust deed or mortgage with a power of sale must specify the address of the trustor or mortgagor and contain a request by that person for receipt of a copy of any notice of default and a copy of any notice of sale, although failure to include this information does not make the instrument invalid [*Gov. Code § 27321.5(b)*].

[ii] Standard Provisions

Aside from formal requirements, the provisions of trust deeds have generally become standardized by common practice [*see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 25A, *Security Instruments for Real Estate Financing* (Matthew Bender)]. Provisions concerning acceleration of the maturity of the obligation and subordination of priority are discussed in *§ 555.15[3]* and *[4]* and*§ 555.16[4]*. A provision for the right to collect rents and profits is discussed in *§ 555.80* et seq.

The trust deed is commonly a filled-out printed form provided by institutional lenders or title companies, and so it may be construed as a contract of adhesion [*Lomanto v. Bank of America (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 663, 668, 99 Cal. Rptr. 442]* . The standardized forms commonly do not contain all of the provisions governing the parties' agreement but instead incorporate many of the standardized provisions by reference to a pro forma trust deed, which contains those provisions and is recorded in each county solely for the purpose of providing constructive notice of the contents [*see Civ. Code § 2952*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Use of Trust Deed Forms in California. Care must be taken to use trust deeds that are catered to peculiarities of California real estate law. Many out-of-state lenders use mortgage forms that do not contain, for example, surety and *Gradsky* waivers. This lack of attention (if not downright sloppiness) can lead to catastrophic results for the unsuspecting lender that does not draft clauses that properly surmount California pro-borrower protections. *By William M. Hensley*

[iii] Status of Trustee

One element of a trust deed different from a mortgage is the addition to the transaction of a third party, the trustee. The status of the trustee is not that of a trustee in the strict sense but is that of a common agent of the trustor and beneficiary [*Lupertino v. Carbahal (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 742, 747, 111 Cal. Rptr. 112]* . The trustee's obligations and liabilities are determined by ordinary principles of agency [*Kerivan v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 225, 229, 195 Cal. Rptr. 53]* . For further discussion of agency principles generally, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

The trustee may be the same person as the beneficiary [*Bank of America Nat'l Trust & Sav. Asso. v. Century Land & Water Co., (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 194, 196, 65 P.2d 109]* , but if this arrangement is made in the initial transaction, the instrument may be construed as a mortgage with a power of sale, under the rule that any doubt as to whether an instrument is a trust deed or mortgage should be resolved in favor of a mortgage with a power of sale [*Banta v. Wise (1901) 135 Cal. 277, 280, 67 P. 129* ; *Godfrey v. Monroe (1894) 101 Cal. 224, 226, 227-228, 35 P. 761* ; *see Civ. Code § 2924(a)* (every transfer made as security, other than in trust, is to be deemed mortgage)].

The trustee is not the trustee of an express trust [*Monterey S.P. Partnership v. W.L. Bangham, Inc. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 454, 462, 261 Cal. Rptr. 587, 777 P.2d 623* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 369(a)*], and service of process on thetrustee does not constitute service on the beneficiary or obligate the trustee to notify the beneficiary [*Monterey S.P. Partnership v. W.L. Bangham, Inc. (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 454, 462, 261 Cal. Rptr. 587, 777 P.2d 623* ; *see Civ. Code § 2937.7*]. The trustee is not acting as a fiduciary in conducting a foreclosure sale [*Hatch v. Collins (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1104,*

1112-1113, 275 Cal. Rptr. 476] .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsEquitable MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagor's Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.13

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.13 Property Interest Encumbered

[1] Nature of Interest

Any interest in real property that is capable of being transferred may be mortgaged [*Civ. Code § 2947*; *see, e.g., Tripler v. MacDonald Lumber Co. (1916) 173 Cal. 144, 147, 159 P. 591* (interest of purchaser under installment land sale contract)]. The parties may even create, by express agreement, a mortgage lien on real property not yet acquired by the person giving the lien, in which case the lien attaches if and when the person giving the lien subsequently acquires an interest in the property, to the extent of that interest [*Civ. Code § 2883(a)*; *see Hosford v. Henry (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 765, 774, 238 P.2d 91* ; *but see Civ. Code § 2883(b)* (beneficiary of estate subject to administration may agree to create lien on undistributed property in estate but cannot thus create actual lien until property is distributed to that beneficiary)]. As a practical matter, however, the property interest provided as security will be some form of present legal ownership, because a trust deed, which by nature requires a transfer of title, is the more commonly used real property security device in California [*see, e.g., Caito v. United California Bank (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 694, 701, 144 Cal. Rptr. 751, 576 P.2d 466* (cotenant's ownership interest was security under trust deed)].

[2] After-Acquired or Reacquired Title

Title acquired by the trustor after execution of the trust deed inures to the beneficiary as security in the same manner as if it had been acquired before the execution [*Civ. Code § 2930*; *Barberi v. Rothchild (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 537, 538-540, 61 P.2d 760]* . If a trustor does not have title at the time he or she purports to transfer it under a trust deed but later acquires it during the life of the trust deed, the trust deed is deemed valid and enforceable on the theory that the trustor is estopped from denying title [*Perego v. Seltzer (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 825, 828-829, 67 Cal. Rptr. 636* ; *cf. Hawkins v. Harlan (1885) 68 Cal. 236, 237-238, 9 P. 108* (holding that this rule would not be given effect when it would result in manifest injustice)].

The rule of *Civ. Code § 2930* also applies when title lost through foreclosure is subsequently reacquired by the trustor, either directly as the purchaser at the foreclosure sale or indirectly as a grantee of the purchaser. The effect of the rule in these cases is to revive any junior trust deeds or mortgages that would ordinarily have been extinguished by the foreclosure of the senior lien [*Barberi v. Rothchild (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 537, 538-540, 61 P.2d 760* (junior trust deed revived); *DMC, Inc. v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 190, 198-199, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 761* (junior trust deed revived but remains second to new purchase-money deed of trust); *Jensen v. Duke (1925) 71 Cal. App. 210, 211-212, 234 P. 876* (junior mortgage revived); *see § 555.18[5]*].

[3] Fixtures and Personal Property

Personal property placed on encumbered real property so as to constitute a fixture or permanent improvement becomes a part of the encumbered real property, even if it became affixed after the creation of the trust deed [*see Harper v. Buckles (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 481, 484-485, 65 P.2d 947* ; *see also Civ. Code §§ 658-660* (fixture is part of real property)]. The lien thus imposed on fixtures as part of the encumbered real property may be subordinate to or otherwise affected by other liens on the fixtures perfected under the Commercial Code [*see Com. Code § 9301 et seq.*]. The trust deed itself may, however, expressly create and perfect a lien on fixtures under these same provisions [*see Com. Code § 9502(c)*]. For further discussion of the operation and effect of these provisions, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

If a fixture is severed, it becomes personal property and is no longer included as part of the encumbered real property. In this event, the beneficiary may bring an action either to enjoin the severance or, after severance, to recover damages for impairment of the security [*Stowell v. Waddingham (1893) 100 Cal. 7, 9-10, 34 P. 436* ; *Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co. (1889) 80 Cal. 245, 246-248, 22 P. 184]* .

Personal property not affixed to the encumbered real property may be included as part of the security under the provisions of the trust deed, and this provision is valid as between the parties [*McLeod v. Barnum (1901) 131 Cal. 605, 606-607, 63 P. 924* ; *Hosford v. Henry (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 765, 773-774, 238 P.2d 91]* . The better practice, however, is to draft a separate security agreement for any personal property, in compliance with the requirements applicable to personal property security interests [*see Com. Code § 9101 et seq.*; *Freedland v. Greco (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 462, 466, 289 P.2d 463]* . For further discussion of the operation and effect of these requirements, see Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Follow Unified Sale Dictates. For commercial properties such as hotels, it is possible to conduct a unified sale of real and personal property without adverse repercussions if the dictates of 9601 et seq. are followed properly. *By William M. Hensley*

[4] Transfer of Encumbered Property

[a] In General

A trustor or successor is free to convey or otherwise transfer property previously provided as security under a trust deed [*Moss v. Minor Properties, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 847, 855, 69 Cal. Rptr. 341* ; *see § 555.15[4]* for discussion of the effect of due-on-sale clauses]. The transfer is subject to the prior trust deed, so that the property continues to be security for the performance of the trustor's obligation, but the transferee has no personal liability for that obligation in the absence of an assumption agreement [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 596-597, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* .

The trustor's personal liability, if any, to satisfy any possible deficiency is unaffected by the transfer. If the transferee does not assume the obligation but merely takes the property subject to the trust deed, the trustor remains liable as a surety for the property itself, thus becoming the principal debtor [*Braun v. Crew (1920) 183 Cal. 728, 731, 192 P.*

531] . If the transferee assumes the obligation, the trustor remains as a surety for the transferee, who assumes the role of principal debtor [*Birkhofer v. Krumm (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 43, 50, 40 P.2d 553]* .

[b] Manner and Effect of Assumption

A transferee assumes the secured obligation by agreeing in writing to assume it [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 596-597, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Everts v. Matteson (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 437, 448, 132 P.2d 476* ; *see Civ. Code § 1624(a)(7)*]. A mere recitation that the transferee takes the property subject to the trust deed is not an effective assumption [*Snidow v. Hill (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 803, 807, 197 P.2d 801]* . Moreover, an assumption agreement is collateral to the transfer itself, and a transferee may not be bound by an assumption provision inserted in a deed without the transferee's knowledge or consent [*Fishback v. J.C. Forkner Fig Gardens (1934) 137 Cal. App. 211, 215-219, 30 P.2d 586]* .

An assuming transferee is estopped to deny the validity of the trust deed [*Harris v. Whittier Bldg. & Loan Asso. (1936) 18 Cal. App. 2d 260, 267, 63 P.2d 840]* and becomes personally liable for any deficiency [*Braun v. Crew (1920) 183 Cal. 728, 731, 192 P. 531]* . However, when the assumption agreement is made with the trustor or a successor, it is not enforceable by the beneficiary and does not give rise to personal liability on the part of the transferee when the trustor has no personal liability [*Ward v. De Oca (1898) 120 Cal. 102, 104-105, 52 P. 130* ; *Dail v. Campbell (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 416, 421, 12 Cal. Rptr. 739]* .

On assumption, a relation of principal and surety arises between the transferee and trustor, so that the transferee becomes personally liable as the principal debtor while the trustor becomes personally liable as surety for the transferee [*Braun v. Crew (1920) 183 Cal. 728, 731, 192 P. 531* ; *Birkhofer v. Krumm (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 43, 50, 40 P.2d 553]* . From the beneficiary's standpoint, both the trustor and the transferee are sureties for any deficiency [*Birkhofer v. Krumm (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 43, 50, 40 P.2d 553]* . Nonetheless, after learning of an assumption, the beneficiary must recognize the suretyship arising between the trustor and the transferee and respect the rights arising under the law of suretyship [*Everts v. Matteson (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 437, 447-448, 132 P.2d 476]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Difficulties of Proving Assumption Defenses. Many borrowers misperceive the scope of an assumption agreement, frequently believing it "exonerates" them from further exposure under the loan documents. This is not necessarily so, unless the lender expressly releases the assignor from liability. These novation theories, in the absence of a release, are difficult to prove, because novation must be established through an elevated "clear and convincing" evidentiary standard [*see Alexander v. Angel (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 856, 860-861, 236 P. 2d 561]* . Furthermore, should the Resolution Trust Corporation or its assignees be involved, the novation theories would be barred under the *D'Oench, Duhme* doctrine [*see RTC Mortgage Trust v. Shlens (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 304, 326, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581]* . Assumption theories must be predicated on ponderable evidence of significance and, further, only work against certain private lenders not purchasing from the RTC or FDIC. *By William M. Hensley*

Under suretyship law [*see Civ. Code § 2787 et seq.*], for example, a trustor as surety, may, in the event of a deficiency, require the beneficiary (creditor) first to proceed against the assuming transferee (debtor) [*Civ. Code § 2845*; *see Hamburger v. Ellingson (1934) 139 Cal. App. 311, 313-315, 33 P.2d 850]* . Also, if the beneficiary grants a partial release of the security without the consent of the trustor, the trustor's personal liability is proportionally reduced under suretyship principles [*Civ. Code §§ 2822, 2849*; *Woodward v. Brown (1897) 119 Cal. 283, 292-295, 51 P. 542* ; *cf. Thompson v. Thomas (1919) 43 Cal. App. 588, 590, 185 P. 427* (surety's liability was not reduced when security instrument expressly provided for partial release)]. For further discussion of suretyship principles generally, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[5] Insurance of Encumbered Property

Trust deeds commonly include provisions requiring that the trustor maintain adequate insurance coverage of the property interest [*see § 555.15[2][a]*].

If the beneficiary or trustee is entitled to receive and control the disbursement of insurance proceeds, that right is enforceable regardless of whether the security interest is actually impaired as a result of the event that caused the proceeds of the policy to become payable [*Civ. Code § 2924.7(b)*; *see* Stats. 1988, ch. 179, § 3 (legislative intent that this provision abrogates contrary decisions)]. A beneficiary may not, however, prohibit the use of insurance proceeds for restoring the property in the absence of evidence that the security interest has been impaired [*Schoolcraft v. Ross (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 75, 80-81, 146 Cal. Rptr. 57* ; *see* Stats. 1988, ch. 179, § 3]. On the other hand, if a trustor is in long-standing default when an event occurs that causes the policy proceeds to become payable, the trustor may not insist that the proceeds be used to restore the property. That would impair the beneficiary's security by delaying the beneficiary's right to foreclose because of the default [*see Ford v. Manufacturers Hanover Mortgage Corporation (9th Cir. 1987) 831 F.2d 1520, 1524]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Earthquake Insurance Proceeds. Deposition of proceeds can be important for lenders of properties involved in earthquakes when borrowers also carry earthquake insurance. Whether the trust deed beneficiary can lay claim to the earthquake insurance proceeds depends on the wording of the germane deed of trust. Specifically, the trust deed must require earthquake insurance and direct the application of insurance proceeds towards repair of the property. Merely designating the lender as a loss payee under the insurance policy does not substitute for precise entitlement language in the trust deed [*see Ziello v. Superior Court (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 321, 329-331, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251]* . However, a deed of trust that does not require the homeowner to obtain earthquake insurance but provides that if such insurance is obtained the lender must be named loss payee and has the right to control or direct the proceeds is fully enforceable [*Martin v. World Savings and Loan Assn. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 803, 809, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 225]* . Careful drafting of the trust deed on insurance proceed disposition issues is imperative for the lender desiring to protect its security from natural calamities. *By William M. Hensley*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsAfter-Acquired PropertyReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersAssignments by MortgagorsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersAssumptionsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersTransfers by MortgageesReal Property LawFixtures & ImprovementsSecurity Interests

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.14

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.14 Obligation Secured

[1] Necessity for and Nature of Obligation

Because a trust deed is merely incidental to the obligation secured [*see Civ. Code § 2909*; *Prob. Code § 15407(a)(2)*], it is valid and enforceable only to the extent that the underlying obligation exists [*Turner v. Gosden (1932) 121 Cal. App. 20, 22, 8 P.2d 505]* . An obligation is essential even though no one need be personally obligated to perform it [*Shelley v. Byers (1925) 73 Cal. App. 44, 58-59, 238 P. 177* ; *see Civ. Code §§ 2890, 2928*]. A trust deed is extinguished by discharge of the underlying obligation [*see § 555.18[1]*].

If there is any inconsistency in the terms of the obligation evidenced by a note and the terms of a trust deed securing the obligation, the terms of the note are controlling [*Pacific Fruit Exchange v. Duke (1930) 103 Cal. App. 340, 345, 284 P. 729]* . Similarly, consideration must support the obligation before the trust deed may be enforced [*Coon v. Shry (1930) 209 Cal. 612, 614-615, 289 P. 815]* , but no further consideration need be given for the trust deed itself [*see Carson v. Reid (1902) 137 Cal. 253, 253-257, 70 P. 89]* .

There are no limitations on the form or character of a secured obligation, as long as it exists. For example, it need not be evidenced by a separate writing [*Todd v. Todd (1912) 164 Cal. 255, 258, 128 P. 413]* , as long as the trust deed refers to it sufficiently to ascertain its extent [*D'Oyly v. Capp (1893) 99 Cal. 153, 157, 33 P. 736]* . In addition, several different obligations may be secured by a single trust deed [*see Hocker v. Reas (1861) 18 Cal. 650, 653]* , or one obligation may be secured by more than one trust deed [*see Security Loan etc. Co. v. Mattern (1901) 131 Cal. 326, 330-331, 63 P. 482]* . The character of the obligation is not limited and may be the performance of any act [*Civ. Code §§ 2872, 2920(a)*; *see, e.g., Stub v. Belmont (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 208, 213, 124 P.2d 826* (obligation was service contract)]. However, most secured obligations are money debts evidenced by a promissory note, and as a practical matter there is little point in securing an obligation if it cannot readily be liquidated for the purpose of applying the

proceeds from a sale of the security.

[2] Usurious Loan

If the secured obligation is a debt, and the terms of the loan are in violation of the usury law, usurious interest cannot be collected, but the debt remains valid and enforceable under the trust deed [*Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82* ; *Harris v. Gallant (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 94, 99-100, 6 Cal. Rptr. 630]* . For discussion of what constitutes usury by a lender, see Ch. 568, *Usury* .

[3] Loan Secured by Dragnet or Future Advance Clause

[a] In General

A trust deed does not secure any prior or subsequent debts owed by the trustor to the beneficiary, in the absence of some express provision to the contrary in the trust deed [*see Civ. Code §§ 2874, 2875, 2891, 2923*]. The standardized trust deeds of most lending institutions include so-called dragnet clauses and future-advance clauses, for the purpose of securing unspecified debts in addition to the specified debt. A dragnet clause, in broad language, secures all other debts owed by the trustor to the beneficiary, regardless of when they arise. A future-advance clause, usually included in a dragnet clause, secures other debts owed by the trustor to the beneficiary arising after the execution of the trust deed [*see Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 292, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* .

Future-advance and dragnet clauses are valid in California [*Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 398, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . However, it is a question of fact in each case, whether a dragnet clause or future-advance clause will be construed to secure a particular unspecified debt [*see Lomanto v. Bank of America (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 663, 670, 99 Cal. Rptr. 442]* . The courts will construe the clause in accordance with the parties' actual intent rather than its literal wording, and the proponent has the burden of showing that both parties intended the unspecified debt to be secured under the clause [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 293-294, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* .

In the absence of expressed intent, two recognized tests or considerations will help determine the reasonable intent of the parties: (1) whether the unspecified debt bears a relationship to the specified debt; and (2) whether the unspecified debt was made in reliance on the security [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 295-296, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . Under the first test, if the unspecified and specified debts are similar in nature or have some close connection, such as two debts for home improvement, the requisite intent may be inferred, whereas the absence of similarity or a connection, such as with a home improvement loan and a business loan, indicates a lack of requisite intent [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 295-296, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; *Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 404, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . Under the second test, if the unspecified debt is expressly secured by a different security, there is an inference that the parties did not intend that it also be secured by the security provided for the specified debt [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 296, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; *Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 404-405, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* .

[b] Pre-existing or Concurrent Debts

In view of the relationship test and reliance test for ascertaining the parties' unexpressed intent [*see* [a], *above*], a pre-existing debt is arguably not secured under a trust deed expressly securing another debt, when the pre-existing debt is not itself specified in the trust deed. Even if there is a close relation between the unspecified debt and the specified debt, there can be no reliance on the security, because the loan was made before the security. Moreover, failure to specify the pre-existing debt together with the specified debt, in spite of the ease of doing so, is strong evidence of an intent that the unspecified debt not be covered [*see Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 293-294, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* .

For example, in one case a trust deed including a dragnet clause was given by three trustors who owned the property as tenants in common. At the time the trust deed was executed, one of the trustors was in default on a pre-existing unsecured personal debt, of which the other trustors were unaware. The court held that the pre-existing debt was not secured by the property interests of the trustors who were unaware of its existence [*Gates v. Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bk. (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 857, 858, 860-861, 65 Cal. Rptr. 536]* . Among the determining factors was the failure to discuss the pre-existing debt or specify it in the trust deed [*Gates v. Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bk. (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 857, 859-860, 861, 65 Cal. Rptr. 536]* .

Another case involved the effect of a dragnet clause on unspecified debts incurred concurrently with the specified debt. The trustor borrowed money to build an apartment complex. For financing reasons the trustor subdivided the property into eight parcels, executed eight separate notes, and then secured each note with a trust deed containing a dragnet clause. The literal effect of the clauses was to make each trust deed security for all eight notes and to secure each debt with all eight trust deeds [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 288-289, 292, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . The court held that the clauses did create that result because of the close relation of each debt to the others, all of which were incurred separately only for financing purposes and in fact constituted a single debt for a single purpose. The relation was so strong that it showed true reliance, even though each note technically stated that it was made in reliance on the security of only one of the eight parcels [*Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 296-297, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338]* .

[c] Subsequent Loan or Future Advance

Future-advance clauses have been held to secure unspecified subsequent debts, even if there was no specified covered debt at the time the trust deed was executed [*Moss v. Odell (1901) 134 Cal. 464, 466, 66 P. 581* ; *see Civ. Code § 2884*], or if the future advances are to be made only at the discretion of the beneficiary [*Langerman v. Puritan Dining Room Co. (1913) 21 Cal. App. 637, 647, 132 P. 617]* . No limit to the number or amount of future advances need be specified, as long as the trust deed provides that it is for future advances [*Imhoff v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1952) 113 Cal. App. 2d 139, 144, 247 P.2d 851]* . If, however, some limitation is specified, a future advance that does not come within the express limitation is not secured [*see* *Keese v. Beardsley (1923) 190 Cal. 465, 470, 213 P. 500* (mortgage secured future advances only if made before certain date)].

An unspecified subsequent debt will not be secured by a future-advance clause unless that was the intent of the parties, as determined by the relationship test and reliance test [*see* [a], *above*]. For example, promissory notes subsequently executed by the trustor in favor of a third person and later bought up by the beneficiary were not covered by the security because they lacked a relation to the specified debt sufficient to infer an intent that they would be secured [*Moran v. Gardemeyer (1889) 82 Cal. 96, 100-101, 23 P. 6* ; *see* *Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 404, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . Similarly, a subsequent loan that was expressly made in reliance on different security was not covered because it was evident that the loan was not made in reliance on the security provided for the specified debt [*Moran v. Gardemeyer (1889) 82 Cal. 102, 103-104, 23 P. 8* ; *see* *Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 404-405, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549* ; *but see* *Wong v. Beneficial Sav. & Loan Asso. (1976) 56 Cal. App. 3d 286, 296-297, 128 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; [b], *above*]. On the other hand, a subsequent loan was held to be secured by a future-advance clause when it was used in part to pay off the specified debt, showing a sufficient relation to that loan, and when it was actually, if not technically, made in reliance on the same security [*Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 405, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* .

A subsequent loan covered by a future-advance clause has the same priority as the trust deed itself if the subsequent loan was obligatory rather than optional on the part of the beneficiary. However, if the subsequent loan was not obligatory, it is subordinate to any intervening lien, if at the time of making the subsequent loan, the beneficiary had been given actual notice of the existence of the junior lien [*Pike v. Tuttle (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 746, 751, 96 Cal. Rptr. 403* ; *see, e.g.,* *Garcia v. Atmajian (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520-521, 169 Cal. Rptr. 845* (subsequent loan

was subordinate to intervening lien of purchaser under land sale contract actually known to beneficiary)]. For further discussion of priorities, see *§ 555.16*.

[4] Statutory Regulation of Loans

The terms for financing a loan secured by a trust deed, whether contained in the trust deed or in the note evidencing the debt, are regulated by state and federal laws. For example, statutes regulate the terms of variable-interest loans and adjustable-rate or renegotiable-rate loans [*Civ. Code §§ 1916.5-1916.12*]. These typically provide for certain limitations on the terms set by the lender and also require certain disclosures to the borrower, to be included in the trust deed and note [*see, e.g., Civ. Code § 1916.5(a)*]. A violation of the requirements of *Civ. Code §§ 1916.5-1916.9* does not itself invalidate the lien of a mortgage or trust deed [*Civ. Code § 1916.11*]. However, violation of those provisions could have some effect on any other remedies or defenses available to the borrower [*see Civ. Code § 1916.11*].

Another statutory regulation is *Civ. Code § 2948.5*, which provides that a borrower may not be required to pay interest on a note secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property improved with one to four residential dwelling units for a period in excess of one day before recording of the mortgage or trust deed if the loan proceeds are paid into escrow, or if there is no escrow, the date on which the loan proceeds have been made available for withdrawal as a matter of right [*Civ. Code § 2948.5(a)*; *see Ins. Code § 12413.1(d)* (withdrawal as matter of right)]. Interest may commence to accrue on the business day immediately preceding the day of recording if both of the following occur [*Civ. Code § 2948.5(b)*]:

- The borrower affirmatively requests, and the lender agrees, that the recording will occur on Monday, or on a day immediately following a bank holiday; and

- The borrower receives disclosure information concerning the amount of additional per diem interest charged to facilitate recording on Monday or the day following a holiday, as the case may be, and stating that it may be possible to avoid the additional per diem interest charge by recording the deed of trust on a day immediately following a business day, and the borrower acknowledges receipt of this information by signing a copy of the disclosure document before placing funds in escrow.

In any case, these provisions do not apply to loans made or negotiated by real estate brokers that are subject to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*, which prohibits charging interest until the date the proceeds of the loan are made available to the lender or are deposited in escrow [*Civ. Code § 2948.5(c)*].

The California Residential Mortgage Lending Act [*Fin. Code § 50000 et seq.*] governs specified persons engaged in the business of making or servicing residential mortgage loans in California. For discussion, see *§ 555.21*. In addition, various requirements are imposed on certain loans with an original balance not exceeding $250,000 [*Fin. Code § 4970 et seq.*]. For discussion of these loans and the requirements applicable to them, see *§ 555.21A*.

Some other pertinent statutes regulating certain terms of secured real property loans and possibly affecting a borrower's remedies or defenses include provisions applicable to:

- Shared-appreciation loans entered into before 1990 [*Civ. Code § 1917.010 et seq.*].

- Changeable-rate mortgage instruments [*Civ. Code §§ 1920, 1921*].

- Balloon-payment loans [*Civ. Code § 2924i*; *see Civ. Code § 2966*].

- Loans made or negotiated by real estate brokers [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.*].

- Due-on-sale or due-on-encumbrance clauses [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3*; *Civ. Code §§ 2924.5, 2924.6,*

2949, 2954.10; for further discussion, see *§ 555.15[4]*].

- Impound account clauses [*Civ. Code § 2954(a)*; *see Civ. Code §§ 2954.1, 2954.8, 2955*].

- Late-payme nt charge clauses [*Civ. Code §§ 2954.4, 2954.5*].

- Prepayment charge clauses [*Civ. Code §§ 2954.9, 2954.10*].

- Disclosure statements [*Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.*; *see 12 U.S.C. § 2601* (Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act); *15 U.S.C. § 1604* (Truth in Lending Act); *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10232.4, 10232.5, 10240* (real estate brokers); *Civ. Code §§ 2970, 2971* (home equity loans); *Corp. Code § 25110* (sale of securities)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawConsumer ProtectionReal Estate Settlement ProceduresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsAdjustable Rate MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationRelease PaymentsReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.15

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.15 Modification of Agreement

[1] Assignment of Debt

[a] In General

Because a trust deed is incidental to the debt that it secures, assignment of the debt carries with it the security [*Civ. Code § 2936*; *Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 553, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529]* . Assignment of a secured debt operates also as an assignment of the benefit of the trust deed without further assignment [*Lewis v. Booth (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 345, 349, 44 P.2d 560]* . Conversely, the trust deed cannot be assigned without also transferring the debt secured, and any attempt to do so is ineffective [*Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 553-554, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529]* .

An assignment of a debt secured by a trust deed constitutes a valid transfer of the beneficial interest in the security even when, at the time of the assignment, an action on the debt is barred by the statute of limitations [*Hohn v. Riverside County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 605, 615, 39 Cal. Rptr. 647]* . When a trust deed secures two or more debts, an assignment of the debts, in the absence of any special agreement, transfers to each assignee a pro rata portion of the beneficial interest in the security [*Redman v. Purrington (1884) 65 Cal. 271, 272, 3 P. 883]* . The assignor of several debts secured by a single trust deed is entitled to fix by agreement the extent or priority of each assignee's interest in the security [*Grattan v. Wiggins (1863) 23 Cal. 16, 30]* .

By assignment of a debt secured by a trust deed, the assignor transfers to the assignee all rights to demand and enforce payment of the debt [*McCown v. Spencer (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 216, 225, 87 Cal. Rptr. 213]* . Only the assignee (not the assignor) may effectively foreclose under the trust deed [*Santens v. Los Angeles Finance Co. (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 197, 202, 204 P.2d 619]* .

For further discussion of assignments generally, see Ch. 60, *Assignments* .

[b] Position of Assignee

The position of the assignee of a promissory note depends on the negotiability of the note. An assignee that is a good faith purchaser of a negotiable note (a holder in due course), takes the note and the security free and clear of almost all claims and defenses that might have been asserted against the original holder of the note, including lack of consideration [*Gribble v. Mauerhan (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 221, 225, 10 Cal. Rptr. 296* ; *Hayward Lbr. & Inv. Co. v. Naslund (1932) 125 Cal. App. 34, 38-41, 13 P.2d 775* ; *see Com. Code § 3305*]. On the other hand, a good faith assignee of a nonnegotiable note takes the note and security subject to all claims and defenses that might otherwise be asserted [*San Jose Ranch Co. v. San Jose L. & W. Co. (1901) 132 Cal. 582, 584, 64 P. 1097]* . For discussion of negotiability, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

[c] Recordation of Assignment

An assignment of a note and trust deed may be recorded. The record provides constructive notice of its contents to all persons [*Civ. Code § 2934*]. However, recordation does not itself provide notice to the trustor or other obligor under the note, so as to invalidate any payment made to the holder of the note [*Civ. Code § 2935*]. If, after recordation of the assignment, the trustor has no actual notice and makes payment to the assigning beneficiary still in possession of the note, the payment is binding on the assignee [*Rodgers v. Parker (1902) 136 Cal. 313, 316, 68 P. 975* ; *Title Ins. etc. Co. v. Kuchenbeiser (1912) 20 Cal. App. 11, 12-13, 127 P. 1039]* . On the other hand, if the assigning beneficiary no longer has possession of the note (and is not acting as the assignee's agent) after the assignment has been recorded, payment to the assignor is made at the risk of the trustor and is not binding on the assignee [*Rodgers v. Peckham (1898) 120 Cal. 238, 242, 52 P. 483]* .

When a secured note is fraudulently assigned to two innocent assignees, the assignee first in time generally, all things being equal, has priority over the second assignee. But if the first assignee has neglected to record the assignment before the fraudulent second assignment, causing the second assignee to take the note and security as a good faith purchaser without actual or constructive notice of the first assignment, the interest of the second assignee will be deemed prior to that of the first assignee, by whose negligence the fraud occurred [*Security Mortgage Co. v. Delfs (1920) 47 Cal. App. 599, 602-604, 191 P. 53* ; *see Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 554-558, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529]* .

[2] Extension or Renewal

[a] In General

The parties may agree to an extension of the maturity date of the obligation for an additional period or agree to a renewal of a secured obligation, substituting a new obligation by the execution of a new instrument [*Morello v. Metzenbaum (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 494, 499-500, 154 P.2d 670]* . An extension or renewal agreement must be evidenced by a writing executed with the same formalities required in a grant of real property [*Civ. Code § 2922*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 360*]. Generally, the formal requirements are met if there is an acknowledgment of the debt signed by the trustor or mortgagor as the party to be charged [*Easton v. Ash (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 530, 536-537, 116 P.2d 433* ; *General v. Anthony (1940) 38 Cal. App. 2d 321, 323-324, 100 P.2d 1087* ; *but see Schwartz v. Edmunds (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532, 67 P.2d 351* (extension valid when signed only by mortgagee)]. A valid agreement may also be signed by the transferee of the trustor or mortgagor even though the transferee has not assumed personal liability for the obligation [*Curtis v. Holee (1921) 184 Cal. 726, 729-730, 195 P. 395* ; *Miller v. Roach (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 427, 431, 59 P.2d 418]* . When this is done without the consent of the trustor or mortgagor, however, any continuing personal liability of the latter is discharged [*Miller v. Roach (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 427, 432, 59 P.2d 418]* . For further discussion of principles relating to assumption or nonassumption, see *§ 555.13[4][b]*.

In addition to the formalities, new consideration is required [*Braun v. Crew (1920) 183 Cal. 728, 734, 192 P. 531]* . However, this requirement is easily met by a promise to pay the pre-existing obligation after it is barred by the statute of limitations, or by the mutual promises of the parties before it is barred [*see, e.g.,* *Easton v. Ash (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 530, 534-535, 116 P.2d 433* ; *Miller v. Roach (1936) 15 Cal. App. 2d 427, 431, 59 P.2d 418]* .

A valid agreement stops the running of the statute of limitations against the obligation for the period of the extension [*Code Civ. Proc. § 360*]. Without the extension, the statute begins to run anew each time a partial payment is made before the expiration of the limitation period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 360*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5* (permitting written waivers of defense that statute of limitations has run, effective for four-year periods)].

[b] Effect on Third Party Interests

A valid extension or renewal will always be effective against the parties. However, its effectiveness as to junior liens or interests depends on when the junior liens or interests were created. Those created before the extension or renewal may not be subject to the agreement. For example, if the senior security instrument is a mortgage, and a junior lien was created before the extension agreement, then, if the senior mortgagee commences judicial foreclosure proceedings after the expiration of the original limitation period, the junior lienholder may raise the defense that the senior mortgage is extinguished by the lapse of the statute of limitations, and may foreclose the junior lien free and clear of the senior mortgage [*Ekmann v. Plumas County Bank (1932) 215 Cal. 671, 672-674, 12 P.2d 433]* . For further discussion of the effect of the statute of limitations on judicial and nonjudicial foreclosure, see *§ 555.18[4][a]*. On the other hand, junior interests created before the extension or renewal agreement may be subject to the agreement if the trust deed expressly provided for the possibility of an extension by mutual consent [*Western F.G. v. Security Title etc. Co. (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 150, 153-154, 66 P.2d 742]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Junior Interests Subject to Extensions. Generally, trust deeds routinely provide that they secure the original note as well as any modifications. Because this language provides constructive notice of any extension arrangements, junior interests subject to these trust deeds likely are subject to any extensions reached by the senior lienholder and borrower. *By William M. Hensley*

Junior interests created after the extension or renewal agreement have been held to be subject to the agreement in any event, because junior lienholders have a duty to go beyond the record and inquire as to possible extensions when their interests are created [*see, e.g.,* *Newhall v. Hatch (1901) 134 Cal. 269, 273, 66 P. 266* ; *Craig v. Dinwiddie (1926) 77 Cal. App. 681, 687-689, 247 P. 516]* .

[3] Acceleration on Default

[a] In General

A standard provision in real property security transactions is an acceleration-on-default clause, which gives the beneficiary, as holder of the note, an election to declare the entire outstanding debt immediately due after a default by the trustor. The type of default covered by this clause is usually a breach of the principal obligation to pay installments on the principal and interest when due [*see* *Wienke v. Smith (1918) 179 Cal. 220, 222, 176 P. 42]* . However, the clause may cover a default in any or all of the trustor's collateral obligations as well [*see, e.g.,* *Coyne v. Mason (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 176, 177-178, 56 P.2d 541* (duty to pay premiums on insurance covering subject property); *Hudson v. Becker (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 743, 746-747, 56 P.2d 249* (duty to pay off senior liens)]. The provisions of a trust deed that authorize acceleration and exercise of the power of sale for failure to pay taxes, rents, assessments, or insurance premiums, or any advances, are enforceable whether or not the security has been impaired by the failure [*Civ. Code § 2924.7(a)*].

Usually the clause is included in the note secured by the trust deed [*see* *Wienke v. Smith (1918) 179 Cal. 220, 222, 176*

P. 42 ; *Coyne v. Mason (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 176, 177-178, 56 P.2d 541]* . The note and trust deed are to be read together as parts of a single contract, however, and the clause is enforceable whether it appears only in the note or appears only in the trust deed [*First-Trust Joint S.L. Bk. v. Meredith (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 214, 218, 53 P.2d 958* (clause in mortgage only); *San Gabriel Val. Bk. v. Lake View etc. Co. (1906) 4 Cal. App. 630, 632, 89 P. 360* (clause in note only); *cf. Civ. Code § 2924.5* (when trust deed is on residential property containing up to four units, clause for acceleration on sale, further encumbrance, or other transfer by trustor must be included in both note and trust deed)].

[b] Manner and Effect of Election to Accelerate

Because an acceleration-on-default clause gives the beneficiary an election to accelerate, acceleration is not automatic and occurs only after an affirmative election by the beneficiary [*see* *Stalder v. Riverside Groves etc. Water Co. (1914) 167 Cal. 560, 562, 140 P. 252]* . An affirmative election to accelerate may be made by giving the trustor notice to that effect [*see, e.g.,* *Stalder v. Riverside Groves etc. Water Co. (1914) 167 Cal. 560, 562,140 P. 252]* . It may also be made by any other positive act indicating an intention to accelerate [*Stalder v. Riverside Groves etc. Water Co. (1914) 167 Cal. 560, 562, 140 P. 252]* . For example, commencement of judicial foreclosure proceedings is sufficient indication of an intention to accelerate [*Title G. & T. Co. v. Fraternal Finance Co. (1934) 220 Cal. 362, 364, 30 P.2d 515]* . A notice of default preparatory to nonjudicial foreclosure under a power of sale is also sufficient indication of an intention to accelerate, if the notice includes an expression of that intention [*Engelbertson v. Loan & Bldg. Asso. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 477, 479, 58 P.2d 647]* .

If the trustor tenders payment sufficient to cure the default before the beneficiary has carried out an intention to accelerate, the beneficiary's right to accelerate is terminated [*Stalder v. Riverside Groves etc. Water Co. (1914) 167 Cal. 560, 562-563, 140 P. 252]* . On the other hand, if the trustor tenders payment that only partially cures the default, the beneficiary may accept the payment and still exercise the right to accelerate [*R.G. Hamilton Corp., Ltd. v. Corum (1933) 218 Cal. 92, 96-97, 21 P.2d 413]* .

Acceleration entitles the beneficiary to foreclose on the security, to recover the entire outstanding debt. In the absence of acceleration, the beneficiary may still foreclose to recover the amount in default but may not recover the remainder of the debt not yet due [*see* *Yoakam v. White (1893) 97 Cal. 286, 289, 32 P. 238]* . In any event, however, the beneficiary's right to foreclose after electing to accelerate is limited by the trustor's statutory right to reinstate the obligation, as if no default had occurred, by curing the default after an acceleration but before the lapse of a specified period [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*]. For further discussion concerning the right of reinstatement, see *§ 555.54[1]*.

[c] Waiver of Right to Accelerate

Because acceleration on default is elective, it is subject to defenses of waiver and estoppel. For example, the beneficiary may be deemed to have waived the right to accelerate after delaying an unreasonable time before electing to accelerate [*Holland v. Paddock (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 534, 538, 298 P.2d 587* (delay of more than 11 months constituted waiver)].

Waiver of the right to accelerate as to one particular default does not waive the right to accelerate as to subsequent defaults [*R.G. Hamilton Corp., Ltd. v. Corum (1933) 218 Cal. 92, 96-97, 21 P.2d 413* ; *Sellman v. Crosby (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 562, 564, 67 P.2d 706]* . Also, a beneficiary who has accepted late payments without accelerating does not relinquish the right to accelerate when subsequent payments are late [*Young v. Burchill (1929) 96 Cal. App. 341, 343-345, 274 P. 379]* . However, the beneficiary must first give notice that late payments will no longer be accepted and must give the trustor a reasonable opportunity to comply before accelerating [*Bledsoe v. Pacific Ready Cut Homes, Inc. (1928) 92 Cal. App.641, 645, 268 P. 697* ; *see* *Altman v. McCollum (1951) 236 P.2d 914]* .

If, after acceleration, the trustor pays only part of the amount in default, the beneficiary's acceptance of the payment does not waive the default as to the amount unpaid and does not affect the acceleration election [*Sellman v. Crosby*

(1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 562, 564-565, 67 P.2d 706] .

[4] Acceleration on Sale or Encumbrance

[a] In General

A trustor is entitled to sell, further encumber, or otherwise transfer the title to the encumbered property, without the consent of the beneficiary [*Moss v. Minor Properties, Inc. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 847, 855, 69 Cal. Rptr. 341* ; *see Civ. Code § 1044*; *Prob. Code § 15410(c)*]. However, promissory notes and trust deeds commonly include so-called due-on-sale clauses, which give the beneficiary the election, on any sale, further encumbrance, or other transfer of the property without the beneficiary's consent, to declare the entire unpaid balance of the note immediately due and payable [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(a)(1)*; *Tucker v. Lassen Sav. & Loan Assn. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 629, 631 n.1, 116 Cal. Rptr. 633, 526 P.2d 1169]* . By this means a beneficiary may discourage unapproved transfers, avoid greater risk of waste or default, or even obtain an advantage by compelling a transferee to refinance the obligation during periods when the market rate exceeds the existing rate of interest on the obligation [*see La Sala v. American Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 864, 879-880, 880 n.17, 97 Cal. Rptr. 849, 489 P.2d 1113]* .

An unauthorized transfer does not itself constitute a default but gives the beneficiary an occasion to declare an acceleration of the unpaid balance of the debt. A default occurs only after the beneficiary has elected acceleration, and the trustor subsequently fails to pay the accelerated debt [*Miller v. Cote (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 888, 895, 179 Cal. Rptr. 753]* .

[b] Enforcement Under Federal Law

[i] Garn Act

The Garn Act [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3* (Garn-St. Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982)] expressly preempts all inconsistent state law regarding the enforcement of due-on-sale clauses [*see* [c], *below*], possibly also regarding due-on-encumbrance clauses [*see* [ii], *below*], and provides generally that a lender may enter into or enforce a contract containing a due-on-sale clause with respect to a real property loan [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(1)*]. "Lender" includes any person or government agency, or the assignee or transferee of a person or agency, that makes a loan, mortgage, advance, or credit sale secured by a lien on real property [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(a)(2),(3)*].

In exercising the election under a due-on-sale clause, a lender is encouraged to permit assumption of the loan at the existing contract rate or at a rate that does not exceed the average between the existing contract rate and current market rate [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(3)*]. However, except as specified in *12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)*, a lender's exercise of the election, and all rights and remedies of the lender and borrower, are governed solely by the contract provisions [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(2)*].

In the case of loans secured by a lien on residential real property containing fewer than five dwelling units, a lender may not elect to accelerate under a due-on-sale clause upon any of the following [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)*]:

- The creation of a lien or other encumbrance subordinate to the lender's lien and not related to a transfer of rights of occupancy in the property [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(1)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(i)* (exception applies only to liens not created pursuant to contract for deed)].

- The creation of a purchase-money security interest for household appliances [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(2)*].

- A transfer by devise, descent, or operation of law on the death of a joint tenant or tenant by the entirety [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(3)*].

- The granting of a leasehold interest of three years' duration or less and not containing an option to purchase [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(4)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(iv)*].

- A transfer to a relative resulting from the borrower's death [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(5)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(v)* (exception applies only if transferee occupies or will occupy subject property)].

- A transfer of ownership to the borrower's spouse or children [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(6)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(v)* (exception applies only if transferee occupies or will occupy subject property)].

- A transfer resulting from a decree of a dissolution of marriage or legal separation agreement, or from an incidental property settlement agreement, by which the spouse of the borrower becomes an owner of the property [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(7)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(v)* (exception applies only if transferee occupies or will occupy subject property)].

- A transfer into an inter vivos trust of which the borrower is and remains a beneficiary, if the transfer does not relate to a transfer of rights of occupancy in the property [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(8)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(vi)* (exception applies only if borrower remains occupant of subject property)].

- Any other transfer or disposition described in regulations prescribed by the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), which has express authority, in consultation with the Comptroller of the Currency and the National Credit Union Administration, to issue rules, regulations, and interpretations governing the implementation of the Garn Act [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(9),(e)(1)*; *see* 12 C.F.R. Pt. 591].

OTS regulations limit the foregoing statutory exceptions in several respects in addition to imposing the occupancy limitations noted above [*see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)*]. For example, if an event later occurs that disqualifies a transfer for a previously applicable exception, the lender is no longer precluded from enforcing the due-on-sale clause [*12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(5)*].

State decisions that limit enforcement of due-on-sale clauses to cases of reasonable necessity, with the burden of proof placed on the lender, appear to be preempted, because they are inconsistent with the federal rule of general enforceability [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. §§ 591.1(b), 591.5(a)*]. Whether state statutes otherwise affecting due-on clauses are also preempted is less certain. *Civ. Code § 2924.5*, requiring a due-on clause to be inserted in both the trust deed and the underlying note when the subject property consists of one-to-four residential units, is arguably consistent with federal law because it is merely designed to provide notice [*see Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953 n.12, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970]* . In fact, when adequate notice is actually given, technical noncompliance with the notice requirements will not preclude enforcement of a due-on-sale clause inserted only in the note [*Fernandez v. American Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 667, 671-672, 205 Cal. Rptr. 707* (noting, however, that creditor might be estopped from enforcing clause against debtor's successors if they were actually misled by lack of record notice)]. It is also arguable that the limitations on enforcement of due-on-sale clauses under *Civ. Code § 2924.6* may be construed consistently with corresponding limitations under federal law [*Civ. Code § 2924.6(a)(1)-(4)*; *cf. 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(5)-(8)*]. For further discussion of these state statutes, see [c], *below.*

[ii] Application to Due-on-Encumbrance Clauses

The Garn Act defines a due-on-sale clause as covering any unapproved sale or transfer of all or any part of the property, or any interest in it [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(a)(1)*]. Implementing regulations define sale or transfer as including a conveyance of real property or any right, title, or interest in real property, whether legal or equitable, by outright sale, deed, contract, lease-option contract, lease for more than three years, or any other method of conveyance [*12 C.F.R. § 591.2(b)*]. These definitions appear to encompass encumbrances generally. If the Garn Act thus applies to

due-on-encumbrance clauses, it further appears that state decisions generally limiting the enforcement of these clauses to cases of reasonable necessity, with the burden of proof placed on the lender, are also preempted as inconsistent with federal law [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. §§ 591.1(b), 591.5(a)*]. However, state statutory limitations on the enforcement of these clauses may arguably be construed consistently with corresponding limitations under federal law [*Civ. Code §§ 2924.6(a)(5), 2949*; *cf. 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(1)*; *12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(i)*]. For further discussion of these state statutes, see [c], *below*.

In the case of loans secured by a lien on residential real property containing fewer than five dwelling units, the Garn Act provides that a lender may not elect to accelerate under a due-on-sale clause because of the creation of a lien or other encumbrance subordinate to the lender's lien and not related to a transfer of rights of occupancy in the property [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(d)(1)*; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(1)(I)* (exception applies only to liens not created pursuant to contract for deed)].

[iii] Effect of Waiver or Estoppel

Because the rights and remedies of the parties with respect to a due-on-sale clause are generally to be governed by reference to their agreement [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(b)(2)*], it appears that normal contract defenses under state law remain applicable. Thus ordinary principles of waiver or estoppel may apply to prevent enforcement of a due-on-sale clause [*see Rubin v. Los Angeles Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 292, 296-300, 205 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. Land Dynamics (1980) 103 Cal. App. 3d 966, 977-978, 163 Cal. Rptr. 348]* .

Additionally, a lender waives the election under a due-on-sale clause as to a specific transfer if, before the transfer, the lender and the borrower's prospective successor agree in writing that the successor will be obligated under the terms of the loan and that interest on sums secured by the lender's security interest will be payable at a rate requested by the lender. On this agreement and resultant waiver, the lender must release the existing borrower from all obligations under the loan, and the lender is deemed to have made a new loan to the successor [*12 C.F.R. § 591.5(b)(4)* (applicable to all loans made by federal association after July 1976 and to all other loans made after May 13, 1983)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Acceptance Can Constitute Garn Act Waiver. Waiver of due-on-sale protections also has been frequently found when a lender accepts payments from a borrower's transferee for a sufficient period of time, notwithstanding the absence of a pre-transfer agreement. This practitioner believes a strong contention can be advanced that "conduct" waiver principles under state law are not preempted by the federal statutory scheme, even though these principles are arguably inconsistent with the federal regulations relating to the Garn Act. *By William M. Hensley*

[iv] Window Period Limitation

The application of the Garn Act is expressly limited by an exemption, under which otherwise preempted state law continues to apply to certain transfers involving window-period loans [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(c)(1)*]. "Window-period loans" are generally those loans, not originated by a federal association, that were made or assumed on or after August 25, 1978, and before October 15, 1982, the respective effective dates of *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970* and the Garn Act [*see Lucas v. Jones (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 1008, 1010-1012, 196 Cal. Rptr. 437* ; *Miranda v. Macias (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 188, 192, 191 Cal. Rptr. 177* ; *see 12 C.F.R. § 591.2(p)*]. This exemption applies only if the transfer with respect to which the due-on clause is invoked occurred before October 15, 1985; or, in some cases depending on the character of the lender, only if the triggering transfer occurred even earlier [*12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3(c)(1)*; *see 12 C.F.R. §§ 30.1, 591.2(p), 591.4(c)(1), 701.21(g)(6)(ii)*].

[c] State Law

[i] Statutes

California statutes proscribe or affect the enforcement of due-on-sale/encumbrance clauses in the following situations:

- In the case of notes, trust deeds, and mortgages executed after June 1972, when the collateral is real property with no more than four residential units, a due-on-sale/encumbrance clause is not valid unless it is included in the trust deed or mortgage as well as in the note evidencing the obligation [*Civ. Code § 2924.5*].

- In the case of notes made after 1972, no due-on-encumbrance clause can be enforced solely on the basis of the owner's creation of a junior lien on a single-family, owner-occupied dwelling [*Civ. Code § 2949(a)*; Stats. 1972, ch. 698, § 2].

- In the case of notes made or refinanced after 1975, when the collateral is real property with no more than four residential units, no due-on-sale/encumbrance clause can be enforced solely on the basis of the following transfers [*Civ. Code § 2924.6(a), (c), (d)*]:

  - A transfer, resulting from the death of an obligor, to the obligor's spouse who is also an obligor.

  - A transfer by an obligor through which the obligor's spouse becomes a co-owner.

  - A transfer resulting from a decree of dissolution of the marriage or legal separation or from a property settlement agreement incidental to such a decree, that requires the obligor to continue to make the loan payments by which the obligor's spouse--who is also an obligor--becomes the sole owner of the property.

  - A transfer by an obligor into an inter vivos trust of which the obligor is a beneficiary.

  - A transfer by which the real property or any portion of it is made subject to a junior encumbrance or lien.

[ii] Decisions

The California Supreme Court has held that a due-on-sale/encumbrance clause is unenforceable, as an unreasonable restraint on alienation, unless the lender can demonstrate that enforcement is reasonably necessary to protect the security from impairment or risk of default [*Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970* (rule applied to preclude enforcement on outright sale); *Tucker v. Lassen Sav. & Loan Assn. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 629, 632, 638-639, 116 Cal. Rptr. 633, 526 P.2d 1169* (rule applied to preclude enforcement on sale by installment contract); *La Sala v. American Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 864, 869, 877-882, 97 Cal. Rptr. 849, 489 P.2d 1113* (rule applied to preclude enforcement on further encumbrance)]. In other cases the Supreme Court expanded the application of this rule to various situations [*see, e.g.,* *Dawn Investment Co. v. Superior Court (1982) 30 Cal. 3d 695, 700-704, 180 Cal. Rptr. 332, 639 P.2d 974* (rule applied to private, rather than just institutional, lenders, and to investment, rather than just residential, property); *West v. Buffo (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 93, 96, 188 Cal. Rptr. 535* (rule applied to individual owner-vendor who took back promissory note and trust deed)].

[5] Substitution of Trustee

At some point a party to a trust deed may wish to replace the original or current trustee, such as when the trustee is unable or unwilling to carry out the beneficiary's request to hold a trustee sale. A substitution of trustees by the parties may be accomplished by a statutory method [*Civ. Code § 2934a*; *see §§ 555.136, 555.137*], by provision, if any, in the

terms of the trust deed [*see, e.g., Bennett v. Ukiah Fair Asso. (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 43, 44-45, 59 P.2d 805]* , or by mutual agreement of the beneficiary and trustor [*see, e.g., Pacific S. & L. Co. v. N. American etc. Co. (1940) 37 Cal. App. 2d 307, 308-311, 99 P.2d 355]* . For further discussion of the substitution of trustees, and related forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25C, *Release and Reconveyance* (Matthew Bender).

A substitution of trustees pursuant to a standard clause included in the trust deed is valid even though it may not conform to the requirements of the statutory method [*U.S. Hertz, Inc. v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 83-85, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44]* . The other nonstatutory method of substitution is the joint execution, acknowledgment, and recordation of an instrument of substitution by the trustor and beneficiary, sometimes used when the trust deed does not include the usual substitution clause. This method is also valid without regard to the requirements of the statutory method [*Pacific S. & L. Co. v. N. American etc. Co. (1940) 37 Cal. App. 2d 307, 311, 99 P.2d 355]* .

Application for substitution of trustees may be made to the superior court under the statutes governing private trusts, when the trustee position is vacant or the trustee refuses to act [*Prob. Code § 15660*; *see Mutual Bldg. & Loan Asso. v. Wiborg, (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 325, 330, 139 P.2d 73* ; *Baumann v. Harrison (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 84, 93, 115 P.2d 530]* . For further discussion and forms relating to the appointment of trustees to a private trust, see Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersAssignments by MortgagorsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersDue-on-Sale Clauses

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.16

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.16 Priorities of Liens

[1] General Rules

[a] Priority Determined By Time of Creation

When a single property interest is encumbered with more than one lien, the rights of the lienholders depend on the priorities of their liens. Other things being equal, different liens on the same real property have priority according to the time of their creation [*Civ. Code § 2897*; *see Fickling v. Jackman (1928) 203 Cal. 657, 661, 265 P. 810* (trust deed is lien for purpose of determining priority)]. In other words, as between two liens on the same property, the first in time of creation has priority in the absence of any contrary statutory or equitable consideration [*see First Nat. Bank v. Silva (1927) 200 Cal. 494, 497-498, 254 P. 262* (junior lien may be given preference by statute); *Smitton v. McCullough (1920) 182 Cal. 530, 534, 189 P. 686* (junior lien may be given preference in equity)].

Time of creation refers generally to the time the trust deed was executed and delivered [*see Walker v. Buffandeau (1883) 63 Cal. 312, 315-317]* . However, a lien is not necessarily created on delivery of an executed trust deed. Execution and delivery of a trust deed has no effect until a binding underlying obligation is created--for example, by the delivery of an executed promissory note [*Western Loan & Bldg. Co. v. Scheib (1933) 218 Cal. 386, 389-390, 23 P.2d 745]* . In accordance with this principle, when the underlying obligation is for future advances that the beneficiary may make, but is not required to make, no lien arises until an advance is actually made [*Fickling v. Jackman (1928) 203 Cal. 657, 662, 265 P. 810]* . For further discussion of priority rules concerning future advances, *see § 555.14[3][c]*. Similarly, a trust deed has no effect if there is no property to encumber, so that when it has been given to cover property not yet acquired, the lien arises only at the time the property is subsequently acquired [*Civ. Code § 2883*].

[b] Legal Lien Has Priority Over Equitable Lien

When a vendor's lien and a lien under a recorded purchase-money trust deed were created simultaneously because the vendor did not receive the full purchase price in cash (that is, the vendor had a vendor's lien for part of the price), the lien under the purchase-money trust deed had priority because it was a legal lien whereas the vendor's lien was an equitable lien. The Civil Code provisions for priority of the lien under a purchase-money trust deed cannot be reconciled with the provisions for priority of a vendor's lien [*compare Civ. Code § 2898(a) with Civ. Code § 3048*]; however, at common law, a legal lien has priority over an equitable lien. Lien priority under a purchase-money trust deed does not depend on lack of notice of the vendor's lien [*Brock v. First South Savings Ass'n (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 661, 672-676, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 700]* .

[2] Effect of Recording Laws

The time of recording does not necessarily establish priority. Recordation is intended simply to give constructive notice of the contents of the recorded document to subsequent purchasers or lienholders. Recordation does not create any presumption as to the time a lien was created [*Civ. Code §§ 1213, 1215*; *see Walker v. Buffandeau (1883) 63 Cal. 312, 315-317]* . An unrecorded lien remains effective as to the parties and those who have actual or constructive notice [*Civ. Code § 1217*; *see Powell v. Goldsmith (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 746, 749, 751-752, 199 Cal. Rptr. 554* (unrecorded lien retained priority over subsequent lien of holder who had actual notice)].

Recording affects priority against claims of subsequent good faith purchasers [*Wells Fargo Bank v. PAL Investments, Inc. (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 431, 438, 157 Cal. Rptr. 818]* . A lien or other interest is void against the claim of any subsequent purchaser or lienholder for value who has no actual or constructive notice of the previously created lien and whose interest is first recorded [*Civ. Code § 1214*; *see Gribble v. Mauerhan (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 221, 227-228, 10 Cal. Rptr. 296]* . The interest of a good faith purchaser or lienholder retains priority even if it is transferred to one who has notice of the previous unrecorded interest [*Jones v. IndependentTitle Co. (1944) 23 Cal. 2d 859, 861-862, 147 P.2d 542]* . For the purpose of *Civ. Code § 1214*, the holder of a judgment lien is not considered to be a good faith purchaser [*Bank of Ukiah v. Petaluma S. Bank (1893) 100 Cal. 590, 591, 35 P. 170* ; *Wells Fargo Bank v. PAL Investments, Inc. (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 431, 438, 157 Cal. Rptr. 818]* .

[3] Statutory Exceptions

The primary statutory exception to the general rule of priority is that a mortgage or trust deed given to secure the price of real property at the time of conveyance has priority over all other liens created against the purchaser, subject to the operation of the recording laws [*Civ. Code § 2898(a)*; *see Powell v. Goldsmith (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 746, 752, 199 Cal. Rptr. 554]* . The priority of the lien of a mortgage or trust deed on an estate for years in real property is determined in the same manner as the priority of a lien of a mortgage or trust deed on real property [*Civ. Code § 2898(b)*]. The effect of *Civ. Code § 2898(a)* is to give a purchase-money trust deed, executed and delivered at the time of conveyance, priority over previously recorded liens against the purchaser. Ordinarily, previously recorded liens against property not yet acquired would attach as soon as the purchaser acquired the property [*see § 555.13[2]*]. However, *Civ. Code § 2898(a)* codifies an equitable principle that is designed to protect the security of a vendor advancing part of the purchase price to the purchaser, namely, that the purchase-money lien attaches at the instant the purchaser acquires title from the vendor. Therefore, no prior voluntary lien can attach [*Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell (1898) 120 Cal. 680, 683, 53 P. 266* ; *see Tolman v. Smith (1890) 85 Cal. 280, 285-286, 24 P. 743* ; *Walley v. P.M.C. Inv. Co. (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 218, 219-220, 68 Cal. Rptr. 711]* . Although *Civ. Code § 2898* was originally intended to benefit vendors, it will also apply to trust deeds securing loans made to the purchaser by a third party, as long as the loan is made and used for the express purpose of paying for the property [*Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell (1898) 120 Cal. 680, 683-684, 53 P. 266* ; *Mercantile Collection Bureau v. Roach (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 355, 358, 15 Cal. Rptr. 710]* .

Because priority under *Civ. Code § 2898* is subject to the operation of the recording laws, the priority of a purchase-money trust deed may be lost against the claim of a subsequent good faith lienholder who first records the lien [*Civ. Code § 1214*; *see Powell v. Goldsmith (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 746, 751-752, 199 Cal. Rptr. 554* (subsequent

lien was not entitled to priority when lienholder had actual notice of unrecorded purchase-money trust deed)]. For further discussion, see [2], *above.*

Other types of liens may have statutory priority regardless of their time of creation [*see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code § 2192.1* (tax liens on real property have priority regardless of time of creation)]. These include mechanics' liens and liens on fixtures perfected under the Commercial Code, the priorities of which are discussed in Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens* , and Ch. 503, *Sales: Secured Transactions* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Mechanics' Lien Interests Versus Senior Encumbrancers. Mechanics' liens do not necessarily defeat predecessor voluntary encumbrances. These statutory liens only "relate back" and have priority from the date improvements began on the property subject to the lien. However, if the consensual trust deed was recorded before improvement work commenced, the trust deed has priority, and the lienholder under the trust deed would wipe out any mechanics' lien claimants upon completion of a successful nonjudicial foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 3134*]. *By William M. Hensley*

[4] Subordination Agreements

[a] In General

The priorities of liens may, to some extent, be determined by private agreement, as when one lienholder agrees to subordinate or waive the priority of a senior lien [*see Civ. Code § 2953.1(b),(c)*; *see also Civ. Code § 2934* (permitting recordation of subordination agreement)]. Typically, the statutory lien of the beneficiary of a purchase-money trust deed [*see* [3], *above*] is subordinated to the lien of an institutional lender's construction loan [*see, e.g., Middlebrook-Anderson Co. v. Southwest Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1026, 1030, 96 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . For extended discussion of subordination agreements and clauses, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25B, *Subordination, Assumption, and Assignment* (Matthew Bender), and California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 114, *Subordination* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Enforceability

An enforceable subordination clause or agreement must contain terms that define and minimize the risk that the superior lien will impair the subordinating lienholder's security. The terms may include limits on the use to which the proceeds of the superior loan may be put (to ensure that the value of the property will be enhanced); maximum amounts, so that the superior loan will not exceed the value of improvements being financed; requirements that the loans not exceed a specified percentage of the construction cost or value of the property as improved; specified amounts per square foot of construction; or other limits designed to protect the subordinating lienholder's security [*Handy v. Gordon (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 578, 581, 55 Cal. Rptr. 769, 422 P.2d 329]* . When these terms are not included, a court may refuse to enforce the clause or agreement on the ground that it is not just and reasonable as to the subordinating lienholder [*see Handy v. Gordon (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 578, 579, 581-582, 55 Cal. Rptr. 769, 422 P.2d 329]* .

Even when a subordination clause may be enforced according to its terms, it may nonetheless be challenged by the subordinating lienholder on the ground that the limiting terms have not been met [*see, e.g., Miller v. Citizens Sav. & Loan Asso. (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 655, 663-665, 56 Cal. Rptr. 844* (loan proceeds used with knowledge of subordinating lienholder for purpose not within terms were not covered by subordination clause)]. The subordinating lienholder may even challenge an automatic subordination on the same ground. In a case of automatic subordination, there is no express subordination agreement or clause but simply an escrow instruction providing for prior recordation of the superior lien [*Middlebrook-Anderson Co. v. Southwest Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1030, 96 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . However, a subordination agreement can and should be inferred in these circumstances, so that the subordinating lienholder may regain the original priority if the terms reasonably implied by the agreement are not met [*Middlebrook-Anderson Co. v. Southwest Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1030-1038, 96 Cal. Rptr.*

338] .

When the purchaser breaches the subordination agreement by not using the proceeds to improve the property, the lender cannot enforce the vendor's agreement to subordinate. The lender is a third-party beneficiary of the agreement between the purchaser and vendor and cannot assert greater rights than those of the purchaser under the subordination agreement [*Protective Equity Trust #83, Ltd. v. Bybee (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 139, 149-151, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864* ; *Middlebrook-Anderson Co. v. Southwest Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1031-1033, 96 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . The lender's failure to undertake supervision of the disbursement of the funds does not preclude liability for the loss of priority from the purchaser's breach, because the lender is in a better position to control the purchaser's use of the funds [*Protective Equity Trust #83, Ltd. v. Bybee (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 139, 149-151, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 864]* .

A lender's lien priority may be lost if the terms of the senior loan are materially changed without the consent of a subordinating vendor. When a purchaser-developer and lender modify the terms of the senior loan so as to materially increase the risk that it will become a subject of default, the priority of the senior lien may be lost if the modification materially affects the subordinating vendor's rights [*Gluskin v. Atlantic Savings & Loan Assn. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 307, 314-315, 108 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . However, a material modification of a senior lien may result in loss of priority only for the modification, when the liens are held by hard money lenders [*Lennar Northeast Partners v. Buice (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1576, 1588, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 435]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Scope of *Lennar* Decision. *Lennar* should not apply when the recorded loan documents, especially the trust deed, and a subordination agreement make note modifications superior to the subordinated lien. In effect, a contractual agreement to modifications overrides the *Lennar* result [*cf. Swiss Properties Mgt. Co., Inc. v. The Southern California IBEW-NECA Pension Plan (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 839, 845-846, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 587]* .

Furthermore, *Lennar* recently has been narrowly circumscribed and held to grant equitable relief to junior lienholders only "according to the facts of the particular case" [*see Friery v. Sutter Buttes Savings Bank (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 869, 876, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 32]* . Thus far, no post-*Lennar* case has invalidated priority for any senior encumbrance over and above the amount of the modification not consented to by the subordinating junior lienholder. *Lennar* is a factually-intensive decision, which should not be relied on beyond a very narrow set of circumstances. *By William M. Hensley*

[c] Statutory Regulation

The provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 2953.1-2953.5* require that certain disclosures be made in a subordination agreement or in a security instrument that includes a subordination clause, if the subordinating loan does not exceed $25,000 [*Civ. Code §§ 2953.2, 2953.3, 2953.5*]. If these requirements apply but are not met, the subordination clause or agreement may be voidable at the election of the person whose security interest is subordinated, if that person lacks actual knowledge of the existence and terms of the subordination clause or agreement and if the election is made within two years after the clause or agreement was executed [*Civ. Code § 2953.4(a)*]. An election to avoid a subordination clause or agreement must be exercised by recording a notice including certain information [*see Civ. Code § 2953.4(b)*]. The holder of the subordinated security interest may, alternatively, record a notice waiving the right to avoid subordination under *Civ. Code § 2953.4(a)* [*Civ. Code § 2953.4(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien PrioritiesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensEquitable LiensReal Property

LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' LiensReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingRecording Acts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.17

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.17 Notice of Transfer of Servicing of Secured Debt

Any person transferring to a different service agency, or assuming from another, the debt servicing of a note, bond, or other instrument secured by a trust deed on real property in California containing one-to-four residential units must give written notice to the borrower or subsequent obligor before the borrower or subsequent obligor becomes obligated to make payments to the new service agent [*Civ. Code § 2937(b), (e)*]. Any person transferring the servicing of indebtedness to a different servicing agent must also provide to the new servicing agent all existing insurance policy information that the person is responsible for maintaining, including, but not limited to, flood and hazard insurance policy information [*Civ. Code § 2937(d)*]. Any person assuming from another the responsibility for debt service on the instrument must include in the notice a statement of the due date of the next payment [*Civ. Code § 2937(f)*]. For further discussion and a form of notice, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25B, *Subordination, Assumption, and Assignment* (Matthew Bender).

If a notice of default has been recorded or a judicial foreclosure proceeding has been commenced, the person transferring the debt service and the person assuming it must give written notice of the transfer to the trustee or attorney named in the notice of default or judicial foreclosure proceeding. A notice of default, notice of sale, or judicial foreclosure will not be invalidated solely because the service agent is changed during the foreclosure process [*Civ. Code § 2937(c)*]. A service agent does not include not a trustee exercising a power of sale pursuant to a trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2937(h)*].

The borrower or subsequent obligor is not liable to the holder of the note, bond, or other instrument, or to any service agent, for payments made to the previous service agent or for late charges, if the payments were made before the borrower or subsequent obligor received written notice of the transfer, and the payments were otherwise on time [*Civ. Code § 2937(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersTransfers by Mortgagees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.18

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.18 Extinction or Expiration of Security

[1] Performance or Discharge of Obligation

A mortgage is incidental to the obligation for which it is security, and a mortgage may be extinguished like any other accessory obligation [*Civ. Code § 2909*]. A mortgage is extinguished when the underlying obligation is extinguished, whether by full performance or otherwise [*Coon v. Shry (1930) 209 Cal. 612, 615, 289 P. 815* ; *see Burge v. Michael (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 780, 786, 29 Cal. Rptr. 290* (dictum); *Trowbridge v. Love (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 746, 751, 137 P.2d 890* (trust deed); *see Civ. Code §§ 1473 et seq., 2910* (extinction of obligations generally; sale of property in discharge of secured obligation extinguishes lien)]. If foreclosure proceedings are pending, a tender of the full amount properly due, made at any time before foreclosure, extinguishes the lien and halts the foreclosure proceedings [*Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 922, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82]* . However, if a mortgage is created for future advances, it remains valid even though at times there may be no actual underlying obligation [*Frank H. Buck Co. v. Buck (1912) 162 Cal. 300, 303-304, 122 P. 466* ; *see Moss v. Odell (1901) 134 Cal. 464, 466, 66 P. 581]* . For further discussion of future advances, see *§ 555.14[3][c]*.

When an obligation is secured by a trust deed, discharge of the obligation accomplishes the purpose for which the trust was created, and the trust terminates [*see Prob. Code § 15407(a)(2)*]. Title automatically revests in the trustor, and if the trustee retains bare legal title of record, the trustee can be compelled to reconvey so as to clear the record title [*Bank of Italy Nat'l Trust & Sav. Asso. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 657, 20 P.2d 940* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 922, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82* ; *Snider v. Basinger (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 819, 823, 132 Cal. Rptr. 637]* .

For further discussion concerning the rights and duties of parties to a mortgage or trust deed on discharge of the secured obligation, see *§§ 555.19* and *555.20*.

[2] Illegality

Certain types of obligations may not be secured by a trust deed. For example, a lien on real property may not be given to secure a loan to finance the purchase of a motor vehicle, with one exception [*Civ. Code § 2982.5(d)(1), (2)*]. A trust deed given in violation of this type of provision is void and unenforceable [*see Civ. Code § 2982.5(d)(1)*; *see also People v. Custom Craft Carpets, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 676, 685, 206 Cal. Rptr. 12* (trust deed was void when it violated prohibition under *Civ. Code § 1804.3* against use of real property security interest in contract for goods that are not attached to real property)].

[3] Merger of Interests

As a general rule, when two interests in real property are joined in one person, the lesser interest becomes merged into the greater and is annihilated [*Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 406, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . A trust deed may be extinguished by merger when the beneficiary acquires the ownership interest of the trustor [*Ralph C. Sutro Co. v. Paramount Plastering, Inc. (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 433, 438, 31 Cal. Rptr. 174]* or the prior security interest of a senior trust deed [*Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 406, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* .

A merger does not invariably occur on the joinder of two interests, however. Whether that is the result is a factual question and depends on the intent of the person in whom the interests are united [*Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 742-743, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132]* . A merger is usually held not to occur if a junior lien intervenes between ownership and senior security interests that are united, because it is in the best interest of the person in whom these interests are joined to retain priority over the junior lien [*Anglo-Californian Bank v. Field (1905) 146 Cal. 644, 653, 80 P. 1080]* . Intent to avoid a merger is ordinarily implied, in the absence of express intent, when all of the circumstances show that the interest of the person in whom the two estates have united would be best served by keeping them separate [*Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 743, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132]* .

[4] Lapse of Time

[a] Effect of Statute of Limitations

A lien is extinguished by the lapse of the statutory period within which an action could be brought on the secured obligation [*Civ. Code § 2911*]. The effect of this provision on a mortgage with a power of sale, as distinguished from a trust deed, demonstrates a major difference between the two [*see Bank of Italy etc. Assn. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 655, 20 P.2d 940]* . After the limitation period has run on an obligation secured by a mortgage, the mortgage is extinguished even if it contains a power of sale [*Faxon v. All Persons (1913) 166 Cal. 707, 715-717, 137 P. 919]* . A trust deed is not extinguished in the same circumstances; courts have held that a trust deed's power of sale may be exercised in spite of the running of the limitation period on the secured obligation [*Carson Redevelopment Agency v. Adam (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 608, 610-612, 186 Cal. Rptr. 615* ; *see Sipe v. McKenna (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 1001, 1006, 200 P.2d 61* (assignment by beneficiary after lapse of statute of limitations was effective and enabled assignee to exercise power of sale); *but see* [b], *below*]. However, because the trust deed is merely an incident of the secured obligation, the lapse of the statute of limitations on the obligation does constitute a defense to a judicial action for foreclosure [*see Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 106-107, 77 P.2d 1090]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Limitations for Judicial Foreclosure Actions. Judicial foreclosure actions are governed by a four-year written contractual limitations period running from the obligation maturity date or pertinent installment due date [*Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 106, 77 P.2d 1090]* . Even if this contractual limitations period runs on the note obligation, a lender can still nonjudicially foreclose a trust deed under the longer 10-year or 60-year periods set forth in Code Civ. Proc. § 882.020 [*see* [b], *below*]. *By William M. Hensley*

[b] Expiration of Ancient Trust Deeds

Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq. provide that a trust deed will be extinguished in the same manner as a mortgage after the lapse of a specified expiration period. Specifically, if a mortgage or trust deed has not already expired under *Civ. Code § 2911* [*see* [a], *above*], it expires on the later of the following dates [*Civ. Code § 882.020(a)*]:

- Ten years after the final due date of the secured obligation if it is ascertainable from the recorded evidence of indebtedness, or 60 years after the recordation date of the instrument creating the security interest if the final due date is not ascertainable from the recorded evidence of indebtedness; or

- If a notice of intent to preserve the security interest is recorded before the expiration of that period, then 10 years after the date of recordation.

For further discussion and a form of notice of intent to preserve a trust deed or mortgage, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 27, *Deeds and Recording* (Matthew Bender).

After the lapse of the expiration period, the mortgage or deed or trust cannot be enforced by the commencement of an action for foreclosure, the exercise of a power of sale, or the assertion of any other means [*Civ. Code § 882.020(a)*]. A power of sale is exercised, within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 882.020(a)*, on the recordation of the deed executed pursuant to the power of sale [*Civ. Code § 882.020(b)*]. The applicable expiration period may be extended by means of a waiver in compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5*, as long as each waiver is recorded before the lapse of the applicable expiration period [*Civ. Code § 882.020(c)*]. For further discussion of the waiver under *Code Civ. Proc. § 360.5*, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

The expiration of the lien of a mortgage, deed of trust, or other security interest pursuant to *Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq.* or any other statute renders the lien unenforceable by any means commenced or asserted thereafter and is equivalent for all purposes to a certificate of satisfaction, reconveyance, release, or other discharge of the security interest. Execution and recording of a certificate of satisfaction, reconveyance, release, or other discharge, while permitted, is not necessary to terminate or evidence the termination of the security interest [*Civ. Code § 882.030*]. *Civ. Code § 882.030* makes unenforceable the right to judicial foreclosure under *Code Civ. Proc. § 725a*, which is subject to the four-year statute of limitations in *Civ. Code § 2911*, but does not apply to the remedy of nonjudicial foreclosure. By use of the term "lien," § 882.030 precludes enforcement of the security interest that has been statutorily extinguished, but not the entire instrument creating the security interest [*Ung v. Koehler (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 186, 196, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 311]* .

Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq. applies to all mortgages, trust deeds, and other instruments that create a security interest in real property to secure a debt or other obligation, whether executed or recorded before, on, or after January 1, 1983 (the operative date of those statutory provisions) [*Civ. Code § 882.040(a)*; *but see Civ. Code §§ 880.370, 882.040(b)* (extending until January 1, 1988, any earlier filing deadline or expiration date established by those statutes)].

[5] Foreclosure of Senior Lien

Foreclosure under a trust deed extinguishes junior liens or any other subordinate interests in the property [*see, e.g., Carpenter v. Smallpage (1934) 220 Cal. 129, 133, 29 P.2d 841* ; *Jensen v. Duke (1925) 71 Cal. App. 210, 212, 234 P. 876]* . The purchaser at either a judicial sale or a nonjudicial trustee's sale takes title free and clear of those interests [*see Dickey v. Gibson (1898) 121 Cal. 276, 278, 53 P. 704* (judicial sale); *Dugand v. Magnus (1930) 107 Cal. App. 243, 247, 290 P. 309* (nonjudicial trustee's sale)]. The security is lost or becomes valueless, there being nothing for the junior lien to attach to [*see Davis v. Myre (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 616, 618-619, 39 Cal. Rptr. 682]* . However, when the original owner's repurchase of property after a trustee's sale revives a junior deed of trust, that junior lien remains second to the new purchase-money deed of trust, which essentially replaces the original senior lien and makes possible the revival of the junior lien [*DMC, Inc. v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 190, 198-199, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 761]* .

For discussion of rules determining priority, see *§ 555.16*. For a form of complaint to recover on a note secured by a junior trust deed rendered valueless by foreclosure of a senior trust deed, see *§ 555.170*. For discussion concerning the revival of a junior trust deed extinguished by foreclosure, see *§ 555.13[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationMergerReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationRelease PaymentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationStatutes of LimitationsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingRecording Acts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.19

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.19 Discharge of Obligation

[1] Clearing Title of Record

The legal effect of a certificate of discharge prescribed by *Civ. Code § 2939*, to which a mortgagor becomes entitled under *Civ. Code § 2941* on discharge of an obligation secured by the mortgage [*see* [2]-[6], *below*], is simply to clear the title of record, as the mortgage is extinguished by the discharge [*see Burge v. Michael (1963) 213 Cal. App. 2d 780, 786, 29 Cal. Rptr. 290]* . *Civ. Code § 2941* essentially entitles a trustor or mortgagor to obtain satisfaction of record when the secured obligation is discharged [*see Windt v. Covert (1907) 152 Cal. 350, 354, 93 P. 67]* . A trust deed terminates and title automatically revests in the trustor when the secured obligation is discharged, so that the legal effect of a subsequent reconveyance, to which the trustor becomes entitled under *Civ. Code § 2941* [*see* [2]-[6], *below*], is merely to clear the title of record [*Snider v. Basinger (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 819, 823, 132 Cal. Rptr. 637]* .

[2] Reconveyance of Title

[a] Trustee's Duty

Within 30 calendar days after the obligation secured by a trust deed is discharged, the beneficiary or the beneficiary's assignee must execute arequest for full reconveyance and deliver it to the trustee together with the original note, trust deed, and any other documents that are necessary to reconvey the trust deed or to cause it to be reconveyed [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(1)*; *see Huckell v. Matranga (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 471, 478-481, 160 Cal. Rptr. 177* (trustee was entitled to demand delivery of original note before reconveying, and when note was not produced, trustee could require beneficiary to provide corporate surety bond to protect trustee from potential liability to holder of note); *see also Civ. Code § 2941(f)* ("original" may include optically imaged reproduction in circumstances discussed *below*)]. The trustee must then execute a full reconveyance and record it or cause it to be recorded (as defined *below*), in the office of the county recorder in which the trust deed is recorded, within 21 calendar days after receipt by the trustee of the following: the

original note and trust deed, the request for a full reconveyance, the fee that may be charged pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2941(e)* [*see* [4], *below*], the recorder's fees, and any other documents that are necessary to reconvey the trust deed or to cause it to be reconveyed [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(1)(A)*]. The trustee must deliver a copy of the reconveyance to the beneficiary, successor in interest, or debt-service agent, if known. The reconveyance instrument must specify one of the following options for delivering the instrument, the addresses of which the recorder has no duty to validate [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(1)(B)*]:

- That the recorder must deliver the recorded instrument pursuant to *Gov. Code § 27321* to the trustor or successor in interest at that person's last known address; or

- That the recorder must deliver the recorded instrument to the trustee's address. If the trustee's address is specified for delivery, the trustee must mail the recorded instrument to the trustor or the successor in interest to the last known address for that party.

Following execution and recordation of the full reconveyance, the trustee is also required, on receipt of a written request by the trustor or the trustor's heirs, successors, or assignees, to deliver, or cause to be delivered, the original note and trust deed to the person making the request [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(1)(C)*].

In lieu of delivery of the original note and deed of trust to the trustee within 30 days of loan satisfaction, as required by *Civ. Code § 2941(b)(1)*, a beneficiary who executes and delivers to the trustee a request for a full reconveyance within 30 days of loan satisfaction may, within 120 days of loan satisfaction, deliver the original note and deed of trust to either the trustee or trustor. If the note and deed of trust are delivered in this manner, on satisfaction of the note and deed of trust, the note and deed of trust must be altered to indicate that the obligation is paid in full [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(8)*]. In any case, this provision does not alter the obligations and requirements set forth in *Civ. Code § 2941(b)(2)* and *(3)* [*see § 555.19[2][b], [c]*].

For these purposes, "original" may include an optically imaged reproduction when the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 2941(f)*]:

- The trustee is an affiliate or subsidiary of the beneficiary or the beneficiary's assignee.

- The optical image storage media used to store the document is nonerasable write once, read many (WORM) optical image media that does not allow changes to the stored document.

- The optical image reproduction is made consistent with the minimum standards of quality approved by the National Institute of Standards and Technology or the Association for Information and Image Management.

- Written authentication identifying the reproduction as an unaltered copy of the note or trust deed is stamped or printed on the reproduction.

As used in *Civ. Code § 2941*, the phrases "cause to be recorded" and "cause it to be recorded" include, but are not limited to, sending the full reconveyance or certificate of discharge in recordable form, together with payment for all required fees, in an envelope addressed to the county recorder's office of the county in which the deed of trust or mortgage is recorded. These items may be sent by certified mail with the United States Postal Service, or by an independent courier service using its tracking service that provides documentation of receipt and delivery, including the signature of the recipient. If the items are received in recordable form together with all the required fees, within two business days from the day of receipt the county recorder must stamp and record the full reconveyance or certificate of discharge. Compliance with these procedures entitles the trustee to the benefit of the presumption under *Evid. Code § 641* that a letter correctly addressed and properly mailed has been received in the ordinary course of mail [*Civ. Code §*

2941(c); *see Civ. Code § 2941(h)* (provision applicable to mortgage or obligation secured by deed of trust satisfied on or after January 1, 2001)].

[b] Beneficiary's Duty

If the trustee fails to execute and record the full reconveyance, or cause it to be recorded, within 60 calendar days after discharge of the obligation, the beneficiary, on receipt of a written request by the trustor or the trustor's heirs, successor in interest, agent, or assignee, must (1) execute and acknowledge a document pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2934a* substituting itself or another as trustee, and (2) issue a full reconveyance [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(2)*; *see Civ. Code § 2941(b)(5)* (this backup provision does not excuse beneficiary or trustee from compliance with primary duty, discussed in *§ 555.19[2][a]*].

A beneficiary may, at its discretion, in accordance with the requirements and procedures of *Civ. Code § 2934a*, substitute the title company conducting the escrow through which the obligation is satisfied for the trustee of record. In that case, the title company assumes the obligation of a trustee under these provisions, and may collect the fee authorized by *Civ. Code § 2941(c)*.

[c] Release by Title Insurance Company

If a full reconveyance is not executed and recorded pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2941(b)(l)* or *(2)* [*see § 555.19[2][a], [b]*] within 75 calendar days after discharge of the obligation, then a title insurance company may prepare and record a release [*see Civ. Code § 2941(b)(3)(A)* (required contents of release)]. At least 10 days before the issuance and recording of the release, the title insurance company must send, by first-class, postage-prepaid mail, the intention to release the obligation to the trustee, trustor, and beneficiary of record, or any successor in interest of record, at the last known address [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(3)*]. When recorded, the release will be deemed to be the equivalent of a reconveyance of the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(3)(B)*; *see Civ. Code § 2941(b)(5)* (this backup provision does not excuse beneficiary or trustee from compliance with primary duties, discussed in *§ 555.19[2][a], [b]*)].

Civ. Code § 2941 creates a hierarchical system for issuing reconveyances. Thus, title insurers may record a release of obligation only if both the beneficiary and trustee, after proper request, have failed or refused to comply with their statutory duties within the specified time periods [*Trustors Security Service v. Title Recon Tracking Service (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 592, 607, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 793]* .

A title insurance company preparing or recording such a release will be liable to any party for damages, including attorney's fees, that any person may sustain by reason of the issuance and recording of the release [*Civ. Code § 2941(b)(6)*].

[3] Mortgagee's Duty to Record Certificate of Discharge

Within 30 days after a mortgage is extinguished, the mortgagee or assignee must execute a certificate discharging the mortgage in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2939* and record it or cause it to be recorded in the office of the county recorder in which the mortgage is recorded. In addition, the mortgagee must deliver the original note and mortgage to the mortgagor or any heir, successor, or assignee at the written request of the latter [*Civ. Code § 2941(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2941(f)*].

[4] Fee for Performing Duty

The trustee, beneficiary, or mortgagee may collect official fees and also may charge a reasonable fee to the trustor or mortgagor, or the owner of the land, as the case may be, for all services involved in the preparation, execution, and recordation of the full reconveyance, including document preparation and forwarding services rendered to effect the full reconveyance. This fee may be made payable no earlier than the opening of a good faith escrow or no more than 60

days before the full discharge of the secured obligation [*Civ. Code § 2941(e)(1)*]. The fee will be conclusively presumed to be reasonable if it does not exceed $45 [*Civ. Code § 2941(e)(2)*].

This fee may not be charged unless demand for the fee was included in the payoff demand statement described in *Civ. Code § 2943* [*Civ. Code § 2941(e)(3)*; *see § 555.53* (payoff demand statements)]. In any case, no fee or charge may be imposed on the trustor in connection with, or relating to, any act described in the provisions of *Civ. Code § 2941* except as expressly authorized by that code section [*Civ. Code § 2941(g)*]. However, notwithstanding any other provision of law, if no payoff demand statement is issued in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2943*, nothing in *Civ. Code § 2941* may be construed to prohibit the charging of a reconveyance fee [*Civ. Code § 2941.1*].

[5] Breach of Duty

[a] Damages and Penalty

If any provision of *Civ. Code § 2941* is violated, the violator will be liable to the person affected by the violation for all damages that the latter may sustain by reason of the violation, and must forfeit $500 to that person [*Civ. Code § 2941(d)*]. The $500 payment is a statutory penalty for the wrongful withholding of a reconveyance and may be recovered without proof of any actual damages [*Dixon v. Grossman (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 941, 944, 99 Cal. Rptr. 659]* . A direct action based on violation of the statutory duty sounds in tort, and damages may be recovered for emotional distress [*Pintor v. Ong (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 837, 841-842, 259 Cal. Rptr. 577]* . For a form of complaint for recovery of the statutory penalty, in addition to other damages and quiet title relief [*see § 555.19[5][b]*], see *§ 555.120*.

Any person who violates *Civ. Code § 2941* is also guilty of a misdemeanor [*Civ. Code § 2941.5*].

[b] Other Relief

A beneficiary or mortgagee that persists in refusing to carry out the duty to clear title of record under *Civ. Code § 2941* may be compelled to do so [*see MacLeod v. Moran (1908) 153 Cal. 97, 100, 94 P. 604]* . This is usually accomplished through the trustor's or mortgagor's action to have title quieted, which may include a cause of action for damages and a statutory penalty under *Civ. Code § 2941(d)* [*Dixon v. Grossman (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 941, 943, 99 Cal. Rptr. 659* ; *see § 555.120*]. Alternatively, the trustor or mortgagor may have the title of record cleared by recording a bond and declaration under *Civ. Code § 2941.7* [*see § 555.20*].

If the trustee wrongfully conducts a private foreclosure sale after the trustor has discharged the secured obligation and become entitled to a reconveyance under *Civ. Code § 2941(b)*, the trustor is not limited to damages under *Civ. Code § 2941(d)* but is also entitled to have the private sale set aside and to have the property reconveyed [*Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 922, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82]* .

[6] Special Rules Concerning Application of Provisions

[a] Costs and Actual Damages

If an action that was filed before January 1, 2002, was dismissed as a result of the 2001 amendments to *Civ. Code § 2941* [*see* 2001 Stats., ch. 560, § 1], the plaintiff was not required to pay the defendant's costs [*Civ. Code § 2941(i)(1)*]. If a claim was barred or dismissed as a result of those amendments, the claimant could, within six months thereafter, file or refile a claim for actual damages that occurred before January 1, 2002 [*Civ. Code § 2941(i)(2)*].

[b] Fees and Recording

Notwithstanding any other penalties, if a beneficiary collects a fee for reconveyance and thereafter has knowledge, or

should have knowledge, that no reconveyance has been recorded, the beneficiary must cause the reconveyance to be recorded. Alternatively, if the release of obligation is earlier and timely recorded, the beneficiary must refund to the trustor the fee charged to perform the reconveyance. Evidence of knowledge includes, but is not limited to, notice of a release of obligation pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2941(b)(3)* [*Civ. Code § 2941(j)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationRelease PaymentsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.20

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.20 Reconveyance After Posting Bond

[1] In General

If a secured obligation has been discharged, but the beneficiary or mortgagee either cannot be located after diligent search or refuses to perform the duty under *Civ. Code § 2941* [*see § 555.19*], the trustor or mortgagor may obtain a release by recording or causing to be recorded, in the office of the county recorder in which the trust deed or mortgage is recorded, a corporate bond accompanied by a declaration and, in the case of a trust deed, a reconveyance [*Civ. Code § 2941.7*]. This procedure for release may also be used if the obligation has not been discharged but the beneficiary or mortgagee of record cannot be located after diligent search [*Civ. Code § 2941.7*]. This procedure is deemed to be a cumulative remedy rather than an exclusive remedy [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(e)*].

"Diligent search" means all of the following [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(d)*]:

- The mailing of notices as provided under *Civ. Code § 2941.7(b)(5)* [*see § 555.20[2]*] and to any other address used to correspond with or contact the beneficiary or mortgagee.

- A check of the telephone directory in the city of the beneficiary's or mortgagee's last known address or place of business.

- A check of the records of the California secretary of state and the secretary of state in the state of incorporation (if known) if the beneficiary or mortgagee is a corporation.

- An inquiry with the regulatory authority of the bank or association if the beneficiary or mortgagee is a state or national bank or state or federal savings and loan association.

For further discussion and forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25C, *Release and Reconveyance* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Reconveyance or Discharge

In the case of a trust deed, when 30 days have expired following the recordation of a bond and declaration under *Civ. Code § 2941.7*, and when the trustor or a successor has delivered to the trustee a demand for reconveyance under *Civ. Code § 2941.7* together with the usual reconveyance fees plus costs, the trustee must execute and record, or otherwise deliver as provided under *Civ. Code § 2941*, a reconveyance in the same form as if the beneficiary had made a proper request for reconveyance, provided the trustee has not received a written objection to the reconveyance from the beneficiary of record [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(c)*].

The trustee is not liable for this reconveyance, and the sole remedy of any person damaged by it is against the trustor, the affiant, or the surety on the bond [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(c)*].

In the case of a mortgage, when 30 days have expired following the recordation of a bond and declaration under *Civ. Code § 2941.7*, the mortgage is satisfied of record, provided no objection to satisfaction has been recorded by the mortgagee within that period [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(c)*].

When there is an outstanding indebtedness, the interest stops accruing as of the date the reconveyance is recorded or the mortgage is satisfied of record [*Civ. Code § 2941.7(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationRelease Payments

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.21

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.21 California Residential Mortgage Lending Act

[1] License Requirements

The California Residential Mortgage Lending Act [*Fin. Code § 50000 et seq.*] governs persons engaged in the business of making or servicing residential mortgage loans in California. In general, persons engaged in these activities must obtain a license from the commissioner of corporations unless the person or transaction is excepted from a statutory definition or from licensure [*Fin. Code § 50002(a)*; *see Fin. Code § 50120 et seq.* (application and issuance of license for residential mortgage lender; suspension, surrender, or revocation of license for violation; licensing of residential mortgage loan servicer)]. The following are among the exempt persons under the Act [*see Fin. Code § 50002(c)(1)*d-(3)]:

- Any bank, trust company, insurance company, or industrial loan company that is authorized to do business in California and is doing business under the authority of, or in accordance with, a license, certificate, or charter issued by the United States or any state, district, territory, or commonwealth of the United States.

- A federally chartered savings and loan association, federal savings bank, or federal credit union that is authorized to transact business in California.

- A savings and loan association, savings bank, or credit union, organized under the laws of California or any other state, that is authorized to transact business in California.

[2] Licensee's Financial Condition and Loan Transactions

For persons who are subject to the Act, matters covered by the Act include the following:

- Annual audits of a licensee's books by an independent certified public accountant [*see Fin. Code § 50200*].

- A licensee's minimal tangible net worth [*see Fin. Code § 50201*].

- Procedures for handling escrow funds and trust accounts, and related financial matters [*see Fin. Code § 50202*].

- Limits on fees to borrowers and related matters [*see Fin. Code § 50203*].

- Prohibited activities [*see Fin. Code § 50204*].

- A licensee's maintenance of a surety bond [*see Fin. Code § 50205*].

- Adherence to specified subprime and nontraditional lending guidelines [*see Fin. Code § 50333*].

- Brokerage services provided to a borrower by a licensee [*see Fin. Code § 50700 et seq.*].

[3] Additional Statutory Requirements

Detailed provisions govern the administration of the Act and the role of the commissioner of corporations. These provisions cover such matters as the functions, powers, and duties of the commissioner [*see Fin. Code § 50301*], the commissioner's required examination of licensees at least every two years [*see Fin. Code § 50302*], and annual reports that must be filed by licensees [*see Fin. Code § 50307*]. Required fees that must be paid, as well other assessments that the commissioner may levy, are set forth in *Fin. Code § 50400 et seq.*, and the general operation of the act and related matters are covered in *Fin. Code § 50601 et seq.*

[4] Violations of Act

If any amount other than, or in excess of, permitted charges is willfully charged, contracted for, or received by a regulated lender, the commissioner of corporations may order the lender to refund the entire amount of the charge (the otherwise permitted amount plus the excess amount) to all borrowers charged the excess amount, together with 10 percent annual interest on the amount computed from the date the improper charge was imposed. This penalty is in addition to any other penalties or remedies imposed on the lender [*Fin. Code § 50504(a)*]. If interest on the principal amount of a loan in excess of the amount authorized by the Actis willfully charged, contracted for, or received, the Commissioner may order the lender to refund the excess interest amount to all borrowers charged the excess amount, together with 10 percent annual interest on that amount computed from the date the improper charge was imposed [*Fin. Code § 50504(b)*]. The Act also sets forth criminal and civil penalties for violations [*Fin. Code §§ 50500, 50501*; *see Fin. Code § 50510*], which may be applied to persons engaged in specified prohibited practices [*see Fin. Code §§ 50502, 50503, 50505-50509*].

In addition to the specific remedies under the Act, the commissioner has more general enforcement powers. Whenever, in the opinion of the commissioner, a person (other than an exempt person) is engaged, either actually or through subterfuge, in the business of making residential mortgage loans or servicing residential mortgage loans, or engaging in business as a mortgage loan originator [*see Fin. Code § 50003.5(a)* (definition); *California Legal Forms, Ch. 25, Real Estate Loans, § 25.12[6]* (Matthew Bender)], without a license, the commissioner may order that person to desist and refrain. If, within 30 days after an order is served, a request for a hearing is filed in writing and the hearing is not held within 60 days after the filing, the order is rescinded [*Fin. Code § 50320*; *see Fin. Code § 50002(c)* (exempt persons)]. Additionally, whenever the commissioner deems it to be necessary for the public interest, the commissioner has

continuous authority to exercise the powers set forth in the act, whether or not an application for a license has been filed with the commissioner, any license has been issued, or a license has been surrendered, suspended, or revoked [*Fin. Code § 50328*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.21A

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.21A Regulation of Certain Secured Consumer Loans

[1] Loans and Real Property Covered

A consumer loan that is secured by real property may be subject to additional regulation [*see Fin. Code § 4970 et seq.*]. For the loan to be covered by the governing provisions, the real property securing the loan must be (1) used or intended to be used as the principal dwelling by the consumer, (2) located in California, and (3) improved by a one- to four-unit residential building [*Fin. Code § 4970(d)*]. In addition, one of the following conditions must be met [*Fin. Code § 4970(b)*]:

- The annual percentage rate at consummation of the transaction will exceed by more than 8 percentage points the yield on Treasury securities having comparable periods of maturity on the 15th day of the month immediately preceding the month in which the application for the extension of credit is received by the creditor.

- The total points and fees payable by the consumer at or before closing will exceed 6 percent of the total loan amount [*see Fin. Code § 4970(c)* (what items are included in "points and fees"); *Wolski v. Fremont Investment & Loan (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 347, 350, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 500* (transaction was not covered loan when total points and fees exceeded 6 percent only if yield-spread premium was included)].

For these purposes, a consumer loan does not include any of the following [*Fin. Code § 4970(d)*]:

- A reverse mortgage.

- An open line of credit as defined by Regulation Z [*see 12 C.F.R. § 226.2(a)(20)*].

- A consumer credit transaction that is secured by rental property or second homes.

- A bridge loan, that is, any temporary loan, having a maturity of one year or less, for the purpose of acquisition or construction of a dwelling intended to become the consumer's principal dwelling.

[2] Prohibited Acts and Limitations for Covered Loans

[a] Prepayment Fee or Penalty

A covered loan may not include a prepayment fee or penalty after the first 36 months following the date of consummation of the loan [*Fin. Code § 4973(a)(1)*]. For the first 36 months, a covered loan may include a prepayment fee or penalty if the person who originates the covered loan has done all of the following [*Fin. Code § 4973(a)(2)*]:

- Offered the consumer a choice of another product without a prepayment fee or penalty;

- Disclosed in writing to the consumer at least three business days before loan consummation the terms of the prepayment fee or penalty for accepting a covered loan with the prepayment penalty, and the rates, points, and fees that would be available to the consumer for accepting a covered loan without a prepayment penalty; and

- Limited the amount of the prepayment fee or penalty to an amount not to exceed the payment of six months' advance interest, at the contract rate of interest then in effect, on the amount prepaid in any 12-month period in excess of 20 percent of the original principal amount.

In addition, a covered loan may not impose the prepayment fee or penalty if the loan is accelerated as a result of default, and the person who originates the covered loan may not finance a prepayment penalty through a new loan that is originated by the same person [*Fin. Code § 4973(a)(2)(D), (E)*].

[b] Permissible Payment Schedules

A covered loan with a term of five years or less may not provide at origination for a payment schedule with regular periodic payments that when aggregated do not fully amortize the principal balance as of the loan's maturity date. If a payment schedule is adjusted for the consumer's seasonal or irregular income, the total installments in a year may not exceed the amount of one year's worth of payments on the loan [*Fin. Code § 4973(b)*; *see Fin. Code § 4973(b)(2)* (not applicable to specified bridge loans)].

[c] Prohibited Terms and Provisions

A covered loan may not contain any of the following terms or provisions:

- A provision for negative amortization such that the payment schedule for regular monthly payments causes the principal balance to increase, unless the loan is a first mortgage and the licensed person discloses to the consumer that the loan contains a negative amortization provision that may add principal to the loan balance [*Fin. Code § 4973(c)*].

- Terms under which periodic payments required under the loan are consolidated and paid in advance from the loan proceeds [*Fin. Code § 4973(d)*].

- A provision that increases the interest rate as a result of a default, unless the change is a result of a

variable rate loan that is consistent with the provisions of the loan documents, and the change in interest rate is not triggered by default or the acceleration of indebtedness [*Fin. Code § 4973(e)*].

- A provision that permits the lender, in its sole discretion, to accelerate the indebtedness, other than an acceleration in accordance with the terms of the loan documents as a result of the consumer's default, pursuant to a due-on-sale provision, or due to fraud or material misrepresentation by a consumer in connection with the loan or the value of security for the loan [*Fin. Code § 4973(i)*].

[3] Lender's Reasonable Belief in Recipient's Ability to Repay Loan

A person who originates a covered loan may not make or arrange the loan unless, at the time the loan is consummated, the person reasonably believes the consumer or consumers will be able to make the scheduled payments to repay the obligation. The lender's belief must be based on a consideration of the consumer's current and expected income, current obligations, employment status, and other financial resources, other than the consumer's equity in the dwelling that secures repayment of the loan. In the case of a covered loan that is structured to increase to a specific designated rate, stated as a number or formula, at a specific predetermined date not exceeding 37 months from the date of application, this evaluation must be based on the fully indexed rate of the loan calculated at the time of application [*Fin. Code § 4973(f)(1)*].

In addition, a licensed person may not refinance or arrange for the refinancing of a consumer loan such that the new loan is a covered loan that is made for the purpose of refinancing, debt consolidation, or cash out that does not result in an identifiable benefit to the consumer,considering the consumer's stated purpose for seeking the loan, as well as fees, interest rates, finance charges, and points [*Fin. Code § 4973(i)*].

A consumer is presumed to be able to make the scheduled payments if, at the time the loan is consummated, the consumer's total monthly debts, including amounts owed under the loan, do not exceed 55 percent of the consumer's monthly gross income, as verified by the credit application, the consumer's financial statement, a credit report, financial information provided to the person originating the loan on behalf of the consumer, or any other reasonable means [*Fin. Code § 4973(f)(1)*; *see Fin. Code § 4973(f)(3)* (loans based on stated income must not be to evade these provisions)]. In any case, no presumption of inability to make the scheduled payments to repay the loan may arise solely from the fact that the consumer's total monthly debts, including the loan amounts owed, exceed 55 percent of the consumer's monthly gross income [*Fin. Code § 4973(f)(1)*].

[4] Other Limitations on Lender and Loans

In general, a person who originates a covered loan may not act in any manner that constitutes fraud, whether specifically prohibited by these provisions or of a different character [*Fin. Code § 4973(o)*]. Specific prohibitions applicable to covered loans include the following:

- A person who originates a covered loan may not pay a contractor under a home-improvement contract from the proceeds of a covered loan other than by an instrument payable to the consumer or jointly to the consumer and the contractor or, at the election of the consumer, to a third-party escrow agent for the benefit of the contractor in accordance with the terms and conditions in a written escrow agreement signed by the consumer, lender, and contractor [*see Fin. Code § 4973(g)*].

- A person who originates a covered loan may not recommend or encourage a consumer to default on an existing consumer loan or other debt in connection with the solicitation or making of a covered loan that refinances all or any portion of the existing consumer loan or debt [*Fin. Code § 4973(h)*].

- A person who originates a covered loan may not steer, counsel, or direct any prospective consumer

to accept a loan product with a risk grade less favorable than the risk grade that the consumer would qualify for based on the lender's current underwriting guidelines [*see Fin. Code § 4973(m)(1)*].

- If a broker originates a covered loan, the broker may not steer, counsel, or direct any prospective consumer to accept a loan product at a higher cost than that for which the consumer could qualify based on loan products offered by persons with whom the broker regularly does business [*Fin. Code § 4973(m)(2)*].

- A person who originates a covered loan may not avoid or attempt to avoid the applications of these provisions by structuring the loan transaction as an open-end credit plan for purposes of evading these provisions if the loan would have been a covered loan if structured as a closed-end loan, or by dividing any loan transaction into separate parts for the purpose of evading these provisions [*Fin. Code § 4973(n), (o)*].

[5] Required Disclosure Statement

A covered loan may not be made unless a statutory disclosure statement has been provided to the consumer no later than three business days before the loan documents are signed. The statement, entitled "CONSUMER CAUTION AND HOME OWNERSHIP COUNSELING NOTICE," must be written in 12-point or larger font [*see Fin. Code § 4973(j)(1)* (text of statutory notice)]. It is a rebuttable presumption that a licensed person has met its obligation to provide this disclosure if the consumer provides the licensed person with a signed acknowledgment of receipt of a copy of the notice [*Fin. Code § 4973(j)(2)*].

[6] Enforcement and Penalties for Violations of Law

An extensive number of provisions govern the enforcement of this law [*see Fin. Code § 4974 et seq.*]. However, any failure to comply with the law that was not willful or intentional and resulted from a bona fide error (which does not include an error in legal judgment), that occurred notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid those errors must be corrected within 45 days after receipt of a complaint or discovery of the error. If corrected in this manner, a person who originates a covered loan will not be administratively, civilly, or criminally liable for the error [*Fin. Code § 4974(a)*]. In addition, any licensed person who violated provisions of the law are deemed to have violated the person's licensing law and are subject to suspension or loss of their license as well as administrative and civil penalties [*Fin. Code § 4975*; *see Fin. Code § 4977*].

[7] Preemption of Local Regulation

Fin. Code § 4970 et seq. fully occupies the field of regulation of predatory lending tactics in home mortgages and therefore preempted a city ordinance regulating such lending practices, including the ordinance's regulation of loans not covered by the state statutes [*American Fin. Servs. Ass'n v. City of Oakland (2005) 34 Cal. 4th 1239, 1258, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453, 104 P.3d 813]* . Although the statutes contain no express preemption language, the scope of the legislative scheme, as well as the legislative history, provide clear indications of the Legislature's implicit intent to fully occupy the field [*American Fin. Servs. Ass'n v. City of Oakland (2005) 34 Cal. 4th 1239, 1255-1256, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 453, 104 P.3d 813]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingConstruction LoansReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 552.21B

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 552.21B Temporary Payment Relief for Service Members in Iraq and Afghanistan

[1] Eligibility for Deferment of Payments

Temporary relief from mortgage payments is available under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* to a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard called to active duty as a result of the Iraq conflict pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 [Pub. L. No. 107-243] or the Afghanistan conflict pursuant to Presidential Order No. 13239. Such a service member is called a "reservist" in the statutes [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 803*].

Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq. will not apply to any active duty voluntarily served after the close of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts or to any reservist on active duty as part of the Iraq or Afghanistan conflicts before January 1, 2006 [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 809*].

In addition to any other benefits provided by law and to the extent permitted by federal law, any member of the U.S. military reserve or the California national guard who is called to active duty after February 9, 2005, as a part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts may defer payments on an obligation secured by a mortgage or deed of trust, while serving on active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(a)*]. "Mortgage" means an obligation secured by a mortgage or deed of trust, and is limited to an obligation secured by a mortgage or deed of trust for residential property owned by the reservist and used as that reservist's primary place of residence on the date the reservist was ordered into active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 801*].

Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq. will apply only to an obligation that was incurred before the date a member of the U.S. military reserve or California national guard was called to active duty as part of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 811*].

[2] Procedure to Obtain Deferment

For a mortgage debt of a reservist to be subject to the provisions of *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.*, the reservist or the reservist's designee must deliver to the lender both of the following [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(b)*]:

- A letter signed by the reservist, under penalty of perjury, requesting a deferment of financial obligations; and

- If required by a financial institution, proof that the reservist's employer does not provide continuing income to the reservist while the reservist is on active military duty, including the reservist's military pay, of more than 90 percent of the reservist's monthly salary and wage income earned before the call to active duty.

On request of the reservist or the reservist's dependent or designee and within five working days of that request, if applicable, the employer of a reservist must furnish the letter or other comparable evidence showing that the employer's compensation policy does not provide continuing income to the reservist, including the reservist's military pay, of more than 90 percent of the reservist's monthly salary and wage income earned before the call to active duty [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(c)*].

[3] Relief During Deferment Period

The deferment period will be the lesser of 180 days or the period of active duty plus 60 calendar days and will apply only to those payments due after the notice provided to a lender by the reservist or reservist's designee [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(d)*].

The lender must extend the term of the obligation by the number of months the obligation was deferred [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(e)*].

During the deferment period, the reservist may defer the payment of principal and interest on the specified obligations. No penalties may be imposed on the nonpayment of principal or interest during this period. No interest may be charged or accumulated on the principal or interest on which the payment was delayed. No foreclosure or repossession of property on which payment has been deferred may take place during the period [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 804*].

[4] Limitations on Relief

Any mortgage payments deferred are due and payable on the earlier of the following [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 802(a)*]:

- The sale of the property or other event specified in the documents creating the obligation permitting the lender to accelerate the loan, other than a deferment of payments authorized by *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800*;

- Further encumbrance of the property; or

- The maturity of the obligation as defined under the terms of the documents creating the obligation or, if applicable, as extended pursuant to *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800(e)* [*see* § 555.21B[3]].

A reservist is not precluded from making payments toward the mortgage payments deferred before the occurrence of any of the events described above [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 802(c)*].

A reservist with a mortgage subject to an impound account for the payment of property taxes, special assessments,

mortgage insurance, and hazard insurance is not relieved from making monthly payments of an amount that is at least sufficient to pay these amounts, unless the borrower and lender agree to a lesser amount [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 802(b)*].

[5] Effect on Holder in Due Course

In those instances when a financial obligation covered by *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* is sold, any requirement to defer payments as specifiedin those code sections is transferred to the purchaser of the obligation [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 810*].

[6] No Adverse Effect on Creditworthiness

A stay, postponement, or suspension under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 800 et seq.* of the payment of any liability of a person in military service may not provide the basis for (1) affecting credit ratings, (2) the denial or revocation of credit, or (3) a change by the lender in the terms of an existing credit arrangement [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 805*].

[7] Continuation of Credit Disability Insurance

The holder of a loan with regard to which the debtor has purchased prepaid credit disability insurance [*see* Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans*] must give notice to the debtor, not less than 30 days before the expiration date of the insurance, that the debtor will not be protected during the period between that expiration date and the deferred maturity date of the loan unless the insurance is extended. The debtor may, at his or her option, direct the holder to add the amount of the additional premium to the unpaid balance of the loan [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 807(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)EnforcementHolders in Due CourseGeneral OverviewInsurance LawLife InsuranceCredit LifeReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.21C

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.21C Restrictions on Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans

[1] Overview

State-licensed lenders can be subject to certain restrictions on higher-priced mortgage loans imposed by *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.* A "higher-priced mortgage loan" is a consumer credit transaction, secured by the consumer's principal dwelling, with an annual percentage rate that exceeds the average prime offer rate for a comparable transaction, as of the date the interest rate is set, by (1) at least 1.5 percentage points, for a loan secured by a first lien on the dwelling, or (2) at least 3.5 percentage points, for a loan secured by a subordinate lien on the dwelling [*Fin. Code § 4995(a)* (incorporating definition in *12 C.F.R. § 226.35(a)*)].

The provisions of *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.* apply only with respect to a higher-priced mortgage loan that originates on or after July 1, 2010 [*Fin. Code § 4995.4*].

The state-licensed lenders that can be subject to the restrictions of *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.* are real estate brokers, finance lenders and brokers licensed under the Finance Lenders Law, residential mortgage lenders, commercial banks, industrial banks, savings associations, and credit unions [*Fin. Code § 4995(b)*].

There is no private right of action against a lender for a violation of *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.*, which can be enforced only by the attorney general or by the culpable lender's licensing agency [*Fin. Code § 4995.3(e)*]. However, in the event of a violation of *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.*, a provision for a prepayment penalty or yield spread premium, with respect to the tainted higher-priced mortgage loan, is unenforceable [*Fin. Code § 4995.3(f)*].

[2] Lenders Making Higher-Priced Loans

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making higher-priced mortgage loans, state-licensed lenders are subject

to certain restrictions. The maximum amount of a prepayment penalty that may be imposed by the lender in connection with the higher-priced mortgage loan must not exceed 2 percent of the principal balance prepaid, for prepayment of the loan during the first 12 months following loan consummation, or 1 percent of the principal balance prepaid, for prepayment of the loan during the second 12 months following loan consummation [*Fin. Code § 4995.1*].

The lender must not *but see Fin. Code § 4995.2(h)* (safe-harbor protection for good faith noncompliance)]:

- Make, or cause to be made, any false, deceptive, or misleading statement or representation in connection with the higher-priced mortgage loan [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(b)*] ;

- Recommend or encourage default on an existing loan or other debt prior to and in connection with the closing or planned closing of the higher-priced mortgage loan, it if refinances all or any portion of the existing loan or debt [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(f)*]; or

- Make the higher-priced mortgage loan with a provision for negative amortization [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(g)*].

After the higher-priced mortgage loan is made, the lender may enter into a subsequent agreement with the borrower to capitalize payments as a means of permitting the borrower to cure or prevent a delinquency; and that would not violate the proscription against negative amortization [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(g)*].

[3] Lenders Acting as Mortgage Brokers

A state-licensed lender is a "mortgage broker" for purposes of *Fin. Code § 4995 et seq.* when the lender arranges or attempts to arrange a higher-priced mortgage loan, which originates on or after July 1, 2010, and which is to be made by an unaffiliated third person, if the state-licensed lender acts, in the transaction, as exclusive agent for the borrower or as dual agent for the borrower and the higher-priced lender, for compensation or in expectation of compensation, whether paid directly or indirectly. In that situation, the lender-broker is engaging in "mortgage brokerage services" [*Fin. Code § 4995(c), (d)*].

A mortgage broker that arranges only higher-priced mortgage loans must disclose that fact to a borrower, both orally and in writing, at the time of initially engaging in mortgage brokerage services with that borrower [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(c)*].

A mortgage broker that provides mortgage brokerage services must not steer, counsel, or direct a borrower to accept a loan at a higher cost than that for which the borrower could qualify based on the loans offered by the persons with whom the broker regularly does business [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(d)*].

A mortgage broker that provides mortgage brokerage services for a borrower must not receive compensation, including a yield spread premium, fee, commission, or any other compensation, for arranging a higher-priced mortgage loan with a prepayment penalty that exceeds the compensation that the mortgage broker would otherwise receive for arranging that higher-priced mortgage loan without a prepayment penalty [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(e)(1)*].

When providing mortgage brokerage services for a borrower, a mortgage broker must receive the same compensation for providing those services whether paid by the lender, by the borrower, or by a third party [*Fin. Code § 4995.2(e)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.21D

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.21D Mortgage Brokers as Fiduciaries

State-licensed lenders can have specific fiduciary duties under *Civ. Code § 2923.1* when acting as mortgage brokers for residential mortgage loans; however, this will not limit or narrow any other fiduciary duty of a mortgage broker [*Civ. Code § 2923.1(c)*].

A "residential mortgage loan" in this context is a consumer credit transaction that is secured by residential real property that is improved by four or fewer residential units [*Civ. Code § 2923.1(b)(4)*].

The state-licensed lenders that could be subject to *Civ. Code § 2923.1* are real estate brokers, finance lenders and brokers licensed under the Finance Lenders Law, residential mortgage lenders, commercial banks, industrial banks, savings associations, and credit unions [*Civ. Code § 2923.1(b)(1)*].

A state-licensed lender is a "mortgage broker" for purposes of *Civ. Code § 2923.1* when the lender arranges or attempts to arrange a residential mortgage loan which is to be made by an unaffiliated third person, if the state-licensed lender acts, in the transaction, as exclusive agent for the borrower or as dual agent for the borrower and the residential lender, for compensation or in expectation of compensation, whether paid directly or indirectly. In that situation, the lender-broker is engaging in "mortgage brokerage services" [*Civ. Code § 2923.1(b)(2), (3)*].

A mortgage broker providing mortgage brokerage services to a borrower is the fiduciary of the borrower, and any violation of the broker's fiduciary duties is a violation of the mortgage broker's license law. This fiduciary duty includes a requirement that the mortgage broker place the economic interest of the borrower ahead of the mortgage broker's own economic interest. A mortgage broker that provides mortgage brokerage services to the borrower owes this fiduciary duty to the borrower regardless of whether the mortgage broker is acting as an agent for any other party in connection with the residential mortgage loan transaction [*Civ. Code § 2923.1(a)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.22

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.22 Deed Absolute As Mortgage

[1] When Given As Security

Every transfer of an interest in real property, other than in trust, that is made only as security for the performance of another act is to be deemed a mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)*]. Courts will deem a grant deed to be a mortgage, in spite of the fact that it is absolute on its face, if it is shown to have been given only to secure a debt [*Chapman v. Hicks (1919) 41 Cal. App. 158, 162, 182 P. 336* ; *see Schriber v. Alameda etc. Title Ins. Co. (1958) 156 Cal. App. 2d 700, 707, 320 P.2d 82* (deed absolute on its face was mortgage even when conveyance was to third person to hold for mortgagee)]. In such a case the intention of the parties will govern [*Chapman v. Hicks (1919) 41 Cal. App. 158, 162-163, 182 P. 336* ; *see Rickless v. Temple (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 869, 890, 84 Cal. Rptr. 828]* .

[2] Effect of Establishing Deed Absolute As Mortgage

A deed absolute on its face, once established as a mortgage, does not pass legal title but creates a mortgage lien in favor of the grantee [*Civ. Code § 2888*; *Moisant v. McPhee (1891) 92 Cal. 76, 79, 28 P. 46* ; *Chapman v. Hicks (1919) 41 Cal. App. 158, 165, 182 P. 336]* . The parties' rights and duties under the deed are then determined by the statutes governing mortgages generally [*see, e.g., Avery v. Hagenios (1919) 45 Cal. App. 176, 179-180, 187 P. 119* (grantee was required under one-form-of-action-rule, *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, to foreclose rather than seek personal judgment for debt)].

[3] Action to Establish Deed Absolute As Mortgage

[a] By Grantor

The grantor of a deed absolute on its face may have the deed established as a mortgage through an action for declaratory

relief [*see Orlando v. Berns (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 753, 754-757, 316 P.2d 705* (grantor sought declaration that, in transaction involving sale with option to repurchase, deed was given as security for loan)].

The grantor may also bring a quiet title action to compel reconveyance of title if the secured obligation has been discharged [*see, e.g., Louvall v. Gridley (1886) 70 Cal. 507, 508-510, 11 P. 777* ; *Steel v. Hadsell (1937) 23 Cal. App. 2d 354, 355-356, 73 P.2d 262]* . If the obligation has not been discharged, the grantor cannot obtain quiet-title relief without first paying the debt [*Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476-477, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91]* . A grantor who brings a quiet title action to compel reconveyance before paying off the debt may obtain relief conditioned on subsequent payment of the remaining debt in an amount and within a reasonable time determined by the court [*see, e.g., Rickless v. Temple (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 869, 875, 84 Cal. Rptr. 828* ; *Greene v. Colburn (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 355, 356, 325 P.2d 148]* . For a form of complaint by a grantor to quiet title and compel reconveyance by the grantee, see *§ 555.125*.

When the grantee has sold the property to a third party, the grantor may elect to affirm the sale and bring an action against the grantee to recover the net proceeds of the sale, less the outstanding debt [*Wilber v. Sanderson (1872) 43 Cal. 496, 497* ; *General Casualty Co. v. Soda (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 390, 391-392, 395, 7 Cal. Rptr. 536]* . Alternatively, the grantor may bring an action to quiet title against the third party transferee, unless that transferee is a good faith purchaser or lienholder [*see, e.g., Steel v. Hadsell (1937) 23 Cal. App. 2d 354, 356-357, 73 P.2d 262* (grantor may compel reconveyance from third-party transferee who acquired title without valuable consideration or had notice that deed was hidden security device); *see also Civ. Code §§ 2925, 2950*; *Duncan v. Ledig (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 7, 14, 202 P.2d 107]* .

[b] By Grantee

The grantee of a deed absolute intended as a mortgage may, on default by the grantor, bring an action to have the deed declared to be a mortgage and then foreclosed [*see, e.g., Churchill v. Woodworth (1906) 148 Cal. 669, 670, 84 P. 155* ; *cf. Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91* (grantee has no remedy when action on secured obligation is barred by statute of limitations)]. This is the grantee's sole remedy, and the grantee may recover a personal judgment on the debt only as adeficiency judgment [*see Avery v. Hagenios (1919) 45 Cal. App. 176, 179-180, 187 P. 119]* . For a form of complaint by a grantee to foreclose a deed established as a mortgage, see *§ 555.127*.

[c] Proof

Parol or extrinsic evidence is competent to show that a deed absolute on its face was intended as a mortgage, except against a good faith purchaser or lienholder [*Civ. Code §§ 2925, 2950*; *Shusett, Inc. v. Home Sav. & Loan Asso. (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 146, 153, 41 Cal. Rptr. 622* ; *Jensen v. Friedman (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 494, 498, 179 P.2d 855]* . There is a rebuttable presumption that a deed absolute on its face is what it purports to be [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 147-148, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193* ; *see Civ. Code § 1105*; *Evid. Code § 602*]. Therefore, the person seeking to show that the deed is actually a mortgage has the burden of proof, by clear and convincing evidence [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 148, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193* ; *Jones v. Dickerman (1931) 114 Cal. App. 357, 362, 300 P. 135]* . In other words, there must be no substantial doubt that the real intention of the parties was to give the deed solely as security [*Jensen v. Friedman (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 494, 505, 179 P.2d 855]* .

The trial court must consider all facts and circumstances in determining whether a deed absolute was intended to be a mortgage [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 149, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193* ; *Greene v. Colburn (1958) 160 Cal. App. 2d 355, 358, 325 P.2d 148]* . The facts of central importance are (1) the existence of a debt owed by the grantor to the grantee at the time of the transaction, and (2) a continuation of this debtor-creditor relationship after the execution of the deed [*Spataro v. Domenico (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 411, 413, 216 P.2d 32* ; *Jensen v. Friedman (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 494, 501, 179 P.2d 855]* . If this is shown, it may reasonably

be inferred that the deed was given only as security for the debt [*Jensen v. Friedman (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 494, 501, 179 P.2d 855* ; *Chapman v. Hicks (1919) 41 Cal. App. 158, 162, 182 P. 336]* . On the other hand, the lack of any surviving debt tends to show that the deed was not intended as a mortgage but was an outright transfer [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 149, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193* ; *Borton v. Joslin (1928) 88 Cal. App. 515, 521, 263 P. 1033]* .

Another important factor is whether there was any express mention by both parties of intent to treat the deed as a mortgage [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 148, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193]* . Mutual intent that the deed operate as a mortgage may be shown, for example, by an express agreement to reconvey on repaymentof a debt [*Rickless v. Temple (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 869, 890, 84 Cal. Rptr. 828]* , or it may be disproved by the express refusal of the grantee to enter into a security transaction [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 148, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193]* . The allocation of ownership rights is also significant. The grantee's assumption of possession after the transaction tends to show that no mortgage was intended [*Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 148, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193]* , while the grantor's retention of possession tends to show the opposite [*see Rickless v. Temple (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 869, 890, 84 Cal. Rptr. 828]* . A marked inequality between the value of the property and the consideration given for it under the deed is also strongly indicative of the deed's status as a security device rather than an outright conveyance [*Beeler v. American Trust Co. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 1, 17, 147 P.2d 583* ; *but see Develop-Amatic Engineering v. Republic Mortgage Co. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 143, 149, 91 Cal. Rptr. 193* (disparity in value was not controlling, in view of other facts showing absolute status of deed)].

[4] Equitable Mortgage Compared

A deed absolute on its face given only as security for a debt is sometimes said to be an equitable mortgage [*see, e.g., Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91* ; *UMET Trust v. Santa Monica Medical Investment Co. (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 864, 868, 189 Cal. Rptr. 922]* . Although the two are functionally similar, a deed absolute given as security is not an equitable mortgage established under equitable principles [*see § 555.23[1]*], but is a legal mortgage, one created by *Civ. Code §§ 2924* and *2925* [*see Schriber v. Alameda etc. Title Ins. Co. (1958) 156 Cal. App. 2d 700, 707, 320 P.2d 82]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensEquitable LiensReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.23

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.23 Equitable Mortgage

[1] Written Agreement Showing Intent

An executory agreement in writing, in which a debtor sufficiently indicates an intent to make certain real property security for the debt, is in equity deemed to create a mortgage on that property, enforceable as any other mortgage except against good faith purchasers or lienholders [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 313-314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds, *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*); *Higgins v. Manson (1899) 126 Cal. 467, 469-470, 58 P. 907]* . A promise to give a mortgage or trust deed on particular property as security for a debt may be enforceable as an equitable mortgage, as may an agreement that fails to qualify as a legal mortgage because of defective execution or some other reason but nonetheless provides that specified property is to be securityfor a debt [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds, *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*); *Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 351, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . A second trust deed with an erroneous description creates an equitable mortgage [*Clayton Development Co. v. Falvey (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 438, 444, 253 Cal. Rptr. 609]* . For further examples and discussion of the showing required to establish an equitable mortgage, see *§ 555.23[3]*.

[2] Other Equitable Liens Compared

With respect to equitable mortgages, courts are primarily concerned with whether the parties intended to create a security interest; if so, courts will enforce that intent in equity, as between the parties, in spite of any legal imperfection in creating that interest [*see Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1915) 171 Cal. 173, 201-202, 152 P. 542]* . On the other hand, courts may impose equitable liens in other situations when there is no intent to create a security interest, such as to prevent unjust enrichment [*see, e.g., Beckman v. Mayhew (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 529, 534, 122 Cal. Rptr. 604]* . For further discussion and forms relating to equitable liens generally, see *Ch. 342, Liens and Wage*

Preferences.

[3] Action to Establish Equitable Mortgage

[a] Foreclosure

Typically, the creditor, after the debtor's default, seeks to establish an equitable mortgage in an action to foreclose that mortgage [*see, e.g.,* *Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 312, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds in *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*)]. If an equitable mortgage has been created, this is the creditor's only remedy, because the creditor as mortgagee must follow the foreclosure procedure of the one-form-of-action-rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*] and may not elect instead to bring an action on the debt [*Clayton Development Co. v. Falvey (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 438, 444, 253 Cal. Rptr. 609* ; *Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 352-353, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . For a form of complaint to establish and foreclose an equitable mortgage, see *§ 555.128*.

[b] Proof of Intent

The controlling factual question is whether the parties intended to make the property security for the debt [*Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 351, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . The instrument itself need not show on its face the intent to create a security interest, as long as itis reasonably susceptible to this interpretation, and the requisite intent is shown by extrinsic evidence [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 314-315, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds in *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970*); *Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 351, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . One factor to consider in determining whether an agreement is reasonably susceptible to interpretation as a security device is whether this interpretation would be consistent with principles applicable to adhesion contracts. A creditor should not be permitted to take advantage of ambiguous language in a printed form that the creditor has provided in lieu of a standard trust deed, so as to convert an agreement into a security device whenever it becomes desirable to do so [*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 11, 19-20, 92 Cal. Rptr. 704, 480 P.2d 320]* .

The Supreme Court has created an apparent conflict with respect to agreements by debtors not to transfer or encumber real property. On one hand, the Court held that an agreement by a debtor not to transfer or encumber certain real property until the debt was discharged was reasonably susceptible to being interpreted as providing the specified property as security for the debt, so that it was enforceable as an equitable mortgage on a sufficient showing that such an interpretation conformed with the parties' intent [*Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 313 n.2, 315, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* , *overruled on other grounds,* *Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970* ; *see* *Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 349-350, 352, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . The court reached the opposite conclusion with respect to an almost identical agreement in another case [*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 11, 14 n.2, 16-21, 92 Cal. Rptr. 704, 480 P.2d 320]* . The court in *Tahoe National Bank* distinguished the agreement in *Coast Bank* on the ground that the *Coast Bank* agreement included an acceleration clause [*see § 555.15[3], [4]*] and was executed in connection with a loan to improve the property covered by the agreement, noting that both features were characteristic of a mortgage and were absent in the agreement considered in *Tahoe National Bank* [*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 11, 20, 92 Cal. Rptr. 704, 480 P.2d 320]* .

Reflecting what may have been a more important distinction between the cases, the *Tahoe National Bank* court also noted the different equities of the two cases, emphasizing that the creditor in *Coast Bank* sought to establish and foreclose an equitable mortgage after the debtor breached the covenant not to convey, which was the creditor's only effective remedy in the circumstances. By contrast, the debtor in *Tahoe National Bank* had merely defaulted on the debt and had not breached the agreement not toconvey, so that the property was still available for satisfaction of the creditor's judgment on the note [*Tahoe National Bank v. Phillips (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 11, 20-21, 92 Cal. Rptr. 704, 480 P.2d 320* ;

see Orange County Teachers Credit Union v. Peppard (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 448, 451-454, 98 Cal. Rptr. 533] .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsEquitable MortgagesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingRecording Acts

23 of 127 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Characteristics of Trust Deeds and Mortgages

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.24-555.29

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.24[Reserved]

24 of 127 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.30

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.30 Foreclosure

[1] Private Sale or Foreclosure Action

Foreclosure refers to the enforcement of a mortgage or trust deed in any manner provided by law. The original judicial method of foreclosure is an equitable proceeding to terminate ("foreclose" in the sense of preclude) a mortgagor's or trustor's right or equity of redemption [*see Civ. Code § 2931*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 725a*; *Bank of Italy etc. Assn. v. Bentley (1933) 217 Cal. 644, 654, 20 P.2d 940* ; *Hibernia Sav. & Loan Soc. v. Lauffer (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 725, 732, 107 P.2d 494]* . A private sale, or trustee's sale, conducted under a contractual power of sale, is referred to as a nonjudicial method of foreclosure [*see, e.g., Miller v. Cote (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 888, 894, 179 Cal. Rptr. 753* ; *Bisno v. Sax (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 714, 722, 346 P.2d 814]* .

Because standard trust deeds and most mortgages include a power of sale, the beneficiary or mortgagee typically has the option of pursuing either the judicial or nonjudicial method of foreclosure [*see Lincoln v. Superior Court (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 127, 128-130, 39 P.2d 405]* . Initially, at least, the beneficiary or mortgagee need not elect one method to the exclusion of the other but may pursue both concurrently [*Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 107-108, 77 P.2d 1090* ; *Carpenter v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1945) 71 Cal. App. 2d 593, 597, 163 P.2d 73* ; *see Commercial Centre Realty Co. v. Superior Court of San Francisco (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 121, 129, 59 P.2d 978]* . The judicial remedy may be pursued until the completion of the nonjudicial sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*; *Hibernia Sav. & Loan Soc. v. Lauffer (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 725, 728, 107 P.2d 494* ; *see § 555.32[2]*]. Conversely, a private sale may be completed at any time before a decree of foreclosure is entered [*see Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 108, 77 P.2d 1090* (whether private sale is available after judgment in foreclosure action is open question)]. For discussion comparing the respective features of the two remedies, see *§ 555.30[2]*.

PRACTICE TIP:

Election Through Judicial Foreclosure Decree Entry. Although the issue was not resolved with certainty in *Flack*, this practitioner finds that many courts have ruled in unpublished proceedings that an election has occurred if a lender has obtained a judicial foreclosure decree (even before a marshall's sale is conducted under the decree). However, this area is still ripe for litigation, because it can be argued that no election occurs until a marshall's sale actually happens and the time begins to accrue for a fair value hearing. *By William M. Hensley*

In the few transactions in which there is no provision for a private sale, such as when a grant deed is established as a mortgage [*see § 555.22*], the only remedy is judicial foreclosure [*see Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476-477, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91]* .

[2] Methods Compared

The following points of comparison are among the significant factors to be considered in determining whether judicial foreclosure or private sale is the more appropriate remedy in a given case [*see* [1], *above*].

1. In a foreclosure action, if the security proves to be insufficient, the beneficiary in some cases may recover a money judgment for the deficiency [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 726(b)*]. For discussion of when a deficiency judgment may be obtained, see *§ 555.32[3]*. After a private sale, a deficiency judgment is barred in nearly all cases [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580b, 580d*; *see § 555.32[2]*].

2. The title conveyed by a private sale is nonredeemable [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 43-44, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *see § 555.62*]. In the case of a sale under a foreclosure decree, the trustor or a successor in interest may, in some cases, redeem the property up to one year after the sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.010 et seq.*; *Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 43-44, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *see § 555.72*].

3. A private sale can be completed in a relatively short period, possibly 110 days [*see Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924f* (90-day period between notice of default and notice of sale plus 20-day period between notice of sale and sale); *Garfinkle v. Superior Court (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 268, 275, 146 Cal. Rptr. 208, 578 P.2d 925* ; *but see § 555.56[4]*]. Judicial foreclosure is subject to the delays incident to civil actions and the enforcement of a judgment for sale of real property. Additionally, a private sale may be expected to involve less expense than a court action.

4. A foreclosure action is subject to the bar of the statute of limitations on the secured obligation, but a private sale is not a judicial action andmay therefore be conducted at any time before final expiration of the trust deed or mortgage with a power of sale [*Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 106-107, 77 P.2d 1090* ; *see § 555.18[4][a]*].

5. Irregularities in the sale are more likely to result in the sale being set aside or invalidated when it is done privately than when it is done pursuant to a foreclosure decree [*cf. Scott v. Security Title Ins., & Guar. Co. (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 606, 613-614, 72 P.2d 143* (private sale was nullity when proper notice of sale was not given); *Hamilton v. Carpenter (1942) 52 Cal. App. 2d 447, 447-448, 126 P.2d 395* (failure to give proper notice of sale was not sufficient reason to invalidate or set aside judicial sale)].

PRACTICE TIP:

The Nod Goes to Private Sales. With rare exceptions, most lenders prefer to pursue private sales rather than judicial foreclosures. Time, expense, lack of a substantial deficiency differential, and marketability concerns tied to redeemability issues are the primary factors that convince most lenders to elect private sales over judicial foreclosure proceedings. Conversely, many secondary loan purchasers opt for judicial foreclosure based upon the "portfolio analysis" of deficiency recoverability and REO collateral values. All things considered, private sales outnumber judicial foreclosures by a large margin. *By William M. Hensley*

[3] Right to Foreclose Is Triggered by Default

Foreclosure, whether judicial or nonjudicial, is generally available on any default under the terms of the obligation and trust deed or mortgage [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)* (foreclosure is sole action for recovery of secured debt or enforcement of secured right); *Lincoln v. Superior Court (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 127, 129, 39 P.2d 405* (customary provision provided for sale by trustee in event of default); *see also Fin. Code §§ 1227.2, 7461* (default provisions that are enforceable even if beneficiary's security interest is not impaired)]. Typically the triggering event is a failure to pay installments of principal and interest due on the secured debt [*see, e.g., California Livestock Production Credit Assn. v. Sutfin (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 136, 139, 142, 211 Cal. Rptr. 152* ; *see also § 555.15[3]*]. However, foreclosure may also be available after a default in the performance of a collateral obligation, such as a duty to pay taxes and assessments on the encumbered property [*see, e.g., Security-First Nat. Bank v. Lamb (1931) 212 Cal. 64, 68, 297 P. 550]* or a duty not to transfer the encumbered property without the beneficiary's consent [*see, e.g., Santa Clara Savings & Loan Assn. v. Pereira (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1089, 1093-1097, 1098, 211 Cal. Rptr. 54* ; *see also § 555.15[4]*].

Not every default will justify foreclosure, however. In some circumstances courts may refuse to permit foreclosure if it would result in a forfeiturebased on a technical but insubstantial default. For example, one court denied any relief in a foreclosure action based on a default consisting of waste, which technically violated a covenant against waste but was, in fact, either ameliorative or harmless in effect [*Bart v. Strueli (1935) 5 Cal. 2d 67, 67-68, 52 P.2d 922]* . Similarly, another court held that a trustor was entitled to relief enjoining a trustee's sale when the sale was based on one day's tardiness in payment [*Bisno v. Sax (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 714, 720-730, 346 P.2d 814* ; *see Baypoint Mortgage Corp. v. Crest Premium Real Estate etc. Trust (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 818, 825-830, 214 Cal. Rptr. 531* (trustor, in action to enjoin private sale, was held likely to prevail on merits when default was merely payment made several days after due date but before date after which late payment charge was to be imposed)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Baypoint Counsels Against Enforcement of Non-Substantial Defaults. Although lenders frequently get frustrated over chronically late-paying borrowers, *Baypoint* came down hard on a lender attempting to enforce technical defaults against a borrower that nevertheless cured the delinquencies through tardy payments. The *Baypoint* court enjoined foreclosure by just such a frustrated lender and stridently counseled lenders not to pursue forfeiture maneuvers against patience-trying borrowers who nonetheless eventually come through with dilatory payments, because the lenders instead can pursue the enforcement of late charge penalties as a less draconian remedy against chronically tardy borrowers. *Baypoint* is must reading for borrowers and lenders in the default enforcement area with respect to what types of defaults will sustain smooth foreclosure efforts. *By William M. Hensley*

[4] Deed in Lieu of Foreclosure

As an expedient and inexpensive alternative to foreclosure, the trustor may give the beneficiary a deed in lieu of foreclosure [*see, e.g., Hamud v. Hawthorne (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 78, 83, 338 P.2d 387]* . At the time the trust deed is created, any agreement by the trustor to make such a conveyance in the event of default is unenforceable [*Civ. Code § 2889*]. However, a separate agreement to convey is valid, as long as it is made after the default for an adequate consideration (for example, cancellation of the secured obligation) and is otherwise fair and free from undue influence [*Hamud v. Hawthorne (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 78, 83, 338 P.2d 387* ; *Phelan v. De Martin (1890) 85 Cal. 365, 367, 24 P. 725]* . The adequacy of consideration would be a question of fact [*Wright v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 264, 280-283, 95 P.2d 194]* .

For discussion of the effect of a conveyance of the trustor's title to the beneficiary, see *§ 555.18[3]*. For discussion of circumstances in which adeed absolute on its face may be established as a mortgage only, see *§ 555.22*.

[5] Foreclosure on Real Property Sales Contracts

Courts have consistently rejected arguments that real property installment sale contracts should be construed as mortgages within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 2924(a)*, on the ground that such a construction should be made expressly by the legislature [*see, e.g.,* *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 106 n.1, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *Kosloff v. Castle (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 369, 377, 171 Cal. Rptr. 308* (disapproved on other grounds in *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232*)]. Under these decisions, a purchaser in default under an installment sale contract has not had the benefit of statutory protections afforded to mortgagors and trustors under *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*, such as the right of reinstatement under *Civ. Code § 2924c*. When the default was not willful or grossly negligent, the purchaser could cure the default and reinstate the contract under *Civ. Code § 3275* (relief from forfeitures) [*see* *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367]* . Otherwise, however, the purchaser was limited either to restitution of any payments made less damages [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833]* , or to redemption of title to the property by paying off the entire outstanding balance plus interest and consequential damages [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232]* . For further discussion of these remedies, see *Ch. 569, Vendor and Purchaser of Real Property* .

In response to these cases, the legislature partly extended the statutory foreclosure provisions to certain real property sale contracts. Specifically, for purposes of *Civ. Code §§ 2924-2924h* (governing foreclosure by private sale), "mortgage" now includes any security device or instrument, other than a trust deed, that contains a power of sale affecting real property that may be exercised after a breach of the secured obligation. In particular, "mortgage" includes any real property sale contract as defined by *Civ. Code § 2985*, when the contract contains such a power of sale [*Civ. Code § 2920(b)*; *see Civ. Code § 2985(a)* (real property sale contract defined as agreement by which one party agrees to convey title to real property to another party on satisfaction of terms of contract and that does not require conveyance of title within one year)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesReal Property LawFinancingInstallment Land Sale ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.31

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.31 Effect of One-Form-of-Action Rule

[1] In General

The one-form-of-action rule of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* is that foreclosure is the only form of action to recover any debt or enforce any right secured by a trust deed or mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*]. This rule has two purposes: to compel a secured creditor to resort first to the security, and to protect the debtor from numerous suits when a creditor holds multiple security interests [*see Savings Bank v. Central Market Co. (1898) 122 Cal. 28, 36, 54 P. 273]* . For discussion of the rule as it applies to guarantors, see *§ 555.32[5]*.

[2] Waiver of Protection

The benefits of the one-form-of-action rule may not be waived in advance by the debtor. Any purported waiver at the time of the transaction is void [*Civ. Code § 2953*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Waiver May Be Ineffective Against Guarantors. Although there is no precise California precedent on this point, a Nevada decision construing California law has held that a guarantor of a real estate loan has the benefit of the one-action rule [*see Component Sys. Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court, (1985) 101 Nev. 76, 692 P.2d 1296]* . If *Component Systems* is correct, this is significant for guarantors given than *Civ. Code § 2953* does not allow for advance waivers of the one-action rule. An issue waiting to be resolved is whether *Civ. Code § 2856* enactments, relative to post-1996 guarantor waivers [*see § 555.32[5][b][iii]*], allows one-action protections to be waived in advance (as it provides) or is inconsistent in some way with the antiborrower waiver policy enunciated through *Civ. Code § 2953*. *By William M. Hensley*

A debtor's waiver of the rule is invalid against other secured creditors. The creditor who has a personal judgment against the debtor and a waiver from the debtor cannot enforce nonjudicial foreclosure rights under the trust deed to obtain priority over other secured creditors. Obtaining a personal judgment exhausts all of the creditor's rights under the note and trust deed and relegates the creditor to the status of an ordinary judgment creditor without priority. Allowing a waiver would violate the policy of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, which is to minimize the extent to which the debtor's unpledged assets may be seized to satisfy a secured creditor's claims--a policy that protects other creditors. Allowing a waiver would also deprive the other creditors of the right of redemption after a judicial foreclosure [*O'Neil v. General Security Corp. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 587, 598-605, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 712]* .

A debtor's waiver is also unenforceable against nonconsenting obligors on the note [*Pacific Valley Bank v. Schwenke (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 134, 146, 234 Cal. Rptr. 298]* or against successors in interest of the debtor [*Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 739, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329]* .

[3] Action on Debt

[a] Barred Until Security Exhausted

[i] Operation of Rule

Under the one-form-of-action rule, a creditor must first exhaust the security before seeking a money judgment on a debt secured by a trust deed or mortgage [*Hartman v. Smith (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 415, 417, 33 Cal. Rptr. 147]* . Thus, if a creditor seeks to recover by an action on the debt instead of a foreclosure action, the debtor may raise the existence of the security as an affirmative defense, the effect of which is to bar the action and force the creditor first to exhaust the security before seeking a personal judgment against the debtor for any deficiency [*Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 734, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329* ; *Hartman v. Smith (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 415, 416-417, 33 Cal. Rptr. 147]* . Similarly, following a debtor's default on a note secured by a trust deed on California real property, the creditor cannot commence an action against the debtor in another country, obtain a prejudgment attachment against the debtor's real property in the other country, and then commence an action in California for judicial foreclosure and a deficiency, because the commencement of the initial action constitutes an election of remedies triggering forfeiture of the creditor's security interest [*Shin v. Superior Court (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 542, 546-549, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 587]* .

The debtor may waive the defense by failing to raise it [*Scalese v. Wong (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 863, 870, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40* ; *Spector v. National Pictures Corp. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 217, 225-226, 20 Cal. Rptr. 307]* . However, even if the debtor waives the defense in an action on the debt, the debtor is still entitled to invoke *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* if the creditor later seeks judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure of the security. In this case, *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* operates as a sanction on the ground that the creditor, by not foreclosing on the security in the action to enforce the debt, made an election of remedies and waived the security [*Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 733-734, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329]* .

[ii] Pursuit of Attachment Not an Action

Subject to the antideficiency provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580b* and *580d* [*see § 555.32*], in an action to foreclose, the pursuit of any remedy authorized by law relating to attachment does not constitute an action for the recovery of a debt for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)* or a failure to comply with other statutory or judicial requirements to proceed first against security [*Code Civ. Proc. § 483.012*].

PRACTICE TIP:

No One-Action Problem for Appointment of Receiver or Turnover of Receivership Funds.

Although the issue was in doubt until recently, *Civ. Code § 2938(c), (e)(2), (f)(1),* as well as *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(d),* now clarify that the appointment of a receiver or the receipt of rents, issues, and profits

under an assignment-of-rents clause in the form of receivership estate proceeds does not run afoul of one-action rule prohibitions. *By William M. Hensley*

[iii] Exception for Fraud Action

The one-form-of-action rule does not bar an action for damages for fraud under *Civ. Code § 1572* if that action is brought by a person authorized by California to make or arrange loans, or by any subsidiary, affiliate, or successor in interest that originated the loan or purchased the loan or any interest in the loan, against a borrower for fraudulent conduct that induced the original lender to make a loan secured by a trust deed. Exemplary damages up to 50 percent of actual damages may be recovered in such an action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(f), (h)*; *Fin. Code §§ 551(a), 7460(a), 15102(a)*]. This exception to the one-form-of-action rule does not apply to loans secured by single-family, owner-occupied residential real property if the property is actually occupied by the borrower as represented to the lender in order to obtain the loan and the loan is for less than $150,000, as adjusted annually to the Consumer Price Index [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(g)*; *Fin. Code §§ 551(b), 7460(b), 15102(b)*].

[b] When Security Is Rendered Worthless

[i] Action on Debt Permitted; Sold-Out Junior Lienholder as Creditor

The security-first requirement of the one-form-of-action rule does not preclude an action on the debt by a creditor whose security has been rendered worthless without any fault on the part of that creditor [*see Savings Bank v. Central Market Co. (1898) 122 Cal. 28, 33-36, 54 P. 273* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 483.010* (attachment is permitted on claim originally secured when security has become valueless without act of plaintiff); *Code Civ. Proc. § 483.012* (pursuit of attachment remedy does not constitute failure to comply with requirement to proceed first against security for recovery of debt secured by mortgage or trust deed)]. The most common example is the sold-out junior lienholder, whose security has been rendered valueless by foreclosure of a senior lien [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 39, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *see § 555.18[5]*]. With certain exceptions, the sold-out junior lienholder may bring an action on the debt, because there is no reason to force recourse first to security that no longer exists [*see Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *Savings Bank v. Central Market Co. (1898) 122 Cal. 28, 33-36, 54 P. 273]* . For further discussion, see [4], *below.* For a form of complaint to enforce a debt secured by a trust deed rendered valueless by foreclosure of a senior lien, see *§ 555.170*.

One court has held that a junior lienholder was not barred from suing directly on the secured obligation when the security was extinguished by the foreclosure of a senior lien, even though the junior lienholder had commenced foreclosure proceedings before the senior lienholder and had suspended the foreclosure sale to allow the senior lienholder to complete a foreclosure sale first [*Bank of America v. Graves (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 607, 614-615, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288]* . The junior lienholder's failure to complete foreclosure proceedings was not an affirmative act leading to the loss of the security, and the mere commencement of the foreclosure proceedings was not an election of remedies that precluded a suit for the deficiency [*Bank of America v. Graves (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 607, 614-615, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288]* . Similarly, when senior and junior debts secured by the same property were assigned by a creditor to two independent parties, the one-form-of-action rule did not prohibit the junior lienholder from bringing a separate action to recover its debt following the senior lienholder's judicial foreclosure of the property. The fact that the junior lienholder's predecessor-in-interest had allowed the holder of the senior lien to foreclose did not require a different outcome [*National Enterprises, Inc. v. Woods (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1217, 1234, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37]* .

[ii] Other Types of Creditors

Other types of creditors that come within the worthless-security exception to *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* include creditors whose security has been (1) physically destroyed without any fault on their part [*Cohen v. Marshall (1925) 197 Cal. 117, 122-123, 239 P. 1050]* , or (2) rendered worthless because the trust deed or mortgage is legally unenforceable without any fault on their part [*see Giandeini v. Ramirez (1936) 11 Cal. App. 2d 469, 472-473, 54 P.2d 91]* . Creditors

that do not come within this exception are generally those at fault, such as creditors that unilaterally waive the security to bring an action on the underlying debt [*Barbieri v. Ramelli (1890) 84 Cal. 154, 156-157, 23 P. 1086* ; *see Savings Bank v. Central Market Co. (1898) 122 Cal. 28, 33-36, 54 P. 273]* or creditors that knowingly accept a security interest that is inadequate or worthless at the time it is accepted [*Giandeini v. Ramirez (1936) 11 Cal. App. 2d 469, 471, 473-475, 54 P.2d 91]* .

[4] All Interests to Be Foreclosed in Single Action

Under the one-form-of-action rule, a creditor can bring only a single action of foreclosure to enforce or recover on a secured obligation [*Appel v. Hubbard (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 639, 643, 318 P.2d 164]* . Thus, if a creditor with several security interests for a single debt brings a foreclosure action but fails to include all those interests in that action, the creditor may be held to have waived the right to foreclose the remaining security interests, whether by another judicial action or nonjudicially [*see Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 733, 734-740, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329]* . In such a case, the debtor may either raise the existence of the excluded security interests as a defense and compel their inclusion in the action or wait and later invoke *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* as a sanction to prevent their foreclosure by either judicial or nonjudicial means [*see Walker v. Community Bank (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 729, 740-741, 111 Cal. Rptr. 897, 518 P.2d 329]* . If the debtor chooses the latter course and does not compel inclusion of all security interests in the creditor's action, the creditor may retain any deficiency recovered after a judicial sale of the included security interests, even though the creditor failed to include some security interests [*United California Bank v. Tijerina (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 963, 968-969, 102 Cal. Rptr. 234]* .

This single-action requirement of the one-form-of-action rule does not prevent a creditor from foreclosing on several different security interests by means of separate private sales, or by means of a private sale followed by a foreclosure action. The reason for this distinction is that any private sale preceding a foreclosure action does not constitute a judicial action within the meaning of the single-action requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* [*see Ramsey v. Furlott (1936) 14 Cal. App. 2d 145, 147, 57 P.2d 1007]* .

[5] Enforceability of Letters of Credit

If an obligation is secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property (or on an estate for years in real property) and is also supported by a letter of credit, the following acts will not constitute an action within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)* or a failure to comply with any other statutory or judicial requirement to proceed first against security [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5(b)*]:

- The presentment, receipt of payment, or enforcement of a draft or demand for payment under the letter of credit by the beneficiary of the letter of credit.

- The honoring or payment of, or the demand for reimbursement, receipt of reimbursement, or enforcement of any contractual, statutory, or other reimbursement obligation relating to, the letter of credit by the issuer of the letter of credit.

This exemption from the one-form-of-action rule applies whether the above acts occur before or after the following: the judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure of the mortgage or trust deed; or a conveyance in lieu of foreclosure [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5(b)*].

Notwithstanding the exemption, a letter of credit will not be enforceable by any party to the letter of credit in a loan transaction in which all of the following circumstances exist [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580.7(b)*]:

- The loan is secured by a purchase-money trust deed or purchase-money mortgage on real property containing one-to-four residential units, at least one of which is owned and occupied, or was intended at

the time the loan was made to be occupied, by the customer.

- The borrower is a natural person.
- The letter of credit is issued to the beneficiary to avoid a default of the existing loan.
- The letter of credit is issued after January 1, 1995 (the operative date of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580.7*).

Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5 also exempts letter-of-credit transactions from the antideficiency statutes [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726(b)*]. For further discussion of the exemption and the legislative intent behind it, see *§ 555.32[6]*. For coverage of letters of credit, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 56, *Letters of Credit and Electronic Fund Transfers* (Matthew Bender).

[6] Effect of Setoff

[a] Creditor's Improper Setoff

It is a violation of the one-form-of-action rule for a bank to set off a deposit account in satisfaction of the depositor's debt to the bank if the debt is secured by a trust deed on the depositor's real property. The one-form-of-action rule requires that the bank first proceed against the security [*Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 991, 999-1000, 275 Cal. Rptr. 201, 800 P.2d 557]* .

When a bank makes an improper setoff, it waives the right to resort to the security. It is not sufficient for the bank merely to reverse the setoff, because the debtor is subjected to the burden of multiple actions in bringing an action for reversal of the setoff and later defending the foreclosure action. Further, the debtor is deprived of funds with which to pay an attorney and suffers costs in recovering funds that should not have been taken in the first place. Therefore, the appropriate remedy is loss of the security interest [*Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 991, 1001-1002, 275 Cal. Rptr. 201, 800 P.2d 557]* . An improper setoff does not, however, deprive the bank of the right to enforce the debt without resorting to the security. The setoff is not a judicial action and does not result in a judgment for the bank on the debt. It could be unfair to deprive the bank of the unsecured right to enforce the debt [*Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 991, 1004-1006, 275 Cal. Rptr. 201, 800 P.2d 557]* .

If a creditor makes an improper setoff, the debtor can demand that the creditor reverse the setoff and resort to the security. If the creditor refuses to reverse the setoff, the security-first rule precludes the creditor from either foreclosing the security interest or proceeding on the debt without waiving the security interest. If the creditor complies with the demand to reverse the setoff, however, the creditor may resort to the security, and the debtor may not thereafter claim that the security interest was waived [*Security Pacific National Bank v. Wozab (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 991, 1006, 275 Cal. Rptr. 201, 800 P.2d 557]* .

[b] Equitable Setoff

An equitable setoff is a means by which a debtor may satisfy, in whole or in part, a judgment or claim against the debtor out of a judgment or claim that the debtor has subsequently acquired against the creditor. The right exists independently of statute and rests on the inherent power of the court to do justice to the parties before it [*Aplanalp v. Forte (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 609, 615, 275 Cal. Rptr. 144]* . However, if the setoff is against a debtor on an obligation secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property, the setoff constitutes an "action" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726.* Either the nonjudicial exercise of the right of setoff or a lawsuit to enforce a setoff without suing for a judicial foreclosure in the same action will result in a waiver of the right to foreclose on the security or to sell the security under a power of sale [*see Aplanalp v. Forte (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 609, 613-617, 275 Cal. Rptr. 144]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsCommercial Law (UCC)Letters of Credit (Article 5)General OverviewContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.32

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.32 Effect of Antideficiency Statutes

[1] Bar or Limitation on Personal Judgment

[a] Applicability

California's antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726(b)*] preclude or limit recovery of a personal judgment against the trustor in most situations in which the sale of the property fails to cover the outstanding debt [*see Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 600-602, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* (discussing history and purpose of antideficiency statutes)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* bars deficiency judgments on purchase-money trust deeds or mortgages, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* prohibits deficiencies after most private sales. In those cases in which a deficiency judgment is allowed, the fair-value limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a* and *726(b)* limit recovery to the excess of the outstanding debt over the property's value at the time of the sale.

The antideficiency statutes apply to loans secured by liens on estates for years [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580b, 580d, 726*; *contra Taylor v. Bouissiere (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1197, 1199-1200, 241 Cal. Rptr. 253* (tenant's interest in estate for years was not real property interest); *but see* Stats. 1989, ch. 698, § 15 (abrogation of *Taylor* holding; application of antideficiency legislation to liens on leasehold interests is consistent with statutory history of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* and Commercial Code)].

[b] Waiver

[i] Advance Waiver

The benefits of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d,* and *726* may not be waived in advance by the debtor [

Freedland v. Greco (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 462, 467, 289 P.2d 463 ; *see Civ. Code § 2953*].

[ii] Subsequent Waiver

The rule against advance waiver of the benefits of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a* and *726* [*see* [i], *above*] does not preclude a trustor from subsequently waiving those provisions [*Salter v. Ulrich (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 263, 266-267, 138 P.2d 7* ; *see Morello v. Metzenbaum (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 494, 498-499, 154 P.2d 670]* .

The California Supreme Court has not decided whether the benefits of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* may subsequently be waived.

PRACTICE TIP:

Contrast Advance Waivers By Guarantors. If *Civ. Code § 2856* is construed literally [*see* [5][b], *below*], guarantors in post-1996 documents may well be held to contractual waivers of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a, 580d*, or *726*. *By William M. Hensley*

A purchaser may not make a contractual waiver of the protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* in exchange for renegotiation of the original obligatio [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843]* . In *DeBerard v. Lim*, the Supreme Court resolved a conflict in state law on this question [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 661, 671, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* (disapproving language to the contrary in *Russell v. Roberts (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 390, 394-395, 114 Cal. Rptr. 305* , *Goodyear v. Mack (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 654, 659-660, 205 Cal. Rptr. 702* , and *Shepherd v. Robinson (1981) 128 Cal. App. 3d 615, 626, 180 Cal. Rptr. 342*)]. It agreed with the court of appeal decision in *Palm v. Schilling (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 63, 68, 75-76, 244 Cal. Rptr. 600* [*DeBerard Properties, Ltd. v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 671, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843]* , which held that a waiver of the antideficiency protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*, at a time when the trustor is in default and in connection with a refinancing, is invalid and unenforceable because it is inconsistent with the explicit language of that statute and is contrary to public policy.

The Supreme Court recognized that *Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055* created a narrow exception to the scope of Section 580b, which applies when a vendor subordinates a deed of trust to a major construction loan on the property [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 664, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* ; *see Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 611, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055]* . The Court emphasized that this exception is limited to situations in which intensification of the property's anticipated post-sale use both requires and eventually results in construction financing that dwarfs the property's value at the time of sale. In addition, the purchaser must be in a much better position than the vendor to assess the property's possible value and to understand the risks involved in capitalizing on the property's potential. Finally, under all the circumstances of the sale, including the property's development and the financing for that development, conferring Section 580b's protection must unfairly place the risk of the failure of the commercial development on the vendor, imposing on it a commercially unreasonable burden because the success of the commercial development depends upon the competence, diligence and good faith of the developing purchaser [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 667-668, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* ; *Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 613, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055]* .

The *DeBerard* Court found that this case was unlike *Spangler*. The defendants in *DeBerard* financed their purchase of a shopping center from the plaintiff by assuming a large debt secured by a first trust deed to a bank, executing a second trust deed in favor of the plaintiff as security for a smaller debt, and paying the plaintiff a substantial down payment. When they could no longer make payments on the two secured obligations they negotiated a refinancing of the major debt. The plaintiff cooperated in exchange for their agreement to waive their rights under *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*. Thereafter, the defendants defaulted and the bank's foreclosure under the first trust deed wiped out the plaintiffs' second-lien security. The Court noted that the defendants continued to operate the shopping center and the center continued to secure the note. They did not obtain a construction loan that dwarded the property's value at the time of

sale and then proceed to build a more intensive use. Further, there was no dramatic change in the financial arrangements that might conceivably have brought this case within *Spangler's* ambit. The Court could not justify permitting a waiver in disregard of the statutory language just because the plaintiff eased the terms of the defendants' obligation to it. Only when the transaction is sufficiently similar to that in *Spangler* will the vendor's relatively poor knowledge of the property's value trump the basic rule, stated in *Brown v. Jensen (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 193, 197, 259 P.2d 425* , that the vendor is assumed to know the value of its security interest and act accordingly [*DeBerard Properties, Ltd. v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 667-668, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843]* .

[c] Rent Skimming

The antideficiency provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d*, and *726* do not apply to any action for damages for rent skimming [*Civ. Code § 891(g)*]. Rent skimming is the owner's use of revenue received from the rental of a parcel of residential real property, at any time during the first year after acquiring that property, without first applying the revenue or an equivalent amount to the payments due on all mortgages and trust deeds encumbering that property [*Civ. Code § 890(a)*]. When a purchaser of rental property engages in rent skimming, the vendor (or any third party) holding a lien may effectively recover a potential deficiency by bringing an action for damages under *Civ. Code § 891*. For further discussion, see *§ 555.94*.

[2] Private Sale

[a] Deficiency Judgment Generally Barred

[i] Single Security Instrument and Note

No deficiency judgment may be rendered on any note secured by a trust deed or mortgage after the encumbered property has been sold by private sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*]. With a few exceptions [*see* [b], *below*], the effect of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* is to limit recovery in nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings to the value of the security only. By choosing nonjudicial foreclosure, the creditor forgoes the right to a deficiency judgment [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 43-44, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97]* . When *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* bars a deficiency judgment after a private sale under a trust deed, the trustee has a duty to cancel the underlying note [*Kerivan v. Title Ins. & Trust Co. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 225, 230-231, 195 Cal. Rptr. 53* (but trustee does not have duty to cancel note if it is subject to sister state law permitting deficiency)].

[ii] More Than One Security Instrument or Note

When more than one trust deed or mortgage is given to secure a single note, the creditor, after a private sale under one of them, may resort to the additional security but cannot obtain a further deficiency judgment even when it would otherwise be allowed by judicial foreclosure of the additional security [*see Freedland v. Greco (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 462, 465-466, 289 P.2d 463]* . This application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* cannot be circumvented by the device of executing two or more notes secured by different security interests, at least when each note evidences the full amount of the same debt [*Freedland v. Greco (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 462, 467, 289 P.2d 463]* . However, the situation is different when a debtor executes two or more notes, so that each note evidences only a part of a single debt, and gives security for one note only. In that case, the creditor may resort to the security and then obtain a money judgment on the separate, unsecured note [*see Christopherson v. Allen (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 848, 851-853, 12 Cal. Rptr. 658* ; *cf. Loretz v. Cal-Coast Dev. Corp. (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 176, 178-179, 57 Cal. Rptr. 188* (single note was not divisible into secured and unsecured portions)].

[iii] Related Obligations

Similarly, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* bars a deficiency judgment based on a related obligation [*but see Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5* (certain letter of credit transactions are exempt from antideficiency legislation); *§ 555.31[5]*]. For instance, when

a lender required the borrower to obtain mortgage insurance, and the mortgage insurer required the borrower to execute an indemnity agreement, the insurer's attempted enforcement of the indemnity agreement after breach and a nonjudicial sale was barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*. The indemnity agreement added nothing to the borrower's obligation and was an attempt to circumvent the antideficiency policy of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* [*Commonwealth Mortgage Assurance Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 508, 515-517, 259 Cal. Rptr. 425]* .

[iv] Successive Loans By Lender

When a lender makes two successive loans secured by separate trust deeds on the same property, then forecloses on the senior lien, the lender is barred from obtaining a deficiency judgment by enforcing the junior lien. The lender is not a true third-party sold-out junior lienholder. Having elected to foreclose the senior lien by a private sale, the lender is barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* from obtaining a deficiency judgment by enforcing the junior lien. The policy of protecting the borrower from a deficiency judgment following a nonjudicial foreclosure may not be circumvented by a lender's structuring a loan to be secured by multiple trust deeds on the same property covering successive notes from the debtor [*Simon v. Superior Court (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 63, 77-78, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 428]* .

[b] Allowable Deficiency Judgments

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* prohibits recovery of any deficiency judgment on a note secured by a trust deed or mortgage with a power of sale after a private sale of the encumbered property [*see* [a], *above*], it provides two exceptions in which a deficiency judgment may be recovered. Those exceptions allow a deficiency judgment when a trust deed or mortgage (1) is given to secure payment of a bond or other debt authorized or permitted to be issued by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 25600*], or (2) is made by a public utility subject to the Public Utilities Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*].

Another exception is that *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* does not bar recovery on the debt by a sold-out junior lienholder whose security has been rendered worthless by private foreclosure of a senior lien [*see, e.g,* *Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 43, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97]* . For further discussion, see [4], *below.* In this situation, the fair-value provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* [*see* [c], *below*] limit the recovery in the event that the junior lienholder purchases the property at the foreclosure sale [*Walter E. Heller Western, Inc. v. Bloxham (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 266, 273-274, 221 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; *see* [4], *below*].

In addition, one court has observed that *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* prohibits deficiency judgments in the case of a secured *note,* whereas *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* applies the fair-value limitation more broadly to a secured *obligation* [*Willys of Marin Company v. Pierce (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 826, 831, 296 P.2d 25]* . For discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a*, see [c], *below.* It appears possible, therefore, that *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* may allow limited deficiency judgments in the case of secured obligations other than promissory notes, such as leases [*see* *Willys of Marin Company v. Pierce (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 826, 831, 296 P.2d 25]* .

[c] Fair-Value Limitation

When a deficiency judgment is available after a nonjudicial sale, the action must be brought within three months after the sale, and recovery is limited to the amount by which the outstanding debt exceeds either the fair market value of the property at the time it was sold or, if less, the sale price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580a*].

When *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* is applied to a sold-out junior lienholder who seeks to recover on the debt after having purchased the property at the senior lienholder's private foreclosure sale, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* limits the junior lienholder's recovery to the excess of the combined debts of the senior lienholder and the junior lienholder over either the fair market value of the property or the selling price at the foreclosure sale, whichever is less [*Walter E. Heller Western, Inc. v. Bloxham (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 266, 270-274, 221 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; *Bank of Hemet v. United States*

(9th Cir. 1981) 643 F.2d 661, 668-670 ; *see* [4], *below*].

The fair-value provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* does not limit subsequent foreclosure of additional security interests, because resorting to additional security does not constitute a deficiency judgment [*Dreyfuss v. Union Bank of California (2000) 24 Cal. 4th 400, 406, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 11 P.3d 383* ; *Hatch v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 254, 260-262, 120 P.2d 869]* .

[3] Foreclosure Action

[a] Fair-Value Limitation

A deficiency judgment may generally be recovered after a judicial foreclosure except when the property was sold under a purchase-money trust deed securing payment of the balance of the purchase price of the property sold [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*; *see also* [b], *below*]. When recovery of a deficiency judgment is otherwise allowed in a judicial foreclosure action, the recovery is limited to the amount by which the outstanding debt exceeds either the fair market value of the property at the time it is sold at the judicial sale or, if less, the sale price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. For further discussion of the procedure for obtaining a deficiency judgment, including a limitation period of three months after the date of the foreclosure sale, see *§ 555.73*.

[b] Purchase-Money Trust Deed

[i] Deficiency Judgment Generally Barred

No deficiency judgment may be recovered in any even t after any sale of property under a trust deed given to the vendor to secure payment of the balance of the purchase price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*]. When the property is a dwelling for no more than four families, occupied in whole or part by the purchaser, this prohibition against any deficiency judgment applies also to a sale under a trust deed given to a third-party lender to secure repayment of a loan that was in fact used to pay all or part of the purchase price [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*; *see Prunty v. Bank of America (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 430, 441, 112 Cal. Rptr. 370]* . This rule protects purchasers of designated residential property from personal liability to all lenders and protects other purchasers from personal liability to the vendor [*Prunty v. Bank of America (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 430, 439 n.10, 112 Cal. Rptr. 370]* . For discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* as it applies to installment land sale contracts, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

[ii] When Deficiency Judgment May Be Recovered

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b does not cover a purchase-money loan secured by other property [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 41-43, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *Scott v. Fidelity Dev. Co. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 131, 135, 113 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *see Goodyear v. Mack (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 654, 657-659, 205 Cal. Rptr. 702* (overruled on other grounds in *DeBerard Properties, Ltd. v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 671, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843*) (transaction was no longer subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* when original purchase-money note and trust deed were exchanged for new note secured by other property)].

The statute applies only to initial purchase-money transactions, and its provisions do not cover a subsequent transaction in which a secured loan is used to pay off an initial purchase-money obligation [*Union Bank v. Wendland (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 393, 399-400, 126 Cal. Rptr. 549]* . However, the protection of the statute is passed to a transferee who assumes the original purchaser's personal liability on the debt [*Weaver v. Bay (1963) 216 Cal. App. 2d 559, 561, 31 Cal. Rptr. 211* ; *see Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* . For discussion concerning assumption of personal liability, see *§ 555.13[4]*.

[iii] Standard Purchase Money Transactions

All standard purchase-money transactions are subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* [*Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 610, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807* ; *Budget Realty, Inc. v. Hunter (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 511, 513-515, 204 Cal. Rptr. 48]* . These are two-party transactions in which the vendor retains a security interest, and three-party transactions in which a lender obtains a security interest by financing a purchaser-occupied dwelling of fewer than five units [*Prunty v. Bank of America (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 430, 439-440, 112 Cal. Rptr. 370]* .

[iv] Variations on Standard Transactions

Any variation on the standard purchase-money transactions may be subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* if, in the circumstances, the transaction is within the purpose of the statute, which justifies placing the risk of inadequate security on the vendor or lender [*see* *Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 610-613, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055]* . The purpose is to discourage overvaluation of the property by the vendor or lender and so discourage land promotion schemes that are precarious because the security value does not reflect true market value. If the security value proves to be inadequate, not because of overvaluation but because of declining land values during a depression, the statute tends to prevent aggravation of the downturn that would result if defaulting purchasers were burdened with large personal liability in addition to the loss of their properties [*Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 612, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055* ; *Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 41-42, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97]* .

For example, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* has been applied to a transaction in which a purchaser obtained a secured loan from a lender for the purpose of constructing an owner-occupied dwelling on the property, because the transaction was within the purposes of the statute in much the same way as a standard third-party-lender transaction [*Prunty v. Bank of America (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 430, 440-443, 112 Cal. Rptr. 370]* . Further, numerous cases have held that a lienholder participating in a sale transaction by agreeing to make a loan to a new purchaser in order to protect the security interest is a vendor for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* [*see, e.g.,* *Costanzo v. Ganguly (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1085, 1090-1093, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 55* (statute should be applied when doing so will promote purposes underlying it)]. The statute also applies when a subordination agreement allows refinancing that does not change the use of the property [*Thompson v. Allert (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1462, 1466-1467, 285 Cal. Rptr. 367]* . Further, the statute applied when two properties were marketed and sold together, the seller made a loan for the purchase of one of the two properties, and the loan was secured by the other property. The court found that this was a variation of the standard purchase-money mortgage and came within the protection of the statute because the two purchases were actually parts of one transaction [*Conley v. Matthes (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1453, 1464-1467, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518]* .

Section 580b also applied in a case in which personal property (a medical practice) belonging to one seller was sold along with real property (the building where the practice was located) belonging to another seller in a transaction in which both sellers took back from the buyer a single purchase money promissory note secured by a deed of trust on the real property and, by a security agreement, by the personal property. The court held that the deed of trust was a "deed of trust upon real property" for purposes of the antideficiency statutes despite the additional security in personal property, and that the seller of the medical practice was a "vendor" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* and was barred from recovering a deficiency judgment. The court noted that the initial note had been amended and made payable solely to the personal property vendor. The real property vendor had liquidated and distributed its interest in the original note to its shareholders, and they had allowed their interest to go into limbo when the note was amended. Those same individuals, as partners of the personal property vendor, brought suit seeking a deficiency judgment that the seller of the real property would have been denied. The court concluded that the shareholders were attempting an impermissible end run around Section 580b [*Sherwood-Trimble Medical Group v. 10001 Venice Boulevard Partnership (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 872, 878-879, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 533]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Importance of Purchase Money Protections in Non-Standard Transactions. Increasingly, courts are applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* protections to non-standard transactions, such as a loan workout when the creditor allowed the property to be kept intact by the borrower but overvalued the remaining security

in the process. Aggrieved borrowers should consult *Constanzo*, and pay careful attention to the reasoning in *Shepherd v. Robinson (1981) 128 Cal. App. 3d 615, 180 Cal. Rptr. 342* and *LaForgia v. Kolsky (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1103, 242 Cal. Rptr. 282* . *By William M. Hensley*

On the other hand, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* has been held not to bar recovery of a deficiency judgment against a purchaser who purchased the property for purposes of radical commercial improvement, the seller having agreed to subordinate the purchase-money trust deed to the construction-loan trust deed. In this situation, the security value did not indicate the ultimate market value, and there was no risk of overvaluation. The risk of loss was more properly placed on the purchaser, whose efforts in development would determine the ultimate market value [*see Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 611-615, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055* ; *Jack Erickson and Associates v. Hesselgesser (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 182, 187-188, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 591]* . The Supreme Court has emphasized that this exception is limited to situations in which intensification of the property's anticipated post-sale use both requires and eventually results in construction financing that dwarfs the property's value at the time of sale [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 666, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843]* . Furthermore, the purchaser must be in a much better position than the vendor to assess the property's possible value and to understand the risks involved in capitalizing on the property's potential. Finally, under all the circumstances of the sale, including the property's development and the financing for that development, conferring Section 580b's protection must unfairly thrust "the risk of the failure of the commercial development ... upon the vendor," imposing on it a commercially unreasonable burden because "the success of the commercial development depends upon the competence, diligence and good faith of the developing purchaser" [*DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 666, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* ; *Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 613, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055]* .

[4] Junior Lienholders

Code Civ. Proc. § 580d, restricting deficiency judgments after nonjudicial sales, and the fair-value limitations of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a* and *726(b)* apply to deficiency judgments sought by the person who undertakes foreclosure. Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*, nonjudicial foreclosure of a senior lien will not bar a sold-out junior lienholder, whose security has been rendered worthless by the sale, from bringing an action on the debt secured by the junior lien [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 43, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *cf.* [2][a], *above*]. Similarly, *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 726(b)* and *580a* do not, in general, limit recovery of the debt by a junior lienholder whose security has been rendered worthless by the foreclosure of a senior lien [*Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 39-40, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97* ; *see §§ 555.31[3][b], 555.170*; *see also* [2][c], [3][a], *above*]. If a sold-out junior lienholder is the purchaser at the senior lienholder's private foreclosure sale, however, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* will limit the recovery on the junior lienholder's debt [*Walter E. Heller Western, Inc. v. Bloxham (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 266, 270-274, 221 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; *see* [2][c], *above*]. If the junior lienholder purchases at the sale, any action for a deficiency must be brought within the three-month period after the sale [*Citrus State Bank v. McKendrick (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 941, 948-949, 263 Cal. Rptr. 781]* .

After a judicial foreclose of a purchase-money trust deed, a sold-out junior lienholder may be barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* from recovering a deficiency judgment. The statute bars a deficiency judgment under a purchase-money trust deed not only after an actual sale but also when a sale is no longer possible because the security has been rendered worthless by foreclosure of a senior lien. This bar serves the purpose of discouraging overvaluation in standard purchase-money transactions, because the seller, who is in the best position to know the true value of the property, must assume the risk that the security may be inadequate under a junior trust deed [*Brown v. Jensen (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 193, 197, 259 P.2d 425* ; *see* [3][b], *above*].

On the other hand, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* does not apply to a junior lienholder in a variation on the standard purchase-money transaction in which the seller subordinates the purchase-money security interest so that the purchaser can obtain financing for commercial development of the property. In this type of transaction, a radically improved change in property use and value being contemplated, the adequacy of the seller's security hinges on the success or

failure of the purchaser's development efforts, rather than on the relation of security value to current market value. In such a case, precarious land promotion schemes are best discouraged by placing the risk of inadequate security not on the seller but on the purchaser, forcing the latter to assume the risk of bad judgment and failure in undertaking commercial development of the property [*Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 613-614, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055* ; *see DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 666, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* ; *Budget Realty, Inc. v. Hunter (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 511, 516-517, 204 Cal. Rptr. 48* (this exception was not applicable to transaction in which commercial development was contemplated but never actually undertaken)].

A wife who was given a promissory note secured by second deeds of trust on several pieces of real property as part of a marital dissolution, and who held nonjudicial trustee's sales on four of the six properties securing the promissory note, was precluded by section 580d from seeking a deficiency judgment on the note through the family law court even though a senior lienholder had foreclosed on one or two of the other properties securing the debt [*In re Marriage of Oropallo (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 997, 1007, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669]* . The rule allowing sold-out junior lienholders to pursue deficiency judgments did not apply in this case, because the wife had elected to proceed against some of the real property securing the debt under the power of sale contained in the deed of trust. Thus, the wife's right to recover was not controlled by the "whim of the senior" [*In re Marriage of Oropallo (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 997, 1007, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669]* .

[5] Guarantors

[a] Not Protected From Deficiency Judgment

Guarantors are generally not protected by the antideficiency statutes because those statutes concern only actions on the principal obligation, as distinguished from actions against a guarantor [*see, e.g., Mariners Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Neil (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 232, 234, 99 Cal. Rptr. 238* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* was not available to guarantor); *Roberts v. Graves (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 410, 415-416, 75 Cal. Rptr. 130* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* was not available to guarantor); *see also Talbott v. Hustwit (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 148, 153, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 703* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 580a* inapplicable in deficiency action against settlors of trust because structure of trust arrangement removed their debtor status and settlors were true guarantors); *Trust One Mortgage Corp. v. Invest America Mortgage Corp. (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1302, 1313, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 83* (indemnification provision in agreement between broker and lender was enforceable under antideficiency laws because broker, who was indemnitor, was not same as or substantially identified with principal loan obligor)]. A guaranty is treated as additional security, which may be exhausted notwithstanding the antideficiency statutes [*Heckes v. Sapp (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 549, 553, 40 Cal. Rptr. 485]* .

Creditors sometimes attempt to avoid the effect of the antideficiency statutes by structuring a transaction so that the debtor becomes a purported guarantor. Courts distinguish between a true guaranty and a purported guaranty fashioned only to avoid the antideficiency statutes [*Union Bank v. Brummell (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 836, 837-838, 75 Cal. Rptr. 234]* . Whether an agreement constitutes a true guaranty or is a sham is a question of fact to be determined from the circumstances of the case [*Roberts v. Graves (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 410, 416, 75 Cal. Rptr. 130]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Sham Guaranties Examined Closely. Increasingly, courts will closely examine and then invalidate guaranties designed to circumvent *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* antideficiency protections. Guaranties that try to relegate true obligors to the status of guarantors in order to surmount antideficiency protections are being scrutinized more rigorously from an enforceability standpoint. For an example finding triable issues on the sham guaranty defense, see *River Bank America v. Diller (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1400, 1423, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790* . *By William M. Hensley*

Purported guarantors were held to be protected by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* when they were actually the purchasers in a secured transaction but had made themselves guarantors for a note executed by a dummy corporation created for that

purpose [*Valinda Builders, Inc. v. Bissner (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 106, 107-112, 40 Cal. Rptr. 735]* . Further, purported guarantors were held to be protected by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* when they were also liable on the principal obligation because of their status as general partners of the principal debtor [*Union Bank v. Dorn (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 157, 158-159, 61 Cal. Rptr. 893]* .

For further discussion and forms concerning the liability of guarantors generally, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings* .

[b] Estoppel of Creditor After Nonjudicial Sale

[i] Basis for Defense

Code Civ. Proc. § 580d, restricting deficiency judgments after a nonjudicial sale, presents a special situation. That section, like the other antideficiency statutes, does not directly bar a creditor's recovery from a guarantor. However, it may indirectly bar recovery by providing the guarantor with an estoppel defense [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 41, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . The estoppel theory arises because the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*; *see § 555.31*] does not apply to guarantors [*see Murphy v. Hellman Commercial etc. Bk. (1919) 43 Cal. App. 579, 583-586, 185 P. 485* ; *see also Loeb v. Christie (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 416, 418-419, 57 P.2d 1303]* . A creditor can generally bring an action against a guarantor without exhausting the security given by the primary debtor. Even though by statute a guarantor may require the creditor to proceed first against the principal debtor [*Civ. Code § 2845*], that protection, unlike the one-form-of-action rule, can be waived in advance [*see, e.g., Krueger v. Bank of America (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 204, 213, 193 Cal. Rptr. 322* ; *Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 43-44 n.3, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64* ; *see also Civ. Code § 2953* (advance waiver of one-form-of-action rule is void)]. The creditor therefore has three choices [*Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 43, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64]* :

- A foreclosure action in which the guarantor is joined as a defendant.
- An action against the guarantor.
- A private sale of the debtor's property.

When the creditor proceeds first by private sale, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* shields the debtor from any deficiency judgment [*see* [2][a], *above*]. By foreclosing through a nonjudicial sale, the creditor forgoes the right to proceed further against the debtor, and consequently the guarantor is denied a claim against the debtor to which the guarantor would have been subrogated if the creditor had chosen instead to proceed first against the guarantor. Therefore, on choosing the remedy that destroys the guarantor's rights of subrogation, the creditor is estopped to pursue the guarantor [*Union Bank v. Brummell (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 836, 838-839, 75 Cal. Rptr. 234* ; *Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 45-48, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64* ; *but see Mariners Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Neil (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 232, 235-236, 99 Cal. Rptr. 238* (criticizing rule for encouraging creditors to proceed first against guarantors rather than debtor's property, contrary to *Civ. Code §§ 2809* and *2845*)].

[ii] Unavailability of Defense

The estoppel defense arising indirectly from *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* is generally subject to waiver by the guarantor [*see Union Bank v. Gradsky (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 40, 48, 71 Cal. Rptr. 64]* . Statutory provisions of model language for a waiver [*see Civ. Code § 2856(c)*] are discussed in [iii] and [iv], *below*. Those provisions do not apply to a guaranty of a debt secured by residential real property that is occupied by the debtor, however.

The estoppel defense is also unavailable when a deficiency judgment against the principal debtor is barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* [*see* [3][b], *above*], because in that situation the creditor's choice of remedies has no effect on the

subrogation rights of the guarantor [*Bauman v. Castle (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 990, 993-994, 93 Cal. Rptr. 565]* .

Even when the defense would otherwise be available, the creditor can avoid it by proceeding first against the guarantor and then exhausting the security of the principal debtor through a private sale [*Krueger v. Bank of America (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 204, 210-214, 193 Cal. Rptr. 322]* .

[iii] Post-1996 Waiver of Defense

A contractual provision that is executed after 1996 and expressly sets forth a waiver of defenses based on the antideficiency laws (see statutory examples *below*) will be effective without regard to whether it includes any particular language or phrases to waive those rights or any references to statutory provisions or judicial decisions [*Civ. Code § 2856(b)*]. This does not apply, however, to a guaranty or other type of suretyship obligation made with respect to a loan secured by a trust deed or mortgage on a dwelling for not more than four families when the dwelling is occupied, entirely or in part, by the borrower and the loan was in fact used to pay all or part of the purchase price of that dwelling [*Civ. Code § 2856(e)*].

Without limiting any rights of the creditor or other guarantor or surety to use any other language to express an intent to waive specified rights and defenses of guarantors or other sureties [*see Civ. Code § 2856(a)* (list of those rights and defenses)], the following provisions in a contract will effectively waive various rights and defenses of guarantors or other sureties, including those arising under *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* [*Civ. Code § 2856(c)*; *see Civ. Code § 2856(a)(2), (3)*]:

> "The guarantor waives all rights and defenses that the guarantor may have because the debtor's debt is secured by real property. This means, among other things:
>
> "(1) The creditor may collect from the guarantor without first foreclosing on any real or personal property collateral pledged by the debtor.
>
> "(2) If the creditor forecloses on any real property collateral pledged by the debtor:
>
> "(A) The amount of the debt may be reduced only by the price for which that collateral is sold at the foreclosure sale, even if the collateral is worth more than the sale price.
>
> "(B) The creditor may collect from the guarantor even if the creditor, by foreclosing on the real property collateral, has destroyed any right the guarantor may have to collect from the debtor. This is an unconditional and irrevocable waiver of any rights and defenses the guarantor may have because the debtor's debt is secured by real property. These rights and defenses include, but are not limited to, any rights and defenses based on *Code of Civil Procedure Sections 580a, 580b, 580d,* and *726*."

Further, the following provision will be effective to waive all rights and defenses the guarantor or other surety may have with respect to obligations as a surety by reason of an election of remedies by the creditor [*Civ. Code § 2856(d)*]:

> "The guarantor waives all rights and defenses arising out of an election of remedies by the creditor, even though that election of remedies, such as a nonjudicial foreclosure with respect to security for a guaranteed obligation, has destroyed the guarantor's rights of subrogation and reimbursement against the principal by the operation of *Code of Civil Procedure Section 580d* or otherwise."

[iv] Pre-1997 Waiver of Defense

The validity of a waiver executed before 1997 must be determined by application of the law that existed on the date the waiver was executed [*Civ. Code § 2856(f)*]. Under former *Civ. Code § 2856,* a waiver could not be effective with

respect to a guaranty of a loan to an individual primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, secured by a trust deed or mortgage on a dwelling for not more than four families when the dwelling was occupied, entirely or in part, by the borrower [former *Civ. Code § 2856(c)*]. In other cases, any language that expressly set forth a waiver of defenses based on the antideficiency laws would be effective, whether or not it contained references to statutory provisions on judicial decisions. The following language would be an effective waiver of the guarantor's defense to a recovery by the creditor by reason of the creditor's election of remedies [former *Civ. Code § 2856(b)*]: "Guarantor waives all rights and defenses arising out of an election of remedies by the creditor, even though that election of remedies, such as a nonjudicial foreclosure with respect to security for a guaranteed obligation, has destroyed the guarantor's rights of subrogation and reimbursement against the principal by the operation of *Code of Civil Procedure Section 580d* or otherwise."

Former *Civ. Code § 2856* in effect abrogated *Cathay Bank v. Lee (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420* , which invalidated a fairly standard *Gradsky* waiver clause [*see* [ii], *above*] because it failed to inform the guarantor (1) that the loss of subrogation rights creates a defense to a deficiency judgment, and (2) that the guarantor was waiving that specific defense [*Cathay Bank v. Lee (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1539, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420]* . In dictum the court also strongly implied that lenders should identify the defenses being waived by including references to the statutory provisions [*Cathay Bank v. Lee (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1541, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420]* .

[6] Transactions Involving Letters of Credit

[a] Exemption From Antideficiency Statutes

If an obligation is secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property (including an estate for years in real property) and is also supported by a letter of credit, the following acts will not constitute a deficiency judgment within the meaning of the antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726(b)*] or a violation of those statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5(b)*]:

- The presentment, receipt of payment, or enforcement of a draft or demand for payment under the letter of credit by the beneficiary of the letter of credit; or

- The honoring or payment of, or the demand for reimbursement, receipt of reimbursement, or enforcement of any contractual, statutory, or other reimbursement obligation relating to, the letter of credit by the issuer of the letter of credit.

This exemption from the antideficiency statutes applies whether the specified acts occur before or after the judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure of the mortgage or trust deed or a conveyance in lieu of foreclosure [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5(b)*]. However, notwithstanding this exemption, a letter of credit will not be enforceable in a loan transaction when the loan is secured by a purchase-money trust deed or mortgage on owner-occupied, one-to-four unit residential property and certain other circumstances exist [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 580.7(b)*; *see also* [3][b][iii], *above*].

[b] Legislative Intent Behind Exemption

In enacting *Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5*, the legislature intended to confirm the independent nature of the letter of credit engagement and to abrogate the holding in *Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 156, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 908* (depublished), that the post-foreclosure presentment of a draft under a letter of credit issued in connection with a loan secured by real property violated *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* and constituted a "fraud ... or other defect not apparent on the face of the documents" under former *Com. Code § 5114(2)(b)* [*see Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 252-253, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507* (reaching opposite result)]. Further, the legislature intended to confirm the expectation of the parties to a contract underlying a letter of credit, that the beneficiary will have available the value of the collateral and the benefit of the letter of credit without regard to the

order in which the beneficiary resorts to them [Stats. 1994, ch. 611, § 5].

Code Civ. Proc. § 580.5 was intended by the legislature to be a clarification of existing law and therefore applies to letters of credit issued before its effective date, September 16, 1994 [*Western Security Bank v. Superior Court (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 232, 252, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 243, 933 P.2d 507]* . The statute also exempts the above-described letter-of-credit transactions from the one-form-of-action rule [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*; *see also § 555.31[5]*].

For discussion of letters of credit, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 56, *Letters of Credit and Electronic Fund Transfers* (Matthew Bender).

[7] Actions Not Seeking Deficiency

[a] In General

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580b and *580d* do not bar subsequent actions that do not seek to enforce the secured debt to the extent that it exceeds the security value of the property [*see Brown v. Jensen (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 193, 198, 259 P.2d 425* (deficiency is difference between security value of property and debt)], nor do they bar the creditor from resorting to additional security [*Armsey v. Channel Associates, Inc. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 833, 837, 229 Cal. Rptr. 509]* . Examples of allowed actions include the following:

- A fraud action when the borrower fraudulently induced the lender to make the loan, even though the alleged misrepresentations did not directly relate to the value of the property securing the debt [*Guild Mortgage Co. v. Heller (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1512-1515, 239 Cal. Rptr. 59* ; *see Lassar & Gross International, Inc. v. Dunham (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 496, 500-502, 241 Cal. Rptr. 854]* ;

- A post-sale action for waste committed in bad faith [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 604, 605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see § 555.90[5]*].

[b] Statutory Exemption

Notwithstanding the antideficiency statutes, a person who is authorized by California to make or arrange loans secured by real property or a successor in interest may bring an action for damages (including exemplary damages not exceeding 50 percent of the actual damages) if (1) the injured person originated, acquired, or purchased a loan secured by a mortgage or trust deed on real property or on an estate for years, (2) the action is based on fraud under *Civ. Code § 1572*, and *(3)* the borrower's fraudulent conduct induced the original lender to make the loan [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(f)*; *see Fin. Code §§ 551(c), 7460(c), 15102(c)* (comparable provisions applicable to banks, savings and loan associations, and credit unions)].

However, this statutory exemption does not apply to loans secured by single-family, owner-occupied residential real property when the property is actually occupied by the borrower as represented to the lender in order to obtain the loan and the loan is for less than $150,000 as adjusted annually to the Consumer Price Index [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(g)*; *see Fin. Code §§ 551(b), 7460(b), 15102(b)*; *see also § 555.31[3][a]*]. Further, the statutory exemption does not apply if the lender purchases the property at the sale by making a full-credit bid [*Commonwealth Mortgage Assurance Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 508, 515-517, 259 Cal. Rptr. 425* ; *Sumitomo Bank v. Taurus Developers, Inc. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 211, 220-221, 229 Cal. Rptr. 719]* .

A lender's acquisition of the property by full-credit bid at a nonjudicial foreclosure sale does not bar the lender from maintaining a fraud action to recover damages from nonborrower third parties (such as a real estate appraiser) that fraudulently induced the lender to make the loan [*Alliance Mortgage Co. v. Rothwell (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1226, 1245-1246, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 900 P.2d 601]* . This exception applies only if the lender (1) was induced to enter into

the loan by the false representation, and (2) was still under the mistaken belief that the representation was true at the time it made the full credit bid. Fraud damages are not recoverable if the lender's reliance at the time of the full credit bid was manifestly unreasonable [*Alliance Mortgage Co. v. Rothwell (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1226, 1246-1247, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 900 P.2d 601* ; *see Michelson v. Camp (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 955, 968-969, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539* (reliance on appraisal done two years prior to foreclosure was manifestly unreasonable)]. One court has held that the exception is clearly limited to fraud claims and therefore barred the full-credit-bid rule a lender from maintaining a negligence action against an appraiser when the appraisal caused the loan to be under-secured. The lender could instead acquire the property and preserve the right to seek damages from the appraiser [*Pacific Inland Bank v. Ainsworth (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 277, 283, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 489* ; *see Bank of America v. Quackenbush (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1171, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 81]* . However, some courts have declined to follow Pacific Inland Bank v. Ainsworth, holding that an action for negligent misrepresentation concerns a species of fraud and thus comes within the rule set forth by *Alliance Mortgage* [*see Kolodge v. Boyd (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 349, 371-372, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 749* ; *First Commercial Mortgage Co. v. Reece (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 731, 744, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 23]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsPurchase-Money Mortgages

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.33

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.33 Effect of Federal Legislation

[1] Federally Guaranteed or Insured Loans

If the secured obligation is a loan insured or guaranteed by the Department of Veterans Affairs or the Federal Housing Administration, the agency should be contacted before commencing any foreclosure proceeding, because each agency has particular requirements affecting foreclosure and deficiency proceedings [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1707 et seq.* (FHA loan); *38 U.S.C. § 3701 et seq.* (DVA loan); 24 C.F.R. Pt. 200 et seq. (FHA loan); *38 C.F.R. Pt. 36* (DVA loan)]. These requirements control in the event of a conflict with state law [*see United States v. Shimer (1961) 367 U.S. 374, 380-381, 81 S. Ct. 1554, 6 L. Ed. 2d 908 (DVA loan)]* . In particular, this means that state antideficiency statutes [*see § 555.32*] do not apply to federally guaranteed or insured loans [*see United States v. Rossi (9th Cir. 1965) 342 F.2d 505, 506* (DVA loan)].

[2] Trustor in Active Military Service

If a trustor is in military service, the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] may preclude any nonjudicial or judicial foreclosure [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*]. The prohibition applies to any obligation on real or personal property owned by a servicemember (1) that originated before the period of the servicemember's military service, (2) for which the servicemember is still obligated, and (3) that is secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(a)*]. A sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for a breach of an obligation described above is not valid if made during, or within 90 days after, the period of the servicemember's military service, except if made either (1) on a court order granted before the sale, foreclosure, or seizure, with a return made and approved by the court; or (2) pursuant to an enforceable waiver agreement [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 517* (waiver agreement)]. Violation of this prohibition is a misdemeanor [*50 U.S.C. App. § 533(d)(1)*]. A trustee, before conducting a nonjudicial foreclosure sale, will typically require proof that the trustor is not, and was not

during the preceding 90 days, in military service. For a form of declaration of a trustor's nonmilitary status, see *§ 555.140*.

Other protection afforded by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act includes the following:

- Limitations on the amount of interest that may be charged on the secured obligation during the trustor's period of active service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 527*]; and

- Relief from penalties imposed for the trustor's default during that period [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 523*].

For discussion of the special protections given to active military service members under both the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act and equivalent California law [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*], see *§ 555.70[8]*. Forms for relief, including discussion of the court's authority to provide relief, are set forth in §§ 555.138-555.139A.

[3] Bankruptcy

If the trustor files a bankruptcy petition, the commencement or maintenance of judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings will be automatically stayed [*11 U.S.C. § 362(a)*]. The stay generally continues in effect until the bankruptcy proceeding is terminated, unless the bankruptcy court grants relief from the stay [*see 11 U.S.C. § 362(d)-(g)*]. The automatic stay would not toll the three-month period for reinstatement of a mortgage after a notice of default [*see Civ. Code § 2924(a)(2)*], although that period is subject to a limited extension pursuant to *11 U.S.C. § 108(b)* [*Napue v. Gor-Mey West, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 608, 617-619, 220 Cal. Rptr. 799* ; *see § 555.54*]. For further discussion, see *Ch. 94, Bankruptcy, § 94.30 et seq.*

PRACTICE TIP:

Published Postponement Notices Do Not Violate Automatic Stay. Although no foreclosure sale can proceed until the bankruptcy court lifts the automatic stay, a foreclosing creditor's published notice of postponement or other acts of continuing a sale noticed before the bankruptcy filing are acts that do not violate the automatic stay [*see Tully v. World Sav. & Loan Assn. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 654, 663, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 545* ; *In re Roach (9th Cir. 1981) 660 F.2d 1316, 1318-1319*]. *By William M. Hensley*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysGeneral OverviewBankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysRelief From StaysGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActReal Property LawFinancingFederal ProgramsFederal Housing AdministrationReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.34

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.34 Notice of Delinquency

[1] Junior Lienholder's Request

The beneficiary of a trust deed covering property containing one-to-four residential units or given to secure an original obligation not exceeding $300,000 may, with the written consent of the trustor, submit a written request by certified mail to the beneficiary of any senior trust deed, for written notice of any or all delinquencies of four months or longer in the payment of principal or interest on any obligation secured by the senior trust deed. The trustor's consent must be obtained either by a signed and dated agreement separate from the loan and security documents or through a disclosure on those documents in at least 10-point type [*Civ. Code § 2924e(a)*].

For further discussion and forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25A, *Security Instruments for Real Estate Financing* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Effect of Proper Request

[a] Period of Effectiveness; Successors in Interest

The request is valid until withdrawn in writing as to all delinquencies covered by *Civ. Code § 2924e* that occur before the specified termination date of the junior beneficiary's interest. It is effective for five years from the date it is mailed or recorded, whichever is later, and may be renewed at five-year intervals [*Civ. Code § 2924e(b)*].

The rights and obligations under *Civ. Code § 2924e* inure to the benefit of, or pass to, any successors in interest of the parties. A successor ininterest of a junior beneficiary entitled to notice must file a request for notice with any senior beneficiary (but a new written consent from the trustor is not required) [*Civ. Code § 2924e(b)*]. In addition, when any

beneficiary has been succeeded by another person, the beneficiary has a duty to transmit promptly to that person any notice received under *Civ. Code § 2924e* [*Civ. Code § 2924e(e)*].

[b] Requirements Governing Notice

Once a proper request is made, the senior beneficiary must give written notice to the requesting junior beneficiary of the fact and amount of any deficiency, unless already cured, that has existed four months or longer and that also existed or occurred on or after 10 days from the mailing or recording or the request, whichever is later. The notice is to be given within 15 days after the lapse of the four-month period, by personal service or first-class mail, postage paid. The beneficiary is not required to give notice of a delinquency under *Civ. Code § 2924e* if a notice of default under *Civ. Code § 2924* [*see § 555.52*] has already been recorded [*Civ. Code § 2924e(c)*].

[c] Discharge of Junior Obligation

On discharge of an obligation secured by a junior lien with respect to which a notice request was made pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924e*, the beneficiary or mortgagee that made the request must communicate that fact in writing to the senior lienholder to whom the request was made. The communication must specify that providing notice pursuant to the previous request is no longer required [*Civ. Code § 2924e(g)*].

[3] Liability for Failure to Give Notice

If the senior beneficiary fails to give notice of a delinquency as required by *Civ. Code § 2924e* and a judicial or nonjudicial foreclosure sale occurs, the senior beneficiary is liable to the requesting junior beneficiary for $300 as a penalty. The senior beneficiary is also liable for any damages arising from the failure to give timely notice and sustained from the date the notice should have been given to the date it is actually given or the date a notice of default is recorded, whichever is earlier [*Civ. Code § 2924e(d)*].

As a defense to this liability, the senior beneficiary may show by a preponderance of evidence that the failure to give notice was due to a good faith error that occurred despite maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid the error [*Civ. Code § 2924e(d)*].

Failure to comply with *Civ. Code § 2924e* does not affect the rights of a good faith lienholder or the validity of a sale in favor of a good faith purchaser [*Civ. Code § 2924e(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien Priorities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.35

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.35 Beneficiaries' Agreement to Be Governed by Majority Beneficiary

[1] Agreement and Disclosure

Following a process established by statute, all of the beneficiaries under a trust deed may agree to be governed, for purposes of certain procedures relating to a default or foreclosure, by beneficiaries holding more than 50 percent of the record beneficial interest of a series of notes secured by the same real property, or of undivided interests in a note secured by real property equivalent to a series transaction, exclusive of any notes or interests of a licensed real estate broker that is the issuer or servicer of the notes or interests or any affiliate of that licensed real estate broker [*Civ. Code § 2941.9(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2941.9(e)* ("affiliate of licensed real estate broker" defined)]. The agreement may cover actions to be taken on behalf of all parties in the event of default or foreclosure for matters that require direction or approval of the parties, including designation of the broker, servicing agent, or other person acting on their behalf, and the sale, encumbrance, or lease of real property owned by the parties after foreclosure or receipt of a deed in lieu of foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2941.9(b)*].

A description of the agreement must be disclosed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10232.5* in the disclosure statement provided by real estate brokers and must be included in a recorded document such as the trust deed or an assignment of interests [*Civ. Code § 2941.9(c)*].

[2] Majority Action Affidavit

Any action taken pursuant to the agreement is not effective unless all of the parties agreeing to the action execute a separate "Majority Action Affidavit" that contains prescribed statements [*Civ. Code § 2941.9(d)*]. The affidavit must be recorded in the office of the county recorder of each county in which the real property described in the trust deed is located. Once the document is recorded, it constitutes conclusive evidence of compliance with the requirements of *Civ.*

Code § 2941.9(d) in favor of trustees acting pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2941.9*, substituted trustees acting pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2934a*, subsequent assignees of the obligation secured by the trust deed, and subsequent good faith purchasers or lienholders for value of the real property described in the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2941.9(d)*].

For further discussion and forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25A, *Security Instruments for Real Estate Financing* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagor's Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.36

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.36 Regulation of Foreclosure Consultants and Home Equity Purchasers

Statutes protect homeowners in foreclosure from sharp practices by foreclosure consultants [*Civ. Code § 2945 et seq.*] and home equity purchasers [*Civ. Code § 1695 et seq.*]. A foreclosure consultant is generally an unlicensed person who offers to assist the trustor with the problems of impending nonjudicial foreclosure of the trustor's residential property [*Civ. Code § 2945.1*]. An equity purchaser is any person that acquires title to a residential property during nonjudicial foreclosure, with certain exceptions, such as a relative of the trustor, a person who intends to use the property as a residence, or a beneficiary that takes a deed in lieu of foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 1695.1(a), (b)*].

The statutory schemes have specific requirements as to the form and content of contracts required to be executed, including certain disclosures and notice of the trustor's special right to cancel the contract within a stated period [*Civ. Code §§ 1695.2-1695.5* (equity sale contracts); *Civ. Code §§ 2945.2, 2945.3* (foreclosure services contract)]. Specified practices are prohibited on the part of equity purchasers [*Civ. Code §§ 1695.6, 1695.13*] and foreclosure consultants [*Civ. Code § 2945.4*; *see Civ. Code § 2945.5*]. Any waiver of the statutory protections is void [*Civ. Code §§ 1695.10, 2945.5*]. In the event of specified violations by an equity purchaser or foreclosure consultant, the trustor has express causes of action for damages or equitable relief [*Civ. Code §§ 1695.7, 2945.6*] and, in the case of a sale of home equity, a right of rescission [*Civ. Code § 1695.14*]. Specified violations are also offenses [*Civ. Code §§ 1695.8, 2945.7*].

A home equity sale agreement with an option to repurchase gives rise, in some circumstances, to a presumption that the purportedly absolute conveyance is in fact a mortgage securing a loan [*Civ. Code § 1695.12*; *see § 555.22*].

The protections of the Home Equity Sales Contract Act and the Mortgage Foreclosure Consultants law only apply when the owner of a "residence in foreclosure" is approached while residing in the home [*In re Phelps (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 451, 455, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217* (granting petition for habeas corpus by defendant convicted of violating Home

Equity Sales Contract Act, on ground Act was inapplicable because homeowner no longer resided in home when approached by defendant)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
1. In General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.37-555.49

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.37[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.50

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.50 Validity and Regulation

Nonjudicial foreclosure refers to the private enforcement of a secured obligation on default, by exercise of a power of sale that is included in trustdeeds and many mortgages. The validity of a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding depends on compliance with the express terms of the provision conferring the power of sale [*see Fogarty v. Sawyer (1861) 17 Cal. 589, 593]* . However, all aspects of the nonjudicial foreclosure process are also regulated in detail by a comprehensive statutory scheme [*see Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*] that is designed to protect the trustor against unreasonable forfeiture [*Garfinkle v. Superior Court of Contra Costa County (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 268, 278, 146 Cal. Rptr. 208, 578 P.2d 925]* .

Because a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding is a private act, it does not constitute a deprivation of property without due process in violation of the state and federal constitutions [*Garfinkle v. Superior Court (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 268, 276-283, 146 Cal. Rptr. 208, 578 P.2d 925* ; *U.S. Hertz, Inc. v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 87-88, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44* ; *see U.S. Const., amend. XIV*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*].

On the other hand, nonjudicial foreclosure is deemed to be a harsh remedy subject to careful scrutiny by the courts [*see System Inv. Corp. v. Union Bank (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 137, 153, 98 Cal. Rptr. 735]* , which is why a private sale must strictly comply with the terms of the power-of-sale provision [*Hill v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 241, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 188]* and any applicable statutory requirements [*Whitman v. Transtate Title Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 312, 322, 211 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . The trustee also has a duty to conduct the sale fairly and openly, with diligence, discretion, and integrity, so as to protect the rights of all interested persons and obtain a reasonable price [*System Inv. Corp. v. Union Bank (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 137, 153, 98 Cal. Rptr. 735* ; *Hill v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 241, 243, 62 Cal. Rptr. 188]* .

For a comparison of a private sale and a foreclosure action, see *§ 555.30[2]*. For discussion of the one-form-of-action

rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*] and the antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726*] as they relate to privates sales, see *§§ 555.31* and *555.32[2]*. For discussion of other statutory schemes potentially affecting a private sale, see *§§ 555.33* (federal law) and *555.36* (regulation of foreclosure consultants and home equity purchasers).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.51

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.51 Preliminary Steps

Nonjudicial foreclosure is based on a default by the trustor entitling the beneficiary to exercise the power of sale in the trust deed [*see § 555.30[3]*]. Standard trust deed forms generally require the beneficiary to deliver to the trustee a written declaration of default and demand for sale, describing the nature of the default, stating an election to accelerate, if appropriate, and demanding a sale. For a form of declaration of default and demand for sale, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25D, *Foreclosure* (Matthew Bender). In addition, the beneficiary generally is required to furnish theoriginal trust deed, note, and any other evidence of the secured debt, as well as the original notice of default and election to sell [*see § 555.52*].

Other matters may require attention at or before this stage of the proceeding. For example, even though nonjudicial foreclosure is not subject to the bar of the statute of limitations [*see § 555.18[4]*], a trust deed is subject to expiration under *Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq.*, after which a private sale can no longer be conducted. For discussion of the expiration period and procedure for preserving a trust deed from expiration, see *§ 555.18[4][b]*. In addition, if a substitution of trustees becomes necessary, this should be done before recording the notice of default [*see Civ. Code § 2934a(b), (c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.51A

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.51A Foreclosure Protection

[1] Foreclosure Crisis

In July 2008, the governor signed into law SB 1137, intended to ameliorate the deleterious effects on the state economy and local economies and the California housing market resulting from the foreclosures of residential properties in unprecedented numbers [Stats. 2008, ch. 69, § 1(d)] resulting from economic factors including subprime lending practices. In SB 1137, the legislature found and declared that residential property foreclosures increased sevenfold from 2006 to 2007; that more than 84,375 properties were lost to foreclosure in California in 2007; and that 254,824 loans went into default, the first step in the foreclosure process [Stats. 2008, ch. 69, § 1(a)]. SB 1137 modified the foreclosure process to require mortgagees, beneficiaries, or authorized agents to provide notice to borrowers and explore options that could avoid foreclosure.

[2] Contacting Borrowers

Effective September 6, 2008 [Stats. 2008, ch. 69, § 10], a mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent may not file a notice of default pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924* [*see § 555.52*] until 30 days after the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent initially contacted the borrower in person or by telephone to assess the borrower's financial situation and explore options for the borrower to avoid foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(a)*]. However, a notice of default may be filed pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924* when a mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent failed to contact the borrower as required, provided that the failure to contact the borrower occurred despite the due diligence of the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(g)*; *see* Civ. Code § 2329.5(g)(1)-(5) (actions required for "due diligence")].

A notice of default must include a declaration that the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent has contacted the

borrower, or has tried with due diligence to contact the borrower as required by *Civ. Code § 2923.5(g)*, or that no contact was required pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2923.5(h)* [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(b)*].

These requirements apply to a loan that is secured by a mortgage or deed of trust recorded from January 1, 2003, to December 31, 2007, inclusive, on real property that is the principal residence of the borrower (as indicated to the lender in loan documents) containing no more than four dwelling units [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(i)*]. However, these requirements do not apply in any of the following cases [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(h)*]:

- The borrower has surrendered the property as evidenced by either a letter confirming the surrender or delivery of the keys to the property to the mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent.

- The borrower has contracted with an organization, person, or entity, whose primary business is advising people who have decided to leave their homes and who need advice on how to extend the foreclosure process and avoid their contractual obligations to mortgagees or beneficiaries.

- The borrower has filed a case under Chapter 7, 11, 12, or 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, and the bankruptcy court has not entered an order closing or dismissing the case or granting relief from a stay of foreclosure.

Civ. Code § 2923.5 is in effect until January 1, 2013, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2013, deletes or extends that date [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(j)*].

[3] Loan Modifications

Under specified circumstances, mortgage lenders and servicers are authorized under their pooling and servicing agreements to modify mortgage loans when the modification is in the best interest of investors. Generally, that modification may be deemed to be in the best interest of investors when the net present value of the income stream of the modified loan is greater than the amount that would be recovered through the disposition of the real property security through a foreclosure sale [Stats. 2008, ch. 69, § 1(c)].

In SB 1137, the legislature found and declared that any duty that servicers may have to maximize net present value under their pooling and servicing agreements is owed to all parties in a loan pool, or to all investors under a pooling and servicing agreement, not to any particular party in the loan pool or investor under a polling and servicing agreement, and that a servicer acts in the best interests of all parties to the loan pool or investors in the pooling and servicing agreement if it agrees to or implements a loan modification or workout plan as to which both of the following apply: (1) The loan is in payment default, or payment default is reasonably foreseeable; and (2) anticipated recovery under the loan modification or workout plan exceeds the anticipated recovery through foreclosure on a net present value basis [*Civ. Code § 2923.6(a)*]. The legislature declared its intent that the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent offer the borrower a loan modification or workout plan if such a modification or plan is consistent with its contractual or other authority [*Civ. Code § 2923.6(b)*]. Section 2923.6 is in effect until January 1, 2013, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2013, deletes or extends that date [*Civ. Code § 2923.6(c)*].

[4] Notice of Foreclosure to Residents

Effective September 6, 2008 [Stats. 2008 , ch. 69, § 10], on posting a notice of sale pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924f*, a trustee or authorized agent must also post, in the manner required for posting the notice of sale on the property to be sold, the following notice in English and the languages described in *Civ. Code § 1632* [*Civ. Code § 2924.8(a)*]:

"Foreclosure process has begun on this property, which may affect your right to continue to live in

> this property. Twenty days or more after the date of this notice, this property may be sold at foreclosure. If you are renting this property, the new property owner may either give you a new lease or rental agreement or provide you with a 60-day eviction notice. However, other laws may prohibit an eviction in this circumstance or provide you with a longer notice before eviction. You may wish to contact a lawyer or your local legal aid or housing counseling agency to discuss any rights you may have."

Concurrently with the mailing of the notice of sale pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924b*, the mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent must send, by first-class mail, a copy of that posted notice, in an envelope addressed to the "resident of property subject to foreclosure sale" [*Civ. Code § 2924.8(a)*]. It is an infraction to tear down the notice within 72 hours of posting. Violators will be subject to a fine of $100 [*Civ. Code § 2924.8(b)*].

These notice requirements apply only to loans secured by residential real property, and if the billing address for the mortgage note is different from the property address [*Civ. Code § 2924.8(d)*].

Section 2923.8 is in effect until January 1, 2013, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2013, deletes or extends that date [Civ. Code § 2923.8(e)].

[5] Maintenance of Vacated Property

A legal owner is required to maintain vacant residential property [*see Civ. Code § 2929.3(g)*] purchased by that owner at a foreclosure sale, or acquired by that owner through foreclosure under a mortgage or deed of trust [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(a)(1)*]. A governmental entity may impose a civil fine of up to $1,000 per day for a violation [*see Civ. Code § 2929.3(a)(1)* (notice of alleged violation and intent to assess fine)]. The governmental entity must provide a period of not less than 30 days for the legal owner to remedy the violation prior to imposing a civil fine and must allow for a hearing and opportunity to contest any fine imposed. In determining the amount of the fine, the governmental entity shall take into consideration any timely and good faith efforts by the legal owner to remedy the violation. The maximum civil fine is $1,000 for each day that the owner fails to maintain the property, commencing on the day following the expiration of the period to remedy the violation established by the governmental entity [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(a)(2)*; *see Civ. Code § 2929.3(b)* ("failure to maintain" defined)]. A governmental entity may establish different compliance periods for different conditions on the same property in the notice of alleged violation mailed to the legal owner [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(a)(3)*].

A governmental entity may provide less than 30 days' notice to remedy a condition before imposing a civil fine if it determines that a specific condition of the property threatens public health or safety and provided that notice of that determination and time for compliance is given [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(c)*]. Fines may not be imposed under both section 2929.3 and a local ordinance [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(e)*]. These provisions do not preempt any local ordinances [[*Civ. Code § 2929.3(f)*]. The rights and remedies provided in section 2929.3 are cumulative and in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(h)*]. Section 2929.3 is in effect until January 1, 2013, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2013, deletes or extends that date [*Civ. Code § 2929.3(I)*].

[6] Notice to Quit

Notwithstanding the unlawful detainer provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1161a*, a tenant or subtenant in possession of a rental housing unit at the time the property is sold in foreclosure must be given 60 days' written notice to quit pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1162* [*see Ch. 333, Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions, § 333.11*] before the tenant or subtenant may be removed from the property through unlawful detainer proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1161b(a)*]. However, this notice requirement does not apply if any party to the note remains in the property as a tenant, subtenant, or occupant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1161b(b)*]. Section 1161b is in effect until January 1, 2013, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, enacted before January 1, 2013, deletes or extends that date [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

1161b(c)].

In 2009, the United States Congress established a 90-day notice requirement in the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act [Pub. L. No. 111-22, S. 896]. This requirement applies to any foreclosure on a federally related mortgage loan or on any dwelling or residential real property after May 20, 2009 [Pub. L. No. 111-22, § 702, 123 Stats. 1660-1661; *see also* Pub. L. No. 111-22, § 703, 123 Stats. 1661, amending *42 U.S.C. § 1437f(o)(7)* (following foreclosure, successor in interest may terminate Section 8 tenancy on 90 days' notice if owner will occupy property as primary residence)]. The Act provides that any immediate successor in interest in the property pursuant to the foreclosure assumes that interest subject to the rights of any bona fide tenant as of the date of the notice of foreclosure, under any bona fide lease entered into before the notice of foreclosure, to occupy the premises until the end of the remaining term of the lease [Pub. L. No. 111-22, § 702(a)(2), 123 Stats. 1661]. However, a successor in interest may terminate a lease effective on the date of sale of the unit to a purchaser who will occupy the unit as a primary residence, subject to the receipt by the tenant of a 90-day notice to vacate [Pub. L. No. 111-22, § 702(a)(2), 123 Stats. 1661].

A lease or tenancy is considered bona fide if (1) the mortgagor or the child, spouse, or parent of the mortgagor under the contract is not the tenant; (2) the lease or tenancy was the result of an arms-length transaction; and (3) the lease or tenancy requires the receipt of rent that is not substantially less than fair market rent for the property or the unit's rent is reduced or subsidized due to a federal, state, or local subsidy [Pub. L. No. 111-22, § 702(b), 123 Stats. 1661]. These provisions are repealed on December 31, 2012 [P.L. 111-22, § 704, 123 Stats. 1662].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.52

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.52 Notice of Default

[1] Filing Notice for Record

[a] Filing Requirement; Exceptions

Generally, no power of sale under a trust deed may be exercised until a notice of default is filed for record in the office of the recorder of each county in which the encumbered property is located [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 2953* (benefit of statutory notice requirements may not be waived in advance)]. Typically, the trustee causes the filing of a notice provided by the beneficiary [*see § 555.51*], but the beneficiary or an agent for the beneficiary or trustee may file instead [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)*; *see Birkhofer v. Krumm (1938) 27 Cal. App. 2d 513, 516-517, 81 P.2d 609]* . For a form of notice of default and discussion of its contents, see *§ 555.142*.

Civ. Code § 2924 does not apply to the following trust deeds [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2953*; *see §§ 555.32[2][b], 555.54[1]*]:

- Trust deeds made pursuant to a court order or judgment.
- Trust deeds that secure payment of a bond or other indebtedness authorized or permitted to be issued by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 25600*].
- Trust deeds made by a utility subject to the Public Utilities Act [*see Pub. Util. Code § 201 et seq.*].

Effective September 6, 2008 [2008 Stats., ch. 69, § 10], with respect to certain residential loans, a mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent may not file a notice of default pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924* until 30 days after the

mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent has contacted the borrower in person or by telephone in order to assess the borrower's financial situation and explore options for the borrower to avoid foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(a)(1), (2)*]. However, a notice of default may be filed pursuant to section 2924 when a mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent failed to contact the borrower as required, provided that the failure to contact the borrower occurred despite the due diligence of the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent [*Civ. Code § 2923.5(g)*; *see* Civ. Code § 2329.5(g)(1)(5) (actions required for "due diligence")]. For discussion of these provisions, see *§ 555.51A*.

[b] Privileged Communications

The mailing, publication, and delivery of notices as required by *Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)* [*see § 555.52[1][a]*] and the performance of the procedures set forth in *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.* (provisions relating to trust deeds and mortgages) constitute privileged communications that fall within the scope of *Civ. Code § 47* (governing privileged publications or broadcasts) [*Civ. Code § 2924(d)*; *see Kachlon v. Markowitz (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 316, 341, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532* (qualified, common interest privilege set forth in *Civ. Code § 47(c)(1)* is applicable privilege); for coverage of *Civ. Code § 47*, *see* Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander*]. Moreover, in performing acts required by *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*, the trustee will not incur any liability for any good faith error resulting fromreliance on informati on provided in good faith by the beneficiary regarding the nature and the amount of the default under the secured obligation, deed or trust, or mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2924(b)*].

[2] Request for Notice

Any person desiring a copy of any notice of default that is required to be filed for recordation [*see § 555.52[1]*] may, at any time after recordation of the trust deed and before recordation of the notice of default, file a duly acknowledged request for notice in the office of the recorder of any county in which any part of the encumbered property is located [*Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*]. For a form of request for notice and discussion of its contents, see *§ 555.141*. A similar request for notice may be included in the trust deed, on behalf of any person or party to the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2924b(d)*]. A recorded request for notice entitles the designated person to receive a copy of the notice [*see § 555.52[3]*]; it does not operate as notice of any claim to the encumbered property [*Civ. Code § 2924b(g)*].

[3] Mailing Copies of Notice

[a] To Trustor and Persons Requesting Notice

Within 10 days following recordation of the notice of default, the trustee or other person authorized to record the notice (including an agent for the mortgagee or beneficiary, an agent of the named trustee, any person designated in an executed substitution of trustee, or an agent of that substituted trustee) must send or cause to be sent to the following persons, by registered or certified mail, with postage prepaid, a copy of the notice of default [*see § 555.142*] showing the date of recordation [*Civ. Code § 2924b(b)(1), (4)*]:

- To each trustor, at the last known address if it is different from the address specified in the trust deed.

- To each person entitled to receive notice by reason of a recorded request under *Civ. Code § 2924b(a)* and *(d)* [*see § 555.52[2]*], at the address designated in the request.

The last known address is the last business or residence physical address actually known by the trustee or other person authorized to record the notice of default. A physical address does not include an e-mail address or any form of electronic address for a trustor or mortgagor. An address is "actually known" if it is contained in the original deed of trust or mortgage, or in any subsequent written notification of a change of physical address from the trustor or mortgagor pursuant to the deed of trust or mortgage. The beneficiary must inform the trustee of the trustor's last address actually known by the beneficiary, but the trustee is not liable for failure to send any notice to this last address unless it is actually known by the trustee [*Civ. Code § 2924b(b)(3)*]. Although the trustee has noobligation to take any steps to

discover the trustor's current address or to determine whether the trustor is living [*see I.E. Associates v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 281, 285-289, 216 Cal. Rptr. 438, 702 P. 2d 596]* , if the trustee has actual knowledge that the trustor died and that the deceased trustor's estate is being administered by the public administrator, the trustee is obligated to send the notice to the public administrator [*Estate of Yates (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 511, 521, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 53]* .

The person required to send copies of the notice of default as described in the preceding paragraph must also simultaneously send or cause to be sent, by regular first-class mail, with postage prepaid, an additional copy of the notice, addressed to each trustor at the same address to which the notice is sent by registered or certified mail. The sender must execute and retain an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing that this requirement was met. In the absence of fraud, the affidavit establishes a conclusive presumption of mailing [*Civ. Code § 2924b(e)*].

Standard trust deed forms typically include the trustor's address and a request that the trustor be sent any notice of default or sale [*see Gov. Code § 27321.5(b)* (trustor's address and request for notice is prerequisite to recordation of trust deed)]. However, failure to include this information does not affect the validity of the trust deed [*Gov. Code § 27321.5*].

For a form of the declaration of mailing and discussion of the contents, see *§ 555.145*. For discussion of proof of mailing of copies of the notice, see *§ 555.145[2]* and *[3]*.

[b] To Other Persons

[i] Potential Recipients

Within one month following recordation of the notice of default, if certain conditions are satisfied [*see § 555.52[3][b][ii]*], the trustee or other person authorized to record the notice (including an agent for the mortgagee or beneficiary, an agent of the named trustee, any person designated in an executed substitution of trustee, or an agent of that substituted trustee) must send or cause to be sent to the following persons, by registered or certified mail, with postage prepaid, a copy of the notice of default [*see § 555.142*] showing the date of recordation [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(1), (2), (4)*]:

- The successor in interest, as of the recording date of the notice of default, of all or part of the estate or interest of the trustor [*see generally Perez v. 222 Sutter St. Partners (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 938, 947-949, 272 Cal. Rptr. 119* (easement holder is not successor in interest and does not have to be notified except pursuant to recorded request for notice)].

- The beneficiary of any trust deed recorded after the trust deed being foreclosed, or recorded before or concurrently with that trust deed butsubject to a recorded agreement or statement of subordination to that trust deed [*see § 555.16[4]*].

- The assignee of any junior beneficiary described in the preceding item, as of the recording date of the notice of default [*see § 555.15[1]*].

- The purchaser of any contract of sale (or the lessee of any lease) of the estate or interest being foreclosed, which was recorded after the trust deed being foreclosed or was recorded before or concurrently with that trust deed but is subject to a recorded agreement or statement of subordination to that trust deed [*see generally* Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser of Real Property*].

- The successor in interest of a purchaser or lessee described in the preceding item, as of the recording

date of the notice of default.

- The state controller in Sacramento, when, as of the recording date of the notice of default, a notice of lien against the encumbered property for postponed property taxes has been recorded [*see § 555.56[4]*].

When the mailing address of any person listed above, as provided to the county recorder, is the address of the person's attorney, agent, or employee, the fact that a notice of default is mailed to that address does not impose on the attorney, agent, or employee any duty to communicate the notice to the designated person [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(5)*].

For a form of the declaration of mailing and discussion of the contents, see *§ 555.145*. For discussion of proof of mailing of copies of the notice, see *§ 555.145[2]* and *[3]*.

[ii] Conditions Precedent

A copy of the notice need not be sent to a person described in § 555.52[3][b][i] unless the following conditions are satisfied with respect to that person [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(1)*]:

- The estate or interest of that person in the encumbered property was acquired by an instrument sufficient to impart constructive notice of the estate or interest.

- The instrument is recorded in the office of the county recorder so as to impart constructive notice before the recording date of the notice of default.

- The instrument as recorded sets forth a mailing address for use by the county recorder to return the instrument after recording, which is the address to be used for the purpose of mailing the notice of default.

[4] Publication or Posting of Notice

The trustee or beneficiary must publish a copy of the notice of default in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the propertyis located [*see Gov. Code § 6000* (defining newspaper of general circulation); *see generally* Ch. 386, *Newspapers*] if the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 2924b(d)*]:

- The trust deed does not contain a mailing address of the trustor or mortgagor named in it.

- The trustor has not recorded a request for notice [*see § 555.52[2]*] under *Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*.

The publication must commence within 10 business days after filing the notice of default for record and must occur once a week for at least four weeks. In lieu of publication, the trustee or beneficiary may arrange to have a copy of the notice of default personally delivered to the trustor, within 10 business days after the notice is filed for record or at any time before publication is to be completed, or post the notice of default in a conspicuous place on the property and mail the notice to the trustor's last known address [*Civ. Code § 2924b(d)*].

For discussion of proof of publication, see *§ 555.56[2]*.

[5] No Duty to Give Actual Notice

A trustee's statutory duty to provide notice is exclusive, and the trustee is not liable, as common agent of the parties, for any failure to provide actual notice to the trustor after meeting the requirements of *Civ. Code § 2924b* [*I.E. Associates v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 281, 285-289, 216 Cal. Rptr. 438, 702 P.2d 596]* .

[6] Warning to Buyer Under Secured Retail Installment Contract

When a default has not been cured within 30 days after recordation of the notice of default, and the default relates to an obligation under a contract for goods or services subject to the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] and secured by a trust deed on a single-family owner-occupied residence, the trustee must mail a warning statement [*see Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(3)*] to the trustor's last known address [*Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(1), (3)*]. The warning must also be included in all notices of sale [*see Civ. Code § 2924f(b)*].

For a form of a notice of sale containing the required warning, see *§ 555.144[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEvidencePrivilegesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.53

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.53 Status of Secured Debt

[1] Duty to Provide Statement

[a] Request for Statement

Trustors, junior beneficiaries and mortgagees, and certain other persons may request either a beneficiary statement [*see § 555.53[2]*] or a payoff demand statement [*see § 555.53[3]*] from the beneficiary, to determine the status of the loan [*see Civ. Code § 2943(b)(1), (c)*]. A beneficiary statement or payoff demand statement may be relied on in accordance with its terms [*Civ. Code § 2943(d)(1)*].

The request for a beneficiary statement may be made at any time before, or within two months after, the recording of a notice of default, or may otherwise be made more than 30 days before the entry of decree of foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2943(b)(2)*]. The request for a payoff demand statement may be made at any time.

The preparation and delivery of a beneficiary statement or a payoff demand statement does not change a date of sale established pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924g* [*Civ. Code § 2943(f)*; *see* § 555.27].

[b] Delivery; Fee; Failure to Furnish

The beneficiary may deliver the beneficiary statement or payoff demand statement by depositing it in the United States mail, with postage prepaid,or by transmitting it by facsimile machine [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(3)*]. The beneficiary may charge an amount not to exceed $30 for furnishing each required statement [*Civ. Code § 2943(e)(6)* (not applicable to FHA-insured or DVA-guaranteed trust deeds or mortgages)].

Willful failure to furnish a statement in a timely manner entitles the person making the request to actual damages plus a $300 penalty [*Civ. Code § 2943(e)(4)*]. A willful failure is an intentional failure to comply with the requirements of *Civ. Code § 2943* without just cause or excuse [*Civ. Code § 2943(e)(4)*].

[2] Beneficiary Statement

A beneficiary must, within 21 days after receiving a written demand by an entitled person, prepare and deliver to the person demanding it a copy of the note and a beneficiary statement [*Civ. Code § 2943(b)(1)*]. A beneficiary statement is a written statement showing the following information [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(2)*]:

- The amount of the unpaid balance of the obligation secured by the mortgage or trust deed and the interest rate together with the total amounts, if any, of all overdue installments of principal or interest or both.

- The amounts of periodic payments, if any.

- The date the obligation is due in whole or in part.

- The date to which real estate taxes and special assessments have been paid, to the extent that information is known by the beneficiary.

- The amount of hazard insurance in effect and the term and premium of that insurance, to the extent that information is known by the beneficiary.

- The amount in an account, if any, maintained for the accumulation of funds with which to pay taxes and insurance premiums.

- The nature and, if known, the amount of any additional charges, costs, or expenses paid or incurred by the beneficiary that have become a lien on the encumbered property.

- Whether the obligation secured by the mortgage or trust deed can or may be transferred to a new borrower.

[3] Payoff Demand Statement

A beneficiary must, on written demand by an entitled person, prepare and deliver a payoff demand statement to the person demanding it within 21 days after receiving the demand. However, if the loan is subject to a recorded notice of default or a filed complaint commencing a judicial foreclosure, the beneficiary has no obligation to prepare and deliver the statement unless the written demand is received before the first publication of a notice of sale or the notice of first date of sale established by a court [*Civ. Code § 2943(c)*].

A payoff demand statement is a written statement setting forth the amounts required as of the date of preparation by the beneficiary to discharge all obligations secured by the trust deed that is the subject of the payoff demand statement. The written statement must include information reasonably necessary to compute the payoff amount on a per diem basis for a period, not to exceed 30 days, during which the per diem amount is not changed by the terms of the note [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(5)*].

Any sums that were due but, for any reason, were not included in the payoff demand statement or an amended statement will be recoverable by the beneficiary as an unsecured obligation, pursuant to the terms of the note and provisions of law [*Civ. Code § 2943(d)(3)*; *Cathay Bank v. Fidelity Nat. Title Ins. Co. (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 266, 270-271, 53 Cal.*

Rptr. 2d 595 ; *see* *Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1996) 14 Cal. 4th 39, 52, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687, 924 P.2d 996* (reaching similar result based on common law in effect before enactment of *Civ. Code § 2943*)].

A letter sent by a bank to the escrow agent handling a sale, stating that it had received "payoff funds" for the secured promissory note that it held, did not meet the statutory requirements for a payoff demand statement. The letter did not advise the borrower of the sums needed to pay off the loan nor did it provide a per diem interest rate. The use of the term "payoff funds" in the letter was not sufficient to transform a letter advising the escrow agent of the status of the transaction into a payoff demand statement binding on the bank [*California Nat. Bank v. Havis (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1134, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 245]* .

[4] Short-Sale Transactions

The provisions of *Civ. Code § 2943* discussed below apply from January 1, 2010, until January 1, 2014 [*Civ. Code § 2943(g)*; *see* Stats. 2009, ch. 43, § 5]. These provisions are intended to allow escrow agents to obtain valid payoff statements in short-sale transactions, which can occur when deeds of trust or mortgages have to be foreclosed in a distressed real estate market.

A "short-pay agreement" is an agreement in writing in which the beneficiary agrees to release its lien on a property in return for payment of an amount less than the secured obligation [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(6)*].

A "short-pay demand statement" is a written statement, issued subsequent to and conditioned on the existence of a short-pay agreement in the possession of the entitled person, that is prepared in response to a written demand made by an entitled person or authorized agent, setting forth an amount less than the outstanding debt, together with any terms and conditions, under which the beneficiary will execute and deliver a reconveyance of the deed of trust securing the note that is the subject of the short-pay demand statement. The period must not be greater than 30 days from the date of preparation by the beneficiary [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(7)*].

A "short-pay request" is a written request made by an entitled person or authorized agent requesting the beneficiary to provide a short-pay demand statement that includes a copy of an existing contract to purchase the property for an amount certain, a copy of the short-pay agreement in the possession of the entitled person, and information related to the release of any other liens on the property [*Civ. Code § 2943(a)(8)*].

A beneficiary, or his or her authorized agent, must, on receipt of a short pay request, prepare and deliver a short-pay demand statement to the person requesting it within 21 days of the receipt of the short-pay request. A beneficiary, or his or her authorized agent, that elects not to proceed with the transaction that is the subject of the short-pay request may refuse to provide a short-pay demand statement for that transaction, but in that case, the beneficiary or agent must provide a written statement to the person requesting it, indicating that the beneficiary elects not to proceed with the proposed transaction, within 21 days of receipt of the short-pay request. If the terms and conditions of the short-pay agreement require approval by the beneficiary of a closing statement or similar document prepared by an escrow holder, then approval or disapproval must be provided not more than four days after receipt by the beneficiary of the closing statement, otherwise the closing statement will be deemed approved, provided the statement is not clearly contrary to the terms of the short-pay agreement or the short-pay demand statement provided to the escrow holder [*Civ. Code § 2943(c)(2)*].

A short-pay demand statement may be relied on by the entitled person or his or her authorized agent in accordance with its terms, including for the purpose of establishing the amount necessary to pay the obligation in full. If the beneficiary notifies the entitled person or his or her authorized agent of any amendment to the statement, then the amended statement may likewise be relied on by the entitled person or his or her authorized agent [*Civ. Code § 2943(d)(1)*].

If an entitled person or his or her authorized agent requests a statement pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2943* and does not

specify a short-pay demand statement, the beneficiary must treat the request as a request for a normal payoff demand statement [*Civ. Code § 2943(e)(1)*]. The provisions of *Civ. Code § 2943(e)(2)-(6)* also apply to a short-pay demand statement [*Civ. Code § 2943(e)*].

The preparation and delivery of a short-pay demand statement pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2943* will not change a date of sale established pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924g* [*Civ. Code § 2943(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.54

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.54 Reinstatement of Accelerated Obligation

[1] Power to Reinstate: Extent and Exercise

[a] Power to Effect Reinstatement

[i] Persons Entitled to Reinstate

The trustor and other persons are empowered by statute to effect reinstatement of the secured obligation and trust deed, *status quo ante*, after the beneficiary has elected to accelerate the secured obligation as the result of a monetary default, such as a failure to pay interest or installments on the principal or failure to make collateral payments such as taxes or insurance premiums [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*; *see § 555.15[3]*]. Persons entitled to reinstate during the reinstatement period [*see § 555.54[1][b]*] are the trustor, a successor in interest as to all or part of the encumbered property, and any junior beneficiary or mortgagee [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*].

The protection of *Civ. Code § 2924c* may not be waived in advance [*Civ. Code § 2953*].

[ii] Payment of Amount Due

Persons entitled to reinstate [*see § 555.54[1][a][i]*] may accomplish reinstatement by curing the monetary default, that is, paying or tendering payment of the entire amount due under the terms of the trust deed and the secured obligation, including the following [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*]:

- Certain costs and fees [*see § 555.54[2]*].

- All amounts of principal, interest, taxes, assessments, insurance premiums, or advances that are actually known by the beneficiary to be, and are, in default and are shown in the notice of default, under the terms of the trust deed or mortgage and the secured obligation.

- All amounts in default on recurring obligations not shown in the notice of default.

Recurring obligations comprise all amounts of principal and interest on the loan or rents, subject to the trust deed or mortgage in default, due after the notice of default is recorded, all amounts of principal and interest or rents advanced on senior liens or leaseholds that are advanced after recordation of the notice of default, and payments of taxes, assessments, and hazard insurance advanced after recordation of the notice of default [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*]. If the beneficiary has made no advances on defaults that would constitute recurring obligations, the beneficiary may require the trustor to provide reliable written evidence that the amounts have been paid [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*].

The amount required for reinstatement does not include any portion of the principal that, but for the acceleration on default, would not be due [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*; *see Bisno v. Sax (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719-720, 346 P.2d 814* (partial payment after default was insufficient cure, and person attempting to cure is not required to tender any amounts not claimed in notice of default)].

[b] Reinstatement Periods

Except when the extraordinary provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 2923.52-2923.55* require a 90-day extension of the time for reinstatement [*see § 555.54[1][f]*], or after those provisions expire on January 1, 2011 [*see Civ. Code §§ 2923.52(e), 2923.53*(*l*), 2923.54(c), 2923.55(d) (sunset date)], the time for reinstatement is governed by the statutory provisions discussed below.

The initial period during which reinstatement can be effected commences with the date of recordation of the notice of default and continues until five business days before the date of sale set forth in the initial recorded notice of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1), (e)*]. This period, at a minimum, exceeds three months, in view of the time requirements for setting the date of sale [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924b, 2924f* ; *see § 555.56*].

If the sale does not take place on the date set by the notice of sale or if a subsequent notice of sale is required to be recorded, the right of reinstatement revives as of the date of subsequent recordation of a notice of sale and continues until five business days before the date of sale set forth in the subsequent notice. If the sale is postponed on the date of sale set by the last-recorded notice of sale, or on the date declared for sale at an immediately preceding postponement of sale, and the postponementperiod exceeds five business days, the right of reinstatement revives as of the date of postponement and continues until five business days before the date of sale declared at the time of the postponement. There is no right of reinstatement during the period of five business days before the date of sale, whether that date is given in a notice of sale or declared at a postponement of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924c(e)*]. The term "business day" has the same meaning under *Civ. Code § 2924c(e)* as under *Civ. Code § 9* [*Civ. Code § 2924c(e)*]. For discussion of the postponement procedure, see *§ 555.57[4]*.

A foreclosure sale was invalid and the trustee's deed upon sale was void when the homeowner cured the default before the sale. The fact that the agreement to cure the default did not take place within the time statutorily granted to a trustor to cure a default as a matter of right [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1), (e)*] was irrelevant, because the homeowner and lender mutually agreed to the cure and reinstatement of the loan [*Bank of America N.A. v. La Jolla Group II (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 706, 712, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 825]* .

Bankruptcy proceedings may in effect permit the debtor to reinstate even after the reinstatement period has elapsed [*see 11 U.S.C. §§ 1124* cl. (2)(A), 1322(b)(2), *(5)*]. One court has held, however, that the postponement of a foreclosure sale numerous times for five or fewer business days during the time a sale was enjoined or stayed--thereby precluding

revival of an expired reinstatement period--was not improper [*Hicks v. E.T. Legg Associates (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 496, 508, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10]* . For further discussion, see Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy* .

[c] Duty to Accept Payment

If a person entitled to effect reinstatement tenders the amount necessary to cure the monetary default, the beneficiary cannot properly refuse the tender [*see Munger v. Moore (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1, 8, 89 Cal. Rptr. 323]* . A proper tender effectively cures the default even if is not accepted [*Magnus v. Morrison (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 208 P.2d 407]* , and the beneficiary and trustee may be liable for damages if they proceed with the sale [*Munger v. Moore (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1, 8, 89 Cal. Rptr. 323]* .

A beneficiary cannot, as a condition to reinstatement, demand the cure of any delinquency unless it has been sufficiently specified in the notice of default. For example, if a junior beneficiary records a notice of default and afterward cures a default under a senior lien, the junior beneficiary is entitled to add the paid amount to the debt owed to the junior beneficiary. The junior beneficiary, however, may not require the trustor to reimburse that amount in tendering payment for reinstatement under the junior notice of default, because the junior notice of default could not have included any delinquency under the senior trust deed [*Little v. Harbor Pacific Mortgage Investors (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 717, 720-721, 221 Cal. Rptr. 59]* .

[d] Effect of Tendering Payment

Once the monetary default is cured by a proper tender of payment, the secured obligation and the trust deed are automatically reinstated in full force and effect, as if no acceleration had occurred, and all pending foreclosure proceedings must be dismissed or discontinued [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Tender All of It! If a borrower or subordinated junior lienholder wants to cure so as to stop foreclosure proceedings, it is necessary that all amounts under loan documents (even disputed ones) be paid in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*. These tender rules also apply to pre-maturity delinquencies and do not disrupt common-law tender rules upon maturity. A borrower who properly tenders upon maturity may be able to stop the accrual of interest or extinguish the lien if a creditor wrongfully rejects a proper tender. *By William M. Hensley*

When a junior beneficiary or mortgagee is compelled to cure the default and effect reinstatement for self-protection, the amount so paid may be added to the debt secured by the junior trust deed or mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2876*; *see United Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Hoffman (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 306, 313, 106 Cal. Rptr. 275]* .

[e] When Reinstatement Is Not Available

Because *Civ. Code § 2924c* applies only to monetary defaults, it does not appear to limit acceleration based on a nonmonetary default, such as an unauthorized transfer by the trustor [*see § 555.15[4]*]. This distinction appears to be in accord with the original purpose of the statute, that is, to relieve debtors that were distressed by the Great Depression [*see Magnus v. Morrison (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 208 P.2d 407]* .

Civ. Code § 2924c does not apply to secured obligations authorized or permitted to be issued by the Commissioner of Corporations [*see Corp. Code § 25600*] or those made by a utility subject to the Public Utilities Act [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*; *see §§ 555.32[2][b], 555.52[1]*].

[f] Extraordinary Extension of Time

Normally a notice of sale cannot be given until after the passage of three months from the date of filing of the notice of

default [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(2), (3)*; *see § 555.54[1][b]*]. However, starting June 15, 2009, until January 1, 2011, in some cases in which the delinquent loan is secured by residential real property, that mandatory delay (the purpose of which is to allow time for the noticed default to be cured) is extended an additional 90 days, to allow the parties to pursue a loan modification so as to prevent the impending foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2923.52(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.52(d), (e)* (operative date and sunset date); *see also 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4.1 et seq., 2031.1 et seq., 2850.1 et seq.* (implemental regulations, issuance of which on June 1, 2009, made statute operative 14 days later)].

Once a notice of default has been recorded, the 90-day extension is effective in any case in which no exception is applicable (see below) and the following conditions are satisfied [*Civ. Code § 2923.52(a)*]:

- The deed of trust or mortgage was recorded during the period from January 1, 2003, to January 1, 2008, inclusive.

- It is the first deed of trust or mortgage encumbering the property that provides security for the loan.

- That property was residential real property when the deed of trust or mortgage was recorded.

- That property was occupied as the borrower's principal residence at the time the loan became delinquent.

In a case in which those conditions are satisfied, the notice of sale may nevertheless be given after the passage of three months from the date of filing of the notice of default [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(2), (3)*; *see § 555.54[1][b]*] when one of the following conditions exists, because in that case, the 90-day extension is not triggered:

- The delinquent loan is serviced by a mortgage loan servicer that has obtained a temporary or final order of exemption from the appropriate regulatory agency [*see Civ. Code § 2923.53(k)(1)* (either Commissioner of Corporations, Commissioner of Financial Institutions, or Real Estate Commissioner, depending on loan servicer's regulated status)], and that order is current and valid at the time the notice of sale is given [*Civ. Code § 2923.52(b)*]. To be eligible for an order of exemption, the loan servicer must have implemented a comprehensive loan modification program that meets the requirements of *Civ. Code § 2923.53* [*Civ. Code § 2923.53(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.53*(*l*) (sunset date)].

- The delinquent loan either [*Civ. Code § 2923.52(c)*]:

  - Was made or purchased, or is serviced, by a California state or local public housing agency or authority, including state or local housing finance agencies established under *Health & Safety Code § 50000 et seq.* (Zenovich-Moscone-Chacon Housing and Home Finance Act) and *Mil. & Vet. Code § 980 et seq.* (concerning Cal-Vet loans); or

  - Is collateral for securities purchased by such an agency or authority.

- The borrower has either [*Civ. Code § 2923.55(a)-(c)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.55(d)* (sunset date)]:

  - Surrendered the property to the mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent, as evidenced by either a letter confirming the surrender or delivery of the keys to the property;

  - Contracted with an organization, person, or entity, whose primary business is advising people who have decided to leave their homes, regarding how to extend the foreclosure process and avoid their contractual obligations to mortgagees or beneficiaries;

or

- Filed a case under Chapter 7, 11, 12, or 13 of the Bankruptcy Code, in which the bankruptcy court has not entered an order closing or dismissing the bankruptcy case or granting relief from a stay of foreclosure.

A notice of sale filed pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924f* [*see § 555.144*] must include a declaration from the trustee, mortgagee, or other mortgage loan servicer, stating (1) whether or not a final or temporary order of exemption was obtained pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2923.53* and is current and valid on the date the notice of sale is filed, and (2) whether the 90-day extension for giving notice of sale, specified in *Civ. Code § 2923.52(a)*, applies or does not apply, pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2923.52(b)* and *(c)* and *Civ. Code § 2923.55*. However, failure to comply with *Civ. Code § 2923.52* or *2923.53* will not invalidate any sale that would otherwise be valid under *Civ. Code § 2924f* [*Civ. Code § 2923.54(a), (b)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.54(c)* (sunset date)].

[2] Costs and Fees

[a] Statutory Limitations on Chargeable Costs

Costs and fees that a beneficiary may charge as a condition for reinstatement are subject to statutory limitations [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*]. Chargeable costs and expenses are limited to costs actually incurred for recording, mailing, publishing, and posting any notices required under *Civ. Code §§ 2924-2924i*, plus a fee not exceeding $50 for any postponement of a private sale, plus a fee for a trustee's sale guaranty [*Civ. Code § 2924c(c)*; *see Engelbertson v. Loan & Bldg. Asso. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 477, 479, 58 P.2d 647* (tender of amount due did not cure default when it did not include costs incurred)]. A trustee or beneficiary may purchase a trustee's sale guaranty at a rate meeting the standards in *Ins. Code §§ 12401.1* and *12401.3* [*Civ. Code § 2924c(c)*].

[b] Trustee's or Attorney's Fees

Any charge for trustee's or attorney's fees that does not exceed the following statutory ceiling is conclusively presumed to be lawful and valid [*Civ. Code §§ 2924c(d), 2924d(a)*]. Up to the time the notice of sale is mailed to the trustor, the trustee's or attorney's fees chargeable as a condition of reinstatement may not exceed the following amount [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1), (d)*]:

- $300 if the unpaid principal sum secured is $150,000 or less, or $250 if the unpaid principal sum secured exceeds $150,000, plus

- 0.5 percent of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $50,000, up to and including $150,000, plus

- 0.25 percent of any portion of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $150,000, up to and including $500,000, plus

- 0.125 percent of any portion of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $500,000.

The unpaid principal sum secured is determined as of the date the notice of default is recorded [*Civ. Code § 2924c(d)*].

In addition, when the trust deed secures an obligation subject to the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.* (retail installment sale contracts)], an additional $50 trustee's fee is authorized [*Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(5)*].

After the notice of sale is mailed to the trustor, the trustee's or attorney's fees chargeable as a condition of reinstatement

(in lieu of, not in addition to, the fees authorized above) may not exceed the following amount [*Civ. Code § 2924d(a)*]:

- $425 if the unpaid principal sum secured is $150,000 or less, or $360 if the unpaid principal sum secured exceeds $150,000, plus
- 1 percent of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $50,000, up to and including $150,000, plus
- 0.5 percent of any portion of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $150,000, up to and including $500,000, plus
- 0.25 percent of any portion of the unpaid principal sum secured exceeding $500,000.

A beneficiary also may demand, as a condition to reinstatement, reimbursement for any additional attorney's fees for other services related to the trust deed that are recoverable under the terms of the trust deed. However, these fees must be claimed in the notice of default, as part of the total amount required to cure the default [*Buck v. Barb (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 920, 924-925, 195 Cal. Rptr. 461* ; *see Bisno v. Sax (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 714, 720, 346 P.2d 814]* .

A trustee may pay or offer to pay an agent or subagent for work performed in discharging the trustee's obligations under the terms of the trust deed. The payments are conclusively presumed to be lawful and valid if, when the payments are added to the trustee's other fees, the aggregate sum does not exceed the trustee's authorized fee [*Civ. Code § 2924d(d)*].

[3] Notice of Rescission of Default

Within 21 days following a reinstatement, the beneficiary or an agent must execute and deliver to the trustee a notice of rescission, rescinding the declaration of default and demand for sale and advising the trustee of the date of reinstatement. The trustee must cause the notice of rescission to be recorded within 30 days after receiving it and all allowable fees and costs. No charge except the recording fee may be made to the trustor for the execution and recordation of the notice of rescission [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)*]. For a form of notice of rescission, see *§ 555.143*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.55

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.55 Equity of Redemption

[1] Right to Redeem

Any person having an interest in the encumbered property has a right to redeem the property from the lien of the mortgage or trust deed, until the property is sold at a foreclosure sale [*Civ. Code § 2903*]. Junior lienholders are specifically entitled to redeem [*Civ. Code § 2904*], as long as the junior interest was acquired in good faith and not as a sham to destroy the rights of other junior lienholders [*Lee v. Joseph (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 30, 32-35, 72 Cal. Rptr. 471]* .

This right of redemption is commonly referred to as an equity of redemption, a term dating to the period when a mortgagor retained only an equitable, rather than legal, interest in the encumbered property [*see Bradbury v. Davenport (1896) 114 Cal. 593, 601-602, 46 P. 1062]* . The term "equity of redemption" is used here to distinguish it from the statutory redemption procedure that applies following a judicial foreclosure sale [*see Duff v. Randall (1897) 116 Cal. 226, 229-230, 48 P. 66* ; § 555.72].

The person redeeming the encumbered property becomes subrogated to all of the benefits of the trust deed or mortgage, as against all owners of other interests in the property [*Civ. Code §§ 2903, 2904*].

[2] Waiver

An equity of redemption may not be waived in advance [*Civ. Code § 2889*; *Bradbury v. Davenport (1896) 114 Cal. 593, 599, 46 P. 1062]* . It may, however, be subsequently released or conveyed by an agreement that is sufficiently specific and deliberate and is given for an adequate consideration [*Bradbury v. Davenport (1896) 114 Cal. 593, 599-600, 46 P. 1062* ; *see Graves v. Arizona Central Bank (1928) 205 Cal. 715, 717-718, 272 P. 1063* ; *General*

Casualty Co. v. Soda (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 390, 394-395, 7 Cal. Rptr. 536 (no effective release of equity of redemption when agreement was not sufficiently specific)]. The most common instance of such a conveyance occurs when a trustor relinquishes the equity of redemption by giving the beneficiary a grant deed in consideration for cancellation of the secured obligation [*Graves v. Arizona Central Bank (1928) 205 Cal. 715, 717-719, 272 P. 1063* ; *see § 555.30[4]*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Other Consideration for Waiver of Redemption Rights. Various forms of consideration other than lien cancellation can support a waiver of redemption rights. For example, this practitioner has structured a redemption waiver in return for a stipulated-to lower deficiency judgment or for a reduction in a future deficiency judgment in some negotiated proportion to the price at which the property is sold to an outside third party without the cloud of redemption rights. *By William M. Hensley*

[3] Amount Payable for Redemption

Redemption is effected through full payment of the secured debt plus any damages sustained by reason of the default or delay in performance [*Civ. Code § 2905*]. Thus, the effect of redemption is to discharge the security and bar further foreclosure proceedings [*see Lee v. Joseph (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 30, 35, 72 Cal. Rptr. 471]* . If a proper tender of the amount necessary for redemption is refused, the obligation remains but the security is nonetheless discharged [*Lichty v. Whitney (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 696, 699-701, 182 P.2d 582]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionMortgagor's Right

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.56

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.56 Notice of Sale

[1] In General

[a] Basic Notice Requirement

After at least three months from the recordation date of the notice of default, if no reinstatement, redemption, or waiver of the default has occurred, the trustee or other person authorized to make the sale must, before proceeding further, give notice of the sale [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(3)*; *see § 555.56[2], [3]*]. The statute requires only the lapse of a minimum period between the notice of default and notice of sale, and the trustee may wait a longer period if the delay does not prejudice the trustor [*see Arata v. Downer (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 406, 408-409, 69 P.2d 213* ; *see also Hayward Lbr. & Invest. Co. v. Corbett (1934) 138 Cal. App. 644, 651, 33 P.2d 41* (reference to "month" in statute or contract is to calendar month); *but see Bennett v. Ukiah Fair Asso. (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 43, 47, 59 P.2d 805* (lapse of three-month period of *Civ. Code § 2924(a)(3)* was described in dictum as passage of 90 days)].

Starting June 15, 2009, until January 1, 2011, in some cases in which the delinquent loan is secured by residential real property, the normal three-month delay between recording the notice of default and giving notice of the sale is extended an additional 90 days, to allow the parties to pursue a loan modification so as to prevent the impending foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2923.52(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.52(d), (e)* (operative date and sunset date)]. For discussion, see *§ 555.54[1][f]*.

For a form of notice of sale and discussion of the contents, see *§ 555.144*.

[b] Failure to Give Notice; Privileged Communications

When the trustee fails to give notice of the sale to the trustor, junior lienholder, and judgment creditor, and when the failure to give notice is discovered before a deed is issued to the purchaser at the sale, the sale is void and of no effect. No conclusive presumption of the validity of the sale arises, and the purchaser is only entitled to a refund of its bid with interest [*Little v. CFS Service Corp. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1360-1362, 233 Cal. Rptr. 923]* .

The mailing, publication, and delivery of the notice, and the performance of the procedures set forth in *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.* (all provisions relating to trust deeds and mortgages), constitute privileged communications that fall within the scope of *Civ. Code § 47* (governing privileged publications or broadcasts) [*Civ. Code § 2924(d)*]. For coverage of *Civ. Code § 47*, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

[c] No Liability for Good Faith Error

In performing acts required by *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*, the trustee will not incur any liability for any good faith error resulting from reliance on information provided in good faith by the beneficiary regarding the nature and the amount of the default under the secured obligation, trust deed, or mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2924(b)*].

[2] Notice Procedure

[a] Posting

At least 20 days before the date set for the sale, a written notice must be posted in one public place in the city in which the property is to be sold. If it is not to be sold in a city, the notice must be posted in one public place in the judicial district in which the property is to be sold [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*]. Public places typically used include the courthouse and city hall [*see McCabe v. Willard (1931) 119 Cal. App. 122, 125, 6 P.2d 258]* .

A copy of the notice also must be posted in some conspicuous place on the property to be sold, when posting is possible and not restricted for any reason. If the property is a single-family residence, the notice must be posted on the front door, but if that posting is not possible or restricted, then in some other conspicuous place on the property. If access is denied because a common entrance to the property is restricted by a guard gate or similar impediment, the notice may be posted at that guard gate or impediment [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

If the property includes more than one parcel, posting separate notices on each parcel is necessary only to the extent that the parcels are not contiguous [*see Peterson v. Corporation of America (1937) 21 Cal. App. 2d 527, 529-530, 69 P.2d 904]* .

For discussion of proof of posting of a notice of sale, see *§ 555.145[2]* and *[3]*.

Effective September 6, 2008 [2008 Stats., ch. 69, § 10], with respect to residential foreclosures, on posting a notice of sale pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924f*, a trustee or authorized agent must also post, in the manner required for posting the notice of sale on the property to be sold, a specified notice in English and the languages described in *Civ. Code § 1632* [*Civ. Code § 2924.8(a)*]. For discussion of this provision and the text of the notice, see *§ 555.51A*.

[b] Publishing

A copy of the notice must be published once a week for three consecutive calendar weeks, with the first publication occurring at least 20 days preceding the sale, in a newspaper of general circulation [*see Gov. Code § 6000 et seq.*; *see also* Ch. 386, *Newspapers*] published in one of the following areas, to be selected in this order according to the location of the property and the existence of a qualifying newspaper [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1), (c)(4)*]:

- The city in which all or part of the property is located, if any part of the property is located in a city.

- The judicial district in which all or part of the property is located.
- The county in which all or part of the property is located.
- The contiguous county having the highest population.

Publication once weekly during the 20-day period is satisfied by three successive publications in a weekly newspaper, and need not be timed to span the entire period [*Hotchkiss v. Darling (1933) 130 Cal. App. 625, 626-627, 20 P.2d 343* (lapse of 14 days between first and third publication)].

An affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing publication of a notice of default or sale can be executed by the newspaper that published the notice [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2010*] and, when filed with the clerk of the county where the newspaper is printed, constitutes prima facie evidence of the facts stated in it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2011*].

[c] Recording

At least 20 days before the date set for the sale, the notice of sale must be recorded with the county recorder of the county in which all or part of the property is located [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

[3] Copies of Notice

At least 20 days before the date of sale, the trustee or other person authorized to record the notice of default (including an agent for the mortgagee or beneficiary, an agent of the named trustee, any person designated in an executed substitution of trustee, or an agent of that substituted trustee) must send, or cause to be sent, a copy of the notice of the time and place of sale, by registered or certified mail, with postage prepaid, addressed to (1) each person entitled to receive notice by reason of a duly recorded request [*see Civ. Code § 2924b(a), (d)*], at the address designated in the request [*see § 555.52[2]*], and (2) each trustor, at the last known address if it is different from the address specified in the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2924b(b)(2), (4)*]. For discussion of "last known address," see *§ 555.52[3][a]*. For discussion of proof of mailing the copies of the notice, see *§ 555.145[2], [3]*.

The person sending the copies of the notice of sale must also simultaneously send or cause to be sent, by regular first-class mail, with postage prepaid, an additional copy of the required notice, addressed to each trustor at the same address to which the notice is sent by registered or certified mail. The sender must execute and retain an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing that this requirement was met. In the absence of fraud, the affidavit establishes a conclusive presumption of mailing [*Civ. Code § 2924b(e)*]. For a form of declaration of mailing and discussion of the contents, see *§ 555.145*.

Additionally, at least 20 days before the date of sale, a copy of the notice of sale must be mailed in the same manner to each person entitled to receive a notice of default under *Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(1), (2)* [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(3)*; *see § 555.52[3][b]*].

[4] Special Notice for State and Federal Tax Liens

[a] State Tax Liens

If a state tax lien for postponed property taxes is recorded as of the date of the recordation of the notice of default, a copy of the notice of sale must be mailed to the state controller at least 20 days before the date of sale, in the same manner as to other entitled persons [*Gov. Code §§ 16182, 16187(b)*; *Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(2)(F), (3)*; *see §§ 555.52[3][b], 555.56[3]*]. However, when the tax lien has been recorded after the recordation of the notice of default but more than 30 days before the date of sale, a copy of the notice of sale must be given to the state controller at least 25

days before the date of sale [*Gov. Code § 16187(b)*]. If notice is not given, the sale will not extinguish the tax lien [*Gov. Code § 16187(b)*].

A copy of the notice of sale also must be mailed, at least 20 days before the date of sale and in the same manner as to other entitled persons [*see § 555.56[3]*], to the office of any other state taxing agency in Sacramento that recorded a notice of tax lien before the recordation of notice of default [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(3)*].

[b] Federal Tax Liens

The mortgagee, trustee, or other person authorized to record the notice of default must provide a copy of the notice of sale to the Internal Revenue Service in accordance with *I.R.C. § 7425* if a "Notice of Federal Tax Lien under Internal Revenue laws" has been recorded against the real property to which the notice of sale applies [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(4)*]. The failure to provide the Internal Revenue Service with a copy of the notice of sale is sufficient cause to rescind the trustee's sale and invalidate the trustee's deed, at the option of either the successful bidder at the trustee's sale or the trustee, and in either case with the consent of the beneficiary. Any option to rescind the trustee's sale must be exercised before any transfer of the property by the successful bidder to a bona fide purchaser for value. A recision of the trustee's sale may be recorded in a notice of recision pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1058.5* [*Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(4)*].

If a federal tax lien on the property has been filed for recordation more than 30 days before the sale, notice of the sale must be given to the Internal Revenue Service at least 25 days before the date of sale [*I.R.C. § 7425(c)*; *see Treas. Reg. § 400.4-1* (regulations governing notice of nonjudicial sale to be given to IRS)]. If notice is not given as required, the sale will not extinguish the lien [*I.R.C. § 7425(b)*; *Puls v. United States (N.D. Cal. 1974) 387 F. Supp. 760, 762-763* ; *see I.R.C. § 7425(d)* (IRS is empowered to redeem property within 120 days from date of sale)].

[c] Impact of Tax Liens on Duration of Process

Because *I.R.C. § 7425(c)* and *Gov. Code § 16187(b)* necessitate a record search for possible tax liens filed 31 days or longer before the sale dateand may require a notice of sale to be given 25 days rather than 20 days in advance, they effectively lengthen the minimum 110-day period within which nonjudicial foreclosure may be completed under *Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3)* and *2924b*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureTax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureTax Credits & LiabilitiesLiens (IRC secs. 6320-6327)Discharges of LiensTax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureTax Credits & LiabilitiesLiens (IRC secs. 6320-6327)Property & Rights Subject to LienTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax Liens

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.57

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.57 Conduct of Sale

[1] In General

[a] Trustee's Duty

A private sale of property under the power of sale of a trust deed must be made at auction to the highest bidder [*Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*; *see § 555.57[5*]; *see also Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(4)*]. The trustee is empowered to conduct the sale but may delegate this task [*see Civ. Code § 2924a* (trustee's attorney or any duly authorized agent may be auctioneer); *Central Sav. Bank of Oakland v. Lake (1927) 201 Cal. 438, 447, 257 P. 521* (trustee hired auctioneer under trust deed provision)]. The trustee has a duty to conduct the sale fairly and openly, with due diligence and sound discretion to protect the rights of the trustor and others and using all reasonable efforts to obtain the best possible or most reasonable price for the benefit of the trustor [*Baron v. Colonial Mortgage Service Co. (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 316, 322-323, 168 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *Kleckner v. Bank of America (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 30, 33, 217 P.2d 28]* .

[b] Time and Place of Sale

The time of the sale must be between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on any business day, Monday through Friday [*Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*].

The sale must take place in the county in which all or part of the property is located [*Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*]. If the property is located in two or more counties, all of the property may be sold in any one of the counties in which it is located [*Civ. Code § 2924g(b)*].

In the case of a sale of a single-family owner-occupied residence that is security for a contract for services or goods

subject to the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.* (retail installment sale contracts)], the sale must be in the county in which the residence is located [*Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(4)*].

[2] Disclosure of Property Defects

A beneficiary with knowledge of a defect in the property has a duty to disclose the defect to potential purchasers, if only the beneficiary knows of the defect, and the beneficiary knows that the purchaser does not know and cannot reasonably discover the defect. Thus, a beneficiary was held liable for failure to disclose soil movement under a house that was known by the beneficiary, when the purchaser had no chance to inspect theproperty before the sale [*Karoutas v. Homefed Bank (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 767, 770-774, 283 Cal. Rptr. 809]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Civ. Code § 2924h(g)* and *Karoutas. In 1992, *Civ. Code § 2924h(g)* was amended to allow "as-is" foreclosure sales. Although the provision likely was passed to abrogate *Karoutas*, there is still the likelihood that this statutory subdivision does not protect foreclosing persons from liability for selling property with known but undisclosed defects. The prudent course is to disclose known defects, because "as-is" clauses or statements generally do not protect against disclosure of known problems. *By William M. Hensley*

[3] Multiple Parcels

When the property comprises several lots or parcels, each one must be sold separately unless the trust deed provides otherwise [*Civ. Code § 2924g(b)*]. The trustor, if present at the sale, is entitled to direct the order in which the trustee separately sells the lots or parcels, unless the trust deed provides otherwise [*Civ. Code § 2924g(b)*]. Typically, standard trust deed forms do provide otherwise, giving the trustee discretion to sell the property either as a whole or in separate parcels in whatever order the trustee determines. After sufficient property is sold to satisfy the indebtedness, no more may be sold [*Civ. Code § 2924g(b)*].

If more than one parcel is scheduled to be sold separately at the same time and place by the same trustee, the postponement of any of the sales must be announced at the time specified in the notice of sale for the commencement of the sale. Any sales not postponed must commence immediately afterward, with each successive sale to take place as soon as possible after the completion of the preceding sale [*Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*].

A portion of the property may be sold separately if it is claimed by a third person who requires it to be sold separately [*Civ. Code § 2924g(b)*]. For example, in a judicial foreclosure proceeding, lessees of a portion of the mortgaged premises were entitled to require that the unleased portions be sold first at the judicial sale [*Mack v. Shafer (1901) 135 Cal. 113, 67 P. 40* ; *see Civ. Code § 2899* (security is to be exhausted, on demand, so that portion of property encumbered exclusively by senior lien is sold before portions that are also subject to junior interest)].

[4] Postponement of Sale

[a] When Authorized

The trustee is authorized to postpone the sale in accordance with any of the following [*Civ. Code § 2924g(c)(1)*]:

- On the order of any court of competent jurisdiction;

- If stayed by operation of law [*see, e.g.,* *California Livestock Production Credit Assn. v. Sutfin (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 136, 141, 211 Cal. Rptr. 152* (postponement during pendency of trustor's bankruptcy proceedings is required by operation of law)];

- By mutual agreement, whether oral or in writing, of any trustor and any beneficiary or any mortgagor and any mortgagee; or

- At the trustee's discretion [*see, e.g., Pacific Ready-Cut Homes v. Title G. & T. Co. (1929) 103 Cal. App. 1, 5-6, 283 P. 963* (highest amount bid did not constitute fair price)].

Sale proceedings may be postponed, including a postponement on instruction by the beneficiary to the trustee that the sale proceedings be postponed, at any time before the sale's completion, for any period of time not to exceed a total of 365 days from the date set forth in the notice of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924g(c)(1)*].

As a general rule, the trustee must proceed with the sale with reasonable dispatch, and it is not an abuse of discretion to refuse to hold up the sale at the request of a bidder. However, it has been suggested that the trustee's discretion is abused in refusing briefly to postpone the sale to allow a junior lienholder to obtain funds for a qualified bid, at least when there is no higher bid already qualified [*see Hill v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Assn. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 241, 62 Cal. Rptr. 188* ; *Kleckner v. Bank of America (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 30, 33-34, 217 P.2d 28]* .

In the case of a sale of a single-family owner-occupied residence that is security for a contract for services or goods subject to the Unruh Credit Sales Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*], the trustee may receive offers during the 10-day period immediately before the date of sale, and the sale must be postponed to a specified date if any offer so received is accepted in writing by both the trustor and beneficiary. Before the rescheduled date of sale, the trustor may convey the property according to the terms of the accepted offer, and this effectively terminates any further proceedings [*Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(4)*].

[b] New Notice of Sale and New Fees

In the event that the sale proceedings are postponed for a period or periods totaling more than 365 days, the scheduling of any further sale proceedings must be preceded by giving a new notice of sale in the manner prescribed in *Civ. Code § 2924f* . New fees incurred for the new notice of sale must not exceed the amounts specified in *Civ. Code §§ 2924c* and *2924d* and must not exceed reasonable costs that are necessary to comply with these requirements [*Civ. Code § 2924g(c)(2)*].

[c] Notice By Public Declaration; Seven-Day Holding Period; Sale

The trustee must give notice of each postponement, together with the reason for it, by public declaration at the time and place last appointedfor the sale [*Civ. Code § 2924g(d)*; *see Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*]. The declaration must also set forth the new date, time, and place of sale (which must be the same place as that originally fixed by the trustee). No other notice of the postponement need be given [*Civ. Code § 2924g(d)*; *see United States Cold Storage v. Great Western Savings & Loan Assn. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1214, 1228-1230, 212 Cal. Rptr. 232]* .

The sale may be conducted no sooner than the seventh day after dismissal of any action or, if earlier, expiration or termination of any injunction, restraining order, or stay that required postponement of the sale (whether by entry of an order by a court of competent jurisdiction, operation of law, or otherwise), unless the injunction, restraining order, or subsequent order expressly directs the conducting of the sale within that seven-day period. The seven-day period does not include the day the action is dismissed or the injunction, restraining order, or stay expires or is terminated. If the sale had been scheduled to occur during that seven-day period but could not be held as scheduled because of this seven-day requirement, a new notice of postponement must be given. The trustee is required to keep a record of the reason for each postponement [*Civ. Code § 2924g(d)*]. Notwithstanding these time periods, if postponement of a sale is based on a stay granted under the bankruptcy provisions of Title 11 of the United States Code, the sale may be conducted no sooner than the expiration of the stay granted under the Bankruptcy Code and the seven-day provision of *Civ. Code § 2924g(d)* does not apply [*Civ. Code § 2924g(e)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Ask For Waiver of Holding Period in Section 2924g(d). When representing a foreclosing lender or seller in a proceeding to dissolve a foreclosure injunction or to lift the bankruptcy automatic stay, counsel should make sure to expressly request, in the moving papers, that the court waive the seven-day holding period of *Civ. Code § 2924g(d)* so the foreclosure can take place forthwith. It is this practitioner's experience that courts will not truncate this holding period unless the request is made in the moving papers. *By William M. Hensley*

[5] Bidding Requirements

[a] Irrevocable Offer; Cancellation

Each bid made at the sale is deemed to be an irrevocable offer by the bidder to purchase the property for the amount of the bid. A bid is effectively canceled by a subsequent bid by any bidder for a higher amount [*Civ. Code § 2924h(a)*]. A postponement or discontinuance of the sale [*see § 555.57[4]*] cancels the last bid [*Civ. Code § 2924h(e)*]. The completion of the sale is to be announced by the fall of the hammer or in another customary manner [*Civ. Code § 2924h(b)*].

[b] Requirement for Cash or Financial Institution's Check

[i] Acceptable Forms

Standard trust deeds typically provide that the property must be sold for cash in U.S. currency, payable at the time of sale. The trustee may, before recognizing any bid, and as a condition of doing so, require every bidder to show evidence of ability to deposit the full amount of the final bid in one of the following forms [*Civ. Code § 2924h(b)*]:

- Cash.

- A cashier's check drawn on a state or national bank [*see Baron v. Colonial Mortgage Service Co. (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 316, 320-321, 323, 324, 168 Cal. Rptr. 450* (trustee was liable for abuse of discretion in refusing to accept cashier's check made out to bidder as cash equivalent)].

- A check drawn by a state or federal credit union.

- A check drawn by a state or federal savings and loan association, savings association, or savings bank specified in *Fin. Code § 5102* and authorized to do business in California.

- A cash equivalent designated in the notice of sale as acceptable [*see California Golf v. Cooper (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1068-1069, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 153* (legislature used words "cash equivalent" as a term of art in section 2924h to refer to something different from "cash," "cashier's check," or "check drawn by a [bank]")].

The trustee is entitled to hold the bidders' cash or cash equivalent during the sale. If the last bidder has not previously deposited the full amount of the bid, the trustee may require this amount to be deposited immediately, before completing the sale [*Civ. Code § 2924h(b)*].

[ii] Special Handling Requirements; Finality of Sale

In the event that the trustee accepts a check drawn by a credit union or a savings and loan association or a cash equivalent designated in the notice of sale, the trustee may withhold the trustee's deed until funds become available to the payee or endorsee as a matter of right [*Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*].

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*, the trustee's sale will be deemed final on the acceptance of the last and highest bid, and will be deemed perfected as of 8:00 a.m. on the actual date of sale if the trustee's deed is recorded within 15 calendar days of the sale, or the next business day following the fifteenth day if the recorder's office is closed on the fifteenth day. However, the sale will be subject to an automatic rescission for a failure of consideration if the funds are not "available for withdrawal" as defined in *Ins. Code § 12413.1* [*Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*; *see Ins. Code § 12413.1(e)* (when draft has been submitted for collection, "available for withdrawal" means when draft has been submitted for collection and payment has been received); *Ins. Code § 12413.1(g)* (incorporating by reference definition set forth in *12 C.F.R. § 229.2(d)* as that regulation existed on January 1, 1990)]. The trustee must send a notice of rescission for a failure of consideration to the last and highest bidder submitting the check or alternative instrument, if the address of the last and highest bidder is known by the trustee. If a sale results in an automatic right of rescission for a failure of consideration under *Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*, the interest of any lienholder is reinstated in the same priority as if the previous sale had not occurred [*Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*].

[c] Beneficiary's Full-Credit Bid

An exception to the general requirement of cash bids is made for the present beneficiary of the trust deed being foreclosed, who may bid on credit to the extent of the outstanding secured debt, including the trustee's fees and expenses [*Civ. Code § 2924h(b)*; *see Central Sav. Bank of Oakland v. Lake (1927) 201 Cal. 438, 447-448, 257 P. 521* (consideration given by beneficiary is discharge of debt)].

The trustee need not accept a partial-credit bid by a junior beneficiary [*see Nomellini Constr. Co. v. Modesto S. & L. Assn. (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 114, 115, 79 Cal. Rptr. 717]* .

[d] High Bidder's Duty to Complete Sale

If the trustee has not, pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924h(b)*, required the last and highest bidder to deposit the amount of the bid in cash or a cash equivalent, the trustee must complete the sale. If the successful bidder thereafter fails to deliver, on demand, the amount of the bid in cash or a cash equivalent, the bidder is liable to the trustee for all damages sustained as a result, including any court costs and reasonable attorney's fees. If the last and highest bidder willfully fails to deliver the amount of the bid, or delivers a check or other instrument as a cash equivalent but later cancels that instrument, the bidder is also guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by a fine up to $2,500 [*Civ. Code § 2924h(d)*].

In the event that the last and highest bidder cancels an instrument submitted to the trustee as a cash equivalent, the trustee must provide a new notice of sale in the manner set forth in *Civ. Code § 2924f* and is entitled to recover the costs of the new notice of sale as provided in *Civ. Code § 2924c* [*Civ. Code § 2924h(d)*]. For discussion of a notice of sale under *Civ. Code § 2924f*, see *§§ 555.56* and *555.144*. For discussion of the expenses that a trustee may recover under *Civ. Code § 2924c* as a condition to reinstatement, see *§ 555.54*.

The civil remedies provided by *Civ. Code § 2924h* are not exclusive. Thus, section 2924h did not bar an action for breach of warranty and fraud by the foreclosing beneficiary against bidders at a nonjudicial foreclosure sale who stopped payments on cashiers' checks and falsely stated that the checks had been lost and never endorsed [*California Golf v. Cooper (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1068-1069, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 153*]. Furthermore, the criminal remedies in section 2924h are not exclusive. The existence of a potential misdemeanor penalty, as provided for in section 2924h(d), would not foreclose prosecution for felony perjury simply because the defendant's allegedly perjurious conduct happened to also constitute the cancellation of a declined cashier's check in a nonjudicial foreclosure sale. Similarly, it did not prohibit a foreclosing beneficiary from pursuing remedies in tort for the bidders' fraudulent conduct in canceling cashiers' checks, simply because that conduct happened to occur in the course of a nonjudicial foreclosure sale [*California Golf v. Cooper (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1072-1073, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 153*].

If the last and highest bidder cancels an instrument submitted to the trustee as a cash equivalent, the trustee must provide a new notice of sale and is entitled to recover the costs of the new notice of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924h(d)*; *see California Golf v. Cooper (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1068-1069, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 153* (legislature plainly used words "cash equivalent" as a term of art in *Civ. Code § 2924h* to refer to something different from "cash," "cashier's check," or "check drawn by a [bank]"; thus, trial court erred in holding this provision was only remedy available where bidders canceled cashier's checks submitted to trustee as payment)].

[e] Proscription of Collusive Bidding

Collusive bidding at the sale is prohibited. Anyone who, acting alone or with others, offers or accepts consideration of any type to fix or restrain bidding that would in any manner operate as a fraud or deceit on any beneficiary, trustor, or junior lienholder, may be punished by a fine up to $10,000 or imprisonment up to one year or both. However, this does not make it unlawful for any person, including the trustee, to state that a property subject to a recorded notice of default or subject to a sale is being sold in an "as is" condition [*Civ. Code § 2924h(g)*].

Any person other than the trustor whose rights as a bidder are not prejudiced, cannot complain of alleged collusive bidding; thus, a junior beneficiary who made no attempt to bid could not have the sale set aside on that ground [*Bertschman v. Covell (1928) 205 Cal. 707, 709-710, 272 P. 571]* .

Gross inadequacy of price coupled with even slight irregularity is enough to set aside the sale. The trustee's failure to tell a bidder that the bid must be a specific amount more than the prior bid has been held to be a sufficient irregularity to set aside the sale [*Bank of Seoul & Trust Co. v. Marcione (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 113, 118-120, 244 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

[6] Completion of Sale

[a] When Sale is Complete

To complete the sale, the trustee may accept a final bid that is below the value of property. Mere inadequacy of price is not, by itself, a ground for setting aside an otherwise properly conducted sale [*Engelbertson v. Loan & Bldg. Asso. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 477, 479, 58 P.2d 647* ; *Crofoot v. Tarman (1957) 147 Cal. App. 2d 443, 446-447, 305 P.2d 56* ; *but see Pac. Ready-Cut Homes v. Title G. & T. Co. (1929) 103 Cal. App. 1, 5-6, 283 P. 963* (trustee was able to postpone sale because final bid was too low)]. If the trustee accepts a check drawn by a credit union or a savings and loan association, or a cash equivalent designated in the notice of sale, special requirements determine when the sale will be deemed completed. Further, the sale will be subject to an automatic rescission if the funds are not "available for withdrawal" [*see Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*; *see also § 555.57[5][b]*].

The sale is complete the moment the trustee accepts the high bid, regardless of whether a trustee's deed is subsequently executed and delivered. The subsequent execution and delivery of the deed are merely ministerial acts [*Ballengee v. Sadlier (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1, 4-5, 224 Cal. Rptr. 301* (holding limited to facts in *Little v. CFS Service Corp. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1354, 1362, 233 Cal. Rptr. 923*)].

[b] Form and Delivery of Deed

The successful bidder is not entitled to receive a deed from the auctioneer at the time of tendering payment of the amount bid. Usually the auctioneer gives the purchaser a receipt for the amount received, and the deed is afterward executed and delivered by the trustee in a day or two [*see Kleckner v. Bank of America (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 30, 34, 217 P.2d 28]* . The deed is usually without warrant, as the trustee has no duty to guaranty the title [*Tomczak v. Ortega (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 902, 907, 50 Cal. Rptr. 20]* and in fact must sell it, on proper demand, even if defective [*Brown v. Busch (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 200, 204, 313 P.2d 19]* . For a form of trustee's deed and discussion of the contents, see *§ 555.146*. For further discussion of the title conveyed by a trustee's deed, see *§ 555.62*.

[7] Notice of Rescission

When a trustee's deed is invalidated by a pending bankruptcy or otherwise, recordation of a notice of rescission of the trustee's deed restores the condition of record title and the priority of all liens to the status before the recordation of the trustee's deed. The notice of rescission must properly identify the trust deed, the identification numbers used by the recorder or the books and pages at which the trustee's deed and the trust deed are recorded, the names of all trustors and beneficiaries, the location of the property subject to the trust deed, and the reason for rescission. Only the trustee or beneficiary who caused the trustee's deed to be recorded, or a successor in interest, may record a notice of rescission [*Civ. Code § 1058.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawSales of GoodsAuction SalesCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.58

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.58 Expenses of Sale

On sale of the property, the trustee or an agent or successor in interest may demand and receive from the beneficiary or an agent or successor in interest, or may deduct from the proceeds of the sale, the reasonable costs actually incurred in enforcing the terms of the obligation, to the extent allowed under *Civ. Code § 2924c(c)* [*Civ. Code § 2924d(b)*]. For discussion of costs allowable under *Civ. Code § 2924c(c)*, see *§ 555.54[2]*. The trustee also may recover, in the same manner, trustee's or attorney's fees not exceeding $425 or, if greater, 1 percent of the unpaid principal sum secured, determined as of the date the notice of default was recorded. Any charge for fees within this limit is conclusively presumed to be lawful and valid, but is recoverable only in lieu of, not in addition to, fees chargeable under *Civ. Code § 2924c(d)* or *Civ. Code § 2924d(a)* [*Civ. Code § 2924d(b)*]. For discussion of fees allowable under those code sections, see *§ 555.54[2]*.

A trustee may pay or offer to pay an agent or subagent for work performed in discharging the trustee's obligations under the terms of the trust deed. The payments are deemed to be conclusively lawful and valid if, when added to the trustee's other fees, the aggregate sum does not exceed the trustee's authorized fee [*Civ. Code § 2924d(d)*].

The beneficiary may, in addition, add to the outstanding indebtedness any reasonable attorney's fees incurred in successfully defending an action brought by the trustor to enjoin the sale, pursuant to the standard trust deed provisions for recovery of attorney's fees. The beneficiary may add these fees even after failing to request a court award of attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* [*De La Cuesta v. Superior Court (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 945, 948-950, 200 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.59

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.59 Application of Proceeds

The trustee or the clerk of the superior court on order of the court must distribute the proceeds of the trustee's sale in the following order [*Civ. Code § 2924k(a)*]:

- Reimbursement of costs and expenses of exercising the power of sale and conducting the sale, including the payment of the trustee's fees and attorney's fees permitted pursuant to *Civ. Code §§ 2924d(b)* and *2924k(b)*.

- Payment of the obligations secured by the trust deed or mortgage.

- Payment of obligations secured by any junior liens or encumbrances in the order of their priority.

- Disbursement of any balance to the trustor or a successor in interest or, in the event the property was sold or transferred to another, to the vested owner of record at the time of the sale.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.60

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.60 Notice of Sale Proceeds

[1] General Requirements

Unless an interpleader action has been filed [*see § 555.60[2][e]*], within 30 days after the execution of the trustee's deed resulting from a sale in which there are proceeds remaining after payment of the costs of sale and the secured obligation, the trustee must send written notice to all persons with recorded interests in the property as of the date immediately before the trustee's sale and entitled to notice of sale pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924b(b)* and *(c)* [*see § 555.52[2]*]. The notice must be sent by first-class mail in the manner set forth in *Civ. Code § 2924b(c)(1)* [*see § 555.52[3][a]*]. It must state the following [*Civ. Code § 2924j(a)*]:

- There has been a trustee's sale of the described real property.

- The notified person may have a claim to all or a portion of the sale proceeds remaining after payment of the expenses of sale and the amounts owing on the obligation primarily secured.

- The notified person may contact the trustee at the address provided in the notice to pursue any potential claim.

- Before the trustee can act, the notified person may be required to present proof that the person holds the beneficial interest in the obligation and the security interest for the obligation. In the case of a promissory note secured by a trust deed, proof that the person holds the beneficial interest may include the original promissory note and assignment of beneficial interests related to the note. The notified person must also submit a written claim to the trustee, executed under penalty of perjury, stating the

amount of the claim to the date of the trustee's sale and containing an itemized statement of the principal, interest, and other charges.

- Claims must be received by the trustee at the address stated in the notice no later than 30 days after the date the trustee sends the notice.

Nothing in *Civ. Code § 2924j* precludes a person from pursuing other remedies or claims as to surplus proceeds [*Civ. Code § 2924j(b)*].

[2] Priority of Claims; Conflicting Claims

[a] Duty and Failure to Investigate; Payment in Absence of Dispute; Unclaimed Property Law

The trustee must exercise due diligence to determine the priority of the written claims to the surplus proceeds [*Civ. Code § 2924j(b)*]. For these purposes, "due diligence" means the trustee has researched the written claims submitted or other evidence of conflicts and determined that a conflict of priorities exists between two or more claimants, which the trustee is unable to resolve [*see Civ. Code § 2924j(c), (f)*].

If there is no dispute as to the priority of the written claims submitted to the trustee, the trustee must pay the proceeds within 30 days after the conclusion of the notice period [*Civ. Code § 2924j(b)*; *see § 555.60[1*] (notice period)]. If the trustee fails to determine the priority of written claims within 90 days following the 30-day notice period, then within 10 days thereafter the trustee must deposit the funds with the clerk of the court pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924j(c)* [*see § 555.60[2][b]*] or file an interpleader action pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924j(e)* [*Civ.Code § 2924j(b)*; *see § 555.60[2][e]*].

In a case in which a trustee conducted a nonjudicial foreclosure sale that resulted in excess sale proceeds, the trustee did not have a duty to search for, verify, prioritize, and distribute the surplus funds to a junior lien holder who had recorded a judgment lien against the property owner but had not recorded a request to receive notice of default and sale. The comprehensive statutory scheme regarding nonjudicial foreclosures clearly delineates the limited role and duties of a trustee in a nonjudicial foreclosure sale, and those duties do not include the responsibility for searching and finding all possible judgment creditors [*Banc of America Leasing & Capital LLC v. 3 Arch Trustee Services Inc. (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1104-1105, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397]* .

To the extent required by the Unclaimed Property Law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1500 et seq.*], a trustee in possession of surplus proceeds not required to be deposited with the court pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2924j(b)* must comply with the Unclaimed Property Law [*Civ. Code § 2924j(g)*]. For coverage of the Law, see Ch. 252, *Escheat (Unclaimed Property)*.

[b] Deposit With Court for Unresolved Claims

If, after due diligence [*see § 555.60[2][a]*], the trustee is unable to determine the priority of the written claims to the surplus, or the trustee determines that there is a conflict between potential claimants, the trustee may file a declaration of the unresolved claims with the clerk of the superior court of the county where the sale occurred [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*]. For the Judicial Coucil form that must be used to accomplish this filing, and related discussion concerning completing and filing the form, see *§ 555.148*. At the same time, the trustee must deposit the portion of the sale proceeds that cannot be distributed. The declaration must set forth the date of the trustee's sale, a description of the property, the names and addresses of all persons to whom notice was sent, a statement that the trustee exercised due diligence and provided written notice as required, and the amount of the sale proceeds deposited. The trustee must also submit a copy of the trustee's sale guaranty and any information relevant to the identity, location, and priority of the potential claimants and file proof of service of the required notice [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*].

On deposit of that portion of the sale proceeds that cannot be distributed by due diligence, the trustee is discharged of further responsibility for the distribution of the sale proceeds [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*].

[c] Notice of Deposit

Before the trustee deposits the funds discussed in *§ 555.60[2][b]* with the clerk, the trustee must send written notice by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to all persons entitled to notice of conflicting claims [*see § 555.60[1]*]. The notice must state that the trustee intends to deposit the funds with the clerk and that claimants must file claims with the court within 30 days from the date of the notice. The notice must also provide the address of the court where the funds were deposited and a phone number to call for further information [*Civ. Code § 2924j(d)*].

[d] Court Determination

Within 90 days after deposit with the clerk, the court must consider all claims filed. At least 15 days before the scheduled hearing date, the court clerk must serve written notice of the hearing by first-class mail on all claimants identified in the trustee's declaration, at the addresses specified in the declaration. After the hearing, the court must distribute the deposited funds to all entitled claimants in the priority stated in *§ 555.59* [*Civ. Code § 2924j(d)*].

[e] Interpleader Not Restricted

The special requirements relating to conflicting claims do not restrict the trustee's right to file an interpleader action in order to resolve a dispute about the proceeds of a trustee's sale. After an interpleader action has been filed, the notice provisions of *Civ. Code § 2924j* do not apply [*Civ. Code § 2924j(e)*]. For discussion of interpleader actions, see Ch. 314, *Interpleader* .

[3] Costs of Distribution

The trustee may charge costs and expenses incurred in distributing the proceeds, including but not limited to costs incurred in investigating the priority and validity of claims and the distribution of funds. If the fee does not exceed $100, or $125 when there are obligations secured by junior liens or encumbrances [*see Civ. Code § 2924k(a)(3)*], the fee is conclusively presumed to be reasonable [*Civ. Code § 2924k(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesInterpleadersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDeposits in CourtReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale Foreclosure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.61

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.61 Effect of Sale

On sale of the property, the trust deed ceases to exist [*Streiff v. Darlington (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 42, 45, 68 P.2d 728* ; *see Civ. Code § 2910*; *Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 606, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* . A full-credit bid by a junior lienholder extinguishes any right to obtain insurance proceeds or to pursue any other remedy based on diminution of the value of the property [*Bank of America v. Quackenbush (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1167, 1171, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 81* ; *Caruso v. Great Western Savings (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 667, 673-674, 280 Cal. Rptr. 322]* .

When the property is sold for less than the outstanding debt, the beneficiary is barred from seeking a deficiency judgment in almost all cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*]. The beneficiary may, however, recover amounts that do not constitute a deficiency judgment, such as damages for bad faith waste [*see Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 604-605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see also United Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Hoffman (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 306, 312-314, 106 Cal. Rptr. 275* (beneficiary often makes less-than-full-credit bid in order to recover, from other sources, amounts not constituting deficiency judgment, such as recovery of rents and profits)]. For discussion of limitations on the recovery of deficiency judgments after a private sale, see *§ 555.32[2]*. For discussion of recovery of rents and profits or damages for waste, see *§§ 555.80 et seq.* and *555.90*.

In the event that the property is sold for at least the outstanding debt, the beneficiary cannot subsequently recover from any other source, such as insurance proceeds payable for damage to the property, net rents and profits, or damages for waste [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth 24 (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 606-607, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* .

When a lender who is named as a loss payee on the debtor's insurance policy forecloses on the property and thereafter prevails in an action for breach of contract and bad faith against the insurance company, the lender's contract damages

are limited under the full credit bid rule to the difference between the amount secured by the deed of trust and the amount of the lender's credit bid at the foreclosure sale [*Track Mortgage Group, Inc. v. Crusader Ins. Co. (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 857, 865, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228]* . The lender's tort damages are also limited by the credit bid rule absent a showing that the insurer's conduct caused the lender to make the credit bid [*Track Mortgage Group, Inc. v. Crusader Ins. Co. (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 857, 866, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228* ; *see Alliance Mortgage Co. v. Rothwell (1995) 10 Cal. 4th 1226, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352, 900 P.2d 601* ; *see also § 555.32[b]*]. The lender is entitled, however, to other consequential tort damages such as interest and attorney's fees [*Track Mortgage Group, Inc. v. Crusader Ins. Co. (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 857, 861, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 228]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawTortsWasteGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.62

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.62 Purchaser's Title and Rights

[1] Title

The purchaser acquires title on receipt of the trustee's deed [*Central Sav. Bank of Oakland v. Lake (1927) 201 Cal. 438, 448, 257 P. 521]* . The title dates back to the date the trust deed was executed and is free and clear of all subsequent or subordinate encumbrances and interests [*Hohn v. Riverside County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 605, 612-613, 39 Cal. Rptr. 647* ; *Dugand v. Magnus (1930) 107 Cal. App. 243, 247* ; *but see Call v. Thunderbird Mortgage Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 542, 548-549, 25 Cal. Rptr. 265, 375 P.2d 169* (subordinate liens were not extinguished when purchaser was trustor or successor)]. It is also free and clear of the interest of the trustor or a successor, which is foreclosed by the sale [*see Hohn v. Riverside County Flood Control etc. Dist. (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 605, 612-613, 39 Cal. Rptr. 647]* . The purchaser's title remains subject to all prior or superior encumbrances and interests [*Streiff v. Darlington (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 42, 45, 68 P.2d 728]* .

[2] No Redemption Rights; Exception for IRS

The purchaser's title is generally not conditional on any rights of redemption, as these are terminated by the sale [*Py v. Pleitner (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 576, 578-579, 161 P.2d 393* ; *see § 555.72*]. Redemption rights are cut off when the sale is completed, not the time the trustee's deed is executed and delivered [*Stockwell v. Barnum (1908) 7 Cal. App. 413, 418-419, 94 P. 400]* . However, when a subordinate federal tax lien has been filed against the property more than 30 days before the recordation date of the notice of default, the Internal Revenue Service has a right to redeem the property during a period of 120 days following the sale [*I.R.C. § 7425(d)*]. The method of this redemption is governed by federal law [*see 28 U.S.C. § 2410(d)*; *Treas. Reg. § 400.5-1*; *Bank of Hemet v. United States (9th Cir. 1981) 643 F.2d 661, 666-667]* .

[3] Right of Immediate Possession

The purchaser, on acquisition of title, has the right of immediate possession and all other incidents of legal ownership [*Farris v. Pacific States Aux. Corp. (1935) 4 Cal. 2d 103, 105, 48 P.2d 11* ; *Central Sav. Bank of Oakland v. Lake (1927) 201 Cal. 438, 448, 257 P. 521]* . If the trustor or another person remains in possession, the purchaser may bring an unlawful detainer action to recover possession, and need only prove acquisition of title at the sale [*Abrahamer v. Parks (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 82, 84, 296 P.2d 341* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1161a(b)(3)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(7)* (receiver may be appointed to take possession in action for unlawful detainer)]. The only feasible defense would be that the sale was not conducted in compliance with the requirements of *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.* and the terms of the trust deed [*Cheney v. Trauzettel (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 158, 159-160, 69 P.2d 832* ; *MCA, Inc. v. Universal Diversified Enterprises Corp. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 170, 176-177, 103 Cal. Rptr. 522]* . However, even this defense may be precluded by a recital in the trustee's deed of compliance with all statutory requirements [*see Civ. Code § 2924(c)*; *Abrahamer v. Parks (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 82, 84, 296 P.2d 341]* . For further discussion of the effect of such a recital, see *§ 555.63[2][d]*.

If the issue of the regularity of the sale is litigated in an unlawful detainer action, the doctrine of res judicata may prevent its relitigation in a subsequent action to set aside the sale [*Vella v. Hudgins (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 251, 255-256, 142 Cal. Rptr. 414, 572 P.2d 28]* . For further discussion and forms relating to unlawful detainer actions by the purchaser at a nonjudicial foreclosure sale, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[4] Acquisition and Subsequent Sale by Mortgagee or Trust Deed Beneficiary

If the mortgagee or trust deed beneficiary becomes the purchaser at the foreclosure sale and then sells the property, the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1103.20 et seq.* (the Buyer's Choice Act) may apply. Until January 1, 2015 [*Civ. Code § 1103.23*], no mortgagee or trust deed beneficiary (or any trustee, agent, officer, or other employee, of a mortgagee or beneficiary) that acquired title to residential real property improved by four or fewer dwelling units at a foreclosure sale may require, directly or indirectly, as a condition of selling the property, that title insurance covering the property, or escrow service provided in connection with the sale of the property, must be obtained by the purchaser from a particular title insurer or escrow agent [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(a), (b)(2)*; *see Civ. Code § 1103.22(b)(1), (3)* ("escrow service" and "title insurance" defined)]. However, the purchaser may agree to accept the services of a title insurer or an escrow agent recommended by the seller if the seller first gives the purchaser written notice of the right to make an independent selection of those services [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(a)*].

Civ. Code § 1103.22 applies regardless of whether the secondary sale ensues from a solicitation of purchasers or from acceptance of an unsolicited offer to purchase [*see Civ. Code § 1103.21(b)*].

A sale subject to *Civ. Code § 1103.22* cannot be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with any provision of *Civ. Code § 1103.20 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(d)*]. However, a violation of *Civ. Code § 1103.22* is a cause of action, and the purchaser may recover statutory damages equal to three times all of the charges made for the required title insurance or escrow services. A violation also is a ground for disciplinary action by a licensing agency, if the culpable mortgagee or beneficiary (or a culpable trustee, agent, officer, or other employee, of the mortgagee or beneficiary) is a state-licensed person [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & Detainer

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.63

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.63 Challenging Private Sale

[1] Action to Enjoin Pending Sale

Before completion of a private sale, the trustor or any other person who disputes the propriety of the sale may bring an action to enjoin the exercise of the power of sale. For example, a trustor may be able to enjoin a sale after offering to cure the default, when the beneficiary and trustee did not give proper notice of the default until after the lapse of the reinstatement period [*see Lupertino v. Carbahal (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 742, 744-750, 111 Cal. Rptr. 112]* . For further discussion of reinstatement, see *§ 555.54*. Similarly, a trustor may obtain declaratory relief and an injunction on the ground that there is no actual default justifying a sale [*see Baypoint Mortgage Corp. v. Crest Premium Real Estate etc. Trust (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 818, 825-830, 214 Cal. Rptr. 531* (trustor, in action to enjoin private sale, was held likely to prevail on merits when default was merely payment made several days after due date but before date after which late payment charge was to be imposed); *Bisno v. Sax (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 714, 718, 720-730, 346 P.2d 814]* or that the secured transaction is itself invalid [*Daniels v. Williams (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 310, 312-313, 270 P.2d 556]* . An action for declaratory relief and an injunction is also appropriate to resolve a dispute as to the amount of the default [*More v. Calkins (1890) 85 Cal. 177, 188-190, 24 P. 729]* . For a form of complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief to block a nonjudicial foreclosure sale, see *§ 555.147*.

If there is no dispute as to the default and the amount due, the trustor must do equity, namely, offer to cure the default, in order to obtain injunctive relief [*Meetz v. Mohr (1904) 141 Cal. 667, 672-673, 75 P. 298]* . However, such an offer is not required when the trustor is seeking preliminary injunctive relief in an action to rescind the secured transaction for fraud [*Stockton v. Newman (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 558, 563-564, 307 P.2d 56* ; *see U.S. Hertz v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 75-82, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44* ; *but see Kemple v. Security First Nat. Bank (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 719, 720-721, 57 Cal. Rptr. 838* (federal law prohibits injunction of private sale against national bank until final

judgment)].

For further discussion and forms relating to the availability of declaratory and injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , and Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[2] Action to Set Aside Sale

[a] Equitable Action

A completed private sale under a trust deed may, in proper circumstances, be attacked by an action to set aside the sale, in which the court will review the proceedings with care to see that the trustor's rights were not violated [*Stirton v. Pastor (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 232, 234, 2 Cal. Rptr. 135* ; *Py v. Pleitner (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 576, 579, 161 P.2d 393]* . Because it is an equitable action, there is ordinarily no right to a jury trial [*Raedeke v. Gibraltar Sav. & Loan Asso. (1974) 10 Cal. 3d 665, 671, 111 Cal. Rptr. 693, 517 P.2d 1157]* , and the action may be subject to the defense of laches [*see Hauger v. Gates (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 752, 756, 269 P.2d 609]* .

[b] Grounds

Whether the circumstances constitute grounds for setting aside a private sale is essentially a question of fact [*Py v. Pleitner (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 576, 579, 161 P.2d 393]* . Whatever the ground, it must have caused injury to the plaintiff [*see, e.g., California Trust Co. v. Smead Inv. Co. (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 432, 435, 44 P.2d 624* (trustor was not injured by beneficiary's failure to comply with terms of trust deed by giving trustee note and trust deed when delivering declaration of default); *see also Copsey v. Sacramento Bank (1901) 133 Cal. 659, 662, 66 P. 7]* . Grounds have included the following:

- The trust deed was invalid [*see, e.g., Stirton v. Pastor (1960) 177 Cal. App. 2d 232, 234, 2 Cal. Rptr. 135* (ineffective delivery of trust deed); *see also Saterstrom v. Glick Bros. Sash etc. Co. (1931) 118 Cal. App. 379, 380-383, 5 P.2d 21* (trust deed was void because of insufficient description of property)].

- There was no actual default [*see, e.g., Hauger v. Gates (1954) 42 Cal. 2d 752, 754-755, 269 P.2d 609* (no default because of setoff under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 440*); *Lopez v. Bell (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 394, 398-399, 24 Cal. Rptr. 626* (waiver of right to declare default)].

- There was fraud, unfairness, or failure to comply with the trust deed provisions or statutory requirements [*see, e.g., Garcia v. World Savings, FSB (2010) 183 Cal. App. 4th 1031, 1046, 107 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683* (sufficient evidence of detrimental reliance by borrowers on promise by lender to delay foreclosure to support claim of promissory estoppel); *Whitman v. Transtate Title Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 312, 322-323, 211 Cal. Rptr. 582* (failure to comply with mandatory postponement requirement); *Standley v. Knapp (1931) 113 Cal. App. 91, 97-102, 298 P. 109* (failure to properly post notice of sale)].

- A gross disparity between the purchase price and the value of the property was coupled with some (even slight) unfairness or irregularity [*see, e.g., Angell v. Superior Court (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 691, 700, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 657* (defect in notice of sale, coupled with gross inadequacy of price, was sufficient to set aside sale); *Whitman v. Transtate Title Co. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 312, 322-323, 211 Cal. Rptr. 582* (failure to postpone sale on request of trustor's successor in interest); *see also Sargent v. Shumaker (1924) 193 Cal. 122, 129, 223 P. 464]* .

- An inaccurate description of the property may have dissuaded potential purchasers, and the price was

grossly inadequate [*In re Worcester (9th Cir. 1987) 811 F.2d 1224, 1228-1229]* .

- The auctioneer at the foreclosure sale read from a script for a different foreclosure but erroneously called out the street address for the subject property, and as a result opened the bidding with a credit bid that was only a fraction of what was actually owed on the subject property; in conjunction with the gross inadequacy of price, the auctioneer's mistake, discovered after the close of bidding but before the issuance of the trustee's deed, constituted an "irregularity" sufficient to give the trustee the right to rescind the sale [*Millennium Rock Mortgage Inc. v. T.D. Service Co. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 804, 811, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 544]* .

Mere inadequacy of the purchase price, in the absence of some irregularity, fraud, unfairness, or oppression, is not a sufficient ground to set aside the sale [*Engelbertson v. Loan & Bldg. Asso. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 477, 479, 58 P.2d 647* ; *Brown v. Busch (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 200, 205, 313 P.2d 19]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Irregularity in Sale Must Be Significant to Justify Set Aside Action. The type of accompanying irregularity to justify a "set aside" action must be significant in nature. For example, lack of proper notice in tandem with a low sales price of the property will justify relief. However, slight deviations in the technical requirements for the format of the notice of default or notice of sale apparently do not constitute the type of gross irregularity that will justify disruption of a trustee's sale [*see, e.g., Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. v. Clance (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 828, 830, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 899]* . *By William M. Hensley*

To prove that a junior lienholder was damaged by irregularities in a foreclosure sale that allegedly prevented a higher bid, the junior lienholder must produce a ready, willing, and able purchaser who would have paid a higher price at the sale [*FPCI RE-HAB 01 v. E & G Investments, Ltd. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1018, 1022-1024, 255 Cal. Rptr. 157* (not action to set aside sale, but for damages)].

[c] Balancing of Equities

If grounds for setting aside the sale exist, the plaintiff may nonetheless be denied relief unless the plaintiff offers to do equity through redemption [*see § 555.55*]. In other words, a valid and viable tender of the outstandingdebt is a prerequisite to an action to set aside a sale [*Karlsen v. American Sav. & Loan Assn. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 112, 117, 92 Cal. Rptr. 851* (complaint that does not show offer to redeem does not state cause of action); *Py v. Pleitner (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 576, 582, 161 P.2d 393]* . This rule applies to junior lienholders as well as to trustors [*Arnolds Management Corp. v. Eischen (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 575, 577-580, 205 Cal. Rptr. 15* ; *but see United States Cold Storage v. Great Western Savings & Loan Assn. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1214, 1221-1226, 212 Cal. Rptr. 232* (holding of *Arnold's Management Corp.* questioned and held to be prospective only)].

An offer to have the property sold by the bankruptcy court and the proceeds disbursed to creditors has been held to be a sufficient offer to do equity, and producing cash to redeem was not required [*In re Worcester (9th Cir. 1987) 811 F.2d 1224, 1230-1231]* . For discussion relating to setting aside a private sale under bankruptcy law, see Ch. 94, *Bankruptcy* .

[d] Effect of Recitals in Trustee's Deed

Standard trust deed forms typically provide that the recital of a fact in the trustee's deed is conclusive proof of that fact. If the trustee's deed includes a recital of compliance with all statutory notice requirements, this recital is conclusive evidence of compliance in favor of a good faith purchaser, and prima facie evidence of compliance in all other cases [*Civ. Code § 2924(c)*]. When a recital constitutes conclusive evidence, it cannot be refuted in the absence of a showing

of actual fraud [*Karrell v. First Thrift of Los Angeles (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 536, 539, 232 P.2d 1* ; *see Central Nat. Bank v. Bell (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 324, 327-328, 54 P.2d 1107]* .

For these purposes, a good faith purchaser is a third-party purchaser for value who lacks knowledge of any alleged irregularity or unfairness [*see Pierson v. Fischer (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 208, 217, 280 P.2d 491* ; *Karrell v. First Thrift of Los Angeles (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 536, 539, 232 P.2d 1]* . A beneficiary who purchases at the sale is not included in this category, so that a recital of compliance constitutes, as to the beneficiary, only prima facie evidence of compliance, controvertible by evidence presented by the trustor [*see Beck v. Reinholtz (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 719, 723, 292 P.2d 906* ; *Seccombe v. Roe (1913) 22 Cal. App. 139, 143-144, 133 P. 507]* .

The ultimate validity and effect of the statutory provision concerning recitals in trustees' deeds has been expressly left undecided [*Garfinkle v. Superior Court (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 268, 279 n.16, 146 Cal. Rptr. 208, 578 P.2d 925* ; *see Homestead Savings v. Darmiento (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 424, 432-436, 281 Cal. Rptr. 367* (conclusive presumption that proper notice has been given is not violation of due process with regard to junior lienholder who was not given notice); *Pierson v. Fischer (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 208, 216-217, 280 P.2d 491* (trust deed provision that recital is conclusive did not violate *Civ. Code § 2953*); *contra, Tomczak v. Ortega (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 902, 907, 50 Cal. Rptr. 20]* .

One court has held that the conclusive presumption language in *Civ. Code § 2924(c)* applies only to challenges to statutory compliance with regard to default and sales notices [*Melendrez v. D & I Investment, Inc. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1256, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413]* . The court recognized that there is dictum suggesting that the conclusive presumption applies across the board to any claimed irregularities in the trustee's sale [*Melendrez v. D & I Investment, Inc. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1256, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413* , citing *Moeller v. Lien (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 822, 831, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 777* ; *Residential Capital v. Cal-Western Reconveyance Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 807, 817, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 162]* . However, the court declined to follow these cases to the extent they could be construed as describing the presumption as precluding any attack on the foreclosure sale as to a bona fide purchaser, irrespective of whether the challenge relates to the trustee's compliance with procedural requirements concerning the default and sale notices [*Melendrez v. D & I Investment, Inc. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1238, 1256, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413]* .

[3] Action for Damages

The beneficiary and trustee may be liable to the trustor or a successor in an action for damages based on an illegal, fraudulent, or wilfully oppressive private sale. The measure of damages is the value of the property at the time it was sold, less the encumbrances against the property [*Munger v. Moore (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7-8, 11, 89 Cal. Rptr. 323]* . In one case, the court of appeal found a senior lienholder and the debtor could be liable for damages to a junior lienholder when the junior alleged that the senior and debtor agreed that no one but the senior would be permitted to purchase at the foreclosure sale, the first two sales were postponed when other bidders appeared, the senior knowingly allowed the trustee to overstate the amount in default, and the trustee failed to collect the full amount of the senior's bid and distribute the excess to the junior [*South Bay Building Enterprises, Inc. v. Riviera Lend-Lease, Inc. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1111, 1122, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 647]* .

[4] Attorney's Fees

Standard trust deed forms typically provide that the trustor must pay reasonable attorney's fees that may be incurred by the trustee or beneficiary in any action or proceeding concerning the trust deed. When the beneficiary prevails in an action brought by the trustor to attack a private sale, the beneficiary is entitled to add reasonable attorney's fees to the outstanding debt even if the beneficiary failed to request a court award of attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* [*De La Cuesta v. Superior Court (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 945, 948-950, 200 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . If, on the other hand, the trustor prevails, as a party subject to the provision for fees, the trustor may recover reasonable attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 1717* [*Valley Bible Center v. Western Title Ins. Co. (1983) 138 Cal. App. 3d 931, 932-933, 188 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . For

further discussion of *Civ. Code § 1717*, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.50 et seq.*

Civ. Code § 1717 applies in an action brought by a trustor's nonassuming grantee. Even though not directly subject to the provision for fees, a nonassuming grantee has practical liability to pay any fees, because if the beneficiary prevails, the beneficiary can add the fees to the amount that the nonassuming grantee would have to pay in order to prevent foreclosure of the grantee's own interest [*Saucedo v. Mercury Sav. & Loan Assn. (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 309, 315, 168 Cal. Rptr. 552* ; *see Wilhite v. Callihan (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 295, 301-302, 185 Cal. Rptr. 215]* .

In an action to set aside a foreclosure sale, the antideficiency provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* do not prohibit an award of attorney's fees. Furthermore, *Civ. Code §§ 2924c* and *2924d*, which provide for maximum sums that may be claimed as expenses of foreclosing on the property, do not limit the amount of fees the court may award [*Jones v. Union Bank of California (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 542, 547, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 783]* . Those maximum amounts do not include other costs, including legal fees, which may be incurred by a creditor in protecting the security [*Jones v. Union Bank of California (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 542, 548, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 783]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityReliefCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.64

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.64 Trustee's Declaration of Nonmonetary Status

If a trustee reasonably believes that in an action or proceeding concerning the trust deed the trustee is named solely because of being the trustee and not because of any wrongful acts or omissions on the trustee's part, then, at any time, the trustee may file a declaration of nonmonetary status [*see § 555.135*]. The declaration must contain specified information [*see Civ. Code § 2924 l*] and must be served on the parties in the manner of serving papers in civil actions generally [*Civ. Code § 2924 l*(a); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.*].

Within 15 days after service of the declaration, the parties who have appeared in the action or proceeding may object to it [*Civ. Code § 2924l(c)*; *but see Civ. Code § 2924 l(e)* (providing for later filing and service on all parties and the trustee of motion to require trustee to participate in action if parties determine that trustee should participate because of performance of duties as trustee)]. During this period, the time within which the trustee must file an answer or other responsive pleading is tolled [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(f)*]. If no timely objection is served, the trustee will not be required to participate any further in the action or proceeding and will be bound by any court order relating to the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(d)*]. If a timely objection is served, the trustee will be required to participate in the action or proceeding [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(e)*] and will have 30 days from the date of service in which to file an answer or other responsive pleading [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(f)*].

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 2924l*, "trustee" includes any agent or employee of the trustee who performs some or all of the duties of a trustee under *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
2. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.65-555.69

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.65[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.70

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.70 Foreclosure Action

[1] Judicial Foreclosure

Judicial foreclosure is the only action that may be maintained after a default to recover on the debt or enforce the obligation secured by a mortgage or trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2931*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)*; *see Lincoln v. Superior Court (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 127, 129, 39 P.2d 405]* . For discussion of what constitutes a default, see *§ 555.30[3]*. The action is a proceeding in equity [*Nelson v. Orosco (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 73, 76, 172 Cal. Rptr. 457]* . The remedy sought is a court-ordered sale of the property, to be followed by a proceeding, when permitted, to obtain a personal judgment for any deficiency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a), (b)*]. It is the exclusive remedy when there is no power of sale under the mortgage or trust deed [*see Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476-477, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91]* . For further discussion, see *§ 555.30*.

For discussion of the merits of a foreclosure action, as compared with nonjudicial foreclosure pursuant to a power of sale, see *§ 555.30[2]*. For discussion of the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*] and the antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726*] as they relate to judicial foreclosure, see *§§ 555.31* and *555.32*. For discussion of other statutes that may affect judicial foreclosure, see *§§ 555.33* and *555.36*. For a form of complaint in a foreclosure action, see *§ 555.160*.

[2] Parties

[a] In General

A foreclosure action may be brought by the beneficiary or trustee of a trust deed, by a mortgagee, or by a successor in interest to any of these [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726*].

In the typical foreclosure action by the beneficiary of a trust deed, the trustee is a proper, but not a necessary, defendant. Because the trustee has no real interest, the trustee cannot properly interfere with the beneficiary's maintenance of the action and, if named as a defendant by the beneficiary, cannot recover attorney's fees from the beneficiary [*Field v. Acres (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 110, 112-113, 69 P.2d 422]* .

The present owner of record of the encumbered property is a necessary defendant, even though the owner may not be either the original trustor or an assuming grantee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(c)*; *Johnson v. Home Owners' Loan Corp. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 546, 548-549, 116 P.2d 167]* .

The original trustor or an assuming grantee has no further interest or lien after transferring all interest in the property to others and is, therefore, a proper but not a necessary defendant, unless the beneficiary intends to make a case against that party for any deficiency [*Johnson v. Home Owners' Loan Corp. (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 546, 548-549, 116 P.2d 167]* . For discussion of personal liability of grantees, see *§ 555.13[4]*. If a deficiency judgment is being sought, a guarantor having independent liability for the secured obligation is a proper, but not a necessary, defendant [*see Titus v. Woods (1920) 45 Cal. App. 541, 542-547, 188 P. 68]* .

[b] Joinder of Parties With Recorded Interest

[i] Subordinate Interest or Lien

Anyone having a subordinate interest or lien that is recorded as of the commencement of the action must be joined as a defendant, otherwise that interest or lien will not be affected by the judicial sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(c)*; *Castle v. Schulman (1948) 32 Cal. 2d 222, 225, 195 P.2d 781]* . This includes the United States or the State of California when there is a subordinate federal or state tax lien or other claim on the property [*I.R.C. § 7425(a)*; *28 U.S.C. § 2410(a)*; *Civ. Code § 2931a*]. If a subordinate interest is properly included in the action, it will generally be terminated by the sale [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 701.630*].

[ii] Interests Not Subject or Subordinate to Trust Deed

Persons having recorded interests not subject or subordinate to the trust deed being foreclosed are strictly not proper or necessary defendants, because their interests are not involved and will not be affected by the judicial sale [*see Beronio v. Ventura Co. Lumber Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 232, 237, 61 P. 958* ; *San Francisco v. Lawton (1861) 18 Cal. 465, 473-474]* . These persons may be named as defendants, however, if there is any doubt as to whether their interest is actually not subject or subordinate to the plaintiff's interest, and this issue may properly be decided in a foreclosure action when it has been submitted without objection [*Dobbins v. Economic Gas Co. (1920) 182 Cal. 616, 623-626, 189 P. 1073* ; *Barrow v. Santa Monica B. Sup. Co. (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 601, 602-606, 71 P.2d 1108* ; *see Beronio v. Ventura Co. Lumber Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 232, 237, 61 P. 958]* . If a prior lienholder is named as a defendant, that person may file a cross complaint to foreclose a prior lien that is also in default [*Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell (1901) 131 Cal. 489, 494, 63 P. 773]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Get a Litigation Sales Guaranty. For litigators involved in prosecuting judicial foreclosure actions, it is highly advisable to get a litigation sales guaranty from a reputable title company. Such a guaranty is insurance that all recorded interests have been identified so that all necessary parties can be named in the judicial foreclosure action. If any mistake is made, counsel can look to the title company for recourse. *By William M. Hensley*

[iii] Unrecorded Interests

A person with an interest in the encumbered property that is unrecorded as of the time the foreclosure action is

commenced need not be made a defendant, and the ensuing judgment is conclusive against the person as if made a defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(c)*]. This rule has been applied even when the plaintiff had actual knowledge of the unrecorded interest [*Hager v. Astorg (1904) 145 Cal. 548, 549-551, 79 P. 68]* . For further discussion of the joinder of persons with interests recorded after the commencement of the foreclosure action, see [3], *below.*

[3] Recordation of Lis Pendens

The plaintiff should record a lis pendens in each county in which all or part of the property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20 et seq.*]. For further discussion and a form of lis pendens for use in a foreclosure action, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* . If a lis pendens is recorded, it imparts constructive notice of the foreclosure action, and any person acquiring or recording an interest in the property after the commencement of the foreclosure action need not be named as a defendant, because that person will be bound by the judgment in any event [*Hibernia Sav. and Loan Soc. v. Cochran (1904) 141 Cal. 653, 656-657, 75 P. 315* (grantee); *Bolton v. Logan (1938) 30 Cal. App. 2d 30, 32-33, 85 P.2d 546* (purchaser at execution sale of judgment lien)]. However, when the plaintiff fails to record a lis pendens, any person who subsequently acquires or records an interest in the property, and who is not joined in the action nor has actual knowledge of it, will not be bound by the judgment [*Foster v. Warren (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d 470, 475, 103 P.2d 591]* .

[4] Appointment of Receiver

The plaintiff may have a receiver appointed to take possession of the encumbered property during the action on a showing that (1) the property is in danger of being lost or materially injured, or the conditions of the trust deed are not being performed, and (2) the property probably has insufficient security value to discharge the secured debt [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*; *see Title etc. Trust Co. v. California Dev. Co. (1912) 164 Cal. 58, 60-62, 127 P. 502]* . For further discussion and forms relating to the appointment of a receiver pendente lite, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

Following the judicial foreclosure sale, a receiver may be appointed to collect and disburse rents during the redemption period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Move for a Post-Sale Redemption Receiver. After the judicial foreclosure sale, the debtor retains possession of the property during the redemption period and *should* remit any rents, issues, or profits to the foreclosure purchaser. However, because the remittance is within the control of the debtor, a post-sale receiver is a necessity for a purchaser who wants to insure rents, issues, or profits are not dissipated by the debtor in possession. *By William M. Hensley*

[5] Defenses

[a] Overview

Circumstances that may affect the validity or enforceability of a given trust deed and may provide a basis for an affirmative defense are discussed throughout this chapter [*see, e.g., §§ 555.12[2][d][i], 555.33[2]*]. Defenses applicable generally to contracts, notes, and deeds may also apply [*see, e.g., Benson v. Andrews (1955) 138 Cal. App. 2d 123, 132-135, 292 P.2d 39* (failure of consideration as to secured obligation)]. For further discussion and forms relating to these general defenses, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* , Ch. 140, *Contracts* , Ch. 184, *Deeds* , and Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Affirmative Defenses in Judicial Foreclosure Action. Because judicial foreclosure actions are equitable in nature, affirmative defenses such as unclean hands and laches are allowable and should not be neglected (if facts exist for their assertion). *By William M. Hensley*

[b] Statute of Limitations

The statute of limitations that may be raised to bar a foreclosure action is the one governing an action on the secured obligation [*Civ. Code § 2911*; *see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)* (four-year period for enforcement of written obligation); *see also* Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.18[4][a]*. For a form of this defense, see *§ 555.161*.

[c] One-Form-of-Action Rule

If the beneficiary previously brought an action on the underlying debt, and the trustor then failed to raise the defense that foreclosure was the only proper action, the beneficiary may thereafter be barred from bringing a subsequent foreclosure action, by operation of the one-form-of-action rule of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)* [*Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 353, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* . For further discussion of the one-form-of-action rule, see *§ 555.31*.

[d] Antideficiency Statutes

If a deficiency judgment is being sought, the defendant may be protected by the antideficiency statutes, as when the trust deed secures payment of all or part of the purchase price of the encumbered property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*; *see § 555.32[3][b]*].

Nonliability for a deficiency would not be an affirmative defense but could be proved under a denial. A nonassuming grantee, for example, is not personally liable for the secured obligation [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 596-597, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see § 555.13[4]*].

PRACTICE TIP:

Allege It As a Defense or Waive It. A borrower must allege *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* as a defense; otherwise, the borrower will be found to have waived it by failure to place the defense at issue in the action [*see Palm v. Schilling (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 63, 67 n.3, 244 Cal. Rptr. 600] . By William M. Hensley*

[e] Lack of Notice

A third party defendant may raise the defense that the trust deed being foreclosed is void as to his or her subsequent encumbrance for lack of constructive or actual notice [*Civ. Code §§ 1214, 1215*; *see § 555.16[2]*]. For a form of this defense, see *§ 555.162*.

[f] Fraud

Fraud in inducing the loan secured by the trust deed may be raised as an affirmative defense to a foreclosure action. If successful, that defense would invalidate the trust deed [*Wittman v. Chrysler Corp. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 586, 590-591, 245 Cal. Rptr. 20]* .

[6] Reinstatement and Equity of Redemption

The right of reinstatement is available as in a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding, except that a person entitled to exercise the right of reinstatement may do so at any time before the entry of the decree of foreclosure [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.54*. If reinstatement is accomplished by curing the default, the foreclosure action must be dismissed [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*].

The costs and attorney's fees recoverable by the plaintiff as a condition to reinstatement and dismissal of the action are

limited by statute [*see Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*; *see also § 555.54[2]*]. For example, the amount of recoverable attorney's fees before the entry of a foreclosure decree are limited in the same manner as in a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding before giving the notice of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924c(d)*; *Bruntz v. Alfaro (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 411, 417-423, 260 Cal. Rptr. 488]* .

Any person having an interest in the encumbered property has a right to redeem the property by discharging the secured obligation, and offering to pay any damages caused by delay, before the foreclosure sale [*Civ. Code §§ 2903, 2905*]. For further discussion of this right, see *§ 555.55*. Junior lienholders are specifically entitled to redeem [*Civ. Code § 2904*]. For discussion of the separate right to redeem the property from the purchaser after the judicial foreclosure sale, see *§ 555.72*.

[7] Foreclosure Decree

If the court determines that the plaintiff is entitled to foreclosure, the court must enter judgment accordingly. For a form and discussion of a judgment for use in a foreclosure action, see *§ 555.163*.

After a judgment for judicial foreclosure has been rendered, it is improper for the court to make an order for a nonjudicial sale. Obtaining a judgment constitutes an election of remedies, and it would be unfair to allow the plaintiff to change remedies and deprive the defendant of the right to redeem [*Vlahovich v. Cruz (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 317, 321-323, 261 Cal. Rptr. 565* ; *see C.J.A. Corp. v. Trans-Action Financial Corp. (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 664, 671, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 538* (once junior lienholder pursued judicial foreclosure remedy to judgment it was estopped from seeking different remedy after senior lienholder sold property at trustee's sale; trial court therefore erred in modifying foreclosure judgment to money judgment for full amount of note)].

The court must direct the sale of the entire property and the application of the proceeds to the entire secured debt, if it is shown that the property cannot be sold in portions without injury to the parties. Otherwise, when the entire secured debt is not due, only as much of the property may be sold as is necessary to pay the amount then due [*Code Civ. Proc. § 728*].

[8] Protection from Foreclosure for Active Duty Service Members

[a] State Provisions

In 2002, the state legislature enacted special protections for officers and enlisted members of the National Guard called or ordered into active state or federal service and reservists of the United States Military Reserve who have been called to full-time active service or duty [*see* 2002 Stats., ch. 60, § 1; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*]. This legislation establishes special protection from foreclosure for active service members and reservists [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408*]. The legislation includes many provisions that are very similar to those included in the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 502, 511*], discussed in [b], *below*. However, the federal legislation has many more provisions than the California law covering a greater variety of topics.

The state protections apply to obligations secured by mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage on real or personal property owned by a service member at the commencement of the period of the military service and still owned by the service member [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(a)*]. In any proceeding commenced in any court during the period of military service to enforce that obligation, arising out of nonpayment of any sum due or out of any other breach of the terms of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security occurring before or during the period of service, the court may, after hearing and in its discretion on its own motion, and must, on application by the service member or some person on the defendant's behalf (1) stay the proceedings for any period as the court deems just, and (2) make any other disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*]. The court may deny the stay if it finds that the ability of the defendant to comply with the terms of the obligation is not

materially affected by the military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*].

No sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for nonpayment of any sum due under any obligation described above will be valid if made during the period of military service or within three months thereafter, except pursuant to an agreement between the parties or on an order previously granted by the court and a return thereto made and approved by the court [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)*]. Any person who knowingly makes or causes to be made a sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property in violation of these provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(d)*].

These provisions apply to service members on active service or duty since September 11, 2001. However, the protections apply prospectively from June 20, 2002 (date bill was signed into law) [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.11*]. Dependents of service members are also entitled to these benefits unless the court finds that the dependents' ability to comply with the terms of the obligation has not been materially impaired by the military service of the person on whom the applicants are dependent [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.5*].

Relevant forms for relief under the provisions of both the state and federal Acts include (1) a petition for relief from a mortgage or installment contract for the purchase of real property [*see § 555.138*], (2) an application for stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments [*see § 555.139*], and (3) an order staying an action on an obligation secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or similar security [*see § 555.139A*].

[b] Federal Provisions

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 502, 511* (applicable to current military personnel)] suspends the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of active service members so that they can devote their entire energy to national defense [*50 U.S.C. App. § 502*]. Among SCRA's protections are many similar to those afforded by the 2002 California legislation, discussed in [a], *above*.

With regard to mortgages and similar instruments, many provision of the SCRA are substantively the same as provisions in the Military and Veterans Code. These laws give a court authority to allow an eligible service member to postpone making payments on mortgages that were entered before the member began active duty, on property that was owned before that time, and that is still owned by the member, if the member's ability to pay the mortgage is affected by his or her service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533, 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408*]. Active service members are allowed to apply to a court for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 561, 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2*], and the court is empowered to cap interest rates at 6 percent on all obligations of active service members (including mortgages) incurred before active duty [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 527*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*].

The SCRA allows for the stay of many civil legal proceedings if the service member demonstrates that his or her military service has materially affected the member's ability to appear for the court proceedings, including proceedings concerning mortgage foreclosures [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 522, 533*]. The length of the stay is at the court's discretion based on the service member's showing. The SCRA also offers protections against eviction from residential property rented by a service member, as well as lawful termination of leases for members entering active duty [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 531, 535*; *see also* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsClean Hands PrincipleCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial Foreclosures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.71

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.71 Judicial Sale

[1] Writ of Sale

To enforce a judgment for the sale of real property, the plaintiff applies to the clerk of the court for a writ of sale directed to the sheriff or other levying officer in the county in which the judgment is to be enforced [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 712.010, 716.010(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 680.260* (levying officer is sheriff, marshal, or constable)]. That county is the county in which all or part of the property is located [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 701.570(a)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 726(d)* (when property is located in two or more counties, court may direct sale to take place in any of those counties)]. For further discussion and a form of writ of sale, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.130* et seq.

[2] Absolute Sale When No Deficiency Allowed

If the decree declares that a deficiency judgment cannot be recovered because of a waiver or bar [*see § 555.163[2]*], the levying officer executes the writ of sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(e)*] by effecting a levy on the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 716.020(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 700.010 et seq.* (levy)] then giving notice of the sale and selling the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 716.020(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 701.510 et seq.* (sale)]. The proceeds are applied in conformity with the foreclosure decree [*Code Civ. Proc. § 716.020(c)*; *see § 555.163[2]*].

There is no right of redemption following the sale [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 726(e), 729.010(a)*]. When the sale has been completed, the levying officer executes and delivers a deed to the purchaser and records a duplicate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 701.660*]. By this deed, the purchaser acquires the interest in the property that was held by the judgment debtor on the effective date of the trust deed, as well as any title acquired by the judgment debtor between that date and the date of sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 701.640*]. The foreclosed lien and subordinate liens are generally extinguished by the sale [*Code*

Civ. Proc. § 701.630]. However, in the rare situation that the judgment debtor is the purchaser, the foreclosed lien is extinguished but the property remains subject to any subordinate liens [*Call v. Thunderbird Mortgage Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 542, 548, 25 Cal. Rptr. 265, 375 P.2d 169]* .

For discussion and forms relating to the foregoing requirements for the issuance and execution of a writ of sale, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.130* et seq.

[3] Redemption When Deficiency Allowed

If a deficiency judgment is not waived or barred, and the decree declares one or more of the defendants to be personally liable [*see § 555.163[2]*], the levying officer must sell the property subject to a right of redemption [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 729.010-729.090* (redemption)], unless the property is a leasehold estate with an unexpired term of less than two years at the time of the levy [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 726(e), 729.010(a)*]. A sale subject to the right of redemption is in most respects conducted in the same manner as an absolute sale [*see* [2], *above*], except for certain notice requirements [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.010(b)*]. The chief difference is the effect of the sale.

After a sale subject to the right of redemption, the levying officer issues a certificate of sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.040*]. The levying officer subsequently executes and delivers a deed to the purchaser only after the lapse of the redemption period, if there has been no redemption [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.080(a)*]. During the redemption period, the judgment debtor remains entitled to possession of the property in the absence of an agreement to the contrary [*Petersen v. Jurras (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 253, 257, 40 P.2d 257* ; *House v. Lala (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 238, 245, 29 Cal. Rptr. 450]* . The purchaser, however, has a statutory right to rents and profits or the value of use and occupation of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.090(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 729.090(c)* (purchaser's right to enter for purpose of repair and right to obtain court order restraining waste)]. A receiver may be appointed to collect and disburse rents during the redemption period [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(4)*].

For further discussion of a sale of property subject to the right of redemption, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.150 et seq.* For discussion of the manner and effect of exercising the right of redemption, see *§ 555.72*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionMortgagor's Right

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.72

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.72 Statutory Redemption

[1] By Judgment Debtor

Statutory redemption refers to a right of redemption after a judicial sale, which exists only if a deficiency judgment is allowed under the foreclosure decree [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 726(e), 729.010(a)*; *see also § 555.71[3]*]. The term is used to distinguish this right from the broader equity of redemption existing before foreclosure [*see Duff v. Randall (1897) 116 Cal. 226, 229-230, 48 P. 66* ; *see also § 555.55*]. Only the judgment debtor or a successor in interest may redeem, and for the purpose of this limitation the purchaser at the sale is not a successor in interest [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.020*]. For further discussion of the procedure for redeeming property and the time limit for exercising the right of redemption under *Code Civ. Proc. § 729.010 et seq.*, together with related forms, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.150 et seq.*

On redemption, the judgment debtor is restored to the former estate, and the effect of the judicial sale is terminated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.080(d)*]. As a result, the judgment debtor becomes entitled to any rents and profits received by the purchaser before redemption [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.090(b)*; *see § 555.71[3]*]. There is, however, one important exception to the rule that the effect of the judicial sale is terminated. Liens, such as the judgment lien under which the sale was made and subordinate liens, are extinguished by the judicial sale and do not reattach after redemption, and the redeemed property cannot thereafter be applied to the satisfaction of a claim or judgment underlying an extinguished lien [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.080(d), (e)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 701.630* (foreclosed lien, subordinate liens, and state tax liens defined by *Gov. Code § 7162* are extinguished by sale)]. This appears to be the rule even though the opposite is true if, instead of redeeming the property, the judgment debtor becomes the purchaser at the judicial sale [*Call v. Thunderbird Mortgage Co. (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 542, 548-549, 25 Cal. Rptr. 265, 375 P.2d 169]* .

[2] By United States

When the United States is named as a defendant in the action on the basis of a subordinate claim or encumbrance [*see § 555.70[2][b]*], the government has a right of redemption under federal law. The redemption period is generally one year, unless the subordinate interest is a lien in favor of the Internal Revenue Service, in which case the redemption period is 120 days [*28 U.S.C. § 2410(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionStatutory Redemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.73

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.73 Deficiency Judgment

[1] In General

The recovery of a deficiency judgment in a foreclosure action is a two-stage proceeding. In the first stage, culminating in the foreclosure decree, the court determines whether any of the defendants is personally liable for the debt and may be subject to a deficiency judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *United California Bank v. Tijerina (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 963, 967-968, 102 Cal. Rptr. 234* ; *see § 555.163[2]*]. In the second stage, in a subsequent proceeding, the court determines the amount of the deficiency, if any, remaining after the sale of the encumbered property, and renders a money judgment for that amount [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *United California Bank v. Tijerina (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 963, 968, 102 Cal. Rptr. 234]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Make Section 998 Offer Before Foreclosure Decree Trial. If a party desires to make a pre-trial settlement offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*, the proper time to do it is before the trial of the foreclosure decree phase of the action. In an unpublished section of the *San Paolo* decision [*see* [4][b], *below*], which this practitioner believes was correctly reasoned, the Court of Appeal found a Section 998 offer was too late when made at the fair value hearing juncture of the action. Counsel must make the Section 998 offer timely in the first phase if he or she wishes to use this method to attempt a resolution or to recover certain costs. *By William M. Hensley*

[2] Motion for Judgment

The plaintiff commences the second stage by moving for a deficiency judgment at any time within three months after the property has been sold under the foreclosure decree [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *United California Bank v. Tijerina*

(1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 963, 965-966, 102 Cal. Rptr. 234] . The three-month period is a statute of limitations. Thus, a party entitled to seek a deficiency judgment must file an application within three months of the foreclosure sale or no money judgment for a deficiency can be obtained [*Life Savings Bank v. Wilhelm (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 174, 177, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 657]* . The motion must be filed within three months from the date the sale is effected, that is, when the highest bid is received at the auction, not when the certificate of sale is recorded [*Paykar Construction, Inc. v. Bedrosian (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 803, 808, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 135]* . Notice of the motion must be served at least 15 days before the scheduled date for the hearing, on all defendants who appeared in the action and against whom the deficiency judgment is sought [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. For a form of notice of motion for a deficiency judgment and a form of supporting declaration, see *§§ 555.164* and *555.165*.

[3] Appointment of Probate Referee As Appraiser

On the motion of any party made at least 10 days before the date set for the hearing of the motion for a deficiency judgment, the court must appoint a probate referee to appraise the property or interest that was sold, as of the time of the sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 8900 et seq.* (probate referees)]. For a form of notice of motion for the appointment of a referee and a form of order of appointment, see *§§ 555.166* and *555.167*.

The court may make such an appointment at any time on its own motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

The probate referee must file the appraisal with the clerk, together with a subscribed oath. The court fixes a reasonable compensation for the referee, not to exceed similar fees for similar services in the community, and this amount is taxed and allowed together with other costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

[4] Hearing and Judgment

[a] Evidence; Issue to Be Determined

The court must receive evidence, which may be presented by either party, as to the fair value of the property or property interest that was sold, as of the date of sale. If a probate referee was appointed for the purpose of appraising the property [*see* [3], *above*], the filed appraisal is admissible in evidence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. The only issue to be determined is the amount of the deficiency, and a defendant cannot relitigate any issues decided by the foreclosure decree, such as the defendant's personal liability or the plaintiff's right to recover a deficiency judgment [*United California Bank v. Tijerina (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 963, 968-969, 102 Cal. Rptr. 234]* .

[b] Amount of Deficiency Judgment

The court must render a money judgment against the defendant or defendants for the amount by which the outstanding debt, with interest and costs, exceeds the fair value of the property as of the date of sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. "Fair value," within the context of the statute, may be simply the fair market value of the property, as of the date of the sale, without any reduction for the adverse impact of the foreclosure and the one-year right of redemption, which would temporarily lower the market value of the property [*San Paolo U.S. Holding Co. v. 816 South Figueroa Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1010, 1026, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272]* . The market value of the property is not necessarily the determining value, however. The history of the statute indicates that market value is to be taken as one of the elements, but not the determinant, of the "fair value." Even property for which the market value happens to be zero as of the sale date can have a "fair value" for the purpose of limiting a deficiency [*see* *Rainer Mortgage v. Silverwood Ltd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 359, 365-367, 209 Cal. Rptr. 294]* . On the other hand, if there is a market value but it happens to be temporarily depressed as of the sale date (for a reason other than the adverse impact of the foreclosure and the one-year right of redemption which all courts agree must not be considered), that temporary depression cannot be ignored in determining the "fair value" for the purpose of limiting a deficiency [*San Paolo U.S. Holding Co. v. 816 South Figueroa Co. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1010, 1026, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272* (general market depression); *Nelson v. Orosco (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 73, 79, 172 Cal. Rptr. 457* (cloud on title, from existence of lis pendens in unrelated action)].

PRACTICE TIP:

Significance of *San Paolo* Decision. The Second District's *San Paolo* decision is a very important case in the fair value hearing area. Aside from establishing that a bright-line "fair market value" test as of the date of the foreclosure sale governs at the fair value hearing stage, *San Paolo* dismissed a pro-borrower appraisal that essentially tried to disregard recessionary factors that made the fair market value much more depressed in amount. The *San Paolo* approach negates dicta in *Rainer* and will result in larger deficiencies. Although the fair market value test is a certain one, *San Paolo* ignores the 1939 legislative history to *Code Civ. Proc. § 726*, which rejected using "fair market value" language in favor of "fair value" verbiage. *San Paolo* does not address this important point relied on in *Rainer* to find a difference between "fair value" and "fair market value" constructs. Borrowers should continue to rely on broader intrinsic worth valuation language in *Rainer*, while creditors would do best to emphasize *San Paolo's* fair market value test until the Supreme Court definitively resolves the issue. *By William M. Hensley*

If the fair value of the property is less than the purchase price at the sale, the amount of the deficiency judgment is limited to the actual deficiency. In other words, the judgment amount, excluding costs and interest from the date of sale, can in no event exceed the amount by which the entire outstanding secured debt exceeds the price paid for the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. For a form of deficiency judgment, see *§ 555.168*.

[c] Enforcement of Deficiency Judgment

The deficiency judgment may be enforced in the same manner as any other money judgment [*see, e.g., Tompkins v. Powers (1930) 106 Cal. App. 464, 465, 289 P. 685]* . For further discussion and forms relating to the enforcement of money judgments generally, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.40* et seq. However, the deficiency judgment may not be enforced against the property sold at the foreclosure sale when the property has been redeemed by the judgment debtor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 729.080(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency Judgments

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.74

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.74 Attorney's Fees and Costs

Standard trust deed forms typically provide that the trustor must pay all costs and reasonable attorney's fees in a foreclosure action brought by the beneficiary. If the trust deed being foreclosed includes a provision for attorney's fees, the court may fix an award of attorney's fees in any reasonable amount, notwithstanding any contrary stipulation, except that the award cannot exceed the amount, if any, specified in the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2924d(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580c, 726(a), 730*; *Hotaling v. Montieth (1900) 128 Cal. 556, 557-558, 61 P. 95]* .

In many counties, a local court rule determines the manner in which an award of attorney's fees is computed in a foreclosure action [*see, e.g.,* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rule 3.2(b)]. Otherwise, the manner of computing the award is within the court's discretion [*see Hotaling v. Montieth (1900) 128 Cal. 556, 558, 61 P. 95]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Local Rule Schedules May Be Nondeterminative. Although many trial judges rely on local rules establishing fee amounts in judicial foreclosure actions, practitioners are advised to not place total reliance on these schedules and, in the process, imprudently dispense with proof of actual fees/costs incurred. One decision holds that local rules establishing schedules cannot be relied on because governing statutes (such as *Civ. Code § 1717*) require the trial judge to actually determine reasonableness of fees without use of arbitrary local rule ceilings [*see Contractors Labor Pool, Inc. v. Westway Contractors, Inc. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 152, 169, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715* (construing L.A. Super. Ct. Local Rule 3.2)]. Practitioners should prove their actual fees and costs rather than bank on local schedule amounts, which may not be determinative at all. *By William M. Hensley*

Recoverable costs are limited to the actual cost of publishing, recording, mailing, and posting notices, a litigation

guaranty, and litigation costs of suit [*Civ. Code § 2924d(e)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 580c*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial Foreclosures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Foreclosure
3. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.75-555.79

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.75[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.80

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.80 Right to Possession, Rents, and Profits

In the absence of a contrary agreement, the trustor retains all ownership rights in the property, including the right to possession and any rents and profits of the property, while the property is encumbered by the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2927*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 744*; *Kinnison v. Guaranty Liquidating Corp. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 256, 260, 115 P.2d 450* ; *Hamel v. Gootkin (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 27, 29-30, 20 Cal. Rptr. 372]* . However, the beneficiary may, and commonly does, acquire possessory rights before foreclosure, either under a provision in the trust deed or under separate contract [*Civ. Code §§ 2927, 2938*; *Kinnison v. Guaranty Liquidating Corp. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 256, 260, 115 P.2d 450* ; *see § 555.81[1]*].

The beneficiary may obtain appointment of a receiver to protect the security value of the property during a foreclosure action, if that value is in danger of being lost or materially injured to the extent of becoming insufficient to cover the secured obligation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*; *see § 555.70[4]*]. However, the trustor would remain entitled to any rents and profits collected by the receiver in the absence of a special agreement to the contrary [*Locke v. Klunker (1898) 123 Cal. 231, 235-238, 55 P. 993]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.81

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.81 Assignment of Rents and Profits

[1] Creation of Security Interest

A written assignment of an interest in leases, rents, issues, or profits of real property made in connection with an obligation secured by the property, irrespective of whether the assignment is denoted as absolute, absolute conditioned on default, additional security for an obligation, or otherwise, is, on execution and delivery by the assignor, effective to create a present security interest in existing and future leases, rents, issues, or profits of the property. For these purposes, the term "leases, rents, issues, and profits of real property" includes the cash proceeds of the foregoing. "Cash proceeds" means cash, checks, deposit accounts, and the like [*Civ. Code § 2938(a)*].

Former *Civ. Code §§ 2938* and *2938.1* as they were in effect before 1997 govern assignments made before 1997 and actions and proceedings based on those assignments [*Civ. Code § 2938(i)*]. For discussion of the prior law, see [8], *below.*

[2] Recordation and Perfection

The assignment may be recorded in the county in which the real property is located in the same manner as a conveyance of an interest in real property [*Civ. Code § 2938(b)*]. When the assignment (or a trust deed or mortgage containing the assignment) is duly recorded, the record will be deemed to give constructive notice of the assignment, and the security interest created by the assignment will be deemed fully perfected as of the time of recordation, notwithstanding any provision of the assignment or any provisions of law that would otherwise preclude or defer enforcement of the rights granted to the assignee until the occurrence of a subsequent event, including, but not limited to, a subsequent default of the assignor, the possession of the property by the assignee, or the appointment of a receiver [*Civ. Code § 2938(b)*].

[3] Enforcement on Assignor's Default

[a] Enforcement Steps

On default by the assignor under the obligation secured by the assignment of leases, rents, issues, and profits, once the assignee takes one or more of the enforcement steps described below, the assignee is entitled to collect and receive all rents, issues, and profits that have accrued but remain unpaid and uncollected by or for the assignor on the enforcement date and all rents, issues, and profits that accrue on or after that date [*Civ. Code § 2938(c), (g)*].

The assignment must be enforced by one or more of the following methods:

- Appointment of a receiver [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)(1), (g)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11), (12)*; *see also* [5], *below*].

- Obtaining possession of the rents, issues, or profits [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)(2), (g)*].

- Delivery to any one or more of the tenants of a written demand for turnover of rents, issues, and profits [*see Civ. Code § 2938(j)*; [4], *below*], a copy of which must be delivered to the assignor [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)(3)*].

- Delivery to the assignor of a written demand for the rents, issues, or profits, a copy of which must be mailed to all other assignees of record of the leases, rents, issues, and profits of the real property [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)(4)*].

[b] Application of Money Received by Assignee

Money received by the assignee pursuant to the enforcement action, less amounts paid for certain expenses [*see Civ. Code § 2938(g)*; [6], *below*], must be applied by the assignee to the debt or otherwise in accordance with the assignment or the promissory note, trust deed, or other instrument evidencing the obligation. However, neither the application nor the failure to apply the rents, issues, or profits will result in a loss of any lien or security interest that the assignee may have in the property or any other collateral, render the obligation unenforceable, constitute a violation of the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*], or otherwise limit any right available to the assignee with respect to its security [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)*].

Nothing in *Civ. Code § 2938(c)* affects the entitlement to rents, issues, or profits as between assignees, as set forth in *Civ. Code § 2938(h)* [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*; *see* [7], *below*].

[4] Demand for Turnover of Rents, Issues, and Profits

[a] Execution and Receipt

If an assignee elects to make a demand for turnover of rents, issues, and profits [*see Civ. Code § 2838(c)(3)*; [3], *above*], the demand in the form specified by statute [*see § 555.189*] must be signed under penalty of perjury by the assignee or an authorized agent of the assignee. The demand will be effective against a tenant when it is actually received by the tenant at the address for notices provided under the lease or other contractual agreement under which the tenant occupies the property or, if no address for notices is so provided, at the property [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*].

[b] Tenant's Obligations

On receipt of this demand, the tenant must pay to the assignee all rents, issues, and profits that are past due and payable on the date of receipt of the demand and all rents, issues, and profits coming due under the lease following the date of receipt of the demand, unless either of the following conditions is satisfied [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*]:

- The tenant previously received, from another assignee of the leases, issues, rents, and profits, a demand that is valid on its face and was sent by the other assignee in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2938(c)* and *(d)*.

- The tenant, in good faith and in a manner that is not inconsistent with the lease, previously paid, or within 10 days following receipt of the demand pays, the rent to the assignor.

Payment of rent to an assignee following a demand under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, and profits discharges the tenant's obligation to pay the amounts under the lease. If the tenant pays rent to the assignor after receipt of a demand other than in the circumstances described above, the tenant's obligation to pay rent to the assignee will not be discharged unless the tenant occupies the property for residential purposes. The obligation of a tenant to pay rent pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(c)* and *(d)* continues until receipt by the tenant of a written notice from a court directing the tenant to pay the rent in a different manner, or until receipt by the tenant of a written notice from the assignee from whom the demand was received canceling the demand, whichever occurs first [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*].

[5] Appointment of Receiver

A receiver may be appointed in an action by a secured lender for specific performance of an assignment of rents in a trust deed, mortgage, or separate document. That appointment may be continued after entry of a judgment for specific performance, if it is appropriate to protect, operate, or maintain the encumbered property or to collect the rents from the property while a pending nonjudicial foreclosure under power of sale in the trust deed or mortgage is being completed. In this situation, there is no need to show that the security is probably inadequate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*; *see Turner v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 804, 811, 140 Cal. Rptr. 475]* . For a form of complaint for specific performance and appointment of a receiver, see *§ 555.180*.

A receiver may be appointed in a case brought by the assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*]. For discussion, see [6][c], *below.*

[6] Effect of Enforcement Action and Limitations

[a] In General

The application of rents, issues, or profits to the secured obligation discharges the secured obligation to the extent of those rents, issues, or profits, and, notwithstanding any provisions of the assignment or other loan documents to the contrary, must be credited against any amounts necessary to cure any monetary default for purposes of reinstatement under *Civ. Code § 2924c* [*Civ. Code § 2938(e)*].

No enforcement action of the type authorized by *Civ. Code § 2938(c)* [*see* [3], *above*], and no collection, distribution, or application of rents, issues, or profits by the assignee following such an enforcement action, may do any of the following [*Civ. Code § 2938(e)*]:

- Make the assignee a mortgagee in possession of the property, except if the assignee obtains actual possession of the real property, or an agent of the assignor.

- Constitute an action, render the obligation unenforceable, violate the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*], or, except with respect to marshaling requirements, otherwise limit any rights available to the assignee with respect to security.

- Be deemed to create any bar to a deficiency judgment pursuant to any provision of law governing or relating to deficiency judgments following the enforcement of any encumbrance, lien, or security

interest, notwithstanding that the action, collection, distribution, or application may reduce the debt secured by the assignment or by any trust deed or other security instrument.

[b] Distribution of Cash Proceeds

If cash proceeds of rents, issues, or profits to which the assignee is entitled following enforcement [*see Civ. Code § 2938(c)*; [3], *above*] are received by the assignor or an agent for collection or by any other person who has collected the rents, issues, or profits for the assignor's benefit, or for the benefit of any subsequent assignee [*see Civ. Code § 2938(h)*; [7], *below*], following a turnover demand by the assignee [*see Civ. Code § 2938(c)(3),(4)*; [4], *above*], and the assignee has not authorized the assignor's disposition of the cash proceeds in a writing signed by the assignee, the rights to the cash proceeds and to the recovery of the cash proceeds must be determined as follows [*Civ. Code § 2938(f)*].

- The assignor or other party in possession of the cash proceeds must turn over the full amount of the cash proceeds to the assignee, less any amount representing payment of expenses authorized by the assignee in writing. The assignee will have a right to bring an action for recovery of the cash proceeds, without the necessity of bringing an action to foreclose any security interest in the real property. This action will not violate the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*] or otherwise limit any right available to the assignee with respect to its security [*Civ. Code § 2938(f)(1)*].

- Between an assignee with a perfected security interest in cash proceeds [*see Civ. Code § 2938(b)*; [2], *above*] enforced by a turnover demand [*see Civ. Code § 2938(c)(3),(4)*; [3], *above*] and any other person claiming an interest in the cash proceeds, other than the assignor or an agent for collection or one collecting rents, issues, and profits for the benefit of the assignor, the assignee will have a continuously perfected security interest in the cash proceeds, to the extent that the cash proceeds are identifiable; but the assignee's interest is subject to *Civ. Code § 2938(h)* [*see* [7], *below*] and any generally applicable law with respect to payments made in the operation of the assignor's business [*Civ. Code § 2938(f)(2)*].

For these purposes, cash proceeds are identifiable if they are segregated or, if commingled with other funds of the assignor or an agent or one acting on the assignor's behalf, they can be traced using the lowest intermediate balance principle, unless the assignor or other party claiming an interest in proceeds shows that some other method of tracing would better serve the interests of justice and equity in the circumstances of the case [*Civ. Code § 2938(f)(2)*].

[c] Costs of Protecting Property

If the assignee enforces the assignment by any means other than the appointment of a receiver [*see* [5], *above*] and receives rents, issues, or profits pursuant to the enforcement, the assignor or any other assignee may make written demand on the enforcing assignee to pay the reasonable costs of protecting and preserving the property, including the payment of taxes and insurance and compliance with any applicable building and housing codes [*Civ. Code § 2938(g)(1)*].

On and after the date of receipt of the demand, the assignee must pay the reasonable costs of protecting and preserving the real property to the extent of any rents, issues, or profits actually received by the assignee. However, no such acts by the assignee will cause the assignee to become a mortgagee in possession, and the assignee's duties in this situation will not be construed to require the assignee to operate or manage the property. Instead, the assignor will continue to be responsible for that [*Civ. Code § 2938(g)(2)*].

The assignee's obligation continues until the date the assignee obtains the appointment of a receiver or, if earlier, the date the assignee ceases to enforce the assignment [*Civ. Code § 2938(g)(3)*].

The foregoing provisions may not be construed to supersede or diminish the right of the assignee to the appointment of a receiver [*Civ. Code § 2938(g)(4)*].

[7] Rents, Issues, or Profits Collected Before Enforcement

The lien priorities, rights, and interests among creditors concerning rents, issues, or profits collected before the enforcement by the assignee are governed generally by *Civ. Code § 2938(a)* and *(b)* [*see* [1], [2], *above*]. However, if an assignee with priority (according to the record) takes any enforcement action after a subordinate assignee's enforcement action, the prior assignee is entitled only to the rents, issues, and profits that are accrued and unpaid as of the date of that assignee's enforcement action, and to unpaid rents, issues, and profits accruing after that date. The prior assignee has no right to rents, issues, or profits paid before the date of the enforcement action, whether held by the assignor or a subordinate assignee. On receipt of notice that the prior assignee has enforced the prior interest in the rents, issues, and profits, the subordinate assignee must immediately send a notice canceling any turnover demand [*see* [3], *above*] previously sent to any tenant [*Civ. Code § 2938(h)*].

[8] Pre-1997 Law

[a] Applicability; General Rules

Former *Civ. Code §§ 2938* and *2938.1* as in effect before 1997 continue to govern contracts entered into and actions and proceedings commenced before 1997 [*Civ. Code § 2938(i)*]. An assignment of the rents, issues, and profits of real property that was executed after 1992 and stated that it was given as additional security, was perfected by recording an instrument of assignment in the county in which the real property was located. Recordation perfected the assignment without requiring the beneficiary to obtain possession of the property, to have a receiver appointed, or to take any other action [former *Civ. Code § 2938.1(a)*].

The assignment could be contained in a mortgage, trust deed, or other instrument [former *Civ. Code § 2938.1(c)*]. The beneficiary could not exercise any rights under this type of assignment until and unless the trustor was in default [former *Civ. Code § 2938.1(b)*].

These provisions did not invalidate assignments as additional security that were perfected by other means before 1993. Further, they did not apply to absolute assignments of rents, issues, and profits [former *Civ. Code § 2938.1(d)*], discussed in the next paragraph.

[b] Absolute Assignment

An assignment of rents, issues, and profits made in connection with a loan secured by real property that was expressly absolute, was deemed to constitute a present transfer of the assignor's interest in existing and future rents, issues, and profits of that real property, effective when the assignment was executed and delivered by the assignor [former *Civ. Code § 2938(a)*]. Such an assignment could be recorded in the county in which the real property was located, whether the assignment was in a separate document or part of a mortgage or trust deed. The record constituted constructive notice of the contents and effect of the assignment. The interest granted by the assignment was deemed perfected as of the date it was recorded, notwithstanding any contrary provision of the assignment or of any other provision of law that would otherwise preclude or defer enforcement of the rights granted to the assignee under the assignment until the occurrence of a subsequent event, including, but not limited to, a subsequent default of the assignor [former *Civ. Code § 2938(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingAssignees & PriorityReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.82

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.82 Mortgagee in Possession

The mortgagee-in-possession doctrine holds that a beneficiary who, after default, succeeds peaceably in obtaining possession of the encumbered property may not be ousted by the trustor until the default is cured [*Snyder v. Western Loan & Bldg. Co. (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 697, 700-701, 37 P.2d 86]* . A mortgagee in possession may, notwithstanding the absence of any contractual right, collect rents and profits and apply any net profit to the outstanding debt [*Nelson v. Bowen (1932) 124 Cal. App. 662, 670-671, 12 P.2d 1083]* . The chief disadvantage of being a mortgagee in possession is that this status entails a duty of ordinary prudence in managing the property, and a mortgagee in possession may be liable to others having an interest in the property for negligent failure to collect rents or for other mismanagement [*see, e.g., Johns v. Moore (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 709, 713, 336 P.2d 579* ; *Davis v. Stewart (1944) 67 Cal. App. 2d 415, 418, 154 P.2d 447]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.83-555.89

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.83[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.90

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.90 Waste

[1] Trustor's Duty Not to Impair Security by Waste

Standard trust deeds commonly obligate the trustor to maintain and care for the property [*see Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 593-594, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Krone v. Goff (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 191, 193 n.1, 127 Cal. Rptr. 390]* . By statute, no person whose interest is subject to the lien of a mortgage may do any act that will substantially impair the mortgagee's security [*Civ. Code § 2929*]. This statute codifies in part the common law action for waste, which may be defined as injury to property by one in possession that substantially depreciates its value and is actionable by another having a nonpossessory interest in the property [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 597-598, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Patel v. Athow (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 727, 735, 110 Cal. Rptr. 460]* . The duty not to commit waste applies to a nonassuming transferee, who otherwise has no personal liability under the trust deed [*see § 555.13[4]*], as well as to the trustor or a successor under the trust deed [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 596-597, 599, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* .

[2] What Constitutes Waste

Actionable waste is some physical harm to the property caused by injurious acts or a failure to care for the property [*see, e.g., Easton v. Ash (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 530, 538-539, 116 P.2d 433* (removal of timber); *Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co. (1889) 80 Cal. 245, 256, 22 P. 184* (removal of fixtures); *Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 908, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304* (allowing property to deteriorate by failing to preserve and properly cultivate orchard and vineyard)].

Physical harm not caused by the trustor, such as earthquake or fire damage, or failure to make repairs necessitated by this harm, does not constitute actionable waste, even if the failure to repair is in violation of the trust deed [*Krone v. Goff (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 191, 194-195, 127 Cal. Rptr. 390* (also holding that breach of contractual duty to repair was

enforceable only by foreclosure)].

One court has expanded the potential of an action for waste by holding that a trustor's failure to pay property taxes as required under the trust deed, if it results in a tax sale of the property that renders the security worthless, constitutes waste within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 2929* [*Osuna v. Albertson (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 71, 75-78, 184 Cal. Rptr. 338* ; *but see Krone v. Goff (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 191, 195, 127 Cal. Rptr. 390* (noting absence of any authority for proposition that failure to pay taxes comes within traditional and legal meaning of waste)].

[3] Foreclosure Based on Waste

When the trustor commits waste in violation of a trust deed provision but is not otherwise in default, that may be a sufficient basis to commence foreclosure proceedings. However, foreclosure is proper only if the waste has substantially impaired the security; if it has not, the trustor may seek relief from foreclosure based on a mere technical violation [*Bart v. Streuli (1935) 5 Cal. 2d 67, 67-68, 52 P.2d 922* ; *see § 555.30[3]*].

During judicial foreclosure, whether or not based on waste, a beneficiary may have the court appoint a receiver to preserve the property from the risk of harm that would render the security inadequate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.70[4]*.

[4] Injunctive Relief Against Waste

Before the commencement of a foreclosure action, the beneficiary may obtain an injunction to prevent acts that would materially impair the security value of the property [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598 n.2, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see, e.g., Robinson v. Russell (1864) 24 Cal. 467, 473* (recognizing right to this relief but denying it when alleged injury did not materially impair value of property); *see also Miller v. Waddingham (1891) 91 Cal. 377, 382, 27 P. 750* (no right to enjoin removal of buildings placed on property by trustor in absence of allegation that removal rendered security inadequate)]. A beneficiary may also obtain an injunction during foreclosure, on a showing of good cause, to restrain the person in possession from doing any harm to the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 745*].

For a form of complaint for use in an action to enjoin impairment of security by waste, see *§ 555.191*.

[5] Action for Damages for Waste

[a] Amount of Recovery; Timing of Action

In an action for waste, the beneficiary may recover damages to the extent that the security is rendered inadequate [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598, 602-603, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* . For example, if the beneficiary purchases the property at a private foreclosure sale by making a full-credit bid, the purchase establishes that the value of the security is adequate, which in turn shows that there was no impairment of the security and precludes any recovery for waste [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 606-608, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *cf. Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 902-903, 905 n.5, 908, 910, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304* (damages could be recovered for impairment of security when beneficiary bought property with less-than-full-credit bid)].

It appears that an action for damages must be brought either together with an action for judicial foreclosure or following foreclosure [*see Easton v. Ash (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 530, 534, 538-539, 116 P.2d 433* (action for damages was properly brought together with action for foreclosure); *Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co. (1889) 80 Cal. 245, 246, 22 P. 184* (action for damages was properly brought after action for foreclosure); *Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 903, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304* (action for damages was properly brought after trustee's sale)]. Before foreclosure, there is no way to determine the extent to which the security is inadequate. In addition, under the one-form-of-action-rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*], the beneficiary must first foreclose and exhaust the security before attempting to recover damages

from the trustor for rendering that security inadequate [*see U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 15, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* .

For a form of complaint for use in an action for damages for impairment of security by waste, see *§ 555.190*.

[b] Requirement of Bad Faith Waste

Recovery of damages for waste is similar in effect to a deficiency judgment [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 603, 605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* . Therefore, when the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* or *580d* would bar recovery of a deficiency judgment following foreclosure [*see § 555.32*], they also bar recovery of damages for waste unless the waste was committed in bad faith [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 604-605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see Osuna v. Albertson (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 71, 79-80, 184 Cal. Rptr. 338]* . Bad faith waste includes reckless, intentional, or malicious despoiling of the property. It results from more than a simple inability to maintain the property adequately during depressed economic conditions [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 603-604, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 903, 908-909, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304* (allegation of willful mismanagement resulting in deterioration of property was sufficient pleading of bad faith waste)]. The reason for this distinction is that allowing recovery for waste resulting only from depressed economic conditions would defeat the primary purpose of the antideficiency statutes [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 603-605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* . Whether a given instance of waste is in bad faith is a question of fact [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 604, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 907, 909, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTortsWasteElementsReal Property LawTortsWasteRemedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.91

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.91 Impairment of Security by Third Party

[1] Tortious Impairment

The beneficiary may bring an action based on tortious impairment of security caused by a third party's injury to the encumbered property [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598 n.3, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *American Sav. & Loan Asso. v. Leeds (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 611, 614 n.2, 68 Cal. Rptr. 453, 440 P.2d 933]* . This type of action is sometimes referred to as an action for waste [*see, e.g., Brown v. Critchfield (1980) 100 Cal. App. 3d 858, 868, 161 Cal. Rptr. 342]* , but this is inaccurate unless the third party is in possession of the property [& it;see *Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598 n.3, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *see also § 555.90*]. The action may be premised on negligent as well as intentional conduct [*U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 12-14, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . For discussion and forms relating to actions to enjoin a third party from injuring real property or to recover damages for the injury, which may be adapted for use by a beneficiary not in possession, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Landowners* ; Ch. 266, *Fences* ; Ch. 303, *Injunctions* ; Ch. 391, *Nuisance* ; and Ch. 550, *Trespass* .

The beneficiary may join a third-party tortfeasor as a defendant in an action for foreclosure and may recover damages from that defendant for any deficiency caused by the tortious injury [*Los Angeles T. & S. Bk. v. Bortenstein (1920) 47 Cal. App. 421, 423-424, 190 P. 850* ; *see Easton v. Ash (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 530, 534, 538-539, 116 P.2d 433]* . Alternatively, a separate action for damages may be brought after foreclosure [*see Lavenson v. Standard Soap Co. (1889) 80 Cal. 245, 246, 22 P. 184]* . The statutes barring recovery of deficiency judgments following foreclosure [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581b, 581d*] do not apply to actions for a third party's tortious impairment of security [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598 n.3, 604 n.9, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981]* .

Injunctive relief is available, before or during foreclosure, when threatened acts by the third party would injure the property so as to render the security inadequate, if damages would not be an adequate remedy [*Robinson v. Russell*

(1864) 24 Cal. 467, 467-468, 473 ; *U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 14, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2)*].

The beneficiary is not required to foreclose either before or at the time of bringing an action for damages against a third-party tortfeasor, because the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*] applies only to actions against trustors [*U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 14-16, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . Moreover, the fact that a third party tortiously impaired the security does not necessarily mean that the trustor will default so as to permit the beneficiary to commence foreclosure proceedings [*U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 16, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . When an action is brought before foreclosure, the value of the property before and after injury is compared, and damages may be recovered to the extent that the security has been rendered inadequate [*Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 598 n.3, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 17, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* .

[2] Recovery by Trustor As Substitute Security

The trustor also has a cause of action against a third party who injures the property [*U.S. Financial v. Sullivan (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 5, 17, 112 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . If the trustor sues first and recovers damages, the judgment becomes in effect a substitute security to the extent that the injured property has been rendered inadequate as security [*Los Angeles T. & S. Bk. v. Bortenstein (1920) 47 Cal. App. 421, 424-425, 190 P. 850* (in subsequent foreclosure action, mortgagor's judgment debtor was ordered to pay specified percentage of judgment to mortgagee in event of deficiency); *see American Sav. & Loan Asso. v. Leeds (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 611, 614 n.2, 68 Cal. Rptr. 453, 440 P.2d 933* (dictum)].

Damages recovered by the trustor to compensate only for the trustor's losses do not become substitute security for the beneficiary [*American Sav. & Loan Asso. v. Leeds (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 611, 615-616, 68 Cal. Rptr. 453, 440 P.2d 933* (award of trustor's personal damages based on third party's fraud was not substitute security)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTortsTrespass to Real PropertyTortsNegligenceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.92

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.92 Environmentally Impaired Security

[1] Lender's Remedies Generally

When real property that is hypothecated to a lender becomes environmentally impaired [*see* [b][iii], *below*] without the lender's knowledge or complicity, the lender has statutory remedies [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 726.5(g), 736(e)* (dates of application)]. On one hand, the lender may elect to waive the lien or pursue the remedies of an unsecured creditor [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5*; [2], *below*]. On the other hand, the lender may bring a contract action against the borrower based on breach of any environmental provision in the security agreement [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 736*; [3], *below*].

In addition, the lender has express rights of entry and inspection related to the environmental damage [*see Civ. Code § 2929.5*; for discussion, *see § 555.93*]. A receiver may be appointed to enable the lender to enter and inspect [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)-(e)*; *see* Ch. 486, *Receivers*].

For discussion and forms regarding civil actions relating to pollution and other environmental matters generally, see Ch. 418, *Pollution and Environmental Matters* .

[2] Lender's Election to Waive Lien or Rely on Security

[a] When Election Is Available

If the borrower is in default, the secured lender may elect to waive the lien and exercise the rights and remedies of an unsecured creditor. When several parcels compose the encumbered property, the lender may waive the lien as to the affected parcels only [*see* [b][i], *below*]; and when the lien attaches to fixtures, the lender may waive the lien as to the fixtures only. On the other hand, the lender may elect to rely on the security, even though the property is environmentally impaired [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(a)*].

This election applies only to loans, extensions of credit, guaranties, or other obligations secured by real property made, renewed, or modified after 1991 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(g)*], and notwithstanding the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*] or any other provision of law except *Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(d)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(a)*; *see* [5], *below*].

The lender's election is not available if the release, or threat of release, of a hazardous substance, which is the cause the environmental impairment [*see* [b][iii], *below*], was not knowingly or negligently caused or contributed to, or knowingly or willfully permitted or acquiesced in, by the borrower or any related party or by any of their affiliates or agents [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(d)(1)*], and either [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(d)(2)*]:

- Neither the borrower nor any related party, nor any of their affiliates or agents, had actual knowledge or notice of the release, or threat of release, in conjunction with the making, renewal, or modification of the loan, extension of credit, guaranty, or other obligation secured by the property.

- If such a person had knowledge or notice of the release, or threat of release, the borrower made written disclosure of it to the secured lender after the lender's written request for information concerning the environmental condition of the property, or the lender otherwise obtained actual knowledge of it, before the making, renewal, or modification of the obligation.

[b] Definitions

[i] Borrower and Related Party

"Borrower" means the trustor under a trust deed, or the mortgagor under a mortgage, when the trust deed or mortgage secures a loan, extension of credit, guaranty, or other obligation. The term includes any successor in interest to the trustor or mortgagor before foreclosure or extinction of the trust deed or mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(2)*].

"Related party" means any person who shares an ownership interest with the borrower in the property or is a partner or joint venturer with the borrower in a business that includes the acquisition, development, use, lease, or sale of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(6)*].

[ii] Environmentally Impaired

"Environmentally impaired" means that the estimated costs to clean up and remedy a past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance [*see* [iv], *below*] into, onto, beneath, or from the property, which is not disclosed in writing to, or otherwise actually known by, the secured lender before the making of the loan or extension of credit secured by the property, exceeds either 25 percent of the aggregate fair market value of all security for the loan or extension of credit at the time of the making of the loan or extension of credit or, if higher, 25 percent of the aggregate fair market value of all security for the loan or extension of credit at the time of the discovery of the release or threatened release by the secured lender [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(3)*].

If the property is included in the National Priorities List [*see 42 U.S.C. § 9605*] or in any list published by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control [*Health & Safety Code § 25356(b)*], it is deemed to be environmentally impaired, notwithstanding the foregoing definition [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(3)*].

The estimated cost to clean up and remedy the resultant contamination includes only costs that would be incurred reasonably and in good faith. Fair market value is determined without giving consideration to the release or threatened release and is exclusive of the amount of all liens and encumbrances against the property that are senior to the lien of the secured lender [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(3)*].

[iii] Real Property and Affected Parcel

"Real property" (or "real property security" in the statute) means any real property and improvements, other than a separate interest and any related interest in the common area of a residential common interest development [*see Civ. Code § 1351*], or residential real property containing not more than 15 dwelling units, that in either case is used solely for residential purposes or, if reasonably contemplated by the parties to the trust deed or mortgage, is used for residential purposes as well as limited incidental agricultural or commercial purposes, and is the subject of an issued certificate of occupancy unless the dwelling is to be owned and occupied by the borrower [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(5)*].

"Affected parcel" means any portion of a parcel of the property that is (1) contiguous to the environmentally impaired parcel, even if separated by roads, streets, utility easements, or railroad rights-of-way, (2) part of an approved or proposed subdivision [*see Gov. Code § 66424*], of which the environmentally impaired parcel is also a part, or (3) within 2,000 feet of the environmentally impaired parcel [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(1)*].

[iv] Release of Hazardous Substance

"Release of a hazardous substance" means any spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, injecting, escaping, leaching, dumping, or disposing into the environment, including continuing migration, of hazardous substances into, onto, or through soil, surface water, or groundwater. The term does not include actions directly relating to the incorporation in a lawful manner of building materials into a permanent improvement to the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(7)*].

"Hazardous substance" means any hazardous substance as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 25281(h)*, any waste material as defined in *Water Code § 13050(d)*, or petroleum, including crude oil (or any fraction of crude oil), natural gas, natural gas liquids, liquefied natural gas, or synthetic gas usable for fuel, or any mixture of those substances [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)(4)*].

[c] Notice of Default and Action to Confirm Impaired Status

Before the secured lender may elect to waive the lien on any parcel of property because of environmental impairment, the lender must provide written notice of the default to the borrower, and the value of the property must be established and its environmentally impaired status must be confirmed by an order of a court of competent jurisdiction in an action brought by the secured lender against the borrower. The complaint in a valuation and confirmation action may include causes of action for a money judgment for all or part of the secured obligation, in which case the waiver of the secured lender's lien is effective only if and when a final money judgment is obtained against the borrower [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(b)*].

[d] Foreclosure Against Additional Collateral

If the secured lender elects to waive the lien, and the borrower's obligations are also secured by other real property, fixtures, or personal property, the secured lender must first foreclose against the additional collateral to the extent required by applicable law. In that case, the judgment for the lender must be limited to the extent that *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580d*, and *726(b)* (antideficiency statutes) apply to the foreclosure against the additional real-property collateral. The borrower may waive or modify the other-collateral-first foreclosure requirement, provided the waiver or modification is in writing and signed by the borrower after default [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(c)*].

[e] Other Contractual Rights Not Impaired

Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5 does not invalidate or otherwise affect in any manner any rights or obligations arising under contract in connection with a loan or extension of credit, including, without limitation, provisions limiting recourse [

Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(f)].

[3] Contract Action for Violation of Environmental Provision

[a] In General

[i] When Lender May Bring Action

A secured lender may bring an action for damages against a borrower for breach of any environmental provision relating to the property and for specific enforcement of the environmental provision. That action (or the attendant failure to foreclose first against collateral) does not constitute an action within the meaning of the one-form-of-action rule [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*] or constitute a money judgment for a deficiency or a deficiency judgment within the meaning of the antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726(b)*]. No injunction for the enforcement of an environmental provision may be issued after the obligation secured by the property has been discharged or after all of the borrower's rights, title, and interest in and to the property have been transferred in a good faith transaction to an unaffiliated third party for fair value [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(a)*].

This statutory rule is applicable notwithstanding any other provision of law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(a)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 736* applies only to environmental provisions contracted in conjunction with loans, extensions of credit, guaranties, or other obligations made, renewed, or modified after 1991. The statute does not validate, invalidate, or otherwise affect in any manner the rights and obligations of the parties to, or the enforcement of, environmental provisions contracted before 1992 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(e)*]. The statute is not intended to establish, abrogate, modify, limit, or otherwise affect any cause of action other than that provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 736(a)* that a secured lender may have against a borrower under an environmental provision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(d)*].

[ii] "Environmental Provision" Defined

"Environmental provision" means any written representation, warranty, indemnity, promise, or covenant relating to the existence, location, nature, use, generation, manufacture, storage, disposal, handling, or past, present, or future release or threatened release, of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the property, or to past, present, or future compliance with any related law, made by a borrower in conjunction with the making, renewal, or modification of a loan, extension of credit, guaranty, or other obligation involving the borrower. This definition applies whether or not the representation, warranty, indemnity, promise, or covenant is or was contained in or secured by the trust deed or mortgage, and whether or not the trust deed or mortgage has been discharged, reconveyed, or foreclosed on [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(f)(2)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 736(f)(1),(3)-(6)* (other definitions, which are same as in *Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(e)*); [2][b], *above*].

[b] Limitation on Damages

The lender's damages are limited to reimbursement or indemnification of the following items [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(b)*]:

- If cleanup or remediation is not pursuant to an order of any federal, state, or local governmental agency relating to the cleanup, remediation, or other response action required by applicable law: the costs relating to a reasonable and good faith cleanup, remediation, or other response action concerning a release or threatened release of hazardous substances that is anticipated by the environmental provision.

- If cleanup or remediation is pursuant to an order of any federal, state, or local governmental agency relating to the cleanup, remediation, or other response action required by applicable law that is anticipated by the environmental provision: all amounts reasonably advanced in good faith by the lender in connection with those activities, provided the lender negotiated, or attempted to negotiate, in good

faith to minimize the amounts the lender was required to advance under the order.

- Indemnification against all liabilities to any third party relating to the breach and not arising from acts, omissions, or other conduct that occur after the borrower is no longer an owner or operator of the property [*see 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20)(A)* (definition of "owner or operator," which is incorporated by reference)], provided the lender is not responsible for the environmentally impaired condition of the property in accordance with the standards under *Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5(d)* [*see* [2][a], *above*].

- Attorney's fees and costs incurred by the lender relating to the breach.

[c] Items Not Recoverable

The lender may not recover damages for (1) any part of the principal amount or accrued interest of the secured obligation, except for amounts advanced by the lender to cure or mitigate the breach of the environmental provision that are added to the principal amount, plus contractual interest, or (2) amounts that relate to a release of a hazardous substance that the lender, or an affiliated person or agent, knowingly permitted, caused, or contributed to [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(b)*].

The lender may not recover damages for amounts advanced or obligations incurred for the cleanup or other remediation of property, and related attorney's fees and costs, if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Code Civ. Proc. § 736(c)*]:

- The original principal amount of, or commitment for, the loan or other obligation secured by the property did not exceed $200,000.

- The lender, in conjunction with accepting the environmental provision, agreed in writing to accept the property on the basis of a completed environmental site assessment and other relevant information from the borrower.

- The borrower did not permit, cause, or contribute to the release of a hazardous substance or threatened release.

- The trust deed or mortgage covering the property has not been extinguished.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesCleanupReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.93

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.93 Inspection Regarding Hazardous Substance Release

[1] Lender's Right to Enter for Inspection

A secured lender may enter and inspect the property for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature, and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the property in either of the following situations [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(a)*]:

- On reasonable belief of the existence of a past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the property not previously disclosed in writing to the lender in conjunction with the making, renewal, or modification of a loan, extension of credit, guaranty, or other obligation involving the borrower [*see Civ. Code § 2929.5(e)* (definitions); *see also § 555.92[2][b]*].

- After the commencement of nonjudicial or judicial foreclosure proceedings against the property.

The lender must reimburse the borrower for the cost of repair of any physical harm to the property caused by the entry and inspection [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(c)*].

[2] Required Notice of Intent to Enter

The lender is prohibited from abusing the right of entry and inspection or using it to harass the borrower or tenant of the property. Except in an emergency, when the borrower or tenant of the property has abandoned the premises, or if it is impracticable to do so, the lender must give the borrower or tenant of the property reasonable notice of the secured lender's intent to enter. The lender may enter only during the borrower's or tenant's normal business hours. Twenty-four hours' notice is presumed to be reasonable notice in absence of evidence to the contrary [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(b)*; *see*

Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c) (action for appointment of receiver to enforce right)].

[3] Petition for Entry and Inspection

If the lender is refused the right of entry and inspection by the borrower or tenant of the property, or is otherwise unable to enter and inspect the property without a breach of the peace, the lender may, on petition, obtain an order from a court of competent jurisdiction to exercise the lender's inspection rights [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(d)*].

A receiver may be appointed by the superior court to enable the lender to enter and inspect the property for the purpose of determining the existence, location, nature, and magnitude of any past or present release or threatened release of any hazardous substance into, onto, beneath, or from the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(c)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

An action to enforce the right of entry and inspection or for appointment of a receiver does not constitute an action within the meaning of the one-form-of-action rule [*Civ. Code § 2929.5(d)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(d)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesReceivershipsReceiversAppointmentsEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesCleanupReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.94

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.94 Rent Skimming

[1] Definition; Overview of Action; No Waiver

Rent skimming is the landlord's use of revenue received from the rental of a parcel of residential real property, within the first 12 months after acquiring the property, without first applying the revenue or an equivalent amount to the payments due on all mortgages and trust deeds encumbering the property [*Civ. Code § 890(a)*].

Vendors as lienholders, other lienholders, and tenants may, in certain circumstances, bring an action for damages against a person who has engaged in rent skimming [*see Civ. Code § 891(a), (c), (d)*; *see also Civ. Code § 890(c)* (definition of "person")]. The antideficiency statutes [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 580b, 580d, 726*] do not apply to the action [*Civ. Code § 891(g)*]. For a form of complaint for use in an action based on rent skimming, see *§ 555.192*.

There can be no effective waiver of the provisions of *Civ. Code § 891* [*Civ. Code § 891(f)*]. The rights and remedies provided by *Civ. Code § 891* are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law [*Civ. Code § 891(e)*]. For discussion of other rights and remedies available to tenants and vendors, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy* , and Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

[2] Action for Damages

[a] By Vendor As Lienholder

The vendor of an interest in residential real property who received a promissory note or other evidence of a debt for all or a portion of the purchase price, which is secured by a lien on the property, may bring an action against any person who has engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property. The vendor is entitled to recover all actual damages as well as reasonable attorney's fees and costs. The court may also award exemplary damages and any appropriate

equitable relief [*Civ. Code § 891(a)*].

If the defendant engaged in multiple acts of rent skimming, the court must award exemplary damages not less than three times the actual damages [*Civ. Code § 891(a)*]. "Multiple acts of rent skimming" occur if the landlord knowingly and willfully engages in rent skimming with respect to each of five or more parcels of residential real property acquired within any two-year period [*Civ. Code § 890(b)*].

[b] By Other Lienholder

A mortgagee or beneficiary under a trust deed encumbering residential real property may bring an action against a person who has engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property as one of multiple acts of rent skimming [*see* [a], *above*]. The lienholder may bring such an action whether or not the defendant has become contractually bound by an obligation secured by the mortgage or trust deed. The mortgagee or beneficiary is entitled to recover actual damages, to the extent of the amount of the rent collected on the encumbered property, as well as reasonable attorney's fees and costs. The court may also award exemplary damages and any appropriate equitable relief [*Civ. Code § 891(c)*].

[c] By Tenant

A tenant of residential real property may bring an action against a person who has engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property for the recovery of actual damages, including any security deposit [*see Civ. Code § 1950.5*; Ch. 334, *Landlord and Tenant: Claims for Damages*], and for moving expenses if the property is sold at a foreclosure sale and the tenant is required to move. The tenant is entitled to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs as well. The court may also award exemplary damages, and the court must award exemplary damages of at least three times the amount of actual damages if the defendant engaged in multiple acts of rent skimming [*see* [a], *above*], or if the payments due under any trust deed or mortgage were two or more months delinquent at the time the tenant rented the premises [*Civ. Code § 891(d)*].

[3] Vendor's Motion to Clear Reacquired Interest of Judgment Liens

If the vendor of an interest in residential real property reacquires that interest from a person who engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property, the vendor may move for an order declaring that the reacquired interest is not encumbered by any lien that is or has the effect of a judgment lien against the person who engaged in rent skimming. This motion must be granted, unless the interests of justice would not be served, when the lien is not related to any improvement of the property and does not represent security for a loan made in good faith by a lender without knowledge of the rent skimming [*Civ. Code § 891(b)*]. For a form of notice of this motion, see *§ 555.194*.

[4] Criminal Penalties for Multiple Acts

A person who engages in multiple acts of rent skimming is subject to a $10,000 fine or one year's imprisonment or both, upon conviction of five acts of rent skimming. Conviction of additional acts will carry the same punishment for each additional act, as does a conviction of an act after a prior conviction [*Civ. Code § 892(a), (b)*; *see Civ. Code § 892(c)* (three-year limitation period for prosecution); *Civ. Code § 892(d)* (penalties are cumulative to other remedies or penalties for same conduct); *see also Civ. Code § 890(c)* (definition of "person")].

"Multiple acts of rent skimming" occur if the landlord knowingly and willfully engages in rent skimming with respect to each of five or more parcels of residential real property acquired within any two-year period [*Civ. Code § 890(b)*].

[5] Defense

The following conditions would constitute an affirmative defense for a natural person who is a defendant in a civil or criminal action for rent skimming [*Civ. Code § 893(a)*]:

- The defendant used the rental revenue, which was due but not paid to holders of mortgages or trust deeds, to make payments to health care providers [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6146(c)(2)* (definition)] for unforeseen and necessary medical treatment of the defendant or a spouse, parent, or child or to licensed contractors or material suppliers to correct the violation of any statute, ordinance, or regulation relating to the habitability of the premises.

- The defendant made the payments within 30 days of receiving the rental revenue.

- The defendant had no other source of funds from which to make the payments.

The defendant has the burden of proof of each element of the defense in a civil action and the burden of producing evidence in a criminal action [*Civ. Code § 893(b)*]. For a form of this affirmative defense, see *§ 555.193*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleRemediesReal Property LawTortsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.95-555.99

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.100

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.100 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities related to forms in this chapter, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 230, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* (Matthew Bender)

[2] California Legal Forms

For additional discussion of trust deeds and mortgages and related transactional forms, see California Legal Forms (Matthew Bender):

- Ch. 25A, *Security Instruments for Real Estate Financing*
- Ch. 25B, *Subordination, Assumption, and Assignment*
- Ch. 25C, *Release and Reconveyance*
- Ch. 25D, *Foreclosure*

[3] California Real Estate Law & Practice

For additional discussion of trust deeds and mortgages, see California Real Estate Law and Practice (Matthew Bender):

- Ch. 111, *Deeds of Trust and Mortgages*
- Ch. 114, *Subordination*
- Ch. 115, *Release and Reconveyance*
- Ch. 120, *Representing a Client After Default*
- Ch. 121, *Priorities of Liens*
- Ch. 122, *Antideficiency Legislation*
- Ch. 123, *Nonjudicial Foreclosure*
- Ch. 124, *Judicial Foreclosure*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien Priorities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.101

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.101 Federal Statutes

Stay of foreclosure proceedings during bankruptcy proceedings. *11 U.S.C. § 362*

Garn-St. Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982, governing due-on clauses. *12 U.S.C. § 1701j-3*

Restrictions on foreclosure proceedings applicable to secured loan guaranteed or insured by DVA or FHA. *12 U.S.C. § 1707 et seq.* (FHA); *38 U.S.C. § 3701 et seq.* (DVA)

Disclosure statements required for benefit of borrower in certain loan transactions secured by mortgage or trust deed. *12 U.S.C. § 2601*; *15 U.S.C. § 1604*

Notice of nonjudicial sale and redemption provisions applicable when federal tax lien exists on property to be sold. *I.R.C. § 7425(b)-(d)*; *28 U.S.C. § 2410(d)*

When United States is named as defendant in foreclosure action, action may be brought in or removed to federal district court. *28 U.S.C. §§ 1444, 2410(a)*

Limitation under Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*) on foreclosure proceedings against trustor in active military service. *50 U.S.C. App. § 533*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawConsumer ProtectionReal Estate Settlement ProceduresGeneral OverviewBanking LawFederal

ActsGarn-St. Germain Depository Institutions ActBankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActReal Property LawFinancingFederal ProgramsFederal Housing Administration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.102

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.102 State Statutes

[1] In General

Suretyship. *Civ. Code § 2787 et seq.*

Trustee is authorized to sue to exercise trustee's powers and duties with regard to trust deeds. *Code Civ. Proc. § 369(b)*

Enforceability of letter of credit supporting obligation that is secured by mortgage or trust deed. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580.5, 580.7*

Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a et seq., 725a et seq. are not applicable to any security interest governed by Commercial Code, except as provided under *Com. Code § 9604. Code Civ. Proc. § 730.5*

Treble damages for forged trust deed involving residential property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 749, 749.5*

Acceleration of trust deed by bank or savings and loan association on failure to pay taxes, rents, assessments, or insurance proceeds is enforceable whether or not security is impaired. *Fin. Code §§ 1227.2, 7461*

Provision authorizing holder of trust deed to receive insurance proceeds is enforceable whether or not security is impaired. *Fin. Code §§ 1227.3, 7462*

Special notice of sale requirements applicable when state lien for postponed property taxes exists on property to be sold. *Gov. Code § 16187(b)*

Protections from certain civil liabilities, including mortgages and property taxes, for active service members. *Mil. &*

Vet. Code §§ 400-420

Trust terminates when trust purpose is fulfilled. *Prob. Code § 15407(a)(2)*

[2] Civil Actions

[a] In General

Venue in foreclosure action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*

Pursuit of attachment remedy does not constitute action for recovery of debt or failure to comply with requirement to proceed first against security. *Code Civ. Proc. § 483.012*

Receivers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 564 et seq.*

Actions for foreclosure of mortgages and trust deeds. *Code Civ. Proc. § 725a et seq.*

Secured lender's right of election of remedies regarding environmental impairment of property on borrower's default. *Code Civ. Proc. § 726.5*

Actions for nuisance, waste, and willful trespass, in certain cases, on real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 731 et seq.*

Secured lender's right of action regarding borrower's breach of environmental provision in contract. *Code Civ. Proc. § 736*

Actions for the recovery of real property, and other provisions relating to actions concerning real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 740 et seq.*

Mortgage is not to be deemed conveyance enabling mortgagee to recover possession without foreclosure and sale. *Code Civ. Proc. § 744*

Injunction against waste pending foreclosure. *Code Civ. Proc. § 745*

Quiet title. *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*

[b] Antideficiency Statutes and One-Form-of-Action Rule

Exception to one-form-of-action rule for action based on environmental impairment of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564(d), 726.5, 736*

Procedure for and limitation on recovery of deficiency judgment after foreclosure. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580a, 726(b)*

Deficiency judgment is barred after any sale of real property under purchase-money mortgage or trust deed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*

Deficiency judgment is generally barred after nonjudicial foreclosure. *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*

Foreclosure is only form of action permitted for recovery of debt or enforcement of obligation secured by mortgage or trust deed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*

[3] Liens in General

Definition of liens. *Civ. Code § 2872 et seq.*

Creation of liens. *Civ. Code § 2881 et seq.*

Effect of liens. *Civ. Code § 2888 et seq.*

Priority of liens. *Civ. Code § 2897 et seq.*

Redemption from liens. *Civ. Code § 2903 et seq.*

Extinction of liens. *Civ. Code § 2909 et seq.*

[4] Mortgages and Trust Deeds

Ancient mortgages and trust deeds. *Civ. Code § 882.020 et seq.*

Rent skimming. *Civ. Code § 890 et seq.*

Home equity sales contracts. *Civ. Code § 1695 et seq.*

Mortgage loans. *Civ. Code § 1918.5 et seq.*

Reverse mortgages. *Civ. Code § 1923 et seq.*

Mortgages in general. *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.*

Mortgage foreclosure consultants. *Civ. Code § 2945 et seq.*

Mortgage of real property. *Civ. Code § 2947 et seq.*

Disclosures regarding purchase money liens on residential property. *Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.*

Home Equity Loan Disclosures Act. *Civ. Code § 2970 et seq.*

[5] Recordation of Mortgage or Trust Deed

Record as notice. *Civ. Code § 1213 et seq.*

Mortgage or trust deed, unless fictitious, must be acknowledged before recordation. *Gov. Code § 27287*

Recorded trust deed must include address of trustor and request by trustor for copy of any notice of default or sale. *Gov. Code § 27321.5*

County recorder may use system of microphotography, optical disk, or reproduction by other techniques not permitting additions, deletions, or changes to original document as photographic reproduction process to record instruments, papers, and notices required or permitted by law to be recorded or filed, and every such reproduction is deemed original.

Gov. Code §§ 27322.2, 27322.4

[6] Statutory Regulation of Loans

[a] In General

Advance fee for arranging loan secured by real property is prohibited, with exceptions, and violation is punishable by fine of up to $10,000 for individual or $50,000 for corporation. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10085.5*

Disclosure statements required for benefit of borrower in certain loan transactions secured by mortgage or trust deed. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10232.4, 10232.5, 10240*; *Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.*; *Corp. Code § 25110*

Loans made or negotiated by real estate brokers. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.*

Loans of money. *Civ. Code § 1912 et seq.*

Shared appreciation loans. *Civ. Code §§ 1917 et seq., 1917.110 et seq.*

Loans of ERISA pension funds. *Civ. Code §§ 1917.010 et seq., 1917.210 et seq.*

Shared appreciation loans for seniors. *Civ. Code § 1917.320 et seq.*

[b] Residential Mortgage Loans

Licensing of residential mortgage loan originators under Real Estate Law, Finance Lenders Law, and Residential Mortgage Lending Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10166.01 et seq.*; *Fin. Code §§ 22012-22014, 22105.1-22105.4, 22109.1-22109.6, 50002.5, 50003.5, 50003.6, 50140 et seq., 50150 et seq.*

California Residential Mortgage Lending Act. *Fin. Code § 50000 et seq.*

Licensing of residential mortgage lender. *Fin. Code § 50120 et seq.*

Licensing of residential mortgage loan servicer. *Fin. Code § 50130*

Requirements governing financial condition, loan transaction, and bonds of licensees. *Fin. Code § 50200 et seq.*

Assessments levied by Commissioner of Corporations. *Fin. Code § 50400 et seq.*

Prohibited mortgage loan practices; penalties. *Fin. Code § 50500 et seq.*

Requirements governing brokerage services provided to borrowers by licensees. *Fin. Code § 50700 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsSatisfaction & TerminationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien PrioritiesReal Property LawFinancingState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.103

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.103 Federal Administrative Regulations

Regulations of Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), a bureau of Department of Treasury, relating to enforcement of due-on-sale clauses in general. 12 C.F.R. Pt. 591

Regulations of National Credit Union Administration relating to enforcement of due-on-sale clauses in loans by national credit unions. *12 C.F.R. § 701.21(g)(6)*

Requirements for foreclosure proceedings applicable to secured loan guaranteed or insured by DVA or FHA. 24 C.F.R. Pt. 200 et seq. (FHA); *38 C.F.R. Pt. 36* (DVA)

Requirements for notice of nonjudicial sale to be given to IRS when federal tax lien exists on property to be sold. *Treas. Reg. § 400.4-1*

Regulations governing redemption by IRS following private sale. *Treas. Reg. § 400.5-1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingFederal ProgramsFederal Housing AdministrationReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersDue-on-Sale ClausesTax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureTax Credits & LiabilitiesLiens (IRC secs. 6320-6327)Discharges of Liens

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.104

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.104 Local Court Rules

[1] Contra Costa County

Attorney's fees in foreclosure action. Contra Costa Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 20(g)

[2] Los Angeles County

Attorney's fees in foreclosure action. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 3.2(b)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.105

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.105 Decisions

[1] Antideficiency Statutes

When debtor fraudulently fabricated assets as security for loan and then further secured loan by real property, antideficiency statutes did not bar creditor's action for fraud. *In re Franklin (9th Cir. 1991) 922 F.2d 536, 543*

Action for money judgment was not election to proceed personally instead of proceeding against security if judgment was not obtained; obtaining personal judgment was election of remedies. *In re Madigan (9th Cir. 1991) 122 Bankr. 103, 106-107*

Purchaser may not make contractual waiver of protections of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* in exchange for renegotiation of original obligation. *DeBerard v. Lim (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 659, 661-662, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292, 976 P.2d 843* ; *Palm v. Schilling (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 63, 72-76, 244 Cal. Rptr. 600*

Three-month period in which motion for deficiency judgment must be filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*] is statute of limitations; thus, party who fails to file timely motion may not seek relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* from "a judgment, dismissal, order, or other proceeding taken against him or her through his or her mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect." *Life Savings Bank v. Wilhelm (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 174, 178, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 657*

Sham guaranty when guarantor was settlor and trustee of inter vivos revocable trust that was the principal obligor on obligation governed by antideficiency laws; guarantor's agreement to modification of loan did not waive protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*. *Cadle Co. II v. Harvey (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 927, 933, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 150*

Fraud action could not be based on borrowers' waiver of antideficiency protection of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b*; because protections of § 580b may not be contractually waived by debtor, lender's fraud action was for nonperformance of

invalid waiver. *Lawler v. Jacobs (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 723, 736, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 52*

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b did not bar deficiency when trust deed securing payment of purchase price was not recorded against purchased property but against property purchased by defendants three years earlier in completely unrelated transaction. *Kurtz v. Calvo (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 191, 195, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99*

9604(a)(2)(A) (limited application of one action rule and antideficiency legislation when obligation secured by interest in personal property or fixtures is also secured by interest in real property) relieves mixed collateral creditor entirely from complying with three-month time limit for applying for deficiency judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 726. Florio v. Lau (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 637, 653, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 409*

Judgment creditor who secured judgment lien by accepting note and trust deed was secured creditor and, thus, was barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d* from recovering deficiency after nonjudicial foreclosure sale. *Rettner v. Shepherd (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 943, 949-952, 282 Cal. Rptr. 687*

Purchase of all shares of farming corporation that owned real property and had other assets was purchase of personal property not subject to bar of deficiency judgment. *Union Bank v. Anderson (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 941, 945-950, 283 Cal. Rptr. 823*

When loan was made to revocable family trust and was guaranteed by husband and wife, who were trustees, trustors, and beneficiaries of trust, guaranties were not true guaranties, and deficiency was barred. *Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 308, 318-322, 282 Cal. Rptr. 354*

Fair-value limitation was not applicable to bankruptcy sale free and clear of all liens. *Coppola v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 848, 870-876, 259 Cal. Rptr. 811*

Out-of-state judgment for deficiency on purchase money note in California was not entitled to full faith and credit when there was prior judgment in California denying deficiency. *Stuart v. Lilves (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1215, 1219-1221, 258 Cal. Rptr. 780*

Subordinated loan secured by residential property to be demolished to construct three residential units was not standard transaction even though residential, not commercial, use was involved, and thus deficiency was available. *Boyle v. Sweeney (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 998, 1002-1004, 255 Cal. Rptr. 153*

When purchase agreement provided for subordination of vendor's lien to new financing, purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* was not served and deficiency judgment was allowed. *Wright v. Johnston (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 333, 337-338, 253 Cal. Rptr. 418*

When exchange controlled by vendor purported to pass purchase money through third party not on title controlled by vendor, purchase money antideficiency protection for purchaser was continuing. *Ziegler v. Barnes (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 224, 229-230, 246 Cal. Rptr. 69*

When purchase-money note was not subject to antideficiency statutes because of subordination clause, renegotiation of subordination clause increasing amount to be subordinated was not making loan subject to antideficiency protection. *Ziegler v. Barnes (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 224, 231-233, 246 Cal. Rptr. 69*

Loan was purchase money even when proceeds were not used to pay purchase price if loan was integral part of purchase transaction. *BMP Property Development v. Melvin (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 526, 529-531, 243 Cal. Rptr. 715*

Purchase-money antideficiency law was applicable when nonpurchase-money loan was rewritten to allow other creditor to purchase in attempt to resell property and avoid foreclosure. *LaForgia v. Kolsky (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1103, 1108-1113, 242 Cal. Rptr. 282*

Attorney's fees awarded in opposing action to enjoin sale were recoverable in nonjudicial foreclosure sale, and recovery was not precluded by one-form-of-action rule or antideficiency statutes. *Passanisi v. Merit-McBride Realtors, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1496, 1506-1512, 236 Cal. Rptr. 59*

Deficiency against purchaser was not barred when purchaser fraudulently obtained second secured loan with priority over first loan and stopped making payments on both. *Bell v. Roy (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 694, 699-700, 232 Cal. Rptr. 83*

Antideficiency statute did not bar action for fraud in purchase-money transaction because action was not for deficiency. *Manson v. Reed (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1493, 1501, 231 Cal. Rptr. 446*

In action to recover on guaranty securing note executed in California with respect to sale of Texas land, California antideficiency statutes applied because law of situs of debt controls when action is brought on debt and not to obtain land. *Consolidated Capital Income Trust v. Khaloghli (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 107, 112, 227 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Guarantors were not specifically protected by antideficiency statutes; however, when creditor foreclosed on security and thereby destroyed guarantor's subrogation rights against debtor by application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580d*, creditor was thereafter estopped to assert right to recover on guaranty. *Consolidated Capital Income Trust v. Khaloghli (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 107, 112-113, 227 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b did not apply to variation on standard purchase money security transaction in which purchaser contemplated commercial development of purchased property and vendor agreed to subordinate purchase-money trust deed to trust deed securing third party's construction loan. *Roffinella v. Sherinian (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 230, 236-240, 224 Cal. Rptr. 502*

Code Civ. Proc. § 580d, barring deficiency judgment after nonjudicial foreclosure, did not apply to enforcement of judgment of sister state that allowed deficiency judgments. *United Bank of Denver v. K & Y Trucking Co. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 217, 220-221, 195 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b, barring deficiency judgment after sale under purchase-money trust deed, did not apply to variation of standard purchase-money transaction in which secured note was given by one ex-spouse to other to equalize division of community property on divorce. *Nickerman v. Ryan (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 564, 567, 155 Cal. Rptr. 830*

Code Civ. Proc. § 726, requiring sale of security before seeking deficiency judgment, did not require exhaustion of security before personal judgment on note secured by personal property consisting of other note secured by real property. *Bank of California v. Leone (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 444, 448, 112 Cal. Rptr. 394*

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b, barring deficiency judgment after sale under purchase-money trust deed, prevented deficiency judgment even though encumbered property was outside *California. Younker v. Reseda Manor (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 431, 434-438, 63 Cal. Rptr. 197* ; *Kish v. Bay Counties Title Guaranty Co. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 725, 733, 62 Cal. Rptr. 494*

[2] Availability of Foreclosure

Foreclosure was permissible for failure to pay prepayment penalty, even though collection agent mistakenly accepted

payoff from trustor's agent without objection or demand for prepayment penalty; neither *Civ. Code § 1501* (waiver of inadequacies of tendered performance if no objection is made at time of tender) nor *Code Civ. Proc. § 2076* (same) barred collection of prepayment penalty because both apply to intentional failures to demand proper tender. *Sanguansak v. Myers (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 110, 115-117, 223 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Foreclosure for failure to pay prepayment penalty was not barred on basis of equitable estoppel when collection agent mistakenly accepted payoff from maker's agent without penalty and maker's agent knew of clear penalty language in note. *Sanguansak v. Myers (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 110, 117-118, 223 Cal. Rptr. 490*

[3] Collection of Rents and Profits

Rents and profits under assignment of rents clause constituted additional security, not deficiency judgment. *Mortgage Guarantee Co. v. Sampsell (1942) 51 Cal. App. 2d 180, 183-186, 124 P.2d 353*

[4] Creation of Mortgage or Trust Deed

Description of secured obligation sufficient to ascertain extent of encumbrance is required to create valid mortgage. *D'Oyly v. Capp (1893) 99 Cal. 153, 157, 33 P. 736*

When parties each believe that trust deed encumbers different property and beneficiary misled trustor to that belief, trust deed is subject to cancellation. *Balistreri v. Nevada Livestock Production Credit Assn. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 635, 640-644, 262 Cal. Rptr. 862*

[5] Deed or Mortgage

In determining whether deed absolute was intended as mortgage, central inquiry is whether debt existed at time of transaction and relation of debtor and creditor continued thereafter; if so, court may infer that deed was intended as mortgage. *Montgomery v. Spect (1880) 55 Cal. 352, 353*

[6] Emotional Distress

Bank's foreclosure of property pledged to secure loan to corporation, on which individual plaintiff-shareholder lived, was privileged; banker's remark questioning whether plaintiff's daughter had "guts" to act as real estate broker in liquidation sale of her mother's house was heartless, insensitive, and merited condemnation but was not type of outrageous conduct necessary to support action for intentional infliction of emotional distress. *Kruse v. Bank of America (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 38, 67-68, 248 Cal. Rptr. 217*

[7] Equitable Mortgage

Defective mortgage or trust deed intended to provide property as security for debt was enforceable as equitable mortgage. *Earle v. Sunnyside Land Co. (1907) 150 Cal. 214, 227-228, 88 P. 920* ; *Bank of Suisun v. Fiske (1924) 65 Cal. App. 771, 777-778, 225 P. 7*

Promise to give trust deed or mortgage providing property as security for debt was enforceable as equitable mortgage. *Higgins v. Manson (1899) 126 Cal. 467, 469-470, 58 P. 907* ; *Schelling v. Thomas (1929) 96 Cal. App. 682, 684, 687-688, 274 P. 755*

[8] Foreclosure Action

Junior lienholder named as defendant in foreclosure action was permitted to file cross complaint for foreclosure of subordinate lien in default. *Hibernia etc. Soc. v. London etc. Ins. Co. (1903) 138 Cal. 257, 260, 71 P. 334*

[9] Fraud

Full credit bid rule did not bar repurchasing lender's causes of action against third party nonborrowers for fraud, negligent misrepresentation, and breach of contract. *First Commercial Mortgage Co. v. Reece (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 731, 742-744, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 23*

[9A] Home Equity Purchasers

Despite signing general release in settlement of unlawful detainer action brought by equity purchaser, seller was entitled to rescind sale of home when purchaser never provided seller notice of right to rescind as required under *Home Equity Sales Contract Act. Hoffman v. Lloyd (9th Cir. 2009) 572 F.3d 999, 1001*

Four-year limitations period for actions involving fraud [*Pen. Code §§ 803(c)*, 805.1] applied to prosecution for violation of the Home Equity Sales Contract Act [*Civ. Code § 1695 et seq.*] in which the defendant failed to provide home equity seller with written contract that complied with disclosure and other requirements. *People v. Shetty (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1488, 1493-1494, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 355*

[9B] Insurance on Encumbered Property

Lender was entitled to proceeds of earthquake insurance obtained by borrower, pursuant to provision of deed of trust assigning to lender "all sums due or payable" to owner or owner's successor "for injury or damage to such property" and provision stating that lender could use insurance proceeds it received pursuant to deed of trust to repair property, apply those funds to secured debt, or release funds to owner. *JEM Enterprises v. Washington Mutual Bank (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 638, 646, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 458*

Deed of trust that does not require homeowner to obtain earthquake insurance but provides that if such insurance is obtained lender must be named loss payee and has right to control or direct proceeds is fully enforceable. *Martin v. World Savings and Loan Assn. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 803, 809, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 225*

If lender does not require earthquake insurance on property that secured loan, and loan documents contain no reference to earthquake insurance proceeds, lender has no right to receive or to control proceeds of earthquake insurance policy. *Ziello v. Superior Court (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 321, 329, 42 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251*

[10] Obligation Secured

Limitation on right to prepay secured loan under *Civ. Code § 2954.9(a)(3)* applies only during calendar year of sale. *Donahue v. LeVesque (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 620, 626-628, 215 Cal. Rptr. 388*

[11] Priority of Liens

"Partial subordination" principle developed in judicial foreclosure context applied to determine priority of liens in

nonjudicial foreclosure when inconsistency regarding priority was created by successive deeds of trust and intervening subordination agreement between two lenders. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Neilsen (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 602, 616-617, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 547*

Lender was not bona fide encumbrancer when its escrow holder knew that assignee of prior trust deed who had subordinated was pledgee, and pledgee had no right to impair trust deed's security by allowing its subordination without assignor's agreement. *Triple A Management Co. v. Frisone (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 520, 539, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669*

When trust deed was recorded after trustor acquired title but before deed to trustor was recorded, trust deed was not in chain of title and did not impart constructive notice. *Far West Savings & Loan Assn. v. McLaughlin (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 67, 73-74, 246 Cal. Rptr. 872*

Junior lienholder did not have standing to challenge prior-recorded trust deed on ground that husband signed wife's name on it. *Clar v. Cacciola (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1032, 1036, 238 Cal. Rptr. 726*

[12] Private Sale

In nonjudicial sale by state to foreclose tax lien, *Fourteenth Amendment* requires state to give notice of sale reasonably calculated to give actual notice to those with legally protected interest in property; mere posting and publication of notice, rather than personal or mailed service, is insufficient. *Mennonite Board of Missions v. Adams (1983) 462 U.S. 791, 798-800, 103 S. Ct. 2706, 77 L. Ed. 2d 180*

Nonjudicial foreclosure procedures do not implicate *due process clause of Fourteenth Amendment* because there is no direct state involvement in enforcement of creditor's remedies. *Apao v. Bank of New York (9th Cir. 2003) 324 F.3d 1091*

When nonjudicial foreclosure sale was void due to trustee's failure to properly execute ministerial acts, amount of interest due buyer on return of sale proceeds was 7 percent [*Cal. Const., art. XV, sec. 1*] rather than 10 percent under *Civ. Code § 3289* (legal rate of interest chargeable after breach of contract that does not stipulate interest rate is 10 percent). *Pro Value Properties Inc. v. Quality Loan Service Corp. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 579, 583, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 381*

Nonjudicial foreclosure does not involve constitutional rights or free speech, but rather concerns a commercial transaction that is not protected activity under the anti-SLAPP statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16*]; trial court therefore properly denied special motion to strike wrongful foreclosure cause of action. *Garretson v. Post (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1508, 1524-1525, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 230*

Lender and trustee were indispensable parties in action to set aside trustee's sale, and therefore default judgment in that action against the purchaser of the property was subject to collateral attack in subsequent action. *Washington Mutual Bank v. Blechman (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 662, 669, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 87*

Trustee who was negligent in believing it was trustee of record and who conveyed title to successful bidder in nonjudicial foreclosure sale owed no duty to subsequent purchasers of the property. *Heritage Oaks Partners v. First American Title Ins. Co. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 339, 346, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 510*

Premature service of notice of sale in nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings was not prejudicial to borrowers, who received more than 20-day notice required under *Civ. Code § 2924b(b)(2)*; accordingly, summary judgment was properly granted defendants in borrowers' action seeking to set aside foreclosure. *Knapp v. Doherty (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 76, 92-93, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Nonjudicial foreclosure sale is subject to automatic stay pending appeal in lawsuit concerning title to property. *Royal Thrift & Loan Co. v. County Escrow, Inc. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 24, 36, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 37*

Foreclosure sale properly set aside when trustor and beneficiary agreed to postpone sale, trustee did not receive notice of postponement, and trustee never delivered deed to high bidder; relief to which bidder was entitled was return of its money, plus interest. *Residential Capital, LLC v. Cal-Western Reconveyance Corp. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 807, 823-824, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 162*

When escrow for sale of property closed on same day property was sold at foreclosure sale, fact that title passed to plaintiff on close of escrow did not mean foreclosure sale could be set aside; to protect interest in property from pending foreclosure, plaintiff had to ensure underlying obligation was satisfied, and lender did not receive payoff of debt before foreclosure sale. *Nguyen v. Calhoun (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 428, 442-443, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436*

Although nonjudicial foreclosure statutes call for automatic recission when there is a failure of consideration [*Civ. Code § 2924h(c)*], they do not otherwise provide for rescission; thus, mortgagee could not rescind trustee's sale on basis that it mistakenly made full credit bid. *Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. State Farm Fire and Casualty Co. (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 571, 580, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 367*

Nonjudicial foreclosure sale properly set aside when bidders agreed not to compete, in violation of *Civ. Code § 2924h(g)*. *Lo v. Jensen (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1095, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443*

Nothing bars party from rebutting recital in trustee's deed pertaining to amount of unpaid debt at time of trustee's sale by evidence showing that amount was different from that stated in deed. *Kolodge v. Boyd (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 349, 359, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 749*

Foreclosure sale improperly set aside because clerical error by beneficiary's agent setting opening bid at $10,000 rather than $100,000 was not a "procedural error independent of inadequacy of price." *6 Angels, Inc. v. Stuart-Wright Mortgage, Inc. (2001) 85 Cal. App. 4th 1279, 1285, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 711*

Trustee's duty to conduct sale fairly and openly does not extend to duty to bidders to provide detailed explanations concerning recorded encumbrances. *Ostayan v. Serrano Reconveyance Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1411, 1420, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 577*

Nonjudicial sale was properly set aside when defects in notice of default and notice of sale were discovered after sale but before issuance of trustee's deed. *Angell v. Superior Court (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 691, 700, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 657*

Prepayment penalty was includable in amount sought at private sale when right to penalty was set forth in note. *Golden Forest Properties Inc. v. Columbia Sav. & Loan Assn. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 193, 197-199, 248 Cal. Rptr. 316*

Agent of trustee was permitted to bid at private sale. *Stephens, Partain & Cunningham v. Hollis (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 948, 952-955, 242 Cal. Rptr. 251*

Statutory provisions governing chargeable costs and fees in nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding were not applicable when trustor initiated equitable proceeding to enjoin sale. *Sweatt v. Foreclosure Co. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 273, 278, 212 Cal. Rptr. 350*

When there were two or more beneficiaries, any one was empowered to give notice of default and election to sell in event of default. *Perkins v. Chad Development Corp. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 645, 651, 157 Cal. Rptr. 201*

Right to exercise power of sale under trust deed was not affected by death or insanity of trustor. *Strutt v. Ontario Sav. & Loan Assn. (1970) 11 Cal. App.3d 547, 553, 90 Cal. Rptr. 69* (insanity); *New York Life Ins. Co. v. Doane (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 233, 238, 56 P.2d 989* (death)

Even though *Civ. Code § 2924b* requires copies of notice of default or sale to be sent by registered or certified mail, notice was valid when sent by regular mail and received within statutory time. *Crummer v. Whitehead (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 264, 267-268, 40 Cal. Rptr. 826*

[13] Property Encumbered

Severed fixture becomes personal property no longer included as part of encumbered property. *Stowell v. Waddingham (1893) 100 Cal. 7, 9-10, 34 P. 436*

[14] Reconveyance

When signatures on request for reconveyance were forged but reconveyance document was not forged, reconveyance was voidable rather than void and bone fide purchaser for value took property free and clear of plaintiffs' lien. *Schiavon v. Arnaudo Bros. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 374, 381, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 801*

When trustee mistakenly reconveyed, trustor who received full proceeds after sale was liable on ground of unjust enrichment if trustor had knowledge of mistaken reconveyance. *First Nationwide Savings v. Perry (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1657, 1666-1667, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 173*

[15] Subordination Agreements

Seller could not obtain readjustment of priorities under automatic subordination theory when record showed she had tried her case on fraud and conspiracy theory and not on contract theory. *Brown v. Boren (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1303, 1319-1320, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 758*

Agreement that misstates amount of lien to be subordinated is enforceable when intent of parties is clear. *Klingele v. Engelman (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1482, 1485, 238 Cal. Rptr. 199*

[16] Substitution of Trustee

Reformation of substitution of trustee was proper when substitution erroneously failed to indicate it was substitution as to one parcel only and that original trustee was retained for purposes of pending foreclosure proceedings. *Jones v. First American Title Ins. Co. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 381, 389, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 859*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsEquitable MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.106

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.106 Attorney General Opinions

Civ. Code § 2955, requiring impound account funds to be retained and reinvested in California, is constitutional. *62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 351, 351-356 (1979)*

When trustor enters land conservation agreement with county, consent of beneficiary is not required, but in absence of consent, purchaser at trustee'ssale takes title free of restrictions of agreement. *51 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 80, 83-88 (1968)*

Trust deed securing obligation subject to Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*) must be physically attached to contract evidencing obligation. *45 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 8, 9-11 (1965)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesDeposits in CourtContracts LawSales of GoodsBreach, Repudiation & ExcuseInstallment Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.107

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.107 Law Reviews

Comment, *Subrogation of Mortgages in California: A Comparison with the Restatement and Proposals for Change, 48 UCLA L. Rev. 1633 (2001)*

Freeman and Gurev, *An Overview of Defenses Available to Guarantors of Real Property Secured Transactions Under California Law, 38 Santa Clara L. Rev. 329 (1998)*

Sheppard, *Code of Civil Procedure Section 580b, Anti-Deficiency Protection Regarding Purchase Money Debts: Arguments for the Inclusion of Refinanced Purchase Money Obligations Within the Anti-Deficiency Protection of Section 580b, 6 S. Cal. Interdis. L.J. 245 (1997)*

Comment, *Will Refinancing Your Home Mortgage Risk Your Life Savings?: Refinancing and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 580b , 43 UCLA L. Rev. 2077 (1996)*

Knox, *Procedures to Delay Real Property Foreclosures, 23 W. St. U.L. Rev. 303 (1996)*

Harris, *Code of Civil Procedure Section 580b Revisited: Freedom of Contract in Real Estate Purchase Agreements, 30 San Diego L. Rev. 509 (1993)*

Lurie, *Application of California Code of Civil Procedure Section 580d to a Guaranty Secured by Real Property, 28 Cal. W.L. Rev. 51 (1991-1992)*

Comment, *The Sanction for Violation of California's One-Action Rule, 79 Cal. L. Rev. 1601 (1991)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawCongressional Duties & PowersContracts ClauseGeneral OverviewContracts LawThird PartiesSubrogationReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.108

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.108 Text References

Bernhardt, California Mortgage and Deed of Trust Practice (Cal. CEB 2d ed. 1990)

California Real Property Financing (Cal. CEB 1988)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 634-637 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 4, *Security Transactions in Real Property*, § 1 et seq. (10th ed. 2005)

Miller & Starr, Current Law of California Real Estate (2d ed. 1989), vol. 4, ch. 9, *Deeds of Trust and Mortgages*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.109-555.119

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.109[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
1. Discharge of Obligation

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.120

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.120 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020] and for Damages and Penalty [Civ. Code §§ 2941(d), 3281]--Nonperformance of Statutory Duty on Discharge of Secured Obligation [Civ. Code § 2941(b)]

[1] FORM Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020] and for Damages and Penalty [Civ. Code §§ 2941(d), 3281]--Nonperformance of Statutory Duty on Discharge of Secured Obligation [Civ. Code § 2941(b), (c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name(s) of defendant(s)*	)	COMPLAINT TO QUIET TITLE AND FOR DAMAGES AND PENALTY
],	)	
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence of plaintiff, e.g.,* a California corporation authorized to engage in, and engaging in, the banking business as a California state bank].

2. Defendant, _____ [*name of trustee*], is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence, e.g.*, a partnership sued under the name that it has assumed, with its principal place of business in _____ County, California].

3. Defendant, _____ [*name of beneficiary*], is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence, e.g.*, a resident of _____ County, California].

[4. Defendants DOES I through _____, inclusive, have, or claim to have, an interest in the property, the exact nature of which is unknown to plaintiff. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names, interests, rights, and capacities of defendants sued as DOES I through _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by those fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names, rights, interests, and capacities when they are ascertained.]

5. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff, for a valuable consideration, made and delivered a promissory note ("the note") in the sum of $_____, with interest at the rate of _____ percent, dated _____ [*date*] and recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.

6. On the same day, plaintiff executed and delivered to defendant _____ (name of beneficiary), as beneficiary, a certain trust deed ("the trust deed") recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, and covering the following described real property situated in that county ("the property"): _____ [*describe property, including both legal description and street address or common designation, if any*]. The trust deed conveyed the property to defendant _____ [*name*] as trustee.

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and _____ [*name*] ("the purchaser") entered into a written contract by the terms of which plaintiff agreed to sell and the purchaser agreed to buy the property for the price of $_____, subject to the condition that title of record to the property be cleared and the sale be consummated on or before _____ [*date*]. As required by the purchaser, the contract expressly provided that time was of the essence. To secure this contract, plaintiff was required to deposit $_____ into escrow, which, pursuant to the contract of sale, was to be forfeited to the purchaser in the event plaintiff was unable to clear title on or before _____ [*date*]. A copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference. As required by the contract, an escrow was opened into which the purchaser deposited the full purchase price to be delivered to plaintiff on completion of the sale, and plaintiff deposited $_____, to be delivered to the purchaser should plaintiff fail to provide a clear title of record.

8. Plaintiff, on or about _____ [*date*], paid in full the obligation secured by the trust deed. At that time plaintiff, in writing, [notified defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) of the terms and conditions of the pending sale and] requested that defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) expedite the execution and recording of a reconveyance and deliver to plaintiff the note and trust deed. A copy of the request is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

9. In spite of plaintiff's payment of the secured obligation and repeated requests that defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) reconvey the title to plaintiff as required by law [and deliver to plaintiff the note and trust deed], defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to do so[, with full knowledge of the pending sale of the property and that completion of the sale would depend on the recording of a reconveyance on or before _____ (*date*), and that time was of the essence].

10. As a proximate result of this failure and refusal of defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) to

reconvey, _____ [*specify detriment sustained as result of this breach of statutory duty and damages, e.g.,* plaintiff was unable to clear title to the property on or before _____ (*date*), the sale agreement was terminated by its own terms, and plaintiff's deposit in escrow, together with the purchase price deposited by the purchaser, were delivered to the purchaser, to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____. After the date title had to be cleared, the market value of the property plummeted, and the property is now worth no more than $_____. As a further proximate result of this failure and refusal, plaintiff has been damaged in the sum of $_____ (*difference between contract price and present market value*)].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For judgment quieting plaintiff's title to the property against defendants;

2. For damages in the sum of $_____;

3. For a statutory penalty in the further sum of $300;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters that are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a complaint for use by a trustor to quiet title [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*; [6], *below*] against a trustee and beneficiary, and to recover damages sustained as a proximate result of the beneficiary's breach of the statutory duty to execute and record a full reconveyance on discharge of the obligation secured by the trust deed [*see Civ. Code § 2941(d)*; *§ 555.19*].

Although this complaint assumes that the security instrument is a deed of trust, the form may be easily modified to apply to a mortgage and a certificate of discharge [*see Civ. Code § 2941(a)*; *§ 555.19*]. Further, if appropriate, it may be revised to reflect the fact that the action is being brought (1) by the heirs, successors, or assigns of the trustor, or (2) against the assignee of the beneficiary or trustee [*see Civ. Code § 2941(a), (b)*; *§ 555.19*].

This complaint is adapted from the fact situation in *Dixon v. Grossman (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 941, 944, 99 Cal. Rptr. 659* , in which the court of appeal held that the plaintiff was entitled to have the title quieted and to recover the statutory penalty only, after concluding that sufficient evidence supported the trial court's finding that plaintiff had suffered no actual damages from the loss of the pending sale of the property.

[3] Allegations

The required contents of a complaint to quiet title are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020* [*see* [6], *below*]. This complaint alleges the following facts:

- The plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 1).
- The defendants' capacity and status as the trustee and beneficiary under the trust deed (Paragraphs 2 and 3) [*see Civ. Code § 2941(a), (b)*].
- The execution by the plaintiff of the promissory note (Paragraph 5) [*see Civ. Code § 2941(b)*].
- The execution by the plaintiff of the trust deed, and a description of the property (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*].
- The facts concerning the plaintiff's contract to sell the property (Paragraph 7).
- Payment of the obligation secured by the trust deed, entitling the plaintiff to a reconveyance (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 2941(a), (b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(b)*].
- A request for the return of the original note and trust deed (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 2941(b)*].
- The defendant's breach of the statutory duty to reconvey (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 2941(b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*].
- The detriment sustained by the plaintiff as a proximate result of the breach (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 3282*].
- The plaintiff's damages (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code §§ 2941(d), 3281*].

[4] Verification

A complaint to quiet title must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*].

PRACTICE TIP:

File and Serve Lis Pendens. Counsel also must file and record a lis pendens as a prerequisite to maintaining a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010(h)*]. If the plaintiff does not do so, defendant's counsel should consider bringing a motion to strike the quiet title claim. *By William M. Hensley*

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction of actions to quiet title [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*; [6], *below*] is in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040*]. The county in which the real property is situated is the proper county for trial of a quiet title action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.050*].

[6] Quiet Title Actions

Actions to quiet title are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.* The remedy provided by these provisions is cumulative and not exclusive of any other remedy, form or right of action, or proceeding provided by law for establishing or quieting title to property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.030(a)*]. However, in any action in which quieting title is in issue, the court, in its discretion, may, on motion of any party, require that the issue be resolved pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.* to the extent practicable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.030(b)*].

[7] Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, as well as fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to fax service and filing of papers, see Ch. 264, *Fax Service and Filing of Papers*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to quiet title actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
1. Discharge of Obligation

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.121-555.124

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.121[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.125

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.125 Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020]--By Mortgagor

[1] FORM Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020]--By Mortgagor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH DEED AS MORT-
Defendant.	)	GAGE AND QUIET TITLE
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant, _____ [*name*], is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence, e.g.,* a partnership sued under the name that it has assumed, with its principal place of business

in _____ County, California].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was the owner of certain real property located at _____ [*street address or common designation, if any*] in _____ County, California, and described as follows ("the property"): _____ [*legal description*].

4. Plaintiff's title at that time was based on _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a deed from _____ (*name of plaintiff's grantor*) granting the property in fee simple to plaintiff, dated _____ (*date*) and recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____].

5. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff, for a valuable consideration, made and delivered a promissory note in the sum of $_____, with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum, payable _____ [*specify terms of payment*] ("the note"). Defendant is presently the holder of the note, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

6. On the same day, plaintiff executed and delivered to defendant a deed to the property. On _____ [*date*], that deed was recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. A copy of that deed is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. Thatdeed was in fact a mortgage only and was intended by both parties to be mortgage only, in that it was executed and delivered solely to secure payment of the note.

[7. *If accounting of rents and profits is sought from defendant as grantee in possession, allege:* On or about _____ (*date*), defendant entered into actual possession of the property and since that time has received and retained the rents and profits derived from the property.]

[*EITHER*]

8. Plaintiff has paid all sums due to defendant under the note, as follows: _____ [*specify amounts and manner of payment*]. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff demanded that defendant reconvey the title to plaintiff. Defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to reconvey or to recognize the deed (Exhibit B) as a mortgage only.

[*OR*]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff offered to pay defendant the _____ [whole sum *or* the unpaid balance] of principal and interest [owing and] unpaid under the terms of the note, in the sum of $_____, and demanded that defendant reconvey the title to plaintiff. Defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to accept this tender or to reconvey or to recognize the deed (Exhibit B) as a mortgage only.

[*OR*]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff offered to pay defendant the _____ [whole sum *or* the unpaid balance] of principal and interest [owing and] unpaid under the terms of the note, less the rents and profits received by defendant, and requested defendant to give an accounting of rents and profits received and to deliver possession and reconvey the title on being paid whatever sum was found to be due defendant on the account. Defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to account to plaintiff, to deliver possession or reconvey, or to

recognize the deed (Exhibit B) as a mortgage only.

[*CONTINUE*]

9. Plaintiff seeks a determination quieting title as against the defendant as of _____ [*date*] [because _____ (*if date is other than date complaint was filed, allege why determination as of that date is sought*)].

[10. *If unpaid balance is due, allege:* Plaintiff is ready to pay defendant whatever balance and interest are due on the note and offers to deliver this amount into the court for payment.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That the deed attached as Exhibit B be adjudged to be a mortgage;

[*EITHER*]

2. That the court [order an accounting of the rents and profits received by defendant and, after deducting this amount,] determine the amount [owing and] unpaid on the note;

3. That plaintiff be allowed to deposit whatever amount is adjudged due with the clerk of the court for defendant's benefit in discharge of the note and, on condition of making the deposit, plaintiff have title to the property quieted in plaintiff;

[*OR*]

2. That the note be adjudged to have been fully paid;

3. That plaintiff have title to the property quieted in plaintiff;

[*CONTINUE*]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by the grantor under a deed absolute on its face, to establish that the deed was intended to be a mortgage only [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925*] and to quiet title against the grantee after discharge of the debt secured by the mortgage. For further discussion of this particular type of action, see *§ 555.22*.

This form may be modified to state a cause of action against the mortgagee's successor in interest, other than a good faith purchaser or lienholder [*Civ. Code §§ 2925, 2950*]. It may also be modified for use as a complaint for declaratory relief when the mortgagor merely seeks a declaration that a deed absolute on its face is in fact a mortgage [*see Orlando v. Berns (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 753, 754-757, 316 P.2d 705]* .

For a form of judgment, see *§ 555.126*. For a complaint by a mortgagee to establish a deed as a mortgage and to foreclose, see *§ 555.127*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes the following allegations, which are essential to state a cause of action to establish a deed absolute on its face as a mortgage and to quiet title in favor of the mortgagor:

- The mortgagor's title to the property in question and a description of the property (Paragraphs 3 and 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a),(b)*];

- The execution and delivery of the deed solely to secure a debt, and the parties' intent that it be a mortgage only (Paragraphs 5 and 6) [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*];

- The mortgagor's payment of the debt, or offer to pay the debt, secured by the mortgage (Paragraphs 8) [*see Aguilar v. Bocci (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 475, 476-477, 114 Cal. Rptr. 91]* ;

- The date as of which the determination as to title is sought (Paragraph 9) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)*].

For further discussion of allegations necessary to state a cause of action for quiet title generally, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action to quiet title is within the jurisdiction of the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040*]. The proper county for the trial of an action to quiet title to real property is the county in which some or all of the property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.050(a)*].

[5] Verification

A complaint seeking to quiet title must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.126

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.126 Judgment Declaring Deed to Be Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2888, 2924(a), 2925] and Quieting Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010]

[1] FORM Judgment Declaring Deed to Be Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2888, 2924(a), 2925] and Quieting Title [Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

This action came on regularly for trial on _____ [*date*] in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above entitled court, the Honorable _____ [*name*], Judge, presiding[, sitting without a jury]. Plaintiff appeared by _____ [*name*], counsel, and defendant appeared by _____ [*name*], counsel. Oral and documentary evidence was presented by both parties. The cause was argued and submitted for decision. A statement of decision _____ [has been made and filed *or* was not requested].

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. As of _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of plaintiff*] was the sole owner of the title in fee simple to the following real property: _____ [*legal description*].

2. The instrument executed by _____ [*name of plaintiff*] to _____ [*name of defendant*] in the form of a grant deed dated _____ [*date*], which is recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, which purported to convey to defendant the above-described property, is in fact and law a mortgage to secure payment of an obligation evidenced by a promissory note dated _____ [*date*], in the sum of $_____.

[*EITHER*]

3. The above-described note has been fully paid.

4. Title to the above-described property is hereby quieted in _____ [*name of plaintiff*], and _____ [*name of defendant*] owns no right, title, estate, interest, or lien, whatever, in the property.

[*OR*]

3. The above-described note has a balance of principal and interest owing and unpaid on _____ [*date*], in the sum of $_____.

4. On payment to _____ [*name of defendant*] of $_____ on or before _____ [*date*], title to the above-described property shall be quieted in _____ [*name of plaintiff*], whereupon _____ [*name of defendant*] shall own no right, title, estate, interest, or lien whatever in the property. On the motion of any interested party after that date, the court shall enter an order confirming the payment and giving effect to this judgment as described in this paragraph or, if payment be not made, an order dismissing this action.

[*CONTINUE*]

5. Plaintiff shall recover costs from defendant.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is a form of judgment for use by the mortgagor in an action to establish a deed absolute on its face as a mortgage and to quiet the mortgagor's title to the property. If the mortgagor has not previously paid the debt, the judgment quieting title must be conditioned on discharge of the secured obligation. For a related complaint, see *§ 555.125[2]*. For further discussion and forms relating to judgments in quiet title actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

In an action to establish a deed as a mortgage, in which the mortgagor sought to recover clear title to the property on payment of the amount found to be due, the judgment properly provided for dismissal on the defendant's motion if the plaintiff failed to pay the amount determined to be due within a reasonable time set by the court, but the judgment could not provide for foreclosure of the mortgage [*Cline v. Robbins (1896) 112 Cal. 581, 585-586, 44 P. 1023]* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion of obtaining, amending, or attacking judgments in general, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview, et seq.* and Ch. 318, *Judgments*

For discussion and forms relating to statements of decision, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.127

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.127 Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Foreclose [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]--By Mortgagee

[1] FORM Complaint to Establish Deed As Mortgage [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925] and to Foreclose [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]--By Mortgagee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT TO FORECLOSE UNDER MORT-
Defendant.	)	GAGE
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.125[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], defendant, for a valuable consideration, made and delivered a promissory note in the sum of $_____, with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum, payable _____ [*specify terms of payment*] ("the note"). Plaintiff is presently the holder of the note, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

4. On the same day, defendant executed and delivered to plaintiff a deed to the property. On _____ [*date*], that deed was recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. A copy of that deed is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference. That deed was in fact a mortgage only and was intended by both parties to be a mortgage only, in that it was executed and delivered solely to secure payment of the note.

5. Defendant has defaulted under the terms of the note, in that _____ [*specify default, e.g.*, he has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to make payments of $_____, principal and interest, due on _____ (*date*), and subsequent months, to and including _____ (*date*), and amounting to $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That the deed attached as Exhibit B be adjudged to be a mortgage securing payment of the obligation evidenced by the promissory note attached as Exhibit A;

2. [*Set out remainder of prayer as in foreclosure action. See § 555.160[1]*].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a mortgagee as the grantee of a deed absolute, to establish that the deed is in fact a mortgage [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925*] and then to foreclose the mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*; *see § 555.22[5][b]*]. This form may be modified by including, as appropriate, additional allegations set forth in a usual complaint for foreclosure, such as allegations necessary for recovery of a deficiency judgment or for naming junior lienholders as defendants [*see § 555.160*; *see also § 555.163* (foreclosure decree)].

For a complaint by a mortgagor to establish a deed as a mortgage and to quiet title, see *§ 555.125*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes the following allegations, which are essential to state a cause of action to establish a deed absolute on its face as a mortgage for the purpose of foreclosing the mortgage [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*]:

- A debt (Paragraph 3);

- Execution of a deed solely for the purpose of securing the debt and serving as a mortgage (Paragraph 4);

- The mortgagor's default under the terms of the secured obligation, entitling the mortgagee to foreclosure (Paragraph 5).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.128

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.128 Complaint to Establish and Foreclose Equitable Mortgage on Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint to Establish and Foreclose Equitable Mortgage on Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT TO FORECLOSE UNDER EQUIT-
Defendant.	)	ABLE MORTGAGE
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.125[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. _____ [*Allege instrument intended to secure debt, e.g.,* On the same day, and as part of the same transaction, defendant executed and delivered to plaintiff an agreement to provide certain real property then owned by defendant as security for payment of the note, by naming plaintiff as beneficiary in a trust deed to be executed and delivered for that purpose. By the terms of this agreement, the real property to be provided as security is located in _____ County, California, and is described as follows: _____ (*legal description and street address or common designation, if any*). A copy of this agreement is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference].

5. Defendant has defaulted under the terms of the note in that _____ [*specify default, e.g.,* she has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to make payments of $_____, principal and interest, due on _____ (*date*), and subsequent months, to and including _____ (*date*), and amounting to $_____]. _____ [*Allege failure to execute formal security instrument, e.g.,* Further, Defendant has failed to execute and deliver the trust deed mentioned above].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That the real property described above be decreed to be subject to an equitable mortgage in favor of plaintiff, to the extent of $_____.

2. [*Set out remainder of prayer as in foreclosure action. See § 555.160[1]*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a creditor to establish a written agreement as an equitable mortgage [*see, e.g., Higgins v. Manson (1899) 126 Cal. 467, 469-470, 58 P. 907* ; *Schelling v. Thomas (1929) 96 Cal. App. 682, 684, 687-688, 274 P. 755* (written promise to give mortgage or trust deed held enforceable as equitable mortgage)] and then to foreclose the mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.23*. For a related form of judgment, see *§ 555.129*.

This form may be modified by including, as appropriate, additional allegations set forth in a usual complaint for foreclosure, such as allegations necessary for recovery of a deficiency judgment or for naming junior lienholders as defendants [*see § 555.160*; *see also § 555.163* (foreclosure decree)].

An executory agreement in writing, in which a debtor sufficiently indicates the intent to make certain real property security for the debt, is deemed in equity to create an enforceable mortgage on that property except as against good faith purchasers or lienholders [*Kaiser Industries Corp. v. Taylor (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 346, 351, 94 Cal. Rptr. 773]* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint includes the following allegations, which are essential to state a cause of action to establish a writing as an equitable mortgage for the purpose of foreclosing the mortgage [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726*; *see Coast Bank v. Minderhout (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 311, 313-314, 38 Cal. Rptr. 505, 392 P.2d 265* (overruled on other grounds in

Wellenkamp v. Bank of America (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 943, 953, 148 Cal. Rptr. 379, 582 P.2d 970); *Civ. Code §§ 2924(a), 2925*]:

- A debt owed to the plaintiff (Paragraph 3).

- The creation of an instrument that evidences the parties' intent that certain real property should be provided as security for the debt (Paragraph 4).

- A default under the terms of the secured obligation, entitling the plaintiff to foreclosure (Paragraph 5).

[4] Cross References

For further discussion and forms relating to impression and foreclosure of equitable liens on real property, see *Ch. 342, Liens and Wage Preferences*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.129

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.129 Judgment Establishing and Foreclosing Equitable Mortgage [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

[1] FORM Judgment Establishing and Foreclosing Equitable Mortgage [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)]

[*Caption and recitals. See § 555.126[1].*]

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. The real property subject to this decree is located at _____ [*street address or common designation, if any*] in _____ County, California, and is described as follows: _____ [*legal description*].

2. The above-described real property is subject to an equitable mortgage that constitutes a lien in favor of _____ [*name of plaintiff*] to the extent of $_____, together with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum from and after _____ [*date*] until paid.

3. [*Set out remainder of judgment as in foreclosure action. See § 555.163[1]*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a form of judgment for use by the plaintiff in an action to establish and foreclose an equitable mortgage. For a related complaint and discussion of such an action, see *§ 555.128*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
2. Deed Absolute as Mortgage; Equitable Mortgage

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.130-555.134

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.130[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
3. Trustee's Status and Obligations in General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.135

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.135 Declaration of Trustee's Nonmonetary Status [Civ. Code § 2924 *l*]

[1] FORM Declaration of Trustee's Nonmonetary Status [Civ. Code § 2924 ***l***]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF TRUSTEE'S NONMONET-
Defendant.	)	ARY STATUS
	)	
	)	

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am the trustee under a trust deed dated _____, executed by _____ [*name*] as _____ [*trustor*] to _____ [me *or name of original trustee*] as trustee for _____ [*name*] as beneficiary, recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. That trust deed is the subject of this _____ [action *or* proceeding].

2. I _____ [know *or* maintain a reasonable belief] that I have been named as a defendant in this _____ [action *or* proceeding] solely in my capacity as trustee under the trust deed. Further, it is my reasonable belief that I have not been named as a defendant because of any acts or omissions on my part in the performance of my duties as trustee. The following is the basis for this [knowledge and] belief: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the action is a judicial foreclosure action by the beneficiary, and the beneficiary has acknowledged to me that I have been named simply as a nominal defendant and that the beneficiary is not seeking any monetary or other relief against me].

4. I agree to be bound by whatever order or judgment is issued by the court regarding the trust deed.

5. This declaration is made pursuant to *Civil Code Section 2924l*.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a declaration for use by a trustee under a trust deed when the trustee has been named in an action or proceeding in which the trust deed is the subject, and the trustee maintains a reasonable belief that the trustee has been named in the action or proceeding solely in the capacity of trustee and not as a result of any wrongful acts or omissions in the performance of duties as trustee. The trustee may file the declaration at any time [*Civ. Code § 2924 l*(a)].

For purposes of *Civ. Code § 2924l*, "trustee" includes any agent or employee of the trustee who performs some or all of the duties of a trustee under *Civ. Code § 2920 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(g)*].

[3] Contents

The declaration must set forth the following [*Civ. Code § 2924 l*(*b)*]:

- The status of the declarant as trustee under the trust deed that is the subject of the action or proceeding.

- That the declarant knows or maintains a reasonable belief that the declarant has been named as a defendant solely in the capacity of trustee under the trust deed.

- That the declarant maintains a reasonable belief that the declarant has not been named as a defendant because of any acts or omissions in the performance of duties as trustee.

- The basis for that knowledge or reasonable belief.

- That the declarant agrees to be bound by whatever order or judgment is issued by the court regarding the trust deed.

[4] Service; Objections; Subsequent Demand to Participate

The declaration must be served on the parties in the manner of serving papers in civil actions generally [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.*; *see also* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. The parties who have appeared in the action or proceeding will have 15 days from the service of the declaration in which to object to the

trustee's nonmonetary judgment status. Any objection must set forth the factual basis for the objection and be served on the trustee [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(c)*].

If a timely objection is made, the trustee will thereafter be required to participate in the action or proceeding [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(e)*]. Otherwise, the trustee will not be required to participate any further in the action or proceeding, will not be subject to any monetary awards for damages, attorneys' fees, or costs, will be allowed to respond to any discovery requests as a nonparty, and will be bound by any court order relating to the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(d)*].

If the parties do not duly object to the declaration but later, through discovery or otherwise, determine that the trustee should participate in the action because of the performance of duties as a trustee, the parties may file and serve on all parties and the trustee a motion to require the trustee to participate. The motion must be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473* (governing certain amendments to pleadings that may be allowed in the court's discretion) and specify the factual basis for the demand to participate [for coverage of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, *see* Ch. 21, *Amended and Supplemental Pleadings*]. On the court's granting of the motion, the trustee will thereafter be required to participate in the action or proceeding [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(e)*].

[5] Filing of Answer

On the filing of the declaration, the time within which the trustee must file an answer or other responsive pleading will be tolled for the period within which the other parties may respond to the declaration. On the timely service of an objection to the declaration, the trustee will have 30 days from the date of service within which to file an answer or other responsive pleading to the complaint or cross-complaint [*Civ. Code § 2924 l(f)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
3. Trustee's Status and Obligations in General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.136

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.136 Statutory Substitution of Trustee [Civ. Code § 2934a]--By All Beneficiaries

[1] FORM Statutory Substitution of Trustee [Civ. Code § 2934a]--By All Beneficiaries

	)
Recording requested by	)
_____ [*name*]	)
When recorded mail to	)
_____ [*name*]	)
_____ [*address*]	)
_____ [*city, state, zip*]	)
	)

_____

_____

Space above this line for recorder's use

SUBSTITUTION OF TRUSTEE

The undersigned hereby substitutes _____ [*name*] as trustee in place of _____ [*name*

], the trustee now of record, under that certain trust deed executed by _____ [*name*] as trustor to _____ [*name*] as trustee for _____ [*name*], as beneficiary, recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California at book _____, page _____.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Beneficiary

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

	)	
State of California,	)	ss.
County of _____.	)	

On _____ [*date*] before me, _____ [*name and title of officer*], personally appeared _____ [*name(s)*], who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity/capacities, and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity on behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: _____ (Seal)
Name of Office: _____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the sole beneficiary or all beneficiaries of a trust deed to substitute a new trustee in place of the trustee of record [*see Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)(A)*]. This form may be modified to substitute the trustee in multiple trust deeds that are recorded in the same county in which the substitution is being recorded and that all have the same trustee and beneficiary or beneficiaries [*see Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(4)*].

[3] Alternative Statutory Methods

Civ. Code § 2934a provides two alternative methods for substituting a trustee who is acting under a trust deed on real property or an estate for years in real property that (1) was given to secure an obligation to pay money, and (2) confers no duties on the trustee other than those that are incidental to the exercise of the power of sale conferred in the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)*]. Both methods require the recordation of a substitution statement in the county in which the property is located. Under the first method, the substitution (this form) must be executed and acknowledged by all of the beneficiaries of the trust deed, or their successors in interest. The substitution will be effective notwithstanding any contrary provision in the trust deed, provided the trust deed was executed after 1967 [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)(A)*]. For

a form of substitution under the second method, see *§ 555.137*.

Under either statutory method, the instrument of substitution must include the date of recordation of the trust deed, the name of the trustor, the book and page or instrument number where the trust deed is recorded, and the name of the new trustee [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(4)*]. A substitution may be accomplished, with respect to multiple trust deeds that are recorded in the same county in which the substitution is being recorded and that all have the same trustee and beneficiary or beneficiaries, by recording a single document that complies with the requirements and substitutes trustees for all of the trust deeds [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(4)*].

From the time the substitution is filed for record, the new trustee succeeds to all of the powers, duties, authority, and title granted and delegated to the trustee named in the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(4)*].

[4] Notice Requirements

If a substitution document is executed, but not recorded, before or concurrently with the recording of the notice of default, the beneficiary or beneficiaries or their authorized agents must cause notice of the substitution to be mailed, before or concurrently with the recording of the substitution document, to all persons to whom a copy of the notice of default wouldbe required to be mailed [*Civ. Code § 2934a(b)*]. If the substitution is effected after a notice of default has been recorded but before the recording of the notice of sale, the beneficiary or beneficiaries or their authorized agents must cause a copy of the substitution document to be mailed, before or concurrently with the recording of that document, to the trustee then of record and to all persons to whom a copy of the notice of default would be required to be mailed [*Civ. Code § 2934a(c)*]. An affidavit must be attached to the substitution document, stating that notice has been given to the persons and in the manner required [*Civ. Code § 2934a(b), (c)*; *see Civ. Code § 2924b* (requirements for mailing)].

A trustee named in a recorded substitution document must be deemed to be authorized to act as the trustee under the mortgage or deed of trust for all purposes from the date the substitution document is executed by the mortgagee, beneficiaries, or by their authorized agents. Nothing in *Civ. Code § 2934a* requires that a trustee under a recorded substitution document accept the substitution. Once recorded, the substitution document constitutes conclusive evidence of the authority of the substituted trustee or his or her agents to act [*Civ. Code § 2934a(d)*].

Unless a new notice of sale containing the name, street address, and telephone number of the substituted trustee is given in accordance with *Civ. Code § 2924f* after execution of the substitution document, any sale conducted by the substituted trustee will be void [*Civ. Code § 2934a(e)*].

[5] Format Requirements

The document must meet format requirements prescribed for recordable documents (for instance, a half-inch margin on each vertical side and the top 2.5 inches of the first page left blank for recording information) [*see Gov. Code § 27361.6*]. For discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 27, *Deeds and Recording* (Matthew Bender).

[6] Cross References

For discussion and alternative forms of acknowledgments, see Ch. 9, *Acknowledgments*

For additional forms of declarations and affidavits, which may be modified, see Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For a form of declaration of mailing, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25C, *Release and Reconveyance* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
3. Trustee's Status and Obligations in General

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.137

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.137 Statement by Beneficiaries Holding More Than 50 Percent of Specified Interests [Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)(B), (2)]

[1] FORM Statement by Beneficiaries Holding More Than 50 Percent of Specified Interests [Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)(B), (2)]

[*Recording information. See § 555.136[1].*]

STATEMENT BY PARTIES SIGNING SUBSTITUTION OF TRUSTEE

The undersigned, the beneficiaries who executed the Substitution of Trustee to which this statement is attached (the "Substitution of Trustee"), hereby assert the following.

(1) The Substitution of Trustee was signed pursuant to *Civil Code Section 2934a(a)(1)(B)*.

(2) None of the undersigned is a licensed real estate broker or an affiliate of the broker that is the issuer or servicer of the obligation secured by the trust deed ("Deed of Trust") described in the Substitution of Trustee.

(3) The undersigned together hold more than 50 percent of _____ [the record beneficial interest of a series of notes secured by the same real property securing the Deed of Trust *or* the undivided interests in a note secured by real property equivalent to a series transaction].

(4) Notice of the substitution was sent by certified mail, postage prepaid, with return receipt requested, to each holder of an interest in the obligation secured by the Deed of Trust identified in the Substitution of Trustee who has not joined in the execution of the Substitution of Trustee or this statement.

We, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Beneficiary
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Beneficiary

[*Acknowledgment. See § 555.136[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a separate statement that may be used in connection with a form of substitution of the trustee [*see § 555.136[1]*] when the substitution is effected by the holders of more than 50 percent of the record beneficial interest of a series of notes secured by the same real property securing the trust deed or of undivided interests in a note secured by real property equivalent to a series transaction [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(1)*].

A substitution executed under this method is not effective unless all of the parties signing the substitution also sign, under penalty of perjury, a separate written document (this form) containing certain specified statements regarding compliance with the applicable statutory requirements [*see Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(2)*]. This separate document must be attached to the substitution and must be recorded in each county in which the real property described in the trust deed is located. Once this separate document is recorded, it constitutes conclusive evidence of compliance with these statutory requirements in favor of substituted trustees acting pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2934a*, subsequent assignees of the obligation secured by the trust deed, and subsequent good faith purchasers or lienholders for value of the described real property [*Civ. Code § 2934a(a)(2)*].

For additional discussion, see *§ 555.136[3]* and *[4]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
4. Protections for Military Service Members

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.138

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.138 Petition for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Relief From Installment Contract or Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Purchase of Real Property by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407(a), (b), 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533]

[1] FORM Petition for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Relief From Installment Contract or Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Purchase of Real Property by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407(a), (b), 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 531, 532]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	PETITION BY ACTIVE
_____ [*name*],	)	SERVICE MEMBER FOR
Petitioner,	)	STAY OF FORECLOSURE
vs.	)	PROCEEDINGS AND
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	OTHER APPROPRIATE
Respondent(s)	)	RELIEF WITH REGARD
	)	TO _____
	)	INSTALLMENT *or* MORTGAGE]
	)	PAYMENTS
	)	

_____

1. Petitioner _____ [*name*] is currently an active member of the military service of the United States, being a member of _____ [*describe service, rank, and position*].

2. Respondent _____ [*name*] is a _____ [*describe, e.g.,* lending institution doing business in California].

3. Before entry into activity military service, Petitioner executed _____ [*describe and attach as exhibit to petition, e.g.,* an installment loan agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ (*e.g.,* A) to this Petition] with Respondent for a loan to purchase real property located at _____ [*address of property*], with the loan to be secured by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a mortgage *or* a deed of trust] on that property and with payments on the loan to be made under the terms of the agreement.

4. Petitioner now finds that, because of active military service, he/she is unable to keep up with the payments required by the agreement with Respondent described in Paragraph 3, above. As a result, Respondent began foreclosure proceedings against the Petitioner on _____ [*date*], by serving the notice attached as Exhibit _____ [*e.g.,* B] to this document. The details of why Petitioner's military service interferes with his/her ability to keep up with the loan are as follows: _____ [*describe*].

5. Petitioner requests the Court to provide relief from the agreement described in Paragraph 3, and set out in full as Exhibit _____ [*e.g.,* A] to this Petition, under the authority granted to the Court by the *California Military & Veterans Code Sections 407, 408*, and by the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act at *50 United States Code Appendix Sections 532, 533*. In addition to the stay of foreclosure proceedings, Petitioner seeks the following relief from the Court: _____ [*describe desired action in as great as detail as possible, including suggested time for relief and subsequent resumption of payments.*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a petition for stay of foreclosure proceedings and related relief with regard to an installment contract or mortgage for the purchase of real property. It may be filed with the court by an active member of the United States military who otherwise meets the requirements for this type of relief with regard to an installment contract or mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage on real property. The form provides the court with information on the key elements that must be satisfied for the court to have authority to modify the terms of the installment or mortgage loan agreement and to provide relief for the active service member [*Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407(a), (b), 408*; *50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533*; *see* [3], *below*].

[3] Court's Authority to Provide Relief for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

A court has extensive latitude in handling claims against a person who has joined military service after the date when he or she has given a deposit or paid an installment of the purchase price under a contract for the purchase of real or personal property, or purchased property secured by a mortgage, deed of trust, or other similar security [*Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408*; *50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533*].

With regard to proceedings to enforce mortgages and similar obligations of active service members, on application to the court by an active service member (or another person on the service member's behalf) or on the court's own motion, the court must stay the proceedings and take any other action to conserve the interest of all the parties if it finds that the

ability of the defendant to comply with the terms of the obligation is materially affected by reason of the member's military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(b)*]. This applies to proceedings arising out of nonpayment of any sum due or out of any other breach of the terms of the mortgage commenced in any court during the period of military service to enforce the obligation. It covers obligations secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage on real property owned by a service member at the commencement of the period of the military service, and still owned by the service member whose obligations originated before the person's period of military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(a), (b)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(a), (b)*].

An active service member is otherwise protected from foreclosure and similar actions. To be valid, any sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for nonpayment of any sum due under any obligation, or for any other breach of the terms made during the member's period of military service or within three months thereafter (or 90 days under the federal law), except pursuant to an agreement between the parties, may only take place on an order previously granted by the court and a return made and approved by the court [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*]. This is applicable to actions taken under a power of sale, a judgment entered on warrant of attorney to confess judgment contained in the warrant, or otherwise [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)*]. Any person who knowingly makes or causes to be made any invalid sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property, or attempts to do so, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(d)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(d)(1)*].

Similarly, with regard to installment contracts to purchase real property, the court may use its discretion, and on its own motion make any other disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)*]. If the court finds that terminating the contract and allowing the lender to resume possession of the property is an appropriate form of relief, the court may order the repayment of prior installments or deposits or any part of those as a condition of that relief [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(c)(1)*]. A service member who meets the requirements for relief is protected by the law from any other actions from the lender or another party. Only by action of a court of competent jurisdiction may the selling party attempt to exercise any right or option under the contract to rescind or terminate the contract or resume possession of the property for nonpayment of any installment due, or for any other breach of its terms occurring before or during the period of the person's military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(a)* (installment contract may not be rescinded or terminated without court order)]. A lender or seller who knowingly resumes possession of the subject property, or attempts to do so, is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(c)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 532(b)(1)*].

For a general discussion of protection from foreclosure and other similar types of relief for active service members, see *§ 555.70[8]*.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction under California law is in the superior court of the county in which the property is located [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.40, 760.50]. Jurisdiction is also granted by the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*], which applies to any noncriminal proceedings commenced in any court in the United States, the individual states and territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(a), (b)*]. Under the SCRA, appropriate courts include any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*]. Any application under SCRA that is required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has commenced may be made to any court that would otherwise have jurisdiction over the matter [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
4. Protections for Military Service Members

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.139

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.139 Application for Stay in Response to Attempt to Collect Real Property Taxes or Assessments on Property Owned by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2; 50 U.S.C. App. § 561]

[1] FORM Application for Stay in Response to Attempt to Collect Real Property Taxes or Assessments on Property Owned by Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code § 411; 50 U.S.C. App. § 560]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Petitioner,	)	APPLICATION FOR STAY
vs.	)	OF PROCEEDINGS TO
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	COLLECT REAL PROPERTY
Respondent(s)	)	TAXES OR ASSESSMENTS
	)	FROM ACTIVE SERVICE MEMBER
	)	

_____

1. Petitioner _____ [*name*] is currently an active member of the military service of the United States, being a member of _____ [*describe service, rank, and position*].

2. Respondent _____ [*name*] is a _____ [*name of taxing entity, e.g.,* the Tax Collector for Contra Costa County California].

3. Before entry into activity military service, Petitioner purchased residential real property at _____ [*specify address of real property*], described in the records of _____ [*name of taxing entity*] as Parcel Number _____.

4. The property taxes now due on the property described in Paragraph 3 are as follows: _____ [*described in detail, including current assessments and passed due taxes*]. All relevant documents received from _____ [*name of taxing entity*] are attached as Exhibit _____. Therefore, a total amount of $_____ is now owed by Petitioner to _____ [*name of taxing entity*].

5. Petitioner now finds that, because of active military service, he/she is unable to pay the amount of taxes owed on the property, as described above. The details of why Petitioner's military service interferes with his/her ability to keep up with the loan is as follows: _____ [*describe in detail*].

6. Petitioner requests the Court to provide relief from the property taxes described above, and as set out in full in the attached Exhibit _____ to this Petition, under the authority granted by the *California Military & Veterans Code Section 407*, and by the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act at *50 United States Code Appendix Section 561*. Petitioner seeks the following relief from the Court: _____ [*describe desired action such as suspension of tax payments until end of active military service, and any other type of relief desired*.]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an application for a stay of proceedings that may be used in response to an attempt by a taxing entity to collect taxes or assessments on real property of active service members who otherwise meet the requirements for preferential treatment under California or federal law [*see* [3], *below*]. The petition provides the court with information on the key elements that must be satisfied for the court to have authority to provide this relief for an active service member.

[3] Court's Authority to Provide Relief for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

An active service member may seek protection in response to an attempt by a taxing entity to collect any general or special property taxes or assessments that fall due before or during a service members period of military service and are not paid. This applies to taxes on real property owned and occupied for dwelling, professional, business, or agricultural purposes by a service member or his or her dependents at the commencement of the member's period of military service and still so occupied by the service member's dependents or employees [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2(a)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 561(a)* (also applies to taxes on personal property, money, or credits, but not to taxes on income)]. The property may not be sold to enforce the collection of any tax or assessment, or any proceeding or action commenced for that purpose, except on leave of court granted on application by the collector of taxes or other officer whose duty it is to enforce the collection of taxes or assessments. The court may then stay the proceedings or sale for a period extending not more than six months after the member's termination of military service (180 days under the federal statute), unless the court finds that the ability of the service member to pay the taxes or assessments is not materially affected by reason of his or her military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2(b)*; *see 50 U.S.C. App. § 561(b)*]. The unpaid tax or assessment will bear interest until paid at the rate of 6 percent per year. No other penalty or interest may be incurred by reason of the nonpayment. Any lien for any unpaid taxes or assessment must also include 6 percent interest on the lien [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2(d)*; *50 U.S.C. App. § 561(d)*].

If by law the service member's property may be sold or forfeited to enforce the collection of any tax or assessment, the service member has the right to redeem or commence an action to redeem that property, at any time not later than six months (180 days under the federal statute) after the termination of the period of military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2(c)*; *50 U.S.C. App. § 561(c)*].

For a general discussion of protection from foreclosure and other similar types of relief for active service members, see *§ 555.70[8]*.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction under California law is in the superior court of the county in which the property is located [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.40, 760.50]. Jurisdiction is also granted by the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*], which applies to any noncriminal proceedings commenced in any court in the United States, the individual states and territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(a), (b)*]. Under the SCRA, appropriate courts include any court of competent jurisdiction in the United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*]. Any application under SCRA that is required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has commenced may be made to any court that would otherwise have jurisdiction over the matter [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
A. General Forms
4. Protections for Military Service Members

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.139A

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.139A Order for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Remedy of Court in Relation to Obligation Secured by Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533]

[1] FORM Order for Stay of Foreclosure Proceedings and Remedy of Court in Relation to Obligation Secured by Mortgage, Trust Deed, or Other Security in Nature of a Mortgage on Real Property for Active Service Member [Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408; 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 531, 532]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO _____
vs.	)	ORDER STAYING FORECLOSURE
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	PROCEEDINGS AND PROVIDING
Respondent(s).	)	RELATED RELIEF FOR ACTIVE
	)	SERVICE MEMBER
	)	

This action came on regularly for hearing and trial on _____ [*date*] in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] the above entitled court, the Honorable _____ [*name*], Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appeared by _____ [(*name*), *counsel or designate other representative or that Petitioner appeared alone before the Court*], and Respondent appeared by

_____ [*specify name and official position with Respondent company*]. The Petition was argued and submitted for decision. A statement of decision _____ [has been made and filed *or* was not requested].

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. Petitioner _____ [*name*] is currently an active member of the military service of the United States, being a member of _____ [*describe service, rank, and position*].

2. Respondent _____ is a _____ [*describe, e.g.,* lending institution doing business in California].

3. Before entry into activity military service, Petitioner entered _____ [*describe and attach as exhibit, e.g.,* an installment loan agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ to the Petition] with Respondent for a loan to purchase real property located at _____ [*address of property*], with the loan to be secured by that property according to the terms of the agreement, and with payments on the loan to be made under the terms of the agreement.

4. By the power granted to it under *Military & Veterans Code Section 408* and *50 United States Code Appendix Section 533*], the court has fashioned this remedy:

[*Describe court's orders and remedies, e.g.,* The Court orders a stay of all foreclosure proceedings and collection activities by the Respondent with regard to the aforementioned remedy, and that both parties now proceed with regard to the _____ [*specify instrument, e.g.,* mortgage *or* deed of trust] under the follow terms and time line: _____ (*specify*)].

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an order staying an action on an obligation secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or similar security, which may be combined with other related court-ordered remedies. It may be issued by an appropriate court [*see* [4], *below*] providing remedies available to the court to assist active military service members who otherwise meet the requirements for protection under California and federal law [*see* [3], *below*]. For a petition seeking appropriate relief for an active service member from actions based on mortgages or similar arrangements, including a stay of action, see *§ 555.138[1]*.

[3] Protections for Active Military Service Members Under State and Federal Law

A court has extensive latitude in handling claims against a person who has joined military service after the date when he or she has given a deposit or paid an installment of the purchase price under a contract for the purchase of real or personal property, or purchased property secured by a mortgage, deed of trust, or other similar security [*Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408*; *50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533*]. For discussion of this authority, see *§ 555.138[3]*.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction under California law is in the superior court of the county in which the property is located [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.40, 760.50]. Jurisdiction is also granted by the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*], which applies to any noncriminal proceedings commenced in any court in the United States, the individual states and territories, the District of Columbia, and all territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(a), (b)*]. Under the SCRA, appropriate courts include any court of competent jurisdiction in the

United States or any state, whether or not it is a court of record [*50 U.S.C. App. § 511(5)*]. Any application under SCRA that is required to be made to a court in which no proceeding has commenced may be made to any court that would otherwise have jurisdiction over the matter [*50 U.S.C. App. § 512(c)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.140

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.140 Declaration of Trustor's Nonmilitary Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 533(c)]

[1] FORM Declaration of Trustor's Nonmilitary Service [50 U.S.C. App. § 532(3)]

DECLARATION OF TRUSTOR'S NONMILITARY SERVICE

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*set forth capacity or status of affiant, e.g.,* and at all times mentioned was, the beneficiary under a trust deed executed by _____ (*name*) as _____ trustor to _____ (*name*) as _____ trustee for _____ (*name*) as beneficiary and recorded _____ (*date*), in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____].

2. _____ [I have personally known _____ (*name of trustor*) since _____ (*date*) *or* I personally do not know _____ (*name of trustor*)]. He/she presently resides at _____ [*address*] and has resided at this address since _____ [*date*]. He/she is employed by _____ [*name*] at _____ [*address*] and has been so employed since _____ [*date*]. He/she _____ [*set forth all other factors, such as age, physical disability, or discharge, tending to show that trustor is not in military service, and has not been in military service within preceding 90 days, e.g.,* is presently 55 years of age]. I know that he/she is not in military service.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a declaration for use by a beneficiary to submit to the trustee of a trust deed as proof that the trustor is not, and has not been within the preceding 90 days, on active military service. A trustee will usually require this proof before proceeding with a trustee's sale, because a trustor's status as a active member of the armed forces may preclude foreclosure in the absence of a court order [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 533(a), (c)*]. For discussion of the special protections given to active military service members, see *§ 555.70[8]*, and for discussion and forms, see §§ 555.138-555.139A. See also *§ 555.33[2]* for discussion of the effects of federal protections under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act on judicial and nonjudicial foreclosure.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.141

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.141 Request for Copy of Notice of Default and Copy of Notice of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(a)]

[1] FORM Request for Copy of Notice of Default and Copy of Notice of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(a)]

[*Recording information. See § 555.136[1].*]

REQUEST FOR COPIES OF NOTICE OF DEFAULT AND NOTICE OF SALE

In accordance with *Civil Code Section 2924b*, request is hereby made that a copy of any notice of default and a copy of any notice of sale under the _____ [trust deed *or* mortgage] recorded _____ [*date*], _____ [in book _____ at page _____ in the records of *or* filed for record with recorder's serial number _____ in] _____ County, California, executed by _____ [*name*] as _____ [trustor *or* mortgagor] in which _____ [*name*] is named as _____ [beneficiary *or* mortgagee] [and _____ (*name*) is named as trustee], be mailed to _____ [*name*] at _____ [*address*].

NOTICE: A copy of any notice of default and of any notice of sale will be sent only to the address contained in this recorded request. If your address changes, a new request must be recorded.

_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

	)	
State of California,	)	ss.
County of _____.	)	

_____

On _____ [*date*] before me, _____ [*name and title of officer*], personally appeared _____ [*name(s)*], who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity/capacities, and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity on behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature: _____ (Seal)
Name of Office: _____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used by any person to request a copy of any notice of default or notice of sale that is given in a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding under a specified trust deed or mortgage [*Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*; *see §§ 555.52[2], [3][a], 555.56[3]*]. Printed forms of request for copies of notice of default and notice of sale may be obtained from most title insurance companies.

A title insurance company was liable to a junior lienholder in an action for negligent loss of security based on the company's failure to record a request for notice of default and notice of sale [*Howe v. City Title Ins. Co. (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 85, 86-87, 63 Cal. Rptr. 119]* .

[3] Contents, Acknowledgment, and Recordation of Request

A request for copies of a notice of default and notice of sale must be substantially the same as this form. It must (1) specify the name and address of the person to whom the notice is to be mailed, and (2) identify the trust deed or mortgage by stating the names of the parties, the recordation date, and the book and page in which it is recorded or the recorder's number [*Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*].

The request must be signed and acknowledged by the person making the request. It must also include, above the signature, a notice to that person that he or she will receive copies of a notice of default or notice of sale only at the address specified in the request, and he or she must record a new request in the event of a change of address [*Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*].

To be effective, the request must be filed for record in the office of the recorder of any county in which any part of the encumbered property is located, at any time after the recordation of the trust deed or mortgage specified in the request but before the recordation of notice of default [*Civ. Code § 2924b(a)*].

[4] Format Requirements

The document must meet format requirements prescribed for recordable documents (for instance, a half-inch margin on each vertical side and the top two inches of the first page left blank for recording information) [*see Gov. Code § 27361.6*]. For discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 27, *Deeds and Recording* (Matthew Bender).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.141A

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.141A Request by Homeowners' Association to Receive Copy of Trustee's Deed [Civ. Code § 2924b(f)]

[1] FORM Request by Homeowners' Association to Receive Copy of Trustee's Deed [Civ. Code § 2924b(f)]

[*Recording information. See § 555.136[1].*]

_____ [*Name*], which is a homeowners' association, requests that a mortgagee, trustee, or other person authorized to record a notice of default regarding any of the separate interests referred to below, mail to the association a copy of any trustee's deed on a sale concerning a separate interest, as provided in *Section 2924b(f) of the Civil Code*.

The separate interests in question are identified by _____ [*either* Assessor's Parcel Number *or* the following legal description:] _____ [*specify*].

The association's name and address are: _____ [*specify*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[*typed name and title*]

[*Acknowledgment. See § 555.141[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used by a homeowners' association [*see Civ. Code § 1351(a)* (definition)] to request a copy of any trustee's deed in the event of a sale concerning any separate interest governed by the association. With respect to separate interests governed by a homeowners' association, the association may cause to be filed in the office of the recorder, in the county in which the separate interests are situated, a request that a mortgagee, trustee, or other person authorized to record a notice of default regarding any of those separate interests, mail to the association a copy of any trustee's deed on a sale concerning a separate interest. Subsequent requests by an association will supersede prior requests [*Civ. Code § 2924b(f)*].

The request must include a legal description or the assessor's parcel number of the separate interests and must include the name and address of the association and a statement that it is a homeowners' association [*Civ. Code § 2924b(f)*].

To be effective, the request must be recorded before the filing of a notice of default. The mortgagee, trustee, or other authorized person must mail the requested information to the association within 15 business days following the date the trustee's deed is recorded. Failure to mail the request, however, will not affect the title to real property [*Civ. Code § 2924b(f)*].

The document must meet format requirements prescribed for recordable documents (for instance, a half-inch margin on each vertical side and the top two inches of the first page left blank for recording information) [*see Gov. Code § 27361.6*]. For discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 27, *Deeds and Recording* (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.142

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.142 Notice of Default [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(1), 2924c(b)(1)]--By Beneficiary, Trustee, Mortgagee, or Agent

[1] FORM Notice of Default [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(1), 2924c(b)(1)]--By Beneficiary, Trustee, Mortgagee, or Agent

[*Recording information. See § 555.136[1].*]

NOTICE OF DEFAULT

[*If default is curable pursuant to Civ. Code § 2924c, notice of default must begin with statement below, which, except as otherwise specified, must appear in at least 12-point boldface type if printed.*]

[*Heading and introductory clause must be in capital letters if typed or 14-point boldface type if printed.*]

IMPORTANT NOTICE

IF YOUR PROPERTY IS IN FORECLOSURE BECAUSE YOU ARE BEHIND IN YOUR PAYMENTS, IT MAY BE SOLD WITHOUT ANY COURT ACTION, and you may have the legal right to bring your account in good standing by paying all of your past due payments plus permitted costs and expenses within the time permitted by law for reinstatement of your account, which is normally five business days before the date set for the sale of your property. No

sale date may be set until three months from the date this notice of default may be recorded (which date of recordation appears on this notice). This amount is $_____ as of _____ [*date*] and will increase until your account becomes current.

While your property is in foreclosure, you still must pay other obligations (such as insurance and taxes) required by your note and trust deed or mortgage. If you fail to make future payments on the loan, pay taxes on the property, provide insurance on the property, or pay other obligations as required in the note and trust deed or mortgage, the beneficiary or mortgagee may insist that you do so in order to reinstate your account in good standing. In addition, the beneficiary or mortgagee may require as a condition to reinstatement that you provide reliable written evidence that you paid all senior liens, property taxes, and hazard insurance premiums.

On your written request, the beneficiary or mortgagee will give you a written itemization of the entire amount you must pay. You may not have to pay the entire unpaid portion of your account, even though full payment was demanded, but you must pay all amounts in default at the time payment is made. However, you and your _____ [beneficiary *or* mortgagee] may mutually agree in writing before the time the notice of sale is posted (which may not be earlier than the end of the three-month period stated above), among other things, (1) to provide additional time in which to cure the default by transfer of the property or otherwise, (2) to establisha schedule of payments in order to cure your default, or (3) both (1) and (2).

Following the expiration of the time period referred to in the first paragraph of this notice, unless the obligation being foreclosed on or a separate written agreement between you and your creditor permits a longer period, you have only the legal right to stop the sale of your property by paying the entire amount demanded by your creditor.

To find out the amount you must pay, or to arrange for payment to stop the foreclosure, or if your property is in foreclosure for any other reason, contact:

_____ [*name of beneficiary or mortgagee*]
_____ [*mailing address*]
_____ [*telephone*]

If you have any questions, you should contact a lawyer or the government agency that may have insured your loan.

Notwithstanding the fact that your property is in foreclosure, you may offer your property for sale, provided the sale is concluded before the conclusion of the foreclosure.

[*Warning below must be in capital letters if typed or 14-point boldface type if printed.*]

Remember, YOU MAY LOSE LEGAL RIGHTS IF YOU DO NOT TAKE PROMPT ACTION.

[*CONTINUE*]

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by the undersigned, as [agent for] the _____ [beneficiary *or* trustee *or* mortgagee] under a _____ [trust deed *or* mortgage] executed by _____ [*name*] as _____ [trustor *or* mortgagor] to _____ [*name*] as _____ [trustee *or* mortgagee] [for _____ (*name*) as beneficiary], recorded _____ [date] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, that a breach of the obligation, for which the [trust deed *or* mortgage] provides security, has occurred as follows:

1. _____ [*Describe with particularity all breaches in this and succeeding numbered paragraphs, e.g.,* _____ (*name of trustor or mortgagor*) has failed, and continues to fail, to make timely installment payments of principal and interest due for the months of _____ through _____ (*specify*)].

THEREFORE, the _____ [beneficiary *or* mortgagee] [declares that the entire debt and all sums secured by the above-described _____ (trust deed *or* mortgage) are immediately due and payable and] elects to sell the property, or to cause it to be sold, to satisfy the claim for all amounts now due and unpaid.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form may be used by a beneficiary, trustee, or mortgagee (or an authorized agent) in a nonjudicial foreclosure proceeding to give notice of a default on the obligation secured by the trust deed or mortgage and of the consequent election by the beneficiary or mortgagee to sell the encumbered property [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)*]. Optional language is included for use by the beneficiary or mortgagee to declare the entire outstanding secured debt to be immediately due and payable under an acceleration clause [*see Engelbertson v. Loan & Bldg. Asso. (1936) 6 Cal. 2d 477, 479, 58 P.2d 647* (declaration of acceleration in notice of default was sufficient indication of election to exercise option under acceleration clause)]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.15[3]*].

Printed forms of notice of default may be obtained from most title insurance companies.

[3] Contents

[a] Standard Requirements; Actual and Potential Defaults

The notice of default must identify the trust deed by stating the name of the trustor or mortgagor and giving either the book and page in which it is recorded, as in this form, or a description of the property. It must also include a statement that a breach of the obligation secured by the trust deed or mortgage has occurred, a description of the nature of the breach, and a statement of the beneficiary's or mortgagee's election to sell the property [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)*]. All copies of the notice must include its recordation date [*see Civ. Code §§ 2924b(b)(1), (c)(1), 2924c(b)(1)*].

Reference should be made not only to actual defaults but also to any other default that might arise before reinstatement, such as a delinquency in the payment of property taxes or installments under a senior trust deed. In one case, a junior beneficiary recorded a notice of default and afterward cured another default under a senior trust deed. The junior beneficiary then refused to accept a tender of payment for reinstatement on the ground that it did not cover the amount for the curing the default under the senior trust deed. The court of appeal indicated that such a refusal was wrongful. Although the junior beneficiary was entitled to add the disputed amount to the trustor's total debt, the junior beneficiary was not entitled to add that amount to the total sum necessary for reinstatement because that amount was not mentioned in the previously recorded notice of default[*Little v. Harbor Pacific Mortgage Investors (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 717, 720-721, 221 Cal. Rptr. 59]* . The court noted that the notice of default would have been sufficient to require tender of the disputed amount if it had included a reference, not only to actual delinquencies, but also to delinquent payments, if any, under the senior trust deed [*Little v. Harbor Pacific Mortgage Investors (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 717, 721 n.6, 221 Cal. Rptr. 59]* .

[b] Reinstatement

If the beneficiary or mortgagee has elected to accelerate the secured debt, the trustor or mortgagor has a limited right to

reinstate the obligation without paying the entire accelerated amount [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(1)*; *see § 555.54*], and the notice of default must be prefaced with the statement set out in this form, which provides information concerning reinstatement [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(1)(D), 2924c(b)(1)*]. The statement must be given in Spanish if either of the following conditions is satisfied [*Civ. Code § 2924c(b)(1)*]:

- The trustor or mortgagor requested a Spanish translation of the security agreement in a consumer transaction described in *Civ. Code § 1632(a)(1)* or *(4)*.

- The secured obligation was negotiated principally in Spanish and is a home improvement contract [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 7151.2, 7159*] that is subject to the Unruh Act [*see Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*].

[C] Failure to Comply

Failure to comply with these requirements does not affect the validity of a subsequent private sale to a good faith purchaser or the rights of a good faith lienholder [*Civ. Code § 2924c(b)(2)*]. There is a rebuttable presumption that the beneficiary actually knew of all unpaid loan payments to the beneficiary and secured by the trust deed or mortgage subject to the notice of default. The failure to include an actually known default does not invalidate the notice of sale, however, and the beneficiary is not precluded from asserting a claim based on the omitted default in a separate notice of default [*Civ. Code § 2924(e)*].

[4] Recording, Mailing, and Publishing Notice

The trustee, beneficiary, or mortgagee, or an authorized agent, must file the original notice of default for record in each county in which some part of the property is located [*Civ. Code § 2924(a)(1)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.52*. Acknowledgment is not required before recordation [*U.S. Hertz, Inc. v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 85-86, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44]* .

Copies of the notice of default must be mailed to certain persons after recordation of the original notice [*see Civ. Code § 2924b(b)-(e)*]. The time and manner of mailing these copies, and the persons entitled to receive mailed copies, are discussed in *§ 555.52[3]*. In addition, publication of a copy of the notice is required in certain situations for the benefit of the trustor or mortgagor [*Civ. Code § 2924b(d)*]. For discussion of when this publication is necessary, and the time and manner in which it is accomplished, see *§ 555.52[4]*.

The mailing, publication, and delivery of a notice of default (or other notice) as required in *Civ. Code § 2924*, and the performance of related statutory procedures, constitute privileged communications within *Civ. Code § 47* [*Civ. Code § 2924(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.143

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.143 Notice of Rescission of Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale [Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)]

[1] FORM Notice of Rescission of Declaration of Default and Demand for Sale [Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)]

[*Space for recording information; see § 555.141[4].*]

NOTICE OF RESCISSION OF DEFAULT

_____ [*Name*], as [agent for] the _____ [beneficiary *or* trustee *or* mortgagee] under a _____ [trust deed *or* mortgage] executed by _____ [*name*] as _____ [trustor *or* mortgagor] to _____ [*name*] as _____ [trustee *or* mortgagee] [for _____ (*name*) as beneficiary], recorded _____ [date] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, hereby rescinds the declaration of default and election to sell the property that was recorded _____ [date] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. The date of reinstatement is _____ [*date*].

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary or mortgagee (or an agent for a beneficiary or mortgagee) in a nonjudicial

foreclosure proceeding, to record a notice of rescission of the declaration of default and election to sell [*see § 555.142*] after reinstatement of the secured obligation. The form must be delivered to the trustee for recordation [*see Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)*]. For discussion of reinstatement, see *§ 555.54*.

[3] Notice of Rescission As Mandatory

If the trustor, mortgagor, or other authorized person cures the default, the beneficiary, mortgagee, or an agent must, within 21 days, execute and deliver to the trustee a notice rescinding the declaration of default and demand for sale and stating the date of reinstatement. The trustee must cause the notice of rescission to be recorded within 30 days of receiving it (accompanied by all allowable fees and costs). No charge, except for the recording fee, may be made to the trustor for the execution and recordation of the notice of rescission [*Civ. Code § 2924c(a)(2)*]. It appears that acknowledgment of the notice of rescission is not necessary before recordation, as the notice does not confer any right to or lien on the property [*see U.S. Hertz, Inc. v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 86, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.144

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.144 Notice of Sale [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924f(b), 2924g(a)]

[1] FORM Notice of Sale [Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924f(b), 2924g(a)]

[*Space for recording information; see § 555.141[4].*]

NOTICE OF SALE OF PROPERTY UNDER POWER OF SALE

YOU ARE IN DEFAULT UNDER A _____ [TRUST DEED *or* MORTGAGE] DATED _____. UNLESS YOU TAKE ACTION TO PROTECT YOUR PROPERTY, IT MAY BE SOLD AT A PUBLIC SALE. IF YOU NEED AN EXPLANATION OF THE NATURE OF THE PROCEEDING AGAINST YOU, YOU SHOULD CONTACT A LAWYER.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*business day, i.e., Monday through Friday*], the _____ day of _____ [*month*], _____ [*year*], at _____ [*time between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.*] at _____ [*street address and specific place at that address where sale is to be held*], in _____ [*city*], _____ [*name of county in which all or any part of property to be sold is located*] County, California, _____ [*name of trustee or other person acting as trustee's agent and conducting sale*], whose street address in California is _____ and whose _____ [toll-free telephone number *or* telephone number in California] is _____, will sell at public auction to the highest bidder for cash, in lawful money of the United States, all payable at the time of the sale, the real property described below.

[*EITHER*]

The real property is located in the [City of _____,] County of _____, State of California. It is commonly described as _____ [*street address or other common designation*]. The county assessor's parcel number for the property is _____. [*If desired, add:* The following is the legal description of the property: _____.]

[*OR, if property has no street address or other common designation*]

The real property is located in the [City of _____,] County of _____, State of California. The following is the legal description of the property: _____. Directions to the property may be obtained by submitting a written request to the beneficiary requesting this sale, within 10 days after _____ [*date of first publication of notice*]. The name of the beneficiary is _____ and _____ [his *or* her] address is _____.

[*CONTINUE*]

The sale will be made without covenant or warranty regarding title, possession, or encumbrances, pursuant to the power of sale conferred in a _____ [trust deed *or* mortgage] dated _____, executed by _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify status, e.g.,* a single man], as _____ [trustor *or* mortgagor] to _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify status, e.g.,* a corporation], as _____ [trustee for _____ (*name*) asbeneficiary *or* mortgagee], recorded _____ [*date*], in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.

A notice of default was recorded _____ [*date*], in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.

This notice is given in compliance with a written request made to the trustee by the beneficiary.

On _____ [*date*], which is the date of the initial publication of this notice, the total unpaid balance of the obligation secured by the property plus reasonably estimated costs, expenses, and advances amounted to $_____.

[*Add if appropriate:* This notice of sale is being republished pursuant to a cancellation of a cash equivalent pursuant to *Civil Code Section 2924h(d).*]

[*Add if appropriate:* On the date this notice of sale is filed, a final or temporary order of exemption obtained pursuant to *Civil Code Section 2923.53* _____(is *or* is not) current and valid. The 90-day extension for giving notice of sale, specified in *Civil Code Section 2923.52(a),* _____(applies or does not apply) .]

[*If present holder of secured note is not original beneficiary or mortgagee, add:* The beneficial interest under the _____ (trust deed *or* mortgage) and the secured obligations were assigned to _____ (*name of assignee*), _____ (*specify status, e.g.,* a corporation), by an assignment dated _____ (*date*), and recorded _____ (*date*) in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.]

[*If there has been substitution of original trustee under trust deed, add:* The undersigned was appointed and substituted as trustee under the trust deed by a substitution dated _____ (*date*) and recorded _____ (*date*) in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.]

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
_____ [Trustee *or* Mortgagee]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a trustee, mortgagee, or other person conducting a sale of real property pursuant to a power of sale conferred in a trust deed or mortgage, to give notice of the sale [*see Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924b(b)-(e), 2924f(b), 2924g(a)*]. For discussion of the requirements relating to the time and manner of recording the original notice of sale and posting, publishing, and mailing copies of the notice of sale, see *§ 555.56*.

[3] Typeface and Heading

A notice of sale of real property under a power of sale must conform to the minimum requirements of *Gov. Code § 6043* [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*]. Thus, the notice must be set in type that is not smaller than nonpareil. Further, it must be preceded with words (that is, a heading) printed inblackface type, not smaller than nonpareil, describing or expressing in general terms the purport or character of the notice intended to be given [*Gov. Code § 6043*]. (There is no statutory definition of "nonpareil" as a type size. It is about six points, according to some old typesetting manuals.)

[4] Contents of Notice

[a] In General

The notice of sale must include the following contents (as well as information described in § 555.144[4][b]-[d]):

- A statement required by *Civ. Code § 2924f(c)(3)*, which is set out in the first paragraph of the body of this form [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

- The time of the sale, which must be between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on a business day [*Civ. Code § 2924g(a)*].

- The street address and the specific place at that address where the sale will be held, which must be in the county in which any part of the property to be sold is located [*Civ. Code §§ 2924(a)(3), 2924f(b)(1), 2924g(a)*].

- The name, street address in California (which may reflect an agent of the trustee), and either a toll-free telephone number or telephone number in California of the trustee, and the name of the original trustor [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

- A statement that the notice is being republished pursuant to a cancellation of a cash equivalent under *Civ. Code § 2924h(d)* [*see § 555.57[5]*], if this is the case [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

- A statement as to (1) whether a final or temporary order of exemption was obtained pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2923.53* and is current and valid on the date the notice of sale is filed, and (2) whether the 90-day extension for giving notice of sale, specified in *Civ. Code § 2923.52(a)*, applies or does not apply,

pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2923.52(b)* and *(c)* and *Civ. Code § 2923.55* [*Civ. Code § 2923.54(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2923.54(c)* (sunset date is January 1, 2011); for discussion, *see § 555.54[1][f]*].

In addition, if there has been an assignment of the secured note or a substitution of trustees, the notice of sale should include appropriate recording information [*see Civ. Code §§ 2934, 2934a(a)*]. The name, address, and telephone number of the substituted trustee must be included in the notice of sale, otherwise any sale by that trustee will be void [*Civ. Code § 2934a(e)*].

Other provisions in this form, such as the statement that the sale will be made without warranty of title, that the sale will be for cash, and that the notice is given pursuant to the beneficiary's request, are clauses that are typically included pursuant to the terms of standard trust deed forms.

It appears that acknowledgment of the notice of sale is not necessary before recordation, because the notice does not confer any right to or lien on the property [*see U.S. Hertz, Inc. v. Niobrara Farms (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 68, 86, 116 Cal. Rptr. 44]* .

[b] Property Description

The description of the property must include the county assessor's parcel number and the street address, if any, or other common designation, ifany. If the property has no street address or other common designation, the notice must include a legal description of the property, the name and address of the beneficiary at whose request the sale is to be conducted, and a statement that directions may be obtained pursuant to a written request submitted to the beneficiary within 10 days from the first publication of the notice of sale [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

If the notice of sale indicates that directions to the property may be obtained from the beneficiary, any such directions will be deemed reasonably sufficient to locate the property if they refer to the direction and approximate distance from the nearest crossroads, frontage road, or access road [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

If the property description includes a legal description or a county assessor's parcel number and either a street address or another common designation of the property, the validity of the notice and the validity of the sale will not be affected by any error or omission in the street address, other common designation, name and address of the beneficiary, or the directions obtained from the beneficiary [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*].

[c] Amount Due

The notice must state the total amount of the unpaid balance of the secured obligation and reasonably estimated costs, expenses, and advances as of the date of the initial publication of the notice of sale. The trustee is not liable for any good faith error in stating the proper amount, including any amount provided in good faith by or on behalf of the beneficiary, and an inaccurate statement does not affect the validity of the sale to a good faith purchaser [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(1)*]. For discussion of permitted costs and expenses, see *§§ 555.54[2], 555.58*.

[d] Unified Sale Including Personal Property or Fixtures

If the sale of the property is to be a unified sale [*see Com. Code § 9604(a)(1)(B)*], the notice must include a description of the personal property or fixtures to be sold. If it is contemplated that all of the personal property or fixtures are to be sold, the description in the notice of the personal property or fixtures will be sufficient if it is the same as the description of the personal property or fixtures contained in the agreement creating the security interest in or encumbrance on the personal property or fixtures or the filed financing statement relating to the personal property or fixtures. In all other cases, the description in the notice will be sufficient if it would be a sufficient description of the personal property or fixtures under *Com. Code § 9108* [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(2)*].

Inclusion of a reference to or a description of personal property or fixtures will not constitute an election by the secured party to conduct a unified sale and in no way will render defective or noncomplying either the notice or a sale pursuant to that notice by reason of the fact that the sale includesnone or less than all of the personal property or fixtures referred to or described in the notice [*Civ. Code § 2924f(b)(2)*].

95 of 127 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.145

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.145 Declaration of Mailing Notices of Default and Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(e)]

[1] FORM Declaration of Mailing Notices of Default and Sale [Civ. Code § 2924b(e)]

DECLARATION OF MAILING

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identity of declarant, e.g.,* and at all times mentioned was, trustee under a trust deed executed by _____ (*name*) as _____ trustor to _____ (*name*) as _____ trustee for _____ (*name*) as beneficiary and recorded _____ (*date*), in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____]. I am over the age of 18 years. My _____ [residence *or* business] address is _____ [*address*].

2. On _____ [*date*], within 10 business days after recordation of the notice of default, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this declaration, I deposited in the United States mail copies of the notice of default in separate, sealed envelopes, with first-class postage fully prepaid, addressed as follows:

_____ [*Name and address of each trustor or mortgagor to whom notice of default was mailed*].

3. On _____ [*date*], more than three months after the recording of the notice of default and at least 20 days before the date of the sale set forth in the notice of sale, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this declaration, I deposited in the United States mail copies of the notice of sale in separate, sealed envelopes, with

first-class postage fully prepaid, addressed to the persons at the addresses stated above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a declaration for use by any person who is required to send copies of a notice of default or sale to each trustor or mortgagor by first class mail, in addition to those copies required to be sent by registered or certified mail [under *Civ. Code § 2924b(b), (c)*; *see §§ 555.52[3][a], 555.56[3]*]. Such a person must also execute and retain an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) showing that these additional copies were mailed as required [*Civ. Code § 2924b(e)*].

[3] Contents and Effect of Declaration

The affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) must state the following facts [*Civ. Code § 2924b(e)*]:

- The name and residence or business address of the declarant.
- That the declarant is over the age of 18 years.
- A specification of each notice of which a copy was mailed.
- The date each copy of a notice was deposited in the mail.
- The name and address of each trustor or mortgagor to whom a copy of a notice was mailed.
- That each envelope containing a copy of notice was sealed and deposited in the mail with first-class postage fully prepaid.

In the absence of fraud, the affidavit (or declaration) establishes a conclusive presumption of mailing [*Civ. Code § 2924b(e)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.146

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.146 Deed by Trustee Pursuant to Exercise of Power of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924(a), (c)]

[1] FORM Deed by Trustee Pursuant to Exercise of Power of Sale [Civ. Code § 2924(a), (c)]

[*Recording information. See § 555.136[1].*]

TRUSTEE'S DEED

_____ [*Name of trustee*], _____ [*capacity, e.g.,* a California corporation], as trustee under the trust deed described below, grants without warranty to _____ [*name*] all that real property situated in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California, at _____ [*street address or other common designation*], described as follows: _____ [*full legal description*].

This conveyance is made pursuant to the powers conferred on the grantor by the trust deed executed by _____ [*name*] as trustor to _____ [*name*] as trustee for _____ [*name*] as beneficiary, recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, and after fulfillment of the conditions specified in the trust deed authorizing this conveyance, as follows:

1. A default occurred in the obligations for which the transfer in trust under the trust deed was given as security, and notice of default was recorded in _____ [the *or* each] county in which the property described in the trust deed is situated. The default consisted of the following: _____ [*specify all breaches, e.g.,* _____ (*name of trustor*) failed to make timely installment payments of principal and interest due for

the months of _____ through _____]. This default still existed at the time of sale.

2. The beneficiary made due demand on the trustee to sell the property pursuant to the terms of the trust deed.

3. Not less than three months elapsed between the recordation of the notice of default and the posting and first publication of the notice of sale of the property.

4. The trustee gave notice of the time and place of sale of the property in accordance with law and the terms of the trust deed.

5. Copies of the notice of default and notice of sale were mailed in accordance with the law to the trustor and to all persons who recorded requests for copies of notice or who were entitled by law to receive notice.

6. The trustee sold the property at public auction on _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, in accordance with the law and the terms of the trust deed. The above-named grantee was the highest bidder at the sale, became the purchaser, and paid to the trustee the amount bid, being $_____, in lawful money of the United States.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Trustee

[*Acknowledgment. See § 555.141[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a deed for use by a trustee to grant title to the person who purchased the property at the foreclosure sale [*see Civ. Code § 2924(a), (c)*]. For discussion of the effect of the trustee's deed and the rights of the grantee, see *§§ 555.61* and *555.62*.

[3] Contents of Deed

The form includes a conveyance of title without warranty, because the trustee has no duty to guaranty title [*Brown v. Busch (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 200, 204, 313 P.2d 19]* .

The form also includes recitals indicating that title was duly conveyed pursuant to the trustee's authority under the terms of the trust deed, after (1) a specified default in the secured obligation, and (2) compliance with all terms of the trust deed and all applicable requirements of law. For discussion of the effect of the recitals of compliance with statutory notice requirements, see *§ 555.63[2][b]*.

[4] Cross References

For discussion of grant deeds generally, see *Ch. 184, Deeds.* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to unlawful detainer proceedings by a purchaser at a foreclosure sale against a trustor or mortgagor who remains in possession, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.147

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.147 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] and for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.]--To Prevent Private Sale Based on Alleged Breach of Obligation Secured by Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3367(3)]--By Trustor or Successor

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061] and for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.]--To Prevent Private Sale Based on Alleged Breach of Obligation Secured by Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3367(3)]--By Trustor or Successor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
Defendant.	)	AND INJUNCTION
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Relief)

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendants. See § 555.120[1], Paragraphs 2 and 3.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.125[1], Paragraph 5.*]

4. On the same day and as part of the same transaction, plaintiff executed a trust deed conveying certain property to defendant _____ [*name*] as trustee for defendant _____ [*name*], the beneficiary, to secure payment of the note. That property is located in _____ County, California, and is described as follows ("the property"): _____ [*legal description*]. The trust deed was recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. A copy of the trust deed is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

5. On _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*name*] recorded a notice of default in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, alleging that the following breach of the obligation secured by the deed of trust had occurred: _____ [*summarize breach set out in notice of default*]. A copy of the notice of default is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.

6. _____ [*Allege facts showing that default was improperly declared or that defendant is otherwise not entitled to proceed with sale of property*].

7. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendants concerning their respective rights and duties. Plaintiff contends that _____ [*plaintiff's contentions as to legal consequences resulting from allegations above, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) was not entitled to accelerate the maturity of the secured obligation by reason of the acts of plaintiff described above], whereas defendants dispute this contention and contend that _____ [*defendants' contentions, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of beneficiary*) was entitled to accelerate it].

8. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain plaintiff's rights and duties under the note and trust deed.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Injunction)

9. Plaintiff refers to and incorporates Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Cause of Action.

10. Defendants threaten to (and unless restrained, will) sell the property, or cause it to be sold, to plaintiff's great and irreparable injury, for which pecuniary compensation would not afford adequate relief, in that _____ [*specify*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For a declaration of the rights and duties of the parties, including a declaration that _____ [*specify declaration, e.g.,* a breach of the obligation for which the trust deed is security has not occurred];

2. For an order requiring defendant _____ [*name of trustee*] to show cause why defendant should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action;

3. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant _____ [name of *trustee]* and all persons acting under, for, or in concert with that defendant, from selling the trust property or attempting to sell it or causing it to be sold, either under the power of sale in the trust deed or by foreclosure action.

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a trustor or a successor in interest, to bring an action to enjoin a threatened nonjudicial foreclosure sale under a power of sale in a trust deed [*Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.*] and obtain a declaration of the rights of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*], when the plaintiff contends that the beneficiary and trustee are not entitled to exercise the power of sale. For further discussion, see *§ 555.63[1]*.

Although the trustor or a successor in interest is usually the plaintiff in this type of action, it appears that any other person with an interest adversely affected by the sale may also have a cause of action [*see, e.g., Lansdown v. Smith & Sons R. Corp., Ltd. (1934) 1 Cal. App. 2d 618, 619-620, 37 P.2d 127* (assuming, without deciding, that junior lienholder would have standing to sue)].

Foreclosure for failure to pay a prepayment penalty was not enjoinable on the basis of equitable estoppel when the collection agent mistakenly accepted payoff from the debtor's agent without a penalty, even though the debtor's agent knew of the clear penalty language in the note [*Sanguansak v. Myers (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 110, 117-118, 223 Cal. Rptr. 490]* . Nor could an injunction be issued on the basis of *Civ. Code § 1501* (waiver of the inadequacies of tendered performance if no objection is made at the time of tender) or *Code Civ. Proc. § 2076* (same) after the collection agent mistakenly accepted payoff without objection or demand for the prepayment penalty, because those statutes apply to intentional failures to demand proper tender [*Sanguansak v. Myers (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 110, 115-117, 223 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint states two causes of action. The first, for declaratory relief, alleges the following facts:

- The existence of the secured obligation and trust deed in issue, indicating a proper subject for declaratory relief (Paragraphs 3 and 4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaration of rights under written instrument or in respect to property)].

- The declaration of default and election to sell under the trust deed, together with any other steps that the defendant trustee may have taken to conduct the threatened sale (Paragraphs 5).

- The existence of facts on the basis of which the plaintiff contends that an actual justiciable controversy exists with respect to the defendanttrustee's right to conduct the sale (Paragraphs 6-8) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*].

For further discussion and alternative forms of complaints relating to declaratory relief generally, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

The second cause of action for injunctive relief incorporates the allegations of the first cause of action (Paragraph 9) and alleges grounds for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to enjoin the threatened sale (Paragraph 10) [*Civ. Code § 3422(1)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2), (4)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief generally, including forms for use in conjunction with this form of complaint to obtain preliminary injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[4] Verification

Verification [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if the plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on the complaint instead of on an affidavit (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *see generally* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*]. Otherwise, verification is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in an unlimited civil case and even in a limited civil case that is based on a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

If relying on a verified complaint instead of an affidavit (or declaration), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle the plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . In addition, counsel must append to this form a declaration relating to notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action for declaratory relief or for a permanent injunction restraining a private sale of real property is within the jurisdiction of the superior court and is not a limited civil action [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), (b)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In an action for the determination of rights with respect to real property, the superior court in the county in which the real property is situated is the proper court for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.148

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.148 Petition and Declaration Regarding Unresolved Claims and Deposit of Undistributed Surplus Proceeds of Trustee's Sale--Judicial Council Form MC-095

[1] FORM Petition and Declaration Regarding Unresolved Claims and Deposit of Undistributed Surplus Proceeds of Trustee's Sale--Judicial Council Form MC-095

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form illustrated in [1], *above*, is the mandatory Judicial Council form for a petition and declaration to be used by a trustee when the trustee is unable to determine the priority of written claims to the surplus, or the trustee determines that there is a conflict between potential claimants [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*; *see* Cal. Judicial Council Form MC-095]. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

At the time of filing this form, the trustee must deposit the portion of the sale proceeds that cannot be distributed with the court [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*] and send appropriate notice to all potential claimants [*Civ. Code § 2924j(d)*; *see* [4], *below*].

At least 15 days before the scheduled hearing date, the court must serve written notice of the hearing by first class mail on all claimants identified in the trustee's declaration, at the specified addresses of the claimants. Within 90 days after the trustee files the petition and declaration and deposits the funds with the clerk, the court must consider all claims filed. After the hearing, the court must distribute the deposited funds to all entitled claimants in the priority specified by statute [*Civ. Code § 2924j(d)*; *see § 555.59* (priority of claims)].

[3] Information, Allegations, and Accompanying Documents

The declaration must set forth (1) the date of the trustee's sale, (2) a description of the property, (3) the names and addresses of all persons to whom notice was sent, (4) a statement that the trustee exercised due diligence and provided written notice as required, and (5) the amount of the sale proceeds deposited. In addition, the trustee must submit a copy of the trustee's sale guaranty and any information relevant to the identity, location, and priority of potential claims. The trustee must also file proof of service of the required notice with the declaration [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*; *see* [4], *below*].

[4] Notice of Conflicting Claims Mailed to Entitled Persons

Before the trustee deposits the funds with the court clerk, the trustee must send written notice by first-class mail, postage prepaid, to all persons entitled to notice of conflicting claims. The notice must state that the trustee intends to deposit the funds with the clerk, and that claimants must file claims within 30 days following the date of the notice. The address of the court where the funds were deposited, and a phone number for further information, must be included in the notice [*Civ. Code § 2924j(d)*].

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The petition and declaration and related documents [*see* [3], *above*] must be filed, and the sales proceeds that cannot be distributed must be deposited, with the clerk of the superior court of the county in which the sale occurred [*Civ. Code § 2924j(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
B. Nonjudicial Foreclosure

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.149-555.159

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.149[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.160

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.160 Complaint for Foreclosure of Deed of Trust Based on Monetary Default [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint for Foreclosure of Deed of Trust Based on Monetary Default [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR FORECLOSURE OF TRUST
Defendant.	)	DEED
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant, _____ [*name of trustor*], is, and at all times mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and residence, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California].

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. Defendant is the record owner of the property.

6. [On _____ (*date*) the note and the beneficial interest in the trust deed were assigned to plaintiff. A copy of the assignment is attached as Exhibit C and incorporated by reference.] Plaintiff is now, and at all times _____ [mentioned was *or* since _____ (*date of assignment)* has been], the lawful owner and holder of the note and the beneficiary of the trust deed.

7. The note provides that, should a default occur in the payment of any installment when due, or in the performance of any obligation in the trust deed securing payment of the note, the whole sum of principal and interest shall become immediately due at the election of the holder of the note and shall, at the election of the holder, bear interest during the period of the default at the rate of _____ percent per annum. The trust deed provides that, should a default occur in the payment of any debt secured by the trust deed, or in the performance of any obligation in the note or trust deed, all sums secured by the trust deed shall, at the election of the beneficiary, become immediately due and payable.

8. By the terms of the note, defendant promised to pay monthly installments of $_____ or more, principal and interest, on the _____ day of each month beginning _____ [*date*]. Defendant has failed and refused to make payments of $_____ principal and interest, due on _____ [*date*] and in subsequent months, up to and including _____ [*date*], and amounting to $_____ in installments. By reason of these defaults, plaintiff elected to declare the whole sum of principal and interest immediately due and payable. The whole sum due consists of a principal balance of $_____ plus interest from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*] at _____ percent per annum amounting to $_____, a combined total of $_____. Interest on the combined total amounts to $_____ per day for each additional day from _____ [*date*] to the date of entry of judgment.

[9. _____ (*Allege additional obligation in default, e.g.,* By the terms of the trust deed, defendant promised to pay, at least _____ days before delinquency, all general and special city and county taxes affecting the property. Defendant has failed and refused to pay these for the fiscal year _____ in the sum of $_____, and plaintiff has paid these taxes to prevent a sale to the State of California for delinquency).]

[10. _____ (*Allege additional obligation in default, e.g.,* By the terms of the trust deed, defendant promised to provide and maintain in force at all times fire, earthquake, and other insurance, each in an amount satisfactory to, and with loss payable to, plaintiff as beneficiary. Since _____ (*date*), defendant has failed and refused to renew and maintain in force fire, earthquake, and other insurance. By reason of defendant's failure and refusal to pay the premium on the insurance policies at the time of renewal, plaintiff has been required to pay, and has paid, the premiums on the insurance in order to keep the property and improvements insured at all times. The dates and amounts of, and periods covered by, these payments are: _____ (*specify*). By the terms of the trust deed, when plaintiff is required to make payments because of defendant's failure and refusal to pay the premiums on the insurance policies, the amounts paid by plaintiff shall be charged to the principal due on the note secured by the trust deed. The sum of $_____, representing payment by plaintiff on the insurance policies, is not included in, and is in addition to, the above-described principal sum of $_____).]

11. By the terms of the trust deed, defendant promised that if any action were commenced on the note or trust deed, defendant would pay plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees and that these charges would also become a lien on the

property. By reason of the above-mentioned defaults by defendant it has become necessary for plaintiff to employ _____ [*name*], an attorney at law duly licensed to practice in all the courts of the State of California, to commence and prosecute this foreclosure action.

[12. _____ (*If deficiency judgment is being sought, allege basis for personal liability of defendant other than trustor, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*) _____ (*name*) assumed the obligation evidenced by the note. A copy of the assumption agreement is attached as Exhibit D and incorporated by reference).]

[13. _____ (*If deficiency judgment, otherwise permissible, is not being sought, allege express waiver, if desired, e.g.,* Plaintiff waives judgment for any deficiency between the sale price of the real property and the amount due plaintiff with costs).]

[14. _____ (*Allege existence of all known junior lienholders or other interest holders, if any, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) is a judgment creditor of defendant _____ (*name of trustor*) and on _____ (*date*) recorded an abstract of judgment for the sum of $_____ in _____ County, California. The lien of this judgment is subsequent to and subject to the lien of the trust deed).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. Against _____ [*names of trustor and any other defendant personally liable for secured obligation*] for the total sum of $_____, principal and interest, together with interest at the rate of $_____ per day from _____ [*date*] to the date of entry of judgment[, and for the sum of $_____ paid by plaintiff on account of _____ (*specify additional amounts of taxes, premiums, etc., for which plaintiff is entitled to repayment under terms of trust deed*)];

2. Against _____ [*names of trustor and any other defendant personally liable for secured obligation*] for attorney's fees in an amount that the court adjudges reasonable;

3. Adjudging that all rights, claims, ownership, liens, titles, and demands of defendant[s, jointly and severally,] are subsequent to and subject to the lien of the trust deed;

4. Adjudging that the trust deed be foreclosed, that the property be sold according to law by a levying officer to be appointed by the court, that the proceeds of the sale be applied in payment of the amounts due to plaintiff, that [each] defendant and all persons claiming under [each] defendant, after execution of plaintiff's trust deed, whether as lien claimant, judgment creditor, claimant under a junior trust deed, purchaser, lienholder, or otherwise, be barred and foreclosed from all rights, claims, interests, or equity of redemption in the property and every part of the property when time for redemption has elapsed;

[5. Adjudging that _____ (*names of trustor and any other defendant personally liable for secured obligation*) is/are personally liable for payment of the obligation secured by the trust deed, and that a deficiency judgment may be ordered following proceedings prescribed by law;]

6. Permitting plaintiff or any parties to this action to become a purchaser at the foreclosure sale;

7. Directing the levying officer, after the time for redemption has elapsed, to execute a deed to the purchaser of the property at the sale, and directing that the purchaser be let into possession of the property on production of the levying officer's deed;

8. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

9. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a beneficiary of a trust deed to bring an action for foreclosure based on a monetary default in the obligation secured by the trust deed [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)*; *see § 555.70*]. It may be modified for use by a mortgagee [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 725a, 726(a)*; *§ 555.70[2][a]*].

A lis pendens should be recorded at the time the complaint is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20 et seq.*; *see § 555.70[3]*]. For further discussion and a form of lis pendens for use in a foreclosure action, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following essential facts:

- The secured obligation (Paragraph 3).
- The trust deed securing the obligation (Paragraph 4).
- The plaintiff's status as creditor (Paragraph 6).
- Acceleration clauses enabling the plaintiff to declare the entire unpaid debt immediately due (Paragraph 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 728*; *§ 555.15[3]*].
- The defaults entitling the plaintiff to foreclose (Paragraphs 8-10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*].
- A provision for the recovery of reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 730*; *§ 555.74*].
- Optional allegations for use if the plaintiff will seek a deficiency judgment (Paragraph 12) or if the plaintiff desires to waive recovery of a deficiency judgment (Paragraph 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

[4] Defendants

Necessary defendants are the record owner, whether the trustor or a successor, and all persons with a recorded interest in the property that is subsequent or subordinate to the trust deed [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(c)*]. Persons who are liable for the secured obligation must be made defendants if a deficiency judgment is being sought [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. The trustee need not be a defendant [*see Field v. Acres (1937) 9 Cal. 2d 110, 112-113, 69 P.2d 422]* . For further discussion relating to these parties, see *§ 555.70[2]*.

[5] Appointment of Receiver

In some circumstances a receiver may be appointed during the pendency of the action, to take possession of the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*; *see § 555.70[4]*]. For further discussion and related forms, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

A receiver may be appointed in an action by a secured lender for specific performance of an as signment of rents in a trust deed, mortgage, or separate assignment document. Such an appointment may be continued after entry of a judgment for specific performance in the action if appropriate to protect, operate, or maintain the property or to collect rents while a pending nonjudicial foreclosure under power of sale is being completed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*].

A receiver may be appointed in a case brought by an assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*; *see Civ. Code § 2938* (governing written assignments of interests in leases, rents, issues, or profits of real property made in connection with obligation secured by real property); *see also § 555.81[1]*].

[6] Deficiency Judgment

If a deficiency judgment is being sought, the court will determine whether one may be recovered in the circumstances and, if so, who among the defendants may be held liable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see § 555.163[2]*]. The amount of the deficiency will be determined and adjudged in a subsequent proceeding, which must be commenced within three months after the sale of the property under the foreclosure decree [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see § 555.73* and §§ 555.164-555.168].

[7] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in superior court actions that are not limited civil cases and in some limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[8] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of foreclosure actions involving real property; the action is not a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*]. The court retains jurisdiction until expiration of the statutory redemption period [*Van Loben Sels v. Bunnell (1901) 131 Cal. 489, 492, 63 P. 773* ; *see § 555.72*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

When the United States is a defendant, the action may be brought in, or removed to, the U.S. district court [*28 U.S.C. §§ 1444, 2410(a)*; *see § 555.70[2][b]*].

The superior court in the county in which all or part of the encumbered property is located is the proper court for the trial of a foreclosure action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.161

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.161 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Civ. Code § 2911(1); Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Civ. Code § 2911(1); Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action is alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that the plaintiff's alleged cause of action herein is barred by the provisions of *Civil Code Section 2911(1)* and *Code of Civil Procedure Section 337(1)* in that the four-year statute of limitations has run on the promissory note secured by the _____ [trust deed *or* mortgage].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a defendant in an action for foreclosure to raise the statute of limitations as a bar by way of an affirmative defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*; *see Flack v. Boland (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 103, 106-107, 77 P.2d 1090]* . For further discussion, see *§ 555.18[4][a]* and Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* . The limitation period is the one that applies to an action on the secured obligation [*Civ. Code § 2911(1)*]. Usually, it is the four-year period applicable to actions on a written contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)*]. For further discussion of answers generally, including general forms in which this affirmative defense may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

If the defense of the statute of limitations is apparent on the face of the complaint or from matter of which the court may take judicial notice [*see Evid. Code §§ 451, 452*], the bar of the statute may be raised by a general demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(a)*], although the specific ground must be pleaded. This is an exception to the rule that

general demurrers need only state that the complaint fails to state a cause of action. However, the defense of the statute of limitations is not waived for failure to demur, and it may be asserted as an affirmative defense [*California Safe etc. Co. v. Sierra etc. Co. (1910) 158 Cal. 690, 697-698, 112 P. 274]* . For further discussion and forms of demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.162

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.162 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Senior Lien of Another Trust Deed [Civ. Code §§ 1214, 1215]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation--Senior Lien of Another Trust Deed [Civ. Code §§ 1214, 1215]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

1. On _____ [*date*] _____ [*name of trustor*], for a valuable consideration, made, executed, and delivered to defendant a promissory note for the sum of $_____, plus interest. A copy of the note is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

2. On the same day and as part of the same transaction, _____ [*name of trustor*] executed a trust deed conveying the property described in the complaint to _____ [*name*] as trustee for defendant as beneficiary to secure payment of the note. The trust deed, duly acknowledged on _____ [*date*], was recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____. A copy of the trust deed is attached as Exhibit B and incorporated by reference.

3. Defendant took the trust deed attached as Exhibit B in good faith without any knowledge, actual or constructive, that plaintiff had, or claimed to have, a prior trust deed on the property. That prior trust deed was not recorded and is void as against defendant.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use as an affirmative defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*] by the beneficiary of a second trust deed, who has been named in an action to foreclose a prior trust deed and whose trust deed is alleged in the

complaint to be subsequent or subordinate to the trust deed being foreclosed. The defense is that the second trust deed is, in fact, superior to the trust deed being foreclosed, because the second beneficiary was a subsequent lienholder in good faith and for a valuable consideration, who had no actual notice of the prior trust deed and whose own trust deed was first recorded [*Civ. Code §§ 1214, 1215, 1217*].

For further discussion of answers generally, including general forms in which this affirmative defense may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.163

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.163 Judgment of Foreclosure and Order of Sale [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a), (b)]

[1] FORM Judgment of Foreclosure and Order of Sale [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a), (b)]

[*Caption and recitals. See § 555.126[1].*]

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. Now due and owing to plaintiff from defendant _____ [*name of trustor or other defendant personally liable*] are the following sums: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ principal and interest on a promissory note made _____ [*date*]; $_____ expended for general and special city and county taxes; $_____ expended for premiums on fire, earthquake, and other insurance; $_____ in attorney's fees; and plaintiff's costs of suit. These debts are liens on the real property described below, pursuant to a trust deed executed by _____ [*name*] as trustor to _____ [*name*] as trustee for _____ [*name*] as beneficiary, which was recorded _____ [*date*] in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____.

2. The real property described, or as much of it as may be necessary, shall be sold in the manner prescribed by law by the levying officer of _____ County, California, on proper application for issuance of a writ of sale to the levying officer. Any party to this action may be a purchaser at the sale.

3. From the proceeds of the sale, the levying officer shall deduct the expenses for the levy and sale and shall then pay to plaintiff the sums adjudged due, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from

the date of this judgment.

4. If any surplus remains after making those payments, it shall be paid by the levying officer as follows: _____ [*specify order of payment and amounts to be paid to other parties determined to be entitled to any surplus proceeds*].

[*EITHER*]

5. Defendant _____ [*name*] is personally liable for payment of the sums secured by the trust deed, and a deficiency judgment may be ordered against him/her/it following proceedings prescribed by law. The Court retains jurisdiction to determine the amount of the deficiency, if any, and to render a money judgment on proper application.

6. A deficiency judgment not being waived or prohibited, the property shall be sold subject to the right of redemption as provided in *Code of Civil Procedure Section 729.010 et seq.*

[*OR*]

5. _____ [No defendant is personally liable *or* Plaintiff has waived judgment] for any deficiency between the sale price and the total amount due plaintiff together with expenses of sale.

6. A deficiency judgment being _____ [prohibited *or* waived], the property shall be sold as provided in *Code of Civil Procedure Section 716.020*.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. From and after delivery of a deed by the levying officer to the purchaser at the sale, _____ [*name(s) of defendant(s)*] and all persons claiming under him/her/them or having liens subsequent to the trust deed on the real property described below, and their personal representatives, and all persons claiming to have acquired any estate or interest in the property subsequent to the filing of notice of the pendency of this action with the county recorder, are forever barred and foreclosed from all equity of redemption in, and claim to, the property and every part of it.

8. The property that is the subject of this judgment and order is located in _____ County, California, and is described as follows: _____ [*legal description*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a form of judgment for use by the plaintiff in an action for foreclosure and an order of sale under a trust deed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a), (b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 725a*]. For a related complaint and discussion of such an action, see *§ 555.160*.

This form assumes that one or more of the defendants appeared in the action. It may be modified, as appropriate, when judgment is taken by default. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* .

[3] Contents

The judgment must do the following:

- Declare the amount of the secured debt or otherwise state the secured obligation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

- Direct the sale of the encumbered property, or as much of it as may be necessary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*; *see § 555.71*].

- Direct application of the sale proceeds to pay court costs, levy and sale expenses, and the amount due to the plaintiff, including, if the trust deed provides for payment of attorney's fees [*see § 555.74*], a reasonable sum for attorney's fees set by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 730*].

- Direct that any surplus proceeds be paid to the defendants or cross complainants who are determined to be entitled to the surplus, according to their determined priorities; or, if the interests of these parties are not properly put in issue, direct that any surplus be paid into the court pending later determination and order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 727*; *see Livingston v. Rice (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-5, 280 P.2d 52* ; *Withington v. Shay (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 68, 73, 117 P.2d 415* ; § 555.59].

- Identify the defendants, if any, who have been determined to have personal liability and against whom a deficiency judgment may be ordered in subsequent proceedings, unless a deficiency judgment has been waived or is barred by *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* [*see §§ 555.31[4], 555.32[2][a], [3][b]*], in which case the judgment must so declare [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

For discussion and forms relating to a subsequent proceeding for a deficiency judgment, see *§§ 555.73* and 555.164-555.168.

[4] Entry of Judgment and Notice of Entry

In an action tried by the court, the clerk is required to enter judgment immediately after the order granting judgment is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664*]. The prevailing party must then serve notice of entry of judgment on all parties and file the original of the notice with proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5(a)*]. For further discussion and forms of notice and proof of service, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40 et seq.*

[5] Enforcement

The sale of the property is initiated by application of the judgment creditor to the clerk of the court for issuance of a writ of sale to the levying officer of the county in which the property is to be sold [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 701.570(a), 712.010, 716.010(a), 716.020, 726(e), 729.010(b)*; *see § 555.71*]. For further discussion along with forms for use in enforcing the judgment, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.130 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.164

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.164 Notice of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR DEFI-
Plaintiff,	)	CIENCY JUDGMENT
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of trustor or other defendant personally liable*)] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*] or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [

specify party, e.g., plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for a deficiency judgment. The motion will be and hereby is made on the ground that the proceeds for the foreclosure sale, duly held on _____ [*date*], are insufficient to satisfy the judgment of foreclosure entered _____ [*date*], pursuant to which the sale was held, and that plaintiff is entitled to a money judgment for the deficiency, pursuant to that judgment, which provides that the Court shall retain jurisdiction for the purpose of rendering a deficiency judgment in the event that the proceeds from the foreclosure sale are insufficient.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed with this notice, on the records and file in this action, and on evidence to be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion for use by the plaintiff to move for a deficiency judgment after a foreclosure sale held pursuant to a judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see § 555.73[2]*]. It must be filed within three months after the date of the foreclosure sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. The three-month period is a statute of limitations. Thus, a party entitled to seek a deficiency judgment must file an application within three months of the foreclosure sale or no money judgment for a deficiency can be obtained [*Life Savings Bank v. Wilhelm (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 174, 177, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 657]* . The three-month period runs from the date the sale is effected, that is, when the highest bid is received at the auction, not when the certificate of sale is recorded [*Paykar Construction, Inc. v. Bedrosian (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 803, 808, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 135]* . Copies must be served on all appearing defendants against whom a deficiency judgment is sought, or on their attorneys of record, at least 15 days before the date set for the hearing to determine the amount of the deficiency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

For a declaration supporting such a motion, see *§ 555.165*. For a judgment for deficiency, see *§ 555.168*.

A supporting memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Jurisdiction and Venue

For coverage of judisdiction and venue, see *§ 555.160[8]*.

[4] Cross References

For memorandum supporting the relief sought in this form, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 230, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages*, §§ 230.40 (Matthew Bender)

For discussion and forms of motions and applications generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For discussion of service of notices of motions generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.165

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.165 Declaration in Support of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM Declaration in Support of Motion for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Plaintiff,	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR DEFICIENCY
vs.	)	JUDGMENT
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* the attorney of record for the plaintiff].

2. On _____ [*date*], this Court entered a judgment of foreclosure of the trust deed in this action. By

that judgment the Court determined that defendant _____ [*name of trustor or other defendant, as appropriate*] is personally liable for payment of the sums secured by the trust deed and that a deficiency judgment may be ordered.

3. On _____ [*date within three months preceding filing of notice of motion*], the real property was sold at foreclosure sale. As shown by the levying officer's accounting of amounts collected and costs incurred, filed with the return of the writ of sale on _____ [*date*], the property was sold for $_____, and the expenses of levy and sale amounted to $_____.

4. The entire amount of the debt under the judgment, with interest, fees, costs, and expenses of levy and sale, is $_____, consisting of the following items: _____ [*list items and amounts*].

5. The appraised fair value of the property, as of the time of sale, is $_____.

6. There is a deficiency of $_____.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a declaration [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*] for use by a plaintiff to support a motion for a deficiency judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. For an illustrative motion and related discussion, see *§ 555.164*.

[3] Contents

The supporting declaration should show the amount of the deficiency [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see §§ 555.73[1], 555.163[2]*].

The existence of the deficiency and the persons liable for it may be determined by reference to court records showing the amount due to the plaintiff under the judgment and the amount of proceeds and expenses of the sale reported by the levying officer (Paragraphs 2-4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 699.560, 712.050* (return of writ of sale and report of levying officer)].

The amount of the deficiency is determined by reference to the fair value of the property as of the date of sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see § 555.73[4]*]. If the plaintiff had the property appraised (in lieu of or in addition to the appraisal, if any, by a court-appointed probate referee [*see §§ 555.166, 555.167*]), this fact should be included (Paragraph 5).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.166

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.166 Notice of Motion for Appointment of Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Appointment of Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR AP-
Plaintiff,	)	POINTMENT OF PROBATE REFEREE
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant _____ (*name of trustor or other defendant personally liable*)] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*] or as soon

thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order appointing a probate referee to appraise the property sold as of the time of sale, according to law, and to file the appraisal with the clerk of this Court. The motion will be made on the following grounds:

1. On _____ [*date*], this Court entered judgment for plaintiff for the following amounts: principal and interest in the amount of $_____, attorney's fees in the amount of $_____, and costs in the amount of $_____, together with interest. The judgment directed that the real property subject to the trust deed be sold, and this Court retained jurisdiction to enter a deficiency judgment against defendant _____ [*name*].

2. On _____ [*date*], the real property was sold as ordered. The proceeds of $_____, less expenses of levy and sale in the sum of $_____, yielded a net amount of $_____, as shown by the levying officer's accounting of amounts collected and costs incurred, filed with the return of the writ of sale on _____ [*date*].

3. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff moved for a deficiency judgment against defendant _____ [*name*], which motion is set for hearing on _____ [*date*].

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed with this notice, on the records and file in this action, and on evidence to be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a notice of motion for use by any party to a proceeding for a deficiency judgment, to obtain appointment of a probate referee to appraise the property sold at the foreclosure sale, as of the time of the sale [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1003* (application for order not contained in judgment is made by motion); *Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.* (designation by court of probate referee); *see also § 555.73[3]*].

The notice of motion must be filed at least 10 days before the date set for the hearing on the motion for a deficiency judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*]. Service of copies of the notice of motion on other parties to the proceeding does not appear to be necessary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005* (motions requiring written notice)], but counsel may provide copies as a courtesy.

For a form of order of appointment, see *§ 555.167*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.167

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.167 Order Appointing Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM Order Appointing Probate Referee [Prob. Code § 8920 et seq.] in Proceedings for Deficiency Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff], _____ [*name*], for an order appointing a probate referee to appraise the real property described below came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted, and _____ [*name*], a probate referee, is appointed to appraise the following described real property as of _____ [*date*]: _____ [*legal description*]. The referee shall be paid $_____, plus expenses, and is directed to file the appraisal, together with an oath that the referee has truly, honestly, and impartially appraised the property to the best of the referee's knowledge and ability, with the clerk of this Court on or before _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an order for use by the moving party for appointment of a probate referee [*see § 555.166* (related notice of motion)] to appraise the property sold at a foreclosure sale, for the purpose of determining the amount of the deficiency that may be recovered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*].

For further discussion of the probate referee's appointment, compensation, and appraisal, see *§ 555.73[3]*.

[3] Notice of Order

The moving party is generally required to serve notice of the order on all parties and to file the original of the notice with proof of service [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*].

For further discussion and forms of notice and proof of service, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* , and Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.168

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.168 Judgment for Deficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[1] FORM Judgment for Deficiency [Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)]

[*Caption and recitals. See § 555.126[1].*]

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff recover from defendant _____ [*name of trustor or other defendant personally liable*] the sum of $_____, with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*] together with $_____ as costs.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a form of judgment for use by the plaintiff who has moved for a deficiency judgment after the judicial foreclosure and sale of real property under a trust deed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(b)*; *see § 555.164* (related notice of motion)].

For further discussion of the hearing on the motion for a deficiency judgment and the entry of the deficiency judgment, see *§ 555.73[4]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.169

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.169 Stipulation and Deficiency Judgment

[1] FORM Stipulation and Deficiency Judgment

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	STIPULATION AND JUDGMENT
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

STIPULATION FOR DEFICIENCY JUDGMENT

_____ [*Identify stipulating parties, e.g.*, Plaintiff _____ (*name*) and defendants _____ (*names*)] stipulate as follows.

1. On _____ [*date*], pursuant to the judgment of foreclosure entered in this action on _____ [*date*] ("the foreclosure judgment"), the real property described in the foreclosure judgment ("the property") was sold.

2. The parties have exchanged information relating to the value of the property as of the date of sale. There was a deficiency of $_____ for which, pursuant to the foreclosure judgment, defendants _____ [*names*] are personally liable, jointly and severally.

3. _____ [*Financial terms of stipulation and judgment, e.g.,* Defendant _____ (*name*) has paid the deficiency amount to plaintiff _____ (*name*). Judgment may be rendered that defendant _____ (*name*) recover from defendants _____ (*names*), jointly and severally, the sum of $_____ with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ (*date*), and that plaintiff _____ (*name*) has received satisfaction of all claims arising from or based on the foreclosure judgment ("the stipulated judgment"). Each party shall bear the party's own costs. Plaintiff _____ (*name*) shall, on entry of the stipulated judgment, file an acknowledgment of full satisfaction of the foreclosure judgment.]

4. Each of the parties waives any and all rights to appeal or otherwise attack the stipulated judgment. Each of the parties waives the right to have findings of fact or a statement of decision with respect to the stipulated judgment.

5. Each of the parties acknowledges, represents, and warrants that in all negotiations for this stipulation, each party had an adequate opportunity to be, and each party was, represented by the party's attorney of choice, and that each attorney signing this stipulation is duly and fully authorized to make this stipulation on behalf of the party represented.

6. Each attorney signing this stipulation acknowledges, represents, and warrants that he/she is duly and fully authorized to make this stipulation on behalf of the party represented.

7. This stipulation shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

JUDGMENT

The parties having so stipulated, and the Court having determined that the stipulation is regular and proper,

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] recover from defendants _____ [*names*], jointly and severally, the sum of $_____ with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*].

2. Plaintiff _____ [*name*] has received satisfaction of all claims arising from or based on the judgment entered in this action on _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used in lieu of the forms in §§ 555.164-555.168 for rendition of a deficiency judgment following a judicial foreclosure sale, when the parties can come to an agreement about the amount of the deficiency, and they have a reason for wanting and allowing a judgment to be entered (instead of simply paying the amount of the deficiency). For instance, if multiple defendants were jointly and severally liable for the deficiency, they could agree that one of them would pay it and that a judgment would be rendered to establish the payer's claim and the others' liability for contribution. Thus, the paying defendant could take the place of the plaintiff as the judgment creditor to whom the other defendants would be liable--a situation that all of the defendants could have reason to view as preferable in supplanting a potentially hostile creditor with a comparatively friendly one. The plaintiff could be willing to agree on the amount of the deficiency because by stipulating to a judgment, the plaintiff would avoid the litigation expenses of moving for a deficiency judgment and establishing the amount of the deficiency.

The judgment may be separated from the stipulation, as the parties may prefer if the stipulation is lengthy. For further discussion of stipulations and judgments based on stipulations, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.40 et seq.*, and Ch. 533, *Stipulations* .

This stipulation and judgment is based on a form prepared by William M. Hensley, the Editorial Consultant for this chapter, for an action litigated in the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.170

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.170 Complaint on Promissory Note Secured by Junior Trust Deed--Security Rendered Valueless by Foreclosure of Senior Lien

[1] FORM Complaint on Promissory Note Secured by Junior Trust Deed--Security Rendered Valueless by Foreclosure of Senior Lien
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____
[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR MONEY
_____ [*name*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. The trust deed was subject to a senior trust deed encumbering the property, dated _____ [*date*] and recorded in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____, securing payment of an obligation in the original amount of $_____ owed by defendant to _____ [*name*].

6. _____ [*Allege foreclosure of senior lien, e.g.,* After giving notice of default and notice of sale as required by law, _____ [*name*], trustee under the senior trust deed, proceeded at _____ [*time*] on _____ [*date*] under a power of sale to sell the property at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California. The property was sold for $_____; the amount claimed due and delinquent on the obligation secured by the senior trust deed was $_____; and the expenses of the sale were $_____. No portion of the proceeds of the sale remained to be applied on the note after deducting the amount due on the above mentioned obligation and the expenses of the sale.]

7. As a result of the sale of the property, the security for the note has become worthless, without any act on the part of plaintiff.

8. Defendant has defaulted on the note, and the entire unpaid balance, together with interest, is now due.

9. Plaintiff has performed all conditions and promises required to be performed on plaintiff's part by the terms of the note, including all conditions precedent to the right to enforce defendant's duty of performance.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____;

2. For interest on that sum at _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*];

3. For reasonable attorney's fees in the sum of $_____;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by the payee of a promissory note to sue the maker of the note, after real property securing the note

has been rendered worthless as security by foreclosure of a senior lien. This situation is an exception to the general rule requiring a secured creditor first to exhaust the security [*see Roseleaf Corp. v. Chierighino (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 35, 39-44, 27 Cal. Rptr. 873, 378 P.2d 97]* . For further discussion, see *§ 555.31[3]*. An action on the note is barred, however, if the note was secured by a purchase-money trust deed subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* [*see Brown v. Jensen (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 193, 197-198, 259 P.2d 425]* . For further discussion of this ban, see *§ 555.32[4]*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 580a limits the amount of recovery on a debt by a junior lienholder whose security has been rendered worthless by private foreclosure of the senior lien and who purchased the property at the foreclosure sale [*Walter E. Heller Western, Inc. v. Bloxham (1985) 176 Cal. App. 3d 266, 270-274, 221 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . For further discussion, see *§ 555.32[4]*.

[3] Allegations

A complaint to recover money due under a promissory note [*Civ. Code § 3302*; *Com. Code § 3122*] must allege the following essential facts:

- The note and security (Paragraphs 3 and 4).
- That the security for the note has become worthless in consequence of the foreclosure of a senior lien (Paragraphs 5-7).
- The defendant's default and the resulting damage to the plaintiff (Paragraph 8).
- The plaintiff's performance of all conditions to be performed on the plaintiff's part (Paragraph 9).

Usually an action cannot be brought directly on a note secured by a trust deed, because foreclosure is the required remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. § 726(a)*]. To forestall this affirmative defense, the complaint also alleges facts showing that the security for the note has become worthless without any fault on the plaintiff's part, in consequence of the foreclosure of a senior lien on the property [*see, e.g., Cohen v. Marshall (1925) 197 Cal. 117, 122-125, 239 P. 1050* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 483.010(b)* (attachment may be issued on claim originally secured when security has become valueless without any act of plaintiff); *cf. Barbieri v. Ramelli (1890) 84 Cal. 154, 156-158, 23 P. 1086* (action on note was barred when security was initially valueless)].

[4] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in superior court actions that are not limited civil cases and in some limited civil cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

Generally, the proper county for the trial is the county in which the obligation was entered into, the county in which the

obligation is to be performed, or the county in which the defendant presently resides. Unless there is an agreement to the contrary, the county in which the obligation was incurred is deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If the defendant is a corporation or association, the county in which its principal place of business is located is also a proper county for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*].

[6] Cross References

For further discussion and alternate forms for use in an action to enforce a promissory note, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
C. Foreclosure Actions and Deficiency Judgments

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 555.171-555.179

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

[Reserved]

§§ 555.171[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.180

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.180 Complaint for Specific Performance of Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3384 et seq.]--Beneficiary to Take Possession After Default and Collect Rents, Issues, and Profits [Civ. Code § 2927]

[1] FORM Complaint for Specific Performance of Trust Deed [Civ. Code § 3384 et seq.]--Beneficiary to Take Possession After Default and Collect Rents, Issues, and Profits [Civ. Code § 2927]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.160[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. The trust deed provides, "_____ [*recite assignment-of-rents clause, e.g.,* As additional security, Trustor hereby confers on Beneficiary the right, power, and authority, during the continuance of the Trust, to collect the rents, issues, and profits of the property, reserving to Trustor the right, before any default by Trustor in payment of any debt secured by this deed or in performance of any agreement under this deed, to collect and retain the rents, issues, and profits as they become due and payable. Upon any such default, Beneficiary may enforce this assignment in any method authorized by *Civil Code Section 2938*]."

6. The consideration received by defendant for the note was _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the principal amount of the note, received at the time the transaction was entered into], and the agreement is, as to defendant, just and reasonable.

7. Plaintiff has performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required to be performed by plaintiff in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement.

8. Defendant defaulted under the terms of the note and trust deed in that _____ [*allege default, e.g.,* defendant failed to pay interest and principal for the months of _____ through _____].

9. Plaintiff has demanded that defendant let, but defendant failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to let, plaintiff into possession of the property to collect the rents, issues, and profits as provided in the trust deed.

10. There is no adequate remedy at law to enforce the provision of the trust deed set out above.

[11. A notice of default and election to sell under the trust deed, as a result of defendant's default, was recorded on _____ (*date*).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. That a receiver be appointed to take possession and charge of the property described in this complaint, to conserve and manage it [pending the sale] under the terms of the trust deed, and to collect any and all rents and profits [pending the sale];

2. That defendant and anyone holding under defendant be ordered to deliver possession of the property to the receiver without delay;

3. For reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred in the collection of rents, issues, and profits;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a beneficiary of a trust deed, to sue for specific performance of a standard assignment-of-rents clause in the trust deed by requiring the trustor to surrender possession to a receiver, who will collect rents and profits after a default by the trustor. If an action for foreclosure is contemplated, this form should be combined with a complaint for foreclosure [*see § 555.160*]. For further discussion and forms relating to actions for specific performance, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

This form is based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*, which authorizes the appointment of a receiver in the circumstances described and also provides for the appointment of a receiver in a case brought by an assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*; *see § 555.180[4]*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint contains the following allegations essential to state a cause of action for specific performance of a standardized assignment-of-rents clause:

- The execution and delivery of a con tract sufficiently certain in its terms, namely, the promissory note and trust deed (Paragraphs 4 and 5) [*see Civ. Code § 3390(5)*].

- The consideration received by the defendant, showing that the agreement was just and reasonable (Paragraph 6) [*Civ. Code § 3391(1), (2)*].

- The plaintiff's performance of all of his or her contractual obligations (Paragraph 7) [*Civ. Code §§ 3386, 3392*].

- The occurrence of conditions entitling the plaintiff to enforce the assignment-of-rents clause, such as the defendant's default and refusal to give the plaintiff possession (Paragraphs 8 and 9).

- The lack of an adequate legal remedy, which justifies equitable relief (Paragraph 10) [*see Mines v. Superior Court (1932) 216 Cal. 776, 778, 16 P.2d 732]* .

For further discussion of allegations necessary to state a cause of action for specific performance generally, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

An optional paragraph alleging notice of default and election to sell is included (Paragraph 11) for use when nonjudicial foreclosure proceedings have been commenced. This allegation is not required but should be included if applicable, because the plaintiff's rights under the assignment-of-rents clause will be affected by any sale of the property [*see § 555.18[1]*].

[4] Appointment of Receiver

A receiver may be appointed in an action by a secured lender for specified performance of an assignment-of-rents clause in a trust deed, mortgage, or separate assignment document. The appointment may be continued after entry of a judgment for specific performance in that action, if appropriate to protect, operate, or maintain the property encumbered by the trust deed or mortgage, or to collect the rents from the property while a pending nonjudicial foreclosure under

power of sale in the trust deed or mortgage is being completed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*].

A receiver may be appointed in a case brought by an assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*; *see § 555.81[6]*]. That section governs a written assignment of an interest in leases, rents, issues, or profits of real property made in connection with an obligation secured by the property. It specifies alternative methods for the enforcement of the assignment, including the appointment of a receiver and obtaining possession of the rents, issues, or profits [*see Civ. Code § 2938(c)*].

For discussion of these statutory appointments, see *§ 555.81[1]*. For a form of demand for turnover of rents, which may be used in connection with the appointment of a receiver, see *§ 555.189*. If the plaintiff will apply for ex parte appointment of a receiver, see *§ 555.186[3]* for required contents of the application, which may be inserted into a verified complaint (such as the form in [1], *above*) or stated in an accompanying affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see § 555.182*].

[5] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in superior court actions that are not limited civil cases and in some limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action for specific performance to enforce an assignment-of-rents clause of a trust deed must be brought in the superior court and is not a limited civil action [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In an action to determine a right or interest in real property, the superior court in the county in which the real property is located is the proper court for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the appointment of receivers generally, see Ch. 486, *Receivers*

For discussion and forms relating to specific performance generally, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.181

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.181 Notice of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR AP-
Plaintiff,	)	POINTMENT OF RECEIVER
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, for example,* defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [

specify party, for example, plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order appointing a receiver to take possession of, preserve, manage, and collect all rents and profits accruing from the real property located at _____ [*street address or common designation, if any*] in _____ County, California, and described as _____ [*legal description in trust deed*]. The motion will be made on the ground that *Code of Civil Procedure Section 564(b)(11)* gives the court authority to appoint a receiver in an action by a secured lender for specific performance of an assignment-of-rents clause in a trust deed.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed with this notice, on the records and file in this action, and on evidence to be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion for use by a beneficiary who has brought an action for specific performance of a standard assignment-of-rents clause [*see § 555.180*], to obtain appointment of a receiver to take possession of the property pendente lite and to collect rents and profits. A superior court may appoint a receiver in an action by a secured lender for specific performance of an assignment-of-rents clause in a trust deed, mortgage, or separate assignment document. The court also has authority to continue that appointment after entry of a judgment for specific performance in the action, if appropriate to protect, operate, or maintain the property encumbered by the trust deed or mortgage or to collect the rents while a pending nonjudicial foreclosure under power of sale in the trust deed or mortgage is being completed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)*].

A receiver also may be appointed in a case brought by an assignee under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2938(g)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(12)*]. For coverage of that statute, see *§ 555.81[1]*.

A supporting memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

For a related declaration and order, see *§§ 555.182* and *555.183*, respectively.

[3] Ex Parte Application for Appointment of Receiver

An order appointing a receiver pendente lite is generally obtained by a noticed motion but may instead be sought ex parte by an application for an order to show cause why a receiver should not be appointed or by an application for an order of appointment ex parte with a subsequent hearing by way of an order to show cause why the receiver should not be confirmed [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*]. For discussion and forms of orders for the ex parte appointment of a receiver for rents, issues, and profits, see *§§ 555.186* and *555.187*. For further discussion of substantive and procedural requirements for ex parte appointments, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Consult "Local, Local" Rules of Receivership Judges. More and more, certain departments or divisions of courts are designated as "writs and receivers" departments or divisions. The practitioner seeking receiverships in these specialized departments or divisions should consult with department guidelines, or "local, local rules" in common parlance. For example, some Los Angeles County Superior Court judges do not allow for ex parte receiverships (in the absence of waste or an impending calamity)

unless theborrower is at least three monthsdelinquent. Knowing these local, local rules will save receivership attorneys precious time and expense when practicing in this area. *By William M. Hensley*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.182

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.182 Declaration in Support of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM Declaration in Support of Motion for Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]
Plaintiff,	)	IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT
vs.	)	OF RECEIVER
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, for example,* the plaintiff] in this action to specifically enforce the

provisions of a trust deed executed by defendant _____ [*name*].

2. Defendant is in actual possession of the real property that is the subject of the trust deed, which consists of _____ [*specify income-producing aspect of property, e.g.,* a five-unit apartment building]. The property produces an income of approximately $_____ per month, which defendant is receiving and retaining.

3. _____ [*Name of receiver proposed by moving party*], whose address is _____, California, is a disinterested and proper person to be appointed receiver pending trial of this action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a declaration for use in supporting a motion by a beneficiary to appoint a receiver pursuant to an assignment-of-rents clause in the trust deed, pending trial of an action for specific performanceof the clause [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 564(b)(11), 2015.5*; §§ 555.180 (complaint for specific performance), 555.181 (notice of motion for receiver pendente lite)]. Supporting evidence may instead be presented by stating the necessary facts in a verified complaint [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175*; *§ 555.180*].

The declaration should provide evidence as to the income-producing aspect of the property and identify the moving party's nominee [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.183

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.183 Order Appointing Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(11)]

[1] FORM Order Appointing Receiver Pendente Lite Pursuant to Trust Deed [Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(10)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

The motion of _____ [*identify party, for example,* plaintiff] for an order appointing a receiver in the above entitled action came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted, and:

1. _____ [*Name*], whose address is _____ [*specify*], is appointed receiver.

2. Before commencing the duties described below, the receiver shall take an oath to perform these duties faithfully and, further, shall execute an undertaking to the State of California for the faithful performance of these duties and subject to the orders of this Court in the amount of $_____.

3. After qualifying, the receiver shall take possession of the following described property: _____ [*legal description and address or other designation, description of any personal property or fixtures and furnishings, description of any business, etc.*].

4. The receiver shall care for, preserve, and maintain the property and may incur expenses necessary for that care, preservation, and maintenance.

5. The receiver shall demand and collect all rents now due and coming due from tenants of any portion of the property, and tenants occupying or using any portion of the property shall pay rents to the receiver.

6. The receiver shall bring and prosecute all proper actions for the collection of rents due, or for the removal of tenants in default or other persons, or for the protection or to recover possession of the property, and for this purpose may employ an attorney to be approved by this Court.

7. The receiver may employ an agent to collect the rents and/or manage, maintain, or repair the property.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the receiver and _____ [*moving party, e.g.*, plaintiff] may apply to this Court from time to time for further instructions or powers necessary to enable the receiver to perform the receiver's duties properly.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is an order for use by a beneficiary moving for appointment of a receiver pendente lite [*see § 555.181* (notice of motion)]. Submission of a carefully drafted order is essential because of the importance of specifying the property that the receiver is to take into possession and the receiver's powers and duties. Additional powers and duties that might be specified in the order include the duty to file an inventory of all property on taking possession and to make periodic accountings; the duty to make specified payments in a specified order for the secured obligation, taxes, insurance, maintenance expenses, senior liens, compensation for the receiver or agents, and other payments; the duty to hold or otherwise dispose of amounts remaining after the specified payments are made; and particular duties or instructions as to the operation of a business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 568*]. For an illustration of a Judicial Council form of order that may be used as a model for drafting this order, see *§ 555.185[1]* or *§ 555.186[1]*. Under local rules or court practice, one of those Judicial Council forms might be approved for use, with appropriate modifications, in lieu of a custom-drafted order (or an alternative form of order might be prescribed).

[3] Notice of Order

The moving party must serve notice of the order on all other parties, unless the court orders otherwise or notice is waived by all parties in open court and is entered in the minutes [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1019.5(a)*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1109* (notice to be given by clerk)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.184

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.184 Order to Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-300]

[1] FORM Order to Show Cause and Temporary Restraining Order--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-300]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is California Judicial Council Form RC-300, which may be used to obtain appointment of a receiver for rents, issues, and profits, along with a temporary restraining order designed to preserve the status quo respecting the receivership property [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*]. This form would be appropriate when exigent circumstances, not allowing for a normal noticed motion [*see § 555.181[1]*], evidently require issuance of the temporary restraining order. If even more urgent circumstances require the ex parte appointment of a receiver, the form in *§ 555.186[1]* may be used. After the hearing on this order to show cause, the form in *§ 555.185[1]* may be used for the order appointing a receiver.

There is no Judicial Council form specifically for use in applying for this order. The application would be made by verified complaint [*see, e.g., § 555.180[1]*] or by affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see, e.g., § 555.182[1]*]. The contents of the application would be essentially the same as for an application for ex parte appointment of a receiver [*see § 555.186[3]*]. For further discussion of temporary restraining orders and additional forms, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Use of this form is optional. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge.

A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Notice of Hearing

When a temporary restraining order is issued without notice, the matter must be made returnable on an order requiring cause to be shown why a preliminary injunction should not be granted, on the earliest day that the business of the court will allow, but not later than 15 days or, if good cause appears to the court, 22 days from the date the temporary restraining order is issued [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(1)*].

The hearing date will control the service and briefing schedule (*see* Paragraphs 7-9 of form) [*see* [5], *below*].

[4] Nomination of Receiver

No receiver is named in this order to show cause. At the hearing of an application for appointment of a receiver on notice, each party appearing may, at the time of the hearing, suggest in writing one or more persons for appointment as receiver, stating the reasons. For discussion of who may be appointed as a receiver, see *§ 555.185[3][a]*. A party's suggestion is without prejudice to the party's objections to the appointment of a receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*]. The court is not bound by a party's nomination, but the party's choice is usually given considerable weight. The statement of nomination should demonstrate that the nominee is not disqualified for any statutory reason [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(a)*; *§ 555.185[3][a]*].

[5] Service and Briefing Schedule

The party who obtained the temporary restraining order must, within five days from the date the temporary restraining order is issued or two days before the hearing, whichever is earlier, serve on the opposing party:

- A copy of the complaint if not previously served;
- The order to show cause stating the date, time, and place of the hearing;
- Any affidavits to be used in the application; and
- A copy of the points and authorities in support of the application.

The court may for good cause, on motion of the applicant or on its own motion, shorten the time required for service on the opposing party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(2)*].

The service and briefing schedule in this order will necessarily be controlled by the hearing date. For example, if the hearing date were set 10 days after issuance of the order to show cause [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(1)*; *see also* [3], *above*], the schedule might mandate service by the applicant (*see* Paragraph 7 of form) eight days before the hearing, and service of opposition papers (*see* Paragraph 8) four days before the hearing, and service of any reply papers (*see* Paragraph 9) two days before the hearing. This is a matter that could be governed by a local rule or practice.

When the matter first comes up for hearing, if the party who obtained the temporary restraining order has failed to effect service as required, the court must dissolve the temporary restraining order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(3)*; *but see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(5)* (order may be reissued if applicant shows inability to effect service as required)]. The opposing party is entitled to one continuance for a reasonable period of not less than 15 days or any shorter period requested by the opposing party, to enable the opposing party to meet the application for a preliminary injunction. If the opposing party obtains a continuance, the temporary restraining order will remain in effect until the date of the continued hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(d)(4)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.185

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.185 Order Appointing Receiver After Hearing and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-310]

[1] FORM Order Appointing Receiver After Hearing and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-310]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is California Judicial Council Form RC-310, which may be used to appoint a receiver for rents, issues, and profits after a hearing on an order to show cause [*see § 555.184*] and to issue a preliminary injunction in aid of the receivership [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*].

For examples of additional orders that could be stated in (or attached to) Paragraph 27 of this form, see *§ 555.188[1]*.

Use of this form is optional. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

[3] Order Appointing Receiver

[a] Who May Be Receiver

The receiver is the agent of the court and not of any party, and as such (1) is neutral, (2) acts for the benefit of all who may have an interest in the receivership property, and (3) holds assets for the court and not for the plaintiff or the

defendant [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(a)*]. The person appointed as receiver (*see* Paragraph 2 of form) must be eligible under this standard of neutrality and impartiality. The receiver should not be a party, or an attorney of a party, or a person otherwise interested in the action, or a relative of any judge of the court by consanguinity or affinity within the third degree [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(a)*].

The receiver must provide a bond and take an oath (*see* Paragraph 3 of form) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567*]. The court should fix the amount of the receiver's bond so as to cover the value of transferable personal property and cash that the receiver may possess at any point during the expected period of the receivership. If the bond were set too high or too low, the appropriate remedy would be a noticed motion for a modification. Counsel should be prepared to discuss the amount of the bond at the hearing.

[b] Prohibited Arrangements

The party seeking the appointment of the receiver may not, directly or indirectly, require any contract, agreement, arrangement, or understanding with any receiver whom the party intends to nominate or recommend to the court, and the receiver may not enter any such contract, arrangement, agreement, or understanding concerning any of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)*]:

- How much the receiver will charge for services (*see* Paragraph 4 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- Whom the receiver will hire, or seek approval to hire, to perform necessary services (*see, e.g.,* Paragraphs 5 and 14b of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(3)*];

- How much the receiver will pay for services to appropriate or approved third parties hired to provide services (*see, e.g.,* Paragraphs 5 and 14 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- How the receiver will administer the receivership (*see* Paragraph 7 et seq. of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- The role of the receiver with regard to the property following a trustee's sale or termination of the receivership, without specific court permission (*see* Paragraph 8 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(1)*]--for example, the party could not promise or agree that the receiver will get the listing for the property after the receivership or a particular management company will get the right to manage the property; or

- What capital expenditures will be made on the property (*see* Paragraph 14c of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(4)*].

[c] Inventory

A receiver must, within 30 days after appointment, or within any other time as the court may order, file an inventory containing a complete and detailed list of all property of which the receiver has taken possession by virtue of the appointment (*see* Paragraph 9 of form). The receiver must promptly file a supplementary inventory of all subsequently obtained property [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*].

[d] Monthly Reports

The receiver must provide monthly reports to the parties and, if requested, to nonparty client lienholders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*]. The monthly reports are not to be filed with the court unless the court so orders [*Cal. Rules of Ct.,*

Rule 3.1182(b)]. These reports must include all of the following:

- A narrative report of events [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(1)*];
- A financial report (*see* Paragraph 13a of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(2)*]; and
- A statement of all fees paid to the receiver [*see* [e], *below*], employees, and professionals showing all of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(3)*]:
  - Itemized services;
  - A breakdown of the services by six-minute increments;
  - If the fees are hourly, the hourly fees; and
  - If the fees are on another basis, that basis.

Unless good cause is shown, objections to a receiver's interim report and accounting (1) must be made within 10 days of notice of the report andaccounting, (2) must be specific, and (3) must be delivered to the receiver and all parties entitled to service of the interim report and accounting [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*].

[e] Interim Fees

Interim fees (*see* Paragraph 13b of form) are subject to final review and approval by the court. The court retains jurisdiction to award a greater or lesser amount as the full, fair, and final value of the services received [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(a)*].

[f] Employment of Attorney

A receiver must not employ an attorney without the court's approval. The application for approval to employ an attorney must be in writing and must state the necessity for the employment, the name of the attorney whom the receiver proposes to employ, and that the attorney is not the attorney for any party, nor associated with any party, nor employed by an attorney for any party (*see* Paragraph 18 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*].

[g] Final Account and Report on Noticed Motion or Stipulation

A receiver must present all of the following by noticed motion or stipulation of all parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(a)*]:

- A final account and report (*see* Paragraph 22 of form);
- A request for the discharge; and
- A request for exoneration of the receiver's surety.

No memorandum needs to be submitted in support of the motion or stipulation unless the court issues an order requiring a memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(b)*]. Notice of the motion or the stipulation must be given to every person or entity known to the receiver to have a substantial unsatisfied claim that will be affected by the order or stipulation, whether or not the person or entity is a party to the action and has appeared in the action [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(c)*]. If any allowance of compensation for the receiver or for an attorney employed by the receiver is

claimed in an account, it must state in detail what services have been performed by the receiver or the attorney, and whether previous allowances have been made to the receiver or attorney, and the amounts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.186

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.186 Ex Parte Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-200]

[1] FORM Ex Parte Order Appointing Receiver and Order to Show Cause--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-200]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is California Judicial Council Form RC-200, which may be used to order the ex parte appointment of a receiver for rents, issues, and profits [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*], along with a temporary restraining order, if necessary, to preserve the status quo regarding the receivership property. This form may be appropriate for use only in the most urgent circumstances, not allowing for a normal noticed motion [*see § 555.181[1]*] and not amenable to issuance of a show-cause order with a temporary restraining order [*see § 555.184[1]*], but evidently requiring the immediate appointment of a receiver. It would be considered a drastic remedy [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)(1)*; *see also* [3], *below*].

For examples of additional orders that could be stated in (or attached to) Paragraph 29 of this form, see *§ 555.188[1]*.

Use of this form is optional. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

Before going into court to request the ex parte appointment of a receiver, the applicant should verify his or her nominee's availability and obtain the information necessary to ensure that the receiver's bond and oath [*see* [5][b], *below*

] and the applicant's bond [*see* [5][d], *below*] can be immediately submitted to the court if the application is granted.

[3] Contents of Application

There is no Judicial Council form specifically for use in applying for this ex parte order. The application would be made by verified complaint [*see, e.g., § 555.180[1]*] or by affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see, e.g., § 555.182[1]*]. It must show in detail (in addition to any other matters supporting an application for the ex parte appointment of a receiver) all of the following:

- The nature of the emergency and the reasons irreparable injury would be suffered by the applicant during the time necessary for a hearing on notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)(1)*];

- The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the persons in actual possession of the property for which a receiver is requested, or of the president, manager, or principal agent of any corporation in possession of the property [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)(2)*];

- The use being made of the property by the persons in possession [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)(3)*]; and

- If the property is a part of the plant, equipment, or stock in trade of any business, the nature and approximate size or extent of thebusiness, and facts sufficient to show whether the taking of the property by a receiver would stop or seriously interfere with the operation of the business [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175(a)(4)*].

[4] Notice of Hearing

Whenever a receiver is appointed without notice, the matter must be made returnable on an order to show cause why the appointment should not be confirmed. The order to show cause must be made returnable on the earliest date the business of the court will allow, but not later than 15 days or, if good cause appears to the court, 22 days from the date the order is issued [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)*; *see § 555.184[3]*].

The hearing date will control the service and briefing schedule in the form (*see* Paragraphs 34-36 of form) [*see* [6], *below*].

[5] Order Appointing Receiver

[a] Who May Be Receiver

The receiver is the agent of the court and not of any party, and as such (1) is neutral, (2) acts for the benefit of all who may have an interest in the receivership property, and (3) holds assets for the court and not for the plaintiff or the defendant [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(a)*]. The person appointed as receiver (*see* Paragraph 3 of form) must be eligible under this standard of neutrality and impartiality. The receiver should not be a party, or an attorney of a party, or a person otherwise interested in the action, or a relative of any judge of the court by consanguinity or affinity within the third degree [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 566(a)*].

[b] Receiver's Bond and Oath

The receiver must provide a bond and take an oath (*see* Paragraph 4 of form) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 567*]. The court should fix the amount of the receiver's bond so as to cover the value of transferable personal property and cash that the receiver may possess at any point during the expected period of the receivership. If the bond were set too high or too low, the appropriate remedy would be a noticed motion for a modification. Counsel should be prepared to discuss the

amount of the bond at the ex parte hearing (and at the confirmation hearing; *see § 555.187*).

[c] Prohibited Arrangements

The party seeking the appointment of the receiver may not, directly or indirectly, require any contract, agreement, arrangement, or understanding with any receiver whom the party intends to nominate or recommend to the court, and the receiver may not enter any such contract, arrangement, agreement, or understanding concerning any of the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)*]:

- How much the receiver will charge for services (*see* Paragraph 5 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- Whom the receiver will hire, or seek approval to hire, to perform necessary services (*see, e.g.,* Paragraphs 6 and 16b of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(3)*];

- How much the receiver will pay for services to appropriate or approved third parties hired to provide services (*see, e.g.,* Paragraph 6 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- How the receiver will administer the receivership (*see* Paragraph 9 et seq. of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(2)*];

- The role of the receiver with regard to the property following a trustee's sale or termination of the receivership, without specific court permission (*see* Paragraph 10 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(1)*]--for example, the party could not promise or agree that the receiver will get the listing for the property after the receivership or a particular management company will get the right to manage the property; or

- What capital expenditures will be made on the property (*see* Paragraph 16c of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1179(b)(4)*].

[d] Applicant's Bond

Because the receiver is appointed ex parte, the applicant is required to provide a bond (*see* Paragraph 8 of form) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 566(b)*]. Counsel should be prepared to discuss the amount of the bond at the ex parte hearing. If the bond were set too high or too low, the appropriate remedy would be a noticed motion for a modification.

[e] Inventory

A receiver must, within 30 days after appointment, or within such other time as the court may order, file an inventory containing a complete and detailed list of all property of which the receiver has taken possession by virtue of the appointment (*see* Paragraph 11 of form). The receiver must promptly file a supplementary inventory of all subsequently obtained property [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1181*].

[f] Monthly Reports

The receiver must provide monthly reports to the parties and, if requested, to nonparty client lienholders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)*]. The monthly reports are not to be filed with the court unless the court so orders [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(b)*]. These reports must include all of the following:

- A narrative report of events [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(1)*];

- A financial report (*see* Paragraph 15a of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(2)*]; and

- A statement of all fees paid to the receiver [*see* [g], *below*], employees, and professionals showing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1182(a)(3)*]:

    - Itemized services;

    - A breakdown of the services by six-minute increments;

    - If the fees are hourly, the hourly fees; and

    - If the fees are on another basis, that basis.

Unless good cause is shown, objections to a receiver's interim report and accounting (1) must be made within 10 days of notice of the report and accounting, (2) must be specific, and (3) must be delivered to the receiver and all parties entitled to service of the interim report and accounting [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(b)*].

[g] Interim Fees

Interim fees (*see* Paragraph 15b of form) are subject to final review and approval by the court. The court retains jurisdiction to award a greater or lesser amount as the full, fair, and final value of the services received [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1183(a)*].

[h] Employment of Attorney

A receiver must not employ an attorney without the court's approval. The application for approval to employ an attorney must be in writing and must state the necessity for the employment, the name of the attorney whom the receiver proposes to employ, and that the attorney is not the attorney for any party, nor associated with any party, nor employed by an attorney for any party (*see* Paragraph 20 of form) [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1180*].

[i] Final Account and Report on Noticed Motion or Stipulation

A receiver must present all of the following by noticed motion or stipulation of all parties [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(a)*]:

- A final account and report (*see* Paragraph 24 of form);

- A request for the discharge; and

- A request for exoneration of the receiver's surety.

No memorandum needs to be submitted in support of the motion or stipulation unless the court issues an order requiring a memorandum [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(b)*]. Notice of the motion or the stipulation must be given to every person or entity known to the receiver to have a substantial unsatisfied claim that will be affected by the order or stipulation, whether or not the person or entity is a party to the action and has appeared in the action [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(c)*]. If any allowance of compensation for the receiver or for an attorney employed by the receiver is claimed in an account, it must state in detail what services have been performed by the receiver or the attorney, and whether previous allowanceshave been made to the receiver or attorney, and the amounts [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1184(d)*].

[6] Service and Briefing Schedule

The applicant must serve, by personal service (*see* Paragraph 34 of form) on each of the adverse parties all of the following:

- A copy of the complaint if not previously served;
- The order to show cause stating the date, time, and place of the hearing;
- Any affidavits supporting the application; and
- A memorandum of points and authorities supporting the application.

Service must be made as soon as reasonably practical, but no later than five days after the date the order to show cause is issued, unless the court orders another time for service [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(b)*].

The service and briefing schedule will necessarily be controlled by the hearing date. For example, if the hearing date were set 10 days after issuance of the order to show cause [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(a)*; [4], *above*], the schedule might mandate service by the applicant (*see* Paragraph 34 of form) eight days before the hearing, and service of opposition papers (*see* Paragraph 35) four days before the hearing, and service of any reply papers (*see* Paragraph 36) two days before the hearing. This is a matter that could be governed by a local rule or practice.

If the party that obtained the ex parte appointment fails to exercise diligence to effect service on the adverse parties, the court may discharge the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.187

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.187 Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-210]

[1] FORM Order Confirming Appointment of Receiver and Preliminary Injunction--Rents, Issues, and Profits [Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.; Cal. Judicial Council Form RC-210]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is California Judicial Council Form RC-210, which may be used to confirm the ex parte appointment of a receiver for rents, issues, and profits [*see § 555.186*] and to issue a preliminary injunction in aid of the receivership [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*].

Use of this form is optional. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

At the hearing for confirmation of an ex parte appointment, each party appearing may, at the time of the hearing, suggest in writing one or more persons for substitution as receiver, stating the reasons. A party's suggestion is without prejudice to the party's objections to the confirmation of the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1177*].

If the party that obtained the ex parte appointment is not ready to proceed at the confirmation hearing, the court may discharge the receiver [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(c)*]. The adverse parties are entitled to one continuance to enable them to oppose the confirmation. If a continuance is granted, the order to show cause remains in effect until the date of the continued hearing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1176(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.188

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.188 Additional Orders

[1] FORM

[*Following are examples of additional orders that could be stated in (or attached to) Paragraph 27 of form in § 555.185[1] or Paragraph 29 of form in § 555.186[1].*]

A. Preservation of Property. The receiver is authorized to care for, preserve, and maintain property in the receivership estate and, for that purpose, to make decisions or take action not specifically authorized by this order, provided that with regard to such authority:

(1) The receiver shall first attempt to obtain a stipulated agreement from the adversarial parties relating to a contemplated action. If the stipulation is obtained, it shall then be submitted to the court, ex parte, with an order for signature.

(2) If unable to obtain a stipulation, the receiver shall circulate a notice, with details of the recommended course of action, and give the parties an opportunity to object and request an ex parte hearing. The notice shall expressly state the necessity for the contemplated action and shall advise the parties that any objection must be written, must be specific, and must be served on the receiver and other parties, and filed with the court within seven days from being mailed or five days from being faxed.

(3) If the contemplated action is not an emergency, the receiver or the objecting party shall move for an order on a regularly noticed motion.

B. Contracts. If, in the receiver's judgment, a contract is necessary to administer the receivership estate, and if the

contract has a *de minimis* effect on the estate, no prior notice need be given, but the circumstances of entering into the contract shall be included in the receiver's next monthly report.

C. Notification of Tenants. The receiver shall inform all tenants of the telephone number and address of the receiver and notify tenants of the requirement that rents be paid to the receiver.

D. New Leases (or Renewals) in Excess of One Year. The receiver shall negotiate leases in excess of one year so as to obtain the best possible lease for the estate. Before execution of a lease, the receiver shall submit the lease to the plaintiff and the defendant (owner), for review, and give each party an opportunity to object by a date certain. If there is objection, the lease shall be submitted to the court for approval.

[2] Use of Form

This form sets forth examples of additional orders that, depending on the circumstances, could be stated in (or attached to) the JudicialCouncil forms in *§ 555.185[1]* (*see* Paragraph 27 of that form) and *§ 555.186[1]* (*see* Paragraph 29 of that form). These orders are adapted from orders sanctioned in local rules of the Los Angeles County Superior Court [*see* Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rule 9.51 et seq.], now largely superseded by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1175 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
D. Collection of Rents and Profits

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.189

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.189 Demand for Turnover of Rents, Issues, or Profits [Civ. Code § 2938(j)]

[1] FORM Demand for Turnover of Rents, Issues, or Profits [Civ. Code § 2938(j)]

DEMAND TO PAY RENT TO PARTY OTHER THAN LANDLORD
(*CIVIL CODE SECTION 2938*)

Tenant: _____ [*name*]
Property Occupied by Tenant: _____ [*address*]
Landlord: _____ [*name*]
Secured Party: _____ [*name*]
Address: _____ [*address for payment of rent to secured party and for further information*]

The secured party named above is the assignee of leases, rents, issues, and profits under _____ [*name of document*] dated _____ [*date*] and recorded at _____ [*recording information*] in the official records of _____ County, California. You may request a copy of such assignment from the secured party at _____ [*address*].

THIS NOTICE AFFECTS YOUR LEASE OR RENTAL AGREEMENT RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS. YOU ARE THEREFORE ADVISED TO CONSULT AN ATTORNEY CONCERNING THOSE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THIS NOTICE.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 2938 OF THE CIVIL CODE, SUBDIVISION (c), YOU ARE HEREBY DIRECTED TO PAY TO THE SECURED PARTY, _____ [*name*], AT _____ [

address], ALL RENTS UNDER YOUR LEASE OR OTHER RENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE LANDLORD OR PREDECESSOR IN INTEREST OF LANDLORD, FOR THE OCCUPANCY OF THE PROPERTY AT _____ [*address of rental premises*] WHICH ARE PAST DUE AND PAYABLE ON THE DATE YOU RECEIVE THIS DEMAND, AND ALL RENTS COMING DUE UNDER THE LEASE OR OTHER RENTAL AGREEMENT FOLLOWING THE DATE YOU RECEIVE THIS DEMAND UNLESS YOU HAVE ALREADY PAID THIS RENT TO THE LANDLORD IN GOOD FAITH AND IN A MANNER NOT INCONSISTENT WITH THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN YOU AND THE LANDLORD. IN THIS CASE, THIS DEMAND NOTICE SHALL REQUIRE YOU TO PAY TO THE SECURED PARTY, _____ [*name*], ALL RENTS THAT COME DUE FOLLOWING THE DATE OF THE PAYMENT TO THE LANDLORD.

IF YOU PAY THE RENT TO THE UNDERSIGNED SECURED PARTY, _____ [*name*], IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS NOTICE, YOU DO NOT HAVE TO PAY THE RENT TO THE LANDLORD. YOU WILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO DAMAGES OR OBLIGATED TO PAY RENT TO THE SECURED PARTY IF YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED A DEMAND OF THIS TYPE FROM A DIFFERENT SECURED PARTY.

[*For other than residential tenants, add:*]

IF YOU PAY ANY RENT TO THE LANDLORD THAT BY THE TERMS OF THIS DEMAND YOU ARE REQUIRED TO PAY TO THE SECURED PARTY, YOU MAY BE SUBJECT TO DAMAGES INCURRED BY THE SECURED PARTY BY REASON OF YOUR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THIS DEMAND, AND YOU MAY NOT BE DISCHARGED FROM YOUR OBLIGATION TO PAY SUCH RENT TO THE SECURED PARTY. YOU WILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO SUCH DAMAGES OR OBLIGATED TO PAY SUCH RENT TO THE SECURED PARTY IF YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED A DEMAND OF THIS TYPE FROM A DIFFERENT ASSIGNEE.

Your obligation to pay rent under this demand shall continue until you receive either (1) a written notice from a court directing you to pay the rent in a manner provided therein, or (2) a written notice from the secured party named above canceling this demand.

The undersigned hereby certifies, under penalty of perjury, that the undersigned is an authorized officer or agent of the secured party and that the secured party is the assignee, or the current successor to the assignee, under an assignment of leases, rents, issues, or profits executed by the landlord, or a predecessor in interest, that is being enforced pursuant to and in accordance with *Civil Code Section 2938*.

Executed at _____, California, this _____ day of _____, _____.

(Secured Party)
Name: _____ [*signature*]
Title: _____

[2] Use of Form

This form is a statutory demand for a turnover of rents, issues, and profits. It may be used to enforce an assignment of an interest in leases, rents, issues, or profits of real property made in connection with an obligation secured by the property. *Civ. Code § 2938* governs these assignments and sets forth alternative methods of enforcing them. One method permits enforcement by delivering to any one or more of the tenants a written demand (this form) for turnover of rents, issues, and profits [*see Civ. Code § 2938(c)*; *see also* [3], *below*].

The demand must be in the form specified in *Civ. Code § 2938(j)* and must be signed under penalty of perjury by the assignee or the assignee's authorized agent [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*].

For additional discussion of *Civ. Code § 2938*, see *§ 555.81[1]*.

[3] Delivery and Effectiveness

In addition to being delivered to any one or more of the tenants, a copy of this demand must be delivered to the assignor. A copy must be mailedto each other assignee of record of the leases, rents, issues, and profits of the real property at the address for notices provided in the assignment or, if there is none, the address to which the recorded assignment was to be mailed after recording [*Civ. Code § 2938(c)*].

The demand will be effective against the tenant when it is actually received by the tenant at the address for notices provided in the lease or other contractual agreement under which the tenant occupies the property or, if no address for notices is provided, at the property [*Civ. Code § 2938(d)*].

For discussion of the tenant's obligations on receipt of this demand, see *§ 555.81[4]*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.190

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.190 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.160[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant was in possession of the property.

6. When defendant took possession, the property consisted in part of _____ [*aspect of property wasted by defendant, e.g.*, 90 acres of vineyards].

7. After taking possession of the property, defendant committed waste by _____ [*specify defendant's acts and omissions, e.g.*, willfully mismanaging the property and allowing it to deteriorate from a failure to cultivate, irrigate, fertilize, fumigate, prune, and do all other acts necessary to preserve the vineyards].

8. Defendant defaulted on the note by _____ [*specify default, e.g.*, failing to make payments due on and after _____ (*date*)]. After this default, plaintiff caused the property to be sold by the trustee under the power of sale in the trust deed on _____ [*date*].

9. At the time of the trustee's sale, defendant's default amounted to $_____. _____ [*Specify purchaser, e.g.*, Plaintiff] bought the property at the trustee's sale for $_____ and received the customary trustee's deed.

10. As a proximate result of defendant's willful mismanagement of the property, plaintiff's security was impaired and rendered inadequate in theamount of $_____ [*difference between amount of outstanding debt and amount realized by sale of property*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a beneficiary under a trust deed to sue for damages for waste that impaired the security and was committed by the trustor in possession [*Civ. Code §§ 2929, 3333*]. The form may be modified to state a cause of action against any other person in possession, because the duty not to commit waste applies not only to the trustor and successors but also to any other person whose interest is subject to the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2929*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.90[1]*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following essential facts [*see § 555.90[5][a]*]:

- The defendant's status as a person in possession of property subject to the trust deed of which the plaintiff is the beneficiary (Paragraphs 4 and 5).

- The defendant's wasteful acts and omissions (Paragraphs 6 and 7).

- The proximate result that the plaintiff's security was rendered inadequate (Paragraphs 8-10) [*see Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 902-903, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

An additional allegation of bad faith waste is required (Paragraph 7, alleging willful mismanagement) to recover damages when a deficiency judgment would otherwise be barred, such as after foreclosure by a private sale (Paragraph 8) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 581d*; *see Cornelison v. Kornbluth (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 590, 603, 605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 557, 542 P.2d 981* ; *Hickman v. Mulder (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 900, 903, 908-909, 130 Cal. Rptr. 304]* . For further discussion, see *§ 555.90[5][b]*.

[4] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in superior court actions that are not limited civil cases and in some limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In an action for injuries to real property, the superior court in the county in which the real property is located is the proper court for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to tort damages in general, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.191

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.191 Complaint for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.] Based on Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint for Preliminary and Permanent Injunctions [Code Civ. Proc. § 525 et seq.; Civ. Code § 3420 et seq.] Based on Waste Impairing Security [Civ. Code § 2929]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
Defendant.	)	ORDER AND PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT
	)	INJUNCTIONS
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.160[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Defendant's possession of property. See § 555.190[1], Paragraph 6.*]

6. When defendant took possession, _____ [*allege prior condition or nature of property, e.g.,* the first floor of the building on the property consisted of a coin operated laundromat with 46 washers and 20 dryers. The fair market value of the property at that time was $_____].

7. Beginning on or about _____ [*date*], and continuously since then, defendant has committed, and defendant threatens to continue to commit, waste by _____ [*specify, e.g.,* removing the washers and dryers from the property].

8. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff demanded that defendant _____ [*specify, e.g.,* not remove or otherwise dispose of the washers and dryers], but defendant has failed to do so, and threatens to continue unless restrained.

9. Defendant's outstanding debt under the note is $_____.

10. Unless defendant's conduct is restrained, it will cause irreparable injury to plaintiff and render plaintiff's security inadequate in that it will reduce the fair market value of the property to approximately $_____.

11. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for this injury, in that _____[*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant is insolvent].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause why defendant should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action;

2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant and all persons acting under, for, or in concert with defendant from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* removing or otherwise disposing of any washers, dryers, or other equipment used in operating the laundromat located on the property];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by the beneficiary under a trust deed to sue for temporary and permanent injunctions restraining the trustor in possession from committing actual or threatened waste to impair the beneficiary's security interest [*Civ. Code §§ 2929, 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*]. The form may be modified to state a cause of action against any other person in possession, because the duty not to commit waste applies not only to the trustor and successors but also to any other person whose interest is subject to the trust deed [*Civ. Code § 2929*]. For further discussion, see *§ 555.90[1]*. The form may also be modified to include or state a cause of action restraining a third party's injury to the property that impairs the security [*see § 555.91*].

The beneficiary is entitled to obtain injunctive relief before foreclosure in cases in which the waste threatens to render the security inadequate [*see Civ. Code § 2929*; *Miller v. Waddingham (1891) 91 Cal. 377, 382, 27 P. 750]* . If foreclosure proceedings are pending, this form may be modified to enjoin any person in possession of the property from performing any act that injures the property, regardless of whether the acts would render the security inadequate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 745(a)*; *see § 555.90[4]*]. Appointment of a receiver may also be sought in a foreclosure action when acts of waste endanger the security [*Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(2)*]. For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 486, *Receivers* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following essential facts:

- The defendant's status as a person in possession of property subject to the trust deed of which the plaintiff is the beneficiary (Paragraph 5).

- The defendant's wasteful conduct or threatened conduct (Paragraphs 6-8).

- The likelihood that the plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury unless this conduct is enjoined (Paragraphs 9-11) [*see Miller v. Waddingham (1891) 91 Cal. 377, 382, 27 P. 750* ; *Robinson v. Russell (1864) 24 Cal. 467, 473]* .

For further discussion, see *§ 555.90[4]*.

[4] Verification

Verification [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if the plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on the complaint instead of on an affidavit (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *see generally* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*]. Otherwise, verification is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

If relying on a verified complaint instead of an affidavit (or declaration), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle the plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . In addition, counsel must append to this form a declaration relating to notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action seeking permanent injunctive relief is in the jursdiction of the superior court and is not a limited civil action [

Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In an action for injuries to real property, the superior court in the county in which the real property is located is the proper court for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief in general, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.192

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.192 Complaint for Damages for Rent Skimming [Civ. Code § 891]--By Lienholder

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Rent Skimming [Civ. Code § 891]--By Lienholder

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Capacity and residence of plaintiff. See § 555.120[1], Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant. See § 555.125[1], Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Making of promissory note. See § 555.126[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Execution and recordation of trust deed. See § 555.147[1], Paragraph 4.*]

5. Defendant acquired the property on _____ [*date*]. The property is improved with _____ [*describe residential nature of property, e.g.,* a 15-unit apartment building].

6. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that during *or* During] the period commencing on _____ [*date within first year of defendant's ownership*] and continuing until _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the present time], defendant engaged in rent skimming, that is, defendant collected rents of at least $_____ per month in the aggregate from the property and [knowingly and willfully] expended that revenue [for personal purposes] without first applying it, or an equivalent amount, to payments then due on the note.

7. As a proximate result of defendant's rent skimming, plaintiff sustained damages in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant defaulted in the payment on the note. After giving notice of default and notice of sale as required by law, _____ (*name*), trustee under the trust deed, foreclosed the trust deed under the power of sale and sold the property at a public auction for $_____. The amount then due and delinquent on the note was $_____, and the expenses of the sale were $_____. The deficiency, after application of the proceeds of the sale and deduction of the expenses of the sale, is $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For actual damages in the sum of $_____;

[2. For exemplary damages;]

3. For reasonable attorney's fees;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 555.120[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a mortgagee or trust deed beneficiary [*see Civ. Code § 891(b)* (authorizing action by mortgagee or beneficiary)] who has been injured by rent-skimming [*see Civ. Code § 890(a)* (definition)]. Although this complaint has named as defendant only the owner who collected the rents, the complaint may be modified to sue any person, including officers and directors of a business organization, that authorized rent-skimming or, being in a position of control, failed to prevent another from rent skimming [*see Civ. Code § 890(c)*]. The complaint also may be modified for use by a vendor as lienholder or by a tenant, either of whom could be injured by rent skimming. For further discussion, see *§ 555.94*.

For a related affirmative defense allegation, see *§ 555.193*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following essential facts:

- The rent skimming, that is, the failure to apply rents from residential real property, or an equivalent amount, at any time during the first year after acquiring the property, to payments due on all mortgages and trust deeds encumbering the property (Paragraphs 5 and 6) [*see Civ. Code § 890(a)* (defining rent skimming)].

- The plaintiff's damages (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 891(b)* (mortgagee or beneficiary is entitled to actual damages to extent of rents collected on property, attorney's fees, and costs)].

[4] Other Relief

The rights and remedies provided by *Civ. Code § 891* are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law [*Civ. Code § 891(e)*]. In the case of a vendor or another mortgagee or beneficiary, an order for any appropriate equitable relief is specifically authorized [*see Civ. Code § 891(a), (c)*]. For instance, if the mortgage or trust deed contains an assignment of rents as additional security, the beneficiary or mortgagee may seek to have the assignment specifically performed, often by appointment of a receiver, and sometimes in addition to an accounting.

[5] Verification

Verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (unless otherwise required by law, pleadings not required to be verified)]. However, if the complaint is verified, the defendant is required to file a verified answer in a superior court action other than a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446(a)*] and is precluded from making a general denial in superior court actions that are not limited civil cases and in some limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

Generally, the proper county for trial is the county in which a defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. In an action by the vendor or other lienholder, in which the actual damages are essentially the deficiency or the outstanding debt following foreclosure or loss of the security, the proper county for trial is the county in which the obligation was entered into or is to be performed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. In an action by a tenant, in which the actual damages are essentially out-of-pocket losses, the proper county for trial is the county in which injury occurs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If the defendant is a corporation or association, the county in which its principal place of business is located is a proper county for trial [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.193

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.193 Affirmative Defense Allegation--Rental Revenue Used for Emergency Medical Treatment or Necessary Repairs [Civ. Code § 893]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation--Rental Revenue Used for Emergency Medical Treatment or Necessary Repairs [Civ. Code § 893]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges:

1. Within 30 days of receipt of each and every rent payment that is the subject of the complaint, defendant used the [unapplied portion of the] revenue to pay _____ [health care providers, as defined in *Business and Professions Code Section 6146(c)(2),* for unforeseen and necessary medical treatment for _____ (defendant *or* defendant's spouse *or* defendant's parent *or* defendant's child) *or* _____ (licensed contractors *or* material suppliers) for _____ (*specify expenditure to correct violation of statute, ordinance, or regulation relating to habitability of premises, e.g.,* repairs to the heating and plumbing systems at the property, without which the property could not have complied with the city housing code)].

2. At the time of each and every expenditure described in Paragraph 1, defendant had no other source of funds from which to make the expenditure.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is a form of affirmative defense for use by a defendant in an action for damages for rent skimming, when the revenue not applied to debts secured by liens on the property were used for unforeseen medical expenses [*Civ. Code § 893(a)(1)(A)*] or to correct violations relating to the habitability of the premises [*Civ. Code §*

893(a)(1)(B)]. In either case, the payment must have been made within 30 days of the defendant's receipt of the rents that were diverted [*Civ. Code § 893(a)(2)*], and the defendant must not have had any other source of funds from which to make the payments [*Civ. Code § 893(a)(2)*].

For a complaint for damages for rent skimming, see *§ 555.192*.

[3] Burden of Proof

The defendant has the burden of proof of each element of the defense [*Civ. Code § 893(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapter 555 TRUST DEEDS AND REAL PROPERTY MORTGAGES
PART IV. FORMS
E. Injury to Security

48-555 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 555.194

AUTHOR: William M. Hensley Editorial Consultant Editorial Consultant William M. Hensley is an attorney with the Irvine law firm of Jackson, DeMarco & Peckenpaugh. He is a member of the Editorial Board of the California Real Estate Reporter (Matthew Bender).

§ 555.194 Notice of Motion for Order Declaring That Interest Reacquired by Vendor Is Not Encumbered by Another Lien [Civ. Code § 891(b)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Order Declaring That Interest Reacquired by Vendor Is Not Encumbered by Another Lien [Civ. Code § 891(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR OR-
Plaintiff,	)	DER THAT PROPERTY IS NOT SUBJECT TO LI-
vs.	)	EN
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Dept: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record and to _____ [*names of persons having liens on property*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*] or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order that his/her/its interest in the property that is the subject of this action and that was reacquired by _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] on _____ [*date*] is not subject to the lien of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the State of California represented by that certain judgment establishing defendant's unpaid income tax liability for the year 1985. An abstract of that judgment was recorded _____ (*date*) in _____ County, California, at book _____, page _____]. The motion will be made on the grounds that the lien sought to be avoided (1) was incurred by defendant _____ [*name*], a person who engaged in rent skimming as defined in *Civil Code Section 890(a), (2)* _____ [is *or* has the effect of] a judgment lien against that defendant's property, and (3) is not related to any improvement of the property nor does it represent security for any loan made by a good faith lender without knowledge of facts constituting a violation of *Civil Code Section 890 et seq.*

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s)of _____ [*name(s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed with this notice, on the records and file in this action, and on evidence to be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*party's status and name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice of motion for use by a vendor of an interest in residential real property who has reacquired the interest in the property from a person who engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property, or by a law enforcement agency, to request an order declaring that the reacquired interest is not encumbered by a lien that is or has the effect of a judgment lien against the property of the person who engaged in the rent skimming. This relief cannot be granted if the lien is related to any improvement of the property or if it represents security for a loan made by a good faith lender without knowledge of facts constituting a violation of *Civ. Code § 890 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 891(b)*]. The requirement that the lien be incurred by a person engaged in rent skimming implies that only liens incurred during the period in which rent was being skimmed can be avoided [*see Civ. Code § 891(b)*].

A supporting memorandum must be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Notice to Interested Parties

The motion pursuant to *Civ. Code § 891(b)* must be made on at least 30 days' written notice to all persons who may be affected by the order, including lienholders [*Civ. Code § 891(b)*].

[4] Order Granting Motion

If the requirements for relief are met, the court must issue an order granting the requested relief unless the court determines that the interests of justice would not be served by the order [*Civ. Code § 891(b)*].

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

For coverage of jurisdiction and venue, see *§ 555.192[6]*.

127 of 127 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 48: Theaters, Shows, and Amusement Place thru Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages-Chs. 547-559
Chapters 556through 559 RESERVED

48-556 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 556through 559

RESERVED

Chapters 556RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 560.syn

§ 560.syn Synopsis to Chapter 560: TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS

§ 560.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 560.02 Cross References

§§ 560.03-560.09 [Reserved]

§ 560.10 Governing Statutes

§ 560.11 Definition of Express Trust

§ 560.12 Private and Charitable Trusts Distinguished

§ 560.13 Parties to Express Trust

[1] Settlor

[2] Trustee

[3] Beneficiary

§ 560.14 Attorney as Beneficiary

[1] Statutory Limitations

[2] General Rule Invalidating Transfers to Specified Persons

[3] Exceptions to General Rule Invalidating Transfers

[4] Time for Commencement of Action to Establish Invalidity of Transfer

[5] Professional Discipline

§ 560.15 Action to Contest Trust

[1] Contrasted with Will Contest

[2] Time Limits for Commencement

§ 560.16 No-Contest Clauses in Trust Instruments

[1] Nature and Validity

[2] Enforcement of No Contest Clause Under Probate Code

[a] Applicable Law and Enforceability

[b] No Contest Clause Defined

[c] Protected Instrument

[d] Direct Contest

[e] Challenge to Transfer of Property

[f] Creditor's Claim

[g] Declaratory Relief Unavailable

[3] Enforcement of No Contest Clauses Under Common Law

[a] In General

[b] Indirect Attack

[c] Oral Contract

[d] Interpretation

[e] Challenge on Grounds of Duress or Undue Influence Is Not Contest

[f] Contest of One Subtrust May Not Invalidate Other Subtrusts

[4] Strict Construction

[5] Review of Determination

§ 560.17 Applicability of Trust Law

§ 560.18 Nonapplicability of Trust Law

§ 560.19 Effect of Trust Law on Other Relationships and Entities

§ 560.20 Nonretroactive Provisions of Trust Law

[1] Revocation

[2] Trustee's Duty to Account Annually

[3] Trustee's Liability

§§ 560.21-560.39 [Reserved]

§ 560.40 Governing Statutes

§ 560.41 Methods of Creating Trust

§ 560.42 Requirements for Valid Trust

[1] Intention to Create Trust

[2] Trust Property

[3] Ascertainable Beneficiary

[4] Resulting Trust Created on Failure of Express Trust

§ 560.43 Action by Settlor

§ 560.44 Requirements for Promise to Create Trust

§ 560.45 Purpose of Trust

§ 560.46 Statute of Frauds

§ 560.47 Oral Trust of Personal Property

§ 560.48 Merger Doctrine

[1] In General

[2] Exception

§ 560.49 Rule Against Perpetuities

[1] General Application to Trusts

[2] Period Within Which Interest Must Vest

[3] Time of Creation of Interest

[4] Honorary Trusts

[5] Trust for Care of Designated Animal

[6] Accumulation of Trust Income

[7] Interests Excluded From Rule

[8] Termination of Trust After Expiration of Perpetuity Period

[9] Reformation

§§ 560.50-560.69 [Reserved]

§ 560.70 Governing Statutes

§ 560.71 Acceptance of Trust by Trustee

§ 560.72 Rejection of Trust by the Trustee

§ 560.73 Trustee's Bond and Certificate

§ 560.74 Professional Fiduciaries Act

[1] Professional Fiduciary

[2] Licensing Requirements

[3] Qualifications for Licensure

[4] License Renewal

[5] Initial and Annual Statement

[6] Suspension, Revocation, Denial, and Disciplinary Action

§ 560.75 Cotrustees

[1] Unanimous Action Required

[2] Vacancy or Unavailability

[3] Duties of Cotrustees

§ 560.76 Duties of Trustee

[1] Generally

[2] In Revocable Trust

[3] Loyalty

[4] Conflict of Interest and Adverse Interests

[5] Preservation, Use, and Disposal of Trust Property

[6] Commingling Trust Property

[7] Delegation of Performance and Transfer of Office

§ 560.77 Trustee's Compliance With Internal Revenue Code Provisions

[1] Marital Deduction Gifts

[2] Charitable Remainder Unitrusts and Charitable Remainder Annuity Trusts

[3] Charitable Lead Trusts

§ 560.78 Standard of Care

[1] Generally

[2] Investment

[3] Delegation of Investment and Management Functions

[4] Exercise of Discretionary Powers

[a] General Standard

[b] "Absolute," "Sole," or "Uncontrolled" Discretion

[c] Discretionary Distributions for Benefit of Trustee

[d] Definition of "Party In Interest"

§ 560.79 Holder of Power May Not Discharge Own Legal Obligations

§ 560.80 Duty to Report or Account

[1] Generally

[2] On Request by Beneficiary

[3] Copy of Terms of Trust

[4] Annual Account

[5] Exceptions to Accounting Requirements

§ 560.81 Duty to Give Notice When Trust Becomes Irrevocable or On Change of Trustees of Irrevocable Trust

[1] Statutory Notice Requirement

[2] Limiting Effect on Actions to Contest Trust

[3] Persons Who Must Be Notified

[4] Method of Service

[5] Contents of Notification

[6] Trustee's Liability for Failure to Serve Notification

[7] Waiver Against Public Policy

§ 560.82 Powers

[1] In General

[2] Management of Trust Property

[3] Corporate Transactions

[4] Deposits

[5] Deposits in Financial Institution Controlled by Trustee

[6] Actions and Claims

[7] Loans to Beneficiary

[8] Distribution to Beneficiaries

§ 560.83 Notice of Proposed Action by Trustee

[1] In General

[2] Persons to Whom Notice Must Be Given

[3] When Notice May Not Be Given

[4] Contents of Notice

[5] Objections to Proposed Action

[6] Decision Not to Take Action

§ 560.84 Liability to Beneficiaries

[1] Breach of Trust

[2] Acts of Agent

[3] Acts of Cotrustee

[a] Acts Committed on or After July 1, 1987

[b] Acts Committed Before July 1, 1987

[c] Joint and Several Liability

[4] Acts of Predecessor

[5] Remedies for Breach of Trust

[6] Measure of Liability for Breach of Trust

§ 560.85 Release From Liability

§ 560.86 Limitations on Proceedings Against Trustee

§ 560.87 Limitations on Liability

[1] Provision in Trust Instrument

[2] Beneficiary's Failure to Object to Account or Report

[3] Revocable Trust

[4] Consent of Beneficiary

[5] Release or Contract

[6] Affirmance of Transaction by Beneficiary

[7] Marital Deduction QTIP Trusts

§ 560.88 Elder Abuse Action Against Trustee

§ 560.89 Compensation of Trustee

[1] Under Trust Instrument

[2] Reasonable Compensation

[3] Apportionment Among Trustees

[4] When Attorney Is Trustee

§ 560.90 Increased Trustee's Fee

§ 560.91 Indemnification of Trustee

§ 560.92 Resignation of Trustee

[1] Methods

[2] Liability of Resigning Trustee

§ 560.93 Removal of Trustee

[1] General Grounds for Removal

[2] Special Rule When Trustee Is Attorney Who Drafted Instrument or Attorney's Relative, Associate, or Employee

[a] Persons Covered by Rule

[b] Removal of Trustee

[3] Surrender of Trust Property Pending Disposition of Petition Seeking Renewal

[4] Award of Costs and Fees

§ 560.94 Vacancy in Office of Trustee

[1] Manners in Which Vacancy Arises

[2] Delivery of Property by Former Trustee

[3] Appointment of Trustee to Fill Vacancy

[a] In General

[b] Appointment of Trustee Ad Litem

§§ 560.95-560.109 [Reserved]

§ 560.110 Governing Statutes

§ 560.111 Revocation

[1] Generally

[2] Method if Trust Created on or After July 1, 1987

[3] Method if Trust Created Prior to July 1, 1987

[4] Validity of Revocable Trust

§ 560.112 Modification

§ 560.113 Grounds for Modification or Termination

[1] Uneconomically Low Trust Principal

[2] Changed Circumstances

[3] Combination of Similar Trusts

[4] Division of Trusts

§ 560.114 Compelling Modification or Termination

[1] By All Beneficiaries

[2] By Settlor and All Beneficiaries

[3] No Conclusive Presumption of Fertility

[4] Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

§ 560.115 Termination

[1] Methods

[2] Trustee's Powers

[3] Disposition of Property

§§ 560.116-560.129 [Reserved]

§ 560.130 Governing Statutes

§ 560.131 Procedure to Administer Trusts Generally

§ 560.132 No Right to Jury Trial

§ 560.133 Standing

§ 560.134 Grounds for Petition

§ 560.135 Commencement of Proceeding

§ 560.136 Dismissal of Petition

§ 560.137 Notice

[1] In General

[2] Notice to Trustees, Beneficiaries, and Attorney General

[3] Special Notice on Written Request of Beneficiary or Creditor

[4] Special Notice Regarding Future Interests

[5] Copy of Petition on Notice of Appearance or Written Request

[6] Notice to Other Interested Persons

[7] Additional Notice

[8] Lis Pendens

[9] Mailing Procedure

[10] Personal Delivery

[11] Proof of Notice

[12] Shortening Time

[13] Continued or Postponed Hearings

[14] Waiver of Notice

§ 560.138 Orders

§ 560.139 Appeals

§ 560.140 Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

§ 560.141 Judicial Intervention in Trust Administration

§ 560.142 Subject Matter Jurisdiction

§ 560.143 In Personam Jurisdiction

[1] Trustee

[2] Beneficiaries

[3] Basis Not Inconsistent With Constitutions

§ 560.144 Venue

[1] Generally

[2] Appointment of Trustee of Living Trust

[3] Application of Code of Civil Procedure

[4] Testamentary Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction of Court

§ 560.145 Trusts Subject to Continuing Court Jurisdiction

[1] Definition

[2] Transfer Between Counties

§ 560.146 Removal From Continuing Court Jurisdiction

§ 560.147 Transfer of Trust to Another Jurisdiction

[1] Applicable Law

[2] Trusts Subject to Transfer

[3] Procedure

[4] Discharge of Trustee

§ 560.148 Transfer of Trust From Foreign Jurisdiction

[1] In General

[2] Grounds for Transfer

[3] Venue to Transfer Trust

[4] Notice and Hearing of Transfer

[5] Orders Regarding Transfer

[6] Conditional Order Accepting Transfer

[7] Administration of Transferred Trust

§§ 560.149-560.159 [Reserved]

§ 560.160 Governing Statutes

§§ 560.161-560.179 [Reserved]

§ 560.180 Personal Liability of Trustee to Third Persons

[1] Contract

[2] Obligations Arising From Ownership or Control of Property

[3] Torts

[4] Negotiable Instruments

§ 560.181 Personal Liability of Dissenting Cotrustee

§ 560.182 Liability of Trust; Naming Trustee as Defendant in Representative Capacity

§ 560.183 Determining Liability of Trustee Versus Liability of Estate

§ 560.184 Actions Involving Third Persons

[1] Concurrent Jurisdiction of Probate Court

[2] Third Person's Plenary Action Regarding Trust or Trustee

[3] Trustee's Plenary Action Against Third Person

[4] Beneficiary's Remedies for Acts of Third Person

[5] Double Damages for Wrongfully Taking, Concealing, or Disposing of Trust Property

§ 560.185 Recovery of Costs

§§ 560.186-560.199 [Reserved]

§ 560.200 Third Person Transacting With Trustee in Good Faith

§ 560.201 Certification of Trust

§ 560.202 Third Person Transacting With Former Trustee

§ 560.203 Reliance on Record Title to Real Property

§ 560.204 Presumption Regarding Undisclosed Beneficiary

§ 560.205 Recordation of Affidavit of Change of Trustee

§§ 560.206-560.219 [Reserved]

§ 560.220 Enforcement of Judgment Against Judgment Debtor's Interest in Trust

[1] Writ of Execution Not Available

[2] Extent of Liability

[3] Petition Proceedings

§ 560.221 Restrictions on Voluntary and Involuntary Transfer of Interest in Trust

[1] Spendthrift Trust

[2] Trust for Education or Support of Beneficiary

[3] Trust Property Payable to Beneficiary at Trustee's Discretion

§ 560.222 Rights of General Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

[1] Property Generally Subject to Enforcement

[2] Percentage Limitations

[3] Subordination to Child or Spousal Support Claims

[4] No Right to Affect Trustee Discretion

[5] Limitations on Liability and Duty of Trustee Regarding Creditor

[6] Modifiability of Order

§ 560.223 Rights of Support Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

[1] Child or Spousal Support

[2] Public Support

§ 560.224 Rights of Restitution Judgment Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

§ 560.225 Claims Against Settlor

[1] Revocable Trust

[2] Settlor as Beneficiary

§§ 560.226-560.239 [Reserved]

§ 560.240 Governing Statutes

§ 560.241 Payment of Claims From Trust Authorized

[1] In General

[2] "Claim" Defined

§ 560.242 Liability of Deceased Settlor's Surviving Spouse

§ 560.243 Liability of Distributees

[1] When Trustee Does Not Give Notice to Creditors

[2] When Trustee Gives Notice to Creditors

[3] Defenses

[4] Extent of Liability

[5] No Constructive Trust

§ 560.244 Liability Between Trusts Established by Deceased Settlor

§ 560.245 Notice to Creditors

[1] Trustee Under No Duty to Initiate Notice Proceedings

[2] Effect of Filing Notice

[3] Multiple Trusts

[4] Relationship to Decedent's Estate and Other Probate Proceedings

[5] Proposed Notice

[a] Time for Filing

[b] Place of Filing

[6] Notice by Publication

[a] Requirements

[b] Good Faith Substantial Compliance Sufficient

[c] Affidavit of Publication

[7] Actual Notice

[a] Required for Known Creditors

[b] Not Required for Creditor Who Filed Claim

[c] Methods of Notice

[d] Time for Giving Notice

[e] Extent of Trustee's Immunity for Providing or Failing to Provide Notice

§ 560.246 Filing Claims

[1] Time Limitations

[a] Basic Time for Filing Claim

[b] Effect of Vacancy in Office of Trustee

[c] Statute of Limitations

[2] Filing of Late Claims

[a] When Late Claim Allowed

[b] Property and Payments Not Subject to Late Claim

§ 560.247 Procedure for Filing Claims

[1] In General

[2] Claim Based on Written Instrument

§ 560.248 Trustee's Power to Waive Formal Defects in Claim

§ 560.249 Amendment and Revision of Claims

§ 560.250 Claims by Public Entities

[1] In General

[2] Claims Governed by Special Statutes

[3] Liability of Distributees

§ 560.251 Payment, Rejection, or Settlement of Claims

§ 560.252 Petition for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims Against Deceased Settlor

[1] In General

[2] Notice of Hearing on Petition for Approval

[3] Response or Objection

[4] Discretion of Court

[a] Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

[b] Ruling on Petition

[5] Conclusiveness of Order

[6] Appeal

§ 560.253 Allowance and Rejection of Claims

[1] In General

[2] Contents of Allowance or Rejection

[3] Allowance of Claim

[4] Rejection of Claim

§ 560.254 Creditor's Action on Rejected Claim

[1] In General

[2] Notice of Pendency of Action

[3] Costs and Attorney's Fees

§ 560.255 Claims Established by Judgment

[1] Money Judgments

[2] Nonmoney Judgments

[3] Property Subject to Execution Lien

[4] Conversion of Attachment Lien to Judgment Lien

[a] Converting Lien

[b] Exemptions From Lien

§ 560.256 Allocation of Debts Between Trust and Surviving Spouse

[1] Allocation of Debt Authorized

[2] Funeral Expenses and Expenses of Last Illness

[3] Allocation Affected by Value of Surviving Spouse's Property

[4] Allocation by Agreement

[5] Notice of Hearing on Petition for Allocation of Debts

[6] Order Allocating Debts

§§ 560.257-560.269 [Reserved]

§ 560.270 Governing Statutes

§ 560.271 Commercial Fundraisers for Charitable Purposes

[1] Defined

[2] Disclosures Required

§ 560.272 Fiduciary Duties of Persons Soliciting Charitable Contributions

§§ 560.273-560.289 [Reserved]

§ 560.290 Charitable Trust Defined

§ 560.291 Exemption From Rule Against Perpetuities

§ 560.292 Beneficiaries

§ 560.293 Application of Cy Pres Doctrine

§ 560.294 No Charitable Immunity for Torts

§ 560.295 Duties of Trustee

[1] Prohibited Acts

[2] Distribution of Income

[3] Incorporation of Provisions in Trust Instrument

[4] Applicability of Petition Procedure

§ 560.296 Enforcement of Charitable Trusts

[1] By Attorney General

[2] By Parties Other Than Attorney General

§ 560.297 Proceedings Regarding Internal Affairs or Existence of Trust

§§ 560.298-560.309 [Reserved]

§ 560.310 Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporations

§ 560.311 Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporations Holding Assets in Charitable Trust

§ 560.312 Directors' Standard of Conduct

[1] General Standard

[2] Standards for Investment of Corporate Assets

[3] Duties and Obligations of Private Trustees Not Applicable

§ 560.313 Joint and Several Liability for Wrongful Approval

§ 560.314 Actions to Remedy Breach of Trust

§ 560.315 Actions Challenging Self-Dealing Transactions

[1] In General

[2] Excepted Transactions

[3] Effect of Prior Approval of Transaction

§ 560.316 Derivative Actions

§ 560.317 Indemnification of Corporate Agents

§ 560.318 Limited Immunity of Volunteer Director or Officer of Nonprofit Corporations

§ 560.319 Dissolution and Winding Up

[1] Involuntary Proceedings

[2] Voluntary Proceedings

[3] Distribution of Assets

§§ 560.320-560.339 [Reserved]

§ 560.340 Governing Statutes

§ 560.341 Definitions

[1] "Totten Trust Account"

[2] "Beneficiary" and "Party"

§ 560.342 Ownership While All Parties Are Living

§ 560.343 Changes in Account Terms

§ 560.344 Ownership After Death of Party

§ 560.345 Withdrawals

[1] In General

[2] Payments to Trustee

[3] Payment to Heirs or Personal Representative of Deceased Trustee

[4] Payments to Beneficiary

[5] Levies and Setoffs

[6] Notice From Party Restraining Payment of Account

§§ 560.346-560.359 [Reserved]

§ 560.360 State Statutes

§ 560.361 Decisions

[1] Trusts

[a] In General

[b] Beneficiaries

[c] Creation

[d] Vesting

[2] No Contest Clauses

[3] Restorative Payments to Trust

[4] Taking Property Out of Trust

§ 560.362 Law Reviews

§ 560.363 Text References

§§ 560.364-560.379 [Reserved]

§ 560.380 State Statutes

§ 560.381 Decisions

[1] Accounting

[2] Actions and Claims

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Compensation

[5] Duties

[6] Liability

[7] Measure of Liability

[8] Removal

[9] Rights

[10] Successor Trustees

[11] Temporary Trustee or Receiver

[12] Trustee Ad Litem

§ 560.382 Text References

§§ 560.383-560.399 [Reserved]

§ 560.400 State Statutes

§ 560.401 Decisions

§ 560.402 Law Reviews

§ 560.403 Text References

§§ 560.404-560.419 [Reserved]

§ 560.420 California Points and Authorities

§ 560.421 Other California Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Legal Forms

[2] California Wills & Trusts

[3] California Trust Practice

§ 560.422 Federal Statutes

§ 560.423 State Statutes

§ 560.424 Decisions

§ 560.425 Law Reviews

§ 560.426 Text References

§§ 560.427-560.439 [Reserved]

§ 560.440 California Points and Authorities

§ 560.441 California Torts

§ 560.442 State Statutes

[1] Bona Fide Transactions

[2] Enforcement of Money Judgment

[3] Express Trusts Relating to Real Estate

[4] Liability of Trustee

[5] Restrictions on Transfer of Trust Property

[6] Procedure in Plenary Actions

§ 560.443 Federal Rules of Court

§ 560.444 Decisions

[1] Action by Beneficiary Regarding Internal Affairs of Trust

[2] Alter Ego

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Bona Fide Transaction

[5] Liability of Trust Estate

[6] Liability of Trustee

[7] Restrictions on Transfer of Trust Property

[8] Standing

[9] Venue

§ 560.445 Law Reviews

§ 560.446 Text References

§§ 560.447-560.459 [Reserved]

§ 560.460 State Statutes

§§ 560.461-560.479 [Reserved]

§ 560.480 California Legal Forms

§ 560.481 State Statutes

§ 560.482 Administrative Regulations

§ 560.483 Decisions

[1] Characteristics of Charitable Trust or Organization

[2] Charitable Immunity

[3] Cy Pres Doctrine

[4] Enforcement Powers of Attorney General

[5] Enforcement Powers of Parties Other Than Attorney General

[6] Nonprofit Corporation Law

[7] Standard of Conduct Regarding Management of Charitable Assets

[8] Nonprofit Health Care Service Plans

§ 560.484 Law Reviews

§ 560.485 Text References

§§ 560.486-560.499 [Reserved]

§ 560.500 State Statutes

§ 560.501 Decisions

[1] Totten Trust Established

[2] Totten Trust Not Established

§ 560.502 Text References

§§ 560.503-560.519 [Reserved]

§ 560.520 Petition to Determine Existence of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Allegations

[6] Verification

[7] Venue

[8] State Statutes

[a] Jurisdiction and Venue

[b] Notice

[c] Petitions

[d] California Rules of Court

[e] Decisions

§ 560.521 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Validity of Trust Provision [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(3)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Contents of Petition

[5] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[6] List of Beneficiaries

[7] Standing

[a] Irrevocable Trust

[b] Revocable Trust

[8] Jurisdiction

[9] Venue

[a] Generally

[b] Testamentary Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction of Court

[c] Applicability of Civil Code Provisions

[10] No Right to Jury Trial

[11] State Statutes

[a] Jurisdiction and venue

[b] Notice

[c] Petitions

[d] Standing

[e] Decisions

[12] California Rules of Court

[13] Local Rules of Court

[a] Orange County

[b] Riverside County

[c] San Francisco

§§ 560.522-560.539 [Reserved]

§ 560.540 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[8] California Rules of Court

[9] Cross References

§ 560.541 Allegations for Petition by Beneficiary Against Trustee--Trustee Took Part in Transaction in Which Trustee Had Interest Adverse to the Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 16004(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Trustee's Limitation of Liability

[4] Allegations

[5] Cross References

§ 560.542 Prayer for Partial and Temporary Removal and Suspension of Powers of Trustee and Appointment of Trustee Ad Litem [Prob. Code §§ 15642, 16420, 17000, 17200(b)(8), (10), 17206]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 560.543 Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)] for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service

[4] Dismissal of Petition

[5] Cross References

§ 560.544 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Trustee Entitled to Contribution From Cotrustee [Prob. Code § 16402]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 560.545 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Improper Venue [Prob. Code §§ 15803, 17000]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 560.546 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Petitioner's Lack of Standing [Prob. Code §§ 15800, 15803]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Standing of Beneficiary

[4] Cross References

§ 560.547 Petition by Trust Beneficiary for Accounting and to Compel Trustee to Redress Breach of Trust by Payment of Money or Otherwise [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(3), (9), 17200(b)(5), (12)]--Trustee Liable for Acts and/or Omissions of Agent Employed by Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 16062(a), 16401(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Trustee's Liability For Acts of Agent

[a] General Rule of Nonliability

[b] When Trustee May Be Personally Liable for Agent's Acts

[6] Liability for Acts of Agent Prior to July 1, 1987

[7] Cross References

§ 560.548 Petition Compelling Trustee to Account After Written Request [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Cross References

§ 560.549 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Review Reasonableness of Trustee's Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680, 15686, 17200(b)(9)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Effect of Filing of Petition on Increased Trustee's Fee

[7] Cross References

§ 560.550 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Right of Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2)] and to Enforce Oral Trust in Real Property [Prob. Code §§ 850(a)(3)(A), 15206, 17200(a), (b)(2), (12)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Statute of Frauds

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

[8] Lis Pendens

[9] Cross References

[10] California Points and Authorities

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Text References

[14] Cross References

§ 560.551 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Compel Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)] to Invade Principal of Discretionary Trust [Prob. Code § 15303]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Beneficiary's Rights Regarding Discretionary Trust

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[9] Cross References

§ 560.552 Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Beneficiary Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Bond Requirement

[4] State Statutes

[5] Local Rules of Court

[6] Cross References

§ 560.553 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Appoint Successor Trustee to Fill Vacancy [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Cotrustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Appointment of Successor Trustee

[7] Cross References

§ 560.554 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Grant Trustee Powers [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(8)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Limitation on Exercise of Power

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 560.555 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Instructions to Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Allegations

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 560.556 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Injunction to Discontinue and Prevent Breach of Trust of Cotrustee [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(2), 17200(b)(12)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Cross References

[7] California Points and Authorities

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

[10] Text References

§ 560.557 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Resignation of Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15640(d), 17200(b)(11)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Resignation of Trustee

[7] Appointment of Successor Trustee

[8] Cross References

§ 560.558 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Fix Compensation or Allow Greater Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680(b), 17200(b)(9)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Compensation of Trustee

[7] State Statutes

[8] California Rules of Court

[9] Cross References

§ 560.559 Account and Report [Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064, 16063] and Petition [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)] for Settlement--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] When Account Required to be Filed With Court

[4] Contents of Petition

[5] Contents of Account

[a] In General

[b] Statutory Format

[c] Schedules of Receipts, Disbursements, Income or Loss, etc.

[d] Market Value of Assets

[e] Purchases or Other Changes in Form of Assets

[f] Allocation of Receipts Between Principal and Income

[g] Specifically Devised Property

[h] Interest on Pecuniary Devises and Annuities

[i] Proposed Distributions

[j] Liabilities

[k] Trustee Entitled to Rely on Account of Conservator or Guardian

[l] No Requirement for Other Information

[m] Verification

[6] State Statutes

[7] California Rules of Court

[8] Local Rules of Court

[a] Alameda County

[b] Los Angeles County

[c] Orange County

[d] Riverside County

[e] San Francisco

[9] Cross References

§ 560.560 Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Trustee Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 560.561-560.579 [Reserved]

§ 560.580 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)] to Distribute Accumulated Trust Income for Support or Education of Destitute Beneficiary [Civ. Code § 726]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Text References

[7] Cross References

§ 560.581 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Combine Trusts [Prob. Code §§ 15411, 17200(b)(14)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Allegations

[6] Cross References

§ 560.582 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Ascertain Beneficiaries and Determine Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Allegations

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 560.583 Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Ascertainment of Beneficiaries and Determination of Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 560.584 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify or Terminate Irrevocable Trust [Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15408, 15409]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§§ 560.585-560.599 [Reserved]

§ 560.600 Notice [Prob. Code §§ 1211, 17203] of Hearing on Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice Requirements

[4] Form of Notice

§ 560.601 Request [Prob. Code § 17205] for Copy of Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 560.602 Petition and Order for Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Under the Probate Code--Cal. Judicial Council Form DE-350, GC-100 [Prob. Code § 1003]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem at Request of Trustee

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

§ 560.603 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Discharge Guardian Ad Litem and Designate Attorney of Record [Prob. Code § 1003]--Beneficiary's Attaining of Majority--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 560.604 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Construction of Trust Instrument [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(1)]--By Guardian Ad Litem of Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 560.605 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Court of Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17402]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] State Statutes

[7] Cross References

§ 560.606 Order [Prob. Code § 17404] Transferring Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code § 17401]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 560.607 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property From Another Jurisdiction to California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17453]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Petition

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] State Statutes

[7] Cross References

§ 560.608 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Jurisdiction Over Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction to Another County [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(17), 17304]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Granting of Order

[7] Transfer of Documents

[8] Jurisdiction of Court To Which Trust Is Transferred

[9] Venue

[10] State Statutes

§ 560.609 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Testamentary Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court When No Trustee Is Trust Company [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(18), 17352]--By Trustee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Contents of Petition

[5] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

[6] List of Beneficiaries

[7] Granting or Denying of Order

[8] State Statutes

[9] Cross References

§ 560.610 Notice of Removal of Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court [Prob. Code § 17352(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Notice

[4] Service

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§§ 560.611-560.629 [Reserved]

§ 560.630 Petition to Enforce Money Judgment by Collecting Trust Income or Principal Due Judgment Debtor as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] List of Beneficiaries

[6] Filing of Petition

[7] Trust Property Subject to Enforcement of Money Judgment Generally

[8] Cross References

[9] State Constitution

[10] State Statutes

[11] Decisions

§ 560.631 Order For Enforcement of Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor's Interest as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 560.632-560.649 [Reserved]

§ 560.650 Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Prob. Code § 19003]--Notice by Publication

[Prob. Code § 19040]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 560.651 Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Probate Code Section 19003]--Actual Notice [Prob. Code § 19052]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Notice

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 560.652 Petition for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Petition

[4] List of Beneficiaries

[5] Verification

[6] Venue

[7] Notice and Hearing

[8] State Statutes

§ 560.653 Order for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 560.654 Notice of Pendency of Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filing and Service

[4] State Statutes

§ 560.655 Complaint for Damages in Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255]--By Creditor Against Revocable Trust

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Notice of Pendency of Action

[5] Verification

[6] Venue

[7] Cross References

[8] State Statutes

§ 560.656 Petition to Allocate Responsibility for Debts Payable by Decedent's Revocable Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19320]--By Trustee, Surviving Spouse, Personal Representative, Settlor's Estate, or Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Verification

[5] Venue

[6] Notice of Hearing

[7] List of Beneficiaries

[8] State Statutes

§ 560.657 Order to Show Cause Why Information Concerning Property of Surviving Spouse Should Not Be Furnished to Petitioner [Prob. Code § 19322]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 560.658 Order Allocating Debts Between Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19325]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§§ 560.659-560.669 [Reserved]

§ 560.670 Complaint for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. § 526] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] Against Nonprofit Public or Mutual Benefit Corporation for Breach of Charitable Trust [Corp. Code §§ 5142, 7142]--Member's Derivative Action [Corp. Code §§ 5710, 7710]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Rescission or Injunction Against Performance of Contract

[5] Necessity for Alleging Capacity

[6] Jurisdiction

[7] Notice to Attorney General

[8] Cross References

[9] State Statutes

[10] Text References

§ 560.671 Complaint for Actual and Punitive Damages or Accounting [Corp. Code §§ 5233(h), 7238] Based on Self-Dealing Transaction by Director [Corp. Code §§ 5233(c), 7238]--By Other Director or Officer on Behalf of Nonprofit Corporation

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Remedies

[6] Venue

[7] Attorney General as Indispensible Party

[8] Statute of Limitations

[9] State Statutes

[10] Text References

[11] Cross References

§ 560.672 Affirmative Defense Allegations to Action for Damages Based on Defendant Director's Alleged Self-Dealing Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233]--Prior Approval of Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2), (3)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

[5] State Statutes

§ 560.673 Voluntary Winding Up--Petition for Court Supervision and Approval of Distribution of Assets to Proposed Corporation--By Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation [Corp. Code § 6614] or Mutual Benefit Corporation Holding Charitable Assets in Trust [Corp. Code § 8614]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Basis for Jurisdiction

[5] Standing

[6] Venue

[7] Notice of Proceedings

[8] Application of Provisions Governing Involuntary Dissolution

[9] Cross References

[10] California Points and Authorities

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Text References

§§ 560.674-560.689 [Reserved]

§ 560.690 Complaint to Establish Totten Trust [Prob. Code §§ 80, 5301-5307]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.01

§ 560.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms relating to actions concerning trusts. It covers the following topics:

- The scope of the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*; see *§ 560.10* et seq.].

- The creation and validity of express trusts, including application of the statute of frauds and the rule against perpetuities, the permissible accumulation of income, and acceleration of distribution of accumulated trust income [see *§ 560.40* et seq.].

- The rights, duties, and liabilities of trustees, and remedies of the beneficiaries, including the trustee's resignation and removal, and vacancies in the office of trustee [see *§ 560.70* et seq.].

- Revocation, modification, and termination of trusts, and disposition of property on termination of a trust [see *§ 560.110* et seq.].

- The procedure for administering trusts under the Trust Law, including judicial administration of trusts, petition, notice, and appeal procedures, subject matter jurisdiction, personal jurisdiction, venue, the transfer of trusts between jurisdictions, removal of testamentary trusts f rom continuing court jurisdiction, and procedures to appoint a guardian ad litem in trust administration proceedings [see *§ 560.130* et seq.].

- Actions between third persons and the trust [see *§ 560.160* et seq.], including a trustee's liability to third persons, a trustee's standing to prosecute or defend an action involving a third person [see *§ 560.180* et seq.], the protection of third persons engaging in transactions with the trustee [see *§ 560.200* et seq.], and a third party creditor's rights to enforce judgments against trust property [see *§ 560.220* et seq.].

- Procedures for making, allowing, or rejecting creditors' claims against a revocable trust of a deceased settlor [see *§ 560.240* et seq.].

- The establishment and enforcement of charitable trusts generally, including the definition and creation of a charitable trust, the duties of a trustee, standing to enforce a charitable trust, standing to bring a petition regarding the internal affairs and existence of the trust, and parts of the Nonprofit Corporation Law [*Corp. Code § 5000 et seq.*] that may apply if a particular charitable trust is administered by a nonprofit corporation [see *§ 560.270* et seq.].

- Creation and enforcement of Totten trusts [see *§ 560.340* et seq.].

The chapter includes the following forms:

- A complaint for use by a settlor of an irrevocable trust to seek declaratory relief regarding the existence of a trust [see *§ 560.520*].

- A petition for use by a beneficiary to determine the validity of a trust provision [see *§ 560.521*].

- Petitions and related forms by a beneficiary to remove a trustee and obtain redress for breach of trust [see *§§ 560.540*- 560-542].

- A trustee's response to a beneficiary's petition [see *§§ 560.543* - 560-546].

- A petition to recover trust property after breach of duty by the trustee's agent [see *§ 560.547*].

- A petition to compel the trustee to account after written request [see *§ 560.548*].

- A petition to seek review of the reasonableness of the trustee's compensation [see *§ 560.549*].

- A petition to enforce an oral trust in real property [see *§ 560.550*].

- A petition to invade the corpus of a trust [see *§ 560.551*].

- A petition by a trustee to fill a vacancy in the office of cotrustee [see *§ 560.553*].

- A petition to grant the trustee powers [see *§ 560.554*].

- A petition to obtain instructions [see *§ 560.555*].

- A petition by a trustee to obtain an injunction against a cotrustee for breach of trust [see *§ 560.556*].

- A petition by a trustee to resign [see *§ 560.557*].

- A petition by a trustee to obtain compensation [see *§ 560.558*].

- A petition to render an account [see *§ 560.559*].

- Orders granting the beneficiary [see *§ 560.552*] and trustee [see *§ 560.560*] relief as prayed.

- A petition for use by a beneficiary to modify the trust to allow distribution of accumulated trust income [see *§ 560.580*].

- A petition for use by a trustee to seek approval of the combination of trusts [see *§ 560.581*].

- A petition to determine distribution of trust property on termination of the trust [see *§ 560.582*].

- A response to a trustee's petition for use by a beneficiary regarding distribution of property in which the beneficiary is interested [see *§ 560.583*].

- A petition to modify or terminate an irrevocable trust [see *§ 560.584*].

- A notice of hearing for use by the petitioner [see *§ 560.600*].

- A request for use by a trustee or beneficiary to obtain a copy of the petition [see *§ 560.601*].

- A petition by an interested party to appoint a guardian ad litem [see *§ 560.602*].

- A form for use by a minor party to the trust to discharge a guardian ad litem and appoint an attorney of record [see *§ 560.603*].

- A form for use by a guardian ad litem to determine the construction of a trust [see *§ 560.604*].

- Forms for use by a trustee to transfer a trust to a jurisdiction outside California [see *§§ 560.605, 560.606*].

- A petition for use to transfer a trust from a foreign jurisdiction to California [see *§ 560.607*].

- A petition for use to transfer a testamentary trust subject to continuing court jurisdiction to another county [see *§ 560.608*].

- A petition [see *§ 560.609*] and notice [see *§ 560.610*] to remove a testamentary trust from the continuing jurisdiction of the court.

- Forms for use by a judgment creditor to enforce a money judgment against a beneficiary of a trust [see *§§ 560.630*, 631].

- Forms for notice by publication [see *§ 560.650*] and actual notice [see *§ 560.651*] to the creditors of a deceased settlor.

- Forms for a petition [see *§ 560.652*] and an order [see *§ 560.653*] for approval of allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims.

- A notice of pendency of [see *§ 560.654*], and a complaint for [see *§ 560.655*], an action against a revocable trust on a rejected claim.

- A petition [see *§ 560.656*] and an order [see *§ 560.657*] relating to allocation of the responsibility for debts payable by the decedent's revocable trust and the surviving spouse.

- An order to show cause why information concerning property of the surviving spouse should not be furnished to the petitioner [see *§ 560.658*].

- A complaint to bring a member's derivative action against a nonprofit corporation for breach of

charitable trust [see *§ 560.670*].

- A complaint [see *§ 560.671*] and affirmative defense [see *§ 560.672*] for an action seeking damages or an accounting against a director for a self-dealing transaction.

- A petition for court supervision of voluntary winding up of a nonprofit corporation [see *§ 560.673*].

- A complaint to establish a Totten Trust [see *§ 560.690*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank AccountsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.02

§ 560.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to appointment of guardians ad litem generally, see Ch. 291, *Guardians ad Litem*

For forms and discussion regarding in personam jurisdiction, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal*

For discussion of contracts generally, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms relating to enforcement of money judgments generally, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

For discussion and forms regarding negligence actions generally, including discussion of the doctrine of respondeat superior, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For discussion and forms relating to premises liability generally, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*

For discussion and forms regarding a principal's liability for the acts of an agent generally, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*

For discussion and forms relating to general venue requirements, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For discussion and forms relating to actions and proceedings under the Nonprofit Religious Corporation Law, see Ch. 110, *Churches and Religious Organizations*

For discussion and forms relating to actions and proceedings under the General Corporation Law, see Ch. 160, *Corporations: Capacity*

For general discussion of the provisions of the Nonprofit Corporations Law that may be applicable to some aspects of charitable trusts, see Ch. 388, *Nonprofit Corporations*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsDuties & LiabilitiesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewFamily LawFamily Protection & WelfareChildrenProceedingsTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.03-560.09

[Reserved]

§§ 560.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.10

§ 560.10 Governing Statutes

The administration of trusts is governed generally by the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*]. Rules for the construction of trusts and other instruments are set forth in *Prob. Code §§ 21101-21700*]. Compliance with the Internal Revenue Code is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541*.

Although charitable trusts subject to the jurisdiction of the California Attorney General are subject to the Trust Law, the provisions of the Trust Law apply to those trusts only to the extent that they are not in conflict with the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act [*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*]. Administration of the assets of a charitable trust by a nonprofit corporation is governed by *Corp. Code § 5002 et seq.* Constructive and resulting trusts are subject to case law and *Civ. Code §§ 2223-2225*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.11

§ 560.11 Definition of Express Trust

A trust is a legal device by which one person, the trustee, holds title to property for the benefit of another, the beneficiary. The creation of a trust divides title to the trust property, placing legal title in the trustee and equitable title in the beneficiary [*Raczynski v. Judge (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 504, 511, 230 Cal. Rptr. 741* ; *Askew v. Resources Funding, Ltd. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 402, 407, 156 Cal. Rptr. 208]* . Consequently, a trust establishes a fiduciary relationship between the trustee and the beneficiary, as opposed to an arms-length transaction between parties to a contract [*see* *Gonsalves v. Hodgson (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 91, 98, 99, 237 P.2d 656* (finding a contract instead of a trust); *California-Nevada Annual Conf. of the United Methodist Church v. St. Luke's United Methodist Church (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 754, 767, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442* (trust is fiduciary relationship with respect to property, subjecting person by whom title to property is held to equitable duties to deal with property for benefit of another person), *overruled in part by* *Episcopal Church Cases (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 467, 491, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275, 198 P.3d 66* (*Corp. Code § 9142(c)(2)* does give general church the authority to impress trust on local church when local church agrees and is member of governing instruments of general church, which provide any property held by local church is held in trust for general church; local church did not have the right to take church property with it when it disaffiliated from general church even though deeds to property had long been in name of local church)].

A trust is created by the settlor's manifestation of intention to create a trust, trust property, a lawful trust purpose, and an identifiable beneficiary [*California-Nevada Annual Conf. of the United Methodist Church v. St. Luke's United Methodist Church (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 754, 767, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442] , overruled in part by* *Episcopal Church Cases (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 467, 491, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275, 198 P.3d 66* . An express trust is generally created in one of two ways: (1) by a declaration of trust in which the owner of property declares that he or she holds it as trustee for some beneficiary; or (2) by a transfer in trust, by which the owner transfers to another as trustee for some beneficiary, either by deed or other inter vivos transfer, or by will [*California-Nevada Annual Conf. of the United Methodist Church v. St. Luke's United Methodist Church (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 754, 767, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442]* .

A "living" (or "inter vivos") trust is a trust that is created during the lifetime of the settlor. A "testamentary" trust, in contrast, is created by a will and comes into being only on the death of the settlor (also called the "testator") [*see Prob. Code § 7000* (title to person's property transferred when person dies); *see also* *Estate of Lefranc (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 289,*

297, 239 P.2d 617 and *Estate of Wellings (1923) 192 Cal. 506, 510, 221 P. 628* (judgment of distribution merely confirms title in trustee)]. Both living and testamentary trusts are subject to the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*], and are generally administered according to the same rules. Some testamentary trusts are "subject to continuing court jurisdiction" and thus governed by additional Probate Code rules [*see Prob. Code § 17300 et seq.*]. However, the only trusts subject to these additional rules are trusts created by wills executed before July 1, 1977 (and not incorporated by reference in a will executed on or after that date), and trusts created by wills that explicitly provide that they are subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the superior court [*Prob. Code § 17300*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersLiving TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTestamentary TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.12

§ 560.12 Private and Charitable Trusts Distinguished

A charitable trust is actually a donation that is held in trust to promote the welfare of mankind at large, of a community, or of some class within a community. The beneficiaries of a charitable trust are indefinite in number and identity [*Estate of Schloss (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 248, 256, 14 Cal. Rptr. 643, 363 P.2d 875]* . Since the beneficiaries of a private trust must be either ascertained or ascertainable in accordance with the time limits set forth in the Rule Against Perpetuities, private and charitable trusts are subject to different standards for determination of validity [§ 560.13[3]]. Moreover, charitable trusts are primarily supervised and enforced by the Attorney General pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 5250, 7240,* and *10200,* which govern nonprofit corporations. For further discussion of the establishment and enforcement of public charitable trusts, see *§ 560.270* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.13

§ 560.13 Parties to Express Trust

[1] Settlor

A settlor is the person who creates a trust, whether by a will or living trust [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 3; *California-Nevada Annual Conf. of the United Methodist Church v. St. Luke's United Methodist Church (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 754, 768, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442* ; *see also Prob. Code § 15201* (trust created only if settlor manifests intention to do so)]. The term "trustor," previously used to denote a person who creates a living trust, was abolished with the enactment of the Trust Law (*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*) in 1986 [*see* LegislativeCounsel's Digest comments to Stats. 1986, ch. 820, paragraph (2)].

A settlor must have the capacity to make an ordinary transfer of property, and must possess the mental competence to comprehend the subject matter and to understand his or her rights. A person may lack the capacity to declare a trust if a temporary condition, such as intoxication, deprives that person of his or her reason and understanding [*Walton v. Bank of California (1963) 218 Cal. App. 2d 527, 541, 32 Cal. Rptr. 856* (decided under former *Civ. Code § 39*, repealed eff. Jan. 1, 1994)].

[2] Trustee

The person holding property in trust is the trustee [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 3]. A trustee includes an original, additional, or successor trustee, whether or not appointed or confirmed by a court [*Prob. Code § 84*]. Any person, including a beneficiary, may serve as trustee [*Crocker-Citizens National Bank v. Younger (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 202, 212, 93 Cal. Rptr. 214, 481 P.2d 222]* . However, a sole beneficiary usually may not be the sole trustee, because the legal and equitable titles of the trust property would be merged in one person [*Hill v. Conover (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 171, 179, 180, 12 Cal. Rptr. 522* ; *see §§ 560.11, § 560.48*]. Generally, the trustee named by the settlor will be an existing person or legal entity of full capacity who has agreed to accept the trust [*see* Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees, Ch. 8, *The Trustee--Selection: Capacity,* § 121 (2d ed.)]. For discussion of a trustee's acceptance of the trust, see *§ 560.71*. For discussion of a trustee's duties and liabilities with regard to the beneficiary, see *§ 560.76* et seq.. For discussion of a trustee's liabilities to a third party to the trust, see *§ 560.360* et seq.

[3] Beneficiary

A "beneficiary" is a person to whom a donative transfer of property is made, or that person's successor in interest [*Prob. Code § 24*]. As it relates to a trust, "beneficiary" means a person who has any present or future interest, vested or contingent [*Prob. Code § 24(c)*]. As it relates to a charitable trust, it includes any person entitled to enforce the trust [*Prob. Code § 24(d)*]. A beneficiary in a trust other than a charitable trust must be ascertained or ascertainable [*Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1092, 1098, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . For discussion of beneficiaries of a charitable trust, see *§ 560.270* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersLiving TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTestamentary TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.14

§ 560.14 Attorney as Beneficiary

[1] Statutory Limitations

When an attorney who drafts a trust instrument is named as a beneficiary in the agreement, there is an obvious potential for fraud, undue influence, and similar concerns. The same potential may exist when certain relatives, partners, or employees of such an attorney are beneficiaries [*see Prob. Code § 21350*]. To reduce the potential for these problems, *Prob. Code §§ 21350-21356* establish limitations on donative transfers to drafters and other parties. These provisions determine whether an attorney or a relative, partner, or employee of an attorney is entitled to benefits from a trust when the attorney has drafted the instrument. The term "disqualified person" is used in the statutes to refer to a person to whom a valid transfer cannot be made under these statutes [*Prob. Code § 21350.5*].

These provisions apply to all instruments that become irrevocable on or after September 1, 1993 [*Prob. Code § 21355*]. If an instrument was revocable or amendable on that date, but the transferor by reason of incapacity was unable to change the disposition of his or her property and did not regain capacity before the date of his or her death, the instrument is deemed to be irrevocable for this purpose [*Prob. Code § 21355*].

[2] General Rule Invalidating Transfers to Specified Persons

Prob. Code § 21350 generally invalidates transfers made to any of the following [*Prob. Code § 21350*]:

- The person who drafted the instrument;

- A person who is related by blood or marriage to, or is a cohabitant with or employee of, the person who drafted the instrument;

- Any partner or shareholder of any law partnership or law corporation in which the person who drafted the instrument has an ownership interest, and any employee of any such law partnership or law corporation;

- Any person who has a fiduciary relationship with the transferor, including, but not limited to, a conservator or trustee, and who transcribes the instrument or causes it to be transcribed;

- A person who is related by blood or marriage to, or is a cohabitant with or employee of, a person described in the immediately preceding category; and

- A care custodian of a dependent adult.

For purposes of *Prob. Code § 21350*, "a person who is related by blood or marriage" to a person means all of the following [*Prob. Code § 21350(b)*]:

- The person's spouse or predeceased spouse;

- Relatives within the third degree of the person and of the person's spouse; and

- The spouse of any relative within the third degree of the person or of the person's spouse.

In determining relationships for this purpose, *Prob. Code § 6406*, which governs the inheritance rights of relatives of the half blood, *Prob. Code § 6407*, which governs the inheritance rights of afterborn heirs, and *Prob. Code §§ 6450-6455*, which govern the relationship of parent and child for purposes of intestate succession, are applicable [*Prob. Code § 21350(b)*].

For purposes of *Prob. Code § 21350*, the term "care custodian" means an administrator or employee of a public or private care facility or agency (including a member of the support or maintenance staff), or any other person providing care or services for elders or dependent adults, except persons who do not work directly with elders or dependent adults as part of their official duties [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*; *see Welf. & Inst. Code § 15610.17* (list of covered care facilities and agencies)].

"Dependent adult" means any of the following [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*; *see Welf. & Inst. Code § 15610.23(a)*]:

- Any person residing in California, between the ages of 18 and 64 years, who has physical or mental limitations that restrict his or her ability to carry out normal activities or to protect his or her rights including, but not limited to, persons who have physical or developmental disabilities or whose physical or mental abilities have diminished because of age [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*].

- Any person between the ages of 18 and 64 who is admitted as an inpatient to a 24-hour health facility as defined in *Health & Safety Code §§ 1250, 1250.2*, and *1250.3*.

- Any person older than age 64 who would be a "dependent adult" under the above definitions if he or she were between the ages of 18 and 64.

A trust instrument executed by an elderly woman who resided in a skilled nursing facility in which the woman made a donative transfer of property to the long-term care ombudsman for the facility was held invalid under *Prob. Code § 21350(a)(6)*, because the ombudsman was a "care custodian" within the meaning of the statute and therefore disqualified from benefiting from the trust [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 992-993, 1005-1007, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196]* . A long-term care ombudsman is a "care custodian" for purposes of the statute during the time he or she serves as ombudsman for a particular "dependent adult" [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1007, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* . An ombudsman remains a "care custodian" within the meaning of the statute even after his or her formal ombudsman relationship with a particular resident has ended, due either to a change in the ombudsman's

facility assignment or the fact that the resident has left the facility, when the ombudsman, as a result of his or her fiduciary relationship with the resident, develops a personal relationship with the resident and thereby acquires personal and financial information about the resident [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 993, 1007, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196]* .

Prob. Code § 21350(a)(4), which includes in the category of presumptively disqualified persons any fiduciary who transcribes the trust instrument or causes it to be transcribed, does not apply to a person who provides information needed in the preparation of the trust instrument (*e.g.*, a list of the trustor's assets) and who encourages the trustor to execute it, but who does not direct or otherwise participate in the transcription of the instrument to final written form [*Rice v. Clark (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 89, 101-105, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522, 47 P.3d 300]* .

Prob. Code § 21350 implicitly requires a person whose interest in a trust is threatened by a transfer to a disqualified person to invoke the protection of the statute affirmatively by seeking a court order establishing the invalidity of the transfer [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1004, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196]* . The burden then shifts to the transferee to justify the transfer under *Prob. Code § 21351* [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1004, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196]* .

[3] Exceptions to General Rule Invalidating Transfers

Under *Prob. Code § 21351*, a transfer is not invalidated under *Prob. Code § 21350* if any of the following conditions are met [*Prob. Code § 21351(a), (b), (c), (f)*]:

- The transferor is related by blood or marriage to, is a cohabitant with, or is the registered domestic partner of, the transferee or the person who drafted the instrument. "Related by blood or marriage" includes persons within the fifth degree or heirs of the transferor [*Prob. Code § 21351(g)*]. A "cohabitant" means two unrelated adult persons living together for a substantial period of time, resulting in some permanency of relationship [*Prob. Code § 21351(a)*; see *Pen. Code § 13700(b)*]. This provision applies retroactively to an instrument that becomes irrevocable on or after July 1, 1993 [*Prob. Code § 21351(a)*]. This exception applies to a spouse who was care custodian of the transferee prior to marriage [*Estate of Pryor (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1468, 1476, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 895* (decedent's spouse could invoke the spousal exception to the presumption in *Prob. Code § 21351(a)* despite her prior status as a care custodian before her marriage to decedent)].

- The instrument is reviewed by an independent attorney who counsels the transferor about the nature and consequences of the intended transfer, attempts to determine if the intended consequence is the result of fraud, menace, duress, or undue influence, and signs and delivers a "Certificate of Independent Review" in substantially the form set forth in *Prob. Code § 21351(b)*.

- After full disclosure of the relationships of the persons involved, the court approves the instrument by order under *Prob. Code § 2580 et seq.* (substituted judgment).

- The transferee is a federal, state, or local public entity, an entity thatqualifies for a charitable exemption from taxation under *I.R.C. § 501(c)(3)* or *I.R.C. § 501(c)(19)*, or a trust holding an interest for this entity, but only to the extent of the interest of the entity, or the trustee of this trust.

A transfer also is not invalidated under *Prob. Code § 21350* if the court determines, on clear and convincing evidence (but not based solely on the testimony of any person described in Prob. Code § 23150(a)), that the transfer was not the

product of fraud, menace, duress, or undue influence [*Prob. Code § 21351(d)*]. If the court finds that the transfer *was* the product of fraud, menace, duress, or undue influence, the disqualified person must bear all costs of the proceeding, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Prob. Code § 21351(d)*]. This provision only applies to the following instruments:

- Any instrument other than one making a transfer to a person who drafted the instrument [*Prob. Code §§ 21350(a)(1), 21351(e)(1)*].

- Any instrument executed on or before July 1, 1993, by a person who was a California resident at the time the instrument was executed [Prob. Code § 23151(e)(2)].

- Any instrument executed by a California resident who was not a resident at the time the instrument was executed [*Prob. Code § 21351(e)(3)*].

For example, an attorney who drafts a client's trust so as to benefit himself or herself is conclusively disqualified under *Prob. Code § 21351(e)(1)*; an attorney who drafts a client's trust so as to benefit one of the attorney's relatives or law partners is presumed to be disqualified, but this presumption is rebuttable under *Prob. Code § 21351(d)* by clear and convincing evidence other than the attorney's testimony that the client freely chose this disposition [*Rice v. Clark (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 89, 98, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522, 47 P.3d 300]* .

Finally, a transfer is not invalidated under *Prob. Code § 21350* if

- The transfer does not exceed $3,000 [*Prob. Code § 21351(h)*]. This provision is inapplicable if the total value of the property in the transferor's estate does not exceed the amount prescribed by *Prob. Code § 13100, i.e.,* $100,000 [*Prob. Code § 21351(h)*].

- The transfer is made by an instrument executed by a nonresident of California who was not a resident at the time the instrument was executed, and that was not signed in California [*Prob. Code § 21351(i)*; *see also Estate of Clementi (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 375, 383, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685* (*Prob. Code § 21351(i)* exempted testator's will from prohibition in *Prob. Code § 21350* against donative transfers to the drafter of the will, since testator was nonresident of California when he signed will, even though he was a resident of California at time of his death)].

[4] Time for Commencement of Action to Establish Invalidity of Transfer

An action to establish the invalidity of a transfer under *Prob. Code § 21350* can only be commenced within statutory time limits. If the transfer was by will, the action must be commenced after letters are first issued to a general representative and before an order for final distribution is made [*Prob. Code § 21356(a)*]. If the transfer is made by some instrument other than a will, it must be commenced within the later of three years after the transfer becomes irrevocable or three years from the date the person bringing the action discovers, or reasonably should have discovered, the facts material to the transfer [*Prob. Code § 21356(b)*].

[5] Professional Discipline

Any violation of *Prob. Code §§ 21350-21356* by an attorney is grounds for professional discipline if the violation occurred on or after January 1, 1994, and the attorney knew or should have known of the facts leading to the violation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103.6*].

For further discussion of the rule prohibiting attorneys from being beneficiaries under trusts that they have drafted or transcribed, see *California Wills and Trusts, Ch. 4, Ethical Considerations and Professional Responsibility, § 4.05[3]* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationLegal EthicsClient RelationsConflicts of InterestLegal EthicsSanctionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.15

§ 560.15 Action to Contest Trust

[1] Contrasted with Will Contest

The comparative ease with which a will contest may be mounted traditionally has been cited as one of the advantages of choosing the inter vivos (or "living" trust) rather than a will as the primary vehicle of an estate plan. The Probate Code requires that when a petition is filed to probate a will, the testator's heirs be formally notified that if they object to the granting of the petition they should make their objections known to the court by either filing them in writing or personally appearing at the hearing to state them [*Prob. Code § 8100*]. An heir may initiate a will contest before or after probate, and the Probate Code contains special rules governing the pleadings, trial, evidence, and judgment in the contest proceeding [*see Prob. Code §§ 8250-8272*].

While a trust also may be contested, the specific procedures for doing so are not defined by statute. The mechanism for contesting a trust is an independent civil action, which is subject to the same rules as any other civil action. However, the procedural requirements have largely blunted the former differences between wills and inter vivos trusts in this regard, and made it somewhat easier to mount a contest of a trust. More importantly, perhaps, these requirements have made it more likely that an inter vivos trust will be contested after the settlor's death.

Before January 1, 1998, there was no requirement that after a settlor died, the settlor's heirs be notified of the existence or terms of the trust or of their right to bring an action to contest the trust. With the adoption of Prob. Code §§ 16051.5 and 16061.7, effective on that date, the trustee must provide a copy of the terms of the trust to any heir who requests it and serve a special notice, called "notification by trustee," on all of the heirs [for discussion of this requirements, *see § 560.81*].

If the notification by the trustee is served because a revocable trust or any portion of it has become irrevocable because of the death of one or more settlors of the trust, or because, by the express terms of the trust, the trust becomes irrevocable within oneyear of the death of a settlor because of a contingency related to the death of one or more of the settlors of the trust, the notification must include, among other things, a warning specifically referring to the heirs' right to bring an action to contest the trust [*see Prob. Code § 16061.7(h)*].

[2] Time Limits for Commencement

No person upon whom a notification by the trustee [*see § 560.81*] is served may bring an action to contest the trust more than 120 days from the date the notification by the trustee is served on him or her, or 60 days from the day on which a copy of the terms of the trust is mailed or personally delivered to him or her during that 120-day period, whichever is later [*Prob. Code § 16061.8*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersLiving TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawWill ContestsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.16

§ 560.16 No-Contest Clauses in Trust Instruments

[1] Nature and Validity

Trust instruments, like wills, frequently contain "no contest clauses" [*see Colburn v. Northern Trust Co. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 439, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828* ; *McIndoe v. Olivos (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 483, 485, 487-490, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689* ; *Nairne v. Jessop-Humblet (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*]. A no contest clause in an instrument creates a condition on the gifts and dispositions provided for in the instrument [*Burch v. George (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 246, 254, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 866 P.2d 92* ; *Estate of Lindstrom (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 375, 381, 236 Cal. Rptr. 376*]. In essence, a no contest clause conditions the rights of the devisees named in the instrument to take the devises provided for in the instrument on their acquiescence in its terms. To the extent that a particular devisee acquiesces in those terms, the devisee is entitled to take the devise; to the extent that the devisee does not acquiesce, the devisee cannot take [*see Burch v. George (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 246, 254, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 866 P.2d 92*].

The purpose of a no contest clause is to discourage will (or trust) contests by imposing a penalty of forfeiture against any beneficiary who challenges the will (or trust) [Estate of Gonzalez (2002) *102 Cal. App. 4th, 1296, 1302, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 332*]. A no contest clause also is known as an "in terrorem" clause. Although the rules governing no contest clauses originally were developed in connection with wills, they have been held applicable to no contest clauses in inter vivos trusts as well [*see Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-169, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*].

No contest clauses are valid and enforceable in California [*Burch v. George (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 246, 254, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 866 P.2d 92*] to the extent permitted under the governing law [*see* [2], [3], *below*]. Rules relating to the enforcement of no contest clauses are codified in the Probate Code [*see Prob. Code § 21310-21315*]. For additional detailed discussion of the enforceability of no contest clauses, see *Ch. 444, Probate: Will Contests, § 444.14*.

[2] Enforcement of No Contest Clause Under Probate Code

[a] Applicable Law and Enforceability

The rules governing no contest clauses were significantly revised effective January 1, 2010 [*Prob. Code § 21315*; *see*

Prob. Code §§ 21310-21315]. The revised statute governs the enforcement of no contest clauses in "protected instruments" [*see* [c], *below*] that are filed on or after January 1, 2010, whenever executed, provided that the protected instrument became irrevocable on or after January 1, 2001 [*Prob. Code § 21315*]. Common law continues to govern no contest clauses in all other instruments [*Prob. Code § 21315*; *see* [3], *below*].

Under the revised rules, a no contest clause is enforceable only in three specific circumstances [*Prob. Code § 21311(a)*]:

- A direct contest brought without probable cause.
- A challenge to the transfer of property (provided the no contest clause provides).
- The filing of a creditor's claim (provided the no contest clause provides).

There is no opt-out provision in this statute. The provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 21310-21315* apply notwithstanding any contrary provisions in an instrument [*Prob. Code § 21314*].

[b] No Contest Clause Defined

Under the Probate Code revision, a no contest clause is a provision in a valid instrument which, if enforced, would penalize a beneficiary for filing a pleading in any court [*Prob. Code § 21310(c)*]. A pleading is a petition, complaint, cross-complaint, objection, answer, response, or claim [*Prob. Code § 21310(d)*].

[c] Protected Instrument

The Probate Code allows the enforcement of a no contest clause only with respect to a "protected instrument" [*see Prob. Code §§ 21310, 21311*]. "Protected instrument" means the following [*Prob. Code § 21310(e)*]:

- The instrument containing the no contest clause; or
- An instrument that is in existence on the date the instrument containing the no contest clause is executed and is expressly identified in the no contest clause, either individually or as part of an identifiable class of instruments, as being governed by the no contest clause.

Since a no contest clause cannot apply to future instruments [*see Prob. Code § 21310(e)(2)*], each amendment of existing instruments should contain its own no contest clause if one is desired. A commonly used statement in amendments that the settlor confirms and ratifies the original trust agreement is inadequate to incorporate the no contest clause into the amendment [*see Prob. Code § 21310(e), see also Perrin v. Lee (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1239, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 885* (no contest clause did not apply to amendment when amendment stated that grantor and trustee confirmed and ratified original trust agreement because former *Prob. Code § 21305(a)* required that no contest clause must explicitly state that challenging validity of amendment is a violation of the clause)].

It is also important to clarify whether or not a testamentary trust created under a will that contains a no contest clause is subject to a no contest provision. Any no contest clause applicable to the trust should be separately contained in the trust terms as recited in the order for distribution entered in the probate proceeding [*Meyer v. Meyer (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 983, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* (no contest clause had not been incorporated by reference into the testamentary trust because the decrees of distribution specifying the terms of the testamentary trust did not include the will's no contest clause as one of those terms)].

[d] Direct Contest

A no contest clause is enforceable in a direct contest that is brought without probable cause [*Prob. Code § 21311(a)(1)*]. A direct contest is one that alleges the invalidity of a protected instrument or one or more of its terms based on any of the following [*Prob. Code §21310(b)*]:

- Forgery.
- Lack of due execution.
- Lack of capacity.
- Menace, duress, fraud, or undue influence.
- Revocation of a will pursuant to *Prob. Code § 6120*, revocation of a trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15401*, or revocation of an instrument other than a will or trust pursuant to the procedure for revocation that is provided by statute or by the instrument.
- Disqualification of a beneficiary under *Prob. Code §§ 6112, 21350*.

Probable cause exists if, at the time of filing a contest, the facts known to the contestant would cause a reasonable person to believe that there is a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery [*Prob. Code § 21311(b)*].

[e] Challenge to Transfer of Property

A no contest clause also is enforceable against a pleading challenging the transfer of property on the grounds that it was not the transferor's property at the time of the transfer (a "forced election"), as long as the no contest clause expressly so provides [*Prob. Code § 21311(a)(2)*]. In this type of contest, probable cause is irrelevant, and the forced election may be applicable to anyone [*see Prob. Code § 21311(a)(2)*].

[f] Creditor's Claim

A no contest clause also is enforceable against the filing of a creditor's claim or prosecution of an action based on it, as long as the no contest clause expressly provides for such an application of the clause [*Prob. Code § 21311(a)(3)*]. In this type of contest, probable cause is also irrelevant [*see Prob. Code § 21311(a)(3)*].

[g] Declaratory Relief Unavailable

Under former law, declaratory relief was available to determine whether a proposed challenge to an instrument violated a no contest clause [*see* former *Prob. Code §21320*]. Such relief is no longer available under the revised statutes effective January 1, 2010 [*see Prob. Code §§ 21310-21315*].

[3] Enforcement of No Contest Clauses Under Common Law

[a] In General

For contests of a will or trust that contain a no contest clause, but are not governed by the revisions of *Prob. Code § 21310 et seq.* [*see* [2][a], *above*], common law continues to apply. Whether there has been a "contest" within the meaning of the language of a no contest clause is to be determined according to the circumstances of each case and the language used [*Estate of Strader (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 996, 1003, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649* ; *Nairne v. Jessop-Humblet (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 1128, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*].

Factors relevant to determining whether a claim involving the characterization, inclusion, or distribution of a certain

item of property in a testamentary instrument is a contest include [*Nairne v. Jessop-Humblet (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 1129, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726*]:

- The particular language of the no contest clause.
- Whether the instrument specifies the property and its distribution.
- Whether the instrument specifically characterizes the property, e.g., as separate versus community property.
- Whether the challenge, if successful, would thwart the testator's intent.

[b] Indirect Attack

Under common law, an indirect attack in a separate proceeding that nullifies or thwarts the express wishes of the creator of the instrument may constitute a "contest" for purposes of a no contest clause; for example:

- A proposed federal complaint by a surviving spouse against pension plan administrators to assert community property rights to plan benefits that had been transferred to a trust [*see* Burch v. George (1994) *7 Cal. 4th, 246, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 866 P.2d 92*].
- A no contest clause in a trust instrument that applied to any attempt to "impair" the trust extended to a trust beneficiary's adjustment petition under the California Uniform Principal and Income Act to reallocate principal and income, when reallocation would have resulted in more income to beneficiary than allowed by trust and invasion of trust principal reserved to other beneficiaries [*Mc Kenzie v. Vanderpoel (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1454, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 129*].
- A beneficiary's petition to recharacterize property that had been specifically characterized by settlors [Estate of Pittman (1997) *63 Cal. App. 4th, 290, 298-305, 73 Cal Rptr. 2d 622*].
- A proposed challenge by a surviving spouse to a corporate stock redemption agreement that was a "cornerstone" of the decedent's integrated estate plan [*Genger v. Delsol (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1410, 1428-1429, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527* ; *but see Jacobs-Zorne v. Superior Court (1966) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1064, 1075, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 385* (thwarting of testator's intent not appropriate test in determining whether no contest clause has been triggered)].

[c] Oral Contract

Although some older cases suggest that actions seeking to enforce an oral contract independent of a testamentary instrument do not constitute "contests" [*see Estate of Watson (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 569, 573-574, 223 Cal. Rptr. 14* ; *Estate of Black (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 582, 591, 206 Cal. Rptr. 663*], the California Supreme Court has clearly indicated that there is no "categorical proposition that any proceeding based upon a claim of right independent of a will or trust instrument is never a contest for purposes of the no contest law" [Burch v. George (1994) *7 Cal. 4th, 246, 261, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165, 866 P.2d 92]* . As a result, more recent cases have held that a complaint seeking to establish and enforce an oral contract based on a right independent of a testamentary instrument may constitute a contest within the meaning of a no contest provision in that instrument [*Nairne v. Jessop-Humblet (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 1129-1131, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* (complaint alleging that settlors had orally agreed to give specified property to plaintiff and therefore that property should not have been included in trust violated no contest clause in trust because it directly attacked provision of trust that identified and disposed of this property)].

[d] Interpretation

A judicial action seeking an interpretation of a will or other dispositive instrument is not an attack on the instrument and does not constitute a contest of the instrument. It is merely an effort to ascertain the true intentions of the author of the instrument [Graham v. Lenzi (1995) *37 Cal. App. 4th, 248, 258, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 407*]. A petition seeking to interpret a will generally does not violate a no contest clause because, rather than thwarting the testator's dispositive intent, the proceeding serves to ascertain and enforce that intent [*Estate of Strader (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 996, 1004, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649*].

[e] Challenge on Grounds of Duress or Undue Influence Is Not Contest

A proposed challenge to the validity of a trust amendment on the ground of duress or undue influence does not constitute a contest within the meaning of a no contest clause because it is an attack on the circumstances under which the trust amendment was created, not on the settlor's power to amend the instrument [*Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 169-170, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*].

[f] Contest of One Subtrust May Not Invalidate Other Subtrusts

In a typical multi-trust estate plan, the contest of one of the trusts or subtrusts does not automatically trigger a no contest clause as to other subtrusts. In one case involving a typical living trust arrangement under which the trusts was divided into two trusts on the death of the first settlor, the court held that a petition contesting an amendment that the surviving settlor made to Trust A (the survivor's trust) after the first settlor's death did not constitute a contest of Trust B for purposes of the no contest clause in the trust instrument [*Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 170, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*].

[4] Strict Construction

The strict statutory rules regarding no contest clauses reflect the general doctrine that no contest clauses are disfavored by the public policy against forfeiture [*McIndoe v. Olivos (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 483, 487, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689* ; *Estate of Richter (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1361, 1367, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108* ; *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-169, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*]. Accordingly, under both the Probate Code and common law, no contest clauses must be strictly construed and cannot be extended beyond what the settler or testator (as the case may be) clearly intended by the wording of the governing document [*see Prob. Code 21312*; *see also Meyer v. Meyer (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 983, 998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546* ; *Zwirn v. Schweizer (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1159, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527* ; *Nairne v. Jessop-Humblet (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 1128, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 726* ; *see also Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-69, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448* (rule of strict construction applies to no contest clauses in inter vivos trusts as well as in wills)]. Under the common law, a beneficiary will be found to have violated a no contest clause only if the beneficiary's action clearly falls within the terms of the clause, and the penalty will be imposed only if it is found that the beneficiary's act clearly was intended by the settlor or testator to require the imposition of the penalty [*Estate of Rossi (2006) 138 Cal. App. 1325, 1338, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 244* ; *McIndoe v. Olivos (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 483, 487, 489, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 689* ; *Estate of Richter (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1361, 1367, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 108* ; *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-169, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448]* . Although these basic rules were developed in connection with no contest clauses in wills, they have been held applicable to no contest clauses in inter vivos trusts as well [*see Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-169, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*].

Thus, for example, a testator could permissively provide that three of his five children would *all* lose their testamentary gifts under a trust if any one of them contested it [Tunstall v. Wells (2006) *144 Cal. App. 4th, 554, 557-558, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 468*]. The court concluded that the no contest clause did not violate public policy, and reasoned that the decedent's intentions to impose conditions on the gifts of the three children were within his rights as a testator [Tunstall

v. Wells (2006) *144 Cal. App. 4th, 554, 557-558, 50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 468*]. Similarly, a no contest clause in a testamentary trust was upheld although it forced the settlor's former wife and their children to choose between enforcing their rights under an existing martial dissolution judgment by filing creditor's claims, or relinquishing those rights and taking the gifts provided for them in the settlor's trust [*Colburn v. Northern Trust Co. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 439, 447, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828*]. Also upheld was a clause in a trust instrument that applied to any attempt to "impair" the trust, which was held applicable to the trust beneficiary's adjustment petition under the California Uniform Principal and Income Act to reallocate principal and income, when the reallocation would have resulted in more income to the beneficiary than was allowed by the trust and the invasion of trust principal reserved to other beneficiaries [*McKenzie v. Vanderpoel (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1454, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 129*].

Extrinsic evidence on the testator's intended meaning of the no contest clause is admissible if it is relevant to show a meaning to which the language is reasonably susceptible [*Estate of Kaila (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1132, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865*]. However, consideration of extrinsic evidence does not necessarily require a determination of an action on the merits that would preclude relief [*Estate of Kaila (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1122, 1136, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865*].

[5] Review of Determination

A court order determining whether a particular motion, petition, or other act by the beneficiary would constitute a contest within the terms of the no contest clause is appealable [*Prob. Code § 1303(j), see Estate of Hoffman (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 1436, 1438 n.1, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 248*].

Cases have held that, given the short filing times in many probate matters and the need for timely and orderly administration of estates, appeal may constitute an inadequate legal remedy. Under these circumstances, a writ of mandate would be the appropriate remedy for reviewing the court's order [*see Varney v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1092, 1098, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865* ; *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 167, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.17

§ 560.17 Applicability of Trust Law

A comprehensive body of statutes governing trusts was adopted in California in 1987 on the recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission. These statutes, collectively referred to as the Trust Law, prescribe detailed rules for the creation, validity, modification, and termination of trusts. Unless otherwise provided by statute, the Trust Law applies to the following:

- All trusts, regardless of when they were created [*Prob. Code § 15001(a)*].

- All proceedings concerning trusts commenced on or after July 1, 1987 [*Prob. Code § 15001(b)*].

- All proceedings concerning trusts commenced before July 1, 1987, unless in the opinion of the court application of a particular provision of the Trust Law would substantially interfere with the effective conduct of the proceedings or the rights of the parties and other interested persons, in which case the particular provision of the Trust Law does not apply and law applicable before July 1, 1987, applies [*Prob. Code § 15001(c)*].

- Charitable trusts subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, to the extent that the application of the provision is not in conflict with the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act [Prob. Code§ 15004; *see Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.* (Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act)].

Except to the extent that the common law rules governing trusts are modified by statute, the common law regarding trusts is the law of California [*Prob. Code § 15002*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust

LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.18

§ 560.18 Nonapplicability of Trust Law

The Trust Law does not apply to the following:

- Constructive trusts, other than those described in *Prob. Code § 82(a)(2)*, and resulting trusts [*Prob. Code §§ 82(b)(1), 15003(a)*; *see* Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* and Ch. 502, *Trusts: Resulting Trusts* , respectively].

- Guardianships, conservatorships, or personal representatives [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(2), (3)*; *see* Ch. 280, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Appointment of Guardians* , through Ch. 290H, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Termination of Guardianships and Coonservatorships* , and Ch. 440, *Probate: Is Probate Necessary* through 458E, *Probate: Discharge*].

- Totten trust accounts [*see Prob. Code § 82(b)(4)*; *see § 560.340* et seq.].

- Custodial arrangements pursuant to the Uniform Gifts to Minors Act or the Uniform Transfers to Minors Act of any state [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(5)*; *see, e.g., Prob. Code §§ 3900-3925* (California Uniform Transfers to Minors Act, incorporating former California Uniform Gifts to Minors Act)].

- Business trusts that are taxed as partnerships or corporations [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(6)*].

- Investment trusts subject to regulation under the laws of California or any other jurisdiction [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(7)*].

- Common trust funds [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(8)*].

- Voting trusts or security arrangements [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(9), (10)*; *see Corp. Code § 703*; *see also* Ch. 166, *Corporations* : *Shareholders' Meetings and Voting*].

- Transfers in trust for the purpose of suit or enforcement of a claim or right [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(11)*].

- Liquidation trusts [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(12)*].

- Trusts for the primary purpose of paying debts, dividends, interest, salaries, wages, profits, pensions, or employee benefits of any kind [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(13)*].

- Any arrangement under which a person is nominee or escrowee for another [*Prob. Code § 82(b)(14)*].

In addition, nothing in the Trust Law affects the substantive law relating to constructive or resulting trusts [*Prob. Code § 15003(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesCommon Trust FundsBusiness & Corporate LawCorporationsShareholdersMeetings & VotingVoting SharesVoting TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank AccountsEstate, Gift & Trust LawPersonal GiftsGifts to MinorsUniform ActsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrow

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.19

§ 560.19 Effect of Trust Law on Other Relationships and Entities

The 1986 repeal of *Civ. Code §§ 2215-2290.12* was not intended to alter the rules applied by the courts to fiduciary and confidential relationships, except as to express trusts governed by the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 15003(b)*].

Nothing in the Trust Law or in *Prob. Code § 82* is intended to prevent the application of all or part of the principles or procedures of the Trust Law to an entity or relationship that is excluded from the definition of trust provided by *Prob. Code § 82* if these principles or procedures are applied pursuant to statutory or common law principles, by court order or rule, or by contract [*Prob. Code § 15003(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationGovernmentsLegislationExpirations, Repeals & Suspensions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.20

§ 560.20 Nonretroactive Provisions of Trust Law

[1] Revocation

The manner of revocation of a trust revocable by the settlor that was created by an instrument executed before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 15401* [*Prob. Code § 15401(e)*; *see § 560.111[3]*].

[2] Trustee's Duty to Account Annually

A trustee of a living trust created by an instrument executed before July 1, 1987, or of a trust created by a will executed before July 1, 1987, is not subject to the duty to account provided in *Prob. Code § 16061*, but the requirement of an account pursuant to former Prob. Code § 1120.1a (regarding trusts created by wills executed prior to July 1, 1977) may be satisfied by furnishing an account that satisfies the requirement of *Prob. Code § 16063* [*Prob. Code § 16062(b)*; *see § 560.80*].

[3] Trustee's Liability

The liability of a trustee for acts or omissions of agents that occurred before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 16401* [*Prob. Code § 16401(c)*]. Moreover, the personal liability of a trustee on a contract entered into before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 18000* [*Prob. Code § 18000(b)*]. For discussion regarding a trustee's liability to a beneficiary, see *§ 560.94* et seq. For discussion and forms regarding a trustee'sliability to a third party to the trust, see *§ 560.160* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLegislationEffect & OperationProspective Operation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.21-560.39

[Reserved]

§§ 560.21[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.40

§ 560.40 Governing Statutes

The creation and validity of express trusts are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15200-15212*. Future interests are governed by *Civ. Code § 711* and *Prob. Code §§ 15211, 15212, 15413, 15414, 21200 et seq.* Accumulation of trust income is governed by *Civ. Code §§ 722-726*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsFuture InterestsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.41

§ 560.41 Methods of Creating Trust

A trust may be created by any of the following methods, subject to other provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 15200-15212* [*Prob. Code § 15200*]:

- A declaration by the owner of property that the owner holds the property as trustee [*see Prob. Code §§ 15206* (Statute of Frauds), 15207 (oral trust of personal property)].

- A transfer of property by the owner during the owner's lifetime to another person as trustee.

- A transfer of property by the owner, by will or by other instrument taking effect on the death of the owner, to another person as trustee.

- An exercise of a power of appointment to another person as trustee.

- An enforceable promise to create a trust [*see Prob. Code §§ 15206* (Statute of Frauds), 15207 (oral trust of personal property)].

A trust created under *Prob. Code §§ 15200-15210* that relates to real property may be recorded in the county where all or part of the real property is located [*Prob. Code § 15210*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.42

§ 560.42 Requirements for Valid Trust

[1] Intention to Create Trust

A trust is created only if the settlor properly manifests an intention to create a trust [*Prob. Code § 15201*; *see Prob. Code §§ 15206* (Statute of Frauds), 15207 (oral trust of personal property)].

[2] Trust Property

A trust is created only if there is trust property [*Prob. Code § 15202*].

A declaration by the settlors that they hold property in trust for another is sufficient to transfer real property to a trust. It is not necessary to record a deed from real property owners to a trust or to the trustees, or to record the trust [*Estate of Powell (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1443, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501]* .

The following are examples of interests that can be held in trust:

- Any property that can be voluntarily transferred by the owner [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 78].

- Property that is not transferable for a reason applicable only to the transfer of the legal title to the property [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 80].

- An interest that is of the character that a person holding it for his or her own benefit could not transfer it, if it is created in trust, or it accrues to a trustee of a trust already created [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 81].

- Interests in intangible things, if transferable [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 82].

- An equitable interest, if transferable [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 83].

- An interest that is subject to divestment, if transferable [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 84].

- A contingent interest, if transferable [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 85].

- An interest in a thing, although the interest is not the complete property in the thing [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 77].

The following are examples of interests that cannot be held in trust:

- An interest that has not come into existence or that has ceased to exist [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 75].

- Subject matter that is not definite or definitely ascertainable [*see Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1089, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425* (property must be described with certainty)].

- Property that the owner cannot transfer, except as enumerated under items (2) and (3) of the preceding paragraph [*see Strauss v. Summerhays (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 806, 816, 204 Cal. Rptr. 227* (property generally mustbe transferable); Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 79].

- An expectation or hope of receiving property in the future [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 86].

For discussion of contingent interests, see *§ 560.49*.

[3] Ascertainable Beneficiary

A trust, other than a charitable trust, is created only if there is a beneficiary. The instrument therefore must provide either (1) a beneficiary or class of beneficiaries that is ascertainable with reasonable certainty or that is sufficiently described so it can be determined that some person meets the description or is within the class; or (2) a grant of a power to the trustee or some other person to select the beneficiaries based on a standard or in the discretion of the trustee or other person [*Prob. Code § 15205*]. For a definition of a beneficiary, see *§ 560.13[3]*.

[4] Resulting Trust Created on Failure of Express Trust

An attempt to create an express trust that fails to satisfy all the requirements may nevertheless establish an enforceable resulting trust [*see Sears v. Rule (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 374, 379, 114 P.2d 57]* . For further discussion, see Ch. 562, *Trusts: Resulting Trusts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.43

§ 560.43 Action by Settlor

A settlor who seeks court determination regarding the internal affairs or existence of the trust may bring a petition pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200* if the trust is revocable and the settlor holds the present power to revoke [*see Prob. Code §§ 15800* (person holding power to revoke has rights of beneficiary), 17200(a) (standing afforded to beneficiary and trustee generally)]. However, if the trust is not revocable, or it is revocable but the settlor does not hold the present power to revoke, a settlor must bring a plenary action under the Civil Code and Code of Civil Procedure [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10* (civil complaint) and *see § 560.520*].

A settlor unable to bring a petition in the probate court can bring a plenary action in the superior court, because the superior court traditionally has jurisdiction over matters regarding a trust [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10* (superior court jurisdiction over all causes not given to other courts); *see also St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 358, 287 P.2d 387* (superior court jurisdiction to hear equitable actions); *but see Prob. Code § 17000* (exclusive jurisdiction of probate court regarding *Prob. Code § 17000 et seq.*). Inasmuch as suits in equity do not afford a right to jury trial, actions to determine the nature of the trust, or the interpretation or effect of its terms, are within the sole province of the court sitting without a jury [*Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 877, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295]* . For discussion of venue provisions generally, see *Ch. 571, Venue, §§ 571.10* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsIrrevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living Trusts

21 of 195 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.44

§ 560.44 Requirements for Promise to Create Trust

Consideration is not required to create a trust, but a promise to create a trust in the future is enforceable only if the requirements for an enforceable contract are satisfied [*Prob. Code § 15208*; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 30].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawFormationGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.45

§ 560.45 Purpose of Trust

A trust may be created for any purpose that is not illegal or against public policy [*Prob. Code § 15203*].

A trust created for an indefinite or general purpose is not invalid for that reason if it can be determined with reasonable certainty that a particular use of the trust property comes within that purpose [*Prob. Code § 15204*]. The intent of the legislature in enacting *Prob. Code § 15204* was to harmonize the law of trusts and powers in order to effectuate the settlor's intent, because failures at attempts to establish trusts under previous law were often nevertheless upheld as valid powers of appointment [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 527 (1986); *see, e.g., Estate of Davis (1936) 13 Cal. App. 2d 64, 69, 56 P.2d 584* (testamentary trust for distribution to certain issue at discretion of son as trustee upheld as power of appointment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.46

§ 560.46 Statute of Frauds

A trust in relation to real property is not valid unless evidenced by one of the following methods [*Prob. Code § 15206*]:

- A written instrument signed by the trustee, or by the trustee's agent if authorized in writing to do so.
- A written instrument conveying the trust property signed by the settlor, or by the settlor's agent if authorized in writing to do so.
- Operation of law.

All of the conditions and terms of a trust in real property need not be expressed in a single document [*Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1090, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . A trust in real property that violates the Statute of Frauds may subsequently become valid and binding if possession is taken or the transfer of property has been fully executed. A person who complies with its provisions cannot later attack its validity on the ground that it was an orally executed trust proved by parol evidence [*Casa Colina Convalescent Home v. Wiest (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 161, 165, 166, 29 Cal. Rptr. 407]* . For a form for a petition for useby a beneficiary to enforce an oral trust in real property, *see § 560.550*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsSignaturesContracts LawStatutes of FraudsRequirementsWritingsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.47

§ 560.47 Oral Trust of Personal Property

The existence and terms of an oral trust of personal property may be established only by clear and convincing evidence. The oral declaration of the settlor, standing alone, is not sufficient evidence of the creation of a trust of personal property. In the case of an oral trust, a reference in *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* or elsewhere to a trust instrument of declaration means the terms of the trust as established pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15207(a)* [*Prob. Code § 15207*]. Required proof of the existence of an oral trust may be indirect, consisting of acts, conduct, and circumstances, and no particular terminology is needed [*Fahrney v. Wilson (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 694, 697, 4 Cal. Rptr. 670]* . However, the clear and convincing evidence rule applies only at the trial level. On review, it is assumed that the trial court applied the proper standard, and the judgment will not be upset if there is substantial evidence to support it [*California Pac. Title Co. v. Moore (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 114, 117, 40 Cal. Rptr. 61]* .

Nothing under *Prob. Code § 15207* (or in the entire Trust Law) affects the substantive law concerning constructive trusts [*see Prob. Code § 15003(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing Proof

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.48

§ 560.48 Merger Doctrine

[1] In General

When the legal and equitable title to trust property are vested in the same person, the doctrine of merger operates to terminate the trust [*Estate of Washburn (1909) 11 Cal. App. 735, 746, 106 P. 415* ; *see* General Introduction under § 560.11].

[2] Exception

If a trust provides for one or more successor beneficiaries after the death of the settlor, the trust is not invalid, merged, or terminated in either of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15209*]:

- When there is one settlor who is the sole trustee and the sole beneficiary during the settlor's lifetime.

- When there are two or more settlors, one or more of whom are trustees, and the beneficial interest in the trust is in one or more of the settlors during the lifetime of the settlors.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesSuccessive BeneficiariesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.49

§ 560.49 Rule Against Perpetuities

[1] General Application to Trusts

A contingent interest or an expectancy based on an existing contract may be the subject of a trust [*Bank of California v. Connolly (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 350, 373, 111 Cal. Rptr. 468]* . If a trust involves a contingent interest or an expectancy based on an existing contract, the interest must vest within the time limits set forth in the rule against perpetuities [*see Civ. Code § 711* (when restraint of alienation is void); *Prob. Code §§ 15211, 15212, 15413, 15414, 21200 et seq.* (Rule Against Perpetuities and related provisions governing trusts)].

In 1991, the Legislature adopted the Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities [*see Prob. Code § 21200 et seq.*]. *Prob. Code § 21200 et seq.* apply to nonvested property interests and unexercised powers of appointment regardless of when they were created, and supersede former *Civ. Code § 715.2*, the common law rule against perpetuities [*Prob. Code §§ 21201, 21202(a)*]. *Prob. Code § 21200 et seq.* do not apply however, to any property interest or power of appointment the validity of which has been determined in a judicial proceeding or by a settlement among interested persons [*Prob. Code § 21202(b)*]. It must be emphasized that the rule against perpetuities applies only to the vesting of future estates, and not to vested estates. If the rule does apply to a trust, that is, if a trust involves the vesting of a *future* estate, both the legal title in the trustee and the equitable title in the beneficiary must vest within the time limits of the rule [*Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1097, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425]* .

[2] Period Within Which Interest Must Vest

The rule against perpetuities states that a nonvested property interest is invalid unless one of the following conditions is satisfied [*Prob. Code § 21205*]:

- When the interst is created, it is certain to vest or terminate no later than 21 years after the death of an individual then alive; or

- The interest either vests or terminates within 90 years after its creation.

In determining whether a nonvested property interest is valid under the rule against perpetuities, the possibility that a child will be born to an individual after the individual's death is disregarded [*Prob. Code § 21208*]. In addition, an individual described as the spouse of an individual alive at the commencement of the perpetuities period will be deemed to be an individual alive when the interest is created, whether or not the individual so described was then alive [*Prob. Code § 21231*]. The lives of individuals selected to govern the time of vesting may not be so numerous or so situated that evidence of their deaths is likely to be unreasonably difficult to obtain [*Prob. Code § 21230*].

With respect to governing instruments executed on or after January 1, 1992, in measuring a period from the creation of a trust, if language in a governing instrument seeks to disallow the vesting or termination of any interest or trust beyond, to postpone the vesting or termination of any interest or trust until, or to operate in effect in any similar fashion on the later of (1) the expiration of a periodof time not exceeding 21 years after the death of the survivor of specified lives in being at the creation of the trust or (2) the expiration of a period of time that exceeds or might exceed 21 years after the death of the survivor of lives in being at the creation of the trust, that language is inoperative to the extent it produces a period that exceeds 21 years after the death of the survivor of the specified lives [*Prob. Code § 21209*].

[3] Time of Creation of Interest

In general, the time of creation of a nonvested property interest is determined by other applicable statutes or, if none, under general principles of property law [*Prob. Code § 21210*].

If there is a person who alone can exercise a power created by a governing instrument to become the unqualified beneficial owner of a nonvested property interest or a property interest subject to a power of appointment, the nonvested property interest or power of appointment is created when the power to become the unqualified beneficial owner terminates [*Prob. Code § 21211(a)*]. A joint power with respect to community property held by individuals married to each other is a power exercisable by one person alone [*Prob. Code § 21211(b)*].

A nonvested property interest or power of appointment arising from a transfer of property to a previously funded trust is created when the nonvested property interest or power of appointment in the original contribution was created [*Prob. Code § 21212*].

[4] Honorary Trusts

A trust for a noncharitable corporation or unincorporated society or for a lawful noncharitable purpose may be performed by the trustee for only 21 years, whether or not there is a beneficiary who can seek enforcement or termination of the trust and whether or not the terms of the trust contemplate a longer duration [*Prob. Code § 15211*].

[5] Trust for Care of Designated Animal

A trust for the care of a designated domestic or pet animal may be performed by the trustee for the life of the animal, whether or not there is a beneficiary who can seek enforcement or termination of the trust and whether or not the terms of the trust contemplate a longer duration [*Prob. Code § 15212*].

[6] Accumulation of Trust Income

A direction for the accumulation of the income of property is subject to the rule against perpetuities [*see Prob. Code § 12200 et seq.* (Rule Against Perpetuities); *see also Civ. Code § 723* (accumulations otherwise void)]. An accumulation of income of property directed by any will, trust, or transfer in writing sufficient to pass the property or create the trust out of which the fund is to arise, for the benefit of one or more persons, is valid if it does not extend beyond the time permitted for the vesting of future interests [*Civ. Code § 724(a)*]. Nevertheless, the income arising from real or personal property held in a trust forming part of a profit-sharing plan of an employer for the exclusive benefit of its employees or

their beneficiaries or forming part of a retirement plan formed primarily for the purpose of providing benefits for employees on or after retirement may be permitted to accumulate until the fund is sufficient, in the opinion of the trustee or trustees, to accomplish the purposes of the trust [*Civ. Code § 724(b)*].

When one or more persons for whose benefit an accumulation of income has been directed is or are destitute of other sufficient means of support or education, the proper court, on application, may direct a suitable sum to be applied thereto out of the fund directed to be accumulated for the benefit of that person or persons [*Civ. Code § 726*]. For a form for a petition to modify the trust to allow distribution of accumulated trust income from trust property, *see § 560.580*.

[7] Interests Excluded From Rule

Some interests are specifically excluded from the scope of the rule against perpetuities [*see Prob. Code § 21225*]. Among the interests excluded are nonvested property interests in certain trusts forming part of pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus, health, disability, death benefit, income deferral, or other benefit plans [*see Prob. Code § 21225(f)*]. Also excluded are trusts created for the purpose of providing for the beneficiaries under hospital service contracts, group life insurance, group disability insurance, group annuities, or any combination of such insurance [*Prob. Code § 21225(h)*].

[8] Termination of Trust After Expiration of Perpetuity Period

Notwithstanding the general rules of trust termination [*see Prob. Code § 15400 et seq.*; *see also* discussion in *§ 560.110* et seq.], if a trust continues in existence after expiration of the longer of the periods provided by the rule against perpetuities, the trust may be terminated on petition by a majority of the beneficiaries, or on petition by the Attorney General or any person who would be affected by the termination, if the court finds that the termination would be in the public interest or in the best interest of a majority of the persons who would be affected by the termination [*Prob. Code § 15414*; *see also Prob. Code § 21200 et seq.* (rule against perpetuities; discussed in *§ 560.49[2]*)]. A trust provision, express or implied, that the trust may not be terminated is ineffective insofar as it purports to be applicable after the expiration of the longer of the periods provided by the rule against perpetuities [*Prob. Code § 15413*].

[9] Reformation

On petition of an interested person, a court will reform a disposition in themanner that most closely approximates the transferor's manifested plan of distribution and is within the 90 years allowed by the rule against perpetuities, if any of the following conditions is satisfied [*Prob. Code § 21220*; *see also Prob. Code § 21200 et seq.*, discussed in *§ 560.49[2]*)]:

- A nonvested property interest or a power of appointment becomes invalid under the rule against perpetuities;

- A class gift is not, but might become, invalid under the rule against perpetuities and the time has arrived when the share of any class member is to take effect in possession or enjoyment; or

- A nonvested property interest that is not validated by *Prob. Code § 21205(a)* (no later than 21 years after death of individual alive at creation of interest; for discussion, *see § 560.49[2]*) can vest, but not within 90 years after its creation.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.50-560.69

[Reserved]

§§ 560.50[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.70

§ 560.70 Governing Statutes

Acceptance and rejection of the trust, bond requirements, and issuance of a trustee certificate are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15600-15603*. Resignation and appointment of a trustee, and vacancy of the office are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15640-15660*. Compensation and indemnification of trustees are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15680-15685*. Duties of trustees are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16000-16105*. Requirements for the satisfaction of a pecuniary gift by distribution of nonmonetary property are governed by *Prob. Code § 21118*. A trustee's duties, powers, and discretionary authority regarding trusts that relate to various Internal Revenue Code provisions for marital deductions and charitable gifts are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541*. Accounting and reporting requirements are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16060-16064*. Powers of trustees are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16200-16249*. Liabilities of trustees are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16400-16465*. Notice requirements for proposed actions by the trustee are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16500-16504*. Cotrustees are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15620-15622*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointmentEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersCompensationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple TrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.71

§ 560.71 Acceptance of Trust by Trustee

The person named as trustee may accept the trust, or a modification of the trust, by one of the following methods [*Prob. Code § 15600(a)*]:

- Signing the trust instrument or the trust instrument as modified, or signing a separate written acceptance.

- Knowingly exercising powers or performing duties under the trust instrument or the trust instrument as modified, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15600(b)*.

When there is an immediate risk of damage to the trust property, the person named as trustee may act to preserve the trust property without accepting the trust or a modification of the trust, if within a reasonable time after acting, the person delivers a written rejection of the trust or the modification of the trust to the settlor or, if the settlor is dead or incompetent, to a beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 15600(b)* does not impose a duty on the person named as trustee to act [*Prob. Code § 15600(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.72

§ 560.72 Rejection of Trust by the Trustee

A person named as trustee may reject in writing the trust or a modification of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15601(a)*]. If the person named as trustee does not accept the trust or a modification of the trust by a method provided in *Prob. Code § 15600(a)* within a reasonable time after learning of being named as trustee or of the modification, the person has rejected the trust or the modification [*Prob. Code § 15601(b)*]. A person named as trustee who rejects the trust or a modification of the trust is not liable with respect to the rejected trust or modification [*Prob. Code § 15601(c)*]. Moreover, a trustee who rejects new duties arising from a modification need not resign as trustee [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 646 (1986)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointmentEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.73

§ 560.73 Trustee's Bond and Certificate

A trustee is not required to give a bond to secure performance of the trustee's duties, unless any of the following circumstances occurs [*Prob. Code § 15602(a)*]:

- A bond is required by the trust instrument.

- Notwithstanding a waiver of a bond in the trust instrument, the court finds a bond to be necessary to protect the interests of beneficiaries or other persons having an interest in the trust.

- An individual who is not named as a trustee in the trust instrument is appointed as a trustee by the court.

Notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 15602(a)(1)* and *(3)*, the court may excuse a bond requirement, reduce or increase the amount of a bond, release a surety, or permit the substitution of another bond with the same or different sureties [*Prob. Code § 15602(b)*]. However, the court may not excuse the requirement of a bondfor an individual who is not named as a trustee in the trust instrument that the court appoints as trustee, except under compelling circumstances. A request by all of the adult beneficiaries of a trust that the bond be waived for this individual constitutes a compelling circumstance [*Prob. Code § 15602(b)*].

If a bond is required, it must be filed or served and must be in the amount and with sureties and liabilities ordered by the court [*Prob. Code § 15602(c)*]. Except as otherwise provided in the trust instrument or ordered by the court, the cost of the bond will be charged against the trust [*Prob. Code § 15602(d)*]. A trust company may not be required to give a bond, even if the trust instrument requires one [*Prob. Code § 15602(e)*].

On application by the trustee, the court clerk must issue a certificate that the trustee is a duly appointed and acting trustee under the trust if the court file shows the incumbency of the trustee [*Prob. Code § 15603*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsExecutionsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.74

§ 560.74 Professional Fiduciaries Act

[1] Professional Fiduciary

Trustees who are professional fiduciaries are required to comply with the Professional Fiduciaries Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6500 et seq.*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6530(a), Prob. Code § 60.1*]. In the context of trustees, a "professional fiduciary" is anyone who acts as a trustee, agent under a durable power of attorney for health care, or agent under a durable power of attorney for finances, for more than three people or more than three families or a combination of people and families that totals more than three, at the same time, who are not related to the professional fiduciary by blood, adoption, marriage, or registered domestic partnership [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6501(f)*; for discussion of the definition of "professional fiduciary" in the context of guardians and conservators, *see Ch. 281, Guardianship and Conservatorship: Appointment of Conservators, § 281.66*].

The following are specifically exempted from the licensing requirements [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6501(f)(4), 6530(b)-(d)*]:

- Trust companies [*see Prob. Code § 83* (definition)].

- FDIC-insured institutions, or their holding companies, subsidiaries or affiliates.

- Any public agency, including the public guardian, public conservator, or other agency of the State of California or of a county of California or any regional center for persons with developmental disability as defined in *Welf. & Inst. Code § 4620*.

- Any person who is employed by a trust company, an FDIC-insured institution or its holding companies, subsidiaries, or affiliates, or a public agency, who is acting in the course and scope of that employment, and in the instance of a public officer of a public agency, acting in the course and scope of official duties.

- Any person whose sole activity as a professional fiduciary is as a broker-dealer, broker-dealer agent, investment adviser representative registered and regulated under the Corporate Securities Law of 1968 [*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*], the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. 80b-1 et seq.*], or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 [*15 U.S.C. 78a et seq.*], or involves serving as a trustee to a company regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Investment Company Act of 1940 [*15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.*].

- Any licensed attorney.

- Any licensed certified public accountant;

- Any Internal Revenue Service agent acting within the scope of practice.

[2] Licensing Requirements

No person may act or hold himself or herself out to the public as a professional fiduciary unless he or she is licensed as a professional fiduciary under the Act [*Prob. Code § 60.1(b)*]. Persons previously required to register with the statewide registry under *Prob. Code § 2850 et seq.* (inoperative 7/1/2008, repealed eff. 1/1/2009), and persons required to file information with the clerk of the court under the former version of *Prob. Code § 2340 et seq.* (inoperative 7/1/2008; repealed eff. 1/1/2009) are required to obtain a professional fiduciary license [*Bus & Prof. Code § 6502*].

The Professional Fiduciaries Bureau is responsible for administering the licensing and regulatory program established under the Act, approving classes for prelicense and continuing education, and preparing and administering licensing exams [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6518*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6510, 6511* (creation of Bureau)]. Applications for a professional fiduciary license can be obtained online, through the California Department of Consumer Affairs, at http://www.fiduciary.ca.gov/. The Bureau may investigate an applicant's qualifications, and must approve applicants who meet the required qualifications [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6536*].

[3] Qualifications for Licensure

Applicants must meet the following qualifications in order to obtain a professional fiduciary license [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6533(a)-(k)*]:

- Be at least 21 years old.

- Be a United States citizen or legally admitted to the United States.

- Have not committed any acts that are grounds for denial of a license under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 480, 6536* [*see below*].

- Submit fingerprints for the purpose of obtaining criminal offender record information [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6533.5*].

- Have completed 30 hours of prelicensing education [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6538*].

- Have passed the licensing exam [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6539*].

- Have a least one of the following:

  - A B.A. or B.S. degree from a college or university;

- An A.A./A.S. degree from a college or university and at least five years experience with substantive fiduciary responsibilities working as a professional fiduciary, public agency, or financial institution acting as a conservator, guardian, trustee, personal representative, or agent under a power of attorney; or

- Experience of not less than three years, prior to July 1, 2008, with substantive fiduciary institution acting as a conservator, guardian, trustee, personal representative, or agent under a power of attorney.

- Agree to adhere to the Professional Fiduciaries Code of Ethics [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6520*] and to all statutes and regulations.

- Consent to the bureau conducting a credit check.

- File a completed application.

- Pay the nonrefundable application fee.

The Bureau must deny a license if the applicant [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6536(a)-(e)*]:

- Does not meet the qualifications for licensure [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6533(a)-(k), above*];

- Has been convicted of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a fiduciary;

- Has engaged in fraud or deceit in applying for a license;

- Has engaged in dishonesty, fraud, or gross negligence in performing the functions or duties of a fiduciary; or

- Has been removed as a fiduciary by a court for breach of trust committed intentionally, with gross negligence, in bad faith, or with reckless indifference, or has demonstrated a pattern of negligent conduct (including a removal prior to January 1, 2009), and all appeals have been taken or the time to file an appeal has expired.

[4] License Renewal

A professional fiduciary license is valid for one year [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6541(a)*]. To renew the license, a professional fiduciary must file a renewal application, continuing education compliance, and the renewal fee [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6561, 6538(b), 6541(b)*]. Conduct that would result in a refusal of a license renewal is similar to the conduct that would result in a license denial, and includes the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6541(b)*]:

- Conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a fiduciary.

- Fraud or deceit in obtaining a license.

- Dishonesty, fraud, or gross negligence in performing the functions or duties of a professional fiduciary.

- Removal as a fiduciary by a court for breach of a fiduciary duty.

[5] Initial and Annual Statement

A professional fiduciary must keep complete and accurate records of client accounts, and must make them available for audit by the Bureau [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6560*]. A professional fiduciary also must submit a statement, initially and annually thereafter [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6561(a)*]. The annual statement must be filed with the Bureau 60 days prior to expiration of the fiduciary's license [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6562*], and must include the following information [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6561(a)*]:

- The fiduciary's business address, phone, and fax number.

- Whether or not the fiduciary has been removed as conservator, guardian, trustee or personal representative for cause.

- The case names, court locations, and case numbers for all matters in which the fiduciary has been appointed by the court.

- Whether the fiduciary has been found by a court to have breached a fiduciary duty.

- Whether the fiduciary has reassigned or settled a matter in which a complaint has been filed, along with the case number and a statement of the issues and facts pertaining to the allegations.

- Any licenses or professional certificates held.

- Any ownership or beneficial interests in any businesses or other enterprises held by the fiduciary or by a family member who receives or has received payment from a client of the fiduciary.

- Whether the fiduciary has ever filed for bankruptcy or held a controlling financial interest in a business that filed for bankruptcy.

- The name of any persons or entities that have an interest in the fiduciary's professional fiduciary business.

- Whether the fiduciary has been convicted of a crime.

[6] Suspension, Revocation, Denial, and Disciplinary Action

The Bureau has the authority to investigate the actions of any professional fiduciary [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6580(a)*]. Sanctions may include administrative citations and fines, license suspension or probation, or license revocation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6580(b)*]. A license may be suspended, revoked, or denied, or other disciplinary action may be imposed for one or more of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6584*]:

- Conviction of any felony or misdemeanor, if the misdemeanor is substantially related to the functions and duties of a professional fiduciary.

- Failure to notify the bureau of a conviction [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6561(a)(10)*].

- Fraud or misrepresentation in obtaining a license.

- Fraud, dishonesty, corruption, willful violation of duty, gross negligence or incompetence in practice, or unprofessional conduct in, or related to, the practice of a professional fiduciary.

- Failure to comply with, or to pay a monetary sanction imposed by a court for failure to provide timely reports.

- Failure to pay a civil penalty relating to the licensee's professional fiduciary duties.

- The revocation of, suspension of, or other disciplinary action against, any other professional license by the State of California or by another state; Violation of this *Bus. Prof. Code § 6500 et seq.*, *Probate Code § 4000 et seq.*, *Probate Code § 4600 et seq.*, *Probate Code § 5000 et seq.*, or any of the statutes, rules, or regulations pertaining to the duties or functions of a professional fiduciary.

The Bureau has adopted a Professional Fiduciaries Code of Ethics that is available on the bureau's Internet website and is provided to all applicants [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 6520*; www.fiduciary.ca.gov].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.75

§ 560.75 Cotrustees

[1] Unanimous Action Required

Unless otherwise provided in the trust instrument, a power vested in two or more trustees may only be exercised by their unanimous action [*Prob. Code § 15620*].

[2] Vacancy or Unavailability

Unless otherwise provided in the trust instrument, if a vacancy occurs in the office of a cotrustee, the remaining cotrustee or cotrustees may act for the trust as if they are the only trustees [*Prob. Code § 15621*].

Unless otherwise provided in the trust instrument, if a cotrustee is unavailable to perform the duties of the cotrustee because of absence, illness, or other temporary incapacity, the remaining cotrustee or cotrustees may act for the trust as if they were the only trustees, when necessary to accomplish the purposes of the trust or to avoid irreparable injury to the trust property [*Prob. Code § 15622*].

[3] Duties of Cotrustees

If a trust has more than one trustee, each trustee has a duty to participate in the administration of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16013(a)*]. Each trustee must also take reasonable steps to prevent a cotrustee from committing a breach of trust or to compel a cotrustee to redress a breach of trust [*Prob. Code § 16013(b)*]. However, if a cotrustee is also a settlor under a revocable trust, a nonsettlor-cotrustee must follow the directions of the settlor-cotrustee [*see Prob. Code § 16001*].

For discussion of a trustee's liability to a beneficiary for acts of a cotrustee, see *Prob. Code § 16402* and § 560.84[3].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple Trustees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.76

§ 560.76 Duties of Trustee

[1] Generally

On acceptance of the trust, the trustee has a duty to administer the trust according to the trust instrument and, except to the extent the trust instrument provides otherwise, according to the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 16000*]. For discussion of the methods of accepting a trust, see *§ 560.71*. For discussion of the procedure when petitioning the court with respect to administration of a trust under the Trust Law, see *§ 560.130* et seq.

[2] In Revocable Trust

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16001(b)*, the trustee of a revocable trust must follow any written direction acceptable to the trustee given from time to time by (1) the person then having the power to revoke the trust or the part of the trust withrespect to which the direction is given, or (2) the person to whom the settlor delegates the right to direct the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16001(a)*]. If a written direction given under *Prob. Code § 16001(a)* would have the effect of modifying the trust, the trustee has no duty to follow the direction unless it complies with the requirements for modifying the trust [*Prob. Code § 16001(b)*]. For discussion of modification and termination of trusts, see *§ 560.110* et seq.

[3] Loyalty

The trustee has a duty to administer the trust solely in the interest of the beneficiaries [*Prob. Code § 16002(a)*]. It is not a violation of the duty under *Prob. Code § 16002(a)* for a trustee who administers two trusts to sell, exchange, or participate in the sale or exchange of trust property between the trusts, if both of the following requirements are met [*Prob. Code § 16002(b)*]:

- The sale or exchange is fair and reasonable with respect to the beneficiaries of both trusts.
- The trustee gives to the beneficiaries of both trusts notice of all material facts related to the sale or

exchange that the trustee knows or should know.

If a trust has two or more beneficiaries, the trustee has a duty to deal impartially with them and must act impartially in investing and managing the trust property, taking into account any differing interests of the beneficiaries [*Prob. Code § 16003*].

[4] Conflict of Interest and Adverse Interests

The trustee has a duty not to use or deal with trust property for the trustee's own profit or for any other purpose unconnected with the trust, nor to take part in any transaction in which the trustee has an interest adverse to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 16004(a)*; *but see Prob. Code § 16463* (beneficiary's consent relieving trustee from liability)]. The trustee may not enforce any claim against the trust property that the trustee purchased after or in contemplation of appointment as trustee, but the court may allow the trustee to be reimbursed from trust property the amount that the trustee paid in good faith for the claim [*Prob. Code § 16004(b)*].

A transaction between the trustee and a beneficiary that occurs during the existence of the trust or while the trustee's influence with the beneficiary remains and by which the trustee obtains an advantage from the beneficiary is presumed to be a violation of the trustee's fiduciary duties. This presumption affects the burden of proof [*Prob. Code § 16004(c)*; *see Evid. Code §§ 605, 606* (definition of presumption affecting burden of proof)].

Prob. Code § 16004(c) does not apply to the provisions of an agreement between a trustee and a beneficiary relating to the hiring or compensation of the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16004(c)*].

The provision of services for compensation by a regulated financial institution or its affiliates in the ordinary course of business either to a trust of which it acts as trustee or to a person dealing with the trust is not a violation of the duty provided in *Prob. Code § 16002* or *16004*. For the purposes of *Prob. Code § 16015*, "affiliate" means a corporation that directly or indirectly through one or more intermediaries controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with another domestic or foreign corporation [*Prob. Code § 16015*].

Similarly, the duty of loyalty is not violated if the trustee deposits trust funds in a financial institution operated by or affiliated with the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16225(b)*]. However, depositing funds in such an institution is permissible only because it is specifically authorized by statute; without the statute, it would be a clear violation of the duty of loyalty for the trustee to deposit trust funds with itself [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 835, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

The trustee of one trust has a duty not to knowingly become a trustee of another trust adverse in its nature to the interest of the beneficiary of the first trust, and a duty to eliminate the conflict or resign as trustee when the conflict is discovered [*Prob. Code § 16005*; *but see Prob. Code § 16463* (beneficiary's consent relieving trustee from liability)].

[5] Preservation, Use, and Disposal of Trust Property

The trustee has a duty to take reasonable steps, under the circumstances, to take and keep control of and to preserve the trust property [*Prob. Code § 16006*]. Moreover, the trustee has a duty to make the trust property productive under the circumstances and in furtherance of the purposes of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16007*; *see Prob. Code § 16000* (trust instrument controls)].

[6] Commingling Trust Property

The trustee has a duty to keep the trust property separate from other property not subject to the trust [*Prob. Code § 16009(a)*]. There are, however, exceptions, to the general duty to avoid commingling [*see, e.g., Fin. Code §§ 1563*

(registration of trust securities in name of nominee), 1564 (common trust funds)]. The trustee must also see that the trust property is designated as property of the trust [*Prob. Code 16009(b)*].

For discussion of a beneficiary's consent to a trustee's acts that relieve the trustee from liability for breach of trust, see *Prob. Code § 16463* and § 560.87. For discussion of a trustee's standard of care, see *§ 560.78*.

[7] Delegation of Performance and Transfer of Office

The duties of the trustee with respect to the delegation of investment andmanagement responsibilities are subject to special rules set forth in the Uniform Prudent Investor Act [*Prob. Code §§ 16045-16054*] [*see Prob. Code § 16012(c)*]. With respect to all other responsibilities, the authority of the trustee to delegate duties or functions is governed by the general rule stated in *Prob. Code § 16012*. Under that rule, the trustee has a duty not to delegate to others the performance of acts that the trustee can reasonably be required personally to perform, and may not transfer the office of trustee to another person nor delegate the entire administration of the trust to a cotrustee or other person [*Prob. Code § 16012(a)*]. In a case in which a trustee has properly delegated a matter to an agent, cotrustee, or other person, the trustee has a duty to exercise general supervision over the person performing the delegated matter [*Prob. Code § 16012(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 16247* (power to hire agent)]. For discussion of cotrustees, see *Prob. Code §§ 15620-15622* and § 560.75. For discussion of a trustee's liability for acts of an agent, see *§ 560.84* and Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersStandards of Care

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.77

§ 560.77 Trustee's Compliance With Internal Revenue Code Provisions

[1] Marital Deduction Gifts

The federal estate and gift tax laws provide for "marital deductions," under which property passing from one spouse to another is deductible from the gross estate [*see I.R.C. §§ 2056, 2523*]. California law provides that if an instrument contains a marital deduction gift, the provisions of the instrument, including any power, duty, or discretionary authority given to a fiduciary, must be construed to comply with these marital deduction provisions [*Prob. Code § 21522(a)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 39* ("fiduciary" defined), 45 ("instrument" defined); *see also Prob. Code §§ 21500* (reference is to Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as amended), 21501 (applies to distribution made on or after January 1, 1988; prior distributions governed by prior law), 21520(a) ("marital deduction" means deduction under *I.R.C. § 2056* or *2523*), 21520(b) ("marital deduction gift" means a transfer intended to qualify for the marital deduction)].

The trustee may not take any action or have any power that impairs the deduction as applied to the marital deduction gift [*Prob. Code § 21522(b)*]. The marital deduction gift may be satisfied only with property that qualifies for the marital deduction [*Prob. Code § 21522(c)*].

If a marital deduction gift is made in trust, the transferor's spouse has the right to require that the trustee make unproductive marital deduction property productive, or to convert it into productive property within a reasonable time [*Prob. Code § 21524(c)*].

However, the provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541* do not apply to an instrument whose terms expressly or by necessary implication make them inapplicable [*Prob. Code § 21502(a)*]. Moreover, *Prob. Code §§ 21520-21526* do not apply to a trust that qualifies for the marital deduction under Treas. Reg. § 20.2056(e)-2(b), commonly referred to as the "estate trust" [*Prob. Code § 21521*]. An "estate trust" is a trust that ultimately pays the entire trust estate, including an accumulated income, to the surviving spouse, or to the surviving spouse's estate or executors.

For discussion of marital deduction trusts and their use in estate planning, *see* California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 112, *The*

Marital Deduction and Marital Deduction Trusts (Matthew Bender); California Legal Forms, Ch. 71, *Marital Deduction Trust Provisions* (Matthew Bender).

[2] Charitable Remainder Unitrusts and Charitable Remainder Annuity Trusts

If an instrument indicates the transferor's intention to comply with the Internal Revenue Code requirements for a charitable remainder unitrust or for a charitable remainder annuity trust as each is defined in *I.R.C. § 664*, the provisions of the instrument, including any power, duty, or discretionary authority given to a fiduciary, is construed to comply with the charitable deduction provisions of *I.R.C. § 2055* or *2522*, and with the charitable remainder trust provisions of *I.R.C. § 664* in order to conform to that intent. In no event may the fiduciary take an action or have a power that impairs the charitable deduction [*Prob. Code § 21540*; *see Prob. Code §§ 39* ("fiduciary" includes trustee), 21500 (Internal Revenue Code references include subsequent amendments)]. Whether an instrument contains a gift under *Prob. Code § 21540* depends on the intention of the transferor at the time the instrument is executed [*see* Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Comment to *Prob. Code § 21540*, *20* Cal. L. Rev. Com. Reports 1988 (1990)].

The provisions of the instrument may be augmented in any manner consistent with *I.R.C. § 2055(e)* or *2522(c)* on a petition provided for in *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 21540*]. For discussion of petition proceedings under *Prob. Code § 17200*, see *§ 560.270* et seq.

The provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541* apply to a distribution made on or after January 1, 1988; prior distributions are governed by prior law [*Prob. Code § 21501*]. However, they do not apply to an instrument whose terms expressly or by necessary implication make them inapplicable [*Prob. Code § 21502(a)*].

For discussion and forms relating to charitable remainder annuity trusts and unitrusts with regard to estate planning, see California Wills & Trusts, vol. 3, Ch. 116, *Charitable Remainder Trusts* (Mathhew Bender); California Wills & Trusts Forms, Civ. I, *Complete Inter Vivos Trusts*, Trusts 50, 51 (Matthew Bender); California Legal Forms, Ch. 74, *Split-Interest Charitable Trusts* (Matthew Bender).

[3] Charitable Lead Trusts

If an instrument indicates the transferor's intention to comply with the requirements for a charitable lead trust as described in *I.R.C. §§ 170(f)(2)(B)* and *2055(e)(2)* or *2522(c)(2)*, the provisions of the instrument, including any power, duty, or discretionary authority given to a fiduciary, is construed to comply with the provisions of the relevant federal statute in order to conform to that intent. In no event may the fiduciary take any action or have any power that impairs the charitable deduction. The provisions of the instrument may be augmented in any manner consistent with that intent on a petition under *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 21541*; *see Prob. Code §§ 39* ("fiduciary" includes trustee), 21500 (Internal Revenue Code references include subsequent amendments); *but see Prob. Code §§ 21501* (applicable only to distribution made on or after January 1, 1988; prior distribution governed by prior law), 21502(a) (inapplicable to trust that provides or implies otherwise)]. For discussion of petition proceedings under *Prob. Code § 17200*, see *§ 560.270* et seq. For discussion and forms relating to charitable lead trusts with regard to estate planning, see California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 117, *Charitable Lead Trusts* (Matthew Bender); California Wills & Trust Forms, Div. I, *Complete Inter Vivos Trusts*, Trusts 55, 56 (Matthew Bender); California Legal Forms, Ch. 74, *Split-Interest Charitable Trusts* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsMarital Deduction TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.78

§ 560.78 Standard of Care

[1] Generally

The trustee has a duty to apply the full extent of the trustee's skills [*Prob. Code § 16014(a)*]. If the settlor, in selecting the trustee, has relied on the trustee's representation of having special skills, the trustee is held to the standard of the skills represented [*Prob. Code § 16014(b)*].

The standard of care that must be exercised by the trustee in investing and managing trust assets is specified in the Uniform Prudent Investor Act [*Prob. Code §§ 16045-16054*] [*see Prob. Code § 16040(c)*]. In exercising its other responsibilities, the trustee is subject to the general rule stated in *Prob. Code § 16040*, which requires the trustee to administer the trust with reasonable care, skill, and caution under the circumstances then prevailing that a prudent person acting in a like capacity would use in the conduct of an enterprise of like character and with like aims to accomplish the purposes of the trust as determined from the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16040(a)*]. However, *Prob. Code § 16040* authorizes the settlor to expand or restrict the standard set forth in the section by express provisions in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16040(b)*]. When the settlor does this, the trustee is entitled to rely on those express provisions and is not liable to a beneficiary for doing so [*Prob. Code § 16040(b)*].

A trustee's standard of care and performance in administering the trust is not affected by whether or not the trustee receives any compensation [*Prob. Code § 16041*].

[2] Investment

The trustee's duties with respect to investment are specified in the Uniform Prudent Investor Act [*see Prob. Code §§ 16054-16054*], which applies to all trusts existing on and created after its effective date of January 1, 1996 [*Prob. Code § 16054*]. Under this Act, a trustee who invests and manages trusts assets owes a duty to the beneficiaries to comply with the "prudent investor rule," except to the extent that the settlor has expanded or restricted the rule by express provisions in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16046*]. If the settlor has expanded or restricted the rule by express provisions in the trust instrument, the trustee is entitled to rely in good faith on those provisions and cannot be held

liable to a beneficiary for doing so [*Prob. Code § 16046(b)*].

The "prudent investor rule" requires the trustee to invest and manage trust assets as a prudent investor would, by considering the purposes, terms, distribution requirements, and other circumstances of the trust [Prob. Code § 16407(a)]. In satisfying this standard, the trustee must exercise reasonable care, skill, and caution [Prob. Code § 16407(a)].

The prudent investor rule also provides that a trustee's investment and management decisions respecting individual assets and courses of action must be evaluated not in isolation, but in the context of the trust portfolio as a whole and as a part of an overall investment strategy having risk and return objectives reasonably suited to the trust [*Prob. Code § 16047(b)*; for circumstances that are appropriate to consider, *see Prob. Code § 16047(c)*]. Under the rule, a trustee may invest in any kind of property or type of investment, or engage in any course of action or investment strategy, that is consistent with the Uniform Prudent Investor Act [Prob. Code § 16407(d)]. However, the trustee has a duty to diversify the investments of the trust unless, under the circumstances, it is prudent not to do so [Prob. Code § 16408].

Within a reasonable time after accepting a trusteeship or receiving trust assets, a trustee must review the trust assets and make and implement decisions concerning the retention and disposition of assets, in order to bring the trust portfolio into compliance with the purposes, terms, distribution requirements, and other circumstances of the trust, and with the requirements of the Uniform Prudent Investor Act [*Prob. Code § 16049*]. In investing and managing trust assets, a trustee may only incur costs that are appropriate and reasonable in relation to the assets, overall investment strategy, purposes, and other circumstances of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16050*].

[3] Delegation of Investment and Management Functions

A trustee may delegate investment and management functions as prudent under the circumstances. However, the trustee must exercise prudence in selecting an agent, establishing the scope and terms of the delegation, consistent with the purposes and terms of the trust, and periodically reviewing the agent's overall performance and compliance with the terms of the delegation [*Prob. Code § 16052*; *see Prob. Code § 16401* (liability of trustee for acts or omissions of agent)]. See *§ 560.547* for discussion of the extent of a trustee's liability for acts of an agent.

[4] Exercise of Discretionary Powers

[a] General Standard

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16081* [*see* discussion *below*], a trustee must exercise any discretionary powers reasonably, and not arbitrarily [*Prob. Code § 16080*].

[b] "Absolute," "Sole," or "Uncontrolled" Discretion

Subject to the additional requirements of *Prob. Code § 16081(b), (c),* and *(d)* discussed below, if a trust instrument confers "absolute," "sole," or "uncontrolled" discretion on a trustee, the trustee must act in accordance with fiduciary principles and may not act in bad faith or in disregard of the purposes of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16081(a)*]. Notwithstanding the use of terms like "absolute," "sole," or "uncontrolled" by a settlor or testator, a person who is a beneficiary of a trust that permits the person, either individually or as trustee or cotrustee, to make discretionary distributions of income or principal to or for the benefit of himself or herself pursuant to a standard, must exercise that power reasonably and in accordance with the standard [*Prob. Code § 16081(b)*].

[c] Discretionary Distributions for Benefit of Trustee

Unless a settlor or a testator clearly indicates that a broader power is intended by express reference to *Prob. Code § 16081(c),* a person who is a beneficiary of a trust that permits the person, as trustee or cotrustee, to make discretionary

distributions of income or principal to or for the benefit of himself or herself may exercise that power in his or her favor only for his or her health, education, support, or maintenance within the meaning of *I.R.C. §§ 2041* and *2514*. Notwithstanding the foregoing and the provisions of *Prob. Code § 15620* (which requires unanimous action when a power is vested in two or more trustees unless the trust instrument provides otherwise), however, if a power to make discretionary distributions of income or principal is conferred on two or more trustees, the power may be exercised by any trustee who is not a current permissible beneficiary of the power.

If there is no trustee who is not a current permissible beneficiary of the power, any party in interest may apply to the court to appoint a trustee who is not a current permissible beneficiary of the power, and the power may be exercised by the trustee appointed by the court [*Prob. Code § 16081(c)*].

Prob. Code § 16081(c) does not apply to any of the following:

- Any power held by the settlor of a revocable or amendable trust.

- Any power held by a settlor's or testator's spouse who is the trustee of a trust for which a marital deduction as defined in *Prob. Code § 21520* has been allowed.

Prob. Code § 16081(c) does apply to any of the following:

- Any trust executed on or after January 1, 1997.

- Any testamentary trust created under a will executed on or after January 1, 1997.

- Any irrevocable trust created under a document executed before January 1, 1997, or any revocable trust executed before that date if the settlor was incapacitated as of that date, unless all parties in interest elect affirmatively not to be subject to *Prob. Code § 16081(c)* through a written instrument delivered to the trustee. That election must be made on or before the latest of January 1, 1998, three years after the date on which the trust became irrevocable, or, in the case of a revocable trust in which the settlor was incapacitated, three years after the date on which the settlor became incapacitated.

Prob. Code § 16081(c) neither creates a new cause of action nor impairs an existing cause of action that, in either case, relates to any power limited by *Prob. Code § 16081(c)* that was exercised before January 1, 1997.

[d] Definition of "Party In Interest"

For purposes of *Prob. Code § 16081*, the term "party in interest" means any of the following persons [*Prob. Code § 16081(g)*]:

- If the trust is revocable and the settlor is incapacitated, the settlor's legal representative under applicable law, or the settlor's attorney-in-fact under a durable power of attorney that is sufficient to grant the authority required under *Prob. Code § 16081(c)* or *(e)*, as applicable.

- If the trust is irrevocable, each trustee, each beneficiary then entitled or authorized to receive income distributions from the trust, or each remainder beneficiary who would be entitled to receive notice of a trust proceeding under Prob. Code § 15084. Any beneficiary who lacks legalcapacity may be represented by the beneficiary's legal representative, attorney-in-fact under a durable power of attorney that is sufficient to grant the authority required under *Prob. Code § 16081(c)* or *(e)*, as applicable, or in the absence of a legal representative or attorney-in-fact, a guardian ad litem appointed for that purpose.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersStandards of Care

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.79

§ 560.79 Holder of Power May Not Discharge Own Legal Obligations

A person who holds a power to appoint or distribute income or principal to or for the benefit of others, either as an individual or as trustee, may not use the power to discharge the legal obligations of the person holding the power, except as otherwise specifically provided in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16082*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawPowers of AppointmentEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.80

§ 560.80 Duty to Report or Account

[1] Generally

The trustee has a duty to keep the beneficiaries of the trust reasonably informed of the trust and its administration [*Prob. Code § 16060*]. Ordinarily, the trustee is not under a duty to the beneficiary to furnish information in the absence of a request for it. However, if the trustee enters into a transaction with the beneficiary on the trustee's own account, the trustee has a duty to communicate material facts in connection with the transaction that the trustee knows or should know. The trustee also has a duty to communicate material facts affecting the beneficiary's interest that the trustee knows the beneficiary does not know but needs to know for protection against a third person [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 173]. Moreover, during the time that the trust is revocable, the trustee owes the duty under *Prob. Code § 16060* to the settlor or other person who has the power to revoke the trust, and not to the beneficiary [*see Prob. Code § 15800*]. Thus, when the settlor of a revocable trust was under the care and custody of a court-appointed conservator, the beneficiaries had no right to an accounting because the trust remained revocable despite the conservatorship [*Johnson v. Kotyck (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 83, 88, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99]* .

[2] On Request by Beneficiary

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16064*, on reasonable request by a beneficiary, the trustee must provide the beneficiary with a report of information about the assets, liabilities, receipts, and disbursements of the trust, the acts of the trustee, and the particulars relating to the administration of the trust relevant to the beneficiary's interest, including the terms of the trust as defined under *Prob. Code § 16061* [§ 560.80[3]]. This duty to report does not, however, require disclosure of communications protected by the attorney-client privilege [*Wells Fargo Bank v. Superior Court (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 201, 207, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716, 990 P.2d 591]* .

If the trustee does not comply with a reasonable request under *Prob. Code § 16061*, the beneficiary may petition for a report or account [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)* and *see § 560.548*]. Moreover, the availability of information on request under *Prob. Code § 16061* does not negate the affirmative duty of the trustee to provide information under *Prob. Code § 16060* [*see § 560.80*]].

During the time that the trust is revocable, the trustee owes the duty under *Prob. Code § 16061* to the settlor or other person who has the power to revoke the trust, and not to the beneficiary [*see Prob. Code § 15800*].

[3] Copy of Terms of Trust

If a trust is wholly or partially revocable during the settlor's lifetime, the settlor's death may trigger a duty on the part of the trustee to provide copies of the trust instrument to the beneficiaries or the settlor's heirs. Under *Prob. Code § 16061.5*, the trustee of a revocable trust is required to provide a true and complete copy of the "terms of the trust" to any beneficiary or heir of the settlor who requests if the trust becomes irrevocable because of the death of one or more of the settlors, or because, by the express terms of the trust, the trust becomes irrevocable within one year of the settlor's death because of a contingency related to the death of one or more of the settlors of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16061.5(a)*]. If only a portion of the trust has become irrevocable, the trustee is required only to provide a copy of the terms of the "irrevocable portion of the trust" [*Prob. Code § 16061.5*]. The trustee must rely on any final judicial determination of heirship. However, the trustee has discretion to make a good faith determination by any reasonable means of the heirs of a deceased settlor in the absence of a final judicial determination of heirship known to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16061.5(b)*].

For purposes of this rule, "terms of the trust" has a specific meaning. It means the written trust instrument of an irrevocable trust or those provisions of a written trust instrument in effect at the settlor's death that describe or affect that portion of a trust that has become irrevocable at the death of the settlor [*Prob. Code § 16060.5*]. The phrase "terms of the trust" also includes, but is not limited to, signatures, amendments, disclaimers, and any directions or instructions to the trustee that affect the disposition of the trust. However, the phrase does not include documents that were intended to affect disposition only while the trust was revocable [*Prob. Code § 16060.5*]. If a trust has been completely restated, "terms of the trust" does not include trust instruments or amendments that are superseded by the last restatement before the settlor's death, but it does include amendments executed after the restatement. "Terms of the trust" also includes any document irrevocably exercising a power of appointment over the trust or over any portion of the trust which has become irrevocable [*Prob. Code § 16060.5*].

The Probate Code does not specify a time limit within which the trustee must comply with the requirements applicable to providing a copy of the terms of the trust. However, it does set time limits for bringing an action to contest the trust,and those time limits are at least partially determined by reference to the time that the trustee mails or delivered a copy of the "terms of the trust." Under *Prob. Code § 16061.8*, no person upon whom a "notification by trustee" [*see Prob. Code § 16061.7*] is served may bring an action to contest the trust more than 120 days from the date the notification by trustee is served on him or her, or 60 days from the date on which a copy of the terms of the trust is mailed or personally delivered to him or her, whichever is later [*Prob. Code § 16061.8*].

[4] Annual Account

The trustee must account at least annually, at the termination of the trust, and on a change of trustees, to each beneficiary to whom income or principal is required or authorized in the trustee's discretion to be currently distributed, except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code §§ 16062* and *16064* [*Prob. Code § 16062(a)*; for a form of account, *see § 560.559*]. The general duty to provide information is not necessarily satisfied by compliance with *Prob. Code § 16062* [*see Prob. Code § 16060*].

A trustee of a living trust created by an instrument executed before July 1, 1987, is not subject to the duty to account provided by *Prob. Code § 16062(a)* [*Prob. Code § 16062(b)*]. A trustee of a trust created by a will executed before July 1, 1987, is not subject to the duty to account provided by *Prob. Code § 16062(a)*, except that if the trust is removed from continuing court jurisdiction pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17350-17354*, the duty to account provided by *Prob. Code § 16062(a)* applies to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16062(c)*]. The duty of a trustee to account pursuant to former Prob.

Code § 1120.1a (repealed in 1986), under a trust created by a will executed before July 1, 1977, which has been removed from continuing court jurisdiction pursuant to former Prob. Code § 1120.1a, continues to apply after July 1, 1987, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16064*. The duty to account under former Prob. Code § 1120.1a may be satisfied by furnishing an account that satisfies the requirement of *Prob. Code § 16063* [*Prob. Code § 16062(d)*; for a form of account, *see § 560.559*]. Moreover, *Prob. Code § 16062* does not affect any requirement for an account that may exist under prior law, whether pursuant to statute or court order [*see, e.g.*, former Prob. Code § 1121.1a(b) (requirement to furnish statement of income and principal report to income beneficiaries)]. For discussion of removal of a testamentary trust from continuing court jurisdiction, see *§ 560.146*.

[5] Exceptions to Accounting Requirements

The trustee is not required to report information or account to a beneficiary in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16064(b)-(d)*]:

- In the case of a beneficiary of a revocable trust, as provided in *Prob. Code § 15800* for the period during which the trust may be revoked.

- As to a beneficiary who has waived in writing the right to a report or account. A waiver of rights under *Prob. Code § 16064(c)* may be withdrawn in writing at any time as to the most recent account and future accounts. A waiver has no effect on the beneficiary's right to petition for a report or account pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200*.

- If the beneficiary and the trustee are the same person.

The trustee generally will be relieved of the duty to account if the trust instrument waives accounts [*Prob. Code § 16064(a)*]. However, a waiver of the duty to account in a trust instrument is void and unenforceable if there is only one trustee and that trustee is a "disqualified person" as defined in *Prob. Code § 21350.5* [*Prob. Code §§ 16062(e), 16064(a)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 21350, 21351*]. A "disqualified person" is a person to whom a valid transfer cannot be made under *Prob. Code §§ 21350* or *21351* [*Prob. Code § 21350.5*]. A typical example of a "disqualified person" is an attorney who drafted a trust instrument in which the attorney was named as beneficiary [*see Prob. Code § 21350(a)(1)*]. For more detailed discussion of transfers that are invalidated under these statutes, and circumstances under which a person will be deemed a "disqualified person," see *§ 560.14*.

A waiver of accounts is also unenforceable if it is reasonably likely that a material breach of the trust has occurred. If that is the case, the court may always compel the trustee to account [*Prob. Code § 16064(a)*].

Notwithstanding the absence of duty to account under *Prob. Code § 16064*, the trustee may wish to provide information in order to start the running of the statute of limitations under *Prob. Code § 16460* [*see § 560.86*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.81

§ 560.81 Duty to Give Notice When Trust Becomes Irrevocable or On Change of Trustees of Irrevocable Trust

[1] Statutory Notice Requirement

The trustee of a revocable inter vivos (or "living") trust must serve a statutory notice on the beneficiaries and the settlor's heirs whenever the trust becomes irrevocable by reason of the death of the settlor (or one of the settlors), or because, by the express terms of the trust, the trust becomes irrevocable within one year of the death of a settlor because of a contingency related to the death of one or more of the settlors of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(a)(1)*]. This statutory notice is referred to in the statute as a "notification by trustee" [*see Prob. Code § 16061.7(a)*]. This form must also be served on the beneficiaries and heirs when there is a change of trustees of an irrevocable trust. In that case, the duty to serve the notification is the duty of the continuing or successor trustee, and any one cotrustee may serve the notification [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(a)(2)*].

The trustee is not required to serve a notification by the trustee if the event thatotherwise requires service of the notification by trustee occurred before January 1, 1998 [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(j)*].

[2] Limiting Effect on Actions to Contest Trust

When the notification by trustee has been served as required, the time within which a served person may bring an action to contest the trust is limited to 120 days from the date of service, or 60 days from the day on which a copy of the "terms of the trust" is mailed or personally delivered to the person during the 120-day period, whichever is later [*Prob. Code § 16061.8*; for definition of "terms of trust," see *Prob. Code § 16060.5*; for discussion, *see § 560.80[3]*].

[3] Persons Who Must Be Notified

The notification by trustee must be served on each of the following [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(b)*]:

- Each beneficiary with a present interest in the irrevocable trust, or irrevocable portion of the trust. If there are beneficiaries who only have future interests in the trust, they are entitled to receive the

notification only as specified in *Prob. Code § 15804* [for discussion of *Prob. Code § 15804*, see *§ 560.137[4]*].

- Each heir of the deceased settlor, if the event that requires trustee notification is the death of the settlor or irrevocability within one year of the death of the trust's settlor by the express terms of the trust because of a contingency related to the death of a settlor.

- The Attorney General of California, if the trust is a charitable trust subject to the supervision of the Attorney General.

There is no duty to serve a notification by trustee on any beneficiary or heir who is unknown to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(d)(2)*]. Similarly, if the trustee knows of a beneficiary or heir but cannot locate him or her after reasonable diligence, the notification need not be served on that beneficiary or heir [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(d)(1)*]. However, the trustee may serve the notification by trustee on any person or persons in addition to those on whom the notification is required to be served [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(j)*].

In providing notification by the trustee, a trustee must rely on any final judicial determination of heirship known to the trustee. However, the trustee has discretion to make a good faith determination by any reasonable means of the heirs of a deceased settlor in the absence of a final judicial determination of heirship known to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(c)*].

[4] Method of Service

The notification by trustee must be served by personal delivery or by mailing it to the last known address of the beneficiary or heir as prescribed in *Prob. Code § 1215* [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(e)*]. It must be served not later than 60 days after the occurrence of the event requiring service, or 60 days after the trustee becomes aware of the existence of a person entitled to receive the notification, if that person was not known to the trustee on the occurrence of the event requiring service [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(f)*]. If the office of trustee is vacant on the date of the occurrence of the event requiring service of the notification by trustee, or if that event causes a vacancy, the 60-day period for service of the notification commences on the date the new trustee commenced to serve as trustee [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(f)*].

[5] Contents of Notification

The notification by trustee must contain the following information [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(g)*]:

- The identity of the settlor or settlors of the trust.

- The date of execution of the trust instrument.

- The name, mailing address, and telephone number of each trustee of the trust.

- The address of the physical location where the principal place of administration of the trust is located as determined under *Prob. Code § 17002* [*see § 560.520*].

- Any additional information that may be expressly required by the terms of the trust instrument.

- A notification that the recipient is entitled, on reasonable request to the trustee, to receive from the trustee a true and complete copy of the "terms of the trust" [*see Prob. Code §§ 16060.5* and *16061.5* and discussion in *§ 560.80[3]*].

The statute does not specify any particular terms or a particular format that must be used for giving this information [*Germino v. Hillyer (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 951, 956, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478]* . Thus, the trustee's failure to strictly comply with the notice requirements of *Prob. Code § 16061.7(g)* does not render the notice a nullity, and does not make the 120-day statute inapplicable [*Germino v. Hillyer (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 951, 955-957, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478]* . For example, the notice is not rendered a nullity by the fact that the notice failed to specify that the beneficiary on whom notice was served was entitled to a copy of the trust terms, when before service of the notice, but after the settlor's death, thetrustee provided a copy of the trust instrument to the beneficiary [*Germino v. Hillyer (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 951, 956-957, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478]* .

If the notification by the trustee is served because a revocable trust or any portion of it has become irrevocable because of the death of one or more settlors of the trust, or because, by the trust's express terms, the trust becomes irrevocable within one year of the death of a settlor because of a contingency related to the death of one or more of the trust's settlors, the notification by the trustee must also include a warning, set out in a separate paragraph in not less than 10-point boldface type, or a reasonable equivalent, that states as follows: "You may not bring an action to contest the trust more than 120 days from the date this notification by the trustee is served upon you or 60 days from the date on which a copy of the terms of the trust is mailed or personally delivered to you during that 120-day period, whichever is later" [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(h)*]. When the notification required in *Prob. Code § 16061.7(h)* (former *Prob. Code § 16061.7(g)*) was not boldfaced, but was in 12-point type like the rest of the document, the notice was not a reasonable equivalent of 10-point boldface type as required by the statute. As a result, the appellants' petition contesting the trust was not untimely [*Harustak v. Wilkins (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 208, 216-218, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718]* .

[6] Trustee's Liability for Failure to Serve Notification

A trustee who fails to serve the notification by trustee as required by *Prob. Code § 16061.7* on a beneficiary will be responsible for all damages, including attorney's fees and costs, caused by the failure unless the trustee makes a reasonably diligent effort to comply with the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16061.7* [*Prob. Code § 16061.9(a)*]. A trustee who fails to serve the notification by trustee as required by *Prob. Code § 16061.7* on an heir who is not a beneficiary and whose identity is known to the trustee will be responsible for all damages caused to the heir by the failure, unless the trustee shows that the trustee made a reasonably diligent effort to comply with the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16061.7*. For this purpose, "reasonably diligent effort" means that the trustee has sent notice by first-class mail to the heir at the heir's last mailing address actually known to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16061.9(b)*]. A trustee, in exercising discretion with regard to the timing and nature of distributions of trust assets, may consider the fact that the period in which a beneficiary or heir could bring an action to contest the trust has not expired [*Prob. Code § 16061.9(c)*].

A trustee is not liable to any person for serving or not serving the notification by trustee on any person in addition to those on whom the notification is required to be served [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(j)*; *see Prob. Code § 16061.7(a)*].

There is no liability for failure to serve the notification by trustee if the event that otherwise requires service of the notification occurred before January 1, 1998 [*see Prob. Code § 16061.7(j)*].

[7] Waiver Against Public Policy

Any waiver by a settlor of the requirement of serving the notification by trustee required by *Prob. Code § 16061.7(h)* is against public policy and will be void [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(i)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsIrrevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift &

Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.82

§ 560.82 Powers

[1] In General

A trustee has the following powers without the need to obtain court authorization [*Prob. Code § 16200*]:

- The powers conferred by the trust instrument.
- Except as limited in the trust instrument, the powers conferred by statute.
- Except as limited in the trust instrument, the power to perform any act that a trustee would perform for the purposes of the trust under the standard of care provided in *Prob. Code §§ 16040* or *16047*.

However, a trustee may wish to obtain court instructions regarding an anticipated exercise of power, or approval of a completed act [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)* (petition for instructions) and *see § 560.555*].

The grant of a power to a trustee, whether by the trust instrument, by statute, or by the court, does not in itself require or permit the exercise of the power. The exercise of a power by a trustee is subject to the trustee's fiduciary duties [*Prob. Code § 16202*; *see Prob. Code §§ 16000* (duty to administer trust according to instrument), 16001 (revocable trust)]. A trustee's exercise of power is also subject to other limiting provisions [*see, e.g., Prob. Code § 21524(c)* (spouse's right to require that trustee make unproductive marital deduction property productive)].

A court may relieve a trustee from restrictions on the exercise of powers under the trust instrument, notwithstanding the provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 16200-16249* [*Prob. Code § 16201*; *see, e.g., Prob. Code § 15409* (modification of trust after material change of circumstances)]. For a form to petition for a grant of powers, *see § 560.554*.

An instrument that incorporates the powers provided in former Prob. Code § 1120.2 (repealed by 1986 Stats., ch. 820) is deemed to refer to the powers provided in *Prob. Code §§ 16220-16249*. For this purpose, the trustee's powers under

former Prob. Code § 1120.2 are not diminished and the trustee is not required to obtain court approval for exercise of a power for which court approval was not required by former law [*Prob. Code § 16203*].

For discussion of the powers of a trustee with regard to a trust that relates to Internal Revenue Code provisions governing marital deductions and charitable gifts, see *§ 560.77*.

[2] Management of Trust Property

The trustee has the power to do any of the following:

- Collect, hold, and retain trust property received from a settlor or any other person until, in the trustee's judgment, the property should be disposed of. The property may be retained even though it includes property in which the trustee is personally interested [*Prob. Code § 16220*; *see Prob. Code § 62* (definition of property)].

- Continue or participate in the operation of any business or other enterprise that is part of the trust property and may effect incorporation, dissolution, or other change in the form of the organization of the business or enterprise, subject to *Prob. Code § 16222(b)* [*Prob. Code § 16222(a)*].

- Continue the operation of a business or other enterprise only as authorized by the trust instrument or by the court, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16222(c)* [*Prob. Code § 16222(b)*]. For the purpose of *Prob. Code § 16222(b)*, the lease of four or fewer residential units is not considered to be the operation of a business or other enterprise [*Prob. Code § 16222(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 16222(d)* (inapplicability to trust created by instrument executed before July 1, 1987)].

- Continue the operation of a business or other enterprise for a reasonable time pending a court hearing on the matter or pending a sale of the business or other enterprise [*Prob. Code § 16222(c)*].

- Manage, control, divide, develop, improve, exchange, partition, change the character of, or abandon trust property or any interest therein [*Prob. Code § 16227*].

- Encumber, mortgage, or pledge trust property for a term within or extending beyond the term of the trust in connection with the exercise of any power vested in the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16228*].

- Make ordinary or extraordinary repairs, alterations, improvements in buildings or other trust property [*Prob. Code § 16229(a)*].

- Demolish any improvements [*Prob. Code § 16229(b)*].

- Raze existing or erect new party walls or buildings [*Prob. Code § 16229(c)*].

- Insure the property of the trust against damage or loss and insure the trustee against liability with respect to third persons [*Prob. Code § 16240*].

- Borrow money for any trust purpose to be repaid from trust property; the lender may include, but is not limited to, a bank holding company, affiliate, or subsidiary of the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16241*].

- Accept additions to the property of the trust from a settlor or any other person [*Prob. Code § 16221*; *see Prob. Code §§ 62* (definition of property), 16202 (powers subject to fiduciary duties)].

- Acquire or dispose of property, for cash or on credit, at public or private sale, or by exchange [*Prob. Code § 16226*].

- Grant an option involving disposition of trust property or take an option for the acquisition of any property. An option may be granted or taken that is exercisable beyond the term of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16233*].

- Subdivide or develop land [*Prob. Code § 16230(a)*].

- Dedicate land to public use [*Prob. Code § 16230(b)*].

- Make or obtain the vacation of plats and adjust boundaries [*Prob. Code § 16230(c)*].

- Adjust differences in valuation on exchange or partition by giving or receiving consideration [*Prob. Code § 16230(d)*].

- Dedicate easements to public use without consideration [*Prob. Code § 16230(e)*].

- Enter into a lease for any purpose as lessor or lessee with or without the option to purchase or renew and for a term within or extending beyond the term of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16231*].

- Enter into a lease or arrangement for exploration and removal of gas, oil, or other minerals or geothermal energy, and enter into a community oil lease or a pooling or unitization agreement, and for a term within or extending beyond the term of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16232*].

- Pay taxes, assessments, reasonable compensation of the trustee and of employees and agents of the trust, and other expenses incurred in the collection, care, administration, and protection of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16243*; *see Prob. Code §§ 15680-15688* (compensation of trustees)].

- Hire persons, including accountants, attorneys, auditors, investment advisers, or other agents, even if they are associated or affiliated with the trustee, to advise or assist the trustee in the performance of administrative duties [*Prob. Code § 16247*; *but see Prob. Code § 16063(a)(1)* (duty to account regarding agents)].

- Execute and deliver all instruments that are needed to accomplish orfacilitate the exercise of the powers vested in the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16248*].

For requirements regarding allocation of income and principal, see the Uniform Principal and Income Act, *Prob. Code § 16320 et seq.* (generally), and *Prob. Code § 21524* (regarding marital deduction gift in trust [*Prob. Code § 21501*], but not applicable to "estate trust" [*Prob. Code § 21521*], or to a trust that provides or implies otherwise [*Prob. Code § 21502(a)*]).

[3] Corporate Transactions

With respect to any shares of stock of a domestic or foreign corporation, any membership in a nonprofit corporation, or any other property, a trustee has the power to do any of the following [*Prob. Code § 16234*]:

- Vote in person, and give proxies to exercise, any voting rights with respect to the shares, memberships, or property.

- Waive notice of a meeting or give consent to the holding of a meeting.

- Authorize, ratify, approve, or confirm any action that could be taken by shareholders, members, or property owners.

The trustee also has the power to do any of the following:

- Pay calls, assessments, and any other sums chargeable or accruing against or on account of securities [*Prob. Code § 16235*].

- Sell or exercise stock subscription or conversion rights [*Prob. Code § 16236*].

- Consent, directly or through a committee or other agent, to the reorganization, consolidation, merger, dissolution, or liquidation of a corporation or other business enterprise, and to participate in voting trusts, pooling arrangements, and foreclosures, and in connection therewith, to deposit securities with and transfer title and delegate discretions to any protective or other committee as the trustee may deem advisable [*Prob. Code § 16237*].

- Hold a security in the name of a nominee or in other form without disclosure of the trust so that title to the security may pass by delivery [*Prob. Code § 16238*].

- Deposit securities in a securities depository, as defined in *Fin. Code § 30004*, which is licensed under *Fin. Code § 30200* or is exempt from licensing by *Fin. Code § 30005* or *30006*. The securities may be held by the securities depository in the manner authorized by *Fin. Code § 1592* [*Prob. Code § 16239*].

For discussion of voting trusts and shares held by a trustee, see *Corp. Code § 703* and Ch. 166, *Corporations: Shareholders' Meetings and Voting*.

[4] Deposits

The trustee also has the power to deposit trust funds at reasonable interest in an insured account in a financial institution or, to the extent the account is collateralized, in an account in a bank, insured savings and loan association, or insured credit union [*Prob. Code § 16225(a)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 16225(b)* (institution affiliated with trustee), 16225(c) (conditions regarding withdrawals); *see also Fin. Code §§ 1592, 1593* (banks), 7000-7002 (savings accounts)].

The court may authorize the deposit of trust funds in an account under *Prob. Code § 16225(a)* in an amount greater than the maximum insured or collateralized amount [*Prob. Code § 16225(d)*; *see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2), (5), (6)* (petition proceedings)]. *Prob. Code § 16225* does not prevent the trustee from holding an amount of trust property reasonably necessary for the orderly administration of the trust in the form of cash or in a checking account without interest [*Prob. Code § 16225(e)*].

[5] Deposits in Financial Institution Controlled by Trustee

Under *Prob. Code § 16225(b)*, a financial institution that is a trustee has the right to deposit trust funds in itself or an affiliate ("self-depositing"). This right to self-deposit is contrary to the general law of trusts, specifically the duty of loyalty, because it creates a conflict of interest. It is also contrary to the trustee's duty under *Prob. Code § 16002* not to use the trust property for its own benefit [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 836, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* . A balance must be struck between the trustee's duty of loyalty and right to self-deposit trust funds. The right to self-deposit does not overcome the duty to maximize returns on investment of trust funds [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 837, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530* ; *see Prob. Code § 16007* (trustee's duty to

invest trust funds)]. Although noting that the case did not hinge on burden of proof issues for its resolution, one court of appeal has stated that the self-deposit statutes bar the imposition of the usual burden of proof on a defendant-trustee [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 853-854, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530* (usual burden of justifying its actions as shifting to trustee once beneficiary has established existence of fiduciary duty and trustee's failure to perform it)].

The duties of loyalty and maximizing returns have been held not to prevent a bank-trustee from pooling small trust cash balances and investing them for its own benefit. "Small trust cash balances" are funds necessary for the administration of the trust and those awaiting investment or distribution. The court reasoned that because *Prob. Code § 16225(e)* allows self-depositing, without payment of interest, of funds necessary for the administration of the trust, and Fin. Code§ 1562 allows self-deposit of funds awaiting investment or distribution, the trustee is not required to pay interest on those funds; nor is the trustee's right to profit from the use or investment of those funds limited. The trustee is not required to account to the trust beneficiaries for the profit made on the use of self-deposited funds [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 839-840, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* . That holding may be limited, however, because it was based on a finding that during the period at issue, there was no higher yielding short term investment for small amounts of cash [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 842-848, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

Applying this reasoning, a bank-trustee's use of various types of "float" created by processing trust transactions through suspense accounts of which the bank has use, is proper when the float and suspense accounts (1) pertained to balances needed for administration or awaiting investment or disbursement, (2) were created pursuant to standardized or computerized operating procedures that were reasonable in terms of their cost compared to the cost of manual posting on the actual transaction dates involved and thus were reasonably necessary to the orderly administration of the trust accounts, (3) were consistent with generally accepted accounting principles, and (4) did not produce any hidden profit for the bank [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 851-853, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* . Moreover, the bank gave the beneficiaries the option to avoid the creation of one type of float by authorizing direct deposit of disbursements [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 853, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

The practices described also did not constitute fraud or unfair competition within the meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, nor did they result in any unjust enrichment on the part of the bank-trustee [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 854-855, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

A bank-trustee does not have to disclose the use and investment of small cash balances to the trust beneficiaries when the practice is proper and the bank's use of trust account funds is apparent from the account statements it does send [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 848-849, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* . A bank-trustee is not required to disclose the profit earned through self-depositing [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 849, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* . Nor is a bank-trustee required to disclose the alternative uses for the trust funds if those alternatives are unworkable or imprudent [*Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 850, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530]* .

[6] Actions and Claims

The trustee has the power to do the following:

- Pay or contest any claim [*Prob. Code § 16242(a)*; *see also Prob. Code §§ 16010* (duty to enforce claims), 16011 (duty to defend actions)].

- Settle a claim by or against the trust by compromise, arbitration, or otherwise [*Prob. Code § 16242(b)*].

- Release, in whole or in part, any claim belonging to the trust [*Prob. Code § 16242(c)*].

- Prosecute or defend actions, claims, or proceedings for the protection of trust property and of the trustee in the performance of the trustee's duties [*Prob. Code § 16249*].

- Take reasonable steps to enforce claims that are part of the trust property [*Prob. Code § 16010*].

- Take reasonable steps to defend actions that may result in a loss to the trust [*Prob. Code § 16011*].

- In an action for the benefit of the trust, recover from the responsible person twice the value of any trust property that is wrongfully taken, concealed, or disposed of [*Prob. Code § 859*].

Actions not relevant to the internal affairs or existence of the trust are not within the scope of the Trust Law, and therefore may not be the subject of petition proceedings under *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210* [*see Prob. Code § 17200(a)* (subject matter jurisdiction) and § 560.130 et seq.]. Consequently, a trustee must bring an action seeking protection of trust property and of the trustee, pursuant to *Prob. Code § 16249*, under the appropriate provision of the relevant code [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10* (civil complaint)]. For discussion of actions involving third persons, see *§ 560.160* et seq.

[7] Loans to Beneficiary

The trustee has the power to make loans out of trust property to the beneficiary on terms and conditions that the trustee determines are fair and reasonable under the circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16244(a)*]. If the trustee makes an advance or loan of trust money to a beneficiary, the beneficiary's interest is subject to a charge for the repayment of the amount advanced or lent [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 255]. A trustee also has the power to guarantee loans to the beneficiary by encumbrances on trust property [*Prob. Code § 16244(b)*]. However, a beneficiary's interest subject to a spendthrift restraint may not be used to secure a loan [*see Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* (restraints on transfer of trust property)].

[8] Distribution to Beneficiaries

The trustee has the power to pay any sum of principal or income distributable to a beneficiary, without regard to whether the beneficiary is under a legal disability, by paying the sum to the beneficiary or by paying the sum to another person for the use or benefit of the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 16245*; *but see* Prob.Code § 21524 (providing limitations for marital deduction gifts made in trust with distribution on or after January 1, 1988 [*Prob. Code § 21501*], but not applicable to "estate trusts" [*Prob. Code § 21521*], or to any trust that provides or implies otherwise [*Prob. Code § 21502(a)*)].

A sum distributable to a minor may be distributed to a custodian for the minor under the California Uniform Transfers to Minors Act [*Prob. Code §§ 3900 et seq.*]. The custodian may be an adult or a trust company [*Prob. Code § 3906(a)*]. However, the trustee may distribute a sum to such a custodian only if the trustee considers the transfer to be in the minor's best interests and the transfer it not prohibited by or inconsistent with the governing instrument. The transfer must be authorized by the court if it exceeds $10,000 in value [*Prob. Code § 3906(c)*; *see Prob. Code § 16245*].

The trustee has the power to effect distribution of property and money in divided or undivided interests and to adjust resulting differences in valuation [*Prob. Code § 16246*]. The trustee also has the power to sell the property in order to make the distribution [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law,* 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 692 (1986)]. A distribution in kind may be made pro rata or non-pro rata [*Prob. Code § 16246*; *see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law,* 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 692 (1986) (tax considerations regarding distributions)].

If an instrument authorizes a fiduciary to satisfy a pecuniary gift wholly or in part by distribution of property other than money, property selected for that purpose must be valued at its fair market value on the date of distribution, unless the instrument expressly provides otherwise. If the instrument permits the fiduciary to value property selected for distribution as of a date other than the date of distribution, then, unless the instrument expressly provides otherwise, the property selected by the fiduciary for that purpose must fairly reflect net appreciation and depreciation (occurring between the valuation date and the date of distribution) in all assets from which the distribution could have been made [*Prob. Code § 21118(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 39* ("fiduciary" includes trustee); *but see Prob. Code § 21102(b)* (rule applicable only when intention of transferor not indicated by instrument)]. For this purpose, a "pecuniary gift" is a transfer of property that is expressly stated as a fixed dollar amount or is a dollar amount determinable by the provisions of the instrument [*Prob. Code § 21118(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersSales

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.83

§ 560.83 Notice of Proposed Action by Trustee

[1] In General

A trustee may give notice of proposed action regarding a matter governed by *Prob. Code §§ 16200-16249*. For purpose of the notice provisions, a proposed action includes a course of action or a decision not to take action [*Prob. Code § 16500*]. A trustee is not required, however, to use the notice procedures set forth in *Prob. Code §§ 16500-16504* before taking any action [*Prob. Code § 16504*]. Moreover, these notice provisions do not preclude the application or assertion of any other rights or remedies available to an interested party regarding an action to be taken or not to be taken by the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16500*].

[2] Persons to Whom Notice Must Be Given

A trustee who elects to provide notice of a proposed action must mail notice to each of the following [*Prob. Code § 16501(a)*]:

- A beneficiary who is receiving, or is entitled to receive, income under the trust, including a beneficiary who is entitled to receive income at the trustee's discretion.

- A beneficiary who would receive a distribution of principal if the trust were terminated at the time the notice is given.

If the beneficiary is a minor or an incompetent adult, the notice must be served on the guardian or conservator of the beneficiary's estate [*see Prob. Code § 16503(b)*].

The trustee is not required to give notice to:

- A person who consents in writing to the proposed action; the consent may be executed at any time before or after the proposed action is taken [*Prob. Code § 16501(b)*].

- A beneficiary who is known to the trustee but who cannot be located after reasonable diligence, or who is unknown to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 16501(c)*].

[3] When Notice May Not Be Given

The trustee may not use a notice of proposed action with respect to any of the following actions [*Prob. Code § 16501(d)*]:

- Allowance of the trustee's compensation.
- Allowance of compensation for the trustee's attorney.
- Settlement of accounts.
- Preliminary and final distributions and discharge.
- Sale of trust property to the trustee or the trustee's attorney.
- Exchange of trust property for property of the trustee or the trustee's attorney.
- Grant to the trustee or the trustee's attorney of an option to purchase trustproperty.
- Allowance, payment, or compromise of a claim of the trustee or the trustee's attorney against the trust.
- Compromise or settlement of a claim, action, or proceeding by the trust against the trustee or the attorney for the trust.
- Extension, renewal, or modification of the terms of a debt or other obligation of the trustee or the trustee's attorney, owing to or in favor of the trust.

[4] Contents of Notice

The notice of proposed action must state that it is given under *Prob. Code § 16502*, and must include all of the following [*Prob. Code § 16502*]:

- The trustee's name and mailing address.
- The name and telephone number of a person who may be contacted for additional information.
- A description of the proposed action and an explanation of the reasons for the action.
- The time within which objections to the proposed action can be made, which must be at least 45 days from the ate the notice is mailed.
- The date on or after which the proposed action may be taken or is effective.

[5] Objections to Proposed Action

A beneficiary may object to a proposed action by mailing a written objection to the trustee at the address, and within the time, specified in the notice [*Prob. Code § 16503(a)*]. A trustee is not liable to a beneficiary for a proposed action if the trustee does not receive a timely, written objection from the beneficiary. If no beneficiary entitled to notice objects, the trustee is not liable to any current or future beneficiary with respect to the proposed action [*Prob. Code § 16503(b)*].

If the trustee receives a timely, written objection, the trustee or a beneficiary may petition the court to have the proposed action taken as proposed, taken with modifications, or denied. In the proceeding, a beneficiary who objects to the proposed action has the burden of proving that the action should not be taken. A beneficiary who has not objected to the proposed action is not estopped from opposing the action in the proceeding [*Prob. Code § 16503(c)*].

[6] Decision Not to Take Action

If the trustee decides not to implement the proposed action, the trustee must give the beneficiaries notice of this decision and the reasons for it. The trustee's decision not to implement a proposed action does not itself give rise to liability to any current or future beneficiary. A beneficiary may petition the court to have the action taken, and has the burden of proving that the trustee should take the action [*Prob. Code § 16503(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.84

§ 560.84 Liability to Beneficiaries

[1] Breach of Trust

A violation by the trustee of any duty that the trustee owes the beneficiary is a breach of trust [*Prob. Code § 16400*]. However, if a trust is revocable, the trustee owes the duty to the person holding the power to revoke, and not to the beneficiaries [*see Prob. Code § 15800*]. Moreover, the holder of a presently exercisable general power of appointment has the rights of a person holding the power to revoke the trust that are provided by *Prob. Code §§ 15800-15802*, to the extent of the holder's power over the trust property [*Prob. Code § 15803*].

[2] Acts of Agent

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16401(b)*, the trustee is not liable to the beneficiary for the acts or omissions of an agent [*Prob. Code § 16401(a)*].

The trustee is liable to the beneficiary for an act or omission of an agent employed by the trustee in the administration of the trust that would be a breach of the trust if committed by the trustee under any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16401(b)*]:

- The trustee directs the act of the agent.

- The trustee delegates to the agent the authority to perform an act that the trustee is under a duty not to delegate.

- The trustee does not use reasonable prudence in the selection of the agent or the retention of the agent selected by the trustee [*see § 560.78[1], [3]*].

- The trustee does not periodically review the agent's overall performance and compliance with the terms of the delegation [*see Prob. Code § 16012(b)* (duty to exercise general supervision over agent

performing delegated matter)].

- The trustee conceals the act of the agent.

- The trustee neglects to take reasonable steps to compel the agent to redress the wrong when the trustee knows of the agent's acts or omissions [§ 560.78[3]].

For limitations on a trustee's liability to a beneficiary, see *Prob. Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor, not beneficiary), 15803 (rights inure to holder of presently exercisable general power of appointment or power to withdraw property), 16000 (trust instrument controls), 16462 (acts performed or omitted pursuant to written directions of revocable trust), and § 560.87.

The liability of a trustee for acts or omissions of agents that occurred before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 16401* [*Prob. Code § 16401(c)*]. Under prior law, a trustee who employs third persons as agents must select the third persons, and supervise their acts, with reasonable care [*Gaver v. Early (1923) 58 Cal. App. 736, 737, 209 P. 394]* . Moreover, the trustee is not liable to the beneficiary for the acts of agents employed in the administration of the trust unless the trustee does one of the following acts [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 225]:

- Directs or permits the act of the agent.

- Delegates to the agent the performance of acts that he was under a duty not to delegate.

- Does not use reasonable care in the selection or retention of the agent.

- Does not exercise proper supervision over the conduct of the agent.

- Approves or acquiesces in or conceals the act of the agent.

- Neglects to take proper steps to compel the agent to redress the wrong.

For discussion of a principal's liability for acts of an agent generally, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

[3] Acts of Cotrustee

[a] Acts Committed on or After July 1, 1987

The liability of a trustee for a breach of trust committed by a cotrustee on or after July 1, 1987, is governed by *Prob. Code § 16402(b)*. Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16402(b)*, a trustee is not liable for a breach of duty committed by a cotrustee. *Prob Code § 16402(b)* provides that a trustee is liable for a breach of trust committed by a cotrustee if the trustee commits any of the following acts:

- Participates in a breach of trust committed by the cotrustee.

- Improperly delegates the administration of the trust to the cotrustee.

- Approves, knowingly acquiesces in, or conceals a breach of trust committed by the cotrustee.

- Negligently enables the cotrustee to commit a breach of trust [*see Prob. Code § 16012(b)* (duty to exercise general supervision over cotrustee performing delegated matter)].

- Neglects to take reasonable steps to compel the cotrustee to redress a breach of trust when the trustee knows or has information from which the trustee reasonably should have known of the breach.

For discussion of a dissenting cotrustee's liability to a third person under *Prob. Code § 18003*, see *§ 560.160* et seq.

[b] Acts Committed Before July 1, 1987

The liability of a trustee for acts or omissions of a cotrustee that occurred before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law [*Prob. Code § 16402(c)*]. Under that law, a trustee is responsible only for the wrongful acts of a cotrustee to which the trustee consented, or that the trustee negligently enabled the cotrustee to commit [*see* former *Civ. Code § 2239*]. Consequently, a trustee was not strictly liable for the wrongful acts of a cotrustee, but nevertheless had to exercise reasonable supervision over the conduct of the cotrustee in relation to the trust [*see Blackmon v. Hale (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 548, 559, 83 Cal. Rptr. 194, 463 P.2d 418]* .

[c] Joint and Several Liability

When a breach of trust results in liability to more than one trustee, the liability of the affected trustees is joint and several [*Gbur v. Cohen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300, 155 Cal. Rptr. 507* (interpreting former *Civ. Code § 2239, now see Prob. Code § 16402*; *see Cagnolatti v. Guinn (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 42, 49, 189 Cal. Rptr. 151* (applying former *Civ. Code § 2239* (*now see Prob. Code § 16402*) to partners)].

When more than one trustee is liable to a beneficiary for a breach of trust, each trustee ordinarily is entitled to contribution from the other trustees except when their respective degrees of fault substantially differ [*Gbur v. Cohen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 155 Cal. Rptr. 507* ; *see § 560.544*].

If a trustee is liable to beneficiaries under a trust for damages resulting from the acts and omissions of the trustee and the trust's attorney, the trustee and attorney may be held liable as joint tortfeasors [*see Gackstetter v. Frawley (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1275, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 333]* .

For a discussion of duties, *see § 560.75[3]*.

[4] Acts of Predecessor

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16403(b)*, a successor trustee is not liable to the beneficiary for a breach of trust that the predecessor trustee committed on or after July 1, 1987 [*Prob. Code § 16403(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 16403(c)* (breach committed before July 1, 1987)].

Prob. Code § 16503(b) provides that a successor trustee is liable to the beneficiary for breach of trust involving acts or omissions of a predecessor trustee in any of the following circumstances:

- If the successor trustee knows or has information from which the successor trustee reasonably should have known of a situation constituting a breach of trust committed by the predecessor trustee and thesuccessor trustee improperly permits it to continue.

- If the successor trustee neglects to take reasonable steps to compel the predecessor trustee to deliver the trust property to the successor trustee.

- If the successor trustee neglects to take reasonable steps to redress a breach of trust committed by the predecessor trustee when the successor trustee knows or has information from which the successor trustee reasonably should have known of the predecessor trustee's breach.

The liability of a trustee for acts or omissions of a predecessor trustee that occurred before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law [*Prob. Code § 16403(c)*]. There does not appear to be any statutory or decisional California precedent governing a trustee's liability for acts committed by a predecessor prior to July 1, 1987. Under Rest. 2d Trusts § 223, a trustee is not liable to the beneficiary for a breach of trust committed by a predecessor trustee. However, there is authority that a trustee is liable for the predecessor's acts if the trustee is also guilty of a violation of duty to the beneficiary, which is essentially the same as the liability under *Prob. Code § 16403(c)* [*see, e.g.,* City of Fairview, Oklahoma v. Norris (10th Cir. [Okla.] 1956) *234 F.2d 199, 203* (successor trustee not liable for breach by predecessor)].

[5] Remedies for Breach of Trust

If a trustee commits a breach of trust, or threatens to commit a breach of trust, a beneficiary or cotrustee may commence a proceeding to obtain the following relief [*Prob. Code § 16420(a)*]:

- Compel the trustee to perform the trustee's duties [*see § 560.547*].

- Enjoin the trustee from committing a breach of trust [*see St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 359-362, 287 P.2d 387* (action seeking to enjoin trustee from committing breach of trust)].

- Compel the trustee to redress a breach of trust by payment of money or otherwise [*see Prob. Code §§ 16440-16442* (measure of liability)].

- Appoint a receiver or temporary trustee to take possession of the trust property and administer the trust [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(1)* (appointment of receiver when property in danger); *Prob. Code §§ 15660* (appointment of trustee to fill vacancy), 17206 (appointment of temporary trustee); *see also Bowles v. Superior Court (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 574, 583-584, 283 P.2d 704* (appointment of receiver to act as temporary trustee on vacancy of office of trustee)].

- Remove the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 15642* (grounds for removal)].

- Set aside acts of the trustee, subject to *Prob. Code § 18100* (rights of bona fide purchaser); see *§ 560.200* et seq.

- Reduce or deny compensation of the trustee [*see § 560.548*.5].

- Impose an equitable lien or a constructive trust on trust property, subject to *Prob. Code § 18100* (rights of bona fide purchaser) [*see § 560.547* and *§ 560.200* et seq.].

- Trace trust property that has been wrongfully disposed of and recover the property or its proceeds, subject to *Prob. Code § 18100* (rights of bona fide purchaser) [*see § 560.200* et seq.].

The remedies of a beneficiary against the trustee are exclusively in equity [*Prob. Code § 16421*].

The provision of remedies for breach of trust in *Prob. Code § 16420(a)* does not prevent resort to any other appropriate remedy provided by statute or the common law [*Prob. Code § 16420(b)*]. For example, the beneficiary may seek criminal charges against the trustee [*see Penal Code §§ 487* (grand theft), 506 (embezzlement); *see also People v. Stanford (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 247, 105 P.2d 969* (prosecution of trustee for grand theft)]. A court may also use less extreme remedies to remedy a breach of trust [*see Schwartz v. Labow (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 417, 428, 78 Cal. Rptr.*

3d 838 (court had jurisdiction to suspend some of trustee's powers for perceived breaches of trust since court had express statutory authority to remove trustee)].

[6] Measure of Liability for Breach of Trust

If the trustee commits a breach of trust, the trustee is chargeable with any of the following that is appropriate under the circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16440(a)*]:

- Any loss or depreciation in value of the trust estate resulting from the breach of trust, with interest.
- Any profit made by the trustee through the breach of trust, with interest.
- Any profit that would have accrued to the trust estate if the loss of profit is the result of the breach of trust.

If the trustee is liable for interest pursuant to *Prob. Code § 16440*, the trustee is liable for the greater of either the amount of interest that accrues at the legal rate on judgments in effect during the period when the interest accrued, or the amount of interest actually received [*Prob. Code § 16441*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010* (rate of interest on judgments)].

If the trustee has acted reasonably and in good faith under the circumstances as known to the trustee, the court, in its discretion, may excuse the trustee in whole or in part from liability under *Prob. Code §§ 16440(a)* and *16441(a)* if it would be equitable to do so [*Prob. Code §§ 16440(b), 16441(b)*; *see § 560.78*].

The provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 16440-16442* for liability of a trustee for breach of trust do not prevent resort to any other remedy available under the statutory or common law [*Prob. Code § 16442*]. For example, exemplarydamages may be awarded against a trustee who breaches a fiduciary duty if there is evidence of oppression, fraud, or malice [*Vale v. Union Bank (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 330, 339, 151 Cal. Rptr. 784]* . Interest under the Trust Law is not compounded as it was under former *Civ. Code § 2262*, notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 16442* [*see* Communication From the Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Concerning AB 362 (1987) (p. 3)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersStandards of CareEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple TrusteesTortsIntentional TortsBreach of Fiduciary DutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.85

§ 560.85 Release From Liability

A trustee may not require a beneficiary to relieve the trustee of liability as a condition for making a distribution or payment to, or for the benefit of, the beneficiary, if the trust instrument requires the distribution or payment [*Prob. Code § 16004.5(a)*]. This provision, however, does not affect the trustee's right to maintain a reserve for reasonably anticipated expenses, to seek a voluntary release or discharge of the trustee's liability from the beneficiary, to require indemnification against a claim by a person or entity (other than a beneficiary) that may reasonably arise as a result of the distribution, to withhold any portion of an otherwise required distribution that is reasonably in dispute, or to seek court or beneficiary approval of an accounting of trust activities [*Prob. Code § 16004.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSettlementsReleases From LiabilityGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.86

§ 560.86 Limitations on Proceedings Against Trustee

Unless a claim is previously barred by adjudication, consent, limitation, or otherwise, if a beneficiary has received an interim or final account in writing, or other written report, that adequately discloses the existence of a claim against the trustee for breach of trust, the claim is barred as to that beneficiary unless a proceeding to assert the claim is commenced within three years after receipt of the account or report. An account or report adequately discloses existence of a claim if it provides sufficient information so that the beneficiary knows of the claim or reasonably should have inquired into the existence of the claim [*Prob. Code § 16460(a)(1)*; *Di Grazia v. Anderlini (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 1346, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37]* .

If an interim or final account in writing or other written report does not adequately disclose the existence of a claim against the trustee for breach of trust, or if a beneficiary does not receive any written account or report, the claim is barred as to that beneficiary unless a proceeding to assert the claim is commenced within three years after the beneficiary discovered, or reasonably should have discovered, the subject of the claim [*Prob. Code § 16460(a)(2)*; *Di Grazia v. Anderlini (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 1346, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37]* .

For the purpose of *Prob. Code § 16460(a)*, a beneficiary is deemed to have received an account or report as follows [*Prob. Code § 16460(b)*]:

- In the case of an adult who is reasonably capable of understanding the account or report, if it is received by the adult personally.

- In the case of an adult who is not reasonably capable of understanding the account or report, if it is received by the person's legal representative, including a guardian ad litem or other person appointed for this purpose.

- In the case of a minor, if it is received by the minor's guardian or, if the minor does not have a guardian, if it is received by the minor's parent so long as the parent does not have a conflict of interest.

The trustee's written account or report may meet the requirements for formal accounts and reports set forth in *Prob. Code § 16061* or *16063*. However, it is not required to meet those requirements [*Prob. Code § 16460(c)*].

During the time that a trust is revocable, the person holding the power to revoke is the one who must receive the account or report in order to commence the running of the limitations period [*see Prob Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor, not beneficiary), 15803 (rights inuring to holder of presently exercisable general power of appointment or power to withdraw property)]. Thus, when the settlor of a revocable trust was under the care and custody of a court-appointed conservator, the beneficiaries had no right to an accounting because the trust remained revocable despite the conservatorship [*Johnson v. Kotyck (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 83, 88, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.87

§ 560.87 Limitations on Liability

[1] Provision in Trust Instrument

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16461(b)-(d)*, the trustee can be relieved of liability for breach of trust by provisions in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16461(a)*]. A provision in the trust instrument is not effective to relieve the trustee of liability for either of the following [*Prob. Code § 16461(b)*]:

- Breach of trust committed intentionally, with gross negligence, in bad faith, or with reckless indifference to the interest of the beneficiary.

- Any profit that the trustee derives from a breach of trust.

[2] Beneficiary's Failure to Object to Account or Report

A provision in a trust instrument that releases the trustee from liability if a beneficiary fails to object to an item in an interim or final account or other written report within a specified time period is effective only if all of the following conditions are met [*Prob. Code § 16461(c)*]:

- The account or report sets forth the item.

- The period specified in the trust instrument for the beneficiary to object isnot less than 180 days.

- Written notice in 12-point boldface type is provided to the beneficiary with the account or report in the following form:

NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES

YOU HAVE (180 days *or the period specified in the trust instrument, whichever is longer*) FROM

THE RECEIPT OF THIS ACCOUNT OR REPORT TO MAKE AN OBJECTION TO ANY ITEM SET FORTH IN THIS ACCOUNT OR REPORT. ANY OBJECTION YOU MAKE MUST BE IN WRITING, IT MUST BE DELIVERED TO THE TRUSTEE WITHIN THE PERIOD STATED ABOVE, AND IT MUST STATE YOUR OBJECTION. YOUR FAILURE TO DELIVER A WRITTEN OBJECTION TO THE TRUSTEE WITHIN THE PERIOD STATED ABOVE WILL PERMANENTLY PREVENT YOU FROM LATER ASSERTING THIS OBJECTION AGAINST THE TRUSTEE. IF YOU DO MAKE AN OBJECTION TO THE TRUSTEE, THE THREE-YEAR PERIOD PROVIDED IN SECTION 16460 OF THE PROBATE CODE FOR COMMENCEMENT OF LITIGATION WILL APPLY TO CLAIMS BASED ON YOUR OBJECTION AND WILL BEGIN TO RUN ON THE DATE THAT YOU RECEIVE THIS ACCOUNT OR REPORT.

A provision in a trust instrument that provides for a period of less than 180 days to object to an item in an account or report is ineffective to release the trustee from liability. However, a trustee of a trust created by an instrument with an ineffective period may elect to be governed by *Prob. Code § 16461(c)*, except that "180 days" must be substituted in the notice form for the ineffective period [*Prob. Code § 16461(d)*].

A beneficiary who fails to object in writing to an account or report that complies with the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16461(c)* within the specified, valid period, is barred from asserting any claim against the trustee regarding an item that is adequately disclosed in the account or report. An item is adequately disclosed if the disclosure meets the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16460(a)(1)* [*Prob. Code § 16461(e)*; *see § 560.86*].

The trustee is not released from liability as to any claim based on a written objection made by a beneficiary, if the objection is delivered to the trustee within the specified effective period. If a beneficiary files a written objection to an account or report that complies with the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16461(c)* within the specified, valid period that concerns an item that affects any other beneficiary of the trust, any affected beneficiary may join in the objection anytime within the specified, valid period or while resolution of the objection is pending, whichever is later [*Prob. Code § 16461(f)*]. This provision is not intended to establish a class of beneficiaries for actions on an account and report, or to provide that the action of one beneficiary is for the benefit of all beneficiaries. It does not create a duty for any trustee to notify beneficiaries of objections or resolution of objections [*Prob. Code § 16461(f)*].

When a beneficiary has filed a written objection to an account or report that complies with the requirements of *Prob. Code § 16461(c)* within the specified, valid period, a supplemental written objection may be delivered in the same manner as the objection not later than 180 days after receipt of the account or report, or no later than the period specified in the trust instrument, whichever is longer [*Prob. Code § 16461(g)*].

If proper notice has been given and a beneficiary has not made a timely objection, the trustee is not liable for any other claims adequately disclosed by any item in the account or report [*Prob. Code § 16461(i)*].

[3] Revocable Trust

Notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 16461*, a trustee of a revocable trust is not liable to a beneficiary for any act performed or omitted pursuant to written directions from the person holding the power to revoke, including a person to whom the power to direct the trustee is delegated [*Prob. Code § 16462(a) see Prob. Code § 16001* (trustee's duty to follow written directions regarding revocable trust)]. *Prob. Code § 16462(a)* applies to a trust that is revocable in part with respect to the interest of the beneficiary in that part of the trust property [*Prob. Code § 16462(b)*].

[4] Consent of Beneficiary

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16463(b)* and *(c)*, a beneficiary may not hold the trustee liable for an act or omission of the trustee as a breach of trust if the beneficiary consented to the act or omission before or at the time of the

act or omission [*Prob. Code § 16463(a)*]. The consent of the beneficiary does not preclude the beneficiary from holding the trustee liable for a breach of trust in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16463(b)*]:

- If the beneficiary was under an incapacity at the time of the consent or of the act or omission.

- If the beneficiary at the time consent was given did not know of his or her rights and of the material facts (1) that the trustee knew or should have known, and (2) that the trustee did not reasonably believe that the beneficiary knew.

- The consent of the beneficiary was induced by improper conduct of the trustee.

If the trustee has an interest in the transaction adverse to the interest of the beneficiary, the consent of the beneficiary does not preclude the beneficiary from holding the trustee liable for a breach of trust under any of the circumstances described in *Prob. Code § 16463(b)* or if the transaction to which the beneficiary consented was not fair and reasonable to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 16463(c)*].

[5] Release or Contract

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16464(b)*, a beneficiary may be precluded from holding the trustee liable for a breach of trust by the beneficiary's release or contract effective to discharge the trustee's liability to the beneficiary for that breach [*Prob. Code § 16464(a)*].

A release or contract is not effective to discharge the trustee's liability for a breach of trust in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 16464(b)*]:

- The beneficiary was under an incapacity at the time of making the release or contract.

- The beneficiary did not know of his or her rights and of the material facts that the trustee knew or reasonably should have known, and that the trustee did not reasonably believe that the beneficiary knew.

- The release or contract of the beneficiary was induced by improper conduct of the trustee.

- The transaction involved a bargain with the trustee that was not fair and reasonable.

[6] Affirmance of Transaction by Beneficiary

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16465(b)*, if the trustee, in breach of trust, enters into a transaction that the beneficiary may reject or affirm, and the beneficiary affirms the transaction, the beneficiary is not able subsequently to reject it and hold the trustee liable for any loss occurring after the trustee entered into the transaction [*Prob. Code § 16465(a)*].

The affirmance of a transaction by the beneficiary does not preclude the beneficiary from holding a trustee liable for a breach of trust if, at the time of the affirmance, circumstances existed comparable to those enumerated under *Prob. Code § 16464(b)*, discussed in *§ 560.87[5]* [*see Prob. Code § 16465(b)*].

[7] Marital Deduction QTIP Trusts

A fiduciary is not liable for a good faith decision to make any election, or not to make any election, referred to in *I.R.C. §§ 2056(b)(7)* or *2523(f)*, which govern qualified terminable interest property (QTIP) trusts regarding federal estate and gift tax deductions, respectively [*Prob. Code § 21526*; *see Prob. Code §§ 39* ("fiduciary" includes trustee), 21500

(Internal Revenue Code references include subsequent amendments)]. This limitation provides protection for both partial and full elections [*see* Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Comment to *Prob. Code § 21526*]. The provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541* apply to a distribution made on or after January 1, 1988; prior distributions are governed by prior law [*Prob. Code § 21501*]. Nevertheless, they do not apply to a trust whose terms expressly or by necessary implication make them inapplicable [*Prob. Code § 21502(a)*]. Moreover, *Prob. Code § 21526* does not apply to a trust that qualifies for the marital deduction under Treas. Reg. § 20.2056(e)-2(b) ("estate trust") [*Prob. Code § 21521*; *see* discussion in *§ 560.77[1]*].

A QTIP trust is a particular type of marital deduction trust [*see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 71, *Marital Deduction Trust Provisions* (Matthew Bender); California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 112, *Marital Deduction Trusts* (Matthew Bender)]. Under *I.R.C. § 2056(b)(7)(B)(i)*, qualified terminable interest property is property that passes from the decedent in which the surviving spouse has a qualifying income interest for life, and to which an election under that paragraph applies. Under *I.R.C. § 2523(f)(2)*, it is property that is transferred by the donor spouse in which the donee spouse has a qualifying income interest for life, and to which an election under that subsection applies. For forms for QTIP trusts, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 70, *Complete Revocable Trust Forms*; Ch. 71, *Marital Deduction Trust Provisions*; California Wills & Trusts-- Forms, Trust 30 (Matthew Bender). For discussion of the use of QTIP trusts in estate planning, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 71, *Marital Deduction Trust Provisions* (Matthew Bender); California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 112, *Marital Deduction Trusts* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsMarital Deduction TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.88

§ 560.88 Elder Abuse Action Against Trustee

A trustee may be liable under the Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 15600 et seq.*] if the court finds that the trustee abused and neglected a decedent who was entitled to the protection of the Act [*Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 224, 226-231, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828* (trustee allegedly exploited his relationship with decedent and through manipulation, fraud, and undue influence enticed decedent to give property to him and to change her estate plan so he would receive substantially all of her assets; trustee also allegedly abused decedent physically and financially, and intentionally isolated decedent from her family]. After the decedent's death, the right to bring an action under the Act is conferred on the decedent's personal representative or, if none, on the person or persons entitled to succeed to the decedent's estate [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 15657.3(d)*]. A broad definition of standing applies in elder abuse cases [*Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 227, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828]* .

A decision as to whether a person has standing in an elder abuse case may be intertwined with other issues [*Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 230, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828]* . For example, a decedent's granddaughter had standing to bring an elder abuse action against the trustee of the decedent's estate based on the granddaughter's contingent interest in the estate; that is, the fact that she would become the successor trustee and the successor beneficiary to the remainder if the trustee predeceased the decedent [*Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 229-231, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828]* . By virtue of *Prob. Code § 259,* if the trustee isshown to have abused or neglected the decedent, the trustee is deemed to have predeceased the decedent and, therefore, is not entitled to inherit the remainder of the decedent's estate [*Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 228-231, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828]* .

The Act permits recovery of damages for pain and suffering even after the abused elder has died, as well as recovery of punitive damages and attorney's fees if the plaintiff shows by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant is liable for elder abuse and is guilty of recklessness, oppression, fraud, or malice in the commission of the abuse [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 15657*; *Estate of Lowrie (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 220, 226-227, 12 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828]* .

For additional coverage of actions for elder abuse, see Ch. 5, *Abuse of Minors and Elderly* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstFamily LawFamily Protection & WelfareElderly PersonsAbuse, Endangerment & Neglect

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.89

§ 560.89 Compensation of Trustee

[1] Under Trust Instrument

Subject to *Prob. Code § 15680(b)*, and except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15688* (public guardian compensation), if the trust instrument provides for the trustee's compensation, the trustee is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15680(a)*].

On proper showing, the court may fix or allow greater or lesser compensation than could be allowed under the terms of the trust in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15680(b)*; *see § 560.558*]:

- If the duties of the trustee are substantially different from those contemplated when the trust was created.

- If the compensation in accordance with the terms of the trust would be inequitable or unreasonably low or high.

- In extraordinary circumstances calling for equitable relief.

An order fixing or allowing greater or lesser compensation under *Prob. Code § 15680(b)* applies only prospectively to actions taken in administration of the trust after the order is made [*Prob. Code § 15680(c)*].

[2] Reasonable Compensation

If the trust instrument does not specify the trustee's compensation, the trustee is entitled to reasonable compensation under the circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15681*; *see Prob. Code § 16243* (power to pay reasonable compensation)]. Moreover, the court may fix an amount of periodic compensation under *Prob. Code §§ 15680* and *15681*. This compensation may continue for as long as the court determines is proper [*Prob. Code § 15682*].

In determining or approving a trustee's compensation, the court may consider, among other factors, the following [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.776*]:

- The gross income of the trust estate.
- The success or failure of the trustee's administration.
- Any unusual skill, expertise, or experience brought to the trustee's work.
- The fidelity or disloyalty shown by the trustee.
- The amount of risk and responsibility the trustee assumed.
- The time spent in the performance of the trustee's duties.
- The custom in the community where the court is located as to compensation authorized by settlers, as to compensation allowed by the court, or as to charges of corporate trustees for trusts of similar size and complexity.
- Whether the work the trustee performed was routine or required more than ordinary skill or judgment.

[3] Apportionment Among Trustees

Unless the trust instrument otherwise provides or the trustees otherwise agree, if the trust has two or more trustees, the compensation must be apportioned among the cotrustees according to the services rendered by them [*Prob. Code § 15683*].

[4] When Attorney Is Trustee

A trustee who is an attorney generally may not receive compensation both for serving as trustee and for performing legal services for the trustee. This rule applies to any services rendered after January 1, 1994, regardless of any contrary provision in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15687(a), (f)*]. The rules limiting the right to dual compensation also apply when the attorney is a parent, child, sibling, or spouse of the trustee, or when a partner, shareholder, or employee of the attorney's law firm is serving as a trustee. If any of these persons is a trustee, the attorney cannot receive any compensation for legal services performed for the trustee unless the trustee waives his or her compensation or follows the procedures discussed below to obtain approval of dual compensation [*Prob. Code § 15687(b)*]. This rule is inapplicable if the trustee is related by blood or marriage to, or is cohabiting with, the settlor [*Prob. Code § 15687(c)*]. Note that there is no exception based solely on the relationship between the attorney and the settlor. Thus, if the attorney is related to the settlor, but the trustee is not, there are circumstances under which the restrictions on dual compensation would still apply. For example, if the settlor's child serves as attorney for the trust and another member of the same law firm serves as trustee, the exception for related persons is inapplicable and the restrictions on dual compensation apply. Conversely, however, if the settlor's child is a member or employee of a law firm and serves as trustee, another member or employee of the law firm may serve as attorney for the trust and the dual compensation rules are inapplicable [*see Prob. Code § 15687(b), (c)*].

Violation of the dual compensation rules may subject the offending attorney to professional discipline if the attorney knew or should have known of the facts leading to the violation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 6103.6*]. The rules thus constitute a real danger to attorneys and law firms, even when they agree not to charge for work performed in the capacity of trustee. If some of the work for which legal fees are charged, such as fiduciary accountings or the preparation of income

tax returns, can arguably be characterized as fees for trustee work, not legal work, the statute is violated and professional discipline can result.

An attorney-trustee may receive dual compensation if, after the nature of the compensation and the relationship of the trustee to all persons receiving compensation from the attorney-trustee is fully disclosed to the court, the court makes an order determining that dual compensation would be reasonable [*Prob. Code §§ 15687(d)(1), 17200(b)(20)*]. An attorney-trustee may also receive dual compensation after giving 30 days' advance notice to all the beneficiaries (and to the attorney general, if the trust is a charitable trust subject to the attorney general's jurisdiction) if no objection to the dual compensation is received within the 30 days [*Prob. Code § 15687(d)(2)*; for trusts subject to attorney general's jurisdiction, *see Gov. Code §§ 12580-12599.5* (Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act)]. Any of the persons entitled to notice may object within the 30-day period. If an objection is made, the attorney-trustee must obtain court approval of the dual compensation [*Prob. Code § 15687(d)(2)*]. The rule governing dual compensation for an attorney-trustee is based on public policy, and any attempt to waive it is void [*Prob. Code § 15687(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersCompensationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple Trustees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.90

§ 560.90 Increased Trustee's Fee

A trustee may not charge an increased trustee's fee for administration of a particular trust unless the trustee first gives at least 60 days' written notice of that increased fee to all of the following persons [*Prob. Code § 15686(b)*]:

- Each beneficiary entitled to an account under *Prob. Code § 16062*.
- Each beneficiary who was given the last preceding account.
- Each beneficiary who has made a written request to the trustee for notice of an increased trustee's fee and has given an address for receiving notice by mail.

"Trustee's fee" includes, but is not limited to, the trustee's periodic base fee, rate of percentage compensation, minimum fee, hourly rate, and transaction charge, but does not include fees for extraordinary services [*Prob. Code § 15686(a)*].

If a beneficiary files a petition under *Prob. Code § 17200* for review of the increased trustee's fee or for removal of the trustee and serves a copy of the petition on the trustee before the expiration of the 60-day period, the increased trustee's fee does not take effect as to that trust until otherwise ordered by the court or the petition is dismissed [*Prob. Code § 15686(c)*; *see § 560.540* (petition to remove trustee), § 560.549 (petition to review reasonableness of compensation, including review of increased fee)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersCompensationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.91

§ 560.91 Indemnification of Trustee

A trustee is entitled to the repayment out of the trust property for the following [*Prob. Code § 15684*]:

- Expenditures that were properly incurred in the administration of the trust.

- Expenditures that were not properly incurred in the administration of the trust, to the extent that they benefitted the trust.

Consequently, a trustee is not entitled to attorney's fees and expenses in a proceeding in which the trustee is found to have breached the trust, unless otherwise ordered by the court pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15684(b)* [*see, e.g., Estate of Gilmaker (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 658, 665, 38 Cal. Rptr. 270]* .

If litigation is necessary to preserve the trust, the trustee is entitled to reimbursement for his or her expenditures from the trust. However, if the litigation is specifically for the trustee's benefit, the trustee must bear his or her own costs, and is not entitled to reimbursement [*Terry v. Conlan (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1445, 1461, 1464, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 603* (trustee who did not participate in litigation as neutral trustee to defend trust and protect its assets, but rather to pursue her own interests and those of her siblings to detriment of other beneficiary, was required to bear her own costs)]. If the litigation does not involve a challenge to the existence of the trust, but is a dispute over who will control and benefit from it, the trustee is not entitled to reimbursement because no matter who prevails in the litigation, the trust will remain intact, and the trustee's only participation in the litigation should be that of a neutral party [*Terry v. Conlan (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1445, 1461, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 603]* .

The trustee has an equitable lien on the trust property as against the beneficiary in the amount of advances, with any interest, made for the protection of the trust, and for expenses, losses, and liabilities sustained in the administration of the trust or because of ownership or control of any trust property [*Prob. Code § 15685*; *see Prob. Code § 18001* (personal liability of trustee); *Kasperbauer v. Fairfield (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 785, 795* (trustee had right to indemnification for expenses reasonably incurred in defending accounting when court ordered beneficiaries to pay

attorney fees incurred by the trustee in completing and defending an accounting)]. However, a trustee does not have an equitable lien against a transferee of the property who gives fair consideration without knowledge of the lien [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 656 (1986)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersCompensation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.92

§ 560.92 Resignation of Trustee

[1] Methods

A trustee who has accepted the trust may resign only by one of the following methods [*Prob. Code § 15640*]:

- As provided in the trust instrument.
- In the case of a revocable trust, with the consent of the person holding the power to revoke the trust.
- In the case of an irrevocable trust, with the consent of all adult beneficiaries who are receiving or are entitled to receive income under the trust or to receive a distribution of principal if the trust were terminated at the time consent is sought [*see Prob. Code § 15403*].
- Pursuant to a court order accepting the trustee's resignation [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(11)*].

If a beneficiary of an irrevocable trust has a conservator, the conservator may consent to the trustee's resignation on behalf of the conservatee without obtaining court approval [*Prob. Code § 15640(c)*]. Without limiting the power of the beneficiary to consent to the trustee's resignation, if the beneficiary has designated an attorney infact who has the power under the power of attorney to consent to the trustee's resignation, the attorney in fact may consent to the resignation [*Prob. Code § 15640(c)*].

When a petition is filed for a court order accepting the trustee's resignation [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(11)*], the court must accept the trustee's resignation and may make any orders necessary for the preservation of the trust property, including the appointment of a receiver or a temporary trustee [*see §§ 560.557* (petition for resignation), 560.560 (order)].

For discussion of acceptance of the trust, see *§ 560.71*.

[2] Liability of Resigning Trustee

The liability for acts or omissions of a resigning trustee or of the sureties on the trustee's bond, if any, is not released or affected in any manner by the trustee's resignation [*Prob. Code § 15641*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.93

§ 560.93 Removal of Trustee

[1] General Grounds for Removal

A trustee may be removed in accordance with the trust instrument, by the court on its own motion, or on petition of a settlor, cotrustee, or beneficiary under *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 15642(a)*; *see § 560.540*].

The grounds for removal of a trustee by the court include the following [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)*]:

- The trustee has committed a breach of the trust.
- The trustee is insolvent or otherwise unfit to administer the trust.
- Hostility or lack of cooperation among cotrustees impairs the administration of the trust.
- The trustee fails or declines to act.
- The trustee's compensation is excessive under the circumstances.
- The trustee is substantially unable to manage the trust's financial resources.
- The trustee is substantially unable to resist fraud or undue influence.
- For other good cause.

[2] Special Rule When Trustee Is Attorney Who Drafted Instrument or Attorney's Relative, Associate, or Employee

[a] Persons Covered by Rule

A special rule governs the removal of the trustee when there is only one trustee, the trust became irrevocable after January 1, 1994, and the trustee is any of the following [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6)*; *see Prob. Code § 21350(a)*]:

- The person who drafted the instrument.

- A person who is related by blood or marriage to, or is a cohabitant with or employee of, the person who drafted the instrument.

- Any partner or shareholder of any law partnership or law corporation in which the person who drafted the instrument has an ownership interest, and any employee of any such law partnership or law corporation.

- Any person who has a fiduciary relationship with the transferor, including, but not limited to, a conservator or trustee, and who transcribes the instrument or causes it to be transcribed.

- A person who is related by blood or marriage to, or is a cohabitant with or employee of, a person described in the category immediately above.

- A care custodian of a dependent adult.

For purposes of *Prob. Code § 21350*, "a person who is related by blood or marriage" to a person means all of the following [*Prob. Code § 21350(b)*]:

- The person's spouse or predeceased spouse;

- Relatives within the third degree of the person and of the person's spouse;

- The spouse of any relative within the third degree of the person or of the person's spouse.

In determining relationships for purposes of this rule, *Prob. Code § 6406*, which governs the inheritance rights of relatives of the half blood, *Prob. Code § 6407*, which covers the inheritance rights of afterborn heirs, and *Prob. Code §§ 6450-6455*, which prescribe rules for determining the relationship of parent and child for purposes of intestate succession, are all applicable [*Prob. Code § 21350(b)*].

For purposes of *Prob. Code § 21350*, the term "care" custodian means an administrator or employee of a public or private care facility or agency (including a member of the support or maintenance staff), or any other person providing care or services for elders or dependent adults, except persons who do not work directly with elders or dependent adults as part of their official duties [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*; *see Welf. & Inst. Code § 15610.17* for list of covered care facilities and agencies)]. A long-term care ombudsman for a skilled nursing facility remains a care custodian even after his or her formal ombudsman relationship with a resident has ended, due either to a change in the ombudsman's facility assignment or the fact that the resident has left the facility when the ombudsman, as a result of his or her fiduciary relationship with the resident, develops a personal relationship with the resident and thereby acquires personal and financial information regarding the resident [*Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 993, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196]* .

"Dependent adult" means any of the following [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*; *see Welf. & Inst. Code § 15610.23(a)*]:

- Any person residing in California, between the ages of 18 and 64 years, who has physical or mental

limitations that restrict his or her ability to carry out normal activities or to protect his or her rights including, but not limited to, persons who have physical or developmental disabilities or whose physical or mental abilities have diminished because of age [*Prob. Code § 21350(c)*].

- Any person between the ages of 18 and 64 who is admitted as an inpatient to a 24-hour health facility as defined in *Health & Safety Code §§ 1250, 1250.2,* and *1250.3*.

- Any person older than age 64 who would be a "dependent adult" under the above definitions if he or she were between the ages of 18 and 64.

[b] Removal of Trustee

A trustee who is any one of the persons described above may be removed by the court, on its own motion, or on petition of a settlor or beneficiary under *Prob. Code § 17200*, regardless of whether the trustee has received or is entitled to receive a donative transfer under the trust [*Prob. Code § 15642(a), (b)(6)*]. However, a trustee may not be removed under this rule if any of the following conditions are met [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6)*]:

- The settlor is related by blood or marriage to, or is a cohabitant with, any one or more of the trustees, the person who drafted or transcribed the instrument, or the person who caused the instrument to be transcribed.

- The instrument is reviewed by an independent attorney who counsels the settlor about the nature of his or her intended trustee designation and signs and delivers to the settlor and the designated trustee a "Certificate of Independent Review" in substantially the form prescribed by *Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6),* or if, after full disclosure of the relationships of the persons involved, the court approves the instrument by an order under *Prob. Code §§ 2580 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6)*]. This rule is based on public policy, and any attempt to waive it is void [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6)*].

The court may refuse to remove the trustee under this rule if, after considering all of the facts and circumstances, including any evidence of the settlor's intent, it determines that it is consistent with the settlor's intent for the trustee to continue to serve and that this intent was not the product of fraud, menace, duress, or undue influence [*Prob. Code § 15642(b)(6)*]. However, if the court finds that the designation of the trustee was not consistent with the settlor's intent or was the product of fraud, menace, duress, or undue influence, the person removed as trustee must bear all costs of the proceeding, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Prob. Code § 15642(c)*].

[3] Surrender of Trust Property Pending Disposition of Petition Seeking Renewal

If it appears to the court that trust property or the interest of a beneficiary may suffer loss or injury pending a decision on a petition for removal of a trustee and any appellate review, the court, on its own motion or on petition of a cotrustee or beneficiary, may compel the trustee whose removal is sought to surrender trust property to a cotrustee or a receiver or temporary trustee. The court may suspend the trustee's powers to the extent that it deems this necessary [*Prob. Code § 15642(e)*].

[4] Award of Costs and Fees

If the trustee of a trust that is not revocable has refused to transfer administration of the trust to a successor trust company on request of the beneficiaries described in *Prob. Code § 15640(c)* [*see § 560.92[1]*] and the court in subsequent proceedings under *Prob. Code § 17200* makes an order removing the existingtrustee and appointing a trust company as successor trustee, the court may, in its discretion, award costs and reasonable attorney's fees incurred by the petitioner in the proceeding to be paid by the trustee or from the trust as ordered by the court [*Prob. Code § 15645*].

If the court finds that a petition for the removal of a trustee was filed in bad faith and that removal would be contrary to the settlor's intent, it may order that the person or persons seeking the trustee's removal bear all or part of the costs of the proceeding, including reasonable attorney's fees [*Prob. Code § 15642(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.94

§ 560.94 Vacancy in Office of Trustee

[1] Manners in Which Vacancy Arises

There is a vacancy in the office of trustee in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15643*]:

- The person named as trustee rejects the trust [*see Prob. Code § 15601*].
- The person named as trustee cannot be identified or does not exist.
- The trustee resigns or is removed [*see Prob. Code §§ 15640* (resignation), 15642 (removal)].
- The trustee dies.
- A conservator or guardian of the person or estate of an individual trustee is appointed.
- The trustee is the subject of an order for relief in bankruptcy.
- A trust company's charter is revoked or powers are suspended, if the revocation or suspension is to be in effect for a period of 30 days or more [*see Prob. Code § 83* (definition of trust company)].
- A receiver is appointed for a trust company if the appointment is not vacated within a period of 30 days.

[2] Delivery of Property by Former Trustee

When a vacancy has occurred in the office of trustee, the former trustee who holds property of the trust must deliver the trust property to the successor trustee or a person appointed by the court to receive the property and remains responsible for the trust property until it is delivered. A trustee who has resigned or is removed has the powers reasonably necessary

under the circumstances to preserve the trust property until it is delivered to the successor trustee and to perform actions necessary to complete the resigning or removed trustee's administration of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15644*; *see Prob. Code § 16420(a)(4)* (appointment of receiver and protection of property after breach of trust)].

[3] Appointment of Trustee to Fill Vacancy

[a] In General

If the trust has no trustee or if the trust instrument requires a vacancy in the office of a cotrustee to be filled, the vacancy must be filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660* [*Prob. Code § 15660(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 15621* (remaining cotrustees may act for trust in absence of provision to contrary)]. If the trust instrument provides a practical method of appointing a trustee or names the person to fill the vacancy, the vacancy must be filled as provided in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15660(b)*].

If the vacancy in the office of trustee is not filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660(b)*, the vacancy may be filled by a trust company that has agreed to accept the trust on agreement of all adult beneficiaries who are receiving or are entitled to receive income under the trust or to receive a distribution of principal if the trust were terminated at the time the agreement is made. If a beneficiary has a conservator, the conservator may agree to the successor trustee on behalf of the conservatee without obtaining court approval. Without limiting the power of the beneficiary to agree to the successor trustee, if the beneficiary has designated an attorney in fact who has the power under the power of attorney to agree to the successor trustee, the attorney in fact may agree to the successor trustee [*Prob. Code § 15660(c)*].

If the vacancy in the office of trustee is not filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660(b)* or *(c)*, on petition of any interested person or any person named as trustee in the trust instrument, the court may, in its discretion, appoint a trustee to fill the vacancy. If the trust provides for more than one trustee, the court may, in its discretion, appoint the original number or any lesser number of trustees. In selecting a trustee, the court shall give consideration to any nomination by the beneficiaries who are 14 years of age or older [*Prob. Code § 15660(d)*; *but see Prob. Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor, not beneficiary), 15803 (rights inuring to holder of presently exercisable general power of appointment or power to withdraw property)].

[b] Appointment of Trustee Ad Litem

Just as the probate court may entirely remove a trustee and appoint a replacement, the court may also suspend a trustee's powers relative to specified trust litigation and appoint a trustee ad litem with limited powers to conduct that litigation [*see Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 142, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* . For example, if the interests of the trustee in the conduct of third-partylitigation involving the trust assets are similar to those of the third-party litigants and inimical to those of the trust beneficiaries, suspension of the trustee's powers relative to that litigation and appointment of a trustee ad litem to conduct the litigation is appropriate. In deciding whether to partially suspend the trustee's powers and appoint a trustee ad litem, the court will consider whether doing so will lead to confusion and dispute between the trustee and the trustee ad litem relative to their respective powers and duties. The fact that the division of powers between the two is clear and that the trustee ad litem's powers are appropriately defined will militate in favor of the partial suspension and appointment [*see Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 141, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* .

The appointment of a trustee ad litem is a proper exercise of the probate court's general equity jurisdiction, and is intrinsically included in the court's greater power to remove and replace the trustee. Because the court, in the exercise of its general equity jurisdiction, has the power to remove a trustee entirely, the removal of the existing trustee's power to conduct certain lawsuits and the appointment of a trustee ad litem, when there is a conflict of interest, are also an exercise of that general equity jurisdiction [*Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 141-142, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* . Indeed, the appointment of a trustee ad litem is viewed as a modification of a trust necessary to preserve the trust's assets, and California courts have long had the equity power to modify a trust's terms when necessary to preserve the

trust's assets [*Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 142, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342* ; *see* *Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 428-429, 249 Cal. Rptr 622]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.95-560.109

[Reserved]

§§ 560.95[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.110

§ 560.110 Governing Statutes

Revocability of trusts is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15400-15402*. Modification and termination of trusts is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15407-15409*. The consent of a guardian ad litem regarding modification or termination is governed by *Prob. Code § 15405*. The presumption of fertility with regard to a class of beneficiaries for the purpose of modifying or terminating a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 15406*. Disposition of property on termination of a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 15410*. Combination and division of trusts are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15411* and *15412*, respectively.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.111

§ 560.111 Revocation

[1] Generally

Unless a trust is expressly made irrevocable by the trust instrument, the trust is revocable by the settlor under any one of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15400*]:

- The settlor is domiciled in California when the trust is created.
- The trust instrument is executed in California.
- The trust instrument provides that the law of California governs the trust.

The California rule that a trust is presumed to be revocable differs from the rule in many other states in which trusts are presumed to be irrevocable unless the settlor reserves the right to revoke [*California-Nevada Annual Conf. of the United Methodist Church v. St. Luke's United Methodist Church (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 754, 768, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442* (presumption of revocability has been rule in California since 1931 and applies to trusts created since then); *see* Scott, The Law of Trusts (3th ed.), Vol. VA, Ch. 14, *Trusts and the Conflict of Laws,* § 581].

[2] Method if Trust Created on or After July 1, 1987

A trust that is revocable by the settlor may be revoked in whole or in part by either of the following methods [*Prob. Code § 15401(a)*; *Huscher v. Wells Fargo Bank (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 956, 960, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 27]* :

- By compliance with any method of revocation provided in the trust instrument.
- By a writing (other than a will) signed by the settlor and delivered to the trustee during the settlor's lifetime, unless the trust instrument explicitly makes the method of revocation provided in the trust instrument the exclusive method of revocation. A settlor may, however, revoke a trust by a will if the

trust provides, pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15401(a)(1)* [*see* Rest. 2d Trusts § 330, Comment (j)].

When a trust expressly permits revocation during the settlor's lifetime by written notice signed by the settlor and delivered to the trustee, and the settlor does not limit or qualify the term "written notice," the settlor is deemed to have authorized revocation by *any* writing that unambiguously manifests the settlor's intention to revoke the trust, including a will [*Gardenhire v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 882, 888, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 143]* . The power to revoke a trust by will need not be specifically and expressly stated in the trust [*Gardenhire v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 882, 893-895, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 143]* . If a settlor reserves a power to revoke the trust only in a particular manner or under specified circumstances, then the trust can be revoked only in that manner orunder those circumstances [*Gardenhire v. Superior Court (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 882, 890, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 143]* . Additionally, if a revocation provision is not explicitly exclusive, a trust may be revoked by compliance with the revocation statute [*Prob. Code § 15401(a)(2)*; *see* *Masry v. Masry (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 738, 740, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 915* (family trust specified settlor's power to revoke by writing delivered to other settlor; however, since revocation provision was not explicitly exclusive, revocation by delivering notice of revocation to oneself as trustee was held valid and in compliance with *Prob. Code § 15401(a)(2)*)].

Unless otherwise provided in the instrument, if a trust is created by more than one settlor, each settlor may revoke the trust as to the portion of the trust contributed by that settlor, except as provided in *Fam. Code § 761* (community property in certain revocable trusts) [*Prob. Code § 15401(b)*]. This means that one spouse may revoke a joint trust as to all community property in the trust [*see Fam. Code § 761(b)*], but as to other property in the trust, one spouse may only revoke the trust as to his or her share [*Prob. Code § 15401(b)*]. In the case of a trust that was revocable at any time during the life of either spouse and that contained community property, revocation by the surviving spouse after his spouse's death resulted in one-half of the trust assets being returned to him and the other half being disposed of according to his wife's will. Under *Prob. Code § 100*, the community property in the trust was transmuted at the wife's death to separate property. Therefore, the husband's revocation was effective only as to his half of the trust corpus [*Estate of Powell (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1441, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501]* .

A trust created on or after July 1, 1987, may not be revoked by an attorney in fact under a power of attorney unless the power to do so is expressly granted by the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15401(c)*]. Although the Uniform Statutory Form Power of Attorney grants the attorney in fact broad authority to act for the principal with respect to trusts [*see Prob. Code §§ 4401* (statutory form), 4458 (powers granted in statutory form with respect to estate, trust, and other beneficiary transactions)], the statutory form will not be effective to empower an attorney in fact to revoke a trust created by the principal unless that power is expressly granted by the power of attorney [*Prob. Code § 4465*]. Even when the power to revoke is granted by the power of attorney, it may not be exercised by the attorney in fact unless the trust instrument grants the attorney in fact the same power [*Prob. Code § 4465*].

Nothing in *Prob. Code § 15401* limits the authority of the settlor to modify a revocable trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15403* or of the beneficiaries to modify or terminate an irrevocable trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15404* in an appropriate case [*Prob. Code § 15401(d)*].

[3] Method if Trust Created Prior to July 1, 1987

The manner of revocation of a trust revocable by the settlor that was created by an instrument executed before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 15401* [*Prob. Code § 15401(e)*; *Huscher v. Wells Fargo Bank (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 956, 961, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 27]* . Under prior law, every voluntary trust is revocable by the settlor by a writing filed with the trustee, unless expressly made irrevocable by the instrument creating the trust. When a voluntary trust is revoked by the settlor, the trustee must transfer to the settlor its full title to the trust estate [*see* former *Civ. Code § 2280*]. Under prior law, a voluntary trust is defined as an obligation arising out of a personal confidence reposed in, and voluntarily accepted by, one for the benefit of another [*see* former *Civ. Code § 2216*].

The cases discussed below interpreted the law in effect before the 1986 enactment of the Trust Law.

Under former *Civ. Code § 2280*, a trust's modification procedures must be followed if they are explicitly exclusive or if the provisions are so specific and detailed that they implicitly preclude resort to any other method. If not, the trust may be modified in the manner provided by former *Civ. Code § 2280, i.e.,* by delivering a signed modification to the trustee even if the trustee does not sign the amendment [*Huscher v. Wells Fargo Bank (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 956, 961, 967-970, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 27* (purpose behind former *Civ. Code § 2280* was to protect revocability of trusts that were silent on subject and was not intended to create exclusive method of revocation when trust instrument contains one that is quite specific)]. If the trust's revocation or amendment procedure is not explicitly exclusive and is not sufficiently detailed or specific to be considered implicitly exclusive, either method of modification may be used [*Huscher v. Wells Fargo Bank (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 956, 961, 970-971, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 27* (modification provision stating that trustor may at any time amend any of the trust terms by an instrument in writing signed by the trustor and the trustee is not explicitly or implicitly exclusive and thus trust can be modified under former *Civ. Code § 2280*)]. Moreover, a trust, though expressly declared irrevocable, can be terminated by the process of eliminating beneficiaries through amendments until those left are able to terminate the trust of their own right, and join in a notice of revocation and demand for delivery of the property [*Heifetz v. Bank of America (1957) 147 Cal. App. 2d 776, 777, 305 P.2d 979* ; *now see Prob. Code § 15403* (modification or termination of irrevocable trust by all beneficiaries)].

Beneficiaries of a trust are not necessary parties to an action by a settlor to rescind a trust under former *Civ. Code § 2280*, particularly when they have no present interest in the trust property and would not have any interest in it until the death of the trustor [*Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. McGraw (1945) 72 Cal. App. 2d 390, 400, 164 P.2d 846* ; *now see Prob. Code § 15800(a)* (person holding power to revoke has rights afforded beneficiaries under the Trust Law)].

[4] Validity of Revocable Trust

The reservation of power to revoke does not destroy the trust or change its character, and the trust remains operative and absolute until the settlor exercises that right [Kinney's Estate v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue (9th Cir. [Cal.] 1935) *80 F.2d 568, 571* ; *Nichols v. Emery (1895) 109 Cal. 323, 331, 41 P. 1089* (decided prior to enactment of the Trust Law)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsIrrevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.112

§ 560.112 Modification

A trust may be modified under the following circumstances [*see Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15408, 15409,* respectively; *see § 560.584*]:

- By all the beneficiaries of an irrevocable trust, unless continuation is neededto effectuate a material purpose;
- By the settlor and all beneficiaries;
- Pursuant to a petition by the trustee or beneficiary, on the ground of uneconomically low principal; or
- Pursuant to a petition by the trustee or beneficiary, on the ground of changed circumstances.

Unless the trust instrument provides otherwise, if a trust is revocable by the settlor, the settlor may modify the trust by the procedure for revocation [*Prob. Code § 15402*]. Moreover, an unrestricted power to modify may also include the power to revoke a trust [*see Heifetz v. Bank of America (1957) 147 Cal. App. 2d 776, 781-782, 305 P.2d 979]* . However, if a joint inter vivos trust becomes irrevocable at the death of the first spouse, the trust becomes irrevocable in its entirety and the surviving settlor does not have the right to modify the trust instrument or withdraw trust property without consent from the other beneficiaries of the joint trust [*see Aguilar v. Aguilar (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 35, 40, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 193*].

The settlor may bind himself or herself to a specific method of modifying or amending a trust. If the trust instrument prescribes the method for amendment or modification, the instrument controls and the settlor must follow that method. *Conservatorship of Irvine (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1344-1345, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 587]* .

A trust created on or after July 1, 1987, may not be modified by an attorney in fact under a power of attorney unless the

power to modify is expressly granted to the attorney in fact in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15401(c)*]. Although the Uniform Statutory Form Power of Attorney grants the attorney in fact broad authority to act for the principal with respect to trusts [*see Prob. Code §§ 4401* (statutory form), 4458 (powers granted in statutory form with respect to estate, trust, and other beneficiary transactions)], the statutory form will not be effective to empower an attorney in fact to modify a trust created by the principal unless that power is expressly granted by the power of attorney [*Prob. Code § 4465*]. Even when the power to modify is granted by the power of attorney, it may be exercised by the attorney in fact only if the trust instrument grants the attorney in fact the same power [*Prob. Code § 4465*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.113

§ 560.113 Grounds for Modification or Termination

[1] Uneconomically Low Trust Principal

On petition by a trustee or beneficiary, if the court determines that the fair market value of the principal of a trust has become so low in relation to the cost of administration that continuation of the trust under its existing terms will defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of its purposes, the court may, in its discretion and in a manner that conforms as nearly as possible to the intention of the settlor, order termination of the trust, modification of the trust, or appointment of a new trustee [*Prob. Code § 15408(a)*].

If the trust principal does not exceed $20,000 in value, the trustee has the power to terminate the trust, notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 15408(a)* [*Prob. Code § 15408(b)*]. Although not required to do so under *Prob. Code § 15408(b)*, the trustee may wish to obtain court approval pursuant to petition proceedings [*see, e.g., Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)* (instructions), 17200(b)(5) (accounts), 17200(b)(13) (termination)].

The existence of a trust provision restraining transfer of the beneficiary's interest does not prevent application of *Prob. Code § 15408* [*Prob. Code § 15408(c)*].

[2] Changed Circumstances

On petition by a trustee or beneficiary, the court may modify the administrative or dispositive provisions of the trust or terminate the trust if, owing to circumstances not known to the settlor and not anticipated by the settlor, the continuation of the trust under its terms would defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of the purposes of the trust. In this case, if necessary to carry out the purposes of the trust, the court may order the trustee to do acts that are not authorized or are forbidden by the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15409(a)*; *see Bilafer v. Bilafer (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 363, 370, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 880* ; *see also § 560.584*].

The court must consider a trust provision restraining transfer of the beneficiary's interest as a factor in making its decision whether to modify or terminate the trust, but the court is not precluded from exercising its discretion to modify

or terminate the trust solely because of a restraint on transfer [*Prob. Code § 15409(b)*]. For example, when one or more persons for whose benefit an accumulation of income has been directed is or are destitute of other sufficient means of support or education, the proper court, on application, may direct a suitable sum to be applied for those purposes out of the accumulated income [*Civ. Code § 726*; *see § 560.580*].

[3] Combination of Similar Trusts

If the terms of two or more trusts are substantially similar, on petition by a trustee or beneficiary, the court, for good cause shown, may combine the trusts if the court determines that administration as a single trust will not defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of the trust purposes or the interests of the beneficiaries [*Prob. Code § 15411*; *see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(14)* (petition); *see also § 560.581*].

[4] Division of Trusts

On petition by a trustee or beneficiary, the court, for good cause shown, may divide a trust into two or more separate trusts, if the court determines that dividing the trust will not defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of the trust purposes or the interests of the beneficiaries [*Prob. Code § 15412*; *see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(14)* (petition)]. For example, division of a trust may be appropriate when different members of a family desire their own separate trusts because of a disagreement, or when a beneficiary has moved to a different part of the country [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 644 (1986)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.114

§ 560.114 Compelling Modification or Termination

[1] By All Beneficiaries

If all beneficiaries of an irrevocable trust consent, they may compel modification or termination of the trust on petition to the court, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15403(b)* [*Prob. Code § 15403(a)*; for a petition to modify or terminate an irrevocable trust, *see § 560.584*]. *Prob. Code § 15403(a)* permits termination of an irrevocable trust with the consent of all beneficiaries when the trust provides for successive beneficiaries or postpones enjoyment of a beneficiary's interest. It is intended to provide some flexibility in the application of the Material Purposes Doctrine when transfer of the beneficiary's interest is not restricted [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 637 (1986)]. For example, if a trust gives discretion to the trustees to add charitable organizations, and the beneficiaries enter into a settlement agreement that defines the additional beneficiaries and provide for trust modifications, the court has authority to order modification of the trust [*Boys and Girls Club of Petaluma v. Walsh (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1049, 1060, 1062, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413*].

If the continuance of the trust is necessary to carry out a material purpose of the trust, the trust cannot be modified or terminated unless the court, in its discretion, determines that the reason for doing so under the circumstances outweighs the interest in accomplishing a material purpose of the trust [*see Boys and Girls Club of Petaluma v. Walsh (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1049, 1060, 1062, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413* (reasons for modification outweighed interest in preserving trustees' discretion)]. The court does not have discretion under *Prob. Code § 15403* to permit termination of a trust that is subject to a valid restraint on transfer of the beneficiary's interest as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* [*Prob. Code § 15403(b)*].

[2] By Settlor and All Beneficiaries

If the settlor and all beneficiaries of a trust consent, they may compel the modification or termination of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15404(a)*; *see § 560.584*]. Although modification or termination does not require court approval, the beneficiaries may bring a petition for that relief [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)*]. For example, a revocable trust may be modified or terminated pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15404* if the trust instrument specifies an overly restrictive method of

modification or revocation [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law,* 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 638 (1986)].

If any beneficiary does not consent to the modification or termination of the trust, on petition to the court, the other beneficiaries, with the consent of the settlor, may compel a modification or a partial termination of the trust if the interests of the beneficiaries who do not consent are not substantially impaired [*Prob. Code § 15404(b)*].

If the trust provides for the disposition of principal to a class of persons described only as "heirs" or "next of kin" of the settlor, or using other words that describe the class of all persons who would take under the rules of intestacy, the court may limit the class of beneficiaries whose consent is needed to compel the modification or termination of the trust to the beneficiaries who are reasonably likely to take under the circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15404(c)*]. *Prob. Code § 15404(c)* reinstates a form of the doctrine of worthier title by providing that the need for consent of persons constituting the settlor's heirs or next of kin may be excused as to beneficiaries (typically unborn or remote beneficiaries) who are not reasonably likely to take principal under the trust. The limitation protects the interests of beneficiaries who are likely to take while permitting modification or termination of an otherwise irrevocable trust in line with the probable intent of the settlor [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law,* 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 639 (1986); *see also Prob. Code § 21108* (common-law doctrine of worthier title abolished in California); *see also* Witkin, *Summary of California Law* (8th ed.), vol. 3, *Real Property,* § 181].

Nothing under *Prob. Code § 15404* affects the settlor's power to revoke or modify a revocable trust [*see Prob. Code § 15401*]. Moreover, a trust may be modified or terminated under *Prob. Code § 15401* regardless of a trust provision restraining transfer of the beneficiary's interest and regardless of whether the trust purposes have been achieved [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 338, Comments (b)-(d)].

[3] No Conclusive Presumption of Fertility

In determining the class of beneficiaries whose consent is necessary to modify or terminate a trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15403* or *15404,* the presumption of fertility is rebuttable [*Prob. Code § 15406*; *see* Scott, The Law of Trusts (3rd ed.), vol. IV, ch. 10, *The Termination and Modification of the Trust,* § 340.1 (rejection of "fertile octogenarian" doctrine)].

[4] Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

For the purposes of *Prob. Code §§ 15403* and *15404,* the consent of a beneficiary who lacks legal capacity, including a minor, or who is an unascertained or unborn person may be given in proceedings before the court by a guardian ad litem, if it would be appropriate to do so. In determining whether to give consent, the guardian ad litem may rely on general family benefit accruing to living members of the beneficiary's family as a basis for approving a modification or termination of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15405*; *see Recommenda tion Proposing the Trust Law,* 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 639 (1986) (provision is a nonpecuniary *quid pro quo* rule on assumption that benefit to parents will benefit future child)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of Presumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.115

§ 560.115 Termination

[1] Methods

A trust terminates when any of the following occurs [*Prob. Code § 15407(a)*]:

- The term of the trust expires.
- The trust purpose is fulfilled.
- The trust purpose becomes unlawful.
- The trust purpose becomes impossible to fulfill.
- The trust is revoked.

Moreover, there can be no trust if the legal and equitable title to the property is merged in the trustees [*Commissioner of Internal Revenue v. Goodan (9th Cir. 1952) 195 F.2d 498, 505]* . When the legal and equitable title to trust property are vested in the same person, the doctrine of merger operates to terminate the trust. To effect a merger, however, the estates must unite in one and the same person, having a coextensive interest in each, with no intervening interest in another. A legal estate in fee in one who has only a partial equitable interest, or vice versa, would not merge [*Estate of Washburn (1909) 11 Cal. App. 735, 746, 106 P. 415]* .

However, if a trust provides for one or more successor beneficiaries after the death of the settlor, the trust is not invalid, merged, or terminated in either of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15209*]:

- When there is one settlor who is the sole trustee and the sole beneficiary during the settlor's lifetime.

- When there are two or more settlors, one or more of whom are trustees, and the beneficial interest in the trust is in one or more of the settlors during the lifetime of the settlors.

[2] Trustee's Powers

On termination of the trust, the trustee continues to have the powers reasonably necessary under the circumstances to wind up the affairs of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15407(b)*].

[3] Disposition of Property

At the termination of a trust, the trust property must be disposed of as follows [*Prob. Code § 15410*]:

- In the case of a trust that is revoked by the settlor, as directed by the settlor.

- In the case of a trust that is terminated by the consent of the settlor and all beneficiaries, as agreed by the settlor and all beneficiaries.

- In any other case, as provided in the trust instrument or in a manner directed by the court that conforms as nearly as possible to the intention of the settlor as expressed in the trust instrument.

- If a trust is terminated by the trustee pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15408(b)* (uneconomically low principal), the trust property may be distributed as determined by the trustee pursuant to the standard provided in *Prob. Code § 15410(c)* without the need for a court order. When the trust instrument does not provide a manner of distribution at termination and the settlor's intent is not adequately expressed in the trust instrument, the trustee may distribute the trust property to the living beneficiaries on an actuarial basis.

When appropriate, distribution on termination of a trust may be made to a custodian for a minor under the Uniform Transfers to Minors Act (*Prob. Code §§ 3900-3925*) [*see Prob. Code §§ 3905* (transfer authorized in trust), 3906 (unauthorized transfer)]. For discussion of the Uniform Transfers to Minors Act, see Ch. 278, *Gifts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.116-560.129

[Reserved]

§§ 560.116[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.130

§ 560.130 Governing Statutes

Grounds for petition are governed by *Prob. Code § 17200*. The commencement of proceedings is governed by *Prob. Code § 17201*. Dismissal of a petition is governed by *Prob. Code § 17202*. Notice is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 1200-1265, 15804, 17100-17105, 17203-17205*. Guardian ad litem procedures are governed by *Prob. Code § 1003*.

Jurisdiction and venue are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17005*. Standing of the Attorney General is governed by *Prob. Code § 17210*. Lack of right to a jury trial is governed by *Prob. Code § 17006*. Orders are governed by *Prob. Code § 17206*. Appeals are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 1300-1312*.

Testamentary trusts subject to continuing court jurisdiction are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17354*. Removal of trusts from continuing court jurisdic tion is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17350-17354*.

Transfer of trusts to another jurisdiction is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405*, and transfer of trusts from another jurisdiction is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTestamentary Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.131

§ 560.131 Procedure to Administer Trusts Generally

All trusts subject to the Trust Law are administered pursuant to the procedures set forth in *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210*, if the person seeking relief has standing to do so [*see § 560.13*]. *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210* provide petition, notice, and appeal proceedings for matters concerning the internal affairs of the trust and to determine the existence of the trust. The types of trusts subject to the Trust Law are determined by *Prob. Code §§ 82(a)* (definition of trust) and 15001 (application of trust law to trusts) [*see §§ 560.17, § 560.18*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.132

§ 560.132 No Right to Jury Trial

There is no right to a jury trial in proceedings under *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* concerning the internal affairs of trusts [*Prob. Code § 17006*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.133

§ 560.133 Standing

Any trustee or beneficiary of a trust may petition the court concerning the internal affairs of the trust or to determine the existence of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*]. Under appropriate circumstances, the following persons have the same right to petition the court as beneficiaries:

- The person holding the power to revoke [*see Prob. Code § 15800(a)*; *Johnson v. Tate (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1282, 1286, 264 Cal. Rptr. 68* (person having, at most, rights of contingent beneficiary lacks standing)].

- The holder of a presently exercisable general power of appointment, to the extent of the holder's power over the trust property [*see Prob. Code § 15803*].

- The holder of a presently exercisable power to withdraw property from the trust, to the extent of the holder's power over the trust property [*see Prob. Code § 15803*].

The Attorney General may petition in a case involving a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General [*see Prob. Code § 17210*]. However, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Attorney General is subject to the limitations on the rights of beneficiaries of revocable trusts provided by *Prob. Code §§ 15800-15802* [*Prob. Code § 15805*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.134

§ 560.134 Grounds for Petition

Proceedings concerning the internal affairs of a trust include, but are not limited to, proceedings for any of the following purposes [*Prob. Code § 17200(b)*]:

- Determining questions of construction of a trust instrument [*see § 560.604*].

- Determining the existence or nonexistence of any immunity, power, privilege, duty, or right [*see § 560.550*].

- Determining the validity of a trust provision [*see § 560.521*].

- Ascertaining beneficiaries and determining to whom property shall pass or be delivered upon final or partial termination of the trust, to the extent the determination is not made by the trust instrument [*see §§ 560.582, 560.583*].

- Settling the accounts and passing upon the acts of the trustee, including the exercise of discretionary powers [*see §§ 560.540, 560.546,* 27].

- Instructing the trustee [*see §§ 560.551, 560.555*].

- Compelling the trustee to report information about the trust or account to the beneficiary, if the trustee has failed to submit a requested report or account within 60 days after written request of the beneficiary and no report or account has been made within six months preceding the request [*see § 560.548*].

- Granting powers to the trustee [*see § 560.554*].

- Fixing or allowing payment of the trustee's compensation [*see § 560.558*]; or reviewing the reasonableness of the trustee's compensation [*see § 560.548*.5].

- Appointing or removing a trustee [*see §§ 560.540, 560.541*].

- Accepting the resignation of a trustee [*see § 560.557*].

- Compelling redress of a breach of the trust by any available remedy [*see § 560.550*].

- Approving or directing the modification or termination of the trust [*see § 560.580*].

- Approving or directing the combination or division of trusts [*see § 560.581*].

- Amending or conforming the trust instrument in the manner required to qualify a decedent's estate for the charitable estate tax deduction under federal law, including the addition of mandatory governing instrument requirements for a charitable remainder trust as required by final regulations and rulings of the United States Internal Revenue Service inany case in which all parties interested in the trust have either agreed in writing to the proposed changes or submitted written disclaimers of interest [*see Prob. Code § 21540* (authority to augment trust to effect intended compliance with *I.R.C. §§ 664* (charitable remainder trust), 2055, 2522 (charitable deductions)); *see also Prob. Code § 21541* (authority to augment trust to effect intended compliance with *I.R.C. §§ 170(f)(2)(B), 2055(e)(2), 2522(c)(2)* (charitable lead trust)); for discussion of those federal statutes, *see § 560.77*].

- Authorizing or directing transfer of a trust or trust property to or from another jurisdiction [*see §§ 560.605 -560.607*].

- Directing transfer of a testamentary trust subject to continuing court jurisdiction from one county to another [*see § 560.608*].

- Approving removal of a testamentary trust from continuing court jurisdiction [*see §§ 560.609, 560.610*].

- Reforming or excusing compliance with the governing instrument of an organization pursuant to *Prob. Code § 16105* [*see* Pub. L. No. 91-172, § 101(l)(3) (private foundations)].

- Determining petitions filed pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15687* and reviewing the reasonableness of compensation for legal services authorized under that section.

- Appointing a practice administrator if a member of the State Bar of California has transferred the economic interest of his or her practice to a trustee and the member is a deceased member under *Prob. Code § 9764* or a disabled member under *Prob. Code § 2468*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.135

§ 560.135 Commencement of Proceeding

A proceeding under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* is commenced by filing a petition stating facts showing that the petition is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* and the grounds of the petition [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. The petition must also state the grounds of the petition and the names and addresses of each person entitled to notice of the petition [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. The petition must be in writing, signed by all of the petitioners, and filed with the court clerk, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 1023* [*Prob. Code § 1020*]. If a petitioner, objector, or respondent is absent from the county or for some other cause is unable to sign or verify the petition, the person's attorney may sign or verify the petition unless the person is a fiduciary appointed in the proceeding [*Prob. Code § 1023*]. A petition filed pursuant to the Probate Code must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*]. Verification of a document constitutes signature of that document, unless expressly provided to the contrary [*Prob. Code § 1020*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.136

§ 560.136 Dismissal of Petition

The court may dismiss a petition if it appears that the proceeding is not reasonably necessary for the protection of the interests of the trustee or beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 17202*; *see § 560.543*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.137

§ 560.137 Notice

[1] In General

Notice in proceedings commenced pursuant to the Trust Law (*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*), or notice otherwise required by the Trust Law is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 1200-1265*, except as otherwise provided in the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 17100*]. However, *Prob. Code §§ 1200-1265* (as enacted by Stats. 1990, ch. 79, § 14) does not apply to the giving of a particular notice when the notice was delivered, mailed, posted, or first published before July 1, 1991, in which case the applicable law in effect before July 1, 1991, continues to apply to the giving of that notice, notwithstanding repeal [*Prob. Code § 1200(c)*].

[2] Notice to Trustees, Beneficiaries, and Attorney General

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of hearing to be mailed to all of the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]:

- All trustees.

- All beneficiaries, except that if the trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke it is competent notice must be given to the person holding the power to revoke and not to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15802*].

- The Attorney General of California, if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

The amendment of the provisions of a charitable trust regarding appointment of successor trustees was improper under the *Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution* because potential successor trustees under the trust as written were not notified of the proceeding to amend the trust [*Estate of Sigourney v. American Psychoanalytic Ass'n (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 593, 604-605, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 274]* .

At least 30 days before the time set for hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on any person (other than a trustee or beneficiary) whose right, title, or interest would be affected by the petition and who does not receive mailed notice as provided above [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*]. Service must be effected in the manner required forservice of summons in civil actions [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons in civil actions)]. The court may not shorten the time for service [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*].

If a person to whom notice otherwise would be given has been deceased for at least 40 days, and no personal representative has been appointed for that person's estate, and if the deceased person's right, title, or interest has not passed to any other person pursuant to the Probate Code rules for disposition of estates without administration [*see Prob. Code § 13000 et seq.*], notice may instead be given to the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(c)*]:

- Each heir and devisee of the decedent, and all persons named as executors of the will of the decedent, so far as known to the petitioner.

- Each person serving as guardian or conservator of the decedent at the time of the decedent's death, so far as known to the petitioner.

[3] Special Notice on Written Request of Beneficiary or Creditor

If proceedings involving a trust are pending, a beneficiary of the trust may, in person or by attorney, file with the court clerk where the proceedings are pending a written request stating that the beneficiary desires special notice of the filing of petitions in the proceeding relating to any or all of the purposes described in *Prob. Code § 17200* and giving an address for receiving notice by mail. A copy of the request must be personally delivered or mailed to the trustee or the trustee's attorney. If personally delivered, the request is effective when it is delivered. If mailed, the request is effective when it is received. When the original of the request is filed with the court clerk, it must be accompanied by a written admission or proof of service. A request for special notice may be modified or withdrawn in the same manner as provided for the making of the initial request [*Prob. Code § 17204(a)*].

A creditor of the trust, or a creditor of the trustor if the trust has become irrevocable on the trustor's death, may request special notice in the same manner as a trust beneficiary of any proceeding fixing or allowing payment of the trustee's compensation or reviewing the reasonableness of that compensation [*Prob. Code § 17204(b)(1), (3)*; *see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(9)*]. The request must be accompanied by a verified statement of the creditor's interest [*Prob. Code § 17204(b)(1)*]. A creditor may also petition the court for an order for special notice of certain other specified proceedings involving the trust. The petition may be made by ex parte application, and must include a verified statement of the creditor's interest. It may be served on the trustee or the trustee's attorney by personal delivery or by mail under *Prob. Code § 1215* [*Prob. Code § 17204(b)(2)*].

After serving and filing a request and proof of service pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17204(a)* or *(b)(1)*, the beneficiary or Creditor is entitled to notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17203*, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 17204(d)* [*Prob. Code § 17204(c)*]. A creditor whose petition for special notice is granted is also entitled to notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17203* [*Prob. Code § 17204(c)*].

A request for special notice made by a beneficiary whose right to notice is restricted by *Prob. Code § 15802* is not effective [*Prob. Code § 17204(d)*].

[4] Special Notice Regarding Future Interests

Notice must be given to a beneficiary, or to a person interested in the trust, with regard to future interests, as follows [

Prob. Code § 15804(a)]:

- When an interest has been limited on any future contingency to persons who will compose a certain class on the happening of a certain event without further limitation, notice must be given to the persons in being who would constitute the class if the event had happened immediately before the commencement of the proceeding or, if there is no proceeding, if the event had happened immediately before notice is given.

- When an interest has been limited to a living person and the same interest, or a share therein, has been further limited on the happening of a future event to the surviving spouse or to persons who are or may be the distributees, heirs, issue, or other kindred of the living person, notice must be given to the living person.

- When an interest has been limited on the happening of any future event to a person, or a class of persons, or both, and the interest, or a share of the interest, has been further limited on the happening of an additional future event to another person, or a class of persons, or both, notice must be given to the person or persons in being who would take the interest on the happening of the first of these events.

If a conflict of interest involving the subject matter of the trust proceeding exists between a person to whom notice is required to be given and a person to whom notice is not otherwise required to be given under *Prob. Code § 15804(a)*, notice must also be given to persons not otherwise entitled to notice under *Prob. Code § 15804(a)* with respect to whom the conflict of interest exists [*Prob. Code § 15804(b)*].

Nothing in *Prob. Code § 15804* affects any of the following [*Prob. Code § 15804(c)*]:

- Requirements for notice to a person who has requested special notice, a person who has filed notice of appearance, or a particular person or entity required by statute to be given notice.

- Availability of a guardian ad litem pursuant to *Prob. Code § 1003*.

As used in *Prob. Code § 15804*, "notice" includes other papers [*Prob. Code § 15804(d)*].

[5] Copy of Petition on Notice of Appearance or Written Request

If a trustee or beneficiary has served and filed either a notice of appearance, in person or by counsel, directed to the petitioner or the petitioner's counsel in connection with a particular petition and proceeding or a written request for a copy of the petition, and has given an address to which notice or a copy of the petition may be mailed or delivered, the petitioner must cause a copy of the petition to be mailed to that person within five days after service of the notice of appearance or receipt of the request [*Prob. Code § 17205*].

[6] Notice to Other Interested Persons

A petitioner or other person required to give notice may cause notice to be given to any person interested in the trust without the need for a court order [*Prob. Code § 17105*].

[7] Additional Notice

If the court determines that the notice otherwise required is insufficient in the particular circumstances, the court may require that further or additional notice, including a longer period of notice, be given [*Prob. Code § 1202*].

[8] Lis Pendens

If a proceeding under the Probate Code affects the title to or the right to possession of real property, notice of the pendency of the proceeding may be filed in the office of the county recorder in the county in which the property is located, in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 405-405.61* [*see Prob. Code § 1004*]. A notice of the pendency of the proceeding will protect the interest of the petitioner in the property by giving notice to prospective purchasers and encumbrancers that the petition claims some interest in the property. For further discussion, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[9] Mailing Procedure

Unless otherwise expressly provided, notices or other papers must be mailed according to the following procedures [*Prob. Code § 1215*]:

- If a notice or other paper is required or permitted to be mailed to a person, the notice or other paper must be mailed as provided in *Prob. Code § 1215* or personally delivered as provided in *Prob. Code § 1216* [§ 560.137[10]].

- The notice or other paper must be sent by one of following methods:

  - First-class mail if the person's address is within the United States. First-class mail includes certified, registered, and express mail;

  - Airmail if the person's address is not within the United States.

- The notice or other paper must be deposited for collection in the United States mail, in a sealed envelope, with postage paid, addressed to the person to whom it is mailed.

- The notice or other paper must be addressed to the person at the person's place of business or place of residence, subject to *Prob. Code § 1212* (procedure when address is unknown) [*see* discussion *below*].

- When the notice or other paper is deposited in the mail, mailing is complete and the period of notice is not extended.

Unless the court dispenses with the notice, if the address of the person to whom a notice or other paper is required to be mailed or delivered is not known, notice must be given as the court may require in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30* [*Prob. Code § 1212*]. Pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.30*, when no provision is made for service, the court in which the action is pending may direct that service be made in a manner that is reasonably calculated to give actual notice to the party to be served and that proof of service be made as prescribed by the court.

When notice is required to be given to the Attorney General, the notice must be mailed to the Attorney General at the office of the Attorney General at Sacramento, California [*Prob. Code § 1209(b)*].

[10] Personal Delivery

If a notice or other paper is required or permitted to be mailed to a person, it may be delivered personally to that person. Personal delivery as provided in *Prob. Code § 1216* satisfies a provision that requires or permits a notice or other paper to be mailed [*Prob. Code § 1216(a)*]. Personal delivery pursuant to *Prob. Code § 1216* is complete when the notice or other paper is delivered personally to the person who is to receive it [*Prob. Code § 1216(b)*].

[11] Proof of Notice

Proof of mailing may be made in the manner prescribed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a* [*Prob. Code § 1261*]. Pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*, proof of service by mail may be made by one of the following methods [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*]:

- An affidavit setting forth the exact title of the document served and filed in the cause, showing the name and residence or business address of the person making the service, showing that he or she is a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing occurs, that he or she is overthe age of 18 years and not a party to the cause, and showing the date and place of deposit in the mail, the name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope, and also showing that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage on it fully prepaid.

- A certificate setting forth the exact title of the document served and filed in the cause, showing the name and business address of the person making the service, showing that he or she is an active member of the State Bar of California and is not a party to the cause, and showing the date and place of deposit in the mail, the name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope, and also showing that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage on it fully prepaid.

- An affidavit setting forth the exact title of the document served and filed in the cause, showing the name and residence or business address of the person making the service, that he or she is a resident of, or employed in, the county where the mailing occurs, that he or she is over the age of 18 years and not a party to the cause, that he or she is readily familiar with the business' practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service, that the correspondence would be deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business, the name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope, and the date and place of business where the correspondence was placed for deposit in the United States Postal Service, and that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date following ordinary business practices. Service made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(3)*, on motion of a party served, is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in the affidavit.

- In case of service by the clerk of a court of record, a certificate by that clerk setting forth the exact title of the document served and filed in the cause, showing the name of the clerk and the name of the court of which he or she is the clerk, and that he or she is not a party to the cause, and showing the date and place of deposit in the mail, the name and address of the person served as shown on the envelope, and also showing that the envelope was sealed and deposited in the mail with the postage on it fully prepaid. This form of proof is sufficient for service of process when the clerk or deputy clerk signing the certificate places the document for collection and mailing on the date shown on the document so as to cause it to be mailed following standard court practices in an envelope sealed and addressed on that date. If the date of postage cancellation or postage meter imprint shown on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing contained in the certificate, any party served may move the court for an order that the service is deemed to have been made on the date following the date of postage cancellation or postage meter imprint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(4)*].

For discussion and forms regarding *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

Proof of notice by personal delivery may be made by the affidavit of the person making the delivery showing the time and place of delivery and the name of the person to whom delivery was made [*Prob. Code § 1264*].

Proof of notice, however given, may be made by evidence presented at the hearing [*Prob. Code § 1265*]. If notice of a hearing is required, proof of giving notice of the hearing must be made to the satisfaction of the court at or before the

hearing [*Prob. Code § 1260(a)*]. If it appears to the satisfaction of the court that notice has been regularly given or that the party entitled to notice has waived it, the court shall so find in its order [*Prob. Code § 1260(b)*]. That finding, when the order becomes final, is conclusive on all persons [*Prob. Code § 1260(c)*].

[12] Shortening Time

Unless the particular provision governing the notice of hearing provides that the time for giving notice may not be shortened, the court may, for good cause, shorten the time for giving notice of hearing [*Prob. Code § 1203(a)*]. Unless the particular provision governing the publication of notice of hearing otherwise provides, the court may not shorten the time for publication of notice [*Prob. Code § 1203(b)*].

[13] Continued or Postponed Hearings

If a hearing is continued or postponed, no further notice of the continued or postponed hearing is required unless ordered by the court [*Prob. Code § 1205*].

[14] Waiver of Notice

A person, including a guardian ad litem, guardian, conservator, trustee, or other fiduciary, may waive notice by a writing signed by the person or the person's attorney and filed in the proceeding [*Prob. Code § 1204*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesSuccessive BeneficiariesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.138

§ 560.138 Orders

The court in its discretion may make any orders and take any other action necessary or proper to dispose of the matters presented by the petition, including appointment of a temporary trustee to administer the trust in whole or in part [*Prob. Code § 17206*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.139

§ 560.139 Appeals

An appeal may be taken from the grant or denial of any final order made under *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17211*, except the following [*Prob. Code § 1304(a)*]:

- Compelling the trustee to submit an account or report acts as trustee to a beneficiary pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*.

- Accepting the resignation of a trustee pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(11)*.

- Approving removal of a testamentary trust from continuing court jurisdiction pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(18)*.

For discussion and forms relating to appeals generally, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , through Ch. 54, *Appeal: California Supreme Court Review* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.140

§ 560.140 Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

The court may, on its own motion or on request of a trustee or other person interested in the trust, appoint a guardian ad litem at any stage of a proceeding to represent the interest of any of the following persons, if the court determines that representation of the interest otherwise would be inadequate [*Prob. Code § 1003(a)*; *see §§ 560.602*]:

- A minor [*see Fam. Code § 6500 et seq.* (minors)];
- An incapacitated person;
- An unborn person;
- An unascertained person;
- A person whose identity or address is unknown;
- A designated class of persons who are not ascertained or are not in being.

If not precluded by a conflict of interest, a guardian ad litem may be appointed to represent several persons or interests [*Prob. Code § 1003(b)*]. The reasonable expenses of the guardian ad litem, including compensation and attorney's fees, shall be determined by the court and paid as the court orders, either out of property of the estate involved or by the petitioner or from any other source that the court orders [*Prob. Code § 1003(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGuardians for MinorsEstate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGuardians for Missing &

Undetermined HeirsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.141

§ 560.141 Judicial Intervention in Trust Administration

The administration of trusts is intended to proceed expeditiously and free of judicial intervention, subject to the jurisdiction of the court [*Prob. Code § 17209*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.142

§ 560.142 Subject Matter Jurisdiction

The superior court that has jurisdiction over the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17006* has exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings concerning the internal affairs of trusts [*Prob. Code § 17000(a)*; *David v. Hermann (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 672, 680-683, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 622* (superior court of county in which trustee resides had exclusive jurisdiction over proceedings challenging validity of trust)]. The department of the superior court that customarily deals with probate matters is intended to exercise the exclusive jurisdiction relating to internal trust affairs provided by *Prob. Code § 17000(a)* [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 717 (1986)]. However, in a superior court that has a probate department, a nonprobate department does not lack subject matter jurisdiction over a probate matter. A probate department has "primary" jurisdiction, and a nonprobate department has "secondary" jurisdiction of probate-related proceedings [*Harnedy v. Whitty (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1344-1346, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 798* (rejecting challenge to subject matter jurisdiction of nonprobate department to determine claim against trustee)].

The superior court that has jurisdiction over the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457* has concurrent jurisdiction of the following [*Prob. Code § 17000(b)*]:

- Actions and proceedings to determine the existence of trusts [*see § 560.547*].
- Actions and proceedings by or against creditors or debtors of trusts [*see § 560.160 et seq. and §§ 560.630, 560.631*].
- Other actions and proceedings involving trustees and third persons [*see § 560.160* et seq.].

In proceedings commenced under the Trust Law, the court is a court of general jurisdiction and has all the powers of the superior court [*Prob. Code § 17001*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsExclusive JurisdictionEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.143

§ 560.143 In Personam Jurisdiction

[1] Trustee

By accepting the trusteeship of a trust having its principal place of administration in California the trustee submits personally to the jurisdiction of the court under the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 17003(a)*].

[2] Beneficiaries

To the extent of their interests in the trust, all beneficiaries of a trust having its principal place of administration in California are subject to the jurisdiction of the court under the Trust Law [*Prob. Code § 17003(b)*].

[3] Basis Not Inconsistent With Constitutions

The court may exercise jurisdiction in proceedings under the Trust Law on anybasis permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10* [*Prob. Code § 17004*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10* states that a court may exercise jurisdiction on any basis not inconsistent with the California or United States Constitution [*see 1969 Judicial Council Report to the Governor and the Legislature* (1969), Comment to *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10* (pp 33-34), *Appendix II, Bases of Judicial Jurisdiction* (pp 68-96), reprinted in West's Annotated California Codes, Judicial Council comments to *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsConstitutional LimitsCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.144

§ 560.144 Venue

[1] Generally

The proper county for commencement of a proceeding pursuant to the Trust Law is either [*Prob. Code § 17005(a)*]:

- In the case of a living trust, the county where the principal place of administration of the trust is located.

- In the case of a testamentary trust not subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court, either the county where the decedent's estate is administered or where the principal place of administration of the trust is located.

The principal place of administration of the trust is the usual place where the day-to-day activity of the trust is carried on by the trustee or its representative who is primarily responsible for the administration of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17002(a)*]. If the principal place of administration of the trust cannot be determined under *Prob. Code § 17002(a)*, it is determined as follows [*Prob. Code § 17002(b)*]:

- If the trust has a single trustee, the principal place of administration of the trust is the trustee's residence or usual place of business.

- If the trust has more than one trustee, the principal place of administration of the trust is the residence or usual place of business of any of the cotrustees as agreed on by them or, if not, the residence or usual place of business of any of the cotrustees.

[2] Appointment of Trustee of Living Trust

If a living trust has no trustee, the proper county for commencement of a proceeding for appointing a trustee is the county where the trust property, or some portion of the trust property, is located [*Prob. Code § 17005(b)*].

[3] Application of Code of Civil Procedure

Except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code § 17005(a)* and *(b)*, the proper county for commencement of a proceeding pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* is determined by the rules applicable to civil actions generally [*Prob. Code § 17005(c)*]. For example, rules generally governing civil actions would apply if the principal place of administration of a trust is a foreign state, but jurisdiction is proper in California [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 721 (1986)].

In civil actions, the venue for a claim against a trustee in the trustee's official capacity, for the payment of money or for the recovery of personal property, is the county that has jurisdiction of the estate that the defendant represents [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392* (real property generally), 395 (defendant's residence generally), and § 560.160 et seq.].

[4] Testamentary Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction of Court

If a trust described in *Prob. Code § 17300* continues after distribution of the decedent's estate, the court in which the decedent's estate was administered retains jurisdiction over the trust for any of the purposes specified in *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 17301*; for discussion of *Prob. Code § 17300, see § 560.145[1]*]. Consequently, venue for testamentary trusts subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court is only in the county in which the decedent's estate was administered, whereas venue for other testamentary trusts may be established in the county of either the principal place of administration or the estate administration [*compare Prob. Code § 17005*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueSpecial VenueEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersLiving TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTestamentary TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.145

§ 560.145 Trusts Subject to Continuing Court Jurisdiction

[1] Definition

If a trust created by a will continues after distribution of the decedent's estate, the court in which the decedent's estate was administered retains jurisdiction over the trust for the purposes specified in *Prob. Code § 17200* in the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 17300*]:

- When the will was executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1977.

- When the will provides that the trust is subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the superior court. This includes a trust created by will executed before July 1, 1977, that is incorporated by reference in a will thereafter, but that contains a provision making it subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 732 (1986)].

[2] Transfer Between Counties

At any time after final distribution of the decedent's estate, a trust described in *Prob. Code § 17300* may be transferred to a different county in California if the transfer will be in the best interests of the estate, or if economical and convenient administration of the trust will be facilitated by the transfer [*see Prob. Code § 17304(a), (c)*; for discussion of the procedure and a form for a petition for transfer, *see § 560.608*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of JusticeEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.146

§ 560.146 Removal From Continuing Court Jurisdiction

Trusts created by will executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1987, may be removed from continuing jurisdiction of the court [*Prob. Code § 17350*].

If the trustee is a trust company, the trust company is required to remove the trust from continuing court jurisdiction within six months after the trust is initially funded by giving notice to the beneficiaries. Proof of giving the notice is filed with the court that had jurisdiction over the administration of the decedent's estate, but court approval is not required [*see Prob. Code §§ 17351(a), (c)* (removal when trustee is trust company), 17353 (removal when trust company is successor trustee); *see also Prob. Code §§ 83* (trust company defined), 15804 (notice regarding future interests) and § 560.137[4]].

If the trustee is not a trust company, the trust may be removed from continuing court jurisdiction only with approval of the court on the trustee's petition. The court may receive testimony from any interested person at the hearing. If the petition is granted, the trustee must give notice to each beneficiary and file proof of service pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17351*. If it is denied, the trust continues to be administered under *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17304* [*see Prob. Code § 17352* and §§ 560.609, 560.610].

After a trust is removed from continuing court jurisdiction pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17350-17354*, neither a change in trustees nor any other event causes the trust to be subject to continuing court jurisdiction under *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17304* [*Prob. Code § 17354*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.147

§ 560.147 Transfer of Trust to Another Jurisdiction

[1] Applicable Law

The court may make an order for the transfer of the place of administration of a trust or the transfer of some or all of the trust property to a jurisdiction outside California as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405* [*Prob. Code § 17401(a)*]. Except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405*, proceedings under *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405* are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457* (judicial proceedings concerning trusts) [*Prob. Code § 17401(b)*].

[2] Trusts Subject to Transfer

The procedure to transfer a trust to another jurisdiction under *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405* applies to all of the following [*Prob. Code § 17400(a)*]:

- A trust that is subject to the Trust Law [see *Prob. Code § 82* (definition of trust)].
- A trust subject to *Prob. Code §§ 6320-6330* (insurance or employee benefit trusts).
- Any other trust to which the provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405* apply.

Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405 does not prevent the transfer of the place of administration of a trust or of trust property to another jurisdiction by any other available means [*Prob. Code § 17400(b)*].

[3] Procedure

The court may order the trustee to transfer the trust property, or to transfer the place of administration of the trust to the other jurisdiction if, after hearing on petition [*see Prob. Code § 17404*]:

- The transfer will promote the best interests of the trust and those interested in it;

- The transfer will not violate the trust instrument;

- Any new trustee is qualified, willing, and able to administer the trust or trust property under the trust instrument.

For forms for use to transfer a trust to a jurisdiction outside California, *see §§ 560.605 -560.606*.

[4] Discharge of Trustee

If a transfer is ordered under *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405*, the court may direct the manner of transfer and impose terms and conditions as may be just, including, but not limited to, a requirement for the substitution of a successor trustee in any pending litigation in California. The delivery of property in accordance with the order of the court is a full discharge of the trustee in relation to all property embraced in the order [*Prob. Code § 17405*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of JusticeEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.148

§ 560.148 Transfer of Trust From Foreign Jurisdiction

[1] In General

The place of administration of a trust that is, or a portion of which is, administered in a jurisdiction outside California, may be transferred to Californiaas provided in *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457*. The same procedure may be used to transfer some or all of the trust property in another jurisdiction to a trustee in California [*see Prob. Code §§ 17450(a), 17451(a)*; *see also Prob. Code § 82* (definition of trust)]. *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* does not prevent the transfer of the place of administration of a trust or of trust property to California by any other available means [*see Prob. Code § 17450(b)*]. Consequently, the procedure for transfer under *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* applies to trusts administered in foreign countries as well as those administered in other states [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 741 (1986)]. For a petition to transfer administration or property of a trust from a foreign jurisdiction to California, *see § 560.607*.

[2] Grounds for Transfer

The court may, in its discretion, grant the petition and issue an order accepting transfer of trust property or the place of administration of the trust to California and appoint a trustee to administer the trust in California, if, after hearing, all of the following appear to the court [*Prob. Code § 17455(a)*]:

- The transfer of the trust property to a trustee in California, or the transfer of the place of administration of the trust to California, will promote the best interests of the trust and those interested in it, taking into account the interest in the economical and convenient administration of the trust.

- The transfer will not violate the trust instrument.

- The trustee appointed by the court to administer the trust in California, and to whom the trust property is to be transferred, is qualified, willing, and able to administer the trust or trust property under the trust instrument.

- The proper court in the other jurisdiction has approved the transfer if approval is necessary under the law of the other jurisdiction.

[3] Venue to Transfer Trust

If the petition requests that a resident of California be appointed trustee, the petition must be filed in the court of the county where the proposed principal place of administration of the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17002* is located [*Prob. Code § 17452(a)*; *see § 560.144*].

If the petition requests that only a nonresident of California be appointed trustee, the petition must be filed in the court of the county where either (1) any beneficiary resides or (2) a substantial portion of the trust property to be transferred is located or will be located [*Prob. Code § 17452(b)*].

[4] Notice and Hearing of Transfer

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing to be mailed to each of the persons named in the petition at their respective addresses as stated in the petition [*Prob. Code § 17454(a)*]. Any person interested in the trust, as trustee, beneficiary, or otherwise, may appear and file written grounds in opposition to the petition [*Prob. Code § 17454(b)*; *see, e.g., Prob. Code §§ 15802* (notice to beneficiary of revocable trust), 1215 (manner of mailing), 1216 (personal delivery instead of mailing), 17203(c) (notice to Attorney General)].

[5] Orders Regarding Transfer

The court may make an order accepting the transfer of the place of administration of a trust from another jurisdiction to California or the transfer of some or all of the trust property in another jurisdiction to a trustee in California as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* [*Prob. Code § 17451(a)*].

Except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457*, proceedings under *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457* (judicial proceedings concerning trusts) [*Prob. Code § 17451(b)*].

If the court grants the petition under *Prob. Code § 17455(a)*, the court must require the trustee to give a bond, if necessary under the law of the other jurisdiction or of California, and may require bond as provided in *Prob. Code § 15602* [*Prob. Code § 17455(b)*; *see § 560.73*].

[6] Conditional Order Accepting Transfer

If appropriate to facilitate transfer of the trust property or the place of administration of a trust to California, the court may issue a conditional order appointing a trustee to administer the trust in California and indicating that transfer to California will be accepted if transfer is approved by the proper court of the other jurisdiction [*Prob. Code § 17456*]. Therefore, a California court can indicate its willingness to accept jurisdiction over a trust administered in another jurisdiction if the law of the other jurisdiction requires appointment of a trustee in the proposed new place of administration before approving transfer [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 745 (1986)].

[7] Administration of Transferred Trust

A trust transferred to California pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* must be administered in the same manner as a trust of that type created in California. This provision, however, does not affect the validity of a trust or the construction of the beneficial provisions of a trust transferred to California [*Prob. Code § 17457*; *see, e.g.,* Gov. Code § 12580 et

seq., Prob. Code § 15004 (charitable trusts)]. It should be noted that *Prob. Code § 17457* is not intended to provide choice of law rules. A trust that was subject to judicial supervision in another statewill not be subject to continuing court jurisdiction under *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17304* unless the trust instrument so provides and the court so determines in the order accepting transfer to California [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 745 (1986)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of JusticeEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating to Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.149-560.159

[Reserved]

§§ 560.149[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
I. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.160

§ 560.160 Governing Statutes

Liability of a trustee to third persons generally is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 18000-18005*. The personal liability of a trustee signing a negotiable instrument is governed by *Com. Code §§ 1201(b)(33)* and *3402(b)(2)*. Protection of a third person who transacts with a trustee is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 18100-18104*. Recordation of an affidavit of change of trustee when title to an interest in real property is affected by the change is governed by *Prob. Code §§ 18105-18108*. A trustee's standing to bring an action against a third person is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 369*. Recovery of costs by a trustee in a plenary action is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1026*.

The rights of a settlor's creditor against the property of a revocable trust are governed by *Prob. Code § 18200*. The settlor whose trust property is subject to the claims of creditors is entitled to all exemptions provided under *Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq.* (exemptions under the Enforcement of Judgments Law) [*Prob. Code § 18201*]. *Prob. Code § 15304* governs the subjection of trust property to claims by transferees and creditors when the settlor is the beneficiary. Enforcement of money judgments against a trust beneficiary's interest is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 695.030*, *699.720*, and *709.010*. Restrictions on voluntary and involuntary transfers of a benficiary's interest in a trust (spendthrift trusts) and exceptions to the restrictions are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

82 of 195 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
I. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.161-560.179

[Reserved]

§§ 560.161[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.180

§ 560.180 Personal Liability of Trustee to Third Persons

[1] Contract

A trustee is not personally liable on a contract properly entered into on or after July 1, 1987, in the trustee's fiduciary capacity in the course of administration of the trust, unless the trustee fails to reveal the trustee's representative capacity or identify the trust in the contract, except as otherwise provided in the contract or in *Prob. Code §§ 18000-18005* [*Prob. Code § 18000*].

The personal liability of a trustee on a contract entered into before July 1, 1987, is governed by prior law and not by *Prob. Code § 18000* [*Prob. Code § 18000(b)*]. Former law is the reverse of the law under *Prob. Code § 18000* [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 746 (1986)]. Under former law, a trustee is personally liable on a contract unless the contract expressly states that the trustee is not liable [*Goldwater v. Oltman (1930) 210 Cal. 408, 426, 292 P. 624]* . This is the rule even if the terms of the trust exempt the trustee from personal liability [*see Zimmer Constr. Co. v. White (1935) 8 Cal. App. 2d 672, 674, 47 P.2d 1087*].

[2] Obligations Arising From Ownership or Control of Property

A trustee is personally liable for obligations arising from ownership or control of trust property only if the trustee is personally at fault [*Prob. Code § 18001*]. A trustee incurs personal liability by either intentionally or negligently acting or failing to act [*Haskett v. The Villas at Desert Falls (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 864, 877-878, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888* ; *see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 747 (1986)].

[3] Torts

A trustee is personally liable for torts committed in the course of administration of the trust only if the trustee is personally at fault [*Prob. Code § 18002*]. A trustee incurs personal liability by committing a tort either intentionally or negligently [*Haskett v. The Villas at Desert Falls (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 864, 877-878, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888* ; *see*

Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 747 (1986)]. For discussion of general principles of negligence, see the Ch. 380, *Negligence*.

[4] Negotiable Instruments

A trustee who signs his or her own name to a negotiable instrument may incur personal liability on the instrument [*Com. Code § 1201(b)(33)* (representative includes trustee); *Com. Code § 3402(b)(2)* (liability of representative)]. If the form of the signature does not show unambiguously that the signature is made in a representative capacity, or if the trust (or other represented person) is not identified in the instrument, the trustee is liable on the instrument to a holder in due course that took the instrument without notice that the trustee was not intended to be liable on the instrument [*Com. Code § 3402(b)(2)*]. With respect to any other person, the trustee is liable on the instrument unless the trustee proves that the original parties did not intend the trustee to be liable on the instrument[*Com. Code § 3402(b)(2)*]. The trustee is not liable, however, for signing his or her name as drawer of a check that is payable from a trust account if the account is identified as a trust account on the check and if the trustee's signature is an authorized signature on the account [*Com. Code § 3402(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Commercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)Party LiabilitiesSignaturesContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstTortsIntentional TortsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDutyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.181

§ 560.181 Personal Liability of Dissenting Cotrustee

A cotrustee who does not join in exercising a power held by three or more cotrustees is not liable to third persons for the consequences of the exercise of the power [*Prob. Code § 18003(a)*].

A dissenting cotrustee who joins in an action at the direction of the majority cotrustees is not liable to third persons for the action if the dissenting cotrustee expresses the dissent in writing to any other cotrustee at or before the time the action is taken [*Prob. Code § 18003(b)*].

Prob. Code § 18003 does not excuse a cotrustee from liability for failure to discharge the cotrustee's duties as a trustee [*Prob. Code § 18003(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple Trustees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.182

§ 560.182 Liability of Trust; Naming Trustee as Defendant in Representative Capacity

The trust is liable for authorized actions of the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 18004*]. A claim based on a contract entered into by a trustee in the trustee's representative capacity, on an obligation arising from ownership or control of trust property, or on a tort committed in the course of administration of the trust may be asserted against the trust by proceeding against the trustee in the trustee's representative capacity, whether or not the trustee is personally liable on the claim [*Prob. Code § 18004*]. However, third parties may proceed against the trustee's personal assets only if the trustee is personally liable on the claim [*Haskett v. The Villas at Desert Falls (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 864, 880, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesTrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.183

§ 560.183 Determining Liability of Trustee Versus Liability of Estate

The question of liability between the trust estate and the trustee personally may be determined in a proceeding under *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 18005*]. Under *Prob. Code § 18005*, ultimate assessment of liability between a trustee and the estate need not be determined before the third person's claim can be satisfied. It is permissible, and possibly preferable, for judgment to be entered against the trust without determining the trustee's ultimate liability until later. If judgment is entered against the trustee individually, the trustee's right to reimbursement may be settled informally with the beneficiaries or in a separate proceeding in the probate court [*see Prob. Code § 15684* (indemnity)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.184

§ 560.184 Actions Involving Third Persons

[1] Concurrent Jurisdiction of Probate Court

The superior court that has jurisdiction over the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457* has concurrent jurisdiction of actions and proceedings by or against creditors or debtors of trusts, and other actions and proceedings involving trustees and third persons [*Prob. Code § 17000(b)*]. Moreover, in proceedings commenced pursuant to the Trust Law, the court is a court of general jurisdiction and has all the powers of the superior court [*Prob. Code § 17001*]. *Prob. Code § 17001* rejects and supersedes the holding in *Copley v. Copley (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 97, 104-109, 145 Cal. Rptr. 437* , which confined probate court power to *in rem* jurisdiction over the trust, thereby precluding jurisdiction over third parties, regardless whether the issues concerned the affairs of the trust [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 718 (1986); for discussion of jurisdiction and other procedural matters, see *§ 560.130* et seq.].

However, a third party does not have standing to file a petition under the Trust Law, and therefore, the manner in which third-party matters might be brought before a court that has jurisdiction over petition proceedings under *Prob. Code § 17200* is unclear [*see Prob. Code §§ 15800* (standing of person having power to revoke), 17200 (standing generally of trustee and beneficiary); *see also Estate of Bowles (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 684, 695, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 122* (court had concurrent jurisdiction over civil complaint as it was related to beneficiary's petition under *Prob. Code § 17000*)]. It is possible that a petitioner, for example, a trustee or beneficiary, may file papers in the nature of a civil interpleader on the theory that adjudication of third-party issues would avoid multiplicity of litigation [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 386(a)* and Ch. 314, *Interpleader*]. It is further feasible that a third party having an interest regarding the internal affairs of the trust or a claim against the trustee, may file papers in a pending petition proceeding, requesting the court to determine the appropriate matters. In any case, counsel should contact the local court for preferred procedure and guidance in this area.

[2] Third Person's Plenary Action Regarding Trust or Trustee

One method by which a third person may obtain adjudication of an action involving a trust or a trustee is by filing a plenary action under the relevant provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10* (complaint)]. The action must name the trustee as defendant. An action naming the trust itself as the defendant is demurrable, because an ordinary express trust is not an entity separate from its trustees [*Lazar v. Estate of Lazar (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 554, 557 25 Cal. Rptr. 354* (allowing amendment of the complaint naming decedent's estate as defendant); *see Prob. Code § 18004* (claims against trust asserted by suing trustee in trustee's representative capacity)].

A third person who obtains a money judgment against a beneficiary may petition the probate court for enforcement against the trust property [*see* Code Civ.Proc. § 709.010; *see also § 560.220[3]*].

When the trustee is sued in the trustee's representative capacity on a claim for the payment of money or for the recovery of personal property, the county that has jurisdiction of the trust estate is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*]. For discussion of general venue provisions that apply under other circumstances, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

For discussion of subject matter jurisdiction generally, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter* . For complaint forms that may be adapted for use against a trust and/or its trustee, see the articles relating to the underlying cause of action, such as Ch. 140, *Contracts*, Ch. 380, *Negligence*, or Ch. 421, *Premises Liability*.

[3] Trustee's Plenary Action Against Third Person

The trustee is the real party in interest for purposes of bringing a claim on the trust's behalf [*O'Flaherty v. Belgum (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 1044, 1062, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 286]* . The trustee may bring suit on these claims without joining as parties the beneficiaries of the trust [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 369(a)(2)*]. This general rule of standing, however, is subject to exceptions.

For example, the beneficiaries of a trust have standing to bring a claim of misfeasance by the trustee and third parties who participated in or benefited from the trustee's breach of trust. The action may be filed against the trustee alone, the third parties alone, or both the trustee and the third parties [*Harnedy v. Whitty (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1339, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 798]* . A beneficiary lacks standing to sue only if the beneficiary is not asserting misfeasance or breach of trust by the trustee, but is, in effect, attempting to step into the trustee's shoes and enforce the trust agreement directly [*Harnedy v. Whitty (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1342, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 798]* .

Individuals who are both trustees and beneficiaries of a trust may sue in their own names without mentioning the trust [*Hassoldt v. Patrick Media Group, Inc. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 153, 170-171, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 662]* .

Although a trustee generally is the proper party to bring an action to protect the trust, the trustee cannot appear in pro per in that action, but may only appear through counsel [*Hansen v. Hansen (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 618, 621-622, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 688]* .

A successor trustee has standing to assert a professional negligence claim against attorneys retained by a prior trustee to provide tax assistance for the benefit of the trust [*Borissoff v. Taylor & Faust (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 523, 529-535, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 735, 93 P.3d 337]* .

[4] Beneficiary's Remedies for Acts of Third Person

Because beneficiaries have no legal title to the trust assets, they are not the real parties in interest, and in the usual case they may not sue third parties in the name of the trust [*Saks v. Daimon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 427, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869]* . This is not the case, however, if the trustee wrongfully refuses to bring an action against a third person. Under those circumstances, the beneficiary may have a right of action, but only if the beneficiary proves that the

trustee should have brought suit against the third party but unreasonably or negligently failed to do so [*Pillsbury v. Karmgard (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 743, 756-758, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 491]* . When a beneficiary sues a third party under these circumstances, both the third party and the trustee must be named as defendants [*Pillsbury v. Karmgard (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 743, 756-758* ; *Saks v. Daimon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 427-428, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* ; *Triplett v. Williams (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 135, 137-138, 74 Cal. Rptr. 594]* .

The beneficiary also may bring an action against a third party when the action is for breach of trust and the third party participated with the trustee in the breach. In these circumstances, both the trustee and the third party should be named as defendants in the action [*Pierce v. Lyman (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1098-1106, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 236* ; *Saks v. Daimon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 428, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869* ; *City of Atascadero v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 445, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329]* . However, a trust beneficiary was held to have standing to bring an action against attorneys who actively participated in the trustee's breach of trust even though the then-deceased trustee's estate was not also named as a defendant in the action. It was enough to allege that the successor cotrustee had controlled and directed the trustee to make improper investments on behalf of the trust, and that the attorneys had actively participated in the breaches of trust [*Wolf v. Mitchell, Silverberg & Knupp (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 1030, 1038-1040, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 792]* . In addition, a third party must be shown to have knowledge of the unauthorized nature of the trustee's actions to be liable for breach of trust [*Vournas v. Fidelity Nat'l Title Ins. Co. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 668, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 490* ; *see Prob. Code §§ 18100, 18101*].

A trust beneficiary has standing to sue a fellow beneficiary, under either a third-party participant theory or a constructive trustee theory, despite appointment of a successor trustee, if the fellow beneficiary aided the trustee in transferring property out of the trust in breach of the trustee's duties [*King v. Johnston (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1488, 1502, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 269]* .

Before commencing any suit against a third party, the beneficiary should carefully consider the effect that the Probate Code rules defining the rights, duties, and powers of beneficiaries and trustees could have on the suit [*Saks v. Daimon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 428, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869]* . *Prob. Code § 16401*, for example, provides that the trustee generally is not liable to beneficiaries for the acts or omissions of agents [*Prob. Code § 16401(a)*]. However, the trustee may be liable for an agent's acts or omissions in specified circumstances. For example, the trustee may be liable if the trustee directs the agent's acts, if the trustee delegates to the agent authority that the trustee is under a duty not to delegate, if the trustee does not use reasonable prudence in the selection or retention of the agent, if the trustee does not periodically review the agent's overall performance and compliance with the terms of the delegation, ifthe trustee conceals the agent's acts, or if the trustee knows of a wrongful act or omission by the agent and does not take reasonable steps to compel the agent to redress the wrong [*Prob. Code § 16401(b)*]. Further, the Probate Code provides remedies for a trustee's breach of trust [*see Prob. Code §§ 16420, 16421*]. To the extent that the Probate Code provides remedies for the actions of a trustee or an agent of the trustee, the Probate Code remedies must be followed, and civil suits are not appropriate [*see Saks v. Damon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 428-430, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869]* . For discussion of the liability of trustees for acts of agents, see *§ 560.78*.

[5] Double Damages for Wrongfully Taking, Concealing, or Disposing of Trust Property

A person who, in bad faith, has wrongfully taken, concealed, or disposed of property in or belonging to the trust is liable for twice the value of the property. Damages may be recovered in an action by the trustee for the benefit of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16249(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral JurisdictionCivil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesTrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust

LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.185

§ 560.185 Recovery of Costs

In any action prosecuted or defended by a trustee of an express trust, or by a person expressly authorized by statute, costs may be recovered as in an action by or against a person prosecuting or defending in the person's own right. However, such costs must, by the judgment, be made chargeable only on the estate, fund, or party represented, unless the court directs the costs to be paid by the fiduciary personally for mismanagement or bad faith in the action or defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1026*; *see Rudnick v. Rudnick (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1335, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493* (court had equitable power to charge reasonable and necessary fees incurred by trustee in opposing unfounded proceeding brought by trust beneficiary against that beneficiary's share of trust estate); for discussion of costs, *see* Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
II. Actions Between Trustees and Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.186-560.199

[Reserved]

§§ 560.186[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.200

§ 560.200 Third Person Transacting With Trustee in Good Faith

With respect to a third person dealing with a trustee or assisting a trustee in the conduct of a transaction, if the third person acts in good faith and for a valuable consideration and without actual knowledge that the trustee is exceeding the trustee's powers or improperly exercising them [*Prob. Code § 18100*]:

- The third person is not bound to inquire whether the trustee has power to act or is properly exercising a power and may assume without inquiry the existence of a trust power and its proper exercise; and

- The third person is fully protected in dealing with or assisting the trustee, just as if the trustee has and is properly exercising the power the trustee purports to exercise.

The protection afforded by *Prob. Code § 18100* is limited by *Com. Code § 3307* in the case of persons taking negotiable instruments from fiduciaries, which includes trustees. *Com. Code § 3307*, which is discussed in Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* , and is the basis for a complaint form in Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* [*see* Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* , *see § 560.650*], specifies certain actions, such as taking an instrument in payment of a debt the taker knows to be the personal debt of the fiduciary, that impart notice of breach of fiduciary duty [*see Com. Code § 3307(b)(2)(A)*].

A third person who acts in good faith is not bound to ensure the proper application of trust property paid or delivered to the trustee [*Prob. Code § 18101*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersSalesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona

Fide Purchasers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.201

§ 560.201 Certification of Trust

A trustee may satisfy third persons who wish to deal with the trustee that the trustee has power to act in behalf of the trust by executing a certification of trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 18100.5*. Such a certification may be used to establish the existence and terms of the trust without the necessity of providing a copy of the trust instrument. A certification of trust may be issued on the trustees own initiative, or on request of any person with whom the trustee is dealing [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(a)*].

A certification issued pursuant to *Prob. Code § 18100.5* must be in the form of an acknowledged declaration signed by the trustee or, if there are co-trustees, by all of the acting co-trustees [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(c)*]. It may contain the following information [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(b)*]:

- The existence of the trust and date of execution of the trust instrument.
- The identity of the settlor or settlors and the currently acting trustee or trustees of the trust.
- The powers of the trustee.
- The revocability or irrevocability of the trust and the identity of any person holding any power to revoke the trust.
- When there are multiple trustees, the signature authority of the trustees, indicating whether all or less than all of the currently acting trustees are required to sign in order to exercise various powers of the trustee.
- The trust identification number, whether a social security number or an employer identification number.

- The manner in which title to trust assets should be taken.
- The legal description of any real property interest held in the trust.

The certification must contain a statement that the trust has not been revoked,modified, or amended in any way that would cause the representations contained in it to be incorrect. It may be recorded in the office of the county recorder in the county where all or a portion of the real property held in the trust is located [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(c)*].

A person whose interest is, or may be, affected by the certification of trust may require the trustee offering or recording the certification of trust to provide copies of excerpts from the original trust documents, any amendments to these documents, and any other documents that designate, evidence, or pertain to the succession of the trustee or confer on the trustee the power to act in the pending transaction, or both. The trustee need not, however, provide the dispositive provisions of the trust or the entire trust and amendments to the trust [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(e)*]. The certification of trust may, but is not required to, include excerpts from the original trust documents, any amendments to these documents, and any other documents that evidence or pertain to the succession of successor trustees. The certification of trust is not required to contain the dispositive provisions of the trust that set forth the distribution of the trust estate [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(d)*].

A certification of trust provides some protection to persons who deal with trustees. For example, a person who acts in reliance upon a certification of trust without actual knowledge that it contains incorrect representations cannot be held liable to any other person for doing so. Further, a person dealing with a trust is entitled to rely on the information contained in a certification of trust without the necessity of inquiring as to its truth or accuracy. Finally, any transaction (and any lien created by a transaction) entered into by a trustee and a person acting in reliance on a certification of trust will be enforceable against the trust assets [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(f)*].

Failure to demand a certification of trust under *Prob. Code § 18100.5* will not affect the protection provided by *Prob. Code § 18100* [*see* discussion in *§ 560.202*], and no inference as to whether a person has acted in good faith may be drawn from the failure to demand such a certification [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(g)*].

A certification of trust will provide no protection from liability if the person dealing with the trustee has actual knowledge that information contained in the certification is not correct. However, actual knowledge will not be inferred solely from the fact that a copy of all or part of the trust instrument is held by the person relying on the trust certification [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(f)*].

Except when requested by a beneficiary or in the context of litigation concerning the trust, any person who makes a demand for the trust documents, in addition to a certification of trust, to prove facts set forth in the certification acceptable to the third party is liable for damages including attorney's fees incurred as a result of the refusal to accept the certification of trust in place of the requested documents, if the court determines that the person acted in bad faith in requesting the documents [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(h)*].

Any person may record a certification of trust that relates to an interest in real property in the office of the county recorder in the county where all or a portion of the property is located. The recorded certification is a public record of the real property. A certification of trust need not be recorded in conjunction with the recordation of a transfer of title of real property involving a trust [*Prob. Code § 18100.5(i)*].

For a certification of trust that meets the requirements of *Prob. Code § 18100.5*, see California Wills and Trusts Forms, Div. VIII, MISC 17 (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersSalesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide Purchasers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.202

§ 560.202 Third Person Transacting With Former Trustee

If a third person acting in good faith and for a valuable consideration enters into a transaction with a former trustee without knowledge that the person is no longer a trustee, the third person is fully protected just as if the former trustee were still a trustee [*Prob. Code § 18102*]. *Prob. Code § 18102* is intended to restate former *Civ. Code § 2281* ("bona fide transaction" with former trustee binding on all parties) without substantive change, and was written to conform with the language of *Prob. Code § 18100* [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm'n Reports 749 (1986)].

A bona fide transaction is one in which the parties operate in good faith, honesty, openness, and sincerity, without deceit or fraud. Therefore, the statute makes binding any transaction entered into without fraud, bad faith, or collusion, between a discharged trustee and a purchaser without actual knowledge of the fact of discharge. Consequently, "bona fide transaction" within the meaning of the statute is not synonymous with "bona fide purchaser," and the parties to a bona fide transaction are not held to both actual and constructive notice, as is a bona fide purchaser [*Leach v. Home Savings & Loan Assn. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1295, 1301-1302* , 230 Cal. Rtpr. 553 (interpreting former *Civ. Code § 2281*; *now see Prob. Code § 18102*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersSalesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple Trustees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.203

§ 560.203 Reliance on Record Title to Real Property

If an express trust relating to real property is not contained or declared in the grant to the trustee, or in an instrument signed by the trustee and recorded in the same office with the grant to the trustee, the grant is deemed absolute in favor of a person dealing with the trustee in good faith and for a valuable consideration [*Prob. Code § 18103*; *see also Civ. Code § 1214* (priority recording of subsequent conveyance)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersSalesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide Purchasers

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.204

§ 560.204 Presumption Regarding Undisclosed Beneficiary

If an interest, lien, or encumbrance on real property is conveyed, created, or affected by an instrument in favor of a person in trust, but no beneficiary is indicated in the instrument, it is presumed that the person holds the interest, lien, or encumbrance absolutely and free of the trust. This is a presumption affecting the burden of proof. In an action or proceeding involving the interest, lien, or encumbrance instituted against the person, the person is deemed the only necessary representative of the undisclosed beneficiary, the original grantor or settlor, and anyone claiming under them. A judgment is binding on and conclusive against these persons as to all matters finally adjudicated in the judgment [*Prob. Code § 18104(a)*].

An instrument executed by the person holding an interest, lien, or encumbrance described in *Prob. Code § 18104(a)*, whether purporting to be the act of that person in his or her own right or in the capacity of a trustee, is presumed to affect the interest, lien, or encumbrance according to the tenor of the instrument. This is a presumption affecting the burden of proof. After the instrument is recorded in the county where the land affected by the instrument is located, the presumption is conclusive in favor of a person acting in good faith and for valuable consideration [*Prob. Code § 18104(b)*].

The presumption of holding the title free from the trust is rebuttable, not conclusive [*Hansen v. G & G Trucking Co. (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 481, 491-494, 46 Cal. Rptr. 186]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of Presumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.205

§ 560.205 Recordation of Affidavit of Change of Trustee

When title to an interest in real property is affected by a change of trustee, the successor trustee may execute and record in the county where the property is located an affidavit of change of trustee. The affidavit must include the legal description of the property, the name of the former trustee(s), and the name of the successor trustee(s). It may also include excerpts from the original trust documents, any amendments to these documents, and any other documents that evidence or pertain to the succession of the successor trustee(s) [*Prob. Code § 18105*]. The affidavit is subject to all statutory requirements for recorded documents [*Prob. Code § 18106(a)*].

The recorded affidavit must be indexed in the index of grantors and grantees. For purposes of the index entry, the person who has been succeeded as trustee is deemed the grantor [*Prob. Code § 18106(b)*]. The recorded affidavit is prima facie evidence of the change of trustee insofar as it identifies an interest in real property located in the county, title to which is affected by the change. This presumption is a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence [*Prob. Code § 18107*].

Any person whose interest is, or may be, affected by the recordation of an affidavit of change of trustee may require the successor trustee to provide copies of excerpts from the original trust documents, any amendments to these documents, and any other documents that evidence or pertain to the succession of the successor trustee(s). The entire trust, any amendments to the trust, or the dispositive provisions of the trust need not be provided [*Prob. Code § 18108*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & ResignationEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingTitle Registration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
III. Protection of Third Person Transacting With Trustee

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.206-560.219

[Reserved]

§§ 560.206[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.220

§ 560.220 Enforcement of Judgment Against Judgment Debtor's Interest in Trust

[1] Writ of Execution Not Available

The interest of a trust beneficiary is not subject to levy under a writ of execution [*Code Civ. Proc. § 699.720(a)(8)*]. For discussion of executions generally, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

[2] Extent of Liability

An interest in a trust is subject to enforcement of a money judgment to the extent provided by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 695.030(b)(1)*; *see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*; §§ 560.220[3]]. A trust that does not restrain transfer of a beneficiary's interest is subject in its entirety to satisfaction of a money judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 633-634 (1986)]. However, property of a judgment debtor that is not assignable or transferable is not subject to enforcement, except as otherwise provided by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 695.030(a)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* (restrictions on transfers)].

[3] Petition Proceedings

The judgment debtor's interest as a beneficiary of a trust is subject to enforcement of a money judgment only on petition under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* by a judgment creditor to a court having jurisdiction over administration of the trust under *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(b)*; for discussion of jurisdiction, *see § 560.130* et seq.]. The judgment debtor's interest in the trust may be applied to the satisfaction of the money judgment by such means that the court, in its discretion, determines are proper, including but not limited to imposition of a lien on or sale of the judgment debtor's interest, collection of the judgment debtor's interest, collection of trust income, and liquidation and transfer of trust property by the trustee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(b)*].

The definition of a trust for the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* is that of *Prob. Code § 82* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(a)*; *see § 560.17*].

Nothing in *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* affects the limitations on the enforcement of a money judgment against the judgment debtor's interest in a trust under *Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* (restrictions on transfers), and the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* are subject to the limitations of *Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.221

§ 560.221 Restrictions on Voluntary and Involuntary Transfer of Interest in Trust

[1] Spendthrift Trust

A spendthrift trust is one in which the settlor declares that the trust property is inalienable, and may not be reached by the creditors of the beneficiary [*DiMaria v. Bank of California (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 254, 258, 46 Cal. Rptr. 924]* . The validity of spendthrift trusts are recognized by the Trust Law [*see Prob. Code §§ 15300* (restrictions on transfer of income) and 15301 (restrictions on transfer of principal); *De Mille v. Ramsey (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 116, 126, 254 Cal. Rptr. 573* . If the trust instrument provides that a beneficiary's interest in income or principal is not subject to voluntary or involuntary transfer, it may not be transferred and is not subject to enforcement of a money judgment until paid to the beneficiary, except as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 15304* (settlor is beneficiary), 15305 (child or spousal support), 15305.5 (restitution judgments), 15306 (public support), 15306.5 (general creditors), and 15307 (excess of amount for education or support) [*Prob. Code §§ 15300, 15301*]. In addition to these exceptions, a creditor may also reach principal that has become due and payable to the beneficiary under the trust instrument by petitioning the court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* for an order that the trustee satisfy all or part of the money judgment out of that principal amount [*Prob. Code § 15301(b)*].

Once a beneficiary has received the trust property, the creditors may reach it and the beneficiary may dispose of it at will [*Kelly v. Kelly (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 356, 362, 79 P.2d 1059* ; *Estate of Schneider (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 710, 717, 296 P.2d 45 , appeal dismissed sub nom. Seibert v. Brownell 352 U.S. 938, 77 S. Ct. 263, 1 L. Ed. 2d 235]* .

A disclaimer or renunciation by a beneficiary of all or part of the beneficiary's interest under a trust is not considered a transfer under *Prob. Code § 15300* or *15301* [*Prob. Code § 15309*].

For discussion of spendthrift trusts of which the settlor is beneficiary, *see § 560.225[2]*.

[2] Trust for Education or Support of Beneficiary

If the trust instrument provides that the trustee must pay income or principal or both for the education or support of a beneficiary, the beneficiary's interest in income or principal or both under the trust, to the extent that either one or both is necessary for the education or support of the beneficiary, may not be transferred and is not subject to the enforcement of a money judgment until paid to the beneficiary, except as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 15304* (settlor is beneficiary), 15305 (child or spousal support), 15305.5 (restitution judgments), 15306 (public support), 15306.5 (general creditors), and 15307 (excess of amount for education or support) [*Prob. Code § 15302*].

Any amount to which the beneficiary is entitled under the trust instrument or that the trustee, in the exercise of discretion, has determined to pay to the beneficiary in excess of the amount that is or will be necessary for the education and support of the beneficiary may be applied to the satisfaction of a money judgment against the beneficiary. On the judgment creditor's petition under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*, the court may make an order directing the trustee to satisfy all or part of the judgment out of the beneficiary's interest in the trust. The order is proper notwithstanding a restraint on transfer of a beneficiary's interest in the trust under *Prob. Code § 15300* or *15301* [*Prob. Code § 15307*; § 560.220[3]]. Any order entered by a court under *Prob. Code § 15307* is subject to modification on petition of an interested person filed in the court where the order was made [*Prob. Code § 15308*].

Under the "station-in-life" rule, a creditor can reach surplus of income not required for the judgment debtor, taking into account the beneficiary's condition in life, health, and other circumstances, and the condition of a beneficiary's family, if any [*Canfield v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 1, 23, 87 P.2d 830]* . Relevant factors include the cost of housing, medical care, the manner in which the beneficiary has been reared, the beneficiary's health, and the health of any dependents [*Canfield v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 1, 24, 87 P.2d 830]* . However, a beneficiary's standard of living is not properly determined by the beneficiary's extravagance [*Howard v. Adams (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 253, 259, 105 P.2d 971]* .

For discussion of trusts for education or support of which the settlor is beneficiary, *see § 560.225[2]*.

[3] Trust Property Payable to Beneficiary at Trustee's Discretion

If the trust instrument provides that the trustee must pay to or for the benefit of a beneficiary so much of the income or principal or both as the trustee in the trustee's discretion sees fit to pay, a transferee or creditor of the beneficiary may not compel the trustee to pay any amount that may be paid only in the exercise of the trustee's discretion [*Prob. Code § 15303(a)*].

If the trustee has knowledge of the transfer of the beneficiary's interest or has been served with process in a proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* by a judgment creditor seeking to reach the beneficiary's interest, and the trustee pays to or for the benefit of the beneficiary any part of the income or principal that may be paid only in the exercise of the trustee's discretion, the trustee is liable to the transferee or creditor to the extent that the payment to or for the benefit of the beneficiary impairs the right of the transferee or creditor [*Prob. Code § 15303(b)*]. *Prob. Code § 15303(b)* does not apply if the beneficiary's interest in the trust is subject to a restraint on transfer that is valid under *Prob. Code § 15300* or *15301* (spendthrift trusts) [*Prob. Code § 15303(b)*].

Prob. Code § 15303 applies regardless whether or not the trust instrument provides a standard for the exercise of the trustee's discretion [*Prob. Code § 15303(c)*]. Nothing in *Prob. Code § 15303* limits any right the beneficiary may have to compel the trustee to pay to or for the benefit of the beneficiary all or part of the income or principal [*Prob. Code § 15303(d)*]. Consequently, the beneficiary, but not the transferee or creditor, can compel the trustee to make a payment pursuant to a standard set out in the trust instrument [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 628 (1986)]. For a form for use by a beneficiary to compel a trustee to invade the corpus of a discretionary trust, see *§ 560.551*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsExceptions to EnforceabilityEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsRequirementsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.222

§ 560.222 Rights of General Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

[1] Property Generally Subject to Enforcement

On a judgment creditor's petition under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*, the court may make an order directing the trustee to satisfy all or part of the judgment out of the payments to which the beneficiary is entitled under the trust instrument or that the trustee, in the exercise of the trustee's discretion, has determined or determines in the future to pay to the beneficiary. The order is proper notwithstanding a restraint on transfer of the beneficiary's interest in the trust under *Prob. Code § 15300* or *15301* (spendthrift trust) but is subject to the limitations of *Prob. Code § 15306.5* [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(a)*; § 560.220[3]].

[2] Percentage Limitations

An order under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* may not require that the trustee pay in satisfaction of the judgment either of the following:

- An amount exceeding 25 percent of the payment that otherwise would be made to, or for the benefit of, the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(b)*].

- Any amount that the court determines is necessary for the support of the beneficiary and all the persons the beneficiary is required to support [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(c)*].

Further, the aggregate of all orders for satisfaction of money judgments against the beneficiary's interest in the trust may not exceed 25 percent of the payment that otherwise would be made to or for the benefit of the beneficiary, subject to the provisions of *Prob. Code § 15306.5(d)* (child or spousal support) [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(f)*; *see § 560.223[1]*].

[3] Subordination to Child or Spousal Support Claims

An order for satisfaction of a support judgment under *Prob. Code § 15305* (child or spousal support) has priority over an order to satisfy a judgment of a general creditor under *Prob. Code § 15306.5*. Any amount ordered to be applied to the satisfaction of a judgment under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* must be reduced by the amount of an order for satisfaction of a support judgment under *Prob. Code § 15305*, regardless of whether the order for satisfaction of the support judgment was made before or after the order under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(d)*; *see § 560.223*].

[4] No Right to Affect Trustee Discretion

If the trust gives the trustee discretion over the payment of either principal or income of a trust, or both, nothing in *Prob. Code § 15306.5* affects or limits that discretion in any manner [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(e)*].

[5] Limitations on Liability and Duty of Trustee Regarding Creditor

The trustee has no duty to oppose a petition to satisfy a judgment under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* or to make any claim for exemption on behalf of the beneficiary. The trustee is not liable for any action taken, or omitted to be taken, in compliance with any court order made under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* [*Prob. Code § 15306.5(e)*].

[6] Modifiability of Order

Any order entered by a court under *Prob. Code § 15306.5* is subject to modification on petition of an interested person filed in the court where the order was made [*Prob. Code § 15308*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsExceptions to EnforceabilityEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.223

§ 560.223 Rights of Support Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

[1] Child or Spousal Support

Under *Prob. Code § 15305*, a claimant for delinquent child or spousal support may reach a beneficiary's interest in a trust [*Ventura County Dep't of Child Support Servs. v. Brown (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 144, 151, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489* (support claimants are preferred creditors and have rights unavailable to general creditors)].

If the beneficiary has the right under the trust to compel the trustee to payincome or principal or both to or for the benefit of the beneficiary, the court, to the extent that the court determines it is equitable and reasonable under the circumstances, may order the trustee to satisfy all or part of a support judgment out of all or part of those payments as they become due and payable, presently or in the future [*Prob. Code § 15305(b)*]. A support judgment is a money judgment for support of beneficiary's spouse, former spouse, or minor child [*Prob. Code § 15305(a)*].

Whether or not the beneficiary has the right under the trust to compel the trustee to pay income or principal or both to or for the benefit of the beneficiary, the court, to the extent that the court determines it is equitable and reasonable under the circumstances, may order the trustee to satisfy all or part of the support judgment out of all or part of future payments that the trustee, pursuant to the exercise of the trustee's discretion, determines to make to or for the benefit of the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15305(c)*].

Prob. Code § 15305 applies to a support judgment notwithstanding any provision in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15305(d)*]. Thus, a minor's right to support is not defeated by a spendthrift provision in a trust instrument [*Ventura County Dep't of Child Support Servs. v. Brown (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 144, 152, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489* (legislative history behind *Prob. Code § 15305* establishes that support creditor may reach beneficiary's interest in spendthrift trust)].

A court may order a trustee to satisfy a beneficiary's past due and ongoing child support obligations directly from the

trust [*Ventura County Dep't of Child Support Servs. v. Brown (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 144, 155, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489]* .

To obtain relief under *Prob. Code § 15305*, a judgment creditor must file a petition with the court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 630 (1986); *see also § 560.220[3]*].

Any order entered by a court under *Prob. Code § 15305* is subject to modification on petition of an interested person filed in the court where the order was made [*Prob. Code § 15308*].

[2] Public Support

If the beneficiary is liable under a California statute for reimbursement to California or a local public entity for public support furnished to the beneficiary or the beneficiary's spouse or minor child, on petition to the court under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* by the appropriate entity or official, the court may subject the trust property to satisfaction of that claim under certain circumstances, notwithstanding any provision in the trust instrument [*see Prob. Code § 15306*]. If the beneficiary is also the settlor (or the settlor's spouse or minor child), the court may order reimbursement without regard to whether the trustee has then exercised or may thereafter exercise its discretion in the beneficiary's favor [*Prob. Code § 15306(a)(3)*].

Any order entered by a court under *Prob. Code § 15306* is subject to modification on petition of an interested person filed in the court where the order was made [*see Prob. Code § 15308*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsExceptions to EnforceabilityEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewFamily LawChild SupportObligationsEnforcementAttachmentsFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportSpousal SupportEnforcementGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.224

§ 560.224 Rights of Restitution Judgment Creditors Regarding Transfer Restrictions

If the beneficiary has the right under the trust to compel the trustee to pay income or principal or both to or for the benefit of the beneficiary, the court to the extent that the court determines it is equitable and reasonable under the circumstances, may order the trustee to satisfy all or part of a restitution judgment out of all or part of those payments as they become due and payable, presently or in the future [*Prob. Code § 15305.5(b)*]. The term "restitution judgment" means a judgment awarding restitution for the commission of a felony or a money judgment for damages incurred as a result of conduct for which the defendant was convicted of a felony [*Prob. Code § 15305.5(a)*].

Whether or not the beneficiary has the right under the trust to compel the trustee to pay income or principal or both to or for the benefit of the beneficiary, the court, to the extent that it determines it is equitable and reasonable under the circumstances, may order the trustee to satisfy all or part of the restitution judgment out of all or part of future payments that the trustee, pursuant to the exercise of the trustee's discretion, determines to make to or for the benefit of the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15305.5(c)*; *see Chatard v. Oveross (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1098, 1114, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 883* (surcharge order upheld notwithstanding existence of spendthrift provision, when trust beneficiary was also trustee and committed a breach causing fiduciary harm to trust); *see also Young v. McCoy (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1078, 1087* ; *54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 847* (trustee reasonably exercised discretion in refusing payment of trust assets to judgment creditor when there is no abuse of trustee's discretion)].

Prob. Code § 15303.5 applies to a restitution judgment notwithstanding any provision in the trust instrument [Prob. Code § 15303.3(d)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.225

§ 560.225 Claims Against Settlor

[1] Revocable Trust

If the settlor retains the power to revoke the trust in whole or in part, the trust property is subject to the claims of creditors of the settlor to the extent of the power of revocation during the lifetime of the settlor [*Prob. Code § 18200*].

Under former law, on the death of a settlor who had retained the power to revoke the trust in whole or in part, the property that was subject to the power of revocation at the time of the settlor's death was subject to the claims of creditors of the decedent settlor's estate and to the expenses of administration of the estate to the extent that the decedent settlor's estate was inadequate to satisfy those claims and expenses [*see* former *Prob. Code § 18201*].

The former law has been replaced with provisions governing the payment of claims, debts, and expenses from the revocable trust of a deceased settlor [*see Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.*]. For discussion and forms relating to these provisions, see *§ 560.240* et seq.

[2] Settlor as Beneficiary

If the settlor is a beneficiary of a trust created by the settlor and the settlor's interest is subject to a provision restraining the voluntary or involuntary transfer of the settlor's interest, the restraint is invalid against transferees or creditors of the settlor. The invalidity of the restraint on transfer does not affect the validity of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15304(a)*]. Consequently, a person cannot create a spendthrift trust for his or her own benefit as a device to shield property from creditors [*Ventura County Dep't of Child Support Servs. v. Brown (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 144, 156, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 489]* . However, *Code Prob. Code § 15304* does not affect the protection of certain pension trusts under *Civ. Proc. § 704.115* [*see Prob. Code § 82(c)* (definition of trust excludes pensions)].

If the settlor is the beneficiary of a trust created by the settlor and the trust instrument provides that the trustee must pay income or principal or both for the education or support of the beneficiary, or gives the trustee discretion to determine

the amount of income or principal or both to be paid to or for the benefit of the settlor, a transferee or creditor of the settlor may reach the maximum amount that the trustee could pay to or for the benefit of the settlor under the trust instrument, not exceeding the amount of the settlor's proportionate contribution to the trust [*Prob. Code § 15304(b)*].

A settlor who is a beneficiary of a revocable trust has the power, under the doctrine of equitable conversion, to convey property to which the trust holds title and over which the beneficiary has complete control [*Walgren v. Dolan (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 572, 576-579, 276 Cal. Rptr. 554]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons
IV. Rights of Third Party Creditors

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.226-560.239

[Reserved]

§§ 560.226[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.240

§ 560.240 Governing Statutes

Prob. Code § 19000 et seq. governs the payment of claims, debts, and expenses from the revocable trust of a deceased settlor who dies on or after January 1, 1992. For settlors who died prior to that date, the applicable law in effect before January 1, 1992, applies [*Prob. Code 19012*; *see* former *Prob. Code § 18201* (predecessor to *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.241

§ 560.241 Payment of Claims From Trust Authorized

[1] In General

On the death of a settlor of a trust, property of the settlor that was subject to the power of revocation at the time of his or her death is subject both to claims of creditors of the estate and to expenses of administration of the estate, to the extent that the estate is inadequate to satisfy those claims and expenses [*Prob. Code § 19001(a)*; former *Prob. Code § 18201*; *see also Prob. Code §§ 18200, 19000(d)* ("trust" defined)].

Judgment creditors of a decedent's estate are not required to file suit against trustees of the decedent's revocable inter vivos trust in order for the judgment to be satisfied from trust assets [*Dobler v. Arluk Med. Ctr. Indus. Group (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 530, 539-540, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478]* . Instead, any judgment creditor that seeks to satisfy its money judgment with property of the decedent must file a timely claim [*see § 560.246[1][a]*]. The judgment then is paid to the judgment creditor in the ordinary course of administration of the estate or trust [*Embree v. Embree (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 487, 493-494, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782]* . If the estate and trust are insufficient to satisfy the judgment, a judgment creditor that has preserved its claim by filing a timely claim may pursue trust property distributed to the beneficiaries of the decedent's revocable living trust to the same extent that the property would have been available to satisfy the judgment during the settlor's lifetime [*Embree v. Embree (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 487, 494, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782]* . A failure to file a timely claim bars the creditor from recovering against the property of the decedent whether or not the property is distributed [*Prob. Code § 19004*; *Embree v. Embree (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 487, 494, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782]* .

A trustee does not have a duty to withhold otherwise authorized distributions to beneficiaries to preserve trust assets for the benefit of creditors who have pending against the estate [*Arluk Med. Ctr. Indus. Group v. Dobler (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1328, 1335, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 194]* . The only duty the trustee owes to creditors is to refrain from affirmative misconduct that defeats the creditors' reasonable expectation for a recovery from trust assets [*Arluk Med. Ctr. Indus. Group v. Dobler (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1328, 1335, 1341, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 194]* . For example, a creditor may seek to hold a trustee personally liable for improperly distributing assets to a trust beneficiary knowing that

an order in the creditor's favor has been entered and judgment is imminent, and the assets will be expended or otherwise unavailable to the creditor once distributed [*Arluk Med. Ctr. Indus. Group v. Dobler (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 1324, 1340, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 194]* .

By appropriate direction in the trust instrument, the settlor may direct the priority of sources of payment of debts among subtrusts or other gifts establishedby the trust at the deceased settlor's death. No direction by the settlor, however, may alter the priority of payment of the debts of the decedent and decedent's estate as set forth in *Prob. Code § 11420*, which is applied to a trust as it is applied to a probate estate [*Prob. Code § 19001(b)*; *see also Prob. Code § 19000(f)* ("debts" defined)]. For further discussion of the priority for payment of claims against a decedent's estate, see Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate* .

Prob. Code § 19000 et seq. does not permit or require disclosure of the existence of the trust or the contents of any of its provisions to any creditor or beneficiary except as that creditor or beneficiary may otherwise be entitled to that information [*Prob. Code § 19009*].

[2] "Claim" Defined

The term "claim" means a demand for payment, whether due, not due, accrued or not accrued, or contingent, and whether liquidated or unliquidated, for any of the following [*Prob. Code § 19000(a)*]:

- Liability of the deceased settlor, whether arising in contract, tort, or otherwise.

- Liability for taxes incurred before the deceased settlor's death, whether assessed before or after death, other than property taxes and assessments secured by real property liens.

- Liability for the deceased settlor's funeral expenses.

The term "claim" does not include a dispute regarding title to specific property alleged to be included in the trust estate [*Prob. Code § 19000(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.242

§ 560.242 Liability of Deceased Settlor's Surviving Spouse

If proceedings are commenced under *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* for the settlement of claims against the trust and the time for filing claims has commenced, any action on the liability of the surviving spouse under *Prob. Code § 13550 et seq.* is barred to the same extent as provided for other claims against the trust, except as to the following [*Prob. Code § 19330*]:

- Any creditor who commences judicial proceedings to enforce a claim and serves the surviving spouse with the complaint prior to the expiration of the time for filing claims.

- Any creditor who has or who secures the surviving spouse's acknowledgment in writing of the liability of the surviving spouse for the claim.

- Any creditor who files a timely claim in the proceedings for the administration of the estate of the deceased spouse.

For discussion of allocation of debts between the trust and the deceased settlor's surviving spouse, see *§ 560.256*. For discussion of the personal liability of the surviving spouse for debts of the deceased, see Ch. 441, *Probate: Disposition Without Administration* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.243

§ 560.243 Liability of Distributees

[1] When Trustee Does Not Give Notice to Creditors

Subject to the statute of limitations on actions that survive the defendant's death [*Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2*], if there is no proceeding to administer the estate of the deceased settlor and if the trustee does not file a proposed notice to creditors and publish notice to creditors, a beneficiary of the trust to whom payment, delivery, or transfer of the deceased settlor's property is made pursuant to the terms of the trust is personally liable for the unsecured claims of the creditors of the deceased settlor's estate [*Prob. Code § 19400*]. This liability does not arise if trust assets are sufficient to cover the claim [*see Prob. Code § 19402(b)*].

If the creditor fails to bring a claim against the beneficiaries of the trust within one year of the decedent's death, as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2*, property distributed to the beneficiaries under the terms of the trust is protected and cannot be used to satisfy the creditor's claim [*Embree v. Embree (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 487, 494-497, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782* (property distributed to trust beneficiaries could not be used to satisfy judgment against decedent when judgment creditor did not file claim until 19 months after decedent's death)].

[2] When Trustee Gives Notice to Creditors

If the trustee filed a proposed notice to creditors and published notice to creditors, and if the identity of the creditor was known to, or was reasonably ascertainable by, the trustee within four months of the first publication of notice, a person to whom property is distributed is personally liable for the claim of the creditor, without a claim first having been filed, if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Prob. Code § 19401*]:

- The creditor's claim was not merely conjectural;

- Notice to the creditor was not given to the creditor under *Prob. Code § 19050 et seq.* [*see § 560.245[7]*] and neither the creditor nor the attorney representing the creditor in the matter had actual knowledge of the administration of the trust estate sooner than one year after the date of first publication

of notice; and

- The statute of limitations applicable to the claim under *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* has not expired at the time of commencement of the action. That section requires any action on the claim to be commenced within one year of the decedent's death.

Any property distributed by the trustee under the terms of the trust after 120 days from the later of the time a notice of rejection is given or the claim is due, and before a notice of pendency of action or referral or arbitration is filed and given (excluding any time during which there is a vacancy in the office of trustee), is not subject to claims. The distributee is not liable on account of the distribution [*Prob. Code § 19255(d)*].

In any event, liability does not arise if trust assets are sufficient to cover the claim [*see Prob. Code § 19402(b)*].

[3] Defenses

In any action under *Prob. Code § 19400 et seq.*, subject to the statute of limitations on causes of action by and against persons who have died [*Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2*], the distributee may assert any defenses, cross complaints, or setoffs that would have been available to the deceased settlor if the settlor had not died [*Prob. Code § 19402(a)*].

[4] Extent of Liability

A distributee is personally liable only to the extent the claim of the creditor cannot be satisfied out of the trust estate of the deceased settlor. Further, a distributee's personal liability is limited to a pro rata portion of the claim of the creditor, based on the proportion that the value of the property distributed to the person out of the trust estate bears to the total value of all property distributed to all persons out of the trust estate. The distributee's personal liability for all claims of all creditors may not exceed the value of the property distributed to the person out of the trust estate. The term "the value of the property" means the fair market value of the property on the date of its distribution, less the amount of any liens and encumbrances on the property at that time [*Prob. Code § 19402(b)*].

The provisions governing liability of distributees do not affect the rights of a purchaser or encumbrancer of property in good faith and for value from a distributee who is personally liable [*Prob. Code § 19403*].

[5] No Constructive Trust

A distributee cannot be held liable to the creditors on a constructive trust theory merely because he or she received a distribution from the trust [*Valentine v. Read (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 787, 795, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836]* . Under the constructive trust theory, one who wrongfully acquires the property of another holds it as an involuntary trustee for the benefit of the person to whom it rightfully belongs [*see Civ. Code §§ 2223* (one who wrongfully detains thing is involuntary trustee for benefit of owner), 2224 (one who gains thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, violation of trust, or other wrongful act is involuntary trustee for person who would otherwise have had it)]. However, a person who receives a distribution from a trust does not do so wrongfully, even if the distribution is made during litigation and to make it more difficult to collect a potential judgment. The Probate Code clearly contemplates that distributions will be made from trusts, and it provides the exclusive remedy of the creditors when distributions are made [*Valentine v. Read (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 787, 795, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesNotice to CreditorsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties &

PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.244

§ 560.244 Liability Between Trusts Established by Deceased Settlor

Prob. Code § 19000 et seq. does not determine the liability of any trust established by the deceased settlor as against any other trust established by that settlor, except to the extent that the trustee of the other trust must file, publish, and serve notice as specified in *Prob. Code § 19003* [*see § 560.245*] and thereafter seeks a determination of relative liability [*Prob. Code § 19007*; *see also Prob. Code § 19020 et seq.* (determination of liability)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.245

§ 560.245 Notice to Creditors

[1] Trustee Under No Duty to Initiate Notice Proceedings

Prob. Code § 19000 et seq. does not impose any duty on the trustee to initiate the notice proceeding set forth in *Prob. Code § 19003* [§ 560.245[5]], and the trustee is not liable for failure to initiate the proceeding [*Prob. Code § 19010*]. Further, the trustee may not be held personally liable to the creditors merely for making a distribution from the trust. If creditors of the deceased settlor are successful in prosecuting a claim against trust assets, a judgment may properly be rendered against the trustee *as trustee*; but there is no basis for rendering a judgment against the trustee personally [*Valentine v. Read (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 787, 793, 794, 796, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836]* .

[2] Effect of Filing Notice

If the trustee elects to file, publish, and serve notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 19003*, all claims against the trust must be filed in the manner and within the time provided in *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* Claims that are not filed in accordance with those provisions are barred from collection from trust assets [*Prob. Code § 19004(a), (b)*; *see Prob. Code § 19010*]. Further, the holder of a claim may not maintain an action on the claim against the trust unless the claim is first filed as provided by *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 19004(c)*]. For discussion of claim procedure, see *§ 560.246*.

If there is no proceeding to administer the estate of the deceased settlor (§ 560.245[4]) and if the trustee does not file a proposed notice to creditors and publish notice to creditors, the liability of the trust to any creditor of the deceased settlor is as otherwise provided by law [*Prob. Code § 19008*].

[3] Multiple Trusts

If the trustee files, publishes, and serves notice as provided in *Prob. Code § 19003*, the protection from creditors afforded that trustee and trust will also be afforded to any other trusts established by the deceased settlor and the trustees and beneficiaries of those trusts [*Prob. Code § 19006(a)*].

[4] Relationship to Decedent's Estate and Other Probate Proceedings

If the personal representative of the deceased settlor's estate has published notice under *Prob. Code § 8120* (notice of petition to administer decedent's estate) and has given notice of administration of the estate of the deceased settlor under *Prob. Code § 9050 et seq.* (notice to known creditor's of decedent), the protection from creditors afforded the personal representative of the deceased settlor's estate will be afforded to the trustee and to the beneficiaries of the trust [*Prob. Code § 19006(b)*]. For discussion of the notice and publication requirements of *Prob. Code §§ 8120, 9050*, see Ch. 442, *Probate: Initiating Probate Administration* .

If, following the filing and publication of the notice set forth in *Prob. Code § 19003*, a proceeding requiring publication of a notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 8120* is commenced [*see Prob. Code § 8003* (administration of decedent's estate requires notice under *Prob. Code § 8120*)], the trustee has a right of collection against the estate to recover the amount of any debts paid from trust assets that would otherwise have been satisfied by law or by direction in the deceased settlor's will or trust by the property subject to probate proceedings [*Prob. Code § 19006(c)*].

[5] Proposed Notice

[a] Time for Filing

At any time following the settlor's death, and during the time that there has been no filing of a petition to administer the estate of the deceased settlor in California of which the trustee has actual knowledge, the trustee may file with the court a proposed notice to creditors. After the court assigns a proceeding number to the proposed notice, the trustee must publish and serve the notice to creditors of the deceased settlor [*Prob. Code § 19003(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 19003(c)* (requirements of *Prob. Code § 19003(a)* do not affect notice or request to a public entity pursuant to *Prob. Code § 19200 et seq.*, discussed in *§ 560.250*); *Prob. Code §§ 19040 et seq., § 19050 et seq.* (publication and notice requirements, discussed in *§ 560.245[6]*)].

[b] Place of Filing

If the trustee elects to file a proposed notice [*see Prob. Code § 19010*; § 560.245[5]], the filing must be made with the superior court for the county where the deceased settlor resided at the time of death or, if none, in any county in which trust property was located at the time of the settlor's death or, if none, in the county that was the principal place of administration of the trust at the time of the settlor's death [*Prob. Code § 19003(b)*].

[6] Notice by Publication

[a] Requirements

If the trustee has elected to initiate notice proceedings [*see Prob. Code § 19010*], publication of notice must be for at least 15 days. Three publications in a newspaper published at least once a week, with at least five days intervening between the first and last publication dates, not including the first and last publication dates, are sufficient. Notice must be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the California city, county, or city and county where the deceased settlor resided at the time of death or, if none, in the California city, county, or city and county where trust property was located at the time of the settlor's death or, if none, in the California city, county, or city and county where the principal place of administration of the trust was located at the time of the settlor's death [*Prob. Code § 19040(a)*].

If there is no newspaper of general circulation published in the applicable city, county, or city and county, notice must be published in a newspaper of general circulation published in California nearest to the applicable city, county, or city and county seat, and that is circulated within the applicable city, county, or city and county. If there is no such newspaper, notice must be given in written or printed form, posted at three of the most public places within the community. The term "city" means a charter city as defined in *Gov. Code § 34101* or a general law city as defined in

Gov. Code § 34102 [*Prob. Code § 19040(a)*].

For a form of notice, *see § 560.650*.

[b] Good Faith Substantial Compliance Sufficient

To prevent a minor error in publication from invalidating what would otherwise be a proper proceeding, the Legislature has found and declared that notice published in a good faith attempt to comply with *Prob. Code § 19040* is sufficient to provide notice to creditors and establish jurisdiction if the court expressly finds that the notice was published in a newspaper of general circulation published within the city, county, or city and county and widely circulated within a true cross section of the community in which the deceased settlor resided or wherein the principal place of administration of the trust was located or the property was located, in substantial compliance with section 19040 [*Prob. Code § 19041*].

[c] Affidavit of Publication

An affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see* Code Civ. Proc.§ 2015.5] showing due publication of the notice must be filed with the clerk on completion of publication. The affidavit or declaration must contain copy of the notice and state the date of its first publication [*Prob. Code § 19040(c)*].

[7] Actual Notice

[a] Required for Known Creditors

If the trustee has elected to initiate notice proceedings [*see Prob. Code § 19010*] and has knowledge of a creditor of the deceased settlor, the trustee must give the creditor actual notice. A trustee has knowledge of a creditor of the deceased settlor when the trustee is aware that the creditor has demanded payment from the deceased settlor or the trust estate [*Prob. Code 19050*]. The trustee has no duty, however, to make a search for creditors of the deceased settlor [*see Prob. Code § 19053(d)*]. The actual notice requirement is in addition to the requirement of publication of notice under *Prob. Code § 19040* [*Prob. Code § 19050(b)*; for discussion of the publication requirement, *see § 560.245[6]*].

For a form for use in providing actual notice to creditors of the deceased settlor of a revocable trust, *see § 560.651*.

[b] Not Required for Creditor Who Filed Claim

The trustee need not give notice to a creditor, even though the trustee has knowledge of the creditor, if the creditor has filed a claim pursuant to *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* or the creditor has demanded payment and the trustee elects to treat the demand as a claim under *Prob. Code § 19154* [*Prob. Code § 19054*; for discussion of treating a demand as a claim, *see § 560.248*].

[c] Methods of Notice

Notice must be given as provided in *Prob. Code § 1215* for mailing of notices [*Prob. Code 19050*]. Alternatively, notice may be given by personal delivery because, under *Prob. Code § 1216*, personal delivery of a notice or other paper required or permitted to be mailed satisfies any statutory provision under the Probate Code, requiring or permitting the mailing of the notice or paper [*see Prob. Code 1216*]. For discussion of *Prob. Code § 1215* and other general provisions relating to notice under the Probate Code, see Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements* .

[d] Time for Giving Notice

Notice must be given before the expiration of the later of (1) four months after the first publication of notice under

Prob. Code § 19040, or *(2)* 30 days after the trustee first had knowledge of the creditor [*Prob. Code § 19051*].

[e] Extent of Trustee's Immunity for Providing or Failing to Provide Notice

If the trustee believes that notice to a particular creditor is or may be required and gives notice based on that belief, the trustee is not liable to any person for giving the notice, whether or not the notice was required [*Prob. Code § 19053(a)*].

If the trustee fails to give notice, the trustee is not liable to any person for that failure, unless a creditor establishes all of the following [*Prob. Code 19053(b)*; *see also Prob. Code § 19010* (no duty to initiate notice proceeding, discussed under)]:

- The failure was in bad faith [*Prob. Code § 19053(b)(1)*];

- The creditors had actual knowledge of the proceedings under *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* sooner than one year after publication of notice to creditors and payment would have been made on the creditor's claim if the claim had been properly filed [*Prob. Code § 19053(b)(2)*];

- Within 16 months after the first publication of notice, the creditor filed a petition requesting that the court in which the proceedings under *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* were initiated make an order determining the liability of the trustee under this subdivision [*Prob. Code § 19053(b)(3)(A)*]; and

- Within 16 months after the first publication of notice, and at least 30 days before the hearing on the petition, the creditor caused notice of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on the trustee in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 19053(b)(3)(B)*].

Probate Code § 19053 does not affect the liability of the trust estate, if any, for the claim of a creditor, and the trustee is not liable to the extent the claim is paid out of the trust estate [*Prob. Code § 19053(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesNotice to CreditorsEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesTime LimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.246

§ 560.246 Filing Claims

[1] Time Limitations

[a] Basic Time for Filing Claim

A creditor must file a claim before expiration of the later of four months after the first publication of notice to creditors under *Prob. Code § 19040* [§ 560.245[6]] or 60 days after the date actual notice is mailed or personally delivered to the creditor, if notice is given within the time provided in *Prob. Code § 19051(a)* or *(b)* [*Prob. Code § 19100(a)*]. A reference in another statute to the time for filing a claim means the four-month period after the first publication of notice to creditors, unless the provision or context requires otherwise [*Prob. Code § 19100(b)*].

[b] Effect of Vacancy in Office of Trustee

A vacancy in the office of the trustee that occurs before expiration of the time for filing a claim does not extend the time [*Prob. Code § 19101*]. Nevertheless, a claim that is filed before expiration of the time for filing the claim is timely even if acted on by the trustee or the court after expiration of the time for filing claims [*Prob. Code § 19102*].

[c] Statute of Limitations

A claim barred by the statute of limitations may not be allowed by the trustee. Nevertheless, the filing of a claim tolls the statute of limitations otherwise applicable to the claim until the trustee gives notice of allowance or rejection. Allowance or rejection of the claim further tolls the statute of limitations as to the part of the claim allowed until that portion of the claim is paid [*Prob. Code § 19253*; for discussion of allowance and rejection of claims by the trustee, *see § 560.253*].

[2] Filing of Late Claims

[a] When Late Claim Allowed

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 19103(b)* [*see below*], on a creditor's petition and after giving notice of hearing as set forth in *Prob. Code § 19024* (*see* discussion in *§ 560.252[2]*), the court may allow a claim to be filed after expiration of the time limitation if either [*Prob. Code § 19103(a)*]:

- The trustee failed to send proper and timely notice to the creditor and the petition is filed within 60 days after the creditor has actual knowledge of the administration of the trust; or

- The creditor did not have knowledge of the facts giving rise to the existence of the claim more than 30 days prior to the time for filing a claim, and the petition is filed within 60 days after the creditor has actual knowledge of both the existence of facts reasonably giving rise to the existence of a claim, and the administration of the trust.

The court, however, will not allow a late claim to be filed more than one year after the date of first publication of notice to creditors under *Prob. Code § 19040*, and *Prob. Code § 19103* does not authorize the allowance or approval of a claim barred by, or extend the time provided in, *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2* (statute of limitations on cause of action against a person who dies) [*Prob. Code § 19103(b)*].

The court may condition a late claim on terms that are just and equitable, and may deny the claimant's petition if a distribution to trust beneficiaries or payment to general creditors has been made and it appears that filing or establishment of the claim would cause or tend to cause unequal treatment among beneficiaries or creditors [*Prob. Code § 19103(c)*].

[b] Property and Payments Not Subject to Late Claim

Regardless of whether a late claim is later established in whole or in part, property distributed under the terms of the trust subsequent to an order settling claims [*see Prob. Code § 19020*] and payments otherwise properly made before a late claim is filed are not subject to the late claim. Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 19400 et seq.* [*see § 560.243*], and subject to *Prob. Code § 19053* (trustee's immunity; § 560.245[7][e]], the trustee, distributee, or payee is not liable on account of the prior distribution or payment [*Prob. Code § 19103(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesTime LimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.247

§ 560.247 Procedure for Filing Claims

[1] In General

A claim may be filed by the creditor or a person acting on behalf of the creditor [*Prob. Code § 19150(a)*]. The claim must be filed with the court and a copy mailed to the trustee. Failure to mail a copy to the trustee does not invalidate a properly filed claim, but any loss that results from the failure must be borne by the claimant [*Prob. Code § 19150(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 19153* (Judicial Council authorized to adopt official claim form)]. For an illustration of the Judicial Council form of creditor's claim against the decedent's estate, see Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate* .

The claim must be supported by the affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury of the creditor or the person on behalf of the creditor stating all of the following [*Prob. Code § 19151*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (use of declaration in lieu of affidavit)]:

- The claim is a just claim;
- If the claim is due, the facts supporting the claim, the amount of the claim, and that all payments on and offsets to the claim have been credited;
- If the claim is not due or contingent or the amount is not yet ascertainable, the facts supporting the claim; and
- If the affidavit is made by a person other than the creditor, the reason it is not made by the creditor.

The trustee may require satisfactory vouchers or proof to be produced to support the claim. An original voucher may be withdrawn after a copy is provided. If a copy is provided, the copy shall be attached to the claim [*Prob. Code § 19151(b)*].

[2] Claim Based on Written Instrument

If a claim is based on a written instrument, either the original or a copy of the original with all endorsements must be attached to the claim. If a copy is attached, the original instrument must be exhibited to the trustee on demand unless it is lost or destroyed, in which case the fact that it is lost or destroyed must be stated in the claim [*Prob. Code § 19152(a)*].

If the claim or a part of the claim is secured by a mortgage, deed of trust, or other lien that is recorded in the office of the recorder of the county in which the property subject to the lien is located, it is sufficient to describe the mortgage, deed of trust, or lien and the recording reference for the instrument that created the mortgage, deed of trust, or other lien [*Prob. Code § 19152(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.248

§ 560.248 Trustee's Power to Waive Formal Defects in Claim

If a creditor makes a timely written demand for payment, the trustee may waive formal defects and elect to treat the demand as a claim that is properly filed and established by paying the amount demanded [*Prob. Code § 19154(a)*]. This power does not, however, limit application of the doctrines of waiver, estoppel, laches, or detrimental reliance or any other equitable principle [*Prob. Code § 19154(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.249

§ 560.249 Amendment and Revision of Claims

If a claim is timely filed, the creditor may later amend or revise the claim. The amendment or revision must be filed in the same manner as the claim [*Prob. Code § 19104(a)*].

An amendment or revision may not be made to increase the amount of a claim after the time for filing a claim has expired. An amendment or revision to specify the amount of a claim that, at the time of filing, was not due, was contingent, or was not yet ascertainable is not an "increase in the amount of the claim" [*Prob. Code § 19104(b)*].

A claim may not be amended or revised for any purpose after the earlier of the date the court makes an order approving settlement of the claim against the deceased settlor or one year after the date of the first publication of notice to creditors [*Prob. Code § 19104(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.250

§ 560.250 Claims by Public Entities

[1] In General

A claim by a public entity must generally be filed within the same time as any other claims against the trust [*see Prob. Code § 19200(a)*]. A claim not so filed is barred, including any lien imposed for the claim [*Prob. Code § 19200(a)*].

As used in the provisions governing claims against the decedent's trust by public entities, the term "public entity" has the meaning provided in *Gov. Code § 811.2*, and includes an officer authorized to act on behalf of the public entity. *Gov. Code § 811.2* defines "public entity" to include the state, the Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state [*see Gov. Code § 811.2*].

The provisions governing claims against the decedent's trust by public entities do not affect the order of priority of debts provided for under other provisions of law, and do not apply to liability for the restitution of amounts illegally acquired through the means of a fraudulent, false, or incorrect representation or a forged or unauthorized endorsement [*Prob. Code §§ 19204, 19205*].

[2] Claims Governed by Special Statutes

Notwithstanding any other statute, a claim of a public entity that arises under the statutes listed in *Prob. Code § 19201(b)* is barred only after written notice or request to the public entity and expiration of the period provided in the applicable section. If no written notice or request is made, the claim is enforceable by the remedies, and is barred at the time, otherwise provided in the law, act, or code [*Prob. Code § 19201(a)(2)*]. A comparable list of statutes is given in *Prob. Code § 9201(b)* (claims by public entities against decedent's estate) and is set out in Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate* .

The public entity may provide a form to be used for the written notice or request to the public entity. When appropriate, the form may require the decedent's social security number, if known [*Prob. Code § 19201(a)(1)*].

If the trustee knows or has reason to believe that the deceased settlor received health care under the Medi-Cal Act (*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14000 et seq.*) or the Waxman-Duffy Prepaid Health Plan Act (*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14200 et seq.*), or was the surviving spouse of a person who received health care, the trustee must give the Director of Health Services notice of the settlor's death in the manner provided in *Prob. Code § 215* [*Prob. Code § 19202(a)*; for discussion of notice under *Prob. Code § 215*, *see* Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate*]. Notice must also be given if the deceased settlor was the surviving spouse of a person who received health care under either of those acts [*Prob. Code § 9202*]. If a person who received that health care dies leaving a surviving spouse, no claim for reimbursement can be made against the person's estate [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14009.5(b)(2)(A)*]. When the surviving spouse dies, however, the State Department of Health Services is required to make a claim against the estate of the surviving spouse (or against any person who has obtained property from the surviving spouse by distribution or survival) for the amount paid for the medical assistance given to the deceased spouse, or the value of any of the deceased spouse's property received by the surviving spouse through distribution or survival, whichever is less [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14009.5(b)(2)(A)*]. The Probate Code gives the State Director of Health Services four months after the trustee has given the Director notice of the recipient's death to file a claim [*Prob. Code § 19202(b)*]. Notwithstanding the Probate Code provision, however, the Welfare & Institutions Code provides that any statute of limitations that purports to limit the ability to recover for medical assistance granted under these circumstances "shall not apply to any claim for reimbursement" [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14009.5(b)(2)(A)*].

[3] Liability of Distributees

If property in the trust is distributed before expiration of the time allowed a public entity to file a claim, the public entity has a claim against the distributees to the full extent of the public entity's claim or each distributee's share of the distributed property, as set forth in *Prob. Code § 19402* [*see § 560.250[3]*], whichever is less. The public entity's claim against distributees includes interest at a rate equal to that specified in *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19521*, from the date of distribution or the date of filing the claim by the public entity, whichever is later, plus other accruing costs as in the case of enforcement of a money judgment [*Prob. Code § 19203*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.251

§ 560.251 Payment, Rejection, or Settlement of Claims

At any time, the trustee may pay, reject, or contest any claim against the deceased settlor or settle any claim by compromise, arbitration, or otherwise [*see § 560.253*]. The trustee may also file a petition to settle any claim in the manner set forth in *Prob. Code § 19020 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 19005*; *see § 560.252*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.252

§ 560.252 Petition for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims Against Deceased Settlor

[1] In General

At any time after the filing and first publication of notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 19040 et seq.*, and after expiration of the time to file claims, a trustee or beneficiary may petition the court to approve either of the following [*Prob. Code § 19020*]:

- An allowance, compromise, or settlement of any claims that have not been rejected by the trustee under *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* for which trust property may be liable; or

- An allocation to two or more trusts that may be liable for the claims of any amounts due by reason of allowance, compromise, or settlement of any claims.

A proceeding to approve and settle a claim is commenced by the filing of a verified petition stating facts showing that the petition is authorized under *Prob. Code § 19020 et seq.* and the grounds of the petition [*Prob. Code 19022(a)*].

In cases involving charitable trusts subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, the Attorney General may petition under *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 19030*].

For a form of petition for approval of allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims, *see § 560.652*.

[2] Notice of Hearing on Petition for Approval

The clerk will set a hearing date for the petition, and, at least 30 days before the time set for the hearing, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on each of the creditors whose interests in the estate may be affected by the petition. Service must be effected in the manner provided in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* [*Prob. Code §§ 19022(c), 19023*].

In addition, at least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing, together with a copy of the petition, to be mailed to each of the following persons who is not a petitioner [*Prob. Code § 19024*]:

- All trustees of the trust and of any other trusts to which an allocation of liability may be approved by the court pursuant to the petition;

- All affected beneficiaries;

- The personal representative of the deceased settlor's estate if any is known to the trustee; and

- The Attorney General if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, unless the Attorney General waives notice.

Except as otherwise provided, notice in proceedings under the Trust Law, which includes *Prob. Code § 19000 et seq.*, is governed by *Prob. Code § 1200 et seq.* [*see Prob. Code § 17100*]. For further discussion of the general notice provisions under the Probate Code, see Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements* .

[3] Response or Objection

Any interested person may appear to respond or object to the petition [*see Prob. Code §§ 1040, 1043*]. For discussion of the procedure for responding or objecting with regard to claims against an estate, see Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate* .

If any creditor beneficiary, or trustee fails to file a timely written pleading after notice, the case is at issue, notwithstanding the failure. The case may proceed on the petition and written statements filed by the time of the hearing, and no further pleadings by other persons are necessary. The creditor, beneficiary, or trustee who failed to file a timely written pleading may not participate further in the proceeding and will be bound by the decision in the proceeding [*Prob. Code § 19025(a)*].

[4] Discretion of Court

[a] Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem

The court may, on its own motion or on the request of a trustee or other person interested in the trust, appoint a guardian ad litem in accordance with *Prob. Code § 1003* [*Prob. Code § 19029*; for discussion, *see § 560.140*].

[b] Ruling on Petition

The court in its discretion may make any orders and take any other action necessary or proper to dispose of the matters presented by the petition [*Prob. Code § 19027(a)*]. The court may dismiss the petition if the proceeding does not appear to be reasonably necessary for the protection of the interests of the trustee or any beneficiary of the trust [*Prob. Code § 19026*].

If the court determines that the assets of the trust estate are insufficient to pay all debts, the court shall order payment in the manner set forth in *Prob. Code § 11420* (priority of payment) [*Prob. Code § 19027(b)*; for discussion, *see* Ch. 454, *Probate: Claims Against the Estate*].

For a form for an order granting petition for approval of allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims, *see § 560.653*.

[5] Conclusiveness of Order

The court's order, when final, is conclusive as to the liability of the trust property with respect to the claims at issue in the petition. In the event of a subsequent administration of the estate of the deceased settlor, the order is binding on the personal representative of the estate of the deceased settlor as well as on all creditors and beneficiaries who had notice of the petition [*Prob. Code § 19025(b)*].

[6] Appeal

An final order approving (or refusing to approve) an allowance, compromise, or settlement of a claim against the revocable trust of a deceased settlor is appealable [*Prob. Code § 1304(b)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 19020-19030* (petition for approval and settlement of claims against deceased settlor)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.253

§ 560.253 Allowance and Rejection of Claims

[1] In General

When a claim is filed, the trustee may allow or reject the claim in whole or in part [*Prob. Code § 19250*]. The allowance or rejection must be in writing, and must be filed by the trustee with the court clerk. The trustee must also mail notice to the claimant, together with a copy of the allowance or rejection [*Prob. Code § 19251(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 1215* (manner of mailing notice)]. For discussion of mailing notice, see Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements* .

[2] Contents of Allowance or Rejection

The allowance or rejection must contain the following information [*Prob. Code § 19251(b)*; *see also Prob. Code § 19251(c)* (Judicial Council to promulgate official form of allowance or rejection)]:

- The name of the creditor;
- The date of the settlor's death;
- The total amount of the claim;
- The amount allowed or rejected by the trustee; and
- A statement that the creditor has 90 days from the time the notice of rejection is given or 90 days after the claim becomes due, whichever is later, in which to bring an action on a claim rejected in whole or in part.

Prob. Code § 19251 does not apply to demands a trustee elects to treat as claims pursuant to *Prob. Code § 19154* [*Prob. Code § 19251(d)*; for discussion of *Prob. Code § 19154, see § 560.248*].

[3] Allowance of Claim

The trustee has the power to pay any claim or portion of a claim, and payment constitutes allowance of the claim to the extent of the payment. The trustee also has the power to compromise any claim or portion of a claim. If the trustee or the attorney for the trustee is a creditor of the deceased settlor, the trustee has the same powers regarding allowance, rejection, payment, or compromise as he or she would if he or she were not a creditor [*see Prob. Code § 19252*].

Claims barred by the statute of limitations may not be allowed by the trustee [*Prob. Code § 19253(a)*; for discussion of time limitations applicable to claims, *see § 560.246[1]*].

The trustee may petition the court to approve any claims allowed [*see Prob. Code § 19020 et seq.*]. For discussion of petitioning for approval of claims, see *§ 560.252*.

[4] Rejection of Claim

If within 30 days after a claim is filed the trustee has refused or neglected to act on the claim, the refusal or neglect may, at the option of the claimant, be deemed equivalent to the giving of a notice of rejection on the 30th day [*Prob. Code § 19254*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesRejected ClaimsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.254

§ 560.254 Creditor's Action on Rejected Claim

[1] In General

A rejected claim is barred as to the part rejected unless the creditor brings an action on the claim or the matter is referred to a referee or to arbitration within 90 days after notice is given if the claim is due at the time of giving notice of rejection or, if the claim is not due at the time of giving notice of rejection, 90 days after the claim becomes due. Neither 90-day period includes time during which there is a vacancy in the office of the trustee [*Prob. Code § 19255(a)*]. Notwithstanding the statute of limitations otherwise applicable to a claim, if an action on a rejected claim is not timely commenced or the matter is not timely referred to a referee or arbitration, it is forever barred [*Prob. Code § 19253(d)*].

For a form for a complaint in an action on a rejected claim, *see § 560.654*.1.

[2] Notice of Pendency of Action

The creditor must file a notice of the pendency of the action or the referral to a referee or to arbitration with the court clerk in the trust proceeding, together with proof of giving a copy of the notice to the trustee as provided in *Prob. Code § 1215*. Personal service of a copy of the summons and complaint on the trustee is equivalent to the filing and giving of the notice [*Prob. Code § 19255(c)*; for discussion of *Prob. Code § 1215*, *see* Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements*]. For a form for this notice, *see § 560.654*.

Any property distributed by the trustee under the terms of the trust after 120 days from the later of the time the notice of rejection is given or the claim is due and before the notice of pendency of action or referral or arbitration is filed and given (excluding any time during which there is a vacancy in the office of trustee) is not subject to the claim. Neither the trustee nor the distributee is liable on account of the distribution [*Prob. Code § 19255(d)*].

[3] Costs and Attorney's Fees

The prevailing party in the action is entitled to court costs, and, if the court determines that the prosecution or defense of

the action against the prevailing party was unreasonable, the prevailing party is to be awarded reasonable litigation expenses, including attorney's fees. In this context, the creditor is the prevailing party if the creditor recovers an amount greater than the amount of the claim allowed by the trustee. The trustee is the prevailing party if the creditor recovers an amount equal to or less than the amount of the claim allowed by the trustee [*Prob. Code § 19255(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesBad Faith AwardsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesRejected ClaimsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.255

§ 560.255 Claims Established by Judgment

[1] Money Judgments

After the death of the settlor, a creditor cannot enforce either a money judgment against the deceased settlor on a claim against the deceased settlor or a money judgment against the trustee on a claim against the decedent or the trust estate against property in the trust estate under the Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.*), except property that was subject to an execution lien at the time of the settlor's death [*Prob. Code §§ 19300(a), 19303*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 686.020*].

All money judgments against the deceased settlor or trustee are payable in the course of administration and must be filed in the same manner as other claims [*Prob. Code § 19300*; *see also Prob. Code § 19301*]. For discussion of claim filing requirements and procedures, see *§ 560.246*.

When a money judgment against a trustee in a representative capacity becomes final, it conclusively establishes the validity of the claim for the amount of the judgment. The judgment must provide that it is payable out of property in the deceased settlor's trust estate in the course of administration. In addition, an abstract of the judgment must be filed in the trust administration proceedings [*Prob. Code § 19301*].

[2] Nonmoney Judgments

Notwithstanding the death of the settlor, a judgment for possession of trust property or a judgment for sale of trust property may be enforced under the Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.*). This does not, however, authorize enforcement under the Enforcement of Judgments Law against any property in the trust estate of the deceased settlor other than the property described in the judgment for possession or sale [*Prob. Code § 19302(a)*]. For discussion and forms relating to enforcement of nonmoney judgments, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments* .

After the settlor's death, a demand for money that is not satisfied from the trust property described in a judgment for sale

of property must be filed as a claim in the same manner as other claims and is payable in the course of administration [*Prob. Code § 19302(b)*].

[3] Property Subject to Execution Lien

If trust property of the deceased settlor is subject to an execution lien at the timeof the settlor's death, enforcement against the property may proceed under the Enforcement of Judgments Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.*) to satisfy the judgment. The levying officer must account to the trustee for any surplus. If the judgment is not satisfied, the balance of the judgment remaining unsatisfied is payable in the course of administration [*Prob. Code § 19303*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 680.260* (definition of "levying officer")].

[4] Conversion of Attachment Lien to Judgment Lien

[a] Converting Lien

An attachment lien may be converted into a judgment lien on property in the trust estate subject to the attachment lien, with the same priority as the attachment lien, if the judgment debtor dies after entry of judgment in an action in which the property was attached or if a judgment is entered after the death of the defendant in an action in which the property was attached [*Prob. Code § 19304(a)*].

To convert the attachment lien into a judgment lien, the levying officer must, after entry of judgment in the action in which the property was attached and before the expiration of the attachment lien, do one of the following [*Prob. Code § 19304(b)*]:

- Serve an abstract of the judgment, and a notice that the attachment lien has become a judgment lien, on the trustee or other person holding property subject to the attachment lien.

- Record or file in any office where the writ of attachment and notice of attachment are recorded or filed an abstract of the judgment and a notice that the attachment lien has become a judgment lien. If the attached property is real property, the plaintiff or the plaintiff's attorney may record the required abstract and notice with the same effect as if recorded by the levying officer.

[b] Exemptions From Lien

After the death of the settlor, any members of the deceased settlor's family who were supported in whole or in part by the deceased settlor may claim an exemption provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 487.020* for property levied on under the writ of attachment if the right to the exemption exists at the time the exemption is claimed [*Prob. Code § 19304(c)*]. The exemptions allowed under that provision are the following:

- All property exempt from enforcement of a money judgment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq.*];

- Property necessary for support;

- "Earnings" as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 706.011* (Wage Garnishment Law); and

- Property not subject to attachment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 487.010*.

The trustee may claim the exemption on behalf of members of the deceased settlor's family. The claim of exemption may be made at any time before the time the abstract and notice are served, recorded, or filed with respect to the property claimed to be exempt. The claim of exemption must be made in the same manner as an exemption is claimed under *Code Civ. Proc. § 485.610* [*Prob. Code § 19304(c)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to claims of

exemption, Ch. 62, *Attachment*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionExemptionsCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministration

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.256

§ 560.256 Allocation of Debts Between Trust and Surviving Spouse

[1] Allocation of Debt Authorized

If a debt of the deceased settlor appears to have been paid or to be payable in whole or in part from property in the deceased settlor's trust, the trustee, the surviving spouse, the personal representative, if any, or a deceased settlor's probate estate, or a beneficiary may petition for an order to allocate the debt [*Prob. Code § 19320*]. For a form of petition for allocation of debt, *see § 560.654*.2.

Absent an agreement, each debt of the deceased settlor must be characterized as separate or community. Then the debts will be allocated as follows [*Prob. Code § 11444(b)*]:

- Separate debts of either spouse are allocated to that spouse's separate property assets, and community debts are allocated to the spouses' community property assets.

- If a separate property asset of either spouse is subject to a secured debt that is characterized as that spouse's separate debt, and the net equity in that asset available to satisfy the secured debt is less than the secured debt, the unsatisfied portion of the secured debt is treated as an unsecured separate debt of that spouse and allocated to the net value of that spouse's other separate property assets.

- If the net value of either spouse's separate property assets is less than that spouse's unsecured separate debt or debts, the unsatisfied portion of the debt or debts is allocated to the net value of that spouse's one-half share of the community property assets. If the net value of that spouse's one-half share of the community property assets is less than that spouse's unsatisfied unsecured separate debt or debts, the remaining unsatisfied portion of the debt or debts is allocated to the net value of the other spouse's one-half share of the community property assets.

- If a community property asset is subject to a secured debt that ischaracterized as a community debt,

and the net equity in that asset available to satisfy the secured debt is less than the secured debt, the unsatisfied portion of the secured debt is treated as an unsecured community debt and allocated to the net value of the other community property assets.

- If the net value of the community property assets is less than the unsecured community debt or debts, the unsatisfied portion of the debt or debts is allocated equally between the separate property assets of the decedent and the surviving spouse. If the net value of either spouse's separate property assets is less than that spouse's share of the unsatisfied portion of the unsecured community debt or debts, the remaining unsatisfied portion of the debt or debts is allocated to the net value of the other spouse's separate property assets.

The net value of separate property is its fair market value as of the date of the decedent's death, minus the date-of-death balance of any liens and encumbrances that are characterized as debts of the owner spouse [*Prob. Code § 11444(c)(1)*]. The net value of community property is its fair market value as of the date of the decedent's death, minus the date-of-death balance of any liens and encumbrances that are characterized as community debts [*Prob. Code § 11444(c)(2)*]. For allocation purposes, a nonrecourse debt is defined as a debt for which the debtor's obligation to repay is limited to the collateral securing the debt and for which a deficiency judgment against the debtor is not permitted, and would limit the amount of a nonrecourse debt to the net equity in the collateral [*Prob. Code § 11444(c)(3)*]. A court may order a different allocation of debts if it finds that allocation to be equitable under the circumstances [*Prob. Code § 11444(d)*].

If a trustee, personal representative or the surviving spouse incurs any damages or expense, including attorney's fees, on account of the nonpayment of a debt that was allocated to the other party, or as the result of a debt being misallocated due to fraud or intentional misrepresentation by the other party, the party incurring damages may recover from the other party for reasonable damages or expense [*Prob. Code § 11444(e)*].

[2] Funeral Expenses and Expenses of Last Illness

Notwithstanding any other statute, funeral expenses and expenses of last illness, in the absence of specific provisions in a will or trust to the contrary, must be charged against the deceased settlor's probate estate and, thereafter, against the deceased settlor's share of the trust, and may not be allocated to or charged against the community share of the surviving spouse, whether or not the surviving spouse is financially able to pay the expenses and whether or not the surviving spouse or any other person is also liable for the expenses [*Prob. Code § 19326*].

[3] Allocation Affected by Value of Surviving Spouse's Property

If it appears from the petition that allocation would be affected by the value of the separate property of the surviving spouse and any community property and quasi-community property not administered in the trust and if an inventory and appraisal of the property has not been provided by the surviving spouse, the court will make an order to show cause why the information should not be provided [*Prob. Code § 19322*.] For a form of order to show cause, *see § 560.654*.3.

[4] Allocation by Agreement

The trustee, the personal representative, if any, of a deceased settlor's probate estate, and the surviving spouse may provide for allocation of debts by agreement if the agreement substantially protects the rights of other interested persons. The trustee, the personal representative, or the spouse may request and obtain court approval of the allocation provided in the agreement [*Prob. Code § 19324(a)*].

[5] Notice of Hearing on Petition for Allocation of Debts

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place

of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on the surviving spouse in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* for service of a summons [*Prob. Code § 19323(a)*].

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must also cause notice of the time and place of hearing, together with a copy of the petition, to be mailed to each of the following persons who is not a petitioner [*Prob. Code § 19323(b)*]:

- All trustees of the trust and of any trusts to which an allocation of liability may be approved by the court pursuant to the petition [*Prob. Code § 19323(b)*];

- All beneficiaries affected;

- The personal representative of the deceased settlor's estate if any is known to the trustee; and

- The Attorney General if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, unless the Attorney General waives notice.

Mailing notice is governed by *Prob. Code § 1200 et seq.* [*see Prob. Code § 17100*]. For discussion and general forms, see Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements* .

[6] Order Allocating Debts

On making a determination allocating debts, the court is required to make anorder that does the following [*Prob. Code § 19325*]:

- Directs the trustee to make payment of the amounts allocated to the trust by payment to the surviving spouse or creditors.

- Directs the trustee to charge amounts allocated to the surviving spouse against any property or interests of the surviving spouse that are in the possession or control of the trustee. To the extent that property or interests of the surviving spouse in the possession or control of the trustee are insufficient to satisfy the allocation, the court order must summarily direct the surviving spouse to pay the allocation to the trustee.

For a form of order allocating debts, see *§ 560.654*.4.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsDebt Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.257-560.269

[Reserved]

§§ 560.257[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
1. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.270

§ 560.270 Governing Statutes

Administration of charitable trusts (as well as certain express private trusts) is governed generally by the Trust Law (*Prob. Code §§ 15000 et seq.*) to the extent that application is not in conflict with the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*), which otherwise governs. Duties of trustees of private foundations, charitable trusts, and split-interest trusts are governed by *Prob. Code § 16100 et seq.* However, when the assets of a charitable trust are administered by a nonprofit corporation, the Nonprofit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 5000 et seq.*) applies as follows:

- General provisions and definitions [*see Corp. Code §§ 5002-5080*].

- The Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 5110 et seq.*), which relates to nonprofit corporations formed for any public or charitable purposes [*see Corp. Code § 5111*].

- The Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 7110 et seq.*), which relates to nonprofit corporations formed for any lawful purpose, except corporations all of whose assets are irrevocably dedicated to charitable, religious, or public purposes if, on dissolution, the assets will be distributed to a person or persons carrying on a charitable, religious, or public purpose [*see Corp. Code § 7111*].

- The Nonprofit Religious Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 9110 et seq.*), which relates to nonprofit corporations formed primarily or exclusively for religious purposes [*see Corp. Code § 9111*; *see also* Ch. 110, *Churches and Religious Organizations*].

- Transitional provisions (*Corp. Code §§ 9910-9927*), which govern the application of the Nonprofit Corporation Law to corporations organized or existing under prior nonprofit corporation law (see former Corp. Code §§ 9000-9802) [*see Corp. Code §§ 9910(a), 10200* (references to prior law)].

A nonprofit health care service plan holding assets in charitable trust is not subject to the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*), and thus does not have to register with the Attorney General or meet the other requirements of the Uniform Act [*Gov. Code § 12583*; *Van de Kamp v. Gumbiner (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1270, 270 Cal. Rptr. 907]* . Instead, nonprofit health care service plans are governed by the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (*Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.*) and the Nonprofit Corporations Law [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142, 5233, 5250, 6510, 6511, 10820, 10821*].

Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17510.9 and *17510.85* govern fiduciary obligations of, and disclosures by, persons soliciting charitable contributions for compensation.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
1. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.271

§ 560.271 Commercial Fundraisers for Charitable Purposes

[1] Defined

The Attorney General has responsibility for supervising "commercial fundraisers for charitable purposes," who must register with the Attorney General, account annually to the Attorney General for all funds collected pursuant to any solicitation for charitable purposes during the preceding calendar year, and who are constructive trustees of all funds so collected [*Gov. Code § 12599*]. A "commercial fundraiser for charitable purposes" is any individual, corporation, or other legal entity who for compensation either (1) solicits funds, assets, or property in California for charitable purposes, (2) as a result of a solicitation of funds, assets, or property in California for charitable purposes, receives or controls the funds, assets, or property solicited for charitable purposes, or (3) employs, procures, or engages any compensated person to solicit, receive or control funds, assets or property for charitable purposes. Charitable fundraisers also include any person or entity that obtains a majority of its inventory for resale from an organization qualified to solicit donations pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 148.3* [*Gov. Code § 12599(a)*]. Any commercial fundraiser that obtains a majority of its inventory for resale from an organization qualified to solicit donations pursuant to *Welf. & Inst. Code § 148.3* must file special reports with the Attorney General, which differ from the reports other commercial fundraisers file [*Gov. Code § 12599(e), (k)*].

"Commercial fundraisers for charitable purposes" do not include trustees as defined in *Gov. Code § 12582* or *12583*, charitable corporations as defined in *Gov. Code § 12582.1*, or any employee of either, or employees of any person registered with the Attorney General as a commercial fundraiser for charitable purposes. Also excluded are federally insured financial institutions that hold funds received as a result of a solicitation for charitable purposes [*Gov. Code § 12599(a)*].

[2] Disclosures Required

Persons who solicit charitable donations for compensation must disclose that fact at the time of each solicitation, stating the name by which they or their employer is registered with the Attorney General as a commercial fundraiser [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17510.85*]. Similarly, it is unlawful for a commercial fundraiser to fail to disclose on request (written or

oral) its percentage of total fundraising expenses. "Percentage of total fundraising expenses" means the ratio of total expenses of the fundraiser to the total revenues received by the fundraiser for the charitable purpose for which the funds are being solicited as reported on the most recent report filed with the Attorney General. If the request and response are oral, a written follow-up disclosure must still be made within five working days. Failure to make this disclosure is grounds for an injunction prohibiting further solicitation [*Gov. Code § 12599(j)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
1. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.272

§ 560.272 Fiduciary Duties of Persons Soliciting Charitable Contributions

There is a fiduciary relationship between a charity or any person soliciting on the charity's behalf and a person from whom a charitable contribution is being solicited. The acceptance of a charitable contribution by a charity or any person soliciting on behalf of a charity establishes a charitable trust and a duty on the part of the person soliciting on behalf of the charity to use the contributions for the declared charitable purpose for which they are sought [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17510.9*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17510.9* is declarative of existing law.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
1. In General

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.273-560.289

[Reserved]

§§ 560.273[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.290

§ 560.290 Charitable Trust Defined

A charitable trust or a charity is a donation in trust to promote the welfare of the public at large, or a particular class of persons, indefinite with regard to numbers and individuals [*Estate of Schloss (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 248, 256, 14 Cal. Rptr. 643, 363 P.2d 875* ; *Estate of Breeden (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 981, 985-986, 256 Cal. Rptr. 813* ; *People v. Cogswell (1896) 113 Cal. 129, 138, 45 P. 270]* . For the purposes of *Prob. Code §§ 16100-16105* (duties of trustees of charitable trusts, private foundations and split-interest trusts), charitable trusts are defined as those described in *I.R.C. § 4947(a)(1)*, private foundations as those defined in *I.R.C. § 509*, and split interest trusts as those defined in *I.R.C. § 4947(a)(2)* [*Prob. Code § 16100*].

To create a charitable trust, the following must exist [*L.B. Research & Educ. Found. v. UCLA Found. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 171, 177, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710]* :

- A proper manifestation by the settlor of an intention to create a trust;
- A charitable purpose; and
- Trust property.

When a charitable gift is made for a specified purpose, a question may arise as to whether the gift creates a trust or a gift subject to a condition subsequent For example, the owner of property, instead of expressly creating a trust, may transfer property to another on the condition that if the transferee fails to perform a specified act, the transferee's interest will be forfeited either to the transferor or to a designated third party. In such a case, the transferee's interest is subject to a condition subsequent and is not held in trust [*L.B. Research & Educ. Found. v. UCLA Found. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 171, 177, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710]* . Whether a trust or a condition is created depends on the transferor's manifested intention. The fact that the word "condition" is used does not necessarily indicate that a condition and not a trust is intended, because trusts can be created by words of condition. Property given on condition that it will be applied to specified charitable purposes is particularly likely to be construed as having been given in a charitable trust [*L.B.*

Research & Educ. Found. v. UCLA Found. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 171, 177-178, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710] . The question to be decided in such cases is whether the donor intended to provide that if the property were not used for the designated charitable purpose it should revert either to the donor's estate or to a contingent donee, or the donor intended to impose an enforceable obligation on the donees to devote it to those purposes [*L.B. Research & Educ. Found. v. UCLA Found. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 171, 178-180, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710* (conditional contract, not charitable trust, was created by instrument giving contribution of $1 million to university but also providing that if this money is not used as directed, fund must be transferred to another institution)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

127 of 195 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.291

§ 560.291 Exemption From Rule Against Perpetuities

A charitable trust is exempt from the Rule Against Perpetuities [*Civ. Code § 715* (perpetuities not allowed except for eleemosynary purpose); *People v. Cogswell (1896) 113 Cal. 129, 138, 45 P. 270* (term "eleemosynary" interchangeable with "charitable")]. For discussion of the Rule Against Perpetuities, see *§ 560.49*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.292

§ 560.292 Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries of a charitable trust are indefinite in number and identity [*Estate of Schloss (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 248, 256, 14 Cal. Rptr. 643, 363 P.2d 875]* . A charitable trust differs significantly from an express private trust in this respect, because the beneficiaries of an express private trust must be ascertained or ascertainable [*see Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1092, 1098, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425]* . For further discussion, see *§ 560.40* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.293

§ 560.293 Application of Cy Pres Doctrine

The law favors gifts for charitable purposes, and instruments providing for such gifts will be liberally construed to accomplish the donor's intent [*Estate of Tarrant (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 42, 46, 237 P.2d 505]* . If a donor has expressed a general charitable purpose that for some reason cannot be accomplished in the manner specified, the court may apply the equitable doctrine of cy pres to substitute another charitable object that approximates the original purposes as closely as possible [*see Estate of Tarrant (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 42, 49, 237 P.2d 505* ; *In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 918, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303]* . The doctrine has been applied in various situations, including the following:

- To determine the disposition of assets on dissolution of a charitable corporation [*see In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 917-918, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303]* .

- To uphold gifts when the testator has failed to specify the precise charitable purpose or to name a trustee to administer the gift [*see Estate of Quinn, (1958) 156 Cal. App. 2d 684, 687, 320 P.2d 219]* .

- To uphold gifts made to charitable institutions that do not accept them [*see Estate of Faulkner (1954) 128 Cal. App. 2d 575, 275 P.2d 818]* .

- To uphold gifts made to charitable institutions that cannot be identified with certainty [*see Estate of Gatlin (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 644, 650, 94 Cal. Rptr. 295]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.294

§ 560.294 No Charitable Immunity for Torts

Charitable immunity does not exist under California law, and charitable corporations are liable for their torts [*see Malloy v. Fong (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 356, 364-367, 232 P.2d 241* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1714(a)* (everyone liable for injuries arising from willful or negligent acts)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsTortsNegligenceDefensesPrivate ImmunitiesCharitable Immunity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.295

§ 560.295 Duties of Trustee

[1] Prohibited Acts

During any period when a trust is deemed to be a charitable trust, a private foundation, or a split-interest trust, the trustee shall not do any of the following [*Prob. Code § 16102*; *see Prob. Code § 16000* (definition of trusts)]:

- Engage in any act of self-dealing as defined in *I.R.C. § 4941(d)*.
- Retain any excess business holdings as defined in *I.R.C. § 4943(c)*.
- Make any investments in a manner that subjects the property of the trust to tax under *I.R.C. § 4944*.
- Make any taxable expenditure as defined in *I.R.C. § 4945(d)*.

Exceptions to *Prob. Code § 16102* with regard to split-interest trusts are set forth in *Prob. Code § 16103*.

[2] Distribution of Income

During any period when a trust is deemed to be a charitable trust or a private foundation, the trustee must distribute its income for each taxable year (and principal if necessary) at a time and in a manner that will not subject the property of the trust to tax under *I.R.C. § 4942* [*Prob. Code § 16101*].

[3] Incorporation of Provisions in Trust Instrument

The provisions of *Prob. Code §§ 16101*, *16102*, and *16103* are deemed to be contained in the instrument creating every trust to which *Prob. Code §§ 16100-16105* applies. Any provision of the instrument inconsistent with or contrary to *Prob. Code §§ 16100-16105* is without effect [*Prob. Code § 16104*].

[4] Applicability of Petition Procedure

A proceeding contemplated by the federal Tax Reform Act of 1969 (Pub. L. No. 91-172 § 101(l)(3)) may be commenced pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200* (petition in probate court) by the organization involved. All specifically named beneficiaries of the organization and the Attorney General must be parties to the proceedings. Probate court jurisdiction is not exclusive and does not limit any jurisdiction that otherwise exists, notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 16105(a)*; for recording requirements, see *Prob. Code § 16105(b)*]. For discussion regarding petition procedure under *Prob. Code § 17200* and related provisions, see *§ 560.130* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersLimitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.296

§ 560.296 Enforcement of Charitable Trusts

[1] By Attorney General

The Attorney General is responsible for the supervision of charitable trusts, and is empowered to institute proceedings to ensure compliance pursuant to the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*) and other statutory provisions listed in *Gov. Code § 12598*, theNonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 5110 et seq.*), and the Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code §§ 7110-8910*) [*see Gov. Code §§ 12591, 12598* and *Corp. Code §§ 5250, 7240*, respectively]. *Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.* primarily set forth registering and reporting requirements regarding certain charitable trusts [*see Gov. Code §§ 12582* (trustee includes any individual, or corporation, or other entity holding property for any charitable trust), 12582 (exclusions, e.g., religious corporations)]. Forms for complying with the reporting requirements may be obtained from the Office of the Attorney General. For further discussion of corporate trusts, see *§ 560.310* et seq.

The Attorney General is empowered to oversee charities as the representative of the public, and of beneficiaries who, unlike beneficiaries of a private trust, are ordinarily indefinite and therefore unable to enforce the trust in their own behalf [*see Holt v. College of Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 750, 754, 40 Cal. Rptr. 244, 394 P.2d 932* ; *People v. Cogswell (1896) 113 Cal. 129, 136-137, 45 P. 270]* .

[2] By Parties Other Than Attorney General

Although the Attorney General has the primary responsibility for the enforcement of charitable trusts, the courts have recognized that others with sufficient interest in the trust as donor, trustee, *cestui*, or holder of a reversionary right have the right to bring actions for enforcement [*see Holt v. College of Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 750, 753-754, 40 Cal. Rptr. 244, 394 P.2d 932* (minority trustees of charitable trust have capacity to sue to enforce trust); *L.B. Research & Educ. Found. v. UCLA Found. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 171, 180-181, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710* (donor has standing to enforce terms of trust it created)]. However, other than the Attorney General, only parties who have a special and definite interest in a charitable trust have standing to institute legal action to enforce or protect the assets of the trust [*Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 161-162, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483* (taxpayers lack

standing even when trust is administered by city officials pursuant to city charter; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526a*, authorizing taxpayer's actions to restrain illegal expenditure of public funds or property does not apply to officials' dealings in their capacity as trustees)].

In addition, a statutory exception is provided in the case of nonprofit health care service plans holding assets in charitable trust. Those plans are not subject to the filing, registration, or reporting provisions of the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*) [*see Gov. Code § 12583*], but are subject to the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (*Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.*) and the Nonprofit Corporations Law. Responsibility for their regulation and authority to oversee their compliance with the enforcement of charitable trusts pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 5142* and *5250* is vested in the Department of Corporations [*see Van de Kamp v. Gumbiner (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1281-1282, 270 Cal. Rptr. 907]* .

For discussion of standing with regard to charitable corporations, see *§§ 560.314, § 560.315*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.297

§ 560.297 Proceedings Regarding Internal Affairs or Existence of Trust

The Trust Law (*Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*) applies to charitable trusts subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General to the extent that application is not in conflict with the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*) [*Prob. Code § 15004*; *see also Prob. Code § 82* (definition of trust includes express charitable trust)]. Consequently, a trustee or beneficiary may initiate petition proceedings regarding the internal affairs or existence of the trust, if to do so would not conflict with *Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 24* (definition of beneficiary), 15801-15803 (limitations on rights of beneficiaries of revocable trust)]. The Attorney General may also petition under *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 17210*]. The Attorney General is subject to the limitations on the rights of beneficiaries of revocable trusts provided by *Prob. Code §§ 15800-15802* (rights of beneficiary of revocable trust inure to person holding power to revoke), notwithstanding any other provision of law [*Prob. Code § 15805*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
2. Charitable Trusts Generally

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.298-560.309

[Reserved]

§§ 560.298[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.310

§ 560.310 Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporations

Nonprofit public benefit corporations, by definition, have a public or charitable purpose [*Corp. Code § 5111*]. The assets are deemed to be impressed with a charitable trust, by virtue of the charitable purposes set forth in the articles of incorporation [*American Center for Education, Inc. v. Cavnar (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 476, 486, 145 Cal. Rptr. 736]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.311

§ 560.311 Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporations Holding Assets in Charitable Trust

A nonprofit mutual benefit corporation may or may not have a charitable purpose, and at any rate may not have all of its assets irrevocably dedicated to a public or charitable purpose [*see Corp. Code § 7111*]. However, a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation may hold charitable assets in trust. The Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law includes several special provisions applicable only to those mutual benefit corporations [*see Corp. Code §§ 7135* (power of court to impress charitable trust on assets of mutual benefit corporation), 7238(director holding assets in charitable trust subject to same standards applied to director of public benefit corporation), 7240 (corporation holding assets in charitable trust subject to examination by Attorney General), and 7913 (notice to Attorney General of disposition of assets held in trust)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.312

§ 560.312 Directors' Standard of Conduct

[1] General Standard

The standards of conduct imposed on directors of public benefit corporations as set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 5230-5238*, are made applicable to directors of mutual benefit corporations that hold assets in charitable trust by *Corp. Code § 7238*.

The general standard of conduct to which the directors are held is the same as that which is applicable to directors of commercial corporations. They must perform their duties in good faith, in a manner the director believes to be in the best interests of the corporation and its shareholders, and are subject to the same standard of care that an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would use under similar circumstances, including the requirement of reasonable inquiry [*Corp. Code §§ 309(a)* (commercial corporations), 5231 (public benefit corporation), 7231 (mutual benefit corporation); *see also Corp. Code §§ 5239, 7231.5, 9247* (liability of volunteer directors and volunteer executive officers)].

[2] Standards for Investment of Corporate Assets

Standards of investment applicable to directors of public benefit corporations are set forth in *Corp. Code § 5240*, and essentially require the directors to avoid speculation, and to act in accordance with the general good faith standard embodied in *Corp. Code § 5231* [*Corp. Code § 5240(b)(1), (d)*]. The directors must also comply with investment standards imposed by the articles, bylaws, or express terms of an instrument or agreement pursuant to which the assets were contributed to the corporation [*Corp. Code § 5240(b)(2)*]. The directors are insulated from liability for making investments authorized or required in an instrument or agreement pursuant to which the assets were contributed to the corporation [*Corp. Code § 5240(c)*]. In proper cases a court may direct or permit the corporation to deviate from the terms of a trust or agreement regarding the making or retention of investments. Notice of such an action or proceeding must be given to the Attorney General, who has the right to intervene [*Corp. Code § 5241*].

Nothing in *Corp. Code § 5240* is to be construed to preclude application of the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act [*Prob. Code § 18501 et seq.*], if it would otherwise be applicable, but nothing in the Uniform

Management of Institutional Funds Act alters the status of governing boards, or the duties and liabilities of directors under the Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law (*Corp. Code § 5110 et seq.*) [*Corp. Code § 5240(e)*].

Directors of mutual benefit corporations are not under any specific statutory standard for the investment of assets beyond the general standard of care set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 7230-7238*.

[3] Duties and Obligations of Private Trustees Not Applicable

The provisions in *Prob. Code §§ 16000-16082*, which govern the duties and obligations of a trustee of a private trust, are not applicable to the directors of nonprofit public benefit and mutual benefit corporations [*Corp. Code §§ 5230, 7230*]. Some of the concepts embodied in these provisions are, however, reflected in the Nonprofit Corporation Law applicable to public benefit corporations and to mutual benefit corporations holding charitable assets in trust. For example, the proscriptions against self-dealing by directors reflect the proscriptions against the trustee of a private trust from profiting from his or her position [*compare Corp. Code §§ 5233, 7238 with Prob. Code §§ 16002, 16004*].

In the case of a mutual benefit corporation that not only owns the assets of a charitable trust but is named as the trustee, the provisions governing trustees of private trusts may be applicable to the corporation, although not to its directors [*see generally* Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations* (Matthew Bender)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersStandards of Care

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.313

§ 560.313 Joint and Several Liability for Wrongful Approval

Directors who approve of any of the following corporate actions are jointly and severally liable to the corporation [*Corp. Code § 5237(a)*]:

- Any distribution.

- Wrongful distribution of assets after institution of dissolution proceedings [*see Corp. Code § 5237(a)(2)*].

- Any distributions, loan, or guaranty contrary to *Corp. Code § 5236* (loan or guaranty regarding obligation of director or officer).

Liability under *Corp. Code § 5237(a)* is subject to *Corp. Code § 5231* (director's standard of care in performing duties) [*Corp. Code § 5237*; *see § 560.312[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsTortsProcedureMultiple DefendantsJoint & Several Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.314

§ 560.314 Actions to Remedy Breach of Trust

An action to enjoin, correct, obtain damages for, or otherwise remedy a breach of charitable trust held by a public benefit or mutual benefit corporation may be brought by any of the following [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142(a), 7142(a)*]:

- The corporation, or a member in the name of the corporation pursuant to *Corp. Code § 5710* (derivative actions by members of public benefit corporations) or 7710 (derivative actions by members of mutual benefitcorporations).

- An officer of the corporation.

- A director of the corporation.

- A person with a reversionary, contractual, or property interest in the assets subject to the charitable trust.

- The Attorney General, or any person granted relator status by the Attorney General.

If the action seeks to have the court rescind or enjoin the performance of a contract entered into in breach of the charitable trust, all of the parties to the contract must be parties to the action [*Corp. Code §§ 5142(b)(1), 7142(b)(1)*]. The contract will not be rescinded or its performance enjoined if a party to the contract has, in good faith and without actual notice of the trust restriction, parted with value under the contract or in reliance on it [*Corp. Code §§ 5142(b)(2), 7142(b)(2)*].

For a complaint to seek remedies for breach of charitable trust, *see § 560.670*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.315

§ 560.315 Actions Challenging Self-Dealing Transactions

[1] In General

If a director of a nonprofit public benefit corporation has a material financial interest in a transaction to which the corporation is a party and that does not meet the requirements of *Corp. Code § 5233(d)*, an action may be brought for the remedies provided in *Corp. Code § 5233(h)*, except for transactions excepted by *Corp. Code § 5233(b)* [*Corp. Code § 5233(a), (c)*; for discussion of remedies, see Comments to *see § 560.671*]. *Corp. Code § 5233* also applies to directors of nonprofit mutual benefit corporations holding assets in trust [*see Corp. Code § 7238*].

The Attorney General or, if the Attorney General is joined as an indispensible party, any of the following may bring the action [*Corp. Code § 5233(c)*]:

- The corporation or a member asserting the right in the name of the corporation in a derivative action under *Corp. Code § 5710*.
- A director of the corporation.
- An officer of the corporation.
- Any person granted relator status by the Attorney General.

[2] Excepted Transactions

Corp. Code § 5233 does not apply to any of the following [*Corp. Code § 5233(b)*]:

- An action of the board fixing the compensation of a director or officer of the corporation.
- A transaction that is part of a public or charitable program of the corporation, if it has been

authorized by the corporation in good faith and without unjustified favoritism, and results in a benefit to one or more directors or their families because they are in the class of persons intended to be benefited by the public or charitable program.

- A transaction of which the interested director has no knowledge, and that does not exceed the lesser of 1 percent of the corporation's gross receipts for the preceding fiscal year or $100,000.

[3] Effect of Prior Approval of Transaction

In an action under *Corp. Code § 5233(c)*, the remedies specified in *Corp. Code § 5233(h)* shall not be granted if prior approval has been granted by a majority of the directors of the board pursuant to the standards set forth in *Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2)*, or by a committee or person authorized by the board under the circumstances set forth in *Corp. Code § 5233(d)(3)*. In addition, relief will not be granted if the Attorney General, or the court in an action in which the Attorney General is an indispensable party, has approved the transaction before or after it was consummated [*Corp. Code § 5233(d)(1)*]. For a form raising prior approval by the board or a committee of the board as an affirmative defense, *see § 560.543*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.316

§ 560.316 Derivative Actions

If a member of a nonprofit public benefit or mutual benefit corporation maintains an action on behalf of the corporation, the requirements of *Corp. Code §§ 5710* and *7710* apply. Generally, a derivative action is only appropriate if the corporation unjustifiably fails to enforce a cause of action it has against a third party [*see Jones v. H.F. Ahmanson & Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 93, 106, 107, 81 Cal. Rptr. 592, 460 P.2d 464]* . For a complaint for breach of trust brought as a derivative action, *see § 560.670*.

The derivative action provisions of the Nonprofit Public Benefit and Mutual Benefit Corporation Laws are similar to those set forth in the General Corporation Law (see *Corp. Code § 800*]. For a discussion and forms for derivative actions under the General Corporation Law, see Ch. 168, *Corporations: Derivative Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsShareholdersActions Against CorporationsDerivative ActionsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.317

§ 560.317 Indemnification of Corporate Agents

A nonprofit public benefit or mutual benefit corporation may indemnify corporate agents, including directors, officers, and employees, for expenses and damages arising from being a defendant in litigation, under statutorily definedcircumstances [*see Corp. Code §§ 5238, 7237*]. Provisions for indemnification of directors and officers are not valid unless consistent with *Corp. Code § 5238* or *7237* [*Corp. Code §§ 5238(g), 7237(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersManagement Duties & LiabilitiesIndemnificationBusiness & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.318

§ 560.318 Limited Immunity of Volunteer Director or Officer of Nonprofit Corporations

If the charitable trust is organized as a nonprofit corporation, a volunteer office or director may be protected from liability for any act or omission done within the scope of his or her duties as a board member or officer based on one of several statutes [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.15*; *Corp. Code §§ 5047.5, 5239, 7231.5, 9247*], as discussed below.

If (1) the charitable trust is administered by a nonprofit corporation, whether organized under *Corp. Code § 5110 et seq.* (nonprofit public benefit corporations), 7110 et seq. (nonprofit mutual benefit corporations), or 9110 et seq. (nonprofit religious corporations)), (2) the corporation bases its federal income tax exemption on *I.R.C. § 501(c)(3)* or *501(c)(6), (3)* the claim against the director or officer may also be made directly against the corporation, and (4) the corporation maintains a general liability insurance policy in the requisite amounts, *Corp. Code § 5047.5* governs [*see* Ch. 388, *Nonprofit Corporations*].

Regardless of the basis of the corporation's federal income tax exemption, no monetary damages may be obtained from a volunteer officer or director of a public benefit corporation if the corporation has insurance to cover the claim or made a good faith attempt to obtain insurance [*see Corp. Code § 5239*, discussed in Ch. 388, *Nonprofit Corporations*]. A similar provision, *Corp. Code § 9247*, applies if the charitable trust is organized as a nonprofit religious corporation. This provision is discussed in Ch. 110, *Churches and Religious Organizations* .

If the charitable trust is organized as a trade, professional, or labor organization incorporated pursuant to the nonprofit mutual benefit corporation law (*Corp. Code § 7110 et seq.*) exclusively for fraternal, educational, or other nonprofit purposes, and bases its federal income tax exemption on *I.R.C. § 501(c)*, immunity is granted to volunteer officers and directors by *Corp. Code § 7231.5*, regardless of insurance coverage. For discussion of *Corp. Code § 7231.5*, see Ch. 388, *Nonprofit Corporations* .

Finally, if the charitable trust is administered by a nonprofit corporation, whether organized under *Corp. Code § 5110 et seq.* (nonprofit public benefit corporations), 7110 et seq. (nonprofit mutual benefit corporations), or 9110 et seq. (nonprofit religious corporations), and the corporation bases its federal income tax exemption on *I.R.C. § 501(c)(1)*

(except a credit union), 501(c)(4) (civic league), 501(c)(7) (club, recreational association), or 501(c)(19) (veterans organization), *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.15* provides immunity to the volunteer officer or director and requires the person intending to sue the volunteer officer or director to first obtain leave from the court to do so. For discussion and a related form, see Ch. 388, *Nonprofit Corporations* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.319

§ 560.319 Dissolution and Winding Up

[1] Involuntary Proceedings

The law governing involuntary dissolution and winding up of nonprofit public benefit and mutual benefit corporations is set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 6510-6519* and *8510-8519*, respectively.

Interested parties [defined in *Corp. Code §§ 6510(a)* and *8510(a)*] may bring an action for involuntary dissolution on several grounds, including inactivity, factionalization of the board or membership, fraud or mismanagement, mandatory termination under the provisions of the articles of incorporation, and, in the case of a public benefit corporation, failure to carry out the corporation's public or charitable purposes [*see Corp. Code §§ 6510(b), 8510(b)*]. In addition, the Attorney General, on his or her own information or on the complaint of a private party, may bring an action for dissolution for violations of laws governing charitable organizations or corporations generally, for failure to pay taxes, or for other fraudulent or unlawful activities [*see Corp. Code §§ 6511(a), 8511(a)*].

In an action under *Corp. Code § 6510(a)*, the Attorney General is an indispensible party, and creditors and the authorized number of members may intervene [*Corp. Code § 6510(c), (d)*; *see Corp. Code § 5036* (authorized number defined)]. In an action under *Corp. Code § 8510(a)*, any member or creditor may intervene, and when the mutual benefit trust holds assets in charitable trust, a copy of the complaint must be served on the Attorney General, who may intervene [*Corp. Code § 8510(c), (e)*].

For further discussion of involuntary dissolution, see Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Law, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations*, § 415.03 (Matthew Bender).

[2] Voluntary Proceedings

The law governing voluntary dissolution and winding up of nonprofit public benefit and mutual benefit corporations is set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 6610-6617* and *8610-8617*, respectively.

A corporation may elect voluntarily to wind up and dissolve by approval of a majority of all members (defined in *Corp. Code § 5033*); or by approval of the board and membership (defined in *Corp. Code § 5034*) [*see Corp. Code §§ 6610(a), 8610(a)*].

Board approval alone is sufficient to elect voluntary dissolution, if thecorporation has been adjudicated a bankrupt, has disposed of all assets and been inactive for five years, has no members, or is required to dissolve pursuant to a provision in its articles of incorporation calling for a subordinate corporation to dissolve when its charter is surrendered to, taken away, or revoked by the head organization granting it [*Corp. Code §§ 6610(b), 8610(b)*; *see Corp. Code §§ 5132(a)(2)(A), 7132(a)(4)(A)*]. For discussion of the procedure for voluntary dissolution, see Ballantine & Sterling, California Corporation Law, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations*, § 415.02 (Matthew Bender).

When a corporation is in the process of voluntarily winding up, the corporation, the authorized number of members defined in *Corp. Code § 5036*, the Attorney General, or three or more creditors may petition the superior court to take jurisdiction over the proceeding [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*; *see § 560.673*]. The court will take jurisdiction if it appears necessary to protect any parties in interest, or in the case of a public benefit corporation, to protect the purposes served by the corporation, or in the case of a mutual benefit corporation holding charitable assets in trust, to protect the assets. Once the court assumes jurisdiction over voluntary dissolution proceedings, *Corp. Code §§ 6512-6519* or *8512-8519*, governing court procedures in proceedings for involuntary dissolution, are applicable [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*].

Court supervision over the winding up process of a public benefit corporation, or a mutual benefit corporation holding assets in charitable trust, is particularly appropriate when the assets of a charitable trust must be transferred to another organization [*see, e.g., In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303* (application of *cy pres* doctrine in disposing of assets of charitable corporation under petition for court supervision over voluntary winding up proceedings)].

[3] Distribution of Assets

After determining that all known debts and liabilities of the corporation have been paid or adequately provided for, all the assets of a public benefit corporation, and all the assets held in charitable trust by a mutual benefit corporation, must be distributed in conformity with the corporation's articles or bylaws, subject to compliance with the provisions of any trust under which the assets are held [*Corp. Code §§ 6716(a), 8716(a)*].

The disposition must be made by decree of the superior court in proceedings to which the Attorney General is a party. The decree must be made on the petition of the Attorney General or, on 30 days notice to the Attorney General, by any person concerned in the dissolution [*Corp. Code §§ 6716(b), 8716(b)*]. The disposition may be made without the decree, subject to the rights of persons concerned in the dissolution, if the Attorney General makes a written waiver of objections to the disposition [*Corp. Code §§ 6716(c), 8716(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsDissolution & Winding UpEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts
3. Charitable Corporations

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.320-560.339

[Reserved]

§§ 560.320[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.340

§ 560.340 Governing Statutes

The definition of a Totten trust, also known as a tentative trust, is governed by *Prob. Code § 80*. The creation and implementation of Totten trust accounts is governed by the Multiple-Party Accounts Law (*Prob. Code §§ 5100-5407*) and other provisions applicable generally to deposit accounts, such as *Fin. Code §§ 6850-6855* and *Fin. Code §§ 952, 953* [*see* Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*].

The Multiple-Party Accounts Law applies to accounts in existence on July 1, 1990, and accounts established thereafter [Stats. 1989, ch. 397, § 41]. "Account" within the meaning of that law means a contract of deposit of funds between a depositor and a financial institution, and includes a checking account, savings account, certificate of deposit, share account, and other like arrangement [*Prob. Code § 5122(a)*]. Joint accounts, "P.O.D. accounts," and Totten trust accounts are "multiple-party accounts" within the meaning of the California Multiple-Party Accounts Law [*Prob. Code § 5132*]. Most business and true fiduciary accounts, for example, regular fiduciary or trust accounts maintained in connection with relationships established other than by the deposit agreement and accounts for the estate of a ward, conservatee, or decedent, are excluded from the coverage of the Multiple-Party Accounts Law [*see Prob. Code § 5122(b)* (also excluding accounts of unincorporated associations or charitable or civic organizations)].

The provisions of the Multiple-Party Accounts Law that apply to the payment of a Totten trust apply to an account in the name of one or more parties as trustee for one or more other persons if the financial institution has no other or further notice in writing that the account is not a Totten trust account as defined in *Prob. Code § 80* [*Prob. Code § 5406*].

Accounts that are governed by the Multiple-Party Accounts Law may be used with a special power of attorney authorized by *Prob. Code § 5204* [*see* Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*].

Prob. Code §§ 5301-5307, concerning beneficial ownership as between parties, or as between parties and P.O.D. payees or beneficiaries of multiple-party accounts, govern controversies between those persons and their creditors and other successors, but have no bearing on the power of withdrawal of those persons as determined by the terms of account contracts [*Prob. Code § 5201(a)*].

Prob. Code §§ 5401-5407 govern the liability of financial institutions who make payments pursuant to those provisions and are discussed in more detail in Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* [*Prob. Code § 5201(b)*].

A financial institution has no duty to inform (1) a depositor holding an account on July 1, 1990, (2) a beneficiary named in a Totten trust account on July 1, 1990, (3) a P.O.D. payee designated on a P.O.D. account on July 1, 1990, or (4) an agent designated on an agency account on July 1, 1990 of the enactment of the revised Multiple Party Accounts as effective July 1, 1990; and no liability may be imposed on a financial institution for failing to do so [Stats. 1989, ch. 397, § 40 as amended by Stats. 1990, ch. 324, § 3].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsRequirementsBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.341

§ 560.341 Definitions

[1] "Totten Trust Account"

A "Totten trust account" is an account in the name of one or more parties as trustee for one or more beneficiaries when the relationship is established by the form of the account and the deposit agreement with the financial institution and there is no subject of the trust other than the sums on deposit in the account. It is not essential that payment to the beneficiary be mentioned in the deposit agreement [*Prob. Code § 80*]. A Totten trust account does not include (1) a regular trust account under a testamentary trust or a trust agreement that has significance apart from the account, or (2) a fiduciary account arising from a fiduciary relation such as attorney-client [*Prob. Code § 80*].

A person may create a tentative trust, or Totten trust account, by depositing money as trustee for another [*Brucks v. Home Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 845, 850, 228 P.2d 545* . A Totten trust account is not in fact a trust, but is rather a recognized exception to the law of testamentary disposition in that it obviates the need to comply with statutory elements of executing a will [*see Prob. Code § 5304*; *Estate of Collins (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 928, 932, 149 Cal. Rptr. 65]* . The trust is tentative in that it remains revocable until the depositor dies or unequivocally creates an irrevocable trust, for example, by delivering the pass book to the beneficiary [*Brucks v. Home Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 845, 850, 228 P.2d 545* ; *Kuck v. Raftery (1931) 117 Cal. App. 755, 758-760, 4 P.2d 552]* . Giving a power of attorney to a third person with instructions to with draw the sums on deposit evidences sufficient intent to revoke a tentative or Totten trust, even if the named beneficiary was able to frustrate the withdrawal [*Roberts v. Goetz (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 364, 368-369, 85 Cal. Rptr. 84]* .

The statutory provisions and the term Totten trust derive from the case of *In re Totten (1904) 179 N.Y. 112, 71 N.E. 748* , which defined a Totten trust as an account opened by a depositor in his or her own name as trustee for another person, but reserving the power to withdraw the funds during his or her lifetime. If the depositor has not revoked the trust by then, on his or her death any balance left in the account is payable to the beneficiary [*Estate of Fisher (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 418, 424, 244 Cal. Rptr. 5]* . Like any other trust, a Totten trust requires a trustor, a trustee (in a Totten trust they are usually the same person), a trust res, a trust beneficiary, and a trust intent [*Estate of Fisher (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 418, 424-425, 244 Cal. Rptr. 5* (decided under prior law, holding that person who claims to be cotrustee,

but who did not sign signature card, cannot use account title as evidence of his or her intent to create trust)].

For a form to establish and enforce a Totten trust account after the death of the trustee, *see § 560.690*.

[2] "Beneficiary" and "Party"

A "beneficiary" means a person named in a Totten trust account as one for whom a party to the account is named as trustee [*Prob. Code § 5126*].

"Party" means a person who, by the terms of the account, has a present right, subject to request, to payment from a multiple-party account other than as an agent [*Prob. Code § 5136(a)*] A beneficiary of a Totten trust account is a party to an account, by reason of being a beneficiary, only after the account becomes payable to that beneficiary by reason of surviving all persons named as trustees [*Prob. Code § 5136(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsCreation & TerminationBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.342

§ 560.342 Ownership While All Parties Are Living

During the lifetime of all parties, a Totten trust account belongs to the parties in proportion to the net contributions by each to the sums on deposit, unless there is clear and convincing evidence of a different intent [*Prob. Code § 5301(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 5150* (sums on deposit defined)]. The net contribution of a party to an account as of any given time is the sum of all of the following [*Prob. Code § 5134(a)*]:

- All deposits to the account made by or for the party, less all withdrawals made by or for the party that have not been paid to or applied to the use of any other party;

- A pro rata share of any interest or dividends earned, whether or not included in the current balance; and

- Any proceeds of deposit life insurance added to the account by reason of the death of the party whose net contribution is in question.

In the absence of proof otherwise, only parties who have a present right of withdrawal are considered as having a net contribution [*Prob. Code § 5134(b)(1)*], and the net contribution of each of the parties having a present right of withdrawal is deemed to be an equal amount [*Prob. Code § 5134(b)(2)*]. This definition is for use in determining ownership interests in an account as between the parties to an account and not as between the parties and the financial institution [*Prob. Code § 5134(c)(2)*].

Notwithstanding *Fam. Code §§ 2581* and *2640*, if parties to an account are married to each other, whether or not they are so described in the deposit agreement, their net contribution to the account is presumed to be and remain their community property [*Prob. Code § 5305(a)*; *see also* Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsGeneral OverviewBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawCommunity PropertyGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank AccountsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsCharacterizationCommunity Property

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.343

§ 560.343 Changes in Account Terms

During the lifetime of a party, the terms of the account may be changed as provided in *Prob. Code § 5303(b)* to eliminate or add rights of survivorship. Withdrawal of funds from the account by a party with a present right of withdrawal during the lifetime of a party also eliminates rights of survivorship on the death of that party with respect to the funds withdrawn [*Prob. Code § 5303(c)*].

Once established, the terms of a multiple party account may be changed only by any of the following methods [*Prob. Code § 5303(b)*]:

- Closing the account and reopening it under different terms;

- Presenting to the financial institution a modification agreement that is signed by all parties with a present right of withdrawal (if the financial institution has a form for this purpose, it may require use of the form);

- If the provisions of the terms of the account or deposit agreement provide a method of modification of the terms of the account, complying with those provisions; or

- As provided in *Prob. Code § 5405(c)*, discussed in *§ 560.345[6]*.

Unless the Totten trust account is described as a community property account, a beneficiary designation in a Totten trust account may not be changed by will [*Prob. Code § 5305(c)*; *see Prob. Code § 5307* (community property account)].

If the Totten Trust account has joint trustees who have rights of survivorship with respect to each others interests, a party who has a unilateral right of withdrawal can eliminate survivorship rights by closing out the account having survivorship rights and opening a new account without survivorship rights [*see* Law Rev. Comm. Comment to *Prob. Code § 5303*]. *Prob. Code § 5303* permits a decedent unilaterally to sever joint tenancy accounts if the decedent had the unilateral right of withdrawal from those accounts. Withdrawal of the funds from the accounts will not, however,

change the other rights of the parties to the moneys withdrawn, for instance the rights accruing pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 5301* and *5305* [*see* Law Rev. Comm. Comment to *Prob. Code § 5303*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsGeneral OverviewBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsCreation & TerminationBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.344

§ 560.344 Ownership After Death of Party

The provisions of *Prob. Code § 5302* regarding rights of survivorship are determined by the form of the account at the death of a party [*Prob. Code § 5303(a)*]. A beneficiary designation in a Totten trust account cannot be changed by will [*Prob. Code § 5302(e)*]. *Prob. Code § 5302(e)* was intended to strengthen the position of Totten trust beneficiaries as against heirs of the depositor [*Estate of Fisher (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 418, 429, 244 Cal. Rptr. 5]* .

A separate property Totten trust account is not part of the decedent/trustee's estate. Thus, the amount of such an account is not included for purposes of calculating an omitted spouse's share of the estate [*Estate of Allen (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1762, 1767-1771, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 352* (decided under former *Prob. Code § 6560(c)*; *now see Prob. Code § 21610(c)*; *compare Prob. Code §§ 5305(b), 5307* (surviving spouse may recover his or her interest in community funds in preference to beneficiary)].

On the death of one of two or more trustees to a Totten trust account, sums remaining on deposit belong to the surviving party or parties, not the estate of the decedent, unless there is clear and convincing evidence of a different intent. If there are two or more surviving parties, their respective ownerships during lifetime are in proportion to their previous ownership interests un der *Prob. Code § 5301*, augmented by an equal share for each survivor of any interest the decedent may have owned in the account immediately before the decedent's death. The right of survivorship continues between the surviving parties [*Prob. Code § 5302(a), (c)(1)*; *see Prob. Code § 5130* ("joint account" as one which is payable on request to one or more of two or more parties whether or not mention is made of any right of survivorship)].

On the death of the sole or surviving trustee of a Totten trust account, any sums remaining on deposit belong to the person or persons named as beneficiaries, if surviving, or to the survivor of them if one or more die before the trustee, unless there is clear and convincing evidence of a different intent [*Prob. Code § 5302(c)(2)(A)*]. If two or more beneficiaries survive, any sums remaining on deposit belong to them in equal and undivided shares unless the terms of the account or deposit agreement expressly provide for different shares [*Prob. Code § 5302(c)(2)(B)*]. If two or more beneficiaries survive, there is no right of survivorship in event of death of any beneficiary thereafter unless the terms of the account or deposit agreement expressly provide for survivorship between them [*Prob. Code § 5302(c)(2)(C)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsGeneral OverviewBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsRequirementsBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.345

§ 560.345 Withdrawals

[1] In General

Financial institutions rights and duties are discussed in more detail in Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* . In general, the financial institution at which the account is maintained must honor withdrawal requests that are made in accor dance with the terms of the account agreement and may do so without regard to whether any other party is incapacitated or deceased at the time the payment is demanded; but payment may not be made to the personal representative or heirs of a deceased party unless proof of death is presented to the financial institution showing that the decedent was the last surviving party or unless there is no right of survivorship under *Prob. Code § 5302* [*Prob. Code §§ 5401(b), 5402*]. Proof of death includes an original, attested, or certified copy of a death certificate, a record or report that is prima facie evidence of death under *Health & Safety Code § 103550, Evid. Code §§ 1530-1532*, or another California statute [*Prob. Code § 5144*].

The financial institution has no obligation to inquire regarding the source of funds received for deposit to a multiple-party account or the proposed application of funds withdrawn [*Prob. Code § 5401(c)(1)*]. A financial institution is not required to determine any party's net contribution or to limit withdrawals based on a party's net contribution [*Prob. Code § 5401(c)(2), (3)*]. Unless the financial institution has received a court order restraining payment, payment made pursuant to *Prob. Code § 5401* discharges the financial institution from all claims for amounts so paid whether or not the payment is consistent with the beneficial ownership of the account as between parties, P.O.D. payees, or beneficiaries, or their successors [*Prob. Code § 5405(a), (b)*].

[2] Payments to Trustee

The financial institution may pay any sums in a Totten trust account, on request and according to its terms, to any trustee [*Prob. Code § 5404*].

[3] Payment to Heirs or Personal Representative of Deceased Trustee

Unless the financial institution has received written notice that the beneficiary has a vested interest not dependent on

surviving the trustee, payment may be made to the personal representative or heirs of a deceased trustee if proof of death is presented to the financial institution showing that the deceased trustee was the survivor of all other persons named on the account either as trustee or beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 5404*; *see Prob. Code § 5144* (defining proof of death)].

[4] Payments to Beneficiary

A Totten trust account may be paid to a beneficiary or beneficiaries or the personal representative or heirs of a beneficiary or beneficiaries if proof of death is presented to the financial institution showing that the beneficiary or beneficiaries survived all persons named as trustees [*Prob. Code § 5404*; *see Prob. Code § 5144* (defining proof of death)].

[5] Levies and Setoffs

All funds in an account, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the financial institution and the parties to the account, remain subject to liens, security interests, rights of setoff, and charges, notwithstanding the determination or allocation of net contributions with respect to the parties [*Prob. Code § 5401(d)*].

[6] Notice From Party Restraining Payment of Account

A party to an account may give written notice to the financial institution, at the branch or office at which the account is carried, not to permit withdrawals in accordance with the terms of the account, other than a checking account, share draft account, or other similar third-party payment instrument, except with the signatures of more than one of the parties during their lifetimes or of more than one of the survivors after the death of any one of the parties. Unless the notice is withdrawn by a subsequent writing, after receipt of such a notice, the financial institution may only pay the sums on deposit in accordance with the written instructions pending determination of the rights of the parties or their successors [*Prob. Code § 5405(c)*; *see Prob. Code § 5146* (absent account terms to contrary, receipt of notice as receipt at branch or office where account is carried)]. No liability attaches to the financial institution for complying with the terms of any written notice provided pursuant to *Prob. Code § 5405(c)* [*Prob. Code § 5405(c)*; *see also Prob. Code § 5405(b)* (court order restraining payments by financial institution, discussed in Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsGeneral OverviewBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsRequirementsBanking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.346-560.359

[Reserved]

§§ 560.346[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.360

§ 560.360 State Statutes

Venue provisions generally. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-395.5*

Methods of creating trust. *Prob. Code § 15200*

Intention to create trust. *Prob. Code § 15201*

Requirement of trust property. *Prob. Code § 15202*

Trust purpose. *Prob. Code §§ 15203, 15204*

Designation of beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 15205*

Statute of frauds. *Prob. Code § 15206*

Oral trust in personal property. *Prob. Code § 15207*

Consideration and promise to create trust. *Prob. Code § 15208*

Exception to doctrine of merger. *Prob. Code § 15209*

Recording of trust. *Prob. Code § 15210*

Rule against perpetuities and related trust provisions. *Prob. Code §§ 15211, 15212, 15413, 15414, 21200 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.361

§ 560.361 Decisions

[1] Trusts

[a] In General

When two individuals entered into a real estate partnership acting in their capacity as trustee of their family trust, the partners were the individuals and not the trust; the trust was not a separate entity from its trustee. *Presta v. Tepper (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 909, 918-919, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 12*

Trust for illegal purpose unenforceable in *California. In re Marriage of Dick (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 144, 161-162, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743*

Trust created by husband for purpose of concealing marital assets from wife illegal and thus unenforceable. *In re Marriage of Dick (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 144, 161-162, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 743*

Interpretation of declaration of trust presents question of law unless interpretation turns on competence or credibility of extrinsic evidence; accordingly, reviewing court not bound by lower court's interpretation, but required to construe declaration independently. *Poag v. Winston (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1161, 1173, 241 Cal. Rptr. 330*

Attempted residuary provision in will leaving property to named person for distribution according to settlor's wishes, absent explanatory provision, is invalid for uncertainty. *Estate of Feldman (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 778, 780, 787-790, 178 P.2d 498*

Express trust may be properly created for any purpose for which persons may lawfully contract; trust to convey property to another as trustee for benefit of settlor is valid. *Reiss v. Reiss (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 740, 746, 114 P.2d 718*

Trust as device to sell real property and dispose of the proceeds of the sale. *Craven v. Dominguez Estate Co (1925) 72 Cal. App. 713, 717, 237 P. 821*

[b] Beneficiaries

Contingent beneficiaries described as lawful issue of other beneficiaries include children adopted when they were minors. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Huse (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 927, 933-934, 129 Cal. Rptr. 522*

Members of definite class of persons are able to be beneficiaries of trust, but identity of all individuals comprising membership of class must be ascertainable in order to satisfy requirement of definiteness. *Reagh v. Kelley (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1082, 1092, 1097-1098, 89 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Beneficiary of testamentary trust providing stipend until remarriage was unable to be reinstated as beneficiary after annulment of subsequent marriage. *Stoner v. Nethercutt (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 667, 669-672, 87 Cal. Rptr. 659*

[c] Creation

Whether trust has been established is determined by law of state that is situs of trust fund. *In re California Trade Technical Schools, Inc. (9th Cir. 1991) 923 F.2d 641, 646* (express trust of student loan funds paid by government to bankrupt, as trustee for student beneficiaries)

Testamentary trust comes into existence and legal title to property vests in trustee at death of testator. *Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Duffill (1923) 191 Cal. 629, 647, 218 P. 14*

Declaration by settlors that they hold property in trust for another is sufficient to transfer real property to a trust; it is not necessary to record deed from real property owners to trust or trustees, or to record trust. *Estate of Powell (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1443, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*

Intention to create trust in real property is subject to proof by parol evidence. *Jose v. Pacific Tile & Porcelain Co. (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 141, 144, 58 Cal. Rptr. 880*

Requirement that trust property be delivered is satisfied by actual or symbolic delivery; for example, delivery of written instrument such as stock certificate may possibly constitute delivery of underlying property. *Lawson v. Lowengart (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 98, 109-110, 59 Cal. Rptr. 186*

[d] Vesting

Period within which interest appointed under special power of appointment must vest is measured from time power created; perpetuities issue under *Civ. Code § 715.2* properly raised for first time on appeal. *United California Bank v. Bottler (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 610, 616-617, 94 Cal. Rptr. 227*

[2] No Contest Clauses

CAUTION:

Effective Jan. 1, 2010, revisions to *Prob. Code § 21310-21315* significantly changed the law governing enforcement of no contest clauses [*Prob. Code § 21315*]. Cases decided under pre-2010 law should be reviewed carefully to determine their applicability under the current law. For discussion of the enforcement of no contest clauses under both the current Probate Code provisions and the common law,

see *§ 560.16*.

Prob. Code § 15409 modification petition to delete a special needs provision because the settler misunderstood the circumstances did not violate a no contest clause as a matter of public policy, and the safe harbor petition was properly granted. Balian v. Balian (2009) *179 Cal. App. 4th, 1505, 1513, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 470*

Challenge to surviving spouse's mental capacity to transfer assets and appoint a successor trustee did not violate a no-contest clause in family trust since trustee did not propose to void, nullify, or set aside trust or any of its provisions, or to change provisions that were clearly and unambiguously expressed. *Johnson v. Greenelsh (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 598, 599 Cal. Rptr. 3d 622, 217 P.3d 1194*

When testators instructed that beneficiary's debt to them be offset against beneficiary's distribution, beneficiary's assertion that his debt was not enforceable was indirect contest that violated no contest provision. *Cook v. Cook (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1436, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 913*

Petition by contingent remainder beneficiaries, seeking information with regard to how trustee was spending trust funds, which was necessary to enable beneficiaries to enforce their rights under the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 16060*, was not a contest within the meaning of trust's no contest clause. *Salter v. Lerner (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1189, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Beneficiary's challenge to validity of handwritten notations made by settlor on trust after it was executed, which qualified as an instrument other than the instrument containing the no contest clause, was determined not to be a contest under *Prob. Code § 21305(a)(3)*. Cory v. Toscano (2009) 174, Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1046, *94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 841*

Proposed petition challenging exercise of a fiduciary power by trustee did not constitute a contest as a matter of public policy. *Bradley v. Gilbert (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1058, 1071, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 680*

Language in trust documents establishing three methods of exercising a limited power of appointment was ambiguous, allowing reformation in accordance with grantors' intent not to violate trust's no contest clause. *Giammarrusco v. Simon (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 1586, 91 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50*

Proposed challenge to trust amendment did no violate trust's no contest clause, because no contest clause in trust did not specifically provide that it applied to trust amendments. *Townsend v. Townsend (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 389, 402-403, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 760*

Beneficiary who filed petition outside of safe harbor provisions of *Prob. Code § 21320*, and whose clear purpose was to defeat surviving settlor's testamentary and donative intent, violated no contest clause. Schwartz v. Schwartz (2008) Cal. App. 4th 733, 745, *84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 387*

Proposed challenge to two trust amendments did not trigger no-contest clause because no-contest clause in trust did not specifically state that it applied to trust amendments and the amendments did not contain a no contest clause as required by *Prob. Code § 21305(a)(3)*. *Perrin v. Lee (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1239, 1244, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 885*

Minor's claims, brought under *Prob. Code § 21320* safe harbor provision through a guardian ad litem, did not violate a trust's no contest clause since minor's written consent to appointment of mother as guardian ad litem does not constitute voluntary participation in trust contest. *Safai v. Safai (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 233, 244, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 759*

After appellate decision that settlor's daughter had triggered no contest clause in irrevocable trust, trial court acted within its authority when it reconsidered on its own motion its earlier grant of *Prob. Code § 21320* relief and held that

daughter lacked standing because she was no longer a beneficiary; and since a related revocable trust contained same no contest language as the irrevocable trust, trial court did not err in ruling that daughter lacked standing as to both trusts. *Montegani v. Johnson (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1231, 1239, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 621*

No contest clause in will was not incorporated by reference into testamentary trust when decrees of distribution contained some language that referred to the will, but clear statement in distributing clause of trust, stating that trust was completely set forth in the decree, established that no trust provisions were omitted and there was no room to supplement trust provisions by incorporating provisions contained in will. *Meyer v. Meyer (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 983, 998, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 546*

Beneficiary's filing of second proposed petition did not violate trust's no contest clause because it sought to impose liability on trustees for alleged breach of fiduciary duty for improper disbursements and did not seek an accounting or seek to void, nullify, or set aside portion of trust limiting liability of successor trustees; doctrine of conclusiveness did not apply as it applies to filed pleadings but has no application to pleadings proposed to be filed under *Prob. Code § 21320*. *Betts v. City Nat'l Bank (2007) 156 Cal App 4th 222, 67 Cal Rptr 3d 152, 162*

No contest clause in trust instrument which applied to any attempt to "impair" the trust extended to trust beneficiary's adjustment petition under California Uniform Principal and Income Act to reallocate principal and income, when reallocation would have resulted in more income to beneficiary than allowed by trust and invasion of trust principal reserved to other beneficiaries. *McKenzie v. Vanderpoel (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1442, 1454, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 129*

No contest clause in testamentary trust upheld as valid although it forced settlor's former wife and their children to choose between enforcing their rights under an existing martial dissolution judgment by filing creditor's claims, or relinquishing those rights and taking gifts provided for them in settlor's trust. *Colburn v. Northern Trust Co. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 439, 447, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828*

No contest clause in testamentary trust providing that contest by one beneficiary would avoid devises to other noncontesting beneficiaries' bequests along with the contestant's does not, in itself, violate public policy. *Tunstall v. Wells (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 554, 558* ; *50 Cal. Rptr. 3d 468*

When trust amendment was separate from instrument containing no contest clause, within meaning of *Prob. Code § 21305(a)(3)*, because it did not contain a no contest clause, it could be challenged without violating no contest clause of instrument that did contain such a clause, because such an action was not expressly identified as a violation. *Estate of Rossi (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1325, 1338, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 244*

Petition proposed by trust beneficiaries to remove trustees for malfeasance violated trust's no contest clause, despite the exception afforded by *Prob. Code § 21305(b)* for challenges to the exercise of fiduciary power or seeking the removal of a fiduciary, when the trust became irrevocable in December 2000; statutory exceptions only apply to trust instruments that become irrevocable before January 1, 2001. *Hermanson v. Hermanson (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 441, 444-446, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486*

No contest clauses in inter vivos trusts must be strictly construed; they are not to be extended beyond what was plainly testator's intent. *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 168-169, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*

Proposed challenge to validity of amendment to inter vivos trust on ground that amendment was result of duress or undue influence constituted attack on *how amendment occurred*, not on settlor's *power to amend*, and therefore did not amount to a "contest" for purposes of no contest clause in trust. *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 169-170, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*

When settlors created typical living trust arrangement under which trust was divided into two trusts on death of first

settlor, petition contesting an amendment that surviving settlor made to Trust A (the survivor's trust) after first settlor's death did not constitute contest of Trust B for purpose of no-contest clause in trust instrument. *Scharlin v. Superior Court (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 162, 170, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*

No contest clause in trust must be strictly construed because clause may work forfeiture. *Poag v. Winston (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1161, 1173, 1181, 241 Cal. Rptr. 330*

No contest clause not violated by actions that assert no claim to assets of, and pose no threat to, trust; clause not applicable to beneficiary's action to impose personal liability on trustee, among other things. *Poag v. Winston (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1161, 1175-1181, 241 Cal. Rptr. 330*

Generally, no contest clause in declaration of trust is valid and must be given effect according to settlor's intent as intent appears from terms of trust and surrounding circumstances. *Poag v. Winston (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1161, 1173, 241 Cal. Rptr. 330*

[3] Restorative Payments to Trust

"Restorative" payments made by trustee of express trust to replace improperly diverted trust funds become part of trust without need for tracing that would arise in constructive trust. *In re California Trade Technical Schools, Inc. (9th Cir. 1991) 923 F.2d 641, 646* (applying California law; except that restorative payments made within 90 days of filing bankruptcy did not become part of express trust)

[4] Taking Property Out of Trust

Provision in living trust, stating that title to trust property could be held in any way, necessarily meant that selling trust asset and taking title in name other than that of trust would not, by itself, take property out of trust; ostensible purpose of provision--to make it easy and convenient for trust to hold property--by providing that title could be taken in name of trustors, as distinct from trust itself, and property would still be in trust, necessarily required that there be some affirmative action by trustors beyond merely change in form of title to take property out of trust. *Heaps v. Heaps (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 286, 291-292, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 239*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.362

§ 560.362 Law Reviews

Engelhardt, *In Terrorem Inter Vivos: Terra Incognita, 26 Real Prop., Prob & Tr. J. 535 (1991)*

Dukeminier, *The Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities: Ninety Years in Limbo, 34 UCLA L. Rev. 1023 (1987)*

Dukeminier, *A Modern Guide to Perpetuities, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 1867 (1986)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.363

§ 560.363 Text References

For a practical guide to planning, drafting, interpreting, and executing wills and trusts, see California Wills and Trusts (Matthew Bender)

For forms for testamentary and inter vivos trusts, see California Wills and Trusts--Forms (Matthew Bender)

Hartog & Dirkes, California Trust Practice (Matthew Bender)

Current Legal Forms With Tax Analysis, Ch. 9, *Irrevocable Trusts* (Matthew Bender)

Modern Estate Planning, Ch. 5, *Grantor Trusts* ; Ch. 8, *Revocable Trusts* (Matthew Bender)

Nossaman and Wyatt, Trust Adminstration and Taxation, pt. I, *Existence, Validity and Interpretation*: Ch. 1, *Nature, Uses, and Purposes of Trusts*; Ch. 2, *Validity--Certainty* (2d ed. rev. Matthew Bender)

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 122, 125, 616-618, 720 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Trusts*, §§ 1-7, 12-16, 31-38 (10th ed. 2005)

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees, Ch. 3, *The Creation of Express Private Trusts--The Settlor and His Intention*; Ch. 4, *The Creation of Express Private Trusts--The Statute of Frauds*; Ch. 5, *The Statute of Frauds--Satisfaction of the Statute*; Ch. 7, *The Trust Subject Matter*; Ch. 8, *The Trustee--Selection: Capacity*; Ch. 12, *The Creation of Trusts--Consideration--Active and Passive Trusts*; Ch. 13, *Restrictions--Illegality--Perpetuities--Accumulations--Suspension of Power of Alienation--Spendthrift Trusts*, §§ 211-220; Ch. 14, *Various Trust Functions* (2d ed.)

Restatement (Second) of Trusts §§ 74-86

Scott, The Law of Trusts, vol. I, Ch. 1, *Definitions and Distinctions,* vol. IA, Ch. 2, *The Creation of a Trust,* Ch. 3, *The Trust Property* (Little, Brown 4th ed. 1987)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCreationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsExecutionEstate, Gift & Trust LawWillsInterpretationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.364-560.379

[Reserved]

§§ 560.364[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, and Duties of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.380

§ 560.380 State Statutes

Professional Fiduciaries Act. *Bus & Prof. Code § 6500 et seq.*

Acceptance and rejection of trust. *Prob. Code §§ 15600-15603*

Cotrustees. *Prob. Code §§ 15620-15622*

Resignation of trustee. *Prob. Code §§ 15640, 15641*

Removal of trustee. *Prob. Code § 15642*

Vacancy in office of trustee. *Prob. Code §§ 15643, 15644*

Appointment of trustee to fill vacancy. *Prob. Code § 15660*

Compensation and indemnification. *Prob. Code §§ 15680-15685*

Duties of trustees. *Prob. Code §§ 16000-16105*

Accounting and reporting. *Prob. Code §§ 16060-16064*

Powers of trustees. *Prob. Code §§ 16200-16249*

Liabilities of trustees. *Prob. Code §§ 16400-16465*

Notice of proposed action by trustee. *Prob. Code §§ 16500-16504*

Requirements for distribution of nonmonetary pecuniary gift. *Prob. Code § 21118*

Duties, powers, and discretionary authority of trustee, and other provisions regarding marital deductions and charitable gifts in trusts; conformance with Internal Revenue Code. *Prob. Code §§ 21500-21541*

Trustee's liability to State of California for distribution of assets prior to payment of taxes. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19516*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesAppointmentEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesMultiple TrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, and Duties of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.381

§ 560.381 Decisions

[1] Accounting

When there has been negligent failure to keep true accounts, or refusal to account, all presumptions are against trustee on settlement. *Blackmon v. Hale (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 548, 560, 83 Cal. Rptr. 194, 463 P.2d 418*

Trustee under duty to support every item of account; unsupported items properly disallowed. *Neel v. Barnard (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 406, 420, 150 P.2d 177*

Court has authority to order beneficiaries to pay attorney fees incurred by trustee in completing and defending accounting; trustee's right to indemnification for expenses reasonably incurred in defending accounting is conferred by *Prob. Code § 15685*. *Kasperbauer v. Fairfield (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 785, 795*

When settlor of revocable trust was under care and custody of court-appointed conservator, beneficiaries had no right to accounting because trust remained revocable despite settlor's conservatorship. *Johnson v. Kotyck (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 83, 88, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 99*

Amendment of *Prob. Code § 16460* in 1996 was intended to reject holding in *Di Grazia v. Anderlini (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37* (discussed *below*) with regard to the content of account required to put a beneficiary on notice; amendment was not intended to change existing law but rather to clarify it by correcting *Di Grazia's* misinterpretation of the statute; thus 1996 amendment was applicable to claims accruing prior to 1990, and if beneficiaries had the required information at that time, their claims based on breaches that occurred more than three years before they filed their petitions were barred by statute of limitations. *Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 858, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

In case involving 20 separate trusts created by husband wife--two trusts each for each of their 10 siblings--statute of limitations applied separately to each remainder beneficiary's claims vis-a-vis the two trusts in which he or she had a per

capita interest, not to all 20 trusts as a whole; each remainder beneficiary's cause of action accrued when he or she had the required knowledge concerning the trusts in which he or she had an interest, and his or her knowledge about the other trusts' assets was legally irrelevant; contention that each reminder beneficiary had to examine the accountings for *all* of the trusts before it was possible to determine that trustee had failed to invest trust corpus for benefit of remainder beneficiaries rejected. *Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

Accountings and letters bank provided to the remainder beneficiaries provided more than enough factual information as a matter of law to trigger *Prob. Code § 16460* prior to1990. *Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

Doctrine of res judicata barred claims of remainder beneficiaries based on breaches of duty by trustee that occurred during years 1969 to 1980 in which probate court had approved the annual reports. *Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 862, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829*

Court may order trustee's accounting to include transactions related to accounts held in joint tenancy by trustee and settlor. *Evangelho v. Presoto (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 615, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 146*

Mere schedule of sales and expenses, which does not provide other information regarding administration of trust, is not sufficient accounting to start running of three-year statute of limitations for actions against trustee for breach of trust under *Prob. Code § 16460*. *Di Grazia v. Anderlini (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1337, 1346, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 37* ; *but see Noggle v. Bank of America (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 853, 858-859, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 829 , above*, in which the court held that the 1996 amendment of *Prob. Code § 16460* was intended to reject the *Di Grazia* holding with regard to the content of the account required to put a beneficiary on notice

When beneficiary filed frivolous objections to one of trustee's accounts, court properly ordered beneficiary under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* to pay sanctions in form of reasonable attorney's fees and expenses incurred by trustee in responding to objections. *Wells Fargo Bank v. DiLeonardo (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 873, 878-879, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 16*

Consent to delay of accounting does not waive right to ultimate account. *Welsh v. Griffin (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 207, 214, 3 Cal. Rptr. 729*

[2] Actions and Claims

Surcharge order upheld notwithstanding existence of spendthrift provision, when trust beneficiary was also trustee and committed a breach causing fiduciary harm to the trust. Chatard v. Oveross (2009) *179 Cal. App. 4th, 1098, 1114, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 883*

Successor trustee acted reasonably and did not have to be represented by counsel when appearing in court to petition to modify and terminate trust, as she was simply fulfilling her duties as trustee, and not engaged in unauthorized practice of law. *Finkbeiner v. Gavid (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 1417, 1421, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 871*

Nonattorney trustee may not represent trust in propria persona in action to protect trust property because in that capacity trustee would be representing interests of beneficiaries and would therefore be engaged in unauthorized practice of law. *Ziegler v. Nickel (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 545, 548-549, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 312*

[3] Attorney's Fees

Provisions of *Cal. Rules of Court, Rule 3.1702*, providing that in civil cases a notice of motion for attorney's fees must be filed and served within 60 days of entry of judgment, do not apply to probate court proceedings. *Hollaway v.*

Edwards (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 94, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 166

Trustee not entitled to attorney's fees in justified removal action. *Estate of Miller (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 536, 546-549, 66 Cal. Rptr. 756*

Beneficiaries not entitled to recover attorney's fees under theory that fees are damages proximately resulting from trustee's negligence. *Estate of Gump (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 111, 118, 180 Cal. Rptr. 219*

Beneficiaries not entitled to recover attorney's fees on common fund theory when increase in assets resulting from action did not substantially benefit any other parties. *Estate of Gump (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 111, 118, 180 Cal. Rptr. 219*

[4] Compensation

If litigation is necessary to preserve trust, trustee is entitled to reimbursement for his or her expenditures from trust; however, if litigation is specifically for trustee's benefit, trustee must bear his or her own costs, and is not entitled to reimbursement. *Terry v. Conlan (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1445, 1461, 1464, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 603*

Appellate court affirmed denial of compensation for services and costs arising from negligent and intentional misconduct in administration of lease property, but remanding denial of ordinary fees for services unconnected with administration of lease property that were reasonable and compensable. *Estate of Gump (1992) 1 Cal. App. 4th 582, 610-611, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269*

Trial court's refusal to award trustee compensation and attorney's fees in proceeding brought by beneficiary for alleged malfeasance was abuse of discretion when trustee successfully defended against majority of charges. *Estate of Cassity (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 569, 574* , 165 Cal. Rtpr. 88

Proper standard regarding reasonableness of compensation of trustee managing corporation is not corporate standard prescribed by *Corp. Code § 310*, which requires reasonableness only at time transaction authorized; reasonableness of testamentary trustee's compensation is continuing responsibility of trustee throughout entire tenure. *Estate of Feraud (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 717, 722-723, 154 Cal. Rptr. 889*

When beneficial owners of corporation's stock were also beneficiaries of trusts and trustee was president and chief operating officer of corporation, trustee's compensation was required to be fair and reasonable as to beneficiaries and not as to corporation. *Estate of Feraud (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 717, 723, 154 Cal. Rptr. 889*

Trustee's compensation was unfair and unreasonable when it was based on gross sales of corporation that trustee managed and stock value rather than on corporation's net profits. *Estate of Feraud (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 717, 723, 154 Cal. Rptr. 889*

In determining reasonable compensation of testamentary trustee and attorney, trial court properly reduced amounts requested. *Estate of Nazro (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 218, 221-223, 93 Cal. Rptr. 116* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1122, *now see Prob. Code § 15681*)

Court permitted to increase compensation of testamentary trustee when compensation provided by will would be so unreasonably low that competent trustee would not undertake to administer trust. *Estate of Taylor (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 16, 20-22, 85 Cal. Rptr. 474* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1122, *now see Prob. Code § 15681*)

[5] Duties

Trustee's duty to report to beneficiaries in *Prob. Code § 16061* does not require disclosure of communications protected by attorney-client privilege. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Superior Court (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 201, 207, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716, 990 P.2d 591*

Duties of testamentary trustee commence on death of testator. *Estate of Wellings (1923) 192 Cal. 506, 510, 221 P. 628*

If a trustee is liable to beneficiaries for damages resulting from acts and omissions of trustee and attorney, trustee and attorney may be held liable as joint tortfeasors. *Gackstetter v. Frawley (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1257, 1275, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 333*

Trustee's failure to strictly comply with notice requirements of *Prob. Code § 16061.7(g)* does not render notice a nullity, and does not make inapplicable the 120-day statute of limitations for bringing an action to contest the trust. *Germino v. Hillyer (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 951, 955-957, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 478*

Interest on general pecuniary gift distributable under trust is not payable when trust was created before effective date of prior version of *Prob. Code § 16340(b)*. *Remsen v. Lavacot (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 421, 429, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612*

Use of 12-point type is not reasonable equivalent of 10-point boldface type as required in notice of trust becoming irrevocable [*Prob. Code § 16061.7(h)* (former *Prob. Code § 16061.7(g)*)]; appellants' petition contesting trust was not untimely. *Harustak v. Wilkins (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 208, 216-218, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 718*

Trust beneficiaries stated cause of action against attorneys for former trustees for active participation in breaches of fiduciary duty by former trustees. *Pierce v. Lyman (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1106, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 236*

Trustee breached duty to beneficiaries by realizing profit from lending purchase price to purchaser of trust property. *Estate of Pitzer (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 979, 991-992, 202 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Bank-trustee that places trust funds on deposit with itself at rate of interest less than that possible in a higher-yielding account bears burden of proving that circumstances reasonably known to it at time of investment justified lower interest account. *Conservatorship of Pelton (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 496, 502, 183 Cal. Rptr. 188* (interpreting former *Civ. Code § 2261, now see Prob. Code § 16225*)

Cotrustee who was public accountant has duty to know that incentive compensation of corporate manager of business and trustee of trust that was totally unrelated to net income of corporation was unfair and unreasonable to beneficial owners of corporation's stock. *Estate of Feraud (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 717, 724, 154 Cal. Rptr. 889*

Trustee's execution of quitclaim deed to son was not inconsistent with terms of trust, and was permissible delegation of duties rather than repudiation of trust. *Welsh v. Griffin (1960) 179 Cal. App. 2d 207, 215, 3 Cal. Rptr. 729*

Provision in trust empowering trustees to appoint someone in their place if necessary to carry out terms of trust was construed as method for appointment of successor trustee rather than authorization to delegate discretion to agents. *Estate of Kessler (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 383, 388, 261 P.2d 27*

[6] Liability

Transaction that would otherwise constitute wrongful use of trust property held proper when consistent with instructions in main trust instrument. *Estate of Thompson (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 613, 616-617, 328 P.2d 1* ; *Copley v.*

Copley (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 248, 279, 178 Cal. Rptr. 842

Managing officer-director of corporate trustee found individually liable to beneficiary for conversion of trust property for corporation's use when he knew or should have known of conversion. *Middlesex Ins. Co. v. Mann (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 558, 572, 177 Cal. Rptr. 495*

[7] Measure of Liability

If trustee wrongfully sells trust property, interest is awarded from date of sale, on proceeds of profits from sale; interest is awarded only on money judgment. *Redke v. Silvertrust (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 94, 106-107, 98 Cal. Rptr. 293, 490 P.2d 805 , cert. denied, 405 U.S. 1041, 92 S. Ct. 1316, 31 L. Ed. 2d 583 (1972)*

In cases involving breach of fiduciary relationship, proof of actual damages is not an important factor in award of exemplary damages. *Werschkull v. United California Bank (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 981, 1004, 149 Cal. Rptr. 829* (large exemplary damages award against trustee)

[8] Removal

Removal of trustee is proper whenever ill-feeling, growing out of trustee's behavior, exists between trustees, or between trustee and beneficiaries, and continuance in office would prevent harmonious administration of trust, even in absence of misconduct. *May v. May (1896) 167 U.S. 310, 320-321, 17 S. Ct. 824* ; *Brown v. Memorial Nat. Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 534, 329 P.2d 118 , cert. denied, 358 U.S. 943, 79 S. Ct. 353, 3 L. Ed. 2d 352 (1959)*

When trustee's duties are solely ministerial, and cotrustee exists who has equal power and must concur in all trust matters, removal was not justified on ground of hostility between trustee and beneficiary. *McPherson v. Cox (1877) 96 U.S. 404, 419, 24 L. Ed. 746*

Trustee held subject to removal for appropriating trust property for personal use, even if trustee mistakenly claimed entitlement to property and subsequently returned it, because purpose of removal is not to penalize past behavior, but to preserve trust property. *Moore v. Bowes (1937) 8 Cal. 2d 162, 165*

Trustee is unable to purchase or deal with subject of trust, purchase debts due and repay them out of trust estate, or be in position antagonistic to trust. *Page v. Naglee (1856) 6 Cal. 241, 245*

Probate court has jurisdiction under *Prob. Code § 17206* to suspend trustee's powers for perceived breaches of trust; since court has express statutory authority to remove a trustee, court has inherent equitable power to use the less extreme remedy of suspending most of trustee's powers, appoint a separate interim trustee, and order trustee to turn over all trust documents and books to interim trustee. *Schwartz v. Labow (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 417, 428, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 838*

Long-term care ombudsman for skilled nursing facility remains care custodian even after formal ombudsman relationship with resident has ended, due either to change in ombudsman's facility assignment or fact that resident has left facility when ombudsman, as result of fiduciary relationship with resident, develops personal relationship with resident and thereby acquires personal and financial information regarding resident. *Estate of Shinkle (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 990, 993, 119 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *disapproved in part on other grounds in Bernard v. Foley (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 794, 816, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 248, 139 P.3d 1196*

Removal of trustee for conflict of interest is unwarranted when trustee is appointed by settlor who is aware of conflicts of interest inherent in appointment and there is no actual breach of trust. *Claypool v. Wilson (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th*

646, 676-677 (applied to Legislature's appointment of actuary for PERS trust)

Assuming existence of legally proper ground for removal, evidence of actual past wrongdoing by trustee is not required to justify removal, because purpose of removing trustee is not to inflict penalty for past action, but to preserve trust assets; question in each case is whether circumstances are such that continuance of trustee in office would be detrimental to trust. *Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 139-140, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Trustee's hostility in response to beneficiary's demand for resignation is not ground for removal absent additional showing that administration of trust consequentially suffered. *IFS Industries, Inc. v. Stephens (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 740, 754, 205 Cal. Rptr. 915*

If settlor has named trustee while fully aware of potential conflict of interest, trustee is not subject to removal on that ground absent demonstrated abuse of power detrimental to trust. *Estate of Gilliland (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 515, 528, 140 Cal. Rptr. 795*

Charitable trustee may be removed on same grounds as trustee of private trust. *Brown v. Memorial Nat. Home Foundation (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 513, 533, 329 P.2d 118 , cert. denied, 358 U.S. 943 (1959)*

Concealment, threat, or adverse pressure of any kind is unlawful as long as confidential relation exists, and constitutes grounds for removal. *Estate of Vokal (1953) 121 Cal. App. 2d 252, 257, 263 P.2d 64*

Trustee who controls company in which trustee holds shares both individually and in trust for beneficiary may be properly removed, because dual relationships conflict. *Overell v. Overell (1926) 78 Cal. App. 251, 259, 248 P. 310*

[9] Rights

Cotrustee had right under trust instrument to exercise power vested in two co-trustees when other cotrustee was unable to serve and trust instrument provided that on death, resignation, or inability of one cotrustee, remaining cotrustee serves as successor, notwithstanding *Prob. Code § 15620* (power vested in two or more trustees may only be exercised by their unanimous action). *La Jolla Mesa Vista Improvement Assn. v. La Jolla Mesa Vista Homeowners Assn. (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1187, 1197-1198, 269 Cal. Rptr. 825*

[10] Successor Trustees

Trustee who requested predecessor to prepare audit is not liable for payment of audit because request was made prior to his succession as trustee and audit was done for benefit of predecessor trustee and not for benefit of trust. *Boyle v. Superior Court (1934) 137 Cal. App. 672, 674, 31 P.2d 828*

[11] Temporary Trustee or Receiver

Appointment of receiver is proper when it does not adversely affect any interest of beneficiaries in trust property, but rather is necessary to protect property that would have been otherwise lost. *Bowles v. Superior Court (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 574, 583, 283 P.2d 704* (now see *Prob. Code § 15640(b)* (appointment of receiver or temporary trustee))

[12] Trustee Ad Litem

When trustee's interests in conduct of third-party litigation involving trust assets are similar to those of third-party

litigants and inimical to those of trust beneficiaries, suspension of trustee's powers relative to that litigation and appointment of trustee ad litem to conduct litigation is proper exercise of probate court's general equity jurisdiction, and as intrinsically included in court's greater power to remove and replace trustee. *Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 141-142, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersAccountingEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersCompensationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, and Duties of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.382

§ 560.382 Text References

Nossaman & Wyatt, Trust Administration and Taxation (2d ed rev) Vol. 1, Part III, *Rights of Settlor and Beneficiaries Generally,* Ch. 23, *Nature of Beneficiaries Rights Under Trust, and in Trust Property,* Vol. 1A, Part VI, *Accountings and Actions,* Ch. 33, *Effect of Orders Settling Accounts,* § 33.03, Part V, *Rights, Powers, Duties, and Liabilities of the Trustee,* Ch. 26, *Who May Be a Trustee --Capacity-- Tenure--Succession* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 13, *Trusts,* § 119 (10th ed. 2005)

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed.), Ch. 26, *Trustee's Duties in General,* Ch. 27, *Trustee's Powers in General,* Ch. 28, *Power to Continue Business of Decedent,* Ch. 29, *Collection and Preservation of the Trust Fund,* Ch. 41, *Remedies of the Beneficiary and Trustee,* Ch. 46, *Accounting and Compensation,* Ch. 47, *Modification and Termination of Trusts*

Restatement (Second) of Trusts §§ 173, 255

Scott, The Law of Trusts, vol. III, Ch. 7, *The Administration of the Trust,* §§ 223-225 (3d ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesRemoval & Resignation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, and Duties of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.383-560.399

[Reserved]

§§ 560.383[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification and Termination of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.400

§ 560.400 State Statutes

Presumption of revocability. *Prob. Code § 15400*

Revocation by settlor. *Prob. Code §§ 15401, 15402*

Methods of modification or termination. *Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404*

Guardian ad litem. *Prob. Code § 15405*

Presumption regarding fertility. *Prob. Code § 15406*

When trust terminates. *Prob. Code § 15407*

Grounds for modification or termination. *Prob. Code §§ 15408-15409*

Disposition of property on termination. *Prob. Code § 15410*

Combination of trusts. *Prob. Code § 15411*

Division of trusts. *Prob. Code § 15412*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of Presumptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification and Termination of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.401

§ 560.401 Decisions

In action to compel distribution of portion of corpus, to which beneficiary had exclusive rights, court has power to order distribution on ground of change in circumstances. *Whittingham v. California Trust Co. (1931) 214 Cal. 128, 129-130, 134, 4 P.2d 142*

Trust beneficiaries could modify irrevocable trust when trust gave discretion to add organizations as beneficiaries, beneficiaries entered into a settlement agreement, transferor's intent was clear, and ascertaining beneficiaries was not necessary under *Prob. Code § 17202*. *Boys and Girls Club of Petaluma v. Walsh (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 1049, 1060, 1062, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 413* .

Wife breached terms of joint inter vivos trust by executing deed purporting to withdraw property from trust after husband's death; even though property was her share of community property, trust had become irrevocable in its entirety on husband's death. *Aguilar v. Aguilar (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 35, 40, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 193*

Revocation of trust by trustor delivering notice of revocation to himself as trustee was held valid and in compliance with *Prob. Code § 15401(a)(2)* when trust's revocation provision was not explicitly exclusive. *Masry v. Masry (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 738, 740, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 915*

Settlor of two irrevocable trusts had standing to petition for reformation, even though he was not a beneficiary and did not have a pecuniary interest, under the trial court's common law equitable power on grounds that drafting errors defeated settlor's dispositive intent. *Bilafer v. Bilafer (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 363, 370, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 880* .

Revocation by surviving spouse of trust funded with community property results in one-half of trust assets being returned to him and other half being disposed of according to wife's will because property was transmuted to separate property at wife's death under *Prob. Code § 100*; surviving spouse's revocation was effective as to his half of corpus. *Estate of Powell (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1434, 1441, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*

Court has equitable power to modify trust to remedy drafting error. *Ike v. Doolittle (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 51, 80-85, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887*

Trust instrument controls method of modification or amendment of trust when itspecifies method; settlor required to comply with method of modification or amendment specified in trust instrument. *Conservatorship of Irvine (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1344-1345, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 587*

Prob. Code § 15409, relating to modification of trust in changed circumstances, and *Prob. Code § 17200*, stating grounds for petition concerning internal affairs of trust, codify long-held equity powers of California courts to modify trust's terms when modification is necessary to preserve trust or serve settlor's original intentions. *Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 428, 249 Cal. Rptr. 622* ; *see* *Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 142, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342*

Prob. Code § 15409, relating to modification of trust in changed circumstances, and *Prob. Code § 17200*, stating grounds for petition concerning internal affairs of trust, is basis for probate court jurisdiction over petition to modify terms of trusts or authorize petition to make modifications otherwise forbidden by trust instrument, including change in designated successor trustee. *Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 429, 249 Cal. Rptr. 622*

Prob. Code §§ 17001 and *17004* refute notion that declaratory relief is beyond jurisdiction of superior court sitting in probate; when statute confers jurisdiction on probate department, that department is empowered to apply legal and equitable principles in aid of its functions, including modifying trust terms. *Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 430, 249 Cal. Rptr. 622*

Petition to modify terms of trust, including modification changing designated successor trustee, is ripe for resolution when trust assets consist largely of interests in same real property and lend themselves to administration by single trustee, and when current state of trust instruments make it likely that settlor's death or incapacity will trigger undesirable division of trustee duties. *Stewart v. Towse (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 425, 430-431, 249 Cal. Rptr. 622*

When settlor reserves power to revoke trust only in particular manner or under particular circumstances, settlor is capable of revoking trust only in that manner or under those circumstances; inability of settlor who reserves power to revoke trust by inter vivos transaction to revoke trust by will. *Estate of Lindstrom (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 375, 386, 236 Cal. Rptr. 376*

Right to revoke trust does not affect legal title to real property held by trust, since title passes to trustee and remains vested for purposes of trust; if trust is never revoked, validity of trust is unaffected. *Estate of Lindstrom (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 375, 388, 236 Cal. Rptr. 376*

Court properly instructed trustee that church named as beneficiary had ceased to exist for purposes of distribution of trust property following termination of trust, when church, although still existing as legal entity, had ceased to exist as canonical entity. *Estate of Klinkner (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 942, 947-951, 151 Cal. Rptr. 20*

When purpose of trust ceases, estate of trustee also ceases, and legal and equitable title vests in beneficial owner unless settlor clearly intended otherwise. *Estate of Downing (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 256, 271, 184 Cal. Rptr. 511* , citing *Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 695, 699, 199 P.2d 706*

Trust established for use and benefit of beneficiary terminates on beneficiary's death. *Cutrera v. McClallen (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 604, 608, 30 Cal. Rptr. 444*

Trust for support of minor terminates when beneficiary attains age of majority. *Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d*

695, 699, 199 P.2d 706

Trust as properly terminated for impossibility when money of trust that was established to invest in high-interest loans was invested in mortgages, and trustee purchased foreclosed property, so the trust property consisted of realty instead of funds that could be invested, and investment opportunities did not appear to exist *Ellis v. Ellis (1937) 20 Cal. App. 2d 293, 294-295, 66 P.2d 738*

When all beneficiaries are competent and join in request that trust be terminated, and no factual or equitable consideration interposed by trustees weighs against beneficiaries' rights, court is under duty to terminate trust despite general rule that termination is discretionary with trial court. *Moor v. Vawter (1927) 84 Cal. App. 678, 684-685, 258 P. 622*

When trustees' only duty was to hold stock for heirs of settlor, stock as becoming property of heirs on trustor's death. *Yoakum v. Grimes (1925) 73 Cal. App. 204, 207, 238 P. 727*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification and Termination of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.402

§ 560.402 Law Reviews

Comment, *Trust Revocation: Do Trust Terms Prevail Over California Civil Code Section 2280? 17 Pac. L. J. 941 (1986)*

Bird, *Commentary: Trust Termination: Unborn, Living, and Dead Hands--Too Many Fingers in the Trust Pie, 36 Hastings L.J. 563 (1985)*

Verrall, *The Doctrine of Worthier Title: A Questionable Rule of Construction, 6 UCLA L. Rev. 371 (1958-1959)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsLife EstatesDoctrine of Worthier TitleEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification and Termination of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.403

§ 560.403 Text References

Nossaman & Wyatt, Trust Adminstration and Taxation (2d ed rev) Vol. 1, Part II, *Rights of Settlor and Beneficiaries--Principal and Income,* Ch. 21, *Right of Settlor or Beneficiaries to Revoke or Otherwise Terminate Trust--Power of Amendment* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Trusts*, § 195 (10th ed. 2005)

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed.), Ch. 47, *Modification and Termination of Trusts*

Scott, The Law of Trusts (3th ed.), Vol. IV, Ch. 10, *The Termination and Modification of the Trust*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & Termination

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification and Termination of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.404-560.419

[Reserved]

§§ 560.404[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.420

§ 560.420 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda relating to in personam jurisdiction, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 132, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction and Inconvenient Forum*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Personam ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.421

§ 560.421 Other California Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Legal Forms

For complete revocable trust forms and discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 70, *Complete Revocable Trust Forms*

For additional and alternative marital deduction trust provisions, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 71, *Marital Deduction Trust Provisions*

For complete irrevocable trust forms and discussion, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 72, *Irrevocable Trusts*

For complete split-interest charitable trust forms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 74, *Split-Interest Charitable Trusts*

[2] California Wills & Trusts

For detailed guidance on planning and drafting all kinds of inter vivos and testamentary trusts, see California Wills & Trusts, text volumes (Matthew Bender)

For complete inter vivos and testamentary trust forms, and alternative provisions, see California Wills & Trusts, forms volumes (Matthew Bender)

[3] California Trust Practice

For detailed guidance on the actions and procedures for postmortem trust administration, and the necessary forms, see Hartog & Dirkes, California Trust Practice (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsIrrevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsMarital Deduction TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsRevocable Living TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTestamentary Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.422

§ 560.422 Federal Statutes

Definition of charitable remainder annuity trust. *I.R.C. § 664(d)(1)*

Definition of charitable remainder unitrust. *I.R.C. § 664(d)(2)*

Estate tax charitable deduction. *I.R.C. § 2055*

Estate tax marital deduction. *I.R.C. § 2056*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawAnnuitiesCharitable AnnuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsMarital Deduction TrustsTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsCharitable Deductions (IRC secs. 2055, 2522, 2524)General OverviewTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsMarital Deduction (IRC secs. 2056, 2523)General Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.423

§ 560.423 State Statutes

Personal jurisdiction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*; *Prob. Code §§ 17003-17004*

Age of majority. *Fam. Code §§ 6500-6502*

Mailing procedure and notice requirements. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)*; *Prob. Code §§ 1202 et seq.* 17100, 17105

Definition of beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 24*

Additional grounds for petition. *Prob. Code § 850(a)(3)*

Court may not grant petition if it thinks matter should be determined by civil action. *Prob. Code § 853*

Appointment of guardian ad litem. *Prob. Code § 1003*

Appeal. *Prob. Code §§ 1300-1312*

Subject matter jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17001*

Place of administration of trust. *Prob. Code § 17002*

Venue. *Prob. Code § 17005*

No right to jury trial. *Prob. Code § 17006*

Grounds for petition. *Prob. Code § 17200*

Commencement of proceeding. *Prob. Code § 17201*

Dismissal of petition. *Prob. Code § 17202*

General notice provision. *Prob. Code § 17203*

Orders. *Prob. Code § 17206*

Judicial intervention policy. *Prob. Code § 17209*

Standing of Attorney General. *Prob. Code § 17210*

Testamentary trusts subject to continuing jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17304*

Removal from continuing jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17350-17354*

Transfer to another jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17400-17405*

Transfer from another jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueSpecial VenueCivil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsRight to Jury TrialEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.424

§ 560.424 Decisions

It was error to dismiss complaint for lack of standing because a trust beneficiary can pursue a cause of action against a third party who actively participates in or knowingly benefits from a trustee's breach of trust; even though the civil complaint was not a probate matter under *Prob. Code § 17200*, it was related to the beneficiary's petition and the probate court had concurrent jurisdiction of the civil complaint under *Prob. Code § 17000*. *Estate of Bowles (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 684, 695, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 122*

Amendment of charitable trust regarding appointment of successor trustees was improper under *Fourteenth Amendment* to U.S. Constitution because potential successor trustees under trust as written were not notified of proceeding to amend trust. *Estate of Sigourney v. American Psychoanalytic Ass'n (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 593, 604-605, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 274*

Prob. Code § 17200, which empowers court to make orders concerning internal affairs of trust, or to determine existence of trust, is applicable to inter vivos as well as testamentary trusts; fact that settlor is still alive does not prevent court from making such an order. *Conservatorship of Irvine (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1341, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 587*

Prob. Code § 369 provides that trustee is real party in interest in suit on behalf of trust; beneficiary is without standing to sue third parties on behalf of trust and is limited to action against trustee or trustee and third parties. *Saks v. Damon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869*

Period for winding up trust subject to continuing court jurisdiction is period after time for termination has arrived and before trust is terminated by distribution of trust property; trustee of trust that continues under court jurisdiction for purpose of winding up has powers and duties that are appropriate for winding up of trust. *Estate of Nicholas (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1082, 1082* , 223 Cal. Rtpr 410 (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120)

Petition and written objections (verified by declarations under Civ. Code § 2015.5) are properly considered evidence

absent objection to contrary. *Estate of Nicholas (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1088, 223 Cal. Rptr. 410* (proceedings under former Prob. Code § 1120)

Provision in will permitting trustee to receive reasonable compensation to be fixed by courts is insufficient to require continuing mandatory court supervision of testamentary trust. *Estate of Goddard (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 340, 343-344, 203 Cal. Rptr. 623* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120(a), *now see Prob. Code § 17300(b)*

Appointment of income beneficiary of trust as guardian ad litem of her children who were minor remainder beneficiaries was improper because, however well-intentioned, income beneficiary is in position adverse to remainder beneficiaries. *Estate of Lacy (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 172, 185, 126 Cal. Rptr. 432*

Appointment of guardian ad litem is advisable and proper when minor enjoys beneficial interest in trust and litigation involves potential destruction of trust. *Estate of High (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 561, 567, 58 Cal. Rptr. 694*

Guardian has no power to consent to act hostile to the interests of its ward, absent some showing that invasion of wards' rights might be beneficial to them. *Leonardini v. Wells Fargo Bank (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 9, 17, 280 P.2d 81*

When there is conflict of interest between beneficiaries, all beneficiaries are entitled to individual representation, and guardian ad litem of minor beneficiary is necessary and not duplication of work of cotrustee or executor. *Estate of Corotto (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 314, 324, 325, 270 P.2d 498*

Trial court's decree depriving unborn and unascertained heirs from ultimately obtaining trust corpus requires reversal on showing from record that, although guardian ad litem was appointed, there was no true representation of those persons. *Wogman v. Wells Fargo Bank (1954) 123 Cal. App. 2d 657, 667, 267 P.2d 423*

Appointment of guardian ad litem for minor beneficiary of a trust is necessary when trust provides for minor's support and education, purpose of action is to dissolve trust, and minor's general guardian, in his or her individual capacity, seeks to revoke trust. *Loock v. Pioneer Title Ins. etc. Co. (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 245, 249, 40 P.2d 526*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesTrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawConservators & GuardiansGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.425

§ 560.425 Law Reviews

Review of Selected 1982 California Legislation, "Taxation; wills--marital deductions, charitable remainder trusts, and beneficiaries," *14 Pacific L.J. 732 (1983)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsMarital Deduction TrustsTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsCharitable Deductions (IRC secs. 2055, 2522, 2524)General OverviewTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsMarital Deduction (IRC secs. 2056, 2523)General Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.426

§ 560.426 Text References

Rabkin and Johnson, Current Legal Forms With Tax Analysis, Ch. 11, *Contributions to Charities,* §§ 11.06A, *11.07* (Matthew Bender)

Rabkin and Johnson, Federal Income, Gift and Estate Taxation, Ch. 53, *Estate Tax Pattern: Deductions and Credits,* § 53.06 (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Tax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsCharitable Deductions (IRC secs. 2055, 2522, 2524)General OverviewTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsMarital Deduction (IRC secs. 2056, 2523)General OverviewTax LawFederal Income Tax ComputationDeductions for Nonbusiness ExpensesCharitable Contributions (IRC sec. 170)General OverviewTax LawFederal Taxpayer GroupsIncome Taxation of Estates, Trusts & BeneficiariesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, and Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Relating toExpress Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.427-560.439

[Reserved]

§§ 560.427[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.440

§ 560.440 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda relating to negligence generally, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 165, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda relating to third-party actions against an agent or principal, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 182, *Principal and Agent* (Matthew Bender)

For a memorandum supporting a motion to change venue to a court having jurisdiction of estate represented by a trustee sued in his or her official capacity, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 238, *Venue* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsCauses of Action & RemediesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesTrusteesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstTortsNegligenceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.441

§ 560.441 California Torts

For discussion of negligence generally, see California Torts, Div. I, *General Principles of Liability*, Subdiv. A, *Negligence* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of torts relating to real property, see California Torts, Div. II, *Torts Relating to Real Property* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of business torts, see California Torts, Div. V, *Intentional Torts and Other Theories of Recovery*, Ch. 40, *Fraud and Deceit and Other Business Torts* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawTortsGeneral OverviewTortsBusiness TortsGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.442

§ 560.442 State Statutes

[1] Bona Fide Transactions

Protection of third party in good faith transactions with trustee. *Prob. Code § 18100*

[2] Enforcement of Money Judgment

Enforcement of money judgment against beneficiary's interest in trust. Code Civ. Proc.§§ 695.030, 709.010

Exemption of beneficiary's interest from writ of execution. *Code Civ. Proc. § 699.720(a)(8)*

[3] Express Trusts Relating to Real Estate

Recording and disclosure requirements. *Prob. Code § 18103*

Recording affidavit of change of trustee when title to real property is affected by change. *Prob. Code §§ 18105-18108*

[4] Liability of Trustee

Personal liability of trustee who signs negotiable instrument. *Com. Code § 3402(b)*

Contracts. *Prob. Code § 18000*

Personal liability regarding ownership of property. *Prob. Code § 18001*

Personal liability for torts. *Prob. Code § 18002*

Dissenting cotrustee. *Prob. Code § 18003*

Claim against trustee in representative capacity. *Prob. Code § 18004*

Liability against trustee or estate. *Prob. Code § 18005*

[5] Restrictions on Transfer of Trust Property

Restraint on transfer of income. *Prob. Code § 15300*

Restraint on transfer of principal. *Prob. Code § 15301*

Trust for support of beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 15302*

Discretion of trustee to pay beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 15303*

Settlor as beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 15304*

Spousal and child support claims. *Prob. Code § 15305*

Restitution judgments. *Prob. Code § 15305.5*

Liability for public support. *Prob. Code § 15306*

Rights of creditors regarding trusts subject to transfer restrictions. *Prob. Code §§ 15306.5, 15307*

Modification of order allowing creditor to reach trust property subject to transfer restrictions. *Prob. Code § 15308*

Disclaimer of interest under trust. *Prob. Code § 15309*

[6] Procedure in Plenary Actions

Real party in interest. *Code Civ. Proc. § 367*

Authority of trustee of express trust to sue without joining beneficiaries. *Code Civ. Proc. § 369*

Recovery of costs in action prosecuted or defended by trustee. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1026*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.443

§ 560.443 Federal Rules of Court

Trustee of express trust as real party in interest. *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 17(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesCapacity of PartiesTrusteesCivil ProcedurePartiesReal Parties in InterestGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.444

§ 560.444 Decisions

[1] Action by Beneficiary Regarding Internal Affairs of Trust

Court had equitable power to charge reasonable and necessary fees incurred by trustee in opposing unfounded proceeding brought by trust beneficiary against that beneficiary's share of trust estate. *Rudnick v. Rudnick (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 1328, 1335, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493*

Trust beneficiary had standing to sue a fellow beneficiary, under either a third-party participant theory or a constructive trustee theory, despite a successor trustee being appointed, when the fellow beneficiary aided the trustee in transferring property out of the trust in breach of trustee's duties. *King v. Johnston (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1488, 1502, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 269*

Beneficiary required to bring action regarding internal affairs of trust against trustee or trustee and third persons; action must be brought in probate department or, if there is no separate probate department, in superior court that has jurisdiction over trust; *Civ. Code § 1559*, which allows third party beneficiaries to enforce contract, does not apply to trust beneficiaries. *Saks v. Damon Raike & Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 419, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869*

[2] Alter Ego

Guarantors of construction loan to revocable family living trust who were also trustors, trustees, and beneficiaries of trust were alter ego of primary obligor trustees; guarantees therefore unenforceable under antideficiency laws after nonjudicial foreclosure. *Torrey Pines Bank v. Hoffman (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 308, 320-323, 282 Cal. Rptr. 354*

[3] Attorney's Fees

Attorney who represented trustee in litigation over validity of trust amendment changing primary beneficiary was not entitled to attorney's fees because litigation was not for benefit of trust; moreover, attorney's defense of trust was unsuccessful. *Whittlesey v. Aiello (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 1221, 1227-1231, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 742*

[4] Bona Fide Transaction

Prob. Code § 18100 protects corporation in bona fide purchase of easement from trustee acting outside its authority without knowledge of corporation; recording requirements of *Prob. Code § 18103* do not alter protection provided by *Prob. Code § 18100*. *Adler v. Manor Healthcare Corp. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1110, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 732*

Former trustee's encumbrance of trust property constitutes bona fide transaction, which is valid under former *Civ. Code § 2267* (*now see Prob. Code § 18102*), when lenders, having knowledge that trustee was not named in trust instrument, satisfied reasonable inquiry into trustee's authority to encumber trust assets at time of loan. *Leach v. Home Savings & Loan Ass'n. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1295, 1304* , 230 Cal. Rtpr 553

[5] Liability of Trust Estate

Trust estate liable for trustee's tortious acts to extent that estate benefitted from those acts. *Alphonzo E. Bell Corp. v. Bell View Oil Syndicate (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 684, 689 , 116 P.2d 786*

[6] Liability of Trustee

Trustee liable under theory of respondeat superior for agent's tortious acts committed in administration of trust. *Longway v. Newbery (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 603, 616-619, 91 P.2d 110*

Trustee that insured trust property premises, and was answerable for premises defects, was potentially liable to third parties for tort liability under doctrine of respondeat superior, and was unable to avoid responsibility therefor on ground that trustee merely held legal title. *Bianchi v. Western Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 235, 239-240, 92 Cal. Rptr. 745*

In action for rescission of contracts to purchase real property on grounds of fraud, trustee corporation held personally liable because contracts represented it to be owner of properties. *Curtis v. Title Guarantee etc. Co (1935) 3 Cal. App. 2d 612, 619-620, 40 P.2d 562*

In action for failure to prosecute, trustee was not personally liable for judgment against him in his representative capacity because it was not demonstrated that he acted intentionally or negligently. *Haskett v. The Villas at Desert Falls (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 864, 877-878, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888*

[7] Restrictions on Transfer of Trust Property

Bankruptcy estate possessed unprotected 25 percent of bankrupt's interest in spendthrift trust and only the interest above bankrupt's support requirements; determination of income necessary for support to be adjusted to bankrupt's fluctuating needs. *In re Neuton (9th Cir. 1990) 922 F.2d 1379, 1384*

Bankrupt beneficiary's interest in assets of California spendthrift trust was immune from judicial process and did not pass to trustee of bankrupt estate. *In re Ahlswede (9th Cir. 1975) 516 F.2d 784, 786*

Voluntary assignment executed before payment to beneficiary conferred on assignee no right to demand payment or delivery from trustee as it becomes due to beneficiary. *Schalk Chemical Company v. C.I.R. (9th Cir. 1962) 304 F.2d 48, 50-51* ; *Kelly v. Kelly (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 356, 362-363, 79 P.2d 1059*

Spendthrift trusts as effective means to prevent indigent beneficiaries from becoming financially dependent on state. *Canfield v. Security-First Nat. Bank (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 1, 13, 87 P.2d 830*

Sisters' written agreement to share equally any inheritance received from their mother, despite any unequal disposition that mother's will might provide, was enforceable against ostensible testamentary spendthrift trust in which bulk of estate was left to one sister, when court determined that trust was not truly spendthrift despite boilerplate spendthrift trust provisions in will. *De Mille v. Ramsey (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 116, 125, 254 Cal. Rptr. 573* (*distinguishing Kelly v. Kelly (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 356, 362-363, 79 P.2d 1059* on ground that trust in *De Mille* was not truly spendthrift)

Despite boilerplate provisions characterizing trust as spendthrift, trust was not spendthrift when trustor's intent, as expressed in language creating trust, was not to keep money out of beneficiary's hands, but to keep trust assets away from creditors of beneficiary's husband. *De Mille v. Ramsey (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 116, 125, 254 Cal. Rptr. 573*

Enforcement of agreement, executed prior to creation of ostensible spendthrift trust, requiring beneficiary to pay to her sister half of any trust funds distributed to beneficiary did not violate *Prob. Code §§ 15300* (restrictions on transfer of income) and 15301 (restrictions on transfer of principal) when spendthrift provisions of trust were not aimed at beneficiary and when beneficiary never technically transferred to her sister any present interest in trust by executing pre-trust agreement. *De Mille v. Ramsey (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 116, 126, 254 Cal. Rptr. 573*

Employee's mandatory contributions to welfare fund with spendthrift provision, pursuant to collective bargaining agreement, was subject to execution for child support. *Parscal v. Parscal (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 1098, 1100-1104, 196 Cal. Rptr. 462*

[8] Standing

Compliance officer of restitutionary fund set up by California state court judgment to remedy statutory violations by corporation was trustee of express trust with right to intervene in class action arising out of corporate activity, citing *Fed. R. Civ. P., Rule 17(a)* (trustee of express trust as real party in interest). *Piambino v. Bailey (5th Cir. 1980) 610 F.2d 1306, 1322-1323*

Trustee's delay in bringing action against third-party wrongdoer, when trustee is not in collusion with wrongdoer, bars beneficiaries from subsequently maintaining action. *DeTarr v. Texaco Inc. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 872, 875, 73 Cal. Rptr. 511*

[9] Venue

Venue provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1* is applicable to all actions brought against trustee to recover money or personal property, and not merely to suits brought on rejected creditors' claims. *Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 30, 36-37 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355*

Venue provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* based on residence of trustee are applicable to transitory actions against trustee that are not covered by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*. *Haines v. Lamb (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 322, 326, 24 Cal. Rptr. 146*

Venue provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1* is applicable only to actions brought against trustee to recover money or

personal property, and not to actions for declaratory relief. *Ramos v. Cypher (1955) 137 Cal. App. 2d 648, 290 P.2d 585*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueSpecial VenueEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsSpendthrift TrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.445

§ 560.445 Law Reviews

Van Alstyne, "Venue of Mixed Actions in California," *44 Cal. L. Rev. 685 (1956)*

Recent Decisions, "Jurisdiction and Venue: Suits Where Actions Involving the Title and Possession of Real Property Are Joined with Transitory Actions," *27 Cal. L.Rev. 468 (1939)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueSpecial Venue

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.446

§ 560.446 Text References

California Forms of Jury Instructions (1985), Ch. 4, *Parties*, § 4.65 (Matthew Bender)

Nossaman & Wyatt, Trust Adminstration and Taxation (2d ed rev), Part I, *Existence, Validity and Interpretation*, Ch. 6, *Validity--Perpetuities, Restraints in Alienation and Other Time Limits*, Ch. 7, *Accumulations and Income Undisposed Of*, Part IV, *Rights and Liabilities of Third Persons*, Ch. 24, *Rights of Creditors of Settlor and Beneficiary*, Ch. 25, *Rights and Liabilities of Persons Dealing with Trustees--Liabilities of Trustees, Trust Estate and Beneficiaries on Trust Obligations* (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, California Procedure (3d ed.), Vol. 2, *Jurisdiction*, Part I, *Jurisdiction of The Subject Matter*, Part II, *Jurisdiction Over Persons*, Part III, *Jurisdiction in Rem and Quasi in Rem*

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed.), Ch 13, *Restrictions --Illegality--Perpetuities--Accumulations--Suspension of Power of Alienation--Spendthrift Trusts*, §§ 221-227

Restatement Trusts 2d, §§ 156, 280-329

Scott, The Law of Trusts (3d ed.), Vol. III, Ch. 8, *Liabilities to Third Persons*, § 272, Vol. IV, Ch. 9, *Liabilities of Third Persons*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsIn Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.447-560.459

[Reserved]

§§ 560.447[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.460

§ 560.460 State Statutes

General provisions relating to payment of claims from revocable trust. *Prob. Code §§ 19000-19012*

Petition for approval and settlement of claims against deceased settlor. *Prob. Code §§ 19020-19030*

Publication of notice to creditors. *Prob. Code §§ 19040, 19041*

Actual notice to creditors. *Prob. Code §§ 19050-19054*

Time for filing claims. *Prob. Code §§ 19100-19104*

Filing of claims. *Prob. Code §§ 19150-19154*

Claims by public entities. *Prob. Code §§ 19200-19205*

Allowance and rejection of claims. *Prob. Code §§ 19250-19255*

Claims established by judgment. *Prob. Code §§ 19300-19304*

Allocation of debts between trust and surviving spouse. *Prob. Code §§ 19320-19326*

Liability of settlor's surviving spouse. *Prob. Code § 19330*

Distributee liability. *Prob. Code §§ 19400-19403*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesNotice to CreditorsEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesTime LimitationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.461-560.479

[Reserved]

§§ 560.461[Reserved]

185 of 195 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.480

§ 560.480 California Legal Forms

For forms relating to the formation and taxation of nonprofit corporations, trusts, and associations, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 13, *Nonprofit Corporations*, Ch. 13A, *Nonprofit Unincorporated Associations*, and Ch. 13B, *Tax-Exempt Status for Nonprofit Entities*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsTax LawFederal Estate & Gift TaxesDeductionsCharitable Deductions (IRC secs. 2055, 2522, 2524)General OverviewTax LawFederal Income Tax ComputationDeductions for Nonbusiness ExpensesCharitable Contributions (IRC sec. 170)General Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.481

§ 560.481 State Statutes

Disclosure requirements for solicitations for charitable purposes. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17510-17510.7*

Definition, registration, and regulation of commercial fund raisers for charitable purposes. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17510.85*; *Gov. Code §§ 12599, 12599.5*

Exemption from Rule Against Perpetuities for charitable gifts. *Civ. Code § 715*

Nonprofit Corporation Law. *Corp. Code §§ 5000-10831*

Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law. *Corp. Code §§ 5110-6910*

Nonprofit Mutual Benefit Corporation Law. *Corp. Code §§ 7110-8910*

Educational institutions. *Corp. Code § 10251*

Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act. *Gov. Code §§ 12580-12599*

False representations of fact by person soliciting funds for charitable purpose; misdemeanor. *Penal Code § 532d*

Notice to Attorney General of probate of will creating charitable trust. *Prob. Code § 8111*

Duties of trustees of private foundations, charitable trusts, and split-interest trusts. *Prob. Code §§ 16100-16105*

Petition to conform trust instrument in manner required to qualify estate for federal charitable estate tax deduction. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(15)*

Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act. *Prob. Code § 18501 et seq.*

Exemption of charitable trusts and corporations from taxation. *Rev. & Tax Code § 23701d*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsManagement Duties & LiabilitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstates Created by Trusts & WillsInvalid Restraints & Rule Against PerpetuitiesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.482

§ 560.482 Administrative Regulations

Attorney General's general provisions and definitions relating to regulation of nonprofit corporations. *11 Cal. Code Reg. § 999.1*

Attorney General's regulations of public benefit corporations. *11 Cal. Code Reg. § 999.2*

Attorney General's regulations of mutual benefit corporations. *11 Cal. Code Reg. § 999.3*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsAdministrationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.483

§ 560.483 Decisions

[1] Characteristics of Charitable Trust or Organization

Charitable trust defined. *Estate of Schloss (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 248, 256, 14 Cal. Rptr. 643, 363 P.2d 875*

Prob. Code § 24 (d) permits settlor of charitable trust to object to an accounting when settlor has reserved that power in the trust instrument. *Patton v. Sherwood (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 339, 347, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 289*

To establish charitable trust, bequest must limit use of funds to charitable purposes; if noncharitable purposes are also permitted, bequest will not be deemed charitable trust, but rules of construction should be applied to accomplish trustor's intent. *Estate of Breeden (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 981, 985, 256 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Trust designed to peacefully promote political purposes and change is charitable; promotion of socialistic principles through education and support of those whose activities advance those principles is proper charitable purpose. *Estate of Breeden (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 981, 986, 987-990, 256 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Charitable nature of trust is not determined by tax status of organizations that may benefit from trust; as long as purpose of gift remains charitable, valid charitable trust does not lose its character because it is not tax-exempt; *Prob. Code § 16100(a)* defines charitable trust in context of duties placed on trustees of tax exempt trusts to maintain that status. *Estate of Breeden (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 981, 989-992, 991, 256 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Charitable trust is fiduciary relationship with respect to property arising from manifestation of intention to create it and subjecting person by whom property is held to equitable duties to deal with property for charitable purpose. *Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 161, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483*

Nonprofit educational society is charitable corporation within meaning of *Gov. Code § 12582.1* and therefore subject to statutory reporting and other regulations applicable to charitable corporation; particular section under which corporation formed is not conclusive on issue of whether corporation is charitable or not. *Younger v. Wisdom Society (1981) 121*

Cal. App. 3d 683, 690, 175 Cal. Rptr. 542

Gifts to charitable corporations deemed to be impressed with charitable trust. *American Center for Education, Inc. v. Cavnar (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 476, 486, 145 Cal. Rptr. 736*

Organization can be charitable in nature even if some activities are noncharitable, as long as main purposes are charitable. *Lynch v. Surprise Valley Lodge No. 235(1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 265, 270-271, 103 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[2] Charitable Immunity

Charitable corporations are liable for their torts. *Malloy v. Fong (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 356, 364-367, 232 P.2d 241*

[3] Cy Pres Doctrine

Trial court's refusal to apply *cy pres* doctrine based on unsubstantiated conclusion that racial qualification in bequest to "all-white" school was *sine qua non* of testator's intent was reversible error. *Estate of Vanderhoofven (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 940, 943-946, 96 Cal. Rptr. 260*

Application of *cy pres* doctrine was appropriate to preserve gifts bequeathed in trust to establish music and rest homes by directing that they be located at suitable sites rather than using sites designated by testator which were not suitable under applicable zoning ordinance. *Estate of Zahn (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 106, 113-116, 93 Cal. Rptr. 810 , cert. denied, 404 U.S. 938*

Doctrine of *cy pres* was applicable to prevent lapse of testamentary gifts to insufficiently identified "homes" for blind and crippled children, when testator's underlying motivation was to aid that class of children rather than particular institutions. *Estate of Gatlin (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 644, 649-650, 94 Cal. Rptr. 295*

Doctrine of *cy pres* applicable in determining disposition of assets of charitable corporation being dissolved. *In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 917-918, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303*

[4] Enforcement Powers of Attorney General

Attorney general has no veto power over compromise reached by individual life beneficiary and charitable beneficiaries of testamentary trust regarding disposition of assets and is not a necessary party to compromise contract. *Estate of Horton (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 680, 685-686, 90 Cal. Rptr. 66*

Participation in will contest to protect gift for charitable purposes is right and duty of Attorney General. *Estate of Ventura (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 50, 394 P.2d 832*

[5] Enforcement Powers of Parties Other Than Attorney General

Others besides Attorney General have right to enforce charitable trusts. *Holt v. College of Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 750, 755-756, 40 Cal. Rptr. 244, 394 P.2d 932* ; *Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 161-162, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483*

Code Civ. Proc. § 526a (taxpayer's action to restrain illegal expenditure of public funds) does not create right of action, based on alleged breach of charitable trust, by resident taxpayer against city officials acting in capacity as trustees of

charitable trust. *Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 163, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483*

Public trust doctrine unavailable to confer standing on member of general public to enforce charitable trust to protect art museum assets, because doctrine applies onlyto abstract trusts, such as tidelands and waterways protected by public trust, and not to formal trusts created by transfer by trustor to trustee of specific trust res. *Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 162-163 n.3, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483*

Resident and taxpayer of city who has no special interest in charitable trust lacks standing to bring action seeking to enjoin mismanagement of trust, even though trust is administered pursuant to city charter and trustees are city officials. *Hardman v. Feinstein (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 157, 159-160, 240 Cal. Rptr. 483*

Donors not entitled to compel hospital district to use funds for purpose for which they were donated or to recover donations. *Marin Hospital Dist. v. State Department of Health (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 442, 448, 154 Cal. Rptr. 838* ; *but see Prob. Code § 24(d)*; *Patton v. Sherwood (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 339, 346-347, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 289*

Boy scout council has standing to sue to enforce charitable trust in favor of all boy scouts and girl scouts of region. *San Diego etc. Boy Scouts of America v. City of Escondido (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 189, 195, 92 Cal. Rptr. 186*

[6] Nonprofit Corporation Law

Corp. Code § 9142(c)(2) provides a general church with authority to impress a trust on a local church when the local church agrees and subscribes to governing instruments of general church, and governing instruments provide that any property held by local church is held in trust for general church; local church did not have right to take church property with it when it disaffiliated from general church even though deeds to the property had long been in the name of the local church. *Episcopal Church Cases (2009) 45 Cal. 4th 467, 491, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 275, 198 P.3d 66*

Corporation's right to prior inspection of materials to be mailed by member to other members on membership list is improper condition for providing membership list to dissident members pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 6330-6338*. *KQED, Inc. v. Hall (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 951, 956-957, 185 Cal. Rptr. 630*

Court is able to limit use of proxies but not preclude all use of them in framing remedy for unfairness in election procedures for directors of nonprofit corporation. *Braude v. Automobile Club of Southern Cal. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 178, 186, 144 Cal. Rptr. 169*

[7] Standard of Conduct Regarding Management of Charitable Assets

Good faith is no defense when directors of charitable trust negligently managed trust funds by placing them in noninterest-bearing account trust. *Lynch v. John M. Redfield Foundation (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 293, 302, 88 Cal. Rptr. 86*

[8] Nonprofit Health Care Service Plans

Nonprofit health care service plans holding assets in charitable trust are not subject to Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act (*Gov. Code § 12580 et seq.*), but to Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975 (*Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.*) and Nonprofit Corporations Law; responsibility for their regulation and authority to oversee their compliance with enforcement of charitable trusts pursuant to *Corp. Code §§ 5142, 5250* is vested in *Department of Corporations. Van de Kamp v. Gumbiner (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1281-1282, 270 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Attorney General is without authority, either common law, statutory, as *parens patriae*, or pursuant to specific grant in 1977 settlement agreement, to contest conversion of nonprofit health care service plan to for-profit status because intervening legislation abrogated that authority in favor of Department of Corporations as single oversight authority. *Van de Kamp v. Gumbiner (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1282-1290, 270 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Nonprofit health care service plan is subject to self-dealing provisions of *Corp. Code § 5233*, dissolution provisions of *Corp. Code §§ 6510, 6511*, and *Corp. Code §§ 5813.5, 10821*; *Health & Safety Code § 1352(b)*, relating to requirement of approval for conversions from nonprofit to for-profit status. *Van de Kamp v. Gumbiner (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1281-1282, 270 Cal. Rptr. 907*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretationGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsTortsNegligenceDefensesPrivate ImmunitiesCharitable Immunity

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.484

§ 560.484 Law Reviews

Comment, *It Pays to Give It Away--Sometimes: Inter Vivos Charitable Remainder Unitrusts in Estate Planning, 15 Pepperdine L. Rev. 367 (1988)*

Note, *Phantom Selves: The Search for a General Charitable Intent in the Application of the Cy Pres Doctrine, 40 Stan. L. Rev. 973 (1988)*

Malone, McEachron, and Cutler, *The Buck Trust Trial--A Litigator's Perspective, 21 U.S.F. L. Rev. 585 (1987)*

Luria, *Prying Loose the Dead Hand of the Past: How Courts Apply Cy Pres to Race, Gender, and Religiously Restricted Trusts, 21 U.S.F. L. Rev. 41 (1986)*

Comment, *Cy Pres Inexpediency and the Buck Trust, 20 U.S.F. L. Rev. 577 (1986)*

Comment, *Nonprofit Corporations* (1982) *13 Pacific LJ 584*

Bell and Bell, *Supervision of Charitable Trusts in California, 32 Hastings L.J. 433 (1980)*

Symposium: California Nonprofit Corporation Law (1979) *13 USF L. Rev. 733*

Jackson, *Gifts of Remainder Interests to Charity,* 47 State B.J. 22 (1972)

Note, *Cy Pres and the Discriminatory Trust, 23 Hastings L.J. 604 (1972)*

Brown, *Family Allowance Payments as a Charge Against Testamentary Trust Income,* 45 State B.J. 690 (1970)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretation

190 of 195 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.485

§ 560.485 Text References

Ballantine and Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations* (Matthew Bender)

Nossaman & Wyatt, Trust Adminstration and Taxation (2d ed rev), Part I, *Existence, Validity and Interpretation*, Ch. 3, *Validity--Charitable Trusts* (Matthew Bender)

Scott, The Law of Trusts (3d ed.), Vol. IV, Ch. 11, *Charitable Trusts*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawNonprofit Corporations & OrganizationsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsCharitable TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsInterpretation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.486-560.499

[Reserved]

§§ 560.486[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.500

§ 560.500 State Statutes

Totten trusts defined. *Prob. Code § 80*

"Beneficiary" means person named in Totten trust account as one for whom party to the account is named as trustee. *Prob. Code § 5126*

Totten trust accounts governed by Multiple-Party Accounts Law (*Prob. Code §§ 5100-5407*). *Prob. Code § 5132*

Net contribution defined. *Prob. Code § 5134*

"Party" means person who, according to account terms, has present right of withdrawal; beneficiary of Totten trust account is not party to account until he or she survives all persons named as trustees. *Prob. Code § 5136*

Rights of account parties while all are living. *Prob. Code § 5301*

Payments authorized on death of party to Totten trust account. *Prob. Code §§ 5302(c), (e), 5404*

Changes in account terms. *Prob. Code § 5303*

Testamentary formalities are not applicable to Totten trust accounts. *Prob. Code § 5304*

When parties to account are married to each other, their contributions to account are presumed to be and remain their community property. *Prob. Code § 5305(a)*

Unless Totten trust account is described as community property account, beneficiary designation may not be changed by will. *Prob. Code § 5305(c)*; *see Prob. Code § 5307* (community property account)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.501

§ 560.501 Decisions

[1] Totten Trust Established

Deposit of money in depositor's own name as trustee for another establishes trust revocable at will until trustee dies or completes gift during lifetime by some unequivocal act or declaration. *Evinger v. MacDougall (1938) 28 Cal. App. 2d 175, 179, 82 P.2d 194*

[2] Totten Trust Not Established

Formation of valid Totten trust requires trustor, trustee, trust res, beneficiary, and trust intent; person named in account title as joint trustee of Totten trust who did not sign account card containing declaration of trust and did not deposit any funds in account is not entitled to funds, except possibly as trustee for named beneficiaries, on death of other trustee, because existence of trust res was not established. *Estate of Fisher (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 418, 424-426, 244 Cal. Rptr. 5* (decided under former *Fin. Code §§ 6850, 6852*, which required express statement of survivorship to create presumption of intent to establish joint account)

Irrevocable trust, not Totten trust, is created by deposit of beneficiary's funds. *Miller v. Miller (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 538, 544, 31 Cal. Rptr. 618*

Totten trust account theory inapplicable when evidence showed that parents used money belonging to child to open account for child and that subsequently more of child's property and gifts of community property were deposited in the account and there were unequivocal acts recognizing irrevocable nature of trust. *Miller v. Miller (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 538, 544, 31 Cal. Rptr. 618*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank Accounts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.502

§ 560.502 Text References

Nossaman & Wyatt, *Trust Administration and Taxation, Ch. 14, Special Types of Trusts, § 14.03* (2d ed. rev.) (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Trusts*, §§ 8-11 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawBank ActivitiesBank AccountsTrust AccountsTypesEstate, Gift & Trust LawNonprobate TransfersJointly Held PropertyBank AccountsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.503-560.519

[Reserved]

§§ 560.503[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.520

§ 560.520 Petition to Determine Existence of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition to Determine Existence of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of _____ [*name of trust*, e.g., The Sally Smith 1994 Trust]	)))))	NO. _____ PETITION TO DETERMINE EXISTENCE OF TRUST

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of settlor or purported settlor*] executed a written instrument titled _____ [*title of instrument, e.g.,* The Sally Smith 1994 Trust], a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

2. At all times herein mentioned, petitioner has been and now is _____ [one of the beneficiaries *or* the sole beneficiary] _____ [named in *or* under] Exhibit "A."

3. _____ [*Name of trustee or alleged trustee*] _____ [was named as trustee in or is acting as trustee under] Exhibit "A." [*If trustee or alleged trustee is a corporation, add appropriate allegation, e.g.,* At all times herein mentioned, _____ (*name of trustee or alleged trustee*) has been and now is a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States and doing business as a trust company in the State of California].

4. [Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that(,)] [A]t all times herein mentioned, the principal place of administration of the trust has been and now is _____ [*e.g.*, 1224 High Road, Suite 112, in the City of Baytown, Pacific County, California].

5. [Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that(,)] [A]t all times herein mentioned, certain property (the "trust property") has been and now is being held by _____ [*name of trustee or alleged trustee*] as trustee under the terms and provisions of Exhibit "A."

6. [Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that(,)] [A]t all times herein mentioned, the "trust property" has included, and now includes, _____ [*describe trust property, e.g.*, certain real property located in the City of Baytown, Pacific County, California, consisting of a residential dwelling house and the lot on which it stands, particularly described as Lot 3, Block 14, Map of Eldorado Heights, No. 4, and commonly known as 123 Taylor Street].

7. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between petitioner and _____ [*name of trustee or alleged trustee*] concerning their respects rights and duties, in that _____ [*allege facts showing actual controversy as to existence or terms of trust, e.g.*, petitioner contents that _____ (he *or* she) is a beneficiary under Exhibit "A" and is entitled to receive payments of trust principal and income pursuant to its terms, while _____ (*name of trustee or alleged trustee*) has denied, and now denies, that _____ (he *or* she *or* it) is acting as trustee under Exhibit "A," or that _____ (he *or* she *or* it) is holding the "trust property" described in Paragraph 4, or any property whatsoever, for the benefit of petitioner under the terms of Exhibit "A." Further, _____ (*name of trustee or alleged trustee*) _____ has refused, and now refuses, to make any payments of principal or income to petitioner as beneficiary of the "trust property" as required by the terms of Exhibit "A," despite demands from petitioner.]

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Declaring that _____ [*name of trustee or alleged trustee*] is now and at all times mentioned herein has been holding the "trust property" describedin this petition for the benefit of petitioner under the terms of Exhibit "A";

2. Compelling _____ [*name of trustee or alleged trustee*] to account to fully for all trust property;

3. Compelling _____ [*name of trustee or alleged trustee*] to make all payments of principal and income required by the terms of Exhibit "A" to be made to petitioner as beneficiary;

4. For all costs herein;

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to matters which are therein alleged on my information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for use by a person who claims to be the beneficiary of an irrevocable inter vivos trust and who seeks a court order determining the existence of the trust and defining the duties of the trustee to make payments of principal and income under terms of the trust instrument [*see Prob. Code § 17200*].

A petition to determine the existence of a trust may be filed by a trustee or beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*]. A person who claims to be the settlor of a trust cannot file such a petition as settlor. However, if a person is both a settlor and a beneficiary or trustee, the petition may be brought in the person's capacity as beneficiary or trustee [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*].

It was formerly possible for a person who was interested under a will or trust to seek a judicial declaration of his or her rights or duties under the trust. If an actual controversy existed as to the existence of the trust, or as to the rights of two or more persons under terms of the trust, the court could resolve the controversy by granting declaratory relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*. Operative January 1, 1995, however, an action for declaratory relief may no longer be maintained by a person who seeks a declaration of his or her rights or duties under a will or a trust [*see* Stats. 1994, ch. 806, § 2, amending *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]. The only remedy available is a petition under *Prob. Code § 17200*, and that remedy may be pursued only by a trustee or beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*].

If a trust is revocable, the person holding the right to revoke the trust (generally the settlor) has all of the rights that

would otherwise devolve on the beneficiaries under the Trust Law. Unless the trust instrument provides otherwise, or unless the joint action of the settlor and all of the beneficiaries is required, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the person holding the power to revoke, and not the beneficiary, has the rights afforded beneficiaries under the Trust Law, and the trustee's duties are owed to the person holding the power to revoke [*Prob. Code § 15800*].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust must be given to the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]:

- All trustees.

- All beneficiaries, except that if the trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke it is competent, notice must be given to the person holding the power to revoke and not to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15802*].

- The Attorney General of California, if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

Personal service may be required if there are persons (other than a trustee or beneficiary) whose right, title, or interest would be affected by the petition and if they do not receive notice by mail [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*]. If the person to whom notice would otherwise be given as been deceased for at least 40 days, notice may be given to the person's executor, heirs, or devisees in specific circumstances [*Prob. Code § 17203(c)*]. For detailed discussion of notice, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Allegations

This form assumes that the petitioner claims to be a beneficiary under the terms of an irrevocable, express trust, and that the alleged trustee denies the existence of the trust, or denies that there property is being held in the trust. It includes allegations as to the principal place of business of the trust (Paragraph 4) and the location of the alleged trust property (Paragraph 6), which will be useful to establish the correct venue for the petition [*see Prob. Code § 17005(a)*; *see also § 560.520[7]*].

[6] Verification

This petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*]. If the proceeding is uncontested, the verified petition must be received as evidence by the court [*Prob. Code § 1022*].

[7] Venue

The proper county for commencement of a judicial proceeding concerning an inter vivos (living) trust is the county in which the principal place of the administration of the trust is located [*Prob. Code § 17005(a)*]. The principal place of administration of the trust is the usual place where the day-to-day activity of the trust is carried on by the trustee, or any representative of the trustee who is primarily responsible for the administration of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17002(a)*].

If the principal place of administration of the trust cannot be determined on the basis of the trust's activity, and if the trust has only one trustee, the principal place of administration will be the trustee's residence or usual place of business [*Prob. Code § 17002(b)(1)*]. If the trust has more than one trustee and the principal place of administration cannot be determined on the basis of the trust's activity, the principal place of administration may be the residence or usual place of business of one of the trustees, as determined by agreement of the trustees; or, if they have not agreed on the question, the residence or usual place of business of any of the them [*Prob. Code § 17002(b)(2)*].

If the trust is a testamentary trust not subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court [*see Prob. Code §§ 17300-17354* (testamentary trusts subject to continuing court jurisdiction)], the proper county for commencement of the proceeding is the county in which the deceased settlor's estate is being administered or in which the principal place of administration of the trust is located [*Prob. Code § 17005*].

[8] State Statutes

[a] Jurisdiction and Venue

Subject matter jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17001*

Principal place of administration of trust. *Prob. Code § 17002*

Jurisdiction over trustees and beneficiaries. *Prob. Code § 17003*

Venue. *Prob. Code § 17005*

No right to jury trial. *Prob. Code § 17006*

[b] Notice

General notice provisions. *Prob. Code § 1200 et seq.*

Mailing. *Prob. Code §§ 1215-1217*

Mailing notice. *Prob. Code §§ 1220, 1221*

Notice in proceedings concerning trusts as provided in Prob. Code *§ 1200 et seq.Prob. Code* § 17100

[c] Petitions

Verification of petition required. *Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*

Petition to determine existence of trust. *Prob. Code § 17200(a)*

Commencement of proceeding by petition. *Prob. Code § 17201*

[d] California Rules of Court

Beneficiaries to be listed in petitions and accounts. [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*]

[e] Decisions

Invalidity of trust was confined to separable provisions regarding future interests, and another provision regarding property transaction made by trustee was not defeated by invalid provisions; trustee was estopped from defeating validity of acts done with trustee's consent. *Burns v. Grable (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287-288, 291 P.2d 969*

See also Comments and References to *see § 560.630*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.521

§ 560.521 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Validity of Trust Provision [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(3)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Validity of Trust Provision [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(3)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO DETERMINE VALIDITY OF
	)	TRUST PROVISION

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is a/the beneficiary of the trust described herein.

2. The trust described herein is not revocable.

3. _____ [*Name of trustee*] is [_____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of California), and is] the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust hereinafter described.

[*EITHER, if living trust*]

4. The principal place of business of the trust herein described is located in _____ County, California.

[*OR, if testamentary trust not subject to continuing jurisdiction*]

4. The _____ [decedent's estate is administered *or* principal place of administration of the trust is located] in _____County, California.

[*OR, if testamentary trust subject to continuing jurisdiction*]

4. The decedent's estate is administered in _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

5. The trust that is the subject of this petition was created pursuant to _____ [a written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*] [, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof].

[6. The provision of Paragraph _____ of the above-described trust is invalid in that it _____ (*set forth grounds for invalidity, e.g.,* violates the Rule Against Perpetuities).]

7. As set forth in Paragraph _____ of the _____ [trust instrument *or* will *or other as appropriate*] herein described, the trustee, _____ [*name*], was directed to _____ [*describe allegedly valid provision, e.g.,* buy and sell real property for the purpose of building up the trust and to distribute the income therefrom to the named beneficiaries according to the terms of the trust].

8. The provision described in Paragraph _____ [*number of paragraph of complaint, e.g.,* 7], above, is valid [notwithstanding the invalid provision described in Paragraph _____ (*number of paragraph of complaint, e.g.,* 6, above)] in that _____ [*set forth ground(s) for validity, e.g.,* it is severable from the invalid provision, and the trustee is estopped from asserting their invalidity in that he/she/it has carried out its terms and retained the proceeds therefrom instead of distributing them to the beneficiaries].

9. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Declaring the trust valid and enforceable to the extent that _____ [*describe disputed provision(s), e.g.,* the trustee is directed to buy and sell real property for the purpose of building up the trust and to distribute the income therefrom to the named beneficiaries according to the terms of the trust];

2. Compelling _____ [*name of trustee*] to account fully for all trust property;

[3. _____ (*Set forth any further relief, e.g.,* Compelling _____ (*name of trustee*) to transfer to the named beneficiaries the proceeds from real property transactions that he/she/it has already completed, as evidenced by the account as approved by the court, and in accordance with the relevant terms of the trust);]

4. For costs herein; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for use by a beneficiary who is seeking a determination of the validity of a trust provision [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(3)*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The capacity and standing of the petitioner (Paragraphs 1, 2) [see *Prob. Code §§ 17200(a)* (standing

of beneficiary generally), 15800 (person holding right to revoke has rights otherwise afforded to beneficiary)];

- The identity of trustee (Paragraph 3);

- The basis for venue (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code §§ 17002* (principal place of administration), 17005 (venue for living trust or testamentary trust generally), 17301 (venue for testamentary trust subject to continuing jurisdiction of court); *see also Prob. Code § 17004* (basis for venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*)];

- Creation of the trust (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15200* (creation of trust), 15206 (Statute of Frauds), 15207 (oral trust in personal property)]; (5) a description of the disputed provision of the trust (Paragraph 7) [*see Burns v. Grable (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 280, 288, 291 P.2d 969]* ; and

- A statement of grounds supporting the validity of the disputed provision (Paragraph 8) [*see Burns v. Grable (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 280, 288-290, 291 P.2d 969]* .

Optional Paragraph 6 is for use if the trust contains a provision that is indisputably invalid, but that does not render the entire trust invalid [*see Burns v. Grable (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287-288, 291 P.2d 969]*

[4] Contents of Petition

A proceeding under *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210* is commenced by filing a verified petition stating facts showing that the petition is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210*, and the grounds of the petition [*Prob. Code § 17201(a)*].

[5] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 9) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. For a more detailed discussion of notice requirements, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[6] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[7] Standing

[a] Irrevocable Trust

Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15800* (revocable trust), a trustee or beneficiary of a trust may petition the court under *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210* concerning the internal affairs of the trust or to determine the existence of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*]. A "beneficiary" of a trust includes a person who has any present or future interest, vested or contingent [*Prob. Code § 24(c)*]. As it relates to a charitable trust, it includes any person entitled to enforce the trust [*Prob. Code § 24(d)*].

[b] Revocable Trust

Under *Prob. Code § 15800*, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the person holding the power to revoke, and not the beneficiary, has the rights afforded beneficiaries under *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.*, and the duties of the trustee are owed to the person holding the power to revoke. However, these provisions do not apply to the extent that the trust instrument otherwise provides, or if the joint action of the settlor and all beneficiaries is required [*Prob. Code § 15800*]. This form therefore may be adapted for use by the person holding the power to revoke a revocable trust.

[8] Jurisdiction

The superior court that has jurisdiction over the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17006* has exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings concerning the internal affairs of trusts [*Prob. Code § 17000(a)*]. In proceedings commenced under the Trust Law, the court is a court of general jurisdiction and has all the powers of the superior court [*Prob. Code § 17001*]. For discussion of in personam jurisdiction, see *§ 560.143*.

[9] Venue

[a] Generally

The proper county for commencement of a proceeding pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 15000-18201* is either [*Prob. Code § 17005(a)*]:

- In the case of a living trust, the county where the principal place of administration of the trust is located [*see Prob. Code § 17002* (principal place of administration); *but see Prob. Code § 17005(b)* (proceeding to appoint trustee if living trust has no trustee)].

- In the case of a testamentary trust not subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court, either the county where the decedent's estate is administered or where the principal place of administration of the trust is located [*but see Prob. Code § 17301*; *see also § 560.521[9][b]*].

[b] Testamentary Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction of Court

If a trust described in *Prob. Code § 17300* continues after distribution of the decedent's estate, the court in which the decedent's estate was administered retains jurisdiction over the trust for any of the purposes specified in *Prob. Code § 17200* [*Prob. Code § 17301*]. Trusts described in *Prob. Code § 17300* are a trust created by a will executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1977; and a trust created by a will that provides that the trust is subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the superior court. Consequently, venue for testamentary trusts subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court may not be established in the county in which the principal place of administration of the trust is located (unless, of course, it is the same county). Venue for other testamentary trusts may be established in the county of either the principal place of administration or the estate administration [*cf. Prob. Code §§ 17005, 17301*].

[c] Applicability of Civil Code Provisions

Except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code § 17005(a)* and *(b)*, the proper county for commencement of a proceeding pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* is determined by the rules applicable to civil actions generally [*Prob. Code § 17005(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392* (real property), 395 (defendant's residence)]. For example, rules generally governing civil actions would apply if the principal place of administration of a trust is a foreign state, but jurisdiction is proper in California [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 721 (1986)].

[10] No Right to Jury Trial

There is no right to a jury trial in proceedings under *Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* concerning the internal affairs of trusts [*Prob. Code § 17006*].

[11] State Statutes

[a] Jurisdiction and venue

Subject matter jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17001*

Place of administration of trust. *Prob. Code § 17002*

Personal jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17003*

Personal and in rem jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17003-17004*

Venue. *Prob. Code § 17005*

No right to jury trial. *Prob. Code § 17006*

[b] Notice

Proof of mailing. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a*; *Prob. Code § 1261*

Notice need not be given to oneself. *Prob. Code § 1201*

Power of court to order additional notice. *Prob. Code § 1202*

Order shortening time. *Prob. Code § 1203*

Waiver of notice. *Prob. Code § 1204*

Continued or postponed hearing. *Prob. Code § 1205*

Form of notice. *Prob. Code § 1211*

Notice when address unknown. *Prob. Code § 1212*

Mailing. *Prob. Code § 1215*

Personal delivery in lieu of mailing. *Prob. Code § 1216*

Proof of notice of hearing. *Prob. Code § 1260*

Proof of publication. *Prob. Code § 1262*

Proof of posting. *Prob. Code § 1263*

Proof of notice by personal delivery. *Prob. Code § 1264*

Mode of proof of notice. *Prob. Code § 1265*

[c] Petitions

Verification. *Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*

Petition to determine validity of trust provision. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(3)*

[d] Standing

Definition of beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 24*

Rights of person holding power to revoke. *Prob. Code § 15800*

Rights of person holding power of appointment or power to withdraw property from trust. *Prob. Code § 15803*

Standing generally. *Prob. Code § 17200(a)*

[e] Decisions

Invalidity of trust is confined to separable provisions regarding future interests, and other provision regarding property transaction made by trustee is not defeated by invalid provisions; trustee as estopped from defeating validity of acts done with trustee's consent. *Burns v. Grable (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 280, 287-288, 291 P.2d 969*

[12] California Rules of Court

Beneficiaries to be listed in petitions and accounts. [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*]

[13] Local Rules of Court

[a] Orange County

Form of papers presented for filing. Orange Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. VI, Rule 601.02

Trusts. Orange Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. VI, Rule 612.01 et seq.

[b] Riverside County

Pleadings and papers. Riverside Co. Consol. Ct. Rules, Rule 6.0101

[c] San Francisco

Pleadings. San Francisco City & County Uniform Local Rules of Court, Rule 14.25

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
1. Creation And Validity Of Express Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.522-560.539

[Reserved]

§§ 560.522[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.540

§ 560.540 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR REMOVAL OF TRUSTEE, AC-
	)	COUNT, AND APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

[6. As set forth in the _____ (trust instrument *or* will *or other as appropriate*) herein described, the trustee, _____ (*name*), was directed to _____ (*describe duties that trustee breached, e.g.,* lease the real property situated at _____ (*street address and if any, city*), _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ (*set forth legal description*) for reasonable value, collect the proceeds therefrom, and distribute rents and profits to the beneficiaries as specified therein).]

7. The trustee, _____ [*name*], has violated the duty owed to petitioner as beneficiary in that _____ [*set forth facts showing breach of trust, e.g.,* he/she/it fails and refuses to administer the trust property according to the trust instrument, and in particular, fails and refuses to lease the trust property, to collect the proceeds from the lease, and to distribute the rents and profits to the beneficiaries as directed in the trust described herein].

[8. In addition, the trustee, _____ (*name*), _____ (*set forth any additional facts showing breach of trust, e.g.,* on or about _____ (*date*), entered and took possession of the property herein described, and has used and is now using the property for her/his/its own personal advantage and profit, and has failed to pay rent or reimburse the trust therefor in any manner whatsoever).]

[9. On the removal of _____ (*name*) as trustee, there will be _____ (no trustee of the trust *or* a vacancy in the office of cotrustee, which the trust instrument requires to be filled). The trust instrument neither provides a practical method of appointing a trustee nor names the person to fill the vacancy.]

[10. There has been no agreement between all adult beneficiaries entitled to enter into such an agreement to provide a successor trustee pursuant to *Probate Code Section 15660(c).*]

[11. Petitioner is over 14 years of age, and nominates _____ (*name*) as successor trustee of the trust. He/She/It is fit and proper to fill the vacancy in the office of trustee of the trust, and is willing to act as trustee.]

12. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Removing _____ [*name of trustee*] as trustee;

2. Appointing _____ [a *or* _____ (*name*) or some other] suitable person as trustee of the trust, and vesting him/her/it with all the powers previously vested in _____ [*name of removed trustee*], as trustee [under the trust instrument];

3. Compelling _____ [*name of trustee*] to account fully for all trust property;

4. Compelling _____ [*name of removed trustee*] to redress the breachof trust by _____ [*describe appropriate redress of breach, e.g.*, paying petitioner $_____, the reasonable rental value of the property wrongfully occupied by him/her/it];

5. For costs herein; and

6. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a beneficiary to seek removal of a trustee, an accounting, appointment of a new trustee, and redress for the breach, after the trustee has violated a duty owed to the beneficiary [*see Prob. Code §§ 15660* (appointment of successor), 16400 (breach of trust), 16420 (remedies for breach of trust), 17200(b)(5) (petition to settle account), 17200(b)(7) (petition to compel trustee to account), 17200(b)(10) (petition to remove and appoint trustee)]. The examples set forth in this form were based on the breach of a trustee's duties to administer the trust according to its terms and to make the trust property productive, and a duty not to use the trust property for the trustee's own benefit [*see Prob. Code §§ 16000, 16007, 16004*, respectively; *see also Prob. Code §§ 16000-16015*]. For an allegation that the trustee breached a duty not to take part in a transaction in which the trustee has an interest adverse to the beneficiary, pursuant to *Prob. Code § 16004(a), see § 560.541*]. For a form to compel the trustee to report information or to account after making a written request [*Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*], *see § 560.548*. For a form containing a separate nomination by a beneficiary of a successor trustee, see *§ 560.553*.

If all the adult beneficiaries of an irrevocable trust with certain rights under the trust have requested the trustee to transfer administration of the trust to a successor trust company, and the trustee has refused to do so, in subsequent petition proceedings for removal and appointment of a successor, the petitioner may recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees from the removed trustee or the trust property [*see Prob. Code § 15645*]. In such a case, this form may be adapted to seek removal based on the trustee's refusal to comply with the beneficiaries' agreement, and to recover costs and attorneys' fees. In that case, Paragraphs 7 and 8 should be used to set forth the agreement between the beneficiaries and the trustee's refusal to comply with it. Paragraph 9 should be included, and Paragraphs 10-11 deleted. The prayer should include a request for attorney's fees as well as costs.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges a statement of facts describing the breach of trust (Paragraphs 6-8) [*see Prob. Code § 16000* (duty

to administer trust according to its terms), 16004 (duty not to use trust property for own profit), 16007 (duty to make trust property productive), 16400 (violation of duty is breach of trust)]. Optional Paragraph 6 is for use to describe a particular provision of the trust that was violated [*see Prob. Code § 16000*]. Optional Paragraphs 9-11 are for use by the petitioner, as beneficiary, to nominate a successor trustee. Paragraph 9 states that on removal of the trustee named in the petition, there will be either no trustee of the trust, or a vacancy in the office of cotrustee, which the trust instrument requires to be filled [*see Prob. Code § 15660(a)*]; and that the trust instrument neither provides a practical method of appointing a trustee nor names the person to fill the vacancy [*Prob. Code § 15660(b)*]. Paragraph 10 states that there has been no agreement between all adult beneficiaries entitled to enter into such an agreement, to provide a successor trustee pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15660(c)* (vacancy filled by trust company under agreement by all adult beneficiaries with certain rights under trust or by specified persons of their behalf). Paragraph 11 states that the beneficiary is over the age of 14 [*see Prob. Code § 15660(d)*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 12) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust must be given to the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]:

- All trustees.

- All beneficiaries, except that if the trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke it is competent notice must be given to the person holding the power to revoke and not to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15802*].

- The Attorney General of California, if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

- Personal service may be required if there are persons (other than a trustee or beneficiary) whose right, title, or interest would be affected by the petition and if they do not receive notice by mail [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*].

For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] State Statutes

Method to fill vacancy of office of trustee. *Prob. Code § 15660*

Effect of filing of petition for removal on increased trustee's fee. *Prob. Code § 15686*

Duty to administer trust according to trust instrument. *Prob. Code § 16000*

Duties of trustee. *Prob. Code §§ 16000-16015*

Duty not to deal with trust property for own profit. *Prob. Code § 16004*

Duty to make trust property productive. *Prob. Code § 16007*

Liabilities of trustee. *Prob. Code §§ 16400-16403*

Breach of trust. *Prob. Code § 16400*

Remedies. *Prob. Code § 16420*

Petition to settle account. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)*

Petition to appoint or remove trustee. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)*

[7] Decisions

Beneficiary seeking to prove breach of trust has initial burden of proving existence of fiduciary duty and trustee's failure to perform it; burden then shifts to trustee to justify its actions. *Van de Kamp v. Bank of America (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 819, 853, 251 Cal. Rptr. 530*

[8] California Rules of Court

Beneficiaries to be listed in petitions and accounts. [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[9] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 560.521*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.541

§ 560.541 Allegations for Petition by Beneficiary Against Trustee--Trustee Took Part in Transaction in Which Trustee Had Interest Adverse to the Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 16004(a)]

[1] FORM Allegations for Petition by Beneficiary Against Trustee--Trustee Took Part in Transaction in Which Trustee Had Interest Adverse to the Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 16004(a)]

1. The defendant trustee, _____ [*name*], has breached his/her/its duty not to take part in a transaction in which he/she/it has an interest adverse to the plaintiff, as beneficiary, in that on or about _____ [*date*], he/she/it _____ [*describe action of trustee, e.g.,* purchased trust property consisting of diamond jewelry without informing plaintiff, and without plaintiff's consent. Further, defendant trustee defrauded plaintiff and concealed his/her/its true actions by supplying the purchase funds to one _____ (*name of third party*), who purported to purchase the property in his/her name alone, and for his/her sole benefit and enjoyment, but who in fact purchased the property as an agent for defendant. Moreover, the appraised price of $250,000 greatly exceeded the purchase price of $60,000, which sum plaintiff was induced to accept by defendant].

2. The defendant trustee, _____ [*name*], has failed to return the trust property to the trust, and to account for profits acquired therefrom.

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use in a petition by a beneficiary to seek remedies against a trustee for breach of trust, on the ground that the trustee breached the trust by taking part in a transaction in which the trustee had an interest adverse to the beneficiary [*see Prob. Code § 16004(a)*]. These allegations may be inserted in addition to or in place of Paragraphs 6-8 in § 560.540 if the beneficiary seeks removal of a trustee, an accounting, appointment of a new trustee, and redress for the breach [*see Prob. Code §§ 16400* (breach of trust), 16420 (remedies for breach of trust), 17200(b)(5) (petition to settle account), 17200(b)(10) (petition to remove and appoint trustee)].

[3] Trustee's Limitation of Liability

With limited exceptions relating to gross negligence, bad faith, and wrongful profits, a trustee can be relieved of liability for breach of trust provisions in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 16461(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 16461(b)* (exceptions that do not allow limitation of liability)]. A provision in a trust instrument that releases the trustee from liability if a beneficiary fails to object to an item in an interim or final account or other written report within a specified time period is effective only if specified conditions are met, and if a statutory notice to beneficiaries is included with an accounting or report [*Prob. Code § 16461(c)*]. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.87*.

[4] Allegations

This form alleges that the trustee breached the duty not to take part in a transaction in which the trustee had an interest adverse to the beneficiary, and describes that transaction [*see Prob. Code § 16004(a)*; *see also Estate of Howard (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 535, 284 P.2d 966* (trustee's sham sale of jewelry to another party as agent for himself deemed grounds for removal)].

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 560.540*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.542

§ 560.542 Prayer for Partial and Temporary Removal and Suspension of Powers of Trustee and Appointment of Trustee Ad Litem [Prob. Code §§ 15642, 16420, 17000, 17200(b)(8), (10), 17206]

[1] FORM Prayer [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)] for Partial and Temporary Removal and Suspension of Powers of Trustee and Appointment of Trustee Ad Litem [Prob. Code §§ 15642, 16420, 17000, 17200(b)(8), (10), 17206]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Suspending the powers of _____ [*name of trustee*], as trustee, to _____ [*state powers sought to be suspended, e.g.,* make compromises or settlements, and prosecute or defend actions or proceedings involving the trust assets] in the above-described litigation.

2. Removing _____ [*name of trustee*] as trustee with respect to the above-described litigation.

3. Appointing _____ [*name of proposed trustee ad litem*] as trustee ad litem to represent the trust and the beneficiaries in the above-described litigation, and vesting him/her with the powers to _____ [*state powers to be vested in trustee ad litem, e.g.,* make compromises or settlements, and prosecute or defend actions or proceedings involving the trust assets] in that litigation, until such time as the litigation is completed.

4. Awarding petitioner costs herein; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

[2] Use of Form

This prayer is for use in a petition to partially and temporarily remove and suspend specified powers of a trustee and appoint a trustee ad litem to exercise those powers. Typically, these powers relate to litigation involving the trust, such as the power to make compromises or settlements [*see Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 138-139, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* . A trustee ad litem may be appointed to conduct certain litigation relating to a trust when, for example, the

trustee has a conflict of interest such that his or her interests and those of third-party litigants are similar and inimical to those of the beneficiaries [*see Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 141, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* .

To avoid confusion and disputes between the trustee and the trustee ad litem relative to their respective powers and duties, the prayer should specifically and carefully list those powers of the trustee that are to be suspended, and those powers that are to be vested in the trustee ad litem [*see Getty v. Getty (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 134, 141, 252 Cal. Rptr. 342]* .

For a petition adaptable for use in seeking the appointment of a trustee ad litem, *see § 560.540*. For a form of order adaptable for use in ordering the appointment of a trustee ad litem, see *§ 560.552*. For further discussion of this type of appointment, see *§ 560.94[3][b]*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see §§ 560.520, 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.543

§ 560.543 Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)] for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)] for Breach of Trust [Prob. Code §§ 16400, 16420(a)(5), 17200(b)(10)], Compel Accounting [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)], and Appoint Successor Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	RESPONSE OF TRUSTEE TO PETITION FOR
	)	REMOVAL OF TRUSTEE, ACCOUNT, AND AP-POINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR

_____

For return and response to the petition filed for his/her/its removal, to compel accounting, and to appoint a successor trustee, and to the notice issued thereon, _____ [*name*], as trustee under the _____ [written declaration of trust of _____, (*name of settlor*) *or* the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*], admits, denies, and alleges:

1. Admits the allegations of Paragraphs _____ [*specify, e.g.,* 1-6] of the petition.

2. _____ [*Set forth here and in subsequent paragraphs, other general and specific admissions, denials, contravening allegations, and affirmative defenses as appropriate, e.g.,* Responding to Paragraphs 7-8, denies that there is any merit or validity to the contentions of petitioners, and alleges that the trust property therein described is unable to

be leased in its present condition in that in several instances its structure is in violation of the building codes, regulations, and ordinances applicable thereto. Respondent did not move into that structure, but rather has allowed access thereto to several contractors and subcontractors who are performing the necessary work thereon. As soon as the work is completed and the building is inhabitable, respondent will seek to lease it].

3. Respondent will promptly render an accounting of all the acts performed as trustee since _____ [*date*], which is the date of the last account.

WHEREFORE respondent prays for an order:

1. Denying and dismissing the petition;

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Respondent _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the respondent in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing response and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:

The Trust Law is silent with respect to the filing of papers in response to a petition to administer a trust. Moreover, there do not appear to be any California Rules of Court or local court rules to provide guidance in this area, nor any uniformity with regard to the procedures presently used throughout California that would warrant the recommendation of one procedure for all jurisdictions. Counsel should therefore contact the appropriate court to ascertain whether any particular form of responsive pleading is preferred by the local commissioner or judge; for example, a response, an answer, or objections, with or without points and authorities [*see Prob. Code § 1000* (applicability of rules of civil practice in probate proceedings)]. An objection or response filed pursuant to the Probate Code must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(2)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a trustee to respond to a petition by a beneficiary seeking removal of the trustee, an accounting, appointment of a new trustee, and redress of a breach of trust [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)* (petition to settle account),

17200(b)(10) (petition to remove and appoint trustee)].

If the disputed issues are legal in nature, counsel should consider filing a memorandum of points and authorities with the responsive pleading, and, if factual, relevant declarations. In questionable matters, counsel should contact the local court for guidance as to whether points and authorities and declarations are appropriate.

For a form of account for submission to the court, see *§ 560.559*.

[3] Service

The Trust Law does not include any provisions specifying on whom responsive pleadings to petitions to administer a trust should be served. However, counsel may obtain guidance from *Prob. Code § 17203*, governing notice of the time and hearing for the petition, and may wish to serve the response on the persons named in that section as well as on the petitioner. *Prob. Code § 17203(a)* provides that a petitioner must cause notice to be mailed to all of the following persons:

- All trustees.

- All beneficiaries, except that if the trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke it is competent notice must be given to the person holding the power to revoke and not to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15802*].

- The Attorney General of California, if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

- *Prob. Code § 17203(b)* provides that a petitioner must cause notice to be served (in the manner provided for service of summons in civil cases) on any person, other than a trustee or beneficiary, whose right, title, or interest would be affected by the petition and who does not receive notice pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17203(a)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 413.10 et seq.* (summons in civil cases)].

For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[4] Dismissal of Petition

The court may dismiss a petition if it appears that the proceeding is not reasonably necessary for the protection of the interests of the trustee or beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 17202*].

[5] Cross References

For a related form, *see §§ 560.521, 560.540*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.544

§ 560.544 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Trustee Entitled to Contribution From Cotrustee [Prob. Code § 16402]

[1] FORM Allegation for Response by Trustee--Trustee Entitled to Contribution From Cotrustee [Prob. Code § 16402]

If the acts of respondent as described in the petition are found to be a breach of trust, _____ [*name of cotrustee*], as cotrustee, is equally responsible therefor, because he/she/it _____ [*describe basis for liability, e.g.,* approved and knowingly acquiesced in the acts]. Therefore, if respondent is liable, he/she/it is liable also, with damages to be apportioned between respondent and the cotrustee.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use in a response by a trustee to a petition brought by a beneficiary alleging breach of trust, to seek contribution from a cotrustee who is jointly responsible with the respondent for the breach [*see Prob. Code § 16402*]. The allegation may be inserted in *see § 560.543* if the trustee denies liability but affirmatively asserts that if the trustee is found liable, the cotrustee is equally liable [*see Gbur v. Cohen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300-303, 155 Cal. Rptr. 507* (cross-complaint for contribution regarding charitable trust)].

The ground for contribution used as an example in this form is that the cotrustee approved and knowingly acquiesced in the breach of trust. Additional grounds for contribution, which may be used in lieu of or in addition to that ground, are the other situations in which a trustee is liable to the beneficiary for a breach committed by a cotrustee. Those situations are when the cotrustee [*see Prob. Code § 10402(b)*]:

- Participated in the breach;
- Improperly delegated the administration of the trust to the respondent;
- Concealed a breach of trust committed by the respondent;

- Negligently enabled the respondent to commit a breach of trust; or

- Neglected to take reasonable steps to compel the respondent to redress a breach of trust in a case in which the cotrustee knew or had information from which he or she reasonably should have known of the breach.

[3] State Statutes

Trustee's liability to beneficiary for acts of cotrustee. *Prob. Code § 16402*

[4] Decisions

When breach of trust results in liability to more than one trustee, liability of affected trustees is joint and several, and suit for contribution may be brought between trustees. *Gbur v. Cohen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 296, 300, 155 Cal. Rptr. 507* (interpreting *Civ. Code § 2239* (principal's liability for authorized or ratified acts of agent) in plenary action for declaratory relief and indemnity regarding charitable trust)

Duties of trustee of charitable trust resemble those of trustee of private trust. *Gbur v. Cohen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 296, 301, 155 Cal. Rptr. 507* (interpreting *Civ. Code § 2239* (principal's liability for authorized or ratified acts of agent) in plenary action for declaratory relief and indemnity regarding charitable trust)

[5] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 560.540, 560.543*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.545

§ 560.545 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Improper Venue [Prob. Code §§ 15803, 17000]

[1] FORM Allegation for Response by Trustee--Improper Venue [Prob. Code §§ 15803, 17000]

The court designated in the petition is not the proper court in which to bring the proceeding described therein because _____ [*if a living trust*, the principal place of administration of the trust is *or, if a testamentary trust not subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court, either* the county where the decedent's estate is administered is *or* the principal place of administration of the trust is *or, if a trust subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the court*, the court in which the decedent's estate was administered is] in _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by a trustee to respond to a petition brought by a beneficiary alleging breach of trust, to raise the issue that the petition was filed in the wrong county [*see Prob. Code §§ 17005* (venue for living trust and trust not subject to continuing jurisdiction of court), 17301 (trust subject to continuing jurisdiction of court)]. For further discussion of venue, see Comments to *§ 560.521*; *see also § 560.144*.

The Trust Law, California Rules of Court, and local court rules are silent with respect to the filing of papers in response to a petition to administer a trust. For discussion of the appropriate form of responsive papers in which to raise this allegation, see *§ 560.543*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.546

§ 560.546 Allegation for Response by Trustee--Petitioner's Lack of Standing [Prob. Code §§ 15800, 15803]

[1] FORM Allegation for Response by Trustee--Petitioner's Lack of Standing [Prob. Code §§ 15800, 15803]

The petitioner does not have standing to bring the petition because _____ [*specify, e.g.*, the petitioner is the beneficiary of a revocable trust, and the power to revoke is in the settlor of the trust].

[2] Use of Form

This form may be used by a trustee to allege that a beneficiary who has filed a petition against the trustee lacks standing to bring the petition [*see Prob. Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor and not beneficiaries), 17200(a) (rights of beneficiaries generally)]. The allegation may be inserted in *§ 560.543* if the trustee wishes to assert the beneficiary's lack of standing as an affirmative defense.

The Trust Law, the California Rules of Court, and local court rules are silent with respect to the filing of papers in response to a petition to administer a trust. However, the rules of practice applicable to civil actions constitute the rules of practice in proceedings under the Probate Code, except to the extent that the Probate Code provides applicable rules [*Prob. Code § 1000*]. In a civil action, lack of standing is normally raised by demurrer to a complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e)* (failure to state cause of action) and 430.30(a) (demurrer proper when ground for objection appears on face of complaint); *but see In re Fred J. (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 168, 176, 152 Cal. Rptr. 327* (use of demurrer inconsistent with legislative purpose under Welfare & Institutions Code provisions otherwise incorporating *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 307-1062.10*)]. Counsel should therefore contact the appropriate court to ascertain whether the issue of lack of standing should be raised in any particular form of responsive pleading, for example, a demurrer, and whether the filing of supporting memorandum and other documents is required or preferred [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1005*; *Cal Rules of Ct, Rules 3.1113(a), 3.1320* (points and authorities and notice of hearing regarding demurrers)]. For discussion of demurrers, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment of the Pleadings* .

[3] Standing of Beneficiary

A beneficiary has standing to bring a petition under *Prob. Code § 17000*, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15800* [*Prob. Code § 17200(a)*]. Under *Prob. Code § 15800*, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the person holding the power to revoke, and not the beneficiary, has the rights afforded beneficiaries under the Trust Law. The trustee then owes its duties to the person holding the power to revoke. These rules apply unless the trust instrument provides otherwise, or if the joint action ofthe settlor and all beneficiaries is required [*Prob. Code § 15800*].

Moreover, the holder of a presently exercisable general power of appointment, or power to withdraw property from the trust, has the rights of a person holding the power to revoke the trust that are provided by *Prob. Code § 15800* to the extent of the holder's power over the trust property [*Prob. Code § 15803*]. For discussion of standing under the Trust Law generally, see *§ 560.130* et seq.

For forms and discussion of memoranda of points and authorities, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 560.521, 560.543*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.547

§ 560.547 Petition by Trust Beneficiary for Accounting and to Compel Trustee to Redress Breach of Trust by Payment of Money or Otherwise [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(3), (9), 17200(b)(5), (12)]--Trustee Liable for Acts and/or Omissions of Agent Employed by Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 16062(a), 16401(b)]

[1] FORM Petition by Trust Beneficiary for Accounting and to Compel Trustee to Redress Breach of Trust by Payment of Money or Otherwise [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(3), (9), 17200(b)(5), (12)]--Trustee Liable for Acts and/or Omissions of Agent Employed by Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 16062(a), 16401(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR RECOVERY OF TRUST PROP-
	)	ERTY AND ACCOUNT

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

6. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of trustee*] delegated to _____ [*name of agent*], as agent of _____ [*name of trustee*] and of the trust, the authority to _____ [*specify nature of authority that was delegated to agent, e.g.,* manage the securities and mutual fund investments of the trust]; and, in conjunction with that delegation of authority, allowed _____ [*name of agent*] access to the trust funds].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe wrongful acts and/or omissions of agent, e.g.,* _____ (*name of agent*) expended $50,000 of the trust funds to purchase 1,000 shares of Universal Retractors, Inc., and thereafter titled those shares in _____ (*name of agent*)'s own name. _____ (*name of agent*) has failed to reimburse the trust for the funds taken or to account for any profits from the use of those funds].

[*INCLUDE one or more of the following paragraphs alleging the basis for the trustee's personal liability*]

8. In performing the wrongful acts described in Paragraph 7, _____ [*name of agent*] was acting at and under the direction of _____ [*name of trustee*].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [By law *or* Under the terms of the _____ (will *or* trust instrument) under which the trust was created)], _____ [*name of trustee*] was under a duty not to delegate the authority referred to in Paragraph 6 of this complaint.

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*Name of trustee*] did not use reasonable prudence in the _____ [selection *and/or* retention] of _____ [*name of agent*] as agent for the trust, in that _____ [*specify factual basis for allegation, e.g.,* _____ (*name of trustee*) failed to conduct a reasonable background check of _____ (*name of agent*) and such a check would have revealed that _____ (*name of agent*) has seventeen previous felony convictions for embezzlement and misappropriation of trust funds *or* _____ (*name of trustee*), after being informed that _____ (*name of agent*) had seventeen previous felony convictions for embezzlement and misappropriation of trust fund, continued to employ _____ (*name of agent*) as an agent of the trust].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*Name of trustee*] did not periodically review _____ [the overall performance of _____ (*name of agent*) as agent for the trust *and/or* the compliance of _____ (*name of agent*) with the terms of the delegation of authority specified in Paragraph 6].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*Name of trustee*] learned of the wrongful acts of _____ [*name of agent*] specified in Paragraph 7, but concealed those acts from plaintiff [and the other _____ (co-trustees

and/or beneficiaries) of the trust)].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*Name of trustee*] was aware of the wrongful acts of _____ [*name of agent*] specified in Paragraph 7, but neglected to take reasonable steps to compel _____ [*name of agent*] to redress those wrongs, in that _____ [*specify nature of failure, e.g.,* _____ (*name of trustee*) failed to initiate legal action against _____ (*name of agent*) or any of his/her/its co-conspirators to recover the sums that were wrongfully misappropriated from the trust].

[*OR, if action relates to the investment and management functions of the trust*]

8. In making the delegation of authority referred to in Paragraph 6, _____ [*name of trustee*] did not act consistently with the purposes and terms of the trust, in that _____ [*explain why delegation was not in accordance with trust's terms and purposes, e.g.,* although the trust instrument required the trustee to comply with the "prudent person" rule in investing and managing trust assets, the delegation of authority referred to in Paragraph 6 did not require that _____ (*name of agent*) diversify trust investments or dispose of unproductive trust property within a reasonable time].

[*CONTINUE*]

9. _____ [*Name of trustee*], as trustee, has failed to _____ [*describe failure of trustee to redress the breach, e.g.,* reimburse the trust for the funds taken or to account for any profits made thereon].

10. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

11. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Compelling _____ [*name of trustee*] to account fully for all trust property;

2. Ordering _____ [*name of trustee*] to redress the breach of trust described in Paragraphs 6 through 9, above, by _____ [*state nature of relief requested, e.g.,* returning to the trust all trust property

wrongfully misappropriated from the trust as a result of the actions of _____ (*name of agent*), reimbursing the trust for all losses occasioned by the wrongful actions of _____ (*name of agent*) described in Paragraph 7, and paying to the trust or distributing to petitioner all profits acquired as a result of those wrongful actions, without deduction for any losses];

[3. Imposing a constructive trust in favor of petitioner on property purchasedwith trust funds and standing in the name of _____ (*name of agent*) or another;]

4. For costs herein; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is a petition for use by a beneficiary who is seeking the hold the trustee liable for wrongful acts committed by an agent of the trustee. The petition seeks orders compelling the trustee to account fully for all trust property [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*] and to redress a breach of trust by returning to the trust all property wrongfully misappropriated from it as a result of the agent's actions [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(12)*]. It includes optional language requesting the imposition of a constructive trust on property wrongfully purchased with trust funds [*see Prob. Code § 16420(a)(9)*].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 10) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, *see § 560.600*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Trustee's Liability For Acts of Agent

[a] General Rule of Nonliability

It is a relatively common practice for trustees to delegate specific trust functions to agents. Preparation of accountings and tax returns, and management of investment portfolios and real property, are typical examples of acts that may be delegated to some extent to agents.

In general, the trustee is not liable to the trust beneficiaries for the acts or omissions of agents [*Prob. Code § 16401(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 16052(c)* (investment and management functions of trust)]. Under this rule, the only recourse of the beneficiary is against the agent directly. An agent has a duty to perform the delegated function with reasonable care to comply with the terms of the delegation [*Prob. Code § 16052(b)*] and, by accepting a delegation from the trustee of a trust that is subject to California law, submits to the jurisdiction of California courts [*Prob. Code § 16052(d)*].

[b] When Trustee May Be Personally Liable for Agent's Acts

There are several important exceptions to the general rule of a trustee's nonliability for acts of agents [*see Prob. Code §§ 16052(a), (c), 16401(b)*]. Under these exceptions, with respects to acts of omissions of agents occurring on or after July 1, 1987, the trustee is liable to the beneficiary for an act or omission of an agent employed by the trustee in the administration of the trust that would be a breach of the trust if the committed by the trustee, if any of the following circumstances exist [*Prob. Code § 16401(b)*]:

- The trustee directs the acts of the agent.

- The trustee delegates to the agent the authority to perform an act that the trustee is under a duty not to delegate. In general, the trustee has a duty not to delegate to others the performance of acts that the trustee can reasonably be required personally to perform, and may not transfer the office of trustee or delegate the entire administration of the trust to a cotrustee or other person [*Prob. Code § 16012(a)*]. The provisions of the governing trust instrument or will may also affect the extent to which the trustee may delegate trust functions to agents [*see Prob. Code § 16000* (duty to administer trust according to provisions of trust instrument)].

- The trustee does not use reasonable prudence in the selection or retention of the agent [*see also Prob. Code § 16052(a)(1)* (delegation of investment and management functions)].

- The trustee does not periodically review the agent's overall performanceand compliance with the terms of the delegation [*see also Prob. Code § 16052(a)(2)* (delegation of investment and management functions)].

- The trustee conceals the act of the agent.

- The trustee neglects to take reasonable steps to compel the agent to redress the wrong in a case in which the trustee knows of the agent's acts and omissions.

In addition to these exceptions, when delegating investment or management functions of the trust the trustee has a duty to exercise prudence in establishing the scope and terms of the delegation, consistent with the purposes and terms of the trust [*Prob. Code § 16052(a)(2)*].

This form contains optional allegations for each of the seven exceptions discussed above. The drafter should select one or more of these options as appropriate to the facts of the case. The appropriate allegation(s) should be inserted into the form as Paragraph 8.

[6] Liability for Acts of Agent Prior to July 1, 1987

The rules discussed above apply to liability of a trustee for acts or omissions of agents that occur on or after July 1, 1987. Liability for acts occurring prior to that time are governed by pre-1987 law.

A trustee is not liable for the acts of an agent occurring on or after July 1, 1987, except as provided in *Prob. Code § 16401(b)* [*Prob. Code § 16401(a)*]. With regard to acts of an agent occurring before July 1, 1987, former law controls [*Prob. Code § 16401(c)*; *see, e.g., Gaver v. Early (1923) 58 Cal. App. 736, 737, 209 P. 394* , and Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 225]. For further discussion, see *§ 560.84[2]*.

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the agency relationship, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* . For memoranda of points and authorities relating to the agency relationship, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 182, *Principal and Agent* (Matthew Bender)

For detailed discussion of the powers of trustees and the delegation of those powers to agents, see California Wills & Trusts, Ch. 96, *Powers and Duties of Trustees* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.548

§ 560.548 Petition Compelling Trustee to Account After Written Request [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition Compelling Trustee to Account After Written Request [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR ACCOUNT
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

6. _____ [*Name*], as trustee, made his/her/its last _____ [report of information about

the trust *or* account of the above-described trust *whichever was made more recently*] on _____ [*date more than six months prior to date of petition*].

7. On or about _____ [*date more than 60 days prior to date of petition*], petitioner delivered to the trustee a written request for _____ [a report of information regarding _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the leasing of the real property situated at _____ (*street address*), _____ County, California) *or* an accounting of his/her/its acts as trustee since the period covered by the last _____ [account *or* report]. A copy of the request is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

8. The trustee fails and refuses to make the requested _____ [account *or* report].

9. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Compelling _____ [*name*], as trustee, to submit his/her/its _____ [report of information regarding _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the leasing of the real property at _____ (*street address*), _____ County, California) *or* an accounting of his/her/its acts as trustee since the period covered by the last _____ [account *or* report];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For all other orders the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:

The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary to compel the trustee to report information about the trust or account to the beneficiary, if the trustee has failed to submit a required report or account within 60 days after written request of the beneficiary and no report or account has been made within six months preceding the request [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*]. For a form to compel accounting in conjunction with removal of a trustee and appointment of a successor trustee, see *§ 560.540*. For a form of account by a trustee, see *§ 560.559*.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*]:

- That the trustee has not made a report of information or an account to the beneficiary within six months of the date of the petition (Paragraph 6);

- That the beneficiary submitted a written request for certain information or for an account more than 60 days prior to the date of the petition (Paragraph 7); and

- That the trustee has failed to submit the requested report or account as of the date of the petition (Paragraph 8).

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 9) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 560.521, 560.559*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.549

§ 560.549 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Review Reasonableness of Trustee's Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680, 15686, 17200(b)(9)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Review Reasonableness of Trustee's Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680, 15686, 17200(b)(9)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO REVIEW REASONABLENESS OF
	)	TRUSTEE'S COMPENSATION

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

[*EITHER*]

6. Pursuant to the above-described trust, _____ [*name of trustee*], as trustee, is entitled to [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per year], as compensation for performing the duties that are described in the trust.

[*OR*]

6. The trust does not specify the trustee's compensation. The trustee's compensation was fixed at _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per year] pursuant to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* court order attached as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof] effective _____ [*date*].

[*CONTINUE*]

[7. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of trustee*), as trustee, served on petitioner a written notice pursuant to *Probate Code Section 15686*, of an increase in his/her/its _____ (*describe type of fee, e.g.,* periodic base fee), from _____ (*describe fee increase, e.g.,* $_____ per year to $_____ per year), effective _____ (*date*).]

8. _____ [*Set forth basis for requested review, e.g.,* The trustee's duties as described in the trust have diminished in that six parcels of real property in Mendocino County, as described in the trust, were sold on or about _____ (*date*), the proceeds of which were distributed to the beneficiaries. There have been no additions to the trust, and the trustee's duties have not been increased by reason of any changes in the remaining trust property.]

9. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Reviewing the reasonableness of the trustee's compensation;

[2. Reducing the trustee's compensation to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per year);]

[3. Not allowing the trustee's increased fee;]

4. For costs herein; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary to seek a review of the reasonableness ofthe trustee's compensation [*see Prob. Code §§ 15680* (court may allow lesser compensation), 17200(b)(9) (petition to review reasonableness of compensation)]. For a form of petition for use by a trustee to fix compensation or allow greater compensation, *see § 560.558*.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- A statement describing the trustee's compensation (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15681* (trustee entitled to reasonable compensation), 15682 (court may fix compensation)]; and

- The basis for the requested review (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15680(b)* (circumstances under which court may allow greater or lesser compensation), 17200(b)(9) (petition to seek review of reasonableness of trustee's compensation)].

Optional Paragraph 7 is for use to seek review of a trustee's increased fee [*see Prob. Code § 15686*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 9) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Effect of Filing of Petition on Increased Trustee's Fee

If a beneficiary files a petition under *Prob. Code § 17200* for review of the increased trustee's fee (or for removal of the trustee), and serves a copy of the petition on the trustee before the expiration of required 60-day notice period, the increased trustee's fee does not take effect as to that trust until otherwise ordered by the court or the petition is dismissed [*Prob. Code § 15686(c)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 560.90*.

[7] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 560.521, 560.558*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.550

§ 560.550 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Right of Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2)] and to Enforce Oral Trust in Real Property [Prob. Code §§ 850(a)(3)(A), 15206, 17200(a), (b)(2), (12)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Determine Right of Beneficiary [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2)] and to Enforce Oral Trust in Real Property [Prob. Code §§ 850(a)(3)(A), 15206, 17200(a), (b)(2), (12)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust, e.g.,* Trust Created by Oral Declaration of _____ (*name of settlor*) for the Benefit of _____ (*name of beneficiary*)]	)))))	NO. _____ PETITION TO ENFORCE ORAL TRUST IN REAL PROPERTY

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city, if any, and county*], California, _____ [*name of settlor*], owned certain real property, situated at _____ [*street address and, if any, city*] _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

4. On or about that same date, _____ [*name of settlor*] orally declared that he/she held _____ [that property *or* a _____ (*specify portion, e.g.,* a one-half) interest in that property] in trust on behalf of plaintiff, as beneficiary. Under the terms of the trust declared by _____ [*name of settlor*], _____ [*set forth terms of oral agreement, e.g.,* petitioner may live on the premises so long as he/she desires and is required to satisfy the outstanding indebtedness on the property in the sum of $90,000, and _____ (*name of settlor*) is required to convey to petitioner an undivided one-half interest in the property on petitioner's demand, or, should the property be sold prior to actual conveyance of title of undivided one-half interest to petitioner, to pay to petitioner one half of the proceeds from the sale].

5. _____ [*Specify acts showing reliance on oral declaration of trust, e.g.,* Petitioner, in reliance on the trust declared by _____ (*name of settlor*), and with his/her consent to all activities herein described, took possession of the real property on _____ (*date*), and has remained in possession since that time, paid the total outstanding indebtedness on the property, in the sum of $90,000, and in addition, paid taxes in the sum of $35,000, and expended the sums of $18,000 for improvements to and $12,000 for maintenance, respectively, of the above-described property, thereby irrevocably changing his/her position in reliance on the trust].

[6. _____ (*Describe satisfaction of any conditions petitioner was required to meet by the terms of the trust, e.g.,* On or about _____ (*date*), petitioner executed and delivered to _____ (*name of settlor*), a written demand for the conveyance of the real property described herein. A copy of the demand is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof).]

7. _____ [*Name of settlor*] has failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to perform the conditions of the trust on his/her part in that he/she _____ [*state facts showing breach of trust, e.g.,* has not conveyed to petitioner an undivided one-half interest in the above-described real property].

8. _____ [*Name of settlor*] is estopped from relying on the Statute of Frauds because petitioner, with his/her consent at all times, irrevocably changed his/her position in reliance on the trust by _____ [*specify facts that avoid the Statute of Frauds, e.g.,* taking possession of the premises and making valuable improvements thereon as described above].

9. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

10. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Compelling _____ [*name of settlor*] to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* execute and deliver to petitioner forthwith an undivided one-half interest in the real property described above];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary to determine the beneficiary's rights with respect to an oral trust in real property [*see Prob. Code §§ 15206* (statute of frauds), 17200(a) (petition to determine existence of trust), 17200(b) (petition to determine existence or nonexistence of any right), 17200(b)(12) (petition to compel redress of breach of trust)]. Any interested person may petition the court for an appropriate order when it appears that the trustee is in possession of, or holds title to, real or personal property, and the property, or some interest in the property, is claimed to belong to another [*Prob. Code § 850(a)(3)(A)*]. The petition prays for an order compelling the trustee to transfer the property to the beneficiary [*see Mulli v. Mulli (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 68, 73, 232 P.2d 556]* .

In lieu of this petition, the beneficiary may initiate a civil action to enforce a trust. Although the superior court having jurisdiction over the trust pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17000 et seq.* has exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings concerning the internal affairs of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17000(a)*], it has concurrent jurisdiction of actions and proceedings to determine the existence of trusts [*Prob. Code § 17000(b)(1)*]. The probate court must not grant a petition under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* if it determines that the matter should be determined by a civil action [*Prob. Code § 853*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The creation of an oral trust in real property and the basis for venue (Paragraphs 3, 4) [*see Prob. Code § 15206(c)* (trust in real property by operation of law); *see also Mulli v. Mulli (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 68, 73, 232 P.2d 556* (oral trust in real property); *see also Prob. Code § 17005(c)* (venue determined by rules applicable to civil actions generally, except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code § 17005(a), (b)*) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 392* (venue regarding real property)];

- Petitioner's performance of acts in reliance on trust (Paragraph 5) [*see Mulli v. Mulli (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 68, 73, 232 P.2d 556]* ;

- Breach of the terms of the trust by the trustee (Paragraph 7); and

- Facts establishing that the defendant is estopped from pleading the Statute of Frauds as a defense (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code § 15206(c)* (trust in real property by operation of law); *see also*

Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 678-679, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210] .

Optional Paragraph 6 is for use to allege that the beneficiary complied with any conditions necessary to establish the trust.

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 9) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, *see § 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Statute of Frauds

A trust in relation to real property is not valid unless evidenced by certain methods, including by operation of law [*see Prob. Code § 15206(c)*]. A trust in real property that violates the Statute of Frauds may subsequently become valid and binding if possession is taken or the transfer of property has been fully executed [*Casa Colina Convalescent Home v. Wiest (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 161, 165, 166, 29 Cal. Rptr. 407]* .

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

Jurisdiction and venue regarding petition proceedings under the Trust Law are discussed in *§ 560.142* et seq. If in lieu of filing this petition, the beneficiary brings a plenary action to enforce an oral trust pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure the superior court will have jurisdiction over the action [*see* Prob. Code§ 17000(b)(1) (probate court's jurisdiction to determine existence of trust is concurrent); *Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 877, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295* (action to establish and enforce trusts are equitable); *St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 358, 287 P.2d 387* (superior court jurisdiction over actions that are substantially equitable in nature)]. An action is substantially equitable in nature if it primarily seeks equitable relief, even if it also requests a money judgment [*Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 877, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295]* . Because suits in equity do not afford a right to jury trial, actions to determine the nature of the trust, the meaning or interpretation of its terms, or the effect of its terms are within the sole province of the court sitting without a jury [*Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 877, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295]* .

With respect to a plenary action to enforce a trust, if the subject of the trust is real property, and the cause of action is "local" (that is, concerns rights to real property), the county in which the real property, or part of it, is located determines the venue of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392*; *see Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530-531, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527]* . If the subject of the trust is personal property, the general venue provisions for actions not specifically set forth apply, and the trustee's residence determines the venue [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395, 395.5*; *see Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530-531, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527]* .

[8] Lis Pendens

If a proceeding under the Probate Code affects the title to or the right to possession of real property, notice of the pendency of the proceeding may be filed in the office of the county recorder in the county in which the property is located, in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 405-405.61* [*see Prob. Code § 1004*]. A notice of the pendency of the proceeding will protect the interest of the petitioner in the property by giving notice to prospective purchasers and encumbrancers that the petition claims some interest in the property. For further discussion, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[9] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the Statute of Frauds, see Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*

[10] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to the Statute of Frauds, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 216, *Statute of Frauds*

[11] State Statutes

Petition requesting that court make order when trustee holds property claimed to belong to another. *Prob. Code § 850(a)(3)(A)*

Lis pendens. *Prob. Code § 1004*

Statute of frauds for trust in relation to real property. *Prob. Code § 15206*

Concurrent jurisdiction of superior court over actions and proceedings to determine existence of trusts. *Prob. Code § 17000(b)(1)*

Probate court petition to determine existence of trust. *Prob. Code § 17200(a)*

Petition to determine existence of right. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2)*

Petition to compel redress of breach of trust. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(12)*

[12] Decisions

Action to convey real property does not require allegation that legal remedy is inadequate, because land is presumed to be unique. *Porporato v. Devincenzi (1968) 261 Cal. App. 2d 670, 677, 68 Cal. Rptr. 210*

Oral trust in real property is enforceable if, with consent of trustee, beneficiary enters into possession of land or makes valuable improvements thereon or irrevocably changes position in reliance on trust; declaration by owner of property to hold it for benefit of another constitutes creation of trust. *Mulli v. Mulli (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 68, 73, 232 P.2d 556*

[13] Text References

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed.), Ch. 5, *The Statute of Frauds--Satisfaction of the Statute*, §§ 81-100

[14] Cross References

For a related form, see *§§ 560.521*, *560.540*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.551

§ 560.551 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Compel Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)] to Invade Principal of Discretionary Trust [Prob. Code § 15303]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Compel Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)] to Invade Principal of Discretionary Trust [Prob. Code § 15303]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO INVADE PRINCIPAL OF TRUST
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

6. Pursuant to the above-described trust, _____ [*set forth provision regarding distribution of*

accumulated income, e.g., the trustee is directed to pay all income from the trust that is available for distribution to petitioner, as beneficiary, for his/her use and benefit, after payment of any expenses of management of the trust estate and administration of the trust, including the compensation for the services of the trustee. In addition, if at any time the income from the corpus of the trust is insufficient to meet the needs of petitioner, then in the sole discretion of the trustee, the trustee may pay to petitioner, as beneficiary, an amount from the principal or corpus of the trust sufficient to meet his/her needs, care, and comfort].

7. _____ [*Describe need to invade principal, e.g.,* Petitioner is physically incapacitated and was institutionalized on or about _____ [*date*]. When the trust instrument was executed, petitioner was confined to her home, and the monthly amount required to meet her needs was $_____. However, due to petitioner's recent institutionalization, she now requires $_____ per month for her reasonable expenses. Consequently, it is necessary that the trustee invade the principal of the trust as necessary in order to maintain monthly payments to petitioner in the amount of $_____ to effectuate the intent of the settlor to provide for petitioner's maintenance and support].

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Instructing the trustee to invade the principal of the trust in the amount of $_____ per month, and to make monthly payments to petitioner in that amount;

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary to petition the court for instructions to the trustee to invade the principal of a trust under which the trustee determines payments from income or principal according to the trustee's discretion [*see Prob. Code §§ 15303(d)* (beneficiary may compel trustee to pay income or principal of discretionary trust), 17200(b)(6) (petition for instructions to trustee)].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The relevant trust provisions regarding distribution of income andprincipal for support of the beneficiary (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code § 15303*]; and

- Facts describing the petitioner's need for invasion of the trust principal (Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 15303*; *see also Estate of Ferrall (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 166, 168-169, 173-174, 258 P.2d 1009* (denying invasion of corpus)].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Beneficiary's Rights Regarding Discretionary Trust

If the trust instrument provides that the trustee must pay to or for the benefit of a beneficiary so much of the income or principal or both as the trustee in its discretion sees fit to pay, a transferee or creditor of the beneficiary may not compel the trustee to pay any amount that may be paid only in the exercise of the trustee's discretion [*Prob. Code § 15303(a)*]. However, a beneficiary has the right to compel the trustee to pay to or for the benefit of the beneficiary all or part of the income or principal [*Prob. Code § 15303(d)*].

[7] State Statutes

Discretionary trust. *Prob. Code § 15303*

Petition to instruct trustee. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*

[8] Decisions

Court does not have control over exercise of absolute discretion absent showing of fraud, bad faith, or abuse of discretion. *Estate of Charters (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 227, 239, 293 P.2d 778*

Sole discretion of trustee to invade corpus of trust for support of beneficiary is properly subject to court review if exercised in bad faith or by abuse of discretion. *Estate of Ferrall (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 166, 168-169, 258 P.2d 1009* (denying invasion of corpus)

Settlor's intent to support beneficiaries within general boundaries of their accustomed standard of living supports invasion of corpus to satisfy debts incurred for purchase of equipment needed in beneficiary's professional practice; discretion of trustee as never unlimited or arbitrary. *Estate of Miller (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 888, 907, 909, 41 Cal. Rptr. 410*

[9] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 560.521*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.552

§ 560.552 Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Beneficiary Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

[1] FORM Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Beneficiary Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ ORDER _____ [*specify, e.g.,* FOR REMOVAL OF TRUSTEE, ACCOUNT, AND APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR

_____

This proceeding for _____ [*specify relief prayed for, e.g,* the removal of _____ (*name of trustee*) as trustee, and appointing a successor trustee] of the _____ (*name of trust*) on the verified petition of _____ [*name of petitioner*], a/the beneficiary of the trust [, and the return and _____ (*specify papers filed in opposition, e.g.,* response) of the trustee], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*], before this court, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] [; the trustee appeared by counsel _____ (*name of removed trustee's counsel*)]. [Evidence was introduced on behalf of both parties and the matter was argued and submitted for decision.]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the petition ought to be granted,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED as follows:

1. That _____ [*specify order granted, e.g.,* _____ (*name of removed trustee*), having violated the trust, is removed herewith as the trustee of the _____ (*name of trust*)].

[2. That _____ (*specify any further order, e.g.,* _____ (*name of removed trustee*) file a full and final account of his/her/its administration of the trust within _____ number of days, and on settlement of the account surrender the assets of the trust to his/her/its duly appointed successor; an order surcharging _____ (*name of removed trustee*) for any sums owing from him/her/it to the trust will be withheld pending filing and settlement of the account).]

[3. That _____ (*specify any further order, e.g.,* _____ (*name of successor*) is appointed trustee, succeeding _____ (*name of removed trustee*)).]

[4. That _____ (*specify any further order, e.g.,* _____ (*name of successor*) is vested with all the powers that were vested in _____ (*name of removed trustee*), as trustee under the _____ (written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*) and must execute the trust according to the terms of _____ (that instrument *or other as appropriate*)).]

[5. That _____ (*specify any further order, e.g.,* _____ (*name of successor*) give a bond in the sum of $_____, to be approved by the court, conditioned on the faithful performance of his/her/its trust).]

[6. That petitioner have and recover his/her costs (from _____ (*name of removed trustee*) taxed at $_____).]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This order may be used to grant relief after hearing on a beneficiary's petition seeking the removal of the trustee, compelling an account by the trustee, and appointing a successor trustee [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7), (10)*]. The order may be submitted to the court for signature either with the petition or after hearing on the petition. In some courts, a proposed order must be submitted before the hearing date. Counsel should consult local court practice to determine the appropriate procedure.

[3] Bond Requirement

A trustee is not required to give a bond to secure performance of duties, unless any of the following circumstances occurs [*see Prob. Code § 15602(a)*]:

- A bond is required by the instrument [*but see Prob. Code §§ 15602(b)* (court may excuse requirement), 15602(e) (exception for trust company)].

- The court finds that a bond is necessary to protect the interests of beneficiaries or other persons having an interest in the trust, notwithstanding a waiver of a bond in the trust instrument.

- An individual who is not named as a trustee in the trust instrument is appointed as a trustee by the court.

[4] State Statutes

Court authority to make necessary orders. *Prob. Code § 17206*

[5] Local Rules of Court

Probate orders.

Alameda Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rules 12.1.10 et seq.

Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 10.36 et seq.

Marin Co. Uniform Local Rules, Rule 5 et seq.

Orange Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. VI, Rule 601.14

San Diego Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. IV, Rule 1.30 et seq.

Santa Clara Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 5.2(G)

San Francisco City & County Unified Local Rules of Court, Rule 14.27

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to orders generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

For a related form, see *§ 560.540*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.553

§ 560.553 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Appoint Successor Trustee to Fill Vacancy [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Cotrustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Appoint Successor Trustee to Fill Vacancy [Prob. Code §§ 15660, 17200(b)(10)]--By Cotrustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO _____ PETITION TO APPOINT SUCCESSOR, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND NOMINATION

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting cotrustee of the trust created _____ [by a written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*] [, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof]. [Petitioner is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of California)].

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. On _____ [*date*], a vacancy occurred in the office of trustee of the above-described trust in that _____ [*describe reason for vacancy, e.g.,* _____ (*name of former trustee*), a trustee _____ (named in the trust instrument *or* formerly appointed *or other as appropriate*) died].

4. The trust instrument requires that a vacancy in the office of a cotrustee be filled, and the instrument neither provides a practical method of appointing a trustee, nor names the person to fill the vacancy.

5. There has been no agreement between all adult beneficiaries entitled to enter into such an agreement to provide a successor trustee pursuant to *Probate Code Section 15660(c)*.

[6. By an instrument in writing dated _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of beneficiary*), a/the beneficiary of the trust, has nominated _____ (*name*) as successor trustee to fill the vacancy (, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof).]

[7. _____ (A bond is required by the trust instrument *or* Petitioner believes that a bond is required to protect the interests of the beneficiaries). Petitioner believes that a bond in the sum of $_____ is appropriate (and that the cost of the bond should be charged against the trust).]

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Appointing _____ [a *or* _____ (*name*) or some other] suitable person as trustee of the trust, and vesting _____ [him/her *or* that person] with all the powers vested in the office of the trustee under the trust instrument;

[2. Requiring the successor trustee to give a bond (in the sum of $_____) (, and that the cost of the bond be charged against the trust);]

3. For costs herein; and

4. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]
EXHIBIT B

BENEFICIARY'S DECLARATION AND NOMINATION OF SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE

I, _____ say:

I am a/the beneficiary of the _____ [*name of trust*].

I am over 14 years of age.

A vacancy exists in the office of trustee of the trust because the former trustee, _____ [*name of former trustee*], _____ [*state reason for vacancy, e.g.,* died on _____ (*date*)].

I nominate and request that the Court appoint _____ [*name of successor trustee*] as successor trustee of the trust. He/She is a fit and proper person to fill the vacancy in the office of trustee of the trust, and is willing to act as trustee.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a cotrustee to request the appointment of a successor after a vacancy has occurred in the office of trustee, when the trust instrument requires that a vacancy be filled [*see Prob. Code §§ 15660* (appointment of successor), 17200(b)(10) (petition for appointment of successor)]. The nomination of a beneficiary over 14 years of age may be attached to the petition as an exhibit [*see Prob. Code § 15660(d)*]. For a petition brought by a beneficiary to seek, among other things, the appointment of a successor trustee, *see § 560.540*, which incorporates the beneficiary's nomination within the body of the form.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The capacity of the petitioner and the creation of the trust (Paragraph 1) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15200* (creation of trust), 15206 (Statute of Frauds), 15207 (oral trust in personal property), 17200(a) (standing to bring petition)];

- The reason for the vacancy (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 15643*];

- A statement that the trust instrument requires that the vacancy be filled (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code § 15660(a)*]; and

- A statement that there has been no agreement between all adult benefi ciaries entitled to enter into such an agreement to provide a successor trustee pursuant to *Prob. Code § 15660(c)* (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code § 15660(c)* (vacancy filled by trust company under agreement by all adult beneficiaries with certain rights under trust or by specified persons of their behalf)].

Optional Paragraph 6 is for use to state that a beneficiary has nominated a successor [*see Prob. Code § 15660(d)*]. Optional Paragraph 7 is for use to require that the successor trustee give a bond [*see Prob. Code § 15603*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Appointment of Successor Trustee

If the trust has no trustee or if the trust instrument requires a vacancy in the office of a cotrustee to be filled, the vacancy must be filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660* [*Prob. Code § 15660(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 15621* (remaining cotrustees may act for trust in absence of provision to contrary)]. If the trust instrument provides a practical method of appointing a trustee or names the person to fill the vacancy, the vacancy must be filled as provided in the trust instrument [*Prob. Code § 15660(b)*]. If the vacancy in the office of trustee is not filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660(b)*, the vacancy may be filled by a trust company that has agreed to accept the trust on agreement of all adult beneficiaries (or conservator or attorney-in-fact on their behalf) who are receiving or are entitled to receive income under the trust or to receive a distribution of principal if the trust were terminated at the time the agreement is made [*Prob. Code § 15660(c)*]. If the vacancy in the office of trustee is not filled as provided in *Prob. Code § 15660(b)* or *(c)*, on petition of any interested person or any person named as trustee in the trust instrument, the court may, in its discretion, appoint a trustee to fill the vacancy [*Prob. Code § 15660(d)*].

If the trust provides for more than one trustee, the court may, in its discretion, appoint the original number or any lesser number of trustees. In selecting a trustee, the court shall give consideration any nomination by a beneficiary who is 14 years of age or older [*Prob. Code § 15660(d)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor, not beneficiary), 15803 (rights inuring to holder of presently exercisable general power or power to withdraw property)]. For further discussion, see *§ 560.94[3]*.

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see §§ 560.521, 560.540*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.554

§ 560.554 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Grant Trustee Powers [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(8)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Grant Trustee Powers [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(8)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO GRANT TRUSTEE POWERS
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust created _____ [by a written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*] [, a copy of which is attached, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof]. [Petitioner is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of California)].

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. The above-described trust provides that the trustee has the power and is directed to _____ [*specify provisions that require construction or expansion of powers, e.g.,* maintain in trust for _____ (*name of beneficiary*), as beneficiary, and not to sell, certain shares of common stock in the XYZ Company, and pay to beneficiary the net income derived therefrom during his/her natural lifetime, and all dividends accruing on the stock

from the effective date of this instrument].

4. _____ [*Describe the powers sought, e.g.,* The trust property presently consists solely of 6,000 shares of common stock in XYZ Company. After careful consideration, petitioner has concluded that in order to bring about a more extensive diversification in the trust assets, it is in the best interests of the beneficiary named herein to sell approximately one-half, or 3,000 shares, of that stock at the current market price on the date of sale, and at a price not less than $28.00 per share].

[5. _____ (*Describe any further powers sought, e.g.,* Petitioner further desires authorization to invest the proceeds of the sale of the above-described common stock in national government, state or municipal bonds or in such other securities as the court deems proper).]

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Authorizing the trustee to exercise the powers described herein;

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek additional powers [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(8)*]. The trustee may use this

form to seek relief from restrictions on the exercise of powers under the trust instrument [*see Prob. Code § 16201*]. Note that a trustee may also seek determination of the existence or nonexistence of any immunity, power, privilege, duty, or right [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(2)*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The capacity of the petitioner and the creation of the trust (Paragraph 1) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15200* (creation of trust), 17200(a) (standing to bring petition)];

- A description of the powers authorized by the trust (Paragraph 3) [*see Estate of Keet (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 328, 330-331, 100 P.2d 1045* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120, *now see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*)]; and

- Facts requiring a grant of powers (Paragraphs 4-5) [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(8)*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, *see § 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Limitation on Exercise of Power

The grant of a power to a trustee, whether by the trust instrument, by statute, or by the court, does not in itself require or permit the exer cise of the power. The exercise of a power by a trustee is subject to the trustee's fiduciary duties [*Prob. Code § 16202*; *see Prob. Code §§ 16000-16015* (fiduciary duties)]. Consequently, counsel may wish to obtain instructions prior to the exercise of a power that may possibly constitute a breach of a fiduciary duty [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)* (petition for instructions)].

[7] State Statutes

Fiduciary duties owed to beneficiaries. *Prob. Code §§ 16000-16015*

Relief by court of restrictions on power. *Prob. Code § 16201*

Exercise of powers subject to duties. *Prob. Code § 16202*

[8] Decisions

Petition by testamentary trustee for authorization to sell trust property as request to grant trustee powers not conferred in trust instrument. *Estate of Keet (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 328, 100 P.2d 1045* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120, *now see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*)

See also Comments and References to § 560.521.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.555

§ 560.555 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Instructions to Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Instructions to Trustee [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR INSTRUCTIONS
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.554, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

[3. As set forth in the above-described trust instrument, _____ (*set forth trust provision that contains an ambiguity or conflict, e.g.,* the trustee is directed to reserve monthly from the rents and income of the property a certain sum that will be sufficient in the trustee's judgment to pay taxes, insurance, repairs, and expenses of the property and trust, when the amounts due thereon shall become payable; and to pay the remainder of the income monthly as follows: a one-third portion to the settlor's child, John Smith).]

[4. The trust further provides that _____ (*set forth any additional relevant provisions of trust, e.g.,* the trustees are to pay the income of the property as set out in the instrument, for and during the term of the natural lives of the settlor's children; on the death of any one of the settlor's children, the amount that would have been paid to that

deceased child as his or her share therein shall be paid by the trustee to the legal heirs of the settlor's deceased child if there shall be any living after such time, and if not, then the share of that deceased child shall be divided between the settlor's remaining living children).]

5. _____ [*Set forth circumstances requiring instructions, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), beneficiary John Smith died, leaving as his sole surviving heirs, his wife, Lucy Smith, and a daughter, Ann Smith. The monthly income formerly paid to the deceased beneficiary was, from and after his death, paid to his widow and daughter. Thereafter, on _____ (*date*), his widow, Lucy Smith, died, leaving as her only surviving heirs a sister, Jane Brown, and the daughter, Ann Smith. Thereafter, on _____ (*date*), Ann Smith died and all further payments of income that would have been paid to her have been withheld by petitioner as trustee. The surviving heir of widow Lucy Smith, to-wit: her sister Jane Brown, now contends that the monthly payments of income formerly paid to the daughter, Ann Smith, should be paid to her].

6. Petitioner requests instructions directing that _____ [*set forth instructions requested, e.g.,* the trustee distribute the monthly income payments, formerly paid to beneficiary Lucy Smith in equal portions to the remaining named beneficiaries of the trust, to-wit: Fred Smith, Irving Smith, and Elizabeth Smith Green].

7. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Instructing the trustee with regard to the proper administration of the trust with respect to the matters alleged herein;

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:

The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to obtain instructions relating to the administration of the trust [see *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*]. It appears that thebeneficiary, as well as the trustee, may petition for instructions to the trustee, and the form may be adapted for use by a beneficiary [*see Estate of Van Deusen (1947) 30 Cal. 2d 285, 289, 182 P.2d 565* (decided under former Prob. Code § 1120, *now see Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* (administration of trusts generally), 17300-17304 (testamentary trusts subject to continuing jurisdiction))].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 6) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- Facts explaining the need for instructions (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*]; and
- A statement of the requested instructions (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*].

Optional Paragraphs 3 and 4 are for use if particular trust provisions require interpretation.

[6] Decisions

Trustee petitioning for instructions regarding exercise of discretionary power has burden to prove exercise will be reasonable. *Estate of Nicholas (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1071, 1087, 223 Cal. Rptr. 410* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120, *now see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*)

Petition for instructions regarding apportionment of inheritance, estate, or death taxes according to terms of will and living trust. *Hoover v. Hartman (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 1019, 1029-1030, 186 Cal. Rptr. 669* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1138.1(a)(4), *now see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*)

Petition for instructions requesting construction of ambiguous terms of trust with respect to distribution after death of certain beneficiaries. *Estate of Hartson (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 757, 19 Cal. Rptr. 694* (interpreting former Prob. Code § 1120, *now see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(6)*)

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.556

§ 560.556 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Injunction to Discontinue and Prevent Breach of Trust of Cotrustee [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(2), 17200(b)(12)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Injunction to Discontinue and Prevent Breach of Trust of Cotrustee [Prob. Code §§ 16420(a)(2), 17200(b)(12)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR INJUNCTION
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.553, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. At all times mentioned herein, _____ [*name of cotrustee against whom injunction is sought*] was and now is a duly appointed cotrustee of the above-described trust] [and is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of California)].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of cotrustee*], _____ [*describe past conduct, e.g.,* acting as individual trustee and without prior consultation, knowledge or consent of the

remaining trustees, and without a resolution or meeting of the board of trustees, executed a purported one-year lease of the real property at _____ (*street address and, if any, city*), which is the subject of the trust, to third parties at a rental of $_____ per month. Since executing the purported lease, he has collected and received $_____ from the third parties as rent for the trust property. He now holds and has the possession of the $_____ and refuses to pay it over or make it available to the petitioner or the remaining trustees].

5. _____ [*Name of cotrustee*] has threatened and now threatens to _____ [*describe threatened conduct, e.g.,* continue to collect the monthly rental, and to use the money he has collected to purchase further rental property, against the will of petitioner and without any right to do so].

[6. On or about _____ (*date*), petitioner demanded that _____ (*name of cotrustee*) _____ [stop his wrongful conduct *and/or* not commit his threatened conduct]. He has refused and continues to refuse to refrain from his above-described (threatened) conduct.]

7. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. For a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction enjoining _____ [*name of cotrustee*] from in any way using or transferring the money he has collected as rent from the above-described property, from further collecting or attempting to collect future rentals on the property, and from interfering with the collections of those rentals by the authorized trustees].

2. For an injunction permanently enjoining _____ [*name of cotrustee*] from _____ [*describe conduct to be prohibited, e.g.,* collecting or attempting to collect future rentals on the above-described property, and from interfering with the collections of those rentals by the authorized trustees].

3. For an order compelling _____ [*name of cotrustee*] to _____ [*describe redress of breach, e.g.,* pay over to petitioner the sum of $_____].

4. For costs herein; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek a temporary restraining order,preliminary injunction, and permanent injunction and any appropriate additional redress against a cotrustee for the cotrustee's breach of the trust [*see Prob. Code § 16420(b)(6)*; *see also St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 356-360, 287 P.2d 387* (interpreting *Civ. Code § 3422(4)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (grounds for issuance of injunction))].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The identity of the cotrustee (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 16420(a)*]; and

- A statement describing the cotrustee's past or present conduct warranting injunctive relief (Paragraphs 4, 5) [*see Prob. Code § 16420(a)(2)*; *see also St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 356-357, 287 P.2d 387]* .

Optional Paragraph 6 is for use if petitioner has unsuccessfully demanded that the cotrustee cease present conduct or not commit threatened conduct [*see St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 357, 287 P.2d 387]* .

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 7) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see §§ 560.521* and *560.544*.

For discussion and forms relating to injunctions generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

[7] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to injunctions generally, and specifically relating to an injunction based on an obligation arising from trust, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions*

[8] State Statutes

Injunctive relief for breach of trust. *Prob. Code § 16420(b)(2)*

Petition to redress breach of trust by any available remedy. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(12)*

[9] Decisions

Minority trustees of charitable corporation can properly maintain action against majority trustees for commission of acts that repudiated charitable purpose of trust. *Holt v. College of Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 750, 759, 40 Cal. Rptr. 244, 394 P.2d 932*

If there are several trustees, each trustee is under duty to beneficiary to use reasonable care to prevent cotrustee from committing breach of trust or to compel cotrustee to redress breach of trust. *Estate of Hensel (1956) 144 Cal. App. 2d 429, 438, 301 P.2d 105* (petition proceeding to settle accounts under former Prob. Code § 1120 brought by one trustee to surcharge another trustee)

Action by trustee is properly brought against cotrustee to compel performance of duties under trust, enjoin commission of breach of trust, or compel redress of breach of trust. *St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 360, 287 P.2d 387* (interpreting *Civ. Code § 3422(4)* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (grounds for issuance of injunction))

[10] Text References

Restatement (Second) of Trusts §§ 199(b), 200 comment (e)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.557

§ 560.557 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Resignation of Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15640(d), 17200(b)(11)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Resignation of Trustee [Prob. Code §§ 15640(d), 17200(b)(11)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR RESIGNATION OF TRUSTEE
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.554, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. Due to _____ [*specify reasons for resignation, e.g.,* urgent and compelling personal business reasons that have arisen], it is necessary that petitioner resign as trustee at the earliest convenience of the court.

[*EITHER*]

[4. Petitioner recognizes that his/her resignation will create a vacancy in the office of trustee. The trust instrument does

not provide a practical method of appointing a trustee and does not name a successor trustee. There has been no agreement between all adult beneficiaries entitled to enter into such an agreement to provide a successor trustee in accordance with *Probate Code Section 15660(c)*. Consequently, in accordance with *Probate Code Section 15660(d)*, petitioner, as a person named as trustee in the trust instrument, seeks to nominate _____ (*name*) as successor trustee.]

[*OR*]

[4. Petitioner understands that, contemporaneously with this petition for resignation, an application for appointment of a successor trustee is being made by _____ (*name*), a _____ (person interested in the trust *or* trustee named in the trust instrument)].

[*CONTINUE*]

5. In order to apprise the court of the current status of the trust, petitioner is filing contemporaneously herewith a current account and report of his/her/its acts as trustee and, on acceptance of the tendered resignation, petitioner will render forthwith a final account and report of his/her/its acts as trustee and will pay over, transfer, and deliver the assets of the trust in his/her/its possession to the person directed by the court.

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. For an order accepting his/her/its resignation as trustee of the above-described trust; [and]

[*EITHER*]

[2. For appointment of a successor trustee in accordance with petitioner's nomination; and]

[*OR*]

[2. For appointment of a temporary trustee; and]

[*CONTINUE*]

3. For such other orders as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521*.]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to tender the trustee's resignation from office[*see Prob. Code §§ 15640(d)* (resignation by court order), 17200(b)(11) (petition for resignation)]. It also contains optional allegations for the nomination of a successor trustee for use if (1) the resigning trustee seeks to nominate a successor or (2) an interested person or a person named as trustee in the trust instrument is petitioning to appoint a successor [*see Prob. Code § 15660* (appointment of trustee to fill vacancy)]. In the prayer, the alternatives set forth in optional Paragraphs 2 are for use if the resigning trustee seeks to nominate a successor [*see Prob. Code § 15660(d)*] or there is no proceeding pending to appoint a successor trustee, and the resigning trustee wishes the court to appoint a temporary trustee [*see Prob. Code § 15640(d)*]. For a form for appointment of a successor trustee by a beneficiary or a cotrustee, *see §§ 560.540* and *560.553*, respectively.

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges the reason for the trustee's resignation (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15640* (resignation of trustee), 17200(b)(11) (petition for resignation)]. The alternatives set forth in optional Paragraphs 4 are for use if the resigning trustee seeks to appoint a successor or the trustee is aware that an interested person or a person named as trustee in the trust instrument has initiated proceedings for the appointment of a successor [*see Prob. Code § 15660* (appointment of successor)].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 6) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and

last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Resignation of Trustee

A trustee who has accepted the trust may resign without a court order only as provided in the trust instrument or with consent of the person holding the power to revoke the trust, or if the trust is not revocable, the consent of all adult beneficiaries with certain rights under the trust or the consent of specified persons of their behalf [*see Prob. Code § 15640(c)*; for discussion, see *§ 560.92*]. Otherwise, the trustee must obtain a court order under *Prob. Code § 15640(d)*, which provides that on the trustee's petition, the court must accept the trustee's resignation [*Prob. Code § 15640(d)*; *cf.* former Prob. Code § 1138.8, which required that the trust be silent with respect to resignation]. The court may also make any orders necessary for the preservation of the trust property, including the appointment of a receiver or a temporary trustee [*Prob. Code § 15640(d)*].

[7] Appointment of Successor Trustee

If certain conditions are satisfied, including the failure of the trust instrument to name a successor trustee, any person named as trustee in the trust instrument may petition for appointing a successor [*see Prob. Code § 15660(d)*]. In addition, *Prob. Code § 17200(a)* states generally that a trustee or beneficiary of a trust may petition the court concerning the internal affairs of the trust; the appointment of a trustee is an enumerated purpose for a petition [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(10)*]. Consequently, this form includes an optional provision in which the resigning trustee either wishes to nominate a successor or makes known to the court that he or she is aware of a pending proceeding to appoint a successor trustee [*see Prob. Code § 15660*]. Whether a resigning trustee seeks to nominate a successor will depend largely on the circumstances surrounding the resignation. For example, a trustee who resigns for reasons that are not antagonistic to the trust may have specific reasons for seeking the appointment of a successor.

If the resigning trustee fails to nominate a successor and there is no proceeding pending to nominate a successor, the court in the petition for resignation may make any order necessary for the preservation of the trust property, including appointing a temporary trustee [*Prob. Code § 15640(d)*]. For further discussion of appointment procedures generally, see *§ 560.94[3]*.

[8] Cross References

For a related form, *see §§ 560.521* and *560.553*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.558

§ 560.558 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Fix Compensation or Allow Greater Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680(b), 17200(b)(9)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Fix Compensation or Allow Greater Compensation [Prob. Code §§ 15680(b), 17200(b)(9)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ PETITION TO _____ [FIX *or* ALLOW GREATER] COMPENSATION OF TRUSTEE

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.554, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

[*EITHER*]

3. Pursuant to the above-described trust, petitioner, as trustee, is entitled to _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $_____ per year], as compensation for performing the duties that are described in the trust.

[*OR*]

3. The above-described trust is silent with regard to compensation to the trustee.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. _____ [*Set forth basis for requested compensation, e.g.*, Pursuant to the order of this court dated _____ (*date*), petitioner, as trustee, has incurred additional duties to those originally set forth in the above-described trust, to-wit: administering two distinct trusts instead of the original trust. Moreover, pursuant to the will of Montford P. Wells, effective _____ (*date*), a copy of which is attached, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof, petitioner, as trustee, accepted additions to the trust in the nature of six parcels of real property as described therein].

5. To effectively administer the above-described duties, petitioner requires _____ [*compensation requested, e.g.*, $_____ per year payable at the end of each fiscal year beginning _____ (*date*)].

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. _____ [Fixing *or* Allowing] compensation to petitioner, as trustee, _____ [*specify compensation being sought, e.g.*, in the amount of $_____ per year];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to obtain a court order fixing compensation if the trust is silent in that regard, or allowing compensation greater than that provided for in the trust instrument [*see Prob. Code § 15680(b)*, (court allowance of greater compensation), 17200(b)(9) (petition to fix, allow, or review compensation)].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The existence or nonexistence of trust provisions regarding compensation(Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 15680* (trust provision for compensation), 15681 (no trust provision for compensation)];

- Facts explaining the need for the court to fix compensation or allow compensation greater than that provided for in the instrument (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15680(b)(1)* (change in compensation based on change in duties), 17200(b)(9) (petition to fix or allow compensation)]; and

- The amount of compensation requested (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15680(b)(1)* (change in compensation based on change in duties), 15682 (periodic prospective payments)].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 6) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Compensation of Trustee

If the trust instrument provides for the trustee's compensation, the trustee is entitled to be compensated in accordance with the trust instrument, subject to *Prob. Code § 15680(b)* and except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15688* (public guardian compensation) [*Prob. Code § 15680(a)*]. On proper showing, the court may fix or allow greater or lesser compensation than could be allowed under the terms of the trust in any of the following circumstances [*Prob. Code § 15680(b)*]:

- If the duties of the trustee are substantially different from those contemplated when the trust was created.

- If the compensation in accordance with the terms of the trust would be inequitable or unreasonably

low or high.

- In extraordinary circumstances calling for equitable relief.

An order fixing or allowing greater or lesser compensation under *Prob. Code § 15680(b)* applies only prospectively to actions taken in administration of the trust after the order is made [*Prob. Code § 15680(c)*].

In determining or approving a trustee's compensation, the court may consider, among other factors, the following:

- The gross income of the trust estate;
- The success or failure of the trustee's administration;
- Any unusual skill, expertise, or experience brought to the trustee's work;
- The fidelity or disloyalty shown by the trustee;
- The amount of risk and responsibility the trustee assumed;
- The time spent in the performance of the trustee's duties;
- The custom in the community where the court is located as to compensation authorized by settlers, as to compensation allowed by the court, or as to charges of corporate trustees for trusts of similar size and complexity; and
- Whether the work the trustee performed was routine or required more than ordinary skill or judgment [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.776*].

For further discussion, see *§ 560.89*.

[7] State Statutes

Compensation of trustee when there is trust provision therefor. *Prob. Code § 15680*

Compensation if trust silent. *Prob. Code § 15681*

Periodic compensation. *Prob. Code § 15682*

Petition for fixing or allowing compensation. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(9)*

[8] California Rules of Court

Factors to consider in determining trustee's compensation. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.776*

[9] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.559

§ 560.559 Account and Report [Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064, 16063] and Petition [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)] for Settlement--By Trustee

[1] FORM Account and Report [Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064, 16063] and Petition [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)] for Settlement--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	ACCOUNT AND PETITION TO SETTLE AC-
	)	COUNT

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.554, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. [Pursuant to the order of this court dated _____ (*date*)] [P]etitioner submits his/her [final] account and report of administration of the trust for settlement and allowance. A complete, true, and correct account of the receipts and disbursements of principal and income that have occurred _____ [during the last complete fiscal year of the trust *or* since the last account] and a statement of the assets and liabilities of the trust as of the end of the _____ [last complete fiscal year of the trust *or* the period covered by the account] is attached as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.

4. During the period covered by this account and report, petitioner has managed and administered the trust estate, making collections of income or principal, investing the sums as were available for investment, retaining or disposing of properties and investments, allocating gains, profits, dividends, or income to income or principal account, making distribution of the net income or corpus of the trust estate to the beneficiaries, and exercising his/her powers and discretions as trustee, all in accordance with law and the terms of the trust as set forth and declared in the _____ [*describe trust instrument, e.g.,* declaration of trust].

5. When disbursements of income or principal, if any, to beneficiaries or in connection with administration of the trust are shown by the schedules and are not mandatory under the terms of the declaration of trust, they have been duly made pursuant to the proper exercise of discretionary power conferred on petitioner as trustee by law or in the declaration of trust, and in accordance with the conditions and limitations, if any, therein prescribed.

6. All investments made on property purchased for and assets retained in the trust during the current accounting period were in conformity with law or were authorized by the terms of the trust and have been carefully, prudently, and in good faith made, purchased, or retained for the purpose of serving the best interests of the trust and all persons interested therein.

7. The names and last known addresses of the beneficiaries of the trust, so far as known to petitioner, are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

[*EITHER*]

8. During the account period, petitioner has not hired any person who has a family or affiliate relationship with the petitioner.

[*OR*]

8. During the account period, petitioner hired _____ [*name of agent*], who is _____ [*describe family or affiliate relationship to petitioner, e.g.,* the son of the petitioner *or* the Apex Accounting Corporation, a California corporation of which petitioner is currently the president and chief executive officer,] to _____ [*describe capacity in which agent was hired or duties agent performed, e.g.,* act as a bookkeeper for the trust *or* act as a real estate broker for the purpose of selling real estate belonging to the trust]. During the account period, petitioner has paid _____ [*name of agent*] the sum of $_____ from the assets subject to the account as compensation for his/her/its services on behalf of the trust.

[*CONTINUE with one of the following alternatives*]

[*EITHER, if no other compensation has been paid to petitioner:*]

9. Petitioner is entitled to compensation for services rendered as trustee during the account period in the total amount of $_____. This is reasonable compensation and is computed as follows: _____ [*specify*]. Petitioner has not received any other compensation from the assets subject to the account during the account period.

[*OR, if other compensation has been paid:*]

9. Petitioner is entitled to compensation for services rendered as trustee during the account period in the total amount of $_____. This is reasonable compensation and is computed as follows: _____ [*specify*]. As set out in Schedule _____ to the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, first annual] account, filed herewith, petitioner has received a payment [of *or* on account of his/her]compensation in the sum of $_____ from the assets subject to the account, without prior court order, leaving a balance due of $_____.

[*CONTINUE with one of the following alternatives*]

[*EITHER, if no other compensation has been paid to attorney:*]

10. Petitioner's attorney, _____ [*name*], is entitled to compensation for services rendered as attorney for petitioner during the account period in the total amount of $_____. This is reasonable compensation and is computed as follows: _____ [*specify*]. Petitioner's attorney has not received any other compensation from the assets subject to the account during the account period.

[*OR, if other compensation has been paid:*]

10. Petitioner's attorney, _____ [*name*], is entitled to compensation for services rendered as attorney for petitioner during the account period in the total amount of $_____. This is reasonable compensation and is computed as follows: _____ [*specify*]. As set out in Schedule _____ to the _____ [*specify, e.g.*, first annual] account, filed herewith, petitioner's attorney has received a payment [of *or* on account of his/her] compensation in the sum of $_____ from the assets subject to the account, without prior court order, leaving a balance due of $_____.

[*CONTINUE*]

11. The trustee's and attorney's fees allowed should be charged to _____ [trust income *and/or* principal] as follows: _____ [*specify*].

12. During the accounting period, all of the cash belonging to the trust estate has been invested and maintained in interest bearing accounts or in investments authorized by law or by the governing instrument, except for an amount of cash that is reasonably necessary for the orderly administration of the trust estate.

13. Any recipient of the account accompanying this petition has a right to petition the court pursuant to *Probate Code Section 17200* to obtain court review of the account and of the acts of petitioner. Claims against petitioner for breach of trust may not be made after the expiration of three years from the date the beneficiary receives an account or report disclosing facts giving rise to the claim.

WHEREFORE petitioner prays for an order and judgment as follows:

1. Settling and allowing the account as filed;

2. Ratifying, confirming, and approving all of the acts and transactions of petitioner as trustee;

3. Allowing reasonable compensation to petitioner for ordinary services rendered as trustee;

[4. Instructing petitioner with regard to _____ (*describe action for which instruction is desired, e.g.,* the distribution of the trust property);]

5. Allowing and directing petitioner to pay to _____ [*name of attorney*] reasonable fees for ordinary legal services rendered as attorney for the trustee; and

6. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

EXHIBIT B--ACCOUNT
Summary of Account
(From _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*])

CHARGES

Property on hand at beginning of account period	$_____
Additional property received (or supplemental inventories)	$_____
Income receipts during account period (Schedule A)	$_____
Principal receipts during account period (Schedule B)	$_____
Net income from trade or business (Schedule E)	$_____
Gains on sales or other dispositions (Schedule F)	$_____

TOTAL CHARGES	$_____

CREDITS

Income disbursements during account period (Schedule C)	$_____
Principal disbursements during account period (Schedule D)	$_____
Net loss from trade or business (Schedule E)	$_____
Losses on sales or other dispositions (Schedule G)	$_____
Distributions to beneficiaries (Schedule H)	$_____
Property on hand at end of account period (carry value) (Schedule I)	$_____
TOTAL CREDITS	$_____

SCHEDULE A. INCOME RECEIPTS DURING ACCOUNT PERIOD

[*Record each receipt in chronological order, e.g.:*]

05/22/98	Payment of interest on note from John Q. Smith dated 10/15/96	$_____
09/01/98	Dividend paid on 2,000 shares, Class B stock of Microtechnics Corporation	$_____

[*Add additional items as needed*]

TOTAL	$_____

SCHEDULE B. PRINCIPAL RECEIPTS DURING ACCOUNT PERIOD

[*Record each receipt in chronological order, e.g.:*]

05/22/98	Payment of face value, note, from John Q. Smith dated 15/25/95	$_____

[*Add additional items as needed*]

TOTAL $_____

SCHEDULE C. INCOME DISBURSEMENTS DURING ACCOUNT PERIOD

[*Record each disbursement in chronological order, e.g.:*]

05/22/98 Payment of interest on note to Alan Jones dated 06/16/96 $_____

09/01/98 Repairs to house at 200 Vizcaino Lane, San Cristobal, California $_____

[*Add additional items as needed*]

TOTAL $_____

SCHEDULE D: PRINCIPAL DISBURSEMENTS DURING ACCOUNT PERIOD

[*Record each disbursement in chronological order, e.g.:*]

02/25/98 Sally Meadows, M.D.
expenses of last illness of settlor $_____

09/01/98 Green and Green Funeral Home
expenses of funeral of settlor $_____

[*Add additional items as needed*]

TOTAL $_____

SCHEDULE E: NET INCOME OR LOSS FROM TRADE OR BUSINESS

Income Received During Account Period from _____ [*name of business*]

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

Expenses During Account Period from _____ [*name of business*]

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

_____ [*describe item*] $_____

NET INCOME (OR LOSS) $_____

SCHEDULE F: GAINS ON SALES OR OTHER DISPOSITIONS

[List all property on hand at end of account period, setting forth value at which property is carried on books:]

1. Inventory Item No. _____, [describe] $_____

2. Appraised at $_____

3. Sold for $_____

4. Gain $_____

[*Describe other items as necessary*]

TOTAL $_____

SCHEDULE G: LOSSES ON SALES OR OTHER DISPOSITIONS

[List all property on hand at end of account period, setting forth value at which property is carried

on books:]

1.	Inventory Item No. _____, [describe]	$_____
2.	Appraised at	$_____
3.	Sold for	$_____
4.	Loss	$_____

[*Describe other items as necessary*]

TOTAL		$_____

SCHEDULE H: DISTRIBUTIONS TO BENEFICIARIES

04/20/98	To Mary Ann Brown tuition costs	$_____
08/15/98	To Joseph Brown, living expenses	$_____
11/15/98	To San Cristobal General Hospital, medical expenses for Rosemary Brown	$_____
12/01/98	To Joseph Brown, 1997 Dodge Ram truck, distributed in accordance with terms of trust instrument	$_____
TOTAL		$_____

SCHEDULE I: PROPERTY ON HAND AT END OF ACCOUNT PERIOD (CARRY VALUE)

[List all property on hand at end of account period, setting forth value at which property is carried on books:]

1.	Cash on hand	$_____
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, 40 acres of unimproved real property situated in San Cristobal, California	$_____
3.	Inventory Item No. _____, U.S. stamp collection	$_____

_

[*List additional items as necessary:*]

TOTAL $_____
_____
_

SCHEDULE J: PROPERTY ON HAND AT END OF ACCOUNT PERIOD (ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE)

[List all property on hand at end of account period, setting forth estimated market value of each item.]

1.	Cash on hand	$_____ _____ _
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, 40 acres of unimproved real property situated in San Cristobal, California	$_____ _____ _
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, U.S. stamp collection	$_____ _____ _

[*List additional items as necessary:*]

TOTAL $_____
_____
_

SCHEDULE K: PROPERTY ON HAND AT BEGINNING OF ACCOUNT PERIOD (ESTIMATED MARKET VALUE)

[In this account, which is required only if the account is not an initial account, list all property on hand at beginning of account period, setting forth estimated market value of each item.]

1.	Cash on hand	$_____ _____ _
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, House and lot at 4111 Navidad Lane, San Cristobal, California	$_____ _____ _
3.	Inventory Item No. _____, Original oil painting by Jasper Johns	$_____ _____ _

[*List additional items as necessary:*]

TOTAL $_____
_____
_

SCHEDULE L: PURCHASES OR OTHER CHANGES IN FORM OF ASSETS DURING ACCOUNT PERIOD

[Set forth any purchases or other changes in forms of assets, such as by sale, exchange, or otherwise, during account period.]

To _____ [*name*]

1.	Inventory Item No. _____, Steinway Grand Piano, Model D, sold on July 1, 1998, for cash in the amount of	$_____
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, real property improved by warehouse building located at 6630 Cabrillo Boulevard, San Cristobal, California, exchanged on August 31, 1998, for 40 acres of unimproved real property at 2000 Vizcaino Road, San Cristobal, California, with a fair market value of	$_____

[*List additional items as necessary:*]

TOTAL $_____

SCHEDULE M: PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION, INCLUDING DISTRIBUTION OF NET INCOME

Petitioner proposes to distribute assets of the estate as follows:

To _____ [*name*]

1.	Inventory Item No. _____, original oil painting by Winslow Homer	$_____
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, 40 acres of unimproved real property at 2000 Vizcaino Road, San Cristobal California,	$_____
3.	Net income received during account period from Item No. 2 above	$_____
	Total distributions to _____ [*name*]	$_____

To _____ [*name*]

1.	Inventory Item No. _____, 1997 Buick Le Sabre,	$_____
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, 2,000 shares of the Class B stock, Microtechnics Corporation,	$_____
3.	Inventory Item No. _____, Net income received during account period from Item No. 2 above	$_____
4.	Inventory Item No. _____ House and lot located at 2000 Shady Lane, San Cristobal, California,	$_____
5.	Inventory Item No. _____, Household furniture and furnishings located at 2000 Portola Lane, San	$_____

	Cristobal, California,	_
	Total distributions to _____ [*name*]	$_____
		_____
		_

[*Set forth additional items of distribution as needed*]

TOTAL DISTRIBUTIONS		$_____
		_____
		_

SCHEDULE N: ALLOCATION OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS BETWEEN PRINCIPAL AND INCOME

	RECEIPTS ALLOCATED TO PRINCIPAL	
1.	World Concepts, Inc., 100 shares, common stock, dividend for period 1/1/98-12/31/99	$_____
		_____
		_
2.	Travelwide Company, 500 shares, common stock, dividend for period 1/1/98-12/31/99	$_____
		_____
		_

[*Add additional items as necessary*]

TOTAL RECEIPTS ALLOCATED TO PRINCIPAL		$_____
		_____
		_
	RECEIPTS ALLOCATED TO INCOME	
1.	City Savings, money market account, dividend for period 1/1/98-12/31/98	$_____
		_____
		_
2.	$50,000 face value, U. S. Treasury notes, interest paid June 1, 1998	$_____
		_____
		_
TOTAL RECEIPTS ALLOCATED TO PRINCIPAL		$_____
		_____
		_

SCHEDULE O: INCOME, DISBURSEMENTS, AND PROCEEDS OF SALE ATTRIBUTABLE TO SPECIFICALLY DEVISED PROPERTY

	INCOME ATTRIBUTABLE TO SPECIFICALLY DEVISED PROPERTY	
1.	Inventory Item No. _____, real property improved with warehouse building located at 6630 Cabrillo Boulevard, San Cristobal, California,net rents received during account period from same	$_____
		_____
		_
2.	Inventory Item No. _____, 2,000 shares of the Class B stock, Micro Force Corporation, dividends received during account period from same	$_____
		_____
		_

[*Add additional items as necessary*]

SCHEDULE P: CALCULATION OF INTEREST TO BE PAID TO _____ [GENERAL PECUNIARY DEVISES *or* ANNUITIES *or DEVISES FOR MAINTENANCE*]

INTEREST TO BE PAID TO GENERAL DEVISE OF $2,000 TO _____

Interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum computed from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*]	$_____

[*Add additional items as necessary*]

SCHEDULE Q: LIABILITIES OF TRUST ESTATE

[*List all liabilities of trust estate, including liabilities which are a lien on assets, taxes due but unpaid as shown on filed returns or assessments received after filing returns, all notes payable, any judgments for which trust estate is liable, and any other material liability*]

Unsecured liability owing to All-Nite Loan Company, for money lent to settlor on or about _____ [*date*], principal plus interest accrued to _____ [*date*]	$_____
Judgment in favor of Bulldog Creditors, Inc., entered on _____ [*date*] in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Imperial, principal plus interest accrued to _____ [*date*]	$_____

[*Add additional items as needed*]

CAUTION:

The petition, report, and account must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to submit an account to the court [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)*].

The exhibits in this form may be adapted for use as an account and report submitted directly to the person entitled to it under *Prob. Code §§ 16060, 16062*, or former Prob. Code § 1120.1a (regarding trust removed from continuing jurisdiction under former law).

[3] When Account Required to be Filed With Court

The trustee is generally required to submit an account only to the person entitled to an accounting, rather than to file it with the court [*see Prob. Code §§ 16060* (general duty to keep beneficiaries informed), 16061 (request by beneficiary), 16062 (duty to account annually, at termination of trust, and on change of trustees), 16064 (exceptions); *see also Prob. Code § 15800* (person holding power to revoke trust entitled to rights otherwise afforded beneficiary); for further discussion, see *§ 560.80*]. One circumstance under which a trustee would file an account with the court is pursuant to a court order compelling an account [*see, e.g., Prob. Code § 17200(b)(7)*; *see also §§ 560.540, 560.547*, 17]. Moreover, a trustee may file an account with the court on the trustee's own petition, in order to obtain court supervision and approval of the account [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(5)*]. The trustee therefore might combine a petition rendering an account with request for other relief [*see, e.g., Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)* (determination of distribution on termination of trust), 17200(b)(6) (instructions), 17200(b)(11) (resignation); *see §§ 560.582, 560.554*, and 24, respectively].

[4] Contents of Petition

The petition for approval of the account must include all of the following [*Prob. Code § 1064(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 39* ("fiduciary" means trustee)]:

- A description of all sales, purchases, changes in the form of assets, or other transactions occurring during the period of the account that are not otherwise readily understandable from the schedules;

- An explanation of any unusual items appearing in the account;

- A statement of all compensation paid from the assets subject to the account to the trustee or to the attorneys for the trustee other than pursuant to a prior court order (Paragraphs 9 and 10);

- A statement disclosing any family or affiliate relationship between the trustee and any agent hired by the trustee during the accounting period (Paragraph 8). For this purpose, "family" means a relationship created by blood or marriage, and "affiliate" means an entity that directly or indirectly through one or more intermediaries controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with, the trustee [*Prob. Code § 1064(c)*]; and

- An allegation disclosing whether all of the cash has been invested and maintained in interest bearing accounts or in investments authorized by law or the governing instrument, except for an amount of cash that is reasonably necessary for the orderly administration of the estate (Paragraph 12).

The trustee's account must include the following information [*Prob. Code § 16063(a)*]:

- A statement of receipts and disbursements of principal and income that have occurred during the last complete fiscal year of the trust or since the last account.

- A statement of the assets and liabilities of the trust as of the end of the last complete fiscal year of the trust or as of the end of the period covered by the account.

- The trustee's compensation for the last complete fiscal year of the trust or since the law account.

- The agents hired by the trustee, their relationship to the trustee, if any, and their compensation, for the last complete fiscal year of the trust or since the last account.

- A statement that the recipient of the account may petition the court pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200* to obtain a court review of the account and of the acts of the trustee.

- A statement that claims against the trustee for breach of trust may not be made after the expiration of three years from the date the beneficiary receives an account or report disclosing facts giving rise to the claim.

[5] Contents of Account

[a] In General

All accounts filed under the Probate Code are subject to the requirements of *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064*, which became operative on July 1, 1997 [*Prob. Code § 1060.5*]. Accounts rendered by trustees must be presented in the manner provided in these sections [*Prob. Code § 16062(a)*]. In addition, *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.901* prescribes rules for

trustee's accounts.

Every account filed under the Probate Code must include a financial statement and a report of administration as provided in *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064* [*Prob. Code § 10900(a)*]. Every account must also state the period that it covers, and contain a summary showing all of the following, to the extent applicable [*Prob. Code § 1061(a)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.901(a)*]:

- The property on hand at the beginning of the account period. If the account is the first account, this will be the value of the property initially received by the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 39* ("fiduciary" includes trustee)]. If it is a subsequent account, it will be the property on hand at the end of the prior account [*Prob. Code § 1061(a)(1)*].

- The value of any assets received during the account period that are not assets on hand as of the commencement of the administration of an estate.

- The amount of any receipts of income or principal, excluding items listed under the first two categories immediately above (Schedules A and B) or receipts from a trade or business.

- Net income from a trade or business (Schedule D).

- Gains on sales (Schedule F).

- The amount of disbursements, excluding disbursements for a trade or business or distributions (Schedules C and D).

- Loss on sales (Schedule G).

- Net loss from trade or business (Schedule E).

- Distributions to beneficiaries (Schedule H).

- Property on hand at the end of the account period, stated at its carry value (Schedule I).

[b] Statutory Format

Prob. Code § 1061(b) establishes a statutory format for the account summary. The format prescribes specific categories of items that must be included, unless they are inapplicable [*Prob. Code § 1061(b)*]. These categories are as follows [*Prob. Code § 1061(b)*]:

```
CHARGES:
Property on hand at beginning of account (or Invent-
ories)
Additional property received (or supplemental in-
ventories)
Receipts (Schedule _____)
Gains on Sale or Other Disposition (Schedule
_____)
Net income from trade or business (Schedule
_____)
Total Charges:
CREDITS:
```

```
Disbursements (Schedule _____)
Losses on Sale or Other Disposition (Schedule
_____)
Net loss from trade or business (Schedule
_____)
Distributions (Schedule _____)
Property on hand at close of account (Schedule
_____)
Total Credits:
```

Amounts must be shown for each of the categories in dollars [*Prob. Code § 1061(b)*]. "Net income" and "net loss" must be determined in accordance with general accounting principles and need not be the same as the "net income" and "net loss" reported on the tax returns for the account period [*Prob. Code § 1061(d)*]. The total charges must equal the total credits [*Prob. Code § 1061(c)*].

[c] Schedules of Receipts, Disbursements, Income or Loss, etc.

The summary of account [*see Prob. Code § 1061*] must be supported by detailed schedules showing the following [*Prob. Code § 1062*]:

- Receipts, showing the nature or purpose of each item, the source of the receipt, and the date (Schedules A and B).
- Disbursements, including the nature or purpose of each item, the name of the payee, and the date (Schedules C and D).
- Net income or loss from a trade or business. It will be sufficient if the summary provides the information disclosed on Schedule C or Schedule F of the federal income tax return (Schedule E).
- Calculation of gains or losses on sales or other dispositions (Schedules F and G).
- Distributions of cash or property to beneficiaries, showing the date and amount of each, with the distribution of property shown at its carry value (Schedule H).
- An itemized list of property on hand, describing each item at its carry value (Schedule I).

[d] Market Value of Assets

All accounts must also include an additional schedule showing the estimated market value of the assets on hand as of the end of the account period (Schedule J) [*Prob. Code § 1063(a)*]. If the account is not the first account, there must also be a schedule of the estimated market value of the assets on hand as of the beginning of the accounting period (Schedule K) [*Prob. Code § 1063(a)*]. The requirement of an estimated value of real estate, a closely held business, or other assets without a ready market may be satisfied by a good faith estimate by the trustee [*Prob. Code § 1063(a)*].

Additionally, if the guardian or conservator has knowledge of any real property of the conservatee or ward located in a foreign jurisdiction, the guardian or conservator must include an additional schedule that identifies the real property, provides a good faith estimate of the fair market value of the real property, and states what action, if any, will or has been taken to preserve and protect the real property, including a recommendation whether an ancillary proceeding is necessary to preserve and protect the real property [*Prob. Code § 1063(h)*].

[e] Purchases or Other Changes in Form of Assets

If there were purchases or other changes in the form of assets occurring during the account period, there must be a schedule showing these transactions [*Prob. Code § 1063(b)*]. However, no reporting is required for transfers between cash or accounts in a financial institution or money market mutual funds [*Prob. Code § 1063(b)*; *see Prob. Code § 8901(d)* (appraisal of cash deposits and money market mutual funds)].

[f] Allocation of Receipts Between Principal and Income

If a trust will be distributed to an income beneficiary, there must be a schedule showing an allocation of receipts and disbursements between principal and income [*Prob. Code § 1063(c)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.901(c)*].

[g] Specifically Devised Property

If there is specifically devised property, there must be an additional schedule accounting for income, disbursements, and proceeds of sale pursuant to *Prob. Code §§ 12002* and *16340(a)* [*Prob. Code § 1063(d)*]. *Prob. Code § 12002* prescribes rules for allocating income and expense to specific devises, and *Prob. Code § 16340* prescribes rules for paying income and interest after death or end of income interest, including specific gifts, general pecuniary gifts, annuities, and gifts for maintenance.

[h] Interest on Pecuniary Devises and Annuities

If any interest has been paid or is to be paid to general pecuniary devises, annuities, or devises for maintenance, there must be a schedule showing the calculation of the interest [*Prob. Code § 1063(e)*; *see Prob. Code §§ 12003* (interest on general pecuniary devise), 12004 (interest on annuity), 12005 (interest on devise for maintenance), 16340(b) (interest after death or end of income interest)]. Interest on a general pecuniary gift distributable under a trust is not payable when the trust was created before the effective date of a prior version of *Prob. Code § 16340(b)* [*Remsen v. Lavacot (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 421, 429, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612* .

[i] Proposed Distributions

If the accounting contemplates a proposed distribution, there must be a schedule setting forth the proposed distribution, including the allocation of income required under *Prob. Code § 12006* (Schedule M) [*Prob. Code § 1063(f)*]. *Prob. Code § 12006* prescribes rules for distribution of net income received during administration and not otherwise devised. If the distributionrequires an allocation between trusts, the allocation must be set forth on the schedule, unless the allocation is to be made by a trustee after receipt of the assets. If the distribution requires valuation of assets as of the date of distribution, the schedule must set forth the fair market value of those assets [*Prob. Code § 1063(f)*].

[j] Liabilities

If at the end of the accounting period there are liabilities of the trust, except current or future periodic payments, including rent, salaries, utilities, or other recurring expenses, there must be a schedule showing the following (Schedule Q) [*Prob. Code § 1063(g)*]:

- All liabilities that are a lien on assets.
- Taxes due but unpaid as shown on filed returns or assessments received after the filing of returns.
- All notes payable.
- Any judgments for which the trust is liable.

- Any other material liability.

Monthly payments, including rent, utilities, salaries, or other recurring expenses need not be separately scheduled [*Prob. Code § 1063(g)*].

[k] Trustee Entitled to Rely on Account of Conservator or Guardian

When a trustee receives assets from the conservator of a deceased conservatee or the guardian of a deceased ward, the trustee may incorporate by reference any accounting provided by the conservator or guardian for the decedent for the period subsequent to the date of death [*Prob. Code § 10902*]. The trustee is entitled to rely on such an accounting and has no duty to independently investigate or verify the transactions report in it [*Prob. Code § 10902*].

[l] No Requirement for Other Information

Before the operative date of *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064* (January 1, 1997), some information in addition to that required by statute was required by local court rules. However, *Prob. Code § 1060* explicitly states that *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064* govern all accounts to be filed with the court and that, except as specifically provided elsewhere in the code, or unless good cause is shown therefore, no information in addition to that required in *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064* need be in an account.

[m] Verification

All accounts must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*]. An account must be verified by the person who has the duty to make it or, if there are two or more parties with that duty, by any of them [*Prob. Code § 1021(b)(2)*].

[6] State Statutes

Accounts filed under Probate Code. *Prob. Code §§ 1060-1064*

Statutes govern all accounts under Probate Code. *Prob. Code § 1060*

July 1, 1997, operative date. *Prob. Code § 1060.5*

Summary of account. *Prob. Code § 1061*

Detailed schedules supporting summary. *Prob. Code § 1062*

Additional schedules. *Prob. Code § 1063*

Petition for approval or accompanying report. *Prob. Code § 1064*

Trustee's duty to report information and account to beneficiaries. *Prob. Code §§ 16060-16064*

Duty to report information to beneficiaries. *Prob. Code § 16060*

Duty to account to beneficiaries. *Prob. Code § 16062*

Contents of account. *Prob. Code § 16063*

Exceptions to duty to report information or account. *Prob. Code § 16064*

[7] California Rules of Court

Identification of all relief sought in title of account. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.102*

Statement in account of period covered by account. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.901(a)*

Allocation of receipts and disbursements between principal and income if trust distributes income. *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.901(c)*

[8] Local Rules of Court

[a] Alameda County

Trustee's Accounts. Alameda Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 12.16.1

[b] Los Angeles County

Trustee's Accounts. Los Angeles Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 10.181

[c] Orange County

Accounts, compensation, and distributions. Orange Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Div. VI, Rule 608.01 et seq.

[d] Riverside County

Accounts, fees, and distributions. Riverside Co. Consol. Ct. Rules, Rule 6.1001 et seq.

[e] San Francisco

Accounts. San Francisco City & County Uniform Local Rules of Court, Rules 14.74, 14.76

[9] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.560

§ 560.560 Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Trustee Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

[1] FORM Order [Prob. Code § 17206] Granting Trustee Relief as Prayed [Prob. Code § 17200(b)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the _____	)	NO. _____
[*name of trust*]	)	ORDER _____ [*specify, e.g.,* AC-
	)	CEPTING RESIGNATION OF TRUSTEE]

_____

This proceeding for _____ [*specify relief prayed for, e.g,* accepting the resignation of the trustee] of the _____ [*name of trust*] on the verified petition of _____ [*name of petitioner*], trustee [, and the return and _____ (*specify papers filed in opposition, e.g.,* response) of the beneficiary _____ (*name*)], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*], before this court, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name of petitioner's counsel*]. [_____ (*Name*), as beneficiary, appeared by counsel _____ (*name of beneficiary's counsel*).] [Evidence was introduced on behalf of both parties and the matter was argued and submitted for decision.]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the petition ought to be granted,

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED as follows:

1. That _____ [*specify order granted, e.g.,* the tendered resignation of _____ (*name of petitioner*) as trustee of the _____ (*name of trust*), is accepted, effective on settlement of his/her/its accounts and delivery of all the trust assets to the person whom the court shall appoint to receive them].

[2. That _____ (*specify any further order, e.g.,* _____ (*name of petitioner*) render a final account and report of his/her/its acts as trustee within a period of _____ (*number*) days, and on settlement and allowance of the account, pay over, transfer, and deliver the assets of the trust in his/her/its possession as directed by the court).]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This order is for use to grant relief sought by a trustee after a hearing on thetrustee's petition. The example shown is for an order granting the relief as prayed in a petition to accept the resignation of the trustee [*see Prob. Code §§ 15640* (resignation by court order), 17200(b)(11) (petition for resignation) and *see § 560.557*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 560.552, 560.557*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
2. Rights, Liabilities, And Duties Of Trustees

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.561-560.579

[Reserved]

§§ 560.561[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.580

§ 560.580 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)] to Distribute Accumulated Trust Income for Support or Education of Destitute Beneficiary [Civ. Code § 726]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)] to Distribute Accumulated Trust Income for Support or Education of Destitute Beneficiary [Civ. Code § 726]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO DISTRIBUTE ACCUMULATED
	)	TRUST INCOME

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

6. Pursuant to the above-described trust, _____ [*set forth provision regarding distribution of*

accumulated income, e.g., income from the principal of the trust is to be accumulated until the beneficiary attains the age of 35, at which time the trustee is directed to pay out that accumulation of income to the beneficiary in monthly installments].

7. Petitioner is destitute of other sufficient means of support or education, and reasonably requires that the sum of $_____ [per month] be distributed to petitioner for petitioner's support or education out of the fund directed to be accumulated for his/her benefit under the trust.

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Instructing the trustee to distribute the sum of $_____ [per month] to petitioner out of the fund directed to be accumulated for the benifit of the petitioner;

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a beneficiary to petition for modification of a trust to allow the trustee to accelerate distribution of the accumulated income prior to the time specified for distribution under the terms of the trust, on the ground that thebeneficiary requires the income for support or education [*see Civ. Code § 726* (application of beneficiary to accelerate accumulated income for support or education), *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)* (petition for modification)].

Prior to the 1986 enactment of the Trust Law, relief under *Civ. Code § 726* was probably initiated most commonly as an ordinary civil action by complaint. However, *Prob. Code § 17200(a)* now provides that a beneficiary or trustee may petition the court concerning the internal affairs of the trust. Although relief under *Civ. Code § 726* is not specifically enumerated under *Prob. Code § 17200*, the list provided therein is not exclusive [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges (1) the trust terms regarding accumulated income (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 726*] and (2) facts describing the beneficiary's need to accelerate distribution of the accumulated income (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 726* (acceleration of accumulated income); *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(13)* (petition for modification)].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Text References

Nossaman & Wyatt, Trust Adminstration and Taxation (2d ed rev) Ch. 7, *Accumulation and Income Undisposed Of*, §§ 7.01-7.06 (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Trusts*, §§ 37 (10th ed. 2005)

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed.), Ch 13, *Restrictions --Illegality--Perpetuities--Accumulations--Suspension of Power of Alienation--Spendthrift Trusts*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.581

§ 560.581 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Combine Trusts [Prob. Code §§ 15411, 17200(b)(14)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Combine Trusts [Prob. Code §§ 15411, 17200(b)(14)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*names of trusts*]	)	PETITION TO COMBINE TRUSTS
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust _____ [*describe first trust, e.g.,* described as the _____ (*name of trust*), created on or about _____ (*date*), by a written declaration of trust of _____, (*name of settlor*), a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof].

2. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust _____ [*describe second trust, e.g.,* described as the _____ (*name of trust*) under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof].

[*EITHER, if one or more of trusts is a living trust*]

3. The principal place of business of the _____ [*name(s) of living trust(s) to be combined*] herein described is located in _____ County, California.

[*AND/OR, if one or more of trusts is testamentary*]

3. The _____ [decedent's estate is administered *or* principal place of administration of the _____ (*name(s) of testamentary trust(s) to be combined*) herein described is located] in _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. _____ [*Set forth facts describing similarity of trusts, e.g.,* Pursuant to the provisions of the _____ (*name of first trust*), described in Paragraph 1, above, petitioner, as trustee, is directed to manage certain real property situated in _____ County, California, for the use and benefit of the children of John Doe. Pursuant to the provisions of the _____ (*name of second trust*), described in Paragraph 2, above, petitioner, as trustee, is directed to manage certain other real property, also situated in _____ County, California, which is also for the use and benefit of the children of John Doe].

5. _____ [*Set forth further reasons, if any, for combination of trusts, e.g.,* Since the death of John Doe, petitioner, as trustee, has been directed to administer the trust described in Paragraph 2, above, in addition to the trust described in Paragraph 1, above, which petitioner has continually administered since _____ (*date*). Petitioner is presently administering the above-described trusts separately, and is subject to accounting requirements for different fiscal years for each trust. Petitioner's administrative duties would be simplified, and therefore less costly to the respective trusts, if petitioner were allowed to combine the trusts and administer them as one].

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Combining the trusts described above as the _____ [*name of first trust*] under the declaration of trust dated _____ [*date*], and the _____ [*name of second trust*] under the will of _____ [*name*], deceased;

2. _____ [*Set forth further order, e.g.,* Establishing the fiscal year for the combined trust for accounting and reporting purposes from June 1 through May 31, and requiring the first annual account due on _____ (*date*)];

3. For costs herein; and

4. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek combination of two or more trusts [*see Prob. Code §§ 15411* (grounds), 17200(b)(14) (petition)].

If the terms of two or more trusts are substantially similar, on petition by a trustee or beneficiary, the court, for good cause shown, may combine the trusts if the court determines that administration as a single trust will not defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of the trust purposes or the interests of the beneficiaries [*Prob. Code § 15411*]. A living trust and testamentary trust may be combined [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 643 (1986)].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 6) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, see *§ 560.600*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The creation of the respective trusts, and the identity of the petitioner (Paragraphs 1-2) [*see Prob.*

Code § 17200(a) (standing), 17200(b)(14) (petition to combine trusts)];

- The basis for venue (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code §§ 17002* (principal place of administration), 17005 (venue for living trust or testamentary trust generally), 17301 (venue for testamentary trust subject to continuing jurisdiction of court); *see also Prob. Code § 17004* (basis for venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 410.10*) and Comments to *see § 560.521*]; and

- Facts explaining the need for combination of the trusts (Paragraphs 4-5) [*see Prob. Code § 15411*].

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.582

§ 560.582 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Ascertain Beneficiaries and Determine Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Ascertain Beneficiaries and Determine Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO DETERMINE DISTRIBUTION OF
	)	PROPERTY

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.553, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. In relevant part, the above-described trust provides as follows: _____ [*set forth any ambiguous or conflicting terms of the trust with respect to the ascertainment of beneficiaries or distribution of property, e.g.,* all of the trust income was to be paid after the settlor's death to his daughter Nancy Smith Jones and her husband Lee Jones, share and share alike during their natural lives, and to the survivor of them during the natural life of the survivor. On their deaths, the income was to be paid equally to the children of Nancy Smith Jones and Lee Jones and the issue of any deceased child born in lawful wedlock, per stirpes, during the lives of those children, as were living at the time of the death of the settlor. On the death of any of the children leaving issue born in lawful wedlock surviving them, the share

of the child in the income was to be paid to the issue, but if the child left no lawful issue, the share of the child would go to the other of the children and issue of any deceased child per stirpes and not per capita. The trust further provided that on the death of Nancy Smith Jones and Lee Jones and all of their children living at the time of the settlor's death, the corpus, with certain exceptions, would pass to, vest in, and be conveyed to the descendants born in lawful wedlock of Nancy Smith Jones and Lee Jones, per stirpes and not per capita, absolutely and free of all trusts].

4. _____ [*Set forth any further necessary facts, e.g.,* Settlor's daughter, Nancy Smith Jones, and her husband, Lee Jones, died on _____ (*date*), and on _____ (*date*), respectively, and on their death were survived by their three children, Gregory Jones, Lee Jones, Jr., and Betsy Jones Roe, who were their only children living at the time of the death of the settlor. Of the three children, Lee Jones died on _____ (*date*), leaving no issue; Gregory Jones died on _____ (*date*), leaving Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones and Mary Jones, his children, and Nora Jones and John Jones, his grandchildren, issue of James Jones, a deceased child of Gregory Jones; and Betsy Jones Roe died on _____ (*date*), leaving Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe, her children].

5. Petitioner requests a determination that _____ [*set forth requested ascertainment of beneficiaries and distribution of property, e.g.,* the trustee distribute the above-described trust property as follows: a one-half share to the issue of Gregory Jones, and a one-half share to the issue of Betsy Jones Roe, to-wit: a one-eighth share to each of the following: Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones, Mary Jones, and the issue of James Jones, to-wit: Nora Jones and John Jones; and a one-half share divided equally between Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe].

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. Ascertaining the beneficiaries and determining distribution of the proceeds with respect to the sale of the above-described real property as follows: _____ [*Set forth requested direction, e.g.,* a one-half share to the issue of Gregory Jones, and a one-half share to the issue of Betsy Jones Roe, to-wit: a one-eighth share to each of the following: Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones, Mary Jones, and the issue of James Jones, to-wit: Nora Jones and John Jones; and a one-half share divided equally between Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition is for use by a trustee to obtain an ascertainment of beneficiaries and determination of the persons to whom property should pass or be delivered on final or partial termination of the trust, to the extent that the determination is not made by the trust instrument [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)*; *see also Lombardi v. Blois (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 191, 198, 40 Cal. Rptr. 899]* .

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 6) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*. For a notice form, *see § 560.600*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- A description of the trust provision that requires interpretation (Paragraph 3) [*see Lombardi v. Blois (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 191, 198, 40 Cal. Rptr. 899]* ;

- A description of the termination of the trust (Paragraph 4); and

- A statement of the determination requested by the trustee (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)*].

[6] Decisions

Distribution of trust property by right of representation (per stirpes) is antithesis of distribution to individual (per capita); per stirpes as meaning by or according to stock or root. *Lombardi v. Blois (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 191, 198, 40 Cal. Rptr. 899*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.583

§ 560.583 Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Ascertainment of Beneficiaries and Determination of Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Response to Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Ascertainment of Beneficiaries and Determination of Distribution of Property on Final or Partial Termination of Trust [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ RESPONSE OF TRUSTEE TO PETITION FOR ASCERTAINMENT OF BENEFICIARIES AND DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY

_____

For return and response to the petition filed by the trustee for ascertainment of beneficiaries and distribution of property, _____ [*name*], as beneficiary under the _____ [written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*], admits, denies, and alleges:

1. Admits the allegations of Paragraphs _____ [*specify, e.g.,* 1-7] of the petition.

2. _____ [*Set forth here and in subsequent paragraphs, other general and specific admissions, denials, contravening allegations, and affirmative defenses as appropriate, e.g.,* Responding to Paragraph 8, denies that there is any merit or validity to the trustee's requested direction that trustee distribute a one-half share to the issue of Gregory Jones, and a one-half share to the issue of Betsy Jones Roe, to-wit: a one-eighth share to each of the following: Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones, Mary Jones, and the issue of James Jones, to-wit: Nora Jones and John Jones; and a one-half

share divided equally between Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe].

[3. Alleges that the great-grandchildren of the settlor, to wit: Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones, Mary Jones, Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe are entitled to share in a per capita distribution of the described trust property and are each therefore entitled to a one-seventh share of the trust property, and that the issue of James Jones, to-wit: Nora Jones and John Jones, are each entitled to a one-half share in the portion to which James Jones would have been entitled, to-wit: a one-fourteenth share of the trust property.]

4. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE respondent prays for an order:

1. Ascertaining the beneficiaries and determining distribution of the proceeds with respect to the sale of the above-described real property as follows: _____ [*set forth requested direction, e.g.,* a one-seventh portion each to Sarah Jones Doe, Grant Jones, Mary Jones, Howard Roe, Amy Roe Green, and Steven Roe; and a one-fourteenth share each to Nora Jones and John Jones];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Respondent _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.543.*]

CAUTION:

The Trust Law is silent with respect to the filing of papers in response to a petition to administer a trust. Moreover, there do not appear to be any California Rules of Court or local court rules to provide guidance in this area, nor any uniformity with regard to the procedures presently used throughout California that would warrant the recommendation of one procedure for all jurisdictions. Counsel should therefore contact the appropriate court to ascertain whether any particular form of responsive papers is preferred by the local commissioner or judge, for example, a response, answer, or objection, with or without a memorandum of points and authorities [*see Prob. Code § 1000* (applicability of rules of civil practice in probate proceedings)]. An objection or response filed pursuant to the Probate Code must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(2)*].

[2] Use of Form

This response is for use by a beneficiary of a trust in response to a petition by a trustee seeking ascertainment of beneficiaries and distribution of property on final or partial termination of the trust [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)(4)*; *see*

also Lombardi v. Blois (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 191, 198, 40 Cal. Rptr. 899] .

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 560.543, 560.583*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.584

§ 560.584 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify or Terminate Irrevocable Trust [Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15408, 15409]

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Modify or Terminate Irrevocable Trust [Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15408, 15409]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ PETITION TO _____ [MODIFY *or* TERMINATE] TRUST

_____

Petitioner(s) allege(s):

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [*Creation of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 5.*]

[*EITHER*]

6. Petitioner(s) seek(s) to modify the trust to _____ [*specify modification sought, e.g.,* allow the sale of real property located at 55 Blue Sky Way, Arlingtonville, California].

[*OR*]

6. Petitioner(s) seek(s) to terminate the trust.

[*ADD, if seeking to modify or terminate pursuant to Prob. Code § 15403*]

7. Every beneficiary of the trust consents to the proposed _____ [modification *or* termination] and these consents are attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

8. Continuance of the trust is not necessary to carry out any material purpose of the trust.

[*If seeking to modify or terminate pursuant to Prob. Code § 15404, ADD EITHER*]

7. The settlor and every beneficiary of the trust consent to the proposed _____ [modification *or* termination], and these consents are attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

[*OR*]

7. The settlor and every beneficiary of the trust except _____ [*name of beneficiaries not consenting to proposed modification or partial termination*] consent to the proposed _____ [modification *or* partial termination], and these consents are attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

[*AND*]

8. The proposed _____ [modification *or* partial termination] will not [substantially] impair the interest(s) of _____ [*name of beneficiaries not consenting to proposed modification or partial termination*], because _____ [*set forth facts demonstrating lack of substantial impairment to interests of nonconsenting beneficiaries*].

[*ADD, if seeking to modify or terminate pursuant to Prob. Code § 15408*]

7. The proposed _____ [modification *or* termination] is necessary because the fair market value of the principal of the trust is so low in relation to the cost of administration that continuation of the trust under its existing terms will _____ [defeat *or* substantially impair] accomplishment of its purposes. A statement setting forth the fair market value of the trust principal and the costs of administration of the estate is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

[*ADD, if seeking to modify or terminate pursuant to Prob. Code § 15409*]

7. The proposed _____ [modification *or* termination] is necessary because continuation of the trust under its existing terms will _____ [defeat *or* substantially impair] accomplishment of its purposes because of _____ [*set forth circumstances not known or anticipated by settlor of trust*], which circumstances were not known to or anticipated by the settlor of the trust.

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, petitioner(s) pray(s) for an order:

[1. Modifying the trust to _____ (*specify modification sought*).]

[2. _____ [Terminating *or* Partially terminating] the trust.]

3. For costs herein; and

4. For such other as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner(s) _____ [*name(s)*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to petition the court to modify or terminate an irrevocable trust [*see Prob. Code §§ 15403, 15404, 15408, 15409*]. An irrevocable trust may be modified or terminated on consent of all the beneficiaries of the trust [*see*

Prob. Code § 15403] or of the settlor and all beneficiaries [*see Prob. Code § 15404(a)*]. An irrevocable trust may also be modified or partially terminated on consent of the settlor and some beneficiaries if the proposed modification or partial termination does not substantially impair the interests of the nonconsenting beneficiaries [*see Prob. Code § 15404(b)*]. Further, a trust may be modified or terminated on petition of a trustee or beneficiary, based on circumstances not known to or anticipated by the settlor, if continuation of the trust under its terms would defeat or substantially impair accomplishment of the purposes of the trust [*Prob. Code § 15409*] or if the court determines that the fair market value of the principal of the trust has become so low in relation to the cost of administration that continuation of the trust under its existing terms will defeat or substantially impair the accomplishment of its purposes [*Prob. Code § 15408*].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code §§ 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] State Statutes

Modification and termination of trusts. *Prob. Code § 15400 et seq.*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
3. Modification And Termination Of Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.585-560.599

[Reserved]

§§ 560.585[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.600

§ 560.600 Notice [Prob. Code §§ 1211, 17203] of Hearing on Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]

[1] FORM Notice [Prob. Code §§ 1211, 17203] of Hearing on Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	NOTICE OF HEARING ON PETITION
	)	

_____

Notice is hereby given that _____ [*name of petitioner*], as _____ [trustee *or* beneficiary *or other as appropriate*] of the above-captioned trust, has filed herein a petition _____ [*describe, e.g.,* to modify the trust], reference to which is made for further particulars. The time and place of hearing the petition has been set for _____ [*date*] at _____ [*time*], in the courtroom [of Department No. _____] of the Superior Court at _____ [*street address*] in _____ [*city*], California.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice is for use by a trustee, beneficiary, or a person having standing otherwise afforded the beneficiary, to give

notice of the time and place of hearing on a petition filed under *Prob. Code § 17200* [*see Prob. Code §§ 1211* (form of notice), 17203 (notice requirement); *see also Prob. Code §§ 15800* (rights regarding revocable trust inure to settlor, not beneficiary), 15803 (rights inure to holder of presently exercisable power of appointment or power to withdraw property)].

[3] Notice Requirements

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of hearing to be mailed to all of the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]:

- All trustees.

- All beneficiaries, except that if the trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke it is competent notice must be given to the person holding the power to revoke and not to the beneficiary [*Prob. Code § 15802*].

- The Attorney General of California, if the petition relates to a charitable trust subject to the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

At least 30 days before the time set for hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on any person (other than a trustee or beneficiary) whose right, title, or interest would be affected by the petition and who does not receive mailed notice as provided above [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*]. Service must be effected in the manner required for service of summons in civil actions [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* (service of summons in civil actions)]. The court may not shorten the time for service [*Prob. Code § 17203(b)*].

If a person to whom notice otherwise would be given has been deceased for at least 40 days, and no personal representative has been appointed for that person's estate, and if the deceased person's right, title, or interest has not passed to any other person pursuant to the Probate Code rules for disposition of estates without administration [*see Prob. Code § 13000 et seq.*], notice may instead be given to the following persons [*Prob. Code § 17203(c)*]:

- Each heir and devisee of the decedent, and all persons named as executors of the will of the decedent, so far as known to the petitioner.

- Each person serving as guardian or conservator of the decedent at the time of the decedent's death, so far as known to the petitioner.

[4] Form of Notice

Except as otherwise provided in the Probate Code, *Prob. Code § 1200 et seq.* govern the notice to be given under the code [*Prob. Code § 1200(a)*]. If notice is required and no other type of notice is prescribed by law, the Judicial Council, or the court or judge, the notice must be substantially in the form set forth in *Prob. Code § 1211* [*see Prob. Code § 1211*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.601

§ 560.601 Request [Prob. Code § 17205] for Copy of Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

[1] FORM Request [Prob. Code § 17205] for Copy of Petition [Prob. Code § 17200]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ REQUEST FOR COPY OF PETITION [TO _____ (*specify, e.g.,* MODIFY TRUST)]

_____

To _____ [*name of petitioner*], as petitioner of the above-entitled proceeding[, and to _____ [*name*], his/her/its attorney of record]:

YOU ARE HEREBY REQUESTED TO MAIL OR DELIVER A COPY OF THE PETITION AS FOLLOWS:

Within five days after receipt of the request, cause a copy of the petition to be mailed or delivered to the undersigned at this address: _____.

The undersigned, _____ [*name*], is a _____ [trustee *or* beneficiary] of the above-captioned trust and is therefore entitled to a copy of the petition pursuant to *section 17205 of the Probate Code*.

_____ [*date and place*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [Trustee *or* Beneficiary]

[2] Use of Form

This request is for use by a trustee or beneficiary to request that the petitioner in a proceeding under *Prob. Code § 17200* deliver or mail a copy of the petition. The petitioner is also required to deliver or mail a copy of the petition if a trustee or beneficiary has served and filed a notice of appearance, in person or by counsel, directed to the petitioner or the petitioner's counsel in connection with a particular petition and proceeding [*see Prob. Code § 17205*].

[3] State Statutes

Request for copy of petition by trustee or beneficiary. *Prob. Code § 17205*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.602

§ 560.602 Petition and Order for Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Under the Probate Code--Cal. Judicial Council Form DE-350, GC-100 [Prob. Code § 1003]

[1] FORM Petition and Order for Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem Under the Probate Code--Cal. Judicial Council Form DE-350, GC-100 [Prob. Code § 1003]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This is a filled-in reproduction of the approved Judicial Council Form of Petition and Order for Appointment of Guardian Ad Litem [Cal. Judicial Council Form DE-350, GC-100; *see Prob. Code § 1003*]. Use of the form is mandatory *Cal. Rules of Court, Rules 1.31, 7.101*]. The form is for use by a trustee or other person interested in the trust to seek appointment of a guardian ad litem to represent the interest of, for example, a minor, an incapacitated person, or an unborn person [*see Prob. Code § 1003(a)*]. This form may be obtained from any superior court county clerk. This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

The Judicial Council form includes not only the petition seeking the appointment of a guardian ad litem, but also a consent to act as a guardian ad litem (to be signed by the proposed guardian), an optional consent of the minor 12 years of age or older (to be signed by the minor), and the court's order.

[3] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem at Request of Trustee

At any stage of a proceeding under the Probate Code, the court may appoint a guardian ad litem to represent the interest of any of the following persons, if it determines that representation of the interest would otherwise be inadequate [*Prob. Code § 1003(a)*]:

- A minor.
- An incapacitated person.
- An unborn person.
- An unascertained person.
- A person whose identity or address is unknown.
- A designated class of persons who are not ascertained or are not in being.

The appointment may be made by the court on its own motion or on request of a personal representative, guardian, conservator, trustee, or other interested person [*Prob. Code § 1003(a)*]. If not precluded by a conflict of interest, a guardian ad litem may be appointed to represent several persons or interests [*Prob. Code § 1003(b)*].

The reasonable expenses of the guardian ad litem, including compensation and attorneys' fees, must be determined by the court and paid as the court orders, either out of the property of the estate involved or by the petitioner or from such other source as the court orders [*Prob. Code § 1003(c)*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

Proceedings concerning trusts are governed by *Prob. Code §§ 17200-17211*. The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under these sections [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (*see* Paragraph 9) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. The various grounds for the petition are set out in *Prob. Code § 17200(b)*.

Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. The court's order portion of the Judicial Council Form requires that the court find (1) that all notices required by law have been given, or (2) that notice has been dispensed with. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.603

§ 560.603 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Discharge Guardian Ad Litem and Designate Attorney of Record [Prob. Code § 1003]--Beneficiary's Attaining of Majority--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Discharge Guardian Ad Litem and Designate Attorney of Record [Prob. Code § 1003]--Beneficiary's Attaining of Majority--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION TO DISCHARGE GUARDIAN AD
	)	LITEM

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity. See § 560.521, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Petitioner was born on _____ [*date*], and since the commencement of this action has attained the age of _____ [18 *or greater number*].

3. Petitioner discharges _____ [*name of guardian ad litem*] and designates _____ [*name*], a duly licensed attorney at law in California with his/her office at _____ [*street address*] in the City of _____, County of _____, California, as his/her attorney of record herein.

4. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a beneficiary of a trust who was a minor at the time a proceeding to administer a trust under the Trust Law was commenced, and who has subsequently attained the age of 18 years, to discharge the guardian ad litem, and to designate an attorney of record [*see Prob. Code § 17200(a)* (standing of beneficiary to petition court concerning internal affairs of trust)]. Although discharge of a guardian ad litem is not an express ground for a petition, the enumerated grounds are not exclusive [*see Prob. Code § 17200(b)*].

[3] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] State Statutes

Age of majority. *Fam. Code §§ 6500-6502*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 560.521, 560.602*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.604

§ 560.604 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Construction of Trust Instrument [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(1)]--By Guardian Ad Litem of Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] for Construction of Trust Instrument [Prob. Code § 17200(b)(1)]--By Guardian Ad Litem of Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TRUST IN-
	)	STRUMENT

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was, and now is the duly appointed and acting guardian ad litem of _____ (*name of beneficiary*) for the purpose of these proceedings.

2. [*Irrevocability of trust. See § 560.521, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Identity of trustee. See § 560.521, Paragraph 3.*]

4. Pursuant to the terms of the above-described trust, _____ [*describe provision requiring construction, e.g.,* _____ (*name of trustee*), as trustee, is directed to manage certain real property for the support and maintenance of _____ (*name of minor beneficiary*) until he/she attains the age of majority. The trust instrument is unclear with respect to _____ [*describe ambiguity, e.g.,* whether the

trust terminates on _____'s (*name of minor beneficiary*) attaining majority, with his/her entitlement at that time to the proceeds of the balance of the trust, or whether his/her interest in the trust terminates on his/her attaining majority, with the holders of remainder interests acquiring his/her interest at that time].

5. Petitioner requests a construction of the trust instrument directing that the above-described trust continues until the beneficiary attains the age of majority, at which time the trust will terminate, and that, at that time, _____ [*name of trustee*], as trustee, must distribute to the beneficiary the balance of any property remaining.

6. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

7. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. _____ [*Specify, e.g.,* Determining that the above-described trust continues until the beneficiary attains the age of majority, at which time the trust will terminate, and that, at that time, _____ (*name of trustee*), as trustee, must distribute to the beneficiary the balance of any property remaining];

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by the guardian ad litem of a minor beneficiary of a trust, to obtain construction of a trust instrument with respect to the beneficiary's interest in the trust [*see Prob. Code § 1003* (appointment of guardian ad litem); *see also Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 695, 199 P.2d 706* (regarding trust for support and maintenance of minor child)].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The capacity and standing of the petitioner (Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(a)* (standing of beneficiary), 17208 (appointment of guardian ad litem)];

- A description of the terms of the trust requiring construction (Paragraph 4) [*see Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 695, 199 P.2d 706]* ; and

- A statement of the requested construction (Paragraph 5) [*see Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 695, 199 P.2d 706]* .

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Decisions

Trust for support and maintenance of minor child is passive and subject to termination when child attains majority age. *Ball v. Mann (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 695, 699, 199 P.2d 706*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.605

§ 560.605 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Court of Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17402]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Court of Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17402]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF TRUST
	)	[PROPERTY]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Petitioner's identity and creation of trust. See § 560.554, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

3. This petition is made to obtain an order transferring _____ [the place of administration of the above-described trust *or* (part of) the property of the above-described trust] to _____ [*court*] in _____ County in _____ [*specify state*].

4. The trustee administering the above-described trust in California is _____ [*name*]. [The trustee is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State

of California)]. _____. [He/She resides at *or* Its place of residence is] _____ [*street address*], _____ County, California.

5. The proposed trustee, _____ [who *or* which] will administer the above-described trust in _____ [*specify state*], is _____ [*name*] [,an individual whose age is _____]. [The trustee is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of _____ [*specify state*)]. _____ [He/She resides at *or* Its place of residence is] _____ [*street address*], _____ County in _____ [*specify state*].

6. The proposed trustee is qualified to act as trustee of the trust in that _____ [*set forth a general statement of qualifications*].

7. The proposed trustee has [not] agreed to accept the trust. [A copy of the agreement is _____ (attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof *or* filed with the court.]

[8. The proposed trustee has a bond in the amount of $_____.]

[9. The proposed trustee is now administering [a] trust[s] of the settlor containing the following assets: _____ (*set forth a general statement of the nature and value of property*). _____ (He/She/It is under the jurisdiction of _____ (*specify court*) *or* His/Her/Its accounts are under the jurisdiction of _____ (*specify court*) *or* Proceedings with respect to the administration of the trust property sought to be transferred may be had in _____ (*specify court*)).]

10. The names, ages, and places of residence of all living beneficiaries of the above-described trust, as far as known to petitioner, are as follows:

Name	Age	Residence
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

11. The character, condition, value, and location of the property included in the trust estate are as follows: _____ [*set forth description*].

12. There is _____ [no *or* a] civil action now pending in California against the proposed trustee. [The action concerns _____ (*set forth brief description of action, if any*).]

13. The reasons for transferring further proceedings relating to administration of the trust to _____ [*specify court*], _____ County, _____ [*specify state*], are as follows: _____ [*set forth ways in which transfer will promote the best interests of the trust and those interested in it, including factors concerning the economical and convenient administration of the trust*].

14. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____

_____ _____
_____ _____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order transferring _____ [the place of administration of the trust *or* _____ (some *or* all) of the trust property] to _____ [*specify court*], _____ County, _____ [*specify state*].

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek a transfer of the administration of the trust, or some or all of the trust property, to a jurisdiction outside California [*see Prob. Code §§ 17401* (court may make order transferring trust administration or property), 17402 (petition for transfer)].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The purpose for the petition (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 17401*];
- The identity and residence of the trustee in California (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(a)(1)*];
- The identity, residence, and age (if an individual) of the proposed trustee (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(a)(2), (d)*];
- The qualifications of the proposed trustee (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(d)*];
- A statement of whether the proposed trustee has agreed to accept the trust (Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(c)*];
- The names, ages, and residences of all living beneficiaries known to the petitioner (Paragraph 10) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(b)*];
- A statement of the character, condition, and value of the trust property subject to transfer (Paragraph 11) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(g)*];

- A statement of whether any civil action against the proposed trustee is pending in California (Paragraph 12) [*see Prob. Code § 17402(h)*]; and

- A statement of the reasons for the transfer (Paragraph 13) [*see Prob. Code §§ 17402(i)* (requirement for statement), 17404(a) (grounds for transfer)].

Optional Paragraph 8 is for use to set forth the amount of any fiduciary bond required of the proposed trustee [*see Prob. Code § 17402(d)*]. Optional Paragraph 9 is for use to describe the nature and value of any property of a trust of the settlor that the proposed trustee is administering in the other jurisdiction [*see Prob. Code § 17402(e)*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] State Statutes

Petition to transfer trust to or from another jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(16)*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.606

§ 560.606 Order [Prob. Code § 17404] Transferring Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code § 17401]

[1] FORM Order [Prob. Code § 17404] Transferring Administration of Trust or Trust Property to Jurisdiction Outside California [Prob. Code § 17401]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of the _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ ORDER TRANSFERRING TRUST [PROPERTY]

This proceeding to transfer the _____ [administration of the trust *or* (part of) the trust property] of the _____ (*name of trust*) on the verified petition of _____ (*name of petitioner*), trustee [, and the return and _____ (*specify papers filed in opposition, e.g.,* response) of the beneficiary _____ (*name*)], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*], before this court, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name of petitioner's counsel*]. [_____ (*Name*), as beneficiary, appeared by counsel _____ (*name of beneficiary's counsel*).] [Evidence was introduced on behalf of both parties and the matter was argued and submitted for decision.]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the petition ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That further proceedings relating to administration of the _____ [*name of trust*] are transferred to

the _____ [*specify court*], _____ County, _____ [*specify state*].

2. _____ [*Specify manner of transfer directed by court, and any terms and conditions imposed*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is an order for use to transfer the administration or property of a trust to a jurisdiction outside California [*see Prob. Code § 17404*].

[3] State Statutes

Court order to transfer administration or property. *Prob. Code § 17401*

Grounds for granting order. *Prob. Code § 17404*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 560.552, 560.605*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.607

§ 560.607 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property From Another Jurisdiction to California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17453]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Administration of Trust or Trust Property From Another Jurisdiction to California [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17453]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF TRUST
	)	[PROPERTY]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was, and now is, the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust created _____ [by a written declaration of trust of _____ (*name of settlor*) *or* under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased *or other as appropriate*]. _____ [A copy of the instrument is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof *or set forth terms of trust instrument in effect at time petition is filed, including all amendments thereto*].

2. Petitioner is _____ [an individual who resides *or* _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company), whose principal place of business is located] at _____ [*street address*] in the State of _____.

[*EITHER, if a proposed trustee is resident of California*]

3. The proposed principal place of administration of the trust pursuant to *section 17002 of the Probate Code* is located in _____ County, California.

[*OR, if no proposed trustee is resident of California*]

3. _____ [The residence of _____ (*name*), a/the beneficiary of the trust *or* a substantial portion of the trust property to be transferred _____ (is *or* will be)] located in _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. This petition is made to obtain an order transferring _____ [the place of administration *or* (part of) the property] of the above-described trust from _____ County, _____ [*specify state*], to _____ County, California.

5. The proposed trustee to whom the _____ [administration of the trust *or* trust property] will be transferred is _____ [*name*] [,an individual whose age is _____]. [The proposed trustee is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of _____ (California *or specify other state*).] _____ [He/She resides *or* Its principal place of business is] at _____ [*street address*], _____ County, _____ [California *or specify other state*].

6. [*Qualifications of proposed trustee. See § 560.605, Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Statement regarding whether proposed trustee has accepted trust. See § 560.605, Paragraph 7.*]

[8. Petitioner requests that the proposed trustee post a bond in the amount of $_____.]

9. [*Names, ages, and places of residence of all living beneficiaries. See § 560.605, Paragraph 10.*]

10. [*Character, condition, location, and value of trust property. See § 560.605, Paragraph 11.*]

11. Administration of the trust has [not] been subject to supervision outside California.

[12. A _____ (petition *or other appropriate request*) for transfer of place of administration of the trust (property) _____ (has not been filed in _____ [*name of state*] *or* has been filed with _____ [*name of court*] in _____ County, _____ [*name of state*], and _____ [*describe status of proceedings in other state, e.g.,* was granted on _____ (*date*)]).]

13. The reasons for transferring _____ [the place of administration *or* (part of) the property] of the above-described trust from _____ County, _____ [*specify state*], to _____ County, California, are that _____ [*set forth ways in which transfer will promote the best interests of the trust and those interested in it, including factors concerning the economical and*

convenient administration of the trust].

14. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

15. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order transferring _____ [the place of administration of the trust *or* _____ (some *or* all) of the trust property] to _____ County, California.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek a transfer of the administration of the trust, or some or all of the trust property, to California from a foreign jurisdiction [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16)* (ground for petition), 17451 (court may make order transferring trust administration or property)]. The procedure for transfer under *Prob. Code §§ 17450-17457* applies to trusts administered in foreign countries as well as those administered in other states [*see Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 741 (1986)].

[3] Contents of Petition

The petition for transfer must set forth all of the following [*Prob. Code § 17453*]:

- The names and places of residence of (a) the trustee administering the trust in the other jurisdiction, and (b) the proposed trustee to whom administration of the trust or trust property will be transferred (Paragraphs 2 and 5, respectively).

- The names, ages, and places of residence of all living beneficiaries, as far as known to the petitioner (Paragraph 9).

- Whether administration of the trust has been subject to supervision in a jurisdiction outside this state. If so, the petition must state whether a petition or appropriate request for transfer of place of administration of the trust or trust property to California has been filed, if necessary, with the court in the other jurisdiction, and the status of the petition or request (Paragraphs 11, 12).

- Whether the trustee proposed to administer the trust in California has agreed to accept the trust in this state. If the trustee has agreed, the acceptance must be attached as an exhibit to the petition or otherwise filed with the court (Paragraph 7).

- A general statement of the qualifications of the trustee proposed to administer the trust in California and the amount of any bond to be requested. If the trustee is an individual, the statement must include the trustee's age (Paragraphs 6, 8, and 5, respectively).

- A copy of the trust instrument or a statement of the terms of the trust instrument in effect at the time the petition is filed, including all amendments thereto (Paragraph 1).

- A statement of the character, condition, location, and value of the trust property sought to be transferred (Paragraph 10).

- A statement of the reasons for the transfer (Paragraph 13).

In addition it alleges: (1) the identity of petitioner (Paragraph 1) [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(a)* (standing), (2) the basis for venue (Paragraph 3) [see *Prob. Code §§ 17002, 17452*; for discussion of *Prob. Code § 17002* (defining principal place of administration), see *§ 560.521[9][a]*]; (3) the purpose for the petition (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code § 17451*]; and (4) optionally, the amount of any bond requested (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code § 17453(e)*].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested orcontingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] State Statutes

Petition to transfer trust to or from another jurisdiction. *Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(16), 17453*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.608

§ 560.608 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Jurisdiction Over Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction to Another County [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(17), 17304]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Transfer Jurisdiction Over Trust Subject to Continuing Jurisdiction to Another County [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(17), 17304]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF TRUST
	)	[PROPERTY]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust created under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof]. [Petitioner is _____ (*specify type of financial institution if trustee is not an individual, e.g.,* a national banking association incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in doing business as a trust company in the State of California)].

2. The decedent's estate was administered in _____County, California.

3. The above-described trust was created by a will _____ [executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1977 *or* that provides that the trust is subject to the continuing jurisdiction of the superior court].

4. Final distribution of the decedent's estate occurred on or about _____ [*date*].

5. This petition is made to obtain an order transferring the jurisdiction over the above-described trust to _____ [*court*] in _____ County, California.

6. The names, ages, and places of residence of all living trustees of the above-described trust are as follows:

Name	Age	Residence
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

7. The names, ages, and places of residence of all living beneficiaries of the above-described trust, as far as known to petitioner, are as follows:

Name	Age	Residence
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8. The character, condition, value, and location of the property included in the trust estate are as follows: _____ [*set forth description*].

9. The reasons for transferring the jurisdiction over the above-described trust to _____ [*specify court*], _____ County, California, are as follows: _____ [*set forth ways in which the transfer will promote the best interests of the estate, or will facilitate the economical and convenient administration of the trust*].

10. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order transferring the jurisdiction over the above-described trust to _____ [*specify court*], _____ County, California.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek to transfer the jurisdiction over a testamentary trust that is subject to continuing jurisdiction of the court to another county in California [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(17), 17304*; *see also Prob. Code § 17300* (description of trusts subject to continuing jurisdiction)].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The identity of the petitioner and the creation of the trust (Paragraph 1) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15200* (creation of trust), 17200(a) (standing to bring petition)];
- The basis for venue (Paragraph 2) [*see Prob. Code § 17301*];
- The basis for continuing court jurisdiction (Paragraph 3) [*see Prob. Code § 17300*];
- A statement that final distribution of the estate has occurred (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code § 17304(a)*];
- The county to which jurisdiction is sought to be transferred (Paragraph 5) [*see Prob. Code § 17304(b)(1)*];
- The names, ages, and residences of all trustees and all beneficiaries known to the petitioner (Paragraphs 6, 7) [*see Prob. Code § 17304(b)(2)*];
- A statement of the character, condition, and value of the trust property subject to transfer (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code § 17304(b)(3)*]; and
- A statement of the reasons for the transfer (Paragraph 9) [*see Prob. Code § 17304(b)(4)* (requirement of statement), 17304(c) (grounds for transfer)].

[4] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and

last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Granting of Order

If, after hearing, it appears to the court that the transfer of jurisdiction to the county designated in the petition or to any other county in California will be in the best interests of the estate, or that economical and convenient administration of the trust will be facilitated by the transfer, the court will make an order transferring jurisdiction over the trust [*Prob. Code § 17304(c)*].

[7] Transfer of Documents

After the order transferring jurisdiction is made, the court clerk will certify a copy of the order of transfer to the clerk of the court to which jurisdiction is transferred, together with copies of the instrument creating the trust, the decree of distribution, and any other documents or matters of record the court determines by order to be necessary to define the powers and duties of the trustee, or otherwise to be necessary in connection with further administration of the trust [*Prob. Code § 17304(c)*].

The court to which jurisdiction is transferred may from time to time require by order the filing of certified copies of additional papers or matters of record from the court in which the decedent's estate was administered as are required [*Prob. Code § 17304(d)*].

[8] Jurisdiction of Court To Which Trust Is Transferred

On the filing of a certified copy of the order of transfer, together with supporting documents, the court to which jurisdiction is transferred has the same jurisdiction over the trust as the court in which the decedent's estate was administered but for the transfer [*Prob. Code § 17304(e)*].

[9] Venue

If a trust described in *Prob. Code § 17300* continues after distribution of the decedent's estate, the court in which the decedent's estate was administered retains jurisdiction over the trust and is the court in which to file the petition to transfer jurisdiction [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(17), 17301*].

[10] State Statutes

Petition to transfer jurisdiction of trust subject to continuing court jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17201(b)(17)*

Trusts subject to continuing court jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17300*

Venue regarding trusts subject to continuing jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17301*

Contents of petition to transfer jurisdiction over trust subject to continuing jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17304*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.609

§ 560.609 Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Testamentary Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court When No Trustee Is Trust Company [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(18), 17352]--By Trustee

[1] FORM Petition [Prob. Code § 17201] to Remove Testamentary Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court When No Trustee Is Trust Company [Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(18), 17352]--By Trustee

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	PETITION FOR TRANSFER OF TRUST
	)	[PROPERTY]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, petitioner was and now is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the trust created under the will of _____ (*name of settlor and testator*), deceased, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

2. Petitioner [is the sole trustee of the trust and] is not a trust company. [None of the remaining trustees is a trust company.]

3. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.608, Paragraph 2.*]

4. The trust was created by a will executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1977.

5. This petition is made to obtain an order removing the trust from the continuing jurisdiction of the court.

6. [*Account and report of trustee's acts. See § 560.559, Paragraphs 4-8.*]

7. [*Condition of estate. See § 560.608, Paragraph 8.*]

8. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

9. The names and addresses of the persons entitled to notice of this petition are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order removing the trust from the continuing jurisdiction of this court.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*EXHIBIT B--ACCOUNT. See § 560.559.*]

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

CAUTION:
The petition must be verified [*Prob. Code § 1021(a)(1)*].

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a trustee to seek removal of a testamentary trust from the continuing jurisdiction of the court [*see Prob. Code §§ 17200(b)(18), 17352*]. It is for use only if no trustee of a trust described in *Prob. Code § 17350* is a trust company, in which case approval of the court is required [*Prob. Code § 17352(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 17351* (notice procedure if trustee is trust company)]. Trusts described in *Prob. Code § 17350* are those created by will executed before July 1, 1977, and not incorporated by reference in a will on or after July 1, 1977. The trustee may petition for court approval at any time, and from time to time, in the trustee's discretion [*Prob. Code § 17352(a)*].

A copy of the trust instrument must be attached to the petition [*Prob. Code § 17352(b)*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The identity of the petitioner and the creation of the trust (Paragraph 1) [*see Prob. Code §§ 15200* (creation of trust), 17200(a) (standing to bring petition)];
- A statement that no trustee is a trust company (Paragraph 2) [*see Prob. Code § 17352(a)*]; and
- The basis for continuing court jurisdiction (Paragraph 4) [*see Prob. Code § 17350*].

[4] Contents of Petition

The petition for removal must set forth the trust accounts in detail (Paragraph 6), report the trustee's acts (Paragraph 6), and show the condition of the trust estate (Paragraph 7). A copy of the trust instrument must be attached to the petition [*Prob. Code § 17352(b)*].

[5] Statement of Grounds and Persons Entitled to Notice

The petition must state facts showing that it is authorized under *Prob. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. It must also state the name and address of each person entitled to notice of the petition (Paragraph 8) [*Prob. Code § 17201*]. Notice of a petition regarding a trust is governed by *Prob. Code § 17203(a)*]. For detailed discussion, see *§ 560.137[2]*.

[6] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[7] Granting or Denying of Order

At the hearing the court may receive testimony from any interested person and may grant or deny the petition, or may grant the petition on such conditions as the court in its discretion deems proper [*Prob. Code § 17352(c)*].

If the petition is granted, the trustee must send the notice of removal of the trust provided in *Prob. Code § 17351(b)* and file proof of service as required by *Prob. Code § 17351(c)* within six months and seven months, respectively, from the date the petition is granted. A copy of the court order granting the petition must be attached to the notice [*Prob. Code § 17352(d)*]. For a notice, *see § 560.610*.

If the petition is not granted, the trust continues to be administered under *Prob. Code §§ 17300-17304* as if the settlor had provided in the will that the court does not lose jurisdiction of the estate by final distribution [*Prob. Code § 17352(e)*].

[8] State Statutes

Petition to remove testamentary trust from continuing court jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17200(b)(18)*

Trusts subject to removal from continuing court jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17350*

Contents of petition to remove trust from continuing court jurisdiction. *Prob. Code § 17352*

[9] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 560.521, 560.608*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.610

§ 560.610 Notice of Removal of Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court [Prob. Code § 17352(d)]

[1] FORM Notice of Removal of Trust From Continuing Jurisdiction of Court [Prob. Code § 17352(d)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
In the Matter of the	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF TRUST FROM CON-
	)	TINUING JURISDICTION OF COURT]

_____

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], the above-entitled Court entered an order removing the above-captioned trust from the continuing jurisdiction of the court. A copy of the order is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof.

FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that as of January 1, 1983, the law was changed to remove the necessity for continuing jurisdiction over the above-captioned trust.

FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that any beneficiary of the trust has the right to petition a court to determine important matters relating to the administration of the trust, pursuant to *section 17200 of the Probate Code*. *Section 17200 of the Probate Code* provides as follows:

(a) Except as provided in *Prob. Code § 15800*, a trustee or beneficiary of a trust may petition the court under this chapter [*Prob. Code §§ 17200-17210*] concerning the internal affairs of the trust or to determine the existence of the trust.

(b) Proceedings concerning the internal affairs of a trust include, but are not limited to, proceedings for any of the following purposes:

- Determining questions of construction of a trust instrument.
- Determining the existence or nonexistence of any immunity, power, privilege, duty, or right.
- Determining the validity of a trust provision.
- Ascertaining beneficiaries and determining to whom property shall pass or be delivered upon final or partial termination of the trust, to the extent the determination is not made by the trust instrument.
- Settling the accounts and passing upon the acts of the trustee, including the exercise of discretionary powers.
- Instructing the trustee.
- Compelling the trustee to report information about the trust or account to the beneficiary, if (A) the trustee has failed to submit a requested report or account within 60 days after written request of the beneficiary and (B) no report or account has been made within six months preceding the request.
- Granting powers to the trustee.
- Fixing or allowing payment of the trustee's compensation.
- Appointing or removing a trustee.
- Accepting the resignation of a trustee.
- Compelling redress of a breach of the trust by any available remedy.
- Approving or directing the modification or termination of the trust.
- Approving or directing the combination or division of trusts.
- Amending or conforming the trust instrument in the manner required to qualify a decedent's estate for the charitable estate tax deduction under federal law, including the addition of mandatory governing instrument requirements for a charitable remainder trust as required by final regulations and rulings of the United States Internal Revenue Service.
- Authorizing or directing transfer of a trust or trust property to or from another jurisdiction.
- Directing transfer of a testamentary trust subject to continuing court jurisdiction from one county to another.
- Approving removal of a testamentary trust from continuing court jurisdiction.
- Reforming or excusing compliance with the governing instrument of an organization pursuant to *Probate Code Section 16105*.

- Determining petitions filed pursuant to *Probate Code Section 15687* and reviewing the reasonableness of compensation for legal services authorized under that section. In determining the reasonableness of compensation under this paragraph, the court may consider, together with all other relevant circumstances, whether prior approval was obtained pursuant to *Probate Code Section 15687*.

Section 17201 of the Probate Code provides as follows:

A proceeding under this chapter is commenced by filing a petition stating facts showing that the petition is authorized under this chapter. The petition shall also state the grounds of the petition and the names and addresses of each person entitled to notice of the petition.

FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that each income beneficiary, as defined in *Probate Code Section 16325*, is entitled to an annual statement of the principal and income receipts and disbursements of the trust, and that any other beneficiary is entitled to that information on written request to the trustee.

FURTHER NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the appropriate court in which to file a petition pursuant to *Section 17200 of the Probate Code* is [either of the following:] the Superior Court of the County of _____ [*name of county having venue under Prob. Code § 17005*], at _____ (*address*) [*if a different court administered decedent's estate, add*, or the Superior Court of the County of _____ (*name of county having venue over decedent's estate*), at _____ (*address*), which is the court that had jurisdiction over the administration of _____'s (*name of decedent*) estate].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice is for use by a trustee to give notice that a testamentary trust was removed from continuing jurisdiction of the court. This form may be used whether or not the trustee is a trust company. A trustee that is a trust company does not file a petition for removal, but rather gives notice of removal within six months of the initial funding of the trust, and may use the foregoing form to comply with those notice requirements [*see Prob. Code § 17351*]. A trustee that is not a trust company must file a petition for removal, and must give notice in compliance with *Prob. Code § 17351(b)* after the court grants the petition [*Prob. Code § 17352(d)*]. For a form of petition for removal, *see § 560.609*.

[3] Contents of Notice

The notice must contain the following [*see Prob. Code §§ 17351(b)* (contents), 17352(d) (requirement for notice)]:

- A statement that as of January 1, 1983, the law was changed to remove the necessity for continuing court jurisdiction over the trust.

- A statement that *Prob. Code § 17200* gives any beneficiary the right to petition a court to determine important matters relating to the administration of the trust.

- A copy of the text of *Prob. Code §§ 17200* and *17201*.

- A statement that each income beneficiary, as defined in *Prob. Code § 16325*, is entitled to an annual

statement of the principal and income receipts and disbursements of the trust and that any other beneficiary is entitled to such information on written request to the trustee.

- The name and location of the court in the county in which it is appropriate to file a petition pursuant *Prob. Code § 17200*, the name and location of the court that had jurisdiction over the administration of the decedent's estate, and a statement that it is appropriate to file a petition pursuant to *Prob. Code § 17200* with either court.

[4] Service

The trustee that is not a trust company must send the notice of removal of the trust to each beneficiary within six months from the date the petition is granted. The trustee must file proof of service with the court that had jurisdiction over the administration of the decedent's estate within seven months from the date the petition is granted [*Prob. Code §§ 17352(d)* (requirement for notice), 17351(c) (proper court for filing)].

[5] State Statutes

Contents of notice of removal. *Prob. Code § 17351(b)*

Proof of service; proper court for filing. *Prob. Code § 17351(c)*

Notice of removal of trust from continuing court jurisdiction after hearing on petition. *Prob. Code § 17352(d)*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.609*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
4. Petition Proceedings, Jurisdiction, Venue, And Appointment Of Guardian Ad Litem Relating To Express Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.611-560.629

[Reserved]

§§ 560.611[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.630

§ 560.630 Petition to Enforce Money Judgment by Collecting Trust Income or Principal Due Judgment Debtor as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

[1] FORM Petition to Enforce Money Judgment by Collecting Trust Income or Principal Due Judgment Debtor as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION TO ENFORCE MONEY JUDGMENT
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is a judgment creditor of respondent _____ [*name of trust beneficiary*].

2. Respondent _____ [*name of trust beneficiary*] is the named beneficiary under the _____ [*name of trust*].

3. Respondent _____ [*name of trustee*] is the trustee of the trust [and _____ (*specify, e.g.*, a national banking corporation, incorporated under the laws of the United States, engaged in and doing business as a trust company in California with its principal place of business located in _____ County.]

4. [*Basis for venue. See § 560.521, Paragraph 4.*]

5. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

6. On _____ [*date*], petitioner recovered a money judgment against _____ [*name of beneficiary*] for the sum of $_____ [and for costs in the sum of $_____] in Action No. _____ in the _____ [*specify*] Court of _____ County, entitled _____ vs. _____, which was duly entered in the Judgment Book of that Court, Vol. _____, page _____, on _____ [*date*] [,a copy of which is attached as Exhibit "A," and incorporated by reference].

7. No part of the [unsatisfied portion of the] judgment has been paid and there is due, owing, and unpaid to petitioner from respondent beneficiary on the judgment the sum of $_____, together with interest at the legal rate from _____ [*date of judgment*].

[*EITHER, if transfer of trust property is not restricted and beneficiary's interest is in income*]

8. By the terms of the trust agreement, _____ [*describe beneficiary's interest in trust income, e.g.,* respondent trustee was and is to receive the income of the trust property and to pay to respondent beneficiary the sum of $_____ per month].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. That respondent trustee withhold from respondent beneficiary and pay to petitioner _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the sum of $_____ per month to which respondent beneficiary would otherwise be entitled, until petitioner's judgment, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after _____ (*date of judgment*) is satisfied in full];

[*OR, if transfer of trust property is not restricted and beneficiary's interest is in principal*]

8. By the terms of the trust agreement, _____ [*describe beneficiary's interest in trust principal, e.g.,* on or about _____ (*date*), respondent trustee will liquidate 400 shares of _____ (*name*) common stock that is the subject of the trust and distribute the proceeds to respondent beneficiary].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. That respondent trustee withhold from respondent beneficiary and pay to petitioner _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the proceeds from the sale of 400 shares of _____ (*name*) common stock to which respondent beneficiary would otherwise be entitled, to the extent that petitioner's judgment, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after _____ (*date of judgment*) is satisfied in full];

[*OR, if transfer of trust property is restricted and beneficiary's interest is in income*]

8. By the terms of the trust agreement, respondent beneficiary's interest in income is not subject to voluntary or involuntary transfer, and _____ [*describe beneficiary's interest in the trust, e.g.,* he/she receives from the trust property income the sum of $_____, and an amount determined by the respondent trustee for the beneficiary's education and support, payable to the beneficiary monthly].

[9. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the amount that is and will be necessary for the beneficiary's education and support (per _____ (*specify period, e.g.,* month) is $_____.]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. That respondent trustee withhold and pay to petitioner _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the sum of $_____, which is the monthly amount to which respondent beneficiary is entitled in excess of the amount necessary for the education and support of the beneficiary, payable to petitioner monthly, until petitioner's judgment, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after _____ (*date of judgment*) is satisfied in full];

[*OR, if transfer of trust property is restricted and beneficiary's interest is in principal*]

8. By the terms of the trust agreement, respondent beneficiary's interest in the principal of the trust is not subject to voluntary or involuntary transfer, and _____ [*describe beneficiary's interest in the trust, e.g.,* he/she has a vested future interest in full legal title to the trust property described as the real property situated at _____ (*street address and if any, city*), _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ (*set forth legal description*).

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. That respondent trustee _____ [*specify, e.g.,* liquidate respondent beneficiary's vested future interest in the above-described trust property and distribute to petitioner the proceeds therefrom to which the beneficiary would otherwise be entitled, to the extent that petitioner's judgment, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after _____ (*date of judgment*) is satisfied in full];

[*CONTINUE*]

2. For costs herein; and

3. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 560.521.*]

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by a judgment creditor to seek an order to enforce a money judgment against the judgment debtor's interest as beneficiary of a trust by ordering the trustee to pay to the petitioner an amount from trust property otherwise payable to the beneficiary, to the extent allowable by the provisions for transfer restrictions under *Prob. Code §§ 15300-15309* [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 695.030(b)(1)* (interest in trust subject to enforcement of money judgment to extent provided by law), 709.010 (petition proceeding); *see also Prob. Code §§ 15306.5* (satisfaction of judgment from payments to which beneficiary otherwise entitled), 15307 (excess of amount necessary for education and support subject to enforcement of judgment)]. This form provides examples for use to obtain the beneficiary's interest in income or in principal for distribution to the petitioner instead of the beneficiary. The form may also be adapted to seek imposition of a lien on the trust property [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(b)*].

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges:

- The petitioner's status as a judgment creditor (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(b)*].

- The identity of respondents and a description of the trust (Paragraphs 2, 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*].

- A description of the underlying judgment and the amount due thereon (Paragraphs 5, 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010(b)*].

- The terms of the trust agreement controlling the amount of income to which the beneficiary is entitled (Paragraph 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 695.030(b)(1)* (interest in trust subject to enforcement of money judgment to extent provided by law), 709.010(b) (means of satisfying judgment by sale of beneficiary's interest, collection of trust income, and liquidation and transfer of trust, among others), *Prob. Code §§ 15306.5* (beneficiary's interest subject to judgment creditor's petition), 15307 (excess of amount for education and support subject to judgment creditor's petition)].

Optional Paragraph 8 is for use to allege the amount required for the beneficiary's education and support [*see Prob. Code § 15307* (excess of amount required for education and support subject to judgment creditor's petition)].

[4] Verification

Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010 does not require that the petition be verified.

[5] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[6] Filing of Petition

This petition is filed in the court having jurisdiction over administration of the trust, as prescribed in *Prob. Code §§ 17000-17457*; that is, the appropriate probate court. For discussion of jurisdiction and venue under *Prob. Code §§*

17000-17457, see Subpart D, of this chapter.

[7] Trust Property Subject to Enforcement of Money Judgment Generally

Generally, an interest in a trust is subject to enforcement of a money judgment to the extent provided by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 695.030(b)(1)*]. With the exception of a trust in which transfer of the beneficiary's interest is restrained, the entire interest of a beneficiary may be applied to the satisfaction of a money judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 695.030(a)*; *see also Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law*, 18 Cal. Law Revision Comm'n Reports 633-634 (1986); *see also § 560.255*]].

[8] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.521*.

For discussion and forms relating to an order applying nonvested interest to satisfaction of a judgment under *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.020*, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.180* et seq.

[9] State Constitution

Legal rate of interest on judgment. *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*

[10] State Statutes

Interest rate on judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010*

Enforcement of a money judgment against trust property generally. *Code Civ. Proc. § 695.030(b)(1)*

Exemption of trust beneficiary's interest from execution. *Code Civ. Proc. § 699.720(a)(8)*

Enforcement of money judgment against interest of beneficiary in trust. *Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*

Creditors' rights against property of trust subject to restraints of transfer. *Prob. Code §§ 15301(b), 15304, 15305, 15305.5, 15306, 15306.5, 15307*

[11] Decisions

Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010 provides procedure for enforcement of money judgment by directing trustee to make payment in satisfaction of judgment; procedure inapplicable to judgment in equitable action against beneficiary requiring beneficiary to pay money received from trust to a third party. *De Mille v. Ramsey (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 116, 127, 254 Cal. Rptr. 573*

Judgment creditor bears burden of proving existence of surplus income from trust estate over that necessary for support of judgment debtor. *Alvis v. Bank of America Nat. Trust & Assn (1950) 95 Cal. App. 2d 118, 124, 212 P.2d 608*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.631

§ 560.631 Order For Enforcement of Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor's Interest as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

[1] FORM Order For Enforcement of Money Judgment Against Judgment Debtor's Interest as Trust Beneficiary [Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	ORDER GRANTING PETITION TO ENFORCE
Respondent.	)	MONEY JUDGMENT
	)	
	)	

This proceeding for enforcement of a money judgment against the interest of respondent _____ [*name of beneficiary*] as a beneficiary of the _____ [*name of trust*] on the petition of _____ [*name of petitioner*] [, and the return and _____ (*specify responsive paper(s), e.g.,* response) of the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* beneficiary)], came on regularly for hearing on _____ [*date*], before this court, sitting without a jury. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] [; respondent beneficiary appeared by counsel _____ (*name*)]. [Evidence was introduced on behalf of both parties and the matter was argued and submitted for decision.]

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the petition ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That _____ [*specify payment or payments to be made by trustee to petitioner, e.g.*, commencing on _____ (*date*), and _____ (*specify period, e.g.*, monthly) thereafter, _____ (*name of trustee*), as trustee, withhold and pay to petitioner the sum of $_____ otherwise due the respondent beneficiary, until petitioner's judgment, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from and after _____ (*date of judgment*), is satisfied in full].

2. Petitioner recover costs herein incurred.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This order is for use to grant relief on a petition by a judgment creditor toenforce a money judgment against a judgment debtor's interest as a beneficiary of a trust [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 709.010*].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 560.551, 560.630*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
5. Actions Involving Third Persons

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.632-560.649

[Reserved]

§§ 560.632[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.650

§ 560.650 Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Prob. Code § 19003]--Notice by Publication [Prob. Code § 19040]

[1] FORM Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Prob. Code § 19003]--Notice by Publication [Prob. Code § 19040]

NOTICE TO CREDITORS
OF _____ [*name of deceased settlor*]
#_____ [*proceeding number*]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

Notice is hereby given to the creditors and contingent creditors of the above-named decedent that all persons having claims against the decedent are required to file them with the Superior Court at _____ [*address*], and mail a copy to _____ [*name*], as trustee of the trust dated _____, wherein the decedent was the settlor, at _____ [*address*], within the later of four months after _____ [the date of the first publication of notice to creditors], or, if notice is mailed or personally delivered to you, 60 days after the date this notice is mailed or personally delivered to you. A claim form may be obtained from the court clerk. For your protection, you are encouraged to file your claim by certified mail, with return receipt requested.

_____
[*Name and address of trustee or attorney*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice for use by the trustee of a revocable trust to give notice by publication of the settlor's death to the deceased settlor's creditors. The caption of the notice, the deceased settlor's name, and the name of the trustee must be in at least 8-point type, the text of the notice must be in at least 7-point type, and the language must be substantially as set forth in the form [*Prob. Code § 19040(b)*].

For discussion of the requirements for publishing the notice to creditors, see *§ 560.245[6]*.

[3] State Statutes

Notice to creditors of deceased settlor of revocable trust. *Prob. Code § 19003*

Requirements for publication. *Prob. Code §§ 19040, 19041*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.651

§ 560.651 Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Probate Code Section 19003]--Actual Notice [Prob. Code § 19052]

[1] FORM Notice to Creditors of Deceased Settlor of Revocable Trust [Probate Code Section 19003]--Actual Notice [Prob. Code § 19052]

[*Caption. See § 560.650.*]

Notice is hereby given to the creditors and contingent creditors of the above-named decedent that all persons having claims against the decedent are required to file them with the Superior Court at _____ [*address*], and mail or deliver a copy to _____ [*name*], as trustee of the trust dated _____, wherein the decedent was the settlor, at _____ [*address*], within the later of four months after _____ [*date of first publication of notice to creditors*], or, if notice is mailed or personally delivered to you, 60 days after the date this notice is mailed or personally delivered to you, or you must petition to file a late claim as provided in *Section 19103 of the Probate Code*. A claim form may be obtained from the court clerk. For your protection, you are encouraged to file your claim by certified mail, with return receipt requested.

_____	_____
[*Date of mailing this notice if applicable*]	[*Name and address of trustee or attorney*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice for use by the trustee of a revocable trust to notify creditors of the settlor of a revocable trust that the settlor has died. The language of the notice must be substantially as set forth, *above* [*Prob. Code § 19052*].

For further discussion of the requirements for actual notice to creditors, see *§ 560.245[7]*.

[3] Service of Notice

Notice must be given as provided in *Prob. Code § 1215* for mailing of notices [*Prob. Code § 19050*]. Alternatively, notice may be given by personal delivery because, under *Prob. Code § 1216*, personal delivery of a notice or other paper required or permitted to be mailed satisfies any statutory provision under the Probate Code requiring or permitting the mailing of the notice or paper [*see Prob. Code 1216*].

[4] State Statutes

Actual notice to creditors. *Prob. Code §§ 19052-19054*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.560*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.652

§ 560.652 Petition for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]--By Trustee or Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF _____ [ALLOWANCE *and/or* COMPROMISE *and/or* SETTLEMENT] OF CLAIM(S) AGAINST DECEASED SETTLOR OF REVOCABLE TRUST [AND FOR ALLOCATION BETWEEN TRUSTS OF AMOUNTS DUE ON CLAIMS]

_____

Petitioner, _____ [*name*], respectfully represents:

[*EITHER*]

1. Petitioner, _____ [*name*], is the duly appointed and acting trustee of the _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust").

[*OR*]

1. Petitioner, _____ [*name*], is the beneficiary of the _____ [*name of trust*] [(hereinafter referred to as "the trust")].

[*CONTINUE*]

2. The trust was created by _____ [*name of deceased settlor*] on _____ [*date*], by _____ [*specify method of creation of trust, e.g.,* a written declaration of trust].

3. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. The time for filing claims against the settlor of the trust expired on _____ [*date*].

5. The claims filed against the settlor of the trust, including the name of the claimant, the amount of the claim, the date the claim was filed, and the determination requested by the court, are as follows:

[*SET FORTH information in separately lettered paragraphs, e.g.:*]

a. Jackson Miller, M.D., claim for $3427 dated October 2, 2007, for expenses of deceased settlor's last illness, _____ [*set forth requested determination e.g.,* to be allowed and paid] on _____ [*date*].

b. Russell & White Mortuary, claim for $4297 dated October 22, 2007, for funeral services, _____ [*set forth disposition of claim e.g.,* to be allowed and paid] on _____ [*date*].

c. John Jones, claim for $37,500, dated October 15, 2007, for breach of contract _____ [*set forth requested determination e.g.,* to be compromised for $24,750, pursuant to the agreement of compromise and settlement attached hereto as Exhibit _____ and incorporated by reference, to be paid] on _____ [*date*].

[6. _____ (*Name of deceased settlor*) also left assets in _____ (*specify trust(s) as to which allocation of debts is desired, e.g.,* Trust B), which was/were revocable by him/her at the time of his/her death. The trustee(s) of _____ (*name of trust, e.g.,* Trust B) is/are _____ (*names(s)*). (*If more than one trust:* The trustee(s) of _____ (*name of trust, e.g.,* Trust C) is/are _____ (*names(s)*)).]

[7. The _____ (beneficiary *or* beneficiaries) of _____ (*specify trust(s) as to which allocation of debts is desired, e.g.,* Trust B) is/are _____ (*name(s)*).]

[8. _____ (*Name of deceased settlor*) left _____ (no instructions for the allocation of

debts between these trusts *or* instructions that _____ (*specify instructions, e.g.,* Trust A was to bear all funeral expenses and expenses of last illness, as well as 50 per cent of all other debts not satisfied from his/her probate estate and Trust B was to bear 50 per cent of all debts not satisfied from his/her probate estate other than funeral expenses and expenses of last illness)).]

[9. Petitioner requests that _____ (*set forth requested allocation, e.g.,* $_____ be allocated to _____ (*name of trust*) and that $_____ be allocated to _____ (*name of trust*)). This allocation _____ (is in accordance with the instructions of _____ (*name of deceased settlor*) *or specify reasons for requested allocation, e.g.,* reflects the proportion of the decedent's assets held by the respective trusts).]

[*EITHER*]

10. There are no other claimants whose interest in the trust will be affected by this petition.

[*OR*]

10. _____ [*Name(s)*] _____ [has a claim *or* have claims] against the trust, and his/her/its/their interest in the trust may be affected by this petition.

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that the court make an order approving _____ [payment *or* compromise and payment *or* settlement and payment] of claims set forth herein, and for such other relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Petitioner
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by the trustee or a beneficiary in obtaining approval of an allowance, compromise, or settlement

of claims against the deceased settlor of a revocable trust [*see Prob. Code § 19020*]. It is not necessary to file a copy of the trust with the petition or that the petition disclose the beneficial interests of the trust [*Prob. Code § 19022(b)*].

For further discussion of the requirements for petitioning for approval of an allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims against the deceased settlor, see *§ 560.252*

[3] Contents of Petition

The petition for approval of allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims must set forth the following [*Prob. Code § 19020(b)*]:

- A description of the trust (Paragraphs 1 and 2).
- The names of the claimants with respect to which the action is requested (Paragraph 5)
- A description of each claim (Paragraph 5).
- The requested determination by the court with respect to the claims (Paragraph 5).
- The beneficiaries of the trust (Paragraph 3).
- Those claimants whose interest in the trust may be affected the petition(alternate Paragraphs 10).
- The trustees of any other trust to which an allocation of liability may be approved by the court pursuant to the petition (Optional Paragraphs 6-9).

[4] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. The petition also does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[5] Verification

The petition must be verified [*see Prob. Code § 1021(a)*; *see also Prob. Code § 12* ("shall" is mandatory)]. If a verified petition is not opposed, it will be accepted as evidence [*see Prob. Code § 1022*].

[6] Venue

The petition is to be filed with the superior court for the county where the deceased settlor resided at the time of death or, if none, in any county in which trust property was located at the time of the settlor's death or, if none, in the county that was the principal place of administration of the trust at the time of the settlor's death [*Prob. Code §§ 19003(b), 19021*].

If the petition seeks approval of allocation to two or more trusts for which *Prob. Code § 19003* prescribes superior courts for more than one county, the court located in the county prescribed for the trustee initiating the proceeding has jurisdiction [*Prob. Code § 19021*].

[7] Notice and Hearing

The clerk will set a hearing date for the petition, and, at least 30 days before the time set for the hearing, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on each of the creditors whose interests in the estate may be affected by the petition and to be mailed to certain other persons who are not petitioners [*see Prob. Code §§ 19022(c), 19023*]. Any interested person may appear to respond or object to the petition [*see Prob. Code §§ 1040, 1043*]. For further discussion of notice and hearing procedures relating to the petition for approval and settlement of claims, see *§§ 560.252*[2,] 560.252[3].

[8] State Statutes

Petition for approval and settlement of claims against deceased settlor. *Prob. Code §§ 19020-19030*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.653

§ 560.653 Order for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]

[1] FORM Order for Approval of Allowance, Compromise, or Settlement of Claims [Prob. Code § 19020]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In the Matter of _____ [*name of trust*]	))))	NO. _____ ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF _____ [ALLOWANCE *and/or* COMPROMISE *and/or* SETTLEMENT] OF CLAIM(S) AGAINST DECEASED SETTLOR OF REVOCABLE TRUST [AND FOR ALLOCATION BETWEEN TRUSTS OF AMOUNTS DUE ON CLAIMS]

_____

The verified petition of _____ [*name*], as the _____ [trustee *or* beneficiary] of the _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust"), for an order approving the _____ [allowance *and/or* compromise *and/or* settlement] of claim(s) against _____ [*name of decedent*], as settlor of the trust, in the amount of $_____, came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ [*name*] [; _____ (*name*), objector, appeared by counsel _____ (*name*)].

The court finds from proof made to its satisfaction:

1. Notice of the time and place of the hearing was given as required by law.

2. _____ [The *or* Each] claim is a claim within the meaning of *Probate Code Section 19000 et seq.*

3. _____ [The *or* Each] claim was timely filed.

4. _____ [The *or* Each] claim is valid.

WHEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

1. The following claim(s) against _____ [*name of decedent*], as settlor of the trust, is/are approved:

[*SET FORTH claims to be approved in as many subparagraphs an necessary, e.g.:*]

a. Jackson Miller, M.D., claim for $3427 dated October 2, 2007, for expenses of deceased settlor's last illness, to be paid on _____ [*date*].

b. Russell & White Mortuary, claim for $4297 dated October 22, 2007, for funeral services, to be paid on _____ [*date*].

[*SET OUT any further orders regarding compromise or settlement in as many paragraphs as necessary, e.g.,:*]

2. The compromise of the claim of John Jones for $37,500, dated October 15, 2007,for breach of contract for $24,750 is approved, and the sum of $24,750 is to be paid in full satisfaction of that claim on _____ [*date*].

Dated _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in obtaining court approval of the allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims against the deceased settlor of a revocable trust [*see Prob. Code § 19202 et seq.*].

For further discussion relating to a court's order on a petitioning for approval of an allowance, compromise, or settlement of claims against the deceased settlor, see *§§ 560.252[4], [5]*.

[3] State Statutes

Court order on petition for approval and settlement of claims against deceased settlor. *Prob. Code §§ 19025-19027*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.652*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.654

§ 560.654 Notice of Pendency of Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255]

[1] FORM Notice of Pendency of Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255].

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF ACTION AGAINST
Trustee of _____	)	REVOCABLE TRUST OF DECEASED SETTLOR
[*name of trust*], Defendant.	)	ON REJECTED CLAIM
	)	
	)	

_____

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], an action on a claim against the above-entitled trust was filed and is pending in the _____ [Municipal Court of the _____ (*name*) _____ (Municipal *or* Judicial) District *or* Superior Court] of _____County, California, entitled _____ [*name*], Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*], as Trustee of _____ [*name of trust*], No. _____.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form is a notice for use by a creditor bringing an action on a rejected claim against a deceased settlor's revocable trust to give notice of the pendency of the action to the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 19255*].

[3] Filing and Service

The creditor must file a notice of the pendency of the action or the referral to a referee or to arbitration with the court clerk in the trust proceeding, together with proof of giving a copy of the notice to the trustee as provided in *Prob. Code § 1215* [*Prob. Code § 19255(c)*; for discussion of *Prob. Code § 1215, see* Ch. 447, *Probate: Statutory Notice Requirements*].

Personal service of a copy of the summons and complaint on the trustee is equivalent to the filing and giving of the notice [*Prob. Code § 19255(c)*].

[4] State Statutes

Notice of pendency of action on rejected claim. *Prob. Code § 19255(c)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.655

§ 560.655 Complaint for Damages in Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255]--By Creditor Against Revocable Trust

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages in Action Against Revocable Trust on Rejected Claim [Prob. Code § 19255]--By Creditor Against Revocable Trust

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT ON REJECTED CLAIM AGAINST
Trustee of _____	)	TRUST FOR _____ [*e.g.,* DAM-
[*name of trust*], Defendant.	)	AGES FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT]
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name*], decedent, died. Decedent was the settlor of _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust").

2. The trust was created on _____ [*date*], by _____ [*specify method of creation of trust, e.g.,* a written declaration of trust].

3. Defendant _____ [*name*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting trustee of the trust.

4. On _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*name*), on plaintiff's behalf,] filed a claim in the amount of $_____ against the trust with the clerk of the court. On _____ [*date*], _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*name*), on plaintiff's behalf,] also _____ [mailed *or* delivered] a copy of the claim to _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*name*), defendant's attorney]. A copy of the claim as so filed is attached hereto as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated by reference.

[*EITHER, if plaintiff rejected claim*]

5. On _____ [*date*], defendant rejected the claim _____ [in its entirety *or* in the amount of $_____ and allowed it in the amount of $_____], filed the [allowance and] rejection with the clerk of the court in the above-mentioned proceeding under the Trust Law, and served plaintiff with written notice of the [partial] rejection on _____ [*date*].

[*OR, if plaintiff treats inaction on claim as rejection of claim*]

5. Thirty days have passed since _____ [plaintiff *or* _____ (*name*), on plaintiff's behalf,] filed the claim with the clerk of the court in the above-mentioned proceeding under the Trust Law and provided defendant with a copy of the claim. Defendant has refused or neglected to act on the claim. Pursuant to *Probate Code Section 19254*, plaintiff elects to treat this inaction on the claim as equivalent to notice of rejection of the claim.

[*CONTINUE*]

6. During the decedent's lifetime, and on or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege here, and in subsequent paragraphs, all allegations necessary to a complete cause of action for damages for breach of contract or for personal injuries or other, as appropriate, as would be done in an action against decedent while alive*].

7. _____ [No part *or* Only $_____ (*set forth amount allowed and paid*)] of the sum of $_____, which is the total amount of plaintiff's claim as filed, has been paid by decedent, by defendant as the trustee of the trust, or otherwise.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant, as trustee of the trust, as follows:

1. For judgment in the sum of $_____;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred;

3. For reasonable litigation expenses, including attorney's fees, expended in this action; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

Dated _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Add verification if desired.*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a creditor to bring an action on a claim against the revocable trust of a deceased settlor when the claim has been rejected, in whole or in part, by the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 19255*].

For further discussion relating to actions on a rejected claim, including the prevailing party's right to recover costs and potential for recovery of litigation expenses including attorney's fees under *Prob. Code § 19255(e)*, see *§ 560.254*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint contains the following allegations:

- Description of the trust (Paragraphs 1-3);
- A claim was filed by the claimant (Paragraph 4);
- The claim was rejected by the trustee (Alternate Paragraphs 5); and
- The creditor has suffered damages (Paragraphs 6 and 7).

[4] Notice of Pendency of Action

The creditor must file a notice of pendency of the action with the court together proof of giving notice to the trustee [*see Prob. Code § 19255(c)*]. For a notice, *see § 560.654*.

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification also will preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Venue

In addition to any other county in which an action on a rejected claim may be commenced, the action may be commenced in the county or city and county in which the principal place of administration of the trust is located [*Prob. Code § 19255(b)*].

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 560.654*.

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, andfictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to fax service and filing of papers, see Ch. 264, *Fax Filing and Service of Papers*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms for allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative verification forms, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[8] State Statutes

Action on rejected claim against revocable trust. *Prob. Code § 19255(c)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.656

§ 560.656 Petition to Allocate Responsibility for Debts Payable by Decedent's Revocable Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19320]--By Trustee, Surviving Spouse, Personal Representative, Settlor's Estate, or Beneficiary

[1] FORM Petition to Allocate Responsibility for Debts Payable by Decedent's Revocable Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19320]--By Trustee, Surviving Spouse, Personal Representative, Settlor's Estate, or Beneficiary
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
In the Matter of the	)	PETITION TO ALLOCATE RESPONSIBILITY
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	FOR DEBTS PAYABLE BY DECEDENT'S RE-
	)	VOCABLE TRUST AND SURVIVING SPOUSE
		[*Prob. Code § 19320*]

_____

Petitioner, _____ [*name*], respectfully represents:

[*EITHER*]

1. Petitioner is the trustee of _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust"), a revocable trust that was settled by _____ [*name of decedent*] on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name of decedent*] died on _____ [*date*].

[*OR*]

1. Petitioner is the surviving spouse of _____ [*name of decedent*], who died on _____ [*date*].

[*OR*]

1. Petitioner is the personal representative of the estate of _____ [*name of decedent*], who died on _____ [*date*].

[*OR*]

1. Petitioner is a beneficiary of _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust"), a revocable trust that was settled by _____ [*name of decedent*] on _____ [*date*]. _____ [*Name of decedent*] died on _____ [*date*].

[*CONTINUE*]

2. All the debts of the decedent and [petitioner, as] the surviving spouse[,] known to the petitioner and subject to allocation are _____ [listed onExhibit _____, attached hereto and made a part hereof *or* the following: _____ (*list*)].

3. The above-described debts should be allocated between [petitioner, as] the surviving spouse of decedent[,] and _____ [the trust *or* _____ (*name of trust*) (hereinafter referred to as "the trust"), a revocable trust that was settled by decedent on _____ (*date*)] for the following reason(s): _____ [*set forth reasons(s)*].

4. Petitioner proposes the following allocation in the belief that it is in the best manner in which to allocate responsibility for the debts listed above between the trust and [petitioner, as] the surviving spouse: _____ [*set forth proposed allocation*].

[5. Petitioner and _____ (*name(s)*), the _____ (personal representative of decedent's estate *and/or* decedent's surviving spouse *and/or* the trustee of the trust) have agreed to the allocation set forth in Paragraph 4, above.]

[6. The above-proposed allocation is affected by the value of the separate property of the surviving spouse and community property and quasi-community property not administered in the trust, because _____ (*specify reasons why allocation would be affected*). The surviving spouse has not provided an inventory and appraisal of this property.]

7. The names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries of the trust are as follows:

Name	Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays after due notice and hearing for an order as follows:

[1. Approving the allocation agreement between petitioner and _____ (*names*).]

2. Directing _____ [*name or* petitioner], as the trustee of the trust, to charge the amounts to be allocated to _____ [*name or* petitioner], as surviving spouse, against any of his/her property or interests that are in the possession or control of _____ [*name or* petitioner], as trustee of the trust.

3. Directing _____ [*name or* petitioner], as surviving spouse, to make payment of the amount to be allocated to the trust to _____ [*name or* petitioner], the trustee of the trust, to the extent that his/her property or interests that are in the possession or control of _____ [*name or* petitioner], as trustee, are insufficient to satisfy the allocation.

4. Directing _____ [*name or* petitioner], as trustee of the trust, to make payment of the amounts allocated to the trust by payment to the surviving spouse or creditors;

[5. Ordering _____ (*name of surviving spouse*) to show cause why the information concerning the inventory of the separate property and quasi-community property not administered in the trust as well as the value thereof should not be furnished to the petitioner.]

6. For such other and further orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Petitioner
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition is for use in obtaining an order allocating responsibility for debts between a decedent's revocable trust and his or her surviving spouse [*see Prob. Code § 19320*].

[3] Contents

This form includes the following:

- The petitioner's capacity and standing (Alternate Paragraphs 1);

- A statement of all debts of the decedent and surviving spouse known to the petitioner that are alleged to be subject to allocation and whether those debts have been paid in whole, paid in part, or have not been paid(Paragraph 2) [*Prob. Code § 19321(a)*];

- The reason why the debts should be allocated (Paragraph 3) [*Prob. Code § 19321(b)*]; and

- The proposed allocation and the basis for the allocation alleged by the petitioner (Paragraphs 4-6) [*Prob. Code § 19321(c)*], including an optional statement that the trustee, the personal representative, if any, of the decedent's estate, and the surviving spouse have agreed to the proposed allocation [*Prob. Code § 19324*].

The petition also includes an optional allegation to use when the petitioner is seeking an order to show cause why the surviving spouse should not file an inventory and appraisal of his or her own property (Optional Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 19322*].

[4] Verification

The petition must be verified [*see Prob. Code § 1021*; *see also Prob. Code § 12* ("shall" is mandatory)]. If a verified petition is not opposed, it will be accepted as evidence [*see Prob. Code § 1022*].

[5] Venue

The petition is required to be filed in the superior court in the principal place of administration of the trust [*see Prob. Code § 17000(a), 17002, 17005(a)(1)*], unless there is no trustee, in which case it is filed in the county where the trust property, or some of it, is located [*see Prob. Code § 17000(a), 17002, 17005(a)(2)*].

[6] Notice of Hearing

At least 30 days before the time set for the hearing on the petition, the petitioner must cause notice of the time and place of the hearing and a copy of the petition to be served on the surviving spouse in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 413.10 et seq.* for service of a summons, and mailed to specified other persons who are not petitioners [*Prob. Code § 19323*; *see § 560.256[5]*].

[7] List of Beneficiaries

The petition must state the names and last known addresses of all vested or contingent beneficiaries, including all persons in being who may or will receive trust income or corpus. However, during the time that a trust is revocable and the person holding the power to revoke the trust is competent, the names and last known addresses of beneficiaries who do not hold the power to revoke do not need to be stated. Additionally, the petition does not need to state the name and last known address of any beneficiary who, under *Prob. Code § 15804* (beneficiaries with a future interest in the trust), need not be given notice [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 7.902*].

[8] State Statutes

Allocation of debts between trust and surviving spouse. *Prob. Code §§ 19320-19326*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.657

§ 560.657 Order to Show Cause Why Information Concerning Property of Surviving Spouse Should Not Be Furnished to Petitioner [Prob. Code § 19322]

[1] FORM Order to Show Cause Why Information Concerning Property of Surviving Spouse Should Not Be Furnished to Petitioner [Prob. Code § 19322]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
In the Matter of the	)	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
_____ [*name of trust*].	)	[*Prob. Code § 19322*]
	)	

_____

TO _____ [*name of surviving spouse*]:

You are hereby ordered to appear before this court [in Department _____] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], then and there to show cause why you should not furnish to _____ [*name of petitioner*] an inventory and appraisal of your separate property and of any community property and quasi-community property not administered in _____ [*name of trust*], to effectuate the allocation and payment of debts as set forth in the attached petition of _____ [*name of petitioner*].

Dated _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form is an order to show cause for use when the petition to allocate debt appears to indicate that allocation would be affected by the value of the separate property of the surviving spouse and any community property and quasi-community property not administered in the trust, and when an inventory and appraisal of the property has not been provided by the surviving spouse. In such a case, the court is required to make an order to show cause why the information should not be provided [*Prob. Code § 19322*].

[3] State Statutes

Order to show cause why information relating to property of surviving spouse should not be provided. *Prob. Code § 19322*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.654*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.658

§ 560.658 Order Allocating Debts Between Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19325]

[1] FORM Order Allocating Debts Between Trust and Surviving Spouse [Prob. Code § 19325]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
In the Matter of the	)	ORDER ALLOCATING DEBTS
_____ [*name of trust*]	)	[*Prob. Code § 19325*]
	)	

_____

The petition of _____ [*name*] for an order to allocate responsibility for the debts of _____ [*name of decedent*], settlor of _____ [*name of trust*] (hereinafter referred to as "the trust"), between the trust and _____ [*name of surviving spouse*], decedent's surviving spouse, came on regularly for hearing by the court this date. [Petitioner appeared by counsel _____ (*name*). (*Specify other appearances, if any, e.g.,* _____ (*name*) appeared by counsel _____ (*name*), in opposition to the petition.)].

The court finds from proof made to the satisfaction of the court:

1. Notice of the time and place of the hearing was given as required by law.

2. All facts set forth in the petition are true.

[3. _____ (*Set forth additional findings as desired, e.g.,* The agreement for allocation between

_____ (*name*), as trustee of the trust, and _____ (*name*), as the decedent's surviving spouse, substantially protects the rights of all persons who are interested in the trust.)]

IT IS ORDERED that [, pursuant to the agreement for allocation,] the debts payable by the estate and the surviving spouse are to be apportioned as follows: _____ [*set forth apportionment of each debt*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that:

1. The trustee charge against the property or interests of the surviving spouse all debts allocated to the surviving spouse pursuant to this order as follows: _____ [*set forth property or interests of surviving spouse that are in trustee's possession or control and amount of debt to be allocated to each item of property or interest*];

[2. The surviving spouse pay to the trustee the additional sum of $_____ in satisfaction of all remaining debts allocated to him/her pursuant to this order;]

3. The trustee pay to _____ [the surviving spouse *or* the hereafter-named creditors] the following amounts in satisfaction of all debts allocated to the estate pursuant to the order: _____ [*set forth amounts to be paid to surviving spouse for each creditor, or to each creditor*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use in allocating the debts between the property in a revocable trust settled by a decedent and the decedent's surviving spouse [*Prob. Code § 19325*]. For further discussion, see *§ 560.256[6]*

[3] State Statutes

Order directing allocation. *Prob. Code § 19325*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.654*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administration Of Express Trusts
6. Claims Against Decedent's Revocable Trust

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.659-560.669

[Reserved]

§§ 560.659[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.670

§ 560.670 Complaint for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. § 526] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] Against Nonprofit Public or Mutual Benefit Corporation for Breach of Charitable Trust [Corp. Code §§ 5142, 7142]--Member's Derivative Action [Corp. Code §§ 5710, 7710]

[1] FORM Complaint for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. § 526] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422] Against Nonprofit Public or Mutual Benefit Corporation for Breach of Charitable Trust [Corp. Code §§ 5142, 7142]--Member's Derivative Action [Corp. Code §§ 5710, 7710]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR PRELIMINARY AND PER-
_____ [*names*],	)	MANENT INJUNCTION
Defendants.	)	(Breach of Charitable Trust)
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. At all times herein mentioned, and at the time of the acts complained of herein, plaintiff was a member of defendant corporation.

[*OR*]

1. Plaintiff's membership in _____ [*name of corporation*], defendant corporation, devolved on plaintiff on _____ [*date*], by _____ [*nature of operation of law resulting in devolution of membership, e.g.,* legacy] from _____ [*name of holder*], who was a member of defendant corporation at the time of the disputed acts.

[*CONTINUE*]

2. Defendant, _____ [*name of corporation*], hereinafter referred to as "the corporation" is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a nonprofit _____ [public *or* mutual] benefit corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California _____ [*either, if corporation is a public benefit corporation,* for charitable purposes *or, if corporation is a municipal benefit corporation holding charitable assets in trust* for lawful purposes, including _____ (*identify charitable purpose*)], and has its principal place of business in _____ County, California.

3. Defendants _____ (*names*) are, and at all times herein mentionedwere, _____ [*identify additional defendants, e.g.,* the duly elected and acting directors of the corporation].

4. _____ [*Allege residence of each additional defendant, e.g.,* Defendant director _____ (*name*) is a resident of _____, County, California].

[5. Defendant(s), _____ (*name*(*s*)), entered into a contract with defendant _____ (*name of corporation*) on or about _____ [*date*], which provides that _____ (*describe relevant provisions of contract to be rescinded or enjoined*)].

6. Defendant _____ (*name of corporation*) holds _____ [real and personal *or* real *or* personal] property subject to charitable trust. This property was received and is held by the corporation for the uses and purposes specified in _____ [its articles of incorporation *or* the trust instrument dated _____ [*date*], pursuant to which the assets were transferred to the corporation], and for no other use or purpose. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that information allege, that the property held subject to trust has a present value in excess of $_____.

[*EITHER, if corporation is a public benefit corporation*]

7. The provisions of the articles of incorporation of the corporation relating to the purposes for which the corporation was formed read: _____ [*set forth relevant provisions*].

[*OR, if corporation is a mutual benefit corporation holding charitable assets in trust*]

7. The provisions of the trust instrument relating to the charitable purposes for which the corporation administers the aforesaid assets read: _____ [*set forth relevant provisions*].

[*CONTINUE*]

8. In accordance with its purposes, and at all times since its incorporation until on or about _____ [

date], the corporation under its board of directors has been _____ [*specify nature of corporation, e.g.,* an osteopathic medical and surgical college in which young men and women are trained in osteopathic medicine].

9. Ever since _____ [its incorporation *or* accepting the assets pursuant to the aforesaid trust instrument] until on or about _____ [*date*], the corporation has actively pursued and fulfilled the charitable purposes set out in the provisions of the _____ [articles of incorporation *or* trust instrument] of _____ [*specify charitable purposes, e.g.,* providing scholarships to young men and women who are studying osteopathic medicine and funding improvements in equipment and other facilities for the study of osteopathic medicine].

10. Defendant directors have repudiated and abandoned the aforesaid charitable purposes and threaten to and, unless enjoined, will divert the funds and other assets of the corporation to purposes other than and contrary to the aforesaid charitable purposes [for which defendant directors and their predecessors in office have solicited and received funds since the incorporation of defendant corporation] in that: _____ [*allege facts of transaction resulting in breach of trust, including, if applicable, entry into a contract sought to be rescinded or enjoined*].

[11. _____ (*State facts showing that none of the parties to the contract has, in good faith and without actual notice of the trust restriction, parted with value under or in reliance on the contract, e.g.,* On or about _____ [*date*], on learning of the proposed contract and before any party to it had parted with value under or in reliance on it, plaintiff informed all parties to the contract that under the express terms of the trust the _____ (*specify trust's restriction that precludes the contract*).]

[*EITHER*]

12. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff made the following efforts to secure action by the board of directors of the corporation to correct the wrongful acts complained of herein: _____ [*describe efforts with particularity*].

[*OR*]

12. Plaintiff did not make any effort to secure action by the board of directors of the corporation to correct the wrongful acts complained of herein, because any effort would have been futile in that _____ [*set forth facts demonstrating futility of demand*].

[*CONTINUE*]

13. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [informed the board of directors of the ultimate facts of each cause of action herein alleged *or* delivered to the board of directors a true copy of the complaint which plaintiff proposed to file].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendants to show cause if they have any, why they should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendancy of this action;

2. For a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction enjoining defendants, and each of them, and their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them from _____ [

specify, e.g., amending the articles of incorporation of defendant corporation or changing or in any way derogating from the charitable purposes set forth in the articles of incorporation];

3. For costs herein; and

4. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 560.520.*]

CAUTION:
A complaint seeking preliminary injunction must either be verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*). The court may not grant a preliminary injunction unless the complaint or affidavits show that there are sufficient grounds for such an injunction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a member of a nonprofit corporation administering the assets of a charitable trust to seek preliminary and permanent injunctions against breach of the trust [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142(a)(1), 7142(a)(1)*; *see also Civ. Code § 3422* (grounds for final injunction); *Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (injunctive relief when obligation arises from a trust)]. Inasmuch as the action is derivative in nature, because it is brought on behalf of the corporation acting as trustee, the plaintiff must comply with the requirements for bringing a derivative suit [*see Corp. Code §§ 5710, 7710*]. For further discussion and forms for use in derivative actions under the analogous General Corporation Law, see Ch. 168, *Corporations: Derivative Actions* .

This form may be adapted for use by plaintiffs other than a member of the corporation [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142(a), 7142(a)* (standing of corporation, officer or director, person with reversionary, contractual or property interest in assets of trust, Attorney General or person granted relator status)].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The plaintiff's standing (Paragraph 1) [*see Corp. Code §§ 5710(b)(2), 7710(b)(2)*];
- The capacity and principal place of business of defendant corporation (Paragraph 2);
- The identities of additional defendants, such as directors or officers of the corporation, and their residences (Paragraphs 3 and 4);

- The nature and value of property held in trust (Paragraph 6);

- The provisions of the articles of incorporation or trust instrument relating to the corporation's charitable purposes (Paragraph 7);

- The charitable purposes of the corporation (Paragraphs 8 and 9);

- The facts concerning the transaction resulting in breach of the charitable trust (Paragraph 10);

- The efforts made by plaintiff to secure action by the directors, or the reasons why such efforts would be futile (Paragraph 12) [*see Corp. Code §§ 5710(b)(2), 7710(b)(2)*]; and

- Notice to the board of directors by the plaintiff concerning the facts of this cause of action (Paragraph 13) [*see Corp. Code §§ 5710(b)(2), 7710(b)(2)*].

Optional allegations are included for use if the action seeks to rescind or enjoin the performance of a contract (Paragraphs 5 and 11) [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142(b)(1), 7142(b)(1)*; *see* § 560.679.[4]].

[4] Rescission or Injunction Against Performance of Contract

In an action under *Corp. Code § 5142* or *7142* for breach of a charitable trust the court may not rescind or enjoin the performance of a contract unless (1) all of the contracting parties are parties to the action, (2) no party to the contract has, in good faith and without actual notice of the trust restriction, parted with value under or in reliance on the contract, and (3) it is equitable to do so [*see Corp. Code §§ 5142(b), 7142(b)*]. For discussion and forms relating to rescission of contracts in general, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

[5] Necessity for Alleging Capacity

Nonprofit public benefit corporations and municipal benefit corporations have the capacity to sue and be sued [*see Corp. Code §§ 5004* (applicability of Code of Civil Procedure), 5140 (powers of public benefit corporation), 7140 (powers ofmunicipal benefit corporation)]. Technically, legal capacity need not be specifically alleged in a pleading, because lack of capacity, if apparent on the face of the complaint, should ordinarily be raised by an answer or demurrer [*Los Angeles Railway Co. v. Davis (1905) 146 Cal. 179, 180-181, 79 P. 865]* . However, the general practice appears to be to include allegations of capacity.

Allegations of the principal place of business of the corporate parties to an action are customarily included, although they are not necessary unless venue is based on location of the corporation's principal place of business [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (corporate defendant); *Corp. Code § 5068* (defining "proper county" regarding certain actions involving nonprofit corporations)].

[6] Jurisdiction

A derivative suit is an equitable action [*see Gaillard v. Natomas Co. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 410, 419, 219 Cal. Rptr. 74]* . Thus, the action is in the jurisdiction of the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b)*].

[7] Notice to Attorney General

In an action brought to enjoin, correct, obtain damages for, or to otherwise remedy a breach of a charitable trust, the Attorney General must be given notice, and may intervene [*Corp. Code §§ 5142(a), 7142(a)*].

[8] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.520*.

For alternative allegations of corporate capacity, see Ch. 160, *Corporations: Capacity* and Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For a discussion of and forms for use in obtaining injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

[9] State Statutes

Breach of obligation arising out of trust as ground for permanent injunctive relief. *Civ. Code § 3422*

Breach of obligation arising out of trust as ground for preliminary injunctive relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Action for breach of charitable trust by a nonprofit public benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 5142*

Requirements for bringing members' derivative action against nonprofit public benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 5710(b)*

Action for breach of charitable trust by a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 7142*

Requirements for bringing members' derivative action against nonprofit mutual benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 7710(b)*

[10] Text References

California Corporation Laws, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.671

§ 560.671 Complaint for Actual and Punitive Damages or Accounting [Corp. Code §§ 5233(h), 7238] Based on Self-Dealing Transaction by Director [Corp. Code §§ 5233(c), 7238]--By Other Director or Officer on Behalf of Nonprofit Corporation

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Actual and Punitive Damages or Accounting [Corp. Code §§ 5233(h), 7238] Based on Self-Dealing Transaction by Director [Corp. Code §§ 5233(c), 7238]--By Other Director or Officer on Behalf of Nonprofit Corporation

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*names*],	)	(Self-dealing Transaction by Director of Nonprofit
Defendants.	)	Organization)
	)	[*Corp. Code §§ 5233, 7238*]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff, _____ [*name of director or officer*], is and at all times mentioned herein was, a _____ [director *or* officer] of _____ [*name of corporation*].

2. [*Capacity of defendant nonprofit corporation. See § 560.670, Paragraph 2*].

3. Defendant, _____ [*name of director*], was at all times herein mentioned a director of the corporation.

4. Defendant, _____ [*name of Attorney General*], is the duly constituted Attorney General of the State of California and as such is charged with the supervision and enforcement of all charitable trusts.

5. _____ [*Allege facts showing contract or transaction that is basis of action, e.g.,* On or about _____ [*date*], after negotiations conducted on behalf of _____ (*name of defendant nonprofit corporation*) by _____ (*name of defendant director*), _____ (*name of defendant nonprofit corporation*) entered into a contract with _____ (*name of buyer*) for the sale of a parcel of property at _____ (*street address*), _____ County, California. On or about, _____ [*date*], on payment to _____ (*name of defendant nonprofit corporation*) of $_____, _____ (*name of defendant nonprofit corporation*) conveyed the property in accordance with the contract].

6. _____ [*Name of defendant director*] had a material financial interest in the transaction described above in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant at that time owned 8000 shares of common stock in _____ (*name of buyer*), which represented 80 percent of the outstanding shares in _____ (*name of buyer*)].

[7. _____ (*Allege any additional facts showing lack of good faith or intent to further best interests of corporation, e.g.,* Two days after the sale of the property to _____ (*name of buyer*), _____ (*name of buyer*) sold the property for $_____, a 250 percent profit over the amount paid to _____ (*name of defendant nonprofit corporation*).]

[*EITHER, if alleging measure of damages*]

8. Defendant _____ [*name of nonprofit corporation*] has lost _____ [*specify property lost to corporation as a result of transaction*], valued at $_____on the date of the transaction described above, [together with $_____in _____ (income *and/or* appreciation) that _____ (*name of nonprofit corporation*) would have earned from the property since that date had the transaction not occurred].

[*OR, if alleging necessity for accounting*]

8. The amount of money and other property due from defendant _____ [*name of director*] to _____ [*name of nonprofit corporation*] is unknown to plaintiff and cannot be ascertained without an accounting of the proceeds that defendant _____ [*name of director*] has gained by reason of the transaction. _____ [Plaintiff has demanded an accounting of the transaction from defendant director and payment of any sum found to be due and delivery of any property that defendant should in equity return to the corporation, but defendant has failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to render such an accounting *or allege facts showing that a demand would have been futile*].

[9. With respect to the acts described above, defendant _____ (*name of director*) acted _____ (maliciously *or* fraudulently) in that _____ (*specify actions related to transaction that show malice or fraud*).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant director as follows:

[*EITHER*]

1. For general damages in the amount of $_____;

[*OR*]

1. For an accounting for any profits defendant _____ [*name of director*] may have made by reason of the transaction described above;

2. For the amount of defendant's profit to be paid to _____ [*name of nonprofit corporation*];

[*CONTINUE*]

3. For interest [on the sum of $_____] at the legal rate from or after _____, [*month/day*] _____ [*year*];

[4. For exemplary damages in the sum of $_____;]

5. For costs herein; and

6. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to bring an action against a director of a nonprofit public or mutual benefit corporation for a self-dealing transaction [*see Corp. Code §§ 5233* (public benefit corporations), 7238 (mutual benefit corporations holding charitable assets in trust)]. The form is for use by a plaintiff who is a director or officer of the corporation, but it may be adapted for use if the plaintiff is the corporation, a member, or any person who has been granted relator status by the Attorney General [see *Corp. Code § 5233(c)*].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The plaintiff's standing (Paragraph 1) [see *Corp. Code § 5233(c)*];
- The capacity of defendant director (Paragraph 3) [*see Corp. Code § 5233(a)*];
- Joinder of the Attorney General (Paragraph 4) [*see Corp. Code § 5233(c)*]; (
- Facts showing that the defendant director had a material financial interest in the transaction (Paragraphs 5-6)].

Paragraph 8 is for use to allege a measure of damages or to seek an accounting (Alternative Paragraphs 8) [*see Corp. Code § 5233(h)*]. Optional Paragraphs 7 and 9 are for use to establish a basis for exemplary damages [*see Corp. Code § 5233(h)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 560.671[5]*.

[4] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*], and will also preclude a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Remedies

If a self-dealing transaction has occurred, the interested director or directors must perform those acts and pay those damages that, in the court's discretion, will provide an equitable and fair remedy to the corporation. Relevant factors are any benefit received by the corporation and whether the interested director or directors acted in good faith and with intent to further the best interest of the corporation [*Corp. Code § 5233(h)*]. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the court may order the director to do any or all of the following [*Corp. Code § 5233(h)*]:

- Account for any profits made from the transaction and pay them to the corporation.
- Pay the corporation the value of the use of any of its property used in the transaction.
- Return or replace any property lost to the corporation as a result of the transaction, together with any income or appreciation lost by reason of the transaction, or account for any proceeds of sale of the property, and pay the proceeds to the corporation together with interest at the legal rate. The court may award prejudgment interest to the extent allowed in *Civ. Code § 3287* or *3288*. Moreover, the court has discretion to grant exemplary damages for a fraudulent or malicious violation of *Corp. Code § 5233*.

[6] Venue

An action for damages based on the self-dealing of a director of a nonprofit corporation must be brought in the superior court of the county in which the corporation's principal office in California is located, or, if the corporation has no such office, in Sacramento County [*Corp. Code § 5068, 5233(c)*].

[7] Attorney General as Indispensible Party

The Attorney General is an indispensible party to an action challenging the self-dealing transaction of a director of a nonprofit corporation under *Corp. Code § 5233* [*see Corp. Code § 5233(c)*].

[8] Statute of Limitations

When brought by a party other than the Attorney General, the action must be filed within two years after written notice has been filed with the Attorney General setting forth the material facts of the transaction and the director's interest in it or, if no such notice is filed, within three years after the transaction occurred. The Attorney General may file the action within 10 years after the transaction occurred [*Corp. Code § 5233(e)*].

[9] State Statutes

Corporation's power to contract, borrow, or lend. *Corp. Code § 5140*

Action by board without meeting. *Corp. Code § 5211(b)*

Restrictions on power of committee to approve self-dealing transaction. *Corp. Code § 5212(a)(8)*

Self-dealing transaction of director of public benefit corporation defined; action authorized. *Corp. Code § 5233*

Corp. Code § 5233 made applicable to mutual benefit corporations holding assets in charitable trust. *Corp. Code § 7238*

[10] Text References

Ballantine and Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations* (Matthew Bender)

[11] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.520*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.672

§ 560.672 Affirmative Defense Allegations to Action for Damages Based on Defendant Director's Alleged Self-Dealing Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233]--Prior Approval of Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2), (3)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegations to Action for Damages Based on Defendant Director's Alleged Self-Dealing Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233]--Prior Approval of Transaction [Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2), (3)]

AS A [_____ (*specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. _____ [*Name of corporation*] entered into the transaction for its own benefit, in that _____ [*specify benefit received or to be received by corporation*].

2. The transaction was fair and reasonable as to _____ [*name of corporation*] at the time _____ [*name of corporation*] entered into the transaction.

[*EITHER, if board of directors authorized or approved transaction*]

3. On _____ [*date*], prior to consummating the transaction, or any part thereof, the board of directors of _____ [*name of corporation*] _____ [authorized *or* approved] the transaction in good faith, with full knowledge of the material facts concerning the transaction and the interest of _____ [*name of defendant director*] in the transaction, by a vote of _____ [*specify number*]. At that time, there were a total of _____ [*specify number*] directors of the board, and the aforementioned vote represented a majority of these directors, excluding the _____ [*specify number*] vote(s) of the defendant director(s).

4. _____ [Prior to _____ (authorizing *or* approving) the transaction, the board considered and in good faith determined after reasonable investigation that the corporation could not have obtained a more advantageous arrangement with reasonable effort under the circumstances *or* The corporation could not have obtained a more advantageous arrangement with reasonable effort under the circumstances in that

_____ (*specify facts*)].

[*OR, if committee or person authorized by board approved transaction*]

3. The disputed transaction was approved by _____ [*name of person or committee authorized by board*] on _____ [*date*], in good faith and with knowledge of the material facts concerning the transaction and the directors's interest in the transaction. [The committee consisted of _____ (*number*) members, _____ (*number constituting majority of members*) of whom voted to approve the transaction.]

4. _____ [*Name of authorized person or committee*] was authorizedby the board of directors of _____ [*name of nonprofit corporation*] to approve the transaction complained of by virtue of _____ [*specify basis for authority, e.g.,* a majority vote taken by the board on _____ [*date*], conferring authority on _____ (him *or* her *or* the committee) to _____ (*specify nature of authority*)].

5. It was not reasonably practicable to obtain approval of the board of directors of the corporation prior to entering into the transaction because _____ [*specify reasons*].

6. _____ [Prior to approving the transaction, the _____ (*name of authorized person or committee*) considered and in good faith determined after reasonable investigation that the corporation could not have obtained a more advantageous arrangement with reasonable effort under the circumstances *or* The corporation could not have obtained a more advantageous arrangement with reasonable effort under the circumstances in that _____ (*specify facts*)].

7. The board, after determining that the transaction benefitted the corporation and was fair and reasonable as to the corporation, ratified the transaction at its next meeting on _____ [*date*], by a vote of _____ [*specify number of majority vote*]. At that time, there were a total of _____ [*specify number*] directors of the board, and the aforementioned vote represented a majority of these directors, excluding the _____ [*specify number*] vote(s) of the defendant director(s).

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use in an answer to an action brought to recover damages, an accounting, or the return of property from a director of a nonprofit corporation who has been sued for a self-dealing transaction under *Corp. Code § 5233*. The affirmative defense set forth is based on prior approval of the transaction by a majority of the directors of the board, or by a person or committee authorized by the board, and subsequent ratification by the board [*see Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2), (3)*].

[3] Allegations

This form alleges: (1) that the corporation received benefit from the transaction (Paragraph 1) [*see Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2)(A)*], and (2) that the transaction was fair and reasonable to the corporation (Paragraph 2) [*see Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2)(B)*]. First alternative Paragraphs 3 and 4 are for use if the board approved the transaction in accordance with the requisite statutory standards [*see Corp. Code § 5233(d)(2)(C), (D)*]. Second alternative Paragraphs 3-7 are for use if a committee approved the transaction in accordance with the requisite statutory standards, and the board thereafter ratified it [*see Corp. Code §§ 5233(d)(3)*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 560.671*.

For discussion and forms relating to answers in general to use with this form, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

[5] State Statutes

Restrictions on power of committee to approve self-dealing transaction. *Corp. Code § 5212(a)(8)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.673

§ 560.673 Voluntary Winding Up--Petition for Court Supervision and Approval of Distribution of Assets to Proposed Corporation--By Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation [Corp. Code § 6614] or Mutual Benefit Corporation Holding Charitable Assets in Trust [Corp. Code § 8614]

[1] FORM Voluntary Winding Up--Petition for Court Supervision and Approval of Distribution of Assets to Proposed Corporation--By Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation [Corp. Code § 6614] or Mutual Benefit Corporation Holding Charitable Assets in Trust [Corp. Code § 8614]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

In re _____ [*name of corporation*], A Corporation in Process of Winding Up.	)))))	NO. _____ PETITION FOR COURT SUPERVISION OF VOLUNTARY WINDING UP OF _____ [PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION *or* MUTUAL BENEFIT CORPORATION HOLDING ASSETS IN CHARITABLE TRUST] [Corp. Code § _____ (6614 *or* 8614)]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner, _____ [*name of corporation*], hereinafter referred to as "petitioner corporation" is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a nonprofit _____ [public *or* mutual] benefit corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California _____ [*either, if corporation is a public benefit corporation,* for charitable purposes *or, if corporation is a municipal benefit corporation holding charitable assets in trust* for lawful purposes, including _____ (*identify charitable purpose*)], and has

its principal place of business in _____ County, California [with chapters throughout the state].

2. The corporation's assets consist of $_____.

3. In accordance with procedures set forth under Section _____ [6610(a) *or* 6610(b) *or* 8610(a) *or* 8610(b)] of the Corporation Code, the following resolution was approved by _____ [a majority of all the members of the corporation *or* the corporation's board of directors *or* the corporation's board of directors and its members]:

_____ [*Set forth language, e.g.,* It is hereby resolved to wind up and dissolve the Corporation, and after paying or providing for all known debts and liabilities, to transfer all remaining assets of the Corporation to _____ (*name of proposed transferee corporation*), or other Corporation or organization as may be approved by the Attorney General or by a Decree of the Superior Court].

[A copy of the Resolution is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof.]

4. A certificate of election to dissolve was filed in the office of the Secretary of State on _____, 19 _____, and with the Attorney General on _____, 19_____. [A copy of the certificate is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.]

5. Supervision of the court over the voluntary winding up proceeding is necessary in that _____ [*specify facts indicating why court supervision is necessary to protect interested persons, the corporation's charitable purpose, or assets held in charitable trust*].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays for an order:

1. For a winding up and dissolution of the corporation;

2. For distribution of petitioner's assets to _____ [*name of proposed transferee corporation*] or to a suitable successor corporation to be held on the same trusts as held by petitioner;

3. Prescribing what notice shall be given to persons interested in the corporation as members or creditors;

4. Assuming jurisdiction over the winding up of the affairs of the corporation; and

5. For such other orders as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 560.521.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a nonprofit public benefit corporation or a nonprofit mutual benefit corporation holding assets in charitable trust to petition the court to assume jurisdiction over the corporation's voluntary winding up and dissolution proceedings [*Corp. Code §§ 6614* (public benefit corporations), 8614 (mutual benefit corporations)]. It may be used only after the board and/or membership have elected to wind up and dissolve [*see Corp. Code §§ 6610, 6614, 8610, 8614*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The capacity of the corporation as petitioner (Paragraph 1) [see *Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*];
- The amount of the corporation's assets (Paragraph 2);
- The substance of the resolution pursuant to which voluntary winding up and dissolution was approved (Paragraph 3) [see *Corp. Code §§ 6610(a), 8610(a)*];
- The filing of a certificate of election to dissolve (Paragraphs 4) [*see Corp. Code §§ 6611(a), 8611(a)*]; and
- The basis for seeking court supervision (Paragraph 5) [*see Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*].

The prayer requests a decree of dissolution and an order naming a successor corporation to the assets held in charitable trust by the petitioning corporation [*see Corp. Code §§ 6716(b), 8716(b)*], and, in accordance with *Corp. Code §§ 6614* and *8614*, orders prescribing the form of notice to be given to interested persons, assuming jurisdiction over the winding up of the corporation's affairs, and such other orders as justice and equity may require.

[4] Basis for Jurisdiction

The court may take jurisdiction if it appears necessary to protect any parties in interest or, in the case of a public benefit corporation, to protect the purposes served by the corporation, or, in the case of a mutual benefit corporation holding charitable assets in trust, to protect those assets [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*].

[5] Standing

The petition may be instituted by the corporation, by the authorized number (percentage of the voting power), by the Attorney General, or by three or more creditors [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*; *see Corp. Code §§ 5036* (defining "authorized number"), 5078 (defining "voting power")].

[6] Venue

The petition must be brought in the superior court of the county in which the corporation's principal office in California is located, or, if none, in Sacramento County [*Corp. Code §§ 5068, 6614, 8614*].

[7] Notice of Proceedings

Notice of the petition proceedings must be given to the corporation (if the petition is instituted by one other than the corporation), and to other persons interested in the corporation as members or creditors as the court may order [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*].

[8] Application of Provisions Governing Involuntary Dissolution

Once the court assumes jurisdiction, the procedures for involuntary dissolution set forth in *Corp. Code §§ 6512-6519* (public benefit corporations), and *Corp. Code §§ 8512-8519* (mutual benefit corporations) apply [*Corp. Code §§ 6614, 8614*].

[9] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to petition proceedings for court supervision of voluntary winding up and dissolution proceedings of commercial corporations, see Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution*

[10] California Points and Authorities

For a memorandum of points and authorities in support of a petition for court supervision of a voluntary winding up and dissolution, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 52, *Corporations*

[11] State Statutes

Election for voluntary wind up and dissolution of public benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 6610*

Jurisdiction over voluntary dissolution of public benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 6614*

General provisions relating to dissolution of public benefit corporation. *Corp. Code §§ 6710-6721*

Election for voluntary wind up and dissolution of municipal benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 8610*

Jurisdiction over voluntary dissolution of municipal benefit corporation. *Corp. Code § 8614*

General provisions relating to dissolution of mutual benefit corporation. *Corp. Code §§ 8710-8724*

[12] Decisions

Court is not bound by Attorney General's nomination of distributee for assets of charitable corporation in connection with petition for approval of voluntary dissolution and proposed disposition of assets. *In re Veterans' Industries, Inc. (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 902, 920, 88 Cal. Rptr. 303*

[13] Text References

Ballantine and Sterling, California Corporation Laws, Ch. 19, *Nonprofit Corporations and Organizations* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions To Establish And Enforce Public, Charitable Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 560.674-560.689

[Reserved]

§§ 560.674[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 560 TRUSTS: EXPRESS, PUBLIC, CHARITABLE, AND TOTTEN TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Totten Trusts

49-560 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 560.690

§ 560.690 Complaint to Establish Totten Trust [Prob. Code §§ 80, 5301-5307]--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint to Establish Totten Trust [Prob. Code §§ 80, 5301-5307]--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*names*],	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH TOTTEN TRUST
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. On or about _____ [*date of death*], _____ [*name*] died, and his/her estate is now pending administration in a probate proceeding in the Superior Court for the County of _____, California, entitled _____ [*name of case in which decedent's estate is being administered*], Case No. _____.

2. Defendant _____ [*name of executor/executrix of will or administrator/adminstratrix of estate*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ [*specify capacity of defendant, e.g.*, executor of the will] of the decedent.

3. Defendant _____ [*name of financial institution in which decedent's account is located*] is a _____ [*specify type of financial institution, e.g.*, a national banking association duly organized and

existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States], and having its principal place of business in the City of _____, County of _____, California.

4. During his/her lifetime, and on or about _____ [*date account was opened*], the decedent opened a savings account in defendant _____ [*specify type of financial institution, e.g.,* bank] with a deposit of $_____ [*amount of initial deposit*] in the name of decedent for the benefit of and in trust for plaintiff, designated "_____ [*name of decedent*], trustee, for _____ [*name of plaintiff*]." At the same time and pursuant to his/her directions, the decedent received from defendant _____ [*specify type of financial institution, e.g.,* bank] its passbook No. _____, bearing the same designation. [From time to time thereafter until his/her death, the decedent made withdrawals from, and deposits in, the account in varying amounts.]

5. Decedent _____ [*describe any changes decedent made to the title of the account, e.g.,* never changed the designation on the account], and when decedent died, plaintiff was the only beneficiary named on the account.

6. At the time of decedent's death, decedent was the sole [surviving] trustee of the savings account herein described.

7. At the time of decedent's death, there was [and still is] on deposit in the account the sum of $_____ [*amount of balance in account at time of decendant's death*].

8. At no time did decedent otherwise provide for an alternative disposition of the funds constituting the balance of the savings account herein described.

9. Defendant _____ [executor/executrix/administrator/administratrix] has _____ [withdrawn the sums on deposit *or* possession of the _____ (*describe any evidence of account, e.g.,* certificate of deposit)], refuses to deliver it/them to plaintiff or recognize the trust in favor of plaintiff, and contends that the sums on deposit in the account are part of decedent's estate.

10. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff delivered _____ [*describe proof of death offered, e.g.,* a certified copy of decedent's death certificate] to defendant's _____ [*address*] branch and demanded payment of all sums remaining on deposit to the credit of account No. _____, but defendant _____ [*name of defendant financial institution*] refuses to pay the balance of the account together with the interest due thereon to plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

1. For a declaration by the court of a trust in the account herein described, and the right of plaintiff to payment of the funds therein together with the interest due thereon;

2. For issuance of an order requiring defendant _____ [executor/executrix/administrator/administratrix/financial in stitution] to deliver the sums on deposit in the account herein described to plaintiff;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by the beneficiary of a Totten trust account [*see Prob. Code § 80* (definition of Totten trust account)] against the administrator of the trustee's estate and the financial institution in which the account is located, after the depositor has died, to declare a trust in the funds remaining in the account [*Prob. Code § 80*; *see Brucks v. Home Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 845, 849-850, 228 P.2d 545]* . The form may be modified for use against a single defendant. For instance, if the personal representative has not already withdrawn the funds, plaintiff may prefer not to name the financial institution as a defendant, in which case, Paragraphs 3 and 10 of this form need not be used. If the personal representative has not withdrawn the funds, counsel may wish to serve the financial institution with written notice not to allow withdrawals except with the signatures of all claimants [*see Prob. Code § 5405(c)*; *see also Prob. Code § 5405(b)* (court order restraining payments by financial institution, discussed in Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks*)].

For a general complaint against a financial institution for use by any depositor whose withdrawal request has been wrongfully refused, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The basis for venue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*].

- The capacities of the defendants (Paragraphs 2, 3) [*see Brucks v. Home Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 845, 228 P.2d 545]* .

- The capacity of the plaintiff, the creation of the trust account, and the intent of the trustee to create a tentative trust (Paragraph 4) [*Prob. Code § 80*; *see Brucks v. Home Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n. (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 845, 849-850, 228 P.2d 545]* .

- Plaintiff's status as sole surviving beneficiary (Paragraph 5) [*Prob. Code § 5302(c)*].

- Decedent's status as the sole trustee at the time of his or her death (Paragraph 6) [*see Prob. Code § 5302(c)*].

- The amount on deposit at the date of death (Paragraph 7) [*see Prob. Code § 5150* (defining "sums on deposit" to include account balance payable with interest and dividends earned, whether or not included in current balance, and any life insurance proceeds added to account by reason of death of party to account)].

- That no other agreement existed relating to those funds (Paragraph 8) [*see Prob. Code §§ 80, 5406*; *see also Prob. Code § 5305(c)* (beneficiary designation may not be changed by will, except on account described ascommunity property)].

- The status of the sums on deposit and/or any evidence of account necessary to accompany a

withdrawal request (Paragraph 9) [*see Prob. Code § 5148* (defining "request" as one that complies with financial institution's regulations)], as well as the personal representative's contention that the sums on deposit at decedent's date of death were not subject to a trust in favor of plaintiff (Paragraph 9) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaratory relief)].

- Any withdrawal request made by plaintiff and the financial institution's response to that request (Paragraph 10) [*see Prob. Code §§ 5401, 5404*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 561.syn

§ 561.syn Synopsis to Chapter 561: TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS

§ 561.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 561.02 Cross References

§§ 561.03-561.09 [Reserved]

§ 561.10 Governing Law

§ 561.11 Constructive Trust as Equitable Remedy

§ 561.12 Involuntary Trust Created by Operation of Law

§ 561.13 Express and Resulting Trusts Distinguished

§ 561.14 Obligations of Trustee

§ 561.15 Applicable to Real or Personal Property

§ 561.16 Establishing Constructive Trust

[1] Summary of Elements

[2] Existence of Trust Res

[3] Adequacy of Legal Remedy

[4] Defendant's Gain

[a] By Fraud

[b] By Mistake

[c] By Accident

[d] By Undue Influence

[e] By Violation of Trust

[f] By Violation of Secret Trust

[g] By Other Wrongful Acts

§ 561.17 Proceeds of Trust Property

§ 561.18 Rights of Bona Fide Purchasers for Value

§ 561.19 Jurisdiction

[1] Real Property

[2] Personal Property

[3] Probate Proceedings

§ 561.20 Venue

§ 561.21 Lis Pendens

§ 561.22 Burden of Proof

§ 561.23 Statute of Frauds

§ 561.24 Parol Evidence

§ 561.25 Statute of Limitations

§ 561.26 Relief Available

[1] Generally

[2] Election of Remedies

[3] Conveyance of Trust Property

[4] Equitable Lien

[5] Charitable Trust

[6] Money Judgments

[7] Injunctive Relief

[8] Punitive Damages

§ 561.27 Defenses

[1] Laches

[2] Bona Fide Purchaser for Value

[3] Unclean Hands

§ 561.28 Sale of Felon's Item Enhanced by Notoriety of Crime

[1] Profits Subject to Involuntary Trust

[2] Duration of Trust; Escheat of Remaining Funds

[3] Definitions

[a] Convicted Felon

[b] Felony

[c] Materials

[d] Story

[e] Sale

[f] Profits

[g] Representative of Felon

[h] Profiteer of Felony

[i] Beneficiary

[j] Beneficiary's Interest

[4] Procedure

[a] Action by Beneficiary

[b] Jurisdiction and Venue

[c] Statute of Limitations

[d] Order for Payment From Profits

[e] Apportionment of Profits Among Beneficiaries

[f] Priority of Payment of Profits

[5] Action by Attorney General

[6] Preliminary Injunctive Relief

[7] Violation of Court Order as Contempt

[8] Remedies Cumulative

§§ 561.29-561.39 [Reserved]

§ 561.40 State Statutes

[1] Deceit

[2] Fraud

[3] Involuntary Trusts

[4] Menace

[5] Mistake

[6] Profits Derived From Felony

[7] Statute of Frauds

[8] Statutes of Limitation

[9] Undue Influence

§ 561.41 Decisions

[1] Accrual of Cause of Action

[2] Attorney's Fees

[3] Burden of Proof

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Limitation of Actions

[6] Lis Pendens

[7] Other Wrongful Acts

[8] Preemption by Federal Law

[9] Proceeds or Profits Subject to Involuntary Trust

[10] Purpose of Remedy

[11] Resulting Trust Distinguished

[12] When Imposition Improper

[13] When Imposition Proper

§ 561.42 Law Reviews

§ 561.43 Text References

§§ 561.44-561.59 [Reserved]

§ 561.60 Complaint--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Real Property Obtained Through Fraud [Civ. Code § 2224]; Order for Reconveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], Preliminary Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 526], and Accounting--Against Constructive Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Pleading Requirements

[4] Allegations

[a] Subject Matter of and Parties to Action

[b] Fraud

[c] Constructive Trust

[5] Preliminary Injunctive Relief

[6] Prayer

[7] Accounting

[8] Verification

[9] Lis Pendens

[10] Cross References

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

§ 561.61 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Damages [Civ. Code § 3336] for Conversion, for Imposition of Constructive Trust on Proceeds of Embezzled Funds, Including Real Property Purchased With Part of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2224], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Embezzler--By

Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Conversion

[b] Constructive Trust

[4] Imposition of Constructive Trust on Proceeds of Funds Wrongfully Acquired

[5] Verification

[6] Lis Pendens

[7] Cross References

[8] State Statutes

[9] Decisions

§ 561.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Interest in Real Property Acquired by Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code § 1577], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and Accounting--Against Joint Tenant--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Mistake of Fact

[b] Constructive Trust

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 561.63 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Undue Influence [Civ. Code § 1575(2), (3)], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for an Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Undue Influence

[b] Constructive Trust

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] Cross References

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

§ 561.64 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Funds Acquired Through Violation of Trust [Civ. Code § 2224]--Breach of Confidential Relationship--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] Breach of Confidential Relationship

[b] Constructive Trust

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 561.65 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Will Under Secret Trust, for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] Cross References

§ 561.66 Complaint Against Convicted Felon, Felon's Representative, or Profiteer of Felony for Recovery of Interest in Profits From Sale of Item With Value Enhanced as Result of Notoriety From Commission of Felony [Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2), (c)] and for Preliminary Injunctive Relief Against Waste of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2225(f); Code Civ. Proc. § 526]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Defendants

[4] Alleging Civil Cause of Action Against Felon

[5] Alleging Previous Civil Recovery Against Convicted Felon

[6] Allegations

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

[8] Preliminary Injunction

[9] Lis Pendens

[10] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.01

§ 561.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the creation and imposition of constructive trusts [*see § 561.10* et seq]. It includes a discussion of tracing the proceeds of constructive trust property, as well as a discussion of the forms of relief available in actions to impose a constructive trust. It includes forms for use to impose constructive trusts on property acquired through fraud [*see § 561.60*], conversion [*see § 561.61*], mistake [*see § 561.62*], undue influence [*see § 561.63*], violation of a confidential relationship [*see § 561.64*], and through violation of a secret trust [*see § 561.65*], as well as a form of pleading for use in imposing a constructive trust under *Civ. Code § 2225* on profits derived from the sale or transfer of an item with value enhanced by the notoriety gained from commission of a felony [*see § 561.66*].

For discussion and forms relating to the imposition of constructive trusts on property received in breach of an oral agreement to make a will, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

For dicussion of resulting trusts, which arise from the transfer of property where the transferee was not intended to take beneficial interest in the property, see Ch. 562, *Trusts: Resulting Trusts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationFiduciary ResponsibilitiesContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.02

§ 561.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For a form of complaint by a member of a dissolved association to bring a class action to impose a constructive trust on the association's fund seized by the parent body's officers, see Ch. 61, *Associations and Clubs*

For a discussion of the imposition of constructive trusts on negotiable instruments, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments*

For a discussion of and forms for use to allege duress, menace, fraud, undue influence, and mistake, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*

For a discussion of the distinction between constructive trusts and gifts, see Ch. 278, *Gifts*

For a discussion of the imposition of constructive trusts on estates held in joint tenancy when one joint tenant intentionally and unlawfully causes the death of a cotenant, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common*

For a form of complaint for declaratory relief by a decedent's personal representative seeking to impose a constructive trust when an instrument was insufficient to establish an intended joint tenancy, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common*

For a discussion of the imposition of constructive trusts in the adjudication of property rights of parties to nonmarital relationships, see Ch. 387, *Nonmarital Cohabitation*

For a discussion of and forms for use in the imposition of constructive trusts in actions for quasi-specific performance, see Ch. 528, *Specific Performance*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawPersonal GiftsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipJoint Tenancies

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 561.03-561.09

[Reserved]

§§ 561.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.10

§ 561.10 Governing Law

The creation of constructive trusts is principally governed by *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* [*American Airlines, Inc. v. Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1017, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 685* ; *Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* . The imposition of constructive trusts is governed by a variety of common and statutory law, including the law of fraud, undue influence, mistake, accident, and breach of trust. Both the creation and imposition of constructive trusts are governed by the equitable principles of restitution and unjust enrichment [*see Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* . Statutory law governing express trusts does not affect the substantive law relating to imposition of constructive trusts [*Prob. Code § 15003(a)*; *see Prob. Code § 82(b)(1)* (term "trust" as used in Probate Code generally excludes constructive trusts)].

The imposition of a constructive trust in favor of a crime victim on the profits derived from the sale or transfer of anything that has enhanced value because of the notoriety gained from commission of the felony, is governed by *Civ. Code § 2225*. The Supreme Court of California has held that *Civ. Code § 2225* is facially invalid under both the free speech clause of the *First Amendment to the federal Constitution* as applied to the states through the *Fourteenth Amendment*, and the liberty of speech clause of the California Constitution [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 415-416, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718* ; *see Cal. Const. art. I, § 2, subd. (a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefQuantum MeruitContracts LawRemediesRestitutionFamily LawCohabitationAgreementsEnforceabilityConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.11

§ 561.11 Constructive Trust as Equitable Remedy

A constructive trust is an involuntary equitable trust created by operation of law as a remedy to compel the transfer of property from a person who is wrongfully holding it to its rightful owner [*Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* . The purpose of a constructive trust is to prevent unjust enrichment and to prevent a person from taking advantage of his or her own wrongdoing [*Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* .

A plaintiff's claim for a constructive trust is, in effect, an action for possession of property [*Olson v. Toy (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 818, 823, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29]* . A constructive trust is not a true trust, but is an equitable remedy available to a plaintiff seeking to recover specific property in a number of different situations [*Olson v. Toy (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 818, 823, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29]* . A constructive trust may be imposed in practically any case in which there has been a wrongful acquisition or detention of property to which another is entitled [*American Airlines, Inc. v. Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1017, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 685* ; *Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704]* . A plaintiff's cause of action for a constructive trust is not based on the establishment of a trust, but consists of the fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, or other act of the defendant that entitles the plaintiff to some relief. This relief may be to make the defendant a constructive trustee with the duty to transfer the property to the plaintiff [*Olson v. Toy (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 818, 823, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29]* .

The equitable principles that one who wrongfully acquires or detains property of another holds the property as an involuntary constructive trustee for the owner are codified in *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* [*American Airlines, Inc. v. Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1017, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 685* ; *Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityReliefEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive

Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.12

§ 561.12 Involuntary Trust Created by Operation of Law

A constructive trust is an involuntary trust created by operation of law [*Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* . Under the principles of constructive trusts, one who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, violation of a trust, or other wrongful act is, unless he or she has some other and better right thereto, an involuntary trustee of the thing gained, for the benefit of the person who would otherwise have had it [*Civ. Code § 2224*]. Also, one who wrongfully detains a thing is an involuntary trustee thereof for the benefit of the owner [*Civ. Code § 2223*].

In order to provide the necessary flexibility to apply an equitable doctrine to individual cases, *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* state general principles for a court's guidance rather than restrictive rules [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 237, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.13

§ 561.13 Express and Resulting Trusts Distinguished

Because the concept of constructive trust is one of equitable remedy, the incidents of a constructive trust differ from those of an express or resulting trust [*Haskel Eng'g & Supply Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 371, 375, 144 Cal. Rptr. 189* ; *see also* Restatement of Restitution § 1, cmt. e, §§ 3 and 4, and § 160, cmts. a-c)].

Express or resulting trusts create substantive rights enforceable by various remedies [*Haskel Eng'g & Supply Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 371, 378, 144 Cal. Rptr. 189]* .

Express and resulting trusts arise from the intention of the parties (express or implied) to set aside property under the stewardship of a trustee for the benefit of the beneficiary. An express trust establishes a fiduciary relationship, while a constructive trust does not. A constructive trust is imposed by a court of equity, independent of the intention of the parties, to prevent a party in possession of property from being unjustly enriched [*see* *Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 892, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582]* . For discussion of the nature of express trusts and resulting trusts, see Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts* , and Ch. 562, *Trusts, Resulting Trusts* ,, respectively.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.14

§ 561.14 Obligations of Trustee

A constructive trust is a passive trust, and it has been held that the trustee's only duty is to convey the property to its rightful owner [*Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571]* . However, it has also been held that a constructive trustee has a duty to preserve the trust property because a constructive trust would lose its efficacy as a remedial device if a trustee were permitted to defeat recovery by wrongfully permitting the property to become valueless [*Elliott v. Elliott (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 205, 209, 41 Cal. Rptr. 686]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.15

§ 561.15 Applicable to Real or Personal Property

A constructive trust may be applied to either personal or real property [*see Weiss v. Marcus (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 590, 594, 600, 124 Cal. Rptr. 297* (reasonable value of legal services)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.16

§ 561.16 Establishing Constructive Trust

[1] Summary of Elements

Under *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* and the case law applying them, a constructive trust may only be imposed when the following three conditions are met: (1) the existence of property or some interest in property; (2) the plaintiff's right to that property; and (3) the defendant's wrongful acquisition or detention of the property [*Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990-991, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* .

[2] Existence of Trust Res

In establishing the existence of a trust res, a plaintiff must plead specifically identifiable trust property [*In re Marriage of Buford (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 74, 79, 202 Cal. Rptr. 20* ; *but see Douglas v. Superior Court (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 155, 160, 263 Cal. Rptr. 473* (pleading held sufficient although plaintiff did not identify specific property but only particular automobile and other specific categories of property acquired with funds due to plaintiff); *see § 561.17*]. A note evidencing indebtedness satisfies any technical requirement of *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* that a thing, or a res, exist as an element of a constructive trust [see *Elliott v. Elliott (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 205, 209, 41 Cal. Rptr. 686* (after note was held to be community property in divorce proceedings, husband, who allowed statute of limitations to run on the note, held constructive trustee of half the value of the debt evidenced by the note)].

[3] Adequacy of Legal Remedy

An action to establish a constructive trust does not depend on, and therefore a plaintiff need not plead, the absence of an adequate remedy at law [*Bacon v. Grosse (1913) 165 Cal. 481, 493, 132 P. 1027* (court sitting in equity as acquiring jurisdiction of action not because damages at law would be inadequate, but because action is one to enforce constructive trust); *GHK Assocs. v. Mayer Group, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 856, 878, 274 Cal. Rptr. 168* (noting that dictum in *Allen v. Powell (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 502, 509, 56 Cal. Rptr. 715* , requiring inadequacy of legal remedy was rejected in *Heckmann); Heckmann v. Ahmanson (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 119, 134, 214 Cal. Rptr. 177* (action in equity to establish constructive trust as not depending on absence of adequate legal remedy); *see also Juranek v. Juranek (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 276, 280, 84 P.2d 195* (plaintiff as not required to plead absence of adequate legal

remedy in equitable actions to establish constructive and resulting trusts)].

[4] Defendant's Gain

[a] By Fraud

In an action to impose a constructive trust on property acquired by another through fraud, a plaintiff must plead and prove a cause of action for fraud [*Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 128, 139, 191 Cal. Rptr. 849* ; see *Civ. Code § 2224*]. The fraud may be actual or constructive [*Briggs v. Nilson (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 342, 345-346, 38 Cal. Rptr. 68* ; see also *Civ. Code § 1571*]. Actual fraud is defined in *Civ. Code § 1572*, and constructive fraud is defined in *Civ. Code § 1573* [*see Civ. Code §§ 1572, 1573*]. Thus, a constructive trust may be imposed on property acquired either through actual fraud in inducing a conveyance of real property, or through constructive fraud arising from a breach of an oral promise to reconvey real property, by a grantee who is in a confidential relationship with a grantor [*Briggs v. Nilson (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 342, 345-346, 38 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . A constructive trust may be imposed on aninterest in property acquired by a party's promise to convey without any intention of performing the promise [*see Civ. Code § 1572(4)*; Helfrich v. Kerley (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 726, 728-729, *192 Cal. App. 2d 726, 13 Cal. Rptr. 753]* . A constructive trust may also be imposed on funds paid to an automobile rental agency by its customers as a result of allegedly fraudulent overcharging of gasoline prices by the agency [*Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 128, 139, 191 Cal. Rptr. 849]* .

Equity will relieve an injured party from the effect of a judgment or decree procured by extrinsic fraud, that was not the result of negligence or laches on the part of the complainant [*see Clavey v. Loney (1926) 80 Cal. App. 20, 24, 251 P. 232* (using term "resulting trust", but relying on cases that merely referred to "involutary trust"). For example, when, through extrinsic fraud practiced in probate proceedings, distributees have obtained property to which they are not entitled, equity will do justice, not by overthrowing the decree of distribution, but by declaring that the distributees hold the property in trust for the rightful owners [*Sears v. Rule (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 374, 384, 114 P.2d 57]* .

For a form of complaint to impose a constructive trust on real property acquired by fraud, see *§ 561.60*. For a complete discussion and forms for use in pleading a cause of action for fraud, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

[b] By Mistake

In an action to impose a constructive trust on property acquired by another by mistake, a plaintiff must establish the existence of some interest in the property, the plaintiff's right to the interest in the property, and defendant's gain of the property by mistake [*Kraus v. Willow Park Pub. Golf Course (1977) 73 Cal. App. 3d 354, 373, 140 Cal. Rptr. 744* ; *see Civ. Code § 2224*]. The mistake may be either of fact or of law [see *Civ. Code § 1576*]. Mistake of fact is defined in *Civ. Code §§ 1577* and *1579*, and mistake of law is defined in *Civ. Code § 1578* [*Civ. Code §§ 1577-1579*].

Actions to impose constructive trusts on property acquired through mistake arise in a variety of contexts. For example, when a grantor, through a mistake of fact in drafting a deed, conveys real property to plaintiff and defendant as joint tenants, rather than solely to plaintiff, defendant holds his or her interest in the property as a constructive trustee for the plaintiff's benefit [*Abbott v. Miller (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 595, 596, 220 P.2d 570]* . A mistake of law that causes the erroneous computation of sales tax reimbursements and payments gives rise to an involuntary trust under *Civ. Code § 2224*, so that when a seller mistakenly collects from its customers and pays to the State Board of Equalization more sales taxes than it should have, both the seller and the Board become constructive trustees of the overage collected for the benefit of the seller's customers [*Decorative Carpets, Inc. v. State Bd. of Equalization (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 252, 254-255, 23 Cal. Rptr. 589, 373 P.2d 637* ; *Javor v. State Bd. of Equalization (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 790, 798, 117 Cal. Rptr. 305, 527 P.2d 1153]* . In addition, when the proceeds from a sale of property that is collateral for a loan are mistakenly paid to the debtor, the debtor holds the proceeds on a constructive trust for the benefit of the lender, who is the rightful owner of the collateral [*People v. Newman (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 426, 430-431, 122 Cal. Rptr. 455]* .

For a form of complaint to impose a constructive trust on property acquired by a mistake of fact, see *§ 561.62*. For a complete discussion of and forms for use in pleading a cause of action for damages based on mistake, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[c] By Accident

Accident appears to be rarely mentioned in case law as a basis for imposition of a constructive trust. When it is mentioned, it arises in connection with mistake. For example, if through accident, fraud, or mistake, distributees under a will hold property to which they are not entitled, equity will do justice, not by overthrowing the decree of distribution, but by declaring the distributees to be involuntary trustees, under *Civ. Code § 2224*, of the rightful owner of the property [*Estate of Walker (1911) 160 Cal. 547, 549, 117 P. 510]* .

[d] By Undue Influence

Undue influence consists of any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1575*]:

- The use, by a person in whom a confidence is reposed by another, or by a person who holds a real or apparent authority over another, of the confidence or authority for the purpose of obtaining an unfair advantage over the other person;
- Taking an unfair advantage of another person's weakness of mind; or
- Taking a grossly oppressive and unfair advantage of another person's necessities or distress.

Not all constructive trusts in property acquired through the exertion of undue influence require the existence of a confiden tial relationship [*see Clark v. Pullins (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 703, 341 P.2d 73]* . However, when undue influence is alleged to be the result of a confidential relationship between parties to a transaction, and the relationship is not presumptively confidential, a plaintiff must plead facts showing the existence of a confidential relationship [*see Johnson v. Clark (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 529, 534, 61 P.2d 767]* .

A constructive trust in favor of the beneficiaries of a decedent's will may also be sought under *Prob. Code § 850 et seq.* (petition by personal representative or interested person, to claim property for estate when another claims title to or possesses the property) against property acquired by undue influence and which another possesses or claims title to [*see Estate of Aiello (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 669, 672-673, 676-677, 165 Cal.Rptr. 207* ; *see generally* Ch. 440, *Probate : Is Probate Necessary?* et seq. regarding forms of petition and order].

For a form of complaint to impose a constructive trust on property acquired by undue influence, see *§ 561.63*. For a complete discussion of and forms for use in pleading a cause of action for damages based on undue influence, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[e] By Violation of Trust

Confidential and fiduciary relations are synonymous in law, and may be said to exist whenever trust and confidence are reposed by one person in the integrity and fidelity of another. Thus, the breach of trust contemplated by *Civ. Code § 2224* need not be a breach of an express or oral trust, but may arise from breach of a confidential relationship [*see South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 284, 303 P.2d 805]* .

For example, a constructive trust will be imposed on property acquired in violation of a confidential relationship between stepfather and daughter by virtue of the stepfather's failure to perform his agreement with his wife to bequeath

certain of her separate property to the daughter [*Redke v. Silvertrust (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 94, 106, 98 Cal. Rptr. 293, 490 P.2d 805]* . A constructive trust will also be imposed on property acquired by a bank loan officer in violation of his fiduciary relationship with the bank when the property acquired consists of gratuities and commissions received from customers in exchange for approving their loans [*Bank of Am. v. Ryan (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 698, 706, 24 Cal. Rptr. 739]* .

Similarly, when partners or joint venturers have agreed to buy a specific parcel of real property, and one partner or joint venturer, in breach of a fiduciary duty, wrongfully acquires the property in his or her own name, the other partner or joint venturer may bring an action to impose a constructive trust and requiring the wrongdoing partner or joint venturer to convey the appropriate share of the legal title [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 970, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* .

An action to impose a constructive trust may also be based on a breach of fiduciary duty by a trustee of an express trust [*Ehret v. Ichioka (1967) 247 Cal. App. 2d 637, 643, 55 Cal. Rptr. 869* ; see *Prob. Code §§ 16002* (duty of loyalty to beneficiary), 16004 (duty to avoid conflict of interest with beneficiary); *see generally* Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable and Totten Trusts* , regarding the duty of a trustee of an express trust]. A beneficiary of an express trust must use petition proceedings under the Trust Law to compel redress of a breach of trust concerning the internal affairs of the trust by any available remedy [*Prob. Code §§ 17000, 17200(a), (b)(12)*; *see Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable and Totten Trusts, § 560.545*].

For a form of complaint to impose a constructive trust on funds acquired through the violation of a trust, *see § 561.64*. For further discussion of which relationships are confidential and the elements of a confidential relationship, together with forms of allegations for use in establishing theexistence of confidential relationships, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[f] By Violation of Secret Trust

A constructive trust may be imposed when property is unconditionally willed to a person based on that person's promise to the testator to hold the property in trust for another [*Estate of Everts (1912) 163 Cal. 449, 454, 125 P. 1058* ; *Prior v. Andrews (1927) 83 Cal. App. 782, 790, 257 P. 560]* . Thus, if a testator is induced to make a will, or not change a will after it has been made, by a promise on the part of a legatee that he or she will devote the legacy to an agreed purpose, a secret trust is created, the terms of of which may be enforced by the mechanism of a constructive trust [*Sears v. Rule (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 131, 139, 163 P.2d 443* ; *Prior v. Andrews (1927) 83 Cal. App. 782, 790, 257 P. 560]* . The promise on the part of the legatee that he or she will perform the secret trust may be express or implied and may be proved by extrinsic evidence [*Estate of Sargavak (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 314, 321, 259 P.2d 897* ; *Prior v. Andrews (1927) 83 Cal. App. 782, 790, 257 P. 560]* .

For a form of complaint for imposing a constructive trust on property gained by violation of a secret trust, *see § 561.65*.

[g] By Other Wrongful Acts

A constructive trust may be imposed in practically any case when there is a wrongful acquisition or detention of property to which another is entitled [*Weiss v. Marcus (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 590, 600, 124 Cal. Rptr. 297* ; *see, e.g., Douglas v. Superior Court (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 155, 160, 263 Cal. Rptr. 473* (cause of action for constructive trust that incorporated allegations of causes of action for fraud, conspiracy, and racketeering was sufficient)]. For example, property obtained through duress or menace, defined in *Civ. Code § 1569* and *Civ. Code § 1570* respectively, may be subject to a constructive trust [*see* *Clark v. Pullins (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 703, 708-709, 341 P.2d 73]* . A constructive trust may be imposed on profits held by one who deprived another of contract rights, whether by breach of contract, tortious interference with the contract, or conspiracy inducing breach of the contract [*GHK Assocs. v. Mayer Group, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 856, 878, 274 Cal. Rptr. 168]* . The wrongful act giving rise to a constructive trust

need not amount to fraud or intentional misrepresentation. All that must be shown is that the acquisition of the property was wrongful and that the keeping of the property by the defendant would constitute unjust enrichment [*Nguyen v. Scott (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737-740, 253 Cal. Rptr. 800* (breach by seller's broker of duty of honesty and fair dealing owed to potential purchasers arising from broker's failure to communicate their offer to seller and eventual purchase of the property for less than amount of that offer as "other wrongful act" within meaning of *Civ. Code § 2224*); *Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 116, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571]* .

Thus, in a case giving rise to a resulting trust, the court also found the imposition of a constructive trust proper against property wrongfully detained by defendant in violation of her promise to convey it (and transfer half of the proceeds to plaintiff) after vacating the premises. The court based its finding on the fact that defendant would be unjustly enriched if she were allowed to retain the property [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

Usually, however, constructive trusts based on property acquired through "other wrongful acts" under *Civ. Code § 2224* are imposed on property acquired through criminal acts. For example, if a defendant embezzles money from his or her employer, the employer may impose a constructive trust on the proceeds acquired with the funds [*Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 503-504, 203 P.2d 547]* . Additionally, if a beneficiary of a life insurance policy murders the insured, the murderer will be deemed the constructive trustee of the proceeds of the policy either for an alternative beneficiary or for the estate of the insured [*Beck v. West Coast Life Ins. Co. (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 643, 645-646, 241 P.2d 544]* . For a form of complaint to impose a constructive trust on the proceeds of embezzled funds, *see § 561.61*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.17

§ 561.17 Proceeds of Trust Property

A constructive trust extends to property acquired in exchange for the wrongfully acquired property [*Coppinger v. Superior Court (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 883, 891, 185 Cal. Rptr. 24]* .

A constructive trust also extends to the profit on and enhancement in value of the property traced into the trust [*Haskel Eng'g & Supply Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 371, 375, 144 Cal. Rptr. 189* (citing Restatement Restitution § 160, com. h; § 205)]. The beneficiary of the constructive trust is entitled to the enhancement in the value of the trust property not because he or she has a substantive right to it but rather to prevent unjust enrichment of the wrongdoer/constructive trustee [*Haskel Eng'g & Supply Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 371, 378, 144 Cal. Rptr. 189]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.18

§ 561.18 Rights of Bona Fide Purchasers for Value

Former Civ. Code §§ 856 and 2243, which provided in essence that any trust could not prejudice the rights of transferees of the trust property who purchased their interest for value and without notice of the trust, were repealed in 1986. However, the result remains the same because under the common law, as well as other statutory provisions, bona fide purchasers and mortagees of property subject to a constructive trust take the property free of the trust [*see Murphy v. Clayton (1896) 113 Cal. 153, 158, 45 P. 267* ; *see also Civ. Code § 1214* (real property; priority to good faith purchasers or mortgagees for value who record first); *Com. Code § 2403* (bona fide purchasers of personal property may take good title); *see also Prob. Code § 18100* (bona fide purchaser fully protected in dealing withtrustee under express trust); 18 Cal. Law Rev Comm'n Reports 501, 793 (1986)]. The grant of protection to bona fide purchasers is in accord with the position of the *Restatement* [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 408].

As against a bona fide purchaser for value, a beneficiary of a constructive trust has no remedy, but instead must seek a personal remedy against the trustee [*see § 561.26[6]*].

A transferee of constructive trust property who is not a bona fide purchaser for value is chargeable as the trustee and may, like the trustee, be either compelled by the beneficiary to reconvey the property or sued by the beneficiary for the value of the property if the transferee conveys it to a bona fide purchaser. A transferee who takes with knowledge of the trust is liable even though he or she acted in good faith or without the intention of perpetrating a wrong [*Lucas v. Associacao Protectora Uniao MadeirenseDo Estado Da Cal. (1943) 61 Cal. App. 2d 344, 351-352, 143 P.2d 53]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.19

§ 561.19 Jurisdiction

[1] Real Property

Actions to impose constructive trusts on real property are within the equity jurisdiction of the superior court and cannot be brought as limited civil cases [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b), 580(b)(3)*].

[2] Personal Property

Actions to impose constructive trusts on personal property are limited civil cases if the amount, or value of the property, in controversy does not exceed $25,000, exclusive of interest [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1), 86(b)*; *see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 580(a)* (court may impose liability on legal or equitable principles)].

If the amount of personal property involved exceeds $25,000, the superior court has jurisdiction of an action to impose a constructive trust, and it can not be brought as a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1), 86(b)*].

[3] Probate Proceedings

In addition, the superior court sitting in probate has jurisdiction over an heir's action to impose a constructive trust on property held individually by the executor of the estate while probate proceedings are pending [*Bauer v. Bauer (1927) 201 Cal. 267, 271-272, 256 P. 820* ; *see Estate of Aiello (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 669, 165 Cal. Rptr. 207]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionAmount in ControversyCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.20

§ 561.20 Venue

Venue in an action to impose a constructive trust turns on whether the action is a local action, a transitory action, or a "mixed" action. If the action is primarily one for the determination of a right and interest in real property, the action is essentially local, and venue is properly laid in the county in which the real property, or part of it, is located [*see Franco Western Oil Co. v. Cameron (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 37, 40, 19 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. 392(a)*]. If the action does not primarily involve the determination of a right and interest in real property, it is essentially transitory, and venue is properly laid in the county of the defendant's residence [*see Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 611, 122 P.2d 557* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If one cause of action requests two distinct types of relief, one local and one transitory, the principal relief sought will be determinative of the nature of the action and hence its venue [*see Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 611, 122 P.2d 557* (principal relief sought was accounting, and determination of interest in real property was incidental); *Franco W. Oil Co. v. Cameron (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 37, 40, 19 Cal. Rptr. 304* (principal relief sought was imposition of constructive trust on interest in real property, even though accounting was sought incidentally thereto)]. For a discussion of the nature of actions as either local or transitory, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

When a defendant is sued in an official capacity as executor, administrator, guardian, conservator, or trustee on a claim for the payment of money or for the recovery of personal property, the county that has jurisdiction of the estate which the defendant represents is the proper county for trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.21

§ 561.21 Lis Pendens

The purpose of a lis pendens is to give constructive notice of an action affecting real property to persons who subsequently acquire an interest in the property, so that any judgment in the action will be binding on those persons, even if they acquire their interest before judgment is rendered [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 647, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* . A party may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the party pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a party is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* . A fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

A motion to expunge a lis pendens may be filed on any of the following grounds: (1) invalid service of the notice of recordation [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 405.22*]; (2) failure to plead a real property claim [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 405.31*]; (3) failure to establish the probable validity of the real property claim [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 405.32*]; or (4) a showing that adequate relief can be secured to the claimant by giving an undertaking [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 405.33*]. If a motion to expunge is filed, the plaintiff has the burden of showing that the complaint sets forth a real property claim [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 405.30, 405.31*]. The plaintiff's purpose in filing the lis pendens is irrelevant [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 649-650, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* . A showing of good faith and a proper purpose are

insufficient to defeat a motion to expunge if the claim does not allege a real property claim [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1378, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* . The plaintiff must also establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, the probable validity of the real property claim [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 405.30, 405.31, 481.190*]. This requires the court to consider the merits of the plaintiff's claim [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 651, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* . Even if the plaintiff shows a probably valid claim, the court may still order expungement of the lis pendens if adequate relief for the plaintiff can be secured by giving an undertaking [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.33*].

If the court finds that the plaintiff has not met this burden, the court must grant the motion to expunge. It may not refuse to grant the motion pending the outcome of the plaintiff's appeal, unless it finds that this ruling will "probably" be overturned on appeal [*Mix v. Superior Court (2004) 124 Cal. App. 4th 987, 994-996, 21 Cal. Rptr. 3d 826]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensNoticesCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensTerminationsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.22

§ 561.22 Burden of Proof

One who claims the ownership of property the legal title to which is in the name of another, and who asserts that the property is held by that person in trust for the claimant, must establish the claim by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence. This burden of proof applies in an action to impose a constructive trust. Whether the claimant meets the burden is primarily a question for the trial court to determine. If there is substantial evidence to support its conclusion, the determination is not open to review on appeal. Similarly, the credibility and weight of the evidence are questions exclusively for determination by the trial court [*Taylor v. Polackwich (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 1014, 1022, 194 Cal. Rptr. 8* ; *but see Liodas v. Sahadi (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 278, 287, 292, 137 Cal. Rptr. 635, 562 P.2d 316* (burden of proof in civil actions in which fraud is an issue is a preponderance of the evidence)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.23

§ 561.23 Statute of Frauds

The statute of frauds does not apply to a constructive trust, because the trust is created by operation of law and is therefore exempt from the provisions of the statute. Thus, a constructive trust relating to real property need not be created, granted, assigned, surrendered, or declared in writing in order to be valid [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*; *see also South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 285, 303 P.2d 805* (based on former Civ. Code § 852 (*now see Prob. Code § 15206*))].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.24

§ 561.24 Parol Evidence

Trusts in personal property may be proved by parol evidence [*In re Kellogg (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 833, 841, 107 P.2d 964]* .

Generally, in an action to impose a constructive trust on real property, parol evidence is admissible not for the purpose of contradicting the deed conveying the property, but for the purpose of explaining the transactionsout of which the equity supporting imposition of the constructive trust arises [*Brison v. Brison (1888) 75 Cal. 525, 533, 17 P. 689]* .

Parol evidence is thus admissible to prove that real property is held by a grantee in constructive trust and to prove the terms of the trust, even though the conveyance of the property is in writing, absolute in its terms, and purports, on its face, to convey an estate in fee. However, in order that the property may be impressed with a constructive trust, the trust must be created and its terms agreed on prior to or at the time of execution of the conveyance [*Kingsley v. Carroll (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 358, 362-363, 234 P.2d 1039]* .

Parol evidence is also admissible to establish an oral employment contract for the purpose of showing a relationship between parties to a transaction for the sale of real property, the fiduciary duty arising therefrom, and to establish a constructive trust based on violation of that fiduciary duty [*Walter H. Leimert Co. v. Woodson (1954) 125 Cal. App. 2d 186, 190-191, 270 P.2d 95]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceParol EvidenceEvidenceRelevanceParol EvidenceReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.25

§ 561.25 Statute of Limitations

Because a constructive trust is a remedy, rather than a trust, a cause of action seeking the remedy is based on some act other than the imposition of the trust. Therefore, in an action for the imposition of a constructive trust, the statute of limitations to be applied is determined by the nature of the right sued on, not by the form of the action or the relief sought [*Davies v. Krasna (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 502, 515-516, 121 Cal. Rptr. 705, 535 P.2d 1161* ; *Day v. Greene (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 404, 411, 29 Cal. Rptr. 785, 380 P.2d 385]* .

An action to impose a constructive trust on real property has been held to be an action for the recovery of real property within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 318*, prescribing a five-year period of limitation [*Coppinger v. Superior Court (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 883, 891, 185 Cal. Rptr. 24* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 318*].

However, when the gist of an action is fraud, regardless of the form, the three-year period of limitation prescribed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)* applies, and this limitation period applies in an action, based on fraud, to establish a constructive trust in real property [*Security First Nat'l Bank v. Ross (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 424, 429-430, 29 Cal. Rptr. 538* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*]. The period does not commence to run until the aggrieved party knows or should know of the fraud [*Security First Nat'l Bank v. Ross (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 424, 429-430, 29 Cal. Rptr. 538* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*]. However, a cause of action to declare a constructive trust in favor of the rightful owner of property acquired by another through fraud arises at the time of acquisition by the latter if, for example,there is no concealment of facts surrounding the fraud and the facts are known or should have been known to the aggrieved party at the time the property was acquired by the constructive trustee [*Bell v. Bayly Bros. (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 149, 159, 127 P.2d 662* ; *see Security First Nat'l Bank v. Ross (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 424, 430-431, 29 Cal. Rptr. 538]* .

Similarly, an action to impose a constructive trust that is based on mistake is governed by the three-year limitation period in *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*. The action is commenced in time if the complaint is filed within three years after discovery of the facts constituting the mistake [*Nevarez v. Nevarez (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 596, 602, 21 Cal. Rptr. 70* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*].

The imposition of a constructive trust in an action in which the limitation period is not otherwise provided for by statute is governed by the four-year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 343*]. This limitation

period applies in all suits in equity not strictly of concurrent cognizance in law and equity [*Nelson v. Nevel (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 132, 140, 201 Cal. Rptr. 93]* . Thus, in an action by one partner to a nonmarital relationship to impose a constructive trust on, and thereby obtain her interest in, real property acquired through the mutual efforts of both partners during their cohabitation, but to which legal title was recorded in the other partner's name only, the court applied the four-year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* [*Nelson v. Nevel (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 132, 138, 140, 201 Cal. Rptr. 93]* .

No repudiation of the law-imposed constructive trust is necessary to set the appropriate statute of limitations in motion [*Security First Nat'l Bank v. Ross (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 424, 431, 29 Cal. Rptr. 538]* .

For a discussion of and forms for use in raising the bar of the statute of limitations, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.26

§ 561.26 Relief Available

[1] Generally

The matter of determining the appropriate equitable relief to be granted to a beneficiary of a constructive trust is generally left to the good judgment of the trial court. From the very nature of equity, a wide play is left to the court in formulating its decree, so that justice may be effectually carried out [*Rivero v. Thomas (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 225, 238, 194 P.2d 533]* .

[2] Election of Remedies

A plaintiff seeking restitutionary relief through the imposition of a constructive trust generally cannot also obtain a remedy at law for damages. Damages and restitution are alternative remedies, and an election to pursue one is a bar to invoking the other [*Weightman v. Hadley (1952) 113 Cal. App. 2d 598, 607, 248 P.2d 801]* .

[3] Conveyance of Trust Property

The theory of a constructive trust was adopted by equity as a remedy to compel one party to restore property to which he or she is not justlyentitled, to another [*Fowler v. Fowler (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 741, 744, 39 Cal. Rptr. 101]* . Thus, one type of relief usually granted in establishing and enforcing a constructive trust is a court order of conveyance of the trust property to the person entitled to it [*Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571* ; *see Michaelian v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1114, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133* (dicta)].

[4] Equitable Lien

A court may impose a lien on the trust property to secure payment of a judgment, including interest and costs of suit. However, punitive damages, even though properly awarded in an action to impose a constructive trust, may not be secured by a lien without special statutory provision therefor [*Rivero v. Thomas (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 225, 239, 194 P.2d 533* ; see also *Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571]* .

[5] Charitable Trust

A court may also achieve an equitable result by imposing a charitable trust on the trust property [*Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571* (imposition of constructive charitable trust on title to property of private civic club as justified to prevent club's unjust enrichment in club's action to discontinue city's use of building on property as public library)].

[6] Money Judgments

The constructive trustee is usually personally liable in damages for his or her acts, although the one whose property has been taken is not relegated to a personal claim against the wrongdoer. However, the beneficiary of the constructive trust cannot have both a judgment declaring the defendant to be a constructive trustee and a personal judgment for money invested in the subject property [*Fowler v. Fowler (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 741, 744-745, 39 Cal. Rptr. 101]* .

Courts have also recognized the rights of a constructive trust beneficiary to obtain a money judgment in lieu of destroyed trust property, and to recover the value of trust property commingled by a constructive trustee with the trustee's own property, so that the identity of the trust property could no longer be traced [*Elliott v. Elliott (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 205, 209-210, 41 Cal. Rptr. 686]* .

When the trust property has been sold to a bona fide purchaser for value, the constructive trust beneficiary may either hold the trustee for the proceeds of the sale or sue for the reasonable value of the trust property [*Johnson v. Clark (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 529, 536, 61 P.2d 767]* . On the other hand, if the purchaser had knowledge of the plaintiff's interest in the property and purchased it anyway, a constructive trust may be imposed on rents and profits derived from the property [*GHK Assocs. v. Mayer Group, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 856, 878-880, 274 Cal. Rptr. 168* (property transferred in breach of development agreement)].

The beneficiary of the constructive trust is also entitled to the profit on and enhancement in the value of the trust property [*Haskel Eng'g & Supply Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. (1978) 78 Cal. App. 3d 371, 375, 144 Cal. Rptr. 189* ; *see also § 561.17*].

[7] Injunctive Relief

Preliminary injunctive relief is available to prevent destruction of a plaintiff's equitable remedy of constructive trust [Heckmann v. Ahmanson (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 119, 135-136, *168 Cal. App. 3d 119, 214 Cal. Rptr. 177* (preliminary relief as proper to prevent dissipation of trust res and to preserve res to enable plaintiffs to trace its proceeds); *see Cramer v. Biddison (1968) 257 Cal. App. 2d 720, 727, 65 Cal. Rptr. 624* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 526* (grounds for preliminary injunctive relief)].

For further discussion of and forms for use in obtaining preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[8] Punitive Damages

A court may award punitive damages in an action to impose a constructive trust when under all the circumstances of the case such an award is not unjust and unreasonable. As a general rule, courts of equity will not award exemplary damages, although this rule is not without exception [*Rivero v. Thomas (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 225, 239, 194 P.2d 533* ; *see Civ. Code § 3294*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensEquitable LiensReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.27

§ 561.27 Defenses

[1] Laches

Laches may bar relief in equity whether or not the statute of limitations has run on the action at law [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 241, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

The defense of laches requires unreasonable delay in bringing suit, coupled with either acquiescence in the act about which plaintiff complains or prejudice to the defendant resulting from the delay. The prejudice is never presumed, but rather must be affirmatively demonstrated by the defendant to sustain his or her burdens of proof and production of the evidence on the issue. The beneficiary of a constructive trust will not be barred by laches even though he or she knows of the circumstances giving rise to the trust when he or she has no reason to believe that the constructive trustee is holding the property adversely [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 241, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

[2] Bona Fide Purchaser for Value

That one is a bona fide purchaser for value and without notice is a defense in an action by a beneficiary against a transferee of trust property [*see § 561.18*].

[3] Unclean Hands

Given the equitable nature of the constructive trust doctrine, a constructive trust will not be imposed if the claimant has unclean hands [*Taylor v. Fields (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 653, 666, 224 Cal. Rptr. 186]* . Any unconscionable conduct may give rise to the unclean hands defense [*Taylor v. Fields (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 653, 666, 224 Cal. Rptr. 186* (claimant in adulterous relationship with person through whom she claimed right to property)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsClean Hands PrincipleContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive TrustsTortsBusiness TortsFraud &

MisrepresentationActual FraudDefenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.28

§ 561.28 Sale of Felon's Item Enhanced by Notoriety of Crime

[1] Profits Subject to Involuntary Trust

NOTE:

The Supreme Court of California has held that *Civ. Code § 2225* is facially invalid under both the free speech clause of the *First Amendment to the federal Constitution* as applied to the states through the *Fourteenth Amendment*, and the liberty of speech clause of the California Constitution [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 415-416, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718* ; *see Cal. Const. art. I, § 2, subd. (a)*].

All "profits" derived from the sale or transfer of certain items by a convicted felon, as defined in *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10)* [*see § 561.28[3][f]*], are subject to an involuntary trust for the benefit of the beneficiaries described in *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)* [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2)*; *see § 561.28[3][i]*]. However, in the case of a sale or a transfer by a profiteer of a felony [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B)* ("profiteer of the felony" defined); for discussion, § 561.28[3][h]], the portion of the profits that represents the inherent value of the memorabilia, property, or thing sold or transferred, exclusive of the enhancement to the value due to the notoriety of the convicted felon, may be excluded from the involuntary trust [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(3)*].

This statutory scheme also provides that all proceeds from the preparation for the purpose of sale, the sale of rights to, or the sale of materials that include or are based on the depiction, portrayal, or reenactment of a felony for which a felon was convicted, are subject to an involuntary trust for the benefit of such beneficiaries [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(1)*; *see also Civ. Code § 2225(a)(9)* ("proceeds" defined)]. However, the California Supreme Court in 2002 ruled that this part of the statute is unconstitutional on its face. Because this provision imposes content-based financial penalties on protected speech, it must be narrowly tailored to meet a compelling state interest. The Court held that the provision is overinclusive in attempting to further the compelling state interest in preventing criminals from profiting from their crimes, and in compensating crime victims from those profits, because the provision confiscates all income from all expressive materials, whatever their general themes or subjects, that include significant discussion of their creators' past crimes [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 417-418, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718]* .

The Supreme Court's ruling does not prevent the victim of a felon, as a judgment creditor, from reaching a convicted

felon's assets, including those derived from expressive materials that describe the crime, by generally applicable remedies for the enforcement and satisfaction of judgments [*see Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 436 n.21, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718* ; *see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 481.010 et seq.*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 680.010 et seq.*].

For a form of complaint to recover profits from the sale or transfer of items, the value of which was enhanced by the notoriety gained from commission of a crime, see *§ 561.66*.

[2] Duration of Trust; Escheat of Remaining Funds

The involuntary trust imposed by *Civ. Code § 2225* continues until five years after the time of payment of the profits to the felon, or five years after the date of conviction, whichever is later. If an action is filed by a beneficiary to recover his or her interest in a trust within the five-year period, the trust character of the property continues until the conclusion of the action [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2)*].

At the end of the five-year trust period, any profits that have not been claimed by a beneficiary are transferred to the Controller, to be allocated to the Restitution Fund for the payment of claims under *Gov. Code § 13969* (state restitution payments to crime victims) [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2)*]. For discussion of procedures for restitution claims by crime victims, see Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

[3] Definitions

[a] Convicted Felon

"Convicted felon" means any person convicted of a felony, or found not guilty by reason of insanity of a felony committed in California, either by a court or jury trial, or by entry of a plea in court [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(1)*].

[b] Felony

"Felony" means a felony defined by any California or United States statute [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(2)*].

[c] Materials

"Materials" means books, magazine or newspaper articles, movies, films, videotapes, sound recordings, interviews or appearances on television and radio stations, and live presentations of any kind [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(6)*].

[d] Story

"Story" means a depiction, portrayal, or reenactment of a felony, and does not mean a passsing mention of the felony, as in a footnote or bibliography [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(7)*].

[e] Sale

"Sale" includes lease, license, or any other transfer or alienation taking place in California or elsewhere [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(8)*].

[f] Profits

"Profits" means all income from anything sold or transferred, by the felon, a representative of the felon, or a profiteer of the felony, including any right, the value of which is enhanced by the notoriety gained from the commission of a felony for which a convicted felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10)*]. The income may have been accrued, earned, or

paid before or after the conviction. However, voluntary donations or contributions to a defendant to assist in the defense of criminal charges are not deemed "profits," provided the donation or contribution is not given in exchange for some material of value [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10)*].

[g] Representative of Felon

"Representative of the felon" means any person or entity receiving proceeds by designation, on behalf, or instead of that felon, whether by the felon's designation or by operation of law [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(A)*].

[h] Profiteer of Felony

"Profiteer of the felony" means any person who sells or transfers for profit any memorabilia or other property or thing of the felon, the value of which is enhanced by the notoriety gained from the commission of the felony for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B)*]. However, this definition does not apply to the following:

- Any media entity reporting on the felon's story or on the sale of the materials, memorabilia, or other property or thing of the felon [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B)*].

- The sale of books, magazine or newspaper articles, movies, films, videotapes, sound recordings, interviews or television or radio appearances, or live presentations of any kind when the seller is exercising his or her *First Amendment* Rights [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B), (6)*].

- The sale or transfer by a profiteer of any other expressive work protected by the *First Amendment* unless the sale or transfer is primarily for a commercial or speculative purpose [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B)*].

[i] Beneficiary

"Beneficiary" means a person who, under applicable law, other than the provisions of *Civ. Code § 2225*, has or had a right to recover damages from the convicted felon for physical, mental, or emotional injury, or pecuniary loss proximately caused by the convicted felon as a result of the crime for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(A)*].

If a beneficiary has died, "beneficiary" also includes a person or estate entitled to recover damages pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.10 et seq.* (survival actions) [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(B)*].

If a person has died and the death was proximately caused by the convicted felon as a result of the crime for which the felon was convicted,"beneficary" also includes a person described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60* (actions for wrongful death) and any beneficiary of a will of the decedent who had a right under that will to receive more than 25 percent of the value of the decedent's estate [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(C)*].

[j] Beneficiary's Interest

"Beneficiary's interest or profits" means that portion of the proceeds necessary to pay the following:

- In the case of a beneficiary described in *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(A)* or *(B)*, those damages which, under applicable law other than *Civ. Code § 2225*, the beneficiary has or had a right to recover from the convicted felon for injuries proximately caused by the convicted felon as a result of the crime for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(A)*].

- In the case of a beneficiary described in *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(C)*, those damages which under all

the circumstances of the case may be just [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(B)*].

A beneficiary's interest is reduced by the following amounts:

- Money paid to the beneficiary from the Restitution Fund because of the crime for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(i)*].

- Money paid to the beneficiary by the convicted felon because of a requirement of restitution imposed by a court in connection with the crime for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(ii)*].

- Money paid to the beneficary because of a judgment against the convicted felon based on the crime for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(iii)*].

In the case of an unsatisfied existing judgment or order of restitution against the convicted felon and in favor of a beneficary, any money paid to the beneficary under *Civ. Code § 2225* must be applied to reduce the amount of the unsatisfied judgment or order [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(D)*].

[4] Procedure

[a] Action by Beneficiary

Any beneficiary may bring an action against a convicted felon, representative of the felon, or profiteer of the felony to recover his or her interest in the trust established by *Civ. Code § 2225* [*Civ. Code § 2225(c)(1)*].

[b] Jurisdiction and Venue

The beneficiary may bring the action in the superior court of the county in which the beneficiary resides, in which the convicted felon resides, or in which the proceeds or profits are located [*Civ. Code § 2225(c)(2)*].

[c] Statute of Limitations

Although the statutory language is not entirely clear, it appears that an action by a beneficiary to recover his or her interest in an involuntary trust under *Civ. Code § 2225* must be brought within the five-year trust period described in *Civ. Code § 2225(b)* [*see § 561.28[2]*]. The right of recovery under *Civ. Code § 2225* is not limited by any period of limitations except those provided by *Civ. Code § 2225* [*Civ. Code § 2225(h)*].

[d] Order for Payment From Profits

If the court determines that a beneficiary is entitled to profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2225*, the court must order the payment from profits that have been received, and, if that is insufficient, from profits that may be received in the future [*Civ. Code § 2225(c)(3)*].

[e] Apportionment of Profits Among Beneficiaries

If there are two or more beneficiaries and if the available profits are insufficient to pay all beneficiaries, the profits must be equitably apportioned among the beneficiaries, taking into account the effect of the crime on them [*Civ. Code § 2225(d)*].

[f] Priority of Payment of Profits

Before any distribution of any profits to a beneficiary, the court must determine whether the convicted felon has failed to pay any portion of a restitution fine or penalty fine imposed by a court, or any restitution imposed as a condition of probation. The court must also determine whether the felon is obligated to reimburse a governmental entity for the costs of his or her defense and whether a portion of the proceeds is needed to cover his or her reasonable attorney's fees incurred in the criminal proceeding related to the felony, in any appeal or other related proceeding, or in the defense of the action brought under *Civ. Code § 2225* [*Civ. Code § 2225(d)*].

The court must order payment of the foregoing obligations prior to any payment to a beneficiary, except that 60 percent of the profits must be reserved for payment to the beneficiaries [*Civ. Code § 2225(d)*].

[5] Action by Attorney General

The Attorney General may bring an action to require profits received by a convicted felon to be held in an express trust in a bank authorized to act as a trustee [*Civ. Code § 2225(e)(1)*]. If the Attorney General prevails in the action, the court will order that all profits be deposited in a bank and held by the bank as trustee of the trust until an order of disposition is made by a court pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2225(d)*, or until the expiration of the period specified in *Civ. Code § 2225(b)* [*see Civ. Code § 2225(e)(3)*]. If the Attorney General prevails, the court must also order the payment of reasonable costs and attorney's fees to the Attorney General from the profits [*Civ. Code § 2225(e)(4)*].

An action by the Attorney General under *Civ. Code § 2225(e)* must be brought within one year after the receipt of the profits by the convicted felon, or one year after the date of conviction, whichever is later [*Civ. Code § 2225(e)(2)*].

[6] Preliminary Injunctive Relief

On motion of any party in an action brought to obtain payment from the involuntary trust, the court must grant a preliminary injunction to prevent any waste of profits if it appears that they are subject to the trust and that they may be subject to waste [*Civ. Code § 2225(f)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10)* ("profits" defined); *see also § 561.28[3][f]*]. On motion of the Attorney General or any potential beneficiary, the court must grant a preliminary injunction against a person against whom an indictment or information for a felony has been filed in superior court to prevent any waste of profits if there is probable cause to believe that the profits would be subject to an involuntary trust on conviction of the person and that they may be subject to waste [*Civ. Code § 2225(f)(2)*].

[7] Violation of Court Order as Contempt

Any violation of a court order made under *Civ. Code § 2225* is punishable as contempt [*Civ. Code § 2225(g)*].

[8] Remedies Cumulative

The remedies available under *Civ. Code § 2225* are in addition to other remedies provided by law [*Civ. Code § 2225(h)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptEstate, Gift & Trust LawIntestacyEscheatEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 561.29-561.39

[Reserved]

§§ 561.29[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.40

§ 561.40 State Statutes

[1] Deceit

Deceit is promise made without intention to perform. *Civ. Code § 1710(4)*

[2] Fraud

Fraud is either actual or constructive. *Civ. Code § 1571*

Actual fraud defined. *Civ. Code § 1572*

Constructive fraud defined. *Civ. Code § 1573*

[3] Involuntary Trusts

One who wrongfully detains a thing is involuntary trustee thereof for benefit of owner. *Civ. Code § 2223*

One who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, violation of trust, or other wrongful act is involuntary trustee thereof. *Civ. Code § 2224*

[4] Menace

Menace is threat of unlawful and violent injury to person. *Civ. Code § 1570(2)*

[5] Mistake

Mistake is either of law or fact. *Civ. Code § 1576*

Mistake of fact defined. *Civ. Code § 1577*

Mistake of law defined. *Civ. Code § 1578*

Mistake of foreign law is mistake of fact. *Civ. Code § 1579*

[6] Profits Derived From Felony

Definitions. *Civ. Code § 2225(a)*

Involuntary trust is imposed on profits from sale or transfer of anything with value enhanced by notoriety derived from commission of crime. *Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2)*

Exclusion from involuntary trust of profits representing inherent value of items sold or transferred. *Civ. Code § 2225(b)(3)*

Action by beneficiary to recover interest in trust. *Civ. Code § 2225(c)*

Allocation of profits recovered. *Civ. Code § 2225(d)*

Action by Attorney General to require deposit of profits in bank to be held in express trust. *Civ. Code § 2225(e)*

Injunctive relief in action under *Civ. Code § 2225*. *Civ. Code § 2225(f)*

Violation of court order under *Civ. Code § 2225* punishable as contempt. Civ. Code § 2225(g)

Cumulative nature of remedies; inapplicability of limitations periods in other statutes. *Civ. Code § 2225(h)*

[7] Statute of Frauds

Creation, assignment, grant, surrender, or declaration of estates or interests in land is only accomplished by instrument in writing unless by operation of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1971 does not prevent creation or extinction of trusts by operation of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*

Trust relating to real property is required to be evidenced by writing or by operation of law. *Prob. Code § 15206*

[8] Statutes of Limitation

Action to recover real property to be commenced within five years of seisin or possession. *Code Civ. Proc. § 318*

Action for relief on ground of fraud or mistake to be commenced within three years after discovery of facts constituting fraud or mistake. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*

Action for relief not limited by other provision to be commenced within four years after accrual of cause of action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 343*

[9] Undue Influence

Undue influence defined. *Civ. Code § 1575*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesDuress & Undue InfluenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.41

§ 561.41 Decisions

[1] Accrual of Cause of Action

Accrual of cause of action to impose constructive trust based on fraud and mistake; knowledge of facts constituting breach of trust. *Bennett v. Hibernia Bank (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 540, 559, 305 P.2d 20* (fraud and mistake); *Marshall v. Marshall (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 232, 250-251, 42 Cal. Rptr. 686* (constructive fraud)

[2] Attorney's Fees

Award of attorney's fees from constructive trust property is not unreasonable in action by plaintiff for benefit of himself and defendant investors, rather than for plaintiff's own right or exclusive benefit, and when plaintiff as well as defendant investors benefited as result of action. *Churchill v. Peters (1943) 57 Cal. App. 2d 521, 531-532, 134 P.2d 841*

[3] Burden of Proof

Degree of proof required in action to impose constructive trust is clear and convincing evidence; mere preponderance of evidence is not sufficient. *Cameron v. Crocker-Citizens Nat'l Bank (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 940, 943-944, 97 Cal. Rptr. 269*

[4] Jurisdiction

In action to impress constructive trust on sums received by defendants from estate, court as properly retaining jurisdiction to amend judgment to include further damages. *Day v. Sharp (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 904, 912, 123 Cal. Rptr. 918*

[5] Limitation of Actions

Three-year period of limitation prescribed by former Code Civ. Proc. § 338(4) (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*) as applicable when constructive fraudis gravamen of action, even though breach of contract is involved. *Day v. Greene (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 404, 411, 29 Cal. Rptr. 785, 380 P.2d 385*

Nature of right sued on, rather than form of action or relief demanded, as determining applicability of particular statute of limitations. *Jefferson v. J.E. French Co. (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 717, 718-719, 7 Cal. Rptr. 899, 355 P.2d 643*

Repudiation as not necessary to start running of statute of limitations against constructive trustee; statute as running from time beneficiaries knew or should have known of trustee's wrongful act. *Bainbridge v. Stoner (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 423, 429, 106 P.2d 423*

Statute of limitations ordinarily commences to run on right to enforce constructive trust from time beneficiary has knowledge of wrongful holding of property. *Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 240, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Action to establish constructive trust when husband had unduly influenced wife to transfer her separate funds to joint account, which he then converted to his own use, held barred within three years under *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d). Triplett v. Williams (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 135, 137, 74 Cal. Rptr. 594*

[6] Lis Pendens

Fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is real property claim for purposes of lis pendens statute. *Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395*

Lis pendens is not available in trustee's action requesting imposition of constructive trust and equitable lien on defendant's house for amount of money defendant used to make improvements to house, which defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over deceased trustor. *Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68*

Plaintiff may not file notice of lis pendens unless plaintiff pleads cause of action that affects title to specific real property. *Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554*

Plaintiff is not entitled to lis pendens in action in which only relief sought is money damages. *Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116*

Plaintiff's entitlement to constructive trust is not determinative of whether plaintiff may maintain a lis pendends. *BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 970, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693*

When pleading combines theories of liability for money damages and for constructive trust, plaintiff should not be allowed to maintain lis pendens. *BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693*

Constructive trust claim does not support a lis pendends. *Lewis v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1850, 1862-1863, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 63* (rejecting contention that plaintiff was entitled to lis pendens in action to impose constructive trust on property purchased with stolen funds)

Expungement of lis pendens proper when purpose of constructive trust on real property is only to secure payment of debt. *LaPaglia v. Superior Court (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1322, 1329, 264 Cal. Rptr. 63* ; *Urez v. Superior Court*

(1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1141, 1149, 235 Cal. Rptr. 837 ; *Deane v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 292, 297, 210 Cal. Rptr. 406* ; *Burger v. Superior Court (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1017-1019, 199 Cal. Rptr. 227* (all criticizing *Coppinger v. Superior Court (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 883, 891, 185 Cal. Rptr. 24* , which held action to impose constructive trust on real property as action affecting title to or possession of real property in which lis pendens may properly be filed).

[7] Other Wrongful Acts

Triable issues of fact as presented whether property was wrongfully acquired by law firm that previously represented partners and used confidentialinformation regarding partnership's negotiations for purchase of property, which was obtained by firm member who was limited partner. *Tri-Growth Ctr. City, Ltd. v. Silldorf, Burdman, Duignan & Eisenberg (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1154, 265 Cal. Rptr. 330*

[8] Preemption by Federal Law

Mere fact that Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act (*5 U.S.C. §§ 8701-8716*) contains no anti-attachment provision is insufficient to support conclusion that constructive trust may be imposed on proceeds of insurance policy issued under act, under California law consistently with act's provisions; imposition of constructive trust under California law on proceeds of policy is preempted by *5 C.F.R. § 870.902*, providing for change of beneficiary at any time and without knowledge or consent of previous beneficary, and prohibiting waiver or restriction of right. *Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. McShan (N.D. Cal. 1983) 577 F. Supp. 165, 167, 169*

Imposition of constructive trust under California law (former Civ. Code § 2224) on proceeds of check cashed and wrongfully retained by debtor's lessor is unenforceable in bankruptcy proceeding if imposition of trust conflicts with distribution of funds contemplated by Bankruptcy Act in case at bar. *In re Esgro, Inc. (9th Cir. 1981) 645 F.2d 794, 797-798*

[9] Proceeds or Profits Subject to Involuntary Trust

Supreme Court of California has held that *Civ. Code § 2225* is facially invalid under both free speech clause of *First Amendment* to federal Constitution as applied to states through *Fourteenth Amendment*, and liberty of speech clause of California Constitution [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 415-416, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718]* .

[10] Purpose of Remedy

Purpose of imposing constructive trust is preventing unjust enrichment. *Day v. Greene (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 404, 411, 29 Cal. Rptr. 785, 380 P.2d 385*

[11] Resulting Trust Distinguished

Purpose of constructive trust is to prevent unjust enrichment and to prevent a person from taking advantage of his or her own wrongdoing. *Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*

Constructive trust is not a true trust, but is an equitable remedy available to a plaintiff seeking to recover specific property in a number of different situations. *Olson v. Toy (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 818, 823, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

[12] When Imposition Improper

When A agrees to sell property to B and B agrees to sell it to C, and both sales are executed through single escrow, property is subject to judgment liens against B, even though B put up no money for property which was paid for entirely by C, and neither resulting trust nor constructive trust arises in favor of *C. Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Co., Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 483-486, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547*

Shareholder does not own any part of specific property of corporation, and thus, did not meet "entitlement to res" criteria for imposition of constructive trust on real property transferred by corporation in allegedly fraudulent merger. *Pacific Lumber Co. v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-378, 276 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Imposition of constructive trust on real property transferred by corporation in allegedly fraudulent merger/exchange of shares was improper when subsidiary that got title to property was not wrongdoer; corporate veil would not be pierced to impute parent corporation's alleged wrongdoing to subsidiary; even if merger was rescinded, constructive trust could only be imposed on shares held by parent corporation. *Pacific Lumber Co. v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 371, 377-378, 276 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Imposition of constructive trust against income tax overpayment refund was improper when state and Franchise Tax Board properly applied refund to offset amount owed to state under prior judgment against taxpayer. *Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 895, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582*

No constructive trust in favor of adopted son on proceeds of ranch sold by deceased adoptive father by virtue of his written agreement to devise property to adopted son. *Walters v. Calderon (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 863, 873-876, 102 Cal. Rptr. 89*

[13] When Imposition Proper

Constructive trust is appropriate remedy for business partner's breach of fiduciary duty in failing to inform other partner of offer for partnership property considerably greater than value placed on property during dissolution negotiations. *Lund v. Albrecht (9th Cir. 1991) 936 F.2d 459, 464*

When partners or joint venturers have agreed to buy specific parcel of real property, and one partner or joint venturer, in breach of fiduciary duty, wrongfully acquires property in his or her own name, the other partner or joint venturer may bring an action to impose a constructive trust and requiring the wrongdoing partner or joint venturer to convey the appropriate share of legal title. *BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 970, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693*

Under *Civ. Code §§ 2223* and *2224* and case law applying them, a constructive trust may only be imposed when the following three conditions are met: (1) the existence of property or some interest in property; (2) the plaintiff's right to that property; and (3) the defendant's wrongful acquisition or detention of the property. *Burlesci v. Petersen (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1062, 1067, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704* ; *Communist Party v. 522 Valencia, Inc. (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 980, 990-991, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*

Constructive trust properly imposed on assets of estate of husband who committed suicide after court in dissolution of marriage proceeding ordered him to provide life insurance for benefit of spouse. *Tintocalis v. Tintocalis (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1590, 1596, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 655*

Allegations that seller's broker failed to communicate plaintiffs' offer to seller and bought property for amount less than plaintiffs offered stated cause of action for imposition of constructive trust; breach by seller's broker of duty of honesty

and fair dealing owed to potential purchasers, while notamounting to misrepresentation nor based on fiduciary obligation, was sufficient. *Nguyen v. Scott (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 725, 737-740, 253 Cal. Rptr. 800*

Court may impose constructive trust on gains resulting from attorney's breach of fiduciary duty to client. *David Welch Co. v. Erskine & Tulley (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 884, 894, 250 Cal. Rptr. 339*

Constructive trust is appropriate remedy to fulfill reasonable expectations of parties to nonmarital relationship and to prevent unjust enrichment; fiduciary or confidential relationship as unnecessary. *Nelson v. Nevel (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 132, 139, 201 Cal. Rptr. 93*

Although judgment affirmed on resulting trust theory, trial court findings supported imposition of constructive trust in plaintiff's favor for one-half interest in real property when each party supplied half of down payment, defendant to take title and make payments in lieu of rent, and plaintiff to receive one-half proceeds when defendant vacated premises. *Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Imposition of constructive trust against income tax overpayment refund was proper under *Civ. Code § 2223-2224* if state and Franchise Tax Board wrongfully detain refund, or gain it by accident, mistake, or other wrongful act absent better right to it than taxpayer. *Del Costello v. State of California (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 887, 895, 185 Cal. Rptr. 582*

Constructive trust theory was proper for allowing court to give plaintiff property purchased with funds stolen from him, although plaintiff's only relevant request was for "such other and further relief as the court deems just." *Pena v. Toney (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 534, 541, 542, 160 Cal. Rptr. 4*

Imposition of constructive trust on properties of decedent's estate in favor of legal wife against interests of putative spouse is appropriate remedy. *Sousa v. Freitas (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 660, 667, 89 Cal. Rptr. 485*

Constructive trust as available to enforce vendor's lien (*Civ. Code § 3046*) against subsequent purchasers of real property with notice. *Edwards-Town, Inc. v. Dimin (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 87, 93-94, 87 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.42

§ 561.42 Law Reviews

Franklin, *Constructive Trust as a Remedy in Commercial Litigation-- An Argument Against It*, 17 Bev. Hills B.J. 110 (1983)

Note, *Constructive Trust and the Political Widow: A Remedy for Unjust Enrichment Arising from Unused Political Campaign Funds, 46 So. Cal. L. Rev. 1168 (1973)*

Note, *The Necessity for Unjust Enrichment in a Constructive Trust in California: Elliott v. Elliott, 19 Hastings L.J. 1268 (1968)*

Evans, *Observations on the State, etc., of the California Laws of Uses and Trusts, 28 So. Cal. L. Rev. 111 (1955)*

Note, *Real Property: Statute of Frauds: Grantor's Remedies for Breach of Invalid Promise to Reconvey: Constructive Trust: Restitution, 40 Cal. L. Rev. 621 (1952)*

Note, *Trusts and Trustees: Creation of Express or Constructive Trusts by Contract for Joint Bank Account, 29 Cal. L. Rev. 90 (1940)*

Comment, *Trusts: Constructive and Resulting: Part Performance: Estoppel, 19 Cal. L. Rev. 70 (1930)*

Comment, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts: Oral Promise to Hold: Fraud: Confidential Relationship, 13 Cal. L. Rev. 174 (1925)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive

Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.43

§ 561.43 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 372, 620-622, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 796-800 (4th ed. 1996-1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 13, *Trusts*, §§ 319-328 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 561.44-561.59

[Reserved]

§§ 561.44[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.60

§ 561.60 Complaint--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Real Property Obtained Through Fraud [Civ. Code § 2224]; Order for Reconveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], Preliminary Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 526], and Accounting--Against Constructive Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Real Property Obtained Through Fraud [Civ. Code § 2224]; Order for Reconveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], Preliminary Injunctive Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 526], and Accounting--Against Constructive Trustee--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR IMPOSITION OF CON-
[and DOES 1 through _____],	)	STRUCTIVE TRUST [AND PRELIMINARY IN-
Defendant(s).	)	JUNCTION]
	)	(Fraud)
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. The real property referred to herein is that real property located at _____ [*street address and, if any, city*], _____ County, California, and more fully described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description of property*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously

named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged.]

[3. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting in the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant orally agreed _____ [*specify oral agreement, e.g.,* to jointly purchase the above-described real property].

5. Pursuant to the terms of the agreement, _____ [*specify defendant's promises, e.g.,* defendant promised to acquire the property for both plaintiff and defendant by bidding at an auction at which the property wasto be sold. Defendant promised, if successful in acquiring the property, to convey a one-third interest in the property to plaintiff in exchange for plaintiff's payment of one third of the purchase price and of the expenses of the purchase.]

6. In reliance on defendant's promises, plaintiff _____ [*specify plaintiff's acts in reliance on defendant's promises, e.g.,* neither attended nor bid for the property at the above-mentioned auction].

7. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*specify defendant's acquisition of the property, e.g.,* at auction in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California, the above-described real property was sold to defendant as the highest bidder, for a price of $_____].

[8. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff demanded of defendant that he/she _____ (*specify plaintiff's demand for performance, e.g.,* convey to plaintiff an undivided one-third interest in the property in exchange for plaintiff's payment of one-third of the purchase price and of the expenses of the purchase).]

9. Defendant has failed and refused and continues to fail and refuse to convey plaintiff's share of the property to him/her.

10. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [A]t the time defendant made the promises to plaintiff, as alleged above, defendant had no intention of performing them.

11. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [D]efendant made these promises to plaintiff with the intent to defraud plaintiff and to induce plaintiff to _____ [*specify acts, e.g.,* forbear from bidding for the property at auction so that defendant could bid for the property without competition and thereby acquire and keep the property all for himself/herself].

12. At the time these promises were made and at the time plaintiff acted in reliance on them, plaintiff was ignorant of defendant's secret intention not to perform, and _____ [*allege plaintiff's justifiable reliance on the promises, e.g.,* could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have discovered defendant's secret intention and therefore acted reasonably in relying on defendant's promises]. Had plaintiff known of defendant's secret intention not to perform, plaintiff would not have acted in reliance on defendant's promises.

13. By virtue of his/her fraudulent acts, defendant holds the property described above as a constructive trustee for plaintiff's benefit.

[14. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (S)ince approximately _____ (*date*), defendant has caused and continues to cause injury to the property and to plaintiff's beneficial interest therein by committing waste on the property by _____ (*describe defendant's acts or omissions constituting waste*)].

[15. (Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (P)rior to the commencement of defendant's conduct, the above-described property had a reasonable market value of $_____; presently, its reasonable market value is $_____].

[16. (Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (P)laintiff's beneficial interest in the property held in trust for him/her by defendant will be further wasted unless defendant's conduct is forthwith enjoined].

[17. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff requested, in writing, that defendant provide plaintiff with a statement of all sums of money collected as rent on the property, less expenses, to which plaintiff is entitled as rightful owner of the property. A copy of the request is attached hereto, marked Exhibit _____, and incorporated by reference herein.]

[18. Defendant refused, and continues to refuse, plaintiff's request for information concerning rental income from the property.]

[19. Plaintiff does not know the amount owing as rental income and an accounting is necessary to determine this amount given the complex nature of the account, in that _____ (*state reason account is complex, e.g.,* the property in issue contains 15 rental units and defendant may be entitled to a number of deductions from gross rental income).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds _____ [the real property *or* an undivided _____ (*specify proportion, e.g.,* one-third) interest in the real property] described above in trust for plaintiff;

2. For an order compelling defendant to convey to plaintiff _____ [the real property *or* an undivided _____ (*specify proportion, e.g.,* one-third) interest in the real property];

[3. For an order granting possession of the property to the plaintiff;]

[4. For an order preliminarily enjoining defendant and his/her agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for him/her from _____ (*specify acts or omissions constituting waste*);] and

[5. For an accounting of all monies owing to plaintiff.]

[6. For damages in the amount of all monies found owing to plaintiff.]

7. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use to bring an action to impose a constructive trust on and to compel reconveyance of real

property acquired through fraud based on a promise made without the intention of performing it [*see Civ. Code §§ 1710(4), 2224*]. The form is adapted from the facts in *Helfrich v. Kerley (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 726, 13 Cal. Rptr. 753* .

CAUTION:

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc.§ 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E. H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Pleading Requirements

The pleading requirements for a constructive trust are [*Michaelian v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1114, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133]* :

- Facts constituting the underlying cause of action, and
- Specific identifiable property to which the defendant has title.

[4] Allegations

[a] Subject Matter of and Parties to Action

This form of complaint identifies the property that is the subject of the action (Paragraph 1), and includes optional paragraphs to allege the existence of fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 474*] and an agency relationship between and among defendants (Paragraph 3).

[b] Fraud

The form alleges elements of a cause of action for fraud based on a promise made without any intention of performing it: (1) defendant's promises to plaintiff (Paragraph 5), (2) plaintiff's actions in justifiable reliance on the promises (Paragraphs 6 and 12), (3) defendant's lack of any intent to perform the promises (Paragraph 10), (4) defendant's intent to induce plaintiff to rely on the promises (Paragraph 11), (5) defendant's refusal to perform the promises (Paragraph 9), and (6) damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 7) [*see Fowler v. Fowler (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 741, 747-748, 39 Cal. Rptr. 101]* .

[c] Constructive Trust

The form also includes allegations necessary for the imposition of a constructive trust on the property wrongfully acquired by defendant: (1) the existence of property or some interest therein (Paragraphs 1, 4, and 5), (2) the plaintiff's right to it (Paragraphs 4-12), and (3) the defendant's gain of the property by fraud (Paragraphs 5-7 and 10-12) [*Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 128, 139, 191 Cal. Rptr. 849]* .

[5] Preliminary Injunctive Relief

The complaint includes optional allegations of waste as grounds for preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraphs 14-16) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2), (5)*]. The doctrineof waste applies, by definition, only to real property. Proof of conduct

that has resulted in substantial depreciation of the market value of land establishes waste (Paragraph 15) [*see Smith v. Cap Concrete, Inc. (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 769, 775-776, 184 Cal. Rptr. 308]* . For further discussion of and forms for use in alleging waste, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common* , Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy* , and Ch. 344, *Life Estates and Remainders* .

[6] Prayer

Paragraph 2 of the prayer requests an order compelling defendant to convey the real property in issue to the plaintiff [*see Civ. Code § 3375*; *Murphy v. Hopcroft (1904) 142 Cal. 43, 46, 75 P. 567]* . Optional Paragraph 3 of the prayer requests an order granting plaintiff possession of the real property in issue to the plaintiff, which is also a proper form of relief when a plaintiff is entitled to specific real property [*see Civ. Code § 3375*; *Smith v. Smith (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 574, 576, 118 P.2d 487]* .

[7] Accounting

Because the form involves real property that may have generated rental income, an optional allegation of plaintiff's demand for and defendant's refusal of an accounting of profits acquired by defendant is included (Paragraphs 17-19). A complaint in an action for an accounting must normally allege either a fiduciary relationship between plaintiff and defendant or an unknown balance due when the accounts are so complicated in nature that an ordinary legal action demanding a fixed sum is impractible and cannot be determined without an accounting (Paragraph 19) [*San Pedro Lumber Co. v. Reynolds (1896) 111 Cal. 588, 596, 44 P. 309* ; *Civic W. Corp. v. Zila Indus., Inc. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 1, 14, 135 Cal. Rptr. 915* ; *see Raymond v. Independent Growers, Inc. (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 154, 160, 284 P.2d 57* ; *St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 359, 287 P.2d 387]* . Generally, the complaint must also allege plaintiff's demand for and defendant's refusal to provide an accounting (Paragraphs 17-18) [*see Wooster v. Nevills (1887) 73 Cal. 58, 60, 14 P. 390]* . For a discussion and forms for use in an accounting action, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*.

[8] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[9] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal.*

App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693] . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[10] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to fraud and deceit, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*

[11] State Statutes

Elements of deceit. *Civ. Code § 1710*

Promise made without intention to perform is deceit. *Civ. Code § 1710(4)*

One who wrongfully detains a thing is involuntary trustee thereof for benefit of owner. *Civ. Code § 2223*

One who gains a thing by fraud, unless holding other and better right thereto, is involuntary trustee of thing gained for benefit of person who would otherwise have had it. *Civ. Code § 2224*

Statute of limitations for fraud is three years from date of discovery by aggrieved party of facts constituting fraud. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*

[12] Decisions

Imposition of constructive trust on property acquired through fraud requires establishment of cause of action for fraud. *Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 128, 139, 191 Cal. Rptr. 849*

In action for imposition of constructive trust, conveyance of property to its equitable owner as normal remedy. *Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571*

Constructive trust as arising and enforceable on repudiation of oral promise to convey property. *Fowler v. Fowler (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 741, 746, 39 Cal. Rptr. 101*

In constructive trusts based on fraud or wrongdoing, oral promise to convey property as sufficient, and existence or absence of confidential relationship between parties as not controlling. *Fowler v. Fowler (1964) 227 Cal. App. 2d 741, 746, 39 Cal. Rptr. 101*

Imposition of constructive trust on property as proper when defendant induced plaintiffs to refrain from bidding on property by agreeing to bid on property to acquire it jointly for parties without any intent to perform agreement, and subsequently bought property for himself. *Helfrich v. Kerley (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 726, 728-729, 13 Cal. Rptr. 753*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.61

§ 561.61 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Damages [Civ. Code § 3336] for Conversion, for Imposition of Constructive Trust on Proceeds of Embezzled Funds, Including Real Property Purchased With Part of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2224], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Embezzler--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Damages [Civ. Code § 3336] for Conversion, for Imposition of Constructive Trust on Proceeds of Embezzled Funds, Including Real Property Purchased With Part of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2224], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Embezzler--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES, IMPOSITION OF
_____ [*name*],	)	CONSTRUCTIVE TRUST, AND ORDER OF CON-
Defendant.	)	VEYANCE
	)	(Embezzlement)
	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 2224, 3336*]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. At all times mentioned herein, defendant was, and now is, a resident of the County of _____, California.

2. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*describe circumstances that put defendant in position to embezzle from plaintiff, e.g.,* plaintiff employed defendant as a bookkeeper for plaintiff's business, _____ (*specify name of business*). Defendant continued in plaintiff's employ until

_____ [*date*]. During the course of his/her employment, defendant, as bookkeeper, was solely and completely in charge of maintaining the business accounts and business records of plaintiff's business, and plaintiff employed no other person for this purpose].

3. During the period of his/her employment, defendant, _____ [*describe manner in which defendant embezzled from plaintiff, e.g.,* by means of false and fraudulent alteration and writing of checks drawn on plaintiff's business accounts, and by means of false, fraudulent, and deceptive entries in the check register, journal, and other business records, misappropriated and converted to his/her personal use and possession, without plaintiff's knowledge or consent, the sum of $_____ (*specify, e.g.,* $45,000), all of which sum belonged to plaintiff].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant deposited the full amount of that sum in a personal account at the _____ [*name of depositary institution*], account number _____.

5. Subsequently, on or about _____ [*date*], defendant purchased a parcel of real property located at _____ [*street address, including city, if any*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as _____ [*provide legal description*]. On or about _____ [*date*], title to the property was conveyed to defendant.

6. To date, defendant has paid the sum of $_____ [*specify, e.g.,* $30,000] on the purchase price of the property, the entire amount of which came from the account at _____ [*name of depositary institution*], mentioned above.

7. By virtue of defendant's wrongful acts, he/she holds the converted funds, in the amount of $_____ [*specify, e.g.,* $45,000], and the real property described above as a constructive trustee for the benefit of plaintiff.

[8. *Right to accounting. See § 561.60, Paragraphs 17-19.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the funds converted in the amount of $_____ [*specify, e.g.,* $45,000];

2. For interest at the legal rate on $_____ (*specify, e.g.,* $45,000), pursuant to *Section 3336 of the Civil Code*, from and after _____ [*date*];

3. For an order declaring that defendant holds the real property described above in trust for plaintiff;

4. For an order declaring plaintiff the owner of the real property, subject to any existing encumbrances thereon;

5. For an order compelling defendant to convey the real property to plaintiff;

[6. *Accounting. See § 561.60, Prayer, Paragraphs 5, 6;*]

7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a person from whom funds have been embezzled to bring an action for damages for conversion and for imposition of a constructive trust on the funds converted and on real property acquired with the converted funds [*Civ. Code §§ 2224, 3336*]. The form is adapted from the facts in *Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 203 P.2d 547* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Conversion

This form of complaint alleges the capacity and residence of the defendant (Paragraph 1) [*see Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 611, 122 P.2d 557* (action primarily involving determination of interest in personal property as essentially transitory, and venue as properly laid in county of defendant's residence); *see also § 561.20*].

The conversion cause of action contains the following allegations: (1) plaintiff's interest in and right to possession of the converted funds (Paragraph 2); (2) the value of the funds (Paragraph 3); and (3) defendant's conversion of the funds, including the acquisition of real property as proceeds of the converted funds (Paragraphs 4-6). For a complete discussion of and forms of for use in actions for conversion, see Ch. 150, *Conversion* .

[b] Constructive Trust

The form also includes allegations necessary to impose a constructive trust on the converted funds and on the real property acquired with a portion of those funds: (1) the existence of property or some interest in that property (Paragraphs 4-6), (2) the plaintiff's right to it (Paragraphs 3 and 7), and (3) the defendant's gain of the property by the wrongful act of conversion (Paragraphs 2-6) [*see Lazar v. Hertz Corp. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 128, 139, 191 Cal. Rptr. 849* ; *see also Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 504, 203 P.2d 547* (one who wrongfully detains funds of another as involuntary trustee thereof for benefit of owner)].

[4] Imposition of Constructive Trust on Proceeds of Funds Wrongfully Acquired

A person who embezzles funds and deposits them in his or her personal bank account becomes a constructive trustee of the funds deposited. Furthermore, a trust will be imposed on property acquired with the funds unless the property is held by a bona fide purchaser for value, without notice, and in good faith [*Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 504, 203 P.2d 547* ; *see §§ 561.17, 561.18*].

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[7] Cross References

For a discussion and forms for use in conversion actions, see Ch. 150, *Conversion*

For a related form, see *§ 561.60*

[8] State Statutes

Statute of limitations as three years in action for taking, detaining, or injuring goods or chattels. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(c)*

Statute of limitations as 90 days in action for conversion of personal property left at hotel, hospital, rest home, sanitarium, boarding house, lodging house, furnished apartment, or furnished bungalow court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 341a*

Statute of limitations as 180 days in action for conversion of well-drilled oil, gas, or other liquid or fluid. *Code Civ. Proc. § 3493*/4

[9] Decisions

Constructive trust as properly impressed on property acquired with funds wrongfully acquired from another, unless property is held by bona fide purchaser for value and without notice. *Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 504, 203 P.2d 547*

One who wrongfully detains funds of another as involuntary trustee thereof for owner's benefit. *Church v. Bailey (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 501, 504, 203 P.2d 547*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.62

§ 561.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Interest in Real Property Acquired by Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code § 1577], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and Accounting--Against Joint Tenant--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Interest in Real Property Acquired by Mistake of Fact [Civ. Code § 1577], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and Accounting--Against Joint Tenant--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR IMPOSITION OF CON-
_____ [*name*],	)	STRUCTIVE TRUST [AND PRELIMINARY IN-
Defendant.	)	JUCTION]
	)	(Mistake)
	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 1577, 2224*]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Description of real property. See § 561.60, Paragraph 1.*]

[*SET OUT the facts giving rise to the mistake in successive paragraphs*]

2. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant were married to each other in _____ [*city and state or country*].

3. The marriage of the parties was dissolved by a judgment of dissolution entered by the Superior Court of _____ County, California, and effective on _____ [*date*].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], prior to the dissolution, the parties, as buyers, entered into a written contract with _____ [*name*], as seller, for the purchase of the real property described above. A copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated herein by reference.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], prior to the dissolution, defendant conveyed to plaintiff in writing all his/her right, title, and interest in and to the property. Plaintiff recorded the conveyance in the Official Records of the County of _____, California, Book _____, page _____. A copy of the conveyance is attached as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated herein by reference.

6. After plaintiff acquired defendant's interest in the contract, plaintiff paid the balance of the purchase price for the property in full.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], the seller of the property _____ [*name*] executed a deed to the property, and recorded the deed in the Official Records of the County of _____, California, Book _____, page _____. A copy of the deed is attached as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated herein by reference.

8. The deed contains a mistake of material fact in that _____ [*specify mistake, e.g.,* contrary to plaintiff's intention, it conveyed the property to plaintiff and defendant as grantees, rather than to plaintiff as grantee].

9. As a result of the mistake, plaintiff was injured in that _____ [*describe injury, e.g.,* there exists a cloud on the title to the property because defendant has refused and continues to refuse to convey his/her legal title to plaintiff].

[10. *Defendant's commission of waste on the property. See § 561.60, Paragraph 14.*]

[11. *Decrease in market value of the property due to defendant's waste. See § 561.60, Paragraph 15.*]

[12. *Plaintiff's beneficial interest in the property subject to further waste absent injunctive relief. See § 561.60, Paragraph 16.*]

[13. *Right to accounting. See § 561.60, Paragraphs 17-19.*]

14. By virtue of the mistake of fact described above, defendant holds his/her interest in the property as a constructive trustee for plaintiff's benefit.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds his/her interest in the real property hereinabove described in trust for plaintiff;

2. For an order compelling defendant to convey to plaintiff defendant's interest in the real property;

[3. *Preliminary injunctive relief. See § 561.60, Prayer Paragraph 3*];

[4. *Accounting. See § 561.60, Prayer Paragraphs 5 and 6*]; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to bring an action to impose a constructive trust on, and to obtain an order conveying to plaintiff, an interest in property that was conveyed by mistake of fact to plaintiff and defendant as joint tenants, rather than to plaintiff alone [*see Civ. Code §§ 1577, 2224*]. The form is adapted from the facts in *Abbott v. Miller (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 595, 220 P.2d 570* .

A grantor's mistake in drafting a deed furnishes grounds for relief under *Civ. Code § 2224*, if a person thereby gains an apparent interest in property to which he or she is not entitled. The person thus holds his or her interest as an involuntary trustee for the benefit of the rightful owner [*Abbott v. Miller (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 595, 596, 220 P.2d 570]* .

CAUTION:

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitleplaintiff to the relief sought [*see E. H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Mistake of Fact

This form of complaint alleges a cause of action for mistake of fact: (1) the facts giving rise to the mistake (Paragraphs 2-6); (2) the mistake of fact, not caused by the neglect of a legal duty on the part of the person making the mistake, but consisting of an unconscious ignorance or forgetfulness of a fact material to the contract (Paragraphs 7 and 8) [*Civ. Code § 1577(1)*]; and (3) damage to plaintiff (Paragraph 9).

Because the mistake involves the ownership of real property, the form includes optional allegations for use in seeking preliminary injunctive relief to prevent waste to the property (Paragraphs 10-12).

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving mistakes of fact and law, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[b] Constructive Trust

The form also includes allegations necessary for the imposition of a constructive trust on the property: (1) the existence of property or some interest in that property(Paragraph 1), (2) the plaintiff's right to it (Paragraphs 5 and 13), and (3) the defendant's gain of the property by a mistake of fact (Paragraph 8) [*see Abbott v. Miller (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 595, 596, 220 P.2d 570]* .

[4] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[5] State Statutes

Mistake as either one of fact or of law. *Civ. Code § 1576*

Mistake of fact defined. *Civ. Code § 1577*

Mistake of law defined. *Civ. Code § 1578*

Mistake of foreign law as mistake of fact. *Civ. Code § 1579*

[6] Decisions

Cause of action for imposition of constructive trust on property acquired by mistake as stated by complaint alleging grantor's mistake in drafting deed. *Abbott v. Miller (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 595, 596, 220 P.2d 570*

[7] Cross References

For a related from, see *§ 561.60*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.63

§ 561.63 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Undue Influence [Civ. Code § 1575(2), (3)], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for an Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Undue Influence [Civ. Code § 1575(2), (3)], for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for an Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR IMPOSITION OF CON-
_____ [*name*],	)	STRUCTIVE TRUST, ORDER OF CONVEYANCE,
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	AND ACCOUNTING
Defendant(s).	)	(Undue Influence)
	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 1575(2), (3), 2224*]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. From _____, until _____ [*dates*], plaintiff was the owner of residential real property located at _____ [*address, including city, if any*], _____ County, California, and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*provide legal description*].

2. From _____, until _____ [*dates*], plaintiff _____ [*allege relationship between plaintiff and defendant, e.g.*, rented a room in the home of defendant, located at _____ (*address, including city, if any*), _____ County, California. Plaintiff's rental

payments were $_____ per month, which he/she paid on a timely basis].

3. Beginning on or about _____ [*date*], during the course of _____ [*specify relationship, e.g.,* plaintiff's tenancy], and continuing until or about _____ [date], _____ [*specify defendant's exercise of undue influence over plaintiff, e.g.,* defendant embarked on a course of violent conduct against plaintiff in that on several occasions defendant struck and beat plaintiff with his/her fists and verbally threatened plaintiff's life].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], during the course of _____ [*specify relationship, e.g.,* plaintiff's tenancy], plaintiff transferred to defendant by deed all his/her right, title, and interest in the real property owned by plaintiff, and described in Pargraph 1.

5. Defendant gained a grossly oppressive and unfair advantage over plaintiff's physical, mental, and emotional distress in that _____ [*specify plaintiff's distress and defendant's advantage, e.g.,* defendant threatened to commit further acts of physical violence against plaintiff, as alleged above, and threatened his/her life if he/she did not transfer the property to defendant without consideration].

6. But for defendant's exercise of undue influence over him/her, plaintiff would not have conveyed the real property to defendant.

7. By virtue of defendant's acquisition and detention of plaintiff's property through undue influence as alleged above, defendant holds title to the property as constructive trustee for plaintiff's benefit.

[8. *Right to accounting. See § 561.60, Paragraphs 17-19.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds his/her interest in the real property described above in trust for plaintiff;

2. For an order compelling defendant to convey the real property to plaintiff;

3. [*Accounting. See § 561.60, Prayer, Paragraphs 5, 6*]; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to bring an action to impose a constructive trust on real property acquired by the exercise of undue influence by the defendant over the plaintiff, for an order compelling defendant to convey the

property to the plaintiff, and for an accounting of any sums received by the defendant during his or her constructive trusteeship of the property, for the use and benefit of the plaintiff [*Civ. Code §§ 2224, 2237*]. The form is adapted from the facts in *Clark v. Pullins (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 703, 341 P.2d 73* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Undue Influence

This form of complaint alleges the location of the real property that is the subject matter of the action (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)*] and the relationship between plaintiff and defendant (Paragraph 2).

The form then alleges a cause of action for imposition of a constructive trust on property acquired by the defendant through the exertion of undue influence over the plaintiff: (1) the nature of the influence exerted (Paragraph 3) [*see Civ. Code §§ 1570, 1575(2), (3)*], and (2) defendant's wrongful acquisition of property as a result of influence unduly exerted (Paragraphs 4-6) [*see Civ. Code § 2224*; *see Clark v. Pullins (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 703, 708-709, 341 P.2d 73]* .

For discussion and additional forms for use in actions involving undue influence, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[b] Constructive Trust

The form also includes allegations necessary for the imposition of a constructive trust on the property: (1) The existence of property or some interest therein (Paragraph 1); (2) the plaintiff's right thereto (Paragraphs 5 and 8); and (3) the defendant's gain of the property by the exercise of undue influence over the plaintiff (Paragraphs 5 and 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2224*].

[4] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[5] Cross References

For a discussion and forms for use in alleging elements of undue influence, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake*

For a related form, see *§ 561.60*

[6] State Statutes

Menace as threat of unlawful and violent injury to person. *Civ. Code § 1570(2)*

Undue influence as taking unfair advantage of another's weakness of mind or taking grossly oppressive and unfair advantage of another's necessities or distress. *Civ. Code § 1575(2), (3)*

One who gains a thing by undue influence as constructive trustee therefor. *Civ. Code § 2224*

[7] Decisions

Physical violence and threats thereof as constituting undue influence and duress sufficient for imposition of constructive trust under *Civ. Code § 2224*. *Clark v. Pullins (1959) 171 Cal. App. 2d 703, 708-709, 341 P.2d 73*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.64

§ 561.64 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Funds Acquired Through Violation of Trust [Civ. Code § 2224]--Breach of Confidential Relationship--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust on Funds Acquired Through Violation of Trust [Civ. Code § 2224]--Breach of Confidential Relationship--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR IMPOSITION OF CON-
_____ [*name*],	)	STRUCTIVE TRUST
Defendant.	)	(Violation of Trust)
	)	[*Civ. Code § 2224*]
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Basis for venue. See § 561.61, Paragraph 1.*]

2. At all material times herein, a confidential relationship existed between plaintiff and defendant in that _____ [*allege facts showing existence of confidential relationship, e.g.,* since _____ (*date*), plaintiff and defendant have been associated at the law firm of _____ (*name of firm*), occupying the same suite of offices and advising each other concerning mutual professional and business transactions.]

3. At all material times herein, plaintiff believed implicitly in the integrity and truthfulness of defendant, and reposed absolute trust and confidence in him/her.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing agreement entered into pursuant to confidential relationship, e.g.,* plaintiff interviewed a client, _____ (*name*) pursuant to the client's desire that plaintiff provide legal services in the organization of client's proposed corporation. In consideration and payment for plaintiff's legal services, _____ (*name of client*) agreed to assign plaintiff a _____ (*specify percent*) interest in royalties from the production of oil and gas from wells located in _____ County, California. Subsequent to the interview, on or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff informed defendant that plaintiff would be unable to meet with _____ (*name of client*), and requested defendant to meet with _____ (*name of client*) in his/her place. Defendant agreed to do so, and to render any necessary legal services. Defendant further agreed to take the assignment of royalties in the name of and for plaintiff.]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing defendant's violation of confidential relationship, e.g.,* defendant met with _____ (*name of client*), pursuant to plaintiff's request and rendered the necessary legal services. Defendant, however, took the assignment of royalties from _____ (*name of client*) in defendant's own name. Defendant took the assignment in the absence of and without the knowledge or consent of plaintiff. On or about _____ (*date*), in response to plaintiff's inquiry of defendant as to the status of _____ (*name of client's*) corporation, defendant falsely informed plaintiff that _____ (*client*) had abandoned his plans and that no assignment was given].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing that defendant acquired funds through violation of confidential relationship, e.g.,* plaintiff discovered that _____ (*name of client*) had assigned a _____ (*specify percent*) royalty interest to defendant]. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, since _____ [*date*], defendant has received approximately $_____ in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* royalty payments] in violation of the confidential relationship between plaintiff and defendant alleged above.

7. By virtue of defendant's violation of the relationship of trust and confidence then existing between plaintiff and defendant, defendant holds _____ [*specify property, e.g.,* all royalty payments from the assignment] as a constructive trustee for plaintiff's benefit.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds _____ [*specify property, e.g.,* the royalty payments he/she has received from the assignment] in trust for plaintiff;

2. For an accounting of _____ [*specify funds, e.g.,* all royalty payments received by defendant since _____ (*date*)]; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff who is in a confidential relationship with defendant to bring an action to impose a constructive trust on and obtain an accounting of funds acquired by the defendant in violation of the confidential relationship [*see Civ. Code § 2224*]. The complaint is adapted from the facts in *South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 303 P.2d 805* .

[3] Allegations

[a] Breach of Confidential Relationship

The cause of action for breach of a confidential relationship contains the following allegations: (1) the existence of a confidential relationship between plaintiff anddefendant (Paragraphs 2 and 3); (2) an agreement entered into between the parties pursuant to that relationship (Paragraph 4); (3) defendant's violation of the relationship by violating the agreement (Paragraph 5); and (4) defendant's wrongful acquisition of property in violation of the relationship (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2224*; *South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 281, 285, 303 P.2d 805]* .

[b] Constructive Trust

The form also includes allegations necessary for the imposition of a constructive trust on the property: (1) the existence of property or some interest in that property (Paragraphs 4 and 5), (2) the plaintiff's right to it (Paragraph 7), and (3) the defendant's gain of the property by the breach of the confidential relationship between plaintiff and defendant (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 2224*].

For discussion and additional forms for use in actions involving misuse of confidential relationships, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* .

[4] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[5] State Statutes

Imposition of constructive trust on property gained by violation of trust. *Civ. Code § 2224*

[6] Decisions

Confidential relationship and fiduciary relationship as synonymous in law. *South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 284, 303 P.2d 805*

Violation of confidential relationship as sufficient to satisfy violation of trust under *Civ. Code § 2224*. *South v. Wishard (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 276, 285, 303 P.2d 805*

[7] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 561.60* and *561.63*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.65

§ 561.65 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Will Under Secret Trust, for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--For Imposition of Constructive Trust [Civ. Code § 2224] on Real Property Acquired by Will Under Secret Trust, for Order for Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375], and for Accounting--Against Trustee--By Beneficiary

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR IMPOSITION OF CON-
[and DOES 1 through_____,]	)	STRUCTIVE TRUST AND ACCOUNTING
Defendant(s).	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 2224, 3367, 3375*]
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Description of real property. See § 561.60, Paragraph 1.*]

2. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of deceased settlor*] agreed to devise to defendant _____ [*name*] the above-described real property on the promise of defendant _____ [*name*] _____ [*describe conditions of trust, e.g.,* that the defendant would hold the property in trust for plaintiff _____ (*name*) until plaintiff's twenty-first birthday and then convey full title to the property to plaintiff].

3. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of settlor*] died and his/her last will unconditionally devised to defendant _____ [*name*] the above-described real property.

4. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's breach of trust agreement, e.g.,* On _____ [*date*], after reaching the age of twenty-one years, plaintiff requested defendant to convey the above-described property to him/her. Defendant refused to convey the property to plaintiff and continues refuse to do so in breach of his/her agreement with _____ (*name of deceased settlor*).]

[5. *Right to accounting. See § 561.60, Paragraphs 17-19.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds the real property described above in trust for plaintiff;

2. For an order compelling defendant to convey to plaintiff the real property described above;

[3. *Accounting. See § 561.60, Prayer, Paragraphs 5, 6;*] and

4. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to bring an action for imposition of a constructive trust on and conveyance of real property when a decedent, without creating a valid testamentary trust, has devised real property to another with the understanding, express or implied, that the person to whom the property was devised will hold the property in trust for the beneficiary [*see Estate of Everts (1912) 163 Cal. 449, 454, 125 P. 1058]* . For a discussion of the law relating to such "secret trusts," see *§ 561.16[4][f]*.

The form may be modified for use to establish a constructive trust in personal property when a party in possession of the property refuses to comply with the terms of secret trust.

Forms for imposing a constructive trust in situations in which a decedent has violated an agreement to devise or bequeath property in an agreed manner can be found in Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

[3] Allegations

This form alleges the essential elements of a cause of action to establish a constructive trust based on the violation of a secret trust. It states the elements of a secret trust by alleging decedent's devise of property to defendant on defendant's

promise to hold the property in trust for plaintiff (Paragraphs 2 and 3) [*see Estate of Everts (1912) 163 Cal. 449, 454, 125 P. 1058* ; *Prior v. Andrews (1927) 83 Cal. App. 782, 790, 257 P. 560]* . It states requirements for a constructive trust by alleging defendant's breach of a secret trust agreement and wrongful retention of the property subject to the secret trust (Paragraph 4) [*see Estate of Everts (1912) 163 Cal. 449, 454, 125 P. 1058* ; *Prior v. Andrews (1927) 83 Cal. App. 782, 790, 257 P. 560]* .

[4] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 561.60*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 561 TRUSTS: CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-561 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 561.66

§ 561.66 Complaint Against Convicted Felon, Felon's Representative, or Profiteer of Felony for Recovery of Interest in Profits From Sale of Item With Value Enhanced as Result of Notoriety From Commission of Felony [Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2), (c)] and for Preliminary Injunctive Relief Against Waste of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2225(f); Code Civ. Proc. § 526]

[1] FORM Complaint Against Convicted Felon, Felon's Representative, or Profiteer of Felony for Recovery of Interest in Profits From Sale of Item With Value Enhanced as Result of Notoriety From Commission of Felony [Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2), (c)] and for Preliminary Injunctive Relief Against Waste of Proceeds [Civ. Code § 2225(f); Code Civ. Proc. § 526]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR RECOVERY OF INTEREST IN
[and DOES 1 through_____,]	)	TRUST PROPERTY
Defendant(s).	)	(Profits From _____ (*specify, e.g.,*
	)	Sale of Felon's Memorabilia))
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[*EITHER*]

1. At all times herein mentioned plaintiff was and is a resident of _____ County, California.

[*OR*]

1. Plaintiff _____ [*name*], is the _____ [*relationship to decedent, e.g.,* widow of _____ (*name of decedent*), deceased, and is the sole surviving heir at law of _____ (*name of decedent*), hereinafter referred to as the decedent].

[*OR*]

1. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff was issued letters _____ [*specify, e.g.,* of administration of the estate *or* testamentary of the will] of _____ [*name of decedent*], deceased, by the Superior Court of California, County of _____. Plaintiff is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting personal representative of the estate of _____ [*name*], deceased (hereinafter referred to as the decedent), and brings this complaint in that capacity.

2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [defendant was and is a resident of *or* the property that is the subject of this action was and is located in] _____ County, California.

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 561.60, Paragraph 2.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 561.60, Paragraph 3.*]

[*Allege facts giving rise to felony conviction and to plaintiff's damages and establishing plaintiff's right to recover damages from defendant, such as the following*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*place*], [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] unlawfully and deliberately took decedent's life by shooting him/her in the back without lawful excuse or justification.

6. Prior to decedent's death, plaintiff lived with decedent as his/her spouse and was dependent on decedent for support and maintenance. At all times prior to his/her death, decedent was a dutiful husband/wife to plaintiff.

7. As a proximate result of the wrongful conduct of [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*], plaintiff has suffered pecuniary loss resulting from the loss of the society, comfort, attention, services, and support of the decedent.

[*CONTINUE*]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], based on the actions and conduct of [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] as alleged in Paragraph(s) _____, above, [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] was charged in _____ [*specify court*] with _____ [*specify crime, e.g.,* first-degree murder] in violation of _____ [*specify criminal statute(s), e.g., Penal Code Sections 187* and *189*], which is a felony under the laws of the _____ [State of California *or* United States of America].

9. On _____ [*date*], after _____ [trial to the court *or* trial by jury *or* entry of a plea of guilty *or* entry of a plea of insanity], judgment was entered in the _____ [*specify court*], _____ [convicting (defendant) _____ (*name of felon*) *or* finding (defendant)

_____ (*name of felon*) not guilty by reason of insanity] of the felony offense under the law of the _____ [State of California *or* United States of America] of _____ [*specify felony, e.g.,* murder in the first degree] committed in the State of California. A certified copy of the judgment is attached as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated herein by reference.

10. Judgment in the above-entitled criminal proceeding has become final. It has not been vacated, modified, stayed, or set aside, and _____ [the time for appeal has expired *or* the judgment was affirmed on appeal to _____ (*specify court*)].

[11. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff commenced a civil action in _____ (*specify court*), entitled _____ vs. _____ (*title of previous action for damages resulting from the crime*), Case No. _____, against (defendant) _____ (*name of felon*) for damages for _____ (physicalinjury *and/or* emotional injury *and/or* pecuniary loss) proximately caused by (defendant) _____ (*name of felon*) as a result of the crime for which he/she was convicted, as alleged above.]

[12. On _____ (*date*), judgment in favor of plaintiff and against (defendant) _____ (*name of felon*) was entered and became final in the above-mentioned civil action. It has not been vacated, modified, stayed, or set aside, and _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the time for appeal has expired *or* the judgment was affirmed on appeal to _____ (*specify court*)). A certified copy of the judgment is attached as Exhibit "_____," and incorporated herein by reference.]

[13. Judgment in the above-entitled civil action awarded plaintiff the sum of $_____ with interest from the date thereof at the rate of _____ percent per annum until paid. _____ (*Specify extent of satisfaction of judgment, e.g.,* No part) of the judgment has been paid.]

14. Plaintiff has received _____ [no restitution from the Restitution Fund or from (defendant) _____ (*name of felon*) *or* $_____ in restitution from _____ (the Restitution Fund *and/or name of felon*)] in connection with the crime for which [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] was convicted.

15. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [O]n or about _____ [*date*], [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*]_____ [sold *or allege other type of transfer*] to [defendant] _____ [*name of transferee*] the following: _____ [*specify thing(s) sold or transferred, e.g.,* the rights to use _____ (*name of felon*)'s name and likeness on "Famous Criminals" trading cards to be produced and marketed by (defendant) _____ (*name*)]. The value of the _____ [*thing sold or transferred, e.g.,* rights] transferred by [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] was enhanced by the notoriety gained by [defendant] _____ [*name of felon*] from his/her commission of the felony described in Paragraph(s) _____ in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* his/her name and likeness would have had no commercial value for purposes of marketing trading cards had he/she not committed that crime].

16. [Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that] (D)efendant _____ [*name of felon*] has received income and profits in the amount of approximately $ _____ from the _____ [*type of transfer, e.g.,* sale] of the [*thing sold or transferred, e.g.,* rights] described in Paragraph 1.

[17. (Plaintiff is further informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (D)efendant _____ (*name of felon*) will receive future income and profits in the amount of approximately $_____ from the _____ (*type of transfer, e.g.,* sale) of the _____ (*thing sold or transferred, e.g.,*

rights) described in Paragraph 1.]

18. Defendant _____ [*name of felon*] holds the above-described income and profits as an involuntary trustee for plaintiff's benefit under *Civil Code Section 2225(b)(2)*.

[19. *If profits are real property, defendant's commission of waste on the property. See § 561.60, Paragraph 14*.]

[20. *If profits are real property, decrease in market value of the property due to defendant's waste. See § 561.60, Paragraph 15*.]

[21. *If profits are real property, plaintiff's beneficial interest in the property subject to further waste absent injunctive relief. See § 561.60, Paragraph 16*.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For an order declaring that defendant holds the present and future profits of _____ [*specify material, e.g.,* the memorabilia] in trust for plaintiff.

2. For an order that _____ [*specify payor(s), e.g.,* defendant, or any party or entity paying defendant for _____ (*specify, e.g.,* sale of the memorabilia)], pay to plaintiff $_____ from the current and future profits of _____ [*specify material, e.g.,* the book] [in satisfaction of the civil judgment in plaintiff's favor alleged above].

[3. *Preliminary injunctive relief. See § 561.60, Prayer, Paragraphs 3, 4*.]

4. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520*.]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a beneficiary against a convicted felon, the felon's representative, or a profiteer of the felony, to bring an action to recover the beneficiary's interest in any profits [*see § 561.28[3][f]*] from the felon's sale or transfer of anything that has enhanced value as a result of the notoriety gained from the felon's commission of the crime for which he or she was convicted [*see Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2), (c), (f)*]. In the case of a sale or transfer by a profiteer of the felony, the court must, on an adequate showing by the profiteer of the felony, exclude from the involuntary trust that portion of the profits that represents the inherent value of the memorabilia, property, or thing sold or transferred and exclusive of the amount of the enhancement of the value due to the notoriety of the convicted felon [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(3)*].

This statutory scheme also provides that all proceeds from the preparation for the purpose of sale, the sale of rights to,

or the sale of materials that include or are based on the depiction, portrayal, or reenactment of a felony for which a felon was convicted, are subject to an involuntary trust for the benefit of such beneficiaries [*Civ. Code § 2225(b)(1)*]. However, the California Supreme Court in 2002 ruled that this part of the statute is unconstitutional on its face [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 417-418, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718* ; *see § 561.28[1]*.

NOTE:

The Supreme Court of California has held that *Civ. Code § 2225* is facially invalid under both the free speech clause of the *First Amendment to the federal Constitution* as applied to the states through the *Fourteenth Amendment*, and the liberty of speech clause of the California Constitution [*Keenan v. Superior Court (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 413, 415-416, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 40 P.3d 718* ; *see Cal. Const. art. I, § 2, subd. (a)*].

CAUTION:

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E. H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan Gold Co. v. San Juan Ridge Mut. Water Ass'n (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Defendants

The action may be brought against a convicted felon who has proximately caused physical, mental, or emotional injury, or pecuniary loss to, or the death of, a person as a result of the felony for which the felon was convicted [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(1), (4), (c)(1)*]. The action may also be brought against the felon's representative, who is any person or entity receiving proceeds by designation, on behalf, or instead of the felon, whether by the felon's designation or by operation of law. The action may also be brought against a profiteer of a felony [*Civ. Code § 2225(a)(3)(B), (c)(1)*; *see § 561.28[3][h]*].

[4] Alleging Civil Cause of Action Against Felon

Plaintiff should allege facts establishing his or her status as a "beneficiary" within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)* [*see § 561.28[3][i]*], thus establishing his or her right to bring an action under *Civ. Code § 2225(c)* to recover his or her interest in the involuntary trust. Therefore, if plaintiff was the direct victim of the crime, it appears that he or she should plead facts showing his or her right to recover damages for physical, mental, or emotional injury or pecuniary loss against the convicted felon under one or more tort causes of action, as part of his or her cause of action under *Civ. Code § 2225* [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(A)*]. Alternatively, plaintiff may join his or her tort cause(s) of action with his or her cause of action under *Civ. Code § 2225(c)* to recover his or her interest in the trust [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 427.10(a)*]. If the causes of action are joined, plaintiff could allege the tort causes of action separately, and incorporate by reference the allegations of his or her tort causes of action into the cause of action under *Civ. Code § 2225(c)*. For discussion of joinder of causes of action, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

If the direct victim of the crime has died, plaintiff should allege facts showing one or more of the following:

- The plaintiff's standing under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.10 et seq.* as the decedent's personal representative or successor in interest to bring anaction for damages sustained by the decedent before his or her death [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(B)*]; or

- If the victim's death was proximately caused by the crime of which the felon was convicted, the

plaintiff's status as (1) a person entitled to bring anaction for wrongful death under *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*, or *(2)* a beneficiary of the decedent's will who has a right under the will to receive more than 25 percent of the value of the decedent's estate [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(C)*].

This form, for example, alleges plaintiff's right to recover from the felon on a theory of wrongful death (Paragraphs 5-7) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)(C)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60*; *see also* Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*]. For other tort allegations, refer to the appropriate chapters in this publication, such as Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*, Ch. 150, *Conversion*, Ch. 257, *False Imprisonment*, Ch. 362, Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress, Ch. 380, *Negligence*, and Ch. 429, *Privacy*.

[5] Alleging Previous Civil Recovery Against Convicted Felon

Although plaintiff must establish his or her right to recover damages against the convicted felon under applicable law other than *Civ. Code § 2225*, the statute does not, by its terms, require plaintiff to obtain a civil judgment against the convicted felon establishing that right of recovery as a prerequisite to bringing an action to impose an involuntary trust [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)* (defining "beneficiary" as person who has or had right to recover)]. If, however, the plaintiff has already obtained such a judgment, it may collaterally estop the defendant from relitigating the issue of his or her responsibility for the plaintiff's damages [*see* Ch. 491, *Res Judicata*]. Thus, plaintiff should allege the facts concerning the prior civil action in the complaint under *Civ. Code § 2225*.

If the plaintiff has recovered a prior judgment against the felon based on the crime for which the felon was convicted, the plaintiff's interest in the trust will be reduced by the amount of the judgment that was previously satisfied by the felon [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(iii)*; *see also § 561.28[3][j]*].

This form contains optional paragraphs for use when the plaintiff has recovered a judgment against the felon in a prior civil action for personal injury, pecuniary loss, or wrongful death, based on the crime for which the felon was convicted (Optional Paragraphs 11, 12) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)*]. It also includes an allegation regarding the amount of the judgment entered in the prior civil action and the amount, if any, that has been satisfied (Optional Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(iii), (D)*].

[6] Allegations

This form of complaint alleges all of the following:

- The felon's conviction (Paragraphs 8-10) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(1), (2)*];

- The plaintiff's standing to bring the action (Paragraphs 1, 5-7) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)*; *see also § 561.28[3][i]* regarding definitions of beneficiaries and their interests in the trust proceeds];

- The plaintiff's recovery against the felon in a previous civil action (Optional Paragraphs 11-13) [*see § 561.66[5]*];

- The amount of money, if any, plaintiff received from either the restitution fund or the felon pursuant to a court order (Paragraph 14) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(5)(C)(i), (ii)*];

- The convicted felon's sale or transfer of a thing, including a right, that has enhanced value because of the notoriety gained from the commission of the crime for which the felon was convicted (Paragraph 15) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(1)*];

- The existence of current and future profits from the sale or transfer (Paragraph 16 and Optional

Paragraph 17) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10), (c)(3)*]; and

- The fact that the profits are subject to an involuntary trust for the plaintiff's benefit (Paragraph 18) [*see Civ. Code § 2225(b)(2)*].

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action by a beneficiary to recover his or her interest in a trust created by *Civ. Code § 2225(b)* may be brought in the superior court of the county in which the beneficiary resides (First Alternative Paragraph 1), in which the convicted felon resides, or in which the proceeds are located (*see* Paragraph 2) [*Civ. Code § 2225(c)(2)*].

[8] Preliminary Injunction

On motion of any party in an action brought under *Civ. Code § 2225*, the court must grant a preliminary injunction to prevent any waste of profits if it appears that they are subject to the trust and that they may be subject to waste [*Civ. Code § 2225(f)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 2225(a)(10)* ("profits" defined); *see also § 561.28[3][f]*].

Inasmuch as this complaint seeks both preliminary injunctive relief and recovery of an interest in the proceeds, it assumes that the defendant has already been convicted of the felony that forms the basis for the plaintiff's claims. However, it is also possible to obtain preliminary injunctive relief prior to the defendant's actual conviction. Upon motion of the Attorney General or any potential beneficiary, the court must grant a preliminary injunction against a person against whom an indictment or information for a felony has been filed in superior court, to prevent any waste of profits if there is probable cause to believe that the profits would be subject to an involuntary trust upon conviction of the person and that they may be subject to waste [*Civ. Code § 2225(f)(2)*]. When such relief is sought, the statute appears to require the plaintiff to allege that:

- Plaintiff is a "beneficiary" within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 2225(a)(4)* [*see § 561.28[3][i]*];

- A felony indictment or information has been filed against the defendant in a superior court;

- There is probable cause to believe that any profits would be subject to an involuntary trust if the defendant is ultimately convicted; and

- There is probable cause to believe that any profits may be subject to waste if preliminary injunctive relief is not granted.

For discussion of the law and procedures relating to preliminary injunctions generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[9] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting

the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a complete discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[10] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 561.60*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 562.syn

§ 562.syn Synopsis to Chapter 562: TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS

§ 562.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 562.02 Cross References

§§ 562.03-562.09 [Reserved]

§ 562.10 Governing Law

§ 562.11 Nature of Resulting Trust

[1] In General

[2] Created by Operation of Law

[3] Involuntary Trust

[4] Constructive Trust Distinguished

§ 562.12 Trustee's Duties

§ 562.13 Liability to Third Parties

§ 562.14 Situations Giving Rise to Resulting Trust

[1] When Real Property Seller Does Not Convey to Buyer Who Has Paid

[2] When Express Trust Fails

[3] Express Trust Does Not Exhaust Trust Estate

[4] Purchase-Money Resulting Trust

[a] In General

[b] Full Payment of Purchase Price

[c] Partial Payment of Purchase Price

[d] Nature of Consideration

[e] Time of Payment of Consideration

[f] Transferee Pays Purchase Price as Loan to Person Claiming Beneficial Interest in Property

§ 562.15 Situtations Not Giving Rise to Resulting Trust

[1] Gift to Transferee--Rebuts Presumption of Resulting Trust

[2] Presumptions in Favor of Gift

[3] Person Claiming Beneficial Interest in Property Pays Purchase Price as Loan to Transferee

§ 562.16 Rights of Bona Fide Purchasers for Value and Creditors

§ 562.17 Statute of Limitations

§ 562.18 Laches

§ 562.19 Statute of Frauds and Parol Evidence

§ 562.20 Burden of Proof

§ 562.21 Termination of Resulting Trust by Merger

[1] Transfer of Trust Property to Beneficiary

[2] Conveyance or Surrender of Trust Property to Trustee

§ 562.22 Relief Available

§§ 562.23-562.39 [Reserved]

§ 562.40 State Statutes

§ 562.41 Decisions

[1] Constructive Trust Distinguished

[2] Defenses

[3] Intent Requirement

[4] Liability of Beneficiary

[5] Period of Limitation

[6] Pro Tanto Resulting Trust

[7] Resulting Trust Defined

[8] When Imposition of Resulting Trust Improper

[9] When Imposition of Resulting Trust Proper

§ 562.42 Text References

§§ 562.43-563.59 [Reserved]

§ 562.60 Complaint To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Full or Partial Interest in Real Property or Sale Proceeds and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Part Payment of Purchase Price

[5] Verification

[6] Demand on Trustee

[7] Pleading Lack of an Adequate Remedy at Law

[8] Jurisdiction

[9] Venue

[10] Quiet Title and Ejectment

[11] Recovery of Money Judgment

[12] No Right to Jury Trial

[13] Lis Pendens

[14] State Statutes

[15] Decisions

§ 562.61 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder--Consideration as Discharge of Preexisting Debt

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 562.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property Purchased in Part With Borrowed Funds With Title Taken in Name of Now Deceased Lender as Security, for Accounting, and for Order to Convey Title [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375] on Payment of Balance of Loan--Against Estate of Title Holder

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Accounting Action

[5] Lis Pendens

[6] Decisions

[7] Text References

[8] Cross References

§ 562.63 Allegation--Property Was Not Transferred as Gift

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Decisions

§ 562.64 Affirmative Defense--Consideration or Transfer of Property Was Gift

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

[4] State Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.01

§ 562.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and provides forms for use in establishing and enforcing resulting trusts [*see § 562.10* et seq.]. It primarily focuses on purchase-money resulting trusts, and the forms are for use in enforcing and establishing purchase-money resulting trusts. The forms include a complaint to establish and enforce a resulting trust in a full or partial interest in real property or the proceeds thereof [*see § 562.60*]; a complaint to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real property when the consideration provided for the transfer was other than money [*see § 562.61*]; a complaint to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real property when the consideration provided took the form of a loan from the trustee to the beneficiary [*see § 562.62*]; an allegation, for use in a complaint to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real or personal property, when the transfer of property was not a gift [*see § 562.63*]; and an affirmative defense when the property was transferred as a gift [*see § 562.64*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.02

§ 562.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For a discussion and forms relating to transfers of community property, see Ch. 122, *Community Property*

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving property held in escrow, see Ch. 253, *Escrows*

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving gifts, see Ch. 278, *Gifts*

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving joint interests, see Ch. 316, *Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common*

For a discussion and forms for use in partition actions, see Ch. 397, *Partition*

For a discussion and forms relating to actions to quiet title, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

For a discussion and forms for use in actions involving trust deeds, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* ,

For a discussion and forms relating to the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Family LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsCharacterizationCommunity PropertyReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipJoint TenanciesReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipPartition ActionsReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipTenancies in CommonReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim

ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART I. SCOPE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 562.03-562.09

[Reserved]

§§ 562.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.10

§ 562.10 Governing Law

Civ. Code §§ 2223 and *2224* provide generally for the creation of an involuntary trust when a person wrongfully detains property. However, excepting these general provisions, the common law governs the establishment and enforcement of resulting trusts [*see Prob. Code §§ 82, 15002, 15003(b)*; *see, e.g., Bainbridge v. Stoner (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 423, 428, 106 P.2d 423]* . It should be noted that although purchase money resulting trusts involving real property were formerly governed by *Civ. Code § 853*, repealed in 1986, that section was declared to be a statement of the common law and therefore cases decided under that provision are presumably still persuasive [*see Estate of Schechtman (1958) 162 Cal. App. 2d 365, 370, 328 P.2d 478]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.11

§ 562.11 Nature of Resulting Trust

[1] In General

A resulting trust arises from the transer of property under circumstances showing that the transferee was not intended to take the beneficial interest in the property [*Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1042, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 404; *see also 15 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 250, 254 (1950)]* . A resulting trust thus arises when one person furnishes the money or other thing of value with which property is acquired and title is taken in the name of another, absent the intention to create a gift [*In re Marriage of Becker (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 65, 75, 207 Cal. Rptr. 392* (former wife's interest in deceased ex-husband's retirement benefits being received by surviving spouse held by surviving spouse subject to resulting trust in favor of former wife)]. A resulting trust may be established in personal as well as real property [*Norman v. Burks (1949) 93 Cal. App. 2d 687, 691, 209 P.2d 815]* .

A resulting trust is not merely a method of repaying a person for money or value furnished, and thus the beneficiary of a resulting trust is entitled to the whole property that is subject to the trust, including interest it has earned [*see In re Marriage of Becker (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 65, 77, 207 Cal. Rptr. 392]* .

[2] Created by Operation of Law

A resulting trust is one created by operation of law [*see Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1042, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339]* . It is a creature of equity [*Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571]* .

[3] Involuntary Trust

A resulting trust is an involuntary trust, implied by law, when the intention of the parties to create a trust is not expressed [*Wells Fargo Bank v. Greuner (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 38 Cal. Rptr. 132]* . A resulting trust therefore enforces the inferred intent of the parties [*Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1042, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339]* .

[4] Constructive Trust Distinguished

The terms "constructive trust" and "resulting trust" have often been confused by attorneys, as well as by some courts. Both are involuntary trusts implied by law and exempt from the statute of frauds [*see § 562.19*]. However, a resulting trust arises from a transfer of property under circumstances showing that the transferee was not intended to take the beneficial interest in the property. A resulting trust has been termed an "intention-enforcing" trust, to distinguish it from the other type of implied trust, the constructive or "fraud-rectifying" trust. While the resulting trust carries out the inferred intent ofthe parties, the constructive trust defeats or prevents the wrongful act of one of the parties [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* . For a complete discussion of and forms for use in establishing and enforcing constructive trusts, see Ch. 561, *Trusts: Constructive Trusts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.12

§ 562.12 Trustee's Duties

The trustee of a resulting trust has no duties to perform, no trust to administer, and no purpose to carry out except the single one of holding the trust property or conveying it to the beneficiary [*Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 515, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.13

§ 562.13 Liability to Third Parties

When the beneficiary controls the operation and maintenance of the trust property, the beneficiary is liable for injury to third parties arising out of the beneficiary's operation and maintenance of the trust property [*Richman v. Green (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 470, 473, 299 P.2d 890]* . *Richman* does not hold, however, that a trustee who is only a nominal owner is not liable, but only that any such liability is not primary [*Bianchi v. Western Title Ins. & Guaranty Co. (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 235, 238, 92 Cal. Rptr. 745]* .

When the operation and maintenance of trust property is under the control of the trustee of a passive, express trust, the trustee is liable for injuries of third parties when the injuries arise out of the trustee's operation and maintenance of the property [*Bianchi v. Western Title Ins. & Guaranty Co. (1970) 14 Cal. App. 3d 235, 238-242, 92 Cal. Rptr. 745* (defendant held title under an express trust, not a resulting trust, for about 13 owners who could internally exchange shares while defendant held title; elevator permit was in defendant's name, however)]. For a discussion of the liability of a trustee of an express trust to third parties, see *Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.160* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsBeneficiariesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.14

§ 562.14 Situations Giving Rise to Resulting Trust

[1] When Real Property Seller Does Not Convey to Buyer Who Has Paid

Under a contract for the purchase of real property, a seller who does not execute a conveyance to a buyer who has fully paid holds the property as trustee on a resulting trust for the buyer [*Scadden Flat Gold Mining Co. v. Scadden (1898) 121 Cal. 33, 39, 53 P. 440]* . For a form of complaint by a purchaser for specific performance of a contract to convey real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

[2] When Express Trust Fails

A resulting trust is created when, because of some invalidity such as lack of a definite purpose or legality, an express trust fails [*Bainbridge v. Stoner (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 423, 428, 106 P.2d 423]* .

To the extent that an express trust fails because of an invalid restraint on alienation, the trustee holds legal title to the trust property on a resulting trust for the trustor and the trustor's heirs [*see* *Davenport v. Davenport Found. (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 67, 75, 222 P.2d 11]* .

To the extent that an express trust fails on the death of the settlor, the trustee holds the trust estate on a resulting trust for the estate of the settlor [*see* *Hansen v. Bear Film Co., Inc. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 154, 173, 168 P.2d 946]* .

To the extent that a testamentary trust fails because it does not adequately designate the subject, purpose, and beneficiary, leaving the residue of an estate undisposed of, the distributee holds the residue on a resulting trust for the benefit of the testator's heirs pursuant to the rules of succession [*Sears v. Rule (1941) 45 Cal. App. 2d 374, 379-384, 114 P.2d 57* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 411, cmt. c; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 411, cmt. c].

[3] Express Trust Does Not Exhaust Trust Estate

A resulting trust is created when, after a trust is fully performed, there is property remaining in the hands of the trustee [*Bainbridge v. Stoner (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 423, 428, 106 P.2d 423]* .

[4] Purchase-Money Resulting Trust

[a] In General

Ordinarily, a purchase-money resulting trust arises in favor of the payor of the purchase price of the property when the purchase price, or a part thereof, is paid by one person and the title is taken in the name of another. The trust arises because it is the natural presumption in such a case that it was the intention of the parties that the ostensible purchaser should acquire and hold the property for the one with whose means it was acquired [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238-239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

However, a resulting trust is not founded on the simple fact that money or property of one has been used by another to purchase property. It is founded on a relationship between the two, and on the fact that as between them, consciously and intentionally, one has advanced the consideration wherewith to make a purchase in the name of the other [*Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Co. Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 485, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547]* .

This rule applies not only when a person other than the transferee pays the purchase price directly to the vendor, but also when transferee pays the purchase price to the vendor with money or other property belonging to another person with the consent of the other person. Thus, when property is transferred to one person who pays the purchase price with money or other property belonging to another person, with the consent of the latter, a resulting trust arises in that other person's favor. If, on the other hand, the other person did not consent to the use of his or her money or other property in making the purchase, or did not consent that the property purchased should be transferred to the transferee, a constructive trust and not a resulting trust arises [*Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Co. Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 485-486, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 440, cmt. h].

The doctrine of purchase-money resulting trusts applies to personal property as well as to real property [*Keene v. Keene (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 657, 665, 21 Cal. Rptr. 593, 371 P.2d 329* ; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 440, cmt. b].

[b] Full Payment of Purchase Price

Full payment of the purchase price of the property gives rise to a resulting trust in the whole of the trust property [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

[c] Partial Payment of Purchase Price

Part payment of the purchase price gives rise to a resulting trust to the extent thereof. When one person pays part of the purchase price and title is taken in another's name, the payor cannot secure a greater interest in the property by way of a resulting trust than the proportion of the amount he or she paid bears to the total purchase price [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 243, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 454]. However, a party seeking to impose a resulting trust based on partial payment has the burden of establishing with definiteness and specificity the proportional amount contributed [*Lloyds BankCal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1044-1045, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339]* .

[d] Nature of Consideration

Consideration for the transfer of property can be in the form of money, property, the performance of services, or the discharge of preexisting indebtedness [*Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 515, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537]* . In addition, a promise to repay a loan used to purchase property is sufficient consideration to support a resulting trust. For example, when the transferee has purchased property for another party under an agreement that the other party will repay the purchase price, a resulting trust is appropriate [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3* ; *Novak v. Novak (1967) 249 Cal. App. 2d 438, 442, 57 Cal. Rptr. 564]* .

[e] Time of Payment of Consideration

Normally, a purchase-money resulting trust arises when the claimant has paid the purchase price of the property at the time it was acquired. However, contemporaneous payment is not an essential requirement for establishing a resulting trust. In situations in which the transferee has paid the purchase price with the understanding that the claimant will repay the transferee, a resulting trust may arise [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 270, 158 P.2d 3* ; *Stone v. Lobsien (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 750, 755, 247 P.2d 357* ; *see § 562.14[f]*].

When a claimant seeks to impose a resulting trust on a proportional interest in property, proportional payment of consideration at the time of conveyance must be distinguished from subsequent monetary contributions to make improvements on property or for installment payments after the title has been acquired, which do not secure an interest by way of a resulting trust [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 243, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* . It is clear that payments made for improvements on property after it has been purchased will not support imposition of a resulting trust [*Keene v. Keene (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 657, 667, 21 Cal. Rptr. 593, 371 P.2d 329]* . However, when a claimant has made installment payments, after title has been acquired, based on an implied promise to make those payments made prior to the acquisition, it appears that a resulting trust establishing a proportionate interest would be appropriate [*see Stone v. Lobsien (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 750, 755, 247 P.2d 357]* .

[f] Transferee Pays Purchase Price as Loan to Person Claiming Beneficial Interest in Property

The payment of the purchase price that gives rise to a beneficial interest in the property may be made in the form of a loan from the transferee to the person claiming the beneficial interest. For example, when defendant (transferee) loans plaintiff (beneficial owner) money to buy residential property and defendant takes title to the property as security for the loan, defendant holds title as a resulting trustee for plaintiff until plaintiff repays the loan [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 448; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 448; *see generally* Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* , regarding actions to establish a deed absolute as a mortgage].

A resulting trust can also arise through the transferee's assumption of an obligation to the vendor or transferor to pay the purchase price, when the person claiming the beneficial interest in the property is obligated to reimburse the transferee. In this case, there is a loan of credit by the transferee to the claimant [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 456, cmt. d].

In the case of either a loan of cash or a loan of credit, it is not necessary that there be an express agreement by the claimant to repay the loan. An agreement to repay may be implied [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 270, 158 P.2d 3]* . However, before a resulting trust in the claimant's favor will arise, there must be evidence of claimant's obligation to repay the loan [*Stone v. Lobsien (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 750, 755, 247 P.2d 357* (dicta)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.15

§ 562.15 Situtations Not Giving Rise to Resulting Trust

[1] Gift to Transferee--Rebuts Presumption of Resulting Trust

A resulting trust will not arise if the intention of the parties was that the person receiving title to the property received it as a gift [*In re Marriage of Becker (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 65, 75, 207 Cal. Rptr. 392* ; *Knouse v. Shubert (1941) 48 Cal. App. 2d 685, 689, 121 P.2d 74]* . The presumption in favor of finding a purchase-money resulting trust when the party claiming the property supplied the purchase money for it may be rebutted, and incertain circumstances a presumption of a gift may arise [*see* *Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1043, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339* ; *Quinn v. Reilly (1926) 198 Cal. 465, 467-468, 245 P. 1091* ; *see § 562.15[2]* ; *see also* Ch. 278, *Gifts*]. For a form raising the defense that the transfer was a gift, *see § 562.64*.

[2] Presumptions in Favor of Gift

Even when it is satisfactorily established that all or part of the purchase price was furnished by one other than the grantee, if it appears in addition that the grantee was the natural object of bounty of the person who made the payment, it will be presumed that a gift was intended [*Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1043, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339* ; *Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 367, 101 P.2d 477* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 442; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 442]. Thus, when a parent pays for a conveyance of property to his or her child, or otherwise transfers property to a child, there is a presumption that a gift is intended and no presumption of a resulting trust arises [*Oyama v. State of California (1948) 332 U.S. 633, 68 S. Ct. 269, 92 L. Ed. 249, 256* ; *Lloyds Bank Cal. v. Wells Fargo Bank (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1043, 232 Cal. Rptr. 339]* . In transactions between spouses, the rule is that a gift is presumed if the wife is the transferee but is not presumed if the husband is the transferee [*compare Altramano v. Swan (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 622, 628, 128 P.2d 353* (presumption of gift arises if wife is transferee and husband is claimant); *with* *Socol v. King (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 342, 348, 223 P.2d 627* (resulting trust presumed if husband takes title and wife furnishes consideration); *see* Restatement of Trusts § 442; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 442]. This rule appears to raise equal protection issues.

When a presumption of gift arises, the burden shifts to the payor to prove that he or she did not intend to make a gift to the transferee [*Altramano v. Swan (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 622, 628, 128 P.2d 353* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 442, cmt. b]. The presumption of a gift may be rebutted by adequate proof that the grantee was not intended to have the beneficial

interest [*Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 367, 101 P.2d 477* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 442; Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 442].

[3] Person Claiming Beneficial Interest in Property Pays Purchase Price as Loan to Transferee

When the transferee, that is, the grantee of a deed, borrows funds with which to purchase property, no resulting trust arises in favor of the lender on account of the loan and the use of its proceeds to pay for the property. For example, when parents lend their son funds with which to purchase property, and the son, in repayment of the loan, subsequently conveys a life interest to his parents in property purchased with proceeds of the loan, the son does not hold the property as resulting trustee for the parents [*Haskell v. Wood (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 799, 805, 64 Cal. Rptr. 459* ; see Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 445]. Similarly, when a transfer of property is made to one person and the purchase price is advanced by another as a loan to the transferee, the lender is not entitled to an equitable lien on the property in the absence of an agreement between the lender and the transferee that the lender is to have such a lien [*Reid v. Gillespie (1948) 87 Cal. App. 2d 769, 771-772, 197 P.2d 566* ; *see* Restatement of Trusts § 445; see Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 445, cmt. b; *see generally* Ch. 348, *Liens and Wage Preferences* , regarding equitable liens].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawPersonal GiftsElements of Valid GiftsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawPersonal GiftsProceduresPresumptionsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.16

§ 562.16 Rights of Bona Fide Purchasers for Value and Creditors

Although former *Civ. Code §§ 856* and *2243*, which provided in essence that a resulting trust could not prejudice the rights of transferees of the trust property who purchased their interest for value and without notice of the trust, were repealed in 1986, the common law as well as other statutory provisions grant this same protection to bona fide purchasers and mortagees [*Murphy v. Clayton (1896) 113 Cal. 153, 158, 45 P. 267* ; see *Civ. Code § 1214* (real property; priority to good faith purchasers or morgagees for value who record first); *Com. Code § 2403* (bona fide purchasers of personal property may take good title); see also *Prob. Code § 18100* (bona fide purchaser fully protected in dealing with trustee under express trust); 18 Cal. Law Rev Comm'n Reports 501, 793 (1986)]. The grant of protection to bona fide purchasers is in accord with the position of the *Restatement* [*see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 408].

An attachment or judgment creditor is not a bona fide purchaser for value. A trustee in bankruptcy has the status of an attachment or judgment creditor and is thus not a purchaser for value without notice [*In re Rogal (S.D. Cal. 1953) 112 F. Supp.712, 717-718* (applying California law); *Owings v. Laugharn (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 789, 791]* .

General creditors of the trustee of a resulting trust may not normally subject the trust property to the debts of the trustee even though the trustee gained credit based in part on the fact that the trust property was in his or her name [*Murphy v. Clayton (1896) 113 Cal. 153, 159-162, 45 P. 267]* . The creditors of the trustee of a resulting trust cannot subject the property to the payment of the trustee's debts merely because the title stands in the trustee's name, and a beneficiary's knowledge, after the transfer of property to the trustee, that the trustee is claiming the property to be his or her own in order to obtain credit cannot be implied from mere recordation or representation by the trustee [*In re Rogal (S.D. Cal. 1953) 112 F. Supp. 712, 719]* . However, the trustee's creditors can subject the property to their claims by showing (1) record title in the trustee's name, (2) knowledge on the part of the beneficiary that the trustee is claiming the property as his or her own, and (3) that a creditor relied on the trustee's claim of title and was induced thereby to extend credit [*In re Rogal (S.D. Cal. 1953) 112 F. Supp. 712, 719* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 459]. In addition, the beneficiary may be estopped from asserting the resulting trust over the rights of the creditors of the trustee if the beneficiary had knowledge that the trustee was obtaining credit based on the trust property, or otherwise by an affirmative act other than allowing title to stand in the name of the trustee, induced the creditors to extend credit to the trustee [*Breeze v. Brooks (1886) 71 Cal. 169, 182, 11 P. 885]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.17

§ 562.17 Statute of Limitations

The four-year period of limitations provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 343* applies to an action to establish a resulting trust and for an accounting incidental thereto [*McCosker v. McCosker (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 498, 501, 265 P.2d 21* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 343*].

The statute of limitations does not run on a beneficiary of a resulting trust until he or she has actual knowledge of repudiation or breach of trust [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 240, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; see *Davenport v. Davenport Found. (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 67, 75, 222 P.2d 11* (statute of limitations as not running in favor of trustee until time of repudiation of trust in case of failure of express trust as well as in case of purchase-money resulting trust)].

When a beneficiary requests conveyance of the legal title and the trustee gives various excuses for delaying, these excuses cannot be deemed to be an unequivocal repudiation of the trust [*Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 519, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537]* . For forms for use in raising the bar of the statute of limitations, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesEquitable AccountingsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.18

§ 562.18 Laches

Laches may bar relief in equity irrespective of whether the statute of limitations has run on the action at law. However, the affirmative defense of laches requires both unreasonable delay in bringing suit, and either acquiescence in the act about which plaintiff complains or prejudice to the defendant resulting from the delay. Moreover, prejudice to the defendant is never presumed; rather it must be affirmatively demonstrated by the defendant in order to sustain his or her burden of proof and production of evidence on the issue. The beneficiary of a resulting trust will not be barred from enforcing the trust merely because of the lapse of time if the trustee has not, to the beneficiary's knowledge, repudiated the trust [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 241, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* . For a form that may be used to raise the defense of laches, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting TrustsTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.19

§ 562.19 Statute of Frauds and Parol Evidence

Aa a general rule, the statute of frauds has no application in an action for a resulting trust [*Jones v. Gore (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 667, 673, 297 P.2d 474* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*]. A resulting trust is a creature of equity and need not be evidenced by writing or even by an express declaration [*Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117-118, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571]* .

When the elements of a resulting trust are present, the fact that the transferee and the payor of the purchase price make an oral agreement, which is unenforceable under the statute of frauds, that the former is to hold the property in trust for the latter does not prevent a resulting trust from arising. In fact, such an agreement supports the inference or presumption that the payor does not intend the transferee to have the beneficial interest [*Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

Parol evidence is admissible to prove the existence of a resulting trust [*Jones v. Gore (1956) 141 Cal. App. 2d 667, 673, 297 P.2d 474]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawStatutes of FraudsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.20

§ 562.20 Burden of Proof

One who claims a resulting trust in property has the burden of proving the facts establishing his or her beneficial interest by clear and convincing evidence [*Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 366-367, 101 P.2d 477* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 458].

Whether the evidence to prove the existence of a resulting trust is clear, satisfactory, and convincing is primarily a question for the trial court to determine. If there is substantial evidence to support its conclusion, the determination is not open to review on appeal. Likewise, the credibility and weight of the evidence are exclusively for the trial court's determination [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 267, 158 P.2d 3]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofClear & Convincing ProofReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.21

§ 562.21 Termination of Resulting Trust by Merger

[1] Transfer of Trust Property to Beneficiary

If a trustee of a resulting trust transfers the trust property to the beneficiary or transfers the trust property at the direction of the beneficiary, the resulting trust terminates. This result is a necessary consequence of the vesting of both legal and equitable titles in the beneficiary, because there is no longer any purpose in keeping the trust relationship alive [*Zakaessian v. Zakaessian (1945) 70 Cal. App. 2d 721, 724, 161 P.2d 677* (purchase money resulting trust); *see* Restatement of Trusts § 410, cmt. b; Restatement (Second) of Trusts, § 410, cmt. b].

[2] Conveyance or Surrender of Trust Property to Trustee

Similarly, the resulting trust that arises in favor of the payor in a purchase-money resulting trust can be extinguished by an oral conveyance or surrender of his or her interest by the beneficiary of the resulting trust to the trustee. The resulting trust in this situation arises from the fact of the payment of the purchase price and without any writing. Just as the inference that a resulting trust arises from the payment of the purchase price can be rebutted without a writing (*see § 562.19*), it can be extinguished without a writing [*Johnson v. Altman (1950) 96 Cal. App. 2d 467, 469, 215 P.2d 768* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 460 and cmt. a].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsModification & TerminationEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsInferencesReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.22

§ 562.22 Relief Available

The usual type of relief contemplated in an action to establish and enforce a resulting trust is a conveyance of the trust property from the trustee to the beneficiary. However, relief is also available in the form of actions to quiet title, and for ejectment [*see Seabury v. Costello (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 640, 642, 26 Cal. Rptr. 248]* .

When the trust property has been disposed of, relief is available in the form of a judgment for the proceeds thereof or for its value [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 244, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* (proceeds); *Penziner v. West Am. Fin. Co. (1933) 133 Cal. App. 578, 586, 24 P.2d 501* (value)]. If the trustee has made subsequent monetary contributions for items such as improvements, utility bills, or loan payments on the property, and the beneficiary recovers judgment for the proceeds of the property, the judgment is for the net proceeds after reimbursing the trustee for the subsequent contributions [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 243-244, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsEjectmentReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

116 of 125 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 562.23-562.39

[Reserved]

§§ 562.23[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.40

§ 562.40 State Statutes

Statute of frauds. *Civ. Code § 1624*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1971*

Involuntary trusts. *Civ. Code §§ 2223, 2224*

Statute of limitations. *Code Civ. Proc. § 343*

Statute of frauds regarding real property transfers inapplicable to trusts arising by implication or operation of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*

Common law as governing establishment and enforcement of resulting trusts. *Prob. Code §§ 15002, 15003(b)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawStatutes of FraudsExceptionsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsGovernmentsCourtsCommon LawGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.41

§ 562.41 Decisions

[1] Constructive Trust Distinguished

Resulting trust as "intention-enforcing" trust, and as distinguished from constructive trust, which is "fraud-rectifying" trust. *Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238-239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *see also Johnson v. Johnson (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 551, 556, 237 Cal. Rptr. 644*

[2] Defenses

Defense of illegality to action to establish resulting trust exists for benefit of public and is permitted to be raised even though party raising defense is not inequitably injured by illegality. *In re Torrez (9th Cir. 1987) 827 F.2d 1299, 1301, 1301 n.4*

[3] Intent Requirement

Resulting trust, like express trust, as based on manifestation of intention of person creating it. *Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Co., Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 485, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547*

Resulting trust as often called "intention-enforcing" trust, and as arising by implication of law to enforce inferred intention of parties to transaction. *Calistoga Civic Club v. City of Calistoga (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 111, 117, 191 Cal. Rptr. 571*

[4] Liability of Beneficiary

When trustee of resulting trust has no duties to perform or trust to administer, except to hold and convey title according to beneficiary's demand, and beneficiary controls operation and maintenance of trust property, beneficiary liable as master for torts of servants committed in scope and course of servants' employment. *Richman v. Green (1956) 143*

Cal. App. 2d 470, 473, 299 P.2d 890

[5] Period of Limitation

Applicable statute of limitations in action to establish resulting trust and for accounting incidental thereto as *Code Civ. Proc. § 343*, four-year statute. *McCosker v. McCosker (1954) 122 Cal. App. 2d 498, 501, 265 P.2d 21*

Statute of limitations as not commencing to run on beneficiary of resulting trust until he or she has actual knowledge of repudiation or breach of trust. Martin v. Kehl (1983) *145 Cal. App. 3d, 228, 240 , 193 Cal. Rptr. 312*

[6] Pro Tanto Resulting Trust

Imposition of simple, rather than pro tanto, resulting trust as proper when (1) substantial evidence exists to support trial court's finding that defendant-trustee made no contribution to purchase price of property subject to trust, (2) court was not provided with argument or authority to convert defendant-trustee's arrangement of loan for purchasing property into pro tanto resulting trust, and (3) it would be unjust, under facts of case, to allow defendant to retain any share of title to property. *Johnson v. Johnson (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 551, 558-559, 237 Cal. Rptr. 644*

[7] Resulting Trust Defined

Resulting trust as not founded on simple fact that money or property of one has been used by another to purchase property, but on relationship betweenparties, that as between them consciously and intentionally, one has advanced consideration to make purchase in other's name; trust as arising because it is natural presumption that it was parties intention that ostensible purchaser should acquire and hold property for one with whose means it was acquired. *Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Co., Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 485, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547*

When resulting trust arises. *Lehmann v. Kamp (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 701, 706, 77 Cal. Rptr. 910*

[8] When Imposition of Resulting Trust Improper

Resulting trust in favor of purchasers of land who placed legal title in their children's names to circumvent federal reclamation law was established and not voided by illegal purpose because (1) agreement was completed, rather than executory, and thus invocation of rule against illegality would benefit public only by way of example; (2) purchasers' conduct did not involve serious moral turpitude; and (3) children would be unjustly enriched if trust were voided. *In re Torrez (9th Cir. 1987) 827 F.2d 1299, 1301-1303* (distinguishing *Hainey v. Narigon (1966) 247 Cal. App. 2d 528, 55 Cal. Rptr. 638*)

Use of "middleman" escrow as not giving rise to resulting trust for benefit of second buyers of property absent parties' intent that first buyer hold property in trust for second buyers. *Majewsky v. Empire Constr. Col, Ltd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 478, 483-486, 85 Cal. Rptr. 819, 467 P.2d 547*

Illegality of loan agreement used to obtain funds to purchase property subject to resulting trust as not barring enforcement of trust when (1) loan transaction is completed and public is not harmed by it, (2) defendant-trustee, rather than plaintiff-beneficiary, is guilty of great moral fault, and (3) nonenforcement of trust would unjustly enrich defendant. *Johnson v. Johnson (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 551, 557, 237 Cal. Rptr. 644*

Settlement paid by insurer to injured party prior to judicial determination that insured's policy did not cover injury as

not establishing resulting trust in favor of insurer and insurer as unable to seek reimbursement from injured party in absence of provision in settlement agreement allowing it to do so. *American Motorists Ins. Co. v. Cowan (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 875, 886, 179 Cal. Rptr. 747*

[9] When Imposition of Resulting Trust Proper

Petition to determine ownership of a real property interest pursuant to *Prob. Code § 850*, when there was no dispute between the testator and decent, brought on a resulting trust and therefore was not subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 366.2*, which specifies one-year limitations period for actions based on the liability of the person. *Estate of Yool (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 867, 875, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 526*

Resulting trust, as well as constructive trust, in plaintiff's favor for one-half interest in real property as proper when each party supplied half of down payment, defendant to take title and make payments in lieu of rent, and plaintiff to receive one-half proceeds when defendant vacated premises. *Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238-239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityMaximsClean Hands PrincipleEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.42

§ 562.42 Text References

Collier on Bankruptcy (15th Ed.), Ch. 5, *Bankruptcy Code, Creditors, the Debtor, and the Estate*, § 541.11[4] (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 13, *Trusts*, §§ 311-318 (9th ed. 1990)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 793-795 (4th ed.)

Restatement (Second) of Trusts §§ 404-460

Bogert, Handbook of the Law of Trusts (3d ed.), Ch. 7

Bogert, The Law of Trusts and Trustees (2d ed. rev.), Ch. 23

Scott, The Law of Trusts (3d ed.), Vol. 5, §§ 404-460

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Estate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsResulting TrustsReal Property LawTrustsResulting Trusts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 562.43-563.59

[Reserved]

§§ 562.43[Reserved]

121 of 125 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.60

§ 562.60 Complaint To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Full or Partial Interest in Real Property or Sale Proceeds and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Full or Partial Interest in Real Property or Sale Proceeds and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH RESULTING
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	TRUST
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. The real property referred to herein is that real property located at _____ [*street address and, if any, city*], _____ County, California, and more fully described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description of property*].

[2. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1- _____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants claims or may claim some interest in the above-described real property adverse to plaintiff, which

claim is without any merit.]

[*EITHER*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing payment of consideration by plaintiff, e.g.,* plaintiff, with his/her own money, paid $_____ as down payment on the above-described real property. The balance of the purchase price was secured by a purchase money first deed of trust, the monthly payments on which defendant agreed to pay in lieu of rent so long as he/she occupied the real property. (The deed of trust was recorded on _____ [*date*], in Volume _____ of Deeds at page _____ in the office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California)].

[*OR*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing proportion of consideration paid by plaintiff, e.g.,* plaintiff, with his/her own money, paid $_____ as _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) of the down payment on the above-described real property. The remaining _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) of the down payment was paid by _____ (*name of co-payer*) in the amount of $_____].

[*CONTINUE*]

4. In consideration of plaintiff's payment, _____ [*allege facts showing transfer of property to trustee, e.g.,* _____ (*name of grantor*), granted the above-described property to defendant by deed dated _____ [*date*], and recorded on _____ [*date*], in Volume _____ of Deeds at page _____ in the office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California].

5. At all times mentioned herein, plaintiff was the equitable owner and defendant was the legal owner of the above-described real property. At all times mentioned herein, it was and is the intention of the parties that _____ [*describe parties' intentions as to the property, e.g.,* defendant hold _____ (the property *or* a _____ per cent interest in the property) in trust for plaintiff until such time as defendant vacated the property, at which time the property would be sold and plaintiff would receive _____ (the net proceeds *or* _____ per cent of the net proceeds) of the sale].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing defendant's breach of trust, e.g.,* defendant vacated the above-described real property. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff, by letter, demanded that defendant either sell the property or pay plaintiff his/her equity share. Defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with plaintiff's demand].

[7. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (a)n escrow has been opened in the _____ (*name and address of title insurance or escrow company*), Escrow No. _____, wherein defendant has agreed to sell, and _____ (*name*(*s*) *of buyer*(*s*)) has/have agreed to buy, the above-described real property for the sum of $_____. Plaintiff regards this price as fair, and is willing, on declaration by this court of his/her rights inthe property, to ratify the sale and to transfer his/her interest in the property to the buyer(s).]

[8. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (P)art of the purchase price has been paid to defendant by the above-mentioned buyer(s), even though the property has not yet been conveyed to the buyer(s).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. Declaring that _____ [defendant holds title to the above-described real property as trustee of a resulting trust for the benefit of plaintiff, and that defendant has no right, title, or interest in the property *or* plaintiff has equitable title to an undivided _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) interest in the above-described real property, and that defendant holds title to the property to that extent in trust for plaintiff];

2. Declaring that, if plaintiff's interest in the above-described real property is disposed of before this judgment becomes final, plaintiff is the owner of _____ [the *or* an undivided _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) interest in the] proceeds of the real property [including the note given in payment for the property and the deed of trust securing it];

3. Ordering defendant to convey to plaintiff forthwith _____ [all of the title to *or* an undivided _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) interest in] the above-described real property or to pay to plaintiff _____ [the *or* _____ (*allege proportionate share, e.g.,* one-half) of the] proceeds of the sale of the property;

4. Ordering that, if the property and its proceeds are disposed of by defendant before the judgment becomes final, plaintiff have and recover judgment from defendant for $_____ [*allege an amount equivalent to the value of plaintiff's interest in the property*];

5. Awarding to plaintiff costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. Awarding to plaintiff such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to establish and enforce a purchase-money resulting trust in a full or partial interest in real property. Actions to establish resulting trusts are governed by the common law [*Prob. Code §§ 15002, 15003(b)*; *see § 562.10*].

The form of complaint is adapted from the facts in *Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* .

[3] Allegations

This form alleges the location and full legal description of the real property that is the subject matter of the action (Paragraph 1). The form then alleges elements of a cause of action for establishment and enforcement of a purchase-money resulting trust under the common law: (1) payment of either full or partial consideration by the plaintiff-beneficiary (Paragraph 3); (2) transfer of the property to the defendant-trustee (Paragraph 4); and (3) the intent of the parties in relation to the property (Paragraph 5); and (4) breach of the resulting trust by the defendant-trustee (Paragraph 6) [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238-239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *Juranek v. Juranek (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 276, 279-280, 84 P.2d 195]* .

The form includes optional paragraphs for use if a sale of the property is pending, alleging that defendant has opened an escrow for receipt of funds from sale of the property (Paragraph 7) and that the buyers have paid a portion of the purchase price to defendant (Paragraph 8) [*see Livernois v. Brandt (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 301, 303, 304, 309, 37 Cal. Rptr. 279* (trust declared in property or its proceeds or equivalent amount should property and proceeds be disposed of prior to finality of judgment)].

The form also includes an optional paragraph alleging the responsibility of fictitiously named defendants sued pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 474* (Paragraph 2).

[4] Part Payment of Purchase Price

When a plaintiff pays only a portion of the purchase price for the trust property, the precise amount or proportion of the consideration furnished must be established clearly, convincingly, and unambiguously [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Demand on Trustee

It is not necessary that the plaintiff-beneficiary tender a demand to the defendant-trustee, before commencing an action to establish and enforce a resulting trust, to convey the property if the facts show that such a demand would not be complied with [*Crozier v. Soquel (1929) 101 Cal. App. 402, 407, 281 P. 698]* .

[7] Pleading Lack of an Adequate Remedy at Law

In an action to establish and enforce a resulting trust, plaintiff-beneficiary need not plead the lack of an adequate remedy at law because the action is one in equity to establish a trust [*Juranek v. Juranek (1938) 29 Cal. App. 2d 276, 280, 84 P.2d 195]* .

[8] Jurisdiction

The superior court, exercising general equity powers, has subject matter jurisdiction over actions to establish and enforce resulting trusts in real property. The action would not be a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 580(b)(3)*; *see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*].

If the action involves personal property in an amount not exceeding $25,000, the matter could be considered as a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 85, 86(b)(1), 580(a)*].

[9] Venue

In an action to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real property, venue is laid in the county in which the property is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*; *Booker v. Aitken (1903) 140 Cal. 471, 476, 74 P. 11]* . In an action to establish and enforce a resulting trust in personal property, venue is laid in the county in which the defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. When a defendant is sued in an official capacity as executor, administrator, guardian, conservator, or

trustee on a claim for the payment of money or the recovery of personal property, venue is laid in the county that has jurisdiction of the estate that the defendant represents [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*].

[10] Quiet Title and Ejectment

An action to quiet title and for ejectment may give rise to a finding by an appellate court of a resulting trust, and relief may subsequently be afforded on the resulting trust theory of liability [*see Seabury v. Costello (1962) 209 Cal. App. 2d 640, 646, 26 Cal. Rptr. 248]* . For a discussion of and forms for use in quiet title and ejectment actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , and Ch. 241, *Ejectment* .

[11] Recovery of Money Judgment

An action to establish and enforce a resulting trust may be combined with an action to recover a money judgment instead of the trust property [*see Penziner v. West Am. Fin. Co. (1933) 133 Cal. App. 578, 586, 24 P.2d 501]* .

[12] No Right to Jury Trial

When a judgment is sought requiring the declaration of a trust, even though the judgment will be one for money, the action is in equity, without right of jury trial [*Hillman v. Stults (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 848, 877, 70 Cal. Rptr. 295]* .

[13] Lis Pendens

If an action to establish a resulting trust on real property is seeking title to or possession of real property, recordation of a lis pendens is proper to put third parties on notice of plaintiff's claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*]. A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

For a detailed discussion of the lis pendens procedure and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[14] State Statutes

Statute of limitations for breach of resulting trust. *Code Civ. Proc. § 343*

Statute of frauds inapplicable to trusts regarding real property arising by implication of law. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1972(b)*

[15] Decisions

Statutory presumption of purchase-money resulting trust as applicable to both personal and real property. *Keene v. Keene (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 657, 665, 21 Cal. Rptr. 593, 371 P.2d 329*

Party claiming resulting trust as bearing burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence. *Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 366-367, 101 P.2d 477* ; *Johnson v. Johnson (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 551, 556, 237 Cal. Rptr. 644*

Party claiming resulting trust as required to establish clearly, convincingly, and unambiguously precise amount or proportion of consideration furnished. *Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 517, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537*

Showing of parties' intention to create trust as necessary in establishing resulting trust. *Baskett v. Crook (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 355, 362, 195 P.2d 39*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.61

§ 562.61 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder--Consideration as Discharge of Preexisting Debt

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property and for Order of Conveyance [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375]--Against Title Holder--Consideration as Discharge of Preexisting Debt

[*Caption. See § 562.60.*]

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Description of real property. See § 562.60, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious defendant allegation. See § 562.60, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing existence of preeexisting debt, e.g.,* plaintiff performed work and labor for defendant, pursuant to an oral contract, on a boat owned by defendant for the agreed compensation of half the proceeds on the sale of the boat. On or about _____ (*date*), the boat was "sold" or traded as a $2,500 down payment on real property located in _____ County, California. On or about _____ (*date*), plaintiff and defendant entered into an oral accord and satisfaction whereby defendant agreed to purchase for plaintiff certain additional real property, described in Paragraph 1, above, and to pay all escrow charges and costs connected therewith. Defendant, with his/her own money, paid all escrow charges and costs connected with the purchase of that real property].

4. In consideration of plaintiff's discharge of defendant's preexisting debt to plaintiff, as alleged above, _____ [*allege facts showing transfer of property to trustee, e.g.,* defendant purchased the property, described in Paragraph 1, above, from _____ (*grantor*) by deed dated _____ (*date*), and recorded on _____ (*date*), in Volume _____ of Deeds, at page

_____, in the office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California. Defendant purchased such real property in his/her own name]. On transfer of the real property, plaintiff took possession thereof, has remained in possession ever since then, and is still in possession thereof.

5. It was and is the intention of the parties that _____ [*describe parties' intentions as to the property, e.g.*, defendant hold the property described in Paragraph 1, above, in trust for plaintiff in consideration for plaintiff's discharge of defendant's preexisting debt to plaintiff].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege facts showing defendant's breach of trust, e.g.*, defendant, through his/her attorney _____ (*name*), wrote to plaintiff and demanded that he/she vacate the real property and premises. Defendant failed and refused, and continues to fail and refuse, to comply with plaintiff's demand].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. Declaring that plaintiff has an equitable title to the above-described real property, and that defendant holds title to the property in trust for plaintiff;

2. Ordering defendant to convey to plaintiff forthwith the above-described real property;

3. Awarding plaintiff costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. Awarding plaintiff such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Form 1.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real property when consideration is provided in a form other than money. Actions to establish resulting trusts aregoverned by the common law [*Prob. Code §§ 15002, 15003(b)*; *see § 562.10*].

The form of complaint is adapted from the facts in *Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537* .

[3] Allegations

This form alleges: (1) facts showing payment of full consideration, in the form of discharge of a preexisting debt, by the plaintiff-beneficiary (Paragraph 3) [*see Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 518, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537]* ; (2) facts showing transfer of the property to the defendant-trustee (Paragraph 4); (3) the intent of the parties in relation to the property (Paragraph 5); and (4) facts showing breach of the resulting trust by the defendant-trustee (Paragraph 6).

[4] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is

not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

[5] Decisions

Money, property, performance of services, or discharge of preexisting debt as permissible consideration for transfer of property subject to resulting trust. *Laing v. Laubach (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 511, 515, 43 Cal. Rptr. 537*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 562.60*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.62

§ 562.62 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property Purchased in Part With Borrowed Funds With Title Taken in Name of Now Deceased Lender as Security, for Accounting, and for Order to Convey Title [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375] on Payment of Balance of Loan--Against Estate of Title Holder

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10]--To Establish Purchase-Money Resulting Trust in Real Property Purchased in Part With Borrowed Funds With Title Taken in Name of Now Deceased Lender as Security, for Accounting, and for Order to Convey Title [Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375] on Payment of Balance of Loan--Against Estate of Title Holder

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
individually and as _____	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH RESULTING
[Administrator of the Estate *or* Executor of the Will]	)	TRUST AND FOR ACCOUNTING
of _____ [*name of deceased*],	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 3367, 3375*]
[and DOES 1 through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name*] is the duly appointed, qualified, and acting _____ [*specify, e.g.*, administrator of the estate (with will annexed) *or* executor of the will] of _____ [*name*],

hereinafter referred to as the deceased[, and is the sole heir of the deceased]. [Defendant is sued herein in his/her representative capacity and individually.]

[2. *Fictitious defendant allegation. See § 562.60, Paragraph 2.*]

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff purchased from _____ [*name of seller*] real property situated at _____ [*street address and if any, city*] _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

4. The purchase price of the property was $_____, and was paid [*specify any consideration paid in addition to loan from defendant, e.g.,* by the assumption of an indebtedness secured by a first deed of trust in the sum of $_____, plaintiff's funds on hand in the sum of $_____, and] by $_____, [borrowed by plaintiff from the deceased on or about _____ (*date*), *or* paid to the seller by the deceased as a loan to plaintiff].

5. Title to the property was taken in the name of the deceased solely as security for repayment by plaintiff of the above-mentioned loan [together with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum]. At the time of the transaction, plaintiff and the deceased orally agreed that the deceased would hold title to the property until the loan, together with interest thereon, was fully repaid, whereon the deceased would convey title to plaintiff.

6. At the time of the transaction, plaintiff and the deceased further orally agreed that, _____ [*specify terms of repayment, e.g.,* commencing on _____ (*date*), plaintiff would make monthly payments to the deceased in the the sum of $_____, $_____ of which the deceased would apply to the payment due on the indebtedness secured by the first deed of trust and the remainder of which the deceased would apply to the principal and interest due on the loan from the deceased to plaintiff].

7. On conclusion of the transaction, plaintiff took charge of the real property, occupied it, and has continually, ever since, occupied the property.

8. In accordance with the agreement alleged above, from _____, until _____ [*dates*], the date of the deceased's death, plaintiff paid to the deceased the total sum of $_____ for application by him/her pursuant to their agreement.

9. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff requested, in writing, that defendant provide plaintiff with a statement of the application by the deceased of the sums paid by plaintiff, and a statement of any balance due on the loan from the deceased. [Coincident with this request, plaintiff offered to pay any balance due and requested defendant to then convey title to the property to plaintiff.] A copy of the request [and offer to pay] is attached hereto, marked Exhibit _____, and incorporated by reference herein.

10. In response to plaintiff's request and offer, defendant refused, and continues to refuse, to recognize the transaction between plaintiff and the deceased as a loan transaction, to provide plaintiff with either a statement of how the deceased applied the sums paid to him/her by plaintiff or a statement of any balance due on the loan from the deceased, to accept any payment on the balance, and to convey title of the property to plaintiff.

11. Plaintiff does not know the amount, if any, owing on the loan from the deceased for the reason that _____ [*specify reason why accounting is necessary, e.g.,* plaintiff does not know the respective amounts that the deceased in fact applied to payments on the indebtedness secured by the first deed of trust and to payments on the loan from the deceased].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. Declaring that defendant[s, and each of them,] holds title to the above-described real property as trustee of a resulting trust for the benefit ofplaintiff, and that defendant[s, and each of them,] has no right, title, or interest in the property;

2. Ordering defendant _____ [*name*] to account for all sums paid by plaintiff and applied by the deceased, pursuant to the agreement between plaintiff and the deceased;

3. Determining the balance, if any, owing by plaintiff on the loan from the deceased;

4. Ordering defendant, on payment by plaintiff of any balance found to be due, to execute and deliver any deeds or other instruments as shall be necessary to convey title to the property to plaintiff;

5. Awarding to plaintiff costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. Awarding to plaintiff such other and further relief as the court deems necessary.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See Ch. 560, Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts, § 560.520.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a beneficiary to establish and enforce a purchase-money resulting trust in real property against the estate of a deceased person who loaned funds to the beneficiary to enable the beneficiary to buy the property and who took title to the property to secure the loan. The complaint also seeks an accounting for amounts paid to the lender [*see Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3* (citing Restatement of Trusts § 448)].

In this type of transaction, the lender typically takes title to the property as security for repayment of the loan and as resulting trustee for the borrower-beneficiary until the beneficiary repays the loan. On repayment, the lender is under a duty to convey title to the borrower-beneficiary, and if the lender fails to so convey, thereby repudiating the trust, a cause of action arises in favor of the beneficiary for enforcement of the resulting trust [*Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3* (citing Restatement of Trusts § 448); *see* Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 448].

The form of complaint is adapted from that in Markgraf v. Koschmieder, San Francisco Superior Court No. 423370.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges: (1) defendant's capacity (Paragraph 1), and (2) a description of the property that is the subject matter of the action (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 455*]. The complaint then alleges elements of a cause of action for enforcement of a purchase-money resulting trust under the common law: (1) plaintiff's purchase of real property (Paragraph 3); (2) payment for the property in whole or in part with consideration borrowed by the plaintiff from the deceased (Paragraph 4) [*see Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3]* ; plaintiff's obligation to repay the loan (Paragraph 6) [*see Viner v. Untrecht (1945)26 Cal. 2d 261, 270, 158 P.2d 3]* ; the intention of the parties that to secure the loan, the deceased take title to the property as trustee until plaintiff's repayment of the loan and that plaintiff remain the beneficial owner of the property (Paragraphs 5-7); and plaintiff's payments on the loan (Paragraph 8).

[4] Accounting Action

A complaint in an action for an accounting must allege the existence of both a relationship between plaintiff and defendant, and an unknown balance due that cannot be determined without an accounting (Paragraphs 3-6, and 11) [*Raymond v. Independent Growers, Inc. (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 154, 160, 284 P.2d 57* ; *see St. James Church v. Superior Court (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 352, 359, 287 P.2d 387]* . Generally, the complaint must also allege plaintiff's demand for and defendant's refusal to provide an accounting (Paragraphs 9 and 10) [*see Wooster v. Nevills (1887) 73 Cal. 58, 60, 14 P. 390]* .

For a complete discussion of and forms for use in pleading the elements of an accounting action, see Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*.

[5] Lis Pendens

A plaintiff may not file a notice of lis pendens unless the plaintiff pleads a cause of action that affects title to specific real property [*Gale v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1395, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 554]* , and a plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens in an action in which the only relief sought is money damages [*Palmer v. Zaklama (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1367, 1381, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116]* .

If a pleading combines theories of liability for monetary damages and for a constructive trust, the plaintiff is not entitled to a lis pendens, because that might provide an unscrupulous plaintiff with a powerful lever to force the settlement of a groundless or malicious suit [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 972, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . A lis pendens is a provisional remedy that must be applied narrowly [*BGJ Assocs. v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 952, 967, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* . For example, a lis pendens is not available in an action by a trustee requesting the imposition of a constructive trust and an equitable lien on the defendant's house for the amount of money that the defendant used to make improvements to the house, which the defendant allegedly obtained by exercising undue influence over the deceased trustor [*Campbell v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 904, 916-922, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 68]* .

However, a fraudulent conveyance action seeking avoidance of a transfer of title of specific real property under *Civ. Code § 3439.07(a)(1)* is a real property claim for purposes of the lis pendens statute [*Kirkeby v. Superior Court (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 642, 652, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 805, 93 P.3d 395]* .

[6] Decisions

Resulting trust as arising on loan from trustee to beneficiary for part payment of purchase price of property. *Viner v. Untrecht (1945) 26 Cal. 2d 261, 269, 158 P.2d 3*

[7] Text References

Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 448

[8] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 562.60*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.63

§ 562.63 Allegation--Property Was Not Transferred as Gift

[1] FORM Allegation--Property Was Not Transferred as Gift

1. At all times mentioned herein, the above-described property was neither conveyed with any intent or purpose that the conveyance be, nor was the conveyance, a gift, advancement, or bounty to _____ [*name of defendant*] from _____ [*name of plaintiff*]. At all times mentioned, _____ defendant has held interest and title in such property in trust and as trustee, as alleged herein, for _____ plaintiff and not otherwise.

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegation is for use in a complaint to establish and enforce a purchase-money resulting trust in real or personal property. It should be used when the defendant is a natural object of the bounty of the plaintiff to allege that the payment for the property was not a gift [*see* *Quinn v. Reilly (1926) 198 Cal. 465, 467-468, 245 P. 1091* (daughter as trustee)].

If it appears that the grantee is a child or other natural object of bounty of the person who makes the payment, it will be presumed that a gift is intended [*Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 367, 101 P.2d 477* , see Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 442]. The presumption of gift is sufficient to rebut the presumption of the existence of a resulting trust [*Oyama v. State of California (1948) 332 U.S. 633, 68 S. Ct. 269, 92 L. Ed. 249, 256]* . The burden of proof then shifts to the payor to prove that he or she did not intend to make a gift to the transferee [*Altramano v. Swan (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 622, 628, 128 P.2d 353* (citing Restatement of Trusts § 442, comment b)].

To rebut the presumption of gift in cases of property transfers between and among family members, a plaintiff must be allowed to allege facts showing that a gift is not intended. In so doing, plaintiff need only allege ultimate facts and not, for example, acts or agreements tending to prove those ultimate facts [*Quinn v. Reilly (1926) 198 Cal. 465, 468, 245 P. 1091]* .

This allegation is adapted from the facts in *Quinn v. Reilly (1926) 198 Cal. 465, 467, 245 P. 1091* .

[3] Decisions

When parent pays for conveyance of property to child, presumption of gift arises, rather than presumption of resulting trust. *Oyama v. State of California (1948) 332 U.S. 633, 641, 68 S. Ct. 269, 92 L. Ed. 249*

When title to property taken in husband's name and consideration for transfer furnished by wife, presumption of resulting trust arises. *Socol v. King (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 342, 348, 223 P.2d 627* .

When title to property taken in wife's name and consideration for transfer furnished by husband, presumption of gift arises, and burden as shifts to payor to prove that gift not intended. *Altramano v. Swan (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 622, 628, 128 P.2d 353*

Presumption of gift is rebutted by adequate proof that grantee was not intended to have beneficial interest. *Gomez v. Cecena (1940) 15 Cal. 2d 363, 367, 101 P.2d 477*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 562 TRUSTS: RESULTING TRUSTS
PART IV. FORMS

49-562 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 562.64

§ 562.64 Affirmative Defense--Consideration or Transfer of Property Was Gift

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense--Consideration or Transfer of Property Was Gift

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of actionalleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that

[*EITHER*]

plaintiff's advance to defendant of consideration for the purchase of property described in plaintiff's complaint was intended by plaintiff to be and was a gift to defendant of money to enable defendant to purchase the above-mentioned property for defendant's own benefit.

[*OR*]

plaintiff's transfer to defendant of the property described in plaintiff's complaint was a gift from plaintiff to defendant. Defendant does not hold, nor has he/she ever held, the above-mentioned property in trust for plaintiff.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense is for use in an answer to a complaint seeking to establish and enforce a resulting trust in real or personal property. It may be used by a defendant to rebut the presumption that when a transfer of property is made to one person and the consideration therefor is paid by or for another, a trust results in favor of the person by or for whom the payment is made [*see Martin v. Kehl (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 228, 238-239, 193 Cal. Rptr. 312* ; *see also Estate of Raphael (1953) 115 Cal. App. 2d 525, 531, 252 P.2d 979]* .

A statement of any new matter constituting a defense must be contained in an answer to a complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. If more than one affirmative defense is set forth in the answer, each defense must be separately stated [

Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)] and numbered [*Cal. Rule of Ct., Rule 2.112(1)*]. If the complaint sets forth more than one cause of action, the affirmative defense must refer to the cause of action it is intended to answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 562.63*

For discussion relating to answers generally and general forms for answers into which the foregoing allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

For a discussion and forms relating to demurrers, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings*

[4] State Statutes

Pleading affirmative defenses. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 564.syn

§ 564.syn Synopsis to Chapter 564: UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

§ 564.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 564.02 Cross References

§§ 564.03-564.09 [Reserved]

§ 564.10 Governing Law

§ 564.11 Federal-State System

§ 564.12 Purposes of Law

§ 564.13 Administration of Law

§ 564.14 Dissemination of Rules and Regulations

§ 564.15 Use of Information Obtained

[1] Confidentiality

[2] Exceptions

§ 564.16 Obtaining Employment Development Department Forms

§§ 564.17-564.29 [Reserved]

§ 564.30 Governing Law

§ 564.31 Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

§ 564.32 Appointment and Duties of Chief Administrative Law Judge

§ 564.33 Appointment and Duties of Administrative Law Judges

§ 564.34 Delegation by Appeals Board of Powers and Authority

§ 564.35 Rules as Governing Procedure

§ 564.36 Consolidation of Similar Matters

§ 564.37 Representation by Counsel

[1] Claimant's Right

[2] Counsel Fees

[3] Authorization for Representation and Service of Notices

§ 564.38 Administering Oaths, Taking Depositions, Certifying to Official Acts, and Issuing Subpoenas; Telephone Participation at Hearings

§ 564.39 Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

§ 564.40 Fees and Expenses

§ 564.41 Rules of Evidence and Official or Judicial Notice

§ 564.42 Record of Proceedings

§ 564.43 Nonfinality of Administrative Law Judge's Decision

§ 564.44 Board's Power to Transfer Case

[1] Before Decision of Administrative Law Judge

[2] After Decision of Administrative Law Judge

§ 564.45 Assignment of Cases to Board Members

§ 564.46 Board's Decisions

§ 564.47 Costs, Penalties, and Interest

§ 564.48 Reconsideration

§ 564.49 Time to Appeal From Board Decision

§ 564.50 Effect of Findings, Judgment, Conclusion, and Order on Separate Actions or Proceedings

§ 564.51 Precedent Decision

[1] Designation

[2] Declaratory Relief Action to Challenge Validity

[3] Procedure on Reversal or Declaration of Invalidity

§§ 564.52-564.69 [Reserved]

§ 564.70 Governing Law

§ 564.71 Definitions

[1] "Employer"

[2] "Employing Unit"

[3] "Calendar Quarter"

[4] "Employment"

[5] "Employee"

[6] "Wages"

[7] "Authorized Regulations"

[8] Other Terms

§ 564.72 Registration With Employment Development Department (EDD)

§ 564.73 Reports, Returns, and Work Records

[1] Requirements

[2] Consequences of Failure to Provide

[3] Use of Agent for Workers Employed by Several Employers

[4] Annual Reconciliation Return

§ 564.74 Employer Contributions

§ 564.75 Reserve Accounts

[1] Charges and Credits

[2] Annual Statements

[3] Protest of Charge or Credit

§ 564.76 Collection of Contributions by Director

§ 564.77 Civil Action to Prevent Collection Prohibited

§ 564.78 Administrative Appellate Review

[1] Levels of Appellate Review

[2] Review by Administrative Law Judge

[3] Review by Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

[4] Effect of Decision and Explanation of Right to Judicial Review

§ 564.79 Judicial Review

[1] Claim for Refund or Credit as Prerequisite

[2] When Action May Be Filed

[a] Generally

[b] On Denial of Claim for Refund or Credit

[c] On Denial of Claim of Exemption by Religious Organization

[d] On Denial of Protest or Denial or Grant of Application for Transfer of Reserve Account

§§ 564.80-564.99 [Reserved]

§ 564.100 Governing Law

§ 564.101 Source of Benefit Payments

§ 564.102 Unemployment Fund

§ 564.103 Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund

§ 564.104 Nonwaiverability and Nonassignability of Benefits

§§ 564.105-564.119 [Reserved]

§ 564.120 Summary of Procedure for Claiming Unemployment Compensation Benefits and Administrative Appeal

§ 564.121 Kinds of Unemployment Compensation Benefits

§ 564.122 Source and Amount of Benefits and To Whom Payable

§ 564.123 Prohibition Against Denial of Benefits and Exceptions

§ 564.124 "Base Period" Defined

[1] Base Period

[2] Alternate Base Period

§ 564.125 "Unemployed" Defined

[1] General Conditions

[2] Commercial Fishing

[3] Shared Work Arrangements

§ 564.126 "Week" Defined

§ 564.127 Eligible Individuals

[1] Conditions of Eligibility

[2] "Week of Unemployment"

[3] "Available for Work" Requirement

[4] "Seek Work" Requirement

[5] What Constitutes "Suitable Employment" and Factors Considered

[6] Unsuitable Employment and Effect of Refusal to Accept

[7] Factors Not Affecting Eligibility

§ 564.128 Ineligible Persons

[1] School and Seasonal Employees

[2] Person Applying to Another Jurisdiction for Benefits

[3] Strikers

[4] Aliens

§ 564.129 Reductions and Deductions for Other Payments

§ 564.130 Disqualified Persons

[1] Grounds

[2] "Most Recent Work" Defined

[3] What Constitutes Voluntary Leaving

[4] "Good Cause"

[a] Defined

[b] Determination as Question of Law

[c] Examples

[i] Harassment

[ii] Reduction in Earnings

[iii] To Preserve Family Relationship

[iv] Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Agreement

[v] Deprivation of Equal Opportunity or Discrimination

[vi] To Escape Domestic Violence

[vii] Absence From Work

[5] What Constitutes Misconduct

[6] Presumption Favoring Employee Absent Contrary Notice From Employer

[7] Other Grounds of Disqualification

§ 564.131 Duration of Disqualification

[1] Person Voluntarily Quit or Was Fired for Misconduct

[2] Refusal to Accept Suitable Employment

[3] False Statement

[4] Serving Multiple Disqualification Periods Concurrently

[5] Extension of Ineligibility Period on Successive Disqualifications

§ 564.132 Claims for Benefits

[1] Kinds of Claims

[a] "New Claim"

[b] "Additional Claim"

[c] "Reopened Claim"

[d] "Continued Claim"

[e] "Partial Claims"

[2] Filing Claim

[a] Requirements

[b] Delayed Filing

[3] Payment or Denial of Claim

[4] Payment of Interest on Wrongful Denial of Claim

§ 564.133 Notice to Employer and Employer's Right to Submit Facts

[1] On Employee's Claim

[2] On Computation of Claim

§ 564.134 Department's Determination or Ruling

§§ 564.135-564.149 [Reserved]

§ 564.150 Generally

§ 564.151 Nature of Disability Insurance Law

§ 564.152 Family Temporary Disability Insurance

§ 564.153 Definitions

[1] "Employment"

[2] "Disability Benefit Period"

[3] "Disability Base Period"

[4] "Valid Claim"

[5] "Disability" and "Disabled"

§ 564.154 Submission of Notices, Protests, and Information

§ 564.155 Eligibility for Benefits

§ 564.156 Ineligibility for Benefits

§ 564.157 Amount of Benefits

§ 564.158 Disqualification

[1] Fraud

[2] Confined as Dipsomaniac, Drug Addict, or Sex Offender

[3] Incarcerated

[4] Disabled Due to Commission of Crime

[5] Disqualified From Receiving Unemployment Compensation

§ 564.159 Filing Claim for Benefits

§ 564.160 Procedure on Claim and Appeal

§ 564.161 Computation, Notice, and Protest

§ 564.162 Eligibility Review for Suspected Fraud

§ 564.163 Reconsideration

§ 564.164 Levels of Administrative Appeal

§§ 564.165-564.179 [Reserved]

§ 564.180 Time Limit on Judicial Review

§ 564.181 Right of Director to Seek Judicial Review

§ 564.182 Review by Administrative Mandate

§ 564.183 Standard and Scope of Review

[1] By Superior Court

[2] By Appellate Court

§§ 564.184-564.199 [Reserved]

§ 564.200 State Statutes

§ 564.201 Administrative Regulations

§ 564.202 Decisions

[1] Evidence

[2] Precedent Decisions

[3] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

[4] Right to Legal Representation

§ 564.203 Law Reviews

§§ 564.204-564.219 [Reserved]

§ 564.220 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Appeal

[2] Alternative Methods of Financing Unemployment Insurance Coverage

[3] Collection of Employee and Employer Contributions

[4] Contributions and Reports

[5] Court Calendar Preference

[6] Disability Compensation

[7] Elective Coverage

[8] Employer-Employee Relationship

[9] Extended Duration Benefits

[10] Federal-State Extended Benefits

[11] Hearing Procedure

[12] Settlement

[13] Violations and Penalties

§ 564.221 Administrative Regulations

[1] Contributions and Reports

[2] Definitions

[3] Employment

[4] Refunds and Overpayments

[5] Withholding Tax on Wages

§ 564.222 Decisions

[1] Actions to Recover Erroneously or Illegally Assessed Contributions

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Contributions

[4] Employee vs. Agent

[5] Employee vs. Independent Contractor

[6] Experience Rating Formula

[7] Jurisdiction

[8] Limitations on Judicial Actions

[9] Penalties

[10] Reserve Accounts

[11] Statutory Interpretation

§ 564.223 Attorney General Opinions

§ 564.224 Law Reviews

§§ 564.225-564.239 [Reserved]

§ 564.240 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Appeal

[2] Child and Spousal Support

[3] Disability Benefits

[4] Disqualification for Unemployment Compensation Benefits

[5] Employment Training

[6] Extended Duration Benefits

[7] Federal-State Extended Compensation

[8] Funds

[9] Judicial Review

[10] Liens

[11] Presumptions

[12] Unemployment Insurance Benefits

[13] Violations and Penalties

[14] Voluntarily Leaving Work with Good Cause

§ 564.241 Administrative Regulations

[1] Collections

[2] Definitions

[3] Disability Benefits

[4] Unemployment Compensation Benefits

[5] Violations and Penalties

[6] Work Incentive Programs

§ 564.242 Decisions

[1] Administrative Appeal

[2] Attorney Fees

[3] Availability for Work

[4] Base Period

[5] Benefits Generally

[6] Burden of Proof and Prima Facie Case

[7] Collateral Estoppel

[8] Collective Bargaining Agreements

[9] Disability Insurance

[10] Disqualified Persons

[11] Duration of Disqualification for Benefits

[12] Federal Law

[13] Fraudulently Obtaining Benefits

[14] Good Cause for Leaving Employment

[15] Misconduct

[16] Overpayment

[17] Penalties

[18] Pregnancy

[19] Presumptions

[20] Recall after Layoff

[21] Representation by Counsel

[22] Review on Mandate

[23] School Employees

[24] Seek-Work Requirement

[25] Strikes and Lockouts

[26] Unemployment Insurance Act as Remedial and Liberally Construed

[27] Violations and Penalties

[28] Voluntary Disability Insurance Plans

[29] Wages

§ 564.243 Law Reviews

§§ 564.244-564.259 [Reserved]

§ 564.260 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--Against Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board to Determine Validity of Precedent Decision [Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2]--By Interested Person or Organization

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Scope and Effect of Court's Determination

[4] Allegations

[5] Standing to Sue

[6] Actual Controversy Implied

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§§ 564.261-564.279 [Reserved]

§ 564.280 Complaint to Recover Erroneously or Illegally Collected Employer Contributions [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)]--By Alleged Employer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] When Refund Is Not Permitted

[5] Necessity of Filing Claim for Refund or Credit

[6] Effect on Claim for Refund of Payment Pending Administrative Appeal of Assessment

[7] Venue of Action

[8] Subject Matter Jurisdiction

[9] State Statutes

§§ 564.281-564.299 [Reserved]

§ 564.300 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Allowing Unemployment Compensation Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--Employee Left Work Without Good Cause or Was Discharged for Misconduct in Connection With Work [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256]--By Employer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Administrative Record

[4] Parties

[5] Allegations

[6] Cross References

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

§ 564.301 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Denying Unemployment Insurance Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--By Unemployed Worker

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.01

§ 564.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the Appeals Division of the Employment Development Department, which consists of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and its employees [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 315, 401*]. The chapter includes a form of complaint for declaratory relief to challenge the validity of a precedent decision issued by the board [*see § 564.260*]. For procedure and forms for use in challenging the validity of an authorized regulation (defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 127*), see Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking* .

This chapter also discusses contributions to the Unemployment and Disability Funds, employers' reserve accounts, the reports required of employers, assessments, alternative methods of financing authorized for specific kinds of employing units, and administrative review. It includes a form of complaint to recover an overpayment after a claim for refund or credit was denied and administrative remedies were exhausted [*see § 564.280*].

This chapter also discusses unemployment compensation and disability insurance, and administrative and judicial review of claims for each. It includes forms of petitions for a writ of mandate to review a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board adverse to an employer [*see § 564.300*] and adverse to a claimant for unemployment insurance compensation [*see § 564.301*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.02

§ 564.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms for use in seeking a declaration as to the validity of a regulation under *Gov. Code § 11350*, see Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART I. SCOPE

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.03-564.09

[Reserved]

§§ 564.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.10

§ 564.10 Governing Law

Unemployment insurance is governed by the federal Unemployment Tax Act (*I.R.C. § 3301* et seq.), the federal Social Security Act (*42 U.S.C. §§ 501-504, 1101*-1109), the California Unemployment Insurance Code, and *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 125.1 et seq.*

Federal disability insurance is governed by *42 U.S.C. § 401 et seq.* [*see, e.g., Brawner v. Secretary of Health and Human Services (9th Cir. 1988) 839 F.2d 432, 433-434]* .

The Unemployment Insurance Code consists of General Provisions (*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1 et seq.*) and seven divisions. Division 1 (*Unemp. Ins. Code § 100 et seq.*) covers unemployment and disability compensation.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDISocial Security Disability InsuranceGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.11

§ 564.11 Federal-State System

The unemployment insurance program was initiated by Congress in the Social Security Act of 1935 [*see City of Sacramento v. State of California (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 182, 187, 203 Cal. Rptr. 258]* . The act provides for a federal-state system of unemployment compensation by imposing a federal tax on an affected employer in specified percentages of the total wages paid in a given calendar year [*see I.R.C. § 3301*]. A partial credit against the tax is allowed for contributions paid by the employer pursuant to a state unemployment compensation program which is approved by the United States Secretary of Labor on review in conformity with qualifying criteria established by federal law [*see I.R.C. §§ 3302*-3304]. State programs approved by the Secretary of Labor are subsidized with federal grants paid to the conforming states pursuant to the Social Security Act (*42 U.S.C. §§ 501-503*) [*see City of Sacramento v. State of California (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 182, 187, 203 Cal. Rptr. 258* ; *Russ v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 834, 842, 178 Cal. Rptr. 421]* . Thus, the act imposes a tax on employers that each state can mitigate by establishing its own unemployment insurance program meeting federal guidelines [*Campos v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966-967, 183 Cal. Rptr. 637]* .

The California law is contained in the Unemployment Insurance Code of 1953 (*discussed under § 564.100*), which consolidated and revised the prior law (originally enacted in 1935) relating to unemployment and disability insurance [*see Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 114, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* . Provisions governing interstate and federal cooperation are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 451-456*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.12

§ 564.12 Purposes of Law

The purposes of the unemployment insurance law are to provide benefits for persons unemployed through no fault of their own and to reduce involuntary unemployment and the suffering caused by it to a minimum. Unemployed persons claiming unemployment insurance benefits are required to make all reasonable effort to secure employment on their own behalf [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 100*; *see Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 316, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.13

§ 564.13 Administration of Law

Under both the federal and state acts, administrative boards are empowered to promulgate rules, regulations, and administrative interpretations [*Manchester Avenue Co. v. Stewart (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 307, 310, 325 P.2d 457* ; *see California Emp. Com. v. Kovacevich (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 546, 554, 165 P.2d 917]* . The administrative board in California charged with the responsibility of carrying out the duties imposed by the Unemployment Insurance Code is the Employment Development Department in the Health and Welfare Agency [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 301-301.7*]. The department is administered by the Director of Employment Development [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 301*], whose duties and powers are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 301, 305-307, 311, 316-318, 320-323, 325-327, 330-334,* and *403*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.14

§ 564.14 Dissemination of Rules and Regulations

On the request of any person or entity, the department is required to provide any or all of its rules, regulations, guidelines, bulletins, manuals, standards of general application, or the departmental responsibilities under any state or federal law, along with any subscription service necessary to assure prompt receipt of amendments to any of the materials. Except for one free copy of the materials that must be provided to each state legislator on request, the department is required to charge a fee to cover the costs of reproducing the materials and the postage associated with a subscription service. Documents properly classified as confidential are exempt from these requirements [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 307*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.15

§ 564.15 Use of Information Obtained

[1] Confidentiality

Information obtained by the department in the administration of the code is for the exclusive use and information of the director and is not open to the public, except as otherwise specifically provided in the Unemployment Insurance Code [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1094(a)*]. Any information released to authorized entities pursuant to other provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Code is not admissible in evidence in any action or special proceeding, other than one arising out of the Code [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1094(b)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095*].

The information may, however, be tabulated and published in statistical form, but the name of the employing unit or of any worker must never be divulged in the course of the tabulation or publication [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1094(c)*].

The confidentiality of medical records obtained under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272* (relating to disability compensation) and exceptions are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2714*.

Thus, except as otherwise provided in the Unemployment Insurance Code, and except with respect to information furnished by the department in connection with its participation as a party or as a lien claimant in a judicial or administrative proceeding, information obtained in the course of administration of the unemployment and disability compensation laws is confidential. It is not to be published or open to public inspection in any manner [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2111*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122* (penalty for violation of nondisclosure provisions)]. Disclosure of amounts of wages paid and amounts of California personal income tax withheld from those wages is not permitted, except as provided by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 19542 et seq.*, which govern disclosure of information by the Franchise Tax Board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1094(d)*; *see, e.g., Rev. & Tax. Code § 19545* (disclosure in judicial or adminstrative proceeding)].

[2] Exceptions

There are several exceptions to the foregoing provisions. Information regarding a recipient of unemployment compensation that must be made available to a federal agency charged with the administration of public works or

assistance through public employment is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 321*. The exchange of information between the department and other state or federal agencies is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 322*. Disclosures required to be made by the department to law enforcement agencies are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095*. Disclosures required to be made by the department regarding entitlement of benefits and regarding employers' obligations and rights are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(b)* and *(c)* and *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(d)* and *(e)*, respectively. Disclosures required to be made by the department regarding public social services and local relief assistance are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(f)* and *(g)*, respectively.

Additional disclosures required to be made by the department are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095*. For example, information may be disclosed to enable an employer to fully discharge its obligations or safeguard its rights under the Unemployment Insurance Code or the Employment Development Act [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1 et seq*, § 9000 et seq.]; to enable federal, state, or local government departments or agencies to verify or determine the eligibility or entitlement of applicant for public social services; and to enable state or local governmental departments or agencies to pursue criminal, civil; or administrative remedies in connection with the unlawful application or receipt of relief under the Welfare and Institutions Code or to enable the collection of expenditures for medical assistance services under the Welfare and Institutions Code) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(d), (f), (h)*]. Disclosures required to be made by the department to public employee retirement systems are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(j)*. Disclosures required to be made to the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement in the Department of Industrial Relations to enable it to seek criminal, civil, or administrative remedies in connection with the failure to pay, or the unlawful payment of, wages pursuant to *Lab. Code § 200 et seq.* (payment of wages) and *Lab. Code § 1720 et seq.* (relating to public works) are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(k)*. Disclosures required to be made to federal, state, or local governmental departments or agencies relating to child support enforcement are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(l)*. Disclosures required to be made to federal, state, or local governmental departments or agencies to assist in location of crime victims entitled to restitution and collection of restitution, fines, penalties, assessments, and fees owed to the county are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(m)*. Disclosures required to be made by the department to provide an authorized governmental agency, such as a county district attorney or office of the Attorney General, with relevant information that relates to any specific workers' compensation insurance fraud investigation are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(o)*. Disclosures required to enablecity and county planning agencies to develop economicforecasts are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(r)*. Disclosure of wage and employer information to the State Department of Developmental Services to assist that department in the collection of moneys owed by the recipient, parent, or any other legally liable person for services and support provided by the department under specified programs is authorized by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(s)*. Disclosure of information to enable the Contractors' State License Board to verify the employment history of an individual applying for a contractor's license [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 7068*] is authorized by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(v)*.

However, nothing in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095* authorizes or permits the use of information obtained in the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Code by any private collection agency [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1095(t)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationFreedom of InformationDefenses & ExemptionsStatutory ExemptionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.16

§ 564.16 Obtaining Employment Development Department Forms

Forms prescribed by the Employment Development Department may be ordered from the Employment Development Department, 800 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814. Form DE 3274 Rev. 14 (4-82), listing theforms and form numbers, may be used to place an order. Forms may also be ordered via the internet from www.edd.cahwnet.gov.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawGovernmental InformationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.17-564.29

[Reserved]

§§ 564.17[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.30

§ 564.30 Governing Law

The organization and function of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and the appointment and general duties of administrative law judges are governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 401-413*. Proceedings before administrative law judges and the appeals board are governed by *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.31

§ 564.31 Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

The Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board consists of seven members, two of whom are required to be attorneys [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 401*].

The appeals board meets as a whole at such times as the chairperson directs, to consider and pass on such matters as the chairperson may bring before it and to consider and decide cases which present issues of first impression or which will enable the board to achieve uniformity of decisions by the respective members [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*].

The appeals board as a whole may promulgate, amend, or rescind rules pertaining to hearing appeals and other matters falling within its jurisdiction [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 411*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.32

§ 564.32 Appointment and Duties of Chief Administrative Law Judge

The chief administrative law judge is appointed by the appeals board and must be a member in good standing of the State Bar of California [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 405*]. This judge (1) serves as the board's chief executive in the administration of the activities of adminstrative law judges and their staffs, and (2) maintains a continuous review of the decisions of the administrative law judges from which no appeal is taken to uncover decisions which appear inconsistent with the law, with established judicial decisions, or with prior decisions of the board or with each other, and recommends such cases to the appeals board for certification to itself for a further hearing [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 406*; *see § 564.44*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.33

§ 564.33 Appointment and Duties of Administrative Law Judges

The administrative law judges are appointed and their activities are directed by the appeals board or by its executive officer [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 404*]. There is no requirement that these judges be attorneys.

The administrative law judges are required to hear and render a decision in every matter in which a petition is filed or in which an appeal is taken to them as provided in the Unemployment Insurance Code [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 404*; *see* Parts II and III, *below*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.34

§ 564.34 Delegation by Appeals Board of Powers and Authority

The appeals board may delegate its power to any deputy, administrative law judge, or other person properly authorized by it in writing for the purposes of any investigation, hearing, or proceeding under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-4751* (relating to unemployment and disability compensation) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1959*]. It may also delegate to any one of its members or to a special examiner or administrative law judge the taking or hearing of evidence in any case before it [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 407*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.35

§ 564.35 Rules as Governing Procedure

The manner in which disputed claims, appeals, and petitions are presented, the reports required from the claimant and from any employing unit, and the conduct of the hearings and appeals must be in accordance with the rules prescribed by the appeals board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1951*]. These rules are set forth in *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency RulemakingGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.36

§ 564.36 Consolidation of Similar Matters

Cases before an administrative judge with respect to which the alleged facts and the points of law are the same must be consolidated for hearing [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1951*], provided that no substantial right of any party will be prejudiced [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5053*]. Cases before the Appeals Board involving similar facts and circumstances may also be consolidated [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5100*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.37

§ 564.37 Representation by Counsel

[1] Claimant's Right

Any individual claiming benefits in any proceedings before the appeals board or its authorized representative may be represented by counsel or agent [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1957*]. However, there is no constitutional right to state-appointed counsel [*Staley v. California Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 675, 678, 86 Cal. Rptr. 294]* . Nevertheless, legal agencies that furnish free legal advice and representation to indigents may be available to the claimant [*see Staley v. California Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 675, 678-679, 86 Cal. Rptr. 294]* .

[2] Counsel Fees

Any counsel or agent representing a claimant must not charge or receive for his or her services more than an amount approved by the appeals board; a violation of this provision is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1957*]. If a fee is charged by an agent for representing a claimant before an administrative law judge and an issue as to the amount is raised by the claimant, the agent, or the judge, the agent must receive no more than an amount approved by the judge. The approved fee may be reviewed by the appeals board [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5011*]. If a fee is charged in a proceeding before the appeals board and an issue is raised as to the amount, the agent must receive no more than an amount approved by the board [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5011*].

[3] Authorization for Representation and Service of Notices

A form is provided by the department without charge for the use of an individual claiming benefits to authorize a counsel or an agent to represent the claimant in any proceedings before the appeals board or its administrative law judges or authorized representatives. If an authorization is filed, the appeals board or its administrative law judges must, on request by the claimant, serve copies of all notices and transcript pertinent to the proceedings on the claimant and his or her counsel or agent [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1957.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.38

§ 564.38 Administering Oaths, Taking Depositions, Certifying to Official Acts, and Issuing Subpoenas; Telephone Participation at Hearings

In any proceeding, hearing, investigation, or in the discharge of any duties imposed by law, any member of the appeals board, an administrative law judge, and any authorized employee designated by the board may administer oaths, take depositions, certify to official acts, and issue subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1953*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5058* (witnesses and subpoenas); *see also Hill v. Brisbane (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 15, 17-18, 151 P.2d 578]* .

Obedience to subpoenas may be enforced by application to the superior court as set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 11180-11191* (relating to investigations and hearings by state agencies) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1954*]. However, the only duty of the court is to assist the department in the performance of its functions, and the court may not in the proceeding usurp the functions of the department [*Hill v. Brisbane (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 15, 20, 151 P.2d 578* (involving predecessor statute)].

A party, or a party's representative, must be allowed to participate in a hearing by telephone on the party's or representative's request and a showing of good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1951* (telephone participation must be in accordance with regulations by appeals board); *see also 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5055*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersAdministrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.39

§ 564.39 Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, and other records as required by a subpoena on the grounds that the testimony or evidence required may tend to incriminate the person or subject the person to a penalty or forfeiture. However, no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he or she is compelled to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, after having claimed the privilege against self-incrimination. But this does not exempt any individual from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed while so testifying [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1955*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral OverviewEvidencePrivilegesSelf-Incrimination PrivilegeExceptionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.40

§ 564.40 Fees and Expenses

Neither the appeals board nor its representative may charge any individual claiming benefits fees of any kind [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1956*].

Subpoenaed witnesses are allowed the fees prescribed in *Gov. Code § 68093*, relating to proceedings in the superior court. These fees and all expenses incurred by the Director of Employment Development or the appeals board, or the representative of either, are part of the expenses of administering the law. But this does not apply to charges for services of counsel or other agent representing the claimant, employer, or other interested person [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1956*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsWitnessesLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.41

§ 564.41 Rules of Evidence and Official or Judicial Notice

The appeals board and its representatives and administrative law judges are not bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence or by technical or formal rules of procedure. Rather, they may conduct the hearings and appeals in such manner as to ascertain the substantial rights of the parties [*Unemp Ins. Code § 1952*]. Thus, any relevant evidence must be admitted if it is the sort of evidence on which responsible persons are accustomed to rely in the conduct of serious affairs, regardless of the existence of any common law or statutory rule that might make improper the admission of the evidence over objection in civil actions [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5062(e)*]. Under this standard, affidavits by persons as to facts within their personal knowledge would qualify as competent evidence provided the opposing party's right to cross-examine is fully protected [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 598, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

The taking of official or judicial notice by an administrative law judge or the board is authorized by *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5009*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceOfficial NoticeLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.42

§ 564.42 Record of Proceedings

A full and complete record must be kept of all proceedings in connection with disputed claims. All testimony at any hearing held in California on a disputed claim must be recorded, and, when feasible, by a reporter in shorthand or by machine writing. The testimony need not be transcribed unless the disputed claim is further appealed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1952*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5010* for party's right to transcript on appeal to appeals board].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersDuties & PowersLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.43

§ 564.43 Nonfinality of Administrative Law Judge's Decision

No decision of an administrative law judge is final if the appeals board sets it aside or removes the proceedings to itself for review and decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 413(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.44

§ 564.44 Board's Power to Transfer Case

[1] Before Decision of Administrative Law Judge

The appeals board acting as a whole may, on its own motion, by notice mailed to the Director of Employment Development and the parties prior to the mailing of an administrative law judge's decision, either (1) transfer the proceedings to another administrative law judge, or (2) remove the proceedings to itself for review and decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 412(a)*]. In this latter event, the board may order the taking of additional evidence and may affirm, reverse, modify, or set aside any findings or actions of the Employment Development Department from which the appeal or petition to the administrative law judge was taken. The board must promptly notify the department and the parties of its order or decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 412(b)*].

[2] After Decision of Administrative Law Judge

The appeals board acting as a whole may, on its own motion, by notice mailed to the Director of Employment Development and to the parties not later than 30 days after the mailing of an administrative law judge's decision, either (1) set aside the decision and remand the proceedings to another administrative law judge for review and decision, or (2) remove the proceedings to itself for review and decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 413(a)*]. In this latter event, the board may order the taking of additional evidence and may affirm, reverse, modify, or set aside the administrative law judge's decision. The board must promptly notify the department and parties to the proceedings of its order or decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 413(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.45

§ 564.45 Assignment of Cases to Board Members

The chairperson of the appeals board assigns cases before the board to any two of the board's members for consideration and decision. Their decision is the board's decision unless they fail to concur, in which event the chairperson or another board member designated by the chairperson is assigned to the panel to resolve the impasse. However, a case must be considered and decided by the appeals board acting as a whole at the request of any board member. Decisions of the board acting as a whole are made by a majority vote of its members [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5108(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationPresiding OfficersAdministrative Law JudgesLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.46

§ 564.46 Board's Decisions

All decisions and orders of the board must be in writing [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 408*]. Each decision must contain a statement of the facts on which it is based and a statement of the decision itself and the reasons for it. Anything incorporated in a decision, other than a precedent decision (discussed *below*), must be physically attached to and made a part of the decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*]. If a request for review may be taken, the board must attach to its decision an explanation of the party's right to seek such review [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*].

Except for action taken by a judicial tribunal as permitted or required by law, a decision of the appeals board is final and binding on the Director of Employment Development with respect to the parties involved in the particular appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*]. However, the director has the right to seek judicial review from an appeals board decision regardless of whether or not he or she appeared or participated in the appeal to the administrative law judge or to the appeals board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsContentsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.47

§ 564.47 Costs, Penalties, and Interest

Costs are not awarded in hearings on appeal by the appeals board. However, if the claimant or an employer acted in bad faith and without reasonable basis for appeal, a penalty not exceeding 10 percent of the amount finally awarded on the appeal may be taxed against and deducted from the award by the appeals board and placed in the Unemployment Fund. If a penalty is assessed against an employer, his or her account is debited with the amount of the penalty [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1958*]. A claimant is not entitled to recover interest on unemployment insurance benefits previously denied by the Employment Development Department but ordered by an administrative law judge. Interest may only be awarded by a superior court in a judicial action reviewing the administrative denial of benefits [In re Kalem (1993) Cal. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Bd. Prec. Dec. No. P-B-476; *see also Aguilar v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 239, 245-246, 272 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *Civ. Code § 3287(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.48

§ 564.48 Reconsideration

After a decision of the appeals board has become final, the matter shall not be reopened, reconsidered, or reheard, and the decision shall not be changed except to correct clerical errors. However, the appeals board, acting as a whole, may on its own motion reconsider a previously issued decision solely to determine whether or not such decision shall be designated as a precedent decision (discussed *below*) [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5108(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.49

§ 564.49 Time to Appeal From Board Decision

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right of the Employment Development Director, or of any other party except as provided by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1241* (actions to recover contributions), 1243 (decisions denying protest of charges to reserve account), and 5313 (relating to work incentive and employment preparation programs), to seek judicial review from a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board must be exercised not later than six months after the date of the decision or the date on which the decision is designated a precedent decision (discussed *below*), whichever is later [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*; *see Tarkington v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1502-1508, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 131* (six-month period under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410* is subject to equitable tolling while plaintiff pursues alternative remedy reasonably and in good faith)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.50

§ 564.50 Effect of Findings, Judgment, Conclusion, and Order on Separate Actions or Proceedings

Any finding of fact or law, judgment, conclusion, or final order made by a hearing officer, administrative law judge, or any person with authority to make findings of fact or law in any action or proceeding before the appeals board, shall not be conclusive or binding in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, and shall not be used as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding, between an individual and his or her present or prior employer brought before an arbitrator, judge, court, or judge of California or the United States, regardless of whether the prior action was between the same or related parties or involved the same facts [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1960*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.51

§ 564.51 Precedent Decision

[1] Designation

The appeals board acting as a whole may designate certain of its decisions as precedents and may on its own motion reconsider a previously issued decision solely to determine whether it shall be designated as a precedent decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5108(d)* (*discussed under § 564.163*)]. Any decision so designated must be identified in such a manner as to clearly show that it is a precedent and must be published in a manner to make it available for public use, although a charge to defray the cost of publication and distribution may be made [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5109*].

The director and the administrative law judges are controlled by precedent decisions except as modified by judicial review [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*; *see, e.g., Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 320-321, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110]* .

The designation of a decision or part of a decision, or failure to designate a decision or part of a decision, as a precedent decision is not subject to judicial review [*Gov. Code § 11425.60*; *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*].

[2] Declaratory Relief Action to Challenge Validity

Precedent decisions are akin to agency rulemaking because they announce how governing law will be applied in future cases and, for all practical purposes, are regulations [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 109, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* . Thus, any interested person or organization may bring a declaratory relief action in the superior court to obtain a judicial declaration as to the validity of a precedent decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2*; *see § 564.260*]. Like *Gov. Code § 11350*, which gives interested persons the right to obtain a judicial declaration as to the validity of any regulation and allows those affected by a regulation to test its legality before risking violation, *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2* confers standing on nonparties to seek a declaration as to the validity of a precedent decision [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 108-109, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* .

In a declaratory relief action brought under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2* by a nonparty to the board's precedential decision, the court may determine only whether the board decision accords with the law that would govern if the rule announced in the board decision had been articulated as a regulation. There should be no review of the underlying record or new evidence to discover whether the board correctly resolved factual disputes. The board's version of those facts may not be disturbed unless it lacks substantial support on the face of the decision [*Pacific Legal Found. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 111, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244* ; *Messenger Courier Assn. of Americas v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1086, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797*].

[3] Procedure on Reversal or Declaration of Invalidity

If a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction reverses a precedent decision or declares it invalid, the board, acting as a whole, must promptly modify the decision to conform in all respects to the court's judgment. The modified precedent decision supersedes the prior precedent decision for all purposes, and the board must promptly notify the director, the administrative law judges, and all other subscribers to the precedent decisions of the modified precedent decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.1*].

By referring separately to reversals and declarations of invalidity, *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.1* reflects the distinction between the review rights accorded the original parties on the one hand and interested third persons on the other. In actions brought by the former, the court may review the administrative record and "reverse" the board decision, altering the outcome between the parties. The board's conforming modifications take account of that effect, and the decision is superseded to the full extent the reversal may require. However, a judicial declaration of invalidity (*see § 564.51[2]*) in an action brought by a third person does not alter the operative impact of the decision between claimants and employers. In such an action, the court may determine only whether the board decision accords with the law that would govern were the rule announced articulated as a regulation [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 110-111, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsRes JudicataAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.52-564.69

[Reserved]

§§ 564.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.70

§ 564.70 Governing Law

Contributions to the Unemployment and Disability Funds and reports are governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 901-1243*.

Definitions of terms used in these sections are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 901-906*. "Wages," the basis of the contribution, is defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 926-940* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 926-1-937-1.

Contribution rates are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 976-994* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 976.7-1-991(b)-1. Reserve accounts are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1025-1037* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1026-1-1036-2. Transfer of reserve accounts are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1051-1060* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1051-1-1060-1. Records, reports, and contribution payments are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1085-1098* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1085-1-1097-1. Payment of reported contributions is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1110-1116* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1110-1 and 1111-1. Assessments are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1126-1142*. Refunds and overpayments are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1176-1185* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1178(c)-1-1181-1.

Acts constituting violations of law and penalties imposed are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1114* and *2101 et seq.*

The manner in which notices may be served by the Employment Development Director, an administrative law judge, or the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1206*. Administrative appellate review is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1221-1224* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5000 *et seq.*. Judicial review is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241-1243*.

The election of an employing unit not otherwise subject to *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-4751* (relating to unemployment and disability compensation) to be covered by those provisions and termination of the election are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 701-713* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 701-1-710-1. Alternative methods of financing the liability for unemployment compensation benefits, extended duration benefits, and federal state extended benefits of nonprofit organizations and public entities which have made the election are authorized by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 801-806* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 803-1-803-4 [*see also Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 702.1(f)* (nonprofit organizations), 710(c) (public entities)]. The financing of unemployment insurance coverage for public school employees is covered by *Unemp. Ins.*

Code §§ 821-832.

Worker contributions to the Disability Fund [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 3001*] are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 984-990* and *2901-2903*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.71

§ 564.71 Definitions

[1] "Employer"

"Employer" means any "employing unit" that employs one or more persons in the current or preceding year and pays "wages" exceeding $100 in any calendar quarter [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 675*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 676 et seq.*, and *Unemp. Ins. Code § 10200 et seq.*].

Whether an individual or entity is the employer of specific employees is determined under common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 606.5(a)*]. However, specific statutory rules govern this determination for individuals or entities that are considered temporary services employers or leasing employers because they contract with clients or customers to supply workers to perform services for the client or customers [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 606.5(b)-(d)*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 606*; 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 606-1 (who is employer of individual employed to perform work of or assist employee)].

[2] "Employing Unit"

"Employing unit" is any individual or type of organization which has in its employ one or more individuals performing services for it within California [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 135(a)*].

An acquisition or change in the form or organization of an existing business enterprise does not create a new employing unit if there is continuity of control [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 135.1(a)*]. Also, if two or more business enterprises are united by factors of control, operation, and use, the Employment Development Director may determine that the business enterprises are one employing unit [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 135.2(a)*].

[3] "Calendar Quarter"

"Calendar quarter" is the three consecutive calendar months periods ending on March 31st, June 30th, September 30th, or December 31st, or the equivalent thereof as may be prescribed by "authorized regulations" (defined *below*) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 129*].

[4] "Employment"

"Employment" is defined generally as meaning any service, including service in interstate commerce, performed for "wages" under a written or oral, express or implied contract of hire [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 601*]. Specific kinds of service included in the term employment are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 601.5-611*; *see also* 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 606-1 (specifying when employer has constructive knowledge of assistant and substitute employees) and 607-1 (relating to segregation of exempt services and subject employment). Services excluded from the term "employment" are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 629 et seq.* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 629-1 et seq. "Employment" for the purposes of disability insurance is defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2606, 2606.4*, and *2606.5*.

[5] "Employee"

The term "employee" includes the following: (1) any corporate officer [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(a)*]; (2) any individual who has the status of an employee under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(b)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 621(b)-1; *see also* Messenger Courier Assn. of Americas v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1089-1092, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797 (common-law rules for this purpose include complementary criteria developed in case law and factors identified in Restatement Second of Agency)]; and (3) certain agent or commission drivers engaged in distributing specified food products or laundry or drycleaning services, specified traveling or city salespersons, and certain home workers [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(c)(1)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 621(c)-1(a)]. However, a person is not an "employee" under the provisions of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(c)(1)* if he or she has a substantial investment in facilities used in connection with the performance of the services, other than in facilities for transportation, or if the services are in the nature of a single transaction not part of a continuing relationship with the employing unit for which the services are performed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(c)(2)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 621(c)-1(b)].

"Employee" also includes any individual [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621.5*]:

- who is an employee pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 601.5* (service in artistic or literary capacity performed pursuant to collective bargaining agreement between employer and labor organization in motion picture, radio, or television industry) or *Unemp. Ins. Code § 686* (contract for creation of specially ordered or commissioned work of authorship) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(d)*];

- whose services are in subject employment pursuant to an election for coverage under any provision of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 701-713* (relating to elective coverage) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(e)*]; and

- who is an employee, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5* (relating to disability insurance and raising rebuttable presumption that worker is employee rather than independent contractor), of a person who holds, or does not hold but is required to obtain, a valid state contractor's license pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* (Contractors License Law) [*see Hunt Bldg. Corp. v. Bernick (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 213, 219-220, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 883* (unlicensed subcontractors and their employees are deemed statutory employees of general contractor for purposes of Unemployment Insurance Code)].

The term "employee" does not include a director of a corporation or association performing services in his or her capacity as a director, but this does not apply to service included in "employment" (discussed *above*) pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 605, 608, 709*, and *710* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 622(a)*]. Services included and excluded from the term "services in his or her capacity as a director" are set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 622(b)* and *(c)*.

For the meaning of "employee," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13000-13101*, relating to the withholding of state taxes on wages, see *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13004, 13004.1*.

[6] "Wages"

The term "wages" is variously defined throughout the Unemployment Insurance Code and its meaning depends on the context in which it is used. For the purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 901-1243* (relating to contributions and reports), and except as otherwise provided by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 926-940* (relating to wages as the basis of the contribution), "wages" means all remuneration payable to an employee for personal services, whether by private agreement or consent or by force of statute, including commissions and bonuses and the reasonable cash value of all remuneration payable to an employee in any medium other than cash [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 926*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 926-1-926-7*]. In this context, the term also means all remuneration payable for personal services, as specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 926, above*, when the legal obligation for the payment of the wages is assumed by an employer specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 678* (relating to motion picture, radio, and television industry), and the first or prior employer for whom the personal services were originally performed is relieved of the legal obligation for the payment of the remuneration [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 926.5*]. The term includes all tips which are received while performing services which constitute employment and included in a written statement furnished to the employer pursuant to *I.R.C. § 6053(a)* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 927*]. For the purposes of specified code sections, "wages" means taxable wages as well as wages that would be taxable except for the limitations on taxable wages provided under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 930* ($7,000 during calendar year) and 985 (relating to employee contributions) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 940*].

For the meaning of "wages," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13000-13101*, relating to the withholding of state taxes, *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 13009*.

[7] "Authorized Regulations"

"Authorized regulations" are regulations promulgated pursuant to the provisions of *Gov. Code § 11340 et seq.* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 127*].

[8] Other Terms

Other terms, as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 901 et seq.* (relating to employer and employee contributions and reports), defined by statute are:

- "computation date" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 902*],
- "rating period" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 903*],
- "net balance of reserve" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 904*],
- "average base pay roll" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 905*], and
- "contributions paid on his own behalf" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 906*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.72

§ 564.72 Registration With Employment Development Department (EDD)

Within 15 days after becoming an employer, an employing unit must register with the Employment Development Department (EDD) on the prescribed form [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1086*]. Any employing unit that fails to register with the EDD because of intentional disregard or intent to evade *Unemp. Ins. Code § 100 et seq.* or authorized regulations is subject to a penalty of $100 for each nonreported employee [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1126.1(a)*]. This penalty is in addition to the penalty for failure to make a reconciliation return [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1126.1(a)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1126*; *see § 564.73[4]*]. The number of unreported employees is the highest number of employees determined by the EDD to have been engaged by the employer during any single calendar quarter included in the assessment issued under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1126* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1126.1(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.73

§ 564.73 Reports, Returns, and Work Records

[1] Requirements

Each employer must file with the Employment Development Director within the time required for payment of employer contributions a report of contributions and a report of wages paid to its workers [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(a)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1088-1(a)]. The report of contributions must be filed within the time required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1110(b)* for payment of worker contributions and must contain the employer's business name, address, and account number, the total amount of worker contributions due, and such other information as the director prescribes [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(b)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1088-1(b)]. Special procedures apply if the Director determines that an employer reporting wages is not the correct employer of the employees whose wages are reported [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1127.5*]. Employers and self-employed individuals who have elected under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 708(a)* to be covered by unemployment and disability insurance must file a separate report of contributions to report wages subject to contributions for disability insurance [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(c)*].

Under the Make it Easy on the Family and Small Business Act, employers who employ individuals to perform domestic service (as described in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 682* and *684*) are authorized to file the report required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088* by telephone [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1118* (operative July 1, 1997; establishing specific procedures and content for reporting by telephone)].

In addition to information in the report of contributions and report of wages under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088*, employers are required to file with the EDD specified information on new employees [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(a)*]. An employer generally must submit the report within 20 days of hiring any new employee who works in California and to whom the employer anticipates paying wages [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(b), (d)(1)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(d)(2)* (semimonthly reporting schedule for employers reporting magnetically or electronically)]. The report must include the employee's name, address, social security number, and starting work date; the employer's name, address, state employer identification number (if one has been issued), and federal taxpayer identification number [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(d)(4)*]. The failure to timely report the hiring of an employee, unless the failure is due to good cause, will be subject to the assessment of a penalty by the EDD [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(e)*]. The information reported may be

used [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(f)*]:

- By the EDD to perform its duties under the Unemployment Insurance Code;

- To locate individuals for purposes of establishing paternity and establishing, modifying, and enforcing child support obligations [*see also* Welf. & Inst. code § 11478.51];

- To administer employment security and workers' compensation programs;

- To provide employer or employee information to the Franchise Tax Board for the purpose of tax enforcement; and

- To verify eligibility of applicants for, or recipients of, public assistance programs.

For purposes of this reporting requirement, an "employer" includes a labor union hiring hall [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(g)*]. The federal government and its departments, agencies, and instrumentalities are not subject to the reporting requirement [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(c)(1)*]. A state agency employer is not required to report an employee performing intelligence or counterintelligence functions, if the head of the agency has determined that reporting the employee would endanger the safety of the employee or compromise an ongoing investigation or intelligence mission [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.5(c)(2)*].

Every employing unit must keep an accurate work record of all its workers and their status (employed, on layoff, or on leave of absence) and the other matters specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1085*. The employing unit must furnish to the Employment Development Director, administrative law judge, or deputy, on demand, a sworn statement of the matters contained in the work records. If the records are kept pursuant to contract with a financial institution as defined in *Gov. Code § 7465*, the employing unit must also furnish to the director or to the director's authorized representative an authorization for disclosure of the account or accounts. The records must be open to inspection and subject to being copied by the director or his or her authorized representative at any time during the employing unit's business hours. Any claimant or his or her authorized representative at a hearing before a deputy or administrative law judge or the appeals board must be supplied with information from the records to the extent necessary for the proper presentation of the claim [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1092*].

Employers that have employees who receive tips must furnish each employee with a written statement showing the excess of contributions required for the tips included in the employee's federal income tax tip report over contributions withheld with regard to the employee's wages generally. Employers must also file a copy of this statement with the Employment Development Director [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.6*].

[2] Consequences of Failure to Provide

If an employer fails to provide any records or reports necessary for the proper disposition of a claim for benefits, it is presumed that the claimant is entitled to the maximum total amount of benefits payable, unless the employer establishes by other evidence that a lesser amount is properly due. Special rules apply to any claimant who has earned wages for more than one employer during his or her base period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1093*].

In addition, an employer that fails to timely provide the report of contributions and wage report required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(a)*) [*see § 564.73[1]*] must pay a penalty equal to 10 percent of the amount of worker contributions required by the return [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1112.5(a)*]. The penalty is in addition to the penalties required by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1112* and *1126* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1112.5(a)*].

Employers who fail to provide the statement showing the excess of contributions required for the tips included in an

employee's federal income tax tip report over contributions withheld with regard to the employee's wages generally [*see § 564.73[1]*] are liable for the excess contributions [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088.6*].

[3] Use of Agent for Workers Employed by Several Employers

If a number of workers are normally employed during the year by several employers, those employers may, with the approval of the Employment Development Director, appoint an agent to prepare and file the required reports for those workers [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1096*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1097, 1098*].

[4] Annual Reconciliation Return

In addition to the reports of wages and worker contributions [*see § 564.73*], each employer must file with the director an annual reconciliation return showing the total amount of wages [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 976, 976.6*], employer contributions [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 976, 976.6*], and worker contributions [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 984*], as well as amounts withheld as California personal income tax [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13020, 13028*], and any other information required by the director [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(e)*]. This return is due the first day of January following the close of the prior calendar year; it is delinquent if not filed by the last day of January [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(e)*]. The penalty for failure to file this return is set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1117*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.74

§ 564.74 Employer Contributions

Employer contributions accrue and become payable to the Employment Development Department for the Unemployment Fund [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1521*] by every employer, except an employer defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 676* (employer for which services are performed that are included in "employment" solely for purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2601 et seq.*, relating to disability compensation) for each calendar year with respect to wages paid for employment. The contributions must not be deducted in whole or in part from the employees' wages [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 976*].

The United States Supreme Court has held that, for purposes of employer taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act [*see I.R.C. §§ 3111, 3301 et seq.*], back wages are allocated to the year in which the wages are actually paid, rather than the year in which they should have been paid [*United States v. Cleveland Indians Baseball Co. (2001) 532 U.S. 200, 205-220, 121 S. Ct. 1433, 149 L. Ed. 2d 401, 411-418]* .

For further discussion of employer contributions, see Wilcox, California Employment Law, ch. 80 (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsTax LawFederal Tax Administration & ProcedureTax Credits & LiabilitiesEstimates & Withholding (IRC secs. 3101-3102, 3301-3310, 3401-3406, 6315, 6654-6655)FUTA Rate of Tax

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.75

§ 564.75 Reserve Accounts

[1] Charges and Credits

The Employment Development Director is required to keep separate records of the amounts paid into the Unemployment Fund by each employer or chargeable to the employer as benefits and to maintain a separate reserve account for each employer in which contributions paid on the employer's own behalf are credited [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1025, 1026(a)*; *see Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 234, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871]* . The director also credits the interest earned by the Unemployment Fund to each positive reserve employer account in proportion to the amount the account bears to the total of all positive reserve accounts [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1026(c)*]. Credits and charges are governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1026(d), (e)*.

[2] Annual Statements

At least once each year, every employer is furnished with an itemized statement of the charges to the reserve account, and with a statement of the reserve accounts showing credits and charges, the net balance of the reserve account, and the contribution rate for the applicable rating period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1033*].

[3] Protest of Charge or Credit

Except as to corrections made by the director as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1036*, the contribution rate and other items shown on the statement are final unless a protest is filed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1034-1].

A written protest on any item shown may be filed by the employer within 60 days or any extension thereof after the date the statement of charges or credits and charges was mailed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034*; 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1034-1(a)]. The protest must include the matter set forth in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1034-1(b). The protest must also set forth the specific grounds on which it is made [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034*]. However, no protest may be made on the grounds that a claimant was ineligible for a benefit payment if (1) the employer was notified of the filing of the claim or of a determination of the claimant's eligibility and failed to file a timely appeal on the benefit claim, or (2) a final decision of

an administrative law judge or of the appeals board affirmed the payment of benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034(a)*]. An employer may file a protest on the grounds that the director did not allow voluntary unemployment insurance contributions to the reserve account in accordance with *Unemp. Ins. Code § 976.5*. The protest must be filed within 30 days after the last working day of March [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034(b)*].

The director is required to give the employer notice of his or her action on the protest [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1035*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.76

§ 564.76 Collection of Contributions by Director

The collection of employee and employer contributions required to be paid to the department by any employing unit is governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1701-1855*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.77

§ 564.77 Civil Action to Prevent Collection Prohibited

No injunction, writ of mandate, or other legal or equitable process shall issue in any suit, action, or proceeding in any court against the state or any state officer to prevent or enjoin the collection of any contribution sought to be collected under the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Code [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1851*; *see Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32*; *see also Lorco Properties, Inc. v. Department of Benefit Payments (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 809, 815, 129 Cal. Rptr. 312]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.78

§ 564.78 Administrative Appellate Review

[1] Levels of Appellate Review

There are two levels of administrative appellate review of (1) the denial of a protest of charges to an employer's reserve account, (2) the denial or granting of an application for transfer of a reserve account, (3) a notice of assessment, (4) the denial of a claim for refund or credit, and (5) any notice under specified code sections made or given by the Director of Employment Development [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1034* (denial of protest), 1051-1055, 1243 (denying or granting transfer of reserve accounts), 1221 (notice of jeopardy assessment), 1222 (notice of assessment, denial of claim for refund or credit, or notice under specified code sections)]. The first consists of a review by an administrative law judge and the second consists of a review by the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board.

[2] Review by Administrative Law Judge

The first of the two levels of appellate review is a review by an administrative law judge on petition for review or reassessment, as the case may be [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1221, 1222*]. The petition must include the name of the petitioner; the employer account number, if any, of the petitioner; the mailing address of the petitioner; the name and mailing address of any representative filing the petition; and the name and social security number of any claimant who is a party [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5008(b)*]. The petition may also include a telephone number for the petitioner; an electronic address of the petitioner; the date or case number of the underlying department action, decision, or order; a concise statement of reasons for the petition; any request for language assistance or special accommodation; and a dated signature of the petitioner [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5008(c)*]. The duty of the administrative law judge to review the matter and, if requested by petitioner, to grant a hearing is set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1223*.

[3] Review by Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

The second level of appellate review is by appeal from the administrative law judge's decision or order to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1034* (review of decision on denial of protest of charges to employer's reserve account), 1224 (review of decision on assessment, denial of claim for refund or credit, or specified notices), 1243 (review of decision on denial of protest under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034* or denial or granting of

application for transfer of reserve account)].

Within 30 days after service of notice of the administrative law judge's decision, or any extension of that period, the petitioner or director may file an appeal with the appeals board. If the administrative law judge fails to serve notice of the decision on a petition for review of the denial of a claim for refund or credit within 60 days after the petition is filed, the petitioner may consider the petition denied and file the appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224(a)*].

The appeal must include the name of the appellant; the employer account number, if any, of the appellant; the mailing address of the appellant; the name and mailing address of any representative filing the appeal; and the name and social security number of any claimant who is a party [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5008(b)*]. The appeal may also include a telephone number for the appellant; an electronic address of the appellant; the date or case number of the underlying department action, decision, or order; a concise statement of reasons for the appellant; any request for language assistance or special accommodation; and a dated signature of the appellant [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5008(c)*].

If an appeal is not filed within the time allowed, the decision of the administrative law judge is final at the expiration of that time. Any assessment involved is also final at the same time except when the administrative law judge's decision requires the adjustment of an assessment by granting a portion of a petition or by increasing an assessment; in this event, the assessment is final 30 days after service on the petitioner by the director of a statement of amounts due setting forth the adjusted liability pursuant to the decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224(a)*].

If an appeal is taken to the appeals board, the board may decrease or increase the amount of the assessment involved. If the appeals board's order or decision requires an adjustment of an assessment by granting a portion of the petition or by increasing an assessment, the order or decision and assessment become final 30 days after service on the petitioner by the director of a statement of amounts due setting forth the adjusted liability pursuant to the appeals board's decision or order. In all other cases, the appeals board's order or decision and any assessment become final 30 days after service on the petitioner of notice of the order or decision [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224(b)*].

[4] Effect of Decision and Explanation of Right to Judicial Review

A decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board is final, except for such action as may be taken by a judicial tribunal as permitted or required by law [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*]. If a request for review may be taken, the appeals board must attach to its decisions an explanation of the party's right to seek such review [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.79

§ 564.79 Judicial Review

[1] Claim for Refund or Credit as Prerequisite

No suit or proceeding shall be maintained in any court for the recovery of contributions, interest, or penalties alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected unless a claim for refund or credit has been filed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*].

[2] When Action May Be Filed

[a] Generally

Except as provided by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1241* (*discussed under § 564.79[2][b]*), 1243 (*discussed under § 564.79[2][d]*), and 5313 (relating to work incentive programs), a party's right to seek judicial review from an appeals board decision must be exercised not later than six months after the date of the board's decision or the date on which the decision is designated as a precedent decision, whichever is later [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*; *see Tarkington v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1502-1508, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 131* (six-month period under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410* is subject to equitable tolling while plaintiff pursues alternative remedy reasonably and in good faith)]. For discussion of precedent decisions, *see § 564.51*.

[b] On Denial of Claim for Refund or Credit

Within 90 days after service of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board's notice of decision on an appeal, the claimant may bring an action against the Employment Development Director on the grounds set forth in the claim for refund or credit in a court of competent jurisdiction in the County of Sacramento (or in any city or city and county in which the Attorney General has an office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401*]) for the recovery of the whole or any part of the amount with respect to which the claim has been denied [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*; *see § 564.280*].

The director may, in writing, extend the time within which the action may be instituted for a period not exceeding two years if a written request for an extension is filed with the director within the 90-day period. Failure to bring an action

within the time specified constitutes a waiver of any demand against the state on account of alleged overpayments. If the appeals board fails to serve notice of its decision on the appeal within 90 days after an appeal is filed, the claimant may consider the claim denied and bring an action against the director [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*].

If judgment is for the plaintiff, the amount of the judgment is first credited on any contributions, interest, and penalties due from the plaintiff and the balance is refunded to the plaintiff. Interest at the rate of 12 percent per annum on the amount of contributions found to have been illegally collected from the date the contributions were paid to the date of the judgment shall be allowed and paid only to the extent that interest and penalties collected are available [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1242*].

[c] On Denial of Claim of Exemption by Religious Organization

To the extent permitted by federal law, an entity or organization that has made a bona fide claim that it is a church, a convention or association of churches, or an organization operated primarily for religious purposes and which is operated, supervised, controlled, or principally supported by a church or convention or association of churches, may bring suit to challenge a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board denying an exemption as a church or religious organization. However, it must first pay the amount of the last quarter assessed immediately preceding the initial appeals board decision denying the exemption and then make a claim for refund or credit pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(b)*].

An entity or organization is deemed to have made a bona fide claim that it is a church or religious entity if (1) it has been recognized as a church or religious organization by any entity of state or federal government, or (2) the appeals board found that the department failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence admitted at the proceedings to determine tax liability that the petitioner had not made a bona fide claim for coverage under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)* as a church or religious entity [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(b)*].

A decision denying eligibility under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(b)* may be challenged by a petition for writ of mandate and shall not be deemed an action proscribed by or within the meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32* (prohibiting legal or equitable process to prevent or enjoin collection of tax), or *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1851* (prohibiting actions or proceedings to prevent or enjoin collection of contributions). The time within which to file any claim or action under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a), discussed under § 564.79[2][b],* is extended during the pendency of the mandate proceeding [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(c)*].

[d] On Denial of Protest or Denial or Grant of Application for Transfer of Reserve Account

A decision of the appeals board on an appeal from a denial of a protest under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1034* or an appeal from the denial or granting of an application for transfer of reserve account under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1051-1055* is subject to judicial review if an appropriate proceeding is filed by the employer within 90 days of the service of the notice of decision. The director may, in writing, extend for a period not exceeding two years the time within which the proceeding may be instituted if written request for the extension is filed with the director within the 90 day period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1243*]._____

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.80-564.99

[Reserved]

§§ 564.80[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.100

§ 564.100 Governing Law

Unemployment compensation benefits are governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1251-1384* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1251-1-1375-1, extended unemployment compensation by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3501-3751*, and federal-state extended compensation by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4001-4751*. Disability compensation is governed by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2601-1-3271-1.

The procedures available to the Employment Development Department for recovering overpayment of unemployment compensation benefits are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1375-1384* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1375-1 [*see Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 316-329, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110]* . Refunds of overpayments and penalties assessed against and collected from recipients by the department resulting from the department's failure to withhold from unemployment insurance benefits the amount of all prior work pension benefits received by a claimant from any source are covered by the McAlister-Duffy-Greene Unemployment Benefit Pension Offset Refund Act (Stats. 1985, ch. 1217, §§ 1, 7, 11, 16). Section 1 of the act sets forth legislative findings and declarations relating to collection of overpayments; section 7 amends *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255.3*, relating to reduction of benefits by retirement pay based on previous work; section 11 requires refund of overpayment assessments and penalties received since March 1, 1984; and section 16 requires the department to prepare and publish a printed summary describing liability for unemployment insurance compensation benefit overpayment, penalty assessments, and the pension offset issue to be included with each refund.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.101

§ 564.101 Source of Benefit Payments

Funds for payment of unemployment and disability benefits come from the Unemployment Fund and the Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund, discussed *below*, which are special funds, separate from all other public money and administered by the Director of Employment Development [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 134.5, 1522, 3001(a), 3002*; *but see Unemp. Ins. Code § 3001(b)* (moneys in Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund may be used for interest-bearing loans to General Fund)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.102

§ 564.102 Unemployment Fund

The Unemployment Fund consists of (1) all employer contributions collected under the Unemployment Insurance Code (*see* discussion in *§§ 564.74, 564.75*); (2) interest earned on any money in the fund; (3) any property or securities acquired through the use of money belonging to the fund; (4) all earnings of the property or securities; (5) all money credited to the state's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund pursuant to "Section 903 of the Social Security Act, as amended" (*see 42 U.S.C. § 1103*); and (6) all other money received for the fund from any other source [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1521*].

Employers' contributions to the Unemployment Fund must not be deducted in whole or in part from the employees' wages [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 976*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.103

§ 564.103 Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund

The Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund consists of (1) all contributions required of individuals under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 984* (*see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 2901*) with respect to wages paid by employers for employment; (2) all money received for the purpose of disability benefits from the United States of America or any of its agencies, or from any other source; and (3) any property or securities acquired through the use of money belonging to the fund, and all earnings on the money or securities [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3004*].

The employer must deduct the employees' contributions to the disability fund from the employees' paychecks, show the deduction on its payroll records, and furnish each worker with a written statement showing the amount that has been deducted [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 986*; 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 986-1, *986-2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.104

§ 564.104 Nonwaiverability and Nonassignability of Benefits

Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1255.7* (relating to support obligations), 1342.1 (relating to income tax withholding), 1345 (redirection of disability insurance voluntary plan benefits to cover cost of employee-paid benefits), and 2630 (relating to duties of State Department of Social Services with respect to individuals having claims for unemployment disability benefits with department or under approved voluntary plan) [*see also Code Civ. Proc. § 704.120(b)(1), (d)*], any waiver by any person of any benefit or right under the Unemployment Insurance Code is invalid [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1342*].

Subject to the same exceptions, benefits under the code and payments to an individual under a plan or system established by an employer that makes provisions for his or her employees generally or for a class or group of his or her employees, for the purpose of supplementing unemployment compensation benefits, are not subject to assignment, release, or commutation [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1342*].

Moreover, any agreement by an individual to pay the employer's contributions to the Unemployment Insurance Fund is void [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1342*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawPerformanceAssignmentGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
1. In General

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.105-564.119

[Reserved]

§§ 564.105[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.120

§ 564.120 Summary of Procedure for Claiming Unemployment Compensation Benefits and Administrative Appeal

Normally, there are five steps for handling a typical unemployment insurance claim: (1) the claimant files a claim for unemployment insurance; (2) in two weeks, or as directed by the Employment Development Department, the claimant reports in person to the department field office to file a continued claim and is interviewed as to eligibility and benefit rights; if the claimant is found to be eligible, he or she is credited for the one week waiting period and is thereafter paid for one week; (3) in the fifth week, the claimant, to be paid for the third and fourth weeks, files by mail a "continued claim" form certifying that he or she meets the eligibility requirements; (4) periodic eligibility reviews; and (5) determinations of eligibility [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-1; *see § 564.16*].

Thus, the initial determination of a claimant's eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits is rendered by a claims interviewer, who examines documents submitted by the claimant and by the claimant's former employer and discusses the matter with the claimaint in a non-adversarial setting. A party dissatisfied with the determination of the claims interviewer may appeal to an administrative law judge [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*]. (An appeal may also be taken to an administrative law judge from a ruling on a computation or recomputation of benefits made under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1329* [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(c), 1031, 1032.5, 1330, 1331*].) Following a hearing at which the parties may be represented by counsel and may present testimonial and documentary evidence, the administrative law judge decides the issue of eligibility de novo [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1957, 1334*; *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5000 et seq.* ; § 564.37; and *Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 317, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110]* . The parties may further appeal the decision of the administrative law judge to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1336*]. The board may decide the case on the record of the administrative law judge's hearing or take additional evidence [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1336*; *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5102*]. If it requires the taking of additional evidence, the hearing must be commenced within 60 days after the submission of the appeal and the board's decision must be mailed within 60 days after completion of the hearing; if the taking of further evidence is not required, it must render its decision within 60 days after the submission of the appeal [*Unemp. Ins.Code § 1337*; *see Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 316-317, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.121

§ 564.121 Kinds of Unemployment Compensation Benefits

Unemployment compensation benefits consist of (1) unemployment compensation benefits [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1251-1384*], (2) extended duration benefits [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3501-3751*], and (3) federal-state extended benefits [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4001-4751*].

Notwithstanding any other provision of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-4751* (relating to unemployment and disability compensation), unemployment compensation benefits, extended duration benefits, and federal-state extended benefits are payable on the basis of service to which *I.R.C. § 3309(a)(1)* (relating to services performed for nonprofit organizations or governmental entities) applies in the same amount, on the same terms, and subject to the same conditions as benefits payable on the basis of other service subject to *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-4751*, except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3(a)*; for the exceptions, *see § 564.128*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.122

§ 564.122 Source and Amount of Benefits and To Whom Payable

Unemployment compensation benefits are payable from the Unemployment Fund to unemployed individuals who are eligible [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1251, 1521*; *see § 564.127*]. Independent contractors, as that term is traditionally used, are not within the coverage of the code [*Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 43, 168 P.2d 686 , overruled on another point, People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-480 n.8, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321*); *Southwest Research Inst. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Board (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 705, 707-710, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769* (when method of performing worker's task is dictated by government regulations, hirer is not exercising control over manner and means of working and thus is not employer); *Aladdin Oil Corp. v. Perluss (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 603, 610, 41 Cal. Rptr. 239]* .

The amount payable depends on the amount of wages received by the worker during his or her base period, up to a maximum specified by statute [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1280*].

The amount of benefits during partial employment is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1279*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsIndependent Contractors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.123

§ 564.123 Prohibition Against Denial of Benefits and Exceptions

Benefits must not be denied to any individual by reason of cancellation of wage credits or total reduction of his or her benefit rights for any cause other than discharge for misconduct connected with his or her work, fraud in connection with a claim for benefits, or receipt of disqualifying income. However, this is not to be construed to authorize cancellation of wage credits or total reduction of benefit rights for any cause whatsoever, nor shall it limit or affect any other section of the code that provides for cancellation of wage credits or total reduction of benefit rights for any cause permitted under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260.1* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.124

§ 564.124 "Base Period" Defined

[1] Base Period

"Base period" means the following [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(a)*]:

(1) For benefit years beginning in October, November, or December, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of June;

(2) For benefit years beginning in January, February, or March, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of September;

(3) For benefit years beginning in April, May, or June, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of December;

(4) For benefit years beginning in July, August, or September, the four calendar quarters ended with the next preceding month of March.

Wages used in the determination of benefits payable to an individual during any benefit year must not be used in determining the individual's benefits in any subsequent benefit year [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(a)*].

[2] Alternate Base Period

An alternate base period may be available for new claims filed on or after April 3, 2011, or earlier if the Employment Development implements the technical changes necessary to establish claims under the alternate base period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(b),(c)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1329.5* (special rules for computation of benefits under alternate base period)]. Under the provisions for an alternate base period, if an individual cannot establish a claim under the regular base period [*see* [1], *above*], that individual may use a base period defined as follows [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(b)*]:

(1) For benefit years beginning in October, November, or December, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of September;

(2) For benefit years beginning in January, February, or March, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of December;

(3) For benefit years beginning in April, May, or June, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of March;

(4) For benefit years beginning in July, August, or September, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of June.

Under the alternate base period, the quarter with the highest wages must be used to determine the individual's weekly benefit amount [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(b)*]. Wages used in the determination of benefits payable to an individual during any benefit year may not be used in determining that individual's benefits in any subsequent benefit year [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.125

§ 564.125 "Unemployed" Defined

[1] General Conditions

With certain exceptions [*see § 564.125[2]*], an individual is unemployed in any week in which he or she meets any of the following conditions [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1252(a)*]:

(1) Any week during which the individual performs no services and with respect to which no wages are payable to him or her.

(2) Any week of less than full-time work, if the wages payable to the individual with respect to the week, when reduced by $25 or 25 percent of the wages payable, whichever is greater, do not equal or exceed his or her weekly benefit amount.

(3) Any week for which, except for the requirements of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(d)*, requiring a one-week waiting period, the individual would be eligible for benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.5*, relating to physical or mental illness or injury for one or more days during a week (§ 564.132[1][e]).

(4) Any week during which the individual performs full-time work for five days as a juror, or as a witness under subpoena.

For the purpose of the foregoing provisions only, "wages" includes any and all compensation for personal services whether performed as an employee or as an independent contractor or as a juror or as a witness, but does not include any payment received by a member of the National Guard or reserve component of the armed forces for inactive duty training, annual training, or emergency state active duty [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1252(c)*].

[2] Commercial Fishing

The general definition of "unemployed" [*see § 564.125*] does not apply to commercial fishermen. For definitions

applicable to both unemployed and partially employed commercial fishermen, see *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1252.1, 1252* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1252.1-1, 1252.2-1.

[3] Shared Work Arrangements

The general definition of "unemployed" [*see § 564.125*] does not apply to individuals working under a shared work arrangement. For a definition of "unemployed" applicable to those individuals, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1279.5(a)*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsDisabilitiesLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.126

§ 564.126 "Week" Defined

The term "week" for benefit purposes means the seven consecutive days commencing at 12:01 a.m. Sunday, and ending 12 midnight the following Saturday [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-1; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 143*]. For the various meanings of the term "week of unemployment," see *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1253-2-1253-11*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.127

§ 564.127 Eligible Individuals

[1] Conditions of Eligibility

An employee qualified for unemployment compensation benefits is eligible for benefits with respect to any week [*see* "Week" Defined, *above*] if the director finds as follows [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253*]:

- A claim for benefits with respect to that week was made in accordance with authorized regulations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(a)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253(a)-1; *see also* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-1 for general description of claims filing procedures for unemployment compensation benefits; and *discussion under § 564.132[1]*].

- The individual has registered for work, and thereafter has continued to report, at a public employment office or such other place as the director may approve. Either or both of these requirements may be waived or altered by authorized regulation as to partially employed individuals attached to regular jobs [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(b)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253(b)-1].

- The individual was able to work and was available for work for that week [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253(c)-2; *see also § 564.127[3]*].

- The individual has been unemployed for a waiting period of one week as defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254*, unless the Governor has waived the waiting period due to war or a state of emergency pursuant to *Gov. Code § 8571* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(d)*; *see § 564.127[2]*].

- The individual conducted a search for suitable work in accordance with specific and reasonable instructions of a public employment office [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(e)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1253(e)-1, 1253(e)-2; *see also §§ 564.127[4] -[6]*].

- If the individual has been identified by an automated profiling system as likely to exhaust regular unemployment benefits, the individual participated as required in reemployment activities, such as orientation and assessment, unless the individual has shown good cause for failure to participate [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(f)*].

Notwithstanding *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c), above,* if an individual is, in all other respects, eligible for benefits and becomes unable to work due to a physical or mental illness or injury for one or more days during the week, he or she shall be paid unemployment compensation benefits at the rate of one-seventh the weekly benefit amount payable for that week for each day which he or she was available for and able to work, but is not entitled to benefits for any day during the week in which he or she was unable to work due to the physical or mental illness or injury [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.5*].

[2] "Week of Unemployment"

No week is counted as a "week of unemployment" [*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-2, defining phrase] under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(d), discussed under § 564.127[1]* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254*]:

- Unless it occurs within the benefit year which includes the week with respect to which the person claims payment of unemployment compensation benefits, but this requirement does not interrupt the payment of benefits for consecutive weeks of unemployment. Moreover, the week immediately preceding a benefit year, if part of one uninterrupted period of unemployment which continues into that benefit year, is deemed, for the purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254* only, to be within the benefit year as well as within the preceding benefit year [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254(a)*].

- If unemployment compensation benefits have been paid with respect to that week [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254(b)*].

- Unless the individual was eligible for unemployment compensation benefits with respect thereto in all respects, except for the requirements of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1253(d), above* and 1281 (relating to minimum earnings requirement) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1254(c)*].

[3] "Available for Work" Requirement

With respect to the requirement that the individual be "available for work" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c), discussed under § 564.127[1]*], the term requires no more than that an individual claimant (1) be willing to accept suitable work that he or she has no good cause for refusing and (2) thereby make himself or herself available to a substantial field of employment [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 55, 67, 141 Cal. Rptr. 146, 569 P.2d 740* ; *see Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 113-114, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244* ; *Glick v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 493, 499, 153 Cal. Rptr. 1, 591 P.2d 24]* . Thus, a person may for good cause refuse otherwise suitable employment without losing his or her right to unemployment compensation benefits, provided the person remains available to a substantial field of employment. For example, a parent or guardian of a minor has good cause for refusing employment that conflicts with parental activities reasonably necessary for the care or education of the minor if no reasonable alternative means of discharging those responsibilities exist, provided the claimant remains available to a substantial field of employment [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 55, 70, 141 Cal. Rptr. 146, 569 P.2d 740* (holding claim for unemployment compensation benefits of mother seeking employment in restaurants or factories, days or nights, Mondays through Friday, was improperly denied because she was unable to accept weekend work that would conflict with her responsibilities to care for her minor child)]. In other words, the requirement of availability does not preclude claimants for unemployment insurance benefits from placing some restrictions on their availability to accept employment, as long as they remain available for employment by a more than a minimal number of employers in the

community [*Rios v. Employment Development Dept. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 489, 493-494, 231 Cal. Rptr. 732]* .

Student status, alone, may not disqualify an individual for unemployment compensation benefits. An unemployed individual may be considered "able and available for work" if school attendance does not eliminate a substantial portion of the individual's full-time labor market availability [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.9*].

Moreover, once the claimant for unemployment compensation benefits has shown that he or she is available for suitable work that he or she has no good cause for refusing, the burden of proof on the issue of whether he or she is available to a substantial field of employment lies with the Employment Development Department; if the department believes a given claimant, despite his or her availability for such suitable work, is nevertheless not attached to a labor market of sufficient dimension, it may be expected to explain its position and support it with appropriate evidence [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 55, 71, 141 Cal. Rptr. 146, 569 P.2d 740* ; *see* *Glick v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 493, 500-505, 153 Cal. Rptr. 1, 591 P.2d 24* (holding claim for unemployment compensation benefits of law student seeking part-time employment that would not conflict with requirements of her full-time schooling was properly granted)].

In addition, to deny an unemployed school teacher, otherwise qualified for and receiving unemployment compensation, benefits for a whole week instead of five sevenths of a week on the ground the teacher was unavailable for work within the meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)* for two of the days due to his or her observance of religious holidays in accordance with the dictates of his or her faith violated the teacher's right to free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the *First Amendment to the United States Constitution* and by *Cal. Const., art. I, § 4* and was erroneous when a market for the teacher's services remained [*Jaffe v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 719, 721-724, 202 Cal. Rptr. 812]* .

However, availability for work includes being legally, as well as physically, available to accept employment. Therefore, an alien who has no work authorization from the federal Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is not available for work as required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)* and the Employment Development Department may deny benefits on this basis. An alien's eligibility for benefits generally under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264*, which restricts benefits to aliens based on their status at the time services were performed, is not relevant to the determination of whether an alien is legally available for work at the time he or she applies for benefits [*Gutierrez v. Employment Development Dept. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1791, 1799, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* ; *see also* *Alonso v. State of California (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 123 Cal. Rptr. 536* ; for discussion of the eligibility of aliens generally, § 564.128[4]].

[4] "Seek Work" Requirement

The "seek-work" statute (now *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(e), discussed under § 564.127[1]*), as adopted in 1947, provided that the claimant must comply with seek-work "regulations" (Stats. 1953, ch. 308). In 1961, the statute was amended to charge the Department of Employment (now Employment Development Department) with directing claimants' work-search efforts in detail. The Legislature apparently believed it was unfair to make each claimant guess what seek-work effort was necessary to maintain eligibility in his or her case. It therefore eliminated the open-ended "regulations" requirement and substituted a mandate that the Employment Development Department give each claimant "specific" instructions, that is, the guidance appropriate for his or her particular circumstances. Under the present statute the claimant must adopt a course of action reasonably designed to result in his or her prompt employment in suitable work, considering the customary methods of obtaining work and the current condition of the labor market [*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253(c)-2, (e)-1(a)]. But the claimant's duty is circumscribed by the department's responsibility under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(e)* to design a proper "course of action" for each case. When the department is better situated than the claimant to know customary methods of obtaining work and the current condition of the labor market, the claimant may rely on its advice or that of another state agency to which the department has referred the claimant. Thus, an applicant for benefits fulfills his or her duty to seek work if he or she follows with reasonable diligence the specific and reasonable seek-work instructions of a public employment office [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment*

Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 111-112, 117, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244] .

For the history and interrelation of the seek-work requirement of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(e)* and the availability for work requirement of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c), discussed under § 564.127[3]*, and the provision that "unemployed persons claiming unemployment insurance benefits shall be required to make all reasonable effort to secure employment on their own behalf," set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 100, see Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 113-117, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244* .

[5] What Constitutes "Suitable Employment" and Factors Considered

The term "suitable employment" means work in the individual's usual occupation or for which the individual is reasonably fitted [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1258*].

In determining whether the work is work for which the individual is reasonably fitted, the Director of Employment Development must consider the following:

- The degree of risk involved to the individual's health, safety, and morals;

- The individual's physical fitness and prior training, experience and prior earnings, and length of unemployment and prospects for securing local work in his or her customary occupation;

- The distance of the available work from the individual's residence; and

- Such other factors as would influence a reasonably prudent person in the individual's circumstances [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1258*; *see Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 55, 63, 141 Cal. Rptr. 146, 569 P.2d 740]* .

[6] Unsuitable Employment and Effect of Refusal to Accept

The term "suitable employment" does not include employment with an employer who does not: (1) possess an appropriate state license to engage in his or her business, trade, or profession; or (2) withhold or hold in trust the employee contributions required by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272* for unemployment compensation disability benefits and does not transmit all such employee contributions to the department for the Disability Fund as required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 986*; or *(3)* carry either workers' compensation insurance or possess a certificate of self-insurance as required by *Lab. Code § 3201 et seq.* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1258.5*].

No work or employment shall be deemed suitable and benefits must not be denied to any otherwise eligible and qualified person for refusing new work under any of the following conditions [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259*]:

- If the position offered is vacant due directly to a strike, lockout, or other labor dispute [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(a)*; *see Campos v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 961, 967, 183 Cal. Rptr. 637]* .

- If the wages, hours, or other conditions of the work offered are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(b)*].

- If, as a condition of being employed, the individual would be required to join a company union or to resign from or refrain from joining any bona fide labor organization [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(c)*].

- If the offer of employment is from an employer who does not possess an appropriate state license to

engage in his or her business, trade, or profession if required by state law [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(d)*].

- If the offer of employment is from an employer who does not carry either workers' compensation insurance or possess a certificate of self-insurance as required by *Lab. Code §§ 3201-6002* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(e)*].

- If the offer of employment is from an employer who does not withhold or hold in trust the employee contributions required by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272* for unemployment compensation disability benefits and does not transmit all such employee contributions to the Employment Development Department for the Disability Fund as required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 986* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259(f)*].

[7] Factors Not Affecting Eligibility

An unemployed person who is otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation benefits is not to be deemed ineligible for any week in which:

- for not exceeding two working days, he or she cannot reasonably be expected to work because (a) he or she is unlawfully detained [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.1(a)*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253.1-1*]; (b) he or she is lawfully detained or arrested, but the charge is subsequently dismissed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.1(b)*]; or (c) there has been a death in his or her immediate family in the state in which he or she resides [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.12(a)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253.12-1];

- for not exceeding four working days, he or she cannot reasonably be expected to work because there has been a death in his or her immediate family outside the state in which he or she resides [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.12(b)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253.12-1]; or

- pursuant to the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement, he or she is allowed not more than one uncompensated day off in that week or is allowed not more than one uncompensated holiday in that week if (a) he or she is employed in longshoring operations; (b) his or her employer regularly offers employment to individuals employed in such operations seven days a week; and (c) he or she is able to work and available for work for six days of the week except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.1* or 1253.12, *above* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.2*].

An unemployed person who has been discharged from any branch of the United States armed services and who is otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation benefits is not to be deemed ineligible in any week for which the person has unexpired leave time for which he or she was compensated on discharge [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.15*].

An unemployed person otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation benefits is not to be deemed not able to work or unavailable for work for any week in which he or she is unable to work or unavailable for work solely because he or she is serving on a grand or petit jury or is responding to a subpoena [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.6*].

An unemployed individual is disqualified for eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits solely on the basis that he or she is available for part-time work, only. If an individual restricts his or her availability to part-time work, he or she may be considered to be able to work and available for work [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)*] if it is determined that all of following conditions exist [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.8*]:

(1) The claim is based on the part-time employment.

(2) The claimant is actively seeking and is willing to accept work under essentially the same conditions

that existed while the wage credits were accrued.

(3) The claimant imposes no other restrictions and is in a labor market in which a reasonable demand exists for the part-time services he or she offers.

An unemployed individual who meets the foregoing criteria will be considered "able and available" for work, despite having restricted availability for part-time work, only, due to school attendance [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.9*].

Finally, a person is not disqualified for any week solely because he or she is (1) before any court of the United States or any state pursuant to a lawfully issued summons to appear for jury duty, or (2) hospitalized for treatment of an emergency or life-threatening condition [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.7*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJurorsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilitySuitable Employment

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.128

§ 564.128 Ineligible Persons

[1] School and Seasonal Employees

Unemployment compensation benefits are generally not payable to school employees in the service of a nonprofit organization, a public entity as defined by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 605*, for holiday recesses, between term breaks, vacations, and paid sabbaticals when there is a contract or reasonable assurance that the employee will perform services for the educational institution after the break or vacation [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3(b)-(i)*; *Russ v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 834, 840-848, 178 Cal. Rptr. 421* ; *Winters v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 41, 45, 133 Cal. Rptr. 567* ; for exceptions applicable to nonprofessional employees of specified state special schools, *see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1451-1454*]. The exclusion of benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3* applies to instructional educational employees regardless of whether their employment status is vested or nonvested or the employee is tenured or nontenured. Thus, if there is a contract or a reasonable assurance that a teacher, who has taught during the prerecess period, will perform teaching services for the employer in the academic year or term during the postrecess period, the teacher must be denied unemployment benefits during the summer recess [*Board of Education v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 674, 682-683, 206 Cal. Rptr. 788]* . On the other hand, assignments given to part-time, hourly instructors of a community college district that depended on their ability to attract a sufficient number of students to justify offering the classes, and for which the standard faculty assignment forms stated that the employment was contingent on adequate class enrollment, do not constitute reasonable assurances of continued employment within the meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3* [*Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 635, 639, 256 Cal. Rptr. 142* (affirming trial court's judgments granting writs of mandate requiring that instructors be paid unemployment benefits for period between fall and spring semesters)].

The same rules apply to between season periods of unemployment of persons employed in seasonal sports and athletic events [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.4*].

[2] Person Applying to Another Jurisdiction for Benefits

A person is not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits for any week or part of any week with respect to

which he or she has received or is seeking unemployment benefits under an unemployment compensation law of another state or the United States unless the other state or United States finally determines the person is not entitled to unemployment compensation benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255*].

[3] Strikers

A person who left his or her work because of a trade dispute is not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits. The ineligibility continues for the period the person remains out of work because of the continuation of the dispute in the establishment in which he or she is employed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262*; 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1262-1, *1262-2*]. The disqualification imposed by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* is not contingent on the merits of the controversy [*Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1044, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513]* . For a definition of when locked-out employees in the course of a selective strike are ineligible for benefits, see *Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 774 n.2, 782, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707* . On the duty of the Employment Development Department to investigate a trade dispute, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262.5*.

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262 manifests the state's desire to maintain neutrality in labor disputes and not to require the employer to subsidize, through its contributions to the unemployment compensation fund, the use of the strike as an economic weapon against it [*Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1044, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513* ; *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1393, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461* ; *Brotherhood of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1515, 1525, 236 Cal. Rptr. 78* ; *National Broadcasting Co. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 550, 555, 157 Cal. Rptr. 207]* . However, an employee is ineligible under the statute for unemployment compensation benefits only if he or she left work because of the dispute; an employee is not ineligible if he or she left work in the course of, and not because of, a trade dispute for another reason constituting good cause [*Bunny's Waffle Shop v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 735, 738-742, 151 P.2d 224]* . In determining ineligibility under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262*, the courts have recognized a two-part test: (1) the worker must voluntarily leave or remain away from his or her employment (a volitional test), and (2) the worker must leave or remain away from his or her employment because of a trade dispute (causational test) [*Campos v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966, 183 Cal. Rptr. 637* ; *see* *Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513* (trade dispute resulted because of employer's requirement that employees accept a 7.8 percent wage reduction and a total wage and benefit reduction of 14.8 percent); *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1390, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461* (trade dispute resulted because of 27 to 33 percent reduction in earnings for employees and in combination with reduced benefits comprised a 34 to 41 percent earnings reduction); *Brotherhood of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1515, 1525, 236 Cal. Rptr. 78* ; *Pacific Maritime Assn. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 568, 575-579, 215 Cal. Rptr. 408* (neither test metwhen claimants for benefits worked out of union hall on rotational dispatch system and werenot scheduled to work during period in question and did not walk off job or refuse work, even though they did not actively repudiate their union's selective work stoppage policy or seek employment from struck employers)]. The form of cessation of employment is not controlling; what matters is what precedes it in terms of causation and volitional conduct [*Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1048, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513]* . When an independent, intervening act of another so disrupts the chain of causation as to render the leaving involuntary, the causation and volitional tests tend to overlap [*Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513]* .

[4] Aliens

Unemployment compensation benefits, extended duration benefits, and federal-state extended benefits are not payable on the basis of services performed by an alien unless the alien was lawfully admitted for permanent residence at the time the services were performed, was lawfully present for purposes of performing them, or was permanently residing in the United States under color of law at the time they were performed, including an alien who was lawfully present in

the United States as a result of the application of the provisions of *Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act* (*8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)*) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264(a)*].

In 1988 the Legislature amended *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264* to prescribe various procedures to be followed by the Employment Development Department respecting aliens who have applied for temporary resident status under the federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (Pub. L. No. 99-603) and whose unemployment insurance benefits are at issue. These provisions are set out in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264(d)-(f)*, which, however, cease to be operative if the United States Secretary of Labor determines that they do not comply with the federal Unemployment Tax Act [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264(g)*] or on September 30, 1990, whichever is earlier, unless the Legislature deletes or extends that date [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1264(h)*].

However, even an alien who falls into one of the three categories discussed above (lawfully admitted for permanent residence, lawfully present for purposes of performing services, or permanently residing in the United States under color of law) at the time services were performed may not be eligible for benefits. If an alien has no work authorization from the federal Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) when he or she applies for benefits, he or she is not legally available for work as required by Unemp. *Ins. Code § 1253(c)* and the EDD may deny benefits on this basis [*Gutierrez v. Employment Development Dept. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1791, 1799, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705* ; *see also Alonso v. State of California (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 242, 249-250, 123 Cal. Rptr. 536* ; for discussion of the requirement of availability for work, § 564.127[3]].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Immigration LawDuties & Rights of AliensPublic BenefitsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.129

§ 564.129 Reductions and Deductions for Other Payments

The weekly amount of any unemployment compensation otherwise due is, subject to specified exceptions, reduced by the amount of any payments received as pension, retirement pay, annuity, or other similar periodic payment based on the person's previous work or for any temporary total disability under any workers' compensation or employer's liability law [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1255.3(a), 1255.5*]. The legislative intent in enacting *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255.3* was to comply with the letter of *I.R.C. § 3304(a)(15)*, mandating the states to enact such provisions, and nothing more [*Evans v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 398, 408-410, 216 Cal. Rptr. 782, 703 P.2d 122* ; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255.3(b)*; and Stats. 1985, ch. 1217, §§ 1, 11, 16 (the McAlister-Duffy-Greene Unemployment Benefit Pension Offset Refund Act)].

However, payments to an individual for vacation pay that was earned but not paid for services performed prior to termination of employment are not construed to be wages or compensation for personal services, and benefits payable under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 100 et seq.* may not be denied or reduced because of the receipt of those payments [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265.5*; *see Evans v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 398, 410, 216 Cal. Rptr. 782, 703 P.2d 122* (construing former version of statute)]. This provision applies notwithstanding any other provision of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 100 et seq.* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265.5*].

Similarly, payments for holiday pay that were earned but not paid prior to an indefinite layoff, termination of employment, or commencement of unemployment caused by disability are not to be construed to be wages or compensation for personal services, and benefits payable must not be denied or reduced because of the receipt of these payments [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265.6*].

On deductions from benefits payable for support obligations, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255.7*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.130

§ 564.130 Disqualified Persons

[1] Grounds

A person is disqualified for unemployment compensation benefits if he or she (1) left his or her most recent work voluntarily without good cause or (2) was discharged for misconduct connected with his or her most recent work [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1256-1-1256-43*; *see also Morrison v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 245, 250, 134 Cal. Rptr. 916* ; *Evenson v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 1005, 1015, 133 Cal. Rptr. 488]* .

[2] "Most Recent Work" Defined

The term "most recent work," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256, above, Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1256.1, 1256.2,* or *1256.5, discussed under § 564.130[7],* is that work in which a claimant for unemployment compensation benefits last performed compensated services (1) prior to and nearest the date of filing a valid new, reopened, or additional claim for unemployment compensation benefits, a valid primary, reopened, or additional claim for extended duration benefits, or a valid application or reopened or additional claim for federal-state extended benefits (2) during the calendar week for which a continued claim is filed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.3*].

[3] What Constitutes Voluntary Leaving

The determination of whether an employee voluntarily quit his or her position, rather than being discharged, hinges on who was the "moving party" in the termination [*Morgan v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 762, 767, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* . If an employer refuses to permit an able and willing employee to continue working or is unable to provide continuing work, the employer is the moving party and the employee is deemed to have been involuntarily unemployed because of a discharge or layoff [*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-1(c), (d)]. If the employee left employment while continued work was available, the employee is the moving party [*Morgan v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 762, 767, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* . Therefore, a voluntary leaving occurs only when work is available and the employee leaves work of his or her own free will [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-1(d) (also

providing examples of "voluntary" leaving)].

[4] "Good Cause"

[a] Defined

The term "good cause" means an adequate cause that comports with the purposes of the Unemployment Insurance Code and with other laws. The concept of good cause cannot be arbitrarily limited; it must take account of real circumstances, substantial reasons, objective conditions, palpable forces that operate to produce correlative results, adequate excuses that will bear the test of reason, just grounds for action, and always the element of good faith. Accordingly, good cause for leaving work means such a cause as justifies an employee's voluntarily leaving the ranks of the employed and joining the ranks of the unemployed; the quitting must be for such a cause as would reasonably motivate in a similar situation the average able-bodied and qualified worker to give up his or her employment with its certain wage rewards in order to enter the ranks of the compensated unemployed [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 584, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61]* . Hence, good cause may exist for reasons that are personal and not connected to the employment situation, but those reasons must be imperative and compelling in nature [*MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 209, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453]* .

For example, the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board found that good cause did not exist in a case in which an employee, whose job was not in jeopardy from his employer's restructuring process, accepted the employer's offer of a bonus to retire 6 months early. The employee chose early retirement for two reasons: his concern that his job might be subject to restructuring sometime in the future, and his desire to prevent the reassignment, downgrading, or potential layoff of an employee with lesser seniority. The first reason was not good cause because it was purely speculative rather than imperative and compelling. The second reason was not good cause because the restructuring process included protection against layoffs, and there was no evidence that the employee would have displaced any other employee had he remained at his job [In re Mitchell (1994) Cal. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Bd. Prec. Dec. No. P-B-479].

[b] Determination as Question of Law

Whether an applicant for unemployment insurance benefits left his or her employment for "good cause," as this term is used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256, discussed under § 564.130[1] above,* is a question of law that must be answered in relation to the particular facts of each case [*MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 209, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453* ; *see Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 585, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61* ; *Norman v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 1, 6, 192 Cal. Rptr. 134, 663 P.2d 904]* .

[c] Examples

[i] Harassment

It has been held that an employee who quit her employment in the face of continuing harassment and threatened dismissal in retaliation for her union activities and "whistle blowing" to public authorities, rather than waiting to be fired, had good cause for leaving her employment [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 578, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61]* .

A person who left work because of sexual harassment is deemed to have left the employment with good cause if the person took reasonable steps to preserve the working relationship, unless such steps would have been futile [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.5*].

[ii] Reduction in Earnings

A substantial reduction in earnings (25-percent wage cut) constitutes good cause for leaving employment [*Bunny's Waffle Shop v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 735, 743, 151 P.2d 224]* . Conversely, an insubstantial reduction (72/3-percent reduction in salary) does not constitute good cause, particularly if the employee would not have quit but for the belief that he or she was eligible for unemployment compensation benefits [*Maitland v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 331, 334-335, 181 Cal. Rptr. 587]* . Workers who leave their jobs because of a trade dispute are ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* (*discussed under § 564.128[3]*), notwithstanding the fact that the trade dispute was precipitated by substantial wage cuts [*Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1390-1394, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461* (wage cuts constituting 27-percent to 33-percent reduction in earnings for employees and in combination with reduced benefits comprised 34-percent to 41-percent earnings reduction); *see also Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513* (trade dispute resulted because of employer's requirement that employees accept 7.8-percent wage reduction and total wage and benefit reduction of 14.8 percent)]. In such cases, *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*, which expressly incorporates a "good cause" standard, does not come into play [*see Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1049-1050, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513]* .

[iii] To Preserve Family Relationship

A person may be deemed to have left his or her most recent work with good cause if he or she left employment to accompany his or her spouse or domestic partner to a place from which it is impractical to commute to the employment [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*]. For the purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*, the word "spouse" includes a person to whom marriage is imminent [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1032, 3701, 3702(c), 4701(a), 4702* (relating to employers' reserve accounts); 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-12; *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 236, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871]* . However, this does not apply to nonmarried persons, even though they may be engaged to be married, if no marriage is imminent and there are no children of their nonformalized relationship [*Norman v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 1, 9-10, 192 Cal. Rptr. 134, 663 P.2d 904* ; *but see MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205*]. Conversely, a worker who leaves his or her employment to accompany his or her nonmarital partner to another state in order to maintain the familial relationship they have established with their child constitutes leaving voluntarily with good cause within the meaning of the statute governing eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits [*MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 212, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453]* . The precise scope of the word "spouse" in this context has become less important with the enactment of legislation, effective January 1, 2002, under which unmarried domestic partners are treated the same as spouses for the purpose of determining whether a claimant left employment to preserve a family relationship [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(a), 1032, 1056*; *see Fam. Code § 297* (definition of "domestic partner"); *see also* 2001 Stats., ch. 893].

[iv] Pursuant to Collective Bargaining Agreement

A person whose employment was terminated under the compulsory retirement provisions of a collective bargaining agreement to which the employer is a party is not deemed to have left his or her work without good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(e), 1256*]. Also, a person is deemed to have left his or her most recent work with good cause if he or she elected to be laid off in place of an employee with less seniority pursuant to a provision in a collective bargaining agreement permitting an employee with more seniority to elect to be laid off in place of an employee with less seniority if the employer has decided to lay off employees [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*].

[v] Deprivation of Equal Opportunity or Discrimination

Subject to specified exceptions, termination of employment by a person whose employer operated so as to deprive the person of equal employment opportunities on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, age, or sexual orientation is not deemed to be "having left the most recent work without good cause" [*see Gov. Code § 12940(a)* (prohibited bases of discrimination);

see also Gov. Code §§ 12926, 12926.1 (definitions)]. However, this does not apply to a deprivation based on a bona fide occupational qualification or on applicable security regulations established by the United States or California, nor does it apply if the person fails to make reasonable efforts to provide the employer with an opportunity to remove any unintentional deprivation of the person's equal employment opportunities [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.2*; *see Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 41, n.19, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540* (*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.2* as declaratory of existing law)]. Thus, if one's work is made intolerable over a period of time by the discriminatory acts of the employer, such as a refusal to reinstate, a demotion in grade, and loss of promotional opportunity, there is good cause for leaving employment and seeking unemployment compensation benefits [*Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 41, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540* (sex discrimination against woman rehired after maternity leave at same pay but in lower grade, resulting in loss of promotional opportunity; *see Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 586-587, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61* , approving *Prescod* and disapproving *Warringer*)].

The term "employment opportunities," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.2*, includes, but is not limited to, assignments to jobs, work atmosphere, compensation, including fringe benefits, promotions, transfer, upgrading, rights and duties of employees under work rules, and the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256.2-1*].

Employers are prohibited from discriminating on the basis of sex in the payment of wages [*Lab. Code § 1197.5(a)*]. Hence, it has been held that an employee who had been discriminated against as to wages due to sex, who had made appropriate protest and request for equalization of compensation, and who had been refused adjustment after the employer had had an opportunity to do so had good cause for leaving the employment [*Morrison v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 245, 250-253, 134 Cal. Rptr. 916* (pointing out, however, that existence of a claim based on past discrimination which has ceased should not afford good cause to leave employment voluntarily, since methods are available for enforcing the claim by legal process)].

[vi] To Escape Domestic Violence

An individual may be deemed to have left his or her most recent work with good cause if he or she leaves employment to protect his or her children, or himself or herself, from domestic violence abuse [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*].

[vii] Absence From Work

A person whose employment is terminated due to his or her absence from work for a period in excess of 24 hours because of his or her incarceration and who is convicted of the offense for which he or she was incarcerated or of any lesser included offense is deemed to have left his or her work voluntarily without good cause for the purposes of determining eligibility for benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.1(a)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030.1(1)*; *see also Jefferson v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 72, 76-79, 130 Cal. Rptr. 405* (upholding constitutionality of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.1(a)* against procedural due process and equal protection challenges)].

[5] What Constitutes Misconduct

The term "misconduct," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (*discussed under § 564.130[1]*), is limited to conduct evincing such wilful or wanton disregard of an employer's interests as is found in deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that the employer has the right to expect of an employee, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree or recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent, or evil design, or to show an intentional and substantial disregard of the employer's interests or of the employee's duties and obligations to the employer. Mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, failure in good performance as the result of inability or incapacity, inadvertencies or ordinary negligence in isolated instances, or good faith errors in judgment or discretion are not misconduct. The

policy of the law as expressed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 100* is to provide benefits to persons unemployed through no fault of their own. Accordingly, fault is the basic element to be considered in interpreting and applying the law governing unemployment compensation. The determination of fault is not concluded by a finding that the discharge was justified. The employee's conduct must evince culpability or bad faith. Hence, a claimant may not be denied benefits solely on the basis of a good faith error in judgment [*Amador v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 671, 678-679, 200 Cal. Rptr. 298, 677 P.2d 224* (worker not disqualified from collecting unemployment insurance benefits if discharged for wilfully refusing to perform work that worker reasonably and in good faith believed would jeopardize health of others); *see Moore v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 235, 242, 215 Cal. Rptr. 316* (if claimant's reasons for refusing work assignment by employer would constitute good cause sufficient to justify resignation, such refusal resulting in employee's discharge as not constituting misconduct); *Rowe v. Hansen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 512, 520, 116 Cal. Rptr. 16]* . The test is essentially volitional: although conduct may be harmful to an employer's interest and justify the employee's discharge, it will not disqualify the employee for unemployment insurance benefits unless it is willful, wanton, or equally culpable [*Jacobs v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1037, 102 Cal. Rptr. 364]* .

Failure to abide by an employer's reasonable and job-related rule or policy amounts to misconduct. For example, an employee who refuses to submit to a drug test while working in a hazardous environment, albeit in a job that would not be considered safety-sensitive in another location, has committed misconduct and is ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits [*American Federation of Labor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 51, 61-62, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 210]* .

The employer has the burden of establishing misconduct to protect its reserve fund [*Cerberonics, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 172, 176, 199 Cal. Rptr. 292]* .

[6] Presumption Favoring Employee Absent Contrary Notice From Employer

A person is presumed to have been discharged for reasons other than misconduct and not to have voluntarily left his or her work without good cause unless the employer has given written notice to the contrary to the Employment Development Department, as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327*, setting forth facts sufficient to overcome the presumption. The presumption is rebuttable [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*]. The presumption is one that affects the burden of proof and controls the burden of proof at each level of appeal; that is, from the Employment Development Department, to the administrative law judge, to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, through the superior court, regardless of whether it was deemed rebutted at a lower level [*O'Connell v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 54, 56-59, 196 Cal. Rptr. 505]* .

[7] Other Grounds of Disqualification

An individual is also disqualified for unemployment compensation benefits if he or she:

> (1) Was discharged from his or her most recent work for chronic absenteeism due to intoxication, reporting to work while intoxicated, using intoxicants on the job, or gross neglect of duty while intoxicated, if any of these incidents is caused by an irresistible compulsion to use or consume intoxicants, including alcoholic beverages, or otherwise left the employment for reasons caused by an irresistible compulsion to use or consume intoxicants, including alcoholic beverages [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.4(a)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-37];
>
> (2) Willfully, for the purposes of obtaining unemployment compensation benefits, either made a false statement or representation, including using a false name, false social security number or other false identification, with actual knowledge of its falsity or withheld a material fact in order to obtain unemployment compensation benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(a)*]; or

(3) Without good cause refused to accept suitable employment when offered or failed to apply for suitable employment when notified by a public employment office [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(b)*; *see § 564.127[5]*]. "Good cause," as used in this provision, means an adequate cause, a cause that comports with the purposes of the Unemployment Insurance Code and with other laws [*Syrek v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 519, 529, 7 Cal. Rptr. 97, 354 P.2d 625* (holding that "good cause" for refusing suitable employment includes conscientious objection to subscribing to a loyalty oath required by a public agency employer as a condition of the position refused)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGood CauseLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.131

§ 564.131 Duration of Disqualification

[1] Person Voluntarily Quit or Was Fired for Misconduct

A person disqualified under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (quitting without good cause or fired for misconduct connected with work, *discussed under § 564.130[1]*) is ineligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits for the week in which the act that causes the disqualification occurs, and continuing until he or she has, subsequent to the act that caused disqualification and his or her registration for work, performed service in bona fide employment for which remuneration is received equal to or in excess of five times his or her weekly benefit amount [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(a)*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1260(a)-1].

[2] Refusal to Accept Suitable Employment

A person disqualified under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(b)* (refusal without good cause to accept suitable employment, *discussed under § 564.130[7]*) is ineligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits for not less than two or more than 10 consecutive weeks beginning with (1) the week in which the cause of disqualification occurs, if he or she registers for work in that week; or (2) the week subsequent to the occurrence of the cause of disqualification in which he or she first registers for work if he or she does not register for work in the week in which the cause of disqualification occurs [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(b)*].

[3] False Statement

A person disqualified under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(a)* (false statement or representation to obtain unemployment compensation benefits, *discussed under § 564.130[7]*) under a determination transmitted to him or her from the department, and who was not paid any benefit amount as a result of his or her false statement or representation, is ineligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits for two weeks, beginning with the week in which the determination is mailed to or personally served on him or her, or any subsequent week for which he or she is first otherwise in all respects eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, and for not more than 13 subsequent weeks for which he or she is otherwise in all respects eligible for unemployment compensation benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code §*

1260(c)]. If the individual was paid any benefit amount as a result of his or her false statement or representation, he or she is ineligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits for five weeks beginning with the week in which the determination is mailed to or personally served on him or her, or any subsequent week, for which he or she is first otherwise in all respects eligible for unemployment compensation benefits and for not more than 10 subsequent weeks for which he or she is otherwise in all respect eligible for unemployment compensation benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(d)]. However, no disqualification under this provision may be applied to any week if all or any portion of the week is beyond the three-year period next succeeding the date of the mailing or personal service of the determination [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(c), (d)*].

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(c), (d) does not apply to a person convicted under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101*, relating to willful misrepresentation or concealment of a material fact [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(c), (d)*; on duration of forfeiture of rights on conviction under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101, see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1263*].

[4] Serving Multiple Disqualification Periods Concurrently

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(c), discussed under § 564.131[3]*, an individual who is subject to a disqualification imposed under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(b)* (*discussed under § 564.131[2]*) may, if he or she is otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, concurrently serve a disqualification imposed under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(a)* (*discussed under § 564.131[3]*) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(d)*].

[5] Extension of Ineligibility Period on Successive Disqualifications

When successive disqualifications under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257* occur, the director may extend the period of ineligibility provided for in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260* for an additional period not to exceed eight additional weeks [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1261*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGood CauseLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilitySuitable Employment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.132

§ 564.132 Claims for Benefits

[1] Kinds of Claims

[a] "New Claim"

A "new claim" for unemployment compensation benefits means an application for the establishment of a benefit year and a computation of the maximum benefits payable and the weekly rate [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-2(a)]. The filing and contents of a new claim are covered by 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-2(b).

[b] "Additional Claim"

An "additional claim" for unemployment compensation benefits means an application that certifies to the beginning date of a period of unemployment (1) that falls within a previously established benefit year, extended duration period, or extended benefit period; and (2) when a break of one or more weeks has occurred in the claim series with intervening employment [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-4(a)]. What constitutes a break in the claim series with intervening employment is set forth in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-4(a)(2)(A)-(C). The filing of an additional claim, when an additional claim may not be filed, and the notice required to be given by the department to the employer of the filing of an additional claim are covered in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-4(b)-(d), respectively.

[c] "Reopened Claim"

A "reopened claim" for unemployment compensation benefits means an application that certifies to the beginning date of a period of unemployment (1) that falls within a previously established benefit year, extended duration period, or extended benefit period; and (2) that follows either of the following: (a) a period of one or more weeks for which the claimant failed to file a continued claim or partial claim [*see § 564.132[1][e]*] and during which the claimant did not perform services in employment; or (b) a period of one or more weeks for which the claimant was ineligible for benefits for a definite period and for which continued claims or partial claims were filed, unless with respect to any week during such period, the claimant was ineligible for benefits pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1252* (*discussed under § 564.125*)

or pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1279* (relating to unemployment compenation benefits during partial employment, *discussed under § 564.122*) due to excessive earnings from services performed in employment that week (if the latter condition is met, an additional claim would be filed following the end of the period of ineligibility [*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-4, *discussed under § 564.132[1][b]*]) [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-5(a)]. The filing of a reopened claim is covered in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-5(b) and (c), and a definition of when a reopened claim may not be filed is covered in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-5(d).

[d] "Continued Claim"

A "continued claim" for unemployment compensation benefits means an application to serve a waiting period or for the receipt of benefits that certifies to a week of unemployment [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-6(a)]. The procedure for filing the claims, the matters to which the claimant must certify, and extensions of time to file are covered in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-6(b)-(e). The notice required to be given to the claimant by the department relating to any right of appeal is set forth in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-6(f).

[e] "Partial Claims"

A "partial claim" for unemployment compensaton benefits is a claim for partial benefits by a partially unemployed individual. "First partial claim" and "subsequent partial claim" for partial unemployment compensation benefits mean an application for a determination of eligibility for partial benefits that certifies to the completion of a week of partial unemployment either to satisfy a week of the waiting period requirement or to claim partial benefits for a compensable week or two compensable weeks [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-8(a)].

A partially unemployed individual is a person who during a week (1) was employed by a regular employer, (2) worked less than his or her normal customary full-time hours for his or her regular employer because of lack of full-time work, and (3) was continuously attached to his or her regular employer in that no severance of the employer-employee relationship occurred [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1252-1(a); *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-7]. A person receiving benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1279.5* (relating to shared work) during a benefit year may not receive benefits as a partially unemployed individual with respect to any week in such benefit year while in employment status with the regular employer who initiated the shared work program [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1252-1(b)(1)]. A person may not claim benefits as a partially unemployed individual if the Department determines that the individual has been laid off for a period in excess of two consecutive weeks [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1252-1(b)(2)].

The employer of a partially unemployed individual is required, within five days after the termination of any payroll week to give the individual a notice of reduced earnings on a form supplied by the department which must set forth the matters listed in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-7 [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-7]. The filing and content of a first or subsequent partial claim for partial unemployment compensation benefits are covered by 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-8(b). When a claimant has filed partial claims for two consecutive weeks during which he or she performed no services for the regular employer, he or she may not file a partial claim for a subsequent week of unemployment until he or she again performs services for the regular employer. For any subsequent weeks in which the claimant is ineligible to file partial claims, he or she may, if unemployed, filed continued claims in accordance with *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326.6* [*see § 564.132[1][d]*] [*22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326.8(c)*].

[2] Filing Claim

[a] Requirements

Claims for unemployment compensation benefits must be made in accordance with authorized regulations of the Director of Employment Development [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1326*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1326-1-1326-11* (discussed in *§ 564.132[1]*)].

[b] Delayed Filing

Regulations permit delayed filing of a claim for good cause. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-8 provides that a week of unemployment of an individual who for good cause delays filing his or her new claim is the week in which he or she first becomes unemployed. Thereafter, his or her week consists of seven consecutive day periods, pursuant to 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-1, commencing immediately after the initial week [*Wang v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 412, 417, 275 Cal. Rptr. 237]* . Good cause for late filing includes, but is not limited to, the examples set forth in 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-10(a) (for example, an employer's failure to comply with regulations regarding partial unemployment benefits, under 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1326-10(a)(1)) [*Wang v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 412, 418, 275 Cal. Rptr. 237]* . Accordingly, good cause for a delayed claim is defined broadly. Although good cause might include the employee's unawareness of the right to seek unemployment benefits if he or she files a claim within a reasonable period of time under the circumstances, unawareness does not constitute good cause when coupled with an unreasonable delay in filing a claim [*Wang v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 412, 420, 275 Cal. Rptr. 237]* .

[3] Payment or Denial of Claim

Except as otherwise provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1326-1342* (relating to the filing, determination, and payment of unemployment compensation claims), the Employment Development Department must promptly pay benefits if it finds the claimant is eligible, or must promptly deny benefits if it finds the claimant ineligible [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1326*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1326-1-1326-11*]. Benefits are paid through public employment offices or through such other agency as may be prescribed by authorized regulations of the director [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1339(a)*]. Payment of benefits due a deceased or legally declared incompetent person is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1341* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1341-1.

[4] Payment of Interest on Wrongful Denial of Claim

Prejudgment interest is properly awarded on unemployment insurance benefits payable under a wrongfully denied claim [*Aguilar v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 239, 245-246, 272 Cal. Rptr. 696]* . This interest is properly awarded by a superior court in an action arising from administrative denial of benefits [*Aguilar v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 239, 241, 246 n.4, 272 Cal. Rptr. 696* (noting EDD's assertion that administrative law judge has no power to award interest, but not necessarily accepting it, and emphasizing that in instant case, interest was awarded by superior court judgment)].

Neither the Board nor an administrative law judge has the authority to award interest on a retroactive lump-sum payment that the Board or judge determines is owed to the claimant. The retroactive amount, covering the period from the first day of eligibility to the date the claimant is administratively determined to be eligible for disability benefits, is not equivalent to "damages" assessed in a civil action, and so *Civ. Code § 3287(a)*, which authorizes a *trial court* to award prejudgment interest, is inapplicable [*see Weber v. Board of Retirement (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1444-1452, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769]* . On the other hand, if the Board *denies* disability benefits and the claimant brings a mandamus action to recover the benefits, the court may award prejudgment interest under *Civ. Code § 3287(a)* on the amount of benefits wrongfully denied by the Board [*see American Federation of Labor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 1017, 1033-1042, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 920 P.2d 1314]* . Under *Civ. Code § 3287(a)*, a claimant must satisfy three conditions for the recovery of interest in a mandamus action against the state: (1) there must be an underlying monetary obligation, (2) the recovery must be certain or capable of being made certain by calculation, and (3) the right to recovery must vest on a particular day *Aguilar v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 239, 242-245, 272 Cal. Rptr. 696* (citing *Tripp v. Swoap (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 671, 681-682, 131 Cal. Rptr. 789, 552 P.2d 749*)]. These criteria are satisfied with respect to unemployment insurance benefits because (1) unemployment benefits are a monetary obligation that can be enforced by a claimant in a mandamus proceeding, (2) the amount to which a particular claimant is entitled can be calculated with certainty by reference to fixed schedules, and (3) the right

to payment of benefits vests when the claimant has established the facts that entitle the claimant to the benefits [*Aguilar v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 239, 245, 272 Cal. Rptr. 696]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment InterestPrejudgment InterestLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.133

§ 564.133 Notice to Employer and Employer's Right to Submit Facts

[1] On Employee's Claim

The Employment Development Department must give notice of the filing of a new or additional claim [*see §§ 564.132[1][a], [b]*] to the employing unit by which the claimant was last employed immediately preceding the filing of the claim unless the additional claim is the result of the filing of a partial claim as defined by the department, there has not been a subsequent employing unit which is designated as the last employer, and there is no separation issue [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327*].

Within 10 days after the notice is mailed or within any extension of that period for good cause, the employing unit so notified is required to submit any known facts that may affect the claimant's eligibility for benefits, including but not limited to any facts pertaining to eligibility under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (*discussed under § 564.130[1]*) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1333-1]. If after the 10-day period the employing unit acquires knowledge of facts that may affect the claimant's eligibility and the facts could not reasonably have been known within the period, the employing unit is required, within 10 days of acquiring the knowledge or any extension of that period for good cause, to submit the facts to the department [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1333-1].

Because of the reference in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (voluntary quitting or discharge for misconduct), the mandatory provisions of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* overlap the permissive provisions of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030*, relating to contributions and reports. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030* provides that an employer entitled under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* to receive notice of the filing of a new or additional claim may, within 10 days after the mailing of the notice or any extension of that period for good cause, submit to the department any facts disclosing whether the claimant (1) left the employing unit's employ voluntarily and without good cause; (2) was discharged for misconduct connected with his or her work; (3) was discharged from or quit his or her most recent employment as the result of an irresistible compulsion to use or consume intoxicants including alcoholic beverages; (4) was a student employed on a temporary basis, whose employment began with the vacation period and ended with return to school at the close of that period; (5) left the job to accompany his or her spouse or domestic partner to, or join him or her at, a

place (a) from which it is impractical to commute to the employment, and (b) to which a transfer of the claimant by the employer is not available; or (6) left the job to protect his or her children or himself or herself from domestic violence abuse [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(a)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1032*]. As used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030*, the word "spouse" includes a person to whom marriage is imminent [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1032*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3701(a), 4701(a)* (relating to extended duration benefits and federal-state extended benefits, respectively)]. The precise scope of the word "spouse" in this context has become less important with the enactment of legislation, effective January 1, 2002, under which unmarried domestic partners are treated the same as spouses for the purpose of determining whether a claimant left employment to preserve a family relationship [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(a), 1032, 1056*; *see Fam. Code § 297* (definition of "domestic partner"); *see also* 2001 Stats., ch. 893].

For the purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030* only, if the claimant voluntarily left the employment without notification to the employer of the reasons and the employer submits all of the facts within its possession concerning the leaving, the leaving is presumed to be without good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(d)*]. On the other hand, an individual whose employment is terminated under the compulsory retirement provisions of a collective bargaining agreement to which the employer is a party shall not be deemed to have voluntarily left his or her employment without good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(e)*].

[2] On Computation of Claim

An employer who is not entitled to receive notice of the filing of the claim under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* (base period employer who was not the last previous employer) but is entitled to receive notice of computation under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1329* (all base period employers) may, within 15 days after the mailing of the notice of computation or any extension of that period for good cause, submit to the department facts disclosing the matters set forth in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(a)* (*discussed under § 564.133[1]*) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(b)*; 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1030-1(b); *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 1032.5* (less than full-time work rendered for base period employer)]. A notice of computation or recomputation given to a base period employer under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1329* and *1330* shall not identify wages paid to the claimant by other employers [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1329-1].

The claimant and any base period employer to whom a notice of computation or recomputation is given may, within 20 days after the mailing or personal service of the notice or any extension of that period for good cause, protest the accuracy of the computation or recomputation [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1330*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1333-2]. The department must consider any protest and must promptly notify the claimant and the base period employer submitting it of the recomputation or denial of recomputation. An appeal may be taken from a notice of denial in the manner prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328* (*discussed under § 564.134*), and the director shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1330*].

Any base period employer shall, within 15 days after a notice of computation was mailed or within any extension of that period for good cause, submit to the department any facts then known which he or she was not previously required to submit to the department under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* that could affect the claimant's eligibility for benefits. If after the 15-day period the employer acquires knowlege of facts that may affect the claimant's eligibility and the facts could not reasonably have been known within the period, the employer shall, within 10 days of acquiring the knowledge or within any extension of that period for good cause, submit the facts to the department [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1331*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1333-1]. The department is required to make a determination or reconsidered determination and promptly notify the claimant and the base period employer of the determination or reconsidered determination and the reasons for it. An appeal may be taken in the manner prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*, and the director shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1331*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1328-1].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.134

§ 564.134 Department's Determination or Ruling

The department will consider the facts submitted by an employer pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* (*discussed under § 564.133[1]*) and, if benefits are claimed subsequent to the filing of the new or additional claim [*see § 564.132[1][a], [b]*], make a determination of the claimant's eligibility for benefits. The department must promptly notify the claimant and any employer who prior to the determination submitted any facts or gave any notice pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1327* or *1328* and authorized regulations of the determination or reconsidered determination and the reasons for it. Within 20 days from the mailing or personal service of the notice of the determination or reconsidered determination or within any extension of the period, the claimant and employer may appeal to an administrative law judge, and the director shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1328-1(b)].

If the employer is entitled to a ruling under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030(b)* (*discussed under § 564.133[2]*), or to a determination under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*, the department shall consider the facts submitted by the employer together with other information it has, and rule as to the cause of termination of the claimant's employment [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(c), 1328*]. Within 20 days after mailing or personal service of the notice of the ruling or reconsidered ruling, or within any extension of that period, the employer may appeal to an administrative law judge. The ruling may be reconsidered for good cause within five days an appeal is filed or, if no appeal is filed, within 20 days after mailing or personal service of the notice of the ruling, except that any ruling or reconsidered ruling relating to a determination which is reconsidered pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1332(b)* may be reconsidered by the department for good cause within 15 days after an appeal is filed or, if no appeal is filed, within 20 days after mailing or personal service of the notice of determination [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1030(c), 1332(b)*].

No ruling made under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030* may constitute a basis for the disqualification of any claimant, but a determination by the department made under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328* (determination of eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits) may constitute a ruling under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1031*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
2. Unemployment Compensation Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.135-564.149

[Reserved]

§§ 564.135[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.150

§ 564.150 Generally

Disability compensation is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272, 3300-3305*, and 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2601-1-3271-1. Workers' contributions to the Disability Fund are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 984* and *985* [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2901*]. Disability payments are made to eligible individuals from the Disability Fund or from a voluntary plan [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2625, 2712, 2712.5*; on voluntary plans, *see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3251-3272*]. Eligible minors may be paid and may receive disability benefits in their own right and a receipt signed by a minor is valid and binding [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2702*]. Benefits are payable by the Employment Development Department through public employment offices or other agencies approved by the Director of Employment Development [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2701*]. Initial payment for disability benefits to a monetarily eligible claimant who is otherwise determined eligible by the department under applicable law and regulation must be issued by the department within 14 days of receipt of the claimant's properly completed first disability claim [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2701.5*].

The benefit rights of industrially disabled persons are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2775-2778* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2777-1. Nonindustrial disability insurance for state employees is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2781-2783*. The exemption of individuals on religious grounds from making contributions to the Disability Fund and their ineligibility for benefits are covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2902*.

The statutory provisions governing disability compensation (*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2601 et seq.*) thus set out the provisions of three separate disability plans: (1) the state disability insurance program, which adopts to some extent the provisions governing unemployment insurance; (2) the nonindustrial disability insurance program, which incorporates some of the provisions of the state disability insurance program but is largely set forth in *Gov. Code § 8000 et seq.*; and *(3)* voluntary plans, which are adopted by some employers in place of the state disability and nonindustrial disability insurance programs. The state disability insurance program and the nonindustrial disability insurance program for state employees are two entirely separate and quite different systems. They differ in terms of eligibility, benefits, and funding, and there is no overlap between them. Because of the separateness of the two programs and the lack of any mechanism for transferring funds between them, a worker who made no employee contributions to the state disability insurance fund during his or her base period has no cognizable wages from employment for purposes of *Unemp. Ins.*

Code § 2652 [*Simpson v. Unemployment Ins. Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 342, 352, 231 Cal. Rptr. 690]* .

The liability of persons who are overpaid any amount as benefits is covered by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2735-2742*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.151

§ 564.151 Nature of Disability Insurance Law

The Unemployment Compensation Disability Act provides benefits, either through the State Disability Fund or under voluntary plans approved and monitored by the Director of Employment Development, for persons who are unable to work because of nonoccupational illness or injury, and is financed by a tax on wages of employees themselves. The act thus fills the gap between workers' compensation, which provides benefits for disability incurred during employment, and unemployment insurance, which affords benefits for involuntary unemployment suffered by persons who are physically able to work [*Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 713, 716-717, 235 Cal. Rptr. 636]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.152

§ 564.152 Family Temporary Disability Insurance

The Legislature has added Family Temporary Disability Insurance (FTDI), also called "Paid Family Leave," to the California Disability Insurance program. Beginning in July, 2004, an eligible worker can receive up to six weeks of FTDI benefits per year for family care leave [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(e)*; *see* 2002 Stats., ch. 901, § 7; *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2613(c)*]. The purpose of the FTDI program is to provide wage-replacement benefits to workers who exercise their rights under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act [*see 29 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq.*] and California's Family Rights Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 12945.1, 12945.2* (Moore-Brown-Roberti Family Rights Act)] to take unpaid, job-protected leave to care for a seriously ill child, spouse, parent, domestic partner, or to bond with a minor child within one year of the birth or placement of the child in connection with foster care or adoption [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3300, 3301(a)*].

Specifically, an employee will be eligible for FTDI benefits equal to one-seventh of his or her weekly benefit amount on any day in which he or she is unable to perform his or her regular or customary work because he or she is bonding with a minor child during the first year after the birth or placement of the child in connection with foster care or adoption, or caring for a seriously ill child, parent, spouse, or domestic if all of the following conditions are satisfied [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3303*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(e)* (defining "family care leave," although that term is not expressly made part of eligibility criteria)]:

(1) The employee has made a claim for temporary disability benefits as required by authorized regulations.

(2) The employee has been unable to perform his or her regular or customary work for a seven-day waiting period during each disability benefit period, with respect to which waiting period no FTDI benefits are payable.

(3) The employee has filed a certificate documenting the reason for taking leave [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2708, 2709*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 3306* (employee may be required to submit additional

medical evidence if it can be procured without additional cost to care recipient)].

For FTDI purposes, "child" means an employee's biological, adopted, or foster son or daughter; an employee's stepson, stepdaughter, or legal ward; a son or daughter of an employee's domestic partner; or a person to whom the employee who stands in loco parentis [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(c)*]. "Parent" means a biological, foster, or adoptive parent, a stepparent, a legal guardian, or other person who stood in loco parentis to the employee when the employee was a child [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(g)*]. A "domestic partner" has the same meaning as under the Family Code [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(d)*; *see Fam. Code § 297(b)* (domestic partnership established by filing Declaration of Domestic Partnership with Secretary of State)]. The term "seriously ill" is not defined in the statute, but "serious health condition" is defined as an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves inpatient care in a hospital, hospice, or residential health care facility, or continuing treatment or continuing supervision by a health care provider [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(h)*; *see Gov. Code § 12945.2* (similar definition under California Family Rights Act)].

The employee's weekly FTDI benefit is computed in the same manner as the weekly benefit under the state disability insurance program [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301(b)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2655*; *see also* "Amount of Benefits," *below*]. An individual is eligible to receive FTDI benefits equal to one-seventh of his or her weekly benefit amount for each full day during which he or she is unable to work due to caring for a seriously ill or injured family member or bonding with a minor child within one year of the birth or placement of the child in connection with foster care or adoption [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301(b)*]. The maximum benefit during any disability period is six times the employee's weekly benefit, and no more than six weeks of FDTI benefits may be paid in any 12-month period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301(c), (d)*].

FTDI benefits will not be paid if the employee is already receiving unemployment compensation, benefits from the state disability insurance program, or other temporary disability benefits under federal or state law [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2629(b), 3303.1(a)(1)-(3)*]. Benefits are also not payable for any day in which another family member is ready, willing, and able and available for the same period of time in a day that the employee is providing the required care [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3303.1(a)(4)*; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 3302(f)* ("family member" is child, parent, spouse, or domestic partner of employee)]. An employee who is entitled to leave under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) [*29 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq.*] or California's Moore-Brown-Roberti Family Rights Act (CFRA) [*Gov. Code §§ 12945.1, 12945.2*] must take FTDI leave concurrent with leave taken under the FMLA and the CFRA [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3303.1(b)*]. Finally, an employer may require the employee to take up to two weeks of earned vacation time before receiving FTDI benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3303.1(c)* (vacation time to be applied against seven-day waiting period for benefits)].

FTDI benefits are funded entirely by employee contributions to the Unemployment Compensation Disability Fund. Employee contributions begin on January 1, 2004 [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 984(a)(2)(B)*], and benefit payments are available beginning on July 1, 2004 [2002 Stats., ch. 901, § 7; *see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2613(c)*].

Except as specifically provided by statute, the FTDI program is administered in accordance with the policies of the state disability insurance program [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 3300(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawLeaves of AbsenceFamily & Medical Leave ActCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.153

§ 564.153 Definitions

[1] "Employment"

"Employment," for the purposes of disability insurance, is defined generally as meaning service included in the term "employment" as defined by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-2116*, relating to unemployment compensation benefits [*see § 564.71[4]*] [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2606(a)*]. The term is further specially defined with respect to service for a public entity, service perfomed in the employ of certain nonprofit corporations, community chests, funds, and foundations in connection with the operation of certain health facilities, and domestic service in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2606(a)* and *(b)* and *2606.5*, respectively.

The services performed for a public entity (defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 605(b)*), within the definition of "employment," are limited to four types [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2606(a)*]. The third is service performed by a state employee to the extent provided by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2781* (relating to nonindustrial disability insurance for state employees) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2606(a)(3)*]. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2781* must, however, be read together with *Gov. Code §§ 19878-19885* (formerly, *Gov. Code §§ 18135-18142*), relating to nonindustrial disability leave. Taken together, *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2781* and *Gov. Code § 19878* provide disability insurance for state employees who are members of the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS), members of the State Teachers' Retirement System (STRS), or employees of the Legislature. Members of the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) are not included, but are covered by the university's own nonindustrial disability insurance plan, which is not legislatively mandated [*Simpson v. Unemployment Ins. Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 342, 348-349, 231 Cal. Rptr. 690]* . Note, however, that in 1988, the Government Code provisions relating to industrial disability leave and nonindustrial disability leave for employees of the California State University were transferred to the Education Code. This was accomplished by repealing former *Educ. Code § 89526* and *Gov. Code §§ 19869.1* and *19878.1*, adding *Educ. Code §§ 89529-89529.11* and *Educ. Code §§ 89529.15-89529.25*, and amending *Gov. Code §§ 19875-19878* and *19885* [Stats. 1988, ch. 670]. These changes do not constitute a change in, but, rather, are declaratory of, the existing law [*see* Stats. 1988, ch. 670, § 11].

[2] "Disability Benefit Period"

"Disability benefit period," with respect to any individual, means the continuous period of unemployment and disability beginning with the first day with respect to which the individual files a valid claim for unemployment compensation disability benefits (for the meaning of "valid claim," *see § 564.153[4]*). Two consecutive periods of disability due to the same or related cause or condition and separated by a period of not more than 14 days is considered as one disability benefit period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2608*; *see Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 663, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837]* .

[3] "Disability Base Period"

"Disability base period," with respect to an individual who does not have an unexpired benefit year for unemployment compensation benefits, means the following [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2610*]:

(1) For disability benefit periods beginning in October, November, or December, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of June;

(2) For disability benefit periods beginning January, February, or March, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of September;

(3) For disability benefit periods beginning in April, May, or June, the four calendar quarters ended in the next preceding month of December;

(4) For disability benefit periods beginning in July, August, or September, the four calendar quarters ended with the next preceding month of March.

The "disability base period," with respect to an individual who has an unexpired benefit year for unemployment compensation benefits, is as follows [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2611*]:

(1) The same as the disability base period in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2610, above*, if the individual has sufficient qualifying earnings in that disability base period;

(2) The same as the base period used to establish the benefit year for unemployment compensation benefits [*see § 564.124[1]*] if the individual does not have sufficient qualifying earnings in the disability base period in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2610, above*.

For when quarters during which the worker was unemployed, or unemployed because of his or her involvement in a trade dispute, are excluded from the disability base period and preceding quarters substituted, see *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2612* and *2658*, respectively. For exclusions from the disability base period applicable to military trainees and to industrially disabled persons, see *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2770* and *2777*, respectively.

[4] "Valid Claim"

"Valid claim" means any claim for disability benefits made in accordance with the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Code and regulations if the individual is unemployed and disabled and has been paid wages in employment for employers necessary to qualify for benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2652, below* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2609*]. An individual cannot establish a valid claim unless he or she has been paid wages for employment by employers of not less than $300 during his or her disability base period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2652*].

The earnings during the base period used for determining eligibility for state disability insurance (*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2652*) must be subject to the state disability insurance tax in order to qualify as state disability "base period wages" [

Simpson v. Unemployment Ins. Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 342, 348, 350-354, 231 Cal. Rptr. 690 (holding that employee working in private sector when disabled was ineligible for state disability insurance when employer during base period was University of California, because base period employment was not subject to state disability insurance tax, and pointing out that worker was also ineligible for benefits under university's plan under which no benefits were payable for any day on and after separation from state service)].

[5] "Disability" and "Disabled"

The terms "disability" and "disabled" include (1) physical or mental illness or injury, including any illness or injury resulting from pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical condition; (2) inability to work because of a written order from a state or local health officer to an individual infected with, or suspected of being infected with, a communicable disease; (3) acute alcoholism being medically treated or, to the extent specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626.1*, resident status in an alcoholic recovery home; and (4) acute drug-induced illness being medically treated or, to the extent specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626.2*, resident status in a drug-free residential facility [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626*]. An individual who is a resident in an alcohol recovery home, or a drug-free residential facility, outside California pursuant to referral or recommendation by a physician is eligible for disability benefits to the extent provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626.1(c)* (alcohol recovery home) or *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626.2(c)* (drug-free residential facility) if an authorized representative of the home or facility certifies that the individual is a resident participating in an alcoholic recovery program or a drug-free residential program, licensed by or satisfying a program review by the state in which the facility is located [*Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2626.1(c), 2626.2(c)*].

An individual is deemed disabled on any day in which, because of his or her physical or mental condition, he or she is unable to perform his or her regular or customary work [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.154

§ 564.154 Submission of Notices, Protests, and Information

Required notices, protests, and information must be submitted in accordance with authorized regulations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.6*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.155

§ 564.155 Eligibility for Benefits

Eligibility for disability benefits is covered in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2625-2629.1*. However, the purpose of the unemployment compensation disability benefit system is to compensate in part for the wage loss sustained by any individual who is unable to work due to his or her own sickness or injury, the sickness or injury of a family member, or the birth, adoption, or foster care placement of a new child, and to reduce to a minimum the suffering caused by unemployment resulting from those circumstances [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2601*]. Thus, as a minimum, to be eligible for disability insurance benefits one must be a part of the covered labor force, that is, a wage earner, at the time of disability [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 140.5, 2601*]. Persons who are self-employed and who earn "profits" as distinguished from "wages" are not a part of the system and are not covered, unless they elect coverage and make contributions as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 708.5*, and this is so notwithstanding the fact that they were wage earners and made contributions during the disability base period as defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2610* [*Simon v. Unemployment Insurance Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1076, 1078, 238 Cal. Rptr. 589]* .

A disabled individual is eligible to receive disability benefits equal to one-seventh of his or her weekly benefit amount for each full day during which he or she is unemployed due to a disability and the Employment Development Director finds as follows [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627*]:

> (1) The person has made a claim for disability benefits as required by authorized regulations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627(a)*];
>
> (2) The person has been unemployed and disabled for a waiting period of seven consecutive days during each disability benefit period with respect to which waiting period no disability benefits are payable [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627(b)*];
>
> (3) Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2626.1* (resident of alcoholic recovery home), 2626.2 (resident of drug-free facility), and 2709 (certificate of disability or serious health condition of family member by authorized religious practitioners), the person has submitted to such reasonable examinations

as the director may require for the purpose of determining his or her disability [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627(c)*]; and

(4) Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2708.1* (person receiving temporary workers' compensation), the person has filed a certificate of disability as required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2708* (certificate of physician, dentist, podiatrist, or, with respect to normal pregnancy or childbirth, nurse-midwife or nurse-practitioner) or 2709 (certificate of authorized religious practitioner) [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627(d)*].

Effective January 1, 2004, eligibility for benefits extends not just to individuals who are unable to work because of their own disabilities, but also to those who are unable to work because of family circumstances. The family temporary disability insurance program, which has been established within the state disability insurance program, provides up to six weeks of wage-replacement benefits to workers who take time off work to care for a seriously ill child, spouse, parent, domestic partner, or to bond with a new child [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3300 et seq.*]. The weekly benefit under the family temporary disability insurance program is the same as the weekly benefit calculated for the individual's own disability, but it is limited to six weeks during any disability benefit period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.156

§ 564.156 Ineligibility for Benefits

An individual is not eligible for disability benefits with respect to any period for which the director finds that he or she has received or is entitled to receive unemployment compensation benefits under the laws of this or any other state or the federal government [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2628*]. Nor is an individual eligible for any day of unemployment and disability for which he or she has received or is entitled to receive "other benefits" in the form of cash payments, except as noted below [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629(a)*]. "Other benefits" means temporary disability indemnity under a state or federal workers' compensation law, permanent disability benefits for the same injury or illness under a state or federal workers' compensation law, or temporary disability benefits under a state or federal employer's liability law [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629(b)*]. However, if the "other benefits" are less than the amount the person would otherwise receive as disability benefits, the person is entitled to receive the difference [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629(c)*; *see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2708.1-1*].

Nothing in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629* is to be construed to authorize a delay in the payment of disability benefits unless the claimant is currently in receipt of other benefits or the department has received notice that the claimant's employer or insurer has agreed to commence the payment of other benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 2929.1(a)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.157

§ 564.157 Amount of Benefits

The weekly benefit amount depends on the amount of wages earned in the highest quarter of the individual's disability base period and ranges from a low of $50 to a high of $343 for periods of disability beginning after 1990 [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2655*]. Effective January 1, 2000, the maximum weekly benefit is equal to the maximum workers' compensation temporary disability indemnity weekly benefit amount [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2655(d)*; *see Lab. Code § 4453, 4653*]. Except for individuals who elect coverage under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 708* and *708.5*, the maximum amount of benefits payable to an individual during any one disability benefit period is 52 times his or her weekly benefit amount, but in no case more than the total wages paid to the individual during his or her disability base period [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2653*].

An individual eligible to receive disability benefits who receives wages or regular wages from his or her employer during the period of his or her disability or period of family care leave must be paid disability benefits for any seven-day week or partial week in an amount that does not exceed his or her maximum weekly amount and that, together with the wages or regular wages, does not exceed his or her weekly wage, exclusive of wages paid for overtime work, immediately prior to the commencement of his or her disability or period of family care leave [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2656(a)*]. To determine the wages or regular wages received by the eligible individual, the amount as stated by the individual is presumed to be accurate, and this presumption affects the burden of producing evidence [Unemp. Ins. Code § 2565(b)]. For purposes of periods of disability beginning after 1991, vacation pay is not considered wages for determining eligibility for disability benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2656(c)*]. The term "regular wages," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2656*, includes sick-leave benefits paid entirely by the employer directly to an employee during the period of the employee's disability [*Cooper v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 166, 168-171, 173 Cal. Rptr. 255* (holding inapplicable provisions of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265*, prohibiting any denial or reduction of benefits because of supplemental unemployment compensation benefits paid by the employer pursuant to an employer plan, on the grounds that *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265* is in a part of the code that deals with unemployment compensation benefits and does not apply to part dealing with disability benefits)].

For the determination of weekly wages when wages are paid at irregular intervals or in such a manner as not to extend

regularly over the period of employment, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2657* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2657-1.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsBenefit Entitlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.158

§ 564.158 Disqualification

[1] Fraud

A person is disqualified from receiving benefits for the period prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2675(b)*, if he or she willfully made a false statement or representation with actual knowledge of its falsity or withheld a material fact for the purpose of obtaining benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2675(a)*]. Persons receiving benefits who are suspected of fraud are entitled to an eligibility review before the department determines whether they are entitled to continue receiving benefits [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2675-1; *see § 564.162*].

[2] Confined as Dipsomaniac, Drug Addict, or Sex Offender

A person is also disqualified from receiving benefits while confined pursuant to a commitment, court order, or certification in an institution or other place as a dipsomaniac, drug addict, or "sexual psychopath" [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2678*; the statutory provisions for commitment of sexual psychopaths (later referred to as mentally disordered sex offenders) [former *Welf. & Inst. Code §§ 6300-6330* have been repealed]].

[3] Incarcerated

A person who is incarcerated because of a criminal violation of a state, federal, or municipal law or ordinance is not eligible for disability benefits. Incarceration includes any time spent in the custody of law enforcement authorities upon adjudication or conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction. This rule applies only to periods of incarceration beginning after 1993 [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2680*].

[4] Disabled Due to Commission of Crime

A person who commits a crime is not eligible for disability benefits if the person's disability was caused by or arose out of the commission of, arrest for, investigation of, or prosecution of any crime that results in a felony conviction. This rule applies only to convictions rendered after 1993, regardless of when the disability commenced [*Unemp. Ins. Code §*

2681(a), (c)].

[5] Disqualified From Receiving Unemployment Compensation

A person disqualified from receiving unemployment compensation benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1256* (quitting work without good cause or fired for misconduct connected with work), 1257 (false statement or representation or failure to report material fact, or who without good cause refused to accept suitable employment), 1260 (duration of disqualification), 1261 (successive disqualifications), and 1263 (conviction for false statement or concealment) is presumed to be ineligible to receive disability benefits for the same period or periods unless he or she establishes that he or she is suffering a bona fide illness or injury or claiming a period of family care leave and the director finds there is good cause for paying disability benefits [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2676*]. However, a person disqualified from receiving unemployment compensation benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* (person who left work because of trade dispute) is not disqualified from receiving disability benefits if otherwise eligible [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2677*]. Nor is a person, if otherwise eligible, disqualified for benefits for the day he or she (or a family member for whom the person was providing care) died [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2679*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsBenefit EntitlementsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityGood CauseLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.159

§ 564.159 Filing Claim for Benefits

Claims for disability benefits must be made in accordance with authorized regulations [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2706*; *see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2706-1, 2706-4]. A claim is made by filing a claim on a form furnished by the department not later than the 41st consecutive day following the first compensable day of unemployment and disability. The time may be extended by the department on a showing of good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2706.1*]. "Good cause" includes, but is not limited to, mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Gruschka v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 789, 791-793, 215 Cal. Rptr. 484]* . For the procedure for filing a claim for benefits by a person legally entitled to them under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1341* when the person eligible to receive disability benefits dies before making a claim, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2705* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2705-1. For the procedure for filing a claim on behalf of an eligible person who is mentally unable to do so and for payment, see *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2705.1* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2705.1-1.

A claim for family temporary disability insurance benefits must be filed not later than the 41st consecutive day following the first compensable day with respect to which the claim is made for benefits, and the time must be extended by the department on a showing of good cause. If a first claim is not complete, the claim form must be returned to the claimant for completion, and it must be completed and returned not later than the tenth consecutive day after the date it was mailed by the department to the claimant; this time must be extended by the department on a showing of good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.160

§ 564.160 Procedure on Claim and Appeal

The department must give notice of the filing of the claim to the claimant's last employer [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707*]. Within two working days after receipt of the notice or, if the claimant's service has been terminated, five days after the termination, whichever is later, the last employer must notify the department of any information it knows which may bear on the claimant's eligibility [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.1*]. The department shall consider the facts submitted by the employer, make a determination as to the claimant's eligibility, and promptly notify the claimant of the determination and its reasons. Within 20 days from the mailing or personal service of the notice of determination, or within any extension of that period, the claimant may appeal to an administrative law judge; the Employment Development Director shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.161

§ 564.161 Computation, Notice, and Protest

Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.3(b), below,* the Employment Development Department, on the filing of a claim for disability benefits, shall promptly make a computation on the claim which shall set forth the maximum amount of benefits potentially payable during the disability benefit period, and the weekly benefit amount and promptly notify the claimant of the computation [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.3(a)*]. However, no computation is made on a worker's claim for disability benefits under an approved self-insured plan if the uninterrupted period of disability does not exceed the waiting period prescribed for benefits from the Disability Fund under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2627(b), discussed under § 564.155* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.3(b)*]. The claimant may file a protest within 20 days, or within any extension thereof, after the mailing or personal service of the notice of computation and appeal from a notice of denial of recomputation in the manner prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.2* (*discussed under § 564.160*); the Employment Development Director shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.162

§ 564.162 Eligibility Review for Suspected Fraud

Any person who is receiving benefits but whom the department suspects of having made a fraudulent claim is entitled to an in-office eligibility review before the department decides whether that person is entitled to continue receiving benefits. The purpose of the review is to give the person a fair and equitable opportunity to be heard in person [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2675-1(a)]. For purposes of this review, fraud includes, but is not limited to, a claim filed by a person other than the individual named on the claim form, a medical certificate that cannot be substantiated, a willful false statement or representation, the withholding of a material fact concerning eligibility for benefits, or an organized scheme to defraud the department [22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2675-1(b)(1)]. For details of the procedures applicable to this review, see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2675-1.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudFraud Against the GovernmentFalse ClaimsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim Procedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.163

§ 564.163 Reconsideration

The Employment Development Department for good cause may reconsider any determination prior to the filing of an appeal from it, or within 30 days after an appeal to an administrative judge is filed, and the department must promptly notify the claimant of any reconsidered determination. The claimant may appeal from a reconsidered determination in the manner prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.2* (*discussed under § 564.160*). The Director of Employment Development shall be an interested party to any appeal [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.5(a)*].

The department may also for good cause reconsider any computation or recomputation in the manner and within the times specified in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.5(b)* and must promptly notify the claimant of the recomputation. The claimant may protest the accuracy of the recomputation as prescribed in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.4* [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 2707.5(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.164

§ 564.164 Levels of Administrative Appeal

As in the case of a claim for unemployment compensation benefits (*see § 564.120*), there are two levels of administrative appeal available to an employee aggrieved by an order or decision of the Director of Employment Development relating to disability benefits. The first is by appeal to an administrative law judge [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2707.2, 2707.4, 2707.5, 2712, 2712.5, 2737*]. The second is by appeal to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2712, 2712.5, 2737*].

Neither the Board nor an administrative law judge has the authority to award interest on a retroactive lump-sum payment that the Board or judge determines is owed to the claimant. The retroactive amount, covering the period from the first day of eligibility to the date the claimant is administratively determined to be eligible for disability benefits, is not equivalent to "damages" assessed in a civil action, and so *Civil Code § 3287(a)*, which authorizes a *trial court* to award prejudgment interest, is inapplicable [*see Weber v. Board of Retirement (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1444-1452, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769]* . On the other hand, if the Board *denies* disability benefits and the claimant brings a mandamus action to recover the benefits, the court may award prejudgment interest under *Civil Code § 3287(a)* on the amount of benefits wrongfully denied by the Board [*see American Federation of Labor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1996) 13 Cal. 4th 1017, 1033-1042, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109, 920 P.2d 1314.]* .

For rules governing payment of disability benefits pending a claimant's appeal in situations where the department initially determines a claimant to be eligible for benefits, the department subsequently determines that the claimant is ineligible or disqualified for benefits, and the claimant files an appeal from the subsequent determination, see 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2706-5.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment

InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
3. Disability Insurance Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.165-564.179

[Reserved]

§§ 564.165[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
4. Judicial Review

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.180

§ 564.180 Time Limit on Judicial Review

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right of the Employment Development Director, or of any other party except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1241* and *1243* [*see § 564.79[2][c], [d]*] and *Unemp. Ins. Code § 5313* (relating to work incentive programs), to seek judicial review from a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board must be exercised not later than six months after the date of the decision or the date on which the decision is designated a precedent decision, whichever is later [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*, fourth paragraph; *see Tarkington v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1502-1508, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 131* (six-month period under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410* is subject to equitable tolling while plaintiff pursues alternative remedy reasonably and in good faith)]. The board must attach to all of its decisions subject to judicial review an explanation of the party's right to seek review [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*, fifth paragraph].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
4. Judicial Review

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.181

§ 564.181 Right of Director to Seek Judicial Review

The Employment Development Director has the right to seek judicial review from a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board whether or not he or she appeared or participated in the appeal to the administrative law judge or to the appeals board [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*, third paragraph].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
4. Judicial Review

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.182

§ 564.182 Review by Administrative Mandate

Court review of decisions of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board relating to the eligibility of unemployed workers for unemployment compensation or disability benefits may be had by a proceeding in administrative mandate under the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*see, e.g., Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 591-592, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63* (unemployment compensation benefits); *Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 660, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837* (unemployment disability benefits); *see also Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 321, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110* (complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief involving construction of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1375* and *1379*, relating to recovery of overpayment of benefits, treated by trial court as petition for administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*); *see §§ 564.300, 564.301*].

For full discussion of administrative mandate, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
4. Judicial Review

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.183

§ 564.183 Standard and Scope of Review

[1] By Superior Court

In reviewing a decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board on a petition for writ of mandate, the superior court must exercise its independent judgment on the evidence in the administrative record [*MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 211-212, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453* (review on employee's petition of decision denying unemployment insurance benefits); *Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 774-782, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707* (review on employer's petition of grant of unemployment insurance benefits); *Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 661, 668, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837* (review on employee's petition of decision denying disability benefits)]. That is, the independent judgment standard, and not the substantial evidence test, applies [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

[2] By Appellate Court

On review of the trial court's judgment in an administrative mandate proceeding, the substantial evidence test applies. That is, except when the trial court admits relevant evidence which, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been produced or which was improperly excluded at the hearing before respondent (*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*), the scope of appellate review is limited to a determination of whether the trial court's decision is supported by substantial evidence [*Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63* ; *see Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 635, 638, 256 Cal. Rptr. 142]* . Thus, the appellate court is ordinarily confined to an inquiry as to whether the findings and judgment of the trial court are supported by substantial, credible, and competent evidence [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 585, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61]* . All conflicts in the evidence must be resolved in favor of the respondent and all legitimate and reasonable inferences must be made to uphold the superior court's finding [*Amador v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 671, 685, 200 Cal. Rptr. 298, 677 P.2d 224* ; *see Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 635, 638, 256 Cal. Rptr. 142]* . If there is any credible evidence in support of the superior court's findings, contrary evidence must be disregarded, and the judgment upheld [

Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63] . Even when the trial court's findings are contrary to those of the board, they cannot be overturned for evidentiary insufficiency if they are substantially supported [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 108, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244]* .

However, if the facts are undisputed and opposing inferences may not reasonably be drawn from those facts, the question of whether or not an employee had, for example, good cause for refusing to perform certain work or for leaving his or her work is an issue of law [*Amador v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 671, 685, 200 Cal. Rptr. 298, 677 P.2d 224* ; *Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 585, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61]* . Thus, if the probative facts are not in dispute, and those facts clearly require a conclusion different from that reached by the trial court, the latter's conclusions may be disregarded by the appellate court [*Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 585, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61]*
.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits
4. Judicial Review

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.184-564.199

[Reserved]

§§ 564.184[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.200

§ 564.200 State Statutes

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 401 et seq.*

Hearing procedure. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1951 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.201

§ 564.201 Administrative Regulations

Proceedings before administrative law judges and before Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 5000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.202

§ 564.202 Decisions

[1] Evidence

Affidavits as competent evidence. *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 598, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63*

[2] Precedent Decisions

Judicial review of precedent decisions. *Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 108-109, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244*

Trial court's judgment reversing precedent benefit decision as required to be upheld if there is any substantial evidence in support of court's findings. *Board of Education v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 674, 683, 206 Cal. Rptr. 788*

[3] Privilege Against Self-Incrimination

Effect of privilege against self-incrimination. *Escamilla v. Superior Court (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 730, 732-735, 76 Cal. Rptr. 704*

[4] Right to Legal Representation

Department of Employment (now Employment Development Department) as not required to advise claimant of availability of counsel on administrative review or to provide claimant with appointed counsel. *Staley v. California Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 675, 677-678, 86 Cal. Rptr. 294*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsStare DecisisAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceAdmissibilityPrivilegeCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.203

§ 564.203 Law Reviews

Comment, "Asserting Confidentiality: The Need for a Lay Representative-Claimant Privilege." *15 Pacific L. J. 245 (1984)*

Comment, "Religious Organizations and the Unemployment Insurance Code; Is California Playing Favorites with Churches?" *10 Pacific L. J. 225 (1979)*

Livingston, "Organizations and Administrative Practice--A Balance to the Corporate State?" *26 Hastings L. J. 91 (1974)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidencePrivilegesGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & Definitions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.204-564.219

[Reserved]

§§ 564.204[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.220

§ 564.220 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Appeal

Administrative appellate review by administrative law judge of assessment, denial of refund or credit, or transfer of reserve account. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1221-1224*

[2] Alternative Methods of Financing Unemployment Insurance Coverage

Nonprofit organization. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 801, 801.5*

State of California or instrumentality of state or of state and one or more other states. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 802*

Method of financing coverage. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 803*

Effect of acquisition of or succession to another entity. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 803.1*

Effect of acquistion by nonprofit corporation of favorable reserve account. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 803.2*

Unregistered organization (as defined) may to elect reimbursement financing as method of financing its liability for unemployment compensation benefits when Director of Employment Development finds that organization has good cause for failing to register as employer. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 805*

Notice required to be given by Employment Development Department to public entity which has elected a method of financing under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 803*. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 806*

Financing coverage for public school employees. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 821-832*

Financing coverage for local public entity employees. Stats. 1985, ch. 1217, § 13

[3] Collection of Employee and Employer Contributions

Priority and lien of tax. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1701-1703*

Liability of successors, officers, and fiduciaries. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1731-1736*

Notice of levy. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1755-1758*

Warrant for collection. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1785-1787*

Summary judgment. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1815-1818*

Civil action. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1851-1855*

Additional remedies for collecting delinquent contributions, interest, and penalties. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1860*

Offers in compromise of delinquent contributions, interest, and penalties. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1860*

[4] Contributions and Reports

Definitions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 901-906*

Wages as basis of contribution. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 926-940*

Contribution rates. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 976-994*

Reserve accounts. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1025-1037*

Transfer of reserve accounts. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1051-1060*

Records, reports, and contribution payments. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1085-1098*

Payment of reported contributions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1110-1116*

Assessments. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1126-1142*

Refunds and overpayments. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1176-1185*

Service of notices. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1206*

Administrative appellate review. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1221-1224*

Judicial review. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1241-1243*

[5] Court Calendar Preference

Courts as required to give calendar preference to any civil action by or against Director of Employment Development over all other civil litigation except equity cases, cases involving extraordinary writs, or summary proceedings. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1853*

[6] Disability Compensation

General provisions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-2612*

Disability benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2625-2778*

Nonindustrial disability insurance for state employees. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2781-2783*

Worker contributions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2901-2903*

Financial provisions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3001-3075*

Voluntary plans. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3251-3272*

[7] Elective Coverage

Election that employing unit not subject to *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 100-4751* (relating to unemployment and disability compensation) be deemed employer subject to such statutes. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 701, 702.1, 702.6, 709, 710.4, 710.5, 710.6, 710.7, 710.8, 710.9*

Election that services not constituting employment be deemed employment. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 702-703, 710*

When election must not be approved. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 704*

Termination of elective coverage. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 704.1-706, 711*

Notice of election or termination. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 707*

Employers' election to qualify for benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 708*

Election of self-employed persons to qualify for benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2601-3272* (relating to disability benefits). *Unemp. Ins. Code § 708.5*

Contributions and credits. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 712, 713*

[8] Employer-Employee Relationship

Rules applicable to determining employer-employee relationship. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 606.5*

[9] Extended Duration Benefits

Reserve accounts. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3701, 3702*

[10] Federal-State Extended Benefits

Reserve accounts. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4701, 4702*

[11] Hearing Procedure

Manner of presenting disputed claims, appeals, and petitions, reports required from claimant and employing unit and conduct of hearings, as required to be in accordance with rules prescribed by Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1951*

Rules of evidence or procedure and recording of proceedings. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1952*

Who may administer oaths, take depositions, certify official acts, and issue subpoenas. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1953*

Enforcement of subpoenas. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1954*

Duty to attend, testify, and produce required records. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1955*

Witness fees. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1956*

Right to representation by counsel before appeals board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1957*

Authorization for representation of claimant. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1957.5*

Costs. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1958*

Delegation of powers by appeals board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1959*

Nonconclusive, nonbinding, and nonevidence effect on separate or subsequent actions or proceedings before California or United States arbitrator, court, or judge of findings, judgment, conclusion, or final order of hearing officer, administrative law judge, or person with authority to make findings of fact or law in any action or proceeding before Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1960*

[12] Settlement

Settlement of civil employment tax matter disputes. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1236*

[13] Violations and Penalties

Right of civil action against contractor that successfully bid on public works contract, by second lowest bidder that suffered damage based on denial of bid because of successful bidder's violation of *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.* or of Unemployment Insurance Code. *Lab. Code § 1750*; *Pub. Contract Code §§ 19102, 20104.70*

Monetary penalty for failure to file employer's reconciliation return described in either *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1088(e)* or *Unemp. Ins. Code § 13021(j)*. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1117*

Personal liability of officers, major stockholders, and other persons having charge of a corporation, association, registered limited liability partnership or foreign limited liability partnership, or limited liability company employing unit which willfully fails to pay contributions or withholdings *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1735*

Misrepresentations and concealment. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2101, 2101.5*

Overdeductions from workers. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2103*

Failure to appear, testify, or produce books or things. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2104*

Failure to make required records available for inspection. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2105*

Failure to furnish required reports. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2106*

Withholding information to aid individual to obtain benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2107*

Nonpayment of contributions. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2108*

Failure of executive officers of corporation, association, or limited liability company to register corporation, association, or limited liability company as employing unit or to submit contribution reports. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2109*

Failure to pay deductions withheld from workers. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2110*

Unauthorized disclosure of confidential information obtained in course of administration of unemployment insurance law. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2111*

Failure to pay contributions agreed to be paid for workers without deduction from remuneration paid to workers. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2110.3*

Failure to withhold deductions in trust and exception. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2110.5*

Failure to hold in trust contributions agreed to be paid for workers without deduction from remuneration. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2110.7*

Violation of law or authorized regulation. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2112*

Report or registration of fictitious employee or fictitious wages to Employment Development Department. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2114*

False report of wages or time period. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2115*

Penalty for failure, with or without intent to evade statutory or Employment Development Department requirement, to file return or report or supply information required by Unemployment Insurance Code, for making false or fraudulent return or report or for supplying false or fraudulent information. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2117*

Penalty for willful failure, with intent to evade tax imposed, to file return or report or supply information, or for willfully, with like intent, making false or fraudulent return or report or supplying false or fraudulent information. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2117.5*

Penalty for failure, without intent to evade, to withhold pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 13020* (relating to state income taxes) or to pay over tax withheld. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2118*

Penalty for willful failure to collect, truthfully account for, and pay over any tax or amount required to be withheld.

Unemp. Ins. Code § 2118.5

Willful failure to furnish statement required by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 13050* (annual statement to employee of wages paid, amounts deducted, etc.) in manner, at time, and showing information required by that section or for willfully furnishing false or fraudulent statement. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2119*

Willful failure to supply employer with information required under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13040, 13041*, or *13042* (relating to withholding taxes on wages) which would require increase in tax to be withheld under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 13020* or who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2120*

Willfully aiding, assisting in, procuring, counseling, coercing, or advising preparation or presentation of return, report, affidavit, claim or other document fraudulent or false as to any material matter. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2121*

Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2117, 2117.5, 2118*, and *2118.5*, penalty for violation of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2101-2127. Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122*

Payment of fines. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122.5*

Certificate of Employment Development Department to the effect that return or report has not been filed or information has not been supplied as required by *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 13000-13101* (relating to withholding taxes on wages) as prima facie evidence of that fact. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2123*

Place of trial. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2124*

Action or prosecution must be instituted within four years after discovery of offense. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2125*

Court has discretion to charge any person or employing unit convicted of offense with costs of investigation and prosecution. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2126*

Penalties are cumulative; prosecutor may compromise penalty with consent of Employment Development Department. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2127*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsIndependent Contractors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.221

§ 564.221 Administrative Regulations

[1] Contributions and Reports

"Wages" the basis of the contribution. *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 926-1 et seq.*

Contribution rates. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 982-1-991(b)-1

Reserve accounts. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1026-1-1036-2*

Transfer of reserve accounts. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1051-1-1060-1*

Records, reports, and contribution payments. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1085-1-1097-1*

Extensions of time for paying contributions and filing returns. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1111-1

[2] Definitions

"Code," terms defined in code, "month," "day," and "social security number." 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 125-1

"Week," for contribution purposes. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 143-1

[3] Employment

Assistant and substitute employees-constructive knowledge. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 606-1

Segregation of exempt services and subject employment. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 607-1

Employer-employee relationship: common law rules. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 621(b)-1

Special classes of employees. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 621(c)-1

Excluded services. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 629-1-653-1*

Musicians. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 680-1

Elective coverage. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 701-1-710-1*

Elections for financing unemployment insurance coverage. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 803-1-803-4*

[4] Refunds and Overpayments

Disposition of erroneous worker contributions. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1178(c)-1

Denial of claim for refund or credit. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1180-1

"Date of the allowance" of refund or credit. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1181-1

[5] Withholding Tax on Wages

General provisions. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4304-1-4309-3*

Withholding and payment of tax. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4320-1-4331-1*

Withholding exemptions. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 4340-1

Reports, returns, and statements. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4350-1-4355

Collections. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4370-1, *4371-1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsIndependent Contractors

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.222

§ 564.222 Decisions

[1] Actions to Recover Erroneously or Illegally Assessed Contributions

Actions to recover contributions, penalties, and interest. *Manchester Avenue Co. v. Stewart (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 307, 325 P.2d 457* (action by golf course operator to recover unemployment insurance taxes paid under protest on behalf of golf course caddies); *Bell-Brook Dairies, Inc. v. Bryant (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 404, 218 P.2d 1* (action involving erroneous charge of unemployment benefits against reserve account, plaintiff having failed to receive any notice of filing of applications for unemployment benefits); *Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 168 P.2d 686 , overruled on another point, People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-480 n.8, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* (action to recover unemployment insurance taxes paid under protest arising out of question whether mine operators were employees or independent contractors); *California Emp. Com. v. Kovacevich (1946) 27 C2d 546, 165 P.2d 917* (action to recover unemployment insurance contributions claimed to be due involving agricultural labor); *Andrews v. California Emp. Com. (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 568, 165 P.2d 929* (action to recover unemployment insurance contributions paid under protest and involving agricultural labor); *Zuckerman-Mandeville, Inc. v. Sheffield (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 793, 88 Cal. Rptr. 57* (action to recover unemployment insurance taxes paid under protest by farming corporation; judgment for plaintiff reversed); *Aladdin Oil Corp. v. Perluss (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 603, 41 Cal. Rptr. 239* (action to recover unemployment insurance contributions, interest, and penalties paid under protest following an assessment; judgment for defendant affirmed); *California Emp. etc. Com. v. Lund (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 567, 173 P.2d 379* (consolidated actions to collect unemployment insurance contributions from garage owner and to recover taxes on contributions paid by him under protest; judgment for garage owner affirmed)

Employer who paid under protest Employment Development Department's levy of assessment for unemployment tax contributions on unreported wages of musicians made pursuant to former *Unemp. Ins. Code § 681* (making certain musicians under prescribed conditions statutory employees of person utilizing their services) were not entitled to refund on ground statute was repealed before assessment had become "due and payable" as defined in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1703(b)*, because *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1703* relates to perfection and enforcement of state tax lien on unpaid contributions, that is, to collection of contributions, and not to employer's liability to pay them, which liability was established prior to repeal, and Legislature, in repealing former *Unemp. Ins. Code § 681*, did not provide for forgiveness

of all earlier tax liability or elimination of department's earlier assessments. *Hotel Del Coronado Corp. v. Employment Development Dept. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 59, 61-62, 255 Cal. Rptr. 804*

When essential facts of unemployment taxation case are not in conflict, nor reasonably susceptible of conflicting inferences, question of legal relationship arising from those facts is one of law. *Avchen v. Kiddoo (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 532, 535, 246 Cal. Rptr. 152* (relationship between nurses and nurses' registry was question of law on undisputed facts in action for refund of taxes paid)

[2] Burden of Proof

Burden of proof in action for refund as on taxpayer-plaintiff. *Aladdin Oil Corp. v. Perluss (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 603, 610, 41 Cal. Rptr. 239*

[3] Contributions

Under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 977*, rate of employer's contribution to Unemployment Fund (pooled fund contributed to by all employers) is based on ratio between its average base payroll and net balance in its reserve account; decision awarding unemployment insurance benefits to claimant that are chargeable to reserve account of claimant's employer has effect of increasing employer's rate of contributions to *Unemployment Fund. Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 234, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871*

Employer as required to make unemployment insurance contributions in favor of writers of television shows. *Tieberg v. Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 943, 946, 88 Cal. Rptr. 175, 471 P.2d 975*

Adjustment of contribution rates for periods elapsing pending appeal in prior action for refund. *Manning's, Inc. v. Burkett (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 43, 44-46, 286 P.2d 13*

[4] Employee vs. Agent

Legislature has enacted numerous statutes in Business & Professions Code explicitly defining nature of relation between nurses and nurses' registries as one of agency [*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2732.05* and former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9958 et seq.* (repealed by Stats. 1989, ch. 704, § 1; *now see Civ. Code §§ 1812.524-1812.533*)] and, hence, in action by nurses' registry to recover unemployment taxes paid under protest, trial court properly found that registry was not nurses' employer when agreement signed by nurses at time they enrolled with registry was nonexclusive and appointed registry as their agent to assist them in securing employment, registry's role was to alert nurses to openings after which nurses themselves negotiated time, pay rate, assignments, and working conditions directly with their prospective employers, and registry's role was that of commercial matchmaker. *Avchen v. Kiddoo (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 532, 535-537, 246 Cal. Rptr. 152* (noting that holding was in accord with *Unemp. Ins. Code § 606.5*, which was effective after trial of case)

[5] Employee vs. Independent Contractor

Determination of whether services are those of employee or independent contractor. *Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 43-44, 168 P.2d 686 , overruled on another point, People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-480 n.8, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321* ; *Santa Cruz Transportation, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1363, 1371, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 64* ; *Sudduth v. California Emp. Stab. Com. (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 304, 313-314, 278 P.2d 946*

[6] Experience Rating Formula

Contributions resulting from improper charges for unemployment claims against employer's account as not to be considered in experience rating formula (cumulated contributions minus cumu lated charges for unemployment claims divided by one-third of wages paid by employer over three-yearperiod). *John Breuner Co. v. Perluss (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 163, 167-170, 33 Cal. Rptr. 580*

[7] Jurisdiction

Original jurisdiction of action involving legality of tax as in superior court. *Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Citizens etc. Bk. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 915, 916, 167 P.2d 752* ; *Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Municipal Ct. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 781, 784-786, 145 P.2d 361* ; *Unemp. etc. Com. v. St. Francis etc. Assn. (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 271, 280, 137 P.2d 64*

[8] Limitations on Judicial Actions

Mandate as unavailable to compel department to transfer its former unemployment insurance reserve account to its current account because contributions are in effect taxes, and judicial process to prevent or enjoin collection of taxes is prohibited by *Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 32* and *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1851*. *Lorco Properties, Inc. v. Department of Benefit Payments (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 809, 815, 129 Cal. Rptr. 312*

[9] Penalties

Intent to deceive as not required to merit imposition of penalty against employer pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030.5* for misrepresenting that claimant's employment was voluntarily terminated. *Diagnostic Data, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 556, 558, 110 Cal. Rptr. 157*

[10] Reserve Accounts

Unemployment insurance benefits paid to claimant and, pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1032*, not charged to employer's reserve account are paid out of pooled fund, and charge is allocated to account of every employer. *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 234-235, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1032, setting forth circumstances in which unemployment insurance benefits awarded to claimant are not charged to employer's reserve account, is intended by Legislature to operate in connection with *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (eligibility for benefits) so that later expansion of word "spouse" in section 1256 to include imminent spouse (claimant who leaves employment to join imminent spouse at distant location has quit for good cause) (*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-12(b)(1)) mandates use of same expanded definition applying section 1032. *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 233-238, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871*

[11] Statutory Interpretation

Uncodified provision of 1982 amendment of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits) states that amendment to section 1256 is intended to endorse Employment Development Department policy, as expressed in its regulations (*see* 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1256-12(b)(1)). *Altaville Drug Store, Inc. v. Employment Development Department (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 231, 236, 242 Cal. Rptr. 732, 746 P.2d 871*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReviewLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsIndependent Contractors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.223

§ 564.223 Attorney General Opinions

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board may conduct hearings on petitions for tax reassessment and review of denial of tax refund without first obtaining relief from automatic stay under Bankruptcy Code, where petitioner has filed bankruptcy and taxes accrued prior to commencement of bankruptcy proceedings. *69 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 51 (1986)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsBankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.224

§ 564.224 Law Reviews

Comment, "Religious Organizations and the Unemployment Insurance Code: Is California Playing Favorites with Churches?" *10 Pacific L.J. 225 (1979)*

Note, "Administrative Law: Unemployment Compensation: Proof Required by Employer Seeking to Remove Charges From His Reserve Account," *9 UCLA L. Rev. 208 (1962)*

Note, "Unemployment Insurance: Definition of Employee and Employing Unit," *33 Cal. L. Rev. 648 (1945)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsEvidenceGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawEmployment RelationshipsIndependent Contractors

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.225-564.239

[Reserved]

§§ 564.225[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.240

§ 564.240 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Appeal

Appeal to administrative law judge of determination of eligibility and hearing. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1328, 1331, 1334*

Appeal to Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1334, 1336*

[2] Child and Spousal Support

Withholding of support obligations from unemployment compensation or disability benefits. *Code Civ. Proc. § 704.120*; *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1255.7, 1342, 2630*

[3] Disability Benefits

Requirement that employer give notice of disability insurance rights and benefits due to sickness, injury, or pregnancy to each new employee and each employee leaving work due to pregnancy or nonoccupational sickness or injury. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2613*

To whom disability benefits are payable. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2625, 2627*

"Disability" and "disabled" defined. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2626*

Eligibility of alcoholic recovery home or drug-free residential facility resident. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2626.1, 2626.2*

Person entitled to unemployment compensation benefits as ineligible for disability insurance benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2628*

Effect on eligibility for disability if entitled to other benefits in form of cash payments. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629, relating to effect on eligibility when individual is entitled to other benefits in form of cash payments, is not to be construed to authorize delay of payment of disability benefits, and exceptions; when payments must commence. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629.1(a), (b)*

Duty of Employment Development Department when claim for disability benefits is filed. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629.1(c)*

Employment Development Department's right to reimbursement if employer or insurer disputes liability for payment of other benefits is subject to jurisdiction of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board in accordance with Lab. Code *§§ 5300 et seq. Unemp. Ins. Code* § 2629.1(d)

Procedure when liability of employer or insurer to reimburse Employment Development Department for disability benefits paid is established. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2629.1(e), (f)*

Requirement for valid claim. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2652*

Amount and duration of disability benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2653, 2655-2658*

Wages due and unpaid as deemed wages paid. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2654*

Disqualifications. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2675-2679*

Filing, determination, and payment of disability benefit claims. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2701-2714*

Overpayments. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2735-2742*

Rights of military trainees. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2765-2772*

Rights of industrially disabled persons. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2775-2778*

Nonindustrial disability insurance for state employees. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2781-2783*

Contributions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2901-2903*

Disability fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3001-3015*

Disability administration account. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 3051*

Disability benefit payment account. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 3075*

Voluntary plans. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3251-3272*

Ineligibility for benefits from Disability Fund of employee covered by approved voluntary plan. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 3253*

Administrative review of denial of employee's claim for disability benefits under approved voluntary plan; mandate as exclusive remedy for judicial review of Appeals Board's decision denying benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 3264*

[4] Disqualification for Unemployment Compensation Benefits

Person who quit most recent work without good cause or was discharged for misconduct. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*

Person discharged for use of intoxicants, including alcoholic beverages. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.4(a)*

Person who made false statement or withheld material fact in order to obtain unemployment compensation benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(a)*

Person who without good cause refused or when properly notified failed to apply for suitable employment. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1257(b)*

[5] Employment Training

Employment Training Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1610 et seq.*

Employment Training Panel. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 10200 et seq.*

[6] Extended Duration Benefits

Eligibility and disqualifications. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3551-3553*

Computation (amount and duration). *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3601-3603*

Filing, determination of claim, and payment. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3651-3656*

Overpayments. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 3751*

[7] Federal-State Extended Compensation

General provisions. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4001-4004*

Eligibility and disqualification. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4551-4558*

Computation (amount and duration). *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4601*

Filing, determination of claim, and payment. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4651-4656*

Notice to individual and employer who submitted facts pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4654* of department's determination of eligibility, and right of individual or employer to appeal to administrative law judge. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4655*

Ruling as to cause of termination of individual's most recent employment. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4701*

When federal-state extended benefits may be charged against employer's reserve account. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4702*

Overpayments. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 4751*

[8] Funds

Unemployment Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1521-1537*

Administration Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1555-1562*

Contingent Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1585-1590*

Benefit Audit Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 130.5, 1595-1598*

Employment Training Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1610 et seq.*

Disability Fund. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3001-3015*

[9] Judicial Review

Time limit on judicial review of decisions of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and exceptions. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*

[10] Liens

Judgment or settlement of action as provided for in *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3865* (relating to subrogation of employer in action against third-party tortfeasor) is subject, on notice to court, to same lien claims of Employment Development Department as are provided for in *Lab. Code §§ 4900-4909.1* and are to be allowed by court as it determines necessary to avoid duplication of payment as compensation to employee for lost earnings. *Lab. Code § 3865*

Workers' Compensation Appeals Board must allow lien equal to amount of unemployment compensation, unemployment disability benefits, and family temporary disability insurance benefits paid against sums to be paid as workers' compensation. *Lab. Code § 4903(f)-(h)*; *see also Lab. Code §§ 4903.2, 4904*; *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2629, 2629.1*

A claim for family temporary disability insurance benefits must be filed not later than the 41st consecutive day following the first compensable day with respect to which the claim is made for benefits, and the time must be extended by the department on a showing of good cause. If a first claim is not complete, the claim form must be returned to the claimant for completion, and it must be completed and returned not later than the tenth consecutive day after the date it was mailed by the department to the claimant; this time must be extended by the department on a showing of good cause [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 3301(e)*].

[11] Presumptions

Rebuttable presumption that person was discharged for reasons other than misconduct and that person did not voluntarily leave work without good cause. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*

[12] Unemployment Insurance Benefits

Eligibility and disqualifications. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1251-1265.9*

Retraining benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1266-1274.10*

Computation of unemployment compensation benefit award (amount and duration). *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1275-1342*

Overpayments. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1375-1384*

Extended duration unemployment compensation. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 3501-3751*

Federal-state extended compensation. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 4001-4751*

[13] Violations and Penalties

Any individual falsely certifying person's medical condition to obtain disability insurance benefits, with intent to defraud, as subject to penalty of 25 percent of benefits paid as result of false certification. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1143*

Employer that induces, solicits, or coerces employee to file false claim for benefits is subject to penalty equal to liability established against employee under *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1375, 1375.1*. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1144*

Assessment against person overpaid unemployment compensation benefits because of false representation or concealment of material fact for purpose of obtaining benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1375.1*

Misrepresentation or concealment to obtain, increase, reduce, or defeat any benefit or payment. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101*

Willfully making false statement or knowingly failing to disclose material fact, including, but not limited to, using a false name, false social security number, or other false identification, is a violation of Unemployment Insurance Code. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101*

Misrepresentation or concealment to obtain benefits under employment laws of another state. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2102*

Withholding information to aid individual to obtain benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2107*

Violation of law or authorized regulation. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2112*

Restitution for overpayment of benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2113*

Reporting or registering a fictitious employer or fictitious employee, and fictitious wages to Employment Development Department in order to obtain or increase benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2114*

False certification of medical condition to obtain disability insurance benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(a)*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(d)* (assisting, abetting, soliciting, or conspiring in act also unlawful)

Knowingly presenting false statement supporting claim for disability insurance benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(b)*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(d)* (assisting, abetting, soliciting, or conspiring in act also unlawful)

Knowingly soliciting, receiving, paying, offering, or accepting consideration for soliciting claimant to apply for disability insurance benefits. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(c)*; *see also Unemp. Ins. Code § 2116(d)* (assisting, abetting, soliciting, or conspiring in act also unlawful)

Penalty for failure, with or without intent to evade statutory or Employment Development Department requirement, to supply information required by Unemployment Insurance Code or for supplying false or fraudulent information. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2117*

Willfully aiding, assisting in, procuring, counseling, coercing, or advising preparation or presentation of document that is fraudulent or false as to any material matter. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2121*

Except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2117* or *2117.5*, penalty for violation of *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 2101-2127*. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122*

Place of trial. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2124*

Action or prosecution must be instituted within four years after discovery of offense. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2125*

Court has discretion to charge any person convicted of offense with costs of investigation and prosecution. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2126*

Penalties are cumulative; prosecutor may compromise penalty with consent of Employment Development Department. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2127*

Payment of fines. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122.5*

[14] Voluntarily Leaving Work with Good Cause

Individual whose employment terminated under compulsory retirement provisions of collective bargaining agreement as not deemed to have left work without good cause. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*

Individual may be deemed to have left most recent work with good cause if he or she left employment to accompany spouse (including person to whom marriage is imminent) or domestic partner to place from which it is impractical to commute to the employment. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationReview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.241

§ 564.241 Administrative Regulations

[1] Collections

Wage Garnishment Law (*Code Civ. Proc. § 706.010 et seq.*). *22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1755-1 et seq.*

[2] Definitions

"Code," "month," "day," and "social security number." 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 125-1

"Week," for contribution and unemployment compensation and disability benefit purposes. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 143-1, *1253-1*

"Applicant," "base period employer," "benefits," "claimant," "department field office," "maximum benefits," and "weekly rate." 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1251-1

"Commercial fishermen." *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1252.1-1* (totally unemployed), 1252.2-1 (partially unemployed)

"Week of unemployment." 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-2

"Week of unemployment" with respect to partial unemployment. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-3

"Week of unemployment," with respect to late or delayed filing of claim. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1253-4, *1253-5, 1253-8*

"Week of unemployment," with respect to person who resides in area served only by itinerant service of unemployment office. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1253-6

"Week of unemployment," with respect to person who resides in remote area not served by itinerant service. 22 Cal.

Code Reg. § 1253-7

[3] Disability Benefits

Disability insurance definitions. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2601-1, *2608-1*

Computation of benefits (amount and duration). 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2657-1, *2658-1*

Eligibility review for persons receiving benefits but suspected of fraud. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2675-1

Filing, determination, and payment of claims. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2705-1-2712-2*

Rights of trainees. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2768-1, *2770-1*

Rights of industrially disabled persons. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2777-1

Payments to the unemployed and noncovered. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 3012-1

Voluntary plans. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 3251-1-3271-1*

[4] Unemployment Compensation Benefits

Eligibility and disqualifications. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1251-1-1262-2*

Retraining benefits. 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1267-1, *1267-2*

Computation (amount and duration). 22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1277-2, *1282-1*

Work sharing unemployment insurance benefits. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1279.5-1-1279.5-10*

Filing, determination, and payment of claims. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1326-1-1341-1*

Recovery of overpayments. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1375-1

[5] Violations and Penalties

When department will seek criminal prosecution for receipt of benefits to which claimant is not entitled. 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 2113-1

[6] Work Incentive Programs

Employment preparation program. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4000-1-4000-5*

Pilot payment component. *22 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 4000-11-4000-15*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsCoverage & DefinitionsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.242

§ 564.242 Decisions

[1] Administrative Appeal

Administrative construction of term "good cause" as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*, relating to extensions of time within which to appeal decision of department as to eligibility for employment benefits to referee (now administrative law judge), so as to exclude cases in which delay was attributable to applicant or his or her counsel, no matter how reasonable or excusable, as subverting remedial purpose of statute and defeating legislative objective of providing prompt administrative adjudication of claims for unemployment benefits without recourse to technical and formal requirements. *Gibson v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 494, 496-497, 501, 108 Cal. Rptr. 1, 509 P.2d 945*

Good cause, as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*, providing that time to appeal decision of department relating to eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits to administrative law judge may be extended for good cause, as applying whether claimant or employer seeks to attack determination; meaning of good cause. *United States Postal Service v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 506, 514-515, 134 Cal. Rptr. 19*

Good cause for extending period for filing appeal from administrative decision denying unemployment compensation benefits to referee (now administrative law judge) as shown by facts that one day after claimant had been informed of decision denying benefits he placed matter of appeal in hands of legal aid attorney and, due to attorney's large case load and backlog of secretarial work, appeal was received at proper office one business day after 10 days allowed by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1328*. *Flores v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 681, 683-685, 106 Cal. Rptr. 543*

Applicant for unemployment insurance benefits as not denied due process of law by fact that after his application had been denied he had not been accorded hearing on merits by referee (now administrative law judge) of his eligibility when he failed to file timely appeal to referee and when he had been given opportunity (albeit unsuccessfully), with assistance of counsel, to show good cause for late appeal. *Hicks v. Sheffield (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 441, 442-443, 100 Cal. Rptr. 274*

Writ of mandate to review administrative decision that petitioner had been untimely in appealing withholding of unemployment benefits by Director of Employment as properly denied where no good cause for late appeal was shown. *Perez v. Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 62, 65-66, 83 Cal. Rptr. 871*

[2] Attorney Fees

In mandate proceeding to compel Employment Development Department and Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board to set aside determination and decision that petitioner was ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits because of her refusal to answer questions with respect to her pregnancy, though she later provided administrative law judge with certificate from her physician stating she was in good health and could work, petitioner as entitled to award of attorney fees both for services rendered at trial and on appeal under private attorney general theory codified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5*, since significant nonpecuniary benefit was conferred by case on large class of persons, namely, working women who become pregnant and unemployed. *Gunn v. Employment Development Dep't (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 658, 665-666, 156 Cal. Rptr. 584*

[3] Availability for Work

Denial of unemployment compensation benefits to nondenominational Christian who refused temporary position offered him by employment agency, which would have required him to work on Sunday, based on his sincerely held religious belief that, as a Christian, he could not work on "the Lord's day," violated *free exercise clause* of *U.S. Const., amend. I*, as applied to states through *U.S. Const., amend. XIV*, when state presents no interest that is sufficiently compelling to override individual's free exercise claim. *Frazee v. Illinois Dep't of Employment Sec. (1989) 489 U.S. 829, 109 S. Ct. 1514, 103 L. Ed. 2d 914, 917-921*

"Availability for work" within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)*, as requiring no more than that claimant (1) be willing to accept suitable work which he or she has no good cause for refusing, and (2) thereby make himself or herself available to substantial field of employment. *Glick v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 493, 499, 153 Cal. Rptr. 1, 591 P.2d 24* ; *Rios v. Employment Development Dept. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 489, 493-494, 231 Cal. Rptr. 732*

Migrant farm workers, who annually came to California to perform seasonable agricultural work and then returned home to Texas, and who applied for California unemployment insurance benefits when they failed to obtain work in Texas, presented substantial evidence of good cause for restricting their labor market by making themselves unavailable for work in California; evidence of simultaneous loss of work and affordable housing was sufficient to support trial court's finding that farmworkers had good cause to return to homes in *Texas. Rios v. Employment Development Dept. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 489, 494, 231 Cal. Rptr. 732*

Denial of full week's benefits based on claimant's declaration that he was unavailable for work for two days due to his observance of religious holidays as unconstitutional; interpretation of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)* permitting apportionment of benefits on daily, rather than weekly, basis as constitutionally compelled. *Jaffe v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 719, 721-725, 202 Cal. Rptr. 812*

Peripheral *First Amendment* or other right applicant for unemployment insurance may have to retain his selected hair styling (hair 13 inches in length tied behind head in pony tail and mustache and full beard which extended 3 or 4 inches below his chin), as yielding to dictate of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)*, requiring person seeking unemployment benefits to keep himself available for work. *Chambers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 923, 926-928, 109 Cal. Rptr. 413* (dictum, court holding that trial court erred in finding applicant ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits after determining there were no jobs available in his job market; person seeking unemployment relief as under no duty to keep himself available for work that did not appear to exist)

Unemployment benefits as improperly denied on ground that applicant voluntarily made himself unavailable for work (*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253(c)*) by his beard and other slovenly dress when there was no showing pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1258* that there was any potential employer to interview applicant. *Spangler v. California Unemp. Ins. App. Bd. (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 284, 288, 92 Cal. Rptr. 266*

[4] Base Period

Earnings during base period used for determining eligibility for state disability insurance [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2652*] must be subject to state disability insurance tax in order to qualify as state disability "base period wages." *Simpson v. Unemployment Ins. Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 342, 348, 350-354, 231 Cal. Rptr. 690*

[5] Benefits Generally

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1335 (prior to its 1971 amendment), permitting automatic termination of unemployment compensation benefits pending employer's appeal, as inconsistent with *42 U.S.C. § 503(a)(1)*, which requires payment of benefits when due. *California Dep't of Human Resources Development v. Java (1971) 402 U.S. 121, 122-124, 91 S. Ct. 1347, 28 L. Ed. 2d 666*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1255.3, providing for pension offset against unemployment compensation benefits received as enacted to comply with mandate of *I.R.C. § 3304(a)(15)*, requiring states to enact such provisions, and nothing more. *Evans v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 398, 408-410, 216 Cal. Rptr. 782, 703 P.2d 122*

Statutory requirements for prompt payment of benefits after determination of eligibility by referee as prohibiting withholding of payments pending employer's appeal of the determination. *Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. Livingston (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 942, 946-947, 178 Cal. Rptr. 680*

Claimant's rights to payment of unemployment compensation when due (*42 U.S.C. § 503(a)(1)*) and procedural due process (*Cal. Const., art. I, § 7*) as violated by practice of Employment Development Department in suspending payment of unemployment insurance benefits pending appeal to any continuing claim recipients determined by department clerk to be ineligible for further payments. *American Federation of Labor v. Employment Dev. Dept. (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 811, 817-821, 152 Cal. Rptr. 193*

Discharged employee as not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits for period between determination by supervisor of Department of Human Resources Development (now Employment Development Department) on reconsideration under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1332(a)* [*now see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1332(b)*] of original interviewer's finding of eligibility that employee was not eligible and decision of referee (now administrative law judge) on appeal upholding that determination. *Miranda v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 213, 218-221, 111 Cal. Rptr. 419*

Recovery of both unemployment disability benefits and worker's compensation for same period of unemployment as not permitted. *Martin v. California Dept. of Employment (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 804, 806-808, 105 Cal. Rptr. 111*

[6] Burden of Proof and Prima Facie Case

Applicant for unemployment insurance benefits as having burden of establishing eligibility. *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63*

When applicant's eligibility for unemployment insurance is at issue before superior court, burden of disqualification as on employer and not on employee. *Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 37-38, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540*

Employer as having burden of establishing that employee is ineligible for unemployment benefits by reason of misconduct. *Jacobs v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1039 n.7, 102 Cal. Rptr. 364*

Burden of establishing prima facie case that employee left work both voluntarily and without good cause as on employer, and meaning of phrase "without good cause," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030*, relating to submission of facts to department by employer showing whether applicant for unemployment compensation benefits left employment voluntarily and without good cause. *Cal. Portland Cement Co. v. Cal. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Board (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 263, 271-275, 3 Cal. Rptr. 37*

[7] Collateral Estoppel

Under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1960*, decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board finding that employee was discharged for misconduct does not collaterally estop employee from relitigating reasons for discharge in civil action for wrongful termination. *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 503, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1960, providing that findings, judgments, and orders in unemployment compensation proceedings are not conclusive or binding in separate or subsequent actions or proceedings, applies retroactively to all litigation pending at time of its enactment. *Mahon v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 616, 619-620, 245 Cal. Rptr. 103*

[8] Collective Bargaining Agreements

Eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits of employee who left work as required by provisions of collective bargaining agreement fixing limited tenure of employment under system of job rotation. *Pacific Maritime Asso. v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Board (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 325, 340-341, 45 Cal. Rptr. 892*

Pregnant employee required by collective bargaining agreement to take leave of absence at end of fourth month of pregnancy as eligible for unemployment compensation benefits when employee was still able to work for two more months. *Douglas Aircraft Co. v. California Unemp. Ins. Appeals Board (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 636, 642-648, 4 Cal. Rptr. 723*

[9] Disability Insurance

"Good cause," as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2706.1*, providing for extension for good cause of time within which to file claim for disability insurance benefits as including, without limitation, mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect. *Gruschka v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 789, 791-793, 215 Cal. Rptr. 484*

Construction of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2608*, defining "disability benefit period," with respect to consecutive periods of disability. *Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 663-668, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837*

[10] Disqualified Persons

Illegal alien as not entitled to collect unemployment benefits. *Alonso v. State of California (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 242, 253-254, 123 Cal. Rptr. 536 , cert. denied, 425 U.S. 903, 96 S. Ct. 1492, 47 L. Ed. 2d 752 (1976)*

Exclusion from unemployment insurance program of individual who is employed by son (*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 631*) as rational and reasonable classification in light of legislative objective. *Miller v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 168, 170, 172-173, 114 Cal. Rptr. 8*

[11] Duration of Disqualification for Benefits

Work performed by worker as condition of receiving general relief under county-operated work relief program does not constitute employment within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 601* (defining employment) or *Unemp. Ins. Code § 621* (defining employee) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 634.5(e)* (relating to public entities)], and hence does not constitute "bona fide employment," within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(a)* and 22 Cal. Code Reg. § 1260(a)-1, relating to duration of disqualification of worker for unemployment insurance benefits resulting from voluntary unemployment without good cause. *Ghent v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1172-1174, 228 Cal. Rptr. 631*

[12] Federal Law

State is not barred by *I.R.C. § 3304(a)(12)* (unemployment compensation not to be denied under state law solely on basis of pregnancy) from denying unemployment benefits to woman who left job due to pregnancy when state disqualifies all persons who leave jobs for reasons not causally connected to their work or to their employer. *Wimberly v. Labor & Industrial Rel. Comm'n (1987) 479 U.S. 511, 107 S. Ct. 821, 93 L. Ed. 2d 909, 912, 915-916, 919*

[13] Fraudulently Obtaining Benefits

Employment Development Department as not required to notify recipients of intent to file criminal complaint for fraudulently obtaining unemployment insurance benefits that restitution may be acceptable alternative to prosecution. *Manning v. Municipal Court (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 932, 936-937, 151 Cal. Rptr. 453*

[14] Good Cause for Leaving Employment

State's denial of unemployment compensation benefits to Jehovah's Witness who terminated his job because his religious beliefs forbade participation in production of armaments as violating *First Amendment* right to free exercise of religion. *Thomas v. Review Bd., Ind. Empl. Sec. Div. (1981) 450 U.S. 707, 709-720, 101 S. Ct. 1425, 67 L. Ed. 2d 624*

Worker who leaves employment to accompany nonmarital partner to another state in order to maintain familial relationship established with their child as constituting good cause for leaving work within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* (governing eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits). *MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 207, 212, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453*

Employee who quit employment in face of continuing harassment and threatened dismissal in retaliation for union activities and "whistle blowing" to public authorities, rather than waiting to be fired, as leaving employment for good cause. *Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 578, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61*

Voluntary termination of one's employment to follow nonmarital "loved one" as not constituting good cause for leaving employment when no marriage between them is imminent and there are no children of nonformalized relationship.

Norman v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 1, 3-10, 192 Cal. Rptr. 134, 663 P.2d 904

Substantial reduction in earnings (25 percent wage cut) as constituting good cause for leaving employment. *Bunny's Waffle Shop v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 735, 743, 151 P.2d 224*

Employee who reasonably and in good faith feared harm to his health from working in unventilated room filled with tobacco smoke and therefore voluntarily left his job as having good cause within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*. *McCrocklin v. Employment Development Dep't (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1074, 205 Cal. Rptr. 156*

Volunteering to leave work during mandatory reduction in work force in order to take place of less senior employee, according to provision in collective bargaining agreement, as constituting "good cause" for employee's leaving work within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*. *Stanford v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 98, 102, 195 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Insubstantial reduction in salary (7-2/3rds) as not constituting good cause for employee's leaving work, particularly when employee would not have quit but for belief that she was eligible to receive unemployment compensation benefits. *Maitland v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 331, 334-335, 181 Cal. Rptr. 587*

When record did not establish that coworker communication was expected or required condition of employment, employer's order to claimant to either speak to coworker or discontinue employment was unreasonable and claimant's leaving employment rather than speak to coworker as not a constructive voluntary leaving. *Steinberg v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 582, 584-587, 151 Cal. Rptr. 133*

Female employee discriminated against as to wages due to sex, who had made appropriate protest and request for equalization of compensation and who had been refused adjustment after employer had opportunity to do so, as having good cause for leaving employment. *Morrison v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 65 Cal. App. 3d 245, 247-253, 134 Cal. Rptr. 916*

When employer's policy regarding maternity leave violated Civil Rights Act (*42 U.S.C. § 2000e*), termination by employee after having at first been refused reinstatement after maternity leave and then rehired in lower grade but with same pay as being for good cause within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* when lower grade operated to deprive her of promotional opportunity. *Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 38-43, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540*

Trial court's determination of whether undisputed facts established a voluntary leaving without good cause, as defined by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*, as conclusion of law subject to judicial review. *Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 38, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540*

Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board as having abused its discretion in denying unemployment compensation benefits on grounds that in serving seven days in jail as result of inability to pay fine, worker, pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.1*, was deemed to have quit voluntarily without good cause. *Kaylor v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 732, 735-737, 108 Cal. Rptr. 267*

Applicant for unemployment insurance benefits as having left last employment without good cause within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* when he quit in order to attend English classes while work was available. *Perales v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 332, 335-337, 108 Cal. Rptr. 167*

[15] Misconduct

State's denial of unemployment compensation benefits to worker discharged for misconduct because of refusal to work on Sabbath, which was contrary to her sincerely-held religious convictions, violated Free Exercise of Religion Clause of *U.S. Const., amend. I.* *Hobbie v. Unemployment Appeals Commission (1987) 480 U.S. 136, 107 S. Ct. 1046, 94 L. Ed. 2d 190*

Employee's willful refusal to perform work which she reasonably and in good faith believed would jeopardize health of others as not constituting misconduct so as to disqualify her under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* from collecting unemployment benefits. *Amador v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 671, 686, 200 Cal. Rptr. 298, 677 P.2d 224*

Word "misconduct" is limited to conduct evincing such willful or wanton disregard of employer's interests as is found in deliberate violations or disregard of standards of behavior that employer has right to expect of employee, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree or recurrence as to manifest equal culpability, wrongful intent or evil design, or to show intentional and substantial disregard of employer's interests or of employee's duties and obligations to employer; mere poor performance is not equated with misconduct. *Robinson v. Hewlett-Packard Corp. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1108, 1123-1124, 228 Cal. Rptr. 591*

Trial court as having erred in finding that refusal of claimants for unemployment compensation benefits to work in radiation areas constituted misconduct justifying discharge (*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*) when evidence demonstrated each claimant's good faith belief that there was substantial health risk in working within assigned areas; reasons for refusing work that would constitute good cause for resignation also justify less drastic step of refusing work assignment. *Moore v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 235, 241-242, 215 Cal. Rptr. 316*

Misconduct under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* as requiring willful or wanton disregard of employer's interests as in deliberate disregard of reasonable standards of behavior, or in carelessness or negligence of such degree or recurrence as to show equal culpability; mere inefficiency, unsatisfactory conduct, inadvertencies, or ordinary negligence as not constituting misconduct. *Cerberonics, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 172, 176, 199 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 as proscribing contracts in restraint of one's profession, trade, or business; restraining individual from seeking employment elsewhere as violating this provision and constituting unreasonable burden on employee; hence, employee's refusal to sign agreement not to permit any competitor of employer to use her resume in submitting contract bids, although it resulted in employee's being fired, as not having committed misconduct for purposes of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*. *Cerberonics, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 172, 176-177, 199 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Question of reasonableness of employer's order for purpose of determining whether employee's disobedience constituted miscon duct as question of law for appellate court when facts are undisputed. *Cerberonics, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 172, 176, 199 Cal. Rptr. 292*

Employer as bearing burden of proving that order disobeyed by employee was given in language understood by employee in order to establish disqualification for benefits due to misconduct. *Lozano v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 749, 757, 182 Cal. Rptr. 6*

Trial court's finding that nurse was discharged for cause as supported by substantial evidence and therefore affirmed though, had trial court found otherwise, decision would also have been supported by substantial evidence and affirmed. *Davis v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 71, 76, 76 n.6, 117 Cal. Rptr. 463*

Trial court's findings that cleaning woman employed by nursing home was discharged for misconduct and thus disqualified for unemployment benefits as supported by substantial evidence showing employee was capable of

performing tasks assigned and that her failure to perform was due to carelessness and negligence of such degree and recurrence as to manifest wrongful intent and to show intentional and substantial disregard of employer's interests and of employee's duties and obligations to employer. *Agnone v. Hansen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 524, 528-529, 116 Cal. Rptr. 122*

Trial court's finding that conduct of restaurant employee established manifestation of persistent and enduring intractability impressing conduct with character of insubordination; that is, willful, deliberate violation of reasonable orders of employer, thus disqualifying her for unemployment benefits, as supported by substantial evidence. *Rowe v. Hansen (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 512, 522-523, 116 Cal. Rptr. 16*

Threatening bodily harm to supervisors as misconduct within scope of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*, and indefinite suspension of employee (treated as discharge for misconduct) on this ground disqualified employee from unemployment compensation benefits. *Morris v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 1002, 1005-1006, 110 Cal. Rptr. 630*

When refusal to shave beard may or may not constitute misconduct. *Thornton v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 180, 183-186, 107 Cal. Rptr. 892* ; *King v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 199, 204-207, 101 Cal. Rptr. 660*

Vulgar statement by employee as minor peccadillo and not misconduct justifying denial of unemployment insurance benefits. *Silva v. Nelson (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 136, 139-142, 106 Cal. Rptr. 908*

Employee's refusal to comply with employer's rule that back hair length shall be trimmed to at least one inch above shoulder level to be measured from colar bone as constituting misconduct under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* justifying denial of unemployment insurance benefits. *McCrae v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 89, 93-95, 106 Cal. Rptr. 159*

Trial court's conclusion that demoted employee's refusal to train man who was her replacement and new superior was reasonable and absolved her from charge of misconduct, though administrative agency had viewed same evidence and had made a contrary finding, as question of fact under circumstances of case and supported by substantial evidence. *Lacy v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 1128, 1132-1135, 95 Cal. Rptr. 566*

[16] Overpayment

Matters considered in determining liability of claimant for overpayment of unemployment compensation benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1375*. *Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 322-323, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110* (*see also* McAlister-Duffy-Greene Unemployment Benefit Pension Offset Refund Act (Stats. 1985, ch. 1217, §§ 1, 7, 11, 16)

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1379 (*now Unemp. Ins. Code § 1379(d)*), providing for setoff of overpayments of benefits against benefits to which claimant may become entitled as not in conflict with federal Social Security Act (*42 U.S.C. § 503(a)(1)*). Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 3l3, 326-327, *113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110*

[17] Penalties

Intent to deceive as not required to merit imposition of penalty against employer pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030.5* (repealed, *now see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101*) for misrepresenting that claimant's employment was voluntarily terminated. *Diagnostic Data, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 556, 558, 110 Cal. Rptr.*

157

[18] Pregnancy

State statute making pregnant women ineligible for unemployment benefits for specified period before and after childbirth as violative of *Fourteenth Amendment*. *Turner v. Dept. of Employment Security (1975) 423 U.S. 44, 45-46, 96 S. Ct. 249, 46 L. Ed. 2d 181, 184*

Mandatory unpaid maternity leave of public school teacher as violative of due process. *Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 643-644, 94 S. Ct. 791, 39 L. Ed. 2d 52*

Because pregnancy may render woman either unable to work or unavailable for work, inquiry by department and board into potential effect of apparent pregnancy on claimant's health as constitutionally permissible provided such inquiry is conducted in least intrusive manner possible. *Gunn v. Employment Development Dep't (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 658, 663-664, 156 Cal. Rptr. 584* (at p 664 n.5 pointing out that *I.R.C. § 3304(a)(12)*, relating to discrimination on basis of pregnancy, may preclude such inquiry)

Pregnant woman required to terminate employment after six months of pregnancy as not voluntarily quitting job. *Young v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 606, 610, 112 Cal. Rptr. 460*

[19] Presumptions

Rebuttable presumption in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256* that worker is presumed to have been discharged for reasons other than misconduct and not to have voluntarily left work without good cause unless employer gives written notice to the contrary as controlling burden of proof at each stage of proceedings in the appeal process for unemployment insurance benefits. *O'Connell v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 54, 57-59, 196 Cal. Rptr. 505*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256, providing that individual is presumed to have been discharged for reasons other than misconduct in connection with his or her work and not to have voluntarily left work without good cause unless employer has given written notice to the contrary to the department, as creating rebuttable rather than conclusive presumption. *Miranda v. Department of Human Resources Dev. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 314, 318-319, 109 Cal. Rptr. 35*

[20] Recall after Layoff

Recall offer after indefinite layoff as offer of "new work" and workers refusing recall offer due to trade dispute (*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1259* (refusal of unsuitable employment)) as eligible for unemployment benefits. *Campos v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 961, 974-975, 183 Cal. Rptr. 637*

[21] Representation by Counsel

Department of Employment as not required to advise claimant of availability of agencies providing free legal advice or to provide claimant with appointed counsel. *Staley v. California Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 675, 677-679, 86 Cal. Rptr. 294*

[22] Review on Mandate

When reviewing decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board on petition for writ of mandate, superior court as required to exercise its independent judgment on evidence in administrative record. *MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 211-212, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453* (review on employee's petition of decision denying unemployment insurance benefits); *Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 585, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61* (same); *Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 774-782, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707* (review on petition of employer of grant of unemployment insurance benefits); *Bilyeu v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 657, 661, 668, 181 Cal. Rptr. 837* (review on petition of employee of decision denying disability benefits); *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63* (review on petition of employer of decision granting unemployment insurance benefits)

Dispute about employer's liability for unemployment benefits as affecting both claimant's and employer's fundamental vested rights; hence, when either challenges board decision by administrative mandate (*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*), trial court as required to exercise independent judgment on evidence in administrative record. *Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101* ; *see Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 775-782, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707*

Exhaustion of administrative remedies provided by Unemployment Insurance Act as jurisdictional prerequisite to court review by mandate. *Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291-296, 109 P.2d 942*

Union has beneficial interest in outcome of proceeding and, hence, standing as representative of its members to petition for writ of mandate when (1) its members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right; (2) interests it seeks to protect are germane to organization's purpose; and (3) neither claim asserted nor relief requested requires participation of individual members in lawsuit. *Brotherhood of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1515, 1521-1524, 236 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Standard of review on mandate. *Brotherhood of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1515, 1525, 236 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Proper interpretation and application of statutes as well as regulations are questions of law for review by court; hence, appeals board's interpretation of "bona fide employment" as used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1260(a)*, relating to duration of disqualification of worker who voluntarily quits employment or is discharged for misconduct, is subject to review by court of appeal. *Ghent v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1171, 228 Cal. Rptr. 631*

Although strong presumption supports correctness of findings of administrative agency, agency's conclusions of law are subject to de novo review by court of appeal, independent of trial court, and, in that review, court looks to complete record before it. *Ghent v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1171, 228 Cal. Rptr. 631*

Although court of appeal may properly assume trial court exercised its independent judgment on evidence, appellate court as required to determine whether judgment is supported by substantial, credible, and competent evidence and whether different result was compelled as matter of law; when probative facts are undisputed and require different conclusion, conclusion reached by trial court may be disregarded. *Gruschka v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 789, 793, 215 Cal. Rptr. 484*

When administrative record may be augmented by evidence introduced at court proceeding. *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 594-599, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63*

Trial court in mandate proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* to review decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board as not required to make findings in sustaining demurrer to petition when only issue involved in case is one of law. *Carleson v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 145, 149-150, 134 Cal. Rptr. 278*

Judicial review of benefit decisions of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board as governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Jacobs v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 1035, 1040, 102 Cal. Rptr. 364*

Trial court in mandate proceeding under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* to review decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board as committing reversible error in sustaining demurrer to petition without leave to amend and failing to make findings of fact when proceeding presented factual issues on which court was required to exercise its independent judgment with respect to evidence presented at administrative hearing and to make findings in accordance therewith. *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Walls (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 284, 288-289, 2 Cal. Rptr. 847*

Right of employer whose reserve account is charged with payment of unemployment insurance benefits to seek judicial review by mandate. *Cal. Portland Cement Co. v. Cal. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Board (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 263, 269, 3 Cal. Rptr. 37* ; *Chrysler Corp. v. California Emp. etc. Com. (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 8, 14-15, 253 P.2d 68*

[23] School Employees

Under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3(g)* (providing that teacher assignment that is contingent on enrollment, funding, or program changes is not "reasonable assurance" of employment), assignments given to part-time, hourly community college instructors that depended on their ability to attract sufficient number of students to justify offering classes is contingent employment not constituting reasonable assurances of continued employment within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3*, and instructors are entitled to be paid unemployment benefits for period between fall and spring semesters. *Cervisi v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 635, 639, 256 Cal. Rptr. 142*

Substitute secondary school teacher as not entitled to unemployment compensation benefits during summer recess when he had worked as substitute teacher for school district during prior academic year and had been offered and accepted continued employment by district during next academic year, even though he had written on his acceptance that he did not accept district's offer as reasonable assurance of employment, but rather as opportunity for such, and district in its subsequent notice to substitute teachers contained statement that substitute teachers were given no assurance of employment, since by district's offer and his acceptance he had reasonable assurance, within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3*, of employment by district for next academic year. *Board of Education v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 674, 680-690, 206 Cal. Rptr. 788*

Denial of unemployment insurance to elementary school teacher's aide as proper when based on finding that aide had been given reasonable assurance within meaning of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1253.3* that she would be reemployed after school recess. *Russ v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 834, 845, 847, 178 Cal. Rptr. 421*

[24] Seek-Work Requirement

Trial court's finding that unemployed truck driver satisfied his union's seek-work requirements as supported by substantial evidence. *Rubino v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 405, 408-409, 105 Cal. Rptr. 158, 503 P.2d 614*

[25] Strikes and Lockouts

National Labor Relations Act (*29 U.S.C. §§ 151-187*) as not precluding state (New York) from authorizing unemployment compensation for workers while on strike. *N.Y. Tel. Co. v. N.Y. State DOL (1978) 440 U.S. 519, 540, 99 S. Ct. 1328, 59 L. Ed. 2d 553, 569, 571-572*

Locked out union members' unemployment as regarded as voluntary and bar to unemployment compensation benefits when it was reasonably foreseeable that selective strike by union against certain members of multiemployer bargaining group might result in retailiatory lockout by other members of the group. *Interstate Brands v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 770, 773, 782, 163 Cal. Rptr. 619, 608 P.2d 707*

Employee who left work in course of, and not because of, trade dispute for another reason constituting good cause as not ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262*, making person who left work because of trade dispute ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits. *Bunny's Waffle Shop v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 735, 738-742, 151 P.2d 224*

Disqualification of striking employees from receiving unemployment benefits imposed by *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* is not contingent on merits of controversy; section 1262 expresses two-pronged and balanced purpose of state to maintain its neutrality in trade dispute and not to use payment or withholding of benefits to aid either party to dispute; although dynamics and economic realities of situation leading to unemployment require examination, motive or justification underlying conduct of parties involved is immaterial. *Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513*

After negotiations for new collective bargaining between employer and labor union had reached impasse, employer's unilateral implementation of its last proposal, effecting wage and benefit reduction that resulted in strike when former collective bargaining agreement expired, was neither drastic economic weapon severing causal connection between existing trade dispute and employees' leaving work, nor constructive lockout rendering unemployment involuntary, when wages and benefits were essence of dispute and union had already voted overwhelmingly to strike rather than accept reduction. *Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045-1046, 1048, 1052-1053, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513*

Trade dispute disqualification of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* does not unconstitutionally discriminate against strikers because they join together in work stoppage as result of reduction in wages and benefits even though if they had not done so, but individually quit work because of reduction, there may have been good cause for leaving work under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256*. *Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1051, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513*

Disqualification for unemployment insurance benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* depends on fact of voluntary action and not on motives that led to it; eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits is determined not by looking at employer's economic problems, but by determining worker's conduct. *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1391, 1392, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461*

Picket line or strike is economic weapon directed against employer by union, and recognition of it by employee amounts to participation by employee in trade dispute it represents; decision to participate in union picket line or strike is never deemed involuntary in eyes of law. *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1391, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461*

Workers who leave jobs because of trade dispute were ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262*, even though dispute was precipitated by wage cuts constituting 27 to 33 percent reduction in earnings for employees and wage cuts in combination with reduced benefits comprised 34 to 41 percent earnings reduction. *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1390-1394, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461*

Two-part test applies for determining whether claimant is ineligible to receive unemployment benefits pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262* (denying benefits to persons who left work because of trade dispute): (1) employee must voluntarily leave or remain away from employment (volitional test); and (2) employee must leave or remain away from employment because of trade dispute (causation test); criteria for denial or awarding of benefits being personal

responsibility of claimant for his or her unemployment in former case, or fault of employer in latter case. *Brotherhood of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1515, 1525-1526, 236 Cal. Rptr. 78*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262, denying benefits to persons who left work because of trade dispute, as inapplicable to longshoremen who applied for benefits for period when their union was engaged in selective work stoppages, where, under rotational dispatch system, longshoremen were not scheduled to work during period in question, and where none of them walked off job or expressly refused work, even though they failed to actively repudiate their union's work stoppage policy or to seek employment, which became available as result of work stoppages, from struck employers. *Pacific Maritime Assn. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 568, 574-576, 215 Cal. Rptr. 408*

Courts as having recognized two-part test in determining ineligibility under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262*, making person who left work because of trade dispute ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits: (1) leaving work or remaining away must be volun tary (volitional test); and (2) leaving work or remaining away must be because of trade dispute (causational test). *Acuff v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1038, 1045, 256 Cal. Rptr. 513* ; *Martinez v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1385, 1390, 254 Cal. Rptr. 461* ; *Campos v. Employment Development Dept. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 961, 966, 183 Cal. Rptr. 637*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1262, making person who left work because of trade dispute ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits, as manifesting state's desire to maintain neutrality in labor disputes and not to require employer to subsidize, through its contributions to Unemployment Fund, use of strike as economic weapon against it. *National Broadcasting Co. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 550, 555, 157 Cal. Rptr. 207*

[26] Unemployment Insurance Act as Remedial and Liberally Construed

Provisions of Unemployment Insurance Code as required to be liberally construed to further legislative objective of reducing hardship of unemployment. *Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 575, 584, 205 Cal. Rptr. 501, 685 P.2d 61* ; *Gilles v. Department of Human Resources Development (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 313, 325, 113 Cal. Rptr. 374, 521 P.2d 110* ; *Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 40, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540*

Unemployment Insurance Act as remedial statute and provisions as to benefits as required to be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes. *Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 43, 168 P.2d 686* , *overruled on another point,* *People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-480 n.8, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321*)

Unemployment Insurance Act as not purely economic but as also remedial. *Prescod v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1976) 57 Cal. App. 3d 29, 40, 127 Cal. Rptr. 540*

Unemployment insurance legislation as remedial in character, subject to a liberal construction, to effectuate its purpose and to coincide with its reflection of public policy. *Zuckerman-Mandeville, Inc. v. Sheffield (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 793, 799, 88 Cal. Rptr. 57*

[27] Violations and Penalties

Violation of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101* (willfully making false statement or knowingly concealing material fact including, but not limited to, using a false name, false social security number, or other false identification) is punishable under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2122* as either misdemeanor or felony, not under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2117* as only misdemeanor. *People v. Booker (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1517, 1523, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 715*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 2113, requiring Employment Development Department to give 10 days' notice to individual of overpayment of benefits prior to filing criminal complaint applies only to misdemeanor prosecutions and not to felony prosecutions under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 2114* (relating to report or registration with department, with intent defraud, of fictitious employer or fictitious employee and fictitious wages in order to obtain unemployment insurance benefits). *People v. Belnick (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 1449, 1450-1455, 229 Cal. Rptr. 414*

Intent to deceive is not required for imposition of penalty against employer under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1030.5* (*now see Unemp. Ins. Code § 2101*) for misrepresenting that claimant voluntarily terminated employment. *Diagnostic Data, Inc. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 556, 558, 110 Cal. Rptr. 157*

[28] Voluntary Disability Insurance Plans

Unemp. Ins. Code § 3264 provides exclusive remedy to disabled worker whose employer or its insurer wholly or partially denies liability on worker's claim for disability benefits under approved voluntary disability insurance plan and bars employee's common law claims against employer for alleged breach of insurance contract, breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, fraud, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and sexual discrimination in violation of Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1964 (*42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e et seq.*). *Safeway Stores, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 713, 717-720, 235 Cal. Rptr. 636*

[29] Wages

Amount equal to former employee's back pay paid by former employer in settlement of NLRB claim for unlawful discharge as constituting wages involving work, as those terms are used in *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1277*, for purposes of determining amount of unemployment insurance payable. *Oliver v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 215, 217, 191 Cal. Rptr. 694*

Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265, which excludes payments by employer under plan established for purpose of supplementing unemploy ment compensation benefits from definition of wages, as applicable only when employer's payments supplement benefits payable under unemployment compensation provisions and not when benefits are payable under disability benefits provisions. *Cooper v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 166, 170, 173 Cal. Rptr. 255*

Severance pay paid to employees after company terminated its operations in accordance with plan adopted and implemented by company as not wages but payments within scope of *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1265* (excluding from term "wages" payments under employer plan supplementing unemployment compensation), since payments were made to all employees and payments had not vested in that they were contingent on signing agreement waiving all other possible or actual claims. *Citroen Cars Corp. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 945, 948-950, 165 Cal. Rptr. 924*

Back pay as wages. *Kerin v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 146, 149-150, 150 Cal. Rptr. 751*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsEstoppelCollateral EstoppelImmigration LawDuties & Rights of AliensPublic BenefitsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilitySuitable EmploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability &

Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.243

§ 564.243 Law Reviews

Comment, *Religious Organizations and the Unemployment Insurance Code: Is California Playing Favorites with Churches? 10 Pacific L.J. 225 (1979)*

Comment, *The Concept of 'Availability' in California's Unemployment Insurance Program: Any Reason for Requiring Good Cause? 66 Cal. L. Rev. 1293 (1978)*

Recent Case, *Unemployment Compensation--Discrimination in Compensation Based Upon Sex Is Good Cause to Terminate Employment Voluntarily-- Morrison v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd., 65 Cal. App.3d 245, 134 Cal. Rptr. 916 (1976) , 18 Santa Clara L. Rev. 828 (1978)*

Comment, *The Claimant Complains: Unemployment Insurance in California, 10 U.S.F. L. Rev. 297 (1975)*

Walker, *Sex Discrimination in Government Benefit Programs, 23 Hastings L.J. 277 (1971)*

Riesenfeld, *Workmen's Compensation and Other Social Legislation: The Shadow of Stone Tablets, 53 Cal. L. Rev. 207, 218*-221 (1965)

Note, *Conscientious Objection to Loyalty Oath--Cause for Refusing Unemployment Insurance*, 34 So Cal. L. Rev. 367 (1961)

Note, *Unemployment Insurance: Effect of Collective Bargaining Agreement upon Disqualification for Voluntary Relinquishment of Employment.--Douglas Aircraft Co. v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd.* (Cal. App. 1960)," *49 Cal. L. Rev. 580 (1961)*

Feldman, *Unemployment Insurance: Its Effect on Trade Disputes in California, 5 UCLA L. Rev. 604 (1958)*

Comment, *Pension Plans and Unemployment Compensation, 4 UCLA L. Rev. 438 (1957)*

Note, *Unemployment Insurance: Effect of Receipt of Dismissal Payments at Time of Discharge from Employment Upon Eligibiliity for State Unemployment Insurance Benefits, 8 Hastings L.J. 233 (1957)*

Netterville, *Judicial Review: The "Independent Judgment" Anomaly, 44 Cal. L. Rev. 262 (1956)*

Feldman, *The Garden of Live Flowers: Terminating the Trade Dispute Disqualification Under the California Unemployment Insurance Act, 27 So. Cal. L. Rev. 3 (1953)*

Comment, *Locked-out Workers Denied Unemployment Benefits, 2 Stan. L. Rev. 427 (1950)*

Note, *Legislative Medicine for the Sick Worker, 2 Stan. L. Rev. 345 (1950)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceDisability BenefitsGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationClaim ProceduresLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationCoverage & DefinitionsLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityInvoluntary UnemploymentLabor & Employment LawDisability & Unemployment InsuranceUnemployment CompensationEligibilityVoluntary Unemployment

105 of 111 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.244-564.259

[Reserved]

§§ 564.244[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.260

§ 564.260 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--Against Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board to Determine Validity of Precedent Decision [Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2]--By Interested Person or Organization

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060]--Against Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board to Determine Validity of Precedent Decision [Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2]--By Interested Person or Organization

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
BOARD,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is [and at all times herein mentioned was] _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.*, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ County, California].

2. Defendant is the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board of the State of California.

3. On or about _____, [*date*] defendant issued _____ [*identify precedent decision,*

e.g., Precedent Benefit Decision No. _____], _____ [*specify effect, e.g.,* (a) reversing the ruling of the administrative law judge that denied an applicant unemployment insurance benefits for a _____ week period on the grounds that he/she did not seek work and was not available for work within the meaning of Section 1253(c) and (e) of the Unemployment Insurance Code, and (b) holding the applicant had satisified the "seek work" and "availability" requirements of the code and was qualified for unemployment benefits]. A copy of the decision is attached as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

4. Plaintiff _____ [is affected by *or* could be subject to] the foregoing decision for the following reasons: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* plaintiff employs _____ (*number*) workers covered by the Unemployment Insurance Code and is required to contribute to the unemployment insurance fund. The precedent decision issued by defendant could result in increasing the amount of plaintiff's contributions which would adversely affect it].

4. Plaintiff contends that the decision is invalid for the following reason(s): _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the decision was issued without express statutory authority and substantially increases the number of eligible claimants for unemployment assistance. This will result in increasing the amount of unemployment assistance paid, thus increasing the employer contributions that will be necessary to support the increased payments].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment declaring defendant's _____ [*identify precedent decision, e.g.,* Precedent Benefit Decision No. _____] invalid, for costs of suit herein incurred, and for such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*Signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by an interested person or organization to challenge the validity of a precedent decision issued by the California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2*; *see also § 564.51*].

[3] Scope and Effect of Court's Determination

In a declaratory-relief action brought under *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2* by a nonparty to the board's precedential decision, the court may determine only whether the board decision accords with the law that would govern if the rule announced in the board decision had been articulated as a regulation. There is no review of the underlying record or introduction of new evidence to discover whether the board correctly resolved disputes on adjudicative facts. The board's version of those facts may not be disturbed unless it lacks substantial support on the face of the decision. A judicial declaration of invalidity does not alter or affect the operative impact of the decision as between the original parties; that is, whatever result the court reaches on the merits, the declaratory judgment may not alter the result between the parties who were the subject of the precedent decision [*Pacific Legal Found. v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 111, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244* ; *Messenger Courier Assn. of Americas v. California Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1086, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797*].

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 1);

- Defendant's identity (Paragraph 2);

- Defendant's issuance of the subject precedent decision (Paragraph 3) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 409, 409.1*];

- Plaintiff's standing to challenge the validity of the precedent decision (Paragraph 4) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2*]; and

- Plaintiff's contention as to why the precedent decision is invalid (Paragraph 5) [*see* Unemp. Ins. Code *§ 409.2, Code Civ. Proc.* § 1060].

[5] Standing to Sue

To maintain the action, plaintiff must be an interested person or organization [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2*]. That is, plaintiff must be a person or organization who is subject to the precedent decision or affected by it, or who is or could be subject to its effects. A plaintiff who is such a person has standing to sue for declaratory relief [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 150, 154, 156, 141 Cal. Rptr. 474* ; *see Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 101, 109, 172 Cal. Rptr. 194, 624 P.2d 244* (term interested persons includes those who, though not directly involved in a benefit case, may be subject to a precedent decision)].

[6] Actual Controversy Implied

Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2 authorizes a declaratory relief action "in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure" to challenge the validity of a precedent decision. Normally, a complaint for declaratory relief must allege the existence of an actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties and their respective contentions [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; and Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*, and Ch. 472B, *Review of Agency Rulemaking*]. However, this rule apparently does not apply to a declaratory relief action to challenge the validity of a precedent decision rendered by the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board; rather, it appears that the mere possibility that an actual controversy might arise in the future is sufficient if the plaintiff has standing to sue as an interested person or organization [*see Pacific Legal Foundation v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 150, 160, 141 Cal. Rptr. 474* (dissenting opinion)].

[7] State Statutes

Designation by appeals board of certain of its decisions as precedents. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409*, 3rd paragraph

Modification of precedent decision to conform to court judgment. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.1*

Declaratory relief action to obtain judicial declaration of validity of precedent decision. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 409.2*

Time limit on when judicial review of precedent decision may be sought by Employment Development Director or any other party. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*, 4th paragraph

[8] Decisions

Trial court properly declared invalid five decisions of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board concerning precedent

benefit, in each of which appeals board denied unemployment compensation benefits solely on claimant's reduction of his or her labor market (e.g., by moving to another geographical locale), as in conflict with *Glick v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 493, 499, 153 Cal. Rptr. 1, 591 P.2d 24* , and *Sanchez v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1977) 20 Cal. 3d 55, 67, 141 Cal. Rptr. 146, 569 P.2d 740* (holding that claimants may reduce their labor markets for good cause and remain eligible for benefits, as long as they are available to a substantial field of employment). *Rios v. Employment Development Dept. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 489, 497, 231 Cal. Rptr. 732*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Appeals Division

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.261-564.279

[Reserved]

§§ 564.261[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.280

§ 564.280 Complaint to Recover Erroneously or Illegally Collected Employer Contributions [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)]--By Alleged Employer

[1] FORM Complaint to Recover Erroneously or Illegally Collected Employer Contributions [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)]--By Alleged Employer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT TO RECOVER
_____ [*name*], as Director of	)	_____ [ERRONEOUSLY *or* IL-
the California Employment Development Depart-	)	LEGALLY] COLLECTED EMPLOYER CONTRI-
ment,	)	BUTIONS TO UNEMPLOYMENT FUND
Defendant.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
		[Amount demanded _____
		(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. The California Employment Development Department (hereinafter, the department) is a department of the State of California. Defendant _____ [*name*] is the Director of Employment Development and is charged by law with the administration of the unemployment compensation program of the State of California, including the computation and assessment of employer contributions payable to the department for deposit in the Unemployment Fund.

2. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*allege capacity and occupation, e.g.,*

engaged as a private individual in the manufacture and sale of wood carvings].

[*Allege in following and successively numbered paragraphs, if required, the working relationship existing between plaintiff and his or her alleged employees, e.g.,*]

3. At all times herein mentioned, plaintiff delivered his/her wood carvings to various persons for sale to the general public; in all such transactions, it was orally agreed between plaintiff and each of the persons that wood carvings not sold would be returned to plaintiff, and that for each carving sold the person would pay to plaintiff _____ percent of the sale price, but in no event less than a minimum price established for each carving. Plaintiff neither had nor attempted to exert control of any kind over the persons as to how the carvings were to be sold, where or when they were to be sold, to whom they were to be sold, or in any other way. Plaintiff was in no way obligated to provide the persons, or any of them, with a minimum number of carvings, or any at all, and the persons were in no way required to sell the carvings or to exert any efforts on plaintiff's behalf. The sole power retained by plaintiff was to require return of the unsold carvings, which power was to be exercised by him/her in his/her sole discretion and for any reason].

[*CONTINUE*]

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff received a written notice that defendant Director had, under the provisions of Section _____ [*e.g.*, 1126] of the Unemployment Insurance Code, assessed plaintiff in the amount of $_____, together with penalty and interest, on _____ [*specify, e.g.*, alleged unreported wages paid by plaintiff for the period from _____ (*date*) to _____ (*date*)].

5. On or about _____ [*date within 30 days, or any extended period, after service of notice of assessment*], plaintiff, pursuant to the provisions of *Section 1222 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*, filed with _____ [*name*], an administrative law judge, a petition for reassessment, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof. On or about _____ [*date*], [after a hearing thereon,] the administrative law judge rendered his/her decision _____ [upholding the assessment as made by defendant Director *or* _____ (increasing *or* decreasing) the amount of the assessment to $_____]. [A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.]

6. On or about _____ [*date within 30 days, or any extended period, after service of notice of administrative law judge's decision*], plaintiff filed an appeal from the administrative law judge's decision with the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, which rendered its decision on _____ [*date*], _____ [*either* affirming the decision of the ad ministrative law judge *or* _____ (increasing *or* decreasing) the amount of the assessment to $_____]. [A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.]

7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff [, under protest,] paid the department the sum so assessed in the amount of $_____.

8. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], plaintiff filed with defendant Director a written claim for refund of the amount paid as hereinabove set forth. A copy of the claim is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.

[*EITHER*]

9. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant Director notified plaintiff that his/her claim for refund had

been denied.

[*OR*]

9. The Director failed to serve on plaintiff notice of his/her action on the claim for refund, more than 60 days elapsed after plaintiff's claim for refund was filed, and plaintiff, therefore, elected to consider the claim denied.

10. On or about _____ [*date within 30 days after director served notice of denial, or after claim for refund was considered denied because of director's failure to have served notice of denial*], plaintiff filed a petition for review of the Director's decision with _____ [*name*], an administrative law judge.

[*EITHER*]

11. On or about _____ [*date*], the administrative law judge rendered his/her decision upholding defendant Director's denial of the claim for refund. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit E and made a part hereof.

[*OR*]

11. The administrative law judge failed to serve on plaintiff notice of his/her decision on the claim for refund. More than 60 days elapsed after the petition for review was filed, and plaintiff, therefore, elected to consider the petition denied.

12. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date within 30 days, or any extended period, after service of notice of administrative law judge's decision or after petition was considered denied because of failure of administrative law judge to have served notice of his/her decision*], plaintiff filed an appeal with the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board. By order dated _____, the appeals board affirmed the denial of the refund. A copy of the order is attached hereto as Exhibit F. and made a part hereof.

13. The assessment was illegally collected for the reasons set forth in plaintiff's petition for reassessment (Exhibit A) and in his/her claim for refund (Exhibit D) filed with defendant Director, as hereinabove alleged.

14. As shown by the foregoing allegations, plaintiff has exhausted the administrative remedies prescribed by law.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. That plaintiff recover from defendant the sum of $_____, which is the sum that was assessed against and paid by plaintiff as employer's contribution, penalty, and interest.

2. Interest on the sum at the rate of 12 percent per annum from _____ [*date*], the date plaintiff paid the assessment.

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other or further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a person or entity to recover erroneously or illegally assessed employer contributions after its claim for refund or credit was denied or deemed denied [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*; *see also Patane v. Kiddoo (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1209-1214, 214 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The status of the Employment Development Department as a state department and the defendant as the Director of Employment Development (Paragraph 1) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*; *Patane v. Kiddoo (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1209 n.1, 214 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

- Plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 2).

- Facts negating the propriety or legality of the assessment (Paragraph 3).

- The receipt of notice of the assessment (Paragraph 4).

- Plaintiff's filing of a petition for reassessment with an administrative law judge who upheld the director's assessment with or without increasing or decreasing the amount (Paragraph 5) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1223*].

- Plaintiff's filing of an appeal with the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, which upheld the administrative law judge's decision, with or without decreasing the amount of the assessment (Paragraph 6) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224*].

- Plaintiff's payment of the assessment (Paragraph 7).

- Plaintiff's filing of a claim for refund (Paragraph 8) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1222, 1241(a)*].

- Defendant director's express or implied denial of the claim for refund (alternative Paragraphs 9) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1180, 1222*].

- Plaintiff's filing of a petition for review with an administrative law judge (Paragraph 10) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1222, 1223*].

- The administrative law judge's express or implied denial of the claim for refund (alternative Paragraphs 11) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224(a)*].

- Plaintiff's appeal to the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board which affirmed the denial (Paragraph 12) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1224*].

- The reason collection of the assessment was illegal (Paragraph 13).

- That, as shown by the complaint, plaintiff has exhausted the administrative remedies prescribed by law (Paragraph 14) [*see Patane v. Kiddoo (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1207, 1214, 214 Cal. Rptr. 9]* .

Payment of the amount of assessment is a precondition to further administrative or judicial review [*Masi v. Nagle (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 608, 615, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423]* . Even cases of severe financial hardship do not permit judicial intervention [*see Masi v. Nagle (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 608, 615, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 423* (citing *Modern Barber Co. v. Cal. Emp. Stab. Com. (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 720, 730, 192 P.2d 916*)].

[4] When Refund Is Not Permitted

Employer contributions paid pursuant to *Unemp. Ins. Code § 976.5* (relating to voluntary contribution for purpose of redetermining contribution rate) may not be refunded except under certain circumstances defined by statute [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1178(e)*].

[5] Necessity of Filing Claim for Refund or Credit

No suit or proceeding shall be maintained in any court for the recovery of any amount of contributions, interest, or penalties alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected until a claim for refund or credit has been filed [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*].

[6] Effect on Claim for Refund of Payment Pending Administrative Appeal of Assessment

The petition for reassessment and review of a denial of the claim for refund or credit, set forth separately in the foregoing form (*see* Paragraphs 5 and 8), may be consolidated when payment of the contributions assessed is made during the administrative appeal. That is, if the employing unit pays the amount of contributions, penalties, and interest assessed before the administrative law judge issues his or her decision on the petition for reassessment, the payment constitutes the filing of a claim for refund, the claim for refund is deemed denied by the director, and the petition for reassessment automatically becomes a petition to review a denial of the claim for refund [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1179.5(a)*]. Also, if payment is not made before that time but is made before the appeals board issues its decision on an appeal from the administrative law judge's decision on a petition for reassessment, the payment constitutes the filing of a claim for refund, the claim is deemed denied by the director, the denial is deemed affirmed by the administrative law judge, and the appeal automatically becomes an appeal from an administrative law judge's decision upholding the director's denial of the claim for refund [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1179.5(b)*].

[7] Venue of Action

The action is required to be filed in a court of competent jurisdiction in the County of Sacramento [*Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*]. However, it may be filed in any city or city and county in which the Attorney General has an office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401*].

[8] Subject Matter Jurisdiction

An action involving the legality of a tax must be brought in superior court and cannot be classified as a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 85, 86(a)(1)*]. If the legality of a tax is not involved in an action to recover taxes, the case is treated as an ordinary action to recover money due and unpaid and should be filed as a limited civil case or otherwise based on the amount in dispute [*see Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Citizens etc. Bk. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 915, 916, 167 P.2d 752]* .

The legality of a tax is involved whenever the taxpayer contends that the tax was illegally assessed or levied [*see Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Citizens etc. Bk. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 915, 916, 167 P.2d 752]* . "Contributions," as used in the Unemployment Insurance Code, is a euphemistic expression meaning tax exactions [*Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 47, 168 P.2d 686 , overruled on another point, People v. Sims (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 468, 479-480 n.8, 186 Cal. Rptr. 77, 651 P.2d 321]* . Hence, the foregoing rule applies to employer's contributions under the Unemployment Insurance Code [*see Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Citizens etc. Bk. (1946) 73 Cal. App. 2d 915, 916, 167 P.2d 752]* . Thus, when the person against whom contributions have been assessed denies that he or she is an employer, the legality of a tax is involved and jurisdiction of the case is in the superior court as an unlimited civil case [*see Cal. Emp. etc. Com. v. Municipal Ct. (1944) 62 Cal. App. 2d 781, 784-786, 145 P.2d 361* (municipal court lacked jurisdiction of action to collect employer contributions where defendants denied they were employers)].

[9] State Statutes

Prerequisites and time for filing civil action to recover erroneously or illegally assessed or collected contributions. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*

Venue of action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 401*; *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1241(a)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Reports, Contributions, and Assessments

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 564.281-564.299

[Reserved]

§§ 564.281[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.300

§ 564.300 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Allowing Unemployment Compensation Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--Employee Left Work Without Good Cause or Was Discharged for Misconduct in Connection With Work [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256]--By Employer

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Allowing Unemployment Compensation Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--Employee Left Work Without Good Cause or Was Discharged for Misconduct in Connection With Work [Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256]--By Employer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
BOARD, EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT DE-	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]
PARTMENT, and _____ [*name*], as	)	
the Director of Employment Development	)	
Respondents;	)	
_____ [*name of claimant*],	)	
Real Party in Interest.		

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* an individual engaged as a sole proprietor in the business of owning and operating _____ (*e.g.,* an automotive parts

supply retail store) in _____ County, California], in the course of which he/she employs _____ persons.

2. Respondent Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (hereinafter, the appeals board) and its employees constitute the Appeals Division of the Employment Development Department.

3. Respondent Employment Development Department (hereinafter, the department) is a department in the Health and Welfare Agency of the State of California.

4. Respondent _____ [*name*] (hereinafter, the director) is the Director of Employment Development and is charged by law with the administration of the unemployment compensation program of the State of California.

5. Real party in interest _____ [*name*] (hereinafter the claimant) was employed by petitioner from _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], as _____ [*title of job, e.g.,* a shipping clerk]. The last-mentioned date was the last day on which the claimant worked for petitioner. On or about _____ [*date*], petitioner received written notice from the department that a claim for unemployment compensation benefits had been filed by the claimant. Pursuant to the provisions of *Section 1327 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*, petitioner submitted to the Department a written statement setting forth facts showing that the claimant _____ [(is deemed to have) voluntarily left his/her employment without good cause *or* was discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work]. A copy of the statement is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

[*ALLEGE each step of administrative proceeding, including any reconsiderations, e.g.*]

6. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], the department issued a determination and ruling that the claimant _____ [voluntarily left his/her work with good cause *or* was not discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work], and was eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, and notified petitioner accordingly. A copy of the notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

7. [As authorized by *Section 1328 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*,] [P]etitioner thereafter duly filed an appeal with an administrative law judge who, by written decision dated _____, affirmed the determination and ruling of the department, and notified petitioner accordingly. A copy of the decision with its reasons is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

8. In affirming the determination and ruling of the director, the administrative law judge _____ [*specify, e.g.,* abused his/her discretion and acted in excess of his/her jurisdiction in concluding that the claimant _____ (voluntarily left his/her work with good cause *or* was not discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work) in that the conclusion is contrary to the (weight of the) evidence and is against the law].

9. [As authorized by *Section 1336 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*,] [P]etitioner duly filed an appeal with the appeals board, which, on _____ [*date*], affirmed the decision of the administrative law judge, and notified petitioner accordingly. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.

10. The appeals board _____ [*specify, e.g.,* abused its discretion and acted in excess of its jurisdiction in the same manner as did the administrative law judge] in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the evidence and the law indisputably establish that the claimant _____ ([is deemed to have] voluntarily left his/her employment with petitioner without good cause *or* was discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work) in that the claimant, as shown by the evidence before the administrative law judge and the appeals board, _____ (*summarize, e.g.,* on the evening of the last day he/she reported for work and worked for

petitioner was arrested for the commission of a criminal offense, to wit, _____ (*specify*), and was subsequently convicted and sentenced to jail for a term of _____ (days *or* months). Subsequent to his/her release from jail, the claimant sought to return to his/her former position, but petitioner was unable to reemploy him/her because the position had been filled)].

[*CONTINUE*]

11. Pursuant to the decision of the appeals board, the department has charged, and will charge, petitioner's reserve account with the amount of benefits paid, and to be paid, to the claimant.

12. Petitioner has exhausted his/her administrative remedies in that, under the provisions of *Section 410 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*, the decision of the appeals board is final, except for such action as may be taken by a judicial tribunal as permitted or required by law.

13. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law to compel the appeals board to reverse its decision or to compel the department and director to credit petitioner's reserve account with the amount charged against it on account of the compensation benefits paid to the claimant, and no remedy at all unless this petition is granted.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays as follows:

1. That this court issue an alternative writ of mandate ordering respondent Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

a. to set aside its decision _____ [*specify, e.g.*, affirming the decision of the administrative law judge affirming the determination of the Director of Employment Development] that the claimant _____ [voluntarily left his/her work with good cause *or* was not discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work], and was eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, and to deny such benefits, or

b. in the alternative, to show cause before this court at a time and place to be fixed by the court why it has not done so and directing it to file with this court the record of all proceedings in this matter before the respondent and the administrative law judge;

2. That, after hearing on the order to show cause, this court issue a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect as the alternative writ except for the order to show cause;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for a discussion of serving the petition, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition for writ of mandate is for use by an employer to seek judicial review of the decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board affirming the decision of an administrative law judge that a claimant was eligible for unemployment compensation [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1328, 1334, 1336*]. The illustrative grounds set forth for issuance of the writ are (1) prejudicial abuse of discretion in that the decision is not supported by the evidence, and (2) excess of jurisdiction in that the decision is against the law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b), (d)*]. The bracketed references in Paragraphs 7 and 9 cite the statutory authority for the particular proceeding referred to. These references may be included, but their inclusion is not required since under *Evid. Code § 451(a)* the court is mandatorily required to take judicial notice of the public statutory law of California.

With appropriate modifications, the form may be used by an employer (1) when the writ is sought on the grounds that the respondent proceeded without jurisdiction or that petitioner was denied a fair hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]; and (2) to seek judicial review of a decision of the appeals board (a) reversing the decision of the administrative law judge denying unemployment compensation benefits, or (b) affirming or reversing the decision of an administrative law judge reviewing the director's (i) computation or recomputation of the benefit amount after protest by the employer, or (ii) reconsidered determination [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1329-1336*].

[3] Administrative Record

All or part of the administrative record of the proceedings may be filed with the petition or with respondent's points and authorities or pursuant to court order. Except when otherwise prescribed by statute, the cost of preparing the record is borne by the petitioner [Code Civ. Prov. § 1094.5(a)]. If the petitioner's court fees have been waived because he or she is proceeding in forma pauperis [*see Gov. Code § 68630 et seq.*], and the transcript is necessary to a proper review of the administrative proceedings, the cost of preparing the transcript is borne by the respondent [Code Civ. Prov. §

1094.5(a)]. For discussion of waiving court fees because of a person's financial condition, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.110* et seq.

If the petitioner has proceeded pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5* (no alternative writ is sought), the administrative record must be filed as expeditiously as possible, and may be filed with the petition, or by the respondent after payment of the costs by the petitioner, when required, or as otherwise directed by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*].

[4] Parties

The decision to be reviewed by the court is that of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board, which would normally be the only respondent. However, this form seeks to have the Director of Employment Development credit the employer's reserve account with the amounts charged against it for benefits (*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 1338*). Consequently, both the director and the Employment Development Department are named as respondents, although the court, if it grants the writ, need not order that the reserve account be credited with the amounts erroneously charged, since this will follow as a matter of law [*see Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 602-603, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63]* .

[5] Allegations

This petition alleges:

- The capacity of petitioner as an employing unit (Paragraph 1) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 135(a)*];
- The names and capacities of the respondents (Paragraphs 2-4).
- The identity of the real party in interest, that is, the claimant for unemployment insurance benefits (Paragraph 5).
- The administrative determinations that the claimant was entitled to unemployment compensation benefits (Paragraphs 6, 7, 9).
- The grounds justifying issuance of a writ of mandate (Paragraphs 8, 10, 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1094.5(b)*].
- The fact showing that petitioner is a party beneficially interested, that is, the charging of the benefits paid against petitioner's reserve account (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Cal. Portland Cement Co. v. Cal. Unemp. Ins. Appeals Board (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 263, 269, 3 Cal. Rptr. 37]* .
- The exhaustion of administrative remedies (Paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 9, 12) [*see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291-296, 109 P.2d 942]* .
- Absence of plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in ordinary course of law (Paragraph 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[6] Cross References

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms for petitions for traditional writ of mandate generally and related forms, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For discussion and forms for petition for administrative mandate, alternative writ of mandate, and related forms, see

Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions*

[7] State Statutes

Finality of appeals board's decision and judicial review. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 410*

Person terminated for absence from work because of incarceration and conviction of offense for period in excess of 24 hours as deemed to have left work without good cause. *Unemp. Ins. Code § 1256.1*

Director as interested party to any appeal to administrative law judge. *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1328, 1331*

On reversal or setting aside of decision, employer's account as not to be charged with benefits except as provided in *Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1026. Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1335(b), (c), 1338*

[8] Decisions

Termination of employment when employee was sentenced for crime was grounds for denial of benefits. *Sherman Bertram, Inc. v. California Dep't of Employment (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 733, 736-739, 21 Cal. Rptr. 130*

111 of 111 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 564 UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY INSURANCE
PART IV. FORMS
C. Eligibility And Claims For Benefits

49-564 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 564.301

§ 564.301 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Denying Unemployment Insurance Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--By Unemployed Worker

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--To Review Decision of Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board Denying Unemployment Insurance Benefits [Unemp. Ins. Code § 410, 1st and 4th paragraphs]--By Unemployed Worker

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE APPEALS	)	NO. _____
BOARD,	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Respondent.	)	
_____ [*name of*	)	
employer],	)	
Real Party in Interest.	)	
	)	

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. [*Respondent's name and capacity. See § 564.300, Paragraph 2*].

2. Real Party in Interest, _____ [*name*] (hereinafter the employer) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify capacity and place of business, e.g.,* a corporation organized and

existing under the laws of California, with its principal place of business located in _____ County, California].

3. From _____ [*date*] to _____ [*date*], petitioner was employed by the employer at its place of business at _____ [*street address and city*], California as a _____ [full *or* part] time _____ [*title of position*] and was paid wages while so employed sufficient to qualify him/her for unemployment compensation benefits.

4. On _____ [*latter date specified above*], petitioner _____ [terminated his/her services *or* was notified by the employer that his/her services were terminated] _____ [*specify reason(s) for termination, e.g.,* to accompany his/her nonmarital partner to _____ (*city and state*) to which he/she had been permanently transferred by her/his employer, in order to maintain the family relationship the partners had established with their children].

5. Thereafter, petitioner duly filed a claim for unemployment compensation benefits at _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a public employment office of the California Employment Development Department] located at _____ [*address*], where he/she registered for employment.

[*ALLEGE each step of administrative proceeding, including any reconsiderations, e.g.*]

6. The claim was denied by an examiner of the California Employment Development Department on _____ [*date*], on the ground petitioner was disqualified from receiving unemployment benefits for the reason(s) that _____ [*specify*], and, on _____ [*date*], petitioner received a written notice of this determination. A copy of the determination is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

7. [Pursuant to the provisions of *Section 1328 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*], [P]etitioner duly filed an appeal with an administrative law judge who, by a written decision dated _____, affirmed the examiner's determination. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

8. In affirming the examiner's determination and ruling, the administrative law judge _____ [*specify, e.g.,* abused his/her discretion and acted in excess of his/her jurisdiction in concluding that the claimant _____ (voluntarily left his/her work without good cause *or* was discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work). The conclusion is contrary to the (weight of the) evidence that the claimant _____ (left his/her employment to accompany his/her nonmarital partner to _____ (*city and state*), to which the nonmarital partner had been transferred by her/his employer, and which is a place from which it is impracticable to commute to the employer's place of employment, in order to maintain the familial relationship he/she and his/her nonmarital partner have established with their children, and is against the law].

9. [As authorized by *Section 1336 of the Unemployment Insurance Code*], [P]etitioner thereafter duly filed an appeal with the appeals board, which on _____ [*date*] affirmed the administrative law judge's decision and notified petitioner accordingly. A copy of the decision is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.

10. In affirming the decision of the administrative law judge, the appeals board _____ [*specify, e.g.,* abused its discretion and acted in excess of its jurisdiction in the same manner as did the administrative law judge, as alleged in paragraph 8].

[*CONTINUE*]

11. [*Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 564.300, Paragraph 12*].

12. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law to compel the appeals board to reverse its decision and to grant petitioner's claim for unemployment compensation benefits, and no remedy at all unless this petition is granted.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays as follows:

1. That this court issue an alternative writ of mandate ordering respondent Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board

(a) To set aside its decision _____ [*specify, e.g.,* affirming the decision of the administrative law judge affirming the determination of the Director of Employment Development] that the claimant _____ [voluntarily left his/her work without good cause *or* was discharged for misconduct in connection with his/her work], and is ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits, and to grant such benefits, or

(b) In the alternative, to show cause before this court at a time and place to be fixed by the court why it has not done so and directing it to file with this court the record of all proceedings in this matter before the respondent and the administrative law judge;

2. That, after hearing on the order to show cause, this court issue a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect as the alternative writ except for the order to show cause;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.
Dated: _____

_____ [*Signature*]

Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 564.300.*]

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for a discussion of serving the petition, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition for writ of mandate is for use by an unemployed worker to seek judicial review of the decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board affirming the decision of an administrative law judge that a claimant is ineligible for unemployment compensation [*see* Unemp. *Ins. Code §§ 1328,* 1334, 1336]. The illustrative grounds for

the writ set forth in the form are (1) prejudicial abuse of discretion in that the decision is not supported by the evidence, and (2) excess of jurisdiction in that the decision is against the law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b), (d)*]. The optional phrases at the beginning of Paragraphs 7 and 9 cite the statutory authority for the particular proceeding referred to. These references may be included, but their inclusion is not required since under *Evid. Code § 451(a)* the court must take judicial notice of the public statutory law of California.

With appropriate modifications, the form may be used by a claimant for unemployment compensation benefits (1) when the writ is sought on the ground that the respondent proceeded without jurisdiction or on the ground that petitioner was denied a fair hearing [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(b)*]; and (2) to seek judicial review of a decision of the appeals board (a) reversing the decision of the administrative law judge granting unemployment compensation benefits, or (b) affirming or reversing the decision of an administrative law judge reviewing the director's (i) computation or recomputation of the benefit amount after protest by the claimant, or (ii) reconsidered determination [*see Unemp. Ins. Code §§ 1329-1336*].

With appropriate modifications, the form may also be used by a claimant to seek review of the decision of the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board denying, or affirming a decision denying, a claim for disability benefits.

[3] Allegations

The form of petition alleges:

(1) Respondent's name and capacity (Paragraph 1);

(2) The name and capacity of the real party in interest as an employing unit (Paragraph 2) [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 135(a)*];

(3) The facts establishing petitioner's eligibility for unemployment compensation benefits (Paragraphs 3, 4);

(4) Petitioner's filing of a claim for benefits (Paragraph 5); the administrative determinations that the claimant was ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits (Paragraphs 6, 7, 9);

(5) The grounds justifying issuance of a writ of mandate (Paragraphs 8, 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1086, 1094.5(b)*];

(6) The exhaustion of administrative remedies (Paragraphs 6, 7, 9, 11) [*see Abelleira v. District Court of Appeal (1941) 17 Cal. 2d 280, 291-296, 109 P.2d 942]* ; and

(7) The absence of plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in ordinary course of law (Paragraph 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

[4] Decisions

Worker who leaves employment to accompany nonmarital partner to another state in order to maintain familial relationship established with their child as leaving work voluntarily for good cause. *MacGregor v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 205, 207, 212, 207 Cal. Rptr. 823, 689 P.2d 453*

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 564.300*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 565.syn

§ 565.syn Synopsis to Chapter 565: UNFAIR COMPETITION

§ 565.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 565.02 Cross References

§§ 565.04-565.09 [Reserved]

§ 565.10 Governing Law

§§ 565.11-565.29 [Reserved]

§ 565.30 Unfair Competition

[1] Statutory Definition

[2] Common Law Concept

§ 565.31 Unlawful, Unfair, or Fraudulent Business Act or Practice

[1] In General

[2] Causal Connection Required

[3] "Act or Practice"

[4] "Unlawful" Acts and Practices

[a] In General

[b] Unfair Practices Act Violations

[c] Cartwright Act Violations

[d] Uniform Trade Secrets Act Violations

[e] Choice of Remedies

[f] Mere Cause of Action Not "Unlawful" Act or Practice

[5] "Unfair" Acts and Practices

[a] Business Rivals

[b] Other Contexts

[6] "Fraudulent" Acts and Practices

§ 565.32 Exempt Acts and Practices

[1] Specifically Permitted Business Activity

[2] No Claim for Conduct Within Litigation Privilege

[3] Political Election Campaigns

[4] Title Insurance Ratemaking

[5] Securities Transactions

§ 565.33 Customers as Victims or Perpetrators of Unfair Competition

§ 565.34 Remedies and Relief

[1] In General

[2] Restitution and Disgorgement

[a] In General

[b] Award to Nonparties in Class Action

[3] Damages

[a] No Private Recovery

[b] In-Lieu Recovery

[4] Cumulative Remedies

[5] Attorney's Fees

[6] Subsequent Administrative Actions

§ 565.35 Action for Relief

[1] Standing to Sue

[2] Suit by Public Attorney

[3] Defendants

[a] Nonresidents

[b] Government Entity Immunity

[4] Time for Bringing Action

[5] Notification Requirement

[6] No Right to Jury Trial

§ 565.36 Suit for Civil Penalty

[1] In General

[2] Determination of Penalty

[3] Penalty for Violation of Injunction

[4] Penalty for Violation Against Senior Citizen or Disabled Person

[a] In General

[b] Senior Citizen and Disabled Person Defined

[c] Factors Considered by Court for Imposition of Penalty

[d] Restitution

§ 565.37 Patent and Copyright Cases

[1] Federal Preemption Generally

[2] Limited State Regulation Allowed

§§ 565.38-565.49 [Reserved]

§ 565.50 Purposes of Act

§ 565.51 Liability for Violation of Act

[1] Civil and Criminal

[2] Liability of Agents

§ 565.52 Prohibited Practices

[1] Locality Discrimination

[2] Sales or Service Below Cost

[3] "Loss Leader" Practices

[4] Secret Rebates or Unearned Discounts

[5] Coercion, Solicitation, or Collusion to Effectuate Prohibited Practice

§ 565.53 Defenses

[1] Applicable in General

[2] Applicable Only to Locality Discrimination, Sales Below Cost, or Loss Leaders

§ 565.54 Contract Violating Act as Illegal

[1] Civil Action

[a] Illegal Contract

[b] Remedies; Injunctive Relief

[c] Treble Damages and Attorney's Fees

[2] Limitation Period

[3] Evidentiary Provisions

[a] Relating to Intent

[b] Relating to Costs

[4] Discovery

[5] Reference Proceeding

[6] Immunity From Prosecution

§§ 565.55-565.69 [Reserved]

§ 565.70 Governing Law

§ 565.71 History and Interpretation of the Cartwright Act

[1] In General

[2] Prohibited Conduct

[a] Contracts Restraining Trade or Practice of Profession; Void as General Rule

[b] Agreement Conferring Exclusive Privilege

[c] Restraints on Former Employees

[d] Restraints in Commercial Leases

[e] Public Policy Overrides Choice of Foreign Law

[3] Combinations in Restraint of Trade

[4] Lease or Agreement for Nonuse of Competitor's Product

§ 565.72 Professions as Within Cartwright Act

§ 565.73 Exceptions

[1] Sale of Business

[2] Dissolution of Partnership

[3] Sale of Interest in Limited Liability Company

[4] Labor and Labor Activities

[5] Petitioning Government for Redress of Grievance (Noerr-Pennington Doctrine)

[a] General Rule

[b] "Sham" Exception

[6] Interstate League Sports

[7] Trade Associations

[8] Insurance

[9] Bargaining Units for Health Care Coverage

[10] Municipal Activities

§ 565.74 Determination of Validity and Effect of Conduct or Agreement

[1] Interpretation and Application

[2] Rule of Reason

[3] Relevant Market

[4] Per Se

§ 565.75 Mergers

§ 565.76 Monopoly

§ 565.77 Particular Situations

[1] Single Entity's Refusal to Deal

[2] Price Fixing

[3] Distributorships and Exclusive Dealing Arrangements

[4] Tie-Ins

[5] Group Boycott

§ 565.78 Preemption of State Court Jurisdiction

[1] By Interstate Activity or Impact

[2] By Exclusive Federal Agency Jurisdiction

[3] By Federal Statute

§ 565.79 Jurisdiction and Venue

[1] State Courts

[2] Federal District Courts

[3] Concurrent Jurisdiction; Res Judicata

[4] Removal to Federal Court

[5] Arbitration of Cartwright Act Claims

§ 565.80 Standing to Sue

[1] Individual Consumers

[2] Competitors

[3] Associations

[4] Class Actions

[a] Certification

[b] Fluid Class Recovery

§ 565.81 Damages, Prejudgment Interest, and Injunctive Relief

§ 565.82 Penalties

§ 565.83 Notification Requirements Relating to Writs and Appeals

§§ 565.84-565.99 [Reserved]

§ 565.100 Governing Law

§ 565.101 Relationship to Patent and Copyright Law

§ 565.102 UTSA Construed to Promote Uniformity

§ 565.103 Application of UTSA

[1] Date of Misappropriation

[2] Relationship to Other Statutes

[3] Relationship to Common Law

[4] Action Under UTSA; Definitions

[a] "Trade Secret"

[b] "Improper Means"

[c] "Misappropriation"

[d] Definitions Not Exhaustive

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Injunctive Relief

[7] Monetary Relief

[a] Damages

[b] Royalties

[c] Exemplary Damages

[d] Attorney's Fees and Costs

[8] Description of Trade Secret for Discovery Purposes

[9] Preservation of Secrecy Ordered by Court

[10] Current Ownership of Trade Secret Not Required

§ 565.104 Common Law Action for Misappropriation

[1] Elements

[2] Protectable Secret

[3] Improper Disclosure

[4] Remedies for Misappropriation

[a] Damages

[b] Injunctive Relief

[c] Statute of Limitations

§ 565.105 Particular Situations

[1] Employment Relationships

[a] In General

[b] Implied Obligation of Confidentiality

[c] Information Particular to Employer

[d] Customer Lists

[i] Statutory Analysis in Determining Trade Secret Status

[ii] Misappropriation

[iii] Common Law Analysis

[iv] "Value" Element

[v] "Secrecy" Element

[vi] Customers' Special Characteristics or Peculiar Requirements

[vii] Announcement of Change of Employment

[viii] Certain Customer Lists Deemed Trade Secrets by Statute

[e] Corporate Director

[f] Injunctive Relief Against Employee

[g] Employee's Wrongful Termination No Defense

[2] Disclosure of Information in Confidence

§ 565.106 Agreement for Use of Trade Secret

§ 565.107 Trade Secret Evidentiary Privilege

§ 565.108 Judicial Proceedings Privilege Inapplicable

§ 565.109 Personal Liability of Corporate Directors for Using Misappropriated Trade Secrets

§§ 565.110-565.129 [Reserved]

§ 565.130 Governing Law

§ 565.131 Terminology Used in This Analysis

§ 565.132 Intentional Interference

[1] General Rule

[2] With Contractual Relationship

[a] Inducing Breach by Third Party

[b] Rendering Plaintiff's Performance More Difficult

[3] With Noncontractual Economic Relationship

[4] First Amendment Limitations

§ 565.133 Elements of Intentional Interference

[1] In General

[2] Existence of Economic Relationship

[a] Contractual

[b] Noncontractual

[3] Defendant's Knowledge of Relationship

[4] Intentional Acts by Defendant

[5] Actual Interference

[6] Wrongfulness of Interference With Prospective Economic Relations

[7] Proximately Caused Damages

§ 565.134 Conspiracy to Interfere

[1] Elements

[2] Contracting Party Not Liable for Conspiracy to Interfere With Own Contract

§ 565.135 Negligent Interference

[1] No Action Under Prior Law

[2] Cause of Action Recognized

[3] Elements of Action--In General

[4] Duty of Care

[a] Factors Considered

[b] Extent to Which Transaction Intended to Affect Plaintiff

[c] Foreseeability of Harm to Plaintiff

[d] Certainty of Injury and Nexus of Defendant's Conduct to Injury

[e] Moral Blame

[f] Public Policy to Prevent Future Harm

§ 565.136 Remedies

[1] Damages--In General

[2] Effect of Available Contract Remedies

[3] Injunctive Relief

§ 565.137 Defenses

[1] Controverting Matter

[2] Defendant as Party to Contractual Relationship

[a] In General

[b] Liability Imposed by Alter Ego Doctrine

[3] Lapse of Limitation Period

[4] Justification or Privilege

[a] General Balancing Test

[b] Fair Competition

[c] Confidential Relationship

[i] Protecting Welfare of Third Party

[ii] Manager's Privilege

[d] Financial Interest

[e] Conduct Protected by Constitution or Statute

[i] In General

[ii] Petitioning Government for Redress of Grievance (Noerr-Pennington Doctrine)

[iii] Privilege for Statements Made in Course of Legislative, Judicial, or Other Official Proceedings

[iv] Other Examples

[v] Motion to Strike Claims Against Constitutionally Privileged Conduct (SLAPP Suits)

[f] Truthful Information or Honest Advice

[g] Bona Fide Claim

[h] Right to Induce Litigation on Contract

§§ 565.137-565.149 [Reserved]

§ 565.150 California Points and Authorities

§ 565.151 California Torts

§ 565.152 Forms of Discovery

§ 565.153 Federal Statutes

§ 565.154 State Statutes

§ 565.155 Decisions

[1] Common Law Unfair Competition

[2] Federal Preemption

[3] Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208)

[4] Unfair Practices Act (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101)

§ 565.156 Attorney General Opinions

§ 565.157 Law Reviews

§ 565.158 Text References

§§ 565.159-565.169 [Reserved]

§ 565.170 California Legal Forms

§ 565.171 Federal Statutes

[1] General Jurisdiction

[2] Sherman Act (15 U.S.C.S. §§ 1-7)

[3] Clayton Act (15 U.S.C.S. §§ 12-27, 44)

§ 565.172 State Statutes

[1] Cartwright Act

[a] In General

[b] Exceptions and Exemptions

[c] Procedural and Enforcement Provisions

[2] Contracts in Restraint of Trade

§ 565.173 Decisions

[1] Boycotts

[2] Class Actions

[3] Conspiracy

[4] Contractual Restraints on Former Employees

[5] Covenants Not to Compete

[6] Distributorships

[7] Exclusive Dealing Arrangements

[8] Exhaustion of Administrative Review

[9] Governmental Immunity

[10] Multiple Listing Services

[11] Medical and Dental Plans

[12] Preemption

[13] Price Fixing

[14] Prohibited Combinations

[15] Proof of Injury

[16] Relevant Market

[17] Summary Judgment Rarely Proper

[18] Tying Arrangements

§ 565.174 Law Reviews

§ 565.175 Text References

§§ 565.176-565.189 [Reserved]

§ 565.190 California Points and Authorities

§ 565.191 California Torts

§ 565.192 State Statutes

[1] California Public Records Act

[2] Criminal Sanctions

[3] Customer lists

[4] Employment Related

[5] Evidence and Discovery

[6] Protection of Trade Secrets Disclosed to Government Agency

[7] Trade Secret Definitions

[8] Uniform Trade Secret Act

§ 565.193 Decisions

[1] Customer Lists

[2] Determining Existence of Trade Secret

[a] Generally

[b] Effect of Employment Agreement

[c] No Trade Secret Found

[3] Federal Preemption

[4] Injunctive Relief

[5] Uniform Trade Secrets Act

§ 565.194 Law Reviews

§ 565.195 Text References

§§ 565.196-565.209 [Reserved]

§ 565.210 California Points and Authorities

§ 565.211 California Torts

§ 565.212 State Statutes

§ 565.213 Decisions

[1] Conspiracy to Interfere

[2] Defenses

[3] Intentional Interference

[a] With Contractual Relationship

[b] With Noncontractual Economic Relationship

[4] Negligent Interference

[5] No Cause of Action Stated

[6] Preemption

§ 565.214 Law Reviews

§ 565.215 Text References

§§ 565.216-565.229 [Reserved]

§ 565.230 Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17081] and for Treble Damages [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17082] for Prohibited Business Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17040, 17043-17049]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Injunction Not Necessary for Recovery of Restitution

[5] Punitive Damages

[6] Attorney's Fees and Costs

[7] Verification

[8] Jurisdiction and Venue

[9] Cross References

[10] California Points and Authorities

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

[13] Text References

§ 565.231 Complaint for Restitution and Injunction [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203]--Class Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 382] for Unfair Acts or Practices [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Standing

[5] Statute of Limitations

[6] Remedies

[7] Attorneys' Fees

[8] Verification

[9] Cross References

[10] California Points and Authorities

[11] State Statutes

[12] Cross References

§§ 565.232-565.249 [Reserved]

§ 565.250 Complaint for Treble Damages for Restraint of Trade [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16727, 17650(a)] and Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422] Injunctive Relief--By Consumer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specificity in Pleading Cartwright Cases Required

[5] Pleading Conspiracy: When Inferences Are Sufficient

[6] Pleading Acts in Furtherance of Conspiracy: Coercion or Leverage?

[7] Pleading Damages

[8] Interest and Attorney's Fees

[9] Verification

[10] Cross References

[11] State Statutes

[12] Decisions

§ 565.251 Proceedings to Obtain Prejudgment Interest [Bus. & Prof. Code § 16761]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Prejudgment Interest

[4] State Statutes

§§ 565.252-565.269 [Reserved]

§ 565.270 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333, 3426.3] for Misappropriation of Trade Secret and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[a] First Count

[b] Second Count

[4] Verification

[5] Pleading

[6] Former Employee as Defendant

[7] Director of Corporate Plaintiff as Defendant

[8] Injunction Broadly Written

[9] Cross References

§ 565.271 Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret by Former Employee--Manufacturing Process

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 565.272 Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret--Customer List

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Factors Considered in Determining Whether Customer List Is Trade Secret

[4] Misappropriation

[5] Decisions

[a] Customer List as Trade Secret

[b] Intent to Injure Plaintiff

[c] Damages

[6] Cross References

§ 565.273 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--No Trade Secret--Information Disclosed by Product

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 565.274 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action Barred by Statute of Limitation [Civ. Code § 3426.6; Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 565.275-565.289 [Reserved]

§ 565.290 Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and for Temporary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-527] and Permanent [Civ. Code §§ 3420-3422] Injunctive Relief for Intentional Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Venue

[6] Verification

[7] Cross References

[8] California Torts

[9] State Statutes

[10] Decisions

[11] Text References

[12] Cross References

§ 565.291 Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Negligent Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 565.292 Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisons

[6] Text References

[7] Cross References

§ 565.293 Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Justification or Privilege

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Justification or Privilege

[4] Alternative Use of Demurrer

[5] California Points and Authorities

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 565.294 Interference With Economic Relations--Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 664]--Awarding Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Entry and Notice of Entry of Judgment

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART I. SCOPE

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.01

§ 565.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses actions based on statutory unfair competition (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*; *see § 565.30* et seq.) and actions under the Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.* [*see § 565.50* et seq.]. It includes a form of complaint for use by a plaintiff to obtain injunctive relief and damages against a defendant for violation of the Unfair Practices Act [*see § 565.230*].

For discussion and forms concerning related actions (other than those discussed in*§ 565.70* et seq.,§ 565.100 et seq., and§ 565.130 et seq.) that are based on false advertising [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*], common law trade libel, and trademark infringement [*see 15 U.S.C.S. § 1051 et seq.*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 14200 et seq.*], or common law confusion of source, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* , Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* , and Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names* .

Causes of action based on federal law, particularly the Robinson-Patman Act [*15 U.S.C.S. § 13 et seq.*] and the Federal Trade Commission Act [*15 U.S.C.S. § 41 et seq.*], are frequently combined with causes of action discussed in this part. For full discussion of related federal legislative schemes governing unfair business practices, see Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation(Matthew Bender).

This chapter also discusses contracts not to compete and other restraints of trade, business, and practice of one's profession prohibited under California law [*see § 565.70* et seq.]. It contains a form of complaint by a consumer plaintiff against various defendants for restraint of trade [*see § 565.250*].

Contracts between former partners or between a former partner and a partnership not to compete are discussed in *Ch. 403, Partnerships: Actions by and Against Dissociated Partners, § 403.14*. For in-depth coverage of antitrust law, see Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation(Matthew Bender).

This chapter also discusses trade secrets generally, including both the common law and the Uniform Trade Secret Act (UTSA), (*Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*[*see § 565.100* et seq.]). It includes a form of complaint for damages for and injunctive relief against misappropriation of a trade secret [*see § 565.270*]. Also included are forms of allegations for use by a plaintiff when the misappropriation is by a former employee [*see § 565.271*] and when the trade secret is in the

form of a customer list [*see § 565.272*]. This part also includes forms of affirmative defense based on product disclosure of the trade secret [*see § 565.273*] and the statute of limitations [*see § 565.274*].

This chapter also discusses tort actions for intentional and negligent interference with economic relations [*see § 565.130* et seq.]. It includes forms of complaint alleging intentional [*see § 565.290*] or negligent [*see § 565.291*] interference with a contract or other economic relationship. Also included are forms of affirmative defenses to an action for interference [*see §§ 565.292, 565.293*] and a form of judgment granting monetary and injunctive relief in such an action [*see § 565.294*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART I. SCOPE

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.02

§ 565.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

For discussion relating to civil actions for false or misleading advertising under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*, see Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

For general discussion and forms relating to tort damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

For discussion and forms relating to jurisdictional allegations in complaints filed in federal court, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

For general discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For general discussion and forms relating to trade libel, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

For general discussion and forms relating to state and federal copyright protection, see Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* .

For discussion and a form relating to actions by independent retail equipment dealers for violations of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22900 et seq.*, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

For discussion and forms relating to trademark and trade name infringement, see Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names* .

For discussion and forms relating to deceit and constructive fraud, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

For discussion and forms relating to procedures for seeking injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions involving the rights and duties of the employment relationship, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions involving an agency relationship, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

For discussion relating to civil conspiracy generally and forms of complaint alleging conspiracy to interfere with business or contractual relationships, see Ch. 126, *Conspiracy* .

For general discussion and forms relating to breach of contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to immunity of public entities for interference with economic relations, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* , and Ch. 464, *Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act* .

For further discussion and a form of complaint for use in an action for intentional interference with a physician's practice, see Ch. 416, *Physicians: Membership on Hospital Staffs or in Professional Organizations* .

4 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART I. SCOPE

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.04-565.09

[Reserved]

§§ 565.04[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
1. In General

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.10

§ 565.10 Governing Law

Actions for unfair competition are generally governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* Particular unfair business practices are also actionable under the Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*), which prohibits locality discrimination, sales and services below cost, secret rebates, and other specified practices.

Civ. Code § 3345 trebles a discretionary civil penalty in any other statute in an action brought by, on behalf of, or for the benefit of, senior citizens or disabled persons to redress unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition.

6 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
1. In General

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.11-565.29

[Reserved]

§§ 565.11[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.30

§ 565.30 Unfair Competition

[1] Statutory Definition

California's unfair competition law, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* (sometimes called, although not officially, the Unfair Competition Act), defines unfair competition to mean and include three types of business-related activities [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*]:

- Any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice [*see § 565.31*];
- Unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising; and
- Any act prohibited by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*, a chapter that governs a broad range of advertising.

For discussion of unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising as well as activities governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*, and related forms, *see* Ch. 14, *Advertising* .

[2] Common Law Concept

Common law unfair competition is limited to fact situations involving confusion of source. Former *Civ. Code § 3369*, which was supplanted by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, encompassed only common law unfair competition [*see Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 111, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817* ; *Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 735, 740 n. 2, 162 Cal. Rptr. 543* ; *Plotkin v. Tanner's Vacuums (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 454, 459, 125 Cal. Rptr. 697* ; Note, *Former Civil Code Section 3369: A Study in Judicial Interpretation, 30 Hastings L.J. 705 (1979)*]. The common law concept is partly subsumed in the statutory definition in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* but for the most part is covered by the law of trademarks and trade names [*see* Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names*] and, to some extent, patent and copyright law [*see* Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* , and Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions* ; *see also § 565.37*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.31

§ 565.31 Unlawful, Unfair, or Fraudulent Business Act or Practice

[1] In General

Actions for relief under the unfair competition law may be based on any business act or practice that is within the broad definition of unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* [*Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Fisher Dev., Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1433, 1438-1439, 257 Cal. Rptr. 151* ; *cf. People ex rel. Mosk v. Nat'l Research Co. of Cal. (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 765, 770-771, 20 Cal. Rptr. 516* (decided under former *Civ. Code § 3369*)].

[2] Causal Connection Required

In an action under the unfair competition statute, a plaintiff is required to provide evidence of a causal connection between a defendant's business practices and the alleged harm--that is, evidence that the defendant's conduct caused or was likely to cause substantial injury. It is insufficient for a plaintiff to show merely that the defendant's conduct created a risk of harm [*In re Firearm Cases (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 959, 982-982, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 659* (no evidence that conduct of gun manufacturers or distributors actually caused harm attributed to gun dealers and users)].

[3] "Act or Practice"

The "act or practice" aspect of the statutory definition of unfair competition covers any single act of misconduct, as well as ongoing misconduct [*see Klein v. Earth Elements, Inc. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 965, 969 n.3, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 623* ; *Podolsky v. First Healthcare Corp. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 632, 654-655]* . Until the words "any ... act or" were added in 1992, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* specified unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent "business practice" and was construed as being directed at ongoing wrongful business conduct, something beyond a single transaction [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1169-1170, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

[4] "Unlawful" Acts and Practices

[a] In General

An unlawful business act or practice is an act or practice that is both undertaken pursuant to business activity and also forbidden by law [*Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 377, 383, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487, 826 P.2d 730]* . Any business act or practice that is unlawful, in the sense that it violates a specific statute, may be enjoined under the unfair competition law [*Comm. on Children's Television, Inc. v. Gen. Foods Corp. (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 197, 209-210, 197 Cal. Rptr. 783, 673 P.2d 660 , superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in Gartin v. S&M NuTec LLC, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 38050 (C.D. Cal.)* ; *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Fisher Dev., Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1433, 1438-1439, 257 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

Virtually any law can serve as the predicate for an unfair competition action [*State Farm Fire & Cas. Co. v. Superior Court (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1102-1103, 53 Cal. Rptr.2d 229]* . The "unlawful" practices prohibited by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* are any practices forbidden by law, be it civil or criminal, federal, state, or municipal, statutory, regulatory, or court-made. It is not necessary that the predicate law provide for private civil enforcement [*Saunders v. Superior Court (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 832, 838-839, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438* ; *see Californians for Population Stabilization v. Hewlett-Packard Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 273, 287, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621* (unfair competition cases have cited anti-discrimination laws, antitrust laws, criminal laws, environmental protection laws, fish and game laws, housing laws, labor laws, and vehicle laws)].

In one case, a court of appeal held that violations of a conditional use permit, as well as violations of a temporary restraining order, could be challenged as unlawful business practices [*Hewlett v. Squaw Valley Ski Corp. (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 499, 532, 535, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118]* .

However, the underlying statute might create an exclusive jurisdictional prerequisite that must be met before any subsequent action may be brought, including an action under the unfair competition statute. For example, the Talent Agencies Act vests exclusive original jurisdiction in the Labor Commissioner for all claims arguably coming under its provisions [*see Lab. Code § 1700.44*], and failure to meet this jurisdictional hurdle will bar an action under the unfair competition statute for violation of the Act [*Blanks v. Seyfarth Shaw LLP (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 336, 364-365, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710*].

Federal law generally does not preempt use of the unfair competition statute to remedy a violation of federal law. To the extent that the action is based on a violation of federal requirements, the plaintiff is not seeking to impose different or additional requirements beyond those imposed under federal law. Therefore, the action does not run afoul of federal preemption concerns [*see McKell v. Washington Mut., Inc. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457, 1485-1486, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 227]* .

[b] Unfair Practices Act Violations

A violation of the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*; *see § 565.50* et seq.] can be the basis for relief under the unfair competition law [*see People v. Thomas Shelton Powers, M.D., Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 330, 338-339, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34* (sale of condominium unit, designated as low- and moderate-income housing, at price exceeding established ceiling, in violation of city code, was unfair practice under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*, andplaintiff entitled to relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*)].

[c] Cartwright Act Violations

Violations of the Cartwright Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16700 et seq.*], which governs activities in restraint of trade [*see § 565.70* et seq.], would constitute unlawful acts or practices under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*see, e.g., BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App.3d 1410, 1422-1423, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819* ; *see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 43-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *B.W.I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1345, 1348, 1348 n. 6, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228]* . This subject is

further discussed in*§ 565.31[5][a]*.

[d] Uniform Trade Secrets Act Violations

Misappropriation of trade secrets in violation of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act [*Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*; *see § 565.100* et seq.] would constitute unfair competition [*see Courtesy Temporary Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1292, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352* ("cases are legion" holding that former employee's use of confidential information obtained from employer to compete with employer and solicit business from employer's customers is regarded as unfair competition)].

[e] Choice of Remedies

An act or practice that violates a specific statute may be redressed under that statute instead of under the unfair competition law. For example, sales that violated provisions of the Unfair Practices Act governing below-cost sales and loss leaders (namely, sales made with the purpose of injuring competitors and destroying competition) were subject to the greater remedies afforded by the Unfair Practices Act [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 174-175, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527* ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17043, 17044*].

[f] Mere Cause of Action Not "Unlawful" Act or Practice

Although any violation of virtually any law, including court-made law, can serve as the predicate for an unfair competition action based on an unlawful business act or practice [*see § 565.31[4]*], such an action is not warranted for a mere cause of action. For instance, mere liability under the doctrines of strict products liability and breach of the implied warranty of fitness was insufficient to support an independent unfair competition action for an unlawful business act or practice [*Klein v. Earth Elements, Inc. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 965, 969, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 623* (manufacturer's unintentional distribution of contaminated pet food was beyond scope and policy of unfair competition law's proscription of unlawful business act or practice)]. In another case, the inclusion of unenforceable liquidated-damages provisions in an employment contract did not constitute an unlawful business practice [*Californians for Population Stabilization v. Hewlett-Packard Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 273, 287, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621]* .

[5] "Unfair" Acts and Practices

[a] Business Rivals

If a plaintiff claims to have suffered injury from a direct competitor's "unfair" act or practice, as that term is used in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, conduct is "unfair" if it threatens an incipient violation of an antitrust law, or violates the policy or spirit of such a law because its effects are comparable to or the same as a violation of the law, or otherwise significantly threatens or harms competition [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 187, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]* . Thus, below-cost sales were unfair under the provisions of the unfair competition law because they were neither protected under a specific statute [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026.1*; *see also § 565.32[1]*] nor yet in violation of the Unfair Practices Act's provisions on below-cost sales and loss leaders [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 188, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]* .

This standard is patterned after the test used to determine "unfair methods of competition" under Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act [*see Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 185-186, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527* ; *see also 15 U.S.C.S. § 45(a)*]. For example, unfair price discrimination between customers may be enjoined under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* [*see Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 735, 739-741, 162 Cal. Rptr. 543]* .

Under this standard, an injury to a competitor is not the same as an injury to competition, and only the latter is actionable. For example, a supplier's refusal to deal on favorable terms with a competitor, although perhaps injurious to the competitor, is not necessarily actionable as an injury to competition [*see People's Choice Wireless, Inc. v. Verizon Wireless (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 656, 666-668, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 819]* .

Unless there is a law that provides otherwise, a private party generally may choose to refuse to do business with whomever he or she pleases without violating the spirit of antitrust laws [*Drum v. San Fernando Valley Bar Assn. (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 247, 254, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d 46]* .

[b] Other Contexts

The standard discussed in*§ 565.31[5][a]* is limited to claims of unfair acts and practices between business rivals. It does not apply to actions brought by consumers [*see § 565.33*] or actions between competitors alleging other kinds of violations of the unfair competition law, such as actions alleging fraudulent or unlawful business practices or unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 187 n.12, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]* .

The standard for determining what constitutes unfair conduct in these othercontexts is not entirely clear. In one line of cases determining whether a business practice or act is unfair within the meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* entails examination of the effect of the practice or act on thevictim, balanced against the reasons, justifications, and motives of the alleged wrongdoer. The court must weigh the utility of the alleged wrongdoer's conduct against the gravity of the harm to the alleged victim [*Progressive West Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (2005) 135 Cal. App. 4th 263, 285-286, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 434* ; *Pastoria v. Nationwide Ins. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1490, 1498, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 148]* . For example, a pet food distributor unintentionally distributed contaminated pet food, but then acted promptly to recall the contaminated products, advertised the recall effort, and afforded restitution to customers. The pet food distributor's conduct was not unfair within the meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. The court reasoned that: (1) although dogs did get sick, the distributor's act was accidental; (2) after discovering what had happened, the distributor moved quickly to abate the harm; and (3) setting the standard at perfection or zero mistakes was too high a price to pay for eliminating the potential harm to the dogs from the unwitting distribution of contaminated food [*Klein v. Earth Elements, Inc. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 965, 970, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 623]* .

However, other court of appeal opinions have questioned whether the earlier formulations for determining what constitutes unfair conduct in an action brought by a party who is not a competitor are now too broad in light of the Supreme Court's more restrictive definition of what constitutes an unfair practice in an action brought by a competitor [*see § 565.31[5][a]*]. Some of these court opinions have suggested that to ensure that a court will not merely apply its own subjective conception of fairness, the conduct alleged to be unfair must be tethered to a specific constitutional, statutory, or regulatory provision, at least if the claim of unfairness is predicated on an alleged violation of public policy [*see, e.g., Scripps Clinic v. Superior Court (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 917, 939-940, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101]* .

Other court of appeal opinions have adopted a test in consumer actions that is patterned after the test applicable in similar cases brought under the Federal Trade Commission Act. Under this test, a consumer must show that the injury: (1) is substantial; (2) is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers or competition, and (3) is not one that consumers themselves could reasonably have avoided [*Davis v. Ford Motor Credit Co. LLC (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 581, 597-598, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 697* ; *Camacho v. Automobile Club of S. Cal. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1403, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770]* . The first court opinion to adopt this test concluded that tethering a finding of unfairness in consumer cases to a violation of specific provisions was too restrictive, given the broad scope of the unfair competition statute and the fact that separate provision is made in the statute for "unlawful" conduct. The court also concluded that although it makes sense to tie unfair, anti-competitive conduct among competitors to antitrust laws, the same cannot be said if the action is brought by a consumer, because the range of potentially unfair, harmful conduct is broader [*Camacho v. Automobile Club of S. Cal. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1394, 1402-1403, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770]* .

[6] "Fraudulent" Acts and Practices

Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* specifies any "fraudulent" business act or practice [*see § 565.30[1]*], courts often speak of "deceptive" acts and practices when applying the unfair competition law. Proving a fraudulent or deceptive business practice only requires a showing that members of the public are likely to be deceived, and unlike common law fraud, it does not require allegations of actual deception, reasonable reliance, and damages [*Blakemore v. Superior Court (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 36, 49, 27 Cal. Rptr. 3d 877* ; *see, e.g.,* *Morgan v. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 1235, 1255-1257, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 768* (plaintiffs sufficiently alleged UCL action based on deceptive conduct by wireless telephone carrier when marketing phone and accompanying network services)].

In one case, a nursing home's proposed third-party guarantee agreement for private-pay residents provided that the guarantor's signature was optional, but if the guarantor did sign, he or she was personally guaranteeing payment to the home for all care, supplies, or services provided to the resident. Because the agreement offered family members little or no additional protection under federal and state law, the absence of any information regarding those protections rendered the guarantee agreement deceptive. The manner in which the original guarantee agreements were presented and explained to potential guarantors may have been deceptive as well. During the admissions process, numerous documents were hurriedly presented to family members, with little or no explanation. The court held that the procedure was likely to deceive consumers, who would not be made aware of the provisions of the proposed guarantee, or who might be misled into believing that signature was required [*Podolsky v. First Healthcare Corp. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 632, 651, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89]* .

On the other hand, the inclusion of unenforceable terms in an employment contract was not considered a deceptive business practice under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. The court reasoned that the employment contract was legal under the laws of India and that the mere fact that certain provisions were unenforceable in California did not render the use of the documents a deceptive business practice [*Californians for Population Stabilization v. Hewlett-Packard Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 273, 293, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.32

§ 565.32 Exempt Acts and Practices

[1] Specifically Permitted Business Activity

An action based on unlawful business practice may be maintained unless the defendant's conduct is privileged or is immunized by another statute, or unless the underlying statute expressly bars its enforcement under the unfair competition law [*Stevens v. Superior Court (1999) 75 Cal. App. 4th 594, 603-604, 89 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370* (plaintiff could base action on violation of Insurance Code requirementthat agents, brokers, and automobile dealers be licensed to transact insurance business)].

In a case brought by cellular telephone retailers alleging injury caused by below-cost sales of cellular telephones by a cellular telephone service provider, the Supreme Court held that cellular telephone sales that were specifically permitted by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026.1*, which is part of the Unfair Practices Act, could not be "unfair" under the unfair competition law [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 187-188, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]* .

The rule that an action under the unfair competition statute cannot be based on conduct that is specifically permitted by law has been applied even though the statute authorizing the conduct was subsequently held to be preempted by federal law [*Olszewski v. Scripps Health (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 798, 829, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1, 69 P.3d 927]* .

[2] No Claim for Conduct Within Litigation Privilege

Conduct that would otherwise amount to unfair competition may be protected by the "litigation privilege" of *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, so that the party against whom the litigation is threatened or maintained cannot state a claim for relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1196-1204, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044* ; *see, e.g., People ex rel. Gallegos v. The Pacific Lumber Co. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 950, 958-963, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 501* (litigation privilege provided complete defense to action brought by State under unfair competition statute against lumber company that allegedly provided false information in administrative proceedings)]. That was the eventual outcome for a retaliatory unfair competition action filed by the owner of a mobile home park after he received a notice

from a tenant stating that she intended to commence an action against him for 23 alleged defects in the operation of the park. The tenant and over 120 other residents of the park eventually did file suit, but not until after the park owner had filed a suit against the tenant who sent the notice and her attorneys for damages and injunctive relief based on meetings that the tenant and her attorneys had with other residents of the park. Those meetings were alleged to have interfered with the park owner's contractual relations with the other tenants and to constitute unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* because they violated *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6152* and *6153*, which make it unlawful to act as an agent in soliciting business on behalf of attorneys.

The entire Supreme Court agreed that the conduct alleged was sufficiently communicative and sufficiently related to the threatened judicial proceeding that *Civ. Code § 47(b)* and the policy interest it is designed to protect--namely, assuring free access to the courts--barred any action for damages [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1196, 1204, 1212, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* .

Regarding the availability of injunctive relief, however, the court was closely divided. The majority reasoned that it would undermine the privilege to permit the same communicative acts that would not support a claim for damages to provide the basis for injunctive relief, and that the privilege should not evaporate merely because there is a conveniently different label for pleading what is in substance an identical grievance arising from identical conduct as that protected by *Civ. Code § 47(b)*. Permitting injunctive relief would upset the balance between a plaintiff's freedom to seek redress in the courts and a potential defendant's interest in being free from unjustified litigation [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1203, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* . The majority emphasized that their result was in part due to the precise circumstances involved, noting that apart from spawning another layer of litigation, allowing injunction relief in the derivative action would promote all the evils that accompany retaliatory suits based on litigation-related communications, such as disruption, intimidation, distractions of requiring counsel to defend the personal countersuit, and the dampening effect on presentation of the underlying claim *[Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1198, 1203-1204, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* .

The minority distinguished between adequate access to the judicial system and illegal access, and thought that allowing injunctive relief would not restrict legal access because it was quick and easy and because even if the underlying action had no merit, it would be allowed to proceed despite any injunction against the unlawful solicitation. The minority believed that allowing injunctive relief would not deprive anyone of access to the courts because there are enough competent, ethical attorneys that any person with any even remotely meritorious claim can find an attorney [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1212, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* . The minority also found it inappropriate that under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*, district attorneys, city attorneys, members of the public, and everyone but the victim will be empowered to bring suit to have the unlawful solicitation enjoined [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1204-1206, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* . The minority did not agree that there was any apparent conflict between *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17203* and *17204*, and *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6152* and *6153*, but believed that the legislature, in enacting the Business and Professions Code sections after the privilege was already in place, intended injunctive relief to be available against unlawful solicitation [*Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1207-1208, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* .

Relying on a distinction drawn by the Supreme Court [*see* *Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1202-1204, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044]* , however, the court of appeal has subsequently held that the litigation privilege is not a defense in an unfair competition action brought against an attorney if the plaintiff was not a party to the earlier litigation in which the allegedly protected conduct occurred [*American Prods. Co., Inc. v. Law Offices of Geller, Stewart & Foley, LLP (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1346, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 93* ; *Kashian v. Harriman (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 892, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576]* . In one case, for example, the manufacturer of after-market automotive accessories, alleged to be illegal for use on California roads, brought suit for unfair competition and related claims against a law firm that had sent demand letters to retailers who sold the goods. The demand letters, and subsequent lawsuits that were brought against these retailers, were allegedly an attempt to force settlements from those retailers and create income for the law firm. When the manufacturer sued the law firm for its litigation-related tactics against the retailers, the court of appeal

held that the litigation privilege did not protect the firm because the manufacturer wasnot a party to the underlying litigation and the Supreme Court's analysis described above was specifically limited to unfair competition actions brought by plaintiffs who were parties to the underlying litigation [*American Prods. Co., Inc. v. Law Offices of Geller, Stewart & Foley, LLP (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1346, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 93]* . The continued vitality of this holding is suspect, however, as the California Supreme Court, while not mentioning the case just described, has subsequently rejected a broad exception to the litigation privilege for parties who did not participate in the underlying litigation [*Action Apartment Assn., Inc. v. City of Santa Monica (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 1232, 1248, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 398, 163 P.3d 89* ; *see People ex rel. Gallegos v. The Pacific Lumber Co. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 950, 961* & n.5, *70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 501*].

[3] Political Election Campaigns

The practices of political election campaigns [*see* Ch. 242, *Election Campaigns*] are not subject to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*O'Connor v. Superior Court (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1014, 1019-1020, 223 Cal. Rptr. 357]* .

[4] Title Insurance Ratemaking

The practices of title insurers [*see* Ch. 548, *Title Insurance*] are subject to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 43-46, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* , except with respect to ratemaking [*see Walker v. Allstate Indem. Co. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 750, 754-760, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 132* (Insurance Code provides immunity to claims under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* challenging rates charged by insurance companies, because rates were approved through appropriate administrative procedures); *cf. Donabedian v. Mercury Ins. Co. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 968, 992-994, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 45* (because insurance commissioner approved only general use of "persistency" as rating factor, claim against insurer for improperly applying lack of prior insurance in determining rates for individual policyholders did not involve "ratemaking")].

[5] Securities Transactions

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. is inapplicable to securities transactions [*Bowen v. Ziasun Techs., Inc. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 777, 788-790, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.33

§ 565.33 Customers as Victims or Perpetrators of Unfair Competition

In broadly defining unfair competition without limiting its scope to acts and practices between business competitors, the legislature has extended protection to the customers, as well as the rivals, of individuals and entities that engage in prohibited acts and practices [*see, e.g., Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 109-113, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817* (collection agency's practice of filing actions in inconvenient forums to obtain default judgments); *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Fisher Dev., Inc. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 1433, 1439, 257 Cal. Rptr. 151* ; *Pines v. Tomson (1984) 160 Cal. App. 3d 370, 379-381, 206 Cal. Rptr. 866* (publisher's discrimination against advertisers on basis of religious belief)].

Moreover, customers can be sued for engaging in prohibited acts and practices [*see, e.g., Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 449-450, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872* (buyer refused delivery of part of crop and downgraded other part, thus undercutting price in violation of statute)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.34

§ 565.34 Remedies and Relief

[1] In General

Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*; *see also Madrid v. Perot Sys. Corp. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 440, 465, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 210* (injunction only appropriate if threat of misconduct's being repeated in future)]. The court may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver [*see* Ch. 486, *Receivers*], as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by a person of any practice that constitutes unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, that may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*].

For a form of complaint to enjoin unfair competition and recover restitution under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq., see § 565.231*. For a form stating a cause of action brought under that statute, based on the deceptive use of a confusingly similar name or mark, *see* Ch. 549, *Trademarks and Trade Names* .

[2] Restitution and Disgorgement

[a] In General

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 expressly authorizes a court to take whatever action is necessary to restore to any person in interest any property acquired by means of unfair competition. There is little question that the broad range of remedies provided for in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* includes restitution and disgorgement of profits [*People v. Thomas Shelton Powers, M.D., Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 330, 339-341, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34* (action by district attorney, not private litigant); *see Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 704, 721, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899* (no challenge to private litigant's recovery of so-called restitutionary damages pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*)]. However, in exercising its discretion to fashion an appropriate equitable remedy, the court may also consider any equitable defenses pleaded by the defendant [*Cortez v. Purolator Air Filtration Prods. Co. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 163, 179-180, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518, 999 P.2d 706]* .

Restitution may be ordered even without the issuance of an injunction. The Supreme Court has rejected the contention that restitution is available only when ancillary to an injunction [*ABC Int'l Traders, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 1247, 1268-1271, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112, 931 P.2d 290]* .

Although restitution and disgorgement of profits are appropriate to prevent a defendant from profiting from unfair competition, disgorgement into a fluid recovery fund is authorized only in a class action suit and may not be used in a representative action that has not been certified as a class action [*Kraus v. Trinity Mgmt. Servs., Inc. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 116, 137, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 485, 999 P.2d 718* ; *see also Corbett v. Superior Court (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 649, 654-655, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 46* (UCLaction may be prosecuted as class action, and class remedy may include disgorgement into fluid recovery fund)]. Moreover, even in a class action, disgorgement into a fluid recovery fund is limited to disgorgementof restitutionary funds and does not extend to amounts that are nonrestitutionary in nature [*Feitelberg v. Credit Suisse First Boston, LLC (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 997, 1016-1020, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 592* ; *Madrid v. Perot Sys. Corp. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 440, 460, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 210]* .

A defendant cannot be ordered to disgorge profits to an individual plaintiff if those profits were not taken from the plaintiff or if the plaintiff does not otherwise have an ownership interest in those profits, because disgorgement of profits in the absence of an ownership interest by the plaintiff goes beyond the restitution that is authorized by the statute [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1144-1148, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937* ; *see also Reid v. Google, Inc. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1342, 1351, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 744* (plaintiff unable to recover stock options that had not vested at time of actionable conduct as restitution)]. However, a plaintiff who purchases a product because of false or misleading advertisements or product packaging statements is entitled to recover from the product manufacturer as restitution the revenue obtained from the sale of the product, even if the plaintiff purchased the product from a retailer rather than directly from the manufacturer. A plaintiff in such cases is effectively seeking the return of money in which plaintiff had an interest prior to the purchase [*Shersher v. Superior Court (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1491, 1494, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 634]* .

Under the appropriate circumstances, a defendant may be ordered to pay restitution even if plaintiff did not pay the money directly to that defendant, as for example, when the money was paid to an agent for the defendant or otherwise was paid to an enterprise of which defendant was an integral part and defendant directly benefited financially from the payments [*Troyk v. Farmers Group, Inc. (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 1305, 1340-1342, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 589]* .

[b] Award to Nonparties in Class Action

An action under the unfair competition statute may be prosecuted as a class action [*Corbett v. Superior Court (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 649, 654-655, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 46]* . However, in a case that involved a challenge to a $50 termination fee that an investment firm assessed on individual retirement accounts, the court held that it was error to certify the action as a class action without any showing that class treatment was demonstrably superior to an individual, representative action [*Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 758, 772-773, 259 Cal. Rptr. 789]* . The court in another case reversed a restitution award to 27 nonparty wine-grape growers on several grounds: each grower's damages required complicated proof of such things as sugar content, tonnages delivered, and delivery dates; serious fundamental due process questions were raised; and administrative proceedings available through the Department of Agriculture provided the growers with an inexpensive and effective remedy [*Bronco Wine Co. v. Frank A. Logoluso Farms (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 699, 717-721, 262 Cal. Rptr. 899]* . Similarly, a defendant cannot be ordered to disgorge profits to an individual plaintiff if those profits were not taken from the plaintiff or if the plaintiff does not otherwise have an ownership interest in those profits, because disgorgement of profits in the absence of an ownership interest by the plaintiff goes beyond the restitution that is authorized by the statute [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1144-1148, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* .

[3] Damages

[a] No Private Recovery

A private plaintiff cannot recover damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* [*Heller v. Norcal Mut. Ins. Co. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 30, 45, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200, 876 P.2d 999* ; *Bank of W. v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 1254, 1266, 1272-1273 & n.7* (disgorgement of wrongfully obtained money does not constitute damages covered by insurance policy), *disapproving United Farm Workers of Am. v. Superior Court (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 334, 120 Cal. Rptr. 904* ; *Industrial Indem. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1096-1097, 257 Cal. Rptr. 655* ; *see E.W. French & Sons, Inc. v. General Portland Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 1392, 1401-1402* ; *Little Oil Co., Inc. v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 852 F.2d 441, 445* (determining pendent state claims)]. The Supreme Court has held that the substantially similar provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17535* [*see* Ch. 14, *Advertising*] does not support the award of compensatory damages to private individuals, but instead limits their relief to equitable remedies--namely, injunction and restitution [*Bank of W. v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 1254, 1272-1273, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 538, 833 P.2d 545* ; *Fletcher v. Security Pac. Nat'l Bank (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 442, 452, 153 Cal. Rptr. 28, 591 P.2d 51* ; *Chern v. Bank of Am. (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 866, 875, 127 Cal. Rptr. 110, 544 P.2d 1310]* .

Because a plaintiff is not entitled to damages under the statute, the proper measure of restitution is the amount received by the defendant as a result of the improper conduct, even if the amount of monetary damage suffered by the plaintiff as a consequence of the conduct is greater [*Inline, Inc. v. Apace Moving Sys., Inc. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 895, 903-904, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 216]* .

[b] In-Lieu Recovery

Although damages are not recoverable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*, a remedy that could constitute "damages" if recovered on a different cause of action may still be available under the unfair competition statute. For example, under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*, a defendant may be compelled to pay back wages that were unlawfully withheld from employees, even though back wages may constitute damages in another action [*Cortez v. Purolator Air Filtration Prods. Co. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 163, 176-178, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518, 999 P.2d 706]* . Restitution under the unfair competition lawis not limited to the return of money or property that was once in possession of the person entitled to restitution; it may include wages that were earned in exchange for labor given, because the right to the wages had already vested in the plaintiff [*Cortez v. Purolator Air Filtration Prods. Co. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 163, 178, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518, 999 P.2d 706* ; *see also Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1149, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* .

However, while wages may be recovered from the actual employer, wages may notbe recovered as restitution from the employer's owners, officers, or managers, unless the labor was performed for such persons personally or those persons appropriated funds from the employer that would otherwise have been used to pay the unpaid wages [*Bradstreet v. Wong (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1440, 1460-1461, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 253*]. In addition, a penalty imposed on an employer under *Lab. Code § 203* for failure to pay earned wages on time are not wages for labor provided and may not be recovered as restitution under the unfair competition statute [*Pineda v. Bank of America, N.A. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 388, 393-394, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 864 , review granted, depublished, Pineda v. Bank of America, N.A. (2009) 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 536, 207 P.3d 1, 2009 Cal. LEXIS 4599*].

[4] Cumulative Remedies

The remedies of the unfair competition law are cumulative to each other and to the remedies or penalties available under all other state laws [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17205*]. Thus, counsel might consider seeking damages under some other law and injunctive relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*. For instance, a growers cooperative, faced with a buyer's refusal to take delivery of part of the crop and the buyer's downgrading of the portions it did accept, recovered damages under *Com. Code § 2706*, and an injunction under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* was not barred by the award of damages, especially because the buyer had perpetrated the same unfair practice on others [*see Allied Grape Growers v. Bronco*

Wine Co. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 432, 452-453, 249 Cal. Rptr. 872] .

[5] Attorney's Fees

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 does not authorize an award of attorney's fees to a successful plaintiff. Attorney's fees may not be recovered under this statute even if the violation of another statute serves as a predicate for the unfair competition action and that underlying statute has a provision for the recovery of attorney's fees, at least when the plaintiff brings the action solely under the unfair competition statute rather than directly under the underlying statute [*Davis v. Ford Motor Credit Co. LLC (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 581, 601, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 697]* .

However, if a provision in a contract that provides for attorney's fees is challenged in an action that is in fact one to enforce or avoid enforcement of that particular contract, attorney's fees may be awarded to the prevailing party in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1717* [*Shadoan v. World Sav. & Loan Assn. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 97, 107-109, 268 Cal. Rptr. 207* (fees to successful defendant, however, were apportioned because plaintiffs sued in individual capacity for restitution and in representative capacity to enjoin application of challenged provision in other contracts; plaintiffs could not be charged with attorney's fees relating to injunction or to issues pursued in representative capacity)].

[6] Subsequent Administrative Actions

The filing of a civil action under the unfair competition law does not preclude the subsequent commencement, by an administrative agency, of an administrative proceeding based on the same facts. There is no fundamental unfairness because the statutory remedies under the unfair competition law are cumulative, and the relief sought in an administrative proceeding is unavailable in a civil action under the unfair competition law [*Setliff Bros. Serv. v. Bureau of Auto. Repair (1997) 53 Cal App. 4th 1491, 1495-1496, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.35

§ 565.35 Action for Relief

[1] Standing to Sue

A private person may bring an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* only if the person has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*]; *R & B Auto Ctr., Inc. v. Farmers Group, Inc. (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 327, 360, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426* (plaintiff's payment of insurance premiums for liability coverage not provided, despite contrary representations, and payment on claim against plaintiff due to lack of coverage, constituted loss sufficient to confer standing). A private plaintiff may file a representative action on behalf of others only if the plaintiff meets this actual injury requirement and meets the requirements for class actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 382* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*; *Arias v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969, 980, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588, 209 P.3d 923*]. However, so long as a class is otherwise properly certified, only the named class representatives must specifically show standing to bring the action and unnamed class members need not do so [*In re Tobacco II Cases (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 298, 321, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559, 207 P.3d 20]* .

Only a person who meets the requirements for standing may bring an action under the unfair competition statute. Thus, an injured party who would have standing cannot assign the right to sue under the unfair competition statute to another party who does not otherwise meet the requirements for standing to sue [*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 993, 1002, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605, 209 P.3d 937*]. Moreover, an association, such as a labor union, does not have standing to sue on behalf of its individual members when the association itself cannot meet the requirements for standing [*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 993, 1003-1004, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605, 209 P.3d 937*]. A private plaintiff must also show a causal connection between the alleged wrongful conduct and the actual injury sustained [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*; *Hall v. Time Inc. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 847, 855, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466* ; *Daro v. Superior Court (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1098, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716]* . For example, if the unfair competition claim is based on fraud stemming from alleged false advertising and misrepresentations made to consumers, the plaintiff must plead and prove actual reliance to satisfy the standing requirement [*In re Tobacco II Cases (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 298, 328, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559, 207 P.3d 20* ; *see, e.g.,* *Princess Cruise Lines, Ltd. v. Superior Court (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 36, 43-44, 101*

Cal. Rptr. 3d 323 (plaintiff's own discovery responses demonstrated that she did not rely on any representations made by defendant cruise line when electing to purchase shore excursions as part of cruise package)]. However, while a plaintiff in those circumstances must allege that the defendant's misrepresentations were an immediate cause of the injury, the plaintiff need not show that those misrepresentations were the sole or even decisive cause. Moreover, the plaintiff is not required to necessarily plead and prove individualized reliance on specific misrepresentations or false statements when those misrepresentations and false statements were part of an extensive and long-term advertising campaign. Finally, an allegation of reliance is not defeated merely because there was alternative information available to the plaintiff that might have countered the defendant's alleged misrepresentations [*In re Tobacco II Cases (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 298, 328, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559, 207 P.3d 20]* .

If the cause of action is based on an unlawful business practice, plaintiff cannot predicate standing to sue on an injury caused by lawful conduct of the defendant that is somehow connected to defendant's unlawful conduct, if that unlawful conduct does not itself cause actionable injury to plaintiff [*Daro v. Superior Court (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1099, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 716]* .

Prior to the passage of Proposition 64 in 2004, the standing requirements for a private plaintiff were much more liberal, and a private person or entity could sue for that person's or entity's interest, the interest of its members, or the interest of the general public [*see* former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*]. Under that standard, a private person or entity could sue on behalf of the general public without having suffered actual injury [*see* *Stop Youth Addiction, Inc. v. Lucky Stores, Inc. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 553, 561, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731, 950 P.2d 1086]* .

A plaintiff may not effectively avoid the changes made by Proposition 64 by claiming as "injury in fact" the expenses incurred in pursuing litigation against the defendant. Similarly, an individual consumer cannot create the requisite injury by purchasing a defendant's product if the purchase was made solely to facilitate a subsequent lawsuit [*Buckland v. Threshold Enterprises, Ltd. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 798, 815-816, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 543]* . Moreover, a plaintiff who purchases a product merely to facilitate future litigation cannot establish that he or she lost money or property "as a result of the unfair competition" [*Buckland v. Threshold Enterprises, Ltd. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 798, 818, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 543]* . In addition, alleged damage to the goodwill of a business, for which no restitution could be recovered under the unfair competition statute, is not a loss of "money or property" sufficient to confer standing to sue [*Citizens of Humanity, LLC v. Costco Wholesale Corp. (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 1, 22, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 455*]. Similarly, a consumer cannot show standing by arguing that he or she would not have purchased the defendant's product had defendant not advertised the product falsely, at least when the product purchased is worth the purchase price, not defective, and priced comparably to competing products [*see, e.g.,* *Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 645, 654-655, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 123* , *review granted, depublished,* *Kwikset Corporation v. Superior Court (2009) 97 Cal. Rptr. 3d 271, 211 P.3d 1060, 2009 Cal. LEXIS 6403* (consumers had no standing to sue padlock manufacturer for falsely representing that locks were made in America, as no restitution would be available for purchases of non-defective locks)].

The California Supreme Court has held that the changes to the requirements for standing enacted by Proposition 64 apply to actions that were pending when Proposition 64 was passed [*Californians for Disability Rights v. Mervyn's, LLC (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 223, 232-233, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 57, 138 P.3d 207]* . However, the ordinary rules governing the amendment of complaints and their relation back to the original complaint apply to these pending lawsuits [*Branick v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 235, 239, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66, 138 P.3d 214]* . Therefore, a complaint brought by a plaintiff who no longer has standing under Proposition 64 may be amended to name a new plaintiff who does meet the standing requirements, so long as the proposed new plaintiff is not stating facts that give rise to a wholly distinct and different cause of action against the defendant [*Branick v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 235, 243, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66, 138 P.3d 214* ; *see, e.g.,* *Foundation For Taxpayer & Consumer Rights v. Nextel Commc'ns, Inc. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 131, 136, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 836* (abuse of discretion for trial court to refuse to allow amendment)]. For purposes of meeting the applicable statute of limitations, any amendment would relate back to the original complaint if the amended complaint rests on the same general set of facts, involves the same injury, and

refers to the same instrumentality as the original complaint [*Branick v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 235, 244, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66, 138 P.3d 214]* .

A plaintiff who has been given an opportunity to amend but cannot meet the requirements for standing, and who has not identified a substitute plaintiff who does meet the requirements for standing, may not have a right to precertification discovery in an attempt to locate an appropriate representative to continue the original plaintiff's action as a class action [*see, e.g.,* *Cryoport Systems v. CNA Ins. Companies (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 627, 633-634, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 358]* . However, when a class action is brought, a plaintiff who is not a class member or is otherwise unqualified to serve as a class representative may, in appropriate cases, move for precertification discovery for the purposes of identifying a proper class representative [*Safeco Ins. Co. of America v. Superior Court (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 814, 828, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814]* . The absence of a reasonable, good-faith belief that the plaintiff had standing under the law in effect at the time the plaintiff was first named as a plaintiff will ordinarily compel denial of a motion for precertification discovery. In other circumstances, however, a trial court should exercise its sound discretion to determine whether the potential for abuse in allowing precertification discovery outweighs the rights of the parties in the particular circumstances of the case [*Safeco Ins. Co. of America v. Superior Court (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 814, 833, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 814]* .

If a plaintiff suffered actual injury sufficient to meet the requirements for standing under Proposition 64, but prior to the passage of Proposition 64 entered into a settlement agreement under which plaintiff released all claims for that injury at least partly in exchange for the right to pursue a claim for injunctive relief, the general rule applying the changes made by Proposition 64 to actions pending at the time of its passage in November 2004 does not bar such a plaintiff from prosecuting the action for injunctive relief [*Zermeno v. Precis, Inc. (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 773, 780, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 360]* .

Collateral estoppel may not bar an unfair competition action seeking class certification under California law just because a court in a previous action alleging the same actionable conduct denied class certification, if the class certification in the previous action was denied because the proposed class included all plaintiffs eligible to bring suit under the more liberal pre-Proposition 64 standing requirements and class certification in the subsequent action is limited to only those plaintiffs who can meet the more stringent standing requirements imposed by Proposition 64 [*Johnson v. GlaxoSmithKline, Inc. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 1497, 1514-1515, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607*].

When certifying a plaintiff class under the current requirements imposed by Proposition 64, even though only the named plaintiff must meet the requirements to establish standing, the class certification process still necessarily includes an inquiry into whether the material questions of law or fact common to the members of the class are substantially similar and predominate over questions affecting the individual class members [*Steroid Hormone Product Cases (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 145, 158, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 329* ; *see also* *McAdams v. Monier, Inc. (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 174, 190-191, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 704]* . However, class certification should not be denied on the grounds that factual issues surrounding actual injury and causation are not substantially similar among the unnamed class members if those inquiries are not necessary to establishing a right to the remedy sought. In one case, for example, a plaintiff sought class certification in a lawsuit seeking the disgorgement of money received by a defendant by selling over-the-counter nutritional supplements that contained steroids that were illegal to sell or possess without a prescription. The trial court denied class certification because of individualized factual inquiries for each class member as to whether the illegality of the product was material to the decision to purchase. The court of appeal reversed, holding that class certification was improperly denied because establishing a right to restitution under the facts required only proof that the defendant's conduct in selling the product was unlawful and evidence of how much money the defendant received through the sale of the unlawful product [*Steroid Hormone Product Cases (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 145, 154-155, 104 Cal. Rptr. 3d 329]* .

As individualized proof of reliance and injury are not generally required for nonrepresentative class members when a class action seeks restitution for alleged misrepresentations in extensive, long-term advertising campaigns, as noted

above, issues concerning reliance by and injury to unnamed class members will not foreclose a class action in that context [*McAdams v. Monier, Inc. (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 174, 192, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 704]* . However, in advertising campaigns of shorter duration, for example a campaign lasting only six months, evidence that many or most of the proposed class members were never actually exposed to alleged misrepresentations can defeat an attempt to certify a class by showing that there was no class-wide injury [*Pfizer Inc. v. Superior Court (2010) 182 Cal. App. 4th 622, 631-633, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795]* .

[2] Suit by Public Attorney

An action for any relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* may also be prosecuted in the name of the people of California by the Attorney General, by any district attorney, by any county counsel authorized by agreement of the district attorney in actions involving violation of a county ordinance, by a city attorney of a city having a population in excess of 750,000, by a city attorney in any city and county, or by a city prosecutor in any city or county having a full-time city prosecutor who has the consent of the either on his or her own complaint or on that of any board, officer, person, corporation, or association [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*]. As the remedies and penalties provided by the unfair competition statute are cumulative to each other and to remedies and penalties available under all other laws of California, a public prosecutor's authority to pursue a remedy under the unfair competition statute is curtailed only as expressly provided by some other law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17205*; *see, e.g.,* *Blue Cross of California, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1237, 1249-1255, -- Cal. Rptr. 3d* -- (city prosecutor was not barred from pursuing unfair competition claims against health care service plan for violations of Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act, *Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.*)].

A city attorney or other public official is not limited to seeking injunctive relief and civil penalties, but may obtain restitution and disgorgement of illicit profits [*see* *People v. Thomas Shelton Powers, M.D., Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 330, 339, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* .

Because an unfair competition action brought by a prosecutor is a law enforcement action primarily for the benefit of the public, res judicata principles do not prevent a person who has been defrauded from seeking restitution in a separate unfair competition suit brought subsequent to the action brought by the public prosecutor, at least if the private plaintiff did not receive restitution from the earlier action brought by the prosecutor [*Payne v. National Collection Sys., Inc. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 1037, 1047, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260]* .

[3] Defendants

[a] Nonresidents

Nonresident as well as resident businesses can be held to account for wrongful business conduct affecting California employers and employees. Thus, a Maryland corporation's use of covenants not to compete in its employment agreements with employees who were not California residents, to prevent them from obtaining employment in California, violated the unfair competition law [*Application Group, Inc. v. Hunter Group, Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 881, 908, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 73]* . However, in that case, an injury was produced in California to California employers. To meet due process concerns, the California unfair competition law may not be applied to defendants whose headquarters and principal places of operation are outside California, if the injuries are suffered by non-California residents and are caused by conduct occurring outside California [*Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 214, 222-227, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 18* (reversing nationwide class certification)].

[b] Government Entity Immunity

Government entities do not meet the definition of "person" applicable to statutory unfair competition actions and thus are not subject to suit brought under the statutory provisions [*California Med. Assn. v. Regents of Univ. of Cal. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 542, 551, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194* ; *Janis v. California State Lottery Comm'n (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th*

824, 831, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 549 ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17201, 17506*]. However, the State Compensation Insurance Fund, although a type of state entity, is statutorily excepted from most protections provided to government entities and may be liable under the unfair competition statute [*Notrica v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 911, 939-944, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89]* . Similarly, a charter school run by a nongovernmental entity is subject to suit under the unfair competition statute, even if the charter school is subject to some degree of oversight by a public school district [*Wells v. One2One Learning Foundation (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 1164*].

[4] Time for Bringing Action

An action based on unfair competition must be commenced within four years after the cause of action accrued [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17208*; *see Mangini v. Aerojet-Gen. Corp. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1125, 1156, 281 Cal. Rptr. 827* (continuing nuisance isdifferent from "continuing misconduct"; unfair competition suit required to be commenced within four years after end of lease term during which defendant failed to remove hazardous waste)]. Court of appeal opinions are in disagreement as to whether a delayed discovery rule, under which the limitations period does not begin to run until a reasonable person would have discovered the factual basis for the claim, may be applied in an unfair competition action [*compare Broberg v. The Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 912, 920-921, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 225* (discovery rule applied to complaint alleging deceptive insurance marketing and sales practices) *with Snapp & Associates Ins. Services, Inc. v. Robertson (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 884, 891, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 331* (delayed discovery rule held inapplicable)].

[5] Notification Requirement

If a cause of action under the unfair competition law is alleged or the application or construction of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* is in issue in any proceeding in the Supreme Court, a court of appeal, or the appellate department of a superior court, the person who commenced the proceeding must serve notice of it. The notice, plus a copy of the brief or petition and brief, must be served on the Attorney General (directed to the attention of the Consumer Law Section) and on the district attorney of the county in which the lower court action or proceeding was originally filed. The notice, brief, and petition, if any, must be served within three days aftercommencement of the appellate proceeding, provided that the time may be extended by the chief justice or presiding judge or justice for good cause shown. No judgment or relief, temporary or permanent, can be granted until proof of service of this notice is filed with the court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17209*]. In addition, at the request of the Attorney General or a district attorney, any person who has filed any other document with the court, including all or a portion of the appellate record, must provide a copy of that document without charge to the Attorney General or district attorney within five days after the request [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17209*].

The phrase "within three days after commencement of the appellate proceeding" in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17209* has been held by one court of appeal to mean that the Attorney General and local district attorney must be served with the appellant's opening brief within three days after its being filed, because it is not until this point that the issues on appeal are specifically set forth and a determination may be made whether to file an amicus curiae brief [*Californians for Population Stabilization v. Hewlett-Packard Co. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 273, 284-285, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621* (rejecting contention that statute establishes jurisdictional requirement for all appellate actions involving unfair competition)].

[6] No Right to Jury Trial

There is no right to a jury trial in an action that is brought solely under the unfair competition statute, even if a jury trial would be available in an action to enforce directly a statute the violation of which forms the basis for the unfair competition action [*Hodge v. Superior Court (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 278, 284, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 519]* . An action brought under the unfair competition statute is a separate cause of action providing equitable, rather than legal, remedies. As such, no right to a jury trial exists [*Hodge v. Superior Court (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 278, 284, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 519* ; *see § 565.34*]. This does not change merely because the defendant asserts an affirmative defense

requiring resolution of disputed factual issues related to statutory or contractual duties that are otherwise legal in nature [*Hodge v. Superior Court (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 278, 285-287, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 519]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.36

§ 565.36 Suit for Civil Penalty

[1] In General

Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed $2,500 for each violation. The penalty is assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of California by the Attorney General, by any district attorney, by any county counsel authorized by agreement with the district attorney in actions involving violation of a county ordinance, by a city attorney of a city with a population exceeding 750,000, by a city attorney in any city and county, and, with the consent of the district attorney, by a city prosecutor in any city having a full time city prosecutor [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206(c)-(f)* (distribution of recovered penalty among public treasurers); *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 132, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191* ($100,000 penalty justified by evidence of 500,000 misleading and deceptive contracts over four-year period and 1,500 false repair invoices)].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206(a) has been interpreted to require imposition of a civil penalty for any act that constitutes unfair competition, although the court has discretion to set the amount imposed after considering mitigating and aggravating factors [*People v. Custom Craft Carpets, Inc. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 676, 686, 206 Cal. Rptr. 12* (false advertising under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.*); *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 578, 584-588, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243* (violation of Cartwright Act, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16700 et seq.*)].

[2] Determination of Penalty

In assessing a civil penalty, a court is directed to consider any and all of the following factors [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206(b)*; *see generally* Stats. 1992, ch. 430, § 6 (1992 amendment not intended to change decisional law regarding methods of determining number of violations on which award of civil penalties is based)]:

- The nature and seriousness of the misconduct;
- The number of violations;

- The persistence of the misconduct;
- The length of time over which the misconduct occurred;
- The willfulness of the defendant's misconduct; and
- The defendant's assets, liabilities, and net worth.

A court is authorized to impose a civil penalty based on any of these factors, or any combination of these factors, but it is up to the parties to present evidence of the factor each party wants to be considered. For example, the prosecuting party is not required to present evidence of a defendant's financial condition, and if neither the prosecuting party nor the defendant present that evidence, a court may impose a civil penalty without it [*People v. First Fed. Credit Corp. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 721, 728-729, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 542]* .

A finding that the defendant's conduct was "reprehensible" is not required to impose a civil penalty [*People ex rel. Bill Lockyer v. Fremont Life Ins. Co. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 508, 524-527, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 463]* .

[3] Penalty for Violation of Injunction

Any person who intentionally violates any injunction prohibiting unfair competition, which was issued under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*, is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed $6,000 for each violation. If the conduct constituting the violation is of a continuing nature, each day of the conduct is a separate and distinct violation. In determining the amount of the civil penalty, the court must consider all relevant circumstances, including [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17207(a)*]:

- The extent of the harm caused by the conduct in question;
- The nature and persistence of this conduct;
- The length of time over which the conduct has occurred;
- The assets, liabilities, and net worth of the defendant, whether corporate or individual; and
- Any corrective action taken by the defendant.

This penalty must be assessed and recovered in a civil action brought in the name of the people of California by the Attorney General, by any district attorney, or by any city attorney [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17207(b)*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 17207(c),(d)* (distribution of recovered penalty among public treasurers)].

[4] Penalty for Violation Against Senior Citizen or Disabled Person

[a] In General

In addition to any liability for a civil penalty pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206*, any person who violates *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* by perpetrating an act or acts of unfair competition against one or more senior citizens or disabled persons is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed $2,500 for each violation, which may be assessed and recovered in a civil action as prescribed in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1*]. *Civ. Code § 3345(b)* provides that this penalty, or any other discretionary civil penalty for unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition perpetrated against senior citizens or disabled persons, may be trebled if one or more

affirmative findings are made. The factors with respect to which an affirmative finding or findings are required under *Civ. Code § 3345(b)* are the same as those required to be considered by the trier of fact under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)* [*see Civ. Code § 3345(b)*; *see also § 565.36[4][c]*].

For a form of allegations relating to the factors to be considered under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1*, *see* Ch. 504, *Sales: Consumers Legal Remedies Act* . For discussion and forms regarding findings and requests for findings generally, *see* Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision* .

[b] Senior Citizen and Disabled Person Defined

As used in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1*, a senior citizen is a person who is 65 years of age or older [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(1)*].

As used in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1*, a disabled person is any person who has a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(2)*]. Major life activities are functions such as caring for one's self, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(2)(B)*]. Physical or mental impairment means any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(2)(A)*]:

- Any physiological disorder or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss substantially affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological; musculoskeletal; special sense organs; respiratory, including speech organs; cardiovascular; reproductive; digestive; genitourinary; hemic and lymphatic; skin; or endocrine; and

- Any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities.

The term "physical or mental impairment" includes, but is not limited to, such diseases and conditions as orthopedic, vision, speech, or hearing impairment, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cancer, heart disease, diabetes, mental retardation, and emotional illness [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(b)(2)(A)*].

[c] Factors Considered by Court for Imposition of Penalty

In determining whether to impose a civil penalty pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(a)*, the trier of fact must consider, in addition to other appropriate factors, the extent to which any or all of the following factors are present [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(c)*]:

- The defendant knew or should have known that his or her conduct was directed to one or more senior citizens or disabled persons.

- The defendant's conduct caused one or more senior citizens or disabled persons to suffer: loss or encumbrance of a primary residence, principal employment, or source of income; substantial loss of property set aside for retirement, or for personal or family care and maintenance; or substantial loss of payments received under pension or retirement plan or a government benefits program, or assets essential to the health or welfare of the senior citizen or disabled person.

- One or more senior citizens or disabled persons are substantially more vulnerable than other members of the public to the defendant's conduct because of age, poor health or infirmity, impaired understanding, restricted mobility, or disability, and actually suffered substantial physical, emotional, or economic damages resulting from the defendant's conduct.

An affirmative finding on one or more of these issues is required to treble the penalty pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3345(b)* [*Civ. Code § 3345(b)*].

[d] Restitution

Any court of competent jurisdiction hearing an action pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1* may make such orders and judgments as may be necessary to restore to any senior citizen or disabled person any money or property, real or personal, that may have been acquired by means of a violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 1720 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(d)*]. Restitution ordered pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(d)* must be given priority over recovery of any civil penalty designated by the court as imposed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206(a)*. If the court determines that full restitution cannot be made to the senior citizens or disabled persons, either at the time of judgment or by a future date determined by the court, then restitution under *Bus.& Prof. Code § 17206.1(d)* must be made on a pro rata basis depending on the amount of the loss [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206.1(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.37

§ 565.37 Patent and Copyright Cases

[1] Federal Preemption Generally

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that if anything is within the purview of federal patent or copyright law, but is not protected by that law, the Supremacy Clause [*see* U.S. Const. art. VI] precludes the states from applying unfair competition law to prohibit copying or to award damages for copying [*see Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co. (1964) 376 U.S. 225, 231-233, 84 S. Ct. 784, 11 L. Ed. 2d 661* ; *Compco Corp. v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc. (1964) 376 U.S. 234, 237-239, 84 S. Ct. 779, 11 L. Ed. 2d 669]* . A state law that substantially interferes with the enjoyment of an unpatented utilitarian or design concept that has been freely disclosed by its author to the public at large impermissibly contravenes the ultimate goal of public disclosure and use that is the centerpiece of federal patent policy [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 156-157, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* . Such state statutes threaten the national uniformity promoted by the patent law and raise the specter of state-created monopolies in a host of useful shapes and processes for which patent protection has been denied or is otherwise unobtainable [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 167, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* .

A federal decision to forgo regulation in a given area may imply an authoritative federal decision that the area is best left unregulated, and in that event would have as much preemptive force as a decision to regulate [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 151-152, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* . To determine whether federal patent or copyright law preempts a state-law unfair competition claim, the court must analyze whether the state-law claim contains an element not shared by the federal law--that is, an extra element that changes the nature of the action so that it is qualitatively different from a copyright or patent infringement claim. If copying the plaintiff's product in itself infringes the state-created right, then the state-created right is preempted [*Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Sys. (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1439-1440, 1442]* .

[2] Limited State Regulation Allowed

The holdings in *Bonito Boats*, *Sears*, and *Compco* [*see § 565.37[1]*] do not preclude all state restriction of unfair competition and trade secrets. Indeed, Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act [*15 U.S.C.S. § 1125(a)*], discussed in Ch. 549,

Trademarks and Trade Names , is an affirmative indication from Congress that both the law of unfair competition and the law of trade secret protection are consistent with the balance struck by the patent laws [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 166, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* .

The states remain free to place limited regulations on the circumstances in which unpatentable designs are used to prevent consumer confusion as to source and to prohibit the tortious appropriation of private information [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 165-166, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* . The law of unfair competition has its roots in the common law tort of deceit: its general concern is with protecting consumers from confusion as to source. The common law of unfair competition is limited, however, to protection against copying nonfunctional aspects of consumer products that have acquired secondary meaning so that they operate as a designation of source [*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats (1989) 489 U.S. 141, 157, 158, 109 S. Ct. 971, 103 L. Ed. 2d 118]* . Judge Learned Hand phrased the distinction as follows: "[T]he plaintiff has the right not to lose [his or her] customers through false representations that those are [the plaintiff's] wares which in fact are not, but [the plaintiff] may not monopolize any design or pattern, however trifling. The defendant, on the other hand, may copy [the] plaintiff's goods slavishly down to the minutest detail: but [the defendant] may not represent [himself or herself] as the plaintiff in their sale" [*Crescent Tool Co. v. Kilborn & Bishop Co. (2d Cir. 1917) 247 F. 299, 301]* .

State unfair competition law may still require that a person take precautionary steps, such as labeling, to prevent customers from being misled as to the source of goods or services, and the state may enforce that requirement through injunctions and awards of damages [*Tomlin v. Walt Disney Prods. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 226, 234-235, 96 Cal. Rptr. 118* ; *see* *Compco Corp. v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc. (1964) 376 U.S. 234, 238, 84 S. Ct. 779, 11 L. Ed. 2d 669* ; *Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Stiffel Co. (1964) 376 U.S. 225, 232, 84 S. Ct. 784, 11 L. Ed. 2d 661]* . Thus, a state court may enjoin a defendant to take adequate precautions to avoid public confusion [*see* *Allied Artists Pictures Corp. v. Friedman (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 127, 133-137, 137 Cal. Rptr. 94* ; *see also* *Sammons & Sons v. Ladd-Fab, Inc. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 306, 313, 187 Cal. Rptr. 874* (complaint insufficient because allegations indicated adequate precaution to identify source of goods); *Capitol Records, Inc. v. Erickson (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 526, 537, 82 Cal. Rptr. 798* (preliminary injunction upheld because there was question of fact concerning adequacy of precautions taken by defendant)]. Damages may be imposed if a defendant imitates a name or design with the intent to deceive the public by palming off copies of goods as original or otherwise deliberately creating a likelihood of confusion of source [*see* *Gordon v. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc. (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 31, 39-40, 74 Cal. Rptr. 499* ; *see also* *Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Sys. (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1441* (state unfair competition laws that seek to prevent reverse palming off are not preempted by federal law)].

15 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
2 Unfair Competition Law: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.38-565.49

[Reserved]

§§ 565.38[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.50

§ 565.50 Purposes of Act

The Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101*) prohibits specified practices, which the legislature has determined to be unfair, in order to safeguard against monopolies and to foster and encourage competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17001*; *Uneedus v. California Shoppers, Inc. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 932, 940-941, 150 Cal. Rptr. 596]* . Its provisions must be liberally construed toward that end [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17002*].

The Act is directed at ongoing wrongful business conduct. The "practice" requirement envisions something more than a single transaction; it contemplates a pattern of conduct. A merger is not ongoing conduct, and hence cannot be enjoined under the Unfair Practices Act [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1169-1170, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

The Act is similar to the federal Robinson-Patman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 13, 13a-13c, 21a*), in that both proscribe three basic types of business practices: (1) price discrimination, (2) sales below cost, and (3) the granting of rebates and discounts not made available to all buyers on like terms or conditions [*Uneedus v. California Shoppers, Inc. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 932, 937, 150 Cal. Rptr. 596]* . For a full discussion of the Robinson-Patman Act, see Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation, Ch. 4 (Matthew Bender).

The Unfair Practices Act reflects a "horizontal" concept of trade regulation: it protects first-line competition against predatory practices, but does not prohibit price discriminations that only affect second-line or third-line competition at the buyer level or lower. Thus, a seller may discriminate in favor of one purchaser if he or she has no intent to prevent or destroy competition of other sellers at his or her own level [*Plotkin v. Tanner's Vacuums (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 454, 458-459, 125 Cal. Rptr. 697]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.51

§ 565.51 Liability for Violation of Act

[1] Civil and Criminal

A civil action for injunctive relief and damages may be brought against a person who violates the act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17070*]. For discussion of the elements of a cause of action as to each type of violation, see*§ 565.71[2]*. For further discussion relating to remedies, discovery, and proof in such actions, see*§ 565.54[1]*. For a form of complaint for use in a civil action brought under the act, see*§ 565.230*.

Each violation of the act also constitutes a misdemeanor [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17100*].

[2] Liability of Agents

Any person who is a director, officer, or agent of any principal violating the act, and who assists or aids the principal, directly or indirectly, in that violation, is equally responsible with the principal [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17095*]. Moreover, when an injunction proceeding or criminal action is brought against any person for his or her conduct as director, officer, or agent, it is sufficient to allege and prove the unlawful intent of the principal for which he or she acts [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17096, 17101*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.52

§ 565.52 Prohibited Practices

[1] Locality Discrimination

It is unlawful for any person engaged in the production, manufacture, distribution, or sale of any article or product of general use or consumption to create locality discriminations with intent to destroy the competition of any regular established dealer in that article or product or to prevent the competition of any person who in good faith intends and attempts to become such a dealer [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17040*]. This prohibition embraces any scheme of special rebates, collateral contracts, or any device of any nature whereby locality discrimination is in substance or fact effected in violation of the spirit and intent of the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17049*]. For discussion of what constitutes an "article or product," see*§ 565.52[2]*].

The essential elements of a cause of action based on locality discrimination are the following [*see Harris v. Capitol Records Distrib. Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 454, 460-461, 50 Cal. Rptr. 539, 413 P.2d 139]* :

- A person with two or more places of business makes a sale of an article or product at a lower price in one place than in another.

- The person acts with the intent to destroy his or her competition.

For further discussion concerning proof of intent, see*§ 565.54[3][a]*.

A locality discrimination is permissible when it is not intended to destroy or prevent competition, but reflects legitimate differences in costs of manufacture, sale, delivery, or transportation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17041*]. This exception is to be a matter of defense; it need not be negatived by the plaintiff in order to state a cause of action for locality discrimination [*see G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 273-274, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (distinguishing contrary holding in *Green v. Grimes-Stassforth Stationery Co. (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d 52, 55-56, 102 P.2d 452* , as based on prior law)]. For further discussion of situations in which the prohibition against locality discrimination does

not apply, see*§ 565.53*.

[2] Sales or Service Below Cost

It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within California to sell any article or product at less than its cost to the vendor, or to give awayany article or product, for the purpose of injuring competitors or destroying competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043*]. "Sell" and "give" include offering to sell or give, or advertising to sell or give, as well as actual selling or giving [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17022, 17023*]. "Article or product" includes services, the output of a service trade, and any thing of value, as well as articles, products, and commodities (with specified exceptions relating to public utility services) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17024*; *Paramount Gen. Hosp. Co. v. National Med. Enters., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 496, 501-502, 117 Cal. Rptr. 42* ; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 17048.5* (special prohibition against provision of warranty or repair service below cost)]. The prohibition against sales below cost embraces any scheme of special rebates, collateral contracts, or any device of any nature whereby the sale below cost is in substance or fact effected in violation of the spirit and intent of the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17049*; *see, e.g., Paramount Gen. Hosp. Co. v. National Med. Enters., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 496, 500-504, 117 Cal. Rptr. 42* (cause of action for sales below cost stated when plaintiff alleged that the defendant was offering incidental services below cost in connection with lease of medical offices)].

In order to demonstrate a violation of these provisions, a plaintiff must show that a defendant acted purposely--that is, with a desire to injure a competitor or destroy competition. It is not enough that the defendant may have acted with knowledge that competitors may be injured by its actions in selling below cost [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 174-175, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527* (distinguishing "purpose" from "intent")]. The Supreme Court opinion so holding did not address the statutory, rebuttable presumption of intent or purpose that is created upon proof of one or more acts of selling or giving away any article or product below cost or at discriminatory prices, along with proof of injurious effect [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071*; *see also § 565.54[3][a]*]. Arguably, the Supreme Court's holding is inconsistent with these evidentiary presumptions, and at very least it appears likely that, despite the Supreme Court's holding, a defendant may still be forced to bear the burden of rebutting a statutory presumption of the requisite purpose by proving the applicability of a statutory exception to the prohibition on selling below cost [*see Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 212-219, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527* (Baxter, J., concurring and dissenting); *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17071, 17050*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026.1*].

"Cost" as applied to production includes cost of raw materials, labor, and all overhead expenses of the producer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17029* ("overhead expenses" defined as all costs of doing business incurred in conduct of business)].

As applied to distribution, "cost" means the distributor's invoice or replacement cost, whichever is lower, plus the cost of doing business, which in the absence of proof constitutes a six percent markup of the invoice or replacement cost [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17029* ("cost of doing business" defined as all costs of doing business incurred in conduct of business)]. Thus, in alleging a distributor's cost, a plaintiff must normally state the sale price, the defendant's cost in the product, and his or her cost of doing business [*see G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 275, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211]* . Furthermore, in establishing a distributor's cost, the invoice cost of an article or product purchased at a forced, bankruptcy, closeout, or other sale outside the ordinary channels of trade may not be used to justify a price lower than one based on the cost of replacement, through ordinary channels of trade as of the date of sale, unless the article or product is kept separate from goods purchased in the ordinary channels of trade and is advertised and sold as merchandise purchased at a forced, bankruptcy, closeout, sale, or by means other than through the ordinary channels of trade [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17027* (also requiring that advertising must state conditions under which goods were purchased, and quantity to be sold or offered for sale); *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17028* (definition of "ordinary channels of trade"); *see also § 565.53[2]*].

As applied to warranty service agreements, "cost" includes the cost of parts, transporting the parts, labor, and all overhead expenses of the service agency [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026*].

Discounts granted for cash payments may not be used to reduce cost [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026*; *but see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026.5* (exception for nondiscriminatory discounts offered to cigarette distributors), *overruling E & H Wholesale, Inc. v. Glaser Bros. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 728, 733-735, 204 Cal. Rptr. 838]* .

Because *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17026* and *17029* define cost to include all variable and fixed costs, the Unfair Practices Act apparently employs a fully allocated cost or fully distributed cost standard to determine whether a sale violates *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043* [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 820, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856* (variable costs are costs that vary with changes in output, whereas fixed costs are those that do not vary with changes in output)]. The concept of fully allocated cost has been equated with average total cost [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 819-820, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . The fully allocated cost method was challenged as arbitrary and irrational and thus in violation of the due process clause of the California and United States Constitutions for favoring small, less efficient, single-product competitors. The fully allocated cost method survived the challenge, however, with the court of appeal holding that, although not perfect, the fully allocated cost method, when viewed in conjunction with the injurious intent requirement of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043*, is rationally related to the valid legislative purpose enunciated in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17001*, which is to guard against the creation or perpetuation of monopolies and of fostering and encouraging competition [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 823, 826, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . A defendant is free to demonstrate to the trier of fact that its fully allocated cost, using another reasonable allocation method other than that used by plaintiff, is actually lower than plaintiff alleges and lower than defendant's sales or bid price [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 822-823, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *see also Pan Asia Venture Capital Corp. v. Hearst Corp. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 424, 439, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118* (error for trial court to refuse to allow defendant to present its cost allocation method to jury)]. To be legally acceptable, the allocation of indirect and fixed overhead costs to a particular product or service must be reasonably related to the burden the product or service imposes on the overall cost of doing business [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 822, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* .

The rationale underlying the challenge proceeds as follows. Under another method, such as the variable cost method, a multi-product competitor could allocate major indirect or fixed costs disproportionately among its products and thus, for one or more products, claim a cost of manufacture far below that of a single-product competitor. After having driven the single-product competitor from the market, the multi-product competitor could reallocate its fixed costs to attack some other product line or market. Thus, the appellant in *Turnbull* contended, application of the fully allocated cost method improperly favors smaller, less efficient, single-product competitors [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 822-823, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* .

The fully allocated cost method was also challenged as preempted by the Sherman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 1 et seq.*) on the ground that its application prohibits procompetitive conduct that is not injurious to competition, specifically that it makes rational, profitable, and nonpredatory pricing above long-run incremental cost presumptively unlawful [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 823-824, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . Application of the fully allocated cost method, however, is not preempted by federal antitrust law [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 826, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . One reason is that there is no clear federal standard with which the Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*) may be said to conflict for determining whether pricing is predatory. The federal circuit courts disagree on the appropriate cost method, and the United States Supreme Court has not made a determination that any particular formula or cost method should be used in determining whether pricing is predatory [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 825, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . The difference between the approaches taken by California courts and the Ninth Circuit has also been described as only a matter of allocation of evidentiary burdens. Assuming proof of injury to a competitor has been made, California allows plaintiffs to establish a prima facie case with proof of prices below average total cost. The defendant then has the burden of negating the inference of illegal intent or establishing an affirmative defense. Under

federal law, the plaintiff who relies on prices below average total cost, but above average variable cost, has not created a presumption of illegal intent. To establish such a presumption under federal law, the plaintiff must show that no legitimate business reason for the below-cost price exists. Therefore, a price below average total cost but above average variable cost does not always violate California law, nor is such a price a guarantee of immunity under federal law [*William Inglis & Sons Baking Co. v. ITT Cont'l Baking Co. (9th Cir. 1981) 668 F.2d 1014, 1049-1050* ; *Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 824-825, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* .

Of course, in determining whether defendant's sales of a product were below cost, it is necessary to define the relevant "product." The defendant and the trial court are not necessarily bound by the plaintiff's characterization of the relevant product for purposes of cost allocation [*see Western Union Fin. Servs., Inc. v. First Data Corp. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1535-1538, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341* (trial court was not bound to accept plaintiff's characterization of domestic money transfers as a separate "product" from international transfers and allocate only costs and revenues attributable to that "product" in determining whether defendant sold money transfer services below cost); *but see Fisherman's Wharf Bay Cruise Corp. v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 309, 322-330, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628* (bay cruise ship line could not avoid claim of selling wholesale tickets to tourist agencies below cost by arguing that relevant product was all cruise tickets sold, both wholesale and retail to walkup ticket buyers)].

For further discussion concerning proof of cost, see *§ 565.54[3][b]*. For discussion of permissible sales below cost, see*§ 565.53*.

[3] "Loss Leader" Practices

It is unlawful for any person engaged in business within California to sell or use any article or product as a "loss leader" [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17044*]. For the purpose of this prohibition, "loss leader" is defined as any article or product sold at less than cost if: (1) the purpose is to induce, promote, or encourage the purchase of other merchandise; (2) the effect is a tendency or capacity to mislead or deceive purchasers or prospective purchasers; or (3) the effect is to divert trade from or otherwise injure competitors [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17030, 17044*; for definition of "article or product," *see § 565.52[2]*].

Despite statutory language that might suggest otherwise, the California Supreme Court has held that proving a violation of these provisions requires proof that the defendant acted purposely--that is, with a desire to injure a competitor or destroy competition [*Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 178, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527]* . However, the Supreme Court opinion so holdingdid not address the statutory, rebuttable presumption of intent or purpose that may be used to shift to a defendant the burden of proving that the requisite purpose was absent [*see § 565.52[2]*]. The evidentiary presumptions are discussed further in § 565.54[3][a].

For discussion of situations in which the prohibition against loss leaders does not apply, see*§ 565.53*.

[4] Secret Rebates or Unearned Discounts

It is unlawful to make secret payments to allow rebates, refunds, commissions, or unearned discounts, whether in the form of money or otherwise; or to secretly extend to certain purchasers special services or privileges not extended to all purchasers on like terms and conditions, when the practice injures a competitor and tends to destroy competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045*]. It is not necessary to purchase "on like terms and conditions" to state a claim that a competitor received a secret rebate or unearned discount, because that phrase only attaches to "special services or privileges not extended to all purchasers" [*Eddins v. Redstone (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 290, 332, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 863]* .

The primary function of this prohibition is to prevent distributors from discriminating between purchasers. However, a purchaser who accepts a prohibited rebate or discount, as well as the distributor who offers it, is deemed to violate this prohibition [*Diesel Elec. Sales & Serv., Inc. v. Marco Marine San Diego, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 202, 214-215,*

20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62 ; *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 271]* . Unlike the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act [*see 15 U.S.C.S. § 13(f)*], a buyer can violate *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* without "knowingly receiving" the illegal discount [*Diesel Elec. Sales & Serv., Inc. v. Marco Marine San Diego, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 202, 214 n.4, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62* (dicta; defendant knew it received discounts other distributors did not)]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* applies to secret payments from a seller to a purchaser, but it does not apply to secret payments from a purchaser to a seller [*Kunert v. Mission Fin. Servs. Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 242, 260-261, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 589]* .

However, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* as applied to trailer-on-flatcar service has been preempted by exemptions granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission pursuant to its authority under the Staggers Rail Act of 1980 [*see 49 U.S.C.S. § 10505*], although antitrust remedies for a combination or conspiracy that injures competition, as opposed to a single competitor, survive [*Alliance Shippers v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (9th Cir. 1988) 858 F.2d 567, 569-570]* .

The elements of a cause of action based on violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* are: (1) a secret payment or rebate, or the a secret allowance of an unearned discount; (2) the injury of a competitor; and (3) the tendency of the payment, allowance, or rebate to destroy competition [*see, e.g.,* *Harris v. Capitol Records Distrib. Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 454, 463, 50 Cal. Rptr. 539, 413 P.2d 139* (cause of action not established when "advertising allowance" was not secret and was extended to all purchasers); *Diesel Elec. Sales & Serv., Inc. v. Marco Marine San Diego, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App.4th 202, 212, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62* (distributor versus distributor; nonsuit reversed); *E & H Wholesale, Inc. v. Glaser Bros. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 728, 738-739, 204 Cal. Rptr. 838* (cause of action not established when rebates were made to meet, rather than to destroy competition)].

The first element, allowance of a "secret unearned discount," is established by the supplier's or competitor's failure to disclose to the plaintiff that a competitor is receiving a discount or allowance that the plaintiff is not receiving [*see Diesel Elec. Sales & Serv., Inc. v. Marco Marine San Diego, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 202, 212-213, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62* (defendant reached maximum volume discount without buying volume to qualify for that discount)].

Prima facie "injury to a competitor" is established by evidence of a decline in plaintiff's gross revenues over a three-year period during which it competed with defendant and during which defendant's revenues increased and plaintiff eventually stopped serving that market. The fact that all or part of the increase in defendant's revenues during that period could be attributable to factors other than secret unearned discounts was matter of weighing evidence and not relevant to determining whether nonsuit was proper [*Diesel Elec. Sales & Serv., Inc. v. Marco Marine San Diego, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 202, 213-214, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62]* .

The term "competition" includes competition among retailers, wholesalers, or producers; violation does not require competitive damage to competitors of the person allowing an unearned discount (the "primary" line of commerce), but can be based on competitive damage to competitors of the person receiving it (the "secondary" line of commerce). Thus, an action by a purchaser who had not received the secret discount was permitted to go forward based on its allegation that it had been injured in its competition with those purchasers who had received the discounts, even without alleging any competitive injury among suppliers [*ABC Int'l Traders, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 1247, 1254, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112, 931 P.2d 290]* .

The fact that a competitor in a "primary" line of commerce may have taken a business action to remain competitive, such as entering into a revenue-sharing agreement or participating in a secret rebate or discount, is not necessarily a defense to an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045*. This so-called "meeting competition" defense does not establish as a matter of law that the conduct does not tend to destroy competition in a "secondary" line of commerce, and harm to this type of competition would be sufficient to overcome the defense [*Eddins v. Redstone (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 290, 339, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 863]* . In one case, for example, movie studios that had entered into revenue-sharingagreements with a large video rental retailer argued that the agreements were necessary to meet the competition posed to them by other studios that had already reached the same agreements, and that this necessity

provided a defense to the claim that their actions tended to destroy competition. However, the court of appeal concluded that the trial court erred by not considering whether the revenue-sharing agreements tended to destroy competition in a secondary line of commerce--in this case, the competition between the large video rental retailer and smaller, independently owned rental outlets who were not doing business with the studios under the same revenue-sharing agreements [*Eddins v. Redstone (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 290, 338-339, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 863]* .

Liability cannot be imposed under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* for price discrimination if that liability is premised on agreements made between two companies that are part of the same corporate family, because these companies form part of a single economic enterprise with a complete unity of financial interest [*Eddins v. Redstone (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 290, 341, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 863]* .

[5] Coercion, Solicitation, or Collusion to Effectuate Prohibited Practice

It is unlawful for any person to use any threat, intimidation, or boycott to effectuate any violation of the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17046*; *see, e.g., Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 324, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* (boycott not established in absence of showing of concerted attempt to coerce third parties not to deal with plaintiff)]. It is also unlawful for any manufacturer, wholesaler, distributor, jobber, contractor, broker, retailer, or other vendor, or any agent of any such person, to solicit any violation of the act or to participate or collude jointly with any other such person in violation of the act [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17047* (solicitation), 17048 (participation or collusion); *see, e.g., Harris v. Capitol Records Distrib. Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 454, 462, 50 Cal. Rptr. 539, 413 P.2d 139* (collusion or conspiracy not shown when wholesaler merely "had reason to know" that purchaser intended to resell below cost)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.53

§ 565.53 Defenses

[1] Applicable in General

Nothing in the Unfair Practices Act precludes a person from selecting the customers with whom he or she will deal [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17042*; *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 324, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481]* . For example, a manufacturer does not violate the act simply by designating one distributor as the only one with whom he or she will deal with directly [*see Plotkin v. Tanner's Vacuums (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 454, 458-459, 125 Cal. Rptr. 697]* .

Similarly, nothing in the act precludes a person from establishing a price differential for any article or product as between customers that he or she has classified in different functions, such as broker, jobber, wholesaler, or retailer [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17042*; *Harris v. Capitol Records Distrib. Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 454, 463, 50 Cal. Rptr. 539, 413 P.2d 139* ; *see also Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co. (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 735, 742-743, 162 Cal. Rptr. 543* (Stevens, J., concurring; suggesting that price discrimination based on classification of customers as wholesaler or retailer is not justified when customers are merely wholesaler or retailer in relation to third parties)].

The practices excepted under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17042* appear to be matters of defense that need not be negatived or disproved by the plaintiff, by analogy to case law relating to other express exceptions [*see § 565.53[2]*].

The equitable defense of "unclean hands" does not apply to actions under the act [*Page v. Bakersfield Unif. & Towel Supply Co. (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 762, 770, 49 Cal. Rptr. 46]* .

[2] Applicable Only to Locality Discrimination, Sales Below Cost, or Loss Leaders

The prohibitions against locality discrimination, sales below cost, and loss leaders do not apply to certain closeout sales: (1) in closing out in good faith the owner's stock or any part thereof for the purpose of discontinuing his or her trade in any article or product, or in the case of seasonal or perishable goods, to prevent loss to the vendor by spoilage or depreciation; or (2) when the goods are damaged or deteriorated in quality. In either case, notice to the public is

required [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050(a),(b)*]. The required notice is not sufficient unless the subject of the sale is kept separate from the other stocks and is clearly and legibly marked with the reason for the sale. Also, any advertisement of the goods must indicate the same facts and the number of items to be sold [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050*].

The prohibitions against locality discrimination, sales below cost, and loss leaders also do not apply to sales made: (1) in an endeavor made in good faith to meet the legal prices of a competitor selling the same article or product in the same locality or trade area and in the ordinary channels of trade; or (2) in an endeavor made in good faith by a manufacturer, selling an article or product of his or her own manufacture, in a transaction and sale to a wholesaler or retailer for resale to meet the legal prices of a competitor selling the same or a similar or comparable article or product in the same locality or trade area and in the ordinary channels of trade [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050(d),(e)*]. "Ordinary channels of trade" means those ordinary, regular, and daily transactions in the mercantile tradewhereby title to an article or product, in no way damaged or deteriorated, is transferred from one person or another. This excludes, for example, bankruptcy sales of stocks, closeout goods, fire sales, and sales of goods that, for any reason, are damaged or deteriorated [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17028*]. Because the exception applies only to meeting the "legal price" of a competitor, it does not apply to one who is attempting to meet competing prices of goods or services that are themselves below cost in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043* [*Page v. Bakersfield Unif. & Towel Supply Co. (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 762, 770, 49 Cal. Rptr. 46* ; *People v. Gordon (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 711, 724, 234 P.2d 287]* .

Finally, the prohibitions against locality discrimination, sales below cost, and loss leaders do not apply to sales made by an officer acting under the orders of any court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050(c)*].

The practices excepted under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050* are matters of defense and need not be negatived or disproved by the plaintiff [*see People v. Gordon (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 711, 724, 234 P.2d 287* (meeting competition exception of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17050(d)* as defense); *see also G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 273-274, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (exception under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17041* also not required to be negatived in initial pleading)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.54

§ 565.54 Contract Violating Act as Illegal

[1] Civil Action

[a] Illegal Contract

Any contract, express or implied, made by any person, firm, or corporation in violation of the Unfair Practices Act is an illegal contract on which there can be no recovery [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17051*].

[b] Remedies; Injunctive Relief

In an action under the Unfair Practices Act, it is not necessary to allege or prove actual damages or the threat thereof, or actual injury or the threat thereof, to the plaintiff [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*]. In other words, a plaintiff may obtain injunctive relief for a violation of the act without showing damages or injury to himself or herself [*see Uneedus v. California Shoppers, Inc. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 932, 943, 150 Cal. Rptr. 596]* .

If it appears to the court on an application for a temporary restraining order, on hearing of an order to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not be issued, or on hearing of a motion for preliminary injunction, that any defendant is violating, or has violated, the Unfair Practices Act, or if the court so finds in any action under that act, it shall enjoin that defendant from doing all acts prohibited by the section or sections that he or she is violating or has violated [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17078*; *see People v. Gordon (1951) 105 Cal. App. 2d 711, 725, 234 P.2d 287* (acts prohibited must be restricted to those done with requisite intent to injure competitors or destroy competition)]. The grant of injunctive relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17078* is mandatory, but only on demonstration of a clear violation of the act [*E & H Wholesale, Inc. v. Glaser Bros. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 728, 733, 204 Cal. Rptr. 838]* .

The court may, in its discretion, include in any injunction against a violation of the act such other restraint as it may deem expedient to deter the defendant from, and to insure against, his or her committing a future violation of the act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17079*].

Any injunction against a violation of the act, whether interim or final, must cover every article or product and not merely the particular article or product involved in the action [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17080*].

It is not necessary for the plaintiff, in any action under act, to provide or file any undertaking or bond for the issuance of any interim or final injunction [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17081*].

For comparative discussion relating to *Civ. Code § 3422* and *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526* and *527*, governing injunctive relief in general, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[c] Treble Damages and Attorney's Fees

In any action under the Unfair Practices Act, it is not necessary to allege or prove actual damages or the threat thereof, or actual injury or the threat thereof, to the plaintiff. However, a plaintiff is entitled, in addition to injunctive relief, to recover three times the amount of his or her actual damages, if any, as well as three times the actual damages, if any, suffered by any person who has assigned his or her claim of damages to the plaintiff [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*; *see Page v. Bakersfield Unif. & Towel Supply Co. (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 762, 773, 49 Cal. Rptr. 46* (recovery denied when damages were uncertain, speculative, and based in part on net losses attributable to that party's sales below cost in violation of the act)]. The provision for treble damages is mandatory, so that if actual damages are shown, the court must award three times that amount without regard to the defendant's malice or any other judicially imposed qualifying condition [*Uneedus v. California Shoppers, Inc. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 932, 941-944, 150 Cal. Rptr. 596* ; for further discussion relating to damages in general, *see* Ch. 177, *Damages*]. Because *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* is mandatory and because punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* and treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* serve substantially the same purpose, a plaintiff who pursues a single cause of action under the Unfair Practices Act and establishes a malicious or oppressive violation of that Act is not entitled to elect whether to take punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* or treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*, but is only entitled to treble damages [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 826-827, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856]* . However, a plaintiff who prevails on a common law tort claim as well as the violation of the Unfair Practices Act and proves malice or oppression under *Civ. Code § 3294* may elect between trebled and punitive damages [*see Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 826-827, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *Marshall v. Brown (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 408, 419, 190 Cal. Rptr. 392* (upheld right to election by plaintiff who prevailed on causes of action for slander and one authorized by *Lab. Code §§ 1050, 1054*); *see also Sandler v. Gordon (1949) 94 Cal. App. 2d 254, 259, 210 P.2d 314* (decided prior to 1959 amendment to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* adding trebling provision and allowing punitive damages pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3294*)].

In any action under the act in which judgment is entered against the defendant, the plaintiff is also entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees together with the costs of suit [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*; *see Page v. Bakersfield Unif. & Towel Supply Co. (1966) 239 Cal. App. 2d 762, 774-775, 49 Cal. Rptr. 46* (failure to award fees not reversible error when both parties prevailed and had incurred fees and costs of approximately equal value); for further discussion relating to attorney's fees and costs in general, *see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.10 et seq. and § 174.50* et seq.].

[2] Limitation Period

The limitation period applicable to a cause of action for injunctive relief and actual damages under the Unfair Practices Act is generally the three-year period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*, which is the period limiting actions based on statutory liability. However, actual damages may not be trebled under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* unless the action is brought within one year after they accrue, because treble damages are penal in nature and the one-year period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(a)* limits statutory actions based on a penalty [*G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 276-279, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211]* .

[3] Evidentiary Provisions

[a] Relating to Intent

On proof of one or more acts of selling or giving away any article or product below cost or at discriminatory prices, together with proof of injurious effect, the requisite intent to injure competitors or to destroy competition must be presumed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071*; *E & H Wholesale, Inc. v. Glaser Bros. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 728, 735, 204 Cal. Rptr. 838* ; *see Dooley's Hardware Mart v. Food Giant Mkts., Inc. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 513, 517, 98 Cal. Rptr. 543* (presumption not applicable absent evidence of injurious effect)]. A similar presumption arises on proof of sale below invoice or replacement cost, whichever is lower, of less than the entire supply of an article or product to any one customer of a retailer engaged primarily in resale [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071.5*].

Whether these presumptions affect the burden of persuasion or merely the burden of producing evidence is not clear under California law [*see Evid. Code §§ 604, 606* (effect of presumptions affecting burden of producing evidence and of persuasion)]. One court of appeal, with little discussion, has held that the presumption in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071.5* is a presumption affecting the burden of persuasion [*see Dooley's Hardware Mart v. Food Giant Mkts., Inc. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 513, 517-518, 98 Cal. Rptr. 543]* . Without expressly addressing the issue, some later cases appear to have also treated the presumption of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071* as a presumption affecting the burden of persuasion [*see William Inglis & Sons, Inc. v. Continental Baking (9th Cir. 1991) 942 F.2d 1332, 1338-1339* ; *E & H Wholesale, Inc. v. Glaser Bros. (1984) 158 Cal. App. 3d 728, 737, 204 Cal. Rptr. 838]* . However, in a more recent case, another court, again without expressly addressing the issue, appeared to treat the presumption under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071* as a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence. The court stated that the only effect of the presumption is "to require ... [the defendant] to go forward with proof to negate the presumption of wrongful intent"; and that once the defendant has done that, the burden of proof regarding intent shifts back to the plaintiff [*Western Union Fin. Servs., Inc. v. First Data Corp. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1530, 1540, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 341* ; *see also People v. Pay Less Drug Store (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 108, 114, 153 P.2d 9* (identically worded predecessor statute interpreted as requiring that defendant "go forward with evidence to rebut a prima facie showing")]. The language in the latter case appears more consistent with a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence than a burden affecting the burden of persuasion.

In an action in which it is alleged and shown that the person complained against is selling below his or her cost of doing business, and the person is including labor at less than the prevailing wage scale in the trade in which he or she is engaged for the locality or vicinity in which he or she is doing business, evidence of the prevailing wage scale is admissible toprove the intent or purpose of that person to violate the Unfair Practices Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17075*].

For discussion relating to proof of intent with respect to agents who assist or aid their principal in violating the act, see*§ 565.51[2]*.

[b] Relating to Costs

When a person complained against is a member of a particular trade or industry that has an established cost survey for the locality and vicinity in which the offense is committed, that survey may be used to prove the costs of that person [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17072*].

Proof of average overall cost of doing business for any particular inventory period when added to (1) the cost of production of each article or product, as to a producer, or (2) the invoice or replacement cost, whichever is lower, as to a distributor, is presumptive evidence of the cost of an article or product [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17073*].

Proof of transportation tariffs fixed and approved by the Public Utilities Commission is presumptive evidence of delivery cost [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17074*].

When an action is brought against a person for unfair business practices that involve the employment or services of others, and these others are not compensated or are compensated below the wage prevailing for such services at the time and place of the service, their services must be charged as an expense of the business in which rendered and at the prevailing wage [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17076*].

In an action for sales below cost, if the defendant acquires his or her raw materials for a consideration not wholly or definitely computable in money, the cost of the raw materials must be presumed to be the prevailing market price for similar raw materials in the ordinary channels of trade in the locality or vicinity in which such raw materials were acquired, at the time of the acquisition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17077*].

[4] Discovery

Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17083 and *17084*, relating to discovery under the Unfair Practices Act, have been unchanged since their enactment in 1941, and should be viewed in light of the subsequently enacted Discovery Act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.*]. Provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17083* and *17084*, relating to the production or inspection of books and records, are similar to, but are not entirely consistent with, the general provisions of the Discovery Act that now govern this type of discovery. For further discussion and forms relating to the general provisions of the Discovery Act, see Ch. 190, *Depositions and Discovery* .

[5] Reference Proceeding

If, during the pendency of an action under the Unfair Practices Act, it appears to the court that an extensive examination of books, papers, records, or documents is or may become material or relevant to the issues in the action, the court may, in its discretion, on the application of any party or on its own motion, order a reference to be had under *Code Civ. Proc. § 638 et seq.* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17085*]. For further discussion and forms relating to reference proceedings, see Ch. 38, *Reference* .

[6] Immunity From Prosecution

Information obtained under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17070 et seq.* or the general discovery provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 2016.010 et seq.* (*see § 565.54[4]*) may not be used against any party or witness as a basis for misdemeanor or felony prosecution in any California state court [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17086*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 17087* (privilege against self-incrimination and immunity from prosecution in proceeding brought by the Attorney General or a district attorney)].

21 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Unfair Business Practices
3 Unfair Practices Act: Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.55-565.69

[Reserved]

§§ 565.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.70

§ 565.70 Governing Law

Contracts restraining trade, business, or the practice of a profession are governed by *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16600-16607*. Combinations in restraint of trade are governed by the Cartwright Act, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16700-16770*. Federal decisions interpreting the Sherman Act and *15 U.S.C.S. § 14* may be applicable to interpret California law [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852-853, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 596 n.9, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331* ; *see § 565.71*].

A Cartwright Act violation may also be subject to the unfair competition provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208* [*see B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1345, 1348, 1348 n.6, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228]* . For discussion and forms relating to these provisions, see*§ 565.10* et seq. and§ 565.230 et seq.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.71

§ 565.71 History and Interpretation of the Cartwright Act

[1] In General

Several decisions have stated that the Cartwright Act is patterned after the Sherman Act, or after a bill that was proposed, but rejected, as an alternative to what became the Sherman Act [*see, e.g., Cianci v. SuperiorCourt (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 919, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375* ; *Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 925-926, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833* ; *Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 542, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706]* . Although those statements are adequate for some analyses, and judicial interpretation of the Sherman Act is often helpful, if not directly probative of the intent of the drafters of the Cartwright Act, more precise analysis of the history of the Cartwright Act is necessary in some situations [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1153-1154, 1168-1169, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385* ; *see § 565.75*]. Enacted in 1907, the Cartwright Act is patterned after the 1889 Texas act governing restraints of trade and after its progeny, most notably the 1899 Michigan act. Those laws used the term "combination" in a narrower sense than did other laws in effect in 1907 [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1160-1163, 1168, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . Dicta that the Cartwright Act "is broader in range and deeper in reach than the Sherman Act" [*see Cianci v. Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 920, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375]* and that it "reaches beyond the Sherman Act to threats to competition in their incipiency--much like section 7 of the Clayton Act ... and thereby goes beyond clear-cut menaces to competition in order to deal with merely ephemeral possibilities" [*see Cianci v. Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 918, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375]* has been criticized as conclusionary and substantially suspect [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1169, 1169 n.20, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

The Cartwright Act is not a codification of the common law of restraint of trade. Although the public policy underlying the Cartwright Act is rooted in common law, the Act is neither confined by, nor as broad as, the common law [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1166, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385* , noting dicta to the contrary in *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953]* .

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727, which was added to the Cartwright Act in 1961, is patterned after Section 3 of the Clayton Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 14*), which deals with exclusive dealing arrangements [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1163 n.15, 1168, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842,852-853, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P. 2d 953]* . Thus, federal decisions interpreting Section 3 of the Clayton Act are applicable to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852-853, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P. 2d 953]* .

[2] Prohibited Conduct

[a] Contracts Restraining Trade or Practice of Profession; Void as General Rule

Except as expressly provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16601-16607*, every contract that restrains anyone from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business of any kind is, to that extent, void [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*].

A contract is void under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* only to the extent it constitutes an unlawful restraint [*Frame v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 668, 673, 97 Cal. Rptr. 811* (arbitration provisions enforced)].

[b] Agreement Conferring Exclusive Privilege

An agreement conferring an exclusive privilege on one person or a group of persons, which may thereby exclude others from some aspect of the practice of their trade or profession, is not per se illegal under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*. Among the factors to be considered in determining whether or not the restraint is valid are the appropriateness of the defendant's conduct as a means of advancing its interests and the availability of less harmful means to achieve those interests [*see* *Blank v. Palo Alto-Stanford Hosp. Ctr. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 377, 384-386, 44 Cal. Rptr. 572* (upholding agreement giving certain staff members exclusive right to use hospital's radiology facilities)].

[c] Restraints on Former Employees

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 invalidates employment contracts that prohibit an employee from working for a competitor after the employment terminates, except to the extent necessary to protect the employer's trade secrets [*Muggill v. Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 239, 242, 42 Cal. Rptr. 107, 398 P.2d 147* ; *Metro Traffic Control, Inc. v. Shadow Traffic Network (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 853, 859, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 573]* . The exception for protection of trade secrets means that, even if a blanket covenant not to compete may be void, restrictions may be placed on a former employee's ability to solicit the employer's customers when confidential information is employed to do so [*see* *Smith v. CMTA-IAM Pension Trust (9th Cir. 1981) 654 F.2d 650, 660-661* (applying California law)]. However, only the use of confidential trade secrets may be enjoined under this exception, and an employer may not prohibit former employees from soliciting its customers through use of information obtained independently of the employer's protected customer lists [*The Retirement Group v. Galante (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1226, 1238-1239, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 585*]. For discussion and forms pertaining to liability for misappropriation of trade secrets, see *§ 565.100* et seq.

There is a split of authority concerning whether covenants not to compete may restrict future employment to a greater degree than would otherwise be permitted under the law of trade secrets or unfair competition [*compare* *Metro Traffic Control, Inc. v. Shadow Traffic Network (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 853, 860-861, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 573* (contract may restrict conduct by former employee only to extent permissible under law of unfair competition in absence of contract); *Moss, Adams & Co. v. Shilling (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 124, 130, 224 Cal. Rptr. 456* (same); *with* *Loral Corp. v. Moyes (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 268, 276-279, 219 Cal. Rptr. 836* (contract may impose greater restraints on former employer than law of unfair competition would otherwise allow)]. For further discussion of this issue and of an employee's liability for unfair competition with his or her former employer, see Wilcox, California Employment Law, ch. 70 (Matthew Bender).

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 also prohibits contractual provisions that impose a penalty on an employee for working for a competitor after termination of employment [*Muggill v. Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 239, 242, 42 Cal. Rptr. 107, 398 P.2d 147]* . For example, provisions terminating all pension benefits or all profit-sharing benefits of a former employee who goes to work for a competitor are void [*see* *Muggill v. Reuben H. Donnelley Corp. (1965) 62 Cal. 2d 239, 242-243, 42 Cal. Rptr. 107, 398 P.2d 147* (pension rights); *Frame v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 668, 672-674, 97 Cal. Rptr. 811* (profit-sharing)]. In another case, by contrast, the court held that *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* did not prohibit a provision of a multi-employer pension plan (negotiated as part of a collective bargaining agreement) under which an otherwise eligible member's benefits are suspended if he or she is employed by another participating employer. The court distinguished *Muggill* and *Frame* because the suspension of benefits in the case before it was not intended to inhibit business competition, was limited in nature, furthered the interests of fairness in allocating retirement benefits, and served other important public policies [*see* *Smith v. CMTA-IAM Pension Trust (9th Cir. 1981) 654 F.2d 650, 660-661]* .

A broad provision in a contract with a customer prohibiting that customer from hiring the employees of the other contracting party for a specified term, and imposing a penalty on the customer if doing so, also violates *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* [*VL Systems, Inc. v. Unisen, Inc. (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 708, 710-714, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818]* . Such a contract limits the ability of the affected employees to change employment, and even more damaging that non-competition clauses in employment contracts, it does so without extracting a prior agreement from the employees or ensuring that the employees even have advance notice of the restriction being placed on their employment opportunities [*VL Systems, Inc. v. Unisen, Inc. (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 708, 717-718, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818]* . It is unclear whether a narrower provision that only prevents a customer from soliciting the employees of the other contracting employer would be enforceable, as such an agreement would leave employees free to pursue other job opportunities on their own initiative [*see* *VL Systems, Inc. v. Unisen, Inc. (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 708, 713 n.4, 718, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818]* .

As discussed in *§ 565.73[1], Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* does not bar certain covenants not to compete within a geographic area that are part of an agreementfor sale of a business [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601*]. In one case, the former employee was also an officer and director of the corporate employer, and had been an officer of the firm that sold its accounts to the corporate employer and a signatory of the buy-sell agreement. The court held that the employee was bound by a noncompetition clause in the buy-sell agreement [*see* *Matull & Assocs. v. Cloutier (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1054-1056, 240 Cal. Rptr. 211* (clause was valid as means of protecting former employer's confidential information)]. However, an employer may not use a stock purchase agreement with its employees as a sham to avoid the prohibition of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* against noncompetition clauses [*see* *Bosley Med. Group v. Abramson (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 284, 290-292, 207 Cal. Rptr. 477* (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* exception permits noncompetition clause only if substantially all of assets of corporate subsidiary or division are sold; did not apply because employee was required to buy stock in corporation and received only small minority interest)].

When a covenant not to compete is void and unenforceable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*, a trial court may not rewrite the covenant more narrowly to make it enforceable, since giving the court such discretion would create an incentive for business owners to write broad covenants knowing that, if challenged in court, the court could be asked to write a narrower, enforceable covenant [*Kolani v. Gluska (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 402, 407-408, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 257* (trial court properly declined to rewrite broad covenant not to compete into narrow bar on theft of confidential information)].

Although some federal courts have approved an exception to Section 16600 for restrictions on trade that are narrowly drawn, as, for example, when the restriction does not place a substantial segment of the market off limits to the restricted party [*see, e.g.,* *Latona v. Aetna U.S. Healthcare Inc. (C.D. Cal. 1999) 82 F. Supp. 2d 1089, 1091-1096]* , the California Supreme Court has specifically rejected this "narrow-restraint" exception and reaffirmed that *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* is unambiguous in invalidating all restraints of trade that do not fall under a specific statutory exception [*Edwards v. Arthur Andersen LLP (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 937, 949-950, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 282, 189 P.3d 285*]. It is unclear

whether this holding by the Supreme Court effectively eliminates the common-law trade secret exception as well, and the Court specifically stated that it had no occasion in that opinion to decide that issue [*Edwards v. Arthur Andersen LLP (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 937, 946 n.4, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 282, 189 P.3d 285* ; *see Dowell v. Biosense Webster, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 564, 576-577, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* . Even if still valid, however, the trade secret exception would apply only if the noncompete or nonsolicitation clause at issue is narrowly tailored or carefully limited to the protection of trade secrets, and not so broadly worded as to restrain competition [*see Dowell v. Biosense Webster, Inc. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 564, 577, 102 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1* (broadly worded noncompetition and nonsolicitation clauses were void and did not trigger trade secret exception)].

[d] Restraints in Commercial Leases

A commercial tenant with substantial leverage may be able to negotiate for the right to operate a certain type of business exclusively within a certain development, building, or center. Although contractual restraints on trade competition are generally invalid under the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*, that section does not invalidate express restrictive covenants regarding the use of retained premises, which are frequently incorporated in leases [*Stockton Dry Goods Co. v. Girsh (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 677, 680, 227 P.2d 1* ; *see Keating v. Preston (1940) 42 Cal. App. 2d 110, 123, 108 P.2d 479]* . Express covenants by a landlord to refrain from engaging in a competing business or leasing other portions of the same premises or adjoining premises owned by the landlord for a competing purpose are generally enforceable [*see Kulawitz v. Pacific Woodenware & Paper Co. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 664, 669, 155 P.2d 24* ; *Medico-Dental Bldg. Co. of L.A. v. Horton & Converse (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 411, 419-420, 132 P.2d 457]* .

If a tenant wants a restrictive covenant for property retained by the landlord, the lease must clearly express this intention [*Stockton Dry Goods Co. v. Girsh (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 677, 680-681, 227 P.2d 1]* , although that covenant may be implied if language indicating the restrictive intent is used [*Keating v. Preston (1940) 42 Cal. App. 2d 110, 122, 108 P.2d 479]* . However, an implied covenant cannot rest solely on an inference from facts surrounding the lease's execution, but must have a basis in the contract itself [*Stockton Dry Goods Co. v. Girsh (1951) 36 Cal. 2d 677, 680-681, 227 P.2d 1]* .

Breach of a restrictive noncompetition covenant by a landlord does not entitle the tenant to escape the obligation to pay rent accrued to the date of the breach [*Kulawitz v. Pacific Woodenware & Paper Co. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 664, 669, 155 P.2d 24]* . However, if the exclusive right to conduct the tenant's business on the premises is the essence of the consideration for that tenant's payment of rent, breach of the restrictive covenant is so substantive that it goes to the whole of the consideration and supports a rescission of the contract, terminating the obligation to pay rent [*Kulawitz v. Pacific Woodenware & Paper Co. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 664, 670, 155 P.2d 24* ; *see Medico-Dental Bldg. Co. of L.A. v. Horton & Converse (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 411, 433-434, 132 P.2d 457]* . Coversely, default by the tenant in the payment of rent does not waive the landlord's performance of the restrictive covenant unless the lease provides expressly or by necessary implication that performance depends on the payment of rent [*Kulawitz v. Pacific Woodenware & Paper Co. (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 664, 670, 155 P.2d 24]* .

Covenants by a landlord in a lease to do any act, or not to use or permit to be used any real property owned by the landlord that is contiguous to premises leased to a tenant, run with the land and are binding on successive owners of the land, if statutory requirements are satisfied [*see Civ. Code §§ 1469, 1470*]. For these covenants, the lease must describe the contiguous real property, must expressly state that successive owners and persons having an interest in the lease are bound by the covenant, and must be recorded in the county in which all or part of the contiguous real property is located [*Civ. Code §§ 1469, 1470*]. A covenant that runs with the land not only binds the covenantor and vests in the covenantee, but also binds the assignees of the covenantor and vests in the assignees of the covenantee in the same manner as if they had personally entered into the covenant [*Civ. Code § 1460*]. Even if a restrictive covenant in a lease is unenforceable because it does not comply with these statutory requirements, it may still be enforceable as an equitable servitude if the restriction is in writing in the lease and the person against whom it runs has actual notice of the covenant [*Civ. Code § 1217*; *Hudson Oil Co. v. Shortstop (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 488, 493-496, 168 Cal. Rptr. 801]* .

For discussion of the legal issues applicable to protective and restrictive covenants, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 153, *Drafting Commercial Leases* , and Ch. 474, *Shopping Centers* (Matthew Bender).

[e] Public Policy Overrides Choice of Foreign Law

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600 is such a strong statement of California public policy that it voids the parties' choice of another state's law if that law would uphold the anticompetition provision [*Frame v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 668, 672-674, 97 Cal. Rptr. 811* ; *accord, Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1039-1041* (applying *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* to determine validity of noncompetition clause in franchise agreement despite provision that it be governed by Pennsylvania law)].

[3] Combinations in Restraint of Trade

The Cartwright Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16700 et seq.*) prohibits trusts or combinations of capital, skill, or acts by two or more persons for any of the following purposes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720*]:

- To create or carry out restrictions in trade or commerce;
- To limit or reduce the production, or increase the price of merchandise or of any commodity;
- To prevent competition in manufacturing, making, transportation, sale or purchase of merchandise, produce or any commodity;
- To fix at any standard or figure, whereby its price to the public or consumer shall be in any manner controlled or established, any article or commodity of merchandise, produce or commerce intended for sale, barter, use or consumption in California;
- To make or enter into or execute or carry out any contracts, obligations, or agreements of any kind or description, by which they do all or any combination of any of the following:
    - Bind themselves not to sell, dispose of, or transport any article or commodity or any article of trade, use, merchandise, commerce, or consumption below a common standard figure or fixed value;
    - Agree in any manner to keep the price of such article, commodity, or transportation at a fixed or graduated figure;
    - Establish or settle the price of any article, commodity or transportation between them or themselves and others, so as directly or indirectly to preclude a free and unrestricted competition among themselves, or any purchasers or consumers in the sale or transportation of any such article or commodity; or
    - Agree to pool, combine, or directly or indirectly unite any interests that they may have connected with the sale or transportation of any such article or commodity, that its price might in any manner be affected.

A "combination" under the Cartwright Act means a concert of action by individuals or entities maintaining separate and independent interests. An individual acting alone through his or her agent or a corporation acting alone through its officers is not a combination in restraint of trade proscribed by the statute [*Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th*

530, 543, 544, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706 ; *see also Bondi v. Jewels by Edwar, Ltd. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 672, 678, 73 Cal. Rptr. 494* ; *cf. Williams v. I.B. Fischer Nev. (9th Cir. 1993) 999 F.2d 445, 447* (violation of Sherman Act § 1 requires proof of conspiracy to restrain trade; to be capable of conspiring, corporate entities must be sufficiently independent of each other; no conspiracy established when defendant entities comprise "common enterprise")]. Thus, for example, an allegation that joint owners and operators of an office building "conspired" with each other to restrict competition by plaintiff by refusing to rent office space to him did not sufficiently allege a combination in restraint of trade in violation of the Cartwright Act because the owners were jointly engaged in the single enterprise of managing the building and each owner was the agent of the other [*see Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 544, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706]* . In the absence of proof of a conspiracy or agreement among independent parties, there can be no liability for a combination in restraint of trade under the Cartwright Act [*see Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 544-545, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* (upholding summary adjudication of Cartwright Act cause of action in favor of defendant because of lack of proof of conspiracy or agreement)].

A combination in restraint of trade may be found even though the actions that form the basis of the combination might be legal when performed by one defendant individually and in isolation. For example, recognition that a single insurer in a market might refuse to insure tax deed titles for a legitimate business reason has been held insufficient to demonstrate "a purpose unrelated to elimination or reduction of competition" for an agreement by a combination of insurers to refuse such policies [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 49-50, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513]* .

In an action alleging an unlawful conspiracy between competitors to limit output or increase price, a defendant moving for summary judgment must carry an initial burden of producing evidence that makes a prima facie showing that no conspiracy existed [*see Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 861, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493]* . To defeat the motion, the plaintiff mustthen present evidence that would allow a reasonable finder of fact to rule in the plaintiff's favor on the unlawful conspiracy issue by a preponderance of the evidence, which means that the plaintiff's evidence must allow the finder of fact to conclude that an unlawful conspiracy was more likely than not [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 852, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493]* . However, speculative inferences or ambiguous evidence showing conduct that is as consistent with permissible competition by independent actors as with unlawful collusion is insufficient to carry the plaintiff's burden to defeat a summary judgment motion [*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co. (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 852, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 841, 24 P.3d 493]* .

[4] Lease or Agreement for Nonuse of Competitor's Product

No one may condition a lease, sale, or contract of sale for goods, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or commodities for use in California or fix the price thereof, or any discount from or rebate on the price, on the agreement that the lessee or purchaser not use or deal in the goods, merchandise, machinery, supplies, commodities, or services of the seller's or lessor's competitor or competitors if the effect may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of trade or commerce in any section of California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*]. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* is based on Section 3 of the Clayton Act, *15 U.S.C.S. § 14*, so federal cases interpreting Section 3 of the Clayton Act are applicable to cases under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* has been described as going "beyond common law and the Sherman Act to inhibit trade restraints at their inception" [*Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 315, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481]* . Tie-ins are an example of a practice that is illegal under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* [*Mailand v. Burckle (1978) 20 Cal. 3d 367, 382, 143 Cal. Rptr. 1, 572 P.2d 1142* ; *see § 565.77[4]*].

Consistent with the interpretation given to Section 3 of the Clayton Act, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* does not apply when the tying item is a service [*Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 534, 546-548, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133* (cable television was service and providers were not subject to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.72

§ 565.72 Professions as Within Cartwright Act

Trade and commerce within the meaning of the Cartwright Act includes professions [*Cianci v. Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 903, 916-925, 221 Cal. Rptr. 575, 710 P.2d 375* (overruling *Willis v. Santa Ana Cmty. Hosp. Ass'n (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 806, 809-810, 26 Cal. Rptr. 640, 376 P.2d 568*); *Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 540, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706]* . Prior to *Cianci*, the only redress available to a professional whose practice was restrained was an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* or under a common law theory of intentional interference with the right to pursue a lawful calling or profession when the interference was by unlawful means or by means otherwise lawful when there was lack of sufficient justification [*see* *Willis v. Santa Ana Cmty. Hosp. Ass'n (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 806, 809-810, 26 Cal. Rptr. 640, 376 P.2d 568* ; *Blank v. Palo Alto-Stanford Hosp. Ctr. (1965) 234 Cal. App. 2d 377, 384, 44 Cal. Rptr. 572]* . If, however, the basis for the Cartwright Act claim is a quasi-judicial decision, such as the decision of a review committee to deny hospital privileges, the state antitrust action is barred unless and until the quasi-judicial decision has been overturned by the grant of a writ of mandate [*Mir v. Little Co. of Mary Hosp. (9th Cir. 1988) 844 F.2d 646, 651* (considering pendent state claim and relying on *Westlake Cmty. Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 484, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410*)]. For discussion and forms for use by physicians excluded or expelled from membership on hospital staffs or other professional organizations, see Ch. 416, *Physicians: Membership on Hospital Staffs or in Professional Organizations* .

Interference with contractual and prospective economic relations is discussed in*§ 565.130* et seq.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.73

§ 565.73 Exceptions

[1] Sale of Business

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601 provides an exception to the general prohibition against restraints on trade or profession set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*. Under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601*, any of the following persons who sell an interest in a business may agree with the buyer to refrain from carrying on a similar business within a specified geographical area in which the business sold has been carried on for so long as the buyer (or any person deriving title to the goodwill or shares from the buyer) carries on a like business in that area:

- Any person who sells the goodwill of a business.

- An owner of a business entity selling or otherwise disposing of all of his or her ownership interest in the business entity.

- Any owner of a business entity that sells: (1) all or substantially all of its operating assets together with the goodwill of the business entity; (2) all or substantially all of the operating assets of a division or a subsidiary of the business entity together with the goodwill of that division or subsidiary; or (3) all of the ownership interest of any subsidiary.

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601 has been interpreted by some courts to apply only to the sale of all or substantially all the stock of a business [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601(b)*; *Bosley Med. Group v. Abramson (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 284, 290-292, 207 Cal. Rptr. 477* (agreement not to compete held unenforceable under any interpretation because forced sale of stock to employee and redemption ontermination of employment was sham for purposes of bringing noncompetition agreement within exception of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601*); *Radiant Indus., Inc. v. Skirvin (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 401, 109 Cal. Rptr. 96* (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* not applicable when seller retained 18 percent of stock)].

Other courts have held that a covenant not to compete is enforceable if the selling shareholder had a substantial share of the business *or* was a substantial contributor to goodwill so that without his or her shares, the purpose of the sale would

be frustrated [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 48-49, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (seller was 9th largest shareholder, owning 3 percent of shares, and officer of corporation)].

To uphold a covenant not to compete on the basis of the buyback of corporate stock from an employee leaving the company, there must be a clear indication that, in the sales transaction, the parties valued or considered goodwill as a component of the sales price. A sales price that is significantly below market value is evidence that goodwill was not a component [*Hill Med. Corp. v. Wycoff (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 895, 906-907, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 779* (covenant unenforceable because repurchase price of employee's shares was substantially below fair market value and employee owned only 7 percent of total shares in corporation)]. Retention by the seller of an insubstantial amount of nonoperating or unrelated assets will not defeat the noncompetition covenant [*Fleming v. Ray-Suzuki, Inc. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 574, 583, 275 Cal. Rptr. 150* (sale of mail order business in United States; retained assets were nonoperating assets related to activities outside United States)].

The exception of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* applies when one corporation is acquired and merged with another corporation, if under the terms of the merger all shares in the first corporation are surrendered in return for shares in the second corporation [*Hilb, Rogal & Hamilton Ins. v. Robb (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1812, 1824-1825, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887]* . Thus, a covenant not to compete executed as part of the merger agreement by a party surrendering his or her shares in the acquired business is valid under that statute [*Hilb, Rogal & Hamilton Ins. v. Robb (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1812, 1825, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887]* . Moreover, under those circumstances, the covenant is valid regardless of whether it is found in the merger agreement or a separate employment contract, so long as the evidence demonstrates that the non-competition agreement was executed as part of the sale or disposition of the shareholder's stock in the acquired corporation [*Hilb, Rogal & Hamilton Ins. v. Robb (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1812, 1826, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887]* .

When a covenant not to compete is executed as an adjunct to a sale of a business, there is an inference that the business had a "goodwill" and that it was transferred. An injunction implementing a covenant not to compete and extending to the territory specified in the agreement, is not overbroad because it exceeds the county or physical location of the buildings, plants, warehouses, or the area in which actual sales were made. Appropriate territorial limits are coextensive with the entire area in which the parties conducted all phases of their business including production, promotion, and marketing activities as well as sales [*Alliant Ins. Services, Inc. v. Gaddy (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1292, 1302-1306, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 259* (upholding restriction covering all 58 counties of California); *Monogram Indus., Inc. v. Sar Indus., Inc. (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 692, 701-703, 134 Cal. Rptr. 714* (nationwide injunction)].

The language in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* limiting the scope of covenants not to compete to "counties and cities" is not limited to California. If the market, goodwill, and area intended by the parties to be encompassed by the covenant not to compete extend outside California, the covenant encompasses areas outside California [*Fleming v. Ray-Suzuki, Inc. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 574, 583, 275 Cal. Rptr. 150* (injunction not to compete in mail-order business of selling tennis products in United States)].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601 has been held inapplicable to a noncompetition clause pertaining to termination of a franchise agreement because of the dissimilarity between termination of a franchise and the sale of a business. Therefore, the noncompetition clause was held to be void and unenforceable against former franchisees who began competing businesses [*see Scott v. Snelling & Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1041* (describing franchise as more like a lease of goodwill)].

Concluding that *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* is intended to protect the value of the business that is sold, the court of appeal has held that an agreement prohibiting the seller from soliciting the employees and customers of the buying company is not enforceable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601*. Although an agreement prohibiting the seller from soliciting the former employees and customers of the sold company would be protected, the assets of the buying company that were not part of the acquired company are not so protected [*Strategix, Ltd. v. Infocrossing W., Inc.*

(2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1073-1074, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 614] . However, if the seller goes to work for the buyer as an employee after selling the company, a covenant prohibiting that employee from soliciting the buying company's customers in the event of termination of employment may be enforceable if necessary to protect the buyer's trade secrets, which may include confidential client information [*Alliant Ins. Services, Inc. v. Gaddy (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1292, 1306-1307, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 259*].

If a noncompetition covenant is valid under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601*, any injunction implementing the covenant must be limited to those types of activities with respect to which the parties can and do actually compete. For example, an injunction against a former attorney-employee-director of a labor relations consulting firm was was held to be overbroad to the extent that it prohibited the attorney from providing legal services to clients of the firm because the firm was not licensed to provide those services [*see Matull & Assocs. v. Cloutier (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1055-1056, 240 Cal. Rptr. 211]* .

[2] Dissolution of Partnership

Another exception to the general prohibition against restraints on trade or profession set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* pertains to the dissolution of a partnership [*see Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 409, 416, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80, 863 P.2d 150]* . *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16602* provides that a partner, on dissolution of a partnership or in anticipation of dissolution, may agree not to carry on a similar business within a specified geographical area where the partnership business has been transacted, so longas any other member of the partnership (or any person deriving title to the business or goodwill of the partnership from another member of the partnership) is carrying on a like business in that area [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16602*; *see Alliance Payment Systems, Inc. v. Walczer (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 620, 637, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789* (provision unenforceable when lacking requirement that former partner remain engaged in like business in order to benefit from terms of provision)]. A ban on soliciting specified clients is sufficient to meet the requirement that the agreement be limited to the specified geographic area in which the former partnership conducted business, so long as the clients had places of business known to the parties to be located in that specified area [*Alliance Payment Systems, Inc. v. Walczer (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 620, 642-643, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789]* .

The requirement of a transfer of goodwill found in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16601* is not read into *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16602*. Thus, a partnership agreement that prevents a departing partner whose interest is bought by the continuing partners from competing with them is valid even though it does not expressly provide for the transfer of a portion of the goodwill of the partnership or take goodwill into account in valuing the departing partner's interest [*South Bay Radiology Med. Assoc. v. Asher (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1092, 220 Cal. App. 3d 1074, 1082-1084, 269 Cal. Rptr. 15]* . For discussion relating to enforcement of a noncompetition clause against a partner who is dissociated from a partnership, see *Ch. 403, Partnerships: Actions by and Against Dissociated Partners, § 403.14*.

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16602, on its face, applies to law partnerships [*Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 409, 417-418, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80, 863 P.2d 150]* . However, special considerations apply to covenants not to compete involving withdrawing law partners because of *Cal. Rules Prof. Conduct, Rule 1-500(A)*, which prohibits a State Bar member from making an agreement that restricts his or her right to practice law on termination of an employment, shareholder, or partnership relationship. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court has held that Rule 1-500 does not prohibit an agreement that does restrict an attorney's practice of law, but merely assesses a reasonable cost against a withdrawing partner who chooses to compete with his or her former partners (e.g., a provision forfeiting a competing partner's withdrawal benefits other than his or her capital interest) [*Howard v. Babcock (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 409, 418-419, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 80, 863 P.2d 150* ; *see also Haight, Brown & Bonesteel v. Superior Court (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 963, 969-972, 285 Cal. Rptr. 845* (reaching same conclusion)].

[3] Sale of Interest in Limited Liability Company

Another exception to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600* applies to members of limited liability companies. Any member may,

on or in anticipation of the dissolution of a limited liability company or a sale of his or her interest in a limited liability company, agree that he or she will not carry on a similar business within a specified geographical area where the limitedliability company's business has been transacted for so long as any other member of the company (or any person deriving title to the company's business or goodwill from another member) carries on a like business in the specified area [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16602.5*].

[4] Labor and Labor Activities

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16703 specifies that labor is not a "commodity" within the meaning of the Cartwright Act. The "labor" exemption of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16703* is not limited to agreements to set the price of labor. It extends to combinations of laborers for purposes of furthering their interests by collective bargaining, when not otherwise unlawful. A labor union, acting alone, violates the Cartwright Act only when its primary purpose is to accomplish a restraint of trade, not when its purpose is to obtain a valid labor objective [*Messner v. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers & Cosmetologists, Int'l Union of Am. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 873, 886, 4 Cal. Rptr. 179, 351 P.2d 347]* . Therefore, peaceful picketing, if directed to a proper objective, is not enjoinable under the Cartwright Act even if the employees of the establishment being picketed do not wish to join the union and even if the employer loses business on account of the picketing [*Messner v. Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers & Cosmetologists, Int'l Union of Am. (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 873, 877-883, 4 Cal. Rptr. 179, 351 P.2d 347]* .

The labor exemption is broad enough to protect more than employees or wage earners. It protects activities by independent contractors whose economic function is the same as that of employees if the activities serve the legitimate labor objective of increasing the amount they are paid or improving their working conditions [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 64-65, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410* (exchange of fee information, refusal to refer hygienists to dentists for less than minimum rate); *Los Angeles Pie Bakers Asso. v. Bakery Drivers Local No. 276 (1953) 122 Cal. App. 2d 237, 239, 243* (independent drivers paid percentage of resale prices)]. Thus, the workers need not be part of a union or collective bargaining unit for their activities to be exempted [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 67-70, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410]* . Similarly, the exemption extends to employment agencies working with the labor groups to raise and maintain compensation levels [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 70-71, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410* ; *see also H.A. Artists & Assocs. v. Actors' Equity Ass'n (1981) 451 U.S. 704, 707-708, 717-721, 101 S. Ct. 2102, 68 L. Ed. 2d 558]* . However, the exemption does not apply if the independent contractors are "entrepreneur service providers" and the challenged activity is designed to advance their interests as entrepreneurs rather than as employees [*Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 927-928, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833* (real estate broker); *California Dental Ass'nv. California Dental Hygienists' Ass'n (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 65-66, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410]* .

The labor exemption of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16703* will not protect all union activity or all collective bargaining agreements. For example, provisions of an agreement prohibiting the sale of prepackaged meats at all and after 6:00 p.m. have been held void as restraining trade [*Alpha Beta Mkts. v. Amalgamated Meat Cutters (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 343, 346-350, 305 P.2d 163* ; *Kold Kist v. Amalgamated Meat Cutters (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 191, 197-201, 221 P.2d 724]* .

Apart from the labor exemption set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16703*, application of the Cartwright Act to activities that are within the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board may potentially be preempted by federal labor law [*see Guss v. Utah Labor Relations Bd. (1957) 353 U.S. 1, 9-11, 77 S. Ct. 598, 1 L. Ed. 2d 601* ; *San Diego Bldg. Trades Council v. Garmon (1957) 353 U.S. 26, 28-29, 77 S. Ct. 607, 1 L. Ed. 2d 618]* . For full discussion of federal labor law preemption, see NLRA Law and Practice, Ch. 22 (Matthew Bender).

[5] Petitioning Government for Redress of Grievance (*Noerr-Pennington* Doctrine)

[a] General Rule

The *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine provides that there is no antitrust liability under the Sherman Act for efforts to influence government that are protected by the *First Amendment* right to petition for redress of grievances, even when the motive behind such actions is anticompetitive [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611, 621-622* ; *see Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 320, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 574, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646]* . The doctrine originated in the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* , in which the Court held that alleged lobbying efforts by the railroad industry to foster legislation that would be adverse to the trucking industry could not form the basis for liability under the Sherman Act, even if the defendants' motive was to injure competition [*see Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 136-140, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *see also United Mine Workers v. Pennington (1965) 381 U.S. 657, 669-670, 85 S. Ct. 1585, 14 L. Ed. 2d 626* ; *Sessions Tank Liners, Inc. v. Joor Mfg., Inc. (9th Cir. 1994) 17 F.3d 295, 299-300* (defendant shielded from antitrust liability for false statements made to induce influential standard-setting body to set new standard that was unfavorable to plaintiff competitor because direct cause of plaintiff's damages was governmental action, i.e., denial of permits by local officials who enforce those standards)]. In a later decision, the Court made clearthat the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine applies to judicial and administrative, as well as legislative, proceedings [*California Transp. v. Trucking Unlimited (1972) 404 U.S. 508, 510-511, 92 S. Ct. 609, 30 L. Ed. 2d 642* ; *see Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611, 621-622]* .

Although the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine originated in the context of federal antitrust litigation, the California Supreme Court has applied the doctrine to actions under the Cartwright Act [*see Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 320-322, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* (defendants' actions aimed at influencing city to license defendants' poker club were protected by *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine from Cartwright Act claim)].

[b] "Sham" Exception

Efforts to influence government that are merely a "sham" are not protected by the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine and are subject to antitrust liability [*see California Transp. v. Trucking Unlimited (1972) 404 U.S. 508, 512-513, 92 S. Ct. 609, 30 L. Ed. 2d 642* ; *Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 144, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 321-322* ; *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 575*]. The sham exception encompasses situations in which persons use the governmental process, as opposed to the outcome of that process, as an anticompetitive weapon [*Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Adver. (1991) 499 U.S. 365, 380, 111 S. Ct. 1344, 113 L. Ed. 2d 382]* . The sham exception has been applied to California actions for unfair competition [*see Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 579, 581-583, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646* (defendants' alleged false and baseless statements to city officials about plaintiffs' plans for automobile body shredder made for purpose of causing regulatory delays constituted sufficient facts to support application of sham exception); *see also Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 321-322, 325-326, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* (recognizing doctrine in action under Cartwright Act, but finding it inapplicable under facts of case)].

Litigation will not be deemed a sham unless the lawsuit is so objectively baseless that no reasonable litigant could realistically expect success on the merits [*Professional Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611, 624, 625* ; *see, e.g., Liberty Lake Invs. v. Magnuson (9th Cir. 1993) 12 F.3d 155, 157-158* (environmental litigation instituted by competitor in attempt to prevent plaintiff from developing competing shopping center was not objectively baseless and therefore not a sham under *Real Estate Investors* test)]. The existence of probable cause to institute the legal proceedings thus precludes a finding that the defendant has engaged in sham litigation [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia PicturesIndus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611, 625-626]* . If an objective litigant could reasonably conclude that the suit is reasonably calculated to elicit a favorable outcome, then the suit is immunized from antitrust liability under the

Noerr-Pennington doctrine, regardless of the defendant's subjective intent in bringing the suit [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611, 621-622, 624* ; *see Liberty Lake Invs. v. Magnuson (9th Cir. 1993) 12 F.3d 155, 157, 159]* .

[6] Interstate League Sports

Because the player-team-league relationships in professional baseball and football involve interstate commerce and require national uniformity, application of state antitrust laws is either preempted or prohibited as an undue burden on interstate commerce [*see Flood v. Kuhn (2d Cir. 1971) 443 F.2d 264, 267-268 , aff'd, 407 U.S. 258, 92 S. Ct. 2099, 32 L. Ed. 2d 728* (baseball); *Partee v. San Diego Chargers Football Co. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 378, 380, 385, 194 Cal. Rptr. 367, 668 P.2d 674* (football); *Hebert v. Los Angeles Raiders, Ltd. (1991) 23 Cal. App. 4th 414, 422-425, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540* (football; following *Partee*)].

[7] Trade Associations

Agreements and associations whose purpose and effect is to promote competition in any trade or industry or that are in furtherance of trade are not prohibited under the Cartwright Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16725*]. In general, trade association activities tend to promote competition and are lawful. Gathering and compiling industry information and disseminating it among members does not offend antitrust policy, even though it may naturally tend to stabilize that trade or business and to produce uniformity of price and trade practice [*BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1410, 1430, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819]* . Disseminating competitive information, even pricing information, through trade associations is condoned by antitrust law. Members may use that information in management and control of their individual businesses. Only if they take concerted action to restrain trade based on that information is the law violated [*BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1410, 1430, 1432-1433, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819* (no conspiracy established among bankers associations to set and manipulate variable interest rates on loans to "middle market" commercial borrowers)].

For example, agreements by which a cooperative marketing association that requires its members to sell all their production to it are not prohibited restraints of trade [*Poultry Producers of S. Cal. v. Barlow (1922) 189 Cal. 278, 283-285, 208 P. 93* (decided under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16723*, which was repealed in 1961)]. Although a federal court stated as dicta that an eligibility rule of bowling proprietors' associations, which limited tournament participation to persons who did all their league bowling inestablishments owned by association members, was protected under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16725*, the California court of appeal, without mentioning *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16725*, held the rules to be an unreasonable restraint of trade and therefore enjoinable [*Monument Bowl, Inc. v. Northern Cal. Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n (N.D. Cal. 1961) 197 F. Supp. 208, 210* (dismissal for failure to allege interstate impact reversed sub nom. *Breier v. Northern Cal. Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n. (9th Cir. 1963) 316 F.2d 787, 789* , requiring allowance of amendment); *People v. Santa Clara Valley Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 225, 236-241, 47 Cal. Rptr. 570* (group boycott as per se restraint)]. Similarly, a trade association that fixes prices and agrees that members will raise their prices to customers who seek to change contractors has gone too far, and such conduct is enjoinable [*People v. Building Maint. Contractors' Ass'n, Inc. (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 719, 726-728, 264 P.2d 31]* .

The practice of limiting membership in a county board of realtors to those who are engaged full time in the real estate business is an unreasonable restraint of trade, as is denying nonmembers access to the board's multiple listing service [*Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 935-940, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833]* . The court in *Marin* applied the rule of reason standard, rejecting the contention that the practice was a per se unlawful group boycott, and characterizing it as a trade association agreement not directly aimed at coercing third parties and eliminating competitors [*Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 930-934, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833]* . In later cases, however, a board's exclusion of nonmembers from its residential multiple listing service was found illegal per se as a group boycott, and its exclusion of nonmembers from its investment multiple listing service was found illegal per se as a tying arrangement [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal.*

App. 3d 578, 583-584, 589, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243 (investment multiple listing service); *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 467-469, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728* (residential multiple listing service); *see § 565.77[4]*].

[8] Insurance

In 1945, Congress passed the McCarran-Ferguson Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 1011-1015*, hereinafter "the McCarran Act"), exempting insurance from federal antitrust laws to the extent that state law regulated insurance. The federal exemption does not extend, and the Sherman Act therefore applies, to agreements to boycott or coerce and acts of boycott and coercion [*15 U.S.C.S. § 1013(b)*]. This exception applies to acts of boycott and coercion among insurance companies and agents and was intended to protect agents from insurance company black lists [*Addrisi v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y of U.S. (9th Cir. 1974) 503 F.2d 725, 728-729]* . States were given until June 30, 1948, to pass laws in the field [*15 U.S.C.S. § 1012(b)*]. In 1947, California enacted *Ins. Code §§ 1850-1860.3* (hereinafter "the McBride Act"), which superseded the Cartwright Act with respect to casualty insurance ratemaking [*Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 966-972, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379* ; *but see Ins. Code § 1851* (types of insurance not within McBride Act as including title insurance, reinsurance, life insurance, marine insurance, disability insurance, workers' compensation insurance, mortage insurance, and insurance transaction by county fire marshal insurers or reinsurers)]. Substantial amendments to the McBride Act (*now see Ins. Code §§ 1850.4-1861.14*) were made by Proposition 103, adopted in 1988. The business of insurance is now subject to the laws of California applicable to any other business, including, but not limited to, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16600-17101*, which encompasses both the Cartwright Act and the Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*) [*Ins. Code § 1861.03(a)*; *see also Industrial Indem. Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1096-1097, 257 Cal. Rptr. 655* (only injunctive relief is available to third party in action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*]. Proposition 103 left some minor exemptions for concerted action intact, such as *Ins. Code § 1853.5*, relating to commonly owned insurers; *Ins. Code § 1853.8*, governing agreements, which must be approved by the Insurance Commissioner, to apportion risks to provide insurance to applicants who would not otherwise be able to obtain insurance; and *Ins. Code § 1855*, which allows advisory organizations. Proposition 103 provided for other types of permissible concerted action, such as agreements to collect, compile, and disseminate historical data on paid claims and reserves for reported claims and participation in joint arrangements established by statute or by the Insurance Commissioner to ensure the availability of insurance, and exchange of premium, rate, and underwriting information between agents or brokers and the insurers they represent [*Ins. Code § 1861.03(b)*].

The procedure for administrative challenges to rates for lines of insurance governed by *Ins. Code §§ 1850.4-1861.14* and for judicial review of administrative orders relating to those challenges [*see, e.g., Ins. Code §§ 1858-1858.7*] were not displaced by Proposition 103, which added new provisions requiring public hearings for approval of rate changes [*Ins. Code §§ 1861.05-1861.09*]. Any person may initiate or intervene in any proceeding permitted or established by *Ins. Code §§ 1850.4-1861.14*, challenge any action of the Insurance Commissioner under the new procedures (*Ins. Code §§ 1861.01-1861.14*), and enforce any provision of *Ins. Code §§ 1861.01-1861.14* [*Ins. Code § 1861.10(a)*; *but see Karlin v. Zalta (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 953, 975, 983-987, 201 Cal. Rptr. 379* (decided before passage of Proposition 103, requiring exhaustion of administrative remedies provided by *Ins. Code §§ 1858-1858.7* prior to initiating action regarding rates)].

The doctrine of primary jurisdiction may be applied to require courts to refrain from proceeding with a case until the Insurance Commissioner has determined the issue even when the applicable statutes do not require it and do not require exhaustion of administrative remedies. Application ofthe doctrine of primary jurisdiction rests on the administrative agency's special competence with respect to a specific statutory scheme or issue and is determined on a case by case basis. Thus, because of the factual complexities of automobile insurance ratemaking, application of the doctrine was appropriate to stay an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17204-17206* seeking redress for an insurer's failure to offer good driver discounts mandated by *Ins. Code §§ 1861.02, 1861.05* pending administrative proceedings by the Insurance Commissioner [*Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 377, 390-401, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 487, 826 P.2d 730]* .

In addition, in 1959, California passed *Ins. Code §§ 790 et seq.* (hereinafter "the Unfair Practices Act" or "UPA"), establishing unfair practices in insurance. *Ins. Code § 790.03(c)* mirrors the Cartwright Act by prohibiting any act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation resulting in or tending to result in unreasonable restraint of, or monopoly in, the business of insurance. Coercion prohibited by this section is coercion in the antitrust sense, conduct that constitutes the improper use of economic power to compel another to submit to the wishes of the one who wields it [*Greenberg v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 994, 999, 110 Cal. Rptr. 470* (tying); *see Bodenhamer v. Superior Court (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 180, 183-185, 223 Cal. Rptr. 486* (*Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, unfair settlement practices, as applicable to independent insurance adjusters); *but see Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Cos. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* (prospectively abrogating private third-party standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*); *Love v. Fire Ins. Exch. (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1136, 1144 n.4, 271 Cal. Rptr. 246* (*Moradi-Shalal* abrogated first-party right of action under *Ins. Code § 790.03*); *Smith v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 1104, 1116, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 131* (same); *Maler v. Superior Court (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 1592, 1597-1601, 270 Cal. Rptr. 222* (same, and Proposition 103 did not establish or revive any right of action under *Ins. Code § 1861.03*); *Zephyr Park v. Superior Court (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 833, 836-838, 262 Cal. Rptr. 106* (same re first-party right of action, but refusing to apply rule retroactively)]. For discussion and forms relating to unfair settlement practices, including rights of both insureds and third parties under the Unfair Practices Act (*Ins. Code § 790 et seq.*), see Ch. 308, *Insurance* .

Thus, when an insurance company doing business both within California and nationwide required borrowers of loans on single family properties to obtain from it a whole life policy and to pledge the policy as additional security for the loan, no federal antitrust cause of action could be stated because state law had regulated insurance, but a cause of action for illegal tie-in could be stated under California law if the insurance company enjoyed a dominant position in the home loan market [*Addrisi v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y of U.S. (9th Cir. 1974) 503 F.2d 725, 728-729* ; *Greenberg v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 994, 998-1000, 110 Cal. Rptr. 470]* .

Although *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Cos. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* , which abrogated private third-party standing to recover for unfair settlement practices that violate *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, distinguished *Shernoff v. Superior Court (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 406, 409-410, 118 Cal. Rptr. 680* (class action alleging conspiracy to fix price of title insurance), and *Greenberg v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc'y (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 994, 1001, 110 Cal. Rptr. 470* (class action challenging illegal tying), as not involving either third parties or *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)* [*see Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Cos. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 295, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58]* , the language of that decision to the effect that *Ins. Code § 790.09* does not support private civil remedies is so broad that it may also be applied to foreclose private remedies for anticompetitive violations of *Ins. Code § 790.03(c)* [*see Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Cos. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 304-305, 320, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58]* .

[9] Bargaining Units for Health Care Coverage

There are several statutory schemes under which price fixing of health care costs are authorized, such as *Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.* (health care service plans), *Ins. Code § 10133 et seq.* (fixed-price contracts between doctors, hospitals, other health care providers and insurers), and *Ins. Code § 11512 et seq.* (hospital service plans). The California Legislature recognized that *State of Arizona v. Maricopa Med. Soc'y (1982) 457 U.S. 332, 352-357, 102 S. Ct. 2466, 73 L. Ed. 2d 48* , which held that medical society fee ceilings constitute per se violations of federal antitrust law, served as a disincentive for medical societies and other health care providers to bargain in groups regarding the types of fixed-price contracts mentioned above. Thus, in 1985, the legislature enacted *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16770*, *Health & Safety Code § 1342.6*, and *Ins. Code § 10133.6* to provide an antitrust exemption for groups and combinations of providers and purchasers formed to create efficient-sized bargaining units for those types of health care coverage. Antitrust law still applies to other aspects of the contracts and combinations, including agreements or arrangements to exclude any person who is lawfully qualified to perform the service because he or she does not have the same license or

certification as the members of the group or combination [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16770(g),(h)*].

For several reasons, alleged anticompetitive effects of health care plans provisions are to be tested by the rule of reason. A plan that is an integrated plan within the definition set forth by the Federal Trade Commission should, as stated by the Commission, generally be judged under the rule of reason standard. Practices that are designed to increase economic efficiency and render markets more, rather than less, competitive should be judged by the rule of reason standard [*Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 597, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331]* . The fact that the legislature enacted *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16770(g)* and*(h)* indicates thatit intended to permit provider-controlled medical plans despite their potential for competitive harm. Thus, the legislature may have mandated that the rule of reason be used to test the practices of those plans [*Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 596-597, 599-600, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331]* . Also, the per se standard is usually not applied until the courts have considerable experience with the business relationship involved. Neither the California nor the federal courts have much exposure to the antitrust implications of prepaid medical plans [*Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 597-598, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331]* . The usual fee requirement of most plans does not fix prices at a specific level, and thus is not plainly anticompetitive [*Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 598, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331]* .

The California court of appeal has rejected antitrust and unfair competition claims stemming from an exclusive provider contract between Blue Cross and a physical therapy provider group brought by competing physical therapy providers. Under the contract between Blue Cross and the defendant provider group, the provider group would accept reduced rates from Blue Cross for its services but would be the exclusive preferred provider of physical therapy services for Blue Cross members. The court in that case concluded that such agreement was expressly authorized by these statutes, notwithstanding the fact that it inhibited the ability of competing providers to compete on the basis of price [*Lori Rubinstein Physical Therapy, Inc. v. PTPN, Inc. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1139, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351]* . In addition, the fact that the defendant provider group restricted the number of its providers by geographic location did not constitute an antitrust violation, as these restrictions helped the group sustain an efficient-sized contracting unit by guaranteeing a certain volume of patients to its member providers [*Lori Rubinstein Physical Therapy, Inc. v. PTPN, Inc. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1141, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351* ; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 16770(g)*]. The court did recognize, however, that an antitrust violation might be found if one or more providers or provider groups used coercion, threats, or intimidation to convince an insurer to refuse to negotiate with other providers or provider groups [*Lori Rubinstein Physical Therapy, Inc. v. PTPN, Inc. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1140, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 351]* .

[10] Municipal Activities

Municipal governments, although they can sue as plaintiffs under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(b)*, cannot be sued as defendants under the Cartwright Act. This immunity extends to individual members of a city's governing body. This municipal immunity under Cartwright is broader than state action immunity under federal antitrust law that would apply only if the state compelled the activity in question [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16702*; *People ex rel. Freitas v. City & County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 917-921, 925-926, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . Not only is the municipal activity protected, but so are private citizens' attempts to influence municipal activity. This is true even though pleaded as a conspiracy between public officials and private citizens and even when there are anticompetitive effects, such as the private citizen's being given a monopoly in a business requiring a city license [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 322-327, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.74

§ 565.74 Determination of Validity and Effect of Conduct or Agreement

[1] Interpretation and Application

A contract that appears by its terms to be in restraint of trade is not necessarily so, for example, when the offending provision has never in fact been enforced. It is not the combination or particular means used but the result to be achieved that antitrust law condemns [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 302, 312-315, 148 Cal. Rptr. 918, 583 P.2d 777]* .

[2] Rule of Reason

Although the Sherman Act and the Cartwright Act by their express terms forbid all restraints on trade, each has been interpreted to permit by implication those restraints found to be reasonable [*Standard Oil Co. v. United States (1911) 221 U.S. 1, 60, 31 S. Ct. 502, 55 L. Ed. 619* ; *People v. Building Maint. Contractors' Ass'n (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 719, 727, 264 P.2d 31]* . Factors to be considered in determining whether or not a particular restraint is unreasonable include the facts peculiar to the business to which the restraint is applied; the condition of the particular business or market before and after the restraint is imposed; the nature of the restraint, and its effect, actual or probable; the history of the restraint; the evil the restraint was implemented to curb and other reasons for adopting it [*Board of Trade v. United States (1918) 246 U.S. 231, 238, 38 S. Ct. 242, 62 L. Ed. 683* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 854, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 727, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . The court should consider the percentage of business controlled, the strength of the remaining competition, and whether the action springs from requirements of business or from a purpose to monopolize [*United States v. Columbia Steel Co. (1948) 334 U.S. 495, 527, 68 S. Ct. 1107, 92 L. Ed. 1533* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 854, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953]* . Whether a restraint of trade is unreasonable or not is a question of fact to be determined at trial [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 855, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953]* .

For additional discussion, see*§ 565.73[9]*.

[3] Relevant Market

Federal courts applying the rule of reason to vertical restraints of trade (thoseimposed by persons or firms further up the chain of distribution of a specific product than the enterprise restrained), have required a threshold inquiry into the defendant's market power, which is usually equated with market share. To meet the initial burden in establishing that the practice is an unreasonable restraint of trade, plaintiff must show that the activity is of the type that restrains trade, and that the restraint is likely to be of significant magnitude. Ordinarily, plaintiff must delineate a relevant market, and show that defendant plays enough of a role in that market to impair competition significantly. The relevant market may be a question of fact, although the issue becomes one of law if the undisputed facts leave no room for a reasonable difference of opinion [*Exxon Corp. v. Superior Court (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 1682* (in Cartright Act action by Exxon franchisee gasoline service station dealers, relevant market for assessing anticompetitive behavior was question of law and was all gasoline, not wholesale market for Exxon fuel); *see also Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 542, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706]* .

[4] Per Se

The per se doctrine is applied if a particular practice and the setting in which it occurs are sufficient to compel the conclusion that competitionis unreasonably restrained. Consequently the practice is illegal without any inquiry as to the precise harm caused or the business excuse for its use [*B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348-1350, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833]* . When conduct is to be tested by the per se standard, most defenses are irrelevant, and the pleading and proof requirements of the specific harm element are relaxed because these practices are deemed so harmful to competition as to amount to public harms [*Klor's v. Broadway-Hale Stores (1959) 359 U.S. 207, 210-214, 79 S. Ct. 705, 3 L. Ed. 2d 741* ; *B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348-1350, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *but see ARCO v. USA Petroleum (1990) 495 U.S. 328, 335-340, 110 S. Ct. 1884, 109 L. Ed. 2d 333* (vertical conspiracy to maintain low prices is illegal per se, but, unless pricing is predatory, competitor has no actionable injury, and effects may actually be procompetitive for consumers); *Mozart Co. v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1342, 1348-1349* (federal law allows business justification defense in action on per se illegal tying arrangement)]. Among the practices that the courts have heretofore deemed to be unlawful in and of themselves are price fixing, division of markets, group boycotts, and tying arrangements [*Northern Pac. Ry. Co. v. United States (1958) 356 U.S. 1, 5, 78 S. Ct. 514, 2 L. Ed. 2d 545* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 853, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* (tying); *B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* (price fixing); *Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 721, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797* (price fixing); *but see ARCO v. USA Petroleum (1990) 495 U.S. 328, 335-346, 110 S. Ct. 1884, 109 L. Ed. 2d 333* (exception for vertical nonpredatory "maximum price fixing conspiracy," which may have procompetitive effect); *Mozart Co. v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1342, 1348-1349* (allowing business justification defense to tying arrangement that is illegal per se)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.75

§ 565.75 Mergers

The Cartwright Act does not regulate mergers--that is, the bona fide purchase and sale of one firm by another [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1151, 1164-1166, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . The Act applies only to situations in which the parties improperly collude *and* continue as separate, independent entities. It does not apply to situations in which, by virtue of purchase and sale, or merger, one or more of the entities ceases to exist [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1151, 1164-1166, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

Several decisions have stated that the Cartwright Act is patterned after the Sherman Act, or after a bill that was proposed, but rejected as an alternative to what became the Sherman Act. Although those statements are adequate for some analyses, and judicial interpretation of the Sherman Act is often helpful if not directly probative of the intent of the drafters of the Cartwright Act, more precise analysis of the history of the Cartwright Act is necessary to determine whether it was intended to regulate mergers [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1153-1154, 1168-1169, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . In 1907, when Cartwright was enacted, many state laws, including the 1903 version of the Texas law, contained antimerger provisions. However, the Cartwright Act uses language identical to the 1889 version of the Texas act, under which the term "combination" had been held not to include a merger, and to the 1899 Michigan act. Neither of those two laws contained antimerger provisions. Also, the Cartwright Act uses the term "combination" without any modification to avoid the then-prevailing narrow construction of that term [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1160-1163, 1168-1169, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . Additionally, the Cartwright Act has been amended 26 times between 1909 and 1988, including the 1961 addition of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*, which is essentially Section 3 of the Clayton Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 14*). Thus, the California Legislature was certainly well aware of the Clayton Act, and, if it intended the Cartwright Act to apply to mergers, it could have adopted the language of Section 7 of the Clayton Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 18*) [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1162-1163, 1163 n.15, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

The Cartwright Act is not a codification of the common law of restraint of trade [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1166, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . The majority view at common

law was that a merger or acquisition was illegal if it involved a clear, actual threat to competition, but not if it only involved an incipient threat to competition. It may be that a common law remedy has survived for a merger that is illegal by common law standards. The common law remedy made the merger agreement void and unenforceable or subject to prosecution by the state by quo warranto [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1167-1168, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385* (dicta because no challenge on common law grounds was made)].

Under federal law, a merger may be attacked under Section 1 or 2 of the Sherman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 1, 2*) or under Section 7 of the Clayton Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 18*). A merger is illegal under Section 1 of the Sherman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 1*) if it effects an unreasonable restraint of trade. Section 2 of the Sherman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 2*) prohibits monopolies. A merger may be attacked under Section 7 of the Clayton Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 18*) if it might substantially lessen competition [*State of California v. American Stores (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 837, 841 , rev'd on other grounds, 495 U.S. 271, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240 (1990)* ; *State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1164-1165, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . Thus, a merger may be subject to attack under the Clayton Act even if it would be proper under Sherman Act standards [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1164 n.14, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* . A merger may substantially lessen competition by permitting one firm to control an undue share of the relevant market and by significantly increasing the concentration of firms in that market [*State of California v. American Stores (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 837, 841 , rev'd on other grounds, 495 U.S. 271, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240 (1990)]* . Relevant indicia of competitive effects are (1) the market shares of the merging firms, (2) the degree of concentration in the market, and (3) the degree to which that concentration will be increased by the merger. Statistics that indicate excessive postmerger market share and market concentration create a presumption that the merger violates the Clayton Act [*State of California v. American Stores (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 837, 842 , rev'd on other grounds, 495 U.S. 271 (1990)*]. However, the absence of barriers to entry into a market constrains anticompetitive conduct, regardless of the market's degree of concentration [*United States v. Syufy Enters. (9th Cir. 1990) 903 F.2d 659, 664-667* ; *State of California v. American Stores (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 837, 842-843 , rev'd on other grounds, 495 U.S. 271, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240 (1990)* (factors relevant to analysis of existence of entry barriers)].

When a merger threatens to cause irreparable harm by substantially lessening competition, or when the merger has been completed and has substantially lessened competition, an injunction under *15 U.S.C.S. § 26* restraining the merger or requiring divestiture is available [*State of California v. American Stores Co. (1990) 495 U.S. 271, 279-285, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240]* . Divestiture is available under *15 U.S.C.S. § 26* in actions initiated by private parties whose own interests are threatened with loss or damage, as well as under *15 U.S.C.S. § 25* in actions initiated by the Federal Trade Commission or the United States [*State of California v. American Stores Co. (1990) 495 U.S. 271, 279-285, 295-296, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240* (however, laches may protect consummated transactions from belated attacks by private parties if it would not be too late for government to vindicate public interest)]. A preliminary injunction requiring the merged entities to be operated separately is considered a way of maintaining the status quo in the event that a permanent injunction requiring divestiture is granted [*see State of California v. American Stores Co. (1990) 495 U.S. 271, 274, 296, 110 S. Ct. 1853, 109 L. Ed. 2d 240, 262]* .

To the extent that the Cartwright Act could be said to be patterned after the Sherman Act, a merger challenge under the Cartwright Act would require the same showing, namely that the merger effected an unreasonable restraint of trade [*State of California ex rel. Van de Kamp v. Texaco, Inc. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 1147, 1165, 252 Cal. Rptr. 221, 762 P.2d 385]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.76

§ 565.76 Monopoly

Under federal law, a single entity may violate antitrust law by creating or being a monopoly [*15 U.S.C.S. § 2*]. There is no similar provision in California law, though *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* prohibits specified acts by one entity that may tend to create a monopoly. For discussion of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*, see*§ 565.71[4]*. Still, a least one case has said that monopoly, though not specifically listed, is a prohibited restraint of trade in California and has adopted the federal definition: that the offense of monopoly involves the willful acquisition of the power to control prices or exclude competition from commerce in a particular geographic area with respect to a specific product [*Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 23, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664* ; *see United States v. Grinnell Corp. (1966) 384 U.S. 563, 86 S. Ct. 1698, 16 L. Ed. 2d 778* ; *United States v. Aluminum Co. of Am. (2d Cir. 1945) 148 F.2d 416*); *see also* Cowan, *California's Single-Firm Monopoly Loophole, 18 Cal. W. L. Rev. 240 (1982)*].

Even if the "offense" charged is not monopoly, monopoly power is relevant in several contexts in California. An entity with monopoly power may not use its refusal to deal with others to restrain trade [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 419, 425-426, 156 Cal. Rptr. 738* ; *see § 565.105*]. A monopoly position in the tying product market determines whether other elements are also necessary to establish an illegal tying arrangement [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 858, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 472-473, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728* ; *see § 565.77[4]*].

A federal court applying California law in a diversity action has held that, although combinations to monopolize would appear to fall within the general prohibition of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720*, that statute does not address unilateral conduct [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1478* ; *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 266, 268, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* ; *Bondi v. Jewels by Edwar, Ltd. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 672, 678, 73 Cal. Rptr. 494* ; *see also Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 543, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* ("combination" requires concerted action by parties with independent interests)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.77

§ 565.77 Particular Situations

[1] Single Entity's Refusal to Deal

In general, absent a monopolistic purpose and unless prohibited by other statutes such as the civil rights laws, a person may exercise his or her own discretion as to parties with whom he or she will deal, and may announce in advance the circumstances under which he or she will refuse to sell [*United States v. Colgate & Co. (1919) 250 U.S. 300, 307, 39 S. Ct. 465, 63 L. Ed. 992* ; *A.B.C. Distrib. Co. v. Distillers Distrib. Corp. (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 175, 188-190* ; *Rolley, Inc. v. Merle Norman Cosmetics (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 844, 846-852, 278 P.2d 63]* . However, a supplier's refusal to deal with a potential customer may constitute a "vertical restraint," the legality of which will be judged by a rule-of-reason analysis [*see § 565.74[2]*], if the supplier has sufficient market power in the relevant market to impair competition [*see Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 542, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* (relying on *Redwood Theatres, Inc. v. Festival Enters., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 703-704, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189* ; *Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc. (9th Cir. 1991) 929 F.2d 1404, 1413)]* . If, however, the defendant lacks market power in the relevant market, his or her unilateral refusal to deal cannot violate the Cartwright Act [*see Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 542-543, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* (refusal of medical doctors who owned office building to rent office space to podiatrist, allegedly to interfere with competition by podiatrists, was not a violation of Cartwright Act because doctors controlled less than 10 percent share of relevant market for office space and therefore possessed insufficient market power to affect competition)].

If an entity with substantial economic clout, such as a manufacturer with 2000 applicants for 167 distributorships whose existing distributorship agreements are terminable without cause on 30 days' notice, maintains prices through "suggestions that distributors cannot refuse," the manufacturer has gone beyond simple announcement of policy and refusal to deal and "has put together a combination in violation of the Sherman Act" [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 419, 425-426, 156 Cal. Rptr. 738* (citing *United States v. Parke, Davis & Co. (1960) 362 U.S. 29, 44, 80 S. Ct. 503, 4 L. Ed. 2d 505*)]. Similarly, if a "single trader" pressures customers or dealers into adhering to resale price maintenance, territorial restrictions, exclusive dealing arrangements, or illegal tie-ins, an unlawful combination is established, irrespective of any monopoly or conspiracy, and despite the recognized right of a producer to deal with whom it will [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 720, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797*

; *see G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 268-269, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (description of retail sole trader's activities amounting to combination)].

[2] Price Fixing

Price fixing often involves distributorships through which the manufacturer coerces its dealers to maintain certain price levels [*see § 565.77[1]*]. Price fixing is considered illegal per se under both California and federal law [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 721, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . The test to determine whether a particular restraint is illegal is whether the agreement or conduct interferes with the freedom of sellers or traders so as to preclude or restrain their ability to sell in accordance with their own judgment, not what effect the agreement or conduct has on actual prices [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 722, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

Parallel movement of prices by itself is not enough to establish a price-fixing violation under either the Cartwright Act or the Sherman Act. Plaintiff must prove that the parallel pricing is the result of an agreement, conspiracy, or contract [*BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1410, 1427-1429, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819* ; *see also Freeman v. San Diego Assn. of Realtors (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 171, 200, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534* (unilateral action by monopolist in charging allegedly excessive prices, by itself, does not violate antitrust laws)].

To recover for an alleged price-fixing conspiracy, the plaintiff must prove that the defendants conspired, or at least acted in conscious parallel, to fix and maintain prices and that both the plaintiff and the competition in general were injured by the artificial price established by the conspiracy or parallel conduct. The plaintiff may prove its case by either direct or circumstantial evidence [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1405-1406* (considering claims under both California and federal law)]. If plaintiffs offer no direct evidence of conspiracy, but only ambiguous evidence, such as evidence that defendants met and exchanged ideas, inferences are required to conclude that any agreement or consensus came out of defendants' discussions [*BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1410, 1430-1433, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819* (plaintiffs' evidence was insufficient to raise triable issue of fact that conspiracy existed)]. If only circumstantial evidence is offered, the defendants are entitled to summary judgment if they provide a plausible and justifiable alternative interpretation of their conduct that rebuts the alleged conspiracy [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1406* (considering claims under both California and federal law)]. Under the doctrine of conscious parallelism, an agreement may be inferred if each participant knew that concerted action was contemplated and invited, gave its adherence to, and participated in the scheme, and understood that cooperation was essential to the plan. Alleged conspirators that dominate the relevant market may be deemed to understand the necessity of cooperation [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1407* (considering claims under both California and federal law)].

A conspiracy to illegally fix prices is not shown merely because separate entities have combined to provide a unified product or service, if the product or service is one that the entities had not or could not have provided individually in competition with one another. Under these circumstances, the entities' interests in providing the new product or service are interdependent, because they share the common purpose of creating and marketing the new product or service [*Freeman v. San Diego Assn. of Realtors (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 171, 192-193, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534]* .

If the price fixing is illegal per se, the following defenses are precluded: (1) the price was reasonable, (2) the conduct complained of had legitimate business purposes other than the stabilization of prices, and (3) the partiesdid not intend to impact prices by their conduct [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 481, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728]* . However, not all conduct by which prices are allegedly fixed is illegal per se. For example, in considering an alleged conspiracy by a consortium of petroleum purchasers to fix prices under a contract that used weighed averages of prices posted or paid to establish the contract price, a type of barter system between the purchasers that removed a substantial portion of their volume from the base used for the contract calculations had to be examined under the rule of reason because those barter exchanges were not only justifiable, but necessary to their operations [*City of Long Beach*

v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1405-1406 (considering claims under both California and federal law)].

A cause of action for conspiracy to fix prices may be maintained even when price controls are imposed by some regulatory agency. Especially when the regulatory price was set after the alleged conspiracy began, the fact of price controls does not in itself mean that the conspirators' conduct could not have caused the injury. If the prices imposed by the regulatory agency would have been different in the absence of the conspiracy, or were based on artificial price levels that resulted from the conspiracy, the plaintiff may recover [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1408-1409* (considering claims under both California and federal law)]. A regulatory price control program will not displace antitrust liability unless the relief desired is available from the regulatory agency [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1409* (considering claims under both California and federal law); *accord Cellular Plus, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1247-1249, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308* (courts, not PUC, have primary, if not exclusive, jurisdiction over Cartwright action charging price fixing of cellular phone service rates)]. Similarly, no exemption to antitrust liability will be found unless the challenged activity is within the scope of the regulation and the conflict between the regulatory decision and antitrust liability is obvious [*City of Long Beach v. Standard Oil Co. of Cal. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1401, 1409* (considering claims under both California and federal law)].

Price fixing is not only a violation of the Cartwright Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16700 et seq.*), but is also an unlawful business practice under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* [*see B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1345, 1348, 1348 n.6, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *BILJAC Assocs. v. First Interstate Bank (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1410, 1422-1423, 267 Cal. Rptr. 819* ; for discussion and forms relating to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq., see § 565.30* et seq.,§ 565.231]. The same conduct that constitutes anticompetitive price fixing may also constitute a breach of the duty of good faith imposed by *Com. Code § 1304*, although a plaintiff would not be permitted double recovery for what are essentially two different claims for the same injury [*State of California v. ChevronCorp. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1410, 1413-1414* (considering both federal antitrust and Cartwright claims and California bad faith claim); for further discussion of breach of the duty of good faith, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. In addition, other types of price discrimination are prohibited by California's Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*) [*see § 565.10* et seq.].

[3] Distributorships and Exclusive Dealing Arrangements

Exclusive dealing arrangements, in which one is prohibited from distributing products other than those of the supplier or in which one entity agrees to deal exclusively with another, are not illegal per se. For instance, the fact that savings and loan and escrow subsidiaries of a holding company use the title insurance services of a company in which the parent has an interest does not amount to an illegal boycott. Such vertical integration is proper so long as there is no intent to coerce third parties to deal with them [*Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 324, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481]* .

Exclusive dealing arrangements are tested by the "rule of reason" standard and are unlawful only if the arrangement was intended to, or actually did, unreasonably restrain trade [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 726-727, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797* ; for discussion of a supplier's right to refuse to deal with a specific entity, *see § 565.77[1]*, and*§ 565.77[2]*]. A determination of illegality under the "rule of reason" requires knowledge and analysis of the line of commerce, the market area, and the affected share of the relevant market [*Fisherman's Wharf Bay Cruise Corp. v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 309, 335, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628]* . To be actionable under this rule, an exclusive dealing arrangement must foreclose competition in a substantial share of the affected market [*Fisherman's Wharf Bay Cruise Corp. v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 309, 335-339, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628* (plaintiff allowed to proceed with claim because 20 percent of relevant market was effectively foreclosed by defendant's exclusive dealership agreements)].

A dealership or distributorship agreement may relate not only to the product itself, but also to replacement parts and service and repairs of the product. The requirement that a dealer or distributor only use authorized replacement parts supplied by the manufacturer has been attacked by independent parts distributors as a boycott, a conspiracy between the manufacturer and its franchised distributors to impose a monopoly, and as an illegal tying arrangement [*see Mozart Co. v. Mercedes-Benz of N. Am., Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 833 F.2d 1342, 1344, 1348-1351* (restriction as justified for quality control)]. Between the manufacturer and the distributors, this type of restriction is generally considered a vertical nonprice restraint and is evaluated under the rule of reason standard [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480* (diversity case applying Californialaw)]. If there is sufficient business justification, amanufacturer, even one that is also a distributor, may refuse to sell replacement parts and do all repair work itself, or may authorize only some of its other distributors to service its product or to sell replacement parts [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1483-1484]* . There may be benefits to competition in the product market, referred to as interbrand competition, that result from this type of intrabrand restriction [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1483-1484]* . Still, if it can be established that the manufacturer and one or more of its distributors agreed to exclude other distributors from the service and replacement market in order to eliminate competition in those markets, rather than to compete more effectively in the product market, the restraint will be illegal. The question is whether the anticompetitive effects in the service market outweigh the procompetitive effects in the product market. In most situations, the service market for that manufacturer's product will be much smaller than the product market. If this is the case, a nontrivial procompetitive effect in the product market will outweigh the anticompeti tive effect in the service market, and the restraint will be legal [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1484]* .

The termination of a dealership or distributorship arrangement is not prohibited, either as a breach of contract or as an antitrust violation, unless the cancellation is for anticompetitive reasons [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 718-719, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797* ; *but see Gianelli Distrib. Co. v. Beck & Co. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1020, 1026-1042, 219 Cal. Rptr. 203* (summary judgment improper; question of fact whether custom and usage requires implied condition to terminate only for cause); for discussion of contracts, including interpretation to include a requirement of good cause in order to terminate, *see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. For discussion of additional considerations relevant to termination of franchises in general, of those for petroleum products or motor vehicle dealerships, and of discriminatory terminations, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

If the termination of an exclusive distributorship was wrongful and done for purposes of restraining trade, the withholding of approval of sale is part of the antitrust injury [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 723-724, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

An agreement between distributors to divide territories or customers is referred to as a horizontal restraint, because it is between competitors at the same level of distribution, and is a per se antitrust violation [*Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. J. Sosnick & Son (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 627, 633, 162 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; *see Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480* (diversity case applying California law under stipulation that it be interpreted in accordance with Sherman Act)]. A relationship between entities at different levels of the same distribution chain is referred to as vertical and is tested under the rule of reason standard [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480]* . A manufacturer that operates at two distinct levels of the distribution chain in the same market by acting as both a supplier and a distributor of its own products is called a dual distributor [*Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480]* . Without characterizing the restraint as vertical or horizontal, a California court held that, if a dual distributor's termination of a distributorship is primarily motivated by a desire to sell directly to customers of the terminated distributor, there is a per se violation [*Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. J. Sosnick & Son (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 627, 633-636, 162 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; *but see Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1482-1483* (diversity case applying California law and refusing to apply per se standard of *Guild* in situation not involving termination on ground that California Supreme Court would not apply per se approach to arrangement, such as dual distributorship, with which it is unfamiliar)].

It is not clear how far a manufacturer can go in enforcing a termination of a distributor. In sustaining summary

judgment for defendants on a Cartwright cause of action, the court said that the manufacturer did not have to allow its wholesalers to continue to supply the terminated distributors to avoid antitrust liability. However, summary judgment for defendants on a cause of action for interference with prospective economic advantage was reversed, with the same court saying there were questions of fact whether the manufacturer was privileged to have its agents request its wholesalers to stop supplying the terminated distributors and to terminate one of those wholesalers [*Gianelli Distrib. Co. v. Beck & Co. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1020, 1049, 1052-1058, 219 Cal. Rptr. 203* ; *see § 565.130* et seq.].

In one example of an insufficient pleading for wrongful termination of a distributorship and Cartwright violations, a distributor alleged that the termination was motivated by his sale of products of other suppliers. However, the termination was not wrongful because the distributorship agreement had been allowed to expire by its own terms. Because no damages for the alleged Cartwright violations were claimed to have been suffered during the term of the agreement, none were available on account of the proper termination [*Witt v. Union Oil Co. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 435, 441, 160 Cal. Rptr. 285]* .

[4] Tie-Ins

A tie-in or tying arrangement involves one party's conditioning a sale of one item (the tying product) to the sale of another (the tied product). Tie-ins in California are prohibited under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* (patterned on § 3 of the Clayton Act, *15 U.S.C.S. § 14*) and under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720* and *16726* (patterned on the Sherman Act). Decisions under those federal antitrust statutes are therefore applicable to interpret California law [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852-853, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953]* . The purpose of the prohibition against the use of ties is to prevent a seller from using a dominant, desired product to compel the purchase of a second distinctcommodity. When a seller has the economic power to coerce buyers to forego exercise of their independent judgment as to the merits of the tied product, thus shielding it from competitive market forces, there is a restraint on competition [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 470, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728]* .

Under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* (and the Clayton Act), a tie-in is illegal if either (1) the seller enjoys a monopolistic position in the market for the "tying" product, or (2) if a substantial volume of commerce in the tied product is restrained [*see, e.g.*, *UAS Management, Inc. v. Mater Misericordiae Hospital (2008) 169 Cal. App. 4th 357, 370-371, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 81* (monopoly hospital's tying of inpatient hospital services with outpatient services, contractually preventing insurers from contracting with competing outpatient service provider, foreclosed sufficient business to constitute illegal tie-in)]. Under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720* and *16726* (and the Sherman Act) tyings are not illegal unless both of these conditions exist [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 472, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728]* . A tying arrangement is illegal per se under the Clayton Act and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* when either of the two elements exist and under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720* and *16726* when both exist [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 578, 583, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . The tying product must in fact be a product, and not a service, to constitute an illegal tying arrangement under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*, although the tied product may be a service [*Fisherman's Wharf Bay Cruise Corp. v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 309, 340-341, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 628* (bay cruise was service, even though tangible ticket had to be purchased to facilitate sale of service)].

Proof of requisite economic power is usually inferred from other, more easily proven, facts. Domination of the market in the tying product is sufficient to infer that competition in the tied product has been or probably will be lessened by the agreement. Thus, evidence of market dominance is sufficient to support a finding of the requisite economic power. The "monopolistic" condition is satisfied when the seller has a dominant, as opposed to absolute, monopoly position in the tying product market and even though this power exists only with respect to some of the buyers in the market [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 858, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953* ; *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 472, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728* (multiple listing service as tying product, real estate association memberships as tied product)]. Neither California courts nor the ninth circuit require a finding of actual restraint of competition before a tie-in can be found illegal [*Roberts v. Elaine Powers*

Figure Salons, Inc. (9th Cir. 1983) 708 F.2d 1476, 1478-1479 ; *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 578, 583-584, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

An illegal tying arrangement requires the existence of two products, and sometimes there is a question of fact as to whether there actually is more than a single, unitary service [*see, e.g.,* *Freeman v. San Diego Assn. of Realtors (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 171, 184-187, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534]* . There may be a legitimate business reason for selling items in a combined form. Though not exhaustive, the following factors are to be taken into account: (1) whether competitors offer to sell the products or services separately or only as a unit, (2) whether the combined product or service is composed of varying assortments of component parts, (3) whether buyers are or can be charged separately for the allegedly separate products or service, and (4) whether defendant sells or offers to sell the products or services separately [*Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 858-859, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953]* .

It is not clear whether a tying arrangement is illegal per se if the seller will sell the tying product without the tied product, but will only do so at a higher price [*see* *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 857 n.13, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953*].

Necessary allegations to state a cause of action for an illegal tying arrangement include a definition of the market by subject matter, total volume, proportion controlled by defendant, availability to plaintiff of the subject matter or a competing subject matter, and availability to the public of the subject matter or competing subject matter. Facts must be set forth from which it can be inferred that the defendant controls the market as geographically and otherwise defined and can substantially exclude plaintiff or others from that market or limit the availability of the product to the public [*Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 325-326, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481]* .

Failure to show that the defendant has any competitors in the tied product market or that the tie-in has any effect on competition in that market will defeat an action brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720* [*Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 534, 543, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133]* . For example, an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727* brought against a cable television provider that tied the purchase of satellite and premium channels to the purchase of local broadcast channels failed when the plaintiff consumers were unable to show that the cable company had any competitors in the market for local broadcast television channels. Since the only other source of local broadcast television channels in the area was free reception over the airwaves, the plaintiffs failed to show that the tying practice had any effect on competition for the product [*Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 534, 543, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133]* . Similarly, a cable company did not engage in an illegal tying arrangement when requiring customers to purchase basic cable television in order to receive FM or audio-only music channels. As the plaintiffs admitted they had no interest in purchasing basic cable, the tying arrangement did not injure competition in that market [*Belton v. Comcast Cable Holdings, LLC (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1235-1236, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 631]* .

The prohibition on illegal tying arrangements may not be used to support a claim that a defendant is illegally evading price controls on the tying product by charging higher prices on the tied product [*Freeman v. San Diego Assn. of Realtors (1999) 77 Cal. App. 4th 171, 187-188, 91 Cal. Rptr. 2d 534 & n.18*].

[5] Group Boycott

In contrast to the single entity's refusal to deal and the exclusive dealing arrangement between two entities, both of which are permissible if no intent to restrain trade or abuse of monopoly power is involved, is the group boycott in which two or more traders refuse to deal with a third [*see* *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 324, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481]* . Group boycott allegations often involve trade or professional associations, exclusive dealing arrangements, or distributorships [*see* *People v. Santa Clara Valley Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 225, 236-241, 47 Cal. Rptr. 570* ; *see* *Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 935-940, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833* ; *see* *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin.*

Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 324, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481 (exclusive dealing arrangements)]. It is not clear when group boycotts are illegal per se and when they are to be tested under the rule of reason. Generally the distinctions arose between group boycotts involving anticompetitive business motivations and those involving trade or professional associations where services or activities were open only to members. Still, this distinction is not absolute [*see People v. Santa Clara Valley Bowling Proprietors' Ass'n (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 225, 236-241, 47 Cal. Rptr. 570* (applying per se standard)]. The landmark federal case enunciating the per se rule involved a retail department store which had exacted promises from all major electrical appliance manufacturers to refuse to sell to a neighboring retail competitor. That conduct was deemed illegal per se. As such, no defenses of reasonableness or mitigation were relevant, and no individual injury had to be shown. Injury to commerce or a tendency to monopoly was presumed to flow from the nature of the combination [*Klor's v. Broadway-Hale Stores (1959) 359 U.S. 207, 210-214, 79 S. Ct. 705, 3 L. Ed. 2d 741]* . In 1976, the California Supreme Court in considering the membership limitations of a local real estate association and the anticompetitive consequences of its allowing only member realtors to use its multiple listing service, distinguished an alleged group boycott by a trade association which is not aimed directly at coercing third parties or eliminating competitors, and tested the restraint by the rule of reason. Application of the rule of reason criteria had precedent in federal trade association cases [*see Associated Press v. United States (1945) 326 U.S. 1, 14-22, 65 S. Ct. 1416, 89 L. Ed. 2013* ; *Marin County Bd. of Realtors, Inc. v. Palsson (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 920, 935-940, 130 Cal. Rptr. 1, 549 P.2d 833]* .

When only competitive business motives are involved, presumably California courts will still consider a group boycott illegal per se [*see Oakland-Alameda County Builders' Exch. v. F. P. Lathrop Constr. Co. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 354, 368, 93 Cal. Rptr. 602, 482 P.2d 226* (builders' exchange bid rules and exclusion of nonmember subcontractors as price tampering and group boycott considered illegal per se); *Jomicra, Inc. v. California Mobile Home Dealers Assn. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401-402, 90 Cal. Rptr. 696* (association formed to boycott mobile home park and dealer to whom it gave exclusive sales' rights as boycott; unclean hands as not applicable to conduct which is illegal per se)].

Boycotts, threats, and coercion are also prohibited by California's Unfair Practices Act, *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17208* [*see § 565.10* et seq.].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.78

§ 565.78 Preemption of State Court Jurisdiction

[1] By Interstate Activity or Impact

State court jurisdiction is not preempted in matters that have interstate aspects if there is a significant affect on state interests [*Younger v. Jensen (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 397, 405-406* ; *Union Oil Co. v. Chandler (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 716, 726, 84 Cal. Rptr. 756]* . Unless there is actual conflict due to the exercise of concurrent state and federal power, there is no federal preemption. When application of the Cartwright Act on interstate commerce is to facilitate competition and not to place a restraint on it, state courts retain subject matter jurisdiction. For instance, if an exclusive distributor whose territory is entirely within California, sues other California distributors and the manufacturer, a foreign corporation, both interstate and intrastate commerce are involved: the purchases and agreement between plaintiff and the manufacturer are in interstate commerce, and the restraint of the unfair distributorship practices has an impact on intrastate commerce [*R.E. Spriggs Co. v. Adolph Coors Co. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 653, 659-666, 112 Cal. Rptr. 585]* . If the same facts give rise to both state and federal antitrust remedies, the plaintiff is free to ignore the federal question and pursue only the state claim [*Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n (9th Cir. 1984) 731 F.2d 1423, 1427* ; *see also Moore's Federal Practice, § 107.14[4][b][i]* (3d ed. Matthew Bender)].

However, the Commerce Clause does not necessarily prevent the application of state antitrust and unfair competition laws to out-of-state conduct causing damage in California, but determining whether a particular claim under state law would be preempted by federal law requires a factual analysis of the burden that would be imposed on interstate commerce [*RLH Indus., Inc. v. SBC Communications, Inc. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 1277, 1290-1291, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 469]* .

[2] By Exclusive Federal Agency Jurisdiction

There are instances in which a California court's exercise of its jurisdiction is preempted by a federal agency. For example, the National Labor Relations Board (hereinafter NLRB) has exclusive primary jurisdiction over matters that affect interstate commerce and may constitute violations of the Taft-Hartley Act [*Garmon v. San Diego Bldg. Trades Council (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 657, 661-664, 291 P.2d 1* (NLRB declined jurisdiction); *California Kitchens v. United Bhd. of Carpenters & Joiners of Am. (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 597, 606, 294 P.2d 468]* . In one case for example, union

workers refused to handle cabinets manufactured out of state in a nonunion shop and caused cancellation of contracts for approximately8,000 cabinets. Although factual findings were made that the union activity was a combination restraining trade, an injunction prohibiting continuation of the activity was set aside because the California court could not assert jurisdiction until the NLRB had determined whether the activity complained of was an illegal boycott, enjoinable under Taft-Hartley, or was protected union activity. State court abstention is required even though injustices might result prior to the NLRB's decision to assume or decline jurisdiction [*California Kitchens v. United Bhd. of Carpenters & Joiners of Am. (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 597, 599-607, 294 P.2d 468]* .

[3] By Federal Statute

If a practice amounting to an unlawful restraint of trade is expressly required by federal law, a state antitrust claim based on that practice may be preempted. For example, a cable television company's practice of requiring customers to subscribe to its basic service tier in order to access other tiers of service, a practice that is expressly required by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, would be preempted if the cable company was regulated under the Act [*see* *Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1520-1522, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544]* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.79

§ 565.79 Jurisdiction and Venue

[1] State Courts

State courts of any county where the defendant resides or is found, or any agent resides or is found, or where service may be obtained, without regard to the amount in controversy, have jurisdiction under the Cartwright Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*]. In addition, once an action is pending, the court may join other parties if the ends of justice so require, whether or not those other parties reside in the county where the action is pending [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16751*; *see Union Carbide Corp. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 15, 19-22, 201 Cal. Rptr. 580, 679 P.2d 14* (1978 amendment to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750* as establishing legislative intent that mandatory joinder procedures of *Code Civ. Proc. § 389* not thwart antitrust relief for indirect purchasers)]. State courts have no jurisdiction to construe or enforce federal antitrust laws [*Blumenstock Bros. Adver. Agency v. Curtis Publ'g Co. (1920) 252 U.S. 436, 440, 40 S. Ct. 385, 64 L. Ed. 649* ; *see Younger v. Jensen (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 397, 405-406* ; Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation, Ch. 6].

[2] Federal District Courts

Federal district courts in any district in which the defendant resides or is found or has an agent, without respect to the amount in controversy, have jurisdiction to determine federal antitrust claims [*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 15* (treble damages), 26 (injunction); *28 U.S.C.S. § 1337* (civil actions under laws against restraints and monopolies)]. To state a federal claim, interstate commerce must be involved. The interstate commerce requirement can be met under either the "in commerce" theory or the "effect on commerce" theory [*McLain v. Real Estate Bd. of New Orleans, Inc. (1980) 444 U.S. 232, 242, 100 S. Ct. 502, 62 L. Ed. 2d 441]* . Under the "effect on commerce" theory, only the local activity, not the alleged illegal conduct, need have a substantial effect on interstate commerce. There must be a sufficient nexus between the local activity and interstate commerce so that it can be said as a practical matter of economics that there is not an insubstantial effect on the line of commerce involved. For instance a dispute over allocation of racing days at a race track where 50 percent of the owners and trainers, 40 percent of the horses, 40 percent of the patrons, and 66 percent of the jockeys were from out of state was found to have sufficient effect on interstate commerce to give the federal district court jurisdiction [*Turf Paradise, Inc. v. Arizona Downs (9th Cir. 1982) 670 F.2d 813, 818-819]* . For full treatment of federal court jurisdiction over antitrust claims, see Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation, Ch. 6.

Federal courts, in addition to having jurisdiction over antitrust claims involving interstate commerce, have pendent jurisdiction over state claims arising from the same facts [*Ford Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 676, 679-680, 110 Cal. Rptr. 59* ; *see § 565.79[3]*].

[3] Concurrent Jurisdiction; Res Judicata

Although one could simultaneously bring a suit in state court for the Cartwright violations and a suit in federal district court for the federal violations, that procedure involves the risk of the first judgment barring the second on the basis of res judicata [*Derish v. San Mateo-Burlingame Bd. of Realtors (9th Cir. 1983) 724 F.2d 1347, 1352* (prior state action bars federal action); *Boccardo v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1053-1054, 184 Cal. Rptr. 903* ; *Ford Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 676, 678, 680, 110 Cal. Rptr. 59* (prior federal action bars state action)]. A federal district court cannot abstain from hearing the matter if only federal claims are set forth in the complaint [*Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation Dist. v. United States Dist. Court (9th Cir. 1979) 604 F.2d 643, 644-645* (commenting also that simultaneous state and federal actions are not in the interests of judicial economy)]. If the facts indicate there has been but one violation of a primary right that will support both state and federal claims and the federal claim is substantial, the federal court will have pendent jurisdiction to determine the state claim [*Sun Valley Disposal Co. v. Silver State Disposal Co. (9th Cir. 1969) 420 F.2d 341, 343-344* (local activity's impact on interstate commerce must be more than incidental); *Ford Motor Co. v. Superior Court (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 676, 679-680, 110 Cal. Rptr. 59]* .

[4] Removal to Federal Court

A state action can be removed to federal court if the claim arises under federal law. When this is done, the federal court acquires jurisdiction over pendent state claims, whether or not the plaintiff recovers on the federal claim [*see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1441(b)*; *Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n (9th Cir. 1984) 731 F.2d 1423, 1426, 1430-1431]* . Removal jurisdiction is derivative of the state court's jurisdiction. Thus, if the state court never actually had jurisdiction, as when an alleged state claim was merely an artfully pleaded federal claim, the federal court will have no removaljurisdiction [*Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n (9th Cir. 1984) 731 F.2d 1423, 1426, 1430-1431]* . The doctrine of artful pleading is also used to allow removal of a state claim filed to avoid the res judicata effect of a federal judgment. The federal court's jurisdiction is considered necessary to protect the earlier federal judgment [*State of California v. Chevron Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1410, 1415* ; *Salveson v. Western States Bankcard Ass'n (9th Cir. 1984) 731 F.2d 1423, 1427-1429]* . However, the doctrine of artful pleading will not be applied in this context to prevent remand when the state claim relates to a later time period than that involved in the earlier federal action [*State of California v. Chevron Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 1410, 1414-1416]* . For discussion of removal, see Ch. 265, *Federal Courts: Jurisdiction and Removal* .

[5] Arbitration of Cartwright Act Claims

One court of appeal decision has held that parties cannot agree privately to arbitrate antitrust claims under the Cartwright Act [*see Bos Material Handling, Inc. v. Crown Controls Corp. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 99, 109-111, 186 Cal. Rptr. 740]* . However, in a more recent case, another court of appeal concluded that Cartwright Act claims are subject to private agreements to arbitrate [*Crown Homes, Inc. v. Landes (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1273, 1276-1283, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 827]* . The court in *Crown Homes* relied on federal cases, decided after *Bos*, which held that federal antitrust claims are subject to private arbitration agreements [*see, e.g., Mitsubishi Motors v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth (1985) 473 U.S. 614, 628-640, 105 S. Ct. 3346, 87 L. Ed. 2d 444* (antitrust claims arising out of international transaction); *Nghiem v. NEC Elec., Inc. (9th Cir. 1994) 25 F.3d 1437, 1441-1442* (applying *Mitsubishi* rule to antitrust claims arising out of domestic transaction); *Kowalski v. Chicago Tribune Co. (7th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 168, 173* (same)].

For full discussion of contractual arbitration, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* , through Ch. 34, *Contractual Arbitration: Judicial Review* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.80

§ 565.80 Standing to Sue

[1] Individual Consumers

Although both the federal statute and the Cartwright Act are phrased in terms of authorizing recovery by persons who have been injured in their "business or property," a consumer plaintiff who has been damaged by the anticompetitive conduct has standing to sue [*Reiter v. Sonotone Corp. (1979) 442 U.S. 330, 337-343, 99 S. Ct. 2326, 60 L. Ed. 2d 931* ; *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 322, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* ; *15 U.S.C.S. § 15*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*]. The California statute further specifies that a plaintiff may recover whether he or she has dealt directly or indirectly with the defendant [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*; *Union Carbide Corp. v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 15, 21-22, 201 Cal. Rptr. 580, 679 P.2d 14]* . Although federal antitrust law does not usually allow recovery to those who dealt only indirectly with the defendant, such as indirect purchasers, recovery by indirect purchasers under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)* is not preempted by federal law because Congress did not express an intent to occupy the field or to preempt state law, and because there is no actual conflict [*State of California v. ARC Am. Corp. (1989) 490 U.S. 93, 109 S. Ct. 1661, 104 L. Ed. 2d 86* ; *B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1346, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *Crown Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 604, 610-612, 223 Cal. Rptr. 164* ; *see Kansas v. Utilcorp United, Inc. (1990) 497 U.S. 199, 110 S. Ct. 2807, 111 L. Ed. 2d 169, 179-186* (describing direct purchaser rule and reasons therefor)].

[2] Competitors

Sometimes standing will be a question of the relevant market, that is, whether plaintiff and defendant compete in the same market. Federal cases hold that the boundaries of a product market are determined by the reasonable interchangeability of use or crosselasticity of demand between the product itself and substitutes for it. If an increase in the price of one product leads to an increase in demand for another, both products should be included in the relevant product market [*State of California v. American Stores (9th Cir. 1989) 872 F.2d 837, 841* (affirming finding that supermarkets are separate market from other retailers of grocery products)]. A federal court has ignored California statutes restricting nurse anesthetists' work and found standing for a nurse anesthetist to challenge an alleged conspiracy to eliminate competition by hiring only M.D. anesthesiologists. The court found that doctors and nurses compete in the same market because of interchangeability of use or cross elasticity of demand between the two professions [*Bhan v.*

NME Hospitals, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1467, 1470-1471 ; *but see Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc. (9th Cir. 1991) 929 F.2d 1404, 1413-1414* (plaintiff failed to prove town in which hospital was located was relevant market or that firing of one nurse anesthetist injured competition)].

[3] Associations

Whether an association has standing to bring an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)* on behalf of its members depends in substantial measure on the nature of the relief sought. If the association seeks a declaration, injunction, or some other kind of prospective relief, it is reasonable to suppose that the remedy, if granted, will inure to the benefit of those members of the association actually injured [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 62, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410]* . Although noting that the federal criteria may differfrom the California criteria, a court of appeal analysed the issue under the general (as opposed to antitrust) federal rule, which states that an association has standing to bring suit on behalf of its members when (1) its members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right; (2) the interests it seeks to protect are germane to the organization's purpose; and (3) neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of individual members in the lawsuit [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 62, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410* ; *see Hunt v. Washington Apple Adver. Comm'n (1977) 432 U.S. 333, 343, 97 S. Ct. 2434, 53 L. Ed. 2d 383]* . The court of appeal held a complaint by an incorporated association of dentists, as limited to the claim for injunctive relief, sufficient to withstand a demurrer because the complaint alleged injuries to the association's members and facts showing the association to be an appropriate representative for purposes of injunctive redress [*California Dental Assn. v. California Dental Hygienists' Assn. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 49, 62, 271 Cal. Rptr. 410* ; *see also Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 128-129, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724* (general California rule regarding standing of association)].

[4] Class Actions

[a] Certification

Class actions are authorized under the Cartwright Act, both with the Attorney General as class representative and with an individual as class representative [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(c)*; *Bruno v. Superior Court (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 120, 130-133, 179 Cal. Rptr. 342]* . Although the Act authorizes the Attorney General to bring state antitrust actions on behalf of the state's political subdivisions; it does not prevent a county or other local public entity from bringing an action on its own behalf. [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. County of Stanislaus (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 1143, 1152, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 947 P.2d 291]* . Counties that have been injured by price-fixing are no different from other persons or other businesses that have been injured by such conduct. The Cartwright Act authorizes a county to bring an action in federal court for violations of federal antitrust law even when the alleged illegal acts and their effects occur primarily outside the county's boundaries. A county, which is a political subdivision of the state with the right to sue and be sued, may bring a civil action for a violation of the Cartwright Act under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*, which provides that any person injured by a violation of the Cartwright Act may bring a civil action, and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(b)*, which defines "person" as including the state and "any of its political subdivisions and public agencies" [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. County of Stanislaus (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 1143, 1150, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 947 P.2d 291]* .

Certification requires that both illegal activity and resultant injury, sometimes referred to as "impact," can be proved predominantly with facts applicable to the class as a whole, rather than by a series of facts relevant to only individual or small groups of plaintiffs. A class impact is most easily established when the violations charged are illegal per se, like price-fixing. When a conspiracy to fix prices has been established and plaintiffs have established that they purchased the affected goods or services, impact or injury can be inferred. In addition, it is not necessary that each member of the purported class prove that he or she absorbed at least some part of the overcharges. The fact that certain members of the class may be injured to a lesser extent or not at all does not defeat certification; nor will local variations in marketing practices defeat certification [*B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348-1355,*

235 Cal. Rptr. 228 ; *Rosack v. Volvo of Am. Corp. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 741, 752-760, 182 Cal. Rptr. 800]* .

When the issue involves the construction and coercive effect of standardized provisions in the defendant's contracts, the fact that there were many transactions with different individual plaintiffs, and that each plaintiff may have had a different understanding of the contract provision, does not prohibit certification. Unlike vindication of private rights through individual breach of contract or fraud causes of action, the purpose of unfair trade laws is to thwart unfair practices and to require the wrongdoer to disgorge the profits obtained in violation of the statute [*MacManus v. A.E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1115-1116, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315]* . Requisite community of interest for certification exists if every member of the class would not be required to litigate numerous and substantial questions to determine his or her right to recover subsequent to the rendering of any class judgment that determines in the plaintiffs' favor those issues common to the class [*Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 809, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964* ; *MacManus v. A.E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1116-1117, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315]* . A variance in purchase prices paid by class members is not an obstacle to certification. The court can divide the class into subclasses [*Occidental Land, Inc. v. Superior Court (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 355, 360 n.3, 134 Cal. Rptr. 388, 556 P.2d 750* ; *MacManus v. A.E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1117, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315]* .

[b] Fluid Class Recovery

If recovery exceeds the claims filed and proved by individual class members, fluid class recovery may be allowed, often by requiring defendants to lower prices for a period of time or by giving the residue of damages to the state to be used to benefit class members [*Bruno v. Superior Court (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 120, 123-124, 130-135, 179 Cal. Rptr. 342]* . Fluid class recovery implements the policies of disgorgement and deterrence, and prevents defendants from retaining ill-gotten gains simply because their conduct harmed large numbers of people in small amounts rather than small numbers of people in large amounts [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 472, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

There are three steps in implementing fluid class recovery. First, the defendant's total damages liability is paid over to the class fund. Second, individual class members claim their shares by proving damages, often according to a lowered standard of proof. Some safeguards against fraud, such as verification of all claims or large claims, is usually required [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 472-473, 476-477, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* . Lastly, the remainder of the fund is distributed by one of several methods.

The appropriateness of a particular method depends on its usefulness in fulfilling the purposes of the underlying action. In determining which particular method to employ, the court must consider: (1) the amount of compensation provided to class members, including nonclaiming members; (2) the proportion of class members sharing in recovery; (3) the extent to which the benefits will "spill over" to nonclass members and the degree to which the spillover benefits will effectuate the purposes of the underlying substantive law; and (4) costs of administration [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 472-473, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

Under the price rollback method, the unclaimed portion of the fund is distributed through the market by lowering prices of the defendant's product for a specified time. This method is appropriate when the product is repeatedly purchased by the same individuals. It is not appropriate in a nonmonopoly market or when defendant is a manufacturer and retailers set the price of defendant's product [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 473-474, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

Under the "earmarked escheat" method, the unclaimed funds are disbursed to a responsible government organization for use on projects that benefit the noncollecting class members and promote the purposes of the underlying action [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 474, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564* , citing *Market St. Ry. Co. v. Railroad Comm'n (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 363, 171 P.2d 875* (not a class action; unclaimed fare overcharges awarded to city to improve street car services)]. Earmarked escheat indirectly benefits silent class members and has the

advantage of minimizing administrative costs to the extent already extant agencies administer the fund. This method should not be used if the relevant governmental body opposes its use [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 474-475, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

General escheat (payment of the recovery to the general fund of a governed body) may be used as a last resort when a more precise remedy cannot be found. Its only advantage is ease of administration [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 475, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

Under the "consumer trust fund" approach, the court appoints a board of directors to administer recovery in the interest of the class for indirect compensation to class members and to further the purposes of substantive law involved. To minimize expenses of administration, the funds can be allocated directly to responsible private organizations. This method has the advantage of ensuring that the recovery will not be submerged in the state's general fund [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 475, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

Under the "claimant fund sharing" approach, the residue is divided among the individual claimants. The disadvantage of the claimant fund sharing method is that it provides no benefit to silent class members. Further, if there is a windfall, it goes not to further the purposes of substantive law, but to overcompensate legitimate claims or to pay erroneous or fraudulent claims. This method is appropriate only if a large proportion of the class members participate and submit accurate claims [*State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 475-476, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* . This determination is not a function of the absolute number of persons recovering, but of the correlation or overlap between the injured class of persons and the class to be benefitted. Such a correlation cannot be found if there is a high incidence of erroneous or fraudulent claims [*see* *State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460, 479, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.81

§ 565.81 Damages, Prejudgment Interest, and Injunctive Relief

Treble damages are recoverable under both the Cartwright Act and federal antitrust law. It has never been determined in California whether, like federal law, the Cartwright Act makes treble damages mandatory once actual damages or injury are shown, but it seems likely that they would be [*see Uneedus v. California Shoppers, Inc. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 932, 936-942, 150 Cal. Rptr. 596* (treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17043, 17082* of California's Unfair Practices Act, discussed in*§ 565.10* et seq. as mandatory because they would be under *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 13, 15*)]. In addition, a plaintiff may recover interest on his or her actual (before trebling) damages from the date of service of the complaint, reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit [*15 U.S.C.S. § 15(a)*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 16761* (10 percent interest)]. A prevailing defendant, by contrast, does not have a right to attorney's fees under these provisions [*Carver v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc. (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 132, 147, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 569]* . Moreover, a prevailing defendant cannot overcome this prohibition under an alternative contractual attorney fee provision if the legal work that was performed to defend against the claims under the Cartwright Act overlapped with work to defend against other claims that would otherwise be covered by the contractual provision [*Carver v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc. (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 498, 505, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* .

15 U.S.C.S. § 26 authorizes injunctive relief in federal antitrust actions, and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16754.5* authorizes injunctive relief in civil Cartwright actions brought by the California Attorney General or a district attorney. In the case of private actions under Cartwright, injunctive relief, both preliminary and permanent, is available when, and under the same conditions and principles as, injunctive relief is granted by courts generally under California law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*; *see also* Stats. 1987, ch. 865, § 1 (declaring 1987 amendment to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)* to be declarative of existing law)]. It is also available under general equitable principles [*Kold Kist v. Amalgamated Meat Cutters (1950) 99 Cal. App. 2d 191, 203-204, 221 P.2d 724* ; *O'Shea v. Tile Layers Union (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 373, 375, 318 P.2d 102* ; *see Civ. Code § 3422*; for complete discussion of the requirements for injunctive relief, *see* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*]. If the conduct complained of is illegal per se, a plaintiff seeking injunctive relief will not be denied that relief because he or she has unclean hands. The unclean hands doctrine is not applicable when conduct that is against public policy is involved [*Jomicra, Inc. v. California Mobile Home Dealers Assn. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401-402, 90 Cal. Rptr. 696]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.82

§ 565.82 Penalties

In addition to the penalties in the Cartwright Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16700 et seq.*), violations of the Cartwright Act subject a defendant to the civil penalties of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206*. Those penalties are fixed in the discretion of the court up to $2500 per violation established in any action brought in the name of the people of California by any of the following officials [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206*; *see People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 473-476, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728]* :

- The Attorney General.
- Any district attorney or county counsel authorized by agreement with the district attorney in actions involving violation of a county ordinance.
- Any city attorney of a city with a population in excess of 750,000 with the district attorney's consent.
- A city prosecutor in any city having a full-time city prosecutor.
- A city attorney in any city and county (that, is San Francisco), with the district attorney's consent.

The *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206* penalty is mandatory, and must be imposed for each violation, not for each category of violation. Factors relevant to the amount of the penalty include the number of persons directly affected by each act of unfair competition, the degree of harm, harassment, and unfair competition caused, whether the acts were malicious and predatory, and the nature and extent of public injury to do so the trial court must make a factual assessment of the number of people injured by the violations [*People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 578, 585-588, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.83

§ 565.83 Notification Requirements Relating to Writs and Appeals

Anyone other than the attorney general or a district attorney who, by writ or appeal, commences any proceeding under the Cartwright Act in the California Supreme Court or a state court of appeal must notify the attorney general within three days of the commencement of the action. No relief, temporary or permanent, may be granted until proof of service of the required notice is filed with the court. On a showing of good cause, the Chief Justice or presiding justice may extend the time for filing the notice [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.2*].

36 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.84-565.99

[Reserved]

§§ 565.84[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.100

§ 565.100 Governing Law

The Uniform Trade Secret Act, *Civ. Code §§ 3426-3426.10*, governs trade secret protection and has been effective since January 1, 1985. Special discovery rules pertaining to misappropriation actions under the UTSA are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.210*. *Evid. Code §§ 915(b)* and *1060-1063* set forth the evidentiary privilege against disclosure of trade secret information. Common law, which adopted the Restatement of Torts § 757 and comments thereto, controls actions for misappropriations occurring prior to January 1, 1985 [*see Sinclair v. Aquarius Elecs., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 216, 221, 116 Cal. Rptr. 654* ; *Civ. Code 3426.10*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.101

§ 565.101 Relationship to Patent and Copyright Law

Although a trade secret may be a device or process that is patentable, patentability is not a condition precedent to the classification of a trade secret. Novelty and invention are not requisite for a trade secret as they are for patentability [*Rigging Int'l Maint. Co. v. Gwin (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 594, 613, 180 Cal. Rptr. 451]* . Whereas patent law is based on a policy of rewarding or otherwise encouraging the development of secret processes or devices, trade secret protection merely guards against breach of faith and reprehensible means of learning another's secret [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 290, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198]* .

Trade secret law also protects items that would not be proper subjects for consideration for patent protection. Since the patent laws require adequate and full disclosure and require a full and clear description of the invention and of the manner and process of making and using it, a patentcannot be a trade secret [*Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp. (1974) 416 U.S. 470, 481-482, 94 S. Ct. 1879, 40 L. Ed. 2d 315* ; *see CytoDyn of New Mexico, Inc. v. Amerimmune Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 288, 298, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 600* (patents and trademarks could not constitute trade secrets)].

Unlike a patent, a trade secret does not give its owner any monopoly and once contracted away is subject to being copied, but the inventor is entirely free to keep the idea secret and not to divulge it to the general public [*Sinclair v. Aquarius Elecs., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 216, 223, 116 Cal. Rptr. 654]* .

Another distinction between trade secrets and patents is the proof required in an action against misuse. To sustain a charge of infringement all of the elements of an invention must have been present in an accused device. But to sustain a claim of trade secret misappropriation, it is only necessary that some secret information relating to one or more essentials of the method or apparatus have been misappropriated [*Engelhard Indus., Inc. v. Research Instrumental Corp. (9th Cir. 1963) 324 F.2d 347, 353* ; for discussion and forms relating to patent law matters in state court actions, *see* Ch. 411, *Patents and Inventions*].

Similarly, states may regulate trade secrets only to the extent that the regulation does not conflict with federal copyright law [*S. O. S., Inc. v. Payday, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1081, 1090 n.13* ; *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Wollersheim (9th*

Cir. 1986) 796 F.2d 1076, 1089] . Federal copyright law, however, does not preempt a state trade-secret cause of action that involves a legal or equitable right that is in addition to, or qualitatively different from, a claim based on copyright infringement [*S.O.S., Inc. v. Payday, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1081, 1089-1090* ; *Balboa Ins. Co. v. Trans Global Equities (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1327, 1340, 1346-1350, 267 Cal. Rptr. 787* (referred to as "extra element" test)]. This rule leaves areas in which state trade-secret laws may properly apply to copyrighted material. For example, the owner of copyrighted computer software programs could state a cause of action against its licensee for surreptitiously obtaining an "unprotected" copy of the program because the California statute pleaded, *Civ. Code § 3426.1(a),(b),* did not involve a legal or equitable right equivalent to an exclusive right of a copyright owner under the Copyright Act, but only prohibited certain means of obtaining confidential information. Thus, application of the UTSA would not conflict with federal copyright law [*S.O.S., Inc. v. Payday, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 886 F.2d 1081, 1089-1090* (reversing summary judgment on pendent state claim and holding triable issue of fact existed regarding whether licensing contract allowed licensee to have copy of program that was not protected by source codes)]. For discussion and forms relating to copyright protection, *see* Ch. 349, *Literary Property and Copyright* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.102

§ 565.102 UTSA Construed to Promote Uniformity

California has adopted the Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA), codified at *Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*. The purpose of the UTSA is to make uniform the law regarding trade secrets among the states enacting similar acts and it is to be applied and construed to further that purpose [*Civ. Code § 3426.8*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.103

§ 565.103 Application of UTSA

[1] Date of Misappropriation

The UTSA does not apply to misappropriation occurring prior to January 1, 1985. If a continuing misappropriation otherwise covered by the UTSA began before January 1, 1985, the UTSA does not apply to the part of the misappropriation occurring before that date, but does apply to that part of the misappropriation occurring on or after January 1, 1985, unless the appropriation was not a misappropriation under the law in effect before the operative date of the UTSA [*Civ. Code § 3426.10*]. Thus, pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3426.10*, damages for a misappropriation that began before January 1, 1985, and continued thereafter are limited to those that occurred after that date. Further, recovery under the UTSA for the part of a continuing misappropriation occurring on or after January 1, 1985, can only be had if the appropriation was a misappropriation under the law in effect before January 1, 1985 [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 685-686, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797* ; *see § 565.104*].

[2] Relationship to Other Statutes

The UTSA does not supersede any statute relating to the misappropriation of a trade secret, or any statute otherwise regulating trade secrets [*Civ. Code § 3426.7(a)*; *see* Research Guide for list of other statutes pertaining to trade secrets]. Thus, unfair and deceptive practices of former employees in stealing customers of their former employer can be enjoined under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* (discussed in§ 565.20 et seq.), whether or not the customer list is a trade secret [*Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1291, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352]* .

The UTSA does not affect contractual remedies or criminal remedies, whether or not based on misappropriation of a trade secret, or other civil remedies that are not based on misappropriation of a trade secret [*Civ. Code § 3426.7(b)*].

Nor does the UTSA affect the disclosure of a record by a state or local agency under the California Public Records Act (*Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*). The determination of whether the disclosure of a record under the California Public Records Act constitutes a misappropriation of a trade secret and the resulting rights and remedies is made pursuant to the common law in effect prior to January 1, 1985 [*Civ. Code § 3426.7(c)*; for discussion of the California Public Records Act, *see* Ch. 470C, *Public Records Act*].

[3] Relationship to Common Law

Knowledge of the common law pertaining to trade secrets is important not only for those misappropriations occurring prior to January 1, 1985, but because it may clarify and provide guidance even for those acts to which the UTSA applies. For example, *Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)* provides descriptions of various acts of misappropriation, two of which revolve around a duty to maintain the secrecy or limit the use of a trade secret. Since the UTSA does not define under what circumstances such a duty would arise, the common law rule applicable to the duty attaching to confidential information should be relevant [*see § 565.104*]. Additionally, the UTSA makes specific reference to the common law, and both *Civ. Code §§ 3426.7(c)* (disclosure of public records) and 3426.10 (application of the UTSA) declare the common law to be determinative in specified instances. Moreover, the UTSA is very similar to the common law in some instances [*compare Civ. Code § 3426.1(b) with* Restatement of Torts § 757 (definitions of misappropriation)].

[4] Action Under UTSA; Definitions

[a] "Trade Secret"

"Trade secret" means information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that

- Derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to the public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and

- Is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*].

This California definition differs from the Uniform Trade Secrets Act proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in that it does not include the phrase "and not being readily ascertainable by proper means," after "generally known to" in *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)(1)*. The deletion apparently resulted from arguments that conditioning the scope of a trade secret on the extent to which the information was not readily ascertainable would muddy the meaning of the term trade secret and invite the various parties to speculate on the time needed to discover a secret [*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 21, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518* (declining to follow *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1326, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713* , to extent it suggests that information is not protectable as trade secret if it is "known or readily ascertainable")]. While the ease of ascertainability is irrelevant to the definition of a trade secret, the assertion that a matter is readily ascertainable by proper means remains available as a defense to a claim of misappropriation if the defendant can establish that its knowledge of the information resulted from its own efforts or some other proper means[*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 21-22 n.9, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

The failure of the UTSA to include customer lists in its definition of a trade secret does not mean that the legislature intentionally excluded such lists. Rather, the language of *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)* is inclusive, not exclusive, and customer lists can be protectable trade secrets under the Act [*Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1523, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731* ; *ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518* ; *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1324, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713]* .

The word "compilation," as used in *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*, is not to be given the dictionary meanings ascribed to the verb "to compile." A compilation of data, as common usage of this term indicates, may come from any source and is as readily storable in one's memory as in some written form [*American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1324, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713]* .

Information may lose its status as a trade secret through widespread distribution to a large group of potential

competitors or other persons to whom the information would have some economic value [*DVD Copy Control Assn., Inc.. v. Bunner (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 241, 251, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 185]* . In one case, for example, the court of appeal held that DVD decryption software, while originally the plaintiff's trade secret, lost its status as a trade secret when it was posted on dozens of Internet web sites within a short time and it was widely publicized through the community of computer programmers that the software was available for download by any interested party [*DVD Copy Control Assn., Inc. v. Bunner (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 241, 251253, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 185* (preliminary injunction improperly granted given loss of secrecy of information at time injunction was sought)].

[b] "Improper Means"

"Improper means" includes theft, bribery, misrepresentation, breach or inducement of a breach of a duty to maintain secrecy, or espionage through electronic or other means. Reverse engineering or independent derivation alone shall not be considered improper means [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(a)*].

The plaintiff bears the burden of proof at trial on the issue of improper means, including the burden of proving that the defendant's use resulted from independent derivation or reverse engineering [*Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1669, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279]* . However, the failure of a defendant to produce evidence to rebut a prima facie showing made by the plaintiff can support a judgment for the plaintiff [*Sargent Fletcher, Inc. v. Able Corp. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1669, 3 Cal. Rptr. 3d 279]* .

[c] "Misappropriation"

"Misappropriation" means [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)*]:

- Acquisition of another's trade secret by a person who knows or has reason to know that the trade secret was acquired by improper means; or

- Disclosure or use of another's trade secret without express or implied consent by a person who:

  - Used improper means to acquire knowledge of the trade secret; or

  - At the time of disclosure or use, knew or had reason to know that his or her knowledge of the trade secret was (i) derived through a person who used improper means to acquire it; (ii) acquired under circumstances giving rise to a duty to maintain its secrecy or limit its use; or (iii) derived through a person who owed a duty to the person seeking relief to maintain its secrecy or limit its use [*see, e.g.,* *Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 51, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (emphasizing, with respect to engineering drawings that were taken before effective date of UTSA, that their continued use after effective date to market products derived therefrom was misappropriation under UTSA definition)]; or

  - Before a material change of his or her position, knew or had reason to know that it was a trade secret and that knowledge of it had been acquired by accident or mistake.

A person "has reason to know" if he or she is on constructive notice and should make further inquiry regarding the ownership of the secret. Constructive notice is codified in *Civ. Code § 19*: every person who has actual notice of circumstances sufficient to put a prudent person on inquiry as to a particular fact has constructive notice of the fact itself in all cases in which, by prosecuting the inquiry, he or she might have learned the fact [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 681-682, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . If no duty is imposed by law on a person to make inquiry and the circumstances are such that a prudent person would not be put on inquiry, the fact that

the means of obtaining the true facts are open to a person and he or she does not pursue those means is not sufficient to impose liability. No definite rule can be formulated to specify what, in a particular instance, is sufficient to arouse suspicion. The better rule is that even information regarding collateral facts, which, if pursued, would have led to the discovery of the ultimate facts, is sufficient to charge the person failing to pursue [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 682, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

General business practices and one's own actions are considered in determining if there is constructive notice [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 683, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . In one case, for example, the defendant had acquired a concept for a television show from plaintiff's employee. The employee allegedly misrepresented to defendant that he owned the rights to the concept. Defendant claimed it had a right to rely on the representation, but plaintiff argued that the reliance was not reasonable and that defendant had a duty to investigate. In reversing summary judgment for defendant, the court of appeal noted that the record did not disclose whether defendant ever received the written verification it requested from the employee that the employee owned the concept and that another studio had decided not to exercise its option on it [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 683-685, 684 n.5, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . Although defendant's usual practice was to have its legal department handle "clearances" for shows, there was no indication whether those normal business practices were followed. Nor did the record contain any evidence regarding the industry standards for obtaining clearances [*Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 684-685, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

A defendant's continuing improper use or disclosure of a trade secret after the defendant's initial misappropriation is considered part of a single claim of continuing misappropriation accruing at the time of the initial misappropriation [*Cadence Design Sys., Inc. v. Avant! Corp. (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 215, 218, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 169, 57 P.3d 647]* . Each new use or wrongful disclosure by that defendant augments a single claim for misappropriation, rather than giving rise to a separate claim [*Cadence Design Sys., Inc. v. Avant! Corp. (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 215, 223, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 169, 57 P.3d 647]* . This does not preclude the existence of separate claims against different defendants, however. For example, some defendants may be liable for the initial misappropriation of the trade secret, while others are liable only for a later continuing use [*Cadence Design Sys., Inc. v. Avant! Corp. (2002) 29 Cal. 4th 215, 225, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 169, 57 P.3d 647]* .

[d] Definitions Not Exhaustive

In addition to not defining every term used in the UTSA, the definitions given may be subject to different meanings, as the statutory definitions are prefaced with the limitation, "unless the context requires otherwise" [*Civ. Code § 3426.1*; *see also § 565.103[2]*].

[5] Statute of Limitations

An action for misappropriation under the UTSA must be brought within three years after the misappropriation is discovered or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been discovered. A continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim for the purpose of determining the accrual of the statute of limitations [*Civ. Code § 3426.6*].

The first discovered, or discoverable, misappropriation of a trade secret commences the limitations period [*see Glue-Fold, Inc. v. Slautterback Corp. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1018, 1026, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 661]* . Therefore, even if there are two distinct periods of misappropriation, separated by a period during which the plaintiff erroneously believes that the defendant has ceased the misappropriation, the statute of limitations begins to run on the entire claim when the plaintiff first discovers or should have discovered the initial misappropriation [*Glue-Fold, Inc. v. Slautterback Corp. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 1018, 1023-1028, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 661]* .

Despite the rule that a continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim, a plaintiff may have more than one claim

for misappropriation, each with its own limitations period, when there is more than one defendant and at least one defendant obtained the trade secret at a later date from the original misappropriation [*Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. Superior Court (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 575, 583-584, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685*]. Thus, if a third party subsequently obtains misappropriated trade secrets from the original misappropriating party, a plaintiff's claim against that third party accrues only when the plaintiff discovers that third party's misappropriation. As to that third party, consistent with the single-claim rule, any continuing misappropriation constitutes a single claim [*Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. Superior Court (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 575, 583-585, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685*]. Although knowledge or lack of knowledge of the tainted nature of a trade secret by such a third-party defendant will be relevant to establishing the merits of a misappropriation claim against that third party, it is the *plaintiff's* knowledge of misappropriation by that third party, rather than the third party's knowledge, that triggers the running of the statute of limitations [*Cypress Semiconductor Corp. v. Superior Court (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 575, 586-587, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 685*].

For a form of affirmative defense based on the statute of limitations, *see § 565.274*.

[6] Injunctive Relief

Actual or threatened misappropriation of a trade secret may be enjoined. On application to the court, an injunction will be terminated when the trade secret has ceased to exist, but the injunction may be continued for an additional period of time in order to eliminate commercial advantage that would otherwise be derived from the misappropriation [*Civ. Code § 3426.2(a)*; *see also Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1528, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731* (upholding injunction that did not have specified time span, but which permitted enjoined party to seek termination of injunction pursuant to statute)]. For discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

If the court determines that it would be unreasonable to prohibit future use, an injunction may condition future use on payment of a reasonable royalty for no longer than the period of time the use could have been prohibited [*Civ. Code § 3426.2(b)*].

In appropriate circumstances, affirmative acts to protect a trade secret may be compelled by court order [*Civ. Code § 3426.2(c)*]. The UTSA neither defines appropriate circumstances nor elaborates on the court order.

Even before a UTSA action is decided on its merits, a plaintiff may obtain a preliminary injunction prohibiting the publication of a trade secret, assuming that the trial court determines that the plaintiff is likely to prevail on the merits of the claim and will suffer irreparable harm without the injunction [*see DVD Copy Control Assn., Inc. v. Bunner (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 864, 875, 889, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 69, 75 P.3d 1* ; *see, e.g., ReadyLink Healthcare v. Cotton (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1006, 1016-1026, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 720* (upholding preliminary injunction)]. A preliminary injunction enjoining the publication of a trade secret does not necessarily violate free speech rights under the federal and California constitutions, so long as the injunction at issue meets the appropriate constitutional standards and is narrowly tailored to enjoin no more speech than is necessary to protect the plaintiff's legitimate property right [*see DVD Copy Control Assn., Inc. v. Bunner (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 864, 876-889, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 69* (upholding preliminary injunction prohibiting publication of DVD decryption software code on Internet web site)].

If a preliminary injunction is issued, the plaintiff must furnish an undertaking equal to the damages the defendant may sustain as a result of the injunction. That estimate is an exercise of the trial court's discretion and will not be disturbed on appeal unless there is a clear abuse of discretion or the amount is arbitrary, capricious, or beyond the bounds of reason [*see ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 14, 22, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518* (dissolving preliminary injunction because $1,000 was insufficient bond in view of evidence that 87.7 percent of defendant's invoices or $315,000 per year came from customers on plaintiff's customer list)]. Although lost profits will be offset by savings resulting from reduced sales expenses or costs of goods sold, the trial court cannot usually assume that the losses a defendant is likely to suffer will be easily compensated by new customers for its product. The amount of the undertaking must factor in reasonable attorney's fees and expenses that the defendant will have to expend to procure a

final decision dissolving the injunction [*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 14-15, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

Also, the California court of appeal has rejected the so-called "inevitable disclosure" doctrine that has been accepted in some other jurisdictions. Under this doctrine, an employer, without proof of actual or threatened trade secret misappropriation, may seek to enjoin a former employee from working for a competitor on the theory that the former employee's new employment will inevitably lead him or her to rely on the former employer's trade secrets. Noting that California public policy strongly favors employee mobility, the court of appeal concluded that adoption of this doctrine would effectively impose a covenant not to compete on the employee without the employee's express agreement, possibly through use of a confidentiality agreement signed after the employment contract with the former employer was already in place [*Whyte v. Schlage Lock Co. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 1443, 1462-1463, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 277]* .

[7] Monetary Relief

[a] Damages

Damages for the actual loss caused by misappropriation may be recovered and any unjust enrichment caused by misappropriation that is not taken into account in computing damages for actual loss may also be recovered [*Civ. Code § 3426.3(a)*; *seealso Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1528, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731* (upholding award characterized as "reasonable approximation" of enrichment)]. For a form of complaint for damages for trade secret misappropriation, *see § 565.270*.

[b] Royalties

If neither damages nor unjust enrichment caused by misappropriation are provable, the court may order payment of a reasonable royalty for no longer than the period of time the use could have been prohibited [*Civ. Code § 3426.3(b)*; *see § 565.103[6]*]. A royalty as damages may only be awarded under the conditions specified by statute. Thus, for example, a royalty may not be awarded as damages when damages or unjust enrichment are otherwise proven or provable [*Robert L. Cloud & Assocs., Inc. v. Mikesell (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1141, 1149-1150, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 143* (also rejecting authority of trial court to order royalties from future business under general civil authority to fashion injunctive relief)].

[c] Exemplary Damages

If the misappropriation was willful and malicious, the court may award exemplary damages in an amount not exceeding twice any award made under *Civ. Code § 3426.3(a)* (damages) or *Civ. Code § 3426.3(b)* (royalties) [*Civ. Code § 3426.3(c)*]. This cap on exemplary damages of twice the compensatory damages does not relieve a plaintiff from the burden of providing meaningful evidence of the defendant's financial condition in order to support an award of punitive damages [*Robert L. Cloud & Assocs., Inc. v. Mikesell (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1141, 1151-1152, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 143]* .

[d] Attorney's Fees and Costs

The court may award reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the prevailing party if a claim of misappropriation is made in bad faith, a motion to terminate an injunction is made or resisted in bad faith, or the misappropriation was willful and malicious [*Civ. Code § 3426.4*; *see Computer Prepared Accounts, Inc. v. Katz (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 428, 431, 439-440, 286 Cal. Rptr. 556* (awarding sanctions and attorney's fees under *Civ. Code § 3426.4* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* for seeking injunction based on forged documents)].

Costs that may be recovered by the prevailing party include a reasonable sum for the services of expert witnesses actually incurred and reasonably necessary in preparation for or during trial or arbitration. Costs may only be recovered

for expert witnesses who are not regular employees of any party [*Civ. Code § 3426.4*].

Although the statute does not define "bad faith," the court of appeal has held that, for these purposes, bad faith requires not only that the claim be objectively specious (not viable despite some apparent superficial merit), but also that the plaintiff brought or maintained the claim in subjective bad faith--that is, with an improper motive [*FLIR Systems, Inc. v. Parrish (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1275-1278, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307* ; *Gemini Aluminum Corp. v. California Custom Shapes, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1261-1263, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358]* . Evidence that plaintiffs had an anticompetitive motive in filing the lawsuit will also support a finding that the lawsuit was objectively specious, at least when there is no evidence of actual damages, misappropriation or threatened misappropriation, and no threat of imminent harm [*FLIR Systems, Inc. v. Parrish (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1276-1277, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307*]. In addition, the fact that the trial court may have denied a defendant's motion for summary judgment will not preclude a later finding that the plaintiff's action was brought or maintained in bad faith [*FLIR Systems, Inc. v. Parrish (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1270, 1283, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307*].

The statute also does not define "willful" or "malicious." One appellate court has held that willfulness and maliciousness are established by a jury's determination, on clear and convincing evidence, to award punitive damages, because such a determination necessitates a finding that defendants' acts of misappropriation were done with malice [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 54, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* .

Because attorney's fees for a prevailing plaintiff when defendant's misappropriation is willful and malicious are authorized by statute, they are awarded pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(a)(10)*, and the amount of the award is fixed by the court in a posttrial noticed motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1033.5(c)(5)*; *Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 55, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* . The amount of the award to a successful plaintiff need not reflect the monetary relief awarded when the most significant relief awarded the plaintiff is injunctive [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 55, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (relatively minor monetary award only reflected fact that defendant has not yet been successful in financially injuring plaintiffs)]. If the misappropriation began before the effective date of the UTSA (January 1, 1985) [*Civ. Code § 3426.10*], any attorney's fee award must be apportioned so that it is only attributable to misappropriations occurring after January 1, 1985 [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 55-56, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* . If one defendant steals the trade secrets and joins with others in using them, that does not mean that attorney's fees may be awarded under the third party tortfeasor doctrine [*see Prentice v. North Am. Title Guar. Corp. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 618, 30 Cal. Rptr. 821, 381 P. 2d 645* (first enunciating doctrine, sometime referred to as "Prentice" award)]. Plaintiff's damages in that situation do not flow from the "first" defendant's initial misappropriation, but from the continuing misconduct of the tortfeasors whose misappropriation was later in time [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 56-57, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* .

An award of attorney's fees is not authorized under the UTSA when the complaint does not actually allege a cause of action for misappropriation of a trade secret, even if the plaintiff mistakenly includes a prayer for relief under the UTSA. In one case, for example, the complaint alleged only misappropriation of patents and trademarks. However, because patents and trademarks, by their very nature, are not trade secrets, defendant was not entitled to attorney's fees under the UTSA, even though the complaint sought double damages under *Civ. Code § 3426.3* [*CytoDyn of New Mexico, Inc. v. Amerimmune Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 288, 296-300, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 600*].

[8] Description of Trade Secret for Discovery Purposes

In any action alleging the misappropriation of a trade secret under the UTSA, before commencing discovery relating to the trade secret, the party alleging the misappropriation must identify the trade secret with reasonable particularity subject to any orders that may be appropriate under *Civ. Code § 3426.5* (protective discovery orders) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.210*; *see § 565.103[9]*].

The statute does not clearly indicate whether the plaintiff must identify the trade secret with reasonable particularity in

the complaint or by some other means. However this identification is made, the "reasonable particularity" mandated by the statute does not require the party alleging misappropriation to define every minute detail of the claimed trade secret at the outset of the litigation. Instead, the plaintiff must make a showing that is reasonable under the circumstances to identify the alleged trade secret in a manner that will allow the trial court to control the scope of discovery, protect the parties' proprietary information, and allow them a fair opportunity to prepare and present their best case or defense [*Advanced Modular Sputtering, Inc. v. Superior Court (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 826, 835-836, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 901]* . Although not always required, if the nature of the alleged trade secret or the technical field in which it arises makes a detailed description alone inadequate to permit a defendant to learn the limits of the secret and develop defenses or permit the court to understand the secret and fashion discovery, the court may require, as necessary to satisfy those needs, an explanation of how the alleged trade secret differs from matters known to skilled persons in the field [*see Brescia v. Angelin (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 133, 150, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 842]* .

However, a plaintiff cannot be required at this stage of the proceedings to convince the court that the purported trade secrets are actually secret. While this is an essential element of the plaintiff's case that must be proven at trial, it is not a required showing at the prediscovery stage of the action [*Perlan Therapeutics, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1351, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 211]* .

A trial court has the authority to reject a trade secret statement if the statement does not clearly identify all of the trade secrets at issue, or if it includes broad, catchall language, extensive extraneous material, or voluminous attachments as a tactic to preserve an unrestricted, unilateral right to subsequently amend the statement to include trade secrets that were not envisioned when the initial statement was filed [*Perlan Therapeutics, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1350-1352, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 211]* .

[9] Preservation of Secrecy Ordered by Court

In an action under the UTSA, a court shall preserve the secrecy of an alleged trade secret by reasonable means, which may include granting protective orders in connection with discovery proceedings, holding in-camera hearings, sealing the records of the action, and ordering any person involved in the litigation not to disclose an alleged trade secret without prior court approval [*Civ. Code § 3426.5*].

During discovery a party responding to a discovery device or any other affectednatural person or organization may make a motion for a protectiveorder after making a reasonable and good faith attempt at informal resolution. The court, for good cause shown, may make any order that justice requires to protect that party and may order that a trade secret or other confidential research not be disclosed or be disclosed only in a certain way [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2025.420(b)(13)* (depositions), *Code Civ. Proc. § 2030.090(b)(6)* (interrogatories), *Code Civ. Proc. § 2031.060(b)(5)* (inspection of documents), and *Code Civ. Proc. § 2033.080(b)(4)* (requests for admissions)]. For discussion of discovery procedures generally, see Ch. 190, *Discovery: Scope, Regulation, and Timing* .

If a protective order is issued to protect trade secrets that are the subject of litigation, a willful violation of the protective order by an attorney or client may result in the imposition of sanctions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7*, or under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* if the suit was brought prior to 1995 [*see Wallis v. PHL Associates, Inc. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 882, 900, 86 Cal. Rptr. 3d 297* (sanctions issued under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5*)].

[10] Current Ownership of Trade Secret Not Required

A plaintiff is not required to prove current ownership of the relevant trade secret in order to prosecute an action for misappropriation of a trade secret. It is sufficient that the plaintiff had an ownership interest in the secret during the time period for which damages are being sought [*Jasmine Networks, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 980, 986, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426]* . Thus, for example, if a plaintiff files suit for trade secret misappropriation, then sells the trade secret but retains the right to sue for the past misappropriation, plaintiff does not lose the right to pursue remedies

for the misappropriation that occurred prior to selling the rights to the trade secret [*Jasmine Networks, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 980, 986, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426]* .

If suit brought by a former owner raises concerns about the rights of an absent party, such as the current owner of the trade secret, or there is a danger of multiple or inconsistent liabilities on the part of the parties before the court, the rules governing permissive or compulsory joinder of parties may be used to seek to join the absent party [*Jasmine Networks, Inc. v. Superior Court (2009) 180 Cal. App. 4th 980, 986, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 426* ; *see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 389*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.104

§ 565.104 Common Law Action for Misappropriation

[1] Elements

The California common law position on liability for misappropriation of trade secrets is based on the Restatement definition of a trade secret. Liability requires proof of the existence of subject matter capable of protection as a trade secret and disclosure of the secret under circumstances giving rise to a contractual or other legally imposed obligation on the part of the disclosee not to use or disclose the secret to the detriment of the discloser [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201* ; Restatement of Torts § 757, cmt. b]. A more recent federal appellate opinion, however, states that the elements of cause of action for common law misappropriation are (1) plaintiff's investment of substantial time and money in developing its "property," (2) defendant's appropriation of that property at little or no cost, and (3) plaintiff's injury by defendant's conduct [*Self-Directed Placement Corp. v. Control Data Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 908 F.2d 462, 467]* .

A complaint alleging trade secret misappropriation must allege all three elements: (1) the existence of a trade secret; (2) disclosure under circumstances imposing an obligation to maintain its secrecy; and (3) use or disclosure to the owner's detriment [*see* *Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201* ; *see § 565.270*]. If the defendant is an employee or former employee of the plaintiff, the facts alleged must also show that the public policy in favor of the protection of the complainant's interest in maintaining the secret outweighs the interest of the employee in using his or her knowledge to support himself or herself in other employment [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201* ; *see § 565.105[1]*]. For discussion of privileges specific to trade secrets, see *§ 565.107*.

[2] Protectable Secret

California adopted the Restatement of Torts definition of trade secret, which provides that a trade secret may consist of any formula, pattern, device, or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives the owner an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. Although the nature of a trade secret is somewhat nebulous, a characteristic common to those secrets which have found protection from disclosure and use by the courts is the need for their continued use by the owner in order to maintain a competitive advantage over others [

Rigging Int'l Maint. Co. v. Gwin (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 594, 606-607, 180 Cal. Rptr. 451 ; *see* Restatement of Torts § 757, cmt. b]. A trade secret differs from other secret information in a business because it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business; it is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201]* .

Some factors to be considered in determining whether given information is one's trade secret are: the extent to which the information is known outside of the business, the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in the business, the extent of measures taken to guard the secrecy of the information, the value of the information to the owner and competitors, the amount of effort or money expended in developing the information, and the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 289, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198]* .

Although the specific character of the trade secret is not important, its secrecy is, and matters which are completely disclosed by the goods marketed cannot be trade secrets [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 289, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; for discussion of reverse engineering, *see § 565.104[3]*].

A trade secret protects only during the period when others working in the same field do not, in the ordinary course of their work, make the same discovery [*Sarkes Tarzian, Inc. v. Audio Devices, Inc. (S.D. Cal. 1958) 166 F. Supp. 250, 279]* . An invention may be placed in public use or on sale without losing its secret character, but, by definition, a trade secret is something which has not been placed in the public domain [*Sinclair v. Aquarius Elecs., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 216, 226, 116 Cal. Rptr. 654* ; for an affirmative defense based on product disclosure of a trade secret, *see § 565.273*]. Even when a product utilizing misappropriated trade secret information is not built until after the information is made public, if the misappropriation occurred while the information was secret, an action for trade secret misappropriation will still exist and damages may be available for profits resulting from the acceleration of the date when production was possible [*Engelhard Indus., Inc. v. Research Instrumental Corp. (9th Cir. 1963) 324 F.2d 347, 353]* .

[3] Improper Disclosure

Trade secrets are protected only when they are disclosed or used through improper means. The significant difference between trade secretinformation and information that is not secret is that knowledge of the latter is available without use of improper means, while trade secret knowledge is usually available only by improper means [*Knudsen Corp. v. Ever-Fresh Foods, Inc. (C.D. Cal. 1971) 336 F. Supp. 241, 244]* . Trade secrets do not enjoy absolute monopoly protection and will lose their character as private property when the owner divulges them or when they are discovered through proper means [*Chicago Lock Co. v. Fanberg (9th Cir. 1982) 676 F.2d 400, 404* (defendants did not use improper means in soliciting lock combinations from locksmiths, using reverse engineering to deduce pattern, and publishing combination codes)]. "Improper means" connotes the existence of a duty to the trade secret owner not to disclose the secret to others [*Chicago Lock Co. v. Fanberg (9th Cir. 1982) 676 F.2d 400, 404-405* ; for discussion of employment and confidential information imposing duty of nondisclosure, *see § 565.105[1],[2]*]. A trade secret does not protect against discovery by fair and honest means such as independent invention, accidental disclosure, or reverse engineering (starting with the known product and working backward to divine the process) [*Sinclair v. Aquarius Elecs., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 216, 226, 116 Cal. Rptr. 654* ; *see also* Restatement of Torts § 758 (1939); *Ralph Andrews Prods., Inc. v. Paramount Pictures Corp. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 676, 686, 271 Cal. Rptr. 797* (issues to be determined on remand were whether defendant paid value in good faith to acquire concept for television show from plaintiff's employee, and whether defendant changed its position such that to subject it to liability would be inequitable)].

[4] Remedies for Misappropriation

[a] Damages

In an action under the common law, damages are recoverable for the pecuniary loss suffered by the defendant's wrongful use of the trade secret [*Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 466, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118]* . Loss of profits through a reduction of sales and price are the usual way to prove damages when the trade secret is production oriented [*Sarkes Tarzian, Inc. v. Audio Devices, Inc. (S.D. Cal. 1958) 166 F. Supp. 250, 269]* . When the trade secret misappropriated is a customer list, this may be shown by the loss of profits resulting from sales actually diverted from plaintiff's business [*Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 466, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118]* . Another method of assessing damages combines the losses sustained by the plaintiff and the benefits enjoyed by the misappropriator [*Tri-Tron Int'l v. Velto (9th Cir. 1975) 525 F.2d 432, 437* (discussing California law)].

[b] Injunctive Relief

Although injunctive relief under the common law has no paramount control over new cases because they are governed by UTSA, the common law principles may serve as important guidelines in deciding when injunctive relief is appropriate [*see § 565.103[1]* and*§ 565.103[3]*]. Moreover, even though UTSA provides for injunctive relief, it does not specify when that relief is warranted [*see Civ. Code § 3426.2*].

While the authority for injunctive relief is not stated in many cases, trade secret misappropriation under the common law could be enjoined under the purview of "unfair competition" and "unlawful" or "unfair business practice" under former *Civ. Code § 3369* (now *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17203*) [*Chicago Lock Co. v. Fanberg (9th Cir. 1982) 676 F.2d 400, 404* ; *see Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn.(1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 108-113, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817* ; *see also § 565.10* et seq.].

The owner of a trade secret is entitled to protection of its trade secret for as long as it remains a secret. If it is determined that information would not remain secret forever, but would be fully disclosed as a result of public announcements, demonstrations, sales of products, or other disclosures, that may be reflected in any injunctive relief ordered by the court [[*Winston Research Corp. v. Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. (9th Cir. 1965) 350 F.2d 134, 141]* . Injunctive relief has been granted for the approximate period it would require a legitimate competitor to develop a successful product after public disclosure of the previously secret information [*Winston Research Corp. v. Minnesota Mining & Mfg. Co. (9th Cir. 1965) 350 F.2d 134, 142* ; *Knudsen Corp. v. Ever-Fresh Foods, Inc. (C.D. Cal. 1971) 336 F. Supp. 241, 244]* .

[c] Statute of Limitations

No case definitively states what statute of limitations was applicable to trade secret misappropriation cases. While some cases theorized that trade secret protection was based on a property right [*see, e.g., California Intelligence Bureau v. Cunningham (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 197, 203, 188 P.2d 303]* , others reasoned that it arose out of a personal relationship requiring good faith actions [*see, e.g., Monolith Portland Midwest Co. v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Corp. (9th Cir. 1969) 407 F.2d 288, 293* ; *see also § 565.105[1]*]. The period of limitation for an action for breach of good faith confidence is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*, which imposes a two year limitation on actions on a contract, obligation, or liability not founded on an instrument of writing [*see Davies v. Krasna (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 502, 509-510, 121 Cal. Rptr. 705, 535 P.2d 1161* (case analyzed from fiduciary duty viewpoint rather than misappropriation of trade secret, but implies that two year limitation applies to trade secrets)]. For discussion of the elements and requirements of a confidential relationship, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

A cause of action for violation of a trade secret accrues at the first moment of adverse use or disclosure of a trade secret in violation of the confidential relationship. Once the relationship is violated, it is not violatedanew with each added use or disclosure, although the damages suffered may thereby be aggravated. The cause of action arises only once [*Monolith Portland Midwest Co. v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Corp. (9th Cir. 1969) 407 F.2d 288, 292-293]* . For a

form of affirmative defense based on the statute of limitations, *see § 565.274*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.105

§ 565.105 Particular Situations

[1] Employment Relationships

[a] In General

Although *Lab. Code § 2860*, which provides that everything which an employee acquires by virtue of employment, except compensation due from the employer, belongs to the employer, whether acquired lawfully or unlawfully, or during or after the expiration of the terms of employment, has been cited as authority for protection of the employer's secrets [*see Reid v. Mass Co., Inc. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 293, 300, 318 P.2d 54]* , it is not necessary, because the employer's right to protection of trade secrets derives from the fact that the information was secret, not from the fact that it came to the employee in the course of employment [*see King v. Pacific Vitamin Corp. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 841, 849, 64 Cal. Rptr. 486]* . While there is an older line of cases referring to trade secret as an absolute property right of the employer [*see, e.g., California Intelligence Bureau v. Cunningham (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 197, 203, 188 P.2d 303]* , more recent cases focus on relationship between the parties at the time the secret is disclosed [*see, e.g., Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 288, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198]* . The protected relationship, although not a confidential relationship, is one to which some rudimentary requirements of good faith attach [*see Monolith Portland Midwest Co. v. Kaiser Aluminum & Chem. Corp. (9th Cir. 1969) 407 F.2d 288, 293* (action based on supplier-customer relationship)]. For discussion of the elements and requirements of a confidential relationship, see Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent* .

Regardless of the underlying theory, the employer does not have a monopoly in the use of a trade secret, but merely a proprietary right against usurpation by unfair means. The employer has the burden of showing two things in an action for trade secret misappropriation against an employee or former employee: a legally protectable trade secret and a legal basis, either a covenant or a confidential relationship, on which to predicate relief [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 283, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; *see § 565.271* for an allegation of trade secret misappropriation by a former employee].

[b] Implied Obligation of Confidentiality

In the employment relationship, the employee's obligation not to disclose trade secrets exists in the absence of any stipulation to the contrary [*By-Buk Co. v. Printed Cellophane Tape Co. (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 157, 164, 329 P.2d 147]* . The implied obligation not to make use of or disclose trade secrets is one of trust and encompasses the use of the information to the employers's prejudice [*American Loan Corp. v. California Commercial Corp. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 515, 521, 27 Cal. Rptr. 243]* . As in other circumstances, if the information is not known to be secret or confidential, it will not be protected as such. For example, if an employer does not in any manner inform or indicate to employees that particular information is secret or to be treated in confidence, a warning that nonspecific information is secret after an employee terminates his or her employment is, in effect, ex post facto, and not effective [*see Architectural Models, Inc. v. Neklason (N.D. Cal. 1967) 264 F. Supp. 312, 321 , aff'd, (9th Cir. 1968) 397 F.2d 405]* . The implied obligation not to disclose the employer's trade secrets does not extend to create an obligation not to disclose trade secrets developed by the employee. Unless the employer can demonstrate another reason for the implication of confidence, an employee is privileged to disclose and use trade secrets which he or she developed--they being a part of the technical knowledge and skill acquired by virtue of employment [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 285-287, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198]* .

An employment agreement may contain various provisions, and in that contract an employee may limit his or her right to compete with the employer or restrict his or her right to use trade secret information [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 323, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201]* . An agreement not to use trade secrets is not an unlawful restraint of trade unless it is more extensive than is reasonably required to protect the employer's interests [*By-Buk Co. v. Printed Cellophane Tape Co. (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 157, 164, 329 P.2d 147* ; for discussion of contracts not to compete generally, *see § 565.70* et seq.]. However, merely labeling something as confidential or a trade secret in an employment agreement will not make matters generally known in the trade or readily discernible by those in the trade a secret [*see Sarkes Tarzian, Inc. v. Audio Devices, Inc. (S.D. Cal. 1958) 166 F. Supp. 250, 264-265]* .

Whether or not a duty not to divulge trade secret information is expressed in an employment contract is a question of fact [*Ungar Elec. Tools, Inc. v. Sid Ungar Co., Inc. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 398, 403, 13 Cal. Rptr. 268]* . A promise in an employment contract not to use confidential information regarding customers for one year after termination of employment is enforceable [*Gordon v. Landau (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 690, 694, 321 P.2d 456* (damages awarded for period promise was effective, injunctive relief not available past the effective time of promise)].

[c] Information Particular to Employer

The cases reflect the accommodation of competing policies in the law: the right of a business to be protected against unfair competition stemmingfrom the usurpation of its trade secret and the right of an individual to the unhampered pursuit of the livelihood for which he or she is best suited [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 285-286, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198]* . Trade secret protection is available only when the information has value through affording the employer a competitive advantage over competitors who do not know of it, and when the granting of protection will not unduly hamstring the former employee in the practice of his or her occupation [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 288, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198*]. Thus, trade secrets must be the particular secrets of the employer as distinguished from the general secrets of the trade. Secrets acquired and developed as a result of long employment in the particular trade may be carried over and put to use by the former employee and the new employer [*Sarkes Tarzian, Inc. v. Audio Devices, Inc. (S.D. Cal. 1958) 166 F. Supp. 250, 264-265]* . An employee's skill and knowledge of a particular business constitute the means by which he or she earns a living, and the courts will not readily label them confidential when that will deprive the employee of employment opportunities. If no confidential information is used, a former employee is free to compete with his or her former employer, to advise the former employer's customers of his or her new activities, and to solicit their business [*Rigging Int'l Maint. Co. v. Gwin (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 594, 612, 180 Cal. Rptr. 451]* .

[d] Customer Lists

[i] Statutory Analysis in Determining Trade Secret Status

The failure to include customer lists in its statutory definition of a trade secret [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*] in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act does not mean that the legislature intentionally excluded them. Rather, the language of the statute is inclusive, not exclusive, and customer lists can be protectable trade secrets under the Act [*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518* ; *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1323-1324, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713]* .

Whether or not a particular customer list is a trade secret is determined by an analysis that had five components in the pre-UTSA cases (before January 1, 1985) [*Civ. Code § 3426.10*; *see Aetna Bldg. Maint. Co. v. West (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 198, 204-205, 246 P.2d 11* ; *see also § 565.105[2][c][iii]*]. The analysis now has only three components, although two or three of the five seem to have been subsumed in the "value" component of the most recent articulation of the criteria [*compare Aetna Bldg. Maint. Co. v. West (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 198, 204-205, 246 P.2d 11* ; *with ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18-19, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

The statutory definition of trade secret analyzed in the context of a customer list requires (1) information (2) that is valuable because it is unknown to others, and (3) which the owner has attempted to keep secret [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*; *ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 18, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518* ; *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* ; *see MAI Sys. Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 991 F.2d 511, 521* (computer company's confidential customer database constituted trade secret under California UTSA); *see also Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1287-1291, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352* ; *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* (describing test as consisting only of second and third elements)]. For example, in one case the court reiterated the above factors, and determined that a customer list fell within the definition of a trade secret under the Uniform Trade Secret Act (*Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*) because: (1) plaintiff company provided a relatively unusual roofing service, commercial roof repair and maintenance; (2) its customer list was a compilation developed over a period of years, consisting of names, addresses, and contact persons, containing pricing information and knowledge about particular roofs and roofing needs of customers using its services; (3) the identities of those particular commercial buildings using these services were not generally known to the roofing industry; and (4) the company made reasonable efforts to maintain the secrecy of its customers' identities by limiting circulation of its customer lists, and by advising its employees, through an employment agreement and an employee handbook, that the company considered the information valuable and confidential [*Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1520-1521, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731]* .

A customer list, otherwise a trade secret, remains a trade secret belonging to the employer, even if prepared in part by the former employee [*Empire Steam Laundry v. Lozier (1913) 165 Cal. 95, 99, 130 P. 1180* ; *Reid v. Mass Co., Inc. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 293, 302, 318 P.2d 54*]. A customer list may exist in the memory of the employee as well as in writing [*George v. Burdusis (1942) 21 Cal. 2d 153, 160, 130 P.2d 399* ; *Whitted v. Williams (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 52, 56, 37 Cal. Rptr. 692]* .

[ii] Misappropriation

Once an employer proves a customer list is entitled to trade secret protection, it must then prove that the former employee misappropriated the information to attain an unfair competitive advantage. Under the Uniform Trade Secret Act (*Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*), the term "misappropriation" is defined to include the nonconsensual disclosure or use of a trade secret [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)(2)*]. Acts of solicitation may constitute use or misappropriation of protected information [*Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1520-1521, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731* (commercial roof repair business's former employees' use of customer list to solicit customers for their new commercial roof repair business constituted misappropriation)]. However, merely announcing a job change, or impending job change, to clients of a former employer is not by itself solicitation of thebusiness of those clients and is not actionable [*Hilb, Rogal & Hamilton Ins. v. Robb (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1812, 1821-1822, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887* (clients initiated transfer of

accounts on learning of employee's job change)].

[iii] Common Law Analysis

Under common law, to assure protection of a customer list, the former employer had to show that [*Aetna Bldg. Maint. Co. v. West (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 198, 204-205, 246 P.2d 11]* :

- The customer information was confidential and not readily accessible to competitors;
- The former employee solicited those customers with intent to injure the former employer;
- The former employee sought out certain preferred customers whose trade is particularly profitable and whose identities are not generally known to the trade;
- The business is such that a customer will ordinarily patronize only one concern; and
- The established business relationship between the customer and the former employer would normally continue unless interfered with.

The fundamental test for judicial protection of employer information was whether the knowledge gained by an employee is secret and confidential, and although all five factors were present in most instances of trade-secret protection, not all five had to be present for a plaintiff to prevail [*Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley (9th Cir. 1980) 622 F.2d 1324, 1331* ; *see Greenly v. Cooper (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 382, 391 n.2, 143 Cal. Rptr. 514* (possibility that other courts may have inadvertently interpreted five factors conjunctively rather than disjunctively)].

[iv] "Value" Element

The "value" element requires the information to have value to other businesses that are unaware of the information and that could put that information, if known, to valuable use [*see, e.g., GAB Business Servs., Inc. v. Lindsey & Newsom Claim Servs., Inc. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 409, 428, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 665* (secrecy of employee salaries did not prove that knowledge of salaries had independent economic value)].

To illustrate, suppose the hypothetical widget industry consists of five sellers and there are 1,000,000 businesses engaged in industries that have been known to use widgets in their operations, but there is no way for the sellers to know for sure which of those 1,000,000 use widgets and which do not. Seller A's customer list of 500 would therefore have value to its competitors because it would allow them to distinguish the proven customers from those that are only potential customers and thus allow them to focus their sales efforts. However, if each of Seller A's competitors already knows that the businesses on A's customer list are proven widget consumers (even though they do not know that those businesses buy their widgets from A), A's customer list has no independent value because the identities of its customers are already known to its competitors. In the first situation, A's customer list would be a protectable trade secret, but in the second it would not [*ABBA Rubber Co. v. Seaquist (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1, 19, 286 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

A case that fits within the first hypothetical involved a customer list of a company selling credit insurance. Credit insurance would be purchased by an entity selling receivables and would insure against defaults. Of the potential purchasers of credit insurance at the time of the case, when credit insurance was new and there was resistance to it, only 6.5 percent were actually purchasing it. Therefore, knowledge of the customer list would have great value to a competitor [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630-631, 638, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92]* . Temporary employees is another example of a product market in which a customer list is likely to have value to competitors because without it, a competing seller will have to expend quite a bit of effort to determine which potential purchasers are actual purchasers [*Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1282, 272*

Cal. Rptr. 352] .

[v] "Secrecy" Element

The "secrecy" prong of the test is satisfied if an employer requires employees to sign a confidentiality agreement respecting its client list, expiration dates of customer contracts, lists of business leads, history of customer relationships, and related client information [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 631, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92]* .

The secrecy prong can be satisfied even if the employee is not required to sign an agreement regarding confidentiality, for example, if the information is not divulged to anyone outside the business, is only divulged to employees when necessary for them to effectively carry out their functions, and the employees are told the information is confidential [*Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1288, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352]* .

[vi] Customers' Special Characteristics or Peculiar Requirements

Even when the customer list is not protected as a trade secret, if the former employment is one by which the former employee obtained information regarding the customers that would enable him or her to secure or retain their business, the list may be protected as a trade secret, and the former employee restrained from using or disclosing that information in a competing business [*Whitted v. Williams (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 52, 57, 37 Cal. Rptr. 692]* . A finding of confidentiality may be proper, even if thecustomers' names are well known, if their special characteristics are important to the seller and not obvious. For example, a customer list of home loan investors that contained other valuable information such as areas in which a customer would or would not invest, the maximum amount of investment, and loan expiration dates (enabling one to solicit the customer for additional business when the loan expires) warranted protection as a trade secret [*Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley (9th Cir. 1980) 622 F.2d 1324, 1333]* .

Salespersons must know the particular requirements of customers; that knowledge is not always protected as confidential [*American Alloy Steel Corp. v. Ross (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 215, 218-219, 308 P.2d 494]* . A former employee's subsequent use of knowledge of the "peculiar likes and fancies and other characteristics" of the former employer's customers is not allowed when that knowledge aids in securing and retaining their business [*Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1288-1291, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352]* . This knowledge is critical when friendly contact with customers is important to solicitors, a circumstance typical of the "trade route" cases, and when knowledge of the customer's desires for specialized information, preference for certain products, and buying habits are important to the sale. When superiority of product or service, rather than personal relationships or a secret specialty, is the basis for patronage, knowledge of the customer's requirements is not critical and usually does not warrant protection [*Aetna Bldg. Maint. Co. v. West (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 198, 205-206, 246 P.2d 11* ; *Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 465, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118]* .

[vii] Announcement of Change of Employment

Before the effective date of the UTSA, the announcement rule permitted a former employee to announce a change of employment to individuals or firms he or she had serviced for the former employer, whether or not those individuals or firms were on a protected trade-secret customer list [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 636, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* ; *Theodore v. Williams (1919) 44 Cal. App. 34, 39, 185 P. 1014* ; *see Moss, Adams & Co. v. Shilling (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 124, 127-130, 224 Cal. Rptr. 456* (applying pre-UTSA announcement rule but holding customers serviced and remembered by former employees without resort to list were not trade secrets)]. Under UTSA, the fact that an employee personally rendered service to a customer of the former employer is not determinative of the trade-secret issue. The announcement rule retains its validity, however, and permits a former employee to announce a change of employment to individuals or firms he or she had serviced for the former employer even if those individuals or firms were on a protected trade-secret customer list because the right to announce a new affiliation is

basic to an individual's right to engage in fair competition [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 636, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* ; *MAI Sys. Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 991 F.2d 511, 521* (applying California law)].

If the customer list is a trade secret, the former employee must stop at announcing his or her change of employment and cannot solicit the customer of the former employer. Providing personal service to a customer whose identity is a trade secret does not thereafter render that customer fair game for solicitation [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 636, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* ; *see, e.g., MAI Sys. Corp. v. Peak Computer, Inc. (9th Cir. 1993) 991 F.2d 511, 521-522* (applying California law; former employee's use of former employer's customer database to contact former employer's customers and try to induce them to switch over to his new employer constituted improper solicitation)]. An "announcement" of new employment that informs the former employer's customers of the interesting competitive alternatives available from the former employee's new employer and invites inquiries goes beyond announcing new employment and is a solicitation [*American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 636-637, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92]* .

[viii] Certain Customer Lists Deemed Trade Secrets by Statute

Certain customer lists have been deemed trade secrets by statute. For example, the customer list (including the names, addresses, and identities of customers) of a telephone answering service constitutes a trade secret and confidential information of the owner of the telephone answering service [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16606*].

Likewise, the customer list of an employment agency (including the names, addresses, and identities of (1) all employer customers who have listed job orders with the agency within 180 days before separation of an employee from the agency, and (2) all job applicant customers) constitutes a trade secret and confidential information of the employment agency [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607(a)*]. However, no liability arises from, and no cause of action attaches to, the use of an employment agency's customer list by a former employee who enters into business as an employment agency more than one year immediately following termination of his or her employment [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607(b)*].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607 has been construed to apply only to employer-employee relationships. A federal district court refused to apply *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607* in the context of a franchise agreement regarding temporary personnel agencies, in part because former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 9902*, which was applicable to the acts complained of, excluded temporary personnel agencies from its definition of employment agency (*now see Civ. Code § 1812.501(a)*, which has no such exclusion). Thus, the court did not extend trade secret protection to the customer list or the temporary employee lists and would not enforce a noncompetition clause against former franchisees who established competing businesses [*Scott v. Snelling & Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1043-1044* (evidence showed former franchisees developed customer lists through their own efforts, personal knowledge, and business contacts; temporary employee lists were not so nonexclusive, given fact that employees often listed themselves with several agencies, as to be trade secret under *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*)].

[e] Corporate Director

Even in the absence of an express agreement against revelation of trade secrets, a director is under a fiduciary duty not to use or reveal them to the detriment of the corporation of which he or she is a director [*Components for Research, Inc. v. Isolation Prods., Inc. (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 726, 729, 50 Cal. Rptr. 829* ; for discussion and forms relating to corporate directors, *see* Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management*].

While a person is a director of a corporation, he or she may not undertake or participate in activities adverse to the interest of the corporation. A director is free to engage in competition with the corporation after termination of employment, but may plan and develop a competitive enterprise during the course of the directorship only when the particular activity engaged in is not against the best interests of the corporation [*see* *Sequoia Vacuum Sys. v. Stransky*

(1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 281, 287, 40 Cal. Rptr. 203 (likening director to agent and finding him guilty of unfair competition)]. If a director violates this fiduciary duty, the corporation is entitled to recover all the profits of the transaction [*American Loan Corp. v. California Commercial Corp. (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 515, 524, 27 Cal. Rptr. 243]* .

[f] Injunctive Relief Against Employee

Within an employment relationship, injunctive relief should be granted only on convincing proof of a harmful violation of the plaintiff's rights, and the instances in which those rights are violated by an employee's misuse of information given during employment constitute an exceedingly small proportion of the whole [*Mathews Paint Co. v. Seaside Paint Co. (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 168, 175, 306 P.2d 113]* . The doctrine under which injunctive relief is granted should not be given application that would overemphasize the employer's right to the detriment of the employee by treating as confidential and secret all knowledge and information gained by the employee that might be of assistance to the employee and a later and competing employer. Whether or not injunctive relief will be granted is determined by whether the knowledge gained by an employee is secret and confidential. Only if the information is secret and confidential will its use by a former employee be enjoined. Some knowledge gained by an employee is of such a general character that equity will not restrict its later use [*American Alloy Steel Corp. v. Ross (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 215, 218-219, 308 P.2d 494* ; *see, e.g.,* *Electro Optical Indus., Inc. v. White (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 653, 661-662, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* (plaintiff's customer lists, sales prices, production costs, and marketing plans were not trade secrets because they were common knowledge or readily available)].

One court of appeal opinion has held that if an employer seeks an injunction preventing a former employee from working for a direct competitor, the former employer must demonstrate either that the disclosure of trade secrets is likely to result from the subsequent employment or that it would be impossible for the employee to perform his or her new job without disclosing those trade secrets [*Electro Optical Indus., Inc. v. White (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 653, 660, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* (former employer failed to show that disclosure would likely result from new employment)].

A salesperson necessarily becomes somewhat acquainted with the particular requirements of customers, but that knowledge is not in and of itself confidential information that is the property of the employer. Trade and business secrets and confidential information are the property of the employer and cannot be used by the employee for his or her own benefit [*American Alloy Steel Corp. v. Ross (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 215, 218-219, 308 P.2d 494* ; *see Lab. Code § 2860*].

When the trade secrets obtained by a former employee are not used by him or her, or that employee's subsequent employer, no ground for any injunction exists. The receipt or acceptance of further business by the new employer from former customers of the former employer who were not solicited or are not retained through the use of the former employer's trade secret may not be enjoined [*Whitted v. Williams (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 52, 59, 37 Cal. Rptr. 692]* .

The fact that the employer that owns the trade secret wrongfully terminated the employment of the person who misappropriated the trade secret does not usually amount to "unclean hands" to bar injunctive relief. Unclean hands is determined by the impact the conduct has on the equitable relations between the parties. The firing of an employee on a pretextual basis does not implicate the equities between the parties arising out of the employee's tortious misconduct or obligation to refrain from a tortious invasion of the employer's proprietary rights [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 52-54, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (wrongful termination occurred after employee had stolen engineering plans, drawings, and parts comprising trade secrets but before employee started using them to solicit plaintiff's customers or manufacture competing products)]. To conclude otherwise would invite every disgruntled terminated employee to defend charges of theft and misappropriation by establishing breach or wrongful termination of employment contract [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 53, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602]* .

For general considerations involved in granting or denying injunctive relief, see*§ 565.103[6]*.

[g] Employee's Wrongful Termination No Defense

The fact that employment of the employee who misappropriated the trade secret was wrongfully terminated does not provide defense or bar to prevent the employer from recovering compensatory relief [*Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 53, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602* (to conclude otherwise would invite every disgruntled terminated employee to defend charges of theft and misappropriation by establishing breach or wrongful termination of employment contract)]. Nor does it bar injunctive relief [*see § 565.105[1][f]*].

[2] Disclosure of Information in Confidence

Trade-secret misappropriation is not based on a trade secret as a physical object of property, but on abuse of confidence or impropriety in learning the secret, and that abuse or impropriety may exist when the information is not a trade secret [*see Ojala v. Bohlin (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 292, 301, 2 Cal. Rptr. 919* (action for unfair competition by plaintiff against a manufacturer who made goods of plaintiff's design for plaintiff under a contract including a covenant not to compete, but who used plaintiff's design to manufacture a competing product); *Thompson v. California Brewing Co. (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 469, 476, 310 P.2d 436* (disclosure of marketing idea); *but see American Alloy Steel Corp. v. Ross (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 215, 218-219, 308 P.2d 494* (information must be secret)]. An obligation not to disclose confidential information may arise from express or implied agreement [*Plant Indus., Inc. v. Coleman (C.D. Cal. 1968) 287 F. Supp. 636, 644* (involving employee)]. Because trade-secret law protects against breach of faith and reprehensible means of learning another's secret, a specific and judicially recognized relationship need not have been established. The circumstances surrounding the acquisition and disclosure of secret information may indicate that an implied relationship of trust and confidence exists with respect to that information. For example, a trial court's finding of a breach of faith and confidence was upheld when the defendant, a manufacturer, solicited a breakdown of the physical properties and characteristics of a part from the part supplier without revealing that the information would be used to allow the defendant to copy the part and transfer the information to other potential suppliers [*Pachmayr Gun Works, Inc. v. Olin Mathieson Chem. Corp., Winchester W. Div. (9th Cir. 1974) 502 F.2d 802, 807-808]* .

Other circumstances in which secret information may be disclosed include in the course of contract negotiations. However, confidence cannot be imposed on a person without that person's consent or if that person has no knowledge of the confidential nature of the information being disclosed [*Thompson v. California Brewing Co. (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 469, 475-476, 310 P.2d 436* (disclosure of marketing idea); *see* Restatement of Torts § 757, cmts. b, j].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.106

§ 565.106 Agreement for Use of Trade Secret

Parties may elect to make a legally binding agreement for the use, payment, preservation of confidentiality, and return of trade secret information. That agreement is effective only between the contracting parties and does not constitute a bar to free copying by others who independently discover the idea [*Sinclair v. Aquarius Elecs., Inc. (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 216, 224, 116 Cal. Rptr. 654]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.107

§ 565.107 Trade Secret Evidentiary Privilege

The owner of a trade secret has a privilege to refuse to disclose a trade secret and to prevent another from disclosing it, if allowing that privilege will not work an injustice [*Evid. Code § 1060*]. In cases involving a trade secret privilege, the burden of proof is on the party claiming the privilege; that party should be prepared to prove the existence of the trade secret and the business injury caused by disclosure. The claimant may also be required to furnish the court with sufficient information for the court to balance whether the interest involved in the secret's value to its owner outweighs the need of the adverse party for that information, as well as to show why a protective order would not solve the problems caused by the requested disclosure [*Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. v. Richard A. Glass Co. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 703, 715, 221 Cal. Rptr. 63* (disclosure allowed); *see also Hofmann Corp. v. Superior Court (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 357, 362, 218 Cal. Rptr. 355* (no disclosure allowed)].

The court may not require disclosure of the trade secret in order to rule on the claim of privilege except as provided in *Evid. Code § 915(b)* [*Evid. Code § 915(a)*]. Under *Evid. Code § 915(b)*, if a claim of privilege under *Evid. Code § 1060* is made and the court is unable to rule without requiring disclosure of the information claimed to be secret, the court may require the person from whom disclosure is sought or the person authorized to claim the privilege, or both, to disclose the information in chambers out of the presence and hearing of all persons except the person authorized to claim the privilege and any other person that person is willing to have present. If the judge determines that the information is privileged, neither the judge nor any other person may ever disclose the information so disclosed without the consent of a person authorized to permit the disclosure [*Evid. Code § 915(b)*].

In a criminal proceeding, the privilege is asserted by the owner of the trade secret, or by the People on the owner's behalf and with the owner's permission, making a motion for a protective order. The protective order shall be granted if a preponderance of evidence demonstrates that a trade secret might be disclosed during the proceeding unless a protective order is issued and that issuance of a protective order would not conceal a fraud or work an injustice [*Evid. Code § 1061*]. In addition in a criminal case, the court may exclude the public from any portion of the proceeding duringwhich it is likely that the trade secret would otherwise be disclosed to the public if there is a substantial probability that the disclosure would cause serious harm to the owner of the trade secret and there is no overriding public interest in an open proceeding. A hearing on a motion to exclude the public is conducted in camera [*Evid. Code §*

1062; *see also Evid. Code § 1063* (procedure for sealing articles protected by protective order in criminal proceeding)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.108

§ 565.108 Judicial Proceedings Privilege Inapplicable

Notwithstanding *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, referred to as the judicial proceedings privilege, there is no privilege for the voluntary, intentional disclosure of trade secret information, unauthorized by its owner, to a competitor or potential competitor of the owner of the trade secret information or the agent or representative of that competitor or potential competitor in any legislative or judicial proceeding, or in any other official proceeding authorized by law, or in the initiation or course of any other proceeding authorized by law and reviewable by writ of mandate [*Civ. Code § 3426.11*]. Such disclosure is not privileged and is not a privileged communication for purposes of Part 2 of Division 1 of the Civil Code (*Civ. Code § 43 et seq.*) [*Civ. Code § 3426.11*].

Civ. Code § 3426.11 does not in any manner limit, restrict, impair, or otherwise modify either the application of the other subdivisions of *Civ. Code § 47* to the conduct to which *Civ. Code § 3426.11* applies or the court's authority to control, order, or permit access to evidence in any case before it [*Civ. Code § 3426.11*]. Nor may *Civ. Code § 3426.11* be construed to limit, restrict, or otherwise impair, the capacity of persons employed by public entities to report improper government activity, as defined in Gov. Code § 8457.2(b), or the capacity of private persons to report improper activities of a private business [*Civ. Code § 3426.11*].

Civ. Code § 3426.11 was enacted by Stats. 1992, ch. 165, and abrogates the privilege enunciated in *ITT Telecom Prods. Corp. v. Dooley (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 307, 314-317, 262 Cal. Rptr. 773* . The court in *ITT Telecom* held that a voluntary disclosure of a trade secret or other information in aid of a judicial proceeding that is also a breach of an express agreement is not privileged [*ITT Telecom Prods. Corp. v. Dooley (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 307, 320, 262 Cal. Rptr. 773]* .

For a form of affirmative defense based on the judicial proceeding privilege, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.109

§ 565.109 Personal Liability of Corporate Directors for Using Misappropriated Trade Secrets

In applying the statutory definition of "misappropriation" under the Uniform Trade Secret Act (UTSA) [*see Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)*] [*see § 565.103[4][c]*], corporate directors and officers who have joined a corporation after the initial trade secret misappropriation may be held personally liable if they used, through the corporation, the trade secrets and if, at the time of their use, they knew or had reason to know that knowledge of the trade secrets was derived from or through a person who had improperly acquired the knowledge or that the trade secrets were obtained by a person who owed a duty to the plaintiffs to maintain their secrecy [*PMC, Inc. v. Kadisha (2000) 78 Cal. App.4th 1368, 1383, 1385, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 663]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.110-565.129

[Reserved]

§§ 565.110[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.130

§ 565.130 Governing Law

An action based on intentional interference with economic relations is governed by case law principles that have their roots in the common law tort of inducing breach of contract [*see Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 387-391, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* ; *Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 822-823, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865 , overruled on other grounds, Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393 n.5, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* ; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Torts §§ 766-766B]. However, the California Supreme Court has emphasized the distinctions between interference with a contract and interference with prospective economic relations. The law grants greater solicitude to relationships that have ripened into agreements, while recognizing that relationships short of that "subsist in a zone where the risks and rewards of competition are dominant" [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 392, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* .

An action based on negligent interference with economic relations is governed by case law that begins with the Supreme Court's decision in *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 803-808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.131

§ 565.131 Terminology Used in This Analysis

"Interference with economic relations" is used by some courts, and is so used in this analysis, to describe all types of actionable interference short of interference with a contractual relationship, that is, wrongful interference with a person's general right to establish a lawful contractual, business, or other advantageous economic relationship [*see Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 381 n.2, 387-392, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* (setting forth preferred terminology, based on discussion of conceptual distinctions between interference with contract and interference with prospective economic relationships)]."Interference with contract" refers to the narrower cause of action, which provides for greater protection from interference by a stranger to the agreement [*see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 55, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 381 n.2, 392, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* .

In the past, courts had stated that the two causes of action were conceptually similar, even that interference with contract was one type of the broader tort of interference with prospective economic advantage [*see, e.g., Environmental Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 188, 193, 203 Cal. Rptr. 127, 680 P.2d 1086]* . The California Supreme Court has clearly repudiated this view of the actions [*see Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 381 n.2, 392, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* .

Several other terms are commonly used to describe specific types of interference (for example, "inducing breach of contract" and "interference with business relations") [*see Manor Inv. Co. v. F.W. Woolworth, Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 586, 592-594, 206 Cal. Rptr. 37 , overruled on other grounds, Applied Equip.t Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454]* . Counsel may prefer to use these terms in pleadings or other papers in accordance with local practice or personal preference.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.132

§ 565.132 Intentional Interference

[1] General Rule

A cause of action will lie for intentional interference with a contractual relationship, or with some other economic relationship containing a probability of future benefits accruing to plaintiff, when the interference is accomplished either by wrongful means or, in the case of interference with contract, by means that are lawful but lack sufficient justification [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 381 n.2, 392-393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* (plaintiff alleging interference with economic relations must plead and prove that interference was wrongful by some measure beyond fact of interference itself); *Herron v. State Farm Mutual Ins. Co. (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 202, 205, 14 Cal. Rptr. 294, 363 P.2d 310* (interference with contractual relationship); *A-Mark Coin Co. v. General Mills, Inc. (1983) 195 Cal. Rptr. 859* (same); *A.F. Arnold & Co. v. Pacific Prof'l Ins., Inc. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 710, 716, 104 Cal. Rptr. 96* (interference with noncontractual relationship)].

Interference by unlawful means is actionable because of the defendant's use of improper methods, whereas interference by lawful but unjustified means is actionable because of the defendant's improper purpose or motive [*see Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 18,144 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . Accordingly, "justification" for interference by lawful means generally depends on whether the defendant's purpose or motive is proper in the sense that it advances an interest with greater social significance than the interest with which it interferes [*Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 35, 112 P.2d 631* ; *see Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 228, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180* , *overruled on other grounds, Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454* (justification based on defendant's confidential relationship with third party is lost when defendant acts from improper motive rather than to protect welfare of third party)]. Although intentional interference with contract by lawful means is not actionable when it is justified, lack of justification is not an element of plaintiff's cause of action; justification must be affirmatively shown by the defendant [*see Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 449, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* ; *Rickel v. Schwinn Bicycle Co. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 648, 657-658, 192 Cal. Rptr. 732]* . For further discussion of this defense, see*§ 565.137[4]*. If the means of interference are unlawful, the interference cannot be justified and is beyond the reach of that affirmative defense. Unlawful means include defamation and other forms of tortious conduct [*Savage v. Pacific*

Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 449, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305] .

For a form of complaint for use in an action for intentional interference with economic relations, see*§ 565.290*.

[2] With Contractual Relationship

[a] Inducing Breach by Third Party

The first type of intentional interference held to be actionable was that involving a contractual relationship, specifically, a defendant's inducement of a third party to breach his or her contract with the plaintiff. Initially, this interference was actionable only if the means used were themselves unlawful. In 1941 the Supreme Court expressly recognized that interference by lawful but unjustified means was also actionable [*Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 35, 37-39, 112 P.2d 631* (repudiating contrary statements in *Boyson v. Thorn (1893) 98 Cal. 578, 33 P. 492*); *see* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 766; *see also § 565.132[1]*].

[b] Rendering Plaintiff's Performance More Difficult

The original tort of intentional interference by inducing a breach of contract [*see § 565.132[2][a]*] now extends to impose liability, not only when a defendant causes a third party to breach a contract with the plaintiff, but also when a defendant causes the plaintiff to breach a contract with a third party, or otherwise causes the plaintiff's own contract performance to be more difficult or burdensome [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1126-1127, 1129-1130, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* (but holding defendant's conduct not actionable on public policy grounds, as discussed in*§ 565.137[4][h]*); *Lipman v. Brisbane Elementary Sch. Dist. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 224, 232, 234, 11 Cal. Rptr. 97, 359 P.2d 465* ; *see* *Seaman's Direct Buying Serv., Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 766, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* ; Restatement (Second) of Torts § 766A; *see also § 565.132[1]*].

However, one court of appeal rejected a claim involving interference that made plaintiff's contract obligations to third parties more expensive, when the claim was made by a public entity with respect to payments to employees for additional public services required by defendant's conduct, that is, a county's increased payments to sheriffs for services required to break up defendants' blockade of a nuclear power facility. In that case the court held, without further discussion, that defendant's conduct was not the kind of "disruption" required to state a claim [*County of San Luis Obispo v. Abalone Alliance (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 848, 861, 223 Cal. Rptr. 846* (upholding general demurrer)].

[3] With Noncontractual Economic Relationship

Interference with a prospective economic relationship that is short of a contractual relationship can be the basis of liability, even though the law will protect contractual relationships to a greater extent [*see* *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 392-393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* .

Interference with noncontractual economic relationships, includes, most commonly, interference with a specific prospective contract [*Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 828-830, 827, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865* , *overruled on other grounds,* *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393 n.5, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* (interference with broker's prospective contract for commission fees)], but also includes interference with the operation or pursuit of any lawful business, calling, trade, or occupation [*Willis v. Santa Ana Cmty. Hosp. Ass'n (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 806, 810, 26 Cal. Rptr. 640, 376 P.2d 568* (interference with physician's pursuit of medical practice); for further discussion and a form of complaint for use in an action for interference with a physician's practice, *see* Ch. 416, *Physicians: Membership on Hospital Staffs or in Professional Associations*].

Many cases have discussed in*§ 565.172[1][a]*.

[4] First Amendment Limitations

First Amendment doctrines analogous to those that limit defamation claims apply to interference claims based on the alleged injurious falsehood of a statement [*see Blatty v. New York Times Co. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 1033, 1045, 232 Cal. Rptr. 542, 728 P.2d 1177* ; *Morningstar, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 676, 696, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547]* . Thus, for example, expressions of opinion may not form the basis of an action for interference with contract or with prospective economic advantage unless they contain false and defamatory statements of fact [*see Morningstar, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 676, 696, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 547* ; *see also Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 450, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* (action for interference with economic relations may not be based on alleged unfounded opinion)]. For detailed discussion of what constitutes a defamatory statement as well as *First Amendment* limitations on defamation actions, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* , and Levy, Golden & Sacks, California Torts, Ch. 45 (Matthew Bender).

For discussion of the defense of justification based on constitutional or statutory protection for the defendant's conduct, see*§ 565.137[e]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.133

§ 565.133 Elements of Intentional Interference

[1] In General

The following elements are necessary to state a cause of action for intentional interference with contract [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 448, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* ; *Settimo Assocs. v. Environ Sys., Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 842, 845, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757* ; *Wanland v. Los Gatos Lodge, Inc. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1507, 1522, 281 Cal. Rptr. 890* ; *see Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Sys. (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1442]* :

- The existence of a valid contract or some other economic relationship between the plaintiff and a third party containing a probability of future economic benefits to the plaintiff;
- The defendant's knowledge of the existence of the relationship;
- Intentional acts on the part of the defendant designed to disrupt the relationship;
- Actual disruption of the relationship; and
- Damages to the plaintiff proximately caused by the defendant's acts.

In a case involving interference with prospective economic relationship that is short of contractual, the plaintiff must plead and prove as part of its case-in-chief that the defendant not only knowingly interfered with the plaintiff's expectancy, but engaged in conduct that was wrongful by some legal measure other than the fact of interference itself [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* . An act is independently wrongful if it is unlawful, which means that it must be conduct proscribed by some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* . Although the defendant must know of the plaintiff's prospective economic advantage is required, a plaintiff isnot required to allege that the defendant acted with the specific

intent or purpose of disrupting the plaintiff's prospective economic advantage. It is sufficient that the plaintiff plead that the defendant knew that the interference was certain or substantially certain to occur as a result of the defendant's action [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1153, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* .

A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with existing as opposed to prospective contractual relations need not plead and prove that the defendant's interference was wrongful by some measure beyond the fact of the interference itself [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 55, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *LiMandri v. Judkins (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 343, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539]* . Pecuniary or economic benefit to the defendant is not an element of the action [*McCalden v. California Library Ass'n (9th Cir. 1990) 955 F.2d 1214, 1220]* .

For a general form of complaint for intentional interference with economic relations, *see § 565.290*. For discussion of elements necessary to plead an additional cause of action for conspiracy to interfere with economic relations, see*§ 565.134[1]*. For discussion of elements necessary to state cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations, see*§ 565.135[3]*.

[2] Existence of Economic Relationship

[a] Contractual

In an action for interference with a contractual relationship, the plaintiff must show an existing contract between the plaintiff and a third party [*Shamblin v. Berge (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 118, 122-123, 212 Cal. Rptr. 313]*]. Thus, there is no cause of action if, for example, the plaintiff is not a party to the alleged contract [*see Beckjord v. Slusher (1937) 22 Cal. App. 2d 559, 567-568, 71 P.2d 820* (contract between defendant and third party)], or if the alleged contract was no longer in force at the time of the alleged interference [*see Dryden v. Tri-Valley Growers (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 990, 997-998, 135 Cal. Rptr. 720* (third party cancelled contract before defendant's alleged interference)]. Only a "stranger to the contract" may be liable for interference with that contract, and an agent for a contracting principal, including a corporate agent or employee, cannot be liable for interfering with the principal's contract with the plaintiff if the alleged interference was committed when the agent was acting in the scope of the agency [*Mintz v. Blue Cross of California (2009) 172 Cal. App. 4th 1594, 1603-1604, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422]* .

The contract must also be valid [*Shamblin v. Berge (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 118, 122-123, 212 Cal. Rptr. 313* ; *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189, 331 P.2d 689]* . For purposes of this requirement, a contract is valid if it is not illegal, opposed to public policy, or otherwise void [*Shamblin v. Berge (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 118, 124, 212 Cal. Rptr. 313]* . A contract that is entirely void ab initio is not a basis for an action for interference with contract and, further, it is not a basis for an action for interference with a noncontractual economic relationship because it cannot provide any probable future economic benefit [*see A-Mark Coin Co. v. General Mills, Inc. (1982) 148 Cal. App. 3d 312, 320-322* (contract void as one subject to vacated order of probate court); *see also § 565.133[b]* and*§ 565.137[1]*]. A contract that is illegal or contrary to public policy is not a basis for an action for intentional interference [*Renaissance Realty, Inc. v. Soriano (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 13, 17-18* (fraudulently conceived real estate agreement)].

It is sometimes stated that an existing contract that is voidable, not void, because of the statute of frauds, lack of consideration, uncertainty of terms, or other formal defect, nonetheless satisfies the validity requirement [*Shamblin v. Berge (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 118, 124, 212 Cal. Rptr. 313* ; *see Zimmerman v. Bank of Am. (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 55, 58, 12 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . Such a contract is said to be valid as to the defendant, because its voidability constitutes an affirmative defense that may only be asserted by a party to the contract [*see Golden v. Anderson (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 714, 719, 64 Cal. Rptr. 404]* . However, other courts, including the Supreme Court, have indicated that an action for intentional interference may be based on a voidable contract, not so much because it is valid but because the action may also be based on interference with noncontractual economic relationship [*see Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d*

815, 822-823, 827-830, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865 (overruled on other grounds in *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393 n.5, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740*); *Zimmerman v. Bank of Am. (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 55, 57-58, 12 Cal. Rptr. 319]* . Still other courts have held that an unenforceable contract cannot form the basis of a cause of action for intentional interference with contractual relations [*Bed, Bath & Beyond of La Jolla, Inc. v. La Jolla Vill. Square Venture Partners (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 867, 879, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830]* .

If a valid, existing contract is shown, the fact that it is terminable at will does not preclude recovery [*Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 448, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* ; *see Speegle v. Board of Fire Underwriters (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 34, 39-41, 172 P.2d 867* ; *see also § 565.137[4][b]*]. However, if a party terminates a contract that the party was free to terminate, there is no breach of contract, and an issue arises as to whether a third party should be held liable for inducing a party to terminate such a contract. The California Supreme Court has noted that interference with an at-will contract is properly viewed as an interference with prospective economic advantage, rather than as interference with an existing contract, because the expectation of an at-will contract is that of a future relationship between the parties to the contract [*Reeves v. Hanlon (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1140, 1151-1152, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 289, 95 P.3d 513]* .

For example, the Supreme Court has held that a plaintiff may recover for interference with an at-will employment relationship, although the plaintiff must plead and prove the elements of a cause of action for interference with prospective economic advantage. In accordance with the elements of that cause of action, the plaintiff must show that the defendant engaged in conduct that is independently wrongful--that is, conduct that is proscribed by some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Reeves v. Hanlon (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1140, 1152-1153, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 289, 95 P.3d 513* ; *see § 565.133[1]*]. Therefore, an employer may pursue an action against a competing employer for interfering with the plaintiff's at-will employment relationships, although the plaintiff must show that the competing employer engaged in wrongful conduct that consisted of something more than just hiring away the plaintiff's employees [*Reeves v. Hanlon (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 1140, 1154-1155, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 289, 95 P.3d 513]* .

A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with existing as opposed to prospective contractual relations need not plead and prove that the defendant's interference was wrongful by some measure beyond the fact of the interference itself [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 55, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *LiMandri v. Judkins (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 343, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539]* .

[b] Noncontractual

In an action for interference with noncontractual economic relations, the plaintiff must show the existence of an economic relationship, between himself or herself and a third party, that contains a probability of future economic benefit to the plaintiff [*see Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 827, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865* (overruled on other grounds in *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393 n.5, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740*); *Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 448, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* ; *see also Roth v. Rhodes (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 530, 546, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706* (existence of business relationship is essential element of tort of intentional interference with prospective business advantage; element not satisfied by allegation that defendant's conduct resulted in loss of potential future referrals and patient contacts)]. The "future economic benefit" refers to an expectancy in ordinary commercial dealings, not, for example, an expectancy in obtaining a license to do business [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58]* .

This expectancy must be "probable" in the sense that it is more than a mere hope or desire for an economic relationship or future benefit. Thus, an expected economic relationship with potential patrons was held to lack sufficient probability when it was contingent on plaintiff's first obtaining a business license from a government agency vested with broad discretion to grant or deny the license [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330-331, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58]* . Similarly, the outcome of a sporting event is normally too uncertain to support an allegation that a plaintiff had a

reasonable expectancy of winning prize money but for the defendant's wrongful interference [*see* *Youst v. Longo (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 64, 74-79, 233 Cal. Rptr. 294, 729 P.2d 728* (public policy prohibited recovery based on interference with opportunity to win prize in sporting event)]. A plaintiff's expectation of winning a judgment for punitive damages or one that will be nondischargeable in bankruptcy also lacks sufficient probability [*see* *Hepe v. Paknad (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 412, 420-421, 244 Cal. Rptr. 823* (defendant concealed driver who injured plaintiff while allegedly driving under the influence of alcohol, preventing police or plaintiff from establishing driver's intoxication)].

By contrast, allegations that defendant's conduct caused a newspaper to cease accepting articles written by plaintiff (a freelance reporter) for publication sufficiently alleged interference with an economic relationship offering a probability of future economic benefit because plaintiff could expect payment for articles that might otherwise have been accepted for publication [*Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 449, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305]* .

Not every business relationship will support an action for intentional interference with economic advantage. For example, the possibility of obtaining a discount on a loan by threatening default is not a protected economic interest for purposes of the tort [*AB Group v. Wertin (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1022, 1034, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 652]* . Whether the business relationship between the plaintiff and the third party is sufficient to support the tort of interference with noncontractual economic advantage is a question of fact [*Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 830 n.7, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865 , overruled on other grounds,* *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393 n.5, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* ; *Tri-Growth Ctr. City, Ltd. v. Silldorf, Burdman, Duignan & Eisenberg (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1153-1154, 265 Cal. Rptr. 330]* .

[3] Defendant's Knowledge of Relationship

The second essential element to a cause of action for intentional interference with contract or economic relations is that the defendant had knowledge of the existence of the relationship interfered with [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189, 331 P.2d 689]* . Showing the defendant's actual knowledge is, in effect, the first step in establishing the fact that he or she acted with the necessary intent. If the defendant had no knowledge, he or she cannot be liable for intentional interference [*Seaman's Direct Buying Serv., Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 765-766, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* ; *see* *Summit Mach. Tool Mfg. v. Victor CNC Sys. (9th Cir. 1993) 7 F.3d 1434, 1442* ; for discussion concerning intent, see*§ 565.133[4]*]. Thus, it is not enough to show that the defendant learned of the economic relationship *after* he or she performed the interfering action [*Dryden v. Tri-Valley Growers (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 990, 995, 135 Cal. Rptr. 720* ; *Springer v. Singleton (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 184, 189, 63 Cal. Rptr. 770]* .

When the claim involves interference with the economic relations of plaintiff and a third party, it is not necessary that the defendant's knowledge include an awareness of the plaintiff's specific identity or name, so long as plaintiff is identified in some manner. For example, the defendant's knowledge is sufficient when he or she knows that the third party was negotiating a lease with a particular, but unnamed, lessee [*Ramona Manor Convalescent Hosp. v. Care Enters. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1120, 1130-1132, 225 Cal. Rptr. 120]* .

[4] Intentional Acts by Defendant

The third essential element to a cause of action for intentional interference with contract or economic relations is an intentional act by the defendant designed to disrupt the economic relationship [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 448, 449, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* ; *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189, 331 P.2d 689]* . This act may be pleaded as an ultimate fact, such as a defendant's advising, counseling, or persuading a third party to terminate his or her contract with the plaintiff [*see* *Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 221, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *but see* *Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hosp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 590, 619, 262 Cal. Rptr. 842* (conclusionary pleading that defendant "embarked on course of intentional conduct designed to disrupt plaintiff's

relationship with employer" was insufficient)].

In an action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage that has not ripened into a contract, a plaintiff is not required to allege that the defendant acted with the specific intent or purpose of disrupting the plaintiff's prospective economic advantage. It is sufficient that the plaintiff plead that the defendant knew that the interference was certain or substantially certain to occur as a result of its action [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1153, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* . However, as part of its burden of pleading and proof, the plaintiff must also show that the defendant's conduct was wrongful by some measure other than the fact of the interference. This requires a showing that the conduct was independently unlawful--that is, that it violated some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* . Therefore, the defendant's intent may in some cases be relevant to showing that the conduct was unlawful by some independent legal standard [*see Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1161, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* .

A plaintiff seeking to recover for intentional interference with existing as opposed to prospective contractual relations need not plead and prove that the defendant's interference was wrongful by some measure beyond the fact of the interference itself [*Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 55, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *LiMandri v. Judkins (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 343, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539]* . The defendant's act need not be wrongful in itself, but the plaintiff must nevertheless show facts that take the act out of the realm of legitimate business transactions [*Rickel v. Schwinn Bicycle Co. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 648, 657-658, 192 Cal. Rptr. 732* ; *see Tri-Growth Ctr. City, Ltd. v. Silldorf, Burdman, Duignan & Eisenberg (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1153-1154, 265 Cal. Rptr. 330* (defendant's acts must be somehow wrongful, but showing is met by facts taking defendant's acts out of realm of legitimate business transactions)]. Thus, in proving this element, particularly when the act is itself lawful, it is crucial to show the defendant's intent in acting. General intent to perform the act is not enough; the defendant must have intended specifically to interfere with the plaintiff's economic relationship [*Seaman's Direct Buying Serv., Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 765-766, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* ; *Ramona Manor Convalescent Hosp. v. Care Enters. (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1120, 1130-1131, 225 Cal. Rptr. 120]* . An attorney's payment of fees recovered from a third party to his or her client rather than to the insurance company lienor cannot be construed as an act designed to induce breach or disruption of a contractual relationship [*Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Zerin (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 445, 458, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707]* .

In a claim of intentional interference with contractual relations, the actor's primary purpose need not be the disruption of the contract; actionable conduct may include interfering conduct taken not only with the desire to interfere, but for some other purpose as well [*see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 56, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* ; *see also* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 766, cmt. j]. Moreover, intent to interfere may be inferred from a defendant's intentional performance of an act substantially certain to result in interference [*Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 449, 450, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305]* , assuming, of course, that he or she also had the prerequisite awareness of the existence of the relationship [*see § 565.133[3]*].

[5] Actual Interference

The fourth essential element to a cause of action for intentional interference with contract or economic relations is that defendant's intentional act caused interference resulting in injury to the plaintiff [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189, 331 P.2d 689]* . In other words, there must be some showing that injurious interference did, in fact, occur [*see Davis v. Nadrich (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 414* ; *Short v. Nevada Joint Union High Sch. Dist. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 1087, 1101, 210 Cal. Rptr. 297* (both cases; no actual interference when conduct by third parties that was allegedly induced by defendants did not actually constitute breach of contract terms); *see also § 565.132[2], [3]*]. An interference is an action designed to induce breach or disruption of a contractual relationship [*Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Zerin (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 445, 458, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707* (attorney's payment of fees recovered from third party, to

client rather than to insurance company lienor, insufficient act of interference)]. Also, there must be some showing that the defendant's intentional act was a cause in fact of this interference [*see Dryden v. Tri-Valley Growers (1977) 65 Cal App. 3d 990, 995-996, 997, 135 Cal. Rptr. 720* (no allegation that alleged breach was result of defendant's alleged conduct); *see also Springer v. Singleton (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 184, 189, 63 Cal. Rptr. 770* (defendant not liable because evidence supported finding that alleged breach of contract with plaintiff was initiated by third parties and occurred before defendant's alleged acts); for discussion concerning proximate causation, as distinguished from cause in fact, see *§ 565.133[7]*].

In one case, for example, a physician was unable to state a cause of action against another physician at the same hospital who allegedly refused to examine plaintiff's patients in retaliation for plaintiff's having reported instances of a third physician's misconduct to the hospital. Although the complaint alleged that plaintiff's relationship with the hospital was actually disrupted because plaintiff had to seek other physicians and the welfare of plaintiff's patients was actually threatened, there was no allegation that plaintiff lost patients [*Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hosp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 590, 619-620, 262 Cal. Rptr. 842]* . In addition, having to seek other physicians or threats to patient welfare are not the kind of economic interest that this tort is designed to protect [*Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hosp. (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 590, 620, 262 Cal. Rptr. 842]* .

[6] Wrongfulness of Interference With Prospective Economic Relations

A plaintiff seeking to recover for an alleged interference with prospective contractual or economic relations must plead and prove as part of its case-in-chief that the defendant engaged in conduct that was wrongful by some measure other than the fact of interference itself [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* . An act is independently wrongful for these purposes if it is unlawful, which means that it must be conduct proscribed by some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* .

Actions that are contractually permissible are not wrongful for these purposes [*see, e.g., Lange v. TIG Ins. Co. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1187-1188, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39* ; *Arntz Contracting Co. v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 464, 476-480, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888]* .

It is also insufficient to allege that the defendant engaged in tortious conduct distinct from or only tangentially related to the conduct that constituted the alleged interference [*LiMandri v. Judkins (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 342, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539]* . One court of appeal opinion held that allegations that the defendant's conduct was unethical, or violated vague industry standards, was insufficient to meet the test of wrongfulness [*Gemini Aluminum Corp. v. California Custom Shapes, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 1249, 1259, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358]* . However, the result may be different if the industry standards are more defined, such as with written industry standards. In a subsequent case, the court of appeal held that in an action between competitors who are bound by well-defined, established rules or standards of a trade, association, or profession, a violation of those rules or standards may constitute wrongful conduct under the *Korea Supply* standard [*Stevenson Real Estate Servs., Inc. v. CB Richard Ellis Real Estate Servs., Inc. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1223, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 235]* . The rule or standard allegedly violated must be independently actionable, however, which necessarily requires that the rule or standard provide for, or give rise to, a sanction or means of enforcement for a violation. A right to arbitration between aggrieved members of the trade or association would be sufficient to meet this requirement [*Stevenson Real Estate Servs., Inc. v. CB Richard Ellis Real Estate Servs., Inc. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1223-1224, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 235]* . If a particular rule or standard unduly restricts free competition, that particular rule may not be an appropriate basis for an interference action [*Stevenson Real Estate Servs., Inc. v. CB Richard Ellis Real Estate Servs., Inc. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1223, 42 Cal. Rptr. 3d 235]* .

[7] Proximately Caused Damages

The final element of a cause of action for intentional interference with contract or economic relations is that the defendant's intentional act proximately caused plaintiff's damages [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189, 331 P.2d 689]* . To meet this burden, plaintiff must prove that defendant's conduct was a substantial factor in causing the harm alleged [*Bank of New York v. Fremont Gen. Corp. (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 902, 909-910* ; *CACI No. 2201*]. The plaintiff must also show that the injury to his or her economic interests resulted in actual damages or economic loss [*see Baldwin v. Marina City Props., Inc. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 393, 407, 145 Cal. Rptr. 406* (no cause of action for interference with security agreement stated when there was no allegation of any loss or impairment of value of security); *see also § 565.136[1]*].

In an action for inducing breach of contract, one court of appeal held that the complaint was defective because it included no allegation that the contract would otherwise have been performed but for the alleged interference [*Augustine v. Trucco (1954) 124 Cal. App. 2d 229, 246-247, 268 P.2d 780]* . Other courts of appeal, however, have held that this allegation is sufficiently, if impliedly, stated by the more general allegation of proximately caused damages [*Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 189 n.2, 331 P.2d 689* ; *see also Allen v. Powell (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 502, 508, 56 Cal. Rptr. 715]* .

The necessity of showing damages is particularly important in actions for interference with noncontractual economic relationships, and in such a case this showing is related to the probability of economic benenfit in the relationship interfered with [*see § 565.133[2][b]*]. For example, when a plaintiff brought an action on the basis of adefendant's alleged inducement of third parties not to rent him business space, his complaint was held to be defective because it failed to allege that he would otherwise have consummated a rental agreement, and also because it failed to allege any facts tending to show the nature or amount of any resulting damage [*Campbell v. Rayburn (1954) 129 Cal. App. 2d 232, 234-235, 276 P.2d 671* ; *see also Eichman v. Fotomat Corp. (9th Cir. 1989) 880 F.2d 149, 167-168* (applying California law; no cause of action established when there was no evidence that would support inference that decline in franchisee's sales was caused by franchisor's company stores in same area); *Wilson v. Loew's Inc. (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 183, 190-195, 298 P.2d 152* (no cause of action stated for interference with prospective contractual relationship when plaintiffs failed to show actual damages in that they otherwise would have entered into contract)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.134

§ 565.134 Conspiracy to Interfere

[1] Elements

A cause of action for civil conspiracy will lie against third persons who pursuant to a conspiracy have interfered with a contractual or other economic relationship resulting in damages [*Wise v. Southern Pac. Co. (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 50, 65, 35 Cal. Rptr. 652* , (disapproved by *Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454* , to extent that it held that party can be liable in tort for conspiracy to interfere with its own contract)].

A conspiracy is not actionable unless a civil wrong has been committed resulting in damage. The general elements of a cause of action for conspiracy are therefore stated to be [*Olivet v. Frischling (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 831, 837, 164 Cal. Rptr. 87 , disapproved on other grounds, Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454* ; *Wise v. Southern Pac. Co. (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 50, 64, 35 Cal. Rptr. 652]* :

- The formation and operation of the conspiracy,
- The wrongful act done pursuant thereto, and
- The damage resulting from such act.

In other words, there is no actionable conspiracy when acts done pursuant to the conspiracy are not themselves actionable. For example, in a case involving interference with contract, a jury verdict finding defendants liable for conspiracy was inconsistent with another verdict finding in their favor on the underlying cause of action for interference [*Manor Inv. Co. v. F.W. Woolworth, Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 586, 594-596, 206 Cal. Rptr. 37* (retrial required)]. For further discussion relating to civil conspiracy in general, including forms of complaint based on conspiracy to interfere with a contract or other economic relation, see Ch. 126, *Conspiracy* .

[2] Contracting Party Not Liable for Conspiracy to Interfere With Own Contract

A contracting party cannot be held liable in tort for conspiracy to interfere with its own contract [*Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 507-508 & n.10* (disapproving prior court of appeal decisions holding to contrary)]. Because a party to a contract owes no tort duty to refrain from interference with its own contract [*see § 565.137[2]*], a contracting party cannot be bootstrapped into tort liability by allegations of conspiracy [*Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 514, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454]* . To hold otherwise would circumvent limitations on the damages recoverable for breach of contract and obliterate the distinction between tort and contract recovery [*see Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 516-518, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454]* .

Similarly, because a corporate officer or employee acting within the scope of his or her authority cannot be held liable for inducing a corporation's breach of contract [*see § 565.137[2]*], such a corporate officer or agent cannot be held liable for conspiring to induce the corporation's breach of a contract [*Grosvenor Props., Ltd. v. Southmark Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 1149, 1153-1154* (applying California law)].

Prior to the Supreme Court's decision in *Applied Equip. Corp.*, courts of appeal had held that parents, subsidiaries, and other affiliates may be liable for conspiring to induce breach of the affiliate's contract [*see GHK Assocs. v. Mayer Group, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 856, 881, 274 Cal. Rptr. 168]* . Whether these holdings remain good law after *Applied Equip.* is unclear. To the extent that the parent or subsidiary is considered to be in privity of contract with its affiliate, such holdings would appear to conflict with the reasoning of the *Applied Equip.* decision. In some cases, the parent or subsidiary may be able to successfully assert the manager's or financial interest privileges [*see §§ 565.137[4][c][ii], 565.137[4][d]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.135

§ 565.135 Negligent Interference

[1] No Action Under Prior Law

There is no cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations under the majority rule of common law jurisdictions [*see* Restatement (Second) of Torts, § 766C, cmt. a].

The Supreme Court has cited the majority rule with approval and held that a plaintiff who had contracted to provide lifetime health care to a third party could not recover the increased expenses incurred after the defendant negligently injured the third party [*Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 636-637, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073]* . This decision was interpreted by lower courts to bar recovery for negligent interferenceunder any circumstances [*see Rodrigues v. Campbell Indus. (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 494, 499, 151 Cal. Rptr. 90* ; *Adams v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 37, 39-41, 123 Cal. Rptr. 216* ; *Costello v. Wells Fargo Bank (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 90, 94-96, 65 Cal. Rptr. 612* ; *Stromer v. City of Yuba City (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 286, 288-291, 37 Cal. Rptr. 240]* .

[2] Cause of Action Recognized

In *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory* [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* , the Supreme Court changed its earlier position and recognized a cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations. The court in *J'Aire* held that the plaintiff, a restaurant operator leasing its business premises, had stated a cause of action against defendant for business losses resulting from the latter's negligent delay in completing a contract with the owner of the premises to construct certain improvements [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* .

The key issue considered by the court in *J'Aire* was whether, under the circumstances, the defendant owed a duty of care to the plaintiff. Unlike its earlier decision in *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 636, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073* , the court disregarded the majority common law rule that there is no duty. Instead, the court analysed the issue of duty under general negligence principles under which a person is generally liable for negligent injury of another, and any exception to this rule on the ground that no duty of care exists is determined on a case-by-case basis, primarily by focusing on the foreseeability of the risk of harm [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24*

Cal. 3d 799, 803-806, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60 (also citing *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*)]. The court distinguished the *Fifield* decision, noting that the facts of the latter case did not show enough foreseeability of injury to justify imposing a duty of care [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 806-807, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* , *disapproving Adams v. Southern Pac. Transp. Co. (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 37, 47, 123 Cal. Rptr. 216* (*Fifield* decision did not entirely foreclose recovery for negligent interference)].

To determine whether a specific duty of care existed in an action involving negligent interference with economic relations, the court relied on another line of negligence cases, beginning with *Biakanja v. Irving (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 647, 320 P.2d 16* . Under this line of cases, when a special relationship exists between the parties, a plaintiff may recover for the loss of expected economic advantage occasioned by a defendant's negligent performance of a contract even though the parties were not in contractual privity [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *see, e.g.,* *Biakanja v. Irving (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 647, 648-651, 320 P.2d 16* (plaintiff beneficiary allowed to recover value of bequest lost due to defendant's negligent preparation of third party's will); for further discussion of this line of cases, *see* Ch. 380, *Negligence*].

The precise scope of a cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations, as defined by the court in *J'Aire*, is somewhat unclear. At one point the Court indicated that such a cause of action would merely be limited to cases in which the risk of harm is foreseeable and closely connected with the defendant's conduct, and in which damages are not wholly speculative and the injury is not part of the plaintiff's ordinary business risk [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . However, it also appears, under the criteria that govern such a cause of action, that recovery may be more specifically limited to cases in which the defendant's negligent conduct relates to some specific "transaction," relationship, or activity that, to some extent, is intended or known to have an effect on plaintiff's economic relations [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . In fact, those cases that have so far upheld a cause of action for negligent interference have specifically involved a defendant's negligent performance of a contract with a third party, when that performance had a more or less direct affect on plaintiff's economic relations [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463]* . For further discussion, see*§ 565.135[4][b]*.

There is, on the other hand, no apparent reason to limit recovery for negligent interference to the type of interference discussed in *J'Aire*--that is, negligent interference with noncontractual or prospective economic relationships. The court in *J'Aire* itself described the cause of action as one for negligent interference with "prospective economic advantage" [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* , and it has used this same term in intentional interference cases to include contractual as well as noncontractual interference [*Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 822-823, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865* ; *see* discussion under Terminology Used in This Part]. Moreoever, one court of appeal, applying the criteria set forth in *J'Aire*, held that a complaint was sufficient to state a cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations when the facts involved interference with a contract. In that case the plaintiff, a general contractor, alleged that its own performance of a contract was rendered more burdensome, in that it was forced to pay liquidated damages, due to the defendant's negligent delay in performing a separate contract to furnish supplies to one of plaintiff's subcontractors [*Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463]* .

Conversely, one court of appeal case in 2009 held that there is no cause of action for negligent interference with an existing contract. In that opinion, the court noted that the California Supreme Court had rejected such a cause of action in the 1960 case of *Fifield Manor v. Finston* [*see* *Fifield Manor v. Finston (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 632, 636, 7 Cal. Rptr. 377, 354 P.2d 1073]* . Because that case has never been overruled, by *J'Aire* or any subsequent Supreme Court case, the court of appeal concluded that it was still bound by its holding [*Davis v. Nadrich (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 1, 9-10, 94 Cal. Rptr. 3d 414]* .

For a form of complaint for use in an action for negligent interference with economic relations, *see § 565.291*.

[3] Elements of Action--In General

As discussed in*§ 565.135[2]*, the leading Supreme Court opinion in *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory* [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* indicates that a cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations is elementally similar to negligence actions in general, and in particular to actions to recover for economic losses resulting from negligence in performing a contract to which the plaintiff was a third party beneficiary [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *see also Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463]* .

The elements of a general cause of action for negligence are: (1) a legal duty to use due care (2) breach of that duty, (3) and the breach as proximate cause of resulting injury and damages [*see United States Liab. Ins. Co. v. Haidinger-Hayes, Inc. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 586, 594, 83 Cal. Rptr. 418, 463 P.2d 770* (general elements of actionable negligence); *see also Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 513-514, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851* ; for further discussion relating to the elements of a cause of action for negligence generally, *see* Ch. 380, *Negligence*].

The court of appeal subsequent to the Supreme Court's opinion in the *Della Penna* case [*see Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* ; *see § 565.133*], held that the Supreme Court's requirement that plaintiff prove that defendant's conduct was wrongful by some measure beyond the fact of the interference applies regardless whether the alleged interference was intentional or merely negligent [*National Med. Transp. Network v. Deloitte & Touche (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 412, 440, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 720]* . However, it seems likely that the breach of a negligence duty of care would satisfy the requirement of independently wrongful conduct. In fact, one court of appeal opinion agreeing that wrongfulness is an element of an action for negligent interference cited with seeming approval language from another court opinion suggesting that wrongful conduct is subsumed within a finding that a legal duty of care was owed [*see Lange v. TIG Ins. Co. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1187-1189, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 39]* . It is clear, in any event, that when negligent interference is alleged, plaintiff is not required to prove that defendant's conduct was intentional or willful. Negligent conduct is sufficient [*Venhaus v. Schultz (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1072, 1079, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 432* ; *see CACI No. 2204*].

[4] Duty of Care

[a] Factors Considered

The Supreme Court in *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799* adopted the following criteria for determining the existence of a duty of care [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *see Biakanja v. Irving (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 647, 648-651, 320 P.2d 16* ; *see also § 565.135[2]*]:

- The extent to which the transaction was intended to affect the plaintiff,
- The foreseeability of harm to the plaintiff,
- The degree of certainty that the plaintiff suffered injury,
- The closeness of the connection between the defendant's conduct and the injury suffered,
- The moral blame attached to the defendant's conduct, and
- The policy of preventing future harm.

The court concluded that these criteria should be applied, together with ordinary tort principles such as proximate cause,

to determine recovery for negligent interference [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* .

[b] Extent to Which Transaction Intended to Affect Plaintiff

The first criterion is the extent to which the "transaction" is intended to affect the plaintiff [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . This appears to require some showing that the defendant entered into or engaged in a contract, relationship, activity, or other "transaction" that did not involve the plaintiff as a party but which was nonetheless intended or known to affect an economic relation that contained a probability of future economic benefit to the plaintiff [*see, e.g.*, *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* (defendant contracted with owner to improve business premises leased by plaintiff); *Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463* (defendant contracted with one of plaintiff's subcontractors to furnish supplies); *see also* *Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330-331, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* (intentional injury to economic interest not actionable when that interest contained no probable economic benefit to plaintiff)]. For further discussion of the possible limitations imposed by this "transaction" criterion, see*§ 565.135[2]*.

[c] Foreseeability of Harm to Plaintiff

The second criterion is the foreseeability of harm to the plaintiff [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . The court in *J'Aire* frequently emphasized this requirement, so it would appear to be essential for the plaintiff to show that there was a foreseeable risk of harm to his or her economic relationship if defendant failed to use ordinary care in performing the alleged transaction [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-805, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* (plaintiff repeatedly told defendant that his prolonged construction disruption was adversely affecting operation of plaintiff's business)].

[d] Certainty of Injury and Nexus of Defendant's Conduct to Injury

The third and fourth criteria are the degree of certainty that the plaintiff suffered injury and the closeness of the connection between the defendant's conduct and the plaintiff's injury [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . The court in *J'Aire* emphasized the latter criterion, the nexus between the negligent conduct and injury, together with foreseeability [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 806-808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . Thus, it appears to be essential that the plaintiff show a close connection between thedefendant's negligence in performing the transaction and the plaintiff's injury. Moreover, the plaintiff must also show that the injury was not a part of his or her ordinary business risk, and that it resulted in relatively certain, or at least not wholly speculative, damages [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 805, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* (plaintiff could not operate business as direct result of defendant's unreasonable delays in performance); *cf.* *Worldvision Enters., Inc. v. American Broad. Cos., Inc. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 589, 596, 191 Cal. Rptr. 148* (no cause of action when injury was ordinary business risk known to plaintiffs)]. This showing appears to be identical to that necessary to establish the third element of a general cause of action for negligence--that is, proximately caused damages [*cf.* *United States Liab. Ins. Co. v. Haidinger-Hayes, Inc. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 586, 594, 83 Cal. Rptr. 418, 463 P.2d 770]* .

[e] Moral Blame

The fifth criterion is the moral blame attached to the defendant's conduct [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . In this sense it is at least helpful if a plaintiff can show some particular blameworthiness in the defendant's conduct [*see* *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* (defendant's delay continued after his attention was drawn to its adverse effect on plaintiff's business)]. However, simple negligence may be enough if the other criteria support a finding of duty [*see* *Chameleon Eng'g Corp.v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463* (cause of action stated although

blameworthiness of defendant's conduct not significant either way)].

[f] Public Policy to Prevent Future Harm

The last criterion is the public policy of preventing future harm [*J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* . In this sense it may be helpful if there is some expression of public policy that is specifically directed against the defendant's conduct [*see J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* (defendant's negligent delay also constituted grounds for disciplinary action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7119*)]. One court of appeal has indicated that *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*, holding persons liable for negligence generally, is a sufficient expression of public policy when the other criteria support a finding of duty [*Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463]* . On the other hand, in considering this criterion, other, countervailing public policies may also be considered to prevent a finding of duty even though other criteria support such a finding. For example, a defendant was held not liable on this ground for offering an opinion in good faith on a matter of public interest, in view of the countervailing public policy that strongly favors this conduct [*Worldvision Enters., Inc. v. American Broad. Cos., Inc. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 589, 596, 598, 191 Cal. Rptr. 148]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.136

§ 565.136 Remedies

[1] Damages--In General

Damages for intentional interference with economic relations are recoverable by analogy to other intentional torts, and recovery is allowed for all resulting harm, including expenses, mental distress, and damage to business reputation [*Duff v. Engelberg (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 505, 508, 47 Cal. Rptr. 114* ; *see Civ. Code § 3333*; *Guillory v. Godfrey (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 628, 632-634, 286 P.2d 474* (upholding award of damages for mental distress and medical expenses incurred for aggravation of existing condition)]. The measure of tort damages for economic loss is reflected by loss of profits, expenses incurred, or similar concrete evidences of injury [*Elsbach v. Mulligan (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 354, 366-367, 136 P.2d 651* (upholding capitalization of past profits as method of measuring damage to value of business in action for interference); *see also Mayes v. Sturdy N. Sales, Inc. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 69, 84, 154 Cal. Rptr. 43* (upholding recovery of loss of net profits); *Crummer v. Zalk (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 794, 797-798, 57 Cal. Rptr. 185* (upholding recovery of difference between contract price and value of what plaintiff parted with); Restatement (Second) of Torts § 774A(1) (recovery allowed for pecuniary loss, proximately caused consequential losses, and for mental suffering or damage to reputation that may reasonably be expected to result from interference)].

Punitive damages may also be recovered for intentional interference if the defendant acted with malice, fraud, or oppression [*Duff v. Engelberg (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 505, 509, 47 Cal. Rptr. 114* ; *see Civ. Code § 3294(a)*; *Guillory v. Godfrey (1955) 134 Cal. App. 2d 628, 633, 286 P.2d 474* (upholding award of punitive damages)].

In cases involving negligent interference with economic relations, recovery is limited by ordinary principles of proximate cause governing other negligence actions. In addition, damages may not be wholly speculative nor based on injuries that are merely a part of the plaintiff's ordinary business risks [*see J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60]* .

For discussion concerning the effect of alternate contract remedies in a case involving interference with contract relations, see*§ 565.136[2]*. For forms of complaint for intentional or negligent interference with economic relations including causes of action for monetary relief, see*§§ 565.290* and *565.291*. For discussion and forms relating to tort

damages generally, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

[2] Effect of Available Contract Remedies

A defendant's liability in tort for intentional interference with contract is not affected by the fact that the plaintiff may also have a cause of action in contract against the defaulting party to the contract, even if the plaintiff has reduced the latter claim toan unsatisfied judgment. A plaintiff may even recover from both wrongdoers, as long as there is no double recovery of compensatory damages. For example, he or she may obtain specific performance and contract damages from the defaulting party, but may still recover any additional, noncontractual damages and punitive damages from the defendant tortfeasor [*Duff v. Engelberg (1965) 237 Cal. App. 2d 505, 507-508, 47 Cal. Rptr. 114* ; *see also Owens v. Palos Verdes Monaco (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 855, 872, 191 Cal. Rptr. 381* (cause of action for damages for conspiracy to interfere with contractual relations not barred by cause of action for specific performance of contract); Restatement (Second) of Torts § 774A(2)].

[3] Injunctive Relief

Injunctive relief is available to restrain the threat of future interference with economic relations [*Uptown Enters. v. Strand (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 45, 51, 15 Cal. Rptr. 486* ; *California Grape Control Bd., Ltd. v. California Produce Corp., Ltd. (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 242, 244, 40 P.2d 846]* . For example, it may be available to restrain continued harassment of a business operator and his or her patrons [*see Uptown Enters. v. Strand (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 45, 50, 15 Cal. Rptr. 486* (harassment of drive-in theater operator and patrons)], or to restrain a competitor's continuing inducement of suppliers to breach their contracts with plaintiff [*California Grape Control Bd., Ltd. v. California Produce Corp., Ltd. (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 242, 243, 40 P.2d 846* (inducement by produce marketer of individual growers to breach their contracts with plaintiff competitor)]. Relief is afforded on the same basis as in other suits for injunctive relief, such as when damages are not sufficiently ascertainable or are otherwise inadequate relief [*see Huong Que, Inc. v. Luu (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 400, 418, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527* ; *Uptown Enters. v. Strand (1961) 195 Cal. App. 2d 45, 50, 15 Cal. Rptr. 486* ; *see also Civ. Code § 3422* (grounds for permanent injunction)].

For a form of complaint for intentional interference with economic relations including a cause of action for injunctive relief, see*§ 565.290*. For discussion and forms governing injunctive relief generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.137

§ 565.137 Defenses

[1] Controverting Matter

A defendant in an action for interference may, in addition to other general defenses, simply rebut one or more of the essential elements that the plaintiff must prove. For example, in an action for interference with contract, a defendant may show that he or she was not the "moving" or proximate cause of the breach in issue [*see Eltolad Music, Inc. v. April Music, Inc. (1975) 139 Cal. App. 3d 697, 703, 706, 708, 188 Cal. Rptr. 858* (breach of contract be tween plaintiff and third party was at instigation of third party)], or that the contract was entirely void or illegal at the time of the alleged interference [*see A-Mark Coin Co. v. General Mills, Inc. (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 312, 320-322, 195 Cal. Rptr. 859* (contract was void as one made pursuant to vacated probate order); *cf.* § 565.133[a]]. Similarly, a defendant may rely on his or her lack of any knowledge of the existence of the economic relationship in issue [*see Contemporary Invs., Inc. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 999, 1002-1003, 193 Cal. Rptr. 822]* .

For further discussion relating to each essential element, see*§ 565.135[3]* and*§ 565.135[4]*. For general forms denying allegations of a complaint, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[2] Defendant as Party to Contractual Relationship

[a] In General

Relief based on tort liability for intentional interference with contractual relations may be sought only against those who are not themselves parties to the contractual relationship. This is because contract remedies may be pursued against the parties thereto, and allowance of tort recovery against parties to a contract would circumvent limitations applicable to recovery of damages in contract actions, such as those preventing an award of punitive damages or damages for emotional distress [*Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 24, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *Dryden v. Tri-Valley Growers (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 990, 998-999, 135 Cal. Rptr. 720* ; *see also Deeter v. Angus (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 241, 252-253, 224 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *Kelly v. General Tel. Co. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 278, 288, 186 Cal. Rptr. 184]* . This is the rule even if the theory of recovery is interference with prospective economic advantage and even if the conduct constituting the breach of contract also happens to violate an independent statutory duty [*JRS Prods.,*

Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. of Am. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 168, 181-183, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 840 (defendant's conduct also violated franchise and unfair competition laws)].

It is also well established that corporate agents and employees acting for and on behalf of a corporation cannot be held liable for inducing breach of the corporation's contract [*Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 24, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *Gruenberg v. Aetna Ins. Co. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 566, 576, 108 Cal. Rptr. 480, 510 P.2d 1032]* . Thus, an officer or employee of a corporation has no independent duty to parties with whom the corporation contracts and cannot be liable for inducing breach of the corporation's contract or conspiring to breach it [*Grosvenor Props., Ltd. v. Southmark Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 1149, 1153-1154* (analysis under California law; choice-of-law issue was never reached because officer would not have been liable under Canadian law)]. Similarly, neither a party to a contract nor agents of that party may be liable for interference with related subcontracts that would require the performance of the party to the primary contract [*PM Group, Inc. v. Stewart (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 55, 65, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 227]* .

On the other hand, a claim for interference with contract may be brought against an owner, officer, or director of a company whose contract was the subject of the litigation. Although these defendants may defend on the grounds that their conduct was privileged or justified, that defense must be pleaded and proved [*Woods v. Fox Broad. Sub., Inc. (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 344, 356, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 463]* . For example, a director of an entity that is a party to a contract may be liable for interfering with that contract if the acts constituting interference are not undertaken in the scope of the director's duties as agent of the corporation [*Mouchette v. Board of Educ. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 303, 312, 266 Cal. Rptr. 1* (director of school board who, motivated by political alliances, influenced board to terminate plaintiff's contract); *see also Plate v. Sun-Diamond Growers (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1115, 1126, 275 Cal. Rptr. 667* (director liable but not entitled to indemnification from corporate party to terminated contract)]. The immunity for officers, directors, and shareholders of corporations appears to be based not on the fact that they are the same entity as the corporation, but on the fact that, when acting in the corporation's interest, that is to say, within the scope of their office, their actions are privileged [*see § 565.137[4][c],[d]*].

[b] Liability Imposed by Alter Ego Doctrine

If the "manager's privilege" defense [*see § 565.137[4][c]*] is not raised or if the alter ego does not prevail on that defense, the alter ego doctrine cannot be used as a shield to prevent imposition of tort liability on the alter ego who caused the corporation to breach its contract [*Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1466, 1471-1473, 272 Cal. Rptr. 480* (manager's privilege was not tendered by either argument or requested jury instructions; however, evidence suggested that manager's privilege would not have applied because, in causing corporation to breach contract, alter ego was acting to recoup losses on investments unrelated to corporation or in retaliation for unrelated project)]. The manager's privilege and the alter ego doctrine serve different purposes. Imposition of liability under the alter ego doctrine does not depend on whether the owner or manager was acting in the corporation's interest. The alter ego doctrine imposes liability to avoid inequitable results that would otherwise be suffered by the party who dealt with the corporation [*Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1466, 1469-1471, 272 Cal. Rptr. 480]* . In arguing that the alter ego doctrine should be applied to limit the alter ego's liability to the contract claim, the court of appeal said the alter ego was attempting to obtain relief that would be denied to similarly situated defendants under the "manager's privilege" criteria (that is, immunity without regard to motive), and rejected such an application of the alter ego doctrine [*Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1472, 272 Cal. Rptr. 480]* .

The original judgment in *Shapoff v. Scull* was against the corporation and its two principals, awarding plaintiff $55,000 for breach of a development agreement with the corporation, $55,000 for intentional interference with contractual relations, and $300,000 in punitive damages. The judgment was based in part on findings that the individual defendants were the alter egos of the corporate defendant and that the breach was caused by the tortious interference of one of them. The individual defendant found to have tortiously interfered with the contractual relations moved for judgment notwithstanding the verdict, asking the court to limit his liability to the contract claim on the ground that it was inconsistent to impose liability on both the contract claim and the tort claim. The trial court agreed that it was

inconsistent, and gave plaintiff the election to enforce one or the other. Not surprisingly, plaintiff chose to proceed on the tort claim. The trial court amended the judgment to delete its determination that the individual was an alter ego of the corporation [*Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1462, 272 Cal. Rptr. 480]* . Plaintiff did not contest that election on appeal, so the related issue of whether one person can be held liable both in tort for interference and on the contract as an alter ego was not addressed [*Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1473, 272 Cal. Rptr. 480]* .

A similar result occurred in another case in which the court of appeal upheld a jury finding that both an individual defendant and corporatedefendants were liable for conspiring to interfere with the plaintiff's contractual security interest, despite the fact that the individual defendant was arguably the alter ego of both the corporate defendants and the corporation that had the contract with the plaintiff [*Webber v. Inland Empire Invs., Inc., (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 884, 898-901, 88 Cal. Rptr 2d 594]* . The court concluded that the case before it was virtually indistinguishable from *Shapoff* [*Webber v. Inland Empire Invs., Inc., (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 884, 899-900, 88 Cal. Rptr 2d 594* (Supreme Court's subsequent disapproval of *Shapoff* extended only to *Shapoff* court's holding that party to contract can be liable in tort for conspiring to interfere with own contract)].

[3] Lapse of Limitation Period

No limitation period is specifically provided for an action for interference with economic relations. Thus, as a general rule, the applicable limitation period is the two-year period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*, which governs tort actions that involve intangible interests for which no limitation period is specifically provided [*McWilliams v. Holton (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 447, 454, 56 Cal. Rptr. 574* (dictum); *see, e.g., Kenworthy v. Brown (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 298, 301, 56 Cal. Rptr. 461* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* applied to action for conspiracy to interfere with contract); *Kiang v. Strycula (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 809, 811-812, 42 Cal. Rptr. 338* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* applied to action for intentional interference with contract)].

Other limitation periods may apply to an interference action when the alleged wrongful conduct is tortious in itself. For example, the three-year period set forth in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(4)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*) was held to apply to an action for intentional interference with contract that was based on allegations of fraud [*Romano v. Wilbur Ellis & Co. (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 670, 673-674, 186 P.2d 1012]* .

Similarly, dictum in a court of appeal decision indicated that an action for interference by means of libel, slander, or physical violence would fall within the one-year limitations period of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 335.1, 340(c)* (beginning in 2003, two-year limitations period for actions for personal injury or death caused by negligence or wrongful act of another, and one-year limitations period for actions for libel or slander)) [*see Romano v. Wilbur Ellis & Co. (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 670, 674, 186 P.2d 1012* ; *see also Ch. 345, Limitation of Actions, § 345.14*].

The applicable statute of limitations may be pleaded affirmatively as a bar to an action not brought within the prescribed period [*see McFaddin v. H.S. Crocker Co. (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 585, 591, 33 Cal. Rptr. 389* ; *see also Union Sugar Co. v. Hollister Estate Co. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 740, 744, 47 P.2d 273* (bar of statute of limitations as affirmative defense required to be raised in appropriate pleading)]. For a form of affirmative defense allegation raising the bar of *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1), see § 565.292*. For discussion and forms relating to limitations periods generally, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* .

[4] Justification or Privilege

[a] General Balancing Test

One defense to actions for interference with economic relations is that of justification or privilege. The terms

"justification" and "privilege" are essentially synonymous, signifying that the defendant's conduct was not improper under the particular circumstances [*see Environmental Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 188, 193-194, 194 n.3, 203 Cal. Rptr. 127, 680 P.2d 1086]* . This general defense is based on the rule that intentional interference with economic relations is only actionable if the method of interference was itself unlawful, or if the method was lawful but there was a lack of sufficient justification or privilege [*Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 17-18, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664]* .

A plaintiff must now plead and prove that a defendant's conduct was wrongful by some measure other than the act of the interference itself in order to recover for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage. Therefore, the burden is now on the plaintiff in those actions to prove the element of "wrongfulness" by pleading and proving that the defendant's interference was unlawful, which means that it must be conduct proscribed by some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* . Therefore, if the plaintiff is required to prove that the defendant's conduct was unlawful as an element of the cause of action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage that has not yet ripened into a contract, it would seem that the defendant's only real remaining burden in these actions on what was in the past considered the defense of justification is to counter the plaintiff's evidence and argument with the defendant's own showing that the conduct was not unlawful.

For other types of interference claims, however, the defense of justification or privilege is an affirmative defense that is waived if not raised [*GHK Assocs. v. Mayer Group, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 856, 882, 274 Cal. Rptr. 168* ; *Mayes v. Sturdy N. Sales, Inc. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 69, 80, 154 Cal. Rptr. 43* ; *see also Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 827-828, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865]* . Moreover, it cannot be considered as a ground for sustaining a general demurrer unless the facts giving rise to the defense appear on the face of the complaint [*Herron v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co. (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 202, 206-207, 14 Cal. Rptr. 294, 363 P.2d 310* ; *Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 18-19, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664]* .

There are a number of general fact situations in which the defense of justification or privilege is typically recognized [*see, e.g., § 565.137[4][b]*]. As a general rule, however, the contours of justification or privilege are not precisely defined, and establishing the defense requires a balancing of the importance, social and private, of the objective advanced by the interference against the importance of the interest interfered with, considering all the circumstances including the nature of the defendant's conduct and the relationship between the parties [*Environmental Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 188, 193-194, 203 Cal. Rptr. 127, 680 P.2d 1086]* .

In other words, the issue is essentially whether the defendant's conduct was fair and reasonable under all the circumstances. Existence of justification or privilege is therefore a question of fact usually decided by proof of facts rather than by the pleadings [*Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 228-229, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 17-21, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . One of the most significant considerations is the purpose or motive underlying the defendant's intentional acts [*see Seaman's Direct Buying Serv., Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 766, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158* (defendant's motive becomes relevant issue only as defense once intent is shown)]. If the motive is improper, that is, solely to harm the plaintiff, this will defeat any apparent defense of justification or privilege that might otherwise apply due to the existence of a relationship or interest that typically gives rise to the defense [*Bridges v. Cal-Pac. Leasing Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 118, 132, 93 Cal. Rptr. 796]* .

Some courts, in determining whether justification or privilege exists, have adopted a balancing test that includes consideration of the following specific factors [*see, e.g., Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 230, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180* ; *Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 21, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664* ; Restatement (Second) of Torts § 767]:

- The nature of the defendant's conduct;

- The defendant's motive;
- The interests of the plaintiff that are interfered with;
- The interests sought to be advanced by the defendant;
- The social interests in protecting the freedom of the action of the defendant and the contractual or other economic interests of the plaintiff;
- The proximity or remoteness of the defendant's conduct to the interference; and
- The relationship between the parties.

For a form of affirmative defense based on justification or privilege, *see § 565.293*.

[b] Fair Competition

The interest in competitive freedom is important enough to justify fair and lawful efforts to obtain the business of a third person by inducing him or her to forsake a competitor, when there is no existing contractual relation between the third person and the competitor [*Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 36, 112 P.2d 631]* . As a general rule, this defense arises if [*Los Angeles Land Co. v. Brunswick Corp. (9th Cir. 1993) 6 F.3d 1422, 1430-1431* ; *A-Mark Coin Co. v. General Mills, Inc. (1981) 148 Cal. App. 3d 312, 323* ; *Charles C. Chapman Bldg. Co. v. California Mart (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 846, 855-856, 82 Cal. Rptr. 830* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 768(1)]:

- The relation concerns a matter involved in the competition between the defendant and the plaintiff;
- The defendant does not employ means wrongful in themselves;
- The defendant's action does not create or continue an unlawful restraint of trade; and
- The defendant's purpose is at least in part to advance the defendant's interest in competing with the plaintiff.

However, the interest in contractual stability is deemed to be more important than the interest in competitive freedom. Therefore, the mere fact that one is in competition with another for the business of a third person does not justify inducing the third person to breach an existing contract with the other [*Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 36-37, 112 P.2d 631]* . This is true even though the contract is terminable at the will of the parties [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1127, 1129, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* (however, defendant's conduct not actionable on public policy grounds; *see § 565.137[h]*); *Speegle v. Board of Fire Underwriters (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 34, 39-41, 172 P.2d 867* (fact that contract is terminable at will of parties does not mean that it is terminable at will of others); *Freed v. Manchester Serv., Inc. (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 186, 188-189, 191, 331 P.2d 689* ; *but see A-Mark Coin Co. v. General Mills, Inc. (1981) 148 Cal. App. 3d 312, 323* (citing with approval Restatement (Second) of Torts § 768(1), under which fair competition justifies interference with existing contract that is terminable at will)]. For example, an insurer may be liable for inducing an attorney's client to breach his or her contingent fee contract with the attorney in order to settle with the client for lesser sum, notwithstanding the fact that a contingent fee contract may be terminated at will by a client with or without cause [*Herron v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co. (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 202, 205, 207, 14 Cal. Rptr. 294, 363 P.2d 310]* . The reason for making it actionable to induce a party to terminate a contract according to its terms is that, if protection from outside interference is accorded to an economic relationship that is wholly prospective, protection must also be accorded to contractual relationships that are subject to

termination [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1127-1128, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587]* .

Although fair competition does not justify active and affirmative efforts to interfere with or induce a breach of contract, a person is free to compete by lawful means even though an incidental result may be to induce a third party to breach a contract with a competitor. Similarly, if two parties have separate contracts with a third party, each may resort to lawful means to secure performance even though the necessary result is a breach of the other's contract [*Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 36-37, 112 P.2d 631* (dictum); *see also § 565.137[4][g]*].

[c] Confidential Relationship

[i] Protecting Welfare of Third Party

A defendant who induces a third party to sever an existing contract or not to enter some other economic relation may justify doing so if he or she had a confidential relationship with the third party. The general rule may be stated as follows: a defendant who is charged with the responsibility or welfare of a third party is not liable for intentionally causing that party to breach his or her contract or not to enter into a prospective contractual relation with the plaintiff, when the defendant uses lawful means and acts to protect the welfare of the third party [Restatement (Second) of Torts § 770]. For example, an attorney may not be held liable for advising a client to breach a contract with a third party. Public policy dictates that attorneys must remain free to counsel their clients without fear of subjecting themselves to liability as a result of the proper discharge of their professional obligations. Clients also must feel free to seek out an attorney's advice on any issue at any time. Any rule to the contrary would constitute a serious impairment of the confidential attorney-client relationship and would have a resulting deleterious effect on the administration of justice [*Schick v. Lerner (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1321, 1329, 238 Cal. Rptr. 902]* .

[ii] Manager's Privilege

Under the "manager's privilege," a corporate agent or employee acting for and on behalf of his or her corporation is privileged to induce the corporation to breach a contract, by virtue of his or her confidential relationship with the corporation [*Mayes v. Sturdy N. Sales, Inc. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 69, 77-78, 154 Cal. Rptr. 43* ; *Wise v. Southern Pac. Co. (1963) 223 Cal. App. 2d 50, 72-73, 35 Cal. Rptr. 652* ; *see also Mallard v. Boring (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 390, 393, 6 Cal. Rptr. 171* (same privilege applied to employee of partnership)].

The manager's privilege may not be sufficient to insulate an officer or director from liability if imposition of liability is otherwise appropriate under the alter ego doctrine [*see Shapoff v. Scull (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1457, 1469-1473* (manager's privilege defense was not raised, but court noted that alter ego liability does not depend on whether owner or manager was acting in corporation's interest); *see also § 565.137[2][b]*].

The manager's privilege is not limited to cases in which a manager has allegedly induced an entity principal to breach a contract, but may apply to a manager or agent who acts on behalf of a natural person [*Huynh v. Vu (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1183, 1195, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 595* (husband could assert privilege as agent for wife)].

California court opinions have not entirely established whether the manager's privilege is an absolute privilege, or whether it is a qualified privilege that may be defeated by a showing that the manager's motive was improper [*see Halvorsen v. Aramark Unif. Servs., Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1383, 1391-1393, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 383]* . For these purposes, an improper motive would be one in which the manager acted in his or her best interests, rather than in the principal's best interests [*see Wanland v. Los Gatos Lodge, Inc. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1507, 1522-1523, 281 Cal. Rptr. 890*].

However, at least one court of appeal opinion has specifically held that the privilege is absolute regardless of the

manager's motivations, at least in the context of employment decisions made by a managing agent of the employer [*Halvorsen v. Aramark Unif. Servs., Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1383, 1392-1396, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 383* (in interference with contract action based on termination from employment, manager's privilege was absolute when employment was terminable at-will)].

Other opinions have considered the propriety of the manager's motives in determining whether to apply the privilege [*see, e.g., Aalgaard v. Merchants Nat'l Bank, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 674, 684-686, 274 Cal. Rptr. 81* (privilege protected defendants when evidence established that officers did not act in their own interests)], and the privilege has been denied in instances when the manager acted primarily out of self-interest [*see, e.g., Olivet v. Frischling (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 831, 840-841, 164 Cal. Rptr. 87 , disapproved on other grounds, Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454]* .

Even when motive has been considered, however, the privilege has applied when the predominant motive of the manager was proper [*see Halvorsen v. Aramark Unif. Servs., Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1383, 1392-1393, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 383* (discussing earlier cases)]. Under this predominant motive test, if the manager has some personal financial interest in the transaction, so that it is reasonably possible that the manager acted at least in part out of self-interest, a manager's desire to advance his or her personal interests does not vitiate the privilege as long as the manager's predominant motive is advancing the principal's interests [*Huynh v. Vu (2003) 111 Cal. App. 4th 1183, 1198-1200, 4 Cal. Rptr. 3d 595]* .

[d] Financial Interest

A defendant who has a financial interest in the business of a third party, and who intentionally causes that person not to enter into a prospective contractual relation with the plaintiff, is justified in so doing if he or she does not employ wrongful means and acts to protect his or her interest from being prejudiced by the relation [*Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 319, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* ; *Culcal Stylco, Inc. v. Vornado, Inc. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 879, 882, 103 Cal. Rptr. 419* ; *see* Restatement (Second) of Torts § 769]. "Financial interest" refers to an investment or ownership interest. For example, a parent corporation has a financial interest in its subsidiary, although the opposite is not true [*Culcal Stylco, Inc. v. Vornado, Inc. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 879, 882-883, 103 Cal. Rptr. 419]* .

The privilege based on financial interest is qualified, in the sense that a defendant must show not only that the existence of the financial interest, but also that he or she acted with the proper purpose, that is, to protect his or her interest or the interest of the entity he or she owns [*Wanland v. Los Gatos Lodge, Inc. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 1507, 1522, 281 Cal. Rptr. 890* ; *see also Culcal Stylco, Inc. v. Vornado, Inc. (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 879, 882-883, 103 Cal. Rptr. 419* (existence of privilege normally determined on basis of proof rather than pleadings)].

Financial interest, like fair competition, does not justify intentional interference with an existing contract, as distinguished from a noncontractual relationship. For example, one court held that the defense was not available when defendants, who were controlling shareholders, induced their corporation to breach an existing contract [*Winn v. McCulloch Corp. (1976) 60 Cal. App. 3d 663, 673-674, 131 Cal. Rptr. 597]* .

[e] Conduct Protected by Constitution or Statute

[i] In General

In certain instances, a defendant's interference with economic relations has been held to be justified or privileged because the interfering conduct was protected by public policy expressed in a constitutional or statutory provision, which outweighed any detriment resulting to the economic interest interfered with. Specific applications of this principle are discussed in the subheadings below.

[ii] Petitioning Government for Redress of Grievance (*Noerr-Pennington* Doctrine)

The *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine provides that there is no antitrust liability under the Sherman Act for efforts to influence government that are protected by the *First Amendment* right to petition for redress of grievances, even when the motive behind such actions is anticompetitive [*ProfessionalReal Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 56-58, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611* ; *see* *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1133, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* ; *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 574, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646]* . The doctrine originated in the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* , in which the Court held that alleged lobbying efforts by the railroad industry to foster legislation that would be adverse to the trucking industry could not form the basis for liability under the Sherman Act, even if the defendants' motive was to injure competition [*see* *Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 136-140, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *see also* *United Mine Workers v. Pennington (1965) 381 U.S. 657, 85 S. Ct. 1585, 14 L. Ed. 2d 626]* . In a later decision, the Court made clear that the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine applies to judicial and administrative, as well as legislative, proceedings [*California Transp. v. Trucking Unlimited (1972) 404 U.S. 508, 510-511, 92 S. Ct. 609, 30 L. Ed. 2d 642* ; *see* *Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 56-58, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611]* .

Although the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine originated in the context of federal antitrust litigation, courts have also applied the doctrine to actions for intentional interference with economic relations under California law. Thus, the scope of interference claims is limited by the constitutional right to petition for redress of grievances [*see* *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1133-1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* ; *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 577-578, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646* ; *Matossian v. Fahmie (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 128, 138-139, 161 Cal. Rptr. 532* ; *Sierra Club v. Butz (N.D. Cal. 1972) 349 F. Supp. 934, 937-938]* . In one case, for example, a court held that the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine barred a timber company that had a logging contract with the United States from bringing an action for intentional interference with contract against an environmental group seeking to enjoin the company from logging in an area under consideration for wilderness status [*see* *Sierra Club v. Butz (N.D. Cal. 1972) 349 F. Supp. 934, 938-939]* . In another case, the doctrine was applied to bar an action for interference with business relations brought by alcoholic beverage licenseholders against competitors who had unsuccessfully protested the granting of the plaintiffs' liquor license [*see* *Matossian v. Fahmie (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 128, 138-139, 161 Cal. Rptr. 532]* .

Efforts to influence government that are merely a "sham" are not protected by the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine and are subject to antitrust liability [*see* *California Transp. v. Trucking Unlimited (1972) 404 U.S. 508, 512-513, 92 S. Ct. 609, 30 L. Ed. 2d 642* ; *Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 144, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 575, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646]* . The sham exception encompasses situations in which persons use the governmental process, as opposed to the outcome of that process, as an anticompetitive weapon [*Columbia v. Omni Outdoor Adver. (1991) 499 U.S. 365, 380, 111 S. Ct. 1344, 113 L. Ed. 2d 382]* . The sham exception has been applied to California tort actions for intentional interference with economic relations [*see* *Hi-Top Steel Corp. v. Lehrer (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 570, 579, 581-583, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 646* (defendants' alleged false and baseless statements to city officials about plaintiffs' plans for automobile body shredder made for purpose of causing regulatory delays constituted sufficient facts to support application of sham exception)].

Litigation will not be deemed a sham unless the lawsuit is so objectively baseless that no reasonable litigant could realistically expect success on the merits [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 60-63, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611]* . The existence of probable cause to institute the legal proceedings thus precludes a finding that the defendant has engaged in sham litigation [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 61-64, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611* ; *see also* *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* (plaintiff

seeking to state claim for intentional interference with economic relations based on defendant's inducing another party to undertake litigation must allege that litigation was brought without probable cause and was concluded in plaintiff's favor)]. If an objective litigant could reasonably conclude that the suit is reasonably calculated to elicit a favorable outcome, then the suit is immunized under the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine, regardless of the defendant's subjective intent in bringing the suit [*Professional Real Estate Investors v. Columbia Pictures Indus. Inc. (1993) 508 U.S. 49, 56-58, 60-61, 113 S. Ct. 1920, 123 L. Ed. 2d 611]* .

[iii] Privilege for Statements Made in Course of Legislative, Judicial, or Other Official Proceedings

Under *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, a statement is generally privileged if made in the course of a legislative, judicial, or other official proceeding. Although this provision is most often invoked in defamation actions, it has also been applied to actions for intentional interference with economic relations [*see* *Rubin v. Green (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1187, 1196, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828, 847 P.2d 1044* (acts alleged amounted to unlawful attorney solicitation); *1-800-Contacts, Inc. v. Steinberg (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 568, 586-588* (statements in anticipation of legislative activity were shielded from action for interference with contract); *Rosenthal v. Irell & Manella (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 121, 125-128, 185 Cal. Rptr. 92* (statements connected with judicial proceeding); *Asia Inv. Co. v. Borowski (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 832, 841-842, 184 Cal. Rptr. 317* (filing of petition for writ of mandate)]. However, the privilege has been held inapplicable, despite the fact that the defendant was involved in a judicial proceeding, when the defendant's conduct had no connection with the issues raised in the litigation [*see* *Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 231-234, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180]* . The privilege is also inapplicable where the conduct is largely noncommunicative and unrelated to any anticipated litigation [*see* *LiMandri v. Judkins (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 326, 348, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539* (attorney's conduct in securing trust company's lien rights not privileged under *Civ. Code § 47(b)* because unrelated to subsequent interpleader action)].

For further discussion of the scope of the privilege under *Civ. Code § 47(b)*, see Ch. 340, *Libel and Slander* .

[iv] Other Examples

In one case, an attorney contracted with members of a city council to contest a recall election seeking the removal of these members. Proponents of the election persuaded the city treasurer to refuse to disburse any public funds pursuant to this contract, and the attorney sued the proponents for interference. In this situation, it was held that the interference was privileged, notwithstanding any detriment to the attorney's contract interest, in view of the strong public interest in allowing free challenges to public expenditures, as expressed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 526a* [*Bledsoe v. Watson (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 105, 108-111, 106 Cal. Rptr. 197* (also citing *U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV*; *Cal. Const. art. I, § 1*); *see also* *Gold v. Los Angeles Democratic League (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 365, 376, 122 Cal. Rptr. 732* (freedom of speech may be raised as defense in action based on defendant's alleged misrepresentations interfering with plaintiff's prospective opportunity to be elected as city treasurer)].

In another case, a plaintiff publishing company brought an action against defendants based on their intentional efforts to dissuade third parties from advertising in plaintiff's newspaper. The California Supreme Court noted that a politically motivated boycott designed to force governmental or economic change was a constitutionally protected activity. The Court held that defendants' conduct was similarly motivated to force a change in plaintiff's editorial policy, and as such it was justified as a matter of public policy expressed in *U.S. Const. amend. I*, as well as common law principles [*Environmental Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 188, 195-198, 203 Cal. Rptr. 127, 680 P.2d 1086]* .

[v] Motion to Strike Claims Against Constitutionally Privileged Conduct (SLAPP Suits)

The legislature has declared that there is a disturbing increase in lawsuits brought primarily to chill the valid exercise of the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and petition for the redress of grievances (Strategic Litigation Against

Public Participation or "SLAPP suits"). In orderto protect the public interest to encourage continued participation in matters of public significance, and to prevent this participation from being chilled through abuse of the judicial process, the legislature enacted *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16(a)*], which authorizes a special motion to strike in order to determine the validity of such actions.

The motion to strike is based on the ground that the actions complained of arise from acts of the defendant in furtherance of his or her right of petition or free speech under the United States or California Constitution in connection with a public issue. In response to the motion, the plaintiff has the burden to establish that there is a probability that plaintiff will prevail on the claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16(b)*]. In making its determination, the court considers the pleadings, and supporting and opposing affidavits stating the facts on which the liability or defense is based [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16(b)*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16(c),(g)* (costs and fees, stay of discovery during pendency of motion)].

These special motion provisions are not applicable to any enforcement action brought in the name of the people of the State of California by the Attorney General, district attorney, or city attorney, acting as a public prosecutor [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16(d)*].

For detailed discussion and a form of motion and supporting declaration, see Ch. 376, *Motions to Strike: Anti-SLAPP* .

[f] Truthful Information or Honest Advice

A defendant who intentionally causes a third party not to perform a contract or not to enter into a prospective contractual relation with the plaintiff is justified in doing so if he or she has merely given the third party truthful information or honest advice within the scope of a request for the advice [Restatement (Second) of Torts § 772; *see Savage v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1993) 21 Cal. App. 4th 434, 449-450, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 305* (applying privilege for providing truthful information); *Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 20 n.1, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664* (privilege based on honest advice does not apply unless advice is requested); *Walsh v. Glendale Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 578, 588-589, 81 Cal. Rptr. 804 , disapproved on other grounds, Garrett v. Coast & Southern Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. (1973) 9 Cal. 3d 731, 737-738, 108 Cal. Rptr. 845, 511 P.2d 1197* (privilege based on honest advice not apparent on face of complaint when defendant gave advice on request and within scope of request but allegedly gave false and fraudulent information)].

[g] Bona Fide Claim

A defendant who intentionally interferes with a contract or other economic relationship by asserting in good faith a legally protected interest of his or her own or by threatening in good faith to protect that interest by appropriate means is justified in doing so if he or she believes that his or her interest may otherwise be impaired or destroyed by the performance of the contract or other transaction interfered with [Restatement (Second) of Torts § 773]. This privilege refers generally to a defendant's assertion of an honest claim by bringing or threatening to bring a suit in good faith, to protect a present, existing, economic interest, such as an ownership interest in property or a contractual interest. For example, if the defendant has a prior contract with a third party, he or she may prevent that third party from performing another contract with the plaintiff that threatens the prior contract [*Richardson v. La Rancherita (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 73, 81, 159 Cal. Rptr. 285* ; *see also Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 37, 112 P.2d 631* ; *Lawless v. Brotherhood of Painters (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 474, 478, 300 P.2d 159* (if two parties have separate contracts with third party, each may resort by lawful means to secure performance of his or her own contract even though the necessary result is a breach of the other's contract)].

As with all recognized situations in which justification or privilege may apply, a showing of proper motive is crucial [*cf.* § 565.137[4][c], [d]]. The defendant must not only show the existence of a legally protected interest, but must act in good faith to preserve that interest. To establish "good faith," the defendant must show some objective basis for his or

her belief, something more than mere reliance on counsel or mere sincerity and honest conviction with regard to the validity of the claim. For example, in one case, a defendant lessor interfered with a lessee's sale of corporate stock on the ground that it constituted a lease assignment requiring the lessor's consent. However, justification on the basis of a bona fide claim was held not to apply, because the evidence supported findings that the lessor's predominant motive was to use its consent to negotiate an increase in the financial return on the leased property, and there was insufficient objective basis for its claim that the sale of stock amounted to a lease assignment in violation of the terms of the lease [*Richardson v. La Rancherita (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 73, 82, 159 Cal. Rptr. 285* ; *cf. Bridges v. Cal-Pac. Leasing Co. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 118, 131-132, 93 Cal. Rptr. 796* (evidence supported finding of good faith claim to protect property interest)].

[h] Right to Induce Litigation on Contract

No cause of action for intentional interference with economic relations can be stated based on the defendant's inducing another to undertake litigation relating to the contract unless that litigation was brought without probable cause and was concluded in plaintiff's favor [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* (issue raised on demurrer)]. To allow a cause of action to be stated for interference with a contract or a prospective advantage when the only interference alleged is that defendant induced the bringing of potentially meritorious litigation would be an unwarranted expansion of thescope of these torts and a pernicious barrier to free access to the courts [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1123, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587]* .

In one case, the defendant induced a county water agency to seek a declaratory judgment that it could terminate its contract with plaintiff early by retiring related project bonds. That action resulted in a trial court judgment for the agency, which was reversed on appeal and still pending when the action for damages and injunctive relief based on intentional interference with contract and with prospective economic advantage reached the Supreme Court [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1124-1125, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587]* .

In reaching its conclusion, the Court considered the public policy to allow free access to the courts to provide for peaceful, judicial resolution of differences [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1131-1133, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* ; *see Civ. Code § 47(b*); *see also § 565.137[4][e][iii]*], the constitutional right to petition for redress of grievances [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1133-1135, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* ; *see § 565.137[4][e][ii]*], and the fact that the interference torts themselves have been criticized as favoring secure enjoyment of contractual and economic relations at the expense of a freely competitive economy, and have been limited accordingly [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1136-1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* ; *see, e.g., Youst v. Longo (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 64, 74-75, 233 Cal. Rptr. 294, 729 P.2d 728* (tort not extended to context of sporting event)]. The Court concluded that the appropriate balance between the right to free access to the courts and the interest in being free from the financial and emotional cost of defending litigation is already struck by the tort of malicious prosecution [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1131-1133, 1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587]* . The Court acknowledged that the right to petition for redress of grievances has previously been applied only to protect the litigants, but held that, in order to assure free access to the courts and to prevent a flood of oppressive derivative litigation, third parties should be similarly protected [*Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1135-1136, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587]* . For discussion of tort actions for malicious prosecution, see Ch. 357, *Malicious Prosecution and Abuse of Process* .

Likewise, an action for intentional interference with contractual relations may not be brought against a defendant whose conduct induces the *plaintiff* to institute litigation to determine its rights under a contract with a third party, at least when the plaintiff's position on the contractual dispute is not indisputably correct. A business relationship with a party to a contract that merely brings to head the contracting parties' good faith dispute about the interpretation of the contract is not tortious [*Golden W.Baseball Co. v. City of Anaheim (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 11, 51, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 378]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.137-565.149

[Reserved]

§§ 565.137[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.150

§ 565.150 California Points and Authorities

For points and authorities supporting an application for a preliminary injunction restraining the use of misleading advertising as unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 14, *Advertising* (Matthew Bender)

For points and authorities supporting an application for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction restraining trade name infringement, restraint of trade, and unfair trade practices under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000 et seq.* and *17200 et seq.*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

For points and authorities pertaining to actions under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000 et seq.* and *17200 et seq.*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 235, *Unfair Competition* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.151

§ 565.151 California Torts

For full discussion of the business related torts generally, see Levy, Golden, and Sacks, California Torts, Ch. 40 (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.152

§ 565.152 Forms of Discovery

For forms of interrogatories for use in actions involving unfair competition, see Bender's Forms of Discovery, Ch. 207, *Unfair Competition* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.153

§ 565.153 Federal Statutes

Price discrimination prohibited under Robinson-Patman Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 13, 13a-13c, 21a*). *15 U.S.C.S. § 13*

Unfair competition prohibited under Federal Trade Commission Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 41-58*). *15 U.S.C.S. § 45(a)(1)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.154

§ 565.154 State Statutes

Resale of drugs acquired at preferentially low prices pursuant to *15 U.S.C.S. § 13c* (federal Nonprofit Institutions Act), with limited exceptions, is unfair competition within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* et seq. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 4450, 4470*

Unfair Practices Act; action for injunctive relief and damages for locality discrimination, sales and service below cost, secret rebates or unearned discounts, and loss leaders. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101*

Retailer not permitted to refuse to sell cellular phone because customer refuses to use service for which retailer is agent. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17026.1(c)*

Action for injunctive relief and civil penalties for unfair competition. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208*

Action for injunctive relief and damages for direct-mold duplication of manufactured item. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17300, 17301*

Action for injunctive relief and civil penalties for false advertising. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500-17572*

Untruthful, misleading, or deceptive environmental claims, whether explicit or implied, are unlawful. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17580.5*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17580* (record keeping requirements)

Production, advertising, offering to sell, selling, distributing, or otherwise transferring for use in California simulated check that is not clearly marked "THIS IS NOT A CHECK" is prohibited and may be enjoined; civil penalty. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 22433*

Treble penalty in action brought by, on behalf of, or for benefit of, senior citizens or disabled persons, to redress unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. *Civ. Code § 3345*

Failure to comply with *Gov. Code § 11011.20* or *53086* (advertising by private entity regarding sale of government property) is unfair business practice within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *Gov. Code §§ 11011.20, 53086*

Appointment of receiver in action by Attorney General in name of people of state of *California. Gov. Code § 12527*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.155

§ 565.155 Decisions

[1] Common Law Unfair Competition

Advertisements by producers of turfgrass seed and sod claiming that advertised turfgrass was better than competition in certain key characteristics does not support claim for common law unfair competition; allegations do not amount to "passing off one's goods as those of another." *Southland Sod Farms v. Stover Seed Co. (1997) 108 F.3d 1134, 1147*

Unauthorized use of computer software enhancements and support system, confidential information, and customer lists involves four species of unfair competition: breach of confidence, breach of fiduciary duty, trade secrets, and common law misappropriation, only last of which is preempted by federal copyright law because it does not require extra element of relationship between unauthorized user and owner of information. *Balboa Ins. Co. v. Trans Global Equities (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1327, 1344-1345, 1350-1353, 267 Cal. Rptr. 787*

[2] Federal Preemption

Class action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* against tobacco companies for advertising allegedly targeted at minors preempted by Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, *15 U.S.C.S. § 1331 et seq.*, because claim was necessarily and inherently based on concerns about smoking and health. *In re Tobacco Cases II (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 1257, 1272-1276, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 418, 163 P.3d 106* (overruling *Mangini v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 1057, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358, 875 P.2d 73*)

Federal regulations did not preempt causes of action against lenders, including some claims brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, alleging that lenders used deceptive and misleading statements to convince consumers that tax refund anticipation loans were merely accelerated tax refunds, rather than loans, and that they failed to clarify to applicants that tax refunds could be seized to pay existing debts from prior, similar loans; actions were brought in part to enforce federal law and had only incidental effect on lender's deposit-taking and non-real-estate-lending powers. *Hood v. Santa Barbara Bank & Trust (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 526, 542-548, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 369*

Class action brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* and based on violation of federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), *29 U.S.C.S. § 207*, not preempted by FLSAmerely because state statute allows traditional opt-out class actions while FLSA requires that class members specifically opt in. *Harris v. Investor's Bus. Daily, Inc. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 28, 32-36, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 108*

State court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over claims for unfair competition and violation of Cartwright Act because claims presented questions of invalidity or enforceability of patents, resulting in exclusive federal jurisdiction under federal patent law. *Holiday Matinee, Inc. v. Rambus, Inc. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1413, 1426-1427, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 766*

Statutory unfair competition claims brought against savings association for charging borrowers more for replacement hazard insurance than cost of insurance were not preempted by federal law limiting application of state laws to lending activities, because claims were based on violation of generally applicable contractual duties and only incidentally affected lending activities. *Gibson v. World Sav. & Loan Assn. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1291, 1301-1302, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19*

Action based on false advertising under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, brought against makers of over-the-counter dietary supplements, was not preempted by either Federal Trade Commission Act, *15 U.S.C.S. § 41 et seq.*, or Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act, *21 U.S.C.S. § 301 et seq.* *Consumer Justice Ctr. v. Olympian Labs, Inc. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 1056, 1059-1066, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 749*

Claims brought against federally chartered savings and loan association under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, based on defendant's charging preclosing interest on loan proceeds once proceeds were made available to borrower through escrow by wire or electronic transfer, were preempted by federal Home Owners' Loan Act, *12 U.S.C.S. § 1461 et seq. Washington Mut. Bank v. Superior Court (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 606, 621, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 765*

Action brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* against hospital alleging that hospital had included anti-union expenses in annual Medicare cost reports in violation of federal law was preempted by federal law, which thoroughly occupies field with pervasive and complex regulatory scheme governing provider cost reporting and reimbursement. *Congress of Cal. Seniors v. Catholic Healthcare W. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 491, 508-509, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 655*

Federal law did not preempt class action for violations of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* based on allegations that stock brokerage firm breached duty to customers by not executing their sell orders in fair and timely manner, but instead executing its own sell orders first in violation of federal law. *Roskind v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 345, 352-354, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 258*

Action brought under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200* and *17500* by consumers of pre-paid phone cards against providers of phone services for alleged failure to disclose in advertising and packaging that charges would be rounded up to nearest full minute, were not barred by filed rate doctrine, which would bar suit for damages arising out of claims involving rates filed with FCC, because consumers' action challenged improper advertising practices, not rates; plaintiffs' remedies limited to injunctive relief, however, because disgorgement of profits from use of cards would constitute illegal rebate prohibited by filed rate doctrine. *Day v. AT & T Corp. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 325, 334-339, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 55*

Neither *12 U.S.C.S. § 1461 et seq.* (Home Owners Loan Act) nor related regulations (*12 C.F.R. §§ 545.1, 545.2*) preempts cause of action against savings association and its officers for unfair competition based on making loans to unqualified strawmen to maximize income and perpetuate slum conditions; however, allegation with regard to "points" charged in conflict with *12 U.S.C.S. § 1463(g)*, and portion of prayer seeking foreclosure in conflict with 12 C.F.R. § 545.34, requiring that both be stricken. *People v. Highland Fed. Sav. & Loan (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1692,*

1708-1713, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 555

Action for injunctive relief to prevent violations of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500* and *Civ. Code § 1770* (state unfair trade practices laws) in HMO's marketing of subscriptions and Medicare supplemental plans to Medicare-eligible individuals (elderly and disabled) not preempted by *42 U.S.C.S. § 1395mm* or 42 C.F.R. § 417.223 (federal regulation of HMO activities in that area). *Solorzano v. Superior Court (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1139-1149, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

Fact that one defendant was foreign government did not implicate any issue of federal supremacy, preclusion, or preemption on basis of foreign relations or foreign commerce sufficient to bar California action when anticompetitive conduct in question has direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect in California; California unfair competition and unfair trade practice laws neutral in their application. *Amarel v. Connell (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 137, 144-150, 248 Cal. Rptr. 276*

[3] Unfair Competition (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200-17208)

Under "reasonable consumer" standard, plaintiffs stated cause of action for deceptive advertising under California unfair competition statute, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, when alleging that defendant's packaging implied that "fruit juice snacks" contained juice of those fruits shown on box, in light of box statements that product was made with "fruit juice and other all natural ingredients" and were "nutritious." *Williams v. Gerber Products Co. (9th Cir. 2008) 523 F.3d 934, 939-940*

Likelihood of confusion is applicable test both for California trademark infringement (*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 14320, 14330, 14335*) and for whether use of similar business name constitutes unfair competition (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*). *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Sandlin (9th Cir. 1988) 846 F.2d 1175, 1180* ; *see In re Marriage of Shelton (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 811, 814-815, 173 Cal. Rptr. 629* (unfair competition)

General practice of "blind bidding" (bidding for right to exhibit movie without first viewing it) not prohibited in California; "blind bidding" of movie that was in stage of production unsuitable for screening did not constitute unfair trade practice under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *Orion Pictures Distribution v. Syufy Enters. (9th Cir. 1987) 829 F.2d 946, 949*

Plaintiff may not recover under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, if some other provision of law specifically legalizes challenged conduct, while court is not precluded from finding that challenged conduct is unfair under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* merely because Legislature has failed to make conduct illegal. *Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 184, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527*

When plaintiff claims to have suffered injury from direct competitor's "unfair" act or practice, as that term is defined for purposes of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, conduct is "unfair" if threatening incipient violation of antitrust law, or violating policy or spirit of antitrust law because effects are comparable to or same as violation of antitrust law, or otherwise significantly threatening or harming competition. *Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 187, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527*

Medical center did not engage in fraudulent conduct actionable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* when billing insured patients at full amount for health care not covered by patient's insurance, without notifying patient of discount voluntarily offered by medical provider if bill was paid within 30 to 60 days. *Buller v. Sutter Health (2008)160 Cal. App. 4th 981, 988, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 47*

Although de minimus injury might occur to some consumers, mortgage lender's calculation of interest payments based

on average 30.4 day month was not actionable as unfair under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* when consistent with national lender practices designed to foster consumer loan availability. *Puentes v. Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, Inc. (2008) 160 Cal. App. 4th 638, 648-651, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 903*

Cell phone purchasers suffered no actual injury and thus had no standing to sue phone vendor under unfair competition law for selling cell phone insurance without license, even when vendor collected commission on sales from insurer; plaintiffs did not allege they paid more for insurance due to commission, or that insurance could have been obtained for lower price from licensed agent. *Peterson v. Cellco Partnership (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 1583, 1590-1591, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316*

Although seller of wheel and tire service coverage was unlicensed as insurer in California, plaintiff consumer suffered no injury caused by unlicensed status for purposes of prosecuting unfair competition action when contract was still enforceable by plaintiff, he had not had claim denied, and he did not pay more for contract than it was worth. *Medina v. Safe-Guard Products, Internat., Inc. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 105, 112-115, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 672*

Plaintiffs asserting that defendant's failure to provide complete tenant screening reports resulted in denial of residential tenant applications lacked standing to bring action under unfair competition statute when evidence indicated that applications would have been denied even if reports had been complete; as such, plaintiffs had suffered no actual injury. *Trujillo v. First American Registry, Inc. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 628, 639, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 732*

Automobile manufacturer's failure to warn consumers about engine defect that did not cause malfunctions until after expiration of three-year express warranty period was not deceptive or unfair practice actionable under unfair competition statute. *Daugherty v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 824, 838-839, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118*

Customer had alleged sufficient facts to support cause of action for unfair competition against truck rental company when alleging that company charged $20 "refueling fee," plus $2 per gallon, when customer returned truck with less gasoline than when rented, even though company did not actually refuel trucks when they were returned, but merely rented them to next customer with whatever amount was left in tank by previous customer, and customer effectively had to return truck with more fuel than when rented to ensure avoidance of fees. *Aron v. U-Haul Co. of California (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 796, 804-807, 49 Cal. Rptr. 3d 555*

California Milk Producers Advisory Board is public entity not susceptible to suit under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* *People for Ethical Treatmentof Animals, Inc. v. California Milk Producers Advisory Bd. (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 871, 878-879, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 900*

Representations that satellite television signal would deliver "crystal clear video" and "CD quality sound" were not factual representations that would, if false, support liability under False Advertising Act or unfair competition statute. *Consumer Advocates v. Echostar Satellite Corp. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 1361, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 22*

Unfair competition statute, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, may apply if employer is guilty of age discrimination under Fair Employment and Housing Act, *Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*, at least if only injunctive relief is sought under unfair competition statute. Herr v. Nestl'e *U.S.A., Inc. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 779, 782, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 477*

Failure of law firm to register as corporation with State Bar, even though it holds itself out as "law corporation," does not in and of itself warrant private remedies, such as disgorgement of legal fees under unfair competition statute, in action brought by clients who have not shown reliance on corporate status in seeking legal services or any other injury by virtue of firm's failure to register. *Olson v. Cohen (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 1209, 1214-1216, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 620*

Hospital adequately pleaded action under unfair competition statute against health care service plan for withholding payment for services rendered to plan members in alleged violation of Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act (*Health & Saf. Code § 1340 et seq.*). *Coast Plaza Doctors Hosp. v. UHP Healthcare (2002) 105 Cal. App. 4th 693, 703-705, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 650*

Decision of large supermarket chain to keep former store empty to prevent competitors from leasing space and competing with newer store nearby was not actionable as unfair business conduct under unfair competition statute, even though keeping former site empty may have been contributing to urban blight at shopping mall in which former store was located. *Gregory v. Albertson's, Inc. (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 845, 854-857, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 389*

Hotel's practice of charging mandatory service charge for room service, but not telling patrons that charge went to servers, was neither unfair nor deceptive under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* *Searle v. Wyndham Int'l, Inc. (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 1327, 1334-1335, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 231*

Mortgage loan servicing company's practice of passing modest cost of performing property inspections to delinquent borrowers was not unlawful, unfair, or deceptive under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* *Walker v. Countrywide Home Loans, Inc. (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1158, 1170-1178, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 79*

Conduct determined not to be unreasonable restraint of trade under Cartwright Act could not support cause of action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* *Chavez v. Whirlpool Corp. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 363, 374-375, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 175*

Appellants stated cause of action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* by alleging that insurance company violated *Civ. Code § 1457* by transferring contractual obligations under insurance policies to another insurance company without obtaining policyholders' consent. *AICCO, Inc. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am. (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 579, 588-589, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*

Statutory action for unfair competition is not barred by pending action brought under False Claims Act (*Gov. Code § 12650 et seq.*); provision of False Claims Act barring "related action based on the facts underlying the pending action" applies only to subsequent qui tam actions brought under *False Claims Act. Rothschild v. Tyco Int'l (US), Inc. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 488, 499-500, 99 Cal. Rptr. 2d 721*

Former *Civ. Code § 1936(m)(2)* (*now see Civ. Code § 1936(n)(2)*), which permits rental car companies to impose charges for optional services if car renter knows that charge may be avoided, provided rental car company with "safe harbor" from claims under unfair competition statute based on imposition of refueling surcharge and amount of surcharge; however, *Civ. Code § 1936* did not protect company from claim under unfair competition statute that company unfairly or fraudulently advised customers of fuel service surcharge. *Schnall v. Hertz Corp. (2000) 78 Cal. App. 4th 1144, 1156, 1162, 1170, 93 Cal. Rptr. 2d 439* ; *see also* *Shvarts v. Budget Group, Inc. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1159-1160, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 722* (agreeing with *Schnall* analysis, but rejecting fraud claim because amount of refueling surcharge was clearly printed on first page of rental agreement)

Plaintiff car dealership was not entitled to recover against wholesale floor plan lender under Unfair Competition statute for defendant's use of interest calculation method that was based on 360-day year, because evidence of plaintiff's course of dealings with defendant and widespread industry use of practice demonstrated that plaintiff knew of and expected defendant to use that interest calculation method. *South Bay Chevrolet v. General Motors Acceptance Corp. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 861, 878-890, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301*

Practice of clinical medical laboratory in negotiating discounts for physicians' private-pay patients did not constitute unfair competition, because practice was not injurious to consumers, there was no serious risk that physicians would choose laboratory for reasons other than quality of its work, and under state regulations, Medi-Cal controlled amount it

would pay and was not at disadvantage by not being offered similar discounts. *People v. Duz-Mor Diagnostic Lab., Inc. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 654, 662-663, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 419*

Trial court injunction ordering bank to lower its service fee for deposited items returned constituted abuse of court's discretion to enjoin unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*, because regulation of fees charged by federally chartered banks is more appropriately left to *Comptroller of Currency. California Grocers Ass'n v. Bank of Am. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 205, 218-219, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396*

Injunction under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* against enforcement of health maintenance organization (HMO) plan provision requiring member to reimburse HMO for cost of medical services provided to member from judgment or settlement recovered by member against third party not properly based on alleged violations of provisions of *Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.* (Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act), because Act's provisions did not define unlawful acts but merely constituted guidelines governing the exercise of Department of Corporation's regulatory power over *HMO's. Samura v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1284, 1300-1302, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20*

No cause of action for damages and injunctive relief could be stated under *Civ. Code § 1670.5* based on unconscionability of contract term; but if term was unconscionable, injunctive relief could be awarded under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* on ground that imposition of offending term constituted unfair business practice. *Shadoan v. World Sav. & Loan Assn. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 97, 101, 268 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Demurrer properly sustained to complaint challenging prepayment penalty as unconscionable and unfair business practice when lack of availability of financing without offending term, and thus lack of bargaining power, was pleaded as conclusion and without facts; nor was prepayment penalty oppressive or unreasonably favorable to defendant. *Shadoan v. World Sav. & Loan Assn. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 97, 103-106, 268 Cal. Rptr. 207*

Since *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Cos. (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 305-313* , abolished third party's private right of action for unfair claims settlement practices under *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*, third party has no cause of action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *Safeco Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1990) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1491, 1493-1494, 265 Cal. Rptr. 585*

Eviction service that cloaked itself with aura of expertise and provided more than clerical services by assisting clients in advancing their legal rights, engaged in unauthorized practice of law (*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 6125, 6126*), and thus was guilty of unfair competition and subject to penalty under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17206*. *People v. Landlords Prof'l Servs., Inc. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1599, 1608-1610, 264 Cal. Rptr. 548*

Employer's practice of conditioning acceptance of offers of employment on prospective employee's successful completion of physical examination that includes drug and alcohol testing not violative of *Cal. Const. art. I, § 1*, or *2 Cal. Code Reg. § 7294.0(b)(3)*, and thus not unfair business practice. *Wilkinson v. Times Mirror Corp. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1034, 1052-1053, 264 Cal. Rptr. 194*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 designed to protect consumers as well as competitors. *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 129, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Practice of charging "retail repair rate" to renter when rental company only paid wholesale repair rate, without explanation or substantiation, was deceptive business practice within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 129-130, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Fact that consumer did not read contract not relevant when ambiguous written contracts and deceptive oral misrepresentations of sales representatives constituted deceptive business practice within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 131, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Ambiguous written contracts and misleading oral sales presentations that failed to inform renter that collision damage waiver was not insurance and was voided by renter's negligence, was deceptive business practice. *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 130-131, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Majority stockholder and chief executive officer who was responsible for ambiguous written contracts and misleading presentations of selling agents was personally liable for violations of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17500*. *People v. Dollar Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 119, 132, 259 Cal. Rptr. 191*

Hospital's change from "open staff" to exclusive contract with one bypass surgeon not unfair competition within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*; no fraud or unfair business practice was involved when change was not made for anticompetitive purposes. *Redding v. St. Francis Med. Ctr. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 98, 107, 255 Cal. Rptr. 806*

Because borrower has no duty to disclose known defects at trustee's sale, lender acquiring property at foreclosure does not have cause of action against builder/borrower under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200* (unfair and deceptive practices) based on known construction defects. *Sumitomo Bank v. Taurus Developers, Inc. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 211, 222-223, 229 Cal. Rptr. 719*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq. (unfair competition) and *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 et seq.* (false advertising) not applicable to political election campaign practices. *O'Connor v. Superior Court (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1019-1020, 223 Cal. Rptr. 357*

Use of similar alphanumeric telephone number that is likely to confuse potential customers as to source of services was possible basis of unfair competition claim. *Cytanovich Reading Ctr. v. Reading Game (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 107, 114, 208 Cal. Rptr. 412*

Laches available defense in action to enjoin unfair competition based on confusion of source of goods or services. *Tustin Cmty. Hosp., Inc. v. Santa Ana Cmty. Hosp. Ass'n (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 889, 894, 153 Cal. Rptr. 76* ; *McCord Co. v. Plotnick (1951) 108 Cal. App. 2d 392, 395-396, 239 P.2d 32*

[4] Unfair Practices Act (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101)

Presumption of unlawful purpose created by evidence of sales below average total cost plus proof of injury to competition; presumption allows fact-finder to infer unlawful intent without regard to particular market conditions. *William Inglis & Sons, Inc. v. Continental Baking (9th Cir. 1991) 942 F.2d 1332, 1338*

In order to demonstrate violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043* (sales below cost) or *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17044* (low cost leader), plaintiff must show that defendant acted *purposely*, that is, with desire to injure competitor or destroy competition; it is insufficient that defendant may have acted with knowledge that competitors may be injured by its actions. *Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co. (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 163, 174-178, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 548, 973 P.2d 527*

Catholic hospital's failure voluntarily to offer information concerning pregnancy prevention, including fact that "morning after pill" would have to be administered within 72 hours after intercourse to be effective, to rape victim treated in its emergency room did not constitute to unfair, dishonest, deceptive, destructive, fraudulent, or discriminatory practice. *Brownfield v. Daniel Freeman Marina Hosp. (1989) 208 Cal. App. 3d 405, 411, 256 Cal. Rptr. 240*

When third party brought action against insured for violations of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17043* (sales below cost) and

later obtained judgment of treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*, insured's liability for judgment covered under insurer's business liability policy when insured's conduct was intentional but without malice; award of treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* covered under policy because it is not exemplary but constitutes additional compensation. *California Shoppers, Inc. v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 1, 31-34, 221 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *but see Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 827, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856* (barring plaintiff's election between punitive damages and trebled damages in part because *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* and *Civ. Code § 3294* both serve punitive purpose)

Evidentiary presumption under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17071* on proof of certain facts did not prevent sustaining of general demurrer. *Hladek v. City of Merced (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 585, 591 n.3, 138 Cal. Rptr. 194*

Waiver of bond requirement for preliminary injunction under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17081* proper only in action based on violation of Unfair Practices Act. *Federal Automotive Servs. v. Lane Buick Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 689, 693-695*

People are proper party plaintiff in action based on violation of Unfair Practices Act. *People v. Part (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 653, 654*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.156

§ 565.156 Attorney General Opinions

Lender practice of designating those foreclosure trustees who agree to charge trustee fee only in amount that federal government will reimburse lender for foreclosure sale on FHA or VA secured loans, and allowing trustee to charge maximum fee allowed by state law on other loan foreclosures, violates Unfair Business Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*). *71 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 314 (1988)*

Wine products included within "articles or products" subject to Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101*); *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17031* includes all commodities except those expressly excluded. *19 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 88 (1952)*

Use of colored lights to alter appearance of food displayed for sale is unfair competition under former *Civ. Code § 3369* (*now see Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*). *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 750 (1975)*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 17048.5 inapplicable to reimbursement agreement between automobile manufacturer and new car dealer for performance of warranty repair service; agreements governed by more specific provisions of *Veh. Code §§ 3050, 3065*. *62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 726 (1979)*

District attorney may bring action under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17204, 17206* for conduct in violation of *Lab. Code §§ 1420, 1420.1, 1420.35*. *63 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 457 (1980)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.157

§ 565.157 Law Reviews

Feldon, *Breach of Contract as an Unfair Consumer Practice--The "Orkin" Case*, 44(5) Bus. Law. 1047 (1989)

Note, *Folklore and Myth in Judicial Opinions--Some Reflections Inspired by Texaco-Getty, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 591 (1987)*

Beschle, *"What, Never? Well, Hardly Ever": Strict Antitrust Scrutiny as an Alternative to Per Se Antitrust Illegality, 38 Hastings L.J. 471 (1986)*

Comment, *Local Government Antitrust Update, 16 Lincoln L. Rev. 179 (1986)*

Thompson, *An Outline of 23 California Common Law Business Torts, 13 Pac. L.J. 1 (1981)*

Note, *Prevention of Unfair Business Practices in California: A Proposal for Effective Regulation, 32 Hastings L.J. 229 (1980)*

Note, *Former Civil Code Section 3369: A Study in Judicial Interpretation, 30 Hastings L.J. 705 (1979)*

Browne, *Actionable Unfair Competition: Prevention and Litigation*, 12 Bev. Hills B.J. 169 (1978)

Browne, *Guarding Against Unfair Competition and Business Piracy Through Preventive Law, 51 L.A. Bar J. 153 (1975)*

Note, *Unfair Competition and the Consumer--Barquis v. Merchants Collection Association, Inc., 24 Hastings L.J. 537 (1973)*

Comment, *The Misappropriation Doctrine: A Search for Literary Title Protection, 12 Santa Clara Lawyer 142 (1972)*

Goldstein, *The Competitive Mandate: From Sears to Lear*, *59 Cal. L. Rev. 873 (1971)*

Comment, *The Protectability of Package, Container, and Product Configurations*, *5 U.S.F. L. Rev. 451*, *6 U.S.F. L. Rev. 172 (1971)*

McCarthy, *Whatever Happened to the Small Businessman? The California Unfair Practices Act*, *2 U.S.F. L. Rev. 165 (1968)*

Comment, *People v. National Research Co. of California--An Extension of the California Cause of Action for Unfair Competition*, *36 S. Cal. L. Rev. 304 (1963)*

Barron, *California Antitrust--Legislative Schizophrenia*, *35 S. Cal. L. Rev. 393 (1962)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.158

§ 565.158 Text References

Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation, Ch. 11 et seq.

California Forms of Jury Instruction, Ch. 33, *California Judicial Council Unfair Practices Act Instructions*, and Ch. 33A, *Matthew Bender Unfair Competition Instructions*

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 607, 610, 741, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 735, 786, Vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 312 (4th ed. 1996-1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Insurance §§ 252-256*; vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 98-125, 130-132 (10th ed. 2005)

Restatement of Torts §§ 711-761

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.159-565.169

[Reserved]

§§ 565.159[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.170

§ 565.170 California Legal Forms

For a form of noncompetition covenant that may be used in a business buy-out agreement, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 17, Buying and Selling a Business or Professional Practice, § 17.213* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.171

§ 565.171 Federal Statutes

[1] General Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction of district courts over actions under laws regulating commerce or protecting trade and commerce from restraints and monopolies. *28 U.S.C.S. § 1337*

[2] Sherman Act (15 U.S.C.S. §§ 1-7)

Combinations in restraint of trade; price fixing. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 1, 3*

Monopolies, attempts and conspiracies to monopolize. *15 U.S.C.S. § 2*

Jurisdiction of federal district courts; joinder of additional parties, whether or not they reside within district. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 4, 5*

Forfeiture of property involved in combination. *15 U.S.C.S. § 6*

[3] Clayton Act (15 U.S.C.S. §§ 12-27, 44)

Discrimination in prices, services, facilities, or selection of customers; discrimination in rebates, discounts, advertising; underselling; exemptions for cooperative and nonprofit associations. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 13, 13a-13c*

Sales, leases, and contracts conditioned on nonuse of competitor's product. *15 U.S.C.S. § 14*

Standing to sue; treble damages, costs, and attorney's fees; United States as plaintiff. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 15, 15a*

Four-year limitation period; tolling of limitation period for private actions during pendency of specified actions instituted by United States. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 15b, 16(i)*

Exemptions for labor organizations, specified agricultural and horticultural organizations. *15 U.S.C.S. § 17*

Mergers and acquisitions which lessen competition or tend to create monopoly prohibited; notification and waiting period requirements. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 18, 18a*

Interlocking directorates. *15 U.S.C.S. § 19*

Federal agency enforcement provisions. *15 U.S.C.S. § 21*

Venue over corporate defendant in any district wherein it transacts business. *15 U.S.C.S. § 22*

Corporate directors, officers, or agents who authorize corporate violations liable for violation. *15 U.S.C.S. § 24*

Injunctions. *15 U.S.C.S. §§ 25, 26*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.172

§ 565.172 State Statutes

[1] Cartwright Act

[a] In General

Definition of person. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16702*

Trusts and combinations in restraint of trade prohibited; contracts in violation of Act and unlawful trusts are void. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16722, 16726*

Conditioning lease, sale, or contract on nonuse of competitor's product prohibited. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*

[b] Exceptions and Exemptions

Labor. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16703*

Associations to promote competition. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16725*

[c] Procedural and Enforcement Provisions

Jurisdiction; venue; standing; injunctive relief; treble damages; prejudgment interest, costs, and attorney's fees; additional parties; attorney general as class representative. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750, 16751, 16760, 16761*

Four-year limitation period. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.1*

Foreign and domestic corporations and associations are subject to forfeiture of corporate charter, franchises, and privileges on violation. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16752* (domestic), *16753* (foreign)

Actions brought by state. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16754, 16754.5*

Fines and penalties for violations. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16755*

Specificity of pleading and proof required. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16756, 16757*

Self-incrimination privilege of attorney general's witness suspended; investigative powers of attorney general, district attorneys; damages in actions by attorney general. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16758-16760*

Appointment of receiver in action by Attorney General in name of people of State of *California. Gov. Code § 12527*

[2] Contracts in Restraint of Trade

Contracts restraining trade, business, or practice of one's profession are void to that extent. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*

Noncompetition clause in buy-out agreement is enforceable against former (selling) partner or shareholder. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16601* (corporate shares), *16602* (partnership)

Prohibited transactions relating to sales and consignments of horror comics, books, magazines, and publications. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16603-16605*

Customer list of telephone answering service is trade secret of service owner. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16606*

Customer list of employment agency is trade secret of agency, but former employee is entitled to use list after one year from termination of employment. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.173

§ 565.173 Decisions

[1] Boycotts

Vertical restraint and boycott are labels for different forms of antitrust analysis, one focusing on practices and other on broader question of market structure. *Redwood Theaters, Inc. v. Festival Enters., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 703, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189*

In testing alleged exclusive-dealing agreements of competing exhibitor with each of three distributors as boycotts that tended to cut off plaintiff's access to first-run films of those distributors, evidence of predatory intent is necessary for boycott to be illegal per se. *Redwood Theaters, Inc. v. Festival Enters., Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 702-703, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189*

[2] Class Actions

Variance in purchase prices paid by class members is not obstacle to certification; court is empowered to divide class into subclasses. *Occidental Land, Inc. v. Superior Court (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 355, 360 n.3, 134 Cal. Rptr. 388, 556 P.2d 750* ; *MacManus v. A. E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1117, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315*

Requisite community of interest for certification is established if every member of class would not be required to litigate numerous and substantial questions to determine his or her right to recover subsequent to rendering of any class judgment in plaintiffs' favor on common issues. *Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 800, 809, 94 Cal. Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964* ; *MacManus v. A. E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1116-1117, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315*

Certification is not to be denied because case involves construction or coercive effect of standardized provisions in defendant's contracts, there were many individual transactions, and each plaintiff may have had different understanding of contract provisions; individual understanding is not as important as vindication of purpose of unfair trade laws. *MacManus v. A. E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1115-1116, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315*

For certification of class of indirect purchasers in action alleging price fixing conspiracy, damages are presumed to flow from per se nature of offense; each class member is not required to have purchased every product fixed in price. *B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348-1355, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228*

[3] Conspiracy

Under Cartwright Act, when conduct is tested by rule of reason, plaintiff must show that either purpose or effect of conspiracy is illegal restraint. *Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1483*

Simultaneous refusals to deal are consistent with independent action even when each refusing party is aware of the other's refusal. *Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1479*

Concerted refusals to deal are tested by rule of reason when economic impact of challenged practice is not obvious. *Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480-1483*

Conspiracy in violation of Cartwright Act not alleged if manufacturer announced minimum resale prices for its products and that it would refuse to sell to retailers who did not comply, and manufacturer took steps to monitor which retailers were in compliance with pricing policy. *Chavez v. Whirlpool Corp. (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 363, 373, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 175*

[4] Contractual Restraints on Former Employees

Former employer may restrain by contract only that conduct of former employee which would have been subject to judicial restraint absent contract. *Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley (9th Cir. 1980) 622 F.2d 1324, 1338*

Injunction was overbroad in prohibiting former attorney employee of consulting firm from rendering legal services, which firm was not licensed to do, to clients of firm. *Matull & Assocs. v. Cloutier (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1055-1056, 240 Cal. Rptr. 211*

Former employee who was officer and director of corporate employer, and was officer of firm that sold its accounts to corporate employer and signatory of buy-sell agreement, was bound by broad noncompetition clause in buy-sell agreement. *Matull & Assocs. v. Cloutier (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1054-1055, 240 Cal. Rptr. 211*

Contract prohibiting solicitation of employer's customers may permissibly prohibit more than law of marketplace otherwise would prohibit. *Loral Corp. v. Moyes (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 268, 276-280, 219 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[5] Covenants Not to Compete

Covenant not to compete, even one with temporal and geographic limitations, after termination of franchise term is unenforceable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*, which applies even though franchise agreement that provides it will be governed by law of another state. *Scott v. Snelling and Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1045-1046*

Covenant not to compete contained in warehouse management partnership agreement was void under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600*; covenant sought to prevent partner from designing or building any other warehouse, but partnership agreement also specified that partnership was limited in scope to listed warehouse, that partners could engage separately in competing real estate activities, and that partners had no obligation to refer any business opportunity to partnership. *Kelton v. Stravinski (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 941, 946-947, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 877*

Jury instruction requested by plaintiff was not erroneous because it failed to define competition; plaintiff is not required to educate jury regarding defenses. *Fleming v. Ray-Suzuki, Inc. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 574, 583, 275 Cal. Rptr. 150*

[6] Distributorships

Agreement between manufacturer and distributor to establish exclusive distributorship is not, of itself, violation of antitrust laws, and in most circumstances, does not adversely affect competition in market; no antitrust violation occurs unless agreement is intended to or actually does harmcompetition in relevant market. *Rutman Wine Co. v. E. & J. Gallo Winery (9th Cir. 1987) 829 F.2d 729, 735*

Agreement between distributors to divide territories or customers is horizontal restraint and per se violation. *Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. J. Sosnick & Son (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 627, 633, 162 Cal. Rptr. 87* ; *but see Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1480-1483* (refusing to follow *Guild Wineries & Distilleries v. J. Sosnick & Son (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 627, 162 Cal. Rptr. 87* , on ground that California Supreme court would apply rule of reason standard)

[7] Exclusive Dealing Arrangements

Contract exclusively entitling franchisor of employees' cafeteria operation to provide coffee sold in cafeteria, under which employer foreclosed franchisee operator of cafeteria from providing coffee, had de minimis impact on relevant market and was not unreasonable restraint on trade. *Kim v. Servosnax, Inc. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1361, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 422*

Vertical restraints on customers and territory are tested by rule of reason and require threshold inquiry into defendants' market power (share); 16 percent market share is below threshold for scrutiny; market shares of separate distributors cannot be aggregated for threshold determination unless there is evidence or allegation of collusion between them. *Redwood Theatres, Inc. v. Festival Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 704-705, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189* (citing Department of Justice's Vertical Restraint Guidelines, as published January 23, 1985)

[8] Exhaustion of Administrative Review

If basis of Cartwright claim is quasi-judicial decision, such as decision of review committee to deny physician hospital privileges, state antitrust action is barred unless and until quasi-judicial decision has been overturned by grant of writ of mandate. *Mir v. Little Co. of Mary Hosp. (9th Cir. 1988) 844 F.2d 646, 651* (considering pendent state claim); *Westlake Community Hosp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 465, 484, 131 Cal. Rptr. 90, 551 P.2d 410*

[9] Governmental Immunity

Cities are not "persons" within meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16702* and are not subject to suit under *Cartwright Act. Penn v. City of San Diego (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 636, 642-643, 233 Cal. Rptr. 514* ; *People ex rel. Freitas v. City and County of San Francisco (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 913, 921, 155 Cal. Rptr. 319*

[10] Multiple Listing Services

Multiple listing service is not required to be open to members of public who do not hold real estate licenses. *Derish v. San Mateo-Burlingame Bd. of Realtors (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 534, 540-542, 186 Cal. Rptr. 390*

Multiple listing service's refusal to accept exclusive agency listings and open listings is impermissible restraint. *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 477-479, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728*

Rule of reason test applied to claim that listing service must be available on reasonable fee basis; injury to plaintiff broker was insufficient, impaired market or monopoly is required. *Feldman v. Sacramento Bd. of Realtors, Inc. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 739, 742-745, 747-748, 174 Cal. Rptr. 231*

[11] Medical and Dental Plans

Question of fact was presented regarding whether plan provision requiring provider to charge same price to plan member as to patient who is not plan member was restraint of trade, but summary judgment in favor of plan was proper because plan members were unable to show any injury. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 604-605, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Provision in dental plan prohibiting dentist from waiving patient's copayment did not constitute price fixing, nor create any anticompetitive effect. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 601-603, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Usual fee requirement of most plans is not fixing prices at specific level, and thus, is not plainly anticompetitive. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 598, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Alleged anticompetitive affects of health care plans provisions are to be tested by the rule of reason. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 596-600, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

[12] Preemption

No conflict exists between *Pub. Util. Code § 21690.8* grant of authority to fix prices and Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act (*15 U.S.C.S. §§ 751-760*) as long as price fixed under authority of *Pub. Util. Code § 21690.8* does not exceed federal guideline. *California Aviation, Inc. v. City of Santa Monica (9th Cir. 1986) 806 F.2d 905, 908-909*

Fact that one defendant-buyer was foreign government did not implicate any issue of federal supremacy, preclusion, or preemption on basis of foreign relations or foreign commerce sufficient to bar California action when anticompetitive conduct in question has direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeable effect in California; California antitrust and unfair trade laws neutral in their application. *Amarel v. Connell (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 137, 144-150, 248 Cal. Rptr. 276*

[13] Price Fixing

Under Cartwright Act, economic reasonableness of prices not determinative; issue is whether prices are artificially maintained at uniform level, whether "reasonable" or not. *Cellular Plus, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1246, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308*

[14] Prohibited Combinations

Plaintiffs sufficiently pleaded combination in restraint of trade when alleging that title to property conveyed by tax deed had become unmarketable incounty as result of efforts of defendants to convince public that title insurance is

necessity whenever real property is purchased, and conspiracy among only three title insurers in county to refuse to insure title to tax-defaulted property. *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guaranty Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 48-51, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513*

Two entities necessary for prohibited combination under *15 U.S.C.S. § 1*; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16720* are defendant and plaintiff/victim; cause of action stated against real estate developer and escrow subsidiary for developer-seller's allegedly requiring plaintiff-buyers to use escrow services of its subsidiary. *MacManus v. A. E. Realty Partners (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 1106, 1110-1112, 241 Cal. Rptr. 315* (distinguishing *Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp. (1984) 467 U.S. 752, 759-768, 104 S. Ct. 2731, 81 L. Ed. 2d 628*)

[15] Proof of Injury

No injury shown under either federal or California law by alleged conspiracy to fix electrical construction contract prices when price paid by plaintiff was fixed by arbitrator as fair in contract litigation between parties. *Kaiser Cement Corp. v. Fischbach and Moore, Inc. (9th Cir. 1986) 793 F.2d 1100, 1104-1105*

Poll taken by expert economist sufficient to establish that plaintiff's share of market would be greater but for defendant's activities. *Dolphin Tours, Inc. v. Pacifico Creative Serv., Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 773 F.2d 1506, 1510*

Antitrust laws designed to provide competitors just and equal opportunity to compete, and to prohibit unreasonable restraints on entrepreneurs' freedom to enter new markets or to expand market share. *Redwood Theatres, Inc. v. Festival Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 708-710, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Question of fact presented regarding whether plan provision requiring provider to charge same price to plan member as to patient who is not plan member was restraint of trade, but summary judgment in favor of plan proper because plan members unable to show any injury. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 604-605, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

[16] Relevant Market

Although interchangeability of products is usually considered in defining market, some products, such as popular first-run movies, are not substitutable. *Redwood Theatres, Inc. v. Festival Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 705-707, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189*

Definition of relevant market is question of law and fact often necessary to resolution of antitrust claim. *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 855, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953*

Test under rule of reason standard is whether anticompetitive effects of challenged restraint outweigh procompetitive ones. *Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1484* (diversity case applying California law, and citing *Gianelli Distributing Co. v. Beck & Co. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1020, 1048, 219 Cal. Rptr. 203*)

Per se standard usually not applied until courts have considerable experience with business relationship involved. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 597-598, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Alleged anticompetitive affects of health care plans provisions tested by rule of reason; integrated plan (as defined by Federal Trade Commission) judged under rule of reason standard. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 597, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Practices that are designed to increase economic efficiency and render markets more, rather than less, competitive are

judged by rule of reason standard. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 597, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

Fact that California Legislature enacted *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16770(g)* and *(h)* indicates intention to permit provider-controlled medical plans despite their potential for competitive harm; thus, rule of reason applicable to test practices of those plans. *Reynolds v. California Dental Serv. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 590, 596-597, 599-600, 246 Cal. Rptr. 331*

[17] Summary Judgment Rarely Proper

Summary judgment for defendant disfavored in antitrust matters, in which motive and intent play leading roles and proof is largely in hands of alleged conspirators and hostile witnesses, credibility and weight of whose testimony can be properly determined only when opportunity to cross-examine is present. *Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System (1962) 368 U.S. 464, 473, 82 S. Ct. 486, 7 L. Ed. 2d 458* ; *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 852, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953*

Whether or not particular restraint of trade is reasonable is question of fact to be determined at trial. *Corwin v. Los Angeles Newspaper Serv. Bureau, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 842, 855, 94 Cal. Rptr. 785, 484 P.2d 953*

Summary judgment disfavored in complex antitrust litigation if extensive factual determinations must be made concerning intent and motive; however, summary judgment is appropriate in absence of any significant probative evidence tending to support complaint. *Three Movies of Tarzana v. Pacific Theatres, Inc. (9th Cir. 1987) 828 F.2d 1395, 1398*

When defendants' explanations for refusal to deal are not entirely convincing and both defendants' admit agreement to refuse to deal with plaintiff was discussed, summary judgment for defendants improper. *Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell (9th Cir. 1986) 803 F.2d 1473, 1479-1480, 1483-1484*

Summary judgment for defendants was error after trial court denied plaintiff's motion to compel discovery of evidence that was necessary to establish existence of alleged exclusive dealing agreements; whether agreements resulted in unreasonable restraint of trade was question of fact. *Redwood Theatres, Inc. v. Festival Enterprises, Inc. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 687, 713-714, 248 Cal. Rptr. 189*

[18] Tying Arrangements

Plaintiff manufactured homes dealer did not state cause of action for illegal tying arrangement between mobilehome park operator and other mobilehome dealers when evidence did not support allegations that potential tenants of park could only rent space in park if they purchased mobilehome from specified dealers. *SC Manufactured Homes, Inc. v. Liebert (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 68, 87-89, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 73*

Decision of automobile distributor to package custom floor mats with automobiles as standard equipment before sending vehicles to dealerships was notillegal tying arrangement under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16727*. *Lloyd Design Corp. v. Mercedes-Benz of North America, Inc. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 716, 725, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 185*

Allegation that cable television company illegally tied sale of satellite channels to sale of broadcast channels and sale of premium channels to sale of both broadcast and satellite channels not preempted by Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 provision prohibiting states from regulating rates. *Morrison v. Viacom, Inc. (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1527, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 544*

Defendant's influence in market sufficient to establish illegal tying arrangement; elements to establish tying arrangement. *MacManus v. A. E. Realty Partners (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 275, 285-286, 194 Cal. Rptr. 567*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.174

§ 565.174 Law Reviews

Hovenkamp, *The Indirect-Purchaser Rule and Cost-Plus Sales, 103 Harv. L. Rev. 1717 (1990)*

Minda, *Interest Groups, Political Freedom and Antitrust: A Modern Reassessment of the Noer-Pennington Doctrine, 41 Hastings L.J. 907 (1990)*

Peritz, *A Genealogy of Vertical Restraints Doctrine, 40 Hastings L.J. 511 (1989)*

Riley, *At the Cutting Edge--How "Sharp" Will Affect Antitrust Plaintiffs, 35 Prac. Law. 53 (1989)*

Rock, *Antitrust and the Market for Corporate Control, 77 Cal. L. Rev. 1365 (1989)*

Marvel, Netter & Robinson, *Price Fixing and Civil Damages: An Economic Analysis, 40 Stan. L. Rev. 561 (1988)*

Spitzer, *Antitrust Federalism and Rational Choice Political Economy: A Critique of Capture Theory, 61 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1293 (1988)*

Zwirb, *Dual Distribution and Antitrust Law, 21 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1273 (1988)*

Note, *Labor Unions and the Sherman Act: Rethinking Labor's Nonstatutory Exemption, 22 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 151 (1988)*

Leibman and Nathan, *The Enforceability of Post-Employment Noncompetition Agreements Formed After At-Will Employment Has Commenced: The "Afterthought" Agreement, 60 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1465 (1987)*

Symposium, *Anticipating Antitrust's Centennial, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 787 (1987)*

Comment, *Section 16 of The Clayton Act: Divestiture An Intended Type of Injunctive Relief, 19 Pac. L.J. 143 (1987)*

Arthur, *Farewell to the Sea of Doubt: Jettisoning the Constitutional Sherman Act, 74 Cal. L. Rev. 266 (1986)*

Stern and Getzendanner, *Gauging the Impact of Associated General Contractors on Antitrust Standing Under Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 159 (1986)*

Wiley, *A Capture Theory of Antitrust Federalism, 99 Harv. L. Rev. 713 (1986)*

Comment, *Local Government Antitrust Update, 16 Lincoln L. Rev. 179 (1986)*

Note, *A Mixed Blessing for Predicting Antitrust Liability: Northwest Wholesale Stationers, Inc. v. Pacific Stationery and Printing Co., 20 U.S.F. L. Rev. 877 (1986)*

Note, *Concerted Behavior Under the Antitrust Laws (A Review of Areeda: Antitrust Law: An Analysis of Antitrust Principles and Their Application), 99 Harv. L. Rev. 1986 (1986)*

Egelko, *California's Trust Busters: Federal Retrenchment Has Shifted the Burden of Antitrust Enforcement to the States*, 5(7) Cal. Lawyer 26 (1985)

Kleine, *New Department of Justice Vertical Restraints Guidelines--A Search for Legal Certainty, 40 Bus. Law. 1335 (1985)*

Roberts, *Sports Leagues and the Sherman Act: The Use and Abuse of Section 1 to Regulate Restraints on Interleague Rivalry, 32 UCLA L. Rev. 219 (1984)*

Churchwell, *The Federal Antitrust Implications of Local Rent Control: A Plaintiff's Primer, 12 Pepperdine L. Rev. 919 (1985)*

Comanor, *Vertical Price-Fixing, Vertical Market Restrictions, and the New Antitrust Policy, 98 Harv. L. Rev. 983 (1985)*

Egelko, *California's Trust Busters, 5 Cal. Lawyer 27 (July 1985)*

Klein, *Some Thoughts on the Practicalities in Communicating with Distributors After Spray-Rite, 40 Bus. Law 581 (1985)*

Butler, Lane, and Phillips, *The Futility of Antitrust Attacks on Tie-In Sales: An Economic and Legal Analysis, 36 Hastings L.J. 173 (1984)*

Clanton, *Horizontal Agreements, the Rule of Reason, and the General Motors--Toyota Venture, 30 Wayne L. Rev. 1239 (1984)*

Epley and Banks, *National Real Estate Firms and Antitrust: Avoiding Liability*, 12 Real Estate L.J. 243 (1984)

Hovenkamp, *Merger Actions for Damages, 35 Hastings L.J. 937 (1984)*

Lopatka, *The Electric Utility Price Squeeze as an Antitrust Cause of Action, 31 UCLA L. Rev. 563 (1984)*

Comment, *Antitrust and California's New Preferred Provider Organization Legislation: A New Alternative in Health*

Care Cost Containment, 12 Pepperdine L. Rev. 121 (1984)

Comment, *Beyond Marginal Cost Pricing Rules: A Rule of Reason Approach to Predatory Pricing, 18 U.S.F. L. Rev. 559 (1984)*

Comment, *The Numerosity Requirement For Group Boycotts: Toward a Horizontal Benefit Analysis, 18 U.S.F. L. Rev. 577 (1984)*

Cowan, *California's Single-Firm Monopoly Loophole, 18 Cal. West L. Rev. 240 (1982)*

Note, *Indirect Purchaser Suits Under State Antitrust Laws: A Detour Around the Illinois Brick* Wall, *34 Stan L. Rev. 203 (1981)*

Note, *Avoiding the Antitrust Statute of Limitations Under Zenith:* A Decade of Inconsistency, *55 S. Cal. L. Rev. 255 (1981)*

Comment, *A Matter of Survival: How To Defend Small Business Cooperative Activity Against Antitrust Challenge, 13 U.C.D. L. Rev. 756 (1980)*

Comment, *Attorneys' Fees In Individual And Class Action Antitrust Litigation, 60 Cal. L. Rev. 1656 (1972)*

Alioto, *Proving Damages in an Antitrust Case, 44 L.A. Bar B. 485 (1969)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.175

§ 565.175 Text References

Modern Federal Jury Instructions, Chs. 79, *Restraint of Trade* , and 80, *Monopolization* (Matthew Bender)

Von Kalinowski, Antitrust Laws and Trade Regulation Ch. 105 (Matthew Bender)

Attorney's Guide to The Law of Competitive Business Practices (Cal. C.E.B. 1981), Ch. 5, *Antitrust*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.176-565.189

[Reserved]

§§ 565.176[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.190

§ 565.190 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in proceedings involving tort damages, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 64, *Damages: Tort* (Matthew Bender)

For memoranda of points and authorities relating to motions in support for and opposition to injunctions, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.191

§ 565.191 California Torts

For discussion of trade secrets, see N. Levy, M. Golden & L. Sacks, *California Torts, ch. 40, Fraud and Deceit and Other Business Torts, §§ 40.50 -40.56* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.192

§ 565.192 State Statutes

[1] California Public Records Act

California Public Records Act. *Gov. Code § 6250 et seq.*

"Trade secret" defined. *Gov. Code §§ 6254.2, 6254.7*

[2] Criminal Sanctions

"Trade secret" defined, and unlawful use made crime. *Penal Code § 499c*

Transmission through telecommunication to obtain trade secrets from public utility by fraudulent representations is crime. *Penal Code § 538.5*

[3] Customer lists

Customer list of telephone answering service is trade secret. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16606*

Customer list of employment agency is trade secret. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16607*

[4] Employment Related

Everything acquired by employee by virtue of employment belongs to employer. *Lab. Code § 2860*

Disclosure of trade secrets revealed during employment safety inspections is prohibited. *Lab. Code §§ 6322, 6396* (governed by California Public Records Act)

Rule prohibiting retaliation against employee disclosing information to government is not applicable to trade secret information. *Lab. Code § 1102.5*

[5] Evidence and Discovery

Discovery in action under UTSA for misappropriation of trade secret. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2019.210*

Privilege of nondisclosure attaches to trade secret. *Evid. Code §§ 915, 1060-1063*

[6] Protection of Trade Secrets Disclosed to Government Agency

Trade secret protection related to investigation of health effects of pesticides. *Food & Agric. Code § 14022*

Trade secret acquired through compliance with health emergency situation must be kept confidential by health officer. *Health & Safety Code § 473*

Information distributed by officials concerning treatment, recycling, and disposal of hazardous waste is required to protect trade secrets. *Health & Safety Code §§ 25170, 25175*

"Trade secret" defined and protected in Underground Storage of Hazardous Substances Chapter (*Health & Safety Code § 25280 et seq.*). *Health & Safety Code § 25290*

"Trade secret" defined and protected in Carpenter-Presley-Tanner Hazardous Substance Account Act (*Health & Safety Code § 25300 et seq.*). *Health & Safety Code § 25358.2*

Disclosure of trade secret acquired by state agent during inspection under food, drug, and cosmetic law is prohibited. *Health & Safety Code § 110165*

Disclosure of trade secret acquired by state agent under authority of California Hazardous Substances Act (*Health & Safety Code § 108100 et seq.*) is prohibited. *Health & Safety Code § 108290*

Trade secret protection is related to clean air standards and reports. *Health & Safety Code §§ 39660, 43206*

Disclosure of trade secrets revealed during employment safety inspections is prohibited. *Lab. Code §§ 6322, 6396*

Trade secret submitted as required by California Environmental Quality Act (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*) to public agency to apply for lease, permit, or other entitlements for use for proposed project, may not be disclosed by public agency. *Pub. Res. Code § 21160*

Trade secret presented by gas and electric utilities to Public Utilities Commission for forecasting purposes is protected. *Pub. Res. Code § 25321*

Trade secrets are not required to be presented at open meetings of county board of equalization. *Rev. & Tax. Code § 1605.4*

[7] Trade Secret Definitions

"Trade secret" defined. *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d), Gov. Code § 6254.2, Gov. Code § 6254.7, Health & Safety Code §§ 25358.2, 25290, Penal Code § 499c*

[8] Uniform Trade Secret Act

Uniform Trade Secrets Act. *Civ. Code § 3426*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.193

§ 565.193 Decisions

[1] Customer Lists

In context of particular terminated franchise relationship regarding temporary employment service agency, customer list was not trade secret under *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)* because it was developed by franchisees through their own efforts, personal knowledge, and business contacts. *Scott v. Snelling & Snelling, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1990) 732 F. Supp. 1034, 1044-1045*

Triable issue existed as to whether construction project binders generated by defendant while employed by plaintiff constituted protectable trade secrets; binders were more than just subcontractor contact lists and contained correspondences, descriptions, measurements, and detailed cost estimates for upcoming projects. *San Jose Construction, Inc. v. S.B.C.C., Inc. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 1528, 1538-1543, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 54*

Civ. Code § 3426.1(d), defining trade secret, is inclusive and not exclusive, and hence does not exclude customer lists by its failure to include them. *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1323-1324, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713*

[2] Determining Existence of Trade Secret

[a] Generally

Fact that product might disclose so-called secret is not determinative when there was sufficient evidence to support conclusion implied by verdict that plans and designs taken by employee/defendant were trade secrets under both common law and UTSA because plaintiff treated them as secrets and took reasonable steps to protect them. *Vacco Indus., Inc. v. Van Den Berg (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 34, 50, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 602*

[b] Effect of Employment Agreement

Agreement between employer and employee defining trade secret is not decisive in determining whether court will so regard it. *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1325, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713*

Employer-employee agreement defining "trade secret" was not necessarily binding on court; contractual restrictions on customer solicitation are more likely to be binding on former employee than contractual restrictions on nondisclosure. *Loral Corp. v. Moyes (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 268, 275, 219 Cal. Rptr. 836*

[c] No Trade Secret Found

Elements of employment counseling program are obvious to anyone who enrolled in program, generally known to public or other persons who can obtain economic value from them, and thus not trade secret. *Self-Directed Placement Corp. v. Control Data Corp. (9th Cir. 1990) 908 F.2d 462, 465-466* (applying California law)

Scriptural materials of church are not trade secret because church alleged no competitive market advantage from maintaining their secrecy, but only religious harm; materials are spiritual, not commercial, and thus do not have independent economic value necessary under definition of *Civ. Code § 3426.1(d). Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Wollersheim (9th Cir. 1986) 796 F.2d 1076, 1089-1091* (applying California law); *but see Religious Tech. Ctr., Church of Scientology Int'l, Inc. v. Scott (9th Cir. 1989) 869 F.2d 1306, 1309-1310* (same case; second application for temporary restraining order on amended complaint alleging materials had economic value was not res judicata but had to be considered on merits)

Computer software "routines" were not trade secrets when software company failed to prove that these routines had independent economic value by showing how helpful these routines were when crafting competing software or demonstrating how much of defendant's software consisted of these routines. *Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Systems Corp. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 547, 564-572, 66 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Fact that former employees (traffic reporters) possessed characteristics specified by former employer's customer (a radio station) did not support enforcement of noncompetition clause against former employees because personal characteristics of employees are not "trade secrets" of former employer. *Metro Traffic Control, Inc. v. Shadow Traffic Network (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 853, 861-862, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 573*

Information regarding radio station's preferences and requirements regarding traffic reporters was not trade secret of traffic reporting service that formerly employed reporters because information was available directly from radio station to anyone contracting with station. *Metro Traffic Control, Inc. v. Shadow Traffic Network (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 853, 863, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 573*

[3] Federal Preemption

Defense of federal preemption by copyright law is jurisdictional and may be raised for first time on appeal. *Balboa Ins. Co. v. Trans Global Equities (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1327, 1338-1339, 1344-1345, 267 Cal. Rptr. 787* ; *see 28 U.S.C.S. § 1338(a)*

Unauthorized use of computer software enhancements and support system, confidential information, and customer lists involves four species of unfair competition: breach of confidence, breach of fiduciary duty, trade secrets, and common law misappropriation, only last of which is preempted by federal copyright law because it does not require extra element of relationship between unauthorized user and owner of information. *Balboa Ins. Co. v. Trans Global Equities (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1327, 1344-1345, 1350-1353, 267 Cal. Rptr. 787*

[4] Injunctive Relief

Preliminary injunction against former employee is appropriate if former employee has already solicited customers on protected customer list and persuaded largest customer to contract with new employer, former employer is likely to prevail on merits, and likelihood of continuing harm to former employer in interim is strong. *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 637-638, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92*

Under *Civ. Code § 3426.2(a)*, injunction lasts only as long as is necessary to eliminate commercial advantage that person would obtain through misappropriation of trade secret and terminates when what once might have been trade secret becomes known to good faith competitors; information generally known in trade and already used by good faith competitors is not protectable trade secret and injunction does not issue to restrain its use. *AmericanPaper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1326, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713*

[5] Uniform Trade Secrets Act

Legislative intent in enacting Uniform Trade Secrets Act (UTSA), *Civ. Code §§ 3426, 3426.10*, was to codify better-reasoned cases concerning remedies for trade secret misappropriation and thus provide for more uniform application in area of misappropriation through improper means of trade secrets. *American Paper & Packaging Prods., Inc. v. Kirgan (1986) 183 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1324, 228 Cal. Rptr. 713*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.194

§ 565.194 Law Reviews

Griffinger, *Strategies for Ex-Employer Plaintiffs in Trade Secret Actions, 34 Prac. Law. 69 (1988)*

Note, *Inevitable Disclosure Trade Secret Disputes: Dissolutions of Concurrent Property Interests, 40 Stan. L. Rev. 519 (1988)*

Comment, *The Secret's Out: California's Adoption of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act--Effects on the Employer-Employee Relationship, 20 Loy. L.A. L. Rev. 1167 (1987)*

Comment, *The Specifically Defined Trade Secret: An Approach to Protection, 27 Santa Clara L. Rev. 537 (1987)*

Pooley, *Better Protection for Trade Secrets,* 5(8) Cal. Law. 51 (1985)

Seidel, *Handling Unsolicited Submissions of Trade Secrets,* 30(2) Prac. Law. 43 (1984)

Protecting Computerland's Fragile New Trade Secrets: Legal Uncertainties and Enforcement Problems Abound in Application of Copyright, Patent and Trade Secret Laws, 2(9) Cal. Law. 43 (1982)

Bramson, *Intellectual Property as Collateral--Patents, Trade Secrets, Trademarks and Copyrights, 36 Bus. Law. 1567 (1981)*

Note, *A Balanced Approach to Employer-Employee Trade Secret Disputes in California, 31 Hastings L. J. 691 (1980)*

Note, *Trade Secrets and the NLRA: Employees' Right to Health Safety Information, 14 U.S.F. L. Rev. 495 (1980)*

Comment, *Trade Secrets: How Long Should an Injunction Last? 26 UCLA L. Rev. 203 (1978)*

Note, *Antitrust Implications Arising From Use of Overly Broad Restrictive Covenants for Protecting Trade Secrets, 29 Hastings L. J. 297 (1977)*

Sloan, *Trade Secrets, 2 W. St. U. L. Rev. 1 (1973)*

Keating, *Trade Secret License: Industrial Property or Private Patent? 4 Sw. U. L. Rev. 54 (1972)*

Comment, *Industrial Espionage: Piracy of Secret Scientific and Technical Information, 14 UCLA L. Rev. 911 (1967)*

Note, *Justifying Relief in Customer List Litigation, 37 S. Cal. L. Rev. 112 (1964)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.195

§ 565.195 Text References

Milgram, Business Organizations, *Milgram on Trade Secrets* (Matthew Bender)

Attorney's Guide to the Law of Competitive Business Practices (Cal. C.E.B. 1981), Ch. 4. *Trade Secrets*

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, § 785 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 13, *Equity*, §§ 81-82, 93-96 (10th ed. 2005)

Restatement of Torts § 757

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.196-565.209

[Reserved]

§§ 565.196[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.210

§ 565.210 California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting and opposing demurrers or motions for summary judgment in an action for interference with business or contractual relationships, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 122, *Interference*

82 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.211

§ 565.211 California Torts

For full discussion of the torts of interference with business or contractual relationships, see Levy, Golden & Sacks, *California Torts, Ch. 40, §§ 40.100 -40.135*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.212

§ 565.212 State Statutes

Publication privileged when made in legislative, judicial, or other official proceeding. *Civ. Code § 47(b)*

Everyone is generally responsible for injury to rights of another occasioned by willful or negligent conduct. *Civ. Code § 1714(a)*

Punitive and compensatory monetary relief in tort action. *Civ. Code §§ 3294(a), 3333*

Injunctive relief. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*

Action based on liability not founded on written instrument must be brought within two years. *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*

Public entity's immunity for intentional or negligent misrepresentations of entity's employees. *Gov. Code § 818.8*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.213

§ 565.213 Decisions

[1] Conspiracy to Interfere

Contracting party is not liable in tort for conspiracy to interfere with its own contract. *Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 507-508, 521 & n.10* (disapproving prior court of appeal cases to contrary)

[2] Defenses

Defense of justification, or privilege, depends on balancing of importance, social and private, of objective advanced by interference against importance of interest interfered with, considering all circumstances including nature of actor's conduct and relationship of parties. *Environmental Planning & Inf. Council v. Superior Court (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 188, 193-194, 203 Cal. Rptr. 127, 680 P.2d 1086* ; *Greenberg v. Hollywood Turf Club (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 968, 977, 86 Cal. Rptr. 885*

City was not liable for intentional or negligent interference with economic relationships based on misrepresentations of city's employees because immunity under *Gov. Code § 818.8* applied. *Los Angeles Equestrian Ctr., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 432, 449-450, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 313*

Fact that utility merger required regulatory approval did not entitle competitor to interfere other than by making its objections in context of regulatory process; regulatory approvals are merely condition precedent like any other. *SCEcorp v. Superior Court (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 673, 678-683, 681, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 372*

Even if credit report causes harm, truth of report is complete defense to causes of action for defamation, interference with prospective economic advantage, injurious falsehood, or intentional infliction of emotional distress. *Francis v. Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 535, 539-541, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 361*

First Amendment protection is defense to injunction against signs and picketing and claim of intentional interference

with economic advantage where there is no claim of untrue statements *Paradise Hills Assocs. v. Procel (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1528, 1542-1545, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514* (signs, pickets regarding construction defects in home defendant purchased from plaintiff)

Summary judgment for defendant was proper when there was no factual question presented that directors' actions were undertaken in best interest of bank. *Aalgaard v. Merchants Nat'l Bank, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 674, 683-686, 274 Cal. Rptr. 81*

Defense of confidential relationship extends to attorney in rendering advice to client to breach contract. *Schick v. Bach (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 1321, 1329, 238 Cal. Rptr. 902*

Service station operator's claims of violation of covenant of good faith, fraud, and interference with prospective advantage arising from oil company's failure to maintain underlying ground lease was preempted by federal Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (*15 U.S.C.S. § 2806(a)*). *Mobil Oil Corp. v. Superior Court (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 485, 488-490, 234 Cal. Rptr. 482*

Existence of privilege is question of fact. *Gianelli Distrib. Co. v. Beck & Co. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1020, 1054-1057, 219 Cal. Rptr. 203*

Landlord's refusal to consent to tenant's sublease and subsequent negotiation of new lease on terms identical to that of sublease does not constitute cause of action for interference with contract relationship, when tenant's execution of sublease without landlord's written consent broke lease and entitled landlord to unilaterally sever landlord-tenant relationship. *Hamilton v. Dixon (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1011-1013, 214 Cal. Rptr. 639*

[3] Intentional Interference

[a] With Contractual Relationship

To state cause of action, plaintiff need not allege that some pecuniary or economic benefit accrued to defendant that formerly was plaintiff's. *McCalden v. California Library Ass'n (9th Cir. 1991) 919 F.2d 538, 543* (applying California law)

Airline could validly enforce tariff with holders of frequent flyer coupons and refuse to accept "brokered" coupons, but evidence of damages was insufficient to sustain summary judgment or injunction against broker of frequent flyer coupons. *Transworld Airlines v. American Coupon Exch. (9th Cir. 1991) 913 F.2d 676, 691-693, 698*

Jury instruction that culpable intent is deemed to exist if defendant knew that interference with plaintiff's contract with third party was substantially certain to result from its conduct was erroneous; proper instruction was that jury might infer culpable intent from conduct substantially certain to interfere with contract. *Seaman's Direct Buying Serv., Inc. v. Standard Oil Co. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 752, 767, 206 Cal. Rptr. 354, 686 P.2d 1158*

Plaintiff is entitled to bring action for inducing breach of contract by third party, or for rendering plaintiff's own performance more difficult, when interference is by unlawful means or by means lawful but without sufficient justification. *Lipman v. Brisbane Elementary Sch. Dist. (1961) 55 Cal. 2d 224, 232, 11 Cal. Rptr. 97, 359 P.2d 465* ; *Imperial Ice Co. v. Rossier (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 33, 35-36, 112 P.2d 631*

Injury to plaintiff's business employee by drunk driver was insufficient basis for cause of action for intentional interference with contractual relations because defendant's conduct was not "calculated to disrupt" employer-employee relationship. *Herrick v. Superior Court (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 787, 790-792, 233 Cal. Rptr. 675*

Question whether defendant's conduct caused third party to break contract with plaintiff was one of fact. *Gianelli Distrib. Co. v. Beck & Co. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1020, 1054 n. 12, 1057, 219 Cal. Rptr. 203*

Failure to instruct jury that proof of valid and existing contract was necessary to establish interference with contractual relations was harmless error due to overwhelming evidence of existence of contract; recovery for interference with contractual relations is not barred because contract is voidable. *Shamblin v. Berge (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 118, 123-125, 212 Cal. Rptr. 313*

[b] With Noncontractual Economic Relationship

Plaintiff is entitled to bring action for interference with relationship involving prospective economic advantage, whether or not relationship is contractual. *Buckaloo v. Johnson (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 815, 822-823, 122 Cal. Rptr. 745, 537 P.2d 865* ; *Zimmerman v. Bank of Am. (1961) 191 Cal. App. 2d 55, 57-58, 12 Cal. Rptr. 319*

Public policy dictates against allowing cause of action for interference with prospective economic advantage based on interference with opportunity towin prize in sporting event. *Youst v. Longo (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 64, 77-79, 233 Cal. Rptr. 294, 729 P.2d 728*

In action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage based on landlord's failure to disclose to tenant that its subtenant had signed a sublease with another tenant, allegedly causing the subtenant to default on and not renew its sublease with the plaintiff tenant, plaintiff failed to establish loss of economic advantage because plaintiff failed to show that it would have been better off had defendant landlord disclosed the other sublease. *Girard v. Delta Towers Joint Venture (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1741, 1750, 26 Cal. Rptr. 2d 102*

Factual contentions that law firm, which had previously represented partners and other of their ventures, used confidential information regarding partnership's negotiations for purchase of property, which was obtained by firm member who was limited partner, to allow firm to make more favorable offer, which was accepted, supported cause of action for intentional interference and presented triable issues of fact. *Tri-Growth Centre City, Ltd. v. Silldorf, Burdman, Duignan & Eisenberg (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1153-1154, 265 Cal. Rptr. 330*

References to plaintiff's medical practice, and right of employment with individual patients plaintiff had evaluated and treated and might evaluate and treat in future, was insufficient pleading of economic relationship with third parties to support cause of action for interference with prospective business advantage. *Amid v. Hawthorne Cmty. Med. Group, Inc. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1383, 1392, 261 Cal. Rptr. 240*

Individual shareholder's claim that bank interfered with relationship between shareholder and corporation by denying corporation's loan request and liquidating corporation to pay other loans was nothing more than indirect attempt to recover damages to corporation, which shareholder lacked standing to do. *Kruse v. Bank of Am. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 38, 65-66, 248 Cal. Rptr. 217*

Tort of interference with prospective economic advantage does not protect against interference with plaintiff's expectation of winning judgment for punitive damages or one that will be nondischargeable in bankruptcy. *Hepe v. Paknad (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 412, 420-421, 244 Cal. Rptr. 823*

Existence of legally binding agreement is not required to maintain action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage. *Rader Co. v. Stone (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 10, 28, 223 Cal. Rptr. 806*

Cause of action for interference with prospective economic advantage was stated against defendant, who owned

premises leased to corporate business which plaintiff had contracted to purchase, when complaint alleged that defendant unreasonably and for improper motive refused to consent to assignment of lease, even though lease authorized defendant arbitrarily to withhold consent to assignment. *Sade Shoe Co. v. Oschin & Snyder (1984) 162 Cal. App. 3d 1174, 1179-1181, 209 Cal. Rptr. 124*

[4] Negligent Interference

Cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations is stated when plaintiff suffers damages from injury to economic relationship due to defendant's negligent performance of contract with third party and such injury is foreseeable. *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463*

No cause of action for negligent interference with prospective economic advantage stated where doctor and assistant who administered neurological examination to boxer owed no duty to boxer's manager. *Colome v. State Athletic Comm'n (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1444, 1460, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 300*

No cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations was stated when plaintiff's injury was part of its ordinary business risk and when defendant merely gave opinion on matter of public interest. *Worldvision Enters., Inc. v. American Broad. Cos., Inc. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 589, 596-598, 191 Cal. Rptr. 148*

[5] No Cause of Action Stated

Employee who cannot identify any "prospective economic advantage" other than continuation of his or her employment relationship in action against employer does not state cause of action because party cannot induce breach of its own contract. *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 24, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054*

Motion to strike cause of action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage brought under anti-SLAPP statute, *Code Civ. Proc. § 425.16*, failed for lack of evidence of economic detriment; plaintiff provided no evidence to support allegations that value of plaintiff's real property was diminished by defendant's conduct. *Salma v. Capon (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1275, 1292-1293, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 873*

Bidding without necessary license, although intended to disrupt prospective business relationships of competitors, is essential to free-market system; thus, licensed competitor that was outbid by entity licensed to do only part of work bid was unable to state cause of action for interference with prospective advantage. *Settimo Assocs. v. Environ Sys., Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 842, 845-846, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757*

Subcontractor was not able to state cause of action for interference with contract or with prospective business advantage against department of power and water based on termination of primary contract after one unit of multiple-unit contract because claims were barred by governmental immunity and subcontractor was not intended beneficiary of primary contract. *Lundeen Coatings Corp. v. Department of Water & Power (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 816, 834, 283 Cal. Rptr. 551*

[6] Preemption

State claims for interference are preempted by*§ 301(a) of Labor* Management Relations Act (*29 U.S.C.S. § 185(a)*) when their determination requires interpretation of collective bargaining agreement. *Milne Employees Ass'n v. Sun Carriers (9th Cir. 1991) 960 F.2d 1401, 1412*

Fact that one defendant, buyer, was foreign government did not implicate any issue of federal supremacy, preclusion, or preemption on basis of foreign relations or foreign commerce sufficient to bar California action for interference with contract and prospective economic advantage when anticompetitive conduct in question has direct, substantial, and reasonably foreseeableeffect in California; California antitrust and unfair trade laws are neutral in their application.
Amarel v. Connell (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 137, 144-150, 248 Cal. Rptr. 276

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.214

§ 565.214 Law Reviews

Comment, *Lateral Moves and the Quest for Clients: Tort Liability of Departing Attorneys for Taking Firm Clients, 75 Cal. L. Rev. 1809 (1987)*

Matz and Howard, *Potential Tort Liability in Business Takeovers*, 6(9) Cal. Law. 33 (1986)

Note, *Interference With Prospective Gain: Must There Be a Contract? 22 San Diego L. Rev. 401 (1985)*

Krietzer, *Intentional Interference With Prospective Economic Relationships: A Case for Intentional Tort Recovery for the California Real Estate Broker, 15 U.S.F. L. Rev. 205 (1981)*

Thompson, *An Outline of 23 California Common Law Business Torts, 13 Pac. L.J. 1 (1981)*

Note, *Plaintiff's Measure of Recovery for Tortious Inducement of Breach of Contract--Profits or Losses? 19 Hastings L.J. 1119 (1981)*

Note, *Civil Conspiracy and Interference With Contractual Relations, 8 Loy. L. Rev. 302 (1975)*

Note, *Interference With Contractual Relations: A Property Limitation, 18 Stan. L. Rev. 1406 (1966)*

Comment, *Negligent Interference With Economic Expectancy: The Case for Recovery, 16 Stan. L. Rev. 664 (1964)*

Note, *Torts: Interference With Business Relations: Unreasonable Use of Power to Restrict Competitor's Access to Customers, 5 UCLA L. Rev. 341 (1957)*

Note, *Torts: Interference With Business Relations, 32 Cal. L. Rev. 205 (1944)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.215

§ 565.215 Text References

California Forms of Jury Instruction, Ch. 41, *Interference With Economic Relations*, §§ 41.01-41.17 (Matthew Bender)

Attorney's Guide to the Law of Competitive Business Practices (Cal. C.E.B. 1981), Ch. 9, *Business-Related Torts*, §§ 9.2-9.18

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 1, *Attorneys*, § 245; vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 574-576, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 727-732, Vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 312 (4th ed. 1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Insurance*, §§ 247, 248; vol. 5, *Torts*, §§ 731-748, 750-753, 756, 757, 759, 760, 762, 766; vol. 6, *Torts*, § 1709 (10th ed. 2005)

Prosser and Keeton on the Law of Torts (5th ed. 1984), Ch. 24, *Economic Relations*, §§ 129, 130

Restatement (Second) of Torts §§ 766-774B

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.216-565.229

[Reserved]

§§ 565.216[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.230

§ 565.230 Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17081] and for Treble Damages [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17082] for Prohibited Business Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17040, 17043-17049]

[1] FORM Complaint for Temporary and Permanent Injunctive Relief [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17081] and for Treble Damages [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17082] for Prohibited Business Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17040, 17043-17049]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTION AND TREBLE DAMAGES
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	
through_____,]	)	(Unfair Business Practice)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. _____ (*Allege identity and capacity of plaintiff, e.g.,* Plaintiff_____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the state of California, and doing business in California).]

[2. _____ (*Allege identity and capacity of defendant(s), e.g.,* Defendant_____ (*name*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a partnership sued herein under the name_____ (by which it is known *or* which it has assumed), with its principal office located_____ (at_____ (

street address) *or* in_____ (*city*)),_____ County, California.]

[3. Defendants DOES 1 through_____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by such defendants.]

4. _____ [*Allege act(s) of defendant(s) that constitute sales or services below cost, locality discrimination, the use of loss leaders, or the useof secret rebates or unearned discounts, e.g.,* Between_____, and_____ (*dates*), defendant_____ (*name*) offered for sale and sold to purchasers(, for whom plaintiff and defendant compete,) large quantities of Brand-X latex house paint at the price of $_____ per gallon. These offers of sale and sales were made below cost, in that_____ (*specify facts showing the costs of defendant(s), e.g.,* defendant purchased them at a price of $_____ per gallon, and his/her costs of doing business exceeds $_____ (*sale price minus purchase price*) per gallon)].

5. [Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that] [D]efendant(s) performed the above-mentioned act(s) for the purpose of_____ [*specify requisite wrongful intent, e.g.,* injuring (plaintiff and other) competitors].

6. Defendant(s) threatens/threaten to [and unless restrained, will]_____ [*specify continuing threat of alleged act(s) violating the Unfair Practices Act, e.g.,* continue to offer to sell and sell to purchasers the above-mentioned_____ (*specify, e.g.,* commodities) below cost].

7. As a proximate result of the above-mentioned act(s) of defendant(s), plaintiff has been deprived of the patronage of a large number of his/her actual and potential customers, all to his/her damage in the sum of $_____, trebled to the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant[s, and each of them,] to show cause, if any they have, why they should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action;

2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant(s) from_____ [*specify, e.g.,* offering to sell or selling any article or product below cost];

3. For trebled damages in the amount of $_____;

4. For reasonable attorney's fees in the amount of $_____;

5. For his/her costs incurred; and

6. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I,_____ [*name*], declare:

I am an officer,_____ [*specify office held*], of_____ [*name of corporation*], a corporation organized and existing under the laws of_____ [*specify state*], which is the plaintiff in the above-entitled action, and I have been authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. I am informed and believe that the matters stated therein are true and on that ground I allege that the matters stated therein are true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to state a cause of action for injunctive relief and trebled damages based on conduct in violation of the Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17000 et seq.*) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17082*].

[3] Allegations

The complaint includes initial, optional paragraphs that allege the capacity of a nonnatural plaintiff (Paragraph 1), the capacity of a nonnatural defendant and a basis for venue (Paragraph 2), and fictitiously named defendants (Paragraph 3). It then alleges the essential elements of a cause of action based on a violation of the Unfair Practices Act: defendant's commission of an act or acts prohibited by the Unfair Practices Act (Paragraph 4), with the requisite wrongful intent (Paragraph 5) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17040-17050*; *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 275, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (sales below cost); *see also § 565.52*].

As a basis for injunctive relief, it alleges defendant's continuing commission or threat of commission of the alleged prohibited acts (Paragraph 6) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17082*; *see also § 565.54[1][b]*; *see generally* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

As a basis for trebled damages, it alleges actual damages proximately caused by defendant's conduct (Paragraph 7) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17082*; *see also § 565.54[1][c]*; *see generally Ch. 177, § 177.70* et seq.].

[4] Injunction Not Necessary for Recovery of Restitution

Restitution pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* may be recovered even without the issuance of an injunction; the California Supreme Court has rejected the contention that restitution is available as relief only when ancillary to an injunction. Thus, the failure to allege entitlement to injunctive relief does not preclude the recovery of restitution [*ABC Int'l Traders, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 1247, 1268-1271, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112, 931 P.2d 290]* .

[5] Punitive Damages

The form contains no allegation for punitive damages because courts have held that a plaintiff who pursues a single cause of action under the Unfair Practices Act and establishes a malicious or oppressive violation of that Act is not entitled to elect whether to take punitive damages under *Civ. Code § 3294* or treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*, but is only entitled to treble damages [*Turnbull & Turnbull v. ARA Transp., Inc. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 811, 826-827, 268 Cal. Rptr. 856* ; *see § 565.54[1][b]*].

[6] Attorney's Fees and Costs

The form includes a prayer for reasonable attorney's fees, which are expressly authorized under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082*. For further discussion, see*§ 565.54[1][b]*.

[7] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*] and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For alternative forms of verification for use when the plaintiff is an individual or other noncorporate entity, *see § 565.250* and Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[8] Jurisdiction and Venue

An action seeking permanent injunctive relief is in the jurisdiction of the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), 580(b)(2)*].

If permanent injunctive relief is not sought, the superior court has jurisdiction of the action [*Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*]. In limited civil cases (amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less) the caption must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000. The caption must also identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9),(10)*].

If treble damages are sought, the proper county for trial of the action appears to be the county in which all or part of the cause of action arose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(a)* (action for recovery of penalty imposed by statute); *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 276-279, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17082* as penal in nature)]. Otherwise, the proper county for trial of the action is the county in which at least one defendant resided at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*] or, if a defendant is a corporation, the county in which its principal place of business is located or, if a defendant is a partnership or other unincorporated association, the county in which its principal office is located (Paragraph 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*].

[9] Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and procecedural requirements of establishing an award of attorney's fees, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and procecedural requirements for temporary restraining orders, preliminary and permanent injuctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter Jurisdiction*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

[10] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting an application for a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction restraining the useof a loss leader in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17030, 17044*, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 116, *Injunctions* (Matthew Bender)

[11] State Statutes

Action for injunctive relief and trebled damages for violation of Unfair Practices Act (*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17000-17101*). *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17070, 17078-17082*

[12] Decisions

"Competition" includes competition among retailers, wholesalers, or producers; *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17045* does not require competitive damage to competitors of person allowing unearned discount ("primary" line of commerce); violation can be based on competitive damage to competitors of person receiving it ("secondary" line of commerce). *ABC Int'l Traders, Inc. v. Matsushita Elec. Corp. (1997) 14 Cal. 4th 1247, 1254, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 112, 931 P.2d 290*

Allegations that only amount to breach of contract are insufficient; complaint must allege facts supporting statutory elements of violation and identify particular section of statutory scheme that was violated. *Khoury v. Maly's of Cal.,*

Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 612, 619, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708

[13] Text References

Attorney's Guide to the Law of Competitive Business Practices, Ch. 5, *Antitrust*, §§ 5.107-5.126 (Cal. C.E.B. 1981)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.231

§ 565.231 Complaint for Restitution and Injunction [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203]--Class Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 382] for Unfair Acts or Practices [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200]

[1] FORM Complaint for Restitution and Injunction [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203]--Class Action [Code Civ. Proc. § 382] for Unfair Acts or Practices [Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR INJUNC-
_____ [*names*]	)	TION AND RESTITUTION
Defendants.	)	(Unfair Competition)
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Identity and capacity of the plaintiff. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 1*.]

[2. *Identity and capacity of the defendant. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 2*.]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 3*.]

4. The plaintiff brings this action on his/her own behalf and on behalf of all persons similarly situated. The class that the plaintiff represents is composed of all persons who, at any time since the date four years before the filing of this complaint, [*specify facts common to class members on which injunction and restitution are based, e.g.,* have had their

vehicle towed by the defendant and been charged an unconscionable fee to retrieve the vehicle]. The persons in the class are so numerous [consisting of approximately_____ individuals,] that the joinder of all such persons is impracticable and that the disposition of their claims in a class action is a benefit to the parties and to the court.

5. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented in that each member of the class is or has been in the same factual circumstances, hereinafter alleged, as the plaintiff. Proof of a common or single state of facts will establish the right of each member of the class to recover. The claims of the plaintiff are typical of those of the class and the plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class.

[6. There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by maintenance of this class action because the plaintiff is informed and believes that each class member is entitled to restitution of a relatively small amount of money, amounting at most to $_____ each, making it economically infeasible to pursue remedies other than a class action. Consequently,there would be a failure of justice but for the maintenance of the present class action.]

7._____ [*Set forth factual allegations that the defendant's acts or practices occurred while doing business, e.g.,* The defendant_____ (*name*) is a business incorporated in the state of California and at all times herein mentioned owned and operated a vehicle towing service in_____ (*city*), California].

8._____ [*Set forth factual allegations of the defendant's acts that are the basis of the claim, e.g.,* Beginning on or about July 1, 1998, and continuing to the present time, the defendant_____ (*name*) was awarded a vehicle towing service license in_____ (*city*), California, and has towed and impounded vehicles at both the request of city officials and public persons. On June 1, 2004, the defendant_____ (*name*) towed the vehicle of the plaintiff_____ (*name*), a 1995 Ford Probe, License Plate No. 1234567, from_____ (*street address*),_____ (*city*), California].

9._____ [*Set forth allegations that show that defendant's acts are unfair, e.g,* The defendant_____ (*name*) towed and impounded the vehicle of the plaintiff_____ (*name*) on June 1, 2004, without sufficient warning. The defendant_____ (*name*) charged an unconscionable fee to retrieve the car, would not relinquish the vehicle from the defendant's impound lot unless the plaintiff signed a waiver of damage claims, and informed the plaintiff that the defendant would take title of the vehicle to pay for the towing and impound fees when the plaintiff refused to sign the damage waiver. On information and belief, the defendant_____ (*name*) has charged other members of the plaintiff class unconscionable fees to retrieve cars, forced owners to waive damage claims in order to retrieve vehicles from the defendant's impound lot, and forced owners to relinquish title to the vehicles when damage waivers were not signed and the unconscionable fees not paid].

10._____ [*Set forth causation and injury, e.g.,* As a direct, proximate, and foreseeable result of the defendant's wrongful conduct, as alleged above, the plaintiff_____ (*name*) and other members of the plaintiff class, who are unknown to the plaintiff but can be identified through inspection of the defendant's towing and impound records and by other means, were subjected to unlawful vehicle tows due to insufficient warning, were forced to pay unconscionable towing and storage fees in order to retrieve their vehicles, were not compensated for damage inflicted on their vehicles by improper towing procedures, and lost title to their vehicles if they refused to sign the defendant's damage waiver and pay the unconscionable fees. The plaintiff is entitled to relief, including full restitution and/or disgorgement of all revenues, earnings, profits, compensation, and benefits that may have been obtained by the defendant_____ (*name*) as a result of such unfair business acts or practices].

[11._____ (*Set forth allegations of attempts to notify the defendant of conduct and requests for non judicial remedies, if appropriate, e.g.,* The defendant_____ (*name*) has failed and refused to accede to

the plaintiff's request for a refund of the unconscionable fees obtained by the defendant. The plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the defendant has likewise failed and refused, and in the future will fail and refuse, to accede to other drivers' requests for refunds. The defendant_____ (*name*) has also refused to accede to the plaintiff's request for return of the title to the plaintiff's vehicle after the plaintiff refused to sign a damage waiver and pay the unconscionable fees, and the plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the defendant has likewise failed and refused, and in the future will fail and refuse, to accede to other drivers' requests for return of title to their vehicles).]

12. The defendant's acts hereinabove alleged are acts of unfair competition within the meaning of *Business and Professions Code Section 17203*. The plaintiff is informed and believes that the defendant will continue to do those acts unless the court orders the defendant to cease and desist.

13. The plaintiff has incurred and, during the pendency of this action, will incur expenses for attorney's fees and costs herein. Such attorney's fees and costs are necessary for the prosecution of this action and will result in a benefit to each of the members of the class. The sum of $_____ is a reasonable amount for attorney's fees herein.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff prays for judgment as follows:

1. For restitution to the plaintiff and each other member of the class, as his or her interest may appear, of all sums unlawfully collected by the defendant from the plaintiff and other members of the class since_____ [*date*];

2. For interest on these sums at the legal rate from the date of each unlawful collection [*or other prayer for interest*];

3. For a permanent injunction enjoining the defendant, and the defendant's agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under or in concert with them, to cease and desist from the following acts:

a._____ [*Specify according to allegations, e.g.,* Towing any vehicles in_____ (*city*) without adequate warning];

b._____ [*Continue as appropriate*];

[4. For_____ (*Specify if return or refund sought, e.g.,* an order requiring the defendant to return title to the plaintiff's 1995 Ford Probe, License Plate No. 1234567).]

5. For_____ [*Specify actions required to provide relief for class, e.g.,* an order requiring the defendant to compile a list identifying, as far as possible, all other persons who have had their vehicle towed by the defendant, and to send each such person a written offer to return any vehicle whose title was improperly transferred and to refund the unconscionable towing fees].

6. For the payment of the plaintiff's attorney's fees out of the moneys recovered for the joint benefit of the members of the class;

7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See§ 565.230* .]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to state a class action cause of action for restitution and injunctive relief based on conduct in violation of the unfair competition statute (*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.*) [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*].

For further discussion of the unfair competition statute, *see § 565.30* et seq. For discussion of, and forms for use in, class actions or actions for injunctions, *see* Chs. 120, *Class Actions* , and 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The factual predicates necessary to prosecute the action as a class action lawsuit (Paragraphs 4, 5, and 6);
- The defendant's business status (Paragraph 7);
- The factual basis for the claim and the conduct of defendant that constituted unfair competition (Paragraphs 8, 9);
- The injury suffered by the plaintiff and members of the plaintiff class, and that this injury was caused by defendant's unfair competition (Paragraph 10);
- The defendant's refusal to cooperate with attempts to resolve the dispute through nonjudicial means (Paragraph 11);
- That defendant's conduct violates the unfair competition statute and will continue to do so absent judicial relief (Paragraph 12); and
- The attorney's fees incurred by the plaintiff in prosecuting the claim as a class action (Paragraph 13).

[4] Standing

In 2004, the voters approved Proposition 64, which imposed standing requirements on private plaintiffs seeking relief under the unfaircompetition statute. Proposition 64's stated intent was to prohibit private attorneys from filing lawsuits for unfair competition if they do not have clients who have been injured in fact under the standing requirements of the United States Constitution [Proposition 64, § 1(h) (2004)]. As a result, a private person may bring an action under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* only if that person has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204*]. A private plaintiff may file a representative action on behalf of others only if the plaintiff meets this actual injury requirement and meets the requirements for class actions under *Code Civ. Proc. § 382* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*; *Arias v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 969, 980, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 588,*

209 P.3d 923]. However, so long as a class is otherwise properly certified, only the named class representatives must specifically show standing to bring the action and unnamed class members need not do so [*In re Tobacco II Cases (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 298, 321, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559, 207 P.3d 20]* .

Only a person who meets the requirements for standing may bring an action under the unfair competition statute. Thus, an injured party who would have standing cannot assign the right to sue under the unfair competition statute to another party who does not otherwise meet the requirements for standing to sue [*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 993, 1002, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605, 209 P.3d 937*]. Moreover, an association, such as a labor union, does not have standing to sue on behalf of its individual members when the association itself cannot meet the requirements for standing [*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1756, AFL-CIO v. Superior Court (2009) 46 Cal. 4th 993, 1003-1004, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605, 209 P.3d 937*].The changes to the requirements for standing enacted by Proposition 64 apply to actions that were pending when Proposition 64 was passed [*Californians for Disability Rights v. Mervyn's, LLC (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 223, 232-233, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 57, 138 P.3d 207]* . However, the ordinary rules governing the amendment of complaints and their relation back to the original complaint apply to these pending lawsuits [*Branick v. Downey Savings & Loan Assn. (2006) 39 Cal. 4th 235, 239, 46 Cal. Rptr. 3d 66, 138 P.3d 214* ; *see § 565.35[1]*].

[5] Statute of Limitations

An action brought to enforce any cause of action for unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.* must be brought within four years after the cause of action accrued [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17208*].

[6] Remedies

Any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*]. The court may make such orders or judgments, including the appointment of a receiver [*see* Ch. 486, *Receivers*], as may be necessary to prevent the use or employment by a person of any practice that constitutes unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*, or as may be necessary to restore to any person in interest any money or property, real or personal, that may have been acquired by means of such unfair competition [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*]. However, a private plaintiff cannot recover damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203* [*Heller v. Norcal Mut. Ins. Co. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 30, 45, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 200, 876 P.2d 999]* .

For further discussion of the remedies available in an action brought under the unfair competition statute, *see § 565.34*.

[7] Attorneys' Fees

This form includes a prayer for reasonable attorney's fees. Although the unfair competition statute does not contain any provision for the recovery of attorney's fees by a successful plaintiff, a plaintiff may recover those fees in a successful class action suit under the common fund principle. Under that principle, a party who incurs attorney's fees in bringing a cause of action that creates or preserves a fund for the benefit of nonlitigants as well as the prevailing litigants, is entitled to recover attorney's fees from the fund itself [*see* *D'Amico v. Board of Med. Examiners (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 1, 25, 112 Cal. Rptr. 786, 520 P.2d 10]* .

[8] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if the plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits or declarations, counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle the plaintiff to the relief sought [*see* *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction,

see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification of the complaint requires the defendant to file a verified answer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*], and precludes use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion of the effect that verifying a complaint has on the answer, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For alternate forms of verification for use when the plaintiff is an individual or other noncorporate entity, *see § 565.250* and Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[9] Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For discussions and forms for use in class action lawsuits, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and procedural requirements for establishing an award of attorney's fees, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and procedural requirements for temporary retraining orders, preliminary injunctions, and permanent injunctions, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

[10] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting a cause of action brought under the unfair competition statute, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 235, *Unfair Competition* , (Matthew Bender)

[11] State Statutes

Actions for restitution or injunction restraining acts constituting unfair competition under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200*. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203*

[12] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.230*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Unfair Business Practices

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.232-565.249

[Reserved]

§§ 565.232[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.250

§ 565.250 Complaint for Treble Damages for Restraint of Trade [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16727, 17650(a)] and Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422] Injunctive Relief--By Consumer

[1] FORM Complaint for Treble Damages for Restraint of Trade [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16727, 17650(a)] and Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent [Civ. Code § 3422] Injunctive Relief--By Consumer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*names*], [individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,] Plaintiffs, vs. _____ [*names*], [and DOES 1 through _____,] Defendants.	))))))	NO. _____ COMPLAINT FOR TREBLE DAMAGES FOR RESTRAINT OF TRADE [AND (PRELIMINARY AND) PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF] [Amount demanded_____ (exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000] [LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

1. Plaintiffs_____ [*describe plaintiffs' capacity and residence, including facts showing participation in the relevant market, e.g.,* are or were owners of housing units for occupancy by four families or less in_____ (*describe geographic perimeters of relevant market, e.g.,* _____ County) who listed those properties for sale and/or sold them during the period beginning_____ [*date*] (*specify date within four years of date of filing of complaint*), and ending on the date of the filing of this complaint].

[*SPECIFY, in successive paragraphs, capacity and residence of named defendants, e.g.,*]

2. Defendant_____ [*name*] is a local professional real estate association operating in_____ County.

3. Defendant_____ [*name*] is a state professional real estate association.

4. Defendant_____ [*name*] is a nation-wide incorporated trade association of real estate professionals.

5. Defendants_____ [*names*] are real estate brokers licensed as such under the laws of the State of California and doing business in_____County; all are members and officers of one or more of defendant real estate associations.

[*CONTINUE*]

[6. *Fictitious name allegation. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 3.*]

[7. Plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all persons similarly situated. The class which plaintiffs represent is composed of all_____ (*describe class, e.g.,* individuals, firms, partnerships, associations, and corporations who have listed for sale and/or sold residential properties in_____ County within the four years immediately preceding the filing of this complaint). The persons in the class are so numerous, consisting of approximately_____ (*specify number and nature of class members, e.g.,* 55,000 individuals, firms, partnerships, associations, and corporations), that joinder of all such persons is impracticable and that the disposition of their claims in a class action is a benefit to the parties and to the court.]

[8. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented in that_____ (*specify common issues, e.g.,* defendants carried out the combination and conspiracy hereinafter alleged by using standardized agreements and negotiating practices so that individualized negotiations with plaintiffs as to commission rates never occurred and all commission negotiations and agreements were carried out in accordance with defendants' common practices). Proof of a common or single set of facts will establish the right of each member of the class to recover. The claims of plaintiffs are typical of those of the class and plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class.]

[9. There is no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy other than by maintenance of this class action since plaintiffs are informed and believe that the damage to each plaintiff, approximating between $_____ and $_____, is relatively small compared to the expenses of litigation, making it economically unfeasible to pursue the remedies other than as a class action. In addition, some members of the class no longer reside in_____ County. Consequently, there would be a failure of justice but for the maintenance of the present class action.]

[*DESCRIBE, in as many paragraphs as necessary, the relevant market, in terms of both product/service and geography, and the portion of that market controlled by the defendants. The market description should be broad enough to set forth any frequently substituted product or service or a statement that there is no comparably priced substitute.*]

10. Eleven hundred twenty three of the 1221 real estate brokers handling residential properties in_____ County, constituting 92 percent of such brokers, are members of defendant_____ [*name of local association*], and 534 of the real estate brokers handling residentialproperties in_____ County are members of more than one defendant association. Defendant_____ [*name of local association*] operates the only multiple listing service for residential

properties in_____ County. In each of the four years prior to the filing of this complaint, 98 or 99 percent of the dollar volume of residential properties sold in_____ County had been listed in defendant's multiple listing service. There is no alternative service available in_____ County to disseminate information regarding price, availability, and particularized terms of offers of sale of residential properties. A person seeking to sell residential real property in_____ County must list the property with a broker member of the multiple listing service. There is no alternative which will expose the property to as broad a market or invite comparable cooperation from brokers representing purchasers.

[*DESCRIBE, in as many paragraphs as necessary, the formation of the agreement, combination, or conspiracy and identify specific acts in furtherance thereof.*]

11. Since 1955 and up to the present time, defendants, and each of them, combined, conspired, and agreed together and continue to combine, conspire, and agree to fix and maintain the commission rates, terms, and conditions of residential real estate broker commissions. In 1974, defendants, and each of them, agreed at joint meetings to establish a standard commission rate of 6 percent for all residential listings and sales and to accept only "exclusive right to sell" listings for residential properties. The 6 percent commission rate was formalized in policy statements of defendant associations and in advisory schedules, both of which were, at all times relevant herein, published and dis seminated on a regular basis to all members of defendant associations. Defendant associations drafted, printed, and supplied to their members a standardized form of "exclusive right to sell" listings for residential property.

12. In furtherance of this unlawful combination, conspiracy, and agreement, defendant_____ [*name of local association*] refused to accept for inclusion in its multiple listing service any listing agreement other than those evidenced by the terms contained in its standardized "exclusive right to sell" agreement. Defendant_____ [*name of local association*] required the commission rate to be included in each listing published by the multiple listing service. By means of the regular publication of listings, commission information was continually collected, monitored, and disseminated.

13. In furtherance of this unlawful combination, conspiracy, and agreement, defendants, and each of them, encouraged individual members to refuse to cooperate with or share commissions with real estate brokers who entered into residential listing agreements for less than the agreed 6 percent. Individual defendants adhered to the 6 percent commission rate and refused to cooperate with brokers who entered into listing agreements at less than a 6 percent commission.

[*DESCRIBE, in as many paragraphs as necessary, the harm to, and damages sustained by, the plaintiffs and the public at large*]

14. As a direct consequence of the acts of defendants, and each of them, competition in both prices of real estate broker commissions on the sale and terms of listing agreements for residential real property in_____ County have been restrained, suppressed, and eliminated; the commission rate has been raised, fixed, and maintained at a high and artificial level; plaintiffs and other sellers of residential property in_____ County have been deprived of the benefit of free, competitive negotiations for real property listings and brokers' commission rates and have been forced to enter into "exclusive right to sell" listings and to pay artificially high commission rates.

15. As a direct consequence of the agreement, acts, and course of conduct of defendants, and each of them, plaintiffs were deprived of the benefit of free, competitive negotiations for real property listings and brokers' commission rates._____ [Each plaintiff suffered damages of $_____ per $100,000 of sales or listing price *or* Plaintiffs are unable to state their damages with precision at this time, since that determination will require discovery and accounting analysis of defendants' books and records]. Under *Section 16750(a) of the Business*

and Professions Code, plaintiffs are entitled to interest on the aforementioned sum from the date of service of this complaint until entry of judgment thereon, to their reasonable attorney's fees, and to treble damages.

[*CONTINUE*]

[16. Defendants' continuing wrongful conduct as alleged above, unless and until restrained by order of this court, will cause great and irreparable harm to_____ (*describe injury to all or some of plaintiffs, e.g.,* those plaintiffs who have been forced to enter into listing agreements without benefit of competitive negotiations but who have not yet completed performance under those agreements and to the public at large which is deprived of a free market as set forth in Paragraph 14., above).]

[17. Plaintiffs (and the public at large) have no adequate remedy at law for the injuries currently being suffered or which will result in the future from defendants' continued wrongful conduct in that_____ (*specify grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.,* most individual injuries are too small to warrant the expenditures necessary in litigation. In addition, damages flowing from the artificial restraint of the free market as set forth in Paragraph 14, above, are difficult if not impossible to ascertain. Unless this court restrains defendants, some plaintiffs and other members of the public will be forced to institute a multiplicity of suits to obtain compensation.)]

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray judgment against defendants, and each of them, as follows:

[1. For an order requiring defendants to show cause, if any they have, why they should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth during the pendency of this action;]

[2. For (a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and) a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendants, and each of them, their agents, servants, and employees, and all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them from directly or indirectly or in any manner_____ (*specify acts to be en joined, e.g.,* adopting, advertising, participating in, adhering to, applying or enforcing any by-law, rule, regulation, agreement, contract, understanding, practice, procedure, or arrangement of any kind or nature whatsoever which has the purpose or effect, directly or indirectly, of requiring as a condition of eligibility for participation in, or listing by, any multiple listing service directly or indirectly controlled or sponsored by defendants, or any of them, that a commission of a specified percentage rate be paid by the seller to the listing broker or that the agency agreement between the broker and the seller be an exclusive right to sell listing);]

3. For damages according to proof, and that said sum be trebled; [that said sum be paid on the basis of individual claims presented, and to the extent that class members do not present such claims, on whatever basis the court deems proper, such as by lowering of the brokerage commission rate on residential real properties sold in_____ County or by depositing said sum with the State of California or a unit thereof for the limited purpose of being applied to eleemosynary purposes benefiting the consuming public in_____ County;]

4. For interest from and after the date of service of this complaint at the legal rate;

5. For payment of plaintiffs' reasonable attorney's fees;

6. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I,_____ [*name*], am [one of] the [individual] plaintiff[s] in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a consumer to bring an action in state court to seek treble damages and injunctive relief under the Cartwright Act when the defendants have conspired to restrain trade [*Civ. Code § 3422*; *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, 16727, 16750*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)*]. It may be used by the consumer as an individual or as the representative of a class of similarly situated consumers. This form is based in part on the fact situation in *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 578, 202 Cal. Rptr. 243* [*see § 565.77[4]*], and in *People v. National Ass'n of Realtors (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 459, 477-479, 174 Cal. Rptr. 728* .

[3] Allegations

The form alleges:

- Plaintiffs' capacity, residence, and facts which establish standing by showing the way plaintiff participates in the market claimed to be affected by the restraint (Paragraph 1);

- Defendants' capacity and residence (Paragraphs 2-5)

- A detailed description of the market claimed to be affected by the restraints, including some factual showing of the percentage of the market controlled or affected by defendants (Paragraph 10) [*see Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 325-326, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* (allegation of market insufficient); *Bhan v. NME Hospitals, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1467, 1470-1471]*

- The formation of the specific agreement or combination and specific acts done in furtherance of the conspiracy or agreement (Paragraphs 11-13) [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16756, 16757*; *Jones v. H.F. Ahmanson & Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 93, 118-119, 81 Cal. Rptr. 592, 460 P.2d 464* ; *Bartley v. California Ass'n of Realtors (1980) 115 Cal. App. 3d 930, 934-935, 173 Cal. Rptr. 284]*

- The harmful impact on the relevant market caused by defendants' conduct (Paragraph 14) [*Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 709, 721-722, 187 Cal. Rptr. 797* ; *Feldman v. Sacramento Bd. of Realtors, Inc. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 739, 747-748, 174 Cal. Rptr. 231]* ;

- The damages caused to plaintiffs by defendants' conduct (Paragraph 15) [*Saxer v. Philip Morris, Inc. (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 7, 20-23, 126 Cal. Rptr. 327]* .

The form includes optional paragraphs to allege the basis for injunctive relief (Paragraphs 16, 17; Paragraphs 1 and 2 of prayer).

The form also includes optional paragraphs for use to bring the suit as a class action:

- The description of the class, including an estimate of its size and the way in which its members participate in the relevant market (Paragraph 7);

- The specific ways in which common questions of law and fact predominate (Paragraph 8);

- A statement why the class action is the most appropriate method of relief (Paragraph 9). Paragraph 3 of the prayer includes an optional provision seeking fluid class recovery [*see* *Bruno v. Superior Court (1981) 127 Cal. App. 3d 120, 123-124, 130-135, 179 Cal. Rptr. 342]* .

[4] Specificity in Pleading Cartwright Cases Required

Antitrust complaints, more than others, require detailed specific factual allegations. Conclusionary pleadings are insufficient. To maintain a cause of action for combination in restraint of trade one must allege:

- The formation and operation of a conspiracy whose purpose is to restrain trade in a particular market, including, in most cases, the intent of all parties to the conspiracy to restrain trade;

- The illegal acts done pursuant thereto;

- The damage caused by the acts.

Specific facts must be alleged indicating all elements of the cause of action--the creation of the conspiracy, its objectives and impact, the specific acts in furtherance of the conspiracy, and specific damage to plaintiff's business or property [*Jones v. H.F. Ahmanson & Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 93, 118-119, 81 Cal. Rptr. 592, 460 P.2d 464* ; *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 325-326, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* ; *Truta v. Avis Rent A Car Sys. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 802, 822, 238 Cal. Rptr. 806* ; *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 264-270, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211]* . The market should be described in terms of geography, subject matter, total volume, proportion controlled by defendants, availability to plaintiffs and to the public of the subject matter or competing subject matter (interchangeable products or services) [*Ralph C. Wilson Indus. v. Chronicle Broadcast. (9th Cir. 1986) 794 F.2d 1359, 1363-1364* ; *Chicago Title Ins. Co. v. Great W. Fin. Corp. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 305, 325-326, 70 Cal. Rptr. 849, 444 P.2d 481* ; *Bhan v. NME Hospitals, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1467, 1470-1471* ; *see also § 565.80[2]*].

[5] Pleading Conspiracy: When Inferences Are Sufficient

Although this complaint alleges an actual agreement, often a conspiracy will provide the basis for the action. The formation and operation of the conspiracy must be shown by facts which establish the intent or purpose of the

defendants to restrain trade. Although in some cases it may be sufficient to allege solely the effect of a combination from which a purpose to eliminate competition may be inferred, no inference will be made when the alleged conduct is consistent with a lawful purpose. For instance, no inference was made when the allegations showed defendants' primary motive to be personal financial gain but did not show any acts which would be consistent with a separate purpose to eliminate the market for minority shares [*Jones v. H.F. Ahmanson & Co. (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 93, 118-119, 81 Cal. Rptr. 592, 460 P.2d 464]* .

On the other hand, in a court of appeal case, a cause of action was stated against a "passive" parent that merely acquiesced in a conspiracy. For a party's participation in the conspiracy to be inferred, the acts done, the relationship of the alleged conspirators, the interests of the parties, and the individual circumstances must support the inference [*Saxer v. Philip Morris, Inc. (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 7, 19, 24-26, 126 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . In this case, the active defendants were all owned by the passive parent corporation, many officers of the parent corporation were also officers of the more active defendants, there were numerous communications between the officers of the parent and those of the more active subsidiaries, and the parent was aware of the subsidiaries' plans and operations and supported them [*Saxer v. Philip Morris, Inc. (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 7, 19, 24-26, 126 Cal. Rptr. 327]* .

[6] Pleading Acts in Furtherance of Conspiracy: Coercion or Leverage?

Although general allegations of agreement have been held sufficient and a conspiracy allegation has been held unnecessary, the unlawful acts in furtherance of the conspiracy must be specifically alleged [*Bartley v. California Ass'n of Realtors (1980) 115 Cal. App. 3d 930, 934-935, 173 Cal. Rptr. 284]* . An allegation that two defendant retailers, which were among the largest record retailers, used their economic leverage to convince record distributors to grant them price discounts and other beneficial terms was insufficient. Allegations as to a third retailer defendant that it obtained favorable treatment from distributors by threats, coercion, intimidation, and boycott were sufficient when coupled with specific descriptions of the threats and boycott [*G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 268-269, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (boycott by single trader that uses coercion, threats or intimidation to exact unwilling cooperation from another as combination in restraint of trade); *see also § 565.77[1]*].

[7] Pleading Damages

The alleged antitrust violation need not be the sole cause of plaintiff's injury, but it must be a substantial factor in bringing about the injury [*Saxer v. Philip Morris, Inc. (1975) 54 Cal. App. 3d 7, 23, 126 Cal. Rptr. 327]* . Moreover, individual injury to plaintiff's business is not enough. A plaintiff must show that there is some public injury to the market inquestion that does public harm, for instance by creating a monopoly, or that plaintiff is a competitor or a consumer in a market in which defendant's conduct has impaired competition [*Feldman v. Sacramento Bd. of Realtors, Inc. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 739, 747-748, 174 Cal. Rptr. 231]* . The individual injury pleading and proof requirements are less stringent if the conduct complained of is illegal per se rather than to be evaluated under the rule of reason [*Klor's v. Broadway-Hale Stores (1959) 359 U.S. 207, 210-214, 79 S. Ct. 705, 3 L. Ed. 2d 741* ; *B. W. I. Custom Kitchen v. Owens-Ill., Inc. (1987) 191 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1348, 235 Cal. Rptr. 228* ; *see also §§ 565.74[2],[4], 565.77[1]*].

[8] Interest and Attorney's Fees

Prejudgment interest on actual damages in Cartwright actions is allowed from the date of service of the complaint [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750(a), 16761*]]. Attorney's fees are authorized in Cartwright actions [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750(a)*].

[9] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §*

527(a)]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[10] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and procedural requirements in class actions, see Ch. 120, *Class Actions*

For discussion and forms relating to injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms relating to termination or nonrenewal of franchises, other than those involving petroleum products or new motor vehicles, under the California Franchise Relations Act, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation*

For discussion and forms relating to prohibited practices, termination, or nonrenewal of petroleum product franchises, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation*

For discussion and forms relating to regulation, termination, or nonrenewal of new motor vehicle dealerships, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation*

For discussion and forms relating to special civil rights afforded all franchisees under California's Fair Dealership Law, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation*

[11] State Statutes

Jurisdiction; venue; standing; injunctive relief; treble damages; prejudgment interest, costs, and attorney's fees; additional parties; attorney general as class representative. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750, 16751, 16760, 16761*

Four-year limitation period. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.1*

Pleading is not required to give name or description of combination or date and place of its creation; purpose and effect of trust or combination and fact that defendant acted in furtherance of or aided purpose of trust or combination is sufficient. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16756*

Character of trust or combination is provable by its general reputation, written instrument is not necessary; proof of nondefendant members is not required. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16757*

[12] Decisions

Considerations in choosing method for distribution of unallocated damages residue in fluid class recovery; analysis of various methods appropriate in various situations. *State of California v. Levi Strauss & Co. (1986) 41 Cal. 3d 460,*

473-479, 224 Cal. Rptr. 605, 715 P.2d 564

Agreement between wholesale bakers setting retail price of bread and refusing to sell to retailers who would not maintain that price was prohibited restraint. *People v. H. Jevne Co. (1919) 179 Cal. 621, 627-628, 178 P. 517*

Allegations that individual subscribers of cellular phone service paid articifially inflated prices because of defendants' price fixing was sufficient allegation of standing. *Cellular Plus, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1233-1235, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308*

Although loss of sales is not always sufficient antitrust injury to confer standing, allegations by defendants' corporate sales agents that they lost sales as result of articifially inflated prices maintained by defendants' price fixing was sufficient allegation of standing. *Cellular Plus, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1233-1235, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308*

Complaint in action for conspiracy under Cartwright Act must allege (1) formation and operation of conspiracy, (2) wrongful act or acts done pursuant to conspiracy, and (3) resulting damage; sustaining of defendant's demurrer by trial court was proper when plaintiff failed to allege specific overt acts in furtherance of conspiracy. *Truta v. Avis Rent A Car Sys. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 802, 822-823, 238 Cal. Rptr. 806*

Allegation that defendant published form of agreement and repeatedly and forcefully urged its members to use it was insufficient to establish defendant's participation in conspiracy. *Bartley v. California Ass'n of Realtors (1980) 115 Cal. App. 3d 930, 934-935, 173 Cal. Rptr. 284*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.251

§ 565.251 Proceedings to Obtain Prejudgment Interest [Bus. & Prof. Code § 16761]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings to Obtain Prejudgment Interest [Bus. & Prof. Code § 16761]--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRE-JUDGMENT INTEREST [, SUPPORTING_____ (AFFIDAVIT *or* DECLARATION) OF_____ (*name*), AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]
vs.	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date:_____
	)	Time:_____
	)	Location:_____
		Judge:_____
		Date Action Filed:_____
		Trial Date:_____

_____

To_____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant]_____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on_____ [*date*], at_____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division)_____ of]

this court, located at_____ [*street address*],_____ [*city*], plaintiff will, and hereby does, move for an order awarding prejudgment interest on the actual damages recovered by plaintiff pursuant to *Section 16750 of the Business and Professions Code*, at the rate of 10 percent per annum for the period beginning on_____ [*date complaint served or later*], and ending on_____ [*date of judgment or earlier*]. The total amount of interest sought is $_____ [*amount*]. The motion will be made on the grounds that such an award of interest is authorized by *Section 16761 of the Business and Professions Code* and is just under the circumstances.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of_____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the papers, records, and file herein, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated:_____.

_____ [*firm name, if ny*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for_____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion is for use in obtaining prejudgment interest after a judgment for damages for unfair competition is recovered pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750*. An award of prejudgment interest is authorized by *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750(a)*, and *16761*. For a general form of declaration in support of a motion and a form of an order granting a motion, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

A memorandum of points and authorities must be filed and a copy served with this notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[3] Prejudgment Interest

Prejudgment interest may be allowed on a motion by the person recovering damages pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750*. Interest is calculated on the actual damages at the rate of 10 percent per annum for the period beginning on the date of service of the complaint and ending on the date of judgment, or for any shorter period therein, if the court finds that the award of interest for that period is just in the circumstances. In determining whether or not an award of interest for any period is just, the court may consider only the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 16761*]:

- Whether the person or opposing party, or the representative of any of these people, made motions or asserted claims or defenses so lacking in merit as to show that the party or representative acted intentionally for delay, or otherwise acted in bad faith;

- Whether, in the course of the action involved, the person or opposing party, or the representative of any of these people, violated any applicable rule, statute, or court order providing for sanctions for dilatory behavior or otherwise providing for expeditious proceedings; and

- Whether the person or opposing party, or the representative of any of these people, engaged in conduct primarily for the purpose of delaying the litigation or increasing the cost thereof.

[4] State Statutes

Prejudgment interest in unfair competition actions. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16750(a), 16761*

93 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Restraints Of Trade

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.252-565.269

[Reserved]

§§ 565.252[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.270

§ 565.270 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333, 3426.3] for Misappropriation of Trade Secret and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333, 3426.3] for Misappropriation of Trade Secret and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES[, TEMPORARY
_____ [*name*],	)	RESTRAINING ORDER, AND PRELIMINARY
[and DOES 1 through_____,]	)	(AND PERMANENT) INJUNCTION(S)]
Defendant(s).	)	(Misappropriation of Trade Secret)
	)	[Amount demanded_____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Misappropriation of Trade Secret--Statutory)

[1. *Identity and capacity of plaintiff. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 1*.]

[2. _____ (*Name of plaintiff corporation*) is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation organized and existing under the_____ (*governing law, e.g.*, General Corporation Law of California)(*if foreign corporation, add* : and subject to *Section 2115 of the Corporations Code*).]

[3. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 2.*]

[4. At all times herein mentioned defendant(s),_____ (*name(s*))_____ (was a director *or* were directors) of_____ (*name of plaintiff corporation*).]

[5. *Fictitious name allegation. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 3.*]

[6. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants was the agent of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, wasacting within the course and scope of such agency and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendants.]

7. Plaintiff was in possession of a trade secret_____ [*identify trade secret with reasonable particularity, e.g.*, which consisted of a secret recipe for plaintiff's gourmet cheesecake].

8. Plaintiff's_____ [*specify trade secret, e.g.*, recipe] had economic value in that_____ [*specify its economic value, either actual or potential, e.g.*, its use resulted in the creation of cheesecakes with a unique taste for considerably less overhead expenses than the usual mass produced cheesecake]. Plaintiff made reasonable efforts to insure that the_____ [*specify trade secret*] remained a secret by_____ [*specify measures used by plaintiff to maintain secrecy, e.g.*, keeping the recipe in a safe and disclosing it only to employees who had acheived the position of assistant chef].

9. On or about_____ [*specify date of January 1, 1985 or thereafter*], [and continuing to the present time], defendant[s, and each of them,] misappropriated the above-described trade secret of plaintiff by_____ [*specify the act of misappropriation meeting the definition of Civ. Code § 3426.1(b), e.g.*, using plaintiff's recipe to make cheesecakes to be sold under defendant's name after paying a large sum of money to one of plaintiff's employees for unauthorized disclosure of the secret recipe].

[*EITHER, if alleging general damages*]

10. As a proximate result of the_____ [*specify the misappropriation of plaintiff's trade secret, e.g.*, use by defendant of plaintiff's cheesecake recipe], plaintiff has suffered actual damages. [As a further proximate result of the misappropriation, defendant was unjustly enriched_____ [*specify any unjust enrichment enjoyed by defendant, e.g.*, by obtaining the dessert catering contract for the county fair.]

[*OR, if alleging royalties*]

10. Because neither plaintiff's actual damages nor defendant's unjust enrichment are subject to proof, plaintiff is entitled to a reasonable royalty_____ [*specify nature and amount of royalty, e.g.*, in the amount of 55 percent of the revenue received by defendant from cheesecake sales].

[11. The (plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the) aforementioned acts of the defendant were willful and malicious in that_____ (*allege facts indicating presence of willfulness and malice, e.g.*, defendant misappropriated plaintiff's recipe with the deliberate intent to injure plaintiff's business and improve its own).

Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages. Plaintiff is also entitled to reasonable attorney's fees.]

[12. Defendant's wrongful conduct_____ (*describe conduct, e.g*, in misappropriating plaintiff's recipe), unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will_____ (*specify particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g.*, cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff's business in that plaintiff has lost several of its most profitable catering accounts and is continuing to lose accounts, plaintiff has been forced to lay off workers and will be forced to lay off more, and is operating at such a loss that it may be forced out of business before this action can be brought to trial).]

[13. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries_____ (currently being suffered *or* which are threatened) in that_____ (*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.*, defendant will continue to misappropriate the trade secret and plaintiff would be required to maintain a multiplicity of judicial proceedings to protect its interests).]

SECOND COUNT
(Misappropriation of Trade Secret--Common Law)

14. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-8 of the First Count.

15. On or about_____ [*specify date prior to January 1, 1985*], [and continuing until January 1, 1985], defendant[s, and each of them,] misappropriated the above-described trade secret of plaintiff by_____ [*specify the act of misappropriation meeting the definition of Restatement of Torts § 757, e.g.*, using plaintiff's recipe to make cheesecakes to be sold under defen dant's name after paying a large sum of money to one of plaintiff's employees for unauthorized disclosure of the secret recipe].

16. As a proximate result of the_____ [*specify the misappropriation of plaintiff's trade secret, e.g.*, use by defendant of plaintiff's cheesecake recipe], plaintiff has suffered actual damages_____ [*specify compensatory damages, e.g.*, in the nature of lost profits resulting from decreased sales].

[17. The (plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges thereon that the) acts of defendant alleged above were_____ (malicious *and/or* oppressive *and/or* fraudulent) in that_____ (*state facts showing malice, oppression, or fraud within meaning of Civ. Code § 3294*). Plaintiff is therefore entitled to an award of punitive damages.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

On the FIRST COUNT:

[1. For an order requiring defendants to show cause, if any they have, why they should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendancy of this action;

[2. For a temporary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all requiring defendant and his/her agents, servants, and employees, and all persons, acting under, in concert with, or for him/her:

a. To refrain from_____ (*specify each of the acts and courses of conduct defendants are to be prohibited from doing, commencing, or continuing, e.g.*, continuing the misappropriation of plaintiff's trade secret by ongoing use of plaintiff's recipe);

b. To_____ (*specify each of the acts and courses of conduct defendants are to be commanded to do or*

undertake, e.g., return all copies of the recipe to plaintiff);]

[*EITHER, if general damages are alleged*]

3. For general damages [and the amount necessary to prevent the unjust enrichment of defendant];

[*OR, if alleging royalties*]

3. For reasonable royalties_____ [*specify nature and amount*];

[4. For punitive damages;]

[5. For reasonable attorney's fees;]

On the SECOND COUNT:

6. For general damages;

[7. For punitive damages;]

On all COUNTS:

8. For all costs of suit herein incurred; and

9. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See§ 565.230.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action based on misappropriation of a trade secret. The First Count is based on the UTSA, which governs misappropriations occurring after January 1, 1985, and seeks both damages and injunctive relief [*see Civ. Code §§ 3426.3* (remedies), *3426.10* (effective date of UTSA)]. The Second Count is based on common law, which governs misappropriations occurring prior to January 1, 1985, and seeks only damages (injunctive relief was available under the common law; however, any injunctive relief is now governed by UTSA) [*see Diodes, Inc. v. Franzen (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 244, 250-251, 67 Cal. Rptr. 19* ; Restatement of Torts § 757]. Because a misappropriation may have begun prior to January 1, 1985, and continued after that date, situations may arise in which both counts may be used for the same act of misappropriation [*see Civ. Code § 3426.10*].

[3] Allegations

[a] First Count

The First Count of the complaint alleges:

- The existence and possession by plaintiff of a trade secret (Paragraph 7) [for first count *see Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*, for second count *see* Restatement of Torts § 757, cmt. b]

- The economic value of the trade secret and the measures taken by plaintiff to insure its secrecy (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*]

- The nature of defendant's wrongful act (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)*].

It includes alternate allegations for the measure of damages (Paragraphs 10) [*see Civ. Code § 3426.3(a),(b)*].

The form also includes optional paragraphs alleging the breach of a defendant corporate director's fiduciary duty (Paragraphs 2 and 4) [*see* Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management*], the agency relationship of defendants (Paragraph 6) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*], facts showing that punitive damages are appropriate (Paragraph 11) [*see Civ. Code § 3426.3(c)*], facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1]* , and any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *see* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

[b] Second Count

The Second Count of the complaint incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1-13 of the First Count (Paragraph 14). It then alleges the nature of defendant's wrongful act (Paragraph 15) [*see* Restatement of Torts § 757], and damages proximately caused by defendant's misappropriation (Paragraph 16) [*see Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 466, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118]* . It also includes an optional paragraph alleging a factual basis for an award of punitive damages (Paragraph 17) [*see Civ. Code § 3294*].

[4] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a proceduralchecklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required. but verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b)*, 467]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[5] Pleading

In a trade secret action the facts pleaded must show the existence of subject matter which is capable of protection as a trade secret and disclosure of the secret under circumstances giving rise to a contractual or other legally imposed obligation not to use or disclose the secret to the detriment of the discloser [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971)*

14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201] . A complaint which fails to allege that the information claimed to be a trade secret was, in fact a secret and unknown by others, may be dismissed [*American Alloy Steel Corp. v. Ross (1957) 149 Cal. App. 2d 215, 219-220, 308 P.2d 494]* . If the defendant is an employee or former employee of the plaintiff the facts alleged must also show that the public policy in favor of protection of the complainant's interest in maintaining the secret outweighs the interest of the employee in using his or her knowledge to support himself or herself in other employment [*Cal Francisco Inv. Corp. v. Vrionis (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 92 Cal. Rptr. 201* ; *see § 565.105[1]*].

In order to avoid the destruction of the very thing for which protection is sought, the details of the trade secret need not be spelled out to avoid a demurrer to a complaint. However, the ultimate facts showing the existence of a trade secret or other confidential data must be alleged to state a cause of action. The complaint should describe the subject matter of the trade secret with sufficient particularity to separate it from matters of general knowledge in the trade or of special knowledge of those skilled in the trade, and to permit the defendant to ascertain at least the boundaries within which the secret lies. If the subject matter of the claimed trade secret is a manufacturing process, the plaintiff must identify the end product manufactured, and supply sufficient data concerning the process, without revealing the details of it, to provide reasonable notice of the issues and reasonable guidance in ascertaining the scope of appropriate discovery [*Diodes, Inc. v. Franzen (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 244, 252-253, 67 Cal. Rptr. 19]* . For discussion of privileges specific to trade secrets, see*§ 565.107*.

[6] Former Employee as Defendant

When the plaintiff is alleging that a former employee misappropriated trade secrets acquired through employment with the plaintiff and then implemented those secrets for a new employer, the plaintiff may name both the former employee and the new employer as defendants in the same action [*see, e.g.,* *King v. Pacific Vitamin Corp. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 841, 843, 64 Cal. Rptr. 486]* .

[7] Director of Corporate Plaintiff as Defendant

Optional Paragraphs 2 and 4 may be included when the plaintiff is a corporation bringing an action against a director or former director. *Corp. Code § 309* requires that corporate director actions be actions which the director believes in good faith are in the best interests of the corporation. When the plaintiff is a corporation bringing an action for misappropriation of trade secrets against a director or former director, counsel should be cognizant of the time limitations imposed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 359. Code Civ. Proc. § 359* provides that an action must be brought within three years after discovery or the liability was created. Thus, both *Code Civ. Proc. § 359* and *Civ. Code § 3426.6* indicate that a misappropriation action under the UTSA must be brought within three years. However, in a similar action brought under the common law, the two year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* rather than *Code Civ. Proc. § 359* appears to control [*see* *Southern Counties Thrift Co. v. Rairdon (1941) 47 Cal. App. 2d 770, 771-772, 118 P.2d 828* ; for discussion and forms pertaining to corporate directors and additional causes of action against them for breach of duty which may be joined with this action, *see* Ch. 167, *Corporations: Directors and Management* ; for discussion and forms concerning the limitation of actions generally, *see* Ch. 345, *Limitations of Actions*].

[8] Injunction Broadly Written

When the subject matter of the injunction is a matter within the peculiar knowledge of the defendant, and the spelling out of the nature of the trade secret involved would, in and of itself, destroy the existence of that very secret, the injunction restraining misappropriation of a trade secret may be more broadly worded than usual [*Ungar Elec. Tools, Inc. v. Sid Ungar Co., Inc. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 398, 404, 13 Cal. Rptr. 268]* .

[9] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.230*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.271

§ 565.271 Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret by Former Employee--Manufacturing Process

[1] FORM Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret by Former Employee--Manufacturing Process

1. Plaintiff was in possession of a trade secret that consisted of a unique manufacturing process_____ [*identify trade secret meeting definition of either Civ. Code § 3426.1(d) or Restatement of Torts § 757, cmt. b, or both, e.g.*, for casting metal electrical energy conductors within epoxy resin].

2. Plaintiff's_____ [*specify trade secret*] had economic value in that_____ [*specify its economic value, either actual or potential, e.g.*, its use resulted in the casting of metal electrical energy conductors in a commercially feasible manner]. Plaintiff made reasonable efforts to insure that the secret manufacturing process remained a secret by_____ [*specify measures used by plaintiff to maintain secrecy, e.g.*, disclosing the casting process only to persons directly involved in the casting itself].

3. Defendant was employed by plaintiff as_____ [*specify defendant's position with plaintiff, e.g.*, supervisor of the casting division] and while employed in that capacity was informed of the above-described trade secret_____ [*specify reason for disclosure to defendant, e.g.*, in order that he might perform his job effectively].

4. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant[s, and each of them,] misappropriated the above-described trade secret of plaintiff by_____ [*specify the act of misappropriation, e.g.*, leaving the employment of plaintiff in which he had gained knowledge of the manufacturing process, forming his own corporation, and commencing production of conductors using the manufacturing process which had been developed and maintained by plaintiff as a trade secret].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use by a plaintiff in a complaint for misappropriation of a trade secret against a former employee when the trade secret is in the form of a manufacturing process [*see § 565.105[1]*]. When using these allegations, Paragraphs 1 through 3 should replace Paragraphs 7 and 8 in the First Count, which are incorporated in the

Second Count by Paragraph 14, and Paragraph 4 should replace Paragraph 9 in the First Count and Paragraph 15 in the Second Count of § 565.270.

With appropriate modifications these allegations may be used when the defendant was never an employee of the plaintiff, but obtained the trade secret under different circumstances of confidentiality imposing the duty to not disclose or use the information [*see Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)(2)(B)*; Restatement of Torts § 757(b), (c); for discussion of other circumstances imposing a duty of nondisclosure, *see § 565.105[2]*]. These allegations use a manufacturing process as an example of a trade secret, but may be modified to be used when the trade secret is in another form, such as a formula, pattern, compilation, device, program, method, or technique [*see Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)*; Restatement of Torts § 757, cmt. b].

These allegations are adapted from the fact situation in *Components for Research, Inc. v. Isolation Prods., Inc. (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 726, 50 Cal. Rptr. 829* .

[3] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.270*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.272

§ 565.272 Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret--Customer List

[1] FORM Allegations--Misappropriation of Trade Secret--Customer List

1. Plaintiff was in possession of a customer list_____ [*identify customer list as trade secret, e.g.,* of nationwide purchasers of its load binders. The list was the result of a substantial amount of time, energy, and money on the part of plaintiff and included special financial arrangements made based on the credit status of each customer].

2. Plaintiff's customer list had economic value in that_____ [*specify its economic value through its confidential nature, e.g.,* it contained information not generally known within the trade and represented many years of research and client communications]. Plaintiff made reasonable efforts to insure that the customer list remained a secret by_____ [*specify measures used by plaintiff to maintain secrecy, e.g.,* disclosing the list only to those employees who needed the information to perform their jobs].

3. Plaintiff's customer list was a trade secret which merited legal protection from defendant's misappropriation in that_____ [*set forth as many of the following additional factors as are present* : (1) defendant solicited the customers of plaintiff with intent to injure plaintiff; (2) plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that defendant sought out certain preferred customers whose trade is particularly profitable and whose identities are not generally known to the trade; (3) in the_____ (*specify nature of business, e.g.,* load binding business) a customer ordinarily patronizes only one concern; (4) established business relationships between customers and the plaintiff normally continue unless interfered with].

4. On or about_____ [*date*], defendant[s, and each of them,] misappropriated the above-described customer list of plaintiff by_____ [*specify the act of misappropriation, e.g.,* copying plaintiff's customer list, leaving the employment of plaintiff, establishing a company engaging in the same type of business, and soliciting business primarily from those customers on the list].

[2] Use of Form

These allegations are for use by a plaintiff in a complaint for misappropriation of a trade secret when the trade secret is

in the form of a customer list. When using these allegations, Paragraphs 1 through 3 should replace Paragraphs 7 and 8 in the First Count, which are incorporated in the Second Count by Paragraph 14, and Paragraph 4 should replace Paragraph 9 in the First Count and Paragraph 15 in the Second Count of § 565.270.

These allegations are adapted from the fact situation in *Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118* .

[3] Factors Considered in Determining Whether Customer List Is Trade Secret

The courts consider five factors in awarding relief: the four factors articulated in Paragraph 3 and the confidentiality factor of Paragraph 2 [*Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 463-464, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118* ; *see § 565.192[3]*]. Although in most cases meriting protection of information as a trade secret, all five factors will be present, a plaintiff is not required to prove all five to prevail, and the confidential nature of the list is seen as the most important [*Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley (9th Cir. 1980) 622 F.2d 1324, 1329-1331* ; *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* (distinguishing cases involving use of lists before January 1, 1985; since that date, only two elements of *Civ. Code § 3426.2(d)* as necessary for customer list to be trade secret); *see* *Greenly v. Cooper (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 382, 391 n.2, 143 Cal. Rptr. 514* (noting possibility that five factors may have been inadvertently interpreted conjunctively rather than disjunctively)].

[4] Misappropriation

Once an employer proves a customer list is entitled to trade secret protection, it must then prove that the former employee misappropriated the information to attain an unfair competitive advantage. Under the Uniform Trade Secret Act (*Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.*), the term "misappropriation" is defined to include the nonconsensual disclosure or use of a trade secret [*Civ. Code § 3426.1(b)(2)*]. Acts of solicitation may constitute use or misappropriation of protected information [*Morlife, Inc. v. Perry (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 1514, 1520-1521, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731* (commercial roof repair business's former employees' use of customer list to solicit customers for their new commercial roof repair business constituted misappropriation)].

[5] Decisions

[a] Customer List as Trade Secret

Factual considerations helpful in determining whether customer list warrants protection as trade secret as including whether there was competition with other businesses for customer's patronage; whether customer's name appears in extensive listings in public directories along with names of many other businesses which are not even potential customers and whether reasonably diligent salesperson could perceive narrowing classification to reduce costs of identifying potential customers; percentage of businesses serviced by plaintiff which salesperson contacted for new employer; whether customer identities and locations are numerous and scattered and require substantial amount of time, effort, and expense to obtain; whether customer's decision to purchase is influenced primarily by considerations such asprice, quality, reliable delivery, and efficient service, or by considerations such as special needs or susceptibilities; and whether former employer and customer had stable and continuous relationship. *Hollingsworth Solderless Terminal Co. v. Turley (9th Cir. 1980) 622 F.2d 1324, 1333-1334*

To be trade secret, customer list must (1) derive independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to public or to other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure; and (2) be subject of efforts that are reasonable under circumstances to maintain its secrecy. *Courtesy Temp. Serv., Inc. v. Camacho (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1278, 1287-1291, 272 Cal. Rptr. 352* ; *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* (construing *Civ. Code § 3426.2(d)*)

Second prong of *Civ. Code § 3426.2(d)* test as satisfied if employer requires employees to sign confidentiality agreement respecting its client list and related client information. *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 631, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92*

Second prong of *Civ. Code § 3426.2(d)* test as satisfied when product is unique and product resistance has to be overcome before anyone will purchase it. *American Credit Indem. Co. v. Sacks (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 622, 630-631, 638, 262 Cal. Rptr. 92* (credit insurance purchased by seller covering defaults of its receivables; resistance indicated by fact that only 6.5 percent of potential market purchases product)

Former employee of consulting firm who was also attorney as entitled to render legal services to firm's clients, which firm was not licensed to do; attorney as entitled to use firm's customer list to inform legal clients of change of employment and whether or not representation would continue. *Matull & Assocs. v. Cloutier (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1055-1056, 240 Cal. Rptr. 211* (involving noncompetition clause in buy-sell agreement)

Former employee as not allowed to use trade secrets to announce change of employment to former employer's clients; names of clients personally serviced by former employee as not trade secret; antisolicitation covenants as unlawful business restraint except when enforcement is necessary to protect trade secrets. *Moss, Adams & Co. v. Shilling (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 124, 130, 224 Cal. Rptr. 456* (applying pre-UTSA announcement rule)

[b] Intent to Injure Plaintiff

Failing to illustrate exclusivity in business relationship between plaintiff and customers or that customers' names were not commonly known in trade, combined with failure to contend that defendant was only competitor or that plaintiff would have made sale had defendant not done so as fatal to plaintiff's case. *Continental Car-Na-Var Corp. v. Moseley (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 104, 108-109, 111-113, 148 P.2d 9*

Threat to quit employment followed by deliberate acts of leaving employment, using information acquired through employment, and working for competitor as example of intent to injure. *Gloria Ice Cream & Milk Co. v. Cowan (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 460, 464-465, 41 P.2d 340*

Intention to take away some business when action is in good faith and without malice as insufficient to show deliberate intent to injure. *King v. Pacific Vitamin Corp. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 841, 850, 64 Cal. Rptr. 486*

Intent to injure as reasonably inferred from defendant's admissions of deliberately soliciting only plaintiff's customers at time most disadvantageous to plaintiff and from evidence concerning defendant's methods of obtaining subscribers. *Reid v. Mass Co., Inc. (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 293, 303, 318 P.2d 54*

[c] Damages

Damages for misappropriation of customer list trade secret as able to be shown by loss of profits on sales actually diverted from plaintiff's business. *Klamath-Orleans Lumber, Inc. v. Miller (1978) 87 Cal. App. 3d 458, 466, 151 Cal. Rptr. 118*

[6] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.270*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.273

§ 565.273 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--No Trade Secret--Information Disclosed by Product

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--No Trade Secret--Information Disclosed by Product

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE_____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that any information concerning_____ (*specify the nature of the alleged trade secret, e.g.,* the design features of the specified valve) was not a trade secret in that the essence of the alleged secret was completely disclosed by_____ (*specify the manufactured product which discloses the alleged secret information, e.g.,* the manufactured valve itself).

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint for trade secret misappropriation when the alleged secret information was completely disclosed by the product marketed. Although a trade secret need not be of a specific character, it must be kept secret by the owner and not disclosed by the product [*Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 289, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198* ; Restatement of Tort § 757, cmt. b; for discussion of the concept of reverse engineering, *see § 565.104[3]*]. This affirmative defense is adapted from the fact situation in *Futurecraft Corp. v. Clary Corp. (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 279, 23 Cal. Rptr. 198* .

If more than one affirmative defense is set forth in the answer, each defense must be separately stated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*] and numbered [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 2.112(1)*]. If the complaint sets forth more than one cause of action, the affirmative defense must refer to the cause of action it is intended to answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*].

[3] Cross References

For discussion and forms showing the format of answers generally, see Ch. 28, *Answers*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.274

§ 565.274 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action Barred by Statute of Limitation [Civ. Code § 3426.6; Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action Barred by Statute of Limitation [Civ. Code § 3426.6; Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE_____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that the cause of action set forth in the complaint is barred by the_____ [two *or* three] year provision of_____ *[Section 339(1) of the Code of Civil Procedure or Section 3426.6 of the Civil Code*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint for trade secret misappropriation when the statute of limitation has run on the misappropriation. When it appears on the face of the complaint that the statute has run, the objection may be raised by demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30*]. The form has alternatives which reflect the different statutes depending on the type of action brought. The time for bringing an action for misappropriation of a trade secret in an action under the UTSA is three years [*Civ. Code § 3426.6*; for further discussion, *see § 565.103[5]*]. The time for bringing an action for misappropriation of a trade secret in a common law action appears to be two years [*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*; *see Davies v. Krasna (1975) 14 Cal. 3d 502, 508, 121 Cal. Rptr. 705, 535 P.2d 1161* (apparent breach of confidence case); *see also §§ 565.104[1], 565.104[4][c]*].

[3] Cross References

See generally Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings*

For discussion of statutes of limitations generally, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions*

For a related form, see*§ 565.270*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
C. Trade Secrets

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 565.275-565.289

[Reserved]

§§ 565.275[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.290

§ 565.290 Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and for Temporary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-527] and Permanent [Civ. Code §§ 3420-3422] Injunctive Relief for Intentional Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

[1] FORM Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and for Temporary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 525-527] and Permanent [Civ. Code §§ 3420-3422] Injunctive Relief for Intentional Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNC-
[and DOES 1 through_____,]	)	TION
Defendant(s).	)	(Intentional Interference With Economic Relation-
	)	ship)
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Identity and capacity of plaintiff. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 3.*]

[*EITHER*]

4. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff and_____ (*name of third party*)_____ [*allege facts showing existence of valid contract between plaintiff and third party, e.g.,* entered into a written agreement whereby_____ (*name of third party*) agreed to use plaintiff's janitorial service in the operation of_____'s (*name*) business, and plaintiff agreed to provide such service on an exclusive basis, from_____ [*date*], to_____ [*date*], with terms of payment as follows:_____ (*specify*). A copy of this agreement, marked Exhibit "A," is attached and incorporated herein by reference].

[*OR*]

4._____ [*Allege facts showing existence of noncontractual economic relationship between plaintiff and third party that contains probable future economic benefits to plaintiff, e.g.,* Between_____ [*date*] and_____ [*date*], plaintiff customarily provided janitorial service to_____ (*name of third party*) pursuant to contracts that expired annually on_____. On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff and_____ (*name of third party*) began discussions to renew the contract due to expireon_____ [*date*]. At that time plaintiff and_____ (*name of third party*) agreed informally to renew the contract for one year with terms of payment as follows:_____ (*specify*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

5. Defendant_____ (*name*) knew of the above described_____ (contract *or* relationship) existing between plaintiff and_____ (*name of third party*), in that_____ [*allege facts showing that defendant(s) knew of the existence of the economic relationship described above, e.g.,* defendant was formerly employed by plaintiff, from_____ [*date*] to_____ [*date*], and during his/her employment had supervised_____'s (*name of third party*) account].

6._____ [*Allege facts showing intentional acts by defendant(s) designed to disrupt the above described economic relationship, e.g.,* On or about_____ [*date*], defendant met with_____ (*name of third party*). At this meeting defendant falsely represented that plaintiff was insolvent, unreliable, and no longer capable of providing quality janitorial service, all with the intent to harm plaintiff financially and to induce_____ (*name of third part* y) to_____ (breach his/her contract *or* sever his/her business relationship) with plaintiff].

[*ADD, if complaint is for interference with prospective relations*]

7._____ [*Allege facts showing that interference was wrongful by some legal measure other than the interference itself, e.g.,* Defendant's false representation as alleged in Paragraph 6, above, constituted an unfair trade practice in violation of *Business and Professions Code Section 17200*.]

8._____ [*Allege facts showing disruption of the above described economic relationship, e.g.,* On_____ [*date*],_____ (*name of third party*)_____ (cancelled the described contract *or* broke off the contract negotiations) with plaintiff as a result of defendant's conduct].

9._____ [*Allege facts showing that the acts of defendant(s) were a proximate cause of actual damages*

suffered by plaintiff, e.g., As a proximate result of defendant's conduct and the_____ (breach of contract *or* severance of contract negotiations) by_____ (*name of third party*), plaintiff has suffered damages].

[10. The aforementioned acts of defendant[s, and each of them,] were willful and_____ (*specify, e.g.,* oppressive *or* fraudulent *or* malicious). Plaintiff is therefore entitled to punitive damages.]

11. Defendant(s) threaten(s) to [and unless restrained, will]_____ [*specify continuing threat of interference, e.g.,* disrupt other_____ (contracts *or* business relationships) between plaintiff and_____ (*name*(*s*)), whose accounts defendant also supervised during the period of his/her employment with plaintiff], to plaintiff's great and irreparable injury, for which damages would not afford adequate relief, in that_____ [*specify, e.g*, they would not completely compensate for the injury to plaintiff's business reputation and goodwill].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For damages.

[2. For exemplary and punitive damages.]

3. For an order requiring defendant[s, and each of them,] to show cause, if any they have, why they should not be enjoined as set forth below, during the pendency of this action;

4. For a temprorary restraining order, a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant(s) from_____ [*specify, e.g.,* making any false misrepresentations to or otherwise harassing_____ (*name*(*s*)) concerning his/her/their_____ (contract(s) *or* business relationship(s)) with plaintiff].

5. For his/her costs incurred; and

6. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See§ 565.230.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to state a cause of action for damages and injunctive relief based on intentional interference with a contract or other advantageous economic relationship. For discussion of damages and injunctive relief in an action for interference, see*§ 565.136*. For a form of judgment awarding damages and injunctive relief in an action for interference, see*§ 565.294*.

For discussion of effect of the availability of a cause of action based on a third party's breach of contract, see*§ 565.136[2]*. For discussion concerning an alternate or separate cause of action for conspiracy to interfere with economic relations, see*§ 565.134*.

[3] Allegations

This complaint consists of a cause of action for damages and injunctive relief [*Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333, 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*]. It alleges:

- The existence a valid contract or other economic relationship containing a probability of future economic benefits accruing to the plaintiff (Paragraph 4).

- Defendant's knowledge of the relationship (Paragraph 5).

- Defendant's intentional acts designed to disrupt the relationship (Paragraph 6) [*see Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1153, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937* (in action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, plaintiff need not allege defendant's specific intent to interfere, and knowledge of certainty or substantial certainty of interference will suffice); *but see Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 57, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513* (in pleading defendant's intent, general allegations of deliberate, willful, and intentional interference with contractual relations were sufficient to withstand demurrer; proof of defendant's intent was matter for trial)].

- The unlawfulness of the conduct by some measure other than the fact of interference itself, for use in an action for interference with prospective contractual or economic relations (Paragraph 7) [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* .

- Actual disruption of the relationship (Paragraph 8); damages proximately caused by defendant's disruption of the relationship (Paragraph 9) [*Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58* ; *see also §§ 565.133, 565.213[3]*].

- A basis for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief to enjoin defendant's continuing interference (Paragraph 11) [*Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526(a)(2),(4)*; *see generally* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

An optional paragraph alleges a basis for punitive damages (Paragraph 10) [*Civ. Code § 3294(a)*; *see generally* Ch. 174, *Damages*].

[4] Jurisdiction

An action seeking permanent injunctive relief is in the jurisdiction of the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), 580(b)(2)*]. However, in a limited civil case, the court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*].

An action for damages is in the jurisdiction of the superior court [*see Cal. Const. art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*]. In limited civil cases (amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less) the caption must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000. The caption must also identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9),(10)*].

[5] Venue

An action for interference with economic relations is based on nonphysical injury to intangible interests and is transitory in nature. Thus, theproper county for trial is that in which the defendants or some of them reside at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 218-220, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645* (interference with operation of business)]. If a defendant is a corporation or association, the county in which its principal place of business is located is also a proper county for trial (Paragraph 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*].

[6] Verification

Verification [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*] is required if plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction on a complaint instead of on affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary in order to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

Otherwise, verification is not required, but verification will require any answer to be verified also, if the action is in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial except in a limited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms of complaint alleging a civil cause of action for conspiracy to interfere with business or contractual relationships, see Ch. 126, *Conspiracy*

For a related form, *see § 565.230*

[8] California Torts

For full discussion of the torts of interference with business or contractual relationships, see Levy, Golden, and Sacks, *California Torts, Ch. 40, §§ 40.100 -40.135*

[9] State Statutes

Punitive and compensatory monetary relief in tort action. *Civ. Code §§ 3294(a), 3333*

Injunctive relief. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527*

[10] Decisions

Pecuniary or economic benefit to defendant is not element of tort of intereference with contractual relationship. *McCalden v. California Library Ass'n (9th Cir. 1990) 955 F.2d 1214, 1220*

In action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage, plaintiff need not allege defendant's specific intent to interfere, and knowledge of certainty or substantial certainty of interference will suffice; in pleading conduct

was wrongful, plaintiff must plead that conduct was unlawful by some independent legal standard. *Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1153, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937*

Plaintiff in intentional interference with existing contractual relations action is not required to plead "wrongfulness" independent of the inducement to breach the contract; in pleading defendant's intent, general allegations of deliberate, willful, and intentional interference with contractual relations were sufficient to withstand demurrer; proof of defendant's intent was matter for trial. *Quelimane Co. v. Stewart Title Guar. Co. (1998) 19 Cal. 4th 26, 55-57, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 709, 960 P.2d 513*

Interference with prospective relations cause of action required to be based on conduct wrongful by some legal measure other than fact of interference itself; distinctions between actions for interference with contract and interference with prospective relations. *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 387-393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740*

General or conclusionary pleading of elements of intentional interference is insufficient; complaint must allege factual basis for assertion that defendant interfered with plaintiff's business relations with improper malicious purpose to destroy plaintiff's business. *Khoury v. Maly's of Cal., Inc. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 612, 618, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 708*

Matters that must be pleaded and proved in action for interference with an advantageous contractual relationship or with prospective economic advantage. *Northridge Hospital Foundation v. Pic'N' Save No. 9, Inc. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1088, 1102-1103, 232 Cal. Rptr. 329*

Elements of cause of action for intentional interference with economic relations. *Blank v. Kirwan (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 311, 330, 216 Cal. Rptr. 718, 703 P.2d 58*

[11] Text References

Attorney's Guide to the Law of Competitive Business Practices (Cal. C.E.B. 1981), Ch. 9, *Business-Related Torts*, §§ 9.2-9.18

Witkin, California Procedure, vol. 1, *Attorneys*, § 245, vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 574-576, Vol. 5, *Pleading*, §§ 727-732, 778-783, Vol. 6, *Provisional Remedies*, § 312 (4th ed. 1996-1997)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Insurance*, §§ 247, 248; vol. 5, *Torts*, §§ 731-754, 756-763, 765-766; vol. 6 *Torts*, § 1709 (10th ed. 2005)

[12] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.230*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.291

§ 565.291 Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Negligent Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

[1] FORM Interference With Economic Relations--Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Negligent Interference With Contract or Other Economic Relationship

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	(Negligent Interference With Economic Relation-
through_____,]	)	ship)
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded_____ (exceeds
	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Identity and capacity of plaintiff. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Identity and capacity of defendant. See§ 565.230, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. Defendants DOES 1 through_____, inclusive, are sued herein under ficititious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintiff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is negligently responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged,

and thereby proximately caused injuries and damages to the plaintiff as herein alleged.]

4._____ [*Allege facts showing plaintiff's contractual or advantageous economic relationship, e.g.,* On or about_____ [*date*], plaintiff entered into a written contract with_____ (*name*) whereby plaintiff undertook to construct an office building located in_____ (*city*),_____ County, California. Pursuant to the terms of this contract, plaintiff was obligated to pay liquidated damages in the sum $_____ for any significant delay in completing the building. A copy of this contract, marked Exhibit "A," is attached and incorporated by reference herein].

5._____ [*Allege facts showing contract, relationship, activity, or other transaction under which defendant's performance was intended to affect plaintiff's relationship, e.g.,* On or about_____ [*date*], defendant_____ (*name*) entered into a written contract with_____ (*name*), who was one of plaintiff's subcontractors on the above described building project, whereby defendant agreed to furnish necessary building materials].

6._____ [*Allege facts showing foreseeability of risk of harm to plaintiff's economic relationship if defendant did not perform his/her transaction with ordinary care, e.g.,* Defendant was informed, when he/she entered the above described contract with plaintiff's subcontractor, that his/her failure to furnish supplies in a timely fashion could subject plaintiff to liability under the general building contract].

7._____ [*Allege negligent acts by defendant(s), e.g.,* Defendant nevertheless negligently failed to furnish supplies in a timely fashion, in that_____ (*specify, e.g.,* he/she failed to take ordinary precautions in advance to insure that necessary materials would be shipped and delivered on time].

8._____ [*Allege actual damages proximately caused by the defendant's negligent acts, e.g.,* As a result of defendant's negligence, plaintiff's subcontractor was unable to obtain necessary materials in time to complete his/her part of the building project on time, and, as a proximate result of this delay, plaintiff was compelled to pay liquidated damages under his/her general contract in the sum of $_____].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For damages in the amount of $_____.

2. For his/her costs incurred; and

3. For any other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By:_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff_____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See§ 565.230.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to state a cause of action for damages based on negligent interference with a contract or other advantageous economic relationship. This form may be modified to state an additional cause of action for injunctive relief in an appropriate case [*see § 565.290*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint consists of a cause of action for damages [*Civ. Code § 3333*]. It alleges [*see United States Liab. Ins. Co. v. Haidinger-Hayes, Inc. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 586, 594, 83 Cal. Rptr. 418, 463 P.2d 770* (general elements of actionable negligence); *see also Hoyem v. Manhattan Beach City Sch. Dist. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 508, 513-514, 150 Cal. Rptr. 1, 585 P.2d 851]* :

- A legal duty to use due care owed by the defendant to the plaintiff (Paragraphs 4-6, 8);
- The defendant's breach of that duty (Paragraph 7); and
- The breach as proximate cause of resulting injury and damages (Paragraph 8).

The allegations showing a duty of care are based on the criteria that are to be considered in determining the existence of such a duty in any action for negligent interference [*see J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463* ; *see also § 565.135[3]*]:

- The defendant entered into or engaged in a contract, relationship, activity, or other "transaction" that was intended or known to affect an economic relationship of plaintiff (Paragraph 4);
- There was a foreseeable risk of harm to plaintiff's economic relationship if defendant failed to use ordinary care in performing the transaction (Paragraph 5);
- There was a close connection between the defendant's negligence and the plaintiff's injury (Paragraph 8)
- The plaintiff's injury resulted in certain damages (Paragraphs 4, 8); and
- The defendant's conduct was blameworthy (Paragraphs 5-8).

A final criterion, the public policy of preventing future harm, appears to be a matter of judicial notice of the policy applicable to the particular facts [*see J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 804-805, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *Chameleon Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463* ; *see also § 565.135[3]*].

[4] State Statutes

Compensatory monetary relief in tort action. *Civ. Code § 3333*

[5] Decisions

Cause of action for negligent interference with economic relations is stated if plaintiff suffers damages from injury to economic relationship due to defendant's negligent performance of contract with third party and such injury is foreseeable. *J'Aire Corp. v. Gregory (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 799, 808, 157 Cal. Rptr. 407, 598 P.2d 60* ; *Chameleon*

Eng'g Corp. v. Air Dynamics Inc. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 418, 420-423, 161 Cal. Rptr. 463

[6] Cross References

For related forms, *see §§ 565.230* and *565.290*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.292

§ 565.292 Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

[1] FORM Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Bar of Statute of Limitations [Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE_____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that the action is barred by the provisions of_____ [*specify applicable section, e.g.,* Section 339, subdivision 1, of the Code of Civil Procedure].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a defendant in an action for interference with economic relations to raise the bar of the statute of limitations by way of an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. The limitation period is usually the two-year period set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*, although another period may apply when the defendant's conduct constitutes a separate tort [*see Kiang v. Strycula (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 809, 811-812, 42 Cal. Rptr. 338* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* applied); *Romano v. Wilbur Ellis & Co. (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 670, 673-674, 186 P.2d 1012* (three-year period of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(4)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*) applied when complaint alleged fraudulent conduct); *see also § 565.137[3]*]. For discussion relating to limitations periods generally, see Ch. 345, *Limitation of Actions* . For discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Alternative Use of Demurrer

If the defense of the statute of limitations is apparent from the face of the complaint or from matter of which the court may take judicial notice, the objection may be raised by general demurrer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 430.10(e), 430.30(a)*; *see Evid. Code §§ 451, 452* (judicial notice)]. The specific grounds must be pleaded (an exception to the general rule that general demurrers need only state that the complaint fails to state a cause of action). However, the defense of the statute of limitations is not waived for failure to demur, and may nonetheless be asserted as an affirmative defense in the

answer [*California Safe Deposit & Trust Co. v. Sierra Valleys Ry. Co. (1910) 158 Cal. 690, 697-698, 112 P. 274]* . For further discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[4] State Statutes

Action based on liability not founded on written instrument must be brought within two years. *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*

In pleading statute of limitations, facts showing defense are not required to be stated; pleading is permitted to state generally that action is barred by specified statutory provision that is relied on. *Code Civ. Proc. § 458*

[5] Decisons

Action for interference with business was barred when it was not commenced within two-year period embodied in *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*. *McFaddin v. H.S. Crocker Co. (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 585, 591, 33 Cal. Rptr. 389*

[6] Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, §§ 574-576 (4th ed. 1997)

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.290*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.293

§ 565.293 Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Justification or Privilege

[1] FORM Interference With Economic Relations--Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Justification or Privilege

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE_____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that his/her conduct was_____ [justified *or* privileged] under the circumstances, in that_____ [*allege facts showing justification or privilege, e.g.,* he/she was a corporate officer of_____ (*name of third part* y), acting within that corporate capacity with the sole purpose of protecting the interests of_____ (*name of third party*)].

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a defendant as an affirmative defense allegation in his or her answer in an action based on intentional or negligent interference with a contract or other economic relationship [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*]. The affirmative defense alleged is that the defendant's alleged conduct was justified or privileged under the particular circumstances.

In an action for interference with prospective economic relations, an element of the plaintiff's cause of action is that defendant's conduct was wrongful by some legal measure beyond the fact of interference itself [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740]* . For these purposes, conduct is independently wrongful if it is unlawful, which means that it must be conduct proscribed by some constitutional, statutory, regulatory, common law, or other determinable legal standard [*Korea Supply Co. v. Lockheed Martin Corp. (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 1134, 1159, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29, 63 P.3d 937]* . Because a plaintiff is required to prove that the defendant's conduct was unlawful as an element of the cause of action for intentional interference with prospective economic advantage that has not yet ripened into a contract, it would seem that the defendant's only real remaining burden in these actions on what was in the past considered the defense of justification is to counter the plaintiff's evidence and argument with the defendant's own showing that the conduct was not unlawful.

For further discussion relating to answers generally, including general forms into which this affirmative defense allegation may be inserted, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[3] Justification or Privilege

Whether a defendant's conduct is justified or privileged is a question of fact usually established by proof of facts rather than pleadings, whichturns essentially on whether the defendant's conduct was fair and reasonable under all the circumstances [*Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman v. Cohen (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 200, 228-229, 194 Cal. Rptr. 180* (overruled on other grounds in *Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454*); *Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 17-21, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . There are, however, several general fact situations in which the defense is typically recognized. For example, this form alleges illustrative facts showing a "manager's privilege" to induce his or her principal to breach its contract or to otherwise sever its economic relationship with plaintiff, so long as his or her purpose was to protect the principal's interests [*see Mayes v. Sturdy N. Sales, Inc. (1979) 91 Cal. App. 3d 69, 77-78, 154 Cal. Rptr. 43* ; *Olivet v. Frischling (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 831, 840-841, 164 Cal. Rptr. 87 , disapproved on other grounds, Applied Equip. Corp. v. Litton Saudi Arabia Ltd. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 503, 521 n.10, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475, 869 P.2d 454]* . For further discussion, including discussion of other situations in which the defense commonly arises, see*§ 565.137[4]*.

[4] Alternative Use of Demurrer

Justification or privilege is an affirmative defense that usually must be raised by way of allegation in the answer. It may be considered as a ground for demurrer only when it is apparent on the face of the complaint [*see Lowell v. Mother's Cake & Cookie Co. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 13, 18-19, 144 Cal. Rptr. 664* ; *see, e.g., Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Bear Stearns & Co. (1990) 50 Cal. 3d 1118, 1125, 1137, 270 Cal. Rptr. 1, 791 P.2d 587* (right to induce litigation on contract held privileged on demurrer)]. In an action for interference with prospective economic relations, an element of the plaintiff's cause of action is that defendant's conduct was wrongful by some legal measure beyond the fact of interference itself [*Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. (1995) 11 Cal. 4th 376, 393, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 436, 902 P.2d 740* ; *see § 565.290*]. A demurrer would be used if the complaint did not allege wrongfulness. For further discussion and forms relating to demurrers generally, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* .

[5] California Points and Authorities

For memoranda of points and authorities supporting a motion for summary judgment on the ground that defendant's acts were justified or privileged, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 122, *Interference* (Matthew Bender)

[6] Decisions

Insurer's and its adjuster's misrepresentations and concealment from plaintiff regarding whereabouts of her artwork during her action against insured, and their instructions to insured to falsely deny knowledge of whereabouts of painting, were absolutely privileged under *Civ. Code § 47(b)(2)*. *Kupiecv. American Int'l Adjustment Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1326, 1331-1332, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371*

Privilege under *Civ. Code § 47(b)(2)* is applicable only to communications, not to tortious courses of conduct; purpose of privilege is to afford litigants freedom of access to courts and open channels of communication by absolutely protecting them from derivative litigation based on communicative acts during judicial proceedings. *Kupiec v. American Int'l Adjustment Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1326, 1331, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371*

Privilege under *Civ. Code § 47(b)(2)* as applicable to communicative acts done in judicial proceeding by litigants, to achieve objects of litigation, and that had logical relation to action. *Kupiec v. American Int'l Adjustment Co. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1326, 1331-1332, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 371* (misrepresentations to delay prior lawsuit and to avoid liability)

[7] Cross References

For a related form, *see § 565.290*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapter 565 UNFAIR COMPETITION
PART IV. FORMS
D. Interference With Economic Relations

49-565 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 565.294

§ 565.294 Interference With Economic Relations--Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 664]--Awarding Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM Interference With Economic Relations--Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 664]--Awarding Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF_____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], [and DOES 1	)	JUDGMENT
through_____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

This action came on regularly for trial on_____ [*date*] in [_____ (Department *or* Division_____ of] the above entitled court, the Honorable_____ (*name*), Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Plaintiff appeared by_____ [*name*], counsel; defendant_____ [*name*] appeared by_____ [*name*], counsel[; and_____ (*specify appearances by additional defendants, if any*)]. Oral and documentary evidence was presented by both parties. The cause was argued and submitted for decision. A statement of decision_____ [has been made and filed *or* was not requested].

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ADJUDGED, ORDERED, AND DECREED that:

1. Plaintiff recover from defendant(s)_____ [*name(s)*] the sum of $_____, as actual

damages sustained by plaintiff, [the sum of $_____, as exemplary or punitive damages,] and the sum of $_____, for costs herein incurred.

2. Defendant(s),_____ [*name(s)*], his/her/their agents, employees, and all persons in active concert and participation with him/her/them be, and hereby are, permanently enjoined from engaging in or performing, directly or indirectly, any of the following acts:_____ [*specify acts of interference enjoined, e.g.*, harassment or obstruction of plaintiff's patrons as they enter or leave plaintiff's place of business].
Dated:_____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of judgment is for use by a plaintiff who has successfully obtained an award of damages and injunctive relief after trial by the court of an action for interference with economic relations. For discussion relating to the availability of damages and injunctive relief in such an action, see*§ 565.136*. For general forms of judgment that award or deny monetary relief on the basis of a jury verdict, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[3] Entry and Notice of Entry of Judgment

In an action tried by the court, the clerk is required to enter judgment immediately after the order granting judgment is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664*]. The prevailing party must then serve notice of entry of judgment on all parties, and file the original of such notice with proof of service [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5*]. For further discussion and forms of notice and proof of service, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

[4] State Statutes

Statement of decision. *Code Civ. Proc. § 632*

Entry and notice of entry of judgment. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 664, 664.5*

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to execution of money judgments and enforcement of nonmoney judgments, see Ch. 254, *Executions and Enforcement of Judgments*

For general discussion and forms relating to obtaining, amending, and enforcing judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments*

For discussion and forms relating to statements of decision, see Ch. 529, *Statement of Decision*

For related forms, *see §§ 565.290* and *565.291*

105 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 49: Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts thru Unfair Competition-Chs. 560-567
Chapters 566through 567 RESERVED

49-566 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapters 566through 567

RESERVED

Chapters 566RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 568.syn

§ 568.syn Synopsis to Chapter 568: USURY

§ 568.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 568.02 Cross References

§§ 568.03-568.09 [Reserved]

§ 568.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

[2] Historical Background

§ 568.11 Definitions and General Principles

§ 568.12 Establishing That Transaction Is Usurious

[1] Credit Sale Versus Loan

[2] Variable Interest Rate

§§ 568.13-568.29 [Reserved]

§ 568.30 Maximum Rate of Interest Under State Constitutional Provisions

§ 568.31 Statutory Restrictions

§ 568.32 Remedies Available When Transaction Shown to Be Usurious Under General Provisions

[1] Interest Provision Null and Void

[2] Action at Law

[a] Treble Damages

[b] Money Had and Received

[3] Action in Equity

[4] Rights of Usurer to Recover Debt but Not Interest

[5] Defense and Cross Complaint to Complaint by Usurer to Recover Debt

[6] Criminal Liability

§§ 568.33-568.49 [Reserved]

§ 568.50 In General

§ 568.51 Depository Institutions

[1] General Preemption of Laws Restricting Interest Rates

[2] Federal Rate Restrictions for State-Chartered Insured Depository Institutions, Insured Branches of Foreign Banks, and Insured Credit Unions

§ 568.52 Federally Related Mortgage Loans

§ 568.53 Credit Card Interest and Late Payment Fees

§ 568.54 Small Business Investment Company

§§ 568.55-568.69 [Reserved]

§ 568.70 In General

§ 568.71 Banks, Associations, Trust Companies, and Other Fiduciaries

§ 568.72 Credit Unions

§ 568.73 Industrial Loan Companies

§ 568.74 Deferred Deposit Lenders (Payday Lenders)

§ 568.75 Pawnbroker

[1] In General

[2] Licensure

§ 568.76 Personal Property Brokers and Consumer Finance Lenders

§ 568.77 Real Estate Brokers

[1] In General

[2] Maximum Charges on Original Loans

[3] Maximum Charges on Refinanced Loans

[4] Maximum Charge for Late Payment

[5] Effect of Prepayment by Borrower

[6] Remedies for Excess Charges

§ 568.78 Nonprofit Cooperatives

§ 568.79 Common Interest Development Association

§ 568.80 Insurer

§ 568.81 Sales of Securities

§ 568.82 Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA)

§ 568.83 State or Local Public Retirement System

§ 568.84 Mortgage Loans for Residential Property

§ 568.85 Bottomry Contract

§ 568.86 Shared Appreciation Loans

§§ 568.87-568.99 [Reserved]

§ 568.100 California Points and Authorities

§ 568.101 California Legal Forms

§ 568.102 California Constitution

§ 568.103 Federal Statutes

[1] Business and Agricultural Loans

[2] Banks, Savings Associations, and Credit Unions

[a] Applicability of Statutes

[b] Credit Unions

[c] Depository Institutions

[d] Mortgage Loans

[e] Small Business Investment Companies

[f] State and Foreign Banks

§ 568.104 California Statutes

[1] Automobile Sales

[2] Banking Institutions Exempted From Constitutional Usury Law

[3] Bottomry Contracts

[4] Common Interest Development Associations

[5] Consumer Finance Lenders

[a] In General

[b] Restrictions on Charges and Fees

[c] Violation of Statute

[6] Credit Unions

[7] Industrial Loan Companies

[8] Insurers

[9] Mortgage Loans

[10] Pawnbrokers

[11] Personal Property Brokers

[a] In General

[b] Restrictions on Charges and Fees

[c] Violation of Statute

[12] Public Retirement Systems

[13] Real Estate Brokers

[a] In General

[b] Maximum Charges

[c] Recovery of Usurious Interest from Real Estate Broker

[14] Retail Installment Contracts

[a] In General

[b] Civil and Criminal Liabilities

[c] Regulation of Charges

[15] Sales of Securities

[16] Usury Laws in General

[a] Definitions and Principles

[b] Civil Remedies

§ 568.105 Decisions

[1] Agricultural Labor

[2] Assignee of Usurious Note

[3] Attorney's Fees

[4] Choice of Law Determination

[5] Credit Sales

[6] Defense

[7] Effect of Change in Usury Laws

[8] Effect of Subsequent Events

[9] Effect of Usurious Provision

[10] ERISA

[11] Estoppel

[12] Evidence and Procedure

[13] Examples

[a] Usurious Loans

[b] Nonusurious Loans

[14] Exemption and Common Law Remedies

[15] Extension of Time for Payment

[16] Intent as Element of Usury

[17] Interest Assessed on Unpaid Taxes

[18] Judgment Interest

[19] Pawnbrokers

[20] Personal Property Broker or Finance Lender

[21] Rate Assigned by Court on Implied Loan Agreement

[22] Real Estate Broker

[23] Reformation of Contract

[24] Sale Versus Loan

[25] Standing to Challenge Usury

[26] Treble Damages

§ 568.106 Attorney General Opinions

§ 568.107 Law Reviews

[1] California Usury Laws

[2] Conflict of Laws

[3] Federal Usury Laws and Preemption

[4] Mortgage Banking

[5] Public Utilities

[6] Real Estate

[7] Sales of Goods

[8] Third Party Payments

[9] Usury Laws in General

§ 568.108 Text References

§§ 568.109-568.119 [Reserved]

§ 568.120 Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-3], Recovery of Interest Paid on Loan as Money Had and Received (Indebitatus Assumpsit), and Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Declaring

Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Void--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--By Borrower Against Person to Whom Interest Paid

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction

[7] Venue

[8] California Constitution

[9] California Statutes

[10] Cross References

§ 568.121 Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Interest Provision Null and Void [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] California Statutes

[5] Cross References

§ 568.122 Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Debt Not Due Until Full Contractual Period Elapses [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 568.123 Complaint for Recovery of Double Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)] and for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] to Declare Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Forfeited--Loan Violates Federal Usury Limits on Loans by State Depository Institutions, Foreign Banks, or Credit Unions [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g), 1831d]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Federal Statutes

[6] California Constitution

[7] California Statutes

[8] Cross References

§ 568.124 Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246]--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] California Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 568.125 Demand Letter for Recovery of Real Estate Broker's Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative Procedure to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents

[4] Cross References

§ 568.126 Complaint for Recovery of Actual Damages or Double Amount of Usurious Charges When Real Estate Broker Fails to Return Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days of Service of Demand Letter [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

[5] Cross References

§ 568.127 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22651(a)] or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24651(a)]--Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Interest or Charges for Nonwillful Violation [Fin. Code §§ 22651(a), 24651(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] California Statutes

[a] Consumer Finance Lenders

[b] Personal Property Brokers

[5] Cross References

§ 568.128 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Industrial Loan Company [Fin. Code § 18439], Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22650(a)], or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24650(a)]--Contract Void and Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Principal, Interest, or Charges [Fin. Code §§ 18439, 22650(a), 24650(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] California Statutes

[a] Consumer Finance Lenders

[b] Industrial Loan Companies

[c] Personal Property Brokers

[5] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART I. SCOPE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.01

§ 568.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and provides forms relating to actions to recover usurious interest payments that have been made to a lender or other person on a loan or forbearance. The chapter examines the general usury provisions contained in the state constitution, as well as general statutory provisions and considerations for determining whether or not a given transaction is usurious. In addition, it discusses various federal preemptions of state law, and the numerous state statutory exceptions to the state constitutional provision.

The chapter includes forms of complaints for use in the following actions:

- To recover treble damages under the California constitutional and general statutory usury provisions [*see § 568.120*].

- To recover double damages under the federal provisions [*see § 568.123*].

- To recover actual, double, or treble damages under California real estate broker provisions [Forms 5, 6, and 7].

The chapter includes affirmative defense allegations for use in actions for breach of contract to assert the following defenses:

- Violation of the California constitutional usury provisions [Forms 2, 3].

- Violation of state laws regulating loans made by industrial loan companies, personal property brokers, or consumer finance lenders [Forms 8, 9].

Retail installment contracts, strictly speaking, are sales rather than loans [*see Civ. Code § 1801.6* (establishing standards for determining whether transaction is loan or installment sale); *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 43-46, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200]* . A bona fide credit sale is not subject to usury laws because it does not involve a loan, although the contract of sale calls for interest to accrue at a rate that would be usurious [*see Boerner v. Colwell*

Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 43-46, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200 ; *Verbeck v. Clymer (1927) 202 Cal. 557, 562-563, 261 P. 1017]* . Thus, retail installment contracts and the amounts of interest that may be charged in such a contract [*see Civ. Code §§ 1803.1-1809.1*; *see also Civ. Code § 1810.1 et seq.* (retail installment accounts)], do not involve usury and are discussed in Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* . For detailed discussion and forms relating to automobile sales contracts, which are governed separately from retail installment contracts in general [*see Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.* (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act)], see Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART I. SCOPE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.02

§ 568.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to an action concerning usurious interest rates on an automobile loan, Ch. 89, *Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act.*

For discussion and forms relating to banks, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

For discussion and forms relating to an action on a promissory note, see Ch. 385, *Negotiable Instruments* .

For discussion and forms relating to real estate brokers, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

For discussion and forms relating to credit card transactions, see Ch. 127, *Consumer Contracts and Loans* .

For discussion and forms relating to an action for declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

For discussion and forms relating to an action for reformation of a contract, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

For discussion and forms relating to an action concerning usurious interest rates on a retail installment contract, see Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales* .

For discussion and forms relating to securities, see Ch. 515, *Securities and Franchise Regulation* .

For discussion and forms relating to trust deeds, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

For a discussion of maximum rates charged by a common interest development association, see Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Banking LawConsumer ProtectionCredit Card AgreementsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Negotiable Instruments (Article 3)General OverviewReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART I. SCOPE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.03-568.09

[Reserved]

§§ 568.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.10

§ 568.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

The law governing maximum interest rates that may be charged on loans or forbearances is set forth generally in *Cal. Const., art. XV § 1*, the Usury Law, Stats. 1919, p. lxxxiii, as amended by Stats. 1970, ch. 784, § 1 (Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code §§ 1916-1*-1916-3; throughout the article, this provision will be cited as Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-1*-1916-3), and *Civ. Code §§ 1916.1-1916.12*. Federal preemption of state usury laws is governed by *12 U.S.C.A. § 86a*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 512), *12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7*, *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501, as amended, and Pub. L. No. 96-221, §§ 528, 529), and *15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(3)*. The interest rates permitted by federal law, and the loans to which they apply, are governed by *12 U.S.C. §§ 86a*, *1785*, and *1831d*, and *15 U.S.C. § 687*. State statutory exemptions from the state constitutional usury laws are set forth generally in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*. Specific exemptions are also set forth with respect to banks, associations, trust companies, and other fiduciaries in *Fin. Code §§ 1504*, *3707*, *6515(c)*, and *7675*. Additional statutes governing various specific types of loans and lenders may be found at *Fin. Code § 14000 et seq.* (credit unions); *Fin. Code § 18000 et seq.* (industrial loan companies); *Fin. Code § 21000 et seq.* (pawnbrokers); *Fin. Code § 22000 et seq.* (personal property brokers); *Fin. Code § 24000 et seq.* (consumer finance lenders); *Fin. Code § 26000 et seq.* (commercial finance lenders); *Civ. Code § 1916.1* and *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10131* and *10240-10248.3* (real estate brokers); *Civ. Code §§ 1803.1-1809.1*(retail installment contracts); *Civ. Code §§ 2981 et seq.* (automobile sales contracts); *Civ. Code § 1366(f)* (common interest development associations); *Ins. Code § 1100.1* (insurers); *Corp. Code §§ 25110-25117*, *25211*, and *25211.5* (sales of securities); *Gov. Code § 7509* (state or local public retirement systems); and *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 450*, *455* (bottomry contracts).

Under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] and similar California law [*see Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*], no obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year incurred by a service member [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 511(1)* (member of uniformed services); *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(a)* (member of national guard or military reserve called to active duty)] before his or her entry into service can, during any part of the period of military service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 511(2), (3)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400(b)* (active service or active duty)], bear interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year unless, in the opinion of the court, on application by the obligee, the

ability of the service member to pay interest on that obligation or liability at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year is not materially affected by reason of that service, in which case the court may make whatever order is in its opinion just. "Interest" includes service charges, renewal charges, fees, or any other charges, except bona fide charges for insurance, in respect of any obligation or liability [*50 U.S.C. App. § 527(d)*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*].

Unconscionability is governed by *Civ. Code § 1670.5*, which may be applied to bar enforcement of an interest rate otherwise within an exemption from the usury law [*see Carboni v. Arrospide (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 76, 81-85, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845]* . For discussion of unconscionability and a form for an affirmative defense seeking to have an onerous term declared unconscionable, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[2] Historical Background

California's first usury law was passed by initiative in 1918, setting the ceiling on permissible interest rates that may be charged on a loan or forbearance, and providing for civil and criminal remedies if those rates are exceeded [*see* Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-1*-1916-3]. That law provided in part that the interest rate may not exceed seven percent, except that parties may contract in writing for an interest rate not exceeding twelve percent [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-1*].

In 1934, a state constitutional amendment was passed that lowered the contractual rate from 12 to 10 percent, and provided for various exemptions from the usury law [*see* former *Cal. Const, art. XX, § 22*]. The passage of the constitutional amendment did not supersede all of the provisions of the 1918 initiative, but did supersede the 1918 provisions to the extent that they conflicted with the constitutional amendment. Thus, the courts held that the constitutional amendment was to be read into the initiative provisions [*see, e.g., Heald v. Friis-Hansen (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 834, 838, 345 P.2d 457* (state constitutional usury provisions read into statute)].

The civil and criminal penalties portion of the initiative [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1, § 1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3*] was amended in 1970 [Stats. 1970, ch. 784, § 1]. Six years later, former *Cal. Const, art. XX, § 22* was repealed and reenacted with changes as *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*. Subsequent amendments were made to *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* in 1978 and 1979, including the addition of a different ceiling for a contractual interest rate if the loan or forbearance is for use other than primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. Even with the reenactment and various amendments, however, the courts have continued to hold that the constitutional amendment must be read into the initiative provisions [*see, e.g., Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 280 n. 1, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456]* . Both the constitutional and initiative provisions are discussed in detail in *§§ 568.30, 568.31*.

The Legislature has also enacted numerous statutes to exempt or to specially regulate certain types of interest rates, as discussed in *§ 568.30* et seq. However, these statutes, as well as the constitutional and initiative provisions, are subject to preemption by federal regulation, as discussed in *§ 568.50* et seq.

Any changes in the usury laws are retroactively applied to a transaction, unless a cause of action for usury regarding that transaction has been reduced to final judgment [*Chapman v. Farr (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 1021, 1023, 183 Cal. Rptr. 606* ; *Orden v. Crawshaw Mortgage & Inv. Co. (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 141, 144-146, 167 Cal. Rptr. 62* ; *see Penziner v. West American Finance Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 160, 170-171, 74 P.2d 252* (usury law provides recovery as statutory remedy and penalty, which may be repealed); *Garcia v. Wetzel (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1097-1098, 206 Cal. Rptr. 251* (1979 amendment to *Civ. Code § 1916.1* applied retroactively)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryGovernmentsLegislationEffect & OperationRetrospective OperationReal Property

LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.11

§ 568.11 Definitions and General Principles

Usury laws are enacted to limit the amount of interest that may be charged on a loan or forbearance of money [*see, e.g., Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*]. A "loan of money" means a contract by which one delivers a sum of money to another, and the latter agrees to return at a future time a sum equivalent to that which he or she borrowed [*Civ. Code § 1912*]. A "forbearance of money" is the giving of further time for the payment of a debt or an agreement not to enforce a claim at its due date [*Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 44 n.7, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200* ; *see Sheehy v. Franchise Tax Board (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 280, 283-284, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 760* (Franchise Tax Board's six-year delay in informing taxpayers of amount due was not "forbearance" and constitutional prohibition against usurious interest did not apply; true purpose of 10 percent interest rate on delinquent taxes was penalty assessment)]. "Interest" means the compensation allowed by law or fixed by the parties for the use, forbearance, or detention of money [*Civ. Code § 1915*].

A loan of money is presumed to be made on interest, unless otherwise expressly stipulated at the time in writing [*Civ. Code § 1914*; *see Civ. Code § 1912* ("loan of money" defined)].

When a law or contract prescribes an interest rate but does not specify the period of time by which the rate is to be calculated, the rate is deemed to be an annual rate [*Civ. Code § 1916*].

In the case of joint venturers, one of whom holds a note made by the other to effectuate their venture, the usury law does not prevent enforcement of the note even though its terms would violate the usury law if the note had been made to memorialize a loan. Since the note is part of a transaction that is not a "loan or forbearance of any money, goods or things in action" [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*], the usury law does not apply. Whether a transaction is a joint venture or a loan is a question of fact [*Junkin v. Golden West Foreclosure Serv., Inc. (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1150, 1155-1158, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 582* (review of facts supported conclusion that parties to promissory note were joint venturers, not lender and borrower)]. This rule, which comes from case law, is sometimes called the "joint venture exception" to the usury law.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.12

§ 568.12 Establishing That Transaction Is Usurious

[1] Credit Sale Versus Loan

Bona fide credit sales are exempt from the usury law on the theory that in a sale there is no loan or forbearance, and therefore no interest is involved at all [*Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 876, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893]* . In determining whether a transaction, disguised as a sale, actually constitutes a loan or forbearance, the court will look to the substance rather than the form of the transaction [*Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 705, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 44, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200* ; *see Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 802, 883 P.2d 960]* . The issue is whether or not the bargain of the parties, assessed in light of all the circumstances and with a view to substance rather than form, has as its true object the hire of money at an excessive rate of interest [*Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 705, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 44, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200]* . For example, a lease-back arrangement may be found to be a loan merely disguised as lease-back [*see, e.g., Rochester Capital Leasing Corp. v. K & L Litho Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 697, 701, 91 Cal. Rptr. 827]* . On the other hand, an interest-bearing promissory note may be found to be part of a sale if it is included as part of the purchase price in the legitimate sale of a going business [*see, e.g., La France Enterprises v. Van Der Linden (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 375, 381, 138 Cal. Rptr. 690* ; *Lenes v. Dean (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 845, 848, 135 Cal. Rptr. 14]* . Similarly, the purchase of a note at a discount may be found to be a sale rather than a loan [*see, e.g., Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547]* .

An agreement imposing a monthly "late charge" on a buyer's past due account is typically characterized as a credit sale rather than a forbearance because the parties did not intend that the buyer could forbear from making full payment ad infinitum or that the creditor could never recover the principal as long as the late charges were being paid [*see Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 708, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *O'Connor v. Televideo System, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 709, 717, 267 Cal. Rptr. 237]* .

Under the "time-price" doctrine, a transaction is exempt from the usury law if the seller finances the purchase of

property by extending payments over time and charging a higher price for carrying the financing [*Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 705, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *see Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 802-803, 883 P.2d 960]* . When a seller offers to sell at a designated price for cash or at a much higher price on credit, the credit sale does not constitute usury, however great the difference between the two prices, unless the "sale" was a mere pretense [*Verbeck v. Clymer (1927) 202 Cal. 557, 563, 261 P. 1017]* . A retailer's "finance charges" have been held valid under the time-price doctrine when they were charged to a consumer holding a revolving charge account in the form of a credit card [*Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 874, 880, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893* (upholding otherwise usurious charges authorized by Unruh Act; for discussion of the Unruh Act, *see* Ch. 501, *Sales: Retail Installment Sales*]. Commercial sellers also may legally impose such finance charges in connection with revolving charge accounts [*see Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 873, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893]* . "Late charges," which a seller bills to the buyer if full payment is not made within a certain number of days after delivery of goods, have also been held valid under the time-price doctrine [*Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 707, 709, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *see Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 884-885, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893* (upholding finance charges on credit card account requiring full payment every month)]. It appears, however, that even when "late charges" do not run afoul of the usury laws, they may still be challenged as illegal liquidated damages provisions [*see Beasley v. Wells Fargo Bank (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1383, 1398-1401, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 446* (exempt credit card issuer's late-payment and over-limit fees held invalid under *Civ. Code § 1671(d)*), *disapproved on other grounds, Olson v. Automobile Club of So. Cal. (2008) 42 Cal. 4th 1142, 1153 n.6*]. For further discussion of liquidated damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

The legal distinction between a credit sale and a loan has become increasingly blurred, and some courts are now admitting that the decision to label a transaction usurious turns more on policy than on the mechanics of the transaction. For example, in *DCM Partners v. Smith (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 729, 278 Cal. Rptr. 778* , the court held that a private seller who financed a buyer's purchase of real estate could legally raise the interest rate on the secured loan to 15 percent as a condition for extending the loan's maturity date. The court reasoned that to invalidate such transactions would chill the willingness of nonexempt lenders to extend credit, thereby harming consumers. In addition, the court argued, the lender could have legally achieved the same practical result by the more convoluted process of obtaining the property through foreclosure and reselling it to the buyer with financing at the higher 15 percent rate, thereby transacting a bona fide credit sale permissible under the "time-price" doctrine [*see DCM Partners v. Smith (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 729, 733-736, 734 n.1, 278 Cal. Rptr. 778]* . This rationale was subsequently adopted by the *Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 883 P.2d 960* , in which the Court held that the restructuring of an arrangement under which one party transferred an interest in real property to another in exchange for a promissory note and deed of trust was exempt from the usury laws. The original transaction was characterized as a sale rather than a loan, and therefore was found to be exempt under the "time-price" doctrine [*Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 802-803, 883 P.2d 960]* . The contention was that the terms of new notes, executed as a result of the restructuring of the transaction to avoid foreclosure, were usurious. However, the Court concluded that since the original transaction was exempt from the usury laws, a modification of that transaction was similarly exempt [*Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 804, 883 P.2d 960]* , even though the interest rate on the modification was greater than that on the original transaction [*Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 806, 883 P.2d 960]* . The court reasoned that it would be impractical and unfair to both buyer and seller if the only alternative to foreclosure for a seller who had suffered a default was the extension of credit to the buyer on new terms favorable only to the buyer [*Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 804-806, 883 P.2d 960]* . The fact that that the original purchaser had sold the property to another party at the time the restructuring had occurred did not alter this result [*Ghirardo v. Antonioli (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 791, 804-805, 883 P.2d 960]* .

The transfer of structured settlement payments under the Structured Settlement Transfer Act [*Ins. Code § 10136 et seq.*] does not implicate the prohibition against usury in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* because a structured settlement transfer is not a loan or forbearance but is instead a sale, as indicated in *Ins. Code § 10136(b)* [*321 Henderson Receivables Origination LLC v. Sioteco (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1077, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 321]* .

[2] Variable Interest Rate

An agreement may contain a variable interest rate that exceeds the constitutional limit if a specific contingency occurs. This type of interest rate is not deemed usurious if the transaction is consummated in good faith without intent to avoid the usury laws [*see, e.g., McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 365, 377-378, 146 Cal. Rptr. 371, 578 P.2d 1375* ; *Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 289, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456]* . For further discussion of loans secured by real property that provide for variable interest rates, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25, *Real Property Security Estate Loans* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. In General

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.13-568.29

[Reserved]

§§ 568.13[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General State Usury Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.30

§ 568.30 Maximum Rate of Interest Under State Constitutional Provisions

Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1 provides that the interest rate on a loan or forbearance of any money, goods, or things in action, or on accounts after demand, is seven percent per annum, but it is competent for the parties to any loan or forbearance of any money, goods, or things in action to contract for a higher rate of interest as specified [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*].

Parties to any loan or forbearance of any money, goods, or things in action for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes may nevertheless contract in writing for an interest rate not exceeding 10 percent per annum. In this context, however, a loan or forbearance is not deemed for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes if its proceeds are used primarily for the purchase, construction, or improvement of real property [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(1)*].

Parties to any loan or forbearance of any money, goods, or things in action for use other than primarily for personal, family, or household purposes may also contract in writing for an interest rate other than the seven percent rate, if the rate does not exceed the higher of (a) 10 percent per annum or (b) five percent per annum plus the rate established by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco on advances to member banks, or if the rate is not determinable, the closest counterpart of the rate as designated by the California Superintendent of Banks or another person or agency delegated the authority by the California Legislature. For the purposes of determining the maximum rate permitted under (b), the rate used in the computation is that which prevails on the 25th day of the month preceding the earlier of (1) the date of execution of the contract to make the loan or forbearance, or (2) the date of making the loan or forbearance [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(2)*].

In general, no person, association, partnership, or corporation may, by charging a fee, bonus, commission, discount, or other compensation, receive from a borrower more than these authorized interest rates on any loan or forbearance of any money, goods, or things in action [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*]. However, numerous classes of persons are specifically exempted from these rate restrictions, including savings associations, industrial loan companies, credit unions, licensed pawnbrokers, licensed personal property brokers, licensed real estate brokers, banks, certain nonprofit cooperative associations, and any other class of persons authorized by statute, as well as any successor in interest to any loan or

forbearance exempted from the rate restrictions [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*]. Instead, the Legislature may prescribe the maximum rate per annum of these exempted persons [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*]. For further discussion of exempted classes, see *§ 568.70* et seq.

The California Constitution requires the Legislature to set the interest rate on a court judgment at not more than 10 percent per annum. Otherwise, the rate will be deemed to be seven percent per annum. The rate may be variable and based on interest rates charged by federal agencies or economic indicators, or both [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*]. Currently, the Legislature has set the rate at 10 percent per annum on the principal amount of a money judgment remaining unsatisfied; however, the Legislature has reserved the right to change this rate to one less than 10 percent per annum for future interest that accrues [*Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010*].

The provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* supersede any previously adopted constitutional provision or enacted statute to the contrary [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; *see* discussion in *§ 568.10[2]*]. However, Cal. Const., *art. XV, § 1*, is preempted by any federal law to the contrary. For example, prejudgment interest at the market rate in an inverse condemnation case is proper even if the rate exceeds the legal rate set by *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, and *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010*, because the right to prejudgment interest in an inverse condemnation suit derives from *U.S. Const., amend. V*, which has supremacy under U.S. Const., art. VI, *cl. 2*, over any state constitutional provision or statute to the contrary [*see, e.g., Aetna Life & Casualty Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 865, 879, 216 Cal. Rptr. 831]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General State Usury Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.31

§ 568.31 Statutory Restrictions

When computing interest on any bond, note, or other instrument or agreement, interest may not be compounded, nor may the interest be construed to bear interest unless an agreement to that effect is clearly expressed in writing and signed by the party to be charged [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*; *see McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 816, 818-824, 191 Cal. Rptr. 458, 662 P.2d 916* (discussing requirement of writing "clearly expressed")].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsTypesPromissory Notes

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General State Usury Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.32

§ 568.32 Remedies Available When Transaction Shown to Be Usurious Under General Provisions

[1] Interest Provision Null and Void

Any agreement or contract of any nature that provides for an interest rate greater than the maximum rate allowed under *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, or that provides for compounded interest or interest on interest but is not in a writing that is signed by the party to be charged, is null and void as to any agreement or stipulation to pay interest [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*; *see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82* ; *see also Heald v. Friis-Hansen (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 834, 838, 345 P.2d 457* (state constitutional usury provisions read into statute); *Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 280 n. 1, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456* (same)]. When a loan is usurious the creditor is entitled to repayment of principal only [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82]* .

[2] Action at Law

[a] Treble Damages

Any person, company, association, or corporation who has paid any greater sum or value than is allowed may recover treble the violative amount paid, in an action at law against the person, company, association, or corporation to whom the interest was paid [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(a); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(a)*; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829]* . Treble the entire amount of interest may be recovered, not merely treble the excess permissible amount [*Haines v. Commercial Mortgage Co. (1927) 200 Cal. 609, 617, 254 P. 956, 255 P. 805* (overruled on other grounds in *Heald v. Friis-Hansen (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 834, 840, 345 P.2d 457*)].

The action must be brought within one year after any payment in order to recover treble the amount of that payment [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(a); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(a)*]. It is immaterial whether or not any principal remains unpaid at the time the interest is paid [*Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 296, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456]* .

The court has wide discretion in determining whether treble damages should be awarded [*Burr v. Capital Reserve Corp. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 983, 994, 80 Cal. Rptr. 345, 458 P.2d 185* (usurer's unjustifiable claim on title to property is not conduct so shocking as to require treble damages as matter of law); *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (treble damages award is at trial court's discretion)]. However, because public policy favors subjecting a usurious lender to a treble damage penalty, a court might exercise its discretion to deny the penalty only if the borrower rather than the lender was the moving force in the usurious loan [*see, e.g.,* *Buck v. Dahlgren (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 779, 787-789, 100 Cal. Rptr. 462* (borrower suggested and initiated usurious method of payment and induced method through fraudulent representations)].

[b] Money Had and Received

In addition to or in lieu of a cause of action for treble damages, the party who has paid any greater sum or value than is allowed may bring a cause of action against the person to whom the sum was paid to recover money had and received [*Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 816-817, 221 P.2d 15]* . Interest paid within two years of the bringing of the action may be recovered [*Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 816-817, 221 P.2d 15* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* (two-year statute of limitations for money had and received)]. Thus, any amount paid more than one year but less than two years from the date of the bringing of the action, for which treble damage recovery is barred as being untimely, may still be recoverable if the action is brought within the two-year period [*see, e.g.,* *Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 817, 221 P.2d 15* (borrowers not barred from counterclaiming to recover usurious interest paid 14 months before complaint was filed); cf. *G.H.I.I. v. MTS, Inc. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 256, 278-279, 195 Cal. Rptr. 211* (plaintiffs entitled to actual damages from antitrust violations that accrued within three years of filing of complaint and to treble damages from antitrust violations that accrued within one year of filing of complaint)]. However, the statute of limitations on recovery of usurious interest does not apply if the lender has initiated foreclosure proceedings based on the usurious note; in that case the borrower may cross-complain for recovery of all interest actually paid [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (in foreclosure action, cross-complaint for unjust enrichment not barred by statute of limitations)].

Although in many cases a plaintiff may recover the amount of interest paid even though treble damages are not awarded, a court may refuse to allow any recovery when the circumstances justify a finding that no award is appropriate [*see* *Buck v. Dahlgren (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 779, 788, 100 Cal. Rptr. 462* (plaintiff held to be estopped from any recovery)].

[3] Action in Equity

The party who has paid or agreed to pay any greater sum or value than is allowed may bring an action in equity for declaratory relief to declare the interest provisions of the contract void [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1061* (necessity of declaration), 1062 (declaration not exclusive remedy)]. For discussion and forms relating to declaratory relief actions, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* . An action for reformation of the contract to eliminate its interest provisions may also be brought under certain circumstances [*see Civ. Code §§ 3399-3402*]. For discussion and forms relating to the reformation of contracts, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

[4] Rights of Usurer to Recover Debt but Not Interest

The party to whom the interest is to be paid under the terms of the agreement may not maintain an action at law to recover that interest in any sum [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's *Civ. Code § 1916-2*; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82]* , and cannot declare the debt to be due until the full period of time for which it was contracted has elapsed [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*].

When the debt matures, the payee is entitled to payment of the principal sum in full. If the payor fails to make timely payment of the principal at the date of maturity, the payee is entitled to payment of interest on the principal at the legal rate from the date the note matures until the time at which the payee obtains a judgment, as would the payee of any other noninterest-bearing note [*Epstein v. Frank (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 111, 123, 177 Cal. Rptr. 831]* .

[5] Defense and Cross Complaint to Complaint by Usurer to Recover Debt

In an action to recover a debt, the payor may assert usury as a defense to the payment of interest. The defendant must affirmatively plead the defense of usury, or it will be deemed waived [*Willcox v. Edwards (1912) 162 Cal. 455, 462, 123 P. 276]* . However, if the contract is usurious on its face, the court may deny interest on its motion, regardless of whether the defense has been affirmatively pleaded [*Curtis v. Thaxter (1928) 204 Cal. 439, 440, 268 P. 630]* .

Insofar as a guaranteed debt for interest is unenforceable on the ground of usury, the guarantor's contract cannot be construed or enforced so as to waive the guarantor's right to raise that defense, since a promise to pay usurious interest is illegal and therefore cannot be enforced on any theory [*WRI Opportunity Loans II, LLC v. Cooper (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 525, 542-544, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 205*].

The payor may file a cross complaint for treble damages [*Rice v. Dunlap (1928) 205 Cal. 133, 137* ; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*]. The amount to be recovered by the payor may be offset from the principal amount owing on the debt [*Rice v. Dunlap (1928) 205 Cal. 133, 137* ; *see District Bond Co. v. Haley (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 308, 311, 41 P.2d 319]* .

[6] Criminal Liability

A person who willfully makes or negotiates a usurious interest rate and who is neither specially licensed to make or to negotiate loans nor exempted from the licensing or usury laws is guilty of the felony of loan-sharking [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(b); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawRemediesPunitive DamagesCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. General State Usury Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.33-568.49

[Reserved]

§§ 568.33[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.50

§ 568.50 In General

Congress has enacted legislation that preempts certain state constitutional and statutory usury provisions [*see 12 U.S.C.A. § 86a*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 512, as amended (certain business and agricultural loans)); *12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7* (certain insured loans, mortgages, or advances); *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501, as amended (certain loans secured, after March 31, 1980, by first lien on residential real property, cooperative housing stock, or manufactured home), Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 529 (certain loans secured, before March 31, 1980, by first lien on residential real property or cooperative housing stock)); *15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(3)* (certain loans by small business investment companies); *see also 12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 528 (applicable rate when one or more provisions apply))].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal PreemptionContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.51

§ 568.51 Depository Institutions

[1] General Preemption of Laws Restricting Interest Rates

Any state constitutional and statutory provision that expressly limits the rate or amount of interest that may be charged, taken, received, or reserved is preempted by federal law and does not apply to any deposit or account held by, or other obligation of, a depository institution [*12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(2), as amended)].

For purposes of this preemption, a depository institution includes [*12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(2), as amended)]:

- Any insured depository institution, any mutual savings bank, and any savings bank, as defined in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, § 3 (*12 U.S.C. § 1813*); and

- Any insured credit union as defined in the Federal Credit Union Act, § 101 (*12 U.S.C. § 1752*).

[2] Federal Rate Restrictions for State-Chartered Insured Depository Institutions, Insured Branches of Foreign Banks, and Insured Credit Unions

A state-chartered insured depository institution, including an insured savings bank and insured branch of a foreign bank, and any credit union whose member accounts are insured in accordance with *12 U.S.C. § 1781 et seq.* may take, receive, reserve, and charge on any loan, discount, note, bill of exchange, or other evidence of debt, interest at a rate of not more than 1 percent in excess of the discount rate on 90-day commercial paper in effect at the Federal Reserve Bank in the Federal Reserve District where the bank is located, or at the rate allowed by the laws of the state, territory, or district where the bank is located, whichever is greater. This maximum rate applies notwithstanding any state constitution or statute to the contrary [*12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(1), 1831d(a)*; *see 12 U.S.C. § 1752(7)* (powers of federal credit union)]. California law currently does not reject the preemption; in fact, California law specifically exempts these institutions from the state constitutional usury provisions [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* (exemption for credit union); *Fin. Code §§ 1504* (exemption for state bank authorized to engage in trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity, or national bank authorized to engage in trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity, if it maintains main or branch office in

California, or foreign (other state) state bank authorized to engage in a trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity, if it maintains branch office in California), 1716 (exemption for foreign (other nation) bank), 3707 (exemption for bank holding company), 3805 (exemption for foreign (other state) state bank), 6515(c) (exemption for association, federal association, or service corporation, when acting in fiduciary capacity as trustee), 7675 (exemption for association, federal association, qualified foreign savings association, savings and loan holding company, and service corporation); *see also* discussion of these exemptions in § 568.71].

If a state bank or insured branch of a foreign bank knowingly takes, receives, reserves, or charges a greater rate of interest than allowed when state law is preempted pursuant to *12 U.S.C. § 1785(g)(1)* or *1831d(a)*, the entire interest is deemed forfeited. Furthermore, the person who paid any amount of the interest may recover twice that amount in a civil action commenced in a court of appropriate jurisdiction within two years after the date of the payment [*12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)*]. Either federal or state court may be a court of appropriate jurisdiction [*see 28 U.S.C. § 1331*; *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 86, 116.220*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawDepository InstitutionsGeneral OverviewBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryInterestConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.52

§ 568.52 Federally Related Mortgage Loans

Any state constitutional and statutory provision that expressly limits the rate or amount of interest, discount points, finance charges, or other charges that may be charged, taken, received, or reserved is preempted and does not apply to any federally related mortgage loan made in California on or after April 1, 1980, that is secured by a first lien on residential real property, on a residential manufactured home, or on all stock allocated to a dwelling unit in a residential cooperative housing corporation [*12 U.S.C. §§ 1735f-5(b), 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(1), (b), as amended)]. "Federally related mortgage loan" refers to certain federally insured, sponsored, or otherwise associated loans that are secured by residential real property designed principally for the occupancy of from one to four families [*see 12 U.S.C. § 1735f-5(b)* ("federally related mortgage loan" defined)]. Since neither the California Legislature nor the voters of California adopted a law or provision before April 1, 1983, that stated explicitly and by its terms that California does not want the preemption to apply, the federal provisions will continue to apply and preempt state law on the subject, now and in the future [*see 12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(b))].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawDepository InstitutionsGeneral OverviewBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryInterestConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal PreemptionReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.53

§ 568.53 Credit Card Interest and Late Payment Fees

The National Bank Act of 1864 provides that a national bank may charge its loan customers interest at the rate allowed by the laws of the state where the bank is located [*12 U.S.C. § 85*; *see Beneficial National Bank v. Anderson (2003) 539 U.S. 1, 123 S.Ct. 2058, 2060, 156 L.Ed. 2d 1* (National Bank Act provides exclusive cause of action for usury claims against national banks; thus usury action against national bank filed in state court could be removed to federal court because it actually arose under federal law)]. This provision authorizes a national bank to charge out-of-state credit card customers an interest rate allowed by the bank's home state, even when that rate is higher than what is permitted by the states in which the cardholders reside [*Marquette Nat. Bank of Minneapolisv. First of Omaha Service Corp. (1978) 439 U.S. 299, 318, 99 S. Ct. 540, 58 L. Ed. 2d 534]* . That provision of the Act also authorizes a national bank to charge late payment fees that are lawful in the bank's home state but prohibited in the states where the cardholders reside. In other words, the statutory term "interest" encompasses late payment fees [*Smiley v. Citibank (1996) 517 U.S. 735, 116 S. Ct. 1730, 1736, 135 L. Ed. 2d 25* ; *see 12 C.F.R. § 7.4001(a)* (term "interest" in *12 U.S.C. § 85* includes late payment fees)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawConsumer ProtectionCredit Card AgreementsGeneral OverviewBanking LawFederal ActsNational Bank ActBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryInterestBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryUsury Litigation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.54

§ 568.54 Small Business Investment Company

A small business investment company may charge interest on a business loan at a rate that does not exceed the maximum rate prescribed by regulation by the Small Business Administration for loans made by any licensee [*15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(2)*]. That rate is determined without regard to any state rate incorporated by the regulation [*15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(2)*]. A state law or constitutional provision is preempted for these purposes if the loan is made on or after April 1, 1980, and before either the state adopts a law or certifies that the voters of that state have voted to adopt a law or provision that explicitly rejects the preemption [*15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(3)*]. No such law or provision has been adopted in California.

If the maximum rate so authorized exceeds the rate that would be authorized by applicable state law if that state law were not preempted for computation purposes, any charging of an interest rate in excess of the authorized rate is deemed a forfeiture of the greater of (1) all interest carried with the loan, or (2) all interest agreed to be paid on the loan [*15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(4)(A)*]. If the interest is forfeited, the person who paid the interest may recover from the company an amount equal to twice the amount of interest paid on the loan. The interest may be recovered in a civil action commenced in a court of appropriate jurisdiction within two years after the most recent payment of interest [*15 U.S.C. § 687(i)(4)(B)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsurySecurities LawInvestment CompaniesClassification

123 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Federal Preemption of State Laws

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.55-568.69

[Reserved]

§§ 568.55[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.70

§ 568.70 In General

Numerous classes of persons are specifically exempted from the interest rate restrictions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*. In addition, the Legislature is authorized to enact statutes designating classes of persons to be exempted from these usury provisions [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*].

Nevertheless, even an interest rate exempted from the usury law may be unenforceable on the ground of unconscionability [*see Civ. Code § 1670.5*; *Carboni v. Arrospide (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 76, 81-85, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 845* (affirming finding of unconscionability of secured note providing 200 percent annual interest rate over one and one-half year term)]. For discussion of unconscionability and a form of affirmative defense seeking to have an onerous term declared unconscionable, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUnconscionabilityGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.71

§ 568.71 Banks, Associations, Trust Companies, and Other Fiduciaries

The restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* do not apply to any obligations of, loans made or arranged by, or forbearances of any of the following:

- Any California state bank authorized to engage in a trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity [*Fin. Code § 1504(a)*].

- Any national bank authorized to engage in a trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity, if it maintains its main office or a branch office in California [*Fin. Code § 1504(b)*; *see Jones v. Wells Fargo Bank (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1527, 1534-1535, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 835* (because loan and forbearance agreement made by national bank both fell squarely within *Fin. Code § 1504* exemption, they were not illegal under California usury law)].

- Any foreign (other state) state bank authorized to engage in a trust business, when acting in its fiduciary capacity, if it maintains a branch office in California [*Fin. Code § 1504(c)*].

- Any association [Fin. Code § 7565; *see Fin. Code § 5102(a)* (defining "association"); *see also Fin. Code § 6515(c)* (exemption for association acting in fiduciary capacity as trustee)].

- Any federal association [*Fin. Code § 7675(a)*; *see Fin. Code § 6515(c)* (exemption for federal association acting in fiduciary capacity as trustee)].

- A qualified foreign savings association [*Fin. Code § 7675(a)*; *see Fin. Code §§ 10000(c)* (defining foreign savings association), 10002, 10003 (qualification)].

- Any savings and loan holding company [*Fin. Code § 7675(a)*].

- Any subsidiary of a savings and loan holding company that is not an association [*Fin. Code §*

7675(a)],

- Any service corporation that is a subsidiary of an association, federal association, or qualified foreign association [*Fin. Code § 7675(a)*].

- Any service corporation that is authorized to exercise trust powers and is acting in its fiduciary capacity as trustee [*Fin. Code § 6515(c)*].

- A bank holding company or subsidiary of a bank holding company that is not a bank [*Fin. Code § 3707*].

Any foreign bank from another state is exempted from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*Fin. Code § 3805(a)*].

Any foreign bank from another nation is similarly exempted if, at the time it makes a loan or forbearance, or executes a contract for a loan or forbearance, the bank has assets equal to at least $100 million and is licensed to maintain an office in California or in another state or to maintain a federal branch in any state [*Fin. Code § 1716*].

For discussion of federal regulation of the interest rates of depository institutions, preempting any conflicting state law to the contrary, see *§ 568.50* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.72

§ 568.72 Credit Unions

The obligations of, loans made by, or forbearances of any credit union governed by *Fin. Code § 14000 et seq.* are exempted from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* (specifying exemption for former act governing credit unions, repealed and now replaced by *Fin. Code § 14000 et seq.*)].

A credit union may assess charges as approved by the board of directors for failure to meet punctually obligations to the credit union. Any late charge may be made only once for each delinquent payment and is subject to *Civ. Code § 2954.5* (requiring notice to the borrower before imposition of the late charge), Division 1.1 of the Financial Code [*see Fin. Code § 4000 et seq.*], and any other applicable law [*Fin. Code § 15001*].

For discussion of federal regulation of the interest rates of federally insured credit unions, preempting any conflicting state law to the contrary, see *§ 568.51*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawDepository InstitutionsCredit UnionsBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.73

§ 568.73 Industrial Loan Companies

The restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* do not apply to the obligations of, loans made by, or forbearances of any industrial loan company governed by *Fin. Code §§ 18000-18705* [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* (specifying exemption for former act governing industrial loan companies, repealed and now replaced by *Fin. Code § 18000 et seq.*)].

State law places certain restrictions on certain charges that may be levied in connection with a loan by an industrial loan company [*see, e.g., Fin. Code §§ 18212, 18212.1, 18300, 18625-18631*]. If any amount in excess of permitted charges, including interest, is charged, contracted for, or received in the making or collection of a contract of such a loan except as a result of accidental or bona fide error in computation, the contract is void and the company may not collect or receive the principal, interest, or charges [*Fin. Code § 18439*]. Furthermore, a director, officer, or employee of an industrial loan company, its holding company, or its affiliate, who concurs in any vote or act by which it is intended to make a loan or purchase such a contract is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Fin. Code § 18450*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.74

§ 568.74 Deferred Deposit Lenders (Payday Lenders)

Persons licensed under the California Deferred Deposit Transaction Law [*Fin. Code § 23000 et seq.*], operative December 31, 2004 [*Fin. Code § 23104* (effective and operative dates of statute)]--commonly known as payday lenders--are in an exempt class under *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*Fin. Code § 23106*]. Prior to the operative date of the California Deferred Deposit Transaction Law, payday lenders were regulated under the statutes applicable to check cashers [*see Civ. Code § 1789.30 et seq.*]. For discussion, see Ch. 95, *Banks, Deposits, and Checks* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryGovernmentsLegislationEffect & OperationOperabilityReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.75

§ 568.75 Pawnbroker

[1] In General

The obligations of, loans made by, or forbearances of any licensed pawnbroker are exempt from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; *Fin. Code § 21000 et seq.*]. This exemption, however, applies only to pawn transactions within the scope of the pawnbroker license [*Agapitov v. Lerner (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 830, 832, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 837* (pawnbroker could not claim benefit of pawnbroker exemption from usury law with respect to loan that was not pawn transaction, did not comply with statutory requirements, and was not made within scope of pawnbroker's license)]. Except as otherwise provided in *Fin. Code §§ 21200-21209*, no pawnbroker may charge or receive compensation, for a loan of a bona fide principal amount of less than $2,500, at a rate exceeding the sum of the following [*Fin. Code §§ 21051, 21200(a)*] after the first 90 days [*Fin. Code § 21201.4*]:

- Two and one-half percent per month on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to or less than $225;
- Two percent per month on the unpaid principal balance between $225.01-$900;
- One and one-half percent per month on the unpaid principal balance between $900.01-$1,650;
- One percent per month on any remainder of the unpaid principal balance in excess of $1,650; and
- A charge not exceeding $3 a month on any loan when the monthly permitted charge would otherwise be less than $3.

One month's interest may be charged for any part of the month in which pawned property is redeemed [*Fin. Code § 21200(b)*].

A loan setup fee not to exceed $5 or 2 percent, whichever is greater, may be charged for each loan. However, the maximum loan setup fee may not exceed $10. Loan setup fees are in addition to any other allowed charges [*Fin. Code § 21200.1*].

If the principal amount of the loan is less than $2,500, then for the first 90 days of a loan having a term longer than 90 days [*Fin. Code § 21201.4*], or for the term of a loan having a term of up to 90 days, a licensed pawnbroker may charge for a loan as follows [*Fin. Code § 21200.5*; *see also Fin. Code § 21051(a)*]:

- $1 or less for a 30-day loan of no more than $14.99.
- $3 or less for a 90-day loan of $15-$19.99.
- $4 or less for a 90-day loan of $20-$24.99.
- $5 or less for a 90-day loan of $25-$39.99.
- $6 or less for a 90-day loan of $40-$49.99.
- $7.50 or less for a 90-day loan of $50-$64.99.
- $8.50 or less for a 90-day loan of $65-$74.99.
- $10 or less for a 90-day loan of $75-$99.99.
- $12.50 or less for a 90-day loan of $100-$124.99.
- $13.50 or less for a 90-day loan of $125-$149.99.
- $15 or less for a 90-day loan of $150-$224.99.
- $20 or less for a 90-day loan of $225-$324.99.
- $25 or less for a 90-day loan of $325-$449.99.
- $35 or less for a 90-day loan of $450-$599.99.
- $45 or less for a 90-day loan of $600-$799.99.
- $55 or less for a 90-day loan of $800-$999.99.
- $70 or less for a 90-day loan of $1,000-$1,199.99.
- $85 or less for a 90-day loan of $1,200-$1,499.99.
- $100 or less for a 90-day loan of $1,500-$1,799.99.
- $120 or less for a 90-day loan of $1,800-$2,099.99.
- $140 or less for a 90-day loan of $2,100-$2,499.99.

The charge for any extension or renewal of a loan must be computed in accordance with the provisions of *Fin. Code § 21200* [*Fin. Code § 21200.5(v)*].

In addition to other charges allowed, and irrespective of the duration of the time the article is in pledge, a pawnbroker may collect at the time the property is redeemed handling and storage charges based on the size of each article pawned as follows [*Fin. Code § 21200.6(a)*; *see Fin. Code § 21200.6(c)* (measurements taken at widest, deepest, and highest points)]:

- $5 for any article that cannot be contained within one cubic foot.
- $10 for any article that cannot be contained within three cubic feet.
- $20 for any article that cannot be contained within six cubic feet.
- $1 for each additional cubic foot, in excess of six cubic feet.

Whenever a pledger, or his or her assignee, loses a pawn ticket, a fee not to exceed $10 may be charged for services of verifying the identification of the claimant, fingerprinting the claimant, and having the claimant execute a declaration under penalty of perjury [*Fin. Code § 21201.1*]. If the pledger fails to redeem any pawned item during the loan period, thereby obliging the pawnbroker to mail the notice required under *Fin. Code § 21201*, the pawnbroker may charge a fee of up to $3 for services and costs pertaining to the preparation of the notice, in addition to any other allowed charges [*Fin. Code § 21201.2*].

No additional charge is allowed for any article that can be contained within one cubic foot [*Fin. Code § 21200.6(b)*].

In addition to other charges allowed, a pawnbroker may also collect a $4 processing charge for each firearm pawned [*Fin. Code § 21200.8*].

A pawnbroker who knowingly charges, or should know that he or she is charging, more than the permitted amount is guilty of a misdemeanor [*see Fin. Code § 21209*]. However, the Financial Code does not specify a particular civil remedy against a pawnbroker for charging excessive fees.

[2] Licensure

The chief of police, the sheriff, or when appropriate, the police commissioner, must accept an application for and grant a license permitting the licensee to engage in the business of pawnbroker, at the address indicated on the application, to an applicant who has complied with the statutory requirements and has not been convicted of an attempt to receive stolen property or any other offense involving stolen property [*Fin. Code § 21300(a)*; *see Fin. Code §§ 21000* ("pawnbroker" defined), 21303-21305 (statutory requirements); *see also Fin. Code § 21300(b)* ("convicted" defined)]. No person may be denied a pawnbroker's license solely on the grounds that he or she violated any provision of *Fin. Code §§ 21000-21209* (definitions and pawnbroker regulations) or *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21625-21653* (tangible personal property or resale of goods) unless the violation demonstrates a pattern of conduct [*Fin. Code § 21300(c)*].

The statutory requirements require a pawnbroker licensee to file a two-year nonrevocable surety bond in the sum of $20,000 [*Fin. Code § 21303(a)*]. The applicant must also file a financial statement confirming that the applicant has at least $100,000 in liquid assets, not including real property, readily available for use in the business for which the application is made, or in the absence of $100,000, an applicant may post a nonrevocable surety bond for $100,000. In lieu of posting a surety bond, the applicant may deposit money, certificates, accounts, bonds, or notes as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 995.710* (the Bond and Undertaking Law) [*Fin. Code § 21304(a)*]. The financial statement must be filed by the applicant under penalty of perjury and signed by a California Certified Public Accountant verifying that he

or she has reviewed the financial statement [*Fin. Code § 21304(a)*]. However, the requirement of filing a financial statement does not apply to any person holding a secondhand dealers license [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21641, 21642*] and who is actively engaged as a pawnbroker on January 1, 1994 [*Fin. Code § 21304(b)*]. In addition, a pawnbroker licensed under *Fin. Code § 21300* is exempt from the licensing requirements under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21641* and *21642* and may engage in any transaction involving tangible personal property for which a secondhand dealers license is required. Pawnbrokers operating under this license exemption are required to conform to all other requirements of secondhand dealers for which a license is required under *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21641* and *21642* [*Fin. Code § 21306*].

The licensure provisions also provide for renewing a license [*see Fin. Code § 21301(a)*], grounds for forfeiting the license [*see Fin. Code § 21301(b)*], and grounds for bringing an injunction for violating *Fin. Code §§ 21000-21209* (definitions and pawnbroker regulations) or *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 21625-21653* (tangible personal property or resale of goods) [*see Fin. Code § 21302*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawTypes of ContractsGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.76

§ 568.76 Personal Property Brokers and Consumer Finance Lenders

The obligations of, loans made by, or forbearances of any licensed personal property broker are exempt from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; *Fin. Code §§ 22000-22654*]. The exemption also applies to obligations of, loans made by, or forbearances of any licensed consumer finance lender [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* (permitting Legislature to exempt classes of persons from usury provisions); *Fin. Code §§ 24000-24654*; Stats. 1982, ch. 1082, § 28 (set forth as note in annotation to *Fin. Code § 22000*)]. In addition, a loan made by, or forbearance of, a licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender is exempted from certain statutory regulations if the bona fide principal amount of the loan exceeds a specified amount and if the broker or lender has not taken advantage of the exemptions for the purpose of evading the statutory usury laws [*see Fin. Code §§ 22053, 22053.1, 24053, 24053.1*; *see, e.g., Draper v. American Funding Ltd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 345, 350, 285 Cal. Rptr. 640* (*Civ. Code § 2954.9*, governing prepayment penalties, does not apply to loans made by personal property brokers)].

A licensed personal property broker may not charge, contract for, or receive any interest or charge of any nature for a commercial loan of less than $5,000 or a noncommercial loan of any amount, unless the loan is actually made, except that a charge may be imposed for a noncommercial loan of $5,000 or more if the loan is not consummated because of the borrower's failure to disclose essential information [*Fin. Code §§ 22053.1, 22450, 22450.1*]. A licensed consumer finance lender similarly may not charge, contract for, or receive any interest or charge of any nature for a loan of less than $5,000 unless the loan is actually made; however, the charge may be made for a loan of $5,000 or more if the loan is not consummated because of the borrower's failure to disclose essential information [*Fin. Code §§ 24053.1, 24450, 24450.1*].

In general, a loan contract by a licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender may not be unconscionable [*see Civ. Code § 1670.5*; *Fin. Code §§ 22450.5, 24450.5*]. In addition, when a licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender lends less than $2,500, the loan contract may only provide for payment of charges if the rate meets the criteria of either of two alternative schedules of charges. In the case of personal property brokers, however, neither of the schedules applies to any commercial loan made to a person engaged in the business of selling goods for the purpose of financing the purchaser of goods for resale as determined in accordance with *Fin. Code*

§ 22054 [*Fin. Code §§ 22451, 22451.1*]. Under the first schedule, the contract may provide for payment of charges if the rate does not exceed the sum of the following [*Fin. Code §§ 22451* (maximum charges by personal property brokers), 24451 (maximum charges by consumer finance lenders); *see also Fin. Code §§ 22452, 24452* (open end credit program)]:

- Two and one-half percent per month on the unpaid principal balance of the loan that is equal to or less than $225; plus
- Two percent per month on the unpaid principal balance between $225.01-$900; plus
- One and one-half percent per month on the unpaid principal balance between $900.01-$1,650; plus
- One percent per month on any remainder of the unpaid principal balance in excess of $1,650.

Under the alternative to *Fin. Code § 22451* or *24451*, a licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender lending less than $2,500 may contract for payment of charges at the greater of the following [*Fin. Code §§ 22451.1* (alternative charges by personal property brokers), 24451.1 (alternative charges by consumer finance lenders)]:

- A rate not exceeding one and three-fifths percent per month on the unpaid principal balance; or
- A rate, calculated on the unpaid principal balance, not exceeding five-sixths of one percent per month plus a percentage per month equal to one-twelfth of the annual rate prevailing on the 25th day of the second month of the quarter preceding the quarter in which the loan is made as established by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco on advances to members, or if not determinable, the closest counterpart of this rate as determined by the Superintendent of Banks of the State of California.

In addition to the charge, a licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender may charge an administrative fee for a loan of no more than $2,500, at a rate not in excess of five percent of the principal amount or $50, whichever is less [*Fin. Code §§ 22451.3, 24451.3*].

Other fees charged by a licensed personal property broker in connection with commercial loans of less than $5,000 or noncommercial loans of less than $10,000 are regulated by statute [*see Fin. Code §§ 22053, 22458.3-22458.7, 22472*]. Other fees charged by a consumer finance lender are also regulated by statute [*see Fin. Code §§ 24458.3-24458.7, 24472*].

Precomputation and payment of charges on a loan by a licensed personal property broker are governed by *Fin. Code §§ 22480-22482* [*see Draper v. American Funding Ltd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 345, 350-354, 285 Cal. Rptr. 640* (*Fin. Code §§ 22480, 22482*, not *Civ. Code § 2954.9*, governs prepayment penalties charged by personal property brokers)], whereas precomputation and payment of charges on a loan by a consumer finance lender are governed by *Fin. Code §§ 24480-24482*.

If any unpermitted amount is charged, contracted for, or received, for any reason other than a willful act of the licensed personal property broker or consumer finance lender, the broker or lender must forfeit all interest and charges on the loan and may collect or receive only the principal amount of the loan [*Fin. Code §§ 22651(a), 24651(a)*; *see also § 568.127* (affirmative defense to action on loan if violation is nonwillful)]. Nevertheless, the broker or lender may collect or receive the interest and charges if the broker or lender shows by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation was unintentional and due to a bona fide error in computation notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid such errors, and if, within 60 days of discovering the error, the broker or lender notifies the borrower of the error, and makes all necessary corrections to the account [*Fin. Code §§ 22651(b), 24651(b)*].

If any unpermitted amount is willfully charged, contracted for, or received, the contract of loan is void, and the personal property broker or consumer finance lender has no right to collect or receive any principal, charges, or recompense in connection with the transaction [*Fin. Code §§ 22650(a), 24650(a)*; *see also § 568.128* (affirmative defense to action on loan if violation is willful)]. Additionally, any willful violation is punishable by a fine or imprisonment, or both [*Fin. Code §§ 22653, 24653*].

An open-end credit program by a personal property broker or a consumer finance lender is also regulated by statute [*see Fin. Code §§ 22500-22517* (personal property brokers), 24500-24517 (consumer finance lenders)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawConsumer ProtectionGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawTypes of ContractsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.77

§ 568.77 Real Estate Brokers

[1] In General

The usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, do not apply to any loan or forbearance made or arranged by any person licensed as a real estate broker by the State of California if the loan or forbearance is secured, directly or collaterally, in whole or in part, by liens on real property [*Civ. Code § 1916.1*; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829]* . This exemption should be construed broadly to effectuate the Legislature's purpose, which was to increase the availability of money of nonconsumer loans while ensuring protection of the public through existing licensing requirements and regulatory control over real estate brokers [Park Terrace Ltd. v. Teasdale (2002) (*100 Cal. App. 4th 802, 805-806, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797* (finding exemption for loans arranged by licensed real estate broker applicable); *Del Mar v. Caspe (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316, 1326, 272 Cal. Rptr. 446* ; *but see Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-402, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (criticizing broad interpretation of "arranged" in *Del Mar v. Caspe*)].

For the purposes of *Civ. Code § 1916.1*, a loan or forbearance is arranged by a person licensed as a real estate broker when the broker does any of the following [*Civ. Code § 1916.1*]:

- Acts for compensation or in expectation of compensation for soliciting, negotiating, or arranging the loan for another;

- Acts for compensation or in expectation of compensation for selling, buying, leasing, exchanging, or negotiating the sale, purchase, lease, or exchange of real property or a business for another and either (1) arranges a loan to pay all or any portion of the purchase price of, or of an improvement to, that property or business, or (2) arranges a forbearance, extension, or refinancing of any loan in connection with that sale, purchase, lease, exchange of, or an improvement to, real property or a business; or

- Arranges or negotiates for another a forbearance, extension, or refinancing of any loan secured by real property in connection with a past transaction in which the broker had acted for compensation or in

expectation of compensation for selling, buying, leasing, exchanging, or negotiating the sale, purchase, lease, or exchange of real property or a business.

"Made or arranged" includes any loan made by a person licensed as a real estate broker as a principal or as an agent for others, and whether or not the person is acting within the course and scope of that license [*Civ. Code § 1916.1*].

A broker has "arranged" a loan for another within the terms of *Civ. Code § 1916.1(1)* if he or she was essential to the preparation, execution, and completion of the loan documents and transaction, unless the broker's services were nominal or pretextual [Park Terrace Ltd. v. Teasdale (2002) (*100 Cal. App. 4th 802, 806-808, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797* (finding that licensed real estate broker "arranged" obligation; notes also provided conclusive presumption of arrangement); *Del Mar v. Caspe (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316, 1329, 272 Cal. Rptr. 446* ; *but see* *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-402, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (criticizing broad interpretation of "arranged" in *Del Mar v. Caspe*)].

Although one court has stated that the term "arranged" should be broadly construed [*Del Mar v. Caspe (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316, 1328, 272 Cal. Rptr. 446]* , that approach has been criticized as dicta that would lead to absurd results [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-402, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (broad interpretation in *Del Mar* unnecessary because broker acted within meaning of statute, even under narrowest interpretation)]. The real estate broker must do more than photocopy and collate pages of a loan document for a nominal fee, and instead must engage in some conduct as a third-party intermediary that causes the loan to be obtained or procured [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403-404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* (real estate broker who merely prepared documentation of loan already agreed upon by lender and borrower did not act within meaning of usury exemption)]. Specific conduct that has been found to fall within the usury exemption for loans "arranged" by real estate brokers includes:

- Structuring the loan as agent for the lender [*Chapman v. Farr (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 1021, 1026, 183 Cal. Rptr. 606]* .

- Setting the interest rate, points and terms of a forbearance agreement [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-402, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Jones v. Kallman (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 131, 135, 244 Cal. Rptr. 609]* .

- Conducting title searches, drafting terms of the loan, and reviewing loan and forbearance documents [*Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-402, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Jones v. Kallman (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 131, 135, 244 Cal. Rptr. 609]* .

A broker who negotiates a loan on behalf of the lender, and who is an officer and employee of an affiliate of the lender but is not employed by the lender itself, negotiates the loan "for another" within the meaning of *Civ. Code § 1916.1* [*Stoneridge Parkway Partners, LLC v. MW Housing Partners III, L.P. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1379-1380, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 61]* .

[2] Maximum Charges on Original Loans

The costs and expenses of a loan secured by a dwelling that is made or arranged by a real estate broker pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3*, other than a loan for $20,000 or more if secured by a first trust deed or $10,000 or more if secured by any lien junior to a trust deed (referred to as a "regulated dwelling loan"), are subject to certain maximum limits [*Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240.1* (provisions apply only to loans secured by dwelling), 10242(a) (maximum charges), 10245 (certain provisions do not apply to loan of $30,000 or more secured by first trust deed or to loan of $20,000 or more secured by lien junior to first trust deed)]. Specifically, the maximum amount of all costs and expenses to be paid by a borrower for appraisal fees, escrow fees, notary fees, and credit investigation fees may not exceed the greater of five percent of the principal amount of the loan up to $390, or $700. In no event may the maximum amount exceed actual costs and expenses paid, incurred, or reasonably earned [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(a)*

].

The maximum amount of charges to be paid by the borrower on a regulated dwelling loan to the real estate broker for the brokerage or commissions if the broker arranged the loan, or for the loan origination fees, points, bonuses, and other charges in lieu of interest if the broker acted as a lender rather than agent, may not exceed the following amounts [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)*]:

- Five percent of the principal amount of the loan, if the loan was secured directly or collaterally, in whole or in part by a first trust deed, and is for a term of less than three years.

- Ten percent of the principal amount of the loan, if the loan was secured directly or collaterally, in whole or in part by a first trust deed, and is for a term of three years or more.

- Five percent of the principal amount of the loan, if the loan was secured directly or collaterally by a trust deed other than a first trust deed, and is for a term of less than two years.

- Ten percent of the principal amount of the loan, if the loan was secured directly or collaterally by a trust deed other than a first trust deed, and is for a term of at least two years but less than three years.

- Fifteen percent of the principal amount of the loan, if the loan was secured directly or collaterally by a trust deed other than a first trust deed, and is for a term of three years of more.

- With respect to a further advance on a note, the charges may not exceed the charges for an original loan in the same amount as the further advance and made for a term equal to the remaining term of the note on which the further advance is being made, including any extension thereof.

No interest may be charged on a regulated dwelling loan with respect to any period prior to the date that the proceeds of the loan are made available to the borrower or are deposited in escrow [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*].

[3] Maximum Charges on Refinanced Loans

If a regulated dwelling loan has an original maturity period of less than three years and is renewed or refinanced, the total amount of charges to be paid on both the original obligation and the balance of the obligation, as renewed or refinanced, may not in the aggregate exceed the amount of charges as provided in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242*. If the loan is renewed or refinanced through the person who negotiated the original loan, the total amount of costs and expenses to be paid on both the original obligation and the renewed or refinanced obligation may not exceed in the aggregate the amount of costs and expenses authorized in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(a)* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10244*]. However, neither of these restrictions applies if the loan is secured by a first trust deed on real property and is made in connection with the financing of the usual costs of the development of a residential, commercial, or industrial building or buildings on the property under a written agreement that provides for the disbursement of the loan funds as costs are incurred or in relation to the progress of the work and that provides for certain title insurance or final disbursement [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10244*].

[4] Maximum Charge for Late Payment

A charge for a late payment of an installment due on a regulated dwelling loan that is secured by a mortgage or deed of trust on real property may not exceed 10 percent of the principal and interest part of the installment due or $5, whichever is greater [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.5(a)*]. The charge may not be imposed more than once for the same late payment, and may not be imposed on any installment that is paid or tendered in full within 10 days of its due date [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.5(b)*].

A late payment charge may be imposed under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.5* for the payment of any balloon payment more than 10 days after the due date. The charge must not exceed an amount equal to the maximum late charge that could have been assessed with respect to the largest single monthly installment previously due, other than the balloon payment, multiplied by the sum of one plus the number of months occurring since the late payment charge began to accrue [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.5(c)*].

[5] Effect of Prepayment by Borrower

With respect to any loan secured by a single-family, owner-occupied dwelling, that is made or arranged by a real estate broker pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3*, the borrower may prepay, at any time and in whole or in part, the principal and accrued interest on the loan, if the loan is secured by a mortgage or deed of trust on real property containing only a single-family, owner-occupied dwelling. However, a prepayment charge may be levied on any amount prepaid in any 12-month period within seven years of the date of execution of the mortgage or deed of trust, if the prepaid amount exceeds 20 percent of the unpaid balance. The prepayment charge may not exceed an amount equal to the payment of six months' advance interest on the amount prepaid in excess of 20 percent of the unpaid balance [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.6*].

[6] Remedies for Excess Charges

If any amount prohibited by *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10242, 10242.5, 10242.6*, or *10248.1* [*see § 568.77[2] -[5]*] is received by any person, the borrower may recover from that person three times the amount of the prohibited amount. However, if the prohibited amount is the result of a bona fide error, the borrower may only recover the prohibited amount [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*]. In addition, the borrower is entitled to costs and reasonable attorney's fees. The borrower must bring the recovery action within two years from the date on which the prohibited amount was received [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*].

If the loan is negotiated in violation of any provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3*, the borrower may seek relief in a demand procedure. However, if the demand procedure is pursued, the borrower may not additionally seek relief under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246* for the same breach. Under the demand procedure, the borrower may demand that the broker return to the borrower any bonus, brokerage, or commission paid or payable under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242* for negotiation of the loan. If the demand is not satisfied within 20 days from the date on which the written demand is personally delivered or mailed to the broker, the borrower may commence an action and recover actual damages or twice the bonus, brokerage or commission, whichever is greater. The borrower may also recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees in the action [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. The action must be commenced within two years after the maturity of the loan [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(d)*]. The broker will not be held liable in the action if the broker shows, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the violation was unintentional and resulted from a bona fide error [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. (Although *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)* does not explicitly remove mistakes of law from the scope of the "bona fide error" defense--whereas some other statutes allowing the same defense do exclude mistakes of law--the defense probably does not cover a violation that arose from the defendant's mistaken interpretation of statutory requirements [*cf. Jerman v. Carlisle, McNellie, Rini, Kramer & Ulrich LPA (2010) -- U.S. --, 130 S. Ct. 1605, 176 L. Ed. 2d 519, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 3480, at *15-*59* (such defense allowed by Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, *15 U.S.C. § 1692k(c)*, in same language as *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*, did not cover debt-collecting attorney's mistake of law as to Act's requirements)].)

For a form for use in drafting a demand letter, see *§ 568.125*. For a form for use in drafting a complaint if the demand is not met, see *§ 568.126*. For a form for use in drafting a complaint if the demand procedure has not been employed, see *§ 568.124*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.78

§ 568.78 Nonprofit Cooperatives

Any nonprofit cooperative association governed by *Food & Agric. Code § 54001 et seq.*, and any nonprofit cooperative governed by the Agricultural Credits Act of 1923 [*12 U.S.C. § 1151 et seq.*], is exempt from the interest rate restrictions contained in *Cal. Const., art XV, § 1* [*Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCooperativesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.79

§ 568.79 Common Interest Development Association

A common interest development association is exempt from the interest-rate limitations imposed by *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*Civ. Code § 1366(f)*]. Instead, the association is permitted to levy a late charge on an owner of a separate interest in the development for an assessment of that interest that is delinquent, as long as the late charge does not exceed 10 percent of the delinquent assessment or $10, whichever is greater. However, if the declaration governing the development specifies a late charge in a smaller amount, the late charge actually levied may not exceed that specified amount [*Civ. Code § 1366(e)(2)*]. The association may recover interest on all sums imposed in accordance with *Civ. Code § 1366*, including the delinquent assessments, reasonable fees and costs of collection, and reasonable attorney's fees, at an annual interest rate not to exceed 12 percent, commencing 30 days after the assessment becomes due, unless the declaration specifies the recovery of interest at a rate of a lesser amount, in which case the lesser rate of interest applies [*Civ. Code § 1366(e)(3)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.80

§ 568.80 Insurer

Any admitted incorporated insurer possessing a valid certificate of authority issued pursuant to *Ins. Code § 699 et seq.* is exempted from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*Ins. Code § 1100.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.81

§ 568.81 Sales of Securities

Five classes of persons created under the state corporate securities laws [*Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*] in regard to the sale of securities are exempt from the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*see Corp. Code §§ 25116-25118, 25211.5*], as follows:

First, an evidence of indebtedness issued pursuant to a qualification of a sale of a security under *Corp. Code § 25110* or *Corp. Code § 25120 et seq.*, and its purchaser, are exempt from the usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*. However, the exemption is subject to compliance by the issuer of the security and by the purchaser with the terms and requirements that may be imposed by the Commissioner of Corporations as a condition of the qualification [*Corp. Code § 25116*].

Second, an evidence of indebtedness and its purchasers or holders are exempt from the usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* if either of the following criteria are met [*Corp. Code § 25117(a)*]:

- The evidence of indebtedness is rated or provisionally rated by Standard & Poor's Corporation as AAA, AA, A, BBB, or investment grade commercial paper, or by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. as Aaa, Aa, A, Baa, or investment grade commercial paper, including any such ratings with "+" or "-" designation or other variations that occur within these ratings, or has a rating or a provisional rating by another nationally recognized rating agency or system, which rating and agency or system have been certified by rule or order of the Commissioner of Corporations; or

- The issuer of the security either (1) has any security listed or approved for listing on notice of issuance on a national securities exchange, if the exchange has been certified by the Commissioner of Corporations, pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25100(o)*, or *(2)* is a corporation subject to Section 13 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, has total shareholders' equity of at least $1 million, and has consolidated net income of at least $500,000. Any evidence of indebtedness issued in compliance with the above criteria will be entitled to the benefits of the usury exemption, regardless of whether, after its issuance, the evidence of indebtedness is determined by a court to be a "security" [*Corp. Code §*

25117(c)].

Third and fourth, the following evidences of indebtedness, and the purchasers or holders, are exempt from the usury provisions of the Constitution (provided the transaction is not disqualified as specified below and meets either of two criteria specified below):

- An evidence of indebtedness issued by an entity or guaranteed by an entity that is an affiliate [*see Corp. Code § 150* (definition)] of the borrower if, on the day the evidence of indebtedness or guaranty is first issued or entered into, the entity has total assets of at least $2 million according to its then most-recent financial statements [*Corp. Code § 25118(a)*].

- Any one or more evidences of indebtedness if either of the following applies [*Corp. Code § 25118(b)*]:

  - The evidences of indebtedness aggregate at the time of issuance at least $300,000 in original face amount, or, if the evidences of indebtedness are purchased with original issue discount, they are purchased for an aggregate purchase price at the time of issuance of at least $300,000.

  - The evidences of indebtedness are issued pursuant to a bona fide written commitment for the lending to the issuer of at least $300,000, or the provision of a line of credit to the issuer in a principal amount of at least $300,000. The exemption provided by this paragraph will not be affected by a subsequent event of default or other event not in the lender's control that has relieved or may relieve the lender from its commitment.

These exemptions are not available, however, if the issuer or guarantor is an individual (whether directly or through a controlled trust or partnership) or the transaction is for personal, family, or household purposes [*Corp. Code § 25118(e)*]. Moreover, these exemptions are available only in a transaction that meets either of the following criteria [*Corp. Code § 25118(f)*]:

- The lender and either the issuer of the indebtedness or the guarantor, as the case may be, or any of their respective officers, directors, or controlling persons, or, if any party is a limited liability company, the managers as appointed or elected by the members, have a preexisting personal or business relationship [*see Corp. Code § 25118(g)* (definition)].

- The lender and the issuer, or the lender and the guarantor, by reason of their own business and financial experience or that of their professional advisers, could reasonably be assumed to have the capacity to protect their own interests in connection with the transaction.

The evidences of indebtedness described above, and the purchasers or holders, are entitled to the benefits of the usury exemption regardless of whether, at any time after the evidence of indebtedness or guaranty is first issued or entered into, the evidence of indebtedness or guaranty is determined by a court of competent jurisdiction not to be a "security" [*Corp. Code § 25118(c)*].

Finally, a broker-dealer of securities, acting pursuant to a certificate that is then in effect and that is issued pursuant to *Corp. Code § 25211*, is exempt from the usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* [*Corp. Code § 25211.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.82

§ 568.82 Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA)

Civ. Code § 1917.220 provides that the restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art XV, § 1* do not apply to any obligation of, loan made by, or forbearance of, any pension fund or retirement system that is subject to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) [*29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.*]. However, a California appellate court has held that *Civ. Code § 1917.220* is itself preempted by ERISA [*Varr v. Olimpia (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 675, 680-682, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 106]* . *Civ. Code § 1917.220* specifically refers to ERISA and singles out ERISA-governed pension plans for special treatment. Furthermore, *Civ. Code § 1917.220* is specifically designed to affect employee pension plans [*Varr v. Olimpia (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 675, 682, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 106]* .

The court also held that although *Civ. Code § 1917.220* is preempted, ERISA does not preempt California's general usury law itself. The court noted that there was no indication that when Congress enacted ERISA, it intended to displace state usury laws. ERISA does not dictate rates of interest that plans can charge on loans to third parties, and gives plan administrators broad discretion to choose among investments for the benefit of plan participants and beneficiaries [*Varr v. Olimpia (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 675, 686-687, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 106]* .

Since this case holds that ERISA preempts the statutory exemption for ERISA plans, but not the general California usury laws, the net result under this decision is that ERISA plans are subject to the state usury laws notwithstanding the statutory exemption [*see* *Varr v. Olimpia (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 675, 687, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 106* (*Civ. Code § 1917.220* could not form basis for lower court's denial of preliminary injunction against foreclosure of allegedly usurious obligations)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryPensions & Benefits LawEmployee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA)General OverviewPensions & Benefits LawEmployee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA)Federal PreemptionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.83

§ 568.83 State or Local Public Retirement System

The restrictions on interest rates contained in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* do not apply to any loans made by, or forbearances of, any state or local public retirement system [*Gov. Code § 7509*]. They also do not apply to any loans made by, or forbearances of, a public retirement or pension system created, authorized, and regulated by the laws of a state or of a local agency of a state other than California [*Civ. Code § 1916.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryPensions & Benefits LawGovernmental EmployeesState PensionsReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.84

§ 568.84 Mortgage Loans for Residential Property

Because most mortgage loans are arranged by parties such as financial institutions and real estate brokers, most mortgage loans for residential property will be exempt from the usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* under a specific exemption for those parties [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; *see also* Banks, Associations, Trust Companies, and Other Fiduciaries, and Real Estate Brokers, *above*]. However, if a mortgage loan is not made or arranged by an exempt party, the general constitutional and statutory usury provisions [*see § 568.30* et seq.] will apply to the loan.

A mortgage contract, deed of trust, real estate sales contract, or any note or negotiable instrument issued in connection with that contract or trust deed, for residential real property, may contain a provision for a variable interest rate [*see Civ. Code §§ 1916.5-1916.12, 1918-1921*]. For further discussion of loans secured by real property that provide for variable interest rates, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25, *Real Estate Loans* (Matthew Bender).

For regulation of the interest rates of federally related mortgage loans for residential property, see the discussion in *§ 568.52*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksReal Estate LoansReal Property LawFinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.85

§ 568.85 Bottomry Contract

The Harbors and Navigation Code provides that a higher rate of interest than that allowed by law on other contracts may be stipulated by the parties in a contract of bottomry, which is a contract by which a vessel or its freightage is hypothecated as security for a loan to be repaid only if the vessel survives a particular risk, voyage, or period [*see Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 450, 455*]. Under that the provision, the court may reduce any stipulated rate that is unjustifiable and exorbitant [*Harb. & Nav. Code § 455*].

Although it is questionable whether this provision survived the passage of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, its validity has not yet been challenged in the courts.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsBottomryContracts LawDefensesUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.86

§ 568.86 Shared Appreciation Loans

Lenders are exempt from the usury provisions of Cal. Const., art. XV, with respect to shared appreciation loan transactions [*Civ. Code § 1917.005*]. A "shared appreciation loan" is any loan made on the security of an interest in real property and obligating the borrower to pay to the lender contingent deferred interest pursuant to the loan documentation, but not including a loan made on the security of an interest in real property containing one to four residential units at least one of which, at the time the loan is made, is or is to be occupied by the borrower [*Civ. Code § 1917(b)*; *see Civ. Code § 1917.006(a)* (additional definition, applicable when lender is local public entity providing low-income-housing financial assistance)]. "Contingent deferred interest" means the sum that a borrower is obligated to pay to a lender pursuant to the documentation of a shared appreciation loan as a share of the appreciation in the value of the security property and/or a share of rents and profits attributable to the subject property [*Civ. Code § 1917(a)*].

The Legislature's apparent intent in creating the foregoing exemption was to clarify the application of the so-called interest contingency rule in a defined set of circumstances. Under the rule, a lender may obtain payments on a loan that exceed the maximum allowed by the usury law, provided those payments are subject to risk. Accordingly, the statutory definition of a shared appreciation loan must be understood to permit a lender to obtain fixed-sum interest payments up to the maximum amount permitted under the usury law and, additionally, to obtain further payments of contingent deferred interest that are subject to risk. In other words, the legislative intent behind *Civ. Code § 1917.005* was to establish that if (1) a loan permits the lender to obtain payments over and above the maximum permitted by the usury law, and (2) the loan documents disclose on their face that these payments constitute a share of appreciation, rents, or profits in a secured property, then the statutory exemption will apply [*WRI Opportunity Loans II, LLC v. Cooper (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 525, 539-540, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 205*].

141 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
D. Exemptions From State Constitutional Provisions

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.87-568.99

[Reserved]

§§ 568.87[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.100

§ 568.100 California Points and Authorities

For discussion and forms relating to retail installment sales, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 206, *Sales*

For discussion and forms relating to automobile sales, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 206, *Sales*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawTypes of ContractsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment Contracts

143 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.101

§ 568.101 California Legal Forms

For transactional forms relating to the subject of this chapter, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 25, *Real Property Security Transactions,* Ch. 46, *Credit Card and Other Open-End Transactions,* Ch. 47, *Automotive Financing,* and Ch. 102, *Personal Property Transactions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

144 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.102

§ 568.102 California Constitution

Maximum interest rates charged on loans or forbearances; lenders exempt from rate restrictions. *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.103

§ 568.103 Federal Statutes

[1] Business and Agricultural Loans

Maximum interest rates charged on business and agricultural loans. *12 U.S.C. § 86a*

Application of provisions of *12 U.S.C. § 86a* to business and agricultural loans. *12 U.S.C.A. § 86a*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 512)

[2] Banks, Savings Associations, and Credit Unions

[a] Applicability of Statutes

Application of provisions of *12 U.S.C. §§ 1785, 1831d* to certain loans. *12 U.S.C.A. § 1730g*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, §§ 525-527, as amended)

[b] Credit Unions

Federal credit union definitions. *12 U.S.C. § 1752*

Requirements governing insured credit unions. *12 U.S.C. § 1785*

Maximum interest rates charged by credit unions. *12 U.S.C. § 1785(g)*

[c] Depository Institutions

Maximum interest rates charged by depository institutions. *12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(2), as amended)

[d] Mortgage Loans

"Federally related mortgage loan" defined. *12 U.S.C. § 1735f-5(b)*

Maximum interest rates charged on certain loans, mortgages, credit sales, and advances. *12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, §§ 501, 528, 529, as amended)

[e] Small Business Investment Companies

Maximum interest rates charged by small business investment companies. *15 U.S.C. § 687*

[f] State and Foreign Banks

Bank definitions. *12 U.S.C. § 1813*

Maximum interest rates charged by state and foreign insured banks. *12 U.S.C. § 1831d*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawDepository InstitutionsGeneral OverviewBanking LawDepository InstitutionsCredit UnionsBanking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.104

§ 568.104 California Statutes

[1] Automobile Sales

Automobile sales contracts. *Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*

Maximum finance charge on automobile sales contracts. *Civ. Code § 2982(j)*

[2] Banking Institutions Exempted From Constitutional Usury Law

Banks. *Fin. Code § 1504*

Foreign banks. *Fin. Code § 1716*

Bank holding companies. *Fin. Code § 3707*

Associations. *Fin. Code § 6515(c)*

Associations and savings and loan associations. *Fin. Code § 7675*

[3] Bottomry Contracts

"Bottomry contract" defined. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 450*

Contract for higher interest rate than allowed by law. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 455*

[4] Common Interest Development Associations

Exemption for and maximum rates by common interest development associations. *Civ. Code § 1366(e), (f)*

[5] Consumer Finance Lenders

[a] In General

Reference to personal property broker is reference also to consumer finance lender. Stats. 1982, ch. 1082, § 28 (set forth as note in annotation to *Fin. Code § 22000*)

Governing law. *Fin. Code § 24000 et seq.*

Types of loans not subject to specified statutory requirements. *Fin. Code §§ 24053, 24053.1*

Effect of contract when loan is not actually consummated. *Fin. Code §§ 24450, 24450.1*

[b] Restrictions on Charges and Fees

Maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 24451*

Alternative maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 24451.1*

Administrative fees. *Fin. Code § 24451.3*

Open-end credit program. *Fin. Code § 24500 et seq.*

Other permissible fees. *Fin. Code §§ 24458.3-24458.7*

Statutory fees. *Fin. Code § 24472*

Precomputation and payment of charges. *Fin. Code §§ 24480-24482*

[c] Violation of Statute

Effect of usurious contract. *Fin. Code §§ 24650, 24651*

Willful violation of statute is misdemeanor. *Fin. Code § 24653*

[6] Credit Unions

Governing law. *Fin. Code § 14000 et seq.*

Late charges. *Fin. Code § 15001*

[7] Industrial Loan Companies

Governing law. *Fin. Code § 18000 et seq.*

Maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 18212*

Alternative maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 18212.1*

Open-end loans. *Fin. Code § 18300*

Effect of usurious charge. *Fin. Code § 18439*

Usury as misdemeanor. *Fin. Code § 18450*

Limitation on finance charges. *Fin. Code §§ 18625-18631*

[8] Insurers

Governing law. *Ins. Code § 699 et seq.*

Exemption from constitutional usury law. *Ins. Code § 1100.1*

[9] Mortgage Loans

Variable interest rates. *Civ. Code §§ 1916.5-1916.12*

Variable interest rates. *Civ. Code §§ 1918-1921*

[10] Pawnbrokers

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 21000-21209*

Inapplicability of provisions to certain loans. *Fin. Code § 21051(a)*

Maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 21200*

Alternative maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 21200.5*

Extension or renewal charges. *Fin. Code § 21200.5(v)*

Handling and storage charges. *Fin. Code §§ 21200.1, 21200.6, 21201.1, 21201.2*

Firearm processing charge. *Fin. Code § 21200.8*

Usury as misdemeanor. *Fin. Code § 21209*

[11] Personal Property Brokers

[a] In General

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 22000-22654*

Inapplicability of certain provisions to certain loans. *Fin. Code §§ 22053-22053.1*

Effect of contract when loan not actually consummated. *Fin. Code §§ 22450-22450.1*

[b] Restrictions on Charges and Fees

Maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 22451*

Alternative maximum charges. *Fin. Code § 22451.1*

Administrative fees. *Fin. Code § 22451.3*

Open-end credit program. *Fin. Code § 22500 et seq.*

Other permissible fees. *Fin. Code §§ 22458.3-22458.7*

Statutory fees. *Fin. Code § 22472*

Precomputation and payment of charges. *Fin. Code §§ 22480-22482*

[c] Violation of Statute

Effect of usurious contract. *Fin. Code § 22651*

Willful violation of statute is punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both. *Fin. Code § 22653*

[12] Public Retirement Systems

Governing law. *Gov. Code §§ 7500-7511*; *Civ. Code § 1916.2*

Exemption from constitutional usury law. *Gov. Code § 7509*; *Civ. Code § 1916.2*

[13] Real Estate Brokers

[a] In General

"Real estate broker" defined. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10131*

Loans by real estate brokers. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3*

Application of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3* to loans secured by dwelling. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240.1*

Inapplicability of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3* to certain loans. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10245*

Real estate broker exemption from constitutional usury law. *Civ. Code § 1916.1*

[b] Maximum Charges

Maximum amount of expenses, charges, and interest. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242*

Late payment charges. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.5*

Prepayment of principal and interest. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242.6*

Renewal or refinance. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10244*

Restrictions on charges by real estate licensees. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.1*

[c] Recovery of Usurious Interest from Real Estate Broker

Action to recover usurious charge. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*

Demand procedure. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2*

[14] Retail Installment Contracts

[a] In General

Retail installment sales. *Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*

Retail installment contracts. *Civ. Code §§ 1803.1-1809.1*

Retail installment accounts. *Civ. Code §§ 1810, 1810.1, 1810.12*

[b] Civil and Criminal Liabilities

Willful violation is misdemeanor. *Civ. Code § 1812.6*

Recovery of usurious charge. *Civ. Code § 1812.7*

Nonwillful violation is correctible. *Civ. Code § 1812.8*

Treble damages for willful violation. *Civ. Code § 1812.9*

[c] Regulation of Charges

Finance charge permissible. *Civ. Code § 1803.3*

Delinquency charge. *Civ. Code § 1803.6*

Maximum amount of finance charge. *Civ. Code §§ 1805.1*

Simple-interest basis as required computation. *Civ. Code § 1805.7*

Combining precomputed and simple-interest bases. *Civ. Code § 1805.9*

Extension and deferral charges. *Civ. Code § 1807.1*

Maximum amount of finance charge on outstanding balance. *Civ. Code § 1810.2*

Delinquency charge on installment account. *Civ. Code § 1810.12*

[15] Sales of Securities

State corporate securities law. *Corp. Code § 25000 et seq.*

Qualification of sale of security. *Corp. Code § 25110 et seq.*

Exemption from constitutional usury law for qualified sale. *Corp. Code § 25116*

Exemption from constitutional usury law for certain issuers. *Corp. Code § 25117*

Exemption from constitutional usury law for certain commercial debt instruments. *Corp. Code § 25118*

Exemption from constitutional usury law for certified broker-dealer. *Corp. Code § 25211.5*

[16] Usury Laws in General

[a] Definitions and Principles

Usury law. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 1; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-1*

Usurious provision are null and void. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*

Loan-sharking is felony. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(b); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(b)*

"Loan of money" defined. *Civ. Code § 1912*

Loan of money presumed to be with interest. *Civ. Code § 1914*

"Interest" defined. *Civ. Code § 1915*

Interest rate deemed to be annual when unspecified. *Civ. Code § 1916*

Interest rate on court judgment set at 10 percent. *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010*

[b] Civil Remedies

Treble damages. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(a); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(a)*

Reformation of contract. *Civ. Code § 3399 et seq.*

Statute of limitations for action for money had and received. *Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)*

Permissive cross complaints. *Code Civ. Proc. § 428.10*

Declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsBottomryContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.105

§ 568.105 Decisions

[1] Agricultural Labor

ALRB order is not subject to constitutional interest rate until ALRB obtains superior court enforcement order under *Lab. Code § 1160.8*. *Sandrini Brothers v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 878, 888-889, 203 Cal. Rptr. 304*

[2] Assignee of Usurious Note

Assignee of lender exempt from usury laws is able to collect interest on note although assignee is not exempt. *Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp. (1979)92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 745, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132 , appeal dismissed, 444 U.S. 948, 100 S. Ct. 417, 62 L. Ed. 2d 317*)

[3] Attorney's Fees

Mortgage lender who prevailed in action by borrower is not entitled to attorney's fees as costs when usurious contract did not contain attorney's fees provision. *Orden v. Crawshaw Mortgage & Inv. Co. (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 141, 146-147, 167 Cal. Rptr. 62*

[4] Choice of Law Determination

In action for usury, when promissory notes did not contain any choice-of-law clauses but recited that each note was to be repaid in Nevada, *Civ. Code § 1646* required that Nevada law should be applied since Nevada was place of performance of loan contract; Restatement (Second) of Conflicts analysis reaches same result. *Shannon-Vail Five Inc. v. Bunch (9th Cir. 2001) 270 F.3d 1207, 1210*

Parties' incorporation in promissory note of Colorado interest rate, usurious under California law, would be permitted only on factual examination of reasonable relationship of contract to Colorado, substantial contacts of parties with Colorado, and consideration of California's fundamental policy with respect to usury. *Mencor Enterprises, Inc. v. Hets Equities Corp. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 432, 441, 235 Cal. Rptr. 464*

[5] Credit Sales

Usury law has no place in field of bona fide credit sale financing, unless parties intend to effect hire of money at excessive interest rate rather than to finance bona fide sale of property. *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 54, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200*

Participation by nonexempt financing institution in credit sale contract for construction of residence does not convert otherwise bona fide credit sale into "loan" subject to usury laws. *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 54, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200*

"Finance charge" (time-price differential) on credit sales by various department stores and oil companies is not interest for purpose of applying *Usury Law. Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 872, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

[6] Defense

Pleading usury is unnecessary when contract is usurious on its face; court is entitled to deny interest sua sponte. *Curtis v. Thaxter (1928) 204 Cal. 439, 440, 268 P. 630*

Defense of usury is waived if not affirmatively pleaded. *Willcox v. Edwards (1912) 162 Cal. 455, 462, 123 P. 276*

Usury is defense personal to borrower that may not be asserted by person not party to contract. *Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547*

[7] Effect of Change in Usury Laws

Civ. Code § 1916.1 (real estate brokers' usury exemption) applies retroactively although enacted after decisions of lower courts. In re Lara (9th Cir. [Cal.] 1984) *731 F.2d 1455, 1459*

State constitutional usury provisions are read into existing statutes. *Heald v. Friis-Hansen (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 834, 838, 345 P.2d 457*

Usury law providing recovery is statutory remedy and penalty which may be repealed. *Penziner v. West American Finance Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 160, 170-171, 74 P.2d 252*

1979 amendment to *Civ. Code § 1916.1* applies retroactively. *Garcia v. Wetzel (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1097-1098, 206 Cal. Rptr. 251*

Statutes that repeal or modify usury laws are given retrospective effect to determine scope of liability with respect to transactions entered into prior to the repeal or modification. *Chapman v. Farr (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 1021, 1023, 183 Cal. Rptr. 606*

Change in usury law is applicable retroactively, precluding recovery of penalty for usurious interest charged prior to change in law. *Orden v. Crawshaw Mortgage & Inv. Co. (1980) 109 Cal. App. 3d 141, 144-146, 167 Cal. Rptr. 62*

Maximum interest rate established by former *Cal. Const, art. XX, § 22* (now *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*) is required to be read into Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 §§ 2, 3; West's Annot. *Civ. Code §§ 1916-2, 1916-3*. *Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 280 n. 1, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456*

[8] Effect of Subsequent Events

Contract not usurious in inception does not become usurious by subsequent events (contract assigned by exempt lender to nonexempt party). *Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 745, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132 , appeal dismissed, 444 U.S. 948, 100 S. Ct. 417, 62 L. Ed. 2d 317*)

Loan not usurious in its inception is not subject to claim of usury because of subsequent events (contract assigned by exempt lender to nonexempt party). *Cambridge Dev. Co. v. U. S. Financial (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1025, 1031, 90 Cal. Rptr. 333*

[9] Effect of Usurious Provision

If a loan is usurious the creditor is entitled to no interest whatsoever, and to repayment of principal only. *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Unenforceability of usurious agreement does not affect preexisting lawful agreements between same parties. *Strike v. Trans-West Discount Corp. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 735, 744, 155 Cal. Rptr. 132 , appeal dismissed, 444 U.S. 948, 100 S. Ct. 417, 62 L. Ed. 2d 317*)

Usurious provisions do not affect right of payee to recover principal amount of note when due; payee entitled to interest at legal rate from date note matures until date of judgment. *Epstein v. Frank (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 111, 123, 177 Cal. Rptr. 831*

[10] ERISA

Civ. Code § 1917.220, which provides that *Cal. Const. art. XV § 1* restrictions on interest rates do not apply to loans made by pension fund or retirement system subject to ERISA [*29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.*], was itself preempted by ERISA; ERISA, however, does not preempt California's general usury laws. *Varr v. Olimpia (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 675, 680-682, 686, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 106*

[11] Estoppel

Conduct of borrower's agent creates estoppel against borrower to claim usury. *Lakeview Meadows Ranch v. Bintliff (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 418, 424-425, 111 Cal. Rptr. 414*

Payor is estopped from recovering interest paid as well as treble damages. *Buck v. Dahlgren (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 779, 789, 100 Cal. Rptr. 462*

Borrower estopped from asserting usury due to his fraudulent representations and inducements, even though interest rate exceeded that allowable and one month postponement of foreclosure for $500 constituted usurious forbearance. *Buck v. Dahlgren (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 779, 784-791, 100 Cal. Rptr. 462*

[12] Evidence and Procedure

Civ. Code § 1916.3 limits treble damages for usury to period commencing one year prior to filing of complaint but does not cut off damages accruing after filing of complaint. *Handi Inv. Co. v. Mobil Oil Corp. (9th Cir.1981) 653 F.2d 391, 393*

Parol evidence is not available to explain meaning of written agreement that does not, on its face, clearly provide for compounding of interest by securities broker on customer debit-balance accounts. *McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 816, 822-823, 191 Cal. Rptr. 458, 662 P.2d 916*

Contract subject to two constructions, one usurious and the other lawful, is required to be construed as lawful in absence of evidence requiring it to be construed as usurious. *Lakeview Meadows Ranch v. Bintliff (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 418, 423, 111 Cal. Rptr. 414*

Class action is proper to recover monies wrongfully collected from plaintiff borrowers as late charges; late charge "service fee" is liquidated damages; need for proof of payment by each class member does not bar class action. *Clermont v. Secured Investment Corp. (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 766, 768-771, 102 Cal. Rptr. 340*

Whether transaction is usurious is question of fact; nevertheless, court is able to decide as matter of law if interest rate easily determinable. *Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 560, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529*

Evidence tending to prove usury is proper even though such evidence is something other than written loan documents. *Mission Hills Dev. Corp. v. Western Small Business Inv. Co. (1968) 260 Cal. App. 2d 923, 926-928, 67 Cal. Rptr. 505*

Time in which to bring action based on usury. *Baruch Inv. Co. v. Huntoon (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 485, 490, 65 Cal. Rptr. 131*

[13] Examples

[a] Usurious Loans

Interest provisions of note are void when interest rate is usurious. *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829* ; *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82* ; *Epstein v. Frank (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 111, 122, 177 Cal. Rptr. 831*

Bad faith delay in paying over loan proceeds to borrower results in borrower paying excessive interest and renders loan usurious, even though loan terms provide for maximum rate. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Note is usurious when unpaid monthly payment of maximum interest rate is to be added to principal and bear like interest as principal. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Loan is usurious when borrower is to pay six percent per annum but, to secure to lender a 30 percent per annum return, also takes option to purchase real property of lender for a price which, added to six percent figure, equals 30 percent. *McClung v. Saito (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 143, 148-149, 84 Cal. Rptr. 44*

[b] Nonusurious Loans

Promissory note held not usurious because it was not absolutely repayable; when plain language of promissory note limited repayment to promisor's interests in royalty payments, limitations served as hazard or contingency on loan because if there were no royalties, there would be no repayment. *D-Beam Ltd. P'ship v. Roller Derby Skates, Inc. (9th Cir. 2004) 366 F.3d 972, 975*

Loan is not usurious, although it would be usurious if commission charged by trustee for loan were treated as interest, when trust was not aware of commission and did not receive any portion of it. *Hobbs v. Buck (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 176, 179-184, 171 Cal. Rptr. 258*

Clauses in residential real estate contracts for penalty amount per day for failure to close transaction on certain date protect seller from having to support two residences and are reasonable in light of anticipated harm, despite excessive legal interest rate. *Angell v. Rowlands (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 536, 543, 149 Cal. Rptr. 574*

Late charge provisions of note do not make it usurious. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Lender charging fee in addition to interest in connection with making loan is not necessarily violating usury laws even if combined charges exceed prescribed limit; usury law does not purport to fix or limit legitimate expense or service charge that may properly be borne by borrower. *Cambridge Dev. Co. v. U. S. Financial (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 1025, 1028, 90 Cal. Rptr. 333*

[14] Exemption and Common Law Remedies

Exemption of enumerated classes from restrictions of usury law immunizes them from actions grounded on common law remedies existing prior to usury law. *West Pico Furniture Co. v. Pacific Finance Loans (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 594, 615, 86 Cal. Rptr. 793, 469 P.2d 665*

[15] Extension of Time for Payment

Extension of time for payment of debt due constitutes forbearance on part of creditor within meaning of usury law rather than part of credit sale, since interest becomes due only in event of default on part of purchaser to pay amount due. *Crestwood Lumber Co. v. Citizens Sav. & Loan Assn. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 819, 825, 148 Cal. Rptr. 129*

[16] Intent as Element of Usury

Variable interest rate exceeding constitutional maximum is upheld when contracted for in good faith and without intent to avoid usury laws. *McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 365, 376-378, 146 Cal. Rptr. 371, 578 P.2d 1375*

When bank's note and forbearance agreement fit within legally authorized exception to general usury law (*Fin. Code § 1504*), interest provisions did not exceed statutory maximum and defendant's intent was irrelevant. *Jones v. Wells Fargo Bank (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1527, 1538, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 835*

Interest contingently payable at rate that may be less than or in excess of maximum of legal rate is usurious when parties contract in bad faith and with intent to avoid usury statute. *Arneill Ranch v. Petit (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 277, 283, 134 Cal. Rptr. 456*

Intent to charge more than legal rate of interest is element of usury; that element is not found when borrower requests attorney to draft agreement modifying original note. *Lakeview Meadows Ranch v. Bintliff (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 418, 424-425, 111 Cal. Rptr. 414*

Court correctly admitted evidence of parties' lack of intent to violate usury law in action to reform note by deleting usurious provision. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Conscious and voluntary taking of more than legal rate of interest constitutes usury; taking of amount of interest is only intent necessary by lender. *McClung v. Saito (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 143, 153, 84 Cal. Rptr. 44*

[17] Interest Assessed on Unpaid Taxes

Franchise Tax Board's six-year delay in informing taxpayers of amount due was not "forbearance" under *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*; true purpose of interest on delinquent taxes was penalty assessment. *Sheehy v. Franchise Tax Board (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 280, 283-284, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 760*

[18] Judgment Interest

Neither the 1918 Usury Law nor *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* prohibit the compounding of interest under the renewal provisions of the *Enforcement of Judgments Law. OCM Principal Opportunities Fund, L.P. v. CIBC World Markets Corp. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 185, 203, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 350*

Defendant payee of usurious note is entitled to interest at legal rate from date of maturity to date of judgment; because note was not judgment and did not specify interest rate, constitutional rate of 7 percent a year applied. *Green v. Future Two (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 738, 744, 225 Cal. Rptr. 3*

Prejudgment interest at market rate in inverse condemnation case is proper even though rate exceeded legal rate set by *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1,* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010,* because right to prejudgment interest in inverse condemnation suit derives from *U.S. Const., amend. V,* which has supremacy under U.S. Const., art. VI, *cl. 2,* over any state constitutional provision or statute to contrary. *Aetna Life & Casualty Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 865, 879, 216 Cal. Rptr. 831*

Civ. Code § 3291 (judgment bears 10 percent interest from date of first rejected settlement offer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 998*) and *Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010(a)* (judgment bears 10 percent interest from date judgment rendered) do not violate *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1,* because sections are not applied cumulatively to give 20 percent interest but are applied separately or conjunctively to permit recovery of no more than 10 percent interest. *Mendez v. Kurten (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 481, 487, 215 Cal. Rptr. 924*

[19] Pawnbrokers

Article XV of California Constitution exempts from usury law only those pawn transactions made within scope of pawnbroker license; pawnbroker could not claim benefit of exemption with respect to loan that was not pawn transaction, did not comply with statutory requirements, and was not made within scope of pawnbroker's license. *Agapitov v. Lerner (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 830, 832, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 837*

[20] Personal Property Broker or Finance Lender

On precomputed noncommercial loan over $10,000 made by personal property broker in 1981 and secured by borrower's residence and personal property, prepayment penalty is computed by Rule of 78's under *Fin. Code § 22053*. *Draper v. American Funding Ltd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 345, 350-354, 285 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Finance company, licensed as personal property broker, that lends money to furniture dealer secured by pledge of conditional sale contract is exempted by *Fin. Code § 22053* from maximum rates and is exempted from state constitutional usury provisions. *West Pico Furniture Co. v. Pacific Finance Loans (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 594, 606-615, 86 Cal. Rptr. 793, 469 P.2d 665*

Fin. Code § 22053 and *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1,* exempt licensed personal property brokers from compliance with laws fixing maximum interest chargeable on loans despite gross disparity between values of realty and personalty taken as security. *Hall v. Beneficial Finance Co. (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 652, 653-655, 173 Cal. Rptr. 450*

Personal property broker loan exceeding $10,000, not inflated to make face amount of note appear to be greater than actual unpaid purchase price to avoid usury laws, are exempt from usury laws. *Lenes v. Dean (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 845, 849-850, 135 Cal. Rptr. 14*

Bona fide loan by personal property broker of $30,000 at 18 percent yearly interest secured in part by real property and in part by qualified security under *Fin. Code § 22009* is exempt from interest rate restrictions of *Fin. Code § 22053*.

Raysinger v. Peoples Inv. & Loan Assn (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 248, 250, 112 Cal. Rptr. 163

[21] Rate Assigned by Court on Implied Loan Agreement

Seven percent is maximum interest rate to be assigned by court on implied loan agreement, even if court hearing case sits as court of equity. *Armstrong v. Picquelle (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 122, 128-129, 203 Cal. Rptr. 552*

[22] Real Estate Broker

Trial court did not err in ruling that a secured loan was exempt from the constitutional usury prohibition on the ground that it was negotiated and arranged by a licensed real estate broker where the broker, although an employee of an affiliate of the lender, acted as a third party intermediary and did not negotiate the loan on his own behalf because the lender was a legal entity separate and distinct from the broker and the broker's employer. It was of no moment that the broker indirectly benefitted from the transaction; as long as he was not negotiating solely on his own behalf, he fit squarely within the *Civ. Code § 1916.1* exemption of a licensed broker who negotiated and arranged a loan for another. *Stoneridge Parkway Partners, LLC v. MW Housing Partners III, LP (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1381, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 61*

Usury exemption of *Cal. Const., art XV, § 1* and *Civ. Code § 1916.1* for loans "arranged" by real estate brokers not applicable if lender and borrower had already agreed upon terms of loan and broker's involvement was limited to following parties' instructions in preparing loan documents, ordering title insurance and disbursing funds. *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 401-403, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829*

Usury exemption was applicable to loan arranged by general partner who was licensed real estate broker; broker "arranged" obligation, and provision in each note also provided conclusive presumption of that arrangement; exemption is not limited to brokers who act in capacity requiring license. *Park Terrace Ltd. v. Teasdale (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 802, 806-808, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797*

Fact that nonbroker arranging loan was licensed attorney and thus authorized to perform certain acts for which real estate broker's license would otherwise be required did not constitute substantial compliance with licensing requirement of *Civ. Code § 1916.1*. *Del Mar v. Caspe (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316, 1330, 1334, 272 Cal. Rptr. 446*

Real estate broker was "arranging" loan for purposes of exemption under *Civ. Code § 1916.1(1)* when services performed for compensation included title searches, document reviews, consultation and advisement, computation of principal and interest, preparation of loan documents, discussion of documents and terms with lender and borrower, and securing execution of documents. *Del Mar v. Caspe (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1316, 1328-1329, 272 Cal. Rptr. 446*

For purposes of exemption for broker-arranged loan, compensation encompasses receipt of almost any form of monetary or tangible benefit that is not self-bestowed. *Jones v. Kallman (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 131, 136, 244 Cal. Rptr. 609* ; *Stickel v. Harris (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 575, 584, 242 Cal. Rptr. 88*

Broker compensation was essential element of exemption for broker-arranged loan; fact that salesman-partner rather than broker-partner received all of commission was not disqualifying because firm's practice of applying portion of each commission to firm's expenses provided sufficient compensation to broker. *Jones v. Kallman (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d*

131, 135-136, 244 Cal. Rptr. 609

Even though salesman-partner did most of work, participation of broker-partner in arranging loan, though minimal, was sufficient when broker determined rates and points at lender's request, transmitted those terms to borrower's broker, and reviewed loan documents drafted by salesman. *Jones v. Kallman (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 131, 134-135, 244 Cal. Rptr. 609*

When broker arranged loan to joint venture of which broker was member, broker's anticipated share of joint venture's future profits was sufficient compensation to bring loan within exemption of *Civ. Code § 1916.1*. *Stickel v. Harris (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 575, 585, 242 Cal. Rptr. 88*

Real estate broker neither makes nor arranges loan when broker acts only as borrower and has not otherwise acted to make or arrange loan for another or others, and has not acted to receive or expect compensation; thus, broker was not exempt from usury provisions of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, under that section's exemptions or under *Civ. Code § 1916.1*. *Green v. Future Two (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 738, 742-743, 225 Cal. Rptr. 3*

Loan is not made or arranged by real estate broker within meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*, when broker acts only as borrower, transaction is only between broker and lender who each act on own behalf, and no third-party licensed broker acts for compensation as intermediary. *Winnett v. Roberts (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 909, 921, 225 Cal. Rptr. 82*

Licensed real estate broker is exempt from usury provisions, even if not acting in his or her licensed capacity. *Garcia v. Wetzel (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 1093, 1097-1098, 206 Cal. Rptr. 251*

Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(a) requires some method of cost accounting by real estate broker to protect borrowers. *Pacific Plan v. Fox (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 215, 219, 148 Cal. Rptr. 510*

[23] Reformation of Contract

Reformation of usurious contract under *Civ. Code § 3399* was proper when all parties intended not to bear interest that exceeds maximum permissible rate and separate compound interest provision resulted in mutual mistake; compound interest provision was deleted while 10 percent rate provision left intact. *First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645*

[24] Sale Versus Loan

"Late charges" on buyer's past due account were not subject to usury law because transaction did not involve forbearance; parties did not intend that buyer could forbear from making full payment ad infinitum in exchange for buyer's payment of late charges. *Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh Construction Corp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 708, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ; *O'Connor v. Televideo System, Inc. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 709, 717, 267 Cal. Rptr. 237*

"Late charges" on buyer's past-due account were exempt from usury law under "time-price" doctrine. *Southwest Concrete Products v. Gosh ConstructionCorp. (1990) 51 Cal. 3d 701, 707, 709, 274 Cal. Rptr. 404, 798 P.2d 1247* ;

Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 884-885, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893

The transfer of structured settlement payments under the Structured Settlement Transfer Act (*Ins. Code § 10136 et seq.*) does not implicate the prohibition against usury in *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* because a structured settlement transfer is not a loan or forbearance but is instead a sale, as indicated in *Ins. Code § 10136(b)*. *321 Henderson Receivables Origination LLC v. Sioteco (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1059, 1077, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 321*

Operating agreement requiring defendant to pay interest at the rate of 18 percent on any amount due but not paid within 30 days of a triggering event does not violate usury provision as no forbearance was involved within the meaning of *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1* and there was no agreement between the parties to extend payment of a debt. *Roodenburg v. Pavestone Co., L.P. (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 185, 194, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 558*

"Finance charges" billed to revolving charge account were exempt from usury law under "time-price" doctrine. *Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 873-874, 880, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Court looks to substance rather than form of transaction to assess whether usurious arrangement made; issue is whether bargain of parties, in light of all circumstances and with view to substance rather than form, has hire of money at excessive interest rate as true object. *Boerner v. Colwell Co. (1978) 21 Cal. 3d 37, 44, 145 Cal. Rptr. 380, 577 P.2d 200*

Consideration of whether transaction constitutes loan is substance for transaction rather than its form or terminology used by parties. *Burr v. Capital Reserve Corp. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 983, 989, 80 Cal. Rptr. 345, 458 P.2d 185*

Usury laws do not apply when essence of transaction is sale, since no loan or forbearance of money made, and hence no interest charged. *Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 877, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Usury laws apply to loan disguised as sale. *Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 877, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Court looks to substance of transaction rather than form to determine whether transaction is sale or loan. *Fox v. Federated Department Stores, Inc. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 867, 877, 156 Cal. Rptr. 893*

Buyer's execution of $3,200 note and assumption of seller's obligation secured by business at 10 percent interest was part of purchase price of business in transaction for sale of business, not subject to usury law. *La France Enterprises v. Van Der Linden (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 375, 380-381, 138 Cal. Rptr. 690*

Usury laws are inapplicable to legitimate sale of going business. *Lenes v. Dean (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 845, 848-849, 135 Cal. Rptr. 14*

Mere purchase of note at discount is not affected by usury law. *Moe v. Transamerica Title Ins. Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547*

Sale and lease back of equipment is loan transaction subject to usury laws. *Rochester Capital Leasing Corp. v. K & L Litho Corp. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 697, 702-703, 91 Cal. Rptr. 827*

[25] Standing to Challenge Usury

Under California law, right of action against usury and right to assert defense of usury are personal to borrower; junior lienholder who made its loan with knowledge of usurious senior loan had no standing (in adversary proceeding in borrower's bankruptcy) to challenge payment of usurious interest on senior loan. *In re Dominelli (9th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 313, 318* , citing *Moe v. Transamerica Title Insurance Co. (1971) 21 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300, 98 Cal. Rptr. 547* ; *Domarad v. Fisher & Burke, Inc. (1969) 270 Cal. App. 2d 543, 560, 76 Cal. Rptr. 529*

Exception to rule that defense of usury is personal to borrower is that defense may be asserted by one who stands in borrower's shoes and is damaged by usury; it is not applicable to junior lienholder who made its loan with knowledge of usurious senior loan. *In re Dominelli (9th Cir. 1987) 820 F.2d 313, 318* , citing *Western States Acceptance Corp. v. Frank D. Tuttle, Inc. (1930) 210 Cal. 51, 54, 290 P. 574* ; *Sosin v. Richardson (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 258, 266, 26 Cal. Rptr. 610*

[26] Treble Damages

Court has discretion to award treble damages. *Burr v. Capital Reserve Corp. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 983, 994, 80 Cal. Rptr. 345, 458 P.2d 185* ; *Gibbo v. Berger (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 396, 404, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 829*

Treble damages provision does not abrogate common law rights of borrowers, but as adding statutory remedy to aid borrower and penalize lender; borrower is also permitted to bring action for money had and received to recover usurious interest paid within two years of suit. *Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 816-817, 221 P.2d 15*

Treble damage recovery is statutory remedy and penalty, which may be repealed. *Penziner v. West American Finance Co. (1937) 10 Cal. 2d 160, 170-171, 74 P.2d 252*

Treble damages are prayed for in cross complaint; amount is properly offset from principal. *Rice v. Dunlap (1928) 205 Cal. 133, 137*

Borrower recovers treble entire amount of interest paid rather than merely three times excess amount. *Haines v. Commercial Mortgage Co. (1927) 200 Cal. 609, 617, 254 P. 956, 255 P. 805* (overruled on other grounds in *Heald v. Friis-Hansen (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 834, 840, 345 P.2d 457*)

Court has wide discretion in determining whether treble damages under Usury Act should be awarded. *Buck v. Dahlgren (1972) 23 Cal. App. 3d 779, 788, 100 Cal. Rptr. 462*

Granting of treble damages on a finding of usury is discretionary with court. *McClung v. Saito (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 143, 152, 84 Cal. Rptr. 44*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesEquitable EstoppelGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.106

§ 568.106 Attorney General Opinions

January 1, 1988, reduction in maximum finance charge that may be applied to outstanding balances on retail installment accounts under former *Civ. Code § 1810.2* was applicable to those portions of outstanding balances attributable to purchases made prior to January 1, 1988. *70 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 256 (1987)*

Inclusion of "surcharge" in interest rate charged by Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. 67 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 320 (1984)

Interest rate is not limited when sellers of residential or commercial real property take cash down payment and promissory note for balance of purchase price. *62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 735 (1979)*

Loans made by commercial banks' trust departments and trust company acting as trustee are not exempt from usury restriction [*but now see 12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(2), as amended); *12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(1), 1831d(a)*]. *59 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 515 (1976)*

"Seller's points" received by lender constitute additional interest for purpose of usury; discount points paid by buyer on conventional home loan produced for sale to FHLMC or to FNMA constitute additional interest for purpose of usury; FHA insured or VA guaranteed mortgages not exempt from state usury laws except as provided in federal Veterans Housing Amendments Act [*but now see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1735f-5(b), 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(1), (b), as amended)]. *59 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 452 (1976)*

Mortgage banker is not exempt from maximum interest rate of 10 percent and is prohibited from assigning right to collect interest in excess of that rate. *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 487 (1975)*

Mortgage banker is not exempt from maximum interest rate of 10 percent and is prohibited from assigning right to collect interest in excess of that rate. *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 487 (1975)*

"Seller's points" received by lender constitute additional interest for purpose of usury; discount points paid by buyer on conventional home loan produced for sale to FHLMC or to FNMA constitute additional interest for purpose of usury; FHA insured or VA guaranteed mortgages not exempt from state usury laws except as provided in federal Veterans Housing Amendments Act [*but now see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1735f-5(b), 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(1), (b), as amended)]. *59 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 452 (1976)*

Loans made by commercial banks' trust departments and trust company acting as trustee not exempt from usury restriction [*but now see 12 U.S.C. § 1735f-7*; *12 U.S.C.A. § 1735f-7*, Note (Pub. L. No. 96-221, § 501(a)(2), as amended); *12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(1), 1831d(a)*]. *59 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 515 (1976)*

Interest rate not limited when sellers of residential or commercial real property take cash down payment and promissory note for balance of purchase price. *62 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 735 (1979)*

Inclusion of "surcharge" in interest rate charged by Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. 67 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 320 (1984)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesUsuryContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.107

§ 568.107 Law Reviews

[1] California Usury Laws

Rabin & Brownlie, *Usury Law in California: A Guide Through the Maze, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 397 (1987)*

Ackerman and Bosko, *California's Diminishing Usury Law, 4 Cal. Lawyer No. 7, p. 12 (1984)*

Bosko and Larmore, *Practice Under the New California Usury Law,* 55 State B.J. 58 (1980)

Harroch and Frasch, *The New California Usury Law in Light of the Monetary Control Act,* 35 The Business Lawyer 1053 (1980)

Preble and Herskowitz, *Recent Changes in California and Federal Usury Laws: New Opportunities for Real Estate and Commercial Loans? 13 Loyola L. Rev. 1 (1979)*

Bosko, *Usury Computations: A Primer,* 51 State B.J. 383 (1976)

Comment, *A Comprehensive View of California Usury Law,* 6 Southwestern U. (LA) L. Rev. 166 (1974)

Lowell, *A Current Analysis of Usury Laws: A National View, 8 San Diego L. Rev. 193 (1971)*

Glushon, *The California Usury Law, the Lender's Trap and the Borrower's Windfall?* 43 State B.J. 56 (1968)

[2] Conflict of Laws

Curotto, *Conflict of Laws and Usury in California: The Impact on Flow of Mortgage Funds, 9 USF L. Rev. 441 (1975)*

[3] Federal Usury Laws and Preemption

Kaplinsky, *Federal Usury Law Developments, 101 Banking L.J. 663 (1984)*

Brandel, Burke, Climo, Johnson, Kaplinsky, Rohner, Schellie, Wallace, *Federal Pre-Emption of State Usury Laws: A Program, 37 Bus. Law. 747 (1982)*

Burke & Kaplinsky, *Unraveling the New Federal Usury Law, 37 Bus. Law. 1079 (1982)*

Merlo, *Federal Preemption of State Usury Statutes: Legislative and Judicial Modifications, 99 Banking L.J. 585 (1982)*

Samuels, *Usury Preemption: The Federal/State Scheme, 98 Banking L.J. 892 (1981)*

[4] Mortgage Banking

Waxman, *Real Estate Lending and the Personal Property Broker,* 50 Lab. Arb. Rep. (BNA) 274 (1975)

Waxman, *The Mortgage Banker-Industrial Loan Company: A New Exempt Lender, 6 Pacific L.J. 1 (1975)*

Note, *The Mortgage Banker-Industrial Loan Company: An Anomaly in the Usury Law, 11 Cal. West. L. Rev. 562 (1975)*

Note, *The Mortgage Banking Act: A New Way Around California's Usury Laws? 26 Hastings L.J. 460 (1974)*

[5] Public Utilities

Gravelle and Alderson, *Public Utility Debt Securities: A Transaction Exempt From the Usury Law, 27 Hastings L.J. 825 (1976)*

Blitz, *California Public Utilities and the Usury Law,* 50 Lab. Arb. Rep. (BNA) 177 (1975)

[6] Real Estate

Comment, *The Usury Exemption: Should It Apply to Real Estate Brokers Making Loans? 26 Santa Clara L. Rev. 403 (1986)*

Note, *In re Lara: The Ninth Circuit Places Statutory Meaning in Doubt, 15 Golden Gate U. L. Rev. 99 (1985)*

Comment, *The Wrap-Around Deed of Trust: An Answer to the Allegation of Usury, 10 Pacific L.J. 923 (1979)*

Comment, *Usury and Real Estate Investment Trust: An Analysis of Treasury Regulation 1856(c)(2)(ii), 60 Cal. L. Rev. 147 (1972)*

Comment, *The Variable Interest Rate Clause and Its Use in California Real Estate Transactions, 19 UCLA L. Rev. 468 (1972)*

Note, *McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.: New Tests for Variable-Interest Loans, 30 Hastings L.J. 1843 (1979)*

Note, *McConnell v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.: Variable Rate Loans Under California's Usury Law, 67 Cal. L. Rev. 621 (1979)*

[7] Sales of Goods

Loomis, *Crestwood Lumber Company v. Citizens Savings & Loan Association: The Usury Law and Liquidated Damages in Sale of Goods Transactions, 10 Golden Gate L. Rev. 553 (1980)*

Sporn, *How to Avoid Usury Problems in Sales of Business Purpose Goods,* 25(6) The Practical Lawyer 73 (1979)

[8] Third Party Payments

Andelson and Weiser, *Usury and Third Party Payments: Another View, 51 LA Bar J. 587 (1976)*

Orlanski, *Usury and Third Party Payments,* 50 Lab. Arb. Rep. (BNA) 261 (1975)

[9] Usury Laws in General

Morris, *Consumer Debt and Usury: A New Rationale for Usury, 15 Pepperdine L. Rev. 151 (1988)*

Lobell, *State Usury Laws, 102 Banking L.J. 349 (1985)*

Comment, *The scope of the Corporate Exemption to State Usury Laws,* 3 Ann. Rev. Banking L. 309 (1984)

Comment, *Recent Usury Law Developments, 39 Bus. Law. 1251 (1984)*

Kaplinsky, *Trends Pertaining to the Usury Laws, 38 Bus. Law. 1329 (1983)*

Rich, *Time Price Doctrine in Three-Party Transactions*, 15 UCC L.J. 213 (1983)

Allen & Staaf, *Nexus Between Usury, 'Time Price' and Unconscionability in Installment Sales*, 14 UCC L.J. 219 (1982)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksInterest & UsuryGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureFederal & State InterrelationshipsChoice of LawGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal PreemptionContracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

150 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.108

§ 568.108 Text References

Witkin, Summary of California Law, Vol. 1, *Contracts*, §§ 374-392 (9th ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesUsuryReal Property LawFinancingUsury

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 568.109-568.119

[Reserved]

§§ 568.109[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.120

§ 568.120 Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-3], Recovery of Interest Paid on Loan as Money Had and Received (Indebitatus Assumpsit), and Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Declaring Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Void--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--By Borrower Against Person to Whom Interest Paid

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-3], Recovery of Interest Paid on Loan as Money Had and Received (Indebitatus Assumpsit), and Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Declaring Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Void--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--By Borrower Against Person to Whom Interest Paid

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RECOVERY OF USURIOUS
_____ [*name*],	)	INTEREST AND FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. _____ [*Allege plaintiff's residence and capacity, e.g.,* Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a resident of _____ (*city*), California].

2. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state capacity and residence of defendant or other basis of venue, e.g.,* a resident of _____ County, California *or* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), California].

[3. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times mentioned herein the defendant _____ (*name*) was the agent of the defendant _____ (*name*), and (in doing the things hereafter alleged) was acting within the scope and course of his/her agency and with the permission and consent of his/her codefendant.]

[4. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) defendant _____ (*name*) is the assignee of the right to receive interest payment on the subject contract.]

[*EITHER, if loan was not for personal, family, or household purpose*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff and [defendant] _____ [*name*] entered into a contract in which [defendant] _____ [*name*] promised to loan plaintiff the sum of $_____, for use by plaintiff primarily _____ [*specify purpose, e.g.,* to purchase a computer for business use] and not for a personal, family, or household purpose.

[*OR, if loan was for personal, family, or household purpose*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff and [defendant] _____ [*name*] entered into a contract in which [defendant] _____ [*name*] promised to loan plaintiff the sum of $_____, for use by plaintiff primarily _____ [*specify purpose, e.g.,* to purchase a refrigerator] for a _____ [personal, family, *and/or* household] purpose.

6. Under the terms of the contract, interest payments on the principal were to be made as follows: _____ [*specify, including statement of annual interest rate*].

[*EITHER*]

7. A copy of the contract is attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.

[*OR*]

7. The contract was executed in the form of a promissory note, dated _____ [*date*], a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.

[*EITHER*]

8. The interest payment terms of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are usurious and violate the

California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1(1), which prescribes that a contract in writing for a loan for use primarily for personal, family, or household purposes may not provide for an interest rate that exceeds 10 percent per annum.

[*OR*]

8. The interest payment terms of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are usurious and violate the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1(2),* which prescribes that a contract in writing for a loan for any use other than primarily for personal, family, or household purposes may not provide for an interest rate that exceeds _____ [10 percent per annum *or* five percent per annum plus _____ (*specify applicable rate of Federal Reserve Bank*), which was the applicable rate set by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco on _____ (*set out date that is the 25th day of the month preceding the earlier of the date of execution of contract to make loan or the date of making the loan*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

[9. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of maker of usurious note*) assigned the right to receive interest payments on the subject _____ (contract *or* promissory note) to defendant _____ (*assignee's name*).]

10. On and after _____ [*specify date one year prior to filing complaint*], plaintiff made the following interest payments to defendant(s) _____[*name(s*)] on the _____ [contract *or* promissory note]: _____ [*specify date(s) and amount(s) of payment(s*)]. These payments were in excess of the maximum rate of interest allowed by the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1*, and plaintiff is entitled to recover treble the amount paid pursuant to Section 3(a) of the Statutes of 1919, page lxxxiii, as amended by Section 1 of Chapter 784 of the Statutes of 1970.

[11. On and after _____ (*specify date two years prior to filing complaint*), but before _____ (*specify date one year prior to filing complaint*), plaintiff made the following interest payments to defendant(s) _____ (*name*(*s*)) on the _____ (contract *or* promissory note): _____ (*specify*). These payments were in excess of the maximum rate of interest allowed by the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1*, and plaintiff is entitled to recover the amount paid as money had and received.]

12. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendant _____ [*name*] concerning their respective rights and duties in that plaintiff contends that he/she/it is only obligated to pay defendant _____ [*name*] the principal amount of the loan without interest, and that the interest rate specified in the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] is usurious and should be declared null and void, whereas defendant _____ [*name*] disputes this contention and contends that plaintiff must continue paying both the principal amount and the specified interest rate.

13. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of his/her/its rights and duties, and a declaration that the interest rate provisions of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are null and void, pursuant to the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1* and *Section 2* of the Statutes of 1919, page lxxxiii.

14. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her/its rights and duties under the _____ [contract *or* promissory note].

[15. Plaintiff is entitled to recover attorney's fees against defendant _____ (*name*) in this action

_____ (under paragraph _____ of the _____ (contract *or* promissory note) *or* because defendant _____ (*name*) has been convicted of the felony of loan-sharking).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For the assessment of treble damages against defendant _____ [*name*] in the sum of $_____ [*specify treble the amount of all interest paid to this defendant within the year previous to the filing of the complaint*];

[2. For the assessment of treble damages against defendant _____ (*other defendant's name, to whom payment also made*) in the sum of $_____ (*specify treble the amount of all interest paid to this defendant within the year previous to the filing of the complaint*);]

[3. For the assessment of damages against defendant _____ [*name*] in the sum of $_____ [*specify the amount of all interest paid to this defendant between one and two years of the date of the filing of the complaint*;]

[4. For the assessment of damages against defendant _____ (*other defendant's name, to whom payment also made*) in the sum of $_____ (*specify the amount of all interest paid to this defendant between one and two years of the date of the filing of the complaint*;)]

5. For a declaration that the interest rate provisions of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are null and void and of no force or effect;

[6. For reasonable attorney's fees against defendant _____ (*name*) _____ (in the amount of $_____ *or* according to proof);]

7. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

8. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a borrower to recover treble the amount of interest paid within the one-year period preceding the filing of the complaint, and to obtain a judgment declaring the interest provisions null and void, on the ground that the amount of interest paid under the contract was usurious [Stats. 1919, p. lxxxiii, § 3, as amended by Stats. 1970, Ch 784, § 1 (Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3*); *see Cal. Const., art. XV § 1* (maximum permissible interest rate); *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaratory relief)]. If interest was also paid between one and two years of the filing of the complaint, this form may also be used to recover that interest as money had and received [*see Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 816-817, 221 P.2d 15* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* (two-year statute of limitations)]. For alternative forms for complaints for use in actions seeking a declaratory judgment, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

This form may be adapted for use as an action for reformation of the contract under *Civ. Code § 3399* based on unilateral or mutual mistake, to delete all or part of the usurious provisions. However, this type of request is more likely to be used by the lender, who might request the court to reform the contract to reduce the usurious interest rate to a legal rate of interest, rather than declare the debt to be interest-free [*see, e.g., First American Title Ins. & Trust Co. v. Cook (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 90 Cal. Rptr. 645* (reformation of usurious contract proper when all parties intended to include interest rate that did not exceed maximum permissible rate and inclusion of separate compound interest provision resulted in mutual mistake; compound interest provision deleted while 10 percent rate provision left intact)]. For forms and further discussion, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges:

- The residence and capacity of the parties (Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), (b)* (venue based on residence of defendant), 395.2 (venue for unincorporated association), 395.5 (venue for corporation or association)].

- The existence of an agency relationship among the parties (Paragraph 3).

- Information regarding the assignment of the right to receive payment under the promissory note, if any (Paragraphs 4 and 9).

- The terms and execution of the loan, including the date and place of the signing of the contract, the amount loaned under the contract, whether the loan was to be used by the borrower primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, and the terms of the interest provisions of the contract (Paragraphs 5 and 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (venue when loan not primarily for personal, family, or household purposes), *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (venue when loan primarily for personal, family, or household purposes); *see also Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(1)* (maximum rate when loan is primarily for personal, family, or household purposes), *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(2)* (maximum rate when loan is not primarily for personal, family, or household purposes)].

- That a copy of the contract or promissory note is attached to the complaint as an exhibit (Paragraphs 7).

- That the interest provisions are usurious (first alternative Paragraph 8 if loan was to be primarily used for personal, family, or household purposes [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(1)*], or second alternative Paragraph 8 if loan was not to be used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(2)*].

- The details of all interest payments made during the one-year period prior to the date of the filing of the complaint, including the amount paid, the date on which the payment was made, and the name of the person to whom the payment was made (Paragraph 10) [*see* Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(a); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(a)*].

- The details of any additional interest payments made between one and two years of the date of the filing of the complaint, including the amount of each payment, date of that payment, and payee (Paragraph 11) [*see Stock v. Meek (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 809, 816-817, 221 P.2d 15* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 339(1)* (two-year statute of limitations)].

- Optional allegations that will support a judgment declaring the interest rate provisions as null and void (Paragraphs 12 through 14) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

- That plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees, if applicable (Paragraph 15) [*see § 568.120[4]*].

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

If the plaintiff prevails in the action, he or she is entitled to costs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1032(b)*].

A prevailing plaintiff ordinarily may not recover attorney's fees unless the contract expressly or impliedly provides for attorney's fees [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021*]. However, if the defendant has been convicted of the felony of loan sharking, the plaintiff may recover reasonable attorney's fees regardless of the terms of the contract [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.4*; *see also* Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3(b); West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3(b)* (loan sharking is felony)]. The attorney's fees are fixed by the court, on notice and motion by a party, and are an element of the costs of suit [*see Civ. Code § 1717*]. For further discussion of attorney's fees, see Ch. 174, *Costs and Attorney's Fees* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction

If the language in the form seeking declaratory relief is used, the superior court has jurisdiction of the action, and it cannot be a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7), 589(b)(5), 1060*]. Otherwise, the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*].

In limited civil cases, the caption must identify the case as a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(10)*], and the first page of the paper must state whether or not the demand exceeds $10,000 [*Gov. Code § 72055*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9)* (statement regarding amount of demand must appear "below the character of the action or proceeding")].

[7] Venue

If the loan was to be used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, proper county for the trial of the action

can be, at the plaintiff's option, either the county in which the borrower in fact signed the contract, or the county in which the borrower resided at the time the contract was entered into, or the county in which the borrower resides at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*; *see Fontaine v. Superior Court (CashCall, Inc.) (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 830, 838-840, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607* (statute applies to action by or against consumer, and if any defendant in consumer's action is individual, that is irrelevant to application of statute)]. In any other case--or additionally, in the case of a consumer loan, if the borrower is a plaintiff--the proper county for trial is the county where the defendants or some of them reside at the commencement of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]; and furthermore, a corporation, association, or unincorporated association may be sued in the county in which the contract is made or is to be performed, the obligation arises, the breach occurs, or its principal place of business is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 571, *Venue* .

[8] California Constitution

Maximum interest rates charged on loans or forbearances. *Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1*

[9] California Statutes

Civil and criminal remedies. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 3; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-3*

Award of attorney's fees. *Civ. Code § 1717*

Entitlement to costs and attorney's fees in general. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021*

Entitlement to attorney's fees when losing party convicted of felony. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.4*

Costs. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1032 et seq.*

[10] Cross References

For alternative allegations of agency, capacity, residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms for captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to fax service and filing of papers, see Ch. 264, *Fax Service and Filing of Papers*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms for prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms for verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.121

§ 568.121 Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Interest Provision Null and Void [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Interest Provision Null and Void [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

[*EITHER, if loan was not for personal, family, or household purpose*]

1. Defendant entered into the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] with plaintiff to obtain a loan in the sum of $_____, to be used by defendant primarily _____ [*specify purpose, e.g.,* to purchase a computer for business use] and not for a personal, family, or household purpose.

[*OR, if loan was for personal, family, or household purpose*]

1. Defendant entered into the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] with plaintiff to obtain a loan in the sum of $_____, to be used by defendant primarily _____ [*specify purpose, e.g.,* to purchase a refrigerator] for a _____ [personal, family, *and/or* household] purpose.

2. The interest rate provisions for the debt in the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] provide for an annual interest rate of _____ percent to be paid on the principal[, calculated as follows: _____ (*specify*)].

[*EITHER*]

3. This annual interest rate exceeds the 10 percent maximum rate allowed under the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1(1)* for a contractual loan used primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.

[*OR*]

3. This annual interest rate exceeds the maximum rate allowed under *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1(2)* for a loan for any use other than primarily for personal, family, or household purposes, which permits a maximum interest rate of _____ [*specify interest rate obtained by calculation, e.g.,* 16.5 percent], which represents the sum of five percent per annum plus the Federal Reserve rate of _____ percent that prevailed on _____ [*set out date that is the 25th day of the month preceding the earlier of the date of execution of contract to make loan or the date of making the loan*], for a loan _____ [made *or* contracted for] on _____ [*date*].

[*CONTINUE*]

4. The interest rate provisions for the debt in the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are usurious and, by violating the *California Constitution, Article XV, Section 1*, are null and void under Section 2 of the Statutes of 1919, page lxxxiii. Plaintiff is barred under Section 2 of the Statutes of 1919, page lxxxiii from maintaining this action to recover that interest in any sum.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a breach of contract or specific performance action initiated by a lender of a usurious loan [see *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(b)*]. The form may also be adapted for use as a demurrer to the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*; *see also* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*].

[3] Allegations

This affirmative defense alleges the amount of the usurious loan, the interest rate on the loan, the purpose for which it was to be used, and whether that purpose was a personal, family, or household purpose (Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(1)* (maximum rate when loan is primarily for personal, family, or household purposes), (2) (maximum rate when loan is not primarily for personal, family, or household purposes)]. Alternative paragraphs are provided to state that the interest rate on a loan primarily for a personal, family, or household purpose, or on a loan not primarily for such a purpose, is usurious (Paragraphs 3, respectively) [*see Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1(1)* (maximum rate when loan primarily for personal, family, or household purposes), (2) (maximum rate when loan not primarily for personal, family, or household purposes)]. Finally, the form provides a statement that the interest provisions are null and void, and that the plaintiff may not maintain the action to recover the interest (Paragraph 4) [*see* Stats. 1919, p. lxxxiii, § 2 (Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*)].

For an affirmative defense based on an allegation that the debt does not become due until the full contractual period elapses [*see* Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*], see *§ 568.122*. In an appropriate case, this form and the *form in § 568.122* may be combined.

[4] California Statutes

Borrower obligated to pay principal of loan, even though lender may not maintain action to recover interest. Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code § 1916-2*

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to the format of answers, see Ch. 26, *Answers*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of demurrers, see Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*

See also Comments and References to § 568.120

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.122

§ 568.122 Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Debt Not Due Until Full Contractual Period Elapses [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower--Loan Violates State Constitutional Usury Provisions [Cal. Const., art. XV, § 1]--Debt Not Due Until Full Contractual Period Elapses [Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. Civ. Code § 1916-2]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES:

1. [*Allege amount and purpose of loan. See § 568.121, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Allege interest rate under loan. See § 568.121, Paragraph 2.*]

3. [*Allege constitutional maximum rate. See § 568.121, Paragraphs 3.*]

4. The full period of time for which the loan was contracted does not elapse until _____ [*date*].

5. Section 2 of the Statutes of 1919, page lxxxiii bars plaintiff from declaring the debt under the loan due until that full period of time for which it was contracted has elapsed.

[2] Use of Form

This affirmative defense may be used in an answer to a breach of contract or specific performance action initiated by a lender of a usurious loan [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(b)*]. The form may also be adapted for use in a demurrer to the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*]. In an appropriate case, this form may be combined with the allegations in § 568.121.

[3] Allegations

This affirmative defense alleges that the plaintiff is barred from declaring the debt due (Paragraphs 4 and 5) [*see* Stats. 1919, p. lxxxiii, § 2 (Deering's Annot. Uncod. Measures 1919-1 § 2; West's Annot. *Civ. Code 1916-2*)].

[4] Decisions

Payee entitled to payment of principal sum once debt matures; payee entitled to payment of interest on principal at legal rate from date note matures until payee obtains judgment. *Epstein v. Frank (1981) 125 Cal. App. 3d 111, 123, 177 Cal. Rptr. 831*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 568.120 and 568.121

LexisNexis®

155 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.123

§ 568.123 Complaint for Recovery of Double Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)] and for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] to Declare Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Forfeited--Loan Violates Federal Usury Limits on Loans by State Depository Institutions, Foreign Banks, or Credit Unions [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g), 1831d]

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Double Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Against Payee to Whom Interest Paid [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)] and for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] to Declare Interest Provisions of Loan Contract Forfeited--Loan Violates Federal Usury Limits on Loans by State Depository Institutions, Foreign Banks, or Credit Unions [12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g), 1831d]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RECOVERY OF USURIOUS
_____ [*name*],	)	INTEREST AND FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
Defendant.	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Allege plaintiff's residence and capacity. See § 568.120, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a federally insured _____ [state-chartered depository institution *or* branch of a foreign bank *or* credit union] governed by Title 12 of the United States Code, Section _____[1785(g) *or* 1831d], whose _____ [principal place of business *or* branch office] is located at _____ [*specify address*].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, plaintiff and defendant entered into a contract in which defendant promised to loan plaintiff the sum of $_____.

4. [*Allege interest terms of contract. See § 568.120, Paragraph 6.*]

5. [*State that copy of contract is attached as exhibit. See § 568.120, alternative Paragraphs 7.*]

6. The interest payment terms of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] equal an annual rate of _____ percent. These terms are usurious because they violate Title 12 of the United States Code, Section _____ [1785(g)(1) *or* 1831d(a)], because they provide for an interest rate that is more than 1 percent in excess of _____ [*specify amount of rate*], which is the discount rate _____ [on 90-day commercial paper in effect at the Federal Reserve Bank of _____ (*specify district in which lender is located*) *or, if greater,* provided under _____ (*specify state law allowing rate greater than allowed by Federal Reserve Bank district)*].

7. On and after _____ [*specify date two years prior to filing complaint*], plaintiff made the following interest payments to defendant on the _____ [contract *or* promissory note]: _____ [*specify*]. Plaintiff is entitled to recover double the amount of these payments, pursuant to Title 12 of the United States Code, Section _____ [1785(g)(2) *or* 1831d(b)].

8. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff and defendant concerning their respective rights and duties in that plaintiff contends that he/she/it is only obligated to pay defendant the principal amount of the loan without interest, and that the interest rate specified in the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] is usurious and should be declared forfeited, whereas defendant disputes this contention and contends that plaintiff must continue paying both the principal amount and the specified interest rate.

9. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of his/her/its rights and duties, and a declaration that the interest rate provisions of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are forfeited, pursuant to Title 12 of the United States Code, Section _____ [1785(g)(2) *or* 1831d(b)].

10. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her/its rights and duties under the _____ [contract *or* promissory note].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For damages equal to double the amount of interest paid, in the sum of $_____ [*specify double the amount of all interest paid to this defendant within the two-year period prior to the filing of the complaint*];

2. For a declaration that the interest rate provisions of the _____ [contract *or* promissory note] are forfeited and no longer of any force or effect;

[3. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ (of $_____ *or* according to proof);]

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 568.120.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use to recover double the amount of interest that has been paid to a federally insured state-chartered depository institution (including a savings bank), a foreign bank branch, or a credit union pursuant to a contract or promissory note for a loan containing interest rate provisions that violate *12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)* or *1831d*, and for a judgment declaring the interest rate provisions to be forfeited [*see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The status of the defendant as a financial institution covered by the federal law limits on interest rates (Paragraph 2) [*see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g), 1831d* (usury provisions for certain federal institutions); *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (venue for corporations or associations)].

- The date and place of execution of the contract, and the amount of the loan (Paragraph 3) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (venue for corporations or associations)].

- The usurious nature of the contract (Paragraph 6) [*see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g), 1831d*].

- An accounting of all interest payments made within the two-year period prior to the filing of the complaint (Paragraph 7) [*see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)* (double recovery of payments)].

- The necessary statements for obtaining a declaratory judgment that the interest rate provisions are forfeited (Paragraphs 8 through 10) [*see 12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)* (forfeiture of usurious provisions); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1060* (declaratory relief); *see also* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

[4] Jurisdiction

The civil action must be brought in a court of appropriate jurisdiction, within two years after the date of the payment [*12 U.S.C. §§ 1785(g)(2), 1831d(b)*]. Either federal or state court may be a court of appropriate jurisdiction [*see 28 U.S.C. § 1331*; *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86, 116.220*]. This complaint must be adapted for use if the plaintiff wishes to proceed in federal court.

Declaratory relief actions must be brought in superior court, and may not be filed as limited civil cases [*Code Civ. Proc §§ 86(a)(7), 580(b)(5), 1060*]. Thus this form, when used in its entirety, may not be filed as a limited civil case, regardless of the amount of damages requested. In order to use this form in a limited civil case (amount in controversy less than $25,000), the declaratory relief allegations in this form must be deleted [*see Code Civ. Proc §§ 85, 86(a)(1),*

580(b)(5), 1060]. However, a declaratory relief action may be filed as a limited civil case when filed by way of cross complaint as to a right of indemnity with respect to the relief demanded in the complaint or a cross complaint in an action or proceeding that is otherwise a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc § 86(a)(7)(B)*].

[5] Federal Statutes

Maximum interest rates charged by credit unions. *12 U.S.C. § 1785(g)*

Maximum interest rates charged by federally insured state depository institutions and foreign bank branches. *12 U.S.C. § 1831d*

Federal question jurisdiction. *28 U.S.C. § 1331*

[6] California Constitution

Superior court jurisdiction. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

[7] California Statutes

Limited civil cases. *Code Civ. Proc. § 85, 86*

[8] Cross References

See also Comments and References to § 568.120

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.124

§ 568.124 Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246]--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246]--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RECOVERY OF USURIOUS
_____ [*name*],	)	[INTEREST *and/or* CHARGES]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Allege plaintiff's residence and capacity. See § 568.120, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Allege defendant's residence and capacity. See § 568.120, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Allege agency, if appropriate. See § 568.120, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Allege assignment, if appropriate. See § 568.120, Paragraph 4.*]

5. [Defendant] _____ [*real estate broker's name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a real estate broker duly licensed by the state of California.

6. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, [defendant] _____ [*real estate broker's name*] _____ [made *or* arranged] a loan secured by a dwelling for plaintiff, under the following circumstances: _____ [*specify*].

[7. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant _____ (*real estate broker's name*), as compensation for said defendant's services as described above, entered into a contract under which plaintiff promised to pay said defendant the following _____ (brokerage *or* commissions *or* loan origination fees, points, bonuses, and other charges in lieu of interest): _____ (*specify*). A copy of this contract is attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.]

8. As a result of the actions of [defendant] _____ [*real estate broker's name*], plaintiff and [defendant] _____ [*lender's name*] entered into a contract in which [defendant] _____ [*lender's name*] promised to loan plaintiff the sum of $_____, secured by a dwelling, under the following terms: _____ [*specify all terms, including interest provisions, any trust deeds or liens junior to trust deed, any usurious prepayment charges, and any usurious costs and expenses for appraisal fees, escrow fees, notary fees, and credit investigation fees*].

9. [*State that copy of loan contract is attached as exhibit. See § 568.120, alternative Paragraphs 7.*]

10. The charges imposed for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* appraisal and escrow fees, and for the commission for defendant _____ (*real estate broker's name*)], exceed the maximum limit allowed by Business and Professions Code Section(s) _____ [*specify section or sections, e.g.,* 10242].

[11. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*assignor's name*) assigned the right to receive payment of the _____ (*specify*) charges to defendant _____ (*assignee's name*).]

12. On and after _____ [*specify date two years prior to filing complaint*], plaintiff made the following payments to defendant(s) _____ [*name*(*s*)]: _____ [*specify, listing each charge paid, person to whom paid, and date paid*].

13. Plaintiff is entitled to recover treble the amount of these charges paid and is entitled to costs and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to *Section 10246 of the Business and Professions Code*.

14. Plaintiff has not sought relief pursuant to *Section 10248.2 of the Business and Professions Code*.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) _____ [*name(s*)] as follows:

1. For the assessment of treble damages against defendant _____ [*name*] in the sum of $_____ [*specify treble the amount of all charges paid to this defendant within the two years prior to the filing of the complaint*];

[2. For the assessment of treble damages against defendant _____ (*other defendant's name, to whom payment also made*) in the sum of $_____ (*specify treble the amount of all charges paid to this defendant within the two years prior to the filing of the complaint*);]

3. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ [of $_____ *or* according to proof];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 568.120.*]

CAUTION:

This form may not be used if the alternative demand procedure prescribed by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2* has been or will be employed. Use § 568.125 to initiate the demand procedure, and § 568.126 to institute an action at law if the demand is unsatisfied within 20 days of service [see *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2*].

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use to recover treble the amount of usurious charges paid with respect to a loan secured by a dwelling that is made or arranged by a real estate broker pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.*, other than a loan for $30,000 or more if secured by a first trust deed or $10,000 or more if secured by any lien junior to a trust deed [see *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240.1, 10245, 10246*].

If the usurious charges were levied as the result of a bona fide error, only the amount actually paid may be recovered [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The nature of the relationship between the plaintiff and the real estate broker, including the terms of any usurious contract between them (Paragraphs 6 and 7) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*].

- The terms of the loan contract (Paragraph 8) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10242-10242.6*].

- The usurious nature of the loan charges (Paragraph 10) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10242-10242.6, 10246*].

- The assignment of the loan, if any (Paragraph 11).

- A listing of all usurious charges that were paid within the two-year period preceding the filing of the complaint (Paragraph 12).

- That the plaintiff is entitled to receive treble the amount of the charges paid as damages, as well as costs and reasonable attorney's fees (Paragraph 13) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*].

- That relief has not been sought under the alternative demand procedure [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2*].

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

The prevailing plaintiff is entitled to recover both costs and reasonable attorney's fees [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246*].

[5] California Statutes

Real estate broker usury laws. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3*

[6] Cross References

See also Comments and References to Forms 1, 6, and 7

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.125

§ 568.125 Demand Letter for Recovery of Real Estate Broker's Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative Procedure to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.]

[1] FORM Demand Letter for Recovery of Real Estate Broker's Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative Procedure to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.]

_____ [*Name and address of borrower's attorney*]

_____ [*Name and address of lender*]

Re: _____ [*Give short identification of contract with lender*]

Dear _____ [*Lender's name*]:

On _____ [*date*], you and my client, _____ [*borrower's name*], entered into a contract under which my client became obligated to pay you $_____ as a _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission] for negotiating a loan in the amount of $_____ and secured _____ [directly *or* collaterally] _____ [in whole or in part by a first trust deed *or* by a trust deed other than a first trust deed] and for a term of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* less than three years].

The _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission] exceeds [five *or* 10 *or* 15] percent of the principal amount of the loan, and as such exceeds the maximum amount that may be charged for such a fee as prescribed by *Section 10242(b) of the Business and Professions Code*.

To date, my client has paid you the sum of $_____, as payment for your _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission] pursuant to the contract. [As a result of this payment, my client has suffered actual

damages in the amount of $_____.]

My client hereby demands that you return this $_____. If this amount is not returned to my client within 20 days of the _____ [personal delivery *or* date of the mailing] of this letter, my client will be forced to commence an action at law pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)* to recover either the amount of actual damages or twice the excessive fees, whichever is greater.

Sincerely,

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [*borrower's name*]

CAUTION:

This procedure may not be employed if the borrower has already commenced an action for treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. If such an action is preferred, use § 568.124 rather than this form; see also *§ 568.126*.

[2] Use of Form

This demand letter is for use by a borrower to demand the return of a real estate broker's bonus, brokerage, or commission for negotiation of a loan secured by a dwelling [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. The form may only be used if the loan was other than a loan for $30,000 or more if secured by a first trust deed or $10,000 or more if secured by any lien junior to a trust deed [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10245*].

If the demanded amount is not returned to the borrower within 20 days of service of the letter, the borrower may commence an action at law to recover actual damages or twice the amount paid, whichever is greater [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. In this case, use the *form in § 568.126* to draft an appropriate complaint.

[3] Contents

This demand letter describes the bonus, brokerage, or commission contract, the loan contract, whether the loan was se cured directly or collaterally, in whole or in part by a first trust deed or by a trust deed other than a first trust deed, and the length of the term of the loan [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)*]. The demand letter then alleges that the bonus, brokerage, or commission exceeds the maximum amount that may be charged by the real estate broker [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)*]. Finally, the letter sets forth the amount paid by the borrower, the amount of actual damages suffered by the borrower if greater, and a demand for the return of the bonus, brokerage, or commission within 20 days of service of the letter [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

The bonus, brokerage, or commission may not exceed five percent of the principal amount of the loan if the loan is secured by a first trust deed and its term is less than three years [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)(1)*], or if the loan is secured by a trust deed other than a first trust deed and its term is less than two years [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)(2)*]. The bonus, brokerage, or commission may not exceed 10 percent of the principal amount of the loan if the loan is secured by a first trust deed and its term is three years or more [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)(1)*], or if the loan is secured by a trust deed other than a first trust deed and its term is between two and three years [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)(2)*]. The bonus, brokerage, or commission may not exceed 15 percent of the principal amount of the loan if the loan is secured by a trust deed other than a first trust deed and its term is three years or more [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(b)(2)*].

[4] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 568.124 and 568.126

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.126

§ 568.126 Complaint for Recovery of Actual Damages or Double Amount of Usurious Charges When Real Estate Broker Fails to Return Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days of Service of Demand Letter [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

[1] FORM Complaint for Recovery of Actual Damages or Double Amount of Usurious Charges When Real Estate Broker Fails to Return Bonus, Brokerage, or Commission Within 20 Days of Service of Demand Letter [Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)]--Alternative to Complaint for Recovery of Treble Amount of Interest Paid on Loan Secured by Dwelling--By Borrower Against Payee to Whom Interest or Charge Paid--Loan Violates State Real Estate Broker Usury Laws [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10240-10248.3]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RECOVERY OF USURIOUS
_____ [*name*],	)	_____[BONUS *or* BROKERAGE
Defendant.	)	*or* COMMISSION]
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Allege plaintiff's residence and capacity. See § 568.120, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant _____ [*name, and if venue so based, residence*] is, and at all times herein mentioned

was, a real estate broker duly licensed by the state of California.

3. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], California, defendant negotiated a loan secured by a dwelling for plaintiff, under the following circumstances: _____ [*specify*].

4. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff and defendant, as compensation for said defendant's services as described above, entered into a contract under which plaintiff promised to pay said defendant the following _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission]: _____ [*specify*]. A copy of this contract is attached as Exhibit A, and incorporated by reference.

5. As a result of the actions of defendant, plaintiff and _____ [*lender's name*] entered into a contract in which _____ [*lender's name*] promised to loan plaintiff the sum of $_____, secured _____ [directly *or* collaterally] _____ [in whole or in part by a first trust deed *or* by a trust deed other than a first trust deed] on a dwelling and for a term of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* less than three years].

6. [*State that copy of loan contract is attached as exhibit. See § 568.120, alternative Paragraphs 7.*]

7. The _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission] exceeds _____ [five *or* 10 *or* 15] percent of the principal amount of the loan, and as such exceeds the maximum amount that may be charged for such a fee as prescribed by *Section 10242(b) of the Business and Professions Code*.

8. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff paid the sum of $_____ to defendant, for the _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission].

[9. As a result of the payment of the $_____ to defendant for the _____ (bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission), plaintiff has suffered actual damages in the amount of $_____, as follows: _____ (*specify*).]

10. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [personally delivered *or* mailed] to defendant a letter demanding the return of the $_____ that had been paid to defendant for the _____ [bonus *or* brokerage *or* commission]. The demand letter stated that the $_____ must be returned within 20 days of the _____ [personal delivery *or* date of the mailing] of the letter, or the plaintiff would be forced to commence an action at law pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)* to recover either the amount of actual damages or twice the excessive fees paid, whichever is greater.

11. Defendant failed to return the $_____ within the aforementioned 20-day period. Plaintiff is entitled to recover either the amount of actual damages or twice the excessive fees paid, whichever is greater and is entitled to costs and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to *Section 10248.2(b) of the Business and Professions Code*.

12. Plaintiff has not sought relief pursuant to *Section 10246 of the Business and Professions Code*.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant as follows:

1. For the assessment of [actual damages or] double the amount of the fees paid against defendant, _____ [in the amount of $_____ *or* whichever is greater];

2. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ [of $_____ *or* according to proof];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 568.120.*]

CAUTION:
This procedure may not be employed if the borrower has already commenced an action for treble damages under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10246* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. If such an action is preferred, use § 568.124 to draft the appropriate complaint.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a borrower to recover the greater of actual damages or double the amount of a bonus, brokerage, or commission paid to a real estate broker for negotiation of a loan secured by a dwelling, after the broker has failed to return the fee within 20 days of the service of a demand letter [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*]. The form may only be used if the loan was other than a loan for $30,000 or more if secured by a first trust deed or $20,000 or more if secured by any lien junior to a trust deed [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10245*]. For a form for a demand letter, see *§ 568.125*.

The action must be commenced within two years after the loan has matured [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(d)*].

The real estate broker will not be held liable if he or she shows by a preponderance of evidence that the usurious charge was unintentional and the result of a bona fide error [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The identity and capacity of the real estate broker, and his or her residence if venue is so based (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395(a), (b)* (venue based on residence of defendant)].

- The nature of the relationship between the plaintiff and the real estate broker, and the terms of the usurious contract between them (Paragraphs 3 and 4) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*].

- A description of the loan contract (Paragraph 5) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*].

- The usurious nature of the bonus, brokerage, or commission (Paragraph 7) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10242(c)*].

- The amount paid for the usurious charge, and the amount of actual damages if appropriate (Paragraphs 8 and 9) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

- The delivery or mailing of a demand letter to defendant, and the failure of the defendant to comply with the demand (Paragraphs 10 and 11) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

- A statement that plaintiff has not sought relief pursuant to Section 10246 (Paragraph 12) [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

[4] Costs and Attorney's Fees

The prevailing plaintiff is entitled to recover both costs and reasonable attorney's fees [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10248.2(b)*].

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to Forms 1, 5, and 6

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.127

§ 568.127 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22651(a)] or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24651(a)]--Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Interest or Charges for Nonwillful Violation [Fin. Code §§ 22651(a), 24651(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22651(a)] or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24651(a)]--Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Interest or Charges for Nonwillful Violation [Fin. Code §§ 22651(a), 24651(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], defendant alleges that:

1. Defendant entered into the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] with plaintiff to obtain a loan in the sum of $_____.

2. Plaintiff is a _____ [personal property broker *or* consumer finance lender] governed by Sections _____ [22000-22654 *if personal property broker or* 24000-24654 *for consumer finance lender*] of the Financial Code.

[*EITHER*]

3. The terms of the loan to defendant violate the provisions of Section(s) _____ [*specify*] of the Financial Code, as evidenced by the following: _____ [*specify*].

[*OR*]

3. The _____ [interest rate *and/or* fees] charged under the terms of the loan to defendant is/are _____ [*specify rate or manner in which rates or fees are calculated*]. This/these _____ [interest rate *or* fees] is/are in excess of the rate allowed by Section(s) _____ [*specify*] of the Financial Code.

[*CONTINUE*]

4. Since the terms of the loan violate Section(s) _____[*specify*] of the Financial Code, pursuant to Section [22651(a) *if personal property broker or* 24651(a) *for consumer finance lender*] of the Financial Code plaintiff must forfeit all interest and charges on the loan.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an affirmative defense that may be used in an answer to a breach of contract or specific performance action initiated by a usurious lender who is a personal property broker or consumer finance lender if the lender seeks to recover interest and/or charges on the loan, and the violation is not willful [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*; *Fin. Code §§ 22651(a)* (personal property brokers), 24651(a) (consumer finance lenders)].

The defense is not available if the broker or lender shows by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation was unintentional and due to a bona fide error in computation, notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adapted to avoid such error, and if, within 60 days of discovering the error, the lender notified the borrower of the error, and made all necessary corrections to the account [*Fin. Code §§ 22651(b), 24651(b)*].

For an affirmative defense to an action based on a willful violation, see *§ 568.128* (lender unable to collect or receive principal, interest, or charges).

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The amount of the loan (Paragraph 1).
- The fact that the plaintiff is a personal property broker or consumer finance lender governed by *Fin. Code §§ 22000-22654* or *24000-24654* (Paragraph 2).
- The usurious nature of the loan (alternative Paragraphs 3) [*see Fin. Code §§ 22053, 22053.1, 22450-22482, 24053, 24053.1, 24450-24482*].
- The requirement that the plaintiff forfeit all interest and charges on the loan (Paragraph 4) [*see Fin. Code §§ 22651(a), 24651(a)*].

[4] California Statutes

[a] Consumer Finance Lenders

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 24000-24654*

Effect of usurious contract if violation is not willful. *Fin. Code § 24651*

[b] Personal Property Brokers

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 22000-22654*

Effect of usurious contract if violation is not willful. *Fin. Code § 22651*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 568.121 and 568.128

160 of 160 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 568 USURY
PART IV. FORMS

50-568 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 568.128

§ 568.128 Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Industrial Loan Company [Fin. Code § 18439], Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22650(a)], or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24650(a)]--Contract Void and Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Principal, Interest, or Charges [Fin. Code §§ 18439, 22650(a), 24650(a)]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)] to Action Based on Usurious Contract--By Borrower Sued by Industrial Loan Company [Fin. Code § 18439], Personal Property Broker [Fin. Code § 22650(a)], or Consumer Finance Lender [Fin. Code § 24650(a)]--Contract Void and Lender Unable to Collect or Receive Principal, Interest, or Charges [Fin. Code §§ 18439, 22650(a), 24650(a)]

AS A SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE, defendant alleges:

1. Defendant entered into the subject _____ [contract *or* promissory note] with plaintiff to obtain a loan in the sum of $_____.

2. Plaintiff is a[n] _____ [industrial loan company *or* personal property broker *or* consumer finance lender] governed by Sections _____ [18000-18643 *if industrial loan company*, 22000-22654 *if personal property broker, or* 24000-24654 *if consumer finance lender*] of the Financial Code.

[*EITHER*]

3. The terms of the loan to defendant violate the provisions of Section(s) _____ [*specify*] of the Financial Code, as evidenced by the following: _____ [*specify*].

[*OR*]

3. The _____ [interest rate *and/or* fees] charged under the terms of the loan to defendant is/are _____ [*specify rate or manner in which rates or fees are calculated*]. This/these

_____ [interest rate *or* fees] is/are in excess of the rate allowed by Section(s) _____ [*specify*] of the Financial Code.

[*CONTINUE*]

[4. *If plaintiff is personal property broker or consumer finance lender, allege:* In violating Section(s) _____ (*specify*) of the Financial Code, plaintiff did so willfully.]

[*EITHER, if plaintiff is industrial loan company*]

5. Since the terms of the loan violate Section(s) _____[*specify*] of the Financial Code, pursuant to *Section 18439 of the Financial Code* the entire contract of loan is void, and plaintiff has no right to collect or receive any principal, interest, or charges in connection with the transaction.

[*OR, if plaintiff is personal property broker or consumer finance lender*]

5. Since plaintiff has willfully violated Section(s) _____[*specify*] of the Financial Code pursuant to Section _____ [22650(a) *if personal property broker or* 24650(a) *if consumer finance lender*] of the Financial Code, the entire contract is void, and plaintiff has no right to collect or receive any principal, charges, or recompense in connection with the transaction.

[2] Use of Form

This form is an affirmative defense that may be used in an answer to a breach of contract or specific performance action initiated by a usurious lender who is an industrial loan company, personal property broker, or consumer finance lender [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)*; *Fin. Code §§ 18439* (industrial loan companies), 22650(a) (personal property brokers), 24650(a) (consumer finance lenders)]. The form may also be adapted for use as a demurrer to the action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*].

If the plaintiff is a personal property broker or consumer finance lender, the defense is available only when the violation is willful [*see Fin. Code §§ 22650(a)* (personal property brokers), 24650(a) (consumer finance lenders)]. If the violation is not willful, the lender must forfeit all interest and charges, but may collect or receive the principal amount of the loan [*see Fin. Code §§ 22651(a)* (personal property brokers), 24651(a) (consumer finance lenders)]. For an affirmative defense to an action based on a usurious contract when the violation is not willful, see *§ 568.127*.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- The amount of the loan (Paragraph 1).

- The fact that the plaintiff is an industrial loan company, personal property broker, or consumer finance lender governed by *Fin. Code §§ 18000-18643*, *22000-22654*, or *24000-24654* (Paragraph 2).

- The usurious nature of the loan (alternative Paragraphs 3) [*see Fin. Code §§ 18212*, *18212.1*, *18300*, *18625-18631*, *18702*, *22053*, *22053.1*, *22450-22482*, *24053*, *24053.1*, *24450-24482*].

- The fact that the violation by the plaintiff was willful, as required if the plaintiff is a personal property broker or consumer finance lender (Paragraph 4).

- The void nature of the contract, and the bar to plaintiff to collect or receive any principal, interest, charges, or recompense in connection with the transaction (Paragraph 5) [*see Fin. Code §§ 18439, 22650(a), 24650(a)*].

[4] California Statutes

[a] Consumer Finance Lenders

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 24000-24654*

Effect of usurious contract if violation is willful. *Fin. Code § 24650(a)*

[b] Industrial Loan Companies

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 18000-18643*

Effect of usurious charge. *Fin. Code § 18439*

[c] Personal Property Brokers

Governing law. *Fin. Code §§ 22000-22654*

Effect of usurious contract if violation is willful. *Fin. Code § 22650(a)*

[5] Cross References

See also Comments and References to §§ 568.121 and 568.127

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 569.syn

§ 569.syn Synopsis to Chapter 569: VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY

§ 569.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 569.02 Cross References

§§ 569.03-569.09 [Reserved]

§ 569.10 Governing Law and Definitions

§ 569.11 Residential Seller's Duty of Disclosure

[1] When Required; Legislative Intent

[2] Exempt Transactions

[3] Disclosure Form

[a] Statutory "Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement"

[b] City or County Requirements

[c] Approximate Disclosures

[4] Delivery of Disclosure Statement

[5] Amendment After Delivery

[6] Noncompliance

[a] Seller's Liability Generally

[b] Validity of Transfer

[c] Errors and Omissions

[d] Professional Reports and Opinions in Lieu of Disclosure

[e] Public Agency's or Other Person's Information in Lieu of Disclosure

[f] Subsequent Inaccuracy of Information

[g] Waiver by Purchaser

§ 569.12 Natural Hazard Disclosures

[1] Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement

[2] Exempted Transactions

[3] Delivery and Confirmation of Disclosure Statement

[4] Delivery of Information By Public Agency, Other Person, or Expert

[5] Transferee's Right to Rescind Transaction

[6] Amendment to Disclosure Statement; Subsequent Changes in Information

[7] Liability of Transferor and Real Estate Agents; Third Party Reliance on Statement

[8] Effect of Noncompliance; Good Faith Requirement

[9] Relationship to Other Disclosure Requirements

[10] Special Instructions for Completing Form

[11] Special Flood Hazard Area

[12] Area of Potential Flooding

[13] Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

[14] Delineated Earthquake Fault Zone

[15] Seismic Hazard Zone

[16] Wildland Fire Zone

§ 569.13 Residential Vendor's Special Duties of Disclosure

[1] Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act and Assessment Installments Under Improvement Bond Act of 1915

[2] Supplemental Property Tax Bills

[3] Former Ordnance Location

[4] Industrial Use Zoning

[5] Registered Sex Offenders Data Base

[6] Arranged Credit

[7] Noncompliant Plumbing Fixtures (Pre-1994 Residential Property)

§ 569.14 Liability for Failure to Disclose Presence of Hazardous Substance

§ 569.15 Disclosures Regarding Environmental and Earthquake Hazards

[1] Environmental Hazards

[a] Consumer Information Booklet

[b] Toxic Mold Protection Act

[c] Local Health Officer's Order Prohibiting Use or Occupancy

[2] Earthquake Hazards Generally

[3] Earthquake Hazards of Certain Residential Property

[a] Disclosure Requirement

[b] Contents of Disclosure

[c] Exempt Transfers

[d] Retrofit Standards

§ 569.16 Private Transfer-Fee Requirement

§ 569.16A Sale Cannot Be Conditioned on Purchase of Title Insurance

§ 569.17 Expiration of Rights Under Unperformed Recorded Contract of Sale

§ 569.18 Duty to Execute Release

§ 569.19 Expiration of Record of Expired Option

§ 569.20 Risk of Loss

§ 569.21 Formation and Breach of Contract

[1] In General

[2] Performance or Excuse of Conditions

§ 569.22 Purchaser's Remedies

[1] In General

[2] Purchaser's Remedies to Gain Possession

[3] Purchaser's Damages for Breach of Contract

[4] Purchaser's Right to Specific Performance

[5] Purchaser's Enforcement of Liquidated Damage Clause

[6] Purchaser's Damages for Fraud

[7] Purchaser's Right to Rescission

§ 569.23 Protection From Foreclosure for Active Duty Service Members Under California and Federal Law

[1] Purpose and Application of Protections

[2] Actions for Foreclose on Mortgage or Deed of Trust

[3] Actions to Rescind or Terminate Contract for Purchase

§ 569.24 Vendor's Remedies

[1] Consideration; Election of Remedies

[2] To Remove Clouds on Title Created by Purchaser's Claims

[3] To Regain Possession

[4] Vendor's Damages for Breach of Contract

[5] Vendor's Right to Specific Performance

[6] Vendor's Retention of Deposit

[a] Under Liquidated Damages Clause

[i] Residential Property

[ii] Nonresidential Property

[b] Absent Liquidated Damages Clause

[7] Vendor's Right to Rescission

[a] Grounds

[b] Procedure

[c] Cancellation and Rescission Distinguished

[8] Vendor's Damages for Fraud

[9] Action for Unlawful "Rent Skimming"

§ 569.25 Declaratory Relief

§ 569.26 Reformation

§ 569.27 Options and Preemptive Rights

§§ 569.28-569.59 [Reserved]

§ 569.60 Governing Law

§ 569.61 Installment Sales Contract--Definition

§ 569.62 Disclosure Requirements

§ 569.63 Transfer of Contract and Fee Must Coincide

§ 569.64 Tax and Term Statement

§ 569.65 Encumbrances Prohibited

§ 569.66 Misuse of Payments Prohibited

§ 569.67 California Veteran Loans

§§ 569.68-569.79 [Reserved]

§ 569.80 Reinstatement Under Power of Sale in Contract

§§ 569.81-569.99 [Reserved]

§ 569.100 Installment Purchaser's Remedies

[1] In General

[2] Restitution

[3] Redemption or Specific Performance

[a] Judicial Recognition of Right

[b] Procedure for Asserting Right

[c] Time for Asserting Right

[4] Reinstatement

§ 569.101 Money Judgment Prohibited as Deficiency

§ 569.102 Unlawful Detainer Unavailable

§ 569.103 Judicial Sale

§ 569.104 Installment Vendor's Remedies

[1] In General

[2] Quiet Title

[3] Limitations on Installment Vendor's Damages

[a] Election of Measure

[b] Rental Value Measure

[c] Contract Measure

[d] Incidental Damages

§§ 569.105-569.119 [Reserved]

§ 569.120 California Real Estate

§ 569.121 Federal Statutes

§ 569.122 State Statutes

[1] In General

[2] Agents

[3] Damages and Remedies

[4] Disclosures and Informational Requirements

[5] Options

§ 569.123 Decisions

[1] In General

[2] Arbitration

[3] Conditions Precedent

[4] Damages

[a] Measure

[b] Recoverable by Defaulting Purchaser

[c] Damages Recoverable by Vendor for Breach of Contract

[5] Duty of Disclosure

[6] Fraud

[7] Implied Covenants

[8] Liquidated Damage Clause

[9] Options

[10] Preemptive Rights

[11] Right of First Refusal

[12] Subdivision Map Act

[13] Subordination of Seller's Purchase Money Lien

[14] Risk of Loss

[15] Time Essence; Delays Not Amounting to Breach

[16] Vendor's Election of Remedies

[17] Warranties

§ 569.124 Law Reviews

§§ 569.125-569.139 [Reserved]

§ 569.140 State Statutes

§ 569.141 Decisions

§§ 569.142-569.159 [Reserved]

§ 569.160 Complaint by Vendor--To Establish and Foreclose Vendor's Lien [Civ. Code § 3046]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Establishing Lien Without Foreclosing

[4] Allegations

[5] Verification

[6] Jurisdiction

[7] Venue

[8] Statute of Limitations

[9] Waiver of Lien

[10] Statutes

[11] Decisions

[a] In General

[b] Priorities

[12] Cross References

§ 569.161 Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Purchase Real Property [Civ. Code § 3307]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[a] Vendor's Performance or Excuse

[b] Consequential Damages

[i] In General

[ii] Broker's Fees

[iii] Loss of Income

[iv] Purchase of Other Residence

[c] Difference in Value Damages

[7] Cross References

§ 569.162 Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Fraud in the Purchase or Exchange of Real Property [Civ. Code § 3343]--Or in the Alternative, for Rescission [Civ. Code § 1692] and Cancellation [Civ. Code § 3412]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Parties

[4] Allegations

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[a] Attorney's Fees

[b] Cancellation

[c] Misrepresentations as to Value of Consideration Given by Purchaser

[d] Subordination of Purchase Money Deed of Trust

[e] Right to Rescission

[8] Cross References

§ 569.163 Complaint by Purchaser--To Establish and Foreclose Purchaser's Lien For Amount Paid Toward Purchase Price [Civ. Code § 3050]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Priority of Lien

[4] Allegations

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 569.164 Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Sell Real Property [Civ. Code § 3306]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Breach of Collateral Promise

[4] Allegations

[5] Allegations Regarding Vendor Financing

[6] State Statutes

[7] Decisions

[a] Damages for Breach of Collateral Promise

[b] Damages for Failure to Convey

[c] When Performance or Tender Necessary

[d] Who May Waive Particular Conditions

[8] Cross References

§ 569.165 Complaint by Purchaser--For Specific Performance of Contract to Convey Real Property [Civ. Code §§ 3384, 3387]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Laches and Limitations

[6] Lis Pendens

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[a] In General

[b] Decree and Incidental Adjustments

[c] Options

[d] Specific Performance Properly Denied

[e] Description

[9] Cross References

§ 569.166 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Make Required Disclosures [Civ. Code § 1102]--By Purchaser Against Vendor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Statute of Limitations

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 569.167 Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Failure to Provide Written Notice of Hazardous Substance on Property--Against Vendor or Landlord of Nonresidential Real Property [Health & Safety Code § 25359.7(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 569.168 Complaint by Purchaser--For Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692] for Purchase and Sale of Real Property, for Cancellation of Instrument [Civ. Code § 3412], and for Exemplary Damages [Civ. Code § 3294(a), (c)] and Attorney's Fees [Civ. Code § 1717]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Parties

[4] Allegations

[5] Jurisdiction

[6] Venue

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[a] Grounds for Fraud or Rescission

[b] Particular Relief

[9] Cross References

§ 569.169 Complaint by Purchaser or Optionee--For Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Seeking Declaration That Contract or Option to Purchase Real Property Is in Full Force and Effect

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Decisions

[6] Text References

[7] Cross References

§§ 569.170-569.189 [Reserved]

§ 569.190 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Purchaser's Rights of Redemption, Reinstatement; Notice of Election

[4] Allegations

[5] Additional Defendants

[6] Verification

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

[8] Lis Pendens

[9] Decisions

[10] Cross References

§ 569.191 Interlocutory Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against

Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Reinstatement [Civ. Code § 3275] or Redemption, or in the Alternative, Quieting Vendor's Title on Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Judgment

[4] Notice of Judgment

[5] Effect of Judgment

[6] Procedure for Obtaining Final Judgment

[7] State Statutes

[8] Decisions

[9] Cross References

§ 569.192 Conditional Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 569.193 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Relief From Forfeiture [Civ. Code § 3275] by Allowing Reinstatement of Contract--By Purchaser

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 569.194 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Redemption of Purchaser's Interest Under the Contract

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 569.195 Complaint Under Installment Sales Contract--For Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369] by Purchaser

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Venue

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART I. SCOPE

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.01

§ 569.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses provisions relating to transfers of real property, including vendor's and purchaser's liens, options, installment sales contracts, and the expiration of rights under unperformed recorded contracts for the transfer of real property. It includes coverage of disclosure requirements and damage provisions unique to real property transactions, provides forms of complaints by which buyers and sellers of real property may enforce their rights, and discusses the most common alternative remedies available to vendors and purchasers. It contains the following forms:

- Complaints by a vendor to enforce a statutory lien to obtain unpaid purchase money, for damages for breach of contract or fraud, or for rescission and cancellation [*see §§ 569.160 -569.162*].

- Complaints by a purchaser to obtain unrefunded amounts paid under a contract, for damages for breach of contract or failure to comply with statutory disclosure or notice requirements, for specific performance, for rescission and cancellation, or for declaratory relief to establish that a contract or option remains in force [*see §§ 569.163 -569.169*].

This chapter also discusses special remedies, rights, and duties of vendors and purchasers peculiar to real property installment sales contracts. The remedies, rights, and duties, with few exceptions such as *Civ. Code §§ 1675-1681* relating to liquidated damages, are of a general nature and also apply to vendors and purchasers using installment sales contracts. The chapter also contains forms for use by vendors and purchasers under installment contracts [*see §§ 569.190 -569.195*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART I. SCOPE

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.02

§ 569.02 Cross References

Other chapters that discuss and contain forms relating to specific aspects of real property transfers include the following:

- Ch. 103, *Brokers*.
- Ch. 104, *Building Contracts*.
- Ch. 184, *Deeds*.
- Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain and Inverse Condemnation*.
- Ch. 253, *Escrows*.
- Chs. 330-335, *Landlord and Tenant*.
- Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks*.
- Ch. 530, *Statute of Frauds*.
- Ch. 579, *Zoning and Planning*.

General contract requirements are discussed in Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

Fraud and mistake as defenses negating formation of a contract and fraud as a ground of affirmative relief, are discussed in Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence, and Mistake* , and Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

Lis pendens are covered in Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

The more general aspects of specific performance are discussed in Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawConstruction LawContractsReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawInverse CondemnationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART I. SCOPE

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.03-569.09

[Reserved]

§§ 569.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.10

§ 569.10 Governing Law and Definitions

Various statutes govern the rights and obligations of vendors and purchasers, that is, sellers and buyers of real property. For a list of the principal statutes, see *§ 569.122*.

This chapter uses the terms "vendor" and "seller" synonymously. The person who transfers property by sale, particularly real estate, has traditionally been termed a "vendor," and "seller" has been the more commonly used term for one who sells personal property. However, a "seller" may, with entire propriety, be termed a "vendor" [Black Law's Dictionary, p. 1395 (Fifth Ed.)]. Similarly, this chapter uses the terms "purchaser" and "buyer" synonymously as well.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.11

§ 569.11 Residential Seller's Duty of Disclosure

[1] When Required; Legislative Intent

A seller of residential property is required, except in certain cases (*see § 569.11[2]*), to make specified disclosures about the property to the buyer [*see Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*]. The requirement applies generally to any transfer by sale, exchange, installment land sale contract (as defined by *Civ. Code § 2985(a)*), lease with an option to purchase, any other option to purchase, or ground lease coupled with improvements, of real property, or a residential stock cooperative, improved with or consisting of not less than one nor more than four dwelling units [*Civ. Code § 1102(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 1102(b)* (requirements also apply to resale of manufactured home or mobilehome that is classified as personal property and intended for use as residence)].

The required disclosures must be made, and each required act relating to the disclosure statement must be performed, in good faith, that is, with honesty in fact in the conduct of the transaction [*Civ. Code § 1102.7*].

The required disclosure is not a warranty of any kind by the seller and is not a substitute for any inspections or warranties that the buyer may wish to obtain [*Civ. Code § 1102.6* (first paragraph of prescribed disclosure statement)]; however, the purchaser may rely on the information in the disclosure statement when deciding whether to purchase the property and on what terms to purchase it [*Civ. Code § 1102.6* (Part II of prescribed statement)].

Other disclosure requirements may be applicable as well; for example, depending on the facts of the transaction, disclosures may be required concerning the property's inclusion in a special study zone or concerning purchase-money liens on the property [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6* (Part I of prescribed disclosure form)]; *see also* discussion of other disclosure requirements in §§ 569.12-569.16. Any other applicable disclosure requirements are not limited or abridged by the requirements being discussed here [*Civ. Code § 1102.8*].

In enacting the disclosures requirements in *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, the California Legislature intended to clarify and facilitate the use of the real estate transfer disclosure statement specified in *Civ. Code § 1102.6* [*see § 569.11[3]*]. The Legislature intended the statement to be used by (1) transferors making disclosures required under *Civ. Code § 1102 et*

seq., and *(2)* agents making disclosures required by *Civ. Code § 2079* on the agent's portion (Paragraphs III and IV) of the real estate transfer disclosure statement. In transfers not subject to *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, agents may make required disclosures in a separate writing. The Legislature did not intend to affect the existing obligations of the parties to a real estate contract, or their agents, to disclose any fact materially affecting the value and desirability of the property. In transfers not subject to these provisions, agents may make required disclosures in a separate writing [*Civ. Code § 1102.1(a)*]. Further, nothing in *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* is to be construed to change the duty of a real estate broker or salesperson pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2079*. It was also the intent of the Legislature that the delivery of a real estate transfer disclosure statement may not be waived in an "as is" sale, as held in *Loughrin v. Superior Court* [*Civ. Code § 1102.1(a)*; *see Loughrin v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161* ; *see also § 569.11[6][g]*].

[2] Exempt Transactions

The seller's duty of disclosure does not arise in any of the following transactions:

- A transfer that is required to be preceded by the furnishing to the transferee of a copy of a public report pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.1* (concerning subdivided lands) [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(a)*].

- A transfer that can be made without a public report pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.4* (concerning subdivided lands) [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(a)*].

- A transfer pursuant to a court order [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(b)*].

- A transfer to a secured creditor that effects a foreclosure of the debtor's interest [*see Civ. Code § 1102.2(c)*].

- A transfer in the course of administering an estate or trust or guardianship or conservatorship, unless (1) the transfer involves a sole trustee of a revocable trust, (2) this trustee is a natural person, and (3) he or she is aformer owner of the property or was an occupant in possession of the property within the preceding year [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(d)*].

- A transfer between co-owners [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(e)*] or between spouses or ancestor and descendant [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(f)*].

- A transfer between the parties to a marriage dissolution or legal separation proceeding or parties to a property settlement agreement incidental to such a proceeding [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(g)*].

- A transfer by the Controller of the State of California in the course of administering the Unclaimed Property Law [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(h)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1500 et seq.*].

- A transfer of tax-deeded property [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(i)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691 et seq., 3771 et seq.*].

- A transfer to or from any governmental entity [*Civ. Code § 1102.2(j)*].

[3] Disclosure Form

[a] Statutory "Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement"

The required disclosures must be made on a prescribed form called a "Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement." The

seller must make specified disclosures, regarding (1) appliances, fixtures, and features, including whether there are significant defects or malfunctions, and (2) environmental hazards, noncompliance with building codes and permit requirements, and structure and site problems [*Civ. Code § 1102.6*]. The prescribed form includes disclosure statements to be signed by the vendor's listing and selling brokers, if any. For discussion of brokers' disclosure duties and liabilities, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

If other disclosure forms have been completed in connection with the transaction, the prescribed form referred to here need not be completed with respect to matters that are covered in the other forms, if those other forms are identified on the prescribed form [*Civ. Code § 1102.6* (Part I of prescribed form)].

[b] City or County Requirements

Cities and counties may elect to require additional disclosures [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(a)*]. These must be made on an additional prescribed form called a "Local Option Real Estate Transfer Disclosure Statement" [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(b)*], which may be supplemented with addenda to facilitate making the required disclosures. The city or county may use the local-option disclosure form for other purposes [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(c)*].

After 2004, if a city or county adopts a different or additional disclosure form pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1102.6a* regarding the proximity or effects of an airport, the statement in that form must contain, at a minimum, the information in the "Notice of Airport in Vicinity" found in the following statutes [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(d)(1)*]:

- *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010(b)(13)(A)*, relating to the contents of a filed notice of intention to offer subdivided land [*see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 30, *Subdivision Regulation* (Matthew Bender)];

- *Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)*, relating to natural hazards disclosures in an expert's report provided at the transferee's request [*see § 569.12[4]*]; or

- *Civ. Code § 1353(a)(1)*, relating to the contents of the declaration that is recorded with regard to the creation of a common-interest development [for sample declarations of different common interest developments, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 33C, Stock Cooperatives, § 33C.201*; *Ch. 33D, Planned Developments, § 33D.200*; and Ch. 34, *Condominiums*, § 34.202 (Matthew Bender)].

After 2005, if a city or county does not adopt a different or additional disclosure form pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1102.6a*, then the provision of an "airport influence area" disclosure under one of the statutes listed above [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010(b)(13)*; *Civ. Code §§ 1103.4(c), 1353(a)*] or, if there is not a current airport influence map, a written disclosure of an airport within two statute miles, will be deemed to satisfy any city or county requirements for the disclosure of airports in connection with transfers of real property [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(d)(2)*].

A local-option disclosure is not a warranty of any kind by the vendor and is not a substitute for any inspections or warranties that the purchaser may wish to obtain [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(b)* (first paragraph of prescribed form)]; however, the purchaser may rely on the information in the disclosure statement when deciding whether to purchase the property and on what terms to purchase it [*Civ. Code § 1102.6a(b)* (Part I of prescribed form)].

Certain natural hazard disclosures required by *Civ. Code § 1103* and related statutes may be made in the local option real estate disclosure statement if that statement includes substantially the same information and substantially the same warnings that are in the statutory natural hazard disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(e)*; *see Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.*]. For further discussion of natural hazard disclosures, see *§ 569.12*.

[c] Approximate Disclosures

If the seller does not know or does not have access to particular information that is required to be disclosed, and the seller has made a reasonable effort to obtain the information, the seller may "use an approximation of the information," provided the approximation (1) is clearly identified as such, (2) is reasonable, (3)is based on the best information available to the seller or the seller's agent, and (4) is not used for the purpose of circumventing or evading the disclosure requirement [*Civ. Code § 1102.5*].

[4] Delivery of Disclosure Statement

The disclosure statement must be delivered personally or by mail to the buyer. It may be delivered instead to the purchaser's spouse, with the same effect as delivery to the purchaser, unless the contract provides otherwise [*Civ. Code § 1102.10*].

In the case of an ordinary sale or exchange, the statement must be delivered as soon as practicable before the transfer of title [*Civ. Code § 1102.3(a)*]. In the case of transfer by a real property sales contract, as defined in *Civ. Code § 2985(a)*, or by a lease together with an option to purchase, or a ground lease coupled with improvements, the statement must be delivered as soon as practicable before execution of the contract. For these purposes, "execution" means the making or acceptance of an offer [*Civ. Code § 1102.3(b)*]. The seller must indicate compliance with *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* on the receipt for deposit, the real property sales contract, the lease, or any addendum attached to these documents, or on a separate document [*Civ. Code § 1102.3*].

If any disclosure, or any material amendment of any disclosure required by *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, is delivered after the execution of an offer to purchase, the buyer may, within three days following personal delivery or five days following delivery by mail, revoke the offer. Revocation must be made by delivery of a written notice of termination to the seller or the seller's agent [*Civ. Code § 1102.3*].

The transferor of any manufactured home or mobilehome subject to the disclosure requirements [*see § 569.11[1]*] must deliver the required written disclosure statement to prospective transferees, at the times and in the manner specified by statute [*see Civ. Code § 1102.3a*]. In addition, the management of a mobilehome park must provided a prospective homeowner with a completed written disclosure form at least three days before execution of a rental agreement [*Civ. Code § 798.75*.5]. For complete coverage of these and related requirements, see Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks* .

[5] Amendment After Delivery

The disclosure statement may be amended in writing, provided the amendment is delivered in compliance with delivery requirements for the original statement [*Civ. Code § 1102.9*]. See the discussion in *§ 569.11[4]*.

[6] Noncompliance

[a] Seller's Liability Generally

A seller who willfully or negligently fails to perform any duty with regard to the disclosure requirements is liable in damages for any actual harm resulting to the buyer [*Civ. Code § 1102.13*]. For a form of complaint by the buyer, see *§ 569.166*. However, this provision is applicable only when the buyer has gone through with the transaction despite the seller's failure to comply with the statutory disclosure requirements. If no transfer has taken place, *Civ. Code § 1102.13* does not apply. Prior to transfer, the failure to provide a disclosure statement gives rise to a right to rescission in the buyer [*Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 202, 204, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569* ; for a form of complaint for use by a purchaser seeking rescission, *see § 569.168*].

[b] Validity of Transfer

The sale, exchange, or other transfer that is subject to the disclosure requirements is not invalidated by any failure of any person to comply with those requirements [*Civ. Code § 1102.13*]. However, this provision is applicable only when the buyer has gone through with the transaction despite the seller's failure to comply with the statutory disclosure requirements. If no transfer has taken place, *Civ. Code § 1102.13* does not apply. Prior to transfer, the failure to provide a disclosure statement gives rise to a right to rescission in the buyer [*Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 202, 204, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569* ; for a form of complaint for use by a buyer seeking rescission, *see § 569.168*].

[c] Errors and Omissions

The seller is not liable on account of any error, inaccuracy, or omission in the disclosure statement if (1) the seller had no personal knowledge of the matter in question, (2) the defect resulted from information timely provided by a public agency or any of specified contractors (*see § 569.11[6][d]*), and (3) the seller exercised ordinary care in obtaining and transmitting that information [*Civ. Code § 1102.4(a)*].

[d] Professional Reports and Opinions in Lieu of Disclosure

The seller may avoid liability on account of an error, inaccuracy, or omission in the disclosure statement by properly relying on a professional report or opinion in meeting the disclosure requirement (*see § 569.11[6][c]*). The report or opinion must be prepared by a licensed engineer, land surveyor, geologist, structural pest control operator, or contractor, or some other expert, and must deal with matters within the scope of the author's license or expertise. The report or opinion must be delivered to the purchaser pursuant to a written or oral request for it. If the author of the report or opinion indicates in writing that the information in it willbe used to meet the general disclosure requirements of *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, the report or opinion must indicate also the parts of the required disclosure form to which the information pertains [*Civ. Code § 1102.4(c)*].

[e] Public Agency's or Other Person's Information in Lieu of Disclosure

If a public agency or any other person delivers to the purchaser any informationthat is required to be disclosed to the purchaser, that delivery of information is deemed to be compliance by the seller with the disclosure requirement as to that information, and the seller is relieved of any further duty of disclosure with respect to that information [*Civ. Code § 1102.4(b)*].

[f] Subsequent Inaccuracy of Information

Information disclosed in accordance with the disclosure requirement may be rendered inaccurate as a result of an act, occurrence, or agreement after the disclosure. In that event, however, no violation of the disclosure requirement arises [*Civ. Code § 1102.5*].

[g] Waiver by Purchaser

Any waiver of the disclosure requirements of *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* is void as against public policy [*Civ. Code § 1102(c)*]. This provision, enacted in 1994 [*see* 1994 Stats., ch. 817, § 1], appears to controvert in part the decision in *Loughrin v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161* . That decision held that the benefits of the statutory disclosure requirements may be waived by a knowing waiver because the disclosure requirements are imposed to facilitate private transactions, not for the general public benefit [*Loughrin v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 1194-1194, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161]* .

Loughrin also held that an "as is" clause does not waive the benefits of the disclosure requirements if disclosure is made. The "as is" clause alerts the buyer to the deteriorated nature of the property, gives notice that the seller is not making an inspection, and advises that the buyer is taking the property with its obvious and patent defects. It does not preclude the possibility of a claim for misrepresentation for failure to reveal concealed defects not apparent from an

inspection of the property, including intentional and negligent misrepresentations [*Loughrin v. Superior Court (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 1193-1196, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161]* . The ongoing validity of this portion of the *Loughrin* decision was affirmed by the Legislature in 1994 when it expressly provided that "the delivery of a real estate transfer disclosure statement may not be waived in an 'as is' sale, as was held in Loughrin v. Superior Court" [1994 Stats., ch. 817, § 3].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.12

§ 569.12 Natural Hazard Disclosures

[1] Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement

When property is located in a specified natural hazard area, the seller or other transferor and his or her agent must make certain disclosures in a statutory natural hazard disclosure statement form [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2(b)*] or in the local option real estate disclosure statement [*see § 569.11[3][b]*] if that statement includes substantially the same information and substantially the same warnings that are in the statutory natural hazard disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(e)*; *see Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.*]. These disclosures must be made with regard to the same types of transfers subject to *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* [s *ee Civ. Code § 1103(a)*].

This requirement applies only if the transferor or his or her agent is required to make one of the following disclosures [*Civ. Code § 1103(b), (c)*]:

- A person who is acting as an agent for a transferor of real property that is located within a special flood hazard area (any type Zone "A" or "V") designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or the transferor if he or she is acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a special flood hazard area, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a special flood hazard area; or (2) the local jurisdiction has compiled a list, by parcel, of properties that are within the special flood hazard area and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the parcel list [*Gov. Code § 8589.3*; *see § 569.12[11]*].

- A person who is acting as an agent for a transferor of real property that is located within an area of potential flooding shown on a dam failure inundation map pursuant to *Gov. Code § 8589.5*, or the transferor if he or she is acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within an area of potential flooding, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within an inundation area; or (2) the local jurisdiction

has compiled a list, by parcel, of properties that are within the inundation area and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the parcel list [*see § 569.12[12]*].

- A transferor of real property that is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone [*see Gov. Code § 51178*] must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone and is subject to the maintenance requirements of *Gov. Code § 51182*, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a very high fire hazard severity zone; or (2) a map that includes the property has been provided to the local agency as provided in *Gov. Code § 51178* and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the local agency [*Gov. Code § 51183.5*; *see § 569.12[13]*].

- A person who is acting as an agent for a transferor of real property that islocated within an earthquake fault zone [*see Pub. Res. Code § 2622*], or the transferor if he or she is acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a delineated earthquake fault zone, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a delineated earthquake fault zone; or (2) a map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county as provided in *Pub. Res. Code § 2622* and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9*; *see § 569.12[14]*].

- A person who is acting as an agent for a transferor of real property that is located within a seismic hazard zone [*see Pub. Res. Code § 2696*], or the transferor if he or she is acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a seismic hazard zone, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a seismic hazard zone; or (2) a map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county as provided in *Pub. Res. Code § 2696* and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694*; *see § 569.12[15]*].

- A transferor of real property that is located within a state responsibility area [*see Pub. Res. Code § 4125*] must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a wildland area that may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards and is subject to the maintenance requirements of *Pub. Res. Code § 4291*, if either (1) the transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a wildland fire zone; or (2) a map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county as provided in *Pub. Res. Code § 4125* and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136*]. The transferor must also disclose to any prospective transferee that it is not the state's responsibility to provide fire protection services to any building or structure located within the wildlands unless the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has entered into a cooperative agreement with a local agency for those purposes in accordance with *Pub. Res. Code § 4142* [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(b)*; *see § 569.12[16]*].

A person or entity acting as an escrow agent for the transfer of the property is not deemed the agent of the transferor or transferee for purposes of the natural hazard disclosure requirements, unless the person or entity is empowered to so act by an express written agreement to that effect. In that case, the extent of that agency is governed by the written

agreement [*Civ. Code § 1103.11*].

In any transaction in which a transferor accepted, before June 1, 1998, an offer to purchase, the transferor, or his or her agent, is deemed to have complied with the natural hazard disclosure requirement if the transferor or agent delivered to the prospective transferee a statement that included substantially the same information and warning as the Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(h)*].

Any waiver of the disclosure requirement is void as against public policy [*Civ. Code § 1103(d)*].

[2] Exempted Transactions

The following transactions are exempt from the natural hazard disclosure requirement [*Civ. Code § 1103.1(a)*]:

- Transfers ordered by the court, including, but not limited to, transfers ordered by a probate court in administration of an estate, transfers under a writ of execution, transfers by any foreclosure sale, transfers by a trustee in bankruptcy, transfers by eminent domain, and transfers resulting from a decree for specific performance.

- Transfers to a mortgagee by a mortgagor or successor in interest who is in default, transfers to a beneficiary of a deed of trust by a trustor or successor in interest who is in default, transfers by any foreclosure sale after default, transfers by any foreclosure sale after default in an obligation secured by a mortgage, transfers by a sale under a power of sale or any foreclosure sale under a decree of foreclosure after default in an obligation secured by a deed of trust or secured by any other instrument containing a power of sale, or transfers by a mortgagee or a beneficiary under a deed of trust who has acquired the real property at a sale conducted under a power of sale in a mortgage or deed of trust or a sale under a decree of foreclosure or has acquired the real property by a deed in lieu of foreclosure.

- Transfers by a fiduciary in the course of the administration of a decedent's estate, guardianship, conservatorship, or trust.

- Transfers from one co-owner to one or more other co-owners.

- Transfers made to a spouse, or to a person or persons in the lineal line of consanguinity of one or more of the transferors.

- Transfers between spouses resulting from a judgment of dissolution of marriage or of legal separation of the parties or from a property settlement agreement incidental to that judgment.

- Transfers by the Controller under the Unclaimed Property Law [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1500 et seq.*].

- Transfers under the statutory provisions providing for the sale of tax-defaulted property [*see Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3691 et seq., 3771 et seq.*].

- Transfers or exchanges to or from any governmental entity.

However, these exempted transactions may be subject to other disclosure requirements, including those under *Gov. Code §§ 8589.3, 8589.4* (special flood hazard areas), 51183.5 (fire hazard severity zones), and *Pub. Res. Code §§ 2621.9* (earthquake fault zones), 2694 (seismic hazard zones), and 4136 (state responsibility areas for substantial forest fire risks) [*Civ. Code § 1103.1(b)*].

[3] Delivery and Confirmation of Disclosure Statement

The transferor must deliver to the prospective transferee the Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement, as follows [*Civ. Code § 1103.3(a)*]:

- In the case of a sale, as soon as practicable before transfer of title; or

- In the case of transfer by a real property sales contract [*see Civ. Code § 2985*], or by a lease together with an option to purchase, or a ground lease coupled with improvements, as soon as practicable before execution of the contract.

Delivery of natural hazard disclosures must be made by personal delivery or mail to the prospective transferee. Delivery to the spouse of a transferee is deemed delivery to the transferee, unless provided otherwise by contract [*Civ. Code § 1103.10*].

If more than one licensed real estate broker is acting as an agent in a transaction, the broker who has obtained the offer made by the transferee must, except as otherwise provided *below*, deliver the required disclosure to the transferee, unless the transferor has given other written instructions for delivery [*Civ. Code § 1103.12(a)*].

The transferor must indicate compliance with the natural hazard disclosure requirements either on the receipt for deposit, the real property sales contract, the lease, any addendum attached to the lease, or on a separate document [*Civ. Code § 1103.3(b)*].

If a licensed real estate broker responsible for delivering the disclosures (*see* discussion *above*) cannot obtain the disclosure document required and does not have written assurance from the transferee that the disclosure has been received, the broker must advise the transferee in writing of his or her rights to the disclosure. A licensed real estate broker responsible for delivering the disclosures must maintain a record of the action taken to effect compliance [*Civ. Code § 1103.12(b)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10148*].

[4] Delivery of Information By Public Agency, Other Person, or Expert

The delivery of any information required to be disclosed under *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* to a prospective transferee by a public agency or other person providing the information is deemed to comply with the disclosure requirements and will relieve the transferor or any listing or selling agent of any further duty with regard to that item of information [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(b)*].

The delivery of a report or opinion prepared by a licensed engineer, land surveyor, geologist, or expert in natural hazard discovery dealing with matters within the scope of the professional's license or expertise, is sufficient compliance for application of the exemption discussed in the preceding paragraph if the information is provided to the prospective transferee under a written or oral request. In responding to that request, an expert may indicate, in writing, an understanding that the information provided will be used in fulfilling the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1103.2* and, if so, must indicate the required disclosures, or parts of disclosures, to which the information being furnished is applicable. When that statement is furnished, the expert is not responsible for any items of information, or parts of information, other than those expressly set forth in the statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)*].

Further, in responding to the transferee's request, the expert is required to make the following determinations and include the following statements, as appropriate, in the report [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)*]:

- If the property is determined to be within an "airport influence area" [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010(b)(13)(B)* (definition)], the report must include this statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)(1)*]:

"NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY. This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances, if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you."

- If the property is determined to be within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission [*see Gov. Code § 66620 et seq.*], the report must include this statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)(2)*]: "NOTICE OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION JURISDICTION. This property is located within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission. Use and development of property within the commission's jurisdiction may be subject to special regulations, restrictions, and permit requirements. You may wish to investigate and determine whether they are acceptable to you and your intended use of the property before you complete your transaction."

- If the property is determined to be within one mile of a parcel of real property designated as "Prime Farmland," "Farmland of Statewide Importance," "Unique Farmland," "Farmland of Local Importance," or "Grazing Land" onthe most current "Important Farmland Map" issued by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, using solely the county-level GIS map data, if any, available on the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program web site, the report must include this statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)(3)*]: "NOTICE OF RIGHT TO FARM. This property is located within one mile of a farm or ranch land designated on the current county-level GIS 'Important Farmland Map,' issued by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. Accordingly, the property may be subject to inconveniences or discomforts resulting from agricultural operations that are a normal and necessary aspect of living in a community with a strong rural character and a healthy agricultural sector. Customary agricultural practices in farm operations may include, but are not limited to, noise, odors, dust, light, insects, the operation of pumps and machinery, the storage and disposal of manure, bee pollination, and the ground or aerial application of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides. These agricultural practices may occur at any time during the 24-hour day. Individual sensitivities to those practices can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider the impacts of such agricultural practices before you complete your purchase. Please be advised that you may be barred from obtaining legal remedies against agricultural practices conducted in a manner consistent with proper and accepted customs and standards pursuant to *Section 3482.5 of the Civil Code* or any pertinent local ordinance."

The legal effect of a consultant's report delivered to satisfy the exemption provided by *Civ. Code § 1103.4* is not changed when it is accompanied by a natural hazard disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(f)(1)*]. A consultant's report must always be accompanied by a completed and signed natural hazard disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(f)(2)*].

[5] Transferee's Right to Rescind Transaction

If any disclosure, or any material amendment of any disclosure, required to be made under *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.*, is delivered after the execution of an offer to purchase, the transferee has three days after delivery in person or five days after delivery by deposit in the mail to terminate his or her offer by delivery of a written notice of termination to the transferor or the transferor's agent [*Civ. Code § 1103.3(c)*].

[6] Amendment to Disclosure Statement; Subsequent Changes in Information

Any natural hazard disclosure statement may be amended in writing by the transferor or his or her agent, subject to the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1103.3* [*Civ. Code § 1103.9*; *see § 569.12[3], [5]*].

If information disclosed is subsequently rendered inaccurate as a result of any governmental action, map revision, changed information, or other act or occurrence after the delivery of the required disclosures, the resulting inaccuracy does not constitute a violation of the natural hazard disclosure requirements [*Civ. Code § 1103.5(b)*; *see § 569.12[7]*].

[7] Liability of Transferor and Real Estate Agents; Third Party Reliance on Statement

Neither the transferor nor any listing or selling agent will be liable for any error, inaccuracy, or omission of any information delivered by public agencies or other persons if (1) the error, inaccuracy, or omission was not within the personal knowledge of the transferor or the listing or selling agent, and was based on information timely provided by public agencies or by other persons providing information as specified in § 569.12[4], and (2) ordinary care was exercised in obtaining and transmitting the information [*Civ. Code § 1103.4(a)*].

After a transferor and his or her agent comply with the disclosure requirements of *Civ. Code § 1103.2*, they are relieved of further duty with regard to those items of information. The transferor and his or her agent are not required to provide notice to the transferee if the information provided subsequently becomes inaccurate as a result of any governmental action, map revision, changed information, or other act or occurrence, unless the transferor or agent has actual knowledge that the information has become inaccurate [*Civ. Code § 1103.5(a)*; *see § 569.12[6]*].

The natural hazard disclosures required under *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* are disclosures only between the transferor, the transferor's agents, and the transferee, and may not be used by any other party, including, but not limited to, insurance companies, lenders, or governmental agencies, for any purpose [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(g)*].

[8] Effect of Noncompliance; Good Faith Requirement

A transfer will not be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with the natural hazard disclosure requirements. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by the provisions of *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* is liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

Each disclosure and each act that may be performed in making the disclosure must be made in good faith. "Good faith" means honesty in fact in the conduct of the transaction [*Civ. Code § 1103.7*].

[9] Relationship to Other Disclosure Requirements

The specification of items for disclosure in the statutory form does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision of law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction. In enacting this disclosure legislation, the Legislature did not intend to affect the existing obligations of the parties to a real estate contract, or their agents, to disclose any fact materially affecting the value and desirability of the property, including, but not limited to, the physical condition of the property and previously received reports of physical inspection noted on the disclosure form provided under *Civ. Code § 1102.6* or *1102.6a* [*Civ. Code § 1103.8(a)*]. Likewise, the natural hazard disclosure requirements do not change the inspection and disclosure duties of a real estate broker or salesperson under *Civ. Code § 2079* [*Civ. Code § 1103.8(b)*].

[10] Special Instructions for Completing Form

If an earthquake fault zone, seismic hazard zone, very high fire hazard severityzone, or wildland fire area map or accompanying information is not of sufficient accuracy or scale that a reasonable person can determine if the property is included in a natural hazard area, the transferor or transferor's agent must mark "Yes" on the Natural Hazard Disclosure

Statement. The transferor or transferor's agent may mark "No" on the Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement if he or she attaches a report prepared by an expert [*see § 569.12[4]*] that verifies the property is not in the hazard zone. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to limit or abridge any existing duty of the transferor or the transferor's agents to exercise reasonable care in making a determination of the existence of the natural hazard areas [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(b)*].

If the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has issued a Letter of Map Revision confirming that a property is no longer within a special flood hazard area, then the transferor or transferor's agent may mark "No" on the Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement, even if the map has not yet been updated. In that case, the transferor or transferor's agent must attach a copy of the Letter of Map Revision to the disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(c)*].

If FEMA has issued a Letter of Map Revision confirming that a property is within a special flood hazard area and the location of the letter has been posted in accordance with *Gov. Code § 8589.3(g)*, then the transferor or transferor's agent must mark "Yes" on the Natural Hazard Disclosure Statement, even if the map has not yet been updated. In that case, the transferor or transferor's agent must attach a copy of the Letter of Map Revision to the disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2(d)*].

[11] Special Flood Hazard Area

An agent for a seller or real property that is located within a special flood hazard area (any type Zone "A" or "V") designated by the FEMA or the seller if he or she is acting without any agent, must disclose to any prospective buyer the fact that the property is located within a special flood hazard area [*Gov. Code § 8589.3(a)*]. This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Civ. Code § 1103(c)(1)*; *Gov. Code § 8589.3(b)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a special flood hazard area.

- The local jurisdiction has compiled a list, by parcel, of properties that are within the special flood hazard area and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the parcel list.

For these purposes, the following persons will not be deemed agents of the transferor: (1) persons specified in *Civ. Code § 1103.11* (i.e., escrow agents); and (2) persons acting under a power of sale regulated by *Civ. Code § 2924* [*Gov. Code § 8589.3(d)*].

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see § 569.12[1]*], the special flood hazard area disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Gov. Code § 8589.3(b)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2*; § 569.12[1]].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 8589.3 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Gov. Code § 8589.3(f)*].

A notice must be posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the special flood hazard area map, any relevant Letters of Map Revision from FEMA, and of any parcel list compiled by the local jurisdiction [*Gov. Code § 8589.3(g)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply

with the provisions, including § 8589.3. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Gov. Code § 8589.3(e)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

[12] Area of Potential Flooding

An agent for a seller of real property that is located within an area of potential flooding shown on an inundation map, or the seller if he or she is acting without an agent, must disclose to any prospective buyer the fact that the property is located within an area of potential flooding [*Gov. Code § 8589.4(a)*]. This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Gov. Code § 8589.4(b)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within an inundation area.

- The local jurisdiction has compiled a list, by parcel, of properties that are within the inundation area and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the parcel list.

For these purposes, the following persons will not be deemed agents of the transferor: (1) persons specified in *Civ. Code § 1103.11* (i.e., escrow agents); and (2) persons acting under a power of sale regulated by *Civ. Code § 2924* [*Gov. Code § 8589.4(d)*].

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see § 569.12[1]*], this disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Gov. Code § 8589.4(c)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*Civ. Code § 1103.2*; *see § 569.12[1]*].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 8589.4 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Gov. Code § 8589.4(f)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with those provisions or with *Gov. Code § 8589.4*. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Gov. Code § 8589.4(e)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

[13] Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

A seller of real property that is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone designated pursuant to *Gov. Code § 51175 et seq.* must disclose to any prospective buyer the fact that the property is located within a very high fire hazard severity zone, and is subject to the requirements of *Gov. Code § 51182* [*Gov. Code § 51183.5(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 51182* (imposing maintenance obligations on any person who owns, leases, controls, operates, or maintains occupied dwelling or occupied structure in, on, or adjoining any area or land that is covered with flammable materials and is within very high fire hazard severity zone designated by a local agency pursuant to *Gov. Code § 51179*)]. This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Gov. Code § 51183.5(b)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a very high fire hazard severity zone.

- A map that includes the property has been provided to the local agency pursuant to *Gov. Code § 51178*, and a notice is posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the local agency.

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see § 569.12[1]*], the very high fire hazard severity zone disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Gov. Code § 51183.5(c)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2*; § 569.12[1]].

If the map or accompanying information is not of sufficient accuracy or scale that a reasonable person can determine if the subject real property is included in a very high fire hazard zone, the transferor normally must mark "Yes" on the natural hazard disclosure statement. The transferor may mark "No" on the natural hazard disclosure statement, however, if he or she attaches a report prepared pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)* [*see § 569.12[4]* that verifies the property is not in the hazard zone. These provisions are not intended to limit or abridge any existing duty of the transferor or the transferor's agents to exercise reasonable care in making the above determination [*Gov. Code § 51183.5(d)*].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 51183.5 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Gov. Code § 51183.5(f)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with those provisions or with *Gov. Code § 51183.5*. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Gov. Code § 51183.5(e)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

[14] Delineated Earthquake Fault Zone

An agent for a transferor of real property that is located within a delineated earthquake fault zone, or the transferor if he or she is acting without any agent, must disclose to any prospective transferee the fact that the property is located within a delineated earthquake fault zone [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(a)*]. This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(b)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a delineated earthquake fault zone.

- A map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 2622*, and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county.

For these purposes, the following persons will not be deemed agents of the transferor: (1) persons specified in *Civ. Code § 1103.11* (i.e., escrow agents); and (2) persons acting under a power of sale regulated by *Civ. Code § 2924* [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(e)*].

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see* § 569.2[1]], the delineated earthquake fault zone disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(c)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2*; § 569.12[1]].

If the map or accompanying information is not of sufficient accuracy or scale that a reasonable person can determine if the subject real property is included in a delineated earthquake fault hazard zone, the agent normally must mark "Yes" on the natural hazard disclosure statement. The agent may mark "No" on the natural hazard disclosure statement, however, if he or she attaches a report prepared pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)* [*see § 569.12[4]*] that verifies the property is not in the hazard zone. These provisions are not intended to limit or abridge any existing duty of the transferor or the transferor's agents to exercise reasonable care in making the above determination [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(d)*].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 2621.9 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(g)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with those provisions or with *Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9*. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Pub. Res. Code § 2621.9(f)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

For additional earthquake-related disclosure obligations, see *§§ 569.12[15]* and *569.15*.

[15] Seismic Hazard Zone

An agent for a transferor of real property that is located within a seismic hazard zone as designated under *Pub. Res. Code § 2690 et seq.*, or the transferor if he or she is acting without any agent, must disclose to any prospective purchaser the fact that the property is located within a seismic hazard zone [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(a)*]. This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(b)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a seismic hazard zone.

- A map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 2622*, and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county.

For these purposes, the following persons will not be deemed agents of the transferor: (1) persons specified in *Civ. Code § 1103.11* (i.e., escrow agents); and (2) persons acting under a power of sale regulated by *Civ. Code § 2924* [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(e)*].

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see § 569.12[1]*], the delineated earthquake fault zone disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(c)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2*; § 569.12[1]].

If the map or accompanying information is not of sufficient accuracy or scale that a reasonable person can determine if the subject real property is included in a seismic hazard zone, the agent normally must mark "Yes" on the natural hazard disclosure statement. The agent may mark "No" on the natural hazard disclosure statement, however, if he or she attaches a report prepared pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)* [*see § 569.12[4]*] that verifies the property is not in the hazard zone. These provisions are not intended to limit or abridge any existing duty of the transferor or the transferor's agents to exercise reasonable care in making the above determination [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(d)*].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 2694 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Pub. Res. Code § 2694(g)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with those provisions or with *Pub. Res. Code § 2694*. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Pub. Res. Code § 2694(f)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

For additional earthquake-related disclosure obligations, see *§§ 569.12[14]* and *569.15*.

[16] Wildland Fire Zone

A transferor of real property that is located within a state responsibility area determined by the State Board of Forestry (Board) pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 4125* must disclose to any prospective purchaser the fact that the property is located within a wildland area that may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards and is subject to the requirements of *Pub. Res. Code § 4291* [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(a)*; *see Pub. Res. Code § 4291* (requiring any person that owns, leases, controls, operates, or maintains any building or structure in, on, or adjoining any mountainous area or forest-covered lands, brush-covered lands, or grass-covered lands, or any land that is covered with flammable material, to maintain a firebreak and take other specified fire prevention steps)]. Except for property located within a county that has assumed responsibility for prevention and suppression of all fires pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 4129*, the transferor must also disclose to any prospective buyer that it is not the state's responsibility to provide fire protection services to any building or structure located within the wildlands unless the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has entered into a cooperative agreement with a local agency for those purposes pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 4142* [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(b)*].

This disclosure is required only when one of the following conditions is met [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(c)*]:

- The transferor, or the transferor's agent, has actual knowledge that the property is within a wildland fire zone.

- A map that includes the property has been provided to the city or county pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 4125*, and a notice has been posted at the offices of the county recorder, county assessor, and county planning agency that identifies the location of the map and any information regarding changes to the map received by the county.

In all transactions that are subject to *Civ. Code § 1103* [*see § 569.12[1]*], the state responsibility area disclosure must be provided by either of the following means [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(d)*]:

- The local option real estate transfer disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1102.6a*; § 569.11[3][b]].

- The natural hazard disclosure statement [*see Civ. Code § 1103.2*; § 569.12[1]].

If the map or accompanying information is not of sufficient accuracy or scale that a reasonable person can determine if the subject real property is included in a wildland fire zone, the transferor normally must mark "Yes" on the natural hazard disclosure statement. The transferor may mark "No" on the natural hazard disclosure statement, however, if he or she attaches a report prepared pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1103.4(c)* [*see § 569.12[4]*] that verifies the property is not in the hazard zone. These provisions are not intended to limit or abridge any existing duty of the transferor or the transferor's agents to exercise reasonable care in making the above determination [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(e)*].

The specification of items for disclosure in § 4136 does not limit or abridge any obligation for disclosure created by any other provision or law or that may exist in order to avoid fraud, misrepresentation, or deceit in the transfer transaction [*Pub. Res. Code § 4136(g)*].

No transfer subject to *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.* will be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with those provisions or with *Pub. Res. Code § 4136*. However, any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by these provisions will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*see Pub. Res. Code § 4136(f)*; *see also Civ. Code § 1103.13*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawAssessment & Information AccessGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportDissolution & DivorceProperty DistributionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.13

§ 569.13 Residential Vendor's Special Duties of Disclosure

[1] Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act and Assessment Installments Under Improvement Bond Act of 1915

The seller of any real property subject to the disclosure requirements of *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* [*see § 569.11*] must make disclosures if the property being transferred is subject to a continuing lien securing the levy of special taxes under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act [*Gov. Code 53111 et seq.*] or to a fixed lien assessment collected in installments to secure bonds issued in accordance with the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 [*Sts. & Hy. Code § 8500 et seq.*] which are generally used for street improvements [*Civ. Code § 1102.6b(a)*]. The seller must make a good faith effort to obtain and deliver to the transferee a disclosure notice concerning the special Mello-Roos tax provided in *Gov. Code § 53340.2*, and an assessment installment provided in *Gov. Code § 53754* from each local agency that levies the special tax or that collects the assessment installments [*Civ. Code § 1102.6b(b)*]. Special provisions require the legislative body collecting assessment installments under the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 to designate an office, department, or bureau in the local agency to handle annual assessment installment obligation information, reports, and dissemination, among other related activities [*Gov. Code § 53754(a)*]. For purposes of enabling sellers of real property to satisfy notice requirements concerning these assessment, the agency must furnish a Notice of Assessment on request within five working days, at a charge not to exceed $10 [*Gov. Code § 53754(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 53754(c)* (prescribed form of Notice of Assessment)].

A seller may satisfy the disclosure notice requirements by delivering a disclosure notice obtained from a non-governmental source that satisfies thespecified requirements [*Civ. Code § 1102.6b(d)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 1102.6b(d)(3)* (provision does not change ability to make disclosures under *Civ. Code § 1102.4*)]. With regard to each type of required disclosure, a notice provided by a private entity other than a designated office, department, or bureau of the levying entity may be modified as needed to clearly and accurately describe either of the following [*Civ. Code § 1102.6b(d)(2)*]:

- A special tax pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act levied against the property, or to clearly and accurately consolidate information about two or more districts that levy or are authorized to

levy a special tax pursuant to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act against the property. This notice must include the name of the Mello-Roos levying taxes against the property, the annual tax due for the Mello-Roos for the current tax year, the maximum tax that may be levied against the property in any year, the percentage by which the maximum tax for the Mello-Roos may increase per year, and the date until the tax may be levied against the property for the Mello-Roos and a contact telephone number, if available, for further information about the Mello-Roos.

- Special assessments and bonds pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 levied against the property, or to clearly and accurately consolidate information about two or more districts that levy or are authorized to levy special assessments and bonds pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915 against the property. This notice must include the name of the special assessments and bonds issued pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915, the current annual tax on the property for the special assessments and bonds issued pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915, and a contact telephone number, if available, for further information about the special assessments and bonds issued pursuant to the Improvement Bond Act of 1915.

If these required disclosures have been delivered to the transferee, the seller or the seller's agent is not required to provide additional information concerning the special tax or assessment installments, and the disclosure information is deemed to satisfy the responsibility of the seller or the seller's agent to provide this information to the transferee. In any case, these disclosure requirements do not impose a duty agent to discover a special tax or assessment installments or the existence of any levying district not actually known to the agents [*Civ. Code § 1102.6b(e)*]. For additional discussion of the requirements of this type of disclosure, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* . For discussion of disclosure requirements in general, see *§ 569.11[1]*.

[2] Supplemental Property Tax Bills

It is the sole responsibility of the seller of any residential real property in a transfer that is subject to *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*, or the seller's agent, to deliver to the prospective purchaser a prescribed disclosure notice concerning supplemental property tax bills, in addition to any other disclosure required by *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 1102.6c(a)*].

[3] Former Ordnance Location

The seller of any residential property who has actual knowledge of any former federal or state ordnance locations within one mile (that is, in the "neighborhood area") of the property must give written notice of that knowledge to the buyer as soon as practicable before the transfer of title, if the transfer is subject to the general disclosure requirements imposed on residential sellers [*Civ. Code § 1102.15*; *see Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* (general disclosure requirements)]. A former federal or state ordnance location is an area identified by an agency or instrumentality of the federal government or state government as an area that was used for military training purposes and so may contain potentially explosive munitions [*Civ. Code § 1102.15*].

[4] Industrial Use Zoning

The seller of residential real property who has actual knowledge that the property is adjacent to, or zoned to allow, an industrial use described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 731a*, or affected by a nuisance created by such a use, must give written notice of that knowledge to the purchaser as soon as practicable before transfer of title [*Civ. Code § 1102.17*]. For coverage of § 731a, which places limits on nuisance actions with respect to manufacturing, commercial, or airport uses in certain designated zones or districts, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

[5] Registered Sex Offenders Data Base

In response to the passage of "Megan's Law" requiring law enforcement authorities to maintain a data base of the

locations of registered sex offenders and to provide that information to the public [*see Penal Code §§ 290, 290.4, 290.46*], certain written real estate contracts must contain a notice related to that data base [*see Civ. Code § 2079.10a*]. The notice requirement applies to every contract of sale for residential real property comprising one to four dwelling units, including installment land sales contracts [*Civ. Code § 2079.10a(a)*; *see Civ. Code § 2985(a)* (definition of real property sales contract)].

The contract must contain the following notice, printed in not less than eight-point type [*Civ. Code § 2079.10a(a)(3)* (applicable on and after April 1, 2006); *see Civ. Code § 2079.10a(a)(1), (2)* (this notice may be used in contracts before April 1, 2006, in lieu of notice that formerly was required; contract forms containing notice that formerly was required may be used until April 1, 2006)]:

> **Notice:**
> Pursuant to *Section 290.46 of the Penal Code*, information about specified registered sex offenders is made available to the public via an Internet Web site maintained by the Department of Justice at www.meganslaw.ca.gov. Depending on an offender's criminal history, this information will include either the address at which the offender resides or the community of residence and ZIP Code in which he or she resides.

The information in the notice is deemed adequate to inform the buyer about the existence of the statewide data base and information from the data base regarding the locations of registered sex offenders [*Civ. Code § 2079.10a(b)*]. On delivery of this notice, the seller is not required to provide any further information in addition to that contained in the notice regarding the proximity of registered sex offenders, and making those disclosures cannot give rise to any cause of action against the seller by a registered sex offender [*Civ. Code § 2079.10a(b)*]. However, providing the statutory notice does not alter any other existing duty that a seller has to make disclosures [*Civ. Code § 2079.10a(c)*].

[6] Arranged Credit

Every person who is an arranger of credit must make specific disclosures to the vendor and the purchaser. The vendor must join in the disclosures to the purchaser and the purchaser in the disclosures to the vendor to the extent the purchaser and vendor have knowledge of the information. The conditions in which the disclosures must be made are as follows:

- The purchase is of a dwelling for not more than four families and the vendor extends credit [*Civ. Code § 2956*].

- There is an arranger of credit involved [*Civ. Code § 2956*].

- The credit involved is subject to a finance charge or payable by written agreement in more than four installments, whether providing for payment of principal and interest or interest only, not including a down payment [*Civ. Code § 2957(d)*].

- The vendor or purchaser is not entitled to disclosure of similar facts under other specified statutes [*Civ. Code § 2958*].

"Arranger of credit" includes [*Civ. Code § 2957(a)(1), (2)*]:

- A person, other than a party to the credit transaction and other than an attorney representing one of the parties to the credit transaction, who is involved in developing or negotiating credit terms, participates in the completion of the credit documents, and directly or indirectly receives compensation for arrangement of the credit or from any transaction or transfer of the real property that is facilitated by

that extension of credit; and

- A party to the transaction who is either a real estate licensee or a licensed attorney, if neither party to the transaction is represented by an agent who is a real estate licensee (but in this case, the obligations apply only to the licensee or attorney who is a party to the transaction, and not to any other party).

"Arranger of credit" does not include a person acting as an escrow agent in the transaction, except that a person described in the second bulleted item, above, who acts as escrow agent will be deemed an arranger of credit if he or she acts on behalf of a party to the transaction, or an agent of the party, in negotiating or developing the credit terms. Neither completing credit documents in accordance with instructions of a party or his or her agent nor furnishing information regarding credit terms to a party or his or her agent is considered developing or negotiating credit terms [*Civ. Code § 2957(a)(3), (4)*].

The facts required to be disclosed about the credit transaction are set forth by statute [*see Civ. Code § 2963*]. The disclosures must be made as soon as practicable and before execution of any note or security documents [*Civ. Code § 2959*].

Any credit document or any security document subject to *Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.* is not invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with *Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.* However, any person who willfully violates any provision of *Civ. Code § 2956 et seq.* will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by the vendor or purchaser as the proximate result of the violation. No person may be held liable in any action under this article if it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation was not intentional and resulted from a bona fide error, notwithstanding the maintenance of procedures reasonably adopted to avoid any such error [*Civ. Code § 2965*].

If a balloon payment is involved, there are special provisions requiring notice to the payor not less than 90 or more than 150 days before the payment is due [*Civ. Code § 2966(a)*].

[7] Noncompliant Plumbing Fixtures (Pre-1994 Residential Property)

On and after January 1, 2017 [*Civ. Code § 1102.155(b)*], the seller of residential real property subject to *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* [*see § 569.11[1]*] must disclose, in writing, that *Civ. Code § 1101.4* requires that California singe-lfamily residences, if built and available for use before January 1, 1994 [*Civ. Code § 1101.2*], must be equipped with water-conserving plumbing fixtures on or before January 1, 2017, and the seller must further disclose whether the property includes any noncompliant plumbing fixtures [*Civ. Code § 1102.155(a)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 1101.3(c), (e)* (noncompliant and water-conserving plumbing fixtures listed)]. The seller must affirm that the representation is by the seller and not a representation of an agent, and that the disclosure is not intended to be part of any contract between the buyer and the seller. The seller must further affirm that the disclosure is not a warranty of any kind by the seller or an agent representing a principal in the transaction and is not a substitute for an inspection that or warranties a principal may want to obtain [*Civ. Code § 1102.155(a)(2)*]. For a disclosure form that can be used to meet this requirement, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 23, Real Property Sales Agreements, § 23.315* (Matthew Bender).

Civ. Code § 1101.4(b) provides that on or before January 1, 2017, noncompliant plumbing fixtures in a single-family residential property must be replaced by the property owner with water-conserving plumbing fixtures. On and after January 1, 2017, a seller or transferor of a single-family residential property must disclose in writing to the prospective purchaser or transferee the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1101.4(b)* and whether the property includes any noncompliant plumbing fixtures [*Civ. Code § 1101.4(c)*]. These requirements apply only to residential and commercial real property built and available for use on or before January 1, 1994 [*Civ. Code § 1101.2*]. For discussion of these requirements and definitions of terms, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 23, *Real Property Sales Agreements*, § 23.20B (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedurePostconviction ProceedingsSex OffendersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to DiscloseReal Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.14

§ 569.14 Liability for Failure to Disclose Presence of Hazardous Substance

Owners of nonresidential real property who know or have reasonable cause to believe that a release of hazardous substance has come to be located on or beneath that property must give written notice of that condition to each buyer, lessee, or renter prior to the sale or lease. Failure of the owner to provide this notice subjects the owner to actual damages and to any other remedies provided by law. Additionally, if the owner has actual knowledge of the presence of a hazardous substance and knowingly fails to provide written notice to the buyer, lessee, or renter, the owner is liable for a civil penalty, not to exceed $5,000, for each separate violation [*Health & Safety Code § 25359.7*]. For a form of complaint fordamages for failure to comply with statutory notice requirements, see *§ 569.167*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawAssessment & Information AccessGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.15

§ 569.15 Disclosures Regarding Environmental and Earthquake Hazards

[1] Environmental Hazards

[a] Consumer Information Booklet

If a consumer information book described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10084.1* is delivered to a transferee in connection with a transfer of real property, the seller or broker is not required to provide additional information concerning, and the information provided is deemed to be adequate to inform the transferee regarding, common environmental hazards that can affect the real property [*Civ. Code § 2079.7(a)*]. This does not increase the duties of sellers or brokers or alter the duty of a seller or broker to disclose the existence of known hazards on or affecting the real property [*Civ. Code § 2079.7(b)*].

[b] Toxic Mold Protection Act

The Toxic Mold Protection Act of 2001 [*Health & Safety Code § 26100 et seq.*] requires the Department of Health Services to convene a task force of various experts and interested parties to advise the Department on the development of permissible exposure limits to molds, standards for assessment of molds in indoor environments, standards for identification of molds, and remediation of mold. The Act will eventually require any person who sells, transfers, or rents specified types of residential, commercial, or industrial real property to provide written disclosures to potential buyers, prospective tenants, renters, and landlords concerning mold problems in the real property [*see Health & Safety Code § 26140 et seq.*]. However, these disclosure duties and requirements would not apply until the January 1 or July 1 that occurs at least six months after the Department adopts the requisite standards and guidelines [*see Health & Safety Code § 26154*]. Adding additional uncertainty concerning these requirements, the Act will be implemented only to the extent the Department determines that funds are available for its implementation [*Health & Safety Code § 26156*].

[c] Local Health Officer's Order Prohibiting Use or Occupancy

A local health officer has power to issue and serve an order prohibiting the use or occupancy of particular property after determining that the property is polluted by a hazardous chemical related to methamphetamine-laboratory activities [

Health & Safety Code § 25400.22(a)]. The property owner and any other person occupying the property must immediately vacate, and the owner must promptly engage a contractor to clean up the property [*Health & Safety Code § 25400.25*]. Thereafter, until the owner has received a notice from the local health officer that the property requires no further action, the owner must notify a prospective buyer in writing of the pending order, and provide the prospective buyer with a copy of the pending order, except as otherwise required in *Civ. Code § 1102.3* [*see § 569.11[4]*]. The prospective buyer must acknowledge, in writing, the receipt of a copy of the pending order [*Health & Safety Code § 25400.28(a)*]. The owner is subject to a civil penalty for failing to provide the required notice to a prospective buyer [*Health & Safety Code § 25400.45(a)*].

[2] Earthquake Hazards Generally

If a Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Safety described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10149* or a Commercial Property Owner's Guide described in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10147* is delivered to a transferee in connection with a transfer of real property, the seller or broker is not required to provide additional information concerning, and the information provided is deemed to be adequate to inform the transferee regarding, geologic and seismic hazards that can affect the real property [*Civ. Code §§ 2079.8(a), 2079.9(a)*; *but see Gov. Code § 8897.1* (discussed in *§ 569.15[3]*)]. This does not increase the duties of sellers or brokers or alter the duty of a seller or broker to disclose the existence of known hazards on or affecting the real property [*Civ. Code §§ 2079.8(b), 2079.9(b)*; *but see Gov. Code § 8897.1*].

[3] Earthquake Hazards of Certain Residential Property

[a] Disclosure Requirement

The seller of real property containing any residential dwelling built before January 1, 1960, with one to four living units of conventional light-frame construction must, as soon as practicable before the transfer, deliver to the buyer a copy of the Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Safety published pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10149* and complete the earthquake hazards disclosure regarding the property, clearly indicating whether the seller has actual knowledge that the dwelling has any of the deficiencies listed in *Gov. Code § 8897.2* [*Gov. Code § 8897.1(a)*].

The transferor of property described in *Gov. Code § 8897.1(a)* must make the earthquake hazards disclosure as soon as practicable before the transfer of title in the case of a sale or exchange or prior to execution of the contract when the transfer is by a real property sales contract, and the disclosure must be made in person or by mail to the transferee, to any person authorized to act for the transferee in the transaction, or to additional transferees who have requested delivery from the transferor in writing [*Gov. Code § 8897.1(b)*].

The duty of a real estate licensee under *Gov. Code § 8897.1 et seq.* is limited to providing the seller with a copy of the Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Preparedness for delivery to the transferee pursuant to *Civ. Code § 2079.8* [*Gov. Code § 8897.5*].

No transfer of title may be invalidated on the basis of a failure to comply with*Gov. Code § 8897.1 et seq.* [*Gov. Code § 8897.4*].

[b] Contents of Disclosure

The seller must disclose any of the following deficiencies that are within the seller's actual knowledge and material to the transaction and that may increase a dwelling's vulnerability to earthquake damage [*Gov. Code § 8897.2(a)*]:

- The absence of anchor bolts securing the sill plate to the foundation;

- The existence of perimeter cripple walls that are not braced with plywood, blocking, or diagonal metal or wood braces;

- The existence of a first-story wall or walls that are not braced with plywood, blocking, or diagonal metal or wood braces;

- The existence of a perimeter foundation composed of unreinforced masonry;

- The existence of unreinforced masonry dwelling walls;

- The existence of a habitable room or rooms above a garage; and

- The existence of a water heater that is not anchored, strapped, or braced.

[c] Exempt Transfers

The disclosure required by *Gov. Code § 8897.1(a)* does not apply to any of the following transfers [*Gov. Code § 8897.1(c)*]:

- Transfers that are required to be preceded by the furnishing to a prospective transferee of a copy of a public report pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.1*;

- Transfers pursuant to court order, including, but not limited to, transfers ordered by a probate court in the administration of an estate, transfers pursuant to a writ of execution, transfers by a trustee in bankruptcy, transfers by eminent domain, or transfers resulting from a decree for specific performance;

- Transfers to a mortgagee by a mortgagor in default, transfers to a beneficiary of a deed of trust by a trustor in default, transfers by any foreclosure sale after default, transfers by any foreclosure sale after default in any obligation secured by a mortgage, or transfers by a sale under a power of sale after a default in an obligation secured by a deed of trust or secured by any other instrument containing a power of sale, and any subsequent transfer by a mortgagor or beneficiary of a deed of trust who accepts a deed in lieu of foreclosure or purchases the property at a foreclosure sale;

- Transfers by a fiduciary in the course of the administration of a decedent's estate, guardianship, conservatorship, or trust;

- Transfers from one co-owner to one or more co-owners;

- Transfers made to a spouse or to a person or persons in the lineal line of consanguinity of one or more of the transferors;

- Transfers between spouses resulting from a decree of dissolution of a marriage, from a decree of legal separation, or from a property settlement agreement incidental to either of those decrees;

- Transfers by the Controller in the course of administering the Unclaimed Property Law provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1500 et seq.*;

- Transfers under the provisions of *Rev. & Tax. Code § 3771 et seq.*; and

- Transfers for which the transferee has agreed in writing that the dwelling will be demolished within one year of the date of transfer.

[d] Retrofit Standards

Gov. Code § 8897.3 provides the standards to be used if it is determined that retrofit work is appropriate to address potential deficiencies listed in *Gov. Code § 8897.2* [*Gov. Code § 8897.3(a)*] and provides that any qualified historical building or structure, as defined pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 18955*, may use retrofit alternatives [*Gov. Code § 8897.3(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesToxic MoldFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportDissolution & DivorceProperty DistributionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.16

§ 569.16 Private Transfer-Fee Requirement

If property being transferred after 2007 is subject to a private transfer fee, the transferor must provide, at the time the transfer disclosure statement required pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1102.6* is provided, an additional disclosure statement containing all of the following [*Civ. Code § 1102.6e*]:

- Notice that payment of a transfer fee is required on transfer of the property;
- The amount of the fee required for the asking price of the real property, and a description of how the fee is calculated;
- Notice that the final amount of the fee may be different if the fee is based on a percentage of the final sale price;
- The entity to which funds from the fee will be paid;
- The purposes for which funds from the fee will be used; and
- The date or circumstances under which the obligation to pay the transfer fee expires, if it could expire.

A "private transfer fee", for this purpose, is any fee-payment requirement imposed in a covenant, restriction, or condition contained in any deed, contract, security instrument, or other document affecting the transfer or sale of, or any interest in, real property, which requires a fee be paid on transfer of the real property [*Civ. Code § 1098*; *but see Civ. Code § 1098(a)-(i)* (exceptions)].

In addition, the recipient of any such fee imposed before 2008, or the person or entity imposing any such fee after 2007, must record a document, entitled "Payment of Transfer Fee Required," in which pertinent facts about the fee-payment requirement are disclosed [*Civ. Code § 1098.5*].

For forms of these disclosure statements, see *California Legal Forms, Ch. 23, Real Property Sales Agreements, § 23.314* (Matthew Bender).

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.16A

§ 569.16A Sale Cannot Be Conditioned on Purchase of Title Insurance

Under the Buyer's Choice Act [*Civ. Code § 1103.20*] from October 11, 2009, through January 1, 2015 [*Civ. Code § 1103.23*], a seller of residential real property with four or fewer dwelling units may not require directly or indirectly, as a condition of selling the property, that title insurance covering the property or escrow service provided in connection with the sale be purchased by the buyer from a particular title insurer or escrow agent. However, this does not prohibit a buyer from agreeing to accept the services of a title insurer or an escrow agent recommended by the seller if written notice of the right to make an independent selection of those services is first provided by the seller [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(a)*].

"Escrow service" means service provided by a person licensed pursuant to Division 6 (commencing with Section 17000) of the Financial Code, or exempt from licensing pursuant to *Section 17006 of the Financial Code*. "Seller" means a mortgagee or beneficiary under a deed of trust who acquired title to residential real property improved by four or fewer dwelling units at a foreclosure sale, including a trustee, agent, officer, or other employee of any such mortgagee or beneficiary. "Title insurance" means insurance offered by an insurer admitted in this state to transact title insurance pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 12340) of Part 6 of the Insurance Code [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(b)*].

A seller who violates *Civ. Code § 1103.22* is liable to the buyer for three times all charges made for the title insurance or escrow service. In addition, a person who violates *Civ. Code § 1103.22* will be deemed to have violated his or her license law and subject to discipline by his or her licensing entity [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(c)*]. A transaction subject to this provision will not be invalidated solely because of the failure of any person to comply with any provision of it [*Civ. Code § 1103.22(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.17

§ 569.17 Expiration of Rights Under Unperformed Recorded Contract of Sale

As used in *Civ. Code § 886.010 et seq.*, a "contract for sale of real property" means an agreement wherein one party agrees to convey title to real property to another party on the satisfaction of specified conditions set forth in the contract and that requires conveyance of title within one year from the date of formation of the contract, whether the agreement is designated as a contract for sale of real property, land sale contract, deposit receipt, agreement for sale, agreement to convey, or otherwise [*Civ. Code § 886.010(a)*].

A recorded contract for sale of real property expires of record at the later of the following times [*Civ. Code § 886.030(a)*]:

(1) Five years after the date for conveyance of title provided in the contract or, if no date for conveyance of title is provided in the contract, five years after thelast date provided in the contract for satisfaction of the specified conditions set forth in the contract; or

(2) If there is a recorded extension of the contract within the time prescribed in (1), *above*, five years after the date for conveyance of title provided in the extension or, if no date for conveyance of title is provided in the extension, five years after the last date provided in the extension for satisfaction of the specified conditions set forth in the contract.

The statutory expiration period can be extended or waived only by an instrument recorded before the expiration of the otherwise applicable five-year period [*Civ. Code § 886.030(b)*].

When the unperformed contract has expired of record, the recorded contract has no effect and does not constitute a cloud or encumbrance on the property except as against a party to the contract [*Civ. Code § 886.040*].

Civ. Code §§ 886.010-886.050 apply to all contracts for sale of real property, whether recorded before or after the effective date, which is January 1, 1983. However, no contract for sale of real property will expire until December 31, 1985 [*Civ. Code § 886.050*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.18

§ 569.18 Duty to Execute Release

If the party to whom title to real property is to be conveyed pursuant to a recorded contract for the sale of real property (*defined in § 569.17*) fails to satisfy the specified conditions set forth in the contract and does not seek performance of the contract or restitution of amounts paid under the contract, the party must, on demand therefor, execute a release of the contract, duly acknowledged for record, to the party who agreed to convey title. Willful violation of the above duty by the party to whom title is to be conveyed without good cause makes the party liable for the damages the party who agreed to convey title sustains by reason of the violation, including, but not limited to, court costs and reasonable attorney's fees in an action to clear title to real property. This does not make a release or a demand therefor a condition precedent to an action to clear title [*Civ. Code § 886.020*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesContracts LawTypes of ContractsReleasesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.19

§ 569.19 Expiration of Record of Expired Option

If a recorded instrument creates or gives constructive notice of an option to purchase real property, the option expires of record if no conveyance, contract, or other instrument that gives notice of exercise or extends the option is recorded within the following times [*Civ. Code § 884.010*]:

(1) Six months after the option expires by its terms; or

(2) If the option provides no expiration date, six months after the date the instrument that creates or gives constructive notice of the option is recorded.

When the option has expired of record due to the expiration of the applicable six-month period, the recorded option or instrument giving notice of option does not give notice to anyone or put anyone on inquiry as to the exercise or extension of the option [*Civ. Code § 884.020*].

Civ. Code §§ 884.010-884.030 apply on their operative date (January 1, 1983) to all options executed or recorded before, on, or after the operative date. However, an option that expires according to its terms before January 1, 1984, will not expire until that date, and an option that has no expiration date and was recorded before January 1, 1983, will not expire of record until December 31, 1987 [*Civ. Code § 884.030*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsOption ContractsReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.20

§ 569.20 Risk of Loss

Under the Uniform Vendor and Purchaser Risk Act (*Civ. Code § 1662*), risk follows title and possession. Unless the contract provides otherwise, if all or a material part of the property is destroyed, without fault of the purchaser, or taken by eminent domain, before transfer of either title or possession, the vendor cannot enforce the contract and is excused from performance, and the purchaser is entitled to recover any payments made [*Civ. Code § 1662(a)*; *Dixon v. Salvation Army (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 463, 467, 191 Cal. Rptr. 111]* . Conversely, unless the contract provides otherwise, if all or a material part of the property is destoyed, without fault of the vendor, or taken by eminent domain, after either title or possession has been transferred, the purchaser is not relieved of the duty to pay the purchase price, nor is he or she entitled to recover any portion of payments made [*Civ. Code § 1662(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingRisk of Loss

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.21

§ 569.21 Formation and Breach of Contract

[1] In General

Both buyers and sellers considering suit for damages for breach of contract must first determine (1) that a contract has indeed been formed, rather than just a series of offers and counteroffers; (2) that there has been a breach of contract as opposed to a "no fault" failure of condition; and (3) that all conditions precedent to the other party's obligation have been satisfied or waived [*see, e.g.,* *Krasley v. Superior Court (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 425, 430, 161 Cal. Rptr. 629* (only counteroffers); *Doryon v. Salant (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 706, 711, 142 Cal. Rptr. 378* (contract found); *Spangler v. Castello (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 49, 53, 304 P.2d 752* (requirement for FHA, VA approval is not waivable by purchaser alone)]. In regard to the second consideration, if a buyer's qualification for certain financing is a condition, the law implies a promise by the purchaser to diligently seek that financing. The burden of proving lack of diligence is on the seller asserting breach of contract [*Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 837-839, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . When a seller invites bids as counteroffers and abuyer's bid is in terms of a specified amount more than the highest bid, that incremental bid is fraudulent unless the seller solicited relative bids or such bids are customary in the trade or industry [*Carver v. Teitsworth (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 845, 854-855, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 446]* .

[2] Performance or Excuse of Conditions

Because the seller's conveyance and the buyer's payment are considered concurrent conditions, a seller is not in default until the buyer has paid or tendered the full purchase price and demanded conveyance; although a seller's repudiation or inability to perform or failure to fulfill a condition precedent will excuse a buyer's tender [*Rubin v. Fuchs (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 50, 54-55, 81 Cal. Rptr. 373, 459 P.2d 925* ; *Kossler v. Palm Springs Developments, Ltd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 88, 99-101, 161 Cal. Rptr. 423]* . A purchaser may make a conditional tender, that is, conditioned on a vendor's conveyance [*Groobman v. Kirk (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 117, 118-126, 323 P.2d 867]* . Similarly, unless the purchaser's breach takes the form of repudiation, the vendor will have to tender his or her own performance and, if a time provision is involved, demand strict performance in order to put the purchaser in default [*Baird v. Barton (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 502, 505, 329 P.2d 492]* .

When conditions are concurrent and time is of the essence in the contract, both parties' failure to perform by the closing

date discharges the contract, and one party cannot tender after the closing date and make the contract enforceable [*Pittman v. Canham (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 556, 559-560, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 340]* . However, an agreement for the purchase and sale of property was not automatically discharged when neither party performed concurrent obligations by the date specified in the escrow instructions, even though the sales agreement provided that time was of the essence. The seller waived the time provisions by continuing to deal with the buyer after the date specified in the contract, and the buyer was prevented from tendering the loan funds by the seller's failure to provide a termite report as required by the agreement [*Galdjie v. Darwish (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1342-1343, 7 Cal. Rptr. 3d 178]* . Similarly, a buyer was entitled to specific performance of two purchase and sales contracts when it was ready, willing, and able to perform the transactions and the seller prevented the buyer from performing by failing to comply with its escrow obligations, even though the escrow instructions contained "time is of the essence" clauses [*Ninety Nine Investments, Ltd. v. Overseas Courier Service (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1118, 1134, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 891]* .

A party whose performance is subject to a condition precedent to be performed by the other party which has not been fulfilled or waived, need not perform. This excuse for performance or tender is somewhat vitiated by the rule of construction that conditions are to be construed as concurrent rather than precedent unless a contrary intent is plain from the contract language or the condition must in reality be fulfilled before the other performances can be accomplished. For instance, a seller's recording of a final subdivision map was a condition precedent to the buyer's duty to pay because neither the deed nor the deed of trust to secure purchase money financing could be executed until the final map was recorded to provide the official recording data [*Rubin v. Fuchs (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 50, 53-55, 81 Cal. Rptr. 373, 459 P.2d 925]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawBreachAnticipatory RepudiationGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawFormationGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.22

§ 569.22 Purchaser's Remedies

[1] In General

A purchaser's choice of remedy will be affected by market conditions and the magnitude of the purchaser's desire to own the property, possibly with defects of which the purchaser was not aware at the time of contracting, and very probably after long and expensive litigation. The buyer's remedies include (1) damages for breach of the contract, (2) specific performance, even if there is some defect in title or if the seller does not own the entire estate promised, in which case the buyer is entitled to compensation for the defect, (3) damages for fraud, (4) rescission, and (5) cancellation [*Civ. Code §§ 1689, 1690-1693* (rescission), 3306 (damages for breach of contract to convey), 3343 (damages for fraud), 3384-3395 (specific performance), 3412-3415 (cancellation); *see Miller v. Dyer (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 526, 529, 127 P.2d 901* (buyer is entitled to compel conveyance of defective title with compensation for defect)]. Declaratory relief and reformation are available to purchasers on the same basis as they are to vendors, as discussed in *§§ 569.25* and *569.26*. Also, a reformed contract may be specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3402*]. Purchasers may also enforce liquidated damage provisions for their benefit, though such provisions are rare [*Civ. Code §§ 1671, 1679*].

A defaulting buyer is entitled to restitution of the excess of sums paid under the contract over the amount of actual damages sustained by the seller, if there is no valid liquidated damages provision in the seller's favor [*Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 20-23, 230 P.2d 629* ; *see §§ 569.24[4]* (seller's damages for breach), 569.100[2] (restitution for installment purchaser), 569.104[3] (limitations on installment seller's damages); *see also § 569.195* (complaint for restitution under installment sales contract), which can be modified for use under a non-installment contract].

A purchaser may plead inconsistent remedies and does not have to elect between them until after trial [*Williams v. Marshall (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 445, 457, 235 P.2d 372* ; *Walters v. Marler (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 1, 16, 147 Cal. Rptr. 655* ; *see § 569.24[7][b]*].

[2] Purchaser's Remedies to Gain Possession

It would seem that a provision for delivery of possession would be proper asincidental relief in a specific performance

action [*see Michaelian v. Elba Land Co. (1926) 76 Cal. App. 541, 557]* . If the seller does not deliver possession after conveyance of title as provided in the contract, the buyer's remedy is an unlawful detainer action pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1161a(b)(4)*, which applies also to anyone claiming through the seller [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1161a(b)(4)*; *Moss v. Williams (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 830, 839, 191 P.2d 804* ; *Kessler v. Bridge (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 837, 838, 841* , *327 P.2d 241* ; for discussion and forms of notice and complaint for eviction of a seller holding over, see Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

[3] Purchaser's Damages for Breach of Contract

A purchaser intending to sue for damages for breach of contract should take note of the considerations discussed in *§ 569.21* (formation and breach of contract). In determining the measure of damages to be applied, the distinction must be made whether the promise to convey is the promise breached, in which case *Civ. Code § 3306* governs the measure of damages, or whether some collateral promise has been breached, in which case *Civ. Code § 3300* governs the measure of damages [*see Coughlin v. Blair (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 587, 600, 262 P.2d 305* (collateral promise to connect road, water, electricity); *Christensen v. Slawter (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 325, 330-334, 343 P.2d 341* (delay)]. In some cases both measures will produce the same result [*see Crocker v. Grandi (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 431, 437-438, 11 Cal. Rptr. 330* (specific performance under option with damages for lots to which seller did not have clear title)].

The measure of damages under *Civ. Code § 3306* for a seller's breach of the promise to convey is (1) the amount paid and expenses properly incurred in examining title and preparing the necessary papers, (2) the difference between the contract price and the value of the estate agreed to be conveyed at the time of the breach, (3) the expenses properly incurred in preparing to enter on the land, (4) consequential damages, and (5) interest [*Civ. Code § 3306*]. Before 1984, *Civ. Code § 3306* did not provide for consequential damages or interest, though interest was allowed under case law, and any difference between the contract price and the value on the date of breach was recoverable only if the seller's bad faith was proved [*see Caplan v. Schroeder (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 515, 521-522, 15 Cal. Rptr. 145, 364 P.2d 321* (allowing interest on bad faith damages from date difference could be determined); for a form of complaint by a purchaser seeking damages for breach of contract to convey, *see § 569.164*]. The seller may not recover consequential damages because of loss of rental income if the evidence of capitalized income value of the property included rental income [*Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 890-892, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460]* . Because there is little case law on a buyer's consequential damages, some guidance may be found in the cases establishing the seller's consequential damages, discussed in *§ 569.24[4]*.

The measure of damages under *Civ. Code § 3300* for a vendor's breach of a collateral promise is the amount that will compensate the purchaser for all the detriment caused, or which in the ordinary course of things would be likely to result from the breach [*Civ. Code § 3300*]. For particular applications of the *Civ. Code § 3300* measure, see the decisions in § 569.164[7].

[4] Purchaser's Right to Specific Performance

To obtain specific performance, a purchaser must establish (1) the formation of a contract the terms of which are sufficiently definite to be enforced, (2) the adequacy of the consideration to be received by the vendor, (3) that the contract is just and reasonable as to the vendor, (4) that the purchaser's legal remedy is inadequate, and (5) that the purchaser remains willing and able to perform [*Civ. Code § 3391(1), (2)*; *Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 473, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* ; *see Doryon v. Salant (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 706, 714-715, 142 Cal. Rptr. 378* (failure to allege willingness and ability to perform is not fatal if defendant fails to object to sufficiency of complaint and evidence shows willingness and ability)]. The legal remedy is presumed to be inadequate. If the property with regard to which specific performance is being sought is a single-family residence to be occupied by the purchaser, the presumption is conclusive. In other cases the presumption shifts the burden of proof, so that the vendor is required to show that money damages would be adequate [*Civ. Code § 3387*; *see Evid. Code §§ 601, 606*]. The just and reasonable requirement and the adequacy of consideration requirement are closely linked, as are the certainty requirement and the just and

reasonable requirement [*see* *Handy v. Gordon (1967) 65 Cal. 2d 578, 581, 55 Cal. Rptr. 769, 422 P.2d 329* (uncertain as unjust and unreasonable); *Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 474, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* (just, reasonable, and adequate)]. A purchaser may waive an indefinite provision solely for his or her benefit and thereby obtain specific performance of an agreement that would otherwise be too uncertain to be enforced specifically [*Reeder v. Longo (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 291, 296-297, 182 Cal. Rptr. 287]* . Adequacy of consideration is tested at the time of formation of the contract or, in the case of an option, at the time it was made, not at the time it was exercised [*O'Connell v. Lampe (1929) 206 Cal. 282, 285, 274 P. 336* (option); *see* *Schwartz v. Shapiro (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 238, 255, 40 Cal. Rptr. 189* (error to admit evidence of increased value at time of trial)]. Adequacy of consideration does not require that the vendor receive the highest possible price for the property, but only that considering all the circumstances as they existed at the time of the contract, the price was fair and reasonable. Circumstances to be considered include the relation of the parties; their friendship, love, and affection; the object to be obtained by the contact; and the vendor's desire for a quick sale [*Meyer v. Benko (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 937, 945, 127 Cal. Rptr. 846* ; *Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 474-475, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173]* .

Specific performance is proper if a party did not have the ability to perform when the contract was executed but has the ability when the trial is held. For example, when a property could not be conveyed free and clear when the contract was made because a secured note on the property could not be prepaid, but the note is due when the trial is held, the seller is able to convey title free and clear at the time of trial, and, thus, specific performance is available [*Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 893-897, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460]* .

A defense of impossibility with regard to specific performance was rejected by the court in a case in which a foreclosure sale resulted in the property being conveyed to bona fide third-party purchasers after the plaintiffs had entered into an oral contract for the purchase of the property. The court reasoned that a decree of specific performance need not be absolute in form, and the performance that it requires need not be identical with that promised in the contract; it may be so drawn as to best effectuate the purposes for which the contract was made, and it may be granted on such terms and conditions as justice requires [*Rogers v. Davis (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1221-1222, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716* , citing Restatement of Contracts § 359(2)]. The court held that, as the equitable owners of the property at the time of the foreclosure sale, the plaintiffs were entitled in equity to the proceeds of the sale under the doctrine of equitable conversion [*Rogers v. Davis (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1223, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716]* .

A purchaser who is successful in an action for specific performance is entitled to recover incidentals to compensate for the delay. These include the rents and profits from or rental value of the property from the date the purchaser was entitled to possession. These amounts will be reduced by the amount of interest on so much of the purchase price as has not been set aside by the purchaser, with notice to the vendor, so the purchaser does not derive any benefit from it [*Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 220-222, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7]* . Increased financing costs are another example of incidentals [*Stratton v. Tejani (1982) 139 Cal. App. 3d 204, 208-209, 214-215, 187 Cal. Rptr. 231]* . The court may enter an interlocutory judgment, order an accounting to determine the amount of the incidentals involved, and retain jurisdiction for further supervision of the closing [*Wesley N. Taylor Co. v. Russell (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 816, 817-819, 15 Cal. Rptr. 357* .

For a form of complaint by a purchaser seeking specific performance of a contract to convey real property, see *§ 569.165*.

[5] Purchaser's Enforcement of Liquidated Damage Clause

A clause providing for liquidated damages payable to the buyer in the event of breach by the seller would be tested under *Civ. Code § 1671* and would be valid unless it was proved to be unreasonable under the circumstances existing at the time the contract was made [*Civ. Code §§ 1671(a), (b), 1679*].

If a clause providing for liquidated damages payable to the buyer in the event of breach by the buyer is being used

defensively by the buyer to limit his or her liability to the seller, the validity of the provision will be tested under *Civ. Code § 1671* if commercial property is involved and under *Civ. Code §§ 1675-1681* if residential property is involved. Both are discussed in *§ 569.24[6][a]*. A provision liquidating a seller's damages in the event of the buyer's default may be enforced by the purchaser even if it does not strictly comply with the provisions of *Civ. Code §§ 1675-1677*, for example, when sellers had not initialed the clause as required by *Civ. Code § 1677(a)*. In such a case, the election to void the clause rests solely with the purchaser because purchasers, not vendors, are the class to be protected [*Guthman v. Moss (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 501, 506-512, 198 Cal. Rptr. 54]* .

[6] Purchaser's Damages for Fraud

A buyer's damages for fraud can be based on either affirmative misrepresentations or nondisclosure of material facts. In an action for damages for fraud based on affirmative misrepresentations, a buyer is required to prove that (1) the seller made a false representation respecting a material fact; (2) the seller knew the representation was false or made it without any reasonable ground for believing it to be true; (3) the seller intended to induce the buyer's reliance; (4) the buyer did rely on the representation; and (5) the buyer was damaged as a result of his or her reliance [*Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 264, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130* ; *Roland v. Hubenka (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 215, 220, 90 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

A subsequent purchaser may bring an action for damages against the original seller based on fraudulent misrepresentations made to the original buyer if the seller (1) had reason to expect that the misrepresentations would be repeated and (2) the misrepresentations were repeated to the subsequent buyer [*Geernaert v. Mitchell (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 601, 607-608, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 483]* . Whether a seller of real property had "reason to expect" transmission to the plaintiff depends on (1) the extent of the seller's knowledge of resale to a particular person or class of persons and (2) the likelihood that the particular misrepresentation (or concealment) would be passed on to them [*Geernaert v. Mitchell (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th. 601, 608, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 483]* .

In a case involving a relocation intermediary, the Court of Appeal held that the sellers were subject to common law liability to the eventual purchaser for intentional and/or negligent misrepresentation as well as statutory liability under *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* The sellers had sold their home to a relocation intermediary, executed a grant deed with the name of the grantee left blank, and indicated on the statutory transfer disclosure statement that they were not awareof any neighborhood noise problems. This representation was not true as they had had an ongoing dispute with a neighbor over noise. The court found that the sellers had a common law and statutory obligation to make a full disclosure as to the noise disturbances. The sellers had to know and realize that the intermediary intended to sell the property. Further, because the intermediary had no knowledge of the property or its problems, other than as disclosed by the sellers, the sellers had every reason to expect that their disclosure statement would be delivered to the eventual purchaser. These circumstances were sufficient to satisfy the principles of the indirect deception doctrine [*Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1546, 1550, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101]* .

If damages are based on nondisclosure and no confidential relationship is involved (that is, the fraud is not perpetrated by the purchaser's own agent) in addition to the last three elements set forth above, the purchaser must prove (1) the nondisclosure by the vendor of facts materially affecting value or desirability of property and (2) that the undisclosed facts are known or accessible only to the vendor and not known or within reach of the diligent attention and observation of the purchaser [*Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 265, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130* ; *Driver v. Melone (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 746, 753, 90 Cal. Rptr. 98]* . When these elements exist, a purchaser has an election between rescission and damages for fraud [*Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 251, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800]* . The materiality of the undisclosed fact is determined from consideration of (1) the gravity of the harm inflicted by nondisclosure; (2) the fairness of imposing a duty of discovery on the purchaser as an alternative to compelling disclosure by the vendor; and (3) the impact on the stability of the contract if rescission is allowed [*Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 265-267, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130]* . Some defects or conditions, such as the fact that a lot is all or part fill, are considered by case law to be so material that their nondisclosure is considered an inducement [*see, e.g., Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 251, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800* ; *Buist v. C. Dudley De*

Velbiss Corp. (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 325, 331, 6 Cal. Rptr. 259] . In addition, if a vendor has knowledge of the existence of a past or present progressive destruction or substantial impairment, he or she is under a duty to disclose even if he or she believes the progression has been halted [*Barnhouse v. City of Pinole (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 171, 190, 183 Cal. Rptr. 881]* . If a buyer cannot establish all of these elements, damages may still be recoverable for omissions in the various statutory disclosures [*see, e.g., § 569.11*].

For a form of complaint for damages for a seller's failure to comply with statutory disclosure requirements, see *§ 569.166*. For a form of complaint for rescission based on a seller's fraud, see *§ 569.168*. For more detailed discussion of fraud and for forms specifically for use by defrauded buyer's of real property, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* . For discussion of the purchaser's rights if his or her own agent perpetrated the fraud, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

If the seller's agent's misrepresentations were made within the actual or apparent scope of his or her authority, both the agent and the seller are jointly liable for damages for fraud, even though the seller may be innocent of personally participating in the fraud, on the theory that he or she has accepted and retained the benefits of the transaction [*Ach v. Finkelstein (1968) 264 Cal. App. 2d 667, 677, 70 Cal. Rptr. 472]* . On the other hand, if there is an "as is" provision in the contract, or one stating that no representations or understandings are to be relied on except those written in the contract, an innocent seller will be liable for rescission and restoration, but not for damages for fraud [*Herzog v. Capital Co. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 349, 353, 164 P.2d 8* ; *London v. Guberman (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 215, 218, 29 Cal. Rptr. 279]* .

The measure of damages for fraud in the sale of real property is the difference between the actual value of what the purchaser parted with and the actual value of what he or she received, referred to as "out-of-pocket" damages [*Civ. Code § 3343(a)*]. The purchaser may not recover based on the former "benefit-of-the-bargain" rule which allowed recovery of the difference between the actual value of the property and the value as represented [*Civ. Code § 3343(b)(1)*]. Even when no out-of-pocket damages have been sustained, additional damages can be recovered under *Civ. Code § 3343 (a)(1), (4)*, which allow recovery of amounts actually and reasonably expended in reliance on the fraud and to compensate for any loss of profits or other gains that were reasonably anticipated and would have been earned by the purchaser from the use or sale of the property had it possessed the characteristics fraudulently attributed to it. Because damages for lost profits from the use or sale of the property are only allowed if (1) the property was acquired for use or resale at a profit; (2) the purchaser reasonably relied on the fraud in entering the transaction and anticipating profits; and (3) the damages were actually caused by the fraud and the purchaser's reliance thereon, they are not usually available to a purchaser of a residence [*Civ. Code § 3343(a)(1), (4)*; *Stout v. Turney (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 718, 723-730, 150 Cal. Rptr. 637, 586 P.2d 1228* (mobilehome park); *see also Hartman v. Shell Oil Co. (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 240, 247-250, 137 Cal. Rptr. 244* (purchase of gas station, upholding punitive damages)]. A buyer's damages will not be reduced by the amount of any collateral source which might have mitigated his or her damages. The seller may not recover consequential damages because of loss of rental income if the evidence of capitalized income value of the property included rental income [*Stevens Group Fund IV v. Sobrato Development Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 886, 890-892, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 460]* . For instance, in an action for damages based on the seller's failure to disclose roof leakage, the fact that FHA regulations would allow the buyer of a low-income apartment complex to increase rents to cover the cost of roof repairs was inadmissible [*Philip Chang & Sons Associates v. La Casa Novato (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 159, 165-173, 222 Cal. Rptr. 800]* .

[7] Purchaser's Right to Rescission

The requisite grounds and procedures for rescission of the contract and restitution of any consideration paid, including the requirement that anything of value received by the plaintiff be returned to the defendant, and their comparison to cancellation are discussed in *§ 569.24[7]*. If the grounds for rescission are fraud, a purchaser can elect fraud damages or rescission [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 783, 128 P.2d 868]* . The election can occur unintentionally. For instance, purchasers who demolished a house after learning that the foundation was so defective that the house could not be occupied and believing that there was no other way to correct the defect, were foreclosed from restitution [

Prichard v. Reitz (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 465, 467-469, 223 Cal. Rptr. 734] . A purchaser who is in default is still entitled to rescission and restitution of the excess of the payments made under the contract, plus the value of any improvements made to the property, over the fair rental value of the property during the time he or she was in possession [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 784-785, 128 P.2d 868* ; *but see Lesny Development Co. v. Kendall (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1020-1024, 210 Cal. Rptr. 890* (defaulting purchaser denied specific performance is only entitled to restitution of lesser of enhanced value of property due to, or reasonable cost of obtaining, subdivision map); *Utemark v. Samuel (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 313, 316, 257 P.2d 656* (restitution of costs, which exceeded increased value, to purchaser granted rescission on vendor's refusal to convey)]. If the fraud occurred in the sale of income property or a business, however, the seller's offset is the lesser of the profits made by the buyer before rescission or the reasonable rental value [*McCoy v. West (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 295, 302-303, 138 Cal. Rptr. 660]* . The rental value offset is comprised only of the reasonable rental value of the property sold and does not include the rental value of any improvements made on it by the purchaser. Interest is allowed to the purchaser on the amounts paid towards the purchase price [*Utemark v. Samuel (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 313, 317-318, 257 P.2d 656]* . For a form of complaint for use by a buyer seeking rescission, see *§ 569.168*.

For mutual mistake to provide the basis for rescission there must be some fact that is believed by both parties. Mutual ignorance of a fact, or a failure to contemplate the fact that later became known, for instance, that the holder of the existing deed of trust would require financial information from the purchaser to allow him or her to assume the loan, is not sufficient [*Civ. Code § 1577*; *Spurgeon v. Drumheller (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 659, 663-664, 220 Cal. Rptr. 195]* . When mutual mistake does provide the grounds for rescission, the buyer has an election whether to rescind or to enforce the contract and have damages caused by the mistake [*see Levy v. Wolff (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 367, 368-369, 294 P.2d 945* (belief that property was subject to valid lease)]. For more detailed discussion of the general requirements applicable to rescission and for additional forms, including a form of judgment for restitution based on rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityMistake

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.23

§ 569.23 Protection From Foreclosure for Active Duty Service Members Under California and Federal Law

[1] Purpose and Application of Protections

In 2002, the State Legislature enacted special protections for officers and enlisted members of the National Guard called or ordered into active state or federal service and reservists of the United States Military Reserve who have been called to full-time active service or duty [*see* 2002 Stats., ch. 60, § 1; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 400 et seq.*]. This legislation establishes special protection from foreclosure and other civil liabilities for active service members and reservists who are found by a court to need assistance because of the demands of their military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408*]. The legislation includes many provisions that are similar to those included in the federal Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*], which is also discussed below. However, the SCRA has many more provisions than the California law, covering a greater variety of topics.

The California provisions apply to service members on active service or duty since September 11, 2001. However, the protections apply prospectively from June 20, 2002 (date bill was signed into law) [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.11*]. Dependents of service members are also entitled to these benefits unless the court finds that the dependents' ability to comply with the terms of the obligation has not been materially impaired by the military service of the person on whom the applicants are dependent [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.5*].

[2] Actions for Foreclose on Mortgage or Deed of Trust

These protections apply to obligations secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other security in the nature of a mortgage on real or personal property owned by a service member at the commencement of the period of the military service and still owned by the service member [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(a)*]. In any proceeding commenced in any court during the period of military service to enforce that obligation, arising out of nonpayment of any sum due or out of any other breach of the terms of the mortgage, trust deed, or other security occurring before or during the period of service, the court may, after hearing and in its discretion on its own motion, and must, on application by the service member or some person on the defendant's behalf (1) stay the proceedings for any period as the court deems just, and (2) make any other disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*]. The court may deny the stay if it finds that the ability of the defendant to comply withthe terms of the obligation is not

materially affected by the military service [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(b)*].

No sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for nonpayment of any sum due under any obligation described above will be valid if made during the period of military service or within three months thereafter, except pursuant to an agreement between the parties or on an order previously granted by the court and a return thereto made and approved by the court [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(c)*]. Any person who knowingly makes or causes to be made a sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property in violation of these provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 408(d)*].

[3] Actions to Rescind or Terminate Contract for Purchase

A person may not exercise any right or option to rescind or terminate a contract for the purchase of real or personal property, if the person or the person's assignor has received a deposit or purchase price installment from a person who has entered military service after the date of payment of the deposit or installment. Additionally, the person who holds the contract may not exercise any right or option under that contract to resume possession of the property for nonpayment of any installment due. This prohibition is applicable to any breach of the contract's terms occurring before or during the period of that military service. The only exercise may be action in a court of competent jurisdiction [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(a)*]. Violation of these provisions subjects the violator to a fine and potential imprisonment [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(c)*].

A court, on the hearing of the action, may order the repayment of prior installments or deposits or any part of these, as a condition of terminating the contract and resuming possession of the property. The court must take this action on application to it by the service member or some person on the service member's behalf. Otherwise, the court may take this action on its own motion and discretion [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*]. Alernatively, the court may order a stay of proceedings as the court deems just, unless in the court's opinion, the ability of the defendant to comply with the terms of the contract is not materially affected by reason of the service; or it may make any other disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interests of all parties [*Mil. & Vet. Code § 407(b)*].

The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) [*50 U.S.C. App. § 501 et seq.*] suspends the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of active service members so that they can devote their entire energy to national defense [*50 U.S.C. App. § 502*]. Among the SCRA's protections are many similar to those afforded by the 2002 California legislation, discussed above.

With regard to mortgages and similar instruments, many provisions of the SCRA are substantively the same as provisions in the Military and Veterans Code. These laws give a court authority to allow an eligible service member to postpone making payments on mortgages that were entered before the member began active duty, on property that was owned before that time, and that is still owned by the member, if the member's ability to pay the mortgage is affected by his or her service [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 532, 533, 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 407, 408*]. Active service members are allowed to apply to a court for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 561, 591*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 409.2*], and the court is empowered to cap interest rates at 6 percent on all obligations of active service members (including mortgages) incurred before active duty [*see 50 U.S.C. App. § 527*; *Mil. & Vet. Code § 405*].

The SCRA allows for the stay of many civil legal proceedings if the service member demonstrates that his or her military service has materially affected the member's ability to appear for the court proceedings, including proceedings concerning mortgage foreclosures [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 522, 533*]. The length of the stay is at the court's discretion based on the service member's showing. The SCRA also offers protections against eviction from residential property rented by a service member, as well as lawful termination of leases for members entering active duty [*see 50 U.S.C. App. §§ 531, 535*; *see also* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*].

Forms for relief under the provisions of these Acts are set forth in Chapter 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property*

Mortgages . These forms include a petition for relief from a mortgage or installment contract for the purchase of real property [*see § 555.138*], an application for a stay of proceedings to collect real property taxes or assessments [*see § 555.139*], and an order staying an action on an obligation secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or similar security [*see § 555.139A*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewMilitary & Veterans LawServicemembersSoldiers & Sailors Civil Relief ActReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxCollectionGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.24

§ 569.24 Vendor's Remedies

[1] Consideration; Election of Remedies

In selecting among available remedies, the seller will consider market conditions, the stance of the parties, and other unique aspects of the transaction, such as special conditions or covenants that are uncertain or otherwise difficult to establish in monetary terms or unenforceable in equity. Generally the choices include damages for breach of contract, declaratory relief, damages for fraud, rescission, or cancellation [*Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 847, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *see* *Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 507, 250 P.2d 283]* . Specific performance may be available to a seller in a unique situation [*see § 569.24[5]*.

Although inconsistent remedies may be pleaded, the seller should beware of actions that amount to an election [*see Williams v. Marshall (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 445, 457, 235 P.2d 372* (rescission and breach of contract)]. For instance, resaleof the property to a third party who has no knowledge of the first contract and pays value, forecloses the possibility of specific performance; and a mutual rescission agreement forecloses an action for damages for fraud [*see Civ. Code § 3395*; *Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 836, 847-848, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 507, 250 P.2d 283]* .

[2] To Remove Clouds on Title Created by Purchaser's Claims

If the contract has been recorded and the buyer refuses to execute a release in recordable form, the seller will probably have to sue for declaratory relief, cancellation, or quiet title to be able to convey clear title to anyone else [*see Civ. Code §§ 886.020* (duty to execute release), 886.030(a) (expiration of rights under recorded contract) discussed in *§ 569.18* and *§ 569.17*, respectively; *see also § 569.24[7][c]*]. Each of those three remedies has disadvantages and is discussed in more detail in Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments* , Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* , and Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , respectively. Cancellation operates only on a void or voidable instrument, and is thus inconsistent with damages for breach of contract [*Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532-534, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . While quiet title may be used to establish plaintiff's superior title as against only one adverse claim, to be successful a plaintiff cannot establish merely the weakness in defendant's title, but must prove his or her own title, even if the defendant's default has been taken [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.020(c), 762.010, 762.060(c), 764.010*; *see* *Winter v. Rice (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d*

679, 683, 222 Cal. Rptr. 340 (complaint disclosing defect in plaintiff's title stated cause of action for cancellation, but not for quiet title)]. In addition, quiet title is not technically available to a plaintiff who does not have legal title but only equitable title; nevertheless, the technicalities are occasionally overlooked to provide rescission, cancellation and quiet title to an injured seller in the same action [*see Nevarez v. Nevarez (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 596, 600, 21 Cal. Rptr. 70* (quiet title is not available to plaintiff who does not have legal title; proper remedy is declaration that defendant holds title as constructive trustee for plaintiff); *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 531-532, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335* (transaction rescinded, deed cancelled, and title quieted against holders of deed of trust)]. Declaratory relief could be sought along with damages for breach of contract to establish that the purchaser no longer has any rights under the contract, but reliance on such a judgment to make plaintiff's title marketable seems prudent only if one knows title insurance will be available on that basis.

Thus, if the contract has been recorded and the purchaser refuses to execute a release, a vendor seeking damages for breach of contract will also seek to quiet title, whereas if the underlying transaction is rescinded, the vendor will seek cancellation. Similarly, if rescission of the contract is sought after the deed has been recorded, cancellation or a judgment requiring reconveyance will be necessary.

[3] To Regain Possession

If a buyer has taken possession and refuses to vacate after default or rescission, the seller can regain possession in a quiet title action or by an action for ejectment [*Civ. Code § 3375* (ejectment); *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020* (quiet title); *South Shore Land Co. v. Petersen (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 725, 741, 38 Cal. Rptr. 392* (quiet title); *see Paap v. Von Helmholt (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 823, 828-829, 8 Cal. Rptr. 568* (both)]. The primary difference between the two is that ejectment is based on the right to possession, while quiet title requires plaintiff to have and prove his or her legal title [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.010*]. Nevertheless, title may become relevant in an ejectment action if necessary to determine the right to possession [*Whittaker v. Otto (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 619, 626, 10 Cal. Rptr. 689* (ejectment); *see § 569.24[2]*]. For more detailed discussion and forms for seeking these remedies, see Ch. 241, *Ejectment* , and Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , respectively.

[4] Vendor's Damages for Breach of Contract

A seller considering suit for damages for breach of contract should first take note of the considerations discussed in *§ 569.21*. Because the statutory measure of damages for breach of a contract to purchase real property is the difference, if any, between the contract price and the value of the property to the seller, which is generally the market value, on the date of breach, plus consequential damages and interest, the seller won't have any actual damages for breach of contract in a stable or rising market [*Civ. Code § 3307*; *Royer v. Carter (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 544, 550, 233 P.2d 539]* . In addition, to obtain consequential damages incurred after breach, resale must be made with reasonable diligence [*Spurgeon v. Drumheller (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 659, 665-666, 220 Cal. Rptr. 195* (seller took property off market because personal reasons no longer necessitated sale); *Sutter v. Madrin (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 161, 169, 74 Cal. Rptr. 627]* . If the contract called for the seller to take back a note and deed of trust, the contract price will have to be discounted to reflect its cash equivalent. That discounting will erode, and may eliminate, any difference between the contract price and market value at the time of breach [*Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 841, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Furthermore, a seller who has actual damages based on market value at the time of breach but resells at a profit before trial, cannot recover damages for breach of contract [*Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 19-20, 23, 230 P.2d 629* ; *Smith v. Mady (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 129, 133, 194 Cal. Rptr. 42*)]. Thus, absent significant consequential damages, a seller can recover damages for breach of contract only in a falling market. Even then, the purchaser's liability is fixed as of the date of breach, and losses after that time due to continuing market erosion are not recoverable [*Royer v. Carter (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 544, 548-550, 233 P.2d 539*]. For a form of complaint for use by a seller seeking damages for breach of contract, see *§ 569.161*.

[5] Vendor's Right to Specific Performance

There is a presumption that the breach of an agreement to transfer real property cannot be adequately relieved by monetary damages. In the case of a single-family dwelling that the buyer intends to occupy, the presumption is conclusive. In all other cases, the presumption affects the burden of proof [*Civ. Code § 3387*]. Thus, if a single-family dwelling is not involved, the buyer will have the burden of proving that monetary damages provide adequate relief [*see Civ. Code § 3387*; *Evid. Code §§ 601, 606*; *see also Henderson v. Fisher (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 468, 473, 46 Cal. Rptr. 173* (seller's burden of proof)].

Civ. Code § 3307, which specifies the detriment caused by breach of a real property contract and allows a seller to recover consequential damages and interest, does not eliminate the seller's ability to seek specific performance. The seller has a choice of remedies, and may pursue damages or specific performance [*BD Inns v. Pooley (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 289, 295-296, 266 Cal. Rptr. 815]* .

Adequacy of consideration and the justness and reasonableness of the contract price, elements not required to be proven in an action for damages, must be shown in a specific performance action [*Civ. Code § 3391(1), (2)*]. Adequacy of consideration is determined as of the inception of the contract, or, in the case of an option, at the time the option was given [*O'Connell v. Lampe (1929) 206 Cal. 282, 285, 274 P. 336* (option; purchaser plaintiff); *Schwartz v. Shapiro (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 238, 255, 40 Cal. Rptr. 189* ; *but see Pasteur Realty Corp. v. La Fleur (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 5, 7, 315 P.2d 374* (dicta, trial court denied specific performance because of lapse of time and decreased value at time of trial)]. A vendor seeking specific performance must have performed all conditions precedent to be performed on his or her part and will have to hold the property off the market during the pendency of the action to be ready to perform [*Civ. Code §§ 3392, 3394*; *Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 847, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Any defect in title will prevent a vendor from obtaining specific performance [*Schmidt v. Callero (1950) 97 Cal. App. 2d 582, 589, 218 P.2d 80]* . Specific performance also requires more certainty of contract than does an action for damages [*Store Properties, Inc. v. Neal (1945) 72 Cal. App. 2d 112, 116, 164 P.2d 38 , disapproved on other grounds, Sterling v. Taylor (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 757, 770* ; *but see Schomaker v. Osborne (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 887, 893, 58 Cal. Rptr. 827* (court fixed remaining terms since principal terms were defined)].

A vendor's right to specific performance is not foreclosed by a liquidated damage provision [*Civ. Code § 1680*].

[6] Vendor's Retention of Deposit

[a] Under Liquidated Damages Clause

[i] Residential Property

A valid liquidated damage clause will prevent a seller from seeking damages for breach of contract but will not prevent a specific performance action [*Civ. Code § 1680*]. The rules governing the validity of a liquidated damages clause depend on the nature of the property that is the subject of the contract. If the contract involves a dwelling containing one to four residential units, that (or a unit in which) the buyer intends to occupy as his or her residence, a liquidated damages clause that provides that all or any part of a payment made by the buyer shall constitute liquidated damages if the buyer does not complete the purchase of the property, may be valid to the extent that payment is actually made in the form of cash or check, including a postdated check [*Civ. Code § 1675(a), (b)*]. The buyer's intent to reside on the premises is determined as of the time the contract was made [*Civ. Code § 1675(a)(2)*].

To be valid, the liquidated damages provision must be separately signed or initialed by each party to the contract. If it is included in a printed contract, it must also be set out either in at least 10-point bold type or in contrasting red print in at least 8-point bold type [*Civ. Code §§ 1675(b), 1677*]. If the amount actually paid pursuant to the liquidated damages provision does not exceed 3 percent of the purchase price, the provision is valid to the extent that payment is actually made unless the buyer establishes that the amount is unreasonable as liquidated damages [*Civ. Code § 1675(b), (c)*].

Conversely, if the amount actually paid pursuant to the liquidated damages provision exceeds 3 percent of the purchase price, the provision is invalid unless the party seeking to uphold the provision establishes that the amount actually paid is reasonable as liquidated damages [*Civ. Code § 1675(b), (d)*]. For these purposes, reasonableness of the amount paid is determined by taking into account (1) the circumstances existing at the time the contract was made, and (2) the price and other terms and circumstances of any subsequent sale or contract to sell the same property if the sale or contract is made within six months of the buyer's default [*Civ. Code § 1675(e)*].

Special provisions apply to the initial sale of newly constructed attached residential condominium units [*see Civ. Code § 783*] located within a structure of 10 or more residential condominium units [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(1)*; *see Civ. Code § 1675(f)(6)* ("structure" defined)]. If the amount actually paid to the seller in accordance with the liquidated damages provision exceeds 3 percent of the purchase price of the residential condominium unit, and the buyer then defaults, the seller must perform an accounting of its costs and revenues related to and fairly allocable to the construction and sale of the unit within 60 calendar days after the final close of escrow of the sale of the unit [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(1)(A)*].The accounting must include any and all costs and revenues related to the construction and sale of the residential property and any delay caused by buyer's default. The seller must make reasonable efforts to mitigate any damages arising from the default, and the seller must refund to the buyer any amounts previously retained as liquidated damages in excess of the greater of either 3 percent of the originally agreed-on purchase price or the amount of the seller's losses resulting from the buyer's default, as calculated by the accounting [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(1)(B)*]. The refund must be sent to the buyer's last known address within 90 days after the final close of escrow of the sale or lease of all the residential condominium units within the structure [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(2)*]. If the amount retained by the seller after the accounting does not exceed 3 percent of the purchase price, the amount is valid unless the buyer establishes that the amount is unreasonable as liquidated damages pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1675(e)* [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(3)*; *see Civ. Code § 1675(f)(4)* (*Civ. Code § 1675(d)* does not apply regarding reasonableness)]. If a "new qualified buyer" has entered into a contract to purchase the residential property, the seller must perform the accounting within 60 calendar days after the new buyer entered the contract to purchase the unit [*Civ. Code § 1675(f)(5)*; *see Civ. Code § 1675(f)(7)* ("new qualified buyer" defined)].

Until July 1, 2014, special provision is made for enhanced liquidated damages to be allowed to sellers in cases involving pre-completion sales of units in a structure of 20 or more residential condominium units, standing over eight stories high, that is high-density infill development as defined in *Pub. Res. Code § 21159.24(a)(10)* and is located in a city, county, or city and county with a population density of 1,900 residents per square mile or greater as evidenced by the 2000 federal census. When the sale price of a unit exceeds $1 million and the buyer defaults, liquidated damages of 6 percent of the purchase price will be presumed valid [*Civ. Code § 1675(g), (h)*]. Except regarding the amount of liquidated damages and the conditions prescribed for this case, the rules in this case are essentially the same as in a case subject to *Civ. Code § 1675(f)*, described above.

If more than one payment made by the buyer is to constitute liquidated damages, the amount of any payment after the first is valid as liquidated damages only if (1) the total of all payments is valid under the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1675*, and *(2)* a separate liquidated damages provision satisfying the requirements of *Civ. Code § 1677* is separately signed or initialed by each party for each subsequent payment [*Civ. Code §§ 1675(b), 1678*].

These requirements do not apply to installment contracts as defined in *Civ. Code § 2985(a)* (contracts that do not require conveyance within one year from date contract was formed), which are discussed in *§ 569.60* et seq. [*Civ. Code § 1681*].

[ii] Nonresidential Property

If a contract for the sale of real property does not involve owner-occupied residential property as defined by *Civ. Code § 1675(a)*, discussed in *§ 569.24[6][a][i]*, a provision liquidating the damages to the seller if the buyer fails to complete the purchase of the property is valid, subject to the following two conditions [*Civ. Code § 1676*]:

- The liquidated damages provision is valid unless the party seeking to invalidate the provision establishes that the provision was unreasonable under the circumstances existing at the time the contract was made [*Civ. Code § 1671(b)*; for further discussion of *Civ. Code § 1671(b)*, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.190* et seq.].

- The liquidated damages provision is invalid unless it is separately signed or initialed by each party to the contract and, if it is included in a printed contract, unless it is set out in at least 10-point bold type or in contrasting red print in at least 8-point bold type [*Civ. Code § 1677*].

[b] Absent Liquidated Damages Clause

Although most standard form deposit receipts contain liquidated damage provisions, in some cases a deposit will be made pursuant to some other provision or pursuant to a provision that fails as a liquidated damage provision. If the deposit is actually consideration for part of the agreement, such as an option, the seller may, of course, retain it. However, mere recitation in the agreement that the deposit is consideration for the execution of the agreement is insufficient to establish that the deposit is actually meaningful separate consideration [*Caplan v. Schroeder (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 515, 519, 15 Cal. Rptr. 145, 364 P.2d 321* ; *Rodriguez v. Barnett (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 154, 160, 338 P.2d 907* ; *see Eddy v. Gallaway (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 185, 190-191, 89 Cal. Rptr. 491* (deposit treated as separate consideration for execution of agreement because parties treated it as option)]. Even if the deposit is not separate consideration for execution of the agreement, the seller is entitled to retain it on the buyer's breach to apply to his or her actual damages [*Royer v. Carter (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 544, 547, 233 P.2d 539]* .

If the contract fails or is rescinded due to a failure of condition, such as the buyer's good faith dissatisfaction with a subdivision map, the seller is not entitled to keep any portion of the deposit [*Rodriguez v. Barnett (1959) 52 Cal. 2d 154, 160-161, 338 P.2d 907]* . The seller is liable to return to the defaulting purchaser any excess of the deposit over actual damages, even if the purchaser's breach is willful [*Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 20-23, 230 P.2d 629]* .

[7] Vendor's Right to Rescission

[a] Grounds

The major grounds for rescission are [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)-(5)*]:

- That consent to the contract was given by mistake or obtained through fraud, duress, or undue influence [*see Civ. Code §§ 1569* (defining "duress"), 1571-1574 (defining "fraud"), 1575 (defining "undue influence"), 1576, 1577 (defining "mistake"); *Conlan v. Sullivan (1895) 110 Cal. 624, 626-627, 42 P. 1081* (vendor's mistake, purchaser's fraud)];

- That the consideration for the obligation of the rescinding party failed, in whole or in part, through the fault of the other party;

- That the consideration for the obligation of the rescinding party became entirely void from any cause, or failed in a material respect from anycause before it was rendered; or

- That the contract is unlawful for causes which do not appear in its terms or conditions, and the parties are not equally at fault.

For further discussion of these and other grounds for rescission, see Ch. 215, *Duress, Menace, Fraud, Undue Influence,*

and Mistake , and Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution* .

Failure of a condition precedent to be performed by the buyer is a failure of consideration providing the seller with grounds for rescission. If the condition is to be performed by a specified date, strict performance is not required, but a seller's notice of rescission given after a reasonable time will be upheld [*Fowler v. Ross (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 472, 478-480, 191 Cal. Rptr. 183* (no time essence clause; notice of rescission given 52 days after date verification of financing was required); *see Williams Plumbing Co. v. Sinsley (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1027, 1031-1035, 126 Cal. Rptr. 345* (time essence clause; purchaser who tendered portion of deposit three days late still entitled to specific performance)].

A seller may have a right to rescind if he or she has been misled as to the value of his or her property by the buyer. This right will arise if (1) the purchaser makes a positive statement about the value of the property with intent to deceive, (2) circumstances indicate that the vendor relies on the purchaser's statement and superior knowledge, and (3) the vendor is either pursuaded not to make an independent investigation or is not reasonably situated so as to be able to do so [*Palm v. Smither (1942) 52 Cal. App. 2d 500, 505, 126 P.2d 428]* . A vendor has grounds for rescission if a managing partner or co-owner misrepresents to the vendor of a commercial property that there are operating losses, or if a purchaser misrepresents the value of the collateral, other than the property sold, taken as consideration by the vendor or fails to provide the promised collateral [*see Zeller v. Milligan (1925) 71 Cal. App. 617, 623-625, 236 P. 349* (sale of one-half interest in hotel after co-owner misrepresented operating losses; misrepresentation as to value of note and deed of trust given is consideration); *Frankish v. Federal Mortg. Co. (1939) 30 Cal. App. 2d 700, 713-714, 87 P.2d 90* (promised security never given)]. Other examples of grounds for rescission are discussed in *§ 569.24[8]*.

In addition, a vendor can rescind a sale to the broker who was employed to find a buyer for the property and who purchased the property without disclosing to the vendor that he or she was the purchaser. Because the broker is a fiduciary, such a sale is presumed to be without sufficient consideration, and the burden is on the broker to show otherwise [*Smith v. Zak (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 785, 792-793, 98 Cal. Rptr. 242* ; *Slusher v. Buckley (1959) 174 Cal. App. 2d 324, 331, 344 P.2d 905* (rule applied when agent's spouse was purchaser)]. If the broker, or a person or entity related to or affiliated with the broker, purchases the property, as an alternative to rescission, the vendor can recover any secret profits made by the broker [*Adams v. Herman (1951) 106 Cal. App. 2d 92, 99-102, 234 P.2d 695]* . For more detailed discussion of broker liability and forms of complaint for accounting and to compel reconveyance, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* . Other examples of broker fraud are discussed in *§ 569.24[8]*.

Under *Civ. Code § 1692*, consequential damages may be awarded in incident to rescission. In the context of real estate contracts, this will commonly include the value of the use of the property during the time it was in defendant's possession [*Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532-533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* . Punitive damages may be awarded incident to rescission based on tortious conduct [*Mahon v. Berg (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 588, 589-590, 73 Cal. Rptr. 356* ; *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335]* .

[b] Procedure

Rescission requires the return to the other party of any consideration he or she has paid [*Civ. Code § 1691*]. A seller of real property has to return payments and the value of any improvements made by the purchaser, less credit for the fair rental value for any time the purchaser was in possession [*Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 784-786, 128 P.2d 868]* . Rescission should be instituted as soon as grounds are discovered because it is subject to laches and cannot be granted if the delay has prejudiced the other party [*Civ. Code §§ 1691, 1693*; *Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 214-215, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12* (complaint demurrable for failure to allege prompt rescission)]. If rescission is sought after the deed has been given, it should be coupled with an action to cancel the deed [*see Civ. Code § 3412* (cancellation of void or voidable instrument) and Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*; *see also § 569.162*]. In addition, if a business or rental property is involved, or for some other reason counsel anticipates difficulty in determining the exact amount of restitution required, a cause of action for an accounting should be added to determine the amount of

profits due from the purchaser to the vendor [*see Zeller v. Milligan (1925) 71 Cal. App. 617, 623-625, 236 P. 349* (rescission of sale of half interest in hotel); for discussion of the procedural aspects of accounting and for forms relating to accounting, *see* Ch. 7, *Accounting, Action for*].

Rescission is inconsistent with an action for damages for fraud or for breach of contract, both of which rest on the continuance of the contract. Thus, a completed or effective rescission bars an action for damages for fraud or for breach of contract [*Civ. Code § 1688*; *Sharabianlou v. Karp (2010) 181 Cal. App. 4th 1133, 1146, 105 Cal. Rptr. 3d 300* (award of damages in action for rescission improperly compensated sellers for benefit of bargain that full performance would have brought); *Paularena v. Superior Court (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 906, 915, 42 Cal. Rptr. 366* ; *Evans v. Rancho Royale Hotel Co. (1952) 114 Cal. App. 2d 503, 507, 250 P.2d 283]* . A party seeking damages based on rescission may alternatively seek damages based on breach of contract in the event rescission has not been effected. When such inconsistent remedies are pleaded, the plaintiff cannot be forced to an election until after trial [*Williams v. Marshall(1951) 37 Cal. 2d 445, 457, 235 P.2d 372]* . Nevertheless, because a complaint for rescission is a continuing offer of rescission, the other party may accept the offer at any time [*see Paularena v. Superior Court (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 906, 910, 915, 42 Cal. Rptr. 366]* . If the court in a rescission action finds the contract has not been rescinded, other relief may be granted [*Civ. Code § 1692*]. A vendor's quiet title action does not indicate an election to rescind the contract [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 803, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833]* . However, quiet title and rescission are not inconsistent remedies and may be sought in the same action [*see Seeger v. Odell (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 409, 412-414, 115 P.2d 977]* .

Because a rescission action seeking to recover something other than the consideration paid was an equitable action before the 1961 amendments to the statutes governing rescission, it is an equitable action today. Thus, a vendor was not entitled to a jury trial on a cause of action for rescission against the buyer where the recovery sought by the vendor (money judgment) consisted entirely of something other than the consideration originally paid by vendor (the parcel of land). The 1961 changes to the law of rescission did not give a rescinding plaintiff the right to a jury trial whenever that plaintiff seeks only a monetary recovery [*NMSBPCSLDHB v. County of Fresno (2007) 152 Cal. App. 4th 954, 962-963, 61 Cal. Rptr. 3d 425]* .

[c] Cancellation and Rescission Distinguished

Rescission terminates the contract or obligation while cancellation operates on the instrument. Rescission assumes the existence of a valid contract, while cancellation is only available as to an instrument that is void or voidable [*Civ. Code §§ 1688* (rescission), 3412 (cancellation); *Chas. Brown & Sons v. White Lunch Co. (1928) 92 Cal. App. 457, 461-462, 268 P. 490]* . Cancellation is subject to the additional requirement that there be a reasonable basis for apprehension that if the instrument is left outstanding, it may cause serious injury to a person against whom it is void or voidable. Thus, an instrument that is void on its face, or on the face of another instrument which is necessary to its use in evidence, cannot be the subject of an action for cancellation [*Civ. Code § 3413*]. A deed or a recorded contract for the transfer of property can first be rescinded and then cancelled [*Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532-534, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335* (deed); *Kejr v. Construction Engineers, Inc. (1952) 111 Cal. App. 2d 817, 819, 245 P.2d 21* (recorded timber sale contract)]. Cancellation terminates so much of the contract as remains unperformed and operates as of the time of cancellation; rescission operates to restore the parties to the status quo as of the time the contract was formed [*Mamula v. McCulloch (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 184, 197, 79 Cal. Rptr. 571]* . Still, damages may be awarded incident to both cancellation and rescission [*Oswald v. City of El Centro (1930) 211 Cal. 45, 52, 292 P. 1073* (cancellation of lease); *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 530, 532-533, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335* (both)].

Both rescission of contracts and cancellation of voidable instruments require restoration by plaintiff of anything of value he or she has received from the defendant; cancellation of a void instrument, such as a deed of trust one was tricked into signing, does not [*Fleming v. Kagan (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 791, 796-799, 11 Cal. Rptr. 737]* . Partial cancellation is available, but, absent a showing that certain provisions are severable, partial rescission is not [*Civ. Code § 3414*; *IMO Development Corp. v. Dow Corning Corp. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 451, 457-458, 185 Cal. Rptr. 341* ; *Pitts v.*

Highland Construction Co. (1953) 115 Cal. App. 2d 206, 212-213, 252 P.2d 14 (amount of note reduced in action to cancel note and deed of trust)]. Both rescission and cancellation are subject to laches [*Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 214-215, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12]* .

[8] Vendor's Damages for Fraud

If a vendor has sufficient grounds to recover damages for fraud, he or she will also have grounds for rescission, so counsel will want to carefully evaluate whether rescission or damages for fraud will be more advantageous under the facts of the case [*Civ. Code § 1689(b)(1)*]. For discussion of the relief available in a rescission action as well as examples of fraud allowing rescission, see *§ 569.24[7]*. Vendor's damages for fraud generally arise out of four types of misrepresentations:

- Misrepresentations as to the value of the vendor's property or the extent of the vendor's interest in the property [*see Palm v. Smither (1942) 52 Cal. App. 2d 500, 505, 126 P.2d 428* , discussed in *§ 569.24[7][a]* (value of property); *Seeger v. Odell (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 409, 414-417, 115 P.2d 977* (extent of interest)];

- Misrepresentations as to the value of the consideration given in exchange by the purchaser [*see Schoenberg v. Romike Properties (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 154, 156-157, 59 Cal. Rptr. 359* ; *Salvati v. Cusolito (1950) 98 Cal. App. 2d 582, 584-585, 220 P.2d 800]* ;

- Trickery in obtaining the vendor's signature on the deed [*see Channell v. Anthony (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 290, 298-299, 129 Cal. Rptr. 704]* ; and

- Misrepresentations in connection with the vendor's agreement to subordinate a deed of trust taken back as partial payment. This often involves the contention that the purchaser promised to use the proceeds of the senior loan solely for improvement of the property without any intention of performing that promise. Such a contention is very difficult to prove [*see Tenzer v. Superscope, Inc. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 18, 30-31, 216Cal. Rptr. 130, 702 P.2d 212* (something more than nonperformance is required to prove defendant's intent not to perform the promise); *Rambo v. Blain (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 158, 163-165, 69 Cal. Rptr. 132* (senior lender joined as conspirator)].

A purchaser has a duty to disclose material facts only under certain limited circumstances, including (1) situations in which a fiduciary or confidential relationship exists, (2) situations in which a partial or misleading disclosure is made, and (3) situations in which the purchaser knows that the vendor would reasonably expect a disclosure to be made [*Nussbaum v. Weeks (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1589, 1600-1601, 263 Cal. Rptr. 360]* .

The primary measure of a defrauded seller's damages is the difference between actual value of what he or she parted with and actual value of what he or she received, referred to as "out-of-pocket" damages [*Civ. Code § 3343(a)*]. The seller may not base his or her damages on the former "benefit-of-the-bargain"rule, which allowed recovery of the difference between the actual value of the property and the value as represented [*Civ. Code § 3343(b)(1)*].

Even if no out-of-pocket damages have been sustained, a seller may recover damages (1) for amounts actually and reasonably expended in reliance on the fraud, (2) to compensate the seller for loss of use and enjoyment of the property proximately caused by the fraud, and (3) to compensate the seller for profits or other gains that might reasonably have been earned by use of the property had it been retained [*Civ. Code § 3343(a)(1)-(3)*; *Stout v. Turney (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 718, 723-725, 727-730, 150 Cal. Rptr. 637, 586 P.2d 1228* (purchaser plaintiff)]. Damages of the types numbered (2) and (3) are only available if, under the terms of the particular transaction, the seller retained some right to use the property or participate in profits from the property after conveyance to the defendant. Otherwise, once the seller has parted with title and waived the right to rescission, he or she no longer has any right to use the property or to claim

profits from it [*Channell v. Anthony (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 290, 315-318, 129 Cal. Rptr. 704]* . If the transaction was not structured so as to entitle the vendor to damages for lost use and profits under *Civ. Code § 3343(a)(2), (3),* rescission may provide a better remedy for the particular vendor. The *Civ. Code § 3343* measure of damages is discussed in more detail in Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

A seller of real property may also be the victim of fraud practiced by his or her broker, as well as the purchaser, for instance if the broker failed to disclose a higher offer, and after a sale based on a lower offer, acted as broker for the purchaser to resell to the offeror of the undisclosed higher offer. In such a case, because of the broker's fiduciary duty, the seller's damages are not governed by *Civ. Code § 3343*, but by the broader measures of *Civ. Code §§ 1709* and *3333* [*Lewis v. Upton (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 232, 234-237, 198 Cal. Rptr. 494* (punitive damages also recoverable); *Simone v. McKee (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 307, 315, 298 P.2d 667* (damages awarded equal to difference between the first and second sale prices)]. For a form of complaint against the broker and the purchaser for damages for fraud by taking secret profits on resale, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* . Broker fraud might take the form of misrepresentations concerning the type or value of consideration or negligent misrepresentations by passing on the purchaser's misrepresentations without adequate investigation [*see, e.g.,* *Hartzell v. Myall (1953) 115 Cal. App. 2d 670, 676-677, 252 P.2d 676* (transaction netted seller less consideration for equity than promised; note not worth face value; punitive damages awarded); *Schoenberg v. Romike Properties (1967) 251 Cal. App. 2d 154, 162, 59 Cal. Rptr. 359* (in addition to purchasers' liability, broker who failed to investigate purchasers' misrepresentation as to value of security is liable for constructive fraud); *Banville v. Schmidt (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 92, 95, 98-99, 112 Cal. Rptr. 126* (in addition to liability of purchaser for fraud, broker is liable for negligent misrepresentations to vendor that property securing note and deed of trust taken by vendors was worth much more than amount due on note and that maker of note was financially stable)].

For more detailed discussion of broker liability and forms of complaint for accounting and to compel reconveyance, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

[9] Action for Unlawful "Rent Skimming"

Civ. Code § 890 et seq. establishes civil and criminal liability for rent skimming, which is essentially a purchasing landlord's use of rent revenue from residential property during the first year after acquiring that property without first applying the revenue or an equivalent amount to payments due on all encumbrances on that property [*see Civ. Code § 890(a)*].

The seller of residential real property who holds a lien on the property securing all or part of the purchase price may bring an action against any person who has engaged in rent skimming with respect to that property, in which he or she is entitled to recover actual damages, any appropriate equitable relief, attorney's fees, and costs. The court may also award exemplary damages in an amount not less than three times the actual damages under specified circumstances [*Civ. Code § 891(a)*]. If the seller reacquires the property, he or she may request the court for an order declaring that the property is not encumbered by any lien that is or has the effect of being a judgment lien against the person who engaged in rent skimming, as long as the lien in question is not related to improvement of the property and does not represent security for a loan in good faith without knowledge of facts constituting a violation of *Civ. Code § 890 et seq.* [*Civ. Code § 891(b)*]. For further discussion and forms relating to this type of action, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesContracts LawRemediesLiquidated DamagesContracts LawRemediesRescission & RedhibitionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsEjectment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.25

§ 569.25 Declaratory Relief

Declaratory relief is available to both vendors and purchasers to determine their respective rights under a contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]. Questions relating to the formation of a contract, its validity, its construction and effect, excuses for nonperformance, and termination are proper subjects for declaratory relief [*Fowler v. Ross (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 472, 478, 191 Cal. Rptr. 183* (vendor seeking declaration that contract has been rescinded); *see Holiday Inns of America v. Knight (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 327, 328, 74 Cal. Rptr. 722, 450 P.2d 42* (purchaser/optionee seeking declaration that contract is still in force despite late tender); *Roberts v. Parker (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 140, 141, 331 P.2d 447* (determining proration of taxes and assessments, date for performance); *see § 569.169*]. A declaratory relief action has the advantage of being entitled to priority in trial setting; however priority is not available, absent a showing that a speedy trial is necessary, if other relief is sought in addition to declaratory relief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3*]. For detailed discussion and forms of declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.26

§ 569.26 Reformation

Both vendors and purchasers can have a contract or other instrument reformed, on grounds of fraud, mutual or unilateral mistake, to conform to the true intention of the parties. In the case of unilateral mistake, reformation is available only if the defendant knew of or suspected the plaintiff's mistake at the time it was made. In all cases relief is limited in that it can only be granted without prejudice to rights acquired by third parties in good faith and for value [*Civ. Code §§ 3399-3401*]. A contract may first be reformed and then specifically enforced [*Civ. Code § 3402*]. Because the purpose of reformation is to conform the contract or instrument to the intention of the parties, it is only available when there is in fact a common intention shared by both parties [*Lemoge Electric v. County of San Mateo (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 659, 663-664, 297 P.2d 638]* . Thus, reformation may be based on misrepresentations that a writing conforms to the intention of the parties, but may not be based on misrepresentations that induced the contract, because in the latter case the parties would not have had a common intention [*Lane v. Davis (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 302, 307-308, 342 P.2d 267* ; *California Pac. Title Co. v. Moore (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 114, 116, 40 Cal. Rptr. 61* (error in drafting deed)]. For discussion and forms relating to reformation, see Ch. 488, *Reformation of Instruments* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesReformationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityIllegalityReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityMistake

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.27

§ 569.27 Options and Preemptive Rights

An option, when supported by consideration, is a contract by which an owner gives another the exclusive right to accept or reject a present offer for the sale of his or her property for a stipulated price within a specified time. An option contract is irrevocable by the optionor (owner), and unless the agreement provides to the contrary, it is generally assignable by the optionee [*County of San Diego v. Miller (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 684, 688, 119 Cal. Rptr. 491, 532 P.2d 139]* . The option becomes a contract of sale binding on both parties only on acceptance, or exercise, of the option by the optionee [*Rollins v. Stokes (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 701, 709, 176 Cal. Rptr. 835]* . For cases involving disputes over whether an option has been effectively exercised, see *§ 569.165[8][c]*.

Once the option is exercised, it relates back to the time the option was given, and cuts off intervening interests if the holders of those interests had notice of the existence of the option. Notice can be provided either by recording of the option or from the optionee's possession of the premises [*Claremont Terrace Homeowners' Assn. v. United States (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 398, 407-409, 194 Cal. Rptr. 216* (intervening federal tax lien defeated)]. However, evidence that an optionee has obtained title to property that is the subject of the option is not sufficient to extinguish an intervening lien when there is no evidence that the optionee's title was obtained pursuant to the option. For an optionee to have the benefit of the relation back rule, the optionee must have been able to compel specific performance of the option. If an optionee did not have the right to specific performance of the option, but nevertheless obtains title to the property outside the purview of the option, the optionee has no greater priority among competing claims to the property than any other purchaser of the property [*Wachovia Bank v. Lifetime Industries, Inc. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1042, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168]* .

The California Supreme Court concluded that, although an agreement was titled "Real Estate Purchase Contract," the label was not dispositive. Rather, the Court looked through the agreement's form to its substance, and determined that the agreement contained the classic features of an option. First, the agreement obliged the property owner to hold open an offer to sell the parcel at a fixed price for three years. Second, the optionee had the power to accept the offer by satisfying or waiving the contingencies and paying the balance of the purchase price; however, because of an escape clause, the optionee was not obligated to do anything. The relevant term provided, "It is expressly understood that [optionee] may, at [his] absolute and sole discretion during this period, elect not to continue in this transaction and this

purchase contract will become null and void" [*Steiner v. Thexton (2010) 48 Cal. 4th 411, 418, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d 252, 226 P.3d 359]* . Further, it appeared that the term's broad and express language permitted the optionee to terminate the agreement even if all contingencies had been satisfied. For that reason, the Court rejected the contention that the agreement should instead have been construed as a bilateral contract subject to a contingency [*Steiner v. Thexton (2010) 48 Cal. 4th 411, 418-419, 106 Cal. Rptr. 3d 252, 226 P.3d 359]* .

A preemptive right requires the owner, if and when he or she decides to sell the property, to offer it first to the preemptioner, at the stipulated price. If the preemptioner decides not to buy at that price, the owner is free to sell the property to someone else. Thus, unlike an option, a premeptive right does not give the preemptioner the power to compel an unwilling owner to sell the property subject to the right [*Nelson v. Reisner (1958) 51 Cal. 2d 161, 166, 331 P.2d 17]* . In a sense, however, a preemptive right becomes an option when the property owner decides to sell [*Mercer v. Lemmens (1964) 230 Cal. App. 2d 167, 171, 40 Cal. Rptr. 803]* . Similarly, the granting of an option to a third party is considered a decision to sell so as to trigger a preemptive right, even if the option provides that it cannot be exercised until expiration of the preemptive right [*Rollins v. Stokes (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 701, 705-706, 710-712, 176 Cal. Rptr. 835]* .

Options and preemptive rights given to tenants are discussed in Ch. 331, *Landlord and Tenant: Creating the Tenancy* , Ch. 334, *Landlord and Tenant: Claims for Damages* , and Ch. 335, *Landlord and Tenant: Rent Control* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsOption ContractsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsRights of First RefusalReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsRights of Preemption

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.28-569.59

[Reserved]

§§ 569.28[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.60

§ 569.60 Governing Law

Installment sales contracts are subject to the requirements of *Civ. Code § 2985 et seq.* *Civ. Code §§ 3275* (relief from forfeiture) and 3369 (nonenforcement of penalty or forfeiture in equity) have provided the basis for certain of the equitable and security-type remedies available to a purchaser under an installment sales contracts. The vendor's remedy of strict foreclosure of the purchaser's interest is governed by the quiet title statutes, *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityReliefContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresStrict ForeclosureReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.61

§ 569.61 Installment Sales Contract--Definition

In this chapter, "installment sales contract" is used to refer to the type of contract defined in *Civ. Code § 2985* as a real property sales contract: an agreement in which one party agrees to convey title to real property to another party on the satisfaction of specified conditions set forth in the contract and whichdoes not require conveyance of title within one year from the date of formation of the contract [*Civ. Code § 2985(a)*; *see Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 106, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (right of redemption is applicable to contracts that on their face do not require conveyance within one year); *In re Marriage of Tucker (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 128, 133-134, 190 Cal. Rptr. 127* (deposit receipt stating "Buyers will purchase house on contract of sale," providing for transfer of title in six to 12 months with no requirement of specific time, and evidencing intent that title be conveyed when FHA financing became available one year after completion of construction is contract of sale)].

Because developers could have difficulty financing large-scale residential condominium developments that comprise attached units, if the Civil Code provisions governing installment land sale contracts [*Civ. Code § 2985 et seq.*] were applied to a pre-sale agreement for a unit in such a project, those provisions do not apply to such an agreement that was made in consequence of a conditional public report for the condominium project issued by the Department of Real Estate pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.12* [*Civ. Code § 2985(b)*; *see generally* Assem. Comm. on Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 504 (2005-2006 Reg. Sess.) as amended Jan. 19, 2006; *see also* California Real Estate Law and Pracitce, Ch. 424, *Regulation of Subdivided Land Sales*, § 424.80 (Matthew Bender) (issuance of conditional public report)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesCondominiumsPurchase & SaleReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.62

§ 569.62 Disclosure Requirements

The seller under an installment sales contract is bound by the disclosure requirements applicable to sellers of real property generally [*see Civ. Code § 1102(a)* (statutory provisions governing disclosures on transfer of residential real property apply to installment land sale contracts)]. For discussion of these various disclosure requirements, including a residential seller's duty of disclosure and disclosures required of arrangers of credit, see *§§ 569.11 -569.16*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.63

§ 569.63 Transfer of Contract and Fee Must Coincide

The fee owner of real property subject to an installment sales contract may not transfer the installment sales contract unless the sale is accompanied by a transfer of the real property that is the subject of the contract. Similarly, the fee owner may not transfer the real property unless the transfer is accompanied by an assignment of the contract. Nevertheless, the following are not prohibited: (1) the assignment or pledge of an installment sales contract, as security or for collection, to the holder of the first lien on the real property which is the subject of the contract without transfer of the real property; or (2) the transfer of a fee title in trust without the concurrent assignment of the sales contract [*Civ. Code § 2985.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsAssignmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawOwnership & TransferGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.64

§ 569.64 Tax and Term Statement

Every installment sales contract entered into after January 1, 1966, must contain a statement of (1) the number of years required to complete payment in accordance with the terms of the contract, and (2) the basis on which the tax estimate is made [*Civ. Code § 2985.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to DiscloseTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.65

§ 569.65 Encumbrances Prohibited

It is a public offense for any person, or the assignee of such person, who sells a parcel of land under an installment sales contract which is not recorded to thereafter cause an encumbrance or encumbrances not consented to in writing by the parties on the property in an amount which, together with existing encumbrances thereon, exceeds the amount then due under the contract, or under which the aggregate amount of any periodic payments exceeds the periodic payments due on the contract, excluding any pro rata amount for insurance and taxes. No civil remedy is set forth, but the offense is punishable by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment in a state prison or county jail not exceeding one year, or by both the fine and imprisonment [*Civ. Code § 2985.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.66

§ 569.66 Misuse of Payments Prohibited

It is a public offense for a seller of improved or unimproved real property under an installment sales contract, or any seller's assignee, to knowingly receive an installment payment from the buyer at a time when any payment by the seller or seller's assignee is then due on an obligation secured by an encumbrance on the property subject to the contract and to use that payment, or so much of it as equals the seller's or assignee's obligation, other than for payment of the amount then due on the seller's or assignee's obligation. No civil remedy is set forth, but the offense is punishable by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment in a state prison or county jail not exceeding one year, or by both the fine and imprisonment [*Civ. Code § 2985.3*]. Similarly, a seller who receives pro rata payments for insurance and taxes holds them in trust for the purpose designated and cannot disburse them for any other purpose without the consent of the payor and any entity holding an encumbrance on the property [*Civ. Code § 2985.4*]. *Civ. Code § 2985.4* does not apply to a state- or federal-supervised assignee of a seller who collects and disburses the payments as agent of the seller [*Civ. Code § 2985.4*; *see Penal Code § 506b* (violation of *Civ. Code § 2985.3* or *2985.4*); *People v. Thygesen (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 895, 904-905, 907, 156 Cal. Rptr. 212* (specific intent is not required for conviction; under neither provision does jury determine punishment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsAssignmentsContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.67

§ 569.67 California Veteran Loans

Cal Vet loans are not actually loans; the Department of Veterans Affairs purchases the farm or home and sells it to the veteran on an installment contract [*Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 986.9, 987.69*]. To the extent that the Legislature has not created any specific provision governing Cal Vet loans, they are subject to the same law and equities as regular installment sales contracts [*see, e.g., Brown v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 392, 400-403, 224 Cal. Rptr. 149* (no statutory requirement that department provide insurance)]. If the Legislature has created a specific provision governing Cal Vet loans, the specific provision overrides general rules of law and equity. For instance, under *Mil. & Vet. Code § 987.77*, when a Cal Vet contract is cancelled on account of the veteran's default, the veteran is not entitled to restitution of excess of payments made to the department over the fair rental value during the time he or she was in possession. *Mil. & Vet. Code § 987.77* provides for a forfeiture which is not allowed under regular installment sales contracts [*Department of Veterans Affairs v. Duerksen (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 149, 156-158, 187 Cal. Rptr. 832* ; *but see Mil. & Vet. Code § 987.78* (department may pay veteran gain on resale)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureEquityReliefContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsMilitary & Veterans LawVeteransBenefitsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral Overview

33 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
1. In General

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.68-569.79

[Reserved]

§§ 569.68[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
2. Contract Containing Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.80

§ 569.80 Reinstatement Under Power of Sale in Contract

If the installment sales contract involved gives the vendor a power of sale to be exercised after breach of the obligation, the purchaser has the same rights of notice of default, reinstatement, notice of sale, and all other rights mortgagors have under *Civ. Code §§ 2924-2924h* [*Civ. Code § 2920*]. Similarly, when the installment sales contract involved gives the vendor a power of sale, the vendor's remedy for default is limited to nonjudicial foreclosure of the purchaser's interest. These rights and duties are discussed in *Ch. 555, Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages, §§ 555.50 -555.64*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagor's Interests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
2. Contract Containing Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.81-569.99

[Reserved]

§§ 569.81[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.100

§ 569.100 Installment Purchaser's Remedies

[1] In General

A purchaser under an installment sales contract that does not grant the vendor a power of sale has all the remedies available to a purchaser using any other type of option or contractual arrangement. These are discussed in *§ 569.22* and include a statutory lien on the property pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3050* for payments made, declaratory relief, damages for breach of contract, fraud, rescission, reformation, restitution of any excess of payments made over the vendor's actual damages, and specific performance [*see §§ 569.163 -569.169* (sample complaints)]. As a preventative measure, a purchaser should record the installment sales contract [*see McLane v. Van Eaton (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 612, 615, 141 P.2d 783* (recording of contract gives constructive notice to vendor's grantees so they are not bona fide purchasers); *Resh v. Pillsbury (1936) 12 Cal. App. 2d 226, 230, 55 P.2d 264* (dicta that provision prohibiting recordation is void as against public policy); *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10* (suit to enforce terms of installment sales contract entered into after January 1, 1986, cannot be maintained without prior recordation of contract or filing of change in ownership statement as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480*)].

[2] Restitution

Even a willfully defaulting purchaser under an installment contract without a power of sale is entitled to restitution of any excess of payments made to the vendor over the vendor's actual damages, though the purchaser has the burden of proving that payments exceed the vendor's actual damages [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 113, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* ; *see § 569.104[3]*]. Restitution is also available to a defaulting purchaser under any other arrangement, so the discussion in *§ 569.24[4]*, and the cases in the Research Guide (§ 569.120 et seq.), would also apply under an installment sales contract. A provision in an installment sales contract that provides that in the event of purchaser's default, the vendor may retain all sums paid as rent is unenforceable as an attempt to specify potentially excessive damages unless it otherwise qualifies as a liquidated damages provision, although a vendor who elects rescission may recover the reasonable rental value [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 804, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* (election is vendor's, not purchaser's); *Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186-188,*

49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828 ; *Greene v. Municipal Court (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 446, 450-451, 124 Cal. Rptr. 139]* .

[3] Redemption or Specific Performance

[a] Judicial Recognition of Right

A purchaser under an installment contract without a power of sale, even a willfully defaulting purchaser whose defaults consist solely of failure to pay amounts due, who has made substantial payments on the contract or substantial improvements to the property, has an unconditional right to redeem the property by paying the entire remaining balance, plus interest and damages, before judgment or within a reasonable time thereafter set by the court. The right of redemption is exercisable as soon as the vendor gives notice of election to terminate the contract on account of default [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 106, 111-114, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (payments of $2,900 of $9,162 purchase price is substantial)].

Before *Petersen*, which was in fact a purchaser's suit for specific performance, this right of redemption was referred to as specific performance [*see, e.g.,* *MacFadden v. Walker (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 809, 812-814, 97 Cal. Rptr. 537, 488 P.2d 1353]* . The court in *Petersen* said that a complaint by a purchaser seeking to enforce the right might more properly be called one to redeem the purchaser's equity, implying that the purchaser would not be required to prove that the contract was fair and reasonable and the consideration adequate [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 110-111, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (noting at pp. 110-111 that adequacy of consideration is tested at time contract is made and considers not only value of property but also relationship of parties and object to be obtained by contract); *but see* *Archer v. Miller (1925) 73 Cal. App. 678, 684, 239 P. 92* (purchaser defending against vendor's quiet title action on basis of lease and option to purchase is required to allege value of land, that contract was just and reasonable)].

[b] Procedure for Asserting Right

The right of redemption can be asserted either affirmatively in an action for redemption by the purchaser or in response to the vendor's action. No vendor is entitled to a judgment quieting title until the purchaser has been given a chance to redeem the property, either before judgment or within a reasonable time set by the court [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 106, 111-114, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *see § 569.194* (complaint for declaratory relief, redemption)]. If the right of redemption is raised in response to the vendor's quiet title action, it is not clear whether it constitutes such affirmative relief as to require a cross complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.040(a)* (affirmative relief available by cross complaint in quiet title action); *Furnivall v. Groves (1957) 154 Cal. App. 2d 846, 847-848, 317 P.2d 117* (quiet title unique in allowing affirmative relief on basis of defendant's title without need of cross complaint)]. At any rate, it will have to be set forth in the answer because answers in quiet title actions must give the basis of any claim the defendant has and a statement of any new matter constituting a defense [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.030(a)(1), (3)*].

[c] Time for Asserting Right

There does not seem to be any statute of limitations on the purchaser's right of redemption. The plaintiff in *Petersen* did not commence the action until after a four-year hiatus in payments under the contract. Additionally, the court said that because of *Civ. Code § 2985.1* (discussed in *§ 569.63*), a vendor cannot sell the property subject to the contract to anyone else until the purchaser's interest has been terminated by foreclosure sale (discussed in *§ 569.103*) or by quieting title against the purchaser's equity of redemption [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 116, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232]* . Still, a purchaser who had led the vendor to believe that he or she intended to abandon the contract or was willing to agree to mutual rescission of the contract might be barred by laches.

[4] Reinstatement

By virtue of *Civ. Code § 3275*, providing relief from forfeitures, a purchaser who has made substantial payments on the contract or substantial improvements to the property and whose default is not willful or grossly negligent has an absolute right to reinstate the contract by payment of arrearages [*Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* ($3,114 of improvements, $700 downpayment, and 57 timely monthly payments compared to purchaser price of $6,150; innocent mistake regarding checks drawn on insufficient funds for two installments)]. Lack of funds alone is not sufficient to meet the burden of *Civ. Code § 3275*. There must be some additional showing that the lack is not itself attributable to willful or grossly negligent conduct, for example, that the earning capacity of the purchaser has been unexpectedly impaired by illness or accident [*Bartley v. Karas (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 336, 342-343, 197 Cal. Rptr. 749* , *disapproved on other grounds*, *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* , citing *Scarbery v. Bill Patch Land & Water Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 87, 94, 104-105, 7 Cal. Rptr. 408* (fire on adjacent property and illness of purchaser delayed subdivision work and sales necessary to raise cash); *Major-Blakeney Corp. v. Jenkins (1953) 263 P.2d655* (not an installment sale case, unexpected withdrawal of financial commitment)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & Misrepresentation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.101

§ 569.101 Money Judgment Prohibited as Deficiency

Code Civ. Proc. § 580b prevents a vendor under an installment sales contract of a 1-to-4-family dwelling, who retains title, from obtaining a personal judgment of any type against the purchaser. A vendor cannot recover a money judgment against the purchaser for past due installments, for the unpaid balance, or for damages for breach of the contract [*Venable v. Harmon (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 297, 301-302, 43 Cal. Rptr. 490]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.102

§ 569.102 Unlawful Detainer Unavailable

Language in an installment sales contract to the effect that on default the purchaser's interest is, or at the vendor's election may be, forfeited and the purchaser becomes only a tenant is not enforceable, and a defaulting purchaser in possession under an installment sales contract cannot be removed by the summary method of unlawful detainer [*Greene v. Municipal Court (1975) 51 Cal. App. 3d 446, 449-451, 124 Cal. Rptr. 139]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & DetainerReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsUnlawful Detainer

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.103

§ 569.103 Judicial Sale

A judicial sale, sometimes called foreclosure by sale, may be ordered if an installment sales vendor sues for specific performance and the purchaser does not wish to complete the purchase or cannot pay the balance due. Then any sale proceeds exceeding the balance due under the contract are turned over to the purchaser [*Longmaid v. Coulter (1898) 123 Cal. 208, 213-218, 55 P. 791* ; *Sparks v. Hess (1860) 15 Cal. 186, 193-195* ; *see Laske v. Lampasona (1948) 89 Cal. App. 2d 284, 288, 200 P.2d 871* ; *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 115 n.5, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232]* . It has been suggested that an installment sale purchaser should also be able to initiate judicial sale, thus keeping any proceeds representing any increase in value [*MacFadden v. Walker (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 809, 816, 97 Cal. Rptr. 537, 488 P.2d 1353* ; *see 1 Ward v. Union Bond & Trust Company (9th Cir. 1957) 243 F.2d 476, 480-481* ; *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 115, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232, n.5]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresJudicial ForeclosuresReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.104

§ 569.104 Installment Vendor's Remedies

[1] In General

A seller's remedies are subject to the purchaser's rights of reinstatement, redemption, and restitution [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 111-114, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (redemption); *Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* (restitution); *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* (reinstatement); *see §§ 569.100[4], 569.100[3],* and *569.100[2],* respectively].

[2] Quiet Title

For a vendor who wishes to retain the benefits of any increase in the value of the property since the execution of the installment sales contract, the only remedy is an action to quiet title pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.010-764.070*. Further, in establishing the purchaser's right of redemption, the court said that because of *Civ. Code § 2985.1* (discussed in *§ 569.63*) a vendor cannot sell the property subject to the contract to anyone else until the purchaser's interest has been terminated by foreclosure sale (discussed in *§ 569.103*) or quieting title against the purchaser's equity of redemption [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 116, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232]* . Recovery of possession, damages for withholding, and a declaration of the forfeiture of the purchaser's rights under the installment sales contract are all incidental relief that may be granted in the vendor's quiet title action [*Keele v. Clouser (1928) 92 Cal. App. 526, 529-530, 268 P. 682]* .

[3] Limitations on Installment Vendor's Damages

[a] Election of Measure

The deficiency prohibition of *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* prevents a vendor from being awarded a personal judgment against the purchaser under an installment sales contract covering a 1-to-4-unit dwelling. Therefore, a vendor can only recoup damages to the extent of purchaser's payments under the contract [*Venable v. Harmon (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d*

297, 301-302, 43 Cal. Rptr. 490] . In addition, the purchaser is entitled to restitution of the excess of payments made to the vendor over the vendor's actual damages. The purchaser has the burden of proving that excess [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833]* . Earlier cases held the measure of vendor's damages to be the rental value of the property during the time the purchaser was in possession [*Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186-188, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828]* . More recently, however, the vendor has been said to have an election to proceed (1) on a rescission theory, terminating the contract and recovering damages for the purpose of putting the parties in the position they were in before the contract, which essentially would give the vendor the rental value measure of damages, or (2) on a contract theory to recover damages under *Civ. Code § 3307* of the difference, if any, between the contract price and the market value of the property at the time of the breach. The latter measure will only be beneficial to the vendor if the value of the property at the time of breach is less than the contract price. Seeking to quiet title does not amount to an election to rescind the contract [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 803-805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833]* .

[b] Rental Value Measure

Under the rental value measure, the purchaser is entitled to offset against the rental value of the property during the time he or she was in possession the amount of both principal and interest payments made to the vendor and/or to third parties on the theory that those are not the obligations of a renter, but of an owner. Similarly, whether the purchaser is entitled to credit for taxes paid when applying the rental value measure of damages depends on whether the rental rate used to establish the vendor's credits was the rental rate payable by a tenant who assumed the obligation of taxes or the rental rate payable by a tenant under an arrangement in which the owner paid the taxes [*Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186, 188, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828* (purchaser also credited for value of improvements)].

A vendor desiring the rental value measure of damages will have to give notice of rescission fairly soon after default, or have the complaint serve as notice of rescission and restore, or offer to restore, excess payments to the purchaser [*Civ. Code § 1691*; *Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 753-754, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318* ; *see § 569.24[7][a], [b]*].

[c] Contract Measure

In addition to the difference between the contract price and the value of the property at the time of purchaser's breach, other elements of damage available to the vendor under the contract measure include (1) expenses of resale over and above the expenses assumed by the vendor in connection with the breached contract, (2) real estate taxes and assessments assumed by the purchaser under the contract, but not paid by the purchaser, (3) fees and penalties paid to rescue trust deeds from foreclosure on account of the purchaser's failure to keep payments current, and (4) in the case of income producing property, expenses of a receivership necessary to maintain the property's productivity [*Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 755, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318]* . Under the contract measure of damages, the purchaser is entitled to credit for principal payments made to the vendor or to third parties, but not to credit for interest payments. Loss of interest payments imposes no forfeiture on the purchaser, nor does it enrich the vendor. Interest paid to the vendor is consideration for the purchaser's use of deferredprincipal, and interest paid to a third party is part of the burden of the purchaser's equitable ownership and consideration for the purchaser's use of the third party's money [*Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 756-757, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318]* .

[d] Incidental Damages

If the purchaser refuses to vacate the property or asserts an interest in the property, the vendor's damages include amounts necessary to regain possession and expunge the purchaser's claim whether the vendor proceeds under the rental value or contract measure of damages. In addition, if the purchaser has remained in possession, the vendor may recover the rental value of the premises for the period after the breach or effective date of rescission [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* (contract measure); *Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 754-755, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318* (contract measure); *Millar v. James (1967) 254 Cal.*

App. 2d 530, 532-534, 62 Cal. Rptr. 335 (rescission, but not an installment sales contract case); *see Civ. Code § 1692* (damages incident to rescission)]. The vendor can also recover costs expended to restore the property to the condition it was in before the transaction, less normal wear and tear [*Bensinger v. Davidson (SD Cal, 1956) 147 F. Supp. 240, 248]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsRedemptionMortgagor's RightReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title Actions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Installment Sales Contracts
3. Contract Without Power of Sale

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.105-569.119

[Reserved]

§§ 569.105[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.120

§ 569.120 California Real Estate

For discussion of options, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 70, *Options* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of the basic elements of deposit receipts and other agreements for the sale of real property, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 71, *Deposit Receipts and Other Agreements of Sale* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of the defenses available to both sellers and buyers in an action based on an agreement for the sale of real property, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 73, *Defenses in Actions Involving Agreements of Sale* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of purchasers' remedies, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 74, *Buyer's Remedies in Actions Involving Agreements of Sale* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of vendors' remedies, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 75, *Seller's Remedies in Actions Involving Agreements of Sale* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.121

§ 569.121 Federal Statutes

Purchaser's and lessee's right of rescission under Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (*15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720*, governing sales of unimproved parcels of less than five acres advertised through mails or sold in interstate commerce). *15 U.S.C. §§ 1703, 1709*

Transferee's duty to withhold 10 percent of consideration payable to foreign person on transfer of United States real property interest as defined in *I.R.C. § 897(c)* (which includes shares in corporation owing United States real property). *I.R.C. § 1445*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Immigration LawDuties & Rights of AliensProperty OwnershipReal Property LawOwnership & TransferNatural PersonsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.122

§ 569.122 State Statutes

[1] In General

Subdivided Lands Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.*

Grants, security instruments, and ordinances prohibiting for sale signs are void. *Civ. Code §§ 712, 713*

Written agreement required for transfer of or agreement to sell real property; specific performance of oral agreement for transfer of real property is permissible if partially performed. *Civ. Code §§ 1091, 1624(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1971, 1972*

Disclosure of industrial use zoning by vendor of residential real property. *Civ. Code § 1102.17*

Disclosure of natural hazards on transfer of any real property or residential stock cooperative improved with or consisting of one to four dwelling units. *Civ. Code § 1103 et seq.*

Grant of land bordering highway conveys to center unless different intent appears. *Civ. Code § 1112*

Covenants running with land. *Civ. Code §§ 1460-1471*

Written agreement required for appointment of broker to sell real property. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(4)*

Written agreement required for assumption of indebtedness secured by real property. *Civ. Code § 1624(a)(6)*

Disclosure regarding law enforcement data base of registered sex offenders. *Civ. Code § 2079.10a*

Interest may not accrue on note secured by mortgage or trust deed on residential real property with one to four residential dwelling units for period in excess of one day before recording if loan proceeds are paid into escrow, or if no

escrow, date on which loan proceeds are made available for withdrawal as matter of right under *Ins. Code § 12413.1(d). Civ. Code § 2948.5*

Purchaser, encumbrancer, or other transferee of real property described in recorded notice of pendency of action is deemed to have notice from date of recordation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.24*

Ex parte protective order restraining transfer or encumbrance of community property during dissolution or nullity proceedings. *Fam. Code § 2035(a)*

Recording instrument affecting title to or possession of real property. *Gov. Code §§ 27279, 27280*

Recording judgment affecting title to or possession of real property is proper without acknowledgement, but requires certification of clerk. *Gov. Code § 27282(a)(1)*

Subdivision Map Act. *Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*

[2] Agents

Regulation of real estate brokers. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10000 et seq.*

Requirement that agreement employing broker to purchase or sell real estate be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1624(d)*

Authority of agent to sell real property includes authority to give usual covenants of warranty. *Civ. Code § 2323*

Real estate developer was prohibited from requiring escrow for sale of single-family dwelling to be entity of which developer owned or controlled five percent or more; liability for violation was three times amount charged for escrow services, but at least $250, plus attorney's fees and costs; waiver was void. *Civ. Code § 2995*

[3] Damages and Remedies

Action for damages by seller-lienholder and other affected persons against purchaser-landlord for unlawful use of rental revenue during first year after acquisition of residential rental property without first applying revenue or equivalent amount to pay off encumbrances. *Civ. Code § 890 et seq.*

Uniform Vendor and Purchaser Risk Act. *Civ. Code § 1662*

Liquidated damages generally. *Civ. Code § 1671*

Liquidated damages for buyer's breach of contract (other than installment sale contract) to purchase sale property. *Civ. Code § 1675 et seq.*

Grounds for rescission. *Civ. Code § 1689*

Cancellation of instruments by consent of parties. *Civ. Code § 1699*

Establishment of involuntary trust. *Civ. Code §§ 2223, 2224*

Vendor's lien on land. *Civ. Code §§ 3046-3048*

Purchaser's lien on land. *Civ. Code §§ 3048, 3050*

Relief from forfeiture incurred under terms of obligation on making full compensation to other party, except in case of grossly negligent, willful, or fraudulent breach of duty. *Civ. Code § 3275*

Measure of damages for breach of agreement to convey realty. *Civ. Code § 3306*

Measure of damages for breach of agreement to purchase real property. *Civ. Code § 3307*

Damages for fraud in sale, exchange, or purchase of real property. *Civ. Code § 3343*

Specific performance, generally. *Civ. Code §§ 3369, 3384 et seq.*; *Prob. Code § 9860 et seq.* (by purchaser against decedent's estate)

Revision or reformation of contract; specific performance of revised or reformed contract. *Civ. Code § 3399 et seq.*

Action for cancellation of void instruments. *Civ. Code § 3412 et seq.*

Notice of pendency of action in actions concerning real property (lis pendens). *Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*

Action to quiet title to realty. *Code Civ. Proc. § 760.010 et seq.*; *Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 3727-3729, 3950 et seq., 4113* (by purchaser, redemptioner of tax-defaulted property)

Action for partition of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 872.010 et seq.*

Action for declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060 et seq.*

Recordation of agreement or filing of change-in-ownership statement required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480* is prerequisite to maintaining action to enforce contract, for transfer of real property or mobilehome subject to local property tax. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*

Buyer's right to rescind contract or deed to property divided in violation of Subdivision Map Act (*Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*) within one year of discovery of violation. *Gov. Code § 66499.32*

[4] Disclosures and Informational Requirements

Disclosures and fee ceilings on real property secured loans negotiated by real estate licensees. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10240 et seq.*

Disclosures required in connection with sale of condominium or other common interest development; damages for willful violation. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.6*; *Civ. Code § 1368*

Delivery to purchaser of pest control report and notice of work completed thereunder is required if condition of contract or financing. *Civ. Code § 1099*

Disclosures required by vendor of one-to-four-unit residential property and broker; actual damages, as provided for negligent or willful failure to disclose. *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.*

Notice by subdivider to buyer of existence of blanket encumbrance prior to sale of parcel or unit in subdivision. *Civ.*

Code § 1133

Notice or disclaimer (after inspection) of defects and malfunctions in newly converted condominium, community apartment, or stock cooperative and common areas. *Civ. Code § 1134*

Neither owner, owner's agent, nor transferee's agent must disclose to transferee, purchaser, lessee, or renter that prior occupant died, if death occurred more than three years prior to offer to buy or lease, or that prior occupant had died of AIDS. *Civ. Code § 1710.2*

Seller's broker and cooperating broker have duty to purchaser of one-to-four-unit dwelling to make visual inspection and to disclose material facts affecting property's desirability; action for breach of this duty must be commenced within two years after whichever is earliest: recordation, close of escrow, or date of occupancy. *Civ. Code §§ 2079-2079.5*

Disclosures required when vendor extends credit on sale of one-to-four-unit dwelling and arranger of credit is involved; definition of arranger of credit; actual damages. *Civ. Code §§ 2956-2967, 2957(a), 2965*

Transferors of certain residential property must disclose known deficiencies that constitute earthquake hazards, unless transaction is exempted. *Gov. Code § 8897.1 et seq.*

Sellers of property in area where state has fire responsibility must disclose fact that property is in wildland area that may contain substantial forest fire risks. *Pub. Res. Code § 4136*

[5] Options

Option given by debtor to creditor secured by lien on option property is deemed not to impair debtor's lien redemption rights if right to exercise option is not dependent on default under security agreement and option and lien are on other than one-to-four-unit residential property. *Civ. Code § 2906*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to DiscloseReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.123

§ 569.123 Decisions

[1] In General

Purchasers under "back-up" contract for sale of land, which was subject to condition precedent of failure, termination, cancellation, or novation of existing contract between seller and another party, had heavy burden in attempting to set aside contract relationship between seller and other party; trial court's finding that sale was consummated under modification of original contract and that no condition precedent had occurred was supported by substantial evidence. *Meadows v. Lee (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 475, 483-484, 221 Cal. Rptr. 22*

If offer is accepted after it expired by its terms, person making offer is able to waive expiration of offer and create contract by proceeding with purchase. *Sabo v. Fasano (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d 502, 506-509, 201 Cal. Rptr. 270*

Whether purchaser contracting on behalf of himself or herself and nominee is entitled to maintain action on contract of sale is matter of intention of parties as to whether buyer assigned his or her rights to nominee. *McCown v. Spencer (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 216, 225-226, 87 Cal. Rptr. 213*

Agreement to extend time of closing of escrow is independent agreement; consideration paid to vendor for extension is not recoverable by purchaser. *Morrison v. Frazier (1968) 262 Cal. App. 2d 386, 389-390, 68 Cal. Rptr. 690*

Equitable relief was available to buyers under oral real property sales agreement after foreclosure on the property by bona fide third party lenders; relief properly took form of award of part of proceeds of foreclosure sale. *Rogers v. Davis (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1215, 1221-1222, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716*

[2] Arbitration

Purchaser's claims for rescission and damages based on seller's failure to disclose flooding problems on Transfer Disclosure Statement were subject to arbitration pursuant to broad arbitration clause in purchase agreement. *Johnson*

v. Siegel (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1087, 1094, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412

[3] Conditions Precedent

Phrase "subject to" in contract is generally construed to impose condition precedent. *Rubin v. Fuchs (1969) 1 Cal. 3d 50, 54, 81 Cal. Rptr. 373, 459 P.2d 925*

Seller's delivery of real estate transfer disclosure statement is nonwaivable condition precedent to buyer's duty of performance under contract for sale and purchase of real property. *Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 201-202, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569*

When buyer failed to request opening of escrow and escrow did not close by date required in contract, buyer was not entitled to recover for breach of contract because buyer could not prove that condition precedent was performed. *Consolidated World Investments, Inc. v. Lido Preferred Ltd. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 373, 380-382, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 524*

When buyer expressly disapproved condition, contract was terminated and buyer wasnot later able to enforce it by offering to waive condition. *Beverly Way Associates v. Barham (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 49, 55-56, 276 Cal. Rptr. 240*

When condition does not occur because of party's failure to cooperate, burden of proof is on that party to establish that condition would not have been met even if party had cooperated. *Jacobs v. Tenneco West Inc. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1413, 1417-1418, 231 Cal. Rptr. 351*

Discovery, after real estate sale contract had been performed, of breach of condition precedent was proper basis for cause of action for breach of contract. *Louison v. Yohanan (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 258, 266, 172 Cal. Rptr. 602*

[4] Damages

[a] Measure

Language of *Civ. Code § 3306* makes clear that proper measure of damages for breach of contract to convey real property is difference between contract price and fair market value at time of breach, not difference between contract price and value of property at time of trial. Further, "consequential damages" recoverable under *Civ. Code § 3306* for breach of contract to convey real property does not include appreciation in value of property from time of breach to time of trial. *Reese v. Wong (2001) 93 Cal. App. 4th 51, 59-61, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 669*

[b] Recoverable by Defaulting Purchaser

Willfully defaulting vendee was entitled to recover excess of payments made under contract over vendor's damages caused by breach. *Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 20-23, 230 P.2d 629* ; *Q.S.W. Corp. v. Malick (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 277, 281, 64 Cal. Rptr. 722*

Defaulting purchaser who was denied specific performance of contract for sale of real property was entitled to restitution of reasonable value of services rendered by it that benefitted landowner, but not to enhanced value of property attributable to those services because that would have amounted to windfall. *Lesny Development Co. v. Kendall (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 1010, 1020-1024, 210 Cal. Rptr. 890*

Defaulting vendee was not, because of default alone, to be denied right to recover damages for fraud. *Holder v. Home Sav. & Loan Asso. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 91, 108-109, 72 Cal. Rptr. 704*

[c] Damages Recoverable by Vendor for Breach of Contract

In action arising from buyer's default (after failure to procure financing, and refusal to cancel escrow), vendor was not entitled to recover amount of taxes paid because property was not sold until following year (reflecting change in law increasing tax liability), because buyer's failure to close in August of previous year did not actually cause adverse tax consequences effective in *January. Nielsen v. Farrington (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1582, 1588-1589, 273 Cal. Rptr. 312*

In action by vendor for contract breach against defaulting buyer, buyer is not entitled to offset for "savings" resulting from absence of broker's commission in resale when there is no evidence of value of property at time of breach; court in those circumstances is not required to determine whether benefit-of-bargain damages should be based simply on difference between contract price and value of property, or whether broker's commission should be deducted from contract price before measuring difference. *Nielsen v. Farrington (1990) 223 Cal. App. 3d 1582, 1586-1588, 273 Cal. Rptr. 312*

[5] Duty of Disclosure

Triable issue whether seller of property had common-law duty to disclose existence of prior litigation concerning water intrusion as a material fact affecting the desirability and value of property. *Calemine v. Samuelson (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 153, 166, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 495*

Real estate vendor's failure to comply with statutory disclosure requirements gives right to rescission in buyer if transfer has not taken place. *Realmuto v. Gagnard (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 193, 202, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 569*

[6] Fraud

Sellers who used relocation intermediary and failed to disclose neighborhood noise problems to intermediary were subject to eventual purchaser for intentional and/or negligent misrepresentation as well as statutory liability under *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* *Shapiro v. Sutherland (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1534, 1546, 1550, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101*

Subsequent purchaser may bring action for damages against original seller based on fraudulent misrepresentations made to original buyer if seller had reason to expect that misrepresentations would be repeated and they actually were repeated to subsequent purchaser. *Geernaert v. Mitchell (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 601, 608, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 483*

Damages for lost profits do not encompass profits expected from resale of property that never was acquired because of fraud. *Kenly v. Ukegawa (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 49, 54-56, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 771*

Subdivider was liable in fraud for failure to disclose that units sold were not in maintenance district and thus at risk of losing water and sewer services. *County of Mariposa v. Yosemite West Associates (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 791, 812-813, 248 Cal. Rptr. 778*

Vendor's attorney who is not acting as broker does not have same duty of disclosure to purchaser as broker; attorney would be liable for fraud only if (1) fiduciary relationship existed, (2) attorney had exclusive knowledge of materials facts not known to purchaser, (3) attorney actively concealed material facts, or (4) attorney made partial representation while suppressing some material facts. *Heliotis v. Schuman (1986) 181 Cal. App. 3d 646, 650-651, 226 Cal. Rptr. 509*

Vendor's assertion to purchaser of amount of acreage constituted actionable misrepresentation to seller who did not survey property until one year after purchase; because purchaser acquired property to subdivide and develop it, fact that

actual value of land was more than price paid did not deprive purchaser of right to damages for loss of anticipated profits pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3343(a)(4)*. *Cory v. Villa Properties (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 592, 597-598, 601-603, 225 Cal. Rptr. 628*

Real estate agent is liable for damages resulting from false representation in sale of real property; foreclosure of property is circumstance that may be considered in determining out-of-pocket loss of defrauded purchaser. *Burkhouse v. Phillips (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 661, 665-666, 96 Cal. Rptr. 197*

Buyer learning one representation by seller is false is not entitled to assume that other representations by seller were true. *Roland v. Hubenka (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 215, 225, 90 Cal. Rptr. 490*

[7] Implied Covenants

Contract conditioned on approval of inspections is binding because purchaser has implied duty of good faith with regard to approving inspections; contract is subject to specific performance because strict mutuality of remedy is not required. *Converse v. Fong (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 86, 90, 205 Cal. Rptr. 242*

Contract is not necessarily illusory when conditioned on approval of board of directors of one party because party and party's agent are bound by implied covenant of good faith to submit contract and recommend sale to board for its good-faith consideration. *Moreland Development Co. v. Gladstone Holmes, Inc. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 973, 977-978, 186 Cal. Rptr. 6* ; *Jacobs v. Freeman (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 177, 180-187, 163 Cal. Rptr. 680*

[8] Liquidated Damage Clause

In $1.3 million commercial transaction, $26,000 or 2 percent was reasonable in event of purchaser's breach; purchaser had burden under *Civ. Code § 1671* to prove unreasonableness. *Hong v. Somerset Associates (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 111, 115-116, 207 Cal. Rptr. 597*

[9] Options

Option lying outside safe harbor of *Civ. Code § 2906* because it is dependent on borrower's default will not necessarily be declared void or lose priority; option may be treated as disguised mortgage or facts and circumstances might indicate that option should be enforced according to its terms. *Wachovia Bank v. Lifetime Industries, Inc. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 1039, 1058-1059, 52 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168*

Covenant not to compete given in option takes effect on execution of option contract, not on exercise of option. *Hoover Community Hotel Development Corp. v. Thomson (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 1130, 1135-1140, 213 Cal. Rptr. 750*

Agreement failing as bilateral contract because it gave purchaser unilateral and unconditional right to rescind within 45 days after close of escrow, was revived as option contract by purchaser's delivery and vendors' acceptance of automobile; this part performance was sufficient for 45-day option making promise to sell irrevocable. *Kowal v. Day (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 720, 724-728, 98 Cal. Rptr. 118*

[10] Preemptive Rights

Contract susceptible to different interpretations must be given construction that will make it lawful, operative, definite,

reasonable, capable of being carried into effect, and equitable; thus, contract for option and preemptive right confers rights only on parties, not their successors, so as to avoid violating rule against perpetuities. *Strong v. Theis (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 913, 919-921, 232 Cal. Rptr. 272*

[11] Right of First Refusal

Right of first refusal to purchase property in commercial lease was not triggered when family partnership transferred interest in the property to grandchildren in the family, because transfer was not made pursuant to a "bona fide offer from any third party for the purchase" of the property as required by the parties' agreement. *Hartzheim v. Valley Land and Cattle Co. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 383, 394, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 815*

When exercise of right of first refusal offered different security than original offer, seller had reasonable time to determine whether security was adequate based on reasonableness standard. *McCulloch v. M & C Beauty Colleges (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1338, 1346-1347, 240 Cal. Rptr. 189*

[12] Subdivision Map Act

Buyers who purchased lots from developer who had not yet obtained subdivision approval from Department of Real Estate were entitled to specific performance of purchase agreements; extrinsic evidence is admissible to render description of lots conveyed by purchase agreements sufficiently definite for enforcement. *Blackburn v. Charnley (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 758, 766-767, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 885*

Gov. Code § 66499.32(b), which denies buyer the option of voiding the contract when there is a certificate of compliance filed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66499.35*, parcel map, or final map, does not preclude buyer from voiding sale when seller has violated Act and, by doing so, has also violated certificate of compliance, parcel map, or final map. *Le Gault v. Erickson (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 369, 374, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 692*

[13] Subordination of Seller's Purchase Money Lien

If vendor's security interest in development property under subordinated purchase money deed of trust is lost by foreclosure of senior lien, *Code Civ. Proc. § 580b* is not applicable to bar recovery by vendor of unpaid balance of purchase price. *Spangler v. Memel (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 603, 608-615, 102 Cal. Rptr. 807, 498 P.2d 1055* ; *Roffinella v. Sherinian (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 230, 236-241, 224 Cal. Rptr. 502*

Subordination agreement that does not specify principal amount of lien but requires reasonable amount is not specific enough to be found to be fair to seller. *Roskamp Manley Associates, Inc. v. Davis Development & Investment Corp. (1987) 184 Cal. App. 3d 513, 517-520, 229 Cal. Rptr. 186*

Agreement of vendor to subordinate purchase money deed of trust to institutional purchase money first deed of trust is enforceable even though no interest rate or maximum rate on senior note was specified; vendor is adequately protected because agreement provided senior note would not exceed 60 percent of purchase price and no construction was contemplated. *Thomas v. Fox (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 361, 365-368, 180 Cal. Rptr. 253*

[14] Risk of Loss

Absent agreement so providing, purchaser has no rights in proceeds of insurance policy held by seller on premises destroyed prior to transfer of title. *Long v. Keller (1980) 104 Cal. App. 3d 312, 318-320, 163 Cal. Rptr. 532*

[15] Time Essence; Delays Not Amounting to Breach

Vendor was estopped pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 1962(3)*, now *Evid. Code § 623*, from asserting purchaser's delayed performance if purchaser was misled by vendor's representation. *McCown v. Spencer (1970) 8 Cal. App. 3d 216, 222-225, 87 Cal. Rptr. 213*

[16] Vendor's Election of Remedies

Vendor, but not purchaser, has election to rescind or enforce contract of sale when purchaser has materially breached it. *Sweet v. Relis (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 257, 263, 79 Cal. Rptr. 829*

[17] Warranties

Implied warranty of merchantability is not applicable to individual seller of property who had it constructed by independent contractor. *Siders v. Schloo (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1217, 1220-1221, 233 Cal. Rptr. 906*

Implied warranties were not made in sale of commercial real property that was not new; sale "as is" precluded liability for undisclosed defects in absence of fraud. *Shapiro v. Hu (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 324, 332-334, 233 Cal. Rptr. 470*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to DiscloseReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & Restitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.124

§ 569.124 Law Reviews

Note, *Builder's Liability to New and Subsequent Purchasers, 20 Sw. U.L. Rev. 219 (1991)*

Levin, *Consumerism and Land Sales, 15 Pepperdine L. Rev. 131 (1988)*

Comment, *Easton: The Birth of Negligence in Real Estate Broker-Purchaser Relationships, 14 Pepperdine L. Rev. 667 (1987)*

D. A. Larson, *The "as is" Disclaimer and The Sale of New Houses*, 13 Real Est. L. J. 238 (1985)

J. M. Pedowitz, *The Effect of Bankruptcy or Insolvency on Real Estate Transactions--An Overview, 20 Real Prop., Prob., & Tr. J. 25 (1985)*

H. B. Lambe, *Enforceability of Subordination Agreements, 19 Real Prop., Prob., & Tr. J. 631 (1984)*

McNamara, *Subordination Agreements as Viewed by Sellers, Purchasers, Construction Lenders, and Title Companies*, 12 Real. Est. L.J. 347 (1984)

Note, *Reed v. King: Fraudulent Nondisclosure of a Multiple Murder in a Real Estate Transaction, 45 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 877 (1984)*

Note, *Contracts --Mutual Mistake-- Rescission of a Land Contract for the Purchase of a Residence, 29 Wayne L. Rev. 1433 (1983)*

K. B. Holtzchue, *Contract of Sale for Office, Commercial, and Multi-Family Residential Premises--A Commentary, 17 Real Prop., Prob., & Tr. J. 382 (1982)*

Note, *The Home Buyers' Protection Act: An Alternative to Building Codes For Single Family Homes, 54 So. Cal. L. Rev. 529 (1981)*

Watson, *Impairment of Purchase-Money Security by Disaster and the Antideficiency Legislation: The Sounds of Silence*, 47 Lab. Arb. Rep. (BNA) 146 (1972)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawBrokersFiduciary ResponsibilitiesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresDeficiency JudgmentsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityMistakeReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Actions Between Vendors and Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.125-569.139

[Reserved]

§§ 569.125[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.140

§ 569.140 State Statutes

Requirements if interest rate changes in contract relating to residential property or property on which residence will be constructed. *Civ. Code § 1916.5*

For purposes of *Civ. Code §§ 2924-2924h* (nonjudicial foreclosure) mortgage includes installment sales contract that gives vendor power of sale to be exercised after breach of obligation. *Civ. Code § 2920*

Limitations on tax, insurance, or other impound accounts. *Civ. Code §§ 2954, 2954.1, 2954(a)*

Purchaser of one-to-four-unit residence under installment sales contract is entitled to annual statement detailing payments applied to interest, principal, taxes, assessment, insurance, and other credits. *Civ. Code § 2954.2*

Vendor is trustee of payments for taxes and insurance, and is required to invest impound funds in California and to disburse them only for stated purpose, unless payor and encumbrancers agree. *Civ. Code §§ 2955, 2985.4*

Purchaser is entitled to prepay all or part of balance due on installment sales contract with respect to land that has been subdivided into lot or lots containing one-to-four-unit residence; provided, however that seller may, by written agreement, prohibit prepayment for one year after sale; waivers are void. *Civ. Code § 2985.6*

Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Acts of 1943 and 1974. *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 985-987.31*; *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 987.50-987.95*

NOTE: See other applicable statutes listed in § 569.122.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresPrivate Power-of-Sale ForeclosureReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.141

§ 569.141 Decisions

Both vendor and purchaser under installment sales contract have insurable interests; absent statutory or contractual provision, neither party has obligation to other to insure property. *Brown v. Department of Veterans Affairs (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 392, 400, 403, 224 Cal. Rptr. 149*

Instrument entitled "Option for Sale and Purchase of Real Property" constitutes installment sales contract because monthly payments were substantial and were described as payments on purchase price and continued payments were required. *Smith v. Morton (1972) 29 Cal. App. 3d 616, 619-620, 106 Cal. Rptr. 52*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsInsurance LawProperty InsuranceInsurable InterestsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.142-569.159

[Reserved]

§§ 569.142[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.160

§ 569.160 Complaint by Vendor--To Establish and Foreclose Vendor's Lien [Civ. Code § 3046]

[1] FORM Complaint by Vendor--To Establish and Foreclose Vendor's Lien [Civ. Code § 3046]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH AND FORECLOSE
_____ [*name*(*s*)], [and DOES I	)	VENDOR'S LIEN
through _____],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. At all times mentioned herein, defendant(s) _____ (*name(s)*), sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Buyers," was/were, and now is/are, _____ (husband and wife *or other allegation of capacity or residence as necessary*).]

[2. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as Doe I to Doe _____, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff(s), who therefore sue said defendants by such fictitious names; plaintiff(s) will amend this complaint to show such true names and capacities when the same are ascertained. Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe and thereon allege that said defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest superior to plaintiff's(s') in the real property which is the subject of this action.]

[3. (Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe and thereon allege that) at all times herein mentioned, each of the defendants

was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency.]

4. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written agreement, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof by reference, whereby plaintiff(s) agreed to sell to defendant(s) and defendant(s) agreed to purchase from plaintiff(s) for the sum of $_____ that certain real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

5. On _____ [*date*], in accordance with the terms of the agreement, plaintiff(s) conveyed the premises described above to defendant(s) by execution and delivery of a grant deed to defendant(s). Defendant(s) paid plaintiff(s) a down payment of $_____ and agreed to pay the balance of $_____ as follows: _____ [*specify*].

6. Defendant(s) failed to make the payments provided for in that he/she/it/they _____ [*set forth details of default*]. Defendant(s) is/are indebted to the plaintiff(s) in the sum of $_____, no part of which has been paid and no part of which is secured other than by the personal obligation of defendant(s).

7. As vendor(s), plaintiff(s) has/have a lien on the property described above for the payment of the unpaid portion of the purchase price. Plaintiff(s) claim(s) that lien in this action.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff(s) pray(s) for judgment against the defendant(s) as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____ [, which includes reasonable attorney's fees as provided in the _____ (contract *or* note),] with interest at the rate of _____ percent from _____ [*date*];

2. For a declaration that plaintiff(s) has/have a vendor's lien on the aforesaid property to secure repayment of that sum;

3. For the sale of the premises in accordance with law and that the proceeds therefrom be used to satisfy the indebtedness of $_____ with interest;

4. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

5. For such other and further relief as this court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am [one of] the plaintiff(s) in the above-entitledaction. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a vendor of real property to establish and foreclose the vendor's lien provided by *Civ. Code § 3046* for the amount of the unpaid portion of the purchase price that is unsecured and payment of which is in default [*Civ. Code § 3046*]. The lien is not an absolute charge on the property, only an equitable right that must be established by action before it can be asserted [*Brown v. Johnson (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 844, 850-851, 159 Cal. Rptr. 675]* . The lien arises only after title has been transferred to the purchaser. Before then the vendor is said to have an express lien in the form of the contract and retention of title [*Avery v. Clark (1891) 87 Cal. 619, 625, 25 P. 919* ; *Barron-Gray Packing Co. v. Tapley (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 432, 437-439, 177 P.2d 776]* . A vendor's lien must be based on an obligation to pay money. A promise to perform personal services will not give rise to a vendor's lien [*Womble v. Womble (1910) 14 Cal. App. 739, 745, 113 P. 353]* .

If the real property is in another state and the purchasers are subject to personal jurisdiction in California, this form can be modified to state a cause of action for declaratory relief to establish the lien and that purchasers hold the property as constructive trustees of the vendor [*Mills v. Mills (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 107, 116-118, 305 P.2d 61]* .

[3] Establishing Lien Without Foreclosing

A vendor may bring an action for declaratory relief to establish, but not foreclose, the lien before default in order to preserve the lien as against subsequent purchasers [*LaHue v. Dougherty (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 1, 4, 206 P.2d 640]* .

[4] Allegations

This complaint sets forth the allegations necessary to establish a vendor's lien: the formation of a contract for the sale of real property (Paragraph 4); the vendor's performance of the contract by transfer of title (Paragraph 5); and default by the purchaser in unsecured cash payments for the purchase price (Paragraphs 5, 6) [*LaHue v. Dougherty (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 1, 5, 206 P.2d 640]* . Because venue rests on the location of the real property [*see § 569.160[7]*], the residence of the parties is not a necessary allegation, although allegations regarding capacity and/or residence of the parties may be included (Paragraph 1). Other optional allegations include those for fictitious defendants (Paragraph 2) and agency (Paragraph 3).

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude the defendant from using a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial in a limited civil case if the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In limited civil cases, the first page of the first paper filed must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[7] Venue

In an action for the foreclosure of a lien on real property, the proper court for the trial of the action is the superior court in the county in which the real property (or some part of it) is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*].

[8] Statute of Limitations

The limitation period for an action to establish a vendor's lien is the limitation period applicable to an action to recover the purchase money. If, as in most cases, a note was given for the balance of the purchase price, the limitation would be four years from the date of default [*Finnell v. Finnell (1909) 156 Cal. 589, 599, 105 P. 740* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)*].

[9] Waiver of Lien

A vendor's lien can be waived by any action of the vendor evidencing an intent not to rely on the lien, including in some cases the characteristics of the transaction itself. For instance, when the property was first to be conveyed free of all encumbrances to an agent who would hold title until a corporation was formedand then convey to the corporation free of all encumbrances, the vendor was found to have waived any right to a lien [*Royal Con. Min. Co. v. Royal Con. Mines (1910) 157 Cal. 737, 746-749, 110 P. 123]* . Neither consideration nor a writing is necessary to waive the lien [*Royal Con. Min. Co. v. Royal Con. Mines (1910) 157 Cal. 737, 746, 110 P. 123* ; *Claiborne v. Castle (1893) 98 Cal. 30, 33-34, 32 P. 807]* . The burden of proof of waiver rests on the party resisting the lien [*Selna v. Selna (1899) 125 Cal. 357, 362, 58 P. 16* ; *Edwards-Town, Inc v. Dimin (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 87, 92, 87 Cal. Rptr. 726]* . The vendor waives the lien by taking a mortgage for the balance of the purchase price [*Wells v. Harter (1880) 56 Cal. 342, 344]* , or by taking a note from a third party as security [*Jones v. Allert (1911) 161 Cal. 234, 237, 118 P. 794]* . The vendor's lien is not necessarily waived by his or her obtaining a money judgment for the balance of the purchase price, even if he or she has levied execution against the property. For the vendor's lien to be extinguished by execution on the money judgment, without satisfaction or sale of the property, the purchaser must show that there is property to which the judgment lien of the money judgment can attach, and which can thus serve as security for the debt [*Brown v. Kahn (1917) 176 Cal. 159, 160-164, 167 P. 869]* . Similarly, approval of a creditor's claim against the purchaser's estate for the balance of the purchase price does not extinguish the lien [*Selna v. Selna (1899) 125 Cal. 357, 362-364, 58 P. 16]* .

[10] Statutes

Absolute transfer (as opposed to transfer in trust to pay debts) of contract for all or part of payment of purchase price is waiver of lien to extent of sum payable under contract. *Civ. Code § 3047*

Vendor's lien is valid against everyone claiming under debtor except purchaser or encumbrancer in good faith and for value. *Civ. Code § 3048*

Recording lis pendens in connection with action concerning real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*

Judgment for sale of real property; contents and execution of writ of sale of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 712.010-712.070, 716.010-716.030*

[11] Decisions

[a] In General

Types of estate sold that give rise to vendor's lien. *Rogers Etc. Co. v. S. California Etc. Co. (1911) 159 Cal. 735, 740-741, 115 P. 934* (equitable interest under purchase contract); *Grossman v. Lippson (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 554, 562, 146 Cal. Rptr. 741* (sublease at premium exceeding rent payable under lease); *McGreevy v. Constitution Life Ins. Co. (1965) 238 Cal. App. 2d 364, 368-369* (oil and gas lease)

Transfer of note for collection does not waive vendor's lien. *Nolan v. Nolan (1909) 155 Cal. 476, 479, 482, 101 P. 520*

Vendor's lien passes to and may be established by personal representative or heirs of deceased vendor and is enforceable against estate or heirs of deceased purchaser. *Selna v. Selna (1899) 125 Cal. 357, 361, 58 P. 16* ; *Mills v. Mills (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 107, 118-120, 305 P.2d 61*

Vendor's lien is not assignable. *Williams v. Young (1862) 21 Cal. 227, 228*

Vendor's lien is not extinguished by extension of time for payment of purchase money. *Mills v. Mills (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 107, 118, 305 P.2d 61*

One-action provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* are not applicable to vendors' liens. *Schwartz v. Mead (1931) 116 Cal. App. 606, 611-614, 3 P.2d 48*

Deficiency provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 726* do not apply to vendors' liens. *Ocean Shore Dev. Co., Inc. v. Hammond (1918) 38 Cal. App. 102, 108, 175 P. 706*

[b] Priorities

When purchaser had given mortgage on property subject to vendor's lien and on adjoining parcel and had declared homestead on adjoining parcel, mortgage has priority over vendor's lien, but foreclosing vendor is entitled to require homestead parcel to be sold first. *Nolan v. Nolan (1909) 155 Cal. 476, 487-488, 101 P. 520*

Vendor's lien is superior to homestead. *Williams v. Young (1861) 17 Cal. 403, 406*

Subsequent purchaser who has no notice of unpaid balance of purchase price takes free of vendor's lien even though notice of vendor's lien had been recorded; recordation of lien before lien has been established by action does not impart constructive notice. *Brown v. Johnson (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 844, 849-851, 159 Cal. Rptr. 675*

Vendor's lien continues after sale of property to subsequent purchaser who had notice of unpaid balance of purchase price. *Edwards-Town, Inc. v. Dimin (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 87, 93-94, 87 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Judgment lien does not have priority over vendor's lien unless judgment creditor extended credit believing purchaser owned property free and clear or parted with value so as to become good faith encumbrancer. *Schut v. Doyle (1959) 168 Cal. App. 2d 698, 702-704, 336 P.2d 567*

[12] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.163*.

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions*

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion and forms for enforcement of a judgment of foreclosure, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.130* et seq.

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal Jurisdiction, Inconvenient Forum, and Appearances* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter Jurisdiction*

For discussion of when recording of lis pendens is appropriate in connection with an action regarding real property and form of lis pendens, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Admiralty LawMaritime LiensNatureAssignabilityAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesGeneral OverviewAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesContractsAuthorityAdmiralty LawMaritime LiensPriority & SourcesTortCivil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsAncillary WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsAncillary WritsWrits of ExecutionContracts LawDebtor & Creditor RelationsContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDefensesStatutes of LimitationsContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsTransfersContracts LawThird PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawFinancingGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawLeases & LicensesAssignment, Release & Surrender ClausesSubleasesEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawEstate AdministrationClaims Against EstatesGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbateGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsConstructive TrustsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewReal Property

LawAdjoining LandownersMines & MiningReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawHomestead ExemptionsReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensLien PrioritiesReal Property LawNonmortgage LiensMechanics' LiensReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingBona Fide PurchasersReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTrustsConstructive Trusts

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.161

§ 569.161 Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Purchase Real Property [Civ. Code § 3307]

[1] FORM Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Purchase Real Property [Civ. Code § 3307]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name(s)*,	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
_____ [*name(s)*,	)	CONTRACT TO PURCHASE REAL PROPERTY
[and DOES I through _____],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

1. Plaintiff(s) _____ [*name(s)*] is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ [*state capacity of plaintiff(s) as necessary, e.g.*, husband and wife and fee owners of the real property described below].

2. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*], sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Buyer(s)," is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ [*state capacity and if used as basis of venue, residence of defendant(s), e.g.*, husband and wife, residing at _____ (*street address and city*), _____ County, California].

[3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants sued herein as Doe I to Doe _____, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff(s), who therefore sue(s) said defendants by such fictitious names; plaintiff(s) will amend this complaint to show such true names and capacities when the same are ascertained. Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe and thereon allege that said defendants, and each of them, is responsible in some manner for plaintiff's(s') damages herein alleged.]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160[1], Paragraph 3.*]

5. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof by reference, whereby plaintiff(s) agreed to sell to defendant(s) and defendant(s) agreed to purchase from plaintiff(s) for the sum of $_____ that certainreal property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

6. The contract price of $_____ was to be paid _____ [*specify terms, e.g.,* $_____ as a cash downpayment prior to close of escrow, $_____ from the proceeds of a note and first deed of trust in favor of an institutional lender, and $_____ in the form of a note to plaintiff(s) secured by a second deed of trust on the property. Discounting the value of the note to be taken by plaintiff(s) the contract price was equivalent to an all-cash-to-seller price of $_____.]

7. Plaintiff(s) has/have fully performed all conditions, covenants, and promises he/she/they is/are required to perform under the terms of the contract referred to in Paragraph 5, above, [and the escrow instructions executed by the parties on _____ (*date*),] [_____ (*if performance has not been completed by plaintiff(s), so state, giving the excuse for nonperformance, e.g.,* except that plaintiffs did not place their deed in escrow because tender was excused by defendants' conduct described in Paragraph 9, below)].

[8. On or about _____ (*date*), _____ (*describe the satisfaction or waiver of any condition precedent to defendant's(s') performance, e.g.,* defendant's received from _____ (*name of lender*) a written commitment for a loan for _____ ($_____ or _____ per cent of the purchase price) to be secured by the subject property).]

9. _____ [*Describe defendant's(s') breach, e.g.,* The defendants have failed and refused to pay the remainder of the downpayment required by the contract or to execute the note and deed of trust in connection with the loan described above _____ (for 50 days after the time called for by the contract *or* and on _____ (*date*), stated that they are not going to comply with the provisions of the agreement and escrow instructions)].

[10. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s) demanded that defendant(s) perform his/her/its/their obligations under the contract.]

11. On the date defendant(s) breached the contract, the _____ [fair market value of the property *or* value of the property to plaintiff(s)] was $_____. As a result of the breach, plaintiff(s) has/have suffered damages of $_____, reflecting the difference between the contract price and the _____ [market value of the property *or* value of the property to plaintiff(s)] at the time of the breach.

[12. Plaintiffs purchased a replacement home after learning that defendant(s) had qualified for financing. As a further proximate cause of defendant's(s') breach of the contract, plaintiff(s) has/have incurred liability for and paid _____ (*specify any special damage incurred by plaintiff(s), e.g.,* sewer assessments, taxes, utility and

maintenance costs required to keep the contract property free from vandalism and ready for resale in the sum of $_____.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____, together with interest thereon from the date of defendant's(s') breach;

2. For special damages in the sum of $_____, together with interest thereon from the date of defendant's(s') breach;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred[, including attorney's fees as provided by the contract here at issue];

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a vendor under a contract for the sale and purchase of real property to recover damages resulting from purchaser's breach of the contract [*Civ. Code § 3307*]. For discussions of circumstances to be considered in electing a remedy, see *§§ 569.21, 569.24[1], [4]*. For an illustration of the Judicial Council breach of contract pleading form, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

[3] Allegations.

This complaint sets forth:

- The formation of a written contract for the sale of real property (Paragraph 5) [*Civ. Code § 1624(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*].

- The vendor's performance of the contract or excuses for nonperformance of any obligations under the contract plaintiff did not perform (Paragraph 7).

- The satisfaction or waiver of any conditions precedent to defendant's performance (Paragraph 8); defendant's breach of the contract (Paragraph 9).

- The value of the property to plaintiffs on the date of breach, which isgenerally the fair market value of the property, and a calculation of general damages (Paragraph 11) [*see Jensen v. Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 657-658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426* (value of property to vendor on date of breach is decreased by amount of taxes, utilities, and assessments coming due between date of contract and date of breach)].

- Any special damages suffered by plaintiffs (Paragraph 12) [*Lortz v. Connell (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 286, 290-291, 78 Cal. Rptr. 6* (breach of contract elements); *Caspar Lumber Co. v. Stowell (1940) 37 Cal. App. 2d 58, 61, 98 P.2d 744* (market value date of breach); *Employees' Participating Asso. v.*

Pine (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 299, 301, 204 P.2d 965 (market value date of breach)].

Unless the breach was repudiation, plaintiff's tender and demand must be alleged (Paragraphs 7 and 10). The allegation of demand is especially important if plaintiff/vendor had allowed the time specified for performance to pass without objection [*McKinley v. Lagae (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 284, 291, 293-294, 24 Cal. Rptr. 454* (repudiation); *Baird v. Barton (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 502, 505-506, 329 P.2d 492* (demand to reinstate time provision)].

While no case has held that the cash equivalent of the contract price must be pleaded, in a transaction that calls for the vendor to take back a note and deed of trust, damages are measured as if the contract provided for all cash to the seller [*Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 841, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Because contract price is an element of damage, and damages are required to be pleaded, it would seem prudent to add Paragraph 6 if the contract called for vendor financing.

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In limited civil cases, the first page of the first paper filed must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

An action for damages for breach of contract may be brought in the county in which the contract was formed or is to be performed or in which any defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (county in which contract formed as county of performance unless contract provides otherwise)]. Venue will be the same if this form is used in a complaint that also seeks declaratory relief based on the contract [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 930-931, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* . If this form is used in a complaint that also seeks to quiet title, only the superior court has jurisdiction, regardless of the amount of any incidental damages sought, and venue is in the county in which the real property is located, although that court may transfer it [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.040(a), 760.050(a)*].

[5] State Statutes

Contract for sale of real property must be in writing. *Civ. Code § 1624(c)*

Nonapplicability of Unruh Act (*Civ. Code § 1810 et seq.*) to contract for sale of entire residence or lot. *Civ. Code § 1801.4(a), (b)*

Resale by personal representative of deceased vendor if purchaser defaults after sale is confirmed. *Prob. Code § 10350*

[6] Decisions

[a] Vendor's Performance or Excuse

Purchaser's unconditional repudiation excuses vendor's performance if vendor has acted in reliance on repudiation prior to attempted retraction. *Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 19, 230 P.2d 629*

Purchaser's offer to perform if granted demands to which he or she is not entitled does not amount to retraction of

repudiation. *Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 19, 230 P.2d 629*

Purchasers' failure to make timely deposit of funds in escrow was not breach because seller/builder had not completed home according to specifications and tender by each party was concurrent condition. *Kossler v. Palm Springs Developments, Ltd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 88, 99-101, 161 Cal. Rptr. 423*

[b] Consequential Damages

[i] In General

Vendor is entitled to recover costs of clearing title or regaining possession. *Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* ; *Yackey v. Pacific Development Co. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 776, 786-787, 160 Cal. Rptr. 430* (costs of removing lis pendens of third party that purchaser had agreed to assume)

Vendor is not entitled to recover expenses would have been incurred if sale was completed, but is entitled to recover expenses of actual or hypothetical resale that exceed expenses assumed under breached contract. *Royer v. Carter (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 544, 550-551, 233 P.2d 539* (actual resale); *Jensen v. Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 657-658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426* (hypothetical resale)

To sustain award to vendor of mortgage interest and taxes paid between breach andtrial, trial court must find that these expenses were reasonably foreseeable, thatvendor diligently attempted resale or that defaulting purchaser's lis pendens made property unmarketable, and that awarded expenses exceeded value of vendor's use of property during period. *Askari v. R. & R. Land Co. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1101, 1108, 225 Cal. Rptr. 285*

If vendor diligently attempted resale or defaulting purchaser's lis pendens made property unmarketable, vendor was entitled to consequential damages equal to interest that would have been earned on down payment between date of breach and time of trial and interest that would have been earned on vendor-assisted financing during that period. *Askari v. R. & R. Land Co. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1101, 1108-1110, 225 Cal. Rptr. 285*

Vendor who could not resell property because of defaulting purchaser's lis pendens was entitled to consequential damages for decrease in value of property attributable to lis pendens; increase or decrease in value was to be calculated as of date lis pendens is lifted. *Askari v. R. & R. Land Co. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1101, 1110-1112, 225 Cal. Rptr. 285*

Defaulting purchaser was entitled to offset for difference between contract price and higher market value at time of trial; if defaulting purchaser's lis pendens hindered vendor's resale efforts, offset was to be calculated as of date of breach; in both cases, burden of proof of greater value was on defaulting purchaser. *Askari v. R. & R. Land Co. (1986) 179 Cal. App. 3d 1101, 1112, 225 Cal. Rptr. 285*

Vendor is entitled to recover taxes, utilities, and assessments that came due between date of contract and date of breach on theory they decreased net value of property to vendor on date of breach. *Jensen v. Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 657-658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426*

Vendor whose purchase of replacement home is reasonably foreseeable at time of contracting and who, as a consequence of purchaser's breach, is required to maintain two residences until resale of contract property is entitled to recover commuting expenses related to contract property. *Jensen v. Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426*

Vendor is not entitled to recover expenses of normal occupation, only those necessary for resale. *Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 850, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Although *Civ. Code § 3353* relates only to resale of personal property and not to resale of real property, vendor must show that resale was made with reasonable diligence to recover any consequential damages. *Sutter v. Madrin (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 161, 169-170, 74 Cal. Rptr. 627* (hotel operating expenses)

If resale is made in shortest possible time, vendor's out-of-pocket expenses for fire insurance, mortgage interest, and real property taxes are consequential damages. *Allen v. Enomoto (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 798, 803-804, 39 Cal. Rptr. 815*

When property that is vendor's residence remains unoccupied between date of breach and resale, vendor is not entitled to recover rental value. *Allen v. Enomoto (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 798, 804, 39 Cal. Rptr. 815*

When other property is taken as partial payment on resale, vendor is entitled to recover expenses incurred in refinancing other property, but neither loss nor expenses on resale of other property is recoverable. *Allen v. Enomoto (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 798, 804, 39 Cal. Rptr. 815*

[ii] Broker's Fees

Amount of broker's commission on resale recoverable by vendor must be required to be decreased by amount of commission saved (i.e., difference between commission agreed to be paid and actually paid or enforceable by broker) on breached sale. *Royer v. Carter (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 544, 551, 233 P.2d 539*

Vendor is entitled to recover broker's commission necessary to resell even though breached sale did not involve broker. *Jensen v. Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 657-658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426*

Vendor's recovery of damages for breach of contract is not in itself sufficient to establish vendor's liability for brokerage commission. *Barton v. White Oak Realty, Inc. (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 579, 585-587, 76 Cal. Rptr. 587*

Vendor is entitled to recover amount of broker's judgment against him or her for fee on breached sale plus interest on that judgment from date thereof. *McKinley v. Lagae (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 284, 295, 24 Cal. Rptr. 454*

[iii] Loss of Income

Vendor of agricultural property who has refrained from planting crops in reliance on contract is entitled to recover net income crops would have produced. *Wade v. Lake County Title Co. (1970) 6 Cal. App. 3d 824, 831, 86 Cal. Rptr. 182* ; *Yocum v. Taylor (1920) 50 Cal. App. 294, 295, 195 P. 62*

Vendor who evicts tenant in reliance on contract is entitled to recover lost rentals from time of eviction until date of resale. *McKinley v. Lagae (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 284, 295, 24 Cal. Rptr. 454*

[iv] Purchase of Other Residence

If vendor's purchase of another residence is foreseeable and expenses connected with purchase are caused by purchaser's breach, those expenses are recoverable by vendor. *Angell v. Rowlands (1978) 85 Cal. App. 3d 536, 542-543, 149 Cal. Rptr. 574* (penalty paid for delay in closing purchase of replacement home); *Jensen v Dalton (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 654, 658, 88 Cal. Rptr. 426* (refinance because of lower downpayment, commuting between two

residences)

Whether purchase of replacement residence was foreseeable and reasonable is question of fact; vendor's purchase of replacement home before purchaser qualified for financing may not be reasonable; expenses of two residences are recoverable by vendor only if purchase was both foreseeable and reasonable and resale was in shortest possible time. *Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 850-851, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855*

[c] Difference in Value Damages

Traditional measure of damages assumes vendor is able to resell property; when purchaser had agreed to remove lis pendens filed by third party, vendor was properly awarded costs to remove lis pendens plus interest on contract price fromdate escrow should have closed until lis pendens was removed. *Yackey v. Pacific Development Co. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 776, 786-787, 160 Cal. Rptr. 430*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.160*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachCauses of ActionElements of ClaimsContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawPerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesConsequential DamagesContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesInterestContracts LawRemediesElection of RemediesContracts LawThird PartiesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsPrice TermsEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsRemedies for BreachEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbateGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsFinancingInsurance LawIndustry RegulationInsurance Company OperationsRepresentativesBrokersInsurance LawProperty InsuranceCoverageReal PropertyGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationBreach of ContractExpress ContractsPublic Contracts LawBids & FormationOffer & AcceptanceAcceptances & AwardsReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawBrokersDiscipline, Licensing & RegulationReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien PrioritiesReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsDamagesConsequential DamagesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesConsequential DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesIncidental DamagesReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesPublic Utilities TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationGeneral OverviewTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuationTortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseForeseeability

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.162

§ 569.162 Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Fraud in the Purchase or Exchange of Real Property [Civ. Code § 3343]--Or in the Alternative, for Rescission [Civ. Code § 1692] and Cancellation [Civ. Code § 3412]

[1] FORM Complaint by Vendor--For Damages for Fraud in the Purchase or Exchange of Real Property [Civ. Code § 3343]--Or in the Alternative, for Rescission [Civ. Code § 1692] and Cancellation [Civ. Code § 3412]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR FRAUD[,
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	RESCISSION, AND CANCELLATION]
[and DOES I through _____],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Damages for Fraud in _____ [Purchase *or* Exchange] of Real Property)

1. [*Capacity and residence of defendant(s). See § 569.161, Paragraph 2.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

4. At all times herein mentioned prior to _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) was/were [husband and wife and] fee owner(s) of that certain real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

[*EITHER, if purchase contract*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof, whereby plaintiff(s) agreed to sell to defendant(s) and defendant(s) agreed to purchase from plaintiff(s) for the sum of $_____ the real property described in Paragraph 4. On or about _____ [*date*], pursuant to that agreement, plaintiff(s) conveyed the property described in Paragraph 4 to defendant(s).

[*OR, if exchange of property*]

5. At all times herein mentioned prior to _____[*date*], defendant(s) was/were fee owners of that certain real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

6. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof, whereby plaintiff(s) agreed to convey to defendant(s) the real property described in Paragraph 4, above, and defendant(s) agreed to convey to plaintiff(s) the real property described in Paragraph 5, above. On or about _____[*date*], pursuant to that contract, plaintiff(s) conveyed the property described in Paragraph 4, above, to defendant(s), and defendant(s) conveyed the property described in Paragraph 5, above, to plaintiff(s).

[*CONTINUE*]

[7. The deed from plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) was recorded on _____ (*date*), in _____(Book *or* Reel) _____, at _____ (Page *or* Image) _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California. A copy of that deed is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof.]

[8. The deed from defendant(s) to plaintiff(s) was recorded on _____ (*date*), in _____(Book *or* Reel) _____, at _____ (Page *or* Image) _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California. A copy of that deed is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "C" and made a part hereof.]

[9. _____ (*Describe any provisions of the agreement which are relevant to the relief sought, such as notes or deed of trust taken by plaintiff and performance of those provisions, e.g.,* The purchase price was to be paid $_____ as a cash down payment prior to close of escrow and $_____ in the form of a note payable to plaintiff(s) secured by a deed of trust on the subject property. Plaintiff(s) agreed to subordinate this deed of trust to a development loan of not more than $_____ which defendant(s) represented to plaintiff(s) that he/she/it/they intended to obtain. Defendant(s) agreed that the proceeds of the development loan would

be used exclusively to install roads, water, sewage, and electrical systems on the subject property and to subdivide it into parcels of no less than four acres each. The down payment, note, and deed of trust were received by plaintiff(s) on or about _____(*date*), at which time plaintiff(s) executed the subordination agreement (*if cancellation of the subordination agreement will be sought, add recording data:*, which was recorded on _____ (*date*), in _____ (Book or Reel) _____, at _____ (Page or Image) _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____County, California, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "D" and made a hereof)].

10. On or about _____ [*date*], and during the negotiations for the above-described contract for the _____ [sale and purchase *or* exchange] of property defendant(s) falsely represented to plaintiff(s) _____ [*state the substance of the misrepresentation, e.g.,* that plaintiff's(s') property described in Paragraph 4, above, had a fair market value of $_____ (*the contract price*) and that it's highest and best use was as vacation parcels].

11. In fact, _____ [*state the true facts, e.g.,* plaintiff's(s') property described in Paragraph 4, above, was within an area which the State of California intended to take by eminent domain for use as in the state water project's canal system].

12. These representations were made by defendant(s) with the intent to deceive and defraud plaintiff(s) and to induce him/her/them to enter into the above-described contract of _____ [sale and purchase *or* exchange].

13. The representations made by defendant(s) were in fact false, and defendant(s) knew them to be false at the time he/she/they made them [and at all times herein mentioned].

14. Plaintiff(s) relied on the representations by defendant(s) in entering into the above-described contract of _____ [sale and purchase *or* exchange]. Plaintiff's(s') reliance on these representations was justified because _____ [*set forth facts showing justifiable reliance, e.g.,* plaintiffs live in _____ County, California, some _____ miles from their property described in Paragraph 4. Plaintiffs are 87 and 89 years old respectively and have never visited that property, which they acquired in satisfaction of a debt in 1972. Until defendant(s) approached them, plaintiffs had no intention of selling that property, and had not investigated the real estate market in that area].

15. The representations defendant(s) made to plaintiff(s) were a material inducement to plaintiff(s) to enter into the contract. Plaintiff(s) would not have entered into the contract but for those representations.

16. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) _____ [*allege discovery of true facts, e.g.,* were informed by their grandson that the state of California intended to acquire land in _____ County for expansion of its water project's canal system and asked plaintiffs if their land was within the area targeted for acquisition. Plaintiffs immediately contacted the Department of Water Resources and were informed that the property described in Paragraph 4, above, was targeted for acquisition at an offering price of $_____].

17. As a proximate result of defendant's(s') fraud and deceit plaintiff(s)has/have sustained damages of $_____, which is the difference between the actual value of the property described in Paragraph 4, above, and the actual value of the consideration received by plaintiff(s) in exchange for that property.

[18. As a (further) proximate result of the defendant's(s') fraud and deceit, plaintiff(s) has/have _____ (*describe other items of allowable damages, such as income from property after sale, if plaintiff(s) would have been entitled to it or if rescission is pleaded as an alternative, e.g.,* been deprived of the use and value of the use of the property described in Paragraph 4, which is worth $_____ per month, since the time defendant(s) have taken possession thereof).]

[19. At all times herein mentioned, _____ (*allege facts showing that defendant(s) acted with oppression, fraud, and malice, e.g.,* and even before he/she/they approached plaintiff(s), defendant(s) knew that plaintiff's(s') property was targeted for acquisition by emiment domain. Each and every act of defendant(s) and statement of defendant(s) to plaintiff(s) was part of a scheme to intentionally and maliciously deceive plaintiff(s) and take unfair advantage of his/her/their advanced years, lack of familiarity with the property, and lack of ability to travel).]

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Rescission)

20. Plaintiff(s) reallege(s) and incorporate(s) herein Paragraphs 1-19 of the First Cause of Action.

[21. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ (*name*), hereinafter referred to as "Title Company," was, and now is, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the law of the State of California, with its principal office for the transaction of business in _____ County, California, and trustee of the deed of trust described in Paragraph 9, above, given by defendant(s) to plaintiff(s) to secure the note for $_____ of the purchase.]

22. Plaintiff(s) intend(s) that service of summons of this action and of this complaint serve as notice of rescission of the aforementioned contract of _____ [sale and purchase *or* exchange] [including the loan transaction evidenced by the note, deed of trust, and subordination agreement referred to in Paragraph 9] and hereby offer(s) to restore all consideration furnished by defendant(s) under the contract [, note, and deed of trust], on condition that defendant(s) restore to plaintiff(s) the consideration furnished by plaintiff(s).

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Cancellation)

23. Plaintiff(s) reallege(s) and incorporate(s) herein Paragraphs 1-19 of the First Cause of Action [and Paragraph 21 of the Second Cause of Action].

24. Plaintiff(s) intend(s) that service of summons of this action and of this complaint serve as notice of cancellation of the _____ [deed referred to in Paragraphs 5 and 7 *or* deeds referred to in Paragraphs 5, 6, 7, and 8] [and of the note, and deed of trust referred to in Paragraph 9] and hereby offer(s) to restore all consideration furnished by defendant(s), on condition that defendant(s) restore to plaintiff(s) the consideration furnished by plaintiff(s).

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

On the FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:

1. For general damages _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

[2. For special damages _____ (in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof);]

On the SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION:

3. For a determination by the Court that the contract has been rescinded and ordering defendant(s) to convey the real property described in Paragraph 4, above, to plaintiff(s) [as husband and wife] on condition that plaintiff(s) _____ [(surrender the note and deed of trust executed by defendant(s) to the Court for cancellation

and) pay to defendant(s) such sums as ordered by the judgment of this Court *and/or* convey to defendant(s) the real property described in Paragraph 5, above];

[4. That there be deducted from any sum found owing by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) on rescission of the contract, the sum of $_____, together with interest thereon at the legal rate from _____ (*date*);]

On the THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION:

5. That the deed _____ [*describe with specificity, e.g.,* given by plaintiff(s) conveying the property described in Paragraph 4 to defendant(s), which was recorded on _____ (*date*), in _____ (Book *or* Reel) _____, at _____ (Page *or* Image) _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California] [and the note and deed of trust described in Paragraph 9, above,] be declared void;

On all CAUSES OF ACTION:

[6. For exemplary damages;]

7. For costs of suit herein incurred [*if rescission is sought and the contract provided for attorney's fees*, including attorney's fees as provided by the contract here at issue];

8. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a vendor who has been defrauded in the sale or exchange of real property to recover damages resulting from the purchaser's fraud [*Civ. Code § 3343*]. The form also includes causes of action for rescission of the contract and any subsidiary agreements [*Civ. Code § 1692*] and cancellation of the deed and any other instruments involved, such as notes, deeds of trust, or subordination agreements [*see Civ. Code § 3412*]. The form may be modified to seek only damages or only rescission and cancellation. For discussion of these remedies and the circumstances in which each is appropriate, see *§ 569.24[2], [7], [8]*. An illustration of the Judicial Council pleading form for damages for fraud can be found in Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

[3] Parties

All parties to any instrument sought to be cancelled or rescinded must be made parties to the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 389*; *see Cooke v. Darnell (1929) 100 Cal. App. 482, 490, 280 P. 383* (holder of encumbrance not bound by judgment, though named as defendant, because not served)].

[4] Allegations

The essential allegations to establish fraud in a real estate transaction are (1) that defendants made a false representation respecting a material fact (Paragraphs 10 and 11 (false representation) and 15 (materiality)); (2) knowing the

representation to be false or without having any reasonable basis for believing it to be true (Paragraph 13); (3) with the intent that plaintiffs rely thereon (Paragraph 12); (4) that plaintiffs relied on the representation (Paragraph 14) [*see also Palm v. Smither (1942) 52 Cal. App. 2d 500, 505, 126 P.2d 428* (special elements to establish fraud on vendor relating to value of his or her own land), discussed in *§ 569.24[7][a]*]; and (5) to their damage (Paragraphs 17 (general fraud damages under *Civ. Code § 3343*) and 18 (special fraud damages under *Civ. Code § 3343(a)(1)-(3)* or damages incident to rescission) [*Roland v. Hubenka (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 215, 220, 90 Cal. Rptr. 490* ; *Simone v. McKee (1956) 142 Cal. App. 2d 307, 312, 298 P.2d 667]* . Paragraph 16 provides the basis to establish that the cause of action was brought within the applicable three-year limitation period, commencing on discovery of the fraud, or, in the case of rescission or cancellation that laches do not apply [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*; *see Leeper v. Beltrami (1959) 53 Cal. 2d 195, 214-215, 1 Cal. Rptr. 12, 347 P.2d 12* (complaint for rescission, cancellation as subject to demurrer for failure to show prompt action to rescind or excuse)]. Optional Paragraph 19 seeks punitive damages.

If rescission is sought, Paragraphs 1-19 establish the grounds; Paragraph 21 sets forth the capacity of another party to a subsidiary contract sought to be rescinded; and Paragraph 22 alleges notice of rescission and offer to restore consideration. Consecutively numbered additional paragraphs should be added after Paragraph 21 to allege the capacity of each other party to all of the contracts sought to be rescinded. If notice of rescission was given prior to commencement of the action, Paragraph 19 will not be appropriate. Instead use the allegation in § 569.168, second alternative Paragraph 21.

If cancellation is sought, Paragraphs 1-19 establish the grounds; Paragraph 21 and as many other paragraphs as are necessary set forth the capacity of each other party to all of the instruments sought to be cancelled; and Paragraph 24 alleges notice of cancellation and offer to restore consideration. If notice of intent to cancel was given prior to commencement of the action, Paragraph 19 will not be appropriate. Instead use the allegation in § 569.168, second alternative Paragraph 21.

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless the amount in controversy, exclusive of interest, is $25,000 or less, in which case it will be classified as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In limited civil cases, the first page of the first paper filed must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

Venue for an action to recover damages for fraud is the county of defendant's residence, so if only damages for fraud are sought (Paragraphs 1-19), it is clear that the proper venue is the county or judicial district where defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. If only rescission and cancellation are sought, venue is in the county in which the real property is located [*Eckstrand v. Wilshusen (1933) 217 Cal. 380, 382-383, 18 P.2d 931* ; *see Etter v. Vollmer (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 718, 720, 294 P.2d 55* (vendor's action for declaration that deed is void and for reconveyance; restoration of benefits considered incidental)]. If both damages and rescission are pleaded as alternative remedies, it is not clear whether venue will lie in the county of defendant's residence on the basis of the rule that in mixed actions, defendant is entitled to have the action tried in the county of hisor her residence [*see Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527* , 530-531, *173 Cal. Rptr. 527* (discussing rules); *see also* Ch. 571, *Venue*].

[6] State Statutes

Redelivery of deed to grantor or cancellation of deed does not retransfer title. *Civ. Code § 1058*

Relief based on rescission of contract. *Civ. Code § 1692*

Measure of damages for fraud in sale, purchase, or exchange of property. *Civ. Code § 3343*

Cancellation of instruments. *Civ. Code §§ 3412-3415*

Exemplary damages. *Civ. Code § 3294*

When prevailing party in action on contract entitled to attorneys' fees. *Civ. Code § 1717*

Limitation period for fraud action is three years from discovery of fraud. *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*

[7] Decisions

[a] Attorney's Fees

Action for rescission is one "on contract" so as to allow recovery of attorney's fees to successful party if contract contains attorney's fee clause that does not limit recovery to particular form of action on contract. *Hastings v. Matlock (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 826, 840-841, 217 Cal. Rptr. 856*

[b] Cancellation

Instead of pleading in general terms that defendant claims adverse interest, to state cause of action under *Civ. Code § 3412* plaintiff is required to allege facts showing invalidity of apparently valid instrument. *Wolfe v. Lipsy (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 633, 638, 209 Cal. Rptr. 801* (disapproved on another point in *Droeger v. Friedman, Sloan & Ross (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 26, 36-39, 283 Cal. Rptr. 584, 812 P.2d 931*)

[c] Misrepresentations as to Value of Consideration Given by Purchaser

Vendor who took 24 overvalued or worthless second deeds of trust in exchange for real property is entitled to recover under former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10239.4* (renumbered *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10238.7*) providing for interest and attorney's fees. *Harvey v. Davis (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 362, 367-369, 71 Cal. Rptr. 129, 444 P.2d 705*

Purchasers were liable for damages for fraud equal to difference between unpaid balance of note secured by chattel mortgage on restaurant equipment given in partial payment for purchase of home and amount realized by vendor on foreclosure of note and resale of equipment. *Metz v. Malley (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 848, 849-852, 318 P.2d 843*

[d] Subordination of Purchase Money Deed of Trust

Purchaser has breached subordination agreement, and if promise to use proceeds of loan secured by senior deed of trust for improvements to property that was security for note payable to vendor was made without intent to perform, purchaser has committed fraud by using senior loan proceeds for other purposes. *Joanaco Projects, Inc. v. Nixon & Tierney Constr. Co. (1967) 248 Cal. App. 2d 821, 830-831, 57 Cal. Rptr. 48* (senior foreclosed)

[e] Right to Rescission

Vendor is entitled to rescind when offer is subject to conditions as to appraisal and termite reports and is accompanied by post-dated deposit check and vendor is not informed of either postdating or conditions by broker who is agent for both parties. *Wilson v. Lewis (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 802, 806-809, 165 Cal. Rptr. 396*

Vendor whose mistake is based on purchaser's agent's fraud is entitled to rescission. *Wright v. Lowe (1956) 140 Cal. App. 2d 891, 897-898, 296 P.2d 34*

[8] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.160*.

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For general discussion of and forms of judgment for cancellation, see Ch. 107, *Cancellation of Instruments*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading and proof of damages in tort actions, including punitive damages, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to fraud generally, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit*

For discussion of when recording of lis pendens is appropriate in connection with an action regarding real property and form of lis pendens, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*

For general discussion of and forms of judgment for rescission, see Ch. 490, *Rescission and Restitution*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationOffersGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsDischarge & PaymentGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesForgery, Fraud & MistakeContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesImposters & Fictitious PayeesContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesTypes of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSecured TransactionsPerfection & PriorityPriorityGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawLitigation & Administrative ProceedingsToxic TortsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsRemediesCancellation & RescissionReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsConstitutional Limits & RightsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsValuationReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsPurchase-Money MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien PrioritiesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral

OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesAward CalculationsGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesConduct Supporting AwardsTortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsDiscovery RuleTortsTransportation TortsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.163

§ 569.163 Complaint by Purchaser--To Establish and Foreclose Purchaser's Lien For Amount Paid Toward Purchase Price [Civ. Code § 3050]

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser--To Establish and Foreclose Purchaser's Lien For Amount Paid Toward Purchase Price [Civ. Code § 3050]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT TO ESTABLISH AND FORECLOSE
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	PURCHASER'S LIEN
[and DOES I through _____],	)	[Civ. Code §(§ 3048,) 3050]
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. At all times mentioned herein, defendant(s) _____ (*name(s)*), sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Sellers," was/were, and now is/are, _____ (husband and wife *or other allegation of capacity or residence*).]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

4. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [city], _____ County, California, plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof by reference, whereby defendant(s) agreed to sell to plaintiff(s) and plaintiff(s) agreed to purchase from defendant(s) for the sum of $_____ that certain real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

5. The contract Exhibit "A," provided that the purchase price was payable by plaintiff(s) as follows: _____ [*specify, e.g.,* $20,000 on acceptance of plaintiff's(s') offer, $30,000 within 10 days of notice of completion of the repairs by defendant(s) as required by the structural pest control report dated _____, by Term-X Co., and the remainder in cash on the close of escrow which was to be within 30 days from plaintiff's(s') obtaining of a loan commitment at the rate and for the terms specified in the agreement]. On completion of payments, defendant(s) was/were to deliver a grant deed of the property to the plaintiff(s).

[6. *Conditions precedent to performance of either party. See § 569.164, Paragraph 6.*]

7. In accordance with the terms of the contract, plaintiff(s) paid _____ [*specify payment or payments made in compliance with contract, e.g.,* $_____ on or before _____ (*date*), an additional $_____, on or before _____ (*date*), and the balance of $_____, for a total of $_____, on or before _____ (*date*).

[8. Immediately on execution of the contract plaintiff(s) entered into and assumed possession of the property and constructed thereon the following improvements of the aggregate value of $_____, to wit: _____ (*describe improvements*). Between _____ (*date*), and _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s) expended the sum of $_____ for taxes and insurance on the property and the sum of $_____ to _____ (*describe any repairs made, e.g.,* replace broken windows on the premises).]

[9. *Satisfaction or waiver of conditions precedent to performance of either party. See § 569.164, Paragraph 8.*]

[*EITHER, if plaintiff's performance was excused*]

10. Plaintiff(s) duly performed all the conditions, terms, and promises required to be performed on his/her/its/their part by the contract [and the escrow instructions executed by the parties on _____ (*date*),] except that plaintiffs did not _____ [*specify portion of plaintiff's performance which was not completed, e.g.,* place the final payment in escrow] because his/her/its/their _____ [performance *or* tender] was excused by defendants' conduct [and inability to perform] described in Paragraph 11).

11. Defendant(s) has/have failed and refused to execute and deliver a grant deed or any other conveyance to plaintiff(s) and on _____ [*date*], _____ [*specify conduct or inability of defendant(s) which excused plaintiff's performance, e.g.,* stated that he/she/it/they had conveyed the property to a third party and would not comply with the provisions of the contract with plaintiff(s) or the escrow instructions of the parties].

[*OR, if plaintiff performed or tendered performance*]

10. Plaintiff(s) duly performed all the conditions, terms, and promises required to be performed on his/her/its/their part by the contract [and the escrow instructions executed by the parties on _____, (*date*),] and on _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) demanded that defendant(s) execute and deliverto him/her/it/them a grant

deed to the property which is the subject of the written contract of the parties.

11. Defendant(s) has/have failed [and refused] to execute and deliver a grant deed or any other conveyance to plaintiff(s).

[*CONTINUE*]

[12. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s) vacated the premises and surrendered possession thereof to defendant(s). Plaintiff(s) was/were in possession and occupancy of the property for a period of _____ months and _____ days. The reasonable rental value of the property during the period of plaintiff's(s') possession and occupancy thereof was and is the sum of $_____.]

13. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) demanded a return of the $_____ paid to defendant(s) [and reimbursement for the _____ (*specify as appropriate*) $_____ paid for taxes, insurance, repairs, and the value of the improvements to the property set forth in Paragraph 8, *above*], but the defendant(s) has/have not repaid those sum(s) or any part thereof.

14. Plaintiff(s) has/have a lien on the property as (a) purchaser(s) for the amount of $_____ which plaintiff(s) is/are entitled to recover back from defendant(s).

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For the sum of $_____ with interest at the rate of _____ percent from _____ [*date*];

2. For a declaration that plaintiff(s) has/have a purchaser's lien against the property herein described to secure repayment of the said sum;

3. For an order for the sale of the premises in accordance with law and that the proceeds from the sale be used to satisfy the indebtedness of $_____ with interest;

4. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

5. For such other and further relief as this court may deem just and proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser of real property who is not in default under the contract to establish and foreclose the purchaser's lien provided by *Civ. Code § 3050* for so much of the purchase price as has been paid, together with expenditures made on the property including taxes, insurance, and the value of improvements, less the reasonable rental value for any period during which the purchaser had possession of the property [*Civ. Code § 3050*; *see Kent v.*

Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 784-786, 128 P.2d 868 (value of improvements less reasonable rental value during purchaser's occupancy); *Montgomery v. Meyerstein (1921) 186 Cal. 459, 462, 464, 199 P. 800* (taxes, insurance, improvements); *Benson v. Shotwell (1890) 87 Cal. 49, 54-55, 60, 25 P. 249* (purchaser who is in default first is not entitled to lien)]. The purchaser's lien arises on the vendor's failure, refusal, or inability to convey, or if the purchaser is entitled to avoid the contract because of the vendor's misrepresentations or for another reason. It is not necessary for the purchaser to give notice of rescission or to ground the action on the theory of rescission [*Moresco v. Foppiano (1936) 7 Cal. 2d 242, 247, 60 P.2d 430* ; *Montgomery v. Meyerstein (1921) 186 Cal. 459, 464-465, 199 P. 800]* .

[3] Priority of Lien

The priority of the purchaser's lien over preexisting encumbrances on the property is determined as of the date of the contract of sale. Thus, the purchaser can have a declaration of the actual amounts owing under the prior encumbrances as of the date of the contract, and will be entitled to priority over optional additional advances made after the contract date by the holder of an encumbrance who knew of contract of sale [*Civ. Code § 3048*; *Garcia v. Atmajian (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 516, 520-521, 169 Cal. Rptr. 845]* .

[4] Allegations

This form of complaint alleges:

- The formation and terms of a contract for the sale and purchase of real property (Paragraphs 4 and 5).

- The extent of purchaser's payments under the contract (Paragraph 7).

- If purchaser's performance was excused, the performance of all unexcused obligations required to be performed by purchaser and the excuse for nonperformance of the remainder (first alternative Paragraphs 10 and 11), or, if purchaser's performance or tender was not excused, purchaser's performance or tender and demand, and vendor's failure or refusal to perform (second alternative Paragraphs 10 and 11).

- Plaintiff's demand for return of moneys paid and sums expended, including the value of any improvements made to the property (Paragraph 13), and the assertion that plaintiff has a lien on the property for those sums (Paragraph 14).

Optional allegations allege the capacity or residence of the defendants (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)* (venue for lien foreclosure is superior court in county in which property is located)]; fictitious defendants (Paragraph 2); and agency (Paragraph 3). In addition, if plaintiff has taken possession, that must be alleged (Paragraph 8), as well as surrender of possession and value of occupancy to determine the amount of the offset to which defendant/vendor is entitled (Paragraph 12) [*Montgomery v. Meyerstein (1921) 186 Cal. 459, 465, 199 P. 800]* . If plaintiff has made improvements or expenditures, a description of the improvements and their value and/or the description and amount of the expenditures should be alleged (Paragraph 8) [*Montgomery v. Meyerstein (1921) 186 Cal. 459, 464-465, 199 P. 800]* .

If either party's performance was subject to a condition precedent, additional paragraphs should be added setting forth the condition or conditions (Paragraph 6) and alleging the satisfaction of the condition, or, its waiver by the party for whose benefit the condition existed (Paragraph 9) [*see Doryon v. Salant (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 706, 712-713, 142 Cal. Rptr. 378* (party may waive condition solely for his or her benefit)].

[5] State Statutes

Person entitled to recover damages certain or capable of being made certain by calculation, if right to recover is vested on particular day, is entitled to recover interest thereon from that day. *Civ. Code § 3287*

[6] Decisions

Lien is applicable on vendor's abandonment of executory contract without need of rescission. *Lockie v. Cooperative Land Co. (1929) 207 Cal. 624, 629-630, 279 P. 428*

Purchaser's lien is enforceable against subsequent purchaser with notice. *S. San Bernardino Co. v. S. B. Nat. Bk. (1899) 127 Cal. 245, 247, 59 P. 699*

Purchaser is entitled to recover interest on his or her deposit in event of vendor's breach of agreement. *Rasmussen v. Moe (1956) 138 Cal. App. 2d 499, 504, 292 P.2d 226*

Lien is applicable in case of fraud and rescission. *Newcomb v. Title Guar. & Trust Co. (1933) 131 Cal. App. 329, 333, 21 P.2d 456*

[7] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.160*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenuePublic OfficialsContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawTypes of ContractsExecutory ContractsInsurance LawClaims & ContractsEstoppel & WaiverGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsFormalitiesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleFormalitiesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingTender of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.164

§ 569.164 Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Sell Real Property [Civ. Code § 3306]

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Breach of Contract to Sell Real Property [Civ. Code § 3306]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	CONTRACT TO SELL REAL PROPERTY
[and DOES I through _____],	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. Plaintiff(s) _____ (*name(s*)) is/are and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ (*State capacity of plaintiff(s) as necessary, e.g.,* husband and wife).]

2. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s*)], sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Seller(s)," is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ [*state capacity and if used as basis of venue, residence of defendant(s), e.g.,* husband and wife, residing at _____ (*street address and city*), _____ County, California and (at all times prior to _____ [*date*], was/were the) fee simple owner(s) of the real property described in Paragraph 5, below].

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

5. [*Formation of contract. See § 569.163, Paragraph 4.*]

[6. The contract _____ (*specify any relevant terms of the contract, including any conditions precedent to the performance of either party, e.g.,* was subject to the following conditions: (1) that plaintiffs qualify within 45 days from the date of the contract for a 30-year loan for 90 percent of the purchase price at an interest rate not exceeding 10.5 percent per annum and (2) that defendants qualify within the same period for a 30-year loan of at least $_____ at an interest rate not exceeding 10.5 percent per annum to finance the purchase of their replacement home).]

[7. The contract price was payable as follows: $_____ as a cashdownpayment prior to close of escrow, $_____ from the proceeds of a note and first deed of trust in favor of an institutional lender, and $_____ in the form of a note to defendant(s) secured by a second deed of trust on the property. Discounting the value of the note to be taken by defendant(s) the contract price was equivalent to an all-cash-to-seller price of $_____.]

[8. _____ (*Set forth the satisfaction of any conditions precedent or their waiver by the party for whose benefit the particular condition was inserted, e.g.,* On _____ (*date*), plaintiffs notified defendants that plaintiffs had waived the condition regarding their loan qualification and intended to fund their performance pursuant to a loan committed on _____ (*date*), by _____ (*name of lender*) at an interest rate of 10.25 percent per annum with a 15-year amortization period. On _____ (*date*), _____ (*name of lender*) issued to defendants a written commitment for a $_____ 30-year loan at an interest rate of 10.25 percent per annum to finance the purchase of defendants' replacement home).]

[*EITHER, if plaintiff's performance was excused*]

9. Plaintiff(s) duly performed all the conditions, terms, and promises required to be performed on his/her/its/their part by the contract [and the escrow instructions executed by the parties on _____ (*date*),] except that plaintiff(s) did not _____ [*specify portion of plaintiff's performance which was not completed, e.g.,* place the final payment in escrow] because his/her/its/their _____ [performance *or* tender] was excused by defendants' conduct [and inability to perform] described in Paragraph 10.

[*OR, if plaintiff has fully performed or tendered performance*]

9. Plaintiff(s) has/have fully performed all conditions, covenants, and promises he/she/it/they is/are required to perform under the terms of the contract referred to in Paragraph 5 [and the escrow instructions executed by the parties on _____ (*date*),] and on _____ [*date*], _____ [*set forth tender or performance by plaintiffs, e.g.,* offered to pay the balance of the purchase price on condition that defendant(s) execute and deliver to him/her/it/them a grant deed to the property which is the subject of the written agreement of the parties] and demanded that defendant(s) execute and deliver said deed.

[*CONTINUE*]

10. The defendant(s) has/have failed and refused _____ [*describe defendant's(s') breach, and if failure to perform is not accompanied by a specific repudiation or a certain inability, indicate that nonperformance has continued for more than a reasonable time, e.g.,* to execute and deliver a deed to plaintiff(s) _____ (for 50 days after the time called for by the contract *or* and on _____ (*date*), stated that they are not going to comply with the provisions of the contract and escrow instructions.)]

11. Pursuant to the contract, plaintiff(s) have paid to defendant(s) the total amount of $_____, consisting of the following payments made on the following dates: _____.

[12. In reliance on the contract, plaintiff(s) _____(*set forth compensable expenses incurred by plaintiffs, e.g.,* has/have paid $_____ on account of a contract entered into by the defendants with a third party for termite repairs on the property to be sold, all to the benefit of the defendants).]

13. Subsequent to the agreement entered into by and between the plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) on _____ [*date*], the property has appreciated in value, and as of _____ [*date of breach*], had a reasonable value of $_____. By reason thereof, the plaintiff(s) has/have sustained damage in the amount of $_____.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For general damages in the sum of $_____, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from _____ [*the date of breach or any later date on which market value as of the date of breach was determined*];

2. For the sum of $_____ special damages, together with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum from the date of each payment;

3. For the sum of $_____ [*payments made to seller*], together with interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum, from the date payments thereon were made to defendants;

4. For their costs of suit incurred herein[, including reasonable attorney's fees as provided by the contract]; and

5. For such other and further relief as this court may deem just and proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser of real property who is not in default under the contract to recover damages for the vendor's failure or refusal to convey [*Civ. Code § 3306*].

[3] Breach of Collateral Promise

The form may be modified to set forth a cause of action for damages for delay in conveyance or for breach of some collateral promise in the agreement of the parties, such as a promise by the vendor to construct improvements on the

property or to build a road on other property belonging to the vendor to connect the parcel conveyed with the public road. Damages for breach of some collateral promises are governed by *Civ. Code § 3300*, not *Civ. Code § 3306* [*Coughlin v. Blair (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 587, 600, 262 P.2d 305* (connecting road, water, electricity); *Christensen v. Slawter (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 325, 330-334, 343 P.2d 341* (delay)].

[4] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The capacity of the parties, and, if suit is brought in the county of defendant's residence rather than in the county in which the contract was formed or was to be performed, the residence of defendant(s) (Paragraphs 1-4) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (venue of contract action as county in which contract was formed or is to be performed or in which any defendant resides)].

- The formation of a written contract for the sale of real property (Paragraph 5) [*Civ. Code § 1624(c)*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 430.10(g)*] and any conditions precedent to the performance of either party or terms of the contract relevant to the breach at issue (Paragraph 6).

- Satisfaction or waiver of any conditions precedent to the performance of either party (Paragraph 8).

- Plaintiff's partial performance and the excuse for further performance (first alternative Paragraph 9) or plaintiff's performance or tender and demand for defendant's performance (second alternative Paragraph 9) [*see Fogarty v. Saathoff (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 780, 785, 180 Cal. Rptr. 484* (generally offer, tender, or ability to perform as required to place other party in default)].

- Defendant's nonperformance (Paragraph 10).

- The total of payments made by plaintiff to defendant under the contract (Paragraph 11).

- Special damages incurred by plaintiff (Paragraph 12) [*see Moore v. Fredericks (1914) 24 Cal. App. 536, 538-539, 141 P. 1049* (special damages, which are those not necessarily following from breach, as must be specially pleaded)]; and the difference in value damages (Paragraph 13) [*see Employees' Participating Asso. v. Pine (1949) 91 Cal. App. 2d 299, 301, 204 P.2d 965* (market value on date of breach as required to be pleaded)].

[5] Allegations Regarding Vendor Financing

While no case has held that the cash equivalent of the contract price must be pleaded, in a transaction that calls for the vendor to take back a note and deed of trust, damages are measured as if the contract provided for all cash to seller [*Abrams v. Motter (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 828, 841, 83 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Because contract price is an element of damage, and damages are required to be pleaded, it would seem prudent to include the discounted value allegations in optional Paragraph 7 if the contract called for vendor financing [*see Lortz v. Connell (1969) 273 Cal. App. 2d 286, 290-291, 78 Cal. Rptr. 6* (elements are formation of contract, plaintiff's performance or excuse, defendant's breach, and damages)].

[6] State Statutes

Recovery of attorney's fees when provided by contract. *Civ. Code § 1717*

Legal rate of interest specified in contract remains chargeable after breach until superseded by verdict or other obligation; 10 percent per annum is rate if contract does not specify legal rate chargeable after breach. *Civ. Code § 3289*

[7] Decisions

[a] Damages for Breach of Collateral Promise

Measure of damages for breach of promise to build improvement on plaintiff's land is reasonable cost to complete work; measure of damages if improvements were to be constructed on property not owned by plaintiff is difference in value of plaintiff's land; plaintiff's easement is not considered to be plaintiff's land for application of these rules. *Coughlin v. Blair (1953) 41 Cal. 2d 587, 600, 262 P.2d 305* ; *Glendale Fed. Sav. & Loan Assn. v. Marina View Heights Dev. Co. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 101, 123-124, 135 Cal. Rptr. 802*

[b] Damages for Failure to Convey

Purchaser is entitled to interest from date damages could be calculated, which would be date of breach if value of land was then known. *Caplan v. Schroeder (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 515, 521-522, 15 Cal. Rptr. 145, 364 P.2d 321* (finding value was not certain until date of stipulation by parties)

[c] When Performance or Tender Necessary

Vendor who had placed deed in escrow was not in default for failure to provide termite clearance or title insurance because purchaser's nonperformance made both impossible. *Fogarty v. Saathoff (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 780, 784-787, 180 Cal. Rptr. 484*

When vendor had leased property to another and purchaser was able to perform,purchaser's offer to deposit balance of purchase price conditioned on conveyance was sufficient tender of performance to put vendor in breach. *Groobman v. Kirk (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 117, 118-126, 323 P.2d 867*

Statements by purchaser's banker that purchaser was ready, willing, and able to perform and bank would forward funds to escrow when called for was sufficient tender when vendor had not completed construction and did not have marketable title; purchaser's tender was excused by vendor's inability to perform or notification that vendor won't perform. *Hunt v. Mahoney (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 540, 546-549, 187 P.2d 43*

[d] Who May Waive Particular Conditions

Contract provision that vendor subordinate purchase money deed of trust was solely for purchaser's benefit and was subject to waiver by purchaser so long as waiver was not conditional or ambiguous. *Reeder v. Longo (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 291, 296-297, 182 Cal. Rptr. 287* (absolute waiver); *Spellman v. Dixon (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4-5, 63 Cal. Rptr. 668* (ambiguous waiver); *Magna Development Co. v. Reed (1964) 228 Cal. App. 2d 230, 236-243, 39 Cal. Rptr. 284* (conditional waiver)

Conditions regarding availability of construction loan and number of houses that could be built per lot was solely for benefit of, and waivable by, purchaser. *Pease v. Brown (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 425, 429, 8 Cal. Rptr. 917*

Condition that planning commission approve subdivision of property to be sold under contract was solely for purchaser's benefit and therefore waivable by purchaser. *Johnson v. Lehtonen (1957) 151 Cal. App. 2d 579, 582, 312 P.2d 35*

When vendor was providing financing, FHA, VA approval was for benefit of both parties and was not waivable by

purchaser alone. *Spangler v. Castello (1956) 147 Cal. App. 2d 49, 53, 304 P.2d 752*

[8] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.161* and *569.163*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureParties General OverviewCivil ProceduresPretrial JudgmentsDefaultDefault JudgmentsCivil Rights LawContractual Relations & HousingFair Housing RightsFair Housing ActContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsConditions PrecedentContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformancePartial PerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawFinancingGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawTransportation & PipelinesEasements & Rights of WayGovernmentsPublic ImprovementsBridges & RoadsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawEstatesPresent EstatesFee Simple EstatesReal Property LawFinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsPurchase-Money MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingLien PrioritiesReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsPerformanceGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingImpossibility of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingTender of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesMeasures of DamagesTransportation LawBridges & RoadsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.165

§ 569.165 Complaint by Purchaser--For Specific Performance of Contract to Convey Real Property [Civ. Code §§ 3384, 3387]

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser--For Specific Performance of Contract to Convey Real Property [Civ. Code §§ 3384, 3387]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE
[and DOES I through _____],	)	(Contract to Convey Real Property)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff(s), if appropriate. See § 569.164, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s*)], sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Seller(s)," is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, [husband and wife and] fee simple owner(s) of the real property described in Paragraph 5.

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

5. [*Formation of contract. See § 569.163, Paragraph 4.*]

[6. *Relevant terms, including conditions precedent to the performance of either party. See § 569.164, Paragraph 6.*]

[7. *Vendor financing, if applicable. See § 569.164, Paragraph 7.*]

[8. *Satisfaction of any conditions precedent or waiver of condition precedent by the party for whose benefit the particular condition was inserted. See § 569.164, Paragraph 8.*]

9. [*Plaintiff's part performance and excuse for remainder of performance, or plaintiff's performance or tender or and demand. See § 569.164, alternate Paragraphs 9.*]

10. [*Defendant's failure, refusal, or inability to perform. See § 569.164, Paragraph 10.*]

11. The consideration named in the contract to be received by defendant(s) is adequate when compared to the value of the real property [and considering allcircumstances including the relationship of the parties and the objects to be accomplished by the contract].

12. The agreement is fair, just, and reasonable in all respects as to defendant(s).

13. Plaintiff(s) is/are still ready, willing, and able to consummate the purchase of the real property and to pay to defendant(s) the purchase price as set forth in the written contract.

14. Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and thereon allege(s) that from and after _____ [*date when plaintiff(s) would have been entitled to possession under the contract*], the reasonable rental value and the reasonable value of the use and occupancy of the real property is the sum of $_____ per month.

[15. Plaintiff(s) has/have been further damaged by the increase in financing costs since the time required by the contract for defendant's(s') conveyance. If defendant(s) had conveyed the property at the time required by the agreement, plaintiff(s) would have financed the purchase with _____ [the loan described in Paragraph 7 which required *or* a _____-year loan of $_____ bearing interest at _____ percent per annum requiring] monthly payments of interest and principal of $_____; whereas interest rates have now risen to _____ percent per annum and a similar loan would now require monthly payments of $_____. Plaintiff(s) is/are informed and believe(s) and thereon allege(s) that interest rates will increase even more by the time defendant(s) are required by decree of this Court to convey the property to plaintiff(s).]

16. Plaintiff(s) has/have no adequate remedy at law because _____ [the real property which is the subject of the contract is a single-family dwelling which plaintiff(s) intend(s) to occupy *or specify other reason for inadequacy of remedy at law, e.g.,* plaintiff's contract remedy will not provide compensation to plaintiff for the increase in value of the property since defendant's refusal to perform].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For a decree that on the payment to him/her/it/them by plaintiff(s) of the sum of $_____ and the performance by plaintiff(s) of all conditions of the written contract to be performed by him/her/it/them, defendant(s) be ordered and directed to convey the real [and personal] property described in Paragraph 5 to plaintiff(s) and to perform all other conditions of the written contract to be performed by him/her/it/them;

2. That plaintiff(s) have and recover from defendant(s) or that there be deducted from the purchase price required to be paid by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) the sum equal to plaintiff's(s') damages for the wrongful withholding of the real property from plaintiff computed at the rate of $_____ per month commencing as of _____ [*date*];

3. That plaintiff(s) have and recover from defendant(s) or that there be deducted from the purchase price required to be paid by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) the sum equal to plaintiff's(s') increased financing costs on account of the failure of defendant(s) to convey the property on _____ [*date*];

4. For costs of suit herein[, including reasonable attorney's fees as provided by the contract]; and

5. For such other relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser under a written contract for the purchase and sale of real property to bring an action to compel specific performance [*Civ. Code § 3384*]. To use the form, the purchaser must not be materially in default under the contract [*see Civ. Code § 3392* (specific performance may be granted in favor of party whose failure to perform is partial and either immaterial or fully compensable)].

This form of complaint may be modified for use when the vendor does not have all the interest promised to be conveyed. Unless the defect relates to the community property interest of a spouse, the purchaser can compel conveyance of whatever interest the vendor has with an abatement in the purchase price to compensate for the defect [*see Fam. Code § 1102* (both spouses must join in conveyance of community property); *Andrade Development Co. v. Martin (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 330, 333-339, 187 Cal. Rptr. 863* (purchaser knew it was community property and was not even entitled to breach of contract damages from signatory spouse); *Johnson v. Lehtonen (1957) 151 Cal. App. 2d 579, 581-582, 312 P.2d 35* (specific performance affirmed as to one spouse's interest; property held in joint tenancy and purchased with community funds was not shown to be community property)].

Paragraphs 2 and 11-16 of this form may be added as a second count to § 569.164 to seek specific performance or, as an alternative if specific performance is not available, damages for breach of contract. If that is done, the first paragraph of the specific performance cause of action must reallege by incorporation all paragraphs of § 569.164.

This form may be modified to seek specific performance of a contract based on exercise of an option by substituting Paragraphs 1-4 of § 569.169 for Paragraphs 1-2 and 5-6 of this form and adding a Paragraph alleging exercise of the option.

[3] Allegations

In addition to the contract allegations set forth and discussed in *§ 569.164*, this form of complaint alleges:

- That the consideration is adequate (Paragraph 11).

- That the contract is fair and reasonable as to defendant (Paragraph 12) [*Civ. Code § 3391(1), (2)*; *see Meyer v. Benko (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 937, 945, 127 Cal. Rptr. 846* (adequacy as tested was of formation of contract in light of all circumstances then existing; $23,500 sale price to vendor who had duty to build new roof on property worth $29,000-$30,000 was adequate when vendor had dropped asking price to get quick sale); *Weneda Corp. v. Dispalatro (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 187, 190-191, 37 Cal. Rptr. 267* (both allegations were necessary)].

- That plaintiff is still ready, willing, and able to purchase (Paragraph 13) [*but see Hunt v. Mahoney (1947) 82 Cal. App. 2d 540, 547-549, 187 P.2d 43* (purchaser need not keep good tender or deposit money in vendor's name when vendor does not have marketable title or has notified purchaser he/she does not intend to perform)].

- The reasonable rental value of the property from the time purchaser was entitled to conveyance under the contract (Paragraph 14) [*see Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 219-220, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7* (rents and profits from time property should have been conveyed as not really damages but incidental compensation for delay); *Meyer v. Benko (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 937, 946, 127 Cal. Rptr. 846* (entitlement to rents and profits was not conditioned on property's being income-producing)].

- That the plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law [*see Civ. Code § 3387* (conclusive presumption that pecuniary compensation is inadequate in case of single-family dwelling that plaintiff intends to occupy; presumption affects burden of proof in case of other real property); *see also Evid. Code §§ 601, 606*].

The form includes an optional allegation that plaintiff has been damaged by the delay because financing costs have increased (Paragraph 15) [*see Stratton v. Tejani (1982) 139 Cal. App. 3d 204, 208-209, 214-215, 187 Cal. Rptr. 231* (present value of difference in loan payments at different rates only over length of time purchasers were likely to possess property or until they were likely to refinance if evidence showed rates likely to decrease after close of escrow); *Hutton v. Gliksberg (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 240, 247-252, 180 Cal. Rptr. 141* (present value of difference of 30 years' payments at different loan rates)]. The fact that the property is unimproved, zoned commercial, and being purchased for development and resale, or lease, does not mean that it is not unique. The size of the parcel and its proximity to such things as thoroughfares and a post office may contribute to its uniqueness [*Stewart Development Co. v. Superior Court (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 266, 272-275, 166 Cal. Rptr. 450]* .

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of an action for specific performance [*see Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*]. An action for specific performance of a contract to convey real property is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

Venue lies in the superior court in the county in which the property, or any part of it, is located, even if the cause of action for specific performance is pleaded as an alternative to damages for breach of contract [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*; Santa Barbara Lodge No. 605 v. *Penzner (1951) 104 Cal. App. 2d 494, 231 P.2d 595]* .

[5] Laches and Limitations

An action for specific performance of a written contract to convey real property is subject to the four-year limitation of *Code Civ. Proc. § 337(1)* [*Reiner v. Hermann (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 543, 545, 548, 180 P.2d 385]* . However, if the purchaser has fully performed, the vendor is trustee of the legal title for the benefit of purchaser, and the limitation period will not begin to run until the vendor has made a specific repudiation of the trust. Similarly, if the purchaser is in possession, the vendor's repudiation will not commence the running of the period unless it includes an actual taking of

possession [*Kidd v. Kidd (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 479, 481, 39 Cal. Rptr. 203, 393 P.2d 403]* .

Laches, which requires not only the passage of time, but also prejudice to the adverse party, applies to actions for specific performance [*see Stafford v. Ballinger (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 289, 296, 18 Cal. Rptr. 568* (17 years and intervening transfers; specific performance pleaded as alternative to quiet title)].

[6] Lis Pendens

Plaintiff will probably wish to record a notice of pendency of the specific performance action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*; *see Stewart Development Co. v. Superior Court (1980) 108 Cal. App. 3d 266, 276-277, 166 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *see also* Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*].

[7] State Statutes

Specific performance is available against any successor of vendor except purchaser in good faith. *Civ. Code § 3395*

[8] Decisions

[a] In General

Fact that contract precluded seller's remedy of specific performance did not preclude buyer's right to specific performance; buyer's promise to use best efforts to obtain development permits was sufficient mutuality of obligation to make binding contract. *Bleecher v. Conte (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 345, 350-355, 173 Cal. Rptr. 278, 626 P.2d 1051*

Law favors carrying out parties' intentions through enforcement of contracts and disfavors holding them unenforceable for uncertainty; in real property transaction, material terms are price, time and manner of performance, property to be transferred, and description sufficient to identify that property. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 500, 501, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

By litigating entitlement to premium, vendor waived contract provision for arbitration by panel of three appraisers to determine premium payment, if any, payable to vendor for increased value on rezoning; submission of evidence of value went beyond that necessary to establish fairness and reasonableness of contract price. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 503-505, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

"Fair market value" is certain enough price term to allow specific performance. *Goodwest Rubber Corp. v. Munoz (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 919, 921, 216 Cal. Rptr. 604* (option)

Purchaser's failure to allege willingness and ability to perform is not fatal if defendant fails to object to sufficiency of complaint and evidence shows willingness and ability. *Doryon v. Salant (1977) 75 Cal. App. 3d 706, 714-715, 142 Cal. Rptr. 378*

Purchaser who is willing to accept defective title with adjustment is required to indicate that willingness within reasonable time. *Weneda Corp. v. Dispalatro (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 187, 192, 37 Cal. Rptr. 267*

Vendor who has accepted payment is unable to complain that payment was late or that consideration was inadequate. *Crocker v. Grandi (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 431, 436-437, 11 Cal. Rptr. 330*

[b] Decree and Incidental Adjustments

Vendee entitled to specific performance and the rents and profits of the land from the time the conveyance should have been made. *Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 219, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7*

Vendor is entitled to offset against rents and profits allowed to purchaser interest on purchase price during period of delay, except interest is not to be allowed on sums purchaser has set aside, with notice to vendor, so as not to derive benefit therefrom; funds placed in escrow by purchaser are not subject to interest credit in favor of vendor. *Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 220-222, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7*

Purchaser was entitled to compensation for carrying costs during period of delay and for costs of having to reobtain governmental approvals that expired during delay wrongfully caused by vendor; vendor who did not raise issue in trial court was not entitled to offset for lost interest on purchase price; question of entitlement to offset was not pure question of law but required equitable accounting, which involved factual and legal issues. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 499, 505-506, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Appellate court may correct judgment containing obvious clerical error by modifying judgment; in specific performance action, when findings of fact set forth in statement of decision clearly show amount of purchase price payable and amount of and reasons for several offsets, mathematical error in judgment is clerical error. *Hennefer v. Butcher (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 492, 506-508, 227 Cal. Rptr. 318*

Party awarded specific performance is also entitled to compensation for increased costs resulting from breaching party's delay; such compensation is not limited by foreseeability but is required to be reasonable and based on equitable principles. *Bravo v. Buelow (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 208, 213-215, 214 Cal. Rptr. 65* (increased construction costs); *Housing Authority v. Monterey Senior Citizen Park (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 348, 356-357, 210 Cal. Rptr. 497* (increased financing costs)

Attorney's fee award was not proper incident of decree of specific performance against defendant who was third party to whom vendor had sold property after making contract with plaintiff because third party wasn't party to contract with plaintiff providing for attorney's fees as between them; plaintiff had cause of action against vendor for attorney's fees incurred in action against third party. *Glynn v. Marquette (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 277, 280-282, 199 Cal. Rptr. 306*

Preliminary injunction was proper to keep second purchaser from moving into new house pending outcome of first purchaser's action for specific performance. *Grey v. Webb (1979) 97 Cal. App. 3d 232, 236-238, 158 Cal. Rptr. 595*

Court properly retains jurisdiction in interlocutory decree to determine amounts owed. *Wesley N. Taylor Co. v. Russell (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 816, 817-819, 15 Cal. Rptr. 357*

Specific performance decree conditioned conveyance on payment. *Greenstone v. Claretian Theo. Seminary (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 21, 37, 343 P.2d 161* (overruled on other grounds in *Ellis v. Mihelis (1963) 60 Cal. 2d 206, 221, 32 Cal. Rptr. 415, 384 P.2d 7*)

[c] Options

Option that was required to be exercised "within 30 days prior to the expiration date" could be exercised at any time in 30-day period preceding expiration date; language did not require exercise at least 30 days before expiration date. *Wilson v. Gentile (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 759, 762-768, 10 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*

Exercise of option by ordinary mail is adequate; such exercise is not required to include tender of purchase price in absence of clause in option regarding time andmode of payment of pur chase price. *Erich v. Granoff (1980) 109 Cal.*

App. 3d 920, 927-929, 167 Cal. Rptr. 538

Acceptance of exercise of option waives any objection to form of exercise (oral exercise accepted when written acceptance specified in contract). *Collins v. Marvel Land Co. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 34, 40, 91 Cal. Rptr. 291*

Rejection by buyer-optionee of nonconforming escrow instructions does not affect validity of land sales contract that becomes *in esse* on exercise of option. *Collins v. Marvel Land Co. (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 34, 41, 91 Cal. Rptr. 291*

Exercise of option or tender of performance is ineffective if it includes conditions that optionee is not entitled to demand; nevertheless, defects are waived unless optionor/vendor specifically points out alleged defects at time of exercise/tender. *Layton v. West (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 508, 511-512, 76 Cal. Rptr. 507*

[d] Specific Performance Properly Denied

Document signed only by husband was not contract, but only counteroffer, and because never accepted, was not specifically enforceable; even though no contract existed, vendors were entitled to attorney's fees under provision in document claimed to by contract. *Manier v. Anaheim Business Center Co. (1984) 161 Cal. App. 3d 503, 505-508, 207 Cal. Rptr. 508*

Specific performance of alleged contract for purchase and sale of portion of real property was abuse of discretion; specific performance is required to be refused when written contract of parties is ambiguous and parol evidence of transaction between parties fails to remove ambiguity as to material term. *White Point Co. v. Herrington (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 458, 461, 467-468, 73 Cal. Rptr. 885*

[e] Description

Description of property without street address or legal description is inadequate for specific performance. *Gorges v. Johnson (1959) 167 Cal. App. 2d 349, 352, 334 P.2d 621* .

[9] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.164*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensNoticesCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)Form, Formation & ReadjustmentGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawConsiderationGeneral OverviewContracts LawConsiderationAdequate ConsiderationContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract InterpretationParol EvidenceGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesInterestContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawSales of GoodsBreach, Repudiation & ExcuseRightful RejectionContracts LawThird PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsBona Fide PurchasersEstate, Gift & Trust LawCommunity PropertyGeneral OverviewEvidenceDocumentary EvidenceParol EvidenceEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsRebuttal of PresumptionsFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty

RightsGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsCharacterizationGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Duties & RightsProperty RightsCharacterizationCommunity PropertyGovernmentsCourtsCourt RecordsGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipJoint TenanciesReal Property LawEstatesPresent EstatesFee Simple EstatesReal Property LawFinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingConstruction LoansReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingTender of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingTime of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesCompensatory DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesIncidental DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific PerformanceReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.166

§ 569.166 Complaint for Damages for Failure to Make Required Disclosures [Civ. Code § 1102]--By Purchaser Against Vendor

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages for Failure to Make Required Disclosures [Civ. Code § 1102]--By Purchaser Against Vendor

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR FAILURE TO
_____ [*name*],	)	MAKE REQUIRED DISCLOSURES
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____
Defendant(s).	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff as necessary. See § 569.164, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of named defendant. See § 569.164, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 2.*]

4. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ [*county*], California, plaintiff and defendant entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and

made a part of this complaint by reference. Under this contract, defendant agreed to sell to plaintiff and plaintiff agreed to purchase from defendant for the sum of $_____ that certain real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, [commonly known as _____(*common designation or street address*),] and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*]. The escrow closed on this sales transaction on _____ [*date*].

5. At all times mentioned in this complaint the property was improved with a _____ [single-family residence *or* multi-residential building consisting of _____ (*number of units*) units].

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Violation of *Civil Code Section 1102 et seq.*)

[*EITHER*]

6. _____ [Prior to the close of escrow *or* At some time prior to the execution of the sales agreement and continuing through the escrow period],defendant became aware that _____ [*specify nondisclosed items, e.g.,* certain additions or alterations were completed by defendant's predecessor in interest without the required permits].

[*OR*]

6. Prior to the close of escrow, defendant failed to use reasonable care to observe that _____ [*specify nondisclosed items, e.g.,* certain additions or alterations were completed by defendant's predecessor in interest without the required permits].

[*CONTINUE*]

7. Prior to the close of escrow, defendant _____ [willfully *or* negligently] failed to _____ [provide plaintiff with a Transfer Disclosure Statement required by *Civil Code Section 1102 et seq. or* indicate on the Transfer Disclosure Statement provided to plaintiff pursuant to *Civil Code Section 1102 et seq.* that _____ (*specify omitted items, e.g.,* certain additions or alterations were completed by defendant or defendant's predecessor in interest without the required permits)].

8. As a result of defendant's breach of his/her duty to _____ [provide plaintiff with a Transfer Disclosure Statement required by *Civil Code Section 1102 et seq. or* indicate on the Transfer Disclosure Statement provided to plaintiff pursuant to *Civil Code Section 1102 et seq.* that _____ (*specify omitted items, e.g.,* certain additions or alterations were completed by defendant or defendant's predecessor in interest without the required permits)], plaintiff completed the purchase of the property and has been damaged in the sum equal to the amount required to _____ [*specify requirements to cure problem, e.g.,* bring the property into compliance with local regulations].

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Failure to Disclose Material Facts)

9. _____ [Prior to the close of escrow *or* At some time prior to the execution of the sales agreement

and continuing through the escrow period], defendant became aware that _____ [*specify nondisclosed items, e.g.,* certain additions or alterations were completed by defendant's predecessor in interest without the required permits]. Defendant knew that these facts were unknown to plaintiff or were not within the diligent attention and observation of plaintiff, and failed to disclose these facts to plaintiff.

10. These facts materially affect the value and the desirability of the property.

11. As a result of defendant's breach of his/her duty to disclose these facts to plaintiff, plaintiff completed the purchase of the property and has been damaged in the sum equal to the amount required to _____ [*specify requirements to cure problem, e.g.,* bring the property into compliance with local regulations].

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Fraud)

12. Plaintiff incorporates in this cause of action by reference Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Second Cause of Action.

13. Defendant failed to disclose these facts to plaintiff with the intent to induce plaintiff to purchase the property.

14. As a result of defendant's fraudulent nondisclosure of these facts, plaintiff completed the purchase of the property and has been damaged in the sum equal to the amount required to _____ [*specify requirements to cure problem, e.g.,* bring the property into compliance with local regulations].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant[s, and each of them,] as follows:

1. For damages _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* equal to the amount required to _____ (*specify requirement to cure problem*), according to proof];

2. For interest on this sum at the prevailing legal rate from _____ [*date*];

[3. For reasonable attorney's fees _____ (of $_____ *or* according to proof);]

4. For costs of suit herein by plaintiff; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*].
_____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is a complaint for use by a purchaser of a one-to-four unit residential property to recover damages sustained as the result of the vendor's willful or negligent failure to comply with the disclosure requirements imposed generally on residential vendors. The broker(s) for the vendor and the purchaser may also be potential defendants.

For discussion and forms relating to a cause of action against a broker for the failure to disclose, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* . For a form seeking rescission and cancellation based on fraudulent misrepresentations, see *§ 569.168*.

[3] Allegations

The complaint includes allegations regarding the formation of the sales contract and the close of escrow (Paragraph 4), and the type of residential property involved (Paragraph 5).

The first cause of action is based on the vendor's failure to comply with the disclosure requirements of *Civ. Code § 1102 et seq.* Any person who willfully or negligently violates or fails to perform any duty prescribed by any provision of this statutory scheme will be liable in the amount of actual damages suffered by a transferee [*Civ. Code § 1102.13*]. For a discussion of the statutory disclosure requirements, see *§ 569.11*.

Paragraph 6 alleges either that the defendant was aware or should have been aware of certain facts required to be disclosed. Paragraph 7 alleges that the defendant either willfully or negligently failed to provide the statutory Transfer Disclosure Statement to the plaintiff or failed to include certain facts on the statement provided to the plaintiff. Paragraph 8 alleges the damages suffered by the plaintiff as a result of the defendant's violation of the statutory duty to disclose.

The second cause of action is based on the vendor's common law duty to disclose material facts. When the seller knows of facts materially affecting the value or desirability of the property that are known or accessible only to him or her, and also knows that these facts are not known to, or within the reach of the diligent attention and observation of, the buyer, the seller is under a duty to disclose the facts to the buyer. Whether information is of sufficient materiality to affect the value or desirability of the property depends on the facts of the particular case [*Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 265, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130* (buyer stated cause of action for seller's failure to disclose material fact based on nondisclosure of 10-year-old multiple murders in the residence)]. For further discussion of this common law duty, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

Paragraph 9 alleges the defendant's knowledge of and failure to disclose certain facts that were unknown to the plaintiff or not within the diligent attention and observation of the plaintiff. Paragraph 10 alleges that the facts materially affect the value and the desirability of the property. Paragraph 11 alleges the damages suffered by the plaintiff as the result of the defendant's failure to disclose material facts.

The third cause of action is based on the vendor's fraudulent nondisclosure of material facts. In addition to the allegations included in the second cause of action, Paragraph 13 alleges the vendor's intent to induce the plaintiff to purchase the property. For coverage of fraud in this context, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

[4] Statute of Limitations

It appears that an action under *Civ. Code § 1102.13* is subject to the three-year limitation period for actions based on a liability created by statute [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)*]. Unlike the three-year limitation period applicable to common law fraud actions, the limitation period specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* commences on accrual of the cause of action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 312*], even though the plaintiff may not have discovered the facts constituting the cause of action. In contrast, the cause of action for fraud is not deemed to have accrued until the plaintiff's discovery of the facts constituting the fraud [*Code Civ. Proc. § 338(d)*].

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)*], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

[6] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.161*.

For discussion and forms relating to fraud generally, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

For discussion and forms relating to a broker's duty to disclose facts, see Ch. 103, *Brokers* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleFormalitiesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to DiscloseTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationNondisclosureRemediesTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesProperty DamageGeneral OverviewTortsProcedureStatutes of LimitationsAccrual of ActionsDiscovery Rule

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.167

§ 569.167 Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Failure to Provide Written Notice of Hazardous Substance on Property--Against Vendor or Landlord of Nonresidential Real Property [Health & Safety Code § 25359.7(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser--For Damages for Failure to Provide Written Notice of Hazardous Substance on Property--Against Vendor or Lessor of Nonresidential Real Property [Health & Safety Code § 25359.7(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*],	)	(Failure to Disclose Presence of Hazardous Sub-
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	stance)
Defendant(s).	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff as necessary. See § 569.164, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of named defendant. See § 569.164, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 2.*]

4. [*Formation of contract. See § 569.163, Paragraph 4.*]

5. At all times herein mentioned the property that is the subject of the contract was used for nonresidential purposes only.

6. On _____ [*date*], defendant knew or had reasonable cause to believe that a release of hazardous substance had come to be located on or beneath the property.

7. The _____ [transfer of title to *or* lease of] the property occurred on _____ [*date*]. Defendant failed to give plaintiff written notice before that date regarding the presence of a hazardous substance on or beneath the property.

8. As a result of defendant's failure to give the notice as required by law, _____ [*describe harm to plaintiff, e.g.,* because of the extreme danger to human life posed by the presence of toxic and hazardous waste on the property, plaintiff was forced to sell the property at a loss].

[9. In performing the acts herein alleged, defendant had actual knowledge of the presence of a hazardous substance on or beneath the property and knowingly and willfully failed to give plaintiff the notice required by law.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For actual damages;

[2. For the civil penalty provided by law;]

3. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court deems proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser or tenant of nonresidential real property who has suffered harm because of the vendor's or landlord's failure to give written notice of the presence of a hazardous substance. The vendor or landlord is required to give this notice when he or she knows or has reasonable cause to believe that a release of hazardous substance has come to be located on or beneath the property. The vendor or lessor is liable for actual damages resulting from a failure to give the required notice before the transfer of title or making of the lease. In addition, the vendor or lessor is liable for a civil penalty if he or she had actual knowledge of the situation and knowingly and willfully failed to give notice as required by law [*Health & Safety Code § 25359.7(a)*].

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges:

- The nonresidential nature of the real property (Paragraph 5).

- The vendor's or lessor's knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that a hazardous substance was located on or beneath the property (Paragraph 6).

- The transfer of title to, or lease of, the property without the notice required by law (Paragraph 7).

- The harm that the purchaser or lessee suffered as a result of the vendor's or lessor's failure to give the notice (Paragraph 8). The complaint contains an optional allegation of actual knowledge and willful failure to give thenotice, as a basis for claiming a civil penalty (Paragraph 9) [*Health & Safety Code § 25359.7(a)*].

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.160*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesFictitious NamesContracts LawTypes of ContractsLease AgreementsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawHazardous Wastes & Toxic SubstancesCERCLA & SuperfundRecordkeeping & ReportingReal Property LawLandlord & TenantGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsLiabilities of LessorsGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsLiabilities of LessorsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsPremises Liability & PropertyLessees & LessorsLiabilities of LessorsNegligenceSafety Requirements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.168

§ 569.168 Complaint by Purchaser--For Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692] for Purchase and Sale of Real Property, for Cancellation of Instrument [Civ. Code § 3412], and for Exemplary Damages [Civ. Code § 3294(a),(c)] and Attorney's Fees [Civ. Code § 1717]

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser--For Rescission of Contract [Civ. Code § 1692] for Purchase and Sale of Real Property, for Cancellation of Instrument [Civ. Code § 3412], and for Exemplary Damages [Civ. Code § 3294(a),(c)] and Attorney's Fees [Civ. Code § 1717]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RESCISSION, CANCELLA-
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	TION OF DEED, NOTES, AND DEEDS OF
[and DOES I through _____],	)	TRUST, EXEMPLARY DAMAGES, AND ATTOR-
Defendant(s).	)	NEY'S FEES
	)	[Amount demanded _____
	)	(exceeds *or* does not exceed) $10,000]
		[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff(s) as necessary. See § 569.164, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Capacity and residence of defendant seller(s). See § 569.164, Paragraph 2*].

[*ALLEGE, in successively numbered paragraphs, the capacity of each party to all of the contracts and instruments*

sought to be rescinded or cancelled, for example:]

3. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____, hereinafter referred to as "Bank" was, and now is, a National Banking Association, duly authorized to transact business in the State of California.

4. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____, hereinafter referred to as "Title Company," was, and now is, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the law of the State of _____, [and authorized to transact and transacting business in California,] with its principal office for the transaction of business in [California in] _____ County, California.

5. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____, hereinafter referred to as "Securities Company," was, and now is, a corporation organized andexisting under and by virtue of the laws of the State of _____, [and authorized to transact and transacting business in California,] with its principal office for the transaction of business in [California in] _____County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

[6. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

7. [*Agency allegation. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

8. [*Formation of contract. See § 569.163, Paragraph 4.*]

9. Pursuant to the contract mentioned above, Seller(s), on or about _____ [*date*], executed a deed, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B", and made a part hereof, conveying the real property to plaintiffs. That deed was recorded on _____ [*date*], in _____ (Book *or* Reel) _____, at _____ (Page *or* Image) _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California.

10. Pursuant to the contract, plaintiff(s) made a cash down payment in the sum of $_____, _____ [*give particulars of subsidiary agreements, notes, and/or deeds of trust sought to be rescinded or cancelled, e.g.,* assumed an existing note payable to Bank in the unpaid amount of $_____, secured by a first deed of trust, and executed an additional note in the sum of $_____, payable to defendant Seller(s) secured by a second deed of trust on the real property. The note payable by plaintiff(s) to Seller(s), a copy which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "C" and made a part hereof, is dated _____.

[*DESCRIBE, in successively numbered paragraphs, each additional contract and instrument sought to be rescinded or cancelled, or affected by the rescission or cancellation of some other contract or instrument, for example:*]

11. The trustee of the second deed of trust is defendant Title Company and the holders thereof are defendant Seller(s). The second deed of trust, a copy of which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "D" and made a part hereof, is dated _____ [*date*] and was recorded on _____ [*date*], in _____ [Book *or* Reel] No. _____, at _____ [Page *or* Image] _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California.

12. The assumption agreement between plaintiff(s), Seller(s), and Bank, a copy of which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "E" and made a part hereof, is dated _____.

13. The first deed of trust [referred to in the assumption agreement] is dated _____, and was recorded on _____ [*date*], in _____ [Book *or* Reel] No. _____, at _____[Page *or* Image] _____ of the Official Records in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California. The trustee of the first deed of trust is defendant Securities Company and the holder thereof is defendant Bank.

[*CONTINUE*]

[14. Plaintiff(s) thereafter made the following improvements on the real property: _____ [*itemize*]. The reasonable value of the improvements is _____ (the sum of $_____ *or itemize value of each improvement*), and the real property is increased in its fair market value by that amount.]

[*ALLEGE, in successively numbered paragraphs, the ground, such as fraud, on which rescission, cancellation, and restitution are sought, for example*]

15. Thereafter, on or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) discovered _____ [*state grounds for rescission, e.g.*: that a moderate rain causes the real property to become flooded. As a result of this discovery, plaintiff(s) made inquiry and discovered that heavy rain causes the interior of the residence situated on the real property to become flooded to a depth of several inches or more, to be totally uninhabitable, that the water flows onto the property from three sides, that it is not practical to attempt to solve the problem of flooding, and that the value of the property by reason of the propensity to flood is not more than the sum of $_____, which sum _____ (does *or* does not) inlcude the value of improvements made by plaintiffs as alleged above)].

16. Defendant Seller[s, and each of them], at the time he/she/it/they agreed to sell the property to plaintiff(s), knew of the _____ [*set forth material fact required to be disclosed or which was subject of fraudulent misrepresentation, e.g.,* propensity of the property to flood], _____ [concealed that fact from plaintiff(s) *or* falsely represented to the plaintiff(s) that the property _____ (*set forth substance of misrepresentation, e.g.,* did not flood)], all [with the intent to deceive and defraud plaintiff(s) and] as an inducement to plaintiff(s) to purchase the property. Plaintiff(s) had no knowledge of the _____ [*true facts, e.g.,* propensity of the property to flood] until he/she/it/they discovered that fact as herein alleged, and would not have purchased the property had he/she/it/they known of the true facts.

17. An examination of the premises at the time plaintiff(s) agreed to purchase the property would not have revealed the _____ [*true condition, e.g.,* propensity of the property to flood], and the Seller[s, and each of them,] knew that a prospective purchaser would not be able to discern the _____[*true condition, e.g.,* propensity] by looking at the property, that plaintiff(s) had no knowledge thereof, and that plaintiff(s) would not have agreed to purchase the property had he/she/it/they known thereof.

18. By reason of the above _____ [failure to disclose *or* falserepresentation], Seller[s, and each of them,] has/have been guilty of fraud.

[*CONTINUE*]

19. As a result of purchasing the real property, plaintiff(s) have incurred expenses in addition to those alleged above. These expenses include, without limitation, closing costs, title insurance, casualty and liability insurance, principal and interest on obligations outstanding, taxes, fees for engineers, and moving expenses. Plaintiff(s) has/have paid a total of

$_____ for these expenses as of the date of this complaint and will continue to incur them in an amount unknown to him/her/it/them at this time. Plaintiff(s) pray(s) leave of court to amend this complaint to insert herein the true amount of those expenses when they are ascertained.

[20. *Punitive damage allegation. See § 569.166, Paragraph 12.*]

[*EITHER*]

21. Plaintiff(s) intend(s) that service of summons in this action and of the complaint serve as notice of rescission of the contract [and _____ (*specify subsidiary agreement(s), e.g.,* assumption agreement)] and cancellation of the deed [_____ (*specify other instruments to be cancelled, e.g.,* note(s) and deed(s) of trust in favor of _____)] described above, and hereby offer(s) to restore all consideration furnished by Seller(s) under the contract, on condition that Seller(s) restore to plaintiff(s) the consideration furnished by plaintiff(s), and the value of his/her/its/their improvements.

[*OR*]

21. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) notified defendants, and each of them, in writing that he/she/it/they had rescinded the contract [and _____ (*specify subsidiary agreement(s), e.g.,* assumption agreement)] and intended to seek cancellation of the deed [, _____ (*specify other instruments to be cancelled, e.g.,* note(s) and deed(s) of trust in favor of _____)] described above on the ground of _____ [*specify, e.g.,* fraud] and offered to restore to Seller(s) all consideration given by him/her/it/them on condition that Seller(s) restore to plaintiff(s) the consideration advanced by him/her/it/them and the value of plaintiffs' (plaintiff's(s') improvements. Defendants, and each of them, refused, and continue to refuse, to return the consideration or to pay the value of the improvements, or to recognize that the contract [and assumption agreement] has/have been rescinded and that the deed, note(s), and deed(s) of trust have been cancelled.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment as follows:

1. That defendant Seller[s, and each of them,] be ordered to pay to plaintiff(s) the following sums:

[(a) The down payment made by plaintiff(s) to Seller(s) in the sum of $_____;]

[(b) The reasonable value of the improvements made by plaintiffs to said real property in the sum of $_____;]

[(c) The sums paid, or which will be paid, by plaintiff(s), for closing costs, title insurance, moving expenses, casualty and liability insurance, principal and interest on outstanding obligations, taxes, fees for engineers, and miscellaneous costs, in an amount which will be set forth by amendment to this complaint when it has been ascertained;]

[(d) Exemplary damages; and]

(e) The costs of suit herein incurred[, including reasonable attorney's fees as authorized by *Civil Code Section 1717*].

2. That the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* contract of the parties and the assumption agreement] has/have been rescinded [; that plaintiff(s) be relieved of any liability on the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* note and deed(s) of trust _____ (given *and/or* assumed) by them)] [; that Seller(s) be required to assume the obligations of plaintiff(s) to _____(*specify third party lenders*)] [; and that plaintiff(s) be indemnified and held

harmless by defendant Sellers from any actions or claims thereunder by _____ (*specify, e.g.,* Bank or Security Company)].

[3. That the note and second deed of trust executed by plaintiff(s) be ordered surrendered up by their holders and cancelled by this Court.]

4. That plaintiff(s) be ordered to convey the real property to Seller(s) by quitclaim deed on condition that Seller(s) pay to plaintiff(s) the sums as ordered by the judgment of this Court.

5. That any sums which this Court finds to be due to plaintiff(s) from defendant Seller(s) be declared a lien on the real property.

6. For such other relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser of real property to bring anaction for rescission of the contract and any collateral agreements, such as agreements assuming preexisting encumbrances. To provide complete relief, the complaint also seeks cancellation of the deed and any notes and deeds of trust in favor of the vendor, restitution, and that vendor's indemnify, and hold purchasers harmless from any claims on the preexisting encumbrances or assume purchase money obligations to third party lenders.

The ground for rescission used in the form is either nondisclosure of a material fact required to be disclosed or affirmative misrepresentation. The form may be modified for use if material mistake or some other ground is the basis for rescission [*see Civ. Code § 1689* and discussion in *§ 569.22[7]*].

This form may be used to seek alternative relief to damages for fraud or for failure to make statutory disclosures [*Civ. Code §§ 1102-1102.14, 1134.5, 3343*; *see § 569.166*].

If any of the lenders has commenced foreclosure proceedings, plaintiff may wish to seek an injunction to restrain the sale to preclude a purchaser at the foreclosure sale from establishing rights superior to plaintiff's rights. For a form of complaint that includes allegations to enjoin a sale that may be combined with this form, see Ch. 555, *Trust Deeds and Real Property Mortgages* .

[3] Parties

All parties to a contract or instrument sought to be rescinded or cancelled must be named in an action for relief based on rescission or cancellation [*Holder v. Home Sav. & Loan Asso. (1968) 267 Cal. App. 2d 91, 107, 72 Cal. Rptr. 704]* . In this complaint, Paragraphs 3 through 5 set forth the capacity of the lenders and trustees on loans which are original obligations of plaintiffs and those assumed by plaintiffs. While the court cannot require full payoff of a loan made by a third party, it can compel vendors to assume those obligations [*see Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 254-258, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800* (party extending financing is not indispensible to rescission so long as decree can be made that does not infringe lender's rights)]. The trustee of the assumed loan has been named in this

complaint in order that it will be bound by any judgment rescinding the assumption agreement (Paragraph 5) [*see Cooke v. Darnell (1920) 100 Cal. App. 482, 490, 280 P. 383* (holder of encumbrance not bound by judgment, though named as defendant, because not served)].

[4] Allegations

In addition to the capacities of all the parties, this form of complaint sets forth the formation and performance of the contract (Paragraphs 8 and 9) and describes each subsidiary agreement and instrument to be affected (Paragraphs 10 through 13). Additional paragraphs should be added as necessary to describe other terms of the transaction and agreements and instruments affected.

Other allegations set forth in this form are:

- Plaintiff's discovery of the defect and its impact on the property's market value (Paragraph 15) [*see Hefferan v. Freebairn (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 715, 721-722, 214 P.2d 386* ; *Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 267-268, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130* (purchaser not required to prove pecuniary loss, property need not be worth less than purchaser paid to entitle purchaser to rescission)].

- Defendant's knowledge of the defect not disclosed or falsity of the affirmative misrepresentation and intent to induce reliance, plaintiff's lack of knowledge of the defect or falsity, the materiality or the defect or misrepresentation, and purchaser's reliance on the nonexistence of the defect or misrepresentation (Paragraph 16) [*see Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 251, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800* ; *Buist v. C. Dudley DeVelbiss Corp (1960) 182 Cal. App. 2d 325, 331, 6 Cal. Rptr. 259* (misrepresentation or concealment of known fact of fill in lot is material inducement and fraud if purchaser does not know)].

- That the defect would not have been apparent to purchasers from a reasonably diligent inspection of the property (Paragraph 17) [*see Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 252, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800* (independent investigation does not preclude reliance if falsity would not be apparent from inspection, if defendant had superior knowledge, or if plaintiff is not competent to judge facts within expert assistance)].

- Consequential expenditures (Paragraph 19).

- Notice of rescission and cancellation and offer to restore consideration or that service of summons and complaint should constitute notice and offer to restore (alternative Paragraph 21).

Optional allegations regarding improvements made by plaintiffs (Paragraph 14) and punitive damages (Paragraph 20) are also included [*Civ. Code §§ 1692, 3294(a)*; *see Kent v. Clark (1942) 20 Cal. 2d 779, 784-786, 128 P.2d 868* (value of improvements)].

[5] Jurisdiction

The superior court has jurisdiction of the action, which will be classified as an unlimited civil case unless it qualifies as a limited civil case [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(1)*]. An action to cancel or rescind a contract is a limited civil case when the relief is sought in connection with an action to recover money not exceeding $25,000 or property of a value not exceeding $25,000, paid or delivered under, or in consideration of, the contract [Code Civ.Proc. § 86(a)(3)]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

In limited civil cases, the first page of the first paper filed must identify the case as a limited civil case and must state whether the demand exceeds or does not exceed $10,000 [*Code Civ. Proc. § 422.30(b)*; *Gov. Code § 70613*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.111(9), (10)*].

[6] Venue

A purchaser's action for rescission of a contract for purchase and sale of real property is considered transitory if the gravamen of the action is fraud despite the fact that transfer of title to real property will be required if plaintiff is successful; therefore, venue is in the county of defendant's residence [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Coe v. Kessler (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 536, 540-542, 294 P.2d 83* ; *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 149-150, 151 P.2d 887]* . When individual and corporate defendants are named, the residence of the individual defendant is entitled to have the action removed to the county of his or her residence [*Rosen v. Kessler (1956) 145 Cal. App. 2d 676, 681-683, 303 P.2d 110]* .

[7] State Statutes

When prevailing party in action on contract is entitled to attorneys' fees. *Civ. Code § 1717*

Exemplary damages. *Civ. Code § 3294*

Cancellation of instruments. *Civ. Code §§ 3412-3415*

[8] Decisions

[a] Grounds for Fraud or Rescission

Purchaser is not prevented by "as is" provision from rescission and restitution from honest vendor on account of vendor's agent's misrepresentations; honest vendor is not liable for other damages. *Herzog v. Capital Co. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 349, 353, 164 P.2d 8*

Misrepresentations as to acreage, susceptibility of property to flooding, and suitability of property for cultivation; purchaser's replacement and repair of culverts does not preclude reliance; numerous visits to property by purchaser as not precluding reliance when purchaser was not knowledgable as to soil or land conditions as they related to cultivation. *Shearer v. Cooper (1943) 21 Cal. 2d 695, 697-702, 134 P.2d 764*

Cause of action was stated for fraud when purchasers bought house without knowing or being told that foundation was so defective that house could not be occupied because broker who was also vendor had duty to disclose defects; purchasers' demolition of house, even in belief that was only way to correct defect, precluded restitution. *Prichard v. Reitz (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 465, 467-469, 223 Cal. Rptr. 734*

Purchaser was entitled to rescission if fact that murders occurred in home 10 years earlier was material; market value assumes purchaser has knowledge of all issues and purposes to which property is adapted. *Reed v. King (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 261, 267-268, 193 Cal. Rptr. 130* (murders in home)

Every contract is subject to rescission for material misrepresentation whether innocent or fraudulent within reasonable time after discovery of falsity; rescission was proper within 60 days after date of contract when property was represented to net $19,000 but in fact it was operating at substantial loss and even though contract provided purchaser seven days to verify income and expenses. *Osborne v. Cal-Am Financial Corp. (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 259, 266-268, 145 Cal. Rptr. 584*

Purchaser was not entitled to unilateral rescission for mutual mistake or innocent misrepresentation regarding gas leak when leak was discovered after representation was made, and was repaired, tested, and passed city inspection, before close of escrow; gas leaks were too common and repaired leak was too immaterial to allow rescission because purchaser's unusual susceptibility to concern over gas leaks was not communicated. *Wood v. Kalbaugh (1974) 39 Cal. App. 3d 926, 929-932, 114 Cal. Rptr. 673*

Purchaser was entitled to rescission for broker's misrepresentation that dwellings had been constructed in compliance with local building codes and ordinances and pursuant to valid permit. *Thompson v. Guyer-Hays (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 366, 369-371, 374, 24 Cal. Rptr. 461*

[b] Particular Relief

Quitclaim deed is generally preferable to grant deed in rescission judgment. *Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 256, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800*

Court was not permitted to require immediate full payoff of purchase money loan made by third party lender; court as properly required vendors to assume obligation of third party purchase money note and deed of trust and to hold purchasers harmless from demands, and claims of lender. *Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 257-258, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800*

Brokers were properly held liable with vendors for restitution of downpayment, closing costs, incidental consequential damages, and payments made by purchasers on note. *Snelson v. Ondulando Highlands Corp. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 243, 258, 84 Cal. Rptr. 800* .

[9] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.163* and *569.166*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawNational BanksAffiliates & SubsidiariesBusiness & Corporate LawCorporate NamesFictitious NamesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawCorporate NamesFictitious NamesConducting Business Under Fictitious NamesBusiness & Corporate LawCorporationsDissolution & ReceivershipGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsLeave of CourtCivil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesContracts LawDefensesGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeGeneral OverviewContracts LawDefensesAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawDefensesFraud & MisrepresentationMaterial MisrepresentationContracts LawFormationAmbiguity & MistakeMutual MistakeContracts LawFormationOffersGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDefensesFailure of ConsiderationContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesForgery, Fraud & MistakeContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsEnforcementDuties & Liabilities of PartiesTypes of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesEquitable ReliefInjunctive ReliefContracts LawThird PartiesGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesEnergy & Utilities LawFinancingGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawGrants & ReservationsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsPrice

TermsEnergy & Utilities LawUtility CompaniesService TerminationsEnvironmental LawLitigation & Administrative ProceedingsToxic TortsEnvironmental LawWater QualityClean Water ActDischarge PermitsDredged or Fill MaterialAlternatives AnalysisEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceInsurance LawIndustry RegulationInsurance Company OperationsRepresentativesGeneral OverviewInsurance LawIndustry RegulationInsurance Company OperationsRepresentativesBrokersInsurance LawProperty InsuranceTitle InsuranceReal Property LawBrokersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawBrokersFiduciary ResponsibilitiesReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsTypesQuit Claim DeedsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesCancellation & RescissionReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsMortgagee's InterestsReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsPurchase-Money MortgagesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsTransfersAssumptionsReal Property LawFinancingSecondary FinancingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawOwnership & TransferDeath & IncapacityTestamentary DispositionsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityFraud & MisrepresentationReal Property LawPurchase & SaleFraudulent TransfersReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesPunitive DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing CodesTortsBusiness TortsGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesPunitive DamagesAward CalculationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.169

§ 569.169 Complaint by Purchaser or Optionee--For Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Seeking Declaration That Contract or Option to Purchase Real Property Is in Full Force and Effect

[1] FORM Complaint by Purchaser or Optionee--For Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Seeking Declaration That Contract or Option to Purchase Real Property Is in Full Force and Effect

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
[and DOES I through _____],	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff(s) alleges(s):

1. At all times herein mentioned plaintiff(s), sometimes hereinafter referred to as _____ ["Buyer(s)" *or* "Optionee(s)"], was/were, and is/are, _____ [*plaintiff's capacity, e.g.*, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California].

2. At all times herein mentioned defendant(s), sometimes hereinafter referred to as _____ ["Seller(s)" *or* "Optionor(s)"], was, and is, _____ [*state capacity and if used as basis of venue, residence of defendant(s), e.g.*, husband and wife, residents of _____ County, California, and the fee owner(s) of the following described real property(, hereinafter referred to as the option property), situated in the County of

_____, State of California, (commonly known as _____ (*common designation or street address*),) and more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

3. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written agreement, [hereinafter referred to as the option agreement,] a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof, whereby plaintiff(s) was/were _____ [granted the exclusive option to purchase the option property on or before _____ (*date*), *or* to purchase from defendant(s) and defendant(s) was/were to sell to plaintiff(s) for the sum of $_____ the real property described above]. The [option] agreement provided for an initial payment of $_____, which was paid on or about _____ [*date*], and for _____ [*specify number, or* an] additional [_____ (*regular interval, if applicable, e.g.,* quarterly)] payment(s) of $_____ [each] to be paid to _____ [Seller(s) *or* Optionor(s) *or name of escrow or other agent*] on _____ [*specify date(s) or other, e.g.,* the last business day of March, June, September, and December of each year, commencing on _____ (*date*),], [unless the option was exercised or canceled before the next payment became due]. The payment(s) was/were [not] to be applied to the purchase price [but was/were to be made as consideration for the _____ (execution of the agreement *or* option)]. _____ [*Specify other relevant conditions, e.g.,* Plaintiff's obligation to purchase the property was conditioned on its obtaining, on or before _____ (*date*), tentative subdivision map approval from the City and/or County of _____]. The agreement further provided that time was of the essence and that failure to make a payment on or before the prescribed date would automatically _____ [cancel *or* terminate] the _____ [option *or* contract] without further notice.

[4. From and after _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s) has/have expended in excess of $_____ on _____ (*specify expenditures on subject property or adjacent property, and if applicable, any increase in value of the subject property on account of the expenditures, e.g.,* planning, building, and developing a major residential and commercial center consisting of shopping centers, office buildings, apartments, and parking garages on approximately _____ acres of land in _____ County, California, located adjacent to the option property. A portion of the adjacent property was purchased by plaintiff(s) from defendant(s). The planning, building, and developing of adjacent property has caused the option property to increase substantially in value since _____ (*date*), the date of the option agreement).]

[5. Pursuant to the terms and conditions of the (option) agreement, plaintiff(s) paid defendant(s) the sum of $_____ on or about _____ (*date*), and, in addition, plaintiff(s) paid _____ (defendant(s) *or name of escrow or other agent*) the _____ (*date*), and _____ (*date*), installment payments of $_____ each.]

6. Plaintiff(s) made the _____ [*specify payment that was not timely made, e.g.,* 2005 fourth quarter payment] installment of $_____ by depositing, on or about _____, a check dated _____ [*date*], in the sum of $_____ in the regular mail addressed to defendant(s). A copy of the check is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof.

7. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant(s) advised plaintiff(s) in writing that he/she/it/they considered the [option] agreement _____ [cancelled *or* terminated] on the ground that the _____ [*specify payment that was not timely made, e.g.,* 2005 fourth quarter payment] installment payment was not received by him/her/it/them until _____ [*date*]. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant(s) returned the check to plaintiff(s).

8. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) again tendered the $_____ due as the _____ [*date*], installment and notified defendant(s) that he/she/it/they considered the _____ [option *or* contract] to be and remain in full force and effect, but defendant(s) refused, and still refuses, to accept the same.

9. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) concerning their respective rights and duties under the [option] agreement in that plaintiff(s) contend(s), and defendant(s) denies/deny, that plaintiff(s) has/have performed and that the [option] agreement is now in full force and effect and that defendant's(s') purported _____ [termination *or* cancellation] thereof is of no legal force or effect.

10. Plaintiff(s) desire(s) a judicial determination of his/her/its/their rights and duties, and a declaration as to which party's interpretation of the [option] contract is correct.

11. [*Necessity and appropriateness of judicial declaration. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 17.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration that the [option] contract described above is now in full force and effect and that the purported _____ [termination *or* cancellation] of it is of no legal force or effect;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred[, including reasonable attorney's fees as provided by the agreement]; and

3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff(s)

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser or optionee of real property to seek a declaration that the late payment of an installment has not terminated the entire agreement or option. This complaint is adapted in part from the facts in *Holiday Inns of America v. Knight (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 327, 74 Cal. Rptr. 722, 450 P.2d 42* , involving an option contract. Relief is based on *Civ. Code § 3275*, prohibiting forfeitures for nonwillful defaults when the payee can be made whole. This basis for relief also applies to installment sales contracts [*see § 569.193*]. If the option has been exercised or the final payment under the contract is at issue, plaintiff's relief would be specific performance [*see § 569.165*] instead of declaratory relief.

If payments were to be made to an escrow rather than to the vendor directly, the allegations should be modified accordingly.

[3] Allegations

This form of complaint alleges the following:

- The capacity of the parties, and residence of defendant if used as the basis of venue (Paragraphs 1-2) [*see also Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 930-931, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* (venue for declaratory relief regarding contract is same as for contract); *see also §§ 569.164* and *569.193*].

- The formation of the contract or option and the particular terms relevant to the dispute (Paragraph 3).

- Expenditures made by plaintiff in reliance on the contract or option, and any benefit therefrom that accrues to defendant (Paragraph 4).

- The extent of plaintiff's performance under the contract or option (Paragraph 5).

- Plaintiff's late tender (Paragraph 6).

- Defendant's refusal to accept the late tender and insistence that the contract or option is terminated (Paragraph 7).

- Plaintiff's retender and demand that the contract or option be honored as still in force (Paragraph 8).

- A description of the actual controversy that exists (Paragraph 9), and statements that plaintiff desires a judicial determination (Paragraph 10), and that a judicial determination is necessary and appropriate (Paragraph 11).

[4] Jurisdiction

Actions for declaratory relief are in the jurisdiction of the superior court as cases of unlimited jurisdiction. An action for declaratory relief is in the jurisdiction of the superior court as a limited civil case only when brought as a cross complaint for indemnity in an action or proceeding that is otherwise a limited civil case or in cases following nonbinding arbitration between an attorney and client when the amount in controversy is $25,000 or less [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7)(A)*, 580(b)(4), *1060*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case willbe classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*].

[5] Decisions

Purchaser/optionee who makes payment within reasonable time after it is due is entitled to relief from forfeiture under *Civ. Code § 3275* and declaration that option/agreement remains in force. *Holiday Inns of America v. Knight (1969) 70 Cal. 2d 327, 329, 74 Cal. Rptr. 722, 450 P.2d 42*

Purchaser entitled to specific performance of contract despite three day late tender of second installment. *Williams Plumbing Co. v. Sinsley (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 1027, 1031-1035, 126 Cal. Rptr. 345*

[6] Text References

California Real Estate Law & Practice, Ch. 70, *Options* (Matthew Bender)

[7] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.165* and *569.193*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityCase or Controversy RequirementsActual DisputesCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureDeclaratory

Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewContracts LawFormationCapacity of PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawNegotiable InstrumentsDischarge & PaymentPaymentGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceDischarges & TerminationsContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawTypes of ContractsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsOption ContractsReal Property LawAdjoining LandownersGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SalePeriod Between Execution & ClosingTender of PerformanceReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawPurchase & SaleOption ContractsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
A. Actions Between Vendors And Purchasers Generally

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 569.170-569.189

[Reserved]

§§ 569.170[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.190

§ 569.190 Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages

[1] FORM Complaint to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT TO QUIET TITLE
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

1. _____ [Plaintiff is the sole owner *or* Plaintiffs are the owners concurrently, as _____ (joint tenants *or* tenants in common *or* partners *or* husband and wife *or* husband and wife as joint tenants),] of the fee simple title to certain real (and personal) property, namely _____ [*give both street address or common designation and legal description of real property; the description of any personal property must include its usual location*].

2. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s)*], sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Purchaser(s)," is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, [husband and wife and] Purchaser(s) of the real [and personal] property described above pursuant to a written contract of sale executed by him/her/it/them and by plaintiff(s) on _____

[*date*], a copy of which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "A" and incorporated herein by reference. By the terms of that contract plaintiff(s) agreed to sell to defendant(s) and defendant(s) agreed to purchase from plaintiff(s) the above-described real property for a total purchase price of $_____, payable as follows: _____ [*set forth payment terms, e.g.,* the sum of $_____ on execution of the contract, receipt of which is therein acknowledged, and the balance in equal monthly installments of $_____ or more, including interest at the rate of _____ percent per annum, on the _____ day of each and every month, commencing _____ [*date*].

[3. On execution of the contract, Purchaser(s) entered into and assumed possession of the property. Since _____ (*date of forfeiture or by which demand set forth in Paragraph 7 was to have been performed*), Purchaser(s)has/have been, and is/are now, unlawfully withholding possession thereof from plaintiff(s).]

4. The basis of plaintiff's (plaintiffs') title is _____ [*specify, e.g.,* a deed from _____ (*name of grantor*) granting the above-described property in fee simple to plaintiff(s) dated _____ and recorded in the Official Records of the County of _____ at _____(Book *or* Reel) No. _____ at _____ (Page *or* Image) _____ (*number*)].

5. _____ [Plaintiff(s) *or* Plaintiff's(s') _____ (ancestor *or* predecessor *or* grantor)] was _____ [seized *or* possessed] of the above-described property within five years of the commencement of this action.

6. Plaintiff(s) admit(s) the following claims against the property described above:

[*LIST, in consecutively lettered subparagraphs, all admitted claims, for example:*]

a. The lien of [defendant] _____ County, California for taxes for the fiscal year(s) _____ [through _____];

b. The utility easement of [defendant] Pacific Gas and Electric Company as shown on the map of the _____ [*name of subdivision or survey*] filed in Book _____, Page _____ of Parcel Maps in the Office of the County Recorder of _____ County, California; and

c. The deed of trust dated _____, to [defendant] _____ [name of trustee] as trustee, in favor of [defendant] _____ [name of beneficiary] as beneficiary, securing the original principal sum of $_____ recorded _____ [*date*], in _____ [Book *or* Reel] _____, at _____[Page *or* Image] _____ in the Official records of County Recorder of _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. Plaintiff(s) seek(s) to quiet title against the claim of defendant Purchaser(s) under the written contract which is Exhibit "A." The claim of defendant Purchaser(s) is without any right whatever and defendant Purchaser(s) has/have no right, title, estate, lien, or interest whatever in the property described above for the reasons described below.

8. _____ [*Set forth any terms of contract relating to breach, but not described in Paragraph 2, and contract terms providing for forfeiture, e.g.,* Paragraph _____ of the contract provides that Purchasers will pay all taxes on the property as they come due. Paragraph _____ of the contract provides that in the event of the failure of the purchasers to comply with any of the terms and conditions of said contract, or any part thereof, on their part to be

performed, plaintiff(s) may elect to (*if proceeding on rescission theory* rescind the contract and) terminate Purchasers' interest thereunder; on such election, Purchasers shall forfeit all rights under the contract, and plaintiff(s) shall be entitled to immediate possession of the premises; Paragraph _____ of the contract provides that "time is of the essence of this agreement"].

9. Purchasers have defaulted in _____ [*set forth facts constituting breach, e.g.,* payments of $_____ per month due to plaintiff according to the terms of said contract _____ (*set forth default in detail, e.g.,* for each month from June, 1998, to the present and have failed to pay county property tax installments of $_____ due December 10, 1998, and April 10, 1999, and installments of $_____ due December 10, 2000, and April 10, 1986, together with delinquent interest now due therefor).]

10. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff served written notice on defendants notifying them of the defaults and of plaintiff's(s') election to (*if proceeding on rescission theory* rescind the contract and) declare all right of Purchaser(s) under the contract forfeited and to seek immediate possession of the property unless payment in full of the amount then due under the contract, the sum of $_____, was made to plaintiff(s) and a receipt for payment of the delinquent county tax installments, and interest accrued thereon, was delivered to plaintiff on or before _____ [*date*]. The notice specified that the total remaining unpaid balance under the contract was $_____, which sum would accrue interest at the rate of $_____ per day after _____ (*date of notice*)). A copy of the notice (*if proceeding on rescission theory*, which also offered to restore to Purchaser(s) the excess of his/her/its/their payments under the contract over the reasonable rental value of the property since the execution of the contract on receipt of his/her/its/their quitclaim deed, in recordable form, reconveying the property to plaintiff(s),) is attached hereto marked Exhibit "B," and made a part hereof.

11. Purchaser(s) has/have failed and refused to pay the taxes or the sum specified in the notice, or any part thereof, the time specified in the notice has expired, and plaintiff has declared [the contract rescinded and] all rights of Purchaser(s) under the contract forfeited.

[*EITHER, if proceeding on breach of contract theory*]

12. As a proximate result of the failure of Purchaser(s) to perform under the contract, plaintiff(s) has/have suffered damages of $_____, _____ [*specify element(s) of damage, e.g.,* the excess of the contract price over the fair market value of the property on the date of Purchaser's(s') default, plus $_____ which will be necessary expenses on resale]. [This amount is in excess of the $_____ received in payments from Purchaser(s).]

[*OR, if proceeding on rescission theory*]

12. As a result of the failure of Purchaser(s) to perform under the contract, plaintiff(s) has/have sustained damages equal to the excess of the value of the use of the property since the date of execution of the contract of $_____ per month, over the $_____ received in payments from Purchaser(s).

[*CONTINUE*]

13. As a proximate result of the failure of Purchaser(s) to perform under the contract, plaintiff(s) has/have sustained damages of $_____, reflecting _____ [*specify any consequential damages, e,g.,* taxes and delinquent interest thereon which were assumed by Purchasers under the contract but were not paid by them.

Plaintiff(s) has/have incurred expenses, including attorney's fees, in addition to those alleged above, which expenses were, and are, necessary to (regain possession and) remove the cloud of Purchaser's(s') claim from his/her/its/their title. Plaintiff(s) will continue to incur these expenses in an amount unknown to him/her/it/them at this time. Plaintiff(s) pray(s) leave of court to amend this complaint to insert herein the true amount of said expenses when they are ascertained. In addition, the reasonable value of the property to Plaintiff(s) since _____, (*date of rescission or forfeiture*) has been and still is, the sum of $_____ per day, and by reason of defendant's (defendants') unlawful detention of the premises plaintiff(s) is/are deprived of the reasonable value of the use and occupancy thereof, and will continue to be so deprived until possession is restored to Plaintiff(s)].

14. Plaintiff(s) seek(s) to quiet title as of _____ [the date of the filing of this complaint *or specify other date and reason why determination is sought as of the other date*].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against said defendant(s) as follows:

1. For a decree declaring that certain Contract for Sale of Real Property between plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) dated _____ is _____ [terminated *or* rescinded] and all rights of defendant(s) thereunder forfeited;

2. For a decree declaring that all moneys heretofore paid by defendant(s) to plaintiff(s) under and by virtue of the contract shall be retained by plaintiff(s) as payment of _____ [the fair value for the use and occupancy of the property since the execution of the contract *and/or* plaintiff's(s') damages];

3. For restitution of the premises;

4. For damages at the rate of $_____ per day for the wrongful detention of the premises by defendant from _____ [*date*], until such time as possession of the premises is restored to plaintiff;

5. For a judgment that plaintiff(s) is/are the fee simple owners of the property and that defendant(s) has/have no interest in the property adverse to plaintiff(s);

6. For costs of court herein, including reasonable attorney's fees;

7. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a vendor under an installment sales contract to terminate the purchaser's interest and to quiet title [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020*]. For more detailed discussion of quiet title procedures, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[3] Purchaser's Rights of Redemption, Reinstatement; Notice of Election

Before a vendor is allowed to quiet title, a purchaser, even a willfully defaulting purchaser, who has made substantial

payments on the contract or substantial improvements on the property has an unconditional right to redeem the property by paying the entire remaining balance, plus interest and damages, within a reasonable time. This right of redemption is exercisable as soon as the vendor gives notice of election to terminate the contract on account of default [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 111-114, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* (payment of $2,900 of $9,162 purchase price was substantial)]. For this reason, Paragraph 10 contains the optional allegation that the notice of election to terminate the contract set forth the payoff balance.

Also, a purchaser who has made substantial payments on the contract or substantial improvements on the property and whose default is not willful or grossly negligent has an absolute right to reinstate the contract on payment of arrearages, hence the allegations in Paragraph 10 that the notice contained a statement of arrearages [*Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* ($3,114 of improvements, $700 downpayment, and 57 timely monthly payments compared to purchaser price of $6,150; innocent mistake regarding checks drawn on insufficient funds for two installments)].

[4] Allegations

This form alleges:

- Plaintiff's capacity and interest and the description of the property with the specificity required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)* (Paragraph 1) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010(a), (b)*].

- The identity of defendant purchasers and the basis of their claim (Paragraph 2) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.020(c), 762.010*].

- The basis of plaintiff's title (Paragraph 4) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 761.010(b), 764.010*; *see Winter v. Rice (1986) 176 Cal. App. 3d 679, 683, 222 Cal. Rptr. 340* (plaintiff in quiet title action is required to prove his or her title, even if defendant defaults)].

- That plaintiff or plaintiff's predecessor was seized or possessed of the property within five years before commencement of the action (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 318*; *Safwenberg v. Marquez (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 301, 311, 123 Cal. Rptr. 405* (seizing or possession within five years before commencement of action is necessary to recover possessory interest in real property)].

- The claims against the property which are admitted by plaintiff (Paragraph 6) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(c)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045* (holders of known or recorded claims who are not parties to action are not bound by judgment)].

- That the purchasers have no interest in the property (Paragraph 7).

- The contract terms, in addition to those set forth in Paragraph 2, that are the basis for the default and the election to require forfeiture of the purchaser's interest (Paragraph 8).

- The facts constituting purchaser's default (Paragraph 9).

- Plaintiff's notice of election to rescind or to terminate the contract, which gave defendant an opportunity to reinstate the contract and/or redeem the property (Paragraph 10) [*see Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 111-114, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* , discussed in *§ 569.190[3]*].

- That no reinstatement or redemption has been made at the time the complaint is filed (Paragraph 11).

- Damages under a breach of contract measure or under the rescission/rental measure (alternative Paragraphs 12) [*see Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 803-805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* (*Civ. Code § 3307* measure, not rental value, is appropriate when rescission is not sought); *Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186-188, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828* (allowing rental measure without rescission but after purchasers' abandonment so long as purchasers given credit for interest payments); for more detailed treatment of vendor's damages, *see § 569.104[3]*].

- Consequential damages likely to be applicable under either measure of damages (Paragraph 13) [*see South Shore Land Co. v. Petersen (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 725, 741, 38 Cal. Rptr. 392* (return of possession and damages for withholding is proper relief incident to quiet title)].

- The statement required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)* regarding the date as of which the determination is sought (Paragraph 14).

Optional Paragraph 3, alleging defendant's possession of the premises, is included for use when a judgment restoring plaintiff to possession is sought [*South Shore Land Co. v. Petersen (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 725, 741, 38 Cal. Rptr. 392* (return of possession and damages for withholding is proper relief incident to quiet title)].

It is not clear whether this action is one to enforce the terms of a contract within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*, which provides that no action can be maintained to enforce the terms of a real property installment sales contract providing for a change in ownership until the agreement has been recorded or the change of ownership statement required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480* has been filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*]. Because a redemption action by the purchaser would require compliance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*, and because redemption may be part of a conditional judgment in the vendor's quiet title action, it would seem that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10* should be complied with. Compliance would require an additional allegation either that the contract was recorded or that the change of ownership statement has been filed.

[5] Additional Defendants

There are four classes of potential defendants not named as defendants in this form:

- Additional known defendants claiming adverse interests that plaintiff contests, such as an assignee of defendant's interest under the contract.

- Holders of known or recorded adverse claims that plaintiff admits, such as utility easements or deeds of trust [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b), (c)*].

- Unknown adverse claimants [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 762.010, 762.020, 762.060(a)*].

- Unknown successors of a deceased person required to be named as a defendant [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030*].

If there are other known entities whose claims are contested, the capacity ofeach claimant and basis of his/her/its claim should be set forth in separate consecutively numbered paragraphs after Paragraph 2. Each of those claims must also be mentioned in Paragraph 7 as a claim against which determination is sought and that is without merit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.020(c)*].

If unknown defendants are named under *Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(a)*, holders of known or recorded claims must be made defendants [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b)*]. Holders of known or recorded claims who are not made parties to

the action will not be bound by the judgment, but because, with the exception of an assignee of defendant's interest, those claims will be admitted in most situations, they have been omitted from this form for clarity [*Code Civ. Proc. § 764.045*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.010* (only holders of claims against which determination is sought must be named defendants)].

For allegations, more detailed discussion of their use, and special requirements for the caption and service when unknown defendants are named, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[6] Verification

A complaint to quiet title must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.020*].

[7] Jurisdiction and Venue

The superior court has jurisdiction of a quiet title action, including jurisdiction to grant whatever equitable relief is proper under the circumstances [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040*]. The action is not a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(b), 580(b)(3)*]. When title or right to possession is to be tried, or permanent injunctive relief is sought, the case will be classified as an unlimited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 88*]. The court has complete jurisdiction over the parties to the action and the property described in the complaint and is deemed to have obtained possession and control of the property for the purposes of the action with complete jurisdiction to render the quiet title judgment [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.040(b)*].

Subject to the power of the court to transfer actions, the proper county for a quiet title action of real, or real and personal, property is the county in which the real property, or some part of it, is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.050(a)*].

[8] Lis Pendens

Immediately on commencement of a quiet title action by filing of the complaint, the plaintiff must file a lis pendens in the office of the county recorder of each county in which any real property described in the complaint is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010*]. For a form of lis pendens, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[9] Decisions

Vendor who has waived time provisions by accepting late payment may revive requirement of strict compliance with time provision by giving proper notice to that effect. *Gonzalez v. Hirose (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 213, 216-217, 200 P.2d 793* ; *Bishop v. Barndt (1919) 43 Cal. App. 149, 154-157, 184 P. 901*

When final installment has come due, vendor is required to tender deed in order to put purchaser in default. *Boone v. Templeman (1910) 158 Cal. 290, 297, 110 P. 947*

Recovery of possession, damages for withholding, and declaration of forfeiture of purchaser's rights under installment sales contract are proper incidental relief in vendor's quiet title action. *Keele v. Clouser (1928) 92 Cal. App. 526, 529-530, 268 P. 682*

[10] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.193 -569.195*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsLeave of CourtCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesForfeituresGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesLis PendensNoticesContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsWaiversAcceptance of Late PaymentContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsLegal TitleContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsCriminal Law & ProcedureSentencingForfeituresGeneral OverviewEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsPrice TermsEnergy & Utilities LawPurchase ContractsRemedies for BreachEstate, Gift & Trust LawWill ContestsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsElectionsLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationRemediesReinstatementReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsTypesQuit Claim DeedsReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawEstatesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipJoint TenanciesReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipTenancies in CommonReal Property LawEstatesPresent EstatesFee Simple EstatesReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawOwnership & TransferPublic EntitiesReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingLis PendensReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesMeasures of DamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsFailure to Pay TaxTax LawState & Local TaxesAdministration & ProceedingsTax LiensTax LawState & Local TaxesPublic Utilities TaxGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesProperty DamageGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCompensatory DamagesProperty DamageAward Calculations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.191

§ 569.191 Interlocutory Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Reinstatement [Civ. Code § 3275] or Redemption, or in the Alternative, Quieting Vendor's Title on Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

[1] FORM Interlocutory Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Reinstatement [Civ. Code § 3275] or Redemption, or in the Alternative, Quieting Vendor's Title on Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

This cause came on regularly for trial on _____ [*date*], in Department _____ of the above-entitled Court, the Honorable _____, Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Plaintiff(s) appeared by his/her/its/their attorney _____ and defendant(s) appeared by his/her/its/their attorney _____ and evidence both oral and documentary having been presented by both parties, the cause having been argued and submitted for decision, [and the Court having made and caused to be filed herein its written Statement of Decision,]

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. As of _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) herein _____ [was the sole owners *or* were the owners concurrently, as _____ (joint tenants *or* tenants in common *or* partners *or* husband and wife *or* husband and wife as joint tenants),] of the fee simple title to certain real [and personal] property, namely _____ (*give legal description of real property as in deed for real property and bill of sale for personal property*)].

2. Plaintiff's(s') title to that real property is subject to the right of defendant(s) arising from the contract for the purchase and sale of that property executed by the parties and dated _____ to _____ [reinstate *or* redeem his/her/its/their interest under] the contract by payment to _____ [plaintiff(s) *or* the clerk of this Court for the benefit of plaintiff(s) *or* (*name of third party escrow*) for the benefit of plaintiff(s)] _____ [on or before _____ [*date*], *or* within _____ days from the _____ (entry of this judgment *or* from service on him/her/it/them of written notice of the entry of this judgment)] of the sum of $_____ together with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum which is $_____ per day, from and after _____ [*date*].

3. If it is made to appear to this Court that the payment set forth in Paragraph 2, above, has not been made by the appointed date, this Court shall make and enter a final judgment cancelling the contract for the purchase and sale of the real property herein described; providing that plaintiff(s) shall have and recover possession of the real [and personal] property and that a writ of execution shall be issued to the sheriff of _____ County, California, directing the sheriff to remove defendant(s) and all those claiming by, through, or under defendant(s), and to place plaintiff(s) in possession of the premises; and terminating all rights of defendant(s) under the contract, except the right to receive from plaintiff(s) the excess of defendant's(s') payments under the contract [plus the value of improvements made to the property by defendant(s)] over plaintiff's(s') actual damages on account of defendant's(s') failure to fully perform the contract, including the reasonable rental value of the premises for the period after breach of the contract during which defendant(s) retained possession of the premises. Said excess amounts to $_____, with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum [which is $_____ per day] from and after _____ [*date*]. For each day after _____ [*date*], that defendant(s) retain(s) possession of the premises, there shall be deducted from the amount owed by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) the sum of $_____. If it is made to appear to this Court that the payment from plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) has been made, judgment shall further provide that plaintiff's(s') title to the real [and personal] property be quieted against any and all claims of defendant(s) and any person or persons claiming by, through, or under defendant(s).

[*EITHER, if reinstatement*]

4. On payment being made as provided in Paragraph 2, above, this Court shall make and enter a final judgment declaring the contract in full force and effect and all rights of defendant(s) thereunder reinstated, and ordering plaintiff(s), so long as defendant(s) shall thereafter not default on the contract, to perform all conditions thereof on his/her/its/their part to be performed.

[*OR, if redemption*]

4. On payment being made by defendant(s) as provided in Paragraph 2, above, plaintiff(s) shall execute and deliver to _____ [defendant(s) *or* the clerk of this Court for the benefit of defendant(s) *or* (*name of third party escrow*) for the benefit of defendant(s)] a good and sufficient _____ [grant *or* warranty] deed conveying to defendant(s) good and marketable title to the property as described in Paragraph 1, above, and evidenced by a standard policy of title insurance in the full amount of the purchase price [procured and paid for by plaintiff];

[*CONTINUE*]

5. Each party to bear his/her/its/their own costs [and attorney's fees], except that plaintiff(s) shall recover from defendant(s) any costs and reasonable attorney's fees expended after the date of this judgment to recover possession of the premises.

[6. That this Court reserves and continues its jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action to supervise, compel compliance with, and enforcement of this judgment and decree until it has been fully discharged and satisfied.]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of judgment is for use in a vendor's quiet title action in which the purchaser has established a right to reinstatement or redemption, and if reinstatement or redemption cannot be made within the time allowed, a right to restitution. If purchaser has established only the right to restitution, the *form in § 569.192* should be used rather than this form.

This form has been framed as an interlocutory judgment on the assumption that each party will want a final judgment for his or her protection. It could be modified to be a conditional judgment by deleting references to the final judgment.

[3] Contents of Judgment

Judgment in a vendor's action foreclosing a purchaser's rights under a contract of sale must be qualified or conditional; it must set forth (1) the amount due, (2) that it be paid on or before a certain date, (3) that on failure of payment, the purchaser's equity is foreclosed, or (4) that if payment is made, vendor must give a deed [*Gonzalez v. Hirose (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 213, 216-217, 200 P.2d 793* ; *Petersen v. Ridenour (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728-730, 287 P.2d 848]* . The judgment should also provide for the amount of restitution to be made from the vendor to the purchaser in order to quiet the vendor's title [*see Bartley v. Karas (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 336, 345 n.5, 197 Cal. Rptr. 749 , disapproved on other grounds, Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *Crofoot v. Weger (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 839, 843, 241 P.2d 1017]* .

[4] Notice of Judgment

In a contested action or special proceeding, the party submitting a judgment for entry must prepare and mail a copy of the notice of entry of judgment to all appearing parties and file with the court the original notice of entry of judgment together with the proof of service by mail, unless the court orders the clerk to mail notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 664.5*].

[5] Effect of Judgment

The judgment, whether framed as interlocutory or conditional, is final when it establishes all the rights and liabilities of the parties, even though the question of whether redemption has been effected is necessarily left open for future determination [*Newhouse v. Upchurch (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 204, 211, 99 Cal. Rptr. 436* ; *Perry v. West Coast Bond etc. Co. (1934) 136 Cal. App. 557, 559, 29 P.2d 279* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1(a)(8)* (appealability of interlocutory judgment regarding redemption)]. The vendor's payment of the sums required as restitution is merely a condition of quieting his or her title. Failure to make the payment will not divest the vendor of title [*Stein v. Simpson*

(1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 559, 563-564, 253 P.2d 1026] .

[6] Procedure for Obtaining Final Judgment

The usual procedure is for the party who has satisfied his or her part of the judgment, that is, a purchaser who has paid the reinstatement or redemption amount or a vendor who has paid the restitution amount, to move for final judgment or to compel compliance by the other party on the basis of a satisfaction of judgment given by the other party or on the basis of declarations and documentary evidence [*see Newhouse v. Upchurch (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 204, 206-210, 99 Cal. Rptr. 436* ; *Scarbery v. Bill Patch Land & Water Co. (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 87, 96-98, 7 Cal. Rptr. 408* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 904.1* (appealability of orders after judgment)]. Acceptance of amounts owing as restitution and giving of a satisfaction of judgment therefor will not foreclose the purchaser's right to appeal based on a claim that a greater amount is owed as restitution [*Stein v. Simpson (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 79, 87, 230 P.2d 816]* .

[7] State Statutes

Contents and manner of execution of writ of possession of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 715.010-715.040*

Judgment not otherwise enforceable may be enforced by service of certified copy of judgment on party required to perform under it and invocation of court's contempt power. *Code Civ. Proc. § 717.010*

[8] Decisions

Vendor's quiet title judgment is required to be qualified so as to provide for delivery of deed conveying title to purchaser on payment of amounts due vendor within such time as court deems reasonable. *Gonzalez v. Hirose (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 213, 217, 200 P.2d 793*

Judgment requiring conveyance is authorized to appoint clerk of court as receiver, though sometimes called commissioner, pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 564(3), (4)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 564(b)(3), (4)*) to execute deed if difficulty is anticipated in compelling party to make conveyance; receiver's powersand duties to be fixed by decree. *Scadden Flat G. M. Co. v. Scadden (1898) 121 Cal. 33, 41, 53 P. 440*

Willful refusal of party to comply with judgment requiring him or her to execute conveyance is punishable by contempt of court.' *76 L. & W. Co. v. Superior Court (1892) 93 Cal. 139, 143, 28 P. 813* ; see *Addiego v. Hill (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 453, 460, 95 Cal. Rptr. 151* (dicta)

When vendor seeks to foreclose purchaser's equity in quiet title action, decree should fix time within which purchaser may pay balance due on contract or be foreclosed. *Keller v. Lewis (1878) 53 Cal. 113, 118*

On stipulated judgment for reinstatement, when one of two checks tendered one week late was not covered by sufficient funds through innocent mistake, but was made good within four days, equities were with purchaser and reinstatement was affected, especially because stipulated judgment should not have included two payments coming due between date of oral stipulation and date for performance under stipulated judgment and should have given credit to purchaser for rents collected by vendor during interim. *Newhouse v. Upchurch (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 204, 208-212, 99 Cal. Rptr. 436*

Quiet title action brought to terminate contract of sale of realty is strict foreclosure; court is required to find amount due and decree that it be paid on or before certain date and that on failure of payment, purchaser's equity is foreclosed. *Petersen v. Ridenour (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 720, 728, 287 P.2d 848*

Equities require qualified judgment providing for delivery of deed to purchaser on payment of sums owed to vendor within reasonable time. *Petersen v. Ridenour (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 720, 730, 287 P.2d 848*

[9] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.190, 569.192, 569.193 -569.195*.

For discussion and forms for enforcement of judgments for possession of property, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.130* et seq.

For discussion of interlocutory and conditional judgments, see Ch. 318, *Judgments* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsAncillary WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsAncillary WritsWrits of ExecutionContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsLegal TitleContracts LawThird PartiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsContracts LawTypes of ContractsPersonal PropertyGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtInsurance LawClaims & ContractsDisclosure ObligationsWarrantiesReal Property LawDeedsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsTypesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsTypesWarrantyReal Property LawDeedsProperty DescriptionsReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipJoint TenanciesReal Property LawEstatesConcurrent OwnershipTenancies in CommonReal Property LawEstatesPresent EstatesFee Simple EstatesReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresStrict ForeclosureReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleEnforceabilityMistakeReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleFormalitiesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleEscrowReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleRemediesReal Property LawTitle QualityMarketable TitleTests

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.192

§ 569.192 Conditional Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

[1] FORM Conditional Judgment in Vendor's Action to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020, 761.020] Against Purchaser's Interest Under Installment Sales Contract and to Recover Possession and Damages--Granting Purchaser Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	CONDITIONAL JUDGMENT
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

This cause came on regularly for trial on _____ [*date*], in Department _____ of the above-entitled Court, the Honorable _____, Judge, presiding, sitting without a jury. Plaintiff(s) appeared by his/her/its/their attorney _____ and defendant(s) appeared by his/her/its/their attorney _____ and evidence both oral and documentary having been presented by both parties, the cause having been argued and submitted for decision, [and the Court having made and caused to be filed herein its written Statement of Decision,]

IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. [*Order regarding ownership and description of property. See § 569.191, Order 1.*]

2. That plaintiff(s) restore to defendant(s) the excess of defendant's(s') payments under the contract for the purchase and sale of the above-described real property executed by the parties and dated _____, [plus the value of improvements made to the property by defendant(s)] over plaintiff's(s') actual damages on account of defendant's(s') failure to fully perform the contract, including the reasonable rental value of the premises for the period after breach of the contract during which defendant(s) retained possession of the premises, which is the sum of $_____, plus interest at _____ percent per annum from _____ [*date*], less the sum of $_____ per day for each day from and after _____ [*date*], that defendant(s) retains(s) possession of the premises;

3. [Plaintiff's(s') title is subject to the lien of defendant(s) for restitution of the excess set forth in Item 2, above.] Quieting of plaintiff's(s') title to the real [and personal] property against any and all claims of defendant(s) and any person orpersons claiming under said defendant(s) is conditioned on payment from plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) of the sum set forth in Item 2.

4. Other than the claim set forth in Item 2, defendant(s) has/have no right, title, estate, or interest in the property.

5. A writ of execution shall be issued to the sheriff of _____ County, California, directing the sheriff to remove defendant(s) and all those claiming by, through, or under defendant(s), and to place plaintiff(s) in possession of the premises.

6. [*Award of costs and attorney's fees. See § 569.191, Order 5.*]

7. [*Retention of jurisdiction. See § 569.191, Order 6.*]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of conditional judgment is for use in a quiet title action by a vendor under an installment sales contract who has been awarded judgment conditioned on restitution to the purchaser of the excess of payments under the contract over vendor's actual damages. It may be modified for use as an interlocutory judgment by changing Order 2 to state that a final judgment quieting vendor's title must be entered when it is made to appear to the court that the amounts specified as restitution have been paid.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 569.190*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionContracts LawBreachNonperformanceContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsLegal TitleContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsCriminal Law & ProcedureTrialsBench TrialsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesCompensatory Damages

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.193

§ 569.193 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Relief From Forfeiture [Civ. Code § 3275] by Allowing Reinstatement of Contract--By Purchaser

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Relief from Forfeiture [Civ. Code § 3275] by Allowing Reinstatement of Contract--By Purchaser

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
[and DOES I through _____],	)	(Reinstatement of Installment Sales Contract)
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. _____ (*State capacity of plaintiff(s) as necessary, e.g.,* Plaintiff(s) _____ [and _____] is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ husband and wife.]

2. Defendant(s) _____ [*name(s*)], sometimes hereinafter referred to as "Seller(s)," is/are, and at all times herein mentioned, was/were, _____ [*state capacity, and if used as basis of venue, residence of defendant(s), e.g.,* husband and wife and residents of _____ County, California, residing at _____ (*street address and city*)].

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

5. On _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) entered into a written contract, a copy of which is attached hereto, marked Exhibit "A," and made a part hereof. The contract was recorded in the office of the County Recorder of _____ County on _____ [*date*]. By the terms of the contract, defendant(s) agreed to sell to plaintiff(s) and plaintiff(s) agreed to purchase from defendant(s) the real property situated in the County of _____, State of California, described as follows: _____ [*legal description and/or street name or common designation; if modified for use as cross complaint to vendor's quiet title action, legal description is required*].

6. The contract provides that the total purchase price of $_____ ispayable as follows: _____ [*set forth terms of contract, e.g.,* the sum of $_____ on execution of the contract, receipt of which is therein acknowledged, and the balance in equal monthly installments of $_____ or more on the _____ day of each and every month, commencing _____ [*date*], and continuing until the entire amount of the purchase price together with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent per annum has been paid].

7. Paragraph _____ of the contract provides that _____ [*set forth provision of contract that vendor claims allows acceleration and/or forfeiture for default, e.g.,* "if default be made in the payment of any of the said sums of principal or interest when due, all moneys theretofore paid on the premises by the Purchaser shall, at the option of the Seller, become absolutely forfeited to and be retained by the Seller as and for liquidated and agreed damages for breach of this agreement; and this agreement shall then become and be absolutely void and of no effect. It being expressly agreed that time is of the essence of this contract."]

[8. Immediately on execution of the contract plaintiff(s) entered into and assumed possession of the property and constructed on it _____ [*describe improvements, e.g.,* a house, two-car garage, and driveway, together with landscaping,] of the aggregate value of $_____.]

9. Plaintiff(s) fully and duly performed all terms, conditions, and covenants of the contract on his/her/its/their part required to be performed prior to _____ [*date*], and paid to _____ [defendant(s) or _____ (*name*), as agent for defendant(s)] all sums of money becoming due under the contract to and including the installment becoming due under the contract on _____ [*date*].

10. The total amount of money paid by plaintiff(s), pursuant to the contract, on the purchase price of the property is the sum of $_____.

11. Plaintiff(s) is/are currently in default in payment of installments due on the contract in that _____ [*allege default, e.g.,* the check delivered by plaintiff(s) to _____ (defendant(s) or _____ (*name*), as agent for defendant(s)) as and for the payment becoming due under the contract on _____ (*date*), was not honored by the bank on which it was drawn but was marked by the bank "Refer to Maker" and returned, unpaid to defendant(s)].

12. _____ [*Allege facts showing default was not grossly negligent, willful or fraudulent, e.g.,* Plaintiffs had miscalculated the balance on deposit in their checking account and had no knowledge of the default until _____ (*date*), when defendant served written notice of default on them, notifying them of the default, of defendant's election, pursuant to Paragraph _____ of the contract, to declare all interests (and payments) of plaintiffs under the contract forfeited (and demanding immediate possession of the property *and/or* immediate payment, in full, of the remainder of the purchase price).]

13. _____ [On _____ (*date*), *or specify very short period, e.g.,* Within two days of receiving notice of the default], plaintiff(s) _____ [*specify act curing default, e.g.,* tendered the full amount then due under the contract to defendant(s)] but defendant(s) refused, and still refuse(s), to accept the same.

14. Plaintiff(s) is/are ready, willing, and able to pay to defendant(s) or to deposit with this Court all sums now due, owing, and unpaid on the contract and all sums necessary to fully compensate the defendant(s) for any damages suffered by him/her/it/them by reason of the default.

15. An actual controversy has arisen between plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) concerning their respective rights and duties under the contract in that plaintiff(s) contend(s) he/she/it/they is/are entitled as a matter of law to reinstate the contract by paying arrearages [and/or to a reasonable amount of time within which to redeem his/her/its/their interest by paying the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest,] and any other damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* late payments], whereas defendant(s) claim(s) that he/she/it/they can enforce Paragraph _____ of the contract as written and cause forfeiture of all plaintiff's(s') rights under the contract and all sums heretofor paid by plaintiff(s) under the contract [and expended for improvements to the property].

16. Plaintiff(s) desire(s) a judicial determination of his/her/its/their rights and duties, and a declaration as to which party's interpretation of the contract is correct.

17. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her/its/their rights and duties under the contract. _____ [*Allege any other burden being caused by the unsettled state of affairs, e.g.,* Plaintiffs would ordinarily have begun construction of an addition on the residence. Postponement for the resolution of this issue may cause expiration of plaintiffs' building permit, and due to a moratorium on new construction in the City of _____, plaintiff's could not obtain another permit.]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For a declaration by the Court that Paragraph _____ of the contract is void and not enforceable, that plaintiff(s) is/are relieved from forfeiture of the contract, and that [on payment by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) within such reasonable time as the Court may fix, of all sums the Court finds are now due under the contract, together with such further sums as the Court may find are necessary tocompensate defendant(s) fully for any damages which the Court may find to have been caused by the default, (less a reasonable sum fixed by the Court as plaintiff's(s') costs and attorney's fees),] the contract _____ [is *or* be] fully reinstated and remain(s) in full force and effect;

[2. In the alternative, for a declaration by the Court that Paragraph _____ of the contract is void and not enforceable, that plaintiff(s) may be relieved from forfeiture of the contract, and that on payment by plaintiff(s) to _____ [defendant(s) *or* the clerk of the Court *or* specify third party escrow] within such reasonable time as the Court may fix, of all sums the Court finds due as the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest, together with such further sums as the Court may find are necessary to compensate defendant(s) fully for any damages which the Court may find to have been caused by the default, [less a reasonable sum fixed by the Court as plaintiff's (plaintiffs' costs and attorney's fees,] the defendant(s) be required to convey the plaintiff(s) the property which is the subject of the contract;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred [, including attorney's fees as provided by the contract here at issue]; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser under an installment sales contract to seek relief from forfeiture by way of reinstatement on the ground that the default was not willful [*Civ. Code § 3275*; *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* ; *see § 569.100[4]*]. This form is set forth as a complaint for declaratory relief in order to gain the trial setting priority accorded declaratory relief actions, but it may be modified by deleting Paragraphs 15-17 to be merely a complaint for relief from forfeiture by allowing reinstatment [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3* (trial setting priority for declaratory relief actions)]. If it is so modified, the word "declaration" should be replaced in the prayer with the word "decree" and the title of the paper in the caption should be changed to: " Complaint for Relief From Forfeiture (Installment Sales Contract)."

This form may also be modified for use as a cross complaint in response to a vendor's action foreclosing the purchaser's interest by changing the word "plaintiff(s)" to "cross-complainant(s)" wherever it appears and by adding "cross" before the word "defendant(s)" each time it appears. If modified for use as a cross complaint in a quiet title action, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , for particular requirements and procedures applicable to quiet title actions.

If counsel is not sure of prevailing on the issue that the default is nonwillful and therefore qualifies the purchaser for reinstatement, or if for some other reason the purchaser would like to pay off the entire balance instead of just reinstating delinquencies, a second cause of action for redemption may be joined seeking redemption as alternative relief [*see § 569.194*]. Item 2 of the prayer should be used only when redemption is sought as alternative relief.

[3] Allegations

This form alleges:

- Defendant's residence (Paragraph 2).

- The formation and terms of the contract, and that the contract was recorded (Paragraphs 5-7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10* (suit to enforce terms of installment sales contract entered into after January 1, 1986, cannot be maintained without prior recordation of contract or filing of change in ownership statement as required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480*)].

- The extent of plaintiff's performance under the contract (Paragraphs 8-10).

- Plaintiff's default (Paragraph 11).

- The facts from which the court can determine that the default was not willful, grossly negligent, or fraudulent (Paragraph 12).

- Defendant's notice of election to terminate the contract (Paragraph 12).

- Plaintiff's tender of all sums or doing of all acts necessary to cure the default or defaults (Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 1504* (offer of performance stops interest accruing)].

- Defendant's refusal to accept reinstatement (Paragraph 13).
- Plaintiff's continuing willingness and ability to reinstate (Paragraph 14).

To be entitled to reinstatement one must establish substantial performance under the contract (Paragraphs 9 and 10 compared with purchase price and terms set forth in Paragraph 6) or substantial improvements to the property (Paragraph 8), and that the default was not willful, grossly negligent, or fraudulent [*Civ. Code § 3275*; *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* ; *see § 569.100[4]*].

To establish the basis for declaratory relief, the form alleges an actual andimmediate controversy (Paragraph 15), plaintiff's desire for a judicial declaration (Paragraph 16), and that this is an appropriate and necessary situation for declaratory relief (Paragraph 17) [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060, 1061*; *see City of Alturas v. Gloster (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 46, 48, 104 P.2d 810* (mere statement that controversy exists is insufficient, facts must show controversy)]. For discussion of the procedural and other requirements applicable to declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

Actions for declaratory relief are generally in the jurisdiction of the superior court as cases of unlimited jurisdiction [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7)(A)*, 580(b)(4), *1060*]. In addition, because an action for reinstatement is not one of the enumerated cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], jurisdiction is in the superior court [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*].

If the action is considered one on the contract, venue lies in the county in which the contract was formed or is to be performed or in which any defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (county in which contract formed is county of performance unless contract provides otherwise); *see Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 930-931, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* (venue in declaratory relief action based on contract as contract venue)]. If the action is considered one to establish rights in land, venue lies in the superior court in the county in which the land is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* (recovery of real property or determination of interest or right therein)].

[5] Decisions

When purchaser's breach in giving vendor check for which there was insufficient funds on deposit was not willful or grossly negligent, relief from forfeiture by reinstatement was proper. *Barkis v. Scott (1949) 34 Cal. 2d 116, 117-118, 122-123, 208 P.2d 367* ($3,114 of improvements, $700 downpayment, and 57 timely monthly payments compared to purchaser price of $6,150)

Lack of funds alone is not sufficient to meet burden of *Civ. Code § 3275*; additional showing that lack is not itself attributable to willful or grossly negligent conduct is required, such as, earning capacity of purchaser having been unexpectedly impaired by illness or accident. *Bartley v. Karas (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 336, 342-343, 197 Cal. Rptr. 749* (purchaser tendered full payoff during trial), *disapproved on other grounds, Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232*

Even willfully defaulting purchaser is entitled to restitution of excess of payments under contract over vendor's damages. *Bartley v. Karas (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 336, 345 n. 5, 197 Cal. Rptr. 749 , disapproved on other grounds, Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232*

Even if willfully defaulting purchaser does not pray for restitution of excess of payments over vendor's damages, court has duty to determine if unjust enrichment would result from forfeiture of purchaser's rights under contract. *Crofoot v. Weger (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 839, 843, 241 P.2d 1017*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.190*, *569.194*, and *569.195*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Banking LawCriminal OffensesCheck FraudElementsBusiness & Corporate LawAgency RelationshipsCauses of Action & RemediesBreach of ContractCivil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenuePublic OfficialsCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract InterpretationGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesForeseeable DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsLegal TitleContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsPriorityContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsRecordingContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & AgainstGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsFinanceLegal EthicsClient RelationsAttorney FeesFee AgreementsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsQuiet Title ActionsTortsDamagesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.194

§ 569.194 Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Redemption of Purchaser's Interest Under the Contract

[1] FORM Complaint for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] Under Installment Sales Contract--For Redemption of Purchaser's Interest Under the Contract

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
[and DOES I through _____],	)	(Purchaser's Right of Redemption Under Installment
Defendant(s).	)	Sales Contract)
	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff(s), if necessary. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161[1], Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160[1], Paragraph 3.*]

4. [*Formation and recording of contract and legal description of property. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 5.*]

5. [*Provisions of contract which relate to breaches at issue. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 6.*]

6. [*Provision of contract which defendant claims as basis for declaring forfeiture. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 7.*]

[7. *Change of possession and/or construction of improvements, if applicable. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 8.*]

8. [*Plaintiff's performance. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 9.*]

9. [*Total paid by plaintiff under contract. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 10.*]

10. Plaintiff's(s') default(s) consist(s) entirely and only of the failure to pay money, specifically, he/she/it/they has/have failed to pay the _____ [*number*] installments _____ [*if desired, specify composition of payments, e.g.,* of principal and interest due _____ (*specify, e.g.,* from June 10, 2004 to August 10, 2005, inclusive)].

11. On _____ [*date*], defendant(s) served written notice of default on plaintiff(s), notifying him/her/it/them of defendant's(s') election, pursuant to Paragraph _____ of the contract, to declare all interests [and payments] of plaintiff(s) under the contract forfeited [and demanding immediate possession of the property *and/or* immediate payment, in full, of the remainder of the purchase price].

12. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) told defendant(s) that he/she/it/they intended to exercise his/her/its/their right of redemption and that he/she/it/they was/were ready, willing, and able to pay to defendant(s), within a reasonable amount of time, the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest, and any other damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the late payments in exchange for defendant's(s') conveyance of the property [and requested from defendant(s) a statement of the full remaining balance due under the contract].

13. _____ [*Set forth details and extent of disagreement as to amount of remaining balance, e.g.,* Defendant(s) has/have failed and refused, and still fail and refuse to inform plaintiff(s) of the total remaining unpaid balance of the purchase price plus the amounts, if any, claimed by defendant(s) as interest and damages.]

[14. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) tendered to defendant(s) the sum of $_____ which he/she/it/they believe to be the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest at the rate of _____ (*contract rate*) percent per annum from _____ [*date*] (*if interest paid in arrears, date payment before last payment*), but defendant(s) refused, and still refuse(s), to accept the same.]

15. Defendant(s) has/have failed and refused, and still fail and refuse to agree _____ [on a reasonable period of time within which plaintiff(s) is/are entitled to tender the sums owing in order to receive a deed to the property *or* that plaintiff(s) have a reasonable time within which to pay the unpaid balance of the purchase price plus the amounts, if any, claimed by defendant(s) as interest and damages].

16. Plaintiff(s) remain(s) ready, willing, and able, within such reasonable period of time as may be fixed by this Court, to pay to defendant(s), or to deposit with this Court [or with the escrow holder specified in the contract], the full remaining unpaid balance of the purchase price, plus interest, and all sums necessary to fully compensate the defendant(s) for any damages suffered by him/her/it/them by reason of the default in return for defendant(s) conveyance to plaintiff(s) of the real [and personal] property which is the subject of the contract.

17. An actual controversy has arisen between plaintiff(s) and defendant(s) concerning their respective rights and duties under the contract in that plaintiff(s) contend(s) that he/she/it/they are entitled as a matter of law to redeem his/her/its/their interest under the contract by paying the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest, and any other damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the late payments, whereas defendant(s) claim(s) that he/she/it/they can enforce Paragraph _____ of the contract as written and cause forfeiture of all plaintiff's(s') rights

under the contract and all sums heretofore paid by plaintiff(s) under the contract [and expended for improvements to the property].

18. [*Plaintiff's desire for judicial declaration. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 16.*]

19. [*Necessity and appropriateness of declaratory relief. See § 569.193[1], Paragraph 17.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For declarations by the Court that Paragraph _____ of the contract is void and not enforceable; that plaintiff(s) may be relieved from forfeiture of the contract; that plaintiff(s) is/are entitled to redeem his/her/its/their interest under the contract by payment to _____ [*choose as many as plaintiff would be willing to perform:* defendant(s) *or* the clerk of the Court *or* specify third party escrow] within such reasonable time as the Court may fix, of all sums the Court finds due as [*if deposit has been made pursuant to Civ. Code § 1500,* any additional sums still owing for] the full remaining balance of the purchase price, with interest, together with such further sums as the Court may find are necessary to compensate defendant(s) fully for any damages which the Court may find to have been caused by the default, [less a reasonable sum fixed by the Court as plaintiff's(s') costs and attorney's fees]; and that on such redemption and payment by plaintiff(s), the defendant(s) be required to convey to the plaintiff(s) the property which is the subject of the contract;

2. For costs of suit herein incurred [, including attorney's fees as provided by the contract here at issue];

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser who is in default under an installment sales contract but who has substantially performed under the contract or has made substantial improvements to the property to seek a declaratory judgment that he or she has a right to redeem the property, that is, a reasonable opportunity to tender the full remaining balance under the contract, plus interest, and any incidental damages, in return for the deed. The plaintiff may seek redemption even if the default was willful so long as the default consists solely of the failure to pay money [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 106, 111-114, 116-117, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* ; *see § 569.100[3]*]. The foregoing form of complaint is set forth as one for declaratory relief in order to gain the trial setting priority accorded declaratory relief actions, but it could be modified by deletion of Paragraphs 17-19 to be merely a complaint for redemption of purchasers' interest [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3* (trial setting priority for declaratory relief actions)]. If it is so modified, the word "declaration" should be replaced in the prayer with the word "decree", and the title of the paper in the caption should be changed to: "COMPLAINT FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF (Purchaser's Right of Redemption Under Installment Sales Contract)."

This form may also be modified for use as a cross complaint in response to a vendor's action foreclosing the purchaser's interest by changing the word "plaintiff" to "cross complainant" wherever it appears and by adding "cross" before the word "defendant" each time it appears.

If this form is used as a second cause of action to seek redemption as alternative relief along with reinstatement [*see § 569.193*], Paragraphs 1-13 and 15-17 of the *form in § 569.193* may be incorporated by reference into the cause of action for redemption. If those Paragraphs are incorporated, Paragraphs 12-16 of the form may be the only additional Paragraphs necessary in the second cause of action. Paragraph 10 of the form will be unnecessary if it is clear from the facts set forth in Paragraph 11 of § 569.193 that the default consists only of the payment of money. Paragraph 11 of the form is alleged as part of Paragraph 12 in § 569.193. Paragraph 17 of the form will be unnecessary if the first bracketed phrase of Paragraph 15 of § 569.193 was included in the cause of action for reinstatement.

[3] Allegations

In addition to basic allegations relating to formation of the contract, its terms, performance, and breach, which are incorporated from the *form in § 569.193*, this form alleges:

- That plaintiff's default consists solely of the failure to pay money (Paragraph 10).

- Plaintiff's demand for a statement of the full remaining balance, interest, and any other sums claimed by defendant and an expression of the willingness, ability, and desire to redeem plaintiff's interest within a reasonable amount of time (Paragraph 12).

- That defendants have either refused to give a statement of the balancedemanded or have demanded sums to which they are not entitled (Paragraph 13).

- That defendants have either claimed plaintiff has no right of redemption or have demanded that it be exercised in an unreasonably short period of time (Paragraph 15).

- That plaintiff remains willing and able to pay the proper amount owing within a reasonable amount of time (Paragraph 16); and that the controversy is in regard to the right of redemption (Paragraph 17).

Optional Paragraph 14 alleges the tender of the full remaining balance, plus interest and any other applicable damages, and defendants' refusal to accept that tender [*see Civ. Code § 1504* (tender of performance stops further accrual of interest)].

To establish one's right of redemption, one must show substantial payments under the contract or substantial improvement to the property and that the default consists solely of the obligation to pay money [*Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 114, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232]* .

[4] Jurisdiction and Venue

Actions for declaratory relief are generally in the jurisdiction of the superior court as cases of unlimited jurisdiction [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7)(A)*, 580(b)(4), *1060*]. In addition, because an action for redemption is not one of the enumerated cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], jurisdiction is in the superior court [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*].

Because redemption, if successfully completed, would require the defendant to convey the property to the plaintiff, the action is one to determine an interest in real property. Venue is in the superior court in the county in which the property, or some portion of it, is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

[5] State Statutes

Neither specific nor preventative relief is available to enforce penalty or forfeiture. *Civ. Code § 3369*

Contract as defined in *Civ. Code § 2985(a)* providing for change in ownership of real property is required to be recorded or change-in-ownership statement required by *Rev. & Tax. Code § 480* is required to be filed before action to enforce contract can be maintained if contract was entered into after January 1, 1986. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.10*

[6] Decisions

Purchaser guilty of willful breach granted specific performance of installment sales contract of real property. *Ward v. Union Bond & Trust Company (9th Cir. 1957) 243 F.2d 476, 479-481*

[7] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.190*, *569.193*, and *569.195*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesDeposits in CourtContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawPerformanceSubstantial PerformanceContracts LawPerformanceTender & DeliveryContracts LawRemediesSpecific PerformanceContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsPriorityContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsCriminal Law & ProcedureSentencingForfeituresGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureSentencingForfeituresProceedingsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of CourtReal Property LawDeedsRemediesDamagesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific PerformanceTax LawFederal Income Tax ComputationTax AccountingAccounting Records (IRC secs. 446, 6001)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 569 VENDOR AND PURCHASER OF REAL PROPERTY
PART IV. FORMS
B. Installment Sales Contracts

50-569 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 569.195

§ 569.195 Complaint Under Installment Sales Contract--For Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369] by Purchaser

[1] FORM Complaint Under Installment Sales Contract--For Restitution [Civ. Code § 3369] by Purchaser

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*(*s*)],	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR RESTITUTION
_____ [*name*(*s*)], [and DOES I	)	(Installment Sales Contract)
through _____],	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

Plaintiff(s) allege(s):

[1. *Capacity of plaintiff(s), if necessary. See § 569.193, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Capacity and residence of defendant(s), if necessary. See § 569.193, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.161, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation, if appropriate. See § 569.160, Paragraph 3.*]

5. [*Formation and recording of contract and legal description of property. See § 569.193, Paragraph 5.*]

6. [*Provisions of contract which relate to breaches at issue. See § 569.193, Paragraph 6.*]

7. [*Provision of contract which defendant claims as basis for declaring forfeiture. See § 569.193, Paragraph 7.*]

[8. *Change of possession and/or construction of improvements, if applicable. See § 569.193, Paragraph 8.*]

9. [*Plaintiff's performance. See § 569.193, Paragraph 9.*]

10. The total amount of _____ [*if rental value measure of vendor's damages applies, mention those actually paid* principal and interest *or, if contract measure vendor's of damages applies,* principal] paid by plaintiff(s), pursuant to the contract is the sum of $_____.

11. On _____ [*date*], defendant(s) served on plaintiff(s) a written notice of default, notifying plaintiff(s) of defendant's(s') election pursuant to Paragraph _____ of the contract to declare all interests and payments of plaintiff(s) under the contract forfeited for default _____ [*specify, e.g.,* in making payments due under the contract for the months of June 2004, through March 2005, inclusive,] _____ [*add as applicable:* and demanding immediate possession of the property *and/or* immediate payment, in full, of the remainder of the purchase price].

[12. On _____ (*date*), plaintiff(s), pursuant to _____ (*specify, e.g.,* a mutual release executed by the parties, a copy of which is attached hereto marked Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof by reference, which reserved for future determination the amount defendant(s) is/are liable to return to plaintiff(s) as the excess of payments made by plaintiff(s) under the contract over actual damages suffered by defendant(s)). Plaintiff(s) was/were in possession and occupancy of the property for a period of _____ months and _____ days.]

[*EITHER, if rental value measure of vendor's damages is in issue*]

13. The reasonable rental value of the property during the period of plaintiff's(s') possession and occupancy thereof was and is the sum of $_____ [*add if plaintiffs continue in possession* from _____ (*date*), to _____ (*date*), and continues from and after _____ (*date*), at the rate of $_____ per _____ (month *or* day)].

[*OR, if contract measure of vendor's damages applies*]

13. The fair market value of the property which is the subject of the contract between the parties on _____ [*date of breach*] was $_____. _____ [*Continue with vendor's incidental damages as applicable, e.g.,* Defendant's(s') reasonable expenses of resale are not likely to exceed the expenses assumed under the contract with plaintiff(s). As plaintiff(s) surrendered possession and delivered a quitclaim deed to defendant(s) within two weeks of receipt of the notice of defendant's(s') election to terminate the contract, defendant(s) was/were not required to expend any sums for costs or attorney's fees to recover possession of the property or to expunge plaintiff's(s') claim as a cloud on his/her/its/their title. The rental value of the property from the _____ (*date of breach*), until plaintiff(s) surrendered possession was the sum of $_____].

[*CONTINUE*]

14. The payments [*if breach of contract measure applies, add* of principal] made by plaintiff(s) to defendant(s) [and to

_____ (*state name and capacity of any third parties to whom plaintiff(s) made payments, e.g.,* XYZ Bank, holder of the first deed of trust on the property)] under the contract [*add, if applicable,* plus the value of the improvements made to the property by plaintiff(s)] exceed _____ [*if rental value measure of vendor's damagesapplies,* the reasonable rental value of said property for the period plaintiff(s) was/were in possession thereof (through the date of the filing of the complaint) *or, if contract measure vendor's of damages applies,* the actual damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the failure of plaintiff(s) to complete contract] by the sum of $_____.

[*EITHER, if restitution is the only relief sought*]

15. On _____ [*date*], plaintiff(s) demanded in writing that defendant(s) return to plaintiff(s) the amount by which the [principal] payments under the contract [plus the value of the improvements made to the property by plaintiff(s)] exceed _____ [*if rental value measure of vendor's damages applies,* the reasonable rental value of the property during the period plaintiff(s) was/were in possession thereof *or, if contract measure vendor's of damages applies,* the actual damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the failure of plaintiff(s) to complete the contract], but defendant(s) has/have refused to so do and no part of said excess has been paid.

[*OR, if restitution is being sought as alternative relief in the event reinstatement is denied and/or redemption cannot be made*]

15. If plaintiff(s) is/are _____ [not entitled _____ (*or* able) to reinstate the contract *and/or* not able the redeem his/her/its/their interest under the contract within the reasonable time set by this Court] and therefore forfeit(s) his/her/its/their interest under the contract, he/she/it/they will be entitled to recover from defendant(s) the amount by which [principal] payments made by plaintiff(s) under the contract [plus the value of the improvements plaintiff(s) made to the property] exceed _____ [*if rental value measure of vendor's damages applies,* the reasonable rental value of the property during the period plaintiff(s) was/were in possession thereof *or, if contract measure vendor's of damages applies,* the actual damages suffered by defendant(s) on account of the failure of plaintiff(s) to complete the contract]. [Defendant(s) is/are not entitled to a decree quieting his/her/its/their title to the property which is the subject of the contract unless and until such sums are paid to plaintiff(s), but defendant(s) deny any obligation to pay such sums to plaintiff(s).]

[*CONTINUE*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff(s) pray(s) judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For damages in the sum of $_____, with interest thereon at the rate of _____ percent from _____ [*date*];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred[, including attorney's fees as provided by the contract here at issue];

[3. For a decree providing that defendant's(s') title to the property which is the subject of the contract not be quieted unless and until defendant(s) pay(s) to plaintiff(s) all sums found by this Court to be owing from defendant(s) to plaintiff(s).]

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 569.160.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a purchaser under an installment sales contract to seek relief from forfeiture by way of restitution [*see Civ. Code § 3369*; *Petersen v. Hartell (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 102, 113, 219 Cal. Rptr. 170, 707 P.2d 232* , citing *Freedman v. St. Matthias Parish (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 16, 22, 230 P.2d 629* (not an installment sales case) and *Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 803, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* ; *see also §§ 569.100[2], 569.104*]. Because restitution is applicable whether or not the transaction is based on an installment sales contract, the discussion in *§ 569.24[4],* and the cases in § 569.123[4][b] also apply to restitution under an installment sales contract. This form may be modified to seek restitution under a noninstallment contract by modifying the allegations of Paragraph 6 to describe the terms of the contract at issue.

This form may be modified for use as a cross complaint in response to a vendor's action foreclosing the purchaser's interest by changing the word "plaintiff" to "cross complainant" wherever it appears and by adding "cross" before the word "defendant" each time it appears. If modified for use as a cross complaint in a quiet title action, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* , for particular requirements and procedures applicable to quiet title actions.

If this form is used to seek alternative relief in a complaint based on the *forms in § 569.193* or *§ 569.194* for reinstatement or redemption, respectively, counsel may incorporate some of the earlier allegations by reference and can avoid redundancies, for example, by setting forth the composition of payments in the first Paragraph 10 and by omitting Paragraph 11 of the complaint if an incorporated paragraph sets forth sufficient facts about the notice of election by the vendor.

The most difficult part of a restitution action for the purchaser is that the vendor, not the purchaser, is entitled to elect which measure of damages will apply [*Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 804, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18 , 415 P.2d 833]* . In most cases, the value of the property will have increased during the interval between the formation of the contract and the breach, making the contract measure of damages more beneficial to the purchaser. If the vendor has taken some action before the purchaser brings the action for restitution, the vendor's election may be clear. For instance, if the vendor relied on a forfeiture provision in the contract and has not offered to restore benefits, the vendor should be locked into the contract measure of damages [*see Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 753, 756, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318]* .

[3] Allegations

In addition to the introductory allegations regarding the residence and capacities of the parties, the formation, subject matter, and relevant terms of the contract, as well as the extent of plaintiff's performance, including taking of possession and construction of improvements, if applicable (Paragraphs 1-10), the form of complaint alleges the following:

- The service and content of defendant's notice of election to terminate the contract (Paragraph 11).

- The fact of and circumstances regarding plaintiff's surrender of possession, if applicable (Paragraph 12).

- The extent of the damages to which the vendor is entitled, under either the rental value measure of

damages (Paragraph 13) [*see Behrendt v. Abraham (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 182, 186-188, 49 Cal. Rptr. 292, 410 P.2d 828]* or the breach of contract measure (Paragraph 14) [*see Honey v. Henry's Franchise Leasing Corp. (1966) 64 Cal. 2d 801, 803, 805, 52 Cal. Rptr. 18, 415 P.2d 833* ; *Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 752-758, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318* ; *Petersen v. Ridenour (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 720, 726, 287 P.2d 848* (if using rental measure, rental value, and if using contract measure, fair value of property at time of breach is essential to showing excess payments over damages)].

- That the payments by plaintiff under the contract for which plaintiff is entitled to credit exceed vendor's actual damages under the appropriate measure (Paragraph 15) [*see, e.g., Kudokas v. Balkus (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 744, 756-757, 103 Cal. Rptr. 318* (plaintiff cannot have credit for interest payments if the breach of contract measure of damages applies)].

- Either that demand for restitution has been made by plaintiff and refused by defendant (Paragraph 16) or that plaintiff wishes to assert the matter as a condition to defendant's quieting title (Paragraph 17).

[4] Jurisdiction

Because an action for restitution is not one of the enumerated cases in equity that are limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 86(b)*], jurisdiction is in the superior court [*Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*].

[5] Venue

If the action is considered to be one on the contract, venue lies in the county in which the contract was formed or is to be performed or in which any defendant resides [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* (county in which contract formed as county of performance unless contract provides otherwise)].

[6] Decisions

Burden of proof is on purchaser to show excess of payments over vendor's damages; in absence of showing that payments by purchaser exceed vendor's damages, judgment quieting vendor's title without requiring refund of any part of purchase price was proper; proof of rental value and/or of fair value of property at time of breach was essential to such showing. *Petersen v. Ridenour (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 720, 726, 287 P.2d 848*

[7] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 569.190*, *569.193*, and *569.194*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesCauses of ActionBreach of ContractBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesGeneral OverviewBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesRemediesCompensatory DamagesBusiness & Corporate LawDistributorships & FranchisesTerminationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesConstitutional SourcesCivil ProcedureEquityGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedurePartiesGeneral OverviewCommercial Law (UCC)Sales (Article 2)RemediesGeneral OverviewContracts LawGeneral OverviewContracts LawBreachGeneral OverviewContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsForfeiture ClausesContracts LawRemediesCompensatory DamagesGeneral OverviewContracts LawRemediesRestitutionContracts

LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsLegal TitleContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsElectionsReal Property LawDeedsTypesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawDeedsTypesQuit Claim DeedsReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLease AgreementsDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 570 [Reserved]

50-570 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 570

[Reserved]

Chapter 570[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 571.syn

§ 571.syn Synopsis to Chapter 571: VENUE

§ 571.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 571.02 Cross References

§§ 571.03-571.09 [Reserved]

§ 571.10 Governing Statutes

§ 571.11 Venue Defined

§ 571.12 Jurisdiction Distinguished

§ 571.13 Jurisdictional Venue

§ 571.14 Subvenue, Filing, and Transfer of a Civil Case Within a Unified Court

§ 571.15 Classification of Actions for Venue Purposes

[1] Transitory Versus Local

[2] Determined by Complaint

[3] Main Relief Rule

§ 571.16 Transitory Actions

[1] Basic Rule of Venue

[a] Residence of Defendant

[b] Multiple Defendants

[c] Residence Defined

[d] Actions Subject to Basic Rule

[2] Rule for Actions Involving Injury to Person or Personal Property

[3] Rule for Contract Actions

[a] Alternative Venues

[b] Where Contract Entered Into

[c] Where Contract Is to Be Performed

[d] Contract Actions Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)

[i] Consumer Transactions

[ii] Unsolicited Telephone Calls and Electronic Transmissions

[iii] Specific Venue Provision

[iv] Provisions Not Subject to Waiver

[e] Contract Actions Arising out of Retail Installment Sales (Unruh Act)

[f] Contract Actions Arising out of Motor Vehicle Sales (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act)

[4] Proceedings to Determine Parental Relationship

[5] Proceedings to Enforce Support Obligation

[6] Nonresident Defendant or County of Residence Unknown

[7] Defendant About to Depart From State

§ 571.17 Local Actions

[1] Situs of Subject Matter of Action Controls

[2] Action Local If It Turns on Title to or Possession of Real Property

[3] Action Not Local If Title or Possession Incidentally Involved

[4] Injury to Real Property

[a] Broadly Construed

[b] Construction Defects

[5] Pleading Requirement for Unlawful Detainer Actions in Limited Civil Cases

[6] Foreclosure of Liens and Mortgages on Real Property

[7] Where Cause Arose

[a] Actions for Penalty or Forfeiture

[b] Actions Against Public Officers

[c] "Public Officer" Defined

[8] Actions Against Personal Representative or Trustee

§ 571.18 Venue Governed by Party

[1] Domestic Corporations

[a] Principal Place of Business or County Where Cause of Action Arises

[b] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

[c] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

[d] Where Breach Occurs

[e] Effect of Alter Ego Allegation

[2] Foreign Corporations

[3] Unincorporated Associations

[3A] Limited Liability Companies

[4] State or Local Government or Agency

[a] Actions Against State

[b] Actions by State

[c] Action Against State for Inverse Condemnation

[d] Action Against State for Money or Damages

[e] Action for Death or Injury to Person or Personal Property

[f] Action by Local Government or Agency Against State

§ 571.19 Actions Involving City or County

[1] Transfer to Neutral County

[2] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against City, County, or Local Agency

[3] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against Resident of or Corporation Doing Business in Another City, County, or Local Agency

[a] General Rule

[b] Corporate Defendants

[4] Actions Against City, County, or Local Agency

[5] Stipulation as to Place of Trial

[6] Assignment of Disinterested Judge in Lieu of Transfer

[7] "Local Agency" Defined

[8] Motion to Transfer

[a] Procedure

[b] Burden of Proof

§ 571.20 Effect of Joinder on Venue

[1] Mixed Actions

[2] Joinder of Causes of Action

[3] Joinder of Defendants

[a] General Rule

[b] Individual and Corporate Defendants Joined

[c] State and Corporate Defendants Joined

§§ 571.21-571.29 [Reserved]

§ 571.30 Governing Law

§ 571.31 Grounds for Motion for Change of Venue

§ 571.32 Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[1] Notice of Motion

[2] Expenses and Attorney's Fees

[3] Pleading After Motion Denied

§ 571.33 Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

§ 571.34 Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

§ 571.35 No Judge Qualified to Act

§ 571.36 Who May Make Motion

§ 571.37 Costs and Fees of Transfer

§ 571.38 Power of Court Limited by Motion

§ 571.39 Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue

[1] In General

[2] By Counteraffidavit or Declaration

[3] By Countermotion

§ 571.40 Burden of Proof

[1] Presumption of Proper Venue

[2] Required Showing to Meet Burden

[a] In General

[b] Burden in Motion Based on Ground That Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[c] Burden in Motion Based on Other Grounds

§ 571.41 Selection of Transferee Court

[1] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[2] Motion Based on Other Grounds

§ 571.42 Transfer of Pleadings and Papers

§ 571.43 Effect of Granting Order on Jurisdiction

[1] Transferee Court

[2] Transferor Court

§ 571.44 Renewal of Motion

§ 571.45 Actions Involving Installment or Automotive Sales, Consumer Obligations, or Unlawful Detainer

[1] Pleading Must Show Proper Venue

[2] Transfer of Case

[a] Case Not Commenced in Proper Court

[b] Case Commenced in Proper Court

[c] Procedure and Fees

§ 571.46 Review of Court Orders Relating to Motions for Change of Venue

[1] Motions in Superior Court

[2] Standard of Review

[3] Time to Answer After Review

§§ 571.47-571.59 [Reserved]

§ 571.60 Related Matthew Bender Publications

§ 571.61 State Statutes

[1] Place of Trial

[2] Small Claims

[3] Venue in Other Actions

[a] Miscellaneous

[b] Dissolution and Winding Up of Corporation

[c] Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings

[4] Effect of Joinder on Venue

[5] Local Actions

[6] Party Venue--Actions by or Against State

[7] Corporations and Unincorporated Associations

[8] Transfer to Neutral County

[9] Transitory Actions

§ 571.62 Decisions

[1] Jurisdiction Distinguished

[2] Venue Defined

[3] Classification of Actions--Determined by Complaint

[4] Main Relief Rule

[5] Local Actions

[a] Generally

[b] Personal Representative or Trustee

[c] Foreclosure of Liens and Mortgages on Real Property

[d] Injury to Real Property Defined

[e] Public Officers

[f] Title to or Possession of Real Property

[g] Title or Possession Incidentally Involved

[6] Transitory Actions

[a] Generally

[b] Application of Basic Rule of Residence Venue

[c] Contract Actions

[i] Exception to Basic Rule of Residence Venue

[ii] Where Contract Entered Into

[iii] "Special Contract in Writing"

[d] Injury to Person or Personal Property

[e] Residence Defined

[7] Venue Governed by Party

[a] When Basic Rule of Venue Applies to Corporations

[b] Domestic Corporations

[i] Generally

[ii] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

[iii] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

[c] Foreign Corporations

[d] State or Local Government or Agency

[i] Actions Against State

[ii] Death or Injury to Person or Personal Property

[iii] Inverse Condemnation, Money or Damages

[e] Unincorporated Associations

[8] Transfer to Neutral County

[a] Generally

[b] Actions Against City, County, or Local Agency

[c] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against City, County, or Local Agency

[d] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against Resident of or Corporation Doing Business in Another City, County, or Local Agency

[i] General Rule

[ii] Corporate Defendants

[e] "Local Agency" Defined

[f] Motion to Transfer

[i] Generally

[ii] Burden of Proof

[9] Effect of Joinder on Venue

[a] Generally

[b] Joinder of Causes of Action

[c] Joinder of Defendants

[i] Generally

[ii] Individual and Corporate Defendants Joined

[iii] State and Corporate Defendants Joined

§ 571.63 Text References

§§ 571.64-571.69 [Reserved]

§ 571.70 State Statutes

[1] Motion for Change of Venue

[a] In General

[b] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[c] Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

[d] Disqualification of Judges

[e] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

[f] In Specific Actions or Proceedings

[2] Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue

[3] Review of Court Orders

[4] Transfer Within County

§ 571.71 Decisions

[1] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Convenience of Witnesses

[4] Expenses and Attorney's Fees

[5] Mixed Action

[6] Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue--Counteraffidavits or Countermotion

[7] Following Compulsory Cross-Complaint

[8] Review of Court Orders

[a] Motions in the Superior Court

[b] Standard of Review

§§ 571.72-571.79 [Reserved]

§ 571.80 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Controlled by Residence of Defendant [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 571.81 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Tortious Conduct Occurred [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 571.82 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract Entered Into [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Alternative Places of Trial in Contract Actions

[4] Cross References

§ 571.83 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract to Be Performed [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Special Contract in Writing Required

[4] Cross References

§ 571.84 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Controlled by Situs of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Local Actions

[a] Recovery of Real Property, Recovery or Determination of Title to Real Property, Injury to Real Property

[b] Foreclosure of Lien or Mortgage on Real Property

[c] Unlawful Detainer

[4] Description of Real Property in Quiet Title Action

[5] Cross References

§ 571.85 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Where Cause of Action Arose--For Recovery of Penalty or Forfeiture Imposed by Statute or Act Done by Public Officer by Virtue of His or Her Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 393]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Penalty or Forfeiture

[4] Actions Against Public Officers

[5] State Agencies as "Public Officers"

[6] Cross References

§ 571.86 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Against Personal Representative or Trustee--County Which Has Jurisdiction of Estate [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] "Claim" Against the Estate Defined

[4] Cross References

§ 571.87 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5]--Transitory Action Against Corporation

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Domestic Corporations

[a] Alternative Places of Trial in Transitory Actions

[b] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

[c] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

[d] Where the Breach Occurs

[4] Foreign Corporations

[5] Cross References

§ 571.88 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5]--Unincorporated Associations

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 571.89 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 401; Gov. Code §§ 955, 955.2]--Actions Against State or State Agency

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 571.90-571.99 [Reserved]

§ 571.100 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Procedure for Filing Motion

[a] When Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[b] Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

[c] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

[d] No Qualified Judge

[5] Costs and Fees of Transfer

[6] Transfer of Action by or Against Local Government Entity Under Code Civ. Proc. § 394

[7] Cross References

§ 571.101 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Inconvenience of Witnesses

[4] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

[5] No Judge in Court Qualified to Act

[6] Cross References

§ 571.102 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--Action Commenced in Improper Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a), 397(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 571.103 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 398] Granting Motion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 571.104 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. § 396b, 397]--Notice of Countermotion

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Cross References

§ 571.105 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] and Order for Change of Place of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397, 398]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART I. SCOPE

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.01

§ 571.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms related to:

- Venue requirements and the proper place of trial for various actions [*see § 571.10* et seq., for forms,*see § 571.80* et seq.].

- Motions for change of venue for use when a party to an action seeks to transfer the action to another place for trial [*see § 571.30* et seq., for forms,*see § 571.100* et seq.].

The forms relating to venue are:

- Forms of allegation for use in actions dealing with personal right or obligations (transitory actions) [*see §§ 571.80 -571.83*].

- Forms of allegation for use in actions relating to title or interest in real property (local actions) [*see §§ 571.84 -571.86*].

- Forms for use in actions in which venue is determined by the party suing or being sued [*see §§ 571.87 -571.89*].

The forms relating to motion for change of venue are:

- A form for notice of motion for change of venue [*see § 571.100*] and a form for notice of countermotion to retain venue [*see § 571.104*].

- A form of declaration to support either the motion or countermotion [*see § 571.101*] and a form of declaration for action commenced in improper court [*see § 571.102*].

- A form of order granting a motion for change of venue [*see § 571.103*].

- A form of stipulation and order for use when the parties agree to a change of venue and wish to avoid the costs of the motion procedure [*see § 571.105*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART I. SCOPE

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.02

§ 571.02 Cross References

- For forms and discussion relating to venue in a proceeding for dissolution of marriage or legal separation, and for proceedings under the Family Code,*see* Ch. 221, *Dissolution of Marriage: Procedure* , and Ch. 258, *Family Law Enforcement: General Enforcement Principles and Remedies* .

- For forms and discussion relating to jurisdiction,*see* Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter Jurisdiction* .

- For discussion and forms of the affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) regarding venue required under the Unruh Act by Civ. Code. § 1812.10,*see Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, § 502.102,* and *Ch. 502, Sales: Warranties, § 502.160[7].*

- For discussion of motions to transfer an action or proceeding that was commenced in a court lacking subject matter jurisdiction to a court with jurisdiction,*see* Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter Jurisdiction* .

- For forms and discussion relating to the requisites of written notice,*see* Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsExpress WarrantiesContracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsImplied WarrantiesGeneral OverviewContracts LawSecured TransactionsInstallment ContractsGeneral OverviewFamily LawChild SupportObligationsEnforcementGeneral OverviewFamily LawMarital Termination & Spousal SupportDissolution & DivorceProcedures

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART I. SCOPE

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.03-571.09

[Reserved]

§§ 571.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.10

§ 571.10 Governing Statutes

The general statutes governing venue or the place of trial in state civil actions are contained in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-402*, and *Gov. Code §§ 955, 955.2* and *955.3*. There are also several statutes that govern venue in particular circumstances that are not contained in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-402*, and that are not within the scope of this chapter [*see, e.g., Fam. Code §§ 8714(a)* (agency adoptions), 8802(a) (independent adoptions); *Prob. Code §§ 2201, 2202* (venue in conservatorship or guardianship proceedings)].

The statute governing venue in transitory actions is *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*. Venue in local actions is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392, 393* and *395.1*. Venue in actions in which the type of party suing or being sued controls is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5* and *401*, and *Gov. Code §§ 955, 955.2* and *955.3*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* governs the transfer of an action to a neutral county when a city, county or other government agency is suing or being sued.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.11

§ 571.11 Venue Defined

Venue indicates the geographical location and political subdivision within which the courthouse that will hear the cause is situated. It refers to the place from which the jury is summoned [*Milliken v. Gray (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 595, 600, 81 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . Venue relates to and defines the particular county or city in which a court having jurisdiction may in the first instance properly hear and determine the case [*Arganbright v. Good (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 877, 878 , 116 P.2d 186]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.12

§ 571.12 Jurisdiction Distinguished

The distinction between jurisdiction and venue is plainly established. Jurisdiction refers to the power of the court to decide a case on the merits [*Milliken v. Gray (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 595, 600, 81 Cal. Rptr. 525]* . It includes the power to inquire into facts, to apply the law, to make decisions, and to declare judgment [*Arganbright v. Good (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 877, 878 , 116 P.2d 186]* .

As venue relates only to the place where suit should be heard, it is not jurisdictional in the fundamental sense. It does not relate to whether a particular court has the power to try the action [*Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 121, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817* ; *see § 571.13* regarding jurisdictional venue].

A court having subject matter jurisdiction over an action, even if not the proper venue, may try the action unless the defendant makes a timely motion for transfer to the proper court [*Lipari v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 667, 672, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 246* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*, discussed in *§ 571.30* et seq., relating to Change of Venue]. Thus, although the defendant may obtain a transfer by timely motion, a defendant may not obtain dismissal, and it is error for the court to dismiss the action [*Lipari v. Department of Motor Vehicles (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 667, 672, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 246* (reversing judgment dismissing petition for writ of mandate)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionPersonal Jurisdiction & In Rem ActionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.13

§ 571.13 Jurisdictional Venue

When a statute makes a local place of trial a part of the grant of subject matter jurisdiction, venue is considered jurisdictional [*Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 121, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817]* . For example, in proceedings for the administration of a decedent's estate, the county of the decedent's residence or the location of his or her property at the time of death establishes jurisdiction of the subject matter in the superior court of that county [*see Prob. Code § 7050-7052*]. Another jurisdictional venue statute is *Welf. & Inst. Code § 3100*, which allows the district attorney to petition the superior court for the commitment of a person when the district attorney has probable cause to believe the person is a drug addict [*see Van Zanten v. Superior Court (1963) 214 Cal. App. 2d 510, 512-514, 29 Cal. Rptr. 625* (decided under former Penal Code § 6500, now *Welf. & Inst. Code § 3100*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionJurisdictional SourcesStatutory SourcesCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureJurisdiction & VenueGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.14

§ 571.14 Subvenue, Filing, and Transfer of a Civil Case Within a Unified Court

With the complete unification of trial courts in California into only superior courts, several provisions providing for specific places of trial in municipal court are no longer applicable (a topic previously known as "subvenue" and reflecting issues of having the case heard in the county judicial district closest to the acts giving rise to the action) [*see, e.g.,* former *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392(2), 395(c)*].

In recognition of unified courts, *Code Civ. Proc. § 402.5* was enacted in 1998 to provide that superior courts may transfer a limited civil case to another branch or location of the superior court in the same county. Effective January 1, 2003, *Code Civ. Proc. § 402.5* is repealed and the matter is addressed in *Code Civ. Proc. § 402*, which provides that except as otherwise provided by law:

- A superior court may specify by local rule the locations where certain types of actions or proceedings are to be filed.

- A superior court may specify by local rule the locations where certain types of actions or proceedings are to be heard or tried.

- A superior court may not dismiss a case, and the clerk may not reject a case for filing, because it is filed, or a person seeks to file it, in a court location other than the location specified by local rule. However, the court may transfer the case on its own motion to the proper court location.

- A superior court may transfer an action or proceeding filed in one location to another location of the superior court.

Code Civ. Proc. § 402 does not affect the authority of the presiding judge to apportion the business of the court as provided by the California Rules of Court.

It is always prudent to check local rules of court to determine if there is a central location for filing civil actions and if

status of the action as a limited or unlimited civil case provides for different treatment. For example, Santa Clara Co. Super. Ct. Rules, Rule 1(C) provides for the proper facility for filing a general civil case, stating:

> (1) All unlimited civil cases must be filed in the Downtown Superior Court.
>
> (2) All limited civil cases must be filed in the Downtown Superior Court or the South County Courthouse, subject to the following rules:
>
> > a. A tort case may be filed in the South County Courthouse if at least one defendant resides at a Gilroy, Morgan Hill, or San Martin address, or the injury or damage occurred in Gilroy, Morgan Hill, San Martin or a surrounding unincorporated area within Santa Clara County.
> >
> > b. A contract case may be filed in the South County Courthouse if at least one defendant resides at a Gilroy, Morgan Hill or San Martin address, or the contract was entered into or to be performed in Gilroy, Morgan Hill, San Martin, or a surrounding unincorporated area within Santa Clara County.
> >
> > c. Other types of cases may be filed in the South County Courthouse if at least one defendant resides at a Gilroy, Morgan Hill or San Martin address or the case requires a determination of a right in land that has a Gilroy, Morgan Hill or San Martin address.
> >
> > d. Upon the noticed motion of a party, or the Court's own motion, for good cause shown, a limited civil case may be transferred from the Downtown Superior Court to the South County Courthouse or vice versa.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.15

§ 571.15 Classification of Actions for Venue Purposes

[1] Transitory Versus Local

The rules of venue generally require actions to be classified mainly as transitory or local [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482* n.5, *208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392, 395*]. An action is transitory if the inquiry deals primarily with financial obligations or personal relationships. It is local if title to or injury to real property is the focus of trial [*Carlton v. Superior Court (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 586, 589, 49 Cal. Rptr. 759]* .

[2] Determined by Complaint

The cause of action affects or determines the place of trial, and whether an action is transitory or local will be ascertained from the complaint alone [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953]* . The court will inspect the complaint to determine the character of the action and the judgment that may be rendered on default [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Eckstrand v. Wilshusen (1933) 217 Cal. 380, 381-382, 18 P.2d 931* ; *see* discussion in [3], *below*].

Thus, the plaintiff's theory of the action as set forth in the complaint determines venue [*Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 544, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

[3] Main Relief Rule

When a complaint states only one cause of action, the relief sought must be characterized as local or transitory to determine venue. Consequently, venue problems arise when the complaint, although stating a single cause of action, demands both local and transitory relief. If that is the case, the characterization will be controlled by the nature of the "main relief" sought, or "principal object" of the action [*Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 535, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527]* . For a discussion relating to the effect of joinder of several causes of action or defendants covered by different venue statutes, *see* the discussion in *§ 571.20[1]*.

To apply the "main relief rule," the main relief sought should first be identified and characterized as local or transitory.

Then, if there is other relief sought that would be characterized differently, the nature of the main relief will control. If all of the relief can be similarly characterized, the "main relief rule" is inapplicable [*Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 535-536, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527]* . For example, an action to recover damages for injury to real property is local under *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)* even though the complaint is framed in various counts according to theories of negligence, negligent breach of contract, and breach of warranty. The addition of the breach of warranty theory, which is transitory, does not transform the action into a transitory one because the subject matter of the action is for injury to real property, and the "main relief" sought is for damages therefor [*Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 1, 4, 71 Cal. Rptr. 202* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)* (situs of subject matter controls in actions for injuries to real property)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual Defendants

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.16

§ 571.16 Transitory Actions

[1] Basic Rule of Venue

[a] Residence of Defendant

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 controls venue in transitory actions [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272]* . Section 395(a) states that, except as otherwise provided by law and subject to the power of the court to transfer actions or proceedings as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the superior court in the county where the defendants or some of them reside at the commencement of the action is the proper court for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. Section 395(a) is intended to protect the defendant from the expense and inconvenience of being compelled to go to a distant county to defend himself or herself against an action commenced in that county [*Turlock Theatre Co. v. Laws (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 573, 576* ; *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 575, 26 P. 356]* .

The phrase "except as otherwise provided by law" is a subordinating declaration that precludes application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* if another venue provision applies to the cause of action [*see* *Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482-487, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272* ; *Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 502-503, 186 Cal. Rptr. 335, 651 P.2d 1141* (applying *Code Civ. Proc. § 393* rather than Section 395)]. For example, in *Brown*, the Court held that *Gov. Code § 12965*, the venue provision of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) is a special venue provision that applies to cases involving FEHA claims joined with non-FEHA claims, so that it applied to the entire case and prevailed over Section 395 [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482-487, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272* (distinguishing the case from a mixed action in which different venue provisions apply to different causes of action)].

In the case of mixed actions, however, where the complaint alleges multiple causes of action subject to different venue provisions, Section 395 may prevail over the more specific provision [*see* *Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 545, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *see also* *Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 487-488, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272]* . For discussion of venue in mixed actions,*see § 571.20[1]*.

[b] Multiple Defendants

A defendant is not entitled to have a transitory action tried in the county of his or her residence when there are several defendants who reside in different counties. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* expressly provides for trial in the county in which the defendants "or some of them" reside. Thus, a plaintiff may bring a good transitory action against two or more defendants in the county of one defendant who is a proper party. The nonresident defendants cannot obtain a change of venue even if the resident defendant joins in the motion. This rule applies even though all of the causes of action do not affect all of the parties [*Colusa Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Superior Court (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 880, 890, 277 Cal. Rptr. 110]* . For further discussion,*see § 571.20[3]* regarding joinder of defendants.

[c] Residence Defined

Within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, a person can have only one residence. Residence depends on intention as well as fact. It has ordinarily been accepted to mean the place where one remains when not called elsewhere on business, pleasure, or for other temporary purposes. For example, the mere inhabitancy of a summer home or country house at certain seasons of the year or at certain times would not make the person inhabiting the house a resident of the county in which the house is situated. The material question is the intent to establish a permanent residence. The place of residence within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is the fixed home of a person as understood by himself or herself and his or her neighbors and friends [*Burt v. Scarborough (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 817, 820-821, 17 Cal. Rptr. 146, 366 P.2d 498* ; *see Gov. Code § 244(a)* (residence as the place where one remains when not called elsewhere for labor or other special or temporary purpose, and to which he or she returns in seasons of repose)].

[d] Actions Subject to Basic Rule

The general rule of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* that the residence of the defendant is the proper place for trial applies to personal torts not involving physical injury, such as conversion [*Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *Mason v. Buck (1929) 99 Cal. App. 219, 221, 278 P. 461]* . Similarly, actions for libel, malicious prosecution, and false imprisonment are also triable solely at the defendant's residence [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 218, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* . This is also true of actions for abuse of process. Actions for abuse of process, like actions for malicious prosecution, are not actions for "injury to the person" that may be brought in the county in which plaintiff's injury occurred pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* [*Cacciaguidi v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 181, 184-186]* . Further, subject to certain exceptions set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, contract actions are also triable in the county where the defendant resides [*Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16[3][a]* regarding alternate venues in contract actions].

[2] Rule for Actions Involving Injury to Person or Personal Property

If the action is for injury to a person or personal property or for death from wrongful act or negligence, either the county where the injury occurs or the injury causing death occurs or the county in which the defendants, or some of them, reside at the commencement of the action, shall be a proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. Thus, a defendant is entitled to have a negligence action tried either in the county of his or her residence or the county in which the tort occurred [*Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916]* .

The phrase "injury to person" as it is used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is limited to physical injury or incapacity or death caused by the wrongful or negligent act of another. It does not apply to nonphysical injuries resulting from false imprisonment or malicious prosecution [*Monk v. Ehret (1923) 192 Cal. 186, 191-193, 219 P. 452* ; *Cacciaguidi v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 181, 187]* . Nor does the phrase refer to injuries to character or reputation [*Carruth v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 215, 219, 145 Cal. Rptr. 344]* . Actions sounding in tort, such as severe humiliation, anguish, emotional distress, and trauma, are also not encompassed in the phrase "injury to a person"

so as to justify grounding venue on them [*Cubic Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 622, 625, 231 Cal. Rptr. 18]* . For a discussion of proper venue in actions for torts not involving physical injury,*see § 571.16[1][d]*.

[3] Rule for Contract Actions

[a] Alternative Venues

Subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* (venue in actions based on consumer obligations), when a defendant has contracted to perform an obligation in a particular county, the proper county for trial of an action founded on the obligation is either (1) the county in which the obligation is to be performed, (2) the county in which the contract in fact was entered into, or (3) the county in which the defendant or any defendant resides at the commencement of the action. The county in which the obligation is incurred shall be deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed unless there is a special contract in writing to the contrary [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840]* . This provision contains exceptions to the basic rule of residence venue [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 224, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* .

In effect, a defendant is entitled to have a contract action transferred to the county of his or her residence unless the obligation was incurred or was to be performed in another county [*Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 694, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* . In fact, the plaintiff is entitled to have the action tried in the county in which it appears the contract was entered into despite the defendant's residence in another county [*Richardson v. Rose (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 318, 322, 17 Cal. Rptr. 84]* .

[b] Where Contract Entered Into

The place where the contract was made is the place where the last act necessary for its validity was done. This is usually the act constituting acceptance. Thus, when a contract is prepared in one county, and is forwarded to a party in another county for acceptance and signature, the latter county is the proper place for trial because that is where the contract was made [*Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696-697, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* . Similarly, when a contract is made by telephone, the contract is entered into at the place where the recipient of the telephone call is when he or she accepts the offer [*Friedman Bag Co., Inc. v. Shrier (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 561, 564, 15 Cal. Rptr. 38* ; *Wilson v. Scannavino (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 369, 371, 324 P.2d 350]* .

[c] Where Contract Is to Be Performed

The language of the contract provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is unclear, and at first glance seems to offer a choice of three separate places for trial: (1) the county in which the contract is to be performed, (2) the county in which the contract was entered into, or (3) the county in which the defendant resides. However, by including the language that the county in which the obligation is incurred shall be deemed to be the county in which it is to be performed, *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* effectively limits the counties in which an action may properly be tried to the county in which the defendant resides, and the county in which the contract was made. The language in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* providing for a special contract in writing creates an exception to this limitation. If there is a special contract designating the county of performance, that county is also a proper county for the trial of an action on contract [*Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 531-532, 122 P.2d 115* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

A special contract is one in which particular stipulations with respect to the obligations of the parties are expressed, and which, if omitted, the law will not supply [*Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535, 122 P.2d 115]* . Thus, before an action may be brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* in the county where the obligation forming the basis of the action is performable, the contract must specifically state the place of performance of the obligation [*Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840]* . The contract must specify a definite, certain place of performance, and any deficiency or lack of a specification cannot be remedied by extrinsic evidence [Fidelity Thrift & Loan Asso. v. Hall (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 895, 899 , *9 Cal. Rptr. 596]* . An agreement to pay money

in a particular county, or to deliver goods at a particular place, or to perform an obligation in a particular city are all sufficient [*Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840]* . Also, a geographic designation of the city or county without setting forth the address is enough to satisfy the requirement that the special contract must be specific. Thus, when a contract merely states the place of payment as the office of a trustee in a particular county, it is sufficient to give the plaintiff the right to specify that county as the proper place of trial in an action on the contract [*Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 16 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102]* .

[d] Contract Actions Subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)

[i] Consumer Transactions

Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b) applies to actions arising from the offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*].

As exceptions, section 395(b) does not apply to an action described in *Civ. Code § 1812.10* (Contract Actions Arising Out of Retail Installment Sales (Unruh Act), *see* [e], *below*) or 2984.4 (Contract Actions Arising Out of Motor Vehicle Sales (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act), *see* [f], *below*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*].

[ii] Unsolicited Telephone Calls and Electronic Transmissions

Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b) applies to actions arising from transactions consummated as a result of an unsolicited phone call by a seller engaged in the business of consummating transactions of that kind [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*].

[iii] Specific Venue Provision

If an action is governed by Section 395(b) the proper court for trial of the action is the superior court in the county where the buyer or lessee [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*]:

- In fact signed the contract,
- Resided at the time the contract was entered into, or
- Resides at the commencement of the action.

This venue provision is expressly subject to the court's power to transfer actions or proceedings as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*].

In the superior court designated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* as the proper court, the proper court location for trial of a case is the location where the court tries that type of case that is nearest or most accessible to where the buyer or lessee resides, where the buyer or lessee in fact signed the contract, where the buyer or lessee resided at the time the contract was entered into, or where the buyer or lessee resides at the commencement of the action. Otherwise, any location of the superior court designated as the proper court in this subdivision is a proper court location for the trial. The court may specify by local rule the nearest or most accessible court location where the court tries that type of case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*].

[iv] Provisions Not Subject to Waiver

Any provision of an obligation described in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)* waiving those subdivisions is void and unenforceable [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(c)*].

[e] Contract Actions Arising out of Retail Installment Sales (Unruh Act)

An action on a contract or installment account under the provisions of the Unruh Act [*Civ. Code § 1801 et seq.*] must be tried in the superior court in the county where the contract was in fact signed by the buyer, where the buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into, where the buyer resides at the commencement of the action, or where the goods purchased pursuant to the contract have been so affixed to real property as to become a part of that real property [Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(a)].

In the superior court designated as the proper court in Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(a), the proper court location for trial of an action under the Unruh Act is the location where the court tries that type of action that is nearest or most accessible to where the contract was in fact signed by the buyer, where the buyer resided at the time the contract was entered into, where the buyer resides at the commencement of the action, or where the goods purchased pursuant to the contract have been so affixed to real property as to become a part of that real property [Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(b)]. Otherwise, any location of the superior court designated as the proper court in Section 1812.10(a) is the proper court location for the trial of the action. The court may specify by local rule the nearest or most accessible court location where the court tries that type of case [Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(b)].

In any action subject to Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10, concurrently with the filing of the complaint, the plaintiff must file an affidavit stating facts showing that the action has been commenced in a superior court and court location described in § 1812.10 as a proper place for the trial of the action [Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(c)]. Those facts may be stated in a verified complaint and must not be stated on information or belief. When that affidavit is filed with the complaint, a copy thereof must be served with the summons. If a plaintiff fails to file the affidavit or state facts in a verified complaint required by this section, no further proceedings may occur, but the court must, upon its own motion or upon motion of any party, dismiss the action without prejudice. The court may, on terms that are just, permit the affidavit to be filed subsequent to the filing of the complaint and a copy of the affidavit must be served on the defendant. The time to answer or otherwise plead must date from that service [Code Civ. Proc. § 1812.10(c)].

For discussion and forms of the affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) regarding venue required under the Unruh Act by Civ. Code. § 1812.10,*see Ch. 501, Sales: Retail Installment Sales, § 502.102,* and *Ch. 502, Sales: Warranties, § 502.160[7]*.

[f] Contract Actions Arising out of Motor Vehicle Sales (Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act)

An action on a contract or purchase order under the provisions of the Rees-Levering Motor Vehicle Sales and Finance Act (*Civ. Code § 2981 et seq.*) must be tried in the county in which the contract or purchase order was in fact signed by the buyer, in the county in which the buyer resided at the commencement of the action, or in the county in which the motor vehicle purchased pursuant to the contract or purchase order is permanently garaged [*Civ. Code § 2984.4*, first paragraph]. In an action involving multiple claims, or causes of action, venue shall lie in the foregoing counties so long as there is at least one claim or cause of action arising from a contract subject to the provisions of the act [*Civ. Code § 2984.4*, second paragraph].

For discussion and a form of the affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) regarding venue required under the Rees-Levering Act by Civ. Code. § 2984.4,*see Ch. 89, Automobiles: Sales and Financing Under the Rees-Levering Act, §§ 89.27, 89.61*.

[4] Proceedings to Determine Parental Relationship

In a proceeding to determine parental relation under *Fam. Code § 7600 et seq.* (Uniform Parentage Act), the county in which the child resides is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[5] Proceedings to Enforce Support Obligation

In a proceeding to enforce an obligation of support under *Fam. Code § 3900* (civil suit on behalf of child to enforce parents' obligations), or to establish and enforce a foreign judgment or court order for the support of a minor child, the county in which the child resides is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[6] Nonresident Defendant or County of Residence Unknown

If none of the defendants reside in the state, or if they reside in the state and the county in which they reside is unknown to the plaintiff, the action may be tried in any county which the plaintiff may designate in his or her complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

[7] Defendant About to Depart From State

If the defendant is about to depart from the state, the action may be tried in any county where either of the parties reside or service is made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsFamily LawChild CustodyVenueFamily LawChild SupportVenueTortsProcedureCommencement & ProsecutionVenue

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.17

§ 571.17 Local Actions

[1] Situs of Subject Matter of Action Controls

Subject to the power of the court to transfer actions and proceedings as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392 et seq.*, the county in which the real property which is the subject of the action, or some part thereof, is situated is the proper county for trial for the recovery of real property, of an estate or interest therein, or for the determination in any form of such right or interest, and for injuries to real property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*].

The right of a plaintiff to have an action tried in a county other than that of the defendant's residence is exceptional. Thus, *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* is an exception to the basic rule of residence venue [*Kaluzok v. Brisson (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 760, 763-764, 167 P.2d 481]* .

[2] Action Local If It Turns on Title to or Possession of Real Property

An action must be wholly local in nature to be governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953]* . An action is local when it turns on title to property as distinct from a personal obligation, and the decree operates by its own force on the title [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 604, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Thielen v. Superior Court (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 217, 219, 33 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . Whether an action is local as opposed to transitory is to be determined on the basis of the relief sought [*Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.15[3]*]. One example of a local action would be when a complaint has for its sole and exclusive object the cancellation of a deed or a deed of trust [*Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 359, 282 P.2d 201* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.15[2]*].

[3] Action Not Local If Title or Possession Incidentally Involved

When title to or possession of real property is only incidentally involved, an action is not local [*Marcacci v. Continental Baking Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 224, 226, 20 Cal. Rptr. 567]* . This distinction is most clearly established when the main relief sought consists of a money judgment. For example, an action for the specific performance of a contract for the sale of realty is not local if it is brought by the vendor, since the vendor merely seeks

the purchase price. Conversely, if the action is brought by the vendee, it is local because the vendee seeks possession of the property [*Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 309, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409]* . Similarly, an action for damages for deceit in inducing a vendee to purchase real property, rather than for rescission and restitution resulting in reconveyance, is not a local action [*Kaluzok v. Brisson (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 760, 763-764, 167 P.2d 481* ; *see Etter v. Vollmer (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 718, 720, 294 P.2d 55* (action for fraud with respect to conveyance of real property local if vendee seeks to reobtain title)]. For a discussion of how the characterization of the relief controls venue, see the discussion in *§ 571.15[3]*.

By contrast, the fact that recovery of a money judgment is sought does not necessarily mean that an action is not local if the judgment is predicated on damages to real property [*Strosnider v. Pomin (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 103, 109, 89 P.2d 179* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* (action for injury to real property also local action); *see* discussion in *§ 571.15[3]* for main relief rule, and § 571.17[4] for an injury to real property]. Further, the local nature of an action is not changed because benefits may incidentally be ordered restored to a defendant in an action in which the main relief sought is the cancellation of a deed and corresponding contract of sale [*Etter v. Vollmer (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 718, 720, 294 P.2d 55]* . Also, allegations of costs and attorney's fees, and claims for punitive damages that are incidental to a claim of injury to real property does not destroy the essential character of an action as one within the scope of *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* [*Wick v. Mattison (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 608, 610, 24 Cal. Rptr. 677]* .

[4] Injury to Real Property

[a] Broadly Construed

The phrase "injury to real property" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* is not limited to physical injury to or interference with the land. It embraces every wrong that in legal contemplation is an injury to real property. It includes not only direct and forcible injury, but consequential and threatened injuries to land. It even includes mere nonfeasance, such as permissive waste [*Coley v. Hecker (1928) 206 Cal. 22, 28, 272 P. 1045* ; *Strosnider v. Pomin (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 103, 108, 89 P.2d 179]* . One example of consequential injuries would be when a plaintiff brings an action for damages because he or she was fraudulently compelled by the defendant to dismiss a prior action to quiet title to a right of way. If the defendant thereafter erected an obstruction on the right of way, any injury to the real property represented by the obstruction is a consequential injury resulting from the defendant's fraud, and plaintiff's action for damages is a local one under *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* [*Strosnider v. Pomin (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 103, 108, 89 P.2d 179]* .

Slander of title is also considered an indirect and consequential injury to real property [*Wick v. Mattison (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 608, 610, 24 Cal. Rptr. 677* ; *see Coley v. Hecker (1928) 206 Cal. 22, 26, 28, 272 P. 1045* (slander of title is a local action also on the theory that the action is one in which determination of an owner's right or interest in title is properly adjudicated)]. Similarly, a malicious prosecution action for damages has been found to be an action for injury to real property when it flows from an unfounded action to set aside a trustee's sale on the false ground that there was no default under a trust deed [*Wick v. Mattison (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 608, 609-610, 24 Cal. Rptr. 677]* .

[b] Construction Defects

Injury to real property includes actions for damage to buildings affixed to real property based on construction defects [*see Foundation Engineers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 104, 111-113, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469]* .

[5] Pleading Requirement for Unlawful Detainer Actions in Limited Civil Cases

Venue in unlawful detainer actions is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)* [*Childs v. Eltinge (1973) 29 Cal. App. 3d 843, 851, 105 Cal. Rptr. 864]* .

Complaints for unlawful detainer actions that are limited civil cases (i.e., damages claimed are $25,000 or less) must state facts, verified by the plaintiff's oath or by the oath of the plaintiff's attorney, showing that the action has been

commenced in the proper court for the trial of the action or proceeding, and showing that the action is an action for an unlawful detainer [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 86(a)(4), 396a*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1161* (unlawful detainer defined)]. Alternatively, the facts may be stated in an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) of the plaintiff or his or her attorney filed with the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a(a)*].

For forms and discussion relating to allegation of proper venue in unlawful detainer actions,*see* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions* .

[6] Foreclosure of Liens and Mortgages on Real Property

Subject to the courts' power to transfer actions and proceedings as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the county in which the real property, or some part thereof, which is the subject of the action is situated, is the proper county for trial for the foreclosure of all liens and mortgages on real property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*, every judicial, ministerial and executive official act necessary to effect a foreclosure may be performed in any county in which any part of real property is situated [*Goldtree v. McAlister (1890) 86 Cal. 93, 106, 24 P. 801]* .

A complaint in an action to foreclose a mechanic's lien on real property may also seek a personal judgment for the amount of the debt secured by the lien without removing the action from *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*. As long as the complaint also alleges that the defendants against whom the personal judgment is sought also have an interest in the property, and as long as that the interest is subject to the lien, the action is still one to foreclose a lien; therefore it must be tried in the county in which the real property is situated [*Case v. Kirkwood (1931) 119 Cal. App. 207, 211, 6 P.2d 110]* .

[7] Where Cause Arose

[a] Actions for Penalty or Forfeiture

Subject to the courts' power to transfer actions and proceedings as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the county in which the cause, or some part of the cause, arose is the proper county for the trial for the recovery of a penalty or forfeiture imposed by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393*].

If the penalty or forfeiture is imposed for an offense committed on a lake, river, or other stream of water situated in two or more counties, the action may be tried in any county bordering on the lake, river, or stream, and opposite to the place where the offense was committed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(a)*].

[b] Actions Against Public Officers

Subject to the power of the court to transfer actions and proceedings as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the county in which the cause, or some part of the cause, arose, is the proper county for the trial against a public officer or person especially appointed to execute his or her duties, for an act done by him or her by virtue of his or her office, or against a person who, by his or her command or in his or her aid, does anything touching the duties of an officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*; *Colusa Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Superior Court (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 880, 887-888, 277 Cal. Rptr. 110]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b) applies to acts by a public officer that directly interfere with the personal rights or property of the person complaining [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 768, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* . For example, *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* would apply in an action against a state agency that deprives the plaintiff of his or her right to do business, and the county where the plaintiff carries on the business and in which he or she will be hurt by the agency's action is the proper county for trial [*Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 538, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457* ; *see Colusa Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Superior Court*

(1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 880, 888, 277 Cal. Rptr. 110] . However, *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* only applies to affirmative acts, that is, acts done as distinguished from acts threatened. Thus, when a petitioner seeks a writ of prohibition to restrain a state board from taking further action, *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* does not apply [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 768, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

[c] "Public Officer" Defined

A "public officer" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)* is not restricted to individuals. Absent a statutory designation of an administrative or enforcement officer, the term "public officer" also includes state agencies, departments, institutions, boards, or other public entities. This is the case even if an entity's individual members are not "public officers," as long as members collectively constitute the entity [*see* *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 537-538, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457* (giving as an example of an administrative or enforcement officer the Director of Agriculture, who serves as the chief executive of the Department of Agriculture under *Food & Agric. Code § 102*); Director has since been retitled as Secretary by 1993 Stats., ch. 42]. Thus, the governing board of a school district is a "public officer" within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)* [*Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182* ; *see* *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534-539, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457* (Regents of the University of California are a "public officer" under *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*)].

[8] Actions Against Personal Representative or Trustee

Except as otherwise provided in *Prob. Code § 17005* (venue for proceedings brought under the Trust Law), when a defendant is sued in an official or representative capacity as executor, administrator, guardian, conservator, or trustee on a claim for the payment of money or for the recovery of personal property, the county that has jurisdiction of the estate that the defendant represents shall be the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*; *see Prob. Code § 15000 et seq.* (Trust Law); for discussion of proceedings under the Trust Law, including venue for those proceedings,*see* Ch. 560, *Trusts: Express, Public, Charitable, and Totten Trusts*]. The word "claim" as it is used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1* does not have any technical meaning. It is commonly defined to mean simply a demand for something rightfully or allegedly due. Therefore, application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1* is not limited only to suits on rejected creditor's claims. For example, an action against an administratix and her attorney for the value of tax services performed for an estate is properly brought in the county that has jurisdiction over the estate [*Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 30, 36-37 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbateProcedures in ProbateGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstReal Property LawFinancingMortgages & Other Security InstrumentsForeclosuresGeneral OverviewReal Property LawLandlord & TenantLandlord's Remedies & RightsEviction ActionsForcible Entry & Detainer

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.18

§ 571.18 Venue Governed by Party

[1] Domestic Corporations

[a] Principal Place of Business or County Where Cause of Action Arises

A corporation or association may be sued in the county where the contract is made or is to be performed, where the obligation or liability arises, where the breach occurs, or in the county where the corporation's principal place of business is situated, subject to the power of the court to change the place of trial as in other cases [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5 governs venue in transitory actions against corporations [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 927, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions]. Its effect is to authorize plaintiffs to sue either at the place where the cause of action arises, or at the corporation's place of business [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 476, 241 P.2d 4* (decided under former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16, now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*)]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* appears to be addressing contract actions, it also governs actions sounding in tort [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* .

The object of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* is to permit an action against a corporation to be brought in a county other than that of the corporation's principal place of business, and thus permit a wider venue than is afforded in actions against individual defendants [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 469, 241 P.2d 4* ; *Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see also* discussion in *§ 571.15[1][a]* regarding alternate venues in contract actions]. Further, the contract provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is not applicable in an action commenced solely against a corporate defendant, because it would be in direct conflict with *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*. Unlike Code Civ. Proc. *§ 395(a), Code Civ. Proc.* § 395.5 allows suit to be brought in the county where the contract is to be performed without any condition that the county must be specified in writing in the contract. Thus, if *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* were applied to these types of actions, it would negate this provision [*see* *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 470-473, 241 P.2d 4* (decided under former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16, now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*); *see* discussion in *§ 571.16[3]* for rules on contract actions].

For a discussion of how *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* may govern venue in actions in which corporate and individual defendants are joined, *see* the discussion in *§ 571.20[3][b]*.

[b] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

As in the contract provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, the last act necessary to the validity of the contract, usually the act constituting acceptance, is the place of its making under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*. Further, it is the defendant's performance that is determined under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* [*Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192]* . However, unlike Code Civ. Proc. *§ 395(a), Code Civ. Proc.* § 395.5 does not contain any provision for a special contract in writing, and therefore, in an action on the contract of a corporation, where no place of performance is expressly stipulated, it will be held performable in the place where the circumstances, viewed in light of pertinent code provisions, indicate that the parties expected or intended it to be performed [*Burr v. Western States Life Ins. Co. (1931) 211 Cal. 568, 574, 296 P. 273]* . For example, *Com. Code § 2319(1)(a)* indicates that in certain f.o.b. shipments, a seller completes delivery, and no longer bears the risk, when it places goods in the possession of a carrier at the place of shipment. Thus, the place of performance is the county from which shipment is being made. It is not the county in which the shipment is to be delivered to the buyer [*see* *Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192* (also holding that the place where the shipment is to be delivered to buyer is not an accurate assessment of the place of breach)]. For a discussion of venue in contract actions in other cases, see the discussion in *§ 571.16[3]*.

[c] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

The place where the contract is made generally is the place where the obligation or liability arises [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 479, 241 P.2d 4]* . Further, *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* permits tort claims against a corporation to be tried in any county in which the liability arises. Thus, in an action for wrongful interference with contractual relations when the cause of action is based on an intimidating letter sent to persons in several counties, venue is properly laid in any of the counties in which the plaintiff suffered injury resulting from the letters [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* .

[d] Where Breach Occurs

In general, the place of performance is also where the breach occurs [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 479, 241 P.2d 4]* . However, it may also occur in the county in which a corporation has its principal place of business, as when the corporation mails a notice of repudiation to plaintiff from its office in that county [*Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 724, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192]* .

[e] Effect of Alter Ego Allegation

In an action for breach of contract, an alter ego allegation places the individual in the same position as the corporation, as a party to a contract. Venue is then proper where the action could be laid for breach of contract against either the individual or corporate defendant [*Lebastchi v. Superior Court (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1465, 1467, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 787]* . If there is only one cause of action alleged against the individual and corporation, the suit does not constitute a "mixed action," which could be transfered to the individual defendant's county of residence [*Lebastchi v. Superior Court (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1465, 1470, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 787* (denying change of venue from San Diego County, where corporation entered, performed, and breached contract to Placer County, where individual defendant lived)].

[2] Foreign Corporations

A foreign corporation may invoke *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* in the same manner as a domestic corporation, provided the foreign corporation establishes that it has qualified to do business in California under *Corp. Code § 2105* [*see* *Easton*

v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642 (decided under former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16*, now *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, and former Corp. Code § 6403, now *Corp. Code § 2105*); for forms and discussion relating to qualification under *Corp. Code § 2105*, *see* Ch. 160, *Corporations: Capacity*]. The designation of the foreign corporation's principal place of business in California is contained in the statement that it must file with the Secretary of State pursuant to *Corp. Code § 2105* to qualify to do business in the state [*Bohn v. Better Biscuits (1938) 26 Cal. App. 2d 61, 64, 78 P.2d 1177* (decided under former *Civ. Code § 405*, now *Corp. Code § 2105*)]. However, a foreign corporation that does not establish that it has qualified to do business in California under *Corp. Code § 2105* may be sued in any county in the state [*Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246-247, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642]* .

[3] Unincorporated Associations

An unincorporated association means an unincorporated group of two or more persons joined by mutual consent for a common lawful purpose, whether organized for profit or not [*Corp. Code § 18035* (formerly *Corp. Code § 24000*); *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 227, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* . Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* actions may be brought against unincorporated associations in the county where a contract is made, where the obligation or liability arises, or where the breach occurs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*; *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 225, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* .

In applying the "liability or obligation" language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* to a lawsuit seeking to enforce a statutory obligation or liability against an unincorporated association, there is no reason to try to pigeonhole the action into contract, quasi-contract, or tort categories; instead, statutory liability cases should be analyzed independently for purposes of determining proper venue. An action for declaratory relief against an insurer may be commenced in the county where a third party claimant sues, because that is where the insurer's liability arises; the same rule should be applied where the obligation is created by a statute rather than an insurance contract. The "obligation or liability" provision of section 395.5 does not require that the defendant perform any act inside the county for venue to be proper; it merely requires that the obligation arise there [*Black Diamond Asphalt, Inc. v. Superior Court of San Joaquin County (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 166, 171, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5 also provides an alternative to lay venue in the county of the principal place of business, but this alternative applies only to corporations by its terms and does not apply to unicorporated associations [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 225, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* . However, if an unincorporated association has filed a statement with the Secretary of State pursuant to *Corp. Code § 18200* (formerly *Corp. Code § 24003*) listing its principal office in California, the proper county for the trial of an action against the unincorporated association is the same as it would be if the unincorporated association were a corporation. Thus, if the unincorporated association has a statement on file, the county of its principal place of business is a proper county for venue. For the purpose of determining the proper county, the principal place of business of the unincorporated association will be deemed to be the principal office in California listed in the statement [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.2*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[1]* regarding venue governed by actions involving domestic corporations]. For forms and discussion relating to the effect of *Corp. Code § 18200* statements on venue in actions against partnerships,*see* Ch. 402, *Partnerships: Actions Between General Partners and Partnership and Third Parties* . If an unincorporated association has no principal place of business, venue is proper in the county of residence of any member of the association [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 229 n.7, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* .

As with corporations, when a plaintiff brings an action against several defendants, including both individuals and unincorporated associations, in a county that is neither the residence nor principal place of business of any defendant, the individual defendant has the right, on a proper showing, to a change of venue to the county of his or her residence even though venue as initially laid may otherwise be justifiable on one of the four alternative grounds provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 226, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[1][a]* regarding principle place of business or county where action arises].

Conversely, however, when an action is brought in the county in which an individual partner resides rather than in the county specified as the principal place of business, the individual partners have no right to a change of venue to the location of the office [*Buran Equipment Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1666-1667, 236 Cal. Rptr. 171]* .

[3A] Limited Liability Companies

The statute governing venue for corporations and associations, *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, does not expressly state that this section is applicable to limited liability companies [*see Corp. Code § 17000 et seq.*]. However, the term "association" may be broadly interpreted to include limited liability companies within the scope of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* [*see, e.g., Buran Equipment Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1665-1666, 236 Cal. Rptr. 171* (law partnership treated as "association" under related statute)]. As such, the provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* and cases interpreting it would likely apply to limited liability companies.

Note that the discussion of unincorporated associations in [3], above, highlights the language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* that provides for additional venue "[i]n the county where the principal place of business of such corporation is situated ...," and that one court interpreted this alternative to lay venue did not apply to unincorporated associations because the clause only states "corporation" by its own terms [*see Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 225, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* . However, venue for an unincorporated association is the same as a corporation if the unincorporated association has filed a statement with the Secretary of State designating its principal office in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.2*]. Given that a limited liability company must file articles of organization with the Secretary of State [*see Corp. Code § 17050*], it is probable that a limited liability company will be treated like a corporation for venue purposes, but clarification of this issue awaits a judicial decision or amendments to the Code of Civil Procedure and/or Corporations Code.

[4] State or Local Government or Agency

[a] Actions Against State

Unless otherwise designated by statute, the provisions for venue that pertain to other civil actions apply to actions against the state and its agencies [*Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534-535, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions, and § 571.17 regarding local actions]. For example, proceedings for writs of mandate and prohibition to compel a state agency to take or refrain from taking certain action are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)* [*Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 500-503, 186 Cal. Rptr. 335, 651 P.2d 1141]* .

There are several statutes covering actions against state agencies, officers, or public entities which operate to override the ordinary venue rules [*Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534-535, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457]* . For example, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060.5*, declaratory actions to establish nonresident tax status can only be commenced in Sacramento, San Francisco, or Los Angeles. Similarly, *Gov. Code § 955* provides that the place of trial of many actions against the state must be changed to Sacramento County on written demand by the Attorney General [*Gov. Code § 955*; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[4][c]* regarding an action against a state for inverse condemnation, and § 571.18[4][d] regarding an action against a state for money or damages]. However, whenever any law of California provides that an action or proceeding against the state or a department, institution, board, commission, bureau, officer or other agency thereof shall or may be commenced in, tried in, or removed to the County of Sacramento, the same may be commenced and tried in any city or city and county of California in which the Attorney General has an office, that is, in the City and County of San Francisco, Los Angeles County, or Sacramento County [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1)*; *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 762, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

[b] Actions by State

Whenever any law of California provides that the state or a department, institution, board, commission, bureau, officer, or other agency thereof shall or may commence an action or proceeding in Sacramento County, the same, on motion of the defendants or some of them, shall be removed for trial to the county or city and county in which the Attorney General has an office nearest to the county in which the defendants or some of them reside or have their principal office in California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401(2)*; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[4*] for discussion of actions against a state or local government agency].

[c] Action Against State for Inverse Condemnation

The proper court for trial of actions against the state for the taking or damaging of private property for public use is a court of competent jurisdiction in the county in which the property is situated [*Gov. Code § 955*].

[d] Action Against State for Money or Damages

Except as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 955.2* and *955.3*, on written demand of the Attorney General made on or before answering, the place of trial in actions other than those for for inverse condemnation shall be changed to Sacramento County [*Gov. Code § 955*]. Because this provision names Sacramento County, *Code Civ. Proc. § 401* applies, and the proper venue is either Sacramento, San Francisco, or Los Angeles [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 766, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

This is the general rule of venue in many actions against the state. However, it relates only to actions on claims for money or damages forwhich the filing of a claim is a statutory prerequisite under *Gov. Code §§ 905* (local public entities) and 905.2 (state), or in actions on claims for money or damages which are specifically exempted from the filing requirement, such as the specifically enumerated matters in *Gov. Code §§ 905* and *905.1* [*Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 499, 186 Cal. Rptr. 335, 651 P.2d 1141]* . Thus, for example, *Gov. Code § 955* will not support a change of venue in a proceeding for writs of mandate and prohibition to compel a state agency to take or refrain from taking certain action, because the proceeding is not a claim for money or damages for which the filing of a claim is a statutory prerequisite or one that is specifically exempted from the filing requirement [*Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 500-503, 186 Cal. Rptr. 335, 651 P.2d 1141* (holding proper statute to be *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*, governing venue in actions against public officers)]. For forms and discussion relating to claims requirements against the state and local public entities,*see Ch. 464, Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act, § 464.20* et seq.

[e] Action for Death or Injury to Person or Personal Property

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when the state is named as a defendant in any action or proceeding for death or injury to person or personal property and the injury or the injury causing death occurred within the state, the proper court for the trial of the action is a court of competent jurisdiction in the county where the injury occurred or where the injury causing death occurred. The court may, on motion, change the place of the trial in the same manner and under the same circumstances as the place of trial may be changed where an action is between private parties [*Gov. Code § 955.2*].

For forms and discussion relating to claims for money damages against the state for an injury for which it is liable,*see Ch. 464, Public Entities and Officers: California Tort Claims Act, § 464.20* et seq.

[f] Action by Local Government or Agency Against State

Notwithstanding any provision of law, when a city, county, city and county, or local agency is a plaintiff in an action or proceeding against the state, the action may be tried in any city or county, or city and county, where the city, county, city and county, or local agency is situated [*Gov. Code § 955.3*].

The Attorney General may, on behalf of the State of California, before answering, move to change the place of trial to Sacramento County, San Francisco County, or Los Angeles County in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 397* [*Gov. Code § 955.3*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 401* (when proper place of trial is Sacramento, action may be moved to either Sacramento, San Francisco, or Los Angeles)].

For the purposes of *Gov. Code § 955.3*, "local agency" means any governmental district, board or agency, or any other local governmental body or corporation or elected local public official, but shall not include the state or any of its agencies, departments, commissions, or boards, or elected public officials in the executive branch of the state government [*Gov. Code § 955.3*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenuePublic OfficialsReal Property LawInverse CondemnationProcedure

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.19

§ 571.19 Actions Involving City or County

[1] Transfer to Neutral County

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 is a mass of cumbersome phraseology [*Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 953 n.3, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* ; *Fitzpatrick v. Sonoma County (1929) 97 Cal. App. 588, 590, 276 P. 113]* . Generally, it provides that actions by or against a city, county, or other local government entity must be transferred to a neutral county [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394*; *see San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 296, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 394* as mandatory)]. A neutral county is other than that in which the plaintiff is situated, and other than that in which the defendant or defendants reside [*City of Stockton v. Wilson (1926) 79 Cal. App. 422, 424, 249 P. 835]* . The neutral county is selected by the trial court [*Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 702, 706, 148 Cal. Rptr. 801]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 is a removal or change of venue statute that comes into operation only when the action is filed in a county that is proper under venue rules [*County of San Bernardino v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 378, 381, 388-389, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 760* ; *Dorame v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 70, 72, 146 Cal. Rptr. 162]* . This is confirmed by the proviso "subject to the power of the court to transfer actions and proceedings as provided in this title" contained in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392, 393*, and *395*. Thus, these statutes, which specify the proper county for initial filing of an action, are subject to the court's power to transfer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* [*County of Riverside v. Superior Court (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 828, 831, 447 P.2d 626* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions, and § 571.17 regarding local actions]. Construing *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* to require the plaintiff to commence the case in a venue chosen according to the usual rules precludes the plaintiff from unilaterally choosing venue by selecting the neutral county most satisfactory to it, and allows the court to exercise its discretion not only in selecting an appropriate neutral county, but also with respect to the option of requesting appointment of a neutral judge [*County of San Bernardino v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 378, 388-389, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 760]* .

It has been held that *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*, which refers specifically only to plaintiffs and defendants, applies to cross complainants and cross defendants [*Ohio Casualty Ins. Group v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 444, 451, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 771* (Third Dist.; criticizing and declining to follow *City of Chico v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App.*

3d 187, 152 Cal. Rptr. 380 (First Dist. Div. Four)) ; *Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 956, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* (First Dist., Div. Five; following *Ohio Casualty*)].

The residence venue provisions in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* are subordinate to the local venue provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* in mixed venue cases involving both provisions [*Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 702, 705, 148 Cal. Rptr. 801]* . Further, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* modifies the venue rules in local actions. Thus, eminent domain proceedings properly brought in the county where the property sought to be taken is located may be transferred on a motion by the plaintiff county to a neutral county [*City of Stockton v. Ellingwood (1926) 78 Cal. App. 117, 121, 248 P. 272* ; *see City of Stockton v. Wilson (1926) 79 Cal. App. 422, 424, 249 P. 835* (holding that if land is situated in neutral county, no purpose would be served by transfer to another neutral county); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1250.020* (venue in eminent domain proceedings)].

[2] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against City, County, or Local Agency

An action or proceeding against a county, city and county, city, or local agency, may be tried in that county or city and county, or in the county in which the city or local agency is situated, unless the action or proceeding is brought by a county, city and county, city, or local agency, in which case it may be tried in any county, or city and county, not a party to the action and in which the city or local agency is not situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*].

Thus, a plaintiff, other than a city, county, or other government entity located in the county, is permitted to commence and proceed to trial in an action or proceeding against a city, county, or other government entity, in the defendant county [*Fitzpatrick v. Sonoma County (1929) 97 Cal. App. 588, 276 P. 113]* . However, an action pitting a government entity against another government entity may not be brought in the home county of the plaintiff government entity [*see Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 268, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847]* .

[3] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against Resident of or Corporation Doing Business in Another City, County, or Local Agency

[a] General Rule

Whenever an action or proceeding is brought by a county, city and county, city, or local agency within a certain county or city and county, against a resident of another county, city and county, or city, or against a corporation doing business in the latter, the action or proceeding must, on motion of either party, be transferred for trial to a county or city and county, other than the plaintiff, if the plaintiff is a county or city and county, and other than that in which the plaintiff is situated, if the plaintiff is a city or a local agency, and other than that in which the defendant resides, or is doing business, or is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*; *see Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 953-964, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* (applying this provision)].

The determination of whether an action is brought by a county agency within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* depends on the role of that county agency within the lawsuit [*Transamerica Homefirst, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 577, 579-580, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705]* . Thus, for example, it has been held that when a district attorney represents the People of the State of California in a red light abatement action pursuant to *Pen. Code § 11226*, the district attorney acts on behalf of the state rather than the county and thus the mandatory transfer provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* do not apply, so that, red light abatement actions are exempt from the mandatory transfer provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* [*Nguyen v. Superior Court (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1784, 1786-1791, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611* (*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(c)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 394(b)*) specifically excludes state action from the mandatory transfer provision; court may still transfer action on showing of prejudice under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*)]. Similarly, when an action is brought on behalf of a conservatee by the county's public guardian against a nonresident defendant, the action is not one brought by a county agency, within the meaning of section 394, and the action need not

be transferred pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* [*Transamerica Homefirst, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 577, 579-581, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705]* .

Section 394 provides for an exception for actions initiated by the district attorney under several Welfare and Institutions Code sections relating to paternity and child support [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]. These sections, however, have been repealed [*see* Stats. 1999, ch. 478, §§ 8, 9, 24, 33]. The new statutory scheme that replaced those statutes and moved the responsibility for enforcement from the district attorneys to local child support agencies, has a venue provision that applies notwithstanding any other law [*see Fam. Code § 17400(n)*]. For discussion of that provision, *see Ch. 259, Family Law Enforcement: Special Remedies for Support Enforcement, § 259.153[4][d]*.

Where a local agency files a compulsory cross-complaint asserting a claim in the county where it resides against a nonresident of that county, the cross-defendant has the right to move for a change of venue pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* [*Metropolitan Transit System v. Superior Court (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 293, 304, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 517]* .

[b] Corporate Defendants

Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a) applies whenever an action or proceeding is brought by a county, city and county, city, or local agency within a certain county or city and county, against a corporation doing business in the latter [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]. However, a defendant corporations's rights under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* may be barred because of the existence, nature, and extent of its activities within the forum county. Activities sufficient to raise this bar are referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* as "doing business" within the county [*San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 297-298, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1]* . Whether a corporation is "doing business" is not determined by the minimum-contacts test used to establish jurisdiction. Nor is merely holding oneself out to others as engaged in the selling of goods or services sufficient [*Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 270, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847]* . Instead, "doing business" is defined in light of the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*, and thus the standard turns on the extent to which the corporation is viewed as an outsider by the community [*San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 298, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *see Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 957-958, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817]* .

The test is whether a corporation's activities are such that the corporation is reasonably likely to be viewed as an outsider, not whether it is actually so viewed. Thus, a corporation is doing business in the community for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* only if its activities in the county are substantial enough that the corporation can reasonably be viewed as being intimately identified with the affairs, or closely associated with the people of the community [*San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court of Alameda County (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271 n.7, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847]* . For example, it may become intimately identified with the affairs of a community, and closely associated with the people of the community if it owns a farm in the communtiy and grows products on the farm rather than engaging in carrying on a store or conducting a mill or foundry in the same community [*Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 270, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847]* . It is the quality of the business connections, however, and not their quantity or duration, that determines whether a party is doing business locally. The qualitative analysis must focus on whether the types of contacts with the county are substantial enough for the company to be reasonably viewed as closely associated with the community [*Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 961, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817]* . If the defendant corporation is thus viewed as closely related to the communtiy, there is less likelihood of the local bias that *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is designed to prevent [*San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1]* .

Moreover, the relevant inquiry under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* includes an analysis of the nature of the litigation as well as the activities of the party seeking a change of venue. When the nature of the case poses a reasonable risk that the defendant would be viewed as an outsider, a change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* is proper [*see* *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299-301, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ;

Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 963-964, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817] .

[4] Actions Against City, County, or Local Agency

Whenever an action or proceeding is brought against a county, city and county, city, or local agency, in any county or city and county, other than defendant if the defendant is a county or city and county, or, if the defendant is a city, or local agency, other than that in which defendant is situated, the action or proceeding must be, on motion of the defendant, transferred for trial to a county, or city and county, other than that in which the plaintiff, or any of the plaintiffs, resides, is doing business, or is situated, and other than the plaintiff county, city and county, or county in which the plaintiff city or local agency is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*].

This provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* contains a proviso that states that any action or proceeding against the city, county, city and county, or local agency for injury occurring within the city, county, or city and county, or within the county in which the local agency is situated, to person or property caused by the negligence or alleged negligence of such city, county, city and county, local agency, or its agents or employees, shall be tried in that county, or city and county, or if a city is a defendant, in that city or in the county in which the city is situated, or if a local agency is a defendant, in the county in which the local agency is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*]. This provision is an exception to the general venue statute (*Code Civ. Proc. § 395*), which permits venue either in the county where the injury occurs or the injury causing death occurs or the county in which the defendants, or some of them, reside at the commencement of the action. For example, if a plaintiff sues both a county and individual defendants who reside outside the county for injuries occurring within the county, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* requires the suit to be tried in defendant county, even though the general venue rules would have permitted trial in the county where the individual defendants reside [*County of Orange v. Superior Court (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1192-1193, 86 Cal. Rptr.2d 923]* . Despite the mandatory language of this particular provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*, a plaintiff may nevertheless seek and obtain a change of venue to another county under the discretionary provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)* [*see Paesano v. Superior Court (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 17, 19-20, 250 Cal. Rptr. 842* ; *see § 571.100* for form and discussion in *§ 571.34*].

If a plaintiff sues a county or local agency for injuries occurring within the county where the public agency is located, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* requires the suit to be tried in the defendant county; and Section 394 unequivocally provides that an action brought against a county or local governmental agency for personal injuries occurring in the county must be brought in that county [*Ventura Unified School District v. Superior Court (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 811, 814, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260]* . However, despite the mandatory language of Section 394, the right to transfer may be waived if there is unreasonable delay [*Ventura Unified School District v. Superior Court (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 811, 814, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260* , citing *Newman v. County of Sonoma (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 625, 627-628, 15 Cal. Rptr. 914]* .

[5] Stipulation as to Place of Trial

In actions referred to in *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*, the parties may, by stipulation in writing, or made in open court, and entered in the minutes, agree on any county, or city and county, for the place of trial thereof [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*; *Newman v. County of Sonoma (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 625, 627, 15 Cal. Rptr. 914, 364 P.2d 850]* .

[6] Assignment of Disinterested Judge in Lieu of Transfer

When the action or proceeding is one in which a jury is not of right, or in case a jury is waived, then in lieu of transferring the cause the court in the original county may request the chairman of the Judicial Council to assign a disinterested judge from a neutral county to hear the cause and all proceedings in connection with it [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*].

This clause of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* applies only to actions between the governmental agencies specified in Section

394. The right of a governmental entity that lacks or waives any right to jury trial to have an action transferred or a disinterested judge assigned under Section 394 is not affected by the presence of another party plaintiff who has a right to jury trial. Section 394 does not require an action involving nongovernmental parties plaintiff to be transferred to a different county, so when plaintiffs include both a governmental entity and nongovernmental parties against another governmental entity, the court retains the option of either transferring the case to another county or requesting the assignment of a disinterested judge even though the nongovernmental plaintiff has a right to a jury trial. It is error for the court to deny the governmental entities' motion based on the presence of the nongovernmental party in the action [*see Brennan v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 454, 460-462, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 693]* .

[7] "Local Agency" Defined

For the purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*, "local agency" shall mean any governmental district, board, or agency, or any other local governmental body or corporation, but shall not include the State of California or any of its agencies, departments, commissions or boards [*Code Civ. Proc. § 394(b)*].

[8] Motion to Transfer

[a] Procedure

The procedural requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*, governing motions for change of venue generally, do not govern a motion made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* [*Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 252, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13]* . For example, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* does not prescribe a time within which a motion for transfer to a neutral county must be made, as long as it is made within a reasonable time [*Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 367, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164]* . Thus, the motion need not be made at the time of answer to a complaint or cross complaint as required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*, but may be made within a reasonable time thereafter [*Marin Community College Dist. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 719, 723, 140 Cal. Rptr. 310]* . Similarly, the motion to transfer may be made either before or a reasonable time after a demurrer has been heard and submitted for decision. However, if the motion is made after the demurrer has been heard and submitted to the court, the issues of law raised by the demurrer may be decided by the original court, and the moving party waives his or her right to have them transferred with the action to a neutral county [*see Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 367-369, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164]* .

Although a motion to transfer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* need only be made within a reasonable time, the right to a change of venue may be waived for lack of diligence in prosecuting the motion. Thus, the failure of a party to assert his or her right to a transfer until after a demurrer has been submitted for decision constitutes a waiver of the right as it applies to the trial of the issues of law raised by the demurrer [*Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 368-369, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164]* . Generally, however, the motion will not be denied on the ground that it is untimely unless it is pursued for dilatory purposes and unless the government entity can show substantial prejudice [*Marin Community College Dist. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 719, 723, 140 Cal. Rptr. 310]* .

[b] Burden of Proof

The burden of proof justifying a change of venue rests on the moving party [*Los Angeles v. Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 253, 260, 330 P.2d 888]* . However, the moving party is not required to show possible prejudice [*City of Alameda v. Superior Court (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 312, 317, 116 Cal. Rptr. 806]* . Nor is a defendant in an action brought by a city, county, or other government entity required to prove which counties are residences of other individual defendants, or places of business of corporate defendants. Thus, a defendant is only required to show (1) that the proceeding was brought in the county in which plaintiff government entity was situated, and (2) that the defendant lived in another county [*City of Oakland v. Darbee (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 493, 500, 227 P.2d 909]* . Once the moving party has met his or her burden, change of venue to a neutral county is mandatory [*see San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 296, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* (noting

mandatory change of venue provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 394* (second and third provisions stating that action must be transferred on motion)]. One court has stated the rule as being that under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* prejudice is presumed and the granting of the motion is mandatory unless the trial court finds that the nonmoving party would suffer actual prejudice from the requested change of venue [*Ohio Casualty Ins. Group v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 444, 452, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 771* (*dicta*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.20

§ 571.20 Effect of Joinder on Venue

[1] Mixed Actions

Mixed venue actions occur when a plaintiff alleges two or more causes of action, each of which is governed by a different venue statute, or when two or more defendants are named who are subject to different venue standards [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 488, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272* ; *see also Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 544, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304]* . These situations should be distinguished from cases in which there is only one cause of action, but different forms of relief are sought, thereby calling for application of the main relief rule [*see Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P. 356* (holding that defendant entitled to have action tried in his or her place of residence if plaintiff either joins a cause of action covered by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392* with one that is not so covered, or also seeks a remedy on matters not embraced by the statute); *see also § 571.15[3]* for discussion of Main Relief Rule].

A distinction must also be made in cases in which the complaint sets forth only one cause of action, but states several different legal theories labelled as separate causes of action. For example, in one case plaintiffs' complaint contained "causes of action" for breach of contract, conversion of certain structures and improvements, restoration and reinstallment of the improvements, and waste. The court, however, held that these were not separate causes of action, but alternative methods of pleading the plaintiffs' right to recover a money judgment for an alleged breach of a lease agreement. Therefore, because the plaintiffs had alleged but one wrong, the main relief rule was applied [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Foundation Engineers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 104, 109-113, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469* (and cases cited therein)].

When two or more inconsistent venue provisions apply in same case, a defendant's motion for change of venue must be granted if that defendant is entitled to a change of venue on any one cause of action. For instance, involuntary dissolution of a corporation is a local action, for which the proper venue is the county in which the corporation maintains its principal office. Thus, in an action for involuntary dissolution of a corporation, the corporation was entitled to have venue changed to the county in which it maintained its principal office, even though venue was proper as to nine other causes of action [*Capp Care, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 504, 508, 241 Cal. Rptr.*

741] .

[2] Joinder of Causes of Action

When transitory and local causes of action are joined in a single complaint, the general rule is that the action will be regarded as transitory in determining the place of trial [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions, and § 571.17 regarding local actions]. A plaintiff cannot, by uniting in the complaint matters that form the subject of a transitory action with matters that form subject of a local action, compel the defendant to have both matters tried in a county other than that in which the defendant resides [*Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P. 356* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13]* . Thus, if an action contains both a transitory cause of action and a local cause of action, the defendant is entitled to have the proceeding transferred to the county of his or her residence [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.17[3]* regarding an action is not local if the title or possession is incidentally involved]. For discussion relating to the permissive joinder of actions generally,*see* Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

[3] Joinder of Defendants

[a] General Rule

When there are several defendants who reside in different counties, the plaintiff has the option and the right to commence the action in a county where any one of the defendants may reside [*Taff v. Goodman (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 771, 776, 107 P.2d 431* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. Thus, the defendant is not entitled to have an action removed to the county of his or her residence unless it appears that none of the other defendants are residents of the county where the action was brought. Even when all of the defendants join in a demand for or consent to a change of venue, the cause will be retained if the complaint attempts, in apparent good faith, to state a cause of action against a defendant who resides in the county where the action was commenced. Further, the fact that another and principal defendant resides in another county is immaterial when the defendant who resides in the county in which the action is brought is a necessary and proper party defendant [*Monogram Co. v. Kingsley (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 28, 30, 237 P.2d 265]* .

The plaintiff cannot join as defendants those who are not real parties in interest merely for the purpose of obtaining trial in the county of their residence [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 612, 122 P.2d 557]* .

The test to determine whether the resident defendant has been joined solely for the purpose of having the action tried in the county of his or her residence is whether the plaintiff had a cause of action against him or her [*Russello v. Mori (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 828, 830, 315 P.2d 343* ; *Taff v. Goodman (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 771, 776, 107 P.2d 431]* . If not, it is sufficient evidence to support the finding that the defendant was joined for the purpose of having the trial in a certain county [*Taff v. Goodman (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 771, 776, 107 P.2d 431]* . However, the issue is determined from examination of the pleadings before the court, and a cause of action purported to be stated against the defendant which is apparently pleaded in good faith is sufficient if it is not, prima facie, so glaringly and vitally defective as to be beyond correction by amendment [*Russello v. Mori (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 828, 830, 315 P.2d 343]* .

For a discussion relating to the joinder of parties generally,*see* Ch. 395, *Parties* .

[b] Individual and Corporate Defendants Joined

The general rules governing the effect of joinder of defendants on venue applies whether the defendants are individuals or corporations. Hence, the plaintiff may fix venue at the residence of either the individual or the corporation in an action stated against both, as long as joinder is in conformity with the statutes [*Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 772, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. For example, when a corporation and an

individual are properly joined as defendants, and the action is commenced in a county where the corporation has its principal place of business, but which is not the county of the individual defendant's residence, the individual defendant may not have the action moved to the county of his or her residence based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 472, 241 P.2d 4]* . The principal place of business of a corporation is its residence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, and the preference for residence venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is satisfied when venue is laid in that county [*McClung v. Watt (1922) 190 Cal. 155, 158-159, 211 P. 17* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions].

However, when a plaintiff joins an individual defendant with a corporate defendant, the plaintiff waives the benefit of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, at least in so far as the individual defendant is concerned [*Walker v. Wells Fargo Bk. & U. T. Co. (1937) 24 Cal. App. 2d 220, 222, 74 P.2d 849* (decided under former Cal. Const., art. XXI, § 16)]. Thus, if an action is commenced in a county that, although proper venue as to the corporate defendant under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (that is, where the contract was made or is to be performed, where the obligation or liability arises, or where the breach occurs), is not a proper place of trial for the individual defendant, the latter is entitled, under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, to a change of venue of the entire case to the county of his or her residence [*State v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 637, 642, 60 Cal. Rptr. 653* ; for discussion of venue relating to corporate defendants generally,*see § 571.18[1]*].

[c] State and Corporate Defendants Joined

A plaintiff waives the procedural rights granted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* by joining the state and a corporation as defendants in an action for personal injuries because *Gov. Code § 955.2* (venue in actions against state or state agency for death or injury to a person or personal property), by its terms, takes precedence [*State v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 637, 643, 60 Cal. Rptr. 653]* . For a discussion relating to venue in actions involving the state or state agencies generally, *see* the discussion in *§ 571.18[4]* for actions against a state or local government agency.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesJoinderGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJoinder of Claims & RemediesClaims

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.21-571.29

[Reserved]

§§ 571.21[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.30

§ 571.30 Governing Law

Motions for change of venue are specifically governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396a, 396b, 397,* and *398*. Noticed motions in general are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020,* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100-3.1390*. *Code Civ. Proc. § 399* sets forth the procedure for transmitting the pleadings and papers to other court.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.31

§ 571.31 Grounds for Motion for Change of Venue

The court may, on motion, change the place of trial in the following cases:

- When the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)*].
- When there is reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had therein [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*].
- When the convenience of witnesses and the ends of justice would be promoted by the change [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*].
- When from any cause there is no judge of the court qualified to act [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of PartiesCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of WitnessesCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of JusticeCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.32

§ 571.32 Action Commenced in Wrong Court

[1] Notice of Motion

Except as otherwise provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*, if an action or proceeding is commenced in a court other than the court designated as the proper court for the trial thereof by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the defendant may, at the time he or she answers, demurs, or moves to strike, or, at his or her option, without answering, demurring, or moving to strike and within the time otherwise allowed to respond to the complaint, file with the clerk a notice of motion for an order transferring the action or proceeding to the proper court, together with proof of service, on the adverse party, of a copy of such papers [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(1)* (court may change place of trial when court designated in complaint is not proper court); *see Otsuka v. Balangue (1949) 92 Cal. App. 2d 788, 790, 208 P.2d 65* (holding that service rather than proof of service vests trial court with jurisdiction to act; technical objection to language of affidavit of proof of service disapproved); for discussion of the *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a* exception,*see § 571.45* regarding actions involving installment or automotive sales, consumer obligations, or unlawful detainer]. Alternatively, the parties may first wish to consider entering a stipulation to change venue [*see § 571.105* and discussion in *§ 571.32[2]* regarding expenses and attorney's fees].

A defendant has an absolute right to have an action that is brought against him or her tried in the county where he or she resides, but not in the remedy that secures that right. Thus, the defendant waives the right to have the action tried in the county of his or her residence unless he or she follows the procedure in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a)* and *397* [*Bohn v. Bohn (1913) 164 Cal. 532, 535, 129 P. 981* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16* regarding transitory actions]. For forms and discussion relating to proof of service by mail,*see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* . For a discussion of the required showing by defendant to support a motion for change of venue based on Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396ba and *397(a)*, *see* the discussion in *§ 571.40[2][b]* regarding actions commenced in the wrong court.

On the hearing of a motion for an order transferring the action or proceeding to the proper court, the court shall, if it appears that the action or proceeding was not commenced in the proper court, order the action or proceeding transferred to the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*; *see § 571.41* regarding selection of transferee court].

[2] Expenses and Attorney's Fees

In its discretion, the court may order the payment to the prevailing party of reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making or resisting the motion to transfer whether or not that party is otherwise entitled to recover his or her costs in the action. In determining whether an order for expenses and fees shall be made, the court shall take into consideration (1) whether an offer to stipulate to change of venue was reasonably made and rejected, and (2) whether the motion or selection of venue was made in good faith given the facts and law the party making the motion or selecting the venue knew or should have known. As between the party and his or her attorney, the expenses and fees shall be the personal liability of the attorney not chargeable to the party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*; *see also Lieppman v. Lieber (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 914, 919, 225 Cal. Rptr. 845* (imposition of sanctions as proper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 128.5* against party who makes frivolous motion for change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)*; *see* discussion in *§ 571.33*, regarding convenience of witnesses and ends of justice].

Section 396b(b) sanctions may not be imposed except on notice contained in a party's papers, or on the court's own noticed motion, and after opportunity to be heard [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*].

If the motion or opposition to it is frivolous or otherwise improper, sanctions may also be available under the general provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 128.5* (sanctions for frivolous tactics for cases filed before 1995) and 128.7 (sanctions for frivolous tactics in actions commenced in 1995 through 2005 unless the legislature changes the ending date). For discussion of sanctions under these statutes,*see* Ch. 510, *Sanctions* .

The court may award attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* if, after reviewing the factual and legal presentation made by the losing party, it finds that no reasonable attorney would have honestly chosen the forum, and that it appears to have been selected to impair the defendant's right to defend. The attorney must carefully investigate the facts with a view to determining which court is proper. This task is complete when, following a thorough investigation, the attorney has an honest and reasonable belief that his or her client has a tenable contention, and the attorney believes that he or she can establish the existence of facts supporting the choice of venue to the satisfaction of the court. An attorney is expected to possess knowledge of those plain and elementary principles of law that are commonly known by well-informed attorneys, and to discover those additional rules of law that, although not commonly known, may be readily found by standard research techniques [*Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App.3d Supp. 30, 38-39 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355* ; *Cacciaguidi v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 181, 276 Cal. Rptr. 465* (declining to award attorney's fees on issuing writ of mandate to compel trial court to grant motion when trial court had found real parties' arguments "inventive" and "compelling" and had denied the motion)].

[3] Pleading After Motion Denied

If the motion to transfer is denied, the court shall allow the defendant time to move to strike, demur, or otherwise plead if the defendant has not previously filed a response [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDiscretionCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.33

§ 571.33 Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

Unlike a motion to change venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)*, there is no statutory procedure relating to the filing of a notice of motion to change venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* based on the ground that the convenience of witnesses and the ends of justice would be promoted [*Thompson v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 300, 306, 103 Cal. Rptr. 94* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b* (procedure for noticed motion and hearing when action not commenced in proper court), 397(a) (on motion, court may change place of trial when the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court); *see* discussion in *§ 571.32[1]* regarding notice of motion for an action commenced in a wrong court]. However, it does appear that *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010* (requisites of written notice) governs notices of motion made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* [*see* *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 295, 112 P.2d 328* ; for form,*see § 571.100*].

There is no express time limit within which a notice of motion for change of venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* must be made. However, it must be made within a reasonable time after the answer is filed [*Cooney v. Cooney (1944) 25 Cal. 2d 202, 208, 153 P.2d 334* ; *Thompson v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 300, 306, 103 Cal. Rptr. 94]* . The court cannot entertain a motion for a change of venue on the ground of convenience of witnesses when the defendant has not yet filed an answer, because until the issues are joined, the court cannot determine what testimony will be material [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 214, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* . For similar reasons, the court cannot entertain a *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* motion when the defendant has appeared only by demurrer [*Russello v. Mori (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 828, 832, 315 P.2d 343]* .

The court should not grant a *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* motion unless both the convenience of the witnesses will be served and the ends of justice will be promoted [*Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578]* . In ruling on the motion, the court will normally consider the convenience only of witnesses who are neither parties to the action nor the employees of a party [*see* *Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450* ; *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 773, 23 Cal. Rptr.498* ; *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 279 P.2d 978* ; *see also* *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 611, 328 P.2d 953* (convenience of expert witnesses as not considered except when they have personal knowledge of facts on which their

testimony is to be based)].

An exception to the rule prohibiting consideration of convenience to a party exists when the serious illness of a party will prevent his or her traveling to attend the trial in the other county and when his or her testimony is material [*Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450]* . Likewise, a limited exception allows the court to consider the convenience of witnesses who are employees of a party when the employees are called as witnesses by the adverse party rather than on behalf of their employer [*Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401-402, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450]* . In *Lieberman*, however, the latter exception was held to be inapplicable because the trial court had erroneously granted the cross defendant's motion to change venue of the action for the convenience of its own employees who were to be called as witnesses to establish its defense to the cross complaint. Additionally, the trial court erroneously granted the cross complainant's motion to change venue for the convenience of the same witnesses because the employees would be called to testify by the cross defendant and would be available at that time to the cross complainant [*Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 402-403, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450]* .

The moving party will meet part of his or her burden by showing that the proposed testimony of the witnesses is admissible, relevant, and material to some issue in the case, and that it will be inconvenient for the witnesses to attend trial [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 293, 112 P.2d 328]* . The issue considered by the court is the convenience of witnesses in attending trial as opposed to the places of their actual residences [*Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 293, 112 P.2d 328]* . The witnesses' residence is not determinative, but convenience may be shown by the fact that all the witnesses reside in the county to which the transfer is requested. Further, inconvenience may be presumed from the witnesses' distance from the county where trial is commenced [*Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578]* . For a discussion of the moving party's burden of proof under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*, see the discussion in *§ 571.40[2][c]*.

The moving party may show that the ends of justice will be promoted by demonstrating that delay and expense in court proceedings will be avoided and savings in the witnesses' time and expenses will be affected [*Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 279 P.2d 978]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of PartiesCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of Witnesses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.34

§ 571.34 Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

Apparently, a motion based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)* must be made after the answer has been filed [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal 72, 79]* . It may even be required that the motion be filed after a jury has been impaneled [*see J.I. Case T. Co. v. Copren Bros. (1917) 35 Cal. App. 70, 79, 169 P. 443* (court expressly stating that it did not so hold, but that it knew of no case when there had not been one trial or when some effort had not been made to obtain a jury)]. However, one court has held that there is no necessity to hold a decision on a motion in abeyance until an attempt to secure a fair and impartial jury had been made if, at the hearing, there appears sufficient reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had [*People v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1938) 24 Cal. App. 2d 420, 427, 75 P.2d 560]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of Justice

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.35

§ 571.35 No Judge Qualified to Act

The place of trial may be changed when the judges of the court in which the action is brought are disqualified to try the case [*Hancock v. Burton (1882) 61 Cal. 70, 71* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(d)*]. However, motions based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(d)* rarely occur because a qualified judge from another county may always be assigned even if all the judges are disqualified [*People v. Spring Valley Co. (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 656, 672, 241 P.2d 1069]* . For forms and discussion relating to disqualification of judges,*see* Ch. 317, *Judges* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.36

§ 571.36 Who May Make Motion

When an action is not brought in the proper county, any defendant, without joining any codefendants, may demand a transfer to the proper county [*People v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1938) 24 Cal. App. 2d 420, 424, 75 P.2d 560]* . However, the moving defendant or defendants must show that none of the other defendants reside in the forum [*Goossen v. Clifton (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 44, 51, 170 P.2d 104]* . These rules apply to motions under any of the grounds stated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 397* [*see People v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1938) 24 Cal. App. 2d 420, 424, 75 P.2d 560* (holding that right of defendant to have action tried where land situated or where some of the defendants reside is no higher nor entitled to more protection than right to have it tried where impartial trial may be had)].

A plaintiff may not move to change the place of trial on the ground that he or she has brought the action in the wrong county. However, he or she may move to change the place of trial on the grounds that the convenience of witnesses and ends of justice will be promoted. Further, a plaintiff may demand a transfer on the ground that a fair and impartial trial cannot be had in the county where the action was commenced, or when the plaintiff ascertains the disqualification of the judge [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 79* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 397*].

A plaintiff/cross-defendant against whom a compulsory cross-complaint has been filed is not entitled to seek a change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b* based on a claim of improper venue as determined by reference to the cross-complaint. Rather, the cross-complaint is to be tried in the same county that has been established as the proper venue based on the original complaint [*K.R.L. Partnership v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 490, 498, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 517]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.37

§ 571.37 Costs and Fees of Transfer

When a transfer is sought on any ground specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)-(d)*, the costs and fees of the transfer, and of filing the papers in the court to which the transfer is ordered, shall be paid at the time the motion is filed by the party making the motion for the transfer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

When the transfer is sought solely, or is ordered, because the action was commenced in a court other than that designated as proper by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the costs and fees, including any expenses and attorney's fees awarded defendant pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*, shall be paid by the plaintiff before the transfer is made [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*; *see § 571.32[2]* regarding expenses and attorney's fees]. If in any such case, the defendant has paid costs and fees at the time of filing the notice of motion, the costs and fees are to be repaid to him or her on the making of the order. If the plaintiff has not so paid the costs and fees within five days after service of notice of the order, then any other party interested therein, whether named in the complaint as a party or not, may pay the costs and fees, and the clerk shall then transmit the papers and pleadings as if the costs and fees had been originally paid by the plaintiff. In that case, the costs and fees shall be a proper item of costs of the party who paid them, recoverable by that party in the event he or she prevails in the action. Otherwise, the costs and fees shall be offset against and deducted from the amount, if any, awarded the plaintiff in the event the plaintiff prevails against that party in the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

The action shall not be further prosecuted in any court until the costs and fees are paid. If they are not paid within 30 days after service of notice of the order, or if a petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 400* is filed in the trial court or an appeal is taken pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.2*, then within 30 days after notice of the finality of the order of transfer, the court on a duly noticed motion by any party may dismiss the action without prejudice to the cause. The dismissal will be on the condition that no other action on the cause may be commenced in another court prior to satisfaction of the court's order for costs and fees. If a petition for a writ of mandate or appeal does not result in a stay of proceedings, the time for payment of costs shall be 60 days after service of the notice of the order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.38

§ 571.38 Power of Court Limited by Motion

The filing of motion for change of venue suspends the power of the trial court to act on any other question until the motion has been determined [*Moore v. Powell (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 583, 587, 138 Cal. Rptr. 914* ; *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 368, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164]* . Aside from certain exceptions provided for in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(c)* and *397(e)*, any order of the court made prior to the determination of the motion is a nullity [*Beard v. Superior Court (1940) 39 Cal. App. 2d 284, 286, 102 P.2d 1087]* . For example, the court has no authority to issue a temporary restraining order relating to the main action after a notice of motion for transfer has been filed [*County of Riverside v. Superior Court (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 828, 831, 73 Cal. Rptr. 386, 447 P.2d 626]* . Similarly, the court may not issue an order passing on a demurrer to the complaint [*see City of Oakland v. Darbee (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 493, 503, 227 P.2d 909* (also holding that rule inapplicable to motion made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsAuthority to Adjudicate

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.39

§ 571.39 Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue

[1] In General

In any case, if an answer is filed, the court may consider opposition to the motion to transfer, if any, and may retain the action in the county where commenced if it appears that the convenience of the witnesses or the ends of justice will thereby be promoted [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)*].

[2] By Counteraffidavit or Declaration

If the defendant's motion is made on the ground that (1) an impartial trial cannot be had, (2) that the change will promote the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice, or (3) that no judge of the court is qualified to act, the plaintiff may file counteraffidavits in response to the defendant's motion. However, the plaintiff may not respond with a countermotion [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 76* ; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397(b)* (impartial trial), 397(c) (convenience of witnesses and ends of justice) and 394(d) (no judge qualified to act)].

[3] By Countermotion

A plaintiff has the right to oppose a defendant's motion made on the ground that the action was not brought in the county of defendant's residence by showing, on a countermotion, that the convenience of the witnesses or the ends of justice would be promoted by refusing to change [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 76* ; *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 697, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* .

Like a motion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*, a countermotion to retain a cause on the ground of convenience of the witnesses will not lie unless the answer has been filed at the time defendant's motion for change of venue is made. Until the issues of fact are settled by the answer, the court cannot determine what testimony will be material [*Gilman v. Nordin (1952)112 Cal. App. 2d 788, 793, 247 P.2d 394]* . Further, an attempt to retain venue as originally laid for the convenience of the witnesses cannot be made when only a demurrer has been filed [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 214, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* .

The courts of appeal are in conflict with respect to whether *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)* requires a plaintiff who is seeking to retain the action in the county where it was commenced to show that both the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be served by retaining the action in that county, or if the plaintiff may prevail by showing that either the convenience of witnesses or the ends of justice would be promoted [*see Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 698 n.2, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666* (showing either factor is sufficient, in contrast to requirement that defendant show both factors to win a change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*); *Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916* (holding that both factors must be shown under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of WitnessesCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferInterests of JusticeCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.40

§ 571.40 Burden of Proof

[1] Presumption of Proper Venue

The plaintiff's choice of venue is presumptively correct [*Buran Equipment Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1666, 236 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246-247, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642*]. Thus, the county in which the title of the action shows that it is brought is, prima facie, the proper county for the commencement and trial of the action absent an affirmative showing to the contrary [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *Smith v. Stanford Research Institute (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 750, 753, 28 Cal. Rptr. 481*].

[2] Required Showing to Meet Burden

[a] In General

The general rule is that the moving party must show (1) that the action is proper in the county to which he or she seeks a transfer, and (2) that the county in which the action was filed was improper under any applicable theory [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 228, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588* ; *Sequoia Pine Mills, Inc. v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 65, 68, 65 Cal. Rptr. 353*]. For example, a corporate defendant seeking a change of venue in a contract action brought in a county other than where it has its principal place of business must show that the contract was not made or to be performed in that county, or that the obligation or liability of the defendant did not arise there, or that any breach of obligation did not occur there [*Shores v. Chip Steak Co. (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 620,623, 279 P.2d 591* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* (venue in actions against corporations and associations); *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[1]*].

[b] Burden in Motion Based on Ground That Action Commenced in Wrong Court

When a motion to change venue is based on the ground that the action was "not in the proper court," the burden of showing facts to justify a change of venue is on the defendant [*Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)*]. For example, if the motion is based on the defendant's

residence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, the defendant is required to show that at the commencement of the action, he or she was not a resident of the county where the action was brought, and that he or she is a resident of the county to which he or she asks that the place of trial be moved [*Sequoia Pine Mills, Inc. v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 65, 67-68, 65 Cal. Rptr. 353]* . If the defendant makes this showing, the burden of proof shifts back to the plaintiff [*Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 15* , *177 Cal. Rptr. 102]* . The plaintiff must then show that the case comes clearly within one of the statutory exceptions to the general rule that actions are triable at the place of defendant's residence [*Archer v. Superior Court (1961) 202 Cal. App. 2d 417, 420, 21 Cal. Rptr. 48* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.16[3*] for rules in contract actions, and § 571.17[1] for local actions and how situs of subject matter of action controls].

[c] Burden in Motion Based on Other Grounds

If the motion is based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)-(d)*, the burden is on the moving party, whether he or she is plaintiff or defendant [*see* *City of Stockton v. Ellingwood (1926) 78 Cal. App. 117, 121-122, 248 P. 272* (countermotion by defendant based on convenience of witnesses); *see also* *J.I. Case T. Co. v. Copren Bros. (1917) 35 Cal. App. 70, 75-76, 169 P. 443* (motion by plaintiff based on absence of impartial trial)].

The moving party in a *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* motion has the burden of proving that both the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be promoted by a change of venue [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Lieberman v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 396, 401, 239 Cal. Rptr. 450]* . To meet this burden, he or she must first show that the witnesses' proposed testimony is admissible, relevant, and material to some issue in the case [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.33* regarding convenience of witnesses and ends of justice]. The convenience of witnesses may be shown by the fact that the residence of all the witnesses is in the county to which the transfer of the cause is requested, and the inference that the ends of justice will be served may be created by showing that by moving the trial closer to the residence of the witnesses, delay and expense in court proceedings are avoided and savings in the witnesses' time and expenses are effected [*Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.41

§ 571.41 Selection of Transferee Court

[1] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

If the court orders the action or proceeding transferred on the ground that it was commenced in the wrong court, it must be transferred to any proper court that the parties may agree on by stipulation in writing, or made in open court and entered in the minutes or docket. If the parties do not so agree, then the action or proceeding must be transferred to any proper court in the county in which the action or proceeding was commenced that the defendant may designate, or, if there is no proper court in that county, to any proper court, in a proper county, designated by the defendant. If the parties do not agree, and the defendant does not designate the court, or if the court orders the transfer on its own motion as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, then the action or proceeding will be transferred to a proper court as determined by the court in which the action or proceeding is pending [*Code Civ. Proc. § 398*; *Cubic Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 622, 625, 231 Cal. Rptr. 18]* .

[2] Motion Based on Other Grounds

If, for any cause specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*, *(c)*, and *(d)*, the court orders the transfer of an action or proceeding, it must be transferred to a court having jurisdiction of the subject matter of the action that the parties may agree on, by stipulation in writing, or made in open court and entered in the minutes or docket, or, if they do not so agree, then to the nearest or most accessible court, where the objection or cause for making the order does not exist [*Code Civ. Proc. § 398*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.42

§ 571.42 Transfer of Pleadings and Papers

When an order is made transferring an action or proceeding under any of the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8*, the clerk shall, after expiration of the time within which a petition for writ of mandate could have been filed pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 400*, or if the petition is filed, after judgment denying the writ becomes final and on payment of the costs and fees, transmit the pleadings and papers therein (or if the pleadings are oral, a transcript of them) to the clerk (or to the judge when there is no clerk) of the court to which the action or proceeding is being transferred [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*; *see § 571.37* regarding costs and fees of transfer].

At the time of the transmittal of the papers and pleadings, the clerk shall mail notice to all parties who have appeared in the action or special proceeding, stating the date on which the transmittal occurred. Promptly on receipt of the papers and pleadings, the clerk of the court to which the action or proceeding is transferred shall mail notice to all parties who have appeared in the action or special proceeding, stating the date of the filing of the case and the number assigned to the case in the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.43

§ 571.43 Effect of Granting Order on Jurisdiction

[1] Transferee Court

The court to which an action or proceeding is transferred under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-404.8* shall have and exercise over the action or proceeding the same jurisdiction as if it had been originally commenced therein, all prior proceedings being saved, and the court may require such amendment of the pleadings, the filing and service of the amended, additional, or supplemental pleadings, and the giving of such notice as may be necessary for the proper presentation and determination of the action or proceeding in the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

[2] Transferor Court

The court granting the motion for a change of venue is without jurisdiction to make any further order or take any further steps in the action [*Chase v. Superior Court (1908) 154 Cal. 789, 792, 99 P. 355* ; *Moore v. Powell (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 583, 587-588, 138 Cal. Rptr. 914]* . However, the transferor court may consider a motion to vacate the order made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, which provides for relief from mistake, inadvertance, surprise, or excusable neglect [*Badella v. Miller (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 81, 86, 279 P.2d 729]* . Further, the court may dismiss the action if the transfer fees are not paid within 30 days of service of notice of the order transferring the action [*Moore v. Powell (1977) 70 Cal. App. 3d 583, 587-588, 138 Cal. Rptr. 914* ; *Code Civ. Proc. § 399*; *see § 571.37* regarding costs and fees of transfer].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.44

§ 571.44 Renewal of Motion

A court has jurisdiction to consider a renewal of a motion for change of venue, but as a matter of policy and practice, renewal of the same motion is discouraged, and the renewed motion will almost invariably be denied when the grounds are the same. However, when circumstances have changed, renewal of the motion may be proper. In such a case, the renewed motion must be made within reasonable time after knowledge of the changed circumstances is or should have been acquired [*Thompson v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 300, 306, 103 Cal. Rptr. 94]* .

There are several other circumstances when a renewed motion may be considered by the court. For example, a court is able to entertain a renewed motion if the first motion was expressly denied without prejudice [*Lundy v. Lettunich (1920) 50 Cal. App. 451, 454-455, 195 P. 451]* . Further, successive motions may be considered if they are made by different parties [*Marshall v. Dunlap (1955) 138 Cal. App. 2d 59, 60-61, 291 P.2d 538]* . A renewed motion may also be proper if it is made on a different ground than the previous one [*Seybert v. County of Imperial (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 221, 226-230, 293 P.2d 135]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.45

§ 571.45 Actions Involving Installment or Automotive Sales, Consumer Obligations, or Unlawful Detainer

[1] Pleading Must Show Proper Venue

In limited civil cases dealing with certain consumer-related subjects, the fact that the action is filed in the proper court and falls within one of those subject matter areas must appear from a verified complaint or an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*].

This requirement applies to actions or proceedings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*]:

- Subject to *Civ. Code § 1812.10* (venue in installment contract actions under the Unruh and Rees-Levering Act).
- Subject to *Civ. Code § 2984.4* (venue in contract action under the Automobile Sales Finance Act).
- Subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*, which governs venue in actions arising from:
  - The offer or provision of goods, services, loans, or extensions of credit intended primarily for personal, family, or household use.
  - Transactions consummated as proximate result of unsolicited telephone calls made by a seller engaged in the business of consummating transactions of that kind.
  - Transactions consummated as proximate result of a telephone call or electronic transmission made by the buyer or lessee in response to a solicitation by the seller.
- For an unlawful detainer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1161*].

[2] Transfer of Case

[a] Case Not Commenced in Proper Court

If it appears from the complaint, affidavit, or declaration, or otherwise, that the court in which the action or proceeding was commenced is not the proper court for its trial, the court in which the action or proceeding is commenced, or a judge thereof, shall, whenever that fact appears, transfer it to the proper court, on its own motion, or on motion of the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*]. If, however, the defendant consents in writing, or in open court (consent in open court being entered in the minutes or docket of the court) to keeping the action or proceeding in the court where it was commenced, it may continue in that court [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396a* (requiring defendant to be represented by counsel at time of giving consent)].

If a case is ordered transferred under this provision and summons is served before the action or proceeding is filed in the court to which it is transferred, as to any defendant so served, who has not appeared in the action or proceeding, the time to answer or otherwise plead dates from service on that defendant of written notice of the filing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*].

[b] Case Commenced in Proper Court

Even if it appears from the plaintiff's complaint or affidavit that the court in which the action or proceeding is commenced is a proper court for its trial, a motion for a transfer of the action or proceeding may be made as in other cases, within the time, on the grounds, and in the manner provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392 et seq.* If on that motion it appears that the action or proceeding is not pending in the proper court, or should for other cause be transferred, it is to be ordered transferred as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392 et seq.* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*].

[c] Procedure and Fees

When any action or proceeding is ordered transferred as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*, proceedings are to be had, and the costs and fees to be paid, as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 398* and *399* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*].

For discussion,*see § 571.41* regarding selection of transferee court, and § 571.37 regarding costs and fees of transfer.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsRequirementsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment Contracts

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.46

§ 571.46 Review of Court Orders Relating to Motions for Change of Venue

[1] Motions in Superior Court

When an order is made by the superior court granting or denying a motion to change the place of trial, the party aggrieved by the order may, within 20 days after service of a written notice of the order, petition the court of appeal for the district in which the court granting or denying the motion is situated for a writ of mandate requiring trial of the case in the proper court. The superior court may, for good cause, and prior to the expiration of the initial 20-day period, extend the time for one additional period not to exceed 10 days [*Code Civ. Proc. § 400*].

The petitioner shall file a copy of the petition in the trial court immediately after the petition is filed in the court of appeal. The court of appeal may stay all proceedings in the case, pending judgment on the petition becoming final. The clerk of the court of appeal shall file with the clerk of the trial court a copy of any final order or final judgment immediately after the order or judgment becomes final [*Code Civ. Proc. § 400*]. For forms and discussion relating to mandate in general,*see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

[2] Standard of Review

When a change of venue is a matter of right, an appellate court will not disturb an order made on conflicting evidence unless it is clear that the order was the result of arbitrary action [*see Swartz v. Cal. Olive Growers Etc. Corp. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 168, 170-171, 133 P.2d 20* (suit commenced in wrong court); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)* (framed in mandatory language and requiring action or proceeding not commenced in proper court to be transferred to proper court)].

Granting or denying a *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* motion is discretionary with the trial court, and an appellate court will reverse an order only on a clear showing of abuse of discretion. For example, the denial of a motion to change venue would be an abuse of discretion if there was a showing that the convenience of witnesses and ends of justice would be be promoted by the change, and there was absolutely no showing whatever to contrary. Under this circumstance, there would be no evidence to sustain the decision of the trial court [*Union Trust Life Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 23, 28, 66 Cal. Rptr. 270]* .

Thus, the appellate court is required to determine that sufficient facts have been shown on which the trial court could base its exercise of discretion [*Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 774, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498]* . The judgment will not be disturbed when the evidence on the motion for change of venue is conflicting [*Wheeler v. Moschetti (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 827, 829, 10 Cal. Rptr. 722]* . All conflicts are required to be resolved in favor of the prevailing party, and all reasonable inferences which are to be drawn must be in support of the trial court's order [*City of Long Beach v. Lakewood Park (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 596, 598, 258 P.2d 538]* . For forms and discussion relating to the scope of review on appeal in general,*see* Ch. 41, *Appeal: Review Standard and Appellate Rules of Law* .

[3] Time to Answer After Review

If the order granting or denying a motion to transfer pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396a* or *396b* is the subject of an appeal pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 904.2* in which a stay is granted, or is the subject of a mandate proceeding pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 400*, the court having jurisdiction over the trial, on application or on its own motion after the appeal or mandate proceeding becomes final or on earlier termination of a stay, shall allow the defendant a reasonable time to respond to the complaint. Notice of the order allowing the defendant further time to respond to the complaint shall be promptly served by the party who obtained such order or by the clerk if the order is made on the court's own motion [*Code Civ. Proc. § 586(a)(6)(C)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureAppealsStandards of ReviewAbuse of Discretion

102 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.47-571.59

[Reserved]

§§ 571.47[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.60

§ 571.60 Related Matthew Bender Publications

For memoranda relating to forms in this chapter, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 238, *Venue*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.61

§ 571.61 State Statutes

[1] Place of Trial

Place of trial in civil actions. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-402*

[2] Small Claims

Venue and court location requirements in small claims court actions as same as in other civil actions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 116.370(a)*

[3] Venue in Other Actions

[a] Miscellaneous

Venue in actions against Board of Medical Examiners. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2109*

Venue for action by Attorney General or county district attorney for violation of Cartwright Antitrust Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 16754*

Venue in agency adoption proceedings. *Fam. Code § 8714(a)*

Venue in independent adoption proceedings. *Fam. Code § 8802(a)*

Venue in proceedings to adopt an adult. *Fam. Code § 9300 et seq.*

Venue in actions on installment contracts under Unruh Act. *Civ. Code § 1812.10*

Venue in actions on installment contracts for sales of motor vehicles under Rees-Levering Act. *Civ. Code § 2984.4*

Venue in actions for partition of real and personal property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 872.110(b)(1)*

Venue in eminent domain proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1250.020(b)*

Venue for applications for change of name. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1276*

Venue in actions and proceedings under Uniform Transfers to Minors Act. *Prob. Code § 3921*

[b] Dissolution and Winding Up of Corporation

Proper county for venue as that in which principal executive office is located. *Corp. Code § 177*

Verified complaint for involuntary dissolution of corporation as able to be filed in superior court of proper county. *Corp. Code § 1800*

Superior court of proper county as able to take jurisdiction of proceeding for voluntary winding up of corporation. *Corp. Code § 1904*

[c] Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings

Venue for resident of state in guardianship and conservatorship proceedings. *Prob. Code § 2201*

Venue for nonresident of state in guardianship and conservatorship proceedings. *Prob. Code § 2202*

[4] Effect of Joinder on Venue

Residence of defendant improperly joined for purpose of establishing venue as not being considered in determining proper place of trial. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

[5] Local Actions

Venue in action for recovery of, interest in, or injuries to real property, and for foreclosure of all liens and mortgages on real property as being at situs of real property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)*

Venue in actions for the recovery of penalty or forfeiture imposed by statute. *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(a)*

Venue in actions against public officers. *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*

Venue in action in which executor, administrator, guardian, conservator, or trustee is sued in official or representative capacity on claim for payment of money. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*

Street address or common designation and legal description of real property as required in quiet title action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*

[6] Party Venue--Actions by or Against State

Venue in action by or against state as proper in any city or city and county where Attorney General has office. *Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1)*

Venue in actions against state for taking or damaging private property for public use. *Gov. Code § 955*

Venue in actions against state generally. *Gov. Code § 955*

Venue in action against state for death or injury to person or personal property. *Gov. Code § 955.2*

Venue in action against state by local government or agency. *Gov. Code § 955.3*

[7] Corporations and Unincorporated Associations

Venue in action against unincorporated association. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.2*

Venue in action against corporation or association. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*

[8] Transfer to Neutral County

Actions by or against county, city, or local agency as requiring transfer to neutral county. *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*

"Local agency" defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(b)*

[9] Transitory Actions

County in which defendants or some of them reside at commencement of action as proper county for trial of action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in actions involving injury to person or personal property or for death from wrongful act or negligence. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in contract actions. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in proceedings for dissolution of marriage. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in proceedings to establish and enforce obligation of support of minor child. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in proceedings under Uniform Parentage Act. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue when defendants do not reside in state, or plaintiff does not know county of residence, or defendant about to move. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*

Venue in actions involving consumer contracts. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*

Venue in action arising from transaction consummated as proximate result of seller's unsolicited telephone call. *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*

Unlawful detainer and consumer actions require verified complaint or affidavit showing action commenced in proper court and that action is unlawful detainer or consumer action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*

"Residence" defined. *Gov. Code § 244(a)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsContracts LawTypes of ContractsInstallment ContractsFamily LawGuardiansGeneral OverviewGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsClaims By & Against

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.62

§ 571.62 Decisions

[1] Jurisdiction Distinguished

California venue requirement as not jurisdictional because proper venue may be waived if not timely asserted; challenge to state court venue as not defeating federal jurisdiction when state court venue not jurisdictional. *Transure, Inc. v. Marsh & McLennan, Inc. (9th Cir. 1985) 766 F.2d 1297, 1300-1301*

Venue as not jurisdictional, except in few cases in which statute makes local place of trial part of grant of subject matter jurisdiction. *Barquis v. Merchants Collection Assn. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 94, 121, 101 Cal. Rptr. 745, 496 P.2d 817* ; *Newman v. County of Sonoma (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 625, 627, 15 Cal. Rptr. 914, 364 P.2d 850* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 250, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13*

Under state law, a venue selection clause is purely an intrastate issue involving the selection of a county in which to hold the trial. By contrast, a forum selection clause usually chooses a court from among different states or nations. *Alexander v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 723, 727, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 111*

[2] Venue Defined

Venue provisions as prescribing where action may be tried. *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 249, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13*

[3] Classification of Actions--Determined by Complaint

Nature of cause of action in so far as it affects or determines place of trial as ascertained from complaint alone. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 601, 328 P.2d 953*

Question of transitory or local nature of causes of action as determined from allegations of complaint on file at time motion for change of venue made, and from nature of judgment which might be rendered on complaint. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 607, 122 P.2d 557* ; *Thielen v. Superior Court (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 217, 218, 33 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *Franco Western Oil Co. v. Cameron (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 37, 38, 19 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Pleader as required to frame complaint to show clearly that he or she is entitled to retain trial of action in county in which it was commenced. *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 613, 122 P.2d 557*

Subject matter of action and issues involved as determinable from facts pleaded, rather than from title or prayer for relief. *Standard Brands of California v. Bryce (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 718, 721, 37 P.2d 446*

To the extent a venue selection clause disrupts statutory venue provisions, it is void as against the legislatively declared public policy fixing the place for trial. *Alexander v. Superior Court (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 723, 731-732, 8 Cal.Rptr. 3d 111*

[4] Main Relief Rule

When complaint states only one cause of action, characterization of cause of action as local or transitory as controlled by nature of "main relief" sought, or "principal object" of action. *Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 535, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Venue as determined by "main relief" rule when there is only one cause of action and different forms of relief are sought. *Dreher v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 695, 697, 307 P.2d 407*

[5] Local Actions

[a] Generally

Right of plaintiff to have action tried in county other than that of defendant's residence as exceptional, and plaintiff who claims that right as required to bring himself or herself within exception. *Kaluzok v. Brisson (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 760, 763, 167 P.2d 481* ; *Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 215, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645* ; *Deas v. Lido Lumber Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 402, 404, 282 P.2d 90*

Action as required to be tried in county where subject matter of action situated if subject matter is local and judgment sought is to operate directly on it. *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P. 356* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13* ; *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 359, 282 P.2d 201*

Defendant as able to invoke *Code Civ. Proc. § 392* only when real estate alone is subject matter of action. *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P.356* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13* ; *All-Cool Alum. Etc. Co. v. Superior Court (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 660, 667, 36 Cal. Rptr. 769* ; *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 360, 282 P.2d 201*

[b] Personal Representative or Trustee

All actions brought to recover money or personal property against executrix, executor, administrator, guardian or trustee as required to be brought in county that has jurisdiction over estate. *Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App.*

3d Supp. 30, 37 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355

Action against administrator or executor in his or her official capacity to recover personal property which had been entrusted to decedent as subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*. *Haines v. Lamb (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 322, 325-326, 24 Cal. Rptr. 146*

[c] Foreclosure of Liens and Mortgages on Real Property

Action alleging that party against whom personal judgment is sought holds interest in real property and seeking foreclosure on that interest as action to foreclose lien, which must be tried in county in which land is situated. *Case v. Kirkwood (1931) 119 Cal. App. 207, 211, 6 P.2d 110*

[d] Injury to Real Property Defined

"Injury to real property" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*) as embracing every wrong that in legal contemplation is injury to real property, including not only direct and forcible injury, but consequential injuries, threatened injuries to land, and even mere nonfeasance, as permissive waste. *Coley v. Hecker (1928) 206 Cal. 22, 28, 272 P. 1045* ; *Strosnider v. Pomin (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 103, 108, 89 P.2d 179*

Construction defect actions asserting damage to buildings affixed to real property as stating claim for injury to real property, and therefore, pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*), venue is appropriate in county where property is located. *Foundation Engineers, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 104, 111-113, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

[e] Public Officers

State agency, department, institution, board, or other public entity as "public officer," absent statutory designation of administrative or enforcement officer, in action founded on its official action. *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 537, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457*

Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Colusa Air Pollution Control District, and Imperial, Santa Barbara, and Yolo-Solano County Air Pollution Control Districts, as public entities sued on claims arising from the conduct of their official action, as public officers within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)*, relating to venue of actions against public officers. *Colusa Air Pollution Control Dist. v. Superior Court (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 880, 888, 277 Cal. Rptr. 110*

Venue in mandamus action brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* as governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*). *Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182* ; *Lynch v. Superior Court (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 929, 931, 86 Cal. Rptr. 925*

Governing board of school district as public officer within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 393*. *Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*) as applying only to affirmative acts that directly interfere with personal rights or property of person complaining, and to acts done as distinguished from acts threatened. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 768, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

Code Civ. Proc. § 393(1)(b) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b)*) as taking precedence over *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*.

Cecil v. Superior Court (1943) 59 Cal. App. 2d 793, 794, 140 P.2d 125

[f] Title to or Possession of Real Property

Nature of action as local, and as required to be tried in county where land is situated, when action turns on title to property as distinct from personal obligation, and decree operates by its own force on title. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 611-612, 122 P.2d 557* ; *Thielen v. Superior Court (1963) 219 Cal. App2d 217, 219, 33 Cal. Rptr. 1* ; *Ponderosa Sky Ranch v. Okay Improvement Corp. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 227, 230, 22 Cal. Rptr. 90*

Action as required to be wholly local in nature to require it to be brought in county of situs as designated in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)*. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Radio K-Dan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 544, 548, 40 Cal. Rptr. 382* ; *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action to cancel deed on ground of fraud and to compel reconveyance to or reverting of title in plaintiff as local action. *Eckstrand v. Wilshusen (1933) 217 Cal. 380, 382-383, 18 P.2d 931*

Slander of title as local action on theory that action is one in which determination of owner's right or interest in title is properly adjudicated, and also that slander of title is injury to real property. *Coley v. Hecker (1928) 206 Cal. 22, 26, 272 P. 1045* ; *Wick v. Mattison (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 608, 609, 24 Cal. Rptr. 677*

Action to eliminate power of sale contained in deed of trust as having real and direct impact on right or interest in real property. *Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 538-539, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Landowner's or tenant's suit for damages to growing crops as real property action, with venue lying in county of land situs. *Stauffer Chemical Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 1, 3, 71 Cal. Rptr. 202*

Action for fraud with respect to conveyance of real property as transitory if vendee sues for damages and as local if vendee seeks to reobtain title. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 310, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action for specific performance of contract for sale of realty as deemed local if brought by vendee, since vendee seeks possession. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 309, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Local action as not becoming partly transitory merely because it may require determination of amount of benefits received by plaintiff. *Franco Western Oil Co. v. Cameron (1962) 200 Cal. App. 2d 37, 40, 19 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Action as not rendered transitory because it may require determination of amount of benefits received by defendants. *Etter v. Vollmer (1956) 139 Cal. App. 2d 718, 720, 294 P.2d 55*

Determination of rights of homesteaders as heard in county where homestead is situated. *Wood v. Emig (1943) 58 Cal. App. 2d 851, 857, 137 P.2d 875*

Action for specific performance of contract for sale of realty as deemed local if brought by vendee, since vendee seeks possession. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 309, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Complaint having for its sole and exclusive object cancellation of deed or deed of trust for fraud as local. *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 359, 282 P.2d 201*

[g] Title or Possession Incidentally Involved

Nature of action as essentially transitory, and defendants as entitled to trial in county of their residence, if determination of estate or interest in land is merely incidental to determination of cause for equitable relief in trust, fraud, or contract. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 611, 122 P.2d 557* ; *Ponderosa Sky Ranch v. Okay Improvement Corp. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 227, 230, 22 Cal. Rptr. 90*

Action for damages for deceit in inducing plaintiffs to purchase real property, rather than for rescission and restitution resulting in reconveyance, as not within exception provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*). *Kaluzok v. Brisson (1946) 27 Cal. 2d 760, 763-764, 167 P.2d 481*

Action as transitory rather than local when right to any real property sought by plaintiffs depends on outcome of controversy concerning personal obligation of defendants, and judgment rendered thereon would be one to enforce that obligation. *Radio K-Dan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 544, 548, 40 Cal. Rptr. 382*

Action for breach of mineral lease, principally seeking royalties for removed minerals, injunction against encumbrance of claims covered by agreement, and decree establishing rights and duties of parties under contract as not becoming local action merely because realty may be involved. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action as required to be classified as transitory when plaintiff's sole and main relief consists of money judgment, and other relief is incidental to that end, even if action involves realty. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 309, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action in which lessor sues for breach of lease as transitory even though rights in property may be involved. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 310, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action for specific performance of contract for sale of realty as deemed transitory if brought by vendor, because vendor merely seeks purchase price. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 309, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action in which lessor sues for breach of lease as transitory even though rights in property may be involved. *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 310, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409*

Action by vendor for purchase price of land, or action by vendor for specific performance of vendee's contract to purchase land as not within Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a) (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*). *Marcacci v. Continental Baking Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 224, 226-227, 20 Cal. Rptr. 567*

Action to cancel or reform a promissory note secured by deed of trust as transitory. *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 359, 282 P.2d 201*

Trespass action seeking damages as not local. *Hardy v. White (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 550, 552, 279 P.2d 126*

[6] Transitory Actions

[a] Generally

Action as transitory when main relief sought is personal. *Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482 n.5,*

208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272

General spirit and policy of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as giving defendant right of having all personal actions against him or her tried in county of his or her residence. *Turlock Theatre Co. v. Laws (1939) 12 Cal. 2d 573, 576* ; *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 575, 26 P. 356* ; *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 844* , *323 P.2d 586* ; *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 149, 151 P.2d 887*

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 as intended to protect defendant from expense and inconvenience of being compelled to go to distant county to defend against action that might be commenced against him or her there. *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P. 356*

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 as applying in absence of specific governing statute. *Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 798, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182*

Venue of transitory action against natural person as governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 223, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588*

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 as prevailing unless cause of action set forth in complaint falls wholly within provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-394*. *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13*

General rule states that defendant is entitled to have actions tried in county of his or her residence. *Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 442, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916*

[b] Application of Basic Rule of Residence Venue

Venue for declaratory relief action as determined by reference to nature of subject matter of action, except when complaint seeks determination of alleged liability asserted by defendant against plaintiff, in which case venue is determined by the subject matter of defendant's cause of action. *Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 930, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *Standard Brands of California v. Bryce (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 718, 720-721, 37 P.2d 446*

Action for accounting as essentially personal action. *Bardwell v. Turner (1933) 219 Cal. 228, 230, 25 P.2d 978* ; *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576,26 P. 356* ; *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 149, 151 P.2d 887* ; *Stesel v. Santa Ana River Water Co. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 117, 126-127, 94 P.2d 1052*

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 as not giving person against whom alleged libel is published in newspaper right to maintain his or her action in any county in which newspaper may circulate. *Graham v. Mixon (1917) 177 Cal. 88, 93, 169 P. 1003*

In action arising from loan obtained primarily for personal, family, or household use, which was a consumer transaction specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(b)*, where borrower resided in Santa Clara County at the time his action commenced, venue was proper in Santa Clara County. The court rejected the lender's argument that Section 395(b) applied only to actions against a consumer defendant, or, alternatively, does not apply where the consumer was the plaintiff and one of the defendants was an individual. *Fontaine v. Superior Court (Cashcall, Inc.) (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 830, 838, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 607*

Action based on injury to person or personal property which is not physical injury, such as libel, malicious prosecution, and false imprisonment, as triable solely at defendant's residence. *Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 218, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Action to have judgment declared null and void based on alleged fraud and mistake, and prayer for equitable relief as personal and transitory action, and as not required to be tried in county where judgment was rendered. *Deas v. Lido Lumber Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 402, 404, 282 P.2d 90*

Suit in equity, in personam, as transitory action. *Sloan v. Court Hotel (1945) 72 Cal. App. 2d 308, 316, 164 P.2d 516*

Action to cancel promissory note on ground of fraud as triable in county of defendant's residence. *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 150, 151 P.2d 887*

Action for cancellation of contract for purchase and sale of realty and for money judgment based on alleged fraud as triable in county of defendant's residence. *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 150, 151 P.2d 887*

Action for rescission of contract, accounting, and injunction based on fraud as personal action that defendants are entitled to have tried in county of their residence. *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 150, 151 P.2d 887*

Action for conversion as required to be tried in county where defendant resides. *Mason v. Buck (1929) 99 Cal. App. 219, 221, 278 P. 461*

[c] Contract Actions

[i] Exception to Basic Rule of Residence Venue

Breach of contract as transitory cause of action. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 601, 328 P.2d 953*

General rule that residence of defendant is proper place for trial as applying to contract actions with certain exceptions set out in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(1)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*). *Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*, defendant as entitled to have action transferred to county of his or her residence unless obligation was incurred or was to be performed in another county. *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 694, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666*

Action as properly brought in county in which defendants or some of them reside if original cause of action was based on contract, which plaintiff sought to have interpreted or reformed and enforced. *Ponderosa Sky Ranchv. Okay Improv. Corp. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 227, 230, 22 Cal. Rptr. 90*

Plaintiff as entitled to have action tried in county in which contract was entered into despite defendant's residence in another county. *Richardson v. Rose (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 318, 322, 17 Cal. Rptr. 84*

Action based on fraud, and in which plaintiff seeks rescission and accounting, as triable in county of defendant's residence regardless of where contract sought to be cancelled was executed, and as not "founded" on contract sought to be cancelled. *Postin v. Griggs (1944) 66 Cal. App. 2d 147, 150, 151 P.2d 887*

[ii] Where Contract Entered Into

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 as interpreted to mean that all actions arising on contract shall be tried in county in which defendant resides, or in which contract was made, unless defendant has contracted specially and in writing as to county in which his or her obligation is to be performed, in which event that county is also proper county for trial of action. *Dawson v. Goff (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 310, 314, 273 P.2d 1* ; *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691,*

695, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666 ; *Wilson v. Scannavino (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 369, 371, 324 P.2d 350* ; *Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 532, 122 P.2d 115*

Obligation as incurred at time contract is made and obligations under it arise and are incurred in county in which it is made. *Dawson v. Goff (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 310, 315, 273 P.2d 1*

Obligation under option contract incurred when option contract made. *Dawson v. Goff (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 310, 318, 273 P.2d 1*

Contract as entered into in county in which it was signed. *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 694, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666*

Place at which contract bears date as prima facie place where it was made. *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666* ; *Archer v. Superior Court (1961) 202 Cal. App. 2d 417, 419, 21 Cal. Rptr. 48*

When contract made by telephone, contract as entered into where recipient of message accepted offer. *Friedman Bag Co., Inc. v. Shrier (1961) 194 Cal. App. 2d 561, 564, 15 Cal. Rptr. 38* ; *Wilson v. Scannavino (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d 369, 371, 324 P.2d 350*

Place where contract actually becomes complete as place where it is made, and its consummation as place where last act necessary to complete its validity is performed. *Cal-Ore Lumber Sales v. Russell (1955) 133 Cal. App. 2d 296, 303-304, 284 P.2d 179* ; *Fitzhugh v. University Realty Co. (1920) 46 Cal. App. 198, 199, 188 P. 1023*

Allegation in complaint that oral agreement was to be performed in specific county, which is not denied by defendant, as admitted, and defendant as estopped to contend that contract not entered into in that county. *Gilman v. Nordin (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 788, 792, 247 P.2d 394*

Limitation in former *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(1)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*) stating that county in which obligation incurred shall be deemed to be county in which it is performed as effectively cutting down number of counties in which action on contract may properly be tried to two, namely, county in which defendant resides, and county in which contract was made. *Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 531, 122 P.2d 115*

Absent special agreement as to place where contract is to be performed, contract as deemed performable at creditor's place of business, or absent contrary showing, contract deemed performable where it is made. Roos v. Jansen (1938) 30 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 773, 775, 78 P.2d 746

Quasi-contract as going into effect immediately on service of notice of rescission of original contract in county where notice was served. *Fitzhugh v. University Realty Co. (1920) 46 Cal. App. 198, 201, 188 P. 1023*

[iii] "Special Contract in Writing"

Place of performance exception in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as referring exclusively to place where defendant's obligation under contract is to be performed. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 224, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588*

"Special contract in writing" as contemplated by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as requiring express provision not dependent on implication. *Mitchell v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1047, 1049, 231 Cal. Rptr. 176* ; *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 224, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588* ; *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666*

Contract as required to specifically state place of performance of obligation before action may be brought under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* in county where obligation is performable. *Mitchell v. Superior Court (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1047, 1049, 231 Cal. Rptr. 176* ; *Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840* ; *Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 536, 122 P.2d 115* ; *Fidelity Thrift & Loan Asso. v. Hall (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 895, 899 , 9 Cal. Rptr. 596*

In contract action, venue and proper court for trial in particular judicial district as place where contractual obligation is to be performed as long as contract specifies in writing place of performance. *Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 14 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102*

Mere specification of geographic location for payment in written contract as sufficient to satisfy "special contract" provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, and as giving plaintiff right to specify place of payment as place for trial of action on contract. *Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 16 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102*

"Special contract" requirement as met by agreement to pay money in particular county, to deliver goods at particular place, or to perform obligation in particular city. *Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840*

Requirements of "special contract" as met if express stipulation respecting obligation in question is embodied in agreement giving rise to action. *Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 536, 122 P.2d 115*

[d] Injury to Person or Personal Property

"Injury to person" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as referring only to injuries of a physical or bodily nature, and not to injuries to character or reputation. *Monk v. Ehret (1923) 192 Cal. 186, 193, 219 P. 452* ; *Carruth v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 215, 219, 145 Cal. Rptr. 344*

"Injury to person" as limited to wrongful or negligent act of another, and as not intended to extend right of place of trial to trespass based on false imprisonment. *Monk v. Ehret (1923) 192 Cal. 186, 192-193, 219 P. 452*

Malicious prosecution as not a *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* "injury to person." *Carruth v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 215, 219, 145 Cal. Rptr. 344*

Defendant as entitled to have negligence action tried either in county of his or her residence or in county where tort occurred. *Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916*

[e] Residence Defined

Person as able to have only one residence at time. *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 844 , 323 P.2d 586*

"Residence" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as not referring to "domicile," but used in sense of place in which to live, dwell, abide, sojourn, stay, remain, or lodge. *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 844-845 , 323 P.2d 586*

Residence as established by personal presence in fixed and permanent abode, with intent of remaining there. *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 845 , 323 P.2d 586*

Elements necessary to create residence as actual bodily presence in place combined with freely exercised intention of remaining there permanently or for indefinite time. *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 845 , 323 P.2d 586*

Address as not always synonymous with "residence." *Enter v. Crutcher (1958) 159 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 841, 846 , 323 P.2d 586*

[7] Venue Governed by Party

[a] When Basic Rule of Venue Applies to Corporations

Corporation as having no standing to move for transfer to its principal place of business if venue in county other than corporation's principal place of business is proper. *Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 478, 241 P.2d 4*

When corporation and individual defendant are properly joined as defendants, and action is commenced in county where corporation has its principal place of business, individual defendant as not able to have action moved to county of his or her residence for trial. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 472, 241 P.2d 4* ; *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 772, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Principal place of business of corporation as its residence for purpose of determining venue. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 472, 241 P.2d 4* ; *All-Cool Aluminum Awning Co. v. Superior Court of Kern County (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 660, 36 Cal. Rptr. 769* ; *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 360, 282 P.2d 201*

[b] Domestic Corporations

[i] Generally

Purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* as to permit wider choice of venue in suits against corporation than is permitted in suits against individual. *Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075* ; *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 469, 241 P.2d 4*

Application of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* to actions against corporations as in direct conflict with and narrowing former *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) by materially reducing number of possible counties for trial of action. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 470-471, 241 P.2d 4*

Effect of former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) as authorizing plaintiffs to sue at the place where the cause of action arises, or at the corporation's place of business. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 476, 241 P.2d 4*

Corporation as entitled to change of venue to county of its principal place of business under last clause of former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) when plaintiff fails to bring action in any county specified therein. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 478, 241 P.2d 4* ; *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 361, 282 P.2d 201* ; *Shores v. Chip Steak Co. (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 620, 623, 279 P.2d 591*

Intention of former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) as to benefit plaintiff, who otherwise would be obliged to travel to corporation's principal place of business to commence action. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 479, 241 P.2d 4*

Corporation is deemed bound by designation of principal place of business in corporate documents filed with Secretary of State and cannot defeat venue in that county by showing it has no office or place of business there. *Rosas v. Superior Court (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 671, 673-674, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 609*

Under former *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*), maintenance of action on quasi-contract against corporation as properly in county in which quasi-contract was made. *Fitzhugh v. University Realty Co. (1920) 46 Cal. App. 198, 201, 188 P. 1023*

[ii] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

Contract of corporation as held performable in place where circumstances, viewed in light of pertinent code provisions, indicate that parties expected or intended it to be performed. *Burr v. Western States Life Ins. Co. (1931) 211 Cal. 568, 574, 296 P. 273*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, place of contract's making as determined by last act necessary to validity of contract, usually act constituting acceptance. *Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192*

[iii] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, place of making contract as place where obligation arises. *Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192*

[c] Foreign Corporations

Foreign corporations that fail to comply with former *Civ. Code § 405* (*now see Corp. Code § 2105*) as having no "residence" within California; if corporation does comply, former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) applies. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 475, 241 P.2d 4*

Foreign corporation that does not establish that it has qualified to do business in California under former Corp. Code § 6403 (*now see Corp. Code § 2105*) as subject to suit in any county in state. *Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246-247, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642*

Foreign corporation as residing at its principal place of business in this state, as designated in statement it is required to file in office of the Secretary of State pursuant to former *Code Civ. Proc. § 405* (*now see Corp. Code § 2105*), and as entitled to change of venue for same reasons applicable to domestic corporations. *Eckles v. Justice's Court (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 269, 271, 190 P.2d 224*

[d] State or Local Government or Agency

[i] Actions Against State

Provisions for venue that pertain to other civil actions apply to actions against state agencies and public entities, unless otherwise designated by statute. *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457*

Board of Regents of University of California characterized as state institution, public corporation, governmental

agency, and public agency, and rules of venue generally applicable to proceedings against state agencies govern actions against *Regents. Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457*

Statutory provisions as to venue for actions against state agencies liberally construed in favor of private litigant. *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 536, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457*

Code Civ. Proc. § 401 is not limited to statutes that expressly name Sacramento County as place of trial. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 764-765, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

Ordinary venue rules apply to transitory actions against state boards, commissions, departments and agencies, and state agency or board located in Sacramento and involved in transitory action may assert venue there on basis of residence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395*. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 765, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

Phrase in *Code Civ. Proc. § 401* stating "whenever it is provided by any law" encompasses situation in which (1) Sacramento County is named by law as county for commencement, trial, removal of action, or proceeding; and (2) by operation of general rules of venue found in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-402*, Sacramento is county where action or proceeding is properly triable. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 766, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1) is not limited to actions defended by *Attorney General. Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 767, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1) as applicable irrespective of whether there is state or nonstate plaintiff. *Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 767, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151*

[ii] Death or Injury to Person or Personal Property

Discretion under *Gov. Code § 955.2* to choose different venue than county where injury occurred is conferred solely on superior court of county where injury occurred; superior court of county where injury did not occur is required to follow statute. *State of California v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 328, 330, 238 Cal. Rptr. 315*

Gov. Code § 955.2 is specifically limited only to certain tort actions involving death or injury to person or personal property. *Hatcher v. California State University, Fresno (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 1, 3 , 194 Cal. Rptr. 756*

[iii] Inverse Condemnation, Money or Damages

Gov. Code § 955, which establishes venue in actions against State for taking or damaging property, relates only to actions on claims for money or damages for which filing of claim is statutory prerequisite, or to actions on claims for money or damages which are specifically exempted from filing requirement. *Tharp v. Superior Court (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 496, 500-501, 186 Cal. Rptr. 335, 651 P.2d 1141*

[e] Unincorporated Associations

In applying the "liability or obligation" language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* to a lawsuit seeking to enforce a statutory obligation or liability against an unincorporated association, there is no reason to try to pigeonhole the action into contract, quasi-contract, or tort categories; instead, statutory liability cases should be analyzed independently for

purposes of determining proper venue. An action for declaratory relief against an insurer may be commenced in the county where a third party claimant sues, because that is where the insurer's liability arises; the same rule should be applied where the obligation is created by a statute rather than an insurance contract. The "obligation or liability" provision of section 395.5 does not require that the defendant perform any act inside the county for venue to be proper; it merely requires that the obligation arise there. *Black Diamond Asphalt, Inc. v. Superior Court of San Joaquin County (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 166, 171, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510*

Alternative provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* to lay venue in county of principal place of business as applies only to corporations and not to unincorporated associations. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 225, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588*

Rule that when plaintiff brings action against several defendants, both individual and corporate, in county that is neither residence nor principal place of business of any defendant, individual defendant has right on proper showing to change of venue to county of his or her residence even though venue as initially laid may otherwise be justifiable on one of four alternative grounds provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* applies to unincorporated associations. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 226, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588*

Principal place of business of unincorporated association is county of its residence for venue purposes. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 226, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588*

[8] Transfer to Neutral County

[a] Generally

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 is liberally construed. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 296, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 266, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847* ; *Garrett v. Superior Court (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 245, 248, 113 Cal. Rptr. 152, 520 P.2d 968* ; *Finance & Construction Co. v. Sacramento (1928) 204 Cal. 491, 493, 269 P. 167*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 is based on premise that there is substantial risk of prejudice in favor of local government entity. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 298, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Governmental entity has presumptive prejudicial advantage in action it brings in its own county. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 272, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Person doing business in county has unfair advantage over city situated outside county in trial of action in which person and city were arrayed against each other. *Finance & Construction Co. v. Sacramento (1928) 204 Cal. 491, 493, 269 P. 167*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 applies to cross-complaints; given that purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is to prevent corporate defendant from suffering prejudice in favor of local governmental entity, statute should be liberally construed to promote this policy. *Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 954-957, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817* (First Dist., Div. Five; following *Ohio Casualty Ins. Group v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 444, 448-451, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 771 (Third Dist.)* and declining to follow *City of Chico v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 187, 188-192, 152 Cal. Rptr. 380 (First Dist., Div. Four)*

Where a local agency filed a compulsory cross-complaint asserting a claim in the county where it resides against a nonresident of that county, cross-defendant had the right to move for a change of venue pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. §*

394. Metropolitan Transit System v. Superior Court (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 293, 304, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 517

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 should receive liberal construction that will promote policy behind law; section 394 is intended to guard against possible local bias against out-of-county defendants; bias protected against is prejudice resulting from county citizens perceiving trial outcome as tied to their economic interests; statute, however, does not require that public entity have economic interest in outcome of lawsuit before nonresident defendant may seek transfer of venue, although court found it relevant that any recovery would go to conservatorship estate, not public coffers; absence of potential impact on county taxpayers' monetary interests meant protective purpose of section 394 was not thwarted by conclusion that statute was inapplicable. *Transamerica Homefirst, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 577, 581, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705*

Purpose of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is to guard against possible local prejudice against out-of-county defendants; *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is designed to protect party from prejudice resulting from citizens in county perceiving trial outcome as tied to their economic interests; court could find no case granting section 394 transfer when judgment had no potential impact on fiscal fortunes of citizens of county. *Nguyen v. Superior Court (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1789-1790, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 is removal or change of venue provision, and has no application unless and until action commenced under applicable venue rules. *County of San Bernardino v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 378, 381, 388-389, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 760* ; *Sutter Union High School Dist. v. Superior Court (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 795, 797, 190 Cal. Rptr. 182* ; *Morrison v. Superior Court (1980) 100 Cal. App. 3d 852, 854, 161 Cal. Rptr. 169* ; *Dorame v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 70, 72, 146 Cal. Rptr. 162*

"Plaintiff" and "defendant" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* include "cross complainant" and "cross defendant." *Ohio Casualty Ins. Group v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 444, 448-449, 451, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 771* (criticizing and declining to follow *City of Chico v. Superior Court (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 187, 152 Cal. Rptr. 380* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 395 is subordinate to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*) in mixed venue case involving both provisions. *Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 702, 705, 148 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *Delgado v. Superior Court (1977) 74 Cal. App. 3d 560, 564, 141 Cal. Rptr. 528*

Neutral county is selected by trial court. *Central Contra Costa Sanitary Dist. v. Superior Court (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 702, 706, 148 Cal. Rptr. 801* ; *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 369, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164* ; *City of Oakland v. Darbee (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 493, 500, 227 P.2d 909*

[b] Actions Against City, County, or Local Agency

Third sentence of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*) asproviding that in action brought against local agency of any kind, change of venue is available in most circumstances. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 268, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

If a plaintiff sues a county or local agency for injuries occurring within the county where the public agency is located, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* requires the suit to be tried in the defendant county, and Section 394 statute unequivocally provides that an action brought against a county or local governmental agency for personal injuries occurring in the county must be brought in that county; however, despite the mandatory language of this statute, the right to transfer may be waived if there is unreasonable delay. *Ventura Unified School Dist. v. Superior Court (2001) 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 (a) provision that any action against county for personal injury that occurred within that county caused by the negligence or alleged negligence of county or its agents or employees, shall be tried in that county is

exception to general venue statute (*Code Civ. Proc. § 395*), which permits venue either in the county where injury occurs or injury causing death occurs or the county in which defendants, or some of them, reside at commencement of the action; if plaintiff sues both county and individual defendants who reside outside county for injuries occurring within county, *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* requires suit to be tried in defendant county, even though general venue rules would have permitted trial in county where individual defendants reside. *County of Orange v. Superior Court (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1189, 1192-1193, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 923*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 does not giving plaintiff right to commence and proceed to trial in action in county where no reason exists for the selection of that particular county. *Fitzpatrick v. Sonoma County (1929) 97 Cal. App. 588, 276 P. 113*

[c] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against City, County, or Local Agency

A contractual provision purporting to waive a defendant's right to transfer an action to a neutral county pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is invalid. *Arntz Builders v. Superior Court (2004) 122 Cal. App. 4th 1195, 1198, 19 Cal. Rptr. 3d 346*

Under first sentence of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(1)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*), when it is shown that both parties are cities within same county, transfer is required, and proceeding may be transferred to any other neutral county. *City of Alameda v. Superior Court (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 312, 316, 116 Cal. Rptr. 806*

[d] Actions by City, County, or Local Agency Against Resident of or Corporation Doing Business in Another City, County, or Local Agency

[i] General Rule

Only nonresident party itself may move for change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 278, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 applies when lawsuit is "brought by" public entity within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*, and determination whether action is brought by county agency depends on county agency's role within lawsuit; when action brought on conservatee's behalf by county's public guardian against nonresident defendant, action is not one brought by county agency, within meaning of section 394, and thus action need not be transferred pursuant to section 394(a). *Transamerica Homefirst, Inc. v. Superior Court (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 577, 579-581, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 705*

District attorney acts on behalf of state rather than county when district attorney represents People of the State of California in red light abatement action pursuant to *Pen. Code § 11226* and thus, mandatory transfer provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* do not apply, that is, red light abatement actions are exempt from the mandatory transfer provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)*. *Nguyen v. Superior Court (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1784, 1786-1791, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 applies to any action or proceeding brought by city against nonresident on any kind of claim city might have against nonresident. *City of Oakland v. Darbee (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 493, 498, 227 P.2d 909*

[ii] Corporate Defendants

Defendant corporation's rights under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* may be barred because of existence, nature, and extent of activities within forum county. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 297-298, 208*

Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1

Question of whether corporation is doing business in county within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is whether corporation's activities are such that it is reasonably likely to be viewed as outsider, not whether it is actually so viewed. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271 n.7, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Corporation with main place of business in county in which it is sued, or with major branch office in that county is not able to invoke *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Corporation with principal place of business elsewhere, and with only limited contacts in county may obtain change of venue in action brought by local government entity. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Services related to subject matter of particular litigation are not normally type of activities that constitute "doing business" within purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 272, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Corporation's right to transfer venue is not diminished by fact that one or more of other corporate defendants may be doing business in county. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 275, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 does not specifically provide for treating unincorporatedassociation, such as joint venture, separately from its members, and close association of members with community mitigates presumed bias. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 277, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Quality of business connections and not their quantity or duration determines whether party is doing business locally; qualitative analysis must focus on whether types of contacts with county are substantial enough for company to be reasonably viewed as closely associated with community; relevant inquiry under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* includes analysis of nature of litigation as well as activities of party seeking change of venue; defendant's section 394 motion to transfer under should have been granted given lack of evidence of activities by defendant to tie it to local community and nature of case, which posed reasonable risk that defendant would be viewed as outsider. *Kennedy/Jenks Consultants, Inc. v. Superior Court (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 948, 957-964, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 817*

[e] "Local Agency" Defined

BART is "local agency within certain county" for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 268, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

[f] Motion to Transfer

[i] Generally

Motion for change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is required to be made only within a reasonable time. *Newman v. County of Sonoma (1961) 56 Cal. 2d 625, 627, 15 Cal. Rptr. 914, 364 P.2d 850* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 252-253, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13* ; *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 367, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 motion as not required to be made at time of answer to complaint or cross complaint, but may be made within reasonable time thereafter. *Marin Community College Dist. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 719, 723, 140 Cal. Rptr. 310* ; *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 367, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 motion as not required to be denied on ground that it is untimely unless it is pursued for dilatory purposes and unless public agency can show substantial prejudice. *Marin Community College Dist. v. Superior Court (1977) 72 Cal. App. 3d 719, 723, 140 Cal. Rptr. 310*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 motion to transfer as able to be made either before or a reasonable time after a demurrer has been heard and submitted for decision. *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 367, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Right to change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* as subject to waiver for lack of diligence in prosecuting motion. *Adams v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 365, 368-369, 38 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Procedural requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b* as not governing motion pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 252, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13*

In passing on sufficiency of showing in support of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* motion to transfer, trial court as unable to try substantive issues. *City of Long Beach v. Lakewood Park (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 596, 598, 258 P.2d 538*

[ii] Burden of Proof

Change of venue because of actual prejudice as within purview of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(2)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*), not *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *San Francisco Foundation v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 285, 299, 208 Cal. Rptr. 31, 690 P.2d 1* ; *Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Superior Court (1976) 17 Cal. 3d 259, 271 n.7, 131 Cal. Rptr. 231, 551 P.2d 847*

Showing of possible prejudice as not required under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394*. *City of Alameda v. Superior Court (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 312, 317, 116 Cal. Rptr. 806*

Burden of proof justifying change of venue as resting on moving party. *Los Angeles v. Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 253, 260, 330 P.2d 888*

Code Civ. Proc. § 394 as not making defendant's right of transfer dependent on residence of other defendants, nor does it require moving party to select county or to make showing concerning county other than county of their residence or county in which city is situated. *City of Oakland v. Darbee (1951) 102 Cal. App. 2d 493, 497, 227 P.2d 909*

[9] Effect of Joinder on Venue

[a] Generally

Mixed action as being when two or more defendants are named who are subject to different venue standards. *Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 488, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272*

Identifying characteristic of "mixed actions" as being two or more inconsistent venue provisions of Code of Civil Procedure or of Constitution that appear to be concurrently applicable in same case. *Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 488, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 248, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13*

[b] Joinder of Causes of Action

General rule as that when action is partly local and partly transitory and is stated in separate causes of action, it is to be regarded as transitory in determining place of trial. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953*

Defendant as entitled to have proceeding transferred to county of his or her residence if there is personal cause of action joined with one that is local in nature. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 605, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Hammon v. American Etc. Mining Co. (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 306, 311, 21 Cal. Rptr. 409* ; *Hardy v. White (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 550, 552, 279 P.2d 126*

Plaintiff as not entitled to unite matters that form subject of personal action with matters that form subject of local action in one complaint so as to compel defendant to have both matters tried in county other than that in which he or she resides. *Smith v. Smith (1891) 88 Cal. 572, 576, 26 P. 356* ; *Channell v. Superior Court (1964) 226 Cal. App. 2d 246, 251, 38 Cal. Rptr. 13* ; *All-Cool Alum. Etc. Co. v. Superior Court (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 660, 667, 36 Cal. Rptr. 769* ; *Beutke v. American Securities Co. (1955) 132 Cal. App. 2d 354, 359-360, 282 P.2d 201*

If defendant is entitled to change of venue as to one cause of action, entire action is transferred. *Gallin v. Superior Court (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 541, 545, 281 Cal. Rptr. 304*

Action as essentially transitory if personal property is involved, or if cause of action of personal nature is joined in good faith and not merely incidentally with local cause of action. *Myers v. Superior Court (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 925, 929, 172 P.2d 84*

Actions to quiet title to personal as well as real property, and for specific performance of contract relating to such personal and real property as essentially transitory. *Myers v. Superior Court (1946) 75 Cal. App. 2d 925, 930, 172 P.2d 84*

[c] Joinder of Defendants

[i] Generally

Defendant as not entitled to have action removed to county of his or her residence unless it appears that none of the other defendants are residents of county where action is brought. *Monogram Co. v. Kingsley (1951) 38 Cal. 2d 28, 30, 237 P.2d 265* ; *Hoag v. Superior Court (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 611, 616, 24 Cal. Rptr. 659*

Plaintiff as not entitled to join as defendants those who are not real parties in interest merely for purpose of obtaining trial in county of their residence. *Neet v. Holmes (1942) 19 Cal. 2d 605, 612, 122 P.2d 557*

Residence of defendant who was not joined in good faith but simply in attempt to defeat right of other defendant to trial at his or her residence under *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* as not considered in determining proper place for trial. *Hoag v. Superior Court (1962) 207 Cal. App. 2d 611, 617, 24 Cal. Rptr. 659* ; *Dreher v. Fidelity & Casualty Co. (1957) 148 Cal. App. 2d 695, 700, 307 P.2d 407*

Party joined as defendant because he or she cannot be joined as plaintiff as exception to general rule that when one defendant has residence or principal place of business in county in which action was brought, other defendants cannot change place of trial to county of their residence. *Stesel v. Santa Ana River Water Co. (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 117, 126-127, 94 P.2d 1052*

[ii] Individual and Corporate Defendants Joined

General rules governing joinder of defendants and effect of such joinder on venue as applying whether defendants are individuals or corporations. *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 772, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Plaintiff as entitled to fix venue at residence of either individual or corporation in cause of action stated against both, and joinder in conformity with statutes. *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 772, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498*

[iii] State and Corporate Defendants Joined

Plaintiff as waiving procedural rights granted by former *Cal. Const., art. XII, § 16* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*) by joining state and corporation as defendants, because *Gov. Code § 955.2*, by its terms, takes precedence. *State v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 637, 643, 60 Cal. Rptr. 653*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenuePublic OfficialsEstate, Gift & Trust LawProbatePersonal RepresentativesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawTitle QualityAdverse Claim ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.63

§ 571.63 Text References

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 3, *Actions*, § 701 et seq. (4th ed. 1996)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueCorporationsCivil ProcedureVenueIndividual DefendantsCivil ProcedureVenuePublic Officials

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.64-571.69

[Reserved]

§§ 571.64[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.70

§ 571.70 State Statutes

[1] Motion for Change of Venue

[a] In General

Transfer of unlawful detainer or consumer actions commenced in wrong court to proper court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a*

Action commenced in wrong court that has subject matter jurisdiction as subject to trial therein absent defendant's motion for transfer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*

Court as able to consider ancillary motions during pendency of motion to transfer in proceeding for dissolution of marriage or legal separation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(c)*

Grounds for change of venue. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397*

Determining transferee court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 398*

Costs and fees of transfer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 399*

Jurisdiction of court to which action is transferred. *Code Civ. Proc. § 399*

Transmittal of pleadings and papers to court to which action is transferred and notice of transmittal. *Code Civ. Proc. § 399*

Voluntary dismissal as not allowed if *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b* motion pending. *Code Civ. Proc. § 581(a)*

Transfer of action or proceeding not commenced in proper court. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a), 397(a)*

Time to file response to action if motion for transfer denied, and if no response previously filed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(e)*

Service and filing of motion as placing motion before court for all purposes. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1005.5*

Requisites of written notice. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010*

Offer to stipulate to change of venue as considered in determining whether party to motion for change should be ordered to pay attorney's fees and cost. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*

Court to which case transferred as having same jurisdiction as if action originally commenced therein. *Code Civ. Proc. § 399*

[b] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

After hearing on defendant's motion, court as required to transfer action or proceeding not commenced in proper court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*

Payment of expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making or resisting motion to transfer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*

Court as required to allow defendant time to move to strike, demur, or otherwise plead if motion for transfer is denied and if no response previously filed. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(e)*

Court as able to change place of trial when court designated in complaint is not proper court. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)*

[c] Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

Change of place of trial when convenience of witnesses and ends of justice would be promoted by change. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*

[d] Disqualification of Judges

Grounds for disqualification of judges. *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1*

Court as able to change place of trial when no judge of court qualified to act. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(d)*

[e] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

Change of place of trial when there is reason to believe that impartial trial cannot be had therein. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*

[f] In Specific Actions or Proceedings

Change of venue in dissolution of marriage proceedings. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397*

Transfer of proceedings under Family Law Act. *Code Civ. Proc. § 397.5*

[2] Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue

Consideration of plaintiff's opposition to motion to transfer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)*

[3] Review of Court Orders

Review of superior court order granting or denying motion for change of venue by petition for writ of mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 400*

Court as required to allow extension of time to answer after appeal from order granting or denying motion to transfer or mandate proceeding pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 400* becomes final. *Code Civ. Proc. § 586(a)(6)(C)*

[4] Transfer Within County

Power of superior court to transfer civil case to another branch or location of court in same county. *Code Civ. Proc. § 402*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of WitnessesCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticeMotion PracticeTime LimitationsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.71

§ 571.71 Decisions

[1] Action Commenced in Wrong Court

Like Code Civ. Proc. *§ 396, Welf. & Inst. Code* § 15657.3, part of the Elder Abuse Act, allows the probate court to determine that a matter should be determined in another portion of the court. Requiring a party to refile a case in the same courthouse, with possible statute of limitations issues, and additional costs to the party, is inconsistent with the legislative attempt to protect elderly *Californians. Conservatorship of Kayle (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1, 6-7, n.3, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 671*

Award of attorney's fees as proper under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* if, after reviewing factual and legal presentation made by losing party, court finds that no reasonable attorney would have honestly chosen such forum, and that forum appears to have been selected to impair defendant's right to defend. *Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 30, 38-39 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355*

[2] Burden of Proof

Corporate defendant moving to change venue in action involving tort as required to prove that its principal place of business is not in county in which complaint was filed, and that alleged liability did not arise in that county. *Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 929, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075*

Affidavit of vice-president of defendant corporation in support of motion to change venue as to fact that none of the defendants, including nonmoving codefendant, were residents of county, which fact must depend on codefendants intent, as sufficient averment of such fact, although made on information and belief. *Brown v. Happy Valley Fruit Growers (1929) 206 Cal. 515, 520, 274 P. 977* ; *see also City of Santa Cruz v. Municipal Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 74, 87, 260 Cal. Rptr. 520, 776 P.2d 222*

Burden of showing facts to justify change of venue as on moving defendant because plaintiff's choice of venue is

presumptively correct. *Massae v. Superior Court (1981) 118 Cal. App. 3d 527, 530, 173 Cal. Rptr. 527*

Motion for change of venue as having two requirements: (1) it must be shown that action is proper in county to which moving party seeks transfer, and (2) it must be shown that county in which action was filed was improper under any applicable theory. *Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 228, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588* ; *Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 245-246, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642* ; *Sequoia Pine Mills, Inc. v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 65, 68, 65 Cal. Rptr. 353*

Presumption as that defendants are residents of county wherein action commenced, and burden of proof as cast on them to show that they were at commencement of action residents of counties other than that wherein suit is brought, to which they ask that the place of trial be removed. *Sequoia Pine Mills, Inc. v. Superior Court (1968) 258 Cal. App. 2d 65, 67-68, 65 Cal. Rptr. 353*

Burden as resting on one who seeks change of venue under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*) to prove that both convenience of witnesses and ends of justice will be promoted. *Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 698-699, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666* ; *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 773, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Corporate defendant seeking change of venue as required to show not only place of residence or principal place of business, but also that contract was not made, that it was not to be performed, that obligation or liability did not arise, and that breach did not occur in venue originally determined by filing of plaintiff's complaint. *Smith v. Stanford Research Institute (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 28 Cal. Rptr. 481*

Burden as on plaintiff to show that case comes clearly within one of statutory exceptions to general rule that actions are triable at place of defendant's residence when defendant has made proper showing of nonresidence. *Archer v. Superior Court (1961) 202 Cal. App. 2d 417, 420, 21 Cal. Rptr. 48*

Statement by party as to his or place of residence in affidavit on motion for change of venue as constituting prima facie showing sufficient to support order directing change, if not overthrown by contrary evidence. *Taff v. Goodman (1940) 41 Cal. App. 2d 771, 774, 107 P.2d 431*

Affidavit of declaration made on information and belief by defendants on motion to change place of trial in relation to nonresidence of other defendants as sufficient. *Sims v. Mains (1933) 131 Cal. App. 307, 310, 21 P.2d 447*

[3] Convenience of Witnesses

Showing that proposed testimony of witnesses is admissible, relevant, and material to some issue in the case as required before witness' convenience may be considered as a ground for order granting a change of venue. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 773, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498* ; *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 755, 279 P.2d 978*

Both convenience of witnesses and ends of justice as required to occur, and moving party as having burden of proving that both conditions will be met. *Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 279 P.2d 978* ; *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 295, 112 P.2d 328*

Convenience of witnesses was shown by fact that all designated witnesses lived or worked, all relevant events allegedly took place, and all relevant documents were located in county to which transfer requested. *Richfield Hotel Management, Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 222, 227, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

Cross defendants may not defeat cross complainant's proper selection of venue even if all cross defendants concur in request for transfer to another venue that would also be proper; forum non conveniens motion based on convenience of witnesses as alternative remedy for cross defendant if trial court's order granting motion for change of venue reversed. *Tutor-Saliba-Perini Joint Venture v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 736, 742-744, 285 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Although there is no special statutory procedure governing motion based on former *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*), and code expresses no time limit within which it must be made, motion must be made within reasonable time after answer is filed. *Thompson v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 300, 306, 103 Cal. Rptr. 94*

Convenience to witnesses as only important consideration, not convenience of parties or employees of parties. *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 773, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498* ; *Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 17 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102*

Convenience of witnesses as shown by fact that residence of all witnesses is in county to which transfer of cause is requested. *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Inconvenience as able to be presumed from distance. *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 78, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Conclusion that ends of justice are promoted as able to be drawn from fact that by moving trial closer to residence of witnesses, delay and expense in court proceedings are avoided and savings in witnesses' time and expenses are effected. *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Granting of motion based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* as discretionary with trial court. *Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578* ; *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 279 P.2d 978* ; *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 293, 112 P.2d 328*

Motion for change of venue based on former *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(3)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*) as unable to be entertained when moving party has appeared only by demurrer and not by answer, as court cannot determine relevance and materiality of prospective witnesses. *Russello v. Mori (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 828, 832, 315 P.2d 343*

Mere numerical majority of witnesses on one side or other as not necessarily determining merits of motion. *Harden v. Skinner & Hammond (1955) 130 Cal. App. 2d 750, 754, 279 P.2d 978*

Convenience of witnesses in attending trial, rather than places of their actual residences, as issue to be decided by trial court. *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 293, 112 P.2d 328*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 as governing notices of motion made under *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*. *Willingham v. Pecora (1941) 44 Cal. App. 2d 289, 295, 112 P.2d 328*

[4] Expenses and Attorney's Fees

Award of attorney's fees under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* for services of defendants' attorney in making unsuccessful motion for change of venue and in obtaining issuance of writ of mandate compelling trial court to grant motion as inappropriate when trial court had found plaintiff's arguments "inventive" and "compelling" and denied motion for change of venue. *Cacciaguidi v. Superior Court (1990) 226 Cal. App. 3d 181, 187*

[5] Mixed Action

When two or more inconsistent venue provisions apply in same case, motion for change of venue is to be granted if defendant is entitled to change of venue on any one cause of action. *Capp Care, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 504, 508, 241 Cal. Rptr. 741*

[6] Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Change of Venue--Counteraffidavits or Countermotion

Only case in which it can ever be necessary or proper for plaintiff to ask on cross motion that action be retained for trial in county where he or she has brought it as when defendant's motion is on ground that county designated in complaint is not proper county. *Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 76*

When defendant's motion was made on ground that impartial trial could not be had, that change would promote convenience of witnesses, or that judge is disqualified, cross motion as not available to plaintiff, but plaintiff as entitled to file counter affidavits. *Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 76*

When venue originally laid in improper court, motion to retain venue there on ground of convenience of witnesses as unavailable when demurrer, but no answer, has been filed. *Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 214, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645*

Determination as to whether to retain cause on account of convenience of witnesses as resting largely within discretion of trial court. *Harris v. Cannon (1941) 42 Cal. App. 2d 748, 749, 109 P.2d 961*

[7] Following Compulsory Cross-Complaint

A plaintiff/cross-defendant against whom a compulsory cross-complaint has been filed is not entitled to seek a change of venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b* based on a claim of improper venue as determined by reference to the cross-complaint. Rather, the cross-complaint is to be tried in the same county that has been established as the proper venue based on the original complaint. *K.R.L. Partnership v. Superior Court (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 490, 498, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 517*

[8] Review of Court Orders

[a] Motions in the Superior Court

Code Civ. Proc. § 400 as providing that order of superior court granting or denying motion to change place of trial is reviewable solely by writ of mandate. *Milliken v. Gray (1969) 276 Cal. App. 2d 595, 599-600, 81 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[b] Standard of Review

Review of motion for change of venue made and determined on allegations of verified complaint, affidavits of respective parties as requiring that all conflicts be resolved in favor of prevailing party, and all reasonable inferences that are to be drawn must be in support of trial court's order. *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 466, 241 P.2d 4*

Appellate court uses abuse of discretion standard in reviewing order denying a venue change motion; trial court abused discretion in denying defendant's motion to change venue from Los Angeles to Sacramento County when all of the alleged acts occurred in Sacramento and venue was mandatory in Sacramento County under at least two of the three enumerated criteria listed in *Gov. Code § 12965(b)* (Fair Employment and Housing Act venue). *Ford Motor Credit*

Co. v. Superior Court (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 306, 310, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 682

For denial of motion to transfer venue pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*, not only is standard of review abuse of discretion, but actual prejudice must be shown. *Nguyen v. Superior Court (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1791, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 611*

Appellate court as able to reverse order denying motion for change of venue on ground of convenience of witnesses only on clear showing of abuse of discretion. *Union Trust Life Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 23, 28, 66 Cal. Rptr. 270* ; *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 774, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498* ; *Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. v. Zachary (1943) 60 Cal. App. 2d 560, 563, 141 P.2d 8*

Denial of motion to change venue as abuse of discretion when there is showing that convenience of witnesses and ends of justice will be promoted by change, and when there is absolutely no showing whatever to contrary, there being no evidence to sustain decision of trial court. *Union Trust Life Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1968) 259 Cal. App. 2d 23, 28, 66 Cal. Rptr. 270*

Appeals court as required to determine that sufficient facts have been shown on which trial court could base exercise of discretion. *Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 774, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498*

Judgment as not disturbed on appeal when evidence on motion for change of venue conflicting. *Wheeler v. Moschetti (1961) 188 Cal. App. 2d 827, 829, 10 Cal. Rptr. 722*

When motion made and determined on allegations of verified complaint and affidavits of defendants, all conflicts as required to be resolved in favor of prevailing party, and all reasonable inferences which are to be drawn must be in support of trial court's order. *City of Long Beach v. Lakewood Park (1953) 118 Cal. App. 2d 596, 598, 258 P.2d 538*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of WitnessesCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral Overview

110 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.72-571.79

[Reserved]

§§ 571.72[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.80

§ 571.80 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Controlled by Residence of Defendant [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Controlled by Residence of Defendant [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____[*name*] was and is a resident of [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action that is governed by the basic rule of venue set out in the first sentence of *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*, which provides that the superior court in the county where the defendants or some of them reside is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. This rule applies unless an action falls within some exception. Thus, if no other venue provision applies, venue is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 395* [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 483, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272]* . For discussion of what constitutes a residence,*see § 571.16[1][c]*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a) controls venue in transitory actions, that is, actions in which the main relief sought is personal [*Brown v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 477, 482 n.5, 208 Cal. Rptr. 724, 691 P.2d 272]* . Transitory actions deal primarily with financial obligations or personal relationships [*Carlton v. Superior Court (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 586, 589, 49 Cal. Rptr. 759]* . In particular, the rule covers personal torts not involving physical injury [*Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520]* . For example, the foregoing form may be used in an action for conversion [*Haurat v. Superior Court (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 330, 333, 50 Cal. Rptr. 520* ; *Mason v. Buck (1929) 99 Cal. App. 219, 221, 278 P. 461]* . Also, it may be used in actions for libel, malicious prosecution, and false imprisonment [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 218, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* .

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.81

§ 571.81 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Tortious Conduct Occurred [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Tortious Conduct Occurred [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

On or about _____[*date*], in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California, defendant _____ [*specify physical injury or death to person or physical injury to personal property, e.g.*, assaulted and battered plaintiff by threatening to strike plaintiff and violently striking plaintiff in and about the face].

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action for injury to a person or personal property, or for death from a wrongful act or negligence. In such a case, either the county where the injury occurs or the injury causing death occurs, or the county where the defendants or some of them reside at the commencement of the action is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*].

Either the form in [1], *above*, or the *form in § 571.81* may be used in actions based on tortious conduct causing physical injury to persons or personal property because *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* allows trial of a negligence action either in the county of defendant's residence or in the county where the tort occurred [*Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916]* . Generally, the facts alleged to establish the elements of a particular tort will be sufficient to establish the place of trial in the county where the tort occurred. Further, if counsel wishes to establish venue in the county where the tort occurred, an allegation setting forth the defendant's place of residence need not be included in the complaint.

The phrase "injury to person" as used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* is limited to physical injury or incapacity or death caused by the wrongful or negligent act of another [*Monk v. Ehret (1923) 192 Cal. 186, 191-193, 219 P. 452]* . Therefore, it refers only to injuries of a physical or bodily nature, and not to injuries to character or reputation [*Monk v. Ehret (1923) 192 Cal. 186, 193, 219 P. 452* ; *Carruth v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 215, 219, 145 Cal.*

Rptr. 344] .

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.82

§ 571.82 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract Entered Into [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract Entered Into [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

The contract that created the obligation on which this action is based, _____ [which is set out herein *or* a copy of which is attached hereto, and marked Exhibit _____], was in fact entered into in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action founded on contract when the plaintiff wishes to bring the action in the county in which the contract was entered into [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*]. The place where the contract was made is the place where the last act necessary for its validity was done. This is usually the act constituting acceptance [*Braunstein v. Superior Court of Monterey County (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 696-697, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* .

[3] Alternative Places of Trial in Contract Actions

In addition to the county in which it was entered into, an action founded on contract may alternatively be tried in the county in which the defendant resides at the commencement of the action or in which the defendant has contracted specially and in writing to perform his or her obligation [*Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840* ; for forms alleging residence and place of performance*see § 571.80* and *§ 571.83*, respectively].

The alternatives in the contract provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)* are exceptions to the general rule that the defendant is entitled to trial in his or her county of residence [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 224, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588]* . Thus, the plaintiff is entitled to have an action founded on a contract tried in the county in which it appears that the contract was entered into despite the defendant's residence in another county [*Richardson v. Rose (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 318, 322, 17 Cal. Rptr. 84]* .

[4] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.83

§ 571.83 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract to Be Performed [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Transitory Action--Place Where Contract to Be Performed [Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)]

Pursuant to _____ [*specify provision in the contract that specifically states the place where defendant was to perform his or her obligation, e.g.,* Paragraph _____ of the contract on which this action is based(, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit _____ and made a part hereof)], defendant was to _____ [*specify obligation on which action is based, e.g.,* tender payment at plaintiff's address] in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action founded on a contract obligation when the plaintiff wishes to bring the action in the county in which the obligation was to be performed. If there is a special contract in writing in which the defendant has contracted to perform an obligation in a particular county, that county is one of the proper places for trial in an action founded on the obligation. Absent a special contract in writing to the contrary, the place of performance is presumed to be the place in which the obligation was incurred [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a)*; *Armstrong v. Smith (1942) 49 Cal. App. 2d 528, 531-532, 122 P.2d 115]* .

[3] Special Contract in Writing Required

A "special contract in writing" must specifically state the place of performance of the obligation [*Wathen v. Superior Court (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 125, 129, 27 Cal. Rptr. 840]* . Any deficiency or lack of a specification cannot be remedied by extrinsic evidence [*Fidelity Thrift & Loan Asso. v. Hall (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 895, 899 , 9 Cal. Rptr. 596]* . However, a geographic designation of the city or county without setting forth the address is enough to satisfy the requirement [*Stute v. Burinda (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 16 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102]* .

[4] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.84

§ 571.84 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Controlled by Situs of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Controlled by Situs of Real Property [Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)]

The real property that is the subject of this action is known as _____[*street address or common designation, and if any, city*], located _____[partly] in _____ County[, and is more particularly described as follows: _____ (*set forth legal description*)].

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action for the recovery of real property, for the recovery or determination of an estate or interest in the property, for injuries to the property, or for the foreclosure of liens or mortgages on the property. The proper venue for the trial of the action is any county in which all or part of the property is situated [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)*]. For a form of allegation based on the residence of defendant,*see § 571.80*.

[3] Local Actions

[a] Recovery of Real Property, Recovery or Determination of Title to Real Property, Injury to Real Property

In a local action, the situs of the real property that is the subject matter of the action controls the place of trial [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392*]. An action is local when it turns on title to property as distinct from a personal obligation, and the decree operates by its own force on the title [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 603, 328 P.2d 953* ; *Thielen v. Superior Court (1963) 219 Cal. App. 2d 217, 219, 33 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . An action is also local if it involves injury to real property, although *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(1)(a)* (*see now Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*) is not limited to physical injury to or interference with the property. It may include nonfeasance, such as permissive waste. It may also include threatened injuries or consequential injuries to property resulting from tortious conduct [*Coley v. Hecker (1928) 206*

Cal. 22, 28, 272 P. 1045 ; *Strosnider v. Pomin (1939) 32 Cal. App. 2d 103, 108, 89 P.2d 179]* .

[b] Foreclosure of Lien or Mortgage on Real Property

The county where all or part of the real property that is the subject of the action is located is also the proper county for trial for the foreclosure of all liens and mortgages on the property [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(2)*; *see* *Goldtree v. McAlister (1890) 86 Cal. 93, 106, 24 P. 801* (every official act necessary to effect foreclosure can occur in any county in which all or part of the real property located)].

[c] Unlawful Detainer

In the court designated as the proper court in *Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)*, the proper court location for trial of a proceeding for an unlawful detainer, as defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1161*, is the location where the court tries that type of proceeding that is nearest or most accessible to where the real property that is the subject of the action, or some part thereof, is situated. Otherwise any location of the superior court designated as the proper court in § 392(a) is a proper court location for the trial. The court may specify by local rule the nearest or most accessible court location where the court tries that type of case [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(b)*].

[4] Description of Real Property in Quiet Title Action

The form in [1], *above*, contains optional language for use to provide the legal description of the property that is the subject of the action. This should be provided when the subject matter of the action involves determination of title to the property. For example, a complaint in a quiet title action must include a description of the property that is the subject of the action. In the case of real property, the description must include both its legal description and its street address or common designation, if any [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*]. For forms of complaints, and a detailed discussion of quiet title actions,*see* Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[5] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.85

§ 571.85 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Where Cause of Action Arose--For Recovery of Penalty or Forfeiture Imposed by Statute or Act Done by Public Officer by Virtue of His or Her Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 393]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Where Cause of Action Arose--For Recovery of Penalty or Forfeiture Imposed by Statute or Act Done by Public Officer by Virtue of His or Her Office [Code Civ. Proc. § 393]

The _____ [*specify penalty or forfeiture or other act that is the subject of the action, e.g.,* action by defendant as herein described to revoke plaintiff's license to carry on his/her business] occurred in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action for the recovery of a penalty or forfeiture imposed by statute, or against a public officer for an act done by him or her by virtue of his or her office. The proper county for the trial of these actions is the county in which the cause, or some part thereof, arose [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393*].

[3] Penalty or Forfeiture

The county in which the cause, or some part thereof, arose is the proper county for the trial of an action for the recovery of a penalty or forfeiture imposed by statute. If the penalty or forfeiture was imposed for an offense committed on a lake, river, or other stream of water, situated in two or more counties, the action may be tried in any county bordering on the lake, river, or stream, and opposite to the place where the offense was committed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393(a)*].

[4] Actions Against Public Officers

Code Civ. Proc. § 393(b) establishes venue in the county where an act was done by a public officer or person especially appointed to execute the public officer's duties by virtue of his or her office [*Code Civ. Proc. § 393*]. It applies to

affirmative acts by a public officer that directly interfere with the personal rights or property of a person, such as the right to do business. Thus, it does not apply to threats of future acts [*Harris v. Alcoholic Bev. Etc. Appeals Bd. (1961) 197 Cal. App. 2d 759, 768, 18 Cal. Rptr. 151]* .

[5] State Agencies as "Public Officers"

The form in [1], *above*, may be used against public entities, as well as against individuals, to establish venue in the county where the cause arose. Absent a statutory designation of an administrative or enforcement officer, the term "public officer" includes state agencies, departments, institutions, boards, or other public entities [Regents of University ofCalifornia v. *Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 537-538, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457]* .

[6] Cross References

For a form of allegation based on the residence of defendant,*see § 571.80*.

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.86

§ 571.86 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Against Personal Representative or Trustee--County Which Has Jurisdiction of Estate [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1]

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Local Action--Against Personal Representative or Trustee--County Which Has Jurisdiction of Estate [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1]

Defendant is the _____ [executor *or* administrator *or* guardian *or* conservator *or* trustee] of _____ [*specify estate, e.g.,* the Estate of _____ (name), Deceased], Case Number _____, which is pending in the Superior Court of _____ County, California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action against an executor, administrator, guardian, conservator, or trustee in his or her official or representative capacity on a claim for the payment of money or for the recovery of personal property. In these actions, the county that has jurisdiction of the estate that the defendant represents is the proper county for the trial of the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1*]. The foregoing form is not for use in establishing venue in probate proceedings. It is for use in a collateral action against the personal representative of the estate.

[3] "Claim" Against the Estate Defined

The form in [1], *above*, may be used even if the plaintiff is not suing because of a rejected creditor's claim. For example, the plaintiff may sue a representative in the county having jurisdiction over an estate for services the plaintiff rendered to the estate. The word "claim" as it is used in *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.1* simply means a demand for something rightfully or allegedly due [*Metzger v. Silverman (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 30, 36-37 , 133 Cal. Rptr. 355]* .

[4] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and*

Cross-Complaints .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.87

§ 571.87 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5]--Transitory Action Against Corporation

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5]--Transitory Action Against Corporation
[*EITHER, if domestic corporation*]

_____[*Name of corporation*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of California, _____ [*specify basis on which venue is established, e.g.,* with its principal place of business] in _____ County, California.

[*OR, if foreign corporation authorized to do business in California*]

_____[*Name of corporation*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____, and authorized to transact, and transacting, intrastate business in California, _____ [*specify basis on which venue is established, e.g.,* with its principal place of business in this state in _____ County, California].

[2] Use of Form

The forms of allegation in [1], *above*, are for use in a complaint in an action brought against a corporation. A corporation may be sued in the county where its principal place of business is situated. It may also be sued where a contract is made or is to be performed, or where the obligation or liability arises, or a breach occurs [*Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*; *Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 476, 241 P.2d 4* (decided under former *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 16*, now *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*)].

[3] Domestic Corporations

[a] Alternative Places of Trial in Transitory Actions

The forms in [1], *above*, should be used in transitory actions against corporations [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal3d 921, 927, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* governs actions sounding in both contract and tort [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* . For a discussion relating to venue in actions against foreign corporations,*see § 571.18[2]*

[b] Where Contract Is Made or to Be Performed

The last act necessary to the validity of the contract, usually the act constituting acceptance, is the place of its making for purposes *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* [*Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 723, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192]* . In an action on the contract of a corporation, when no place of performance is expressly stipulated, it will be held performable in the place where the circumstances, viewed in light of pertinent code provisions, indicate that the parties expected or intended it to be performed. Thus, the place of performance may be implied [*Burr v. Western States Life Ins. Co. (1931) 211 Cal. 568, 574, 296 P. 273* ; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[1][a]* regarding principle place of business or county where cause of action arises].

[c] Where Obligation or Liability Arises

Generally, the place where the contract is made is also the place where the obligation or liability arises [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 479, 241 P.2d 4]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5 permits tort claims against a corporation to be tried in any county in which the liability arises [*Mission Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 921, 928, 184 Cal. Rptr. 296, 647 P.2d 1075]* .

[d] Where the Breach Occurs

In general, the place of performance of a contract obligation is also where the breach occurs [*Hale v. Bohannon (1952) 38 Cal. 2d 458, 479, 241 P.2d 4]* . However, it may also occur in the county where a corporation has its principal place of business [*Jhirmack Enterprises, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 715, 724, 158 Cal. Rptr. 192]* .

[4] Foreign Corporations

The second alternative in the foregoing form is for use against a foreign corporation that has qualified to do business in *California. Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5* applies to a foreign corporation in the same manner as it does to a domestic corporation, provided that the foreign corporation establishes that it has qualified to do business in California under *Corp. Code § 2105* [*Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642* (decided under former *Cal. Const. art. XII, § 16*, now *Code Civ. Proc. § 395.5*, and former Corp. Code § 6403, now *Corp. Code § 2105*)]. If a foreign corporation has not qualified to do business in California under *Corp. Code § 2105*, a plaintiff may sue it in any county in the state [*Easton v. Superior Court (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 243, 246-247, 90 Cal. Rptr. 642]* .

[5] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.88

§ 571.88 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5]--Unincorporated Associations

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5]--Unincorporated Associations

_____[*Name of unincorporated association*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state form of entity, e.g.,* a partnership], _____ [*state basis on which venue is to be established, e.g.,* with its principal place of business] in _____ County California.

[2] Use of Form

The form of allegation in [1], *above*, is for use in a complaint in an action against an incorporated association. The proper county for the trial of an action against an unincorporated association is the same as for corporations if the association has filed a statement with the Secretary of State pursuant to *Corp. Code § 18200* (formerly *Corp. Code § 24003*) listing its principal office in this state. For the purpose of determining the proper county, the association's principal place of business is deemed to be the principal office listed in the statement. If the association has not filed a statement, it may be sued in the county where the contract is made or is to be performed, where the obligation or liability arises, or where the breach occurs [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 395.2, 395.5*]. In addition, because an association that has not filed a statement has no principal place of business in California, venue is proper in the county of residence of any member of the association [*Mosby v. Superior Court (1974) 43 Cal. App. 3d 219, 229 n.7, 117 Cal. Rptr. 588* ; for further discussion,*see § 571.18[3]* regarding unincorporated associations].

Moreover, even if the association has filed a statement, if the action is against partners as individuals as well as the association, venue may be proper in the county or counties in which those partners reside [*Buran Equipment Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1662, 1666-1667, 236 Cal. Rptr. 171]* .

[3] Cross References

For discussion relating to the effect of statements of unincorporated associations on venue in actions against partnerships,*see Ch. 402, Partnerships: Actions Between General Partners or Partnership and Third Parties, § 402.12[3]*.

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.89

§ 571.89 Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 401; Gov. Code §§ 955, 955.2]--Actions Against State or State Agency

[1] FORM Venue Allegation in Complaint--Type of Party [Code Civ. Proc. § 401; Gov. Code §§ 955, 955.2]--Actions Against State or State Agency
[*EITHER, if defendant is State of California*]

Defendant State of California is, and at all times herein mentioned was, a sovereign state of the United States of America, and _____ [*specify facts establishing venue, e.g.,* this action is brought in (_____ (city)), _____ County, California, wherein the injury herein described occurred].

[*OR, if defendant is state agency*]

Defendant _____[*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify facts showing defendant is a state agency, e.g.,* an Appeals Board for the Department of _____] of the State of California, and _____ [*specify facts establishing venue, e.g.,* this action is brought in the City (and County) of _____, wherein the Attorney General has his/her office].

[2] Use of Form

The forms of allegation in [1], *above*, are for use in a complaint in an action against the state or a state agency. Actions against the state or its agencies may be governed by the general venue rules in some actions *Regents of University of California v. Superior Court (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 529, 534-535, 91 Cal. Rptr. 57, 476 P.2d 457]* . There are a few statutes that fix venue in a particular place for specific actions (*see, e.g., Bus. & Prof. Code § 2019* (legal proceedings against the Medical Board of California must be instituted in either Sacramento, Los Angeles, San Diego, or San Francisco)). Generally, however, the Attorney General may make a written demand to move the place of trial to Sacramento in actions on claims for money or damages for which the filing of a claim is a statutory prerequisite under *Gov. Code §§ 905* (local public entities) and 905.2 (state), or in actions on claims for money or damages that are specifically exempted

from the filing requirement, such as the enumerated matters in *Gov. Code §§ 905* and *905.1* [*see Gov. Code § 955* (governing actions other than those for inverse condemnation or injury to a person or personal property); for further discussion,*see § 571.18[4]*]. In those cases, the action may be commenced and tried in any city or city and county of the state in which the Attorney General has an office, that is, Sacramento, San Francisco, or Los Angeles [*Code Civ. Proc. § 401(1)*].

The examples in the forms above are based on venue provisions that are peculiar to public enties. The first alternative paragraph uses the example of *Gov. Code 955.2* (proper court for trial of an action for injury to person or personal property; county where injury occurred)]. The example in the second alternative paragraph would be used when there is a specific statute establishing venue in Sacramento, or when the action is governed by *Gov. Code § 955*. In addition to those examples, the foregoing form may also be used in cases governed by the general venue rules in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-402*, in which case the county of the agency's residence, the situs of the subject matter of the action, or other facts establishing the proper place for trial should be alleged instead of the examples given [*see §§ 571.80* 581.84 for forms; *see* discussion in *§ 571.18[4]* regarding actions against a state or local government agency].

[3] Cross References

For a discussion of complaints and cross-complaints and associated forms, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* .

121 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
A. Place of Trial

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 571.90-571.99

[Reserved]

§§ 571.90[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.100

§ 571.100 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Notice of Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Notice of Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION FOR
_____ [*name*],	)	CHANGE OF VENUE
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] will, and hereby does, move for an order pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure section 397* to transfer the venue of this action to the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of _____. The motion will be made on the ground that under _____ *specify one of the grounds enumerated in Code Civ. Proc. § 397, i.e.,* the court designated in the complaint is not the proper court *or* there

is reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had in the court designated in the complaint *or* the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be promoted by the change *or* there is no judge of the court qualified to act]. [In addition, pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure section 396b(b)*, _____ (*identify party, e.g.*, defendant) will, and hereby does, move for an award of reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making the motion to transfer, in the amount of $_____.]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name*(*s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a defendant to move for a change of venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)*, or for use by either party to move for a change of venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)-(d)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*; *see also Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 79* (plaintiff may move to change venue on grounds that convenience of witnesses and ends of justice will be promoted, when a fair and impartial trial cannot be had, or whenever he or she ascertains the disqualification of the judge); *see § 571.31*, Grounds for Motion for Change of Venue].

The form contains optional language at the end of the first paragraph for use when the movant seeks to recover the reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making the motion for change of transfer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*, and discussion in *§ 571.32[2]* regarding expenses and attorney's fees].

[3] Accompanying Papers

A supporting memorandum is required to be filed and a copy served with the notice of motion in [1], *above*, [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms,*see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Procedure for Filing Motion

[a] When Action Commenced in Wrong Court

Code Civ. Proc. § 396b sets forth specific procedures to change venue when an action has been commenced in a county that is not a proper one for trial under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392-395.5*. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b*, the defendant may file with the clerk a notice of motion for an order transferring the action or proceeding to the proper court, together with proof of service on the adverse party of a copy of such papers. The defendant may file the notice of motion at the time he or she answers, demurs, or moves to strike, or, at his or her option, without answering, demurring, or moving to strike and within the time otherwise allowed to respond to the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(a)* (court may change place of trial when court designated in complaint is not proper court)]. Limited civil actions and proceedings governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 396a* (specified consumer obligations and unlawful detainer) are excepted from the coverage of *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*].

Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a) requires a notice of motion together with proof of service [*Otsuka v. Balangue (1949) 92*

Cal. App. 2d 788, 790, 208 P.2d 65] . Further, a *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)* motion for change of venue is also governed by the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010* [*Bohn v. Bohn (1913) 164 Cal. 532, 536, 129 P. 981]* . *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010* provides that written notices must state when the hearing on the motion will be held, the grounds on which the motion will be made, and the papers, if any, on which the motion is to be based. If the notice fairly advises the opposing counsel of the issues to be raised, the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397,* and *1010* will be satisfied [*Tarman v. Sherwin (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 49, 52, 10 Cal. Rptr. 787]* . It may be sufficient if the notice contains a statement that the motion will also be based on the papers served with it [*Modlin v. Walter's Fur Shop (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 384, 388, 188 P.2d 805* ; *see* *Butterfield v. Butterfield (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 227, 228, 34 P.2d 145* (holding that former Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule XIX, now *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a),* requiring a memorandum to be filed applies to motions for change of venue)]. In any event, any defect in the notice may be cured by amendment [*Joe Lowe Corp. v. Rasmusson (1942) 53 Cal. App. 2d 490, 497, 127 P.2d 1002]* .

[b] Convenience of Witnesses and Ends of Justice

The form of notice in [1], *above*, may also be used to move for change of venue on the ground that the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be promoted [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*]. Although there is no express time limit within which the notice of motion must be made, it must be made within a reasonable time after the answer is filed [*Thompson v. Superior Court (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 300, 306, 103 Cal. Rptr. 94]* . However, the answer must be on file before the motion is made, because until the issues are joined, the court cannot determine whether the witnesses' testimony will be relevant [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 214, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* . For similar reasons, it is not enough that the defendant has appeared only by demurrer [*Russello v. Mori (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 828, 832, 315 P.2d 343]* .

Counsel should ensure that the statement of grounds in the notice follows the statutory language of *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c),* because both the conditions in the statute must be met before a motion can be granted [*Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578]* . Thus, the moving party has the burden of proving that both the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be promoted by a change of venue [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953]* .

[c] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

The form in [1], *above*, may also be used to give notice of a motion based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*. The motion must be made after the answer has been filed, and possibly even after a jury has been impaneled [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 79* ; *see* *J.I. Case T. Co. v. Copren Bros. (1917) 35 Cal. App. 70, 79, 169 P. 443]* . However, counsel may not have to wait until an attempt to secure a fair and impartial jury has been made if, at the hearing, there appears sufficient reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had [*People v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1938) 24 Cal. App. 2d 420, 427, 75 P.2d 560]* .

When motion based on ground that defendant joined to defeat right of real defendant to have cause removed to proper county for trial, ground as required to be distinctly specified in notice of motion. *McDonald v. California Timber Co. (1907) 151 Cal. 159, 161, 90 P. 548* .

[d] No Qualified Judge

The form of notice in [1], *above*, may be used for a motion to change venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(d)*. However, it is unlikely that this type of motion will ever be required, because a qualified judge from another county may always be assigned [*People v. Spring Valley Co. (1952) 109 Cal. App. 2d 656, 672, 241 P.2d 1069]* .

[5] Costs and Fees of Transfer

When a transfer is sought on any ground specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b), (c),* or *(d),* the costs and fees of the

transfer, and of filing the papers in the court to which the transfer is ordered, shall be paid by the party making the motion for the transfer at the time the motion is filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 399*].

[6] Transfer of Action by or Against Local Government Entity Under Code Civ. Proc. § 394

The form in [1], *above*, may also be modified for use in moving for a change of venue to a neutral county in an action by or against a county or other local government agency [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* (discussed in *§ 571.19*); *see also Dorame v. Superior Court (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 70, 72, 146 Cal. Rptr. 162* (holding that *Code Civ. Proc. § 394* is removal or change of venue statute)]. In such a case, counsel should specify the applicable grounds for transfer to a neutral county under *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* rather than the grounds for change of venue set out in *Code Civ. Proc. § 397*.

Although one provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a)* states that an action against a county or other local entity "shall be tried" in that county when it involves injuries occurring in that county as a result of that county's negligence, a plaintiff in such a case may nevertheless seek a change of venue under the discretionary provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)* [*see Paesano v. Superior Court (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 17, 19-20, 250 Cal. Rptr. 842]* .

[7] Cross References

For a declaration in support of a motion for change of venue, see *§ 571.101*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.101

§ 571.101 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--General Form

[1] FORM Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR CHANGE
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	OF VENUE
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for defendant *or other statement as appropriate*].

[*SET FORTH, in successively numbered paragraphs, facts supporting the ground on which the motion is being made, for example:*]

2. _____ [*Set forth the names and addresses of the witnesses and the nature of their testimony, e.g.,* Plaintiff expects to call as witnesses at the trial of the above-captioned action the following persons, who will testify in substance as follows: _____].

3. _____ [*Set forth facts showing reasons why attendance at the present place of trial would be inconvenient, e.g.,* These witnesses are beyond subpena range of this court, and are prevented from voluntarily attending this court because _____].

4. _____[*Set forth facts tending to show that change of venue will promote the ends of justice*].

[5. *If reasonable expenses and fees are sought pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b), set forth basis for award, e.g.,* I have contacted plaintiff's attorney by telephone on three separate occasions to discuss the possibility of a stipulation that the above-captioned action be transferred. I explained during each of the conversations that several of plaintiff's witnesses are beyond the subpoena range of this court and that they are prevented from voluntarily attending this court. Nevertheless, each time I have offered to stipulate to a change of venue, plaintiff's attorney has refused. As a result of these refusals, defendant has incurred expenses and attorney's fees in making this motion for change of venue, in the amount of $_____.]

[*CONTINUE*]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The general form of declaration in [1], *above*, is for use by either party to support a motion for change of venue. The example used in the form is based on the ground that the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be served by a change [*Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)*]. However, the form may also be used to support a motion based on the grounds that there is reason to believe that an impartial trial cannot be had in the county where the action was commenced, or that there is no judge of the court qualified to act [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397(b), (d)*]. If the form is used to support a motion based on *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397(b)* or *(d)*, counsel should aver facts supporting those particular grounds.

Paragraph 5 of the form contains optional language for use when the movant seeks to recover the reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making the motion for change of transfer [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* and discussion in *§ 571.32[e]* regarding expenses and attorney's fees].

[3] Inconvenience of Witnesses

The moving party's burden of proving that both the convenience of the witnesses and the ends of justice will be promoted by a change of venue may be satisfied by affidavits or declarations to that effect [*Corfee v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 473, 477, 20 Cal. Rptr. 870]* . The affidavits or declarations must set forth the names of the witnesses, the nature of the testimony expected from each, and the reasons why the attendance of each would be inconvenient [*Peiser v. Mettler (1958) 50 Cal. 2d 594, 607, 328 P.2d 953* (affidavits); *Stute v. Burinda*

(1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d Supp. 11, 17 , 177 Cal. Rptr. 102 (declarations)]. They must contain more than generalities and conclusions [*Dillman v. Superior Court (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 769, 773, 23 Cal. Rptr. 498]* . Thus, a bare conclusory averment that witnesses are material and necessary is insufficient [*Flanagan v. Flanagan (1959) 175 Cal. App. 2d 641, 644, 346 P.2d 418]* . The averments must reveal what the substance of the witnesses' testimony would be, and whether it would be favorable or unfavorable to the moving party. The convenience of witnesses whose testimony will be merely cumulative is entitled to little consideration [*Corfee v. Southern Cal. Edison Co. (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 473, 477, 20 Cal. Rptr. 870]* .

The declaration is also required to set forth facts from which the conclusion can be drawn that the ends of justice will be promoted. However, the court may rely not only on the direct facts set forth in the affidavits or declarations, but also on any reasonable and relevant inference therefrom [*Pearson v. Superior Court (1962) 199 Cal. App. 2d 69, 77, 18 Cal. Rptr. 578]* .

[4] Impartial Trial Cannot Be Had

Affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) may be used as evidence to support a motion for change of venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 397(b)*. Affidavits were held to be sufficient to establish that it would be extremely doubtful that an impartial trial could be held before a jury in a county when they tended to show, by reference to newspaper editorials and articles, reports of civic meetings, and statements made by numerous citizens of the county, a widespread feeling of prejudice extending over a long period of years [*People v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1938) 24 Cal. App. 2d 420, 427-428, 75 P.2d 560]* .

[5] No Judge in Court Qualified to Act

The venue statutes provide no grounds for the disqualification of judges, nor is there any authority establishing the showing required for a motion for change of venue on this ground. However, it appears that such a motion may be supported by affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) [*see* *Meyer v. City of San Diego (1898) 121 Cal. 102, 103-104, 53 P. 434* (affidavit to support motion for change of venue showing judge was owner of real property located in defendant city which was subject to taxes for the payment of a bonded indebtedness such as the one that was the subject of the action); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1* (grounds for disqualification of judges for cause)]. For forms and discussion relating to disqualification for judges for cause,*see* Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[6] Cross References

For forms and discussion relating to affidavits, certificates, and declarations under penalty of perjury,*see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

For related form of notice of motion for change of venue,*see § 571.100*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.102

§ 571.102 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--Action Commenced in Improper Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a), 397(a)]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Declaration in Support of Motion--Action Commenced in Improper Court [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a), 397(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	DECLARATION OF _____
_____ [*name*],	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR CHANGE
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	OF VENUE
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

I, _____[*name of defendant*], declare:

1. I am the defendant in the above-captioned action.

[*EITHER, if motion based on situs of subject matter of action*]

2. The real property that is the subject of the above-captioned action is located _____[partly] in [_____ (*city*),] _____[*specify county where action should be tried*] County, California.

[3. No part of the subject real property is located in _____ (*specify county in which action has been commenced*) County, California.]

[*OR, if motion based on where the cause of action arose*]

2. The _____ [alleged offense which is the basis of the _____ (penalty *or* forfeiture) *or* act done by the _____ (*specify public officer*)] on which the above-captioned action is based occurred in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

[*OR, if motion based on residence of defendant or defendants*]

2. At the time of the commencement of this action, I resided in _____ County, California.

[*OR, if motion based on place where contract entered into or was to be performed*]

2. _____ [The contract and all other oral and written agreements between myself and plaintiff on which this action is founded were entered into *or* Pursuant to Provision _____ in the contract on which the above-captioned action is founded, the obligation which is the subject of this action was to be performed] in [_____ (*city*),] _____ County, California.

3. _____ [*Set forth facts showing either that contract was in fact entered into in another county, or that, pursuant to a special contract in writing, the obligation was to be performed in another county, e.g.,* I signed the contract on which this action is founded in (_____ (*city*),) _____ County, California, and there is no written provision in the contract specifying the place where the obligation was to be performed].

[*OR, if motion based on place where injury to person or personal property occurred*]

2. _____ [*Set forth facts showing that injury occurred in county other than where action commenced, e.g.,* The injury to my automobile on which the above-captioned action is based occurred] in [_____ (*city*)], _____ County, California.

[*CONTINUE*]

[3. *If reasonable expenses and fees are sought pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b), set forth basis for award, e.g.,* I have contacted plaintiff's attorney by telephone on three separate occasions to discuss the possibility of a stipulation that the above-captioned action be transferred. I explained during each of these conversations that no part of the subject real property is located in the county in which plaintiff's action was commenced, and that the proper venue would be in the county in which the property is located. Nevertheless, each time I have offered to stipulate to a change of venue, plaintiff's attorney has refused. As a result these refusals, defendant has incurred expenses and attorney's fees in making this motion for change of venue, in the amount of $_____.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____[*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The declaration in [1], *above*, is for use to support a motion for change of venue when an action has been commenced in the wrong court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b(a), 397(a)*]. Although there is no statutory requirement, it is general practice to support a motion with declarations or affidavits [*see Hagan v. Gilbert (1948) 83 Cal. App. 2d 570, 576, 189 P.2d 548* (where contract was entered into)]. For example, a declaration of residence will normally satisfy defendant's burden of proving that neither he or she, nor any other defendant, resided in the county in which the action was commenced [*see Carruth v. Superior Court (1978) 80 Cal. App. 3d 215, 223-224, 145 Cal. Rptr. 344]* . A defendant's affidavit may contain conclusory averments as to his or her own residence, but the same averments made in an affidavit by a third person about a defendant are legal conclusions, and therefore insufficient [*McKune v. McKune (1920) 48 Cal. App. 204, 205-206, 191 P. 958]* .

[3] Cross References

For related form of notice of motion for change of venue,*see § 571.100*.

For a form of declaration in support of a motion for change of venue for reasons other than commencement in the wrong court,*see § 571.101*.

For forms and discussion relating to affidavits, certificates, and declarations under penalty of perjury,*see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.103

§ 571.103 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 398] Granting Motion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 397]--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 398] Granting Motion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR CHANGE OF
_____ [*name*],	)	VENUE
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____
_____		

The motion of _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] for an order to transfer venue of the above-captioned action from this court to the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of _____, came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____[*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____[*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____[*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted and that the action of the above-captioned case is hereby

transferred to the Superior Court of California for the County of _____ on payment of all the necessary fees required by law. The clerk of this court is authorized to transfer all the pleadings and papers herein to the clerk of that court.

[IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that _____ (*specify attorney fo* r *opposing party, e.g.,* plaintiff's attorney, _____ (*name*),) pay _____ (*identify moving party, e.g.,* defendant) the sum of $_____ as the amount of reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in making the motion to transfer.]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of order in [1], *above*, is for use when the court grants a motion for a change of venue pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 397* [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 396b, 398, 399]. On the hearing of a motion for an order transferring the action or proceeding to the proper court, the court shall, if it appears that the action or proceeding was not commenced in the proper court, order the action or proceeding transferred to the proper court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)*].

[3] Cross References

For related form of notice of motion for change of venue,*see § 571.100*.

For a form of declaration in support of a motion for change of venue for reasons other than commencement in the wrong court,*see § 571.101*.

For discussion of the possibility of recovering expenses and attorney's fees when the action or proceeding was originally brought in the wrong court,*see § 571.32[2]*.

For discussion of the procedure for making the transfer after the order has been granted,*see §§ 571.37* and *§ 571.42*.

126 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.104

§ 571.104 Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. § 396b, 397]--Notice of Countermotion

[1] FORM Proceedings for Change of Venue [Code Civ. Proc. § 396b, 397]--Notice of Countermotion

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
	)	MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION TO RE-
_____ [*name*],	)	TAIN VENUE
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To defendant _____[*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], plaintiff will move for an order to retain the above-captioned action in the county where it was commenced. The motion will be made on the ground(s) that _____ [the convenience of the witnesses will be promoted *and/or* the ends of justice will be promoted]. [In addition, _____ (*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff) will move at the aforementioned time and place for an award of reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in opposing the motion to transfer, in the amount of $_____.]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The notice of motion in [1], *above*, is for use by a plaintiff in response to a defendant's motion to change venue. The basis of the countermotion is that the convenience of the witnesses or the ends of justice or both will be promoted by retaining venue where the action was commenced [*Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)*]. The form may only be used if the defendant's motion was based on the ground that the action was not brought in the county of his or her residence. If the defendant's motion was based on other grounds, plaintiff's opposition based on convenience of the witnesses and ends of justice may only be asserted by counteraffidavits to defendant's motion [*Cook v. Pendergast (1882) 61 Cal. 72, 76* ; *Braunstein v. Superior Court of Monterey County (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 697, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* .

A countermotion to retain venue based on *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)* cannot be made unless the answer is filed, because until the issues of fact are settled by the answer, the court cannot determine what testimony will be material [*Gilman v. Nordin (1952) 112 Cal. App. 2d 788* . 793, *247 P.2d 394]* . For the same reasons, filing of a demurrer alone is not sufficient [*Johnson v. Superior Court (1965) 232 Cal. App. 2d 212, 214, 42 Cal. Rptr. 645]* .

Although the courts are in conflict on the issue, it may be sufficient to establish that either the convenience of witnesses or the ends of justice would be promoted [*see Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 698 n.2, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666* (showing that either convenience of witnesses or ends of justice sufficient); *but see Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916* (showing that both convenience of witnesses and ends of justice required); *see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)* (action may be retained if it appears that convenience of witnesses or ends of justice will be promoted); *cf. Code Civ. Proc. § 397(c)* (court may change place of trial when convenience of witnesses and ends of justice would be promoted)].

The form contains optional language at the end of the first paragraph for use when the plaintiff seeks to recover the reasonable expenses and attorney's fees incurred in opposing the defendant's motion for change of venue [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)* and discussion in *§ 571.32[2]*].

[3] Accompanying Papers

A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with the notice of motion in [1], *above* [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms,*see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

The form in [1], *above*, should be supported by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) establishing facts showing that the convenience of witnesses or the ends of justice will be promoted [*see § 571.101*]. Affidavits or declarations supporting plaintiff's countermotion to retain venue under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(d)* are required so that the trial court can determine whether the witnesses' testimony will be material, relevant, and admissible. They must be specific as to the facts to which the witnesses will testify, and mere conclusions or indefinite statements are insufficient [*Braunstein v. Superior Court (1964) 225 Cal. App. 2d 691, 698, 37 Cal. Rptr. 666]* . The affidavit or declaration

must indicate the names of the witnesses, the nature of testimony that may be expected from them, and the reasons why they would be inconvenienced by a transfer [*Maxwell v. Murray (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 440, 443, 11 Cal. Rptr. 916]* .

[4] Cross References

For a related form of declaration in support of countermotion,*see § 571.101*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 571 VENUE
PART IV. FORMS
B. Change of Venue

50-571 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 571.105

§ 571.105 Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] and Order for Change of Place of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397, 398]

[1] FORM Stipulation [Code Civ. Proc. § 283] and Order for Change of Place of Trial [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397, 398]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name(s)*],	)	NO. _____
Defendant.	)	STIPULATION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE
	)	
	)	

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties hereto, by their respective counsel, that the place of trial of this action be changed to the superior court of _____[*name of county or judicial district*] and that payment of the costs and fees of such transfer be made by _____[*name of party or parties*].

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff
_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Defendant

ORDER

The parties hereto having so stipulated, IT IS ORDERED that the the action of the above-captioned case is hereby transferred to the Superior Court of California for the County of _____ on payment by _____[*party or parties*] of all the necessary fees required by law. The clerk of this court is authorized to transfer all the pleadings and papers herein to the clerk of that court.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form of stipulation and order in [1], *above*, is for use when the parties agree to a change of venue and wish to avoid the costs of making a motion for transfer under *Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(a)* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 396b(b)*]. For discussion of the circumstances in which a court is authorized to transfer a case to a proper court,*see § 571.31*. For discussion of the procedure for making the transfer after the order has been granted,*see § 571.37*.

[3] Cross References

For discussion of stipulations in general,*see* Ch. 533, *Stipulations* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 572.syn

§ 572.syn Synopsis to Chapter 572: VERIFICATION

§ 572.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 572.02 Cross References

§§ 572.03through 572.09 [Reserved]

§ 572.10 Governing Statutes

§ 572.11 Verification Defined

§ 572.12 Forms of Verification

[1] Affidavit and Declaration

[2] Affidavit

[3] Declaration

§ 572.13 Verification of Pleadings

[1] Complaints

[2] Answers

[3] Evidentiary Value

§ 572.14 Who May Verify

[1] Parties

[2] Attorneys

[3] Other Persons With Knowledge of Facts

[4] Officer of a Corporation

§ 572.15 Criminal Consequences of Improper Verification

[1] False Verification

[2] False Personation

§ 572.16 Sufficiency of Verification

[1] Form and Substance

[2] Information and Belief

§ 572.17 Effect of Failure to Verify Pleadings

[1] Complaints

[2] Answers

[3] Omission Cured by Amendment

[4] When Pleading Not Verified or Improperly Verified

[a] Remedies Available

[b] Waiver of Defect

§§ 572.18through 572.29 [Reserved]

§ 572.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

[2] California Legal Forms

§ 572.31 State Statutes

[1] General Verification Requirements

[2] Methods of Verification

[3] Papers Requiring Verification

[a] Actions

[b] Miscellaneous Proceedings

[c] Special Proceedings

[d] Criminal Consequences of Improper Verification

§ 572.32 Decisions

[1] Affidavit

[2] Answer

[3] Any Other Person

[4] Attorney Verification

[5] Declaration

[6] False Verification

[7] Lack of Verification

[8] Nature of Verification

[9] Objection and Waiver

[10] Officer of Corporation

[11] Public Entities

[12] Sufficiency of Verification

§ 572.33 Text References

§§ 572.34through 572.39 [Reserved]

§ 572.40 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--Third Person Format

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.41 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--First Person Format

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.42 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 572.43 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Attorney

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.44 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Information and Belief

§ 572.45 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Attorney

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.46 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Assignor

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.47 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Officer of Corporate Party

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 572.48 Notice of Motion for Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 577] on the Pleadings--Failure to State a Defense--Unverified Answer to Verified Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 446]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Accompanying Papers

[4] Cross References

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART I. SCOPE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.01

§ 572.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses and contains forms for use in verifying pleadings in actions and special proceedings. It includes the following forms:

- Two alternative forms of a sworn affidavit [*see §§ 572.40* and *572.41*].
- A declaration by a party [*see § 572.42*].
- Nonparty declarations by:
  - A party's attorney [*see §§ 572.43* and *572.44*].
  - Other nonparties [*see §§ 572.45* and *572.46*].
  - A corporate officer [*see § 572.47*].
- A notice of motion for judgment on the pleadings for use when an unverified answer to a verified complaint is filed [*see § 572.48*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsJudgment on the PleadingsCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART I. SCOPE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.02

§ 572.02 Cross References

For discussion and forms regarding general forms of affidavit and declaration, *see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

For discussion of the general format of verified answers, *see* Ch. 26., *Answers* .

For discussion of general format of verified complaint, *see* Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross-Complaints* ..

For discussion and forms for verified complaint for involuntary dissolution of corporations, *see* Ch. 170, *Corporations: Dissolution and Winding Up*

For discussion and general forms for motions for judgment on the pleadings, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings*

For discussion of verified petitions relating to the appointment of conservators and guardians, *see* Ch. 280, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Appointment of Guardians* , and Ch. 281, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Appointment of Conservators*

For discussion of verified complaints and supporting declarations for temporary restraining orders, preliminary injunctions, and permanent injunctions, *see* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*

For discussion and forms of verification of preferred wage claims, *see Ch. 342, Liens and Wage Preferences, § 342.60* et seq.

For discussion of verification of both petitions and responses relating to writs of mandate, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*

For discussion of verification of both petitions and responses relating to writs of prohibition, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate*

and Prohibition

For discussion and general forms for motions to strike, *see* Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings* ; Ch. 376, *Motions to Strike: Anti-SLAPP*

For discussion of verification of both petitions and responses relating to writs of review, *see* Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of*

For discussion of verification by petitioner in probate proceedings, *see* Ch. 442, *Probate: Initiating Probate Administration*

For verification of claim of mechanics' lien, *see* Ch. 361, *Mechanics' Liens*

For forms of declaration for attachment in unlawful detainer action, orders to show cause regarding the appointment of a receiver, and publication of summons, *see* Ch. 333, *Landlord and Tenant: Eviction Actions*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsDemurrersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsCross-ComplaintsCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamus

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART I. SCOPE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 572.03through 572.09

[Reserved]

§§ 572.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.10

§ 572.10 Governing Statutes

Verification of pleadings is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*.

"Affidavit" is defined in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*, and the permissible uses of affidavits are set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*.

Use of a declaration in lieu of a sworn affidavit is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446* and *2015.5*.

The criminal consequences of a false verification, and punishment therefor, are set out in *Penal Code §§ 27(b)*, *118*, *529*, and *777b*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification RequirementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesAbuse of Public OfficeFalsificationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.11

§ 572.11 Verification Defined

A "verification" is an affidavit verifying the truth of the matters covered by it [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *Albertson v. Raboff (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 372, 388, 8 Cal. Rptr. 398* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*].

The objective of a verification is to insure good faith in the averments or statements of a party to litigation [*Silcox v. Lang (1889) 78 Cal. 118, 122, 20 P. 297* ; *Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.12

§ 572.12 Forms of Verification

[1] Affidavit and Declaration

A verification may be in the form of an affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. It may also be in the form of a declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5*]. A person verifying a pleading need not swear to the truth or his or her belief in the truth of the matters stated therein but may, instead, assert the truth or his or her belief in the truth of those matters "under penalty of perjury" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. In addition, whenever under any state law, rule, regulation, order or requirement, any matter is required or permitted to be supported, evidenced, established, or proved by the sworn written statement, declaration, verification, certificate, oath, or affidavit (other than a deposition, or an oath of office, or an oath required to be taken before a specified official other than a notary public), the matter may with like force and effect be supported, evidenced, established or proved by the unsworn written statement, declaration, verification, or certificate which recites that it is certified or declared by him or her to be true under penalty of perjury [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*].

[2] Affidavit

An affidavit is a written declaration under oath, made without notice to the adverse party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*]. It may be used to verify a pleading or a paper in a special proceeding, to prove the service of a summons, notice, or other paper in an action or special proceeding, to obtain a provisional remedy, the examination of a witness, or a stay of proceedings, and in uncontested proceedings to establish a record of birth, or on a motion, and in any other case expressly permitted by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*].

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* refers to verification by affidavit, this form should be distinguished from an evidentiary affidavit used to establish the facts stated in it. When an affidavit is used as evidence, the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* do not apply [*Toboni v. Pennington Millinery Co. (1959) 172 Cal. App. 2d 47, 52, 341 P.2d 845]* . For a discussion of the use of affidavits to establish evidentiary facts, *see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

When no particular affidavit format is prescribed by statute, any format appears to be sufficient even though the affidavit does not specifically state that the affiant was first duly sworn, as long as it indicates somewhere that it was

made under oath [*Osborn v. City of Whittier (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 609, 619, 230 P.2d 132* (form of affidavit verifying claim for damages against municipality, which indicated that it was "subscribed" and "sworn to" by plaintiff before a notary public whose signature was affixed, as sufficient verification)]. Presumably, this rule also applies to affidavits that verify pleadings, as neither *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* nor *Code Civ. Proc. § 2003* prescribe any particular format to be used to indicate that an affiant was first duly sworn [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003*].

Although no particular affidavit format is required to verify pleadings, the mere acknowledgment of execution before a notary public is not equivalent to a verification [*Palm Springs Alpine Estates, Inc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 883, 888, 63 Cal. Rptr. 618]* . There must also be a declaration that the statements in the affidavit are true of the affiant's own knowledge, except as to matters that are stated on information or belief, and as to those matters that they are believed to be true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Borders v. Civil Service Commission (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 678, 683, 27 Cal. Rptr. 490* ; for a more detailed discussion of the form and contents of affidavits, *see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*].

[3] Declaration

An unsworn certification or declaration made under penalty of perjury may be used in lieu of a statement under oath [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*]. It should be in substantially the following forms:

If the declaration is executed within this state, it may say: "I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct." The declaration must bear the date and place of execution, and the declarant's signature [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5(a)*].

If the declaration is executed at any place, within or without the state, it may say: "I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct." The declaration need bear only the date of execution, and the declarant's signature [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5(b)*].

The declaration need not appear at the end of the verified document although this is the better practice [*People v. Pierce (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 53, 59, 56 Cal. Rptr. 817, 423 P.2d 969]* . For a more detailed discussion of the form and contents of declarations *see* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification RequirementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.13

§ 572.13 Verification of Pleadings

[1] Complaints

Generally, a complaint need not be verified to commence a civil action [*Quick v. Corsaro (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 831, 836, 4 Cal. Rptr. 674]* . Moreover, when the plaintiff is the state, or a county, city, school district, district, public agency, or public corporation, or an officer of any of these entities in his or her official capacity, the complaint need not be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. However, there are numerous actions or proceedings in which a verification is required by statute. For example, the complaint in a quiet title action must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*]. For a list of actions and proceedings in which a verification is specifically required, *see § 572.31[1]*.

Even in cases in which verification of a complaint is not required, other purposes may be served by doing so. For example, a verified complaint may:

- Serve as an affidavit to support a preliminary injunction [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*].

- Require the defendant in an unlimited civil case to file a verified answer and preclude use of a general denial [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 431.30(d), 446*]. By contrast, in a limited civil case, verification of the complaint will not require the defendant to verify the answer or preclude use of a general denial, with the exception that if the cause of action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection, verification of the complaint will require the denial of the allegations to be made positively or on information and belief [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 431.30(d)*].

- Serve as a counter-affidavit on a motion for a change of venue or a motion to quash service of summons [*Atkins, Kroll & Co. v. Broadway Lbr Co. (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 646, 654, 35 Cal. Rptr. 385]* .

A verified complaint cannot, however, serve as a counter-affidavit to prove that there are triable issues of fact in opposition to a motion for summary judgment [*People v. City of Garden Grove (1958) 165 Cal. App. 2d 794, 802, 332 P.2d 841]* .

For a discussion of the effect of failure to verify a complaint when required by statute, *see § 572.17[1]*.

[2] Answers

When the complaint is verified, the answer must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *French v. Smith Booth (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863]* . Conversely, when the complaint is not verified, the answer need not be [*Kraus v. Walt Disney Productions (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 736, 742, 34 Cal. Rptr. 702]* . Answers in a limited civil case need not be verified even if the complaint or cross complaint is verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 92(b)*].

When the state, or a county, city, school district, district, public agency, public corporation, or any officer of any of these entities in his or her official capacity is the plaintiff, the answer shall be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. But when these entities or officers are the defendant, their answer to a complaint or petition need not be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Seckels v. Department of Indus. Relations (1929) 98 Cal. App. 647, 648, 277 P. 497]* .

The requirement that an answer must be verified when a public entity or officer is the plaintiff does not apply if the admission of the truth of the complaint might subject the defendant to criminal prosecution [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. The general requirement that answers must be verified when the complaint is verified is a separate provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* and is not subject to this exception. However, a verified answer required by this provision may not be used against a defendant in subsequent criminal proceedings [*DeCamp v. First Kensington Corp. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 268, 276, 147 Cal. Rptr. 869]* .

[3] Evidentiary Value

A verified pleading may constitute an affidavit competent to prove the facts stated in it [*Atkins, Kroll, & Co. v. Broadway Lbr. Co. (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 646, 654, 35 Cal. Rptr. 385]* . However, an unverified pleading cannot serve as an affidavit [*Sheard v. Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 207, 212, 114 Cal. Rptr. 743]* . The circumstances under which a verified complaint may constitute an affidavit are *discussed under § 572.13[1]*.

Although an unverified pleading has no such evidentiary value, it does not follow that it must be ignored. For example, in a motion to quash service of an unverified cross complaint, the existence of the cross complaint may be a material fact if it defines a cause of action that has some bearing on whether it is fair and reasonable for the court to assert jurisdiction [*Mihlon v. Superior Court (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 703, 710, 215 Cal. Rptr. 442* ; *Lundgren v. Superior Court (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 477, 485, 168 Cal. Rptr. 717]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.14

§ 572.14 Who May Verify

[1] Parties

Absent extenuating circumstances, a pleading shall be verified by the party litigant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Perlman v. Municipal Court (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 568, 573, 160 Cal. Rptr. 567]* . When parties sue or are sued jointly, verification of a pleading by one coplaintiff or codefendant is sufficient [*Butterfield v. Graves (1902) 138 Cal. 155, 158, 71 P. 510* ; *Claiborne v. Castle (1893) 98 Cal. 30, 33, 32 P. 807]* .

In all cases of verification of pleadings by a party, the affidavit shall state that the same is true of his or her own knowledge, except as to the matters that are stated on his or her information and belief, and as to those matters that he or she believes it to be true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*].

[2] Attorneys

If a party is unable to verify a pleading because he or she is absent from the county where his or her attorney has his or her office, or if the party is unable to verify for some other cause, the attorney may verify the pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Cummings v. Cummings (1929) 97 Cal. App. 144, 147, 275 P. 245* ; *Brown v. Sandell (1926) 79 Cal. App. 313, 315-316, 249 P. 209]* . For a discussion of attorney verification when he or she has personal knowledge of the facts, *see* [3], *below*.

The attorney's affidavit of verification shall state that he or she has read the pleading and that he or she is informed and believes that the matters in it are true and on that ground alleges that they are true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 361, 156 P. 515* (when party absent from county, or from some other cause is unable to verify pleading, attorney verification may be made on information or belief)]. However, in such a case the pleading will not be considered an affidavit or declaration establishing the facts alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. The effect of improper verification is *discussed under § 572.17[4][a]*.

The practice of attorney verification is discouraged, and to that end the provisions of the code allowing it are strictly construed [*Silcox v. Lang (1889) 78 Cal. 118, 122, 20 P. 297]* . Thus, attorney verifications are not authorized when the absence of the party creates no inability to verify, as when the absence is only temporary and there is still time to file

a verified pleading, or when the absence is contrived in order to circumvent the requirement of verification [*see DeCamp v. First Kensington Corp. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 268, 275, 147 Cal. Rptr. 869]* .

When a pleading is verified by an attorney, he or she shall set forth in the affidavit the reasons why it is not made by one of the parties [Code *Civ. Proc. § 446*]. When the averments in the affidavit of the attorney state that the facts contained in the pleading are within his or her knowledge, it is deemed a sufficient statement as to why the party did not make the verification [*Oak Grove School Dist. v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 678, 707, 32 Cal. Rptr. 288]* .

[3] Other Persons With Knowledge of Facts

A person other than the party may verify a pleading if the facts are within his or her knowledge without regard to whether the party is absent from the county, or from some other cause is unable to verify the pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 361, 156 P. 515]* . This person is not required to be the party's agent [*Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153]* . As in an attorney verification, the person shall set forth in the affidavit the reasons why it is not made by one of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see* the discussion under [2], *above*].

An attorney may also verify a pleading if the facts are within his or her knowledge [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 361-62, 156 P. 515* ; *Oak Grove School Dist. v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 678, 707, 32 Cal. Rptr. 288]* . An attorney may verify a pleading based on information and belief, but a verification on information and belief is insufficient when the attorney does not also claim that the facts are within his or her knowledge [*Perlman v. Municipal Court (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 568, 574, 160 Cal. Rptr. 567]* . For a discussion of attorney verification when the party is out of the county, or for some other reason is unable to verify, *see § 572.14[2], above*.

[4] Officer of a Corporation

When a corporation is a party, a verification can be made by any of its officers. The affidavit shall state that the officer has read the pleading and that he or she is informed and believes that the matters in it are true and on that ground alleges that they are true. But the pleading shall not be considered an affidavit or declaration establishing the facts alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*].

This provision does not mean that only an officer is authorized to verify a pleading. The clause is permissive, not exclusive, and allows an attorney or other party to verify in a proper case [*Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 362, 156 P. 515]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.15

§ 572.15 Criminal Consequences of Improper Verification

[1] False Verification

Any person who willfully makes a false verification as to the truth of any material matter, which he or she knows to be false is guilty of perjury [PenalCode § 118(a); *People v. Agnew (1947) 77 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 176 P.2d 724* , *cert. denied, 337 U.S. 909, 69 S. Ct. 1041, 93 L. Ed. 1721* ; *see also Penal Code § 118(b)* (proof of falsity)]. This is true whether the false verification is made or subscribed within or without the state, and is punishable by the court in the jurisdictional territory where the related action or proceeding occurs [*Penal Code §§ 27(b), 118(a), 777b*].

Inconsistent *theories* of recovery in a pleading are permitted, but verification of inconsistent *facts* alleged in a complaint indicates perjury [*Manti v. Gunari (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 442, 449, 85 Cal. Rptr. 366]* .

Although verified complaints are not required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*, they are contemplated and given legal sanction by the statute. Therefore, it is perjury to render false statements in a verified complaint even though it could have been filed without being verified [*People v. Godines (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 721, 724, 62 P.2d 787]* . However, no charge of perjury can be maintained when an oath is not authorized or provided for by law [*see Penal Code § 118*]. For example, *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* provides an exception to the requirement that an answer to a verified complaint must be verified, when a defendant would be subjected to criminal prosecution should he or she file a verified answer to the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. In such a case an oath is *not* authorized or provided for by law, and therefore is not subject to a perjury charge [*People v. Millsap (1927) 85 Cal. App. 732, 744-745, 260 P. 378]* .

[2] False Personation

When a person falsely personates another to make a verification, he or she is subject to a $10,000 fine, or imprisonment up to one year, or both [*Penal Code § 529*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification

RequirementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.16

§ 572.16 Sufficiency of Verification

[1] Form and Substance

The chief test of the sufficiency of an affidavit is whether it is so clear and certain that an indictment for perjury may be sustained on it if false [*Sheeley v. City of Santa Clara (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 83, 85, 30 Cal. Rptr. 121* ; *Borders v. Civil Service Commission (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 678, 684, 27 Cal. Rptr. 490]* . It must be made by a person authorized by law to do so, and it must comply in form and substance with statutory provisions [*see French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863* (holding that if requirements satisfied, verification sufficient to install and support pleading)]. The statutory provisions regarding the form and substance of verifications and the persons authorized to verify are *discussed under §§ 572.12,* and *572.14, above* .

[2] Information and Belief

Code Civ. Proc. § 446 was adopted for the express purpose of permitting allegations to be verified on information and belief because parties often rely on information furnished to them by others [*North v. Cecil B. De Mille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 59, 39 P.2d 199]* . However, the provision in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* authorizing verification on information and belief refers to pleadings that *join issues*, such as complaints and answers [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . *Facts* purported to be stated on information and belief are hearsay [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *Sheard v. Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 207, 212, 114 Cal. Rptr. 743]* . Thus, when a verification based on information and belief is to be used as evidence of facts to support a petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*, it must be disregarded [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *see also Burger v. Superior Court (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 1013, 1019, 199 Cal. Rptr. 227* (attorney's declaration on information and belief insufficient to support opposition to motion to expunge lis pendens)]. For discussion of party, attorney, or other person verification on information or belief, *see § 572.14*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral

OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification RequirementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.17

§ 572.17 Effect of Failure to Verify Pleadings

[1] Complaints

The failure to verify a complaint when required by statute is only a defect in pleading and does not deprive the court of jurisdiction to hear the matter on the merits [*Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237 24 Cal. Rptr. 153* ; *People v. Birch Securities Co. (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 703, 707, 196 P.2d 143* , *cert. denied, 336 U.S. 936, 69 S. Ct. 745, 93 L. Ed. 1095]* . At most, failure to verify a complaint when required to do so may render it fatally defective, and on a proper motion, the complaint may be stricken [*Silcox v. Lang (1889) 78 Cal. 118, 121-122, 20 P. 297* ; *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153]* . For a discussion of remedies available for failure to verify pleadings, *see* [4][a], *below*. For a discussion of circumstances under which a verified complaint may be required, *see § 572.13[1]*.

[2] Answers

When a complaint is not verified, a general denial of its allegations in the answer is sufficient, but only puts in issue the material allegations of the complaint. If the complaint is verified, its allegations shall be positively denied or denied according to the information and belief of the defendant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. Thus, a general denial to a verified complaint is insufficient to put the material allegations in the complaint in issue [*Hirons v. Clare (1918) 38 Cal. App. 608, 609, 177 P. 291]* . Further, anunverified answer to a verified complaint is an admission of the allegations in the complaint, and the answer may be subject to a motion for judgment on the pleadings [*DeCamp v. Kensington (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 268, 283, 147 Cal. Rptr. 869* ; *Patterson v. Blackburn (1920) 47 Cal. App. 362, 363, 190 P. 483]* . For a general form of a notice of motion for judgment on the pleadings, *see § 572.48*.

[3] Omission Cured by Amendment

Generally, an omission of a verification may be cured by amendment [*Ford v. Loaney (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 503, 509, 337 P.2d 527]* . A defective verification in a complaint may be cured by amendment even though the statute of limitations has run on the time to file the original complaint, since verification of a complaint is not a jurisdictional requirement [*United Farm Workers of America v. Agricultural Labor Relations Bd. (1985) 37 Cal. 3d 912, 915, 210 Cal. Rptr. 453, 694 P.2d 138* ; *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153]* . However, this

does not appear to apply when a verified claim must be filed within a statutory period as a condition precedent to maintaining an action [*see Hoffman v. Palm Springs (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 645, 650-651, 337 P.2d 521* (amended claim filed against municipality after statutory period for filing had expired)].

[4] When Pleading Not Verified or Improperly Verified

[a] Remedies Available

An improper verification is not a proper ground for a demurrer [*Butterfield v. Graves (1902) 138 Cal. 155, 158, 71 P. 510* ; *Lapique v. Kelley (1927) 82 Cal. App. 586, 592, 256 P. 229]* . However, if an answer is not sufficiently verified it may be stricken, or judgment on the pleadings may be ordered [*French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863* ; *Stockton Lumber Co. v. Blodgett (1906) 3 Cal. App. 94, 95, 84 P. 441* ; *see also Zavala v. Board of Trustees (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1755, 1761, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* (dicta; proper remedy is motion to strike)]. For a form of a notice of motion for a judgment on the pleadings on the ground that the answer was not sufficiently verified, *see § 572.48*.

These remedies are not available when it is necessary to inquire into the truth of the verifying affidavit to show insufficiency. For example, the court will not entertain an objection to a verified complaint when the defendant attempts to show that the affiant did not have the personal knowledge of facts he or she claimed to have in the verification [*French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863]* .

[b] Waiver of Defect

A defective verification of a pleading may be waived by proceeding to trial without proper objection [*Zavala v. Board of Trustees (1993) 16 Cal. App.4th 1755, 1761, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768* ; *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153* ; *People v. Birch Securities Co. (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 703, 707, 196 P.2d 143]* . However, a waiver of verification does not admit the sufficiency of an answer or dispense with the necessity of specific denial of a verified complaint [*Harney v. Porter (1881) 62 Cal. 511, 512]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsMotions to StrikeGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

140 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 572.18through 572.29

[Reserved]

§§ 572.18[Reserved]

141 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.30

§ 572.30 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] California Points and Authorities

For a form of memorandum of points and authorities regarding a verified petition for writ of habeas corpus, *see* California Points and Authorities, Ch. 110, *Habeas Corpus*

[2] California Legal Forms

For verified certificates of amendments to and restated articles of incorporation, *see* California Legal Forms, Ch. 10, *Amendment of Articles*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsGoverning Documents & ProceduresArticles of Incorporation & BylawsMinimum Requirements for Articles of IncorporationCriminal Law & ProcedureHabeas CorpusGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.31

§ 572.31 State Statutes

[1] General Verification Requirements

Answer in limited civil case courts need not be verified *Code Civ. Proc. § 92(b)*

Positive denial or denial according to information and belief of material allegations of verified complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*

Verification of pleadings, contents, and who may verify. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Public agency or officer plaintiff exempt. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Answer as required to be verified when plaintiff files verified complaint. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Verified answer not required when public agency or officer is defendant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

[2] Methods of Verification

Affidavit defined. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2003*

Use of affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*

Certification of declaration in lieu of sworn statement. *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*

[3] Papers Requiring Verification

[a] Actions

Affidavits supporting permanent injunction. *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Preliminary injunction on verified complaint or affidavit. *Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*

Verified complaint in actions to determine adverse claims and clouds on title to real property. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 749, 749.1*

Verified complaint in actions to reestablish destroyed land records. *Code Civ. Proc. § 751.04*

Verified complaint in quiet title action. *Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*

[b] Miscellaneous Proceedings

Verified petition showing claim or right in escheated property. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1355*

Petition for writ of habeas corpus verified by oath or affirmation. *Penal Code §§ 1474, 1475*

Petitions, reports, and accounts filed pursuant to Probate Code and objections and responses filed pursuant to Probate Code to petition, report, or account. *Prob. Code § 1021(a)*

Verified petition for administration of estate or probate of will of missing person. Prob. Code § 1354

[c] Special Proceedings

Verified cross complaint in interpleader. *Code Civ. Proc. § 386*

Verified petition for writ of certiorari. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*

Verified petition for writ of mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*

Verified petition for writ of prohibition. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1103*

Verified complaint for unlawful detainer or forcible entry or detainer. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1166*

Verified complaint for involuntary dissolution of a corporation. *Corp. C § 1800(b)*

Verified complaint in action against vessel. *Harb. & Nav. Code § 495*

[d] Criminal Consequences of Improper Verification

Perjury as punishable when committed outside of *California. Penal Code § 27(b)*

False declarations or certifications as perjury. *Penal Code § 118*

False declarations or certifications committed outside of California as punishable in *California. Penal Code § 777b*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.32

§ 572.32 Decisions

[1] Affidavit

Affidavits are ordinarily not allowed in evidence unless permitted by statute. *Estate of Fraysher (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 131, 135, 301 P.2d 848*

Affidavits do not constitute best evidence to prove issuable facts. *Lacrabere v. Wise (1904) 141 Cal. 554, 556, 75 P. 185*

Acknowledgment of execution of document before notary public is not equivalent of jurat or verification. *Palm Springs Alpine Estates, Inc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1967) 255 Cal. App. 2d 883, 888, 63 Cal. Rptr. 618*

Notice of appeal to civil service commission "subscribed and sworn to" before notary public does not constitute verification. *Borders v. Civil Service Commission (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 678, 683, 27 Cal. Rptr. 490*

Test of sufficiency of affidavit is whether it is so clear and certain that indictment for perjury may be sustained on it if false. *People v. Thompson (1935) 5 Cal. App. 2d 655, 664, 43 P.2d 600* ; *Application of Behymer (1933) 130 Cal. App. 200, 203, 19 P.2d 829* ; *Gee Chong Pong v. Harris (1918) 38 Cal. App. 214, 217, 175 P. 806*

[2] Answer

One defendant as able to verify answer when more than one defendant sued jointly and they claim an estate or interest adverse to plaintiff. *Butterfield v. Graves (1902) 138 Cal. 155, 158, 71 P. 510*

When complaint is verified, *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* requires answer to be verified. *Benham v. Connor (1896) 113 Cal. 168, 171, 45 P. 258* ; *French v. Smith Booth (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863* ; *Johnson v. Dixon Farms Co. (1915) 29 Cal. App. 52, 55, 155 P. 134*

Verification of pleading by one coplaintiff or codefendant as sufficient. *Claiborne v. Castle (1893) 98 Cal. 30, 33, 32 P. 807*

Complaint filed for injunctive relief by officer of state as not requiring verification. *California State University, Hayward v. National Collegiate Athletic Assn. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 533, 545, 121 Cal. Rptr. 85*

When complaint is not verified, answer need not be verified. *Kraus v. Walt Disney Productions (1963) 221 Cal. App. 2d 736, 742, 34 Cal. Rptr. 702*

Answer of officer of state to complaint or petition as not requiring verification. *Seckels v. Department of Indus. Relations (1929) 98 Cal. App. 647, 648, 277 P. 497*

Unverified answer to verified complaint as admission of allegations in complaint. *Patterson v. Blackburn (1920) 47 Cal. App. 362, 363, 190 P. 483*

General denial to verified complaint as insufficient to put in issue material allegations in complaint. *Hirons v. Clare (1918) 38 Cal. App. 608, 609, 177 P. 291*

[3] Any Other Person

Verification by employee of party valid when employee had greater familiarity with facts than party. *Conservatorship of Isaac O. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 50, 54-55, 235 Cal. Rptr. 133*

Provision of *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* permitting verification by "any other person" does not require that person verifying be party's agent. *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 236, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153*

[4] Attorney Verification

Complaint verified by plaintiff's attorney who has knowledge of facts is sufficient to support application for preliminary injunction. *Continental Baking Co. v. Katz (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 512, 532, 67 Cal. Rptr. 761, 439 P.2d 889*

Attorney's verification of proposed answer to cross complaint on motion to set aside default and default judgment is proper when party is out of state. *Beard v. Beard (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 645, 649, 107 P.2d 385*

Attorney may verify pleading when facts are within his or her knowledge. *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 362, 156 P. 515* ; *Oak Grove School Dist. v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 678, 707, 32 Cal. Rptr. 288*

Attorney verification is not authorized when absence of party creates no inability to verify. *DeCamp v. First Kensington Corp. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 268, 275, 147 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Defective averment is not fatal when verification otherwise complies with any of three *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* contingencies allowing for attorney verification. *Milstein v. Sartain (1943) 56 Cal. App. 2d 924, 927, 133 P.2d 836*

Attorney of plaintiff is permitted under *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* to verify complaint when plaintiff is absent from county where attorney has his or her office. *Cummings v. Cummings (1929) 97 Cal. App. 144, 147, 275 P. 245* ; *Brown v. Sandell (1926) 79 Cal. App. 313, 315-316, 249 P. 209*

[5] Declaration

Declaration under penalty of perjury as not required to be at end of document, although this is better practice. *People v. Pierce (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 53, 59, 56 Cal. Rptr. 817, 423 P.2d 969*

Declaration under penalty of perjury is permitted by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* for use in lieu of affidavit to support petition for writ of mandate. *Hand v. Board of Examiners (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 605, 615, 136 Cal. Rptr. 187*

Addition of *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* as expressly authorizing use of declaration in lieu of affidavit to establish existence of facts to support issuance of preliminary injunction. *People ex rel. Savage v. L. A. Trust Deed etc. Exchange (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 66, 70, 12 Cal. Rptr. 144*

Mere addition of jurat to letter, without indication that signers vouched for letter's statements, as not constituting verification. *Hoffman v. City of Palm Springs (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 645, 337 P.2d 521*

[6] False Verification

Oath or declarations required to be such that criminal sanctions of perjury might apply. *Ancora-Citronelle Corp. v. Green (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 146, 150, 115 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Verification of inconsistent facts alleged in complaint as perjury. *Manti v. Gunari (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 442, 449, 85 Cal. Rptr. 366*

Making false statement in pleading filed in judicial proceeding as perjury. *People v. Agnew (1947) 77 Cal. App. 2d 748, 753, 176 P.2d 724 , cert. denied, 337 U.S. 909, 69 S. Ct. 1041, 93 L. Ed. 1721*

False statements in verified complaint as possible perjury. *People v. Godines (1936) 17 Cal. App. 2d 721, 724, 62 P.2d 787*

Charge of perjury is not proper under *Penal Code § 118* when oath was not authorized or provided for by law. *People v. Millsap (1927) 85 Cal. App. 732, 744-745, 260 P. 378*

[7] Lack of Verification

Unverified petition for reconsideration in workers' compensation action as properly accepted where state as plaintiff is excused from verificationrequirements under *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*. *Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1055, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343*

Improper verification is not proper ground for demurrer. *Butterfield v. Graves (1902) 138 Cal. 155, 158, 71 P. 510* ; *Lapique v. Kelley (1927) 82 Cal. App. 586, 592, 256 P. 229*

Unverified complaint and answer have no effect in presenting issues to court for consideration at trial. *Ponce v. Black (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 159, 164, 36 Cal. Rptr. 419*

Defective verification is curable by amendment even though statute of limitations has run on time to file original complaint. *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153*

Defective verification does not deprive court of jurisdiction to hear matter on merits. *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206*

Cal. App. 2d 232, 237 24 Cal. Rptr. 153

Failure to verify pleading when required by statute is mere defect in pleading. *People v. Birch Securities (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 703, 707, 196 P.2d 143* ; *In re Staser (1948) 84 Cal. App. 2d 746, 751, 191 P.2d 791*

Insufficiently verified answer is subject to motion to strike, or judgment on pleadings may be ordered. *French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863*

Proposed unverified complaint accompanying notice of motion to set aside default and default judgment may be corrected after six month period allowed to file motion. *Roseborough v. Campbell (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 257, 262, 115 P.2d 839*

Plaintiff entitled to judgment on pleadings, and not limited to striking out answer, when unverified answer was filed to verified complaint. *Stockton Lumber Co. v. Blodgett (1906) 3 Cal. App. 94, 95, 84 P. 441*

[8] Nature of Verification

Verified answer is presumed to contain facts within knowledge or belief of adversary party. *Lindemann v. San Joaquin Cotton Oil Co. (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 480, 500, 55 P.2d 870*

Object of verification is to insure good faith in averments of party. *Silcox v. Lang (1889) 78 Cal. 118, 122, 20 P. 297* ; *Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *Hoffman v. City of Palm Springs (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 645, 648, 337 P.2d 521*

Verified pleading as affidavit competent to prove facts stated therein. *Lundgren v. Superior Court (1980) 111 Cal. App. 3d 477, 485, 168 Cal. Rptr. 717* ; *In re O'Brien Machinery, Inc. (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 563, 569, 36 Cal. Rptr. 782* ; *Atkins, Kroll, & Co. v. Broadway Lbr. Co. (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 646, 35 Cal. Rptr. 385*

Affidavit or declaration is not evidence absent statutory authorization, party stipulation, or waiver. *Windigo Mills v. Unemployment Ins. Appeals Bd. (1979) 92 Cal. App. 3d 586, 597, 155 Cal. Rptr. 63*

Verification as affidavit verifying truth of matters covered by it. *Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *Sheeley v. City of Santa Clara (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 83, 85, 30 Cal. Rptr. 121* ; *Albertson v. Raboff (1960) 185 Cal. App. 2d 372, 388,8 Cal. Rptr. 398* ; *Hoffman v. City of Palm Springs (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 645, 648, 337 P.2d 521* ; *Osborn v. City of Whittier (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 609, 619, 230 P.2d 132*

[9] Objection and Waiver

Defective verification as waived by proceeding to trial without proper objection. *Security T. & S. Bk. v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. (1920) 184 Cal. 173, 176, 193 P. 102* ; *San Francisco v. Itsell (1889) 80 Cal. 57, 60, 22 P. 74* , dismissed *133 U.S. 65, 10 S. Ct. 241, 33 L. Ed. 570* ; *McCullough v. Clark (1871) 41 Cal. 298, 302* ; *Greenfield v. Steamer Gunnell (1856) 6 Cal. 67, 68* ; *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 237, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153* ; *People v. Birch Securities Co. (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 703, 707, 196 P.2d 143* ; *Hill v. Nerle (1916) 29 Cal. App. 473, 475, 156 P. 981*

Waiver of verification as not admitting sufficiency of answer or dispensing with necessity of specific denial of verified complaint. *Harney v. Porter (1881) 62 Cal. 511, 512*

[10] Officer of Corporation

Clause in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* providing for verification of pleading by an officer when corporation is party as not exclusive but permissive, and allowing attorney or other party to verify in proper case. *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 362, 156 P. 515*

Notwithstanding *Code Civ. Proc. § 482.040*, which provides that verified complaint may be used in lieu of affidavit in attachment proceedings, *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* precludes cross complaint verified by corporate officer on behalf of corporation from supporting opposition for right to attach order. *Lorber Industries v. Turbulence, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 532, 536, 221 Cal. Rptr. 233*

Manager of corporation as officer entitled to verify. *Stockton v. Blodgett (1906) 3 Cal. App. 94, 95, 84 P. 441*

[11] Public Entities

Answer filed by public entity in writ proceeding, as in a civil action, need not be verified. *Crowl v. Commission on Professional Competence (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 334, 342, 275 Cal. Rptr. 86* (relying on *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*)

Pleading by state or subdivision of state need not be verified (*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*), allegations are not legally incompetent on ground that they are not verified, and under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1091* factual allegations in answer to petition for writ of mandate are taken as true if not countervailed by proof at trial or by replication. *Elliott v. Contractors' State License Bd. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1048, 1054, 274 Cal. Rptr. 286*

[12] Sufficiency of Verification

Code Civ. Proc. § 446 was adopted for express purpose of permitting allegation to be verified on information and belief. *North v. Cecil B. De Mille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 59, 39 P.2d 199*

Affidavit based on information and belief to support petition for mandate is hearsay and insufficient to establish facts in it. *Star Motor Imports, Inc. (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721*

Allegations on information and belief do not support injunction. *Ancora-Citronelle Corp. v. Green (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 146, 150, 115 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Facts stated in verified complaint are hearsay when made on information and belief. *Sheard v. Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 207, 212, 114 Cal. Rptr. 743*

Chief test of sufficiency of affidavit is whether it is so clear and certain that indictment for perjury may be sustained on it if false. *Sheeley v. City of Santa Clara (1963) 215 Cal. App. 2d 83, 85, 30 Cal. Rptr. 121* ; *Borders v. Civil Service Commission (1963) 211 Cal. App. 2d 678, 684, 27 Cal. Rptr. 490* ; *Hoffman v. City of Palm Springs (1959) 169 Cal. App. 2d 645, 648, 337 P.2d 521* ; *Osborn v. City of Whittier (1951) 103 Cal. App. 2d 609, 619, 230 P.2d 132*

"Clear and certain" means that allegations in affidavit must show facts and circumstances from which ultimate facts sought to be proved may be deduced by court. *Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 238, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153*

Verification is sufficient when made by person authorized by law to do so, and in compliance in form and substance with statutory provisions. *French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863*

Sufficiency of verification as not extending to cases in which inquiry into truth of verifying affidavit is necessary to show insufficiency. *French v. Smith Booth Usher Co. (1942) 56 Cal. App. 2d 23, 29, 131 P.2d 863*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Business & Corporate LawCorporationsDirectors & OfficersGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification RequirementsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesPerjuryGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.33

§ 572.33 Text References

California Civil Procedure Before Trial, Vol. 1, Ch. 22, *Drafting Complaints*, § 22.12 et seq. (3d ed. Cal. CEB 2000)

Witkin, California Procedure, Vol. 4, *Pleading*, § 490 et seq. (4th ed.)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsCertification Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 572.34through 572.39

[Reserved]

§§ 572.34[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.40

§ 572.40 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--Third Person Format

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--Third Person Format

VERIFICATION

	)	
State of California	)	ss.
[City and] County of _____	)	

_____ [*Name*], being duly sworn, deposes and says:

He/She is [one of] the _____ [plaintiff(s) *or* defendant(s)] in the above-entitled action. He/she has read the foregoing _____ [*specify pleading or paper being verified, e.g.,* complaint] and knows the contents thereof. The same is true of his/her own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, he/she believes it to be true].

_____ [*signature*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me on _____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature of officer*]

_____ [*typed name of officer*]

_____ [*specify title of officer,*

e.g., Notary Public]

[*Seal*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of verification in [1], *above*, is styled as an affidavit, and is for use in verifying any pleading or paper which may or must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009*]. It may be used to verify a pleading or a paper in a special proceeding, to prove the service of a summons, notice or other paper in an action or special proceeding, to obtain a provisional remedy, the examination of a witness, or a stay of proceedings, and in uncontested proceedings to establish a record of birth, or on a motion, and in any other case expressly permitted by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2009*].

Although authorized by statute [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2009*], the affidavit form used in this form and in the form *set out in § 572.41* has almost entirely been superseded in practice by the unsworn declaration under penalty of perjury authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446* and *2015.5* [for a form of declaration, *see § 572.42*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.41

§ 572.41 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--First Person Format

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Affidavit [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009]--By Party--First Person Format

VERIFICATION

	)	
State of California	)	ss.
[City and] County of _____	)	

I, _____ [*name*], being duly sworn, say:

I am [one of] the _____ [plaintiff(s) *or* defendant(s)] in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify pleading or paper being verified, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

_____ [*signature*]

Subscribed and sworn to before me on _____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature of officer*]

_____ [*typed name of officer*]

_____ [*specify title of officer,*

e.g., Notary Public]

[*Seal*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of verification in [1], *above*, is styled as an affidavit, and is for use in verifying any pleading or paper which may or must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2003, 2009*]. It may be used in any situation in which the *form in § 572.40* may be used. The only difference is that the above form uses the first person while § 572.40 uses the third person. Use of this form appears to be supplanting use of the third person form. However, both forms of affidavit are now much less used than the unsworn declaration under penalty of perjury authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446* and *2015.5* [for a form of declaration, *see § 572.42*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.42

§ 572.42 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Party

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Party

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am [one of] the _____ [plaintiff(s) *or* defendant(s)] in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing [*specify pleading or paper, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.]

I _____ [declare *or* certify] under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form of verification in [1], *above*, is styled as a declaration, and is for use in verifying any pleading or paper which may or must be verified [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2003, 2009*]. An unsworn declaration made under penalty of perjury may be used in lieu of a sworn affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*; for forms of affidavits, *see §§ 572.40* and *572.41*]. A declaration may be executed within or without California if it states the date of execution and that it is certified or declared under the laws of California [*Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*].

[3] Cross References

For a form of verification by the declaration of a party's attorney, see *§§ 572.43*

For forms of verification by the declaration of a nonparty with personal knowledge of the facts, see *§§ 572.44 -572.47*

For general discussion and other forms of declaration under penalty of perjury, *See also* Ch. 15, *Affidavits, Certificates, and Declarations*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.43

§ 572.43 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Attorney

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Attorney

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am an attorney at law duly admitted and licensed to practice before all courts of this State and I have my professional office at _____ [*street address and city*], _____ County, California.

I am [one of] the attorney[s] of record for _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff(s)] in the above-entitled action.

[*EITHER*]

The _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff(s)] is/are absent from the county in which I have my office.

[*OR*]

The _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff(s)] is/are unable to verify the _____ [*specify pleading or paper, e.g.,* complaint] because _____ [*set forth good cause reasons for party's inability to verify, e.g.,* plaintiff is currently hospitalized and incompetent to execute a verification].

[*CONTINUE*]

For that reason I am making this verification on his/her/their behalf.

I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify pleading or paper to be verified, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an attorney, acting in his or her capacity as a party's attorney, to verify a pleading or other paper for the party. An attorney may verify a pleading if the party is unable to verify because he or she is absent from the county in which the attorney has his or her office, or for some other cause [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see Beard v. Beard (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 645, 649, 107 P.2d 385* (attorney could verify proposed answer to cross complaint on motion to set aside default and default judgment when party was out of state)].

The verification must state that the attorney has read the pleading and that he or she is informed and believes that the matters in it are true and on that ground alleges that they are true. The attorney shall set forth the reasons why verification is not made by one of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5* (form of certification or declaration in lieu of sworn statement)].

An attorney may also verify a pleading in the same manner as any nonparty if he or she has personal knowledge of the facts to be verified [for forms, *see §§ 572.44* and *572.45*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.44

§ 572.44 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--General Form

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--General Form

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify pleading or paper to be verified, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

I make this verification because the facts set forth in the _____ [*specify pleading or paper verified, e.g.,* complaint] are within my knowledge [and because _____ (*specify facts showing cause, e.g.,* I am more familiar with such facts than is the plaintiff herein)].

I _____ [declare *or* certify] under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*Signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* is for use by any person other than a party to verify a pleading or other paper if that person has personal knowledge of the facts alleged. Apparently, the verification may be made without regard to whether the party

is absent from the county, or from some other cause is unable to verify the pleading [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 361, 156 P. 515* (verification by plaintiff's assignor)]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* does not require that the other person verifying pleading on behalf of parties be parties' agent [*Ware v. Stafford (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 232, 24 Cal. Rptr. 153]* .

The person verifying must set forth the reason or reasons why the verification is not made by one of the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. When the averments in the verification state that the facts contained in the pleading are within the person's knowledge, it is deemed a sufficient statement as to why the party did not make the verification [*Oak Grove School Dist. v. City Title Ins. Co. (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 678, 707-708, 32 Cal. Rptr. 288]* . However, when another reason exists making verification by a nonparty preferable to verification by the party, that reason may also be stated.

For a form and discussion of the circumstances when a party's attorney or assignor may verify when he or she has knowledge of the facts, *see §§ 572.45* and *572.46*.

The use of a certification or declaration in lieu of a sworn statement is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*.

[3] Information and Belief

The form in [1], *above*, contains optional language allowing a person with knowledge of the facts to verify a pleading or paper on information and belief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* was adopted for the express purpose of permitting allegations to be verified on information and belief because parties often rely on information furnished to them by others [*North v. Cecil B. De Mille Productions, Inc. (1934) 2 Cal. 2d 55, 59, 39 P.2d 199]* . However, a verification based on information and belief is hearsay. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*, insofar as it purports to permit verification on information and belief, refers to pleadings that join issues, such as a complaint or answer. When the verification is to be used as evidence of facts, *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* does not apply, and such facts cannot be verified on information and belief [*Star Motor Imports, Inc. v. Superior Court (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 201, 204-205, 151 Cal. Rptr. 721]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.45

§ 572.45 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Attorney

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Attorney

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am an attorney at law duly admitted and licensed to practice before all courts of this State and I am [one of] the attorney[s] of record for _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.

I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify paper being verified, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

I make this verification because the facts set forth in said _____ [*specify verified paper, e.g.,* complaint] are within my knowledge [and because _____ (*specify facts showing cause, e.g.,* I am more familiar with such facts than is the plaintiff herein)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an attorney to verify a pleading or other paper on the ground that he or she has personal knowledge of the facts. An attorney may verify a pleading as within his or her own knowledge and also on information and belief [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see Continental Baking Co. v. Katz (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 512, 532, 67 Cal. Rptr. 761, 439 P.2d 889* (complaint verified by plaintiff's attorney, having knowledge of facts, is sufficient to support application for preliminary injunction)]. The circumstances under which an attorney who has knowledge of the facts may verify are the same as for any other person who has knowledge of the facts [*see § 572.44*].

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* provides that a verification of a pleading may be made on information and belief, matters thus verified have no evidentiary value [*see § 572.44[3]*].

The use of a certification or declaration in lieu of a sworn statement is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.46

§ 572.46 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Assignor

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Party's Assignor

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am the assignor of _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action.

I make this verification because the facts set forth in the _____ [*specify pleading or paper to be verified, e.g.*, complaint] are within my knowledge [and because _____ (*specify facts showing cause, e.g.,* it was I who entered into the subject agreement with defendant)].

I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify verified pleading or paper, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

I _____ [declare *or* certify] under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a nonparty with personal knowledge of the facts to verify a complaint when the nonparty is the assignor of the party's claim [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. A statement that the nonparty making the verification is the plaintiff's assignor, that facts are true of his or her own knowledge, and that the assignor is better informed as to the facts than is the plaintiff, is sufficient to support the nonparty verfication [*Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 360, 156 P. 515]* .

For discussion of nonparty verifications, *see §§ 572.44[2]* and *572.45[2]*.

The use of a certification or declaration in lieu of a sworn statement is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*.

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* provides that a verification of a pleading may be made on information and belief, matters thus verified have no evidentiary value [*see § 572.44[3]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.47

§ 572.47 Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Officer of Corporate Party

[1] FORM Verification of Pleading [Code Civ. Proc. § 446] or Paper--Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5]--By Nonparty With Personal Knowledge of Pleaded Facts--By Officer of Corporate Party

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

I am an officer, to wit: _____ [*specify title, e.g.,* President] of _____ [*specify name of corporation*], a corporation organized and existing under the laws of _____ [*specify state*]. _____ [*Name of corporation*] is the _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] in the above-entitled action, and I have been authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing _____ [*specify verified pleading or paper, e.g.,* complaint] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge [, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true].

I _____ [declare *or* certify] under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Califonia that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the officer of a corporate party to verify a pleading or other paper. When a corporation is a party to an action, a pleading may be verified by any of the corporation's officers. The affidavit must state that the officer has read the pleading and that he or she is informed and believes that the matters in it are true, and on that ground alleges that they are true [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*; *see Stockton v. Blodgett (1906) 3 Cal. App. 94, 95, 84 P. 441* (manager or corporation was officer entitled to verify)].

The clause in *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* providing for verification of pleading by an officer of a corporate is party is not exclusive but permissive, and allows the party's attorney or other party to verify in proper case. *Bittleston Law etc. Agency v. Howard (1916) 172 Cal. 357, 362, 156 P. 515*

The use of a certification or declaration in lieu of a sworn statement is authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*.

Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* provides that a verification of a pleading may be made on information and belief, matters thus verified have no evidentiary value [*see § 572.44[3]*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 50: Usury thru Verification-Chs. 568-572
Chapter 572 VERIFICATION
PART IV. FORMS

50-572 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 572.48

§ 572.48 Notice of Motion for Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 577] on the Pleadings--Failure to State a Defense--Unverified Answer to Verified Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 446]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion for Judgment [Code Civ. Proc. § 577] on the Pleadings--Failure to State a Defense--Unverified Answer to Verified Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 446]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION FOR JUDG-
Plaintiff,	)	MENT ON THE PLEADINGS
vs.	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Defendant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

To _____ [*identify party, e.g.,* defendant] _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court,

located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], _____ [*specify party, e.g.,* plaintiff] will, and hereby does, move for an order of entry of judgment on the pleadings. The motion will be made on the ground that defendant's unverified answer to plaintiff's verified complaint does not state facts sufficient to constitute a defense in that it admits the material allegations in the complaint.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated:_____.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

[2] Use of Form

The notice of motion in [1], *above,* is for use by plaintiff to move for a judgment on the pleadings prior to trial when the defendant has filed anunverified answer to a verified complaint. When the complaint is verified, the answer must be verified in most instances [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 446*]. This requirement, however, does not apply in limited civil cases [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 91, 92(b)*]. Even in an unlimited civil case, verification of the complaint does not require a verified answer from a defendant public agency or public officer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 446*].

An unverified answer to a verified complaint is an admission of the allegations in the complaint, and the answer may be subject to a motion for judgment on the pleadings [*DeCamp v. First Kensington Corp. (1978) 83 Cal. App. 3d 268, 283, 147 Cal. Rptr. 869* ; *Patterson v. Blackburn (1920) 47 Cal. App. 362, 363, 190 P. 483]* .

In addition, verification of a complaint in an unlimited civil case requires positive denial or denial according to information and belief of the material allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*; *see Hirons v. Clare (1918) 38 Cal. App. 608, 609, 177 P. 291* (general denial to verified complaint was insufficient to put in issue material allegations in complaint)]. This requirement does not apply if the complaint is subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 90 et seq.* (most limited civil cases) unless the cause of action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*].

[3] Accompanying Papers

A supporting memorandum must be filed and a copy served with the foregoing notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, *see* Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[4] Cross References

For discussion and general forms for motions for judgment on the pleadings, *see* Ch. 206, *Demurrers and Motions for Judgment on the Pleadings* For discussion and general forms for motions to strike, *see* Ch. 375, *Motions to Strike: Pleadings*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 573.syn

§ 573.syn Synopsis to Chapter 573: VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS

§ 573.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 573.02 Cross References

§§ 573.03-573.09 [Reserved]

§ 573.10 Function and Purpose of Vexatious Litigant Statutes

§ 573.11 Application of Vexatious Litigant Statutes to Plaintiffs Litigating In Propria Persona

§ 573.12 Constitutionality of Vexatious Litigant Statutes

§ 573.13 Definitions

[1] Vexatious Litigant

[2] Other Definitions

[3] Interpreting Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)

[a] Five Adverse or Unjustified Litigations in Seven Years

[b] Relitigation of Validity of Final Determination or of Cause of Action or Issues Finally Determined

[c] Frivolous Motions or Tactics

[d] Prior Determination as Vexatious Litigant in Action Based on Same Facts, Transaction, or Occurrence

§ 573.14 Prefiling Order Restricting Filing of New Litigation In Propria Persona

§§ 573.15-573.29 [Reserved]

§ 573.30 State Statutes

§ 573.31 Decisions

§§ 573.32-573.39 [Reserved]

§ 573.40 Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration for Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 573.41 Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]--Judicial Council Form MC-700

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 573.42 Notice That Clerk Mistakenly Filed Litigation Subject to Prefiling Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 573.43 Request and Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant--Judicial Council Form MC-701

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART I. SCOPE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.01

§ 573.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses general provisions relating to vexatious litigants and includes forms for use in seeking a prefiling order to restrict the further filing of litigation by a vexatious litigant [*see §§ 573.40, 573.41*]. It also includes a form of notice that a clerk has mistakenly filed litigation that is subject to a prefiling order [*see § 573.42*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious Litigants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART I. SCOPE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.02

§ 573.02 Cross References

For discussion of security for costs generally and forms for obtaining an order requiring a vexatious litigant to furnish security for costs, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.290* et seq. For a general discussion of judicial bonds and undertakings, see *Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious Litigants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART I. SCOPE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 573.03-573.09

[Reserved]

§§ 573.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.10

§ 573.10 Function and Purpose of Vexatious Litigant Statutes

The vexatious litigant statutes (*Code Civ. Proc. § 391 et seq.*) enable a defendant who has become the target of a vexatious litigant to require the litigant to put up security for the defendant's reasonable expenses [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 391, 391.1, 391.3*; for definition of vexatious litigant *see § 573.13[1]*].

For discussion and forms relating to this procedure, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.90* et seq.

The statutes also permit such a defendant to obtain a prefiling order requiring a vexatious litigant to obtain leave of the presiding judge prior to filing new litigation in propria persona [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7*]. The purpose of the statutory scheme is to address the problem created by the persistent and obsessive litigant who has constantly pending a number of groundless actions. Often, such actions may be against the judges and other court officers who decided or were concerned in the decision of previous actions adversely to the litigant [*First Western Development Corp. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 860, 867-868, 261 Cal. Rptr. 116]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious Litigants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.11

§ 573.11 Application of Vexatious Litigant Statutes to Plaintiffs Litigating In Propria Persona

The vexatious litigant statutes are aimed specifically at litigants who vexatiously bring actions in propria persona, including an attorney at law acting in propria persona [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b), (d)*]. If an attorney files an action on a plaintiff's behalf, the plaintiff generally will not be required to post security under the vexatious litigant statutes [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 391(b),(d), 391.1*]. Similarly, a prefiling order only restricts the filing of new litigation by a vexatious litigant seeking to file in propria persona [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7*].

In certain cases, however, a litigant presently represented by counsel may be deemed a vexatious litigant. Of the four defining acts that transform a plaintiff into a vexatious litigant [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b), discussed under § 573.13[1*], each refers to acts committed while the person was in propria persona. Although the second and third acts described in the statute refer to a person acting in propria persona in the very proceeding in which a defendant attempts to obtain an order requiring the plaintiff to furnish security, the first and fourth do not. Consequently, with respect to the first and fourth described acts, *Code Civ. Proc. § 391* applies to persons currently represented by counsel whose conduct was vexatious when they represented themselves in the past [*Camerado Ins. Agency, Inc.v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 838, 842, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)*].

A represented plaintiff may be required to post security for costs under statutes other than *Code Civ. Proc. § 391 et seq.* [*see, e.g., Code Civ. Proc. § 1029.6* (security for costs in certain actions for personal injury against medical practitioners)]. For further discussion, see *Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.90* et seq.

In addition, although corporations generally cannot appear in propria persona, a corporation may be subject to the vexatious litigant provisions as the alter ego of a vexatious litigant who is using the corporation to circumvent Section 391 et seq. [*Say & Say, Inc. v. Ebershoff (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1759, 1770* , 25 Cal. Rtpr. 2d 703].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious

Litigants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.12

§ 573.12 Constitutionality of Vexatious Litigant Statutes

The vexatious litigant statutes have withstood constitutional challenge on a number of grounds. Constitutionality of the statutes has been upheld under both the federal and state constitution, as well as the issue of due process and the right to counsel [In *Re R.H. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 678, 700-708, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 650]* . The statutes do not unlawfully discriminate against litigants too poor to afford attorneys or litigants proceeding in propria persona [*Taliaferro v. Hoogs (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 521, 527, 46 Cal. Rptr. 147]* . In addition, the statutes do not operate to deprive a litigant of due process of law or of the right to a jury trial [*Taliaferro v. Hoogs (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 521, 528, 529, 46 Cal. Rptr. 147]* . The requirement that security must be furnished by one who is found to be a vexatious litigant if there is no reasonable probability that he or she will prevail is not unconstitutionally vague or uncertain [*Muller v. Tanner (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 445, 452-453, 82 Cal. Rptr. 738* ; *Taliaferro v. Hoogs (1965) 236 Cal. App. 2d 521, 529, 46 Cal. Rptr. 147]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious LitigantsConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsProcedural Due ProcessScope of ProtectionConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsTrial by Jury in Civil ActionsConstitutional LawEqual ProtectionPovertyGovernmentsLegislationOverbreadthGovernmentsLegislationVagueness

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.13

§ 573.13 Definitions

[1] Vexatious Litigant

Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b) specifies four situations that result in a person being a vexatious litigant:

(1) In the immediately preceding seven-year period, the person has commenced, prosecuted, or maintained in propria persona at least five litigations, other than in a small claims court, that have been finally determined adversely to the person or unjustifiably permitted to remain pending at least two years without having been brought to trial or hearing [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(1)*]. The immediately preceding seven-year period is measured from the filing of a motion for security under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.1* [*Stolz v. Bank of America (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 217, 221-223, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19* ; *see § 573.10*]. This definition of vexatious litigant applies whether the litigant brings the action in propria persona or is represented by counsel [*Camerado Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 838, 842, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42]* .

(2) After a litigation has been finally determined against the person, he or she repeatedly relitigates or attempts to relitigate in propria persona either the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(2)*].

(3) In any litigation, while acting in propria persona, the person repeatedly files unmeritorious motions, pleadings, or other papers, conducts unnecessary discovery, or engages in other tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(3)*].

(4) The person, whether acting in propria persona or represented by counsel, has previously been declared to be a vexatious litigant by any state or federal court of record in any action or proceeding based on the same or substantially similar facts, transactions, or occurrences [*Code Civ. Proc. §*

391(b)(4); *see In re Shieh (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1166, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886]* .

[2] Other Definitions

For purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391 et seq.*, "litigation" means any civil action or proceeding commenced, maintained, or pending in any state or federal court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(a)*]. This term has been construed to include appeals and civil writ proceedings [*McColm v. Westwood Park Assn. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1216, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288]* . This term also applies to appeals and writs in dependency actions [In *Re R.H. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 678, 693-700, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 650]* .

"Plaintiff" means the person who commences, institutes, or maintains a litigation or causes it to be commenced, instituted, or maintained, including an attorney at law acting in propria persona [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(d)*; *see In re Shieh (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1166, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886* (holding that attorney-plaintiff in numerous actions was vexatious litigant); *Say & Say, Inc. v. Ebershoff (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1759, 1770* , 25 Cal. Rtpr. 2d 703 (holding that corporation was alter ego of vexatious litigant attorney-plaintiff Shieh and was therefore subject to vexatious litigant statutes)]. "Defendant" means a person (including a corporation, association, partnership, firm, or governmental entity) against whom a litigation is brought or maintained or sought to be brought or maintained [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(e)*].

[3] Interpreting Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)

[a] Five Adverse or Unjustified Litigations in Seven Years

Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(1) applies whether the litigant is bringing the new litigation in propria persona or whether the litigant is represented by counsel [*Camerado Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 838, 842, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42]* . The legislative purpose of the statute would be frustrated if a litigant could avoid the vexatious litigant label simply by obtaining counsel for any further litigations once the litigant qualifies as vexatious [*Camerado Ins. Agency, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 838, 842, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 42]* . The term "litigation" is broadly defined as "any civil action or proceeding, commenced, maintained or pending in any state or federal court" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391(a)*; *Fink v. Shemtov (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1170, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 509* ; *see McColm v. Westwood Park Assn. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1215, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288]* . "[A]ny civil action or proceeding" includes any appeal or writ proceeding. "[A]ny state or federal court" includes the California Court of Appeal [*Fink v. Shemtov (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1170, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 509* ; *McColm v. Westwood Park Assn. (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1215, 73 Cal. Rptr. 2d 288]* .

Although a writ proceeding generally qualifies as a litigation within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(a)*, summary denials of writ petitions do not necessarily constitute a litigation that has been "finally determined adversely to the person" [*Fink v. Shemtov (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1171-1173, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 509]* . The "immediately preceding seven-year period" within which a litigant must have "commenced, prosecuted, or maintained in propria persona at least five litigations" that were determined adversely or unjustifiably permitted to remain pending with being brought to trial is measured from the date of the filing of the motion to declare the plaintiff a vexatious litigant [*Stolz v. Bank of America (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 217, 220, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19]* .

The fact that a litigation was "commenced" outside the seven-year period does not necessarily exclude it from consideration if it was "prosecuted" or "maintained" within that window [*Stolz v. Bank of America (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 217, 225, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19]* .

A voluntary dismissal without prejudice is considered an adverse determination for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(1)* [*Tokerud v. Capitolbank of Sacramento (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 775, 780, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 345]* . An action dismissed voluntarily is still a burden on the target of the litigation and on the judicial system [*Tokerud v. Capitolbank of Sacramento (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 775, 779, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 345]* .

Where the five adverse litigation requirement is not met and the motions are not unmeritorious or frivolous, a finding of the plaintiff as a vexatious litigant under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(3)* will not be upheld on appeal [*Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 963, 972, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818* (cases affirming the vexatious litigant designation involved situations where litigant filed "dozens" of motions)]. However, repeated motions on the same issue may form the basis for a vexatious litigant finding [*Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 963, 972, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818]* .

[b] Relitigation of Validity of Final Determination or of Cause of Action or Issues Finally Determined

A judgment is final within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(2)* when all avenues for direct review have been exhausted [*First Western Development Corp. v. Superior Court (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 860, 864, 261 Cal. Rptr. 116]* . Thus, a plaintiff who had appeals pending in two prior cases, one in state court and one in federal court, could not be determined to be vexatious because there was not yet a final determination in those cases [*Childs v. PaineWebber Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 982, 993, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93]* . Although one plaintiff attempted to relitigate matters that had been finally determined when he filed an untimely motion for reconsideration in a federal court case and then filed a similar action in state court, he did not repeatedly relitigate within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(2)* [*Holcomb v. U.S. Bank (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 1494, 1505-1506, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 578]* .

[c] Frivolous Motions or Tactics

Repeatedly contending that the vexatious litigant statutes are unconstitutional when the issue had been previously decided by the court of appeals in the litigant's own prior case is a frivolous tactic within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(3)* [*In re Whitaker (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 54, 56, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 249]* .

[d] Prior Determination as Vexatious Litigant in Action Based on Same Facts, Transaction, or Occurrence

Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(4) does not require the parties to be the same; it is enough that the proceedings arise from substantially similar facts. Therefore, in a series of disputes between a law firm and a paralegal formerly employed by the law firm, a replevin action by the law firm to recover documents taken by the paralegal and an indemnity action by the paralegal seeking indemnification from the firm for legal counsel were substantially similar despite having slightly different parties [*Devereaux v. Latham & Watkins (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1571, 1581, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 849* (disapproved on other grounds in *Moran v. Murtaugh Miller Meyer & Nelson, LLP (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 780, 785 n.7, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 112, 152 P.3d 416*)]. For purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(4)*, it is immaterial whether the litigant files in propria persona or is represented by counsel [*In re Shieh (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1166, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886* (plaintiff had been declared a vexatious litigant in the United States District Court for the Central District of California and by two separate superior court judges in three distinct cases, all of which were substantially similar to the instant case)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious Litigants

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.14

§ 573.14 Prefiling Order Restricting Filing of New Litigation In Propria Persona

A court may, on its own motion or the motion of any party, enter a prefiling order that prohibits a vexatious litigant from filing any new litigation in California courts in propria persona without first obtaining leave of the presiding judge of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*]. Determination that a person is a vexatious litigant may be made during an appeal [In *Re R.H. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 678, 707, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 650]* . Prior to such a motion, the person must have either been declared a vexatious litigant in a prior proceeding or have been declared a vexatious litigant after a noticed hearing in the current proceeding [*Andrisani v. Hoodack (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 279, 281, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 511* (plaintiff had been declared a vexatious litigant in two prior published appellate court opinions); *Bravo v. Ismaj (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 211, 225, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 879* (plaintiff had not been declared vexatious by any court in the past, and therefore was entitled to a noticed motion and hearing before being declared vexatious and therefore subject to a prefiling order)]. The court issuing the prefiling order has discretion to limit the scope of the order to filings related to a specific matter [*Wilmot v. Commission on Professional Competence (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1133, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656]* . For forms for use in obtaining a prefiling order, see *§§ 573.40* and *573.41*. Disobedience of such an order by a vexatious litigant may be punished as a contempt of court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*; *In re Shieh (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1166, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 886]* .

The Judicial Council is required to keep a list of persons declared by courts to be vexatious litigants subject to prefiling orders [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(e)*]. While the Judicial Council is required to keep a list, it is not required to make the list public, and nothing in Section 391.7 requires the Judicial Council to make the list public; Section 391.7(e) provides that the list is to be disseminated annually to "clerks of the courts of this state," and one court recommends Judicial Council Form MC-700 form should not be public [*Kobayashi v. Superior Court (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 536, 540, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 99]* . As stated in a 2009 case where the plaintiff falsely claimed he was not the same person as the one on the vexatious litigant list: "On the one hand, it is easy for vexatious litigants to make claims of mistaken identity. But on the other hand, our judicial system must protect the rights of innocent litigants who really do have the misfortune of simply sharing the same name as a vexatious litigant, or who, perhaps because of some typo, might be mistakenly placed on the vexatious litigant list [*Kobayashi v. Superior Court (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 536, 542, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 99]* . Should this issue arise, consult *Kobayashi* for a list of suggestions for determining if the plaintiff is on the Judicial Council list and for suggestions of improving the verification process. Note: Plaintiff in this case was referred to the county district attorney's office for possible criminal prosecution for perjury.

If a vexatious litigant seeks to file new litigation in propria persona after the entry of a prefiling order, the presiding judge may only permit the filing if it appears that the litigation has merit and has not been filed for the purposes of harassment or delay. The presiding judge may condition the filing of the litigation on the furnishing of security for the benefit of the defendants as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.3* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(b)*; for discussion and forms regarding security, *see Ch. 174, Costs and Attorney's Fees, § 174.90* et seq.]. Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.3*, the court must order a plaintiff to furnish security if the court determines that plaintiff is a vexatious litigant and that there is no reasonable probability that the plaintiff will prevail in the litigation. In determining whether there is a reasonable probability plaintiff will prevail, the court is permitted to weigh the evidence rather than simply assume the truth of plaintiff's alleged facts [*Moran v. Murtaugh Miller Meyer & Nelson, LLP (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 780, 785, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 112, 152 P.3d 416]* .

The clerk must not file any litigation presented by a vexatious litigant subject to a prefiling order unless the vexatious litigant first obtains an order from the presiding judge permitting the filing. If the clerk mistakenly files the litigation without such an order, any party may file with the clerk and serve on the plaintiff and other parties a notice stating that the plaintiff is a vexatious litigant subject to a prefiling order as set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*; *see § 573.42*]. The filing of the notice automatically stays the litigation, and the litigation will be automatically dismissed unless the plaintiff within 10 days of the filing of the notice obtains an order permitting the filing of the litigation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*].

Although it was formerly held that a Section 391.7 order does not require court approval for filing actions in small claims court [*Banks v. State of California (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1147, 1149-1150, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 127]* , that decision was based on the construction of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(a)*, which defined "litigation" in terms of courts of record. As amended by 1994 Stats., ch. 587, § 391, no longer limits the definition of litigation to courts of record, so it is likely that the court approval requirement applies to actions in small claims court.

The requirements of a prefiling order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7* remain in effect throughout the life of a lawsuit and permit dismissal at any point when a vexatious litigant proceeds without counsel or without the permission of the presiding judge; therefore, a court may dismiss a suit under this statute when counsel withdraws representation just before trial and no new counsel is substituted [*Forrest v. State of California Dept. of Corporations (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 183, 197, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466]* .

A prefiling order is, as defined by *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7*, an injunction; and the order may be modified as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 533* based on a change in the facts, a change in the law, or when a change would serve the ends of justice [*Luckett v. Panos (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 77, 85, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 745*]. The factors for lifting the order include: 1) the litigant must show honesty in the presentation of relevant facts in his or her application for the lifting of the prefiling order, 2) the litigant must show genuine remorse for the costs of litigation inflicted on defendants in prior lawsuits, 3) the litigant must attempt restitution toward the targets of prior litigation, especially payment of cost orders made by the court, 4) the litigant must give up the "habit of suing people as a way of life," and 5) the vexatious litigant must file an application to lift a prefiling order in the same forum that originally entered the order [*Luckett v. Panos (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 77, 90-97, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 745*].

An appellate court may not require a defendant who has been declared a vexatious litigant to obtain leave of the presiding judge before filing an appeal of a judgment against him or her; a defendant who appeals an adverse ruling is not filing "new" litigation or "maintaining" litigation within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 391* and *391.7* [*Mahdavi v. Superior Court (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 32, 42, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 121*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious LitigantsGovernmentsCourtsClerks of Court

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 573.15-573.29

[Reserved]

§§ 573.15[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.30

§ 573.30 State Statutes

Definition of vexatious litigant. *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)*

Procedure for requiring vexatious litigant to obtain leave of court before filing further litigation in propria persona. *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*

Conditions for filing new litigation subject to prefiling order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(b)*

Notice re mistakenly filed litigation. *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*

Judicial recordkeeping concerning prefiling orders. *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(e)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious LitigantsGovernmentsCourtsCourt Records

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.31

§ 573.31 Decisions

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.3*, the court must order a plaintiff to furnish security if the court determines that plaintiff is a vexatious litigant and that there is no reasonable probability that the plaintiff will prevail in the litigation. In determining whether there is a reasonable probability plaintiff will prevail, the court is permitted to weigh the evidence rather than simply assume the truth of plaintiff's alleged facts. *Moran v. Murtaugh Miller Meyer & Nelson, LLP (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 780, 785, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 112, 152 P.3d 416*

Trial court properly declared plaintiff vexatious litigant on ground he commenced, prosecuted, or maintained at least five separate litigations that were finally determined adversely to him, where plaintiff conceded first, second, and fifth cases listed in vexatious litigant order each qualified as litigation finally determined adversely to him, matter listed as third case in the vexatious litigant order also qualified as litigation finally determined adversely to plaintiff within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(1)*, because appellate court's decision showed plaintiff filed complaint in propria persona, judgment was entered in plaintiff's favor against entity defendant, but plaintiff appealed from judgment on ground judgment should have also been entered against individual defendants, and appellate court affirmed judgment, thereby finally determining appeal adversely to plaintiff; and two more litigations were determined adversely to him because his notices of appeal were untimely filed. However, record did not contain any evidence regarding nature of seven writ proceedings relied upon by trial court, other than trial court's statement that petitions had been "summarily denied," and summary denial of writ petition that merely sought relief from pretrial rulings and did not constitute exclusive means of obtaining appellate review did not qualify as litigation finally determined adversely as to plaintiff and could not count toward five litigations required for vexatious litigant status. *Fink v. Shemtov (2010) 180 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1171-1174, 103 Cal. Rptr. 3d 509*

The vexatious litigant statutes are constitutional under both the California and federal constitution and apply to appeals and writs in dependency actions; determination that a person is a vexatious litigant may be made during an appeal. In *Re R.H. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 678, 698-707, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 650*

The Judicial Council is required to keep a list of persons declared by courts to be vexatious litigants subject to prefiling orders; however, this list need not be made public. Plaintiffs claiming mistaken identity for being on the list may

petition the court for resolution, but falsely asserting mistaken identity may result in a referral to the district attorney's office for perjury prosecution. *Kobayashi v. Superior Court (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 536, 540, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 99*

An appellate court may not require a defendant who has been declared a vexatious litigant to obtain leave of the presiding judge before filing an appeal of a judgment against him or her; a defendant who appeals an adverse ruling is not filing "new" litigation or "maintaining" litigation within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 391* and *391.7. Mahdavi v. Superior Court (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 32, 42, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 121*

Vexatious litigant who has had prefiling order entered against him may seek to have the order lifted based on change in circumstances under injunction statute (*Code Civ. Proc. § 533*). The factors for lifting the order include: 1) the litigant must show honesty in the presentation of relevant facts in his or her application for the lifting of the prefiling order, 2) the litigant must show genuine remorse for the costs of litigation inflicted on defendants in prior lawsuits, 3) the litigant must attempt restitution toward the targets of prior litigation, especially payment of cost orders made by the court, 4) the litigant must give up the "habit of suing people as a way of life," and 5) the vexatious litigant must file an application to lift a prefiling order in the same forum that originally entered the order. Prefiling order retained because plaintiff had spent the past 16 years suing people, and he presented misleading facts in application for lifting of order. *Luckett v. Panos (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 77, 90-97, 73 Cal. Rptr. 3d 745*

Where the five adverse litigation requirement is not met and the motions are not unmeritorious or frivolous, a finding of the plaintiff as a vexatious litigant under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(3)* will not be upheld on appeal; however, repeated motions on the same issue may form the basis for a vexatious litigant finding. *Morton v. Wagner (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 963, 972, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 818*

In case where vexatious litigant plaintiff's counsel withdrew prior to trial, trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's action under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*; requirements of prefiling order remain in effect throughout life of lawsuit and permit dismissal at any time when plaintiff proceeds without counsel or without permission of presiding judge. *Forrest v. State of California Dept. of Corporations (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 183, 197, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466*

Defendants were not entitled to attorney's fees when court dismissed vexatious litigant plaintiff's complaint for failure to post security; the vexatious litigant statutes do not authorize such an award. *Luckett v. Keylee (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 919, 926, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 718*

Although nonrepresentative class members cannot "commence, prosecute, or maintain" litigations within the meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)(1)*, they can engage in behavior qualifying them for vexatious litigant status under subdivisions (2) and (3). *In re Natural Gas Cases (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 387, 395-396, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 909*

Although court did not reach the issue of whether a vexatious litigant determination can be erased once made, the court did state that in order to remove the vexatious litigant label a court must find a change in the facts or circumstances leading to the original determination. In this case, the judge abused his discretion in undoing the vexatious litigant determination because there was no showing that the litigant changed the conduct that led to the vexatious litigant designation. *PBA, LLC, v. KPOD, Ltd. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 965, 976, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532*

The prefiling order authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7* may be viewed as a form of injunction reversible under *Code Civ. Proc. § 533*. *PBA, LLC, v. KPOD, Ltd. (2003) 112 Cal. App.4th 965, 978, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 532*

Appellate court as determining that corporation was a vexatious litigant since it was alter ego of attorney who had previously been found to be a vexatious litigant. *Say & Say, Inc. v. Ebershoff (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1759, 1770* , 25 Cal. Rtpr. 2d 703

Collateral estoppel as bar to relitigation of determination that particular litigation wasdetermined adversely or

unjustifiably permitted to remain pending for purposes of *Code Civ. Proc. § 391(b)*. *Stolz v. Bank of America (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 217, 221-223, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 19*

Appellate court as having authority to enter prefiling order under *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*. *Andrisani v. Hoodack (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 279, 281, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 511*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesSelf-RepresentationSanctionsCivil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsVexatious LitigantsCivil ProcedureAppealsFrivolous Appeals

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 573.32-573.39

[Reserved]

§§ 573.32[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART IV. FORMS

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.40

§ 573.40 Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration for Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]

[1] FORM Notice of Motion and Supporting Declaration for Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*],	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR PREFILING ORDER PROHIBITING VEXATIOUS LITIGANT FROM FILING NEW LITIGATION IN PROPRIA PERSONA, SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*], AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM
Defendant.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	[Judge: _____]

_____

To _____ [*identify party if applicable, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*]:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____[*date*], at _____[*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____[*street address*], _____[*city*], _____ [*identify party if applicable, e.g.,* defendant] _____[*name*] will move for an order prohibiting plaintiff

from filing any new litigation in propria persona in the California courts without first obtaining leave of the presiding judge of the court in which the litigation is proposed to be filed. The motion will be made on the ground that [*identify party if applicable, e.g.,* plaintiff] _____[*name*] is a vexatious litigant as defined under *section 391(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure.*

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of_____[*name(s)*] and the memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____[*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*moving party*) *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. _____ [*Set forth facts supporting motion, e.g.,* _____ (*Name*) has, within the past seven years, maintained in propria persona eight civil actions in Paradise County Superior Court that have been finally determined adversely to plaintiff: _____ (*list docket numbers*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM

[*Add memorandum supporting motion.*]

[2] Use of Form

This notice of motion and supporting declaration may be used by any party to obtain an order prohibiting a vexatious litigant from filing additional litigation in propria persona without first obtaining leave of the presiding judge of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*; for discussion, *see § 573.14*].

A supporting memorandum must be served with the notice of motion [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100, 3.1113(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*].

[3] Cross References

For the related form of order, see *§ 573.41*

For a discussion and forms relating to motions and orders generally, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART IV. FORMS

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.41

§ 573.41 Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]--Judicial Council Form MC-700

[1] FORM Order Prohibiting Vexatious Litigant From Filing New Litigation In Propria Persona [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)]--Judicial Council Form MC-700

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form of order illustrated in [1], *above*, is an illustration of the Judicial Council form [Form No. MC-700] for use when the court has granted a motion to have a prefiling order entered against a vexatious litigant, restricting the litigant's filing of further litigation in propria persona [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(a)*]. Use of the Judcial Council form is mandatory.

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in *LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms*, which may be accessed at www.lexisone.com for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at www.lexisone.com at no charge.

After issuing a prefiling order against a vexatious litigant, the court will send a copy of the order to the Judicial Council, so that the Council may add the vexatious litigant's name to its annually disseminated list of vexatious litigants [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(e)*].

For a form of notice of motion and supporting declaration that may be used to apply for this order, see *§ 573.40*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART IV. FORMS

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.42

§ 573.42 Notice That Clerk Mistakenly Filed Litigation Subject to Prefiling Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)]

[1] FORM Notice That Clerk Mistakenly Filed Litigation Subject to Prefiling Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Defendant.	)	NOTICE THAT CLERK MISTAKENLY FILED
	)	LITIGATION SUBJECT TO PREFILING ORDER
	)	

_____

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____[*date*], the clerk of _____ [*specify court, e.g.,* Lincoln County Superior Court] mistakenly filed an _____ [action *or* proceeding] that was subject to a prefiling order pursuant to *Code of Civil Procedure section 391.7*. On _____[*date*], the _____ [*specify court issuing prefiling order, e.g.,* Paradise County Superior Court] entered an order against _____[*name of vexatious litigant*] prohibiting him/her from filing any new litigation in California courts in propria persona without first obtaining leave of the presiding judge of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed. _____[*Name of vexatious litigant*] did not obtain such leave before filing the above-entitled litigation in this court, and consequently, the filing of this litigation by the clerk was improper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Defendant

[2] Use of Form

The form of notice in [1], *above*, is for use when a clerk has mistakenly filed litigation that is subject to a prefiling order made pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7* [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*; for discussion, *see § 573.14*]. The filing of

the notice automatically stays the litigation, and the litigation will be automatically dismissed unless the plaintiff within 10 days of the filing of the notice obtains an order permitting the filing of the litigation. If the presiding judge issues an order permitting the filing, the stay of litigation will remain in effect, and the defendants need not plead, until 10 days after the defendants are served with a copy of any such order [*Code Civ. Proc. § 391.7(c)*].

171 of 171 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 573 VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS
PART IV. FORMS

51-573 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 573.43

§ 573.43 Request and Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant--Judicial Council Form MC-701

[1] FORM Request and Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

Judicial Council Form MC-701, Request and Order to File New Litigation by Vexatious Litigant illustrated in [1], *above*, is approved by the Judicial Council for optional use [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 1.35*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms, which may be accessed at *www.lexisone.com* for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format is also available at *www.lexisone.com* at no charge.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 574 RESERVED

51-574 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 574

RESERVED

Chapter 574RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 575.syn

§ 575.syn Synopsis to Chapter 575: WATERS

§ 575.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 575.02 Cross References

§§ 575.03-575.09 [Reserved]

§ 575.10 Governing Law

§ 575.11 Flood Waters

[1] Self-Protection by Landowner

[2] Protective Action by State

[3] Protective Action Must Be Reasonable

§§ 575.12-575.29 [Reserved]

§ 575.30 Governing Law

§ 575.31 Control of Navigable Waters

[1] Federal Versus State Power

[2] Definitions

[3] Public Trust

§ 575.32 Nonnavigable Water

§ 575.33 Federal Water Projects

[1] Federal Powers

[2] State Powers

§ 575.34 Riparian Rights on Federally Reserved Lands

§ 575.35 Adjudication of Federal Water Rights

§ 575.36 Interstate Waters

[1] Choice of Law

[2] Interstate Compacts

[3] Jurisdiction

§§ 575.37-575.49 [Reserved]

§ 575.50 Governing Law

§ 575.51 Manner of Acquiring Water Rights

§ 575.52 State Water Policy

§ 575.53 Constitutional Mandate

[1] Reasonably Beneficial Use

[2] Beneficial Use Not Equivalent to Reasonable Use

§ 575.54 Riparian Rights

[1] Background

[2] Elements

[3] Watercourse Defined

[4] Reasonable and Beneficial Use

[5] Correlative Right

[6] Dormant Rights

[a] Existence Without Exercise

[b] Assertion at Any Time

[c] Priority Over Appropriation Rights

§ 575.55 Appropriation Rights

[1] Obtained by Permit Procedure

[2] Water Subject to Appropriation

[a] Water Available

[b] Fully Appropriated Stream System

[3] Elements of an Appropriation

§ 575.56 Priority of Appropriation Rights

§ 575.57 Public Trust

[1] Relation to Appropriation Decisions

[2] Continuing Supervision

§ 575.58 Application to Appropriate Water

§ 575.59 Appropriation Must Be in Public Interest

§ 575.60 Factors Considered by State Board in Appropriation Decisions

[1] Generally

[2] Amount of Water

§ 575.61 Application Determines Priority

§ 575.62 Issuance of Permit

§ 575.63 Terms and Conditions of Permit

§ 575.64 Modification of Permit Terms

§ 575.65 Permit Specifies Deadlines

§ 575.66 Revocation of Permit

[1] Failure to Comply With Deadlines

[2] Recourse After Revocation

§ 575.67 Temporary Permit

§ 575.68 Precursors to License

§ 575.69 License Determinations by State Board

§ 575.70 Writ of Mandate Available for Limited License

§ 575.71 Conditions of License

§ 575.72 License Information Filed in County Recorder's Office

§ 575.73 Revocation of License

[1] Result of Licensee's Actions

[2] Challenging Revocation Order

§ 575.74 Temporary Urgency Changes

§ 575.75 Change in Appropriative Use

[1] In General

[2] Protests

[3] Hearing

[4] Minor Petition

[5] Change to Preserve or Enhance Environmental Resources or Recreational Uses

§ 575.76 Transfer of Water or Water Rights

[1] Temporary Changes

[2] Long-Term Transfers

[3] Expiration of Transfer Period

[4] Transfer of Decreed Rights

§ 575.77 Judicial Review of State Board's Decision

§ 575.78 Forfeiture of Appropriation Right

§ 575.79 Appropriation of Water for Small Domestic and Livestock Stockpond Use

[1] Acquisition of Right

[2] "Small Domestic Use" Defined

[3] "Livestock Stockpond" Defined

[4] Terms and Conditions

[5] Who May Register Water Use

[6] Registration of Water Use

[7] Registration Lists

[8] Effect of Registration

[9] Amended Registration

[10] Renewal of Registration

[11] Reports to the State Board

[12] Protest of Approval of Stockpond Registration

§ 575.80 Prescriptive Rights

§ 575.81 Underground Basin Waters

[1] Right to Use Water

[2] Priority of Competing Uses

[3] Overdraft

§ 575.82 Fees

§§ 575.83-575.99 [Reserved]

§ 575.100 Governing Law

§ 575.101 Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

[1] Cease and Desist Order--Violation of Right

[2] Issuance of Cease and Desist Orders

[3] Judicial Review of Cease and Desist Order

[4] Enforcement of Cease and Desist Order

[5] Effect on Private Litigants

§ 575.102 Unauthorized Use Constitutes Trespass

[1] Civil Liability

[2] Administrative Liability

[3] Cease and Desist Orders

[4] Civil and Administrative Liability Are Distinct

§§ 575.103-575.119 [Reserved]

§ 575.120 Governing Law

§§ 575.121-575.139 [Reserved]

§ 575.140 Statutory Adjudication of Water Rights in Stream System

§ 575.141 Petition to Board

§ 575.142 Notice of Proceedings

§ 575.143 Minor Quantity Exception

§ 575.144 State Board Investigation

§ 575.145 State Board Report

§ 575.146 Objection Procedure

§ 575.147 Hearing on Objections

§ 575.148 Order of Determination

§ 575.149 Filing Order in Court

[1] Notice of Hearing

[2] Exceptions to Order

[3] Powers of Court

[4] Court Decree

[5] Conclusiveness of Decree

§ 575.150 Intervention

§ 575.151 Incomplete Appropriations--General Proceedings

§ 575.152 Supplemental Decrees

[1] Incomplete Appropriation

[2] Revocation or Change in Use

§ 575.153 Expenses

§ 575.154 Modification of Court Decrees

§§ 575.155-575.169 [Reserved]

§ 575.170 Jurisdiction of Water Rights Controversies

§ 575.171 Judicial Determination of Water Rights

[1] Declaratory Relief

[a] Protection Against Appropriators

[b] Between Owners of Same Type of Right

[2] Injunctive Relief

§ 575.172 Inadequacy of Private Suits

§ 575.173 Court Action

[1] Referral to Board

[2] Objections to Report

[3] Expenses

[4] Federal Court Cases

[5] Reservation of Jurisdiction

§§ 575.174-575.189 [Reserved]

§ 575.190 Governing Law

§ 575.191 Essential Elements of Water Contract

[1] General Contract Principles

[2] Characterization of Water as Personal or Real Property

§ 575.192 Remedies Available for Breach

§ 575.193 Damages

[1] Measure of Damages Varies

[2] Limitation of Damages

§ 575.194 Water Companies

§ 575.195 Dedication to Public Use

[1] Service to Public

[2] Dedication May Be Limited

§ 575.196 Extension of Water Service

[1] Reasonable Necessity

[2] Factors Determining Reasonableness

§ 575.197 Public and Private Water Companies

[1] Regulations for Service

[2] Remedies for Discontinuance of Service

§§ 575.198-575.209 [Reserved]

§ 575.210 Governing Law

§ 575.211 Water Districts and Local Agency Formation Commission

§ 575.212 Overlapping Districts

§ 575.213 District Merged With City

§§ 575.214-575.229 [Reserved]

§ 575.230 Federal Constitution

§ 575.231 State Constitution

§ 575.232 Federal Statutes

§ 575.233 State Statutes

§ 575.234 Decisions

[1] Flood Waters

[2] Interplay Between Federal and State Rules

[3] Navigability Issues

[4] Public Trust

§ 575.235 Attorney General Opinions

§ 575.236 Law Reviews

§ 575.237 Text References

§§ 575.238-575.249 [Reserved]

§ 575.250 State Statutes

§ 575.251 Decisions

§ 575.252 Text References

§§ 575.253-575.269 [Reserved]

§ 575.270 State Constitution

§ 575.271 State Statutes

§ 575.272 Decisions

[1] Appropriative Rights

[2] Board Actions

[3] Diversion Requirements in General

[4] Generally

[5] Prescription

[6] Riparian

§ 575.273 Attorney General Opinions

§ 575.274 Law Reviews

§ 575.275 Text References

§§ 575.276-575.289 [Reserved]

§ 575.290 State Statutes

§ 575.291 Decisions

§ 575.292 Text References

§§ 575.293-575.309 [Reserved]

§ 575.310 Federal Statutes

§ 575.311 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

[2] Delivery Requirements

[3] Miscellaneous

[4] Private Water Companies

§ 575.312 Decisions

[1] Actions on Contract

[2] Extension of Service

[3] Liability for Failure to Provide Water

[4] Miscellaneous

[5] Rates

§ 575.313 Law Reviews

§ 575.314 Text References

§§ 575.315-575.329 [Reserved]

§ 575.330 State Statutes

[1] Local Agencies

[2] Water Districts

§ 575.331 Decisions

§ 575.332 Law Reviews

§ 575.333 Text References

§§ 575.334-515.349 [Reserved]

§ 575.350 Appropriation of Water--Application--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

[5] Cross References

§ 575.351 Appropriation of Water--Supplement to Application--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.352 Appropriation of Water--Environmental Information--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.353 Appropriation of Water--Statement of Posting Notice--State Board Form [Water Code § 1300]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

[5] Cross References

§ 575.354 Appropriation of Water--Protest--State Board Form [Water Code § 1330]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Resolving the Protest

[4] Field Investigations Required for Minor Applications

[5] State Statutes

[6] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.355 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Correction of Description--State Board Form [Water Code § 1701]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Administrative Regulations

[4] Cross References

§ 575.356 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Change in Point of Diversion or Place of Use--State Board Form [Water Code § 1700]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.357 Appropriation of Water--Protest to Change Petition--State Board Form [Water Code § 1704]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Minor Petition for Change

[4] Judicial Review

[5] Administrative Regulations

[6] Cross References

§ 575.358 Appropriation of Water--Permit for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1380]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.359 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Extension of Time--State Board Form [Water Code § 1398]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice

[4] State Statutes

[5] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.360 Appropriation of Water--License for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1610]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 575.361 Appropriation of Water--Complaint--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.362 Appropriation of Water--Answer--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.363 Appropriation of Water--Statement of Water Diversion and Use--State Board Form [Water Code § 5101]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 575.364 Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel State Water Resources Control Board to Issue Permit to Appropriate Water [Water Code § 1126]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Points and Authorities

[6] State Statutes

[7] Cross References

§ 575.365 Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel Review of State Water Resources Control Board Cease and Desist Order [Water Code § 1126]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Cross References

§§ 575.366-575.379 [Reserved]

§ 575.380 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Petition to State Water Resources Control Board for Determination of Water Rights [Water Code § 2525]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.381 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Proof of Claim of Water Right--State Board Form [Water Code § 2575]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Administrative Regulations

§ 575.382 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Objection to Determination of State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code § 2628]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

§ 575.383 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Exception and Proof of Claim of Claimant in Intervention [Water Code § 2780] and Application for Order Prescribing Service [Water Code § 2781]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 575.384 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Order Prescribing Time and Manner of Service of Exception and Proof of Claimant in Intervention and Time for Filing and Service of Contests [Water Code § 2781]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.385 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and

Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

[6] State Statutes

[7] Cross References

§ 575.386 Order of Reference to State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code §§ 2000, 2001]--Action for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.387 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Lower Riparian Owner Against Upper Riparian Owner--Interference With Right to Use Water

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 575.388 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water by Impounding Water--Absence of Watercourse; Only Surface Drainage Impounded

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 575.389 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Riparian Right to Reasonable Use of Water

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.390 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Sufficient Water Available to Plaintiff

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.391 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Right by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007, Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 575.392 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Lower Riparian Owner for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Certification re Notice

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 575.393 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Application for Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 530]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.394 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§

526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.395 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Notice of Motion for Order Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.396 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion Dissolving Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 575.397 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.398 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Overlying Landowner for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Underground and Percolating Water

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

§ 575.399 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020] to

Easement by Adverse Possession [Code Civ. Proc. § 321] and for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422], and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Water Right

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Lis Pendens

[5] State Statutes

[6] Cross References

§ 575.400 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Acquisition of Right to Water by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007; Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.401 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Nonuse

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 575.402 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Abandonment

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 575.403-575.419 [Reserved]

§ 575.420 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Use Agreement and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Dispute Between User and Supplier--By User

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

[5] Cross References

§ 575.421 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Service Agreement--Dispute Over Supplying Subdivision--By Developer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Cross References

§ 575.422 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Water District to Supply Water

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Verification

[5] Points and Authorities

[6] Decisions

§§ 575.423-575.439 [Reserved]

§ 575.440 Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 39400, 39425]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Procedure After Filing of Petition

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Cross References

§ 575.441 Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Declaration of Intention to Withdraw Name From Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code § 39431]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.442 Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Exclusion of Land From Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48000, 48001]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 575.443 Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Inclusion of Land Within Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48200, 48201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 575.444 Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30200-30204]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[a] Formation

[b] General

[4] Decisions

[5] Attorney General Opinions

§ 575.445 Notice of Hearing on Petition for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30230, 30231]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] State Statutes

[4] Cross References

§ 575.446 Application to County Board of Supervisors for Inclusion of Land Within Proposed County Water District [Water Code § 30264(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 575.447 Petition to Local Agency Formation Commission to Detach Territory [Gov. Code § 56700] From County Water District [Water Code § 32200]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Petition Signature Requirements

[4] Commission Proceedings

[5] Conducting Authority

[6] Petition Signed by All Landowners

[7] State Statutes

[a] Definitions

[b] General Provisions

[8] Decisions

§ 575.448 Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of Municipal Water District [Water Code §§ 71120-71124]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Supplemental Petition

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

[6] Attorney General Opinions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART I. SCOPE

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.01

§ 575.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses the interaction between the federal and state governments regarding water. It also discusses the interaction between states when a stream system is interstate [*see § 575.30* et seq.].

This chapter also discusses riparian, appropriative, and prescriptive rights to water, including the statutory procedure for acquiring appropriative water rights [*see § 575.50* et seq.]. It includes forms for use before the State Water Board to apply for appropriative rights [*see §§ 575.350 -575.353*], to apply for changes in appropriative rights [*see §§ 575.355, 575.356*], to protest those applications [§§ 575.354, 575.357], to complain of a violation of a permit or license [*see § 575.361*], and to make a statement of water diversion [*see § 575.363*]. It also includes the permit [*see § 575.358*] and license [*see § 575.360*] issued by the board. This chapter includes forms for use in a petition for a writ of mandate to compel the board to issue a permit to appropriate water [*see § 575.364*] and to compel review of a cease and desist order issued by the board [*see § 575.365*].

This chapter also discusses the enforcement of appropriative water rights, including the procedures for obtaining a cease and desist order, and the effect of the procedures on private litigants [*see § 575.100* et seq.].

This chapter also discusses the adjudication of water rights by the State Water Resources Control Board and the judicial determination of water rights [*see § 575.120* et seq.]. It includes forms for use in statutory adjudication proceedings before the board to petition for determination of water rights [*see § 575.380*], to file proof of claim of water right [*see § 575.381*], and to object [*see § 575.382*] and to intervene [*see §§ 575.383, 575.384*] in board proceedings. For use in the judicial determination of water rights, this chapter includes a complaint for declaratory relief for determination of water rights and for injunctive relief [*see § 575.385*] and an order of reference to the board [*see § 575.386*]. It includes a form of complaint for damages by a lower riparian owner against an upper riparian owner for interference with water rights [*see § 575.387*] and forms of affirmative defenses to that complaint [*see §§ 575.388 -575.391*]. It includes forms of complaint [*see § 575.392*], notice of motion [*see § 575.393*], and preliminary injunction [*see § 575.394*] for a lower riparian owner seeking a temporary restraining order, injunctive relief, and damages against an upper riparian, and forms of notice of motion [*see § 575.395*], declaration [*see § 575.396*], and order [*see § 575.397*] for the upper riparian to seek to dissolve a preliminary injunction. Also included are a form of complaint by an overlying landowner for injunctive relief and damages for interference with underground water [*see § 575.398*], and a form of complaint to

quiet title to an easement and for injunctive relief and damages for interference with a water right [*see § 575.399*], and forms of allegation for use with that complaint [*see §§ 575.400 -575.402*].

The unauthorized diversion or use of water is a trespass, for which civil and administrative liability may be imposed [*see § 575.102[1]*].

This chapter also discusses actions under agreements to supply water [*see § 575.190* et seq.]. It contains a form of complaint [*see § 575.420*] for declaratory relief for a determination of rights under a water use agreement and for damages for its violation, a complaint [*see § 575.421*] for declaratory relief for a determination of rights appropriate when more than one supplier is involved, and a form of petition [*see § 575.422*] for writ of mandate to compel a water district to supply water. The liability of a utility in small claims court for delay of service under *Civ. Code § 1722(c)* is discussed in Ch. 545, *Telephone and Telegraph Communication* .

This chapter also discusses the formation of water districts [*see § 575.210* et seq.]. It contains forms for use in forming [*see § 575.440*], excluding land from [*see § 575.442*], and including land within [*see § 575.443*] a water storage district. Also included is a declaration of intention by a person to withdraw his or her name from the petition for formation of a water storage district [*see § 575.441*]. It contains a petition for use in forming [*see § 575.444*], including land within [*see § 575.446*], and detaching territory from [*see § 575.447*], a county water district, and a notice of hearing [*see § 575.445*] on the petition to form a county water district. Also included is a form for use in petitioning for formation [*see § 575.448*] of a municipal water district.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART I. SCOPE

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.02

§ 575.02 Cross References

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

For discussion and forms relating to adverse possession and use of real property, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession* .

For discussion and forms relating to the establishment of uncertain boundary lines, see Ch. 101, *Boundaries* .

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms relating to actions in contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* .

For discussion and forms relating to pleading the nature and extent of tort damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages* .

For discussion and forms relating to declaratory relief actions, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

For discussion and forms relating to actions involving easements, see Ch. 240, *Easements* .

For discussion and forms relating to election proceedings generally, see Ch. 243, *Elections* .

For discussion and forms relating to eminent domain and inverse condemnation proceedings, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* .

For discussion relating to termination of public utility service, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .

For discussion and forms relating to procedures for seeking injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

For discussion and forms relating to interference or wrongful use of irrigation water, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation* .

For discussion and forms relating to traditional mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* .

For discussion and forms for use in petitioning for court review of an adjudicatory decision of an administrative agency through the use of administrative mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

For discussion and forms relating to use in proceedings before the California Public Utilities Commission, see Ch. 480, *Public Utilities* .

For discussion, procedural checklist, and forms relating to the resolution of conflicting claims of ownership to property through use of an action to quiet title, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

For discussion and forms relating to sanitation and sewerage districts, see Ch. 511, *Sanitation and Sewerage Districts* .

For detailed coverage of all aspects of California water law, see Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

5 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART I. SCOPE

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.03-575.09

[Reserved]

§§ 575.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
1. In General

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.10

§ 575.10 Governing Law

The relationship between federal and state water law is generally governed by the United States Constitution, through which the federal government exercises its control, and is specifically governed by the Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*), the Property Clause (U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 3*), and the General Welfare Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8*).

The appropriation of water rights is governed by *Water Code § 1200 et seq.* Enforcement of appropriative water rights is governed by *Water Code § 1825 et seq.* When a judicial determination of water rights is sought, and the court refers the action to the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board or Board), those procedures are governed by *Water Code § 2000 et seq.* Statutory adjudication of water rights by the State Board is controlled by *Water Code § 2500 et seq.*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
1. In General

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.11

§ 575.11 Flood Waters

[1] Self-Protection by Landowner

Flood waters are those that escape from a stream or other body of water and overflow the adjacent territory. They are a common enemy, and a landowner may protect his or her land even to the detriment of neighbors. The common enemy rule only applies to flood waters in the strict sense; that is, waters escaping because of their height from the confinement of a stream and running over adjacent property. Implicit in the definition of flood waters is the element of abnormality; they are flood waters because of their escape from the usual channels under conditions that do not ordinarily occur [*Everett v. Davis (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 389, 393, 115 P.2d 821* ; *Beckley v. Reclamation Board (1962) 205 Cal. App. 2d 734, 743 n. 2, 23 Cal. Rptr. 428]* . Excessive storm waters that overflow the banks of a stream, but that later find their way back into the stream either by drainage or by percolation, as the stream subsides, are not flood waters, but are waters of the stream, the natural flow of which may not be interfered with to the damage of upper riparian owners of land [*Costello v. Bowen (1947) 80 Cal. App. 2d 621, 631, 182 P.2d 615]* .

Protection from flood waters may be used as a defense to a claim of negligence alleging damages from floodwaters [*see, e.g., Linvill v. Perello (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 195, 197, 234 Cal. Rptr. 392]* . It may also be an appropriate defense to an action seeking injunctive relief against the erection and continued maintenance of a fence, embankment, or levee that causes the diversion of flood waters [*see, e.g., Everett v. Davis (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 389, 390, 115 P.2d 821]* . For additional discussion of flood waters and a form of affirmative defense based on flood waters, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* .

[2] Protective Action by State

A public entity that undertakes construction or operation of a flood control project is liable for unreasonable conduct. Thus, when the public entity's design, construction, or maintenance of a flood control project is shown to have posed an unreasonable risk of harm to the plaintiffs, and the unreasonable design, construction, or maintenance constituted a substantial cause of the damage, plaintiffs may recover, regardless of the fact that the project's purpose was to to contain the common enemy of floodwaters [*Belair v. Riverside County Flood Control Dist. (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 550, 559-560,*

253 Cal. Rptr. 693, 764 P.2d 1070] . The *Belair* reasonableness standard applies in any flood control case when the failure of publicly managed flood control facilities causes damage to property historically subject to flooding, including cases involving the diversion of water from its natural flow [*Bunch v. Coachella Valley Water Dist. (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 432, 447, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89, 935 P.2d 796]* . For forms and discussion relating to inverse condemantion, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain* .

[3] Protective Action Must Be Reasonable

The landowner may use every reasonable precaution to avert injury to his or her land. The reasonableness of the precautions is determined by existing conditions and not by aftereffects [*The Weinberg Co. v. Bixby (1921) 185 Cal. 87, 96, 196 P. 25* ; *Tahan v. Thomas (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 78, 81, 86 Cal. Rptr. 440]* . Although each case is decided on its own facts, one court has articulated a balancing test that weighs the utility of the diverter's use of his or her land against the gravity of the harm resulting from the alteration of the water flow as one factor in determining reasonableness. If the balance weighs on the side of the person who diverted the floodwaters, that is a factor tending to show that he or she has acted reasonably; if the harm to other landowners is severe, that is a factor tending to show that the economic costs incident to diversion of floodwaters should be borne by the owner who diverted the waters [*Linvill v. Perello (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 195, 199, 234 Cal. Rptr. 392]* . The protection from liability does not extend to an obstruction of the natural river channel or the creation of an artificial channel by which the natural stream waters of the river are carried onto the lands of another that would have been protected but for the creation of that channel [*Clement v. State Reclamation Board (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 628, 635-638, 220 P.2d 897]* . For forms and discussion pertaining to liability of landowners regarding waters that are not flood waters, see Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* . For forms and discussion pertaining to irrigation waters, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
1. In General

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.12-575.29

[Reserved]

§§ 575.12[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.30

§ 575.30 Governing Law

The federal government has rights to the nation's navigable waters, including water within the state of California, through application of the Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8, cl. 3*), the Property Clause (U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 3*), and the General Welfare Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8*).

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.31

§ 575.31 Control of Navigable Waters

[1] Federal Versus State Power

Under the Commerce Clause (U.S. *Const., art I, § 8, cl. 3*), the federal government has dominion, to the exclusion of the states, over navigable waters of the United States [*Tacoma v. Taxpayers of Tacoma (1958) 357 U.S. 320, 334, 78 S. Ct. 1209, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1345]* . This power has been validly exercised in a variety of ways, including the improvement of navigation and the development of power [*see Tacoma v. Taxpayers of Tacoma (1958) 357 U.S. 320, 334, 78 S. Ct. 1209, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1345* ; *Arizona v. California (1930) 283 U.S. 423, 452, 51 S. Ct. 522, 75 L. Ed. 1154]* .

Although the federal government has a dominant servitude over the navigable waters of the United States, the preexisting private proprietary rights under state law must be recognized unless the Congress, in exercising federal servitude, clearly authorizes their abolishment [*Federal Power Com. v. Niagara Mohawk P. Corp (1954) 347 U.S. 239, 241, 249-250, 74 S. Ct. 487, 98 L. Ed. 666]* . Thus, the state has absolute power to control, regulate, and utilize its navigable waterways and the lands beneath them, except as limited by the paramount supervisory power of the federal government over navigable waters [*Marks v. Whitney (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 251, 260, 98 Cal. Rptr. 790, 491 P.2d 374* ; *see Utah Division of State Lands v. U.S. (1987) 482 U.S. 193, 208-209, 107 S. Ct. 2318, 96 L. Ed. 2d 162]* .

Even when the federal government has acted to exercise its authority over navigable waters, unless the field is exclusively occupied for all purposes by the federal action, there may be a duality of control between the federal and state governments [*Calif. Oregon Power Co. v. Superior Court (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 858, 868, 291 P.2d 455 , cert. denied, 352 U.S. 823, 77 S. Ct. 30, 1 L. Ed. 2d 47 (1956)* (state had authority to abate nuisance created by federal public utility when federal act did not address nuisances)].

The navigable waters of the United States are subject to regulations for their use, administration, and navigation. Failure to comply with those regulations may be a misdemeanor [*see 33 U.S.C. § 1*]. Unless preempted by federal action, in California navigable waters and their frontages are subject to the right of public access and eminent domain [*see Cal. Const., art. X, §§ 1, 4*].

[2] Definitions

There are two federal definitions of navigable waters. The first, for purposes of the Commerce Clause, says that rivers which are actually used or are susceptible to being used, in their natural condition or with reasonable improvements, for purposes of trade and commerce are navigable in law. Substantially the same test is used for purposes of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. The second definition, used to determine the respective rights of the states and the United States to the title of stream beds, is the basic Commerce Clause test, with two exceptions: it is applied to the stream in its natural condition, and it is determined as of the time of admission of the state to the United States. On the question of state versus federal rights, this test is mandatory in both the state and federal courts [*Hitchings v. Del Rio Woods Recreation & Park Dist. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 560, 567, 127 Cal. Rptr. 830]* .

For purposes of public use of a state's navigable waters, the state may adopt a test of navigability different from and less stringent than the federal test. For example, in determining navigability for purposes of a public navigational easement, state law may evaluate navigability as of a date later than statehood [*Hitchings v. Del Rio Woods Recreation & Park Dist. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 560, 568, 127 Cal. Rptr. 830]* .

In California, the test of navigability provides that rivers are regarded as public navigable rivers in law when they are navigable in fact. Rivers are navigable in fact when they are used, or are susceptible to being used, in their ordinary condition, as highways for commerce, over which trade and travel are or may be conducted in the customary modes of trade and travel on water. Navigability is determined by the character of the stream, its situation and availability as a highway of commerce, and other surrounding circumstances [*Bohn v. Albertson (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 738, 741, 238 P.2d 128]* .

[3] Public Trust

Through application of the public trust doctrine, the right of the public to use the navigable waters, whether federal or state, is extremely broad and encompasses the right to use rivers for all recreational purposes such as boating, swimming, fishing, and hunting. It is sufficiently flexible to encompass changing public needs, and includes preservation of those lands in their natural state, for ecological purposes. Indeed, the public's right of access to navigable waters is of great public importance and must be expansively interpreted [*see* *Marks v. Whitney (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 251, 259-260, 98 Cal. Rptr. 790, 491 P.2d 374* ; *Kern River Public Access Com. v. City of Bakersfield (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1205, 1216 n. 4, 217 Cal. Rptr. 125]* . The public trust doctrine, however, is not applicable to nonnavigable waterways in the absence of any impact on navigable waters [*Golden Feather Community Assn. v. Thermalito Irrigation Dist. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1276, 1283-1287, 257 Cal. Rptr. 836* (doctrine held inapplicable to nonnavigable waterway in action to compel continued, authorized diversion from nonnavigable stream into artificial reservoir while precluding use of diverted water to maintain reservoir for recreational purposes)]. For discussion of the public trust doctrine, see *§ 575.57*.

If, at the time the state grants a land patent, there are navigable waters on the land, the right of navigation is reserved to the state and the landowner's rights are subject to the navigation rights of the public, even without an express reservation of the right [*Bohn v. Albertson (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 738, 741-742, 238 P.2d 128]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.32

§ 575.32 Nonnavigable Water

Through the Property Clause (U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 3*), the federal government also has control over nonnavigable waters on public lands and reservations of the United States [*Federal Power Com. v. Oregon (1955) 349 U.S. 435, 442-443, 75 S. Ct. 832, 99 L. Ed. 1215]* .

When the federal government withdraws its land from the public domain and reserves it for a federal purpose, it impliedly reserves appurtenant water then unappropriated to the extent needed to accomplish the purpose of the reservation; only the amount of water necessary is reserved [*Cappaert v. United States (1976) 426 U.S. 128, 138, 141, 96 S. Ct. 2062, 48 L. Ed. 2d 523]* . If a federal act expands the reserved water rights of the United States, the expanded rights are subordinate to any prior appropriation of water under state law [*United States v. New Mexico (1978) 438 U.S. 696, 713 n. 21, 98 S. Ct. 3012, 57 L. Ed. 2d 1052]* . Thus, while the initial reservation includes a water right of the highest priority, an expansion of the reserved right is allowed only if the excess water has not already been appropriated.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.33

§ 575.33 Federal Water Projects

[1] Federal Powers

In furthering the promotion of agriculture through the development of reclamation and irrigation projects, which is a valid public and national purpose, the federal government may expend funds and acquire property. The authority to do so arises from both the General Welfare Clause (U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8*) and the Property Clause (U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 3*)[*Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken (1958) 357 U.S. 275, 294, 78 S. Ct. 1174, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1313 , reh'g denied, 358 U.S. 805, 79 S. Ct. 10, 3 L. Ed. 2d 94]* .

The federal government has the power to impose reasonable conditions on the use of federal funds, federal property, and federal privileges [*Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken (1958) 357 U.S. 275, 295, 78 S. Ct. 1174, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1313 , reh'g denied, 358 U.S. 805, 79 S. Ct. 10, 3 L. Ed. 2d 94]* . Provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (*43 U.S.C. § 371 et seq.*, as codified, incorporating 1982 amendment), which generally restrict the use of reclamation water at subsidized rates on lands in excess of certain acreage in single ownership, have been upheld as accomplishing the governmental purpose of supplying water to the greatest number of individuals and preventing federal subsidy of speculation [*Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken (1958) 357 U.S. 275, 296-297, 78 S. Ct. 1174, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1313 , reh'g denied, 358 U.S. 805, 79 S. Ct. 10, 3 L. Ed. 2d 94]* . "Large landowners" (that is, those owning land in excess of specified acreage) have been unsuccessful in their constitutional attacks on contracts between water districts and the federal government, and related recordable contracts between the large landowners and the federal government (subjecting the excess lands that do receive reclaimed water to certain government control), asserting that the excess-acreage provisions amount to a taking of vested property rights and discrimination against excess landowners, in violation of *U.S. Const., amends. V* and *XIV* [*Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. McCracken (1958) 357 U.S. 275, 294-297, 78 S. Ct. 1174, 2 L. Ed. 2d 1313 , reh'g denied, 358 U.S. 805, 79 S. Ct. 10, 3 L. Ed. 2d 94]* .

Moreover, large landowners were unsuccessful in attempts to obtain specific enforcement of those contracts following subsequent amendment of the Reclamation Act of 1902 that provided stricter limitations on the use of reclaimed water on excess lands than the limitations under the contracts (which reflected superseded law). The landowners could not

claim that the provision of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (R.R.A; *43 U.S.C. §§ 373(a), 390aa*-390zz-1, 422e, 425b, 485h, 502), raising the subsidized rates, and shortening to 10 years the time period for which they could use reclaimed water on excess lands at the superseded rate, violated their rights under the due process and "taking" clauses of *U.S. Const., amend. V*, because they had no contractual right to receive water for those lands at subsidized rates for more than 10 years [*Barcellos and Wolfsen v. Westlands Water Dist. (9th Cir. 1990) 899 F.2d 814, 821-825* (construing *43 U.S.C. § 390ww(h)*)]. Similarly, water districts failed in a constitutional attack on provisions of the R.R.A. because they had no vested property right to the continuation of terms of their contracts with the federal government that conflicted with superseding federal statutes. The water districts sought unsuccessfully to invalidate the "hammer clause" of the R.R.A. (*43 U.S.C. § 390cc(a), (b)*), which essentially required that those receiving subsidized water from federal reclamation projects elect whether to (1) amend their contracts to conform to the requirements of the R.R.A., which increases the eligible single-ownership acreage from 160 to 960 acres, but increases the subsidized price and eliminates the "leasing loophole," which had exempted leased lands from the acreage limitations; or (2) continue to deliver water to leased lands in excess of 160 acres but pay the full cost rather than a subsidized price. Their claims of violation of due-process and "taking" clauses of *U.S. Const., amend. V*, failed because they had no vested property right to buy reclamation water for delivery to leased lands, and the statute was rationally related to the legitimate governmental purpose of promoting small farming operations, equitably distributing water under modern farming conditions, and conserving water [*Peterson v. United States Dep't of Interior (9th Cir. 1990) 899 F.2d 799, 813-814]* .

By contrast, when a federal act implementing a water project supplemental to the reclamation laws specifically recognizes certain landowners' vested or "presently perfected" property rights under state law to receive reclaimed water under certain conditions, those landowners are entitled to rights under the provisions of the supplemental act, rather than the reclamation laws that would otherwise apply [*Bryant v. Yellen (1980) 447 U.S. 352, 355, 100 S. Ct. 2232, 65 L. Ed. 2d 184* , *reh'g denied*, *448 U.S. 911, 101 S. Ct. 25, 65 L. Ed. 2d 1172* (regarding Boulder Canyon Project Act, *43 U.S.C. § 617 et seq.*)].

[2] State Powers

A state may impose conditions on a permit it grants to the United States to implement a federal water project so long as the conditions are not inconsistent with congressional provisions authorizing that project. Section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (*43 U.S.C. §§ 372, 383*), which requires compliance with state laws, requires the federal project to comply with state law in the purchase or condemnation of vested water rights, and also in the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water. Congress intended to defer to the substance, as well as the form, of state water law [*California v. United States (1978) 438 U.S. 645, 672-675, 98 S. Ct. 2985, 57 L. Ed. 2d 1018]* . However, a state may not take an action that would be contrary to the congressional directive [*Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. East Bay Mun. Utility Dist. (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 183, 193, 161 Cal. Rptr. 466, 605 P.2d 1* (state had no authority to prevent federal dam construction)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.34

§ 575.34 Riparian Rights on Federally Reserved Lands

In California, which recognizes riparian water rights as well as appropriative rights (*see §§ 575.54, 575.55*), the Supreme Court has held that the federal Constitution does not preclude the United States from acquiring riparian water rights under California law on federal reserved lands within the state [*In re Water of Hallett Creek Stream System (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 448, 466-467, 243 Cal. Rptr. 887, 749 P.2d 324]* . The Court stated that the underlying principle of deference to state law extends to any water right recognized under local law, including riparian rights. Furthermore, the federal government may exercise riparian rights on reserved lands for secondary purposes, such as wildlife enhancement, the same as any other ordinary proprietor, that is, the government's rights are not subordinate to rights of subsequent appropriators [*In re Water of Hallett Creek Stream System (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 448, 470, 243 Cal. Rptr. 887, 749 P.2d 324]* . If the riparian right is unexercised, however, that right may be subordinate to any uses of water authorized before the government attempts to exercise its right [*In re Water of Hallett Creek Stream System (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 448, 471-472, 243 Cal. Rptr. 887, 749 P.2d 324* ; *see § 575.54[6]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.35

§ 575.35 Adjudication of Federal Water Rights

Federal water rights are not dependent on state law or state procedures; water rights claims of the United States may be adjudicated in federal courts under the jurisdictional grant of *28 U.S.C. § 1345*, as well as in state courts [*Cappaert v. United States (1976) 426 U.S. 128, 145, 96 S. Ct. 2062, 48 L. Ed. 2d 523]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.36

§ 575.36 Interstate Waters

[1] Choice of Law

In determining the relative rights of states and their citizens in the waters of an interstate stream, if both states follow the same doctrine for determining water rights, that doctrine will be applied [*Wyoming v. Colorado (1921) 259 U.S. 419, 467-470, 42 S. Ct. 552, 66 L. Ed. 999]* .

When the states have different water doctrines, the federal common law doctrine of equitable apportionment will be applied. It is a flexible doctrine based on consideration of many factors to secure a just and equitable allocation of the waters, and includes a weighing of the harms and benefits to the competing states [*Colorado v. New Mexico (1982) 459 U.S. 176, 183-186, 103 S. Ct. 539, 74 L. Ed. 2d 348]* . The doctrine of equitable apportionment is only applied in the absence of a statute resolving interstate claims [*Arizona v. California (1963) 373 U.S. 546, 562, 83 S. Ct. 1468, 10 L. Ed. 2d 542]* .

[2] Interstate Compacts

States may make agreements or compacts between themselves as allowed by U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10(3)*. California has entered into compacts with both Oregon and Nevada concerning the use of water [*see Water Code §§ 5900-5901, 5950-5951* and *Water Code §§ 5975-5976*, respectively; *see also Water Code § 123*]. Additionally, *Civ. Code § 1410a* provides that the entire flow of any natural stream carrying water from California into another state is governed by California law.

[3] Jurisdiction

The United States Supreme Court has original jurisdiction of water rights controversies between states [U.S. *Const., art. III, § 2*; *Arizona v. California (1963) 373 U.S. 546, 564, 83 S. Ct. 1468, 10 L. Ed. 2d 542* ; *see Texas v. New Mexico (1987) 482 U.S. 124, 126-128, 107 S. Ct. 2279, 96 L. Ed. 2d 105* (interpretation of compact)]. When there is a dispute concerning water rights between citizens of different states, there is concurrent jurisdiction in the two states, and

whichever court first acquires jurisdiction is entitled to proceed to final determination without interference from the other [*Rickey Land & C. Co. v. Miller & Lux (1910) 218 U.S. 258, 262, 31 S. Ct. 11, 54 L. Ed. 1032]*
.

16 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
2. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.37-575.49

[Reserved]

§§ 575.37[Reserved]

17 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.50

§ 575.50 Governing Law

The appropriation of water rights is governed by *Water Code §§ 1200-1801*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.51

§ 575.51 Manner of Acquiring Water Rights

California recognizes three methods of acquiring rights to the use of water. The riparian right is acquired by owning land adjoining a watercourse [*see § 575.54*]. The appropriative right is acquired by following statutory procedures to obtain a license [*see § 575.55*]. The prescriptive right is based on a taking that is hostile to the rights of another [*see § 575.80*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.52

§ 575.52 State Water Policy

State policy requires that water resources be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent possible and that waste and unreasonable use be prevented [*Cal. Const., Art X, § 2*; *Water Code § 100*]. All water within California belongs to the people, but its use may be acquired by legal appropriation or riparian right [*Water Code §§ 101, 102*]. The right to use water will be regarded and protected as a real property interest, even though there is no ownership in the water itself [*Fullerton v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 590, 598, 153 Cal. Rptr. 518]* . However, no water right is inviolable, and all water rights, whether riparian or appropriative, are subject to government regulations requiring reasonable use [*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 105-106, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

California operates under a dual system of water rights that recognizes both the appropriation and the riparian doctrines. The riparian doctrine confers the right to the reasonable and beneficial use of water on that land on the owner of land contiguous to a watercourse. The appropriation doctrine contemplates the diversion of water and applies to any taking of water for other than riparian or overlying uses [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 441, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* . An appropriative taking of water that is wrongful may ripen into a prescriptive right [*see Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*; *California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 726-727, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . However, because the statutory procedure for obtaining appropriative rights is exclusive, there is some controversy over whether prescription is a valid means of acquiring a water right [*People v. Shirokow (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 301, 307-308, 162 Cal. Rptr. 30, 605 P.2d 859]* . For discussion of the riparian and appropriative rights, see *§§ 575.54, 575.55*. For discussion of prescriptive rights, see *§ 575.80*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.53

§ 575.53 Constitutional Mandate

[1] Reasonably Beneficial Use

The general welfare requires that the state's water resources be put to beneficial use to the fullest extent of which they are capable, and that waste, unreasonable use, or unreasonable method of water use be prevented. Conservation of water must be exercised with a view to reasonable and beneficial use [*Cal. Const., Art. X, § 2*]. When the holder of an appropriative right fails to use the water as a result of conjunctive use of surface water and ground water, the reduction in use under the appropriative right is a reasonable and beneficial use [*Water Code § 1011.5*].

[2] Beneficial Use Not Equivalent to Reasonable Use

Beneficial use cannot be equated with reasonable use and a use may be beneficial without being reasonable [*Joslin v. Marin Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 132, 142-143, 60 Cal. Rptr. 377, 429 P.2d 889* (use of waters as an agent to depose silt and carry away salt was obviously beneficial to owner of land, but not reasonable)]. A use that is reasonable and beneficial when water is present in excess of all needs, may not be a reasonable beneficial use in an area of great scarcity and great need. Similarly, a use that is beneficial at one time may, because of changed circumstances, become a waste of water at a later time [*People ex rel. State Water Resources Control Bd. v. Forni (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 743, 750, 126 Cal. Rptr. 851* ; *Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Wat. Resources Control Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 548, 570, 275 Cal. Rptr. 250* (district's use of water may be beneficial but unreasonable if it does not promote water conservation)].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.54

§ 575.54 Riparian Rights

[1] Background

No riparian proprietor owns water in a stream; riparians (owners of lands contiguous to water) have only the right to the reasonable use of the water [*Williams v. Rankin (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 803, 819, 54 Cal. Rptr. 184]* . The right to the water of flowing streams originally vested in the state or federal governments in their capacities as riparian owners, not in their capacities as sovereigns, and the right remains vested in them prior to any sale or disposition of lands by them. When land is disposed of by either government entity, the riparian water right pertaining to that land passes to the purchaser as a part of that realty. The riparian rights cannot be divested from the riparian owners, and have not been divested from them, except (1) by their consent, expressed, as by statute or by actual grant or contract, or implied, as by prescription, or (2) by enforced taking for public use, as by condemnation [*Palmer v. Railroad Com. of California (1914) 167 Cal. 163, 173-174, 138 P. 997* ; see *Miller & Lux, Inc., v. Light & Power Corp. (1932) 120 Cal. App. 589, 612, 8 P.2d 560]* . For discussion of the nature of the federal government's riparian rights in reserved lands under California law, see *§ 575.34*.

[2] Elements

A landowner asserting a riparian right must plead the following three elements: (1) the riparian character of his or her land, (2) the quantity of water or the proportion of the watercourse to which he or she claims to be entitled, and (3) the location of his or her land with respect to the land of the other party [*Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828, 306 P.2d 807]* .

The riparian character of the land may be pleaded either (1) by alleging the existence of ultimate facts, which if proved would establish the land as riparian, or (2) by alleging generally that the land is riparian to a stream or natural watercourse. Land will be established as riparian when three things are proved: (1) some part of the land must be contiguous to a stream or natural watercourse, (2) the land for which water is claimed must be within the watershed of the stream, and (3) the land for which water is claimed must be part of the smallest tract held under one title in the chain of title leading to the present owner--the land's riparian status must not have been lost by severance [*Hudson v. West*

(1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828-829, 306 P.2d 807] .

When asserting a riparian right, the quantity of water sought must be definite. A specific number of inches of water without further qualification is an indefinite quantity of running water and is an insufficient allegation of quantity that may be subject to a special demurrer for uncertainty [*Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828, 306 P.2d 807* (allegation stated to be sufficient in absence of special demurrer)]. When pleading a riparian right, gallons or acre-feet may be useful terms in expressing the quantity of water.

Land is only riparian at the times when it is reached by the stream [*Williams v. Rankin (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 803, 814, 54 Cal. Rptr. 184]* . If a tract of land has any access to the stream at all, and the other riparian elements exist, including the requirement that title to the tract is derived from a single source and has never been severed, the entire tract is riparian. It is the status of the land, not the quantity of water, and not the size of the tract, that is relevant in determining riparian status [*Rancho Santa Margarita v. Vail (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 501, 529, 533-534, 81 P.2d 533]* .

[3] Watercourse Defined

A watercourse consists of a stream flowing in a particular direction, though it need not flow continually, and may sometimes be dry. It must flow in a definite channel, stream, or body of water. A watercourse may exist even though it serves as a mere channel by means of which a particular watershed is drained; water runoff from usual and recurring rainfall constitutes a watercourse when it runs in a well-defined channel [*Van Zyl v. Spiegelberg (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 367, 374, 82 Cal. Rptr. 689* (negligence and nuisance action)].

The riparian right to use water on adjoining land applies to the water of a running stream, lake, pond, slough, or any natural body of water. Even if a pond or lake is caused solely by an overflow, has no other source of supply, and would soon disappear due to seepage and evaporation, the riparian owners have a right to the reasonable use of the water [*Turner v. The James Canal Co. (1909) 155 Cal. 82, 87, 90, 99 P. 520]* .

Although riparian rights usually exist only in natural watercourses, a channel for the diversion of water may have existed for such a length of time, and may have been used under such circumstances, that the manner of its creation is not material; it then has all the attributes of a water channel wholly natural in its origin, and bordering lands are riparian in the same manner and to the same extent as lands bordering on streams which are natural in their origin [*Chowchilla Farms Inc. v. Martin (1933) 219 Cal. 1, 19-20, 25 P.2d 435]* .

[4] Reasonable and Beneficial Use

Riparian use must comply with the constitutional requirement of reasonable and beneficial use [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 351, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656]* . Riparian rights in a watercourse attach to, but to no more than, so much of the flow as may be required or put to a reasonable and beneficial use [*Cal. Const., Art. X, § 2*].

What constitutes a reasonable use or method of use of water is a question of fact to be determined according to the circumstances in each particular case [*Joslin v. Marin Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 132, 139, 60 Cal. Rptr. 377, 429 P.2d 889]* . The reasonableness of a riparian use cannot be determined without considering the effect of that use on all the needs of those in the stream system, nor can it be a context isolated from statewide considerations of transcendent importance such as maximum beneficial use of limited water resources, prevention of waste and unreasonable use, and conservation for the public welfare [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 354, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656]* .

[5] Correlative Right

The riparian right is a correlative right, shared with other riparian owners on the same watercourse. The riparian rights of owners of land adjoining a stream, or any connected bay, inlet, or slough, are equal and coextensive with those of persons owning land bordering the main current or channel. However, when there is not enough water to supply the needs of all, factors such as quantity of land owned, the owners' respective interests, the quantity of the water in the smaller body as compared to the main one, and the quantity of water capable of being diverted naturally will be considered [*Turner v. The James Canal Co. (1909) 155 Cal. 82, 90-91, 99 P. 520]* .

[6] Dormant Rights

[a] Existence Without Exercise

The rights of a riparian owner are not destroyed or impaired by the fact that the water has not been used on the riparian lands, and the riparian right exists, whether exercised or not. A dormant riparian right may be qualified, but not extinguished, by active appropriative rights [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 357-359, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656* ; *see In re Water of Hallett Creek Stream System (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 448, 471, 243 Cal. Rptr. 887, 749 P.2d 324]* .

[b] Assertion at Any Time

Dormant riparian rights are unrecorded and their quantity is unknown. They present a major source of uncertainty in water rights law. This uncertainty fosters recurrent, costly, and piecemeal litigation. The uncertainty arises because the riparian right is not an entitlement to a specific quantity of water; it is an entitlement to make reasonable use of a correlative share of the stream flow. What a riparian's actual entitlement is at any given time varies with the circumstances of the time and place. A new riparian user, from a recent patent of riparian land, a recent activation of a previously dormant riparian right, or the expanded use of an active riparian right, is entitled to share equally with all earlier riparian users. Thus, the other riparians can never know what their share will be in the future [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 355, n. 10, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656]* .

[c] Priority Over Appropriation Rights

Furthermore, as against an appropriator, a riparian owner has a fixed priority of right. But the quantity of water to which the right attaches remains unfixed. Thus, an expanded riparian use has the potential to preempt an inferior appropriative right when the supply of water originally was sufficient to satisfy both uses [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 355 n.10, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.55

§ 575.55 Appropriation Rights

[1] Obtained by Permit Procedure

The appropriation right to water is acquired by complying with the procedures set forth in *Water Code § 1000 et seq.* Under this method, a person who wishes to appropriate water applies for a permit to appropriate water, a permit to construct necessary water works and divert water is granted, and on completion of the works, a license is issued. This procedure is the exclusive method of appropriating water in California, except as provided in *Water Code §§ 1226-1226.4*, which governs stockponds [*Water Code § 1225*; *Fullerton v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 590, 593 n. 2, 599-600, 153 Cal. Rptr. 518]* .

[2] Water Subject to Appropriation

[a] Water Available

All water flowing in any natural channel, whether surface or subterranean, unless already applied to useful and beneficial purposes on lands riparian thereto, or otherwise appropriated, is public water of the State and subject to appropriation [*Water Code §§ 1200, 1201*]. Whenever water in a watercourse, whether the water is foreign or part of the natural flow, is not reasonably required for beneficial use by the owners of existing rights to that water, those owners cannot prevent its beneficial use by other persons [*Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Bank of America (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 719, 729, 28 Cal. Rptr. 401]* .

Unappropriated water includes (1) all water that has never been appropriated, (2) all water appropriated before the effective date of the Water Commission Act (December 19, 1914) that has not been put to beneficial use or utilized for the purpose of the appropriation, (3) all water lawfully appropriated that has ceased to be put to the useful or beneficial purpose for which it was appropriated, and (4) water that flows back into a stream, lake, or other body of water after having been appropriated or used [*Water Code § 1202*].

If a municipality holds the right to use water in excess of existing municipal needs, anyone entitled to possession of land

on which the excess water may be put to beneficial use may appropriate that excess water, but only for the time during which that water is not needed by the municipality [*Water Code § 1203*].

In determining the amount of water available for appropriation for other beneficial uses, the State Board is required to take into account, whenever it is in the public interest, the amounts of water required for recreation and the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources [*Water Code § 1243*].

[b] Fully Appropriated Stream System

Following notice and hearing, the State Board may adopt a declaration that a stream system is fully appropriated based on its finding that the stream system water is being fully applied to beneficial uses when previous water rights decisions have determined that no water remains available for appropriation [*see Water Code § 1205(a), (b)*].

From the date of adoption of a full appropriation declaration, and subject to *Water Code § 1206(b)*, the Board will not accept any application for a permit to appropriate water from the stream system described in the declaration, and may cancel any application pending on that date [*Water Code § 1206(a)*]. *Water Code § 1206(a)* does not apply to applications for temporary permits made pursuant to *Water Code §§ 1425-1431* or to any Water Code provision respecting change in point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use [*Water Code § 1206(c)*]. For discussion of temporary permits, see *§ 575.67*. For discussion of changes in use, see *§ 575.75*.

Notwithstanding *Water Code § 1206(a)*, in its declaration the Board may provide for acceptance of applications to appropriate water under specified conditions. Any such provision must specify the conditions and may contain application limitations, including, but not limited to, limitations on the purpose of use, on the instantaneous rate of diversion, on the season of diversion, and on the amount of water that may be diverted annually. The Board may make those limitations applicable to individual applications to appropriate water, or to the aggregate of the applications, or both [*Water Code § 1206(b)*].

The Board may, either on its own motion or on petition of any interested person, after notice and hearing, revoke or revise a declaration that a stream system is fully appropriated [*Water Code § 1205(c)*].

Any notice of hearing pursuant to *Water Code §§ 1205-1207* must be published at least once a week for four consecutive weeks in one or more newspapers of general circulation published in each county in which any part of the stream system is situated, and publication must be complete at least 60 days prior to the date of hearing [*Water Code § 1207(a)*]. At least 60 days prior to the date of the hearing, the notice must be mailed to all persons known to the Board who own land that appears to be riparian to the stream system, who divert water from the stream system, or who have made written request to the Board for special notice of hearing pursuant to *Water Code §§ 1205-1207* [*Water Code § 1207(b)*].

[3] Elements of an Appropriation

To constitute an appropriation, there must be (1) an intent to take, (2) accompanied by an open, physical demonstration of that intent, (3) for a valuable use. The outward manifestation of all three elements is most often evidenced by a diversion of the water from its natural source prior to using it, although other means are also acceptable, such as watering livestock directly from the course. There must be physical use or control of the water in some fashion, however, either by artificial means (diversion or a storage structure) or by establishing a possessory right in the land to which the water is appurtenant [*Fullerton v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 590, 598-599, 601, 153 Cal. Rptr. 518* (Board properly denied permit to State Department of Fish and Game for "in-stream" appropriation to provide minimum flow guarantees to protect fish resources)].

Appropriation must be for some useful or beneficial purpose [*Cal. Const., Art. X, § 2*; *Water Code § 1240*].

Storing water underground, including the diversion of streams and the flowing of water on lands necessary to the accomplishment of that storage, can be a beneficial use [*Water Code § 1242*]. Storage of water to be released for the purpose of protecting or enhancing the quality of other waters which are put to beneficial uses may also be a beneficial use [*Water Code § 1242.5*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.56

§ 575.56 Priority of Appropriation Rights

An appropriator has no right superior to the rights attaching to lands riparian to the same stream or to that of a prior appropriator on the same stream [*Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Bank of America (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 719, 728, 28 Cal. Rptr. 401* ; *see § 575.54[6][c]*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.57

§ 575.57 Public Trust

[1] Relation to Appropriation Decisions

The concept of the public trust is that the sovereign owns all of its navigable waterways and the lands lying beneath them as trustee of a public trust for the benefit of the people. This trust requires the state to protect navigable waters from harm caused by diversion of nonnavigable tributaries [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 425-427, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* .

Because the prosperity and habitability of much of the state requires the diversion of great quantities of water from its streams for purposes unconnected to public trust uses at the source stream, the state has the power to grant nonvested usufructuary rights to appropriate water even if diversions harm public trust uses, but it should attempt to avoid or minimize any harm to those interests before approving water diversions. Even if one trust is preferred to another in one instance, a state agency has no power to abrogate a public trust by authorizing a use inconsistent with it [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 439-441, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* .

[2] Continuing Supervision

The state has an affirmative duty to take the public trust into account in the planning and allocation of water resources, and to protect public trust uses whenever feasible. Once an appropriation has been approved, the public trust imposes a duty of continuing supervision over the taking and use of the appropriated water. In exercising its power to allocate water resources in the public interest, the state is not confined by past allocation decisions which may be incorrect in light of current knowledge or inconsistent with current needs; it may reconsider allocation decisions even though those decisions were made after due consideration of their effect on the public trust [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 446-447, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* .

Members of the public as well as public interest groups have standing to bring an action to enjoin appropriation of water in violation of the public trust [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 431 n. 11, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709]* . The courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the board over such cases. The public trust

issue may be raised before the board by a proceeding to determine water rights in a stream system under *Water Code § 2501* [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 448, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709* ; *see §§ 575.140* and *575.380*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.58

§ 575.58 Application to Appropriate Water

Any person may apply for and secure from the State Board, pursuant to statutory and regulatory provisions, a permit for any unappropriated water [*Water Code § 1252*; for the form of application, *see § 575.350*]. The Board must consider and act on all applications for permits to appropriate water and must do all things proper relating to those applications, including conducting necessary investigations [*Water Code §§ 1250, 1251*]. Appropriation rights and privileges may be conferred on the United States, on the State, and on any entity or organization capable of holding an interest in real property, as well as on a person [*Water Code § 1252.5*].

The Board will make necessary investigations of the state's water resources to secure information needed in connection with applications for appropriation of water [*Water Code § 1251*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.59

§ 575.59 Appropriation Must Be in Public Interest

The State Board will allow the appropriation of unappropriated water for beneficial purposes under any terms and conditions that it judges will best develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water sought to be appropriated [*Water Code § 1253*]. Proposed appropriations not best conserving the public interest will be rejected [*Water Code § 1255*]. In determining the public interest, the Board must consider any state-authorized plan pertaining to the control, protection, development, utilization, and conservation of water resources [*Water Code § 1256*]. The role of the Board in acting on permit applications is a necessary balancing process requiring maximum flexibility in considering the competing demands for water [*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 126, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.60

§ 575.60 Factors Considered by State Board in Appropriation Decisions

[1] Generally

In acting on applications to appropriate water the State Board is guided by the policy that domestic use is the highest use and irrigation is the next highest use [*Water Code § 1254*]. The Board must also consider the relative benefit to be derived from (1) all beneficial uses of the water concerned including, but not limited to, use for domestic, irrigation, municipal, industrial, preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife, recreational, or mining and power purposes, and from any uses specifically protected under any relevant water quality control plan; and (2) the reuse or reclamation of the water sought to be appropriated, as proposed by the applicant. The Board may subject appropriations to whatever terms and conditions it finds to be in the public interest [*Water Code § 1257*; *see United States v. State Water Resources Control Board (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 132-133, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* . Stream flow requirements proposed for fish and wildlife purposes pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code §§ 10001, 10002*, and water quality control plans established pursuant to the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (*Water Code § 13000 et seq.*) must be considered by the Board [*Water Code §§ 1257.5, 1258*]. Underlying all the necessary elements for the Board to consider in its appropriation decisions is the state goal of providing a decent home and suitable living environment for its inhabitants [*Water Code § 1259*].

[2] Amount of Water

In determining the amount of water available for appropriation, the State Board will take into account the amounts of water needed to remain in the source for protection of beneficial uses, including any uses specifically protected under any relevant water quality control plan [*Water Code § 1243.5*]. The Board will similarly take into account the amounts of water required for recreation and for the preservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife resources [*Water Code § 1243*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.61

§ 575.61 Application Determines Priority

Any properly made application for appropriation gives the applicant a priority of right as of the date of the application until the application is either approved or rejected. That priority continues only so long as the applicant complies with applicable laws and regulations [*Water Code § 1450*]. If the permit is granted, that priority continues and gives the permittee the right to take and use the amount of water specified until the permit is revoked or until a license is issued [*Water Code § 1455*].

A municipality's application for a permit for water use for the municipality or for the domestic needs of its inhabitants is first in right, irrespective of whether it is first in time [*Water Code § 1460*]. The Water Code also provides a priority for specified situations, such as for an application by the Department of Water Resources in aid of a water plan or an application pertaining to action on certain types of hydroelectric plants that have no significant adverse environmental impact [*see Water Code §§ 1480, 1490-1491*, respectively].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.62

§ 575.62 Issuance of Permit

As prerequisites to the issuance of a permit to appropriate water, there must be an applicant, the application must contain prescribed information in the form required by the State Board, the intended use must be beneficial, there must be unappropriated water available for the applicant's supply, and all fees must be paid [*Water Code § 1375*]. Once the application is approved, the Board must issue a permit [*Water Code § 1380*; *see § 575.358*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.63

§ 575.63 Terms and Conditions of Permit

Use of water following the issuance of a permit is limited to the extent and purpose allowed in the permit [*Water Code § 1381*]. A permit is effective only for the time the water actually appropriated under it is used for a useful and beneficial purpose [*Water Code § 1390*]. Every permit must include the enumeration of its conditions (in substance the provisions of *Water Code §§ 1390-1394*) and the statement that any appropriator of water to whom a permit is issued takes it subject to the conditions expressed in the permit [*Water Code § 1391*; *see United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 132-133, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* . Every permittee accepts a permit under the condition that no value in excess of the actual amount paid to the State therefor shall at any time be claimed for the permit in respect to public entity regulation of the services rendered by the permittee or in respect to any valuation for purposes of sale to or purchase by, whether through condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a public entity of the rights and property of any permittee acquired through the permit process [*Water Code § 1392*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.64

§ 575.64 Modification of Permit Terms

The State Board may reserve jurisdiction in whole or in part to amend or revise terms and conditions in a permit if the Board finds that there is insufficient information to finally determine the terms and conditions that will reasonably protect vested rights without resulting in waste of water or that will best develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water sought to be appropriated, and that a period of actual operation or time for completion of studies is necessary to secure the required information. The Board may also reserve jurisdiction if (1) the application under consideration represents only part of a coordinated project and the other applications for the project are pending, and (2) the Board finds that the coordinated project requires coordinated terms and conditions that cannot reasonably be decided until a decision is reached on the other pending applications [*Water Code § 1394(a)*]. Jurisdiction will be reserved for no longer a period than is reasonably necessary and will not be exercised after the license is issued. Reserved jurisdiction can be exercised only after notice to the parties and a hearing [*Water Code § 1394(b)*]. The Board's decision or order reserving jurisdiction and its decision or order in the exercise of that reserved jurisdiction are both subject to reconsideration [*Water Code §§ 1120, 1122*].

Independent of its power to reserve jurisdiction under *Water Code § 1394*, the Board has the authority to modify a permit under its power to prevent waste or unreasonable use or methods of diversion of water. Because a determination of reasonable use depends on the totality of the circumstances presented, when the Board determines that changed circumstances reveal new information about the adverse effect of a water project, the Board may modify the permit to curtail use and diversion of the water on the ground that the project's use and diversion of the water has become unreasonable [*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 129-130, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.65

§ 575.65 Permit Specifies Deadlines

The permit will specify deadlines for commencement and completion of construction work and for application of the water to beneficial use [Water Code §§ 1395, 1398]. Although both the construction work and utilization of water for beneficial purposes must be prosecuted with due diligence, the permit-specified time periods may be extended by the State Board for good cause shown [*Water Code §§ 1396, 1398*]. After any hearing on a petition for extension of time, the Board may revoke the permit [*Water Code §§ 1398(b), 1410*; for a form of petition, *see § 575.359*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.66

§ 575.66 Revocation of Permit

[1] Failure to Comply With Deadlines

A permit may be revoked (1) if the work is not commenced, prosecuted with due diligence, and completed, or (2) if the water is not applied to beneficial use as contemplated in the permit and in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements [*Water Code § 1410(a)*].

The State Board may revoke a permit if, after a hearing on a petition for an extension of time to complete a project and apply water to beneficial use, the Board finds that cause exists to revoke the permit [*Water Code § 1410(b)(1)*]. A permit may also be revoked if, after an investigation other than a hearing on a petition for an extension of time, it appears that cause exists to revoke a permit. The Board must give the permittee written notice of the proposed revocation. If the permittee fails to request a hearing within the required time period, the Board will revoke the permit and declare the water subject to appropriation. After any hearing requested by the permittee, the Board may, on a finding that cause exists, revoke the permit and declare the water subject to appropriation [*Water Code § 1410(b)(2)*].

[2] Recourse After Revocation

The State Board may act to revoke the permit without a hearing unless the permittee requests a hearing within 15 days after receiving notice of possible revocation [*Water Code § 1410.1*]. When a permit is revoked without a hearing, the permittee, within 90 days of the order, may file a request to set aside the revocation, and the Board, for good cause shown, may reinstate the permit [*Water Code § 1410.2*].

The holder of any permit that is revoked may file a petition for a writ of mandate to inquire into the revocation order's validity. The proceedings must be filed in superior court no later than 30 days from the date of final action by the Board [*Water Code § 1126*; *see Water Code § 1412* (proceedings pending on December 31, 1996, must have been filed in county in which proposed diversion was situated)]. The time for filing is extended if the holder seeks reconsideration by the Board [*Water Code § 1126*]. The right to petition will not be affected by the failure to seek reconsideration before the Board [*Water Code § 1126*].

For all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996, the priority of right of any permittee filing a petition for a writ of mandate continues under the permit until a final judgment is rendered as to the permit revocation [*Water Code § 1414*]. Unless the permittee files a petition for a writ of mandate, all of his or her rights under the permit cease [*Water Code § 1413*]. The findings of the Board on the revocation of a permit are prima facie correct until set aside by the court [*Water Code § 1411*]. Until and unless the order revoking the permit is ordered to be set aside by the court, the permittee must not exercise the right to take or use any water granted by the permit [*Water Code § 1415*]. Legislation enacted in 1996 repealed these provisions, effective prospectively [*Water Code § 1126.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.67

§ 575.67 Temporary Permit

The State Board may issue a conditional, temporary permit to appropriate water to any person, whether or not that person is an applicant, permittee, or licensee, when that person has an urgent need to divert and use water. The temporary permit may be issued without requiring compliance with the regular permit procedures [*Water Code § 1425(a)*]. Before issuing a temporary permit, the Board must find (1) that the applicant has an urgent need for the water proposed to be diverted and used, (2) that the water may be diverted and used without injury to any lawful user of water and without unreasonable effect on fish, wildlife, or other instream beneficial uses, and (3) that the proposed diversion and use are in the public interest [*Water Code § 1425(b)*; *see Water Code § 1425(c)* ("urgent need" defined)]. The application for a temporary permit must be completed in accordance with the provisions of *Water Code § 1260* (contents of appropriation application), and must be accompanied by those maps, drawings, and other data required by the Board. The applicant must pay an application fee and a permit fee if a temporary permit is issued [*Water Code § 1426*]. Notice requirements for temporary permits are set forth in *Water Code § 1428*, although the Board may issue a temporary permit in advance of that notice [*Water Code § 1428*].

Before issuing a temporary permit the Board must review available records, files, and decisions relating to the availability of water from the source at the proposed point of diversion to serve the proposed temporary diversion and use, and relating to the rights of downstream users. The Board must consult with representatives of the Department of Fish and Game and may make a field investigation [*Water Code § 1427*]. The Board will supervise diversion and use of water under the temporary permit for the protection of all lawful users of waters and instream beneficial uses and to ensure compliance with permit conditions [*Water Code § 1429*].

No temporary permit will create a vested right, even of a temporary nature. The permit will be subject at all times to modification or revocation in the Board's discretion and will automatically expire within 180 days, unless the permittee requests a renewal of up to 180 days [*Water Code §§ 1430, 1431*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.68

§ 575.68 Precursors to License

The permittee must report the completion of the construction of works and application of the water to the State Board [*Water Code § 1600*]. The Board will make a full inspection and examination of the works and the water use. The permittee must furnish the Board with any records, data, and information required to enable the Board to determine the amount of water that has been applied to beneficial use and whether the construction of the works and the use of the water from the works is in conformity with the law, the Board's rules and regulations, and the permit [*Water Code § 1605*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.69

§ 575.69 License Determinations by State Board

If the State Board determines that the construction and condition of the works or the use of water do not conform to the law, the Board's rules and regulations, or the terms of the permit, it may revoke the permit as provided in *Water Code §§ 1410-1410.2* (permit revocation). The Board may allow a reasonable time for the permittee to correct discrepancies in the works or use of water before taking action to revoke the permit [*Water Code § 1611*]. For discussion of permit revocation procedures, see *§ 575.66*.

When the Board's determination as to completion is favorable to the permittee, the Board must issue a license which confirms the right to appropriate water in an amount applied to beneficial use [*Water Code § 1610*].

Before issuing a license for an amount of water or season of use less than that specified in the permit, the Board must either (1) obtain the permittee's consent or (2) afford the permittee an opportunity to show cause why the amount or season of use should not be reduced [*Water Code § 1610.5*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.70

§ 575.70 Writ of Mandate Available for Limited License

A permittee to whom the State Board has issued a license for an amount of water or a season of use less than that specified in the permit may file a petition for a writ of mandate in the superior court to inquire into the order's validity [*Water Code § 1126*]. Unless the petition for a writ of mandate is filed within 30 days after issuance of the license, all rights of the permit holder except as specified in the license will cease [*Water Code § 1616* (applicable to all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996)]. After December 31, 1996, unless a petition is filed not later than 30 days from the date of final action by the Board, the Board's decision or order will not be subject to review by any court [*Water Code § 1126*].

With regard to proceedings pending on December 31, 1996, the rights of the permittee filing a petition for a writ of mandate will continue under the permit until the judgment in the proceedings has been entered and becomes final [*Water Code § 1617*]. However, until the Board's order is set aside or modified by the court, the permittee must take or use water only as specified in the license [*Water Code § 1618*]. In addition, these provisions have been repealed and are applicable only to proceedings filed before December 31, 1996 [*Water Code § 1126.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.71

§ 575.71 Conditions of License

A license is only effective for the time the water appropriated under it is used for a beneficial purpose [*Water Code § 1627*]. Every licensee takes a license to appropriate water subject to the expressed conditions, including the general statutory conditions [*Water Code § 1628*]. Every license is accepted under the same conditions regarding valuation as is every permit [*Water Code § 1629*; *see § 575.63*].

Twenty years after a license has been granted, the state, any city or city and county, any municipal water, irrigation, or lighting district, or any political subdivision of the state, has the right to purchase the works and property occupied and used under the license and the works built or constructed for the enjoyment of the rights granted under the license [*Water Code § 1630*]. Valuation may be computed as in eminent domain proceedings [*Water Code § 1631*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.72

§ 575.72 License Information Filed in County Recorder's Office

The State Board must file a copy of every license issued and every order modifying or changing a license within 30 days after its issuance in the office of the recorder of the county or counties in which the points of diversion lie and in the county or counties in which the places of use lie [*Water Code § 1650*]. Whenever an order revoking a license in whole or in part becomes final, a copy of the order must also be recorded [*Water Code § 1651*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.73

§ 575.73 Revocation of License

[1] Result of Licensee's Actions

After a license is issued, if the State Board finds that the licensee never put the water granted under the license to a useful or beneficial purpose or has ceased to do so, or that the licensee has failed to observe any of the license conditions, the Board, after notice to the licensee, may revoke the license and declare the water to be subject to appropriation. Unless the licensee makes a written request for a hearing within 15 days of notice, the Board may act without a hearing. "Licensee" includes the heirs, successors, or assigns of the licensee [*Water Code §§ 1675, 1675.1*].

The findings of the Board on the revocation of a license are prima facie correct until the order revoking the license is ordered to be set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction [*Water Code § 1676* (repealed as of January 1, 1997, but applicable to all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996)].

[2] Challenging Revocation Order

The notice of proposed revocation of a license must contain a statement of facts on which the proposed revocation is based and warn the licensee that the State Board may take action without a hearing unless the licensee requests a hearing within 15 days after receiving the notice [*Water Code § 1675.1*]. Whenever a license is revoked without a hearing, the licensee, within 90 days, may file with the Board a request to set aside the revocation, and the Board, for good cause shown, may reinstate the license [*Water Code § 1675.2*].

The licensee may petition for a writ of mandate to inquire into the validity of an order of the Board revoking a license. That petition must be commenced within 30 days after the service of notice of revocation. The right to petition is not affected by the failure to seek reconsideration before the Board [*Water Code § 1677* (repealed as of January 1, 1997, but applicable to all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996); *Water Code § 1126* (applicable thereafter)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.74

§ 575.74 Temporary Urgency Changes

Any permittee or licensee who has an urgent need to change a point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use from that specified in the license or permit may petition for, and the State Board may issue, a conditional temporary change order without compliance with the procedures required in the issuance of a regular permit or license [*Water Code § 1435(a)*]. Before issuing a change order the Board must find (1) that the permittee or licensee has an urgent need for the proposed change, (2) that the change may be made without injury to any other lawful user of water and without unreasonable effect on fish, wildlife, or other instream beneficial uses, and (3) that the proposed change is in the public interest [*Water Code § 1435(b)*; *see Water Code § 1435(c)* ("urgent need" defined)]. Before issuing a change order the Board must also review available records, files, and decisions relating to the rights of other legal users and consult with representatives of the Department of Fish and Game. The Board may make a field investigation [*Water Code § 1437*].

Water Code § 1438(b) sets forth notice requirements for a temporary urgency change, but the Board may issue a temporary change order in advance of the notice required [*Water Code § 1438(a)*]. Regardless of the rate of diversion or the amount of storage, if the change order is to be in effect less than 10 days, the Board must exercise its discretion in requiring notice, both before and after issuance of the change order, and may require whatever proof of notice it deems appropriate [*Water Code § 1438(c)*].

Any interested person may file an objection to the temporary change with the Board, and the Board will send a copy of that objection to the permittee or licensee [*Water Code § 1438(d)*]. The Board must give prompt consideration to any objections, and may hold a hearing, after notice to all interested persons [*Water Code § 1438(e)*].

The Board will supervise the diversion and use of water under the temporary change order for the protection of all other lawful users of water and instream beneficial uses and for compliance with change order conditions [*Water Code § 1439*].

A temporary change order will not create any vested right, even of a temporary nature, and it is subject at all times to modification or revocation in the Board's discretion. Any temporary change order automatically expires within 180

days, although it may be renewed for up to 180 days [*Water Code §§ 1440, 1441*].

If the permittee or licensee fails to comply with any requirement, the temporary change will be automatically terminated [*Water Code § 1438(f)*].

Water Code §§ 1435-1442, which govern the temporary urgency changes, do not apply to any permittee or licensee petitioning for a temporary change pursuant to *Water Code § 1725 et seq.* (change involving transfer or exchange of water or water rights) [*Water Code § 1442*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.75

§ 575.75 Change in Appropriative Use

[1] In General

Water appropriated for one specific purpose is not allowed to be appropriated for any other purpose. However, with the State Board's permission, any time after notice of an application is given, an applicant, permittee, or licensee may change the point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use from that specified [*Water Code §§ 1700, 1701*]. The petitioner must give written notice of the proposed change to the Department of Fish and Game [*Water Code § 1703*]. Before granting permission to make a change, the petitioner must establish that the change will not operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved [*Water Code § 1702*]. The Board may require the petitioner to publish or otherwise give notice of the change in a manner prescribed by the Board [*Water Code § 1703*].

Petitions for change must be on the form required by applicable regulations and contain specified information [*Water Code §§ 1701.1* (petition for change filed after notice of application), 1701.2 (petition for change in permit or license)]. After a petition is filed, the Board may request additional information reasonably necessary to clarify, amplify, correct, or otherwise supplement the information required to be submitted in the petition [*Water Code § 1701.3*]. If the petitioner does not provide the requested information, the Board may cancel the petition or, on a showing of good cause, allow additional time to submit the requested information [*Water Code § 1701.4*]. For forms requesting changes, *see §§ 575.355* and *575.356*.

[2] Protests

Any interested person may file a written protest against approval of the petition. The protest must be filed within the time allowed in the notice of petition or within the time allowed by the State Board on a showing of good cause [*Water Code § 1703.1*]. The protest must clearly and specifically set forth the protester's objections and the bases for the objections [*Water Code § 1703.2(c)*]. The protest must be served on the petitioner by mail or through service undertaken in a manner determined to be adequate by the Board [*Water Code § 1703.2(e)*]. The Board may request additional information that is reasonably necessary to clarify, amplify, correct, or otherwise supplement the information required to be submitted in the protest. It must provide a reasonable period for submitting the information, and may

allow additional time for good cause shown [*Water Code § 1703.3*].

The protester and the petitioner must make a good faith effort to resolve the protest not later than 180 days from the expiration date in the notice of petition. The Board may allow additional time on a showing of good cause [*Water Code § 1703.4*]. The Board may request additional information from the protester or the petitioner that the Board determines is reasonably necessary to attempt to resolve the protest. It must provide a reasonable period for submitting the information, and may allow additional time for good cause shown [*Water Code § 1703.5*].

The Board may cancel a protest or petition for failure to provide requested information within the time period provided [*Water Code § 1703.6(a)*; *see Water Code § 1703.6(c)* (cancellation when protest is based on injury to legal user of water), (d) (cancellation when protest is based on allegation of injury to other than legal user of water), (e) (cancellation when protest is based on both types of allegations)]. However, the Board may not cancel a protest for failure to submit information not in the possession or under the control of the protester if the protest meets the requirements of *Water Code § 1703.2* and the petitioner is or could be required to submit the information [*Water Code § 1703.6(b)*].

[3] Hearing

The State Board, after a hearing, may approve with conditions or deny a petition [*Water Code § 1704(a)*]. It must give notice of the hearing to the petitioner and any protester by registered mail not less than 20 days before the hearing date [*Water Code § 1704(b)*]. The Board may, but is not required to, hold a hearing before approving any unprotested petition [*Water Code § 1704(c)(1)*]. The Board may also hold a hearing if it determines that undisputed facts support the approval of the petition and there is no disputed issue of material fact [*Water Code § 1704(c)(2)*]. The Board may, but is not required to, hold a hearing before denying a petition, if, after notice, it determines that (1) the petition is defective, (2) the petition fails to provide information requested by the Board, or (3) undisputed facts support the denial of the petition and there is no disputed issue of material fact [*Water Code § 1704(c)(3)*]. A petition for a writ of mandate to inquire into the validity of the Board's order after a hearing must be filed within 30 days [*Water Code §§ 1126, 1705*].

[4] Minor Petition

A minor petition for change is one that does not involve direct diversions in excess of three cubic-feet per second or storage in excess of 200 acre-feet per year [*Water Code § 1704.4*]. The State Board will conduct a field investigation and prepare an analysis of all minor protested petitions for change. The Board must notify the parties not less than 20 days before conducting the field investigation, so that the parties can attend and present information to the Board [*Water Code § 1704.1*]. The Division of Water Rights may request that the parties submit information in support of their positions before, during, or after the field investigation. After the field investigation, the Division of Water Rights may conduct additional proceedings in accordance with the informal hearing procedure set forth in *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1704.2*]. Based on the field investigation and any other information it has obtained, the Division of Water Rights must issue an order acting on the minor petition for change unless the Board determines that additional proceedings should be conducted [*Water Code § 1704.3*]. The order is subject to review as provided in *Water Code § 1120 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1704.3*].

[5] Change to Preserve or Enhance Environmental Resources or Recreational Uses

Any person entitled to use water based on an appropriative, riparian, or other right may petition the State Board for a change in use to preserve or enhance wetlands habitat, fish, and wildlife resources, or recreation in or on the water [*Water Code § 1707(a)*]. The petition may be filed pursuant to *Water Code §§ 1700 et seq.* [*see § 575.75*], 1435 et seq. [*see § 575.74*], or 1725 et seq. [*Water Code § 1707(a)*; *see § 575.76*].

The Board may approve the petition subject to any terms and conditions that the Board deems will best develop, conserve, and utilize the water at issue in the public interest. The petition may be approved regardless of whether the

proposed use involves a diversion of water. However, the proposed change must meet all of the following requirements: (1) it must not increase the amount of water the person is entitled to use, (2) it must not unreasonably affect any legal user of water, and (3) it must otherwise meet the requirements of *Water Code § 1000* [*Water Code § 1707(b)*]. The water at issue may be used to satisfy any applicable federal, state, or local regulatory requirements governing water quantity, water quality, instream flows, fish and wildlife, wetlands, recreation, and other instream beneficial uses [*Water Code § 1707(c), (d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.76

§ 575.76 Transfer of Water or Water Rights

[1] Temporary Changes

A permittee or licensee may temporarily change the point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use due to a transfer or exchange of water or water rights if that transfer (1) would only involve the amount of water that would have been consumptively used or stored by the permittee or licensee in the absence of the proposed temporary change, (2) would not injure any legal user of the water, and (3) would not unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other in-stream beneficial uses [*Water Code § 1725*]. For the purposes of *Water Code § 1725 et seq.* (temporary changes), the phrase "consumptively used" means the amount of water that has been consumed through use by evapotranspiration, has percolated underground, or has been otherwise removed from use in the downstream water supply as a result of direct diversion [*Water Code § 1725*]. A temporary change means any change of point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use involving a transfer or exchange of water or water rights for a period of one year or less [*Water Code § 1728*]. The one-year period does not include any time required for monitoring, reporting, or mitigation before or after the temporary change is carried out. If, within a period of one year or less, the water involved in the temporary change is moved to off-stream storage outside of the watershed where the water originated, the change will be considered a temporary change, and the water moved to off-stream storage outside the watershed where the water originated may be put to beneficial use in the place of use and for the purposes of use specified in the order approving the temporary change either during or after that period [*Water Code § 1728*].

A permittee or licensee who proposes a temporary change must submit a petition to the State Board to change the terms of the permit or license [*Water Code § 1726(a)*]. The petition must refer to the permit or license that serves as the basis for the water transfer and must include a written description of the changes in water storage, timing and point of diversion, place and purpose of use, timing and point of return flow, and water quality of instream flows that are likely to occur as a result of the proposed temporary change [*Water Code § 1726(b)*]. The petitioner must also provide a copy of the petition to the Department of Fish and Game, the board of supervisors of the county or counties in which the petitioner stores or uses the water subject to the petition, and the board of supervisors of the county or counties to which the water is proposed to be transferred [*Water Code § 1726(c)*]. In addition, within 10 days of submitting the petition

the petitioner must publish notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the county or counties in which the petitioner stores or uses the water subject to the petition. The Board is required to provide the petitioner with a list of water right holders of record on file with the Board who may be affected by the transfer, and the petitioner must provide written notice to those water right holders not later than 10 days after the date on which the petition is submitted [*Water Code § 1726(d)*].

Within 10 days of receipt of a petition, the Board must begin an investigation of the proposed temporary change to determine if the water proposed to be transferred would have been consumptively used or stored pursuant to the petitioner's permit or license in the absence of the proposed transfer or conserved pursuant to *Water Code § 1011*. The Board must also evaluate the changes in water storage, timing and point of diversion, place and purpose of use, timing and point of return flow, water quality, and instream flows, and other changes likely to occur as a result of the proposed temporary change [*Water Code § 1726(e)*]. Affected water users and other interested parties may file written comments with the Board, within 30 days after the publication date of the notice [*Water Code § 1726(f)*].

The Board must render a decision in writing not later than 35 days after the date the investigation was commenced or notice was published, whichever is later. The deadline may be extended up to 20 days if comments have been filed. If the Board or the petitioner determines that an additional extension of time is necessary for the Board to make findings or that a hearing is necessary for the Board to make findings, the Board may extend the time for a decision with the petitioner's consent. If the petitioner agrees to a hearing, the Board must identify the issues for which additional evidence is required and provide notice of the time, place, and subject matter of the hearing to the petitioner, the Department of Fish and Game, the board of supervisors of the county or counties where the petitioner stores or uses the water subject to the petition, the water right holders of record, the proposed transferee, and any party who has filed a written comment [*Water Code § 1726(g)*].

The Board must approve a temporary change if it determines that a preponderance of the evidence shows that the proposed temporary change (1) would not injure any legal user of the water, during a potential hydrologic condition that the Board determines is likely to occur during the proposed change, through significant changes in water quantity, water quality, timing of diversion or use, consumptive use of the water, or reduction in return flows, and (2) would not unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other in-stream beneficial uses [*Water Code § 1727(b)*]. The petitioner has the burden of establishing that the proposed temporary change meets these requirements. If the Board determines that the petitioner has made a prima facie case, the burden of proof shifts to any party that has filed a comment. The Board may make its determination without a hearing [*Water Code § 1727(c)*].

In reviewing a petition for a temporary change, the Board may not modify any term or condition of the petitioner's permit or license, including those terms that protect other legal users of water, fish, wildlife, and other instream beneficial uses, except as necessary to carry out the temporary change. In addition, in determining that the proposed change would not injure any legal user of the water or unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other in-stream beneficial uses, the Board may not deny, or place conditions on, a temporary change to avoid or mitigate impacts that are not caused by the temporary change [*Water Code § 1727(d)*]. Furthermore, the Department of Fish and Game and any other state agency that comments on the proposed temporary change may not propose conditions to mitigate effects on fish, wildlife, or other in-stream beneficial uses caused by factors other than the proposed temporary change [*Water Code § 1727(e)*].

Within 30 days after final action by the Board, a party may file a petition for writ of mandate to inquire into the validity of the Board's finding or order. The right to petition is not affected by the failure to seek reconsideration before the Board [*Water Code § 1730(a)* (repealed as of January 1, 1997, but applicable to all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996); *Water Code § 1126* (applicable thereafter)]. In a writ of mandate proceeding, the court considers only those documents and materials that were in the administrative record before the Board made its finding or order. However, if the court finds that there is relevant evidence that, in the exercise of due diligence, could not have been produced, or that was improperly excluded from the administrative record by the Board, the court may admit the evidence at the

hearing of the writ [*Water Code § 1730(b)* (repealed as of January 1, 1997, but applicable to all proceedings pending on December 31, 1996)].

A proposed temporary change under *Water Code §§ 1725-1732* is exempt from the requirements of *Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.* (The California Environmental Quality Act), relating to environmental quality [*Water Code § 1729*].

[2] Long-Term Transfers

The State Board may consider a petition for a long-term transfer (that is, a transfer for any period in excess of one year) of water or water rights involving a change of point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use [*Water Code § 1735*]. Before approving the petition, the Board must provide notice and an opportunity for a hearing, including written notice to the Department of Fish and Game, which must be allowed an opportunity to review and to make recommendations. Thereafter, the Board may approve the petition if the change would not result in substantial injury to any legal user of water and would not unreasonably affect fish, wildlife, or other in-stream beneficial uses [*Water Code § 1736*].

[3] Expiration of Transfer Period

Following the expiration of the temporary or long-term transfer period, all rights automatically revert to the original holders of that right without any action by the State Board [*Water Code §§ 1016, 1731, 1737*]. After the conclusion of the term of a water transfer agreement, the transferee or any beneficiary of the transfer may not bring any claim for a continuation of the water supply made available by the agreement or claim any right to a continued supply of water as a result of the transfer, based on reliance, estoppel, intervening public use, prescription, water shortage emergency, unforeseen or unforeseeable increases in demand, or any other cause [*Water Code § 1016*].

[4] Transfer of Decreed Rights

Any water right determined under a court decree issued under *Water Code § 2500 et seq.* (relating to statutory adjudications) after January 1, 1981, is transferable under *Water Code §§ 1725-1737* (discussed in *§ 575.76[1]* and *[2]*) and *Water Code §§ 1700-1706* (discussed in *§ 575.75*). The court having the appropriate jurisdiction over the decreed rights may enter a supplemental decree modifying any rights involved on motion of the State Board or any party with a vested water right [*Water Code § 1740*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.77

§ 575.77 Judicial Review of State Board's Decision

The power of the State Board to prevent unreasonable methods of water use must be broadly interpreted to enable the Board to strike the proper balance between the interests in water quality and water project activities to determine objectively whether a reasonable method of use is manifested [*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 129-130, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

In assessing the validity of conditions imposed by the Board on water appropriation permits in order to implement water quality standards in a Board-developed water quality control plan, the courts ordinarily apply the substantial evidence rule. In the context of water rights issues, this rule has been interpreted to require a search of the record for a reasonable factual basis for the Board's action. Accordingly, in reviewing challenged conditions, courts must determine whether the conditions are supported by precise and specific reasons founded on tangible record evidence [*United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 115, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.78

§ 575.78 Forfeiture of Appropriation Right

If the appropriator or a successor in interest ceases to use the water for a useful or beneficial purpose, the right of appropriation ceases [Water Code § 1240]. When the person entitled to the use of water fails to use beneficially for a period of five years all or any part of that water, for which a right of use has vested, for the purpose for which it was appropriated or adjudicated, the unused water may revert to the public and will be regarded as unappropriated public water. This reversion requires a finding by the State Board following notice to the permittee and a public hearing if one is requested by the permittee [*Water Code § 1241*].

The sale, lease, exchange, or transfer of water or water rights is not evidence of waste or unreasonable use, unreasonable method of use, or unreasonable method of diversion and will not affect any determination of forfeiture applicable to appropriated water [*Water Code § 1244*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.79

§ 575.79 Appropriation of Water for Small Domestic and Livestock Stockpond Use

[1] Acquisition of Right

On or after January 1, 1989, to initiate any right to appropriate water for a "small domestic use," compliance with *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* is required; these provisions are the exclusive means of acquiring and maintaining the right [*Water Code § 1228.9*]. However, nothing in *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* may be construed as affecting any right initiated or acquired pursuant to permit or evidenced by license, and including any application filed but not permitted, before January 1, 1989 [*Water Code § 1228.9*]. Moreover, these provisions do not apply to those stream segments for which the Director of Fish and Game establishes proposed streamflow requirements under *Pub. Res. Code § 10002*, notwithstanding the July 1, 1989, deadline for preparation of the requirements [*Water Code § 1229.1*].

[2] "Small Domestic Use" Defined

"Small domestic use" means a domestic use, not to exceed direct diversion of 4,500 gallons per day or diversion by storage of 10 acre-feet per annum, as that use is defined by State Water Resources Control Board (State Board or Board) rule, and includes impoundment for incidental aesthetic, recreational, or fish and wildlife purposes [*Water Code § 1228.1(b)*].

[3] "Livestock Stockpond" Defined

"Livestock stockpond" means a water impoundment structure constructed for livestock watering use, not to exceed direct diversion of 4,500 gallons per day, or diversion by storage of 10 acre-feet per year, as that use is defined by the State Board, and includes impoundment for incidental aesthetic, recreational, or fish and wildlife purposes [*Water Code § 1228.1(c)*].

[4] Terms and Conditions

The State Board is required to establish, and may from time to time revise, reasonable general conditions to which all

appropriations made under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* must be subject [*Water Code § 1228.6(a)*].

The conditions must include, but are not limited to, the following [*Water Code § 1228.6(a)*]:

- The appropriation is subject to prior rights.

- All conditions lawfully required by the Department of Fish and Game are conditions on the appropriations.

- Diversion works must be constructed and water applied to beneficial use with due diligence.

- Registration must be renewed and water use reported pursuant to law and to the rules of the Board.

Immediately on registration under *Water Code § 1228.3* (discussed in *§ 575.79[6]*), renewal of registration under *Water Code § 1228.5* (discussed in *§ 575.79[10]*), or amended registration under *Water Code § 1228.7* (discussed in *§ 575.79[9]*), the Board must provide the registrant with a written document setting forth the conditions required by *Water Code § 1228.6*, and the perfection and exercise of rights acquired under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* must at all times be subject to those conditions [*Water Code § 1228.6(b)*].

The conditions are deemed "terms and conditions" within the meaning of *Water Code § 1825*, and the expression of legislative intent contained in that section apply to them [*Water Code § 1228.6(c)*]. *Water Code § 1825* expresses the legislative intent that the state take vigorous action to enforce the terms and conditions of existing permits and licenses to appropriate water and to prevent the unlawful diversion of water (see generally discussion in *§§ 575.100 -575.102*).

The Board's authority to enforce the terms and conditions of permits and licenses to appropriate water, and to prevent unlawful diversion of water, including, but not limited to, provisions regarding cease and desist orders and the revocation of permits and licenses, applies to appropriations initiated or perfected under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* [*Water Code § 1228.6(c)*].

[5] Who May Register Water Use

Any person may, subject to *Water Code § 1228.2(b)*, obtain a right to appropriate water for a small domestic use or livestock stockpond use on first registering the use with the State Board and thereafter applying the water to reasonable and beneficial use with due diligence [*Water Code § 1228.2(a)*]. With regard to an appropriation for small domestic use, not more than one registration may be in effect at any time for any facility [*Water Code § 1228.2(a)*]. With regard to an appropriation for livestock stockpond use, more than one registration may be in effect at any time for a registrant if stockponds subject to registration for that registrant do not exceed the ratio of one per 50 acres [*Water Code § 1228.2(a)*]. *Water Code § 1228.2(b)* provides in turn that the initiation of the right to appropriate water is subject to *Water Code §§ 1205-1207* (discussed in *§ 575.55[2][b]*).

[6] Registration of Water Use

Registration of water use must be made on a form prescribed by the State Board that sets forth (1) the name and post office address of the registrant; (2) the source of water supply; (3) the nature and amount of the proposed use; (4) the proposed place of diversion; (5) the place where it is intended to use the water; (6) the time for completion of construction of diversion works and for complete application of the water to the proposed use; (7) a certification that the registrant has contacted a representative of the Department of Fish and Game designated by the department for that purpose, has provided information to that department that is set forth in the registration form, and has agreed to comply with all lawful conditions, including, but not limited to, conditions on the construction and operation of diversion works required by the Department of Fish and Game and the certification must include a copy of any conditions required by

the Department of Fish and Game; and (8) any other information that may reasonably be required by the Board [*Water Code § 1228.3(a)*]. Every person registering a small domestic or livestock stockpond use of water must pay the Board a registration fee [*Water Code § 1525(b)(2)*] and an annual fee thereafter [*Water Code § 1525(a)*; *see § 575.82*]. Registration is deemed completed on the date the form, executed in substantial compliance with the requirements of *Water Code § 1228.3*, and the registration fee are received by the Board [*Water Code § 1228.3(b)*].

The Board must not accept any registration that proposes as a source of water supply any stream system that has been unconditionally declared by the Board to be fully appropriated pursuant to *Water Code § 1205*, except that *Water Code § 1206(b)*, relating to conditional declarations of fully appropriated stream systems, apply to registration of water use under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1*, and the Board must accept those registrations if consistent with the conditions specified in any such declaration [*Water Code § 1228.2(b)*].

[7] Registration Lists

The State Board must issue, and mail to any person who so requests, a monthly list of registrations filed during the preceding month and containing the information required by *Water Code § 1228.3(a)(1)-(6)* (discussed in *§ 575.79[6]*) [*Water Code § 1228.3(c)*]. The list must include a date before which any interested person may file a written protest in opposition to the approval of a stockpond registration [discussed in *§ 575.79[12]*]. That date may not be later than 30 days from the date on which the list is issued [*Water Code § 1228.3(c)*].

[8] Effect of Registration

A completed registration gives the registrant, as of the date of completed registration, a priority of right to take and use the amount of water, not exceeding the amount of proposed use as shown on the registration form, ultimately applied with due diligence to reasonable and beneficial use thereunder [*Water Code § 1228.4(a)*]. The right remains in effect unless and until it is (1) forfeited for nonuse under *Water Code § 1241* (discussed in *§ 575.78*) or abandoned; (2) revoked because the registrant knowingly made any false statement, or knowingly concealed any material fact, in the registration; (3) revoked for failure to renew; or (4) revoked under *Water Code § 1228.6(c)* (discussed in *§ 575.79[4]*) [*Water Code § 1228.4(b)*].

[9] Amended Registration

Any registrant may change the point of diversion or place of use by delivering to the board an amended registration form in accordance with *Water Code § 1228.3* (*see § 575.79[6]*), including payment of the registration fee specified in *Water Code § 1228.8(a)* ($100), except that the purpose of the use may not be changed and the change may not operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved [*Water Code § 1228.7(a)*]. *Editor's Note*: *Water Code § 1228.8*, referred to in *Water Code § 1228.7*, was repealed by 2003 Stats., ch 741, § 83.

A completed amended registration of water use continues in effect the priority of right as of the date of the original completed registration [*Water Code § 1228.7(b)*]. All provisions regarding appropriations made under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1*, including, but not limited to, provisions regarding enforcement, apply to the appropriation as described in the completed amended registration, except that the conditions established by the Board under *Water Code § 1228.6* (*see § 575.79[4]*) in effect at the time of completion of the amended registration supersede the conditions that applied to the original completed registration [*Water Code § 1228.7(c)*].

[10] Renewal of Registration

Registration must be renewed before the expiration of each five-year period following completed registration [*Water Code § 1228.5(a)*]. Renewal is made on a form prescribed by the State Board and must contain the report of water use made pursuant to the registration as may be required by the Board [*Water Code § 1228.5(b)*].

The conditions established by the Board under *Water Code § 1228.6* (*see § 575.79[4]*) that are in effect at the time of renewal supersede the conditions applicable to the original completed registration [*Water Code § 1228.5(c)*].

[11] Reports to the State Board

On or before June 30, 1989, and annually thereafter, the Division of Water Rights is required to prepare and submit to the State Board a report summarizing the location, nature, and amount of water appropriated under *Water Code §§ 1228-1229.1* [*Water Code § 1228.2(c)*]. The report must include a description of the availability of unappropriated water in those stream systems that may become fully appropriated with the next reporting period [*Water Code § 1228.2(c)*]. Whenever it can be reasonably anticipated that a stream system may become fully appropriated within the next reporting period, the Board must, following notice and hearing, determine whether that stream system should be declared fully appropriated under *Water Code §§ 1205-1207* (*see § 575.55[2][b]*) [*Water Code § 1228.2(d)*].

[12] Protest of Approval of Stockpond Registration

Before the date set forth on the monthly list of filed registrations [*see § 575.79[7]*], any interested person may file with the State Board a written protest opposing the approval of a stockpond registration [*Water Code § 1228.3(d)*]. The protest must clearly set forth the protester's objections to the registered use based on interference with prior rights [*Water Code § 1228.3(d)*]. The protester must serve the protest on the registrant by mailing a duplicate copy of the protest to the registrant, or through service undertaken in another manner determined to be adequate by the Board [*Water Code § 1228.3(d)*]. Review of a protested registration must be conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in *Water Code §§ 1345-1348* [*Water Code § 1228.3(d)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.80

§ 575.80 Prescriptive Rights

An appropriative taking of water that is not surplus is wrongful and may ripen into a prescriptive right when the use is (1) actual, (2) open and notorious, (3) hostile and adverse to the original owners, (4) continuous and uninterrupted for the statutory period of five years, and (5) under claim of right. The permanent right acquired by prescription is commensurate to the rights enjoyed during the full prescriptive period [*see Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*; *California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 726-727, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . The person with the riparian or appropriative right to use the water must have knowledge of the diversion and must be made a party to the action to perfect a prescriptive right [*People v. Shirokow (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 301, 312, 162 Cal. Rptr. 30, 605 P.2d 859]* .

Neither public rights and properties that the state possesses and administers, nor the public trust as to their administration and exercise, can be destroyed by adverse possession. No one can acquire a prescriptive title to the public rights in the waters of the state that the State Board is charged to administer [*People v. Shirokow (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 301, 311, 162 Cal. Rptr. 30, 605 P.2d 859]* .

Moreover, because *Water Code § 1225* provides that no right to appropriate or use water subject to appropriation can be acquired except by compliance with *Water Code § 1000 et seq.*, there is some controversy over whether prescription is still a valid means of acquiring any water right [*People v. Shirokow (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 301, 306-307, 162 Cal. Rptr. 30, 605 P.2d 859]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.81

§ 575.81 Underground Basin Waters

[1] Right to Use Water

Rights to water in an underground basin are classified as overlying, appropriative, and prescriptive. The right of the owner of land overlying an underground basin is analogous to that of the riparian owner in a surface stream. The owner has the right to take water from the ground underneath for use on land within the basin or watershed; it is based on the ownership of the land and is appurtenant thereto [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 725, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

Any water not needed for the reasonable beneficial use of those having prior rights to underground waters is excess or surplus water and may properly be appropriated on privately owned land for non-overlying use, such as devotion to public use or exportation beyond the basin or watershed. When there is a surplus, the holder of prior rights may not enjoin its appropriation [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 725, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . Moreover, ground water is exempted from the extensive appropriation procedural regulations applicable to surface water set forth in *Water Code § 1200 et seq.* [*Wright v. Goleta Water Dist. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 74, 87, 219 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *see Water Code § 1200*].

Appropriation of water that is not excess or surplus is an adverse taking of water and may ripen into a prescriptive right when the use is actual, open and notorious, hostile and adverse to the original owner, continuous and uninterrupted for five years, and under claim of right. Adverse use begins with the first overdraft, or taking of nonsurplus water. Appropriative and prescriptive rights to groundwater are subject to loss by an adverse user; overlying rights are not [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 726, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

[2] Priority of Competing Uses

The rights of overlying owners are correlative; they are mutual and reciprocal. When there is a sufficient quantity of water, each overlying owner has the right to take all that he or she can beneficially use on his or her land. If there is insufficient water for all the beneficial uses, each overlying owner is limited to his or her proportionate fair share of the

total amount available based on reasonable need [*City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 908, 926, 207 P.2d 17 , cert. denied, 339 U.S. 937, 70 S. Ct. 671, 94 L. Ed. 1354]* . The proportionate share of each owner is predicated not on past use over a specified period of time, nor on the time of commencement of pumping, but solely on the owner's current reasonable and beneficial need for water [*Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1001, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* .

When there is insufficient water for the current reasonable needs of all the overlying owners, among the many factors to be considered in determining each owner's proportionate share are (1) the amount of water available, (2) the extent of ownership in the basin, and (3) the nature of the projected use. If the water is used for agriculture, the area sought to be irrigated, the character of the soil, the practicability of irrigation, and the comparative profit of the different crops are also considered [*Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1001-1002, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* .

In the event of a shortage, an appropriator must yield to overlying owners who are making proper use of the water because the appropriator's right is limited to using the surplus amount of the water, unless the appropriator has gained prescriptive rights through the taking of nonsurplus water [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 725, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . As between appropriators, the one first in time is the first in right, and a prior appropriator is entitled to all the water reasonably needed, up to the amount taken in the past, before a subsequent appropriator may take any [*Civ. Code § 1414*; *California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 725-726, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

[3] Overdraft

An overdraft results when more water is extracted from the basin than is naturally replenished [*Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 996 n.2, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* . Each taking of water in excess of the safe yield is wrongful because the overdraft, from its very beginning, operates progressively to reduce the total available supply [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 726, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* . When the supply of water is limited, as it is in an overdrawn basin, the public interest requires that there be the greatest number of beneficial users that the supply can yield. The court must devise a physical solution, such as a proportional reduction in the amount available to each user, or the total elimination of one use, if possible [*California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 731-732, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.82

§ 575.82 Fees

Each person or entity who holds a permit or license to appropriate water, and each lessor of water [*see Water Code § 1020 et seq.* (water leases)], is required to pay an annual fee according to a fee schedule established by the State Water Resources Control Board [*Water Code §§ 1525(a), 1530*]. An annual fee is also imposed on each person or entity filing a "Notice of Extraction and Diversion of Water" in the County of Riverside, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, or Ventura [*Water Code § 1529*; *see Water Code § 4999 et seq.*].

In addition, each person or entity who files any of the following must pay a fee according to a fee schedule established by the State Board [*Water Code § 1525(b)*]:

- An application for a permit to appropriate water [*see § 575.350*].
- A registration of appropriation for a small domestic use or livestock stockpond.
- A petition for an extension of time within which to begin construction, to complete construction, or to apply the water to full beneficial use under a permit [*see § 575.359*].
- A petition to change the point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use, under a permit or license [*see § 575.356*].
- A petition to change the conditions of a permit or license, requested by the permittee or licensee, that is not otherwise subject to the third and fourth bulleted items above.
- A petition to change the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use, of treated wastewater, under *Water Code § 1211*.
- An application for approval of a water lease agreement.

- A request for release from priority pursuant to *Water Code § 10504*.
- An application for an assignment of a state-filed application pursuant to *Water Code § 10504*.

For these listed filings, the schedule may provide for either a single filing fee or for an initial filing fee followed by an annual fee [*Water Code § 1525(d)(2)*].

Fees are also imposed on each person or entity who files a proof of claim of water right under *Water Code § 2575 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1528*; *see § 575.381* (proof of claim)].

If the State Board determines that the person or entity on whom a fee or expense is imposed will not pay the fee or expense based on the fact that the fee payer has sovereign immunity [*see Water Code § 1560*], the Board may allocate the fee or expense, or an appropriate portion of the fee or expense, to persons or entities who have contracts for the delivery of water from the person or entity on whom the fee or expense was initially imposed. The allocation of the fee or expense to these contractors does not affect ownership of any permit, license, or other water right, and does not vest any equitable title in the contractors [*Water Code § 1540*].

If a fee established under *Water Code §§ 1525(b)*, *1528*, or *13160.1* is not paid when due, the Board may cancel the application, registration, petition, request, or claim, or may refer the matter to the State Board of Equalization for collection of the unpaid fee [*Water Code § 1535(b)*]. In any proceeding pursuant to *Water Code § 1052* in which it is determined that there has been a violation of the prohibition against the unauthorized diversion or use of water, the Board or court may impose an additional liability in the amount of any annual fees that would have been required if the diversion or use had been authorized by a permit or license to appropriate water [*Water Code § 1538*]. If a permit or license holder fails to pay an annual fee for a period of five years, the Board may revoke the permit or license [*Water Code § 1539*].

A determination by the Board that a person or entity is required to pay a fee, or a Board determination regarding the amount of a fee, is subject to review under *Water Code § 1120 et seq.* and is not subject to a petition for redetermination by the State Board of Equalization [*Water Code § 1537(b)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
3. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.83-575.99

[Reserved]

§§ 575.83[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
4. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.100

§ 575.100 Governing Law

Enforcement of appropriative water rights is governed by *Water Code §§ 1825-1851*. Trespass, in the form of unauthorized diversion of water, is governed by *Water Code §§ 1052-1055.3*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
4. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.101

§ 575.101 Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

[1] Cease and Desist Order--Violation of Right

If a violation of a term or condition of a permit, license, certification, or registration occurs or threatens to occur, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board or Board) must give notice by personal notice or certified mail to the person allegedly engaged in the violation, informing the person that he or she may request a hearing not later than 20 days from the date on which the notice is received [*Water Code § 1834(a)*]. The notice must contain a statement of facts tending to show the proscribed action and notification that the State Board may adopt a proposed preliminary cease and desist order without a hearing unless the alleged violator makes a written request for a hearing within 20 days [*Water Code § 1834(a), (b)*]. "Person" is not restricted to natural persons and includes public entities such as a city, a county, a district, and the state [Water Code § 1835]. A private party may file a complaint with the Board for harm caused by an alleged violation [*see § 575.361*].

[2] Issuance of Cease and Desist Orders

If the State Board determines that a person is violating any term or condition of a permit, license, certification, or registration for the appropriation of water, or a prior decision or order of the Board in which the person or a predecessor in interest to that person was named as a party directly affected by the decision or order, the Board may issue an order to cease and desist from that violation [*Water Code § 1831(a), (d)*]. The cease and desist order will require either immediate compliance or compliance in accordance with a time schedule set by the Board [*Water Code § 1831(a), (b), (d)(2)*].

Cease and desist orders are effective on issuance. The Board may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, on its own motion or on application from an aggrieved person, modify, revoke, or stay in whole or in part the cease and desist order [*Water Code § 1832*].

The Board is not precluded from taking any action authorized by *Water Code § 275* (board initiated action to prevent waste) or *Water Code § 1052* (board initiated action to prevent trespass), and should take vigorous action to enforce the

terms and conditions of appropriation permits and licenses to prevent the unlawful diversion of water [*Water Code §§ 1825, 1836*].

[3] Judicial Review of Cease and Desist Order

Any aggrieved party may file a petition for a writ of mandate for review of a cease and desist order [*Water Code § 1126*; for discussion and forms relating to mandate proceedings, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*]. For a form of petition under *Water Code § 1126*, see *§ 575.365*.

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 governs the mandate proceedings [*Water Code § 1126(c)*]. The petition for writ of mandate must be filed not later than 30 days from the date of final action by the State Board [*Water Code § 1126(b)*]. The court is required to exercise its independent judgment on the evidence in any case involving the judicial review of a cease and desist order [*Water Code § 1126(c)*].

[4] Enforcement of Cease and Desist Order

If any person fails to comply with any valid, final cease and desist order issued by the State Board, the Attorney General, at the Board's request, will petition the court for the issuance of appropriate prohibitory or mandatory injunctive relief [*Water Code § 1845(a)*]. The Attorney General will also petition for fines of up to $1,000 for each day of the violation [*Water Code § 1845(b)*]. The amount of the fine will be based on a consideration of all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the extent of harm caused by the violation, the nature and persistence of the violation, the length of time over which the violation occurs, and any corrective action taken by the violator [*Water Code § 1845(c)*].

Civil liability may also be imposed administratively by the Board [*Water Code §§ 1055, 1845(b)(3)*]. Under this procedure, the executive director of the Board issues a complaint [*Water Code § 1055(a)*], which is served by personal notice or certified mail on the alleged violator [*Water Code § 1055(b)*]. The violator may request a hearing within 20 days after service. The hearing is before a member of the Board [*Water Code § 1055(b)*], who reports a proposed decision and order to the Board and supplies a copy to the party served [*Water Code § 1055(c)*]. The Board independently reviews the record and may take additional evidence that is necessary and that could not reasonably have been offered before the hearing officer. The Board may then adopt, with or without revision, the proposed decision and order [*Water Code § 1055(c)*].

No person or entity may be subject to both civil liability imposed administratively under *Water Code § 1055* and civil liability imposed by the court under *Water Code § 1845* for the same act or failure to act [*Water Code § 1055.2*].

[5] Effect on Private Litigants

Any factual or legal determinations made in accordance with a cease and desist order are conclusive and preclude any party to the order from raising those issues in any subsequent administrative proceeding [*Water Code § 1850*]. The provisions of *Water Code §§ 1825-1851* governing enforcement of water rights do not limit the right of any person to bring an action for equitable or legal relief from harm caused by an unauthorized diversion or a violation of a term or condition of a permit or license. That person will not be required to exhaust any administrative remedy provided by *Water Code §§ 1825-1851* before bringing that action [*Water Code § 1851*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
4. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.102

§ 575.102 Unauthorized Use Constitutes Trespass

[1] Civil Liability

The unauthorized diversion or use of water subject to *Water Code § 1000 et seq.* is a trespass [*Water Code § 1052(a)*]. Any person or entity committing a *Water Code § 1052* trespass may be liable for a sum not to exceed $500 for each day in which the trespass occurs. On request of the State Board, the Attorney General will petition the superior court to impose and recover that sum. In determining the appropriate amount, the court will take into consideration all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the extent of harm caused by the violation, the nature and persistence of the violation, the length of time over which the violation occurs, and the corrective action, if any, taken by the violator [*Water Code § 1052(d)*]. Similarly, on the Board's request, the Attorney General will institute an appropriate action for injunctive relief in the form of a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, or permanent injunction [*Water Code § 1052(c)* (action is to be instituted in superior court for county where diversion or use is threatened, is occurring, or has occurred)]. These remedies are cumulative, not alternative [*Water Code § 1052(f)*].

[2] Administrative Liability

The State Board may administratively impose civil liability in accordance with *Water Code § 1055* for a *Water Code § 1052* trespass in an amount not exceeding $500 for each day in which the trespass occurs [*Water Code § 1052(b)*]. Under this procedure, the executive director of the Board issues a complaint [*Water Code § 1055(a)*], which is served by personal notice or certified mail on the alleged trespasser [*Water Code § 1055(b)*]. The trespasser may request a hearing within 20 days after service. The hearing is before a member of the Board [*Water Code § 1055(b)*], who reports a proposed decision and order to the Board and supplies a copy to the party served [*Water Code § 1055(c)*]. The Board independently reviews the record and may take additional evidence that is necessary and that could not reasonably have been offered before the hearing officer. The Board may then adopt, with or without revision, the proposed decision and order [*Water Code § 1055(c)*]. The same procedure may be followed to impose civil liability on a person or entity for any willful misstatement in connection with the preparation of a statement of water diversion and use [*Water Code §§ 1055(a), 5107*].

In determining the amount of civil liability, the Board will consider all relevant circumstances, including, but not limited to, the extent of harm caused by the violation, the nature and persistence of the violation, the length of time over which the violation occurs, and the corrective action, if any, taken by the violator [*Water Code § 1055.3*].

Any party aggrieved by a final order issued by the Board under *Water Code § 1055* may obtain review of the Board's order in superior court by filing a petition for writ of mandate within 30 days following the order's issuance. If no aggrieved party petitions for writ of mandate within the time provided, the Board's order is not subject to review by any court [*Water Code § 1055.1* (repealed as of January 1, 1997, but applicable to proceedings pending on December 31, 1996); *Water Code § 1126* (applicable thereafter)]. For discussion and forms relating to review by writ of mandate of an adminstrative hearing under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* .

After the time for review has expired, the Board may apply to the clerk of the appropriate court for a judgment to collect the administrative civil liability imposed in accordance with *Water Code § 1055*. The application constitutes a sufficient showing to warrant issuance of the judgment, and the court clerk must enter the judgment immediately in conformity with the application. The judgment entered by the clerk has the same force and effect as, and is subject to all the provisions of law relating to, a judgment in a civil action, and may be enforced in the same manner as any other judgment of the court in which it is entered [*Water Code § 1055.4*].

[3] Cease and Desist Orders

If the State Board determines that any person is violating or threatening to violate the prohibition against the unauthorized diversion of water set forth in *Water Code § 1052* or a prior decision or order of the Board in which the person or a predecessor in interest to that person was named as a party directly affected by the decision or order, the Board may issue an order to cease and desist from that violation [*Water Code § 1831(a), (d)*]. The cease and desist order will require either immediate compliance or compliance in accordance with a time schedule set by the Board [*Water Code § 1831(a), (b), (d)(2)*]. For a discussion of the issuance of cease and desist orders by the Board, see *§ 575.101[2]*.

[4] Civil and Administrative Liability Are Distinct

No person or entity will be subject to both civil liability imposed under *Water Code § 1055* and civil liability imposed by the superior court under *Water Code § 1052(d)* for the same act or failure to act [*Water Code § 1055.2*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
4. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.103-575.119

[Reserved]

§§ 575.103[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
I. In General

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.120

§ 575.120 Governing Law

Adjudication of water rights by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board or Board) is governed by *Water Code §§ 2500-2866*. The procedure by which a court may refer to the State Board an action in which a determination of water rights is sought is governed by *Water Code §§ 2000-2048*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
I. In General

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.121-575.139

[Reserved]

§§ 575.121[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.140

§ 575.140 Statutory Adjudication of Water Rights in Stream System

Water Code §§ 2500-2866 establish a statutory procedure for the adjudication of water rights under which the Board may determine all rights to water of a stream system, whether based on appropriation, riparian right, or other basis of right [*Water Code § 2501*]. The State Board's determination is filed in court, which after a hearing will enter a decree determining the rights of all persons involved in the proceeding [*Water Code §§ 2750, 2768*]. "Stream system" includes stream, lake, or other body of water, and tributaries and contributory sources, but does not include an underground water supply other than a subterranean stream flowing through known and definite channels [*Water Code § 2500*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.141

§ 575.141 Petition to Board

On petition by one or more claimants to water of any stream system, requesting the determination of the rights of the claimants to the water of that stream system, the State Board will investigate the relevant facts and conditions. If it finds that the public interest and necessity will be served by a determination of the water rights involved, the Board will enter an order granting the petition and begin determination procedures [*Water Code § 2525*; for a form of petition, *see § 575.380*].

The Board also has authority to initiate its own investigation of water waste and to take appropriate remedial action. Thus, the Board may begin or continue an investigation of water usage, even if parties who were contesting water rights have settled the dispute [*see Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 548, 568-569, 275 Cal. Rptr. 250]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.142

§ 575.142 Notice of Proceedings

After granting the petition the State Board will issue a notice stating that the proceedings are pending, that all claimants to rights to the use of water of that stream system must inform the Board within 60 days from the date of the notice of their intention to file proof of claim, the date by which that written notice must be received, and the fact that all claimants will be required to make proof of their claims after the conclusion of the Board's investigation [*Water Code § 2526* (although the notice is not required to so state, an intent to file proof of claim may also be filed after the Board's investigation under *Water Code § 2555*)]. The notice must be published in generally circulating newspapers in the counties in which any part of the stream system is situated and must be mailed to riparian owners and appropriators of waters from the stream system [*Water Code § 2527*].

All interested claimants who received notice of the proceedings must notify the Board of their intention to file proof of claim and to appear and submit proof of their respective claims at the time and in the manner required by *Water Code §§ 2500-2866* [*Water Code § 2528*]. The proof of claim must be filed with the Board on a form provided by the Board [*Water Code § 2575*; *see § 575.381*].

Within 60 days of the date by which claimants were required to provide notice of their intent to file proof of claim, the Board must file for record in the county recorder's office of each county in which any part of the stream system is situated a notice setting forth facts enumerated in *Water Code § 2529(a)* [*Water Code § 2529(a)*]. It must identify the current owners of each parcel that appears to be riparian to the stream system or to which water is diverted from the stream, and must be recorded in a manner so that anyone researching the title of a parcel will find the notice [*Water Code § 2529(b)*; *see Water Code § 2529(c)* (supplementary notice if and when additional parcels are identified)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.143

§ 575.143 Minor Quantity Exception

If the State Board finds that the use by any person under claim of right of only minor quantities of water would have no material effect on the rights of other claimants, it may exempt that person from being subject to statutory adjudicatory proceedings with respect to those minor quantities of water. However, any exempted person may elect to continue to be subject to the proceedings by giving prompt notice to the Board [*Water Code § 2502*]. "Minor quantities of water" means the diversion or extraction of water in an amount not exceeding 10 acre-feet per year [*Water Code § 2503*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.144

§ 575.144 State Board Investigation

The State Board will investigate the diversion of water, the beneficial uses being made of the water, the water supply available for those uses, and any other essential data [*Water Code § 2550*]. The Board will conduct a detailed field investigation of the water uses of all water users known to the Board, giving 30 days written notice to those users who gave notice of intent to file proof of claim. The Board will define the place and purpose of use, determine the locations and capacity of each person's diversion works and conduits conveying water from the stream system, and the amount of water diverted and reasonably required to satisfy the uses being made [*Water Code §§ 2551, 2554*]. Each claimant must be present at some time during the field investigation in person or by an agent authorized to sign the proof of claim, and must cooperate in the investigation and provide necessary information to the Board [*Water Code §§ 2551, 2552*]. At the conclusion of that investigation the claimant will receive a copy of the factual determinations of the Board [*Water Code § 2553*].

Water users who were not present during the field investigation and those who did not file notice of intent to file proof of claim must, insofar as they are known, be supplied with a copy of the factual determinations of the representative of the Board and a blank proof of claim form. They may file proof of claim after completion of the investigation of their project by the Board's representatives on the same basis as persons who were present and who filed timely notice of intent [*Water Code § 2555*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.145

§ 575.145 State Board Report

After all the field investigations are complete and the time for filing proofs of claims has expired, the State Board must prepare a report describing the water supply and abstracting the claim of water right of each claimant [*Water Code § 2600*]. The report must note separately any material difference between the claims and the Board's factual determinations and must include a map showing the use of the stream system, as well as any other necessary information [*Water Code §§ 2601*, *2602*]. The report must include a preliminary order of determination establishing the several rights to the water of the stream system, giving appropriate consideration to claims at variance with the Board's measurements and determinations [*Water Code § 2603*].

A copy of the report will be sent by registered mail to each claimant and to each person not filing a claim who appears in the report as a water user. A notice setting forth the objection procedure will accompany the report [*Water Code § 2604*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.146

§ 575.146 Objection Procedure

The objection procedure notice accompanying the State Board's report must set a deadline of at least 60 days by which objections to the report or preliminary order of determination must be filed [*Water Code § 2604*]. It will also set a reasonably convenient time and place for inspection of the filed proofs of claim, Board measurements, and other data collected during the investigation. The period for inspection by all interested persons will last at least five days and will end at least 30 days before the deadline for filing objections [*Water Code §§ 2625-2627*].

Objections to the report and preliminary order of determination must be written and must state with reasonable certainty the grounds of the objection [*Water Code § 2628*; *see § 575.382*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.147

§ 575.147 Hearing on Objections

The State Board will mail copies of the objections to the claimant or water user against whom the objections are directed and will notify by registered mail the persons whose rights are significantly affected to appear before it at a specified time and place when the objections will be heard. The notice will be sent within 10 days after the filing deadline and will specify a hearing date of at least 15 days later [*Water Code § 2650*].

The Board may adjourn the hearing of objections on reasonable notice to all parties in interest [*Water Code § 2651*]. At the hearing each party must pay for the direct examination of his or her own witness and the cross examination of the opponent's witness. The parties will share equally for that part of the examination directed by the Board's representative [*Water Code § 2652*]. The parties must also provide one copy of the transcript of hearing testimony to the Board at their own expense [*Water Code § 2653*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.148

§ 575.148 Order of Determination

The State Board will adopt an order determining and establishing the several rights to the water of the stream system after the hearing or after the expiration of the filing time if no objections are filed [*Water Code § 2700*]. In its order, the Board may establish standards for the water's reasonable use. The Board has authority to set controls and conditions on water use, including standards of quality and prevention of waste. The Board may order a water user to develop and present a water conservation plan to remedy misuse of water, and may retain jurisdiction to review the adequacy of the water user's plans [*Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Wat. Resources Control Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 548, 570, 275 Cal. Rptr. 250]* . Notice of its adoption and a copy of the order of determination will be sent by registered mail to each claimant and each person whose rights are determined in the order [*Water Code § 2701*].

The Board may order a reconsideration of all or part of the order of determination on its own motion or on petition by any party affected by the order. The Board's authority to order reconsideration on its own motion expires 30 days after it adopts the order. A petition to reconsider must be filed within 30 days after the *Water Code § 2701* notice of it is sent. The Board must rule on a reconsideration petition within 90 days after the notice required by *Water Code § 2701* is sent [*Water Code § 2702(a)*].

The order of determination may be reconsidered by the Board on all the pertinent parts of the record and arguments, or a further hearing may be held, on notice to all affected parties, to receive additional evidence that the Board may, for cause, allow. The order on reconsideration has the same effect as an original order [*Water Code § 2702(b)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.149

§ 575.149 Filing Order in Court

[1] Notice of Hearing

A copy of the order, the original evidence, and the transcript of testimony certified by the State Board will be filed with the superior court of the county in which the stream system is situated [*Water Code § 2750*]. The court will issue an order setting the time for hearing and certified copies of the order will be sent by the Board to each known party in interest [*Water Code §§ 2751-2753*]. The Board will also publish the order in appropriate newspapers [*Water Code §§ 2754, 2755*].

Whenever the court finds the State is a necessary party to the action, it will make an order to that effect and copies of all pleadings and proceedings on file will be served on the Attorney General [*Water Code § 2765*].

[2] Exceptions to Order

Each party in interest who is dissatisfied with the order of determination may file with the court a notice of exceptions to the order of determination. The notice of exceptions must be filed and copies sent by registered mail to the State Board and to each person who was an adverse party to any issue raised by the exception at least 10 days before the hearing [*Water Code §§ 2757-2759*; for form of objection to determination, *see § 575.382*].

The hearing pleadings will consist of the order of determination, the statements or claims of claimants, and the exceptions made to the order of determination, although the court may allow additional pleadings as may be necessary to a final determination of the proceeding [*Water Code §§ 2760, 2761*]. If no exceptions are filed, the court will enter a decree affirming the order of determination [*Water Code § 2762*].

All proceedings on the hearing will accord as nearly as possible with the rules governing civil actions [*Water Code § 2764*]. All parties in interest who filed notices of exceptions will appear at the hearing, which will continue until all exceptions are settled [*Water Code § 2763*].

[3] Powers of Court

The court (1) may employ qualified persons to conduct additional investigations and to testify, (2) may take additional evidence on any issue, (3) may refer the case for further evidence to be taken by the State Board, and (4) may require a further determination by the State Board [*Water Code §§ 2766, 2767*]. It may also assess and adjudge costs against any party [*Water Code § 2770*].

[4] Court Decree

After the hearing the court will enter a decree determining the rights of all persons involved in the proceedings [*Water Code § 2768*]. The decree will declare the priority, amount, season of use, purpose of use, point of diversion, and place of use as to the water right adjudged to each party. For water used for irrigation, the decree will also declare the specific tracts of land to which it is appurtenant, together with any other factor necessary to define the right [*Water Code § 2769*].

[5] Conclusiveness of Decree

The decree is conclusive as to the rights of all existing claimants on the stream system lawfully embraced in the determination [*Water Code § 2773*]. When a decree has been entered, any claimant who has failed to appear and submit proof of his or her claim is barred and estopped from subsequently asserting any rights theretofore acquired on the stream system embraced in the proceedings, and will be held to have forfeited all rights to water theretofore claimed by him or her on the stream system, other than as provided in the decree, unless entitled to relief under the laws of this state [*Water Code § 2774*].

Appeals from the decree may be taken by the State Board or by any party in interest in the same manner and with the same effect as in civil cases [*Water Code § 2771*; *see* Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview*].

A certified copy of the decree will be filed for record in the office of the county recorder of each county in which any part of the stream system is situated [*Water Code § 2772*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.150

§ 575.150 Intervention

A claimant who had no actual knowledge or notice that the proceedings were pending prior to entry of the order of determination by the State Board may intervene in the proceedings. The intervention, in the form of filing an exception to the order and a proof of claim containing all the matters required of noticed claimants, must be made at least 10 days before the hearing or within any further time the court may allow [*Water Code § 2780*]. The intervening claimant must apply for a court order prescribing the notice requirements to the other claimants and contests by them [*Water Code § 2781*]. The court will hear and determine the exception and proof of intervenor and any contest as nearly as possible in accordance with the provisions of *Water Code §§ 2750-2774*, which govern the court proceeding [*Water Code § 2782*; for a form of exception and an order prescribing notice *see §§ 575.383* and *575.384*].

The court may refer the matter to the Board for further evidence, and may require a further determination by the Board, for which the Board is entitled to reimbursement for expenses [*Water Code § 2783*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.151

§ 575.151 Incomplete Appropriations--General Proceedings

Any person claiming rights under an incomplete appropriation, when properly notified, must appear and submit a proof of claim or be held to be in default and to have abandoned or to have no right, title, or interest in or to the water of the stream system, other than as that person may be found to be entitled by the State Board [*Water Code § 2801*].

The order of determination will provide that within the time prescribed for completion of the appropriation, or within such further time as the court may allow, the claimant must submit to the court proof of completion and the amount of water actually applied to beneficial use [*Water Code § 2803*; for discussion of the appropriation procedure, *see § 575.50* et seq.].

The time for completion may be extended by the court on a motion made prior, but not more than 90 days prior, to the expiration of the previous time limit [*Water Code §§ 2807, 2808*]. The court may refer the matter of the motion to the Board for its recommendation [*Water Code § 2810*]. After receipt of the Board's recommendation or after 90 days, the court will either deny the motion or grant an extension of time in the amount for which there is good and sufficient cause [*Water Code § 2811*]. If the motion is denied, the applicant has 10 days to file notice of intention to offer proof of completion with the court [*Water Code §§ 2812, 2813*].

The court may hear and determine proof offered as to completion of that right [*Water Code § 2806*]. If submission of proof of completion is made after entry of the court decree, the court must enter a supplemental decree determining the right before it; if no proof is submitted, the court must enter a supplemental decree denying the right [*Water Code § 2815*].

Any person claiming a right under incomplete appropriation who fails to complete his or her appropriation within the allowable time limit is deemed to have abandoned his or her right of appropriation as far as it remains incomplete, and has no right, title, or interest in or to the water of the stream system as far as the appropriation has not been completed [*Water Code § 2816*].

Appeals from any action of the court may be taken by the Board or by any party in interest in the same manner and with the same effect as in civil cases [*Water Code § 2817*].

Water Code §§ 2801-2820 will not be construed to confer any rights of appropriation on parties who abandoned their appropriations or failed to use due diligence in the application of the water to a beneficial use and in the completion of their appropriations [*Water Code § 2818*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.152

§ 575.152 Supplemental Decrees

[1] Incomplete Appropriation

Incomplete appropriations initiated by application under the provisions of the Water Commision Act or the Water Code will be included in the decree but will continue to be administered by the State Board as in other cases. On issuance of a license by the Board and completion of any court review sought pursuant to *Water Code § 1126* and on motion of the licensee or the Board, the court will enter a supplemental decree confirming the right in accordance with the license [*Water Code § 2819*].

[2] Revocation or Change in Use

Any change authorized by the State Board pursuant to *Water Code §§ 1700-1707* (change in use) will also be the subject of a supplemental decree [*Water Code § 2819*]. A supplemental decree denying a right will be entered after Board revocation of a permit or license relating to a right included in the decree. This will be done on completion of a requested court review of the Board's action under either *Water Code §§ 1410-1450* (permits) or *Water Code §§ 1675-1675.2* (licenses), on a motion by the Board or any interested party [*Water Code § 2820*].

On entry of a supplemental decree establishing or modifying a right, the Board must furnish a copy of the supplemental decree to each claimant who could be significantly affected [*Water Code § 2826*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.153

§ 575.153 Expenses

All expenses incurred by the State Board in performing the duties required of it by *Water Code §§ 2500-2866* in excess of the amount received from claimants at the time of submission of proofs will be equitably apportioned against the parties to the proceeding [*Water Code §§ 2851, 2852*]. A procedure to object to the expense apportionment is available to claimants [*Water Code §§ 2853-2859*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.154

§ 575.154 Modification of Court Decrees

In rendering its decree for the determination of rights to water, whether in suits referred to the State Board under the provisions of *Water Code §§ 2000-2048* or in adjudications under the provisions of *Water Code §§ 2500-2866*, the court may provide that the Board or any party affected by the decree may, at any time within three years, apply to the court for a modification of the decree in its determination of quantities of water, and after hearing the motion and any competent and admissible evidence offered, the court may modify the decree by increasing or decreasing the quantities of water allowed [*Water Code § 2900*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
II Statutory Adjudication

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.155-575.169

[Reserved]

§§ 575.155[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
III Declaratory Relief and Quiet Title

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.170

§ 575.170 Jurisdiction of Water Rights Controversies

State courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the California State Water Resources Control Board in water rights controversies. A party need not exhaust administrative remedies with the State Board before filing suit in court. The courts may refer water rights disputes to the Board as referee, but will continue to exercise their original concurrent jurisdiction [*National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 419, 426, 449-451, 189 Cal. Rptr. 346, 658 P.2d 709* ; *see Water Code §§ 2000, 2001, 2075*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
III Declaratory Relief and Quiet Title

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.171

§ 575.171 Judicial Determination of Water Rights

[1] Declaratory Relief

[a] Protection Against Appropriators

Owners of riparian and overlying water rights have the right to obtain a judgment declaring their water rights and protecting their prospective beneficial uses even without the presence of substantial damage to their rights [*Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 529-530, 45 P.2d 972* ; *Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 998, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* . This protects not only the actual reasonable beneficial use, but also the prospective reasonable beneficial use. As to the prospective reasonable beneficial uses, the quantity of water required cannot be fixed in amount until the need arises. Therefore, as to those uses, the court should declare them paramount to any right of any would-be appropriator. By such a declaratory judgment, an owner's rights will be fully protected against any appropriative use ripening into a right by prescription, but, until the owner needs the water, an appropriator may use it [*Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 525, 45 P.2d 972]* . Because water rights are a species of real property, the action may also be characterized as a quiet title action to adjudicate conflicting claims to water [*Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist., v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999 n.5, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918]* . For discussion and forms relating to quiet title actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* .

[b] Between Owners of Same Type of Right

When there is insufficient water for the uses of all those claiming riparian or overlying water rights, the trial court must ascertain whether there is a physical solution to the problem that will avoid waste and that will not unreasonably or adversely affect the rights of the parties. The court should work out, if possible, a physical solution [*Rancho Santa Margarita v. Vail (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 501, 558-559, 81 P.2d 533* (riparian); *see California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 724-725, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1* (overlying)]. When the conflict is between those claiming appropriative rights, the one first in time is the first in right, and a prior appropriator is entitled to a

judgment entitling him or her to all the water he or she needs, up to the amount that he or she has taken in the past, before a subsequent appropriator may take any [*see California Water Service Co. v. Edward Sidebotham & Son (1964) 224 Cal. App. 2d 715, 725-726, 37 Cal. Rptr. 1]* .

The court may refer the matter to the State Board for the Board to referee any issue or for the Board to investigate the facts [*Water Code §§ 2000, 2001*, discussed in *§ 575.173[1]*].

[2] Injunctive Relief

Before ruling on a request for injunctive relief, the trial court must determine whether the owners, considering all the needs of those in the particular water field, are putting the waters to any reasonable beneficial uses, giving consideration to all factors involved, including reasonable methods of use and reasonable methods of diversion. From a consideration of those uses, the court must then determine whether there is a surplus in the water field subject to appropriation. If an owner is putting the water to any reasonable beneficial use, it is necessary for the court to find expressly the quantity so required and so used. A finding that the owner is using a reasonable amount for that purpose is insufficient. The court must fix the quantity required by each owner for his or her actual reasonable beneficial use [*Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 524-525, 45 P.2d 972* (involving riparian right)].

In ascertaining the rights between riparians, and in ascertaining whether a lower riparian has suffered damages by reason of an upper riparian's diversion sufficient to warrant an injunction, the court should consider all of the water available to either party from the river, and then determine, considering the entire supply, the needs of the parties, their methods of use and diversion, and other necessary factors, whether the lower riparian has in fact suffered damage [*Rancho Santa Margarita v. Vail (1938) 11 Cal. 2d 501, 558, 81 P.2d 533]* . So long as a riparian owner takes no more than his or her reasonable share and uses it on his or her riparian land, without unreasonable waste, other riparian owners below have no right to inquire, how, or by what means, or at what place, that share is diverted from the stream [*Turner v. The James Canal Co. (1909) 155 Cal. 82, 92, 99 P. 520]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
III Declaratory Relief and Quiet Title

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.172

§ 575.172 Inadequacy of Private Suits

Although parties who use substantial amounts of water may be ordered joined in the action, it may be impracticable to attempt to include every person having some actual or potential right to the water and its sources of supply. Persons not made parties are not bound by judgment nor are they injured by any injunction [*City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 908, 919-920, 207 P.2d 17 , cert. denied, 339 U.S. 937, 70 S. Ct. 671, 94 L. Ed. 1354]* .

A private suit for determining title to water binds only those who are parties to the suit. It may later be nullified by the assertion of a legitimate claim by a water user on the stream who was not a party to the suit. Moreover, private suits are inadequate because shortages in supply, new appropriations, or new riparian uses have the potential for bringing all water users on the stream in conflict [*In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 347, 356, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656* (court retention of jurisdiction over prospective riparian claims may offer partial relief)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
III Declaratory Relief and Quiet Title

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.173

§ 575.173 Court Action

[1] Referral to Board

In any suit brought in any court of competent jurisdiction for determination of rights to water, the court may order a reference to the State Board, as referee, of any or all issues involved in the suit [*Water Code § 2000*]. The court may also refer the suit to the Board for an investigation of and a report on any or all of the physical facts involved [*Water Code § 2001*]. For a form of an order of reference to the Board, see *§ 575.386*.

The Board may either base its report solely on its own investigation or may hold additional hearings and take testimony [*Water Code § 2010*]. The report of the Board as referee must set forth the findings of fact and conclusions of law required by the court's order of reference and may contain its opinion on the law and the facts [*Water Code §§ 2011, 2012*].

Before filing its report the Board must announce it in the form of a draft [*Water Code § 2013*]. Notice and a copy of the draft must be mailed by the Board to the parties [*Water Code § 2014*].

[2] Objections to Report

Any party may file objections to the draft with the State Board within 30 days after the date the draft was mailed [*Water Code § 2015*]. Before filing its report as referee with the court, the Board will consider the objections and may hold a hearing on them [*Water Code § 2016*].

The report of the Board as referee is subject to review by the court on exceptions to it filed with the court clerk within 30 days after mailing notice of the filing of the report [*Water Code § 2017*]. The court will not consider an exception to the report unless that issue was presented as an objection to the Board, although this rule may be changed for good cause or in the court's discretion [*Water Code § 2018*].

The Board's report is prima facie evidence of the physical facts, but the court will hear any evidence offered by any party to rebut the report or the prima facie evidence [*Water Code § 2019*].

[3] Expenses

The State Board is not entitled to any fee for its services, but will be paid or reimbursed for its total expenses [*Water Code § 2040*]. The total expense will be equitably apportioned by the Board against the parties to the suit [*Water Code § 2043*]. If the Board lacks the funds to advance the expense of a reference, or if it feels that the payment of the expense of any reference is not reasonably certain, it must refuse to undertake a reference until adequate provision is made by the parties and approved by the court for the payment of expenses [*Water Code § 2041*]. While the reference is pending, the Board may move the court for an order for interim or partial payments. The order may only be granted after a hearing with at least 10 days notice to the parties [*Water Code § 2042*].

On written application by any aggrieved party within 30 days after the statement of final expense and its apportionment has been mailed to the parties, the court will set a hearing for the determination of any objections to the expenses or the apportionment. The court clerk is required to give at least 10 days notice of the hearing by mail to all the parties [*Water Code § 2045*]. Failure to object is deemed a waiver, and the court will enter a judgment against the parties and in favor of the Board ex parte if no objections are filed [*Water Code §§ 2046, 2047*]. If there is a hearing on any objection, the court will apportion the expenses equitably [*Water Code § 2048*].

[4] Federal Court Cases

The State Board may accept a reference as master or referee from a federal court if the case involves water rights within, or partially within, California [*Water Code § 2075*]. In so acting, the Board will proceed according to the rules of practice and procedure of the court or as otherwise directed by the court [*Water Code § 2076*].

[5] Reservation of Jurisdiction

The trial court may reserve jurisdiction over the parties to settle future disputes concerning their rights in the water [*Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 1002-1003, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918* (court may also appoint watermaster to monitor amount of future pumping from basin)]. Retention of jurisdiction is desirable so that when an owner claims the need for water, the prospective right to which was awarded under a declaratory decree, the court may determine whether the proposed new use, under all the circumstances, is a reasonably beneficial use and, if so, the quantity required [*Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 525, 45 P.2d 972]* .

77 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Rights to Water
5. Adjudication of Water Rights
III Declaratory Relief and Quiet Title

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.174-575.189

[Reserved]

§§ 575.174[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.190

§ 575.190 Governing Law

Private agreements to supply water are contracts and are controlled by contract law [*see, e.g.,* Riverside Water Co. v. Jurupa Ditch Co. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 538, 542, *187 Cal. App. 2d 538, 9 Cal. Rptr. 742]* . Thus, the regular rules of contract interpretation will be applied to actions on contracts for the use of water [*see Acadia, California, Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 334-335, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686, 353 P.2d 294* ; *see also* Ch. 140, *Contracts*]. If a water servicer has made a dedication to public use, the consumer has certain vested rights and may seek declaratory relief for a continuation of service [*see, e.g., Vila v. Tahoe Southside Water Utility (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 469, 479-480, 43 Cal. Rptr. 654]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.191

§ 575.191 Essential Elements of Water Contract

[1] General Contract Principles

It is essential to the existence of a water contract between private parties that there be (1) parties capable of contracting, (2) consent by the parties, (3) a lawful object, and (4) a sufficient cause or consideration [*Civ. Code § 1550*; *see Marshall & Co. v. Weisel (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 191, 196, 51 Cal. Rptr. 183]* . When there is no agreement on the part of the user to buy the water offered for sale, a water contract is lacking in mutuality. Similarly, when there is no time specified to which the stated water rate applies, a water use contract is void due to uncertainty [*Schimmel v. Martin (1923) 190 Cal. 429, 431, 213 P. 33]* .

[2] Characterization of Water as Personal or Real Property

Water may be characterized as real or personal property for purposes of its sale. Water, in its natural state, whether in streams, lakes, or ponds, or in percolation through the soil, is part of the land. Water becomes personal property only when severed from the realty [*Copeland v. Fairview Land Etc. Co. (1913) 165 Cal. 148, 154, 131 P. 119]* .

When water is sold for domestic use and delivered by means of pipes to the premises, the pipes themselves are fixtures and part of the realty. Severance occurs and water becomes personal property when it is taken from the pipes by the consumer [*Copeland v. Fairview Land Etc. Co. (1913) 165 Cal. 148, 154, 131 P. 119]* . In comparison, irrigation water, even though delivered in pipes, permeates the soil and remains a part of the realty, so that no severance occurs and the water remains real property [*Copeland v. Fairview Land Etc. Co. (1913) 165 Cal. 148, 154, 131 P. 119]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.192

§ 575.192 Remedies Available for Breach

Breach of a water service contract may merit damages, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief [*see Acadia, California, Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 337, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686, 353 P.2d 294]* . An act which breaches a water service agreement may be actionable either as a breach of contract or as a tort. An action in tort may be the preferable remedy for a disruption of water service, because punitive damages and damages for mental distress may be available [*Acadia, California, Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 336-338, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686, 353 P.2d 294* ; *see* Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.193

§ 575.193 Damages

[1] Measure of Damages Varies

If there is a permanent failure of a contract to supply water which affects an easement in the water as a perpetual and inseparable part of the real property, the measure of damages is similar to that in eminent domain proceedings and is the difference between the market value of the land with and without the water [*Crane v. East Side Canal etc. Co. (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 361, 370-371, 44 P.2d 455]* .

When the failure to furnish water pursuant to water supply contract is only for a single season or a specified limited period of time, the measure of damages is the difference in the rental value of the land with and without the water [*see Crane v. East Side Canal etc. Co. (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 361, 370, 44 P.2d 455]* .

When a land lease agreement that includes irrigation rights is breached by denying access to irrigation water, the measure of damages is the difference between the rental value of the land with and without water for irrigation [*Pallett v. Murphy (1900) 131 Cal. 192, 197-198, 63 P. 366* ; for discussion and forms involving breach of covenants, see Ch. 332, *Landlord and Tenant: The Tenancy*].

If a contract for the sale of water as personal property is breached, the measure of damages is the amount that will compensate the party aggrieved for all the damage proximately caused thereby, or which, in the ordinary course of things, would be likely to result therefrom [*Civ. Code § 3301*; for discussion and forms relating to contract damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*]. The party aggrieved is required to mitigate damages [*see Schultz v. Lakeport (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 377, 383-385, 54 P.2d 1110, 55 P.2d 485]* . Moreover, if a water company's failure to supply water is a failure to comply with the applicable municipal regulations, the party aggrieved may recover from the water company twice the amount of damages sustained by reason of that failure [*Pub. Util. Code § 8203*].

[2] Limitation of Damages

A water company is not liable for damages resulting from a failure to supply water for a particular use in the absence of a specific undertaking to supply water for that use [*Gelhaus v. Nevada Irrigation Dist. (1955) 43 Cal. 2d 779, 782,*

278 P.2d 689] .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.194

§ 575.194 Water Companies

Any person, firm, or corporation, their lessees, trustees, receivers or trustees appointed by any court whatsoever, owning, controlling, operating, or managing any water system within California, who sells, leases, rents, or delivers water to any person, firm, corporation, municipality, or other political subdivision, whether under contract or otherwise, is a public utility and is subject to the regulation of the Public Utilities Commission, unless specifically provided otherwise [*Pub. Util. Code § 2701*].

Any corporation or association organized for the purposes of delivering water to its stockholders and members at cost and that delivers water to no one except its stockholders or members, the state or any state agency or department, any public district, or any federal agency that provides fire protection or operates park facilities, or to any other mutual water company, at cost, is not a public utility and is not subject to the regulation of the Public Utilities Commission [*Pub. Util. Code § 2705*]. However, if this mutual type of corporation or association has a dual purpose or sells water to those outside its association for compensation, it is a public utility [*Pub. Util. Code §§ 2702, 2703*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.195

§ 575.195 Dedication to Public Use

[1] Service to Public

Dedication of property to public use is never presumed without evidence of unequivocal intention. It need not be expressly stated; it is normally evidenced by some act which is reasonably interpreted and relied on by the public as a holding out or indication of willingness to provide service on equal terms to all who might apply. A water supplier is subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission only if a dedication to the public has been made [*see Cal. Water & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 494, 334 P.2d 887]* . A public utility is bound to provide and maintain water service in accordance with the requirements imposed by law, custom, or special contract. Once a system is established as public, all persons to whose use the water is appropriated or dedicated are vested with a right to have the supply continued [*Coulter v. Sausalito Bay Water Co. (1932) 122 Cal. App. 480, 496, 10 P.2d 780]* .

[2] Dedication May Be Limited

The owner of a water supply may make a limited dedication of it to public use, confining the use to a limited territory, or dedicating only a part of the water to public use. Thus, a water company has the right to decline to furnish its water to persons not within the area it has undertaken to serve [*Cal. Water & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 490, 334 P.2d 887]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.196

§ 575.196 Extension of Water Service

[1] Reasonable Necessity

The inhabitants of the city, as well as county or municipal authorities, may use mandate proceedings to compel a water district to extend its water mains and supply petitioners with water [*see Lukrawka v. Spring Valley Water Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 318, 320, 146 P. 640* ; *Boies & Soule v. East Bay Mun. Util. Dist. (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 843, 844, 9 Cal. Rptr. 464]* .

A public utility may not be compelled to extend its service beyond the territorial limits of its dedication. When a water company has dedicated its service to the inhabitants of a municipality, the territorial scope of its dedication may ordinarily be measured by the municipality's boundaries, and it may be required to make reasonable extensions of its lines to accommodate the increased demands of a growing municipality [*Cal. Water & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 492-493, 334 P.2d 887]* . The duty of the water company is of a public nature and is to meet a public necessity for the supplying of water to the community. Its obligation is not to supply each or any number of inhabitants of the municipality on demand as an absolute right on their part, but it does have the public duty of furnishing water service when there is a reasonable demand for it and a reasonable extension of service can be made to meet the demand. The right to require the service and the duty of furnishing it by an extension of the water system is determined by the reasonableness of the demand, which is a question of fact [*Lukrawka v. Spring Valley Water Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 318, 332-333, 146 P. 640]* .

[2] Factors Determining Reasonableness

The expense of extending service is one of many factors in determining whether an extension of service is reasonable; it is not the deciding factor. Among the factors considered in determining reasonable necessity are the duties of the company, the rights of its stockholders, the supply of water which the company may control for distribution, the facilities for making extensions to a locality beyond its present point of service, the rights of existing customers, the wants and necessities of the locality demanding it, and how far the right of the community as a whole may be affected by the demanded extensions [*Lukrawka v. Spring Valley Water Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 318, 333-334, 146 P. 640]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.197

§ 575.197 Public and Private Water Companies

[1] Regulations for Service

A water company, whether privately or publicly owned and operated, has the right to require compliance with reasonable rules and regulations for service to customers and to provide for the discontinuance of the service for the violation thereof [*Schultz v. Lakeport (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 377, 381, 55 P.2d 485, 54 P.2d 1110]* .

[2] Remedies for Discontinuance of Service

If the water company is a privately owned "water corporation," that is, a corporation or person owning, controlling, operating, or managing any water system for compensation in California, the termination of residential water utility service is governed by statute [*Pub. Util. Code § 241*; *see Pub. Util. Code §§ 777-780*].

When there is a legitimate dispute as to consumer compliance, an injunction may be granted to restrain the threatened discontinuance of the service, whatever the character of the proprietorship [*see Coulter v. Sausalito Bay Water Co. (1932) 122 Cal. App. 480, 496, 10 P.2d 780]* . A water user may choose instead to recover damages, in which case the user will be required to mitigate damages [*see Schultz v. Lakeport (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 377, 383-385, 55 P.2d 485, 54 P.2d 1110]* .

For further discussion of termination of public utility service, including termination of residential service by a water corporation, see Ch. 277, *Gas and Electricity* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.198-575.209

[Reserved]

§§ 575.198[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.210

§ 575.210 Governing Law

Water storage districts are governed by *Water Code §§ 39000-48401*. County water districts are governed by *Water Code §§ 30000-33900*. Municipal water districts are governed by *Water Code §§ 71000-73001*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.211

§ 575.211 Water Districts and Local Agency Formation Commission

The formation and organization of local agencies, including the various types of water districts, are governed by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 [*Gov. Code § 56000 et seq.*]. Under the Act, the local agency formation commission (LAFCO) of the principal county of the entity proposing a change of organization or reorganization is the "conducting authority" for changes of organization or reorganization, unless another conducting authority is specified by law [*Gov. Code § 56029*]. However, a metropolitan water district is not a "district" or a "special district," and any proceedings for a change of organization involving the entity [*see Gov. Code § 57000 et seq.*] must be conducted in accordance with the principal act authorizing the establishment of that entity [*Gov. Code § 56036(b)*]. Furthermore, if the LAFCO determines that a water conservation district, water replenishment district, the Orange County Water District, a California water storage district, a water agency, a county water authority or a water authority is not a "district" or a "special district," any proceedings for a change of organization involving the entity [*see Gov. Code § 57000 et seq.*] must be conducted in accordance with the principal act authorizing the establishment of that entity [*Gov. Code § 56036(c)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.212

§ 575.212 Overlapping Districts

Some overlap of purpose and territory is inevitable given the broad scope of powers and purposes of water districts [*see, e.g., Water Code §§ 31000-31187* (county water districts); *Water Code §§ 43000-44105* (water storage districts); *Water Code §§ 71590-71759* (municipal water districts)]. While cooperation between water districts having overlapping territory and some overlapping purposes is often specifically provided for by statute, more frequently it is not [*see, e.g., Water Code §§ 31150-31162* and *Water Code §§ 31180-31182* (relations between county water districts and irrigation districts and municipality utility districts, respectively)].

When each district enjoys some powers not held by the other, neither district is of a greater or higher class. The overlapping of one district by another, each having different powers as well as some in common, does not affect the continued existence of either [*36 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 299-300 (1960)* ; *see, e.g., Water Code § 30065* (public corporation or agency having substantially identical purposes as county water district is not destroyed, nor are its powers impaired, by annexation of all or part of agency's territory by county district)].

When one water district is adequately providing a particular service within an area under the jurisdiction of two districts having common powers over the subject, the district first in time and functioning in the area should continue to provide the service without duplication by the other. Any further problem should be solved by the governing bodies of the two districts in a manner which will work to the best advantage of the inhabitants and with the least tax burden [*see South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Dist. v. Santa Clara Valley Water Dist. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 852, 861-862, 143 Cal. Rptr. 193]* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.213

§ 575.213 District Merged With City

Only when all the territory of a district is annexed to or is entirely embraced within the boundaries of an incorporated city having powers equal to and greater than those of the district is the district dissolved and merged with the city by operation of law. The partial inclusion of a district within a city having powers equal to and greater than those of the district does not operate to dissolve the district in the overlapping area [36 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 297-300 (1960)]
.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.214-575.229

[Reserved]

§§ 575.214[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.230

§ 575.230 Federal Constitution

General Welfare Clause. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8*

Commerce Clause. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 8(3)*

Compact Clause. U.S. *Const., art. I, § 10(3)*

Jurisdiction of United States Supreme Court. U.S. *Const., art. III, § 2*

Property Clause. U.S. *Const., art. IV, § 3*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.231

§ 575.231 State Constitution

Public access to navigable waters. *Cal. Const., Art. X, § 4*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.232

§ 575.232 Federal Statutes

Federal Power Act. *16 U.S.C. §§ 791a-828c*

Desert Land Act of 1877. *43 U.S.C. §§ 321-323*

Reclamation Act of 1902. *43 U.S.C. §§ 371-600e*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.233

§ 575.233 State Statutes

State is owner of water. *Civ. Code § 670*

Boundaries of land bordering navigable waters. *Civ. Code § 830*

Accession to real property resulting from actions of water. *Civ. Code §§ 1014-1018*

Stream flowing from California into another state is subject to California laws. *Civ. Code § 1410a*

Obstruction of navigable water is nuisance or misdemeanor. Civ. Code § 3479, Harb. & Nav. Code *§ 131, Penal Code* § 370

Public access to natural resources. *Gov. Code §§ 66478.1-66478.14*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.234

§ 575.234 Decisions

[1] Flood Waters

Landowner is not usually required to maintain obstruction built for purpose of protection from flood waters or to refrain from restoring natural conditions; when obstruction was intended to be permanent and community has adjusted itself to its existence, for time beyond prescriptive period, new condition will be regarded is though it were natural and landowner is not allowed to destroy it. *Clement v. State Reclamation Board (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 628, 638-639, 220 P.2d 897*

Flood waters is common enemy that must be guarded against; property owner is allowed to take defensive actions that are not calculated to interfere with current of natural channel to guard against water. *The Weinberg Co. v. Bixby (1921) 185 Cal. 87, 95, 196 P. 25*

Liability of defendants depends on reasonability of their conduct in action brought by neighbors for erosion of their property allegedly resulting from defendants' alteration of flow of creek by placing riprap (boulders) along banks to prevent washing away of their own property. *Weaver v. Bishop (1988) 206 Cal. App. 3d 1351, 1353-1359, 254 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Flood water is defined as extraordinary overflow of rivers and streams. *Martinson v. Hughey (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 318, 325, 244 Cal. Rptr. 795*

[2] Interplay Between Federal and State Rules

Federal Power Act (*16 U.S.C. § 791a et seq.*) preempts state regulation regarding minimum instream flow requirements for hydroelectric project of federally licensed power plant; federal interest in accomplishing congressional objectives of protecting wildlife and ensuring economical feasibility of federally licensed power plants, precludes California from

imposing significantly higher minimum stream flow requirements than those of *Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. State of California v. FERC (1990) 495 U.S. 490, 506-507, 110 S. Ct. 2024, 109 L. Ed. 2d 474*

State statute limiting transport of ground water to states granting reciprocal rights violates of Commerce Clause. *Sporhase v. Nebraska ex rel. Douglas (1982) 458 U.S. 941, 957-958, 102 S. Ct. 3456, 73 L. Ed. 2d 1254*

United States assertion of authority under Commerce Clause to utilize or regulate water flow of navigable water is not taking of property in *Fifth Amendment* sense because United States has superior navigation easement which precludes private ownership of water or its flow. *United States v. Grand River Dam Authority (1960) 363 U.S. 229, 231-232, 80 S. Ct. 1134, 4 L. Ed. 2d 1186 , reh'g denied, 364 U.S. 855, 81 S. Ct. 33, 5 L. Ed. 2d 78*

Equitable apportionment of benefits is doctrine governing interstate water controversies; controversies between states involve different considerations than controversies between private parties. *New Jersey v. New York (1930) 283 U.S. 336, 342-343, 51 S. Ct. 478, 75 L. Ed. 1104* ; *Connecticut v. Massachusetts (1930) 282 U.S. 660, 670-671, 51 S. Ct. 286, 75 L. Ed. 602*

Surcharge on price of water from project if water is put to agricultural or manufacturing use on land of one owner in excess of 160 acres is valid limitation of subsidy received by persons with large land holdings. *Metropolitan Water Dist. v. Marquardt (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 159, 186-188, 28 Cal. Rptr. 724, 379 P.2d 28*

Federal government has power to impose reasonable conditions on use of federal funds, property, and privileges, especially in regard to water projects; state is unable to compel use of federal property on terms other than those prescribed or authorized by *Congress. Ivanhoe Irrig. Dist. v. All Parties (1960) 53 Cal. 2d 692, 704, 3 Cal. Rptr. 317, 350 P.2d 69*

[3] Navigability Issues

Stream is not required to be navigable in fact throughout year in order to be navigable in law. *Hitchings v. Del Rio Woods Recreation & Park Dist. (1976) 55 Cal. App. 3d 560, 569-571, 127 Cal. Rptr. 830*

Navigability of river determines whether owners of riparian property may obstruct use of river because they own stream, banks, and bed or whether that obstruction would be nuisance under *Civ. Code § 3479*. *People ex rel. Baker v. Mack (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1044, 97 Cal. Rptr. 448*

Stream capable of use, and used, for pleasure boating is navigable even though stream is not used for commercial purpose; failure of Legislature to include stream within list of navigable waters in *Harb. & Nav. Code §§ 101-106* is of no consequence in determining navigability. *People ex rel. Baker v. Mack (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 1040, 1044, 1047-1049, 97 Cal. Rptr. 448*

Navigability caused by flood waters creates public navigation right until owners of flooded land, in whom title remains, reclaim land. *Bohn v. Albertson (1951) 107 Cal. App. 2d 738, 749-750, 238 P.2d 128*

[4] Public Trust

On entering Union, state is given ownership in public trust over all lands under waters subject to ebb and flow of tide, whether or not those waters are navigable; ownership rights remain in title holders when state has previously relinquished public trust claim to tidelands. *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Mississippi (1988) 484 U.S. 469, 476-484, 108 S. Ct. 791, 98 L. Ed. 2d 877*

Littoral property owners' fee simple title in shorezone of lake is impressed with public trust analagous to easement, acquired by state through prescription and held for benefit of public for purposes of commerce, navigation, fishing, recreation, and preservation of land in its natural state; public trust is applicable to lands between low and high watermarks of level of lake after construction of nearby dam since that was current level of lake. *State v. Superior Court of Lake County (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 210, 226-232, 172 Cal. Rptr. 696, 625 P.2d 239 (Clear Lake)* ; *Fogerty v. State of California (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 224, 233-234, 231 Cal. Rptr. 810 (Lake Tahoe)*

Tidelands public trust doctrine easement for commerce, navigation, and fishery exists only over those lands to which state acquired title on admission to Union; no easement for seawater flow through shallow lagoon as existing for property granted by Mexico to private ownership, ceded to United States, and patented under Act of 1851. *City of Los Angeles v. Venice Peninsula Properties (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1522, 1530-1535, 253 Cal. Rptr. 331*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.235

§ 575.235 Attorney General Opinions

Ocean ecological reserves established under Marine Resources Protection Act of 1990 (Cal. Const., art. X B) is limited to scientific research; all other human activity is excluded. *75 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 125, 129-130 (1992)*

State has authority to lease public lands beneath navigable lakes and rivers for purely private purposes and to exclude public from these lands except for privileged use in times of emergency to protect life or property. *61 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 56 (1978)*

Governor as having power to order mandatory rationing of water during "state of emergency." *60 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 99 (1977)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.236

§ 575.236 Law Reviews

Note, *Forcing the Federal Hand: Reserved Water Rights v. States' Rights for Instream Protection, 41 Hastings L.J. 1271 (1990)*

Note, *The Public Trust Doctrine Unprecedentedly Gains New Ground in Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Mississippi, 22 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 1319 (1989)*

Attwater and Markle, *Overview of California Water Rights and Water Quality Law, 19 Pac. L.J. 957 (1988)*

Dunn, *Cooperative Federalism in the Acquisition of Water Rights: A Federal Practitioner's Point of View, 19 Pac. L.J. 1323 (1988)*

Kramer, *Lake Tahoe, the Truckee River, and Pyramid Lake: The Past, Present, and Future of Interstate Water Issues, 19 Pac. L.J. 1339 (1988)*

Littleworth, *The Public Trust vs. The Public Interest, 19 Pac. L.J. 1201 (1988)*

Robie, *The Delta Decisions: The Quiet Revolution in California Water Rights, 19 Pac. L.J. 1111 (1988)*

Schultz and Weber, *Changing Judicial Attitudes Towards Property Rights in California Water Resources: From Vested Rights to Utilitarian Reallocations, 19 Pac. L.J. 1031 (1988)*

Steinberg and Schoenleber, *Salinity Control and the Riparian Right, 19 Pac. L.J. 1143 (1988)*

Trager, *Emerging Forums for Groundwater Dispute Resolution in California: A Glimpse at the Second Generation of Groundwater Issues and How Agencies Work Towards Problem Resolution, 20 Pac. L.J. 31 (1988)*

Walston, *Federal-State Water Relations in California: From Conflict to Cooperation, 19 Pac. L.J. 1299 (1988)*

Comment, *Imperial Irrigation District v. State Water Resources Control Board: Board as Arbiter of Reasonable and Beneficial Use of California Water, 19* Pac. L.J. 1565 (1988)

Comment, *California Water for National Forests: Reserved Rights, Riparian Rights, and Instream Appropriations, 20 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 921 (1987)*

Comment, *Small Hydroelectric Projects and State Water Rights, 18 Pac. L.J. 1225 (1987)*

Kelley, *Staging a Comeback--Section 8 of the Reclamation Act, 18 U.C.D. L. Rev. 97 (1984)*

Comment, *Hydroelectric Power, the Federal Power Act, and State Water Laws: Is Federal Preemption Water Over the Dam? 17 U.C.D. L. Rev. 1179 (1984)*

Comment, *States' Rights in Hydroelectric Development: The Interrelation Between California Water Law and Section 27 of the Federal Power Act, 18 U.S.F. L. Rev. 535 (1984)*

Comment, *The Adjudication of Indian Water Rights in State Courts, 19 U.S.F. L. Rev. 27 (1984)*

Comment, *The Fifth Amendment as a Limitation on the Public Trust Doctrine in Water Law, 15 Pacific L.J. 1291 (1984)*

Note, *Sporhase v. Nebraska ex rel. Douglas: A Call for New Approaches to Water Resource Management, 11 Hastings Const. L.Q. 283 (1984)*

Frank, *Forever Free: Navigability, Inland Waterways, and the Expanding Public Interest, 16 U.C.D. L. Rev. 579 (1983)*

Comment, *Constitutional Right to Fish: A New Theory of Access to the Waterfront, 16 U.C.D. L. Rev. 661 (1983)*

Comment, *The Public Trust After Lyon and Fogerty: Private Interests and Public Expectations--A New Balance, 16 U.C.D. L. Rev. 631 (1983)*

Hoff, *The Legal Battle over Mono Lake*, 2(1) Cal. Lawyer 28 (1982)

Walston, *The Public Trust Doctrine in the Water Rights Context: The Wrong Environmental Remedy, 22 Santa Clara L. Rev. 63 (1982)*

Note, *Lyon and Fogerty: Unprecedented Extensions of the Public Trust, 70 Cal. L. Rev. 1138 (1982)*

Comment, *The Effect of Geothermal Classification on the Use and Development of Water: Conflicts Between State and Federal Laws, 33 Hastings L.J. 427 (1981)*

Dunning, *The Significance of California's Public Trust Easement for California's Water Rights Law, 14 U.C.D. L. Rev. 357 (1980)*

Johnson, *Public Trust Protection for Stream Flows and Lake Levels, 14 U.C.D. L. Rev. 233 (1980)*

Walston, *Reborn Federalism in Western Water Law: The New Melones Dam Decision, 30 Hastings L.J. 1645 (1979)*

Comment, *Need for a Uniform Public-Private Boundary: Application of the High Water Boundary to Inland Navigable Lakes, 12 U.C.D. L. Rev. 125 (1979)*

Abrams, *Reserved Water Rights, Indian Rights and the Narrowing Scope of Federal Jurisdiction: The Colorado River Decision, 30 Stan. L. Rev. 1111 (1978)*

Comment, *Acreage, Residency and Excess-Land Sale: Striking a Balance Between Modern Agriculture and Historic Water Policy, 15 San Diego L. Rev. 887 (1978)*

Comment, *Federal Water Projects: After California v. United States, What Rights Do the State and Federal Governments Have in the Water? 11 U.C.D. L. Rev. 401 (1978)*

McHugh, *Allocation of Water from Federal Reclamation Projects: Can the States Decide?*, 4 Ecol. L.Q. 343 (1974)

Note, *California's Tideland Trust: Shoring It Up, 22 Hastings L.J. 759 (1971)*

Note, *Public Recreation and Subdivisions on Lakes and Reservoirs in California, 23 Stan. L. Rev. 811 (1971)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.237

§ 575.237 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law (9th ed. 1987), Vol. 4, *Real Property*, §§ 756-761

62, 63 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Waters*, §§ 50-64, 422-431, 756-819

93 C.J.S., *Waters*, §§ 1-2, 18-19, 103-111

78 Am. Jur. 2d, *Waters*, §§ 1-4, 59-85, 223-228

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
1. Interplay of State and Federal Systems

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.238-575.249

[Reserved]

§§ 575.238[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
2. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.250

§ 575.250 State Statutes

Fees. *Water Code § 1525 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
2. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.251

§ 575.251 Decisions

Owner of unimproved real property has no cause of action against Department of Health Services based on moratorium on new water service connections, when local water district imposed moratorium, and Department issued new permit to water district on condition that it continue existing moratorium; Department has discretion under former Health & Safety Code § 4010 et seq. (*now see Health & Safety Code § 116325 et seq.*) (procedures regarding issuance of water permits to water districts) to require water district to continue moratorium, and does not have nondiscretionary duty to issue permit without conditions once it made required potability determinations. *Gilbert v. State of California (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 234, 248-249, 266 Cal. Rptr. 891*

Potential water user does not possess absolute right to be afforded water service; cause of action for inverse condemnation under *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19*, is not established based on denial of application for new water service connection for use on real property that, when purchased, lacked service connection to water district system. *Gilbert v. State of California (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 234, 249-258, 266 Cal. Rptr. 891*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
2. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.252

§ 575.252 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
2. Nature and Acquisition of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.253-575.269

[Reserved]

§§ 575.253[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.270

§ 575.270 State Constitution

General welfare of state requires fullest beneficial use of waters. *Cal. Const., art. X, § 2*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.271

§ 575.271 State Statutes

Conservation of fish and wildlife resources through protection of rivers, streams, and lakes. *Fish & Game Code § 1600 et seq.*

Diversion or obstruction of watercourse designated by Department of Fish and Game as wildlife resource without notice is unlawful. *Fish & Game Code § 1602*

Costa-Isenberg Water Transfer Act of 1986. *Water Code §§ 470-484*

Unauthorized diversion or use of water is trespass resulting in administratively imposed civil penalties. *Water Code § 1052 et seq.*

Appropriation of water and determination of water rights. *Water Code §§ 1200-2866*

Applications to appropriate water. *Water Code §§ 1250-1271*

Appropriation permits. *Water Code §§ 1375-1431*

Joint use and development. *Water Code §§ 1750-1814*

Agricultural Water Conservation and Management Act of 1992. *Water Code § 10520 et seq.*

Agricultural Water Management Planning Act. *Water Code §§ 10800-10855*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.272

§ 575.272 Decisions

[1] Appropriative Rights

Appellate court's direction to trial court to issue appropriate writs commanding State Water Resources Control Board to attach conditions mandated by *Fish & Game Code § 5946* to licenses that it issued to local power agency, requiring that agency release sufficient water from its dams into streams to protect preexisting fisheries, subject to immediate compliance by virtue of statutory mandate; water board not entitled to delay implementation of court directive while conducting administrative hearing to determine feasibility. *California Trout, Inc. v. Superior Court (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 187, 203, 207-213, 266 Cal. Rptr. 788*

Denial of petitions for writs of mandate seeking rescission of licenses confirming rights to appropriation of water improperly denied when licenses violated *Fish & Game Code §§ 5937* and *5946*, requiring licenses to appropriate water in Mono and Inyo counties to be conditioned on dam owners allowing sufficient flow of water to keep fish below dam in good condition; *Fish & Game Code § 5946* not limited to appropriation of water obtained by diversion from dams constructed after September 9, 1953, effective date of statute. *California Trout, Inc. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 585, 598-633, 255 Cal. Rptr. 184*

Public trust imposes duty of continuing supervision on state over taking and use of appropriated water; state not confined to past allocation decisions which might be incorrect in light of current knowledge or inconsistent with current needs, but has power to reconsider allocation decisions; no vested rights bar that reconsideration. *United States v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 82, 149-150, 227 Cal. Rptr. 161*

Filing application for appropriative water right confers possessory interest in real property pending perfection of appropriator's right to take water; applicant able to maintain action against trespassers or hostile claimants. *Miller & Lux, Inc. v. Bank of America (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 719, 726, 28 Cal. Rptr. 401*

[2] Board Actions

Board has broad discretion to act on appropriation applications, but may not arbitrarily and capriciously reject application. *People v. Shirokow (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 301, 310, 162 Cal. Rptr. 30, 605 P.2d 859* ; *East Bay M. U. Dist. v. Dept. of P. Wks. (1934) 1 Cal. 2d 476, 481, 35 P.2d 1027*

Under *Water Code §§ 1253-1256*, "public interest" is primary statutory standard guiding board in acting on applications to appropriate water. *Bank of America v. State Water Resources Control Bd (1974) 42 Cal. App. 3d 198, 212, 116 Cal. Rptr. 770*

[3] Diversion Requirements in General

Fish & Game Code § 1603, requiring notice to Department of Fish and Game before any diversion or obstruction of streambed designated as wildlife resource by department, is constitutional, and violation is a misdemeanor. *Rutherford v. State of California (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1267, 1278, 233 Cal. Rptr. 781*

[4] Generally

Watercourse is a stream, containing definite bed, banks, and channel, which flows into some other river, stream, lake, or sea; none of these characteristics is an absolute fixed factor. *South Santa Clara Etc. Dist. v. Johnson (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 388, 393-394, 403, 41 Cal. Rptr. 846*

Owner of land in which spring with no natural outlet lies owns water as completely as he or she does soil. *State of California v. Hansen (1961) 189 Cal. App. 2d 604, 610, 11 Cal. Rptr. 335*

[5] Prescription

Owner of prescriptive right who ceased for period of more than five years to apply any part of water to beneficial use loses right to water. *Bazet v. Nugget Bar Placers, Inc. (1931) 211 Cal. 607, 617-618, 296 P. 616*

Water easement rights conveyed by grant able to be enlarged by enlarged claim exercised openly, notoriously, continuously, and adversely during prescription period of five years. *Security Pac. Nat. Bank v. City of San Diego (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 421, 432, 432 n.3, 97 Cal. Rptr. 61*

[6] Riparian

Riparian right not lost by nonuse, but subject to appropriation and beneficial use by others. *In re Waters of Long Valley Creek Stream System (1979) 25 Cal. 3d 339, 358-359, 158 Cal. Rptr. 350, 599 P.2d 656* ; *Wright v. Goleta Water Dist. (1985) 174 Cal. App. 3d 74, 83, 219 Cal. Rptr. 740* ; *Orange County Water District v. City of Riverside (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 137, 184, 343 P.2d 450*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.273

§ 575.273 Attorney General Opinions

Ocean ecological reserves established under Marine Resources Protection Act of 1990 (Cal. Const., art, XB) limited to scientific research; all other human activity excluded. *75 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 125, 129-130 (1992)*

Proposed regulations of State Water Resources Control Board providing procedure for determination of instream flow requirements not authorized under *Water Code §§ 1000-5976*. *63 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 95 (1980)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.274

§ 575.274 Law Reviews

Note, *Groundwater Rights on Public Land in California, 35 Hastings L.J. 1007 (1984)*

Comment, *The Application of California Riparian Water Rights Doctrine to Federal Lands in the Mono Lake Basin, 34 Hastings L.J. 1293 (1983)*

Comment, *Groundwater: A Call for A Comprehensive Management Program, 14 Pac. L.J. 1279 (1983)*

Rossmann and Steel, *Forging the New Water Law: Public Regulation of 'Proprietary' Groundwater Rights, 33 Hastings L.J. 903 (1982)*

Comment, *The Public Trust Doctrine and California Water Law: National Audubon Society v. Department of Water and Power, 33 Hastings L.J. 653 (1982)*

Note, *People v. Shirokow: Abolishing Prescriptive Water Rights Against the State, 69 Cal. L. Rev. 1204 (1981)*

Trelease, *Legal Solutions to Groundwater Problems: A General Overview, 11 Pac. L.J. 863 (1980)*

Comment, *Protecting Streamflows in California,* 8 Ecol. L.Q. 697 (1980)

Comment, *Protection of a Riparian's Right to Prospective Water Use: A Constitutional Shell Game, 11 Pac. L.J. 1113 (1980)*

Comment, *Administrative Water Rights Inspections in California, 12 U.C. Davis L. Rev. 105 (1979)*

Comment, *Litigation of the Reclamation Law in the Imperial Valley: Who has Standing to Challenge Which Law? 14*

Cal. W. L. Rev. 563 (1979)

Note, *Cappaert v. United States: A Dehydration of Private Groundwater Use? 14 Cal. W. L. Rev. 382 (1978)*

Comment, *California Civil Code Section 830: A Rule of Property Needed for the Protection of the Private Landowner, 9 Pac. L.J. 1011 (1978)*

Gleason, *Los Angeles v. San Fernando: Ground Water Management in the Grand Tradition, 4 Hastings Const. L.Q. 703 (1977)*

Maloney & Ausness, *A Modern Proposal for State Regulation of Consumptive Uses of Water, 22* Hastings L.J. 523 (1971)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.275

§ 575.275 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 4, *Real Property*, §§ 754-806 (9th ed. 1987)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
3. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.276-575.289

[Reserved]

§§ 575.276[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
4. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.290

§ 575.290 State Statutes

References to State Water Resources Control Board. *Water Code §§ 2000-2048*

Adjudications involving statutory procedures. *Water Code §§ 2500-2866*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
4. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.291

§ 575.291 Decisions

New appropriator's burden of proving existence of surplus from which it can extract quantity of water it desires without injury to those with prior rights arises only after riparians first proved the amount required by them for reasonable beneficial purposes. *Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 535, 45 P.2d 972* ; *Peabody v. City of Vallejo (1935) 2 Cal. 2d 351, 381, 40 P.2d 486*

Appropriator is able to claim only amount necessary to properly supply needs, and is permitted no waste; appropriator is not bound to adopt best methods for utilizing water or to take extraordinary precautions to prevent waste. *Tulare Irrigation Dist. v. Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation Dist. (1935) 3 Cal. 2d 489, 573, 45 P.2d 972*

Trial court with expressly reserved jurisdiction over consent judgment prohibiting water district from interfering with defendant water company's use of water from lake does not abdicate its responsibilities under public trust doctrine in refusing to consider adoption of plan of water district, allegedly designed to increase water use efficiency, interpreting and modifying physical solution injunction. *Big Bear Mun. Water Dist. v. Bear Valley Mutual Water Co. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 363, 375-384, 254 Cal. Rptr. 757*

Board has power to adjudicate all competing water claims, even riparian claims and prescriptive claims which do not fall within appropriative licensing system. *Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1160, 1169, 231 Cal. Rptr. 283*

Judicial action is merited even without annual overdraft when sufficient injury can be shown either through requiring wells to be deepened or abandoned and through increased pumping costs throughout basin. *Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
4. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.292

§ 575.292 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

Witkin, Summary of California Law (9th ed. 1987), Vol. 4, *Real Property*, § 762

62, 63 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Waters*, §§ 442-513

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Rights to Water
4. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.293-575.309

[Reserved]

§§ 575.293[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.310

§ 575.310 Federal Statutes

Safe Drinking Water Act. *42 U.S.C. § 300f et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.311

§ 575.311 State Statutes

[1] Definitions

Water system defined. *Pub Util. Code § 240*

Water corporation defined. *Pub. Util. Code § 241*

[2] Delivery Requirements

Requirement of water corporation to deliver water in reasonable manner. *Civ. Code § 549*

Standards of water delivered by public water systems. *Pub. Util. Code § 4010 et seq.*

Adequate water service requirements. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 8201-8204*

[3] Miscellaneous

Special rules apply to corporations formed to furnish water. *Civ. Code §§ 548-552*; *Corp. Code §§ 14300-14303*

Public acquisition of utility properties. Civ. Code § 1401et seq.

Actions by water utilities against unauthorized taking of services. *Civ. Code §§ 1882-1882.6*

Water company is quasi-public entity able to take water through eminent domain. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1245.320*; *Pub. Util. Code § 2729*

Water corporation is public utility. *Pub. Util. Code § 216*

Certificate of public convenience and necessity is required of water corporations. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1001-1011*

Water companies are public utilities. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 2701-2714*

Duties and liabilities of municipal water franchises. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 6291-6302*

Municipality's rights in public lands and waters. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 10151-10155*

[4] Private Water Companies

Requirements for mutual water companies formed in connection with subdivided lands. *Corp. Code § 14310 et seq.*

Private and mutual water companies are not subject to Public Utilities Commission. *Pub Util. Code § 2705*

Private and mutual water service law. *Pub. Util. Code §§ 2725-2729*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.312

§ 575.312 Decisions

[1] Actions on Contract

Injunction to refrain from diverting water does not excuse water company from contract obligation to supply irrigation water, especially when injunction was three years old and water company took no steps to have injunction dissolved. *Sample v. Fresno Flume Etc. Co. (1900) 129 Cal. 222, 226-228, 61 P. 1085*

Municipality's acceptance of district's offer to supply water by enactment of ordinance creates binding contract; recovery of costs of system is based on landowner's proportionate share of capacity of whole line. *American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. v. Home Sav. and Loan Assn. (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 73, 80-81, 112 Cal. Rptr. 897*

Requirements contract between subdivision developer and water company binds subdivider to look to water company for all water service and binds company to extend its service into additional units whenever extension provisions went into operation. *Citizens Suburban Co. v. Rosemont Dev. Co. (1966) 244 Cal. App. 2d 666, 677-678, 53 Cal. Rptr. 551*

Regular rules of contract interpretation apply in contract dispute between water company and community service district. *Bakersfield Country Club v. Pacific Water Co. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 528, 535-537, 13 Cal. Rptr. 573*

When contract consideration running to upstream promissor was that promisor could use water flowing in river without regard to downstream promissee's water rights, subsequent diminishment or drying up of river does not relieve promisor from liability on promise. *Riverside Water Co. v. Jurupa Ditch Co. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 538, 542, 9 Cal. Rptr. 742*

[2] Extension of Service

Water public utility seeking to extend its main beyond its dedicated area was required to comply with terms and conditions in its main extension rule on file with Public Utilities Commission, and must obtain PUC authority for any

deviations; PUC was unable to compel water utility to extend its mains into a wholly new proposed residential community to be created in nondedicated territory. *Cal. Water & Tel. Co. v. Public Util. Com. (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 501-502, 334 P.2d 887*

[3] Liability for Failure to Provide Water

Primary business of water company is being furnisher of water as commodity; liability for fire loss is not within ordinary relation of water distributor and consumer and is created only by express private contract to that effect. *Lainer Investments v. Department of Water & Power (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 1, 9-13, 215 Cal. Rptr. 812* ; *Luis v. Orcutt Town Water Co. (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 433, 438-440, 22 Cal. Rptr. 389*

[4] Miscellaneous

Water rights acquired from riparian owners are taxable. *San Francisco v. County of Alemeda (1936) 5 Cal. 2d 243, 246-247, 54 P.2d 462*

[5] Rates

City acquisition of water system of another community obligates city to deal fairly with customers in that community and to provide them with service at reasonable rates; rates established by lawful rate-fixing body are presumed reasonable, fair, and lawful; lack of uniformity in rates does not establish unreasonableness. *Hansen v. City of San Buenaventura (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 1172, 1180-1181, 233 Cal. Rptr. 22, 729 P.2d 186*

In action by water company against water district alleging excessive charges for water provided under water service agreement, and seeking declaration that charges were unconstitutional under Cal. Const., art. XIIIB (limiting government's authority to expend proceeds of taxes), defendant has burden of proving compliance with art. XIIIB, that is, that fees are not excessive and therefore "proceeds of taxes" for purposes of invoking constitutional prohibition. *Oildale Mutual Wat. Co. v. North of the River Mun. Wat. Dist. (1989) 215 Cal. App. 3d 1628, 1634, 264 Cal. Rptr. 544*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.313

§ 575.313 Law Reviews

Note, *The Thirst for Population Control: Water Hookup Moratoria and the Duty to Augment Supply*, *27 Hastings LJ 753 (1976)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.314

§ 575.314 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

62, 63 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Waters*, §§ 549-608, 820-843

121 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.315-575.329

[Reserved]

§§ 575.315[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.330

§ 575.330 State Statutes

[1] Local Agencies

Uniform procedures for imposing standby charges. *Gov. Code § 54984 et seq.*

Local agency formation commission. *Gov. Code § 56300 et seq.*

Commission proceedings for change of organization or reorganization. *Gov. Code § 56650 et seq.*

Conducting authority proceedings for change of organization or reorganization. *Gov. Code § 57000 et seq.*

Conditions and effect of change of organization or reorganization. *Gov. Code § 57300 et seq.*

[2] Water Districts

County Water District Law. *Water Code § 30000 et seq.*

California Water District Law. *Water Code § 34000 et seq.*

California Water Storage District Law. *Water Code § 39000 et seq.*

Reclamation Districts. *Water Code § 50000 et seq.*

County Waterworks District Law. *Water Code § 55000 et seq.*

County Drainage District Act. *Water Code § 56000 et seq.*

Water Replenishment District Act. *Water Code § 60000 et seq.*

Levee District Law of 1959. *Water Code § 70000 et seq.*

Municipal Water District Law of 1911. *Water Code § 71000 et seq.*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.331

§ 575.331 Decisions

Writ of mandamus is proper to compel public irrigation district to fulfill its statutory duties; petition is required to show that (1) district has clear duty; (2) petitioner has beneficial interest in district's performance of that duty; (3) district has ability to perform duty; (4) district has failed to perform duty or has abused its discretion in performing duty; and (5) petitioner has no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy. *Elmore v. Imperial Irrigation Dist. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 185, 193, 205 Cal. Rptr. 433*

Municipal water district's promulgation of rates for water and sewer services is quasi-legislative and reviewable only by means of ordinary mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; standard of review is whether actions were arbitrary or capricious or whether district failed to follow procedure and give notices required by law. Car lton *Santee Corp. v. Padre Dam Mun. Water Dist. (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 14, 18-19, 174 Cal. Rptr. 413*

Municipal water district is quasi-municipal corporation with broad grant of legislative policy-making power; merger agreement by which two public agencies join to form one integrated water system is within authority of *Water Code §§ 71722, 71723*. *Hewitt v. Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water Dist. (1980) 107 Cal. App. 3d 78, 84, 89, 165 Cal. Rptr. 545*

General district first in time and functioning in area of overlap with special district continues to have authority within its own territory without interference. *South Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation Dist. v. Santa Clara Valley Water Dist. (1978) 76 Cal. App. 3d 852, 861-862, 143 Cal. Rptr. 193*

List of agencies in *Cal. Const., Art. XIII, § 40*, which prohibits incurring indebtedness exceeding income and revenue without election, is exclusive; water district's performing functions traditionally performed by county are not sufficient to subject it to debt limitation applicable to county. *Vanoni v. County of Sonoma (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 743, 748-750, 115 Cal. Rptr. 485*

Administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* is not available to review water district's decision to grant or

withhold its consent to annexation of part of its territory by another water district. *Wilson v. Hidden Valley Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 271, 276-277, 63 Cal. Rptr. 889*

Consent is condition precedent to formation of new district containing in whole or in part territory of existing district or annexation by district of portion of another district. *Fuller v. San Bernardino Valley Mun. Wat. Dist. (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 52, 63, 51 Cal. Rptr. 120*

Water Code § 30065 requires consent of county water district before new public agency with substantial identity of purpose is formed within district; "purpose" as object to be attained or end sought. *Andressen v. Board of Supervisors (1965) 235 Cal. App. 2d 436, 442, 45 Cal. Rptr. 306*

124 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.332

§ 575.332 Law Reviews

Comment, *Water Districts Contracting For Water With the Bureau of Reclamation--Can a State-Created Entity Violate State Laws? 11 UCD L Rev 473 (1978)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.333

§ 575.333 Text References

Slater, California Water Law and Policy (Matthew Bender)

63 Cal. Jur. 3d, *Waters*, §§ 844-1036

126 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.334-515.349

[Reserved]

§§ 575.334[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.350

§ 575.350 Appropriation of Water--Application--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Application--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to apply for a permit to appropriate water. Use of the form is mandatory [*see Water Code § 1252*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 705*]. An application will not be accepted unless the filing fee is also submitted [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 676*; *see Water Code § 1525(b)(1)*]. An application is complete when the State Board has certified that the applicant has fully and completely disclosed all information required [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 656(a)*; *see 23 Cal. Code Reg. § 683* regarding necessity of submitting environmental information; for the environmental information form, *see § 575.352*]. If an application is incomplete [*see 23 Cal. Code Reg. § 656(b)*], but the applicant has made a bona fide attempt to conform to the laws and regulations, the Board will notify the applicant of the incompleteness and allow 60 days for an amended and completed application to be filed. For good cause shown, this time may be extended. If an amended and completed application is not filed within the time allowed, the application may be canceled without notice [*see Water Code §§ 1270, 1270*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 679*].

After receipt of a conforming application, the Board will issue and deliver a notice of that application to the applicant and to the district attorney and the board of supervisors of each county in which water is to be diverted [*Water Code § 1300*]. The notice serves to provide information concerning protests to the application [*see Water Code § 1304*]. Appropriation rights to water may only be obtained through compliance with this application procedure [*Water Code § 1225*; *see § 575.55[2]*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] State Statutes

Water subject to appropriation. *Water Code §§ 1200-1202*

Treated waste water. *Water Code §§ 1210-1212*

Appropriation from interstate streams. *Water Code §§ 1230-1232*

Appropriation applications. *Water Code §§ 1250-1259*

Rejection of application. *Water Code § 1255*

Content of application. *Water Code §§ 1260-1266*

Notice of application. *Water Code §§ 1300-1324*

Proceedings on application. *Water Code §§ 1340-1353*

Priority of application. *Water Code § 1450*

Application fees. *Water Code § 1525(b)(1)*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Incomplete or defective applications. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 656, 679-683*

Uses requiring separate applications. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 686-689*

Instances of reasonable water requirements. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 697*

Application for excessive amount of water. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 698*

Content of application. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 705-711*

Application and accompanying statements must be sworn to. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 711*

Map requirements. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 715-724*

Application when existing right is claimed. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 731*

[5] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.351* and *575.352*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.351

§ 575.351 Appropriation of Water--Supplement to Application--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Supplement to Application--Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to supplement the application for a permit to appropriate water. When directed by the State Board, the applicant must supplement the application with a statement showing the maximum quantity of water, in acre-feet or other unit of measurement prescribed by the Board, that will be beneficially used each month during the proposed season of use [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 708*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.350*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.352

§ 575.352 Appropriation of Water--Environmental Information--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Environmental Information--State Board Form [Water Code § 1252]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to provide environmental information in an application for a permit to appropriate water. The State Board may request an applicant to supplement the application with information necessary to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*). Failure by the applicant to comply with such a request within a reasonable time and in a responsive manner may be cause for the Board to cancel or reject the application [*see 23 Cal. Code Reg. § 683*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov. In addition, the regional water quality control boards provide detailed information about the individual boards, such as regional maps, news, events, activities, and meeting agendas within a particular region. To locate a particular region, go to www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcbs/index/html.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.350*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.353

§ 575.353 Appropriation of Water--Statement of Posting Notice--State Board Form [Water Code § 1300]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Statement of Posting Notice--Board Form [Water Code § 1300]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board form for use by the applicant in posting notice of his or her application for a permit to appropriate water. As soon as practicable after receiving a complete application and, if an instream beneficial use assessment is required by *Water Code § 1250.5* (small hydroelectric project), as soon as practicable after the determination that the instream beneficial use assessment is adequate, the State Board will issue a notice. The applicant will be directed to post or publish it [*Water Code § 1300*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 684(a)*].

When the application is for three cubic feet or less per second or for 200 acre-feet or less per annum of storage, the Board will mail three copies of the notice to the applicant by registered mail and will send a copy by registered mail to each person known or judged by the Board to be interested in the application [*Water Code §§ 1320, 1321*]. The applicant must post the notice within 20 days of its issuance in at least two conspicuous places in the locality to be affected by the proposed application [*Water Code § 1322*].

The applicant, or the person posting notice on the applicant's behalf, must submit proof of posting by an affidavit (or declaration under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) filed within 40 days from the date of issuance of the notice [*Water Code § 1323*]. Failure to file proof of posting may result in the Board's cancelling the application after giving the applicant notice and 15 days in which to file the proof [*Water Code § 1324*].

[3] State Statutes

Contents of notice. *Water Code §§ 1300-1304*

Publication of notice for more than three cubic feet per second or more than 200 acre-feet per annum of storage. *Water Code §§ 1310-1317*

Notice of petition for permission to change. *Water Code § 1703*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Issuance of new notice. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 684(b)*

Effect of issuance of notice. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 685*

Applications within wild and scenic river system. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 734*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.350*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.354

§ 575.354 Appropriation of Water--Protest--State Board Form [Water Code § 1330]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Protest--Board Form [Water Code § 1330]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use by any interested person to protest an application to appropriate water. One side of the form is for use when the protest is based on injury to vested rights. The other side is for use when the protest is based on environmental considerations, public interest, public trust, and other issues. Any interested person may, within the time allowed in the notice of application or within a further time allowed for good cause, file a written protest [*Water Code § 1330*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 747*]. The time allowed for protests of an application for more than three cubic feet per second or for more than 200 acre-feet per annum of storage is 60 days from the date of issuance of the notice; for applications for those amounts or less, the time allowed is 40 days [*Water Code §§ 1302, 1303*].

A duplicate copy of the protest must be sent to the applicant. Depending on the grounds of the protest, it must contain specific allegations [*see 23 Cal. Code Reg. § 745*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] Resolving the Protest

The protestant and the applicant must make a good faith effort to resolve the protest within 180 days from the date on which the period provided under *Water Code § 1330* expires. However, for good cause, the State Board may allow additional time for the protestant and the applicant to attempt to resolve the protest [*Water Code § 1333*]. The Board

may request the protestant or the applicant to supply additional information that the Board determines is reasonably necessary to attempt to resolve the protest [*Water Code § 1334*], and may cancel a protest or application for failure to provide the information requested by the Board within the time period provided [*Water Code § 1335*].

[4] Field Investigations Required for Minor Applications

The State Board's Division of Water Rights must conduct a field investigation of all minor protested applications [*Water Code § 1345*]. "Minor applications" are applications that do not involve direct diversions in excess of three cubic-feet per second or storage in excess of 200 acre-feet per year [*Water Code § 1348*]. The Board must notify the parties not less than 20 days before conducting the field investigation, so that the parties may attend and present information to the Board [*Water Code § 1345*]. The Division of Water Rights may request the parties to submit information in support of their positions before, during, or after the field investigation. After the field investigation, the Division of Water Rights may conduct additional proceedings in accordance with the informal hearing procedure set forth in *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1346*]. Based on the field investigation and any other information it has obtained, the Division of Water Rights must issue a decision unless the Board determines that additional proceedings should be conducted [*Water Code § 1347*]. The decision is subject to review as provided in *Water Code § 1120 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1347*].

[5] State Statutes

Protest of application. *Water Code §§ 1330, 1331*

Notice of hearing on protested application. *Water Code §§ 1340, 1341*

[6] Administrative Regulations

Protest requirements. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 745*

Rejection of protest. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 749*

Abandonment of protest. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 750*

Answers to protests. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 751, 752*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.355

§ 575.355 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Correction of Description--State Board Form [Water Code § 1701]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Petition for Correction of Description--Board Form [Water Code § 1701]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to petition for correction of the description of the point of diversion or place of use. Changes in an application, permit, or license may be made with the State Board's permission [*Water Code § 1701*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 791*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] Administrative Regulations

Changes before notice of application. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 797*

Changes to cover incidental uses of reservoir. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 798*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.356*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.356

§ 575.356 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Change in Point of Diversion or Place of Use--State Board Form [Water Code § 1700]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Petition for Change in Point of Diversion or Place of Use--Board Form [Water Code § 1700]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use by an applicant, permittee, or licensee to petition the State Board for a change in the point of diversion or place of use from that specified in the application, permit, or license or for the addition of a point of rediversion. The change may be made at any time after notice of the application has been given, but only with the permission of the Board [*Water Code § 1701*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 791*]. The petitioner must also give written notice of the proposed change to the Department of Fish and Game [*Water Code § 1703*]. Before any change is granted, the petitioner must establish to the Board's satisfaction, and it must find, that the change will not operate to the injury of any legal user of the water involved. The required fee must be submitted before the petition will be considered [*Water Code § 1702*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 791*]. The Board may require that the petitioner publish or otherwise give notice of the change in a manner prescribed by the Board [*Water Code § 1703*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 745*].

The Board has other specific forms of petitions that should be used to petition for change in the distribution of storage water or for change in the purpose of water use.

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] State Statutes

Procedure on protests to change petition. *Water Code §§ 1703.1-1703.6, 1704-1705*

Change involving temporary or long-term transfer of water or water rights and transfer of decreed rights. *Water Code § 1725 et seq.*

Fees. *Water Code § 1525(b)(4)*

Preservation or enhancement of environmental resources or recreational uses is basis for petition for change of water use. *Water Code § 1707*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Maps and data required. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 794*

Procedure on petitions. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 796*

Changes with board authority. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 791-799*

Temporary changes due to transfer of water or water right. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 800-803*

Changes involving long-term transfer. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 811-816*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.357

§ 575.357 Appropriation of Water--Protest to Change Petition--State Board Form [Water Code § 1704]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Protest to Change Petition--Board Form [Water Code § 1704]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to protest a change petition or an extension of time. One side of the form is for use when the protest is based on injury to vested rights. The other side is for use when the protest is based on environmental or public interest considerations. If a protest against a proposed change is filed with the State Board at any time before the Board grants permission to make the change pursuant to *Water Code § 1701*, the Board will set a time and place for a hearing on the petition and the objections [*Water Code § 1704*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] Minor Petition for Change

A minor petition for change is one that does not involve direct diversions in excess of three cubic-feet per second or storage in excess of 200 acre-feet per year [*Water Code § 1704.4*]. In the case of minor petitions, a protest does not automatically result in a hearing. Rather, the State Board's Division of Water Rights will conduct a field investigation. The Board must notify the parties not less than 20 days before conducting the field investigation, so that the parties may attend and present information to the Board [*Water Code § 1704.1*]. The Division of Water Rights may request the parties to submit information in support of their positions before, during, or after the field investigation. After the field investigation, the Division of Water Rights may conduct additional proceedings in accordance with the informal hearing procedure set forth in *Gov. Code § 11445.10 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1704.2*]. Based on the field investigation and any

other information it has obtained, the Division of Water Rights must issue an order acting on the minor petition for change unless the Board determines that additional proceedings should be conducted [*Water Code § 1704.3*].

[4] Judicial Review

The order of the Division of Water Rights is subject to review as provided in *Water Code § 1120 et seq.* [*Water Code § 1704.3*]. Any petition for a writ of mandate to inquire into the validity of the State Board's order after the hearing must be filed not later than 30 days from the date of final action by the Board [*Water Code § 1126*].

[5] Administrative Regulations

Protest requirements. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 745, 796*

Time for filing. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 747, 753, 796*

Answers to protests. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 751, 752, 796*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.354* and *575.356*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.358

§ 575.358 Appropriation of Water--Permit for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1380]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Permit for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1380]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form of permit granted by the State Board after the hearing on the application if the application is granted [*Water Code § 1380*; *see § 575.62*].

[3] State Statutes

Prerequisites to issuance of permit. *Water Code § 1375*

Issuance of permit. *Water Code §§ 1380-1382*

Permit terms and conditions. *Water Code §§ 1390-1394*

Application to beneficial use. *Water Code §§ 1395-1398*

Revocation of permit. *Water Code §§ 1410-1410.2*

Temporary permits. *Water Code §§ 1425-1431*

Permit fees. *Water Code § 1525(a)*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Approval of application for partial season of use. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 700*

Permit terms and conditions. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 780-784*

Enforcement of terms and conditions. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 820-823*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.359

§ 575.359 Appropriation of Water--Petition for Extension of Time--State Board Form [Water Code § 1398]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Petition for Extension of Time--State Board Form [Water Code § 1398]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use by the permittee to request an extension of time in putting the water to beneficial use [*Water Code § 1398*]. There is a mandatory fee, and extensions may be submitted on this form [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 842*]. Actual construction work on any project must begin within the time specified in the permit, which must not be less than 60 days from the date of the permit [*Water Code § 1395*]. Due diligence must be exercised in construction and water utilization, although time extensions may be granted for good cause shown [*Water Code §§ 1396, 1398*]. An extension of time will be granted only on those conditions that the State Board finds are in the public interest and on a showing that due diligence has been exercised, that failure to comply with previous time requirements was caused by obstacles that could not reasonably be avoided, and that satisfactory progress will be made if an extension is granted. Good cause does not usually include lack of finances, occupation with other work, physical disability, and other conditions affecting the person and not the enterprise [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 844*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] Notice

The State Board may require the permittee applying for an extension of time to cause notice to be given in a manner prescribed by the Board. Usually the Board does not require notice when the project is already under construction or a substantial financial commitment has been made, the project is not in an area of unusual competition for water, and the

project is not a large multi-stage project which may be behind schedule [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 843(a)*]. Protests to the extension of time may be filed and the Board may require a hearing [*23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 843(c), 844*]. After any hearing on a petition for extension of time, the Board may revoke the permit [*Water Code §§ 1398(b), 1410*].

[4] State Statutes

Revocation of permit. *Water Code § 1410*

Fee required. *Water Code § 1525(b)(3)*

[5] Administrative Regulations

Reasonable promptness in completion time. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 840*

Notice of petitions and protests. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 843*

Cause for extension. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 844*

Withholding issuance of permit. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 845*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.360

§ 575.360 Appropriation of Water--License for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1610]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--License for Diversion and Use of Water--State Board Form [Water Code § 1610]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form of license granted by the board. After a full inspection and examination of the works constructed, the use of the water therefrom, and a determination as to completion favorable to the permittee, the State Board will issue a license which confirms the right to the appropriation of the amount of water applied to beneficial use [*Water Code §§ 1605, 1610*; *see § 575.68*].

[3] State Statutes

Fees. *Water Code § 1525(a)*

Permittee's report of completion. *Water Code § 1600*

Examination and inspection. *Water Code § 1605*

Issuance of license, revocation of permit. *Water Code §§ 1610, 1611*

Review by court. *Water Code § 1126*

Contents and conditions of license. *Water Code §§ 1625-1631*

Filing with county recorder. *Water Code §§ 1650, 1651*

Revocation of license. *Water Code §§ 1675-1675.2*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.361

§ 575.361 Appropriation of Water--Complaint--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Complaint--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use by any person to make a complaint concerning a violation of any term or condition of a permit or license. It may be based on the effect of the violation on the complainant or may be made for the benefit of the public [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 820*]. The State Board may also act on its own motion [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 823*].

If, after investigation, the Board's Division of Water Rights finds that a violation has occurred that might be cause for enforcement action by the Board, the matter may be referred to the Board for hearing. If it is found that no violation occurred, the complainant will be notified and no further action taken unless the complainant requests a hearing, in which event the Board will determine whether to hold a hearing based on information supplied by the complainant and the Board's staff [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 821*].

After the requisite notice and hearing, if the Board finds that a violation has occurred, the Board may revoke the permit or license or take other appropriate action [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 822*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] State Statutes

Revocation of permit. *Water Code §§ 1410-1410.2*

Revocation of license. *Water Code §§ 1675-1675.2*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Contents of complaint. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 820*

Investigation of complaints. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 821*

Revocation of permits and licenses. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 850-852*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.362

§ 575.362 Appropriation of Water--Answer--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Answer--State Board Form [Water Code §§ 1410, 1675]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use by any person to answer a complaint concerning a violation of any term or condition of a permit or license. For the State Board's form of complaint, see *§ 575.361*.

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] State Statutes

Revocation of permit. *Water Code §§ 1410-1410.2*

Revocation of license. *Water Code §§ 1675-1675.2*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Contents of complaint. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 820*

Investigation of compaints. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 821*

Revocation of permits and licenses. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 850-852*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.363

§ 575.363 Appropriation of Water--Statement of Water Diversion and Use--State Board Form [Water Code § 5101]

[1] FORM Appropriation of Water--Statement of Water Diversion and Use--State Board Form [Water Code § 5101]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Water Rights, form for use to make a statement of water diversion and use. Each person who, after December 31, 1965, diverts water must file with the State Board, before July 1 of the succeeding year, a statement of diversion and use [*Water Code § 5101*]. However, *Water Code § 5101* lists several circumstances under which no statement needs to be filed, including diversions covered by an application, permit, or license to appropriate water on file with the Board. A separate statement must be filed for each point of diversion [*Water Code § 5102*]. Supplemental statements must be filed at three-year intervals [*Water Code § 5104*].

If any person fails to file the required statement, the Board may, at that person's expense, conduct its own investigation and determination, after first giving that person written notice of its intention and 60 days in which to file the statement without penalty [*Water Code § 5105*].

Neither the statements nor the Board determinations constitute evidence of a water right. However, they are evidence of the facts stated therein in a Board application proceeding [*Water Code §§ 5106, 5106*].

This form, as well as other Division of Water Rights forms and further water rights information, can be obtained at www.waterrights.ca.gov. The form is available in Adobe PDF format. The State Water Resources Control Board also maintains a useful website at www.swrcb.ca.gov.

[3] State Statutes

"Person" and "diversion" defined. *Water Code § 5100*

Contents of statement. *Water Code § 5103*

Penalties for willful misstatement. *Water Code § 5107*

Statements are for information purposes only. *Water Code § 5108*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.364

§ 575.364 Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel State Water Resources Control Board to Issue Permit to Appropriate Water [Water Code § 1126]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel State Water Resources Control Board to Issue Permit to Appropriate Water [Water Code § 1126]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. _____ [*Set forth identity of petitioner and if petitioner is not an individual, set forth petitioner's identity as corporation, partnership, or other entity capable of holding an interest in real property and its interest in appropriating water, e.g.,* Petitioner is a water company which delivers, supplies, and distributes water for domestic and irrigation uses, and acquires or constructs dams, canals, ditches, land, rights-of-way, or other appurtenances that are necessary to accomplish its purpose].

2. Respondent State Water Resources Control Board of the State of California is the board within the Resources Agency of the State of California charged with the orderly and efficient administration of water resources. Under *Water Code Sections 1250 through 1259*, the State Board is charged with investigating all applications to appropriate water and to exercise its judgment in issuing permits for appropriations which will best utilize water for the public interest. Pursuant to *Water Code Section 1350*, the Board is required to hold a hearing before rejecting any application to appropriate water.

3. On _____ [*date*], petitioner filed with the Board an Application to Appropriate Water, application No. _____, for a permit to appropriate unappropriated water of the State of California to be used _____ [*specify beneficial purpose, e.g.,* for irrigation and domestic purposes]. Petitioner made the application on a printed blank form prescribed by the Board and complied with all the application requirements. A copy of the application is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of the petition.

4. In that application petitioner sought to appropriate water from _____ [*specify the natural channel, e.g.,* Muddy River], a natural channel beginning _____ [*specify source, e.g.,* in the foothills of the Sierra Madre Mountains] and flowing in a generally _____ [*specify direction, e.g.,* southeasterly] direction to its termination in _____ [*specify location, e.g.,* the Pacific Ocean]. Petitioner sought to divert the water at _____ [*specify diversion point*], which is situated in _____ County, California.

5. The water that petitioner sought to appropriate was from the _____ [*specify the natural channel, e.g.,* Muddy River] and was unappropriated, and was therefore public water subject to appropriation under *Section 1201 of the Water Code*.

6. The State Board held a hearing on the application on _____ [*date*], and rejected petitioner's application in an order dated _____ [*date*]. A copy of the order containing the facts and conclusions on which it is based is attached to this petition as Exhibit B, and made a part of this petition.

[7. On _____ [*date*], petitioner filed a reconsideration petition with the State Board, pursuant to *Section 1122 of the Water Code*, requesting a reconsideration of the Board's rejection of the application.]

[8. The Board (held a hearing on the reconsideration petition on _____ (*date*), and) rejected petitioner's application in an order dated _____ (*date*). A copy of the order containing the facts and conclusions on which it is based is attached to this petition as Exhibit C, and made a part of this petition.]

9. _____ [*Allege the reason why the decision is invalid, e.g.,* The Board's refusal to issue the appropriation permit to petitioner was arbitrary and was not supported by the evidence, which indicated that the appropriation was urgently needed for domestic and irrigation purposes]. _____ [A verbatim transcript of the record of the hearing, containing the evidence received, is attached to this petition as Exhibit D and made a part of this petition *or* The substance of the evidence received at the hearing is as follows: _____ (*state substance of evidence*)].

[*EITHER, if alleging that evidence does not support findings*]

10. The evidence does not support the findings for the following reasons: _____ [*specify*].

[*AND/OR, if alleging that incompetent evidence was received*]

10. Petitioner objected at the hearing to the following evidence, on the grounds indicated, but in each instance petitioner's objection was not sustained and the evidence was received: _____ [*identify evidence, e.g.,* the testimony of _____ (*name*), which was offered to show _____ (*specify*); _____ (*specify and state ground for objection, e.g.,* the evidence was objected to on the ground that _____ (*specify*))].

[*CONTINUE*]

[11. Petitioner has the following relevant evidence which was not presented at the hearing: _____ (*describe completely*). This evidence could not be produced at the hearing because _____ (*specify why, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, petitioner could not produce evidence*). This evidence tends to show that _____ (*state what evidence will prove*).]

[12. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that respondent's action was arbitrary and capricious. As an incident of bringing and maintaining this proceeding, petitioner has become and is obligated personally to pay to his/her/its counsel _____ (*name*), attorney's fees _____ (exceeding $7,500 *or* in the sum of $_____).]

13. The Board has the duty to approve petitioner's application and issue an appropriation permit. Petitioner is the party beneficially interested, and has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law, but brings this petition under the authority of *Section 1126 of the Water Code*.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its order of _____ (*date*), rejecting petitioner's appropriation permit and to reconsider whether petitioner is entitled to receive a permit, or alternatively to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. For an order restraining operation of the State Board's cease and desist order of _____ (*date*), _____ (*specify effect of cease and desist order*), until further order of the court and for an order to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending the judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its order of _____ [*date*], rejecting petitioner's appropriation permit and directing respondent to reconsider whether petitioner is entitled to receive a permit;

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem equitable.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents tof this petition. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters that are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition is for use by an applicant, whose application for a permit to appropriate water was denied, to petition the court for a writ of mandate for relief from that denial. Any interested person may petition for a writ of mandate inquiring into the State Water Resources Control Board action. The petition must be made within 30 days of the State Board action [*Water Code § 1126(b)*]. Optional Paragraphs 7 and 8 should be included when the applicant requested a reconsideration by the Board, although failure to seek a reconsideration does not affect the right to petition [*Water Code § 1126(b)*].

[3] Allegations

This petition for a writ of mandate alleges the following:

- The petitioner's identity as one capable of appropriating water (Paragraph 1) [*see Water Code §§ 1252, 1252.5*];

- The respondent's identity and capacity to make appropriation decision (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Water Code § 1253*];

- That an application was made to appropriate water (Paragraph 3) [*see Water Code §§ 1250-1258*];

- That the location of the diversion point is within the county (Paragraph 4);

- That the water to be appropriated is public water (Paragraph 5) [*Water Code § 1201*];

- That the respondent held a hearing and rejected the application (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Water Code § 1350*];

- That the respondent's decision is not supported by the evidence (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a), (b)*];

- The specific reasons why the evidence does not support the findings (Paragraph(s) 10); and

- That the petitioner is beneficially interested and has no adequate or speedy legal remedy (Paragraph 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

The form includes optional paragraphs for use to allege (1) the petitioner's request for a reconsideration and respondent's denial (Paragraphs 7 and 8) [*see Water Code § 1122*], (2) the submission of any additional relevant evidence (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(e)*], and (3) arbitrary and capricious action by the State Board

warranting attorney's fees (Paragraph 12) [*see Gov. Code § 800*].

[4] Verification

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for a discussion of serving the petition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*].

[5] Points and Authorities

Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court before a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[6] State Statutes

Writ of mandate to inquire into validity of administrative order. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

Recovery of damages, costs, and attorney's fees from public entity. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1095*; *Gov. Code § 800*

Powers and duties of State Water Resources Control Board. *Water Code § 179*

Water available for appropriation. *Water Code §§ 1201, 1202*

No hearing necessary to approve unprotested application or if undisputed facts support the issuance of the permit and there is no disputed issue of material fact, or to reject defective application, or if the applicant fails to provide information requested by the board, or undisputed facts support the denial of the application and there is no disputed issue of material fact. *Water Code § 1351*

Prerequisites to issuing appropriation permit. *Water Code § 1375*

[7] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to judicial review of administrative trials by writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.365

§ 575.365 Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel Review of State Water Resources Control Board Cease and Desist Order [Water Code § 1126]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate--To Compel Review of State Water Resources Control Board Cease and Desist Order [Water Code § 1126]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*],	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
Respondent.	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner respectfully represents:

1. Petitioner _____ [*set forth petitioner's identity as one aggrieved by the preliminary cease and desist order, e.g.,* holds a permit to appropriate water from the Muddy River for domestic and irrigation purposes].

2. Respondent State Water Resources Control Board of the State of California is the board within the Resources Agency of the State of California charged with enforcement of the terms or conditions of any permit or license issued by it in order that the public interest is best served. Under *Water Code Sections 1825 through 1851*, the State Board is allowed

to issue preliminary cease and desist orders to prevent permit or license violations. Pursuant to *Water Code Sections 1831* and *1834*, when requested to do so by the person alleged to be committing a violation, the Board is required to hold a hearing before issuing a preliminary cease and desist order.

3. On _____ [*date*], petitioner _____ [delivered *or* mailed] a written request for a hearing to the State Board signed _____ [by *or* on behalf of] petitioner. On _____ [*date*], the Board held a hearing to receive evidence _____ [*specify issue of hearing, e.g.,* on whether or not a violation of petitioner's permit was occurring]. Petitioner attended the hearing.

4. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received the State Board's preliminary cease and desist order providing that _____[*specify terms of order*]. [A copy of the preliminary cease and desist order is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of this petition.]

[5. On _____ (*date*), petitioner received the State Board's final cease and desist order. A copy of the final cease and desist order is attached to this petition as Exhibit B and made a part of this petition.]

6. [*Invalidity of State Board's action. See § 575.364, Paragraph 9.*]

[7. *Description of evidence introduced at hearing or incorporation of transcript of hearing. See § 575.364, Paragraph 9.*]

[8. *Grounds for allowing submission of additional evidence. See § 575.364, Paragraph 11.*]

9. [*Attorney's fees allegation. See § 575.364, Paragraph 12.*]

10. The State Board has the duty to revoke any cease and desist order against petitioner because its continuance is not in the public interest. Petitioner is the party aggrieved by the cease and desist order, and has no adequate or speedy remedy at law, but brings this petition under the authority of *Section 1126 of the Water Code*.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays judgment as follows:

[1. For an alternative writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its cease and desist order of _____ (*date*), compelling petitioner to cease and desist from _____ (*specify*), or in the alternative to show cause why a peremptory writ of mandate to the same effect should not be issued;]

[2. For an order restraining operation of the State Board's cease and desist order of _____ (*date*), _____ (*specify effect of cease and desist order*), until further order of the court and to show cause why operation of that order should not be stayed pending the judgment in this proceeding;]

3. For a peremptory writ of mandate directing respondent to set aside its order of _____ [*date*], compelling petitioner to cease and desist from _____ [*specify*];

[4. For reasonable attorney's fees, in addition to any other relief granted or other costs awarded;]

5. For costs of suit; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem equitable.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____ [*petitioner*]

[*Verification. See § 575.364.*]

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for a discussion of serving the petition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*]. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court before a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[2] Use of Form

This form of petition for a writ of mandate is for use by a person aggrieved by a cease and desist order issued by the State Board to obtain judicial review of that order. After notifying the alleged violator, the Board may issue a preliminary cease and desist order when it determines that there is a violation of a permit or license to appropriate water [*Water Code §§ 1831, 1834*]. Any aggrieved person may file a petition for a writ of mandate for review of either a preliminary or a final cease and desist order. The petition should be filed within 30 days after receipt of the final cease and desist order [*Water Code § 1126*]. For further discussion of the enforcement of water rights, see *§ 575.101*.

[3] Allegations

This petition for a writ of mandate alleges (1) the petitioner's identity as one aggrieved by the cease and desist order (Paragraph 1) [*see Water Code § 1126*], (2) that the respondent is the state entity with discretion to make a decision (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Water Code §§ 1831-1836*], (3) that the respondent held a hearing (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5(a)*; *Water Code § 1834*], (4) that the respondent issued a preliminary cease and desist order (Paragraph 4) [*see Water Code § 1831*], and (5) that the petitioner is an aggrieved person and has no adequate or speedy legal remedy (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. An optional paragraph is included for use when the State Board has issued a final cease and desist order (Paragraph 5) [*see Water Code § 1833*].

[4] State Statutes

Cease and desist orders. *Water Code §§ 1831-1836*

Sanctions for failure to comply with cease and desist order. *Water Code § 1845*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.364*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
1. Enforcement of Appropriative Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.366-575.379

[Reserved]

§§ 575.366[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.380

§ 575.380 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Petition to State Water Resources Control Board for Determination of Water Rights [Water Code § 2525]

[1] FORM Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Petition to State Water Resources Control Board for Determination of Water Rights [Water Code § 2525]

BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Determination of the Rights of the Various Claimants to the Waters of _____, and Its Tributaries, in _____, County, California

PETITION FOR DETERMINATION OF WATER RIGHTS

To The State Water Resources Control Board:

The undersigned, your petitioners, respectfully represent:

First--That they are claimants to water or use of water of the above-named stream system, to wit, said _____ and its tributaries, in _____ County, California.

Second--That there are various claimants to waters and the use of water of this stream system and to _____ [*specify nature of right, e.g.,* appropriative] rights in and to the waters of this petition.

Third--That the public interest and necessity will be served by a determination of the rights in and to the water of this stream system.

WHEREFORE, your petitioners request that a determination of the rights of the various claimants to the waters of this stream system be undertaken as provided for in Sections 2500 to 2900, inclusive, of the California Water Code.

Dated:

Petitioner	Post Office Address
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by claimants to the water or the use of water in a stream system to petition the State Board for a determination of the rights of the various claimants to that water [*Water Code § 2525*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 945*]. For discussion of adjudications of water rights by the Board, see *§ 575.140*. The procedure of petitioning the Board is an alternative to filing an action for declaratory relief for determination of water rights in the courts, and is preferable in many ways [*see § 575.172*]. For a form of complaint for declaratory relief for determination of water rights to be filed with the court, see *§ 575.385*.

[3] State Statutes

Statutory adjudication of water rights. *Water Code §§ 2500-2866*

Petition and preliminary proceedings. *Water Code §§ 2525-2529*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Petition. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 945*

Statutory adjudications. *23 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 945-951*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.381

§ 575.381 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Proof of Claim of Water Right--State Board Form [Water Code § 2575]

[1] FORM Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Proof of Claim of Water Right--State Board Form [Water Code § 2575]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form is a reproduction of the State Water Resources Control Board form for use by a claimant as a proof of claim of a water right [*Water Code § 2575*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 947(a)*]. All interested claimants who receive notice of the determination proceedings must notify the State Board of their intention to file a proof of claim and to appear and submit proof of their claims [*Water Code § 2528*]. An interested claimant may provide the requisite notice of intention through a letter to the Board. A separate proof must be filed for each purpose of use, except that water for incidental domestic, stock watering, and recreational use may be claimed in the same proof with any other use [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 947(b)*]. When a water right is held by two or more parties and the interests in that water right have been divided among the parties, each party must file a separate proof covering his or her individual interest in the water right [*23 Cal. Code Reg. § 947(f)*].

Any person not submitting a proof of claim by the conclusion of the investigation will be notified that his or her rights will be entered in the preliminary order of determination by the Board based on information gathered during the investigation unless a claim is submitted within 30 days [*Water Code § 2577*].

[3] State Statutes

Proof of claim. *Water Code §§ 2575-2577*

[4] Administrative Regulations

Signature of deponent claimant. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 948*

Objections to proof of claim. *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 949*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.382

§ 575.382 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Objection to Determination of State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code § 2628]

[1] FORM Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Objection to the Determination of the State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code § 2628]

BEFORE THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Determination of the Rights of the Various Claimants to the Waters of _____, and Its Tributaries, in _____, County, California

OBJECTION TO THE _____ [REPORT *and/or* ABSTRACT OF PROOFS OF CLAIMS *and/or* PRELIMINARY ORDER OF DETERMINATION] OF THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

The undersigned hereby files objection to certain statements, claims, or preliminary water right determinations set forth in the State Water Resources Control Board report in the above-entitled matter, as follows:

[*Check appropriate item and state grounds for objection*]

1. Proof of claim No. _____ filed by _____.

[*State grounds for objection*] _____
_____
_____

2. The Preliminary order of determination.

[*State grounds for objection*] _____
_____
_____

3. Other information contained in the State Board's report.

[*State grounds for objection*] _____
_____
_____

Date _____
Signature _____

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to object to the report, abstract of proofs of claims, or the preliminary order of determination of the State Board regarding the water rights in a stream system. The claimant has 60 days after the Board has made its report to file any objections [*Water Code § 2604*]. Objections must be written and state with reasonable certainty the grounds of the objection [*Water Code § 2628*; *23 Cal. Code Reg. § 949*]. For discussion of the entire process, see *§ 575.146*.

[3] State Statutes

Report and preliminary order of determination. *Water Code §§ 2600-2604*

Objections to report. *Water Code §§ 2625-2628*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.383

§ 575.383 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Exception and Proof of Claim of Claimant in Intervention [Water Code § 2780] and Application for Order Prescribing Service [Water Code § 2781]

[1] FORM Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Exception and Proof of Claim of Claimant in Intervention [Water Code § 2780] and Application for Order Prescribing Service [Water Code § 2781]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	EXCEPTION AND PROOF OF CLAIM OF
_____ [*name*],	)	CLAIMANT IN INTERVENTION AND APPLICA-
Defendant(s).	)	TION FOR ORDER PRESCRIBING SERVICE
	)	[*Water Code §§ 2780, 2781*]
	)	

_____

_____ [*Name of intervenor*], alleges:

1. _____ [*Name of intervenor*], a claimant in intervention, takes exception to the order of determination of water rights of _____ [*specify watercourse system which is object of the determination, e.g.,* the Muddy River] by the State Water Resources Control Board dated _____.

2. Claimant in intervention takes exception to that order on the ground that the order fails to determine his/her/its right to take waters from _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River].

3. _____ [*Name of intervenor*] claims a right to take waters from that watercourse system, in

_____ County, California, as fully set forth in his/her/its Proof of Claim of Water Right, a copy of which is attached to this proof of claim as Exhibit A and made a part of this proof of claim.

4. _____ [*Name of intervenor*] was not served with notice of the proceedings for the determination of the water rights to _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River] before the State Water Resources Control Board, and had neither actual knowledge nor notice of the pendency of this proof of claim prior to the entry of the order of determination by the State Board.

5. Claimant in intervention first received knowledge of the proceedings on _____ [*date*], when _____ [*set forth how intervenor learned of proceedings*].

WHEREFORE, claimant in intervention prays:

1. That this court hold such hearings and take such other action as is necessary and proper to determine claimant's right to take water from _____ [*specify watercourse system, e.g.,* the Muddy River];

2. That this court issue an order prescribing the time and manner of service of this exception and proof of claim on other claimants and the time within which contests of the proof may be filed and served, as provided by *Section 2781 of the Water Code*.

_____ [*date and place*]

_____ [*Signature*]
Claimant in Intervention

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a claimant to intervene in, and take exception to, proceedings in superior court for the affirmation of the State Board's order of determination of water rights in a stream system. A claimant who had no actual knowledge or notice of the pendency of the proceedings prior to the entry of the order of determination by the Board may intervene [*Water Code § 2780*]. The claimant intervenor must also apply for an order prescribing the time and manner of service to the exception and proof on other claimants and the time within which contests of the proof may be filed with the court and served on the intervenor [*Water Code § 2781*; *see § 575.150*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.384

§ 575.384 Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Order Prescribing Time and Manner of Service of Exception and Proof of Claimant in Intervention and Time for Filing and Service of Contests [Water Code § 2781]

[1] FORM Statutory Adjudication Proceedings--Order Prescribing Time and Manner of Service of Exception and Proof of Claimant in Intervention and Time for Filing and Service of Contests [Water Code § 2781]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER PRESCRIBING TIME AND MANNER OF
vs.	)	SERVICE OF EXCEPTION AND PROOF OF
_____ [*name*],	)	CLAIMANT IN INTERVENTION AND TIME FOR
Defendant.	)	FILING AND SERVICE OF CONTESTS
	)	[*Water Code § 2781*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
		Location: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The application of _____ [*identify claimant in intervention*] for an order prescribing the time and manner of service of the exception and proof of the claimant in intervention and the time for filing contests of the proof and serving them on the intervenor came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the application ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the application be, and it hereby is, granted and a copy of the exception and proof of claim of the claimant in intervention, together with a copy of this order, be served on each claimant herein by _____ [*specify manner of service, e.g.*, registered mail] on or before _____ [*date*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that contest, if any, to intervenor's proof of claim must be filed with the court and served on claimant in intervention on or before _____ [*date*].
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use when a claimant is seeking intervention in the proceedings on the order of determination by the State Water Resources Control Board based on the claimant's lack of knowledge until after the order had been entered [*see Water Code §§ 2780, 2781*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.383*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.385

§ 575.385 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]--General Form

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF[,
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, AND
through _____,]	)	PRELIMINARY (AND PERMANENT) INJUNC-
Defendant(s).	)	TION(S)]
	)	(Determination of Water Rights)
		[(*Civ. Code § 3422*;) Code Civ. Proc. §(§ 526, 527(a),) 1060]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

2. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description of land*].

[*IDENTIFY, in successively numbered paragraphs, each additional defendant claiming water rights adverse to plaintiff's claim; then CONTINUE*]

[3. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is claiming an interest in the water described below.)]

[4. (Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that) (A)t all times herein mentioned each of the defendants sued herein as DOES I-_____, (*specify number smaller than total number of does alleged to reflect only those to whom the agency allegation applies*) inclusive, was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants and was at all times acting within the course and scope of such agency and employment.]

[5. *If plaintiff is asserting a riparian right, add description of riparian ownership, e.g.,* Plaintiff has a right to the use of _____ (*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure of water or proportion of watercourse*), in that his/her land is riparian to the Muddy River, located _____ (upstream *or* downstream) from defendant's land.]

6. Plaintiff is a claimant to water and the use of water of _____ [*specify water, e.g.,* the Muddy River and its tributaries)] in _____ County, California, for beneficial use as follows: _____ [*set forth particular use and amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*].

7. Each of the defendants is a claimant to water and the use of water of _____ [*specify water, e.g.,* the Muddy River and its tributaries] in _____ County, California, [for uses which each defendant claims to be beneficial and in amounts which are unknown to plaintiff *or if the uses and amounts are known, plaintiff may describe them with particularity*].

8. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists among the various claimants to the water and the use of that water because of the disputed types and amounts of the various claims.

9. Plaintiff will suffer damages _____ [*describe type of damage, e.g.,* in the form of loss of crops due to inadequate irrigation water] as a result of defendants' use of water under their claimed water rights, which are adverse to the water rights claimed by plaintiff. The various claims of defendants are adverse to each other as well as to the claim of plaintiff.

10. Plaintiff has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law, and a judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain the extent of his/her/its rights to the water and to the use of that water.

[11. The assertion and enforcement by defendants, and each of them, of their respective claims to the water and use of the water, unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will _____ (*specify particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g.,* cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff in that plaintiff's land is planted in crops which require water, defendants' use of the water leaves no water available for plaintiff, and plaintiff has already lost a portion of his/her/its crop and may lose the entire crop if defendants' use of the water continues until this action can be brought to trial).]

[12. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries _____ (currently being suffered *or* which are threatened) in that _____ (*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.*, defendants will continue to use the water and plaintiff would be required to maintain a multiplicity of judicial proceedings to protect his/her interests).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration determining the rights of the various claimants to the waters of _____ [*specify the water in controversy, e.g.*, the Muddy River and its tributaries];

[2. For issuance of a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction restraining and enjoining defendants from _____ [*specify, e.g.*, removing any water from the Muddy River];

[3. For issuance of a permanent injunction restraining and enjoining defendants from _____ [*specify, e.g.*, removing any water from the Muddy River];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents tof this petition. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action for declaratory relief to determine water rights in a watercourse and to request injunctive relief from interference with that right [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a), 1060*]. The plaintiff's claim may be based on a riparian right, an appropriative right, or both.

[3] Allegations

The above complaint alleges the following:

- Plaintiff's and defendant's ownership of land for purposes of venue (Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*];

- Plaintiff's and defendants' claims to water (Optional Paragraph 5; Paragraphs 6 and 7);
- Existence of an actual controversy (Paragraph 8); and
- The necessity for a declaration of rights (Paragraphs 9 and 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*].

Optional Paragraph 5 is for use if plaintiff is asserting a riparian right. In that case, plaintiff must plead the following:

- The riparian character of the land;
- The quantity of water or the proportion of the watercourse to which entitlement is claimed; and
- The location of the land with regard to the land of the other party.

The riparian character of the land may be pleaded either by alleging the existence of ultimate facts, which if proved would establish the land as riparian, or by alleging generally that the land is riparian to a stream or natural watercourse. The following three facts must be proved to establish land as riparian [*see Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828-830, 306 P.2d 807* (holding that quantity of water must be definite and if number of inches of running water is indefinite complaint is subject to demurrer for uncertainty)]:

- Some part of the land must be contiguous to a natural watercourse;
- The land for which water is claimed must be within the watershed of the stream; and
- The land for which water is claimed must be part of the smallest tract held under one title in the chain of title leading to the present owner.

The form also includes optional paragraphs for alleging the following:

- The fictitious names of defendants (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*; *see also* Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*];
- The agency relationship of defendants (Paragraph 4) [*see* Ch. 427, *Principal and Agent*];
- Facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1]* ; and
- Any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *see also* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

[4] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary

injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[5] Jurisdiction and Venue

The county in which the real property through which plaintiff is asserting a right to the watercourse is situated is the proper county for the action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*]. The action must be brought in the superior court and is not a limited civil case [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(7), (8), 580(b), 1060*].

[6] State Statutes

Permanent injunctive relief. *Civ. Code § 3422*

Preliminary injunctive relief. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)*

Declaratory relief for determination of rights to water in watercourse. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and for fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to judicial remedy of declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.386

§ 575.386 Order of Reference to State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code §§ 2000, 2001]--Action for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

[1] FORM Order of Reference to State Water Resources Control Board [Water Code §§ 2000, 2001]--Action for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Water Rights and for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)], and Permanent Injunction [Civ. Code § 3422]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	ORDER OF REFERENCE TO STATE WATER RE-
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	SOURCES CONTROL BOARD
through _____,]	)	[*Water Code §§ 2000, 2001*]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

The above-entitled action is one for a determination of the rights to water.

It appears to the court that [_____ (some *or* all) of the issues in this action should be referred to the State Water Resources Control Board as referee *or* this suit should be referred to the State Water Resources Control Board to investigate _____ (some *or* all) of the physical facts involved in this action], and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

[*EITHER*]

Pursuant to *Water Code Section 2000*, _____ [all of the *or* the following] issues are referred to the State Water Resources Control Board as referee [: _____ (*itemize issues, if fewer than all*)].

[*OR*]

Pursuant to *Water Code Section 2001*, this suit is referred to the State Water Resources Control Board for investigation of and report on _____ [all of the *or* the following] physical facts involved in this action [: _____ (*itemize facts, if fewer than all*)].

[*CONTINUE*]

The Board is further ordered to file its report _____ [seasonably *or* not later than _____ (*date*)] with this court.

[*Set forth any further requirements ordered by court*].

_____ [*date and place*]
_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This order is for use to refer an action for determination of water rights to the State Water Resources Control Board, either (1) for it to serve as a referee in some or all of the issues or (2) for it to investigate some or all of the physical facts relevant to a determination of the rights of the parties [*Water Code §§ 2000, 2001*; *see § 575.173[1]*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.385*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.387

§ 575.387 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Lower Riparian Owner Against Upper Riparian Owner--Interference With Right to Use Water

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Lower Riparian Owner Against Upper Riparian Owner--Interference With Right to Use Water

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	[*Civ. Code § 3333*]
through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner, in possession, and entitled to the possession of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*] and to all right, title, and interest in and to any and all springs, streams, ditches, canals, flumes, rights-of-way, water locations, water rights, privileges, and licenses in any way connected with or appurtenant to that real property. Plaintiff has a right to the use of _____ [*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure or proportion of watercourse*], in that his/her land is riparian to _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River], and located _____ [upstream *or* downstream] from defendant's land.

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 4.*]

4. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River] was, and now is, a natural watercourse flowing in its natural course in a generally _____ [*specify direction, e.g.*, southerly] direction through, along, over, across, on, and past plaintiff's above-described real property, which is riparian tto this petition. _____ [*Specify manner in which water may be of use to plaintiff, e.g.*, A large portion of plaintiff's land is irrigated by the natural flow of the Muddy River across it. That natural irrigation renders the land capable of producing large quantities of pasturage for livestock.]

5. Plaintiff and his/her/its predecessors in interest, under their rights as riparian proprietors in _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River], and by virtue of their ownership of the property bordering thereon, have for more than _____ years used, and are now using, except as that use has been interfered with by defendants as hereinafter alleged, the water of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River] for _____ [*set forth beneficial uses made of that water, e.g.*, stock, domestic, and agricultural purposes]. Plaintiff's use of his/her/its land has required the entire amount of his/her/its riparian right for those purposes, and will continue to so require.

[*EITHER*]

6. Defendant at all times herein mentioned was the owner of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*], together with riparian rights on _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River]. Defendant's riparian right on that watercourse is upper to plaintiff's.

[*OR*]

6. Defendant has not, and never had, any right whatsoever in or to the waters of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River], or any part tof this petition, or any right to divert any of its waters, and defendant's use of the water is neither a riparian use, nor the lawful exercise of a riparian right. If defendant had not wrongfully taken those waters, plaintiff would have put them to reasonable, lawful, and beneficial purposes.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. _____ [*Set forth defendant's use of the water of that watercourse which has injured plaintiff, e.g.*, During the past two years defendant has performed logging operations on his land, and in so doing, has wrongfully and unlawfully dammed up the Muddy River, taking large quantities of water from the river, thereby preventing the waters of the river from reaching plaintiff's land in sufficient quantities for plaintiff's purposes as set forth above, and interrupting the natural flow of the waters].

8. As a proximate result of defendant's unlawful and wrongful taking of the waters of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River], that water has not been reaching plaintiff's land in sufficient quantities to provide water for _____ [*specify purpose for which plaintiff used the water, e.g.*, pasturage for livestock] and plaintiff has sustained damages _____ [*specify nature and extent of damages, e.g.*, by being required to move his stock to another range, rent pasturage, hire extra help, and pay extra labor, all to his damage in the sum of

$_____].

[9. The aforementioned acts of the defendant were willful and _____ (oppressive *or* fraudulent *or* malicious *or any combination tof this petition*) in that _____ (*allege facts indicating presence of oppression, fraud, and/or malice*).]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For general damages in the sum of $_____;

[2. For punitive damages;]

3. For costs of suit; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 575.385.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action to recover damages for interference with a riparian water right against the owner of an upper riparian right. The form is adapted from the fact situation in *Eldridge v. Scott Lumber Co. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 457, 9 Cal. Rptr. 623* .

[3] Allegations

The above complaint alleges (1) plaintiff's ownership of land for purposes of venue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*], (2) plaintiff's riparian right to water (Paragraphs 1 and 4) [*see Hudson v. West (1957) 47 Cal. 2d 823, 828-829, 306 P.2d 807]* , (3) plaintiff's beneficial riparian use (Paragraph 5), (4) defendant's riparian right or lack tof this petition (Paragraph 6), (5) facts showing the defendant's use causing injury (Paragraph 7), and (6) damages proximately caused by defendant's wrongful conduct (Paragraph 8). It also includes an optional allegation for punitive damages (Paragraph 9) [*Civ. Code § 3294*].

[4] Decisions

Lower riparian owner is entitled to damages when land used for grazing and cattle lost weight due to lack of water caused by upstream damming. *Eldridge v. Scott Lumber Co. (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 457, 460-461, 9 Cal. Rptr. 623*

[5] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.385*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.388

§ 575.388 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water by Impounding Water--Absence of Watercourse; Only Surface Drainage Impounded

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water by Impounding Water--Absence of Watercourse; Only Surface Drainage Impounded

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. The waters alleged in the complaint to have been impounded on his/her/its property were not waters of the watercourse specified in the complaint, nor of any other watercourse.

2. The waters impounded by defendant were, and are, in fact surface drainage waters only. These surface waters are, and were at all times mentioned in the complaint, fed only by the runoff of waters at times of heavy rainfall from natural drainage resulting solely from that rainfall. That runoff did not then, or now, consist of waters running in a well-defined channel.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of interference with the riparian right of another through the impounding of waters. When the waters impounded are not part of a watercourse, but are merely surface drainage waters, there is no interference with a riparian right [*South Santa Clara Etc. Dist. v. Johnson (1964) 231 Cal. App. 2d 388, 394-395, 403, 41 Cal. Rptr. 846]* .

If more than one affirmative defense is set forth in the answer, each defense must be separately stated and numbered [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 2.112*]. If the complaint sets forth more than one cause of action, the affirmative defense must refer to the cause of action it is intended to answer [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*].

For discussion and forms relating to affirmative defenses, see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.389

§ 575.389 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Riparian Right to Reasonable Use of Water

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Riparian Right to Reasonable Use of Water

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. At all times mentioned in the complaint, defendant was, and is, the riparian owner of the property described as belonging to him/her/it in the complaint. Defendant has a right to the use of _____ (*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure or proportion of watercourse*), in that his/her/its land is riparian to _____ (*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River), and his/her/its land is located _____ (upstream *or* downstream) from plaintiff's land.]

2. Defendant's use of waters on his/her/its property was in a reasonable amount necessary for beneficial enjoyment of his/her/its property in that _____ [*state facts showing reasonableness of defendant's use of water, e.g.,* defendant impounded water in an amount only as needed for domestic and irrigation use on his/her land].

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of interference with the riparian right of another. A riparian owner is permitted to use a reasonable amount of water necessary for beneficial enjoyment of the riparian property [*see Gutierrez v. Wege (1905) 145 Cal. 730, 734-735, 79 P. 449* (impounding of waters)].

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.385* and *575.388*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.390

§ 575.390 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Sufficient Water Available to Plaintiff

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Sufficient Water Available to Plaintiff

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. The water used by defendant on his/her/its property was the amount necessary for beneficial enjoyment of his/her/its property in that _____ [*state facts showing reasonableness of defendant's water use, e.g.,* defendant impounded water in an amount only as needed for irrigation use on his/her land].

2. As a riparian owner plaintiff was only entitled to the amount of water necessary for useful and beneficial purposes, and the amount of water which continued to reach plaintiff's land was sufficient to satisfy his/her/its reasonable demands.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of interference with the riparian right of another. When a riparian owner has enough water to satisfy the reasonable demands on the riparian property, that owner has no authority to interfere with the use by another [*see Meridian, Ltd. v. San Francisco (1939) 13 Cal. 2d 424, 450, 90 P.2d 537, 91 P.2d 105* (impounding case suggesting that seepage, drainage, and spill causing return flow may be included in determining amount of water available to lower riparian)].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.388*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.391

§ 575.391 Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Right by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007, Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

[1] FORM Affirmative Defense Allegation [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2)]--Action for Interference With Right to Use Water--Right by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007; Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE [*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ (*specify, e.g.,* SECOND) CAUSE OF ACTION], DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:

1. At all times mentioned in the complaint, defendant was, and is, the riparian owner of the property described as belonging to him/her/it in the complaint, and is thereby entitled to make reasonable use of the waters flowing on his/her/its property.

2. Defendant's use of waters on his/her/its property exceeded his/her/its riparian right and was adverse to the riparian rights of plaintiff in that _____ [*specify improper nature of water use, e.g.,* defendant impounded water during the dry season, retained it for an indefinite period of time, and released it only to suit his/her/its convenience].

3. For _____ [five *or more*] years defendant [and his/her/its predecessors in title] has/have openly, notoriously, continuously, and under a claim of right to do so, _____ [*state facts showing adverse use of water, e.g.,* diverted waters from the watercourse and impounded them for a beneficial purpose].

4. Through the above-described diversion of water, defendant has acquired a prescriptive right to the waters of the watercourse as against plaintiff.

[2] Use of Form

This form of affirmative defense is for use by a defendant in an answer to a complaint of interference with the riparian

right of another. An upper riparian owner may acquire a prescriptive right to the waters of a stream as against a lower riparian owner by an adverse use of those waters for the prescriptive period [*Moore v. Cal. Oregon Power Co. (1943) 22 Cal. 2d 725, 735, 140 P.2d 798]* . Adverse possession for a five-year period will ripen into title by prescription [*Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*].

For discussion and forms relating to adverse possession and use of real property, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession* .

[3] State Statutes

Right of prescription acquired by adverse possession for period of five years. *Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.388*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.392

§ 575.392 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Lower Riparian Owner for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Lower Riparian Owner for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff, vs. _____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	COMPLAINT FOR [TEMPORARY RESTRAIN-
Defendant(s).	)	ING ORDER,] PRELIMINARY AND PERMAN-
	)	ENT INJUNCTIONS AND DAMAGES
	)	[*Civ. Code §§ 3333, 3422, Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527, 530*]

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Plaintiff's ownership of land allegation. See § 575.387, Paragraph 1.*]

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 4.*]

4. Plaintiff has a riparian right to the use of _____ [*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure of water or proportion of watercourse*] of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River] in that his/her/its above-described land is riparian to _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River].

5. The average flow of water in that watercourse to plaintiff's land is _____ per year. Plaintiff took from that watercourse at a point on it within the boundaries of his/her/its above-described land _____ [*amount*] of water per year for _____ [*specify beneficial uses made of that water, e.g.,* the irrigation of 250 acres of orange trees and 500 acres of grain crops located] on that land. The entire amount of water taken by plaintiff was, and is now, necessary for those beneficial purposes.

[*EITHER, if seeking temporary restraining order without notice to defendant and diversion has occurred*]

6. Until _____ [*specify date within 10 days prior to the date this complaint will be filed*], plaintiff was in peaceful possession of the unobstructed flow of water from that watercourse. Beginning on _____ [*specify same date*], plaintiff has been deprived of his/her/its peaceful possession of the unobstructed flow of water from that watercourse by the wrongful diversion of that flow by defendant.

7. On or about _____ [*specify same date*], defendant _____ [*describe method by which defendant has wrongfully diverted water thereby interfering with plaintiff's right, e.g.,* willfully and without just cause constructed at a point approximately 300 feet upstream from plaintiff's land on the watercourse a diversion channel and dam by which defendant diverted and continues to divert all the water from the natural channels of that watercourse for use on lands not riparian to that watercourse].

[*OR, if seeking temporary restraining order without notice to defendant and diversion has only been threatened*]

6. Until _____ [*specify date within 10 days prior to the date this complaint will be filed*], plaintiff was in peaceful possession of the unobstructed flow of water from that watercourse. Beginning on _____ [*specify same date*], plaintiff has been deprived of his/her/its expectation of the continued peaceful possession of the unobstructed flow of water from that watercourse.

7. On or about _____ [*specify date within 10 days of the date this complaint will be filed*], defendant _____ [*set forth threat of wrongful diversion, e.g.,* told plaintiff that he wanted to eliminate plaintiff as an agricultural competitor and was going to kill plaintiff's trees and crops by constructing a diversion channel and dam at a point approximately 300 feet upstream from plaintiff's land on the watercourse and divert all the water from the natural channels of that watercourse for use on lands not riparian to that watercourse].

[*CONTINUE*]

8. _____ [*Specify present damages and any uncertainty as to amount, e.g.,* The trees and crops currently maturing on plaintiff's land are presently being damaged by the lack of water; therefore, the exact amount of damages is not known. Plaintiff will move to amend this complaint to state that amount when the same becomes known to him/her/it, or on proof tof this petition].

9. Unless defendant is restrained and enjoined from _____ [continuing the *or* carrying out the threatened] diversion of water _____ [*specify method of diversion, e.g.,* through use of the channel and dam], defendant will prevent the transmission of water to plaintiff's land and will thus _____ [*specify*

particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g., cause immediate great and irreparable injury to plaintiff through the impairment of the trees and crops].

10. Unless water continues to reach plaintiff's land, _____ [*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.,* all the trees and crops currently growing will die and plaintiff would be required to maintain a multiplicity of judicial proceedings to protect his/her/its trees and crops in the future]. For these reasons, plaintiff has no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For an order requiring defendant to show cause, if any, why he/she/it should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;

2. For [a temporary restraining order,] a preliminary injunction[,] and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant from diverting water from the watercourse in quantities to prevent the free flow of _____ [*amount*] of water per year in the natural channels of that watercourse to plaintiff's land;

3. For damages [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 575.387.*]

CERTIFICATION RE NOTICE

I hereby certify that _____ [*any of the following*: on _____ [*date*], I informed defendant of the time and place the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order would be made *or* in good faith I attempted to inform defendant of the time and place the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order would be made by _____ (*specify efforts made to inform defendant*), but I was unable to do so *or* notice to defendant of the foregoing application for a temporary restraining order should not be required for the reason that _____ (*specify*)].

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

This general form of complaint is for use by the owner of a riparian right to bring an action for damages and injunctive

relief against an upstream owner of a water right who has diverted or has threatened to divert water from the watercourse in an amount that interferes or would interfere with the amount needed by the plaintiff. The court will act to enjoin upstream diversion when it is wrongful and when the amount so diverted would be used for reasonable and beneficial purposes by the lower riparian plaintiff [*Carlsbad Etc. Co. v. San Luis Rey Etc. Co. (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 900, 914, 178 P.2d 844]* . The complaint may also be used to apply for a temporary restraining order if, within the 10 days preceeding the filing of the complaint, the plaintiff was in peaceable possession of the water flow and the defendant either actually deprived or threatened to deprive the plaintiff of the water [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 530*].

No temporary restraining order will be granted without notice to the opposing party unless the applicant or the applicant's attorney certifies one of the following to the court under oath [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(c)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]:

- That within the applicable time period before the application, the applicant informed the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney at what time and where the application would be made;

- That the applicant in good faith attempted but was unable to inform the opposing party and the opposing party's attorney, specifying the efforts made to contact them; or

- That for reasons specified the applicant should not be required to so inform the opposing party or the opposing party's attorney.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- That the plaintiff's beneficial use of water was wrongfully diverted (Paragraph 5) [*see Carlsbad Etc. Co. v. San Luis Rey Etc. Co. (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 900, 914, 178 P.2d 844]* ;

- Proximate damages (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*];

- Facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1* ; *see also* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*]; and

- Any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 10) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*].

Also included are optional alternative allegations for use when a temporary restraining order without notice to defendant is sought either because wrongful diversions or threats of wrongful diversion have occurred within the 10 days before filing the complaint (Paragraphs 6 and 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 530*].

[4] Certification re Notice

In an action for an injunction or a restraining order brought to prevent the diversion, diminution, or increase of the flow of water in its natural channels, notice of the application must first be given to the defendant. However, if it appears from the verified complaint or affidavits on which the application is made that within 10 days prior to the time of application the plaintiff was in the peaceable possession of the flow of that water and that within that time the plaintiff has been deprived of the flow by the defendant's wrongful diversion or has received from the defendant threats to divert that water, notice is not required. If notice of that application is given and on the hearing it appears to the court that the plaintiff is entitled to the injunction, but that issuance of the injunction will cause great damage to the defendant and

that the plaintiff will not be greatly damaged by the acts complained of pending the litigation, and can be fully compensated for the damages suffered, the court may refuse to issue the injunction if the defendant gives a bond as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 532* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 530*].

When a temporary restraining order is sought without formal notice, the applicant or the applicant's attorney is required to certify to the court under oath that (1) within the applicable time period before the application he or she informed the opposing party or his or her attorney at what time and where the application would be made; (2) that he or she in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party or his or her attorney but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made; or (3) that for reasons specified he or she should not be required to so inform the opposing party or his or her attorney [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(c)*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1204(b)*]. For a form of an application for a preliminary injunction and a form of preliminary injunction, see *§§ 575.393* and *575.394*, respectively.

[5] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . In a limited civil case, the court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions, but not permanent injunctive relief; thus, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the action cannot be brought as a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), 580(b)(1)*].

For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.385* and *575.387*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.393

§ 575.393 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Application for Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 530]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Application for Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 530]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR PRELIMINARY
vs.	)	INJUNCTION
_____ [*name*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 530*]
Defendant.	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To defendant _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ _____.M., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], plaintiff will apply for an order restraining you, during the pendency of this action, from diverting water from

_____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River] or otherwise interfering with the free flow of that water so as to prevent the free flow of _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] of water per year in the natural channels of that watercourse to plaintiff's land described in the complaint filed and served herewith. The application will be made on the grounds that the diversion of that water by you produces great and irreparable injury to plaintiff for which pecuniary compensation provides inadequate relief.

The application will be based on this notice of application, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the application.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for _____ [*moving party*]

CAUTION:
A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113*; see also *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a plaintiff to give notice of an application for a preliminary injunction in an action to enjoin diversion of water. Injunctive relief and diversion of water and procedures therefor are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 530*. For discussion and forms relating to injunctions generally, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.392*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.394

§ 575.394 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 527]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
vs.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 527*]
_____ [*name*],	)	Date: _____
Defendant.	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
	)	[Trial Date: _____]
	)	

_____

The application of plaintiff for a preliminary injunction restraining defendant from diverting or otherwise interfering with the free flow of water from _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River] came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the application ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that during the pendency of this action the above-named defendant and his/her/its officers, agents, employees, representatives, and all persons acting in concert or participating with him/her/it, shall be and are hereby enjoined and restrained from diverting from the natural channels of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.*, the Muddy River] at any point on that watercourse upstream from plaintiff's lands described herein any quantity of water greater than _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] of water per year or in any way interfering with the free flow of _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] of water per year in the natural channels of that watercourse to plaintiff's land situated in _____, County, California, and described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, before this order shall take effect, plaintiff herein shall file a written undertaking in the sum of $_____, as required by *Section 529 of the Code of Civil Procedure*, for the purpose of indemnifying defendant for such damages as he/she/it may sustain by reason of this preliminary injunction if the court finally decides that plaintiff is not entitled to this petition.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the preliminary injunction as set forth above shall issue on plaintiff's filing a written undertaking in the sum specified above.

The court reserves jurisdiction to modify this injunction as the ends of justice may require.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of preliminary injunction is for use to prevent an upstream user from diverting water from the watercourse, thereby interfering with the water flow to plaintiff's land [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 530*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.392*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.395

§ 575.395 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Notice of Motion for Order Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Notice of Motion for Order Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	NOTICE OF MOTION FOR ORDER
vs.	)	_____ [DISSOLVING *or* MODIFY-
_____ [*name*],	)	ING] PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
Defendant.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 532*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

To plaintiff _____ [*name*] and to his/her attorney of record:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on _____ [*date*], at _____ _____.M., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____

of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*], _____ [*city*], defendant will move for an order _____ [dissolving *or* modifying] the preliminary injunction. The motion will be made on the grounds that defendant will suffer great damages by continuation of the preliminary injunction, that plaintiff can be fully compensated for any damages he/she/it may suffer by reason of any such diversion of water from that watercourse by defendant during the pendency of this action, and that all water to be so diverted will be used for irrigational and domestic purposes only.

[_____ (*If the preliminary injunction is to be modified or only partially dissolved, specify the extent of that change*.]

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the declaration(s) of _____ [*name(s*)] and the supporting memorandum served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Defendant

CAUTION:

A supporting memorandum is required to be served and filed with this notice of motion [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113*; *see also Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005(b), 1010*]. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a defendant who is subject to a preliminary injunction barring the diversion of water to give notice of a motion to dissolve or modify the injunction. In actions in which an injunction to prevent the diversion of water is available, the court may dissolve or modify the injunction (1) if the water is diverted for domestic or irrigation uses only, (2) if the defendant will suffer great damage if the injunction is continued, and (3) if the plaintiff can be fully compensated for damages sustained [*Code Civ. Proc. § 532*].

The dissolution or modification is subject to the person enjoined giving a bond in an amount fixed by the court, conditioned that the enjoined person will pay all damages that the person on whose behalf the injunction issued may suffer by reason of the continuance, during the litigation, of the acts complained of. On trial, the amount of the damages must be ascertained, and in case judgment is rendered for the person in whose behalf the injunction was granted, the amount fixed as damages must be included in the judgment, together with reasonable attorney's fees. In any proceedings to enforce the liability on the bond, the amount of the damages as fixed in the judgment is conclusive [*Code Civ. Proc. § 532(b)*]. For discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 530*, governing the injunction procedures, see *§ 575.392*.

[3] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.392 -575.394*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.396

§ 575.396 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion Dissolving Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5] in Support of Motion Dissolving Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	DECLARATION OF _____
vs.	)	[*name*] IN SUPPORT OF MOTION IN SUPPORT
_____ [*name*],	)	OF MOTION DISSOLVING PRELIMINARY IN-
Defendant.	)	JUNCTION
	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 532*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.,* an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for defendant *or other statement as appropriate*].

2. On _____ [*date*] this court issued a preliminary injunction restraining defendant from diverting water from _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River] at any point on that watercourse upstream from the land described in plaintiff's complaint in the above-entitled action.

3. Defendant has fully complied with that order but if the order is continued, defendant will suffer great damages in that _____ [*set forth reasons for defendant's damage, e.g.,* defendant is a public water district supplying water to approximately _____ subscribers occupying approximately _____ acres in _____ County, California. Those subscribers have no other source of water for irrigating that land and defendant has been unable to procure any other adequate supply of water. Estimates by qualified engineers indicate that the cost of relocating the diversion point to a location downstream from plaintiff's land is $_____, a sum beyond defendant's ability to obtain a bond. The land serviced by defendant is planted in various agricultural products with an annual value of $_____. Declarant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the entire production of those agricultural products will be destroyed unless an immediate supply of water sufficient for proper irrigation of those lands is made available].

4. All of the water proposed to be diverted from the watercourse will be used for irrigational and domestic purposes.

5. Trial of this action has been set for _____ [*date*]. The only damage that may result to plaintiff by dissolution of the preliminary injunction and defendant's diversion from the upstream location during the pendency of this action would be _____ [*specify potential damage, e.g.,* the loss of the orange crop from plaintiff's west orchard, amounting to $_____], which can be fully compensated for in damages.

6. Defendant is willing and able to post with the court a bond as provided in *Section 532 of the Code of Civil Procedure,* in the amount the court may fix conditioned on defendant's paying all damages that plaintiff may suffer by defendant's diversion of water from the upstream location during the pendency of this action.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this is true and correct.

_____ [*date and place*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of declaration is for use by a defendant seeking the dissolution of a preliminary injunction. In specified circumstances, the court may dissolve a preliminary injunction which enjoined water diversion [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 532*]. For a related form, see *§ 575.395*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.397

§ 575.397 Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

[1] FORM Proceedings for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] by Lower Riparian Owner to Enjoin Upstream Diversion of Water--Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003] Dissolving or Modifying Preliminary Injunction [Code Civ. Proc. § 532]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION
vs.	)	_____ [DISSOLVING *or* MODIFY-
_____ [*name*],	)	ING] PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
Defendant.	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 532*]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		[Trial Date: _____]

_____

The motion of defendant for an order _____ [modifying *or* dissolving] the preliminary injunction granted herein on _____ [*date*], came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; defendant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*].

[*EITHER, if seeking dissolution*]

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court that great damage will be suffered by defendant if that injunction be continued, that plaintiff can be fully compensated for any damages he/she/it may suffer by reason of the continuance of the acts enjoined during the pendency of this litigation, and defendant having posted with the clerk of this court a bond in the amount previously ordered of $_____ conditioned as provided in *Section 532 of the Code of Civil Procedure*,

[*OR, if seeking modification*]

Proof having been made to the satisfaction of the court that defendant will suffer great damage if the injunction is not modified to allow him/her/it to divert from _____ [*specify watercourse*] a quantity of water not exceeding _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] during the pendency of this action but that defendant will not otherwise be damaged by the continuation of that injunction, that plaintiff can be fully compensated for any damages he/she/it may suffer by reason of the diversion of that amount of water from that watercourse by defendant, and defendant having posted with the clerk of this court a bond in the amount previously ordered of $_____ conditioned as provided in *Section 532 of the Code of Civil Procedure*,

IT IS ORDERED that the preliminary injunction granted herein on _____ [*date*], be and hereby is _____ [dissolved *or* modified as follows: _____(*specify how injunction is modified, e.g.*, to allow defendant to divert, on or before _____ [*date*], a quantity of water not exceeding _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] from that watercourse).] [As _____ (modified *or* partially dissolved), the injunction provides _____ (*set forth the terms of the injunction in full as they stand after modification or partial dissolution*).]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
Judge of the Superior Court

[2] Use of Form

This form of order is for use to grant a motion to dissolve or modify a previously-granted preliminary injunction restraining defendant's diversion of water [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 532*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.395*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.398

§ 575.398 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Overlying Landowner for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Underground and Percolating Water

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] by Overlying Landowner for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422] and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Underground and Percolating Water

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR PRELIMINARY AND PER-
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	MANENT INJUNCTIONS AND DAMAGES
through _____,]	)	[*Civ. Code § 3422, 3333*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)*]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Plaintiff's status as owner of land. See § 575.385, Paragraph 1.*]

2. At all times herein mentioned, defendant was, and still is, the owner of real property adjoining plaintiff's above-described property on the _____ [*specify direction, e.g.*, south] and located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 4.*]

5. Plaintiff had for many years [profitably] used the above-described land _____ [*specify uses to which land was put, e.g.,* for ranching and grazing]. Prior to the drilling and operation of the wells on defendant's property as described below, there was abundant water on plaintiff's land _____ [*specify indications of sufficient water for plaintiff's needs, e.g.,* as indicated by the lush grass and other foliage for use as pasturage].

6. Prior to the drilling and operation of the wells on defendant's property as described below, plaintiff's above-described land and soil were naturally well supplied with ground water, underground water, moisture, and percolating waters [and was particularly well adapted to the use plaintiff made of the land].

7. Between _____ [*date*], and _____ [*date*], defendant drilled wells on and into his/her/its property and maintained, and continues to maintain, pumping stations in close proximity to plaintiff's property. Defendant has used and operated and continues to use and operate those wells and pumping stations for the purpose of _____ [*specify purpose which requires the pumping and exportation of large quantities of water, e.g.,* supplying water to the inhabitants of the city of _____, _____ County, California, for household, domestic, commercial, industrial, and other purposes for profit].

8. Defendant's wells and pumps are large and powerful and have been, and are now, pumping great and excessive quantities of water by a system of ditches and pipelines, and withdraw from beneath the surface of plaintiff's property the greater part of the natural underground and percolating waters, lowering and continuing to lower the normal water table. Plaintiff's land and soil have been rendered dry and unproductive resulting in _____ [*specify injury, e.g.,* much lower profits than before the wells and pumps were drilled].

9. The water withdrawn, and now being withdrawn, by defendant's wells is from the underground waters common to the lands of plaintiff and defendant. Defendant is withdrawing a quantity of water greatly in excess of the amount to which he/she/it is entitled by law. The operation of those wells and pumps is unreasonable and has drained excessive quantities of water from beneath defendant's land and from part of the common water supply underlying plaintiff's land.

10. There are other and closer sources of water available to defendant to adequately _____ [*specify purpose for which supply is used, e.g.,* supply water to the inhabitants of the city of _____], but there is no other source of water available to plaintiff.

[11. Prior to commencing this action, plaintiff had made repeated demands to defendant to cease the pumping, but defendant refused to comply. Defendant continues the wrongful and unlawful pumping over the protests of plaintiff and without his/her/its consent.]

12. As a proximate result of defendant's unlawful and wrongful pumping, plaintiff has sustained damages _____ [*specify nature and extent of damages, e.g.,* in that the value of his/her/its land has decreased by $_____ and 200 head of cattle have died from lack of water], all to plaintiff's damage in the sum of $_____.

13. Defendant's pumping operations, unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will _____ (*specify particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g.,* cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff in that plaintiff's land and soil have been rendered dry and unproductive resulting in the death of foliage and an inadequate amount of water for watering purposes, resulting in the death of several head of cattle and the possible death of the entire herd if defendant's pumping continues until this action can be brought to

trial).]

14. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries currently being suffered in that _____ [*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.,* defendants will continue to pump and export the water, rendering plaintiff's land so dry as to be useless for ranching purposes, the only purpose for which it is suitable, and plaintiff would be required to maintain a multiplicity of judicial proceedings to protect his/her/its interests].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For issuance of a preliminary injunction and a permanent injunction restraining and enjoining defendants from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* withdrawing water from the common underground basin],

2. For damages in the sum of $_____,

3. For costs of suit herein incurred, and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Plaintiff _____ [*name*]

[*Verification. See § 575.385.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action for damages and injunctive relief for interference with plaintiff's underground and percolating water caused by the defendant's drilling, pumping, and exporting of water from a common underground basin. The rights of an overlying landowner to underground water beneath the land are correlative and analagous to the riparian right, and injunctive relief may be appropriate [*see Tehachapi-Cummings County Water Dist. v. Armstrong (1975) 49 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999, 1001, 122 Cal. Rptr. 918* ; *see also § 575.81*]. Although in most instances the parties will be adjoining landowners, that relationship is not essential to the action.

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges the following:

- That the plaintiff's use of his or her land required water, which was in ample supply before the defendant's pumping (Paragraphs 5 and 6);

- The defendant's wrongful drilling and pumping (Paragraphs 7 and 11);

- That the defendant's pumping of water from the common underground waters was in an amount greater than the defendant's share of those waters (Paragraphs 8 and 9) [*see City of Pasadena v. City of Alhambra (1949) 33 Cal. 2d 908, 926, 207 P.2d 17 , cert. denied, 339 U.S. 937, 70 S. Ct. 671, 94 L. Ed. 1354]* ;

- That the plaintiff had no other source of water, while the defendant did (Paragraph 10);

- The damages proximately caused by the defendant's pumping (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*];

- Facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1]* ; and

- Any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 14) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *see also* Ch. 303, *Injunctions*].

[4] Verification

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 7 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 686, 106 P.2d 1* ; *Finnie v. Town of Tiburon (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1, 15, 244 Cal. Rptr. 581]* . In a limited civil case, the court may issue temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions, but not permanent injunctive relief; thus, if permanent injunctive relief is sought, the action cannot be brought as a limited civil case [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 85, 86(a)(8), 580(b)(1)*]. For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.399

§ 575.399 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020] to Easement by Adverse Possession [Code Civ. Proc. § 321] and for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422], and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Water Right

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] to Quiet Title [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.020(a), 761.020] to Easement by Adverse Possession [Code Civ. Proc. § 321] and for Temporary Restraining Order [Code Civ. Proc. § 530], Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422], and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] for Interference With Water Right

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT TO QUIET TITLE, FOR
_____ [*name of known defendant*] [*if unknown defendants are included, add:* and all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud on plaintiff's title tto this petition] [; and DOES I-_____, inclusive],	)	[TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER,] PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTIONS AND DAMAGES (Interference with Water Right) [*Civ. Code §§ 3422, 3333*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 321, 526, 527(a)*, [530,] 760.020, 761.020(a)]
Defendant(s).	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Quiet Title)

1. [*Plaintiff's ownership of land. See § 575.385, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Defendant's ownership of adjoining land. See § 575.385, Paragraph 2.*]

[3. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 3.*]

[4. *Agency allegation. See § 575.385, Paragraph 4.*]

5. A natural spring is located on defendant's above-described property _____ [*specify position, e.g.,* at a point approximately 60 feet southeast of its northwest corner].

6. Plaintiff is the owner of an easement _____ [*describe easement, e.g.,* in the form of a pipeline running southeasterly from plaintiff's land across defendant's property to the base of the spring and including a catch basin at the base of that spring].

7. The basis of plaintiff's title is prescriptive, resulting from plaintiff's actual, open, exclusive, hostile, and adverse possession and use of the above-described easement for more than five years.

8. Plaintiff is seeking to quiet title against the claims of defendant(s) as follows: defendant(s) _____ [*name(s) of the named defendant(s)*], who _____ [*describe claim of named defendant(s), e.g.,* denies that plaintiff's use of the easement has been hostile or continuous for the requisite period and claims to have permitted plaintiff's use of the easement] [*continue with whichever are applicable:*; the claims of the successor defendants described in Paragraph _____; the claims of all unknown defendants described in Paragraph 9, whether or not the claim or cloud is known to plaintiff; and the unknown, uncertain, or contingent claim, if any, of _____ (*name*) more fully described in Paragraph 10]. Defendant's/Defendants' claim(s) is/are without any right whatever and that/those defendant(s) has/have no right, title, estate, lien, or interest whatever in the above-described property, or any part of that property[, except the following: _____ (*set forth any claims of which plaintiff admits the validity, e.g.,* ownership by defendant _____ (*name*) of the real property that is subject to plaintiff's easement)].

[9. *If "all persons unknown" are named as defendants, allege:* The defendants herein named as "all persons unknown, claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud on plaintiff's title tto this petition" (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the unknown defendants") are unknown to plaintiff(s). These unknown defendants, and each of them, claim some right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the above-described property adverse to plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title; and their claims, and each of them, constitute a cloud on plaintiff's/plaintiffs' title to that property.]

[10. *If the claim of a named defendant is unknown, uncertain, or contingent, allege:* The claim of _____ (*name of defendant*) is _____ (unknown *or* uncertain *or* contingent). (*If the lack of knowledge, uncertainty, or contingency is caused by a transfer to an unborn or unascertained person or class member, or by a transfer in the form of a contingent remainder, vested remainder subject to defeasance, executory interest, or similar disposition, allege:* _____ (*Name*), age _____, is the person who would be entitled to an adverse claim if _____ (*describe contingency*) had occurred prior to the commencement of this action.) (*If this person is subject to a legal disability, allege:* This person is subject to _____ (*specify legal disability*).)]

11. Plaintiff seeks to quiet title as of _____ [*date*]. [*If the date is a date other than the date the complaint is filed, allege why a determination as of that date is sought.*]

12. For _____ [five *or more*] years plaintiff [and his/her/its predecessors in title] has/have openly, notoriously, continuously, and under a claim of right to do so, diverted waters from that spring and used them for _____ [*specify beneficial purpose, e.g.,* irrigation of an orange grove and domestic use for plaintiff's household]. Through this diversion of water, plaintiff has acquired a prescriptive right to the waters of the spring.

SECOND COUNT
(Interference with Water Right)

13. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-6 of the First Count.

14. At all times herein mentioned, the water diverted from that spring by plaintiff [and his/her/its predecessors in title], amounting to a maximum of _____ [*specify amount in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] per year, has been, and now is, applied for the above-described beneficial purposes and no others.

15. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant, without plaintiff's knowledge or consent, and without any right do to so, _____ [*describe interference with the flow of plaintiff's water, e.g.,* placed a cap on the two-inch water pipeline at the point where it protrudes into the catch basin, thereby preventing the flow of water from the spring to plaintiff's land].

16. Plaintiff has made demands on defendant that _____ [*describe demand, e.g.,* the cap be removed and the water be permitted to flow as it previously did], but defendant has refused, and continues to refuse, to do so.

[17. *Temporary restraining order allegation. See § 575.392, Paragraphs 6 and 7.*]

18. [*Proximate damage allegation. See § 575.392, Paragraph 8.*]

19. [*Preliminary injunctive relief allegation. See § 575.392, Paragraph 9.*]

20. [*Permanent injunctive relief allegation. See § 575.392, Paragraph 10.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

On the FIRST COUNT:

1. For a judgment that plaintiff is the owner of the easement and that defendant[s, and each of them] has/have no interest in the easement adverse to plaintiff's interest;

On the SECOND COUNT:

2. For an order requiring defendant[s, and each of them] to show cause, if any, why he/she/it/they should not be enjoined as hereinafter set forth, during the pendency of this action;

3. For [a temporary restraining order,] a preliminary injunction, and a permanent injunction, all enjoining defendant[s, and each of them], and their agents, servants, and employees, all persons acting under, in concert with, or for them:

a. From _____ [*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendants are to be*

prohibited from doing, commencing, continuing, or maintaining, e.g., placing a cap on the pipeline and thus preventing the flow of water to plaintiff's property]; and

b. To _____ [*specify each of the acts, courses of conduct, and conditions defendants are to be commanded to do or undertake, e.g.*, maintain the pipeline in its present condition and refrain from in any way interfering with the flow of water through the pipeline to plaintiff's property];

4. For damages [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

On all COUNTS:

5. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

6. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification. See § 575.385.*]

[*Certification re Notice. See § 575.392.*]

CAUTION:
A complaint to quiet title must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020*]. The above form does not contain any allegations regarding defendants who are personal representatives [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(a)*] or heirs and intestate or testate successors [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.030(b)*] of persons known or believed by the plaintiff to be deceased. If those defendants are necessary in your particular situation, use the appropriate allegations from Ch. 482, *Quieting Title.*

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to quiet title to his or her interest in an easement and to seek damages for and injunctive relief against interference with a prescriptive water right. Although in most instances the parties will be adjoining landowners, that relationship is not essential to the action.

For discussions regarding who must be named as defendants in a quiet title action and the statutory designations for particular classes of defendants, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title* . A plaintiff who intends to name unknown persons as defendants may wish to obtain a title report before commencing the action, because an examination of the record title and an inspection of the property will be necessary [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(b)*]. Also, the court may order plaintiff to obtain a title report and keep it available for inspection and copying by the parties [*Code Civ. Proc. § 762.040(b)*].

There is some question as to whether an attempt to base a right of prescription on a use that began after 1908 is valid, because since that time *Water Code § 1225* has required a permit for the right to appropriate [*see § 575.55[1]*]. Counsel should also be aware of the existence of *Water Code §§ 5100-5108*, requiring a statement of water use and diversion from all but those specifically excepted. Claimants under a prescriptive right are not within any of the exceptions [*Water Code § 5101*].

[3] Allegations

The first cause of action of the above complaint alleges (1) the parties' ownership and a description of the land (Paragraphs 1 and 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 392(a)(1), 761.020(a)*], (2) location of a spring (Paragraph 5) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(a)*], (3) plaintiff's ownership of an easement (Paragraph 6) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(b)*], (4) the basis of plaintiff's title (Paragraph 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(b); see* Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession*], (5) the adverse claim to plaintiff's title (Paragraph 8) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(c)*; Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*], (6) the date as of which a determination is sought (Paragraph 11) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 761.020(d)*], and (7) plaintiff's prescriptive right to the spring water (Paragraph 12) [*see Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*]. It also alleges plaintiff's beneficial use of the water, which is necessary in an action to quiet title to a water right (Paragraph 13) [*see Carlsbad Etc. Co. v. San Luis Rey Etc. Co. (1947) 78 Cal. App. 2d 900, 914, 178 P.2d 844]* . The complaint also includes optional paragraphs for use when unknown defendants have been named (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.060(a)*], and when the claim of a named defendant is unknown (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 762.020(b)*].

This form also incorporates fictitious name allegations (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 474*]. Rules governing civil actions generally apply in quiet title actions unless they are inconsistent with quiet title provisions [*Code Civ. Proc. § 760.060*]. Some people also additionally designate testate and intestate successors or "all persons unknown" as DOES. That is not recommended because it differs from the statutory language of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 762.030(b)(2), (3)* and *762.060*, by which those defendants are to be designated, and because it may limit the in rem effect of the judgment by limiting the number of adverse claimants in those classes [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 763.030(b)*].

The second cause of action of the complaint incorporates by reference the paragraphs setting forth plaintiff's ownership of the land, the location of the spring, and the nature of plaintiff's interest in the easement. The second cause of action alleges facts showing defendant's wrongful acts causing injury (Paragraphs 15 and 16).

[4] Lis Pendens

Immediately on filing the complaint in a quiet title action, the plaintiff must file a lis pendens in the office of the county recorder of each county in which any real property described in the complaint is located [*Code Civ. Proc. § 761.010*].

Before recording the notice, the plaintiff must mail a copy of the notice to be mailed, by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to all known addresses of the parties to whom the plaintiff's claim is adverse and to all owners of record of the real property affected by the plaintiff's claim as shown by the latest county assessment roll or more recent assessment information in the possession of the county. If there is no known address for service on an adverse party or owner, then as to that party or owner a declaration under penalty of perjury to that effect must be recorded in lieu of a filed proof of service, and service on that party is not required. Immediately after recording the notice, the plaintiff must file a copy of the notice in the court in which the action is pending. Upon an adverse party's being joined in the action, the notice must be served on that party [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.22*].

Any notice of pendency of action is void and invalid as to any adverse party or owner of record unless mailing requirements have been met for that party or owner and a proof of service in the form and content specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a* has been recorded with the notice of pendency of action [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.23*] (or an in lieu declaration has been recorded as described above).

From the time of recording of the notice of pendency of action, any purchaser, encumbrancer, or other transferee of the real property described in the notice is deemed to have notice of the pendency of the action as it relates to the real property, but only insofar as the action is pending against parties not fictitiously named. The plaintiff's rights and interest in the property, as ultimately determined in the pending noticed action, relate back to the date of recording of the notice [*Code Civ. Proc. § 405.24*].

For further discussion and forms, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens* .

[5] State Statutes

Acquisition of prescriptive water rights. *Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*

Injunctions specific to diversion of water. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 530, 532, 533*

Actions to quiet title. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 760.010-764.070*

[6] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.385* and *575.392*.

For discussion and forms relating to property rights of adjoining landowners generally, see Ch. 11, *Adjoining Landowners*

For discussion and forms relating to adverse possession and prescription, see Ch. 13, *Adverse Possession*

For discussion and forms for use in actions involving easements, see Ch. 240, *Easements*

For discussion and forms relating to interference with irrigation water, see Ch. 315, *Irrigation*

For discussion and forms relating to quiet title actions, see Ch. 482, *Quieting Title*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.400

§ 575.400 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Acquisition of Right to Water by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007; Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

[1] FORM Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Acquisition of Right to Water by Prescription [Civ. Code § 1007, Code Civ. Proc. § 321]

1. _____ [*Name of party pleading the right*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify activity requiring beneficial use of water, e.g.,* engaged in the cultivation of flowers for commercial florists] on the premises described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

2. For _____ [*number greater than five*] years prior to the commencement of this action, _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant], [and his/her/its predecessors in title], has/have hostilely, openly, notoriously, continuously, and without interruption, under a claim of absolute right, diverted and used _____ [*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure*] of the water of _____ [*specify watercourse, e.g.,* the Muddy River], and _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] is still beneficially using those waters for _____ [*specify uses to which the waters were put, e.g.,* the watering of the flower fields] for which _____ [plaintiff *or* defendant] has acquired the right to divert, direct, and use that water.

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by a plaintiff in a complaint to enforce a water right based on prescription or by a defendant to assert such a right as an affirmative defense. Adverse use of water for a beneficial purpose for five years may confer a title by prescription [*see Civ. Code § 1007*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 321*; *Cal. Const., Art. X, § 2*].

There is some question as to whether an attempt to base a right of prescription on a use that began after 1908 is valid, because since that time *Water Code § 1225* has required a permit for the right to appropriate [*see § 575.55[1]*]. Counsel should also be aware of the existence of *Water Code §§ 5100-5108*, requiring a statement of water use and diversion from all but those specifically excepted. Claimants under a prescriptive right are not within any of the exceptions [

Water Code § 5101].

When using these paragraphs as allegations, they should replace Paragraphs 6 through 10 in § 575.399.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.399*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.401

§ 575.401 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Nonuse

[1] FORM Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Nonuse

[AS A (_____ [*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST]) SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____[*specify, e.g.,* SECOND] CAUSE OF ACTION), DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:]

1. _____ [*Name of opposing party*] has lost his/her/its _____ [prescriptive *or* appropriative] right in _____ [*describe water to which right had attached, e.g.,* Clear Stream] situated in _____ County, California. _____ [*Name of opposing party*] had the right to divert water therefrom _____ [*describe former use to which lost water right was put, e.g.,* for domestic uses on his/her land], but has lost that right in that for more than _____ [*number greater than five*] years _____ [*name of opposing party*] has failed to make any beneficial use of that water under his/her/its right.

2. [That water was appropriated by _____ (*name of opposing party*) for _____ (*describe use, e.g.,* domestic purposes for his/her garden and care of barnyard animals), and] since on or about _____ [*date*] _____ [*name of opposing party*] has failed to beneficially use that water [or to use that water for that purpose] and has thereby lost his/her/its right to that water.

3. On _____ [*date*], the State Water Resources Control Board made a [written] finding that _____ [*name of opposing party*] had failed to make beneficial use of the above-described water for _____ years and had thereby lost his/her/its rights to that water. [A copy of the finding is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint.]

[2] Use of Form

This form of allegation is for use by a plaintiff in a complaint to claim a water right based on nonuse by the previous owner or by a defendant to assert that plaintiff's water right has been lost through nonuse. It may be used when the former owner's right was either prescriptive or appropriative [*see Water Code §§ 1240, 1241*]. A riparian owner's right will not be lost through nonuse, although to the extent the right is not exercised, riparian water is subject to appropriation and beneficial use by others [*Orange County Water District v. City of Riverside (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 137, 184, 343 P.2d 450]* .

When using these paragraphs as allegations in a complaint, omit the optional introductory paragraph; the allegations should replace Paragraphs 6-10 in § 575.399. For discussion of affirmative defenses, see *§ 575.388*.

Water that is unused may revert to the public and be available for appropriation by another. The reversion requires (1) a finding by the State Water Resources Control Board of nonuse for five years, (2) notice to the permittee, and (3) a public hearing if one is requested by the permittee [*Water Code § 1241*]. Before using the above allegation, it is advisable to have a finding of reversion by the State Board.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.402

§ 575.402 Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Abandonment

[1] FORM Allegation for Complaint or Affirmative Defense--Loss of Prescriptive or Appropriative Water Right--By Abandonment

[AS A (_____ [*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST]) SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (*if more than one cause of action alleged, state* TO THE _____ [*specify, e.g.,* SECOND] CAUSE OF ACTION), DEFENDANT ALLEGES that:]

1. Since _____ [*date*], _____ [*name of opposing party*] has abandoned any right he/she/it may have had to _____ [*describe water to which right had attached, e.g.,* Clear Stream] situated in _____ County, California, by relinquishing his/her/its possession and enjoyment tof this petition, in that he/she/it _____ [*set forth acts showing relinquishment, e.g.,* moved away from her house on the land near the stream]. _____ [*Name of opposing party*] intended that relinquishment to be an abandonment in that _____ [*set forth facts from which intention may be inferred, e.g.,* she sold her barnyard animals, failed to replant a garden, and no longer used the land or waters for any beneficial purpose].

2. On _____ [*date*], the State Water Resources Control Board made a [written] finding that _____ [*name of opposing party*] abandoned any right he/she/it may have had to that water on or about _____ [*date*], by relinquishing his/her/its possession and enjoyment tof this petition and that he/she/it thereby lost his/her/its rights to the water. [A copy of the finding is attached to this complaint/defense as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint/defense.]

[2] Use of Form

This allegation is for use by any party to an action who claims a right to water, alleging abandonment by the previous appropriative or prescriptive owner [*see Water Code §§ 1240, 1241*]. It may be used by a plaintiff in a complaint to enforce a water right based on abandonment by the previous owner or by a defendant to assert that plaintiff's water right

has been lost through abandonment. Abandonment requires proof of an intent to permanently relinquish the possession and enjoyment of a property right. Nonuse affords evidence on which the intent to abandon may be inferred [*Lindblom v. Round Valley Water Co. (1918) 178 Cal. 450, 455, 173 P. 994]* . The previous owner's right ceases at the moment abandonment is complete [*Smith v. Hawkins (1895) 110 Cal. 122, 126-128, 42 P. 453]* .

When using these paragraphs as allegations, omit the optional introductory paragraph; the allegations should replace Paragraphs 6-10 in § 575.399. For discussion of affirmative defenses, see *§ 575.388*.

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.401*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
A. Rights to Water
2. Adjudication of Water Rights

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.403-575.419

[Reserved]

§§ 575.403[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.420

§ 575.420 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Use Agreement and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Dispute Between User and Supplier--By User

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Use Agreement and for Damages [Civ. Code § 3300]--Dispute Between User and Supplier--By User

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	AND DAMAGES
through _____,]	)	[*Civ. Code § 3300*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of a parcel of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.387, Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 575.387, Paragraph 4.*]

[4. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant sold and conveyed to plaintiff the above-described parcel of real property (and a residence thereon).]

5. Without a supply of water the above-described parcel was worthless and uninhabitable, as it had no water of its own. _____ [*Describe defendant's knowledge of the land's condition and steps taken to make the land habitable, e.g.,* Defendant owned the parcels surrounding the parcel sold to plaintiff, planned to develop them for residential purposes, and toward that end, had developed a water system, consisting of a well, pump, and distribution lines for the purpose of supplying and distributing water to the entire tract, of which plaintiff's parcel was only a small portion].

6. [As part of the transaction conveying the above-described property to plaintiff, and for the same consideration,] [d]efendant and plaintiff executed a written water use agreement, _____ [a copy of which is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint *or set forth terms of water use agreement*].

7. On or about_____ [*date*], and thereafter, defendant _____ [*specify defendant's acts in reducing the supply of water to plaintiff's land, e.g.,* installed additional gages, meters, pressure reducers, and pipes which diminished the flow and the pressure of water to plaintiff's land. By _____ [*date*], both the flow and pressure of the water had been so diminished as to effectively eliminate water service to plaintiff's land].

8. Plaintiff has performed all of the stipulations, conditions, and covenants required to be performed by him/her in accordance with the terms and conditions of the water use agreement. Plaintiff has made repeated requests to defendant to furnish water as provided in the agreement, but defendant has refused, and continues to refuse, to so furnish water.

9. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*describe availability of water for delivery, e.g.,* the water well was capable of maintaining the water delivery at the original rate of flow and amount of pressure].

10. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties herein in that the water use agreement _____ [*set forth point over which controversy has arisen, e.g.,* provides for the supply of the quantity of water reasonably necessary for domestic use, but does not define what is a reasonable amount]. Plaintiff contends that under the contract _____ [*set forth plaintiff's interpretation, e.g.,* he/she is entitled to up to _____ (*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure that plaintiff contends to be reasonable*)]; whereas defendant contends that under the contract _____ [*set forth defendant's interpretation, e.g.,* plaintiff is only entitled to _____ (*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure that defendant contends to be reasonable*)].

11. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of his/her/its rights and duties and a declaration as to which party's interpretation of the water use agreement is correct.

12. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her/its rights and duties under the above-described water use agreement. [*Allege any financial or other burden suffered by plaintiff by the unsettled situation*.]

13. As a result of defendant's breach of the water use agreement, plaintiff has _____ [*specify damages suffered, e.g.,* incurred costs and expenses in the transport of water from a supplier 50 miles away] to his/her damage in the sum of $_____.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration that _____ [*state the determination the court is requested to render, e.g.,* under the

contract described above plaintiff is entitled to _____ (*specify amount of water in gallons, acre-feet, or other measure that plaintiff is entitled to under his/her interpretation of the contract*)];

2. For damages in the sum of $_____;

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 575.385.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action for declaratory relief to determine his or her rights under a water service agreement, and to recover damages for breach of the agreement. The form suggests a well as the source of the water, but its use is not restricted to well water. Although the form seeks contract damages, denial of water service may support an action for mental suffering, for which tort damages, including exemplary damages, are available; both contract and tort damages will not be awarded [*Acadia, California, Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 337, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686, 353 P.2d 294* ; for discussion and forms relating to mental suffering, see Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress*].

With appropriate modifications, the form can be adapted and expanded to seek injunctive relief as well. For a complaint seeking injunctive relief against interference with a water right, see *§ 575.399*. The above form is adapted from the fact situation in *Acadia, California, Ltd. v. Herbert (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 328, 5 Cal. Rptr. 686, 353 P.2d 294* .

[3] Allegations

This complaint alleges: (1) plaintiff's ownership of land for purposes of venue (Paragraph 1) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 392(a)(1)*], (2) factual background for existence of water use agreement (Paragraphs 4-6) [*see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*], (3) defendant's breach (Paragraph 7), (4) plaintiff's performance (Paragraph 8), (5) existence of sufficient water supply for delivery (Paragraph 9), (6) the existence of an actual controversy and the necessity for a judicial determination (Paragraphs 10-12) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see also* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*], and (7) damages (Paragraph 13) [*see Civ. Code § 3300*].

[4] Decisions

Declaratory judgment, injunctive relief, and damages are appropriate relief in action for breach of water delivery contract. *Robinson v. Nevada Irrigation Dist. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 760, 769, 161 Cal. Rptr. 863*

For a related form, see *§ 575.387*.

[5] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to contract actions, see Ch. 140, *Contracts*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion and forms relating to judicial remedy of declaratory relief, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.421

§ 575.421 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Service Agreement--Dispute Over Supplying Subdivision--By Developer

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] for Determination of Rights Under Water Service Agreement--Dispute Over Supplying Subdivision--By Developer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*]
through _____,]	)	
Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Plaintiff [_____ (*specify identity, e.g.,* Sunshine Development Company] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of a tract of land located near _____ [*city*] California, and known as Tract _____ in _____ County, California.

[2. *Fictitious name allegation. See § 575.387, Paragraph 3.*]

[3. *Agency allegation. See § 575.387, Paragraph 4.*]

4. Plaintiff and defendant _____ [*set forth identity of water company, e.g.,* Pacific Water Company]

entered a written contract on or about _____ [*date*], under the terms of which defendant agreed to provide water service to Tract _____ in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Public Utilities Commission and plaintiff agreed to pay the sum of $_____. _____ [A copy of that contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint *or set forth terms of the contract*].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], defendant _____ [*set forth identity of water district, e.g.*, Dry Valley Water District], pursuant to a written contract, purchased the water system operated by defendant Water Company, which was within the boundaries of defendant Water District. Tract _____ is within the boundaries of defendant Water District and was encompassed within that sale.

6. In the purchase agreement between the defendants, defendant Water District agreed that it would fulfill the contract defendant Water Company had made with plaintiff _____ [*specify terms by which this was agreed*]. _____ [A copy of that contract is attached to this complaint as Exhibit B and made a part of this complaint *or set forth terms of the contract*].

7. Plaintiff subdivided Tract _____, promising all the purchasers that each lot would be supplied with water. _____ [Many *or* All] of the lots are now without water, and those lot purchasers have made demands on plaintiff to supply water.

8. Plaintiff has demanded that defendants Water Company and Water District supply water to the lots without water, but defendants have not performed.

9. Plaintiff has performed all of the stipulations, conditions, and covenants that he/she is required to perform under the terms and conditions of his/her/its contract with defendant Water Company, which was to be performed in _____County. By its terms, the purchase agreement contract between defendant Water Company and defendant Water District was also to be performed in _____ County.

10. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists relating to the rights and duties of the parties herein relative to the contracts [attached to this complaint as Exhibits A and B] in that _____ [*specify essence of controversy, e.g.*, defendant Water Company contends that under the terms of Exhibit B defendant Water District is responsible for the installation and operation of water facilities for the lots in Tract _____, whereas defendant Water District contends that the terms of Exhibit A take precedence and defendant Water Company remains responsible for the installation and operation of water facilities for the lots in Tract _____].

11. [*Desire for judicial determination allegation. See § 575.420, Paragraph 11.*]

[12. *Necessity of judicial declaration allegation. See § 575.420, Paragraph 12.*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

1. For a declaration _____ [*state the determination the court is requested to render, e.g.*, determining who is responsible for providing water service to the lots in Tract _____ and the terms and conditions under which that water must be provided];

2. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]
Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 575.385.*]

[2] Use of Form

This complaint is for use by a subdivision developer to bring an action for declaratory relief to determine the rights and obligations of the parties to a contract for supplying water service to a subdivision. In the example used the dispute relates to the responsibility to perform particular obligations under the contract after the supplier has assigned the contract. A declaratory relief action is appropriate in ascertaining the duties of providing water when there is a controversy between the parties concerning contract responsibility [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *Bakersfield Country Club v. Pacific Water Co. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 528, 531, 13 Cal. Rptr. 573]* . The form is adapted from the fact situation in *Bakersfield Country Club v. Pacific Water Co. (1961) 192 Cal. App. 2d 528, 13 Cal. Rptr. 573* .

[3] Allegations

The complaint alleges: (1) plaintiff's identity and capacity (Paragraph 1), (2) existence of a contract (Paragraph 4) [*see* Ch. 140, *Contracts*], (3) a breach resulting in no water service (Paragraphs 7 and 8), (4) plaintiff's performance (Paragraph 9), and (5) existence of an actual controversy (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see also* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief*].

Also included are optional paragraphs for use when defendant water company has been purchased or otherwise transferred (Paragraphs 5 and 6).

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.420*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.422

§ 575.422 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Water District to Supply Water

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086] to Compel Water District to Supply Water

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]
through _____,]	)	
Respondent(s).	)	
	)	

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*]. This land is situated within the area serviced with water by respondent _____ [*specify name of Water District*], a public corporation.

2. The respondent Water District is a public utility and in exclusive control of the water supplied to the inhabitants of the area surrounding and including petitioner's lot. By law, respondent has the duty to supply all inhabitants of that area with water.

3. At all times herein mentioned respondent Water District has consistently refused, and still refuses, to supply water to petitioner's above-described land as well as to the land of others with an equal right, even though petitioner has complied with all the rules and regulations for obtaining service and has submitted a demand for water service as described below.

4. Petitioner's land is within the flow of the conduit of respondent Water District. Respondent has sufficient water available to it to supply petitioner's land, but refuses to extend its water mains or service to petitioner's parcel of land.

5. On or about _____ [*date*], [and on or about _____ (*date*),] a written and/or oral demand was made on respondent requesting that water be supplied to petitioner's land. _____ [*Set forth details of demands including extension of water conduits, tender, if any, of legal water rates, etc.*].

6. Respondent Water District has consistently refused, and still refuses, to serve water to petitioner's land through its existing facilities and has consistently refused, and still refuses, _____ [*describe refusal to expand facilities to serve petitioner, e.g.,* to install or extend additional conduits or water mains to serve petitioner's parcel of land].

7. As a result of the refusal of the respondent to supply water to petitioner's above-described land, petitioner has suffered damages in that _____ [*specify damages, e.g.,* petitioner has been required to transport his/her own water supply for his/her living and garden needs from a town 50 miles away, at a cost of $_____].

[8. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the aforementioned acts of the respondent were willful and _____ (oppressive *or* fraudulent *or* malicious *or any combination tof this petition*) in that _____ (*allege facts indicating presence of oppression, fraud, malice, or any combination tof this petition*). Petitioner is therefore entitled to exemplary damages.]

9. Petitioner is a person beneficially interested in the issuance of a writ by virtue of the fact that _____ [*specify facts demonstrating that petitioner is beneficially interested in the issuance of a writ, e.g.,* the issuance of a writ ordering respondent to provide service will directly and immediately benefit petitioner who is still without water service].

10. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, other than the relief sought herein, in that respondent, a public utility, has been granted the exclusive privilege from the State of California to supply water to the inhabitants of the area surrounding and including petitioner's land, and in that there is no other available water supply in that area.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. That the court issue a peremptory writ of mandate ordering respondent Water District to supply petitioner with water;

2. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

[3. For punitive damages;]

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]
By: _____ [*signature*]
_____ [*typed name*]
Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read this petition and know the contents tof this petition. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]
_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a person residing within the boundaries of a water district to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the water district to extend its mains and provide water service to the petitioner's property [*see Lukrawka v. Spring Valley Water Co. (1915) 169 Cal. 318, 320, 146 P. 640* ; *Boies & Soule v. East Bay Mun. Util. Dist. (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 843, 844, 9 Cal. Rptr. 464]* .

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges the following:

- The petitioner's capacity (Paragraph 1);
- The existence of the respondent's duty to provide water (Paragraph 2) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Hildreth v. Montecito Creek W. Co. (1903) 139 Cal. 22, 25-26, 72 P. 395]* ;
- The petitioner's right to receive water (Paragraph 3) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *Hartigan v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1918) 38 Cal. App. 763, 764, 177 P. 484]* ;
- The ability of the respondent to deliver water to all those entitled (Paragraph 4) [*see Cozzens v. North Fork Ditch Co. (1905) 2 Cal. App. 404, 414, 84 P. 342]* ;
- Demand made of respondent (Paragraph 5) [*see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*];
- Compensatory damages (Paragraph 7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1095*];
- Petitioner is a beneficially interested person (Paragraph 9) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]; and
- Lack of an adequate legal remedy (Paragraph 10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*].

The form also includes an optional paragraph for alleging exemplary damages (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code § 3294*; *Lowe v. Yolo County etc. Water Co. (1910) 157 Cal. 503, 510-512, 108 P. 297]* .

[4] Verification

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [Code Civ. Proc. § 1107; for a discussion of serving the petition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*].

[5] Points and Authorities

Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court before a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[6] Decisions

When water company's obligation to connect water service was clear under its own rules, superior court has jurisdiction over action brought by prospective water user for mandatory injunction requiring provision of service and for compensatory and exemplary damages; existence and exercise of that jurisdiction is in aid and not in derogation of jurisdiction of *Public Utilities Commission. Vila v. Tahoe Southside Water Utility (1965) 233 Cal. App. 2d 469, 479-480, 43 Cal. Rptr. 654*

171 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
B. Actions Under Agreements to Supply Water

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 575.423-575.439

[Reserved]

§§ 575.423[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.440

§ 575.440 Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 39400, 39425]

[1] FORM Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 39400, 39425]

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Petition for Formation of Water Storage District

To the Department of Water Resources of the State of California:

Petitioners allege:

[*EITHER*]

1. Petitioners constitute a majority in number of the holders of title to land irrigated or susceptible of irrigation from a common source and by the same system of works and are also the holders of title to a majority in value of the land included within the proposed water storage district.

[*OR*]

1. Petitioners number not less than 500 persons, each of whom is the holder of title to land within the proposed water storage district, and include the holders of title to not less than 10 percent in value of the land included within the

proposed water storage district.

[*CONTINUE*]

2. The boundaries of the proposed water storage district, which lies within the _____ [County *or* Counties] of _____, California, are as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

3. The proposed source(s) of water supply is/are as follows: _____ [*set forth general description, e.g.,* the Red River project for the importation of water into the proposed water district which may be used on lands within the district, as well as any project under Federal Reclamation Law, including any appropriate extensions or modifications].

[4. The location proposed for storage of water to be used for irrigation is as follows: _____ (*set forth location*).]

5. _____ [Drainage *or* Reclamation] connected with the project is as follows: _____ [*describe, e.g.*, the district will install and operate those drainage canals and works as are necessary and practicable for the removal of waters containing excessive amounts of salt, and operate whatever wells, pumping plants, and other facilities as are necessary and practicable to control the level of ground waters within the district].

[*EITHER*]

6. It is not proposed that the water storage district develop any hydroelectrical energy.

[*OR*]

6. Incidental development of hydroelectrical energy is as follows: _____ [*set forth description of any hydroelectrical energy resulting*].

[*CONTINUE*]

7. The nature of the proposed works to be developed is as follows: _____ [*set forth general description, e.g.,* the works will consist of conduits and distribution facilities necessary to deliver water to lands within the district, together with (temporary) surface storage facilities as described above, (and) the _____ (drainage *or* reclamation) facilities as described above(, and the facilities for the development of hydroelectric energy)].

8. Submitted and filed with this petition is a list of the names and addresses of all persons holding title to land within the proposed district as shown by the last equalized assessment roll of [each of] the affected _____ [county *or* counties].

9. Submitted and filed with this petition is the undertaking in the amount and form required by *Section 39428 of the Water Code*.

WHEREFORE, petitioners pray that the territory included within the proposed district be formed into a water storage district in accordance with the provisions of *Section 39000 et seq. of the Water Code*, and that the district be known as _____ Water Storage District.

Name	Residence	Date
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____

[*COMPILE sufficient signatures to meet statutorily required number of holders of title*]

[2] Use of Form

This petition is for use by the holders of title to land susceptible of irrigation from a common source to petition for the formation of a water storage district. *Water Code § 39400* sets forth the qualifications and number of petitioners required. A water storage district need not consist of contiguous parcels of land and may include land situated within other water storage districts having different plans and purposes [*Water Code §§ 39401, 39402*].

The petition is submitted to the Department of Water Resources and must be accompanied (1) by an undertaking in an amount double to the formation cost and (2) by a list of the names and addresses of all persons holding title to land within the proposed district [*Water Code §§ 39427-39430*].

[3] Procedure After Filing of Petition

After the formation petition is filed, the department will determine the practicability, feasibility, and utility of the proposed project, and may make all necessary studies, examinations, surveys, plans, and estimates of cost [*Water Code § 39600*]. There will be a hearing on the petition at which its sufficiency and the notice compliance will be considered [*Water Code §§ 39750-39752*]. If the department finds compliance with the statutory requirements, a hearing on the petition is held, after which the department makes an order as specified by statute [Water Code §§ 39755-39800].

Within 60 days after filing its order, the department will give notice of an election to be held to determine whether the district should be formed [*Water Code § 39900*]. If a majority votes for formation, the department will declare the territory formed as a district under the name designated, and will file for record in the office of the county recorder of each affected county a certified copy of the order declaring the district formed [*Water Code §§ 40100-40101*]. Formation of the district is complete with the filing for record of the order [*Water Code § 40102*].

[4] State Statutes

California Water Storage District Law. *Water Code § 39000 et seq.*

Contents of formation petition. *Water Code § 39425*

Petition consists of duplicate separate instruments. *Water Code § 39426*

Publication of notice. *Water Code §§ 39460-39466*

Defective notice not fatal. *Water Code § 39464*

Personal notice by registered mail. *Water Code § 39465*

Election on formation. *Water Code §§ 39900-39933*

Establishment of district. *Water Code §§ 40100-40104*

Powers and functions of district. *Water Code § 43000 et seq.*

[5] Decisions

Notice required is statement of time, place, and purpose of election, posted in three public places for 20 days, and published once a week for three successive weeks; personal notice by mail to electors is not required; landowner is responsible for assuring that name appears on assessment roll and that he or she is eligible to vote. *Froehlich v. Board of Directors (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 98, 101-103, 110 Cal. Rptr. 456*

[6] Cross References

For discussion and forms relating to statutory bonds and undertakings, see Ch. 538, *Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.441

§ 575.441 Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Declaration of Intention to Withdraw Name From Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code § 39431]

[1] FORM Proceedings Before Department of Water Resources--Declaration of Intention to Withdraw Name From Petition for Formation of Water Storage District [Water Code § 39431]

BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Declaration of Intention to Withdraw Name From Petition for Formation of Water Storage District

To the Department of Water Resources of the State of California:

I _____ [*name*], declare that:

1. I am the owner of the following described real property located within the proposed _____ [*name*] Water Storage District, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description of real property*].

2. On or about _____ [*date*], I signed the petition for the formation of that water storage district.

3. It is my intention to withdraw my signature from that petition.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this is true and correct.

_____ [*date and place*]
_____ [*signature*]
Declarant

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

	)	
State of _____,	)	ss.
County of _____.	)	

_____

On _____ [*date*], before me, _____ [*name and quality of officer*], personally appeared _____ [*name*], _____ [personally known to me *or* proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence] to be the person whose name is subscribed to this instrument, and acknowledged that he/she executed it.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
[*name of office*]
[*seal of office*]

[2] Use of Form

This declaration is for use by a person who signed a petition for formation of a water storage district and who wants to withdraw his or her name from the petition. A petition signature may be withdrawn at any time before publication of the petition by filing a declaration signed and acknowledged by the petitioner stating that it is his or her intention to withdraw from the petition [*Water Code § 39431*]. Publication will not occur until five days after the petition is filed [*Water Code § 39461*].

[3] Cross References

For alternative forms of acknowledgement, see Ch. 9, *Acknowledgements*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.442

§ 575.442 Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Exclusion of Land From Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48000, 48001]

[1] FORM Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Exclusion of Land From Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48000, 48001]

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
_____ WATER STORAGE DISTRICT

Petition for Exclusion of Land From _____ Water Storage District

To the Board of Directors of the _____ Water Storage District:

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is the holder of title to a tract of land located in _____, County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth description, which need not be more particular or certain than is required when the land is entered in the assessment book by the county assessor, as provided in Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 321-328*].

2. The boundaries of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District are as follows: _____ [*describe*].

3. _____ [All *or* The following described portion] of petitioner's land is presently included within the boundaries of _____ [*name*] Water Storage District: _____ [*set forth description*].

[4. The following described tract(s) is/are contiguous to the tract(s) described in Paragraph 3 of this petition:

_____ (*set forth description*).]

5. The land described above in Paragraph 3 [and the contiguous tract(s) described above in Paragraph 4] should be excluded from the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District for the following reason: _____ [*set forth specific reason for exclusion, e.g.,* petitioner was not advised by registered mail or otherwise informed of the proposed formation of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District and the inclusion of his/her land within it as required by *Section 39465 of the Water Code*].

[6. The _____ [*name*] Water Storage District, at the time of the filing of this petition, has no bonded indebtedness. Therefore, petitioner's exclusion from the district does not require the approval of any bondholders].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that the boundary of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District be changed to exclude petitioner's land, and that the board hold hearings, duly noticed, and conduct other proceedings as are necessary and proper in accordance with the provisions of *Sections 48000 et seq. of the Water Code* to exclude petitioner's land from the boundaries of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[*Acknowledgment, see § 575.441*.]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a holder of title to a tract of land within a water storage district to petition the board of directors of that water storage district to exclude that tract from the district. Holders may file jointly for exclusion of their tracts and any other contiguous tracts [*Water Code § 48000*].

The board must provide notice of the petition and the time of hearing [*Water Code §§ 48003, 48004*]. At the hearing the board will consider the petition and any written objections as well as supporting evidence for either position [*Water Code § 48025*]. Among other factors, the decision regarding exclusion will be based on the best interests of the district and whether the tract will be benefited by the operations of the district [*Water Code §§ 48029, 48030*].

[3] State Statutes

"Board" defined. *Water Code § 39016*

"Holder of title" defined. *Water Code § 39020*

Exclusion of land. *Water Code § 48000 et seq.*

Contents of petition. *Water Code § 48001*

Acknowledgment of petition. *Water Code § 48002*

Expenses required of petitioner. *Water Code § 48028*

Liability of excluded land. *Water Code §§ 48080-48087*

Assent of bondholders. *Water Code § 48055*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.441*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.443

§ 575.443 Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Inclusion of Land Within Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48200, 48201]

[1] FORM Proceedings Before Board of Directors of Water Storage District--Petition for Inclusion of Land Within Water Storage District [Water Code §§ 48200, 48201]

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
_____ WATER STORAGE DISTRICT

Petition for Inclusion of Land Within _____ [*name*] Water Storage District

To the Board of Directors of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District:

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is the holder of title to the following described tract of land which _____ [is *or* is not] contiguous to the existing boundaries of _____ [*name*] Water Storage District: _____ [*set forth description, which need not be more particular or certain than is required when the land is entered in the assessment book by the county assessor, as provided in Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 321-328*].

2. Petitioner expressly assents to the inclusion of the above-described land within the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District.

3. Petitioner is informed and believes and thereon alleges that it is feasible and practicable to irrigate that land.

4. Petitioner will advance to the board of directors of _____ [*name*] Water Storage District sufficient funds to pay the estimated costs of all proceedings on this petition.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays that the boundary of the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District be changed to include petitioner's land, described above in Paragraph 1, and that the board hold hearings, duly noticed, and conduct other proceedings as are necessary and proper in accordance with the provisions of *Section 48200 et seq.of the Water Code* to include petitioner's land within the _____ [*name*] Water Storage District.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[*Acknowledgment, see § 575.441*.]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a person holding title to land within the same watershed as an existing water storage district to petition the board of directors of that water storage district for the inclusion of the land within that district. The land to be included need not be contiguous to the existing district boundaries [*Water Code § 48200*]. The board must provide notice of the petition and the time of hearing [*Water Code §§ 48203, 48204*]. The board will order inclusion of the land (1) if it is in the best interests of the district, (2) if service is feasible by the system of works, (3) if no written protest is made, and (4) if no protests by holders of title are made pursuant to *Water Code § 48250* (inclusion election) [*Water Code § 48227*].

[3] State Statutes

"Board" defined. *Water Code § 39016*

"Holder of title" defined. *Water Code § 39020*

Inclusion of land. *Water Code § 48200 et seq.*

Contents of petition. *Water Code § 48201*

Acknowledgment of petition. *Water Code § 48202*

Advancement of costs by petition. *Water Code § 48205*

Inclusion elections. *Water Code §§ 48250-48260*

[4] Cross References

For related forms, see *§§ 575.441* and *575.442*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.444

§ 575.444 Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30200-30204]

[1] FORM Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30200-30204]

Petition for Formation of County Water District

To the Board of Supervisors of _____ County, California:

1. Petitioners are voters residing within the boundaries of the proposed district hereinafter described. Petitioners hereby petition the Board of Supervisors of _____ County to initiate the procedures as may be required by law to organize and incorporate a county water district and request that territory lying within the proposed boundaries of the proposed district be incorporated into a county water district in accordance with the provisions of *Section 30000 et seq. of the Water Code*.

2. The boundaries for the proposed county water district are as follows: _____ [*describe*].

3. The territory within the proposed boundaries is situated _____ [entirely within the County of _____ *or* within the contiguous Counties of _____ and _____], California.

4. When organized, the proposed district shall be known as the _____ County Water District.

5. Petitioners constitute voters equal in number to at least 10 percent of the voters registered within the boundaries of the proposed district 30 days prior to the filing of this petition.

[6. The boundaries of the proposed county water district include (part of) the _____ (City *or* Cities) of

_____ (and _____).]

[7. This petition is signed by at least 10 percent of the voters of _____ (that *or* that part of the *or* each) municipal corporation and of the unincorporated territory included in the proposed district voting at the election.]

WHEREFORE, petitioners pray that the above-described territory be incorporated into a county water district to be known as the _____ County Water District, as prescribed by law.

Name	Residence	Date
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____

[*COMPILE sufficient signatures to meet statutorily required percentage of residents*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by residents of one or two or more contiguous counties to petition for the formation of a county water district [*Water Code § 30200*]. The petition must be signed by 10 percent of the registered voters within the proposed boundaries [*Water Code § 30202*]. If at least part of one or more municipal corporations is included within the proposed district, the petition must be signed by at least 10 percent of those voters as well [*Water Code § 30203*]. Optional Paragraphs 6 and 7 may be used in that situation.

The petition is presented to the board of supervisors of the county in which the greater portion of the district is located [*Water Code §§ 30064, 30260*]. The county elections official will publish notice of the petition and the time of hearing [*Water Code § 30230*]. The board of supervisors will hold a hearing on the petition and consider all relevant evidence [*Water Code §§ 30260-30263*]. The board of supervisors will make changes in the proposed boundaries as deemed advisable, and will either dismiss the petition and terminate the proceedings or call an election to determine whether the district should be organized, depending on which alternative it determines is in the public interest [*Water Code §§ 30264, 30264.1*]. The election will be held on the next established election date not less than 74 days after the final hearing on the formation petition [*Water Code § 30291*]. If there is a majority vote in favor of formation, the board of supervisors will declare the district formed [*Water Code § 30320*].

[3] State Statutes

[a] Formation

County Water District Law. *Water Code § 30000 et seq.*

Contents of petition. *Water Code § 30201*

Number of signatures required. *Water Code §§ 30202-30203*

Petition is authorized to be made up of separate instruments. *Water Code § 30204*

Notice of petition. *Water Code §§ 30230-30232*

Defect not fatal if sufficient number of qualified signatures. *Water Code § 30232*

Election on formation. *Water Code §§ 30290-30297*

Name must include "County Water District." *Water Code § 30292(c)*

[b] General

County water district is district of limited power. *Gov. Code § 56037*

Community Services District Law. *Gov. Code §§ 61000-61144*

Powers and purposes of county water district. *Water Code § 31000 et seq.*

[4] Decisions

Water Code § 31021 defines one purpose of county water district as conserving water supply for future as well as present use. *Atchison etc. Ry. Co. v. Kings Co. Water Dist. (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 140, 146-147, 302 P.2d 1*

County water districts are merely "taxing districts" and Legislature has plenary control over matters regarding organization and change of boundaries; extent of annexed territory is political question. Sacramento M. U. Dist. v. All Parties, etc. *(1936) 6 Cal. 2d 197, 201, 57 P.2d 506*

Failure of predecessor in interest to challenge inclusion within county water district precludes landowner from making collateral attack on tax proceeding based on delinquent district taxes. *Taylor v. Coachella Valley Water Dist. (1952) 108 Cal. App. 2d 743, 745, 239 P.2d 454*

[5] Attorney General Opinions

Annexation of city land from county water district does not require detachment. *61 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 497, 498-502 (1978)*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.445

§ 575.445 Notice of Hearing on Petition for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30230, 30231]

[1] FORM Notice of Hearing on Petition for Formation of County Water District [Water Code §§ 30230, 30231]

Notice is hereby given that on _____ [*date*], a petition requesting the formation of a county water district, to be known as the _____ County Water District, was filed with the Board of Supervisors of the County of _____, State of California.

That petition is signed by _____ [*number*] voters within the proposed district, and the text of the petition, including _____ [*number, at least five*] of the names attached tto this petition, is as follows: _____ [*set forth text of petition*].

Notice is further given that the petition will be presented to and considered by the Board of Supervisors on _____ [*date*], at the hour of _____ _____. M., in the _____ [boardroom *or other room designation*] of the Board of Supervisors at _____ [*street address and city*], in _____ County, California. At that time and place, all persons interested may appear and be heard.

At the time and place stated in this notice, the Board of Supervisors of the County of _____ will hear the petition and those appearing thereon, together with any written protests filed with the Clerk of the Board prior to the hearing by or on behalf of owners of taxable property situated within the proposed district.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]
County Clerk
By: _____

[2] Use of Form

This notice is used to provide the requisite notice of hearing on a petition for formation of a county water district. The county elections official must publish the notice once a week for at least two weeks before the time of consideration of

the petition in at least one, but no more than three, newspapers published in the county [*Water Code § 30230*].

[3] State Statutes

Contents of notice. *Water Code § 30231*

Defect in notice not fatal. *Water Code § 30232*

[4] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.444*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.446

§ 575.446 Application to County Board of Supervisors for Inclusion of Land Within Proposed County Water District [Water Code § 30264(c)]

[1] FORM Application to County Board of Supervisors for Inclusion of Land Within Proposed County Water District [Water Code § 30264(c)]

Application for Inclusion of Land Within Proposed _____ County Water District

To the Board of Supervisors of _____ County, California:

The application of _____ [*name*] respectfully shows:

1. Applicant is the owner of the following described real property located in _____ County, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description of real property*].

2. That property has not been included within the boundaries of the proposed _____ County Water District, more particularly set forth in the petition for the formation of that county water district and in the notice of hearing thereon [published in _____ (*name of newspaper*) on _____ (*date*)].

3. Applicant's property will be benefited by the proposed county water district in that _____ [*specify benefit of inclusion within the proposed district, e.g.,* applicant's land is not included within any existing water district and applicant presently has no consistent and reliable access to water].

WHEREFORE, applicant prays that the real property above described be included within the proposed county water district.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a landowner to apply for the inclusion of his or her land within a proposed county water district. The board of supervisors has the power to change the proposed boundaries of the proposed water district and may include land not included in the petition when that land will be benefited by inclusion within the district [*Water Code § 30264(c)*].

Because the board of supervisors only has the power to change the boundaries while the water district is still a proposal, the above form should be used before the district has been formed [*see Water Code § 30264(c)*].

[3] Cross References

For a related form, see *§ 575.444*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.447

§ 575.447 Petition to Local Agency Formation Commission to Detach Territory [Gov. Code § 56700] From County Water District [Water Code § 32200]

[1] FORM Petition to Local Agency Formation Commission to Detach Territory [Gov. Code § 56700] From County Water District [Water Code § 32200]

Petition to Detach Territory From County Water District

To the Local Agency Formation Commission of _____ County, California:

Petitioners allege:

1. This petition is made pursuant to the provisions of *Section 56000 et seq. of the Government Code*.

2. Petitioner _____ [*name*] is the owner of the following described real property situated in _____ County, California: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

3. This-described real property is a tract of land located _____ [wholly *or* partially] within the _____ County Water District.

4. The _____ County Water District includes _____ [a portion of _____ County *or* portions of the Counties of _____ and _____], and the _____ [city *or* cities] of _____ [and _____]. A map of that water district showing its location relative to contiguous territories is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of this petition.

5. Petitioners propose that the above-described real property be excluded and detached from that water district.

[*EITHER*]

6. This-described real property proposed to be detached is inhabited in that _____ [*specify number of 12 or more*] persons who have been registered to vote within that territory _____ [*set forth date determined by legislative body, e.g.,* for at least 54 days prior to the date of initiation of preliminary proceedings herein] reside therein.

[*OR, if territory is uninhabited*]

6. This-described real property proposed to be detached is uninhabited in that it now contains, and has for _____ [*specify pertinent date as determined by legislative body, e.g.,* one year prior] to the initiation of these proceedings contained, less than 12 registered voters.

[*CONTINUE*]

7. A description of the exterior boundaries of the above-described real property proposed to be detached and excluded from _____ County Water District is as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*]. A map of that district showing the exterior boundaries thereon of the territory to be excluded is attached to this petition as Exhibit B and made a part of this petition.

8. Petitioners propose the following changes in the organization of that county water district to accommodate the exclusion: _____ [*describe*].

9. Petitioners make this proposal for the reason that the above-described territory is not directly and substantially benefited by being included in that district in that _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the land is composed of granite and limestone with only a thin layer of topsoil and no amount of water will ever render it capable of a greater productive capacity].

10. This-described proposal _____ [is *or* is not] consistent with the sphere of influence of any affected city or district.

11. Petitioners respectfully request that proceedings be taken to effect the change in _____ [organization *or* reorganization] of that county water district as proposed herein [and that this Commission set a date and place for hearing on this petition and give notice tof this petition as the law requires].

[12. *To designate up to three persons as chief petitioners, pursuant to Gov. Code § 56700(a)(7) add, e.g.,* _____ (*Name(s*)) of _____ (*mailing address(es*)) are designated chief petitioners.]

Name	Residence	Date
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____

[*COMPILE sufficient signatures to meet statutorily required percentage of residents*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to petition a local agency formation commission to detach territory from a county water district [*see Gov. Code § 56650*; *Water Code § 32200*]. With appropriate modification, it may be used to have land annexed, rather than detached, from a county water district [*see Water Code § 32400*]. Land consisting of any portion of the county wherein the district was formed or of any municipality therein, or land in a county contiguous to the county wherein the district was formed or of any municipality therein, may be included within the district. It is not necessary that the land to be annexed be contiguous to any portion of the district [*Water Code § 32400*]. Commission proceedings for annexation of land to, or detachment of land from, a district after its formation may be initiated by petition or by resolution of an application [*see Gov. Code § 56650*].

[3] Petition Signature Requirements

A resident-voter petitioner is required to add to his or her signature his or her place of residence, giving street and number or a designation sufficient to enable the place of residency to be readily ascertained [*Gov. Code § 56704(b)*]. A landowner petitioner must affix the date on which he or she signs the petition, and include a written description sufficient to identify the location of the land owned [*Gov. Code § 56704(c)*]. The number of signatures required on petitions for district annexation or detachment is set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 56767* and *56768*.

[4] Commission Proceedings

The petition is filed with the executive officer who must determine within 30 days whether or not it is complete and acceptable for filing. Immediately after receiving an application, and before issuing a certificate of filing, the executive officer will give mailed notice of the application to each interested agency, each subject agency, and other affected county. If it is acceptable, the executive officer will issue a certificate of filing and set the proposal for hearing and give published notice. The hearing date must not be more than 90 days after issuance of the certificate of filing or after the application is deemed accepted, whichever is earlier [*Gov. Code § 56658*]. The executive officer must review each application and prepare a report, including his or her recommendations, on the application. The report must be completed at least five days before the hearing [*Gov. Code § 56665*].

At the hearing the commission must hear and receive any oral or written protests, objections or evidence made, presented, or filed and consider the report of the executive officer [*Gov. Code § 56666*]. In any order approving a proposal for an annexation to, or detachment from, a district, the commission may determine that any election called may be held within a specified territory [*Gov. Code § 56876*]. Not later than 35 days after the conclusion of the hearing, the commission must adopt a resolution making determinations approving or disapproving the plan. If it disapproves the proposed plan, no further proceedings will be taken [*Gov. Code § 56880*]. The resolution of the commission is to initiate protest proceedings [*see Gov. Code § 57000 et seq.*] in compliance with the resolution [*Gov. Code § 56881(d)*].

[5] Conducting Authority

Within 35 days following the adoption of the commission's resolution making determinations, and following the reconsideration period [*see Gov. Code § 56895* (person or agency seeking reconsideration must file written request within 30 days of adoption of initial or superseding resolution by commission making determinations)], the executive officer of the commission must set the proposal for hearing and give notice of that hearing by mailing, publication, and posting [*Gov. Code § 57002(a)*]. The date of the hearing must not be less than 21 days or more than 60 days after the date the notice is given [*Gov. Code § 57002(a)*]. The hearing may not be held before expiration of the reconsideration period [*Gov. Code § 57002(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 56895(b)* (reconsideration period)]. If authorized by the commission [

see Gov. Code § 56663] a change of organization or reorganization may be approved by resolution of the conducting authority without notice, hearing, and election [*Gov. Code § 57002(c)*]. The protest hearing must be held by the commission on the date and at the time specified in the notice given by the executive officer. It may be continued on a later date, not to exceed 60 days from the date specified [*Gov. Code § 57050(a)*].

In the case of annexations or detachments in registered voter districts, the commission, not more than 30 days after the hearing's conclusion, must make a finding regarding the value of extant written protests, and, in the case of inhabited territory, either terminate the proceedings or order an election by the registered voters residing within the affected territory, if extant protests have been filed by either of the following: (1) at least 25 percent, but less than 50 percent, of the registered voters residing in the affected territory, or (2) at least 25 percent of owners of land who also own at least 25 percent of the assessed value of land within the affected territory [*Gov. Code § 57075(a)*].

In the case of annexations or detachments in landowner-voter districts, the commission must either terminate the proceedings or make a finding regarding the value of extant written protests, and must order an election within the affected territory if extant protests have been filed representing either of the following: (1) 25 percent or more of the owners of land who also own 25 percent or more of the assessed value of land within the territory, or (2) 25 percent or more of the voting power of landowner voters entitled to vote as a result of owning property within the territory [*Gov. Code § 57076(b)*].

[6] Petition Signed by All Landowners

If a petition for an annexation or a detachment, or for a reorganization consisting solely of annexations or detachments, is signed by all the owners of land within the affected territory of the proposed change, the commission may approve or disapprove the change without notice and hearing [*Gov. Code § 56663(a)*]. The commission might also approve and authorize the conducting authority to conduct proceedings without notice, hearing, and an election [*Gov. Code § 56663(a)*].

[7] State Statutes

[a] Definitions

"Conducting authority" defined. *Gov. Code § 56029*

"Inhabited territory" and "uninhabited territory" defined. *Gov. Code § 56046*

"Interested agency" defined. *Gov. Code § 56047.5*

"Landowner-voter," "landowner-voter district" defined. *Gov. Code §§ 56049, 56050*

"District," "special district" defined. *Gov. Code § 56036*

[b] General Provisions

Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (formerly the Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985). *Gov. Code § 56000 et seq.*

Petition requirements. *Gov. Code §§ 56700-56711*

Commission proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 56825-56898*

Conducting authority proceedings. *Gov. Code §§ 57000-57204*

Effect of reorganization. *Gov. Code §§ 57300-57550*

Exclusion of territory from county water district. *Water Code § 32200*

Inclusion of territory from county water district. *Water Code § 32400*

[8] Decisions

Mandamus is appropriate remedy to test proper exercise of discretion vested in local board; substantial evidence is test on review. *Atchison etc. Ry. Co. v. Kings Co. Water Dist. (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 140, 143, 302 P.2d 1*

Exclusion of land from county water district permissible only when there is no substantial and direct benefit to land; "no substantial and direct benefit test" applied to land itself, as distinguished from benefit to landowner's particular use of that land. *Atchison etc. Ry. Co. v. Kings Co. Water Dist. (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 140, 144-145, 302 P.2d 1*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 575 WATERS
PART IV. FORMS
C. Water Districts: Formation; Inclusion; Exclusion

51-575 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 575.448

§ 575.448 Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of Municipal Water District [Water Code §§ 71120-71124]

[1] FORM Petition to County Board of Supervisors for Formation of Municipal Water District [Water Code §§ 71120-71124]

Petition for Formation of Municipal Water District

To the Board of Supervisors of _____ County, California:

The undersigned hereby petition for the formation of a municipal water district in accordance with the provisions of *Section 71000 et seq. of the Water Code*, and their petition respectfully shows:

1. The boundaries for the proposed municipal water district are: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

[*EITHER*]

2. Those boundaries include _____ [the entire *or* a portion of the] corporate area of the _____ [City *or* Cities] of _____ [and _____].

[*OR*]

2. Those boundaries do not include the entire or any portion of the corporate area of any city.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. Petitioners constitute qualified voters equal in number to at least 10 percent of the voters registered within the boundaries of the proposed district as of _____ [*specify date 30 days prior to the date petition is filed*].

[*EITHER, if one or more city is included*]

4. Petitioners constitute at least 10 percent of the voters in the _____ [City *or* Cities] of _____ [and _____, respectively], registered to vote therein as of _____ [*specify date 30 days prior to the date petition is filed*].

[*OR, if only portion of city; 12 or more resident voters*]

4. There are _____ [*specify number of 12 or more*] registered voters residing within that portion of the City of _____ that is included within the boundaries of the proposed municipal water district. Petitioners are voters residing within that portion equal in number to at least 10 percent of _____ [*specify the lesser of either* the total number of registered voters in that portion *or* the number of voters of that portion voting for all candidates for the office of Governor at the last general election prior to the filing of this petition].

[*OR, if only portion of city; less than 12 resident voters*]

4. There are _____ [*specify number less than 12*] registered voters residing within that portion of the City of _____ which is included within the boundaries of the proposed municipal water district. Petitioners are at least 50 percent of the voters residing in that portion.

[*CONTINUE*]

5. The proposed name for the district is the _____ Municipal Water District.

WHEREFORE, petitioners pray that the above-described territory be incorporated into a municipal water district to be known as the _____ Municipal Water District, as prescribed by law.

Name	Residence	Date
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____
_____ [*signature*]	_____	_____

[*COMPILE sufficient signatures to meet statutorily required percentage of resident voters*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use to petition for formation of a municipal water district. The petition is filed with the elections official of the principal county, which is the county in which the greater portion of the land of a proposed district is situated [*Water Code §§ 71015, 71050, 71120*]. The formation petition may consist of separate documents [*Water Code § 71120*]. It must be signed by 10 percent of the registered voters within the boundaries of the proposed district. If a city is included within the boundaries, the petition must also be signed by 10 percent of its voters [*Water Code § 71121*]. If only a portion of a city is included, the petition must also include a specified percentage of its voters [*Water Code § 71122*]. The alternative Paragraphs 4 are for use to state that these requirements have been met, and one or more of them may be appropriate. If the second alternative Paragraph 2 is used, indicating that no portion of any city is within the proposed district boundaries, Paragraph 4 is not necessary.

After an examination and certification of the signatures of voters reveal that the petition is sufficient, the elections official presents the petition to the board of supervisors [*Water Code §§ 71126, 71133*]. The board of supervisors will make an order dividing the proposed district into five divisions based on population and will provide for an election to determine formation and election of the first board of directors [*Water Code §§ 71160, 71161*]. On a majority vote, the board of supervisors will declare the territory included within the proposed boundaries to be formed as a municipal water district under the designated name [*Water Code § 71190*].

[3] Supplemental Petition

If the petition is insufficient it may be amended by filing a supplemental petition to include the requisite number of signatures within 10 days [*Water Code § 71129*].

[4] State Statutes

Municipal Water District Law. *Water Code § 71000 et seq.*

Formation petition. *Water Code §§ 71120-71135*

Signatures required. *Water Code §§ 71121, 71122*

Contents of petition. *Water Code § 71123*

Powers and purposes of district. *Water Code §§ 71590-71759*

Formation election. *Water Code §§ 71160-71172*

Establishment of district. *Water Code §§ 71190-71196*

[5] Decisions

Municipal water districts have power to either regulate or contract as to rates. *Louisiana-Pacific Corp. v. Humboldt Bay Mun. Water Dist. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 152, 158-161, 186 Cal. Rptr. 833*

Municipal water district are not required to consider benefit to land in its formation or exclusion decisions; water district is able to be formed and maintained for largely negative purposes as well as for positive purposes, and formation for purpose of preventing importation of water from another water district is valid. *Wilson v. Hidden Valley Mun. Water Dist. (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 271, 282-284, 285, 63 Cal. Rptr. 889*

[6] Attorney General Opinions

Municipal water district must consider effect of water pipeline on total environment. *58 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 438, 442 (1975)*

181 of 181 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 576 RESERVED

51-576 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 576

RESERVED

Chapter 576RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 577.syn

§ 577.syn Synopsis to Chapter 577: WORKERS' COMPENSATION

§ 577.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 577.02 Cross References

[1] Arbitration

[2] Exclusive Remedy Principles

[3] Judicial Review

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Subrogation

[6] Third Party Actions

§§ 577.03-577.09 [Reserved]

§ 577.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

[2] Applicability of 1989 and 1990 Amendments

§ 577.11 Nature and Purpose of Law

§ 577.12 Administration of Law

[1] In General

[2] Division of Workers' Compensation

[3] Workers' Compensation Appeals Board

[a] Jurisdiction

[b] Power to Punish for Contempt

[c] Disciplinary Powers Over Representatives of Parties

[d] Establishment of Uniform Procedures and Forms

§ 577.12A Electronic Adjudication Management System

[1] Using EAMS; General Characteristics

[2] Case Names, Case Index, and Adjudication Files

[3] Official Participant Record and Duty to Furnish Correct Address

[4] Designated Preferred Method of Service

[5] Failure to Comply With Court Administrator's Rules

[6] Corrective Measures for Misfiled or Misdirected Documents Into the Case Management System

[7] Extended System Unavailability

§ 577.13 Employer's Liability for Workers' Compensation Benefits

[1] Basis for Liability

[2] Extent of Liability

[a] Disability and Medical Treatment

[b] Death Benefits

[3] Employer's Obligation to Secure Payment of Compensation

[4] Failure to Secure Payment of Compensation

[a] Criminal and Civil Penalties

[b] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

§ 577.14 General Definitions

[1] Compensation

[2] Dependency

[a] In General

[b] Presumption of Dependency

[i] Children

[ii] Spouses

[c] Actual Dependency

[3] Injury and Compensability

[a] In General

[b] Specific Versus Cumulative Injuries

[c] Date of Injury

[i] In General

[ii] Specific Injuries

[iii] Cumulative Injuries

[iv] Knowledge of Injury

[v] Date of Injury Versus Fact of Injury

[d] Psychiatric Injuries

[i] Causation; Actual Events of Employment

[ii] Six-Month Rule

[iii] Post-Termination Claims

[iv] Good Faith Personnel Actions

[e] Multiple and Successive Injuries

[f] Excluded Injuries

[4] Temporary Disability

[5] Permanent Disability

§ 577.15 Employer's Death

§ 577.16 Employer's Bankruptcy

§ 577.17 Serious and Willful Misconduct

[1] By Employee

[2] By Employer

[a] In General

[b] Willfully Uninsured Employer

§ 577.18 Unlawful Discrimination

[1] Against Injured Employee

[2] Against Witness

§ 577.19 Fraudulent Workers' Compensation Claims

[1] In General

[2] Enforcement of Anti-Fraud Laws

[3] Criminal and Civil Penalties

§ 577.20 Consideration for Referral for Benefits

[1] In General

[2] Criminal and Civil Penalties

§ 577.21 Advertising

[1] False and Misleading Advertising

[a] In General

[b] Criminal and Civil Penalties

[2] Advertising Legal Services

§ 577.22 Employment Relationships

[1] In General

[2] Special Employees

[3] Independent Contractors

[a] Defined

[b] Right to Control Work Test

[c] Other Factors to Be Considered

[d] Determination of Status

[4] Presumptions

[a] Employee Status

[b] Work for Which License Is Required

[i] In General

[ii] Contractor's License

[iii] Medical License

[5] Aliens/Undocumented Workers

§ 577.23 Conditions of Compensation Liability

[1] In General

[2] Proximate Causation

[3] Post-Termination Claims

§ 577.24 Arising Out of and in the Course of Employment

[1] In General

[2] Burden of Proof

[3] Employee Misconduct

[4] Acts Personal to Employee

[5] Emergency Efforts on Behalf of Employer

[6] Going and Coming Rule

[a] In General

[b] Exceptions to Rule

[i] Special Risk Exception

[ii] Special Mission or Errand Exception

[iii] Commercial Traveler Exception

[c] Meal Breaks

[7] Bunkhouse Rule

§ 577.25 Time Limitations

[1] In General

[2] Proceedings to Collect Compensation

[a] In General

[b] Cumulative Injury

[c] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

[d] Proceeding to Collect Death Benefits

[i] In General

[ii] Death From Asbestosis

[iii] Death From HIV-Related Disease

[e] Serious and Willful Misconduct

[i] By Employer

[ii] By Employee

[3] Minors and Incompetents

[4] Tolling of Statute on Submission to Information and Assistance Officer

[5] As Affirmative Defense

§§ 577.26-577.39 [Reserved]

§ 577.40 Governing Law

§ 577.41 Consultation With Attorney

[1] Disclosure Statement

[2] [Reserved]

[3] Fees and Fee Agreements

§ 577.42 Notice Requirements

[1] Employee's Duty to Notify Employer of Injury or Death

[a] In General

[b] Effect of Failure to Provide Notice

[2] Employer's Duty to Notify Injured Employee of Workers' Compensation Rights

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1990

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

[c] Victims of Crime

[d] Failure to Give Employee Notice of Workers' Compensation Rights

§ 577.43 Filing a Claim Form

[1] Source of Form

[2] Content of Form

[3] Manner of Filing Form

[4] Employer's Duties on Receipt of Claim Form

[a] In General

[b] Denial of Claim

[c] Presumption of Compensability if Liability Not Rejected

[5] Effect of Filing on Statute of Limitations

[6] Dismissal of Claim for Lack of Activity

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1994

[i] If Claim Denied

[ii] If Benefits Furnished

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994

[c] Service of Notice of Dismissal

[d] Evidence That Claim Is Active

[e] Jurisdiction of WCAB

§ 577.44 [Reserved]

§ 577.45 Provision of Benefits

[1] Medical Treatment

[a] In General

[b] Official Medical Fee Schedule; Contractual Fees

[c] Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule and Utilization Review Process

[d] Medical Provider Networks

[i] Creation and Approval of Medical Provider Network

[ii] Economic Profiling of Providers

[iii] Continuity of Care and Completion of Treatment by Terminated Providers

[iv] Injured Employee's Rights in Medical Provider Network

[v] Independent Medical Review Process

[2] Vocational Rehabilitation

[a] Eligibility

[b] Rehabilitation Unit

[c] Cap on Expenses for Injuries on or After January 1, 1994

[2A] Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits

[a] Nature of and Eligibility for Benefits

[b] Dispute Resolution

[c] Training Vouchers

[d] State Approved or Accredited Schools

[e] Vocational and Return to Work Counselors

[f] Termination of Claims Administrator's Liability for Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit

[3] Temporary Disability Indemnity

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1990

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

[c] Notice Required With Last Payment of Temporary Disability Indemnity

[4] Permanent Disability Benefits

[a] In General

[b] Formal Rating Determinations

[c] Informal Ratings

[d] Summary Rating Determinations

[i] In General

[ii] Represented Employee

[iii] Unrepresented Employee

[e] Consultative Rating Determinations

[5] Return-to-Work Program

[a] Term and Scope of Program

[b] Obligations of Director of Industrial Relations

[c] Employer Reimbursement

[d] Regulations and Funding

[e] Offer of Work; Adjustment of Permanent Disability Payments

§ 577.46 Medical-Legal Evaluations

[1] Report of Treating Physician

[2] Medical Evaluation to Determine Compensability of Injury

[a] In General

[b] Unrepresented Employees

[3] Medical Evaluation When Parties Do Not Agree to Permanent Disability Rating or Need for Continuing Medical Care

[a] QME Panel Requests

[b] Specialist Designation

[c] QME Panel Selection

[d] QME Panel Selection Disputes in Represented Cases

[e] Scheduling Appointment With Panel QME

[f] QME Replacement Requests

[g] Obtaining Additional QME Panel in Different Specialty

[h] Consultations

[i] Additional QME Evaluations Ordered by Appeals Board

[j] Appointment Notification and Cancellation

[k] Compliance by AMEs and QMEs With Administrative Director Evaluation and Reporting Guidelines

[l] Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports by Medical Evaluators, Including Reports Under Lab. Code § 4061

[m] Service of Comprehensive Medical/Legal Report in Claims of Injury to Psyche

[n] Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs

[o] Disclosure and Ethical Requirements for QMEs and AMEs

[p] Methods of Evaluation and Minimum Time Guidelines of Various Disabilities

[q] Calculation and Service of Permanent Disability Rating by Administrative Director

[r] Request for Reconsideration of Rating When Employee Is Unrepresented

[s] Medical Evaluation of Permanent Disability as Condition Precedent to Filing Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

[t] Limitations on Informal Evaluation of Permanent Impairment or Need for Continuing Medical Care

[4] Objections to Determinations by Treating Physician

[5] General Procedures Applicable to Comprehensive Medical Evaluations for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1991

[a] Information Provided to Medical Evaluators

[b] Communications With Agreed or Qualified Medical Evaluator

[c] Failure to Complete Comprehensive Medical Evaluation in a Timely Manner

[d] Procedure When Compensation Is Required by Comprehensive Medical Evaluation

[e] Liability for Costs of Evaluations and Reports

[f] Liability for Attorney's Fees When Employer Files Application for Adjudication Contesting Comprehensive Medical Evaluation

[g] Additional Medical Evaluations for Modified Compensation Awards

[h] Presumption That Treating Physician's Findings Are Correct

[i] Determination of Disability Rating When Comprehensive Medical Evaluation Is Contested

[6] Medical-Legal Fee Schedule

§§ 577.47-577.59 [Reserved]

§ 577.60 Governing Law

[1] In General

[2] Representation Required

§ 577.61 Disputes Subject to Arbitration

[1] Mandatory Arbitration

[2] Voluntary Arbitration

§ 577.62 Arbitration Submittal Form

§ 577.63 Arbitrators

[1] Qualifications and List of Eligible Arbitrators

[2] Selection of Arbitrator

[a] Parties in Agreement

[b] Parties Not in Agreement

[3] Disqualification of Arbitrator

[4] Duties and Responsibilities

§ 577.64 Costs and Compensation Related to Arbitration

[1] In General

[2] Resolution of Disputes Over Costs or Fees

[3] Amount of Arbitrator's Fees

§ 577.65 Time and Place of Arbitration

§ 577.66 Submission and Service of Papers

§ 577.67 Communication With Arbitrator

[1] Disclosure of Settlement Offers Prohibited

[2] Ex Parte Communication

§ 577.68 Arbitrator's Findings and Award

[1] In General

[2] Reconsideration

[a] In General

[b] Alternative Dispute Resolution Systems

§ 577.69 Arbitration of Subsequent Issues or Proceedings

§ 577.70 Submission of Supplemental Proceedings

§§ 577.71-577.79 [Reserved]

§ 577.80 Governing Law

§ 577.81 Guardian ad Litem and Trustee

§ 577.82 Pleadings

[1] Requirements, In General

[2] Amendment of Pleadings

[3] Proper Identification of Parties and Lien Claimants

§ 577.83 Application for Adjudication and Answer

[1] Application

[a] By Party in Interest

[b] By Lien Claimant

[c] Separate Application for Each Injury Required

[d] Dismissal of Application That Shows No Right to Compensation

[2] Answer

[a] Grounds for Filing

[b] Time for Filing

[c] Appearances

[i] Appearances Required

[ii] Failure to Appear

[iii] Appearances in Settled Cases

[iv] Procedures Following Failure to Appear

[3] Demurrers Prohibited

[4] Statement to Be Filed With Application or Answer

§ 577.84 Initiation of Proceeding

[1] Filing

[2] Service

[3] Failure to Comply With Court Administrator's Rules

§ 577.85 Parties

[1] Designation

[2] Joinder of Applicants

[3] Joinder of Defendants

§ 577.86 Joinder of Claims

§ 577.87 Venue

[1] In General

[2] Asbestos-Related Injuries

[3] Petition for Change

§ 577.88 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

[1] Service and Filing

[2] Objection to Declaration

[3] False Declaration or Certification

[4] Setting for Hearing Other Than as Requested

§ 577.89 Filing and Service of Physicians' Reports

[1] In General

[2] Content of Medical Reports

[3] Form of Medical Evidence

[4] Employer-Maintained Records

[5] Failure to Comply with Requirements

§ 577.90 Consolidatation of Cases

§§ 577.91-577.99 [Reserved]

§ 577.100 Governing Law

§ 577.101 Caption of Papers

§ 577.102 Data Entry Sheet

§ 577.103 Petitions

§ 577.104 Form and Size Requirements of Papers

§ 577.105 Verification

§ 577.106 Filing Papers

[1] In General

[2] Manner of Filing Documents

[3] Electronic Filing Exemption for Electronic Filing Trial

[4] Time of Filing Documents

[5] Filing of Copies of Documents

[6] Petitions for Reconsideration or Removal and Subsequent Filings

[7] Papers That Will Not Be Filed

§ 577.107 Duty to Furnish Correct Address

§ 577.108 Service of Papers

[1] Application for Adjudication

[2] Other Papers Served by Party

[3] Other Papers Served by WCAB

[4] Manner of Service

[5] Proof of Service

[a] Personal Service

[b] Service by Mail

[c] Service by E-Mail

[d] Service by Fax

§§ 577.109-577.119 [Reserved]

§ 577.120 Governing Law

§ 577.121 Written Stipulation

§ 577.122 Oral Stipulation

§ 577.123 WCAB Action on Stipulation

§ 577.124 Resolution of Liens

§§ 577.125-577.129 [Reserved]

§ 577.130 Governing Law

§ 577.131 Right to Compromise and Release From Liability

[1] In General

[2] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

§ 577.132 Compromise and Release Agreements

[1] Form and Contents of Agreement

[2] Filing Agreement

[3] Service of Agreement on Lien Claimants

[3A] Resolution of Liens

[4] WCAB Approval of Agreement Required

[5] WCAB Action on Agreement

[a] Adequacy of Agreement

[b] Proof of Service

[6] Rescission of Agreement

[7] Reconsideration of Order Approving Agreement

[8] Effect of Compromise and Release on Non-Workers' Compensation Claims

§ 577.133 Occupational Disease or Cumulative Injury Case

§ 577.134 Claims Against Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

§§ 577.135-577.139 [Reserved]

§ 577.140 Governing Law

§ 577.141 Issuance of Process

§ 577.142 Attachment

§ 577.143 Inactive Cases

[1] Removing and Restoring Cases to Calendar

[2] Dismissal for Failure to Activate Case

§ 577.144 Joinder and Dismissal of Parties

§ 577.145 Workers' Compensation Judges

[1] Assignment of Cases to Workers' Compensation Judge

[2] Powers of Workers' Compensation Judge

[a] In General

[b] To Punish for Contempt and to Issue Process

[c] Disqualification of Workers' Compensation Judge

[i] In General

[ii] Petitions to Disqualify and for Reassignment

[iii] WCAB's Action on Petition to Disqualify

§ 577.146 Consolidation of Cases

§ 577.147 Subpoenas

[1] Issuance

[2] Recordings and Reproductions of Destroyed Originals

[3] Service on Medical Witness

[4] Personal Records

[5] Employment Records

[6] Records, Files, and Proceedings of WCAB

[7] Judicial Enforcement

[a] Petition to Compel

[b] WCAB's Action on Petition to Compel

§ 577.148 Witness Fees

§ 577.149 Depositions

[1] In General

[2] Costs and Fees

§ 577.150 Sexual Harassment or Assault Cases

§ 577.151 X Rays

§ 577.152 Notice of Medical Appointment

§ 577.153 Substitution or Dismissal of Attorneys; Dismissal of Agents

§ 577.154 Prehearing Motions

§ 577.155 Dismissals

[1] In General

[2] Failure to Comply With Notice Requirement

[3] Grounds for Dismissal

§ 577.156 Compelling Medical Examination or Autopsy

§ 577.157 Settlement Conference

[1] When Required

[2] Continuances

[3] Qualifications of Referee

[4] Conference Statement; Discovery; and Evidence

[5] Appearance Required at Conference

[6] Conduct of Mandatory Conference

[a] In General

[b] Pre-Trial Statement

[c] Summary of Proceedings

[7] Hearing Date When Dispute Unresolved by Settlement Conference

§ 577.158 Walk-Through Documents

§ 577.159 Emergency Petitions for Stay

§§ 577.160-577.169 [Reserved]

§ 577.170 Governing Law

§ 577.171 Types of Hearings

§ 577.172 Time for Hearing

[1] In General

[2] Continuances

[3] Expedited Hearing Procedure

§ 577.173 Notice of Hearing and Failure to Appear

[1] Notice

[2] Failure to Appear

§ 577.174 Single Trial Requirement

§ 577.175 Hearings in Cases Involving Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund, Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund, or Death Without Dependents

§ 577.176 Qualified Interpreters

[1] Definition

[2] Entitlement

[3] Fees

§ 577.176A Devices to Assist the Hearing Impaired

§ 577.177 Reporting of Proceedings and Transcripts

§ 577.178 Evidence

[1] Rules of Evidence

[2] Form of Evidence

[3] Procedure on Evidence Taken Without Notice

[4] Return of Exhibits

§ 577.179 Burden of Proof and Affirmative Defenses

[1] In General

[2] Preponderance of the Evidence

[3] Proof of Industrial Causation--Reasonable Probability

§ 577.180 Minutes of Hearing and Summary of Evidence

§ 577.181 Minute Orders

§ 577.182 Record of Proceedings

§§ 577.183-577.189 [Reserved]

§ 577.190 Governing Law

§ 577.191 Findings and Award, Order, or Decision

[1] Filing and Content

[2] Summary of the Evidence

[3] Compensation Awarded

[4] Filing Liens With WCAB

§ 577.192 Adoption, Modification, or Vacation by WCAB

§ 577.193 Interest and Costs

§ 577.194 Sanctions

[1] Bad Faith Actions or Tactics

[2] Imposition of Sanction

§ 577.195 Correction of Errors

[1] Prior to Filing of Petition for Reconsideration

[2] After Filing of Petition for Reconsideration

§§ 577.196-577.209 [Reserved]

§ 577.210 Governing Law

§ 577.211 Reconsideration on WCAB's Own Motion

§ 577.212 Reconsideration on Petition of Aggrieved Person

[1] Time for Filing Petition

[2] Manner of Filing and Service

[a] Filing

[b] Service

[3] Final Orders

[4] Grounds

[5] Answer to Petition

[6] Supplemental Petitions

[7] Referral to Workers' Compensation Judge

[8] Denial of Petition by Inaction

[9] Action of WCAB on Filing of Petition or Granting Reconsideration

[a] In General

[b] Without Further Hearing

[c] After Hearing

[d] Form and Content of Decision

[e] Referral for Proceedings on Reconsideration

§§ 577.213-577.219 [Reserved]

§ 577.220 Governing Law

§ 577.221 Continuing Jurisdiction of WCAB

§ 577.222 Petition to Reopen

[1] Showing Good Cause

[2] Scope of Reconsideration on Reopening

[3] Time to File Petition and Counterpetition

[4] New or Further Disability

[a] WCAB's Jurisdiction Over Claims--Five-Year Statute of Limitations

[b] Invoking Jurisdiction

[c] WCAB's Continued Jurisdiction to Enforce Previous Awards

§ 577.223 Attorney's Fees

§ 577.224 Vocational Rehabilitation Appeals

§ 577.225 Notice of Compensation Due; Appeal of Notice

§§ 577.226-577.239 [Reserved]

§ 577.240 Governing Law

§ 577.241 Preference of Compensation Claim

§ 577.242 Nonassignability of Claim or Compensation

§ 577.243 Payment of Compensation

[1] Not Due or Pending Dispute

[2] Pursuant to Order

[3] To Injured Minor

[4] Penalties for Delay or Nonpayment

[a] In General

[b] Purpose and Application of Penalty

[c] Penalty Assessed Against Amount Unreasonably Delayed

[d] Multiple Penalties

[e] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

[f] Self-Insured Employers

§ 577.244 Commutation of Compensation to Lump Sum

§ 577.245 Enforcement of Awards

§ 577.246 Execution

[1] Certified Copy of Award and Entry of Judgment

[2] Stay of Execution

[3] Liens Created by Recording Judgment

§ 577.247 Satisfaction of Judgment

§§ 577.248-577.259 [Reserved]

§ 577.260 Governing Law

§ 577.261 Kinds of Liens Allowed and Reimbursement

[1] In General

[2] Asbestos Workers

[3] Reimbursement for Benefits or Services Provided in Award or Approval of Compromise and Release Agreement

§ 577.262 Procedure for Claiming

§ 577.263 Notice of Lien

[1] In General

[2] Employment Development Department Liens

§ 577.264 Amendment

§ 577.265 Payment of Lien

[1] Order to Pay Claim When No Lien Requested

[2] Compromise and Release Agreements

§§ 577.266-577.279 [Reserved]

§ 577.280 Governing Law

§ 577.281 Manner of Review and Jurisdiction

§ 577.282 Scope of Review

§ 577.283 Who May Apply for Writ

§ 577.284 Time to Apply for Writ

§ 577.285 Manner of Applying

§ 577.286 Proof of Service

§ 577.287 Stay of Order, Rule, Decision, or Award

§ 577.288 Return of Writ

§ 577.289 Right of Appeals Board and Parties to Appear

§ 577.290 Answer to Petition

§ 577.291 Reply Brief

§ 577.292 Service of Pleadings and Papers

§ 577.293 Judgment

§ 577.294 Supplemental Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs

§§ 577.295-577.309 [Reserved]

§ 577.310 Governing Law

§ 577.311 Workers' Compensation as Exclusive Remedy in Employee Injury Cases

[1] Scope of Principle

[2] Application of Principle

[3] Burden of Proof

§ 577.312 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Employer

[1] In General

[2] Civil Action Against Uninsured Employer

[a] In General

[b] Attachment of Employer's Property

[c] Judgment

[d] Employees of Unlicensed and Uninsured Subcontractors

[3] Civil Action if Conditions of Compensation Have Not Been Met

[a] In General

[b] Excluded Employment

[i] In General

[ii] Contributory and Comparative Negligence

[c] Injury Outside Scope of Employment

§ 577.313 Civil Action for Non-Disabling or Non-Compensable Injuries

[1] Physical Injury

[2] Emotional Distress

[3] Defamation

[4] Contract Damages

[5] Spoliation of Evidence

§ 577.314 Civil Action Against Employer for Injury Also Within Workers' Compensation Coverage

[1] In General

[2] Willful Assault

[a] In General

[b] Assault by Co-employee

[3] Fraudulent Concealment

[a] In General

[b] Affirmative Misrepresentation Not Required

[c] Statute of Limitations

[4] Products Liability

[5] Power Press Guard

[a] Removal of or Failure to Install Guard

[b] Actual Knowledge Required

[c] Definitions

[i] Guard

[ii] Power Press

[d] Employer as Manufacturer

§ 577.315 Termination, Discipline, and Related Conduct

[1] Civil Action Generally Preempted

[2] Exceptions to General Rule

[a] Violation of Public Policy

[b] Employer Conduct Outside the Compensation Bargain

[i] In General

[ii] Whistleblowing

[iii] Discrimination in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act

[iv] False Imprisonment

[v] No Exception for Reckless, Negligent or Criminally Negligent Conduct

[c] Retaliation for Claiming Workers' Compensation Benefits

§ 577.316 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Coemployee

[1] In General

[a] Employer Liability for Act of Coemployee

[b] Employee Liability for Injury or Death of Coemployee

[c] Willful and Unprovoked Physical Act of Aggression

[2] Injuries Caused by Acts Outside Coemployee's Scope of Employment

§ 577.317 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Insurer

[1] Insurer's Liability for Deceitful and Intentional Practices

[a] Pre-1982 Statutory Amendments

[b] Post-1982 Statutory Amendments

[i] No Express Exception to Exclusive Remedy Principle

[ii] Effect of Amendments

[2] Insurer's Liability to Medical Providers for Mishandling Lien Claims

§ 577.318 Effect of Exclusive Remedy Doctrine on Tort Actions by Employee's Relatives and Heirs

[1] In General

[2] Wrongful Death

[3] Loss of Consortium

[4] Fetal Injury

§ 577.319 Dual Remedies

[1] In General

[2] Jurisdiction and Res Judicata

[a] In General

[b] If Remedies Are Cumulative

[c] If Remedies Are Not Cumulative

[d] Res Judicata Effect of Determination by WCAB That Injury Compensable Under Workers' Compensation

[e] Effect of Determination That Employee Sought Unavailable Remedy

[3] Tolling of Statute of Limitations

§ 577.320 Employer's Duty and Proof of Negligence

[1] In General

[2] Admissibility of Occupational Safety Statutes

[3] Injury Caused by Negligence of Coemployee

[4] Actions Against Uninsured Employers

§ 577.321 Interrelationship Between Exclusive Remedy Doctrine and Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)

[1] Federal Preemption

[2] Application of Analysis to Determine That Exclusive Remedy Doctrine Preempted

§§ 577.322-577.329 [Reserved]

§ 577.330 Governing Law

§ 577.331 Definitions

[1] Employee

[2] Employer

§ 577.332 Actions Against Third-Party Tortfeasor

[1] In General

[1A] Attorney's Duty to Advise Regarding Possible Third Party Action

[2] Purpose of Law

[3] Nature of Law

[4] Applicability of Substantive Tort Law

[5] Survival of Action

[6] Joinder and Consolidation

[7] Intervention

[8] Statute of Limitations

[9] Effect of Delay in Prosecution

[10] Service of Complaint on Nonfiling Employee or Employer

[11] Proof of Damages

[a] Actions Prosecuted by Employer

[b] Actions Prosecuted or Joined By Employee

[12] Medical Practitioner As Third-Party Tortfeasor--Limitation on Employer's Right to Reimbursement or Credit

§ 577.333 Employer's Recovery in Third-Party Action

[1] In General

[2] Effect of Employee's Concurrent Negligence

[3] Effect of Employer's Concurrent Negligence

[a] In General

[b] Raising Issue of Concurrent Negligence--Procedure

[c] Determination of Issue

[d] Effect of Third Party's Failure to Raise Issue

§ 577.334 Allocation of Judgment in Third-Party Action

[1] Action by Employer Alone

[2] Action by Employee Alone

[3] Action by Both Employee and Employer

[4] Litigation Expenses and Attorney's Fees

[a] Entitlement and Amount

[b] Payment From Judgment

[5] Release of Employer by Satisfaction of Third-Party Judgment

§ 577.335 Other Employer Remedies

[1] In General

[2] Employer's Lien

[a] Entitlement

[b] Enforcement

[c] Amount of Lien

[d] Purchase of Lien by Third-Party

[3] Settlement of Claim

[a] Restrictions on Right to Settle

[i] Notice and Consent Requirements

[ii] Settlement Without Employer's Consent

[b] Division of Settlement

[i] Amount of Expenses and Attorney's Fees

[ii] Payment of Expenses and Attorney's Fees if Settlement Effected by Either Employer's or Employee's Attorney

[iii] Payment of Expenses and Attorney's Fees if Settlement Effected by Both Employer's and Employee's Attorney

[4] Credit Against Employer's Liability

[a] In General

[b] Credit and Lien Distinguished

§ 577.336 Nonliability of Employer to Indemnify Tortfeasor

[1] In General

[2] Multiple Employers

§§ 577.337-577.349 [Reserved]

§ 577.350 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Workers' Compensation Principles--In General

[2] Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim

[3] Initiating Proceedings to Collect Benefits

[4] Filing and Service of Papers

[5] Arbitration

[6] Settling Claims

[7] Stipulations and Requests for Award

[8] Pre-Hearing Proceedings and Hearings

[9] Findings and Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

[10] Payment and Enforcement of Awards

[11] Judicial Review

[12] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[13] Third-Party Actions

§ 577.351 California Constitution

§ 577.352 Federal Statutes

§ 577.353 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Assistance

[2] Administrative Director

[3] Advertising

[4] Administrative and Civil Penalties

[5] Appeals Board

[6] Arbitration

[7] Attorneys and Representatives

[a] Substitution and Dismissal

[b] Fees--In General

[c] Fee Disclosure Statement

[8] Audits

[9] Autopsies

[10] Benefits

[11] Claim Procedure

[12] Collateral Estoppel

[13] Collective Bargaining Agreement

[14] Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation

[15] Compensation

[16] Compromise and Release Agreements

[17] Construction of Law

[18] Counsel to Division of Workers' Compensation

[18A] Court Administrator

[19] Dangerous Business Practices

[20] Death Benefits

[21] Dependents

[22] Depositions

[23] Disability

[24] Dismissal

[25] Employees

[26] Employers

[27] Employer Remedies

[28] Employment Safety Standards

[29] Evidence

[30] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[31] Filing of Papers

[32] Findings and Awards

[33] Funds

[34] Hearings

[35] Independent Contractor

[36] Independent Medical Examiner

[37] [Reserved]

[38] Information Request Form

[39] Injury

[40] Insurers

[41] Interstate Commerce

[42] Judgment

[43] Judicial Review

[44] Liens

[44A] Lifeguards

[45] Medical Director

[46] Medical Evaluators

[47] Medical Personnel, Treatment and Evaluation

[48] Medical-Legal Expenses

[49] Minors and Incompetents

[50] Notice to Employer of Injury or Death

[51] Parties

[52] Payment and Assignment

[53] Peace Officers

[54] Penalties

[55] Permanent Disability Medical Issues

[56] Pleadings

[57] Process

[57A] Return-to-Work Program

[58] Self-Insured Employers

[59] Serious and Willful Misconduct

[60] Service of Papers

[61] Settlement Conferences

[62] State Employees Not Otherwise Covered

[63] Statutes of Limitation

[64] Stipulations and Requests for Award

[65] Subrogation

[66] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

[67] Supplemental Proceedings

[68] Third-Party Actions

[69] Uninsured Employers

[70] [Reserved]

[71] Witnesses

[72] Workers' Compensation Judges or Referees

[73] Wrongful Death

§ 577.354 Administrative Regulations

[1] Advertising

[2] Administrative and Civil Penalties

[3] Appeals Board--Practice and Procedure

[4] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem and Trustee

[5] Arbitration

[6] Attorneys and Representatives

[a] In General

[b] Substitution, Dismissal and Discipline

[c] Fees

[7] Audits

[8] Autopsies

[9] Benefits

[a] Medical Treatment and Evaluation

[b] Permanent Disability

[c] Vocational Rehabilitation

[d] Notice Requirements

[10] Calendar

[11] Claim Procedure--Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

[11A] Claims Adjusters

[12] Compromise and Release Agreements

[13] Consolidation of Cases

[14] Continuances

[14A] Court Administrator

[15] Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

[15A] Disability Evaluation Unit Regulations

[16] Dismissal

[17] Employers' Duties

[18] Evidence

[19] Fees

[20] Filing of Papers

[21] Findings and Awards

[22] Health Care

[23] Hearings

[24] Information and Assistance Program

[25] [Reserved]

[26] Interpreter's Fees

[27] Judicial Review

[28] Liens

[29] Medical Reports

[30] Parties

[31] Pensions

[32] Petitions

[33] Pleadings

[34] [Reserved]

[35] Qualified Medical Examiners

[36] Reconsideration

[36A] Retraining and Return to Work Regulations

[37] Sanctions

[38] Self-Insured Employers

[39] Service of Papers

[40] Settlement Conferences

[41] Stipulations and Requests for Award

[42] Subpoenas

[43] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

[44] Supplemental Proceedings

[45] Witness Fees

[46] Workers' Compensation Judge

§ 577.355 California Rules of Court

[1] Judicial Review

§ 577.355A California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI)

§ 577.356 Decisions

[1] In General

[2] Affirmative Defenses

[2A] Aliens/Undocumented Workers

[3] Appeals Board

[4] Applications for Adjudication of Claim

[5] Apportionment

[6] Arising Out of and in Course of Employment

[7] Asbestos

[8] Athletes

[9] Athletic, Social, or Recreational Activities

[10] Attorney's Fees

[11] Average Earnings

[12] Awards

[13] Bunkhouse Rule

[14] Burden of Proof

[15] Civil Action

[16] Claim Procedure

[17] Clerical Errors

[18] Compensation

[19] Compromise and Release Agreement

[a] In General

[b] Constitutionality

[c] Effect

[d] Setting Aside Agreement

[e] Subsequent Injury

[f] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

[20] Contempt Proceedings

[a] In General

[b] Acts Constituting Contempt

[c] Indirect Contempt

[d] Nature of Proceeding

[e] Procedure

[f] Statutes of Limitations

[21] Contract of Hire

[21A] Costs

[22] Credit Against Compensation

[23] Death Benefits

[24] Declaration of Readiness

[25] Dependents

[a] In General

[b] Partial Dependents

[c] Putative Spouse

[26] Disability Defined

[27] Discovery

[28] Discrimination Against Injured Workers, Claimants, Participants

[29] Dismissals

[30] Employees

[31] Employment Contract

[32] Employment Relationship

[33] Evidence

[34] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[a] In General

[b] Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)

[c] Assault and Battery

[d] Co-employees, Acts of

[e] Contract Damages

[f] Discrimination

[g] Dual Capacity Doctrine

[h] Emotional Distress

[i] Federal Law; Preemption

[i.1] Fraudulent Concealment

[j] Insurer's Duty to Defend

[k] Insurance Carriers, Administrators or Adjusters, Actions Against

[l] Medical Malpractice

[m] Peculiar Risk Doctrine

[n] Power Press Injuries

[o] Premises Liability

[p] Spouses of Employees, Independent Actions

[q] Uninsured Employers

[r] Unlicensed Contractors

[s] Unsafe Workplace

[t] Vicarious Liability

[u] Wrongful Death Actions

[v] Wrongful Discharge

[35] Federal Law

[36] Federal-State Jurisdiction

[37] Firefighters

[38] Going and Coming Rule; Exceptions

[39] Independent Contractors

[40] Injuries

[41] Insurance Carriers

[42] Insurance Fraud

[43] Joint Ventures and Partnerships

[44] Judicial Review

[a] Effect of Appeals Board Decisions on Appellate Courts

[b] WCAB Orders

[c] Petitions for Writ of Review

[d] Prerequisite to Seeking Appellate Review

[e] Scope of Review

[i] In General

[ii] Statement of Evidence and Reasons for Decision

[iii] Substantial Evidence

[f] Waiver of Issues on Appeal

[45] Jurisdiction

[46] Liens

[47] Mandatory Settlement Conferences--Disclosure of Evidence

[48] Medical-Legal Evaluations

[48A] Medical Provider Networks

[49] Medical Treatment Benefits

[50] Nature and Purpose of Workers' Compensation

[51] Peace Officers

[52] Penalties for Delay in Payment

[53] Permanent Disability Benefits

[54] Preexisting Conditions and Subsequent Injuries

[55] Presumptions

[56] Prisoners

[57] Psychiatric Injury

[58] Reconsideration

[59] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

[60] Sanctions

[61] Self-Insurers' Security Fund

[62] Serious and Willful Misconduct by Employer

[63] Services Performed for Aid or Sustenance

[64] Special Employees

[65] State Compensation Insurance Fund

[66] Statute of Limitations

[67] Stipulations and Requests for Award

[68] Suicide

[69] Supplemental Proceedings

[70] Temporary Disability

[71] Third-Party Actions

[a] In General

[b] Aggravation of Injuries

[b.1] Attorney's Duty to Advise Regarding Possible Third Party Action

[c] Attorney's Fees

[d] Comparative Negligence

[e] Credit Against Compensation Liability

[f] Damages and Liability

[g] Discovery

[h] Dismissal

[i] Employer's Right to Notice of Third-Party Action

[j] Firefighter's Rule

[k] Indemnity

[l] Intervention

[m] Jurisdiction

[n] Liens

[o] Reimbursement and Off-Set for Compensation Benefits Paid

[p] Settlement

[q] Statute of Limitations

[r] Subrogation

[s] Uninsured Motorist Insurance

[t] Waiver of Rights

[72] Treating Physicians

[73] Uninsured Employers

[74] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

[74A] Utilization Review

[75] Vocational Rehabilitation

[76] Voluntary Services

[77] Work Place

§ 577.357 Law Reviews

[1] Workers' Compensation System--In General

[2] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[3] Third-Party Actions

§ 577.358 Text References

[1] Workers' Compensation Principles--In General

[2] Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim

[3] Initiating Proceedings to Collect Benefits

[4] Filing and Service of Papers

[5] Arbitration

[6] Settling Claims

[7] Stipulations and Requests for Award

[8] Pre-Hearing Proceedings and Hearings

[9] Findings and Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

[10] Payment and Enforcement of Awards

[11] Judicial Review

[12] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[13] Third-Party Actions

§§ 577.359-577.369 [Reserved]

§ 577.370 Attorney's Fees Disclosure Statement [Lab. Code § 4906(e); 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135] [DWC Form 3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.371-577.372 [Reserved]

§ 577.373 Employee's Claim for Workers' Compensation Benefits [Lab. Code § 5401; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10118.1] [DWC Form 1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Form and Content

[4] Filing and Service of Claim Form

[5] Employer's Duties

[6] Cross References

§§ 577.374-577.389 [Reserved]

§ 577.390 Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 1A]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Application

[4] Additional Allegations and Information

[5] Cross References

§ 577.391 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Disability Compensation for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408] [WCAB Form 1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Application

[4] Additional Allegations and Information

[5] Cross References

§ 577.392 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1990, or on or After January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408, 10412(b)] [DIA WCAB Form 2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Application

[4] Cross References

§ 577.393 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408] [WCAB Form 1A]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Application

[4] Cross References

§ 577.394 Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 10]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time to File Answer

[4] Employee's Serious and Willful Misconduct

[5] Text References

§ 577.395 Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500(a), 5505]--For Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990 and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484; former 8 Cal. Code Reg. 10969] [WCAB Form 2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Time to File Answer

[4] Employee's Serious and Willful Misconduct

[5] Cross References

§ 577.396 Allegation of Entitlement to Increased Benefits Because Injury Caused by Employer's Serious and Willful Misconduct [Lab. Code §§ 4553, 4553.1; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Serious and Willful Misconduct

[4] Pleading Requirements

[5] Service of Form

[6] Cross References

§ 577.397 Application for Subsequent Injuries Fund Benefits

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

[4] Filing and Service of Application

[5] Service of Medical Reports

[6] Cross References

§ 577.397A Document Cover Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.397B Document Separator Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.2]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.398 Petition for Appointment of Guardian ad Litem and Trustee [Lab. Code § 5307.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402] [DIA WCAB Form 8]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.399 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed [DWC-CA Form 10250.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.400 General Caption for Use on Paper Filed With WCAB

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.401 WCAB--Data Entry Sheet

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 577.402-577.409 [Reserved]

§ 577.410 Subpoena [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530] With Proof of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 30]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.411 Subpoena Duces Tecum [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530], Declaration for Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.5, 2015.5], and Declaration of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 32]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.412 Petition for Order to Compel Employee to Submit to Medical Examination and to Suspend Employee's Right to Begin or Maintain Proceeding for Collection of Workers' Compensation [Lab. Code §§ 4051, 4053, 4054, 5703.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Failure to Submit to Examination

[4] Cross References

§ 577.413 Petition for Order Directing [Exhumation and] Autopsy [Lab. Code §§ 5706, 5707; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10342(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.414 Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Motion

[4] Cross References

§ 577.415 Order Limiting Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1, 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.416 Letter to Physician Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.417 Letter to Copy Service Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.418-577.419 [Reserved]

§ 577.420 Request for Informal Rating (by Insurance Carrier or Self-Insurer) [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167] [DEU Form 201]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.421 Employee's Disability Questionnaire [DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.422 Request for Summary Rating Determination of Qualified Medical Evaluator's Report [DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Unrepresented Employees

[4] Cross References

§ 577.423 Request for Summary Rating Determination of Primary Treating Physician's Report [DWC-AD Form 102 (DEU)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.424 Request for Consultative Rating [DWC-AD Form 104 (DEU)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Purpose of Requesting Consultative Rating Determination

[4] If Application for Adjudication Has Been Filed

[5] Cross References

§§ 577.425-577.429 [Reserved]

§ 577.430 Petition to Join Omitted Employers in Occupational Disease or Cumulative Injury Case [Lab. Code § 5500.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10380]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.431 Petition to Dismiss Improperly Joined Insurance Carrier [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.432-577.439 [Reserved]

§ 577.440 Substitution of Attorneys [Code Civ. Proc. § 284; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 36]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.441 Notice of Dismissal of Attorney [Code Civ. Proc. § 285; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 37]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 577.442-577.449 [Reserved]

§ 577.450 Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Claim Has Been Denied (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Form

[4] Determining When Claim Is Not Inactive

§ 577.451 Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Benefits Have Been Furnished (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Form

[4] Determining When Claim Is Not Inactive

§ 577.452 Request for Dismissal by Employee [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780] [DWC WCAB Form 43]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.453 Petition for Dismissal by Defendant [Lab. Code § 5507; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10445, 10562, 10582]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Notice of Intention

[4] Cross References

§§ 577.454-577.459 [Reserved]

§ 577.460 Compromise and Release [DWC-CA Form 10214(c)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Execution and Attestation or Acknowledgment

[4] Cross References

§ 577.461 Compromise and Release--Dependency Claim [DWC-CA Form 10214(d)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Service of Compromise and Release

[4] Cross References

§ 577.462 Compromise and Release--Third Party [DWC-CA Form 10214(e)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.463 Information Guidelines for Submission of Settlement Documents

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.464 Settlement of Prospective Vocational Rehabilitation Services [RU 122 (Voc. Rehab.) § 10133.22]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.465-577.469 [Reserved]

§ 577.470 Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.471 Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(b)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.472 Stipulation and Award and/or Order

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 577.473-577.479 [Reserved]

§ 577.480 Notice and Request for Allowance of Lien [DWC/WCAB Form 6]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.481 Stipulation and Order to Pay Lien Claimant

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.482 Declaration of Defendant re Resolution of Liens

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 577.483-577.489 [Reserved]

§ 577.490 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing (Trial) [DWC-CA Form 10252.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Entitlement to Expedited Hearing

[4] Cross References

§ 577.491 Pre-Trial Conference Statement [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Failure to Disclose Evidence

[4] Filing and Service

[5] Penalties

[6] Cross References

§ 577.492 Pre-Trial Conference Statement (Multiple Parties) [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.493-577.499 [Reserved]

§ 577.500 Petition for Certified Copy of Award [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820]--By Person Entitled to Benefits Under the Award

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Form and Contents of Petition

§ 577.501 Petition for Reconsideration [Lab. Code § 5902; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842] [DIA WCAB Form 45]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Grounds for Reconsideration

[4] Form and Contents

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 577.502 Petition to Reopen [Lab. Code § 5803; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10454] [DIA WCAB Form 42]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.503 Petition for Commutation of Future Benefits [Lab. Code § 5100] [DIA WCAB Form 49]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.504 Notice of Intent to Seek Multiple Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Separate and Distinct Acts of Delay

[4] Filing and Service

[5] Cross References

§ 577.505 Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§ 577.506 Answer to Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Cross References

§§ 577.507-577.509 [Reserved]

§ 577.510 Petition for Writ of Review [Lab. Code § 5950; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)]--By Injured Employee or Dependent of Deceased Employee

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Petition

[4] Format and Copies

[5] Verification and Supporting Papers

[6] Cross References

§§ 577.511-577.519 [Reserved]

§ 577.520 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] or in Intervention [Code Civ. Proc. § 387; Lab. Code § 3853]--By Insurance Carrier Against Third-Party Tortfeasor [Lab. Code § 3852]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Specification of Damages

[4] Allegations

[5] Pleading Employee's Cause of Action

[6] Verification

[7] Intervention

[a] Generally

[b] By Employee

[8] Service of Complaint on Employee

[9] Burden of Proof and Evidence

[10] Cross References

§ 577.521 Notice of Filing of Complaint Against Third Party [Lab. Code § 3853]--By Employee or Employer

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.522 Complaint for Compensatory Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Injured Employee Against Negligent Employer Who Failed to Secure Compensation Under Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3706]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Specification of Damages

[5] Verification

[6] Cross References

§ 577.523 Allegation--Employment Excluded From Workers' Compensation Law Coverage [Lab. Code §§ 2800, 2801]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Pleading Alternative: No Mention of Employment Relationship

§ 577.524 Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Willful Physical Assault by Employer [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 577.525 Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Aggravation of Work-Related Injury by Fraudulent Concealment [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§§ 577.526through 577.529 [Reserved]

§ 577.530 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Employee's Action Barred by Exclusive Remedy Principle of Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3602(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Pleading Affirmative Defenses

§ 577.531 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Lack of Jurisdiction Due to Pending Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Proceeding

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§ 577.532 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Negligence of Plaintiff [Lab. Code § 2801]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

§§ 577.533through 577.539 [Reserved]

§ 577.540 Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] and Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Filing Motion

[4] Supporting Papers

[5] Amount Claimed and Supplemental Applications

§ 577.541 Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Order Granting Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Enforcement of Lien

§ 577.542 Petition for Credit of Third-Party Judgment Against Compensation Liability [Lab. Code § 3861]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Credit Allowed

[4] Comparative Negligence of Employer

[a] Determined in Judicial Forum

[b] Determined by Appeals Board

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART I. SCOPE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.01

§ 577.01 Scope of Chapter

IMPORTANT NOTE: Comprehensive workers' compensation reform was recently enacted into law. Stats. 2004 Ch. 34 (SB 899) applies prospectively from the date of enactment (April 19, 2004), regardless of the date of injury, unless specified otherwise in the chaptered bill. Selected highlights of the reform legislation are set forth below. Detailed discussion of SB 899 is set forth throughout this chapter.

Medical Provider Networks. In enacting *Labor Code §§ 4616-4616.7*, the legislature has authorized insurers and employers beginning January 1, 2005, to create or modify medical provider networks within which their employees' industrial injuries must be treated. The Administrative Director has adopted regulations implementing the medical provider networks statutes, including regulations that establish procedures for making medical provider network modifications. The medical provider network statutes speak in terms of "economic profiling," which is defined as any evaluation of a particular physician, provider, medical group, or individual practice association based in whole or in part on the economic costs or utilization of services associated with medical care provided or authorized by that person or entity. The medical provider network statutes also set forth provisions for initial medical evaluation and independent medical review. [Note: For a summary of a worker's right to control medical treatment when there is *no* medical provider network in place, *see* summary highlight of amended *Labor Code § 4600*, below.]

Two-Year Temporary Disability Cap. In amending *Labor Code § 4656*, the legislature has provided that, for injuries occurring on or after April 19, 2004, temporary disability payments are limited to 104 compensable weeks within a period of two years from the date of the first payment, with *exceptions* specified for certain injuries and conditions to allow payment of temporary disability to be extended to 240 compensable weeks within five years from the date of injury.

Return-to-Work Program. In amending *Labor Code § 139.48*, effective July 1, 2004, the legislature has eliminated the payment of wage reimbursement and premium reimbursement from the program, made reimbursements under the program available for an eligible employer only, as defined, and provided that the Return-to-Work Fund will consist of certain penalties and transfers made by the Administrative Director from the Workers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund.

Permanent Disability. In amending *Labor Code § 4650*, the legislature has provided that, for injuries occurring on or after April 19, 2004, timely payment of permanent disability indemnity, based on a reasonable estimate of the amount due, is to be commenced, regardless of whether the extent of permanent disability can be determined at the date on which the first payment is due. In amending *Labor Code §§ 4658* and *4660*, and in enacting *Labor Code § 4658.1*, the legislature has added a schedule for converting permanent disability ratings for injuries occurring on or after the effective date of the revised permanent disability schedule to be adopted by the Administrative Director, no later than January 1, 2005, pursuant to amended *Labor Code § 4660*. For compensable claims arising before April 30, 2004, the schedule set out in *Labor Code § 4658* does *not* apply to the determination of permanent disabilities when there has been either a comprehensive medical-legal report or a report by a treating physician, indicating the existence of permanent disability, or when the employer is required to provide the notice required by *Labor Code § 4061* to the injured worker. Newly enacted *Labor Code § 4658.1* contains provisions regarding the offer of regular, modified, or alternative work and its effect on permanent disability payments. In amending *Labor Code § 4660*, the legislature has placed various requirements on the Administrative Director regarding periodic revisions of the schedule for the determination of the percentage of permanent disability. In determining the percentages of permanent disability, account must be taken of the nature of the physical injury or disfigurement, the occupation of the injured employee, and his or her age at the time of the injury, with consideration being given to an employee's *diminished future earning capacity*. For purposes of this statute, the "nature of the physical injury or disfigurement" must incorporate the descriptions and measurements of physical impairments and the corresponding percentages of impairments published in the American Medical Association (AMA) *Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment* (5th Edition). For compensable claims arising before January 1, 2005, the schedule as revised by legislation during the 2003-2004 Regular and Extraordinary Sessions will apply to the determination of permanent disabilities when there has been either no comprehensive medical-legal report or no report by a treating physician indicating the existence of permanent disability, or when the employer is not required to provide the notice required by *Labor Code § 4061* to the injured worker [*see State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1311, 1314-1316, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 568* (court of appeal, annulling WCAB decision that applied 1997 permanent disability rating schedule, held that WCAB's decision was not supported by substantial evidence, since 12/15/2004 single-sentence report by treating physician stating physician's belief that permanent disability was within reasonable medical probability as result of employee's 7/21/2004 industrial injury was not followed by any other treating physician's report that provided reasoning to support physician's 12/15/2004 conclusion, and medical opinion is not substantial evidence if it does not indicate reasoning behind physician's opinion)].

The Appeals Board in an en banc opinion held that an employee did not carry his burden of demonstrating that adoption of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule by the Administrative Director was arbitrary and capricious or inconsistent with *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)*. Thus, the employee failed to rebut the presumptive validity of the 2005 Schedule. The Board pointed out that an administrative regulation is presumptively valid and that, if there is a reasonable basis for it, a reviewing court will not substitute its judgment for that of the administrative body. The role of the reviewing court is limited to inquiring into the legality, rather than the wisdom, of the challenged regulation. The evidentiary record in the reviewing court, when it evaluates the validity of a regulation, is limited to the rulemaking record. Extra-record evidence should not be admitted, the only exception being evidence that existed before the agency made its decision but that could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, be presented to the agency before its decision was made so that it could be considered and included in the administrative record. In the present case, the Board found that, although some evidence admitted at the trial existed before the Administrative Director made her decision to adopt the 2005 Schedule, no showing was made that, even with the exercise of reasonable diligence, this evidence could not have

been submitted to the Administrative Director before her decision was made. Thus, no basis was established to consider this extra-record evidence. Moreover, said the Board, even on the assumption that such evidence was properly in the record, the Board en banc had already held in *Costa v. Hardy Diagnostic* [Costa v. Hardy Diagnostic (2006) *71 Cal. Comp. Cases 1797 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* that Senate hearing testimony of both the Administrative Director and an expert witness indicated that empirical data from the 2003 RAND Interim Report were, as mandated by *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)*, used in formulating the 2005 Schedule, that the employee in that case had failed to meet his burden of proving the invalidity of 2005 Schedule because he had failed to demonstrate that the actions of the Administrative Director in adopting the 2005 Schedule were arbitrary, capricious, or not reasonably necessary to effectuate the purpose of, or were inconsistent with, *Lab. Code § 4660*, and that the Administrative Director's reasons for not pursuing a "crosswalk" study, which would correlate the disability ratings assigned under the 1997 Schedule to those assigned under the new 2005 Schedule, were neither arbitrary nor capricious [Boughner v. Comp USA (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 854, 859-869 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* .

The Appeals Board has issued four en banc opinions interpreting the third sentence of *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, the latter two of which rescinded the preceding two.

In April 2007, the Appeals Board en banc, with three Commissioners dissenting, rescinded its prior en banc decision [*see* Baglione v. Hertz Car Sales (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 86 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)* (majority held that existence of pre-2005 comprehensive medical report, regardless of whether report indicated existence of permanent disability, required use of 1997 schedule)], from which three Commissioners had also dissented, and held that, for compensable claims arising before January 1, 2005, in order for the 1997 schedule for rating permanent disabilities to apply, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, the existence of permanent disability must be indicated in either a pre-2005 comprehensive medical-legal report or a pre-2005 report from a treating physician, and that, otherwise, the 2005 permanent disability rating schedule applied. The Board's en banc majority found that the legislature's denomination of SB 899, which amended *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, as an "urgency statute" that sought to provide relief from the state's workers' compensation crisis "at the earliest possible time" supported the majority's view that the 1997 schedule applied in the presence of a pre-2005 comprehensive medical-legal report only when that report indicated the existence of permanent disability. Also, in the majority's view, in light of *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*'s declaration that the schedule "shall promote consistency, uniformity and objectivity," no rationale existed for delaying the use of the 2005 schedule merely because a comprehensive medical-legal report had issued. The majority added that, although the reference to a "comprehensive medical-legal report" was not directly antecedent to the phrase "indicating the existence of permanent disability" in *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, the language and the need to consider the obvious purpose of that statute required the Board to look beyond the mere order of words to the underlying intent of the statute. Finally, said the Board majority, the fact that *Lab. Code § 4658(d)(4)*, in addressing the same topic as the relevant clause in *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, had virtually identical language, except that it contained a comma and *Lab. Code § 4660(d)* did not, did not indicate a different legislative intent and, thus, did not defeat implementation of the 2005 schedule [Baglione v. Hertz Car Sales (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 444, 448-452 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , writ den. sub nom. Baglione v. W.C.A.B. (2008) 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 250, 254*].

Also in April 2007, the Board en banc, with three Commissioners dissenting, rescinded its prior en banc decision [*see* Pendergrass v. Duggan Plumbing (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 95 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)* (majority held that employer's duty to provide notice required by *Lab. Code § 4061* arose with first payment of temporary disability indemnity, so that, if first date of compensable temporary disability occurred prior to 1/1/2005, 1997 schedule applied)], from which three Commissioners had also dissented, and held that, for compensable claims arising before January 1, 2005, only if the last payment

of temporary disability indemnity was made for any period of temporary disability ending before that date would the 1997 schedule for rating permanent disabilities apply to determine the extent of permanent disability, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, because *Lab. Code § 4061* required the employer to provide an injured employee with notice regarding permanent disability "[t]ogether with the last payment of temporary disability indemnity," and that, otherwise, the 2005 permanent disability rating schedule applied. The Board's en banc majority found that the "plain language" of *Lab. Code §§ 4660(d)* and *4061* stated that the employer's obligation to provide notice did not arise until the actual last payment of temporary disability indemnity, which in the present case had been made in July 2005. Finally, said the Board majority, the legislature's denomination of SB 899, which amended *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, as an "urgency statute" that sought to provide relief from the state's workers' compensation crisis "at the earliest possible time" supported the majority's view [Pendergrass v. Duggan Plumbing (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 456, 460-463 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , writ den. sub nom. Pendergrass v. W.C.A.B. (2008) 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 304, 309]* .

Subsequently, the court of appeal followed these en banc decisions of the Board [*Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 148, 153-157, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 611* ; *Zenith Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 461, 465-466, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683* ; *Energetic Painting and Drywall, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 633, 636-639, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 210* ; *Vera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 996, 1003-1008, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151* ; *Tanimura & Antle v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1494-1496, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 127]* .

The court of appeal, relying on *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 148, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 611* , held that a pre-2005 comprehensive medical-legal report must indicate the existence of permanent disability to satisfy the *Lab. Code § 4660(d)* exception to application of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule and, rejecting another court of appeal's decision in *Vera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 996, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151* , held that the employee's condition need not be permanent and stationary for a treating physician's report or a comprehensive medical-legal report to indicate the existence of permanent disability. The court of appeal remanded the case for the Appeals Board to determine whether a qualified medical evaluator's April 2004 report or the treating physician's 2004 reports constituted substantial evidence indicating the existence of permanent disability, as required by *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1311, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 568* [*Genlyte Group, LLC v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 705, 716-724, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 903* ; *see Zenith Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 483, 494-499, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 724* (following *Genlyte* to hold that employee's condition need not be permanent and stationary for treating physician's report or comprehensive medical-legal report to indicate existence of permanent disability); *Lewis v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 696, 700, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 661* (following *Genlyte* and *Zenith* to hold that comprehensive medical-legal report or treating physician's report need not state that injured worker's condition has reached permanent and stationary status to indicate existence of permanent disability within meaning of *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, when treating physician's 12/17/2004 report stated that employee could not "return to his usual and customary job duties" and that "[v]ocational rehabilitation efforts are indicated," and court of appeal remanded matter to WCAB to determine whether treating physician's report was substantial evidence "indicating the existence of permanent disability")].

The Appeals Board en banc has held that the AMA *Guides* portion of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule is rebuttable, that it is rebutted by showing that an impairment rating based on the *Guides* would result in a permanent disability award that would be inequitable, disproportionate, and not a fair and accurate measure of the employee's permanent disability, and that, when an impairment rating

based on the *Guides* has been rebutted, the Appeals Board may make an impairment determination that considers medical opinions that are not based or are only partially based on the *Guides*. The Board en banc found that the *Guides* itself recognizes its limitations, indicates that it should not necessarily be the sole determinant of work impairment, and allows other factors to be considered. Moreover, said the Board, the *Guides* does not measure work impairment and recognizes that it is merely a first step for measuring work impairment. Therefore, the Board concluded, factors outside the *Guides* may be considered, including the impact of the injury on the employee's ability to perform work activities, and the *Guides* allows the evaluating physician, through exercise of his or her judgment, to modify the impairment rating [Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 201, 211-217, 233, 239-245 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] . Subsequently, the Appeals Board en banc held that its above-discussed en banc decision on the issue of rebutting the AMA *Guides* portion of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule constituted a "final" order, granted the defendant's petition for reconsideration in *Almaraz*, granted reconsideration on its on motion in *Guzman*, allowed the parties in *Guzman* a specified time to file briefs on the merits, allowed any interested persons or entities a specified time to file amicus curiae briefs on the issues addressed by its en banc opinion, and allowed each counsel a specified time to file a reply brief that responds to all of the amicus briefs [Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 470, 471-475 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] .

Finally, in September 2009, the Appeals Board en banc, reconsidering its decision in *Almaraz/Guzman*, discussed above, and stating that "we clarify and modify our en banc decision of February 3, 2009," held, in a 4-3 decision, that (1) the language of *Lab. Code § 4660(c)*, which provides that "the schedule ... shall be prima facie evidence of the percentage of permanent disability to be attributed to each injury covered by the schedule," unambiguously means that a permanent disability rating established by the 2005 Schedule is rebuttable, (2) the burden of rebutting a scheduled permanent disability rating rests with the party disputing that rating, (3) one method of rebutting a scheduled permanent disability rating is to successfully challenge one of the component elements of that rating, such as the injured employee's whole person impairment under the AMA Guides, and (4) when determining the injured employee's whole person impairment, it is not permissible to go outside the four corners of the AMA Guides, but a physician may utilize any chapter, table, or method in the AMA Guides that most accurately reflects the injured employee's impairment. Moreover, the Board now specifically rejected the "inequitable, disproportionate, and not a fair and accurate measure of the employee's permanent disability" standard set forth in its February 2009 opinion. It added that its present decision does *not* permit a physician to utilize any chapter, table, or method in the AMA Guides simply to achieve a desired result, e.g., a whole person impairment that would result in a permanent disability rating based directly or indirectly on any schedule in effect prior to 2005, that a physician's opinion regarding an injured employee's whole person impairment under the Guides must constitute substantial evidence, that the opinion must set forth facts and reasoning that justify it, and that a physician's whole person impairment opinion that is not based on the AMA Guides does not constitute substantial evidence [Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1084, 1085-1087, 1114 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *pet. for writ of rev. filed sub nom.* Milpitas Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Guzman) 10/16/2009]. The three dissenting commissioners would have affirmed the February en banc decision. They disagreed with the majority's view that a party may never go outside the AMA Guides to rebut a scheduled permanent disability rating. In the dissenters' view, long-standing California case law is clear that a scheduled permanent disability rating may be rebutted if it is shown that the scheduled rating would result in a permanent disability award that would be inequitable, disproportionate, and not a fair and accurate measure of the employee's permanent disability. Moreover, they suggested, the legislative shift from diminished ability to compete in the open labor market to the focus on whole person impairment under the AMA Guides and diminished future earning capacity is irrelevant to the question of what standard is used to *rebut* a scheduled permanent disability rating [

Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1084, 1116, 1118 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) (Brass, Caplane, and Moresi, Comms., dissenting)].

On the same day that it decided *Almaraz/Guzman*, discussed above, the Appeals Board en banc decided another case in which it held that the diminished future earning capacity (DFEC) portion of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule is rebuttable, since *Lab. Code § 4660(c)* provides that the 2005 Schedule is merely "prima facie evidence of the percentage of permanent disability to be attributed to each injury." The DFEC portion of the 2005 Schedule ordinarily is *not* rebutted, the Board cautioned, by establishing the percentage to which the injured employee's future earning capacity has been diminished, because, generally, an employee's DFEC percentage is not tantamount to his or her percentage of permanent disability. Nor is the DFEC portion of the 2005 Schedule ordinarily rebutted by taking two-thirds of the injured employee's estimated diminished future earnings, then comparing the resulting sum to the permanent disability money chart to approximate a corresponding permanent disability rating. Rather, the Board stated, in the usual case, the DFEC portion of the 2005 Schedule may be rebutted in a manner consistent with *Lab. Code § 4660*, including *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)* and the RAND data to which *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)* refers. According to the Board, such a DFEC rebuttal approach consists, in essence, of: (1) obtaining two sets of wage data (one for the injured employee and one for similarly situated employees), generally through the Employment Development Department; (2) doing some simple mathematical calculations with that wage data to determine the injured employee's individualized proportional earnings loss; (3) dividing the employee's whole person impairment rating by his proportional earnings loss to obtain a ratio; and (4) seeing if the ratio falls within certain ranges of the ratios in Table A of the 2005 Schedule. If it does, determination of the employee's DFEC adjustment factor relates back to the 2005 Schedule, but, if it does not, then a non-complex formula is used to perform additional calculations to determine the individualized DFEC adjustment factor [Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) *74 Cal. Comp. Cases 248, 255-274 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* . Commissioner Caplane dissented, stating that she would hold that the 2005 Schedule is rebutted when a party proves that the employee's diminished future earning capacity is disproportionate to the rating under the 2005 Schedule, and that she would further hold that, once the 2005 Schedule is rebutted, the permanent disability rating is the percentage loss of future earning capacity [Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 248, 281 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) (Caplane, Comm., dissenting)]. Subsequently, the Appeals Board en banc held that its above-discussed en banc decision on the issue of rebutting the diminished future earning capacity portion of the 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule constituted a "final" order, granted both parties' petitions for reconsideration, allowed any interested persons or entities a specified time to file amicus curiae briefs on the issues addressed by its en banc opinion, and allowed each counsel a specified time to file a reply brief that responds to all of the amicus briefs [Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 478, 479-482 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] .

Finally, in September 2009, the Appeals Board en banc, reconsidering its decision in *Ogilvie*, discussed above, and stating that "we clarify the holdings reached in our en banc decision of February 3, 2009," held that (1) the language of *Lab. Code § 4660(c)*, which provides that "the schedule... shall be prima facie evidence of the percentage of permanent disability to be attributed to each injury covered by the schedule," unambiguously means that a permanent disability rating established by the Schedule is rebuttable, (2) the burden of rebutting a scheduled permanent disability rating rests with the party disputing that rating, and (3) one method of rebutting a scheduled permanent disability rating is to successfully challenge one of the component elements of that rating, such as the injured employee's diminished future earning capacity adjustment factor, which may be accomplished by establishing that the individualized adjustment factor most accurately reflects the injured employee's diminished future earning capacity. However, stated the Board, any individualized diminished future earning capacity

adjustment factor must be consistent with *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)*, the RAND data to which it refers, and the numeric formula adopted by the Administrative Director in the 2005 Schedule. Moreover, any evidence presented to support a proposed individualized diminished future earning capacity adjustment factor must constitute substantial evidence on which the Board may rely, and, even if this rebuttal evidence is legally substantial, the Board as trier-of-fact may still determine that the evidence does not overcome the diminished future earning capacity adjustment factor component of the scheduled permanent disability rating [Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1127, 1129, 1130 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *pet. for writ of rev. filed* 10/7/2009]. Commissioner Caplane dissented, adopting and incorporating by reference her dissent to the Board's February 2009 decision, and stating that she still disagreed with the majority's restrictions on the nature and scope of the evidence a party may offer in rebuttal, noting specifically her view that *Lab. Code § 4660* does not limit the evidence a party may present to rebut a prima facie correct permanent disability rating established by the 2005 Schedule [Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) *74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1127, 1164-1166 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)* (Caplane, Comm., dissenting)].

Apportionment. In repealing, then adding a new version of, *Labor Code § 4663*, and in adding *Labor Code § 4664*, the legislature has recast the statutory treatment of the apportionment of permanent disability, including placement of new responsibilities on physicians who prepare reports addressing the issue of permanent disability due to claimed industrial injury. The new statute provides, among other things, that apportionment of permanent disability is to be based on *causation;* specifically, the employer is liable for only the percentage of permanent disability directly caused by the injury arising out of and occurring in the course of employment. Any physician who prepares a report addressing the issue of permanent disability due to a claimed industrial injury must in that report address the issue of causation of the permanent disability. An employee who claims an industrial injury must, upon request, disclose all previous permanent disabilities or physical impairments. If the applicant has received a prior award of permanent disability, it will be conclusively presumed that the prior permanent disability exists at the time of any subsequent industrial injury. This presumption is a presumption affecting the burden of proof. The accumulation of all permanent disability awards issued with respect to any one region of the body in favor of one individual employee cannot exceed 100 percent over the employee's lifetime unless the employee's injury or illness is conclusively presumed to be total in character.

In May 2007, the California Supreme Court resolved the uncertainty, generated by conflicting court of appeal opinions, regarding whether the language of *Lab. Code § 4663(c)*, plus the language of *Lab. Code § 4664(a)*, meant that the so-called apportionment "Formula A" adopted by the Supreme Court in *Fuentes* [*Fuentes v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 1, 128 Cal. Rptr. 673, 547 P.2d 449]* , pursuant to which the percentage of disability attributable to the new injury is calculated by subtracting the old permanent disability rating from the new permanent disability rating, then consulting the table for the award due this difference, remained the proper method for calculating apportionment. Injured employees had argued that statutory changes made by SB 899 mandated the use of "Formula C," rejected by th e Supreme Court in *Fuentes*, pursuant to which the dollar award for the new injury is calculated as if apportionment were not an issue, then the dollar award of the old injury is subtracted. The Supreme Court found that neither the plain language of relevant portions of SB 899 nor the legislative history of that bill evidenced any legislative intent to abandon "Formula A" [*Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1313, 1323-1332, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644, 156 P.3d 1100]* .

Penalties. In enacting a new version of *Labor Code § 5814*, effective June 1, 2004, and which is applicable to all injuries, regardless of whether the injury occurs before, on, or after the effective date of the statute, the legislature has provided, among other things, that when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, the

amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused will be increased up to 25 percent or $10,000, whichever is less. If, however, a potential violation of this statute is discovered by the employer prior to an employee claiming a penalty under it, the employer, within 90 days of the date of the discovery, may pay a self-imposed penalty in the amount of 10 percent of the amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused, along with the amount of the payment delayed or refused, in lieu of the 25 percent or $10,000 penalty. No action may be brought to recover penalties that may be awarded under this statute more than two years from the date the payment of compensation was due. In enacting *Labor Code § 5814.6*, the legislature has provided that any employer or insurer that knowingly violates *Labor Code § 5814* with a frequency that indicates a general business practice is liable for administrative penalties not to exceed $400,000.

Burden of Proof--Preponderance of the Evidence. The legislature has amended *Labor Code § 3202.5* to provide that all parties and lien claimants must meet the evidentiary burden of proof on all issues by a preponderance of evidence in order that all parties are considered equal before the law, and has redefined "preponderance of the evidence" as "that evidence that, when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and greater probability of truth."

Alternative Dispute Resolution--Collective Bargaining and Labor-Management Agreements. In amending *Labor Code §§ 3201.5* and *3201.7*, the legislature has provided that alternative dispute resolution procedures in collective bargaining agreements in construction-related industries and in labor-management agreements for any employer or groups of employers that meet certain requirements may allow the parties to negotiate for the delivery of medical benefits and disability compensation to employees who are eligible for group health benefits and non-occupational disability benefits through their employer.

Vocational Rehabilitation Reinstated for Injuries Before January 1, 2004. In reenacting *Labor Code § 139.5*, the legislature has reinstated vocational rehabilitation for injuries occurring before January 1, 2004. The reenacted statute will remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date.

Medical Billing and Provider Fraud --Reporting-- Immunity From Civil Action. In amending *Labor Code § 3823*, the legislature has provided that no party, reporting in good faith what is believed to be a fraudulent claim made by a medical care provider, is subject to any civil liability.

Right to Request Qualified Medical Examination--Disputed Permanent Disability Rating. In amending *Labor Code § 4061*, the legislature has recastthe provisions governing the right of either party to request a qualified medical evaluation in the event of a disputed permanent disability rating.

Objections to Medical Determinations. In amending *Labor Code § 4062*, the legislature has recast the provisions governing objections by either the employee or the employer to a treating physician's determination of any medical issue not covered by *Labor Code § 4060* or *4061* and not subject to the utilization review process pursuant to *Labor Code § 4610*.

Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluations. In amending *Labor Code § 4060*, the legislature has recast the basic provisions governing entitlement to medical evaluations when compensability of an injury is disputed.

Comprehensive Medical Evaluations--Rights of Unrepresented Employee. In amending *Labor Code § 4062.1* by adding new subsections (b)-(e), the legislature has spelled out the procedures to be used

when either party seeks appointment of a qualified medical evaluator and the employee is not represented by an attorney. As of April 19, 2004, unrepresented employees must now select a Qualified Medical Examiner from a panel of three medical evaluators to resolve claim disputes. There are also time limits to make the request, to select a medical evaluator from the panel, and to make an appointment.

Comprehensive Medical Evaluations--Rights of Represented Employee. In repealing *Labor Code § 4062.2* and adding new *Labor Code § 4062.2*, the legislature has spelled out the procedures to be used when a comprehensive medical evaluation is required to resolve any dispute arising out of an injury or a claimed injury occurring on or after January 1, 2005, either party seeks appointment of an agreed medical evaluator, and the employee is represented by an attorney. If, however, an Agreed Medical Evaluator is not used, then the parties may request a panel of three Qualified Medical Examiners from which an Agreed Medical Evaluator can be selected. There are also time limits to make the request, to select a medical evaluator from the panel, and to make an appointment.

Panel Qualified Medical Evaluators and Agreed Medical Evaluators--Information and Communication. In adding *Labor Code § 4062.3*, the legislature has spelled out the rules regarding information to be provided to, as well as communications with, Qualified Medical Examiners selected from a panel and Agreed Medical Evaluators.

Failure of Qualified Medical Evaluator to Complete Timely Evaluation. In amending *Labor Code § 4062.5*, the legislature has outlined the consequences for the parties of a Qualified Medical Examiner's failure to complete a timely medical evaluation.

Educational Materials to Train Physicians and Other Providers. In adding *Labor Code § 4062.8*, the legislature has instructed the Administrative Director to prepare educational materials to be used in training physicians and other providers in relevant aspects of workers' compensation law.

Treating Physician Presumption of Correctness Repealed. In repealing *Labor Code § 4062.9*, the legislature has deleted the provision that gave a presumption of correctness to the findings of a treating physician or chiropractor who had been designated by an injured worker as his or her personal physician prior to the industrial injury.

Worker's Choice of Physician --No Medical Network-- Predesignation of Personal Physician. The legislature has amended *Labor Code § 4600* to provide that, unless the employer or the employer's insurer has established a medical provider network as provided for in *Labor Code § 4616*, an industrially injured worker has the right to select his or her own physician after 30 days from the date on which the injury is reported to the employer. If an employee has notified his or her employer in writing before the date of injury that he or she has a personal physician, the employee has the right to be treated by that physician from the date of injury if the employer provides either nonoccupational group health coverage in a health care service plan or nonoccupational health coverage in a group health plan or a group health insurance policy.

Medical Treatment--Itemization--Amounts to Be Paid. In amending *Labor Code § 4603.2*, the legislature has specified that, in general, payments for medical treatment are to be made at reasonable maximum amounts in the official medical fee schedule in effect on the date of service. The legislature has made further amendments throughout *Labor Code § 4603.2*, including that payment to an employee-selected physician or physician designated by the employer must be made within 45 working days (60 working days if the employer is a governmental entity) after receipt of each separate *itemization* of medical services provided, together with any required medical reports and any written authorization for services that may have been received by the physician.

Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule--Rebutting Presumption of Correctness. In amending *Labor Code § 4604.5*, the legislature has provided that, upon adoption of this schedule by the Director, the recommended guidelines set forth in it are to be presumptively correct on the issue of extent and scope of medical treatment. The presumption is rebuttable and may be controverted by a preponderance of the scientific medical evidence establishing that a variance from the guidelines is reasonably required to cure or relieve the employee from the effects of his or her injury. The presumption created is one affecting the burden of proof. These recommended guidelines are to reflect practices that are evidence and scientifically based, nationally recognized, and peer-reviewed. For all injuries not covered by the Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines or the official utilization schedule after adoption, authorized treatment is to be in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines generally recognized by the national medical community and that are scientifically based.

Medical Treatment Reasonably Required to Cure or Relieve. The legislature amended *Labor Code § 4600* to provide that medical treatment "reasonably required to cure or relieve the injured worker from the effects of his or her injury" means treatment that is based on the guidelines adopted by the Administrative Director pursuant to *Labor Code § 5307.27* or, prior to the adoption of those guidelines, the updated American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines.

Evidence--Medical Treatment Utilization Guidelines. In amending *Labor Code § 5703*, the legislature has authorized the WCAB to receive medical treatment utilization guidelines as evidence.

Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule--Occupational Therapy. In amending *Labor Code § 4604.5*, the legislature has provided that an employee is entitled to no more than 24 occupational therapy visits per industrial injury.

Filing of Claim Form and Employer's Obligation for Medical Treatment. In amending *Labor Code § 5402*, the legislature has specified that the employer must provide medical treatment within one working day of the filing of a claim form by an employee and must continue to provide the treatment until the date the claim is accepted or rejected. Until that date, liability for medical treatment is limited to $10,000. Treatment so provided does not give rise to a presumption of liability on the part of the employer.

Medical and Hospital Liens--Lien Filing Fee. The legislature amended *Labor Code § 4903.05* to provide that a filing fee of $100 is to be charged for each initial lien filed by health care providers, or on behalf of providers, pursuant to *Labor Code § 4903(b)*. Effective July 1, 2006, however, the legislature repealed *Lab. Code § 4903.05*, thereby abolishing the filing fee [*see* Stats. 2006, ch. 69, § 25; *see also § 577.262*].

Injury and Illness Prevention Program. The legislature amended *Labor Code § 6401.7* to provide that insurers must conduct a review and provide a written report of the injury and illness prevention program of each of its insureds with an experience modification of 2.0 or greater within six months of the commencement of the initial insurance policy term. The reviewer must be or work under the direction of a licensed California Professional engineer, certified safety professional, or a certified industrial hygienist.

Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act. The legislature amended *Labor Code § 2699* to provide that the statute does not apply to the recovery of administrative and civil penalties in connection with workers' compensation laws as contained in Division 1, Dept. of Industrial Relations, and Division 4,

Workers' Compensation and Insurance, including, but not limited to, *Labor Code § 129.5* (audit penalties) and *Labor Code § 132a* (discrimination against injured workers).

Workers' Compensation Funds--Employer Surcharges. In amending *Labor Code § 62.5*, the legislature has clarified uncertainties generated by apparently conflicting provisions in different pieces of 2003 legislation and provided that theWorkers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund, the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund, and the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund are to be financed exclusively be surcharges levied by the Administrative Director against employers.

Workers' Compensation Insurance Rates. In enacting *Labor Code § 138.65*, the legislature has provided for a study of the effects of legislative reform on workers' compensation insurance rates and for the Governor and the Insurance Commissioner to make recommendations as to the appropriateness of regulating insurance rates. The legislation requires that the study be submitted by January 1, 2006.

This chapter discusses proceedings under California's workers' compensation law to recover compensation for work-related injury, illness or death. In addition, the chapter discusses the exclusive remedy principle and its exceptions, as well as third-party actions.

The legal background (contained in Part II of this chapter) begins by discussing the general purpose, scope, and coverage of workers' compensation law and time limitations on proceedings under that law [*see §§ 577.10 -577.25*].

Subpart A discusses proceedings for the adjudication of workers' compensation claims before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board and addresses the following topics:

- Workers' compensation procedures that are preliminary to initiation of proceedings before the Appeals Board, such as initial attorney consulations and the requirements as to attorney's fees, fee agreements, and attorney's fees disclosure statements; initial notice requirements for employees and employers; and the benefits to be provided by the employer on notification of an injury, including procedures applicable to permanent disability benefits [*see §§ 577.40 -577.46*].

- Mandatory and voluntary arbitration of workers' compensation disputes [*see §§ 577.60 -577.70*].

- Proceedings for adjudication of claims, including procedures for initiation of a proceeding [*see §§ 577.80 -577.90*]; captions, verification, service, and filing of papers with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board [*see §§ 577.100 -577.108*]; stipulations and requests for awards [*see §§ 577.120 -577.122*]; compromise and release agreements [*see §§ 577.130 -577.134*]; prehearing proceedings [*see §§ 577.140 -577.157*]; hearings [*see §§ 577.170 -577.182*]; findings and awards [*see §§ 577.190 -577.195*]; reconsideration [*see §§ 577.210 -577.212*]; supplemental proceedings [*see §§ 577.220 -577.225*]; payment, commutation, and enforcement of awards [*see §§ 577.240 -577.247*]; and lien claims [*see §§ 577.260 -577.265*].

- Judicial review of Appeals Board decisions [*see §§ 577.280 -577.294*].

Subpart B discusses the exclusive remedy principle of workers' compensation law and exceptions to that principle which allow injured employees to maintain civil actions against their employers [*see §§ 577.310 -577.321*].

Subpart C discusses third party actions, including the effect of employer negligence on the liability of third parties, the allocation of third-party judgments, and the subrogation rights of employers [*see §§ 577.330 -577.336*].

Part IV of this chapter contains forms for use in workers' compensation proceedings and in civil actions against

employers or third parties. Subpart A includes the following workers' compensation forms:

- Forms for filing workers compensation claims, and obtaining information regarding employee injuries [*see §§ 577.370* -577.376].

- Forms used to initiate proceedings before the Appeals Board, including Applications for Adjudication of Claim in disability and death cases [*see §§ 577.390 -577.401*].

- Forms used in the discovery process, including subpoenas and a petition to compel an employee to submit to a medical examination [*see §§ 577.410* -477.413].

- Forms used to obtain permanent disability ratings [*see §§ 577.420 -577.423*].

- Forms used to join and dismiss parties to a workers' compensation proceeding [*see §§ 577.430 -577.431*].

- Forms used to dismiss or substitute attorneys [*see §§ 577.440 -577.441*].

- Forms used to dismiss workers' compensation claims for inactivity or at the request of a party [*see §§ 577.450 -577.453*].

- Forms used to settle workers' compensation claims, including Compromise and Release Agreements and informational guidelines for submission of settlement documents [*see §§ 577.460 -577.463*].

- Forms used for stipulations and request for awards [*see §§ 577.470 -577.471*].

- Forms used in the resolution of lien claims [*see §§ 577.480 -577.482*].

- Forms used in pre-hearing proceedings and hearings, including pre-trial conference statements and a request for an expedited hearing [*see §§ 577.490 -577.492*].

- Forms used after an award is issued, including a form to request a certified copy of award, to petition for reconsideration, and to reopen a claim [*see §§ 577.500 -577.503*].

- Form of a petition for writ of review [*see § 577.510*].

Subpart B contains the following forms for use in civil actions:

- Forms of complaints for damages [*see §§ 577.520 -577.525*].

- Forms of affirmative defenses [*see §§ 577.530 -577.532*].

- Forms for use in securing liens against third-party judgments and obtaining credit against compensation liability [*see §§ 577.540* -57.542].

The chapter also contains a Research Guide (*see* Part III, *§ 577.350 et seq.*)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical EvidenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Partial DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART I. SCOPE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.02

§ 577.02 Cross References

[1] Arbitration

For discussion and forms relating to arbitration, see Ch. 32, *Contractual Arbitration: Agreements and Compelling Arbitration* , and Ch. 33, *Contractual Arbitration: Appointment of Arbitrator and Conduct of Proceedings*

[2] Exclusive Remedy Principles

For discussion of and forms for actions for injuries arising from willful physical assault, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery*

For discussion of and forms for wrongful death actions under the Code of Civil Procedure, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For discussion of and forms for actions for wrongful termination from employment, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline*

For discussion of principles of negligence and forms for actions for injuries caused by negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For discussion of and forms for actions for injuries caused by defective products, see Ch. 460, *Products Liability*

[3] Judicial Review

For discussion, format requirements of papers filed in appellate courts, and related forms, see Ch. 40, *Appeal: An Overview* , and Ch. 50, *Appeal: Briefs*

For discussion and forms of petitions for writs of review under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1110* and related forms, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of*

[4] Jurisdiction

For discussion of federal-state jurisdiction and forms for use in actions under the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C. § 51 et seq.*), the Safety Appliance Act (*45 U.S.C. § 1 et seq.*), and the Boiler Inspection Act (*45 U.S.C. § 22 et seq.*), see Ch. 485, *Railroads*

For discussion of federal-state jurisdiction and forms for use in actions under the Jones Act (*46 U.S.C. § 688*), the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. § 30301 et seq.), and the Death on the High Seas Act (*46 U.S.C. § 761 et seq.*), see Ch. 522, *Ships and Shipping*

[5] Subrogation

For discussion and forms for use in subrogation actions, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation*

[6] Third Party Actions

For discussion and forms for use in actions by a decedent's heirs to recover damages for wrongful death, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For discussion and forms for use in actions based on negligence or strict liability in torts, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 460, *Products Liability* , respectively

For discussion and forms for use in actions in subrogation, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsIntentional TortsFalse ImprisonmentGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsProducts LiabilityGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity ProvisionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsFederal Employers' Liability Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART I. SCOPE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.03-577.09

[Reserved]

§§ 577.03[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.10

§ 577.10 Governing Law

[1] In General

Workers' compensation and insurance are governed by Cal. Const., art. XIV, *§ 4, Division 4 of the Labor Code* (*Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.*), and *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10300 et seq.* Workers' compensation and insurance for state employees not otherwise covered are governed by Division 4.5 of the Labor Code (*Lab. Code § 6100 et seq.*). Division 4 does not apply to employers or employments engaged in interstate commerce or to employees injured while they are so engaged, except insofar as they are permitted to apply under the federal constitution or laws [*Lab. Code § 3203*].

Compensation proceedings are governed generally by *Lab. Code § 5300 et seq.* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10300 et seq.* The rules relating to workers' compensation matters adopted by the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9710 et seq.* and *10100 et seq.* Judicial review is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5950-5956* and by *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495*. Third-party actions are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3865*. Finally, rules of the Court Administrator, *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297, became effective on November 17, 2008.

Several federal laws also provide workers' compensation for injury to or death of members of various classes of employees. Examples are the Federal Employers' Liability Act (*45 U.S.C. § 51 et seq.*), the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (*33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.*), the Jones Act (*46 U.S.C. § 688*), the Death on the High Seas Act (*46 U.S.C. § 761 et seq.*), the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (*43 U.S.C. § 1331 et seq.*), the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (*5 U.S.C. § 8101 et seq.*), the Defense Base Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1651 et seq.*), and the War Hazards Compensation Act (*42 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.*). There may be some situations in which a particular worker will come under the protection of both the California workers' compensation law and a federal act [*see Duong v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 980, 981-984, 215 Cal. Rptr. 609* (land-based shipyard worker injured while repairing vessel docked on navigable waters held subject to both California law and Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, *33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.*)]. Employees of private contractors on federal lands or buildings are, however, covered by the workers' compensation law of the state in which the land or buildings are situated in some circumstances [*see 40 U.S.C. § 3172*].

[2] Applicability of 1989 and 1990 Amendments

In 1989, the Legislature enacted the Margolin-Bill Greene Workers' Compensation Reform Act of 1989 [1989 Stats., chs. 892, 893], which made numerous significant changes in the workers' compensation law and related provisions of the Labor Code, particularly workers' compensation procedure. These changes apply only to *injuries* occurring on or after January 1, 1990, unless a specific statutory provision provides otherwise [*see* 1989 Stats., ch. 893, § 6]. Thus, many proceedings, including some proceedings commenced *after* January 1, 1990, will continue to be governed by provisions of the Labor Code (and related administrative regulations) *as they existed prior to the 1989 amendments* if they involve injuries that occurred before January 1, 1990. Thus, when handling any workers' compensation proceeding, counsel must be careful to ascertain both:

- The date of injury (that is, whether it occurred before or after January 1, 1990), and

- Whether the particular provision(s) of the Labor Code relied on by counsel were amended by 1989 Stats., ch. 892 or 893.

In those instances in which a statutory provision or regulation has been affected by the 1989 legislation, this article discusses both the current law and the prior law. It also discusses the 1990 "cleanup" legislation [*see* 1990 Stats., ch. 1550].

For discussion of the what constitutes the date of injury for purposes of workers' compensation law, see *§ 577.14[3][c]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityJones ActWorkers' Compensation & SSDIMaritime Workers' ClaimsCompensabilityLongshore & Harbor Workers' Compensation ActGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.11

§ 577.11 Nature and Purpose of Law

The California workers' compensation law is designed to impose on employers the burden of injuries caused by work-related accidents while protecting workers from the special risks of employment [*Laeng v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 771, 782, 100 Cal. Rptr. 377, 494 P.2d 1]* . The touchstone of the workers' compensation system is industrial injury that results in occupational disability or death [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 752, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* . A compensable injury is an injury that causes disability or the need for medical treatment, and compensable injuries may be physical, emotional, or both, so long as they are disabling [*see Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 752-753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* . The workers' compensation system is designed, however, to compensate *only* for such disability or need for treatment that is occupationally related [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* . The basic purpose of the system is to compensate for a disabled worker's diminished ability to compete in the open labor market, and not to compensate for every work-related injury [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808*]. Thus, it is theoretically possible to incur a work-related injury that results in no compensable industrial disability under the workers' compensation system [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 754, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* .

Pursuant to the plenary power the California Constitution has granted to the Legislature to create and enforce a complete system of workers' compensation under *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, the Legislature has created a statutory scheme requiring all employers to secure the payment of workers' compensation to injured employees, either by obtaining insurance coverage of their liability or by obtaining a certificate of consent to self-insure issued by the Director of Industrial Relations. The right to workers' compensation benefits is entirely statutory and is not derived from the common law [*DuBois v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 382, 388, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523, 853 P.2d 978]* .

At its inception, a principal purpose of the law was to eliminate the three common law defenses that had prevented recovery for injuries received on the job:

- Contributory negligence;
- Assumption of risk; and
- Fault of a fellow employee.

Employees were relieved of these defenses and given the certainty of financial and other benefits whenever the "conditions of compensation" were established [*see Lab. Code § 3600* and *discussion under § 577.23*]. In exchange, employers were given an exemption from civil actions for damages [*see Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* (under workers' compensation law, employee is afforded relatively swift and certain payment of benefits to cure or relieve effects of industrial injury without having to prove fault, but, in exchange, gives up the wider range of damages potentially available in tort); *Hisel v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 969, 974-975, 238 Cal. Rptr. 678* (tracing legislative history of workers' compensation law); *see also,* discussion under subpart B, *§ 577.310 et seq*.].

The basic purpose of the law is to ensure that a worker who sustains injury in the course of employment, regardless of the fault of any party, and those who depend on the worker for support, will have adequate means of support while the worker is unable to work, and that the injured worker will be furnished with the medical and other remedial treatment required to cure and relieve him or her from the effects of the injury. The policy of the law is to accomplish substantial justice in all cases expeditiously, inexpensively, and without incumbrance of any character [*Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*; *see City etc. of San Francisco v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 1001, 1010, 88 Cal. Rptr. 371, 472 P.2d 459]* . In sum, the purposes of the workers' compensation law are several [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 354, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* :

- To ensure that the cost of industrial injuries will be part of the cost of goods rather than a burden on society;
- To guarantee prompt, limited compensation for an employee's work injuries, regardless of fault, as an inevitable cost of production;
- To spur increased industrial safety; and
- In return, to insulate the employer from tort liability for his or her employees' injuries.

To these ends, the workers' compensation law is to be construed liberally [*Lab. Code § 3202*; *see Martinez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 982, 987, 127 Cal. Rptr. 150, 544 P.2d 1350* ; *In-Home Supportive Services v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 720, 733, 199 Cal. Rptr. 697]* . The rule of liberal construction applies to all aspects of the workers' compensation law [*LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 241, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity ProvisionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.12

§ 577.12 Administration of Law

[1] In General

The California workers' compensation law is administered by the Division of Workers' Compensation in the Department of Industrial Relations [*see Lab. Code §§ 19, 56*]. Prior to 1990, the division was called the Division of Industrial Accidents, and prior to 1966, the Industrial Accident Commission administered the law. Within the division, the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) exercises the judicial functions of adjudicating claims, whereas the other functions of the division are administered by the division's administrative director and court administrator [*see Lab. Code §§ 110, 111, 123, 123.5, 127, 127.5, 127.6, 138.1, 3200*].

The administrative director appoints the workers' compensation judges [*see Lab. Code §§ 123, 123.5(a)*] and is authorized to appoint a California licensed attorney as counsel to the division [*Lab. Code § 117*].

The Administrative Director has promulgated ethical standards to which the workers' compensation law judges (WCJ's) must adhere. Among the topics covered by these standards are: gifts, honoraria, and travel; disclosure requirements; disqualification; restriction on investments; financial interests in educational programs; duty to report ethics violations; an ethics advisory committee with investigatory powers; investigation and action by the Administrative Director or Court Administrator [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9720.1*-9723].

[2] Division of Workers' Compensation

The Division of Workers' Compensation is required to make available to employees, employers, and other interested parties information, assistance, and advice to assure the proper and timely furnishing of benefits and to assist in the resolution of disputes on an informal basis [*Lab. Code § 5450*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9921-9929*]. The informal procedure is set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5451-5455*.

[3] Workers' Compensation Appeals Board

[a] Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction of the WCAB is set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5300-5305* [*see Marcus v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 598, 602, 111 Cal. Rptr. 101]* . The following must be instituted before the WCAB, and may not be instituted elsewhere:

- Proceedings for recovery of workers' compensation, or concerning any right or liability arising out of or incidental to the proceedings.

- Proceedings for enforcement against an employer or an insurer of any liability for compensation imposed on him, her, or it by *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.* in favor of an injured employee, an injured employee's dependents, or any third person.

- Proceedings for determination of any question as to the distribution of workers' compensation among dependents or other persons.

- Proceedings for determination of any question as to who are dependents of any deceased employee or what persons are entitled to any benefit under the compensation provisions of *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.*

- Proceedings for obtaining any order that the WCAB is authorized to make pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.*

- Proceedings for determination of any other matter over which jurisdiction is vested by *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.* in the Division of Workers' Compensation, including the administrative director and the WCAB.

A superior court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over an action to enjoin the WCAB from enforcing provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act [*Lab. Code § 5955*; *Greener v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1028, 1034, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539, 863 P.2d 784]* . A party who is aggrieved by an order of the WCAB applying the workers' compensation law to that party may seek relief by filing a petition for review of the WCAB's order with the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court, or by filing a petition for a writ of mandate with the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court if the criteria for extraordinary relief under *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085* are satisfied [*Greener v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1028, 1046, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539, 863 P.2d 784]* . See *§ 577.280* et seq., for a discussion of judicial review.

Courts must resolve any reasonable doubts as to jurisdiction in favor of the WCAB [*Gilford v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 828, 831, 833-834, 116 Cal. Rptr. 615]* .

For further discussion of the exclusive nature of the jurisdiction of the WCAB, see subpart B, § 577.310 et seq.

[b] Power to Punish for Contempt

The WCAB and its members may issue all necessary process in proceedings for contempt in like manner and to the same extent as courts of record [*Lab. Code § 134*; *see Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414* ; *Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 928, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651* ; *Rowen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 633, 639, 639 n.5,174 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *Marcus v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 598, 602-605, 111 Cal. Rptr. 101]* . Accordingly, the WCAB must follow the applicable provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure pertaining to contempt (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1209-1222*) [*Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414* ;

Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 928, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651 ; *Rowen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 633, 643, 174 Cal. Rptr. 185]* . When the contempt is not committed in the WCAB's presence, the WCAB must proceed by way of order to show cause supported by affidavit [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1211, 1212*] or declaration under penalty of perjury [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*], and the alleged contemner is entitled to appear before and be heard by the WCAB [*Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414* ; *Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 928, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651]* . Moreover, there is no right to reconsideration of a contempt order under *Lab. Code § 5900* [*Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 927 n.1, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651]* .

Judicial review of a finding of contempt by the WCAB may be had by filing a petition for a writ of certiorari or, in the case of a jail sentence, a writ of habeas corpus, addressed in either instance to the appropriate court of appeal [*Rowen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 633, 637, 174 Cal. Rptr. 185* ; *Marcus v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 598, 601 n.3, 111 Cal. Rptr. 101]* . Prohibition is also an appropriate remedy to restrain threatened contempt proceedings by the WCAB, if the WCAB is acting without or in excess of jurisdiction [*see Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 171-172, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414]* . For discussion of when the WCAB may direct and order a workers' compensation judge to issue necessary process in proceedings for direct and hybrid contempt, see*§ 577.145[b]*.

For further discussion of contempt and for forms that may be adapted for use in contempt proceedings before the WCAB, as well as for forms for use in securing judicial review of a contempt adjudication, see Ch. 135, *Contempt* .

[c] Disciplinary Powers Over Representatives of Parties

After a hearing, the WCAB may remove, deny, or suspend the privilege of a person to represent any party in any proceeding before the WCAB or workers' compensation judges for a violation of *Lab. Code §§ 4900-4909.1* (*discussed under § 577.242*) or for other good cause [*Lab. Code § 4907*]. *Lab. Code § 4907*, by its terms, applies to attorneys, but this application was held unconstitutional under the separation of powers doctrine (*Cal. Const., art. III, § 3*) [*Hustedt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 30 Cal. 3d 329, 335-346, 178 Cal. Rptr. 801, 636 P.2d 1139* ; *see Katz v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 30 Cal. 3d 353, 357, 178 Cal. Rptr. 815, 636 P.2d 1153]* .

[d] Establishment of Uniform Procedures and Forms

The court administrator is required to establish uniform district office procedures, uniform forms, and uniform time of court settings for all district offices of the Appeals Board. No district office or workers' compensation judge may require forms or procedures other than as established by the court administrator. A workers' compensation judge who violates this requirement may be subject to disciplinary proceedings [*Lab. Code § 5500.3(a)*]. The Appeals Board is required to establish uniform court procedures and uniform forms for all other proceedings of the Board. No district office or workers' compensation judge may require forms or procedures other than as established by the Board [*Lab. Code § 5500.3(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptLegal EthicsSanctionsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

45-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.12A

§ 577.12A Electronic Adjudication Management System

[1] Using EAMS; General Characteristics

As DWC moves toward eventual use of electronic forms, the various DWC units are now referred to as "product delivery units" [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(bb)*]. The units are abbreviated as follows: Adjudication Unit "ADJ"; Disability Evaluation Unit "DEU"; Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund "SIF"; Uninsured Employers' Benefits Trust Fund "UEF"; Vocational Rehabilitation "VOC"; and Retraining and Return to Work Unit "RSU." For each product delivery unit, there is an area in EAMS in which the case management information related to that product delivery unit is stored. That area is called the "product delivery case." "INT" is the integrated case, which is the umbrella for the individual product delivery cases for each unit residing in EAMS. External users are being integrated into EAMS, meaning that attorneys and other interested parties will have much of their contact with DWC via EAMS. Once the shift to fully electronic forms is accomplished, each attorney or other interested party, in order to access EAMS, must have taken a computer-based training course. Upon passing this course, the participant will receive a user name and a password. Access to EAMS will be through a link to be added to the DIR/DWC website.

Clicking on the EAMS link from the DIR/DWC website will lead to the EAMS page, from which various functions may be performed:

- The General-Public-Search link that will appear on the EAMS page will allow a user to search for basic case information, such as the first and last names of an injured worker, the worker's date of birth, and the case number.

- Links to eForms will be provided, with forms grouped by unit area (e.g., ADJ, UEF, DEU), each of which may be filled out online and submitted electronically. Among the eForms to be available through EAMS will be Application for Adjudication of Claim, Compromise and Release, Declaration of Readiness to Proceed, Notice of Request for Allowance of Lien, Petition to Terminate Liability for Temporary Disability Indemnity, and Stipulations With Request for Award.

- The logon-to-EAMS link will lead to the EAMS logon page, through which information will be accessible to only those persons who have received an appropriate EAMS account, which will presumably include all representatives of injured workers, employers, or lien claimants.

Having selected the logon-to-EAMS link, the user will be led to the search page. This page will function as an EAMS home page. From it, the user may search by any field on the page, e.g., participant name, case number, worker's date of birth. With the search results, the user has the ability to sort the cases, by case number, injured worker, date of injury, and several other data categories.

The EAMS user will need to become familiar with some new terminology. For example, the "primary client" means the injured worker, and "Legacy Case ID" means the number previously used by the specific DWC unit (ADJ, DEU, SIF, VOC, RSU, UEF) to refer to the case. Under EAMS, a case will have one master number that will not change among the units. Another new term is the "product delivery case home page," also accessed via the search page. From the product delivery case home page, the user may navigate to items such as the case calendar or case events, which is the EAMS case history. If, for example, a case has a hearing scheduled, the user will see that hearing on the calendar, much like meetings noted on a Microsoft Outlook calendar. [Note: There will be a separate "product delivery case home page" for each type of case (ADJ, VOC, DEU, etc.).] The case home page contains details such as the "product name," i.e., the EAMS case type (ADJ, DEU, etc.); the "case reference," i.e., the EAMS case number; and the case status.

Another new concept with which attorneys and other participants in the workers' compensation system will need to become familiar is that of the "integrated case." This is the umbrella that contains the product delivery cases such as ADJ or UEF. The user will click on the Case Reference hyperlink to view a case. The integrated case contains information common to the product delivery cases, such as information about the injured worker, the employer, etc. From the integrated case, it will be possible to access the various product delivery cases via the Case Reference hyperlinks mentioned above. To access documents for a case, the user will click on the case type hyperlink in the Case Documents section. All case documents will be stored in EAMS, and case participants will be able to search for and access documents in their cases by Case ID, Case Type, Document Date, or Author.

EAMS will allow case files to be prepared more quickly, the number of human errors to be decreased, fewer resources to be used in the process, and the viewing of files to be done from the user's own office. For example, on the "Check In Check Out Documents" page, a list of case documents will appear. Once the user has located the document sought, it can be viewed by clicking on the document hyperlink. Thus, trips to a DWC District Office for the purpose of viewing case documents will be eliminated. Moreover, any changes that need to be made to a given document may be made online, followed by electronic submission of the new version to DWC.

With the proper access rights, a user is able to modify personal information in EAMS, including mailing address, e-mail address, and phone number. Again, no trip to a District Office or even a mailed letter will be required.

On the "Request for Action" page, an attorney will have the ability to request that DWC perform an action on one of his or her cases. The attorney may request an order taking the case off calendar, a rehabilitation conference change, or a continuance. When requesting an action, the user will be required to input the case type, the case ID, and the user's first and last names. For example, if requesting a continuance, the user will select Continuance from a dropdown list, enter the case number, the user's first and last name, then add "good cause" in the Reason box, informing DWC of the situation. When the user then clicks the Submit button, the Continuance request will be sent to the in-box of a DWC worker. The in-box will show that worker what activities he or she needs to perform.

[2] Case Names, Case Index, and Adjudication Files

An index of all cases filed with a district office will be maintained in EAMS under the name of the person claimed to

have been injured or the identification assigned to that person, whether or not that person is an applicant. Reference to the case will be by the name of the injured person and the case number [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10215*].

All cases filed on and after November 17, 2008, are required to be maintained by DWC in an electronic format in EAMS. All paper documents properly filed in such cases must be scanned into the EAMS adjudication file, then destroyed anytime more than 30 business days after filing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(a)*].

All case opening documents are required to be given a case number by the district office when no case number has been previously assigned for the injured worker for the alleged date of injury. The parties must be notified of the case number by their preferred method of service, which may include U.S. Mail, fax, or e-mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(b)*].

If a case number has been previously assigned by DWC, a new case number will be assigned when a document is filed, as follows: the prefix "ADJ" will replace the previously assigned three-letter prefix (e.g., "OAK") and precede the assigned case number [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(c)*].

Except as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10273* (retention, return, and destruction of records and exhibits), DWC is required to maintain a paper adjudication file until it is converted to an electronic adjudication file. If, however, a paper adjudication file is maintained on or after November 17, 2008, an electronic adjudication file must also be created, and any documents filed thereafter must be maintained electronically in EAMS, in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(c)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(d)*; *see above*].

A paper adjudication file or a portion of a paper adjudication file may be converted to an electronic adjudication file by DWC at any time. If a paper adjudication file is completely scanned into EAMS, DWC must notify the parties to the case of the change in how the file is maintained, and the paper adjudication file may then be destroyed anytime more than 30 business days after the issuance of the notification [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10216(e)*].

[3] Official Participant Record and Duty to Furnish Correct Address

DWC is required to maintain an official participant record for each adjudication file, which must contain the names of all parties and lien claimants and their attorneys or hearing representatives [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(a)*].

In order to ensure that case parties and documents are accurately associated to the correct electronic adjudication file, uniform names for claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices are required to be used when filing documents in EAMS. These names are assigned by DWC [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)*]. DWC will maintain a list on its website of uniform names and mailing addresses and preferred method of service for claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(1)*]. Additions for new claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices and changes of name, location or address, telephone number, fax number, e-mail address, or preferred method of service must be registered by the entity requesting the change with the Central Registration Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(f)* (Central Registration Unit is unit within DWC that maintains website list of uniform names and addresses)]. The entity requesting the change must fax or e-mail a letter on letterhead with a signature from an authorized individual requesting the change to DWC's Central Registration Unit within five business days of any change. The entity must also advise all parties of any change of name, mailing address, or telephone number by furnishing the current information within five business days of any change [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(A)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(B)* (fax number for Central Registration Unit is: 1 (888) 822-9309, and e-mail address for Central Registration Unit is: cru@dir.ca.gov); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(C)* (new uniform name or address and preferred method of service will be posted by Central Registration Unit within 10 business days of receipt of request)].

Except as required in the preceding paragraph, every party and every lien claimant having an interest in an active case pending before the district office or WCAB must advise the district office and all parties of any change of mailing

address and telephone numbers by furnishing the current information within five business days of any change [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(c)*]. Similarly, every lien claimant that has filed a lien in a case pending in a district office must advise all parties within five business days of any change in the identity and/or telephone number of the person with authority to resolve the lien by furnishing the correct name and daytime telephone number of that person to the interested parties, and must advise DWC of any such change after a declaration of readiness is filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(d)*]. Finally, every party and lien claimant having an interest in an inactive case must advise all other known parties, lien claimants, attorneys, and hearing representative within five business days of any change of address (which must include any change of mailing address and telephone numbers) by furnishing the correct and current address and/or number, and must advise DWC of any such change within five business days if there is an outstanding award of further medical treatment or if there is continuing jurisdiction pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803*, and *5804* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(e)*].

[4] Designated Preferred Method of Service

Claims administrators' offices [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(g)* ("claims administrator's office" defined)] and representatives' offices [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(dd)* ("representative's office" defined)] may designate first-class mail, electronic mail, or fax as their preferred method of service for receiving documents from the district office and the Appeals Board. The designated method of service must be the same for all active cases for that claims administrator's office or representative's office. A party, a lien claimant, or an attorney or other representative for a party or a lien claimant who does not designate a preferred method of service will be served by first-class mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10218(a)*].

Represented parties, lien claimants, or attorneys or other representatives for parties or lien claimants may agree among themselves that any method of service may be used for receiving documents among the parties to the agreement. If such an agreement is made, service pursuant to the agreement constitutes valid service. Absent such an agreement, service between these parties or entities must be made by first-class mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10218(b)*].

Service by or on an unrepresented injured worker, unrepresented dependent, or unrepresented uninsured employer must be made by first-class mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10218(c)*].

[5] Failure to Comply With Court Administrator's Rules

If a document is not filed in compliance with the Court Administrator's rules, because it does not comply with either the procedural requirements or with the place of filing requirements, the Court Administrator may in his or her discretion take the following actions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(a)*]:

- Correct the defect and file the document.

- Notify the filer that the document is not accepted for filing by service of a Notice of Document Discrepancy. This Notice must state the discrepancy and the date of the attempted filing, and provide the filer with 15 business days from service to cure the discrepancy. If the document is corrected within 15 business days, or at a later date upon a showing of good cause, it will be deemed filed on the original date the document was submitted.

The following documents are not to be filed with the district office or the Appeals Board, except as a non-duplicative supporting exhibit or by order of a WCJ or the Board. Documents improperly submitted will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed and will not be acknowledged and may be discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(b)*]:

- Letters to opposing parties or counsel.

- Subpoenas.
- Notices of taking deposition.
- Medical appointment letters.
- Proofs of service ordered pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*.
- Medical reports, except as required by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233*.
- Copies of any decision of any federal or state court opinion otherwise available.
- Copies of any decision of the Appeals Board or a WCJ that is otherwise available.
- Duplicate medical and medical-legal reports.
- No diagnostic imaging as defined in *Lab. Code § 139.3(b)(1)* is to be transmitted to the district office or the Appeals Board unless it is ordered.

No document is to be sent by electronic mail or by fax directly to the district office or the Appeals Board. If a document is sent by electronic mail or fax directly to the district office, it will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed, will not be acknowledged, and may be discarded unless otherwise ordered by the WCJ or the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(c)*].

Failure to comply with the rules of the Court Administrator will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless that failure results from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10211*].

[6] Corrective Measures for Misfiled or Misdirected Documents Into the Case Management System

DWC may perform document substitution on filed documents, repair scanned documents, and move documents to other adjudication files [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(a)* ("adjudication file" defined)].

A document substitution may occur when a technical problem of readability and/or legibility exists with a filed document. The filer may seek a substitution of the document by filing a petition to substitute. The proposed document for substitution must be appended to a petition to substitute. If the petition to substitute is granted, the proposed document for substitution will replace the document that was unreadable or illegible [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(b)*].

A document repair may occur when a document scanned into an electronic adjudication file by DWC fails to reflect the original paper document. DWC may repair the document so that the scanned image accurately reflects the original paper document. DWC may repair a document at any time, or a party may request that a document be repaired. EAMS will retain as viewable the original document for those who have access to the electronic file [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(c)*].

A document may be moved when a document originally scanned by DWC is filed into the wrong electronic file [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(d)*].

Documents that are in the process of being substituted or repaired will not be moved [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(e)*].

DWC will provide notice to all parties of moved, substituted, or repaired documents within 15 business days [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10223(f)*].

[7] Extended System Unavailability

If, for any reason, there is a technical failure of EAMS for longer than 24 hours, the Court Administrator, in his or her discretion, may declare that EAMS is unavailable for an extended period of time [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(a)*]. After issuing a declaration of extended system unavailability, the Court Administrator must issue an order that includes, but is not limited to [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(b)*]:

- Requiring that the district office or the Appeals Board serve all documents by first-class mail.
- Providing that filed documents be maintained in temporary paper adjudication files.
- Providing that the time for performing any action, whether by the parties or by the district office, be extended by a specified period or until EAMS is declared to be operational.
- Requiring or allowing any other actions or remedies, as deemed appropriate under the circumstances.

The Court Administrator must post the declaration of extended system unavailability on DWC's website, if the website remains operational, and at every district office and the office of the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(c)*].

Any declaration of extended unavailability remains in effect until the Court Administrator issues a subsequent declaration that EAMS is operational [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(d)*].

DWC will maintain on its website a list of all technical failures of EAMS that last longer than 24 hours [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(e)*].

EAMS will be backed up daily pursuant to the State of California's information technology standards [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10225(f)*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.13

§ 577.13 Employer's Liability for Workers' Compensation Benefits

[1] Basis for Liability

Liability for injury is based not on any act or omission of the employer but on the existence of the relationship that the employee bears to the employment [*Bell v. Industrial Vangas, Inc. (1981) 30 Cal. 3d 268, 277, 179 Cal. Rptr. 30, 637 P.2d 266]* . Determination of whether there is a sufficient relationship to impose liability cannot be determined simply from technical contractual or common law conceptions of employment and must be resolved by reference to the history and purposes of the workers' compensation law [*Laeng v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 771, 777-778, 100 Cal. Rptr. 377, 494 P.2d 1* ; *see County of Los Angeles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 30 Cal. 3d 391, 397, 179 Cal. Rptr. 214, 637 P.2d 681* ; *In-Home Supportive Services v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 720, 728, 199 Cal. Rptr. 697]* . For a full discussion of what constitutes an employment relationship for purposes of workers' compensation law, see *§ 577.22*.

[2] Extent of Liability

[a] Disability and Medical Treatment

The workers' compensation laws provide for a variety of benefits to injured employees, although the benefits are limited in comparison to tort damages. Benefits include compensation for temporary disability (*Lab. Code §§ 4650, 4650.5, 4652, 4653*), permanent disability (*Lab. Code §§ 4061* (operative for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991), 4062 (operative for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991), 4650, 4658-4660), and medical care (*Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1*). The separate statutory treatment of these benefits serves different legislative goals.Employer liability for medical and surgical services is provided in major part to facilitate the worker's speedy recovery and to maximize his or her productive employment. Temporary disability indemnity is intended primarily to substitute for the worker's lost wages, in order to maintain a steady stream of income. Permanent disability indemnity has a dual function: to compensate both for actual incapacity to work and for physical impairment of the worker's body, which may or may not be incapacitating [*Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1535, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190]* . For discussion of benefits for medical treatment, temporary disability, and permanent disability, see

discussion under § 577.45.

[b] Death Benefits

The death of an injured employee does not affect the employer's liability under *Lab. Code § 4600 et seq.* (relating to medical and hospital treatment) or *Lab. Code § 4650 et seq.* (relating to disability payments), but neither temporary nor permanent disability payments may be made for any period of time subsequent to the employee's death. Any accrued and unpaid compensation must be paid to the dependents or, if there are no dependents, to the deceased employee's personal representative or heirs or other persons entitled to it, without administration [*Lab. Code § 4700*]. A survivor's entitlement to a deceased employee's accrued and unpaid compensation does not diminish a survivor's entitlement to full statutory death benefits [*Lab. Code § 4702(a), (c)*].

The liability of the employer for burial expenses and death benefits is provided for in *Lab. Code § 4701*. The death benefit allowed is set forth in *Lab. Code § 4702*, the death benefit payable in cases of one total dependent and additional partial dependents or two or more total dependents, in *Lab. Code § 4703*, the amount and duration of death benefits payable when there are totally dependent minor children, in *Lab. Code § 4703.5*, the WCAB's power to adjust the allocation, in *Lab. Code § 4704*, and the payment of accrued benefits when a dependent beneficiary dies, in *Lab. Code § 4706*. Payments to the Department of Industrial Relations when the employee dies without dependents is covered in *Lab. Code § 4706.5* [*see Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 715, 727, 182 Cal. Rptr. 778, 644 P.2d 1257]* .

The court of appeal has held that *Lab. Code § 4702(a)(6)(B)*, which provides that, when a worker without dependents suffers a fatal industrial injury, the employer must pay $250,000 to the deceased worker's estate as a workers' compensation death benefit, is unconstitutional because the constitutional enabling provision, *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, does not identify estates as a class of beneficiaries entitled to workers' compensation death benefits, but rather identifies only three classes of beneficiaries of workers' compensation benefits, workers, dependents, and the State of California [*Six Flags, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 91, 93-94, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 377*]. Subsequently, the court of appeal annulled an Appeals Board order requiring an employer to pay a full $125,000 death benefit to the Death Without Dependents Unit pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4706.5(a)*, when the court found that the employer had paid a deceased employee's mother/heir death benefits of $104,208 pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4702(a)(6)(B)*. The employer had ceased such payments following the decision in *Six Flags*, discussed above. Because death benefits were paid to the decedent's heir pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4702(a)(6)(B)* before it was declared unconstitutional, the Death Without Dependents Unit was not entitled to be paid any death benefit [*City of Los Angeles v. Workers' Comop. Appeals Bd. (Foster) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 134, 146151, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 513*].

The person to whom the death benefit is paid for the use of several beneficiaries must apply it in compliance with the findings and directions of the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 4705*]. Special provisions apply when the deceased employee was a member of the Public Employees' Retirement System [*see Lab. Code §§ 4707, 4708*], to dependents of a deceased peace or law enforcement officer, an officer or employee of the Department of Corrections or the Department of Youth Authority, or a firefighter [*see Lab. Code § 4709*], and to the assassination of an elected public official [*see Lab. Code §§ 4720-4728*].

[3] Employer's Obligation to Secure Payment of Compensation

Every employer other than the State of California is required to secure the payment of workers' compensation [*Lab. Code § 3700*]. No part of thecost may be charged against the employee [*see Lab. Code §§ 3751, 3752*; *Muffett v. Royster (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 289, 301 n.6, 195 Cal. Rptr. 73* ; *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Superior Court (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1101-1102* (employee stated cause of action in alleging that employer violated *Lab. Code § 3751* by including workers' compensation costs incurred by store as one element in calculation of employee incentive bonus)]. For example, *Lab. Code § 3751* has been held to bar freight transportation companies from requiring independent

contractor truck owners/operators to pay the costs of their own workers' compensation insurance, when the parties had elected under *Lab. Code § 4150* to come under the workers' compensation law's compensation provisions, which include *Lab. Code § 3751* [*Albillo, et al. v. Intermodal Container Services, Inc.; Montoya v. W.C.A.B. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 190, 197-207, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 350]* . Payment must be secured by the employer's:

- Being insured for workers' compensation liability by an insurer authorized to write this kind of insurance in California [*Lab. Code § 3700(a)*]; or

- Securing a certificate of consent to self-insure either as an individual employer or as one employer in a group of employers [*Lab. Code § 3700(b), (c)*; *see* *Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1156, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693]* .

An employer can secure the payment of compensation on employees provided to the employer through an agreement with another employer, by entering into a valid and enforceable agreement with the other employer under which the other employer agrees to obtain, and does obtain, workers' compensation coverage for those employees [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*]. In such cases, both employers will be considered to have secured the payment of compensation [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*]. Employers who comply with this rule will not be subject to civil, criminal, or other penalties for failure to provide workers' compensation coverage or tort liability in the event an employee is injured, but may, in the absence of compliance, be subject to all three [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*].

The means by which a private self-insurer provides compensation is detailed in *Lab. Code § 3701*. The statutory obligation to secure payment commences with the inception of employer status, and the duty must be discharged before the necessity for payment of any award arises [*Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1156, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693]* . An employer who does not purchase insurance or qualify as a self-insurer is illegally uninsured, and numerous penalties and consequences may flow from this illegality [*Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1157, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693* ; *see* discussion under *§ 577.13[4]*].

[4] Failure to Secure Payment of Compensation

[a] Criminal and Civil Penalties

The failure to secure the payment of compensation by one who knew, or because of his or her business knowledge or experience should be reasonably expected to have known, of the obligation to do so is a misdemeanor [*Lab. Code § 3700.5*; *see* *Muffett v. Royster (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 289, 300 n.5, 195 Cal. Rptr. 73]* . Furthermore, an injured employee or a deceased employee's dependents (as well as a "qualified alien" and his or her dependents) may sue an uninsured employer for damages for the injury or death as if the workers' compensation law did not apply [*Lab. Code § 3706*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 15740(b)*; *see* discussion in subpart B, § 577.312[2]; *see also § 577.522[1]*].

One court of appeal, with a strong dissent, has held that, since the duty to secure the payment of compensation is imposed on employers, the word "one," as used in *Lab. Code § 3700.5*, means an employer; and that the behavior proscribed by *Lab. Code § 3700.5* is confined to the employer's nonfeasance, or, in certain instances, the nonfeasance of those who control the employer by virtue of their shareholder or parent status, and cannot be expanded to impose liability on one who does not already possess a duty under the statutory scheme to secure the payment of compensation; that is, the statute does not extend to officers and managing employees of a corporate employer [*Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1156, 1158-1159, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693]* . The same court further held that the purpose of *Lab. Code § 3700.5* is to secure the payment of compensation in the first instance, that prosecution under this statute would occur only when an employer was illegally uninsured, and that, once the obligation to secure payment of compensation is satisfied, *Lab. Code § 3700.5* does not apply to punish employers and their managers for inaccurately estimating liabilities or otherwise submitting incomplete annual reports, the penalties and remedies for which are provided for in other statutes [*Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App.*

3d 1148, 1156, 1158-1160, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693] .

In addition to any other remedies provided by law, the Director of Industrial Relations may enforce a judgment against an uninsured employer by nonjudicial foreclosure of property not subject to *Code Civ. Proc. § 703.010 et seq.* (exemptions) [*see Lab. Code § 3716.3*]. Furthermore, if an employer has failed to secure compensation as required by *Lab. Code § 3700*, the Director must issue a stop order prohibiting the use of labor by that employer until the employer complies with *Lab. Code § 3700* [*Lab. Code § 3710.1*; *see Lab. Code § 3710.3* (transmission of stop order to Public Utilities Commission (PUC) or the Department of Motor Vehicles, whichever has jurisdiction over the affected carrier); *see also Pub. Util. Code §§ 1033.8(a), 5285.5(a), 5378.7(a)* (PUC's authority to investigate and impose appropriate penalties, including suspension of operating authoritywhen Director has issued stop order to carrier regulated by PUC)]. An employer may protest the issuance of a stop order according to the procedures set forth in *Lab. Code § 3710.1*.

The court of appeal has held that a penalty assessed against an employer for failure to have workers' compensation coverage would not be set aside, when the insurer had notified the employer that coverage would be canceled unless all past-due premiums were made by a specified date, the employer paid only a portion of that premium, so that on the date of the penalty assessment the employer had no coverage in effect, and the fact that, subsequently, coverage was reinstated retroactively to include the date of the penalty assessment could not rewrite history to establish that the lapse had not occurred and to invalidate the penalty assessment [*Leo's Assocs., Inc. v. Department of Indus. Relations (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 628, 631-632, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 594]* .

[b] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

Except for certain residential employees [*see Lab. Code §§ 3351(d), 3715(a), (b)*], the employee or the deceased employee's dependents may also apply to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB) for an award of workers' compensation benefits. If the WCAB awards benefits and the employer neither pays the award nor furnishes a bond to secure payment of the award, the award will be paid from the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund [*see Lab. Code §§ 3715, 3716*; *see also Lab. Code § 5106* (order for lump-sum payment of present worth of benefits to be paid in future installments)]. The fund may pay the claimant only such benefits allowed, however, recognizing proper liens on them that would have accrued against an employer properly insured for workers' compensation liability, and is not liable for any penalties or interest on any awards [*Lab. Code § 3716.2*; *see Duncan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 294, 300-304, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 664* (limitation of liability specified by *Lab. Code § 3716.2* precludes imposition of sanction against UEBTF pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5813* for bad-faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or intended solely to cause unnecessary delay)]. Alternatively, the Director of Industrial Relations, as administrator of the fund, may resolve the claim for benefits by compromise and release or stipulated findings and award if the WCAB has jurisdiction over the employer and the employer has been given notice and an opportunity to object [*see Lab. Code § 3715(e)*].

The UEBTF may not be joined in any proceedings unless a legal person or entity has been identified as an illegally uninsured employer in an application and special notice of lawsuit and that employer has been served with the application and special notice of lawsuit in the manner provided for service of summons in the Code of Civil Procedure [*Rea v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 625, 644-652, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 828* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10, 415.20, 415.30, 415.40, 415.50*].

A findings and award of compensation benefits that is the subject of a demand on the fund, or an approved compromise and release or stipulated findings and award entered into by the Director of Industrial Relations pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3715(e)*, or a decision and order of the rehabilitation unit of the Division of Industrial Accidents (now the Division ofWorkers' Compensation) [*see Lab. Code § 110(c)*] that has become final, constitutes a liquidated claim for damages against the employer in the amount ascertained and fixed by the WCAB. The WCAB must certify the same to the Director who may then institute a civil action against the employer or obtain a judgment against the employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5806* (entry of judgment by superior court clerk in conformity with certified copy of WCAB's order,

decision or award filed with court by any party affected by it) [*Lab. Code § 3717(a)*]. In an action like this, the total amount of the award, including interest, other penalties, and attorney's fees granted by the award, must be sought, and recovery of awarded benefits in excess of the amounts paid the claimant by the fund must be paid over to the injured employee or the employee's representative as the case may be [*Lab. Code § 3716.2*; *see also Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1157-1158, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693* (discussing foregoing, as well as additional, penalties and tracing statutory history); *Lab. Code § 3716.4* (when final judgment is entered under *Lab. Code § 3716.2* against carrier regulated by Public Utilities Commission (PUC) or Department of Motor Vehicles, Director may transmit copy of judgment to PUC or the Department of Motor Vehicles, whichever has jurisdiction over the affected carrier, with complaint requesting that the carrier's certificate of public convenience and necessity or permit be immediately revoked); *Pub. Util. Code §§ 1033.8(b), (c), 5285.6(b), (c)*, 5379.7(b), (c) (procedures when PUC receives complaint from Director)].

An uninsured employer's obligation to reimburse the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund for an award of workers' compensation benefits that the UEBTF paid to an injured employee is not an excise tax for purposes of federal bankruptcy law and is, therefore, dischargeable in bankruptcy proceedings [*George v. Uninsured Employers Fund (9th Cir. 2004) 361 F.3d 1157, 1162-1164]* .

In one case a plaintiff against whose property a lien had been filed by the UEF [now called the UEBTF] sued individual employees of the UEF to recover damages, alleging a federal civil rights claim and several state law claims. The trial court found that the federal claim was barred by the statute of limitations and that, on the state claims, the defendants were immune from suit. The case had arisen when an employee of another employer (not the plaintiff), who was using the plaintiff's contractor's license number without the plaintiff's consent, was injured. That employer had no workers' compensation insurance. The UEF paid benefits to the injured employee, then filed a lien on the plaintiff's residence. The court of appeal ruled that the plaintiff's federal civil rights claim was barred by the statute of limitations and that the state-law claims were barred by the California Government Claims Act, specifically by *Gov. Code § 821.6* [*Javor v. Taggart (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 795, 799-800, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentCausationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.14

§ 577.14 General Definitions

[1] Compensation

As used in the workers' compensation law, "compensation" includes every benefit or payment conferred by that law on an injured employee, or on his or her dependents in the event of the employee's death, without regard to negligence [*Lab. Code § 3207*; *see Adams v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 226, 231, 133 Cal. Rptr. 517, 555 P.2d 303* ; *Knopfer v. Flournoy (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 318, 320, 109 Cal. Rptr. 892]* .

[2] Dependency

[a] In General

For purposes of awarding benefits for the death of a covered employee, dependency is defined as reliance on another person for total or partial support. Total dependents are those who at the time of injury are supported solely by the decedent or who have a legal right to look to the decedent for their entire support. Partial dependents are those who at the time of the injury are partially supported by the decedent or who have a legal right to look to the decedent for partial support, but have some means of support other than the deceased's contributions [*see Mendoza v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 820, 823-824, 127 Cal. Rptr. 173]* .

No person is a dependent of any deceased employee unless, in good faith, he or she is a member of the family or household of the employee, or unless the person bears to the employee the relation of husband or wife, child, posthumous child, adopted child, stepchild, grandchild, father or mother, father-in-law or mother-in-law, grandfather or grandmother, brother or sister, uncle or aunt, brother-in-law or sister-in-law, or nephew or niece [*Lab. Code § 3503*; *see Donovan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 323, 328-329, 187 Cal. Rptr. 869* (mere occupation of same residence does not confer status of dependency under *Lab. Code § 3503*)]. In allowing death benefits, the Legislature is not limited to dependents with a legal or moral claim to support from the deceased employee, but may, as it has done, extend the benefit to those whose maintenance has been voluntarily and gratuitously assumed by the employee [*Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1051, 232 Cal. Rptr.*

343] .

Dependency is determined as of the date of the employee's injury [*Lab. Code §§ 3501, 3502*; *see Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1051, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343* ; *Donovan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 323, 329 n.6, 187 Cal. Rptr. 869* ; *Roblyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 574, 580, 133 Cal. Rptr. 246]* . In cases involving cumulative injuries, the "time of injury" set forth in *Lab. Code § 3502* has the same meaning as the "date of injury" set forth in *Lab. Code § 5412* [*Department of the California Highway Patrol v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1828, 1836, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 188]* .

[b] Presumption of Dependency

[i] Children

A child under 18 years of age, or a child of any age found by any trier of fact, whether contractual, administrative, regulatory, or judicial, to be physically or mentally incapacitated from earning, is conclusively presumed to be wholly dependent for support on a deceased employee-parent with whom the child was living at the time of the injury resulting in the parent's death or for whose maintenance the parent was legally liable at the time of the injury resulting in the parent's death, if there is no surviving totally dependent parent [*Lab. Code § 3501(a)*; *see Arp v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 395, 410, 138 Cal. Rptr. 293, 563 P.2d 849]* .

[ii] Spouses

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, a spouse to whom a deceased employee is married at the time of death is conclusively presumed to be wholly dependent for support on the deceased employee if the surviving spouse earned $30,000 or less in the 12 months immediately preceding the death [*Lab. Code § 3501(b)*].

[c] Actual Dependency

In all other cases, questions of entire or partial dependency and questions as to who are dependents and the extent of their dependency are determined in accordance with the facts as they exist at the time of the employee's injury [*Lab. Code § 3502*].

Actual dependency in fact, as opposed to presumptive dependency, is determined by the support actually given by the deceased and the extent of the dependent's reliance on that support [*see Mendoza v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 820, 824, 127 Cal. Rptr. 173* (partial dependency on income of deceased siblings established)]. For example, in a case requiring a determination of when parents should be considered "partial dependents" of their adult children living at home, for purposes of recovering death benefits, the court concluded that the deceased adult child had to have been providing a net financial benefit to the household, deducting first those costs attributable solely to the deceased. In that case, the adult child had been paying his parents $150 per month. Unrebutted testimony indicated that the monthly cost of the child's food exceeded this amount. Thus, said the court, the child's monthly payment, while making *him less dependent on them*, did not make them dependent on him. Expressing the same point another way, the court noted that, following the child's death, the household's monthly food bill decreased by more than the $150 that the child had been contributing to the household income. Consequently, the parents were not eligible to receive death benefits [*Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 560, 568-570, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420]* .

[3] Injury and Compensability

[a] In General

As used in the workers' compensation law, "injury" includes any injury or disease arising out of the employment [*Lab.*

Code § 3208; *see J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 332-333, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . The term includes:

- any disease that may be infectious, contagious, or the product or aggravation of a discogenic disease [*Chavez v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 5, 11, 106 Cal. Rptr. 853]* ;

- illnesses such as heart disease that may result from the cumulative effect of each day's strain [*Chavez v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 5, 8-10, 12 n.6, 106 Cal. Rptr. 853]* ;

- a psychoneurotic injury caused by the work environment [*Baker v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 18 Cal. App. 3d 852, 861, 96 Cal. Rptr. 279]* ; and

- a psychiatric injury sustained in the course of the worker's employment [*see Cooper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 44, 48-49, 218 Cal. Rptr. 783* ; *see also* discussion under *§ 577.140[3][d]*].

A number of statutes define "injury" to include certain illnesses or disabilities that manifest themselves during employment with respect to specified workers [*see Lab. Code §§ 3212, 3213*; *see also Lab. Code § 3208.05* ("injury" includes a reaction to or a side effect arising from health care provided by an employer to a health care worker that is intended to prevent the development or manifestation of any bloodborne disease, illness, syndrome, or condition recognized as occupationally incurred by Cal/OSHA, the Federal Centers for Disease Control, or other appropriate governmental entities)].

The California Supreme Court has stated that a compensable injury is an injury that causes disability or the need for medical treatment when the disability or need for medical treatment is occupationally related, and that a compensable injury may be physical, emotion, or both, so long as the injury is disabling [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 752-753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* .

[b] Specific Versus Cumulative Injuries

An injury may be either "specific," occurring as the result of one incident or exposure that causes disability or the need for medical treatment, or "cumulative," occurring as repetitive mentally or physically traumatic activities extending over a period of time, the combined effect of which causes disability or the need for medical treatment [*Lab. Code § 3208.1*; *see Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1110, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868* ; *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 332-333, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219* ; *Chavez v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 5, 7-9, 11, 106 Cal. Rptr. 853]* .

An employee who suffers from a cumulative injury may invoke the rights and benefits provided under the workers' compensation laws if the cumulative effects of the repetitive events result in a compensable injury, i.e., one resulting in lost wages or the need for medical treatment [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 234, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . Under *Lab. Code § 3208.1*, an injury causing a need for medical treatment is compensable even in the absence of disability [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 236, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* .

In any given case, there can be more than one injury, either specific or cumulative, or a combination of both, arising from the same event or from separate events. The number and nature of the injuries sustained are questions of fact for the WCJ or the WCAB. For example, one exposure may result in two distinct injuries, posing a question of fact for the WCJ or the WCAB. The nature and number of injuries suffered are determined by the events leading to the injury, the employee's medical history, and the medical testimony received [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 234-235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26* (stating that employee who suffered nervous

breakdown, and also developed ulcer, as result of work-related stress would have two distinct injuries from one exposure)].

[c] Date of Injury

[i] In General

Determining the date of injury is important because the date of injury is one of the events that may commence the running of the statute of limitations for recovery of medical or disability benefits [*see Lab. Code §§ 5404, 5405, 5407*; *see also § 577.25[2]*]. The date of injury is also relevant to determination of the applicability of those statutes amended and enacted by 1989 Stats., chs. 892 and 893, and the corresponding regulations [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10100-10137*], which apply only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990 [*see discussion under § 577.10*].

[ii] Specific Injuries

The date of injury is the date during the employment on which the alleged incident or exposure occurred for the consequences of which compensation is claimed [*Lab. Code § 5411*].

[iii] Cumulative Injuries

In cases of occupational diseases or cumulative injuries, however, the date of injury is the date on which the employee first suffered disability from the disease or injury and either knew, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that the disability was caused by his or her present or prior employment [*Lab. Code § 5412*; *see Lab. Code § 3208.1*; *see also Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1110, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868* ; *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 336, 341-342, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219* ; *Hanna v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 719, 722, 108 Cal. Rptr. 227]* . Thus, for the purpose of the statute of limitations, the date of a cumulative injury requires concurrence of two elements [*see Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1110, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868]* :

- Compensable disability; and
- Knowledge of causation by the employment.

[iv] Knowledge of Injury

Whether the employee knew, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that the disability was caused by the employment is a question of fact. The employer has the burden of proof on this issue, and the burden is not sustained merely by showing that the employee knew he or she had some symptoms [*Chambers v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 556, 559, 72 Cal. Rptr. 651, 446 P.2d 531* ; *City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 471, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463]* .

With respect to when the employee knew or should have known that his or her disability was industrially caused, the Court of Appeal for the Fifth Appellate District has concluded, based on prior case law and other authorities, that an applicant will not be charged with knowledge that his or her disability is job-related without medical advice to that effect, unless the nature of the disability and the applicant's training, intelligence, and qualifications are such that the applicant should have recognized the relationship between the known adverse factors involved in the employment and his or her disability [*City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 473, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463]* .

Division Two of the Court of Appeal for the Fourth Appellate District, however, characterizing the foregoing rule as "a bit overly expansive" in light of prior case law, said that the absence of a medical opinion confirming causation by the

employment is but one important circumstance to be considered together with other circumstances in determining in a particular case whether the applicant should reasonably have known that his or her injury was industrially caused [*Nielsen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 918, 929-930, 210 Cal. Rptr. 843]* . In a subsequent case, the Court of Appeal for the Fifth Appellate District noted the conflict between *City of Fresno* and *Nielsen*, but concluded that, under the standards of either case, substantial evidence supported the WCAB's determination in the case before it that the applicant knew, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that the applicant's disability was work related more than one year prior to filing her claim for cumulative disability [*Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1111-1113, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868]* .

[v] Date of Injury Versus Fact of Injury

The date of injury and the fact of injury are not equivalent, and it is therefore possible to find that an employee has sustained a cumulative industrial injury or occupational disease without making a finding as to the date of injury when the injury has caused no temporary or permanent disability, but has resulted in a need for medical treatment [*J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 340, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* .

With respect to cumulative injuries, if the "date of injury" as determined pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5412* is on or after January 1, 1990, the parties and counsel must comply with the workers' compensation law as revised by 1989 Stats., chs. 892 and 893, and the corresponding regulations [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10100-101370*], and must use any applicable new forms promulgated by the Division of Workers' Compensation and the WCAB. The revised provisions govern, regardless of the fact that the conditions that caused the injury may have predated January 1, 1990.

[d] Psychiatric Injuries

[i] Causation; Actual Events of Employment

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, a psychiatric injury is compensable under the workers' compensation law if [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(a), (b)*].

- It is a mental disorder that causes disability or the need for medical treatment;

- It is diagnosed pursuant to procedures promulgated by the Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(4)*, or, until those procedures are promulgated, it is diagnosed using the terminology and criteria of the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition-Revised, or the terminology and diagnostic criteria of other psychiatric diagnostic manuals generally approved and accepted nationally by practitioners in the field of psychiatric medicine; and

- The employee demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that actual events of employment were responsible for at least 10 percent of the total causation from all sources contributing to the psychiatric injury (if the injury occurred prior to July 16, 1993) or that the actual events of employment were predominant as to all causes combined of the psychiatric injury (if the injury occurred on or after July 16, 1993).

In the case of employees whose injuries occurred on or after July 16, 1993, as the result of being a victim of a violent act or from direct exposure to a significant violent act, the employee is required to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that actual events of employment were a "substantial cause" of the injury, meaning at least 35 to 40 percent of the causation from all sources combined [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(2), (3)*]. It was the intent of the Legislature in enacting *Lab. Code § 3208.3* to establish a "new and higher threshold of compensability" for psychiatric injury under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(c)*]. Thus, the phrase "predominant as to all causes" in *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)*, requires that the work-related cause of an employee's psychiatric injury be greater than 50 percent of the

entire set of causal factors [*Dept. of Corrections v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 76 Cal. App. 4th 810, 816, 90 Cal. Rptr. 2d 716]* .

The court of appeal has held that an employee's psychiatric injury satisfied the standard for compensability set forth in *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)* only if it was proven that events of employment were predominant as to all causes combined of the psychiatric disability taken as a whole. The court found that the legislative history of the statute indicated that the Appeals Board's award of benefits, even though the AME had found that the employee's overall psychiatric injury was only 35-percent industrially caused but stated that one of three separate diagnoses was caused exclusively by industrial factors, was contrary to the legislature's intention [*Sonoma State University v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 500, 504-506, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 330]* .

The statutory language has been held applicable to a psychiatric injury claimed as a compensable consequence of a precipitating physical injury, and the precipitating physical injury has been held to constitute an actual event of employment. That is, a *consequential* psychiatric injury is compensable if and only if it is more than half attributable to the physical industrial injury [*Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1237, 1249, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865]* .

In one case, the court of appeal annulled and remanded the Appeals Board's award of benefits to an employee for work-related psychiatric injury, when it found that only one of the four factors relied on by the Board, namely, the employee's daily interactions with angry customers of his employer, fell within the definition of actual events of employment in *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)*, while the other three factors, namely, the downsizing of the employer, the loss of value of the employer's stock owned by the employee, and the employee's concern about his employer's future and his retirement funds, did not fall within the definition of actual events of employment. The court concluded that a reasonable probability existed that, but for the error, the Board would not have concluded that actual events of the employee's employment were predominant as to all causes combined of psychiatric injury [*Pacific Gas & Electric v. W.C.A.B. (Bryan) (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1182-1184, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467]* .

In another case, the court of appeal held that an employee did not suffer psychiatric injury AOE/COE as a result of actual events of employment that were predominant as to all causes combined, when it found that substantial evidence supported the Appeals Board's factual findings that the employee's supervisor and co-workers did not persecute or harass her and that it was the employee who caused a stressful work environment by being rude, inflexible, easily upset, and demeaning toward other employees. Moreover, said the court of appeal, the fact that the employee subjectively misperceived as harassment the disdainful reaction of her co-workers to her mistreatment of them did not entitle her to workers' compensation benefits for psychiatric injury, since the disdainful reactions of co-workers to the employee's abusive conduct toward them were neither "actual events of employment" nor the "predominant" cause of the employee's psychiatric injury. Rather, the predominant cause of the employee's injury was the employee herself, through her intentional abuse of her co-workers, whereas the "actual events of employment" language of *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)* required the employee to establish objective evidence of harassment, persecution, or other basis for the alleged psychiatric injury [*Verga v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 174, 183-189, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 871*].

The California Supreme Court has held the provisions of *Lab. Code § 3208.3* inapplicable to members of the California Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS). In this case, a public employee's application for disability retirement, alleging cumulative workplace trauma, including psychiatric injury, had been approved without a finding as to whether the psychiatric injury was industrial in character. The employee petitioned the Appeals Board, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 21166*, for a finding of fact on that issue, since public employee disability retirement benefits based on industrial injury are substantially higher than those based on non-industrial injury. *Gov. Code § 21166* mandates that in such situations theAppeals Board use "the same procedure as in workers' compensation hearings" to "determine whether the disability is industrial." The Court held that this language merely directs the Appeals Board to use its fact-finding apparatus, including rights of notice, hearing, and representation by counsel, to make this determination. The statutory language

does not, said the Court, direct the Appeals Board to apply workers' compensation *substantive* law, specifically not *Lab. Code § 3208.3*'s high threshold for finding a psychiatric injury to be industrial. Rather, *Gov. Code § 20046*'s lower threshold of disability, "as a result of injury or disease arising out of and in the course of ... employment," governs [*Pearl v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 189, 194-198, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308, 26 P.3d 1044* ; *see also Abraham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1087-1089, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 820* (superior court had no jurisdiction to review Appeals Board decision when Board jurisdiction was invoked, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 21166*, for determination as to whether disability of public safety employee, member of Public Employees Retirement System, was industrial)].

[ii] Six-Month Rule

Notwithstanding any other provision of the workers' compensation law, workers' compensation will not be paid for a psychiatric injury related to a claim against an employer unless the employee has been employed by that employer for at least six months. The six months of employment need not be continuous [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(d)*]. The six-month minimum employment period of *Lab. Code § 3208.3(d)* does not apply, however, if the psychiatric injury is caused by a sudden and extraordinary employment condition [*Matea v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 1435, 1447-1450, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 314* (employee met his burden of establishing that he suffered psychiatric injury as result of sudden and extraordinary employment condition, making psychiatric injury compensable even though it occurred during first six months of employment, when court of appeal found that lumber falling into aisle and onto employee's leg was such uncommon, unusual, and totally unexpected event that it would naturally be expected to cause psychic disturbances even in diligent and honest employee)]. *Lab. Code § 3208.3(d)* may not be construed to authorize an employee or the dependents of an employee to bring an action at law or equity for damages against an employer for a psychiatric injury, when those rights would not exist pursuant to the exclusive remedy doctrine [*see Lab. Code § 3602*] in the absence of the amendment of *Lab. Code § 3208.3* by 1991 Stats., ch. 115 [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(d)*].

The court of appeal has held that the rule regarding six months of employment applies to all claims of injury to the psyche (other than those subject to the statutory exception of having been caused by "a sudden and extraordinary employment condition"), including those claimed to have arisen out of physical industrial injuries [*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1435, 1441-1443, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 822]* .

[iii] Post-Termination Claims

When the claim for compensation is filed after notice of termination of employment or layoff, including voluntary layoff, and the claim is for an injury occurring on or after July 16, 1993, and prior to the time of the notice, no compensation is payable unless the employee demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that actual events of employment werepredominant as to all causes combined of the psychiatric injury and that one or more of the following conditions exist [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(e)*]:

- Sudden and extraordinary events of employment were the cause of the injury.

- The employer has notice of the psychiatric injury prior to the notice of termination or layoff.

- The employee's medical records compiled prior to notice of termination of layoff contain evidence of treatment of the psychiatric injury.

- On a finding of sexual or racial harassment by any trier of fact, whether contractual, administrative, regulatory, or judicial.

- Evidence that the date of injury is subsequent to the date of the notice of termination or layoff, but prior to the effective date of the termination or layoff.

A notice of termination or layoff that is not followed within 60 days by a termination or layoff is not subject to the provisions, discussed above, and these provisions do not apply until receipt of a later notice of termination or layoff. The issuance of frequent notices of termination or layoff to an employee is considered a bad faith personnel action and makes the foregoing provisions inapplicable to the employee [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(g)*].

[iv] Good Faith Personnel Actions

No compensation is payable by an employer for a psychiatric injury that was substantially caused by a lawful, nondiscriminatory, good faith personnel action. The burden of proof rests with the party asserting the issue [*Lab. Code § 3208.3(h)*].

The Court of Appeal has interpreted this statutory language in a manner that allows for an employer's mistake. The employer had demoted an employee as part of an employer-wide reduction in force and after the employee's supervisor had led him to believe that his demotion might be avoidable. The court held that the correct legal standard is whether the employer made and carried out a regular and routine personnel decision with subjective good faith and whether the employer's actions were objectively reasonable. Here, the demotion was shown to have been justified by the employer's fiscal concerns and not to have been the product of an unlawful animus toward the employee, even if the employer had made mistakes in carrying out the demotion and attempting to protect the employee from demotion [*City of Oakland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 261, 267-270, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 873]* .

In a case involving an employee who alleged psychiatric injury caused by allegations against him of racial discrimination against a fellow employee and by the employer's subsequent investigation of those allegations, the Court of Appeal concluded that the WCAB's finding that the investigation did not constitute a lawful, nondiscriminatory, good faith personnel action was not supported by substantial evidence. The court noted that the employer's investigation was mandated by law, that racial discrimination in employment is prohibited by both state and federal law, that the prohibition against workplace racial discrimination is a fundamental public policy, and that the employer's duty to prevent harassment and discrimination is affirmative and mandatory. That the employer was later, after investigating the racial discrimination claim, unable to substantiate the accusation did not remove the investigation from the realm of good faith employer personnel actions. There was no evidence, said the court, of an arbitrary or unlawful motive for the employer's investigation. Nor was there any evidence of an intent to mislead, deceive, or defraud or of collusion or unlawful design by an employee of the employer in the investigation [*Northrop Grumman Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1021, 1035-1037, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 285]* .

[e] Multiple and Successive Injuries

When disability, need for medical treatment, or death results from the combined effects of two or more injuries, whether specific, cumulative, or both, all questions of fact and law must be separately determined with respect to each injury, including, but not limited to, the apportionment between the injuries of liability for disability benefits, the cost of medical treatment, and any death benefit [*Lab. Code § 3208.2*; *see Lab. Code § 5303*; *see also Aetna Cas. & Surety Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 329, 332-343, 110 Cal. Rptr. 780* ; *Chavez v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 31 Cal. App. 3d 5, 9-10, 106 Cal. Rptr. 853]* . For example, if an employee becomes disabled, is off work, and then returns to work and again becomes disabled, there is a question of fact as to whether the new disability is due to the old injury or to the new and separate injury [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 234, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* .

The purpose of *Lab. Code §§ 3208.2* and *5303* is to preclude the cumulation of injuries subject to separate statutory remedies in a single claim so as to escape the bar of the statute of limitations (discussed under *§ 577.25*) [*Wilkinson v. Workers' Comp Appeals Bd. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 491, 501-502 n.5, 138 Cal. Rptr. 696, 564 P.2d 848* ; *Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1539, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190]* . *Lab. Code §§ 3208.2* and

5303 are unrelated to the substantive law of apportionment governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4663* and *4750* [4750 repealed in 2004], which govern liability for permanent disability caused by successive injuries [*see Wilkinson v. Workers' Comp Appeals Bd. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 491, 501-502 n.5, 138 Cal. Rptr. 696, 564 P.2d 848* ; *Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1535, 1538, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *but see* Benson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 72 Cal. Comp. Cases 1620, 1622, 1634-1635 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) (rule established by *Wilkinson v. W.C.A.B.*, which provided that injured worker who, while employed by same employer, sustained two separate injuries to same part of body, which became permanent and stationary at same time, was entitled to receive combined award of permanent disability, is no longer generally applicable because inconsistent with post-SB 899 requirement that apportionment be based on causation, and in light of current versions of *Lab. Code §§ 4663(a)* and *(c)* and *4664(a)*, as explained by *Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1313, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644, 156 P.3d 1100* , Appeals Board must now determine and apportion to cause of disability for each industrial injury, meaning that all potential causes of disability, whether from current industrial injury, prior or subsequent industrial injury, or prior or subsequent nonindustrial injury or condition, must be taken into consideration), *aff'd sub nom. Benson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1535, 1549-1560, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 166* ; *see also Schmidt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 28 Cal. App. 4th 1458, 1463, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 279* (apportionment under *Lab. Code § 4663* requires that part of disability would have resulted from normal progress of underlying nonindustrial disease)].

Lab. Code § 3208.2 applies to the combination of injuries, not to periods of disability. Thus, if an employee has two periods of disability, i.e., the inability to work, but these two periods are connected by a continuous need for medical treatment caused by a single work-related cumulative injury, the two periods of disability are not considered distinct, and a WCJ does not impermissibly merge the two periods in violation of *§ 3208.2* [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 236-237, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* .

If the applicant has received a prior award of permanent disability, it is conclusively presumed that the prior permanent disability exists at the time of any subsequent industrial injury [*Lab. Code § 4664(b)*; *see Lab. Code § 4663(d)* (employee who claims industrial injury required, upon request, to disclose all previous permanent disabilities or physical impairments); *see also § 577.46[3][c]* (physician who prepares report addressing issue of permanent disability due to claimed industrial injury must in that report address issue of causation of permanent disability)]. This presumption is a presumption affecting the burden of proof [*Lab. Code § 4664(b)*].

The court of appeal has held that the Appeals Board correctly determined that, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4664(b)*, an employee was not entitled to prove that he was medically rehabilitated from a prior permanent disability when he sustained a subsequent industrial injury, when the court found that the legislature intended the statute's presumption to be conclusive, not rebuttable, notwithstanding the second sentence in the statute, which states that this presumption affects the burden of proof. The court annulled the decision of the Appeals Board and held that the Board incorrectly determined that the employee had the burden of disproving overlap between the current permanent disability and the previous disability in order to establish his claim to permanent disability benefits. Rather, found the court, the employer, while able to rely, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4664(b)*, on the conclusive presumption that the employee's permanent disability that was the subject of the prior award existed at the time of the subsequent industrial injury, nonetheless had the burden of proving overlap in order to establish its right to apportionment of the employee's permanent disability [*Kopping v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1106-1115, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618]* .

In 2006, the legislature amended *Lab. Code § 4663* to provide that the statute's apportionment provisions do not apply to injuries or illnesses covered under *Lab. Code §§ 3212 through 3213.2* [*Lab. Code § 4663(e)*]. Moreover, in adding this provision to the statute, the legislature stated that its intent was that this act be construed as declaratory of existing law [Stats. 2006, ch. 836, § 2].

Since April 19, 2004, the accumulation of all permanent disability awards issued with respect to any one region of the body in favor of one individual employee cannot exceed 100 percent over the employee's lifetime, unless the employee's

injury or illness is conclusively presumed to be total in character pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4662* [*Lab. Code § 4664(c)(1)*]. As used in this statute, the regions of the body are [*Lab. Code § 4664(c)(1)*]:

- (A) Hearing.
- (B) Vision.
- (C) Mental and behavioral disorders.
- (D) The spine.
- (E) The upper extremities, including the shoulders.
- (F) The lower extremities, including the hip joints.
- (G) The head, face, cardiovascular system, respiratory system, and all other systems or regions of the body not listed in (A) through (F).

Nothing in this statute is to be construed to permit the permanent disability rating for each individual injury sustained by an employee arising from the same industrial accident, when added together, to exceed 100 percent [*Lab. Code § 4664(c)(2)*].

SB 899, effective April 19, 2004, contained Section 47, which stated that SB 899 "shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award." The court of appeal has held that there was no "existing order, decision, or award" in the case before the court, within the meaning of Section 47 of SB 899, and that the legislature intended Section 47's language to be consistent with the general rule that statutory rights end during litigation with repeal or amendment of the statute unless appeals were exhausted and a final judgment existed. The court held that reopening in workers' compensation generally refers to reopening orders, decisions, or awards for new and further disability under *Lab. Code § 5410* and that the Section 47 language incorporated the language of good cause needed under the Appeals Board's continuing jurisdiction to rescind, alter, or amend an order, decision, or award under *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804*. *Lab. Code §§ 5410*, *5803*, and *5804*, said the court, normally apply to orders, decisions, or awards that are beyond the reconsideration period or when appeals have been exhausted and the decision is final and no longer pending, and applying apportionment under new *Lab. Code §§ 4663* and *4664* in the present case did not reopen, rescind, alter, or amend a previous "existing order, decision, or award" of permanent disability. Thus, the employee's claims were pending and not final judgments, making *Lab. Code §§ 5410*, *5803*, and *5804* irrelevant, and application of SB 899 was not precluded by Section 47 [*Kleemann v. W.C.A.B. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 274, 285-288, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 448]* .

Another court of appeal, following *Kleemann*, affirmed an Appeals Board order that had remanded the case to the WCJ for the purpose of determining the applicability of SB 899, which had been enacted 10 days after the WCJ's order denying apportionment, when the employer petitioned for reconsideration of the WCJ's order in light of SB 899. The court of appeal held that an Appeals Board determination was not "final" for purposes of considering apportionment under SB 899 until the Board had issued a final judgment and the appellate process had been exhausted, which had not occurred in the present case, so that the language of Section 47 of SB 899 that SB 899 "shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board" was no barrier to applying SB 899's apportionment provisions to the present case [*Marsh v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 906, 912-916, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598]* . Both *Kleemann* and *Marsh* were followed in another case in which the court of appeal held that repeal of former *Lab. Code § 4663* was effective immediately on enactment of SB 899 on April 19, 2004, and that new *Lab. Code §§ 4663* and *4664* were applicable to any case still pending, such as the present case, except those cases that were finally concluded, subject only to the Appeals Board's

continuing jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804*. The court of appeal found that the language of Section 47 of SB 899, stating that SB 899 "shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award," essentially tracked the continuing jurisdiction language of *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804*. Continuing jurisdiction to reopen a case was different, said the court of appeal, from the Appeals Board's reconsideration of a "final" order of the Board or a WCJ. The court of appeal found that it could presume that the Legislature, inusing the language quoted above, was intentionally referring to the Board's continuing jurisdiction authority under *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804* [*Rio Linda Union School District v. W.C.A.B. (Scheftner) (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 517, 525-532, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789]* .

In May 2007, the California Supreme Court resolved the uncertainty, generated by conflicting court of appeal opinions, regarding whether the language of *Lab. Code § 4663(c)*, plus the language of *Lab. Code § 4664(a)*, meant that the so-called apportionment "Formula A" adopted by the Supreme Court in *Fuentes* [*Fuentes v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 1, 128 Cal. Rptr. 673, 547 P.2d 449]* , pursuant to which the percentage of disability attributable to the new injury is calculated by subtracting the old permanent disability rating from the new permanent disability rating, then consulting the table for the award due this difference, remained the proper method for calculating apportionment. Injured employees had argued that statutory changes made by SB 899 mandated the use of "Formula C," rejected by the Supreme Court in *Fuentes*, pursuant to which the dollar award for the new injury is calculated as if apportionment were not an issue, then the dollar award of the old injury is subtracted. The Supreme Court found that neither the plain language of relevant portions of SB 899 nor the legislative history of that bill evidenced any legislative intent to abandon "Formula A" [*Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1313, 1323-1332, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644, 156 P.3d 1100]* .

[f] Excluded Injuries

The workers' compensation law relates to medical and/or occupational injuries, that is, to personal injuries, and to those risks to which the employee is exposed by the fact of being employed in the industry. Hence, the word "injury," as used in that law, does not include, for example, such things as damage to reputation as the result of slander [*Howland v. Balma (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 899, 904, 192 Cal. Rptr. 286]* . Nor does the law provide compensation for intentional infliction of emotional distress when no allegation of physical disability is made [*McGee v. McNally (1981) 119 Cal. App. 3d 891, 895, 174 Cal. Rptr. 253* ; *Renteria v. County of Orange (1978) 82 Cal. App. 3d 833, 840-842, 147 Cal. Rptr. 447]* . If physical injury or disability results as well as emotional distress, however, the workers' compensation law provides the exclusive remedy for the employee [*see Hollywood Refrigeration Sales Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 754, 758-759, 210 Cal. Rptr. 619* ; *Ankeny v. Lockheed Missile & Space Co. (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 531, 533-536, 151 Cal. Rptr. 828* ; *Lab. Code § 3208.3* (psychiatric injuries compensable under workers' compensation law); *see also Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 151, 157 n.9, 160, 162, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743* ; *Valenzuela v. State of California (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 916, 919, 922-924, 240 Cal. Rptr. 45* ; *Gates v. Trans Video Corp. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 196, 204-206, 155 Cal. Rptr. 486]* . For discussion of the exclusive nature of workers' compensation remedies, see *§ 577.310 et seq*.

Language in the Supreme Court's decision in *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743* , suggests a distinction between emotional distress resulting in "disability," which is covered by workers' compensation, and emotional distress not resulting in disability. One court of appeal has concluded that the Court in *Cole* adopted an "alternative action theory," under which courts are required to analyze whether a tort action is authorized. Under this analysis, tort recovery is permitted if the tort plaintiff did not sustain "personal injury" within the meaning of the workers' compensation statute. If he or she did sustain "personal injury," tort recovery is denied if the injury "arose out of employment," but is otherwise permitted even if the injury is a type of harm covered by workers' compensation [*Jones v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 794, 805, 244 Cal. Rptr. 37]* .

[4] Temporary Disability

The term "temporary disability" means an impairment of bodily function caused by industrial injury, reasonably expected to be completely curedor materially improved with proper medical attention [*see Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26* ; *Chavira v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 463, 473, 286 Cal. Rptr. 600]* . Temporary disability may either be partial, when the employee is able to earn some income during the healing period, or total, when the injury renders the employee unable to earn any income during that period [*Herrera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 254, 257, 78 Cal. Rptr. 497, 455 P.2d 425* ; *see Lab. Code §§ 4653-4657* (standards of payment for partial and total temporary disability)]. Temporary disability benefits are primarily intended to replace lost earnings [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . If an employee has two discrete periods of temporary disability, they are not merged into a single disability, but are treated as separate entitlements to benefits [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235-236, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . For discussion of temporary disability benefits, see *§ 577.45[3]* .

[5] Permanent Disability

A permanent disability is one that causes impairment of earning capacity or of normal use of a member, or results in a competitive handicap in the open labor market [*Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 613, 628, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *Franklin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 224, 237, 145 Cal. Rptr. 22* ; *see Lab. Code § 4660(a)*].

A disability is considered permanent when the employee has reached maximal improvement, meaning his or her condition is well stabilized, and unlikely to change substantially in the next year with or without medical treatment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10152*; *Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . If applied to a progressive occupational disease, however, the foregoing definition is inadequate. The reference to "maximum improvement" obviously refers to the more classical concept of "injury," which envisions a traumatic incident resulting in corporal injury with a period of healing to a point of greatest improvement. The term did not envision an insidious, progressive disease process that results from a remote, undramatic work exposure and is of little or no use in determining the status of such a condition [*General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 335, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124]* .

A disability cannot be both permanent and temporary at the same time. If a disability changes from temporary to permanent, the permanent disability is considered a new and further disability [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . Whether a disability is permanent or temporary is a question of fact [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 236, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* .

Permanent disability may be either partial or total [*see Lab. Code § 4662* (specific permanent disabilitites conclusively presumed total)]. Permanent disability benefits are intended to compensate an injured employee both for actual incapacity to work, and for the physical impairment suffered by the employee [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* . For discussion of permanent disability benefits, see *§ 577.45[4]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentCausationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesCumulative InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesPsychological InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesSuccessive InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesStatutes of Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.15

§ 577.15 Employer's Death

The employer's death after sustaining an injury by an employee does not impair the employee's right to proceed before the appeals board against the employer's estate. The failure of the employee or of his or her dependents to cause a claim to be presented to the executor or administrator of the employer's estate does not bar or suspend the right [*Lab. Code § 5306*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.16

§ 577.16 Employer's Bankruptcy

If an illegally uninsured employer petitions for bankruptcy after an employee has filed a claim for compensation benefits, an automatic stay goes into effect, barring any creditor from taking any action to collect [*see 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1)*]. Relief from the automatic stay in bankruptcy is, however, generally granted, on request, for workers' compensation proceedings [*Ortiz v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 392, 397, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 484]* . Relief from the stay may be obtained either by stipulation with counsel or by motion before the bankruptcy court [*Ortiz v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 392, 397, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 484]* .

An action before the WCAB to obtain judgment against an uninsured employer, which is a prerequisite to the UEBTF's obligation to pay benefits, is not barred by the bankruptcy discharge injunction. Moreover, in such situations no bankruptcy court order is necessary for the WCAB action to proceed [*In re Munoz (9th Cir. 2002) 287 B.R. 546, 550, 554-556]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawCase AdministrationAdministrative PowersStaysGeneral OverviewBankruptcy LawDischarge & DischargeabilityEffects of DischargeGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.17

§ 577.17 Serious and Willful Misconduct

[1] By Employee

When an employee's injury is caused by his or her own serious and willful misconduct, the compensation otherwise recoverable is reduced one half, except when [*Lab. Code § 4551*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10440*]:

- The injury results in death or permanent disability of 70 percent or more;

- The injury is caused by the employer's failure to comply with any law or safety order of the Division of Occupational Safety and Health relating to the safety of places of employment; or

- The injured employee is under 16 years of age at the time of injury.

The reduction in compensation is not enforceable, valid, or binding in any respect until the WCAB has so determined by its findings and award [*Lab. Code § 4552*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440-10445* (relating to pleading allegations of serious and willful misconduct); *§§ 577.394, 577.395*].

The standard of serious and willful misconduct is the same for an employee as it is for an employer [*Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd. v. Ind. Acc. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 656, 664, 255 P.2d 431]* . Serious and willful conduct is something more than negligence, or even gross negligence. It involves conduct of a quasi-criminal nature and the intentional doing of something either with the knowledge that it is likely to result in serious injury, or with a wanton and reckless disregard of its possible consequences [*Mercer-Fraser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 102, 117, 251 P.2d 955]* . For discussion of the time limitations on proceedingsto reduce compensation on the ground of the employee's serious and willful misconduct, see *§ 577.25[2][e]*. For discussion of the effect on compensation of an employer's serious and willful misconduct, see [2], *below*.

[2] By Employer

[a] In General

The amount of compensation otherwise recoverable is increased one half, together with costs and expenses not in excess of $250, when an employee is injured by reason of the serious and willful misconduct of any of the following [*Lab. Code § 4553*]:

- The employer or the employer's managing representative;
- If the employer is a partnership, one of the partners or a managing representative or general superintendent of the partnership; or
- If the employer is a corporation, an executive, managing officer, or general superintendent of the corporation.

Negligence of any degree, including gross negligence, does not constitute serious and willful misconduct [*Mercer-Fraser Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 102, 117, 251 P.2d 955]* . The employer must know of the dangerous condition, know that the probable consequences of its continuance will involve serious injury to an employee, and deliberately fail to take corrective action [*Johns-Manville Sales Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 96 Cal. App. 3d 923, 933, 158 Cal. Rptr. 463]* . When the employer's misconduct involves concealment of dangers in the workplace or a deliberate failure to assure that the workplace is safe, *Lab. Code § 4553* is the sole remedy for the additional compensation, and an action at law for damages is barred [*Johns-Manville Products Corp. v. Superior Court (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 465, 474, 165 Cal. Rptr. 858, 612 P.2d 948* ; *see also* subpart B, § 577.310 et seq.].

An increase in workers' compensation benefits due under *Lab. Code § 4553* applies not only to compensation indemnity benefits, but to every benefit or payment conferred by the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act, including non-indemnity benefits such as vocational rehabilitation, medical treatment payments and medical-legal fees [*Ferguson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1613, 1624-1626, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 806]* . So long as an award for increased compensation calculated on the basis of all compensation received by the injured worker does not provide the injured worker more than is necessary to compensate the worker for all damages he or she sustained as a result of the willful misconduct of the employer, the award does not constitute punitive damages and is, therefore, not constitutionally excessive [*Ferguson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1613, 1624-1626, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 806]* .

For discussion of the time limitations on proceedings to increase compensation on the ground of the employer's serious and willful misconduct, see *§ 577.25[2][e]* . For a form of application for adjudication alleging serious and willful misconduct of an employer, see *§ 577.396*. For discussion of the effect on compensation of an employee's serious and willful misconduct, see [1], *above.*

[b] Willfully Uninsured Employer

When an employer has willfully failed to secure the payment of compensation, the amount of compensation recoverable by an injured employee, or by his or her dependents in the event of the employee's death, is increased by 10 percent [*Lab. Code § 4554*]. The failure to secure the payment of compensation as required by statute is prima facie evidence of willfulness [*Lab. Code § 4554*]. An employee is not, however, entitled to a 10 percent increase in the amount of damages recovered from the employer in a civil action pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3706* [*Leung v. Chinese Six Companies (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 801, 806-807, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 593* ; *see also* discussion in subpart B, *§ 577.312[2]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesSelf-Inflicted InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersIntentional MisconductWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.18

§ 577.18 Unlawful Discrimination

[1] Against Injured Employee

No employer may discharge, threaten to discharge, or in any way discriminate against an employee because the employee has filed or made known his or her intention to file a claim for compensation with his or her employer or an application for adjudication with the WCAB, or has received a rating, award, or settlement. An employer engaging in such discrimination is guilty of a misdemeanor, and the employee's compensation is increased by one half, but in no event more than $10,000, together withcosts and expenses not in excess of $250. In addition, the employee is entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by the acts of the employer [*Lab. Code § 132a(1)*]. *Lab. Code § 132a* reflects a broad policy against discrimination, and therefore an employer who discriminates against an injured employee may be guilty of a violation of that section without violating any of its specific prohibitions [*Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 667, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564]* .

An injured worker discriminated against because of disability from a work related injury may bring a claim before the WCAB under *Lab. Code § 132a* as well as an action in state court seeking remedies under the Fair Employment and Housing Act and common-law wrongful discharge theory [*City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1156, 1161, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291*); *see also* subpart B, *§ 577.310 et seq.*]. The statute serves a remedial function by providing some compensation to an employee who suffersdiscrimination as a result of an employment-related injury, and is to be liberally construed, as required by *Lab. Code § 3202* [*Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 668, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564* ; *see* *Crown Appliance v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 620, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 415* (finding that employer discriminated against employee in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*, when evidence showed that employer believed employee was faking disability, that employer wanted to dismiss employee since employee returned to work on light duty, that employer's evidence of customer complaints against employee was not persuasive, and that employer terminated employee in retaliation for filing workers' compensation claim)].

The California Supreme Court has held that an employee made no prima facie showing of violation of *Lab. Code § 132a* when his employer refused to pay him temporary disability indemnity for time spent away from work attending medical treatment appointments, when the employee was permanent and stationary after his industrial injury, had returned to work, and received a medical treatment award. Moreover, the employee failed to show a right to prevent his employer from requiring him to use his sick leave and/or vacation leave while attending these medical appointments [*Department of Rehabilitation v. W.C.A.B. (Lauher) (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1281, 1297, 1301, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 665, 70 P.3d 1076]* . However, the court of appeal, in a slightly different fact situation, held that an employer had discriminated against its employee, in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*, by requiring the employee, who had returned to work following industrial injuries, to use earned vacation time rather than sick leave to attend medical appointments needed to care for those industrial injuries, while permitting employees with non-industrial injuries to use their sick leave for medical appointments. The court pointed out that local government entities (City of Santa Barbara in this case) and unions may not create policies that discriminate against their industrially injured employees to their detriment [*Andersen v. W.C.A.B. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1369, 1376-1380, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 839]* .

The court of appeal has held that an employee did not make a prima facie showing of discrimination in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a* in the following situation: The employee sustained an industrial injury to his neck and was taken off work by his treating physician. The reports and releases to return to work from the treating physician and the agreed medical evaluator received by the employer were unclear and ambiguous regarding the employee's ability to return to his usual and customary duties. When the agreed medical evaluator resolved that question in his 12/1/2006 deposition by testifying that he thought that the employee could probably perform his usual and customary job, the employer returned the employee to work on 1/8/2007. Because the employee presented no evidence that the employer treated him disadvantageously as a consequence of the industrial nature of his injury, as compared with how the employer treated any non-industrially injured employee, he failed to satisfy the test established in *Department of Rehabilitation v. W.C.A.B. (Lauher)*, discussed above, for making a prima facie showing of discrimination [*Gelson's Markets v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Fowler) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 201, 209-210, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 548*].

Proceedings for increased compensation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 132a(1)* must be instituted by filing an appropriate petition with the WCAB within one year from the discriminatory act or date of termination. The WCAB has full power, authority, and jurisdiction to try and determine finally all matters specified under *Lab. Code § 132a*, subject only to judicial review; except that it has no jurisdiction to try and determine a misdemeanor charge against the employer. In such a case, the WCAB may refer, and any worker may complain of, suspected violations of the criminal misdemeanor provisions of *Lab. Code § 132a* to the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, or directly to the office of the public prosecutor [*Lab. Code § 132a*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10447* (relating to pleadings in proceedings under *Lab. Code § 132a*)].

In a case not originating in the workers' compensation system, an employee's claim alleging wrongful termination in retaliation for filing a workers' compensation claim failed because the employer terminated the employee's employment for a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason, i.e., management's loss of confidence in the employee. The court of appeal found that the employer made a statistical showing that it did not discharge employees for filing workers' compensation claims, and that, when, as here, the employee relies solely on temporal proximity in response to the employer's evidence of a non-retaliatory reason for termination, the employee does not create a triable issue as to pretext [*Arteaga v. Brink's, Inc. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 327, 356-357, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 654]* .

In another case not originating in the workers' compensation system, an employer's policy regarding "cash out" payments of excess accumulated vacation hours to sheriff's deputies who were not on *Lab. Code § 4850* leave as a result of industrial injuries, as opposed to its policy regarding such payments to deputies who were on such leave, was held by the court of appeal to discriminate against the latter group in violation of *Lab. Code §§ 4850* and *132a*. Any deputy who accumulated more than 320 hours of vacation time could defer the hours in excess of 320 to the following year. If those excess hours were not used by the end of that year, the employer paid the deputy for them. Generally, if this "cash out" payment took place during the deputy's final compensation measurement period (the period used to determine the

deputy's salary for purposes of retirement benefits), the "cash out" payment was pensionable income, i.e., part of the calculation of the deputy's salary for purposes of retirement benefits. However, the employer would not "cash out" deferred excess hours of a deputy who had been on *Lab. Code § 4850* leave at any time during the deferral year. Rather, such a deputy's excess hours remained in his or her account, and such a deputy who retired in the year following the *Lab. Code § 4850* leave never had an opportunity to "cash out" or use those hours. Instead, such a deputy was compensated for those hours at retirement, but this compensation was not pensionable income. Thus, a deputy who accumulated excess vacation hours, but who had never been injured on duty, and a deputy who retired after taking leave due to a non-job-related injury, might collect more in retirement benefits than a deputy who retired after having suffered an industrial injury, even if all of these deputies had the same employment history in terms of rank, years of experience, etc. [*Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers' Association v. County of Los Angeles (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 63, 67-72, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 572]* .

[2] Against Witness

If an employer discharges, threatens to discharge, or in any manner discriminates against an employee because the employee testified or made known his or her intentions to testify in another employee's case before a WCJ, the employer is guilty of a misdemeanor, and the employee is entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by the acts of the employer [*Lab. Code § 132a(3)*].

Proceedings for lost wages and work benefits must be instituted by filing an appropriate petition with the WCAB within one year from the discriminatory act or date of termination. The WCAB has full power, authority, and jurisdiction to try and determine finally all matters specified under *Lab. Code § 132a*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersRetaliatory Discharge

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.19

§ 577.19 Fraudulent Workers' Compensation Claims

[1] In General

The Legislature has declared that workers' compensation fraud harms employers by contributing to increasingly high costs of workers' compensation insurance and self-insurance, and harms employees by undermining the perceived legitimacy of all workers' compensation claims. The Legislature has also declared its intent to prevent workers' compensation insurance fraud, thereby reducing costs, assisting in restoring confidence and faith in the workers' compensation system, and facilitating expedient and full compensation for employees injured at the workplace [*see Ins. Code § 1871(d), (e)*].

It is unlawful to do any of the following [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(a)*]:

- Make or cause to be made any knowingly false or fraudulent material statement or material representation for the purpose of obtaining or denying any compensation, as defined in *Lab. Code § 3207*.

- Present or cause to be presented any knowingly false or fraudulent written or oral material statement in support of, or in opposition to, any claim for compensation for the purpose of obtaining or denying any compensation, as defined in *Lab. Code § 3207*.

- Knowingly assist, abet, solicit, or conspire with any person who engages in an unlawful act under *Ins. Code § 1871.4*.

- Make or cause to be made any knowingly false or fraudulent statements with regard to entitlement to benefits with the intent to discourage an injured worker from claiming benefits or pursuing a claim.

- Make or cause to be made any knowingly false or fraudulent material statement or material

representation for the purpose of obtaining or denying any of the benefits or reimbursement provided in the Return-to-Work Program established under *Lab. Code § 139.48*.

- Make or cause to be made any knowingly false or fraudulent material statement or material representation for the purpose of discouraging an employer from claiming any of the benefits or reimbursement provided in this Return-to-Work Program.

For purposes of *Ins. Code § 1871.4*, the term "statement" includes but is not limited to any notice, proof of injury, bill for services, payment for services, hospital or doctor records, X rays, test results, medical-legal expense as defined in *Lab. Code § 4620*, other evidence of loss, injury, or expense, or payment [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(a)*]. An employee's false statements and misrepresentations made on deposition are sufficient to support a conviction pursuant to the statute [*People v. Post (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 467, 475-476, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356]* .

The court of appeal, affirming the trial court's order pursuant to an employee's anti-SLAPP motion that struck the employer's complaint that alleged the employee's filing of a fraudulent workers' compensation claim, held that the employer failed to demonstrate a probability that it would prevail on the merits of its fraud claim because the employer could not establish either of two elements of a cause of action for fraud, justifiable reliance or resulting damages. The employer argued that justifiable reliance was shown by its forwarding of the employee's workers' compensation claim to its insurer, but the court of appeal found that the employer was required to do so both by law and by insurance policy provisions, not because it relied on the employee's alleged fraud. Similarly, when the employer argued that it was damaged in the form of increased premiums, the court of appeal found such an argument premature because the employee's workers' compensation claim had not yet been adjudicated. Finally, the court of appeal found sound policy considerations supporting its conclusions, in that permitting an employer to bring a civil action for fraud against an employee while a workers' compensation proceeding was pending could have a chilling effect on the employee's exercise of the right to file a workers' compensation claim [*Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. Diaz (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1517, 1523-1527, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 139]* .

It is also illegal for a firm, corporation, partnership, association, or any person acting in his or her individual capacity as a public or private employee, to solicit, accept, or refer any business to any individual or entity with the knowledge that, or with reckless disregard for whether, the individual or entity for or from whom the solicitation or referral is made, or the individual or entity who is solicited or referred, intends to violate *Penal Code § 550* or *Ins. Code § 1871.4* [*Penal Code § 549*].

As of March 6, 2005, an insurer or self-insured employer must provide the following notice, in both English and Spanish, to an injured worker on or with a check for temporary disability benefits [*Ins. Code § 1871.8* (Stats. 2004, ch. 2 (4th ext. session) (operative January 1, 2005; effective March 6, 2005))]:

WARNING:
You are required to report to your employer or the insurance company any money that you earned for work during the time covered by this check, and before cashing this check. If you do not follow these rules, you may be in violation of the law and the penalty may be jail or prison, a fine, and loss of benefits.

[2] Enforcement of Anti-Fraud Laws

Ins. Code § 1871.4 is enforced by the Department of Insurance's Fraud Division [*Ins. Code § 1872*; *see also Ins. Code §§ 1872.3* (powers of Fraud Division), *1872.83(a)* (Division required to forward names of fraud suspects licensed under Business and Professions Code to appropriate disciplinary body), *1872.95* (Medical Board, Board of Chiropractic Examiners, and State Bar must designate employees to investigate and report on possible fraudulent activities relating to workers' compensation)]. The exchange of information between insurers and district attorneys, the office of the

Attorney General, the Department of Insurance, the Department of Industrial Relations, and licensing agencies is governed by the Workers' Compensation Insurance Fraud Reporting Act, *Ins. Code § 1877 et seq.* In order to facilitate such exchange of information, it has been held that insurers are absolutely privileged under *Civ. Code § 47* to report workers' compensation insurance fraud [*Fremont Compensation Insurance Co. v. Superior Court of Orange County (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 867, 875-877, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 211]* .

The court of appeal has held that a civil action for violation of *Ins. Code § 1871.7(b)* arising from fraudulent acts made unlawful by *Penal Code § 550(a)(10)* did not violate the exclusive remedy provision of the workers' compensation law. Moreover, said the court, a preponderance of the evidence was the appropriate standard of proof for liability under *Ins. Code § 1871.7*, since the court found no constitutional, statutory, or decisional law that imposed a burden to show liability by clear and convincing evidence [*People v. Thompson (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 24, 29-31, 37-38, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 677]* .

[3] Criminal and Civil Penalties

Violation of *Ins. Code § 1871.4* (discussed in [1], *above*) is punishable by imprisonment in county jail for one year, or in the state prison for two, three, or five years, or by a fine not exceeding $150,000 or double the value of the fraud, whichever is greater, or by both imprisonment and fine [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(b)*; *see also Ins. Code § 1871.4(c)* (enhancement for prior convictions); *People v. Webb (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 688, 693-694, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 259]* . Restitution must be ordered, including restitution for any medical evaluation or treatment services obtained or provided [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(b)*]. The court must determine the amount of restitution and the person or persons to whom the restitution must be paid [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(b)*]. A person convicted under this section may be charged the costs of investigation at the discretion of the court [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(b)*].

A conviction pursuant to *Ins. Code § 1871.4* that materially affects the basis of an order, decision, or award of the WCAB is sufficient grounds for a reconsideration of that order, decision, or award [*Lab. Code § 5803.5*]. *Ins. Code § 1871.4* may not be construed to preclude the applicability of any other provision of criminal law that applies or may apply to any transaction [*Ins. Code § 1871.4(d)*].

Following a workers' compensation fraud conviction, an employee who seeks to receive or retain workers' compensation benefits is barred from retaining or receiving any compensation which stems directly from the fraudulent representation [*Ins. Code § 1871.5*; *Tensfeldt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 116, 123-124, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691]* . However, whether the employee is barred from receiving *all* workers' compensation benefits following a fraud conviction must be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature of the employee's misrepresentation. To receive further workers' compensation benefits after a fraud conviction requires [*Tensfeldt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 116, 125, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691]* :

- An actual, otherwise compensable, industrial injury;

- Substantial medical evidence supporting an award of compensation not stemming from the fraudulent misrepresentation for which the employee was convicted; and

- That the employee's credibility is not completely destroyed so as to make the employee unbelievable with regard to any disputed issues in the compensation case.

An employee who is convicted for fraud because of a lie about the statutory compensability of an injury is precluded by *Ins. Code § 1871.5* from receiving or retaining *all* workers' compensation benefits, because the fraudulent misrepresentation is material to establishing an industrial injury and to entitlement to any benefits under the Labor Code [*Tensfeldt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 116, 124, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691]* . On the other hand, an employee who has been convicted of fraud may be able to retain or receive some compensation in the same

workers' compensation proceeding if it is shown that the compensation is not owed as a result of his or her unlawful conduct [*see Tensfeldt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 116, 125, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691]* . For example, a worker convicted of fraudulent misrepresentation in the acquisition of medically required special footwear, and ordered by the court to make restitution, was barred from receiving only future reimbursement for further purchases of shoes. Moreover, when the worker failed to make restitution as ordered, a credit sought by the defrauded insurer against other medical treatment was held an impermissible bar of benefits not directly emanating from the fraud [*Farmers Insurance Group v. W.C.A.B. (Sanchez) (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 684, 690-691, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 353]* .

In addition to the criminal penalties set forth in *Ins. Code § 1871.4*, *Lab. Code § 3820* provides civil money penalties for workers' compensation fraud.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesFraudFraud Against the GovernmentFalse ClaimsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsFraud

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.20

§ 577.20 Consideration for Referral for Benefits

[1] In General

Lab. Code § 3215 provides that, except as otherwise permitted by law, it is a crime for any person acting individually or through his or her employees or agents to offer, deliver, receive, or accept any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage, dividend, discount, or other consideration, whether in the form of money or otherwise, as compensation orinducement for referring clients or patients to perform or obtain workers' compensation services or benefits [*Lab. Code § 3215*; *see also Lab. Code § 3218* (criminal penalty for violation); *Ins. Code § 1871.7* (civil penalty for use of runners or cappers to procure clients to perform or obtain workers' compensation services or benefits, or to procure clients to perform workers' compensation services or obtain benefits under an insurance contract)].

This prohibition does not, however, prevent an attorney or law firm from the following [*Ins. Code § 750.5*]:

- Dividing fees for legal services with a lawyer under circumstances expressly permitted by *Rule 2-200 of the Rules of Professional Conduct* of the State Bar.

- Offering or giving an incidental nonmonetary gift or gratuity to a person who has made a recommendation resulting in the employment of the attorney or law firm, provided that the gift or gratuity was not offered in consideration of any promise, agreement, or understanding that the gift or gratuity would be forthcoming or that referrals would be made or encouraged in the future.

- Offering or giving a bonus to an employee who has made a referral or recommendation resulting in the employment of the attorney or law firm, provided that the bonus was not offered in consideration of any promise, agreement, or understanding that the bonus would be forthcoming or that referrals or recommendations would be made or encouraged in the future.

In addition, the prohibition does not apply to the recommendation of professional employment when the

recommendation is not prohibited by the State Bar Rules of Professional Conduct [*Lab. Code § 3217(a)*]. Similarly, it does not prohibit a public defender or assigned counsel from making known his or her availability as a criminal defense attorney to persons unable to afford legal counsel, whether or not those persons are in custody [*Lab. Code § 3217(b)*], nor does it preclude an attorney or law firm from providing persons or entities with legal services without charge or for a lawfully agreed upon attorney fee [*Lab. Code § 3217(e)*]. Finally, *Lab. Code § 3215* does not prohibit a workers' compensation insurer from offering an employer discounted rates based on the employer securing health or disability insurance from an affiliate of the insurer [*Lab. Code § 3217(f)*].

[2] Criminal and Civil Penalties

Lab. Code § 3219(a) provides that, except as otherwise permitted by law, any person acting individually or through his or her employees or agents, who offers or delivers any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage, dividend, discount, or other consideration to any adjuster of claims for compensation, as compensation, inducement, or reward for the referral or settlement of any claim, is guilty of a felony [*Lab. Code § 3219(a)(1)*]. It further provides that, except as otherwise permitted by law, any adjuster of claims for compensation who accepts or receives any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage, dividend, discount, or other consideration, as compensation, inducement, or reward for the referral or settlement of any claim, is guilty of a felony [*Lab. Code § 3219(a)(2)*].

Lab. Code § 3219(b) provides that any contract for professional services secured by any medical clinic, laboratory, physician, or other health care provider in this state in violation of *Ins. Code § 1871.4* or *Lab. Code §§ 3215* or *3219(a)* is void [*Lab. Code § 3219(b)*]. In any action against the provider, any judgment must include an order divesting the medical clinic, laboratory, physician, or other health care provider, and the owners and operators thereof, of any fees and other compensation received under the void contract. The judgment may also include an order prohibiting the person from further participation in any manner in the entity in which that person directly or indirectly owned or operated for a time period that the court deems appropriate [*Lab. Code § 3219(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesCrimes Against PersonsBriberyCommercial BriberyGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesCrimes Against PersonsBriberyPublic OfficialsGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesAbuse of Public OfficeIllegal GratuitiesGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsClient RelationsAttorney FeesFee SplittingWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.21

§ 577.21 Advertising

[1] False and Misleading Advertising

[a] In General

In 1992, the Legislature enacted the Workers' Compensation Truth in Advertising Act, the purpose of which is to assure truthful and adequate disclosure of all material and relevant information in advertising that solicits persons to file workers' compensation claims or to engage or consult an attorney or a medical care provider or clinic to consider a workers' compensation claim [*see Lab. Code §§ 5430, 5431*]. The implementing regulations specify that they do not apply to attorneys, physicians, government agencies, labor and charitable organizations, or non-profit tax-exempt bar associations whose primary business or purpose is other than providing workers' compensation services. However, they do apply to advertisers who may also be subject to attorney or physician workers' compensation advertising laws because they advertise with or for an attorney or physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9821(a)-(c)*]. The regulations may not be construed to obviate or lessen the obligations of attorneys or physicians under *Lab. Code §§ 5430-5434*, or under other provisions of law [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9821(a)*].

An "advertisement" is any form of communication in writing, photograph or picture, electronic broadcasting or transmission, that solicits any person

- To file a workers' compensation claim;
- To use any workers' compensation services [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9820(k)*]; or
- To engage or consult counsel or a medical care provider or clinic to consider a workers' compensation claim.

The form of advertisement may include, but is not limited to, advertising by newspaper, magazine, circular, form letter, publication, billboard, card, label, placard, transit advertisement, business card, envelope, book, list, directory, radio,

motion picture, video, television, or electronic mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9820(b)*]. Any such advertisements must contain a notice that making a false or fraudulent workers' compensation claim is a felony subject to up to five years in prison or a fine of up to $50,000 or double the value of the fraud, whichever is greater, or by both imprisonment and fine [*Lab. Code § 5432*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9823(b)*]. Advertising by or on behalf of a non-attorney advisor or representative whose right to practice before the WCAB is suspended or revoked is completely prohibited [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9825*], as is advertising by or on behalf of a person who does not hold a valid, active license to provide medical goods or services for which a license is required [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9827*]. An advertisement for a workers' compensation non-attorney advisor or representative must identify the advertiser as a non-attorney by including a notice to that effect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9824*]. An advertisement by or on behalf of one whose license to practice law in California is suspended or revoked must include a similar notice [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9826*].

Liability does not attach to third parties who merely disseminate false and misleading advertisements. This includes the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9820(c)*]:

- A publisher, printer, distributor, or circulator of a written medium;
- An operator of a broadcasting station, movie, or video production company;
- The operator of premises where advertisements are displayed; or
- An employee of anyone listed in items (1)-(3).

Any advertisement or other device designed to produce leads based on a response from a person to file a workers' compensation claim or to engage or consult an attorney or a medical care provider or clinic must disclose that an agent may contact the person if that is the fact. In addition, an individual who makes contact with a person as a result of acquiring that person's name from a lead-generating device must disclose that fact in the initial contact with that person [*Lab. Code § 5433(a)*]. The use of a name that is deceptive or misleading to solicit persons to file compensation claims is also prohibited, as is the use of misleading words, initials, letters, symbols, or other devices in advertisements [*Lab. Code § 5433(b)-(f)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9823(d)-(f)*]. Finally, advertisements may not imply that the reader, listener, or viewer may lose a right, privilege, or benefits under federal, state, or local law if he or she fails to respond to the advertisement [*Lab. Code § 5433(g)*].

[b] Criminal and Civil Penalties

The Administrative Director is responsible for investigating violations of the Act and regulations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9833*]. To this end, he or she may issue orders to provide advertising-related information [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9834*] and compliance orders [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9835*]. Anyone aggrieved by an order issued by the director may request a hearing, which will be held in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9837*]. In addition to issuing compliance orders, the director may institute civil proceedings against any person for violation of the Act or regulations, or may refer any violation for civil, criminal, or professional disciplinary proceedings to others having jurisdiction. The director has discretion to pursue any or all available remedies [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9836*].

[2] Advertising Legal Services

In 1993, the Legislature enacted laws regarding advertising of legal services for obtaining workers' compensation benefits. Under the statute, any individual, firm, corporation, partnership, organization, or association that prints, displays, publishes, distributes, or broadcasts any advertising that purports to provide legal services for obtaining workers' compensation benefits must include the name of at least one attorney associated with the individual, firm, corporation, partnership, organization, or association in all such advertising [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 5499.30(a)*]. For purposes of this provision, "legal services" includes any service that refers potential clients to any attorney [*Bus. & Prof.*

Code § 5499.30(b)]. A violation of this provision is a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in the county jail for up to one year or by a fine of up to $10,000, or both [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 5499.30(c)*].

In 1994, the Legislature enacted several laws regulating the advertising of legal services in general. In particular, *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6158* provides that, with regard to advertisements by electronic media, the message as a whole may not be false, misleading, or deceptive, and the message as a whole must be factually substantiated. For further discussion, see Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingState RegulationCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewLegal EthicsLegal Services MarketingAdvertisingWorkers' Compensation & SSDIGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.22

§ 577.22 Employment Relationships

[1] In General

Coverage for work-related injuries is predicated on defined employment relationships, which are generally to be found not in the definition of employer but in the definitions of employee. That is, an "employee," as defined by specified employment relationships, is one who is entitled to workers' compensation coverage for an injury occurring in the course of the specified employment [*In-Home Supportive Services v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 720, 727, 199 Cal. Rptr. 697]* .

The term "employer" is defined as follows [*Lab. Code § 3300*]:

- The State of California and every state agency;
- Each county, city, district, and all public and quasi-public corporations and public agencies therein;
- Every person, including any public service corporation, that has any natural person in its service; and
- The legal representative of any deceased employer.

The term "employee" is broadly defined in *Lab. Code § 3351*. *Lab. Code §§ 3351* and *3351.5* specify several classes of persons as included within the definition of employee. Exclusions are set forth in *Lab. Code § 3352*. The court of appeal has held that *Lab. Code §§ 3351(d)* and *3352(h)* were the only relevant statutes for defining "employee" when the issue was whether an injured worker was a residential employee of the homeowners. The court stated that *Lab. Code § 3715(b)*, relied on by the Appeals Board in the present case, was inapplicable, since that statute applied to only uninsured homeowners, whereas the homeowners in the present case were insured. Thus, the injured worker was not an "employee" and was not entitled to workers' compensation benefits [*Cal. State Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau v. W.C.A.B. (Hestehauge) (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044-1048, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 743]* . In addition, the law contains

a number of statutes defining various employment relations as excluded from or included in the law [*see Lab. Code §§ 3352.94, 3358-3371*; *Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1003-1004, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494* ; *see also Penal Code §§ 4017, 4017.5*; *Parsons v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 629, 634, 179 Cal. Rptr. 88* (jail inmates)]. An employee excluded from compensation benefits under *Lab. Code § 3352* retains his or her right to maintain a civil action for damages against his or her employer [*Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1003-1004, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494]* .

For the purposes of the workers' compensation law, an employment relationship may exist prior to establishment of an employer-employee relationship in the contractual or common law sense [*see Laeng v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 771, 774, 100 Cal. Rptr. 377, 494 P.2d 1* (person injured while participating in "tryout" for employment)] or after the employer-employee relationship has been terminated [*see Gates v. Trans Video Corp. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 196, 202, 155 Cal. Rptr. 486* (discharged worker sustained injury while leaving jobsite)]. This does not apply, however, to a person merely calling at employment premises to inquire about the availability of employment, even though, if there were work, hiring would be a virtual certainty [*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 647, 654-655, 130 Cal. Rptr. 831]* .

[2] Special Employees

The employee of one employer may become the special employee of another employer so as to insulate the special employer from tort liability for injury to the employee, relegating the employee to the exclusive remedy provisions (*Lab. Code § 3602(a)*) of the workers' compensation law [*see Kowalski v. Shell Oil Co. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 168, 174-179, 151 Cal. Rptr. 671, 588 P.2d 811* ; *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1074-1075, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67* ; *Barajas v. USA Petroleum Corp. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 974, 983-985, 229 Cal. Rptr. 513]* . An employer can secure the payment of compensation on employees provided to the employer through an agreement with another employer, by entering into a valid and enforceable agreement with the other employer under which the other employer agrees to obtain, and does obtain, workers' compensation coverage for those employees [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*]. In such cases, both employers will be considered to have secured the payment of compensation [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*]. Employers who comply with this rule will not be subject to civil, criminal, or other penalties for failure to provide workers' compensation coverage or tort liability in the event an employee is injured, but may, in the absence of compliance, be subject to all three [*Lab. Code § 3602(d)*].

[3] Independent Contractors

[a] Defined

Independent contractors are not covered by the workers' compensation law. "Independent contractor" is defined as any person who renders service for a specified recompense for a specified result, under the control of his or her principal as to the result only and not as to the means by which it is accomplished [*Lab. Code § 3353*; *see S. G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 349, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* .

[b] Right to Control Work Test

Although the common law "control-of-work" test is included in the statutory definition of independent contractor [*see Lab. Code § 3353*, discussed under [a], *above*], the test must be applied in compensation cases with deference to the purposes of the workers' compensation law. The nature of the work and the overall arrangement between the parties must be examined to determine whether they come within the history and fundamental purposes of that law [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 353-354, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399* ; *see* discussion under *§ 577.11*].

The workers' compensation law intends comprehensive coverage of injuries in employment and accomplishes this goal by defining "employment" broadly in terms of "service to an employer" and by including a general presumption that any

person "in service to another" is a covered "employee." The express exclusion of "independent contractors" is purposeful and has a limited but important function; it recognizes those situations in which the goals of the workers' compensation law are best served by imposing the risk of "no-fault" work injuries directly on the provider, rather than the recipient, of a compensated service. This obviously is the case, for example, when the provider of service has the primary control over work safety, is best situated to distribute the risk and cost of injury as an expense of his or her own business, and has independently chosen the burdens and benefit of self-employment. This is the balance to be struck when deciding whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor for the purposes of the workers' compensation law [*S.G.Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 354, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543*].

A business entity may not avoid its statutory obligations under the workers' compensation law by carving up its production process into minute steps, and then asserting that it lacks "control" over the exact means by which one such step is performed by the responsible workers [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 357, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* .

[c] Other Factors to Be Considered

Although the right to control work details is the "most important" or "most significant" consideration, several "secondary" indicia of the nature of a service relationship have been endorsed [*S. G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 350, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* . For example, strong evidence in support of an employment relationship is the right to discharge at will, without cause [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 350, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399* (citing *Tieberg v. Unemployment Ins. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 943, 949, 88 Cal. Rptr. 175, 471 P.2d 975* , and *Empire Star Mines Co. v. Cal. Emp. Com. (1946) 28 Cal. 2d 33, 43, 168 P.2d 686* , both involving unemployment insurance)].

Additional factors to be considered in deciding whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor for the purposes of the workers' compensation law include those derived principally from Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220, as follows [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 351, 354, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399* (adding that, generally, the individual factors cannot be applied mechanically as separate tests, the factors are intertwined, and their weight often depends on particular combinations)]:

- Whether the one performing services is engaged in a distinct occupation or business;
- The kind of occupation, with reference to whether, in the locality, the work is usually done under the direction of a principal or by a specialist without supervision;
- The skill required in the particular occupation;
- Whether the principal or the worker supplies the instrumentalities, tools, and the place of work for the person doing the work;
- The length of time for which the services are to be performed;
- The method of payment, whether by the time or by the job;
- Whether or not the work is a part of the regular business of the principal; and
- Whether or not the parties believe they are creating the relationship of employer-employee.

The factors that must be established to prove independent contractor status in the case of a worker performing services

for which a license is required under *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* (Contractors' State License Law) are set forth in *Lab. Code § 2750.5* [*see State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 5, 9-10, 219 Cal. Rptr. 13, 706 P.2d 1146* ; *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 614-618, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754* ; *Germann v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 776, 783-784, 176 Cal. Rptr. 868]* , and are also a helpful means of identifying the employee/contractor distinction generally [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 351, 351 n.5, 354, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* .

In addition, other jurisdictions have developed a six-part test to determine independent contractorship in light of the remedial purposes of the legislation, taking into account the "right to control the work," as well as factors similar to those set forth in Restatement (Second) of Agency § 220 and in *Lab. Code § 2750.5*. There are many points of similarity between these various tests, and all are logically pertinent to the inherently difficult determination of whether a provider of service is an employee or an excluded independent contractor for purposes of the workers' compensation law [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 354-355, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* .

The court of appeal has held that the exemption from the contractor's license requirement contained in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7049* for construction or maintenance work incidental to "clearing or other work upon the land in rural districts for fire prevention purposes" meant that the trial court erred in ruling that the defendant was an employee as a matter of law pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5*. The defendant, who was sued in civil court by the family of another worker whose death he was alleged to have negligently caused, had argued to the trial court that he was a fellow employee of the decedent and that, therefore, workers' compensation was the exclusive remedy. The court of appeal remanded the case for further proceedings on the question of fact of whether the defendant was an employee or an independent contractor [*Moehring v. Thomas (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1515, 1520-1525, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118]* .

In another case, the court of appeal, affirming the trial court's order denying plaintiff's petition for a writ of mandate, held that substantial evidence supported the determination by the Department of Industrial Relations that drivers for plaintiff courier service were functioning as employees rather than as true independent contractors. The court of appeal found that the question of the hiree's status must be considered in light of the history and remedial and social purposes of the Workers' Compensation Act, which are: (1) to ensure that the cost of industrial injuries will be part of the cost of goods rather than a burden on society; (2) to guarantee prompt, limited compensation for an employee's work injuries, regardless of fault, as an inevitable cost of production; (3) to spur increased industrial safety; and (4) in return, to insulate the employer from tort liability for employees' injuries. The court of appeal followed *S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations [(1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* , in finding that the functions performed by drivers (pick-up and delivery of papers and packages and driving in between) did not require a high degree of skill, that these functions constituted an integral heart of plaintiff's courier service business, that, by obtaining clients in need of this service and providing workers to conduct it, plaintiff retained all "necessary" control over the operation as a whole, and that these circumstances were enough to find an employment relationship for purposes of the Workers' Compensation Act, even in the absence of plaintiff's exercise of control over the details of work and with plaintiff being more concerned with the results of the work than with the means of its accomplishment [*JKH Enterprises, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1046, 1059-1066, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 563]* . In a subsequent case, the opposite result was reached when the court of appeal affirmed the trial court's judgment that the plaintiffs, representatives of a class of parcel and message drivers/deliverers, were independent contractors, not the defendant's employees. The court held that the trial court's jury instructions properly placed the burden on the defendant of rebutting the *Lab. Code § 3357* presumption that the plaintiffs were the defendant's employees and properly instructed the jury as to the factors to consider in resolving whether the plaintiffs were independent contractors. Moreover, said the court, the plaintiffs had not carried the burden of demonstrating that the trial court abused its discretion in declining to amend the class definition, since the plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that any trial court error in rulings regarding the class definition was sufficiently prejudicial to warrant reversal. Finally, the plaintiffs failed to carry the burden of demonstrating any evidentiary error when it failed even to identify specific testimony that was allegedly erroneously admitted [*Cristler v. Express Messenger Systems (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th*

72, 79-90, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34] .

Similarly, the court of appeal, affirming the trial court judgment denying an employer's petition for writ of administrative mandamus, held that the administrative record supported the conclusion that newspaper carriers were employees for purposes of the workers' compensation law, not independent contractors. Thus, the employer's workers' compensation insurer correctly classified the carriers as employees for purposes of the employer's workers' compensation policy. The court of appeal followed the analysis set forth in *S.G. Borello & Sons v. Department of Industrial Relations [(1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399*] to find that the employer had the right to control the manner and means of the newspaper carriers' work, that various other *Borello* indicia demonstrated that the newspaper carriers were employees, and that the employer had failed to carry its burden of proving that the carriers were independent contractors [*Antelope Valley Press v. Steve Poizner as Insurance Commissioner (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 839, 842-843, 852-856, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 887*].

In a case not involving workers' compensation benefits, the court of appeal held that the Superior Court correctly denied an employers' association's requested declaratory relief to invalidate a precedential decision by the Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (UIAB) that upheld an Employment Development Department (EDD) assessment of unemployment insurance employer contributions and penalties against a courier service, when the EDD had found that drivers for the courier service were employees, not independent contractors. The court of appeal found that California courts and administrative agencies were all authorized to apply the comprehensive and overlapping tests regarding employment status stated in *Borello* [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399*] and that the reasoning of *Borello*, which arose in a workers' compensation context, applied equally to analysis of tax-related issues, such as employer contributions, requiring an employment determination [*see Unemp. Ins. Code § 621(b)*]. The court added that there was nothing in the record or in the UIAB's decision to suggest that there was no proper basis under the Unemployment Insurance Code's provisions for liability for employer assessments, independent of any liberal construction of the Code regarding benefits, or that there was any undue focus in the present case on employee protection, as opposed to employer rights. Finally, the court found that, contrary to the employer association's contentions, *Air Couriers International v. Employment Development Department* [*Air Couriers International v. Employment Development Department (2007) 150 Cal. App. 4th 923, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 37*] was correctly decided when it concluded that an employer had no basis to argue that the legal standards set forth in *Borello* were inapplicable in the unemployment insurance context [*Messenger Courier Association of the Americas v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1089-1096, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797*].

[d] Determination of Status

The determination of employee or independent-contractor status is one of fact if dependent on the resolution of disputed evidence or inferences. If the evidence is undisputed, the question becomes one of law. The label placed by the parties on their relationship is not dispositive, and subterfuges are not countenanced [*S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 349, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399* (ruling that migrant harvesters of grower's cucumber crop were employees and not independent contractors, although written contract between harvesters and grower expressly provided that harvesters were independent contractors and not employees)].

[4] Presumptions

[a] Employee Status

Any person rendering services for another, other than as an independent contractor, or unless expressly excluded from coverage under the workers' compensation law, is presumed to be an employee [*Lab. Code § 3357*; *see Laeng v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 771, 777, 100 Cal. Rptr. 377, 494 P.2d 1]* .

[b] Work for Which License Is Required

[i] In General

There is also a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that a worker performing services for which a license is required pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7000 et seq.* (Contractors' State License Law), or who is performing those services for a person who is required to obtain such a license, is an employee rather than an independent contractor [*Lab. Code § 2750.5*; *see State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 5, 8-12, 15-16, 219 Cal. Rptr. 13, 706 P.2d 1146* ; *Campos Food Fair v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 965, 967, 238 Cal. Rptr. 685* ; *Blew v. Horner (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1384, 232 Cal. Rptr. 660]* .

[ii] Contractor's License

Any person performing any function or activity for which a contractor's license is required must hold a valid contractor's license as a condition of having independent contractor status [*Lab. Code § 2750.5*]. Thus, courts have held that a person lacking the requisite license may not be an independent contractor [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 5, 15, 291 Cal. Rptr. 13, 706 P.2d 1146* ; *Blew v. Horner (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1384, 232 Cal. Rptr. 660]* .

In cases in which a contractor has represented to a principal that he or she is licensed, however, the contractor may be estopped to assert employee status [*see Chin v. Namvar (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 994, 1006-1009, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 294* (plaintiff, injured while performing painting services at shopping center owned by defendants, and who brought suit alleging causes of action for unfair competition, various Labor Code violations, wrongful termination, and negligence, was independent contractor, not employee of defendants, since *Lab. Code § 2750.5*, which creates rebuttable presumption that unlicensed person who performs work requiring license is employee, not independent contractor, was irrelevant because statute's presumption of employee status may be rebutted only as to persons who hold valid contractor's license, which plaintiff did not at time of injury, and trial court did not improperly impose on plaintiff burden of proving that he was employee but rather chose to believe defendants' evidence that plaintiff was independent contractor, with substantial evidence supporting trial court's finding that plaintiff was estopped to assert that he was employee because he had misrepresented himself to defendants as licensed contractor); *see also State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 5, 16, 219 Cal. Rptr. 13, 706 P.2d 1146* (stating that mere failure of contractor to disclose to prospective employer that he or she is unlicensed is an insufficient basis for finding estoppel)]. But this does not apply to the employee of an unlicensed contractor because estoppel is an equitable doctrine and will not be applied against one who is blameless [*Nick Hagopian Drywall v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 767, 772, 251 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . Thus, if asubcontractor, for example, is unlicensed, workers' compensation liability for the subcontractor's employees will be imposed on the general contractor as a matter of law [*Nick Hagopian Drywall v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 767, 772, 251 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *Rinaldi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 571, 574, 242 Cal. Rptr. 895]* . In addition, the employee of an unlicensed subcontractor will be presumed to be an employee of the general contractor without regard to the fact that the unlicensed subcontractor was independently insured for workers' compensation [*Neighbours v. Buzz Oates Enterprises (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 325, 327-330, 333-334, 265 Cal. Rptr. 788]* .

The presumption of *Lab. Code § 2750.5* supplements rather than overrides the statutory definitions of employee and independent contractor. Therefore, although an unlicensed contractor who performs work for which a license is required cannot be an independent contractor, he or she may not be an employee either, if any of the statutory exclusions to workers' compensation coverage are applicable [*Furtado v. Schriefer (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1608, 1617, 280 Cal. Rptr. 16* ; *see Lab. Code § 3352* (exclusions to workers' compensation law)]. For example, an unlicensed contractor was deemed to be an employee under *Lab. Code § 2750.5* for the purposes of pursuing a civil tort action against an allegedly negligent homeowner, even though he had not met the minimum hours required by *Lab. Code § 3352(h)* to be eligible for workers' compensation benefits [*Rosas v. Dishong (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 815, 821-823, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339]* . Similarly, the court of appeal, reversing the trial court's dismissal of the plaintiff's tort action alleging the defendant's negligence, held that the plaintiff, injured while repairing the defendant's roof, was the defendant's employee pursuant to

Lab. Code § 2750.5, which operated to allow the plaintiff's lawsuit, despite the fact that the plaintiff, by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3352(h)*, was not an employee of the defendant for workers' compensation purposes, when the court of appeal found that the plaintiff was not a licensed roofing contractor and, therefore, not an independent contractor [*Mendoza v. Brodeur (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 72, 79-81, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 310]* .

The court of appeal has also held that an injured worker, employed by an unlicensed contractor to repair a homeowner's roof, and who had not worked on that job for the statutorily required number of hours to qualify as an employee ofthe homeowner, nevertheless remained an employee of the contractor for purposes of assigning liability for the injury. Thus, the worker was eligible to receive benefits from the Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] and to pursue tort remedies against the contractor in civil court [*Cedillo v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 227, 232, 236-237, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581]* .

The California Supreme Court has held that an injured worker of an unlicensed contractor hired to trim a homeowner's tree could not maintain a civil tort action against the homeowner that was grounded on the homeowner's alleged violation of CalOSHA tree-trimming safety regulations [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 3421, 3427*]. The Court concluded that the regulations did not apply because the work in question fell within the "household domestic service" exception to the requirements of the California Occupational Safety and Health Act [*Fernandez v. Lawson (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 31, 36-38, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422, 71 P.3d 779* ; *see Lab. Code § 6303(b)*]. The injured worker had previously filed a workers' compensation claim against the homeowner, which the homeowner's insurer had denied on the ground that the worker had not fulfilled the statutory hours-worked and wages-earned requirements to enable him to fall within thestatutory definition of an "employee" eligible for benefits [*Fernandez v. Lawson (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 31, 34-35, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422, 71 P.3d 779* ; *see Lab. Code §§ 3351(d), 3352(h)*]. Having decided the CalOSHA issue, the Court specifically did not reach the other issue in the case: whether the worker may be estopped from denying the contractor's independent contractor status because of any licensing misrepresentations on the part of the contractor [*Fernandez v. Lawson (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 31, 38-39, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422, 71 P.3d 779]* .

The interplay between contractor licensing requirements and the workers' compensation law is sometimes rather complicated. California law provides that persons performing certain services are required to obtain a contractor's license [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 7000-7172*]. A condition precedent to the issuance, reinstatement, reactivation, renewal, or continued maintenance of such a license is that the applicant or licensee have on file a Certificate of Workers' Compensation Insurance or Certification of Self-Insurance [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125(a)*]. This requirement for certification of workers' compensation insurance does not apply, however, to an applicant or a licensee who files a statement with the Contractors State License Board that he or she does not employ any person in any manner so as to become subject to the workers' compensation laws [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125(b)*] and, effective January 1, 2007, does not hold a Class C-39 roofing contractor license, as defined in *16 Cal. Code Reg. § 832.39*. For any license that, on January 1, 2007, is active and includes a C-39 classification in addition to any other classification, the registrar of the Contractors State License Board is required, in lieu of the automatic license suspension otherwise required, to remove the C-39 classification from the license unless a valid Certificate of Workers' Compensation Insurance or Certification of Self-Insurance is received by the registrar prior to the operative date of this requirement, January 1, 2007 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125(e)*]. These provisions addressed specifically to Class C-39 roofing contractor licenses remain in effect only until January 1, 2011, when they are repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, enacted before that date, deletes or extends the date [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125(f)*]. The same sunset provision applies to the requirement, effective January 1, 2007, that an insurer who issues a workers' compensation insurance policy to a roofing contractor holding a C-39 license perform an annual payroll audit for the contractor. The insurer may impose a surcharge on each policy holder so audited in an amount necessary to recoup the reasonable costs of conducting the audit [*Ins. Code § 11665(a), (c)*]. The failure of a licensee required to do so to maintain workers' compensation insurance results in the automatic suspension of the license by operation of law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*]. As noted at the beginning of this subsection, California workers' compensation law provides that any person performing any function or activity for which a license is required pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code, Div. 3, Ch. 9 (commencing with § 7000)* must hold a valid contractor's license as a condition of having independent contractor status [*Lab. Code § 2750.5*].

In one case, the court of appeal was called upon to resolve an issue of liability involving the interplay of these statutory provisions. A company hired an independent contractor to paint one of the company's buildings. The contractor was licensed and had filed the required statement that he had no employees, thereby exempting himself from coverage pursuant to the workers' compensation laws. However, the contractor hired an employee to help paint the company's building, and this employee was injured in the course of performing the job. The employee applied for workers' compensation benefits, which were paid by the Uninsured Employers Fund (UEF) [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund (UEBTF)]. The UEF then argued that, because the contractor had hired an employee, thereby rendering himself ineligible for continued exemption from the requirement that he maintain workers' compensation insurance, his contractor's license was, ipso facto, automatically suspended by operation of law, pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*. Consequently, argued the UEF, the contractor was in fact an employee of the hiring company whose building was being painted, as was the injured employee, with the resultthat the hiring company should be held liable to reimburse the UEF for workers' compensation benefits it had paid to the injured employee [*Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 117, 120-122, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728]* .

The court of appeal, however, pointed to other provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*, specifically, to the requirements that the license board "notify any licensee who fails to maintain workers' compensation that his or her license shall be automatically suspended 30 days from the date of the notice" and that the board "provide the licensee with an additional notice that informs the licensee of thesuspension date, the cause for suspension, and reinstatement procedures" [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*]. Because these notices were not sent to the contractor in this case, the contractor remained a licensed independent contractor, albeit one in violation of California's workers' compensation laws, at the time of the employee's injury. Consequently, the hiring company was not the injured employee's employer and was not liable for reimbursing the UEF [*Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 117, 124-125, 129, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728]* .

In another case, the court of appeal held that the plaintiff, as an unlicensed contractor, could not sue for payment for work that required a license and that the homeowner defendants properly recovered the compensation they had paid to the plaintiff for work that required a license. The court found that, prior to the plaintiff's work for the defendants, the plaintiff's contractor's license had been automatically suspended, pursuant to Lab. Code § 7125.2(a)(2), for failure to *obtain* workers' compensation insurance, not, pursuant to Lab. Code § 7125.2(a)(1), for failure to *maintain* workers' compensation insurance. Suspension of a license for failure to *obtain* workers' compensation insurance does not require the notice from the registrar of contractors that is required for suspension of license for failure to *maintain* workers' compensation insurance. In any event, the court conclusively presumed that the plaintiff had failed to carry his burden in the trial court to prove lack of notice [*Wright v. Issak (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1121-1123, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1]* .

In a wrongful death action brought by a deceased worker's parents, the California Supreme Court held that homeowners neither had nor breached any statutory duty of care owed to a deceased worker under *Penal Code § 385(b)*, which provides that "[a]ny person who either personally or through an employee or agent, or as an employee or agent of another, operates ... or moves any tools ... [or] equipment ... within six feet of a high voltage overhead conductor is guilty of a misdemeanor." The Court found that the worker for an unlicensed contractor, who, through his own conduct, breached the duty of care embodied in *Penal Code § 385(b)* and was killed while trimming trees on the defendant homeowners' property, was not one of the class of persons for whose protection the statute was adopted. Moreover, said the Court, the homeowners had no control over the manner in which the unlicensed contractor or his workers performed their job. Finally, even if the homeowners were deemed to be the deceased worker's employers pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5*, *Penal Code § 385(b)* did not give rise to any special standard of conduct or duty of care owed by them to the deceased worker to ensure that the tree trimming work would not result in his death or injury. The Court concluded that the plaintiffs' wrongful death suit was grounded in the common-law tort of negligence and was properly submitted to the jury based on evidence of the homeowners' allegedly negligent acts or omissions that may have caused or contributed to the deceased worker's fatal injuries, and the trial court properly refused to instruct on *Penal Code §*

385(b) and the plaintiffs' negligence per se theory [*Ramirez v. Nelson (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 908, 917-920, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728, 188 P.3d 659]* .

[iii] Medical License

There is also a rebuttable presumption affecting the burden of proof that a physician and surgeon, licensed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 500 et seq.* (healing arts), who enters into a contract for the performance of health services on behalf of a licensed primary care clinic, as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 1204(a)(1)*, is an independent contractor rather than an employee, but this does not authorize the employment of a physician and surgeon to provide professional services when the employment would violate any other provision of law [*Lab. Code § 2750.6*].

[5] Aliens/Undocumented Workers

Aliens are included in the statutory definition of "employee" under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 3351(a)*]. An "undocumented worker" is an employee who has neither a "green card," that is, a United States Permanent Resident card, nor a work visa [*see 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(a)(1)(A), (a)(2), (h)(3)* ("unauthorized alien")]. Although illegally employed, such workers are entitled to workers' compensation benefits when injured [*Lab. Code § 3351* (defining employee as "every person in the service of an employer ... whether lawfully or unlawfully employed ...")]. The legislature has declared that all protections, rights, and remedies available under state law, except any reinstatement remedy prohibited by federal law, are available to all individuals regardless of immigration status who have applied for employment, or who are or who have beenemployed, in California [*Lab. Code § 1171.5(a)*]. For purposes of enforcing state labor and employment laws, a person's immigration status is irrelevant to the issue of liability, and in proceedings or discovery undertaken to enforce those state laws no inquiryis permitted into a person's immigration status except when the person seeking to make this inquiry has shown by clear and convincing evidence that the inquiry is necessary in order to comply with federal immigration law [*Lab. Code § 1171.5(b)*]. In enacting this statute, the legislature declared that its provisions are declaratory of existing law [*Lab. Code § 1171.5(c)*].

The court of appeal has held that a worker, who at the time of injury was an illegal alien who had obtained his job by showing the employer false Social Security and green cards, was an employee entitled to workers' compensation benefits, excluding reinstatement and back pay. The court found that, by virtue of *Lab. Code § 1171.5*, neither the Federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 nor *Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB* [*Hoffman Plastic Compounds v. NLRB (2002) 535 U.S. 137, 122 S. Ct. 1275, 152 L. Ed. 2d 271]* preempted California from providing workers' compensation coverage to a worker who was unlawfully employed. The court also held that the worker was an "employee" within *Lab. Code § 3351(a)*, when it found that, contrary to the employer's contention, there was no language in the statute to indicate that the legislature intended the statutory inclusion of a person "unlawfully employed" within the definition of "employee" to be limited to a person unlawfully employed by virtue of the employer's guilt in hiring the person in violation of federal law, and that, alternatively, since the employer did not prove that the worker was not an employee for purposes of workers' compensation law, the court assumed that the employer did not comply with federal requirements, so that the employer's own definition of "unlawfully employed" had been met. Finally, the court held that the *Ins. Code § 1871.4* provision that it is unlawful to make knowingly false or fraudulent statements for the purpose of obtaining workers' compensation benefits did not preclude the worker from receiving workers' compensation benefits, since there was no evidence of the worker's having been convicted of fraud, as required by the statute, and since the worker was not required to be a lawfully documented alien to be an employee entitled to workers' compensation benefits, and since it was employment, not a compensable injury, that the worker obtained as a direct result of the use of fraudulent documents [*Farmer Brothers Coffee v. W.C.A.B. (Ruiz) (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 533, 537-544, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 23]* .

When an employer offers modified or alternative work to an injured employee that meets the conditions of *Lab. Code § 4644(a)(5), (6)*, or *(7)*, then subsequently learns that the employee cannot lawfully perform modified or alternative work due to the employee's immigration status, the employer is not required to provide vocational rehabilitation services [*8*

Cal. Code Reg. § 10131(d)]. An undocumented employee is not entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits when the employee is unable to return to work solely because of immigration status and is not precluded from returning to work due to disability, since an employee who was legally entitled to work in the United States would not be entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits in the absence of permanent disability [*Del Taco v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1437, 1442-1443, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825* (providing undocumented worker with greater benefits than those available to legal workers violates *equal protection clause of United States Constitution*)].

The court of appeal has held in a civil action for medical malpractice that the trial court should have excluded from the trial all reference to the plaintiff's immigration status, when the plaintiff was not seeking damages for loss of earnings or earning capacity. The plaintiff's immigration status was neither relevant to any issue in the case nor admissible to attack the plaintiff's credibility. Moreover, the court held that the trial judge's remarks during a motion in limine hearing impugning the character of undocumented immigrants and discussing the plaintiff's residency status were highly inflammatory, gave the appearance of preconceived ideas based on stereotypes about undocumented aliens, were not fair, did not give the appearance of fairness, and would lead a reasonable person to doubt the trial judge's impartiality or the fairness of the proceedings. The appellate court reversed the judgment for the defendant and remanded for retrial, directing the presiding judge of the superior court to reassign the matter to a different judge [*Hernandez v. Paicius (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 452, 456-463, 468, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLicensesImmigration LawDuties & Rights of AliensPublic BenefitsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsBorrowed EmployeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsContractorsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity Provisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.23

§ 577.23 Conditions of Compensation Liability

[1] In General

An employer is liable for workers' compensation benefits without regard to negligence for any injury sustained by an employee arising out of and in the course of the employment, and for the death of any employee if the injury proximately causes death, when specified "conditions of compensation" are satisfied [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)*]. The employer's liability for benefits is in lieu of any other liability to any person, except as discussed in subpart B, *§ 577.310* et seq. [*see Lab. Code §§ 3600(a), 3602, 3706, 4558*]. The "conditions of compensation" are the following:

- At the time of the injury both the employer and the employee were subject to the compensation provisions of the workers' compensation law, the employee was performing service growing out of and incidental to the employment and was acting within the course of the employment, and the injury was proximately caused by the employment either with or without negligence [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(1)-(3)*];

- The injury was not caused by the injured employee's intoxication byalcohol or unlawful use of a controlled substance, was not intentionally self-inflicted, did not arise out of an altercation in which the injured employee was the initial physical aggressor [*see Mathews v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 719, 726-728, 100 Cal. Rptr. 301, 493 P.2d 1165]* , and was not caused by the commissionof a felonious act by the injured employee for which he or she has been convicted [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(4), (5), (7), (8)*]; and

- The injury did not arise out of voluntary participation in any off-duty recreational, social, or athletic activity not constituting part of the employee's work-related duties, except when these activities were a reasonable expectancy of, or were expressly or impliedly required by, the employment [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*; *see Hughes Aircraft Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 571, 573-575, 196 Cal. Rptr. 904* ; *Mason v. Lake Dolores Group (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-838, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 914* (question of whether employee was on duty or off duty at time of injury is not ultimate

test for whether injury was covered by compensation bargain and thus subject to exclusive remedy rule, but rather ultimate test is whether injury arose out of and in course of employment, and "reasonable expectancy" requirement of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)* is simply one subset of ultimate issue of whether injury arose out of and in course of employment)].

In the case of claims for death benefits, the employee must not have deliberately and willfully caused his or her own death [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(6)*].

[2] Proximate Causation

The phrase "proximately caused by the employment," as used in the statute, has been held to merely elaborate on the general requirement that the injury arise out of the employment and means only that the injury must be employment-caused or connected in the sense that there be a cause-and-effect relationship between the employment and the injury. All that *Lab. Code § 3600* requires is that the employment be one of the contributing causes without which the injury would not have occurred [*see Maher v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 729, 734 n.3, 190 Cal. Rptr. 904, 661 P.2d 1058* ; *Cooper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 44, 49, 218 Cal. Rptr. 783]* . However, in one case a psychiatric injury suffered by a worker as a result of workplace gossip about her extramarital affair with a coworker was held, as a matter of law, not to have arisen out of employment. A finding of industrial injury is proper, said the court, only when the employment plays an "active" or "positive" role in the development of the psychological condition. An injury that grows out of a personal grievance between the injured employee and a third party does not arise out of the employment if the injury occurred merely by chance during working hours at the place of employment or if the employer's premises do not place the injured employee in a peculiarly dangerous position. In other words, gossip about an individual's personal life is not part of the employment relationship [*Atascadero Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Geredes) (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 880, 884-885, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 239]* .

[3] Post-Termination Claims

Except for psychiatric injuries, if the claim for compensation is filed after notice of termination or layoff, including voluntary layoff, and the claim is for an injury occurring on or after July 16, 1993 and prior to the time of the notice, no compensation is payable unless the employee demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that one or more of the following conditions apply [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(10)*]:

- The employer has notice of the injury prior to the notice of termination or layoff.

- The employee's medical records, compiled prior to the notice of termination or layoff, contain evidence of the injury.

- The date of injury, as specified in *Lab. Code § 5411*, is subsequent to the date of the notice of termination or layoff, but prior to the effective date of the termination or layoff.

- The date of injury, as specified in *Lab. Code § 5412*, is subsequent to the date of the notice of termination or layoff.

This rule applies only to employer initiated separations, and does not apply to employees who resign from their employment [*CJS Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 294, 298, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 109]* .

A notice of termination or layoff that is not followed within 60 days by that termination or layoff is not subject to the foregoing provisions, and these provisions do not apply until receipt of a later notice of termination or layoff. The issuance of frequent notices of termination or layoff to an employee is considered a bad faith personnel action and

makes these provisions inapplicable to the employee [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(10)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentCausationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentRecreational ActivitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesIntoxicationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesSelf-Inflicted InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesComparative & Contributory Negligence

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.24

§ 577.24 Arising Out of and in the Course of Employment

[1] In General

To be compensable, an injury must both arise out of the employment and occur in the course of employment [*see Lab. Code § 3600*; *Cooper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 173 Cal. App. 3d 44, 48, 218 Cal. Rptr. 783* ; *Rogers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1199, 218 Cal. Rptr. 662]* . "Course of employment" generally refers to the time and place of the injury, whereas "arise out of employment" refers to a causal connection between the employment and the injury [*Maher v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 729, 733-734, 190 Cal. Rptr. 904, 661 P.2d 1058* ; *Rogers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1200, 218 Cal. Rptr. 662]* .

The phrase "in the course of employment" is frequently defined as such service as the employee is expected to render, when it occurs within the period of his or her employment, at a place where the employee may reasonably be for that purpose, and while the employee is engaged in fulfilling his or her duties or in doing something necessarily incident to them. The phrase ordinarily refers to the time, place, and circumstances under which the accident occurs [*Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 252, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26* , quoting *Griffin v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1937) 19 Cal. App. 2d 727, 732-733, 66 P.2d 176]* . The determination whether injury-causing conduct was in the course of employment is necessarily decided on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the particular circumstances of the case, and both the WCAB and the courts are required to liberally interpret and apply the workers' compensation law in favor of conferring benefits on the injured employee. When the material facts of a case are not disputed, that determination is treated as a question of law [*Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 252-253, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26]* .

In one case, the court of appeal held that an employee's death was not the result of an industrial injury, when the court found that the decedent, an accountant with a CPA license employed by the City of Los Angeles, died from injuries received from a fall while attending a CPA convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Neither the commercial traveler doctrine nor the special mission exception applied, said the court. The employer did not require the decedent to have a

CPA license, and traveling to attend the convention for CPA credit was not expressly or impliedly authorized by the decedent's employment contract. Moreover, the employer did not benefit from CPA licensure, and the employer provided the training it considered necessary for its accountants. The employer motivated or encouraged CPA licensure as a personal achievement by bonus salary only, not as an incentive to improve an accountant's ability to do the job [*City of Los Angeles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 78, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 343*].

[2] Burden of Proof

The applicant for compensation has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that his or her injury arose both out of and in the course of employment [*Lundberg v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 436, 439, 71 Cal. Rptr. 684, 445 P.2d 300* ; *Rogers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1199, 218 Cal. Rptr. 662* (citing *Lab. Code §§ 3202.5, 3600*, and *5705*)]. All parties are required to meet the evidentiary burden of proof on all issues by a preponderance of the evidence in order that all parties be considered equal before the law [*Lab. Code § 3202.5* ("preponderance of the evidence" as "that evidence that, when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and the greater probability of truth.")]. Nevertheless, the workers' compensation law must be liberally construed in the employee's favor [*see Lab. Code § 3202*], and all reasonable doubts as to whether the injury arose out of the employment are to be resolved in favor of the employee [*Garza v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 312, 317, 90 Cal. Rptr. 355, 475 P.2d 451* ; *Ferreira v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 120, 125, 112 Cal. Rptr. 232* ; *see Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 253, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26]* .

[3] Employee Misconduct

Employee misconduct, whether negligent, willful, or even criminal, does not necessarily preclude recovery under workers' compensation law. In the absence of an applicable statutory defense [*see discussion under § 577.23*], such misconduct will bar recovery only when it constitutes a deviation from the scope of employment. In determining whether misconduct takes an employee outside the scope of his or her employment, a distinction must be made between an unauthorized departure from the course of employment and the performance of a duty in an unauthorized manner. Injury occurring during the course of the former conduct is not compensable. The latter conduct, although it may in some instances constitute serious and willful misconduct resulting in a reduction of the employee's benefits [*see Lab. Code § 4551*], does not take the employee outside the course of his or her employment [*Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 253, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26* (fact that bus driver was convicted of reckless driving while on assigned run for his employer did not take him outside course of employment so as to deprive him of workers' compensation benefits for emotional injury sustained in near-accident resulting from that reckless driving)]. For discussion of the effect of an employee's serious and willful misconduct, see *§ 577.17[1]* .

[4] Acts Personal to Employee

The employee need not have been rendering service to the employer at the time of the injury in order to recover compensation. Acts that are necessary to the life, comfort, and convenience of the employee, though strictly personal, are incidental to the service rendered, and an injury sustained in their performance arises out of and in the course of the employment. This rule includes the majority of an employee's acts on the employer's premises, such as eating lunch, getting a drink of water, smoking tobacco where not forbidden by the employer, "attending to the wants of nature," changing to or from working clothes, and many others. Such acts, although not themselves representing the rendition of service, are reasonably incidental thereto, and are considered to be acts for the mutual benefit and convenience of the employer and employee [*Dixon v. Ford Motor Co. (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 499, 504-505, 125 Cal. Rptr. 872* ; *see Todd v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 757, 760, 243 Cal. Rptr. 925* ; *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1967) 67 Cal. 2d 925, 927-928, 64 Cal. Rptr. 323, 434 P.2d 619* ; *Duncan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 117, 120, 197 Cal. Rptr. 474]* .

The "personal comfort doctrine" described above does not apply, however, to cases that come within the scope of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, excluding from workers' compensation coverage injuries arising out of voluntary participation in any off-duty recreational, social, or athletic activity not constituting part of the employee's work-related duties, except when these activities are a reasonable expectancy of, or are expressly or impliedly required by, the employment [*Todd v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 757, 760, 243 Cal. Rptr. 925]* . The court of appeal has noted that the question of whether an employee was on duty or off duty at the time of injury is not the ultimate test for whether the injury was covered by the compensation bargain and thus subject to the exclusive remedy rule. Rather, the ultimate test is whether the injury arose out of and in the course of the employment. Moreover, said the court, the "reasonable expectancy" requirement [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*] is simply a subset of the ultimate issue, namely, whether the injury arose out of and in the course of the employment [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(2), (3)*]. The court found that the employee's injury did not arise out of or occur in the course of the employment, since the employee was engaging in an activity for his own enjoyment, using a water slide, that was specifically forbidden to employees by company policy and of no benefit to the employer [*Mason v. Lake Dolores Group (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-838, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 914]* .

On the other hand, the court of appeal held that a police officer's physical training injury, even though occurring while he was on vacation, was a compensable injury because his training was, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, "a reasonable expectancy of ... the employment." The court found that the officer was injured on December 30, 2005, near the end of a three-mile run while on vacation in Wyoming. He was a member of his employer's SWAT team and was training for a physical fitness test to be administered in January 2006, which he was required to pass to retain his status as a SWAT team member. That test included a half-mile run. The court concluded that both requirements of *Ezzy v. W.C.A.B.* [*Ezzy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 252, 194 Cal. Rptr. 90*] were satisfied, i.e., the officer believed that his employer expected him to train for the test while on vacation, and this belief was objectively reasonable [*Tomlin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1423, 1425-1426, 1428-1432, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 672*].

For purposes of determining whether to grant or deny a workers' compensation claim, if an employee is injured or killed by a third party in the course of the employee's employment, no personal relationship or personal connection will be deemed to exist between the employee and the third party based only on a determination that the third party injured or killed the employee solely because of the third party's personal beliefs relating to his or her perception of the employee's race, religious creed, color, national origin, age, gender, disability, sex, or sexual orientation [*Lab. Code § 3600(c)*].

[5] Emergency Efforts on Behalf of Employer

Emergency efforts to save the employer's property from fire, theft, or other hazards are within the course of employment, and the fact that the rescue effort takes place outside of working hours does not detract from its work-connected status [*Martinez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 15 Cal. 3d 982, 986, 127 Cal. Rptr. 150, 544 P.2d 1350]* . Thus, an employee injured while visiting work on her day off when helping fellow employees hold up a collapsing shelf, thereby protecting her employer's property, was injured in the course of employment [*Wright v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 346, 348, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 503]* .

[6] Going and Coming Rule

[a] In General

One of the rules fashioned by the courts over the years to aid in determining whether an injury occurred within the "course of employment" is the "going and coming" rule. Broadly stated, the rule prohibits compensation for injuries received by an employee while traveling to and from work. Courts have reasoned that the employment relationship is suspended during this period and, therefore, injuries occurring when an employee is engaged in off-duty travel, off the employer's premises, are not within the "course of employment" for purposes of the Workers' Compensation Law [

Parks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 585, 588-589 n.4, 190 Cal. Rptr. 158, 660 P.2d 382 ; *see Southern California Rapid Transit Dist., Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 158, 166, 151 Cal. Rptr. 666, 588 P.2d 806* ; *Hinojosa v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 150, 157, 104 Cal. Rptr. 456, 501 P.2d 1176]* .

The "going and coming" rule applies to an employee who voluntarily participates in alternative commute programs sponsored by governmental entities, unless the employee is paid a salary to compensate for those periods of travel [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(a)*]. An employer's reimbursement of employee expenses or subsidization of costs related to an alternative commute program is not considered payment of a salary [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(b)*; *see also Rev. & Tax. Code § 17149*]. If an employee's salary is not based on the hours the employee works, payment of his or her salary is not considered compensation for the period of travel, absent a written agreement [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(b)*]. Vanpool programs may provide workers' compensation benefits to employees who participate in an alternative commute program by riding in a vanpool, if the vanpool vehicle is owned by the employer (or by the State if the State is the employer) [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(d)*].

Any alternative commute program provided, sponsored, or subsidized by an employer to comply with any trip reduction mandates of an air quality management district or local government is considered a program mandated by a governmental entity [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(b)*]. A "governmental entity" is any local jurisdiction authorized to enact air pollution or congestion management controls, including regional air districts, air quality management districts, and congestion management agencies [*Lab. Code § 3600.8(c)*].

The "going and coming" rule has been widely criticized and, because of its harshness, the courts have carved out numerous exceptions [*see Perez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 60, 63, 199 Cal. Rptr. 280]* . The principal exceptions are discussed below.

Although not, strictly speaking, falling under the heading of the "going and coming" rule or its exceptions, injuries incurred by an employee en route to or from a medical appointment to obtain treatment for an industrial injury are compensable, as long as the employee is traveling a reasonable distance, within a reasonable geographic area, to or from that appointment. Determinations of the reasonableness of the geographic area limitation and of the distance the employee travels are made on a case-by-case basis, considering all of the relevant circumstances. Thus, in one case an employee sustained industrial injuries in 2003 and 2005 for which she received ongoing medical treatment. In 2007 she drove approximately 130 miles from her home to visit her mother. Within minutes of leaving her mother's home to drive 136 miles to keep a medical appointment for treatment of her industrial injuries, she sustained serious injuries in an automobile accident. The court of appeal held that her new injuries occurred outside the reasonable geographic area of her employer's risk for incurring compensability liability for such injuries [*Esquivel v. W.C.A.B. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 330, 333-334, 344-345, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 380*].

[b] Exceptions to Rule

[i] Special Risk Exception

Under the special risk exception, the employee is entitled to compensation for injuries sustained within the field of that risk if:

- "But for" the employment the employee would not have been at the location where the injury occurred; and
- The risk is distinctive in nature or quantitatively greater than risks common to the public.

The principle applies when the employee is entering or leaving the employer's premises. But the fact that the accident

happens on a public road and that the danger is one to which the general public is likewise exposed does not preclude the existence of a causal relationship between the accident and the employment if the danger is one to which the employee, by reason of and in connection with his or her employment, is subjected peculiarly or to an abnormal degree [*Parks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 585, 589-590, 190 Cal. Rptr. 158, 660 P.2d 382* ; *see Lefebvre v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 745, 750, 165 Cal. Rptr. 246]* .

[ii] Special Mission or Errand Exception

The special mission or the special errand exception has been defined as a business journey undertaken by an employee at the specific request of the employer. An injury suffered by an employee while performing such a special mission or errand is compensable [*Southern California Rapid Transit Dist., Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 158, 166, 151 Cal. Rptr. 666, 588 P.2d 806* ; *see Guest v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 670, 672-674, 87 Cal. Rptr. 193, 470 P.2d 1]* . The exception exists any time an injury is sustained by an employee performing a special mission for his or her employer. Thus, an injury sustained by an employee during his or her regular commute is compensable if the employee was also performing a special mission for the employer [*Perez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 60, 65, 199 Cal. Rptr. 280* , adding that the rationale for the going and coming rule has in effect been abandoned in the special mission cases)]. By contrast, a police officer injured on his day off while traveling from home to the courthouse where he was to testify under subpoena about police matters was barred from workers' compensation benefits by the "going and coming rule," the court holding that the special mission exception did not apply, since testifying was not extraordinary in relation to the officer's routine duties [*City of San Diego v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1385, 1388-1389, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510]* . Similarly, the court of appeal held that an employee's injury was not industrial since the accident occurred after the business portion of the trip was complete and while the employee and his wife were engaged in non-industrial sightseeing in Italy. The court found that there was no continuing or resumed business purpose at the time of the accident and that the employee was neither a commercial traveler nor on a special mission for the employer at the time of the accident [*Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Moody) (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1316, 1323-1331, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587]* .

In a case not involving workers' compensation, the court of appeal, reversing the trial court's grant of summary judgment to the defendant employer, held that the employer had failed to show that there were no triable issues of material fact as to whether its employee was acting within the course and scope of his employment at the time of an automobile accident causing injuries to the plaintiffs. The facts were as follows: The defendant employee was vice president of anti-piracy Internet operations of Warner Brothers. He attended a three-day business conference in Sunnyvale, California, sponsored by one of his employer's anti-piracy vendors. His employer approved the trip and paid for the employee's airfare, hotel, and airport parking. After leaving the conference, the employee flew back to Burbank Airport, where he retrieved his car from the airport parking lot. On his way home, he drove around the studio complex where his office was located without stopping and took his normal route home until he was involved in the automobile collision that gave rise to the present cause of action. The court of appeal found that the employee's attendance at the out-of-town business conference may be considered a special errand/special mission, and that, when the employee intended to drive home from this errand/mission, the errand/mission was not concluded simply because the employee drove his regular commute route. Rather, the errand/mission was concluded only when the employee returned home or deviated from the errand/mission for personal reasons. In short, the business conference could be found to be a special errand/mission that had not yet concluded at the time of the accident, and the fact that the employee coincidentally passed his office on his return route home was immaterial since he did not stop at the office and intended to return home from the airport [*Jeewarat v. Warner Brothers Entertainment, Inc. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 427, 431, 436-439, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 837*].

[iii] Commercial Traveler Exception

The commercial traveler exception is similar to the special errand exception in that it applies to injuries incurred in the course of a business journey undertaken by an employee at the specific request of the employer, but it connotes a wider

range of activity and applies in those cases in which the employee's work entails travel away from the employer's premises [*see Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 796, 805, 183 Cal. Rptr. 440* ; *IBM Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 279, 282, 142 Cal. Rptr. 543]* . Common examples would include a traveling salesperson and other employees whose job requires their traveling to places other than the employer's place of business [*see Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 796, 805, 183 Cal. Rptr. 440* ; *IBM Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 279, 280-282, 142 Cal. Rptr. 543]* .

The commercial traveler is regarded as acting within the course of his or her employment during the entire period of travel on the employer's business, except when a distinct departure on a personal errand is shown. Thus, for example, a commercial traveler who obtains treatment for a preexisting non-occupational medical condition is not acting within the course of employment, and any secondary injury sustained while undergoing such treatment is noncompensable [*LaTourette v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 644, 655-656, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217, 951 P.2d 1184]* . The employee's acts in traveling and in procuring food and shelter, however, are all incidents of the employment, and, when injuries are sustained during the course of such activities, the workers' compensation law applies [*Wiseman v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 570, 572, 297 P.2d 649* ; *see IBM Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 279, 280-282, 142 Cal. Rptr. 543]* .

The court of appeal has held that the "commercial traveler rule" of workers' compensation law could not be incorporated into the respondeat superior doctrine of civil tort law. Thus, the plaintiff in a civil tort actioncould not join the alleged tortfeasor's employer as a defendant when the alleged tort occurred while the employee was engaged in an activity not occurring within the scope of his employment, as would be required for invocation of the respondeat superior doctrine, even though the employee was a commercial traveler within workers' compensation law at the time of allegedly committing the alleged tort [*Sunderland v. Lockheed Martin Aeronautical Systems Support Co. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10-12, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 665]* .

[c] Meal Breaks

Compensation for injuries sustained during uncompensated meal breaks away from the employer's premises is usually denied under the aegis of the "going and coming" rule; the employer-employee relationship is considered suspended during that period because the employer does not pay for the employee's services and the employee provides no benefits in return [*McFadden v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 279, 281-282, 249 Cal. Rptr. 778* ; *see Mission Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 50, 56-57, 148 Cal. Rptr. 292]* .

The rule is different, however, when the employee is compensated during the lunch break. In those situations, it is reasonable to infer that, by such an arrangement, the employer has impliedly agreed that service will continue during such period, and this is true whether the employee is salaried or paid at an hourly rate [*McFadden v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 279, 282, 249 Cal. Rptr. 778* ; *see also Duncan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 150 Cal. App. 3d 117, 119-121, 197 Cal. Rptr. 474]* . For example, in *McFadden*, the court held that a salaried salesman who was injured while returning to work from an off-premises lunch with his supervisor and a coemployee at which business had been discussed was entitled to workers' compensation benefits because of the following [*McFadden v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 279, 283, 249 Cal. Rptr. 778]* :

- The salesman was salaried;
- He was authorized to take unscheduled lunch breaks;
- On numerous occasions, he had lunch, at which business was discussed, with his coemployees;
- His supervisor frequently joined them for lunch; and

- His employer had never notified him that his salary did not cover his meal periods and was not apportioned over the entire work day, which was from 8:30 a.m. until 4:30 or 5:00 p.m.

The *McFadden* court noted that it did not decide the broader issue of whether salaried employees are always entitled to workers' compensation benefits for injuries sustained during any break period [*see McFadden v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 279, 283 n.2, 249 Cal. Rptr. 778]* .

In another case, an employee who was injured in a traffic accident during an authorized lunch break was held to have been injured in the course and scope of her employment, when she was compensated on a commission basis, and continued to accrue commissions during her authorized lunch break [*Wood Pontiac Cadillac v. Superior Court (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 810, 812-814, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 924]* .

[7] Bunkhouse Rule

The bunkhouse rule renders injuries to an employee who is required to live on the employer's premises compensable under workers' compensation. Under the rule, if an employment contract contemplates, or the nature of the employment requires, an employee to reside on the employer's premises, the employee is entitled to workers' compensation for injuries received during the reasonable and anticipatible use of the premises [*Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1268, 230 Cal. Rptr. 425]* .

In most situations in which the rule has been applied, sleeping on the premises was either required by the employer in order that the employer might more adequately avail himself or herself of the employee's services at any time, or as an extra compensation supplied to the employee in addition to the primary consideration of wages or salary paid [*Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1268, 230 Cal. Rptr. 425]* .

In one case, the court of appeal held that the exclusive remedy rule of *Lab. Code § 3602(a)* barred the plaintiffs' civil action against the defendant for negligence and failure to make a house habitable for human occupation. The court found that the plaintiffs husband and wife lived in a ranch house owned by the defendant as an "employment benefit" of the husband's job as a park ranger employed by defendant. The plaintiff husband was injured when, attempting to get up from the bathroom floor of the house, where he had been observing leaking pipes while "on all fours," he slipped and fell. The bunkhouse rule, said the court, provides that, when an employee is injured while living on the employer's premises, the course-of-employment requirement of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)* is satisfied if the employment contract contemplates, or work necessity requires, the employee to reside on the employer's premises, which was true in the present case. Moreover, the employment and the injury must be linked in some causal fashion to satisfy the arising-out-of-employment requirement of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)*, and an injury occurring in employer-furnished housing in the course of employment ordinarily arises out of employment, which was true in the present case [*Vaught v. State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1538, 1544-1549, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentBusiness TravelersWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentCausationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGoing & Coming RuleWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentPersonal ComfortWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentPlace & Time

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.25

§ 577.25 Time Limitations

[1] In General

Limitations on proceedings for compensation are set forth in *Lab. Code § 5400 et seq.* (discussed below), which must be liberally construed in favor of the employee [*see Bland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 324, 330-331, 90 Cal. Rptr. 431, 475 P.2d 663* ; *City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 471, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463]* . These provisions do not apply, however, to further claims by the same person against the same defendants for the same injury if a timely claim for benefits was filed. The right to present further claims is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5803-5805* (discussed in *§ 577.220* et seq.) [*Lab. Code § 5404*; *see J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 343, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* .

The purpose of a statute of limitations for filing of claims is to cause an early submission of controversies while it is possible to obtain competent evidence concerning the alleged injury and its effects and, thus, to afford protection against false claims or those based on remote and unsatisfactory speculation as to the cause of a disability manifesting itself long after the accident [*Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App.3d 613, 620, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *see also Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1115, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868]* .

An injured employee has a statutory duty to provide his or her employer with notice of the injury [*see Lab. Code § 5400*]. Similarly, the employer must provide the injured employee with certain information relating to the employee's rights under the workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code § 5401*]. For a discussion of these requirements, and the effect on the statute of limitations of an employer's failure to comply with them, see *§ 577.40* et seq.

[2] Proceedings to Collect Compensation

[a] In General

The time within which a proceeding to collect benefits may be commenced is one year from (a) the date of injury, or (b)

the expiration of any period covered by payment under *Lab. Code §§ 4650-4663* (disability payments), or (c) the date any benefits provided for in *Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1* (medical and hospital treatment) were last furnished [*Lab. Code § 5405*; *see J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333-334, 340-341, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219* ; *Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 613, 619, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304]* . The purpose of (b) and (c), *above*, is to protect the injured employee from being lulled into a sense of security by voluntary payments of benefits until the time to commence formal proceedings has expired [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 329, 333, 137 Cal. Rptr. 878, 562 P.2d 1037]* .

Because the three points of time specified in *Lab. Code § 5405* at which the period of limitation starts to run are in the alternative, the defendant, to defeat the applicant's claim on the ground the action is barred by lapse of time, must prove that the time starting from any and all three of the points designated has elapsed [*City etc. of San Francisco v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 1001, 1014, 88 Cal. Rptr. 371, 472 P.2d 459* ; *Colonial Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 437, 441, 164 P.2d 490]* .

[b] Cumulative Injury

Liability for occupational disease or cumulative injury claims filed or asserted on or after January 1, 1981, is limited to those employers who employed the employee during a period of one year immediately preceding either the date of injury or the last date on which the employee was employed in an occupation exposing him or her to the hazards of the disease or injury, whichever occurs first [*Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)*; *see J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 337-338, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . These time restrictions do not limit the period of recovery for a cumulative injury; rather, they reduce the burden placed on the entire compensation system of allocating costs among employers [*Flesher v. Worker's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 322, 327-328, 152 Cal. Rptr. 459, 590 P.2d 35]* . If no employer during the foregoing periods is insured for workers' compensation coverage or an approved alternative, liability will be imposed on the last year of employment exposing the employee to the hazards of occupational disease or cumulative injury for which there is an insured employer [*see Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)*].

Any employer held liable under an occupational disease or cumulative injury award may, within one year after issuance of the award, institute proceedings before the WCAB for the purpose of determining an apportionment of liability or right of contribution under the award [*Lab. Code § 5500.5(e)*]. The statute of limitations begins to run when the initial award of benefits is issued, even if the initial award is not a final award determining the employee's entitlement to all benefits [*see Rex Club v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 1465, 1474, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 393]* .

Special provisions relating to liability for occupational disease or cumulative injury that results from exposure solely during employment by certain residential owners or occupants are set forth in *Lab. Code § 5500.6*.

The date of injury in cases of occupational diseases or cumulative injuries is the date on which the employee first suffered disability from such a disease or injury and either knew, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that the disability was caused by his or her present or prior employment [*Lab. Code § 5412*; *Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 238-239, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26* (holding that employee first suffered disability in 1985 when he was hospitalized and that employee's testimony established that in 1985 he believed his problems were work related)].

In one case, an employee's application for benefits resulting from asbestosis was timely when there was no substantial evidence that the employee had a ratable permanent disability before filing the application, even though he had been hospitalized four years earlier for a respiratory infection, at which time his doctor told him he had asbestosis but also noted that the employee was able to perform his work and normal activities without limitations [*Chavira v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 463, 474-476, 286 Cal. Rptr. 600]* . Moreover, even assuming the employee had a permanent disability that could have been tentatively rated more than one year before he filed the application, the evidence did not support the WCAB's finding that the employee knew or reasonably should have known

he had a permanent disability [*see Chavira v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 463, 475-476, 286 Cal. Rptr. 600]* .

Apportioning liability for cumulative trauma injuries, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5500.5*, requires either compensable temporary disability or permanent disability to satisfy the disability requirement of *Lab. Code § 5412*. Because actual wage loss is required for temporary disability, modified work alone is not a sufficient basis for compensable temporary disability, but it may indicate permanent impairment of earning capacity, especially if the worker is never able to return to the original job duties. Medical treatment alone is not disability, but it may be evidence of compensable permanent disability, as may a need for modified work. These are questions for the trier of fact to determine and may require expert medical opinion [*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Rodarte) (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 998, 1005-1006, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 793]* .

If the WCJ finds that the employee suffered one continuous cumulative injury, then, under the terms of *Lab. Code § 5500.5*, the insurance carrier who provided coverage during the one-year period immediately preceding the *date of injury* or the *date of last exposure, whichever occurs first* bears full responsibility for the payment of workers' compensation benefits [*Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 240-241, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26]* .

[c] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5, 4635-4647*, and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004 [*see § 577.45[2A]*].

In 2004, the legislature reenacted one of the statutes it had repealed in 2003, *Lab. Code § 139.5*, reinstating vocational rehabilitation. *However, the reenacted statute applies only to injuries occurring before January 1, 2004*, and it will remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date [*Lab. Code § 139.5(k)*, (*l*)]. Various other vocational rehabilitation statutes, e.g., *Lab. Code §§ 4642, 4644(d), (e)*, and *5405.5*, once cross-referred to in former *Lab. Code § 139.5* but repealed in 2003, are also cross-referred to in the reenacted *Lab. Code § 139.5* and are now identified with the designation "former." Thus, although the issue may be further clarified by administrative and judicial action, it now appears that the statutory law on vocational rehabilitation applicable to pre-2004 injuries is confined to *Lab. Code § 139.5*, those "former" statutes to which it cross-refers, and those statutes not repealed in 2003. For example, the 2002 amendment to former *Lab. Code § 4646*, which allowed settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation benefits, has not been reenacted, while *Lab. Code § 5100.6*, forbidding such settlements, was never repealed and, thus, remains in force. As a consequence of these legislative developments, at least some of the discussion in this subsection regarding time limitations applicable to vocational rehabilitation benefits applies only to pre-2004 injuries.

Except as otherwise provided in *Lab. Code § 4644* (termination of employer's liability for vocational rehabilitation services) and *Lab. Code § 5410* (discussed in *§ 577.222[4]*), the period within which an employee may request vocational rehabilitation benefits provided by *Lab. Code §§ 4635-4647* is one year from the date of the last finding of permanent disability by the WCAB, or one year from the date that the WCAB approved a compromise and release of other issues [*Lab. Code § 5405.5*; *see also Lab. Code § 139.5(f)* (time within which an employee may request vocational rehabilitation services is set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5405.5, 5410*, and *5803*)]. Therefore, although *Lab. Code § 5410* establishes a limitation period of five years from the date of the injury, *Lab. Code § 5405.5* operates to provide that an initial request for vocational rehabilitation may be made after that time if the request is filed within one year from the last finding of permanent disability or approval of a compromise and release of other issues [*Sanchez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1990) 217 Cal. App. 3d 346, 354-355, 266 Cal. Rptr. 21* ; *Youngblood v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 764, 772, 265 Cal. Rptr. 211* ; *see O'Loughlin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals*

Bd. (1990) 222 Cal. App. 3d 1518, 1521-1524, 272 Cal. Rptr. 499 (holding that *Lab. Code § 5405.5* applies to injuries occurring before enactment date)]. Once rehabilitation entitlement has been adjudicated, further requests for rehabilitatin must be made within the five-year period [*Youngblood v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 764, 773, 265 Cal. Rptr. 211]* .

If the applicant timely raises the issue of entitlement to vocational rehabilitation in the initial application for adjudication and the issue is still pending, the employee's failure to file a formal request for rehabilitation benefits with the WCAB within five years after the date of injury does not prevent an award of rehabilitation benefits [*Vasquez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 867, 872-873, 277 Cal. Rptr. 102* ; *see Lab. Code §§ 5405.5, 5410*].

It has been held that an employee's telephone call to his or her employer's claims adjuster requesting vocational rehabilitation benefits constitutes a "request" for vocational rehabilitation benefits under *Lab. Code § 5405.5*, and that a written request is not required [*Visalia School District v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Hernandez) (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1211, 1228, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 696]* . However, in one case, a request for rehabilitation benefits following the approval of a compromise and release agreement was deemed to be an initial request subject to the limitations period of *Lab. Code § 5405.5* and not a supplemental request subject to the five-years-from-the-date-of-injury limitations period of *Lab. Code § 5410*, despite the applicant's having placed a check mark next to "rehabilitation" in the application form filed for adjudication of claim immediately following his injury [*Roberts v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 33 Cal. App. 4th 631, 635-638, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576]* . It was undisputed that the applicant had not pursued a claim for rehabilitation benefits prior to the issuance of the order approving the compromise and release, and that the applicant's entitlement to those benefits had not previously been adjudicated [*Roberts v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 631, 637-638, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576]* . Whether or not an applicant indicates in an application filed with the WCAB that rehabilitation is a disputed issue is irrelevant [*Roberts v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 631, 638, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 576]* .

[d] Proceeding to Collect Death Benefits

[i] In General

Except when death is from asbestosis or, in some cases, an HIV-related disease (discussed below), the period within which a proceeding to collect death benefits under *Lab. Code § 4700 et seq.* may be commenced is one year from [*Lab. Code § 5406*].

- The date of death when death occurs within one year from the date of injury;

- The date any benefits under *Lab. Code § 4550 et seq.* (compensation) were last furnished when death occurs more than one year after the date of injury; or

- The date of death when death occurs more than one year after the date of injury and compensation benefits have been furnished.

No such proceeding may be commenced more than one year after the date of death nor more than 240 weeks from the date of injury [*Lab. Code § 5406*; *see* *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 972, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002* ; *Ruiz v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1955) 45 Cal. 2d 409, 411-414, 289 P.2d 229]* .

Under *Lab. Code § 5406*, no claim can ever accrue to an adult dependent for benefits from an industrially caused death that occurs more than 240 weeks after the date of injury [*Massey v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 674, 677, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825, 854 P.2d 117]* . The 240-week filing period is not tolled prior to the employee's death for a minor claimant by *Lab. Code § 5408* (no limitation of time runs against minor absent appointment of guardian,

conservator of the estate, or trustee). Under *Lab. Code § 5406*, if the injured employee dies more than 240 weeks from the date of injury, no death benefit claim can arise even though the claimant is a minor at the time of injury and files a claim within 240 weeks of the employee's death [*Massey v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 674, 681-684, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825, 854 P.2d 117]* .

For purposes of the accrual of a dependent's claim for death benefits, the date of injury may depend on the claimant's knowledge of the industrial nature of the injury that caused the employee's death [*Massey v. Workers'Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 674, 678 n.1, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825, 854 P.2d 117]* .

[ii] Death From Asbestosis

In the case of the death of an asbestos worker or firefighter from asbestosis, the period within which proceedings for the collection of death benefits under *Lab. Code § 4700 et seq.* may be commenced is one year from the date of death [*Lab. Code § 5406.5*]. The limitations period of *Lab. Code § 5406.5* is tolled, however, until the dependent of the deceased asbestos worker knows, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should know, that the worker's death was caused by the employment [*Clark v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 230 Cal. App. 3d 684, 696, 281 Cal. Rptr. 485]* . "Asbestosis" means any pathology, whether or not combined with preexisting pathology, that results in disability or need for medical treatment from inhalation of asbestos fibers [*Lab. Code § 4402(a)*]. For a definition of asbestos and discussion of its effects, see *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 335-336 n.2, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124* ; *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 330 n.1, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219* .

[iii] Death From HIV-Related Disease

In the case of the death of health care workers, public safety employees, and certain correctional peace officers from an HIV-related disease, the period within which proceedings may be commenced for the collection of death benefits under *Lab. Code § 4700 et seq.* is one year from the date of death, providing that [*Lab. Code § 5406.6(a)*]:

- A report of the injury or exposure was made to the employer or to a governmental agency authorized to administer industrial injury claims within one year of the date of the injury;

- The worker complied with the requisite notice provisions and the claim has not been finally determined to be noncompensable; or

- The employer provided, or was ordered to provide workers' compensation benefits for the injury prior to the date of death.

"Health care worker" means an employee who has direct contact, in the course of his or her employment, with blood or other bodily fluids contaminated with blood, or with other bodily fluids identified by the Division of Occupational Safety and Health as capable of transmitting HIV, who is either [*Lab. Code § 5406.6(b)*].

- Employed by a provider of health care under *Civ. Code § 56.05*, including but not limited to registered nurses, licensed vocational nurses, certified nurses aides, clinical laboratory technologists, dental hygienists, physicians, janitors or houskeeping workers; or

- Who provides direct patient care.

[e] Serious and Willful Misconduct

[i] By Employer

A proceeding to collect increased compensation under *Lab. Code § 4553* on the ground of the employer's serious and willful misconduct may be commenced within 12 months from the date of injury. This period is not extended by payment of compensation, agreement for payment, or the filing of an application for compensation benefits under other provisions of the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5407*]. For discussion of *Lab. Code § 4553*, see *§ 577.17[2]*.

After the one-year period allowed by the statute, additional employers (such as, in this case, a special employer) may not be joined in a claim for serious and willful misconduct timely commenced against another employer (here, the general employer), unless the employee was ignorant of the identity of the late-filed-against employer until after the running of the statute [*McGee Street Productions v. W.C.A.B. (Peterson) (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 717, 725-726, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813]* .

[ii] By Employee

A proceeding to reduce compensation on the ground that the injury was caused by the serious and willful misconduct of the employee under *Lab. Code § 4551* may be commenced within 12 months from the date of injury. This limitation does not apply, however, if the employee has commenced proceedings for increased compensation on the ground of serious and willful misconduct of the employer [*Lab. Code § 5407.5*]. For discussion of *Lab. Code § 4551*, see *§ 577.17[1]*.

[3] Minors and Incompetents

If an injured employee or any of a deceased employee's dependents is under 18 years of age or incompetent at any time when any right or privilege accrues to the employee or dependent under the workers' compensation law, a guardian or conservator of the estate appointed by the court, or a guardian ad litem or trustee appointed by the WCAB, may, on behalf of the employee or dependent, claim and exercise any right or privilege with the same force and effect as if no disability existed [*Lab. Code § 5408*; *see also discussion under § 577.81*].

No time limitation runs against any person under 18 years of age or any incompetent unless and until a guardian, conservator of the estate, or trustee is appointed [*Lab. Code § 5408*; *see Fogarty v. Dept. of Indus. Relations (1928) 206 Cal. 102, 104-105, 273 P. 791* ; *Roblyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 574, 579, 133 Cal. Rptr. 246* (dependency must be determined as of date of injury in case involving death benefit claim of dependent who was a minor at time injury was sustained and an adult when injured employee died); *see also Fisher v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 924, 929, 133 Cal. Rptr. 471* (same)].

The WCAB may determine the fact of minority or incompetency of any injured employee and may appoint a trustee to receive and disburse compensation payments for the benefit of the minor or incompetent and his or her family [*Lab. Code § 5408*].

[4] Tolling of Statute on Submission to Information and Assistance Officer

Submission of any matter to an information and assistance officer of the Division of Workers' Compensation (formerly the Division of Industrial Accidents) [*see § 577.12[2]*] tolls any applicable statute of limitations for the period that the matter is under consideration by the officer and for 60 days following the issuance of his or her recommendation [*Lab. Code § 5454*].

[5] As Affirmative Defense

The running of the period of limitation is an affirmative defense and operates to bar the employee's remedy and not to extinguish his or her right [*Lab. Code § 5409*]. The burden of proving that the action is barred rests on the defendant employer [*Colonial Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1945) 27 Cal. 2d 437, 440, 164 P.2d 490]* . The defense may, therefore, be waived, and failure to present it prior to the submission of the cause for decision is a sufficient waiver [

Lab. Code § 5409].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTollingWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsDeath BenefitsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesOccupational DiseasesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesStatutes of Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
1. General Principles of Workers' Compensation Law

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.26-577.39

[Reserved]

§§ 577.26[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.40

§ 577.40 Governing Law

Initial attorney consultation requirements, including the requirements for attorney's fees and fee agreements, are governed by *Lab. Code § 4906* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135, 10135.1*. Notice requirements for employers and injured employees prior to initiation of a claim adjudication proceeding are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5400-5403* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10116-10119*. Medical benefits are covered by *Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9780-9787*; vocational rehabilitation benefits by *Lab. Code §§ 4635-4647* [repealed effective January 1, 2004] and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10122-10133.4*; permanent disability ratings by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10150-10168*; permanent disability and determination of medical issues for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991, by *Lab. Code §§ 4061-4067.5*; and temporary and permanent disability payments by *Lab. Code §§ 4650-4663*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.41

§ 577.41 Consultation With Attorney

[1] Disclosure Statement

An employee may consult an attorney prior to notifying his or her employer of an injury, or at any time subsequent to notification. When the employee consults an attorney with respect to an injury occurring on or after January 1, 1990, counsel is required, at the initial consultation, to furnish the employee with a written disclosure statement relating to attorney's fees [*Lab. Code § 4906(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135*]. The form must be signed by the employee and his or her attorney, and the attorney must provide copies to the employee and to the employer, or to the employer's insurer or third-party administrator, if either is known, within 15 days of execution of the form by the employee and attorney [*Lab. Code § 4906(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135.1*].

For a disclosure statement form, see *§ 577.370[1]*.

[2] [Reserved]

[3] Fees and Fee Agreements

No charge, claim, or agreement for attorney's fees pertaining to a workers' compensation claim is enforceable, valid, or binding in excess of a reasonable amount. The WCAB may determine what constitutes a reasonable amount [*Lab. Code §§ 4903(a), 4906(a)*]. Therefore, an attorney or agent may not demand or accept any fee from an employee or dependent of an employee for the purpose of representing the employee or dependent in any proceeding of the Division of Workers' Compensation, the WCAB, or any appellate procedure related to such proceedings, until the amount of the fee is approved or set by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 4906(b)* (governing injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990)]. Additionally, every fee agreement must be submitted to the WCAB for approval within 10 days after it is made [*Lab. Code § 4906(c)* (governing injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990)].

In one case, the court of appeal, affirming an Appeals Board order denying reconsideration of the WCJ's finding that a

written attorney's fee agreement between an employee and his attorney was not binding, held that the legislature, in *Lab. Code § 4906*, has spoken clearly and decisively that attorney's fees in workers' compensation cases cannot exceed an amount that is "reasonable" and that the Appeals Board is the final arbiter of reasonableness in all cases. The court found that the fee agreement stated that SB 899 reduced permanent disability benefits, that the law firm could no longer afford to offer representation under Appeals Board attorney's fee guidelines, that the agreement was an attempt to draft around current policies under *Lab. Code § 4906*, "which are believed to be outdated," and that the parties, therefore, "agree that the fee will be set at $225 per hour to be paid out of permanent disability or 12% of the permanent disability award whichever is less." The agreement, stated the court, purported to override the Appeals Board's authority by guaranteeing that the attorney will receive fees according to a specified formula at the outset of the case, prior to and irrespective of any subsequent determination of reasonableness by the Board. To the extent that the agreement purported to "draft around" *Lab. Code § 4906* by depriving the Board of its statutory authority to fix attorney fees, it conflicted with state law and was not enforceable. After services had been rendered, said the court, the WCJ may approve, increase, or reduce the fees provided for in the agreement, taking into consideration the factors listed in *Lab. Code § 4906(d), 8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10775, and the Appeals Board Policy and Procedure Manual [*Vierra v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1142, 1147-1150, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 423]* .

In establishing a reasonable attorney's fee, the WCAB will consider the responsibility assumed by the attorney, the care exercised in representing the applicant, the time involved, and the results obtained [*Lab. Code § 4906(d)* (governing injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990)]. No fee for legal services may be awarded to a representative who is not an attorney licensed by the California State Bar, except with respect to claims for which an application under *Lab. Code § 5501* was filed on or before December 31, 1991, or for which a disclosure form under *Lab. Code § 4906* was sent to the employer, or insurer or third-party administrator if either is known, on or before December 31, 1991 [*Lab. Code § 4903(a)*; *see also Longval v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 792, 799-803* (*Lab. Code § 4903(a)*, allowing attorney's fees only for attorneys licensed in California, held constitutional)]. For a discussion of liens for attorney's fees, see *§ 577.261*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Legal EthicsClient RelationsAttorney FeesExcessive FeesLegal EthicsClient RelationsAttorney FeesFee AgreementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney Fees

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.42

§ 577.42 Notice Requirements

[1] Employee's Duty to Notify Employer of Injury or Death

[a] In General

A claim to recover workers' compensation may not be maintained unless, within 30 days after the injury that caused the disability or death occurred, a written notice signed by the injured employee or someone in the employee's behalf, or, in the event of the employee's death, by a dependent or someone in the dependent's behalf, is served on the employer [*Lab. Code § 5400*].

For injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, the notice must state the name and address of the person injured, the time and place where the injury occurred, and the nature of the injury [former *Lab. Code § 5401*, prior to repeal by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)].

[b] Effect of Failure to Provide Notice

Failure to give the notice or any defect or inaccuracy in it is not a bar to recovery if it is found as a fact in the proceedings for collection of the claim that the employer was not in fact misled or prejudiced by it [*Lab. Code § 5403*; *see Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 57, 66, 216 Cal. Rptr. 115, 702 P.2d 197]* . Moreover, knowledge of the employee's injury obtained from any source by the employer or the employer's managing agent, superintendent, foreman, or other person in authority, or knowledge of the assertion of a claim of injury sufficient to afford the employer opportunity to make an investigation into the facts, is equivalent to service of the notice on the employer [*Lab. Code § 5402(a)*].

[2] Employer's Duty to Notify Injured Employee of Workers' Compensation Rights

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1990

For injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, on receiving knowledge of the injury, the employer must, unless an application for benefits has been filed, notify the injured employee or, in the case of death, his or her dependents that the employee or dependents may be entitled to benefits under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5402*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)]. Although the law applicable to injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, does not specifically require an employer to provide the employee with a claim form, notice must be within the time period and in the manner prescribed by the regulations of the Administrative Director [*Lab. Code § 5402*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)]. The employer should therefore follow the notice procedures for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, as set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10116-10119*. For discussion of these procedures, see [2][b], *below*.

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, within one working day of receiving notice or knowledge of an injury that results in lost time beyond the employee's work shift at the time of injury or results in medical treatment beyond first aid, or of the employee's request, the employer must provide the injured employee or, in the case of death, his or her dependents with a claim form and a notice of potential eligibility for benefits under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*; *see also Lab. Code §§ 138.3, 138.4* (Administrative Director's authority to promulgate regulations regarding notices to be given to injured employees); *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9812, 9880* (regulations regarding manner and content of notices)].

If the employer's claims administrator obtains knowledge that the employer has not provided a claim form, the administrator must provide one to the employee within three working days of obtaining knowledge that the form was not provided [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(b)*]. If the administrator cannot determine if the employer has provided the employee with a claim form, the administrator must provide one within 30 days of the date the administrator had knowledge of the claim [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(c)*].

For purposes of the above requirement, the term "first aid" means any one-time treatment, and any follow-up visit for the purpose of observation, of minor scratches, cuts, burns, splinters, or other minor industrial injury, which do not ordinarily require medical care. This one-time treatment, and follow-up visit for the purpose of observation, is considered first aid even though provided by a physician or registered professional personnel. The term "minor industrial injury" does not include serious exposure to a hazardous substance as defined in *Lab. Code § 6302(i)* [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*].

Insofar as practicable, the notice of potential eligibility for benefits and the claim form are to be a single document and are to instruct the injured employee to fully read the notice of potential eligibility. The form and content of the notice and claim form are to be prescribed by the Administrative Director after consultation with the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation. The notice is to be easily understandable and available in both English and Spanish. The content must include, but need not be limited to, the following [*Lab. Code § 5401(b)*]:

- The procedure to be used to commence proceedings for the collection of compensation.
- A description of the different types of workers' compensation benefits.
- What happens to the claim form after it is filed.
- From whom the employee can obtain medical care for the injury.
- The role and function of the primary treating physician.

- The rights of an employee to select and change the treating physician pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3550(e)* and *4600*.

- How to get medical care while the claim is pending.

- The protections against discrimination provided pursuant to *Lab. Code § 132a*.

- The following written statements:

  - You have a right to disagree with decisions affecting your claim.

  - You can obtain free information from an information and assistance officer of the state Division of Workers' Compensation, or you can hear recorded information and a list of local offices by calling [applicable information and assistance telephone number(s)].

  - You can consult an attorney. Most attorneys offer one free consultation. If you decide to hire an attorney, his or her fee will be taken out of some of your benefits. For names of workers' compensation attorneys, call the State Bar of California at [telephone number of the State Bar of California's legal specialization program, or its equivalent].

[c] Victims of Crime

Employers are required to give any employee who is a victim of a crime that occurred on the employment premises written notice that the employee is eligible for workers' compensation, including psychiatric injuries, that may have resulted from the crime. The notice must be provided, either personally or by first-class mail, within one working day of the crime's occurrence or within one working day of the date that the employer reasonably should have known of the crime [*Lab. Code § 3553*].

[d] Failure to Give Employee Notice of Workers' Compensation Rights

For all injuries, whenever occurring, if the employer fails to provide the employee with notice of his or her rights under the workers' compensation law, the statute of limitations for filing a claim is tolled, provided the employee would be prejudiced if the statute were not tolled [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 57, 64-65, 67, 216 Cal. Rptr. 115, 702 P.2d 197* ; *Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 613, 621-622, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304]* . The tolling ends, however, at such time as the employee gains knowledge of his or her workers' compensation rights [*Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 514, 522, 230 Cal. Rptr. 649]* . Knowledge by the employee that a claim must be filed will not cease tolling of the statute if the employer fails to notify the employee of the applicable time limits for filing the claim, absent evidence that the employee otherwise knew of the applicable time limits [*Galloway v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 880, 887, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 374]* .

To avoid tolling of the statute, the employer has the burden not only to assert the running of the statute of limitations, but an affirmative burden to establish either that written notice was given to the employee or that the employee had, in fact, actual notice of his or her workers' compensation rights [*Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 613, 622, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

In one case, the court of appeal followed *Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. W.C.A.B. (Martin)* and held that CIGA failed to meet its burden to prove that an employee gained actual knowledge of his potential eligibility for workers' compensation benefits for a 1997 injury more than one year prior to filing his claim. The court found that the employer had breached its statutory duty to notify an unaware employee of his or her workers' compensation rights, tolling the

one-year limitations period for filing a claim for benefits until the employee acquired actual knowledge of those rights. The court also found that there was no substantial evidence that the employee was actually aware that his 1997 injury was potentially compensable, and that his employer had, in fact, told him that his 1997 injury was not compensable. The employee's retention of counsel in 1999 to represent him in proceedings regarding a 1996 industrial injury was not evidence of the employee's knowledge of the compensable status of the 1997 injury. Moreover, the employee's attorney's 2002 request for a continuance of the trial regarding the 1996 injury in order to file a claim for the 1997 injury was not evidence that the employee, as opposed to the employee's attorney, had knowledge of the compensable nature of his 1997 injury. Finally, the court held that CIGA's conduct delayed the employee's filing of a claim for the 1997 injury, so that it was estopped to assert the statute of limitations. According to the court, CIGA's failure until May 2003 to admit that it had coverage for the 1997 injury delayed the employee's filing of an application for adjudication of the 1997 injury, making the employee's March 2004 filing of the application for adjudication timely [*California Ins. Guarantee Assn. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 853, 856-857, 862-878, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 868]* .

For discussion of time limitations generally, see *§ 577.25*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTollingWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsTime LimitationsNotice PeriodsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesStatutes of Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.43

§ 577.43 Filing a Claim Form

[1] Source of Form

The Division of Workers' Compensation provides a claim form for use in filing a claim [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10139*; *see* form in *§ 577.373[1]*]. These forms are available at district offices of the Employment Development Department and the Division of Workers' Compensation, and may also be made available to the employee from other sources [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*].

[2] Content of Form

The claim form must contain, prominently stated, the following statement [*Lab. Code § 5401.7*]:

> Any person who makes or causes to be made any knowingly false or fraudulent material statement or material representation for the purpose of obtaining or denying workers' compensation benefits or payments is guilty of a felony.

The form may, but is not required to, contain the statements required to be displayed by an insurer under *Ins. Code §§ 1871.2* and *1879.2* relating to false or fraudulent claims under a contract of insurance [*Lab. Code § 5401.7*].

[3] Manner of Filing Form

The injured employee or, in the case of death, a dependent of the injured employee or an agent of the employee or dependent must file the completed claim form with the employer [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*]. The claim form must be filed with the employer before the injured employee becomes entitled to late payment supplements under *Lab. Code § 4650(d)* or requests a medical evaluation under *Lab. Code § 4061* or *4062* [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*]. A claim form is deemed filed when it is personally delivered to the employer or received by the employer by first-class or certified mail [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*].

[4] Employer's Duties on Receipt of Claim Form

[a] In General

Within one working day of receipt of a claim form, the employer must date the form and provide a dated copy to the employer's claims administrator and to the employee, dependent, or agent who filed the claim form [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(a)*]. The employer must also provide its insurer with a dated copy of the completed form [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*].

Within one working day after an employee files a claim form under *Lab. Code § 5401*, the employer must authorize the provision of all treatment, consistent with the medical treatment utilization schedule under *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, for the alleged injury and must continue to provide the treatment until the date that liability for the claim is accepted or rejected [*Lab. Code § 5402(c)*]. Until that date, liability for medical treatment is limited to $10,000 [*Lab. Code § 5402(c)*]. Treatment so provided does not give rise to a presumption of liability on the part of the employer [*Lab. Code § 5402(d)*].

An employer's duty to provide timely compensation to an injured worker is not abrogated by an employee's failure to complete and file the claim form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10137*].

[b] Denial of Claim

The claim is deemed denied on the date the written denial notice is personally served or, if the denial notice is mailed, five days after it is placed in the mail if the address is within California, 10 days if the address is outside California but within the United States, and 20 days if the address is outside the United States [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10142*]. In order to cease the claim form's tolling of the limitations period, the denial notice must be issued in accordance with the notice regulations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10142*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9812-9815*].

[c] Presumption of Compensability if Liability Not Rejected

If liability is not rejected within 90 days after the filing of the claim form under *Lab. Code § 5401*, the injury is presumed compensable [*Lab. Code § 5402*]. Application of the presumption is mandatory when liability is not timely denied, even if the claim is accepted and paid, and denied at a later date [*Williams v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1265-1266, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 798]* .

The Supreme Court has rejected the proposition that this 90-day period, during which the employer's rejection of liability will avoid the presumption of compensability of the employee's injury, begins to run when the employer receives knowledge of an injury or asserted injury, even though no claim form has been filed. Rather, the 90-day period runs only from the date on which the employee files a claim form with the employer. The Court found that this rule was the clear and unambiguous command of *Lab. Code § 5402(b)* and was manifestly intended to relieve the employer and the insurer from having to investigate and evaluate every possible claim, some of which might never ripen into actual claims for benefits [*Honeywell v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 24, 33-35, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 179, 105 P.3d 544]* . The Court also noted that an employer generally will be estopped to deny that this 90-day period began running before the filing of a claim form *only* if: (1) the employer, knowing that the employee had suffered or was asserting an industrial injury, refused to provide a claim form or misrepresented the availability of or need for the employee to file a claim form; (2) the employee was actually misled into believing that no claim form was available or necessary and failed to file one for that reason; and (3) because of this reliance, the employee suffered some loss of benefits or setback as to the claim. Finally, the Court stated that the employee need not show that the employer's agents consciously or deliberately set out to prevent or delay the employee's filing of a claim. Rather, the employer's violation, through its negligence, of its duty to provide a claim form and notice of potential eligibility when it learns that an

industrial injury has occurred or is being asserted, resulting in the employee's prejudicial reliance, is sufficient to give rise to estoppel [*Honeywell v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 24, 37-38, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 179, 105 P.3d 544; see Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Moody) (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1316, 1323-1331, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587]* .

The presumption is rebuttable only by evidence discovered subsequent to the 90-day period [*Lab. Code § 5402(b)*]. However, one court of appeal has held that the requirement that the employer reject liability within 90 days in order to avoid a presumption of compensability does not require the employer to actually *notify* the employee of the rejection within that time period so long as the claim itself was rejected within that time frame [*Rodriguez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1425, 1433, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713* (noting, however, that failure to provide timely notice may hamper efforts to prove that timely rejection was indeed made)].

[5] Effect of Filing on Statute of Limitations

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994, the filing of the claim form with the employer tolls the time limitations for commencing proceedings for workers' compensation benefits set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5405* and *5406* until the employer denies the claim or the injury becomes presumptively compensable under *Lab. Code § 5402(b)* [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*]. For purposes of this provision, a claim form is deemed filed when it is personally delivered to the employer or mailed to the employer by first-class or certified mail [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*].

[6] Dismissal of Claim for Lack of Activity

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1994

[i] If Claim Denied

If a claim form has been filed prior to January 1, 1994, and the claim is denied by the employer, the claim may be dismissed if there has been no activity for the previous 180 days and if the claims administrator has served notice specifying that the claim will be dismissed by operation of law unless an application for adjudication is filed within 180 days of service of the notice [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)*; *see § 577.450*].

[ii] If Benefits Furnished

If a claim form has been filed prior to January 1, 1994, and benefits have been furnished by the employer, the claim may be dismissed if there has been no activity for the previous 180 days and if the claims administrator has served notice specifying that the claim will be dismissed by operation of law unless an application for adjudication is filed within five years of the date of injury or within one year of the last furnishing of benefits, whichever is later [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)*; *see § 577.451*]. For these purposes, the date of last furnishing of benefits is the later of either [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)(2)*]:

- The last date the employee received medical or rehabilitation services, or

- The last date that payment of any compensation benefit was mailed or personally delivered to the employee or service provider.

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994

When an application for adjudication for an injury occurring on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994, has not been filed by any of the parties, an employer or insurer seeking dismissal of a claim form for lack of prosecution must solely utilize the procedures set forth in *Labor Code Section 5404.5*, discussed above, and must not seek an order of dismissal from the WCAB by filing an application for adjudication, a request for a pre-application determination, or

any other petition or request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10583*].

[c] Service of Notice of Dismissal

These notices dismissing inactive claims must be served on the employee pursuant the rules regarding service of summons in the Code of Civil Procedure [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(a), (b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10 et seq.*(rules of service)]. If the employee is represented by an attorney, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the attorney by personal delivery or first class mail. If no Application for Adjudication of Claim has been filed, but the WCAB has assigned a case number to the matter because of pre-application filing, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the Appeals Board with proof of service made in accordance with Rule 10975 of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10975*].

[d] Evidence That Claim Is Active

The occurrence of any of the following during the 180 days before service of notice is evidence that the claim is not inactive, thus precluding dismissal due to inactivity [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(e)*]:

- The employee has made demand for payment or provision of benefits;
- The claims administrator has knowledge that there are benefits due and unpaid;
- There has been treatment rendered for the industrial injury;
- There has been a medical-legal evaluation of the employee;
- There has been a deposition in regard to the claim; or
- The claims administrator has other knowledge that the employee is actively pursuing the claim.

[e] Jurisdiction of WCAB

These provisions do not limit the jurisdiction of the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityPresumptionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesStatutes of LimitationsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIPosting & Recordkeeping

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.44

[Reserved]

§ 577.44[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.45

§ 577.45 Provision of Benefits

[1] Medical Treatment

[a] In General

An employer is required to provide an injured employee with all medical, surgical, chiropractic, acupuncture, and hospital treatment that is reasonably required to cure or relieve the injury [*Lab. Code § 4600(a)*]. In 2004, the legislature defined medical treatment "reasonably required to cure or relieve the injured worker from the effects of his or her injury" to mean treatment that is based on the guidelines adopted by the Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or, prior to the adoption of those guidelines, the updated American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines [*Lab. Code§ 4600(b)*]. SB 899, the bill that enacted these provisions [*see* Stats. 2004, ch. 34], also provided that the amendment, addition, or repeal of any law made by SB 899 applied prospectively from the date of SB 899's enactment (April 19, 2004), regardless of the date of injury [*see* Stats. 2004, ch. 34, § 47]. The court of appeal has held that this provision means that the ACOEM Guidelines apply to determine what is reasonable medical treatment in all cases in which no such determination had been made as of April 19, 2004. The court found that the medical treatment in the case before it was completed almost two months before enactment of SB 899 but that no determination of the reasonableness of that treatment was made until May 2005, when the WCJ found, per stipulation of the parties, that the value of the disputed chiropractic services was $6,430 and that the ACOEM Guidelines were not applicable to the case, following which the Appeals Board denied reconsideration. The court of appeal annulled the Board's decision and remanded the case for further proceedings [*Sierra Pacific Industries v. W.C.A.B. (Chatham) (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1498, 1505-1512, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 550]* .

The requirement to provide medical treatment includes provision of nursing, medicines, medical and surgical supplies, crutches, and apparatus, including orthotic and prosthetic devices and services [*Lab. Code § 4600(a)*]. Also included are the following:

- Services provided by licensed physical therapists, chiropractic practitioners, and acupuncturists [*Lab. Code § 3209.5*];

- Services of licensed marriage, family, and child counselors and clinical social workers, if the injured person is referred by a licensed physician and surgeon, with the approval of the employer, for treatment of a condition arising out of the injury [*Lab. Code § 3209.8*];

- Services provided by registered psychological assistants who meet the requirements set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2913* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 2913*; *Bergenstal v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1272, 1279-1280, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266]* ; and

- Any other form of therapy, treatment, or healing practice voluntarily agreed on in writing between the employer and employee [*Lab. Code § 3209.7*].

Within one working day after an employee files a claim form under *Lab. Code § 5401*, the employer must authorize the provision of all treatment, consistent with the medical treatment utilization schedule under *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, for the alleged injury and must continue to provide the treatment until the date that liability for the claim is accepted or rejected [*Lab. Code § 5402(c)*]. Until that date, liability for medical treatment is limited to $10,000 [*Lab. Code § 5402(c)*]. Treatment so provided does not give rise to a presumption of liability on the part of the employer [*Lab. Code § 5402(d)*].

An employer who neglects or refuses to promptly provide medical treatment benefits is liable for the reasonable expense incurred by or on behalf of the employee in providing treatment [*Lab. Code § 4600(a)*]. The requirement that the employer approve a licensed physician's referral of an employee to a licensed marriage, family, or child counselor or social worker does not preclude reimbursement for self-procured treatment that is found by the WCAB to be otherwise compensable, if the employer has refused to authorize any treatment for the condition arising from the injury that is treated by the counselor or social worker [*Lab. Code § 3209.8*].

Medical treatment may be provided by a state-licensed physician assistant or nurse practitioner, acting under the review or supervision of a physician and surgeon pursuant to standardized procedures or protocols within their lawfully authorized scope of practice. "Medical treatment" includes the authority of the nurse practitioner or physician assistant to authorize the patient to receive time off from work for a period not to exceed three calendar days if the authority is included in a standardized procedure or protocol approved by the supervising physician. The nurse practitioner or physician assistant may cosign the Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness. The treating physician, however, must make any determination of temporary disability and must sign the report [*Lab. Code § 3209.10*].

Provision of medical and hospital treatment benefits is governed by *Lab. Code § 4600 et seq.* [*see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9780 et seq.*]. In 1992, the Legislature enacted *Lab. Code § 4612*, which authorized the Administrative Director to implement a pilot project for a three-year period under which an employer participating in the project would be authorized to contract with a health care service plan to be the exclusive provider of medical, surgical, and hospital treatment for occupational and nonoccupational injuries and illnesses incurred by its employees. In 2001, the Legislature ended these pilot projects by repealing *Lab. Code § 4612* [*see* Stats. 2001, ch. 115 § 24].

If an employee has filed a claim form pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5401* (*discussed under § 577.42[2][b]*), a provider of medical services who has actual knowledge that a claim is pending is prohibited from collecting money directly from the employee for services to cure or relieve the effects of the injury for which the claim was filed, unless the medical provider receives written notice that the employer has rejected liability for the injury and provides the employee with a copy of this notice. A medical provider who violates this prohibition is liable for three times the amount unlawfully collected, plus reasonable attorney's fees and costs [*Lab. Code § 3751(b)*].

An employer may comply with the requirement to provide medical treatment to its industrially injured employees by

contracting with a health care organization certified by the administrative director to provide such medical treatment [*Lab. Code §§ 4600.3, 4600.5*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9779.3* (obligations of employer covered by contract with health care organization)].

Unless the employer or the employer's insurer has established a medical provider network, as provided for in *Lab. Code § 4616*, after 30 days from the date the injury is reported, the employee may be treated by a physician of his or her own choice or at a facility of his or her own choice within a reasonable geographic area [*Lab. Code § 4600(c)*].

If an employee has notified his or her employer in writing prior to the date of injury that he or she has a personal physician, the employee has the right to betreated by that physician from the date of injury, if the employer provides either non-occupational group health coverage in a health care service plan, licensed pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 1340 et seq.* (the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975) or non-occupational health coverage in a group health plan or a group health insurance policy as described in *Lab. Code § 4616.7* (medical provider networks) [*Lab. Code § 4600(d)(1)*; *see* [d], *below*].

A personal physician must be the employee's regular physician and surgeon, licensed pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2000 et seq.*, must be the employee's primary care physician who has previously directed the medical treatment of the employee and retains the employee's medical records, including his or her medical history, and must agree to be predesignated. "Personal physician" includes a medical group, if the medical group is a single corporation or partnership composed of licensed doctors of medicine or osteopathy, that operates an integrated multispecialty medical group providing comprehensive medical services predominantly for nonoccupational illnesses and injuries [*Lab. Code § 4600(d)(2)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9780(g)* ("primary care physician" defined)].

If the employer provides non-occupational health care pursuant to the Knox-Keene Act, and the employer is given timely written notice of the employee's personal physician, all medical treatment, utilization review of medical treatment, access to medical treatment, and other medical treatment issues are governed by the Knox-Keene Act. Disputes regarding the provision of medical treatment must be resolved pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 1374.30 et seq.* If the employer provides non-occupational health care, as described in *Lab. Code § 4616.7* (medical provider networks), all medical treatment, utilization review of medical treatment, access to medical treatment, and other medical treatment issues are governed by the applicable provisions of the Insurance Code [*Lab. Code § 4600(d)(3), (4)*].

The insurer may require prior authorization of any non-emergency treatment or diagnostic service and may conduct reasonably necessary utilization review pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* [*Lab. Code § 4600(d)(5)*].

An employee is entitled to all medically appropriate referrals by the personal physician to other physicians or medical providers within the non-occupational health plan. An employee is also entitled to treatment by physicians or other medical providers outside of the non-occupational health plan pursuant to standards established in *Health & Safety Code § 1367 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 4600(d)(6)*].

[b] Official Medical Fee Schedule; Contractual Fees

In 2003 the Legislature, seeking to control rising costs of medical treatment in the workers' compensation system, repealed former *Lab. Code § 5307.1*, which had authorized official medical fee schedules, and enacted a new *Lab. Code § 5307.1*, creating a different, and statutorily more complex, regime of official medical fee schedules [Stats. 2003, ch. 639, §§ 34, 35].

Under the new system, the Administrative Director, after public hearings, is required to adopt and revise periodically an official medical fee schedule that establishes reasonable maximum fees paid for medical services (*other than physician services*), drugs and pharmacy services, health care facility fees, home health care, and all other treatment, care, services, and goods described in *Lab. Code § 4600(a)* and provided pursuant to this new official medical fee schedule

statute [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.10-9789.111*]. Except for physician services, all fees are to be in accordance with the fee-related structure and rules of the relevant Medicare and Medi-Cal payment systems, provided that employer liability for medical treatment, including issues of reasonable ness, necessity, frequency, and duration, are to be determined in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4600* [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*].

Commencing January 1, 2004, and continuing until the time the Administrative Director adopted an official medical fee schedule in accordance with the fee-related structure and rules of the relevant Medicare payment systems, maximum reasonable fees were to be 120 percent of the estimated aggregate fees prescribed in the relevant Medicare payment system for the same class of services before application of inflation factors [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.20-9789.24* (inpatient hospital fee schedule, definitions, and payments for inpatient services); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.20(c), 9789.111(b)* (regulations effective for inpatient hospital admissions with dates of discharge on or after July 1, 2004, while services for discharges after January 1, 2004, but before July 1, 2004, governed by "emergency" regulations that were effective on January 2, 2004, with bills for services with date of admission on or before December 31, 2003, reimbursed in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.1*)]. Pharmacy services and drugs were to be subject to the requirements of this statute, whether furnished through a pharmacy or dispensed directly by the practitioner pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 4024(b)* [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*]. For pharmacy services and drugs that were not otherwise covered by a Medicare fee schedule payment for facility services, the maximum reasonable fees were 100 percent of fees prescribed in the relevant Medi-Cal payment system [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.40*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.111(d)* (regulation for pharmacy effective for services rendered after January 1, 2004)].

Within the limits provided by *Lab. Code § 5307.1*, the rates or fees established are to be adequate to ensure a reasonable standard of services and care for injuredemployees [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(f)*]. In order to comply with these standards, the Administrative Director may adopt different conversion factors, diagnostic-related group weights, and other factors affecting payment amounts from those used in the Medicare payment system, provided estimated aggregate fees do not exceed 120 percent of the estimated aggregate fees paid for the same class of services in the relevant Medicare payment system [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(b)*; *see, e.g., 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.23, 9789.24* (hospital composite factors and specific outlier factors, and diagnosis related groups, relative weights, and geometric length of stay)].

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the fee schedules statute, the maximum facility fee for services performed in an ambulatory surgical center, or in a hospital outpatient department, may not exceed 120 percent of the fee paid by Medicare for the same services performed in a hospital outpatient department [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(c)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.30-9789.38* (hospital outpatient departments and ambulatory surgical centers: definitions, adoption of standards, applicability of fee schedule, determination of maximum reasonable fee, election for high cost outlier, and federal Medicare regulations incorporated); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.32(a)* (regulations apply to maximum allowable fees for emergency room visits and surgical procedures rendered on or after July 1, 2004); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.111(c)* (services rendered after January 1, 2004, but before July 1, 2004, governed by "emergency" regulations that were effective on January 2, 2004)].

The Appeals Board en banc has held, pursuant to *Kunz* [*see* Kunz v. Patterson Floor Coverings, Inc. (2002) *67 Cal. Comp. Cases 1588, 1598-1599 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* , that an outpatient surgery center lien claimant (or any medical lien claimant) has the burden of proving that its charges are reasonable. Moreover, held the Board, the outpatient surgery center lien claimant's billing, by itself, does not establish that the claimed fee is reasonable, so that, even in the absence of rebuttal evidence, a lien need not be allowed in full if it is unreasonable on its face. Any evidence relevant to reasonableness may be offered to support or rebut the lien. That evidence is not limited to fees accepted by other outpatient surgery centers in the same geographic area for services provided. In the case before the Board, the employee underwent surgery on her right wrist at the lien claimant's facility on April 9, 2002, for which the lien claimant billed $23,529, of which the employer had paid $1,667.66, leaving a claimed balance of $21,861.34. At the lien trial, the lien claimant offered no evidence that its billed amount was reasonable. The employer presented extensive rebuttal evidence that the billed amount was *not* reasonable, including evidence that the Official Medical Fee Schedule

for *inpatient* providers of the same services in the geographical area of the lien claimant would be $5,690.80, and that *Lab. Code § 5307.1(c)* and the Official Medical Fee Schedule pertaining to outpatient surgery center fees, which went into effect on January 1, 2004, i.e., after the date on which the lien claimant provided its services, would allow $1,770.34 as a reasonable fee. The Board found that this statute and fee schedule provided some measure of reasonableness, when considered in light of the evidence presented [Tapia v. Skill Master Staffing (2008) 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1338, 1342-1346 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] .

If the Administrative Director determines that a medical treatment, facility use, product, or service is not covered by a Medicare payment system, the Director is to establish maximum fees for that item, provided that the maximum fee paid is not to exceed 120 percent of the fees paid by Medicare for services that require comparable resources. If the Director determines that a pharmacy service or drug is not covered by a Medi-Cal payment system, the Director is to establish maximum fees for that item, provided, however, that the maximum fee paid is not to exceed 100 percent of the fees paid by Medi-Cal for pharmacy services or drugs that require comparable resources [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(d)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.50, 9789.60, 9789.70* (maximum reasonable fees for pathology and laboratory services, durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, miscellaneous supplies and services, and ambulance services); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.111(e), (f), (g)* (regulations for pathology and laboratory, durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies, and ambulance services effective for services rendered after January 1, 2004)].

Prior to the adoption by the Administrative Director of a medical fee schedule pursuant to the fee schedules statute, for any treatment, facility use, product, or service not covered by a Medicare payment system, including acupuncture services, or, with regard to pharmacy services and drugs, for a pharmacy service or drug that is not covered by a Medi-Cal payment system, the maximum reasonable fee paid was not to exceed the fee specified in the official medical fee schedule in effect on December 31, 2003 [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(e)*].

The official medical fee schedule is to be adjusted to conform to any relevant changes in the Medicare and Medi-Cal payment systems no later than 60 days after the effective date of those changes, providing various, specified conditions are met [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(g)(1)*; *see Lab. Code § 5307.1(g)(2)* (duties of Administrative Director with respect to changes in fee schedule); *Lab. Code § 5307.1(g)(3)* (definitions of terms relevant tochanges in fee schedule); *see, e.g., 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.20(d)* (inpatient hospital fee schedule to be adjusted to conform to relevant changes in Medicare payment schedule within 60 days); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.36* (regulations governing hospital outpatient departments and ambulatory surgical centers to be adjusted to conform to relevant changes in Medicare payment system); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.110* (update of regulations to reflect changes in Medicare payment system)].

Nothing in *Lab. Code § 5307.1* is to prohibit an employer or insurer from contracting with a medical provider for reimbursement rates different from those prescribed in the official medical fee schedule [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(h)*; *see also Lab. Code § 5307.11* (discussed below)].

Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 4626*, the official medical fee schedule does not apply to medical-legal expenses, as that term is defined by *Lab. Code § 4620* [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(i)*].

The following Medicare payment system components became part of the official medical fee schedule only on January 1, 2005 [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(j)*]:

- Inpatient skilled nursing facility care.

- Home health agency services.

- Inpatient services furnished by hospitals that are exempt from the prospective payment system for general acute care hospitals.

- Outpatient renal dialysis services.

Notwithstanding the provisions of *Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*, for the calendar years 2004 and 2005, the existing official medical fee schedule rates for physician services were to remain in effect, but these rates were to be reduced by five percent. The Administrative Director could reduce fees of individual procedures by different amounts, but in no event was the Director to reduce the fee for a procedure that was currently reimbursed at a rate at or below the Medicare rate for the same procedure [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(k)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.10, 9789.11* ("physician services" defined and payment rates set forth); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.111(a)* (regulations for physician services effective for services rendered on or after July 1, 2004, with services rendered after January 1, 2004, but before July 1, 2004, governed by "emergency" regulations that were effective on January 2, 2004). The Administrative Director's reduction of the maximum allowable reimbursement amount is set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.11(b)*, and three tables of physician services fees (one for services rendered between July 1, 2004, and January 13, 2005, inclusive, one for services rendered between January 14, 2005, and May 13, 2005, inclusive, and one for services rendered on or after May 14, 2005), all of which set forth each individual procedure code with its corresponding relative value, conversion factor, percentage reduction calculation, and maximum reimbursable fee, are incorporated by reference in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.11(c)*. The tables ("Table A") may be obtained from the Division of Workers' Compensation website: www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/OMFS9904.htm].

Also notwithstanding the provisions of *Lab. Code § 5307.1(a)*, the Administrative Director, commencing January 1, 2006, is to have the authority, after public hearings, to adopt and revise, no less frequently than biennially, an official medical fee schedule for physician services. If the Director fails to adopt an official medical fee schedule for physician services by January 1, 2006, the existing official medical fee schedule rates for physician services is to remain in effect until a new schedule is adopted or the existing schedule is revised [*Lab. Code § 5307.1(l)*].

The Administrative Director is required to contract with an independent consulting firm to analyze whether there is adequate access to quality health care and products for injured workers. If the Director determines that there is insufficient access, he or she may make appropriate adjustments to medical and facilities' fees. When there has been a determination that substantial access problems exist, the Director may, in accordance with the notification and hearing requirements of *Lab. Code § 5307.1*, adopt fees in excess of 120 percent of the applicable Medicare payment system fee for the applicable services or products [*Lab. Code § 5307.2*].

The Official Medical Fee Schedule applies to all covered medical services provided, referred, or prescribed by physicians, as defined in *Lab. Code § 3209.3*, regardless of the type of facility in which the medical services are performed, including clinic and hospital-based physicians working on a contract basis. The schedule does not apply to inpatient medical services provided by employees of a health facility [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9790.1* ("inpatient," "health facility," and "medical services" defined); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.1* (reimbursement for inpatient medical services)], medical-legal expenses authorized under *Lab. Code § 4621*, and medical expenses payable pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795*. Nothing in the schedule precludes any hospital, as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 1250*, from charging and collecting a facility fee for the use of its emergency or operating rooms [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9791*]. The report of the primary treating physician is payable in accordance with the schedule [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785(i)*].

The schedule consists of the procedures, procedure numbers, descriptions, instructions, and unit values adopted by the Administrative Director, effective January 1, 1994 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9791.1*]. For services provided on or after January 1, 1994, the conversion factors to be applied to unit values in the schedule are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792*].

A health care provider or health facility licensed pursuant to *Health and Safety Code § 1250*, and a contracting agent, employer, or carrier may contract for reimbursement rates different from those in the fee schedule adopted and revised pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.1*. In the event of such a contract, the medical fee schedule does not apply to the contracted reimbursement rates. Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 5307.1(b)*, the official medical fee schedule

establishes maximum reimbursement rates for all medical services for injuries provided by a health care provider or health care facility, other than those specified in contracts subject to this statute [*Lab. Code § 5307.11*].

Payment of physicians by employers, requirements governing the review of physicians' submitted bills, disputes regarding payments, and penalties and liabilities for late payments are governed by statute [*see Lab. Code § 4603.2*].

[c] Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule and Utilization Review Process

As required by statute [*see Lab. Code § 5307.27*], the Administrative Director, in consultation with the Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation, has adopted, after public hearings, a medical treatment utilization schedule [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9792.20*-9792.23]. This schedule incorporates the evidence-based, peer-reviewed, nationally recognized standards of care recommended by the Commission pursuant to *Lab. Code § 77.5*, and it addresses, the frequency, duration, intensity, and appropriateness of all treatment procedures and modalities commonly performed in workers' compensation cases [*Lab. Code § 5307.27*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.20 (d), (j), (I), (k)* (defining, respectively, "evidence-based," "peer reviewed," "nationally recognized," "scientifically based")].

Upon adoption of this schedule by the Director, the recommended guidelines set forth in it are presumptively correct on the issue of extent and scope of medical treatment and diagnostic services addressed in the schedule for the duration of the medical condition [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(a)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.22(a)]. The presumption, which is a presumption affecting the burden of proof, is rebuttable and may be controverted by a preponderance of the scientific medical evidence establishing that a variance from the guidelines is reasonably required to cure or relieve the injured worker from the effects of his or her injury [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(a)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.22(a)]. These recommended guidelines reflect practices that are evidence- and scientifically based, nationally recognized, and peer-reviewed [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(b)*]. Moreover, they are designed to assist providers by offering an analytical framework for the evaluation and treatment of injured workers and to help those who make decisions regarding the medical treatment of injured workers understand what treatment has been proven effective in providing the best medical outcomes to those workers, in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4600* [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(b)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.21(b)].

The Administrative Director has adopted and incorporated by reference the following medical treatment guidelines into the medical treatment utilization schedule [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.21(a)*]:

1. The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines (ACOEM Practice Guidelines), Second Edition (2004) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.20(b)* ("ACOEM Practice Guidelines" defined), (g) ("medical treatment guidelines" defined)].

2. Acupuncture medical treatment guidelines, which supersede the ACOEM Practice Guidelines, Second Edition, relating to acupuncture, except for shoulder complaints [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.21(a)(2)* (details regarding permitted acupuncture treatment)].

Notwithstanding the medical treatment utilization schedule or the guidelines set forth in the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 2004, an employee is entitled to no more than 24 chiropractic, 24 occupational therapy, and 24 physical therapy visits per industrial injury [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(d)(1)*]. These limitations of *Lab. Code § 4604.5(d)(1)* do not apply when an employer authorizes, in writing, additional visits to a health care practitioner for physical medicine services [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(d)(2)*].

The court of appeal has upheld the constitutionality of *Lab. Code § 4604.5(d)*'s limitation to 24 chiropractic treatment visits per industrial injury. The court found that *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, vested the legislature with "plenary power" to create a "complete system of workers' compensation." This grant of power, the court noted, neither restricted the

legislature's ability to limit the number of chiropractic treatments for which the workers' compensation system must be financially responsible nor expanded an injured worker's constitutional rights to include entitlement to receive unlimited treatments. Moreover, the statutory exception allowing an employer to authorize chiropractic services in excess of 24 treatments did not constitute an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power, and, because an employer's decision to remove the 24-visit cap was not tethered to any factual or legal dispute requiring adjudication, due process under either the state or the federal constitution was not implicated. Finally, because the legislature's decision to reduce the unlimited availability of chiropractic treatments was rationally related to alleviating the perceived crisis in skyrocketing workers' compensation costs, the employee's rights to equal protection of the law were not violated [*Facundo-Guerrero v. W.C.A.B. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 640, 646-656, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731]* .

For all conditions or injuries not addressed by the medical treatment utilization schedule, authorized treatment and diagnostic services are to be in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines generally recognized by the national medical community and that are scientifically based [*Lab. Code § 4604.5(e)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9792.8(a)(2), 9792.22(b); *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.22(c)* (for conditions or injuries not otherwise covered by medical treatment utilization schedule)]. Treatment may not be denied on the sole basis that the condition or injury is not addressed by the medical treatment utilization schedule. In this situation, the claims administrator must authorize treatment if such treatment is in accordance with other scientifically and evidence-based, peer-reviewed, medical treatment guidelines that are nationally recognized by the medical community, in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.22(b), (c)*, and pursuant to the utilization review standards in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9792.6*-9792.10 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.21(c)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.23* (creation of medical evidence evaluation advisory committee to provide recommendations on matters concerning medical treatment utilization schedule)].

In addition to having created the medical treatment utilization schedule, discussed *above*, the legislature has mandated that every employer establish a utilization review process in compliance with *Lab. Code § 4610*, either directly or through its insurer or an entity with which an employer or insurer contracts for these services [*Lab. Code § 4610(b)*]. For purposes of this statute, "utilization review" means utilization review or utilization management functions that prospectively, retrospectively, or concurrently review and approve, modify, delay, or deny, based in whole or in part on medical necessity to cure and relieve, treatment recommendations by physicians, as defined in *Lab. Code § 3209.3*, prior to, retrospectively, or concurrent with the provision of medical treatment services pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4600* [*Lab. Code § 4610(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(s)* (utilization review does not include determinations of work-relatedness of injury or disease, or bill review for purpose of determining whether medical services were accurately billed)].

Each utilization review process is to be governed by written policies and procedures, which must ensure that decisions based on the medical necessity to cure and relieve of proposed medical treatment services are consistent with the schedule for medical treatment utilization adopted pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* [*Lab. Code § 4610(c)*; *see above*]. Prior to adoption of that schedule, these policies and procedures are to be consistent with the recommended standards set forth in the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational and Environmental Medical Practice Guidelines [*Lab. Code § 4610(c)*; *see above*]. These policies and procedures, and a description of the utilization process, must be filed with the Administrative Director and disclosed by the employer to employees, physicians, and the public upon request [*Lab. Code § 4610(c)*. Upon request by the public, the claims administrator must make available the complete utilization review plan, consisting of the policies and procedures, and a description of the utilization review process. The claims administrator may make these available through electronic means. If a member of the public requests a hard copy of the utilization review plan, the claims administrator may charge reasonable copying and postage expenses related to disclosing the complete utilization review plan. Such charge must not exceed $0.25 per page plus actual postage costs. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(d)*].

The regulations adopted pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* provide that the utilization review process is to cover treatment rendered on or after January 1, 2004, regardless of date of injury, and that each utilization review process is to be set forth in a utilization review plan that must contain [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(r)*

("utilization review plan" means written plan filed with Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610*, setting forth policies and procedures and description of utilization process)]:

1. The name, address, phone number, and medical license number of the employed or designated medical director, who holds an unrestricted license to practice medicine in California issued pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 2050* or *2450*.

2. A description of the process whereby requests for authorization are reviewed, and decisions on such requests are made, and a description of the process for handling expedited reviews [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(o)*] ("request for authorization" means written confirmation of oral request for specific course of proposed medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610(h)* or written request for specific course of proposed medical treatment; oral request for authorization must be followed by written confirmation of request within 72 hours, and both written confirmation of oral request and written request must be set forth on "Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness," Form DLSR 5021 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 14006*] or on Primary Treating PhysicianProgress Report, DWC Form PR-2, in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785.2*, or in narrative form containing same information required in PR-2 form, and, if narrative format is used, document must be clearly marked at top that it is request for authorization); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(b)* ("authorization" means assurance that appropriate reimbursement will be made for approved specific course of proposed medical treatment to cure or relieve effects of industrial injury pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4600*, subject to provisions of *Lab. Code § 5402*); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(g)* ("expedited review" means utilization review conducted when injured worker's condition is such that he or she faces imminent and serious threat to his or her health, including, but not limited to, potential loss of life, limb, or other major bodily function, or when normal time frame for decision-making process would be detrimental to injured worker's life or health or could jeopardize his or her permanent ability to regain maximum function)].

3. A description of the specific criteria utilized routinely in the review and throughout the decision-making process, including treatment protocols or standards used in the process. A description of the personnel and other sources used in the development and review of the criteria, and methods for updating the criteria.

4. A description of the qualifications and functions of the personnel involved in decision-making and implementation of the utilization review plan.

5. A description of the claims administrator's practice, if applicable, of any prior authorization process, including but not limited to, when authorization is provided without the submission of the request for authorization.

The complete utilization review plan, consisting of the policies and procedures, and a description of the utilization review process, must be filed by the claims administrator, or by the external utilization review organization contracted by the claims administrator to perform the utilization review, with the Administrative Director. In lieu of filing the utilization review plan, the claims administrator may submit a letter identifying the external utilization review organization contracted to perform the utilization review functions, provided that the utilization review organization has filed a complete utilization review plan with the Administrative Director. A modified utilization review plan must be filed with the Administrative Director within 30 calendar days after the claims administrator makes a material modification to the plan [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(c)*].

If an employer, insurer, or other entity requests medical information from a physician in order to determine whether to approve, modify, delay, or deny requests for authorization, the employer is to request only the information reasonably necessary to make the determination [*Lab. Code § 4610(d)*]. The employer, insurer, or other entity must employ or

designatea medical director who holds an unrestricted California license to practice medicine, who is to ensure that the process by which the employer or other entity reviews and approves, modifies, delays, or denies requests by physicians prior to, retrospectively, or concurrent with the provision of medical treatment services, complies with statutory and regulatory requirements [*Lab. Code § 4610(d)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(b)(1)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(c)* ("claims administrator" is self-administered workers' compensation insurer, insured employer, self-administered self-insured employer, self-administered legally uninsured employer, self-administered joint powers authority, third-party claims administrator, or other entity subject to *Lab. Code § 4610*; claims administrator may utilize entity contracted to conduct its utilization review responsibilities); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(n)* ("prospective review" means any utilization review conducted, except for utilization review conducted during inpatient stay, prior to delivery of requested medical services); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(p)* ("retrospective review" means utilization review conducted after medical services have been provided and for which approval has not already been given); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(d)* ("concurrent review" means utilization review conducted during inpatient stay)]. No person other than a licensed physician who is competent to evaluate the specific clinical issues involved in the medical treatment services (and when these services are within the scope of the physician's practice) requested by the physician may modify, delay, or deny requests for authorization of medical treatment for reasons of medical necessity to cure and relieve [*Lab. Code § 4610(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(b)(2)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9(f)*]. The only exception to this rule is that a non-physician reviewer may be used to initially apply specified criteria to requests for authorization for medical services. A non-physician reviewer may approve requests for authorization of medical services. A non-physician reviewer may discuss applicable criteria with the requesting physician, should the treatment for which authorization is sought appear to be inconsistent with the criteria. In such instances, the requesting physician may voluntarily withdraw a portion or all of the treatment in question and submit an amended request for treatment authorization, and the non-physician reviewer may approve the amended request for treatment authorization. Additionally, a non-physician reviewer may reasonably request appropriate additional information that is necessary to render a decision, but in no event may this process exceed the time limitations imposed by the regulations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(b)(3)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9(b)(1), (b)(2), (c)* (utilization review process time frame requirements). Any time beyond the time specified in these paragraphs is subject to the provisions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9(g)(1)(A)-(C)* (grounds for extending time frames). *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.7(b)(3).* For a full discussion of utilization review process time frames, *see below*].

Regardless of whether an employer has established a medical provider network or entered into a contract with a health care organization, an employer that authorizes medical treatment may not rescind or modify that authorization after the medical treatment has been provided based on that authorization for any reason, including, but not limited to, the employer's subsequent determination that the physician who provided the treatment was not eligible to treat that injured employee. If the authorized medical treatment consists of a series of treatments or services, the employer may rescind or modify the authorization only for the treatments or services that have not already been provided [*Lab. Code § 4610.3(a)*].

The coverage of this statute has been restricted in the following ways [*Lab. Code § 4610.3(b)-(d)*]:

> 1. The statute is not to be construed to expand or alter the benefits available under, or the terms and conditions of, any contract, including, but not limited to, existing medical provider network and health care organization contracts.
>
> 2. The statute is not to be construed to impact the ability of the employer to transfer treatment of an injured employee into a medical provider network or health care organization. This statement is declaratory of existing law.
>
> 3. The statute is not to be construed to establish that a provider of authorized medical treatment is the physician primarily responsible for managing the injured employee's care for purposes of rendering opinions on all medical issues necessary to determine eligibility for compensation.

The statute spells out the criteria or guidelines to be used in the utilization review process to determine whether to approve, modify, delay, or deny medical treatment services [*see Lab. Code § 4610(f)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.8(a)(2), (3)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9(a), (j)*]. Similarly, the statute sets forth the requirements that must be met in determining whether to approve, modify, delay, or deny requests by physicians prior to, retrospectively, or concurrent with the provisions of medical treatment services to employees [*see Lab. Code § 4610(g)*; *§ 9792.9(b)(2), (3),* (c), *(e), (g)(2), (3), (4), (j), (k), (l)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(o)*].

Every employer, insurer, or other entity subject to this statute must maintain telephone access for physicians to request authorization for health care services [*Lab. Code § 4610(h)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9(h)*].

If the request for authorization of medical treatment is not approved, or if the request for authorization for medical treatment is approved in part, any dispute must be resolved in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4062* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.10(a)(1)*]. An objection to a decision disapproving in whole or in part a request for authorization of medical treatment must be communicated to the claims administrator by the injured worker or the injured worker's attorney in writing within 20 days of receipt of the utilization review decision. The 20-day time limit may be extended for good cause or by mutual agreement of the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.10(a)(2)*]. Nothing in the regulation precludes the parties from participating in an internal utilization review appeal process on a voluntary basis, provided the injured worker and, if the injured worker is represented by counsel, the injured worker's attorney have been notified of the 20-day time limit to file an objection to the utilization review decision in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4062* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.10(a)(3)*]. Additionally, the injured worker or the injured worker's attorney may file an Application for Adjudication of Claim, and a Request for Expedited Hearing, DWC Form 4, in accordance with the relevant regulations [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10252(b)(1), 10400, 10408* (requests for expedited hearings)] and request an expedited hearing and decision on his or her entitlement to medical treatment, if the request for medical treatment is not authorized within the time limitations set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.9*, or when there exists a bona fide dispute as to entitlement to medical treatment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.10(a)(4)*].

The Appeals Board en banc has held that the utilization review time deadlines of *Lab. Code § 4610(g)(1)* are mandatory. A defendant that fails to meet the mandatory deadlines is precluded from using the utilization review procedure. If a defendant undertakes an untimely utilization review procedure, any report it obtains is not admissible in evidence with respect to the particular medical treatment dispute in question, and any report it obtains cannot be forwarded to an AME or QME if *Lab. Code § 4062(a)* procedures are timely pursued [Sandhagen v. Cox & Cox Construction, Inc. (2004) 69 Cal. Comp. Cases 1452, 1456-1460 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] .

The Supreme Court has held that, when deciding whether to approve or deny an injured employee's request for medical treatment, the employer must conduct utilization review pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* and that the employer may not, as an alternative to utilization review, elect to dispute the request for medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062*. The latter statute, said the Court, permits only *employees* to use its provisions to object to employers' decisions regarding treatment requests. The Court found that the legislature's intent regarding employers' use of *Lab. Code § 4062* to dispute treatment requests "could not be more clear," and that the historical evolution of treatment request and review processes, as exemplified by omnibus reforms enacted in SB 228, effective January 1, 2004, and SB 899, effective April 19, 2004, further demonstrates the legislature's intent that *Lab. Code § 4610* govern employers' review [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 230, 233-234, 236-237, 239-245, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171, 186 P.3d 535]* .

The following requirements must be met prior to a concurrent review decision to deny authorization for medical treatment and to resolve disputes [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.10(b)*]:

> 1. In the case of concurrent review, medical care may not be discontinued until the requesting physician has been notified of the decision and a care plan has been agreed on by the requesting physician that is

appropriate for the medical needs of the injured employee. In addition, the non-physician provider of goods or services identified in the request for authorization, and for whom contact information has been included, must be notified in writing of the decision modifying, delaying, or denying a request for authorization that is not to include the rationale, criteria, or guidelines used for the decision.

2. Medical care provided during a concurrent review must be medical treatment that is reasonably required to cure or relieve from the effects of the industrial injury.

The statute establishes procedures by which the Administrative Director is authorized to assess administrative penalties for failures by an employer, insurer, or other entity subject to the statute to meet any requirement under it [*Lab. Code § 4610(i)*] These administrative penalties are not deemed to be an exclusive remedy for the Administrative Director [*Lab. Code § 4610(i)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.11(b)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9792.12*-9792.15 (administrative penalties)].

An employee is not entitled to an increase in compensation under *Lab. Code § 5814* for unreasonable delay in the provision of medical treatment for periods of time necessary to complete the utilization review process in compliance with *Lab. Code § 4610* [*Lab. Code § 4610.1*]. An increase under *Lab. Code § 5814* is appropriate, however, when an employer has unreasonably delayed or denied medical treatment due to an unreasonable delay in completion of the utilization review process set forth in *Lab. Code § 4610* [*Lab. Code § 4610.1*].

[d] Medical Provider Networks

[i] Creation and Approval of Medical Provider Network

In 2004, the legislature created medical provider networks as part of the year's major changes in workers' compensation law. The statutory scheme provides that as of January 1, 2005, an insurer or employer (for purposes of the medical provider networks statutes, "employer" means a self-insured employer, the Self-Insurer's Security Fund, a group of self-insured employers pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3700(b)* and as defined by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 15201(s)*, a joint powers authority, or the state) [*Lab. Code § 4616.5*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.1(a)(7)*] may establish or modify a medical provider network for the provision of medical treatment to injured employees [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(1)*]. The network must include physicians primarily engaged in the treatment of occupational injuries and physicians primarily engaged in the treatment of nonoccupational injuries, with the goal being at least 25 percent of physicians primarily engaged in the treatment of nonoccupational injuries [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(1)*]. The Administrative Director is instructed to encourage the integration of occupational and nonoccupational providers [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(1)*]. The number of physicians in the medical provider network must be sufficient to enable treatment for injuries or conditions to be provided in a timely manner [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(1)*]. Moreover, the provider network is required to include an adequate number and type of physicians, as described in *Lab. Code § 3209.3*, or other providers, as described in *Lab. Code § 3209.5*, to treat common injuries experienced by injured employees, based on the type of occupation or industry in which the employee is engaged, and the geographic area where the employees are employed [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(1)*].

Medical treatment for injuries must be readily available at reasonable times to all employees [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(2)*]. With respect to availability and accessibility of treatment, the Administrative Director is instructed to consider the needs of rural areas, specifically those in which health facilities are located at least 30 miles apart [*Lab. Code § 4616(a)(2)*].

The Administrative Director has considered the needs of rural areas in the regulation promulgated on the subject of access standards for medical provider networks [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5*]. A medical provider network must have at least three physicians of each specialty expected to treat common injuries experienced by injured employees based on the type of occupation or industry in which the employee is engaged and within the access standards provided in the regulation. In addition, a medical provider network must have a primary care physician and a hospital for emergency health care services or if separate from such a hospital, a provider of all emergency health care services, within 30

minutes or 15 miles of each covered employee's residence or workplace. Finally, a medical provider network must have providers of occupational health services and specialists within 60 minutes or 30 miles of a covered employee's residence or workplace [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(a)-(c)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(d)* (alternative standards of accessibility)].

The medical provider network must have a written policy for arranging or approving non-emergency medical care for: (1) an employee authorized by the employer to temporarily work or travel for work outside the service area when the need for medical care arises; (2) a former employee whose employer has ongoing workers' compensation obligations and who permanently resides outside the service area; and (3) an injured employee who decides to temporarily reside outside the service area during recovery. This policy must provide such employees with the choice of at least three physicians outside the service area who either have been referred by the employee's primary treating physician within the medical provider network or have been selected by the employer. In addition to physicians within the network, the employee may change physicians among the referred physicians and may obtain a second and a third opinion from the referred physicians. The referred physicians must be located within the access standards described above. Nothing in this paragraph precludes an employer from having a written policy that allows an employee outside the service area to choose his or her own provider for non-emergency medical care [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(e)*].

For non-emergency services, the medical provider network must ensure that an appointment for initial treatment is available within three business days of receipt of a request for treatment within the network. For non-emergency specialist services to treat common injuries experienced by the covered employees based on the type of occupation or industry in which the employee is engaged, the medical provider network must ensure that an appointment is available within 20 business days of receipt of a referral to a specialist within the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(f), (g)*].

If the primary treating physician refers the employee to a type of specialist not included in the medical provider network, the employee may select a specialist from outside the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(h)*].

The employer must have a written policy to allow an injured employee to receive emergency health care services from a medical service or hospital provider who is not a member of the medical provider network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5(i)*].

To create a medical provider network, the employer or insurer must submit a plan to the Administrative Director for approval, which the Administrative Director must give if he or she determines that it meets the statutory requirements [*Lab. Code § 4616(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9767.2-9767.4, 9767.13*]. If the Administrative Director does not act on the plan within 60 days of its submission, it will be deemed approved [*Lab. Code § 4616(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.2(a)*]. The plan cannot structure physician compensation in order to achieve the goal of reducing, delaying, or denying medical treatment or restricting access to medical treatment [*Lab. Code § 4616(c)*]. However, if the employer or insurer meets the statutory requirements, the Administrative Director may not withhold approval or disapprove an employer's or insurer's medical provider network based solely on the selection of providers [*Lab. Code § 4616(d)*]. (The statutes and regulations specify requirements for approval of a health care organization certified pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4600.5*, a health care service plan licensed pursuant to the Knox-Keene Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, and a group disability insurance policy as defined in *Ins. Code § 106(b)* as a medical provider network. *Lab. Code § 4616.7(a)-(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.3*. Any Taft-Hartley health and welfare fund is deemed approved for purposes of these statutes if it has a reasonable number of physicians with competency in occupational medicine, as determined by the Administrative Director. *Lab. Code § 4616.7(d)*.) In developing a medical provider network, an employer or insurer has the exclusive right to determine the members of the network [*Lab. Code § 4616(d)*].

All treatment provided by members of the network must be in accordance with the medical treatment utilization schedule established pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupational Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, as appropriate [*Lab. Code § 4616(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6*]. No person other than a licensed physician who is competent to evaluate the specific clinical issues involved in the medical

treatment services, when these services are within the scope of the physician's practice, may modify, delay, or deny requests for authorization of medical treatment [*Lab. Code § 4616(f)*].

In one case, the court of appeal held that the defendant, State Compensation Insurance Fund (SCIF), had denied the plaintiff, Palm Medical Group (Palm), admission into its preferred provider network in violation of the common-law fair procedure doctrine. The court found that the record included ample evidence to support the jury's finding that SCIF "possessed power so substantial over the market for the treatment of occupational injuries in the Fresno area in 2001-2002 that the failure to admit an ordinary, competent medical provider to its [PPN] would significantly impair that provider's ability to practice occupational medicine in the Fresno area" and, therefore, that SCIF owed Palm a duty of fair procedure in acting on its application to SCIF's preferred provider network. According to Palm's salespeople, approximately six of every 10 businesses solicited in Fresno were insured by SCIF. Also, in 2002, 61 percent of the total written premiums received by SCIF in Fresno County came from employers participating in its preferred provider network program. In July 2002 SCIF informed Palm that it had "significant concerns with [Palm's] prior and current performance and [could not] consider them for admission into the PPN at [that] time." The court stated that the common-law doctrine of fair procedure protects against arbitrary decisions by private organizations, including decisions to expel or exclude qualified persons without acting in a manner that is substantively rational and procedurally fair, that the doctrine applies primarily to decisions affecting membership in private organizations that affect the public interest, particularly when there are "substantial economic ramifications" from exclusion, and that the obligation to comply with the common-law right to fair procedure arises only when an organization, such as SCIF, possesses power so substantial that denial of membership significantly impairs the ability of an ordinary, competent physician to practice medicine o r a medical specialty in a particular geographic area, thereby affecting an important, substantial economic interest. The court concluded that the jury properly awarded Palm $1,131,000 in damages, but that Palm was not entitled to an injunction compelling its admission to SCIF's preferred provider network since that network has been replaced by a medical provider network, of which Palm was a member [*Palm Medical Group, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 206, 210, 218-228, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 266*].

[ii] Economic Profiling of Providers

The medical provider network statutes and regulations speak in terms of "economic profiling," which they define as any evaluation of a particular physician, provider, medical group, or individual practice association based in whole or in part on the economic costs or utilization of services associated with medical care provided or authorized by that person or entity [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.1(a)(5)*]. An insurer or employer that offers a medical provider network and that uses economic profiling must file with the Administrative Director a description of any policies and procedures related to the economic profiling being utilized [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(a)*]. The filing must describe how these policies and procedures are used in utilization review, peer review, incentive and penalty programs, and in provider retention and termination decisions [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.11*]. The insurer or employer must provide a copy of the filing to an individual physician, provider, medical group, or individual practice association [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(a)*]. The Administrative Director is required to make each insurer's or employer's filing available to the public upon request [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(b)*]. However, the Administrative Director may not publicly disclose any information determined by him or her to be confidential pursuant to state or federal law [*Lab. Code § 4616.1(b)*].

[iii] Continuity of Care and Completion of Treatment by Terminated Providers

An insurer or employer that offers a medical provider network plan must notify each employee in writing about the use of the network, 30 days prior to the implementation of an approved network, at the time of hire, or when an existing employee transfers into the network, whichever is appropriate to ensure that the employee has received the initial notification. The notification must also be sent to an employee at the time of injury. The notification(s) must be written in English and Spanish. The initial written notification is to include the following information [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.12(a)*]:

1. How to contact the person designated by the insurer or employer to be the network contact for employees. The employer or insurer must provide a toll free telephone number if the network's service area includes more than one area code.

2. A description of network services.

3. How to review, receive, or access the network provider directory. Nothing precludes an insurer or employer from initially providing employees with a regional area listing of network providers in addition to maintaining and making available its complete provider listing in writing. If the provider directory is also accessible on a website, the URL address must be listed.

4. How to access initial care and subsequent care, and what the access standards are under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5*.

5. How to access treatment if: (1) the employee is authorized by the employer to temporarily work or travel for work outside the network's geographical service area: (2) a former employee whose employer has ongoing workers' compensation obligations permanently resides outside the service area; and (3) an injured employee decides to temporarily reside outside the service area during recovery.

6. How to choose a physician within the network.

7. What to do if an employee has trouble getting an appointment with a provider within the network.

8. How to change a physician within the network.

9. How to obtain a referral to a specialist within the network or outside the network, if needed.

10. How to use the second and third opinion process.

11. How to request and receive an independent medical review.

12. A description of the standards for transfer of ongoing care into the network and a notification that a copy of the policy must be provided to an employee upon request.

13. A description of the continuity of care policy and a notification that a copy of the policy must be provided to an employee upon request.

At the time of the selection of the physician for a third opinion, the employee must be notified about the Independent Medical Review process. This notification must be written in English and Spanish [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.12(b)*; *see* [iv], [v], *below*].

Employees must be notified 30 days prior to a change of the medical provider network. If the network operator is an insurer, a copy of the notification must be served on the insured employer. This notification must be written in English and Spanish [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.12(c)*].

An insurer or employer that arranges for care for injured employees through a medical provider network must file a written continuity of care policy with the Administrative Director for approval [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(a)*]. Similarly, any revision of the continuity of care policy must be filed for approval if it makes a material change to the policy [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(b)*]. In addition, the insurer or employer must provide to all employees entering the workers' compensation system notice of its written continuity of care policy and information regarding the process for an

employee to request a review under the policy, and must provide, on request, a copy of the written policy to an employee [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(c)*].

If the employee's injury or illness does not meet the conditions set forth in items 1-4 in the list below, the employee may be transferred into the network for medical treatment. Until the injured employee is transferred into the network, the employee's physician may make referrals to providers within or outside the network. Nothing in this regulation precludes an insurer or employer from agreeing to provide medical care with providers outside of the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(a)-(c)*].

If an employee is being treated for an occupational injury or illness by a physician or provider prior to coverage of a medical provider network, and the employee's physician or provider becomes a provider within the network that applies to the employee, the insurer or employer must inform the employee and his or her physician or provider that his or her treatment is being provided by his or her physician or provider under the provisions of the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(d)*].

The insurer or employer must provide for the completion of treatment for employees who are being treated outside of the network for an occupational injury or illness that occurred prior to the coverage of the network and whose treating physician is not a provider within the network, including employees who pre-designated a physician and do not fall within *Lab. Code § 4600(d)*, for the following conditions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(e)*]:

> 1. An acute condition. For purposes of this regulation, an acute condition is a medical condition that involves a sudden onset of symptoms due to an illness, injury, or other medical problem that requires prompt medical attention and that has a duration of less than 90 days. Completion of treatment must be provided for the duration of the acute condition.
>
> 2. A serious chronic condition. For purposes of this regulation, a serious chronic condition is a medical condition due to a disease, illness, catastrophic injury, or other medical problem or medical disorder that is serious in nature and that persists without full cure or worsens over 90 days and requires ongoing treatment to maintain remission or prevent deterioration. Completion of treatment must be provided for a period of time necessary, up to one year: (A) to complete a course of treatment approved by the employer or insurer; and (B) to arrange for transfer to another provider within the network, as determined by the insurer or employer. The one-year period for completion of treatment starts from the date of the injured employee's receipt of the notification [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(f)*] of the determination that the employee has a serious chronic condition.
>
> 3. A terminal illness. For purposes of this regulation, a terminal illness is an incurable or irreversible condition that has a high probability of causing death within one year or less. Completion of treatment must be provided for the duration of a terminal illness.
>
> 4. Performance of a surgery or other procedure that is authorized by the insurer or employer as part of a documented course of treatment and has been recommended and documented by the provider to occur within 180 days from the network coverage effective date.

If the employer or insurer decides to transfer the employee's medical care to the network, the insurer or employer must notify the employee of the determination regarding the completion of treatment and the decision to transfer medical care into the network. The notification is to be sent to the employee's residence, and a copy of the letter must be sent to the employee's primary treating physician. The notification must be written in English and Spanish and use layperson's terms to the maximum extent possible [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(f)*].

If the employee disputes the medical determination under this regulation, the employee must request a report from the

employee's primary treating physician that addresses whether the employee falls within any of the conditions set forth in items 1-4, above. The treating physician must provide the report to the employee within 20 calendar days of the request. If the treating physician fails to issue the report, then the determination made by the employer or insurer will apply [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(g)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(f)*].

If the employer or insurer or the employee objects to the medical determination by the treating physician, the dispute regarding the medical determination made by the treating physician concerning the transfer of care is to be resolved pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(h)*].

If the treating physician agrees with the insurer's or employer's determination that the employee's medical condition does not meet the conditions set forth in items 1-4, above, the transfer of care will go forward during the dispute resolution process. If the treating physician does not agree with the insurer's or employer's determination that the employee's medical condition does not meet the conditions set forth in items 1-4, above, the transfer of care will not go forward until the dispute is resolved [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.9(i), (j)*].

As part of its continuity of care policy, an insurer or employer that offers a medical provider network must, at the request of an injured employee, provide the completion of treatment in certain situations by a terminated provider [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(1)*]. Specifically, the completion of treatment must be provided by a terminated provider to an injured employee who, at the time of the contract's termination, was receiving services from that provider, subject to coverage through the workers' compensation system, for [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(2), (3)*]:

1. An acute condition [*see Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)(A)* ("An acute condition is a medical condition that involves a sudden onset of symptoms due to an illness, injury, or other medical problem that requires prompt medical attention and that has a limited duration." The relevant regulation provides that an acute condition, as referred to in this statute, has a duration of less than 90 days. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.10(b)*)], for which completion of treatment must be provided for its duration.

2. A serious chronic condition [*see Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)(B)* ("A serious chronic condition is a medical condition due to a disease, illness, or other medical problem or medical disorder that is serious in nature and that persists without full cure or worsens over an extended period of time or requires ongoing treatment to maintain remission or prevent deterioration." The relevant regulation provides that an extended period of time, as referred to in this statute with regard to a serious and chronic condition, has a duration of at least 90 days. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.10(c)*)], for which completion of treatment must be provided for a period of time (not to exceed 12 months from the contract termination date) necessary to complete a course of treatment and to arrange for a safe transfer to another provider, as determined by the insurer or employer in consultation with the injured employee and the terminated provider and consistent with good professional practice.

3. A terminal illness [*see Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)(C)* ("A terminal illness is an incurable or irreversible condition that has a high probability of causing death within one year or less")], for which completion of treatment must be provided for its duration.

4. Performance of a surgery or other procedure authorized by the insurer or employer as part of a documented course of treatment and has been recommended and documented by the provider to occur within 180 days of the contract's termination date.

The medical provider network's continuity of care policy must include a dispute resolution procedure that contains the following requirements [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.10(d)*]:

1. Following the employer's or insurer's determination of the employee's medical condition, the employer

or insurer must notify the covered employee of the determination regarding the completion of treatment and whether or not the employee will be required to select a new provider from within the network. The notification must be sent to the covered employee's residence, with a copy to the employee's primary treating physician. The notification is to be written in English and Spanish and use layperson's terms to the maximum extent possible.

2. If the terminated provider agrees to continue treating the injured covered employee in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4616.2*, and if the employee disputes the medical determination, the employee must request a report from the employee's primary treating physician that addresses whether the employee falls within any of the conditions set forth in *Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)*; an acute condition; a serious chronic condition; a terminal illness; or a performance of a surgery or other procedure that is authorized by the insurer or employer as part of a documented course of treatment and has been recommended and documented by the provider to occur within 180 days of the contract's termination date. The treating physician must provide the report to the covered employee within 20 calendar days of the request. If the treating physician fails to issue the report, the determination made by the employer or insurer, referred to in paragraph 1, above, will apply.

3. If the employer or insurer or employee objects to the medical determination by the treating physician, the dispute regarding that medical determination concerning the continuity of care is to be resolved pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062*.

4. If the treating physician agrees with the employer's or insurer's determination that the employee's medical condition does not meet the conditions set forth in *Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)*, the employee must choose a new provider from within the medical provider network, during the dispute resolution process.

5. If the treating physician does not agree with the employer's or insurer's determination that the employees medical condition does not meet the conditions set forth in *Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(3)*, the employee is to continue to treat with the terminated provider until the dispute is resolved.

The insurer or employer may require the terminated provider whose services are continued beyond the contract termination date to agree in writing to be subject to the same contractual terms and conditions that were imposed on the provider prior to termination [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(4)(A)*]. If the terminated provider does not agree to comply or does not comply with these contractual terms and conditions, the insurer or employer is not required to continue the provider's services beyond the contract termination date [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(4)(A)*].

Unless otherwise agreed by the terminated provider and the insurer or employer, the services rendered by the terminated provider are to be compensated at rates and methods of payment similar to those used by the insurer or employer for currently contracting providers providing similar services who are practicing in the same or a similar geographic area as the terminated provider [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(4)(B)*]. The insurer or provider is not required to continue the services of a terminated provider if the provider does not accept these payment rates [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(4)(B)*].

An insurer or employer must ensure that the requirements regarding continued employment of terminated providers are met [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(5)*].

The statute does not require an insurer or employer to provide for completion of treatment by a provider whose contract with the insurer or employer has been terminated or not renewed for reasons relating to a medical disciplinary cause or reason [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 805(a)(6)*], or fraud or other criminal activity, and nothing in the statute precludes an insurer or employer from providing continuity of care beyond the statutory requirements [*Lab. Code § 4616.2(d)(6), (7)*].

[iv] Injured Employee's Rights in Medical Provider Network

When the injured employee notifies the employer of the injury or files a claim for workers' compensation with the employer, the employer must arrange an initial medical evaluation and begin treatment as required by *Lab. Code § 4600* and in compliance with the access standards set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.5* [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6(a)*; *see* [i], *above*]. In fact, within one working day after an employee files a claim form under *Lab. Code § 5401*, the employer or insurer must provide for all treatment consistent with guidelines adopted by the Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or, prior to the adoption of these guidelines, the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines (ACOEM). For all injuries not covered by the ACOEM guidelines or guidelines adopted by the Administrative Director, authorized treatment must be in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines generally recognized by the national medical community and that are scientifically based. The Administrative Director incorporates by reference the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines (ACOEM), 2nd Edition (2004), published by OEM Press. A copy may be obtained from OEM Press, 8 West Street, Beverly Farms, Massachusetts 01915 (www.oempress.com). The employer or insurer must provide for the treatment with medical provider network providers for the alleged injury and must continue to provide the treatment until the date that liability for the claim is rejected. Until that date, liability for the claim is limited to $10,000 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6(b), (c)*]. The employer must notify the employee of his or her right to be treated by a physician of his or her choice after the first visit from the medical provider network, and the method by which the list of participating providers may be accessed by the employee [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6(d)*]. Moreover, the regulation makes clear that, at any time after the initial medical evaluation with a network physician, the employee may select a physician of his or her choice from within the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6(e)*]. Selection by the injured employee of a treating physician and any subsequentphysicians must be based on the physician's specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(d)(1)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(e)*]. Treatment by a specialist who is not a member of the medicalprovider network may be permitted on a case-by-case basis if the medical provider network does not contain a physician who can provide the approved treatment and the treatment is approved by the employer or the insurer [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(d)(2)*]. The employer or insurer is not entitled to file a Petition for Change of Treating Physician, as set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9786*, if an employee is treating with a physician within the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6(f)*].

If an injured employee disputes either the diagnosis or the treatment prescribed by the treating physician, the employee may seek the opinion of another physician in the medical provider network [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(c)*]. If the injured employee disputes the diagnosis or treatment prescribed by the second physician, the employee may seek the opinion of a third physician in the medical provider network [*Lab. Code § 4616.3(c)*]. When an employee seeks the opinion of a second or a third physician, the statutes do not indicate which physician, first, second, or third, will subsequently provide treatment, when the second or the third physician either agrees or disagrees with the first. The regulation provides, however, that during this process, the employee is required to continue his or her treatment with the treating physician or a physician of his or her choice within the network [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(a)*].

If the employee disputes either the diagnosis or the treatment prescribed by the primary treating physician or the treating physician, it is the employee's responsibility to: (1) inform the insurer or employer that he or she disputes the treating physician's opinion and requests a second opinion (the employee may notify the person designated by the employer or insurer either in writing or orally); (2) select a physician or specialist from a list of available network providers; (3) make an appointment with the second opinion physician within 60 days; and (4) inform the insurer or employer of the appointment date. It is the insurer's or employer's responsibility to (1) provide a regional area listing of network providers and/or specialists to the employee for his or her selection based on the specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question and inform the employee of his or her right to request a copy of the medical records that will be sent to the second opinion physician; (2) contact the treating physician, provide a copy of the medical records or send the necessary medical records to the second opinion physician prior to the appointment date, and provide a copy of the records to the employee on request; and (3) notify the second opinion physician in

writing that he or she has been selected to provide a second opinion and the nature of the dispute, with a copy to the employee. If the appointment is not made within 60 days of receipt of the list of the available network providers, the employee will be deemed to have waived the second opinion process with regard to this disputed diagnosis or treatment of this treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(b)*].

If, after reviewing the employee's medical records, the second opinion physician determines that the employee's injury is outside the scope of hisor her practice, the physician must notify the insurer or employer and the employee, so that the insurer or employer can provide a new list of network providers and/or specialists to the employee for his or her selection based on the specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(c)*].

If the employee disagrees with either the diagnosis or treatment prescribed by the second opinion physician, the employee may seek the opinion of a third physician within the network. It is the employee's responsibility to: (1) inform the insurer or employer that he or she disputes the treating physician's opinion and requests a third opinion (the employee may notify the person designated by the employer or insurer either in writing or orally); (2) select a physician or specialist from a list of available network providers; (3) make an appointment with the third opinion physician within 60 days; and (4) inform the insurer or employer of the appointment date. It is the insurer's or employer's responsibility to (1) provide a regional area listing of network providers and/or specialists to the employee for his or her selection based on the specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question and inform the employee of his or her right to request a copy of the medical records that will be sent to the third opinion physician; (2) contact the treating physician, provide a copy of the medical records or send the necessary medical records to the third opinion physician prior to the appointment date, and provide a copy of the records to the employee on request; and (3) notify the third opinion physician in writing that he or she has been selected to provide a third opinion and the nature of the dispute, with a copy to the employee. If the appointment is not made within 60 days of receipt of the list of the available network providers, the employee will be deemed to have waived the third opinion process with regard to this disputed diagnosis or treatment of this treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(d)*].

At the time of the selection of the physician for a third opinion, the medical provider network contact (MPN Contact) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.1(a)(14)* ("medical provider network contact" means individual(s) designated by insurer or employer in employee notification who is responsible for answering employees' questions about medical provider network and is responsible for assisting employee in arranging for independent medical review)] must notify the employee about the independent medical review process and provide the employee with an Independent Medical Review Application form [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.10* (mandatory form)]. The MPN Contact is to fill out the "MPN Contact Section" of the form and list the specialty of the treating physician and an alternative specialty, if any, that is different from the specialty of the treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(a)*; *see also* [v], *below*].

If, after reviewing the employee's medical records, the third opinion physician determines that the employee's injury is outside the scope of his or her practice, the physician must notify the insurer or employer and theemployee, so that the insurer or employer can provide a new list of network providers and/or specialists to the employee for his or her selection based on the specialty or recognized expertise in treating the particular injury or condition in question [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(e)*].

The second and third opinion physicians must each render his or her opinion of the disputed diagnosis or treatment in writing and offer alternative diagnosis or treatment recommendations, if applicable. Any recommended treatment must be in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4616(e)*. The second and third opinion physicians may order diagnostic testing if medically necessary. A copy of the written report must be served on the employee, the insurer or employer, and the treating physician within 20 days of the date of the appointment or receipt of the results of the diagnostic tests, whichever is later [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(f)*].

The employer or insurer must permit the employee to obtain the recommended treatment within the network. The

employee may obtain the recommended treatment by changing physicians to the second opinion physician, third opinion physician, or other network physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.7(g)*].

[v] Independent Medical Review Process

If, after the third physician's opinion, the treatment or diagnostic service remains disputed, the injured employee may request independent medical review regarding the disputed treatment or diagnostic service [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9767.7(h), 9768.9(b)*. The statutes contain no provision regarding responsibility for payment for an independent medical review]. The standard to be utilized for independent medical review is identical to that contained in the medical treatment utilization schedule established in *Lab. Code § 5307.27*, or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, as appropriate [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(b)*]. Employers and insurers are required by regulation to pay for the services of the independent medical reviewers [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.15(a)*].

The Administrative Director is required to contract with individual physicians or an independent medical review organization to perform independent medical reviews [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(a)(1)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.4* (independent medical reviewer contract application procedures); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.5* (physician contract application form); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.6* (Administrative Director's action on contract application submitted by physician)]. Only physicians licensed pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code Ch. 5 may be independent medical reviewers [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(a)(2)*].

The Administrative Director has the following obligations regarding the independent medical reviewers or those within the review organization do all of the following [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(a)(3)*]:

1. Ensure that the medical professionals are appropriately credentialed and privileged [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.3* (qualifications of independent medical reviewers)].

2. Ensure that the reviews provided by the medical professionals are timely, clear, and credible, and that reviews are monitored for quality on an ongoing basis [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.8* (removal of physicians from independent medical reviewer list)].

3. Ensure that the method of selecting medical professionals for individual cases achieves a fair and impartial panel of medical professionals who are qualified to render recommendations regarding the clinical conditions consistent with the medical utilization schedule established pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupation and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines.

4. Ensure the confidentiality of medical records and the review materials, consistent with the requirements of this independent medical review statute and applicable state and federal law.

5. Ensure the independence of the medical professionals retained to perform the reviews through conflict-of-interest policies and prohibitions, and ensure adequate screening for conflicts of interest [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.2* (conflicts of interest); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.1(a)(5)* ("material familial affiliation" defined); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.1(a)(6)* ("material financial affiliation" defined); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.1(a)(7)* ("material professional affiliation" defined)].

Medical professionals selected by the Administrative Director or the independent medical review organizations to review medical treatment decisions must be physicians, as defined in Bus. & Prof. Code Ch. 5, who meet the following minimum requirements [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(a)(4)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.3* (qualifications of independent medical reviewers)]:

1. The medical professional must be a clinician knowledgeable in the treatment of the employee's medical condition, knowledgeable about the proposed treatment, and familiar with guidelines and protocols in the area of treatment under review.

2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the medical professional must hold a nonrestricted license in any state and, for physicians, a current certification by a recognized American medical specialty board in the area or areas appropriate to the condition or treatment under review.

3. The medical professional must have no history of disciplinary action or sanctions, including, but not limited to, loss of staff privileges or participation restrictions taken or pending by any hospital, government, or regulatory body.

Applications for independent medical review are to be submitted to the Administrative Director on a one-page form provided by him or her entitled "Independent Medical Review Application" [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.10* (mandatory independent medical review application form)]. At the time of the selection of the physician for a third opinion, the medical provider network contact (MPN Contact) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.1(a)(9)* ("medical provider network contact" means individual(s) designated by insurer or employer in employee notification who is responsible for answering employees' questions about medical provider network and is responsible for assisting employee in arranging for independent medical review)] must notify the employee about the independent medical review process and provide the employee with an Independent Medical Review Application form. The MPN Contact is to fill out the "MPN Contact Section" of the form and list the specialty of the treating physician and an alternative specialty, if any, that is different from the specialty of the treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(a)*]. The employee completes the "employee section" of the form, indicates on the form whether he or she requests an in-person examination or record review, and may list an alternative specialty, if any, that is different from the specialty of the treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(b)*]. The form contains a signed release from the injured employee, or a person authorized pursuant to law to act on behalf of the injured employee, authorizing the release of medical and treatment information [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.10*]. The injured employee may provide any relevant material or documentation with the application [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(a)* (employee may furnish any relevant medical records or additional materials, with copy to MPN Contact)]. The Administrative Director or the independent medical review organization is to assign the independent medical reviewer [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(c)*]. Within 10 business days of receiving the independent medical review applicationform, the Administrative Director is to select an independent medical reviewer with an appropriate specialty. The Administrative Director's selection is to be based on the specialty of the treating physician, the alternative specialties listed by the employee and the MPN Contact, and the information submitted with the application [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(c)*].

If the employee requests an in-person examination, the Administrative Director must randomly select a physician from the panel of available independent medical reviewers, with an appropriate specialty, who has an office located within 30 miles of the employee's residence, to be the independent medical reviewer. If there is only one physician with an appropriate specialty within that distance, that physician must be selected to be the independent medical reviewer. If there is nophysician with an appropriate specialty within that distance, the Administrative Director is to search in increasing five-mile increments, until one physician is located. If there is no available physician with this appropriate specialty, theAdministrative Director may choose another specialty based on the information submitted [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(d)*].

If the employee requests a record review, the Administrative Director must randomly select a physician with an appropriate specialty from the panel of available independent medical reviewers. If there is no physician with an appropriate specialty, the Administrative Director may choose another specialty based on the information submitted [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(e)*].

The Administrative Director is required to send written notification of the name and contact information of the independent medical reviewer to the employee, the employee's attorney, if any, the MPN Contact, and the independent medical reviewer. In addition, the Administrative Director must send a copy of the completed independent medical review application to the independent medical reviewer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(f)*].

The employee, MPN Contact, or the selected independent medical reviewer may object within 10 calendar days of receipt of the name of the independent medical reviewer to the selection if there is a conflict of interest [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.2*]. If the independent medical reviewer determines that he or she does not practice the appropriate specialty, he or she is to withdraw within 10 calendar days of receipt of the notification of selection. If this conflict is verified or the independent medical reviewer withdraws, the Administrative Director must select another independent medical reviewer from the same specialty. If there is no available physician with the same specialty, the Administrative Director may select an independent medical reviewer with another specialty based on the information submitted and in accordance with the procedure set forth above for an in-person examination or for a record review [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(g)*].

If the employee requests an in-person exam, the employee must contact the independent medical reviewer within 60 calendar days of receiving the reviewer's name to arrange an appointment. If the employee fails to contact the independent medical reviewer within this time frame for an appointment, the employee will be deemed to have waived the independent medical reviewer process with regard to this disputed diagnosis or treatment of this treating physician. The independent medical reviewer must schedule an appointment with the employee within 30 calendar days of the request for an appointment, unless all parties agree to a later date. The independent medical reviewer must notify the MPN Contact of the appointment date [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(h)*].

The employee must provide written notice to the Administrative Director and the MPN Contact if the he or she decides to withdraw the request for an independent medical review [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(i)*].

During this process, the employee is required to remain within the MPN for treatment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.9(j)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9767.6*].

Following receipt of the application for independent medical review, the employer or insurer must provide the assigned independent medical reviewer with all information that was considered in relation to the disputed treatment or diagnostic service, including a copy of all correspondence from, and received by, any treating physician who provided a treatment or diagnostic service to the injured employee in connection with the injury, and a complete and legible copy of all medical records and other information used by the physicians in making a decision regarding the disputed treatment or diagnostic service [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(d)*]. A copy of the documents must be sent to the employee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(a)*].

After receiving relevant information and documents, the independent medical reviewer conducts a physical examination of the injured employee at the employee's discretion [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(e)*]. If an in-person examination is requested and if a special form of transportation is required because of the employee's medical condition, it is the obligation of the MPN Contact to arrange for it. The MPN Contact is to furnish transportation and arrange for an interpreter, if necessary, in advance of the in-person examination. All reasonable expenses of transportation are to be incurred by the insurer or employer [*see Lab. Code § 4600*]. Except for the in-person examination itself, the independent medical reviewer is to have no ex parte contact with any party. Except for matters dealing with scheduling appointments, scheduling medical tests, and obtaining medical records, all communications between the independent medical reviewer and any party must be in writing, with copies served on all parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(a)*].

The reviewer may order any diagnostic tests necessary to make his or her determination [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(e)*]. However, if requiring further tests, the reviewer must notify the MPN Contact within one working day of the

appointment. All tests must be consistent with the medical treatment utilization schedule adopted pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or, prior to the adoption of this schedule, the ACOEM guidelines, and for all injuries not covered by the medical treatment utilization schedule or the ACOEM guidelines, in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines generally recognized by the national medical community and that are scientifically based [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(b)*]. The independent medical reviewer must not request the employee to submit to an unnecessary exam or procedure. If a test duplicates a test already given, the independent medical reviewer must, in his or her report, provide justification for the duplicative test [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(c)*].

If the employee fails to attend an examination with the independent medicalreviewer and fails to reschedule the appointment within five business days of the missed appointment, the independent medical reviewer is to perform a review of the records and make a determination based on those records [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(d)*].

Using the medical treatment utilization schedule established pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27*, or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, as appropriate, and taking into account any reports and information provided, the reviewer is to determine whether the disputed health care service was consistent with *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, as appropriate, based on the specific medical needs of the injured employee [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(i)*. The regulation adds that, for injuries not covered by the medical treatment utilization schedule or by the ACOEM guidelines, the treatment rendered is to be in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines that are generally recognized by the national medical community and scientifically based.].

The statute provides that the independent medical reviewer then issues, within 30 days of the examination of the injured employee, or within less time as prescribed by the Administrative Director, a written report to the Administrative Director, in layperson's terms to the maximum extent practicable, containing his or her analysis and determination as to whether the disputed health care service was consistent with the standards set forth in the above paragraph [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(f)*]. At present, the Administrative Director has prescribed that the independent medical reviewer serve the report on the Administrative Director, the MPN Contact, the employee, and the employee's attorney, if any, within *20* days after the in-person examination or completion of the record review [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(e)*]. The analysis must cite the injured employee's medical condition, the relevant documents in the record, and the relevant findings associated with the documents or any other information submitted to the reviewer in order to support the determination [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(g)*]. To these general statutory requirements, the relevant regulation elaborates a specific list of items to be included in the independent medical reviewer's report. These are [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.12(a)*]:

1. The date of the in-person examination or record review.

2. The patient's complaint(s).

3. A listing of all information received from the parties reviewed in preparation of the report or relied on for the formulation of the physician's opinion.

4. The patient's medical history relevant to the diagnostic services, diagnosis, or medical treatment.

5. Findings on record review or in-person examination.

6. The independent medical reviewer's diagnosis.

7. The physician's opinion whether or not the proposed treatment or diagnostic services are appropriate and indicated. If the proposed treatment or diagnostic services are not appropriate orindicated, any alternative diagnosis or treatment recommendation consistent with the medical treatment utilization

schedule is to be included.

8. An analysis and determination whether the disputed health care service is consistent with the medical treatment utilization schedule established pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or, prior to the adoption of this schedule, the ACOEM guidelines. For injuries not covered by the medical treatment utilization schedule or by the ACOEM guidelines, an analysis and determination whether the treatment rendered is in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines that are generally recognized by the national medical community and scientifically based.

9. The signature of the physician.

An independent medical reviewer must serve with each report the following executed declaration made under penalty of perjury [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.12(c)*]:

"I declare under penalty of perjury that this report is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and that I have not violated *Labor Code Section 139.3*."

If the disputed health care service has not been provided and the independent medical reviewer certifies in writing that an imminent and serious threat to the health of the injured employee may exist, including, but not limited to, serious pain, the potential loss of life, limb, or major bodily function, or the immediate and serious deterioration of the injured employee, the report must be expedited and rendered within three days of the examination by the independent medical reviewer [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(f)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(f)*]. The statute provides that the deadlines for analyses and determinations involving both regular and expedited reviews may be extended by the Administrative Director for up to three days in extraordinary circumstances or for good cause [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(f)*]. However, the Administrative Director's regulation provides that, subject to approval by the Administrative Director, reviews that are *not* expedited may be extended for up to three business days in extraordinary circumstances or for good cause [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(g)*]. Extensions for good cause must be granted for medical emergencies of the independent medical reviewer or the independent medical reviewer's family, death in the independent medical reviewer's family, or natural disasters or other community catastrophes that interrupt the independent medical reviewer's office operations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(h)*].

The independent medical reviewer is forbidden to treat or offer to provide medical treatment for that injury or illness for which he or she has done an independent medical review evaluation for the employee unless a medical emergency arises during the in-person examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(j)*].

Payment for the services of the independent medical reviewers is to be made by the employer or the insurer. The fee is to be based on the Official Medical Fee Schedule using confirmatory consultation codes (99271 through 99275 for in-person examinations or 99271 through 99273 for evaluations not requiring an in-person examination), 99080 for reports, and 99358 for record reviews, and any other appropriate codes or modifiers. An independent medical reviewer may not accept any additional compensation from any source for his or her services as a reviewer except for services provided to treat a medical emergency that arose during an in-person examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.15*].

Neither the employee nor the employer nor the insurer has any liability for payment for the independent medical review that was not completed within the required time frames unless the employee and the employer each waives the right to a new independent medical review and elects to accept the original evaluation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.11(k)*].

The Administrative Director must immediately adopt the determination of the independent medical reviewer and promptly issue a written decision to the parties [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(h)*]. The decision must be issued within five business days of receipt of the report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.16(a)*].

The parties may appeal the Administrative Director's written decision by filing a petition with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board and serving a copy on the Administrative Director, within 20 days after receipt of the decision [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.16(b)*].

The statute provides that, if the determination of the independent medical reviewer finds that the disputed treatment or diagnostic service is consistent with *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, the injured employee may seek the disputed treatment or diagnostic service from a physician of his or her choice from within or outside the medical provider network [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(i)*]. The relevant regulation, however, appears to treat the issue somewhat differently. It provides that, if the independent medical reviewer agrees with the diagnosis, diagnostic service, or medical treatment prescribed by the treating physician, the employee must continue to receive medical treatment from physicians within the MPN [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.17(a)*]. If the independent medical reviewer does not agree with the disputed diagnosis, diagnostic service, or medical treatment prescribed by the treating physician, the employee may seek medical treatment with a physician of his or her choice either within or outside the MPN. If the employee chooses to receive medical treatment with a physician outside the MPN, the treatment is limited to the treatment recommended by the independent medical reviewer or the diagnostic service recommended by the independent medical reviewer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.17(b)*]. Treatment outside the medical provider network must be provided consistent with *Lab. Code § 5307.27* or theAmerican College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Practice Guidelines [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(i)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.17(c)*]. For injuries not covered by the medical treatment utilization schedule or by the ACOEM guidelines, the treatment rendered must be in accordance with other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines that are generally recognized by the national medical community and scientifically based [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.17(c)*]. The employer is liable for the cost of any approved medical treatment in accordance with *Lab. Code § 5307.1* or *5307.11* [*Lab. Code § 4616.4(i)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9768.17(d)*].

No additional examinations may be ordered by the Appeals Board, and no other reports are admissible to resolve any controversy arising out of the medical provider networks statutes [*Lab. Code § 4616.6*].

[2] Vocational Rehabilitation

IMPORTANT NOTE: The WCAB en banc has held that: (1) repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5* terminated any rights to vocational rehabilitation benefits or services pursuant to orders or awards that were not final before January 1, 2009; (2) no saving clause was adopted to protect vocational rehabilitation rights in cases still pending on or after January 1, 2009; (3) vocational rehabilitation statutes that were repealed in 2003 do not continue to function as "ghost statutes" on or after January 1, 2009; (4) effective January 1, 2009, the WCAB lost jurisdiction over non-vested and inchoate vocational rehabilitation claims, but the WCAB continues to have jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5502(b)(3)* and *5803* to enforce or terminate vested rights; and (5) subject matter jurisdiction over non-vested and inchoate vocational rehabilitation claims cannot be conferred by waiver, estoppel, stipulation, or consent [Weiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 736, 737, 742-758 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)] .

With regard to the specified exceptions, the WCAB stated, "We conclude that sections 5502(b)(3) and 5803 give the WCAB jurisdiction to conduct hearings and make determinations regarding the enforcement or termination of vested vocational rehabilitation rights." That is, "... where an injured employee has vested vocational rehabilitation rights, the WCAB may conduct a hearing to enforce or terminate those rights." A right is "vested" when it is the subject of a final order. An order is "final" when it is no longer subject to appeal, because either the appeals have been exhausted or the time for filing appeals has expired [Weiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 736, 754, 755 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)].

Subsequently, the WCAB en banc, denying the employee's petition for reconsideration of the WCAB's prior en banc decision in the same case, *Weiner v. Ralphs Co.*, held now that, even if the WCAB

assumed that some vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance was indisputably due to the employee prior to January 1, 2009, this does not mean that the employee's right to this vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance had vested. The WCAB pointed out that a statutory right vests through a final order or award, that no final order or award of vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance was made in the present case, and that repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5* extinguished the employee's right to such an award [Weiner v. Ralphs Co. (2009) *74 Cal. Comp. Cases 958, 962-964 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , pet. for writ of rev. filed* 9/28/2009].

A court of appeal has followed *Weiner v. Ralphs Co.* and held that an October 2008 WCAB decision that affirmed the WCJ's January 2008 award of vocational rehabilitation benefits to an employee was not a "final" decision, so that the employee lost all rights to vocational rehabilitation benefits as of the January 1, 2009, repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5* [*Beverly Hilton Hotel v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1597, 1604-1611, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50*].

[a] Eligibility

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5, 4635-4647,* and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system, discussed in *§ 577.45[2A]*, applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004.

In 2004, the legislature reenacted one of the statutes it had repealed in 2003, *Lab. Code § 139.5*, reinstating vocational rehabilitation. *However, the reenacted statute applies only to injuries occurring before January 1, 2004*, and it will remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date [*Lab. Code § 139.5(k), (l)*]. Various other vocational rehabilitation statutes, e.g., *Lab. Code §§ 4642, 4644(d), (e),* and *5405.5*, once cross-referred to in former *Lab. Code § 139.5* but repealed in 2003, are also cross-referred to in the reenacted *Lab. Code § 139.5* and are now identified with the designation "former." Thus, although the issue may be further clarified by administrative and judicial action, it now appears that the statutory law on vocational rehabilitation applicable to pre-2004 injuries is confined to *Lab. Code § 139.5*, those "former" statutes to which it cross-refers, and those statutes not repealed in 2003. For example, the 2002 amendment to former *Lab. Code § 4646*, which allowed settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation benefits, has not been reenacted, while *Lab. Code § 5100.6*, forbidding such settlements, was never repealed and, thus, remains in force. As a consequence of these legislative developments, at least some of the existing materials in this chapter on vocational rehabilitation will continue to be relevant for some time with respect to pre-2004 injuries.

An injured employee is eligible for vocational rehabilitation benefits under the following circumstances [*Lab. Code § 4635(a)* (governing injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990); *see also* former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10003* (regulation governing pre-1990 injuries was repealed, effective December 27, 1996)]:

- The employee's expected permanent disability as a result of the injury, whether or not combined with the effects of a prior injury or disability, permanently precludes, or is likely to preclude, the employee from engaging in his or her usual occupation or the position in which he or she was engaged at the time of the injury; and

- The employee can reasonably be expected to return to suitable gainful employment through the provision of vocational rehabilitation services.

Once an injured employee's eligibility for vocational rehabilitation is determined, the employee's vocational feasibility must be determined by a qualified rehabilitation representative [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10124.1, 10127.3*; Admin. Guideline § 8-30-03].

For discussion of compromise and release agreements concerning vocational rehabilitation benefits, see *§ 577.131[2]*.

[b] Rehabilitation Unit

The Rehabilitation Unit, which is established within the Division of Workers' Compensation, Office of Benefit Determination, is responsible for implementation and enforcement of vocational rehabilitation plans, as well as for development of rules and regulations to expedite and facilitate identification, notification, and referral of industrially injured employees to vocational rehabilitation services [*Lab. Code § 139.5(a)*; *see Lab. Code § 4635 et seq.*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10122 et seq.*; *see also Lab. Code § 139.5(g)* (offer of job within state service to specified state employees at same or similar salary and in same or similar geographic location as prima facie offer of vocational rehabilitation)].

[c] Cap on Expenses for Injuries on or After January 1, 1994

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994, there is a $16,000 cap on vocational rehabilitation services incurred after the employee's request for such services, exclusive of temporary disability payments [*Lab. Code § 139.5(c)*]. An injured worker's right to continued receipt of vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance benefits is dependent on his or her regular and consistent attendance at, and participation in, a vocational rehabilitation training program [*Lab. Code § 139.5(c)*].

[2A] Supplemental Job Displacement Benefits

[a] Nature of and Eligibility for Benefits

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5*, *4635-4647*, and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system, discussed below, applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004. Consequently, the existing materials in this chapter on vocational rehabilitation will continue to be relevant for some time with respect to pre-2004 injuries [*see § 577.45[2]*].

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004, if the injury causes permanent partial disability and the injured employee does not return to work for the employer within 60 days of the termination of temporary disability, the injured employee is eligible for a supplemental job displacement benefit in the form of a nontransferable voucher for education-related retraining or skill enhancement, or both, at state-approved or accredited schools, as follows [*Lab. Code § 4658.5(a), (d)*]:

- Up to $4,000 for permanent partial disability awards of less than 15 percent.
- Up to $6,000 for permanent partial disability awards between 15 and 25 percent.
- Up to $8,000 for permanent partial disability awards between 26 and 49 percent.
- Up to $10,000 for permanent partial disability awards between 50 and 99 percent.

The voucher may be used for payment of tuition, fees, books, and other expenses required by the school for retraining or skill enhancement. No more than 10 percent of the voucher moneys may be used for vocational or return-to-work counseling. The Administrative Director is to adopt regulations governing the form of payment, direct reimbursement to the injured employee upon presentation to the employer of appropriate documentation and receipts, and any other matters necessary to the proper administration of the supplemental job displacement benefit [*Lab. Code § 4658.5(b)*].

Within 10 days of the last payment of temporary disability, the employer must provide to the employee, in the form and manner prescribed by the Administrative Director, information that provides notice of rights under this statute. This notice must be sent by certified mail [*Lab. Code § 4658.5(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.51*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.52* (mandatory form)].

The employer is not liable for the supplemental job displacement benefit if the employer meets either of the following conditions [*Lab. Code§ 4658.6*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.53* (notice of offer of modified or alternative work)]:

- Within 30 days of the termination of temporary disability indemnity payments, the employer offers, and the employee rejects, or fails to accept, in the form and manner prescribed by the Administrative Director, modified work, accommodating the employee's work restrictions, lasting at least 12 months.

- Within 30 days of the termination of temporary disability indemnity payments, the employer offers, and the employee rejects, or fails to accept, in the form and manner prescribed by the Administrative Director, alternative work meeting all of the following conditions:

  - The employee has the ability to perform the essential functions of the job provided.

  - The job provided is in a regular position lasting at least 12 months.

  - The job provided offers wages and compensation that are within 15 percent of those paid to the employee at the time of injury.

  - The job provided is within reasonable commuting distance of the employee's residence at the time of injury.

[b] Dispute Resolution

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004, when there is a dispute regarding the supplemental job displacement benefit, the employee or the claims administrator may request the Administrative Director to resolve the dispute [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(a), (b)*]. The party requesting the Administrative Director to resolve the dispute must [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(c)*]:

1. Complete Form DWC-AD 10133.55 "Request for Dispute Resolution Before the Administrative Director."

2. Clearly state the issue(s) and identify supporting information for each issue and position.

3. Attach all pertinent documents.

4. Submit the original request and all attached documents to the Administrative Director and serve a copy of the request and all attached documents on all parties.

5. Sign and date the proof of service section of Form DWC-AD 10133.55 "Request for Dispute Resolution before the Administrative Director."

The opposing party has 20 calendar days from the date of the proof of service of the Request to submit the original response and all attached documents to the Administrative Director and serve a copy of the response and all attached documents on all parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(d)*]. The Administrative Director or his or her designee may request additional information from the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(e)*].

The Administrative Director or his or her designee must issue a written determination and order based solely on the request, response, and any attached documents within 30 calendar days of the date the opposing party's response and supporting information is due. If the Administrative Director or his or her designee requests additional information, the written determination must be issued within 30 calendar days from the receipt of the additional information. In the event no decision is issued within 60 calendar days of the date the opposing party's response is due or within 60 calendar days of the Administrative Director's receipt of the requested additional information, whichever is later, the request will be deemed to be denied [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(f)*].

Either party may appeal the determination and order of the Administrative Director by filing a written petition together with a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed pursuant to *W.C.A.B. Rules § 10250* with the local district office of the Appeals Board within 20 calendar days of the issuance of the decision or within 20 days after a request is deemed denied pursuant to the preceding paragraph. The petition must set forth the specific factual and/or legal reason(s) for the appeal. A copy of the petition and a copy of the Declaration of Readiness to Proceed must be concurrently served on the Administrative Director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.54(g)*].

[c] Training Vouchers

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004, an employee is eligible for the supplemental job displacement benefit when [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.56(a), (b)*]:

1. The injury causes permanent partial disability; and

2. Within 30 days of the termination of temporary disability indemnity payments, the claims administrator does not offer modified or alternative work in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4658.6*; and

3. Either the injured employee does not return to work for the employerwithin 60 days of the termination of temporary disability benefits; or

4. In the case of a seasonal employee, when the employee is unable to return to work within 60 days of the termination of temporary disability benefits because the work season has ended, the injured employee does not return to work on the next available work date of the next work season.

When the above requirements have been met, the claims administrator must provide a nontransferable voucher for education-related retraining or skill enhancement, or both, to the employee within 25 calendar days from the issuance of the permanent partial disability award by the WCJ or the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.56(c)*]. The voucher mustbe issued to the employee, allowing direct reimbursement to the employee upon the employee's presentation to the claims administrator of documentation and receipts or as a direct payment to the provider of the education-related training or skill enhancement and/or to the VRTWC. The voucher must indicate the appropriate level of money available to the employee in compliance with *Lab. Code § 4658.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.56(d), (e)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.57* (mandatory voucher form)]. The voucher must certify that the school is approved, and, if outside of California, approval is required similarly to the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.56(g)*; *see* [d], *below*]. The claims administrator must issue the reimbursement payments to the employee or direct payments to the VRTWC and the training providers within 45 calendar days from receipt of the completed voucher, receipts, and documentation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.56(h)*].

[d] State Approved or Accredited Schools

Private providers of education-related retraining or skill enhancement selected to provide training as part of a supplemental job displacement benefit must be one of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.58(b)*]:

1. Approved by the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (www.bppve.ca.gov), or a California state agency that has an agreement with the Bureau for the regulation and oversight of non-degree-granting private postsecondary institutions.

2. Accredited by one of the Regional Associations of Schools and Colleges authorized by the United States Department of Education.

3. Certified by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Any training outside of California must be approved by an agency in that state similar to the Bureau for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.58(c)*].

[e] Vocational and Return to Work Counselors

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004, the Administrative Director must maintain a list of Vocational and Return to Work Counselors (VRTWC) who perform the work of assisting injured employees. A VRTWC who meets the qualifications specified by regulation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.50(a)(15)* ("A person or entity capable of assisting a person with a disability with development of a return to work strategy and whose regular duties involve the evaluation, counseling and placement of disabled persons. A VRTWC must have at least an undergraduate degree in any field and three or more years full time experience in conducting vocational evaluations, counseling and placement of disabled adults.")] must apply to the Administrative Director to be included on the list throughout the year. The list must be reviewed and revised on a yearly basis and must be made available on the website www.dir.ca.gov or upon request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.59(a), (b)*]. The injured employee may select a Vocational and Return to Work Counselor whenever the assistance of such a person is needed to facilitate an employee's vocational training or return to work in connection with the supplemental job displacement benefit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.59(c)*]. The injured employee is responsible for providing the VRTWC with any necessary medical reports. However, a claims administrator must provide a VRTWC with any medical reports, including permanent and stationary medical reports, upon an employee's written request and a signed release waiver. The VRTWC must communicate with the injured employee regarding the evaluation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.59(d), (e)*].

[f] Termination of Claims Administrator's Liability for Supplemental Job Displacement Benefit

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004, the claims administrator's liability to provide a supplemental job displacement voucher ends if either (1) or (2) in the following list occurs [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10133.60*]:

1. The claims administrator offers modified or alternative work to the employee, meeting the requirements of *Lab. Code § 4658.6*, on DWC-AD Form 10133.53 "Notice of Offer of Modified or Alternative Work." If the claims administrator offers modified or alternative work to the employee for 12 months of seasonal work, the offer must meet the following requirements:

   a. The employee was hired on a seasonal basis prior to injury.

   b. The offer of modified or alternative work is on a similar seasonal basis to the employee's previous employment.

2. The maximum funds of the voucher have been exhausted.

[3] Temporary Disability Indemnity

[a] Injuries Occurring Prior to January 1, 1990

If an injury occurring prior to January 1, 1990, causes temporary disability, adisability payment must be made for one week in advance as wages on the fourth day after the injured employee leaves work as a result of the injury [*Lab. Code § 4650*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)]. Except as provided by *Lab. Code § 4650.5* (relating to injuries to certain state employees resulting from acts of criminal violence), no disability payment is recoverable for the disability suffered during the first three days after the employee leaves work as a result of the injury [*Lab. Code § 4652*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)]. If the injury causes disability of more than 21 days or necessitates hospitalization, however, the disability payment must bemade from the first day the injured employee leaves work or is hospitalized as result of the injury [*Lab. Code § 4650*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)].

Subsequent payments must be made at least twice a month, unless otherwise ordered by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 4651*, prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892 (governing injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990)].

[b] Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, if an injury causes temporary disability and liability for the injury has not been previously denied, the employer must make the first payment of temporary disability indemnity no later than 14 days after knowledge of the injury and disability. On that date, the total amount of indemnity then due must be paid. [*Lab. Code § 4650(a)*]. Subsequent payments must be made every two weeks on the day designated with the first payment [*Lab. Code § 4650(c)*]. The employer is subject to a penalty for failing to make timely payments unless it continues the employee's wages under a salary continuation plan as defined in *Lab. Code § 4650(g)* [*see Lab. Code § 4650(d)*].

Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 4650.5* (injuries to certain state employees resulting from criminal acts of violence), temporary disability indemnity is not available for disability suffered during a "waiting period," which consists of the first three days after the employee leaves work as a result of the injury. If temporary disability continues for more than 14 days or if the employee is hospitalized as an inpatient for treatment required by the injury, however, temporary disability indemnity will be payable from the date of disability. In calculating the waiting period, the day of the injury is included unless the employee was paid full wages for that day [*Lab. Code § 4652*].

Aggregate disability payments for a single injury occurring on or after January 1, 1979, and prior to April 19, 2004 (the effective date of *Lab. Code § 4656(c)*), causing temporary partial disability are not to extend for more than 240 compensable weeks within a period of five years from the date of the injury [*Lab. Code § 4656(b)*].

For injuries occurring on or after April 19, 2004, aggregate disability payments for a single injury causing temporary disability may not extend for more than 104 compensable weeks within two years from the date of commencement of temporary disability payment [*Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)*]. However, for an employee who suffers from certain injuries or conditions, i.e., acute and chronic hepatitis B or C, amputations, severe burns, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), high-velocity eye injuries, chemical burns to the eyes, pulmonary fibrosis, or chronic lung disease, aggregate disability payments for a single injury occurring on or after April 19, 2004, may extend to 240 compensable weeks within five years from the date of injury [*Lab. Code § 4656(c)(2)*].

The court of appeal has held that the one year of industrial disability leave payable to state employees under *Gov. Code §§ 19869-19877.1* falls within the ambit of the two-year limitation on aggregate temporary disability payments in *Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)*. The court found that *Gov. Code § 19870(a)* provides that industrial disability leave "means temporary disability as defined in" the Labor Code workers' compensation provisions, and that the two-year limitation on payment of temporary disability benefits in *Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)* does not restrict itself to only temporary disability benefits payable under the Workers' Compensation Act or the Labor Code, since it more broadly applies to "

[a]ggregate disability payments for a single injury" [*Brooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1522, 1527-1538, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 277* (*emphasis in original*)].

In another case involving the same statute, but with a different result, the court of appeal held that, for purposes of determining the two-year limitation period on temporary disability indemnity, temporary disability payments commenced when a school district paid its injured employee her normal wages under *Ed. Code § 44043*. The employee sustained an industrial injury in June 2004. The first disability payment was made in February 2005. In February 2007 the employer sought an order terminating further liability for temporary disability. The parties stipulated that 85.71 weeks of the employer's payments were made pursuant to *Ed. Code § 44043*, which directs a school district to pay the normal wage of an injured employee receiving temporary disability benefits by supplementing those temporary disability benefits with the employee's accrued leave time. Thus, stated the court of appeal, entitlement to *Ed. Code § 44043* benefits is contingent on payment of workers' compensation temporary disability benefits, so that the date on which temporary disability payments commence can be no later than the date of the first payment under *Ed. Code § 44043* [*Mt. Diablo Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Rollick) (2003) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1158-1161, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 597]* .

When independent injuries result in concurrent periods of temporary disability, the 104-week, two-year limitation of *Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)* likewise runs concurrently. For example, in one case the employee suffered industrial injuries on February 23, 2005, and April 13, 2005. The employee was unable to work only after the second injury, but both injuries contributed to the employee's becoming temporarily disabled at that time. The court of appeal held that the employee was entitled to two periods of temporary disability and that, to determine the impact of *Lab. Code § 4656* in a case involving multiple injuries, the evidence must be examined to determine whether any periods of temporary disability are distinct and independent, staggered, or entirely overlapping. In the present case, the court found that the employee's period of temporary disability for the first injury ran from April 14, 2005, through September 12, 2006, when that first injury became permanent and stationary, and that the employee's period of temporary disability for the second injury ran from April 14, 2005, until it was exhausted under the 104-week limitation of *Lab. Code § 4656*, completely overlapping the period of temporary disability for the first injury. Since the employer began paying temporary disability benefits on April 26, 2005, the employee was entitled to temporary disability benefits until April 26, 2007 [*Foster v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1505, 1511-1513, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 272*].

[c] Notice Required With Last Payment of Temporary Disability Indemnity

For injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991 [*see Lab. Code § 4067.5*], the employer is required to provide, together with the last payment of temporary disability indemnity, in a form prescribed by the administrative director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 138.4*, one of the following notices to the employee [*Lab. Code § 4061(a)*]:

- Either notice that no permanent disability indemnity will be paid because the employer alleges the employee has no permanent impairment or limitations resulting from the injury or notice of the amount of permanent disability indemnity determined by the employer to be payable. The notice must include information concerning how the employee may obtain a formal medical evaluation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4061(c)* or *(d)* (*discussed under § 577.46[3]*) if he or she disagrees with the position taken by the employer. The notice must be accompanied by the form prescribed by the Administrative Director for requesting assignment of a panel of qualified medical evaluators, unless the employee is represented by an attorney. If the employer determines permanent disability indemnity is payable, the employer must advise the employee of the amount determined payable, the basis on which the determination was made, and whether there is need for continuing medical care; or

- Notice that permanent disability indemnity may be or is payable, but that the amount cannot be determined because the employee's medical condition is not yet permanent and stationary. The notice must advise the employee that his or her medical condition will be monitored until it is permanent and

> stationary, at which time the necessary evaluation will be performed to determine the existence and extent of permanent impairment and limitations for the purpose of rating permanent disability and to determine the need for continuing medical care, or at which time the employer will advise the employee of the amount of permanent disability indemnity the employer has determined to be payable. If an employee isprovided with this notice, and the employer later takes the position that the employee has no permanent impairment or limitations resulting from the injury, or later determines permanent disability indemnity is payable, the employer must, within 14 days of the des payable, the employer must, within 14 days of the determination to take this position, provide the employee with the notice specified *above.*

Each of the foregoing notices must describe the administrative procedures available to the injured employee and advise the employee of his or her right to consult an attorney or an information and assistance officer [*Lab. Code § 4061(b)*]. The notice must contain the following language [*Lab. Code § 4061(b)*]:

> Should you decide to be represented by an attorney, you may or may not receive a larger award, but, unless you are determined to be ineligible for an award, the attorney's fee will be deducted from any award you might receive for disability benefits. The decision to be represented by an attorney is yours to make, but it is voluntary and may not be necessary for you to receive your benefits.

[4] Permanent Disability Benefits

[a] In General

If the injury causes permanent disability, the first payment must be made within 14 days after the date of last payment of temporary disability indemnity. When the last payment of temporary disability indemnity has been made pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4656(c)* (maximum period for temporary disability payments for injuries occurring on and after April 19, 2004), and regardless of whether the extent of permanent disability can be determined at that date, the employer nevertheless must commence the timely payment of permanent disability indemnity and continue to make these payments until the employer's reasonable estimate of permanent disability indemnity due has been paid, and if the amount of permanent disability indemnity due has been determined, until that amount has been paid [*Lab. Code § 4650(b)*].

If, within 60 days of a disability becoming permanent and stationary, an employer does not offer the injured employee regular work, modified work, or alternative work, in the form and manner prescribed by the Administrative Director, for a period of at least 12 months, each disability payment remaining to be paid to the injured employee from the date of the end of the 60-day period will be increased by 15 percent [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(2)*].

If, within 60 days of a disability becoming permanent and stationary, an employer offers the injured employee regular work, modified work, or alternative work, in the form and manner prescribed by the Administrative Director, for a period of at least 12 months, and regardless of whether the injured employee accepts or rejects the offer, each disability payment remaining to be paid from the date the offer was made will be decreased by 15 percent [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(3)(A)*].

If the regular work, modified work, or alternative work is terminated by the employer before the end of the period for which disability payments are due, the amount of each of the remaining disability payments will be increased by 15 percent [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(3)(B)*]. An employee who voluntarily terminates employment is not eligible for this increase in payment [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(3)(B)*].

None of the provisions of the preceding three paragraphs applies to an employer that employs fewer than 50 employees [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(2), (3)(B)*].

The court of appeal has held that, because the issues identified in the pretrial conference statement, together with the parties' stipulations, clearly alerted the WCJ that *Lab. Code § 4658(d)* was in issue, there was no basis for failing to apply the entire formula contained in that provision. The court found that in the pretrial conference statement the parties stipulated that the permanent disability benefits that the employer was already paying to the employee included a 15 percent increase pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4658(d)*, and that, by checking the boxes on the pretrial conference form labeled "Permanent Disability" and "Apportionment," the parties conveyed their intention that the WCJ calculate the award for permanent disability benefits under the applicable formula and the facts presented, including *Lab. Code § 4658(d)* [*Bontempo v. W.C.A.B (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 689, 701-704, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 229]* .

For compensable claims arising before April 30, 2004, the above schedule does not apply to the determination of permanent disabilities when there has been either a comprehensive medical-legal report or a report by a treating physician, indicating the existence of permanent disability, or when the employer is required to provide the notice required by *Lab. Code § 4061* to the injured worker [*Lab. Code § 4658(d)(4)*]. (In view of *Lab. Code § 4658(d)(1)*, the need for this provision is not apparent. Moreover, its existence appears to raise the question of which schedule applies to claims arising between April 30, 2004, and the effective date of the revised permanent disability schedule to be adopted by the Administrative Director, which is to be no later than January 1, 2005 [*see Lab. Code § 4660(e)*].)

"Regular work" means the employee's usual occupation or the position in which the employee was engaged at the time of injury and that offers wages and compensation equivalent to those paid to the employee at the time of injury, and located within a reasonable commuting distance of the employee's residence at the time of injury [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(a)*].

"Modified work" means regular work modified so that the employee has the ability to perform all the functions of the job and that offers wages and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to the employee at the time of injury, and located within a reasonable commuting distance of the employee's residence at the time of injury [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(b)*].

"Alternative work" means work that the employee has the ability to perform, that offers wages and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to the employee at the time of injury, and that is located within a reasonable commuting distance of the employee's residence at the time of injury [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(c)*].

For the purpose of determining whether wages and compensation are equivalent to those paid at the time of injury, the wages and compensation for anyincrease in working hours over the average hours worked at the time of injury are not to be considered [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(d)*].

For the purpose of determining whether wages and compensation are equivalent to those paid at the time of injury, actual wages and compensation are to be determined without regard to the minimums and maximums set forth in *Lab. Code § 4451 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(e)*].

The condition that regular, modified, or alternative work be located within a reasonable distance of the employee's residence at the time of injury may be waived by the employee [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(f)*]. The condition will be deemed to be waived if the employee accepts the regular, modified, or alternative work and does not object to the location within 20 days of being informed of the right to object [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(f)*]. The condition will be conclusively deemed to be satisfied if the offered work is at the same location and the same shift as the employment at the time of injury [*Lab. Code § 4658.1(f)*].

The Disability Evaluation Unit, under the direction and authority of the Administrative Director, will issue permanent disability ratings as required, utilizing the Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities adopted by the Administrative Director. The Disability Evaluation Unit prepares the following kinds of rating determinations: formal, summary, consultative, and informal [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10150*].

Reports of permanent disability rating specialists are deemed evidence only with regard to the relation between the disability described and the percentage of permanent disability but not to the existence of the disability [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10167(b), 10602*].

[b] Formal Rating Determinations

Formal rating determinations are prepared by the Disability Evaluation Unit on request of the WCAB or a WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10156*]. Formal rating determinations prepared by disability evaluators are deemed to constitute evidence only as to the relation between the disability or impairment standard(s) described and the percentage of permanent disability [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10158*].

[c] Informal Ratings

If no application for adjudication of claim (discussed under *§ 577.80* et seq.) has been filed and the parties wish to obtain a rating on the basis of medical reports, the Disability Evaluation Unit will issue an informal rating upon the joint request of the parties, or at the request of an information and assistance officer (discussed in *§ 577.12[2]*), providing the necessary information [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(a)*]. The request must be submitted on forms and in a manner prescribed by the administrative director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(a)*; *see § 577.420[1]*]. All medical reports pertaining to the case must be submitted with the request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(a)*].

The Unit will issue the informal rating, which will contain a statement that the informal rating is not a finding, award, order or decision of the Appeals Board, or evidence as to the existence of the factors of disability [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(b)*]. If the rating indicates a life pension or if provision for future medical treatment is indicated, the Unit will forward a copy of the rating to the information and assistance officer for the purpose of obtaining a stipulated award, or for other action as may be appropriate [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(c)*]. Self-ratings prepared by the employer are not acceptable substitutes for informal ratings prepared by the Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167(d)*].

[d] Summary Rating Determinations

[i] In General

Summary rating determinations are prepared by the Disability Evaluation Unit upon receipt of a properly prepared request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160* (unrepresented workers), *10160.5* (represented workers)]. The components of such a request differ depending on whether the injured worker is represented by an attorney [*see* [ii], [iii] *below*].

Once a summary rating determination has been issued to the parties, neither party is permitted to communicate with the Qualified Medical Evaluator. Any dispute with the summary rating or the evaluation on which it is based must be resolved by filing a request for reconsideration of a summary rating with the Administrative Director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(a)*; *see § 577.46[3][f]*].

If the qualified medical evaluator's comprehensive evaluation indicates apportionment of the permanent disability, a summary rating determination may not be made until a WCJ reviews the medical evaluation to determine if the apportionment is inconsistent with the law. The determination of the WCJ is not admissible in any judicial proceeding [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10162(a)*].

[ii] Represented Employee

When an injured employee is represented by an attorney, a person requesting a summary rating must complete DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination [*see § 577.422[1]*] and submit it to a Qualified or Agreed Medical Evaluator, as appropriate, together with all medical reports and medical records

concerning the case. Once the medical evaluator has completed the evaluation report, he or she must submit the report together with the completed DEU Form 101 to the appropriate office of the Disability Evaluation Unit specified on the form and serve copies on the party requesting the evaluation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(b)*].

Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, a represented party who is uncertain as to the need for the expertise of a disability rater may wait to request a summary rating determination until after receiving the report of the Qualified Medical Evaluator or Agreed Medical Evaluator. If, after receiving the evaluator's report, a party determines that a summary rating is needed, he or she must file the Request for Summary Rating Determination of Qualified Medical Evaluator's Report and the medical report with the DEU office designated by the Administrative Director and must immediately serve a filed copy of the Summary Rating Determination on the other party [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(c)*].

In either case, the DEU will prepare a summary rating determination when it has received the completed Request and the evaluator's report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(a)*]. If a case is settled prior to receipt of a summary rating that has been requested, the requesting party must notify the DEU office of the settlement [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(d)*].

If the agreed on medical evaluator or qualified medical evaluator apportions the permanent disability, the Disability Evaluation Unit will issue a summary rating determination "before apportionment" [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10162(d)*].

[iii] Unrepresented Employee

When an injured worker is not represented by an attorney, the insurance carrier or self-insurer must provide the worker with DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU), Employee's Disability Questionnaire [*see § 577.421[1]*] before the worker attends his or her scheduled examination by the Qualified Medical Evaluator. The worker will be instructed in the prescribed form and manner for completing the questionnaire. The worker will then give the completed form to the medical evaluator at the time of the examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(b)*].

Also prior to the injured workers' scheduled examination by the Qualified Medical Evaluator, the insurance carrier, self-insurer, or injured worker must complete DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination [*see § 577.422[1]*] and send it to the medical evaluator, with a copy served on the opposing party, together with all medical reports and medical records relating to the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*]. The form must include the address of the appropriate Disability Evaluation Unit. A list of the Unit's offices with their respective areas of jurisdiction is available from the Unit on request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*].

When a summary rating determination has been requested, the evaluator must submit the completed DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU) and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), together with the formal medical evaluation of the workers' condition and a document cover sheet and a separator sheet, pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(b)* (these sheets to be served on only the Disability Evaluation Unit), to the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit designated on the DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), with a copy to the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(d)*]. Once the Unit has received the completed DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU) and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU) and the formal medical evaluation by the Qualified Medical Evaluator, the Unit will prepare a summary rating determination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(a)*]. No formal medical evaluation will be considered received until the completed DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU) and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU) and the medical evaluation are received in the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit having jurisdiction over the employee's area of residence. Any requests received without all the required documents will be returned to the sender [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(e)*].

When the injury has occurred on or after January 1, 1994, a summary rating determination may also be made for an unrepresented worker based on a report of the primary treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785* (reports of primary treating physician)]. To request a summary rating determination based on the report of the primary treating physician, the carrier, self-insured employer, or employee must send a completed

DWC-AD Form 102 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination of Primary Treating Physician's Report [*see § 577.423[1]*], along with a copy of the primary treating physician's report, if the report has not already been filed in EAMS, to the Disability Evaluation Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1(b)*]. A filed copy of the request and the report must also be served on the non-requesting party, along with proof of service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1(c)*].

[e] Consultative Rating Determinations

Consultative rating determinations may be requested for the purpose of determining the ratable significance of factors, reviewing proposed Compromise and Release Agreements for adequacy, determining commuted values, resolving occupational questions, or any other matters within the expertise of the disability evaluators [*see § 577.424*, for form]. These rating determinations are not admissible in judicial proceedings [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(b)*].

The Disability Evaluation Unit will prepare consultative rating determinations at the request of the WCAB, WCJs, WCJs pro tempore, Settlement Conference Referees, Arbitrators, and Information and Assistance Officers [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(a)*]. The Unit may also prepare consultative rating determinations on receipt of reasonable requests from employers, injured workers, or their respective representatives. A request is not considered reasonable when an insurance carrier or self-insurer seeks a rating determination for the purpose of terminating its liability or for negotiating a Compromise and Release settlement when the injured worker is not represented by an attorney. Consultative rating determinations cannot be used as a substitute for summary rating determinations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(c)*].

In all cases, the person requesting a consultative rating determination must provide the Disability Evaluation Unit with the injured workers' occupation and age at the time of injury [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(d)*].

No consultative rating determination will be provided in cases in which an Application for Adjudication of Claim has been filed with the WCAB without prior written authorization of the WCAB, a WCJ, WCJ pro tempore, Settlement Conference Referee, Arbitrator, or Information and Assistance Officer. In cases inwhich an application has been filed, the disability evaluator may require that any request be accompanied by the WCAB file [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(e)*].

[5] Return-to-Work Program

[a] Term and Scope of Program

Commencing July 1, 2004 [*Lab. Code § 139.48(h)*; *see Lab. Code § 139.48(a)(2)* (statute to be implemented to extent funds are available); *see also* [d], *below*], and, unless otherwise continued by legislative action, sunsetting on January 1, 2009 [*Lab. Code § 139.48(i)*], this program is intended to promote the early and sustained return to work of employees following work-related injuries or illness [*Lab. Code §§ 139.47, 139.48(a)(1)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(d)*]. Its major features include creation of the Workers' Compensation Return-to-Work Fund, subject to appropriation by the legislature, from which an employer will be reimbursed, subject to various conditions and limitations, for wages, workplace modification expenses, and workers' compensation insurance premiums, when an employee returns to modified or alternative work, as defined in *Lab. Code § 4644(a)(5)* and *(6)*, during the period the employee is temporarily disabled. The Administrative Director has adapted regulations to carry out the program [*see Lab. Code §§ 139.47, 139.48, 139.49*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10116*-10133.58]. The details of the program are outlined in [b]-[f], *below*.

[b] Obligations of Director of Industrial Relations

The Director of Industrial Relations is required to establish and maintain a program to encourage, facilitate, and educate employers to provide early and sustained return to work after occupational injury or illness. The program is to do both of the following [*see Lab. Code § 139.47*]:

- Develop educational materials and guides, in easily understandable language in both print and electronic form, for employers, health care providers, employees, and labor unions. These materials are

to address issues including, but not limited to, early return to work, assessment of functional abilities and limitations, development of appropriate work restrictions, job analysis, worksite modifications, assistive equipment and devices, and available resources.

- Conduct training for employee and employer organizations and health care providers concerning the accommodation of injured employees and the prevention of reinjury.

[c] Employer Reimbursement

Upon submission by an eligible employer of documentation in accordance with regulations [*see Lab. Code § 139.48(f)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10120* (Form DWC-AD 10128, Request for Reimbursement of Accommodation Expenses for Injuries on or After July 1, 1004); *see also Lab. Code § 139.48(e)(1)* ("eligible employer" means any employer, except state or employer that is one of state's political subdivisions eligible to become permissibly self-insured pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3700(c)*, who employs 50 or fewer full-time employees on date of injury); [d], *below*], the Administrative Director is to pay the workplace modification expense reimbursement allowed under the program [*Lab. Code § 139.48(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119*].

The Administrative Director is to reimburse an eligible employer for expenses incurred to make workplace modifications to accommodate the employee's return to modified or alternative work, as follows [*Lab. Code § 139.48(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(f), (g)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(g)* ("modified work" means regular work modified so that employee has ability to perform all functions of job and that offers wages and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to employee at time of injury, and located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(a)* ("alternative work" means work (1) offered either by employer who employed injured worker at time of injury, or by another employer when previous employment was seasonal work, (2) that employee has ability to perform, (3) that offers wages and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to employee at time of injury, and (4) that is located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(n)* ("regular work" means employee's usual occupation or position in which employee was engaged at time of injury and that offers wages and compensation equivalent to those paid to employee at time of injury, and located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(o)* ("seasonal work" means employment as daily hire, project hire, or annual season hire)]:

- The maximum reimbursement to an eligible employer for expenses to accommodate each temporarily disabled injured worker is one thousand two hundred fifty dollars ($1,250).

- The maximum reimbursement to an eligible employer for expenses to accommodate each permanently disabled worker who is a qualified injured worker is two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500). If the employer received reimbursement under paragraph 1, the amount of the reimbursement under paragraph 1 and this paragraph is not to exceed two thousand five hundred dollars ($2,500).

- The modification expenses must be incurred in order to allow a temporarily disabled worker to perform modified or alternative work within physician-imposed temporary work restrictions, or to allow a permanently disabled worker who is an injured worker to return to sustained modified or alternative employment [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(f)(2)* ("sustained modified or alternative work" is work anticipated to last at least 12 months)] with the employer within physician-imposed permanent work restrictions.

- Allowable expenses may include physical modifications to the worksite, equipment, devices, furniture, tools, or other necessary costs for accommodation of the employee's restrictions.

An eligible employer seeking reimbursement must submit a "Request for Reimbursement of Accommodation Expenses" (Form DWC-AD 10120) within 90 calendar days from the date of the expenditure for which the employer is seeking reimbursement. As a condition to reimbursement, the expenditure must not have been paid for or covered by the employer's insurer or any source of funding other than the employer. Upon a showing of good cause, the filing date may be extended. The employer must attach to its request copies of all pertinent medical reports that contain the work restrictions being accommodated, any other documentation supporting the request, and all receipts for accommodation expenses. Requests should be sent to the mailing address for the Division of Workers' Compensation Return to Work Program listed in the website of the Division of Workers' Compensation at: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(h)*].

The Administrative Director or his or her designee is required to review each Request for Reimbursement of Accommodation Expenses and within 60 business days provide the employer with one of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(i)*]:

- That the request has been approved, together with a check for the reimbursement allowed, and an explanation of the allowance, if less than the maximum amounts set forth in the statute.

- That the request has been denied, with an explanation of the basis for denial.

- That the request is deficient or incomplete and indicating what clarification or additional information is necessary.

An eligible employer may appeal the Administrative Director's notice under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(i)(1)* and *(2)* by filing a "Petition Appealing Administrative Director's Reimbursement Allowance" setting forth the basis of the appeal. The petition must be filed within 20 days from the date of the issuance of the Administrative Director's notice [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10294(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(k)*].

If an application for adjudication has been previously filed, the petition appealing the Administrative Director's notice must be filed at the district office having venue, and the case number assigned to the application for adjudication will be assigned to the petition. If an application for adjudication has not been previously filed, an application must be filed together with the petition, and venue must be determined in accordance with *Lab. Code § 5501.5* and *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10409 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10294(b)*].

A "Petition Appealing Administrative Director's Reimbursement Allowance" must be accompanied by a declaration of readiness [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10294(c)*].

A copy of the petition must be concurrently served on the Administrative Director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10294(d)*].

This section does not create a preference in employment for injured employees over noninjured employees. It is unlawful for an employer to discriminatorily terminate, lay off, demote, or otherwise displace an employee in order to return an industrially injured employee to employment for the purpose of obtaining the reimbursement set forth in *Lab. Code § 139.48(c)* [*Lab. Code § 139.48(d)*].

For purposes of this section, "employee" means a worker who has suffered a work-related injury or illness on or after July 1, 2004 [*Lab. Code § 139.48(e)(2)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(a)*].

[d] Regulations and Funding

Among the regulations the Administrative Director was required to adopt to carry out the return-to-work program was a regulation containing a prioritization scheme to cover a situation in which budget funds are insufficient to implement

the workplace modification expense reimbursement provided for by the statute [*Lab. Code § 139.48(f)*; *see* [c], *above*]. Pursuant to this directive, the Administrative Director has provided that, in the event that there are insufficient funds in the Return to Work Fund to fully reimburse an employer or employers for workplace modification expenses as required by the statute, the Administrative Director will utilize the following priority list in establishing the amount of reimbursement or whether reimbursement is allowed, in order of decreasing priority [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(j)*]:

- Employers who have not previously received any reimbursement under this program.

- Employers who have not previously received any reimbursement under this program for the employee who is the subject of the request.

- Employers who are seeking reimbursement for accommodation required in returning a permanently disabled employee to sustained modified or alternative work.

- Employers who are requesting reimbursement for accommodation required by a temporarily disabled employee.

The Workers' Compensation Return-to-Work Fund is created as a special fund in the State Treasury. The fund consists of all penalties collected pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814.6* and transfers made by the Administrative Director from the Workers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund established pursuant to *Lab. Code § 62.5*. The fund is to be administered by the Administrative Director. Moneys in the fund may be expended by the Administrative Director, upon appropriation by the legislature, only for purposes of implementing the return-to-work program [*Lab. Code § 139.48(g)*; *see* Stats. 2002, ch. 6, § 86 (intent of legislature is that all reimbursement expended for return-to-work program be funded from annual premium tax, collected under *Rev. & Tax Code § 12201*, directly attributable to compensation benefit rates and amounts set forth in Rev. & Tax Code); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10119(e)*].

[e] Offer of Work; Adjustment of Permanent Disability Payments

As part of the return-to-work program, the Administrative Director has promulgated an additional regulation that applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2005, and to the following employers [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(a)*]:

1. Insured employers who employed 50 or more employees at the time of the most recent policy inception or renewal date for the insurance policy that was in effect at the time of the employee's injury.

2. Self-insured employers who employed 50 or more employees at the time of the most recent filing by the employer of the Self-Insurer's Annual Report that was in effect at the time of the employee's injury.

3. Legally uninsured employers who employed 50 or more employees at the time of injury.

Within 60 calendar days from the date that the condition of an injured employee with permanent partial disability becomes permanent and stationary [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9813.2, 10117(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9*(*l*) ("permanent and stationary" defined)]:

1. If an employer does not serve the employee with a notice of offer of regular work, modified work, or alternative work [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(n)* ("regular work" means employee's usual occupation or position in which employee was engaged at time of injury and that offers wages and comp ensation equivalent to those paid to employee at time of injury, and located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(g)* ("modified work" means regular work modified so that employee has ability to perform all functions of job and that offers wages

and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to employee at time of injury, and located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(a)* ("alternative work" means work (1) offered either by employer who employed injured worker at time of injury, or by another employer when previous employment was seasonal work; (2) that employee has ability to perform; (3) that offers wages and compensation that are at least 85 percent of those paid to employee at time of injury; and (4) that is located within reasonable commuting distance of employee's residence at time of injury)] for a period of at least 12 months, each payment of permanent partial disability remaining to be paid to the employee from the date of the end of the 60 day period is to be paid in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4658(d)(1)* and increased by 15 percent.

2. If an employer serves the employee with a notice of offer of regular work, modified work, or alternative work for a period of at least 12 months, and in accordance with the requirements set forth in paragraphs 3 and 4, below, each payment of permanent partial disability remaining to be paid from the date the offer was served on the employee is to be paid in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4658(d)(1)* and decreased by 15 percent, regardless of whether the employee accepts or rejects the offer.

3. The employer must use Form DWC-AD 10133.53 to offer modified or alternative work, or Form DWC-AD 10003 to offer regular work. The claims administrator may serve the offer of work on behalf of the employer.

4. The regular, alternative, or modified work that is offered by the employer pursuant to paragraph 2, above, must be located within a reasonable commuting distance of the employee's residence at the time of the injury, unless the employee waives this condition. This condition will be deemed to be waived if the employee accepts the regular, modified, or alternative work, and does not object to the location within 20 calendar days of being informed of the right to object. The condition will be conclusively deemed to be satisfied if the offered work is at the same location and the same shift as the employment at the time of injury.

If the claims administrator relies on a permanent and stationary date contained in a medical report prepared by the employee's treating physician, QME, or AME, but there is subsequently a dispute as to an employee's permanent and stationary status, and there has been a notice of offer of work served on the employee, the claims administrator may withhold 15 percent from each payment of permanent partial disability remaining to be paid from the date the notice of offer was served on the employee until there has been a final judicial determination of the date that the employee is permanent and stationary pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(c)*].

1. When there is a final judicial determination that the employee is permanent and stationary on a date later than the date relied on by the employer in making its offer of work, the employee must be reimbursed any amount withheld up to the date a new notice of offer of work is served on the employee.

2. When there is a final judicial determination that the employee is not permanent and stationary, the employee must be reimbursed any amount withheld up to the date of the determination.

3. The claims administrator is not required to reimburse permanent partial disability benefit payments that have been withheld pursuant to this provision during any period for which the employee is entitled to temporary disability benefit payments.

If the employee's regular work, modified work, or alternative work, offered by the employer and accepted by the employee, is terminated prior to the end of the period for which permanent partial disability benefits are due, the amount of each remaining permanent partial disability payment from the date of the termination is to be paid in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4658(d)(1)*, as though no decrease in payments had been imposed, and increased by 15

percent. An employee who voluntarily terminates his or her regular work, modified work, or alternative work is not eligible for this 15 percent increase in permanent partial disability payments [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(d)*].

Nothing in this regulation prevents the parties from settling or agreeing to commute the permanent disability benefits to which an employee may be entitled. However, if the permanent disability benefits are commuted by a WCJ or the Appeals Board pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5100*, the commuted sum will account for any adjustment that would have been required by this regulation if payment had been made pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4658* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(e)*].

When the employer offers regular, modified, or alternative work to the employee that meets the conditions of this regulation and subsequently learns that the employee cannot lawfully perform regular, modified, or alternative work, the employer is not required to provide the regular, modified, or alternative work [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(f)*].

If the employer offers regular, modified, or alternative seasonal work to the employee, the offer must meet all of the following requirements [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10117(g)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10116.9(o)* ("seasonal work" means employment as daily hire, project hire, or annual season hire)]:

1. The employee was hired for seasonal work prior to injury.

2. The offer of regular, modified, or alternative seasonal work is of reasonably similar hours and working conditions to the employee's previous employment, and the one-year requirement may be satisfied by cumulative periods of seasonal work.

3. The work must commence within 12 months of the date of the offer.

4. The offer meets the conditions set forth in this section.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized TreatmentWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsEmployee RightsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsRehabilitationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.46

§ 577.46 Medical-Legal Evaluations

[1] Report of Treating Physician

The treating physician primarily responsible for managing the injured worker's care, or the physician designated by the treating physician, must, in accordance with rules promulgated by the Administrative Director, render opinions on all medical issues necessary to determine eligibility for compensation [*Lab. Code § 4061.5*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785*]. If there is more than one treating physician, a single report must be prepared by the physician primarily responsible for managing the injured worker's care that incorporates the findings of the various treating physicians [*Lab. Code § 4061.5*].

On determining that a treating physician's report contains opinions that are the result of conjecture, are not supported by adequate evidence, or indicate bias, the WCAB must so notify the Administrative Director in writing [*Lab. Code § 4068(a)*]. If the Administrative Director believes that any treating physician's reports show a pattern of unsupported opinions, the Director must notify the treating physician's licensing body [*Lab. Code § 4068(b)*].

[2] Medical Evaluation to Determine Compensability of Injury

[a] In General

When a dispute exists over the compensability of any injury, that is, when injury to some part of the body is not accepted as compensable by the employer, neither the employer nor the employee is liable for any comprehensive medical-legal evaluation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9793(c)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9794(a)(2), 9793(f), (1)* (reimbursement allowed for cost of follow-up and supplemental medical-legal evaluation reports)] performed by other than the treating physician, except as provided in *Lab. Code § 4060*. However, reports of treating physicians shall be admissible [*Lab. Code § 4060(a), (b)*]. If a medical evaluation is required to determine compensability at any time after the filing of the claim form, and the employee is represented by an attorney, a medical evaluation to determine compensability is to be obtained only by the procedure provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.2* [*Lab. Code § 4060(c)*; *see* [3][a], *below*].

[b] Unrepresented Employees

If a medical evaluation is required to determine compensability at any time after the claim form is filed, and the employee is not represented by an attorney, the employer must provide the employee with notice either that the employer requests a comprehensive medical evaluation to determine compensability or that the employer has not accepted liability and the employee may request a comprehensive medical evaluation to determine compensability. Either party may request a comprehensive medical evaluation to determine compensability. The evaluation is to be obtained only by the procedure provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.1* [*Lab. Code § 4060(d)*; *see* [3][b], *below*].

Each notice mentioned in the preceding paragraph must describe the administrative procedures available to the injured employee and advise the employee of his or her right to consult an information and assistance officer or an attorney [*Lab. Code § 4060(e)(1)*]. It must contain the following language: "Should you decide to be represented by an attorney, you may or may not receive a larger award, but, unless you are determined to be ineligible for an award, the attorney's fee will be deducted from any award you might receive for disability benefits. The decision to be represented by an attorney is yours to make, but it is voluntary and may not be necessary for you to receive your benefits" [*Lab. Code § 4060(e)(1)*]. The notice must be accompanied by the form prescribed by the Administrative Director for requesting the assignment of a panel of qualified medical evaluators [*Lab. Code § 4060(e)(2)*].

[3] Medical Evaluation When Parties Do Not Agree to Permanent Disability Rating or Need for Continuing Medical Care

[a] QME Panel Requests

IMPORTANT NOTE: For some time, the law was unclear as to the procedure to be followed in such cases when the injury has occurred in the interval between April 19, 2004 (the date of enactment of the present versions of *Lab. Code §§ 4061* and *4062.2*), and January 1, 2005. However, the court of appeal, in a pair of companion cases, has shed some light on the issue. In the first case, the court held that the pre-April 19, 2004, version of either *Lab. Code § 4061* or *4062* applied when a medical evaluation of a represented employee was required to resolve a dispute arising out of an injury occurring before January 1, 2005. The court found that the plain language of the post-April 19, 2004, *Lab. Code § 4062.2* limited its applicability to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2005, and that it would be illogical to allow a vacuum in which an employer would have no right to have a medical evaluation performed. Moreover, said the court, this conclusion was consistent with § 47 of SB 899 (the major workers' compensation legislation that became law on April 19, 2004), which stated that SB 899 applied prospectively from the date of SB 899's enactment, regardless of the date of injury, unless otherwise specified, and SB 899's *Lab. Code § 4062.2* did otherwise specify, confining its applicability to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2005 [*Nunez v. W.C.A.B. (2006) 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 914*]. In the second case, the court held that, for the reasons set forth in the first case, *Nunez*, the medical evaluation and reporting procedure of pre-SB 899 *Lab. Code § 4062* applied to represented cases with a date of injury prior to January 1, 2005. Additionally, the court held that *Lab. Code § 4050* could not be utilized to circumvent the medical evaluation and reporting procedure of pre-SB 899 *Lab. Code § 4062*, and that *Lab. Code § 5701* should not be utilized to order a medical evaluation that appears to violate pre-SB 899 *Lab. Code § 4062* and that may generate a report that is inadmissible at trial [*Cortez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 596, 601-602, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 922]* .

The relevant regulations provide that, when an injured employee is not represented by an attorney and either the employee or the claims administrator requests a QME panel pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.1*, the request is to be submitted on the mandated form [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 105* (Request for QME Panel under *Lab. Code § 4062.1*)]. The claims administrator or, if none, the employer must provide Form 105 along with the Attachment to Form 105 (How to Request a Qualified Medical Evaluator if You Do Not Have an Attorney) to the unrepresented employee by means of personal delivery or by first class or certified mail [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(a)*].

Requests for a QME panel in a represented case with a date of injury on or after January 1, 2005, or in which represented parties agree to obtain a panel of QMEs pursuant to the process in *Lab. Code § 4062.2*, are to be submitted on the mandated form [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 106* (Request for QME Panel under *Lab. Code § 4062.2*)]. The party requesting a QME panel must: (1) identify the disputed issue that requires a comprehensive medical-legal report to be resolved; (2) attach a copy of the written proposal, naming one or more physicians to be an AME, that was sent to the opposing party once the dispute arose; (3) designate a specialty for the QME panel requested; (4) state the specialty preferred by the opposing party, if known; and (5) state the specialty of the treating physician. In represented cases with dates of injury prior to January 1, 2005, and only upon the parties' agreement to obtain a QME panel pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.2*, the party requesting a QME panel must submit QME Form 106 in compliance with the above requirements and provide written evidence of the parties' agreement. Once such a panel in a represented case with a date of injury prior to January 1, 2005, is issued, the parties are bound by the timelines and process in *Lab. Code § 4062.2* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(b)*].

If a request form is incomplete, or improperly completed, so that a QME panel selection cannot properly be made, the form will be returned to the requesting party with an explanation of why the QME panel selection could not be made. The Medical Director also may delay issuing a new QME panel, if necessary, until he or she receives additional reasonable information requested from a party or both parties needed to resolve the panel request. Reasonable information includes, but is not limited to, whether a QME panel previously issued to the injured employee was used [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(c)*].

After a claim form has been filed, the claims administrator or, if none, the employer may request a panel of QMEs only as provided in *Lab. Code § 4060* to determine whether to accept or reject a claim within the 90-day period for rejecting liability [*see Lab. Code § 5402(b)*] and only after providing evidence of compliance with the relevant statutes [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(d)(1)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 4062.1*, *4062.2*].

Once the claims administrator or, if none, the employer has accepted as compensable an injury to any body part in the claim, a request for a panel QME may be filed based only on a dispute arising under *Lab. Code § 4061* or *4062* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(d)(2)*].

When an injury or illness claim of an employee has been denied entirely by the claims administrator or, if none, by the employer, only the employee may request a panel of QMEs, as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 4060(d)* and *4062.1*, if unrepresented, or as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 4060(c)* and *4062.2*, if represented [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(d)(3)*].

After the 90-day period for denying liability [*see Lab. Code § 5402(b)*] has expired, a request from the claims administrator or, if none, from the employer for a QME panel to determine compensability will be issued only upon presentation of: (1) a finding by a WCJ that the presumption of compensability [*see Lab. Code § 5402(b)*] has been rebutted; and (2) an order by the WCJ that a QME panel should be issued to determine compensability. The order must also specify the residential or, if applicable, the employment-based zip code from which to select QMEs and either the medical specialty of the panel or which party may select the medical specialty [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(d)(4)*].

If the request form is submitted by or on behalf of an employee who no longer resides in California, the geographic area of the QME panel selection within the state must be determined by agreement between the claims administrator or, if none, the employer and the employee. If no agreement can be reached, the geographic area of the QME panel selection will be determined for an unrepresented employee by the employee's former residence in the state and for a represented employee by the office of the employee's attorney [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(e)*].

To compile a panel list of three independent QMEs randomly selected from the specialty designated by the party holding the legal right to request a QME panel, the Medical Director must exclude from the panel, to the extent feasible, any QME who is listed by another QME as a business partner or as having a shared specified financial interest [*8 Cal.*

Code Reg. § 30(f); *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1, 29* (specified financial interests)].

The panel request in a represented case must be sent to the Medical Unit address on QME Form 106 by first class mail. The Medical Unit will not accept panel requests in represented cases delivered in person by a party, the party's attorney, any other person, or by other commercial courier or delivery services [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(g)*].

[b] Specialist Designation

The time periods specified in *Lab. Code §§ 4062.1(c)* and *4062.2(c)*, respectively, for selecting an evaluator from a QME panel and for scheduling an appointment, will be tolled whenever the Medical Director asks a party for additional information needed to resolve the panel request. These time periods will remain tolled until the date the Medical Director issues either a new QME panel or a decision on the panel request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30(h)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 30.5* (in QME panel selection process, Medical Director required to use type of specialist(s) indicated by requestor)].

[c] QME Panel Selection

When requested by an employee or employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.1*, the Medical Director is required to assign a three-member panel of qualified medical evaluators within five working days after receiving a request for a panel, and must notify the employee of the physicians selected for the panel. If a panel is not assigned within 15 working days, the employee has the right to obtain a medical evaluation from any QME of his or her choice [*Lab. Code § 139.2(h)*]. The panel must be selected at random from the appropriate specialty identified by the party who holds the legal right to designate the specialty, requested by the employee on the form, with consideration given to the proximity of the QME's office to the employee's residence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31(a)*; *see Lab. Code § 139.2(d)* (requirements for proximity of QMEs to employee's residence)]. Once the panel has been selected, a selection form will be sent to the employee with (1) the names, addresses, and phone numbers of three physicians and a summary of each one's medical background; (2) the name and address of the employee and the name of the claims administrator; (3) a statement advising the employee that he or she is entitled to receive transportation expenses and temporary disability for each day necessary for the examination; and (4) the following statement in a clear and conspicuous location and type [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 107* (IMC Form 107--panel selection form); *Lab. Code § 139.2(h)*]:

> You have the right to consult with an information and assistance officer at no cost to you prior to selecting the doctor to prepare your evaluation, or you may consult with an attorney. If your claim eventually goes to court, the judge will consider the evaluation prepared by the doctor you select to decide your claim.

Any physician who has served as the employee's primary treating physician or secondary physician and who is chosen for that employee's panel, must disqualify him or herself, and either party may request a replacement [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31(c)*]. The Medical Director is required to exclude from the panel selection process any QME who has informed him or her that he or she is unavailable [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 33* (unavailability of QME)].

For a panel to be issued in a selected specialty, there must be at least five active QMEs in the specialty at the time the panel selection is requested. If fewer than five QMEs are active in a requested specialty, the Medical Director must contact the party who holds the legal right to designate the specialty for an alternative specialty selection [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31(d)*].

[d] QME Panel Selection Disputes in Represented Cases

When the Medical Director receives two or more panel selection forms pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.2* on the same day and the forms designate different physician specialties for the QME panel, the Medical Director will use the following procedures [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.1(a)*]:

1. If one party requests the same specialty as that of the treating physician, the panel will be issued in the specialty of the treating physician unless the Medical Director is persuaded by supporting documentation provided by the requestor that explains the medical basis for the requested specialty.

2. If no party requests a panel in the specialty of the treating physician, the Medical Director will select a specialty appropriate for the medical issue in dispute and issue a panel in that specialty.

3. Upon request by the Medical Director, the party requesting the panel will provide additional medical records to assist the Medical Director in determining the appropriate specialty.

If a party in a represented case wishes to request a QME panel pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.2* in a specialty other than the specialty of the treating physician, the party must submit with the panel request form any relevant documentation supporting the reason for requesting a different specialty [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.1(b)*].

If the Medical Director is unable to issue a QME panel in a represented case within 30 calendar days of receiving the request, either party may seek an order from a WCJ that a QME panel be issued. Any such order must specify the specialty of the QME panel or the party to be designated to select the specialty [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.1(c)*].

If the employee is represented and the parties have completed the conferring and striking processes described in *Lab. Code § 4062.2(c)*, the represented employee must schedule the appointment with the physician selected from the QME panel. If the represented employee fails to do so within 10 business days of the date a QME is selected from the panel, the claims administrator may arrange the appointment and notify the employee and the employee's attorney [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.1(d)*].

[e] Scheduling Appointment With Panel QME

An unrepresented employee must, within 10 days of having been furnished with the relevant form, select a QME from the panel list, contact the QME to schedule an appointment, and inform the claims administrator of the QME selection and the appointment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.3(a)*].

Neither the employer, the claims administrator, nor any other representative of the employer is permitted to discuss the selection of the QME with an unrepresented employee who has the legal right to select the QME [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.3(b)*].

If, within 10 days of the issuance of a QME panel, the unrepresented employee fails to select a QME from the panel or fails to schedule an appointment with the selected QME, the claims administrator may schedule an appointment with a panel QME, only as provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.1(c)*, and must notify the employee of the appointment, as provided in that statute [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.3(c)*].

[f] QME Replacement Requests

A replacement QME to a panel, or at the discretion of the Medical Director a replacement of an entire panel of QMEs, will be selected at random by the Medical Director and provided upon request whenever any of the following occurs [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.5(a)*]:

1. A QME on the panel issued does not practice in the specialty requested by the party holding the legal right to request the panel.

2. A QME on the panel issued cannot schedule an examination for the employee within 60 days of the

initial request for an appointment, or if the 60-day scheduling limit has been waived [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 33(e)*], the QME cannot schedule the examination within 90 days of the date of the initial request for an appointment.

3. The injured worker has changed his or her residence address since the QME panel was issued and prior to the date of the initial evaluation of the injured worker.

4. A physician on the QME panel is a member of the same group practice [*see Lab. Code § 139.3*] as another QME on the panel.

5. The QME is unavailable [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 33* (unavailability of QME)].

6. The evaluator who previously reported in the case is no longer available.

7. A QME named on the panel is currently, or has been, the employee's primary treating physician or secondary physician [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785*] for the injury currently in dispute.

8. The claims administrator or, if none, the employer and the employee agree in writing, for the employee's convenience only, that a new panel may be issued in the geographic area of the employee's workplace and a copy of the employee's agreement is submitted with the panel replacement request.

9. The Medical Director, upon written request, finds good cause that a replacement QME or a replacement panel is appropriate for reasons related to the medical nature of the injury. For purposes of this subsection, "good cause" is defined as a documented medical or psychological impairment.

10. The Medical Director, upon written request, filed with a copy of the Doctor's First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness (Form DLSR 5021) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 14006, 14007*] and the most recent DWC Form PR-2 ("Primary Treating Physician's Progress Report" [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785.2*] or narrative report filed in lieu of the PR-2, determines after a review of all appropriate records that the specialty chosen by the party holding the legal right to designate a specialty is medically or otherwise inappropriate for the disputed medical issue(s). The Medical Director may request either party to provide additional information or records necessary for the determination.

11. The evaluator has violated the regulation regarding appointment notification and cancellation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34*], except that the evaluator will not be replaced for this reason whenever the request for a replacement by a party is made more than 15 calendar days from either the date the party became aware of the violation of the regulation or the date the report was served by the evaluator, whichever is earlier.

12. The evaluator failed to meet the deadlines regarding medical evaluation time frames [*see Lab. Code § 4062.5*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 38], and the party requesting the replacement objected to the report on the grounds of lateness prior to the date the evaluator served the report. A party requesting a replacement on this ground must attach to the request for a replacement a copy of the party's objection to the untimely report.

13. The QME has a disqualifying conflict of interest [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 41.5*].

14. The Administrative Director has issued an order for additional QME evaluation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(c)*].

15. The selected medical evaluator, who otherwise appears to be qualified and competent to address all disputed medical issues, refuses to provide, when requested by a party or by the Medical Director, either: (A) a complete medical evaluation [*see Lab. Code § 4062.3(i), (j)*]; or (B) a written statement that explains why the evaluator believes he or she is not medically qualified or medically competent to address one or more issues in dispute in the case.

16. The QME panel list was issued more than 24 months prior to the date the request for a replacement is received by the Medical Unit, and none of the QMEs on the panel list has examined the injured worker.

When the Medical Director determines that a request made for a QME replacement or QME panel replacement is valid, the time limit for an unrepresented employee to select a QME and schedule an appointment [*see Lab. Code § 4062.1(c)*] and the time limit for a represented employee to strike a QME name from the QME panel [*see Lab. Code § 4062.2(c)*] is tolled until the date the replacement QME name or QME panel is issued [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.5(b)*].

In the event the parties in a represented case have struck two QME names from a panel and subsequently a valid ground arises to replace the remaining QME, none of the QMEs whose names appeared on the earlier QME panel may be included in the replacement QME panel [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.5(c)*].

[g] Obtaining Additional QME Panel in Different Specialty

Once an AME, an Agreed Panel QME, or a panel QME has issued a comprehensive medical-legal report and a new medical dispute arises, the parties, to the extent possible, must obtain a follow-up evaluation or a supplemental evaluation from the same evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.7(a)*].

Upon a showing of good cause that a panel of QME physicians in a different specialty is needed to assist the parties to reach an expeditious and just resolution of disputed medical issues, the Medical Director must issue an additional panel of QME physicians selected at random in the specialty requested. For the purpose of this section, good cause means any of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.7(b)*]:

1. An order by a WCJ for a panel of QME physicians that also either designates a party to select the specialty or states the specialty to be selected and the residential or employment-based Zip code from which to randomly select evaluators.

2. The AME or QME selected advises the parties and the Medical Director that he or she has completed or will complete a timely evaluation of the disputed medical issues within his or her scope of practice and areas of clinical competence but recommends that a new evaluator in another specialty is needed to evaluate one or more remaining disputed medical conditions, injuries, or issues that are outside of the evaluator's areas of clinical competence, and either the injured worker is unrepresented or the parties in a represented case have been unable to select an AME for that purpose.

3. A written agreement by the parties in a represented case that there is a need for an additional comprehensive medical-legal report by an evaluator in a different specialty, that attempts to select an AME pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.2* for that purpose have failed, and the specialty that the parties have agreed on for the additional evaluation.

4. In an unrepresented case, that the parties have conferred with an Information and Assistance Officer, have explained the need for an additional QME in another specialty to address disputed issues, and, as noted by the Information and Assistance Officer on the panel request form, have reached agreement in the presence of and with the assistance of the Officer on the specialty requested for the additional QME panel. The parties may confer with the Information and Assistance Officer in person or by conference

call.

[h] Consultations

When an acupuncturist has been selected by the injured worker from a three-member panel and an issue of disability is in dispute, the acupuncturist must request a consultation from a QME [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 1(z)*] to evaluate the disability issue(s). The acupuncturist will evaluate all other issues as required for a complete evaluation. If requested by the QME acupuncturist to obtain a QME to provide the consulting evaluation, the Medical Director must issue a panel within 15 days of the request in the specialty selected by the QME acupuncturist [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(a)*].

Except as provided in the preceding paragraph, no QME may obtain a consultation for the purpose of obtaining an opinion regarding permanent disability and apportionment consistent with the requirements of *Lab. Code §§ 4660 through 4664* and the AMA *Guides* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(b)*].

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994, a QME may obtain a consultation from any physician as reasonable and necessary pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4064(a)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(c)*].

Whenever an Agreed Panel QME or a QME determines that a consultation is necessary pursuant and the physician selected for the consultation is not selected by the parties from a QME panel issued by the Medical Director, the referring QME must arrange the consultation appointment and advise the injured employee and the claims administrator or, if none, the employer, and each party's attorney, if any, in writing of the appointment date, time, and place by use of QME Form 110 (QME Appointment Notification Form) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(d)*].

The consulting physician must serve the consulting report on the referring QME. On receipt of the consulting physician's report, the referring evaluator must review the report, incorporate it by reference into the referring evaluator's medical-legal report, and comment on the consulting physician's findings and conclusions in the discussion sections of the evaluator's report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(e)*].

The referring QME must file the comprehensive medical-legal report within the specified time periods [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38*]. In the event a consulting physician's report has not been received, or will not be received, in time to comply with the time periods, the referring QME must serve the comprehensive medical-legal report timely, and, on receipt of the consulting physician's report, the referring evaluator must, within 15 calendar days of its receipt, issue a supplemental report that incorporates the consulting physician's report by reference and comments on whether and how the findings in the consulting report change the referring evaluator's opinions. The referring evaluator must list, in the report commenting on a consulting physician's report, all reports and information received from each party for the consulting physician, indicate whether each item was forwarded to the consulting physician, and for items not forwarded the reason the referring evaluator determined it was not necessary to do so [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(f)*].

With the exception of verbal communications between an injured worker and the consulting physician in the course of the consulting examination, all other communications by the parties, as well as any reports and other information from the parties for the consulting physician, if any, must be made in writing directed to only the referring QME, who may forward such communications on to the consulting physician as appropriate. With the exception of deposing the consulting physician if necessary and except as provided in this subdivision, neither party nor a party's attorney may communicate directly with nor send correspondence or records directly to the consulting physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32(g)*].

[i] Additional QME Evaluations Ordered by Appeals Board

The Medical Director must issue a panel of QMEs on receipt of an order of a WCJ or the Appeals Board that includes a finding that an additional evaluation is reasonable and necessary to resolve disputed issues under *Lab. Code § 4060,*

4061, or *4062*. The order must specify the residential or employment-based Zip code from which to randomly select evaluators, specify the specialty for the QME panel or designate the party who will select the specialty of the QME panel, and specify who will select a new specialty in the event there are too few QMEs in the specialty initially selected to issue a panel [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 32.6*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31(d)*].

[j] Appointment Notification and Cancellation

When an appointment for a comprehensive medical evaluation is made with a QME, the QME must complete an appointment notification form [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 110* (QME appointment notification form)]. The completed form must be postmarked or sent by facsimile to the employee and the claims administrator or, if none, the employer within five business days of the date the appointment was made. In a represented case, a copy of the completed form must also be sent to the attorney who represents each party, if known. Failure to comply with this requirement constitutes grounds for denial of reappointment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 51* (reappointment: failure to comply with time frames)].

The QME must schedule an appointment for a comprehensive medical-legal examination to be conducted only at the medical office listed on the panel selection form. However, on written request by the injured worker and only for his or her convenience, the evaluation appointment may be moved to another medical office of the selected QME if it is listed with the Medical Director as an additional office location [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(b)*].

The QME must include in the notification whether a Certified Interpreter [*see Lab. Code § 5811*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3] is required and specify the language. The interpreter must be arranged by the party who is to pay the cost as provided in *Lab. Code § 5811* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(c)*].

An evaluator, whether an AME, an Agreed Panel QME, or a QME, may not cancel a scheduled appointment fewer than six business days prior to the appointment date, except for good cause. Whenever cancelling a scheduled appointment, the evaluator must advise the parties in writing of the reason for the cancellation. The Appeals Board retains jurisdiction to resolve disputes among the parties regarding whether an appointment cancellation pursuant to this subdivision was for good cause. The Administrative Director retains jurisdiction to take appropriate disciplinary action against any Agreed Panel QME or QME for violations of this section [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(d)*].

An Agreed Panel QME or a QME who cancels a scheduled appointment must reschedule the appointment to a date within 30 calendar days of the date of cancellation. The rescheduled appointment date may not be more than 60 calendar days from the date of the initial request for an appointment, unless the parties agree in writing to accept a date beyond the 60-day limit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(e)*].

An AME who cancels a scheduled appointment must reschedule the appointment within 60 calendar days of the date of the cancellation, unless the parties agree in writing to accept an appointment date no more than 30 calendar days beyond the 60-day limit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(f)*].

Failure to receive relevant medical records [*see Lab. Code § 4062.3*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 35 (exchange of information and ex parte communications)] prior to a scheduled appointment does not constitute good cause under this section for the evaluator to cancel the appointment, unless the evaluator is a psychiatrist or psychologist performing an evaluation regarding a disputed injury to the psyche who states in the evaluation report that receipt of relevant medical records prior to the evaluation was necessary to conduct a full and fair evaluation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(g)*].

An appointment scheduled with an evaluator, whether an AME, an Agreed Panel QME, or a QME, may not be cancelled or rescheduled by a party or the party's attorney fewer than six business days before the appointment date, except for good cause. When the claims administrator or, if none, the employer, the injured worker, or either party's attorney cancels an appointment scheduled by an evaluator, the cancellation must be made in writing, state the reason

for the cancellation, and be served on the opposing party. Oral cancellations must be followed with a written confirming letter faxed or mailed by first class U.S. mail within 24 hours of the verbal cancellation and complying with this section. An injured worker is not liable for any missed appointment fee when an appointment is cancelled for good cause. The Appeals Board retains jurisdiction to resolve disputes regarding whether an appointment cancellation by a party was for good cause [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(h)*].

The date of cancellation is determined from the date of postmark, if mailed, or from the facsimile receipt date as shown on the recipient's fax copy [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 34(i)*].

[k] Compliance by AMEs and QMEs With Administrative Director Evaluation and Reporting Guidelines

Each evaluation examination and report completed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4060, 4061, 4062, 4062.1, 4062.2, 4064, 4067,* or *5703.5* must be performed in compliance with all appropriate evaluation procedures [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(a)*].

Each reporting evaluator must state in the body of the comprehensive medical-legal report the date of the examination and the street address at which it was performed. If the evaluator signs the report on any date other than the date on which it was completed, he or she must enter the date on which the report was signed next to or near his or her signature [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(b)*].

The evaluator must address all contested medical issues arising from all injuries reported on one or more claim forms prior to the date of the employee's appointment with the evaluator that are issues within the evaluator's scope of practice and areas of clinical competence. The reporting evaluator must attempt to address each question raised by each party in the issue cover letter sent to the evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(c)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35(a)(3)*].

At the evaluator's earliest opportunity, and no later than the date the report is served, the evaluator must advise the parties in writing of any disputed medical issues outside of the evaluator's scope of practice and area of clinical competency in order that the parties may initiate the process for obtaining an additional evaluation, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062.1* or *4062.2* and these regulations, in another specialty. In the case of an Agreed Panel QME or a panel QME, the evaluator must send a copy of the written notification provided to the parties to the Medical Director at the same time. However, only a party's request for an additional panel, with the evaluator's written notice under this section attached, or an order by a WCJ, will be acted on by the Medical Director to issue a new QME panel in another specialty [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(d)*].

If a new injury or illness is claimed, involving the same type of body part or body system, and the parties are the same, or if either party objects to any new medical issue within the evaluator's scope of practice and clinical competence, the parties must use, to the extent possible, the same evaluator who reported previously [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(e)*].

Unless the Appeals Board or a WCJ orders otherwise or the parties agree otherwise, when a party is legally entitled to depose the evaluator, the evaluator must make himself or herself available for deposition within 120 days of the notice of deposition and, on the request of the unrepresented injured worker, and, when consistent with *Lab. Code § 5710*, the deposition must be held at the location at which the evaluation examination was performed or at a facility or office chosen by the deposing party not more than 20 miles from the location of the evaluation examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(f)*].

When an AME or a QME provides an opinion in a comprehensive medical-legal report on a disputed medical treatment issue, the evaluator's opinion must be consistent with, and apply the standards of, evidence-based medicine [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.20 et seq.* (medical treatment utilization schedule)]. If the disputed medical treatment, condition, or injury is not addressed by the Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule, the evaluator's medical opinion must be consistent with, and refer to, other evidence-based medical treatment guidelines, peer reviewed studies, and articles, if

any, and otherwise explain the medical basis for the evaluator's reasoning and conclusions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35.5(g)*].

[*l*] Service of Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluation Reports by Medical Evaluators, Including Reports Under Lab. Code § 4061

When an injured worker is represented by an attorney, the evaluator must serve each comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report, follow-up comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report, and supplemental evaluation report on the injured worker, his or her attorney, and the claims administrator or, if none, the employer by completing QME Form 122 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 122* (AME or QME declaration of service of medical-legal report form)] and attaching QME Form 122 to the report, unless *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5* [*see* [m], *below*] applies. If applicable in a claim involving disputed injury to the psyche, the evaluator must comply with the requirements of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 36.5, 120, 121*)].

When an injured worker is not represented by an attorney, the QME must serve each comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report, follow-up evaluation report, or supplemental report that addresses only disputed issues outside of the scope of *Lab. Code § 4061* by completing the questions and declaration of service on QME Form 111 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 111* (QME findings summary form)] and by serving the report, with QME Form 111 attached, on the injured worker and the claims administrator or, if none, on the employer, unless *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5* applies. If applicable in a claim involving disputed injury to the psyche, the evaluator must comply with the requirements of Admin. Cir. Rule 36.5 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 36.5, 120, 121*].

When the evaluator is serving a medical-legal evaluation report that addresses or describes findings and conclusions pertaining to permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment of an unrepresented injured worker, the evaluator must serve the evaluation report, the completed QME Form 111 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 111* (QME findings summary form)], DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160, 10161* (employee's disability questionnaire)], and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160, 10161* (request for summary rating determination of qualified medical evaluator's report)], with the document cover sheet, DWC-CA form 10232.1 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232.1*], and separator sheet, DWC-CA Form 10232.2 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232.2*], as required [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(d)(4)*], on the local DEU office, at the same time as serving the report, QME Form 111, DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU), and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU) on the claims administrator or, if none, the employer, and on the unrepresented employee within the required time frames [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5*]. If applicable, in cases involving disputed injury to the psyche, the evaluator must follow the procedures prescribed for such evaluations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(c)*; *see* [m], *below*].

If an evaluation report is completed for an unrepresented employee, in which the QME determines that the employee's condition has not become permanent and stationary as of the date of the evaluation, the parties must request any further evaluation from the same QME if he or she is currently an active QME and available at the time of the request for the additional evaluation. If the QME is unavailable, a new panel may be issued to resolve any disputed issue(s). If the evaluator is no longer a QME, he or she may issue a supplemental report as long as a face-to-face evaluation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49(b)*] with the injured worker is not required. In no event may a physician who is not a QME or no longer a QME perform a follow-up evaluation on an unrepresented injured worker [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(d)*].

After a QME has served a comprehensive medical-legal report that finds and describes permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment in the case of an unrepresented injured worker, the QME may not issue any supplemental report on any of those issues in response to a party's request until after the DEU has issued an initial summary rating report, or unless the evaluator is otherwise directed to issue a supplemental report by the DEU, by the Administrative Director, or by a WCJ. A party wishing to request a supplemental report [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(f)*], based on the party's objection to or need for clarification of the evaluator's discussion of permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment, may do so only by sending the detailed request, within the relevant time limits [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(f)*], directly to the DEU office where the report was served by the evaluator

and not to the evaluator until after the initial summary rating has been issued [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(e)*].

[m] Service of Comprehensive Medical/Legal Report in Claims of Injury to Psyche

For any evaluation involving a claimed or disputed injury to the psyche, the injured worker must be advised by the evaluator that the employee's copy of the comprehensive medical-legal report, and any follow-up or supplemental reports, from the evaluation may be served either directly on the injured worker or instead on a physician designated in writing by the injured worker prior to leaving the evaluator's office, for the purpose of reviewing and discussing the evaluation report with the injured worker. The evaluator must explain that the designated physician may be, but need not be, the injured worker's primary treating physician in the workers' compensation claim and that the employer will be responsible for payment for one office visit with the designated physician for this purpose [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(a)*].

When injury to the psyche is claimed and in the course of the evaluation the evaluator makes a determination pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)* that there is a substantial risk of significant adverse or detrimental medical consequences to the injured worker from seeing or receiving a copy of part or all of the evaluation report, which is a mental health record, the evaluator must do all of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(b)*]:

1. Complete QME Form 121 (Declaration Regarding Protection of Mental Health Record).

2. Advise the injured worker that the determination under *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)* has been made regarding the evaluation report as a mental health record and that the evaluator may serve the injured worker's copy of the evaluation report on only a person who is a licensed physician [*see Lab. Code § 3209.3*], whose name the injured worker may designate in writing prior to leaving the evaluator's office, or on the employee's attorney, if any.

3. Permit inspection and copying of the mental health record(s) subject to the *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)* determination by a licensed physician only [*see Lab. Code § 3209.3*] or another health care provider [*see Health & Safety Code § 123105(a)*].

4. Complete the QME Form 121 (Declaration Regarding Protection of Mental Health Record) and enter the name and address of the physician designated in writing by the injured worker on this form.

5. Attach a completed copy of QME Form 121 to the copy of the evaluation report in the injured worker's medical or medical-legal file.

6. Serve the completed comprehensive medical-legal evaluation report, follow-up medical-legal report, or supplemental medical-legal report(s) subject to the provisions of this section, with the completed QME Form 121 attached, on the licensed physician designated by the injured worker on QME Form 121, on the claims administrator, and on each party's attorney, if any [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36(a)*], and within the relevant time periods [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38*]. If the injured worker designates a physician on QME Form 121 other than the current primary treating physician in his or her workers' compensation claim, the evaluator must also serve a copy of the report with the QME Form 121 attached on the primary treating physician.

7. When the report addresses any permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment and the injured worker is not represented by an attorney, a copy of the report with the completed QME Form 121 attached must also be served on the appropriate office of the DEU, along with the QME Form 111 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 111* (QME findings summary form)], DWC-AD form 100 (DEU) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160, 10161* (employee's disability questionnaire)], and DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160, 10161* (request for summary rating determination of qualified medical evaluator's

report)], with the document cover sheet, DWC-CA form 10232.1 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232.1*], and separator sheet, DWC-CA Form 10232.2 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232.2*], as required [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(d)(4)*].

8. When the report addresses permanent impairment, permanent disability, or apportionment and the injured worker is represented by an attorney, a copy of the report with the completed QME Form 121 attached must be served with QME Form 122 (AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report) on the physician designated by the injured worker, the injured worker's attorney, and the claims administrator's attorney or, if none, on the claims administrator.

"Mental health record" for the purposes of this subdivision means a medical treatment or evaluation record created by or received and reviewed by a licensed physician [*see Lab. Code § 3209.3*], in the course of treating or evaluating the injured worker in a workers' compensation claim, and includes for the purposes of this subdivision, but is not limited to, treatment records and comprehensive medical-legal reports [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(c)*].

On serving the employee's copy of the medical-legal report in compliance with the relevant regulations [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(b)(6), (7), (8)*] on the physician designated by the employee on the QME Form 121 (Declaration Regarding Protection of Mental Health Record), the evaluator's obligation to serve the report on the injured worker [*see Lab. Code §§ 139.2(j)(1), 4061(c)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 36] will be deemed satisfied [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(d)*].

Mental health records subject to a determination under *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)* and this subdivision must be kept confidential by the claims administrator and all parties' attorneys unless ordered otherwise by a WCJ. When such a mental health record is filed by a party at the Appeals Board, the party filing it must request and obtain a protective order from a WCJ that specifies in what manner the mental health record may be inspected, copied, and entered into evidence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(e)*].

When the injured worker advises the evaluator that he or she prefers to have the evaluation report served on a designated physician [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(b)*], and the evaluator does not make a determination pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)*, the evaluator must provide QME Form 120 (Voluntary Directive for Alternate Service of Medical-Legal Report) to the injured worker and request the injured worker to complete the form before leaving the evaluator's office [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(f)*].

On receipt by the evaluator of a QME Form 120 completed by the injured worker, the evaluator must attach the original executed QME Form 120 to the original medical-legal report for service on the claims administrator or, if none, on the employer. The evaluator must serve the evaluation report with QME Form 120 attached by completing the questions and the declaration of proof of service on QME Form 111 (Qualified Medical Evaluator's Findings Summary Form). In the case of an unrepresented injured worker, the evaluator must serve the report with the required forms [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(b)(7)*]. In the case of a represented injured worker, the evaluator must serve the report with QME Form 120 attached, by completing the declaration of service on QME Form 122 (AME or QME Declaration of Service of Medical-Legal Report) and serving it with the report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(g)*].

When an evaluation report is being served on a designated physician with QME Form 120 (Voluntary Directive for Alternate Service of Medical-Legal Report), the evaluator must serve two copies of the medical-legal report with the QME Form 120 attached on the physician designated on the form by the injured worker, at the same time as serving the copies of the medical-legal report on the claims administrator or, if none, on the employer and on the injured worker's attorney, if any. Service of a medical-legal report by an evaluator in compliance with this subdivision satisfies the evaluator's obligation to serve a copy of the report on the employee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(h)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 139.2(j)(1), 4061(c)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 36].

The physician designated by the injured worker in writing and listed on QME Form 120 or QME Form 121 need not be

limited to the primary treating physician in the disputed workers' compensation claim. As an additional medical treatment expense incurred in the claim [*see Lab. Code § 4600*], the claims administrator or, if none, the employer, must reimburse the physician designated by the injured worker and listed on either the QME Form 121 (Declaration Regarding Protection of Mental Health Record) or the QME Form 120 (Voluntary Directive for Alternate Service of Medical-Legal Evaluation Report on Disputed Injury to the Psyche), for one office visit, when used, for the purpose of reviewing and discussing the evaluator's report with the injured worker, at the applicable rate [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9789.11* (physician services rendered on or after 7/1/2004)], for an office visit and may include, as appropriate, record review, any necessary face-to-face time during the visit in excess of that specified in the applicable CPT office visit code, and charges for time required to prepare a treatment report pertaining to the office visit, if necessary [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(i)*].

When the comprehensive medical-legal report is served by the evaluator on a physician [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(f)*] with the QME Form 120 (Voluntary Directive for Alternate Service of Medical-Legal Report on Disputed Injury to the Psyche) attached, one of the two copies of the medical-legal report served on the designated physician must be provided to the injured worker by the designated physician during the office visit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(j)*].

If the injured worker refuses or fails to designate a physician in writing to be listed on either QME Form 120 or QME Form 121, the evaluator must serve the report as appropriate [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 36, 36.5*], and within the required time periods [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38*], except that the injured worker's copy of the report that is subject to a finding under *Health & Safety Code § 123115(b)* must then be served only on the injured worker's attorney, if represented, or, if not represented, on the injured worker's primary treating physician [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 36.5(k)*].

[n] Medical Evaluation Time Frames; Extensions for QMEs and AMEs

The time frame for an initial or a follow-up comprehensive medical-legal evaluations report to be prepared and submitted must not exceed 30 days after the QME, Agreed Panel QME, or AME has seen the employee or otherwise commenced the comprehensive medical-legal evaluation procedure. If an evaluator fails to prepare and serve the initial or follow-up report within 30 days and the evaluator has failed to obtain approval from the Medical Director for an extension of time pursuant to this section, the employee or the employer may request a QME replacement [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 31.5*]. Neither the employee nor the employer has any liability for payment for the medical evaluation that was not completed within the time frames required under this section unless the employee and the employer both waive the right to a new evaluation and elect to accept the original evaluation in writing or by signing and returning to the Medical Director either QME Form 113 (Notice of Denial of Request For Time Extension) or QME Form 116 (Notice of Late QME/AME Report-No Extension Requested) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(a)*].

All requests by an evaluator for extensions of time must be made on Form 112 (QME/AME Time Frame Extension Request). If the evaluation will not be completed on the original due date, the evaluator may request an extension from the Medical Director, not to exceed an additional 30 days. An extension of the time for completing the report will be approved, as follows [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(b)*]:

1. When the evaluator has not received test results or the report of a consulting physician necessary to address all disputed medical issues in time to meet the initial 30-day deadline, an extension of up to 30 days will be granted.

2. When the evaluator has good cause [*see Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(1)(B)*], an extension of 15 days will be granted

Not later than five days before the initial 30-day period to complete and serve the report expires, the evaluator must notify the Medical Director, the employee, and the claims administrator or, if none, the employer of the request for an extension by use of QME Form 112 (QME/AME Time Extension Request) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(c)*].

The Medical Director must notify the requesting evaluator and the parties of the decision on the extension request by completion of the box at the bottom of QME Form 112 (QME/AME Time Frame Extension Request). If a request for an extension of time is denied, the Medical Director must also send the parties QME Form 113 (Notice of Denial of Request for Time Extension) to be used by each party to state whether the party wishes to request a new evaluator or to accept the late report of the original evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(d)*].

When the Medical Director becomes aware that the report of a QME or an AME has not been completed within the required time and no extension of time was requested by the evaluator, the Medical Director must send the parties a Notice of Late QME/AME Report-No Extension Requested (QME Form 116). Each party must complete the form and return it to the Medical Director to indicate whether the party wishes to accept the late report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(e)*].

Good cause [*see Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(1)(B)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 38(b)(2)] means [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(f)*]:

1. Medical emergencies of the evaluator or the evaluator's family.

2. Death in the evaluator's family.

3. Natural disasters or other community catastrophes that interrupt the operation of the evaluator's office operations.

Extensions are not to be granted because relevant medical information/records (including Disability Evaluation Form 101 (Request for Summary Determination of Qualified Medical Evaluator's Report)) have not been received. The evaluator must complete the report based on the information available and state that the opinions and/or conclusions may or may not change after review of the relevant medical information/records [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(g)*].

The time frame for supplemental reports is to be no more than 60 days from the date of a written or electronically transmitted request to the physician by a party. The request for a supplemental report must be accompanied by any new medical records that were unavailable to the evaluator at the time of the original evaluation and that were properly served on the opposing party as required by *Lab. Code § 4062.3*. An extension of the 60-day time frame for completing the supplemental report, of no more than 30 days, may be agreed to by the parties without the need to request an extension from the Medical Director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(h)*].

Evaluators requesting time extensions will be monitored and advised by the Medical Director when such a request appears unreasonable or excessive. Failure to comply with this section may constitute grounds for denial of the QME's request for reappointment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 38(i)*].

[o] Disclosure and Ethical Requirements for QMEs and AMEs

QMEs and AMEs are subject to various disclosure requirements [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 40* (required disclosures to injured workers)], ethical requirements [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 41*], and rules regarding conflicts of interest [*see Lab. Code § 139.2(o)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 41.5; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 41.6* (procedures after notice of conflict of interest and waivers of conflicts of interest)]. Additionally, the regulations restrict gifts that may be accepted by an evaluator from any "source that handles California workers' compensation matters" [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 41.7*].

[p] Methods of Evaluation and Minimum Time Guidelines of Various Disabilities

The regulations specify requirements for evaluating various disabilities [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 43* (psychiatric disability); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 44* (pulmonary disability); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 45* (cardiac disability); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 46* (neuromusculoskeletal disability); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 46.1* (foot and ankle disability); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 47*

(immunologic disability)].

Similarly, the regulations specify guidelines for the minimum "face to face time" [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49(b)* ("face to face time" defined)] for evaluating various disabilities [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49.2* (neuromusculoskeletal evaluation); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49.4* (cardiovascular evaluation); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49.6* (pulmonary evaluation); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49.8* (psychiatric evaluation); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 49.9* (other evaluation)].

[q] Calculation and Service of Permanent Disability Rating by Administrative Director

Within 20 days after receipt, the administrative director will calculate the permanent disability rating according to *Lab. Code § 4660* (procedures and schedules for determining permanent disability rating) and serve the rating on the employee and employer by first class mail [*Lab. Code § 4061(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10165*]. At that time, the administrative director will also serve the employee with DEU Form 110, Notice of Options Following Disability Rating [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10165*]. The form explains what the rating is and advises the employee of the advantages and disadvantages of opting for a Stipulated Findings and Award or settlement by Compromise and Release. It also includes a specific notice to unrepresented employees that specifies the procedure for requesting administrative review of the rating determination [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10165.5* (form of notice)]. For discussion of the unrepresented employee's right to reconsideration of a rating determination, see [r], *below.* For discussion of permanent disability rating determinations, see *§ 577.45[4][d]*.

Any comprehensive medical evaluation concerning an unrepresented employee that indicates that part or all of an employee's permanent impairment or limitations may be subject to apportionment pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 4663* and *4664* will first be submitted by the Office of BenefitDetermination to a workers' compensation judge who may refer the report back to the medical evaluator for correction or clarification if the judge determines the proposed apportionment is inconsistent with the law [*Lab. Code § 4061(f)*].

[r] Request for Reconsideration of Rating When Employee Is Unrepresented

Within 30 days after receipt of the rating, if the employee is unrepresented, the employee or employer may request that the administrative director reconsider the recommended rating or obtain additional information from the treating physician or medical evaluator to address issues not addressed or not completely addressed in the original comprehensive medical evaluation or not prepared in accord with the procedures of the Administrative Director promulgated under *Lab. Code§ 139.2(j)(2)* or *(3)* [*Lab. Code § 4061(g)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(a)*].

The request must be in writing, must specify the reasons the rating should be reconsidered, and must be accompanied by a copy of the rating, a copy of the comprehensive medical evaluation, proof of service on the other party, and any other information necessary to support the request [*Lab. Code § 4061(g)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(a)*]. Reconsideration will only be allowed for the following reasons [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(a)*; *see Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(2), (3)*]:

- The summary rating was calculated incorrectly;
- The evaluation failed to address one or more issues, or failed to do so completely; or
- The evaluation was not prepared in accordance with required procedures, including procedures required under the rules promulgated by the Administrative Director. The administrative director is not allowed to consider a supplemental or follow-up evaluation that was requested by a party after a summary rating determination had already been issued as a basis for a request for reconsideration [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(b)*].

If the administrative director finds that the comprehensive medical evaluation is not complete or is not in compliance

with the required procedures, the administrative director must return the report to the treating physician or qualified medical evaluator for appropriate action as the administrative director instructs [*Lab. Code § 4061(g)*]. If the administrative director determines that an additional evaluation from another Qualified Medical Evaluator is necessary, the matter will be referred to the Executive Medical Director for provision of another Qualified Medical Evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10164(c)*]. On receipt of the treating physician's or qualified medical evaluator's final comprehensive medical evaluation and summary form, the administrative director must recalculate the permanent disability rating according to *Lab. Code § 4660* and serve therating, the comprehensive medical evaluation, and the summary form on the employee and employer [*Lab. Code § 4061(g)*].

[s] Medical Evaluation of Permanent Disability as Condition Precedent to Filing Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

No issue relating to the existence or extent of permanent impairment and limitations resulting from the injury may be the subject of a declaration of readiness to proceed unless there has first been a medical evaluation by a treating physician or an agreed or qualified medical evaluator [*Lab. Code § 4061(i)*].

[t] Limitations on Informal Evaluation of Permanent Impairment or Need for Continuing Medical Care

Except for evaluations prepared by the treating physician or physicians, no evaluation of permanent impairment and limitations or need for continuing medical care resulting from the injury may be obtained prior to service of the comprehensive medical evaluation on the employee and employer if the employee is unrepresented, or prior to the attempt to select an agreed on medical evaluator if the employee is represented [*Lab. Code § 4061(i)*]. Evaluations obtained in violation of this prohibition are not admissible in any proceedings before the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 4061(i)*]. Nevertheless, the testimony, records, and reports offered by the treating physician or physicians who treated the employee for the injury and comprehensive medical evaluations prepared by a qualified medical evaluator selected by an unrepresented employee from a three-member panel are admissible [*Lab. Code § 4061(i)*].

[4] Objections to Determinations by Treating Physician

If either the employee or the employer objects to a medical determination made by the treating physician concerning any medical issues not covered by *Lab. Code § 4060* or *4061* and not subject to *Lab. Code § 4610*, the objecting party must give written notice of the objection to the other party within 20 days of receipt of the report, if the employee is represented by an attorney, or within 30 days of receipt of the report, if the employee is not represented by an attorney [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*]. Employer objections to the treating physician's recommendation for spinal surgery are subject to *Lab. Code § 4062(b)* and, after denial of the physician's recommendation, in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4610* [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*]. If the employee objects to a decision made pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* to modify, delay, or deny a treatment recommendation, the employee must give the employer written notice of the objection within 20 days of receipt of that decision [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*]. These time limits may be extended for good cause or by mutual agreement [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*]. If the employee is represented by an attorney, a medical evaluation to determinethe disputed medical issue must be obtained as provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.2*, and no other medical evaluation may be obtained [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*]. If the employee is not represented by an attorney, the employer must immediately provide the employee with a form prescribed by the medical director with which to request assignment of a panel of three qualified medical evaluators, the evaluation must be obtained as provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.1*, and no other medical evaluation may be obtained [*Lab. Code § 4062(a)*].

The court of appeal, noting that an employer's challenge to an employee's claim of ongoing temporary disability must be made within 20 days of receipt of the physician's report of that disability, has held that the employer's claim of credit against permanent disability payments was allowable only for temporary disability payments made after June 2006, which was the last date for which the employee's treating physician reported that he was temporarily disabled. Any claim of credit for temporary disability payments made prior to that date was foreclosed by *Lab. Code § 4062(a)*.

However, the employer's claim for credit subsequent to June 2006 could not be denied on grounds of that statutory time limit [*J.C. Penney Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 818, 829, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 469*].

The Supreme Court has held that, when deciding whether to approve or deny an injured employee's request for medical treatment, the employer must conduct utilization review pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* and that the employer may not, as an alternative to utilization review, elect to dispute the request for medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062*. The latter statute, said the Court, permits only *employees* to use its provisions to object to employers' decisions regarding treatment requests. The Court found that the legislature's intent regarding employers' use of *Lab. Code § 4062* to dispute treatment requests "could not be more clear," and that the historical evolution of treatment request and review processes, as exemplified by omnibus reforms enacted in SB 228, effective January 1, 2004, and SB 899, effective April 19, 2004, further demonstrates the legislature's intent that *Lab. Code § 4610* govern employers' review [*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 230, 233-234, 236-237, 239-245, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171, 186 P.3d 535]* .

The employer may object to a report of the treating physician recommending that spinal surgery be performed, within 10 days of the receipt of the report [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*]. If the employee is represented by an attorney, the parties must seek agreement with each other on a California licensed board-certified or board-eligible orthopedic surgeon or neurosurgeon to prepare a second opinion report resolving the disputed surgical recommendation [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*]. If no agreement is reached within 10 days, or if the employee is not represented byan attorney, an orthopedic surgeon or neurosurgeon will be randomly selected by the Administrative Director to prepare a second opinion report resolving the disputed surgical recommendation [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*]. Examinations are scheduled on an expedited basis, and the second opinion report must be served on the parties within 45 days of receipt of the treating physician's report [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*]. If the second opinion report recommends surgery, the employer must authorize the surgery, and if the second opinion report does not recommend surgery, the employer must file a declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*]. The employer is not liable for medical treatment costs for the disputed surgical procedure, whether through a lien filed with the Appeals Board or as a self-procured medical expense, or for periods of temporary disability resulting from the surgery, if the disputed surgical procedure is performed prior to the completion of the required second opinion process [*Lab. Code § 4062(b)*].

The second opinion physician must not have any material professional, familial, or financial affiliation, as determined by the Administrative Director, with any of the following [*Lab. Code § 4062(c)*]:

1. The employer, his or her workers' compensation insurer, third-party claims administrator, or other entity contracted to provide utilization review services pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610*.

2. Any officer, director, or employee of the employer's health care provider, workers' compensation insurer, or third-party claims administrator.

3. A physician, the physician's medical group, or the independent practice association involved in the health care service in dispute.

4. The facility or institution at which either the proposed health care service, or the alternative service, if any, recommended by the employer's health care provider, workers' compensation insurer, or third-party claims administrator, would be provided.

5. The development or manufacture of the principal drug, device, procedure, or other therapy proposed by the employee or his or her treating physician whose treatment is under review, or the alternative therapy, if any, recommended by the employer or other entity.

6. The employee or the employee's immediate family.

The Administrative Director has promulgated detailed regulations governing procedures for obtaining a second opinion when a treating physician recommends spinal surgery [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.01*(*l*) ("spinal surgery" defined)], the employer objects, and either the parties cannot agree on a second opinion physician or the employee is unrepresented [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9788.01-9788.91*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.01(k)* ("second opinion physician" defined as physician who is randomly selected pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062(b)* to render second opinion on treating physician's recommendation of spinal surgery)]. Pursuant to these regulations, an employer who objects to the treating physician's recommendation for spinal surgery must serve the objection, written on a form prescribed by the Administrative Director, and with a copy of the treating physician's recommendation attached, by mail or other rapid means of delivery, on the Administrative Director, the employee, the employee's attorney, if any, and the treating physician within 10 days of receipt of the treating physician's report containing the recommendation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.1(a)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.11* (DWC Form 233, Objection to Treating Physician's Recommendation for Spinal Surgery)]. The objection must include the employer's reasons, specific to the injured worker, for the objection to the recommended procedure, and it must include a declaration made under penalty of perjury, in the following form, of the date the report was first received by the employer, employer's insurance carrier, or administrator, the date and time the objection was sent, and the manner in which the objection was sent [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.1(a)*]:

> I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California on (*date*), that the enclosed physician's report was first received by the employer, insurance carrier, or administrator on (*date*), and that on (*date*), I served the enclosed objection on (*names of persons served*) and on the Administrative Director by (*means of service*).

The declaration and form must be executed by a principal or employee of the employer, insurance carrier, or administrator, and the employer must serve the original and one photocopy, or two originals, of the objection on the Administrative Director [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.1(a)*].

The Appeals Board en banc has held that the procedures and timelines governing objections to a treating physician's recommendation for spinal surgery are contained in *Lab. Code §§ 4610* and *4062* and in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9788.1*, *9788.11*, and *9792.6(o)*. These procedures and timelines are [Cervantes v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1336, 1338, 1341-1346, 1351-1355 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]:

> 1. When a treating physician recommends spinal surgery, the employer must undertake utilization review.
>
> 2. If the utilization review approves the requested spinal surgery, or if the employer fails to timely complete the utilization review, the employer must authorize the surgery.
>
> 3. If the utilization review denies the spinal surgery request, the *employer* may object under *Lab. Code § 4062(b)*, but any objection must comply with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.1* and use the form required by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9788.11*.
>
> 4. The employer must complete its utilization review process within 10 days of its receipt of the treating physician's report, which must comply with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.6(o)*, and, if the utilization review denies the requested surgery, any *Lab. Code § 4062(b)* objection must be made within that same 10-day period.
>
> 5. If the employer fails to meet the 10-day timelines or comply with *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9788.1* and *9788.11*, the employer loses its right to a second opinion report and must authorize the spinal surgery.

In the same case, the Board en banc also disapproved of *Brasher v. Nationwide Studio Fund (2006) 71 Cal. Comp.*

Cases 1282 (Appeals Board significant panel decision) to the extent that that case held that: (1) an employer may opt out of utilization review and instead dispute a requested spinal surgery using only the procedure specified in *Lab. Code § 4062(b)*; and (2) if the employer's utilization review denies the spinal surgery, it is the employee who must object under *Lab. Code § 4062(a)* [Cervantes v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1336, 1338, 1350 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)].

[5] General Procedures Applicable to Comprehensive Medical Evaluations for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1991

[a] Information Provided to Medical Evaluators

Any party may provide to the qualified medical evaluator selected from a panel the records prepared or maintained by the employee's treating physician or physicians and the medical and nonmedical records relevant to determination of the medical issue [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(a)*]. Information that a party proposes to provide to the selected qualified medical evaluator must be served on the opposing party 20 days before it is provided to the qualified medical evaluator [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(b)*]. If the opposing party objects to consideration of nonmedical records within 10 days thereafter, the records are not to be provided to the qualified medical evaluator [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(b)*]. Either party may use discovery to establish the accuracy or authenticity of nonmedical records prior to the evaluation [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(b)*]. If an agreed medical evaluator isselected, as part of their agreement on an agreed medical evaluator, the parties must agree on what information is to be provided to the agreed medical evaluator [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(c)*].

In any formal medical evaluation, the agreed medical evaluator or qualified medical evaluator must identify the following [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(d)*]:

1. All information received from the parties.

2. All information reviewed in preparation of the report.

3. All information relied on in the formulation of his or her opinion.

[b] Communications With Agreed or Qualified Medical Evaluator

All communications with an agreed medical evaluator or a qualified medical evaluator selected from a panel before a medical evaluation must be in writing and served on the opposing party 20 days in advance of the evaluation [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(e)*]. Any subsequent communication with the medical evaluator must be in writing and served on the opposing party when sent to the medical evaluator [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(e)*].

Ex parte communication with an agreed medical evaluator or a qualified medical evaluator selected from a panel is prohibited [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(f)*]. If a party communicates with the agreed medical evaluator or the qualified medical evaluator in violation of the preceding paragraph, the aggrieved party may elect to terminate the medical evaluation and seek a new evaluation from another qualified medical evaluator to be selected according to *Lab. Code § 4062.1* or *4062.2*, as applicable, or proceed with the initial evaluation [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(f)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 35(f)*]. The party making the prohibited communication is subject to being charged with contempt before the Appeals Board and will be liable for thecosts incurred by the aggrieved party as a result of the prohibited communication, including the cost of the medical evaluation, additional discovery costs, and attorney's fees for related discovery [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(g)*]. These rules regarding communications with an agreed medical evaluator or a qualified medical evaluator do not apply to oral or written communications by the employee or, if the employee is deceased, the employee's dependent, in the course of the examination or at the request of the evaluator in connection with the examination [*Lab. Code § 4062.3(h)*].

[c] Failure to Complete Comprehensive Medical Evaluation in a Timely Manner

If a qualified medical evaluator selected from a panel fails to complete the formal medical evaluation within the time frames established by the Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(1)*, a new evaluation may be obtained upon the request of either party, as provided in *Lab. Code § 4062.1* or *4062.2* [*Lab. Code § 4062.5*]. Neither the employee nor the employer has any liability for payment for the formal medical evaluation that was not completed within the required time frames unless the employee or employer, on forms prescribed by the Administrative Director, each waives the right to a new evaluation and elects to accept the original evaluation even though it was not completed within the required time frames [*Lab. Code § 4062.5*].

[d] Procedure When Compensation Is Required by Comprehensive Medical Evaluation

If a comprehensive medical evaluation from the treating physician or an agreed medical evaluator or a qualified medical evaluator selected from a three-member panel resolves any issue so as to require the employer to provide compensation, the employer must either commence the payment of compensation or promptly commence proceedings before the WCAB to resolve the dispute for adjudication of claim [*Lab. Code §§ 4061(h)(1), 4063*].

With respect to a medical evaluation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4061* (discussed under [3][c], *above*), if the employee and employer agree to a stipulated finding and award as provided under *Lab. Code § 5702* or to compromise and release the claim under *Lab. Code § 5000 et seq.*, or, if the employee wishes to commute the award under *Lab. Code § 5100 et seq.*, the WCAB must first determine whether the agreement or commutation is in the best interests of the employee and whether the proper procedures have been followed in determining the permanent disability rating [*Lab. Code § 4061(h)(2)*].

[e] Liability for Costs of Evaluations and Reports

For injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991, the employer is liable for the cost of medical evaluations reasonably, actually, andnecessarily incurred, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4060* (compensability of injury disputed), *Lab. Code § 4061(c)* and *(d)* (evaluation of permanent disability) or *Lab. Code § 4062(a)* (evaluation of other disputed medical issues) [*Lab. Code § 4064(a)*]. Each comprehensive medical-legal evaluation must address all contested medical issues arising from all injuries reported on one or more claim forms [*Lab. Code § 4064(a)*].

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2003, if an unrepresented employee obtains an attorney after the evaluation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4061(d)* or § 4062(b) has been completed, the employee is entitled to the same reports at employer expense as an employee who has been represented from the time the dispute arose, and those reports are admissible in any proceeding before the Appeals Board [*Lab. Code § 4064(b)*].

The employer is not liable for the cost of any comprehensive medical evaluations obtained by the employee other than those authorized by *Lab. Code§§ 4060, 4061, 4062* [*Lab. Code § 4064(d)*]. However, a party is not prohibited from obtaining any medical evaluation or consultation at that party's own expense [*Lab. Code § 4064(d)*].

Costs of medical evaluations, diagnostic tests, and interpreters' services incidental to the production of a medical report may not be incurred earlier than the date of receipt by the employer, the employer's insurance carrier, or the attorney of record if the employee is represented, of all reports and documents required by the Administrative Director incidental to the services [*Lab. Code § 4621(a)*]. This provision is not applicable unless there has been compliance with *Lab. Code § 4620* [*Lab. Code § 4621(a)*].

Comprehensive medical-legal evaluations may be performed at any time after the claim form has been filed under *Lab. Code § 5401* if the employer has rejected the claim [*Lab. Code § 4621(c)*]. Except as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 4061, 4062*, or *4621(c)*, no comprehensive medical-legal evaluations, except those at the employer's request, may be performed during the first 60 days after the notice of claim has been filed [*Lab. Code § 4621(b)*]. Neither the employer nor the employee is liable for any expenses incurred for comprehensive medical-legal evaluations performed within this

60-day period [*Lab. Code § 4621(b)*].

[f] Liability for Attorney's Fees When Employer Files Application for Adjudication Contesting Comprehensive Medical Evaluation

For injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991, when the employer files an application for adjudication of claim contesting the comprehensive medical evaluation prepared by an agreed medical evaluator, regardless of outcome, the workers' compensation judge or the WCAB must assess the employee's attorney's fees against the employer, subject to *Lab. Code § 4906* (reasonableness limitation for legal expenses) [*Lab. Code § 4066*]. Also subject to *Lab. Code § 4906*, if an employer files an application for adjudication and the employee is unrepresented at the time the applicationis filed, the employer is liable for any attorney's fees incurred by the employee in connection with the application for adjudication if the employee does not obtain a rebuttal report [*Lab. Code § 4064(c)*].

[g] Additional Medical Evaluations for Modified Compensation Awards

If the WCAB's jurisdiction is invoked pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5803* (WCAB's continuing jurisdiction to modify awards) on the grounds that the effects of the injury have recurred, increased, diminished, or terminated, a comprehensive medical evaluation must be obtained pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4061 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 4067*]. If an agreed on or qualified medical evaluator selected by an unrepresented employee from a three-member panel has previously made a comprehensive medical evaluation of the same or similar issues, the subsequent or additional comprehensive medical evaluation must be conducted by the same agreed on or qualified medical evaluator, unless the workers' compensation judge has made a finding that he or she did not rely on the prior evaluator's comprehensive medical evaluation, any party contested the original medical evaluation by filing an application for adjudication, or the prior evaluator is no longer qualified or readily available to prepare a comprehensive medical evaluation, in which case, *Lab. Code § 4061* or *4062*, as the case may be, applies as if there had been no prior comprehensive medical evaluation [*Lab. Code § 4067*].

[h] Presumption That Treating Physician's Findings Are Correct

Effective April 19, 2004, the former presumption of correctness of the findings of an injured employee's personal physician or personal chiropractor has been repealed. This repeal applies to all cases, regardless of the date of injury, but does not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award of the Appeals Board [Stats. 2004, ch. 34, §§ 22, 46 (repealing former *Lab. Code § 4062.9*)].

[i] Determination of Disability Rating When Comprehensive Medical Evaluation Is Contested

Effective January 1, 2003, the legislature has repealed the statutory provision that required the workers' compensation judge or the WCAB to choose between an employer's and an employee's proposed permanent disability rating, whenever either the employer or the employee had obtained an evaluation of the employee's permanent impairment and limitations from a qualified medical evaluator under *Lab. Code § 4061*, and either party contested the comprehensive medical evaluation of the other party [Stats. 2002, ch. 6, § 55; *see* former *Lab. Code § 4065*].

[6] Medical-Legal Fee Schedule

The Administrative Director, as required, has adopted a fee schedule for medical-legal expenses that is prima facie evidence of the reasonableness of fees charged for these expenses [*Lab. Code § 5307.6(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795*]. A provider may not be paid fees in excess of those set forth in the schedule, unless the provider submits an itemization and explanation of the fee that shows it is both a reasonable fee and that extraordinary circumstances relating to the medical condition being evaluated justify a higher fee [*Lab. Code § 5307.6(b)*]. In no event may a provider charge a fee in excess of the provider's usual fee [*Lab. Code § 5307.6(b)*].

An evaluator may not request or accept any compensation from any source for medical-legal expenses if that compensation is in addition to the fees authorized, as described above [*Lab. Code § 5307.6(d)*]. A provider who violates this prohibition is subject to discipline under *Lab. Code § 139.2(k)* and to disciplinaryaction by the appropriate licensing board [*Lab. Code § 5307.6(d)*].

Following the adoption of the medical-legal fee schedule, there has been ongoing controversy over whether a medical-legal evaluator may charge a fee for missed medical appointments scheduled by or on behalf of an injured worker. The current medical fee schedule is silent on fees for missed appointments, and the issue has not yet been resolved by the Legislature or the courts. Regardless of whether expenses associated with missed appointments are properly construed to be medical-legal expenses, medical evaluators are not precluded from requesting or accepting compensation from an insurer, self-insured employer, or third party administrator for this type of expense [DWC Bulletin 94-7].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized TreatmentWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsEmployee Rights

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
2. Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim--Initial Procedures

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.47-577.59

[Reserved]

§§ 577.47[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.60

§ 577.60 Governing Law

[1] In General

Arbitration of workers' compensation disputes is governed generally by *Lab. Code § 5270 et seq.* and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10997-10999. Reconsideration of arbitrators' decisions or awards is governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10866*. Arbitration of disputes concerning liens for expenses incurred by or on behalf of an injured employee as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1* is authorized by *Lab. Code § 4903.4*. Most of the statutory provisions apply only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990 [*see* 1989 Stats., ch. 893, § 6; *but see Lab. Code § 5275* (arbitration of certain disputes relating to insurance coverage and contribution mandatory regardless of date of injury; voluntary arbitration authorized for all injuries)].

[2] Representation Required

The provisions of *Lab. Code § 5270 et seq.* governing arbitration of workers' compensation disputes are applicable only when the injured employee or dependent is represented by an attorney [*Lab. Code § 5270*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.61

§ 577.61 Disputes Subject to Arbitration

[1] Mandatory Arbitration

Any application for adjudication that lists one or more disputes involving an issue set forth in *Lab. Code § 5275(a)* must be accompanied by an arbitration submittal form, DWC-CA Form 10297. This form is available at the DIR/DWC website: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm. The arbitration submittal form must indicate one of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(a)* (rule applies to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990)]:

1. An arbitrator has been selected pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(a)* [*see § 577.63[2][a]*].

2. An unsuccessful attempt has been made to select an arbitrator, and the Presiding WCJ is requested, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(b)*, to assign a panel of five arbitrators [s *ee* § 577.63[2][b]].

For discussion of form and content of arbitration submittal forms, see *§ 577.62*.

[2] Voluntary Arbitration

Any issue under *Lab. Code § 50 et seq.* (Department of Industrial Relations, including Division of Workers' Compensation) or *Lab. Code § 3200 et seq.* (workers' compensation law) may be submitted for arbitration by agreement of the parties, regardless of the date of injury [*Lab. Code § 5275(b)*].

At any time, the parties may agree to submit any issue for arbitration pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5275(b)* by submitting an arbitration submittal form that indicates that the parties have selected an arbitrator pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(a)* and by filing an application for adjudication if one has not been previously filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10296(a)*].

Within six days of receipt of the arbitration submittal form, the Presiding WCJ must order the issues in dispute submitted for arbitration pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5272, 5273, 5276*, and *5277* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10296(b)*].

If the parties are unable to agree to an arbitrator under *Lab. Code § 5271(a)*, they may agree to follow the procedures for selecting an arbitrator under *Lab. Code § 5271(b)* and *(c)*, as set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10296(c)*; *see § 577.63[2*][b]].

For discussion of procedure for selecting an arbitrator pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(b)*, see *§ 577.63[2]*. In no event will arbitration be permitted after testimony has been taken in any proceeding [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10997*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionMandatory ADRWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.62

§ 577.62 Arbitration Submittal Form

The arbitration submittal form must indicate one of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(a)* (rule applies to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990)]:

1. An arbitrator has been selected pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(a)* [*see § 577.63[2][a]*].

2. An unsuccessful attempt has been made to select an arbitrator, and the Presiding WCJ is requested, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(b)*, to assign a panel of five arbitrators [s *ee* § 577.63[2][b]].

For discussion relating to selection of arbitrators, see *§ 577.63[2]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.63

§ 577.63 Arbitrators

[1] Qualifications and List of Eligible Arbitrators

Any attorney who is an active member of the California State Bar is eligible to become an arbitrator if he or she is any of the following [*Lab. Code § 5270.5(a)*]:

- A certified specialist in workers' compensation, or eligible to become certified;
- A retired workers' compensation judge;
- A retired WCAB member; or
- An attorney who has been certified to serve as a judge pro tempore.

The presiding workers' compensation judge at each district office is required to prepare a list of all eligible attorneys who apply to be placed on the list of eligible arbitrators [*Lab. Code § 5270.5(a)*].

No attorney may be included in a panel of arbitrators if he or she has served as a judge in any proceeding involving the same case, or has represented, or whose firm has represented, any party in the same case [*Lab. Code § 5270.5(b)*].

[2] Selection of Arbitrator

[a] Parties in Agreement

The parties to a dispute submitted for arbitration may select to serve as arbitrator any eligible attorney from the list prepared by the presiding workers' compensation judge. However, when the disputed issue involves insurance coverage, the parties may agree to select any attorney as arbitrator [*Lab. Code § 5271(a)*]. If the parties agree to an arbitrator pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(a)*, the presiding workers' compensation judge will, within six days after receipt of the

arbitration submittal form, order the issue or issues in dispute submitted for arbitration pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5272, 5273, 5276*, and *5277* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(c)*].

[b] Parties Not in Agreement

If the parties cannot agree on an arbitrator, either party may request that the presiding workers' compensation judge assign a panel of five arbitrators selected at random from the list of eligible attorneys [*Lab. Code § 5271(b)*]. No more than three arbitrators on a five-member panel may be defense attorneys, no more than three may be applicant's attorneys, and no more than two may be retired workers' compensation judges or WCAB members [*Lab. Code § 5271(b)*].

When the number of parties exceeds one in the capacity of employer and one in the capacity of injured employee or lien claimant, the presiding judge will randomly select two additional arbitrators to add to the panel for each additional party [*Lab. Code § 5271(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(d)*]. When the additional party is an employer, injured employee, or lien claimant, one of these additional panelists must be a retired workers' compensation judge or a retired appeals board commissioner. The second additional panelist must be an applicant's attorney when the additional party is an employer, and a defense attorney when the additional party is an injured employee or a lien claimant. For each additional other party, the presiding judge will assign two arbitrators to the panel, in order of rotation from case to case, as follows: a retired workers' compensation judge or retired appeals board commissioner, an applicant's attorney, and a defense attorney [*Lab. Code § 5271(c)*].

If the arbitration submittal form requests a panel pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(b)*, the Presiding WCJ must, within six days of receipt of the form, serve on each of the parties an identical list of five arbitrators selected at random pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(b)*. Each party must strike two arbitrators from the list and return it to the Presiding WCJ within six days after service. Failure to timely return the list constitutes a waiver of a party's right to participate in the selection process. If one arbitrator remains, the Presiding WCJ must, within six days of return of the lists from the parties, order the issue or issues submitted for arbitration before the selected arbitrator pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5272, 5273, 5276* and *5277*. If more than one arbitrator remains on the panel, the Presiding WCJ must randomly select an arbitrator from the remaining panelists [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(d)*].

If the parties to the dispute have stricken all the arbitrators from the panel, the Presiding WCJ must, within six days of receipt of the last of the returned lists, serve on each of the parties to the dispute a new list of five arbitrators and any additional arbitrators required by *Lab. Code § 5271(c)*, selected at random but excluding the names of the arbitrators on the prior list. Each of the parties to the dispute must again strike two arbitrators from the list and return it to the Presiding WCJ within six days after service. This procedure will continue until one or more arbitrators remain on the lists returned to the Presiding WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(e)*].

The parties must provide all necessary materials to the arbitrator. Any paper file must remain in the custody of the district office [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295(f)*].

A party may petition the presiding workers' compensation judge to remove a member from the panel pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1* (disqualification of judges for cause), and the presiding judge will assign another eligible attorney to replace any member so removed [*Lab. Code § 5271(d)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10998*]. For discussion relating to disqualification of panelists and arbitrators, see [3], *below*.

[3] Disqualification of Arbitrator

After service of a list of panel members pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295*, any party may, within six days, petition the presiding workers' compensation judge to remove any member from the panel pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1* (disqualification of judges for cause) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10998*; *see Lab. Code § 5271(d)*]. If the presiding workers'

compensation judge finds cause under *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1*, he or she will remove the challenged member or members of the panel and will add to the original list the appropriate number of arbitrators at random to make a full panel. Within six days, the presiding judge will serve the list on the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10998*].

If the presiding workers' compensation judge selects an arbitrator pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10295*, the parties have six days after service of the name of the arbitrator to petition to disqualify that arbitrator pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 170.1*. If the presiding workers' compensation judge finds cause, he or she will assign another arbitrator pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5271(d)*

For discussion of disqualification of judges for cause, see Ch. 317, *Judges* .

[4] Duties and Responsibilities

Arbitrators have all the statutory and regulatory duties and responsibilities of a workers' compensation judge, as set forth in *Lab. Code § 5300 et seq.*, except the power to order the injured worker to be examined by a qualified medical evaluator pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5701* and *5703.5*, and the power of contempt [*Lab. Code § 5272*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.64

§ 577.64 Costs and Compensation Related to Arbitration

[1] In General

In disputes between an employee and an employer, the employer must pay all costs related to the arbitration proceeding, including use of facilities, hearing reporter's per diems, and transcript costs [*Lab. Code § 5273(a)*].

In all other disputes, the costs of the arbitration proceedings, including the arbitrator's compensation, must be paid as follows [*Lab. Code § 5273(b)*]:

- By the parties equally, in any dispute between an employer and an insurer or an employer and a lien claimant;

- By the parties equally, in proceedings subject to *Lab. Code § 5500.5* (occupational disease or cumulative injury arising out of more than one employment); and

- By the dependents in accordance with their proportionate share of death benefits, if there is no dispute as to the injury causing death.

The costs awarded must be reasonable in amount [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999*].

[2] Resolution of Disputes Over Costs or Fees

Disputes regarding costs or fees for arbitration are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the WCAB and are determined initially by the presiding judge of the district office [*Lab. Code § 5273(c)*]. Any dispute involving an arbitrator's fee or cost must be resolved by the presiding workers' compensation judge of the appropriate local office or, in his or her absence, the acting presiding workers' compensation judge [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999*].

Any request to resolve a dispute about arbitrator's fees or costs must be accompanied by any written agreement

pertaining to arbitrator's fees or costs and a statement that must set forth the nature of the dispute and an itemization of the hours spent in actual arbitration hearing, in preparation for arbitration, and in preparation of the decision. The statement must also include an itemization of the verifiable costs including use of facility, reporters, and transcript preparation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999*].

[3] Amount of Arbitrator's Fees

An arbitrator's fee must not exceed a reasonable amount. In establishing a reasonable fee, the presiding workers' compensation judge will consider the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999*]:

- The responsibility assumed by the arbitrator;
- The arbitrator's experience;
- The number and complexity of the issues being arbitrated;
- The time involved; and
- The expeditiousness and completeness of issue resolution.

The presiding workers' compensation judge of each local office is required to maintain statistics on all arbitration fees awarded pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5273(c)* including the amount thereof and rationale or basis for the award pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999(a)-(e)*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.65

§ 577.65 Time and Place of Arbitration

Arbitration proceedings may commence at any place and time agreed on by all parties [*Lab. Code § 5276(a)*]. If the parties cannot agree on a time or place, the arbitrator must order the date, time, and place for commencement of the proceeding [*Lab. Code § 5276(b)*].

Unless all parties agree otherwise, arbitration proceedings must commence not less than 30 days nor more than 60 days from the date that an arbitrator is selected [*Lab. Code § 5276(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.66

§ 577.66 Submission and Service of Papers

Ten days before the arbitration, each party must submit to the arbitrator and serve on the opposing party reports, records, and other documentary evidence on which that party intends to rely [*Lab. Code § 5276(c)*]. If a party intends to rely on excerpts of records or depositions, only copies of the excerpts are to be submitted to the arbitrator [*Lab. Code § 5276(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.67

§ 577.67 Communication With Arbitrator

[1] Disclosure of Settlement Offers Prohibited

Disclosure of any settlement offer made by any party may not be made to the arbitrator prior to the filing of the award [*Lab. Code § 5278(a)*].

[2] Ex Parte Communication

Ex parte communication with an arbitrator or potential arbitrator by counsel or the parties is prohibited except for the purpose of scheduling the arbitration hearing or requesting a continuance [*Lab. Code § 5278(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceRelevanceCompromise & Settlement NegotiationsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.68

§ 577.68 Arbitrator's Findings and Award

[1] In General

The arbitrator's findings and award must be served on all parties within 30 days of submission of the case for decision [*Lab. Code § 5277(a)*]. The award must comply with *Lab. Code § 5313* (findings by workers' compensation judges and WCAB) and be filed with the WCAB office pursuant to venue rules published by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5277(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10295(g), 10296(e)* (copy of final decision, order, or award from arbitrator, together with copy of record developed as set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5276, 5277*, to be filed with Presiding WCJ of district office having venue, and district office to scan copies of arbitrator's decision, order, or award and record into EAMS adjudication file and, after scanning, destroy copies)]. The arbitrator's findings of fact, award, order, or decision has the same force and effect as an award, order, or decision of a workers' compensation judge [*Lab. Code § 5277(c)*]. For discussion of workers' compensation judge and WCAB findings and awards, see *§ 577.190* et seq.

Unless all parties agree to a longer period of time, the failure of the arbitrator to submit the decision within 30 days results in forfeiture of the arbitrator's fee and vacates the submission order and all stipulations [*Lab. Code § 5277(e)*].

When a compromise of a claim or an award is submitted to an arbitrator for approval, the parties must also file with the arbitrator any liens served on the parties [*Lab. Code § 4903.1(b)*].

[2] Reconsideration

[a] In General

Any final order, decision, or award filed by an arbitrator under *Lab. Code §§ 5270-5275* is subject to the reconsideration process set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5900-5911* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10840* and *10842* (reconsideration of decisions by workers' compensation judges and WCAB) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10866*]. The parties, respectively, must serve the arbitrator with the petition for reconsideration and the answer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10866*]. When a petition for reconsideration is filed from any final order, decision, or award made by an arbitrator under *Lab. Code §§ 5270-5275*,

the arbitrator must prepare and serve a report on reconsideration as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860* and must concurrently forward the file and the original report to the presiding workers' compensation judge. The judge will then promptly forward the file and report to the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10866*].

For discussion of reconsideration procedure generally, see *§ 577.210* et seq.

[b] Alternative Dispute Resolution Systems

A petition for reconsideration from an arbitration decision made pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3201.5(a)(1)* (permitting collective baraining agreements that provide for an alternative dispute resolution system governing disputes between employees and employers), must be filed directly with the WCAB's office in San Francisco within 20 days of service of the final order, decision, or award made and filed by the arbitrator or board of arbitrators [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10865*]. A copy of the petition for reconsideration must be served on the arbitrator or board of arbitrators [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10865*]. A copy of that portion of the collective bargaining agreement relating to the arbitration and reconsideration process must be submitted by the petitioner [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10865*]. On receiving the petition for reconsideration, the arbitrator or board of arbitrators must forward to the WCAB in San Francisco the record of proceedings, including the transcript of proceedings, if any, a summary of testimony if the proceedings were not transcribed, the documentary evidence submitted by each of the parties, and an opinion that sets forth the rationale for the decision as to each contention raised by the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10865*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.69

§ 577.69 Arbitration of Subsequent Issues or Proceedings

Use of an arbitrator for any part of a proceeding or any issue does not bind the parties to the use of the same arbitrator for any subsequent issues or proceedings [*Lab. Code § 5277(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.70

§ 577.70 Submission of Supplemental Proceedings

The presiding workers' compensation judge may submit supplemental proceedings to arbitration pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5270 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 5277(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionArbitrationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute Resolution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
3. Arbitration

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.71-577.79

[Reserved]

§§ 577.71[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.80

§ 577.80 Governing Law

The appointment of a guardian ad litem or trustee for a minor or incompetent employee or dependent is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5307.5(a)* and *5408* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402*.

Pleadings are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5500.5, 5501,* and *5505,* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408,* 10250, 10251, *10480,* and *10484*.

Designation of the parties is governed by *Lab. Code § 5503* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10364* and *10368*. Necessary parties are governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10360* and joinder of parties by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10372* and *10380*. Joinder of parties by the WCAB or a workers' compensation judge (hereinafter WCJ) is governed by *Lab. Code § 5307.5(b)*.

The effect of a defendant's failure to answer or appear is set forth in *Lab. Code § 5506* and the dismissal of an application that shows on its face that the applicant is not entitled to compensation is governed by *Lab. Code § 5507*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureParties JoinderNecessary PartiesCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePretrial JudgmentsDefaultGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.81

§ 577.81 Guardian ad Litem and Trustee

The WCAB or a WCJ may appoint a trustee or guardian ad litem to appear for and represent any minor or incompetent on the terms and conditions that it deems proper [*Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*; *see* discussion under *§ 577.25[3*]; *see also* form in *§ 577.398[1]*]. The compensation allowed the trustee or guardian for his or her services is fixed by the WCAB or the superior court [*Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*].

In one case, the court of appeal held that the Appeals Board had no basis for restricting the compensation of a guardian ad litem and conservator of an incompetent injured worker to non-duplicative care and that the employer, not the estate of the injured worker, should bear the expense. The court found that the parties had agreed in a compromise and release agreement that the guardian was entitled to compensation for duplicative care and that decisional law interpreting *Lab. Code § 4600* encompassed care provided by a lay person that might have been done by a professional, including a licensed vocational nurse. In the present case, the care for which the guardian requested compensation from the injured worker's employer did not fall under the duties of a conservator but were rather equivalent to medical treatment. Morever, stated the court, the Board should leave it to the superior court to ensure that the guardian was not compensated for the same care in the conservatorship. Finally, the court found that the guardian was entitled to a penalty assessment under *Lab. Code § 5814*, for unreasonable delay in the payment of compensation, and attorney's fees pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814.5*, for her efforts to obtain the penalty [*Hodgman v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 155 Cal. App. 4th 44, 53-55, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 687]* .

If required by the WCAB, the guardian or trustee must give a bond in the amount determined by the WCAB and in the form and of the character required by law from a guardian appointed by a superior court [*Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*]. For a discussion of bonds required from guardians appointed by a superior court, see Ch. 283, *Guardianship and Conservatorship: Bonds* . For a discussion and forms of bonds and undertakings, see *Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq. The bond must be approved by the WCAB, and the guardian or trustee will not be discharged from liability until he or she files an account with the WCAB or with the superior court and the account is approved [*Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewEstate, Gift & Trust LawTrustsTrusteesDuties & PowersClaims By & AgainstFamily LawGuardiansDuties & RightsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.82

§ 577.82 Pleadings

[1] Requirements, In General

The application and the answer are the only pleadings required in a proceeding for adjudication of a workers' compensation claim. Both must be in writing and conform to the forms prescribed by the WCAB's rules of practice and procedure. They must simply but clearly and completely delineate all relevant matters of agreement and all issues of disagreement within the jurisdiction of the WCAB, and provide for the furnishing of any additional information as the WCAB may properly determine is necessary to expedite its hearing and determination of the claim [*Lab. Code § 5500*]. Except for injuries occurring between January 1, 1990, and January 1, 1994, the filing of an application for adjudication, not the filing of a claim form, establishes jurisdiction of the Appeals Board and commences proceedings for the collection of benefits [*Lab. Code § 5500*].

[2] Amendment of Pleadings

The pleadings are deemed amended to conform to the stipulations and statement of issues agreed to by the parties on the record. Pleadings may be amended to conform to proof by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10492*].

[3] Proper Identification of Parties and Lien Claimants

Whenever any party or lien claimant (or any attorney or other representative for a party or lien claimant) either (i) files any application for adjudication, answer, stipulated findings and award, compromise and release, lien claim, petition or other pleading with the Appeals Board or (ii) states its appearance on the record at any hearing before the Appeals Board (including but not limited to stating its appearance on any pretrial conference statement, appearance sheet, or minutes of hearing), the party or lien claimant, or its attorney or other representative, must comply with the following requirements [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10550*]:

- Each party or lien claimant must set forth its full legal name, and each attorney or other representative must set forth the full legal name(s) of the party or parties he, she, or it is representing.

- If an adjusting agent or third-party claims administrator is appearing, it must disclose: (1) whether it is appearing on behalf of an employer, an insurance carrier, or both; (2) the identity or identities of the party or parties it is representing; and (3) if it is representing an insurance carrier, whether the policy includes a high self-insured retention, a large deductible, or any other provision that affects the identity of the entity or entities actually liable for the payment of compensation.

- If an insurance carrier is appearing, it must disclose: (1) whether it is appearing solely on its behalf, or also on behalf the insured employer; and (2) whether its policy includes a high self-insured retention, a large deductible, or any other provision that affects the identity of the entity actually liable for the payment of compensation.

- If a lien claim is being filed or amended, or if a lien claimant is appearing, the lien claimant must state whether it is the original owner of the alleged debt or whether it has purchased the alleged debt from the original owner or some subsequent purchaser.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.83

§ 577.83 Application for Adjudication and Answer

[1] Application

[a] By Party in Interest

An application for adjudication of claim may be filed by any party in interest or by the party's attorney or other representative authorized in writing [*Lab. Code § 5501*]. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, an application may be filed at any time there is a bona fide dispute after service of the claim form required by *Lab. Code § 5401* (*discussed under § 577.42[2][b]*) [*Lab. Code § 5500*]. For the WCAB office in which the application should be filed, see discussion in *§ 577.87[1]*. For the filing of papers generally and the manner in which the application for adjudication is served, see *discussion under § 577.108[4]*. For application for adjudication forms in disability and death cases, see *§§ 577.390 -577.393*.

A representative who is not an attorney licensed by the State Bar of California must notify the WCAB in writing of that fact [*Lab. Code § 5501*].

[b] By Lien Claimant

A medical lien claimant that provides medical services to an injured employee may initiate compensation proceedings by filing an application. The injured employee must be named as a party and served with notice but need not take part in the proceedings [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 57, 67, 216 Cal. Rptr. 115, 702 P.2d 197* ; *see Lab. Code § 5501*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10360, 10364*]. Also, once an application is filed by an employee, a lien claimant may join the proceeding under *Lab. Code § 4903* (*discussed under § 577.261*). Moreover, a lien claimant may become a party when the applicant's case has been settled by way of a compromise and release, or when the applicant chooses not to proceed with his or her case. Furthermore, a lien claimant may reopen a case within five years after the WCAB's decision under *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803, 5804* (*discussed under § 577.220* et seq.) if there is further disability or good cause shown [*Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 39 Cal. 3d 57, 68 n.11, 216 Cal. Rptr. 115, 702 P.2d 197]* .

[c] Separate Application for Each Injury Required

There is but one cause of action for each injury coming within the provisions of the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5303*]. A separate application must be filed for each separate injury for which benefits are claimed even though the employer in each case is the same [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10401*]. No injury, whether specific or cumulative, shall for any purpose whatsoever, merge into or form a part of another injury, nor shall any award based on a cumulative injury include disability caused by any specific injury or by any other cumulative injury causing or contributing to the existing disability, need for medical treatment, or death [*Lab. Code § 5303*; *see Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1537-1539, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190* ; *Aetna Cas. & Surety Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 329, 333, 110 Cal. Rptr. 780* ; *see also* discussion in *§ 577.14[3]* (definition of injury and types of injuries)].

[d] Dismissal of Application That Shows No Right to Compensation

If an application shows on its face that the applicant is not entitled to compensation, the WCAB may, after the applicant has had an opportunity to be heard orally or to submit his or her claim or argument in writing, dismiss the application without any hearing on its own motion or on the motion of the adverse party [*Lab. Code § 5507*; *see § 577.453*]. The pendency of the motion or notice of intended dismissal does not, however, unless otherwise ordered by the WCAB, delay the hearing of the application on the merits [*Lab. Code § 5507*].

[2] Answer

[a] Grounds for Filing

An answer (*see* forms in *§§ 577.394[1], 577.395[1]*) may be filed and forthwith served on all adverse parties by any defendant who [*Lab. Code § 5505*].

- Desires to disclaim any interest in the subject matter of the claim in controversy;
- Considers that the application is in any respect inaccurate or incomplete; or
- Desires to bring any fact, paper, or document to the attention of the WCAB as a defense to the claim or otherwise.

[b] Time for Filing

An answer to each application for adjudication must be filed and served 10 days after service of the declaration of readiness to proceed required by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250* or *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252* [*Lab. Code § 5505*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10480*].

For discussion of the manner in which the answer may be served, see *§ 577.108[4]*.

[c] Appearances

[i] Appearances Required

All parties and lien claimants must appear at all hearings, except as provided below [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(a)*]:

1. When injury arising out of and in the course of employment is at issue, lien claimants not defined as a party [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(y)(3)* ("party" means: (1) person claiming to be injured employee or dependent of injured employee; (2) defendant; or (3) lien claimant when either (A) underlying case of

injured employee or employee's dependent has been resolved or (B) injured employee or employee's dependent chooses not to proceed with his, her, or their case)] are not required to appear at the mandatory settlement conference or trial, unless otherwise ordered by the WCJ.

2. When liability for the claim has been accepted, lien claimants not defined as a party, with a lien claim of $25,000 or more, must appear or have a representative appear at the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, unless the appearance is excused by the WCJ.

3. Lien claimants not defined as a party, with liens of less than $25,000, must be available by telephone with settlement authority and must notify defendant(s) of the telephone number at which the defendant may reach them during the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, although the WCJ may order the appearance of lien claimants not defined as a party, with liens of less than $25,000, at a mandatory settlement conference or lien conference.

4. All lien claimants must appear at trial at which their lien(s) is an issue to be decided.

All parties must have a person available with settlement authority at the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, although the person with settlement authority need not be present if an attorney or representative who is present can obtain immediate authority by telephone [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(b)*].

Unless the notice otherwise provides, the applicant must be present at a mandatory settlement conference, as provided in *Lab. Code § 5502(e)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(c)*].

Appearance at a hearing not covered by this rule is at the discretion of the WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(d)*].

[ii] Failure to Appear

When a party or a lien claimant is served with notice of trial pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240* [*see* [i], *above*] and fails to appear either in person or by attorney or representative, the WCJ may [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10241(a)*]:

1. Dismiss the application after issuing a notice of intention to dismiss pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*.

2. Dismiss the lien claim after issuing a notice of intention to dismiss pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*.

3. Hear the evidence and, after service of the minutes of hearing and summary of evidence that must include notice of intention to submit the case for decision pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*, submit the case for decision.

When a party or a lien claimant is served with notice of a conference or mandatory settlement conference pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240* [*see* [i], *above*] and fails to appear at the conference, the WCJ may [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10241(b)*]:

1. Dismiss the application after issuing a notice of intention to dismiss pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*.

2. Dismiss the lien claim after issuing a notice of intention to dismiss with or without prejudice pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*.

3. Close discovery and forward the case to the Presiding WCJ to set for trial.

When a party, after notice, fails to appear at either a trial or a conference and good cause is shown for failure to appear, the WCJ may take the case off calendar or may continue the case to a date certain [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10241(c)*].

[iii] Appearances in Settled Cases

When the parties represent to the WCJ assigned to the case that a case has been settled, the case will be taken off calendar, and no appearances will be required [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10244*].

[iv] Procedures Following Failure to Appear

No default may be taken against a defendant who fails to answer or appear. Rather, the WCAB shall proceed to the hearing of the matter on such terms and conditions as it deems proper [*Lab. Code § 5506*]. Moreover, a defendant who fails to appear or answer, or who subsequently contends that no service was made on him or her, or who claims to be aggrieved in any other manner by lack of notice of the pendency of the proceeding, may apply to the WCAB for relief in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, and the WCAB may grant such relief [*Lab. Code § 5506*].

No right to relief, including the claim that the findings and award of the WCAB or judgment entered thereon are void on their face [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 473(d)*], will accrue to a defendant who fails to answer or appear in any court unless prior application is made to the WCAB in accordance with *Lab. Code § 5506*. In no event will any petition to any court be allowed except as prescribed in *Lab. Code §§ 5950* and *5951* (petition for writ of review) [*Lab. Code § 5506*].

For discussion of the relief authorized by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473(b)* (relief from judgment, dismissal, order, or proceeding taken against party through mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect), and sixth paragraph (relief from void judgment or order), see Ch. 489, *Relief from Judgments and Orders* .

[3] Demurrers Prohibited

Demurrers, petitions for judgment on the pleadings, and petitions for summary judgment are not allowed. A continuance may be granted, however, on timely request and on such terms as may be reasonable under the circumstances, or may be ordered by the WCAB on its own motion if the pleading is so uncertain, unintelligible, or ambiguous as to render it impossible for the WCAB to understand or act on it, or if any party is prejudiced by omission or ambiguity of necessary allegations sufficient to prevent that party from adequately presenting a cause of action or defense [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10490*]. For discussion of continuances generally, see the discussion in *§ 577.157[2]*.

[4] Statement to Be Filed With Application or Answer

The employee, the insurer, the employer, and the attorneys for each party must sign and file with the WCAB a statement under penalty of perjury, with the application or answer, that they have not violated *Lab. Code § 139.3* (referral to person with whom physician has financial interest unlawful) and that they have not offered, delivered, received, or accepted any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage, dividend, discount, or other consideration, whether in the form of money or otherwise, as compensation or inducement for any referred examination or evaluation [*Lab. Code § 4906(g)*].

Failure to comply with this requirement must result in a refusal by the WCAB to file or process the party's application for adjudication or answer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10404*]. If any of the parties who are required to file a statement are not available, cannot be located, or are unwilling to sign, a declaration under penalty of perjury setting forth in specific detail the reasons the party is not available, cannot be located, or is unwilling to sign, as well as good faith efforts to locate the party, may be filed with the application or answer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10404*]. If the presiding workers' compensation judge, or designee, determines from the facts set forth in the declaration that good cause has been

established, he or she may accept the application or answer for filing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10404*]. For purposes of this rule, a compromise and release agreement or stipulations with request for an award is not treated as an application for adjudication [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10404*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.84

§ 577.84 Initiation of Proceeding

[1] Filing

With specified exceptions [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10865, 10953*], proceedings for the adjudication of rights and liabilities before the Appeals Board are initiated by filing an Application for Adjudication, a case opening Compromise and Release Agreement, a case opening Stipulations with Request for Award, or a Request for Findings of Fact under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10405* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(a)*]. A case opening Compromise and Release Agreement, a case opening Stipulations With Request for Award, and a Request for Findings of Fact under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10405* is each an "application" for purposes of invoking the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board, but none of these documents is deemed an application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 4064(c)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(b)*].

Upon the filing of an initial application, it will be assigned an adjudication case number and a venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(c)*].

When filing an amended application, the applicant must indicate in the box on the application form that it is an "amended" application [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(d)*].

[2] Service

Upon filing an Application for Adjudication, the filing party or lien claimant must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

If the party filing the application is an unrepresented injured employee, an unrepresented dependent of a deceased employee, or a lien claimant or non-attorney representative of a lien claimant who falls within one of the exceptions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)*, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on all parties and lien claimants, including the filing applicant, who are listed either on the application, on the proof of service to the application, or on the

address record (if an address record was previously created for an earlier application).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*].

For all other parties and lien claimants, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, on the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Upon receipt of the conformed copy of the application, the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative) must forthwith serve a copy of the conformed application on all other parties and lien claimants who are listed on the application or on the proof of service to the application, and, if it is an initial application, concurrently notify all other parties and lien claimants of the assigned adjudication case number and venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*].

Disclosure of the applicant's social security number is voluntary, not mandatory. A failure to provide a social security number will not have any adverse consequences. Nevertheless, although an applicant is not required by law to provide that number, he or she is encouraged to do so. Social security numbers are used solely for identification and verification purposes in order to administer the workers' compensation system. A social security number will not be disclosed, made available, or otherwise used for purposes other than those specified, except with the consent of the applicant, or as permitted or required by statute, regulation, or judicial order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(h)*].

[3] Failure to Comply With Court Administrator's Rules

If a document is not filed in compliance with the Court Administrator's rules, because it does not comply with either the procedural requirements or with the place of filing requirements, the Court Administrator may in his or her discretion take the following actions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(a)*]:

- Correct the defect and file the document.

- Notify the filer that the document is not accepted for filing by service of a Notice of Document Discrepancy. This notice must state the discrepancy and the date of the attempted filing, and provide the filer with 15 business days from service to cure the discrepancy. If the document is corrected within 15 business days, or at a later date upon a showing of good cause, it will be deemed filed on the original date the document was submitted.

The following documents are not to be filed with the district office or the Appeals Board, except as a non-duplicative supporting exhibit or by order of a WCJ or the Board. Documents improperly submitted will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed and will not be acknowledged and may be discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(b)*].

- Letters to opposing parties or counsel.

- Subpoenas.
- Notices of taking deposition.
- Medical appointment letters.
- Proofs of service ordered pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*.
- Medical reports, except as required by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233*.
- Copies of any decision of any federal or state court opinion otherwise available.
- Copies of any decision of the Appeals Board or a WCJ that is otherwise available.
- Duplicate medical and medical-legal reports.
- No diagnostic imaging as defined in *Lab. Code § 139.3(b)(1)* is to be transmitted to the district office or the Appeals Board unless it is ordered.

No document is to be sent by electronic mail or by fax directly to the district office or the Appeals Board. If a document is sent by electronic mail or fax directly to the district office, it will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed, will not be acknowledged, and may be discarded unless otherwise ordered by the WCJ or the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(c)*].

Failure to comply with the rules of the Court Administrator will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless that failure results from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10211*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.85

§ 577.85 Parties

[1] Designation

The person applying for compensation benefits is the applicant and the adverse party is the defendant [*Lab. Code § 5503*].

[2] Joinder of Applicants

Any person in whom any right to relief is alleged to exist may appear, or be joined, as an applicant [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10364*]. Any applicant other than the injured employee must join the injured employee as a party, in which case the application must include the employee's address if known or, if not known, a statement of that fact [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10360*]. In death cases, all persons who may be dependents must either join or be joined as applicants so that the entire liability of the employer or the insurer may be determined in one proceeding [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10372*].

[3] Joinder of Defendants

Any person against whom any right to relief is alleged may be joined as a defendant [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10368*]. The applicant may join as a defendant the employer's compensation carrier or file a separate application against it for any portion of the compensation to which he or she is entitled [*Lab. Code § 3753*; *see Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 287, 292 n.4, 148 Cal. Rptr. 325]* . Joinder of employers in occupational disease cases is covered in *Lab. Code § 5500.5*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesJoinderGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesOccupational Diseases

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.86

§ 577.86 Joinder of Claims

All claims of all persons arising out of the same injury to the same employee must be filed in the same proceeding [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10401*]. All claims for medical expense, disability payments, death benefits, burial expense, liens, or any other matter arising out of the injury may, in the WCAB's discretion, be joined in the same proceeding at any time [*Lab. Code § 5303*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesJoinderGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedurePartiesJoinderNecessary PartiesCivil ProcedureJoinder of Claims & RemediesClaimsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.87

§ 577.87 Venue

[1] In General

The application for adjudication must be filed in one of the following places [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(a)*]:

(1) The county in which the injured employee or dependent of a deceased employee resides on the date of filing;

(2) The county where the injury allegedly occurred or, in cumulative trauma and industrial disease claims, where the last alleged injurious exposure occurred; or

(3) The county where the employee's attorney maintains his or her principal place of business, if the employee is represented by an attorney.

Written consent of the employee or dependent of a deceased employee to the selected venue site must be filed with the application [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(b)*]. Further, if the selected venue site is the county where the employee's attorney maintains his or her principal place of business, that attorney must indicate the venue site when he or she forwards the information request form required by *Lab. Code § 5401.5* for injuries occurring before January 1, 1994 (discussed under *§ 577.41[2]*). The employer then has 30 days from receipt of the information request form to object to the selected venue site. If the employer does object, the application must be filed pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2), *above* [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(c)*].

If the county selected for filing has more than one WCAB office, the application must be filed at any WCAB office within that county that meets the criteria of (1), (2), or (3), *above* [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(b)*]. If there is no WCAB office in any county specified in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3), *above*, the application must be filed at the WCAB office nearest to one of the following [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(d)*]:

- The residence of the injured employee or dependent of a deceased employee on the date of filing;

- The place where the injury allegedly occurred, or, in cumulative trauma and industrial disease claims, the last injurious exposure occurred; or

- The location where the employee's attorney maintains his or her principal place of business, unless the employer objects pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5(c)*.

The person or entity filing an initial application for adjudication (or other case opening document) must designate venue and specify whether venue is based on [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10409(a)*]:

1. The place of the employee or dependent's residence at the time of filing [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(a)(1)* or *(d)*].

2. The place where the injury allegedly occurred or, for cumulative trauma or industrial disease claims, where the last alleged injurious exposure occurred [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(a)(2)* or *(d)*].

3. The place where the employee's attorney maintains his or her principal place of business [*Lab. Code § 5501.5(a)(3)*].

When a Division of Workers' Compensation employee files his or her own application for adjudication or other case opening document, the following provisions apply [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10409(a)*]:

- Regardless of the venue designated by the employee, venue is determined as follows:

  - The parties may agree on a venue, subject to the approval of the presiding WCJ.

  - If the parties are unable to agree on a suitable venue, or for any other good cause shown, the presiding WCJ of the district office designated on the application or other case opening document must consult with the Secretary or other Deputy Commissioner of the Appeals Board to determine the appropriate venue, with the Secretary or other Deputy Commissioner issuing the appropriate venue order.

- The Secretary or other Deputy Commissioner of the Appeals Board will assign the case to a WCJ unfamiliar with the employee. When appropriate, a WCJ from a region other than the employee's region will be assigned.

[2] Asbestos-Related Injuries

All applications for asbestos-related injuries must be filed with and heard by either the San Francisco or the Long Beach branch of the WCAB, regardless of the date of injury. No other WCAB office will accept or hold any proceeding concerning these applications [*see* Memorandum to Presiding WCJs from John A. Merrill, Assistant Chief, Division of Workers' Compensation (July 11, 1990)].

[3] Petition for Change

An applicant or defendant may petition for a change of venue, specifically setting forth the reasons for the change. The petition will be granted for good cause. If the reason for the petition is the convenience of witnesses, the names and addresses of the witnesses and the substance of their testimony must be specifically set forth [*Lab. Code § 5501.6*].

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5(c)*, any employer or insurance carrier listed on an initial application for adjudication may file an objection to a venue selection, based on the employee's attorney's principal place of business under *Lab. Code § 5501.5(a)(3)*, within 30 days after receiving notice of the adjudication case number and venue, stating under penalty of perjury the date when the notice of the adjudication case number and venue was received [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10410*].

A petition for change of venue pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.6* must be filed at the district office with venue. Any objection to a petition for a change of venue must be filed within 10 days of the filing of the petition. The presiding judge of the district office having venue, or his or her designee, must grant or deny the petition for change of venue, or serve notice of a status conference concerning the petition, within 30 days of the filing of the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10411*].

When an order changing venue is issued, all further trial level proceedings must be conducted at, and all further trial level orders, decisions, and awards must be issued by, the district office to which venue was changed until another order changing venue is issued [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10412*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureVenueGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureVenueMotions to TransferConvenience of WitnessesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.88

§ 577.88 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

[1] Service and Filing

Applications or petitions may not be placed on calendar for mandatory settlement conferences, status conferences, priority conferences, expedited hearing, or any other hearing unless one of the parties has filed and served a declaration of readiness to proceed in the form prescribed by the Court Administrator. The declaration of readiness must be served on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(a)*; *see § 577.399[1*] (form)].

All declarations of readiness to proceed must state under penalty of perjury that the moving party has made a genuine, good faith effort to resolve the dispute before filing the declarations of readiness to proceed, and must state with specificity those efforts [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(b)*]. A false declaration or certification by any party, lien claimant, attorney, or representative may give rise to proceedings under *Lab. Code § 134* for contempt or *Lab. Code § 5813* for sanctions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(c)*]. If a party or a lien claimant is represented by an attorney or representative, any declaration of readiness filed on behalf of the party must be executed by the attorney or representative [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(d)*].

The declaration may be filed with the application for adjudication. An application filed without an accompanying declaration will be placed in inactive status [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*].

A priority conference must be set upon the filing of a declaration of readiness requesting a priority conference that shows that the applicant is represented by an attorney and that the issues in dispute include employment and/or injury arising out of and in the course of employment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(a)*]. Upon a showing of good cause, a WCJ may continue the matter to a status conference. At each priority or status conference, the parties must be prepared to set the matter for trial or to provide a plan to complete discovery [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(b)*]. To the extent possible, all priority and status conferences in a case are to be conducted by the same WCJ. When discovery is complete, or when the WCJ determines that the parties have had sufficient time to complete reasonable discovery, the case must be set for trial as expeditiously as possible [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(c)*].

[2] Objection to Declaration

Any objection to a declaration of readiness to proceed must be filed and served within 10 calendar days after service of the declaration. The objection must set forth, under penalty of perjury, specific reason why the case should not be set or why the requested proceedings are inappropriate [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10251(a)*].

If a party or lien claimant is represented, the attorney or representative must execute any objection to the declaration of readiness to proceed on behalf of the party. Declarations of readiness to proceed must be reviewed by the Presiding WCJ or any WCJ designated by the Presiding WCJ, who will determine on the basis of the facts stated in the declaration whether the objection should be sustained [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10251(c)*].

If a party has received a copy of the declaration of readiness to proceed and has not filed an objection under this rule, that party will be deemed to have waived all objections to proceeding on the issues specified in the declaration, absent extraordinary circumstances [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10251(d)*].

[3] False Declaration or Certification

A false declaration or certification filed under this section by any party, lien claimant, attorney, or representative may give rise to proceedings under *Lab. Code § 134* for contempt or *Lab. Code § 5813* for sanctions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10251(b)*].

[4] Setting for Hearing Other Than as Requested

The WCAB, upon the receipt of a declaration of readiness to proceed, may, in its discretion, set the case for a type of proceeding other than that requested. It may on its own motion set any case for conference or trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10420*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersConferencesCase ManagementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.89

§ 577.89 Filing and Service of Physicians' Reports

[1] In General

All medical reports and medical-legal reports filed with the Appeals Board must be filed in accordance with the regulations of the Court Administrator, or as otherwise provided by the Appeals Board rules. Service of all medical reports and medical-legal reports on other parties and lien claimants must be made in accordance with the provisions of this rule [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(a)*].

After the filing of an Application for Adjudication, if a party or lien claimant is requested by another party or lien claimant to serve copies of medical reports and medical-legal reports relating to the claim, the party or lien claimant receiving the request must serve copies of the reports that are in its possession or under its control on the requesting party or lien claimant within six days of the request, if the reports have not been previously served. The party or lien claimant receiving the request must serve a copy of any subsequently received medical report or medical-legal report within six days of receipt of the report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(b)*].

At the time of the filing of a Declaration of Readiness to Proceed or Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing, the filing declarant must concurrently serve copies of all medical reports and medical-legal reports relating to the claim that have not been previously served and that are in the possession or under the control of the filing declarant on (1) all other parties, whether or not they have previously requested service; and (2) all lien claimants that have previously requested service. The filing declarant also must serve a copy of any subsequently received medical report or medical-legal report relating to the claim within six days of receipt of the report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(c)*].

Within six days after service of any Declaration of Readiness to Proceed or Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing, all other parties and lien claimants must serve copies of all medical reports and medical-legal reports relating to the claim that are in their possession or under their control, and that have not been previously served, on (1) all other parties, whether or not they have previously requested service; and (2) all lien claimants that have previously requested service. The other parties and lien claimants also must serve a copy of any subsequently received

medical report or medical-legal report relating to the claim within six days of receipt of the report, consistent with (1) and (2) in the preceding sentence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(d)*].

If, at any time after the periods specified in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608 (b), (c),* and *(d),* discussed above, a lien claimant initiates a request for service of medical reports and medical-legal reports, all parties and other lien claimants must serve the requesting lien claimant with copies of all medical reports and medical-legal reports relating to the claim that are in their possession or under their control, and that have not been previously served, within six days of receipt of the request. The parties and other lien claimants also must serve a copy of any subsequently received medical report or medical-legal report relating to the claim within six days of receipt of the report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(e)*].

All medical reports or medical-legal reports relating to the claim that have not been previously served must be served on all other parties and lien claimants upon the filing of a compromise and release or stipulations with request for award, unless the rights and/or liabilities of those parties or lien claimants were previously fully resolved [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(f)*].

Except as provided by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10603* (regarding oversized exhibits, diagnostic imagining, physical exhibits, and exhibits on media), medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, and other records and documents must be filed only in accordance with the following provisions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(a)*]. The provisions in the list, below, apply when a declaration of readiness (other than a declaration of readiness for an expedited hearing) is being filed, including a walk-through declaration of readiness [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(b)*].

> 1. When filing a declaration of readiness, the filing party or lien claimant must file the report of any agreed medical evaluator, any qualified medical evaluator, and any treating physician that: (A) are then in its possession or control, (B) are relevant to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and (C) have not been filed previously. No other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents may be filed at that time, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ.
>
> 2. When filing an objection to a declaration of readiness, or within 10 days of the filing of the declaration of readiness if no objection is timely filed, each opposing party or lien claimant must file the reports of any agreed medical evaluator, any qualified medical evaluator, and any treating physician that: (A) are then in its possession or control, (B) are relevant to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and (C) have not been filed previously. No other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents may be filed at that time, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ.

The provisions in the list, below, apply when a declaration of readiness for an expedited hearing is being filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(c)*].

> 1. When filing a declaration of readiness for an expedited hearing, the filing party or lien claimant must file the reports of any agreed medical evaluator, any qualified medical evaluator, and any treating physician that: (A) are then in its possession or control, (B) are relevant to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and (C) have not been filed previously. No other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents may be filed at that time.
>
> 2. When filing an objection to a declaration of readiness for an expedited hearing, or within 10 days of the filing of the declaration of readiness if no objection is timely filed, each opposing party or lien claimant must file the reports of any agreed medical evaluator, any qualified medical evaluator, and any treating physician that: (A) are then in its possession or control, (B) are relevant to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and (C) have not been filed previously. No other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents may be filed at that time.

3. All other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents that are being proposed as exhibits with respect to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and that have not been filed previously, must be filed at the time of trial, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ.

The provisions in the list, below, apply when a compromise and release or a stipulations with request for award is being filed, with the exception that they do not apply when the compromise and release or the stipulations with request for award is being filed on a walk-through basis in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(d)*].

1. When filing a compromise and release or a stipulations with request for award, the filing party must file all agreed medical evaluator reports, qualified medical evaluator reports, treating physician reports, any other medical records, or other records (e.g., wage statements) that: (A) are relevant to a determination of the adequacy of the compromise and release or stipulations with request for award, and (B) have not been filed previously.

2. If the compromise and release or the stipulations with request for award is not approved, and the matter is set for a hearing on the adequacy of the proposed settlement, any additional reports, records, or other documents not previously filed that are being proposed as exhibits must be filed at the time of the adequacy hearing, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ.

3. If the compromise and release or the stipulations with request for award is not approved at or after the adequacy hearing, and the matter is set for a mandatory settlement conference or trial, then any additional medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents that are being proposed as exhibits must be filed in the same manner as set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233 (g)* and *(h)* [*see below*].

Excerpted portions of relevant physician, hospital, or dispensary records must be filed in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(e)*; *see § 577.104*]. Similarly, excerpted portions of relevant personnel records, wage records and statements, job descriptions, and other business records must be filed in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(f)*; *see § 577.104*].

At a mandatory settlement conference, rating mandatory settlement conference, priority conference, or lien conference, all other medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents that are being proposed as exhibits with respect to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness, and that have not been filed previously, must be filed, but only if the matter is being set for trial, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(g)*].

At trial, any additional medical reports, medical-legal reports, medical records, or other documents that are being proposed as exhibits with respect to the issue being raised by the declaration of readiness must be filed, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233(h)*].

[2] Content of Medical Reports

The matters that should be included in a physician's report are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*. A failure to set forth these matters will be considered by the workers' compensation judge in weighing this evidence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*]. All medical-legal reports must comply with the provisions of *Lab. Code § 4628* (responsibilities of physician signing medical-legal report). Except as otherwise provided by the Labor Code and the WCAB's rules, a failure to comply with Section 4628 will not make the report inadmissible, but will be considered in weighing this evidence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*].

[3] Form of Medical Evidence

The WCAB favors the production of medical evidence in the form of written reports. Direct examination of a medical witness will not be received at a trial except on a showing of good cause [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*]. A continuance for rebuttal testimony may be granted [*Lab. Code § 5502.5*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*]. In death cases, the reports of non-examining physicians may be admitted into evidence in lieu or oral testimony [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*].

[4] Employer-Maintained Records

A written communication from a physician containing any information listed in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606* that is contained in any record maintained by the employer as employer is deemed to be a physician's report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10616*]. However, records from an employee assistance program are not required to be filed or served unless ordered by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10616*].

[5] Failure to Comply with Requirements

Failure to comply with the requirements concerning disclosure, service, and filing of medical reports may result in the report being deemed inadmissible in evidence [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10622*]. If a willful suppression of a medical report is demonstrated, it will be presumed that the findings, conclusions, and opinions contained in the report would be adverse if produced [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10622*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.90

§ 577.90 Consolidatation of Cases

Consolidation of two or more related cases, involving either the same injured employee or multiple injured employees, rests in the sound discretion of the Appeals Board. In exercising that discretion, the Board is required to take into consideration any relevant factors, including but not limited to the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(a)*]:

1. Whether there are common issues of fact or law.

2. The complexity of the issues involved.

3. The potential prejudice to any party, including but not limited to whether granting consolidation would significantly delay the trial of any of the cases involved.

4. The avoidance of duplicate or inconsistent orders.

5. The efficient utilization of judicial resources.

Consolidation may be ordered for limited purposes or for all purposes [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(a)*].

Consolidation may be ordered by the Appeals Board on its own motion, or may be ordered based on a petition filed by one of the parties. A petition to consolidate must [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(b)*]:

1. List all named parties in each case.

2. Contain the adjudication case numbers of all the cases sought to be consolidated, with the lowest numbered case shown first.

3. Be filed in each case sought to be consolidated.

4. Be served on all attorneys or other representatives of record and on all non-represented parties in each case sought to be consolidated.

Any order regarding consolidation must be filed in each case to which the order relates [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(c)*].

If consolidation is ordered, the Appeals Board, in its discretion, may designate one case as the master file for exhibits and pleadings. If a master file is designated, any subsequent exhibits and pleadings filed by the parties and lien claimants during the period of consolidation are to be filed in the master case only. However, all pleadings and exhibit cover sheets filed must include the caption and case number of the master file case, followed by the case numbers of all of the other consolidated cases [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(d)*].

If a master file has been designated and the consolidated cases are tried, all relevant documentary evidence previously received in an individual case is deemed admitted in evidence in the consolidated proceedings under the master file and is deemed part of the record of each of the several consolidated cases. Evidence received subsequent to the designation of the master file is to be similarly received with like force and effect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(e)*].

When cases are consolidated, joint minutes of hearing, summaries of evidence, opinions, decisions, orders, findings, or awards may be used. However, copies must be filed in the record of proceedings of each case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(f)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases that are assigned to different WCJs in the same district office, or that have not been assigned but are venued at the same district office, must be referred to the Presiding WCJ of that office, whether the cases involve the same injured worker or multiple injured workers [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(a)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases involving the same injured worker that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, must first be referred to the Presiding WCJs of the district offices to which the cases are assigned. If the Presiding WCJs are unable to agree on where the cases will be assigned for hearing, the conflict will be resolved by the Court Administrator upon referral by one of the presiding judges [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(b)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases involving multiple injured workers that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, must be referred to the Court Administrator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(c)*]. In resolving any request or petition to consolidate cases that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, the Court Administrator must set the request or petition for a conference regarding the place of hearing. At or after the conference, the Court Administrator must determine the place of hearing and may determine the WCJ to whom the cases will be assigned, giving consideration to the factors set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589*. In reaching any determination, the Court Administrator may assign a WCJ to hear any discovery motions and disputes relevant to discovery in the action and to report their findings and recommendations to the Court Administrator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(d)*]. Any party aggrieved by the determination of the Court Administrator may request proceedings pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5310*, except that an assignment to a particular WCJ may be challenged only in accordance with the provisions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10452* and *10453* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of ActionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
4. Initiating Proceedings for Adjudication of Claim

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.91-577.99

[Reserved]

§§ 577.91[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.100

§ 577.100 Governing Law

Captions are governed generally by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232* and also by regulations pertaining to contents of specific documents. Verification is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446* and *2015.5* and by various provisions of the workers' compensation law relating to specific papers [*see, e.g., Lab. Code §§ 5902, 5905* (petition for reconsideration and answer to petition)]. The filing of papers and documents is governed by *Lab. Code § 5501* and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10227-10236. Service of papers and proof of service are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5316, 5501, 5504* and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10500-10510.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.101

§ 577.101 Caption of Papers

Most, but not all, papers filed in connection with a workers' compensation claim are filed with the WCAB and should be captioned accordingly. Common exceptions are the following:

- Requests for informal permanent disability ratings (*discussed under § 577.45[4][c]*), which are directed to the Division of Workers' Compensation, Office of Benefit Determination [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9732-9766*]; and

- Reports of occupational injury or illness, which, in the case of a self-insured employer, are filed directly with the Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research, and, in the case of an insured employer, are filed with the insurer, which must immediately transmit a copy of the report to the Division of Labor Statistics and Research [*see Lab. Code § 6409*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 14000-14004*].

The caption, or heading, of all papers filed with the WCAB should include the WCAB's name, the title of the paper, the name of the injured employee (which may be included in the title of the case), the title of the case (that is, the name of the injured employee or of the applicant if other than the injured employee vs. the name of the employer and of the employer's insurance carrier, if any), and, in the case of pleadings and other papers filed subsequent to the application for adjudication, the WCAB case number [*see, e.g., 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232*]. The case is indexed and referred to by the name of the injured employee, whether or not the employee is the applicant [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10215*; *see § 577.12A[2]*].

For a general form of caption, see *§ 577.400*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.102

§ 577.102 Data Entry Sheet

A WCAB Data Entry Sheet must accompany all filings in which no case number has been previously assigned. This includes the Application for Adjudication, Compromise and Release Agreement, Stipulations with Requests for Award, petitions seeking recovery under *Lab. Code § 132a*, and pre-application filings for cases involving injuries between January 1, 1990 and December 31, 1993, in which no case number was previously assigned by the WCAB.

For a copy of the WCAB Data Entry Sheet, see form in *§ 577.401[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.103

§ 577.103 Petitions

A request for action by the WCAB, other than an application for adjudication, an answer, or a declaration of readiness, must be made by petition, the caption of which must contain the case title and adjudication case number and indicate the type of relief sought [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210(z), 10450(a)*]. Any previously filed document must not be attached to a petition; any such document that is attached to a petition may be discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10450(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.104

§ 577.104 Form and Size Requirements of Papers

All documents, except the medical reports of treating physicians, secondary physicians, qualified or agreed medical evaluators, and proposed exhibits, must be filed in accordance with the following standards [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(a)*]:

1. Only one side of each paper is to be used.

2. All documents must be printed with black ink on white paper that is 81/2 x11 inches and at least 12 pound weight. All margins must be at least one inch and be without typed or handwritten text in any margin.

3. The first page must include a case caption that includes the name of the injured worker or dependent claiming benefits, the name of the employer and the employer's insurer or indicating that the employer is self-insured and a case number, if one has been assigned by the district office. If a case number has been assigned, the number must be preceded by the abbreviation "ADJ."

4. All non-form legal pleadings must contain a heading above the case caption containing the name of the filing attorney and his or her state bar membership number and the attorney's law firm name and address.

5. Except as otherwise provided in this regulation or in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)*, all OCR forms and documents must be printed in Times New Roman, Times, Courier, Palatino, Century Schoolbook, or similar serif font of at least 12 points in size.

6. Except as otherwise provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228*, all text added to the OCR forms must be in capital letters.

7. Response to the request on the OCR forms for social security numbers is optional, not mandatory.

8. A list of body part codes is provided with the document cover sheet form and posted on the DWC website (http://www.dir.ca.gov/forms.html). The codes must be used on OCR forms to describe the part of the body injured.

9. A list of district office codes for place of venue is provided with the document cover sheet form and posted on the DWC website (http://www.dir.ca.gov/forms.html). The codes must be used on OCR forms to describe the district office venue.

10. No single document may exceed 25 pages in length without the prior permission of the Appeals Board or the Presiding WCJ of the district office with venue over the case.

11. The text of a document must be double spaced or one and one-half spaced; however, captions, headings, headers, footnotes, footers, and block quotations must be single spaced.

12. The documents must be flat, without folds and without staples.

13. OCR forms have bar codes at the top of the document. No other documents may have bar codes at the top of the document.

All documents must be filed with document cover sheets and document separator sheets, as follows [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(b)*]:

1. A completed document cover sheet must be the first page of each individual document or set of documents filed at one time in the same case. The cover sheet provides space for information regarding 15 companion cases. Only the pages filled out need to be filed. A document separator sheet must precede each document within a set of documents.

2. If an individual document includes an attachment, a completed document separator sheet must precede the attachment, and, if an individual document includes multiple attachments, a document separator sheet must precede each individual attachment. A document separator sheet must not be placed between a document and the proof of service for that document. However, when one proof of service is used for multiple documents, a document separator sheet must precede the proof of service.

3. A list of document titles is provided with the document separator sheet form and posted on the DWC website (http://www.dir.ca.gov/forms.html). These document titles must be used on a document separator sheet to describe the attached document.

4. The document separator sheet requires the filer to list the product delivery units [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(bb)*; *see also § 577.12A[1]*, the date of the attached document, and the author of the attached document.

5. The requirements set out in items [1]-[4] in this list do not apply to any unrepresented employees, unrepresented dependents, or unrepresented uninsured employers who do not have ready access to document cover sheets and document separator sheets.

Oversized documents must be filed at only the time of trial in accordance with the provisions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10603* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(c)*].

If an unrepresented worker, an unrepresented, uninsured employer, or an unrepresented dependent does not have ready access to a computer or a typewriter and compliance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(a)*, items 4 and 5 [*see above*], is not feasible, a hand-printed document may be submitted. Any hand-printed document must be legible and must otherwise comply with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232*, including the requirements of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(a)(2)* regarding margins and text in the margins [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.105

§ 577.105 Verification

Verification in the manner required for verified pleadings in courts of record is required for petitions for reconsideration and answers to such petitions [*Lab. Code §§ 5902, 5905*], but is not required for applications for adjudication or answers to applications or other documents filed with the WCAB. Verification by affidavit of pleadings in civil actions in courts of record is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 446* [*see Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1055, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343* (under *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*, petition by Director of Department of Industrial Relations need not be verified)]. A declaration under penalty of perjury, in lieu of an affidavit, is permissible [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 446, 2015.5*], and is usually more convenient than an affidavit.

For forms of verification that may be adapted for use when required on papers filed with the WCAB, see Ch. 572, *Verifications* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.106

§ 577.106 Filing Papers

[1] In General

After the filing and processing of an initial application for adjudication of claim or other case-opening document, all documents required or permitted to be filed under the regulations must be filed with the district office of the Appeals Board having venue, except as provided by the rules of the Board, unless otherwise ordered by a WCJ or the Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10227(a)*].

[2] Manner of Filing Documents

Except as provided by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10603(a)* (regarding oversized exhibits, diagnostic imagining, physical exhibits, and exhibits on media), all documents are to be filed in paper form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(a)*].

All paper documents will be scanned into the electronic adjudication file, then destroyed no sooner than 30 business days after filing, unless otherwise provided by these rules or ordered by a WCJ or the Appeals Board. A scanned document will have the same legal effect as a document filed in paper form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(b)*].

Each of the following persons or entities must file optical character recognition forms completed by using a computer or typewriter with the exception of OCR forms that are prepared at a hearing or that, for good cause, are filed at trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)*; *see* Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS) Handbook/Instructional Manual for Optical Character Recognition (OCR) Form Filers, available on the DWC website (http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc)]:

1. Any attorney representing any party or any lien claimant.

2. Any insurance carrier or any representative of any insurance carrier (including any claims adjustor).

3. Any self-insured employer or any representative of a self-insured employer (including any claims adjustor).

4. Any third-party administrator or any representative of a third-party administrator (including any claims adjustor).

5. Any lien claimant or any representative of any lien claimant, with the exception of: (A) a lien claimant (or a non-attorney representative of a lien claimant) asserting a living expenses lien under *Lab. Code § 4903(c)*; (B) a lien claimant (or a non-attorney representative of a lien claimant) asserting a burial expenses lien under *Lab. Code § 4903(d)*; or (C) a non-governmental lien claimant (or a non-attorney representative of a lien claimant) asserting a spousal or child support expenses lien under *Lab. Code § 4903(e)*.

OCR forms are posted in fillable format on the DWC website: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/forms.html [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(d)*].

All unrepresented employees, unrepresented dependents, unrepresented uninsured employers, or lien claimants set forth in Item 5 in the list directly above must use OCR forms, where such forms are required, but if they do not have ready access to a computer or a typewriter, printed OCR forms will be available at the district offices, and the information added to the form may be hand-printed in black ink [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(e)*].

Whenever a party or lien claimant files a document using an OCR form, the party or lien claimant must use the appropriate OCR form required by these rules [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(f)*].

Except as set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(e)* [*see above*], any OCR form that was not obtained from DWC's website must function with EAMS in an equivalent manner as the DWC form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(g)*].

[3] Electronic Filing Exemption for Electronic Filing Trial

If a document is filed with EAMS as part of the electronic filing trial, that document does not need to be filed in compliance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10228* and *10232* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10229*].

[4] Time of Filing Documents

A paper document, including one filed by mail (regardless of when posted), is deemed filed on the date it is received, if received prior to 5 p.m. of a court day (i.e., Monday through Friday, except designated state holidays). A paper document received after 5 p.m. of a court day will be deemed filed as of the next court day [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10230(a)*].

When a document is filed by mail or by personal service, the Appeals Board or the district office that received the document for filing will affix on it an appropriate endorsement as evidence of receipt. The endorsement may be made by handwriting, hand-stamp, electronic date stamp, or by other means [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10230(b)*].

[5] Filing of Copies of Documents

Except as provided by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10603(a)* (regarding oversized exhibits, diagnostic imagining, physical exhibits, and exhibits on media), no "original" business, medical, or other documents may be filed with a district office [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10236(a)*]. Rather, only a photocopy or other reproduction of an original document may be filed, and it is presumed that the filed document is an accurate representation of the original document [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10236(b)*].

If a party or a lien claimant alleges that a filed document is inaccurate or unreliable, the party alleging that the document

is inaccurate or unreliable must state the basis for the objection. The filing party must establish that the document is an accurate representation of the original document [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10236(c)*].

A party or a lien claimant that elects to retain the original of an exhibit or proposed exhibit need not retain the original after either (1) the exhibit has been authenticated at trial or (2) a settlement that resolves all pending issues has been approved and all appeals have been exhausted or the time for seeking appellate review has expired [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10236(d)*].

For the discussion of the place for filing an application for adjudication of claim, see *discussion under § 577.87*.

[6] Petitions for Reconsideration or Removal and Subsequent Filings

At any time within 20 days after the service of the order or decision, or of the occurrence of the action in issue, any party may petition for removal, based on one or more of the following grounds [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(a)*]:

1. The order, decision, or action will result in significant prejudice.

2. The order, decision, or action will result in irreparable harm.

The petitioner must also demonstrate that reconsideration will not be an adequate remedy after the issuance of a final order, decision or award. Failure to file the petition to remove timely constitutes valid ground for dismissing the petition for removal [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(a)*].

The petition for removal and any answer must be verified on oath in the manner required for verified pleadings in courts of record [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(b)*].

A copy of the petition for removal must be served forthwith on all parties by the petitioner. Any adverse party may file an answer within 10 days after service. No supplemental petitions, pleadings, or responses will be considered unless requested or approved by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(c)*].

The WCJ may, within 15 days of the filing of the petition for removal, rescind the order or decision in issue, or take action to resolve the issue raised in the petition. If the judge so acts, or if the petitioner withdraws the petition at any time, the petition will be deemed automatically dismissed, requiring no further action by the Appeals Board. The issuance of a new order or decision, or the occurrence of a new action, will recommence the time period for filing a petition for removal, as described above [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(d)*].

The filing of a petition for removal does not terminate the judge's authority to proceed in a case or require the judge to continue or cancel a previously scheduled hearing, absent direction from the Appeals Board. After a petition for removal has been filed, the WCJ must consult with the presiding WCJ prior to proceeding in the case or continuing or canceling a scheduled hearing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10843(e)*].

Except as otherwise provided by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840* or *10865*, all documents filed in connection with any petition for reconsideration, petition for removal, petition for disqualification or any other matter pending before the Appeals Board must comply with the requirements of *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10227*, *10228*, *10230*, *10232*, 10235, and *10236* [*see §§ 577.104*, *577.106[1], [2], [4], [5]*], including but not limited to the 25-page limitation of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(a)(10)* [*see § 577.104*], except that any supplemental petition or answer allowed by the Appeals Board under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10848* [*see below*] may not exceed 10 pages. Any verification, proof of service, exhibit, or document cover sheet filed with the petition or answer is not counted in determining the page limitation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10845(a)*].

On its own motion, or on a clear and convincing showing of good cause, the Appeals Board may allow the filing of a petition, answer, or supplemental petition or answer that does not comply with the provisions set forth in the preceding paragraph, including but not limited to the page limitations. A request to exceed the page limitations must be made by a separate petition, made under penalty of perjury, that specifically sets forth the facts or other reasons why the request should be granted [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10845(b)*].

A document that has been sent directly to the Appeals Board by fax or e-mail will not be accepted for filing, unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10845(c)*].

A petition for reconsideration, removal, or disqualification may be denied or dismissed if it is unsupported by specific references to the record and to the principles of law involved [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10846*].

When a petition for reconsideration, removal, or disqualification has been timely filed, supplemental petitions or pleadings or responses other than the answer will be considered only when specifically requested or approved by the Appeals Board. Supplemental petitions or pleadings or responses other than the answer, except as provided by this rule, will be neither accepted nor deemed filed for any purpose and will not be acknowledged or returned to the filing party [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10848*].

Service of copies of any petition for reconsideration, removal, or disqualification or any answer thereto must be made, in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505* [*see § 577.108[2], [5][a] -[d]*], on all parties to the case and on any lien claimant, the validity of whose lien is specifically questioned by the petition, and to any case that has been consolidated therewith pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589* [*see §§ 577.90, 577.146*]. Failure to file proof of service constitutes valid ground for dismissing the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10850*].

[7] Papers That Will Not Be Filed

The following documents are not to be filed with the district office or the Appeals Board, except as a non-duplicative supporting exhibit or by order of a WCJ or the Board. Documents improperly submitted will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed and will not be acknowledged and may be discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(b)*]:

- Letters to opposing parties or counsel.
- Subpoenas.
- Notices of taking deposition.
- Medical appointment letters.
- Proofs of service ordered pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*.
- Medical reports, except as required by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10233*.
- Copies of any decision of any federal or state court opinion otherwise available.
- Copies of any decision of the Appeals Board or a WCJ that is otherwise available.
- Duplicate medical and medical-legal reports.
- No diagnostic imaging as defined in *Lab. Code § 139.3(b)(1)* is to be transmitted to the district office or the Appeals Board unless it is ordered.

No document is to be sent by electronic mail or by fax directly to the district office or the Appeals Board. If a document is sent by electronic mail or fax directly to the district office, it will not be accepted for filing or deemed filed, will not be acknowledged, and may be discarded unless otherwise ordered by the WCJ or the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222(c)*].

Failure to comply with the rules of the Court Administrator will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless that failure results from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10211*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.107

§ 577.107 Duty to Furnish Correct Address

DWC is required to maintain an official participant record for each adjudication file, which must contain the names of all parties and lien claimants and their attorneys or hearing representatives [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(a)*].

In order to ensure that case parties and documents are accurately associated to the correct electronic adjudication file, uniform names for claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices are required to be used when filing documents in EAMS. These names are assigned by DWC [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)*]. DWC will maintain a list on its website of uniform names and mailing addresses and preferred method of service for claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(1)*]. Additions for new claims administrators' offices and representatives' offices and changes of name, location or address, telephone number, fax number, e-mail address, or preferred method of service must be registered by the entity requesting the change with the Central Registration Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(f)* (Central Registration Unit is unit within DWC that maintains website list of uniform names and addresses)]. The entity requesting the change must fax or e-mail a letter on letterhead with a signature from an authorized individual requesting the change to DWC's Central Registration Unit within five business days of any change. The entity must also advise all parties of any change of name, mailing address, or telephone number by furnishing the current information within five business days of any change [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(A)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(B)* (fax number for Central Registration Unit is: 1 (888) 822-9309, and e-mail address for Central Registration Unit is: cru@dir.ca.gov); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(b)(2)(C)* (new uniform name or address and preferred method of service will be posted by Central Registration Unit within 10 business days of receipt of request)].

Except as required in the preceding paragraph, every party and every lien claimant having an interest in an active case pending before the district office or the Appeals Board must advise the district office and all parties of any change of mailing address and telephone numbers by furnishing the current information within five business days of any change [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(c)*]. Similarly, every lien claimant that has filed a lien in a case pending in a district office must advise all parties within five business days of any change in the identity and/or telephone number of the person with authority to resolve the lien by furnishing the correct name and daytime telephone number of that person to the

interested parties, and must advise DWC of any such change after a declaration of readiness is filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(d)*]. Finally, every party and lien claimant having an interest in an inactive case must advise all other known parties, lien claimants, attorneys, and hearing representative within five business days of any change of address (which must include any change of mailing address and telephone numbers) by furnishing the correct and current address and/or number, and must advise DWC of any such change within five business days if there is an outstanding award of further medical treatment or if there is continuing jurisdiction pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803*, and *5804* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.108

§ 577.108 Service of Papers

[1] Application for Adjudication

Proceedings before the Appeals Board are initiated by the filing of an Application for Adjudication, a case opening Compromise and Release Agreement, a case opening Stipulations with Request for Award, or a Request for Findings of Fact under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10405* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(a)*; *but see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10865, 10953* (exceptions)]. A case opening Compromise and Release Agreement, a case opening Stipulations with Request for Award, and a Request for Findings of Fact under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10405* is each an "application" for purposes of invoking the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board, but none of these documents is deemed an application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 4064(c)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(b)*].

When an initial application is filed, it will be assigned an adjudication case number and a venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(c)*]. (When filing an amended application, the applicant must indicate in the box on the application form that it is an "amended" application [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(d)*].)

The party or lien claimant filing an Application for Adjudication must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

If the party filing the application is an unrepresented injured employee, an unrepresented dependent of a deceased employee, or a lien claimant or non-attorney representative of a lien claimant who falls within one of the exceptions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)* [*see § 577.106[2]*], the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*]:

> 3. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on all parties and lien claimants, including the filing applicant, who are listed either on the application, on the proof of service to the application, or on the address record (if an address record was previously created for an earlier application).
>
> 4. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case

number and venue.

Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*].

For all other parties and lien claimants, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]:

3. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, on the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative).

4. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Upon receipt of the conformed copy of the application, the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative) must forthwith serve a copy of the conformed application on all other parties and lien claimants who are listed on the application or on the proof of service to the application, and, if it is an initial application, concurrently notify all other parties and lien claimants of the assigned adjudication case number and venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*].

Disclosure of the applicant's social security number is voluntary, not mandatory. A failure to provide a social security number will not have any adverse consequences. Nevertheless, although an applicant is not required by law to provide that number, he or she is encouraged by the Appeals Board to do so. Social security numbers are used solely for identification and verification purposes in order to administer the workers' compensation system. A social security number will not be disclosed, made available, or otherwise used for purposes other than those specified, except with the consent of the applicant, or as permitted or required by statute, regulation, or judicial order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(h)*].

[2] Other Papers Served by Party

The Appeals Board may, in its discretion, designate a party or lien claimant, or their attorney or agent of record, to make service of notices of the time and place of hearing, orders approving compromise and release, awards based on stipulations with request for award, and any interim or procedural orders. In deciding whether to exercise this discretion, the Appeals Board may consider whether service by it would be more efficient and cost-effective because most or all of the parties, lien claimants, attorneys, or agents of record to be served have specified e-mail or fax as their preferred method of service. If discretion is exercised so as to require designated service, the party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent of record designated to make service must retain the proof of service and not file it unless ordered to do so by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(a)*; *but see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(b)* (exceptions); *see also* [3], *below*].

The following specific rules apply when a document is served by a party, a lien claimant, or their attorney or other agent of record [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(a)*]. Except when a document is personally served, service of a document must be made by first-class mail or by an alternative method that will effect service that is equivalent to or more expeditious than first-class mail [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(b)* (acceptable alternative methods limited to express or priority mail or "a bona fide commercial delivery service or attorney service promising delivery within two business days, as shown on the service's invoice or receipt")], unless either of the following applies [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(b)*]:

1. The party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent being served has previously specified that a designated preferred method of service other than first-class mail may be used for any service, consistent with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10218* [*see § 577.12A[4]*].

2. The serving party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent and the receiving party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent previously agreed to some other method of service.

By prior agreement of the parties or lien claimants, or when authorized or requested by the receiving party or lien claimant, service of any document may be made by methods other than the designated preferred method of service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(g)*].

The following rule applies when, after serving a document in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(d), (e), (f)* [*see* [5], *below*], and/or (g), the serving party or lien claimant (or their attorney or agent of record) subsequently receives notification that the service to one or more parties or lien claimants (or to their attorneys or agents of record) failed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(h)*]:

1. When the serving party or lien claimant (or their attorney or agent of record) receives notification of failed service to any intended recipient(s), the server must promptly re-serve the document on the intended recipient(s), using the method of service (i.e., mail, e-mail, fax) best calculated to result in valid service on the intended recipient(s), even if the intended recipient(s) did not previously designate that method as their preferred method of service.

2. The server need not re-serve the document on intended recipients for whom the server did not receive notification of failed service.

3. On re-service, the server must execute a new proof of service in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c), (d), (e)*, and/or *(f)* [*see* [5], *below*], showing re-service on the intended recipient(s).

Except for designated service under *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500* or as otherwise provided by the rules, service by any party or lien claimant must be made on the attorney(s) or agent(s) of record of each other affected party or affected lien claimant, unless that party or lien claimant is unrepresented, in which event service must be made directly on the party or lien claimant. Except as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*, or as otherwise ordered by a WCJ or the Appeals Board, no party or lien claimant is required to serve any document on the injured employee or any dependent(s) of a deceased employee, if the employee or dependent is represented by an attorney or other agent of record [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10510(b)*].

Nothing in this rule precludes more comprehensive service, either as ordered by the Appeals Board or in the discretion of the Appeals Board or the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10510(c)*].

No document, including letters or other writings, is to be filed by a party or lien claimant with the Appeals Board unless service of a copy is made on all parties, together with the filing of a proof of service as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10324(a)*].

[3] Other Papers Served by WCAB

All orders, decisions, findings, awards, minutes of hearing, notices of hearing, correspondence, and any other documents issued by the Appeals Board, including those being served by designated service in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*, must be served on [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10510(a)*]:

1. The injured employee or any dependent(s) of a deceased employee, whether or not the employee or dependent is represented by an attorney or other agent of record.

2. Each attorney or other agent of record of the injured employee or any dependent(s) of a deceased employee.

3. Each attorney or other agent of record for any other affected party or affected lien claimant, unless that party or lien claimant is unrepresented, in which event service is to be made directly on the party or lien claimant.

The Appeals Board must serve all parties and lien claimants of record notice of any final order, decision, or award issued by it on a disputed issue after submission. The Board may not designate a party or lien claimant, their attorney, or agent of record to serve any final order, decision, or award relating to a submitted disputed issue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(b)*].

If the Appeals Board effects personal service of a document at a hearing or at a walk-through proceeding, the proof of personal service must be made by endorsement on the document, setting forth the fact of personal service, the name(s) of the person(s) served, and the date of service. The endorsement must bear the signature of the person making the service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(c)*].

If the Appeals Board serves a document by mail, the proof of mail service must be made by endorsement on the document, setting forth the fact of mail service on the persons or entities listed on the official address record who have not designated e-mail or fax as their preferred method of service. The endorsement must state the date of mail service and bear the signature of the person making the service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(d)*].

If the Appeals Board electronically serves a document through EAMS on persons or entities listed on the official address record who have designated e-mail or fax as their preferred method of service, the record of electronic service maintained in EAMS constitutes proof of service by the Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(e)*].

When an application for adjudication, stipulation with request for award, or compromise and release is filed in a death case in which there is a bona fide issue as to partial or total dependency, the filing party must serve copies of the documents on the Department of Industrial Relations, Death Without Dependents Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10501*].

[4] Manner of Service

Service of any notice, order, or decision required by the workers' compensation law to be served on any person before, during, or after the institution of any proceeding before the WCAB may be made in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1010-1020* unless otherwise directed by the WCAB. In the latter event, the document must be served in accordance with the WCAB's direction or order [*Lab. Code § 5316*].

WCAB regulations provide that service of any document may be made by mail or personal service. Service of any document may be made by facsimile transmission by agreement of the parties or lien claimants, or when authorized or requested by the receiving party or lien claimant [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505*].

If a document is served by mail, fax, e-mail, or any method other than personal service, the period of time for exercising or performing any right or duty to act or respond is extended by [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10507(a)*]:

- Five calendar days from the date of service, if the physical address of the party, lien claimant, attorney, or other agent of record being served is within California.

- Ten calendar days from the date of service, if the physical address of the party, lien claimant, attorney, or other agent of record being served is outside of California but within the United States.

- Twenty calendar days from the date of service, if the physical address of the party, lien claimant, attorney, or other agent of record being served is outside the United States.

For purposes of this rule, "physical address" means the street address or post office box of the party, lien claimant, attorney, or other agent of record being served, as reflected in the official address record at the time of service, even if the method of service actually used was fax, e-mail, or other agreed-upon method of service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10507(b)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217*; *see also § 577.12A[3*] (official participant record and duty to furnish correct address)].

This rule applies whether service is made by the Appeals Board, a party, a lien claimant, or an attorney or other agent of record [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10507(c)*].

If the last day for exercising or performing any right or duty to act or respond falls on a weekend, or on a holiday for which the offices of the Appeals Board are closed, the act or response may be performed or exercised on the next business day [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10508*].

For discussion of service by mail in civil actions, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

When a district office of the WCAB maintains mailboxes for outgoing documents and allows consenting parties, lien claimants, and attorneys to obtain their documents from their mailboxes, documents so obtained are deemed to have been served on the party, lien claimant, or attorney by mail on the date of service specified on the document [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10506*].

The WCAB may, in the cases mentioned in the Code of Civil Procedure [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50*], order service to be made by publication of notice of time and place of hearing. If service is ordered to be made by publication, the date of the hearing may be fixed at more than 30 days from the date of filing the application [*Lab. Code § 5316*].

[5] Proof of Service

[a] Personal Service

If a document is personally served by a party or lien claimant, the proof of personal service must be made by endorsement on the document, setting forth the fact of personal service, the name(s) of the person(s) served, and the date of service, and by the signature of the person making the service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)*].

[b] Service by Mail

If a document is served by a party or lien claimant by mail on persons listed on the official address record who have designated mail as their preferred method of service, who have failed to make any designation, or who have previously agreed to accept mail service in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(g)*, the proof of mail service may be made by: (1) affidavit or declaration of service; (2) written statement endorsed on the document served and signed by the party making the statement; or (3) letter of transmittal. The proof of service must set forth the names and addresses of persons served, the fact of service by mail, the date of service, and the address(es) to which mailing was made [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(d)*].

[c] Service by E-Mail

If a document is served by a party or lien claimant by e-mail on persons listed on the official address record who have designated e-mail as their preferred method of service, or who have previously agreed to accept e-mail service in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(g)*, the proof of e-mail service must state [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(e)*]:

1. The e-mail address of the person making the e-mail service.

2. The date of the e-mail service.

3. The name(s) and e-mail address(es) of the person(s) served.

4. That the document was served by e-mail and that there was no report of any error or delay in the transmission of the e-mail.

Absent evidence to the contrary, service by e-mail is deemed complete at the time of transmission, unless a document is re-served in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(h)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(e)*].

[d] Service by Fax

If a document is served by a party or lien claimant by fax on persons listed on the official address record who have designated fax as their preferred method of service, or who have previously agreed to accept fax service in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(g)*, the proof of fax service must state [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(f)*]:

1. The sending fax machine telephone number of the person making the fax service.

2. The date and time of the fax service.

3. The name and the fax machine telephone number of the person served.

4. That the document was served via fax transmission and that the transmission was reported as complete and without error.

Absent evidence to the contrary, service by fax is deemed complete at the time of transmission, unless a document is re-served in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(h)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
5. Captions of Papers, Service and Filing

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.109-577.119

[Reserved]

§§ 577.109[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.120

§ 577.120 Governing Law

Stipulations and requests for awards are governed by *Lab. Code § 5702* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10400, 10496*, and *10497*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.121

§ 577.121 Written Stipulation

The parties may stipulate in writing regarding the facts relating to a matter in controversy and file the stipulation with the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5702*]. The filing of a stipulation with a request for an award initiates a proceeding for the adjudication of rights and liabilities before the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400*]. When a compromise and release agreement or stipulations with request for an award is filed as an application for adjudication, it must be accompanied by a copy of the claim form for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400*].

For a stipulations with request for award form in disability and death cases, see *§§ 577.470, 577.471*, respectively. For informational guidelines for submission of stipulations with request for award, see *§ 577.463*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.122

§ 577.122 Oral Stipulation

An award or order may be made based on an oral stipulation of the parties in open court, as well as on a written stipulation signed by the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10496*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.123

§ 577.123 WCAB Action on Stipulation

The WCAB may either base its findings and award on the stipulation of the parties, or set the matter for hearing and take further testimony or make the further investigation necessary to enable it to determine the matter in controversy [*Lab. Code § 5702*; *see Draper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 502, 507-508, 195 Cal. Rptr. 248* (stipulation not adequately reflecting applicant's disability should not be accepted by WCJ as basis for award)]. A stipulation does not have to be based on evidence to be binding on the parties. Thus, although the WCAB has discretion to reject factual stipulations, the discretion does not permit the WCAB to reject a stipulation solely on the ground that it is not supported by the evidence, absent good cause [*County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 77 Cal. App. 4th 1114, 1121, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290* (court of appeal reversed WCAB's action setting aside stipulation because it was not based on evidence, and held that stipulation could not be set aside absent good cause); *but see Turner Gas Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 286, 290, 120 Cal. Rptr. 663* (WCAB has discretion to reject stipulation and base its decision on the evidence presented at hearing)]. No finding may be made contrary to a stipulation of the parties on an issue, however, without providing the parties with notice and an opportunity to present evidence on the issue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10497*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.124

§ 577.124 Resolution of Liens

Before issuance of an award that resolves a case based upon the stipulations of the parties, if there remain any liens that have not been resolved or withdrawn, the parties must make a good-faith attempt to contact the lien claimants and resolve their liens. A good-faith attempt requires at least one contact of each lien claimant by telephone or letter [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. After issuing an award that resolves a case based upon the stipulations of the parties, if there remain any liens that have not been resolved or withdrawn, the workers' compensation judge must set the case for a lien conference, issue a 10-day notice of intention to order payment of any such lien in full or in part, or issue a 10-day notice of intention to disallow any such lien [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. Upon a showing of good cause, the workers' compensation judge may once continue a lien conference to another lien conference [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. If a lien cannot be resolved at a lien conference, the workers' compensation judge must set the case for trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*].

An agreement to "pay, adjust, or litigate" a lien, or its equivalent, or an award leaving a lien to be adjusted, is not a resolution of the lien [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticePleadingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized Treatment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
6. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.125-577.129

[Reserved]

§§ 577.125[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.130

§ 577.130 Governing Law

Compromise and release agreements generally are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5000-5004, 5100.6*, and compromise of occupational disease and cumulative injury claims is governed by *Lab. Code § 5005*. Settlement and release of claims against third-party tortfeasors is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 3859-3861* (discussed in subpart C § 577.330 et seq.). Agreements to release by compromise claims against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund are governed by *Lab. Code § 4754.5*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesOccupational DiseasesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.131

§ 577.131 Right to Compromise and Release From Liability

[1] In General

No contract, rule, or regulation can exempt an employer from liability for compensation fixed by the workers' compensation law, but this does not impair the right of the interested parties to compromise any liability claimed to exist on account of injury or death [*Lab. Code § 5000(a)*]. Nor does it confer on an injured employee's dependents any interest that the employee may not release by compromise or for which the employee, or his or her estate, is in the event of such compromise accountable to dependents [*Lab. Code § 5000(b)*; *see Sumner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 965, 967, 191 Cal. Rptr. 811, 663 P.2d 534* ; *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 969-972, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002]* .

[2] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5, 4635-4647,* and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004 [*see § 577.45[2A]*].

In 2004, the legislature reenacted one of the statutes it had repealed in 2003, *Lab. Code § 139.5*, reinstating vocational rehabilitation. *However, the reenacted statute applies only to injuries occurring before January 1, 2004*, and it will remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date [*Lab. Code § 139.5(k)*, (*l*)]. Various other vocational rehabilitation statutes, e.g., *Lab. Code §§ 4642, 4644(d), (e)*, and *5405.5*, once cross-referred to in former *Lab. Code § 139.5* but repealed in 2003, are also cross-referred to in the reenacted *Lab. Code § 139.5* and are now identified with the designation "former." Thus, although the issue may be further clarified by administrative and judicial action, it now appears that the statutory law on vocational rehabilitation applicable to pre-2004 injuries is confined to *Lab. Code § 139.5*, those "former" statutes to which it cross-refers, and those statutes not repealed in 2003. For example, the 2002 amendment to former *Lab. Code § 4646*, which allowed settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation benefits, has

not been reenacted, while *Lab. Code § 5100.6*, forbidding such settlements, was never repealed and, thus, remains in force. As a consequence of these legislative developments, at least some of the discussion in this subsection applies only to pre-2004 injuries.

With respect to injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, the Labor Code provides that the WCAB may not permit the settlement of prospective compensation or indemnity payments or other benefits to which an employee is entitled under rehabilitation [*Lab. Code § 5100.6*]. The WCAB has held, however, that settlement of prospective rehabilitation benefits is permissible if there exists a good faith issue, which, if resolved against the employee, would defeat his or her claim to all workers' compensation benefits [*Thomas v. Sports Chalet, Inc. (1977) 42 Cal. Comp. Cases 625, 632-633]* . Prior to approving the agreement, the WCAB must make a finding that such a good faith issue exists [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10870*; *see State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 649, 652-653, 196 Cal. Rptr. 169]* .

In 1989, the Legislature adopted *Lab. Code § 4646*, and codified the WCAB's holding in *Thomas v. Sports Chalet*. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation services is not permitted pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5000 et seq.* unless a workers' compensation judge finds that there are good faith issues that, if resolved against the employee, would defeat the employee's right to all compensation under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 4646(a)*]. However, in 2002 the legislature amended *Lab. Code § 4646* to provide that an employer and a represented employee may agree to settle the employee's right to prospective vocational rehabilitation services with a one-time payment to the employee of not more than $10,000 for the employee's use in self-directed vocational rehabilitation. The settlement agreement must be submitted to, and approved by, the Vocational Rehabilitation Unit upon a finding that the employee has knowingly and voluntarily agreed to relinquish his or her rehabilitation rights. The Rehabilitation Unit may disapprove the settlement agreement only upon a finding that receipt of rehabilitation services is necessary to return the employee to suitable gainful employment [*Lab. Code § 4646(b)*; *see Lab. Code § 4644(a)(8)*]. Prior to entering into any such settlement agreement, the attorney for a represented employee must fully disclose and explain to the employee the nature and quality of the rights and privileges being waived [*Lab. Code § 4646(c)*]. The court of appeal has held that these amendments are procedural in nature and thus apply to injuries occurring prior to January 1, 2003, the date on which the amendments went into effect, as well as to injuries occurring after that date [*Pebworth v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 913, 917-919, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832]* .

If a qualified injured worker signs a compromise and release that states he or she is not interested in receiving vocational rehabilitation services and the agreement does not release any claim to rehabilitation benefits, the workers' compensation judge is not required to make such a finding [*see Cisneros v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 759, 767, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 655]* .

For discussion of vocational rehabilitation benefits, see *§ 577.45[2]*.

For a form for settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation services, see *§ 577.464*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsExemptions & WaiversWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsRehabilitation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.132

§ 577.132 Compromise and Release Agreements

[1] Form and Contents of Agreement

The required form and contents of the agreement are set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5003* (disability case) and 5004 (death case). Every compromise and release agreement must comply with these provisions and conform to the form provided by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10874*; *see forms in §§ 577.460 -577.462*.]

For informational guidelines for submission of compromise and release agreements, see *§ 577.463*.

[2] Filing Agreement

A copy of the compromise agreement signed by both parties must forthwith be filed with the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5002*]. The filing of the agreement initiates the proceeding and constitutes the filing of an application for adjudication of rights and liabilities that may, in the WCAB's discretion, be set for hearing, reserving to the parties the right to put in issue facts that might otherwise have been admitted in the agreement [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10400, 10878*]. When a compromise of claim is submitted to the WCAB, an arbitrator, or a settlement conference referee for approval, the parties must also file with the WCAB, arbitrator, or settlement conference referee any liens served on the parties [*Lab. Code § 4903.1(b)*]. According to the DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual, parties may obtain approval of settlements by following a "walk-through" procedure established by each local office of the Board [DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual Index No. 6.7.4.1].

[3] Service of Agreement on Lien Claimants

If a lien claim is on file with the WCAB, or a party has been served with a lien, when the agreement is filed, a copy of the agreement must be served on the lien claimant by the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10886*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505*]. No lien claim will be disallowed or reduced unless the lien claimant has been given notice and an opportunity to be heard [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10886*; *see also discussion under § 577.261*].

In a case of first impression, a court of appeal held that a medical lien claimant was denied due process and the right to a fair trial when it was not served with defense medical reports prior to trial and denied the right to cross-examine and make objections at trial. The court further held that the denial of the right to a fair trial as to the lien claimant was reversible per se. As stated by the court, a medical lien claimant has the right to participate in a workers' compensation hearing, must be served with notice of all hearings, and must be informed of the scope and purpose of any hearing that may affect its rights or liabilities [*Beverly Hills Multispecialty Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 789, 803, 805-806, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 293]* .

[3A] Resolution of Liens

Before issuance of an order approving compromise and release that resolves a case, if there remain any liens that have not been resolved or withdrawn, the parties must make a good-faith attempt to contact the lien claimants and resolve their liens. A good-faith attempt requires at least one contact of each lien claimant by telephone or letter [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. After issuing an order approving compromise and release that resolves a case, if there remain any liens that have not been resolved or withdrawn, the workers' compensation judge must set the case for a lien conference, issue a 10-day notice of intention to order payment of any such lien in full or in part, or issue a 10-day notice of intention to disallow any such lien [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. Upon a showing of good cause, the workers' compensation judge may once continue a lien conference to another lien conference [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*]. If a lien cannot be resolved at a lien conference, the workers' compensation judge must set the case for trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*].

An agreement to "pay, adjust, or litigate" a lien, or its equivalent, or an award leaving a lien to be adjusted, is not a resolution of the lien [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10888*].

[4] WCAB Approval of Agreement Required

No release of liability or compromise agreement is valid unless approved by the WCAB or a WCJ [*Lab. Code § 5001*; *see Draper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 502, 506-507, 195 Cal. Rptr. 248* ; *Kampner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 376, 378 n.2, 150 Cal. Rptr. 222* ; *but see Lab. Code §§ 5272* (arbitrators and WCJs have same general statutory and regulatory duties and responsibilities), *5502(e)(2)* (settlement conference referees have authority to approve compromise and release agreements at settlement conferences)]. The effect of this requirement is to make every compromise invalid until it is approved [*see Sumner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 965, 971, 191 Cal. Rptr. 811, 663 P.2d 534* ; *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 973, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002]* .

[5] WCAB Action on Agreement

[a] Adequacy of Agreement

On the filing of the agreement and its approval, the WCAB may, without notice, on its own motion or on the application of either party, enter its award based on the agreement [*Lab. Code § 5002*]. The WCAB must inquire into the adequacy of the agreement, however, and may set the matter for hearing to take evidence when necessary to determine whether the agreement should be approved or disapproved or issue findings and awards [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10882*; *see Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 973, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002]* . If a hearing is held with the agreement used as an application, the defendants have available to them all defenses that were available as of the date the agreement was filed. The WCAB may thereafter either approve the agreement or disapprove it and issue findings and award after the hearing has been held and the matter submitted for decision [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10878*].

According to the DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual, a WCJ is required to communicate his or concerns about the adequacy of a proposed settlement in writing or by telephone before setting the issue for hearing. If no response is received within 15 days, the matter will be added to the WCJ's regular calendar; if an inadequate response is received, an order setting forth the missing evidence and suspending action will issue and be served on all parties and their

representatives, and a conference will be set within 30 days if the missing evidence is not received [DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual Index No. 6.7.4.1].

Agreements that provide for payment of less than the full amount of compensation due or to become due and that undertake to release the employer from all future liability will be approved only when it appears that a reasonable doubt exists as to the rights of the parties or that approval is in the best interest of the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10870*].

[b] Proof of Service

Lab. Code § 3761 provides that if the employer notifies its compensation insurer, in writing, that, in the employer's opinion, no compensation is payable to an employee, at the employer's written request to the WCAB, the WCAB may approve a compromise and release agreement or stipulation that provides compensation to the employee only if there is proof of service on the employer by the insurer of notice of the time and place of the hearing at which the agreement or stipulation is to be approved [*Lab. Code § 3761(b)*]. The notice must be given to the employer at its last known address at least 15 days prior to the WCAB action, and proof of this service must be filed with the Appeals Board [*Lab. Code § 3761(b)*]. The insurer's failure to provide the required notice will not prohibit the WCAB from approving the compromise and release agreement or stipulation, but the WCAB must order the insurer to pay the employer's reasonable expenses under *Lab. Code § 5813* [*Lab. Code § 3761(b)*].

If the insurer has attached a declaration to the compromise and release agreement or stipulations with request for an award that it has complied with the provisions of *Lab. Code § 3761*, the WCAB may approve the compromise and release or stipulations with request for an award without a hearing or further proceedings [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10875*]. If the WCAB or a workers' compensation judge has approved a compromise and release or stipulations with request for an award and the insurer has failed to show proof of service pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3761(b)*, the WCAB or workers' compensation judge must award expenses under *Lab. Code § 5813* on the employer's request and after giving notice and an opportunity to be heard to the insurer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10875*].

[6] Rescission of Agreement

A compromise and release agreement that has not been submitted to the WCAB for approval is neither valid nor binding on the parties [*see Lab. Code § 5001*]; therefore, a party may apparently withdraw from such an agreement at will. The WCAB may take into account any payment made to the employee, however, pursuant to the agreement in fixing the amount of compensation to paid [*see Lab. Code § 4909*].

[7] Reconsideration of Order Approving Agreement

An order approving a compromise and release agreement is subject to reconsideration on the same basis as any other final substantive order [*see Argonaut Ins. Exchange v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1958) 49 Cal. 2d 706, 710-711, 321 P.2d 460]* . If the time for reconsideration is past, a party seeking rescission may file a petition to reopen, on a showing of good cause [*see Silva v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1924) 68 Cal. App. 510, 514-515]* . For a discussion of reconsideration and petitons to reopen generally, see *§ 577.240* et seq.

[8] Effect of Compromise and Release on Non-Workers' Compensation Claims

The California Supreme Court has held that the standard language of the preprinted WCAB Form 15 [*see § 577.460[1]*], used in settling workers' compensation claims, releases only those claims within the scope of the workers' compensation system and does not apply to claims asserted in separate civil actions [*Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 376, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246, 96 P.3d 496]* . Moreover, extrinsic evidence is not admissible to show that the preprinted form applies also to claims outside the workers' compensation system, since allowing such evidence would, said the Court, unduly burden the courts and create a trap for the unwary worker, while disallowing such extrinsic evidence would not be unfair to the parties [*Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 377-378, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246,*

96 P.3d 496] . The Court also held that considerations of fairness and public policy required that the holdings in *Claxton* be applied prospectively only, i.e., to cases involving execution of the preprinted workers' compensation release form after finality of the Court's decision [*Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 378-379, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246, 96 P.3d 496]* . The Court distinguished *Claxton* from *Jefferson v. Department of Youth Authority*, decided two years earlier, in which it had held that when an employee has knowledge of a potential claim against the employer at the time of executing a general release in a workers' compensation proceeding, but has not yet initiated litigation of that claim, the employee has the burden of expressly excepting the claim from the release. Absent this exception, and absent contrary extrinsic evidence, a court will enforce general language, such as was found in the compromise and release and attachment in the case before the Court, releasing all claims, including civil claims [*Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 299, 310, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391, 48 P.3d 423]* . In *Claxton*, the Court explained that it was the existence of an attachment to the preprinted form that led to the result in *Jefferson*, whereas no such attachment existed in *Claxton* [*Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 376, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246, 96 P.3d 496]* . The *Jefferson* Court distinguished the factual configuration of the case before it from the facts existing in various court of appeal cases [*Lopez v. Sikkema (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 31, 36-39, 280 Cal. Rptr. 7* ; *Asare v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 856, 864-865,2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 452* ; *Delaney v. Superior Fast Freight (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 590, 599, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33]* . In *Jefferson* the Court was ruling on a broadly worded agreement that expressly released "all claims and causes of action" relating to an injury and that included an attachment establishing the parties' intent to include civil claims within the scope of the release. In this situation, the Court held that the employee was barred from bringing a civil action under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) [*see Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*] for damages relating to the same events that resulted in the injury [*Jefferson v. CaliforniaDepartment of Youth Authority (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 299, 301, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391, 48 P.3d 423]* . The Court pointed out that in *Asare v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.* extrinsic evidence established the parties' intent *not* to settle an FEHA action, whereas in *Jefferson* there was no such extrinsic evidence. Similarly, said the Court, in *Lopez v. Sikkema* and *Delaney v. Superior Fast Freight* there was no attachment to the compromise and release that made clear the parties' intent to settle civil claims in addition to workers' compensation claims. Moreover, the civil actions were already pending in those cases at the time the parties executed their workers' compensation settlements, whereas Jefferson had not filed her FEHA action when she executed the compromise and release, and the Youth Authority had no basis for assuming she intended to do so. In conclusion, the Court expressly neither approved nor disapproved the holdings in *Lopez* and *Delaney* [*Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 299, 309-310, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391, 48 P.3d 423]* . The various court of appeal cases that preceded *Jefferson* should be read with the Supreme Court's comments in mind. The *Claxton* Court noted that *Asare*, *Lopez*, and *Delaney* are not to be followed to the extent that they allow the admission of extrinsic evidence to try to show that the release extends to claims outside the workers' compensation system [*Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 379 n. 2, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246, 96 P.3d 496]* .

In another case, decided prior to *Claxton v. Waters*, the court of appeal, reversing the trial court's grant of an employer's motion for summary judgment, held that settlement of an employee's workers' compensation claim via a document that included language agreeing "to settle any and all claims" did not so clearly operate to settle that same employee's FEHA civil action arising from the same alleged work-related incidents as to support dismissal of the employee's civil action via summary judgment, pursuant to *Jefferson*. The court of appeal found that extrinsic evidence was more than sufficient to establish the existence of a triable issue of fact concerning the parties' intent when the workers' compensation claim was settled, which extrinsic evidence included the facts that (1) the employee/applicant had two attorneys, one representing her in the workers' compensation action, the other representing her in the civil action, (2) the civil action was not mentioned in the compromise and release, (3) both the employer's workers' compensation lawyer and the WCJ, not merely the employee's workers' compensation attorney, conceded that the civil action was not discussed at any time during their negotiations, (4) the employee/applicant had no intent to include the civil action in the settlement of her workers' compensation case, since, at the time of that settlement, the employer's offer to settle the civil action for more than $1,000,000 was still open, and (5) after the workers' compensation settlement was signed, sealed, and paid, the employer again offered to settle the civil action for $1,100,000 plus the employee's attorney's fees, leaving no doubt in the court of appeal's mind that neither the workers' compensation attorneys nor their clients intended to include the civil action in the settlement of the workers' compensation claim [*Mitchell v. Union Central Life Ins. Co.*

(2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1341-1342, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 732] . In light of subsequently decided *Claxton v. Waters*, which discussed and did not criticize *Mitchell*, it appears that the *Mitchell* court reached the right result.

In this connection, it should be noted that the court of appeal has followed *Jefferson* in concluding that an employee's release of her workers' compensation claim against her employer, which released "all claims and causes of action" against the employer, included the release of the employee's civil action under FEHA, when the FEHA action had been filed prior to execution of the release but the employer had not yet been notified of that action [*Kohler v. Interstate Brands Corp. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1099-1102, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366]* . In light of *Claxton*, the continued viability of this holding appears doubtful.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized TreatmentWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.133

§ 577.133 Occupational Disease or Cumulative Injury Case

In the case of a claim for occupational disease or cumulative injury [*see Lab. Code § 5500.5*], the employee and any employer or its insurance carrier may enter into a compromise and release agreement settling all or any part of the employee's claim, including a part of the employee's claim against any employer, but the agreement does not bar recovery from any one or all of the remaining employers or insurance carriers for the periods of exposure not so released [*Lab. Code § 5005*].

When approved by the WCAB or "referee" (now workers' compensation judge), the agreement is a total release as to the employer or insurance carrier for the portion or portions of the claim released [*Lab. Code § 5005*]. In approving the agreement, the WCAB or referee must determine the adequacy of the agreement as it shall then reflect the potential liability of the released exposure after apportionment, but need not make a final actual determination of the potential liability of the employer or employers for that portion of the exposure being released [*Lab. Code § 5005*].

In any case in which a compromise and release agreement of a portion of a claim has been made and approved, the employee may elect to proceed as provided in *Lab. Code § 5500.5* against any one or more of the remaining employers, or against an employer for that portion of its exposure not so released. In any such proceeding, that portion of liability attributable to the portion or portions of the exposure released will be assessed and deducted from the liability of the remaining defendant or defendants. No such defendant, however, can receive credit for any moneys paid by way of compromise and release in excess of the liability actually assessed against the released employments, and the employee will not receive any further benefits from the released employments for any liability assessed to them above what was paid by way of compromise and release [*Lab. Code § 5005*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative

ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesOccupational Diseases

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.134

§ 577.134 Claims Against Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

Subsequent injuries payments are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4751-4755*. These sections do not, however, impair the right of the Attorney General or the Department of Industrial Relations to release by compromise any claims brought against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund [*Lab. Code § 4754.5*].

To be valid, any compromise and release agreement must be approved by the WCAB, but *Lab. Code §§ 5000-5004*, discussed *above*, do not apply [*Lab. Code § 4754.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesSuccessive Injuries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
7. Compromise and Release

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.135-577.139

[Reserved]

§§ 577.135[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.140

§ 577.140 Governing Law

Investigations and hearings before the WCAB or a workers' compensation judge (hereinafter WCJ) are governed by the workers' compensation law and by the WCAB's Rules of Practice and Procedure [*Lab. Code § 5708*]. The WCAB's power to issue process is governed by *Lab. Code § 134*. Attachment is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5600-5603*; removing and restoring cases to the active calendar by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10562* and *10582*; joinder and dismissal of parties by *Lab. Code §§ 5307.5(b)* and *5500.5(b)* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10380* and *10570*; dismissal of applications for adjudication by *Lab. Code § 5507* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10562, 10582,* and *10780*; medical examinations by *Lab. Code §§ 4050-4056*; autopsies by *Lab. Code §§ 5706* and *5707*; assignment of cases and powers of WCJ's by *Lab. Code §§ 3715, 5309,* and *5310* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10346* and *10348*; disqualification of WCJ's by *Lab. Code § 5311* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*; subpoenas, subpoenas duces tecum, and witness fees by *Lab. Code §§ 130, 131,* and *4055.2* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10530-10537*; depositions by *Lab. Code § 5710*; the WCAB's records and files by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10322*; mandatory settlement conferences by *Lab. Code § 5502(e)*; and substitution and dismissal of attorneys and agents by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*. Hearings are governed generally by *Lab. Code §§ 5700-5710* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10541*-10593, and expedited hearings governed by *Lab. Code § 5502(b)* and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10252, 10252.1.

Arbitration of workers' compensation disputes is governed generally by *Lab. Code §§ 4903.4, 5270 et seq.*, and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10997-10999 and is discussed in *§ 577.60* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical EvidenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.141

§ 577.141 Issuance of Process

The WCAB or any of its members may issue writs or summonses, warrants of attachment, and warrants of commitment, in like manner and to the same extent as courts of record [*Lab. Code § 134*]. The process so issued extends to all parts of California and may be served by any persons authorized to serve process of courts of record or any person designated for that purpose by the WCAB or any of its members. The person executing process will receive compensation allowed by the WCAB, which may not exceed the fees prescribed by law for similar services [*Lab. Code § 134*]. Fees prescribed by law for service of process are set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 26721* (sheriffs), 27821 (constables), 71266 (marshals and constables). The fees are paid in the same manner as witness fees [*Lab. Code § 134*; *see discussion under § 577.148*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessMethodsGeneral OverviewCivil ProceduresPleading & PracticeService of ProcessSummonsIssuanceCivil ProceduresRemediesWritsAncillary WritsWrits of Attachment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.142

§ 577.142 Attachment

In any case mentioned in *Code Civ. Proc. § 415.50* (service by publication) or in which the employer failed to secure the payment of compensation (*see* discussion in *§ 577.13[3]*), the WCAB may, on the filing of an application by or on behalf of an injured employee, his or her dependents, or any other party in interest, order the clerk of the superior court to issue writs of attachment authorizing the sheriff to attach the defendant's property as security for the payment of any compensation that may be awarded [*Lab. Code §§ 5600, 5602*]. The amount of the attachment is fixed by the WCAB and may not exceed the greatest probable award against the defendant in the matter [*Lab. Code § 5600*].

A writ of attachment may not be ordered if it appears from the application or supporting affidavit that the employer was, at the time of the injury, insured against workers' compensation liability [*Lab. Code § 5602*]. Moreover, if, at any time after the attachment is levied, it appears that the employer was insured and the requisites for dismissing the employer from the proceeding and substituting the insurer as defendant are established, the WCAB must forthwith discharge the attachment [*Lab. Code § 5602*]. In levying attachments, preference must be given to the employer's real property [*Lab. Code § 5603*].

Attachment procedures in workers' compensation proceedings are governed by the general civil attachment provisions set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 481.010 et seq.*, and the WCAB has the powers and duties of a court under those provisions [*see Lab. Code § 5601*]. For a discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 481.010 et seq.* and forms that may be adapted for use in proceedings under the workers' compensation law, see Ch. 62, *Attachment* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.143

§ 577.143 Inactive Cases

[1] Removing and Restoring Cases to Calendar

In cases concerning injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, applications for adjudication filed without an accompanying declaration of readiness to proceed [*see § 577.399*] will be placed in inactive status. Further, any case that is set for hearing may be removed from the active calendar by an order taking off calendar [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*]. The WCAB may take any case off calendar when a party served with notice of trial fails to appear at the trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*; *see discussion under § 577.173*]. Cases in off-calendar status may be restored to the active calendar on the filing and service of a properly executed declaration of readiness to proceed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*].

[2] Dismissal for Failure to Activate Case

Unless a case is activated for hearing within one year after the filing of the application for adjudication or the entry of an order taking it off calendar, the case may be dismissed after notice and opportunity to be heard. Dismissal may be entered at the request of an interested party or on the WCAB's own motion for lack of prosecution. A case may be dismissed after issuance of a 10-day notice of intention to dismiss and an opportunity to be heard, but not by an order with a clause rendering the order null and void if an objection showing good cause is filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*; *see § 577.453*].

At least 31 days before filing a petition to dismiss, a defendant must mail to the applicant and, if represented, the applicant's attorney or agent a letter stating his or her intention to file the petition 30 days after the date of the letter unless the applicant or his or her attorney or agent shows in writing some good reason for not dismissing the case. A copy of the letter and of any reply must be attached to the petition to dismiss, and a copy of the petition must be served on all parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTerminations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.144

§ 577.144 Joinder and Dismissal of Parties

After the application for adjudication has been filed, the WCAB, or a WCJ may order the joinder of additional parties necessary for the full adjudication of the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10380*; *see Lab. Code § 5307.5(b)*]. The procedure for joinder on request of any interested party of employers not named in the application for adjudication in occupational disease cases is set forth in *Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*. A party not present or represented at the time of joinder must be served with copies of the order of joinder, the application, minutes of hearing and summary of evidence, medical reports, and other documents as directed in the order of joinder. The WCAB may designate the party or parties who are to make service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10380*]. For a petition to join an omitted employer in a cumulative injury action, see *§ 577.430[1]*.

Improper or unnecessary parties may be dismissed by interlocutory or interim order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570*; *see § 577.431*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesJoinderNecessary PartiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.145

§ 577.145 Workers' Compensation Judges

[1] Assignment of Cases to Workers' Compensation Judge

Cases are assigned to WCJs as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10346* [*see Lab. Code § 5310*]. On the agreement of the parties, on the application of either, or on its own motion, and with or without notice, the appeals board may direct and order a WCJ [*Lab. Code § 5309(a), (b)*]:

- To try the issues in any proceeding before it, whether of fact or of law, and make and file a finding, decision, or award based on the issues; or

- To hold hearings and ascertain facts that are necessary for enabling the WCAB to determine any proceeding, for making any order, decision, or award, or for the board's information.

[2] Powers of Workers' Compensation Judge

[a] In General

The WCJ has full power, jurisdiction, and authority to hear and determine all issues of fact and law presented in any case regularly assigned for trial and to issue such interim, interlocutory, and final orders and such findings, decisions, and awards as may be necessary to the full adjudication of the case, including the fixing of the amount of the bond required in *Lab. Code § 3715* (bond required of employer who failed to secure payment of compensation) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10348*].

[b] To Punish for Contempt and to Issue Process

The WCAB may, in accordance with its adopted rules of practice and procedure and on the agreement of the parties, on the application of either, or on its own motion, and with or without notice, direct and order a WCJ to issue writs or summons, warrants of attachment, warrants of commitment, and all necessary process in proceedings for direct and

hybrid contempt, in a like manner and to the same extent as courts of record [*Lab. Code § 5309(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10348*]. "Hybrid contempt" means a charge of contempt that arises from events occurring in the immediate presence of the WCJ for reasons that occur outside the presence of the WCJ [*Lab. Code § 5309(c)*].

The amendment of *Lab. Code § 5309* to add the foregoing subdivision (c) is apparently the Legislature's response to the holdings in *Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651* , and *Marcus v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 598, 111 Cal. Rptr. 101* , which had limited the exercise of the contempt power to the WCAB and its members [*see Lab. Code § 134*], and is indicative of the Legislature's intent that the WCAB have and exercise the contempt power of a court of record to protect its process in adjudicating workers' compensation claims [*Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 171 n.8, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414]* . The WCJ may issue contempt orders only for willful misconduct. A finding of contempt is not an appropriate sanction for failure to appear at a workers' compensation conference or hearing, without evidence that the attorney violated an order to appear by the WCJ [*see Code of Civ. Proc. § 1209*; *Runnion v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 277, 286, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 105]* .

[c] Disqualification of Workers' Compensation Judge

[i] In General

Any party to a proceeding may object to a particular WCJ on any of the grounds specified in *Code Civ. Proc. § 641* (grounds of objection to referee in civil cases), and the objection will be heard and disposed of by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5311*]. The proceeding to disqualify is initiated by filing a petition for disqualification supported by an affidavit or declaration under penalty of perjury stating in detail the facts establishing the grounds for disqualification [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*].

For discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 641* and forms that may be adapted for use to object to a WCJ, see Ch, 38, *Reference* .

[ii] Petitions to Disqualify and for Reassignment

The requirements regarding when a petition to disqualify must be filed and the manner of its determination are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*. A petition for disqualification must be referred to the WCJ from whose decisions or actions relief is sought [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*].

Provisions governing petitions for automatic reassignment to another WCJ when a party or attorney believes that he or she cannot have a fair, expeditious, inexpensive, unencumbered, or impartial trial before the WCJ before whom the case is pending or to whom it is assigned, and the procedure to be followed, are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10453*.

[iii] WCAB's Action on Petition to Disqualify

The WCJ must prepare a report containing a statement of the contentions raised by the petition, a specific response to the allegations, and the action recommended on the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*]. The WCJ must send the report and the WCAB file to the WCAB within 15 days after the petition is filed unless the WCAB grants an extension of time [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*]. At the same time the report is sent to the WCAB, the WCJ must serve a copy of the report on the parties and any lien claimant, the validity of whose lien is specifically affected by the petition for disqualification [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*].

Any order disqualifying a WCJ under *Lab. Code § 5311* may be made only by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10340(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudicial OfficersJudgesDisqualifications & RecusalsGroundsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureSanctionsContemptCivil ContemptWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.146

§ 577.146 Consolidation of Cases

Consolidation of two or more related cases, involving either the same injured employee or multiple injured employees, rests in the sound discretion of the Appeals Board. In exercising that discretion, the Board is required to take into consideration any relevant factors, including but not limited to the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(a)*]:

1. Whether there are common issues of fact or law.

2. The complexity of the issues involved.

3. The potential prejudice to any party, including but not limited to whether granting consolidation would significantly delay the trial of any of the cases involved.

4. The avoidance of duplicate or inconsistent orders.

5. The efficient utilization of judicial resources.

Consolidation may be ordered for limited purposes or for all purposes [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(a)*].

Consolidation may be ordered by the Appeals Board on its own motion, or may be ordered based on a petition filed by one of the parties. A petition to consolidate must [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(b)*]:

1. List all named parties in each case.

2. Contain the adjudication case numbers of all the cases sought to be consolidated, with the lowest numbered case shown first.

3. Be filed in each case sought to be consolidated.

4. Be served on all attorneys or other representatives of record and on all non-represented parties in each case sought to be consolidated.

Any order regarding consolidation must be filed in each case to which the order relates [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(c)*].

If consolidation is ordered, the Appeals Board, in its discretion, may designate one case as the master file for exhibits and pleadings. If a master file is designated, any subsequent exhibits and pleadings filed by the parties and lien claimants during the period of consolidation are to be filed in the master case only. However, all pleadings and exhibit cover sheets filed must include the caption and case number of the master file case, followed by the case numbers of all of the other consolidated cases [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(d)*].

If a master file has been designated and the consolidated cases are tried, all relevant documentary evidence previously received in an individual case is deemed admitted in evidence in the consolidated proceedings under the master file and is deemed part of the record of each of the several consolidated cases. Evidence received subsequent to the designation of the master file is to be similarly received with like force and effect [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(e)*].

When cases are consolidated, joint minutes of hearing, summaries of evidence, opinions, decisions, orders, findings, or awards may be used. However, copies must be filed in the record of proceedings of each case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589(f)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases that are assigned to different WCJs in the same district office, or that have not been assigned but are venued at the same district office, must be referred to the Presiding WCJ of that office, whether the cases involve the same injured worker or multiple injured workers [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(a)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases involving the same injured worker that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, must first be referred to the Presiding WCJs of the district offices to which the cases are assigned. If the Presiding WCJs are unable to agree on where the cases will be assigned for hearing, the conflict will be resolved by the Court Administrator upon referral by one of the presiding judges [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(b)*].

Any request or petition to consolidate cases involving multiple injured workers that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, must be referred to the Court Administrator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(c)*]. In resolving any request or petition to consolidate cases that are assigned to WCJs at different district offices, or that have not been assigned but are venued at different district offices, the Court Administrator must set the request or petition for a conference regarding the place of hearing. At or after the conference, the Court Administrator must determine the place of hearing and may determine the WCJ to whom the cases will be assigned, giving consideration to the factors set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589*. In reaching any determination, the Court Administrator may assign a WCJ to hear any discovery motions and disputes relevant to discovery in the action and to report their findings and recommendations to the Court Administrator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(d)*]. Any party aggrieved by the determination of the Court Administrator may request proceedings pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5310*, except that an assignment to a particular WCJ may be challenged only in accordance with the provisions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10452* and *10453* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersConsolidation of ActionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.147

§ 577.147 Subpoenas

[1] Issuance

The WCAB and each of its members, its secretary, assistant secretaries, and WCJ's may issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, books, accounts, documents, and testimony in any inquiry, investigation, hearing, or proceeding in any part of California [*Lab. Code § 130*]. The WCAB must issue subpoenas [*see § 577.410*] and subpoenas duces tecum [*see § 577.411*] on request in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985* and *1987.5* and *Gov. Code § 68097.1* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*]. Subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum must be on forms prescribed and approved by the WCAB, and for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, must contain, in addition to the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*, an affidavit that a claim form has been duly filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5401(d)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*]. A notice to appear or produce in lieu of a subpoena or subpoena duces tecum in accordance with *Code Civ. Proc. § 1987* is, however, permissible [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10532*]. For forms of notices to appear or produce that may be adapted for use in workers' compensation proceedings, see Ch. 535, *Subpoena* .

[2] Recordings and Reproductions of Destroyed Originals

If records or other documentary evidence have been recorded or reproduced using the methods described in *Evid. Code § 1551* (lost or destroyed writings) and the original records destroyed, the film, legible print, or electronic recording must be produced in response to a subpoena duces tecum [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10534*].

[3] Service on Medical Witness

A subpoena requiring the appearance of a medical witness must be served not less than 10 days before the time the witness is required to appear and testify [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10537*].

[4] Personal Records

Any party who subpoenas any records in connection with a workers' compensation proceeding must, concurrently with the service of the subpoena on the person who has possession of the records, send a copy of the subpoena to all parties of record in the proceeding [*Lab. Code § 4055.2*].

[5] Employment Records

Any party who subpoenas employment records of an employee which are maintained by his or her current or former employer must notify the employee by delivering a copy of the subpoena, the affidavit supporting the issuance of the subpoena, and a specified notice that the records are being subpoenaed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1985.6*].

[6] Records, Files, and Proceedings of WCAB

The records, files, and proceedings of the WCAB must not be taken from its offices either by informal request or in response to a subpoena duces tecum or any order issued out of any other court or tribunal. Except as precluded by *Civ. Code § 1798.24* (disclosure of information under Information Practices Act of 1977) or *Gov. Code § 6254* (exemption from disclosure of particular records), certified copies of portions of the records desired by litigants will be delivered on payment of the fees as provided in the Rules of the Administrative Director. [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10322*].

[7] Judicial Enforcement

[a] Petition to Compel

If a witness refuses to obey a subpoena issued by the WCAB or a WCJ, the WCAB or the WCJ before whom the testimony is to be given or produced may petition the superior court of the county in which the proceeding is pending for an order compelling the witness to attend and testify or produce the papers before the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 132*].

The petition must set forth the following:

- Due notice was given of the time and place of attendance of the witness, or the production of the papers;
- The witness was subpoenaed in the prescribed manner; and
- The witness failed and refused to obey the subpoena, or refused to answer questions propounded to him or her in the course of the proceeding.

The court will then issue an order directing the witness to appear before the court at a time (not more than 10 days from the date of the order) and place fixed in the order and show cause why he or she has not complied with the subpoena. A copy of the order must be served on the witness [*Lab. Code § 132*].

[b] WCAB's Action on Petition to Compel

If it appears to the court that the subpoena was regularly issued and that the witness was legally bound to comply with it, the court will enter an order that the witness appear before the WCAB or the WCJ at a time and place fixed in the order, and testify or produce the required papers, and on failure to obey the order, the witness will be treated as in contempt of court [*Lab. Code § 132*].

The foregoing remedy is cumulative and does not impair or interfere with the power of the WCAB or its members to enforce the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, and to punish for contempt in the same manner and to the same extent as courts of record [*Lab. Code § 132*; *see discussion under § 577.12[3][b]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersSubpoenasWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceWitnesses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.148

§ 577.148 Witness Fees

A witness who appears by order of the WCAB, any of its members, or a WCJ is entitled to receive, if demanded, the same fee and mileage allowed by law to a witness in civil cases [*Lab. Code § 131*]. The fees allowed a witness in civil cases are set forth in *Gov. Code § 68093* and *Evid. Code § 1563*. Payment of the fee is governed by *Lab. Code § 131*. The fee required to be paid medical examiners appointed by the WCAB or agreed to by the parties when subpoenaed for cross examination is set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10536*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.149

§ 577.149 Depositions

[1] In General

In any investigation or hearing before the WCAB, the WCAB, a WCJ, or any party may require the deposition of witnesses residing in or outside of California to be taken in the manner prescribed for like depositions in superior court civil actions, and, to that end, attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required. Depositions may be taken outside California before any officer authorized to administer oaths [*Lab. Code § 5710(a)*]. The manner of taking depositions in civil actions is set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2025.010-2025.620*. For a discussion of these provisions and forms that may be adapted for use in workers' compensation proceedings, see Ch. 193, *Discovery: Depositions* .

[2] Costs and Fees

If the employer or its insurance carrier requests that a deposition be taken of an injured employee or any person claiming benefits as a dependent of an injured employee, the deponent is entitled to receive the following, in addition to all other benefits [*Lab. Code § 5710(b)*]:

- All reasonable expenses of transportation, meals, and lodging incident to the deposition;
- Reimbursement for any loss of wages incurred during attendance at the deposition;
- A copy of the transcript of the deposition without cost;
- A reasonable allowance for attorney's fees for the deponent, if represented by an attorney licensed by the State Bar of California; and
- A reasonable allowance for interpreter's fees for the deponent if interpretation services are needed and provided by a language interpreter certified or deemed certified under *Gov. Code §§ 11513*

(inoperative 7/1/95 and repealed 1/1/96 per sunset legislation in Stats. 1993, ch. 701) or 68566 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3(a)(3)*].

The attorney's fee referred to in above is allowed at the discretion of the WCAB, which fixes the amount of the fee. The fee must be paid by the employer or the employer's insurer [*Lab. Code § 5710(b)*]. A non-attorney hearing representative who represents an employee at a deposition under the supervision of a licensed attorney may receive attorney's fees if the hearing representative's qualifications and the extent of the attorney's supervision is documented. The fees, however, should be awarded at a lower hourly rate than those awarded to licensed attorneys [*99 Cents Only Stores v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 644, 649-651, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 569]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency InvestigationsScopeSubpoenasCivil ProcedureDiscoveryMethodsOral DepositionsCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsDepositions & TranscriptsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.150

§ 577.150 Sexual Harassment or Assault Cases

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994 arising out of alleged conduct constituting sexual harassment, sexual assault, or sexual battery, any party seeking discovery concerning the applicant's sexual conduct with any person other than the defendant, whether consensual or nonconsensual or prior or subsequent to the alleged act complained of, must establish specific facts showing good cause for the discovery [*Lab. Code § 3208.4*]. These facts must be established on a noticed motion to the WCAB, and may not be made or considered at an ex parte hearing [*Lab. Code § 3208.4*].

The procedures set forth in *Evid. Code § 783* must be followed if evidence of the applicant's sexual conduct is offered to attack his or her credibility [*Lab. Code § 3208.4*]. Opinion evidence, evidence of reputation, and evidence of specific instances of the applicant's sexual conduct with any person other than the defendant, is not admissible by the defendant to prove consent by or the absence of injury to the applicant, unless the injury alleged by the applicant is in the nature of loss of consortium [*Lab. Code § 3208.4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesSex CrimesSexual AssaultGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawDiscriminationHarassmentSexual HarassmentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.151

§ 577.151 X Rays

X rays may not be transmitted to the WCAB except under a specific order directing their production [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608(f)*]. On order of the WCAB or a WCJ, a party must forthwith transmit all X rays to the person designated in the order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10618*]. Additionally, on reasonable request of a party, X rays in the possession or subject to the control of an adverse party or lien claimant must be made available for examination by the requesting party or persons designated by that party at a time or place convenient to the persons to make the examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10618*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10622* (penalty for refusing or preventing examination of X ray)].

X rays may be subpoenaed only when they are relevant to pending issues and there is a present and bona fide intent to offer them in evidence. X rays produced in violation of this provision will be ordered returned to their original custodian at the expense of the party causing them to be produced [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10618*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDiscoveryGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.152

§ 577.152 Notice of Medical Appointment

After the filing of an application for adjudication, each party must notify all parties, and their attorneys or representatives, of any medical appointment scheduled for the purposes of medical-legal evaluation. The notice must be given at the same time the injured worker is advised of the appointment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10418*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical Evidence

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.153

§ 577.153 Substitution or Dismissal of Attorneys; Dismissal of Agents

Substitution or dismissal of attorneys must be made in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 284, 285,* and *286* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*; *see § 577.440*]. Dismissal of agents may be made by serving and filing a statement of dismissal [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureCounselDisqualificationsCivil ProcedureCounselSubstitutionsCivil ProcedureCounselWithdrawalsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.154

§ 577.154 Prehearing Motions

The WCJ to whom the case has been assigned may issue interim and interlocutory orders necessary to the adjudication of the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10348*]. Requests for orders are made by petition, the caption of which must contain the title and number of the case and indicate the type of relief sought [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10450*]. As a matter of practice, however, motions before trial are frequently in the form of letter requests.

If the particular motion involves a controversy between the parties, the WCJ may wait until the hearing to grant or deny the interlocutory order. Interlocutory orders are entered on the minutes of the hearing and become the order of the WCAB when they are filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10566(c), 10570*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeMotion PracticeGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.155

§ 577.155 Dismissals

[1] In General

Except as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10562* (failure to appear) and 10582 (inactive cases), and unless good cause to the contrary appears, orders of dismissal of claim forms for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994, and orders of dismissal of applications for adjudication for injuries occurring before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, must be issued forthwith if requested by the employee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780*]. All other orders of dismissal of applications for adjudication for injuries occurring before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, must be issued only after service of a notice of intention, allowing at least 15 days for the adverse parties to show good cause to the contrary, and not by an order with a clause rendering the order null and void if an objection showing good cause is filed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780*].

For a petition for dismissal form, see *§ 577.453[1]*. For a request for dismissal by the employee form, see *§ 577.452[1]*. For discussion of mandatory settlement conferences generally, see *§ 577.157[1]*.

[2] Failure to Comply With Notice Requirement

Failure to comply with the 15-day notice requirement deprives the adverse parties of an adequate opportunity to present their objections and violates their due process rights; thus, any order of dismissal entered by a workers' compensation judge who fails to comply with the notice requirement must be vacated [*Fortich v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1449, 1450-1454, 285 Cal. Rptr. 222]* .

[3] Grounds for Dismissal

An application may be dismissed, for example, by the WCAB after notice and opportunity to be heard as follows:

- When the applicant was served with a notice of trial but failed to appear [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*];

- When the application shows on its face that the applicant is not entitled to compensation [*Lab. Code § 5507* (discussed in *§ 577.83[1][d]*)];

- With respect to proceedings relating to injuries occurring before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, on the WCAB's own motion or on request of an interested party when the case has not been timely activated [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582* (discussed in *§ 577.143[2]*)]; and

- When a party who has been served with notice of a mandatory settlement conference pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5502(e)* fails to appear at the conference [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*; *see also* discussion in *§ 577.157[5]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil ProcedureDismissalsVoluntary DismissalsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTerminationsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.156

§ 577.156 Compelling Medical Examination or Autopsy

An employee is required, on the written request of his or her employer, to submit at reasonable intervals to examination by a practicing physician, provided and paid for by the employer, and to submit to examination at reasonable intervals by any physician selected by the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation, the WCAB, or a WCJ [*Lab. Code § 4050*]. If the employee, after written request of the employer, fails or refuses to submit to or obstructs in any way the examination, his or her right to begin or maintain a workers' compensation proceeding is suspended [*Lab. Code § 4053*]. If the employee fails or refuses to submit to or obstructs in any way the examination after direction by the WCAB or a referee of the board, his or her right to disability payments accruing during the period of refusal or obstruction is barred [*Lab. Code § 4054*]. For a form of petition for an order to compel an employee to submit to a medical examination, see *§ 577.412[1]*.

An autopsy on the body of a deceased employee who dies as a result of industrial injuries may be ordered by the WCAB, subject to the consent of the dependents who have custody of the body [*Lab. Code §§ 5706, 5707*]. If the dependents, or a majority of them, having the custody of the body refuse to allow the autopsy, it shall not be performed. In such a case, on the hearing of any application for compensation, there is a disputable presumption that the injury or death was not due to causes entitling the claimants to death benefits under the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5707*]. For a form of petition for an order directing an exhumation and autopsy, see *§ 577.413[1]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTerminationsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical EvidenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsDeath Benefits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.157

§ 577.157 Settlement Conference

[1] When Required

For all applications filed on and after January 1, 1991 (regardless of the date of injury), a mandatory settlement conference must be conducted not less than 10 nor more than 30 days after the filing of the declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(1)*].

A priority conference must be set upon the filing of a declaration of readiness requesting a priority conference that shows that the applicant is represented by an attorney and that the issues in dispute include employment and/or injury arising out of and in the course of employment [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(a)*]. Upon a showing of good cause, a WCJ may continue the matter to a status conference. At each priority or status conference, the parties must be prepared to set the matter for trial or to provide a plan to complete discovery [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(b)*]. To the extent possible, all priority and status conferences in a case are to be conducted by the same WCJ. When discovery is complete, or when the WCJ determines that the parties have had sufficient time to complete reasonable discovery, the case must be set for trial as expeditiously as possible [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254(c)*].

[2] Continuances

Continuances of settlement conferences are not favored, but may be granted by a WCJ on any terms as are just on a showing of good cause [*Lab. Code § 5502.5*]. When determining a request for a continuance, the WCJ will take into consideration the complexity of the issues, the diligence of the parties, and the prejudice incurred on the part of any party as a result of granting or denying a continuance [*Lab. Code § 5502.5*].

[3] Qualifications of Referee

The settlement conference must be conducted by a workers' compensation judge or by a referee who is eligible to be either a WCJ or an arbitrator [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(2)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 123.5(a)* (qualifications of WCJs), 5270.5 (qualifications of arbitrators)]. Settlement conference referees are employed by the administrative director and are

supervised in the performance of their judicial duties by the presiding workers' compensation judge [*see Lab. Code § 5502(e)(2)*].

[4] Conference Statement; Discovery; and Evidence

If the claim is not resolved at the mandatory settlement conference, the parties must file a pretrial conference statement (*see §§ 577.491[1]*, 577.492[1]) noting the specific issues in dispute, each party's proposed permanent disability rating, and listing the exhibits, and disclosing witnesses. Discovery closes on the date of the conference [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)*]. *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)* further provides that "[e]vidence not disclosed or obtained thereafter shall not be admissible unless the proponent of the evidence can demonstrate that it was not available or could not have been discovered by the exercise of due diligence prior to the settlement conference." Although the preceding language is not entirely clear, this restriction on admissibility apparently refers to evidence that was not disclosed *at the settlement conference* or that was discovered after the conference.

The court of appeal has held admissible at trial the testimony of a vocational rehabilitation counselor developed as a consequence of meetings between the counselor and the injured employee, all of which took place following closure of discovery at the mandatory settlement conference. At the conference, the employee had identified the counselor as an expert trial witness. The court held that this was sufficient to comply with *Lab. Code § 5502*, stating that "discovery," as used in the statute, referred to pretrial processes undertaken to obtain information about an opposing party's case in preparation for trial, not to the collection and organization of information about one's own case. Thus, the statutory discovery restriction was not implicated in the present case [*Grupe Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 977, 985-988, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98]* .

[5] Appearance Required at Conference

All parties and lien claimants must appear at all hearings, except as provided below [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(a)*]:

> 1. When injury arising out of and in the course of employment is at issue, lien claimants not defined as a party [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(y)(3)* ("party" means: (1) person claiming to be injured employee or dependent of injured employee; (2) defendant; or (3) lien claimant when either (A) underlying case of injured employee or employee's dependent has been resolved or (B) injured employee or employee's dependent chooses not to proceed with his, her, or their case)] are not required to appear at the mandatory settlement conference or trial, unless otherwise ordered by the WCJ.
>
> 2. When liability for the claim has been accepted, lien claimants not defined as a party, with a lien claim of $25,000 or more, must appear or have a representative appear at the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, unless the appearance is excused by the WCJ.
>
> 3. Lien claimants not defined as a party, with liens of less than $25,000, must be available by telephone with settlement authority and must notify defendant(s) of the telephone number at which the defendant may reach them during the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, although the WCJ may order the appearance of lien claimants not defined as a party, with liens of less than $25,000, at a mandatory settlement conference or lien conference.
>
> 4. All lien claimants must appear at trial at which their lien(s) is an issue to be decided.

All parties must have a person available with settlement authority at the mandatory settlement conference or lien conference, although the person with settlement authority need not be present if an attorney or representative who is present can obtain immediate authority by telephone [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(b)*].

Unless the notice otherwise provides, the applicant must be present at a mandatory settlement conference, as provided in *Lab. Code § 5502(e)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(c)*].

Appearance at a hearing not covered by this rule is at the discretion of the WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240(d)*].

If a party served with notice of a mandatory settlement conference fails to appear at the conference, the workers' compensation judge may dismiss the application for adjudication after issuing 10 days' notice of intention to dismiss [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*]. Alternatively, the workers' compensation judge may close discovery and forward the case to the presiding workers' compensation judge to set the case for trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*]. If a party, after notice, fails to appear at a conference, and on a showing of good cause for the failure to appear, the workers' compensation judge may take the case off calendar or may continue the case to a date certain [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*].

When a lien claimant served with notice of a conference fails to appear at the conference in person or by attorney or representative, and fails to have a person with settlement authority available by telephone, the workers' compensation judge may dismiss the lien claim after issuing a 10-day notice of intention to dismiss with or without prejudice, or may close discovery and forward the case to the presiding worker's compensation judge to set for trial [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562(d)*].

[6] Conduct of Mandatory Conference

[a] In General

At the conference, the workers' compensation judge has authority to resolve the dispute, including the authority to inquire into the adequacy and completeness, including provision for lien claims, of compromise and release agreements or stipulations with request for award or orders, and to issue orders approving compromise and release agreements or awards or orders based on approved stipulations [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(2)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(a)*]. The workers' compensation judge may also make orders and rulings regarding admission of evidence and discovery matters, including admission of offers of proof and stipulations of testimony when appropriate and necessary for resolution of the dispute, and may submit and decide the dispute on the record pursuant to the agreement of the parties. However, the workers' compensation judge may not hear sworn testimony at any conference [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(a)*].

Subject to the provisions of *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(1)* (time limitations for settlement conference), the workers' compensation judge may temporarily adjourn a conference to a time certain to facilitate a specific resolution of the dispute [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(b)*].

[b] Pre-Trial Statement

If the dispute cannot be resolved, the parties must file, at the mandatory settlement conference, a joint pretrial statement setting forth the issues and stipulations for trial, witnesses, exhibits, and the proposed permanent disability rating [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(c)*]. The parties may modify their proposed ratings only when evidence, relevant to the proposed ratings, and disclosed or obtained after the mandatory settlement conference, becomes admissible under *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)* [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(2)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(c)*].

[c] Summary of Proceedings

A summary of the conference proceedings, including the joint pretrial statement and the disposition, must be filed by the workers' compensation judge in the record of the proceedings on a form prescribed and approved by the WCAB and must be served on the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353(c)*].

[7] Hearing Date When Dispute Unresolved by Settlement Conference

If the dispute is not resolved, the regular hearing must be held within 75 days after the declaration of readiness to proceed was filed [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(1)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteCivil ProcedurePretrial MattersGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTerminationsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized Treatment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.158

§ 577.158 Walk-Through Documents

A "walk-through" document is a document that is presented to a WCJ for immediate action. Notwithstanding the provisions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250* (relating to the filing of declarations of readiness) and *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10544* (relating to notices of hearing), the following provisions govern walk-through documents [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(a)*].

Each district office will have a designee of the Presiding WCJ available to assign walk-through cases from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on court days [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(b)*].

The following documents may be submitted on a walk-through basis [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(c)*]:

1. Compromise and releases.

2. Stipulations with request for award.

3. Petitions for attorney's fees for representation of the applicant in vocational rehabilitation.

4. Petitions for attorney's fees for representation of the applicant at a deposition.

5. Petitions to compel attendance at a medical examination or deposition.

The following procedures are to be followed for filing walk-through documents [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(d)*]:

1. A walk-through settlement document (i.e., a compromise and release or a stipulations with request for award), and all supporting medical reports and other supporting documents not previously filed, must be filed directly with the WCJ at the date and time of the walk-through. The party presenting the walk-through settlement must use the appropriate form, document cover sheet, and document separator

sheet. Permanent and stationary medical or medical-legal reports must be indicated as such. In addition, each walk-through settlement document (i.e., a compromise and release or a stipulations with request for award) must be accompanied by a proof of service showing that the settlement document was served on all other parties to the settlement, on any defendant not executing the settlement who may be liable for the payment of additional compensation, and on all lien claimants whose liens have not been resolved. A case opening settlement document being submitted for a walk-through must be submitted no later than noon of the court day before any action on the walk-through, and must be designated as a walk-through document. All documents in support of the settlement document must be submitted at the walk-through with the assigned WCJ.

2. A walk-through petition (i.e., a petition for vocational rehabilitation attorney's fees, a petition for deposition attorney's fees, or a petition to compel attendance at a medical examination or deposition) and all other documents relating to the walk-through petition, including any supporting documentation, must be filed directly with the WCJ at the date and time of the walk-through. The party presenting the walk-through petition must use the appropriate form, document cover sheet, and document separator. In addition, at the date and time of the walk-through, the party filing the walk-through petition must file a proof of service directly to the WCJ, as follows:

A. For a petition for attorney's fees for representation of the applicant in vocational rehabilitation, a proof of service showing service on the injured worker and the defendant alleged to be liable for paying the fees.

B. For a petition for attorney's fees for representation of the applicant at a deposition, a proof of service showing service on the injured worker and the defendant alleged to be liable for paying the fees.

C. For a petition to compel attendance at a medical examination or deposition, a proof of service showing service on the injured worker, the injured worker's attorney, and all defendants.

When appearing for the walk-through proceeding, the party filing the walk-through document must appear before the district office staff person designated by the Presiding WCJ to assign the walk-through document to a WCJ. The filing party must then appear before the assigned judge. If the assigned judge is unavailable for any reason, the filing party must then proceed to the Presiding WCJ for possible reassignment to another judge [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(e)*].

A WCJ who is presented with a walk-through settlement document will approve it, disapprove it, suspend action on it, or accept it for later review and action. If a WCJ is presented with so many walk-through settlement documents that review of them will interfere with the cases scheduled before him or her for hearing, the judge may refer the walk-through settlement to the Presiding WCJ for possible reassignment to another WCJ [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(f)*].

A walk-through document may be acted on only by a WCJ at the district office that has venue. If an injured worker has existing cases at two or more district offices that have venue, a walk-through document may be filed at any office having venue over an existing case that is a subject of the walk-through document. An existing case is a case that has been filed and assigned a case number prior to the filing of the walk-through document [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(g)*].

A walk-through document may be acted on by any WCJ except as follows [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(h)*]:

1. If a judge has taken testimony, any walk-through document in that case must be acted on by the judge who took testimony if that judge works at the district office to which the case is assigned, unless the presiding judge allows it to be acted on by another judge.

2. If a judge has reviewed a document and declined to approve it, a walk-through document in that case must be acted on by the same judge, if that judge works at the district office to which the case is assigned, unless the presiding judge allows it to be acted on by another judge.

A WCJ who is presented with a walk-through petition for attorney's fees or petition to compel attendance must issue an order in compliance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10349* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10280(i)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical EvidenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

45-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.159

§ 577.159 Emergency Petitions for Stay

A party may present to the Presiding WCJ of the district office having venue a petition to stay an action by another party pending a hearing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10281(a)*].

Each district office will have a designee of the Presiding WCJ available to assign petitions for stay from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on court days [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10281(b)*].

A party who walks through a petition to stay an action must provide notice to the opposing party or parties no later than 10:00 a.m. of the immediately preceding court day. This notice must (1) state with specificity the nature of the relief to be requested by the petition to stay; and (2) state the date, time, and place that the petition to stay will be presented. A copy of the petition to stay must be attached to the notice. The notice may be given by either fax or e-mail. If notice by fax or e-mail fails, or if an opposing party's fax number or e-mail address are unknown, notice must be given in the manner best calculated to expeditiously and timely advise the opposing party of the information set forth in this paragraph, including notice by phone or by overnight mail or delivery service. First-class mail may not be used for notice of a petition to stay an action [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10281(c)*].

A petition to stay an action must be accompanied by a declaration regarding notice, stating under penalty of perjury (1) the notice given, including the date, time, manner, and name of the party informed; (2) the relief sought; and (3) whether opposition is expected. In addition, if the petitioner was unable to give timely notice to the opposing party, the declaration under penalty of perjury also must state that the petitioner in good faith attempted to inform the opposing party but was unable to do so, specifying the efforts made to inform the opposing party [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10281(d)*].

Upon the receipt of a proper petition to stay an action, the Presiding WCJ or his or her designee must, in his or her discretion, either (1) deny the petition; (2) grant a temporary stay and set the petition for a formal hearing; or (3) set the petition for a formal hearing, without either denying the petition or granting a temporary stay [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10281(e)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
8. Prehearing Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.160-577.169

[Reserved]

§§ 577.160[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.170

§ 577.170 Governing Law

Hearings are governed generally by *Lab. Code §§ 5700-5710* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10541*-10593, and expedited hearings governed by *Lab. Code § 5502(b)* and 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10252, 10252.1.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.171

§ 577.171 Types of Hearings

"Hearing" means any trial, mandatory settlement conference, rating mandatory settlement conference, status conference, or priority conference [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10301(s)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10301(u),(v), (z), (aa), (dd)*]. All parties must be present at the time of trial, and the defendants must have a person available with settlement authority. If a lien claimant whose lien has not been resolved or withdrawn is not present at the time of trial, the lien claimant must have a person available with settlement authority, either in person or by telephone [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10240*; *see also § 577.157[5*] (appearances required at mandatory settlement conference)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlements

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.172

§ 577.172 Time for Hearing

[1] In General

A hearing must be held not less than 10 days or more than 60 days after the date the declaration of readiness to proceed is filed, unless the issue or issues concerned require an expedited hearing or settlement conference pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5502(b), (c), (e)* [*Lab. Code § 5502(a)*]. When a claim form has been filed for an injury occurring between January 1, 1990, and January 1, 1994, an application for adjudication must accompany the declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 5502(a)*]. If the notice of hearing is served by publication, the hearing date may be fixed at more than 30 days from the date the application was filed [*Lab. Code § 5316*]. For a discussion of expedited hearings, see [3], *below*. For a discussion of settlement conferences, see *§ 577.157*.

The hearing provisions set forth in *Labor Code § 5502* do not apply in cases involving the Director of the Department of Industrial Relations in his or her capacity as administrator of the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund, unless proof of service, as specified in *Labor Code § 3716(d)(1)*, has been filed with the WCAB and provided to the Director, valid jurisdiction has been established over the employer, and the Fund has been joined [*Lab. Code § 5502(f)*]. The provisions in *Lab. Code § 5502* apply irrespective of the date of injury [*Lab. Code § 5502(g)*].

[2] Continuances

Continuances of hearings or expedited hearings (discussed under [3], *below*) are not favored, but may be granted by a WCJ on any terms as are just on a showing of good cause [*Lab. Code § 5502.5*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10243*]. When determining a request for a continuance, the WCJ will take into consideration the complexity of the issues, the diligence of the parties, and the prejudice incurred on the part of any party as a result of granting or denying a continuance [*Lab. Code § 5502.5*].

According to the DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual, a conflict between a scheduled hearing and an attorney's court appearance elsewhere will not constitute good cause for a continuance unless the attorney provides notice of the conflict within 10 days, permitting another case to be substituted. Likewise, failure to be prepared, failure to complete

discovery, failure to complete medical evaluations despite the allowance of reasonable time to do so, and failure to have the requisite settlement authority do not constitute good cause to continue a case [DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual Index No. 6.7.4.1].

Cases that cannot be heard by the assigned WCJ because the WCJ is engaged in another trial will not automatically be continued, but will be referred to the Presiding Judge for possible reassignment to another WCJ who has time to hear the case that day. However, upon agreement, a case can be continued to another day when the originally assigned WCJ will be available, provided the order is served on all parties and representatives [DWC/WCAB Policy & Procedural Manual Index No. 6.7.4.1].

[3] Expedited Hearing Procedure

The Court Administrator has established, as required by *Lab. Code § 5502(b)*, a uniform priority calendar for issues requiring an expedited hearing and decision. In cases in which expedited hearing procedures apply, the hearing must be held, and a determination as to the rights of the parties made and filed, within 30 days after the declaration of readiness to proceed is filed [*Lab. Code § 5502(b)*].

When injury to any part or parts of the body is accepted as compensable by the employer, a party is entitled to an expedited priority hearing and decision upon the filing of an application for adjudication of claim and a declaration of readiness to proceed pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250* establishing a bona fide, good faith dispute as to any of the following [*Lab Code § 5502(b)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(a); *see § 577.490* (required form for declaration of readiness to proceed to expedited hearing (trial))]:

1. The employee's entitlement to medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4600*.

2. The employee's entitlement to, or the amount of, temporary disability indemnity payments.

3. The employee's entitlement to vocational rehabilitation services, or the termination of an employer's liability to provide these services to an employee.

4. The employee's entitlement to compensation from one or more responsible employers when two or more employers dispute liability as among themselves.

An expedited hearing may be set upon request when injury to any part or parts of the body is accepted as compensable by the employer and the issues include medical treatment or temporary disability for a disputed body part or parts [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(b)*].

A WCJ assigned to a case involving a disputed body part or parts may redesignate the expedited hearing as a mandatory settlement conference, receive a pretrial conference statement pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)*, close discovery, and schedule the case for trial on the issues presented, if the WCJ determines, in consultation with the Presiding WCJ, that the case is not appropriate for expedited determination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(c)*].

Grounds for the redesignation of an expedited hearing includes, but is not limited to, cases in which the direct and cross-examination of the applicant will be prolonged, or in which there are multiple witnesses who will offer extensive testimony [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(d)*].

The parties are expected to submit for decision all matters properly in issue at a single trial and to produce all necessary evidence, including witnesses, documents, medical reports, payroll statements, and all other matters considered essential in the proof of a party's claim or defense [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(e)*].

The Court Administrator has established a priority conference calendar for cases in which the employee is represented by an attorney and the issues in dispute are employment or injury arising out of employment or in the course of employment. The conference is to be conducted by a workers' compensation judge within 30 days after the declaration of readiness to proceed. If the dispute cannot be resolved at the conference, a trial will be set as expeditiously as possible, unless good cause is shown why discovery is not complete, in which case status conferences are to be held at regular intervals. The case will be set for trial when discovery is complete or the workers' compensation judge determines that the parties have had sufficient time in which to complete reasonable discovery. A determination as to the right of the parties must be made and filed within 30 days after the trial [*Lab. Code § 5502(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10254*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePretrial MattersContinuancesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.173

§ 577.173 Notice of Hearing and Failure to Appear

[1] Notice

The WCAB generally serves notice of the time and place of the hearing on all parties and lien claimants and their attorneys or other agents of record by mail at their addresses of record or by personal service [*see Lab. Code §§ 5316, 5504; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10544*]. However, the WCAB may, in its discretion, designate a party or lien claimant to make service of notice of the time and place of hearing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*].

The notice must also include a statement explaining the right to have an interpreter present, at the claim's administrator's expense, if the applicant does not proficiently speak or understand English [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9795.2, 9795.3(a)(4)*]. The WCAB must serve the notice not less than 10 days before the date of hearing, except when notice is waived, a different time is expressly agreed to by all parties and concurred in by the WCAB, or the proceedings involve a claim against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10544*].

[2] Failure to Appear

When a party served with notice of trial fails to appear at trial either in person or by attorney or representative, the WCAB may dismiss the application for adjudication after issuing 10 days' notice of intention to dismiss, or may hear evidence and, after service of minutes of hearing and summary of evidence, which must include a 10-day notice of intention to submit, make decision that is just and proper [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*]. If a party, after notice, fails to appear at a trial, and on a showing of good cause for the failure to appear, the workers' compensation judge may take the case off calendar or may continue the case to a date certain [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*].

When a lien claimant served with notice of a trial fails to appear, the workers' compensation judge may dismiss the lien claim after issuing a 10-day notice of intention to dismiss with or without prejudice, or may hear the evidence and, after service of the minutes of hearing and summary of evidence that must include a 10-day notice of intention to submit, make a decision that is just and proper, or may defer the issue of the lien and submit the case on the remaining issues [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562(e)*]. If the workers' compensation judge defers a lien issue, upon the issuance of his or her

decision on the remaining issues, the judge must issue a 10-day notice of intention to order payment of the lien in full or in part, or issue a 10-day notice of intention to disallow the lien, or continue the lien issue to a lien conference [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.174

§ 577.174 Single Trial Requirement

The parties are expected to submit for decision all matters properly in issue at a single trial and to produce at the trial all necessary evidence, including witnesses, documents, medical reports, payroll statements, and all other matters considered essential in the proof of a party's claim or defense. However, a WCJ may order that the issues in a case be bifurcated and tried separately, upon a showing of good cause [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10560*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDismissalsInvoluntary DismissalsFailures to ProsecuteWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.175

§ 577.175 Hearings in Cases Involving Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund, Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund, or Death Without Dependents

Cases involving the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund or the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund as a party, or involving death without dependents, may only be heard for conference, mandatory settlement conference, standby conference, or rating calendar at the district WCAB office located in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Van Nuys, Anaheim, Sacramento, or San Diego, except for good cause shown and with the Administrative Director's consent [*Lab. Code § 3714(a)*]. For these cases,the presiding judge of the WCAB located in the cities specified may permit a conference, in which no testimony will be taken, to be conducted by telephone conference call among the parties and their attorneys of record who do not reside in the county in which the WCAB is located [*Lab. Code § 3714(b)*].

Any filings of documents necessary for the proceedings may be served on the WCAB and the parties by facsimile machine, but, if so served, must also be served, as required by regulation, on the WCAB and the parties within five working days [*Lab. Code § 3714(c)*]. These provisions are effective for a period of two years commencing on the date the Administrative Director certifies that the rearrangement of judicial resources and conference call facilities required by these provisions are in place [*Lab. Code § 3714(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsDeath BenefitsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.176

§ 577.176 Qualified Interpreters

[1] Definition

For purposes of these requirements, "qualified interpreter" means a language interpreter certified, or deemed certified, pursuant to Article 8 (commencing with Section 11435.05) of Chapter 4.5 of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of, or *Gov. Code § 68566* [*Lab. Code §§ 4600, 5811(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.1(f)*].

[2] Entitlement

When, at the request of the employer, the employer's insurer, the administrative director, the WCAB, or a workers' compensation judge, an employee submits to an examination by a physician and the employee does not proficiently speak or understand the English language, he or she is entitled to the services of a qualified interpreter in accordance with conditions and a fee schedule prescribed by the Administrative Director [*Lab. Code § 4600(f)*; *see* former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3(b)* (fees for interpreter services provided before April 1, 1997); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3* (operative December 30, 1996) (fees for interpreter services provided on or after April 1, 1997); *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.4(c)*]. These services must be provided by the employer [*Lab. Code § 4600(f)*].

The notice of a hearing, deposition, or other setting must include a statement explaining the employee's right to have an interpreter present if he or she does not proficiently speak or understand English. When a party is designated to serve notice, it is that party's responsibility to include the statement in the notice [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.2*].

[3] Fees

The employer's claims administrator may also be required to pay for interpreter fees in settings determined by the WCAB to be reasonable and necessary to determine the validity and extent of injury to an employee [*see Lab. Code § 5811(b)*]. Such settings specifically include depositions ofinjured employees and dependents seeking benefits, appeals board hearings, arbitrations, formal and informal rehabilitation conferences, conferences with information and assistance officers to assist in resolving disputes between injured employees and claims administrators, and

comprehensive medical-legal evaluations including any follow-up or supplemental evaluations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3(a)*].

It is the responsibility of any party producing a witness requiring an interpreter to arrange for the presence of a qualified interpreter [*Lab. Code § 5811(b)*]. For injuries occurring before January 1, 1994, interpreter fees that are reasonably, actually, and necessarily incurred must be allowed as a cost, provided they are in accordance with the Administrative Director's fee schedule [*Lab. Code § 5811(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*]. Recovery must be allowed in the amount charged by the interpreter unless proof of unreasonableness is entered by the party contesting the reasonableness of the charge, or the charge is manifestly unreasonable [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*]. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994, interpreter's fees that are reasonably, actually, and necessarily incurred must be allowed as provided by *Lab. Code §§ 4600, 5710,* and *5811,* as amended July 16, 1993 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*]. Interpreter's fees as defined in *Lab. Code § 4620,* which are reasonably, actually, and necessarily incurred as provided in *Lab. Code § 4621,* must be allowed in accordance with the Administrative Director's fee schedule [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*; *see* former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3(b), (d)* (applicable to interpreter services provided before April 1, 1997); *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9795.3(b), (d)* (operative December 30, 1996) (fees for interpreter services provided on or after April 1, 1997); *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9795.3(c), (e)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.4(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceCompetencyInterpretersWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceWitnessesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.176A

§ 577.176A Devices to Assist the Hearing Impaired

In any administrative hearing of a public agency, when a party, witness, attorney, judicial employee, judge, juror, or other participant is hearing impaired, the individual who is hearing impaired, on his or her request, is to be provided with a functioning assistive listening system or a computer-aided transcription system. Any individual requiring this equipment must give advance notice of his or her need to the appropriate court or agency at the time the hearing is set or not later than five days before the hearing [*Civ. Code § 54.8(a)*]. "Individual who is hearing impaired" means an individual with a hearing loss, who, with sufficient amplification or a computer-aided transcription system, is able to fully participate in the proceeding [*Civ. Code § 54.8(j)*].

Assistive listening systems include, but are not limited to, special devices that transmit amplified speech by means of audio-induction loops, radio frequency systems (AM or FM), or infrared transmission. Personal receivers, headphones, and neck loops must be available on request by individuals who are hearing impaired [*Civ. Code § 54.8(b)*]. If a computer-aided transcription system is requested, sufficient display terminals must be provided to allow the individual who is hearing impaired to read the real-time transcript of the proceeding without difficulty [*Civ. Code § 54.8(c)*].

A sign must be posted in a prominent place indicating the availability of, and how to request, an assistive listening system and a computer-aided transcription system. Notice of the availability of the systems must be posted with notice of trials [*Civ. Code § 54.8(d)*].

In any administrative hearing of a public agency, in which the individual who is hearing impaired is a party, witness, attorney, judicial employee, judge, juror, or other participant, and has requested use of an assistive listening system or computer-aided transcription system, the proceedings are not to commence until the system is in place and functioning [*Civ. Code § 54.8(i)*]. In no case is this statute to be construed to prescribe a lesser standard of accessibility or usability than that provided by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and federal regulations adopted pursuant to that act [*Civ. Code § 54.8(k)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceWitnessesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.177

§ 577.177 Reporting of Proceedings and Transcripts

Oral testimony, objections, and rulings must be taken down in shorthand by a competent phonographic reporter, but, unless otherwise ordered by a commissioner, a deputy commissioner, or a presiding WCJ, testimony taken at the hearing will not be transcribed except on the request of a party accompanied by the prescribed fee [*Lab. Code § 5708*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10740*]. The manner of making the request and deposit of the fee, as well as the proscription against making photographic copies of a transcript from the board file except on payment of the amount prescribed by law for a copy of the transcript, are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10740*.

Stenographic reporters' notes or electronic sound recording of testimony must be retained for a period of six years after the taking of them and thereafter may be destroyed or otherwise disposed of [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10273(f)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsTranscripts & TranslationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.178

§ 577.178 Evidence

[1] Rules of Evidence

The WCAB and WCJs are not bound by the common law or statutory rules of evidence and procedure in conducting hearings and investigations, but may make inquiry, through oral testimony and records, in the manner that is best calculated to ascertain the substantial rights of the parties and carry out justly the spirit and provisions of the workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 5708*]. Consequently, no order, decision, award, or rule will be invalidated because of the admission into the record, and use as proof of any fact in dispute, of any evidence not admissible under the common law or statutory rules of evidence and procedure. Nor will an order, decision, award, or rule be invalidated by any informality in the manner of taking testimony [*Lab. Code § 5709*].

[2] Form of Evidence

Reports, publications, and other writings that may be received in evidence are listed in *Lab. Code § 5703*. The admissibility of certified copies of reports and records of any governmental agency in lieu of the originals is authorized by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10604*. The extent to which permanent disability evaluation reports constitute evidence is set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9750* and *10602*. Physicians' reports and waiver of the right to cross examine a physician on his or her report are governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10606-10616* and *10622*. Rules applicable to X rays are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10618*. Use of hospital and physicians' records are governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10626*, and the service of copies of documents, including videotapes, to be offered into evidence is governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10601*. The admissibility of optical image reproductions, photostatic, microfilm, microcard, miniature photographic, and other photographic copies or reproductions of writings preserved as business records is governed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10605*. Similarly, the presumption of the accuracy of a printed representation of images stored on a video or digital medium, including the rules regarding attacks on and support of that presumption, are set forth in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10605*.

The filing of a document does not signify its receipt in evidence, and, except for the documents listed in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10750* (discussed under *§ 577.182*), only those documents that have been received in evidence will be included

in the record of proceedings on the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10600*].

[3] Procedure on Evidence Taken Without Notice

Transcripts or summaries of testimony taken without notice and copies of all reports and other matters added to the record, other than during the course of an open hearing, must be served on the parties to the proceeding. Unless it is otherwise expressly provided, the parties shall be allowed 10 days after service of such testimony and reports to produce evidence in explanation or rebuttal or to request further proceedings before the case will be deemed submitted for decision [*see Lab. Code § 5704*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10580*].

[4] Return of Exhibits

Any party filing an original document or other pieces of evidence pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10603(a)* (regarding oversized exhibits, diagnostic imagining, physical exhibits, and exhibits on media) must, at the time of filing, either (1) arrange for the return of the document or evidence, at the filing party's sole expense, at the conclusion of all proceedings and appeals, or (2) be deemed by not making such arrangements to have consented to destruction, without notice, of the document or other evidence at the conclusion of all proceedings and appeals [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10273(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceDocumentary EvidenceWritingsTranscripts & TranslationsGeneral OverviewEvidenceInferences & PresumptionsPresumptionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceMedical EvidenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsEvidenceWitnessesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.179

§ 577.179 Burden of Proof and Affirmative Defenses

[1] In General

The burden of proof rests on the party or lien claimant holding the affirmative of the issue [*Lab. Code § 5705*]. The following are affirmative defenses, and the burden of proof rests on the employer to establish them [*Lab. Code § 5705*]:

- The injured person was an independent contractor or otherwise excluded from the protection of the workers' compensation law, if there is proof that the injured person was at the time of injury actually performing service for the alleged employer [*see Germann v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 776, 781-782, 176 Cal. Rptr. 868* ; *Johnson v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321, 115 Cal. Rptr. 871* ; *see also S.G. & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 349, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P. 2d 399* ; discussion under *§ 577.22[3]*].

- The injury was caused by the employee's intoxication by alcohol or unlawful use of a controlled substance as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 11007* [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(4)* (injury not caused by intoxication or unlawful use of controlled substance is condition of compensation)].

- The injury was caused by the employee's willful misconduct [*see Lab. Code § 4551* (compensation reduced if injury caused by employee's serious and willful misconduct)].

- The disability was aggravated by the employee's unreasonable conduct [*see Lab. Code § 4056* (no compensation payable for disability aggravated by employee's unreasonable refusal to submit to medical treatment or surgery)].

- The employer was prejudiced by the employee's failure to give notice as required by *Lab. Code §§ 5400* and *5401* (notice of injury or death), *discussed under § 577.42[1]*.

[2] Preponderance of the Evidence

All parties are required to meet the evidentiary burden of proof on all issues by a preponderance of the evidence in order that all parties be considered equal before the law [*Lab. Code § 3202.5*; *see also Lab. Code § 3202* (requiring that workers' compensation law be liberally construed in favor of injured workers)]. "Preponderance of the evidence" means that evidence that when weighed with that opposed to it, has more convincing force and the greater probability of truth. When weighing the evidence, the test is not the relative number of witnesses, but the relative convincing force of the evidence [*Lab. Code § 3202.5*; *see Rogers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1199, 218 Cal. Rptr. 662]* .

[3] Proof of Industrial Causation--Reasonable Probability

The employee has the burden or proving the industrial causation of his or her injury by a "reasonable probability." This burden manifestly does not require the employee to prove causation by a scientific certainty. The WCAB is bound to uphold a claim in which the proof of industrial causation is reasonably probable, although not certain or convincing, and even though the exact causal mechanism is unclear or even unknown [*Rosas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1692, 1700-1705, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceCausationProximate CauseGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsBurdens of ProofWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesIntoxicationWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesSelf-Inflicted Injuries

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.180

§ 577.180 Minutes of Hearing and Summary of Evidence

Minutes of the hearing and a summary of evidence must be prepared at the conclusion of each hearing, filed in the record of proceedings (discussed under *§ 577.182*), and must include the information specified in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10566* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10566*]. The summary need not be filed, however, on waiver by the parties, or on issuance of a stipulated order, decision, or award [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10578*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.181

§ 577.181 Minute Orders

Interlocutory or interim orders, including dimissal of improper or unnecessary parties, may be entered on the minutes of hearing and will become the order of the WCAB on their filing [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.182

§ 577.182 Record of Proceedings

The record of proceedings consists of the pleadings, declarations of readiness to proceed, minutes of hearing and summary of evidence, transcripts if prepared and filed, proofs of service, evidence received in the course of a hearing, exhibits marked but not received in evidence, notices, petitions, briefs, findings, orders, decisions, and awards. Documents that are in the WCAB file but have not been received in evidence are not part of the evidentiary record [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10750*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
9. Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.183-577.189

[Reserved]

§§ 577.183[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.190

§ 577.190 Governing Law

Findings and awards are governed by *Lab. Code § 5800 et seq.* Reconsideration is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 115* and *5900 et seq.* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840 et seq.* Supplemental proceedings are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803-5805* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10450, 10455*, and *10462-10469*. Supplemental claims for new and further disability or rehabilitation benefits are governed by *Lab. Code § 5410* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10458* and *10470*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.191

§ 577.191 Findings and Award, Order, or Decision

[1] Filing and Content

The WCAB or WCJ must, within 30 days after a case is submitted, make and file findings on all facts involved in the controversy along with an award, order, or decision stating the determination as to the rights of the parties [*Lab. Code § 5313*; *see Industrial Indemnity Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 480, 485, 193 Cal. Rptr. 471]* . The 30-day period runs from the date of submission of the application for decision, and the provisions requiring the decision within the 30-day period are mandatory and not merely directive [*Lab. Code § 5800.5*]. Every order, decision, or award, other than an order merely appointing a trustee or guardian, must contain a determination of all issues presented for determination by the WCAB prior thereto and not theretofore determined. Any issue not so determined will be deemed decided adversely as to the party in whose interest the issue was raised [*Lab. Code § 5815*].

Orders, findings, decisions, and awards issued by a WCJ are deemed to be the orders, findings, decisions, and awards of the WCAB unless reconsideration is granted [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10348*]. For a petition for certified copy of an award, see form in *§ 577.500[1]*.

[2] Summary of the Evidence

A summary of the evidence received and relied on and the reasons or grounds on which the determination was made, together with the findings, order, decision, or award, must be served on all parties to the proceedings [*Lab. Code § 5313*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10782*]. Service may be made as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 1010 et seq.* (discussed in Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*), unless otherwise directed by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5316*].

In one case, the court of appeal held that it was mandatory for a WCJ to provide a summary of the trial evidence under *Lab. Code § 5313* and *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10566 and that a failure to submit such a summary mandated that the matter be returned to the WCJ to prepare and submit one. The court found that the arbitrator in the case before it did not prepare a summary of the evidence and that arbitrators had the same duties and responsibilities as WCJs. The WCJ's summary of the evidence was a required document to accompany petitions for writ of review under Cal. Rules of Ct.,

Rule 8.494(a)(1)(B), because the court of appeal needed a summary to evaluate whether substantial evidence supported the Appeals Board's decision. Therefore, failure of the arbitrator to include a summary of the evidence required annulment of the Appeals Board decision that affirmed the arbitrator's findings on *Lab. Code § 3366(a)* issues, even absent the arbitrator's summary of the evidence, and remand of the matter to the arbitrator to prepare such a summary. Moreover, the Appeals Board's consideration of the existing evidence, absent a summary, was not justified, using any of three standards: the demurrer standard, the state of the decision standard, or the substantial compliance standard [*Sharareh v. W.C.A.B. (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 189, 192-195, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 147]* .

[3] Compensation Awarded

The WCAB in its award may fix and determine the total amount of compensation to be paid and specify the manner of payment, or may fix and determine the weekly disability payment to be made and order its payment during continuance of the disability [*Lab. Code § 5801*]. If it is proved that an injury has been suffered for which the employer would be liable to pay compensation had disability resulted from it, but it is not proved that any disability has resulted, the WCAB may, instead of dismissing the application, award nominal disability indemnity if it appears that disability is likely to result at a future time [*Lab. Code § 5802*].

[4] Filing Liens With WCAB

When an award is submitted to the WCAB for approval, the parties must file with the WCAB any liens served on the parties [*Lab. Code § 4903.1(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.192

§ 577.192 Adoption, Modification, or Vacation by WCAB

Within 60 days after the findings and award, order, or decision of a WCJ are filed, the WCAB may confirm, adopt, modify, or set them aside and may, with or without further proceedings, and with or without notice, enter its own findings, award, order, or decision based on the record in the case [*Lab. Code § 5315*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.193

§ 577.193 Interest and Costs

All awards of the WCAB carry interest at the same rate as judgments in civil actions [*Lab. Code § 5800*; *see Myers v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 120, 122 n.1, 97 Cal. Rptr. 400* ; *Myers v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 621, 626, 83 Cal. Rptr. 427* ; *see also Code Civ. Proc. § 685.010(a)* (interest on judgments)]. Interest runs from the date the award is made and filed as to amounts that are payable forthwith and, with respect to installment payments, the date each installment becomes due and payable [*Lab. Code § 5800*].

With respect to an award of lost wages and benefits, the California Supreme Court has held that the WCAB may and must, when the criteria of *Civ. Code § 3287* are met, add interest from the dates such wages and benefits would have become due had the employer not acted in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*. The Court stated that although *Lab. Code § 132a* does not itself expressly authorize the addition of prejudgment interest to an award of backpay, *Civ. Code § 3287* requires such interest on damages due on a particular date, including awards of backpay, when they are certain or capable of being made certain by calculation. The Court found that neither *Lab. Code § 5800* nor any other provision of the Labor Code precluded the addition of interest to such an award. Moreover, the addition of interest would serve the remedial purpose of *Lab. Code § 132a* [*Currie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 1109, 1119, 17 P.3d 749]* .

Costs as between the parties may be allowed by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5811(a)*]. The court of appeal has held that the Appeals Board has discretion to award costs, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5811*, for a vocational rehabilitation expert's report, regardless of whether the report is admissible. The court found that nothing in the language of that statute suggests that the Board's discretion is circumscribed by rules of admissibility. Inadmissible reports, the court pointed out, might be valuable in preparing for a hearing or to further settlement negotiations. Finally, the court stated that *Costa v. Hardy Diagnostic* [Costa v. Hardy Diagnostic (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 1492 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* reflects a legislative policy to accord the Board discretion to evaluate whether the costs of a vocational rehabilitation consultant's report are reasonable and necessary, based on the facts of the case [*Barr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 163, 176, 179, 181, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 732]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment InterestGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment InterestPrejudgment InterestWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsTypesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.194

§ 577.194 Sanctions

[1] Bad Faith Actions or Tactics

With regard to all applications for adjudication that are filed on or after January 1, 1994 [*see Lab. Code § 5813(c)*], the WCAB may order a party, the party's attorney, or both, to pay any reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees and costs, incurred by another party as a result of bad faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay [*Lab. Code § 5813(a)*]. In addition, the WCAB, in its sole discretion, may order additional sanctions of up to $2,500 to be transmitted to the General Fund [*Lab. Code § 5813(a)*]. The determination of sanctions must be made after written application by the party seeking sanctions or on the WCAB's own motion [*Lab. Code § 5813(b)*].

For purposes of imposing sanctions, a "bad faith action or tactic" is one that results from a willful failure to comply with a statutory or regulatory obligation, or from a willful intent to disrupt or delay the WCAB's proceedings [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]. A "frivolous bad faith action or tactic" is one that is done for an improper motive or is indisputably without merit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]. Violations subject to the provisions of *Lab. Code § 5813* include, but are not limited to the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]:

- Failure to appear or appearing late at a conference or trial will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic solely intended to cause unnecessary delay if a reasonable excuse is not offered or the offending party has demonstrated a pattern of such conduct.

- Filing a pleading, petition, or legal document will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless there is some reasonable justification for filing the document.

- Failure to timely serve evidentiary documents, including but not limited to medical reports pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10608*, will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless that failure resulted from mistake, inadvertence, or excusable

neglect.

- Failing to comply with the WCAB's rules or an order of the WCAB, including a discovery order, will be deemed a bad faith action or tactic that is frivolous or solely intended to cause unnecessary delay unless the failure results from mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect.

[2] Imposition of Sanction

With regard to applications filed on or after January 1, 1994, the WCAB may order the payment of sanctions, as provided in *Lab. Code § 5813*, on its own motion or on the filing of a petition pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10450* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]. Before issuing such an order, the alleged offending party or attorney must be given notice and an opportunity to be heard [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]. The WCAB must not impose a monetary sanction pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5813* if the person subject to the sanction acted with reasonable justification or other circumstances make imposition of the sanction unjust [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*]. The limitation of liability specified by *Lab. Code § 3716.2* precludes imposition of a sanction against the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5813* for bad-faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or intended solely to cause unnecessary delay [*Duncan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 294, 300-304, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 664]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureSanctionsBaseless FilingsFrivolous LawsuitsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.195

§ 577.195 Correction of Errors

[1] Prior to Filing of Petition for Reconsideration

Before a petition for reconsideration (*discussed under § 577.212*) is filed, a WCJ may correct the decision for clerical, mathematical, or procedural error or amend the decision for good cause under the authority and subject to the limitations set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5803* (continuing jurisdiction of WCAB) and 5804 (prohibiting rescission, alteration, or amendment of award after five years from date of injury) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10858*].

[2] After Filing of Petition for Reconsideration

After a petition for reconsideration has been timely filed, a WCJ may, within 15 days following the date of filing of the petition for reconsideration, amend or modify the order, decision, or award, or rescind the order, decision, or award and conduct further proceedings. Further proceedings must be initiated within 30 days after the order of rescission. The time for filing a petition for reconsideration under *Lab. Code § 5903* runs from the filing of the new, amended, or modified decision [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10859*].

After the 15-day period following the filing of the petition for reconsideration has elapsed, a WCJ may not make any order in the case or correct any error until the WCAB has denied or dismissed the petition for reconsideration or issued an order after reconsideration [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10859*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
10. Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.196-577.209

[Reserved]

§§ 577.196[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
11. Reconsideration of Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.210

§ 577.210 Governing Law

Reconsideration is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 115* and *5900 et seq.* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
11. Reconsideration of Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.211

§ 577.211 Reconsideration on WCAB's Own Motion

The WCAB may, on its own motion, grant reconsideration of an order, decision, or award made by a WCJ and the accompanying report at any time within 60 days after they were filed [*Lab. Code § 5900(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
11. Reconsideration of Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.212

§ 577.212 Reconsideration on Petition of Aggrieved Person

[1] Time for Filing Petition

Any person aggrieved directly or indirectly by a final order, decision, or award of the WCAB or of a WCJ may, within 20 days after service of the order, decision, or award, petition the WCAB for reconsideration in respect to any matters determined or covered by the order, decision, or award [*Lab. Code §§ 5900(a), 5903*; *see Nestle Ice Cream Co. v. W.C.A.B. (Ryerson) (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1104, 1108-1111, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 340* (when WCJ, in response to employee's request, amended award by increasing awarded amounts of retroactive temporary disability payments and vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance, court of appeal held that employer's subsequent petition for reconsideration, timely filed as to amended award, but untimely as to original award, was timely filed, since WCJ's amended award effected substantial and material change in award and involved exercise of judicial function); *Scott v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 979, 984, 176 Cal. Rptr. 267* ; *Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 1, 3, 149 Cal. Rptr. 878* ; *§ 577.501*].

[2] Manner of Filing and Service

[a] Filing

A petition for reconsideration (*see § 577.501[1]*) from a final order, decision, or award must be filed at the WCAB district office from which the order, decision, or award issued. A petition for reconsideration from a final order, decision, or award issued by the WCAB at its main office in San Francisco must be filed at the San Francisco office [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840*].

Unless otherwise ordered by the WCAB, filing suspends the affected order, decision, or award with respect to the parties to the petition for a period of 10 days. The WCAB may, however, on terms and conditions that it orders, stay, suspend, or postpone the order, decision, or award during the pendency of the reconsideration [*Lab. Code § 5910*].

[b] Service

The petitioner must forthwith serve a copy of the petition on all adverse parties and on any other persons designated by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5905*]. The WCAB requires that copies of the petition be served on all parties to the case, on a lien claimant if the validity of the claimant's lien is specifically questioned by the petition, and on all parties to any case that has been consolidated with the case pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10850*]. Failure to file proof of this service constitutes a valid ground for dismissing the reconsideration petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10850*]. On a finding that the party to be served was subsequently served and was not prejudiced by the late service, however, the WCAB need not dismiss the petition for failure to have served it in a timely manner [*Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1054-1055, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343]* .

[3] Final Orders

An order, decision, or award of the WCAB or a WCJ is final for purposes of a petition for reconsideration if it determines any substantive right or liability of those involved in the case. To be final, an order need not resolve all issues or represent a final determination of benefits. The term does not include intermediate procedural orders or discovery orders, but it does include orders dismissing a party, rejecting an affirmative defense, granting commutation, terminating liability, and other orders affecting substantive issues [*Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1180, 260 Cal.Rptr. 76]* . In addition, whether or not an employer has provided workers' compensation coverage is a substantive issue and determines the forum for the dispute and the penalties to be imposed [*Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1180, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76* ; *see Lab. Code §§ 3706, 3715*; *see also § 577.13[4]*, and *[2], below*].

[4] Grounds

Reconsideration may only be sought on the following grounds [*Lab. Code § 5903*]:

- The WCJ or WCAB acted without or in excess of its powers;

- The order, decision, or award was procured by fraud [*see Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 287, 293 n.5, 148 Cal. Rptr. 325]* ;

- The findings of fact are not justified by the evidence [*see Gillette v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 312, 320-322, 97 Cal. Rptr. 542, 893]* ;

- The petitioner has discovered new material evidence that petitioner could not, with reasonable diligence, have discovered and produced at the hearing [*see Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 287, 292-293, 148 Cal. Rptr. 325* (evidence in question was not newly discovered)]; or

- The order, decision, or award is not supported by the findings of fact [*see Michon v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 917, 923-925, 93 Cal. Rptr. 476]* .

[5] Answer to Petition

Any adverse party may file a verified answer within 10 days after service of the petition [*Lab. Code § 5905*]. The answer must be filed with at the WCAB district office from which the order, decision, or award issued. An answer to a petition for reconsideration from a final order, decision, or award issued by the WCAB at its main office in San Francisco must be filed at the San Francisco office [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840*]. Copies of documents that have already been received in evidence or that have already been made part of the WCAB's legal file must not be attached as exhibits to an answer to a petition for reconsideration [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842*]. Documents attached in violation of this rule may be detached from the answer and discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842*].

[6] Supplemental Petitions

When a petition for reconsideration has been timely filed, supplemental petitions, pleadings, or responses other than the answer must be considered by the WCAB only if specifically requested or approved by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10848*]. Supplemental petitions, pleadings, or responses other than the answer, that are not requested or approved by the WCAB, are neither accepted nor deemed filed for any purpose, and are not acknowledged or returned to the filing party [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10848*].

[7] Referral to Workers' Compensation Judge

Petitions for reconsideration will be referred to the WCJ from whose decision relief is sought. The WCJ will prepare a report containing the information specified in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*, within 15 days after the petition was filed (unless the WCAB grants an extension) submit the report and the case file to the WCAB, and at the same time serve a copy of it on the parties and any lien claimant whose lien is specifically questioned by the petition for reconsideration [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10860*].

[8] Denial of Petition by Inaction

The petition is deemed denied by the WCAB unless it is acted on within 60 days from the date it was filed [*Lab. Code § 5909*].

[9] Action of WCAB on Filing of Petition or Granting Reconsideration

[a] In General

On the filing of a petition for reconsideration, or on the WCAB's decision to grant reconsideration on its own motion, the WCAB may, with or without further proceedings and with or without notice, affirm, rescind, alter, or amend the order, decision, or award on the basis of the evidence previously submitted in the case, or may grant reconsideration and direct the taking of additional evidence. Notice of the time and place of any hearing on reconsideration must be given to the petitioner and adverse parties and to other persons as the WCAB orders [*Lab. Code § 5906*].

[b] Without Further Hearing

If, at time it grants reconsideration, the WCAB determines that no sufficient reason exists for taking further testimony, the WCAB may affirm, rescind, alter, or amend the order, decision, or award and may, without further proceedings, notice, or hearing, enter its findings, order, decision, or award based on the record in the case [*Lab. Code § 5907*].

[c] After Hearing

After taking additional evidence and considering all the facts, the WCAB may affirm, rescind, alter, or amend the original order, decision, or award. An order, decision, or award made following reconsideration that affirms, rescinds, alters, or amends the original order, decision, or award must be made by the WCAB but does not affect any right or the enforcement of any right arising from or by virtue of the original order, decision, or award, unless the WCAB so orders [*Lab. Code § 5908(a)*].

If the WCAB rescinds or reduces an order, decision, or award on the grounds that it was procured by fraud [*see Lab. Code § 5903(b)*], the WCAB must, if the employer is insured, refer the case to the Bureau of Fraudulent Claims [*see Ins. Code § 1872 et seq.*], or, if the employer is self-insured, to the district attorney of the county in which the fraud occurred [*Lab. Code § 5908(b)*].

[d] Form and Content of Decision

Any decision of the WCAB granting or denying a petition for reconsideration or affirming, rescinding, altering, or amending the original findings, orders, decision, or award following reconsideration must [*Lab. Code § 5908.5*; *see Lab. Code § 115*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10340(a)-(c)*; *see also Painter v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 166 Cal. App. 3d 264, 268-271, 212 Cal. Rptr. 354* ; *City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 470, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463]* :

- be made by the WCAB and not by a WCJ,
- be in writing, signed by a majority of the WCAB members assigned to the case, and
- state the evidence relied on and specify in detail the reasons for the decision.

The purpose of *Lab. Code § 5908.5* is to apprise the parties of the grounds for the WCAB's decision, to assist the reviewing court to ascertain the principles relied on by the WCAB, to help the WCAB avoid careless or arbitrary action, and to make the right of appeal or of seeking review more meaningful [*Yavitch v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 64, 69, 190 Cal. Rptr. 793* ; *see Cal-Nat Airways, Inc. v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 268 Cal. App. 2d 93, 97, 73 Cal. Rptr. 815]* . For discussion of judicial review, see *§ 577.280* et seq.

[e] Referral for Proceedings on Reconsideration

If reconsideration is granted and the case referred to a WCJ for proceedings on reconsideration, the WCJ will, on conclusion of the proceedings, prepare and serve on the parties a summary of evidence received in the proceedings after reconsideration was granted [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10862*]. Unless otherwise instructed by the panel before which a case is pending, the WCJ may rule on requests for postponement or continuance of further hearing, join additional parties, dismiss unnecessary parties when not opposed by any other party to the case, make all interlocutory or procedural orders that are agreed to by all parties, issue subpoenas, rule on motions for discovery, rule on all evidentiary motions and objections, and make all other rulings necessary to expedite and facilitate the trial and disposition of the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10862*]. The WCJ may not, however, order a medical examination, obtain a recommended disability evaluation, make an order taking the case off calendar, or make an order approving or disapproving a compromise and release [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10862*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAnswersCivil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsComplaintsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentMotions to Alter & AmendWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
11. Reconsideration of Findings and Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.213-577.219

[Reserved]

§§ 577.213[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.220

§ 577.220 Governing Law

Supplemental proceedings are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803-5805* and by *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10450, 10455,* and *10462-10469*. Supplemental claims for new and further disability or rehabilitation benefits are governed by *Lab. Code § 5410* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10458* and *10470*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.221

§ 577.221 Continuing Jurisdiction of WCAB

The WCAB has continuing jurisdiction over all its orders, decisions, and awards under the workers' compensation law and the decisions and orders of the vocational rehabilitation unit established within the Office of Benefit Determination under *Lab. Code § 139.5*. At any time, after the the parties in interest are provided with notice and an opportunity to be heard, the WCAB may, for good cause shown, rescind, alter, or amend any order, decision, or award. This power includes the right to review, grant or regrant, diminish, increase, or terminate, within the limits prescribed by the workers' compensation law, any compensation awarded, on the grounds that the disability of the person in whose favor the award was made has recurred, increased, diminished, or terminated [*Lab. Code § 5803*; *see Bland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 324, 329, 90 Cal. Rptr. 431, 475 P.2d 663* ; *Draper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 502, 507, 195 Cal. Rptr. 248]* .

Any order, decision, or award rescinding, altering or amending a prior order, decision, or award has the same effect as an original order, decision, or award [*Lab. Code § 5805*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsJurisdictionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & Review

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.222

§ 577.222 Petition to Reopen

[1] Showing Good Cause

Petitions invoking the continuing jurisdiction of the WCAB must set forth specifically and in detail the facts relied on to establish good cause for reopening [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10455*]. A variety of factors and circumstances may constitute the requisite good cause. For example, good cause may be established by the following:

- Newly discovered evidence that could not have been produced at the original hearing and that indicates a more extensive disability than that recognized by the original findings;

- A subsequent clarification by a reviewing court of the applicable law that indicates that an employee was originally entitled to a different award than that given; or

- Any factor or circumstance unknown at the time the original award or order was made that renders the previous findings inequitable [*LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 241-242, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989]* .

Moreover, if an injured worker filed for and received a disability award that did not mention rehabilitation benefits because the worker did not initially seek them, a subsequent petition to reopen the award for the purpose of including them is, as a matter of law, supported by good cause [*Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 665, 672-673, 187 Cal. Rptr. 226]* .

[2] Scope of Reconsideration on Reopening

In a petition to reopen (*see § 577.502[1]*), an injured employee need not request any particular classification of compensation in order to vest the WCAB with jursidiction to reconsider the entire case [*Bland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 324, 331, 90 Cal. Rptr. 431, 475 P.2d 663]* . The WCAB does not have the power, however, to find that there was no employment after an award has been made that determined there was employment, if

the time to petition for rehearing or reconsideration or review of the award has expired or if the petition has been determined [*Lab. Code § 5804*].

Although *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804*, discussed *above*, refer to a petition and notice and opportunity to be heard, they do not direct that the petition be filed before the WCAB itself or that it take any particular form, and various documents filed with the Unit may be considered as petitions to reopen. Moreover, in view of the fact that in the area of rehabilitation benefits the Rehabilitation Unit of the Division of Workers' Compensation (formerly the Bureau of Rehabilitation) operates under the appellate supervision of the WCAB [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10014*, 10293], a rehabilitation request filed with the unit may be considered as a petition to reopen within the contemplation of *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804* [*Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 665, 671-672, 187 Cal. Rptr. 226]* . The court of appeal has held that the Rehabilitation Unit's granting of an employer's request to terminate liability for rehabilitation services had no effect on the Appeals Board's continuing jurisdiction to act on the employee's timely petition, filed with the Board, to reopen and reinstate vocational rehabilitation [*Martino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 485, 490, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 812]* .

[3] Time to File Petition and Counterpetition

A petition to reopen may be filed by a party in interest within five years from the date of injury. Any counterpetition seeking other relief and raisingissues in addition to those raised by the original petition may be filed by the adverse party within 30 days of the original petition [*Lab. Code § 5804*].

Neither *Lab. Code § 5804* nor *5410* (discussed under [4], *below*) defines "date of injury." The term is defined, however, in *Lab. Code § 5411* for injuries other than occpational disease or cumulative injury and in *Lab. Code § 5412* for occupational disease and cumulative injury cases (*see discussion under § 577.14[3][c]*). In cumulative injury and occupational disease cases, the *Lab. Code § 5412* definition of date of injury is to be used to determine the date of the injury under *Lab. Code §§ 5410* and *5804* [*Palmer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 1241, 1243, 1249, 237 Cal. Rptr. 800]* . Under *Lab. Code § 5412*, the date of injury is the date on which the employee first suffered disability and either knew or, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, should have known that the disability was caused by the employment.

[4] New or Further Disability

[a] WCAB's Jurisdiction Over Claims--Five-Year Statute of Limitations

Although *Lab. Code §§ 5803-5805*, discussed above appear on their face to confer continuing jurisdiction over all classes of supplemental claims, courts have held that supplemental claims for new and further disability and vocational rehabilitation benefits are governed by *Lab. Code § 5410*, not by *Lab. Code §§ 5803-5805* [*see J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 335, 335 n.12, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* .

Under *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803-5805*, once an employee files a claim for compensation against an employer for an injury, the WCAB's jurisdiction to award additional compensation arising out of the same injury (even if styled "new and further disability") from that employer is limited to five years from the date of injury [*see Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 300, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328* ; *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 335, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219]* . The five-year limitation period expresses a legislative concern for certainty and finality in the determination of compensation benefit obligations [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 299, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* .

Lab. Code § 5410 provides that nothing contained in *Lab. Code §§ 5400-5412* (*discussed under § 577.25*) bars the right of an injured worker to institute proceedings for the collection of compensation, (including vocational rehabilitation services for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990), within five years after the date of the injury if the

proceedings are based on specified grounds. For injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, these grounds are that the original injury has caused new andfurther disability or the need for vocational rehabilitation benefits [*Lab. Code § 5410* prior to amendment by Stats. 1989, ch. 892]. *Lab. Code 5410* does not extend the limitation provided in *Lab. Code § 5407* (*discussed under § 577.25[2][e]*) [*Lab. Code § 5410*].

The WCAB does not have jurisdiction to award temporary disability indemnity, for example, more than five years after the date of the original injury for new and further disability resulting from surgery related to the original injury, even when an award of further medical treatment has been made [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 293-294, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* . Thus, when an employee who had been awarded temporary and permanent disability indemnity and further medical treatment for an industrial injury petitioned to reopen the award more than nine years after the injury based on new and further temporary total disability resulting from surgery related to the injury, the California Supreme Court held that amendments to *Labor Code Section 4656* (providing for no maximum period for awarding temporary disability benefits resulting in period of total disability) did not give the WCAB jurisdiction to award temporary total disability indemnity for indefinite time periods for further surgical procedures to persons originally awarded further medical treatment [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 293-301, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* . As a result, the employee's petition was time-barred by *Labor Code Sections 5804* and *5410* [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 301-302, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* . However, the court of appeal has held that the Appeals Board had jurisdiction to order additional temporary disability benefits more than five years after the date of injury when the employee filed a timely petition to reopen and his new and further disability commenced within five years of the date of his injury. The court found that the employee's petition to reopen alleged a change in his condition and requested further temporary disability benefits, and it was not error for the WCJ to award temporary disability benefits commencing more than five years after the date of injury because there had been no need to award benefits earlier since the employer was making voluntary temporary disability payments until then [*Sarabi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 920, 925-928, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189]* .

[b] Invoking Jurisdiction

Jurisdiction of the WCAB under *Lab. Code § 5410* is invoked by a petition setting forth specifically and in detail the facts relied on to establish new and further disability. If no prior application for adjudication has been filed, jurisdiction is invoked by the filing of an original application for adjudication [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10458*].

[c] WCAB's Continued Jurisdiction to Enforce Previous Awards

Despite the five-year limitation on its continuing jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5804* and *5410*, the WCAB possesses inherent power, as in the case of any court, to *enforce* a previous order, decision, or award, independent of any limitations of time [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 297, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsJurisdictionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsTime LimitationsClaim PeriodsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesStatutes of Limitations

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.223

§ 577.223 Attorney's Fees

If any party institutes proceedings to reduce the amount of temporary or permanent disability awarded and is unsuccessful, the WCAB may make a finding as to the amount of a reasonable attorney's fee incurred by the applicant in resisting the proceeding and assess the same as costs on the party instituting the proceeding to reduce temporary or permanent disability benefits [*Lab. Code §§ 4651.3, 5410.1*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Partial DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.224

§ 577.224 Vocational Rehabilitation Appeals

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5, 4635-4647,* and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004 [*see § 577.45[2A]*].

In 2004, the legislature reenacted one of the statutes it had repealed in 2003, *Lab. Code § 139.5*, reinstating vocational rehabilitation. *However, the reenacted statute applies only to injuries occurring before January 1, 2004*, and it will remain in effect only until January 1, 2009, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, that is enacted before January 1, 2009, deletes or extends that date [*Lab. Code § 139.5(k), (l)*]. Various other vocational rehabilitation statutes, e.g., *Lab. Code §§ 4642, 4644(d), (e),* and *5405.5*, once cross-referred to in former *Lab. Code § 139.5* but repealed in 2003, are also cross-referred to in the reenacted *Lab. Code § 139.5* and are now identified with the designation "former." Thus, although the issue may be further clarified by administrative and judicial action, it now appears that the statutory law on vocational rehabilitation applicable to pre-2004 injuries is confined to *Lab. Code § 139.5*, those "former" statutes to which it cross-refers, and those statutes not repealed in 2003. For example, the 2002 amendment to former *Lab. Code § 4646*, which allowed settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation benefits, has not been reenacted, while *Lab. Code § 5100.6*, forbidding such settlements, was never repealed and, thus, remains in force. As a consequence of these legislative developments, at least some of the discussion in this subsection regarding vocational rehabilitation appeals applies only to pre-2004 injuries.

Appeals from decisions of the DWC's Rehabilitation Unit must be commenced as follows [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10293(a)*]:

1. If an application for adjudication is already on file, by filing and serving a declaration of readiness and a petition setting forth the reason for the appeal.

2. If no application for adjudication is on file, by filing and serving an application for adjudication, a

declaration of readiness, and a petition setting forth the reason for the appeal.

The party appealing the Rehabilitation Unit decision and the party opposing the appeal must file and serve any documents that the parties deem relevant that have not already been filed in the Rehabilitation Unit case file [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10293(b)*].

If an application for adjudication has not been previously filed, venue must be designated and determined in accordance with *Lab. Code § 5501.5* and *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10409. If an application for adjudication has been previously filed, the petition appealing a decision of the Rehabilitation Unit must be filed at the district office having venue, and the case number assigned to the application for adjudication will be assigned to the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10293(c)*].

A petition appealing a decision of the Rehabilitation Unit must be filed within 20 days from the date of the issuance of the Rehabilitation Unit decision *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10293(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsRehabilitation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.225

§ 577.225 Notice of Compensation Due; Appeal of Notice

When, as the result of an audit by the Administrative Director [*see Lab. Code § 129(a)*], it is determined that any compensation, interest, or penalty is due and unpaid to an employee or dependent, the director may initiate a process culminating in the issuance and service on the employer's claims administrator a Notice of Compensation Due detailing the amounts due and unpaid and ordering the amounts to be paid to the person entitled to them [*Lab. Code § 129(c)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10110*]. The issuance of the notice may be appealed by filing an Appeal of Notice of Compensation Due with the WCAB and serving a copy on the injured worker or dependent within 15 days of service of the notice [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10115*, 10291].

Failure to pay or appeal a Notice of Compensation Due within 15 days of receipt may subject the claims administrator to administrative penalty [*Lab. Code § 129.5(a)(1)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10111(c)(1)* (penalty related to injuries on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994), 10111.1(c)(1) (penalty related to injuries on or after January 1, 1994)]. If the claims administrator is a third-party administrator, it is jointly and severally liable with the subject of the audit (whether the employer or insurer) for any administrative penalty. Otherwise the claims administrator is solely liable [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10112*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
12. Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.226-577.239

[Reserved]

§§ 577.226[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.240

§ 577.240 Governing Law

Payment and assignment of claims for compensation or compensation awarded are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4900-4909.1* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10770-10772*. Payment of temporary and permanent disability is governed in *Lab. Code §§ 4650-4663*, payment of death benefits is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4700-4709*, payment of public official death benefits is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4720-4728*, and payment of subsequent injuries payments is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4751-4755*.

Special provisions relating to California Highway Patrol members and certain other state law enforcement personnel are set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 4800-4810* [*see Knopfer v. Flournoy (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 318, 319-322, 109 Cal. Rptr. 892]* , and special provisions relating to city police and firefighters, sheriffs, and other specified public safety personnel are set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 4850-4855*.

The issuance of certified copies of the findings and award, entry of judgment, stay of execution, and satisfaction of judgment are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5806-5809* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10820-10832*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsDeath BenefitsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Partial DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.241

§ 577.241 Preference of Compensation Claim

A claim for compensation, or any award or judgment entered on the claim, has the same preference over the other debts of the employer or the employer's estate and of the insurer that is given by law to wage claims [*Lab. Code § 4908*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1204* (preference for certain wage claims)]. The preference is for the entire amount of the compensation to be paid, but this does not impair the lien of any previous award [*Lab. Code § 4908*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Bankruptcy LawClaimsTypesUnsecured Priority ClaimsCommissions & WagesCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWage & Hour LawsWage PaymentsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.242

§ 577.242 Nonassignability of Claim or Compensation

Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 96* (assignment of claims or awards to Labor Commissioner), no claim for compensation is assignable before payment [*Lab. Code § 4900*]. Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 4900 et seq.* (payment and assignment of compensation and compensation claims), no claim for compensation or compensation awarded, adjudged, or paid is subject to being taken for the debts of the party entitled to it [*Lab. Code § 4901*]. Moreover, no compensation, whether awarded or voluntarily paid, shall be paid to any attorney at law or in fact or other agent, but shall be paid directly to the claimant entitled to it unless otherwise ordered by the WCAB. No payment made to any attorney at law or in fact or other agent in violation of the foregoing provision will be credited to the employer [*Lab. Code § 4902*; *see Knopfer v. Flournoy (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 318, 321-322, 109 Cal. Rptr. 892]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawSecured TransactionsThird Party RightsAssignmentsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.243

§ 577.243 Payment of Compensation

[1] Not Due or Pending Dispute

In the absence of an agreement to the contrary, no payment, allowance, or benefit received by an injured employee during the period of his or her incapacity, or by a deceased employee's dependents, which by the terms of the workers' compensation law was not then due and payable or while there was any dispute or question concerning the right to compensation, is an admission of liability for compensation on the part of the employer. Additionally, the acceptance of the payment, allowance, or benefit does not operate as a waiver of any right or claim that the employee or dependents have against the employer. The payment, allowance, or benefit, however, may be taken into account by the WCAB in fixing the amount of compensation to be paid [*Lab. Code § 4909*].

[2] Pursuant to Order

Payment of compensation in accordance with the order and direction of the WCAB discharges the employer for all claims for that compensation [*Lab. Code § 3603*].

[3] To Injured Minor

Compensation owed to an injured minor may be paid to the minor until his or her parent or guardian gives the employer or the employer's insurance carrier written notice that the parent or guardian claims it. Compensation paid to the injured minor prior to receipt of the written notice releases the employer and its carrier in full for the amount paid, and the minor cannot disaffirm the payment on appointment of a guardian or on coming of age [*Lab. Code § 3605*].

[4] Penalties for Delay or Nonpayment

[a] In General

As of June 1, 2004 [*Lab. Code § 5814(i)*], and applicable to all injuries, without regard to whether the injury occurs

before, on, or after that date [*Lab. Code § 5814(h)*], when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused, either prior to or subsequent to the issuance of an award, *the amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused* is to be increased by up to 25 percent or up to $10,000, whichever is less [*Lab. Code § 5814(a)*]. (Former *Lab. Code § 5814*, providing for a 10-percent penalty on "the full amount of the order, decision, or award," became inoperative on June 1, 2004, and, as of January 1, 2005, is repealed, unless a later-enacted statute, which becomes operative on or before January 1, 2005, deletes or extends the dates on which it becomes inoperative and is repealed [Former *Lab. Code § 5814(b)*].) In any proceeding under *Lab. Code § 5814*, the Appeals Board is to use its discretion to accomplish a fair balance and substantial justice between the parties [*Lab. Code § 5814(a)*; *see Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 223, 227, 230, 93 Cal. Rptr. 192, 481 P.2d 200* (only satisfactory excuse for delay as genuine doubt from medical or legal standpoint as to liability for benefits); *Jensen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 244, 247-249, 216 Cal. Rptr. 33* (same); *cf. Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1451, 1454-1457, 231 Cal. Rptr. 364* (distinguishing *Kerley*, rejecting *Jensen*, and holding 22-day delay based on misunderstanding of correct amount of compromise and release was not unreasonable); *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1209, 1217, 1219-1220, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 528* (disapproving *Jensen* to extent it suggests that inadvertent delay is *per se* unreasonable, and holding solitary instance of human error, which was quickly corrected upon discovery (i.e., within seven days), was not unreasonable in light of no evidence in record that SCIF had history of improperly processing claimant's benefit payments or that SCIF failed to provide sufficient number of adjusters to handle caseload or otherwise configured its office or business practices in such a way that errors were likely or probable); *County of San Luis Obispo v. W.C.A.B. (Barnes) (2001)92 Cal. App. 4th 869, 876-879, 112 Cal. Rptr.2d 246* (in determining reasonableness of delay, court should considertotality of circumstances, balancing fairness between parties, and here inadvertent delay held reasonable when employer had paid employee's medical benefits for 25 years, late quarterly penalty check was sent as soon as error was discovered, no timetable existed in agreement between employee and employer for quarterly penalty payments, employer had no history of late payments or of institutional neglect, employee did not notify employer that check had not arrived within usual time frame, and award of penalty (in excess of $40,000) would upset balance of fairness, constitute windfall to employee, and be out of proportion to employer's conduct (late payment in amount of $97.87))].

The court of appeal has held that the present version of *Lab. Code § 5814*, which became operative on June 1, 2004, applies to all injuries in cases pending on that date, including injuries that occurred prior to that date, when the court found that the legislature intended the new statute to apply retroactively, and that the language of Section 47 of SB 899, the bill that enacted the present version of *Lab. Code § 5814*, to the effect that "The amendment, addition, or repeal of any provision of law ... shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award" simply stated the rule that statutory changes do not apply to cases in which appeals have been exhausted and there is a final judgment, making Section 47 inapplicable to the present pending case, since the employee appealed the Appeals Board's decision, the appellate process had not yet been exhausted, and there was no final judgment [*Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1426* ; *see McCarthy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1230* (following *Green*)].

The Appeals Board en banc has held that the amount of a penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814(a)* is discretionary and should be determined upon consideration of various factors, including, but not necessarily limited to [Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, 1329-1330 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* :

1. Evidence of the amount of the payment delayed.

2. Evidence of the length of the delay.

3. Evidence of whether the delay was inadvertent and promptly corrected.

4. Evidence of whether there was a history of delayed payments or, instead, whether the delay was a solitary instance of human error.

5. Evidence of whether there was any statutory, regulatory, or other requirement (e.g., an order or a stipulation of the parties) providing that payment was to be made within a specified number of days.

6. Evidence of whether the delay was due to the realities of the business of processing claims for benefits or the legitimate needs of administering workers' compensation insurance.

7. Evidence of whether there was institutional neglect by the defendant, such as whether the defendant provided a sufficient number of adjusters to handle the workload, provided sufficient training to its staff, or otherwise configured its office or business practices in a way that made errors unlikely or improbable.

8. Evidence of whether the employee contributed to the delay by failing to promptly notify the defendant of it.

9. Evidence of the effect of the delay on the injured employee.

In the case before it, the Board found that the employee's claim for cumulative trauma injury to various body parts was settled by way of an order approving a compromise and release, pursuant to which the employer was to pay the employee $57,000, plus $3,000 as settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation services. The compromise and release provided that all penalty issues were waived if the employer made payment within 30 days. The employer was five days late in making its payments to the employee, whose attorney notified the employer of the late payments by multiple letters and requested penalties. The employer, without any penalty award, paid the employee penalties of $5,700 and $300. The WCJ found that no further penalties were owed for late payments but offered no explanation as to why he thought the penalties paid by the employer were appropriate penalty amounts under the "fair balance and substantial justice" test of *Lab. Code § 5814(a)*. The Board stated that the overriding consideration in determining what penalty amount to assess should be whether the penalty imposed would serve the purposes sought to be accomplished by *Lab. Code § 5814*, which are both penal (providing an incentive to employers and insurers to pay benefits promptly) and remedial (ameliorating economic hardship on the injured employee that results from delay in provision of benefits). The Board remanded the matter, instructing the WCJ to explain the reasons for his penalty determination [Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, 1328-1331 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* .

If a potential violation of *Lab. Code § 5814* is discovered by the employer before an employee claims a penalty under the statute, the employer, within 90 days of the date of the discovery, may pay a self-imposed penalty in the amount of 10 percent of the amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused, along with the amount of that payment [*Lab. Code § 5814(b)*]. This self-imposed penalty will be in lieu of the penalty in the amount of the lesser of 25 percent or $10,000 [*Lab. Code § 5814(b)*]. The court of appeal has held that the employer may avail itself of this provision, regardless of whether the employee discovered the potential violation of *Lab. Code § 5814* before the employer did, so long as the employee has not claimed a penalty before the employer discovers the potential violation, and the employer then timely pays the self-imposed penalty. Moreover, the court held that the provision's application is not limited to situations in which the employer learns of the potential violation through its own investigation rather than through an employee's or a third person's investigation [*New United Motors Manufacturing, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Gallegos) (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1538-1539, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 200]* .

Upon the approval of a compromise and release, findings and awards, or stipulations and orders by the Appeals Board, it will be conclusively presumed that any accrued claims for penalty have been resolved, regardless of whether a petition for penalty has been filed, unless the claim for penalty is expressly excluded by the terms of the order or award [*Lab. Code § 5814(c)*]. Upon the submission of any issue for determination at a regular trial hearing, it will be conclusively presumed that any accrued claim for penalty in connection with the benefit at issue has been resolved, regardless of whether a petition for penalty has been filed, unless the issue of penalty is also submitted or is expressly excluded in the statement of issues being submitted [*Lab. Code § 5814(c)*].

The payment of any increased award pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814(a)* will be reduced by any amount paid under *Lab. Code § 4650(d)* on the same unreasonably delayed or refused benefit payment [*Lab. Code § 5814(d)*].

No unreasonable delay in the provision of medical treatment will be found when the treatment has been authorized by the employer in a timely manner and the only dispute concerns payment of a billing submitted by a physician or medical provider as provided in *Lab. Code § 4603.2* [*Lab. Code § 5814(e)*].

Nothing in *Lab. Code § 5814* may be construed to create a civil cause of action [*Lab. Code § 5814(f)*].

No action may be brought to recover penalties that may be awarded under *Lab. Code § 5814* more than two years from the date the payment of compensation was due [*Lab. Code § 5814(g)*].

Any employer or insurer that knowingly violates *Lab. Code § 5814* with a frequency that indicates a general business practice is liable for administrative penalties not to exceed $400,000 [*Lab. Code § 5814.6(a)*]. These penalty payments are to be imposed by the Administrative Director, who may impose a penalty under either this statute or *Lab. Code § 129.5(e)* [*Lab. Code § 5814.6(a), (b)*].

For form of petition for penalties, see *§ 577.505[1]*.

[b] Purpose and Application of Penalty

The purpose of the penalty is to help the employee obtain promptly the cure or relief to which he or she is entitled and to compel the employer to provide it in timely fashion. The penalty has been applied to virtually all types of benefits, including temporary and permanent disability indemnity, interest on an award, and amounts awarded as reimbursement of medical-legal costs [*Adams v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 226, 229, 133 Cal. Rptr. 517, 555 P.2d 303]* . The penalty has even been applied when an employer unreasonably delayed the payment of industrial disability leave to which an injured state employee was entitled under *Gov. Code § 19869 et seq.* [*State of California v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 128, 146, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 606]* .

Lab. Code § 5814 is both a remedial and a penalty statute. The remedial aspect is to facilitate the injured employee's return to work as quickly as possible. The penal aspect is to compel the employer to comply with the law fully and promptly [*DuBois v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 382, 396, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523, 853 P.2d 978]* .

[c] Penalty Assessed Against Amount Unreasonably Delayed

The penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814* is assessed against "the amount of thepayment unreasonably delayed or refused" [*Lab. Code § 5814(a)*]. This marks a significant departure from the former rule that assessed thepenalty against "the full amount of the order, decision, or award" [former *Lab. Code § 5814(a)* [*Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1227-1228, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129, 848 P.2d 244* ; *Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 815, 826, 153 Cal. Rptr. 590, 591 P.2d 1242* ; *see Avalon Bay Foods v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1165, 1176-1177, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 552* (dictum that medical treatment transportation benefits were an element of overall medical treatment benefits)]. In computing the full amount of benefits awarded in a particular class, voluntary, timely preaward payments as well as all future awards were included [*Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1225-1227, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129, 848 P.2d 244* ; *Consani v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 12, 24-25, 277 Cal. Rptr. 619]* .

[d] Multiple Penalties

Between January 1, 2003, and June 1, 2004, *Lab. Code § 5814* provided that multiple penalties were not to be awarded

for repeated delays in making a series of payments due for the same type or specie of benefit unless there had been a legally significant event between the delay and the subsequent delay in payments of the same type or specie of benefits [former *Lab. Code § 5814(a)*]. No such language appears in the version of *Lab. Code § 5814* that became operative on June 1, 2004. Moreover, as discussed in [c], *above*, whereas the pre-June 1, 2004, version of the statute assessed the penalty against "the full amount of the order, decision, or award" [former *Lab. Code § 5814(a)*], the post-June 1, 2004, version assesses the penalty against only "the amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused" [*Lab. Code § 5814(a)*]. The extent to which these legislative changes have affected the jurisprudence developed by California courts and the Appeals Board on the issue of when multiple and successive penalties may be awarded remains to be seen. On the one hand, questions of type or specie of benefit have presumably become irrelevant, since penalties are now assessed against simply the amount of the payment unreasonably delayed or refused. On the other hand, when, for example, several disability payments are unreasonably delayed due to a single error on the paying party's part, the courts and the Appeals Board may still interpret the statute as requiring something akin to the pre-June 1, 2004, mandate for "a legally significant event between the delay and the subsequent delay in payments" before imposing multiple penalties. Indeed, such a reading of the current statute may find support in the statute's admonition to the Appeals Board to use, in proceedings pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814*, "its discretion to accomplish a fair balance and substantial justice between the parties" [*Lab. Code § 5814(a)*].

Prior to the January 1, 2003, introduction of the requirement of "a legally significant event between the delay and the subsequent delay" to justify imposition of multiple penalties, the law regarding multiple penalties hadbeen set forth in a series of cases. Pursuant to this case law, multiple penalties were permitted only when delay or nonpayment of benefits was attributable to separate and distinct acts [*Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 815, 824, 153 Cal. Rptr. 590, 591 P.2d 1242* ; *Christian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 505, 509, 936 P.2d 115* (reaffirming holding in *Gallamore* and concluding that employer's unreasonable termination of temporary disability benefits was a single act and did not become a separate and distinct act supporting additional penalties each time a benefit check should have been paid after the initial termination); *see § 577.504*, for discussion of notice required when seeking multiple penalties]. Similarly, when an employer or a carrier made one late benefit payment and failed to include interest in that payment, only a single penalty could be imposed under *Lab. Code § 5814* [*California Highway Patrol v. W.C.A.B. (Erebia) (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1201, 1206-1207, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118]* .

Since the preceding paragraphs were written, one court of appeal has held that agreed medical evaluator opinions and a stipulation may each result in liability under the new *Lab. Code § 5814* and may each qualify as a separate, legally significant event, and that the legislature did not eliminate multiple increases in compensation for conduct occurring either before or after the award, as long as the events were "separate and distinct" under *Christian*. The court of appeal remanded to the Appeals Board for determination of whether compensation owed pursuant to the opinions of the agreed medical evaluators and compensation owed pursuant to a stipulation were unreasonably delayed under the new *Lab. Code § 5814* [*Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1426, 1443-1445, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527]* .

The Appeals Board en banc held that, although, under *Lab. Code § 5814(a)*, a successive penalty may be awarded for an unreasonable delay in making a prior penalty payment, it should not be awarded when the employer had genuine doubt as to its liability or when there has been no legally significant intervening event. The Board found that, in the case before it, a significant possibility existed that, when the employer made penalty payments of $5,700 and $300, i.e., 10 percent of $57,000 and $3,000, respectively (the two payments it had agreed to make via compromise and release, and which it was five days late in making), it could have had genuine doubt from a legal standpoint regarding its liability for more than it paid, since there had been no order or award directing it to pay more than 10 percent. Indeed, there had been no order or award directing it to pay any penalty at all. Remanding the matter, the Board instructed the WCJ to decide whether a successive penalty would be justified [Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, 1331-1332 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)]* .

Lab. Code § 5814 makes no provision for any deductions or credits for payments made by the employer, including a

deduction or credit for the employer's timely preaward payments [*Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1225-1227, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129, 848 P.2d 244]* .

[e] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

The Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund (UEBTF) is exempt from payment of the penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814* by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3716.2*, which provides that the UEBTF is not liable for any penalties, including penalties for its own unreasonable delay in paying benefits to an injured employee with whom it has stipulated to pay benefits [*DuBois v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 382, 398-399, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523, 853 P.2d 978]* .

If payment of compensation was unreasonably delayed or refused prior to the issuance of an award, and the Administrative Director has provided discretionarycompensation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4903.3* (payment from Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund), the WCAB will award the Administrative Director a penalty to be paid by the employer in the amount of 10 percent of the compensation provided by the director. This penalty is in addition to the penalty imposed by *Lab. Code § 5814* [*Lab. Code § 5814.1*].

[f] Self-Insured Employers

When an employer that has secured the payment of compensation pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3700(c)* (self-insured public entity) unreasonably delays or refuses payment of compensation subsequent to the issuance of an award, the WCAB will, in addition to increasing the order, decision or award pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814*, award reasonable attorney's fees incurred in enforcing payment of the compensation awarded [*Lab. Code § 5814.5*].

A self-insured employer's excess coverage policy provision that excluded indemnification for "payments made by the Insured in excess of benefits regularly required by the Workers Compensation Law if such excess payments are required because ... the Insured violated or failed to comply with any Workers Compensation Law" applied to exclude indemnification for *Lab. Code § 5814* penalties paid by the employer [*General Reinsurance Corp. v. St. Jude Hospital (Ballard) (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1097, 1103-1108, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
EvidenceHearsayExemptionsStatements by Party OpponentsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsExemptions & WaiversWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.244

§ 577.244 Commutation of Compensation to Lump Sum

The WCAB may, when it makes its award or at any time thereafter, on its own motion on notice, or on noticed application of either party [*see § 577.503*], commute the compensation payable to a lump sum and order it to be paid forthwith or at some future time if [*Lab. Code § 5100*]:

- The commutation is necessary for the protection of the person entitled to it, or for the best interest of the applicant;
- The commutation will avoid inequity and will not cause undue expense or hardship to the applicant;
- The employer has sold or otherwise disposed of the greater part of his or her assets or is about to do so; or
- The employer is not a resident of California.

The procedure to be followed is set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5101-5106*. This does not apply, however, to compensation payable from the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund under *Lab. Code § 4751* [*Lab. Code § 5100.5*] or prospective compensation, indemnity payments, or other benefits to which the employee is entitled under the rehabilitation provisions [*Lab. Code § 5100.6*].

In determining what is in the best interest of the applicant, the WCAB will consider the applicant's general financial condition, including withoutlimitation the applicant's ability to live without periodic indemnity payments and to discharge debts incurred prior to the date of injury [*Lab. Code § 5100(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Workers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.245

§ 577.245 Enforcement of Awards

On the request of a complaining party, the WCAB may issue an order to show cause directing the employer or insurance carrier to appear and show cause why the WCAB's order, decision, or award has not been complied with [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10832* (repealed October 21, 1996, and inoperative November 1, 1996, per 1996 revisions to regulations); *see Betancourt v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1971) 16 Cal. App. 3d 408, 410-413, 94 Cal. Rptr. 9* (mandate as proper remedy to compel issuance of order)]. Despite the five-year limitation on its continuing jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5804* and *5410*, the WCAB possesses inherent power, as in the case of any court, to enforce a previous order, decision, or award, independent of any limitations of time [*Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 297, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.246

§ 577.246 Execution

[1] Certified Copy of Award and Entry of Judgment

Certified copies of findings and awards or other final orders may be issued by the WCAB for the purpose of having judgment entered and execution issued by the clerk of the superior court. A certified copy will be issued, however, only on written request of a person entitled to benefits under the award or by his or her attorney or authorized representative and payment of the fee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*]. Any party affected thereby may file a certified copy of the findings and order, decision, or award of the WCAB with the clerk of the superior court of any county, who must immediately issue judgment in conformity therewith. The words "any party affected thereby" include the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund, which is entitled to have judgment entered not only against the uninsured employer but also against any person who is a parent or substantial shareholder of the employer [*Lab. Code § 5806*]. For procedure and forms for use in executing on a judgment, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.40* et seq.

[2] Stay of Execution

The WCAB or any of its members may for good cause stay execution of a judgment entered on an order, decision, or award and may impose terms and conditions on the stay [*Lab. Code § 5808*]. A certified copy of the order is then filed with the clerk entering judgment. If a certified copy of the order, decision, or award and findings has not been issued, the WCAB or any of its members may order the certified copy to be withheld with the same forceand under the sameconditions as it might issue a stay of execution had the certified copy been issued and judgment entered on it [*Lab. Code § 5808*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10825*].

Before staying execution or issuing an order withholding issuance of a certified copy of an order, decision, or award, the WCAB in its discretion may require the filing of a bond from an approved surety equivalent to twice the probable amount of liability in the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10825(a)*]. For discussion and forms of bonds, see *Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq.

[3] Liens Created by Recording Judgment

Liens on real property arising from lump-sum money judgments entered pursuant to the workers' compensation law are created by recording an abstract of the judgment as provided in *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.310* or, if the money judgment is for payment in installments, by recording a certified copy of the judgment as provided by *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.320*. Except as provided in the workers' compensation law, these liens are governed by the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 697.310* (lump-sum judgments) and 697.320 (installment judgments) [*Code Civ. Proc. § 697.330(a)*]. For discussion of those provisions, see *Ch. 318, Judgments, § 318.90* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsEnforcement & ExecutionWrits of ExecutionCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays of ProceedingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.247

§ 577.247 Satisfaction of Judgment

When a judgment is satisfied in fact, other than on an execution, the WCAB may, on motion of either party or on its own motion, order the entry of satisfaction of the judgment. The clerk will enter satisfaction of judgment only on the filing of a certified copy of the WCAB's order [*Lab. Code § 5809*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentDischarge, Release & SatisfactionCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
13. Payment, Commutation, and Enforcement of Awards

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.248-577.259

[Reserved]

§§ 577.248[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.260

§ 577.260 Governing Law

Liens against compensation are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 4903-4909.1* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10770-10772*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsEnforcement

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.261

§ 577.261 Kinds of Liens Allowed and Reimbursement

[1] In General

The WCAB must determine and allow as a first lien against any sum to be paid as compensation the amount of compensation, including the cost of medical treatment, provided by the Director of Industrial Relations from the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4903.3* [*Lab. Code § 4903.3*]. If more than one lien is allowed, the WCAB may determine the priorities, if any, between them [*Lab. Code § 4903*].

The following liens against compensation may be determined and allowed by the WCAB:

(1) A reasonable attorney's fee for legal services pertaining to a workers' compensation claim before the WCAB or any of the appellate courts, and reasonable disbursements in connection therewith, but no fee for legal services may be awarded to a representative who is not an attorney licensed by the California State Bar, except with respect to claims for which an application under *Lab. Code § 5501* was filed on or before December 31, 1991, or for which a disclosure form under *Lab. Code § 4906* was sent to the employer, or insurer or third-party administrator if either is known, on or before December 31, 1991 [*Lab. Code § 4903(a)*; *see also Lab. Code § 4906*; *Longval v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 792, 799-803* (*Lab. Code § 4903(a)*, allowing attorney's fees only to attorneys licensed in California, held constitutional)];

(2) The reasonable expense of required medical treatment for the injury and, to the extent the employee is entitled to reimbursement under *Lab. Code § 4621*, medical-legal expenses as provided in *Lab. Code §§ 4620-4628* [*Lab. Code § 4903(b)*; *see also Lab. Code §§ 4903.4* (resolution of disputes regarding liens by arbitration), 4906(a); *Zenith Ins. Co. v. W.C.A.B. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 373, 376-377, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 380* (Appeals Board's awards to lien claimants, outpatient medical treatment centers, were not supported by substantial evidence, because lien claimants, in order to establish their right to reimbursement, bore initial burden of proving they were properly licensed or accredited, and they had

not carried this burden)];

(3) The reasonable value of the employee's or dependents' living expenses subsequent to the injury [*Lab. Code § 4903(c)*; *see Prudential Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 776, 780, 151 Cal. Rptr. 537, 588 P.2d 239* (purpose of this lien is to protect persons who advance credit or loan money to dependents for necessary living expenses)];

(4) The deceased employee's reasonable burial expenses not to exceed the amount specified in *Lab. Code § 4701* (liability of employer for burial expenses and death benefits) [*Lab. Code § 4903(d)*];

(5) The reasonable living expenses of the injured employee's spouse, minor children, or both subsequent to the date of injury, if the employee hasdeserted or is neglecting his or her family [*Lab. Code § 4903(e)*];

(6) Unemployment compensation disability benefits paid under or pursuant to the Unemployment Insurance Code in those cases when, pending a determination under the workers' compensation law, there was uncertainty whether such benefits were payable under the workers' compensation law or the Unemployment Insurance Code [*Lab. Code § 4903(f)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 3865, 4903.2* (attorney's fees), *4904* (determination of amount of lien, effect ofdetermination, payment); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10772*; *California-Western States Life Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 257, 262-266, 28 Cal. Rptr. 872, 379 P.2d 328]* ;

(7) Unemployment compensation benefits and extended duration benefits paid to the injured employee for the same day or days for which he or she received, or was entitled to receive, temporary total disability indemnity payments [*Lab. Code § 4903(g)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 3865, 4903.2* (attorney's fees), *4904* (determination of amount of lien, effect of determination, payment); *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10772*; *California-Western States Life Ins. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 257, 262-266, 28 Cal. Rptr. 872, 379 P.2d 328]* ;

(8) The amount of family temporary disability insurance benefits paid to the injured employee pursuant to the Unemployment Insurance Code for the same days for which the employee is entitled to receive temporary total disability benefits, as this lien is allowed by *Lab. Code § 4904(b)(3)* [*Lab. Code § 4903(h)*];

(9) The amount of indemnification granted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 13950 et seq.* (victims of crime) [*Lab. Code § 4903(i)*]; and

(10) The amount of compensation, including expenses of medical treatment, and recoverable costs paid by the Asbestos Workers' Account pursuant to the provisions of *Lab. Code § 4401 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 4903(j)*].

For notice and request for allowance of lien form, see *§ 577.480*. See also *§§ 577.481[1], 577.482[1]* for forms used when liens are reduced or settled.

[2] Asbestos Workers

With respect to asbestos workers, it should be noted that the provisions of *Lab. Code §§ 4401-4418* that provide for the payment of workers' compensation asbestos workers' benefits from the Asbestos Workers Account were repealed by their own terms on January 1, 1989. As of that date, all payments from the fund were terminated and the state had no further obligation to pay asbestos workers' benefits. The authority of the Asbestos Workers' Account under *Lab. Code*

§§ 4401-4418 to recover the benefits and costs paid to asbestos workers prior to January 1, 1989, however, continue until the benefits and costs have been recovered [*Lab. Code § 4418*]. Therefore, the WCAB apparently may still determine and allow a lien filed by the Asbestos Workers' Account to recover moneys expended for compensation benefits [*see Lab. Code § 4414* (filing of lien by Account)].

[3] Reimbursement for Benefits or Services Provided in Award or Approval of Compromise and Release Agreement

Before issuing an award or approval of any compromise of claim, the WCAB, arbitrator, or settlement conference referee must determine, on thebasis of the liens filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4903.1(b)* or discussed under *(c)*, [*§ 577.262*], whether any benefits have been paid or services provided by a health care provider, a health care service plan, a group disability policy, including a loss of income policy, a self-insured employee welfare benefit plan, or a hospital service contract, and its award or approval must provide for reimbursement for benefits paid or services provided under such plans as set forth in *Lab. Code § 4903.1(a)(1)-(4)* [*Lab. Code § 4903.1(a)*].

When a Medi-Cal lien filed by the Department of Human Services is settled as part of a compromise and release agreement, recovery on the lien is limited to an amount derived from applying *Welf. & Inst. Code § 14124.72*, *14124.76*, or *14124.78*, whichever is less [*Welf. & Inst. Code § 14124.785*]. However, when the Medi-Cal lien is not included in the compromise and release, it may, like any other successfully litigated lien in this situation, be recovered in its full amount [*Boehm & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 137, 150152, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396* (medical provider in this situation who has received payment under Medi-Cal is entitled to file lien for services but may recover on lien only after reimbursing any fees paid by Medi-Cal)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementContracts LawSecured TransactionsPerfection & PriorityPriorityLiensWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized Treatment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.262

§ 577.262 Procedure for Claiming

Unless the lien claimant is excepted by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)* [*see § 577.106[2]*], any lien claimant under *Lab. Code § 4903* or *4903.1* [*see* [1], [2], *above*] must file its lien in writing using an optical character recognition (OCR) lien form approved by the Appeals Board or electronically as approved by the Administrative Director or the Court Administrator [*see § 577.480[1]*]. Lien claimants excepted by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)* [*see § 577.106[2]*] may file a lien using a non-optical character recognition form, provided that it is in the same format and contains the same information as the corresponding OCR form approved by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(a)*].

All lien claims filed must be accompanied by (1) a full statement or itemized voucher supporting the lien and justifying the right to reimbursement; and (2) a proof of service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(b)*].

All liens, along with the full statement or itemized voucher supporting the lien, must be concurrently served as follows [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(c)*]:

1. The injured worker (or, if deceased, the worker's dependent(s)) must be served, unless (A) the worker or dependent is represented by an attorney or other agent of record, in which event service may be made solely on the attorney or agent of record; or (B) the underlying case of the worker or dependent(s) has been resolved. For purposes of this rule, the underlying case will be deemed to have been resolved if any of the following has occurred:

i. In a stipulated findings and award or in a compromise and release agreement, a defendant has agreed to hold the worker or dependent(s) harmless from the specific lien claim being filed and has agreed to pay, adjust, or litigate that lien.

ii. A defendant had written notice of the lien in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4904(a)* before the lien was filed and, in a stipulated findings and award or in a compromise and

release agreement, that defendant has agreed to hold the worker or dependent harmless from all lien claims and has agreed to pay, adjust, or litigate all liens.

iii. The application for adjudication of claim filed by the worker or the dependent(s) has been dismissed, and the lien claimant is filing or has filed a new application.

iv. The worker or the dependent(s) choose(s) not to proceed with his, her, or their case.

2. Any employer(s) or insurance carrier(s) that are parties to the case must be served, unless the employer(s) or insurance carrier(s) is/are represented by an attorney or other agent of record, in which event service may be made solely upon the attorney(s) or other agent(s) of record.

Service of a lien on a party constitutes notice to it of the existence of the lien.

The Appeals Board will not accept for filing a lien that does not bear an adjudication case number previously assigned by the Board for the injury, unless the lien claimant is also filing an initial (case opening) application in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(d)*].

The lien claimant must provide the name, mailing address, and daytime telephone number of a person who will be available at the time of all conferences and trials, and who will have authority to resolve the lien on behalf of the lien claimant [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(e)*].

After a lien has been filed, the lien claimant must file any amendments to the lien, together with a full statement or itemized voucher supporting the amendment, and serve the amended lien in accordance with the service provisions set forth above. When filing an amended lien, the lien claimant must indicate on the box set forth on the lien form that it is an "amended" lien. For purposes of this rule, an "amended" lien includes (1) a lien that is for or includes additional services or charges for the same injured employee for the same date or dates of injury; (2) a lien that reflects a change in the amount of the lien based on payments made by the defendant; or (3) a lien that has been corrected for clerical or mathematical error. A subsequent lien claim that adds an additional adjudication case number or numbers is an "amended" lien with respect to the adjudication case number(s) originally listed [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(f)*].

Within five business days after a lien has been resolved or withdrawn, the lien claimant must notify the Appeals Board, the party defendant(s), and the worker or dependent(s) (except as provided in subsection (c), discussed above) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(g)*].

The lien claimant must be notified by the Appeals Board when any hearing is scheduled, whether or not the hearing directly involves the lien [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(h)*].

Inclusion of the injured employee's Social Security number on a lien form is voluntary, not mandatory. A failure to provide a Social Security number will not have any adverse consequences. Nevertheless, although a lien claimant is not required by law to include the employee's social security number, lien claimants are encouraged to do so because this will facilitate the processing and filing of the lien claim. Social security numbers are used solely for identification and verification purposes in order to administer the workers' compensation system. A social security number will not be disclosed, made available, or otherwise used for purposes other than those specified, except with the consent of the employee, or as permitted or required by statute, regulation, or judicial order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(i)*].

In 2003 the legislature enacted, and in 2004 amended, *Lab. Code § 4903.05*, establishing a filing fee of $100 for medical liens. Liens filed by the Veterans Administration, the Medi-Cal program, and public hospitals were excepted from the requirement [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 639, § 33; Stats. 2004, ch. 34, § 39]. Effective July 1, 2006, however, the legislature repealed *Lab. Code § 4903.05*, thereby abolishing the filing fee [*see* Stats. 2006, ch. 69, § 25]. According to

the Division of Workers' Compensation, the intent of requiring a filing fee was to share costs of the workers' compensation system, which was otherwise funded entirely by employers, and to stop medical providers from filing unnecessary liens when reimbursement for their services was not in doubt. However, the cost of filing the liens was being passed through to employers, and the number of liens filed did not decrease. At the same time, the DWC had to process the liens and related filing fees, which did not positively impact the system or the settling of claims, but instead created a process that was inefficient and took DWC staff away from other duties. It is assumed that the regulation promulgated pursuant to former *Lab. Code § 4903.05* will be repealed or amended [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250*].

In an apparent attempt to address some of the problems that gave rise to the now-being-repealed *Lab. Code § 4903.05*, the legislature enacted *Lab. Code § 4903.6*, effective July 1, 2006. This statute provides that, except as necessary to satisfy the statute of limitations governing the filing of liens for medical treatment expenses and medical-legal expenses [*see Lab. Code § 4903.5*], no such lien claim or application for adjudication may be filed until the expiration of one of the following [*Lab. Code § 4903.6(a)*; *see Lab. Code § 4903(b)* (authorizing payment of liens for medical treatment expenses and medical-legal expenses)]:

- Sixty days after the date of acceptance or rejection of liability for the claim, or expiration of the time provided for investigation of liability pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5402(b)*, whichever date is earlier.

- The time provided for payment of medical treatment bills pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4603.2*.

- The time provided for payment of medical-legal expenses pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4622*.

No declaration of readiness to proceed may be filed for a medical expenses lien or a medical-legal expenses lien until the underlying case has been resolved or when the employee chooses not to proceed with his or her case [*Lab. Code § 4903.6(b)*].

The Appeals Board is required to adopt reasonable regulations to ensure compliance with *Lab. Code § 4903.6*, and it is instructed to take any further steps that may be necessary to enforce the regulations, including, but not limited to, impositions of sanctions pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5813* [*Lab. Code § 4903.6(c)*].

The prohibitions of *Lab. Code § 4903.6* do not apply to lien claims, applications for adjudication, or declarations of readiness to proceed filed by or on behalf of the employee, or to the filings by or on behalf of the employer [*Lab. Code § 4903.6(d)*].

In 2002, the legislature enacted a statute of limitations governing the filing of lien claims [*see* Stats. 2002, ch. 6, § 70].

Effective January 1, 2003, no lien claim for expenses as provided in *Lab. Code § 4903(b)* may be filed after whichever is the latest date among the following [*Lab. Code § 4903.5(a)*]:

- Six months from the date on which the Appeals Board or a workers' compensation administrative law judge issues a final decision, findings, order (including an order approving compromise and release), or award, on the merits of the claim.

- Five years from the date of the injury for which the services were provided.

- One year from the date the services were provided.

Notwithstanding these time limits, any health care provider, health care service plan, group disability insurer, employee benefit plan, or other entity providing medical benefits on a nonindustrial basis, may file a lien claim for expenses as provided in *Lab. Code § 4903(b)* within six months after the person or entity first has knowledge that an industrial

injury is being claimed [*Lab. Code § 4903.5(b)*].

The injured worker is not liable for any underlying obligation if a lien claim hasnot been filed and served within the allowable period. Except when the lien claimant is the applicant as provided in *Lab. Code § 5501*, a lien claimant may not file a declaration of readiness to proceed in any case until the case-in-chief has been resolved [*Lab. Code § 4903.5(c)*].

This section does not apply to civil actions brought under the Cartwright Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, Div. 7, Part 2, Ch. 2), the Unfair Practices Act (Bus. & Prof. Code, Div. 7, Part 2, Ch. 4), or the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organization Act (18 U.S.C. Ch. 96) based on concerted action with other insurers that are not parties to the case in which the lien or claim is filed [*Lab. Code § 4903.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementContracts LawSecured TransactionsPerfection & PriorityPriorityLiensWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized Treatment

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.263

§ 577.263 Notice of Lien

[1] In General

If written notice is given to the insurer or uninsured employer of the nature and extent of any claim that is allowable as a lien, the claim is a lien against any amount thereafter payable as compensation, subject to the determination of the amount and approval of the lien by the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 4904*].

[2] Employment Development Department Liens

If the Employment Development Department (EDD) serves an insurer or employer with a lien claim, the insurer or employer must provide the EDD with written notice of commencing disability indemnity payments. The notice must be provided as soon as possible, but in no event later than 15 working days after the payments commence. Further, the insurer or employer must notify the EDD, in writing, within 10 working days of filing with the WCAB an application for adjudication, a stipulated award, or a compromise and release [*Lab. Code § 4904*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.264

§ 577.264 Amendment

After a lien has been filed, the lien claimant must continue to serve amendments to it on the parties. Amendments must be filed only upon the filing of a declaration of readiness, compromise and release, or stipulations with request for award or order, or upon receipt of a notice of hearing. An amendment to a lien filed at any other time, and any attachments to such an amendment, will not be filed and may be discarded by the WCAB. If a lien has been filed electronically, upon the filing of a declaration of readiness, compromise and release, or stipulations with request for award or order, or upon receipt of a notice of hearing, the lien claimant must file a full statement or itemized voucher supporting the lien unless the lien claimant advises in writing, or electronically, that the lien has been resolved or withdrawn [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePleading & PracticePleadingsAmended PleadingsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.265

§ 577.265 Payment of Lien

The WCAB may order the amount of any lien claim, as determined and allowed by it, to be paid directly to the person entitled, either in a lump sum or in installments [*Lab. Code § 4904*]. The payment of liens does not affect the commencement of immediate payments on any balance of the award to the injured claimant when an installment payment for his or her disability has been determined [*Lab. Code § 4904.1*].

[1] Order to Pay Claim When No Lien Requested

When it appears that a lien should be allowed, had it been duly requested by the party entitled to it, the WCAB may, without any request for the lien having been made, order the payment of the claim to be made directly to the person entitled, in the same manner and with the same effect as though the lien had been regularly requested. The award constitutes a lien against unpaid compensation due at the time the award is served [*Lab. Code § 4905*].

[2] Compromise and Release Agreements

The WCAB may approve a compromise and release agreement on all other issues and may defer to subsequent proceedings determination ofa lien claimant's entitlement to reimbursement if the defendant agrees to pay the amount subsequently determined to be due under the lien claim [*Lab. Code § 4904*]. For discussion and forms concerning compromise and release generally, see *§ 577.130* et seq. and §§ 477.460 -*577.462*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesJudgment LiensEnforcementWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAwardsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling Requirements

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
14. Liens Against Compensation

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.266-577.279

[Reserved]

§§ 577.266[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.280

§ 577.280 Governing Law

Judicial review of the WCAB's orders, rules, decisions, and awards is governed by *Lab. Code §§ 5950-5956* and *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495*. Insofar as they are appropriate, the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure relating to writs of review (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1110*) apply [*Lab. Code § 5954*]. For a discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1110*, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.281

§ 577.281 Manner of Review and Jurisdiction

Judicial review is by writ of review [*see Lab. Code §§ 5810, 5950, 5952*]. Jurisdiction to issue such writs is in the California Supreme Court and courts of appeal [*Lab. Code § 5955*; *see Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*; *Lab. Code §§ 5910, 5950*]. No new or additional evidence can be introduced on such review and the cause must be heard on the WCAB's certified record [*Lab. Code § 5951*].

A superior court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over an action to declare provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act invalid and to enjoin the WCAB from enforcing those provisions [*Lab. Code § 5955*; *Greener v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1028, 1034, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539, 863 P.2d 784]* . Only the Courts of Appeal and the Supreme Court have jurisdiction to entertain challenges to the constitutional validity of provisions of the workers' compensation law [*Greener v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1028, 1046, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539, 863 P.2d 784]* . Similarly, the superior court has no jurisdiction to review Appeals Board decisions, invoked pursuant to *Gov. Code § 21166*, to determine the industrial nature of the disability of a public safety employee who is a member of the Public Employees Retirement System. Rather, appeals of such decisions must be taken to the court of appeal or the Supreme Court, as in workers' compensation cases generally [*Abraham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1087-1089, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 820]* . A party who is aggrieved by an order of the WCAB applying the workers' compensation law to that party may seek relief by filing a petition forreview of the WCAB's order with the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court, or by filing a petition for a writ of mandate with the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court if the criteria for extraordinary relief under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* are satisfied [*Greener v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 6 Cal. 4th 1028, 1046, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 539, 863 P.2d 784]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.282

§ 577.282 Scope of Review

Judicial review is limited to determining whether [*Lab. Code § 5952*; *see Braewood Convalescent Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 159, 164, 193 Cal. Rptr. 157, 666 P.2d 14]* :

- The WCAB acted without or in excess of its powers;
- The order, decision, or award was procured by fraud;
- The order, decision, or award was unreasonable;
- The order, decision, or award was not supported by substantial evidence; or
- The findings of fact, if any, support the order, decision, or award.

In making these determinations, the court may not hold a trial de novo, take evidence, or exercise its independent judgment on the evidence [*Lab. Code § 5952*].

The WCAB's findings and conclusions on questions of fact are conclusive and final and are not subject to review so long as, based on the entire record, the are supported by substantial evidence. Questions of fact include ultimate facts and the findings and conclusions of the WCAB [*Lab. Code § 5953*]. However, the reviewing court is not bound to accept the WCAB's findings if the findings are unreasonable [*Rouseyrol v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1476, 1483, 286 Cal. Rptr. 250]* . Moreover, a reviewing court is not bound by the WCAB's conclusions on questions of law. When a compensation award is based on an erroneous interpretation of law, it will be annulled by the reviewing court [*Save Mart Stores v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 720, 723, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 597]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.283

§ 577.283 Who May Apply for Writ

Any person affected by an order, decision, or award of the WCAB may apply to the Supreme Court or to the court of appeal for the appellate district in which he or she resides for a writ of review to inquire into and determine the lawfulness of the original order, decision, or award or of the order, decision, or award following reconsideration [*Lab. Code § 5950*]. As a matter of practice, applications for a writ of review are filed in the courts of appeal rather than in the Supreme Court.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingPersonal StakeCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.284

§ 577.284 Time to Apply for Writ

The application for a writ of review must be made within 45 days after a petition for reconsideration was denied, or, if the petition for reconsideration was granted or reconsideration was had on the appeal board's own motion, within 45 days after the filing of the order, decision, or award following reconsideration [*Lab. Code § 5950*; *see Lab. Code § 5901*; *Nelson & Sloan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 51, 53-55, 144 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . This 45-day time limitation is jurisdictional, and is not extended by 5 days pursuant to the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013(a)* when service of the WCAB's decision on reconsideration is made by mail [*Camper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 679, 684-688, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 101, 836 P.2d 888* ; *Malloy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1660-1662, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820* ; *Southwest Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1421, 1423-1431, 286 Cal. Rptr. 347]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.285

§ 577.285 Manner of Applying

An application for a writ of review is made on the verified petition of the party beneficially interested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *see also § 577.510[1]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.286

§ 577.286 Proof of Service

The petition must be accompanied by proof of service of two copies on the WCAB and of one copy on each party who entered an appearance in the proceeding before the WCAB in San Francisco and whose interest is adverse to the party filing the petition. Service on the WCAB's local district office is not required [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)(3)*; *see also Lab. Code § 5954, discussed under § 577.292*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.287

§ 577.287 Stay of Order, Rule, Decision, or Award

The filing of a petition, or the pendency of a review proceeding, does not automatically stay or suspend operation of the WCAB's order, rule, decision, or award, but the court may, on the giving of an appropriate undertaking as required by *Lab. Code §§ 6000-6002*, stay or suspend its operation in whole or in part on the terms and conditions that it directs [*Lab. Code § 5956*].

Moreover, the WCAB may by order direct that no certified copy of the final order, decision, or award be issued. This order has the same effect as an order staying execution [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10825*]. When a party intending to file for a writ of review requests a stay of execution or withholding issuance of a certified copy of the order, decision, or award that is the subject of the party's complaint, the request will ordinarily be granted, conditioned on the filing of a bond from an approved suretyequivalent to twice the probable amount of liability in the case [*8 Cal. Code Reg § 10828*]. For discussion and forms of bonds and undertakings and procedure, see *Ch. 538, Suretyship, Bonds, and Undertakings, § 538.40* et seq.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJudgmentsEntry of JudgmentsStays Pending AppealsSupersedeas BondsCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.288

§ 577.288 Return of Writ

The writ is made returnable at a time and place then or thereafter specified by court order and directs the appeals board to certify its record in the case to the court within a specified time [*Lab. Code § 5951*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.289

§ 577.289 Right of Appeals Board and Parties to Appear

The appeals board and each party to the proceeding before the board has the right to appear in the proceeding [*Lab. Code § 5953*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.290

§ 577.290 Answer to Petition

Within 25 days after service of the petition, the appeals board and any real party in interest may serve and file or join in the filing of an answer and brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(b)(1)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsBriefsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.291

§ 577.291 Reply Brief

Within 15 days after service of the answer, the petitioner may serve and file a reply brief [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(b)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewCivil ProcedureAppealsBriefsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.292

§ 577.292 Service of Pleadings and Papers

A copy of every pleading filed must be served on the appeals board and on every party who entered an appearance in the proceeding before the appeals board and whose interest is adverse to the party filing the pleading [*Lab. Code § 5954*; *see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)(3)*; *see also* discussion under *§ 577.286*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.293

§ 577.293 Judgment

On the hearing, the court must enter judgment either affirming or annulling the order, decision, or award, or remanding the case for further proceedings before the appeals board [*Lab. Code § 5953*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.294

§ 577.294 Supplemental Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs

In the event the injured employee or his or her dependent prevails on any petition by the employer for a writ of review from an award of the appeals board and the reviewing court finds that there is no reasonable basis for the petition, the reviewing court shall remand the cause to the appeals board for the purpose of making a supplemental award of areasonable attorney's fee for services rendered in connection with the petition. Any such fee is in addition to the amount of compensation otherwise recoverable and must be paid as part of the award by the party liable to pay the award [*Lab. Code § 5801*; *see Nelson & Sloan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 51, 53, 144 Cal. Rptr. 614]* . Moreover, under *Lab. Code § 5811(a)*, providing that in all proceedings before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board costs as between the parties may be allowed by the board, the board is authorized to award reasonable costs, including printing costs, incurred by an injured employee in answering a petition for a writ of review filed by a compensation carrier which is summarily denied by the reviewing court [*Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 235, 242, 207 Cal. Rptr. 857, 689 P.2d 1127* (disapproving contrary dictum in *Employers Mut. Liab. Ins. Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1975) 46 Cal. App. 3d 104, 108 n.2, 120 Cal. Rptr. 48*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Administrative Actions
15. Judicial Review

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.295-577.309

[Reserved]

§§ 577.295[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.310

§ 577.310 Governing Law

The exclusive remedy principle is found in *Lab. Code §§ 3600(a), 3601(a),* and *3602(a)*. Statutory exceptions are set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 3601(b), 3602(b), 3706,* and *4558*. Other exceptions of judicial creation that predate the 1982 amendments to *Lab. Code §§ 3600, 3601,* and *3602* have not all been expressly abrogated, but are of questionable continuing validity [*see Continental Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 156, 162, 235 Cal. Rptr. 260* , discussed under *§ 577.313[3]*].

Lab. Code §§ 2801 and *2803* apply to actions by an employee against his or her employer for injury within the scope of employment due to the employer's negligence if the employment is excluded from workers' compensation coverage. *Lab. Code §§ 3700-3709.5* govern actions by an employee against his or her uninsured employer based on the employer's negligence. The conditions of compensation are set forth in *Lab. Code § 3600(a),* and employment relationships are defined for the purposes of the workers' compensation law in *Lab. Code §§ 3350-3353*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity ProvisionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityEmployees & EmployersWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.311

§ 577.311 Workers' Compensation as Exclusive Remedy in Employee Injury Cases

[1] Scope of Principle

As a general rule, if all the conditions of compensation have been met, workers' compensation is the exclusive remedy for employment-related injuries [*Lab. Code §§ 3601, 3602*; *see Lab. Code § 3600(a)*; *see also* the General Introduction under Conditions of Compensation Liability]. This principle provides tort immunity for the employer of an injured worker for any injury that is within the scope of workers' compensation coverage [*Lab. Code § 3602(a)*; *see Logan v. Masters (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 145, 147, 174 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *see also Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 15, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* (basis for workers' compensation and the exclusive remedy provisions is an injury sustained during and arising out of the course of employment)]. The employer's workers' compensation insurance carrier stands in the employer's shoes, and may invoke the exclusive remedy defense [*Continental Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 156, 159, 235 Cal. Rptr. 260* ; *see Lab. Code § 3850(b)*; *see also discussion under § 577.312*].

[2] Application of Principle

This immunity applies to an action for damages arising from the industrial injury brought by any person on any theory [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)*; *see Salin v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 185, 190-193, 185 Cal. Rptr. 899* (and cases cited therein)]. Also as a general rule, suits against coemployees are also barred by the exclusive remedy principle in the same manner as suits against employers [*Lab. Code § 3601(a)*]. There are, however, express statutory exceptions to the exclusive remedy principle [*see Lab. Code §§ 3601, 3602(b)*, discussed in *§§ 577.312, 577.317*].

The fact that either the employer or the employee also occupied another or dual capacity prior to or at the time of the employee's industrial injury does not negate the operation of the exclusive remedy principle [*Lab. Code § 3602(a)*]. This statutory rule negates the common-law "dual capacity" doctrine, under which an employer who would otherwise be shielded from tort liability by the exclusive remedy principle became liable in tort to an employee if the employer occupied a second capacity that conferred obligations independent of those imposed by the employment relationship [*see, e.g., Power Fabricating, Inc. v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1446, 1453-1454, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770*]. An employee may, however, be permitted to bring an action at law for damages against the

employer when the employer's dual capacity did not exist at the time of the injury, but rather arose after the injury.

For example, an employee of a medical center who was injured on the job and who was treated for these injuries at the center was held entitled to bring a malpractice action against her employer and the treating physician, since the employer's dual capacity did not exist until after the injury [*Sturtevant v. County of Monterey (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 758, 764-767, 279 Cal. Rptr. 161]* . Similarly, an action by an injured employee against the employer for negligent spoliation of evidence (no longer a recognized tort in California, *see § 577.313[5]*) was not barred by *Lab. Code § 3602(a)* because the second or dual capacity that the employer allegedly occupied when it lost the evidence came into existence after, not prior to or at the time of, the employee's injury [*Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1292-1293, 286 Cal. Rptr. 855]* .

The exclusive remedy principle does not apply to an action against a third party whose conduct is alleged to have been a cause of the employee's injury [*see Lab. Code § 3852*, discussed in Subpart C, § 577.330 et seq.].

[3] Burden of Proof

As a general rule, the employer-defendant has the burden of pleading and proving as an affirmative defense that the Workers' Compensation Act is a bar to an employee's civil action [*Popejoy v. Hannon (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 159, 173-174, 231 P.2d 484* ; *Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 224, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *Iverson v. Atlas Pacific Engineering (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 219, 224, 191 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *Power Fabricating, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (2008) 167 Cal. App. 4th 1446, 1453-1454, 84 Cal. Rptr. 3d 770*]. Failure to plead the exclusive remedy principle as an affirmative defense results in a waiver of that defense [*Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 224, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . However, if the complaint affirmatively alleges facts indicating coverage by the workers' compensation laws and fails to allege additional facts negating application of the exclusive remedy principle, no civil action will lie and the complaint is subject to demurrer [*Colombo v. State of California (1991) 3 Cal. App. 4th 594, 599, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 567* ; *Halliman v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 46, 50, 209 Cal. Rptr. 175* (allegation in complaint that plaintiff was defendant's employee, that accident occurred during work hours and on work premises, and that plaintiff was acting with scope of employment)].

For a form for an affirmative defense alleging that an action is barred by the exclusive remedy principle, see § 522.530[1].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProceduresPleading & PracticeDefenses, Demurrers & ObjectionsAffirmative DefensesGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsBurdens of ProofGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity Provisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.312

§ 577.312 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Employer

[1] In General

An employee or his or her dependents may avoid the application of the Workers' Compensation Act and bring a tort action against the employer only if the action falls within an exception to the exclusive remedy principle. The exclusive remedy principle may be avoided by showing one or more of the following:

- That the employer of the injured worker was uninsured [*see Lab. Code § 3706*, discussed under [2], *below*].

- That one or more of the conditions to compensation have not been met, and thus, the injury is of a type that is outside of the application of workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code § 3602(c)*, discussed in [3], *below*; *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 14-15, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* (exclusive remedy principle as applicable only in the case of personal injury or death sustained in and arising out of course of employment); *see also Lab. Code § 3600(a)(1)-(10)*, discussed under *§ 577.23*].

- That the employee's injury or death falls within one of the four express statutory exceptions to the exclusive remedy principle that apply to insured employers and injuries within the scope of workers' compensation [*see Lab. Code §§ 3602(b), 4558*, discussed under [2], *below*].

- That the action involves conduct by an employer that violates fundamental public policy or is otherwise outside the scope of the "compensation bargain" [*see City of Moorpark v. Superior Court of Ventura County (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1152-1153 Gantt v. Sentry Insurance (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 1083, 1101, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 824 P.2d 680* ; *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *see also § 577.315[2]*]. The court of appeal has relied on *City of Moorpark* to support the view that the workers' compensation laws do not provide the exclusive remedy for a plaintiff pleading a Fair Employment and Housing Act claim for physical damages as a result of an employer's unlawful business practice, as defined by *Gov. Code § 12940(m)*, of failing to provide reasonable

accommodation for the plaintiff's nonindustrial disability from polio. Such an unlawful business practice, said the court, was not part of the compensation bargain. Moreover, the public policies enacted in the Fair Employment and Housing Act precluded a finding that workers' compensation was the exclusive remedy for the plaintiff's claim [*Bagatti v. Department of Rehabilitation (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 344, 356-357, 364-367, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443]* . On the other hand, in a civil action by an injured agricultural laborer against his employer (a licensed farm labor contractor), the court of appeal has held that the California Farm Labor Contractors Act, *Lab. Code § 1682 et seq.*, does not provide an exception to the exclusive remedy rule of the workers' compensation laws [*Ruiz v. Cabrera (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1198, 1199, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 320]* .

In one case, the exclusive remedy rule was held not to bar a civil action between an injured workers' union and the employer in which the union sought to compel the employer to arbitrate the worker's return to work under terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Such an action, the court held, is an equitable action to compel specific performance of the contract and is thus not an "action at law" pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3602(a)* that would be prohibited by the exclusive remedy rule. The worker was seeking arbitration on the claim for her salary for the period when she was allegedly no longer suffering the disabling effects of an industrial injury and was able to work, but denied the right to work guaranteed in the collective bargaining agreement. This, said the court, was not a workers' compensation issue. The worker was also seeking arbitration of her demand to be returned to work, and the court noted that a return to work is not one of the workers' compensation benefits available by statute to which the exclusive remedy rule would apply [*Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1277 v. Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1277 (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 673, 682-684, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207]* .

[2] Civil Action Against Uninsured Employer

[a] In General

If an employer has failed to secure the payment of workers' compensation, any injured employee (or his or her dependents) may bring an action at law against the employer for damages as if the Workers' Compensation Act did not apply [*Lab. Code § 3706*]. A copy of the complaint must be served on the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund [*Lab. Code § 3708.5*]. In addition, the plaintiff may also file for workers' compensation benefits to be paid from the Fund [*Lab. Code § 3715*; *see discussion under § 577.13[4]*]. Jurisdiction of the superior court to try claims of an employee against his or her employer for damages under *Lab. Code § 3706* arises only when payment of compensation is not secured. Under the exclusivity provisions of the workers' compensation law, this is true even though, in some instances, a particular worker may have a better claim in a state civil action [*Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1177, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76]* .

A failure to secure compensation refers to a failure by the employer to obtain insurance or to be self-insured, as required by *Lab. Code § 3700* [*see § 577.13[3]*]. No such action may be brought simply because the employer or its insurer has denied payment. In the civil action, the plaintiff must plead and prove a violation of *Lab. Code § 3700*, which sets forth employer insurance requirements [*Campos Food Fair v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 965, 968, 238 Cal. Rptr. 685]* . That is, the employee has the burden of showing that there was no workers' compensation coverage [*Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1178, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76]* . However, if the plaintiff does not allege an employment relationship, a defendant who is found to be an employer must show that compensation was secured [*Muffett v. Royster (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 289, 299, 195 Cal. Rptr. 73]* .

In any action against an uninsured employer, principles of fault apply [*see Logan v. Masters (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 145, 148, 174 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . However, except in the case of certain household employees, it is presumed that the injury to the employee directly resulted from and grew out of the negligence of the employer. The burden of proof is on the employer to rebut this presumption. Comparative negligence, either of the employee or of a coemployee, and assumption of the risk are not defenses to the action, regardless of the provision of any contract [*Lab. Code § 3708*; *see*

Logan v. Masters (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 145, 174 Cal. Rptr. 465] . The statutory presumption that the employee's injury was due to the uninsured employer's negligence does not extend, however, to a presumption that the employee's claimed injury arose in the course of employment. Rather, an employee seeking damages from an uninsured employer has the same burden of proof as an employee seeking workers' compensation benefits, i.e., the employee bears the burden of proving that the injury was sustained in the course of employment. Thus, if an injury arising from the employment is shown, it is presumed to have resulted from the employer's negligence, and the employer is then required to rebut that presumption to avoid liability [*Huang v. L.A. Haute (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-291, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 619]* . For discussion of comparative negligence generally, see Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Levy, Golden & Sacks, California Torts, ch. 4 (Matthew Bender).

It is no defense that the employer did not intentionally fail to secure payment [*Hicks v. Ocean Shore Railroad, Inc. (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 773, 787, 117 P.2d 850]* . The fact that an employer pays the employee's medical bills and wages during disability or otherwise compensates the employee does not bar a suit for damages if the employer was not properly secured prior to the injury [*see* *Coffin v. Bloodworth (1938) 28 Cal. App. 2d 522, 524, 82 P.2d 953]* . In a case of dual employment, if one employer is insured and the other is not, the injured employee (or his or her dependents) may obtain a workers' compensation award jointly and severally against both employers and still maintain an action at law against the uninsured employer [*Strickland v. Foster (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 114, 118-119, 211 Cal. Rptr. 305* ; for further discussion of dual employment, *see § 577.22[2]*].

The court of appeal has held that, in a plaintiff's personal injury action filed under *Lab. Code § 3706*, the employer's liability is determined under rules of pleading and proof that differ significantly from those of a common-law personal injury action. Consequently, this statute creates a statutory cause of action for personal injuries subject to the three-year statute of limitations in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* [*Valdez v. Himmelfarb (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1269-1270, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195]* .

For a form for a complaint for use in a civil action against an uninsured employer, see *§ 577.522[1]*.

[b] Attachment of Employer's Property

At any time on or after the institution of the action, the plaintiff may attach the property of the employer, in an amount fixed by the court, to secure the payment of any judgment that is ultimately obtained. The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure generally govern the issuance of and proceedings on the attachment [*Lab. Code § 3707*; *see* Ch. 62, *Attachment*].

[c] Judgment

Any compensation awarded, paid, or secured by the employer must be credited against the judgment. The court must allow the amount of any compensation paid from the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund as a first lien against the judgment. There is also a similar lien against any proceeds of settlement, either before or after judgment. The judgment must include a reasonable attorney's fee fixed by the court [*Lab. Code § 3709*].

The amount of the judgment may not be increased by 10 percent for the employer's failure to insure pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4554*, because thatsection provides for an increase only in the amount of "compensation" payable and not in the amount of "damages" payable pursuant to a civil action under *Lab. Code § 3706* [*Leung v. Chinese Six Companies (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 801, 806-807]* .

[d] Employees of Unlicensed and Uninsured Subcontractors

Although an injured employee of an unlicensed and uninsured subcontractor is covered by a general contractor's workers' compensation insurance under the provisions of Lab. Code § 2750.2, the uninsured subcontractor may,

nevertheless, be liable in tort to the injured employee pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3706* [*Hernandez v. Chavez Roofing, Inc. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 1092, 1094-1095, 286 Cal. Rptr. 919* ; *Cedillo v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 227, 232, 236-237, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581]* .

[3] Civil Action if Conditions of Compensation Have Not Been Met

[a] In General

In all cases in which the conditions of compensation of *Lab. Code § 3600* do not concur, the liability of the employer is the same as if there were no workers' compensation law [*Lab. Code § 3602(c)*; *see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(1)-(10)* (conditions of compensation), *discussed under § 577.23*].

[b] Excluded Employment

[i] In General

One of the conditions of compensation is that both the employer and employee be subject to workers' compensation provisions [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(1)*]. Thus, if the particular employment is excluded from workers' compensation requirements under *Lab. Code § 3352*, the exclusive remedy principle does not bar a civil action against the employer based on common law tort principles [*see Mantonya v. Bratlie (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 120, 124, 199 P.2d 677* ; *Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1003-1004, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494]* . For discussion of employers and employees covered and excluded from coverage under the workers' compensation law, see *§ 577.22*.

For a form for a complaint by an employee whose employment is excluded from workers' compensation coverage alleging injury due to the employer's negligence, see *§ 577.523[1]*. For a form for an affirmative defense alleging the negligence of the plaintiff in such an action, see *§ 577.532*.

[ii] Contributory and Comparative Negligence

Such an action, by one whose employment is outside the scope of workers' compensation, is subject to *Lab. Code §§ 2800* and *2801* [*Devens v. Goldberg (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 173, 176-177, 199 P.2d 943* ; *see Logan v. Masters (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 145, 147, 174 Cal. Rptr. 465]* . *Lab. Code § 2800* simply states that an employer is liable for negligence to an employee, negligence that for most employment is remedied exclusively by workers' compensation. However, *Lab. Code § 2801* is a special rule of employee "contributory negligence" that predates the adoption in California of principles of comparative negligence [*see Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 828-829, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226]* . Under this rule, the fact that the employee has been guilty of contributory negligence does not bar recovery if the employee's negligence was slight and that of the employer was gross in comparison. However, damages may be diminished in proportion to the employee's negligence [*Lab. Code § 2801*]. The effect of the adoption of comparative negligence on this statute has not been resolved. If the statute is not affected by comparative negligence, it would appear that the defense of contributory negligence would bar an action if the employee's negligence were deemed to be greater than that of the employer.

There is also a conclusive presumption that the employee was not guilty of contributory negligence in any case in which the violation of any law enacted for the safety of employees contributed to the employee's injury [*Lab. Code § 2801*]. The employer also cannot assert the defenses of express or implied assumption of risk and of coemployee negligence [*Lab. Code § 2801(a), (b)*]. The court of appeal has held, however, that ski resort employees who are exempt from workers' compensation coverage under *Lab. Code § 3352(f)* are not also exempt from assumption of risk under *Lab. Code § 2801*, because the latter statute bars employers from raising assumption of risk as a defense in negligence actions by employees only when the employee has been injured in the course of employment. The court found that the legislature, by virtue of it use of the phrase "the course of his employment as such" in *Lab. Code § 2801*, contemplated a more restrictive concept of course of employment in that statute than in the workers' compensation statutes, only the

latter of which include off-duty recreational activities if they are a reasonable expectancy of employment [*Vine v. Bear Valley Ski Co. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 577, 587-590, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 370]* .

No contract or regulation may exempt the employer from the provisions of *Lab. Code § 2801* [*Lab. Code § 2801*]. Any contract or agreement, express or implied, made by any employee to waive these rights is null and void [*see Lab. Code § 2804*].

[c] Injury Outside Scope of Employment

The employee must be performing service growing out of or incidental to the employment and acting within the course of the employment as another condition to receiving compensation through the operation of the exclusive remedy principle [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)(2)*]. Thus, an employeemay bring a civil action against the employer for an injury incurred due to the employer's negligence but while the employee was outside of the scope of employment [*Seymour v. Setzer Forest Products, Inc. (1954) 124 Cal. App. 2d 608, 610-611, 268 P.2d 1084* (employee was on premises on his own time before shift began); *but see Wright v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 346, 357, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 503* (employee's civil negligence suit against her employer barred because workers' compensation law was exclusive remedy, when employee was injured while visiting work on her day off and helping fellow employees hold up collapsing shelf)]. For discussion of the covered scope of employment under the workers' compensation law, see *§ 577.24*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesProvisional RemediesAttachmentsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesComparative & Contributory NegligenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.313

§ 577.313 Civil Action for Non-Disabling or Non-Compensable Injuries

[1] Physical Injury

Generally, compensability of an injury is not one of the conditions of compensation that triggers workers' compensation coverage under *Lab. Code § 3600(a)*. Thus, the fact that a particular physical industrial injury is not of a kind that is compensable under workers' compensation law does not avoid the exclusive remedy principle pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3602* and permit a civil action. For example, even if a particular injury results in little or no occupational handicap and therefore is subject to little or no permanent disability rating, it does not bring the injury outside of the exclusive remedy principle [*Williams v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1975) 50 Cal. App. 3d 116, 121-123, 123 Cal. Rptr. 812* (sexual dysfunction)].

[2] Emotional Distress

Emotional injuries that cause disability are generally compensable under workers' compensation law [*see* *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 753-754, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195* ; *Lab. Code § 3208.3*]. Even if an employee suffers emotional distress that is not disabling, and thus not compensable, the exclusive remedy doctrine will nevertheless bar a civil actions seeking damages for that distress unless the distress is caused by employer actions that contravene fundamental public policy or are otherwise outside the risks inherent in the employment relationship [*Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 754-755, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195]* . For further discussion, see *§ 577.315[2]*.

[3] Defamation

It has been held that injury to reputation is not the kind of injury contemplated under the workers' compensation system, and that therefore an action for defamation by an employee against his or her employer isnot barred by the exclusive remedy principle [*Howland v. Balma (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 899, 902-905, 192 Cal. Rptr. 286* ; *see* *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* (citing *Howland* with apparent approval); *see also* *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 757, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195* (assuming, without deciding, that certain defamatory remarks in the employment context may be subject to workers' compensation, the

seriousness of the allegations in plaintiff's complaint raised issue of whether defendants' conduct was outside the scope and normal risks of employment, and court of appeal directed to address this issue on remand)].

Communications about an employee made by the employee's supervisor to other managers within the organization were presumed to be privileged communications under *Civ. Code § 47(c)* and, thus, the employee's cause of action against the supervisor for slander per se was properly dismissed when the employee did not meet the burden of defeating this privilege [*Kacludis v. GTE Sprint Communications Corp. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 806 F. Supp. 866, 872]* . However, it was held that an employee was entitled to bring a defamation action against her employer when the employer had falsely told other employees that she was stealing money from the company and had worked out a deal with the company's health insurer to receive her health insurance benefits to the detriment of other employees [*Davaris v. Cubaleski (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1583, 1590-1591, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 330]* .

[4] Contract Damages

At least one court has held that when an employee sues an employer for breach of contract, and the same conduct also caused an injury compensable under the workers' compensation law, the employee will be precluded from recovering only those damages caused by the compensable injury [*Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 500, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . However, as workers' compensation provides for lost wages for the period of disability, and there is therefore a substantial risk of double recovery in these cases, the amount of workers' compensation paid must be set off from the contract damages [*Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 501, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677]* .

In a different context, the court of appeal held that a petition for writ of mandate filed by a public school employee, seeking differential pay and reinstatement under *Ed. Code §§ 44977* and 44987.1, not tort damages for a work-related injury, was not preempted by the exclusivity provisions of workers' compensation law [*Veguez v. Governing Board of the Long Beach Unified School District (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 406, 417-418, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 526]* .

[5] Spoliation of Evidence

Following two landmark decisions by the California Supreme Court, the tort of intentional spoliation of evidence no longer exists in California, evenif the alleged spoliator is not a party to the litigation [*Cedars-Sinai Medical Center v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1, 17-18, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 248, 954 P.2d 511* ; *Temple Community Hospital v. Superior Court (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 464, 478, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852, 976 P.2d 223]* . Thus, an employee has no remedy against his or her employer for spoliation of evidence relevant to a third-party action. Although the Supreme Court did not address the tort of negligent spoliation of evidence in either of its decisions, it appears very unlikely that this is still a viable theory of recovery given the Court's refusal to recognize the even more egregious conduct-- *intentional* spoliation--as a basis for tort recovery.

Prior court of appeal decisions have held that the exclusive remedy rule does not bar an employee's tort claim against an employer for negligent spoliation of evidence, since the claim involves an injury to property interests, rather than to the person [*see* *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1285-1287, 286 Cal. Rptr. 855* ; *Gomez v. Acquistapace (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 740, 748-752, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 821]* .

PRACTICE TIP:

Preservation of Evidence. Although employers and insurance carriers are no longer liable in tort for the intentional spoliation of evidence, defense attorneys would be wise to counsel their clients to preserve any evidence which may be useful in a third-party action. If such evidence is destroyed or damaged, an injured worker's case against a third-party may be significantly weakened, in turn, diminishing the employers opportunity to receive credit or reimbursement for workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsDefamationGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesPsychological InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.314

§ 577.314 Civil Action Against Employer for Injury Also Within Workers' Compensation Coverage

[1] In General

Lab. Code § 3602(b), as amended in 1982, sets forth three express circumstances under which an employee may bring a civil action against an insured employer for an industrial injury that is also within the scope of workers' compensation coverage [*Lab. Code § 3602(b)*; *see* discussion below]:

- For the employer's willful assault;
- For the employer's fraudulent concealment of the injury or its relation to the employment; and
- In certain products liability cases.

A fourth express statutory exception involves a failure to install or the removal of a guard on a power press [*Lab. Code § 4558*; discussed *below*].

These exceptions represent codifications of some of the previous judicially created exceptions to the exclusive remedy principle [*see, e.g., Johns-Manville Products Corp. v. Superior Court (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 465, 165 Cal. Rptr. 858, 612 P.2d 948* (fraudulent concealment of asbestosis)]. Other judicially created exceptions that were not expressly codified in the 1982 amendments [*see, e.g., Ramey v. General Petroleum Corp. (1959) 173 Cal. App. 2d 386, 343 P.2d 787* (alleged fraudulent concealment by employer of third-party tortfeasor's culpability for injury until after statute of limitations had run as to third party)] may no longer be valid [*see Lab. Code § 3602(a)* (only exceptions to exclusive remedy doctrine are those set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 3602(b), 3706*, and *4558*); *see also Continental Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 156, 162, 235 Cal. Rptr. 260* (stating that statute implies that no other exceptions exist)].

[2] Willful Assault

[a] In General

The exclusive remedy principle does not apply if the employee's injury was proximately caused by a willful physical assault by the employer [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)]. In cases decided before the willful-assault exception was statutory, it has been held that the exclusive remedy principle does not apply in the case of an assault committed against an employee by a partner when the employer is a partnership [*see Magliulo v. Superior Court (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 760, 767-780, 121 Cal. Rptr. 621]* , or in the case of an assault committed by an officer of a labor union [*see Meyer v. Graphic Arts International Union (1979) 88 Cal. App. 3d 176, 178, 151 Cal. Rptr. 597* (characterizing officer as agent of union)].

For a form for a complaint against an employer for willful assault, see *§ 577.524[1]*.

[b] Assault by Co-employee

In the case of an assault committed by a coemployee, employer liability must be predicated on the employer's positive misconduct constituting ratification of the assault [*Iverson v. Atlas Pacific Engineering (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 219, 227-228, 191 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *see Lab. Code § 3601(b)*]. At least one court has reaffirmed this rule as still valid under the statutory expression of the exception [*Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1432, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68]* . Thus, the exception to the exclusivity rule contained in *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)*, does not authorize civil actions against employers for injury resulting from willful assaults by co-employees based on a theory of respondeat superior, when there is no employer ratification of the co-employee's conduct [*Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1491, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359]* .

Additionally, one court of appeal has held that a covered employer cannot be sued by employees for negligent or reckless failure to provide adequate security on the employer's premises, despite knowledge of the potential danger [*Arendell v. Auto Parts Club, Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1265, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 83* (failure allegedly resulted in assault and kidnapping against two employees perpetrated by non-employee third parties)].

[3] Fraudulent Concealment

[a] In General

The exclusive remedy principle does not apply if the employee's injury is aggravated by the employer's fraudulent concealment of the existence of the injury and its connection with the employment. In such a case, the employer's liability is limited to those damages proximately caused by the aggravation. The burden of proof respecting apportionment of damages between the injury and any subsequent aggravation is on the employer [*Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*]. This statute codifies the holding of *Johns-Manville v. Superior Court*, in which the California Supreme Court refused to invoke the exclusive remedy principle to bar an action alleging that the employer had fraudulently concealed from its employees its knowledge of the harmful health effects of exposure to asbestos [*see Johns-Manville ProductsCorp. v. Superior Court (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 465, 165 Cal. Rptr. 858, 612 P.2d 948]* . Punitive damages may also be recovered [*McDonald v. Superior Court (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 297, 300-303, 225 Cal. Rptr. 394* ; *see also Transport Indemnity Co. v. Aerojet General Corp. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 1184, 1186-1191, 249 Cal. Rptr. 463* (holding employer's aggravation of injuries by fraudulent concealment is not necessarily a willful act within meaning of *Ins. Code § 533*, and as not necessarily releasing insurer from duty to defend or indemnify employer in civil action by employee for aggravation of injury caused by employer's fraudulent concealment of nature and extent of work-induced injuries)].

For a form of complaint for use against an employer alleging fraudulent concealment of injury and its connection with employment, see *§ 577.525[1]*.

[b] Affirmative Misrepresentation Not Required

An affirmative misrepresentation is not required; fraudulent concealment encompasses the failure of the employer to reveal pertinent information to the employee. However, the plaintiff must establish the employer's actual knowledge of the information [*Foster v. Xerox Corp. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 306, 309-312, 219 Cal. Rptr. 485, 707 P.2d 858* ; *see Palestini v. General Dynamics Corp. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 80, 89-90, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 741* (following *Foster* in holding that employee seeking to state cause of action need only "in general terms" plead facts that if found true by trier of fact establish existence of three essential elements under *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*, i.e., (1) employer knew that plaintiff had suffered work-related injury, (2) employer concealed that knowledge from plaintiff, and (3) plaintiff's injury was aggravated as result of concealment, and that in determining whether allegations in complaint are legally sufficient trial court must liberally construe pleading with view to achieving substantial justice between parties); *see also Ashdown v. Ameron International Corp. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 868, 881, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 20* (fraudulent concealment exception to exclusive remedy rule did not apply to claims stemming from decedent's asbestos related injury and death, when there was no evidence indicating employers knew decedent had asbestos-related disease); *Santiago v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1318, 1334, 274 Cal. Rptr. 576* (trial court properly instructed jury that actual knowledge is required for action under *Lab. Code § 3602*, and did not err in failing to instruct as to constructive knowledge, imputed knowledge, and reckless misrepresentation); *Hughes Aircraft Co. v. Superior Court of Orange County (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1790, 1797, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 514* (employer's prior knowledge of its unsafe work environment was insufficient to establish that employer had actual prior knowledge of employee's injuries as required under *Lab. Code § 3602*)].

For example, when the employer established by uncontroverted evidence that the employee had known for years about the possible health problems arising from exposure to asbestos and other chemicals used in the course of his work, and when there was nothing in the record to suggest that the employer withheld any information relevant to the employee's condition from him, the employee was not entitled, as a matter of law, to bring a civil action against the employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)* [*Davis v. Lockheed Corp. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 519, 522-523, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 233* ; *see Jensen v. Amgen, Inc. (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1322, 1326-1327, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 899]* .

[c] Statute of Limitations

The fraudulent concealment is regarded as a separate injury from the contraction of the injury in the first instance. Thus, the applicable statute of limitations is not tolled for the purposes of the civil action for fraudulent concealment by the filing of an application for workers' compensation benefits for the injury itself [*Aerojet General Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 950, 954-957, 223 Cal. Rptr. 249]* .

[4] Products Liability

The exclusive remedy principle does not apply if the employee's injury or death was proximately caused by a defective product that was manufactured by the employer and sold, leased, or otherwise transferred for valuable consideration to an independent third person, and the product is thereafter provided for the employee's use by a third person [*Lab. Code § 3602(b)(3)*]. This statute represents a legislative preservation of one aspect of the otherwise-discarded dual capacity doctrine [*see Lab. Code § 3602(a)* (eliminating dual capacity doctrine in all but above limited products liability circumstances)]. This exception to the exclusive remedy rule was held to be inapplicable in a case in which the employee came into contact with an allegedly defective product as the primary objective of her job, and not as a consumer. In essence, the employee was not provided with the product for her use, but rather it was her job to perform tasks using the product [*Behrens v. Fayette Manufacturing Co. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1567, 1574-1575, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 264]* .

[5] Power Press Guard

[a] Removal of or Failure to Install Guard

An employee (or his or her dependents in the case of death) may bring an action at law for damages against the

employer if the employee's injury or death is proximately caused by the employer's knowing removal of, or knowing failure to install, a point-of-operation guard on a power press. The removal of or failure to install the guard must have been specifically authorized by the employer under conditions known by the employer to create a probability of serious injury or death [*Lab. Code § 4558(b)*; *see Lab. Code §§ 3600(a), 3602(a)*; *see also Watters Associates v. Superior Court (1990)218 Cal. App. 3d 1322, 1325, 267 Cal. Rptr. 696* (temporary machine operator trainee injured because of unguarded power press may not maintain cause of action against employment agency that placed him in job, as he did not allege that employment agency removed or authorized removal of guard; *Lab. Code § 4558* as applicable only to employers who directly authorize removal of guard and general agency allegation as insufficient to support cause of action)].

An employee who brings a civil action pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4558* may not also allege other causes of action such as negligence and strict liability that require a lesser standard of proof to establish liability [*Award Metals, Inc. v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 1128, 1131, 279 Cal. Rptr. 459]* .

[b] Actual Knowledge Required

It appears that the Legislature used the word "known" in *Lab. Code § 4558* in the sense of actual awareness. Nothing in that section indicates that the courts may impute knowledge to or impose constructive knowledge on the employer [*Saldana v. Globe-Weis Systems Co. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1516-1517, 285 Cal. Rptr. 385]* . Moreover, that section does not encompass situations in which the employer does not know of any danger at the time the employer replaces a guard initially installed by the manufacturer, and is subsequently negligent in failing to maintain the replacement guard, since the statute requires that the employer know of the potential danger in removing or replacing the guard at the time the employer actually removes or replaces it [*Saldana v. Globe-Weis Systems Co. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1519, 285 Cal. Rptr. 385]* . Finally, *Lab. Code § 4558* does not apply to an employer's mere act of removing the manufacturer's guard and replacing it with a new guard, without regard to the employer's state of mind in doing so [*Saldana v. Globe-Weis Systems Co. (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1505, 1519-1520, 285 Cal. Rptr. 385]* .

The employer is not civilly liable absent proof that the manufacturer designed, installed, required, or otherwise provided by specification for the attachment of the guards and conveyed knowledge of that fact to the employer [*Lab. Code § 4558(c)*; *see Jones v. Keppeler (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 705, 710-713, 279 Cal. Rptr. 168* (employer held not liable under *Lab. Code § 4558* when information about guard was provided by previous owner of machine and by manufacturer of control system added as modification to machine but was not provided by original manufacturer); *Swanson v. Matthews Products, Inc. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 901, 906-907, 221 Cal. Rptr. 84* (proof that press did not meet federal occupational safety standards irrelevant if manufacturer did not communicate specification to employer); *see also E. W. Bliss Co. v. Superior Court (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 1254, 1259, 258 Cal. Rptr. 783* (mandate proceeding arising out of an action by an employee injured by a punch press against his employer and the manufacturer and seller of the press, in which the court construed *Lab. Code § 4558(d)*, which prohibits any action for contribution or indemnity by any defendant against the employer, but allows a defendant to seek contribution after the employee secures a judgment against the employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4558* and fails to discharge his or her comparative share of judgment)].

[c] Definitions

[i] Guard

The term "guard," as used in *Lab. Code § 4558*, includes the myriad types of apparatus available to keep workers' hands outside the point of operation, and is not a term of art [*Bingham v. CTS Corp. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 56, 65, 282 Cal. Rptr. 161]* . A point of operation guard is "removed" for purposes of *Lab. Code § 4558* when it is rendered dysfunctional or unavailable for use by the operator for the particular task assigned [*Bingham v. CTS Corp. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 56, 68, 282 Cal. Rptr. 161]* .

[ii] Power Press

The term "power press," as used in *Lab. Code § 4558*, means any material-forming machine that utilizes a die designed for use in the manufacture of other products. Thus, under the statutory definition, a machine such as a printing press, that does not form materials to be used in the manufacture of other products does not constitute a "power press" [*McCoy v. Zahniser Graphics, Inc. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 107, 111, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 871]* . Similarly, a material-forming machine that does not use a "die" does not satisfy the definition of a "power press" [*Graham v. Hopkins (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1483, 1487-1489, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 82]* .

Affirming the earlier court of appeal decisions defining the term "die" [*see Ceja v. J. R. Wood, Inc. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1377, 242 Cal. Rptr. 531* ; *Graham v. Hopkins (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1483, 1487-1489, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 82]* , the California Supreme Court described a "die" as a tool that imparts some version of its own shape to material by pressing or impacting against or through the material, in a punching, stamping, or extruding motion. Thus, the Court held that a V-notching tool which formed material by cutting along its surface in the manner of a blade was not a die under *Labor Code § 4558* [*Rosales v. Depuy Ace Medical Co. (2000) 22 Cal. 4th 279, 285, 92 Cal. Rptr. 2d 465, 991 P.2d 1256]* .

The question of whether a machine is a "power press" within the meaning of *Lab. Code § 4558(a)(4)* is one for the jury [*Islas v. D & G Manufacturing Co., Inc. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 571, 577580, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559]* .

[d] Employer as Manufacturer

An employer who designs, manufactures, and installs its own power presses is considered to be a "manufacturer" for purposes of *Lab. Code § 4558*. In an action against an employer-manufacturer of a power press for failure to install a point-of-operation guard, the injured employee must prove that the employer's design of the press provided for a guard that was later removed or never installed, or, alternatively, that one was required to protect against a known risk of serious injury, but was deliberately omitted by the employer from the design fabrication or assembly of the machine. An employer may be liable even if the design of the press did not provide for attachment of a guard, as long as a guard was required to protect against a known risk of serious injury and the press was capable of functioning with the required guard [*Flowmaster, Inc. v. Superior Court (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1019, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 666]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationActual FraudGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewTortsProducts LiabilityGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.315

§ 577.315 Termination, Discipline, and Related Conduct

[1] Civil Action Generally Preempted

Workers' compensation is generally an employee's exclusive remedy for emotional or physical injuries that result from employer misconduct that is a "normal part of the employment relationship," such as demotions, promotions, criticism of work practices, and friction in grievance negotiations [*Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 160-161, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743]* .

Termination of employment, and the events leading up to termination, are also deemed a "normal part" of the employment relationship for purposes of the exclusive remedy doctrine [*Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 17-19, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *see Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 662-665, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721* ; *Jenkins v. Family Health Program (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 440, 450, 262 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 496, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677]* . In such cases, the exclusive remedy doctrine cannot be avoided by allegations that the injury resulted from intentional conduct of the employer or that the employer's conduct was unfair, outrageous, harassing, or intended to cause emotional distress [*Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 160, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743* ; *see Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 15, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054]* . However, it has been held that an employee's damages for emotional distress resulting from the employer's misrepresentations made to induce the employee to enter the employment relationship, were not a consequence of a normal part of that relationship or a risk reasonably encompassed within the compensation bargain. In making these misrepresentations (regarding the employer's financial stability, its future plans to relocate its operations, and the prospective employee's promotion in the corporate ranks), the employer stepped out of its proper role as an employer, engaging in behavior that is not a normal part of the employment relationship. Thus, the exclusive remedy rule did not bar the employee's civil damages for emotional distress [*Lenk v. Total-Western, Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 959, 971-973, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* .

An employer does not step out of its proper role as an employer by discussing with an employee the form the termination will take, as, for example, the ramifications of a voluntary as opposed to an involuntary retirement [*Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . Any statements by the employer that

an involuntary resignation could reflect negatively on future job references are deemed to be a normal and inherent part of the employment relationship and therefore within the exclusive remedy provisions of the compensation system [*Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 664-665, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721]* .

The employer's motivation for its conduct is irrelevant; thus, the fact that the employer's conduct may have been motivated by its desire to extract a waiver from the employee of his or her right to sue for wrongful termination does not remove the injury from the workers' compensation system [*Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 664, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721]* . Moreover, the exclusive remedy rule is applicable even when part of the employer's alleged wrongful conduct occurs after the termination, since the temporal sequence of events is not the conclusive test of whether the injury arose out of the employment relationship [*Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 663-664, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721]* .

[2] Exceptions to General Rule

[a] Violation of Public Policy

The exclusive remedy doctrine will not apply if the employer's conduct contravenes fundamental public policy [*Gantt v. Sentry Insurance (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 1083, 1100-1101, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 824 P.2d 680]* .

For example, in *Gantt*, the employee was allegedly terminated in retaliation for testifying truthfully before the Department of Fair Employment and Housing in support of a coworker's claim of sexual harassment. The public policy that was allegedly violated by the employer was the prohibition set forth in *Gov. Code § 12975* against obstructing an official investigation of sexual harassment. The Court noted that when an employer's decision to discharge an employee results from an animus that violates the fundamental policy of this state proscribing any interference in the official investigation of sexual harassment, this misconduct cannot, under any reasonable viewpoint, be considered a normal part of the employment relationship or a risk reasonably encompassed within the compensation bargain [*Gantt v. Sentry Insurance (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 1083, 1100-1101, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 824 P.2d 680]* .

See also, Operating Engineers Local 3 v. *Johnson (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 180, 184-192, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 552* (worker's civil cause of action against her employer for invasion of privacy was not barred by exclusive remedy rule when worker's supervisor reprimanded worker and disseminated information about reprimand to other employees who had no reason to know this information, thereby violating worker's right of privacy conferred by California Constitution and thus contrary to fundamental public policy); *Phillips v. Gemini Moving Specialists (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 563, 571-574, 577, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29* (wrongful discharge action based on termination for complaining of illegal wage withholding was proper based on wage protections found in various Labor Code provisions and *Code Civ. Proc. § 487.020*, and recovery of emotional distress damages was not preempted by exclusive remedy provision); *Maynard v. City of San Jose (9th Cir. 1994) 37 F.3d 1396, 1405-1406* (claims under California law for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress caused by personnel moves are not preempted by California workers' compensation statute when claims implicate fundamental public policy considerations embodied in *Gov. Code § 12940(f)* and *Lab. Code § 1102.5*, which prohibit retaliatory discrimination); *Shoemaker v. Myers (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1407, 1418-1419, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 203* (employee's cause of action against employer for wrongful discharge was not preempted by workers' compensation law when employee alleged that he was terminated in retaliation for exercising his right to counsel under Public Safety Officers Procedural *Bill of Rights* Act (*Gov. Code § 3300 et seq.*)); *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1148, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* (injured worker not precluded from bringing claim before WCAB under *Lab. Code § 132a* and action in state court seeking remedies under FEHA and common-law wrongful discharge theory when disability discrimination at issue violated public policy).

In one case, the court of appeal reached a contrary result when it held that the workers' compensation exclusive remedy provisions applied to an industrial injury, including the plaintiff's emotional distress as a result of that injury, that followed an allegedly unlawful demotion because of the plaintiff's age, in violation of public policy and the Fair

Employment and Housing Act, when the court found that evidence demonstrated that the alleged discriminatory act was not a "substantial factor" in causing the subsequent industrial injury [*Huffman v. Interstate Brands Cos. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 679, 692-700, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397]* .

For further discussion of civil actions for wrongful termination in violation of public policy, see Ch. 249, *Employment Law: Termination and Discipline* .

[b] Employer Conduct Outside the Compensation Bargain

[i] In General

The exclusive remedy doctrine does not apply if the employer's conduct does not constitute "a risk reasonably encompassed within the compensation bargain" [*Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *see* *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 757, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195* (case remanded to court of appeal to determine whether defendants' conduct was "a normal part of the employment relationship" when plaintiff alleged that defendants had engaged in a campaign of outrageous and harassing conduct resulting in his wrongful termination, which included falsely claiming that plaintiff embezzled money from the company and tried to sabotage its product and forcing plaintiff to sell his independent distribution company, which had been distributing the company's product, under threat of retaliation if he refused); *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1152-1153, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* ; *Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1427-1432, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68* (employer's harassment, assault, and battery through obscene gestures and acts held not be "normal" part of relationship)].

[ii] Whistleblowing

Although the full scope of this exception awaits further definition by the courts, it appears that statutory causes of action that protect employees against various types of discrimination or retaliation are deemed to be not "within the compensation bargain." In *Shoemaker*, for example, the Supreme Court held that a civil action alleging a violation of a statute that protected governmental "whistleblowers" from discipline and discharge and expressly allowed a civil damages action for such violations [*see* former *Gov. Code § 19683*] was outside the scope of the compensation bargain and constituted a statutory exception to the exclusive remedy provisions [*Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 22-23, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054]* .

[iii] Discrimination in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act

Several courts of appeal have held that the exclusive remedy principle of the workers' compensation law does not bar a statutory employment discrimination action by an employee who alleges that he or she suffered physical, mental, or emotional injury resulting from violations of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) [*Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*], which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, race, ancestry, color, marital status, medical condition, national origin, physical handicap, religion, age over 40 years, or pregnancy [*see Gov. Code §§ 12940, 12941, 12945*].

The courts have reasoned that the workers' compensation law and the FEHA are designed to remedy different evils, and the Legislature did not intend that the objectives of the civil rights statutes would be defeated by the bar of the exclusive remedy principle of the workers' compensation law.The FEHA must be liberally construed to achieve its purposes [*see Gov. Code § 12993*], and its purpose is to provide effective remedies to eliminate discriminatory practices [*Jones v Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 794, 804, 807-808, 244 Cal. Rptr. 37* (race discrimination); *see Gov. Code § 12920*; *see also* *Goldman v. Wilsey Foods, Inc. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1085, 1095-1096, 265 Cal. Rptr. 294* (religious discrimination); *Meninga v. Raley's, Inc. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 79, 91, 264 Cal. Rptr. 319* (sex discrimination); *Watson v. Department of Rehabilitation (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1271, 1286-1287* (age and race discrimination)].

In *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* , the Supreme Court held that discrimination based on a work-related physical disability, which was outside the compensation bargain, is not subject to the exclusive remedy of *Lab. Code § 132a*. The employee, an administrative secretary, was terminated after she sustained an industrial knee injury. The employer stated that the employee's residual disability from her industrial injury prevented her from performing essential job functions. However, she apparently was able to perform her job duties and was willing to return to work. The Court held that *Lab. Code § 132a* is not an injured worker's exclusive remedy for discrimination based on a work related disability and, thus, does not preclude injured workers from bringing claims before the WCAB under *Lab. Code § 132a* and actions in state court seeking remedies under the Fair Employment and Housing Act and common-law wrongful discharge theory [*City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1147-1149, 1161, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* ; *see* *Green v. State of California (2007) 42 Cal. 4th 254, 262-264, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 390, 165 P.3d 118* (FEHA requires employee to prove that he or she is "qualified individual" when alleging discrimination on grounds of disability, meaning that plaintiff's burden of proving actionable discrimination on basis of disability includes proof that he or she has ability to perform essential duties of position with reasonable accommodation); *see also* *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1484-1486, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359]* .

Based on the holding in *City of Moorpark*, an employee's emotional distress claims seeking damages for work-related injury discrimination are not barred by the exclusivity rule since such discrimination is not a normal risk of the compensation bargain [*Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1492, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359]* .

In one case, the court of appeal reached a contrary result when it held that the workers' compensation exclusive remedy provisions applied to an industrial injury, including the plaintiff's emotional distress as a result of that injury, that followed an allegedly unlawful demotion because of the plaintiff's age, in violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act and of public policy, when the court found that evidence demonstrated that the alleged discriminatory act was not a "substantial factor" in causing the subsequent industrial injury [*Huffman v. Interstate Brands Cos. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 679, 692-700, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397]* .

For discussion of civil actions under the FEHA, see Ch. 115, *Civil Rights: Employment Discrimination* .

[iv] False Imprisonment

The California Supreme Court has held that false imprisonment committed by an employer against an employee is always outside of the compensation bargain; therefore, an action based on such a claim is not barred by the exclusive remedy provisions of the workers' compensation law [*Fermino v. Fedco, Inc. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 701, 723-724, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 18, 872 P.2d 559]* . In *Fermino*, an employee brought a civil action for false imprisonment alleging that her employer accused her of theft, threatened to have her arrested, held her against her will for over one hour, and interrogated her until she became hysterical. The Supreme Court reversed the trial court's decision sustaining the employer's demurrer to plaintiff's complaint. In doing so, the Court found that, although reasonable attempts to investigate an employee's theft are a normal part of the employment relationship entitled to the protection of the exclusivity rule, an employer's actions that go beyond the bounds of reasonble interrogation and detention and thereby constitute false imprisonment, are not entitled to such protection [*see* *Fermino v. Fedco, Inc. (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 701, 723-724, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 18, 872 P.2d 559]* .

[v] No Exception for Reckless, Negligent or Criminally Negligent Conduct

In applying the California Supreme Court's *Fermino* analysis, one court of appeal stressed that there is no "beyond the compensation bargain" exception for employer behavior that is merely negligent or reckless [*Arendell v. Auto Parts Club, Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1265, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 83* (exclusivity doctrine barred action against employer for negligent or reckless failure to provide adequate security on its premises, despite knowledge of potential danger)].

Another court applied the same analysis to find that even conduct which could be construed as criminally negligent, including involuntary manslaughter caused by unsafe working conditions, is not beyond the compensation bargain [*Vuillemainroy v. American Rock & Asphalt, Inc. (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1280, 1285-1286, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269]* . Similarly, a court has held that an employer's conduct of providing employees with a hazardous chemical substance to clean a film processing laboratory, concealing known unsafe working conditions, and violating environmental safety regulations was within the compensation bargain, making workers' compensation benefits the employees' exclusive remedy [*Gunnell v. Metrocolor Laboratories, Inc. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 710, 714, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195]* .

[c] Retaliation for Claiming Workers' Compensation Benefits

Lab. Code § 132a is not the exclusive remedy for discrimination due to disability from work related injury [*City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1158, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291*)]. As pointed out by the Court, *Lab. Code § 132a* is contained in Division 1 of the Labor Code, and the plain language of the exclusive remedy provisions of the workers' compensation law apparently limits those provisions to those set forth in Division 4 of the Labor Code. The Court reasoned that remedies that the Legislature placed in other divisions of the Labor Code are simply not subject to the workers' compensation exclusive remedy provisions [*City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1154-1155, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationGeneral OverviewLabor & Employment LawWrongful TerminationPublic PolicyTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewTortsIntentional TortsFalse ImprisonmentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.316

§ 577.316 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Coemployee

[1] In General

If the conditions of compensation set forth in *Lab. Code § 3600(a)* concur [*see § 577.23*], the right to recover workers' compensation benefits is the sole remedy of an injured employee against a coemployee acting within the scope of his or her employment [*Lab. Code § 3601(a)*]. This exclusive remedy principle is subject to two exceptions [*Lab. Code § 3601(a)(1), (2)*]:

- If the injury or death is proximately caused by the willful and unprovoked physical act of aggression of the other employee.

- If the injury or death is proximately caused by the intoxication of the other employee.

If either of the exceptions apply, the injured employee (or his or her dependents in the case of death), in addition to recovering compensation benefits from the employer, has a right to bring an action at law for damages against the other employee as if workers' compensation law did not apply [*Lab. Code § 3601(a)*].

[a] Employer Liability for Act of Coemployee

In no event, neither by legal action nor by agreement, may the employer be held vicariously liable, directly or indirectly, for damages awarded against, or for a liability incurred by, the other employee [*Lab. Code § 3601(b)*]. However, the employer may be held directly liable for a willful physical assault under *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)* as a joint participant if its conduct constitutes subsequent ratification of the act of the coemployee [*Iverson v. Atlas Pacific Engineering (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 219, 227-228, 191 Cal. Rptr. 696]* .

[b] Employee Liability for Injury or Death of Coemployee

No employee may be held liable, directly or indirectly, to his or her employer for an injury to or the death of a

coemployee unless the injured employee (or the dependents) obtains a recovery against the coemployee [*Lab. Code § 3601(c)*].

[c] Willful and Unprovoked Physical Act of Aggression

The "willful and unprovoked physical act of aggression" requirement of *Lab. Code § 3601(a)(1)* does not require conduct that would constitute a battery; that is, there need not be physical contact. One who by physical conduct first places another in reasonable fear of bodily harm may be liable under the exception [*Iverson v. Atlas Pacific Engineering (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 219, 225, 191 Cal. Rptr. 696* ; *see* *Mathews v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 719, 727, 100 Cal. Rptr. 301, 493 P.2d 1165]* . The trial court may properly instruct the jury that the plaintiff must prove that the co-worker had intent to injure the plaintiff [*Torres v. Parkhouse Tire Service, Inc. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 995, 1003-1006, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 564, 30 P.3d 57]* . Allegations based on such an act may also be sufficient to state a cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress [*Iverson v. Atlas Pacific Engineering (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 219, 229-231, 191 Cal. Rptr. 696]* .

[2] Injuries Caused by Acts Outside Coemployee's Scope of Employment

The coemployee exclusive remedy principle applies only to tortious conduct of a coemployee that is "within the scope of his or her employment" [*Lab. Code § 3601(a)*]. The scope of employment of a coemployee is not coterminous with the "course-of-employment" standard that entitles the injured employee to workers' compensation. Thus, the injured employee may be acting within the course of his or her employment, and therefore entitled to workers' compensation [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(2)*], even though the tortfeasor employee is found not to be within the scope of his or her employment for purposes of the exclusive remedy principle [*see* *Saala v. McFarland (1965) 63 Cal. 2d 124, 128-130, 45 Cal. Rptr. 144, 403 P.2d 400* (injured employee was within course of employment while in employer's parking lot after shift had ended, while coemployee who struck her with his car while also leaving work was outside scope of his employment)].

One court has held that the coemployee's "scope of employment" is coterminous with the standard by which it would be determined whether the employer was vicariously liable for the acts of the employee to a nonemployee third person under the doctrine of respondeat superior [*see* *Brittell v. Young (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 400, 402-407, 153 Cal. Rptr. 387* (injured employee who was arriving for meeting was within course of employment; coemployee who was on premises but working on own vehicle after work was also within scope of employment)].

Lab. Code § 3602(a), as amended in 1982, which sharply limited the application of the dual capacity doctrine with respect to employers [*see § 577.311*], does not protect coemployees from civil liability; but coemployees do enjoy the immunity created by *Lab. Code § 3601*, which expressly immunizes them for acts within the scope of their employment [*Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 737-738, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1]* .

The California Supreme Court has held that the 1982 amendment of *Lab. Code § 3602* confirms that there can be no judicially created dual capacity exceptions to the immunity from civil liability granted to coemployees [*Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 737-738, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1]* . Thus, a physician who was employed by a professional football team to provide treatment to players injured in the course of their employment by the team was protected from a malpractice suit by the statutory immunity of *Lab. Code § 3601*, since the physician was acting within the scope of his employment when he diagnosed and treated the plaintiff whose injury was proximately caused by his employment by the team [*Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 738-739, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1.]*

However, if a coemployee provides medical services other than those contemplated by the employee's employment and in so doing is not acting for the employer, he or she no longer enjoys the immunity from suit provided by *Lab. Code § 3601* for acts that are within the scope of employment [*Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 741, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1* (disapproving contrary holding in *Hoffman v. Rogers (1972) 22 Cal. App. 3d 655, 99 Cal. Rptr. 455*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsIntentional TortsAssault & BatteryGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesIntoxicationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityEmployees & EmployersWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.317

§ 577.317 Exceptions to Exclusive Remedy Principle Permitting Suit Against Insurer

[1] Insurer's Liability for Deceitful and Intentional Practices

[a] Pre-1982 Statutory Amendments

The inclusion of the employer's workers' compensation insurer within the scope of those protected by the exclusive remedy principle arises from the statutory exclusion of the insurer as a third party against whom a civil action may be filed [*Lab. Code §§ 3850(b), 3852* ("employer" includes insurer for purposes of third-party subrogation action, which may be filed against person other than employer); *see Jablonski v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 379, 385-386, 251 Cal. Rptr. 160]* . Prior to the 1982 amendments to the exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code §§ 3600-3602*], the California Supreme Court held that a compensation insurer forfeited its immunity from civil suit for intentional torts if it engaged in deceitful conduct in investigating an injured employee's claim. In so holding, the Court stated that by embarking on a deceitful course of conduct, the insurer was abandoning its proper role within the framework of the workers' compensation system. Therefore, in so acting, the insurer became a person other than the employer and was subject to civil suit [*Unruh v. Truck Insurance Exchange (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 616, 629-631, 102 Cal. Rptr. 815, 498 P.2d 1063]* .

[b] Post-1982 Statutory Amendments

[i] No Express Exception to Exclusive Remedy Principle

Under the 1982 amendments, no express exception to the exclusive remedy principle was preserved by statute for intentional and deceitful insurance practices [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)*]. Several courts are of the opinion that no common-law exceptions to the exclusive remedy principle remain valid except those specifically preserved by statute [*see Continental Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 156, 162, 235 Cal. Rptr. 260* (stating that statute implies that no other exceptions exist); *see also Lab. Code § 3602(a)*; *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 153-155, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743* ; *but see Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1431, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68* (finding cause of action for intentionally inflicted emotional distress still permitted under some circumstances despite lack of statutory preservation)].

[ii] Effect of Amendments

One court has reaffirmed the holding of *Unruh* under current law without discussion of any possible effect of the 1982 amendments. The court held that allegations of the insurer's fraudulent denial of the existence of a workers' compensation policy, and allegations that the insurer destroyed the policy, stated causes of action for fraud and spoliation of evidence that were not preempted by the exclusive remedy principle. The court stated that the exclusive remedy principle does not apply if the acts alleged are in themselves fraudulent, deceitful, outrageous, perfidious, or so extreme or abnormal as to fit in the class of misconduct considered in *Unruh*. Such conduct falls outside the permissible boundary of protected behavior by a compensation carrier [*Jablonski v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 379, 387-391, 391 n.6, 251 Cal. Rptr. 160* (also noting that standard is not identical with that applicable to tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress); *see Everfield v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 15, 18, 171 Cal. Rptr. 164]* .

To the extent that the exception of *Unruh* is still valid, it does not apply to mere negligence in the conduct of an investigation or handling of a claim [*Unruh v. Truck Insurance Exchange (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 616, 627-629, 102 Cal. Rptr. 815, 498 P.2d 1063]* . Delay in payment or other conduct related to the improper processing of a claim does not cause the insurer to lose its exclusivity defense [*see Jablonski v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 379, 388, 251 Cal. Rptr. 160* (and cases cited therein); *see also Mitchell v. Scott Wetzel Services, Inc. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1474, 1480-1481, 278 Cal. Rptr. 474* (action by injured employee against self-insured employer's workers' compensation administrator alleging perjury before WCAB and misrepresentation regarding benefit checks and availability of rental car as within exclusive jurisdiction of workers' compensation system)].

The exclusive remedy principle is also not negated simply because the injured employee alleges that the insurer's conduct violates the Insurance Code [*Jablonski v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 379, 392, 251 Cal. Rptr. 160* (rejecting argument that exclusive remedy principle did not apply to cause of action for unfair insurance claims practices under *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)*)]. It has also been held that *Unruh* does not apply to a self-insured employer for acts done in the course of investigating a compensation claim [*Gallo Glass Co. v. Superior Court (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 485, 488-490, 196 Cal. Rptr. 23]* .

In *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court [(1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762]* , in the course of holding that the California workers' compensation system preempts a private cause of action by an injured worker against an independent claims administrator of his self-insured employer for the delay or refusal to pay compensation benefits and that the exclusive jurisdiction over such matters is in the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, the Supreme Court affirmed its holding in *Unruh*.

The Court pointed out that in *Unruh* it had carved out a narrow exception to the appeals board's exclusive jurisdiction over the claims of an injured employee against her employer's insurance carrier by allowing the employee to bring an action against the insurer for assault and intentional infliction of emotional distress based on the tortious acts of the insurer's private investigator because the insurer's misconduct was so extreme and outrageous that it had in fact stepped out of its role as an insurer and could, therefore, be held liable under *Lab. Code § 3852* as a person other than the employer [*see also Lab. Code § 3850(b)* (defining "employer" as used in the workers' compensation law as including "insurer")]. The Court added that in *Unruh* it had also noted that the workers' compensation law did not preclude the plaintiff from bringing a separate suit against the insurer's investigator, since investigators are neither employers nor insurers under the workers' compensation law [*Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 6-7, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762]* .

An injured worker's civil action against his employer's workers' compensation insurer for malicious prosecution of an insurance fraud criminal complaint against the worker has been held not barred by the exclusive remedy rule of workers' compensation law. An allegation that the insurer acted with malice amounts to an allegation that the insurer stepped out of its role in processing workers' compensation claims and, thus, places the insurer's act of reporting alleged insurance

fraud outside the compensation bargain [*Mosby v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 995, 999, 1004-1006, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 286]* .

Similarly, a workers' compensation insurer for an employee leasing company was held to have engaged in breach of contract, insurance bad faith, and fraud when it denied coverage to an injured employee working for the contractor to whom the leasing company had leased employees [*Diamond Woodworks, Inc. v. Argonaut Insurance Co. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1020, 1030-1049, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 736]* .

[2] Insurer's Liability to Medical Providers for Mishandling Lien Claims

Economic injuries sustained by medical providers to their businesses resulting from failure to receive full and timely payment on their lien claims from insurance carriers fall within the scope of the exclusivity provisions. However, medical providers may bring civil actions against insurers for acts by the insurers that fall outside the scope of the compensation bargain, thereby violating public policy [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 814, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234* ; *see also Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 6, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762* ; *Unruh v. Truck Ins. Exch. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 616, 629-631, 102 Cal. Rptr. 815, 498 P.2d 1063]* .

In *Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund*, a group of medical providers sued various workers' compensation insurers, claiming that the insurers conspired to put them out of business by intentionally mishandling their lien claims before the Appeals Board. The providers alleged causes of actions for: (1) abuse of process; (2) fraud; (3) violations of the Cartwright Act; (4) RICO violations; (5) conspiracy to violate RICO; (6) intentional and negligent interference with ongoing businesses; (7) intentional and negligent interference with contractual and prospective economic relations; and (8) violations of the unfair compensation law (UCL). The California Supreme Court concluded that the exclusive remedy provisions barred some, but not all, of the claims brought by the providers [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 823-828, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234]* .

In analyzing this issue of first impression, the Court first determined that the alleged injury underlying all of the medical providers' causes of action was collateral to or derivative of a compensable workplace injury since the providers' lien claims were to recover compensation for medical services provided to injured workers. Therefore, the injury fell within the ambit of the exclusive remedy rule [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 811, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234]* . The Court next considered whether there were any applicable exceptions to the exclusivity rule which would allow the providers to pursue their causes of action, based on conduct by the insurers which fell outside the scope of the employment bargain and violated public policy. After reviewing the acts and motives giving rise to the providers' claims, the Court concluded that the abuse of process and fraud claims did not fall within any exception, because the insurers' acts and motives were closely connected to normal insurer activity--the processing and payment of medical lien claims--and fell within the risks contemplated by the compensation bargain [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 823-824, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234]* . In contrast, however, the Court found that the providers' Cartwright Act and RICO claims were not barred by the exclusivity doctrine because the acts and motives giving rise to these claims, by their very nature, fell outside the compensation bargain [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 825-827, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234]* . With regard to tortious interference with business relations and violations of the UCL, the Court concluded that the claims were barred to the extent that they focused on the individual misdeeds of each individual insurer because such misconduct was connected with normal insurer activity. However, the claims were not precluded to the extent they were predicated on the conspiratorial misconduct of the insurers [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 827-828, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234]* .

Although he concurred with the disposition and much of the reasoning of the majority opinion, Justice Werdegar determined that the exclusivity provisions did not apply to health care providers and, therefore, it was unnecessary to consider the application of exceptions [*Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 829, 102*

Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234] .

In a civil action that arose out of successful attempts by the California Insurance Guarantee Association and numerous insurers and employers to have the Appeals Board consolidate many different medical lien claims in order to obtain a determination from the Board as to whether Premier Medical Management Systems, Inc., was improperly representing treating physicians in Appeals Board proceedings, Premier and five affiliated treating physicians sued the insurers and employers, alleging various tort and statutory causes of action based on claims that the defendants were engaged in anti-competitive activity. The gravamen of the complaint was that, after Premier submitted the plaintiff physicians' bills to the defendants for payment and filed liens in numerous workers' compensation cases before the Appeals Board, the defendants collectively conspired to contest, delay, and avoid payment of those bills and liens [*Premier Med. Mgmt. Sys., Inc. v. Cal. Ins. Guarantee Ass'n (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 464, 468-470, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43]* . The defendants argued that the complaint was an anti-SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation) lawsuit because it was based entirely on the defendants' constitutional right to petition the Appeals Board [*see Code of Civ. Proc. § 425.16*]. The court of appeal agreed with the defendants, finding that the anti-SLAPP statute applied because the defendants had shown that the plaintiffs' complaint related to activity that was a protected activity, i.e., the right to petition the Appeals Board and litigate lien claims before the Board, and that the defendants had a probability of prevailing on the plaintiffs' complaint, based on the applicability of the *Noerr-Pennington* doctrine that parties who petition the government for redress are generally immune from antitrust liability. Consequently, the court of appeal reversed the trial court's order denying the defendants' special motion to strike the complaint [*Premier Med. Mgmt. Sys., Inc. v. Cal. Ins. Guarantee Ass'n (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 464, 472-480, 39 Cal. Rptr. 3d 43* ; *see Eastern R. Presidents Conf. v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc. (1961) 365 U.S. 127, 81 S. Ct. 523, 5 L. Ed. 2d 464* ; *United Mine Workers v. Pennington (1965) 381 U.S. 657, 85 S. Ct. 1585, 14 L. Ed. 2d 626]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawDefensesPublic Policy ViolationsTortsBusiness TortsFraud & MisrepresentationGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.318

§ 577.318 Effect of Exclusive Remedy Doctrine on Tort Actions by Employee's Relatives and Heirs

[1] In General

If the conditions of compensation exist, the employer's liability to pay compensation is "in lieu of any other liability whatsoever to any person" [*Lab. Code § 3600(a)*; *see Williams v. Schwartz (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 628, 634, 131 Cal. Rptr. 200]* . Thus, any action by any person that arises from an injury to an employee sustained in the course of employment is barred by the exclusive remedy principle [*Soil Engineering Construction, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 329, 332-333, 186 Cal. Rptr. 209]* .

[2] Wrongful Death

The exclusive remedy principle applies to wrongful death actions in the same manner as it does to the underlying injury causing death [*see Lab. Code §§ 3600-3602*]. Thus, if a tortious act causing death falls within the exclusive remedy principles of workers' compensation law, an action for wrongful death will be barred, whether or not the parties suffering damages as a result of the "wrongful death" are entitled to benefits under workers' compensation law based on their status as dependents of the deceased worker [*see Soil Engineering Construction, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 329, 332-333, 186 Cal. Rptr. 209* ; *see also Lab. Code §§ 4700-4709* (governing availability of death benefits)].

A wrongful death action against an employer who is not a covered employer under workers' compensation is specifically preserved by statute [*see § 577.312[2]*]. If death, whether happening instantaneously or otherwise, results from an injury to an employee caused by the want of ordinary or reasonable care of an employer or of any officer, agent, or servant of the employer, the personal representative of the employee has a right of action against the employer, and may recover damages for and on behalf of the surviving spouse, children, dependent parents, and dependent brothers and sisters, in order of precedence as stated. No more than one such action may be brought [*Lab. Code § 2803*].

Lab. Code § 2803 provides a more restrictive remedy than that provided under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62*, the general wrongful death statutes. First, under *Lab. Code § 2803*, in the absence of a surviving spouse and children, the action may only be brought by dependent parentsand siblings, whereas a wrongful death action may be brought by any

person entitled to succeed to the decedent's property by intestate succession (if there is no surviving spouse, child, or issue of a deceased child) [*compare Lab. Code § 2803 with Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60(a)*]. These persons are not required to be dependent on the decedent to maintain a wrongful death action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60(a)*]. Furthermore, certain additional classes of dependents (beyond parents and siblings) are eligible to bring a wrongful death action [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 377.60(b), (c)*]. In those cases in which an exception to the exclusive remedy doctrine exists, it appears that any person entitled to bring an action under the general wrongful death statute may do so, regardless of the limitations set forth in *Lab. Code § 2803* [*see Gonsalves v. Petaluma etc. Ry. Co. (1916) 173 Cal. 264, 266-268, 159 P. 724* (construing similar former statutes)].

The Supreme Court has held that a Medi-Cal lien could not be asserted against a wrongful death action, when the damages recoverable by the plaintiff in that action did not and could not include compensation for medical services provided to the decedent by Medi-Cal. The Court found that in California a wrongful death action is a cause of action in favor of the heirs as beneficiaries, based on their own independent pecuniary injury suffered by the loss of a relative. Thus, it is distinct from any action that the deceased might have maintained, had he or she survived, so that the damages awarded in a wrongful death action are for harm done to the survivors, not to the deceased [*Fitch v. Select Products Co. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 812, 819-822, 115 P.3d 1233]* .

For a form of complaint based on wrongful death, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions* .

[3] Loss of Consortium

Actions against an employer to recover damages for loss of consortium are barred if they are based on an injury to an employee that is within the exclusive coverage of workers' compensation [*Santiago v. Employee Benefits Services (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 898, 906, 214 Cal. Rptr. 679* ; *Casaccia v. Green Valley Disposal Co. (1976) 62 Cal. App. 3d 610, 612, 133 Cal. Rptr. 295]* . Similarly, actions by a nonemployee for infliction of emotional distress that are based on a tortious act of an employer towards an employee are not permitted as long as the harm to the employee is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Workers' Compensation Act [*Williams v. Schwartz (1976) 61 Cal. App. 3d 628, 632-634, 131 Cal. Rptr. 200]* .

[4] Fetal Injury

The exclusive remedy provisions of the workers' compensation law do not apply to independent fetal injuries caused by an employer's negligent conduct towards a pregnant employee [*Snyder v. Michael's Stores, Inc. (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 991, 994, 1005, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476, 945 P.2d 781]* .In *Snyder v. Michael's Stores, Inc.*, the California Supreme Court overruled an earlier decision in which a court of appeal applied the "derivative injury rule" to hold that workers' compensation was the only remedy available to an injured fetus because the child's prenatal injury flowed or derived from the injury to the mother [*see Bell v. Macy's California (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1442, 1443, 1445, 261 Cal. Rptr. 447]* . The Court criticized the appellate court's application of the "derivative injury rule," finding that fetal injuries are not necessarily derivative of the mother's injuries, but may be separate and distinct, entitling the fetus to an independent claim.

The Court explained that, generally, a business is civilly liable to an independent third party, including the unborn child of a non-employee, whom is injured as a result of the businesses negligent conduct [*see Civ. Code § 43.1*]; there is nothing to indicate a legislative intent that prenatal injuries to the children of employee's be treated any differently. The Court concluded that the exclusive remedy doctrine does not bar civil claims for independent injuries sustained by the unborn child of an employee [*Snyder v. Michael's Stores, Inc. (1997)16 Cal. 4th 991, 997-1000, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 476, 945 P.2d 781]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsDamagesConsortium DamagesGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsGeneral OverviewTortsWrongful Death & Survival ActionsDeceased PersonsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity Provisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.319

§ 577.319 Dual Remedies

[1] In General

If the exclusive remedy principle does not apply, the remedies of workers' compensation and civil damages are cumulative and not alternative [*Burnelle v. Continental Can Co., Inc. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 315, 320, 238 Cal. Rptr. 253* ; *see Lab. Code § 3600(b)*; *but see Hollywood Refrigeration Sales Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 754, 757-758, 210 Cal. Rptr. 619* (decided under prior law but after 1982 enactment of statute, noting that issue of whether workers' compensation and tort damages are ultimately cumulative or alternative is essentially unsettled)].

If an employee (or his or her dependents) receives workers' compensation and also secures a judgment for or settlement of civil damages under an exception to the exclusive remedy principle, workers' compensation benefits are to be credited against the tort judgment or settlement. The employer is also relieved of the obligation to pay further workers' compensation up to the net amount of the judgment or settlement, or up to the portion of the judgment that has been satisfied [*Lab. Code § 3600(b)*]. Compensation includes sums received by the employee prior to a final adjudication of the workers' compensation claim and sums received by the employee in the form of an award following a final adjudication of the workers' compensation claim [*Burnelle v. Continental Can Co., Inc. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 315, 320, 238 Cal. Rptr. 253]* .

Dual remedies with setoff principles are also statutorily authorized in an action against an uninsured employer [*see Lab. Code § 3709*]. For further discussion, see *§ 577.312[2]*.

[2] Jurisdiction and Res Judicata

[a] In General

In many cases, it is not clear whether the conditions of workers' compensation exist or whether an exception to the exclusive remedy principle applies. Thus, the employee must decide whether to pursue dual remedies simultaneously or to elect one remedy to pursue first. If any doubt exists, it is proper to protect against the running of the statute of limitations by filing both a civil action and an application for workers' compensation benefits [*Dixon v. Ford Motor*

Co. (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 499, 502 n.*, *125 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

The civil courts and the WCAB have concurrent jurisdiction to determine jurisdiction [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* . If an exception to the exclusive remedy principle applies, the injured worker's remedies are cumulative [*Burnelle v. Continental Can Co., Inc. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 315, 320, 238 Cal. Rptr. 253* ; *see Lab. Code § 3600(b)*; *but see Hollywood Refrigeration Sales Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 754, 757-758, 210 Cal. Rptr. 619* (decided under prior law but after 1982 enactment of statute, noting that issue of whether workers' compensation and tort damages are ultimately cumulative or alternative is essentially unsettled); for discussion, *see* [1], *above*].

[b] If Remedies Are Cumulative

If workers' compensation and civil remedies are cumulative, a determination in one forum is not subject to merger and bar under the doctrine of res judicata [*Burnelle v. Continental Can Co., Inc. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 315, 320, 238 Cal. Rptr. 253]* .

[c] If Remedies Are Not Cumulative

If remedies are not cumulative, the tribunal assuming jurisdiction retains it to the exclusion of all other tribunals. Once a tribunal determines that is has jurisdiction over the case, jurisdiction becomes exclusive, and the final determination regarding jurisdiction is res judicata before the other tribunal with regard to the same parties [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Scott v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1956) 46 Cal. 2d 76, 81, 293 P.2d 18]* . A party may obtain an order preventing the second tribunal from acting pending determination by the first tribunal of the jurisdictional question [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Taylor v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 148, 151, 301 P.2d 866]* . For a form for an affirmative defense to a civil action alleging that the WCAB has already assumed exclusive jurisdiction, see *§ 577.531[1]*.

[d] Res Judicata Effect of Determination by WCAB That Injury Compensable Under Workers' Compensation

A determination by the WCAB that the conditions of compensation exist and that an injury is compensable under workers' compensation is res judicata as to that issue in a civil action based on the same injury. Thus, if the right to bring the civil action is based on a noncompensable injury, the action is barred by the prior determination of compensability. In addition, a compromise settlement approved by the WCAB has the same force and effect as a judgment made after a full hearing and is entitled to full res judicata effect [*Hollywood Refrigeration Sales Co. v. Superior Court (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 754, 759, 210 Cal. Rptr. 619]* . However, to preclude an action, the compromise settlement must include the determination that all of the claims released are compensable under workers' compensation law; if it does not do so, res judicata principles do not preclude relitigation of the issue [*Lopez v. Sikkema (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 31, 40-44, 280 Cal. Rptr. 7* (compromise and release approved by WCAB, which did not clearly determine that all claims were compensable under workers' compensation law, did not preclude tort action based on employer's conduct outside compensation bargain; triable issue of fact remained regarding scope of release)].

The fact that the compromise and release sets forth the nature of the injury suffered does not, by itself, support the conclusion that all claims arising from that injury were covered by the settlement [*Lopez v. Sikkema (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 31, 44, 280 Cal. Rptr. 7* (triable issue of fact remained regardless of whether settlement was intended to cover claims for civil rights violation and intentional physical injury)]. A WCAB decision has no res judicata effect on matters that are unnecessary to the determination [*Young v. Libbey-Owens Ford Co. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1037, 1042-1043, 214 Cal. Rptr. 400]* .

[e] Effect of Determination That Employee Sought Unavailable Remedy

If a civil judgment or WCAB determination is rendered for the employer because the employee has sought a remedy that is not available to him or her, that judgment or determination does not bar a proceeding in the proper tribunal for a proper remedy [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 974, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* .

[3] Tolling of Statute of Limitations

The filing of a claim for workers' compensation effectively tolls the statute of limitations for the purposes of a later tort claim based on the same facts [*Elkins v. Derby (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 410, 412, 115 Cal. Rptr. 641, 525 P.2d 81]* . However, the filing of a claim for workers' compensation does not toll an action against an employer for aggravation of an injury resulting fromthe employer's fraudulent concealment of the cause of the injury [*Aerojet General Corp. v. Superior Court (1986) 177 Cal. App. 3d 950, 955-957, 223 Cal. Rptr. 249* ; *see § 577.314[3]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsPreclusion & Effect of JudgmentsRes JudicataGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTollingWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsJurisdictionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity ProvisionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.320

§ 577.320 Employer's Duty and Proof of Negligence

[1] In General

In a civil action by an employee against an employer under any exception to the exclusive remedy principle, principles of fault apply. If the alleged wrong is negligence, the employer's obligation is simply to use reasonable care, which is that degree of care that one of ordinary prudence in the same line of business would be expected to exercise to secure his or her own safety in doing the work [*Hall v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 72, 80, 19 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

An employer must exercise ordinary and reasonable care to provide safe tools, machinery, and appliances. To establish a breach of this duty, it must be shown that the employer either had actual knowledge of any defect or should have discovered the defect in the exercise of reasonable care [*Hall v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 72, 80, 19 Cal. Rptr. 797]* . The employer also has a continuing duty of careful inspection at reasonable intervals [*Hall v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 72, 80, 19 Cal. Rptr. 797]* .

The employer has a duty to warn the employee of any dangers connected with the work of which the employer is aware, or that might be discovered with proper care, and of which the employee might reasonably be expected to be unaware. This duty is particularly true with regard to an inexperienced employee. However, no warning is necessary if the danger should be obvious to the employee. An experienced employee may be assumed to be aware of the ordinary dangers of the work, even if they are not apparent to one unfamiliar with the work [*Baez v. Southern Pacific Co. (1962) 210 Cal. App. 2d 714, 717, 26 Cal. Rptr. 899]* .

The exclusive remedy rule bars an employee's civil tort action against his or her employer for aggravation of pre-existing illness resulting from negligent diagnostic treatment voluntarily provided by the employer, regardless of the cause of the pre-existing illness. For example, when an employer administered regular hearing tests as an ongoing condition of employment to determine whether the noise to which the employee was exposed on the job had adversely affected his hearing, the employer's failure to notify the employee of a test result that indicated a possible brain tumor (whose genesis had nothing to do with the employee's job) until the tumor had caused permanent injury to the employee was held to constitute an industrial injury subject to the exclusive remedy rule [*Weber v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*

(2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 801, 806-809, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412] .

[2] Admissibility of Occupational Safety Statutes

California's occupational safety statutes [*Lab. Code § 6300 et seq.*] are admissible and may be considered in a personal injury or wrongful death action between an employee and employer [*see Lab. Code § 6304.5*]. The Supreme Court has held that *Lab. Code § 6304.5*, as amended effective January 1, 2000, allows plaintiffs to use Cal-OSHA provisions to show duty or standard of care to the same extent as any other regulation or statute, whether the defendant is the plaintiff's employer or a third party [*Elsner v. Uveges (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 915, 927-928, 935-936, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 530, 102 P.3d 915]* . The Court held, moreover, that these amendments to *Lab. Code § 6304.5* were not applicable to litigation arising from an injury that occurred prior to their effective date, January 1, 2000, when the Court found that the amendments created a new standard of care for the defendant and shifted the burden of proof to the defendant [*Elsner v. Uveges (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 915, 937-940, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 530, 102 P.3d 915* (holding also that trial court's rulings that made amendments applicable to this litigation did not constitute harmless error)].

[3] Injury Caused by Negligence of Coemployee

In the case of injury caused by the negligence of a coemployee, the employer's lack of ordinary care may be shown by retention of an unfit employee after the employer has knowledge of the employee's unfitness, or by the employer's failure to use due diligence in selecting an employee who, as it happens, is unfit [*Gier v. Los Angeles C. E. R. Co. (1895) 108 Cal. 129, 133, 41 P. 22]* .

[4] Actions Against Uninsured Employers

In an action against an uninsured employer, there is a rebuttable presumption of employer negligence [*Lab. Code § 3708*]. For discussion, see *§ 577.312[2]* . Special rules of comparative negligence also apply in actions against uninsured employers and actions by employees whose employment is excluded from workers' compensation coverage [*see Lab. Code §§ 2801, 3708*]. For discussion, see *§§ 577.312[2], [3]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsBusiness TortsNegligent Hiring & SupervisionGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceProofViolations of LawStatutesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityPresumptionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageActions Against EmployersStatutory RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.321

§ 577.321 Interrelationship Between Exclusive Remedy Doctrine and Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)

[1] Federal Preemption

The interrelationship between the exclusive remedy doctrine in the California Workers' Compensation Act and the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) [*see 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.*] is not altogether settled at this point. However, a case of first impression from the United States District Court, Northern District of California, has held that theexclusive remedy doctrine is preempted by the ADA [*see Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 665]* .

In *Wood v. County of Alameda*, the plaintiff suffered an injury on the job in 1992, became disabled, and filed for workers' compensation benefits under California law. When plaintiff was cleared by her physician to return to work, she was not returned to her formerly held position or a comparable position with her employer. Plaintiff alleged that the defendant employer's actions represented a denial of "reasonable accommodation" to a "qualified individual with a disability" in violation of the ADA. The defendant argued that plaintiff was barred from bringing the ADA claim on the ground that California's Workers' Compensation Act provided the sole remedy for such claims [*Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 660-661]* .

The court followed the analytical framework set forth in *Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett (1990) 494 U.S. 638, 642, 110 S. Ct. 1384, 108 L. Ed. 2d 585* :

- Does the federal statute explicitly or implicitly indicate that Congress intended the statute to defer to state law in situations like the one at issue?

- If it does not, do preemption principles mandate that all or part of the state law be denied effect in light of Congress's intent in enacting the federal law?

The court recognized that "[i]n either case, the issue turns on the language of the statute and, where the language is not dispositive, on the intent of Congress as revealed in the history and purposes of the statutory scheme" [*Wood v. County*

of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 662] .

[2] Application of Analysis to Determine That Exclusive Remedy Doctrine Preempted

In applying the first part of the *Adams Fruit* analysis, the court found that the language of the ADA in *42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)* that it does not "limit or invalidate" certain state laws basically meant that it does not excuse defendants from fulfilling their parallel obligations under other compatible state laws. Thus, the court found that Congress did not intend the ADA to defer to the California workers' compensation law at issue here. The court further noted that, unlike the War Hazards Compensation Act in which Congress has expressed clearly its intent to limit the availability of a federal remedy when the claimant has received workers' compensation benefits related to the same injury, the court believed that, had Congress intended the ADA to defer to circumstances like those presented in the instant case, it would have so stated [*Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 662-664]* .

In applying the second part of the *Adams Fruit* analysis, the court found that the exclusive remedy doctrine of the California Workers' Compensation Act is preempted by the ADA. The court stated that, under the Supremacy Clause contained in Article VI of the Constitution, which provides that state law is preempted to the extent it actually conflicts with federal law or when the state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment of the full purposes and objectives of Congress, giving effect to the exclusive remedy doctrine in the state statute in a manner that limits the availability of federal remedies would clearly stand as an obstacle to the accomplishment of Congress' stated purpose in enacting the ADA to provide a national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against the disabled, to establish strong and consistent standards addressing such discrimination, and to ensure that the federal government plays a central role in remedying this discrimination [*Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 664-665]* .

The court limited its holding in *Wood*, however, providing that only the exclusive remedy doctrine, and not the substantive protections, of the California Workers' Compensation Act is preempted by the ADA. As stated by the court, Congress intended plaintiffs to have the benefit of both federal and state causes of action to the extent that the two are compatible. When, as here, they are not wholly compatible, preemption principles clearly require that those parts (and only those parts) of the state law that hinder the accomplishment of federal objectives be denied effect [*Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 665-666]* .

For further discussion of the ADA, see *California Employment Law, Vol. 2, § 40.22A* (Matthew Bender); Larson's Worker's Compensation Law, Vol. 2, § 61.26 (Matthew Bender); Americans With Disabilities Act, chs. 6, 8 (Matthew Bender); Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, §§ 10.607 -*10.63, ch. 35, §§ 35.90 -35.104* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawSupremacy ClauseFederal PreemptionLabor & Employment LawDiscriminationDisability DiscriminationFederal & State InterrelationshipsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity ProvisionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Civil Actions Against Employer--Exclusive Remedy Principle

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.322-577.329

[Reserved]

§§ 577.322[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.330

§ 577.330 Governing Law

Actions by injured employees or their dependents and employers or their insurance carriers against third parties who are responsible for the employee's injuries in whole or in part and the employer's right to subrogation are governed by *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864* and by the substantive law of the particular tort involved. Wrongful death actions are governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62*. The right of the Director of Industrial Relations to recover damages from any person or entity, other than the employer, whose tortious act or omission proximately caused the injury to or death of the employee is governed by *Lab. Code § 3732*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.331

§ 577.331 Definitions

[1] Employee

As used in *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*, "employee" includes the person injured and any other person to whom a claim accrues by reason of the injury or death of the person injured [*Lab. Code § 3850(a)*].

[2] Employer

The term "employer" includes the employer's compensation carrier and the Self-Insurer's Security Fund when the employer's compensation obligations have been assumed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3743* (insolvent self-insurer) [*Lab. Code § 3850(b), (c)*; *see Chase Chemical Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 229, 237, 205 Cal. Rptr. 469* ; *Johnson v. Santos (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 566, 570, 196 Cal. Rptr. 145]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsEmployeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICoverageEmployment RelationshipsEmployersWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.332

§ 577.332 Actions Against Third-Party Tortfeasor

[1] In General

A claim for workers' compensation benefits does not affect the injured employee's claim or right of action or of that of his or her heirs for all damages proximately resulting from the injury or death against any person other than the employer [*Lab. Code § 3852*]. Hence, notwithstanding the recovery of workers' compensation benefits, the injured employee, or the employee's heirs in the event of the employee's death, are free to sue a third-party tortfeasor for all the damages sustained as a result of the employee's injury or death [*see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 334, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068* ; *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 833, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see also* complaint for damages in § 577.520[1]].

Moreover, except to the extent the rule has been modified by statute (see *Civ. Code § 3333.1(a), (b)*, exempting negligent health care providers from any duty to reimburse employers or their carriers for workers' compensation benefits paid as a result of the negligence of the health care providers) and *Barme v. Wood (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 174, 180-182, 207 Cal. Rptr. 816, 689 P.2d 446* , upholding the legal validity of *Civ. Code § 3333.1*; *see also Graham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 499, 501, 504, 258 Cal. Rptr. 376* , and discussion under [12], *below*) any employer, or its compensation carrier, who pays or becomes obligated to pay compensation, or who pays or becomes obligated to pay salary in lieu of compensation, or who pays or becomes obligated to pay an amount to the Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4706.5* (payment when deceased employee left no dependents), may likewise make a claimor bring an action against the third person [*Lab. Code § 3852*; *see § 577.521*].

Thus, under *Lab. Code § 3852*, both the employee and the employer, except as noted above, may sue a third party who may be responsible for the employee's injuries [*Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . In addition, in the event of the employee's death, his or her heirs may sue for wrongful death under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 377* (now *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62*). However, a wrongful death action under former *Code Civ. Proc. § 377* (now *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62*) is in no way a claim derived from the decedent via the survival of a claim the decedent may have had and, being original rather than derivative in nature, is independent of the employer's

or its insurance carrier's action for recovery of funds paid out under *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Eli v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 901, 904-905, 235 Cal. Rptr. 704]* . The court of appeal has held that, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852*, a workers' compensation carrier stated a cause of action against alleged third-party tortfeasors for recoupment of death benefits the carrier paid to a deceased employee's survivor, who was an actual dependent of the employee but who had no standing to bring a wrongful death action against the alleged tortfeasors. The court held that the carrier's right to sue was not limited to its status as subrogee of the survivor and that the wrongful death statute, with its limited standing provisions, was irrelevant in determining the carrier's right to sue [*Fremont Comp. Ins. Co. v. Sierra Pine, Ltd. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 389, 394-401, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80]* .

[1A] Attorney's Duty to Advise Regarding Possible Third Party Action

Failure by an attorney representing an employee in a workers' compensation proceeding to timely advise the employee that he or she may have a viable personal injury action against third parties may constitute malpractice or negligence. The elements of a cause of action in tort for professional negligence are: (1) the duty of the professional to use such skill, prudence, and diligence as other members of the profession commonly possess and exercise; (2) a breach of that duty; (3) a proximate causal connection between the negligent conduct and the resulting injury; and (4) actual loss or damage resulting from the professional's negligence [*Budd v. Nixen (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 195, 200, 98 Cal. Rptr. 849, 491 P.2d 433]* . As part of the third element--proof that any loss suffered by plaintiff was proximately caused by defendant's negligence--plaintiff must prove that the third party action would have resulted in a favorable judgment and that at least some portion of that judgment would have been collectible [*Campbell v. Magana (1960) 184 Cal. App. 2d 751, 754, 8 Cal. Rptr. 32]* . Thus, plaintiff's failure in the malpractice action to present any evidence regarding the collectibility of some portion of a judgment in the third party action will defeat the malpractice action [*Garretson v. Miller (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 563, 571-573, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 317]* .

[2] Purpose of Law

The purpose of *Lab. Code § 3850 et seq.* is to insure, first, that, regardless of whether it is the employee or the employer who sues the third party, both the employee and the employer recover their due, and, second, that, as far as possible, the third party need defend only one lawsuit [*Board of Administration v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 912, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363]* .

[3] Nature of Law

The claim of the employer and its compensation carrier against the third-party tortfeasor derive from the injured employee's claim against the tortfeasor for damages for personal injuries. In their own right, the employer and its carrier possess no claims of their own against the tortfeasor, since the tortfeasor has committed no wrong against them. Only because they have carried part of the costs of the injured person's losses do they acquire claims against the tortfeasor as subrogees to the injured person's claims for damages for personal injuries [*Board of Administration v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 915, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *see Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 928-931, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *Mendenhall v. Curtis (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 786, 791-794, 162 Cal. Rptr. 569* ; *see also § 577.520*]. Thus, although employer and employee actions are interchangeable, substantively as well as procedurally, Lab. Code § 3282 does not enlarge the tort remedy of a compensation carrier beyond that of the injured employee [*Eli v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 901, 904, 235 Cal. Rptr. 704]* .

[4] Applicability of Substantive Tort Law

Lab. Code § 3850 et seq. governing employer and employee actions against third parties, does not define the substantive law that determines whether an employee or an employer will in fact recover. Instead, the substantive law that governs employer and employee actions is usually the general tort law. As applied in cases involving employee and employer third-party claims, however, the general tort law works in parallel with the procedures that the Legislature has

set up in *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*.

Substantively, as well as procedurally, employer and employee actions are interchangeable. Hence, regardless of who brings an action, it is essentially the same lawsuit. Thus, the employee's general damage claim, whether prosecuted by the employee personally or by the employee's employer or its insurance carrier on the employer's behalf, is solely one in tort for personal injuries arising out of the negligence of the third-party tortfeasor, and the tort liability of the third-party tortfeasor remains the same [*County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 873-875, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Finney v. Manpower, Inc. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 1066, 1070, 177 Cal. Rptr. 74]* . For a discussion of the substantive tort law that applies and forms of complaints that may be used by an employee to sue a third-party tortfeasor for damages or adapted for use by the employer to recover workers' compensation or death benefits it has paid because of the third party's tort, see the appropriate chapter in this publication, for example, Ch. 362, *Mental Suffering and Emotional Distress* , Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

[5] Survival of Action

The death of the employee or of any other person does not abate any right of action established by *Lab. Code § 3850 et seq.* [*Lab. Code § 3851*].

[6] Joinder and Consolidation

If the action is brought by either the employer or the employee, the other may, at any time before trial on the facts, join as party plaintiff or must consolidate his or her action, if brought independently [*Lab. Code § 3853*; *see County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Johnson v. De Santos (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 566, 570, 196 Cal. Rptr. 145* ; *see also San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 846, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163]* .

[7] Intervention

Under *Lab. Code § 3853*, the employer or employee may also intervene in the other's action [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 833, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 846, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163* ; *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 n.2, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 387* and § 577.521].

The right to intervene before trial commences is unconditional [*Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 n.2, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455]* . However, since one of the purposes of intervention is to avoid delay in litigation [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Selma Trailer & Manufacturing Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 740, 754-755, 258 Cal. Rptr. 545]* , when an employee's third-party action has been dismissed for failure to effect timely service of the summons, the employee may not intervene in the action maintained by the employer's compensation carrier, who had intervened in the employee's action [*Bishop v. Silva (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1317, 1324-1327, 285 Cal. Rptr. 910]* . Similarly, when an employee's action has been dismissed for failure to diligently prosecute the action, the employee is not permitted to intervene in the employer's independent subrogation action [*Fairmont Ins. Co. v. Frank (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 457, 460, 49 Cal. Rptr. 2d 670]* .

As noted above, under *Lab. Code § 3853*, an employer has an unconditional right to intervene in the employee's third-party action at any time before a trial on the facts. When the employer makes a pretrial motion to be joined as a party, the employer has, as a matter of law, satisfied the "upon timely application" requirement of *Code Civ. Proc. § 387*, which governs intervention in general. Thus, the trial court erred in refusing an employer's pretrial request to intervene in an employee's action when, although the employee and the third party had settled, there still remained for trial the insurance carrier's complaint to recover the amount of compensation benefits it had paid to the employer [*Mar*

v. Sakti Internat. Corp. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1780, 1784-1785, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 388] .

[8] Statute of Limitations

A complaint by the employee against the third-party tortfeasor for damages for personal injuries must be filed within two years from the date the injury was sustained [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 335.1*]. A complaint against the third-party tortfeasor by the employer to recover compensation benefits paid is subject to the same period of limitation; that is, it must be filed within the statutory limitations period from the date of the employee's injury and not from the date workers' compensation benefits were paid [*County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 868-886, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363]* .

However, a complaint in intervention filed in the employee's action is timely, even if filed after the running of the statute of limitations, if the statute had not yet run at the time the employee's complaint was filed and the complaint in intervention is filed before trial [*see Lab. Code § 3853*; *see also County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 885, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363]* . This is also true with respect to a complaint in intervention filed by the employee in a prior timely filed action by the employer or its insurance carrier [*see State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Selma Trailer & Manufacturing Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 740, 754-755, 258 Cal. Rptr. 545* ; *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 826, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *Jordan v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 202, 206-211, 172 Cal. Rptr. 30* ; *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Matulich (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 528, 529-530, 131 P.2d 21]* .

[9] Effect of Delay in Prosecution

Delay in prosecuting the third-party action may result in the involuntary dismissal of the complaint [*see generally Code Civ. Proc. §§ 581, 583.110-583.430*; *see also* Ch. 212, *Dismissal*] and of the complaint in intervention. *Lab. Code § 3853*, which permits the filing of a complaint in intervention, does not qualify or eliminate the intervenor's obligation to pursue his or her claim diligently from the beginning [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Selma Trailer & Manufacturing Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 740, 755, 258 Cal. Rptr. 545]* . Because the complaint and the complaint in intervention are essentially the same lawsuit, the intervenor may rely on the plaintiff's exercise of due diligence, but if the plaintiff failed to exercise diligence, then the intervenor must demonstrate the exercise of diligence from the date the complaint was filed, not the date the complaint in intervention was filed, to avoid involuntary dismissal of the complaint in intervention for delay in prosecution [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Selma Trailer & Manufacturing Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 740, 755, 258 Cal. Rptr. 545]* .

The rule does not operate inflexibly and perhaps unjustly as would be the case if the plaintiff's delays and conduct were imputed to the intervenor or vice-versa. Rather, the plaintiff and the intervenor will each be judged on his or her own actions and conduct in pursuing the litigation [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Selma Trailer & Manufacturing Co. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 740, 756, 258 Cal. Rptr. 545* (affirming judgment dismissing compensation carrier's complaint and employee's complaint in intervention for lack of diligent prosecution in bringing action to trial within three years (now two years) from date complaint was filed); *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.410, 583.420(a)(2)*].

[10] Service of Complaint on Nonfiling Employee or Employer

If either the employee or the employer institutes a third-party action, he or she must give to the other a copy of the complaint by personal service or certified mail, and proof of service must be filed in the action [*Lab. Code § 3853*; *see § 577.521*].

[11] Proof of Damages

[a] Actions Prosecuted by Employer

If the action is prosecuted by the employer alone, evidence of any amount that the employer has paid or become

obligated to pay because the employee's injury or death is admissible, and the expenditures or liability are considered as proximately resulting from the injury or death in addition to any other items of damage proximately resulting therefrom [*Lab. Code § 3854*]. This does not mean, however, that the employer can recover from the alleged third-party tortfeasor workers' compensation benefits paid when the jury finds that the tortfeasor's negligence was not the proximate cause of any injury to the employee [*Mendenhall v. Curtis (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 786, 791-794, 162 Cal. Rptr. 569* ; *see Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 928-931, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987* ; *see also § 577.520*]. The employer may also not recover from the third-party tortfeasor increased workers' compensation insurance premiums and resulting lost profits, as these are not "compensation" within the meaning of *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Fischl v. Paller & Goldstein (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1299, 1304-1305, 282 Cal. Rptr. 802]* .

[b] Actions Prosecuted or Joined By Employee

If the employee joins in or prosecutes the action, either evidence of the amount of disability indemnity or death benefit paid or to be paid by the employer or evidence of the loss of earning capacity by the employee is admissible, but not both [*Lab. Code § 3855*; *see* *Slayton v. Wright (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 219, 234, 76 Cal. Rptr. 494]* . Proof of all other items of damage to either the employer or the employee proximately resulting from the injury or death is admissible and is part of the damages [*Lab. Code § 3855*].

[12] Medical Practitioner As Third-Party Tortfeasor--Limitation on Employer's Right to Reimbursement or Credit

Civ. Code § 3333.1 abrogates the collateral source rule in medical malpractice actions [*Graham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 499, 501, 504, 258 Cal. Rptr. 376]* . It provides that:

- In an action against a health care provider for personal injuries based on professional negligence, the defendant, if he or she so elects, may introduce evidence of any amount payable as a benefit to the plaintiff as a result of the personal injury pursuant to, among other things, any workers compensation act [*Civ. Code § 3333.1(a)*]; and

- No source of collateral benefits introduced pursuant to *Civ. Code § 3333.1(a)* shall recover any amount against the plaintiff, nor shall it be subrogated to the rights of the plaintiff against a defendant [*Civ. Code § 3333.1(b)*].

Under *Civ. Code § 3333.1*, the employer's right to reimbursement under *Lab. Code § 3852* for compensation benefits paid from amounts recovered by the worker in an action against a third-party medical practitioner is barred [*Graham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 499, 505-506, 258 Cal. Rptr. 376* (quoting from *Miller v. Sciaroni (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 306, 310-312, 218 Cal. Rptr. 219*)]. Furthermore, Civ. Code § 3333.1 overrides the employer's right under *Lab. Code §§ 3858* and *3861* to a credit of any such recovery against its liability for workers' compensation when an employee settles, rather than tries, his or her medical malpractice action and the evidence establishes that the employee and third party deducted the amount of the employee's workers' compensation benefits from the settlement [*Graham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 499, 501, 506-508, 258 Cal. Rptr. 376]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedurePartiesJoinderGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCollateral Source RuleEmployment Benefits & Workers' CompensationTortsMalpractice & Professional LiabilityAttorneysWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.333

§ 577.333 Employer's Recovery in Third-Party Action

[1] In General

An employer who makes a claim or brings an action against a third-party tortfeasor may recover in the same suit, in addition to the total amount of compensation, damages for which he or she was liable including all salary, wage, pension, or other emolument paid to the employee or to his or her dependents [*Lab. Code § 3852*; *see discussion under § 577.332[11]*]. The employer or its carrier may not, however, recover any damages in excess of those recoverable by the employee [*San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 847, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163]* .

The respective rights against the third person of the heirs of an employee claiming under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62* (wrongful death action) and of the employer claiming pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852* will be determined by the court [*Lab. Code § 3852*]. Were it not for *Lab. Code § 3852*, a court would have no interest or reason to involve itself in the determination of the competing claims. But by mandating that the respective rights against the third person of the heirs of an employee claiming under *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 377.60-377.62* and an employer claiming pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852* shall be determined by the court, *Lab. Code § 3852* makes manifest that neither claim is to have "priority" over the other as a matter of law. Rather, the court is required to ascertain the damages to which each claimant is entitled and then to apportion the total award accordingly [*Eli v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 901, 905, 235 Cal. Rptr. 704]* . In this regard, it is to be noted that *Lab. Code § 3856* (*discussed under § 577.335[2]*), allowing the employer a lien on the employee's recovery, does not apply to the heirs' recovery in a wrongful death action [*Eli v. Travelers Indemnity Co. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 901, 906, 235 Cal. Rptr. 704]* .

[2] Effect of Employee's Concurrent Negligence

The employer can never recover more from the third party than the amount representing the third party's proportional share of the responsibility for the injury. Thus, if the third party and the employee are each found 50 percent responsible for the employee's injuries and the employer is found to be without fault, the employer-insurer's recovery from the third party is limited to half of the total amount of damages found to have been suffered by the employee [*Finney v. Manpower, Inc. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 1066, 1071, 177 Cal. Rptr. 74]* .

[3] Effect of Employer's Concurrent Negligence

[a] In General

If the employee's injury was caused by the concurrent negligence of a third party and the employer, the employer's claim for reimbursement is limited to the amount that exceeds the employer's percentage share of the employee's total recovery according to the principles of comparative negligence [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 842, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 334-335* , 204 Cal. Rpr 403, *682 P.2d 1068* ; *Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1052-1053, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855]* .

To prevent double recovery, the amount of workers' compensation benefits paid up to the time of trial is deducted from the employee's recovery of economic damages [*see Civ. Code § 1431.2*] against the third party, to the extent that those benefits do not exceed the employer's proportionate share of responsibility under comparative fault principles [*see Torres v. Xomox Corp. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1, 25-37, 42, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 455* ; *Scalice v. Performance Cleaning Systems (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 221, 225-238, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 711* ; *Rosales v. Thermex-Thermatron, Inc. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 187, 197-198, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 861]* . After deducting those amounts, the third party is jointly and severally liable for all of the employee's "economic damages," as defined by Proposition 51 [*see Civ. Code § 1431.2*], such as damages for medical expenses and lost wages [*see DaFonte v. Up-Right, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 593, 600, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 238, 828 P.2d 140* ; *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 842-843 n.9, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684]* . Under Proposition 51, however, the third party's liability to the employee for "non-economic damages," such as damages for mental suffering and emotional distress, is limited to the third party's proportionate share of those damages as determined under comparative fault principles [*DaFonte v. Up-Right, Inc. (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 593, 600-604, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 238, 828 P.2d 140* ; *see Civ. Code § 1431.2*].

For further discussion of comparative fault principles and the effect on Proposition 51 on those principles, see *Ch. 300, Indemnity and Contribution, § 300.90* et seq., and Ch. 380, *Negligence* .

[b] Raising Issue of Concurrent Negligence--Procedure

The California Courts of Appeal are split on the issue of whether an employer and carrier may be brought into an employee's lawsuit by a third-party defendant's cross-complaint for declaratory relief [*compare Difko Admin. (US) Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 126, 134-135, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 291* , *C.J.L. Construction, Inc. v. Universal Plumbing (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 376, 391-392, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* , *and State of California v. Superior Court (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 659, 664-665, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256* , *with Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1053-1055, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . One line of cases holds that a third-party defendant who wishes to establish the concurrent negligence of an employer that is not a party to the employee's lawsuit may do so by pleading the issue as an affirmative defense to the employee's complaint, but may not join the employer by way of cross-complaint [*Difko Admin. (US) Inc. v. Superior Court (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 126, 134-135, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 291* ; *C.J.L. Construction, Inc. v. Universal Plumbing (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 376, 391-392, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360* ; *see also State of California v. Superior Court (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 659, 664-665, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256]* .

The other line of authority holds that if the employer and carrier are not parties to the employee's action and there is a justiciable issue as to the concurrent negligence or fault of the employer, the third-party defendant may bring the employer into the lawsuit by cross complaint for declaratory relief as to the third-party defendant's right to have any judgment against him or her reduced by the amount of compensation benefits paid up to the amount of the employer's proportionate share of fault [*Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1054-1055, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Until this issue is resolved, attorneys should exercise caution when raising the claim of concurrent employer negligence. It is always wise to plead the claim as an affirmative defense since this is a proper procedure for establishing employer negligence under both lines of cases.

[c] Determination of Issue

Once the issue of the employer's concurrent negligence is raised, the trier of fact should determine the employer's degree of fault. The court should then deduct the employer's percentage share of the employee's total recovery from the third party's liability up to the amount of the workers' compensation benefits assessed against the employer. Correspondingly, the employer should be denied any claim of reimbursement, or any lien under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)* (discussed under *§ 577.335[2]*), to the extent that his or her contribution would then fall short of his or her percentage share of responsibility for the employee's total recovery [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 842, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 335, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068]* . In such case, the employer may seek reimbursement or credit (discussed under *§ 577.335[4]*) only for the amount by which his or her compensation liability exceeds his or her proportional share of the injured employee's recovery [*Kramer v. Cedu Foundation, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 1, 7, 155 Cal. Rptr. 552]* .

Workers' compensation benefits previously paid by the employer must be included in calculating the employer's credit threshold, and the employer's credit threshold must be reduced by any amounts the employer receives by way of lien settlement from the third party [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 766, 771-772, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* .

[d] Effect of Third Party's Failure to Raise Issue

If, in an action by the employee against the third party, the defendant does not have the employer joined and neither introduces nor offers any evidence bearing on the concurrent negligence of the employer or show that the negligence, if any, proximately caused the injury or death, a judgment for plaintiff, without reduction by the amount of compensation benefits paid, will be affirmed [*De Cruz v. Reid (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 217, 223, 70 Cal. Rptr. 550, 444 P.2d 342* ; *Curtis v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 668, 683-685, 180 Cal. Rptr. 843]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceGeneral OverviewTortsNegligenceDefensesComparative NegligenceMultiple PartiesGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.334

§ 577.334 Allocation of Judgment in Third-Party Action

[1] Action by Employer Alone

If the action is prosecuted by the employer alone, the court must first order paid from any judgment for damages recovered the reasonable litigation expenses incurred in the preparation and prosecution of the action, together with a reasonable attorney's fee that shall be based solely on the services rendered by the employer's attorney in effecting recovery both for the benefit of the employer and the employee. After payment of these expenses and attorney's fee, the court shall apply out of the amount of the judgment an amount sufficient to reimburse the employer for the amount of his or her expenditure for compensation together with any amounts to which he or she may be entitled as special damages under *Lab. Code § 3852* and shall order any excess paid to the injured employee or other person entitled to it [*Lab. Code § 3856(a)*; *see County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872-873, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Walsh v. Woods (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1277, 232 Cal. Rptr. 629* (apportionment of attorney fee)].

[2] Action by Employee Alone

If the action is prosecuted by the employee alone, the court must first order paid from any judgment for damages recovered the reasonable litigation expenses incurred in preparation and prosecution of the action, together with a reasonable attorney's fee that shall be based solely on the services rendered by the employee's attorney in effecting recovery both for the benefit of the employee and the employer [*Lab. Code § 3856(b)*; *see Quinn v. State of California (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 162, 169-176, 124 Cal. Rptr. 1, 539 P.2d 761* (apportionment of attorney's fee); *Walsh v. Woods (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1277, 232 Cal. Rptr. 629* (same)]. After the payment of these expenses and attorney's fee, the court will allow the employer a lien against the judgment for reimbusement of compensation benefits paid as provided in *Lab. Code § 3856(b)* (discussed under *§ 577.335[2]*).

[3] Action by Both Employee and Employer

When the employer intervenes in an employee's third-party action, the employer's status is akin to that of a subrogee. Thus, the employer's right to recover workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee derives from and does not

extend beyond the employee's tort remedy against the third party. Although the employer and employee are entitled to verdicts and judgments setting forth their respective rights, the damages awarded must be segregated between them to prevent a double recovery against the third party. In general, the employer may recover the amount of compensation benefits paid, but the amount of its judgment may not exceed the total amount of tort damages suffered by the employee.

The employee is entitled to have the jury determine his or her total tort damages, but may recover only a net judgment for the difference, if any, between the total tort damages and the workers' compensation benefits received. To prevent a double recovery, the trial court may instruct the jury to segregate the types of damage as between the employee and the employer, awarding to the employer only those tort damages not recoverable by the employer. Alternatively, the jury may be instructed on the types of tort damages to which the employee may be entitled, and then given a special verdict form that requires it to find whether the defendant was negligent, whether the negligence was the proximate cause of the employee's injuries, what the employee's total tort damages are, without taking into account his or her receipt of compensation benefits, and what the reasonable amount of benefits paid by the employer were. Thereafter, the court will enter individual judgments on the special verdict for the amounts to which the employee and the employer are entitled [*Demkowski v. Lee (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1251, 1258-1259, 284 Cal. Rptr. 919]* .

An employer is not entitled to a right to reimbursement under *Lab. Code § 3856(c)* if it begins as a party plaintiff, but later chooses to abstain and file for a lien on the judgment prior to trial. *Lab. Code § 3856(c)* applies only if the action is prosecuted both by the employee and the employer. If the employer remains a formal party to the proceedings, its right to reimbursement must be expressly set forth in both the verdict and in the judgment obtained by the employee against the third party; however, this is unnecessary if its interests are protected by a lien on the judgment [*Manthey v. San Luis Rey Downs Enterprises, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 782, 787-788, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* .

[4] Litigation Expenses and Attorney's Fees

[a] Entitlement and Amount

The amount of reasonable litigation expenses and the amount of attorney's fees under *Lab. Code § 3856(a)-(c)* are fixed by the court. When the employer and employee are respresented by separate attorneys, they may propose to the court, for its consideration and determination, the amount and division of the expenses and fees [*Lab. Code § 3856(d)*].

An insurer is subrogated not only to an employer's right of action against a third party, but also to the employer's additional rights and liabilities. Thus, if the employer and the third-party tortfeasor have a prior contractual agreement in which the prevailing party has a right to attorney's fees from the other party in the event of litigation, the insurance carrier who brings a claim for reimbursement directly against the alleged tortfeasor is liable for the third-party's attorney's fees under the contract to the same extent as would be the employer [*Employers Muttal Liability Ins. Co. v. Tutor-Saliva Corp. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 632, 640, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 851, 951 P.2d 420]* .

[b] Payment From Judgment

If the action is prosecuted by both the employee and the employer, in a single action or in consolidated actions, and they are represented by the same agreed attorney or by separate attorneys, the court must first order paid from any judgment for damages recovered, the reasonable litigation expenses incurred in the preparation and prosecution of the action or actions, together with reasonable attorney's fees based solely on the services rendered for the benefit of both parties if they are represented by the same attorney, and, if they are respresented by separate attorneys, based solely on the service rendered in each instance by the attorney in effecting recovery for the benefit of the party represented [*Lab. Code § 3856(c)*; *see Walsh v. Woods (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1277-1278, 232 Cal. Rptr. 629* (when each party is represented by separate attorney, award of fees to each attorney as based, not on services benefitting both parties, but on service rendered in each instance by attorney in effecting recovery for benefit of party represented)]. After the

payment of these expenses and attorney's fees, the court shall apply out of the amount of the judgment for damages an amount sufficient to reimburse the employer for the amount of his or her expenditures for compensation together with any other amounts to which he or she may be entitled as special damages under *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Lab. Code § 3856(c)*].

However, when the employee and the employer settle the action against the third-party tortfeasor for a sum that is less than the employer's reimbursable compensation costs, so that the employee recovers nothing from the settlement, and the employee has a contingency fee agreement with his or her attorney, the employee's attorney is entitled to no fee out of the settlement proceeds, and the employee owes no attorney's fees [*Draper v. Aceto (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 1086, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 33 P.3d 479]* .

[5] Release of Employer by Satisfaction of Third-Party Judgment

After payment of the litigation expenses and attorney's fees fixed by the court pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3856* and payment of the employer's lien, the employer shall be relieved from the obligation to pay further compensation to or on behalf of the employee up to the entire amount of the balance of the judgment, if satisfied, without any deduction. No satisfaction of the judgment in whole or in part shall be valid without giving the employer notice and a reasonable opportunity to perfect and satisfy his or her lien [*Lab. Code § 3858*; *see § 577.335[4]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJudgmentsRelief From JudgmentDischarge, Release & SatisfactionCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCollateral Source RuleEmployment Benefits & Workers' CompensationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.335

§ 577.335 Other Employer Remedies

[1] In General

Instead of suing the third-party tortfeasor, the employer may

- File an application for a lien against the employee's judgment in the employee's action against the tortfeasor [*Lab. Code § 3856* (discussed in [2], *below*); *see also San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 849, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163]* ;

- Enter into a settlement with the third-party tortfeasor and the employee [*Lab. Code §§ 3859, 3860* (*see* discussions in *§ 577.130*et seq., and *[3], below*)]; and

- Apply to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board for a credit against compensation liability of the amount recovered by the employee by settlement or after judgment [*Lab. Code § 3861* (discussed under [4], *below*); *see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 334, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068* ; *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 833, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872-873, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363]* .

[2] Employer's Lien

[a] Entitlement

When judgment is rendered in favor of the employee in an action against the third-party tortfeasor prosecuted by the employee alone, after payment of the expenses and attorney's fees (discussed under *§ 577.334[2]*), the court, on application of the employer or its carrier, must allow as a first lien against the amount of the judgment the amount of the employer's expenditure for compensation together with any amount to which he or she may be entitled as special damages under *Lab. Code § 3852* [*Lab. Code § 3856(b)*; *see also § 577.540[1*], for form of a notice of motion to secure lien against third-party judgment].

Moreover, the court must, on further application at any time before the judgment is satisfied, allow as a further lien the amount of any expenditures of the employer for compensation subsequent to the original order [*Lab. Code § 3857*; *see also* [4][b], *below*]. Under *Lab. Code § 3857*, *above*, and *Lab. Code § 3858* (discussed under [5], *below*), an employer can apply for a lien in the employee's pending third-party action at any time before satisfaction of judgment. Thus, an application for a lien can be made after the statute of limitations has barred the employer from bringing an independent action or after the entry of judgment has barred the employer from intervening [California Workers' Damages Practice, *Reimbursement*, § 4.32 *Burrow v. Pike (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 384, 395, 235 Cal. Rptr. 408* (quoting Peyrat, California Workers' Damages Practice, *Reimbursement*, § 4.32)].

However, if the third-party tortfeasor has raised as a defense in the lawsuit that the employer's negligence contributed to the employee's injuries, the employer's mere filing of a lien is insufficient to protect its claim for reimbursement [*Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Superior Court (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1502, 1509, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 301]* . For the effect of the employer's concurrent negligence on his or her lien, see *§ 577.333[3][c]*.

[b] Enforcement

Any employer entitled to and who has been allowed and perfected a lien on the judgment or award in favor of an employee against a third party for damages occasioned to the same employer by payment of compensation, expenses of medical treatment, and any other charges under the Workers' Compensation Law, may enforce payment of the lien against the third party, or, in case the damages recovered by the employee have been paid to the employee, against the employee to the extent of the lien, in the manner provided for enforcement of money judgments generally [*Lab. Code § 3862*; *Burrow v. Pike (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 384, 395, 235 Cal. Rptr. 408]* . For discussion and forms for use in enforcing money judgments, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.40* et seq.

[c] Amount of Lien

An employer's workers' compensation lien claim may not exceed the amount of damages the employee recovers from the third-party tortfeasor. In general, the employer may recover the amount of workers' compensation benefits paid, but the amount of the employer's judgment may not exceed the total amount of tort damages suffered by the employee. The employee is entitled to have the jury determine his or her total tort damages, but may recover only a net judgment for the difference between the tort damages and the workers' compensation benefits received [*Crampton v. Takegoshi (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 308, 320, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 284 , rev'd on other grounds, Phelps v. Stostad (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 23, 34, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360, 939 P.2d 760]* .

[d] Purchase of Lien by Third-Party

If the employer has filed a lien claim on any judgment, recovery, or settlement in the injured employee's third-party action, and subsequently sells the lien to the third party, the workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee represent a lien as to the third party and not a right to reimbursement under *Lab. Code § 3856(c)*. When the third-party tortfeasor purchases the employer's compensation lien, it steps into the shoes of the employer and gains no greater rights than those originally owned by the employer [*Manthey v. San Luis Rey Downs Enterprises, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 782, 786-787, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* . Until a judgment is entered, the third party merely holds an expectancy, and if the employee fails to obtain a judgment in his or her favor, the lien simply "evaporates" [*Manthey v. San Luis Rey Downs Enterprises, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 782, 787, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* .

[3] Settlement of Claim

[a] Restrictions on Right to Settle

[i] Notice and Consent Requirements

No release or settlement of any claim as to either the employee or the employer is valid without the written consent of both. Proof of service filed with the court is sufficient in any action or proceeding in which such approval is required by law [*Lab. Code § 3859(a)*]. Moreover, no release or settlement under *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*, with or without suit, is valid or binding as to any party thereto without notice to both the employer and the employee, with opportunity to the employer to recover the amount of compensation it has paid or become obligated to pay and any special damages to which it may be entitled under *Lab. Code § 3852*, and opportunity to the employee to recover all damages he or she has suffered and with provision for determination of expenses and attorney's fees as provided in *Lab. Code § 3860* [*Lab. Code § 3860(a)*; *see San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 849, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163]* . Thus, in one case the court of appeal, reversing the trial court's summary judgment in favor of the alleged third-party tortfeasor, held that, pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3853, 3859*, and *3860(a)*, when the employer fails to adequately notify its employee of its subrogation lawsuit and proposed settlement involving an alleged third-party tortfeasor and fails to obtain the employee's consent to settlement of that suit, and when the settling alleged third-party tortfeasor, prior to settlement, was or reasonably should have been aware of the possibility of the employee's claim for damages against the tortfeasor, the alleged tortfeasor cannot use the mere settlement and dismissal of the employer's subrogation action to bar the employee from maintaining an action for damages against the alleged tortfeasor. However, the employee's action for damages against the alleged tortfeasor must account for any workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee, or to be paid, so as to preclude double recovery for the employee and double liability for the tortfeasor. The court of appeal found that the employer did not serve by personal service or certified mail the statutorily-required copy of the employer's complaint against the alleged tortfeasor, the employee never gave the statutorily-required consent to the employer's settlement of its action against the alleged tortfeasor, and the alleged tortfeasor, prior to settlement, was or reasonably should have been aware of the possibility of the employee's claim for damages [*McKinnon v. Otis Elevator Co. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1125, 1128, 1131-1137, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 723]* .

[ii] Settlement Without Employer's Consent

An employee may settle and release any claim he or she may have against a third party without the consent of the employer, but the settlement or release shall be subject to the employer's right to proceed in accordancewith *Lab. Code § 3852* to recover the compensation it has paid [*Lab. Code § 3859(b)*; *see Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 837-840, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *San Diego Unified Port Dist. v. Superior Court (1988) 197 Cal. App. 3d 843, 849, 243 Cal. Rptr. 163]* . Except as provided in *Lab. Code § 3859*, the entire amount of the settlement, with or without suit, is subject to the employer's full claim for reimbursement for compensation that it has paid or become obligated to pay and any special damages to which it may be entitled under *Lab. Code § 3852*, together with expenses and attorney's fees, if any, subject to the limitations set forth in *Lab. Code § 3860* [*Lab. Code § 3860(b)*].

The purpose of *Lab. Code § 3859(b)* and the introductory phrase in *Lab. Code § 3860(b)* ("Except as provided in Section 3859") is to permit an employee to segregate his or her own damage claim against a third party from the employer's claim against that third party for reimbursement for workers' compensation benefits paid. The employee thus is permitted to settle his or her own claim for a sum exclusive of amounts already received in the form of a workers' compensation award without jeopardizing the employer's subrogation right. This exception to the rule requiring an employer's consent to an employee's settlement is a limited one; the settlement is free from the employer's claim for reimbursement only when the settlement is exclusive of the amount of workers' compensation benefits paid by the employer [*Board of Administration v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 913-914, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *but see Ellis v. Wells Manufacturing, Inc. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 312, 317, 264 Cal. Rptr. 648* (lien by workers' compensation carrier on settlement between employee and third party as improper even though settlement included workers' compensation benefits paid to employee, as employer's negligence was alleged by third party and not litigated, and settlement provided that employee would hold third party harmless against any claim by employer)].

The employee's failure to secure the employer's consent prior to settling the claim with the third-party tortfeasor and

executing a general release in the tortfeasor's favor may subject the settlement to the employer's claim for reimbursement of compensation benefits paid. It may also subject the third-party tortfeasor, who was, or reasonably should have been, aware of the possibility of the employer's claim and who failed to notify the employer of the settlement and obtain its consent, to liability under *Lab. Code § 3850 et seq.* [*see Board of Administration v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 914-919, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834* ; *American Home Assurance Co. v. Hagadorn (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1898, 1907, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 536* (employer had right to maintain action against employee for breach of duty to notify employer of third-party settlement); *see also Insurance Co. of North America v. T.L.C. Lines, Inc. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 90, 101-102, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 542* (third-party tortfeasor's good-faith settlement and release of liability extinguished workers' compensation insurer's right to seek reimbursement from tortfeasor)].

[b] Division of Settlement

[i] Amount of Expenses and Attorney's Fees

The amount of expenses and attorney's fees shall, on settlement of suit, or on any settlement requiring court approval, be set by the court. In all other cases these amounts shall be set by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (WCAB). When the employer and the employee are represented by separate attorneys they may propose to the court or the appeals board, for consideration and determination, the amount and division of the expenses and fees [*Lab. Code § 3860(f)*].

Lab. Code § 3860(f) does not specify the time in which the WCAB must rule on the amount of attorney's fees and expenses, and does not require that the applicant raise the issue in any specified way. Hence, when the employer's compensation carrier petitions the WCAB for credit against its compensation liability for the amount of the worker's settlement of his or her third-party action, the amount of the credit is necessarily placed in issue. If the evidence presented establishes the amounts of the worker's attorney's fees and expenses in the third-party action, those amounts should be deducted from the worker's gross recovery to reach the amount of credit to be allowed [*see Griffith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1263-1264, 257 Cal. Rptr. 813]* .

[ii] Payment of Expenses and Attorney's Fees if Settlement Effected by Either Employer's or Employee's Attorney

If the settlement is effected with or without suit solely through the efforts of either the employee's or employer's attorney, but not both, then, prior to the reimbursement of the employer as provided in *Lab. Code § 3860(b)*, there shall be deducted from the amount of the settlement the reasonble expenses incurred in effecting the settlement, including costs of suit, if any, together with a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid to the attorney for his or her services in securing and effecting settlement for the benefit of both the employer and the employee [*Lab. Code 3860(c), (d)*; *see Quinn v. State of California (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 162, 169-176 n.20, 124 Cal. Rptr. 1, 539 P.2d 761* (involving apportionment of attorney's fee under *Lab. Code § 3856, discussed under § 577.334[4*], but disapproving following cases involving *Lab. Code § 3860*: *Fuchs v. Western Oil Fields Supply (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 728, 102 Cal. Rptr. 74* ; *Moreno v. Venturini (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 286, 81 Cal. Rptr. 551* ; *Johnson v. L.D.S. Trucking Co. (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 496, 62 Cal. Rptr. 501*)]. When the employee's attorney alone effects third-party settlement, the attorney is entitled to an award of attorney's fees, even if the employer participates in the litigation and its reimbursement claim exceeds the amount of the settlement [*Luque v. Herrera (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 558, 563, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 853]* .

In contradistinction to the situation involving an award of attorney's fees following a jury trial that resulted in a judgment, payment of whose total included the employer's lien amount, it was error for the trial court, in calculating fees for an employee's attorney, to include the amount of the employer's workers' compensation lien, which the employer assigned to the third party as part of the settlement between them and which the third party then gave up the right to enforce against the employee as part of the settlement between *them*. Similarly, it was error for the trial court to award the employee's attorney's fees based on the total settlement achieved among the employee, the employer, and the third party without addressing the issue of whether that settlement was obtained solely through the efforts of the

employee's attorney [*Manriquez v. Adams (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 340, 346-348, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 449]* .

In one case not involving workers' compensation insurance, the California Supreme Court held that, although the made-whole rule applies in the medical payments insurance context, and the insured must be made whole as to all damages proximately caused by the injury, liability for attorney's fees is not included under the made-whole rule, but is instead subject to the equitable apportionment rule. In this case, the insured settled a claim for damages, arising from an automobile accident, against a third party for $6,000, which sum represented her total damages. The insured incurred approximately $2,000 in attorney's fees in obtaining that settlement. The insurer paid the insured $1,000 under her insurance policy's medical payments provision. The policy required the insured to reimburse the insurer for monies she recovered from a third party that duplicated her recovery under her policy. The insured reimbursed the insurer in the amount of $600, arrived at by subtracting attorney's fees of $400 (the insurer's pro rata share of the total attorney's fees of $2,000) from the $1,000 in medical payments the insured received from the insurer. The Court held that the insured was not entitled to withhold reimbursement from the insurer on the grounds that she had not been reimbursed for 100 percent of the attorney's fees she incurred [21st *Century Insurance Co. v. Superior Court of San Diego County; Silvia Quintana, Real Party in Interest (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 527-528, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972*].

[iii] Payment of Expenses and Attorney's Fees if Settlement Effected by Both Employer's and Employee's Attorney

When both the employer and the employee are represented by the same agreed attorney or by separate attorneys in effecting a settlement, prior to reimbursement of the employer as provided in *Lab. Code § 3860(b)*, there shall be deducted from the amount of the settlement the reasonable expenses incurred by both the employer and the employee or on behalf of either, including costs of suit, if any, together with reasonable attorney's fees to be paid to the respective attorneys for the employer and the employee, based on the respective services rendered in securing and effecting settlement for the benefit of the party represented.

If both parties are represented by the same attorney, by agreement, the attorney's fee shall be based on the services rendered for the benefit of both [*Lab. Code § 3860(e)*]. According to the California Supreme Court's interpretation of *Labor Code § 3860(e)*, when the employer and employee are separately represented by attorneys who each actively participate in achieving a settlement, the fees awarded to the employer's attorney and the employer's pro rata share of other litigation costs must be deducted from the amount paid to the employer out of the settlement proceeds as reimbursement for its workers' compensation expenses, rather than being paid out of the employee's share of the proceeds [*Summers v. Newman (1999) 20 Cal. 4th 1021, 1035-1036, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 303, 978 P.2d 1225]* .

Interpreting the provisions of *Lab. Code § 3860*, the court of appeal has held that equitable apportionment of settlement funds between the employee and the employer is not allowed, even when the funds are insufficient to fully reimburse the employer and pay the employee for pain and suffering and other losses not covered by workers' compensation [*Gapusan v. Jay (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 734, 742, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250]* . In such a case, the employer is entitled to full reimbursement for compensation paid pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3860(b)*. Portions of a settlement allocated to a claim independent of the employee's claim, such as a claim for loss of consortium by an employee's wife, are not subject to an employer's claim for credit or reimbursement [*Gapusan v. Jay (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 734, 742-743, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250]* .

[4] Credit Against Employer's Liability

[a] In General

The appeals board must allow, as a credit to the employer to be applied against his or her liability for compensation, the amount of any recovery by the employee, either by settlement or after judgment, as has not theretofore been applied to the payment of expenses or attorney's fees pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3856, 3858*, and *3860*, or has not been applied to

reimburse the employer [*Lab. Code § 3861*; *see Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 833-840, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see also Lab. Code § 3858*, discussed under [5], *above*; *§ 577.542*].

Thus, an employer who has not completely paid compensation benefits to the employee may receive a credit before the appeals board for money obtained in a third-party judgment in the employee's favor [*Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1052, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855]* . Portions of a settlement allocated to a claim independent of the employee's claim, such as a claim for loss of consortium by an employee's wife, are not subject to an employer's claim for credit [*Gapusan v. Jay (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 734, 742-743, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 250]* . For the effect on the employer's right to a credit of the employer's concurrent negligence, see *§ 577.333[3][c]*, and *§ 577.542*.

The court of appeal has held that, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3861*, an employer was entitled to credit against future workers' compensation benefits to be paid to an employee in the amount of the net settlement of the employee's action against a third-party tortfeasor, paid to the employee by CIGA. The court found that the employee sustained an industrial injury at the hands of the third party tortfeasor, that the employer had provided the employee with $74,408.79 in workers' compensation benefits, and that the employee's lawsuit against the third party tortfeasor was settled for $50,000, with the employer releasing its lien against workers' compensation benefits already paid to the employee. With the employer claiming credit against its liability for future workers' compensation benefits up to $50,000, the court found that CIGA was obligated under *Ins. Code §§ 1063.1(c)(1)* and *1063.2(a)* to pay the settlement, regardless of whether the employer was entitled to credit, that CIGA's assets were unaffected by grant or denial of the credit to the employer, and that, if credit were denied, the employee would be in a better position than if the third party tortfeasor's insurer had remained solvent [*Baur v. Workers' Comp. appeals Bd. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1264-1267, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493*].

[b] Credit and Lien Distinguished

The employer's right to a credit and right to a lien are separate and distinct. The lien allows the employer to be reimbursed for money already paid, whereas the credit is taken against sums that may become due in the future. The employer loses the credit right only through express waiver or settlement and not by mere satisfaction of a lien claim [*State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 933, 938 n.2, 182 Cal. Rptr. 171* ; *see Hodge v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 501, 511-512, 176 Cal. Rptr. 675]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewTortsDamagesCollateral Source RuleEmployment Benefits & Workers' CompensationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsSubrogationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.336

§ 577.336 Nonliability of Employer to Indemnify Tortfeasor

[1] In General

If an action by the employee, the employer, or both jointly against the third person results in judgment against the third person or settlement by the third person, the employer has no liability to reimburse or hold the third person harmless on the judgment or settlement in absence of a written agreement to do so executed prior to the injury [*Lab. Code § 3864*]. The legislative purpose in enacting *Lab. Code § 3864* was to eliminate the employer's liability for implied indemnity in the absence of a written agreement, because implied indemnity imposed a greater burden on the employer than was contemplated under the workers' compensation system [*Chase Chemical Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 229, 237, 205 Cal. Rptr. 469]* .

The Legislature enacted *Lab. Code § 3864* because the doctrine of implied indemnity imposed a greater burden on the employer than was contemplated under the workers' compensation system [*Up-Right, Inc. v. Van Erickson (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 579, 582, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* . Without this section, the employer's protection of a limit on the economic consequences of claims made under the system could be easily circumvented [*Up-Right, Inc. v. Van Erickson (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 579, 582, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* . When a third-party defendant files a cross complaint for indemnity against the employer, the cross complaint must allege the existence of a written indemnity agreement or it will be subject to demurrer [*Up-Right, Inc. v. Van Erickson (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 579, 582-584, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* .

If the existence of such an agreement is not alleged, *Lab. Code § 3864* precludes a third party from filing a cross-complaint, even if there is a showing that the employer was concurrently negligent in causing the employee's injuries [*State of California v. Superior Court (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 659, 664-665, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 256]* . Moreover, a third party is not excused from the requirement of a written indemnity agreement under *Lab. Code § 3864* by allegations that the employer engaged in criminal conduct by violating the child labor laws, since such criminal conduct by the employer will not render workers' compensation inapplicable [*Up-Right, Inc. v. Van Erickson (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 579, 583-584, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34]* .

[2] Multiple Employers

When an employee has more than one employer, one employer held liable in tort to the employee may be considered a "third party" under *Lab. Code § 3864* with respect to the others. For example, the temporary employer of a worker injured because of an unguarded power press may not seek indemnity from the employment agency that placed the worker in the job. If the worker successfully meets the requisites for *Lab. Code § 4558* (exception to exclusivity rule of workers' compensation for power press guard injuries) [*see discussion under § 577.314[5]*], the employer will be considered a third party liable in tort to the employee but barred by *Lab. Code § 3864* from seeking indemnity from the employment agency. If the employee cannot meet the requisites for *Lab. Code § 4558*, the civil action will be barred, and there will be nothing to support the indemnity action against the agency [*Watters Associates v. Superior Court (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 1341, 1344, 278 Cal. Rptr. 417]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
TortsVicarious LiabilityAgentsIndemnityWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsThird Party Liability

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Third-Party Actions

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.337-577.349

[Reserved]

§§ 577.337[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.350

§ 577.350 Related Matthew Bender Publications

[1] Workers' Compensation Principles--In General

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 1, §§ 1.10 -1.23 (administration); *ch. 2, § 2.03 (anti-fraud provisions)*; ch. 3, §§ 3.01-3.08, 3.130-3.133, *3.142 (employees, independent contractors, and special employees)*; ch. 4 (injuries arising out of and in course of employment); *ch. 7, § 7.01 (temporary disability)*; *ch. 8, § 8.01 (permanent disability)*; *ch. 9, §§ 9.01, 9.05 (dependency and death benefits)*; ch. 10, §§ 10.01-10.28 (penalties); ch. 24, §§ 24.02-24.05 (time limitations) (Matthew Bender)

Larson's Workers' Compensation Law (Matthew Bender)

Levy, Golden & Sacks, California Torts, ch. 10 (Matthew Bender)

Wilcox, California Employment Law, ch. 20 (Matthew Bender)

[2] Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, chs. 5, 7, 8, 20, 25, 32, 35 (Matthew Bender)

[3] Initiating Proceedings to Collect Benefits

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25 (Matthew Bender)

[4] Filing and Service of Papers

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, §§ 23.12[2], 23.14; *ch. 25, § 25.06* (Matthew Bender)

[5] Arbitration

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 33, § 33.01 (Matthew Bender)

[6] Settling Claims

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 29 (Matthew Bender)

[7] Stipulations and Requests for Award

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, § 23.11[2]; *ch. 26, § 26.06[2]* (Matthew Bender)

[8] Pre-Hearing Proceedings and Hearings

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 5, *Medical and Hospital Treatment* ; ch. 22, *Medical-Legal Procedure* ; ch. 26, *Prehearing and Hearing Procedure* (Matthew Bender)

[9] Findings and Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, chs. 27, 28, 31 (Matthew Bender)

[10] Payment and Enforcement of Awards

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, *Added Benefits and Penalties ;* ch. 27, *The Award and Its Enforcement ;* ch. 30, *Liens and Lien Enforcement* (Matthew Bender)

[11] Judicial Review

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 34 (Matthew Bender)

For related jury instructions regarding workers' compensation, see Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, Series 2800 (Matthew Bender), also available in Lexisnexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions

[12] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

For memoranda of points and authorities for use in an action by an employee against the employee's employer or a coemployee supporting and opposing the contention that the claim sued on is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the WCAB, see California Points and Authorities, Ch. 100, *Employer and Employee* , Pt. III (Matthew Bender)

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 11, *Actions Against the Employer Under State Law and Third-Party Tort Actions* ; ch. 21, *Jurisdiction* (Matthew Bender)

Levy, Golden & Sacks, California Torts, ch. 10 (Matthew Bender)

Wilcox, California Employment Law, ch. 20 (Matthew Bender)

For related jury instructions regarding workers' compensation, see Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, Series 2800 (Matthew Bender), also available in Lexisnexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions

[13] Third-Party Actions

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 11

larson's Workers' Compensation Law, Vol. 6, Chs. 110-118 (Matthew Bender)

Wilcox, California Employment Law, ch. 20 (Matthew Bender)

For related jury instructions regarding workers' compensation, see Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions, Series 2800 (Matthew Bender), also available in Lexisnexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity Provisions

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.351

§ 577.351 California Constitution

Establishment of statutory workers' compensation system authorized. *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*

Original jurisdiction of Supreme Court and courts of appeal for extraordinary relief in nature of certiorari. *Cal. Const., art. VI, § 10*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAppealsAppellate JurisdictionState Court Review

186 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.352

§ 577.352 Federal Statutes

Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. *29 U.S.C. §§ 651-678*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Labor & Employment LawOccupational Safety & HealthGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.353

§ 577.353 State Statutes

[1] Administrative Assistance

Availability and procedure. *Lab. Code §§ 5450-5455*

[2] Administrative Director

"Administrative director," as used in *Lab. Code § 110 et seq.*, as meaning Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation. *Lab. Code § 110(b)*

Appointment of medical director by Administrative Director and medical director's duties. *Lab. Code § 122*

Duty to make annual report to Governor and Legislature. *Lab. Code § 111(b)*

Authority to appoint California licensed attorney as counsel to Division of Workers' Compensation. *Lab. Code § 117*

Appointment of workers' compensation judges. *Lab. Code § 123*

Development of cost-efficient workers' compensation information system in consultation with Insurance Commissioner and Workers' Compensation Insurance Rating Bureau, and adoption of regulations specifying data elements to be collected by electronic data interchange. *Lab. Code § 138.6*

Duty of administrative director to adopt regulations allowing reasonable access to individually identifiable information to various persons or entities for the purpose of bona fide statistical research. *Lab. Code § 138.7*

Duties of Administrative Director regarding qualified medical evaluators. *Lab. Code § 139.2(a)-(h)*

Requirement that Administrative Director promulgate rules and regulations concerning matters set forth in *Lab. Code §*

139.2(j)(1)-(6). Lab. Code § 139.2(j)

When Administrative Director may suspend or terminate privilege of physician to serve as qualified medical evaluator. *Lab. Code § 139.2(k), (m)*

When Administrative Director is required to cite qualified medical evaluator for violation and hold hearing; penalties imposed on finding of violation, including report of violation to appropriate licensing board. *Lab. Code § 139.2(l)*

Administrative Director authorized to review advertising copy. *Lab. Code § 139.4*

Authority of administrative director or his or her designees, on submission of matter to information and assistance officer, on agreement of party to pay cost, and with consent of unrepresented employee, to direct injured employee to be examined by qualified medical evaluator selected by medical director to report on clinical question; 1989 and 1990 amendments to section as operative for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1991. *Lab. Code § 5703.5(b)*

[3] Advertising

False, misleading, or deceptive advertising concerning workers' compensation benefits as misdemeanor; prohibition as not applicable to attorneys and physicians. *Lab. Code § 139.43*

False and misleading advertisements defined. *Lab. Code § 139.45*

False, deceptive, and misleading advertising in electronic media. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 6158*

Workers' Compensation Truth in Advertising Act of 1992. *Lab. Code §§ 5430-5434*

[4] Administrative and Civil Penalties

Administrative and civil penalties; schedule of violations. *Lab. Code § 129.5*

[5] Appeals Board

Authority of WCAB. *Lab. Code §§ 110(a), 111(a)*

Judicial powers. *Lab. Code §§ 116, 130, 134*

Jurisdiction. *Lab. Code §§ 5300-5317*

WCAB's power, at any time after application is filed and prior to expiration of its jurisdiction, on agreement of party to pay cost, to direct unrepresented employee to be examined by qualified medical examiner selected by appeals board to report on clinical question; 1989 and 1990 amendments to section as operative for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1991. *Lab. Code § 5703.5(a)*

[6] Arbitration

Arbitration provisions as applicable only when employee or dependent represented by counsel. *Lab. Code § 5270*

Qualifications of arbitrators. *Lab. Code § 5270.5*

Selection of arbitrators. *Lab. Code § 5271*

Duties and responsibilities of arbitrators. *Lab. Code § 5272*

Costs and fees. *Lab. Code § 5273*

Mandatory arbitration. *Lab. Code § 5275(a)*

Voluntary arbitration. *Lab. Code § 5275(b)*

Time and place for arbitration. *Lab. Code § 5276(a), (b)*

Service and submission of documents. *Lab. Code § 5276(c)*

Findings and award. *Lab. Code § 5277(a)-(c), (e)*

Use of an arbitrator for part of proceeding as not binding parties to use of same arbitrator for subsequent proceedings. *Lab. Code § 5277(d)*

Submission of supplemental proceedings to arbitration. *Lab. Code § 5277(f)*

Prior to filing of award, disclosure to arbitrator of settlement offer by party as prohibited. *Lab. Code § 5278(a)*

Ex parte communication with arbitrator or potential arbitrator by counsel or party as prohibited except to schedule arbitration hearing or request continuance. *Lab. Code § 5278(b)*

[7] Attorneys and Representatives

[a] Substitution and Dismissal

Substitution and dismissal of attorneys. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 284, 285, 286*

[b] Fees--In General

Award of attorney's fees in successfully resisting petition to decrease or terminate temporary or permanent disability benefits. *Lab. Code §§ 4651.3, 5410.1*

Charge, claim, or agreement for attorney's fees as not enforceable, valid, or binding in excess of a reasonable amount; WCAB as authorized to determine what constitutes reasonable amount. *Lab. Code § 4906(a)*

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, attorney as not permitted to demand or accept any fee from injured employee or dependent of injured employee for workers' compensation representation until WCAB approves or sets amount of fee. *Lab. Code § 4906(b)*

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, attorney's fees agreement as required to be submitted to WCAB for approval within 10 days after it is made. *Lab. Code § 4906(c)*

Factors considered by WCAB in establishing reasonable attorney's fees for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990. *Lab. Code § 4906(d)*

[c] Fee Disclosure Statement

Attorney as required at initial consulatation to furnish employee injured on or after January 1, 1990, with attorney's fees disclosure statement. *Lab. Code § 4906(e)*

[8] Audits

Audits by Administrative Director. *Lab. Code § 129*

[9] Autopsies

Exhumation and autopsy proceedings. *Lab. Code §§ 5706, 5707*

When WCAB may require autopsy. *Lab. Code § 5706*

Physician's autopsy report as received in any proceedings theretofore or thereafter brought. *Lab. Code § 5706*

Coroner's duty on request for autopsy. *Lab. Code § 5706*

WCAB as permitted to authorize performance of autopsy and, if necessary, exhumation of body when body of deceased employee is not in coroner's custody. *Lab. Code § 5707*

Effect of dependents' refusal to permit autopsy. *Lab. Code § 5707*

[10] Benefits

Permanent disability ratings; determination of medical issues. *Lab. Code §§ 4061-4067.5* (operative for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991)

Medical services. *Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1*

Vocational rehabilitation. *Lab. Code §§ 4635-4647* [repealed effective January 1, 2004]

Temporary and permanent disability payments. *Lab. Code §§ 4650-4664*

Supplemental job displacement benefits. *Lab. Code §§ 4658.5, 4658.6*

[11] Claim Procedure

Claims form; contents, employer's duties, effect of filing. *Lab. Code § 5401*

Injury presumed compensable if liability not rejected by employer within 90 days after filing of claim form under *Lab. Code § 5401*. *Lab. Code § 5402(b)*

[12] Collateral Estoppel

A determination of facts by WCAB under certain provisions relating to workers' compensation would not have collateral estoppel effect on any subsequent criminal proceeding. *Lab. Code §§ 5006, 5413, 5816*

[13] Collective Bargaining Agreement

Extent to which collective bargaining agreement may alter parties' rights and obligations under compensation law. *Lab. Code §§ 3201.5, 3201.7*

[14] Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation

Commission on Health and Safety and Workers' Compensation in Department of Industrial Relations as reviewing and approving applications from employers and employee organizations for grants to assist in establishng effective occupational injury and illness prevention programs, and as required to conduct continuing examination of workers' compensation system and of state's activities to prevent industrial injuries and occupational diseases and to issue annual report on state of workers' compensation system, including recommendations for administrative or legislative modifications that would improve operation of system. *Lab. Code §§ 75-78*

[15] Compensation

"Compensation" defined. *Lab. Code § 3207*

Computing average earnings for disability indemnity. *Lab. Code §§ 4453, 4454-4459*

Compensation schedules. *Lab. Code §§ 4550-4855*

[16] Compromise and Release Agreements

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation services not permitted absent finding by workers' compensation judge of good faith issues that, if resolved against employee, would defeat the employee's right to all workers'compensation benefits, although limited exception allowed for represented employee to receive one-time payment of no more than $10,000. *Lab. Code § 4646*

Compromise and release agreements involving subsequent injuries payments. *Lab. Code § 4754.5*

Compromise and release agreements generally. *Lab. Code §§ 5000-5006*

Prohibition against settlement of prospective benefits to which employee is entitled under rehabilitation. *Lab. Code § 5100.6*

[17] Construction of Law

As used in Labor Code, "shall" as mandatory and "may" as permissive. *Lab. Code § 15*

Workers' compensation law and safety in employment law as liberally construed. *Lab. Code § 3202*

[18] Counsel to Division of Workers' Compensation

Appointment. *Lab. Code § 117*

[18A] Court Administrator

"Court administrator," as used in *Lab. Code § 110 et seq.*, means administrator of workers' compensation adjudicatory process at trial level. *Lab. Code § 110(f)*

Duty of court administrator to establish priority calendar for issues requiring expedited hearing and decision. *Lab. Code § 5502(b), (c)*

Requirement that court administrator report quarterly to Governor and Legislature concerning frequency and types of issues that are not heard and decided within time period prescribed in *Lab. Code § 5502* and reasons why. *Lab. Code § 5502(d)*

[19] Dangerous Business Practices

Employer with actual knowledge of serious concealed danger subject to regulatory authority as criminally liable for knowingly failing to disclose condition to affected employees and appropriate governmental agency. *Penal Code § 387*

[20] Death Benefits

Death benefits. *Lab. Code §§ 4700-4709*

Statute of limitations on recovery of death benefits. *Lab. Code §§ 5406, 5406.5, 5406.6*

[21] Dependents

Presumption of dependency of children of deceased employee-parent. *Lab. Code § 3501(a)*

When spouse of deceased employee is conclusively presumed to be wholly dependent. *Lab. Code § 3501(b)*

Determination of dependency questions. *Lab. Code § 3502*

Requisite relationship. *Lab. Code § 3503*

[22] Depositions

Depositions in workers' compensation cases. *Lab. Code § 5710*

[23] Disability

Permanent total and permanent partial disability defined. *Lab. Code § 4452.5*

Temporary and permanent disability payments. *Lab. Code §§ 4650-4663*

Statute of limitations on filing application for disability benefits. *Lab. Code § 5405*

[24] Dismissal

Dismissal of application that shows on its face that applicant is not entitled to compensation. *Lab. Code § 5507*

[25] Employees

Presumptions that worker is employee. *Lab. Code §§ 2750.5, 3357*

Effect of employee negligence on action for injuries arising in course of employment not covered by workers' compensation. *Lab. Code § 2801*

Employee defined for purposes of workers' compensation. *Lab. Code § 3351-3353*

Specific classes of persons included or excluded within meaning of term employee. *Lab. Code §§ 3351-3371*; *Penal Code §§ 4017, 4017.5*

Workers' compensation coverage provided to members of California National Guard and state militia who are injured, disabled, or killed while on active duty. *Mil. & Vet. Code §§ 340-340.2*

[26] Employers

Employer defined; exclusions. *Lab. Code §§ 3300, 3301*

Duty to secure payment of compensation. *Lab. Code §§ 3700-3800*

"Employer" as including workers' compensation insurer for purpose of third-party action, thereby entitling insurer to protection of exclusive remedy principle. *Lab. Code § 3850(b)*

Election of employer and worker to be subject to compensation provisions of workers' compensation law. *Lab. Code §§ 4150-4157*

[27] Employer Remedies

Workplace Violence Safety Act as allowing employer whose employee has been a victim of workplace violence to seek temporary restraining order or injunction on behalf of employee, prohibiting further violence. Pen. Code § 527.8

[28] Employment Safety Standards

Employment safety laws. *Lab. Code §§ 6300-9061*

Applicability of statutory safety standards to civil action between employer and employee. *Lab. Code § 6304.5*

[29] Evidence

Admissible evidence. *Lab. Code § 5703*

Common law and statutory rules of evidence and procedure as not applicable. *Lab. Code § 5708*

Effect of informality in proceedings and admission of evidence. *Lab. Code § 5709*

[30] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

Exclusive remedy principle and exception with regard to discrimination because of disability caused by work related injury. *Lab. Code § 132a*

Conditions of compensation. *Lab. Code § 3600(a)*

Workers' compensation and civil damages as dual remedies subject to set-off principles if exclusive remedy principle does not apply. *Lab. Code § 3600(b)*

Exclusive remedy principle and exceptions with regard to coemployee of injured employee. *Lab. Code § 3601*

Exclusive remedy principle and exceptions with regard to employer of injured employee. *Lab. Code § 3602*

Exception to exclusive remedy principle in case of uninsured employer. *Lab. Code § 3706*

Power press guard exception to exclusive remedy principle. *Lab. Code § 4558*

Liability for injuries to peace officers, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel. *Civ. Code § 1714.9*

[31] Filing of Papers

Filing of application for adjudication of claim. *Lab. Code § 5501*

Filing of answer. *Lab. Code § 5505*

[32] Findings and Awards

Findings and awards--Generally. *Lab. Code §§ 5800-5816*

Interest on awards. *Lab. Code § 5800*

[33] Funds

State Compensation Insurance Fund. *Ins. Code §§ 11770-11881*; *Lab. Code §§ 56, 57.5, 3211*

Workers' Compensation Administration Revolving Fund. *Lab. Code § 62.5*

Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund. *Lab. Code § 3716, 3716.5*

Self-Insurers' Security Fund. *Lab. Code §§ 3740-3747*

Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. *Lab. Code §§ 4754, 4755*

Cal-OSHA Targeted Inspection and Consultation Fund. *Lab. Code § 62.7*

[34] Hearings

Expedited hearings; entitlement and procedure. *Lab. Code § 5502(b), (c)*

Hearings generally. *Lab. Code §§ 5700-5710*

Devices to assist hearing impaired. *Civ. Code § 54.8*

[35] Independent Contractor

Factors required to prove independent contractor status. *Lab. Code § 2750.5*

Independent contractor defined. *Lab. Code § 3353*

[36] Independent Medical Examiner

Term "independent medical examiner," wherever it appears in Labor Code, as meaning "qualified medical evaluator" for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991. *Lab. Code § 28*

[37] [Reserved]

[38] Information Request Form

Employee's attorney as required to send information request form to employer, or insurer or third-party administrator; contents. *Lab. Code § 5401.5*

Employer, insurer or third-party administrator as required to serve employee's attorney with response within 30 days of receving information request form; contents. *Lab. Code § 5401.6(a), (b)*

Information furnished by employee and employer in information request form and response as not admissible in proceedings before WCAB. *Lab. Code § 5401.6(c)*

[39] Injury

"Injury" defined. *Lab. Code § 3208*

Specific and cumulative injuries distinguished. *Lab. Code § 3208.1*

Procedure when disability, need for medical treatment, or death results from combined effect of two or more injuries. *Lab. Code § 3208.2*

Determination of date of injury. *Lab. Code §§ 5411, 5412*

When employee injured or killed by third party in course of employee's employment, no personal relationship or personal connection deemed to exist between employee and third party based only on determination that third party injured or killed employee solely because of third party's personal beliefs relating to his or her perception of employee's race, religious creed, color, national origin, age, gender, disability, sex, or sexual orientation. *Lab. Code § 3600(c)*

[40] Insurers

"Insurer" defined. *Lab. Code § 3211*

Required notice of non-renewal of workers' compensation insurance policies. *Ins. Code § 11664*

State rate supervision. *Ins. Code §§ 11730-11739*

Required notice in compensation policies regarding changes in the rating laws. *Ins. Code § 11752.8*

[41] Interstate Commerce

Inapplicability of workers' compensation laws to employers or employments engaged in interstate commerce. *Lab. Code § 3203*

[42] Judgment

Creation and duration of judgment lien based on workers' compensation award. *Code Civ. Proc. § 697.330*

Filing of certified copy of WCAB's findings and order, decision, or award with superior court and entry of judgment. *Lab. Code § 5806*

Judgment roll as consisting of certified copy of appeal board's findings and order, decision, or award, and copy of judgment. *Lab. Code § 5807*

Stay of execution of judgment entered on WCAB's order, decision, or award. *Lab. Code § 5808*

Entry of satisfaction of judgment other than on execution. *Lab. Code § 5809*

Court clerk as prohibited from charging any fee for performance of any service required by workers' compensation law, except for docketing of awards as judgments and for certified copies of transcripts thereof. *Lab. Code § 5811*

[43] Judicial Review

Prerequisites to seeking review. *Lab. Code § 5901*

Issues not raised and objections not stated in petition for reconsideration deemed waived. *Lab. Code § 5904*

Application for writ to review original order, decision, or award of appeals board or order, decision, or award following

reconsideration. *Lab. Code § 5950*

Return of writ. *Lab. Code § 5951*

Cause as required to be heard on basis of certified record. *Lab. Code § 5951*

Scope of judicial review. *Lab. Code § 5952*

Effect of appeals board's findings and conclusions; appearances; and judgment. *Lab. Code § 5953*

Applicability of Code of Civil Procedure provisions relating to writs of review (*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1077, 1107-1110*) to proceedings under Labor Code. *Lab. Code § 5954*

Service of pleadings. *Lab. Code § 5954*

No California court, except Supreme Court and courts of appeal, as having jurisdiction to review, reverse, correct, or annul order, rule, decision, or award of appeals board, or to suspend or delay operation or execution thereof, or to restrain, enjoin, or interfere with appeals board in performance of its duties, but writ of mandate as lying from Supreme Court or court of appeal in all proper cases. *Lab. Code § 5955*

Stay of appeals board's order, rule, decision, or award during pendency of writ of review. *Lab. Code § 5956*

Undertaking required for stay. *Lab. Code §§ 6000-6002*

[44] Liens

Liens against compensation. *Lab. Code §§ 4903-4903.3*

Restrictions on filing liens for medical treatment. *Lab. Code § 4903.6*

Notice of lien and determination of amount. *Lab. Code § 4904*

Effect of payment of lien on immediate payment of balance of award. *Lab. Code § 4904.1*

Order for payment of lien without request. *Lab. Code § 4905*

Reasonableness of claim for legal and medical services. *Lab. Code § 4906(a)*

[44A] Lifeguards

Presumption of industrial causation applies to skin cancer that develops or manifests itself during period of employment of active lifeguards employed by city, county, district, or other public or municipal corporation or political subdivision and active state lifeguards employed by Department of Parks and Recreation who have been employed for more than three consecutive months in calendar year. *Lab. Code § 3212.11*

[45] Medical Director

Term "medical director" as meaning physician appointed by Administrative Director pursuant to *Lab. Code § 122*. *Lab.*

Code § 29

Requirement that medical director continuously review quality of comprehensive medical evaluations and reports prepared by agreed and qualified medical evaluators. *Lab. Code § 139.2(i)*

[46] Medical Evaluators

Physicians are prohibited from performing medical evaluations for which an evaluator is required to be certified as a qualified medical evaluator without having first obtained that certification; a violation of this prohibition constitutes unprofessional conduct and grounds for disciplinary action. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 730*

"Qualified medical evaluator" means physicians appointed by Administrative Director. *Lab. Code § 110(e)*

Appointment and qualifications of qualified medical evaluators. *Lab. Code § 139.2*

Review by medical director of comprehensive medical evaluations and reports prepared by agreed and qualified medical evaluators. *Lab. Code § 139.2(i)*

Rules and regulations to be adopted concerning standards governing time frames within which formal medical evaluations shall be prepared and submitted by agreed and qualified medical examiners. *Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(1)*

Guidelines to be adopted for range of time normally required to perform initial comprehensive medical-legal evaluation, treatment procedures that have not been defined and valued on Administrative Director's Official Medical Fee Schedule, and any other evaluation procedure requested by the Insurance Commissioner, or deemed appropriate by the Administrative Director. *Lab. Code § 139.2(j)(5)*

Qualified medical evaluators to pay fee for appointment or reappointment. *Lab. Code § 139.2(n)*

Qualified medical evaluators prohibited from requesting or accepting compensation that could create conflict of interest with their duties as evaluators. *Lab. Code § 139.2(o)*

Unlawful for physician to refer person for clinical laboratory, diagnostic nuclear medicine, radiation oncology, physical therapy, physical rehabilitation, psychometric testing, home infusion therapy, outpatient surgery, or diagnostic imaging goods or services, whether for treatment or medical-legal purposes, if physician or his or her immediate family has financial interest with person or in entity receiving the referral. *Lab. Code § 139.3(a)*

Unlawful for licensee to enter into cross-referral arrangement having principal purpose of ensuring referrals by licensee to particular entity. *Lab. Code § 139.3(c)(1)*

Unlawful for physician to offer, deliver, receive, or accept any rebate, refund, commission, preference, patronage dividend, discount, or other consideration, whether in the form of money or otherwise, as compensation or inducement for referred evaluation or consultation. *Lab. Code § 139.3(c)(2)*

No claim for payment may be presented by entity to any individual, third-party payor, or other entity for a good or service furnished pursuant to a prohibited referral. *Lab. Code § 139.3(d)*

Physician who refers to or seeks consultation from organization in which physician has financial interest must disclose this interest to patient at time of referral. *Lab. Code § 139.3(e)*

No insurer, self-insurer, or other payor may pay charge or lien for any good or service resulting from a prohibited referral. *Lab. Code § 139.3(f)*

Types of physician referrals that are not prohibited. *Lab. Code § 139.31*

When WCAB board may direct unrepresented employee to be examined by qualified medical evaluator selected by appeals board to report on clinical issue. *Lab. Code § 5703.5(a)*

When administrative director or his or her designees may direct injured employee to be examined by qualified medical evaluator selected by medical director to report on clinical issue. *Lab. Code § 5703.5(b)*

[47] Medical Personnel, Treatment and Evaluation

"Physician," "psychologist," and "acupuncturist," defined. *Lab. Code § 3209.3*

Medical, surgical, and hospital treatment as including services and supplies by physical therapists and chiropractic practitioners. *Lab. Code § 3209.5*

Treatment to cure or relieve from effects of injury as including services under specified conditions of marriage, family, and child counselors and clinical social workers licensed by California law. *Lab. Code § 3209.8*

Medical treatment may be provided by state-licensed physician assistant or nurse practitioner, acting under review or supervision of physician and surgeon pursuant to standardized procedures or protocols; "medical treatment" includes authority of nurse practitioner or physician assistant to authorize patient to receive time off from work for up to three calendar days, but does not include authority to make any determination of temporary disability. *Lab. Code § 3209.10*

Employee's duty to submit to medical examinations. *Lab. Code §§ 4050, 4051, 4053, 4054*

Right of employee at his or her own expense to have physician present at examination required by employer. *Lab. Code § 4052*

Determination of medical issues. *Lab. Code §§ 4060-4062.5*

Educational materials to train physicians and other health care providers in relevant aspects of workers' compensation law. *Lab. Code § 4062.8*

Physician who makes or is present at employee's medical examination as subject to being required to report or testify as to results. *Lab. Code § 4055*

Medical and hospital treatment. *Lab. Code §§ 4600-4614.1*

Medical provider networks. *Lab. Code §§ 4616-4616.7*

Power of WCAB to direct employee claiming compensation to be examined by regular physician and report results of examination to WCAB. *Lab. Code § 5701*

When WCAB may direct unrepresented employee to be examined by qualified medical evaluator selected by WCAB to report on any clinical question, other than those issues specified in *Lab. Code §§ 4061* and *4062*, then at issue before WCAB. *Lab. Code § 5703.5(a)*

Confidentiality of Medical Information Act. *Civ. Code § 56 et seq.*

Employee's predesignation of personal physician. *Lab. Code § 4600*

[48] Medical-Legal Expenses

Payment of medical-legal expenses. *Lab. Code §§ 4620-4627*

Medical-legal expenses as consisting of costs and expenses incurred by or on behalf of any party, Administrative Director, WCAB, or referee, for X rays, laboratory fees, other diagnostic tests, medical reports, medical records, medical testimony, and, as needed, interpreter's fees, for purpose of proving or disproving contested claim. *Lab. Code § 4620(a)*

Costs of medical evaluations, diagnostic tests, and interpreters incidental to production of medical report as not constituting medical-legal expenses unless medical report is capable of proving or disproving disputed medical fact, the determination of which is essential to adjudication of employee's claim for benefits. *Lab. Code § 4620(c)*

Costs for medical evaluations, diagnostic tests, and interpreters' services incidental to production of medical report as not permitted to be incurred earlier than date of receipt of all reports and documents required by Administrative Director incidental to the services. *Lab. Code § 4621(a)*

Designated treating physician presumption. *Lab. Code §§ 5307.1, 5307.2*

Health care provider or health facility licensed pursuant to *Health and Safety Code § 1250* and contracting agent, employer, or carrier may contract for reimbursement rates different from those in fee schedule adopted and revised pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5307.1*. *Lab. Code § 5307.11*

Payment of physicians by employers, requirements governing review of physicians' submitted bills, disputes regarding payments, and penalties and liabilities for late payments. *Lab. Code § 4603.2*

[49] Minors and Incompetents

Appointment of guardian ad litem or trustee for minor or incompetent employee or dependent. *Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*

Power of guardian or conservator appointed by court or guardian ad litem or trustee appointed by appeals board. *Lab. Code § 5408*

Power of WCAB to determine fact of minority or incompetency and to appoint trustee to receive and disburse compensation payments for benefit of minor or incompetent and his or her family. *Lab. Code § 5408*

[50] Notice to Employer of Injury or Death

Employee or person on employee's behalf as required to notify employer of injury or death within 30 days of occurrence of injury. *Lab. Code § 5400*

Knowledge of employee's injury obtained from any source on part of employer or employer's managing agent, superintendent, foreman, or other person in authority, or knowledge of assertion of claim of injury sufficient to afford

employer opportunity to investigate facts as equivalent to service of notice of injury under *Lab. Code § 5400. Lab. Code § 5402(a)*

Failure of employee to notify employer of injury not a bar to recovery if employer not misled or prejudiced thereby. *Lab. Code § 5403*

[51] Parties

Joinder of insurance carrier as defendant. *Lab. Code § 3753*

Joinder of parties by WCAB or WCJ. *Lab. Code § 5307.5(b)*

Designation of parties. *Lab. Code § 5503*

Joinder of parties in occupational disease and cumulative injury cases arising out of more than one employment. *Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*

[52] Payment and Assignment

Payment and assignment of claims and awards for compensation, including liens. *Lab. Code §§ 4900-4909.1*

Lump sum payment. *Lab. Code §§ 5100-5106*

[53] Peace Officers

Pursuant to collective bargaining agreement, members of California State University Police Department whose principal duties consist of active law enforcement as entitled to industrial disability leave equal to their take-home salary on date of injury, for period of one year. *Lab. Code §§ 4806, 4816-4820*

For certain law enforcement personnel required to wear duty belt, lower back impairment that develops or manifests itself during period of employment and for specified periods following termination of service is disputably presumed to arise out of and be in course of employment. *Lab. Code § 3213.2*

Presumption of industrial causation applies to heart trouble, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and meningitis that develops or manifests itself during period in which peace officer of Department of Corrections who has custodial or supervisory duties of inmates or parolees, peace officer of Department of Youth Authority who has custodial or supervisory duties of wards or parolees, or peace officer as defined in *Penal Code § 830.5* and employed by a local agency is in service of department or unit. *Lab. Code § 3212.10*

Presumption of industrial causation applies to illness or resulting death due to exposure to biochemical substance, as defined, that develops or occurs during period in which peace officer or member of fire department, as defined, is in service of department or unit. *Lab. Code § 3212.85*

[54] Penalties

Penalties for unreasonable delay in payment of compensation. *Lab. Code §§ 5814-5814.6*

[55] Permanent Disability Medical Issues

Determination of medical issues relating to permanent disability; procedures. *Lab. Code §§ 4061-4067* (operative for injuries occurring on and after January 1, 1991 [*Lab. Code § 4067.5*])

[56] Pleadings

Required pleadings. *Lab. Code § 5500*

Application in occupational disease and cumulative injury cases arising out of more than one employment. *Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*

Answer. *Lab. Code § 5505*

Effect of failure to answer or appear. *Lab. Code § 5506*

Dismissal of application that shows applicant not entitled to compensation. *Lab. Code § 5507*

[57] Process

Issuance of process by WCAB or any of its members. *Lab. Code § 134*

[57A] Return-to-Work Program

Early and sustained return to work. *Lab. Code § 139.47*

Reimbursement; restrictions on return to work; contingent implementation. *Lab. Code § 139.48*

Study of return-to-work program. *Lab. Code § 139.49*

[58] Self-Insured Employers

Requirement that Director of Industrial Relations ensure that all private self-insured employers are audited within three-year cycle by Office of Self Insurance Plans. *Lab. Code § 3702.6(a)*

Requirement that each public self-insured employer advise its governing board within 90 days after submission of its annual report of the total workers' compensation liabilities reported and whether current funding of those liabilities is in compliance with the requirements of Government Accounting Standards Board Publication No. 10. *Lab. Code § 3702.6(b)*

Requirement that Director of Industrial Relations, on a showing of good cause, order a special audit of any public self-insured employer to determine the adequacy of its estimates of future liability of compensation claims. *Lab. Code § 3702.6(c), (d)*

[59] Serious and Willful Misconduct

Of employee. *Lab. Code § 4551*

Of employer. *Lab. Code § 4553*

[60] Service of Papers

Time extensions when service is by mail. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1013*

Service of application for adjudication of claim. *Lab. Code § 5316*

Service of notice of hearing. *Lab. Code § 5504*

Service of answer. *Lab. Code § 5505*

[61] Settlement Conferences

Generally. *Lab. Code § 5502(e)*

Time for conference. *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(1)*

Settlement conference statement. *Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)*

[62] State Employees Not Otherwise Covered

General provisions. *Lab. Code §§ 6100, 6101*

Direct payments. *Lab. Code §§ 6110-6115*

Insurance. *Lab. Code §§ 6130, 6131*

Benefits and procedure. *Lab. Code §§ 6140-6149*

[63] Statutes of Limitation

On proceedings for workers' compensation and death benefits. *Lab. Code §§ 5400-5413*

On liability for occupational disease or cumulative injury. *Lab. Code §§ 5500.5, 5500.6*

[64] Stipulations and Requests for Award

Stipulation of facts and award. *Lab. Code § 5702*

[65] Subrogation

Employer or insurer's right to subrogation. *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3865*

[66] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

State is represented by Attorney General or attorneys of Department of Industrial Relations in any proceeding involving Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. *Lab. Code § 4753.5*

Compromise and release of claim. *Lab. Code § 4754.5*

[67] Supplemental Proceedings

Supplemental proceedings. *Lab. Code §§ 5410, 5803-5805*

[68] Third-Party Actions

Right of Director of Industrial Relations to recover damages from any person or entity, other than employer, whose tortious act or omission proximately caused injury or death of employee when compensation is paid or becomes payable from Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund. *Lab. Code § 3732*

In determining credit to Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund provided by *Lab. Code § 3861*, negligence of employer is not taken into consideration and credit is allowed for entire amount of employee's recovery by settlement or after judgment except for amounts applied to payment of expenses or attorney's fees. *Lab. Code § 3732(e)*

Subrogation rights of employer or insurance carrier. *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3864*; *Ins. Code § 11662*

Settlement and release of claims against third parties. *Lab. Code §§ 3859-3861*

Judgment or settlement of action as provided for in *Lab. Code §§ 3850-3865* as subject, on notice to court, to same lien claims of Employment Development Department as are provided for in *Lab. Code §§ 4900-4909.1* (liens for legal, medical, and other expenses) and are to be allowed by court as it determines necessary to avoid duplication of payment as compensation to employee for lost earnings. *Lab. Code § 3865*

[69] Uninsured Employers

Requirement that all covered employers secure payment of workers' compensation through insurance or by self insuring. *Lab. Code § 3700*

Exception to exclusive remedy principle in case of uninsured employer. *Lab. Code § 3706*

Plaintiff as entitled to attach employer's property to secure payment of judgment. *Lab. Code § 3707*

Limitations on employer's defenses. *Lab. Code § 3708*

Presumption of employer negligence in civil action against uninsured employer. *Lab. Code § 3708*

Any compensation awarded, paid, or secured by employer as required to be credited against judgment. *Lab. Code § 3709*

Judgment as to include attorney's fee. *Lab. Code § 3709*

[70] [Reserved]

[71] Witnesses

Witness fees. *Lab. Code § 131*

Compelling attendance of witnesses. *Lab. Code §§ 131, 132*

[72] Workers' Compensation Judges or Referees

Term "workers' compensation judge" or "workers' compensation referee" as used in relation to workers' compensation law means "workers' compensation administrative law judge." *Lab. Code § 27*

Appointment and qualifications. *Lab. Code §§ 123, 123.5(a), (b)*

Prohibition against receipt of salary while any cause remains pending and undetermined for 90 days after submission for decision. *Lab. Code § 123.5(a)*

Workers' compensation administrative law judges are required to subscribe to the Code of Judicial Ethics adopted by the Supreme Court. *Lab. Code § 123.6(a)*

Limitations on workers' compensation administrative law judges' acceptance of honoraria or travel expenses. *Lab. Code § 123.6(b)*

Matters that WCAB may direct WCJ to do. *Lab. Code § 5309*

Appointment. *Lab. Code § 5310*

Disqualification. *Lab. Code § 5311*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 641*

Workers' compensation referees required to participate in continuing education. *Lab. Code § 5311.5*

Required oath. *Lab. Code § 5312*

[73] Wrongful Death

Wrongful death action for injuries arising in course of employment not covered by workers' compensation. *Lab. Code § 2803*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsClaimsFiling RequirementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsTemporary Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.354

§ 577.354 Administrative Regulations

[1] Advertising

False and misleading advertising. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9820-9837*

[2] Administrative and Civil Penalties

Administrative and civil penalties--generally. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10111-10115.2*

[3] Appeals Board--Practice and Procedure

General provisions. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10300-10324*

Obtaining certified copies of desired portions of WCAB's records. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10322*

Ex parte communication with WCAB regarding merits of case as prohibited. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10324*

Powers, duties, and responsibilities of WCAB. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10340-10352*

Authority of WCAB or member to issue order approving undertaking on stays of proceedings on reconsideration and petitions for writ of review. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10342(b)*

Review of administrative orders by WCAB. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10950 et seq.*

[4] Appointment of Guardian ad Litem and Trustee

Petition for appointment of guardian ad litem and trustee of minor or incompetent applicant. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402*

[5] Arbitration

Notice of injured employee's right to interpreter at arbitration hearing. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.2*

Claims administrator's responsibility for fees for interpreter services at arbitration hearing. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795.3(a)(4)*

Reconsideration of arbitrator's decision or award. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10865, 10866*

Arbitration submittal form. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10297*

Voluntary arbitration. 8 Cal. Code Reg. § *10997*

Disqualification of arbitrator. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10998*

Fee and Cost Disputes. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10999*

[6] Attorneys and Representatives

[a] In General

Attorneys and representatives. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10773-10779*

[b] Substitution, Dismissal and Discipline

Substitution and dismissal of attorneys and dismissal of agents. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*

Disbarred or suspended (for any reason other than nonpayment of dues) attorneys as not permitted to represent any party. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10779*

[c] Fees

Attorney as required at initial consultation to furnish employee injured on or after January 1, 1990, with attorney's fees disclosure statement. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135*

Service of attorney's fee disclosure statement. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10135.1*

Factors considered in establishing reasonable attorney's fees. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10775*

Approval of attorney's fees. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10776*

Request for increase of attorney's fees. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10778*

[7] Audits

Audits by Administrative Director. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10105-10115.2*

Petition appealing audit penalty assessment. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10953*

[8] Autopsies

Order directing exhumation or autopsy as permitted to be made only by WCAB or board member. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10342(b)*

[9] Benefits

[a] Medical Treatment and Evaluation

Medical provider networks. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9767.1-9767.15*

Medical treatment. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9780-9787*

Spinal surgery second opinion procedure. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9788.01-9788.91*

Official medical fee schedule. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9789.10-9789.111*

Procedure for payment of medical treatment and for objecting to payment for medical treatment. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792.5*

Application of the official medical fee schedule. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9790-9792.5*

Standards for insurers' review of medical care and services. *8 Cal. Code. Reg. §§ 9792.6*-9792.11

Utilization review enforcement; administrative penalties. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9792.12*-9792.15

Medical-Legal Expenses and Comprehensive Medical-Legal Evaluations. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9793-9795*

Reporting of medical-legal charges (reports). *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9793-9795*

Certification of consulting physician. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9796-9802*

[b] Permanent Disability

Schedule for rating permanent disabilities. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9805*

Data collection, evaluation, and revision of schedule. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9805.1*

Permanent disability ratings and evaluations. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10150 et seq.*

[c] Vocational Rehabilitation

Vocational rehabilitation services. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10122-10133.4*

Settlement of prospective vocational rehabilitation services. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10131.2, 10133.22*

Employee's vocational feasibility to be determined by qualified rehabilitation representative. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10124.1, 10127.3*; Admin. Guideline § 8-30-03

[d] Notice Requirements

Notices required of employer on injuries involving loss of time. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9810-9816*

Benefit payment and notice. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9812*

Vocational rehabilitation notices. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9813*

[10] Calendar

Removing and restoring cases to calendar. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*

[11] Claim Procedure--Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990

Claims Generally. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10136*-10142

Employer's obligation to provide timely compensation to injured employee as not abrogated by employee's failure to complete and file claim form. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10137*

Claim form; contents. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10138, 10139*

Employer as responsible for processing claim. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140*

Dismissal of inactive claim by operation of law after notice for injuries before January 1, 1994. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141*

Dismissal of claim form where no application for adjudication has been filed for injury occurring on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10583*

[11A] Claims Adjusters

Standards applicable to workers' compensation claims adjusters and medical billing entities and certification of those standards by insurers. *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2592-2592.14*

[12] Compromise and Release Agreements

Proceeding for workers' compensation as initiated by filing compromise and release agreement. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400*

When compromise and release agreements will be approved; limitations on agreements. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10870*

Action by WCAB on compromise and release agreements. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10870, 10875, 10878, 10882*

Requirement that compromise and release agreements comply with *Lab. Code §§ 5003, 5004* (contents) and conform to

form provided by WCAB. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10874*

Compromise and release agreement as application. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10878*

When compromise and release agreement must be served on lien claimant; claimant's protest. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10886*

[13] Consolidation of Cases

Consolidation of cases to receive evidence. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10589*

[14] Continuances

Deficient claim. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10490*

General rules and policy. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10243*

[14A] Court Administrator

Definitions and general provisions. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10214

Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS). *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10215*-10225

Filing of documents by parties or lien claimants. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10227*- 10236

Appearances, form of minutes of hearings and minute orders. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10240*-10246

Declarations of readiness to proceed and objections and hearing calendars. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10250*-10256

Consolidation procedures. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10260*

Access to records and retention of records. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10270*-10275

Procedures for requesting immediate action by judge. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10280*-10281

Review of administrative orders issued by Administrative Director. 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10290-10294.5

Arbitration. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10295*-10297

[15] Declaration of Readiness to Proceed

Filing. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250*

Objections to declaration. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10251*

Setting case on receipt of declaration. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10420*

Application for adjudication with respect to injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, filed without declaration as placed in inactive status. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*

[15A] Disability Evaluation Unit Regulations

Disability Evaluation Unit regulations. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10150*-10167

[16] Dismissal

Dismissal for failure to appear after service of notice of trial. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10562*

Dismissal for failure to activate case within one year after filing application for adjudication concerning injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990, and on or after January 1, 1994. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10582*

Dismissal orders. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780*

[17] Employers' Duties

Employee information. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9880-9884*

Notice of employee death required to be given by employer to Administrative Director. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9900-9918*

Provision to party upon request of computer printout of benefits paid. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10607*

[18] Evidence

Production and evaluation of medical evidence; direct and cross-examination of physicians. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*

Evidence that may be considered by workers' compensation judge in determining permanent disability rating. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10632, 10633*

Reproductions of documents; photocopies of business records; printed representations of images stored on video or digital medium. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10605*

[19] Fees

Medical-legal fee schedule. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9795*

Fees for transcripts, copies of documents, certifications, inspection of case files, and electronic transmissions. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9990-9994*

[20] Filing of Papers

Papers not accepted for filing by WCAB in absence of proof of service. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10324*

Time of filing documents. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10230*

Form and size requirements of filed documents. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232*

Documents that will not be filed. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222*

[21] Findings and Awards

Request for findings of fact in specified proceedings. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10405*

Findings, awards, and orders. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10780, 10782*

When certified copies of findings and awards or other final orders may be issued for purpose of having judgment entered and execution issued by clerk of superior court. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*

Withholding certified copies. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10825*

Stay of execution or withholding of certified copies of order, decision, or award on request of party intending to file for writ of review and filing of bond. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10828*

[22] Health Care

Regulations implementing the Workers' Compensation Health Care Provider Organization Act of 1993. 10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1956-1999

[23] Hearings

Expedited hearings. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10252, 10252.1*

Hearings generally. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10541*

Interpreters and fees. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*

Evidence and reports. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10600-10635*

Transcription of testimony. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10740*

Record of proceedings. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10750*-10755

Attorneys and representatives. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10774-10779*

[24] Information and Assistance Program

Operation of Information and Assistance Program of Division of Industrial Accidents. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9921-9929*

[25] [Reserved]

[26] Interpreter's Fees

Allowance of interpreter's fees as a cost. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10564*

[27] Judicial Review

Order withholding issuance of certified copy of order, decision, or award as alternative to issuance of order staying execution. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10825*

Request of party intending to file for writ of review to stay execution or to withhold issuance of certified copy of order, decision, or award, and bond requirement. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10828*

[28] Liens

Filing fee for medical lien procedures. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(b)*

Lien claimant under *Lab. Code § 4903* or *4903.1* as required to file its lien in writing on form approved by WCAB or electronically as approved by the Administrative Director. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770*

Unemployment compensation disability lien. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10772*

[29] Medical Reports

Filing and service of physicians' reports. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10608, 10615*

[30] Parties

Necessary parties. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10360*

Joinder of applicants and defendants. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10364, 10368*

Parties in death cases. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10372*

Joinder of parties. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10372, 10380*

Dismissal of improper or unnecessary parties. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570*

[31] Pensions

Tables for computation of life pensions. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10169, 10169.1*

[32] Petitions

Request for action by WCAB, other than application for adjudication, answer, or declaration of readiness, as made by petition. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10450*

[33] Pleadings

Form and content of application for adjudication. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10401, 10404, 10408*

Pleading serious and willful misconduct of employee or employer. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445*

Application for Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund benefits. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*

Proceedings under *Lab. Code § 132a*, relating to discrimination by employer or insurer against employee for filing, or making known intention to file, workers'compensation claim. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10447*

Form and content of answer. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484*

Prohibition against demurrers, petitions for judgment on pleadings, and petitions for summary judgment. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10490*

When pleadings are deemed amended. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10492*

[34] [Reserved]

[35] Qualified Medical Examiners

General regulations governing appointment, eligibility, assignment, selection, and discipline of qualified medical evaluators. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 1-65*

Regulation of advertising by qualified medical evaluators and other physicians with respect to industrial injuries or illnesses. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 150-159*

Determination of fees of physicians seeking status as qualified medical evaluators. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 16-19*

Methods for evaluating psychiatric, pulmonary, cardiac, neuromusuloskeletal and immunologic disabilities *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 43-47*

Disclosure requirements of qualified medical evaluators to unrepresented workers. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 40*

Ethical guidelines to be followed by qualified medical evaluators. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 41*

Procedures for discipline of qualified medical evaluators. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 60-65*

Minimal time guidelines to be followed by qualified medical evaluators in evaluating disabilities. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 49-49.9*

Treatment Guidelines for occupational asthma, contact dermatitis, post-traumatic stress disorder, carpal tunnel syndrome, and injuries to the knee, lower back, neck, shoulder, and elbow. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 70-77*

[36] Reconsideration

Procedure on petition for reconsideration. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10840 et seq.*

[36A] Retraining and Return to Work Regulations

Retraining and return to work definitions and general provisions. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10116*-10116.8

Return to work. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10117*-10120

Vocational Rehabilitation. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10123*-10133.3

Supplemental job displacement benefit. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10133.50*-10133.58

[37] Sanctions

Procedure for imposing sanctions for bad faith actions or tactics. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10561*

[38] Self-Insured Employers

Administration of self-insurance plans. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 15200-15481*

[39] Service of Papers

Service of papers by WCAB. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500*

Service in death cases. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10501*

Service by parties and lien claimants. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10500, 10505*

Mail and fax service. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10507*

Service via mailbox for outgoing documents at WCAB district office. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10506*

Service on attorney or agent. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10510*

Duty of parties and lien claimants to furnish WCAB and other parties with correct address. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10217*

[40] Settlement Conferences

Authority of settlement conference judge. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10353*

[41] Stipulations and Requests for Award

Proceeding for adjudication of rights and liabilities as initiated by filing of stipulations with request for award. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400*

Awards and orders as properly based on oral or written stipulations of parties. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10496*

Finding contrary to a stipulation of the parties on an issue as not permitted to be made without providing notice and

opportunity to present evidence. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10497*

[42] Subpoenas

Appeals board's records as not subject to subpoena. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10322*

Issuance of subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10530, 10536, 10537*

Notice to appear or produce in lieu of subpoena or subpoena duces tecum. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10532*

Production of film, legible print, or electronic recording if original record destroyed. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10534*

[43] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

Claims against Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10940-10946*

Service of previously filed medical reports when application is filed against Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10946*

Eligibility requirements for "qualified alien" seeking benefits from Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 15740, 15741*

[44] Supplemental Proceedings

Petition to reopen. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10455*

Petition for new and further disability. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10458*

Petition to terminate liability and objections. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10462-10466*

[45] Witness Fees

Medical examiners. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10536*

[46] Workers' Compensation Judge

Ethical standards. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9720.1*-9723

Ex parte communication with WCJ regarding merits of case prohibited. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10324*

Assignment of cases to WCJ. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10346*

Appointment, authority, and review of order, decision, or award of pro tempore WCJ. *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10350-10352*

Disqualification of WCJ. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10452*

Petition for automatic reassignment of hearing to another WCJ. *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10453*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsAuthorized TreatmentWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsMedical BenefitsRehabilitationWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsPermanent Total Disabilities

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.355

§ 577.355 California Rules of Court

[1] Judicial Review

Requirements of petition to review appeals board's order or award. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.494(a)

Answer to petition and briefs. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.494(b)

Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.494(c)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureAppealsBriefsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.355A

§ 577.355A California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI)

For related jury instructions regarding workers' compensation, see Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions (CACI), Series 2800 (LexisNexis Matthew Bender, Official Publisher), also available in LexisNexis Automated Judicial Council of California Civil Jury Instructions

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureTrialsJury TrialsJury InstructionsGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.356

§ 577.356 Decisions

[1] In General

Lab. Code § 3751 bars freight transportation companies from requiring independent contractor truck owners/operators to pay costs of their own workers' compensation insurance, when parties had elected under *Lab. Code § 4150* to come under workers' compensation law's compensation provisions, which include *Lab. Code § 3751*. Albillo, et al. v. *Intermodal Container Services, Inc.; Montoya v. W.C.A.B. (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 190, 197-207, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 350*

WCAB as duty-bound to interpret and apply all aspects of workers' compensation law, especially Labor Code provisions and its own regulations, liberally in favor of worker consistent with underlying policy of pervasive and abiding solicitude for worker. *Hansen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 717, 722, 259 Cal. Rptr. 506*

Person who suffers work-related injury as required generally to seek relief within workers' compensation system, and all proceedings as required to be before WCAB, which operates under rules of procedure and evidence substantially different from those in superior court, all of which are liberally construed in favor of workers' claims; intent of this special forum as being to compensate worker quickly and its jurisdiction as controlling, even though worker might have better claim against employer in civil action brought in superior court. *Potter v. Arizona So. Coach Lines, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 126, 131, 248 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Workers' compensation law as implementing mandate of *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, that Legislature create "complete system" of compensation for injury or death to employee incurred in course of employment; since source of this law is statutory, rights and liabilities of parties as required to be predicated on statutes and cases that interpret them. *Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1533, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190*

Workers' compensation law as compensating employees for injuries arising out of unsafe work place conditions, including enhanced compensation under *Lab. Code § 4553* in cases involving serious and willful employer misconduct. *Jones v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 794, 804, 244 Cal. Rptr. 37*

Workers' compensation system as not avoided by direct contract, and subterfuges designed to avoid workers' compensation laws as not countenanced; hence, contract between alleged employer and employee as unable to affect true relationship of parties to it or to place employee in different position from that which he or she actually held. *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 614, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754* (contract falsely designating worker as independent contractor)

WCAB as having approved citation of writ-denied summaries published in California Compensation Cases, and, accordingly, courts as permitting citation of California Compensation Cases and as occasionally citing them in published opinions. *Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1053 n.4, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343*

California workers' compensation law as statutory system enacted pursuant to constitutional grant of plenary power to Legislature to establish complete and exclusive system of workers' compensation (*Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*); law as expression and valid exercise of police power. *Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1002, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494*

Right to workers' compensation benefits as wholly statutory and not derived from common law; statutory right as exclusive of all other statutory and common law remedies and as substituting new system of rights and obligations for common law rules governing liability of employers for injuries to their employees; rights, remedies, and obligations as resting on status of employer-employee relationship, rather than on contract or tort. *Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1002-1003, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494*

[2] Affirmative Defenses

Finding of intentional injury under *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(5)*, requires proof that employee deliberately intended to injury himself or herself; employee who injured hand when he intentionally struck wall was not barred from receiving benefits under *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(5)*, when there was no evidence employee intended to injure himself. *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 530, 533, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 186*

Employer as precluded from raising as a defense under *Lab. Code § 4056* plaintiff's refusal to submit to medical treatment when, at the time plaintiff's injuries were discovered, there was no admitted or adjudicated industrial injury and no tender of medical treatment by employer. *See Thompson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1787-1788, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 242*

Lab. Code § 3708 as expressly abolishing common-law defense of contributory negligence in workers' compensation proceedings. *Thompson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1787-1788, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 242*

Employer asserting affirmative defense of employee's intoxication is proximate cause or substantial factor in employee's injury or death. *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 763, 773, 176 Cal. Rptr. 843*

[2A] Aliens/Undocumented Workers

Worker, who at time of injury was illegal alien who had obtained job by showing employer false Social Security and green cards, was employee entitled to workers' compensation benefits, excluding reinstatement and back pay. *Farmer Brothers Coffee v. W.C.A.B. (Ruiz) (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 533, 537-544, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 23*

Undocumented employee is not entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits when employee is unable to return to work

solely because of immigration status, since providing undocumented worker with greater benefits than those available to legal workers violates *equal protection clause of the United States Constitution*. *Del Taco v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1437, 1442-1443, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825*

In civil action for medical malpractice, trial court should have excluded from trial all reference to plaintiff's immigration status, when plaintiff was not seeking damages for loss of earnings or earning capacity, since plaintiff's immigration status was neither relevant to any issue in case nor admissible to attack plaintiff's credibility. *Hernandez v. Paicius (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 452, 456-463, 468, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756*

[3] Appeals Board

Legislature as having vested all judicial powers under Workers' Compensation Act in WCAB (*Lab. Code § 111*); WCAB as authorized to exercise judicial power in all disputes arising under Workers' Compensation Act as a constitutional court subject to general legal principles that circumscribe and regulate judgment of all judicial tribunals and in general as having inherent power to control its practice and procedure to prevent frustration, abuse, or disregard of its process. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

[4] Applications for Adjudication of Claim

WCAB abused its discretion by finding that applicant did not sustain industrial injury based on facts that medical evidence did not support finding of specific injury and applicant did not amend specific injury claim to include cumulative injury, when evidence supported finding of cumulative injury and employer had early knowledge of potential cumulative injury claim despite employees failure to amend pleadings. *Beckstead v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 60 Cal. App. 4th 787, 792, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 254*

Amendment to original application to substitute cumulative-injury claim for specific-injury claim as proper and as not constituting new and different cause of action so as to subject amended claim to bar of statute of limitations when disability is the same and both claims arose from same set of facts. *Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1116, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868*

Inadvertent defect in application as ignored when defendant is not prejudiced by it. *Brennfleck v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 738, 742-743, 71 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[5] Apportionment

Language of *Lab. Code § 4663(c)*, plus language of *Lab. Code § 4664(a)*, meant that so-called apportionment "Formula A" adopted by Supreme Court in *Fuentes v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1976) 16 Cal. 3d 1, 128 Cal. Rptr. 673, 547 P.2d 449* , pursuant to which percentage of disability attributable to new injury is calculated by subtracting old permanent disability rating from new permanent disability rating, then consulting table for award due this difference, remained proper method for calculating apportionment, and statutory changes made by SB 899 did not mandate use of "Formula C," rejected by Supreme Court in *Fuentes*, pursuant to which dollar award for new injury is calculated as if apportionment were not issue, then dollar award of old injury is subtracted. *Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1313, 1323-1332, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 644, 156 P.3d 1100*

AMA *Guides* portion of 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule is rebuttable, and it is rebutted by showing that impairment rating based on *Guides* would result in permanent disability award that would be inequitable, disproportionate, and not fair and accurate measure of employee's permanent disability. Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 201, 211-217, 233,

239-245 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *recon. granted* Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cas. 478, 479-482 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)

Diminished future earning capacity portion of 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule is rebuttable, since *Lab. Code § 4660(c)* provides that 2005 Schedule is merely "prima facie evidence of percentage of permanent disability to be attributed to each injury." Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) *74 Cal. Comp. Cases 248, 255-274 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)* , *recon. granted* Ogilvie v. City and County of San Francisco (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 478, 479-482 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)

Appeals Board en banc has specifically rejected "inequitable, disproportionate, and not a fair and accurate measure of the employee's permanent disability" standard set forth in its previous en banc opinion in same case. Almaraz v. Environmental Recovery Services; Guzman v. Milpitas Unified School District (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1084, 1085-1087, 1114 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *pet. for writ of rev. filed sub nom.* Milpitas Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Guzman) 10/16/2009

Appeals Board en banc has held that any individualized diminished future earning capacity adjustment factor must be consistent with *Lab Code § 4660(b)(2)*, RAND data to which it refers, and numeric formula adopted by Administrative Director in 2005 Schedule. Oglevie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1127, 1129, 1130 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *pet. for writ of rev. filed* 10/7/2009

Rule of *Wilkinson v. W.C.A.B. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 491* , which provided that injured worker who, while employed by same employer, sustained two separate injuries to same part of body, which became permanent and stationary at same time, was entitled to receive combined award of permanent disability, is no longer generally applicable because inconsistent with post-SB 899 requirement that apportionment be based on causation, and in light of current versions of *Lab. Code §§ 4663(a)* and *(c)* and *4664(a)*, as explained by *Brodie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 40 Cal. 4th 1313* , Appeals Board must now determine and apportion to cause of disability for each industrial injury, meaning that all potential causes of disability, whether from current industrial injury, prior or subsequent industrial injury, or prior or subsequent nonindustrial injury or condition, must be taken into consideration. Benson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 72 Cal. Comp. Cases 1620, 1622, 1634-1635 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , *aff'd sub nom. Benson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. [2009) 170 Cal. App. 4th 1535, 1549-1560, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 166*

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4664(b)*, employee was not entitled to prove that he was medically rehabilitated from prior permanent disability when he sustained subsequent industrial injury, when court of appeal found that legislature intended statute's presumption to be conclusive, not rebuttable, notwithstanding second sentence in statute, which states that this presumption affects burden of proof, and court annulled decision of Appeals Board and held that Board incorrectly determined that employee had burden of disproving overlap between current permanent disability and previous disability in order to establish his claim to permanent disability benefits, but court found that employer, while able to rely, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4664(b)*, on conclusive presumption that employee's permanent disability that was subject of prior award existed at time of subsequent industrial injury, nonetheless had burden of proving overlap in order to establish its right to apportionment of employee's permanent disability. *Kopping v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1106-1115, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 618*

There was no "existing order, decision, or award" in case before court of appeal, within meaning of § 47 of SB 899, and Legislature intended § 47's language that SB 899 "shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award" to be consistent with general rule that statutory rights end during litigation with repeal or amendment of statute unless appeals were exhausted and final judgment existed. *Kleemann v. W.C.A.B. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 274, 285-288, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 448*

Appeals Board determination was not "final" for purposes of considering apportionment under SB 899 until Board had issued final judgment and appellate process had been exhausted, which had not occurred in present case, so that

language ofSection 47 of SB 899 that SB 899 "shall not constitute good cause to reopen or rescind, alter, or amend any existing order, decision, or award of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board" was no barrier to applying SB 899's apportionment provisions to present case. *Marsh v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 906, 912-916, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 598*

Submission orders and orders closing discovery, issued prior to effective date of SB 899, April 19, 2004, were not "existing" orders that could not be reopened due to prohibition set forth in Sec. 47 of SB 899, so that SB 899's repeal of former apportionment statutes, *Lab. Code §§ 4663, 4750,* and *4750.5*, and enactment of new apportionment statutes, *Lab. Code §§ 4663* and *4664*, applied to present case. *Rio Linda Union School District v. W.C.A.B. (Scheftner) (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 517, 525-532, 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 789*

Apportioning liability for cumulative trauma injuries, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5500.5*, requires either compensable temporary disability or permanent disability to satisfy disability requirement of *Lab. Code § 5412*. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Rodarte) (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 998, 1005-1006, 14 Cal. Rptr. 3d 793*

Under *Lab. Code § 4750.5* [repealed in 2004], an "unrelated noncompensable injury" is a disabling event which, if work related, would be compensable; the word "solely" has been interpreted to incorporate the existing rules applicable to the apportionment of successive disabilities. *Fresno Unified School Dist. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1295, 1308, 1311, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 569*

Doctor's report that apportioned applicant's permanent disability based upon incorrect legal theory, was insufficient to support WCAB's apportionment. *Martins v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1094-1095, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 386*

Lab. Code § 4750.5 [repealed in 2004] not applicable in permitting apportionment of applicant's permanent disability to her pregnancy or her unemployment since neither condition constituted a "non-compensable injury" within the meaning of the statute; in enacting *Lab. Code § 4750.5* [repealed in 2004], Legislature intended to make distinction between compensable and noncompensable injuries, rather than to expand meaning of "injury" to include conditions and circumstances not relevant in apportionment. *Ashley v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 320, 328-329, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 589*

[6] Arising Out of and in Course of Employment

Although illegal conduct in performance of job-related act will not preclude finding that resulting disability is service-connected, illegal activity wholly unrelated to worker's duties as outside scope of employment. *Traub v. Board of Retirement (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 793, 799, 195 Cal. Rptr. 681, 670 P.2d 335*

Police officer's physical training injury, even though occurring while he was on vacation, was compensable injury because his training was, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, "a reasonable expectancy of ... the employment." *Tomlin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1423, 1425-1426, 1428-1432, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 672*

Employee's death was not result of industrial injury, when court found that decedent, accountant with CPA license employed by City of Los Angeles, died from injuries received from fall while attending CPA convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey, since employer did not require decedent to have CPA license, and traveling to attend the convention for CPA credit was not expressly or impliedly authorized by decedent's employment contract. *City of Los Angeles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 78*

Court of appeal affirmed award of workers' compensation benefits to police officer who was exposed to benzene during his employment and contracted kidney cancer during his employment, holding, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3212.1*, that

employer failed to rebut presumption that cancer was industrial injury when it established merely absence of medical evidence that benzene had been shown to cause kidney cancer. *City of Long Beach v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 298, 314-321, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 782*

Ski resort employees who are exempt from workers' compensation coverage under *Lab. Code § 3352(f)* are not also exempt from assumption of risk under *Lab. Code § 2801*, because latter statute bars employers from raising assumption of risk as defense in negligence actions by employees only when employee has been injured in course of employment, and legislature, by virtue of it use of phrase "course of his employment as such" in *Lab. Code § 2801*, contemplated more restrictive concept of course of employment in that statute than in workers' compensation statutes, only latter of which include off-duty recreational activities if they are reasonable expectancy of employment. *Vine v. Bear Valley Ski Co. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 577, 587-590, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 370*

Question of whether employee was on duty or off duty at time of injury is not ultimate test for whether injury was covered by compensation bargain and thus subject to exclusive remedy rule, but rather ultimate test is whether injury arose out of and in course of employment, and "reasonable expectancy" requirement of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)* is simply one subset of ultimate issue of whether injury arose out of and in course of employment. *Mason v. Lake Dolores Group, L.L.C. (2004) 117 Cal. App. 4th 822, 832-838, 11 Cal. Rptr. 3d 914*

Employee who suffered fatal heart attack at home after telephoning her employer day before she was to return to work following seven-month periodof disability, was not acting in course of her employment since she was off-duty, off-premises, and not performing services incidental to her employment when she suffered heart attack; phone call made by employee just before heart attack to inform her employer that she would be working part-time schedule, did not bring employee within course of employment. *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 647, 651, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

Evidence supported conclusion that probationary sergeant's severe depression caused by his being unable to perform his job duties resulted in suicide and that suicide was compensable since it was the proximate result of injury arising out of and in the course of employment. *Chu v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1176, 1185, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 221*

Test for whether an injury arises out of and in the course of employment under workers' compensation law is broader than test for scope of employment under respondeat superior doctrine. *Bailey v. Filco, Inc. dba Filco Discount Centers (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1552, 1562, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 333*

Lab. Code § 3212.1 as requiring firefighter to establish reasonable causal link between industrial exposure to carcinogens and stomach cancer; although not required to prove proximate cause under statute, firefighter as required to show logical connection between injury and exposure. *Riverview Fire Protection Dist. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1125, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601*

Emotional distress injuries caused by termination of employment as arising out of and in the course of employment, and therefore compensable under workers' compensation law. *Jenkins v. Family Health Program (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 440, 450, 262 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 495-496, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677*

Employee misconduct, whether negligent, willful, or even criminal, as not necessarily precluding recovery of workers' compensation benefits; in absence of applicable statutory defense, such misconduct as barring recovery only when it constitutes deviation from scope of employment. *Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 253, 253 n.4, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26* (also noting that compensation is precluded by *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(8)* when injury is caused by commission of felonious act by injured employee for which he or she has been convicted)

WCAB as having erred in denying bus driver's claim for benefits for emotional injury arising out of accident that occurred while driver was on assigned run on ground that driver's reckless driving, for which he was convicted, took him outside course of his employment. *Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 251, 254, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26*

Generally, employee injured outside workplace and ordinary working hours as not entitled to workers' compensation benefits. *Luna v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 77, 80, 244 Cal. Rptr. 596*

For purposes of workers' compensation law, "in course of employment" as generally referring to time and place of injury and meaning that injured must be engaged in work he or she has been hired to perform, and "arise out of employment" as referring to causal connection between injury and employment. *West American Ins. Co. v. California Mutual Ins. Co. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 314, 321, 240 Cal. Rptr. 540* (distinguishing terms as used in workers' compensation law from terms as used under doctrine of respondeat superior and in private liability insurance law)

To be compensable under *Lab. Code § 3600*, injury as required not only to be sustained in course of employment and during performance of service, but also to be one arising out of and proximately caused by employment; requirement that injury arise out of and be proximately caused by employment as referring to causal connection between employment and injury. *Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 514, 518, 230 Cal. Rptr. 649*

If there is no real dispute as to facts, question of whether injury was suffered in course of employment as one of law. *Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 514, 519, 230 Cal. Rptr. 649*

Statutory requirements that injury occur in course of employment and arise out ofemployment (*Lab. Code §§ 3370, 3600*) as conjunctive, and both as required to be satisfied for injury to be compensable. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1268, 230 Cal. Rptr. 425*

Whether assault on employee by third person arises out of and in course of employment as dependent on whether assault was connected with employment or without any relation to it. *Rogers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 1195, 1200, 218 Cal. Rptr. 662* ; *Western Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 155 Cal. App. 3d 366, 369, 202 Cal. Rptr. 74* ; *California State Polytechnic University v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 514, 518, 179 Cal. Rptr. 605* ; *Murphy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 996, 998-1002, 150 Cal. Rptr. 561*

"Arising out of and in course of employment" test used in workers' compensation law as less restrictive than "scope of employment" test used in respondeat superior doctrine. *Wank v. Richman & Garrett (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 1103, 1110-1111, 211 Cal. Rptr. 919*

[7] Asbestos

Discussion of asbestos and its effects. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 335-336 n.2, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Mesothelioma and asbestosis as separate and distinct diseases resulting in separate and distinct disabilities; survivors of deceased employee entitled to a later date of injury for mesothelioma for purposes of calculating rate of death benefits. *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1990) 219 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1271-1273, 268 Cal. Rptr. 699*

[8] Athletes

Under *Lab. Code § 3352*, term "employee," as used in workers' compensation law, as excluding (1) any person, other than regular employee, participating in sports or athletics who receives no compensation for such participation other than use of athletic equipment, uniforms, transportation, travel, meals, lodgings, or other expenses incidental thereto (*Lab. Code § 3352(g)*, added in 1965); and (2) any student participating as an athlete in amateur sporting events sponsored by any public agency, public or private nonprofit college, university, or school, who receives no remuneration for such participation other than use of athletic equipment, uniforms, transportation, travel, meals, lodgings, scholarships, grants-in-aid, or other expenses incidental thereto (*Lab. Code § 3352(k)*, added in 1981); 1981 legislation as retroactive; hence, student of California State University injured while playing varsity college football in 1978 as not an employee within meaning of workers' compensation law, and as not entitled to workers' compensation. *Graczyk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 997, 1002-1009, 229 Cal. Rptr. 494*

[9] Athletic, Social, or Recreational Activities

Evidence did not support finding that police officer subjectively believed that his employer expected him to engage in occasional pickup game of basketball, and, even if there were evidence of officer's subjective belief, that belief would not have been objectively reasonable. *City of Stockton v. W.C.A.B. (Jenneiahn) (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1513, 1525-1526, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 474*

Injury suffered by applicant while participating in basketball game after work was not compensable under *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, since there was insufficient evidence to indicate that applicant reasonably believed that he was expected to participate in game, or that participation was expressly or impliedly required by his employment. *Tensfeldt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 116, 126-127, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 691*

Highway patrol officer's belief that practicing the long jump while at home was a reasonable expectancy of her employment, was reasonable as a matter of law, since long jump was a required element of annual physical fitness test administered by employer. *Kidwell v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1139, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*

"Reasonable expectancy of employment" test under *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, providing that employee is not entitled to workers' compensation for injury sustained while voluntarily participating in off-duty recreational or athletic activities unless activities are reasonable expectancy of, or are expressly or impliedly required by, employment, as legal question consisting of two elements: (1) whether employee subjectively believes his or her participation in activity is expected by employer and (2) whether that belief is objectively reasonable. *Taylor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 211, 215, 244 Cal. Rptr. 643* ; *Wilson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 902, 905-906, 239 Cal. Rptr. 719* ; *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 816, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641* (plaintiff's participation in drinking alcoholic beverages at job site held a reasonable expectancy of employment, and under facts of case, that belief that worker's participation in drinking was expected by employer was objectively reasonable); *Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 922, 930, 232 Cal. Rptr. 257*

When employer expects employees to participate in recreational or athletic activities to maintain certain standards of physical fitness necessary for performance of their work, employer as able to limit its liability for workers' compensation to injuries sustained in designated and preapproved athletic activities. *Taylor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 211, 215-216, 244 Cal. Rptr. 643* (distinguishing *Wilson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 902, 239 Cal. Rptr. 719*)

Employee injured while voluntarily participating in basketball game on employer's premises during uncompensated lunch break when there was no substantial evidence that employee reasonably believed he was expected to participate, that participation was expressly or impliedly required by employment, or that employer required, encouraged, or

sponsored activity, although employer condoned it, as not entitled to workers' compensation. *Todd v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 757, 759-760, 243 Cal. Rptr. 925*

Failure of employer to post required notice regarding provisions of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*, relating to voluntary off-duty recreational, social, or athletic activity, as not resulting in liability that would not otherwise exist. *Todd v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 757, 761, 243 Cal. Rptr. 925*

Injury to policeman incurred off-duty while running to keep himself in physical condition to pass tests required by city to remain member of police department's special emergency reaction team as arising out of and in course of employment and hence compensable under workers' compensation law. *Wilson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 902, 904, 239 Cal. Rptr. 719*

Former *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(8)* [*now see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*], excluding liability of employer for workers' compensation when injury arises out of voluntary participation in off-duty recreational, social, or athletic activity not constituting part of the employee's work-related duties, except when these activities are a reasonable expectancy of, or are expressly or impliedly required by, the employment, as inapplicable to detective employed by county sheriff's office who was injured while engaged in softball game between sheriffs' departments of neighboring counties when, at time of injury, detective was on standby duty and engaged in activity at place to which his employer had consented. *Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 514, 519-521, 230 Cal. Rptr. 649*

To qualify for compensation for injury sustained in off-duty activities, employee as required not only to satisfy burden of proving subjective belief that participation in off-duty activities was expected by employer [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)(9)*] but also to show subjective belief was reasonable. *Meyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1036, 1042-1044, 204 Cal. Rptr. 74*

[10] Attorney's Fees

Written attorney's fee agreement between employee and his attorney was not binding to extent that it purported to "draft around" *Lab. Code § 4906* by depriving Appeals Board of its statutory authority to fix attorney fees, making it in conflict with state law and unenforceable. *Vierra v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 1142, 1147-1150, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 423*

Lab. Code § 5710(b)(4), allowing deposition attorney's fees only to attorney's licensed in California, is constitutional since it is rationally related to the state's goal of eliminating fraudulent workers' compensation claims. *Longval v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Amaral) (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1056, 1066-1068*

WCAB erred by applying rule in *Goler v. W & J Sloane Co.* in awarding attorney's fee's to applicant's attorney who provided services that significantly increased the benefits received by applicant; WCAB should have also considered factors listed in *WCAB Rule 10775* (*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10775*) in awarding attorney's fees. *Wheeler & Beaton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 389, 396-397, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*

Workers' compensation judge and WCAB as properly denying attorney's fee awarded pursuant to stipulation that fee be paid from "far end of the award," when no accrued but unpaid disability indemnity payments were due to employee at time of his death. *Price v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 959, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 831*

WCAB, in awarding attorney's fees, as required to adequately consider and discuss the criteria listed in *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10775* and in its own guidelines on attorney's fees. *Lawrence Drasin & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1573, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

WCAB as required to base attorney's fee on the amount of all benefits obtained for the applicant through the attorney's efforts. *Lawrence Drasin & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1572-1573, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

Statement that an award of attorney's fees is reasonable under the circumstances given the time, effort, and skill expended by the applicant's attorney on the applicant's behalf and the result ultimately achieved as not constituting either a statement of the evidence relied on by the WCAB nor a specification of the reasons for the WCAB's decision. *Lawrence Drasin & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1572, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

Attorneys as entitled to a careful appraisal of the value of the services rendered, and fees should not be fixed by the WCAB solely to save applicants from expense or be so low that competent attorneys will be discouraged from accepting employment in workers' compensation matters. *Lawrence Drasin & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1572, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

Request for commutation of attorney's fees in a workers' compensation case as required to be first addressed to the WCAB and not to the appellate court. *Lawrence Drasin & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1564, 1569 n.2, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 215*

[11] Average Earnings

Post injury earnings as significant to computation of average earnings, insofar as they illuminate earning capacity at earlier date. *Goytia v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 660, 662, 100 Cal. Rptr. 136, 493 P.2d 864*

Average weekly earnings calculated by applying *Lab. Code § 4453(c)(4)* when employee's regular employment as attorney made him maximum wage earner for purposes of calculating his temporary and permanent disability indemnity benefits but who was injured AOE/COE while on jury duty, which employment paid nominal sum only, when court of appeal held that fact of having been injured while on jury duty did not justify paying employee benefits computed at less than maximum rate of pay. *County of San Joaquin v. W.C.A.B. (Davis) (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 1459, 1464-1468, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 152*

"Average weekly earning capacity" under *Lab. Code § 4453(c)(4)*, providing for disability indemnity based on employee's average weekly earning capacity, as not limited to actual earnings; although due consideration as required to be given to his or her actual earnings from all sources and employments, other relevant factors required to be considered as being applicant's history of earnings before injury, postinjury earnings, ability to work, age, health, skill, education, and opportunities to work. *Elliot v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Board (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1497, 1502-1503, 242 Cal. Rptr. 601*

Average weekly earnings under *Lab. Code § 4453(a), (d)*, as actual earnings of full-time employee at time of injury when amount fairly reflects earning capacity; however, if there is specific demonstrable evidence that injured employee would, but for injury, have received increased earnings, average earnings as computed on basis of earning capacity. *Toccalino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 543, 560, 180 Cal. Rptr. 427*

Average earnings as prediction of what employee's earnings would have been had he or she not been injured. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1976) 59 Cal. App. 3d 647, 655, 130 Cal. Rptr. 831*

[12] Awards

Award of compensation as including right to interest, to have judgment on award entered in superior court, to obtain judgment lien, and to enforce judgment by execution. *Myers v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d*

621, 626, 83 Cal. Rptr. 427

[13] Bunkhouse Rule

Exclusive remedy rule of *Lab. Code § 3602(a)* barred plaintiffs' civil action against defendant for negligence and failure to make house habitable for human occupation, when court found that plaintiffs husband and wife lived in ranch house owned by defendant as "employment benefit" of husband's job as park ranger employed by defendant and that plaintiff husband was injured when, attempting to get up from bathroom floor of house, where he had been observing leaking pipes while "on all fours," he slipped and fell. *Vaught v. State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1538, 1544-1549, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 605*

Bunkhouse rule was inapplicable to an injured worker who worked as a cook at a ski resort and resided in apartments owned by her employer; since the worker was injured while skiing on her day off, she was expressly precluded from recovering workers' compensation benefits under *Lab. Code § 3352(f)*. *Northstar at Tahoe v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1481, 1485, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 475*

Bunkhouse rule as specific application of statutory requirements that injury arise out of and in course of assigned employment [*Lab. Code § 3600*] and hence inapplicable to state prisoner [*see Penal Code § 2601(i)*; *Lab. Code § 3370*] injured while off-duty at forestry conservation camp where he lived and worked while serving his sentence, because his living on premises was result of his custodial status as a prisoner. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 185 Cal. App. 3d 1265, 1268-1269, 230 Cal. Rptr. 425*

[14] Burden of Proof

Employee as having burden of proving that injury was sustained in course of employment. *Lundberg v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 436, 439, 71 Cal. Rptr. 684, 445 P.2d 300*

Once presumption of employment comes into play, burden as shifting to employer to establish that injured person was independent contractor or otherwise excluded from workers' compensation coverage; in addition to relying on specific exclusion to rebut presumption of employee status, alleged employer as permitted to seek to prove that essential contract of hire required under definition of employee in *Lab. Code § 3351* is absent. *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 642-643, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811*

Burden of proving that claimant for workers' compensation was an independent contractor rather than an employee as on alleged employer under *Lab. Code § 5705*. *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 613, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754*

[15] Civil Action

When doubt exists whether death or injury was sustained in course of employment, claimant's filing of civil action to protect against running of statute of limitations together with filing of application for workers' compensation as proper. *Dixon v. Ford Motor Co. (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 499, 502, 125 Cal. Rptr. 872*

[16] Claim Procedure

Employee's knowledge that claim must be filed will not cease tolling of statute of limitations if employer fails to notify employee of applicable time limits, absent evidence that employee otherwise knew of applicable time limits.

Galloway v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 880, 888, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 374

[17] Clerical Errors

Regardless of lapse of time or finality of judgment, court as able, on its own motion, to correct clerical error in judgment even if error was made by court and consisted of failure to provide for reservation of jurisdiction; similarly, Rehabilitation Bureau as able to correct clerical error in its order (order erroneously stated that worker's case was closed on grounds worker declined rehabilitation instead of stating that rehabilitation was suspended while worker sought medical treatment). *Poole v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 694, 697, 259 Cal. Rptr. 564*

Appeals board or workers' compensation judge as able to correct clerical error at any time and without necessity for further hearings, notwithstanding lapse of statutory period for filing petition for reconsideration. *Toccalino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 543, 558, 180 Cal. Rptr. 427*

[18] Compensation

Burial expenses as compensation under *Lab. Code §§ 3207, 4701* (death benefits), and *Lab. Code § 4707* (benefits payable on death of member of Public Employees' Retirement System) as excepting such expenses from any prohibition against payment of workers' compensation benefits when amount of such benefits is less than total death allowance paid to widow or minor children of deceased worker under Public Employees' Retirement Law. *Jones v. Kaiser Industries Corp. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 552, 557 n.7, 237 Cal. Rptr. 568, 737 P.2d 771*

Under worker's compensation law, injured employee as not, in ordinary case, entitled to greater compensation than wages would have been had worker not been injured. *Herrera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 254, 259, 78 Cal. Rptr. 497, 455 P.2d 425*

Portion of workers' compensation lump sum settlement proceeds received by injured worker/spouse during marriage is community property, if attributable to disability or pension payments owed during marriage or to medical expenses paid with community funds, and such settlement's proceeds are injured spouse's separate property, if intended to compensate for injured spouse's diminished earning capacity and/or medical expense after marriage has ended. *Raphael v. Bloomfield (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 617, 621-627, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 583*

Worker who was awarded partial permanent disability compensation for industrial back injury, entered vocational rehabilitation on-the-job training program, and sustained further back injury while engaged in program, as entitled to receive compensation for permanent disability resulting from cumulative injury not at rate in effect on date of original injury but at rate in effect at time of rehabilitation injury; any hardship to insurer in paying indemnity at higher rate as outweighed by employer's rehabilitation duties and public policy of securing maximum rehabilitation benefits to injured employee. *Trevino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1012, 1016, 255 Cal. Rptr. 162*

Person injured while on job as entitled to compensation under workers' compensation law, not because of any act or omission of employer, but because employment relationship exists. *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 642, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811*

[19] Compromise and Release Agreement

[a] In General

Compromise and release agreement that recited that employee had "sustained injury arising out of and in the course of

his employment to 1) Back 2) Psyche," and that further recited that the employee "releases and forever discharges said employer from all claims and causes of action, whether now known or ascertained, or which may hereafter arise or develop as a result of said injury," as not precluding employee from pursuing civil claim against employer for emotional distress resulting from discrimination based on employee's sexual orientation; form release executed by parties that made no specific reference to potentially independent civil rights or remedies as releasing only those claims that traditionally fall within scope of workers' compensation system. *Delaney v. Superior Fast Freight (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 590, 599, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 33*

Compromise and release executed in workers' compensation proceeding as not barring, as a matter of law, employee's subsequent civil action against employer, three related entities, and coemployee for discrimination under Fair Employment and Housing Act (*Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*), when release did not mention discrimination claims, even though parties' attorneys were aware of them. *Asare v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 856, 863, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 452*

Compromise and release agreement executed by surviving family members of agricultural worker shot and killed during strike as ambiguous regarding whether it released employer from liability for civil damages not compensable under workers' compensation law; absent express language, employer as not released as matter of law for civil damages. *Lopez v. Sikkema (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 31, 39, 280 Cal. Rptr. 7*

Compromise and release by settlement of workers' compensation claims as not eliminating worker's right to pursue other remedies for invasion of other interests in other forums, absent specific provision to that effect; workers' compensation compromise and release for emotional injuries arising from employer's action does not bar employee's claim for breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing in wrongfully terminating employee. *Ortiz v. Bank of America Nat. Trust and Sav. Ass'n (9th Cir. 1987) 824 F.2d 692, 694, 695-696*

WCAB as restricted to approving or disapproving compromise and release agreement as a whole. *Burbank Studios v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 929, 936-937, 184 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Workers' compensation and tort releases distinguished. *Sumner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 965, 971, 191 Cal. Rptr. 811, 663 P.2d 534* ; *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 973, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002* ; *City of Anaheim v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 200, 206, 180 Cal. Rptr. 132*

[b] Constitutionality

Barring death benefits pursuant to compromise and release [*Lab. Code § 5000(b)*] as not depriving dependents of constitutional right, because contingent rights to such benefits derive exclusively from statute. *Sumner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 965, 969-970, 191 Cal. Rptr. 811, 663 P.2d 534*

Although *Lab. Code § 5000(b)*, providing that dependents have no interest in injured employee's claim, which employee may not release by compromise, does not deny due process or equal protection of laws, dismissal of application for death benefits before responsive pleadings have been filed as precipitous when affirmative defense of release has not yet been raised and might be avoided. *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 974-975, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002*

Lab. Code § 5000(b), conferring on injured employee power to compromise dependents' claims to death benefits, as not denying dependent due process of law or equal protection of laws. *Sumner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 965, 969-970, 191 Cal. Rptr. 811, 663 P.2d 534* ; *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 964, 970-972, 88 Cal. Rptr. 202, 471 P.2d 1002*

[c] Effect

Standard language of preprinted WCAB Form 15, used in settling workers' compensation claims, releases only those claims within scope of workers' compensation system and does not apply to claims asserted in separate civil actions, and extrinsic evidence is not admissible to show that preprinted form applies also to claims outside workers' compensation system. *Claxton v. Waters (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 367, 376-378, 18 Cal. Rptr. 3d 246, 96 P.3d 496*

Effect of compromise and release agreement on civil claims, when agreement contains attachment arguably relevant to civil claims, depends on whether employee has knowledge of potential claim against employer at time of executing general release in workers' compensation proceeding, but has not yet initiated litigation of that claim, in which case employee has burden of expressly excepting claim from release, and, absent this exception and absent contrary extrinsic evidence, court will enforce agreement's general language, releasing all claims, including civil claims. *Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority (2002) 28 Cal. 4th 299, 310, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 391, 48 P.3d 423*

Settlement of employee's workers' compensation claim via document that included language agreeing "to settle any and all claims" did not so clearly operate to settle that same employee's FEHA civil action arising from same alleged work-related incidents as to support dismissal of employee's civil action via summary judgment, pursuant to *Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority*. *Mitchell v. Union Central Life Ins. Co. (2004) 118 Cal. App. 4th 1331, 1341-1342, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 732*

Court of appeal followed *Jefferson v. California Department of Youth Authority* in concluding that employee's release of her workers' compensation claim against her employer, which released "all claims and causes of action" against employer, included release of employee's civil action under FEHA, when FEHA action had been filed prior to execution of release but employer had not yet been notified of that action. *Kohler v. Interstate Brands Corp. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1099-1102, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 366*

Appeals Board had insufficient medical evidence to determine whether res judicata effect of employee's compromise and release agreement for two pulmonary injuries due to asthma barred applicant's subsequent claim of injury due to asbestos exposure. *General Dynamics Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 71 Cal. App. 4th 624, 631, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 907*

Order approving compromise and release agreement as final judgment entitled to full res judicata effect when WCAB's jurisdiction to rescind, alter, or amend terminates on expiration of five years after date of injury. *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 1160, 1169-1170, 214 Cal. Rptr. 765*

Compromise and release agreement as determinative of rights of parties in dispute. *Burbank Studios v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 929, 935, 184 Cal. Rptr. 879*

Payment of compromise and release approved by WCAB as terminating liability of employer and insurance carrier on account of injury involved, including any liability for increased disability, unless order approving agreement is vacated for legal cause. *City of Anaheim v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 200, 206, 180 Cal. Rptr. 132*

Obvious purpose of *Lab. Code §§ 3859, 3860* as being to protect subrogation rights to which employer is legally entitled. *Garrett v. Shenson Meat Co. (1970) 5 Cal. App. 3d 69, 75-76, 85 Cal. Rptr. 65*

Compromise and release agreement between insurance carrier and employee covering ordinary compensation benefits as not defeating employee's claim for additional benefits predicated on serious and willful misconduct of employer. *Ray v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 393, 397, 303 P.2d 793*

Compromise and release as releasing employer and its insurance carrier from liability but as having no effect on employee's right of action for malpractice for new and aggravated injury inflicted by physician in negligently treating employee's industrial injury. *Smith v. Coleman (1941) 46 Cal. App. 2d 507, 513, 116 P.2d 133*

[d] Setting Aside Agreement

Compromise and release agreement once approved as subject to being set aside only for good cause on petition to reopen demonstrating agreement was result of fraud, mistake, duress, or undue influence. *Draper v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 502, 507, 195 Cal. Rptr. 248*

Incompetency of employee at time of execution of compromise and release as ground for setting aside agreement. *Sun Indem. Co. v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1948) 85 Cal. App. 2d 171, 173, 176-177, 181, 192 P.2d 765*

[e] Subsequent Injury

Compromise and release agreement with regard to injury sustained at work as not barring claim for benefits for subsequent injury sustained in rehabilitation program in which worker participated because of first injury. *Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 567, 575-576, 214 Cal. Rptr. 303*

[f] Vocational Rehabilitation Benefits

Despite *Lab. Code § 5100.6* (prohibiting settlement of rehabilitation benefits), employer's mandatory duty to provide rehabilitation benefits [*Lab. Code § 139.5(c)*] as subject to compromise and release when serious and good faith issue exists as to validity of claim that, if resolved against applicant, would result in denial of all benefits. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 649, 652, 196 Cal. Rptr. 169*

[20] Contempt Proceedings

[a] In General

Legislature as having vested all judicial powers under Workers' Compensation Act in WCAB, including power to issue all necessary process in proceedings for contempt. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414* (citing *Lab. Code §§ 111, 134*)

[b] Acts Constituting Contempt

Inexcusable failure to comply with rule of practice and procedure adopted by WCAB pursuant to statutory authorization pertaining to orderly conduct of proceedings before WCAB, such as *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606*, relating to medical reports, as constituting unlawful interference with WCAB's proceedings within meaning of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1209* and hence as constituting contempt. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 169, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

[c] Indirect Contempt

Affidavit for indirect contempt as not required to state all facts on which WCAB relied in deciding to issue order to show cause regarding contempt, but as required only to make prima facie showing of elements of contempt; elements of

contempt as being that court made lawful order, person cited for contempt had knowledge or notice of order, and person was able to comply, yet willfully disobeyed order; support for order to show cause re contempt as permitted to be provided by combination of documents, and supporting documents as required only to make prima facie showing of contemptuous conduct. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 169-170, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

Under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1211.5*, defect or imperfection in form that does not prejudice substantial right of accused on merits as not affecting trial, order, judgment, or other proceeding; order or judgment of conviction as not to be set aside for pleading error in affidavit or statement of facts, unless, after examining entire case, including evidence, court finds that error complained of has resulted in miscarriage of justice. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 169-170, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

[d] Nature of Proceeding

Although contempt proceedings are quasi-criminal in nature, purpose of such proceedings as being to protect dignity, authority, or process of court or tribunal and to provide court or tribunal with means of controlling its proceedings; thus, WCAB as having inherent power to exercise reasonable control over all proceedings before it to ensure orderly administration of justice, to maintain its dignity and authority, and to punish acts that embarrass or obstruct it in discharge of its duties. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 165, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

[e] Procedure

In proceedings for contempt, WCAB as required to follow applicable provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1209 et seq.*, and, when alleged contempt is not committed in WCAB's presence, contempt proceedings as being in nature of indirect contempt; in such case, WCAB as required to proceed by way of order to show cause supported by affidavit [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1212*], and alleged contemner as entitled to appear before and be heard by WCAB. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 164*

[f] Statutes of Limitations

Neither *Penal Code § 802* (imposing one-year limitation on prosecution of offense not punishable by death or imprisonment in state prison) nor *Code Civ. Proc. § 340* (imposing one-year limitation on action on statute for forfeiture or penalty to people of this state) as applying to contempt proceeding by WCAB against medical doctor for willful violation of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10606* (requiring physician who submits medical report in workers' compensation case to disclose name of any person other than reporting physician who participated in taking medical history); whether WCAB loses jurisdiction of proceeding by passage of time as question of fact dependent on whether delay in prosecution was unreasonable and to contemner's prejudice, and contemner as having burden of demonstrating that delay was unreasonable and prejudiced his or her defense. *Crawford v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 156, 165-167, 259 Cal. Rptr. 414*

[21] Contract of Hire

Contract for hire was formed in California under *Lab. Code §§ 3600.5* and *5305* when professional baseball player signed contract in California accepting offer from out of state team, and approval of baseball Commissioner was a condition subsequent to employment. *Bowen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 15, 26-27, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95*

Consideration other than wages as supporting contract of hire within meaning of *Lab. Code § 3351* (defining "employee"). *Morales v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 283, 289, 230 Cal. Rptr. 575*

[21A] Costs

Appeals Board has discretion to award costs, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5811*, for vocational rehabilitation expert's report, regardless of whether report is admissible. *Barr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 173, 176, 179, 181, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 732*

[22] Credit Against Compensation

Discussion of extent to which city fireman's disability pension, partially funded by employer, can be offset against workers' compensation. *Symington v. City of Albany (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 23, 26, 28-33, 95 Cal. Rptr. 206, 485 P.2d 270*

Employer's challenge to employee's claim of ongoing temporary disability must be made within 20 days of receipt of physician's report of that disability, so that in present case employer's claim of credit against permanent disability payments was allowable only for temporary disability payments made after June 2006, which was last date for which employee's treating physician reported that he was temporarily disabled, and any claim of credit for temporary disability payments made prior to that date was foreclosed by *Lab. Code § 4062(a)*. *J.C. Penney Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 818, 829, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 469*

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3861*, employer was entitled to credit against future workers' compensation benefits to be paid to employee in amount of net settlement of employee's action against third-party tortfeasor, paid to employee by CIGA, when CIGA was obligated under *Ins. Code §§ 1063.1(c)(1)* and *1063.2(a)* to pay settlement, regardless of whether employer was entitled to credit, and, since CIGA's assets were unaffected by grant or denial of credit to employer, if credit were denied, employee would be in better position than if third party tortfeasor's insurer had remained solvent. *Baur v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1264-1267, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 493*

Employer as entitled to credit pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4909* against employee's permanent disability indemnity when employee received benefits under employer's sickness and accident disability plan; employer's committee as determining that plan benefits were of same character and function as workers' compensation benefits and obligating plan to provide all benefits contemplated by workers'compensation law. *Appleby v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 184, 192-193, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 375*

If industrially injured public safety worker entitled to leave at full salary for up to one year in lieu of temporary disability payments under *Lab. Code § 4850* receives earnings from self-employment during leave, employer as entitled to credit such earnings against its obligation to pay full salary. *Kosowski v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 632, 634, 216 Cal. Rptr. 280*

[23] Death Benefits

Because employer had paid deceased employee's mother/heir death benefits pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4702(a)(6)(B)*, before ceasing such payments following decision in *Six Flags, Inc. v. W.C.A.B.* that declared that statute unconstitutional, Death Without Dependents Unit was not entitled to be paid any death benefit. *City of Los Angeles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 134, 146151, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 513*

Lab. Code § 4702(a)(6)(B), which provides that, when worker without dependents suffers fatal industrial injury,

employer must pay $250,000 to deceased worker's estate as workers' compensation death benefit, is unconstitutional because constitutional enabling provision, *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, does not identify estates as class of beneficiaries entitled to workers' compensation death benefits. *Six Flags, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 145 Cal. App. 4th 91, 93-94, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 377*

Employer as required to pay death benefits to Department of Industrial Relations under *Lab. Code § 4706.5* only when deceased employee left no dependents, total or partial. *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 715, 727, 182 Cal. Rptr. 778, 644 P.2d 1257* (disapproving *Department of Industrail Relations v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 94 Cal. App. 3d 72, 79, 156 Cal. Rptr. 183*); *Travelers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 244, 246, 187 Cal. Rptr. 838*)

Lab. Code § 4707 as precluding award under workers' compensation law of death benefit to decedent's minor child when decedent's widow received special death benefit under *Gov. Code § 21363* and former *Gov. Code § 21364* (*now Gov. Code § 21541*) (Public Employees' Retirement Law). *Department of Corrections v. Workers Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 197, 204, 152 Cal. Rptr. 345, 589 P.2d 853*

Deceased employee's grandchild qualifying as "totally dependent minor child" as entitled to special death benefit under *Lab. Code § 4703.5*; grandchild as having resided with grandparents since birth and employee's widow as having continued to support grandchild after employee's death. *State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1645, 1650-1651, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 67*

Dependent's right to statutory death benefits under workers' compensation law as not derived from rights of deceased employee, but as independentand severable from employee's claim for disability compensation. *Berkebile v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 940, 944, 193 Cal. Rptr. 12*

[24] Declaration of Readiness

WCAB as having erred in reversing decision of WCJ setting aside Rehabilitation Bureau's decision terminating workers' compensation applicant's rehabilitation benefits without hearing and in reinstating bureau's decision based on procedural technicality that worker's declaration of readiness did not meet formal requirements for filing appeal from bureau decision; workers' compensation pleadings and proceedings as informal and not to be utilized to preclude WCAB jurisdiction in view of *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, and *Lab. Code § 3202*, mandating that workers' compensation laws be liberally construed in favor of affording substantial justice to injured workers. *Rivera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1452, 1456, 236 Cal. Rptr. 28*

[25] Dependents

[a] In General

Dependent's right to statutory death benefits as not derived from rights of deceased employee, but as independent and severable from employee's claim for disability compensation; amount of death benefits as fixed by statute and as not varying with employee's earnings; size of benefits as depending on relationship and extent of dependency. *Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1051, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343*

True test of dependency in fact as not whether dependent was compelled to rely on deceased employee's contributions for bare necessities of life, but whether dependent relied on contributions for support according to his or her accustomed mode of living; rule of liberal construction as not to be used to relieve party from meeting evidentiary burden of proving dependency by preponderance of the evidence. *Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1051-1052, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343*

Mere promise of future support as not, as a rule, a basis for a dependency finding, except when circumstances indicate a bona fide assumption of responsibility for support without opportunity to make contributions prior to the injury. *Wings West Airlines v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1047, 1052, 232 Cal. Rptr. 343*

WCAB as erring in failing to make finding as to dependency status of live-in associate and alleged dependent of deputy district attorney who had been found to be 100 percent disabled and died following short hospitalization caused by suicide attempt because person who is found not to be dependent is not entitled to any award. *Donovan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 323, 328, 187 Cal. Rptr. 869*

Burden of proof as to dependency of deceased workers' parents as on state when parents and state maintain conflicting positions on whether parents were dependent, and therefore beneficiaries, because state recovers benefits if there are no dependents. *State of California v. Workers' Co. Appeals Bd. (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 673, 678, 161 Cal. Rptr. 821*

[b] Partial Dependents

Computing amount of award to partial dependent pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4702* when both spouses were employed prior to death of one spouse. *Atlantic Richfield Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 715, 719-723, 182 Cal. Rptr. 778, 644 P.2d 1257*

For parents to be considered "partial dependents" of adult children living at home, deceased adult child had to have been providing net financial benefit to household, so that when unrebutted testimony indicated monthly cost of adult child's food exceeded child's contribution to household, child's monthly payment, while making him less dependent on parents, did not make them dependent on him, with consequence that parents were not eligible to receive death benefits. *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 560, 568-570, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 420*

In computing death benefits to partially dependent surviving spouse under *Lab. Code § 4702*, expenses related to the community's standard of living as relevant, whereas expenses personal to decedent as not relevant; decedent's food, clothing, and transportation costs related to employment as spent for benefit of community and properly apportioned to community and support of surviving spouse rather than to personal use. *Lynch v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 594, 598-599, 210 Cal. Rptr. 589*

Partial dependents as receiving death benefits only when decedent's only dependents are partial dependents; total dependents as receiving entire death benefit to exclusion of partial dependents, who receive nothing. *Travelers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 244, 247, 187 Cal. Rptr. 838*

[c] Putative Spouse

Putative spouse as entitled to widow's benefits under *Lab. Code §§ 4702* and *3503*. *Neureither v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 429, 433-435, 93 Cal. Rptr. 162* ; *Brennfleck v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 666, 672, 84 Cal. Rptr. 50* ; *Brennfleck v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 738, 743, 71 Cal. Rptr. 525*

[26] Disability Defined

Disability, under workers' compensation law, as connoting an inability to work. *Herrera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 254, 257, 78 Cal. Rptr. 497, 455 P.2d 425*

Temporary total disability and temporary partial disability distinguished, and payment for each. *Herrera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 71 Cal. 2d 254, 257, 78 Cal. Rptr. 497, 455 P.2d 425* ; *Moore v. American United Life Ins. Co. (1984) 150 Cal. App. 3d 610, 629, 197 Cal. Rptr. 878*

Disability as meaning an impairment of bodily functions that results in impairment of earning capacity. *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 336, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219*

Disability as having two elements: (1) actual incapacity to perform tasks usually encountered in one's employment and wage loss resulting therefrom and (2) physical impairment of body. *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 336 n.14, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219* (citing *Perry v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1977) 66 Cal. App. 3d 887, 890, 136 Cal. Rptr. 309*)

Permanent disability in workers' compensation as disability that causes impairment of earning capacity, impairment of normal use of member, or competitive handicap in open labor market. *Winn v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 532, 539, 197 Cal. Rptr. 111*

[27] Discovery

Parties' duty to disclose all available evidence at MSC supersedes WCAB's duty to develop record, so that employee's attorney's tactical decision at MSC not to disclose certain medical records deprived WCAB of power to order WCJ to admit those records. *Telles Transport, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Zuniga) (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 1159, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 540*

WCJ was permitted to develop record by admitting evidence obtained after trial and, thus, not disclosed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5502(d)(3)*, when due process required that such evidence be admitted in the interest of substantial justice to rebut unanticipated trial testimony. *Kuykendall v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 396, 399, 406, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 130*

WCAB abused its discretion by admitting doctor's report and allowing witness to testify at trial, when neither were disclosed at MSC and employee provided no explanation for failing to disclose evidence; absence of prejudice to opposing party does not affect admissibility of undisclosed evidence under *Lab. Code § 5502(d)(3)*; parties' duty to disclose evidence under *Lab. Code § 5502(d)(3)* can not be circumvented by WCAB's duty to develop record under *Lab. Code §§ 5701* or *5906*. *San Bernardino Community Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 928, 932-935, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 516*

WCJs have authority under *Lab. Code § 5310* to hear discovery disputes and make orders regarding such disputes. *Allison v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 654, 664, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 915*

Employee did not entirely waive doctor/patient privilege by filing workers' compensation claim for cumulative injury to her wrists from February 1996 through June 1997; WCJ's discovery order allowing employee to be questioned regarding her hospitalization history prior to 1965 violated doctor/patient privilege and was overbroad. *Allison v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 654, 661, 84 Cal. Rptr. 2d 915*

WCJ improperly violated mandatory requirement under *Lab. Code § 5502(d)(3)* that discovery be closed at MSC by allowing record to remain open so employee could obtain supplemental QME report; supplemental report obtained after MSC was inadmissible and Board's temporary disability award based on report was annulled. *County of Sacramento v. Worker's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 68 Cal. App. 4th 1429, 1433-1434, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 266*

[28] Discrimination Against Injured Workers, Claimants, Participants

Employee made no prima facie showing of violation of *Lab. Code § 132a* when his employer refused to pay him temporary disability indemnity for time spent away from work attending medical treatment appointments, when employee was permanent and stationary after his industrial injury, had returned to work, and received medical treatment award, and when employee failed to show right to prevent his employer from requiring him to use sick leave and/or vacation leave while attending these medical appointments. *Department of Rehabilitation v. W.C.A.B. (Lauher) (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1281, 1297, 1301, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 665, 70 P.3d 1076*

WCAB may and must, when criteria of *Civ. Code § 3287* are met, add interest from the dates such wages and benefits would have become due had the employer not acted in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*; although *Lab. Code § 132a* does not itself expressly authorize addition of prejudgment interest to award of backpay, *Civ. Code § 3287* requires such interest on damages due on a particular date, including awards of back pay, when they are certain or capable of being made certain by calculation. *Currie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 1109, 104 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392, 17 P.3d 749*

Employee did not make prima facie showing of discrimination in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*, when employee sustained industrial injury and was taken off work by his treating physician, and reports and releases to return to work from treating physician and agreed medical evaluator were unclear and ambiguous regarding employee's ability to return to his usual and customary duties. *Gelson's Markets v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Fowler) (2009) 179 Cal. App. 4th 201, 209-210, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 548*

Employee's claim alleging wrongful termination in retaliation for filing workers' compensation claim failed because employer terminated employee's employment for legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason, i.e., management's loss of confidence in employee. *Arteaga v. Brink's, Inc. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 327, 356-357, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 654*

Employer's policy regarding "cash out" payments of excess accumulated vacation hours to sheriff's deputies who were not on *Lab. Code § 4850* leave as result of industrial injuries, as opposed to its policy regarding such payments to deputies who were on such leave, held to discriminate against latter group in violation of *Lab. Code §§ 4850* and *132a*. *Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers' Association v. County of Los Angeles (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 63, 67-72, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 572*

Employer discriminated against its employee, in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*, by requiring employee, who had returned to work following industrial injuries, to use earned vacation time rather than sick leave to attend medical appointments needed to care for those industrial injuries, while permitting employees with non-industrial injuries to use their sick leave for medical appointments. *Andersen v. W.C.A.B. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1369, 1376-1380, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 839*

Employer discriminated against employee in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a*, when evidence showed that employer believed employee was faking disability, that employer wanted to dismiss employee since employee returned to work on light duty, that employer's evidence of customer complaints against employee was not persuasive, and that employer terminated employee in retaliation for filing workers' compensation claim. *Crown Appliance v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2004) 115 Cal. App. 4th 620, 9 Cal. Rptr. 3d 415*

Lab. Code § 132a is not exclusive remedy for discrimination due to disability from work related injury. *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1156, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291* , and other cases that held *Lab. Code § 132a* was exclusive remedy for disability discrimination)

Injured workers discriminated against because of disability from work related injury may bring claims before Workers' Compensation Appeals Board under *Lab. Code § 132a* and actions to state court seeking remedies under Fair

Employment and Housing Act and common-law wrongful discharge theory. *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1158, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291*)

Employer's termination of employee's seniority rights and, ultimately, his employment because of employee's absence from his job as result of industrial injury as unlawful discrimination within meaning of *Lab. Code § 132a*, thus triggering application of increased award provisions of *Lab. Code § 4553*. *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 661-662, 666-668, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564*

Employer as not permitted to defend discriminatory employment practice proscribed by *Lab. Code § 132a* (discrimination against employee for filing or making known intention to file workers' compensation claim) on basis of provisions of collective bargaining agreement. *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 665 n.5, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564*

WCAB as properly concluding that licensee of residential care facility was employee's employer for purposes of *Lab. Code § 132a* liability when licensee failed to object to its status as employer despite being served with applications, notices, liens and orders and having previously stipulated tobeing the employer; management company that began operating facility after employee's termination as not liable for *Lab. Code § 132a* remedies because, although management company participated in WCAB proceedings, record did not disclose information regarding circumstances of management transfer or whether management company knew of employee's pending claim at time of transfer. *Superior Care Facilities v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1015, 1023, 1029, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 918*

Reinstatement of employee under *Lab. Code § 132a* as probationary rather than permanent as proper when no finding that employee performed or could perform job duties up to standards required by employer and no finding that, but for employee's injury, she would have successfully completed probationary period; Board's refusal to award lost wages and benefits as proper when no finding that employee sought or was ready, willing, and able to maintain employment. *Dyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1376, 1384-1386, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30*

Public employer's failure to award safety incentive bonus to worker due to time lost on account of work-related injury as not illegal discrimination in violation of *Lab. Code § 132a* (prohibiting discrimination against workers injured in course of their employment); *Gov. Code § 19994.20*, under which safety incentive program was adopted and which provides for implementation of accident prevention incentive award programs the purpose of which is to reduce number of on-the-job injuries to, and use of sick leave by, state employees, as dealing only with state employees and their collective bargaining agreements, and, being the more specific statute, as prevailing over *Lab. Code § 132a* in any conflict between them. *Stemler v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 577, 581-582, 251 Cal. Rptr. 364*

Lab. Code § 132a, prohibiting discrimination by employers against workers who are injured in course and scope of their employment, as serving remedial function by providing compensation to aggrieved worker for discrimination incurred as result of worker's work-related injury; employer as not permitted to discharge employee absent from job as result of work-related injury. *Potter v. Arizona So. Coach Lines, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 126, 131, 133, 248 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Construction of *Lab. Code § 132a* (policy opposing discrimination against workers injured in course and scope of their employment). *St. Cyr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 468, 471-473, 243 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Penalty petition for discrimination under *Lab. Code § 132a* (policy opposing discrimination against workers injured in course and scope of their employment) filed within one year from termination date, as opposed to date of notice of termination, as timely. *St. Cyr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 468, 473, 243 Cal. Rptr. 1*

"Discriminate" as meaning to act or to fail to act (when there is a duty to do so), with consequence that some adverse result ensues. *Leamon v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1409, 1417, 235 Cal. Rptr. 912*

Before employer's action against industrially injured employee may be deemed discriminatory under *Lab. Code § 132a*, employer as required to have beenaware of fact of industrial injury at time of its action. *Leamon v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 1409, 1414, 235 Cal. Rptr. 912*

Although *Lab. Code § 132a* prohibits discrimination against employee based on employee's industrial disability or receipt of workers' compensation award, WCAB's award to employee, consisting of additional service credits and increased compensation, on asserted basis that employer discriminated against employee in that it refused to grant additional pension service credits for years during which she did not work as result of injury, as preempted by federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) (*29 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1461*) and federal regulations promulgated pursuant thereto (*see 29 C.F.R. § 2530.200b-2(a)(2)*), which provide that employer may refuse pension service credits for year during which employee actually worked less than 1000 hours for variety of reasons, including employee's industrially caused disability. *Pacific Bell v. Workers' Comp. Appeals. Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1603, 1605-1606, 1614-1615, 231 Cal. Rptr. 484*

[29] Dismissals

Circumstances under which dismissal is permitted. *Roth v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 452, 458-460, 97 Cal. Rptr. 605*

[30] Employees

Extending workers' compensation coverage to persons not within general definition of "employee" on terms different from those generally provided, as not violating state constitutional provisions regarding classification when reasonable basis for distinctions may be found. *Mathews v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 719, 739, 100 Cal. Rptr. 301, 493 P.2d 1165*

College student, injured while enrolled in animal husbandry class and working for non-profit foundation on commercial cattle breeding project, was not employee, because student had paid college for class credit, did not receive wages (but shared in profits of project), project was created exclusively for educational purpose, and student was not rendering service for college. *Land v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 102 Cal. App. 4th 491, 496-497, 125 Cal. Rptr. 2d 432*

Juror was considered an "employee" of defendant County within the meaning of the Workers' Compensation Act, since the County exercised a degree of control over the juror's work environment and benefitted from the juror's services, thereby giving the County responsibility to insure against injuries the juror may have sustained while providing services to the County. *Waggener v. County of Los Angeles (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1078, 1083, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 141*

Doorman as employee of condominium homeowners' association but not of individual homeowners who had no ability to control or discharge him or otherwise exercise the control of an employer over an employee. *Holmes v. Roth (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 931, 936-937, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 315*

No special test, fact, or circumstance as existing that conclusively defines "employee" for all purposes; question of whether worker is an employee within meaning of workers' compensation law as one of mixed law and factto be proved like any other question; question as one of fact when facts are in dispute and as one of law only when but one inference can reasonably be drawn from facts. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 806, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Although person who renders service to another is presumed to be "employee" [*see Lab. Code § 3357*], presumption as overcome if essential contract of hire, express or implied, is not present. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 807, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Question of whether person is employee as one of fact, of mixed law and fact, or of law only; if facts are undisputed, question as one of law and court of appeal may independently review those facts to determine correct answer. *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 642, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811*

Whether worker is an employee within meaning of Workers' Compensation Law as mixed question of law and fact to be proved like any other question; whether worker is employee as question of fact when facts are in dispute and as question of law only when but one inference can reasonably be drawn from facts. *Gigax v. Ralston Purina Co. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 591, 599, 186 Cal. Rptr. 395*

When facts of employment are not disputed, whether worker is within covered employment relationship as question of law. *In-Home Supportive Services v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 720, 729, 199 Cal. Rptr. 697* ; *Johnson v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 41 Cal. App. 3d 318, 320, 115 Cal. Rptr. 871*

[31] Employment Contract

Traditional features of employment contract as being (1) consent of parties, (2) consideration for services rendered, and (3) control by employer over employee; although these common law contract requirements are not to be rigidly applied, consensual relationship between worker and alleged employer as nevertheless indispensable prerequisite to existence of employment contract under *Lab. Code § 3551*. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 807, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347* ; *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 643, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811* (noting that other cases have held that control by employer is most important factor in establishing employment relation for purposes of workers' compensation law)

[32] Employment Relationship

Superior Court correctly denied employers' association's requested declaratory relief to invalidate precedential decision by Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board that upheld Employment Development Department (EDD) assessment of unemployment insurance employer contributions and penalties against courier service, when EDD had found that drivers for courier service were employees, not independent contractors. *Messenger Courier Association of the Americas v. California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board (2009) 175 Cal. App. 4th 1074, 1089-1096, 96 Cal. Rptr. 3d 797*

Administrative record supported conclusion that newspaper carriers were employees for purposes of the workers' compensation law, not independent contractors, pursuant to analysis set forth in *S.G. Borello & Sons v. Department of Industrial Relations. Antelope Valley Press v. Steve Poizner as Insurance Commissioner (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 839, 842-843, 852-856, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 887*

Plaintiff, injured while repairing defendant's roof, was defendant's employee pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5*, which operated to allow plaintiff's lawsuit alleging defendant's negligence, despite fact that plaintiff, by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3352(h)*, was not employee of defendant for workers' compensation purposes, when court of appeal found that plaintiff was not licensed roofing contractor and, therefore, not independent contractor. *Mendoza v. Brodeur (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 72, 79-81, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 310*

Lab. Code §§ 3351(d) and *3352(h)* were only relevant statutes for defining "employee" when issue was whether injured

worker was residential employee of homeowners, because *Lab. Code § 3715(b)*, relied on by Appeals Board in present case, was inapplicable, since that statute applied to only uninsured homeowners, whereas homeowners in present case were insured, so that injured worker was not "employee" and was not entitled to workers' compensation benefits. *Cal. State Auto. Ass'n Inter-Ins. Bureau v. W.C.A.B. (Hestehauge) (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1040, 1044-1048, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 743*

Injured worker of unlicensed contractor hired to trim homeowner's tree could not maintain civil tort action against homeowner that was grounded on homeowner's alleged violation of Cal-OSHA tree-trimming safety regulations. *Fernandez v. Lawson (2003) 31 Cal. 4th 31, 36-38, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 422, 71 P.3d 779*

Injured worker, employed by unlicensed contractor to repair homeowner's roof, and who had not worked on that job for statutorily required number of hours to qualify as employee of homeowner, nevertheless remained employee of contractor for purposes of assigning liability for injury, so that worker was eligible to receive benefits from Uninsured Employers Fund [now called theUninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] and to pursue tort remedies against contractor in civil court. *Cedillo v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 227, 232, 236-237, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*

Newspaper carrier injured in traffic accident while delivering newspapers was considered employee entitled to workers' compensation benefits when employer, as a matter of law, failed to demonstrate that carrier was independent contractor excluded from coverage. *Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1584, 1594, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308*

Taxicab company as employer of injured cabdriver for purposes of workers' compensation notwithstanding agreement between driver and company that purportedly established a lessor-lessee relationship; company as exercising all necessary control over driver's work and driver as therefore not independent contractor. *Yellow Cab Cooperative, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1288, 1297-1300, 277 Cal. Rptr. 434*

If facts of employment are not disputed, existence of relationship covered by worker's compensation as question of law. *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1071, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67*

Factors considered in determining whether worker is employee and covered by workers' compensation law. *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1072-1073, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67*

Question of whether employment relationship exists as generally a question of fact reserved for trier of fact, and this as remaining true if evidence, though not in conflict, permits conflicting inferences; but if neither evidence nor inferences are in conflict, question of whether employment relationship exists as becoming question of law, which may be resolved by summary judgment. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1248, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Employer-employee relationship as required to exist to bring workers' compensation law into effect; whether or not employment relationship exists as usually one of fact for determination of trier of fact, particularly when facts as to employment relationship are in conflict. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 806, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Although it may be true that provisions of workers' compensation law are to beliberally construed in favor of awarding benefits even when it may be to advantage of particular plaintiff to avoid them and seek remedy at law, courts as generally being more exacting in requiring proof of employment relationship when such relationship is asserted as defense by employer to common law action. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 807-808, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Right to control manner in which worker performed work as preeminent factor in determining existence of employer-employee relationship. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 808 n.3, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Employment relationship as existing between hospital and college student who was performing services for hospital as part of externship program that was required for her degree when objective actions of hospital and student indicated they both intended arrangement whereby student would perform services for hospital in exchange for training and instruction by hospital to enable her to earn her degree; monetary consideration as not required tocreate contract. *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 643-648, 650-651, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811*

Principal test of employment relationship as being whether person to whom service is rendered has right to control manner and means of accomplishing result desired. *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 614, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754*

[33] Evidence

In civil action for medical malpractice, trial court should have excluded from trial all reference to plaintiff's immigration status, when plaintiff was not seeking damages for loss of earnings or earning capacity, since plaintiff's immigration status was neither relevant to any issue in case nor admissible to attack plaintiff's credibility. *Hernandez v. Paicius (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 452, 456-463, 468, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756*

WCAB as entitled to rely on relevant and considered opinion of a single physician, although in conflict with other medical opinions, as sufficient to constitute substantial evidence of a factual determination. *Nash v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1793, 1810, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 454*

WCAB as not entitled to rely on physician's opinion based on inadequate medical history or misunderstanding of legal standards or relevant facts; WCAB as not entitled to disregard portions of physician's testimony that contradicted his or her own opinion. *Rosas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1692, 1701-1705, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778*

WCAB as having power to direct taking of additional evidence when it grants reconsideration; thus, in determining reconsideration petition in preexisting disease case involving issue of apportionment, WCAB as having authority to decide that the employer has had an adequate opportunity to meet its burden of proof on apportionment and enter an award denying apportionment, or conclude that the record should be developed further on one or more of the apportionment issues and direct the taking of further evidence on apportionment. *King v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1640, 1649, 283 Cal. Rptr. 98* .

Neither WCAB nor court as required to accept opinion of independent medical examiner appointed by WCAB when conflict in medical evidence exists; WCAB and not physician as trier of fact. *Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 784, 792-793, 239 Cal. Rptr. 841*

WCAB as permitted to choose between conflicting medical opinions, and relevant and considered opinion of one physician, although inconsistent with other medical opinions, as sufficient to constitute substantial evidence in support of WCAB's decision; WCAB as not permitted, however, to rely on report that is known to be erroneous, is no longer germane, or is based on inadequate medical history or examination. *Kyles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 614, 621, 240 Cal. Rptr. 886*

Medical reports and opinions as not substantial evidence if known to be erroneous or based on facts no longer germane, on inadquate medical histories and examinations, or on incorrect legal theories; medical opinion as also failing to support WCAB's finding if based on surmise, speculation,conjecture, or guess. *Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 72, 76, 192 Cal. Rptr. 643* ; *Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 141 Cal. App. 3d 778, 785, 190 Cal. Rptr. 560* ; *Baptist v. Workers' Comp.*

Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 903, 906, 187 Cal. Rptr. 270

Words of conjecture in medical report as permitted to be construed, in proper contexts, as statements of medical probability, and WCAB as permitted to choose most persuasive among conflicting medical reports. *Scott Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 98, 106, 188 Cal. Rptr. 537*

WCAB as required to accept as true intended meaning of evidence that is uncontradicted and unimpeached. *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 639, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432* ; *Erickson v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 388, 391, 90 Cal. Rptr. 706*

Referee (now WCJ) or WCAB as not permitted to leave undeveloped matters that its acquired specialized knowledge should identify as requiring further evidence. *W.M. Lyles Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1969) 3 Cal. App. 3d 132, 138, 82 Cal. Rptr. 891*

[34] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

[a] In General

Worker's civil cause of action against her employer for invasion of privacy was not barred by exclusive remedy rule when worker's supervisor reprimanded worker and disseminated information about reprimand to other employees who had no reason to know this information, thereby violating worker's right of privacy conferred by California Constitution and thus contrary to fundamental public policy. Operating Engineers Local 3 v. *Johnson (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 180, 184-192, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 552*

Exclusive remedy rule bars employee's civil tort action against employer for aggravation of pre-existing illness resulting from negligent diagnostic treatment voluntarily provided by employer, regardless of cause of pre-existing illness. *Weber v. United Parcel Service, Inc. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 801, 806-809, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 412*

Exclusive remedy rule does not bar civil action between injured worker's union and employer in which union seeks to compel employer to arbitrate worker's return to work under terms of collective bargaining agreement. *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1277 v. Amalgamated Transit Union Local 1277 (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 673, 682-684, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207*

Employee's civil negligence suit against her employer barred because workers' compensation law was exclusive remedy, when employee was injured while visiting work on her day off and helping fellow employees hold up collapsing shelf. *Wright v. Beverly Fabrics, Inc. (2002) 95 Cal. App. 4th 346, 357, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 503*

Public policies enacted in Fair Employment and Housing Act preclude finding that workers' compensation is exclusive remedy for plaintiff pleading claim for physical damages as result of employer's unlawful business practice, as defined by *Gov. Code § 12940(m)*, of failing to provide reasonable accommodation for plaintiff's nonindustrial disability from polio. *Bagatti v. Department of Rehabilitation (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 344, 356-357, 364-367, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 443*

In civil action by injured agricultural laborer against his employer (licensed farm labor contractor), California Farm Labor Contractors Act, *Lab. Code § 1682 et seq.*, does not provide exception to exclusive remedy rule of workers' compensation laws. *Ruiz v. Cabrera (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1198, 1202-1203, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 320*

Doorman who was employee of condominium homeowners' association but not of individual homeowners as not barred by exclusive remedy rule from bringing civil action against negligent homeowner. *Holmes v. Roth (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 931, 936-937, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 315*

Under workers' compensation law, employee as afforded relatively swift and certain payment of benefits to cure or relieve effects of industrial injury without having to prove fault, but, in exchange, gives up wider range of damages potentially available in tort. *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1152, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752*

Exclusive remedy doctrine as inapplicable when injury is result of conduct that does not "reasonably [come] within the compensation bargain." *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 16, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054*

Worker's claim based on conduct normally occurring in workplace as within exclusive jurisdiction of WCAB. *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 15, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* ; *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 151, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743*

Exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation system as designed to provide quick, simple, and readily accessible method of claiming and receiving compensation. *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 6, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762*

Lab. Code §§ 3602, 5300, and *5814* as creating statutory scheme that preempts private causes of action by injured employees against independent insurance claims administrators and adjusters hired by their self-insured employers that unreasonably delay or refuse to pay compensation benefits. *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 10, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762*

Workers' compensation law as not superseding tenured teachers' procedureal entitlements under *Education Code. Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1364-1366, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354* (involving procedural requirements under *Educ. Code § 44942* to suspend certifiecated employe or transfer such employee to other duties based on mental illness that renders employee incompetent to perform duties)

Although workers' compensation also provides rehabilitation and disability allowances similar to those afforded by State Teachers' Retirement System, these latter benefits as not falling within exclusive purview of workers' compensation law. *Raven v. Oakland Unified School Dist. (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1347, 1364-1366, 262 Cal. Rptr. 354*

Expressed intent of legislative authors of workers' compensation statutes as being that statutory remedy is exclusive remedy against employer for injuries occurring within scope of employment. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1258, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Legislature's failure to include in workers' compensation law an element of damages recoverable at common law as not subject to judicial correction. *Potter v. Arizona So. Coach Lines, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 126, 131, 248 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Workers' compensation law as precluding civil action by former employee and his wife against former employer and supervisor for damages incident to employer's failure to notify of employment termination resulting in employee's loss of right to convert group insurance policy to individual coverage. *Potter v. Arizona So. Coach Lines, Inc. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 126, 131-136, 248 Cal. Rptr. 284*

Under workers' compensation scheme, employee's remedy against employer for work-related injury as generally exclusively limited to benefits provided by workers' compensation law. *Spradlin v. Cox (1988) 201 Cal. App. 3d 799, 806, 247 Cal. Rptr. 347*

Injured worker's exclusive remedy for insurer's intentional misconduct in persistent withholding of compensation

payments, notwithstanding order by workers' compensation judge to pay, as lying within penalty provisions of workers' compensation law (i.e., *Lab. Code § 5814*). *Stoddard v. Western Employers Ins. Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 165, 171-172, 245 Cal. Rptr. 820*

When special employment relationship exists between temporary employee and employer, employee's exclusive remedy for job-related injuries as being workers' compensation. *Santa Cruz Poultry, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 575, 577, 239 Cal. Rptr. 578*

When employee consumes alcohol in scope of his or her employment, employer as liable under doctrine of respondeat superior (*Civ. Code § 2338*) for injuries proximately caused to members of public by consumption of alcohol and as immunized from liability neither by *Civ. Code § 1714* nor by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 25602* (generally immunizing furnishers of alcoholic beverages for injuries resulting from alcohol caused accidents); but when injury is to coemployee off employer's premises under circumstances in which workers' compensation would have been barred by going and coming rule but resulted from "special risk" causally related to employment and was sustained within field of that risk, injured coemployee's claim as coming within exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law and tort action by coemployee against employer as barred. *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 798, 800-816, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641*

Existence of injury not compensable under workers' compensation as not, without more, abrogating workers' compensation law's exclusive remedy provisions. *Spratley v. Winchell Donut House, Inc. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1408, 1414, 234 Cal. Rptr. 121*

[b] Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)

Exclusive remedy doctrine of California Workers' Compensation Act is preempted by federal Americans With Disabilities Act (*42 U.S.C. § 12101* et seq.); plaintiff is allowed to simultaneously pursue workers' compensation claim and federal claim. *Wood v. County of Alameda (N.D. Cal. 1995) 875 F. Supp. 659, 665*

Third-party seeking to mitigate its damages lacked standing to bring action under the Americans With Disabilities Act against an employer for alleged unlawful discrimination. *Ventura County Railway Company, Inc. v. Hadley Auto Transport (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 878, 882, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 362*

[c] Assault and Battery

Covered employer was protected from suit by employees for negligent or reckless failure to provide adequate security on employer's premises, despite knowledge of potential danger, although failure allegedly resulted in assault and kidnapping against two employees perpetrated by third parties who were not employees. *Arendell v. Auto Parts Club, Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1265, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 83*

Action brought by security guard against director of hotel security for threatening guard with gun as not barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation act, since director's threat constituted physical assault under *Lab. Code § 3602*. *Herrick v. Quality Hotels, Inns & Resorts, Inc. (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1608, 1616-1617, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 203*

Plaintiff as required to show that co-employee specifically intended to injure him or her to come within exception to exclusive remedy rule of *Lab. Code § 3601(a)*, which permits a civil action against against co-employee for injuries caused by willful and unprovoked physical act of aggression. *Soares v. City of Oakland (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1822, 1825-1831, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405*

"Willful" assaults under *Lab. Code § 3601(a)* as not including all common-law batteries, but only those that are specifically intended to injure. *Soares v. City of Oakland (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1822, 1825-1831, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405*

Exclusivity doctrine as not applying to prevent employee's action against employer for assault and battery [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)*]; assault as not required to have been personally committed by employer but only ratified by employer. *Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1432, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68*

[d] Co-employees, Acts of

Trial court may properly instruct jury that plaintiff must prove co-worker had intent to injure plaintiff, for plaintiff to come within exception of exclusive remedy rule of *Lab. Code § 3601(a)*. *Torres v. Parkhouse Tire Service, Inc. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 995, 1003-1006, 111 Cal. Rptr. 2d 564, 30 P.3d 57*

WCAB properly found that pranks and practical jokes condoned by employer were within co-employee's scope of employment under *Lab. Code § 3601*, since condoned pranks and jokes were within scope of co-worker's employment, and specific exceptions of *Lab. Code § 3601* were inapplicable, co-worker was immune from negligence liability. *Oliva v. Heath (1995) 35 Cal. App. 4th 926, 933-934, 41 Cal. Rptr. 2d 613*

Owner of motor vehicle as statutorily liable under *Veh. Code § 17150* to employee for injuries sustained as result of co-employee's negligent operation of motor vehicle when co-employee was operating vehicle with owner's permission; owner as not immune from civil liability because co-employee was immune by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3601*. *Galvis v. Petito (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 551, 556-564, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 560*

Lab. Code § 3601 as expressly immunizing coemployee from civil liability for acts within the scope of their employment, and 1982 amendment of that statute confirms that there can be no judicially created exceptions to the immunity granted to coemployees. *Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 737-738, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1*

When coemployee is injured off employer's premises under circumstances in which workers' compensation would have been barred by going and coming rule but resulted from "special risk" causally related to employment and was sustained within field of that risk, injured coemployee's claim as coming within exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law and tort action by coemployee against employer as barred. *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 798, 800-816, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641*

[e] Contract Damages

Petition for writ of mandate filed by public school employee, seeking differential pay and reinstatement under *Ed. Code §§ 44977* and 44987.1, not tort damages for work-related injury, was not preempted by exclusivity provisions of workers' compensation law. *Veguez v. Governing Board of the Long Beach Unified School District (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 406, 417-418, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 526*

Employee who sues for breach of contract when same conduct also caused injury compensable under workers' compensation law as precluded from recovering only those damages caused by the compensable injury; amount of workers' compensation paid as required to be set off from contract damages. *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 500-501, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677*

[f] Discrimination

FEHA requires employee to prove that he or she is "qualified individual" when alleging discrimination on grounds of disability, meaning that plaintiff's burden of proving actionable discrimination on basis of disability includes proof that he or she has ability to perform essential duties of position with reasonable accommodation. *Green v. State of California (2007) 42 Cal. 4th 254, 262-264, 65 P.3d 118*

Injured workers discriminated against because of disability from work related injury may bring claims before Workers' Compensation Appeals Board under *Lab. Code § 132a* and actions to state court seeking remedies under Fair Employment and Housing Act and common-law wrongful discharge theory. *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1158, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291*)

Plaintiff was estopped from claiming that she could perform her work adequately in FEHA age discrimination action against her employer when she had previously obtained a favorable settlement in her workers' compensation case based on her assertion that she was unable to work; employer entitled to summary judgment in FEHA age discrimination case when plaintiff failed to prove all the elements of age discrimination. Rissetto v. Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 343 *(1996) 94 F.3d 597, 606*

Workers' compensation exclusive remedy provisions applied to industrial injury, including plaintiff's emotional distress as result of that injury, that followed allegedly unlawful demotion because of plaintiff's age, in violation of FEHA and of public policy, when evidence demonstrated that alleged discriminatory act was not "substantial factor" in causing subsequent industrial injury. *Huffman v. Interstate Brands Cos. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 679, 692-700, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 397*

Reinstatement of employee under *Lab. Code § 132a* as probationary rather than permanent as proper when no finding that employee performed or could perform job duties up to standards required by employer and no finding that, but for employee's injury, she would have successfully completed probationary period; Board's refusal to award lost wages and benefits as proper when no finding that employee sought or was ready, willing, and able to maintain employment. *Dyer v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 1376, 1384-1386, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30*

Statutory discrimination action by employee alleging physical, mental, or emotional injury resulting from racial discrimination by employer as not barred by exclusivity doctrine. *Jones v. Los Angeles Community College Dist. (1988) 198 Cal. App. 3d 794, 804, 807-808, 244 Cal. Rptr. 37* ; *see also* *Goldman v. Wilsey Foods, Inc. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1085, 1095-1096, 265 Cal. Rptr. 294* (religious discrimination); *Meninga v. Raley's, Inc. (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 79, 91, 264 Cal. Rptr. 319* (sexual discrimination); *Watson v. Department of Rehabilitation (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 1271, 1286-1287, 261 Cal. Rptr. 204* (age and racial discrimination)

Injured workers discriminated against because of disability from work related injury may bring claims before the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board under *Lab. Code § 132a* and actions to state court seeking remedies under Fair Employment and Housing Act and common-law wrongful discharge theory. *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1158, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752* (overruling *Portillo v. G. T. Price Products, Inc. (1982) 131 Cal. App. 3d 285, 182 Cal. Rptr. 291*)

[g] Dual Capacity Doctrine

Hospital employee who sustained nerve injury while voluntarily undergoing treatment by employer pursuant to a protocol put in place by employer for treating employees exposed to blood or other bodily fluids, was barred by exclusive remedy rule from pursuing tort action against employer. *Alander v. Vaca Valley Hospital (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 1304, 1307, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40*

Lab. Code § 3602(a), barring dual capacity doctrine, as inapplicable to coemployees; however, coemployees as expressly immunized from civil liability for acts within the scope of their employment by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3601*. *Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 737-738, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1*

Employee was permitted to maintain action against her employer under dual capacity doctrine for injuries sustained as result of "slip and fall" while on employer's premises in course of treatment for prior work-related injury, based on theory that employer could be liable under common-law duty of reasonable care owed by landowner to invitee. *Weinstein v. St. Mary's Medical Center (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 1223, 1237, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 461*

Dual capacity exception did not apply in an action brought by a hospital employee who sustained a nerve injury while voluntarily undergoing treatment by her employer pursuant to a protocol put in place by the employer for treating employee's exposed to blood or other bodily fluids. *Alander v. Vaca Valley Hospital (1996) 49 Cal. App. 4th 1298, 1307, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 40*

WCAB as correct in determining that dual capacity exception to rule of exclusivity inapplicable when employee of chiropractic center who sued chiropractic center for injuries received while undergoing chiropractic treatment was patient of center prior to and at time of her injury. *Lake v. Lakewood Chiropractic Center (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 47, 53, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 358*

Lab. Code § 3602(a) as inapplicable to preclude employee's action against employer, when employer's second or dual capacity came into existence after, not prior to or at the time of, the employee's injury. *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1292-1293, 285 Cal. Rptr. 183* ; *Sturtevant v. County of Monterey (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 758, 761-764, 279 Cal. Rptr. 161*

Lab. Code § 3602(a), as amended, abolishing dual capacity doctrine in most cases, as not retroactive. *Perry v. Heavenly Valley (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 495, 504-505, 209 Cal. Rptr. 771*

[h] Emotional Distress

Employee's damages for emotional distress resulting from employer's misrepresentations made to induce employee to enter employment relationship were not consequence of normal part of that relationship or risk reasonably encompassed within compensation bargain; in making these misrepresentations (regarding employer's financial stability, its future plans to relocate its operations, and prospective employee's promotion in corporate ranks), employer stepped out of its proper role as employer, engaging in behavior that is not normal part of employment relationship, so that exclusive remedy rule did not bar employee's civil damages for emotional distress. *Lenk v. Total-Western, Inc. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 959, 971-973, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 34*

Workers' compensation was employee's sole remedy for work-related emotional distress under *Lab. Code § 3601(a)*. *Gibbs v. American Airlines, Inc. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 554*

Employee's emotional distress claims seeking damages for alleged work--related injury discrimination were not barred by the exclusivity rule since work--related injury discrimination is not a normal risk of the compensation bargain. *Fretland v. County of Humboldt (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1478, 1492, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*

Trial court erred in determining that plaintiff's cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress was barred by exclusive remedy rule, when evidence created triable issue of fact as to whether reasonable person would have found working conditions created by defendant to be intolerable, and as to whether conduct experienced by plaintiff was outrageous. *Kovatch v. California Casualty Management Co., Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1277-1278, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

Emotional distress damages may be recovered as part of compensatory damages if plaintiff has cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy or wrongful termination in violation of express statute. *Phillips v. Gemini Moving Specialists (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 563, 577, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

Claims under California law for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress caused by personnel moves were not preempted by California workers' compensation statute when claims implicated fundamental public policy considerations embodied in *Gov. Code § 12940(f)* and *Lab. Code § 1102.5*, which prohibit certain retaliatory discrimination. *Maynard v. City of San Jose (9th Cir. 1994) 37 F.3d 1396, 1405-1406*

In action by three firefighters against city, its fire chief and its city manager for wrongly refusing to grant promotions, defendants waived claim that damages for emotional distress barred by the exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation act as defendants failed to raise issue before or during trial. *Lucich v. City of Oakland (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 494, 498, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 450*

Exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation system as barring civil action for intentional or negligent infliction of emotional distress unless employer's conduct exceeds risks inherent in employment relationship or contravenes public policy. *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 754-755, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195*

Workers' compensation law as exclusive remedy for emotional distress resulting from termination of employment, even if employee does not suffer physical injury. *Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 665-670, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721*

Workers' compensation law as exclusive remedy for emotional distress caused by employer's intentional conduct even if unaccompanied by physical injury, so long as employer's conduct was a normal incident of the employment relationship. *Horn v. Bradco Internat., Ltd. (1991) 232 Cal. App. 3d 653, 665-670, 283 Cal. Rptr. 721*

Workers' compensation law as exclusive remedy for claim of negligent infliction of emotional distress resulting from termination of employment, even if no accompanying physical injury or disability alleged. *Robomatic, Inc. v. Vetco Offshore (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 270, 274-275, 275 Cal. Rptr. 70*

Employee's cause of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress as a result of employment termination as precluded by exclusive remedy of workers' compensation; termination as necessarily arising out of the employment relationship. *Jenkins v. Family Health Program (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 440, 450, 262 Cal. Rptr. 798* ; *Pichon v. Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (1989) 212 Cal. App. 3d 488, 495-496, 260 Cal. Rptr. 677*

Action for intentional infliction of emotional distress against State of California by traffic officer employed by Highway Patrol, who allegedly took disability retirement because of campaign of harassment by superior, as barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law when claim was based on conduct normally occuring in work place and when alleged harassment caused both mental and physical injuries. *Valenzuela v. State of California (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 916, 919, 922-924, 240 Cal. Rptr. 45*

When misconduct attributed to employer consists of actions that are normal part of employment relationship, such as demotions, promotions, criticism of work practices, and frictions in negotiations as to grievances, employee suffering emotional distress causing disability as unable to avoid exclusive remedy provisions of Labor Code and maintain independent action against employer for intentional infliction of emotional distress by characterizing employer's decisions as manifestly unfair, outrageous, harassing, or intended to cause emotional disturbance resulting in disability; when worker's causes of action are barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law, spouse's causes of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress and loss of consortium as also barred. *Shoemaker v.*

Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 15, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054 ; *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 160-163, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743* ; *Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1429-1430, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68*

Proper test in determining whether workers' compensation is exclusive remedy available to employee alleging intentional infliction of emotional distress as being whether acts complained of were normal part of employment relationship or incidents of employment relationship. *Hart v. National Mortgage & Land Co. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 1420, 1429, 235 Cal. Rptr. 68*

California's workers' compensation law as not providing sole and exclusive remedy for employee's claim of negligent infliction of emotional distress resulting from wrongful termination of employee's employment when there has been no physical injury because emotional distress without accompanying physical injury or disability is not compensable under *Lab. Code § 3600*. *Robards v. Gaylord Bros., Inc. (9th Cir. 1988) 854 F.2d 1152, 1157-1158* (affirming judgment for plaintiff for damages for breach of implied contract and negligent infliction of emotional distress); *see also Miller v. Fairchild Industries, Inc. (9th Cir. 1989) 885 F.2d 498, 510* (actions for negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress based on termination after settlement negotiations concerning complaints of racial discrimination as permissible when no physical injury or disability alleged).

Action for intentional infliction of emotional distress based on insurer's delay in paying benefits, change in amounts paid, and disobedience to subpoena duces tecum issued by WCAB as barred by exclusivity of workers' compensation remedy. *Everfield v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 15, 18-21, 171 Cal. Rptr. 164*

Workers' compensation as employee's exclusive remedy for employer's intentional infliction of emotional distress on employer's premises and while employee was still an employee for workers' compensation purposes when emotional distress that was inflicted resulted in physical disabilities to employee. *Gates v. Trans Video Corp. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 196, 201-206, 155 Cal. Rptr. 486*

[i] Federal Law; Preemption

Exclusivity provisions of state workers' compensation laws as not precluding federal remedies under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act (*29 U.S.C. § 1801 et seq.*). *Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett (1990) 494 U.S. 638, 110 S. Ct. 1384, 108 L. Ed. 2d 585, 597-598*

Former employee's claim under *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)* that employer fraudulently concealed fact that her illness was caused by exposure to toxic chemicals in workplace as not preempted by Section 301 of federal Labor Management Relations Act, which provides for federal preemption of state claim if application of law is substantially dependent on analysis of collective bargaining agreement or if claim is founded directly on rights created by such agreement. Lopez v. Continental Can Co., Inc. (9th Cir. [Cal.] 1992) *961 F.2d 147, 148-149*

[i.1] Fraudulent Concealment

Reviewing factual conditions employee must prove in civil tort action against employer pursuant to fraudulent concealment exception to exclusive remedy rule. *Jensen v. Amgen, Inc. (2003) 105 Cal. App. 4th 1322, 1326-1327, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 899*

Employee seeking to state cause of action for fraudulent concealment need only "in general terms" plead facts that if found true by trier of fact establish existence of essential elements under *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*, and in determining whether allegations in complaint are legally sufficient trial court must liberally construe pleading with view to achieving substantial justice between parties. *Palestini v. General Dynamics Corp. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 80, 89-90, 120 Cal.*

Rptr. 2d 741

[j] Insurer's Duty to Defend

Court of appeal, affirming Superior Court's dismissal of plaintiff employer's civil suit against its insurer, which alleged breach of contract, breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and fraud, for failure to defend plaintiff against employee's civil action for damages, held that plaintiff failed to state cause of action, since employee suffered injury compensable under workers' compensation law and insurer had provided both defense and indemnification to employee's workers' compensation claim, making applicable insurance policy's unambiguous provision that excluded any obligation by insurer to defend civil action against employer by employee who had received workers' compensation benefits for injury that was subject of civil action. *Stephenson v. Argonaut Insurance Co. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 962, 969-975, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195*

Insurers had no duty to defend or indemnify insured employer under the workers' compensation or employer's liability portions of their policies when insured's claim was based on discrimination and intentional conduct that was excluded from coverage under the policy. *General Star Indemnity Co. v. Schools Excess Liability Fund (N.D. Cal. 1995) 888 F. Supp. 1022, 1026-1027*

Compensation insurer as having no duty to defend against former employee's civil wrongful termination action when "Workers' Compensation Liability" portion of insurance policy was susceptible of no other objective construction than providing coverage solely for workers' compensation benefits, or claims, proceedings, or suits for such benefits, and not for civil suits for damages; furthermore, civil action involved no potential for damages within the coverage of the policy because superior court has no jurisdiction to award workers' compensation benefits; such award of benefits is exclusively within jurisdiction of WCAB. *La Jolla Beach & Tennis Club, Inc. v. Industrial Indemnity Co. (1994) 9 Cal. 4th 27, 41-44, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 100, 884 P.2d 1048* (disapproving *Wong v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 686, 693-696, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1* , to extent it is inconsistent with La Jolla)

Insurer had no duty to indemnify or defend employer against sexual harassment claim, when neither workers' compensation policy nor general liability policy provided coverage for such claim. *Michaelian v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 1093, 1105-1106, 58 Cal. Rptr. 2d 133*

Workers' compensation insurer had no duty to defend insured employer in civil action based on former employee's claim of defamatory post-termination disparagement of performance when insured failed to show that there was any potential for coverage under the workers' compensation insurance policy. *Frank and Freedus v. Allstate Ins. Co. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 461, 473, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 678*

Employer's liability insurer has no duty to defend employer against suit brought under federal statute by employees and survivors of other employees when liability policy clearly covered only liability arising under California law. *Martinez v. SCIF (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 1589, 1593, 1597, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639*

Employer's liability insurer has no duty to defend employer against cross-complaints for indemnification brought by additional defendants in suit brought by injured employee alleging intentional concealment and aggravation of injury and intentional infliction of emotional distress, even though insurer defended and eventually settled employee's suit, when insurance policy clearly excluded coverage for bodily injury intentionally caused or aggravated by insured. *Reagen's Vacuum Truck Service, Inc. v. Beaver Insurance Company (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 375, 388, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89*

Insurer has no duty under liability portion of insurance contract to defend insured employer against suit for damages brought by injured former employee when former employee received workers' compensation benefits for emotional

distress caused by termination from employment, suit brought against employer alleged sex discrimination, wrongful termination, and related claims, insurance contract clearly stated that insured was not covered under liability portion of policy when underlying claim was covered by workers' compensation, and liability portion of policy clearly excluded coverage for claims based on either wrongful termination or sex discrimination. *Transamerica Insurance Company v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1705, 1715, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 259*

Compensation insurer as not absolved of its duty to defend insured employer on ground that employee's civil action against employer for wrongful termination was barred by exclusive remedy rule when employee's complaint alleged violations of fundamental and substantial public policies that were excepted from exclusive remedy provisions of *Workers' Compensation Act. B & E Convalescent Center v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 78, 89-92, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894*

Employer's liability portion of compensation insurance policy as requiring insurer to defend employer against employee's civil action when potential for coverage exists or employer has reasonable expectation of coverage given nature and kind of risks covered by policy. *B & E Convalescent Center v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 78, 92, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894*

Compensation insurer as having no duty to defend insured employer for employer's willful acts pursuant to *Ins. Code § 533* when employer had intentionally interfered with employee's protected labor union rights and had discriminated against employee on basis of her age, gender, and ethnicity. *B & E Convealescent Center v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 78, 92-102, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 894*

[k] Insurance Carriers, Administrators or Adjusters, Actions Against

Defendant, third party administrator, had duty of care to plaintiff, employer bank's excess insurer, plaintiff was third party beneficiary of contract between employer and defendant, and plaintiff was subrogated to employer's rights against defendant. *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Cambridge Integrated Services Group (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 35, 45-56, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 473*

In civil action that arose out of successful attempts by California Insurance Guarantee Association and numerous insurers and employers to have Appeals Board consolidate many different medical lien claims in order to obtain determination from Board as to whether Premier Medical Management Systems, Inc., was improperly representing treating physicians in Appeals Board proceedings, Premier and five affiliated treating physicians sued insurers and employers, alleging various tort and statutory causes of action based on claims that defendants were engaged in anti-competitive activity, gravamen of complaint being that, after Premier submitted plaintiff physicians' bills to defendants for payment and filed liens in numerous workers' compensation cases before Appeals Board, defendants collectively conspired to contest, delay, and avoid payment of those bills and liens, defendants argued that complaint was anti-SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation) lawsuit because it was based entirely on defendants' constitutional right to petition Appeals Board, and court of appeal agreed with defendants, finding that anti-SLAPP statute applied because defendants had shown that plaintiffs' complaint related to activity that was protected activity, i.e., right to petition Appeals Board and litigate lien claims before Board, and that defendants had probability of prevailing on plaintiffs' complaint, based on doctrine that parties who petition government for redress are generally immune from antitrust liability. *Premier Med. Mgmt. Sys., Inc. v. Cal. Ins. Guarantee Ass'n (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 464*

Superior court had no jurisdiction to decide employee's claim against employer's workers' compensation insurer for allegedly mishandling its lien on employee's third-party settlement; WCAB had exclusive jurisdiction over claim under *Lab. Code §§ 3860* and *5800*. *Hughes v. Argonaut Insurance Co. (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 517, 531, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 877*

Economic injuries sustained by medical providers to their businesses resulting from failure to receive full and timely payment on their lien claims from insurance carriers fall within the scope of exclusivity provisions; however, medical providers may bring civil actions against insurers for acts by the insurers that fall outside the scope of the compensation bargain, including Cartwright Act and RICO claims, and tortious interference with business relations and violations of the UCL to the extent they are predicated on the conspiratorial misconduct of the insurers. *Vacanti v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 800, 814, 825-828, 102 Cal. Rptr. 2d 562, 14 P.3d 234*

Delays in making payments to injured worker and changes in amounts of payment as matters exclusively within jurisdiction of WCAB; hence, action by injured worker against independent claims administrator of self-insured employer for delay or refusal to pay compensation benefits as preempted by California's workers' compensation system. *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 7-10, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762* ("rejecting" contrary holding in *Dill v. Claims Admin. Services, Inc. (1986) 178 Cal. App. 3d 1184, 224 Cal. Rptr. 273*)

Fraudulent misrepresentation by compensation carrier and its independent claims administrators that no policy of insurance existed, made for purpose of advancing carrier's economic interest and defeating injured employee's just entitlement, and subsequent intentional destruction of evidence establishing fraud, as constituting type of outrageously reprehensible conduct that falls outside permissible boundary of protected behavior by compensation carrier and subjects tortfeasors to liability in civil action for fraud and intentional spoliation of evidence. *Jablonski v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 379, 390-394, 251 Cal. Rptr. 160*

Action for damages against self-insured employer's independent claims administrator who unreasonably refused to pay workers' compensation benefitsas barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law; court as having no jurisdiction to hear claim based on delay or refusal to pay workers' compensation benefits, even against third party, except in unusual circumstances when there is intentional, outrageous conduct outside normal scope of duty; mere allegations of emotional distress as not sufficient to trigger this exception. *Phillips v. Crawford & Co. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 383, 385-386, 389 n.6, 248 Cal. Rptr. 371*

Exclusive remedy provision as constituting bar to civil action by employee against independent claims adjuster of self-insured employer for damages based on delay and failure to pay benefits arising from employee's industrial injury. *Mottola v. R. L. Kautz & Co. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 98, 101, 105-109, 244 Cal. Rptr. 737*

Although *Lab. Code §§ 3850* and *3852* authorize independent actions against persons other than employer who are liable for damages resulting from injury, employer's insurance carrier as not a person other than employer but stands in employer's shoes and may invoke exclusivity defense when injury is plainly industrial and compensable within system [*see Lab. Code § 3850(b)*]); hence, employee's action against carrier for (1) negligent failure to make sure employer preserved defective ladder as evidence in employee's third-party product liability lawsuit and (2) negligent failure to notify employee of facts giving rise to third-party liability in time for him to have acted to preserve evidence as barred. *Continental Casualty Co. v. Superior Court (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 156, 158-162, 235 Cal. Rptr. 260]* .

Workers' compensation as exclusive remedy for refusal of independent adjusting agency, as administrator of employer's compensation program, to pay benefits awarded to injured employee. *Santiago v. Employee Benefits Services (1985) 168 Cal. App. 3d 898, 905, 214 Cal. Rptr. 679*

Worker's action against insurance carrier under *Ins. Code § 790.03* for failure to pay benefits as within exclusive jurisdiction of WCAB when alleged conduct did not come within exception for outrageous and extreme conduct. *Depew v. Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 574, 577-579, 185 Cal. Rptr. 472* ; *see* *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* (prospectively abrogating private third-party standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03*)

[l] Medical Malpractice

Physician employed by professional football team to provide treatment to players injured in course of their employment by team as not protected from malpractice suit by exclusive remedy provisions of *Lab. Code § 3602*, which applies only to employers; however, physician was immune from such suit by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3601*, which expressly immunizes coemployees for acts within the scope of their employment, because the physician was acting within scope of his employment when he diagnosed and treated plaintiff whose injury was proximately caused by his employment by the team. *Hendy v. Losse (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 723, 737-738, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 543, 819 P.2d 1*

Employee injured in industrial accident and further injured by negligence of treating physician as having separate remedies available against employer and physician; jurisdiction of claim against employer for injury and aggravation as within exclusive jurisdiction of WCAB, which has no jurisdiction overaction against physician for malpractice. *Nation v. Certainteed Corp. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 813, 816, 817, 149 Cal. Rptr. 62*

[m] Peculiar Risk Doctrine

Landowner who hires independent contractor may be liable to contractor's employee injured by undisclosed hazard on hirer's land, even if hirer does not retain control over work, if following conditions are present: (1) landowner knew, or should have known, of latent or concealed preexisting hazardous condition on its property, (2) contractor did not know of, and could not have reasonably discovered, this hazardous condition, and (3) landowner failed to warn contractor about this condition. *Kinsman v. Unocal Corp. (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 659, 678-683, 36 Cal. Rptr. 3d 495, 123 P.3d 931*

Gov. Code § 815.4 (Government Claims Act) provides statutory basis for public entity potentially to be held liable on retained control theory under *Hooker* and its progeny, and plaintiff could bring claim on this theory. *McCarty v. State of California/Department of Transportation (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 955, 976-979, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 777*

Privette and *Kinsman* doctrines applied to issue of liability of hirers of subcontractors for injuries to those who worked for those subcontractors, regardless of whether those injured were employees of subcontractors or independent contractors. *Michael v. Denbeste Transp., Inc. (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1093-1096, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 777*

Employee of independent contractor may sue hirer of contractor for tort of negligent exercise of retained control, provided hirer's exercise of retained control affirmatively contributed to employee's injuries. *Hooker v. Department of Transportation (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 198, 202, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 853, 38 P.3d 1081*

Hirer of independent contractor is liable in civil action to employee of contractor insofar as hirer's provision of unsafe equipment affirmatively contributed to employee's injury. *McKown v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. (2002) 27 Cal. 4th 219, 222, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 868, 38 P.3d 1094*

California Supreme Court holdings in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , and *Toland v. Sunland Housing Group, Inc. (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 253, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878, 955 P.2d 504* , extended to bar injured employee of independent contractor from suing contractor's hirer for negligent hiring, with Court citing two related policy considerations in support of its conclusion: (1) rule of workers' compensation exclusivity, which shields independent contractor who pays workers' compensation insurance premiums from further liability to its employees, should apply equally to person hiring contractor because hirer has indirectly paid cost of this coverage inasmuch as it was presumably calculated into contract price; (2) permitting such recovery would give employees of independent contractors unwarranted windfall, something that is denied other workers, i.e., right to recover tort damages for industrial injuries caused by their employer's failure to provide safe working environment. *Camargo v. Tjaarda Dairy (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 1235, 1244-1245, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 617, 25 P.3d 1096*

General contractor was not liable to injured employee of subcontractor, when court of appeal followed *Hooker v. Department of Transportation* and found that, even if it could be shown that general contractor retained control over safety conditions at worksite, there was no triable issue of fact that general contractor affirmatively contributed to subcontractor's employee's injuries. *Millard v. Biosources, Inc. (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1338, 1348-1349, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177*

Neither 1999 amendments to *Lab. Code § 6304.5* nor California Supreme Court's analysis of those amendments in *Elsner v. Uveges (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 915* , abrogated liability rules established by *Privette v. Superior Court* and its progeny. *Millard v. Biosources, Inc. (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 1338, 1349-1352, 68 Cal. Rptr. 3d 177*

Policy considerations relied on in *Privette* and *Hooker*, which established that hirer of subcontractor whose employee was injured on job as result of subcontractor's negligence was not vicariously liable under peculiar risk doctrine for employee's injuries, were equally applicable to claims against hirer's agent and thus barred civil action against that agent. *Ruiz v. Herman Weissker, Inc. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 52, 61-62, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 641*

Even assuming, as plaintiff argued, that hirer had nondelegable duties under Public Utilities Code and PUC regulations to ensure safety of premises where employee of independent contractor was fatally injured, hirer's attempt to delegate such duties to agent created no liability on part of that agent. *Ruiz v. Herman Weissker, Inc. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 52, 64, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 641*

Although hirer of independent contractor remains liable to employee of that contractor who is injured during course of the work when hirer retains control over details of work and its conduct affirmatively contributes to employee's injuries, no evidence in this case showed that hirer's agent asserted authority over independent contractor's crew or instructed them as to what safety procedures to use, so that no evidence showed that hirer's agent affirmatively contributed to contractor's employee's death by some negligent act or omission. *Ruiz v. Herman Weissker, Inc. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 52, 65-67, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 641*

Defendant homeowners' association, which had contracted with plaintiff's employer for security services, had no liability for injuries received by plaintiff when assaulted on homeowner's premises, since defendant owed plaintiff no duty to restrict access to community's premises or to restrict youth parties within its premises, and plaintiff had assumed risk of injuries he suffered, when undisputed evidence demonstrated that defendant neither required nor expected its unarmed security personnel to confront potentially violent persons, or otherwise place themselves in danger, and did nothing to alter basic scope of its security guards' "observe and report" responsibilities, so that it could not be held liable for consequences of plaintiff's decision to take action beyond scope of his duties by attempting to arrest assailant, nor could defendant's failure to take affirmative steps to restrict or control juvenile parties within its property be construed as having affirmatively contributed to plaintiff's injuries for purposes of peculiar risk doctrine. *Tilley v. CZ Master Assn. (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 464, 482-490, 32 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151*

Court of appeal reversed trial court's summary judgment in favor of defendant property owner and held that record showed triable issues of material fact as to whether defendant, who was hirer of plaintiff-employee's employer, breached nondelegable regulatory duty to provide fire extinguishers, pursuant to California Fire Code, and whether such breach affirmatively contributed to plaintiff's injuries. Court of appeal found that plaintiff's lawsuit was not foreclosed by *Privette v. Superior Court* and its progeny, and found, instead, that 24 Cal. Code Reg. § 7904.4.9.2, applicable to petroleum bulk plant facilities such as defendant's, requiring fire extinguishers within 75 feet of those portions of facility where fires are likely to occur, supported plaintiff's lawsuit. *Barclay v. Jesse M. Lange Distributor, Inc. (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 281, 295-301, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 242*

Court of appeal reversed trial court's summary judgment for hirer and general contractor defendants in civil action by plaintiff, employee of subcontractor, who was injured in fall from ladder while installing sprinkler system in hirer's new

building, holding that furnishing and abrupt withdrawal of safety equipment by defendants could be found to constitute negligent performance of voluntary undertaking, affirmatively contributing to plaintiff's injuries and thereby subjecting defendants to liability, when appellate court found that defendants had made no attempt to refute plaintiff's allegations and evidence that defendants had provided, then removed, hydraulic scissor lifts from room in which sprinklers were being installed, resulting in plaintiff's having to use ladder, and had also provided, then removed, suspended anchoring cables to which workers could secure their safety lanyards, resulting in plaintiff's having nothing to which to fasten his safety lanyard, and defendants had presented no evidence precluding finding that they affirmatively contributed to plaintiff's injuries, or affirmatively demonstrating that plaintiff lacked evidence to prove such affirmative contribution, and evidence raised strong possibility, at least, that defendants not only actively contributed to plaintiff's injuries, but actually created situation in which such injuries were likely to occur. *Browne v. Turner Construction Co. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1334, 1345-1348, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 433*

Landowner had no duty to employee of employer (premises occupant) for injuries arising from employee's performance of his job on landowner's land, when hazardous conditions were created by functioning of employer's business, and were not danger existing on land independently of employer's activity, and when there was no evidence of landlord-tenant relationship between landowner and employer or of any other legal relationship giving landowner right of access or control, no evidence showing what reasonable inspection would have disclosed, and no evidence that landowner had ability to detect and avoid unreasonable risk of harm to employee. *Laico v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc. (2004) 123 Cal. App. 4th 649, 670, 20 Cal. Rptr. 3d 307*

Hirer did not affirmatively contribute to employee's injury, and court of appeal rejected injured employee's argument that public policies behind *Privette* and its progeny did not apply and that hirer should be subject to liability for employee's injury because employee's employer was uninsured against workers' compensation at time of employee's injury, with court pointing out that, although uninsured at time of employee's injury, employer had been so insured and had so informed hirer at time contract of hire was entered. *Bell v. Greg Agee Constr., Inc. (2004) 125 Cal. App. 4th 453, 466-468, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 33*

Court of appeal affirmed summary judgment in favor of general contractor in civil action against general contractor by employee whose employer was hired by general contractor for construction project on which employee was injured, when court found no triable issues of fact on theories of general contractor negligence, general contractor negligent exercise of retained control, or premises liability, and court found *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , and its progeny applied and precluded employee from prevailing on such theories of liability against general contractor. *Sheeler v. Greystone Homes, Inc. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 908, 918-922, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683*

Although hirer of contractor, having generated hazardous waste that it hired contractor to remove, and which injured employee, had nondelegable duty under hazardous waste statutes [*42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.*; *Health & Safety Code § 25100 et seq.*] to properly dispose of such waste, nevertheless *Privette/Toland* doctrine means that generator of hazardous waste is not liable to employee of contractor it hires to dispose of that waste unless generator's conduct affirmatively contributed to employee's injuries. *Park v. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Co. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 595, 606-611, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 757*

Employee of uninsured subcontractor on construction project not permitted to sue property owner, because employee had workers' compensation coverage via Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] and allowing suit would tend to discourage employers from obtaining coverage, so that rationales of exclusive remedy rule fully applied, nor was suit allowed on grounds that property owner retained control over construction project by virtue of project's defective architectural plans, because alleged defective plans may give rise to action against architect but, in absence of evidence that property owner exercised any retained control over project, exclusive remedy doctrine applied to foreclose employee's suit against owner. *Lopez v. C.G.M. Development, Inc. (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 430, 444-446, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 227*

Widow's civil negligence action against property owner and general contractor of construction project on which her husband, employee of subcontractor, had been killed, presented triable issues of fact on whether defendants each had general duty of care to protect public roadway for persons traveling on it (and on which her husband had been killed), whether each of defendants breached this duty, and whether these breaches caused decedent's fatal injury. *Ray v. Silverado Constructors (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1120, 1123, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 251*

Liability for accidental death of independent contractor's employee could not be imposed on hirer/general contractor under theory of retained control when general contractor's failure was not shown to have affirmatively contributed to creation or persistence of hazard causing decedent's death. *Villafana v. Camco Pacific Construction Co. (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 189, 197-198, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 170*

Subcontractor's employee barred from pursuing an action against general contractor based upon contractor's failure to require subcontractor to take safety precautions, when general contractor's failure did not affirmatively contribute to creation or continued existence of dangerous condition causing injury to the subcontractor's employee. *Kinney v. CSB Construction, Inc. (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 28, 39, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 594*

Employee of subcontractor injured on construction project who received workers' compensation benefits for injury was barred from pursuing civil action for same injury against employer, construction project manager, and construction project owner. *Zamudio v. City and County of San Francisco (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 445, 455, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 664*

Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721 , precludes application of peculiar risk doctrine to employees of independent contractors who are injured through the negligence of the contractor even when the hirer fails to provide in the contract, or in some other manner, that special precautions be taken to avert the peculiar risks of the work. *Toland v. Sunland Housing Group, Inc. (1998) 18 Cal.4th 253, 267, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878, 955 P.2d 504*

Supreme Court's decision in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , does not abrogate California law that hirer of an independent contractor may be liable to independent contractor's employee for hirer's own negligence. *Grahn v. Tosco Corp. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 1373, 1389*

Indemnification agreement in which contractor agreed to indemnify person who hired independent contractor against liability under peculiar risk doctrine did not create basis for exception to rule in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , that person who hires independent contractor is not liable for workplace injuries sustained by contractor's employees. *Redfeather v. Chevron USA, Inc. (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 702, 705, 67 Cal. Rptr. 2d 159*

Employee of independent contractor who sued property owner and property lessee for injuries sustained when trench in which he was working collapsed was precluded from recovering under the peculiar risk doctrine pursuant to *Privette v. Superior Court*, even though independent contractor was hired by property lessor rather than owner. *Lopez v. University Partners (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 1117, 1125, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 359*

Under California Supreme Court's decision in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , government was not liable to independent contractor's employee for negligent failure to supervise the precautions taken by independent contractor or for failure to take precautions itself; government not entitled to summary judgment when evidence indicated that it could be liable to employee of independent contractor for failure to correct known dangerous condition. *Yanez v. United States of America (9th Cir. 1995) 63 F.3d 870, 875*

Excess insurers that provided overlapping coverage for the same risk, equally shared the excess cost of settlement when the plaintiff alleged causes of action against a landowner and general contractor for negligence and peculiar risk. *Fire*

Insurance Exchange v. American States Insurance Co. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 653, 664-665, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 135

General contractor has no duty to warn employee of independent contractor of obvious dangerous condition; California Supreme Court's holding in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* was not applicable to case involving nondelegable duty. *Felmlee v. Falcon Cable TV (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1032, 1038, 1040, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 158*

California Supreme Court's decision in *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* , abrogating peculiar risk doctrine insofar as it allowed employees of independent contractor's to sue employer of contractor, applied retroactively; reversal of trial court's decision applying peculiar risk doctrine was not required by *Privette*, since judgment against defendant rested on finding of defendant's own negligence, rather than on negligence of subcontractor imputed to defendant under peculiar risk doctrine. *Whitford v. Swinerton & Walberg Co. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1054, 1060, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 688*

Person who hires independent contractor to perform work that is inherently dangerous as liable in tort under peculiar risk doctrine for damages if contractor's negligent performance of work causes injury to others; this liability as not extending to contractor's employees who must seek recovery from workers' compensation system; peculiar risk doctrine's policies of insuring that injuries caused by contracted work are compensated, that risk of loss for those injuries is spread to person who primarily benefited from work, and that adequate safety measures are taken, as achieved by workers'compensation system. *Privette v. Superior Court (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 689, 691-702, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72, 854 P.2d 721* ; *Owens v. Giannetta-Heinrich Construction Co. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1662, 1667, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 11*

Where jury found general contractor responsible for plaintiff's injuries only on theory of vicarious liability, plaintiff's recovery as barred by retroactive application of rule announced by California Supreme Court prohibiting application of peculiar risk doctrine to employee of contractor who seeks recovery of tort damages from person who hired contractor but did not cause injuries; employees of independent contractors may still recover workers' compensation benefits and damages from negligent third parties. *Owens v. Giannetta-Heinrich Construction Co. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1662, 1667-1671, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 11*

[n] Power Press Injuries

Question of whether machine is "power press" within meaning of *Lab. Code § 4558(a)(4)* is one for jury. *Islas v. D & G Manufacturing Co., Inc. (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 571, 577580, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 559*

Exclusive remedy section of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*33 U.S.C. § 905(a)*] did not bar shore-based maritime employee's tort action against employer under *Lab. Code §§ 3602(a)* and *4558*, in which employee alleged that his injury was caused by employer's removal of or failure to install guard on power press. *Lenane v. Continental Maritime of San Diego, Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1089, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 121*

Trial court properly set aside summary judgment order in favor of employer issued on basis that *Lab. Code § 4558* cause of action was precluded because a guard was not available for model of machine that injured employee, when, after summary judgment was granted, employee discovered evidence indicating that guard was available. *Uriarte v. United States Pipe & Foundry Co. (1996) 51 Cal. App. 4th 780, 791, 59 Cal. Rptr. 2d 332*

Trial court granted employer's motion for summary judgment in action by injured employee under power press exception to exclusive remedy doctrine when employee failed to provide evidence that employer was aware that machine was missing point of operation guard. *Aguilera v. Henry Soss & Company (1996) 42 Cal. App. 4th 1724, 1731, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 477*

A printing press is not a "power press" within the meaning of *Lab. Code § 4558* because it does not form materials to be used in the manufacture of other products. *McCoy v. Zahniser Graphics, Inc. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 107, 111, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 871*

Application of power press exception under *Lab. Code § 4558(c)* requires proof that manufacturer informed employer of need for point of operation guard; existence of hole in pasta machine where safety guard was missing was insufficient to constitute the requisite conveyance of knowledge by the manufacturer. *Bryer v. Santa Cruz Pasta Factory (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1711, 1714-1715, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 750*

[o] Premises Liability

Exclusivity doctrine barred action against employer for negligent or reckless failure to provide adequate security on employer's premises, despite knowledge of potential danger. *Arendell v. Auto Parts Club, Inc. (1994) 29 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1265, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 83*

Lab. Code § 3602(a) as not barring waitress who received workers' compensation benefits from corporation owning restaurant from bringing third-party premises liability action against owners of property on which restaurant operated, even though property owners owned stock in restaurant; waitress as not employee of property owners. *Miller v. King (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 1732, 1733-1734, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 284*

[p] Spouses of Employees, Independent Actions

When worker's causes of action against employer are barred by exclusive remedy provisions of Labor Code, worker's spouse's causes of action based on physical injury to or disability of worker as also barred. *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection Dist. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 148, 162-163, 233 Cal. Rptr. 308, 729 P.2d 743*

Spouse of injured employee as having no independent civil action against the employer for loss of consortium. *Colombo v. State of California (1991) 3 Cal. App. 4th 594, 599, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 567*

[q] Uninsured Employers

In plaintiff's personal injury action filed under *Lab. Code § 3706*, employer's liability is determined under rules of pleading and proof that differ significantly from those of common-law personal injury action, so that this statute creates statutory cause of action for personal injuries subject to three-year statute of limitations in *Code of Civ. Proc. § 338(a). Valdez v. Himmelfarb (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 1261, 1269-1270, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 195*

Workers' compensation insurer's civil action against illegally uninsured employer for reimbursement of award of benefits to employee for cumulative trauma was permitted by *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)* as exception to exclusive remedy rule, and jurisdiction of action was not limited to Appeals Board. *Graphics Arts Mutual Ins. Co. v. Time Travel Internat., Inc. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 405, 413-415, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 864*

Statutory presumption that employee's injury was due to uninsured employer's negligence does not extend to presumption that employee's claimed injury arose in course of employment, so that employee seeking damages from uninsured employer has same burden of proof as employee seeking workers' compensation benefits, i.e., burden of proving that injury was sustained in course of employment. *Huang v. L.A. Haute (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-291, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 619*

Public entity operating under self-insured workers' compensation program pursuant to a certificate issued under *Lab. Code § 3700(c)* was not permitted to unilaterally extend its coverage to private entity acting as an agency of public entity. *Huffman v. City of Poway (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 975, 986, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 325*

Lab. Code § 3706, providing that, if any employer fails to secure payment of compensation, any injured employee or his or her dependents may bring action at law against such employer as if workers' compensation law did not apply, as one of principal exceptions to workers' compensation law's exclusive remedy rule, and as providing an alternative remedy to injured worker when employer has failed to secure payment of compensation as required by *Lab. Code § 3700*. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1177, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Jurisdiction of superior court to try claims of employee against his or her employer for damages under *Lab. Code § 3706* as arising only when payment of compensation is not secured, even though, in some instances, particular worker may have better claim in state civil action; employee who seeks recovery in civil action against employer for work-related injuries as barred by exclusivity rule unless he or she can establish that employer failed to secure payment of compensation as required by workers' compensation law, and employee as having burden of showing there was no coverage. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1177-1178, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Requirement of *Lab. Code § 3700* that private employer in California secure payment of compensation by securing insurance against liability from one or more insurers authorized to write compensation insurance in California or obtaining certificate of self-insurance pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3715* as satisfied so as to preclude civil action under *Lab. Code § 3706* when insurer is estopped to deny coverage. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1183-1184, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

Ruling of workers' compensation judge, after hearing arguments of counsel, denying employee's motion to exclude insurance company from workers' compensation proceeding on ground it was not employer's compensation carrier at time employee was injured, and finding that insurer was employer's compensation carrier on date of injury or was estopped to deny workers' compensation coverage, as deciding issue of coverage; ruling as final order for purposes of collateral estoppel in employee's civil action against employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3706* for failure to secure payment of compensation, particularly when employee did not seek reconsideration of coverage ruling and dismissed workers' compensation proceeding without making any effort to challenge workers' compensation judge's decision; hence, trial court as having properly granted employer's motion for judgment on pleadings in employee's civil action againsthim. *Rymer v. Hagler (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1171, 1180, 1182, 1183, 260 Cal. Rptr. 76*

In statutory action under *Lab. Code § 3706*, when employer fails to secure payment of workers' compensation as required by *Lab. Code § 3700*, employee as obligated to both plead and prove violation of *Lab. Code § 3700* and employer's failure to carry workers' compensation insurance. *Campos Food Fair v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 965, 968, 238 Cal. Rptr. 685*

Defense of comparative negligence as unavailable to employer by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3708* in action at law by employee for personal injuries against employer who fails to secure workers' compensation insurance coverage. *Logan v. Masters (1981) 120 Cal. App. 3d 145, 148, 174 Cal. Rptr. 465*

Decision of WCAB, when final, as res judicata, in subsequent superior action, on issue of insurance. *Jones v. Brown (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 513, 522, 89 Cal. Rptr. 651*

Employer's failure to comply with requirement to carry workers' compensation insurance [*Lab. Code § 3700*] as not to be inferred if complaint silent on that subject. *Singleton v. Bonnesen (1955) 131 Cal. App. 2d 327, 331, 280 P.2d 481*

Employer-employee relationship as element of cause of action under *Lab. Code § 3706*; employee as without rights under that section if employer not subject to workers' compensation and insurance laws. *Mantonya v. Bratlie (1948)*

33 Cal. 2d 120, 124-125, 199 P.2d 677

Employer's failure to pay compensation as not constituting failure to secure compensation and, therefore, as not giving right of action under *Lab. Code § 3706*. *Pecor v. Norton-Lilly Co. (1931) 111 Cal. App. 241, 243, 295 P. 582*

Provision of predecessor to *Lab. Code § 3709* for attorney's fees as constitutional. *Marshall v. Foote (1927) 81 Cal. App. 98, 103-104, 252 P. 1075*

[r] Unlicensed Contractors

Contractor's license is automatically suspended, pursuant to Lab. Code § 7125.2(a)(2), for failure to *obtain* workers' compensation insurance, whereas, pursuant to Lab. Code § 7125.2(a)(1), suspension of license for failure to *maintain* workers' compensation insurance requires notice from registrar of contractors. *Wright v. Issak (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1116, 1121-1123, 58 Cal. Rptr. 3d 1*

Plaintiff, injured while repairing defendant's roof, was defendant's employee pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5*, which operated to allow plaintiff's lawsuit alleging defendant's negligence, despite fact that plaintiff, by virtue of *Lab. Code § 3352(h)*, was not employee of defendant for workers' compensation purposes, when court of appeal found that plaintiff was not licensed roofing contractor and, therefore, not independent contractor. *Mendoza v. Brodeur (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 72, 79-81, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 310*

Injured worker, employed by unlicensed contractor to repair homeowner's roof, and who had not worked on that job for statutorily required number of hours to qualify as employee of homeowner, nevertheless remained employee of contractor for purposes of assigning liability for injury, so that worker was eligible to receive benefits from Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] and to pursue tort remedies against contractor in civil court. *Cedillo v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 227, 232, 236-237, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 581*

Unlicensed contractor and its employees as matter of law as employees of person hiring work done and unable to maintain civil action against hirer for damages for injuries at workplace but as required to resort to exclusive remedy of workers' compensation. *Campos Food Fair v. Superior Court (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 965, 967*

[s] Unsafe Workplace

Employer's conduct of providing employees with hazardous chemical substance to clean film processing laboratory, concealing known unsafe working conditions, and violating environmental safety regulations was within compensation bargain, making workers' compensation benefits employees' exclusive remedy. *Gunnell v. Metrocolor Laboratories, Inc. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 710, 714, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 195*

Workers' compensation as sole remedy for employee injured by employer's failure to provide safe workplace; exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law as not avoided by worker's alleging in tort action against employer fraud in the inducement (misrepresentations by employer of safety precautions taken and to be taken to protect worker from burglars made to induce worker to accept employment after worker had said she did not wish to do so because she feared working alone at night at shop where burglary had recently occurred) when worker sustained injury resulting from employer's alleged fraud, discovered alleged fraud only during employment relationship, and injury (fractured jaw and skull) arose out of and in course of employment relationship. *Spratley v. Winchell Donut House, Inc. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1408, 1412-1413, 234 Cal. Rptr. 121*

Failure to assure safe working environment as not creating exception to exclusive remedy provisions of workers'

compensation law. *Halliman v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 46, 51, 209 Cal. Rptr. 175*

[t] Vicarious Liability

Complaint against parent corporation for negligence and wrongful death was subject to demurrer, when it alleged that parent controlled budget of its subsidiary and thereby prevented subsidiary from replacing or repairing dangerous and improperly maintained trash truck that killed decedent employee, for whose death plaintiffs were receiving workers' compensation benefits, since complaint did not allege any independent tort committed by parent, and plaintiffs' claim that parent caused unsafe working conditions by controlling subsidiary's fiscal policies and management decisions was nothing more than claim that parent was responsible for acts or omissions of subsidiary, in which case parent was sheltered by exclusive remedy rule. *Waste Mgmt., Inc. v. Superior Court (2004) 119 Cal. App. 4th 105, 111-114, 13 Cal. Rptr. 3d 910*

Based on reasoning in *Privette*, injured employee is barred from pursuing personal injury action against non-negligent member of joint venture or enterprise when another member of joint venture negligently injures employee and provides workers' compensation coverage. *Orosco v. Sun-Diamond Corp. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1659, 1669-1670, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179*

Parent corporation is not liable in tort under theories of alter ego and vicarious liability for actions of subsidiary corporation when heirs of decedent employees of subsidiary corporation brought suit for negligence and premises liability against parent corporation and exclusivity doctrine precluded suit against subsidiary corporation. *Doney v. TRW, Inc. (1995) 33 Cal. App. 4th 245, 249-250, 39 Cal. Rptr. 2d 292*

[u] Wrongful Death Actions

Medi-Cal lien could not be asserted against wrongful death action, when damages recoverable by plaintiff in that action did not and could not include compensation for medical services provided to decedent by Medi-Cal, since in California wrongful death action is cause of action in favor of heirs as beneficiaries, based on their own independent pecuniary injury suffered by loss of relative, distinct from any action that deceased might have maintained, had he or she survived, so that damages awarded in wrongful death action are for harm done to survivors, not to deceased. *Fitch v. Select Products Co. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 812, 819-822, 115 P.3d 1233*

Wrongful death action by parents of minor employee against employer as barred by exclusive remedy doctrine when minor died in automobile accident on way home from work after being required to work beyond statutorily prescribed hours for minors; "special risk" exception to going and coming rule applicable as employer subjected minor to risk of automobile accident due to exhaustion. *Johnson v. Stratlaw, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1162-1164, 274 Cal. Rptr. 363*

Death action against employer by nondependent heirs of deceased employee as barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law (*Lab. Code §§ 3601, 3602*); legislative intention in its 1982 amendment of *Lab. Code § 3600* and its division of former *Lab. Code § 3601* into two sections, one addressed to suits against coemployees [*Lab. Code § 3601*] and other to actions against employers [*Lab. Code § 3602*] as intended to accommodate changes in dual capacity doctrine and include new exception for power press accidents and not to overthrow long established principles of law and precedent by permitting actions at law by nondependent heirs, notwithstanding fact that *Lab. Code § 3602* makes workers' compensation sole and exclusive remedy of employee or his or her "dependents" against employer. *Hisel v. County of Los Angeles (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 969, 972-979, 238 Cal. Rptr. 678* (tracing legislative and case history of relevant code provisions)

Action by widow and minor children of employee of company under contract with United States Army who was killed

clearing unexploded ordinance and other debris from former hand grenade range for damages for wrongful death, ultrahazardous substance and activity, and fraud as barred by exclusive remedy provisions of *Lab. Code §§ 3600, 3601*, and *4553* for work-related injuries and death when harm complained of was not aggravation of work-related injury but injury itself and no facts were adduced indicating that employer intended that employee be injured; moreover, there is no exception to the exclusivity provisions based on "substantial certainty" of harm from employer's misconduct. *Stalnaker v. Boeing Co. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1291, 1296, 1298-1301, 231 Cal. Rptr. 323*

Parent of deceased employee as barred from bringing wrongful death action by *Lab. Code §§ 3600* and *3601*, even though parent is nondependent and therefore not entitled to recover under workers' compensation law. *Seide v. Bethlehem Steel Corp. (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 985, 990-991, 215 Cal. Rptr. 629*

Workers' compensation as exclusive remedy barring action for wrongful death of employee brought by nondependent heirs and personal representatives of deceased employee. *Soil Engineering Construction, Inc. v. Superior Court (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 329, 333, 186 Cal. Rptr. 209*

[v] Wrongful Discharge

Exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation system as not barring court action for tortious discharge in violation of public policy. *Gantt v. Sentry Insurance (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 1083, 1101, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 824 P.2d 680* ; *City of Moorpark v. Superior Court (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1143, 1155, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 445, 959 P.2d 752*

Employee allegedly terminated for questioning employer about illegal payroll deduction stated cause of action for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy based on fundamental and substantial public policy, embodied in various Labor Code provisions and *Code Civ. Proc. § 487.020*, protecting employee's right to receive his or her wages. *Phillips v. Gemini Moving Specialists (1998) 63 Cal. App. 4th 563, 571-574, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

Trial court erred in entering summary judgment against plaintiff on his cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy, when evidence created triable issue of fact as to whether plaintiff was constructively terminated from his employment as result of harassment in violation of fundamental public policy against sexual orientation discrimination. *Kovatch v. California Casualty Management Co., Inc. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1256, 1275, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

Employee had a claim under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) when he alleged he was terminated due to a non-industrial bone defect, and not because an industrial injury rendered him unfit to work. *Jimeno v. Mobil Oil Corp. (9th Cir. 1995) 66 F.3d 1514, 1535*

"Litigation specialist" for insurance company as failing to state cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy when he alleged that he was terminated for refusing to artificially inflate case reserves, a practice which he alleged violated Proposition 103; neither Proposition 103 nor any other statute as restricting amount of case reserves an insurer must set aside. *Sequoia Ins. Co. v. Superior Court (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 1472, 1480-1481, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 888*

Employee as failing to state cause of action for wrongful termination in violation of public policy when she was terminated for requesting six-month medical leave and public policy allegedly violated was statutory requirement that employer maintain safe and healthful workplace (*Lab. Code §§ 6401, 6403*); employee's contention that statutes cited by employee support public policy of encouraging proper medical care as rejected by court. *Davaris v. Cubaleski (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 1583, 1588-1589, 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 330*

Workers' compensation law as not preempting employee's cause of action against former employer for wrongful

termination of employment in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (*Gov. Code § 12900 et seq.*), when employee alleged he was discharged in retaliation for his efforts to prevent a subordinate from being sexually harassed. *Flait v. North American Watch Corp. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 467, 475-478, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 522*

Generalized statements by supervisor to employee concerning supervisor's intent to assist employee in finding replacement employment as not sufficient to take case out of ambit of workers' compensation because to hold otherwise would exempt all cases of physical or emotional injury resulting from termination from workers' compensation system simply by claiming that employer led employee to believe he or she would not be fired. *Kacludis v. GTE Sprint Communications Corp. (N.D. Cal. 1992) 806 F. Supp. 866, 871*

Employee's cause of action against employer for tortious discharge against public policy, when employee was allegedly terminated in retaliation for testifying truthfully in official investigation of coworker's sexual harassment claim, as not barred by exclusive remedy provisions of compensation law, because employer's alleged misconduct could not be considered a normal part of the employment relationship or a risk reasonably encompassed within the compensation bargain. *Gantt v. Sentry Insurance (1992) 1 Cal. 4th 1083, 1100-1101, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 874, 824 P.2d 680*

Termination of employment, and events leading up to termination, as "normal part of the employment relationship" for purposes of the exclusive remedy doctrine; thus, civil action to recover damages for emotional injuries sustained as result of termination of employment, or events leading up to termination, as barred by exclusive remedy doctrine unless the injury is the result of conduct that does not "reasonably [come] within the compensation bargain." *Shoemaker v. Myers (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 1, 17-20, 276 Cal. Rptr. 303, 801 P.2d 1054* (holding that violation of former *Gov. Code § 19683* (protecting governmental "whistleblowers" from discipline and discharge and expressly allowing civil damages action for such violations) is outside scope of compensation bargain and constitutes statutory exception to workers' compensation exclusive remedy provisions)

Settlement of workers' compensation claim for psychic injuries producing continuing disability for which former employee agreed to release and forever discharge employer from all claims and causes of action known or that might thereafter develop as result of injury as not barring former employee's claim that employer breached covenant of good faith and fair dealing by unfairly and in bad faith depriving employee of right to receive benefits of employment by discharging her; under California doctrine of primary rights, right protected by workers' compensation law as right not to be physically or emotionally injured on the job, whereas right protected by covenant of good faith is right not to be unfairly deprived of benefits of employment; release of claims in workers' compensation settlement as not eliminating right to pursue other remedies for invasion of other interests in other forums, absent a specific provision to that effect. *Ortiz v. Bank of America Nat. Trust and Sav. Ass'n (9th Cir. 1988) 852 F.2d 383, 388*

[35] Federal Law

Supremacy clause of U.S. Const., art. VI, as not barring state from enforcing its workers' compensation law against private operator of federally owned nuclear production facility under contract to Department of Energy; such application of state law as authorized by *40 U.S.C. § 290* [now *40 U.S.C. § 3172*]. *Goodyear Atomic Corp. v. Miller (1988) 486 U.S. 174, 176, 182, 182 n.4, 108 S. Ct. 1704, 100 L. Ed. 2d 158* (Ohio law providing for increased workers' compensation award for injuries resulting from employer's violation of state safety regulation)

[36] Federal-State Jurisdiction

California Lab. Code § 3700, which requires employers to maintain workers' compensation coverage, is not preempted by ERISA, the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Arbitration Act, or the Labor Management Relations Act. *Contract Services Network, Inc. v. Aubry (9th Cir. 1995) 62 F.3d 294, 297*

California's insistence on a separately administered workers' compensation plan (*Lab. Code § 3700*) as not relating to ERISA covered plan but rather to plan that is specifically exempt from ERISA regulation and not preempted by *ERISA. Barker v. Pick N Pull Auto Dismantlers, Inc. (E.D. Cal. 1993) 819 F. Supp. 889, 894*

Exclusive remedy section of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act [*33 U.S.C. § 905(a)*] did not bar shore-based maritime employee's tort action against employer under *Lab. Code §§ 3602(a)* and *4558*, in which employee alleged that his injury was cause by employer's removal of or failure to install guard on power press. *Lenane v. Continental Maritime of San Diego, Inc. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1073, 1089, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 121*

Concurrent federal-state jurisdiction over actions for personal injuries occurring in outer continental shelf. *Bobbitt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 845, 848-849, 192 Cal. Rptr. 267*

Applicability of maritime law in cases within maritime jurisdiction as exclusive and Industrial Accident Commission (now WCAB) as having no jurisdiction to award compensation in these cases. *De Court v. Beckman Instruments, Inc. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 628, 633, 108 Cal. Rptr. 109*

[37] Firefighters

Wage premium mandated by federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), *29 U.S.C. § 207(k)(2)*, was not included as part of firefighter's salary in lieu of disability compensation when firefighter, by virtue of his disability, had not worked number of hours required by FLSA to earn premium. *Fenn v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 107 Cal. App. 4th 1292, 1296-1298, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 878*

Fire recruit injured during training was not firefighter within meaning of *Lab. Code § 4850* and was excluded from receiving leave of absence benefits under *Lab. Code § 4850(b)*, based on that statute and employer's fire recruit job description. *City of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 94 Cal. App. 4th 1304, 1308-1310, 115 Cal. Rptr. 2d 63*

Injured paramedic who operated from city fire station, wore firefighter's gear, and had some of same training and duties as firefighters as entitled under *Lab. Code § 4850* (city, county, or district firefighters) to leave of absence without loss of salary in lieu of less generous temporary disability benefits, when emergency medical services routinely provided by paramedic were also occasionally performed by firefighters. *Charles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 781, 782-784, 248 Cal. Rptr. 805*

[38] Going and Coming Rule; Exceptions

Defendant employer failed to show that there were no triable issues of material fact as to whether its employee was acting within course and scope of his employment at time of automobile accident that injured plaintiffs, when defendant employee had attended three-day, out-of-town business conference, flew back to home airport and retrieved his car from airport parking lot, on his way home drove around studio complex where his office was located without stopping and took his normal route home until he was involved in collision that gave rise to present cause of action, so that employee's attendance at business conference may be considered special errand/special mission, and that, when employee intended to drive home from this errand/mission, errand/mission was not concluded simply because employee drove his regular commute route. *Jeewarat v. Warner Brothers Entertainment, Inc. (2009) 177 Cal. App. 4th 427, 431, 436-439, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 837*

Employee who, upon leaving her mother's home where she had gone to visit, was injured while driving 136 miles to keep medical appointment for treatment of her industrial injuries, did not suffer new compensable injuries because those injuries were sustained outside reasonable geographic area of her employer's risk for incurring compensability liability

for such injuries. *Esquivel v. W.C.A.B. (2009) 178 Cal. App. 4th 330, 333-334, 344-345, 100 Cal. Rptr. 3d 380*

Employee's injury held not industrial since accident occurred after business portion of trip was complete and while employee and his wife were engaged in non-industrial sightseeing in Italy, and with no continuing or resumed business purpose employee was neither commercial traveler nor on special mission for employer at time of accident. *Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Moody) (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1316, 1323-1331, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587*

"Commercial traveler rule" of workers' compensation law could not be incorporated into respondeat superior doctrine of civil tort law, so that plaintiff in civil tort action could not join alleged tortfeasor's employer as defendant when alleged tort occurred while employee was engaged in activity not occurring within scope of his employment, as would be required for invocation of respondeat superior doctrine, even though employee was commercial traveler within workers' compensation law at time of allegedly committing alleged tort. *Sunderland v. Lockheed Martin Aeronautical Systems Support Co. (2005) 130 Cal. App. 4th 1, 10-12, 29 Cal. Rptr. 3d 665*

In civil tort action, defendant's employee held not to have been acting within scope of her employment when she hit plaintiff and his dog with her car on her way into defendant's parking lot, when court found that "premises line" rule, as used in workers' compensation law, did not apply in civil tort cases involving going-and-coming rule for purposes of respondeat superior, that "scope of employment" for purposes of respondeat superior was more restrictive than "arising out of and in course of employment" for workers' compensation, and that premises line rule, developed in context of policies behind workers' compensation, did not fit policy justification for making employers vicariously liable for their employee's torts. *Hartline v. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 458, 465-470, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 713*

Police officer injured on his day off while traveling from home to courthouse where he was to testify under subpoena about police matters was barredfrom workers' compensation benefits by "going and coming rule," and special mission exception did not apply, since testifying was not extraordinary in relation to officer's routine duties. *City of San Diego v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1385, 1388-1389, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 510*

Special risk exception to going and coming rule was not applicable to employee injured on his way to work since driving on street near employer's facility did not subject employee to distinct or quantitatively greater risk than members of general public would be subjected to while driving on same street. *GE Engine Maintenance v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 69 Cal. App. 4th 1528, 1533, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 199*

Wrongful death action by parents of minor employee against employer as barred by exclusive remedy doctrine when minor died in automobile accident on way home from work after being required to work beyond statutorily prescribed hours for minors; "special risk" exception to going and coming rule applicable as employer subjected minor to risk of automobile accident due to exhaustion. *Johnson v. Stratlaw, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1162-1164, 274 Cal. Rptr. 363*

When coemployee is injured off employer's premises under circumstances in which workers' compensation would have been barred by going and coming rule but resulted from "special risk" causally related to employment and was sustained within field of that risk, injured coemployee's claim as coming within exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law and tort action by coemployee against employer as barred. *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 798, 800-816, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641*

Going and coming rule, broadly stated, as prohibiting compensation for injuries received while traveling to and from work; rule as subject to numerous exceptions. *Parks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 585, 588-589, 190 Cal. Rptr. 158, 660 P.2d 382* ; *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 802, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641* ; *Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1419, 1422, 232 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 922, 927-928, 232 Cal. Rptr. 257*

Special risk exception to going and coming rule. *Parks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 585, 589-590, 592-593, 190 Cal. Rptr. 158, 660 P.2d 382* ; *Johnson v. Stratlaw, Inc. (1990) 224 Cal. App. 3d 1156, 1162-1164, 274 Cal. Rptr. 363* ; *Lefebvre v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 745, 750, 165 Cal. Rptr. 246*

Special errand or special mission exception to going and coming rule. *Southern California Rapid Transit Dist., Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 158, 166-167, 151 Cal. Rptr. 666, 588 P.2d 806* ; *Guest v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 670, 672-674, 87 Cal. Rptr. 193, 470 P.2d 1* ; *Felix v. Asai (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 926, 931, 237 Cal. Rptr. 718* (involving injury to third party rather than injury to employee); *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 802, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641* ; *Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1419, 1422-1425, 232 Cal. Rptr. 465* ; *Perez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 60, 63-64, 199 Cal. Rptr. 280*

No exception to going and coming rule applied to on-call employee having status as a peace officer, who carried a gun and pager but was not wearinga uniform when he left house to go to work and was injured in a slip and fall before entering car furnished by employer. *State Lottery Com. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 50 Cal. App. 4th 311, 318, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 745*

Rule that compensation for injuries sustained during uncompensated meal breaks away from employer's premises is denied under aegis of "going and coming" rule, on ground employer-employee relationship is suspended during that period because employer does not pay for employee's services and employee provides no benefits in return, as inapplicable when employee, whether salaried or paid at hourly rate, is compensated during lunch break; by such arrangement, employer as impliedly agreeing that service will continue during such period and worker as entitled to compensation benefits for any injuries sustained during lunch break. *McFadden v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 279, 281-283, 249 Cal. Rptr. 778*

Special mission exception to going and coming rule as applicable when employee is requested to perform unusual service or usual service at an odd hour; trip as becoming "special" because bother and effort of trip itself is important part of what employee is being compensated for. *Luna v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 77, 82, 244 Cal. Rptr. 596*

Uniformed officer on-call exception to going and coming rule as existing when peace officer is injured while engaged in off-duty conduct reasonably directed toward fulfillment of employer's requirements and performed for benefit and advantage of employer; decisions upholding awards on this theory as invariably involving employers who expect to receive benefit of their employees' service during the commute; factors to be considered as including whether (1) express policy or routine practice exists, (2) failure to render services may result in disciplinary measures, (3) employee was in uniform at time of incident, and (4) employer provides on-site accommodation for changing or storing clothing and equipment. *Luna v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 77, 83-84, 244 Cal. Rptr. 596*

Exception to going and coming rule when employee consumes alcohol in scope of his or her employment, which consumption creates a risk of danger, and that risk was proximate cause of accident and of plaintiff's injuries, even though accident occurred while employee was going home from work. *Childers v. Shasta Livestock Auction Yard, Inc. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 792, 802-803, 235 Cal. Rptr. 641*

Commercial traveler exception to going and coming rule. *Hartford Acc. & Indem. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 132 Cal. App. 3d 796, 805, 183 Cal. Rptr. 440*

[39] Independent Contractors

In wrongful death action brought by deceased worker's parents, California Supreme Court held that homeowners neither had nor breached any statutory duty of care owed to deceased worker under *Penal Code § 385(b)*, which provides that "[a]ny person who either personally or through an employee or agent, or as an employee or agent of another, operates ... or moves any tools ... [or] equipment ... within six feet of a high voltage overhead conductor is guilty of a misdemeanor," since worker for unlicensed contractor, who, through his own conduct, breached duty of care embodied in *Penal Code § 385(b)* and was killed while trimming trees on defendant homeowners' property, was not one of class of persons for whose protection statute was adopted. *Ramirez v. Nelson (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 908, 917-920, 80 Cal. Rptr. 3d 728, 188 P.3d 659*

Lab. Code § 6304.5, as amended effective January 1, 2000, allows plaintiffs to use Cal-OSHA provisions to show duty or standard of care to same extent as any other regulation or statute, whether defendant is plaintiff's employer or third party. *Elsner v. Uveges (2004) 34 Cal. 4th 915, 927-928, 935-936, 22 Cal. Rptr. 3d 530, 102 P.3d 915*

Court of appeal affirmed the trial court's judgment that plaintiffs, representatives of class of parcel and message drivers/deliverers, were independent contractors, not defendant's employees, when court of appeal held that trial court's jury instructions properly placed burden on defendant of rebutting the *Lab. Code § 3357* presumption that plaintiffs were defendant's employees and properly instructed jury as to factors to consider in resolving whether plaintiffs were independent contractors. *Cristler v. Express Messenger Systems (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 72, 79-90, 89 Cal. Rptr. 3d 34*

Lab. Code § 2750.5, which creates rebuttable presumption that unlicensed person who performs work requiring license is employee, not independent contractor, was irrelevant because statute's presumption of employee status may be rebutted only as to persons who hold valid contractor's license, which plaintiff did not at time of his injury, and substantial evidence supported trial court's finding that plaintiff was estopped to assert that he was employee because he had misrepresented himself to defendants as licensed contractor. *Chin v. Namvar (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 994, 1006-1009, 83 Cal. Rptr. 3d 294*

Substantial evidence supported determination by Department of Industrial Relations that drivers for plaintiff courier service were functioning as employees rather than as true independent contractors, and court of appeal found that question of hiree's status must be considered in light of history and remedial and social purposes of Workers' Compensation Act, and court of appeal followed *S.G. Borello & Sons, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations [(1989) 48 Cal. 3d 341, 256 Cal. Rptr. 543, 769 P.2d 399]* , in finding that functions performed by drivers did not require high degree of skill, that these functions constituted integral heart of plaintiff's courier service business, that, by obtaining clients in need of this service and providing workers to conduct it, plaintiff retained all "necessary" control over operation as a whole, and that these circumstances were enough to find employment relationship for purposes of Workers' Compensation Act, even in absence of plaintiff's exercise of control over details of work and with plaintiff being more concerned with results of work than with means of its accomplishment. *JKH Enterprises, Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 1046, 1059-1066, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 563*

Exemption from contractor's license requirement contained in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7049* for construction or maintenance work incidental to "clearingor other work upon the land in rural districts for fire prevention purposes" meant that trial court erred in ruling that defendant was employee as matter of law pursuant to *Lab. Code § 2750.5*. *Moehring v. Thomas (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 1515, 1520-1525, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 118*

Licensed contractor who had filed required statement that he had no employees, thereby exempting himself from coverage pursuant to workers' compensation laws, and who subsequently hired employee who was then injured in course of employment, did not, ipso facto, suffer suspension of his contractor's license pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*, but instead, by virtue of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 7125.2(a)*, retained license because license board was required to "notify any licensee who fails to maintain workers' compensation that his or her license shall be automatically

suspended 30 days from the date of the notice" and must "provide the licensee with an additional notice that informs the licensee of the suspension date, the cause for suspension, and reinstatement procedures," and these notices had not been sent to contractor. *Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 117, 124-134, 116 Cal. Rptr. 2d 728*

Exclusive remedy doctrine barred plaintiff's civil claims against property owner, when plaintiff was working for contractor hired by property owner who was unlicensed on date of plaintiff's injury and was, therefore, treated as employee of property owner under *Lab. Code § 2750.5*; fact that contractor was licensed at time he contracted with property owner was not dispositive of plaintiff's employment status when contractor was unlicensed on date of injury. *Zellers v. Playa Pacifica, Ltd. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 129, 134-135, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 919*

Truck drivers hired by trucking broker are independent contractors as matter of law when truckers (1) had complete control over working conditions, (2) could terminate contracts or be terminated at will, (3) were engaged in distinct occupation and had own trade association, (4) could work for other businesses, (5) made capital investments in providing own trucks, (6) were compensated by job and could refuse any assignment without retribution, and (7) expressly and voluntarily agreed to independent contractor status. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Brown (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 188, 203, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 98*

"Peculiar risk" doctrine, which imposes liability on a principal for harm to "others" caused by the negligence of an independent contractor, including the contractor's employees, as not providing a basis for holding a principal liable for injuries suffered by the contractor himself or herself. *Torres v. Reardon (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 831, 839-841, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 52*

Question of whether a person who is engaged to perform services for another is an employee or an independent contractor as ordinarily a question of fact, but if onlyone inference may be drawn from all of the facts, that question as one of law. *Torres v. Reardon (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 831, 838, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 52*

Self-employed gardener as independent contractor, as a matter of law, when he was engaged to produce a result and the means by which the result was to be produced were not discussed and were not part of any agreement, the work was performed in the course of the gardener's independently established business in which he customarily engaged, he supplied the equipment, he was not hired by the day or hour but by the job, the work wasnot ordinarily done in the course of the clients' business, the gardener had a substantial investment in his business, and he had employees who assisted him. *Torres v. Reardon (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 831, 837-838, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 52*

Injured agricultural worker as not employed solely by uninsured crew supervisor who had agreed with grower to prune and harvest growers' almond trees; crew supervisor as not independent contractor due to grower's power of control over performance of work, and injured worker as therefore employee of grower for purposes of workers' compensation. *Rinaldi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 227 Cal. App. 3d 756, 760-765, 278 Cal. Rptr. 105*

Lab. Code § 2750.5, creating rebuttable presumption that worker performing services for which contractor's license is required is employee and not independent contractor, as applying to workers' compensation cases, and, regardless of factors contained in *Lab. Code § 2750.5(a)-(c)*, valid contractor's license as necessary condition of independent contractor status; hence, licensed contractor that employed unlicensed subcontractor, who falsely represented to contractor that he had contractor's license, as liable as matter of law to employee of unlicensed subcontractor for workers' compensation benefits for injuries sustained on job, and employee as not estopped to deny subcontractor's independent contractor status. *Nick Hagopian Drywall v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 767, 770-773, 251 Cal. Rptr. 455*

Licensed general contractor who contracted with homeowners to remodel their home as liable under *Lab. Code § 2750.5* for workers' compensation paid by Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] to injured employee of uninsured subcontractor who had subcontracted to finish job; even if subcontractor,

who falsely represented to contractor that he was licensed, was estopped to deny that he was unlicensed and hence able to claim workers' compensation benefits against licensed contractor, subcontractor's employee, who made no misrepresentations and held no license, as not in privity with subcontractor and hence as not estopped to claim workers' compensation benefits for job-related injury against licensed but uninsured contractor. *Rinaldi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 217, 221-227, 244 Cal. Rptr. 637*

Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] as not estopped to claim reimbursement from licensed but uninsured contractor of sums paid under compromise and release to injured employee of unlicensed and uninsured subcontractor who misrepresented his licensed status to contractor. *Rinaldi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 217, 224-227, 244 Cal. Rptr. 637*

Illegally unlicensed subcontractor hired as independent contractor to do roofing on construction project as employee of general contractor as matter of law under *Lab. Code § 2750.5*; subcontractor's employee as employee of general contractor as well and barred by exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law from suing general contractor in tort for injuries sustained on project. *Blew v. Horner (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1383-1390, 232 Cal. Rptr. 660*

Workers' compensation liability for employees of unlicensed subcontractor as imposed on general contractor as matter of law, whereas workers' compensation liability of general contractor for employees of licensed subcontractorwho is unlawfully uninsured for workers' compensation as question of fact. *Blew v. Horner (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1380, 1390 n.5, 232 Cal. Rptr. 660*

Right to control as dominant criterion and most significant test in determining whether worker is employee or independent contractor. *Muffett v. Royster (1983) 147 Cal. App. 3d 289, 302, 195 Cal. Rptr. 73*

Tests for determining whether alleged third-party tortfeasor is in fact employee's employer and hence insulated from employee's action for damages by workers' compensation laws as being same in workers' compensation cases as in factors to be considered. *Gigax v. Ralston Purina Co. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 591, 599-601, 186 Cal. Rptr. 395*

[40] Injuries

Substantial evidence supported WCAB's decision that employee was not injured AOE/COE when, on his way to work as correctional officer for California Department of Corrections, employee stopped to render aid at accident scene and was injured when oncoming car struck truck involved in original accident and truck struck employee, when court of appeal found that employee had no peace officer status outside grounds of prison where he worked, that employee was not on duty at time of injury, and that there was no evidence that employee was paid for stopping to help at accident scene. *Pettigrew v. W.C.A.B. (2006) 143 Cal. App. 4th 397, 405-408, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 922*

Employee who suffers from a psychoneurotic injury arising out of his or her employment as entitled to receive compensation benefits. *Save Mart Stores v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 720, 724, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 597*

Under workers' compensation law, compensation as awardable for any injury or disease arising out of and in course of employment. *Kyles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 614, 619, 240 Cal. Rptr. 886*

Compensable injuries under workers' compensation law as generally falling into one of four categories: (1) specific injuries incurred as result of one incident or exposure in employment, effects of which are realized or realizable; (2) industrial injuries suffered as result of specific incident or exposure that have latent effects; (3) continuous cumulative traumatic injuries suffered as result of number of minor strains over period of time; and (4) cumulative injuries, such as

silicosis, resulting from continuous exposure to harmful substance. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 812, 817, 82 Cal. Rptr. 102*

[41] Insurance Carriers

Insurer's alleged failure to properly investigate third-party responsibility for accident suffered by insured's employee, resulting in allegedly unreasonably low settlement of insurer's claim against third party, causing increase in insured's workers' compensation insurance premiums, did not give rise to cause of action for tortious breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing or cause of action for breach of contract. *Tilbury Constructors, Inc. v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (2006) 137 Cal. App. 4th 466, 474-482, 40 Cal. Rptr. 3d 392*

Workers' compensation insurer's civil action against illegally uninsured employer for reimbursement of award of benefits to employee for cumulative trauma waspermitted by *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)* as exception to exclusive remedy rule, and jurisdiction of action was not limited to Appeals Board. *Graphics Arts Mutual Ins. Co. v. Time Travel Internat., Inc (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 405, 413-415*

Injured worker's civil action against his employer's worker's compensation insurer for malicious prosecution of insurance fraud criminal complaint against worker is not barred by exclusive remedy rule of workers' compensation law. *Mosby v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 995, 999, 1004-1006, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 286*

Workers' compensation insurer for employee leasing company held to have engaged in breach of contract, insurance bad faith, and fraud when it denied coverage to injured employee working for contractor to whom leasing company had leased employees. *Diamond Woodworks, Inc. v. Argonaut Insurance Co. (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1020, 1030-1049, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 736*

Insurer's duty of good faith and fair dealing with insured includes setting reserves at reasonable expectation of claim's value. *Lance Camper Mfg. Corp. v. Republic Indemnity Co. (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 1151, 1156-1159, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 515*

Employer was not required to exhaust administrative remedies before bringing a civil action for breach of contract and bad faith challenging the claims handling practices of its workers' compensation insurer. *Lance Camper Manufacturing Corp. v. Republic Indemnity Co. of America (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 194, 204, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 622*

[42] Insurance Fraud

Civil action for violation of *Ins. Code § 1871.7(b)* arising from fraudulent acts made unlawful by *Pen. Code § 550(a)(10)* did not violate exclusive remedy provision of workers' compensation law, and preponderance of evidence was appropriate standard of proof for liability under *Ins. Code § 1871.7*. *People v. Thompson (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 24, 29-31, 37-38, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 677*

Court of appeal, affirming trial court's order that struck employer's complaint that alleged employee's filing of fraudulent workers' compensation claim, held that employer failed to demonstrate probability that it would prevail on the merits of its fraud claim because the employer could not establish either of two elements of a cause of action for fraud, justifiable reliance or resulting damages, and court of appeal found that permitting employer to bring civil action for fraud against employee while workers' compensation proceeding was pending could have chilling effect on employee's exercise of right to file workers' compensation claim. *Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. Diaz (2005) 131 Cal. App. 4th 1517, 1523-1527, 33 Cal. Rptr. 3d 139*

Worker convicted of fraudulent misrepresentation in acquisition of medically required special footwear, and ordered by

court to make restitution, was barred from receiving only future reimbursement for further purchases of shoes, and when worker failed to make restitution as ordered, credit sought by defrauded insurer against other medical treatment was held impermissible bar of benefits not directly emanating from the fraud. *Farmers Insurance Group v. W.C.A.B. (Sanchez) (2002) 104 Cal. App. 4th 684, 690-691, 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 353*

Employee's false statements and misrepresentations made on deposition are sufficient to support a conviction pursuant to *Ins. Code § 1871.4(a)(1).* *People v. Post (2001) 94 Cal. App. 4th 467, 475-476, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 356*

Workers' compensation insurer was entitled to restitution for losses resulting from employee's fraudulent claim, when employee pled no contest to fraud under *Lab. Code § 3207* and *Ins. Code § 1871.4(a)(1)* and court found insurer was a direct crime victim under *Pen. Code § 1202.4.* *People v. O'Casey (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 967, 973, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 263*

Civil courts have jurisdiction to order restitution in cases of workers' compensation insurance fraud under *Ins. Code § 1871.4.* *People v. Amin (2000) 85 Cal. App. 4th 58, 64, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 756*

Employee's intentional concealment of prior injuries for purposes of obtaining workers' compensation benefits was "material" under *Ins. Code § 1871.4(a)* despite his claim that prior injuries caused no residual disability, when failure to disclose prior injuries misled QMEs into attributing employee's knee condition to industrial causes and effectively precluded employer from raising apportionment as a defense. *People v. Gillard (1997) 57 Cal. App. 4th 136, 153, 66 Cal. Rptr. 2d 790*

[43] Joint Ventures and Partnerships

No joint enterprise existed between injured employee's employer and various other companies, when other companies had no control over production or sale of employer's goods, did not share profits with employer, and had no ownership interest in employer's assets. *Orosco v. Sun-Diamond Corp. (1997) 51 Cal. App. 4th 1659, 1670, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 179*

Although employee of joint venture or partnership is employee of each joint venturer or partner, employee of one joint venturer or partner as not, as matter of law, also employee of joint venture or partnership itself or other joint venturers or partners and therefore not limited to his or her workers' compensation remedy in seeking recovery of damages from other joint venturers or partners for injuries sustained on work of joint venture or partnership as result of their negligence. *Rogness v. English Moss Joint Venturers (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 190, 191, 193-194, 239 Cal. Rptr. 387*

[44] Judicial Review

[a] Effect of Appeals Board Decisions on Appellate Courts

Although WCAB cases denied writ of review by the Court of Appeal are not binding authority on the appellate courts, they are citable authority as to the holding of the *WCAB. Ralph's Grocery Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 820, 827, n.7, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197*

Decision of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board reported in California Workers' Compensation Reporter as properly citable authority, especially as indication of contemporaneous interpretation and application of workers' compensation laws. *Griffith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1264 n.2, 257 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Decisions of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board as not binding on appellate courts, and denial of review by appellate court of board decisions as not necessarily indicating court's agreement with board's decision on issues

presented. *Leeth v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1550, 1556 n.5, 231 Cal. Rptr. 468*

[b] WCAB Orders

WCAB finding on reconsideration that employee was not entitled to *Lab. Code § 5402* presumption of compensability was a "final order" subject to a petition for writ of review because finding conclusively determined a substantial issue central to employee's entitlement to benefits, even though matter was remanded for new trial on all issues. *Maranian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1078-1081, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 418*

Order of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, following board's granting reconsideration of workers' compensation judge's allowance to employer of credit against its compensation liability for injured employee's recovery in settlement of related medical malpractice action, in which board determined that *Civ. Code § 3333.1*, abolishing collateral source rule in medical malpractice cases, does not preclude employer from asserting such a credit and in which board remanded case to workers' compensation judge for determination of extent of employer's credit rights, as threshhold determination and as appealable even though case was not final. *Graham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 499, 503, 258 Cal. Rptr. 376*

Whether court must entertain review of interim order of appeals board as essentially in hands of board; if board permits reconsideration under *Lab. Code § 5900*, its subsequent decision is "final" for purposes of appellate review. *Kosowski v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 632, 636 n.2, 216 Cal. Rptr. 280*

[c] Petitions for Writ of Review

Timely petition for writ of review filed in incorrect appellate district and transferred to proper district after time for filing had lapsed as not requiring dismissal and transferee court as retaining jurisdiction. *National Kinney v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 203, 206-209, 169 Cal. Rptr. 801*

[d] Prerequisite to Seeking Appellate Review

Although petition for reconsideration is proper when appeals board, in its initial decision on reconsideration, reverses WCJ's decision, such petition is not a prerequisite to seeking writ of review. *Lamb v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 274, 279, fn. 5, 113 Cal. Rptr. 162, 520 P.2d 978*

[e] Scope of Review

[i] In General

Appellate court's authority to consider petition for writ of review of decision of WCAB as limited to determining whether evidence, viewed in light of entire record, supports decision; appellate court as not entitled to reweigh evidence or to decide disputed questions of fact; appellate court as not bound to accept WCAB's factual findings if determined to be unreasonable, illogical, improbable, or inequitable when viewed in light of overall statutory scheme; appellate court as entitled to decide questions of statutory interpretation. *Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 233, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26*

Contemporaneous administrative construction of statute by Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, as administrative agency charged with its enforcement and interpretation, while not necessarily controlling, as being of great weight; courts as not departing from such construction unless it is clearly erroneous. *Griffith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1264, 257 Cal. Rptr. 813*

Reviewing court as not bound by decision of Workers' Compensation Appeals Board dealing only with questions of law. *Wilson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 902, 904-905, 239 Cal. Rptr. 719*

In workers' compensation proceedings, refusal to allow presentation of relevant evidence as appropriate basis for annulling decision of appeals board. *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 612 n.1, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754*

In workers' compensation proceeding in which facts would support but one conclusion, issue as a legal one and contrary finding by appeals board as not sustainable. *Truesdale v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 608, 613, 235 Cal. Rptr. 754*

WCJ's finding adopted by WCAB that applicant's claim for workers' compensation was not barred by going and coming rule as not limiting court's review of decision when finding constitutes conclusion of law based on application of law to substantially undisputed facts. *Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 922, 928, 232 Cal. Rptr. 257*

Under *Lab. Code § 5313* requiring appeals board or referee (now workers' compensation judge) to make and file all findings of fact within 30 days after case submitted, award that fails to make finding on material fact as unable to stand. *Industrial Indemnity Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 480, 485, 193 Cal. Rptr. 471*

When pertinent facts are not in dispute, whether employee sustained injury in scope of employment as presenting question of law, and reviewing court as not bound by conclusionary findings on issue by appeals board. *Perez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 60, 65, 199 Cal. Rptr. 280* ; *C.L. Pharris Sand & Gravel, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 584, 589, 187 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Scope of review of appeals board's interpretation of statute as being whether interpretation was clearly erroneous; interpretation as clearly erroneous when contrary to language of statute. *City of Anaheim v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 609, 613, 177 Cal. Rptr. 441*

Under Lab. Code § 5053, relating to effect of board's findings and conclusions, award as not disturbed if findings are supported by inferences that may fairly be drawn from evidence, even though evidence is susceptible of opposing inferences. *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 664, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564*

[ii] Statement of Evidence and Reasons for Decision

It is mandatory for WCJ to provide summary of trial evidence under *Lab. Code § 5313* and *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10566, and failure to submit such summary mandated that matter be returned to WCJ to prepare and submit one. *Sharareh v. W.C.A.B. (2007) 156 Cal. App. 4th 189, 192-195, 67 Cal. Rptr. 3d 147*

Failure of appeals board to comply with *Lab. Code § 5908.5*, requiring board in granting or denying reconsideration to state evidence relied on and specify in detail reasons therefor, as requiring that its decision after reconsideration be annulled. *Evans v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 753, 754, 68 Cal. Rptr. 825, 441 P.2d 633* ; *see Fairview State Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 595, 599-600, 188 Cal. Rptr. 51* ; *City of Santa Ana v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 212, 219, 180 Cal. Rptr. 125* ; *Zozaya v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 27 Cal. App. 3d 464, 470-472, 103 Cal. Rptr. 793* ; *Solomon v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 282, 286-287, 100 Cal. Rptr. 899*

Lab. Code § 5908.5, requiring appeals board's decision to state evidence relied on and reasons for decision, as not requiring annulment of order when parties were in no doubt as to issue litigated. *Albert Van Luit Wallpaper Co. v. Workmen's Compensation Appeals Bd. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 88, 91-92, 111 Cal. Rptr. 247*

[iii] Substantial Evidence

Court review of appeals board's award as confined to determining whether award is supported by substantial evidence. *Judson Steel Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 658, 664, 150 Cal. Rptr. 250, 586 P.2d 564* ; *Jordan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 162, 164, 220 Cal. Rptr. 554*

Challenged finding of appeals board as required to be upheld if supported by substantial evidence in light of entire record. *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 637, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432* ; *Ferreira v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 120, 124, 112 Cal. Rptr. 232*

Substantial evidence as supporting finding of WCJ and WCAB that employee, who suffered recurrent major depression, suffered single compensable injury; appellate court as bound by finding on review. *Western Growers Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 227, 235, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 26*

Appeals board's decision as required to state evidence relied on and specify in detail reasons for decision; substantial evidence to support decision as measured on basis of entire record, rather than by simply isolating evidence that supports board and ignoring other relevant facts of record that rebut or explain that evidence; if evidence relied on and reasons stated for decision do not support it, decision as required to be annulled. *Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1111, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868*

Court as not interfering with appeals board's factual findings if they are supported by substantial evidence or by reasonable inferences drawn from testimony adduced. *City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 471, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463*

In determining whether order, decision, or award is supported by substantial evidence, court as required to consider weight or persuasiveness of all evidence, not just existence of substantial evidence in favor of respondent. *Skip Fordyce, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 915, 920, 197 Cal. Rptr. 626*

Opinion of medical expert as not supported by substantial evidence when it was based on surmise, speculation, or conjecture. *Baptist v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 903, 906-908, 187 Cal. Rptr. 270*

In reviewing appeals board's decision, court as reviewing entire record before appeals board to determine whether decision is supported by substantial evidence. *Greenberg v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 792, 798-799, 112 Cal. Rptr. 626*

On review of decision of appeals board after board, on reconsideration, set aside referee's (now workers' compensation judge's) decision and made its own finding based on independent examination of record, decision presented for review is that of board rather than of referee, and board's factual determinations as required to be upheld if there is substantial supporting evidence in record. *Erickson v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 388, 391, 90 Cal. Rptr. 706*

[f] Waiver of Issues on Appeal

Failure to raise factual issue before workers' compensation judge or appeals board as precluding its consideration on judicial review. *Griffith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 1260, 1265, 257 Cal. Rptr. 813*

[45] Jurisdiction

Workers' compensation insurer's civil action against illegally uninsured employer for reimbursement of award of benefits to employee for cumulative trauma was permitted by *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)* as exception to exclusive remedy rule, and jurisdiction of action was not limited to Appeals Board. *Graphics Arts Mutual Ins. Co. v. Time Travel Internat., Inc. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 405, 413-415*

Superior court had no jurisdiction to review Appeals Board decision when Board jurisdiction was invoked, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 21166*, for determination as to whether disability of public safety employee, member of Public Employees Retirement System, was industrial. *Abraham v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 113 Cal. App. 4th 1082, 1087-1089, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 820*

WCAB had no jurisdiction under *Lab. Code § 5500.5* or otherwise, to resolve contribution dispute between city and county agency members of a joint powers agency, when members' rights and obligations were established pursuant to formal joint powers agreement and concept of contribution did not apply. *Victor Valley Transit Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 235* .

In controversy over payment of medical treatment, WCAB had jurisdiction to determine whether licensed physician may use medical assistants to perform certain services. *PM & R Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 357, 364, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 887*

WCAB had jurisdiction, pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3600.5* and *5305*, to award workers' compensation benefits to professional baseball player injured out-of-state who signed player's contract for out of state team in California, even though the contract was signed by the team outside of California and, as a condition of the contract, the baseball Commissioner had to approve the contract. *Bowen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 15, 26-27, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95*

WCAB had subject matter jurisdiction to award death benefits to daughter of deceased employee killed in airplane crash while working in Wyoming for Wyoming employer, when deceased employee entered into employment contract in *California. Janzen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 109, 117, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 260*

WCAB has jurisdiction to determine whether housing authority's chief of police is employee within the meaning of *Lab. Code § 4850*. *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1082, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738*

WCAB does not have subject matter jurisdiction over federally recognized Indian tribe for purposes of enforcing workers' compensation laws. *Middletown Rancheria v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1340, 1356, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 105*

Ohio corporation that paid survivors' benefits under California law to family of an employee who was killed while working in California, was entitled to reimbursement from a third-party tortfeasor even though the survivors claimed workers' compensation benefits only in Ohio and State of Ohio did not allow for reimbursement. *Dailey v. Dallas Carriers Corp. (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 720, 727, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 48*

Defendant-employer must plead facts showing that (1) the injury complained of in the tort action occurred at a time when both the plaintiff-employee and the defendant-employer were subject to the provisions of *Lab. Code § 3600(a)(1)*; (2) at the time of the injury, the employee was performing service growing out of and incidental to his or her employment and was acting within the course of that employment; and (3) the injury was proximately caused by the employment, with or without negligence. *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273,*

1285, 285 Cal. Rptr. 183

When the complaint affirmatively alleges facts indicating workers' compensation coverage, the defendant-employer may demur to the complaint or move for judgment on the pleadings. *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Superior Court (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1285, 285 Cal. Rptr. 183*

Superior court as having jurisdiction over compensation insurer's declaratory relief action concerning whether it had duty to defend or indemnify employer with respect to employee's injury. *Aetna Casualty & Surety Co. v. Aceves (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 544, 551-554, 284 Cal. Rptr. 477*

Under *Lab. Code § 5300(a), (b)*, WCAB as having exclusive jurisdiction over disputes regarding employee's right to compensation or liability of employer. *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 5, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762*

WCAB as tribunal of limited jurisdiction with no powers beyond those conferred on it by *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, and the provisions of the *Labor Code. Morton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 193 Cal. App. 3d 924, 927-928, 238 Cal. Rptr. 651*

Although WCAB has no jurisdiction to make an award of *Lab. Code § 4850* benefits (payment of salary in lieu of temporary disability payments to city firefighters among others), WCAB as having jurisdiction under *Lab. Code § 4851* to determine whether disability referred to in *Lab. Code § 4850* arose out of and in course of employment and, in disputed case, to determine when such disability commenced and ceased and amount of benefits to which employee is entitled during period of such disability. *Kosowski v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 632, 637, 216 Cal. Rptr. 280*

Employment contract of Nevada resident as formed in Nevada when words accepting employment were uttered from Nevada telephone, not when work orders were picked up from union local in California, and WCAB as having no jurisdiction over worker's compensation claim for cumulative injury sustained at Nevada jobsite.

Ledbetter Erection Corp. v. Workers' Comp. App. Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1097, 1105-1106, 203 Cal. Rptr. 396

Both WCAB and superior court as having concurrent precedential jurisdiction to determine threshold question of subject matter jurisdiction, namely, whether cause comes within exclusive jurisdiction of *WCAB. Yavitch v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 64, 70, 190 Cal. Rptr. 793* ; *Jones v. Brown (1970) 13 Cal. App. 3d 513, 520, 89 Cal. Rptr. 651*

[46] Liens

Outpatient surgery center lien claimant (or any medical lien claimant) has burden of proving that its charges are reasonable, and outpatient surgery center lien claimant's billing, by itself, does not establish that claimed fee is reasonable, so that, even in absence of rebuttal evidence, lien need not be allowed in full if unreasonable on its face. Tapia v. Skill Master Staffing (2008) 73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1338, 1342-1346 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)

Appeals Board's awards to lien claimants, outpatient medical treatment centers, were not supported by substantial evidence, when court of appeal found that lien claimants, in order to establish their right to reimbursement, bore initial burden of proving they were properly licensed or accredited, and that they had not carried this burden in present case. *Zenith Ins. Co. v. W.C.A.B. (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 373, 376-377, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 380*

Recovery from employer or insurer on Medi-Cal lien filed by Department of Human Services is not limited to amount

equal to one-half of employee's net recovery. *Boehm & Associates v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 137, 150152, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 396*

Provisions of *Lab. Code § 4661.5* applied to lien claimant's *Lab. Code § 4903.1* lien for reimbursement of disability payments made to injured employee, entitling lien claimant to reimbursement at the temporary disability rate applicable at the time payments were made rather than at the rate in effect during the actual period of temporary disability. *Midas Recovery Services, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1321, 1325, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 574*

Medical lien claimants were not denied due process by reliance of WCJ and WCAB on reports filed by AME and a specialist appointed by the employer when lien claimants participated fully in lien hearing and were served with the AME's and the specialist's reports before the hearing; WCAB properly disallowed claim by a rehabilitation center for services of an occupational therapy assistant, because therapy assistant not licensed to provide occupational therapy unless it was under direct supervision of a licensed therapist or physician; WCAB properly rejected rehabilitation center's lien claim because center failed to file a fictitious business name statement as required by *Bus. & Prof. Code § 17918*. *Hand Rehabilitation Center v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 34 Cal. App. 4th 1204, 1212-1215, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 734*

Medical lien claimant as denied due process and right to fair trial when it was not served with defense medical reports prior to trial and denied right to cross-examine and make objections at trial; denial of right to fair trial to lien claimant as reversible per se; medical lien claimant has right to participate in workers' compensation hearing, must be served with noticeof all hearings, and must be informed of scope and purpose of any hearing that may affect its rights or liabilities. *Beverly Hills Multispecialty Group, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 789, 803, 805-806, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 293*

WCAB as permitted to allow lien claim for medical and hospital treatment, but as not permitted to reduce amount. *Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 20, 28, 117 Cal. Rptr. 678, 528 P.2d 766*

County that paid moneys to employee under Aid to Families With Dependent Children program during period when employee was no longer receiving compensation disability payments and when claim for additional compensation benefits was pending and disputed as not entitled to lien on subsequent recovery by employee. *Ogdon v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 192, 208, 113 Cal. Rptr. 206, 520 P.2d 1022*

Lien claimant as entitled to seek relief from the consequences of a failure to appear at a hearing on the claim by utilizing a procedure substantially similar to that provided for a relief from default by *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*. *Fox v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1196, 1205, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 252*

WCAB as having exclusive jurisdiction over medical liens. *Fox v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1196, 1204, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 252*

Lab. Code § 4903(b) as broadly interpreted by the courts to authorize reimbursement for most medical services provided to an industrially injured employee, and as limiting the WCAB's discretion to determining whether or not the amount of the lien is reasonable in relation to the medical services rendered to treat the employee's injuries; WCAB as permitted to reduce a physician's fee if it is considered excessive after giving the physician notice and an opportunity to be heard. *Fox v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 1196, 1203-1204, 6 Cal. Rptr. 2d 252*

Lien against workers' compensation award in favor of insurer for overpayment of uninsured motorist insurance benefits as not authorized under *Lab. Code § 4903* and as therefore not permitted. *Coltherd v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 455, 461-463, 275 Cal. Rptr. 130*

As used in *Lab. Code § 4903*, relating to liens against workers' compensation, phrase "any sum to be paid as compensation," as meaning any benefit or payment under workers' compensation law and as including both temporary and permanent disability awards; hence, amount of indemnification crime victim receives under victims of violent crime program as allowable lien against both temporary and permanent disability awards. *Burnsed v. State Bd. of Control (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 213, 218, 234 Cal. Rptr. 316*

Even though WCAB has authority to determine amount of living expenses for which injured worker may be allowed lien against workers' compensation award under *Lab. Code § 4903(c)* and WCAB may award less than that demanded, WCAB as not having power to modify or to compromise order for restitution in criminal proceeding in absence of an agreement. *People v. Shelton (1986) 188 Cal. App. 3d 371, 373, 232 Cal. Rptr. 783* (welfare fraud)

Burial expenses paid by third party as required, under *Lab. Code § 4903(d)*, to be awarded to widow subject to lien in favor of third party, and not tobe awarded directly to third party. *City and County of San Francisco v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 36 Cal. App. 3d 412, 415, 111 Cal. Rptr. 387*

Landlord's lien for employee's unpaid back rent as limited by *Lab. Code § 4903(c)* to amount of rent due after injury and to amount of rent constituting maintenance for employee and employee's dependents only; WCAB as having no jurisdiction to award any amount for rent due before injury, despite either employee's consent to such arrangement or employee's joint and several liability with others for rent owed. *Williams v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 582, 591-593, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 438*

[47] Mandatory Settlement Conferences--Disclosure of Evidence

Testimony of vocational rehabilitation counselor developed as consequence of meetings between counselor and injured employee that took place following closure of discovery at mandatory settlement conference, held admissible at trial, when, at conference, employee had identified counselor as expert trial witness, which court of appeal held was sufficient to comply with *Lab. Code § 5502*. *Grupe Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 132 Cal. App. 4th 977, 985-988, 34 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98*

Lab. Code § 5502 permits party to call and cross-examine any witness disclosed at mandatory settlement conference, even if witness was only disclosed by other party. *Dole Bakersfield v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 64 Cal. App. 4th 1273, 1277, 75 Cal. Rptr. 2d 836*

[48] Medical-Legal Evaluations

Pre-April 19, 2004, version of either *Lab. Code § 4061* or *4062* applied when medical evaluation of represented employee was required to resolve dispute arising out of injury occurring before January 1, 2005, since plain language of post-April 19, 2004, *Lab. Code § 4062.2* limited its applicability to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2005, and it would be illogical to allow vacuum in which employer would have no right to have medical evaluation performed. *Nunez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 584, 591-593, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 914*

For reasons set forth in *Nunez*, medical evaluation and reporting procedure of pre-April 19, 2004, *Lab. Code § 4062* applied to represented cases with date of injury prior to January 1, 2005, and *Lab. Code § 4050* could not be utilized to circumvent medical evaluation and reporting procedure of pre-April 19, 2004, *Lab. Code § 4062*, and *Lab. Code § 5701* should not be utilized to order medical evaluation that appears to violate pre-April 19, 2004, *Lab. Code § 4062* and that may generate report that is inadmissible at trial. *Cortez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 136 Cal. App. 4th 596, 601-602, 38 Cal. Rptr. 3d 922*

Physician's disclosures to employee's supervisor regarding employee's treatment violated neither Confidentiality of

Medical Information Act nor right to privacy. *Garrett v. Young (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1393, 1406-1412, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 134*

Employer is not entitled to delayed restitution under *Lab. Code §§ 4622* and *4625*, or equitable restitution for negotiated and unprotested payments to medical-legal evaluator. *American Psychometric Consultants, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 36 Cal. App. 4th 1626, 1645, 1647, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 254*

Even absent physician-patient relationship, physician who evaluates workers' compensation claimant at request of defense counsel is liable to claimant for negligence or medical malpractice for injuries incurred during examination. *Mero v. Sadoff (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1478, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769*

Distance limitation and worker's physical condition as relevant factors in determining place of defense medical examination of worker under *Lab. Code § 4051*. *Hansen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 717, 721, 259 Cal. Rptr. 506*

[48A] Medical Provider Networks

Defendant insurer denied plaintiff medical services provider admission into its preferred provider network in violation of common-law fair procedure doctrine. *Palm Medical Group, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 206, 210, 218-228, 74 Cal. Rptr. 3d 266*

[49] Medical Treatment Benefits

Constitutionality of *Lab. Code § 4604.5(d)*'s limitation to 24 chiropractic treatment visits per industrial injury upheld, when court of appeal found that *Cal. Const., art. XIV, § 4*, vested legislature with "plenary power" to create "complete system of workers' compensation," which neither restricted legislature's ability to limit number of chiropractic treatments for which workers' compensation system must be financially responsible nor expanded injured worker's constitutional rights to include entitlement to receive unlimited treatments. *Facundo-Guerrero v. W.C.A.B. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 640, 646-656, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 731*

Because SB 899 provided that amendment, addition, or repeal of any law made by SB 899 applied prospectively from date of SB 899's enactment (April 19, 2004), regardless of date of injury, court of appeal held that this provision meant that ACOEM Guidelines applied to determine what is reasonable medical treatment in all cases in which no such determination had been made as of April 19, 2004, so that, since court found that medical treatment in case before it was completed almost two months before enactment of SB 899 but that no determination of reasonableness of that treatment was made until May 2005, when WCJ found, per stipulation of parties, that value of disputed chiropractic services was $6,430 and that ACOEM Guidelines were not applicable to case, following which Appeals Board denied reconsideration, court of appeal annulled Board's decision and remanded for further proceedings. *Sierra Pacific Industries v. W.C.A.B. (Chatham) (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1498, 1505-1512, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 550*

Employer as liable to provide employee 24-hour attendant care for life under *Lab. Code § 4600* once it was established that employee's industrial injurycontributed to need for such care, even though natural progression of employee's preexisting polio would have resulted in need for same level of care if there had been no industrial injury. *Rouseyrol v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1476, 1484-1485, 286 Cal. Rptr. 250*

Lab. Code §§ 4600 (medical benefits) and 4601 (services of consulting physician at expense of employer) as precluding apportionment of liability for medical expenses rendered to injured worker, even if expenses were partially made necessary by preexisting injury, whether or not industrially caused. *Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1534-1535, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190*

Compensable injury as rendering employer liable for cost of medical treatment under *Lab. Code § 4600*; although medical expenses must be reasonably necessary to cure or relieve from effects of industrial injury, no finding of disability, temporary or permanent, as required condition to such recovery. *Kyles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 614, 619-620, 240 Cal. Rptr. 886*

Medical treatment and disability indemnity as separate and distinct elements of compensation that fulfill different, though complementary, legislative goals. *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219*

Licensed marriage, family and child counselor without license in clinical psychology as not "physician" within meaning of *Lab. Code §§ 3209.3* and *3209.8*; therefore, counselor as not subject to civil penalty under *Lab. Code § 4628(f)* for submitting psychological report regarding claimant without counselor's personal examination of claimant. *Stress Care, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 909, 917, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 426*

Lab. Code § 4600 as precluding apportionment of employee's medical treatmentaward except when industrial and non-industrial causes of disability can be easily differentiated and when treatment for non-industrial condition is not necessary to relieve effects of industrial injury. *Fisk v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 1078, 1085, 25 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*

[50] Nature and Purpose of Workers' Compensation

Employee stated cause of action in alleging that employer violated *Lab. Code § 3751* by including workers' compensation costs incurred by store as one element in calculation of employee incentive bonus. *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Superior Court (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1090, 1101-1102*

Workers' compensation statutes as reflecting legislative compromise between interests of employees and concerns of employers; quid pro quo as existing on both sides; in return for guarantee of compensation, employees as surrendering common-law remedies against their employers for work-related injuries, and reward of employer for securing compensation as being immunity from employee tort suits. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1254-1255 n.8, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Fundamental policy underlying workers' compensation laws as being that those hiring others to perform services should bear risk of injuries incurred in undertakings; workers' compensation system as differing from tort lawbecause it provides for (1) liability without fault, (2) compulsory insurance, (3) automatic delivery of benefits, (4) limited benefits, and (5) expeditious machinery for resolving disputes. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1257-1258, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

[51] Peace Officers

Employee was not entitled to heart trouble presumption in *Lab. Code § 3212* because even if employee, investigator for employer, was police officer of political subdivision, only presumption that applied to that class of employees was hernia presumption, not heart trouble presumption. *California Horse Racing Bd. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 1169, 1174-1177, 64 Cal. Rptr. 3d 222*

Employer failed to rebut presumption in *Lab. Code § 3212.2* that deceased employee's heart trouble, in form of heart attack stemming from upper respiratory infection, arose out of and in course of his employment as correctional officer, when employer's only evidence regarding decedent's heart trouble was in form of physician's report, which stated "there is nothing specific about the patient's occupation that would lead us to conclude that his viral infection and the

secondary myocarditis was occupationally related," and simply pointing out that there was nothing specific about decedent's job that caused his heart attack or put him at greater risk for this condition did not satisfy employer's burden to prove that contemporaneous nonwork-related event was sole cause of decedent's heart attack. *Jackson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 133 Cal. App. 4th 965, 970-972, 35 Cal. Rptr. 3d 256*

Lab. Code § 3212.2 presumption of industrial causation with regard to heart trouble applies to members of the Department of Corrections having *any* custodial duties, not only those whose primary duties consist of the supervision of inmates. *Reeves v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 22, 29, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 74*

University of California police trainee as not entitled to leave of absence without loss of salary pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4806*, which applies only to officers who have completed training and qualify for active law enforcement. *Regents of University of California v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 1101, 1104, 33 Cal. Rptr. 2d 44*

Once operative, presumption of *Lab. Code § 3212.5* (heart trouble of specified peace officers manifesting itself during period of service as peace officer as presumed to arise out of and in course of employment) as not rebuttable by showing that heart trouble, in some undetected form, really preexisted employment; when facts giving rise to presumption have been proven at outset, burden of proof negating presumption as falling on employer; to be entitled to presumption, applicant as required first to show disability can be characterized as "heart trouble" within meaning of *Lab. Code § 3212.5*. *Parish v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 92, 97, 258 Cal. Rptr. 287*

Term "heart trouble," as used in compensation law, as having rather expansive meaning and as encompassing any affliction to, or additional exertion of, heart caused directly by heart or cardiovascular system or to heart or cardiovascular system through interaction with other afflicted areas of body. *Parish v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 210 Cal. App. 3d 92, 97-98, 258 Cal. Rptr. 287*

Under *Lab. Code § 3600.2(a)*, peace officer as entitled to workers' compensation benefits if he or she is injured when acting to apprehend law violator or suspected law violator, or to preserve life, property, or peace, even though not acting under immediate direction of employer; peace officer as notentitled to benefits under *Lab. Code § 3600.2(a)* when officer was injured on way to work by speeding automobile before he could act on thoughts of apprehending its driver. *Luna v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 77, 80, 244 Cal. Rptr. 596*

[52] Penalties for Delay in Payment

Overriding consideration in determining what penalty amount to assess should be whether penalty imposed would serve purposes sought to be accomplished by *Lab. Code § 5814*, which are both penal and remedial. Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, 1329-1330 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)*

Although, under *Lab. Code § 5814(a)*, successive penalty may be awarded for unreasonable delay in making prior penalty payment, it should not be awarded when employer had genuine doubt as to its liability or when there has been no legally significant intervening event. Ramirez v. Drive Financial Services (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 1324, 1331-1332 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)*

Employer may avail itself of *Lab. Code § 5814(b)*, regardless of whether employee discovered potential violation of *Lab. Code § 5814* before employer did, so long as employee had not claimed penalty before employer discovered potential violation, and employer then timely pays self-imposed penalty, and this provision's application was not limited to situations in which employer learned of potential violation through its own investigation rather than through employee's or third person's investigation. *New United Motors Manufacturing, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Gallegos) (2006) 141 Cal. App. 4th 1533, 1538-1539, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 200*

SB 899 version of *Lab. Code § 5814* applied to unreasonable delays or refusals to pay compensation that occurred prior to June 1, 2004, operative date of statute. *McCarthy v. W.C.A.B. (2006) 135 Cal. App. 4th 1230, 1235-1238, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 909*

Present version of *Lab. Code § 5814*, which became operative on June 1, 2004, applies to all injuries in cases pending on that date, including injuries that occurred prior to that date. *Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1426, 1437-1443, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527*

Agreed medical evaluator opinions and stipulation may each result in liability under the new *Lab. Code § 5814* and may each qualify as separate, legally significant event, and legislature did not eliminate multiple increases in compensation for conduct occurring either before or after award, as long as events were "separate and distinct." *Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1426, 1443-1445, 26 Cal. Rptr. 3d 527*

Lab. Code § 4650 self-imposed penalty applies to accrued as well as periodic temporary and permanent indemnity payments, but not to future indemnity payments that are commuted into lump sum. *Rivera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1124, 1134-1136, 6 Cal. Rptr. 3d 16*

Employer or carrier making one late benefit payment and failing to include interest in that payment incurs only single penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814*. *CaliforniaHighway Patrol v. W.C.A.B. (Erebia) (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1201, 1206-1207, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 118*

In determining reasonableness of delay, court should consider totality of circumstances, balancing fairness between parties, and here inadvertent delay held reasonable when employer had paid employee's medical benefits for 25 years, late quarterly penalty check was sent as soon as error was discovered, no timetable existed in agreement between employee and employer for quarterly penalty payments, employer had no history of late payments or of institutional neglect, employee did not notify employer that check had not arrived within usual time frame, and award of penalty (in excess of $40,000) would upset balance of fairness, constitute windfall to employee, and be out of proportion to employer's conduct (late payment in amount of $97.87). *County of San Luis Obispo v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 92 Cal. App. 4th 869, 876-879, 112 Cal. Rptr. 2d 246*

Employer's failure to self-assess *Lab. Code § 4650* penalty for late payment of temporary disability subjected employer to multiple *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version] penalties since failure to self-assess penalty was a separate act of misconduct subject to a separate penalty rather than a "single continuous act of misconduct." *Moulton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 837, 844-845, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 175*

Lab. Code § 5814 penalty was imposed for employer's failure to pay permanent disability advances requested by employee, when employee's failure to pay was allegedly based upon its reliance on outdated authority and found to be unjustified. *Rucker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 151, 159, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 852*

Lab. Code § 5814 penalty was imposed for defendant's repeated and continuous late payment of permanent disability, when there was no reasonable explanation for delays in payment and no prompt correction of errors, and there was no showing that delays were caused by clerical errors or expected in the normal course of business. *Waters v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 652, 664-665, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 574*

When employer unreasonably delayed paying permanent disability advances under *Lab. Code § 139.5* to an injured worker receiving VRMA, *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version] penalty assessed against full amount of permanent disability benefits, not against VRMA supplemented by permanent disability advances. *Kopitske v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 623, 633, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 216*

Lab. Code § 5814 [pre-2004 version] penalty applied against all compensable medical benefits paid before and after

approval of compromise and release agreement, when defendant unreasonably delayed payment of pharmacy bills for one year; court of appeal reversed WCAB's finding that penalty should only be imposed against medical expenses paid after the compromise and release was approved due to language in the agreement settling all future compensation claims. *Neel v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 847, 852, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 353*

Insurer was not liable for a penalty for its eight day delay in paying death benefits check, when brief delay was due to clerical error which was promptly corrected and, therefore, was not unreasonable. *County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 726, 733, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780*

Penalty as required to be applied to the full amount of the award for the class of compensation to which the payment was unreasonably delayed or refused, without deduction or credit for any timely preaward payments made by the employer. *Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1227-1228, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 129, 848 P.2d 244*

Only satisfactory excuse for delay in payment of disability benefits, whether prior or subsequent to award, that would relieve employer or carrier from penalty provisions of *Lab. Code § 5814* as being genuine doubt from medical or legal standpoint as to liability for benefits. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 338, 338 n.4, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124* ; *Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 223, 230, 93 Cal. Rptr. 192, 481 P.2d 200* ; *Jensen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 244, 247-248, 216 Cal. Rptr. 33* (repudiating holding in *Kampner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 376, 384, 150 Cal. Rptr. 222* , that each case had to be judged on its own facts to determine whether delay was reasonable); *Rohrbach v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 896, 897-898, 901-902, 193 Cal. Rptr. 558* ; *cf. Smith v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 1451, 1454-1457, 231 Cal. Rptr. 364* (distinguishing *Kerley*, rejecting *Jensen*, and holding 22-day delay based on misunderstanding of to correct amount of compromise and release was not unreasonable)

Injured worker's exclusive remedy for insurer's intentional misconduct in persistent withholding of compensation payments, notwithstanding order by workers' compensation judge to pay, as lying within penalty provisions of workers' compensation law (i.e., *Lab. Code § 5814*). *Stoddard v. Western Employers Ins. Co. (1988) 200 Cal. App. 3d 165, 171-172, 245 Cal. Rptr. 820*

Preaward and postaward delinquencies as subject to 10-percent penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version], penalty as mandatory despite arguable de minimus nature of amounts involved, and multiple penalties as assessed for successive delays so long as separate and distinct acts of misconduct are involved. *Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 815, 821-828, 153 Cal. Rptr. 590, 591 P.2d 1242* ; *Viegas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 423, 427, 196 Cal. Rptr. 10*

Defendant did not violate *Lab. Code § 4651* and no penalty was assessed under *Lab. Code § 5814* for unreasonable delay in paying applicant amount due under structured settlement agreement, when defendant immediately issued check to applicant pursuant to agreement and funds became available within three business days of payment period agreed to by parties. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1161, 78 Cal. Rptr. 2d 448*

Employee entitled to award of multiple penalties under *Lab. Code §§ 5814* [pre-2004 version], 4650(d) and 4661.5 for employer's unreasonable failure to provide temporary disability benefits and delay in providing such benefits at proper rate, when employee's prior stipulation to lower temporary disability rate did not waivehis right to future statutory increases, employee raised issue of increased rate at two hearings, and employer conceded its failure to timely pay temporary disability benefits and to pay at correct rate; multiple penalties awarded for employer's unreasonable delay in providing medical care, failure to reimburse self-procured expenses, and delay in paying expenses for medication, when employer knew of employee's requests for medical care and medication, medical reports supported these requests, and

employee was awarded further medical treatment and reimbursement for self-procured treatment. *Mote v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 902, 910-912, 914, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 806*

Penalty for employer's unreasonable delay in payment of interest on amount of stipulated award was assessed against total award of benefits per class under *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version], including benefits paid prior to unreasonable failure to pay interest; employer's unreasonable failure to timely pay interest on stipulated award, and subsequent payment of interest at improper rate, constituted single course of conduct resulting in only one penalty assessment. *Soto v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 1356, 1363, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 446*

Award of penalty was allowed based on employer's denial of applicant's request for a second change of physician and interruption of temporary disability benefits when, given the clarity of the law in California on the issue of an applicant's right to choose treating physician, the employer could not have reasonably entertained a genuine doubt regarding its obligation to allow applicant to change her choice of treating physicians. *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 820, 832, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197*

When there is no reasonable basis for review petition under *Lab. Code § 5801*, penalty pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5814* (unreasonable delay in payment of compensation) as proper under appropriate circumstances without chilling effect on right to petition for writ of review; employer as subject to penaltywhen review petition merely challenged substantiality of evidence to support finding of total disability, raised no substantial legal issue, and was apparently filed and maintained merely to delay effect of award. *Klee v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1519, 1525-1526, 260 Cal. Rptr. 217*

Lab. Code § 5814 as providing specific penalty for delay in payment of compensation benefits and, under *Lab. Code § 3602*, that remedy as exclusive. *Soto v. Royal Globe Ins. Co. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 420, 426-427, 429-430, 229 Cal. Rptr. 192* (affirming judgment dismissing complaint by worker and his family against employer's insurance carrier for damages for delayed payment of compensation benefits on theories of (1) intentional infliction of emotional distress, (2) negligent infliction of emotional distress, (3) insurer's alleged violation of *Ins. Code § 790.03(h)(5)*, and *(4)* breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; dismissal as to family members further affirmed on additional grounds); *see* *Moradi-Shalal v. Fireman's Fund Ins. Companies (1988) 46 Cal. 3d 287, 297-305, 250 Cal. Rptr. 116, 758 P.2d 58* (prospectively abrogating third-party private standing under *Ins. Code § 790.03*)

Under *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version], penalty as imposed on entire amount of benefit withheld, regardless of whether delinquency was preaward or postaward or "de minimus." *Toccalino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 543, 554, 180 Cal. Rptr. 427*

Penalty assessed for delay in payment of attorney's fees award as computed as 10 percent of attorney's fees, not 10 percent of total disability award. *General Accident Group v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 151, 154, 172 Cal. Rptr. 754* ; *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 143, 149-150, 172 Cal. Rptr. 557*

When penalty under *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version] has been imposed and not paid and another penalty is imposed, second penalty as imposed on entire award, not just on unpaid penalty. *Anderson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 954, 960-961, 172 Cal. Rptr. 398*

Successive penalties for unreasonable delay of disability payments under *Lab. Code § 5814* [pre-2004 version] as appropriate only in situations of separate, distinct acts of delay or nonpayment, and when prior notice has been given by worker of intent to seek separate penalties. *Los Angeles Unified School Dist. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 662, 664-666, 171 Cal. Rptr. 522*

Penalty for delay in paying one kind of disability benefit as applicable only to payments of that specific type of

disability benefit. *Ryerson Concrete Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 685, 687-689, 110 Cal. Rptr. 319* [decided pursuant to pre-2004 version of *Lab. Code § 5814*]

[53] Permanent Disability Benefits

Because in pretrial conference statement parties stipulated that permanent disability benefits that employer was already paying to employee included 15- percent increase pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4658(d)*, and because, by checking boxes on pretrial conference form labeled "Permanent Disability" and "Apportionment," parties conveyed their intention that WCJ calculate award for permanent disability benefits under applicable formula and facts presented, including *Lab. Code § 4658(d)*. *Bontempo v. W.C.A.B [2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 689, 701-704, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 229*

Employee did not carry his burden of demonstrating that adoption of 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule by Administrative Director was arbitrary and capricious or inconsistent with *Lab. Code § 4660(b)(2)*, so that employee failed to rebut presumptive validity of 2005 Schedule. Boughner v. Comp USA (2008) *73 Cal. Comp. Cases 854, 859-869 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)*

Comprehensive medical-legal report or treating physician's report need not state that injured worker's condition has reached permanent and stationary status to indicate existence of permanent disability within meaning of *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*. *Lewis v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 696, 700, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 661*

Court of appeal, relying on *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 148, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 611* , held that pre-2005 comprehensive medical-legal report must indicate existence of permanent disability to satisfy *Lab. Code § 4660(d)* exception to application of 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule and, rejecting another court of appeal's decision in *Vera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 996, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151* , held that employee's condition need not be permanent and stationary for treating physician's report or comprehensive medical-legal report to indicate existence of permanent disability. *Genlyte Group, LLC v. W.C.A.B. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 705, 716-724, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 903* ; *see* *Zenith Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 483, 494499, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 724* (following *Genlyte* to hold that employee's condition need not be permanent and stationary for treating physician's report or comprehensive medical-legal report to indicate existence of permanent disability)

Employer, who paid injured employee temporary disability benefits through March 2006, was not required to provide employee with *Lab. Code § 4061* notice until that date, and, therefore, no exception in *Lab. Code § 4660(d)* justified use of 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities in rating employee's permanent disability, and 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule was to be used instead. *Tanimura & Antle v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 157 Cal. App. 4th 1489, 1494-1496, 69 Cal. Rptr. 3d 127*

Employer, who paid injured employee temporary disability benefits through March 2005, was not required to provide employee with *Lab. Code § 4061* notice until that date, that, therefore, no exception in *Lab. Code § 4660(d)* justified use of 1997 Schedule for Rating Permanent Disabilities in rating employee's permanent disability, and that 2005 Permanent Disability Rating Schedule was to be used instead. *Energetic Painting and Drywall, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 633, 636-639, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 210*

Treating physician's report dated April 26, 2004, which stated that employee had existence of permanent disability but that employee had not reached permanent and stationary status, was not pre-2005 treating physician report indicating existence of permanent disability, because disability is not ratable if it has not reached permanent and stationary status. *Vera v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 154 Cal. App. 4th 996, 1003-1008, 65 Cal. Rptr. 3d 151*

Court of appeal, annulling WCAB decision that applied 1997 permanent disability rating schedule, held that WCAB's

decision was not supported by substantial evidence, since 12/15/2004 single-sentence report by treating physician stating physician's belief that permanent disability was within reasonable medical probability as result of employee's 7/21/2004 industrial injury was not followed by any other treating physician's report that provided reasoning to support physician's 12/15/2004 conclusion, and medical opinion is not substantial evidence if it does not indicate reasoning behind physician's opinion. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1311, 1314-1316, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 568*

For compensable claims arising before January 1, 2005, in order for 1997 schedule for rating permanent disabilities to apply, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, existence of permanent disability must be indicated in either pre-2005 comprehensive medical-legal report or pre-2005 report from treating physician; otherwise, 2005 permanent disability rating schedule applied. Baglione v. Hertz Car Sales (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 444, 448-452 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , pet. for writ of rev. filed 5/21/2007*; *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 148, 153-157, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 611*

For compensable claims arising before January 1, 2005, only if last payment of temporary disability indemnity was made for any period of temporary disability ending before that date would 1997 schedule for rating permanent disabilities apply to determine extent of permanent disability, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4660(d)*, because *Lab. Code § 4061* required employer to provide injured employee with notice regarding permanent disability "[t]ogether with the last payment of temporary disability indemnity"; otherwise, 2005 permanent disability rating schedule applied. Pendergrass v. Duggan Plumbing (2007) *72 Cal. Comp. Cases 456, 460-463 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , pet. for writ of rev. filed 5/21/2007*; *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 148, 153-157, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 611* ; *Zenith Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 153 Cal. App. 4th 461, 465-466, 62 Cal. Rptr. 3d 683*

WCAB as without jurisdiction to alter permanent and stationary date of earliest injury sustained by employee and to award employee a single combined permanent disability rating of 100 percent for three successive industrial injuries, since award of permanent disability for earliest injury was final. *Dept. of Education v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 14 Cal. App. 4th 1348, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 900*

Permanent disability payments as provided for permanent bodily impairment, to indemnify injured worker for impaired future earning capacity or decreased ability to compete in open labor market. *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195*

In case of employee with progressive disease, WCAB as potentially required to rate worker's permanent disability in stages at several subsequent proceedings; if WCAB concludes at end of each proceeding that condition is not either (1) permanent and stationary, or (2) a total (100 percent) permanent disability, WCAB as permitted to continue to reserve its jurisdiction for future final determination of permanent disability. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 338, 338 n.4, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Right to permanent disability compensation as not arising until injured worker's condition becomes permanent and stationary. *LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 238 n.2, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989*

Employee as not entitled to a combined permanent disability rating for two successive, specific industrial injuries, one to left knee and one to right knee, separated in timeby approximately 18 months, even though both injuries became permanent and stationary at same time, since injuries were not to same part of body. *Parker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1636, 1641-1647, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 370*

Permanent disability compensation as serving a dual function: to compensate both for (1) an actual incapacity to work, and (2) physical impairment of the employee's body that may or may not be incapacitating. *Chavira v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 463, 473, 286 Cal. Rptr. 600*

Permanent disability as one that causes impairment of earning capacity, impairment of normal use of a member, or a competitive handicap in open labor market. *Sidders v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 613, 628, 252 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *Franklin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 79 Cal. App. 3d 224, 237, 145 Cal. Rptr. 22*

Percentage of permanent disability as function of part of body injured, extent of physical disability or impairment, age of employee at time of injury, and injured's occupation at time of injury; hence, occupational variant as having direct impact on size of permanent disability award. *Holt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1257, 1260, 232 Cal. Rptr. 442*

Although employee who performs duties of two occupations is entitled to rating based on occupation carrying higher percentage of disability, employee as required to prove that he or she actually performed duties required of the more arduous occupation. *Holt v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1257, 1262, 232 Cal. Rptr. 442*

Permanent disability indemnity as having dual function: to compensate both for actual incapacity to work and for physical impairment of worker's body, which may or may not be incapacitating. *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219*

[54] Preexisting Conditions and Subsequent Injuries

Employee suffering from preexisting condition and disabled by industrial injury as entitled to compensation and reimbursement of medical expense even though healthy person would not have been injured by event. *Braewood Convalescent Hospital v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 159, 165, 193 Cal. Rptr. 157, 666 P.2d 14* ; *Lamb v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 274, 282, 113 Cal. Rptr. 162, 520 P.2d 978*

Liability for full disability without proration as imposed on employer when subsequent injury lights up or aggravates previously existing condition resulting in disability; apportionment allowed only in those cases in which part of disability would haveresulted, in absence of industrial injury, from normal progress of preexisting disease. *Ballard v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 3 Cal. 3d 832, 837, 92 Cal. Rptr. 1, 478 P.2d 937*

Under *Lab. Code § 4600*, employer as liable for full award of costs of future medical treatment to employee injured in course of employment when need for such medical treatment is partially attributable to previous industrial injury; *Lab. Code § 4600* as not impliedly repealed or amended by later enactment of *Lab. Code § 3208.2*, which requires separate determination of apportionment issues in cases involving combined effect of two or more injuries so as to preclude avoidance of statute of limitations. *Buhlert Trucking v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 199 Cal. App. 3d 1530, 1532, 247 Cal. Rptr. 190*

Employer as liable only for portion of disability attributable to subsequent industrial injuries, not to preexisting condition of employee unless rehabilitation has occurred. *Newman v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 152 Cal. App. 3d 219, 222, 199 Cal. Rptr. 422*

Apportionment between different employers as not permitted to be used to diminish employee's recovery. *Jensen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 1042, 1047, 186 Cal. Rptr. 570*

Apportionment as inappropriate when successive and cumulative injuries to same part of body become permanent and stationary at same time. *Rielli v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 721, 724, 184 Cal. Rptr. 825*

[55] Presumptions

Ninety-day period, during which employer's rejection of liability will avoid presumption of compensability of employee's injury, does not begin to run when employer receives knowledge of injury or asserted injury, even though no claim form has been filed; rather, 90-day period runs only from date on which employee files claim form with employer. *Honeywell v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 24, 37-38, 24 Cal. Rptr. 3d 179, 105 P.3d 544*

Lab. Code § 4663, as enacted in 2004 by SB 899, did not repeal non-attribution presumptions of *Lab. Code §§ 3212-3213.2*, and subsequent legislative enactments mean that non-apportionability of permanent disability awards made pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3212-3213.2* has been law since 2004 enactment of *Lab. Code § 4663* by SB 899. *Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation v. W.C.A.B. (Alexander) (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 911, 917-919, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 920*

Employer's duty to notify employee that his or her claim is rejected arises only when employee actually files formal claim, and only exception to this rule is estoppel when employer has led employee to believe that filing of claim form is not necessary, in which case employer's 90-day period for rejecting claim pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5402(b)*, and avoiding presumption of compensability, may begin before claim is actually filed if employee suffered some loss of benefits or setback as to claim. *Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc. v. W.C.A.B. (Moody) (2005) 134 Cal. App. 4th 1316, 1321-1322, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 587*

Statutory presumption that employee's injury was due to uninsured employer's negligence does not extend to presumption that employee's claimed injury arose in course of employment, so that employee seeking damages from uninsured employer has same burden of proof as employee seeking workers' compensation benefits, i.e., burden of proving that injury was sustained in course of employment. *Huang v. L.A. Haute (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 284, 289-291, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 619*

WCAB applied presumption of compensability under *Lab. Code § 5402* when employer accepted claim within 90 days of receiving claim form without thoroughly investigating claim, then denied liability after paying benefits for almost two years; application of presumption is mandatory when liability is not denied within 90 days, even if claim is accepted and paid but later denied. *Williams v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1999) 74 Cal. App. 4th 1260, 1265-1266, 88 Cal. Rptr. 2d 798*

Provisions of *Lab. Code § 5402* did not bar employer from disputing liability for employee's alleged psychiatric injury based on fact that employee did not meetsix-month employment requirement set forth in *Lab. Code § 3208.3*, even though employer did not deny claim for psychiatric injury within the 90-day period allowed under *Lab. Code § 5402*. *James v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1057, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392*

Employer's failure to reject applicant's claim for workers' compensation within 90 days created presumption of compensability under *Lab. Code § 5402*; evidence contained in defendant's medical reports and records of lien claimant as inadmissible to rebut presumption of compensability since such evidence could have reasonably been obtained within the 90-day period. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Welcher) (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 675, 683-685, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 660*

[56] Prisoners

Inmate earning no cash wages at time of industrial injury entitled to no temporary disability benefits. *Department of Corrections v. W.C.A.B. (Stentz) (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1720, 1723, 1726, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 348*

Person convicted of crime who is not incarcerated but undertakes community service for county in lieu of paying fine is "employee" as matter of law for purposes of exclusive remedy doctrine of workers' compensation law. *Arriaga v.*

County of Alameda (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 1055, 1066-1067, 40 Cal. Rptr. 2d 116, 892 P.2d 150 (expressly disapproving of contrary holding in *California State Univ. Fullerton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1819, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 50*)

County jail inmate who received consideration in form of release from confinement during hours he was not performing work for county pursuant to work release program, for which he volunteered, as an employee within meaning of *Lab. Code § 3351* and entitled to workers' compensation for injury sustained while performing work activities for county under work release program. *Morales v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 283, 289-290, 230 Cal. Rptr. 575*

[57] Psychiatric Injury

Provisions of *Lab. Code § 3208.3* as inapplicable to members of California Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS); *Gov. Code § 20046*'s lower threshold of disability, "as a result of injury or disease arising out of and in the course of ... employment," governs. *Pearl v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 189, 194-198, 109 Cal. Rptr. 2d 308, 26 P.3d 1044*

Employee did not suffer psychiatric injury AOE/COE as result of actual events of employment that were predominant as to all causes combined, as required by *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)*, when substantial evidence supported Appeals Board's factual findings that employee's supervisor and co-workers did not persecute or harass her and that it was employee who caused stressful work environment by being rude, inflexible, easily upset, and demeaning toward other employees. *Verga v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 174, 183-189, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 871*

Employee met his burden of establishing that he suffered psychiatric injury as result of sudden and extraordinary employment condition, making psychiatric injury compensable even though it occurred during first six months of employment, when court of appeal found that lumber falling into aisle and onto employee's leg wassuch uncommon, unusual, and totally unexpected event that it would naturally be expected to cause psychic disturbances even in diligent and honest employee. *Matea v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 144 Cal. App. 4th 1435, 1447-1450, 51 Cal. Rptr. 3d 314*

Employee's psychiatric injury satisfied standard for compensability set forth in *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)* only if it was proven that events of employment were predominant as to all causes combined of psychiatric disability taken as whole, when legislative history of statute indicated that Appeals Board's award of benefits, even though AME found that employee's overall psychiatric injury was only 35 percent industrially caused but stated that one of three separate diagnoses was caused exclusively by industrial factors, was contrary to legislature's intention. *Sonoma State University v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 500, 504-506, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 330*

Court of appeal annulled and remanded Appeals Board's award of benefits to employee for work-related psychiatric injury, when it found that only one of four factors relied on by Board, namely, employee's daily interactions with angry customers of his employer, fell within definition of actual events of employment in *Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1)*, while other three factors, namely, downsizing of employer, loss of value of employer's stock owned by employee, and employee's concern about his employer's future and his retirement funds, did not fall within definition of actual events of employment. *Pacific Gas & Electric v. W.C.A.B. (Bryan) (2004) 114 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1182-1184, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 467*

Rule regarding six months of employment applies to all claims of injury to psyche (other than those subject to statutory exception of having been caused by "sudden and extraordinary employment condition"), including those claimed to have arisen out of physical industrial injuries. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 1435, 1441-1443, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 822*

Employer's investigation of employee's allegations against another employee of racial discrimination constituted good faith personnel action in face of accused employee's claim for psychiatric injury. *Northrop Grumman Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 1021, 1035-1037, 127 Cal. Rptr. 2d 285*

Correct legal standard for determining good faith personnel actions is whetheremployer made and carried out regular and routine personnel decision with subjective good faith and whether employer's actions were objectively reasonable, not product of unlawful animus toward employee, in which case employer's mistakes in carrying out personnel action do not render that action unlawful. *City of Oakland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 261, 267-270, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 873*

Language of *Lab. Code § 3208.3* applies to psychiatric injury claimed as compensable consequence of precipitating physical injury, and precipitating physical injury constitutes actual event of employment, so that consequential psychiatric injury is compensable if and only if it is more than half attributable to physical industrial injury. *Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 96 Cal. App. 4th 1237, 1249, 117 Cal. Rptr. 2d 865*

Psychiatric injury suffered by worker as result of workplace gossip about her extramarital affair with coworker was held, as matter of law, not to have arisen out of employment, since finding of industrial injury is proper only when employment plays "active" or "positive" role in development of psychological condition, so that injury that grows out of personal grievance between injured employee and third party does not arise out of employment if injury occurred merely by chance during working hours at place of employment or if employer's premises do not place injured employee in peculiarly dangerous position. *Atascadero Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Geredes) (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 880, 882, 884-885, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 239*

Lab. Code § 3208.3(b)(1), establishing a test of predominance for psychiatric injury claim, is rationally related to a legitimate governmental purpose and does not unconstitutionally violate employee's due process rights. *Sakotas v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 262, 272, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 153*

Provisions of *Lab. Code § 5402* did not bar employer from disputing liability for employee's alleged psychiatric injury based on fact that employee did not meet six-month employment requirement set forth in *Lab. Code § 3208.3*, even though employer did not deny claim for psychiatric injury within the 90-day period allowed under *Lab. Code § 5402*. *James v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 55 Cal. App. 4th 1053, 1057, 64 Cal. Rptr. 2d 392*

Discharged employee as not entitled to workers' compensation benefits for psychiatric injury arising solely as result of termination from employment; *Lab. Code § 3208.3* as inapplicable to post-termination psychiatric injury. *Bray v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 530, 539-540, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 580*

WCAB as properly finding that employee did not sustain industrial psychiatric injurywhen physician found that employee's psychiatric injury resulted from his reaction to employer's discontinuation of vocational rehabilitation benefits in reliance on physician's opinion that employee was not a qualified injured worker; employee's emotional reaction to physicians opinion and employer's reliance on that opinion as not compensable consequences oforiginal industrial injury. *Rodriguez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 21 Cal. App. 4th 1747, 1760, 27 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93*

Lab. Code § 3208.3(d), requiring at least six months of employment before employee eligible for workers' compensation benefits based on claim of psychiatric injury, as not so arbitrary or irrational to unconstitutionally violate employee's equal protection or due process rights. *Hansen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 1179, 1184, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 30*

[58] Reconsideration

Standards of review on reconsideration. *Lamb v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 274, 280-281*

When WCJ, in response to employee's request, amended award by increasing awarded amounts of retroactive temporary disability payments and vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance, court of appeal held that employer's subsequent petition for reconsideration, timely filed as to amended award, but untimely as to original award, was timely filed, since WCJ's amended award effected substantial and material change in award and involved exercise of judicial function. *Nestle IceCream Co. v. W.C.A.B. (Ryerson) (2007) 146 Cal. App. 4th 1104, 1108-1111, 53 Cal. Rptr. 3d 340*

Effect of WCAB's failure to distinguish between its role as reviewing body and as trier of fact in receiving evidence without referee (now WCJ) and without permitting full cross examination and rebutal testimony. *Redner v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 83, 86-95, 89 n.5, 95 Cal. Rptr. 447, 485 P.2d 799*

WCAB, under *Lab. Code § 5908.5*, as permitted to deny petition for reconsideration of decision by memorandum order incorporating report of referee (now WCJ), provided it states evidence relied on and specifies in detail reasons for decision. *LeVesque v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 627, 635, 83 Cal. Rptr. 208, 463 P.2d 432*

Time period after which a petition for reconsideration is deemed denied by operation of law pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5909* as tolled during period WCAB had misplaced the applicant's file, as file was lost through no fault of the applicant and due to circumstances entirely beyond his control. *Shipley v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1104, 1107-1108, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 345*

WCAB as committing reversible error by denying employer's petition for reconsideration of an award in favor of employee when employer had been deprived of due process since he had never been served with notice of additional injuries claimed by employee or with notice of proceedings before the workers' compensation judge. *Katzin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 703, 711-712, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 66*

WCAB as exceeding its authority in denying reconsideration of workers' compensation award that expressly excluded chiropractic treatment chosen by employee. *Derrick v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 451, 454-456, 205 Cal. Rptr. 595*

Decision of WCAB on reconsideration as not permitted to incorporate petition for reconsideration. *Urlwin v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 466, 469-470, 178 Cal. Rptr. 758*

WCJ's order as sufficiently final for purposes of reconsideration when it resolves current issue affecting substantive rights of parties. *Scott v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 979, 984, 176 Cal. Rptr. 267*

[59] Res Judicata and Collateral Estoppel

Workers' compensation award for emotional injuries as barring injured employee's later claim for emotional distress against municipal employer infederal civil rights action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*. *Sanchez v. City of Santa Ana (9th Cir. 1990) 915 F.2d 424, 431-432*

Housing authority was barred by doctrine of collateral estoppel from denying employee *Lab. Code § 4850* benefits, since issue had been decided against Housing Authority in previous WCAB proceeding. *Housing Authority v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 1076, 1086-1087, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 738*

WCAB as a constitutional court with the result that its final decisions are given res judicata effect with respect to both

subsequent civil actions and subsequent workers' compensation proceedings. *Azadigian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 372, 376, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 643*

Issue necessarily decided by prior criminal conviction as conclusive against convicted person in subsequent civil action, including proceeding before WCAB. *Westbrooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 249, 251-252 ns.1, 2, 252 Cal. Rptr. 26*

When doctrines of res judicata and collateral estoppel apply to WCAB finding or order. *Clemente v. State of California (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 202, 222, 219 Cal. Rptr. 445, 707 P.2d 818* ; *Hughes v. Atlantic Pacific Construction Co. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 987, 1001-1003, 240 Cal. Rptr. 200* (finding not res judicata in tort action); *Dakins v. Board of Pension Commissioners (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 374, 381, 184 Cal. Rptr. 576* ; *De Court v. Beckman Instruments, Inc. (1973) 32 Cal. App. 3d 628, 635, 108 Cal. Rptr. 109*

WCAB's opinions as valid authority and looked to by courts of law. *Ezzy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 252, 261 n.4, 194 Cal. Rptr. 90*

[60] Sanctions

Lab. Code § 5813 sanctions imposed on attorney who failed to appear at conference set on issue of employee's earnings, told claims adjuster he would not appear and that adjuster could take employee's deposition, and failed to notify WCJ that he would not attend. *Runnion v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 277, 287-288, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 105*

[61] Self-Insurers' Security Fund

Self-Insurers' Security Fund as empowered to bring any action against any person to recover compensation paid and liability assumed by fund [*see Lab. Code § 3744(c)*]; purpose of this provision as being to allow fund to seek legal redress against others to recover moneys it expends in continuing insolvent self-insured's compensation payments; term "any person" as sufficiently broad, without specifying language of 1986 amendments, to include one whose actions contributed to inadequacy of sel f-insured's security deposit, thereby necessitating fund's assumption and continued payment of workers' compensation liabilities; by initially not specifying entities whom fund could pursue, Legislature as in effect conferring standing on fund in all instances in which legal theory for recovery could be stated against defendant. *Self-Insurers' Security Fund v. ESIS, Inc. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1148, 1154-1155, 251 Cal. Rptr. 693* (involving theory of equitable subrogation)

[62] Serious and Willful Misconduct by Employer

After one-year period allowed by statute of limitations, additional employers (such as, in this case, special employer) may not be joined in claim for serious and willful misconduct timely commenced against another employer (here, general employer), unless employee was ignorant of identity of late-filed-against employer until after running of statute. *McGee Street Productions v. W.C.A.B. (Peterson) (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 717, 725-726, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 813*

WCAB used proper standard to determine that employer willfully violated an occupational safety standard; finding of willful violation of safety standard does not require showing of actual intent and knowledge to do harm; rather, the standard requires proof by a preponderance of the evidence that the act committed by the employer was the desired consequence of employer's intent, and that employer was aware that act violated a safety order. *Rick's Electric, Inc. v. Occupational Safety & Health Appeals Bd. (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1023, 1037-1039, 95 Cal. Rptr. 2d 847*

Lab. Code § 4553 (increase of compensation if injury results from employer's serious and willful misconduct) as applicable to employer that is governmental entity. *State Dept. of Corrections v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 885, 887-891, 97 Cal. Rptr. 786, 489 P.2d 818*

"Serious and willful misconduct" defined. *Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd. v. Ind. Acc. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 656, 662-665, 255 P.2d 431* ; *White v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1968) 265 Cal. App. 2d 115, 120-121, 71 Cal. Rptr. 49*

Lab. Code § 4553 as sole remedy for additional compensation when employee was injured as result of deliberate failure to ensure safe place to work. *United States Borax & Chemical Corp. v. Superior Court (1985) 167 Cal. App. 3d 406, 410-411, 213 Cal. Rptr. 155*

[63] Services Performed for Aid or Sustenance

Exclusion of employee from workers' compensation coverage under *Lab. Code § 3352(b)* (services performed in return for aid and sustenance from charitable organization) as properly based on whether services are provided at minimal leval to obtain necessities of life, or are instead part of normal employment relationship; employment by church for pay that is above the minimum wage and not gauged by employee's necessities as outside scope of *Lab. Code § 3352(b)* and employee as therefore covered by workers' compensation law. *Hoppmann v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1119, 1123, 277 Cal. Rptr. 116*

[64] Special Employees

Firefighter who was employed by California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and was killed fighting forest fire while under contract to U.S. Interior Department as "special employee" of U.S. government, which was thereby immune from wrongful death suit under Federal Tort Claims Act but subject to payment of compensation under California's workers' compensation law. *Enslow v. U.S. (C.D. Cal. 1992) 811 F. Supp. 503, 506*

Triable issue of fact existed as to whether defendant was plaintiff's special employer, when evidence on issue of control as well as other factors supported conflicting inferences. *Brassinga v. City of Mountainview (1998) 66 Cal. App. 4th 195, 219, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 660*

Temporary employment agency employee was barred by exclusive remedy doctrine from bringing tort action against her assigned employer, when evidence showing that assigned employer had right to control and direct manner in which employee's work was performed supported special employment relationship as matter of law. *Wedeck v. Unocal Corp. (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 848, 862, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 501*

Finding that tanker owner was plaintiff's "special employer" as proper notwithstanding that owner failed to allege exclusive remedy doctrine as affirmative defense in answer, since all parties had actual notice that owner was relying on employment as defense to liability and tried case accordingly; if tanker owner failed to secure workers' compensation insurance pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3700*, it will be liable to plaintiff for civil damages despite special employment relationship. *Douglas Oil Co. v. Western Asphalt Service (1994) 22 Cal. App. 4th 372, 381, 394, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 269*

Special employment relationship as arising when employer lends employee to another employer and relinquishes to borrowing employer all right of control over employee's activities. *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1070 n.3, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67* ; *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1247, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Factors to be considered in determining whether individual is "special employee" or "employee" as essentially identical; in each case, presence of right to control alleged employee as primary factor; label placed by parties on their

relationship as not dispositive. *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1072 n.4, 1072, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67*

Special employment (or borrowed servant) doctrine as applying to labor brokerage situation and as barring employee who is injured while on assignment from labor broker from bringing tort suit against assigned employer. *Johnson v. Berkofsky-Barret Productions, Inc. (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1067, 1074, 260 Cal. Rptr. 67*

Borrowed employee as held to have two employers; his or her original or "general" employer and a second, the "special" employer; in this dual employer situation, employee as generally limited to statutory workers' compensation remedy for injuries received in course of employment with special employer and as not permitted to bring separate tort action against either employer. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1248, 1249, 1251, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Primary consideration in determining whether special employment relationship exists as being whether special employer has right to control and direct activities of alleged employee or manner and method in which work is performed, whether exercised or not; factors relevant to determining whether employee is borrowed employee of another as including (1) whether borrowing employer's control over employee and work that employee is performing extends beyond mere suggestion of details or cooperation; (2) whether there was an agreement, understanding, or meeting of minds between original and special employer; (3) whether employee acquiesced in new work situation; (4) whether original employer terminated his or her relationship with employee; (5) whether special employer furnished tools and place for performance; (6) whether new employment was over considerable length of time; (7) whether borrowing employer had right to fire employee; and (8) whether borrowing employer had obligation to pay employee. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1250, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Circumstances that tend to negate existence of special employment relationship as including following factors: (1) worker is skilled and has substantial control over operational details; (2) worker is not engaged in borrower's usual business; (3) worker works only for brief period of time and does not use tools or equipment of borrowing employer, but uses his or her own tools or tools of lending employer; and (4) borrowing employer neither pays worker nor has right to discharge worker. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1250, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

When alleged special employer was exercising direct supervision over exact task during accomplishment of which employee was injured, status of special employer as required to be found to exist as to claim for that injury. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1251, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Extensive nationwide case law, interpreting both state workers' compensation statutes and Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (*33 U.S.C. § 901 et seq.*), as holding "special employment" or "borrowed servant" doctrine applies to labor brokerage situation and bars employee who is injured while on assignment from labor broker from bringing tort suit against assigned employer. *Riley v. Southwest Marine, Inc. (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1242, 1251, 250 Cal. Rptr. 718*

Worker as able to have more than one employer for purposes of workers' compensation; thus, employee of temporary employment agency (general employer) employed on one-day job assignment as employee of temporary employer (special employer) for purposes of workers' compensation when temporary employer had supervision and control over employee's job duties. *Santa Cruz Poultry, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 575, 577-579, 239 Cal. Rptr. 578*

When special employment relationship exists between temporary employee and employer, employee's exclusive remedy for job-related injuries as being workers' compensation. *Santa Cruz Poultry, Inc. v. Superior Court (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 575, 577, 239 Cal. Rptr. 578*

Neither right to control nor exercise of control by alleged special employer as exclusive consideration in determining whether worker is special employee (employee of one employer sent to do work for another employer) precluding employee's tort action against alleged special employer and relegating employee to exclusive remedy provisions of workers' compensation law (*Lab. Code § 3602(a)*). *Barajas v. USA Petroleum Corp. (1986) 184 Cal. App. 3d 974, 983, 229 Cal. Rptr. 513*

[65] State Compensation Insurance Fund

Supreme Court held State Compensation Insurance Fund was not immune from civil liability under *Ins. Code § 11758* for allegedly misallocating an insured employer's medical-legal expenses and reporting that misinformation to a ratemaking organization, resulting in higher premiums for its insured. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Superior Court of Orange County (2001) 24 Cal. 4th 930, 932, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 662, 16 P.3d 85*

State Compensation Insurance Fund's actions in requiring non-refundable premium were not negligent or deceitful, unfair, unlawful, or arbitrary. *Rail Services of America v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 323, 333-338, 1 Cal. Rptr. 3d 700*

Court of appeal upheld jury verdict finding State Compensation Insurance Fund (SCIF) liable for compensatory and punitive damages based on its breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing and fraudulent business practices; court of appeal upheld trial court's order enjoining SCIF from various business practices. *Notrica v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 911, 925, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 89*

Insured employer is entitled to bring a civil action against State Compensation Insurance Fund for refusal to defend and indemnify in a workers' compensation action. *Salimi v. State Comp. Ins. Fund (1997) 54 Cal. App. 4th 216, 222, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 640*

Insured employer is entitled to present evidence of negligent claims handling as circumstantial evidence of bad faith and breach of contract by *State Compensation Insurance Fund. Tricor California, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 230, 238, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

Adequate and prompt investigation of claims, payment of only legitimate claims in proper amounts, permitting insured employer to review and audit files, and accurate and fair setting of rates paid by employers are implied contractual duties of State Compensation Insurance Fund, violation of which may be actionable by insured under breach of contract and violation of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. *Tricor California, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 230, 238, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

State Compensation Insurance Fund is not immune from payment of punitive damages based on status as quasi-governmental agency. *Tricor California, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 230, 241, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

Insured employer is not required to exhaust administrative remedies prior to bringing suit against State Compensation Insurance Fund for bad faith practices. *Tricor California, Inc. v. State Compensation Insurance Fund (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 230, 242, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550*

State Compensation Insurance Fund as not entitled to governmental immunity from tort claims. *Security Officers Service, Inc. v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 887, 892-893, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*

State Compensation Insurance Fund as required to conduct its functions of defending, investigating, allocating reserves, and settling claims with good faith regard for their effect on insured's premiums and dividends, as determined under the

policy and governing regulations. *Security OfficersService, Inc. v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 887, 893-898, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*

Insured as entitled to bring suit against State Compensation Insurance Fund for tortious breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing and for negligence based on Fund's delay in processing claims and its overestimation of reserves for claims that adversely affected insured's premiums and policy dividends. *Security Officers Service, Inc. v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 887, 899-900, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 653*

Tort Claims Act as not applicable to State Compensation Insurance Fund by virtue of *Ins. Code § 11873*, which excludes Fund from immunities of Act and places Fund in same position as other workers' compensation insurers. *Maxon Industries, Inc. v. State Compensation Ins. Fund (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 1387, 1390-1395, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 730*

Purpose of State Compensation Insurance Fund as to ensure that affordable compensation coverage will be available to all employers. *Courtesy Ambulance Service v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 1504, 1511, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

State Compensation Insurance Fund as granted greater freedom in conducting its affairs by *Ins. Code §§ 11770-11881* than that granted to most other state agencies, enabling it to compete with private insurers. *Courtesy Ambulance Service v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 1504, 1511-1513, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

By virtue of *Ins. Code § 11873*, State Compensation Insurance Fund as not entitled to protection from liability for punitive damages provided by *Gov. Code § 818* to most public entities. *Courtesy Ambulance Service v. Superior Court (1992) 8 Cal. App. 4th 1504, 1513-1519, 11 Cal. Rptr. 2d 161*

[66] Statute of Limitations

WCAB as proper forum for resolving issues regarding limitation period for claim filing by dependents of deceased employees. *Marsh & McLennan, Inc. v. Superior Court (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 1, 5 n.1, 259 Cal. Rptr. 733, 774 P.2d 762*

Although *Lab. Code § 4600* imposes broad duty on employer to provide medical and other treatment to employee and makes employer liable for expenses incurred by employee or by third parties on employee's behalf when employer fails to do so, *Lab. Code § 5405* as setting clear limits on time period within which procedures for enforcement of that duty must be invoked. *Kaiser Foundation Hospitals v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 329, 336, 137 Cal. Rptr. 878, 562 P.2d 1037*

CIGA failed to meet its burden to prove that employee gained actual knowledge of his potential eligibility for workers' compensation benefits for 1997 injury more than one year prior to filing his claim, when court of appeal found that employer had breached its statutory duty to notify unaware employee of his or her workers' compensation rights, so that one-year limitations period for filing claim for benefits was tolled until employee acquired actual knowledge of those rights. *California Ins. Guarantee Assn. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 853, 856-857, 862-878, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 868*

Workers' compensation claim as not barred by statute of limitations unless worker knew, or in exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, that disability was caused by employment. *Chambers v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 556, 559, 72 Cal. Rptr. 651, 446 P.2d 531* (involving occupational disease); *City of Fresno v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 467, 470-471, 209 Cal. Rptr. 463* (involving cumulative injuries)

Insurance carrier paying workers' compensation benefits on behalf of insured employer must file contribution claim against employer's other insurance carriers under *Lab. Code § 5500.5(e)* within one year from the date of award; *Lab. Code § 5500.5(e)* is not satisfied merely by joining another insurance carrier or employer as additional party in workers'

compensation action. *General Accident Insurance Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1141, 1148, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272*

Employee's psychiatric injury sustained during course of vocational rehabilitation for prior industrial injury as not barred by five-year statutory time limitations on WCAB's continuing jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5410* and *5804*; claim for psychiatric injury as new injury claim subject to time limitations set forth in *Lab. Code § 5405*. *Newton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 147, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 146*

Partial payment of injured employee's health care expenses by employer or insurer with knowledge of potential workers' compensation claim as tolling one-year period within which original proceeding must be filed under *Lab. Code § 5405* and triggering five-year period of *Lab. Code § 5410*; subsequent notice of denial of liability as terminating five-year limitation and commencing new one-year period. *McDaniel v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1990) 218 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1016-1019, 267 Cal. Rptr. 440*

For purposes of statute of limitations, date of cumulative injury as requiring concurrence of two elements: (1) compensable disability and (2) knowledge of industrial causation; these elements as presenting questions of fact to be determined by WCAB, and burden of proving them as being on employer. *Bassett-McGregor v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1102, 1110, 252 Cal. Rptr. 868*

If employer or its compensation carrier, knowing of potential claim, furnishes treatment or advances sums for any purpose relating to industrial injury, such benefits as deemed given under Labor Code so as to toll statute of limitations. *Gonzalez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 186 Cal. App. 3d 514, 523, 230 Cal. Rptr. 649*

Amended application for workers' compensation specifying willful misconduct by employer, filed more than one year after injury, as not barred by statute of limitations when original application, though deficient in setting forth factual basis for claim, identified issue and commenced action, and amendment presented no new legal theory or cause of action. *Rubio v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1985) 165 Cal. App. 3d 196, 200-202, 211 Cal. Rptr. 461*

Claims for vocational rehabilitation benefits as governed by five-year limitation period of *Lab. Code § 5804*, rather than by one-year limitation period for claiming medical and disability payments of *Lab. Code § 5405*. *Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 665, 668-670, 187 Cal. Rptr. 226*

[67] Stipulations and Requests for Award

WCAB exceeded its authority by rescinding award based on stipulation to industrial injury and rendering finding of no industrial injury when rescission was based on conflicting AME opinion and erroneous legal interpretation. *Brannen v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1996) 46 Cal. App. 4th 377, 383-384, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 768*

Stipulations as permissible in workers' compensation cases and as treated as evidence in nature of admission, but as not binding on WCJ or WCAB; stipulations as encouraged, however, to expedite proceedings, and as not subject to being set aside absent inadvertence, excusable neglect, fraud, mistake of fact or law, or when facts stipulated have changed or there has been change in underlying conditions that could not have been anticipated, or when special circumstances exist rendering it unjust to enforce stipulation. *Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 784, 790-791, 239 Cal. Rptr. 841*

Stipulation on material fact as evidence in nature of an admission, and party who did not sign stipulation as permitted to take advantage of it. *Turner Gas Co. v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1975) 47 Cal. App. 3d 286, 291-292, 120 Cal. Rptr. 663*

[68] Suicide

When suicide may be considered result of industrial injury. *Donovan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 138 Cal. App. 3d 323, 327-328, 187 Cal. Rptr. 869*

[69] Supplemental Proceedings

Petition to terminate liability for precautionary award of medical benefits must be filed within five years from the date of injury. *Barnes v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 23 Cal. 4th 679, 690, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638, 2 P.3d 1180*

Appeals Board had jurisdiction to order additional temporary disability benefits more than five years after date of injury when employee filed timely petition to reopen and his new and further disability commenced within five years of date of his injury, when court found that employee's petition to reopen alleged change in his condition and requested further temporary disability benefits, and it was not error for WCJ to award temporary disability benefits commencing more than five years after date of injury because there had been no need to award benefits earlier since employer was making voluntary temporary disability payments until then. *Sarabi v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2007) 151 Cal. App. 4th 920, 925-928, 60 Cal. Rptr. 3d 189*

Good cause for reopening as found in mistake of law, inadvertence, newly discovered evidence, fraud, or any factor or circumstance unknown at time of original award or order that renders it inequitable. *LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 241-242, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989* ; *Arias v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 813, 821, 194 Cal. Rptr. 640*

Good cause to reopen permanent disability proceeding under *Lab. Code § 5803* as established when injured worker was found by WCAB to be less than totally disabled and Bureau of Rehabilitation refused to find worker qualified for rehabilitation benefits. *LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 240-245, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989*

Award of medical-legal expenses, self-procured medical expense, and additional permanent disability on applicant's petition to reopen as not constituting termination of prior awards of future medical care, when further medical care was not listed as issue at hearing, award did not expressly rescind future medical care awards, and evidence before WCAB would not have supported determination that worker was not entitled to further medical treatment. *Cedillo v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 5 Cal. 3d 450, 453-457, 96 Cal. Rptr. 471, 487 P.2d 1039*

Petition to reopen case pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 5803* and *5804* as enabling WCAB to exercise jurisdiction and to award relief not specifically requested (temporary disability when petition requested permanent disability). *Bland v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 3 Cal. 3d 324, 328-329, 331, 90 Cal. Rptr. 431, 475 P.2d 663*

Employee, who does not timely object to the termination of rehabilitation services, is required to fulfill requirements of *Lab. Code § 5410* to reopen rehabilitation. *Cisneros v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 41 Cal. App. 4th 759, 768-769, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 655*

Lab. Code §§ 5410 and *5804* as precluding award of temporary total disability indemnity more than five years after date of injury, even though in case of progressive disease, WCAB may tentatively rate employee's permanent disability and reserve jurisdiction to make final determination of permanent disability beyond five-year period; 1978 amendment of *Lab. Code § 4656*, removing 240-week limitation on awards of temporary total disability, as permitting award of temporary total disability beyond five-year period only when disability commences within five-year period and is continuous; amendment to *Lab. Code § 4656* as not altering time and jurisdictional limits of *Lab. Code §§ 5410* and

5804; WCAB as having no power to reserve jurisdiction to award temporary total disability indemnity for surgery that might take place more than five years after date of employee's specific injuries. *Hartsuiker v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 12 Cal. App. 4th 209, 213-220, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 719*

Existence of good cause as essential to WCAB's exercise of its continuing jurisdiction over its orders, decisions, and awards pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5803*; without proof of good cause, WCAB has no power to disturb its prior ruling. *Azadigian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 372, 378, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 643*

Employee as entitled to full award for a 100 percent permanent disability under a single award for a combined disability arising from two separate industrial injuries for which the employee had filed two separate cases, even though the WCAB had properly determined that it lacked jurisdiction to reopen the earlier case since the petition to reopen was filed more than five years after the first injury. *Stoiber v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 5 Cal. App. 4th 1403, 1407-1410, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 470*

Failure of efforts at self-rehabilitation as change of circumstances constituting good cause why initial award should be reopened to determine whether applicant is entitled to rehabilitation benefits not initially requested. *Bekins Moving & Storage Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 665, 672, 187 Cal. Rptr. 226*

Reopening case more than five years after date of injury as proper when petition to reopen was filed within five years of date of injury. *Aliano v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 341, 365, 161 Cal. Rptr. 190*

Subsequent judicial interpretation of compensation statutes contrary to prior administrative interpretation as good cause to reopen case under *Lab. Code § 5803* when request to reopen is made within five years from date of injury. *Knowles v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 1027, 1030, 89 Cal. Rptr. 356*

[70] Temporary Disability

Injured employee not entitled to temporary disability benefits to reimburse him or her for wages lost while pursuing medical treatment for industrial injury,once that injury has become permanent and stationary and employee has returned to work with medical award. *Department of Rehabilitation v. W.C.A.B. (Lauher) (2003) 30 Cal. 4th 1281, 1297, 1301, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 665, 70 P.3d 1076*

One year of industrial disability leave payable to state employees under *Gov. Code §§ 19869-19877.1* falls within the ambit of the two-year limitation on aggregate temporary disability payments in *Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)*. *Brooks v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1522, 1527-1538, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 277*

For purposes of determining two-year limitation period on temporary disability indemnity, temporary disability payments commenced when school district paid its injured employee her normal wages under *Ed. Code § 44043*. *Mt. Diablo Unified School District v. W.C.A.B. (Rollick) (2003) 165 Cal. App. 4th 1154, 1158-1161, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 597*

When independent injuries result in concurrent periods of temporary disability, 104-week, two-year limitation of *Lab. Code § 4656(c)(1)* likewise runs concurrently. *Foster v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 161 Cal. App. 4th 1505, 1511-1513, 75 Cal. Rptr. 3d 272*

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4653*, temporary disability during seasonal employee's in-season period of regular employment was payable based on two-thirds of employee's in-season average weekly earnings, but seasonal employee was not entitled to temporary disability during off-season when parties stipulated that employee did not have any off-season earnings, and court stated that temporary disability was intended as substitute for injured employee's lost wages, so it would be illogical to award employee temporary disability as wage replacement when it was undisputed that there

would be no wage to replace. *Signature Fruit Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 790, 800-804, 47 Cal. Rptr. 3d 878*

Employee was not entitled to temporary disability indemnity after her retirement date, when she indicated an intent to retire from all employment and, therefore, had zero earning capacity after her retirement date. *Gonzales v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 843, 850, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 54*

Employer's failure to reject appliant's claim for workers' compensation within 90 days created presumption of compensability under *Lab. Code § 5402*; evidence contained in employer's medical reports and records of lien claimant was inadmissible to rebut prsumption of compensability since such evidence could have reasonably been obtained within the 90-day period. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 675, 683-685, 43 Cal. Rptr. 2d 660*

Requirement of *Lab. Code § 5402* that employer rejuect liability within 90 days in order to aboid presumption of compensability does not require that employer actually *notify* employee of rejection within that time period. *Rodriguez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 1425, 1433, 35 Cal. Rptr. 2d 713*

Temporary disability benefits as a substitute for lost wages during period of temporary incapacity from working. *Livitsanos v. Superior Court (1992) 2 Cal. 4th 744, 753, 7 Cal. Rptr. 2d 808, 828 P.2d 1195*

Lab. Code § 4656 (maximum period for temporary disability payments) as not authorizing unlimited temporary total disability as consequence of award of further medical treatment. *Nickelsberg v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 54 Cal. 3d 288, 302, 285 Cal. Rptr. 86, 814 P.2d 1328*

Temporary disability as rated as total or partial, depending on employee's ability to work during period of convalescence; under "odd lot" doctrine, worker who is only partially disabled as permitted to receive total disability payments if partial disability results in total loss of wages; this doctrine as placing burden on employer to show that work within capabilities of partially disabled employee is available; if employer does not make this showing, employee as entitled to temporary total disability benefits. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 338, 339 n.5, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Period of temporary total disability as that period when employee is totally incapacitated for work and during which he or she may reasonably be expected to be cured or materially improved with proper medical attention, or until his or her condition becomes permanent and stationary; whether condition has become permanent and stationary as purely question of fact to be determined from evidence. *Robinson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 784, 792, 239 Cal. Rptr. 841*

Temporary disability indemnity as intended primarily to substitute for worker's lost wages, in order to maintain steady stream of income. *J. T. Thorp, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 327, 333, 200 Cal. Rptr. 219*

[71] Third-Party Actions

[a] In General

Trial court properly granted summary judgment for employer and labor union as to employee's claims for breach of the union's statutory duty of fair representation and wrongful termination by employer without just cause in violation of collective bargaining agreement when employee injured in 1991 was unable to return to full job duties with employer and employer refused to hire her back. *Conkle v. Sulinna Jeong (1995) 73 F.3d 909, 916*

California workers' compensation laws (1) as allowing both employee and employer to sue third party who may be responsible for employee's injuries (*see Lab. Code § 3852*); (2) as authorizing employee and employer to intervene in each other's action (*see Lab. Code § 3853*); (3) as providing for mandatory consolidation of their lawsuits (*see Lab. Code § 3853*); (4) as allowing employer to sue on employee's behalf for employee's damages (*see Lab. Code § 3852, 3853, 3854, 3859*); and (5) as granting employee and employer right to share in each other's judgment or settlement (*see Lab. Code §§ 3856, 3860*). *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 868, 868 n.1, 872-873, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363*

Surviving wife and children of tow truck driver, who was killed when struck by passing motorist while working to remove defendant's car from side of highway, had no third-party cause of action against defendant when defendant's car had been left on side of highway after defendant had been stopped and arrested by police for driving while intoxicated. *Bryant v. Glastetter (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 770, 782-783, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 291*

Even absent physician-patient relationship, physician who evaluates workers' compensation claimant at request of defense counsel is liable to claimant for negligence or medical malpractice for injuries incurred during examination. *Mero v. Sadoff (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1466, 1478, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 769*

Injured worker as entitled to pursue malpractice claim against his attorneys for failure to advise him of possibility of filing third-party action and of applicable statute of limitations. *Nichols v. Keller (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 1672, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 601*

Under *Lab. Code § 3853*, if action against third party is brought by either employer or employee, other as permitted at any time before trial on facts to join as party plaintiff or shall consolidate his or her action if brought independently; workers' compensation insurance carrier under *Lab. Code § 3850(b)* as having same right to sue as employer. *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 ns.1, 2, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455*

[b] Aggravation of Injuries

In addition to workers' compensation proceeding, employee injured in industrial accident as permitted to institute and pursue civil suit at common law against treating doctor for aggravation of injury through negligent treatment. *Nation v. Certainteed Corp. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 813, 816, 149 Cal. Rptr. 62*

[b.1] Attorney's Duty to Advise Regarding Possible Third Party Action

Failure by attorney representing employee in workers' compensation proceeding to timely advise employee of possible personal injury action against third parties may constitute malpractice or negligence, but plaintiff's failure in malpractice action against workers' compensation attorney to present any evidence regarding collectibility of some portion of judgment in any third party action defeats malpractice action. *Garretson v. Miller (2002) 99 Cal. App. 4th 563, 571-573, 121 Cal. Rptr. 2d 317*

Workers' compensation insurer's attorneys owe no duty to employer after employer's dismissal from workers' compensation case by operation of *Lab. Code § 3755*, in absence of extenuating facts. *Canton Poultry & Deli, Inc. v. Stockwell, Harris, Widom & Woolverton (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 1219, 1227-1229, 135 Cal. Rptr. 2d 695*

[c] Attorney's Fees

Although made-whole rule applies in medical payments insurance context, and insured must be made whole as to all

damages proximately caused by injury, liability for attorney's fees is not included under made-whole rule, but is instead subject to equitable apportionment rule. 21st *Century Insurance Co. v. Superior Court of San Diego County; Silvia Quintana, Real Party in Interest (2009) 47 Cal. 4th 511, 527-528, 98 Cal. Rptr. 3d 516, 213 P.3d 972*

When employee and employer settle action against third-party tortfeasor for sum that is less than employer's reimbursable compensation costs, so that employee recovers nothing from settlement, and employee has contingency fee agreement with his or her attorney, employee's attorney is entitled to no fee out of settlement proceeds, and employee owes no attorney's fees. *Draper v. Aceto (2001) 26 Cal. 4th 1086, 113 Cal. Rptr. 2d 61, 33 P.3d 479*

When employer and third-party tortfeasor have prior contractual agreement in which prevailing party has right to attorney's fees from other party in event of litigation, subrogated insurance carrier who brings claim for reimbursement directly against alleged tortfeasor is liable for third-party's attorney's fees under contract to same extent as employer. *Employers Muttal Liability Ins. Co. v. Tutor-Saliva Corp. (1998) 17 Cal. 4th 632, 640, 71 Cal. Rptr. 2d 851, 951 P.2d 420*

Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21(a)(ii) did not bar allocation of portion of plaintiff-employee's trial judgment proceeds for payment of reasonable litigation expenses and attorney's fees pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3856*, even though plaintiff rejected more favorable settlement offer. *Phelps v. Stostad (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 23, 34, 65 Cal. Rptr. 2d 360, 939 P.2d 760*

Fee of plaintiff's attorney under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)* in successful action by employee against third-party tortfeasor in which employer's compensation carrier filed lien to recover workers' compensation benefits paid as apportioned between parties benefitted by judgment by trial court on motion after judgment after court first calculates reasonable fee reflecting total services rendered to both beneficiaries. *Quinn v. State of California (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 162, 164-167, 175-176, 124 Cal. Rptr. 1, 539 P.2d 761*

Error for trial court, in calculating fees for employee's attorney, to include amount of employer's workers' compensation lien, which employer assigned to third party as part of settlement between them and which third party then gave up right to enforce against employee as part of settlement between them, and error for trial court to award employee's attorney's fees based on total settlement achieved among employee, employer, and third party without addressing issue of whether that settlement was obtained solely through efforts of employee's attorney. *Manriquez v. Adams (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 340, 346-348, 133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 449*

Plaintiff employee in action against third party is entitled under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)* to attorney's fees and costs allocated from workers' compensation lien when carrier's attorney's participation in lawsuit was limited to attending three of four depositions but asking only one question of one witness, submitting expert witness list naming "all such witnesses so designated by the plaintiff and defendants in this case," and allegedly spending 86.25 hours on case without specifying how hours were spent. *Kindt v. Otis Elevator Company (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 452, 460, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 121*

Plaintiff-employee as entitled to attorney's fees under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)* even though plaintiff's damages award was less than amount spent on workers' compensation benefits and resulted in no net recovery; despite lack of net recovery, benefit as conferred on plaintiff's employer who, without plaintiff's efforts, would not have had any fund from which to recoup or offset amount of benefits paid to plaintiff; when employer sold its workers' compensation lien to defendant, defendant as having stepped into employer's shoes for all purposes; lien rights as allowable against judgment only after payment of litigation and attorney's fees. *Crampton v. Takegoshi (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 308, 316-319, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 284 , overruled on other grounds by Phelps v. Stostad (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 23*

Plaintiff's claim for attorney's fees under *Lab. Code § 3856(d)* as not precluded by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21*, when plaintiff recovered more at trial de novo than from arbitration in terms of damages awarded, notwithstanding that

plaintiff's net recovery at trial was zero as a result of amount paid for workers' compensation benefits; assigned lien as not a factor in determining whether plaintiff's damages at trial were more favorable or not when employer assigned its lien to defendant and was not a party; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1141.21* as inapplicable when verdict between plaintiff and defendant was larger than arbitrator's award. *Crampton v. Takegoshi (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 308, 319-321, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 284 , overruled on other grounds by Phelps v. Stostad (1997) 16 Cal. 4th 23*

When compensation insurer assigns worker's compensation lien to third party, if third party desires to avoid apportionment of attorney's fees under *Lab. Code § 3856*, third party must provide court with sufficient factual detail to establish that activities of insurer's attorney constituted a conscientious effort to address the substantive issues in the case; apportionment as not avoided if the only evidence presented by the third party consists of the attorney's declaration that fails to explain the nature of his services and provides no evidence of the hours expended. *Hartwig v. Zacky Farms (1992) 2 Cal. App. 4th 1550, 1556-1557, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828*

Employer as not passive beneficiary of employee's third-party litigation when employer was represented in that action by its own attorney and this attorney was involved in discovery and pretrial settlement conference, designated several expert witnesses for trial, and appeared at trial and engaged in some questioning of witnesses; thus, employee's attorney was not entitled to an attorney's fee out of employer's recovery in action. *Kavanaugh v. City of Sunnyvale (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 903, 916, 284 Cal. Rptr. 698*

Principle of equitable apportionment of attorney's fees in action against third-party tortfeasor as applying when both employee and employer, or employer's workers' compensation carrier, retain separate attorneys so long as resulting fund is produced through efforts of only one of them; employee's attorney is entitled to attorney's fees based on amount of lien unless attorney for lienholder actively participated in prosecuting suit; attorney's fees are recoverable from liened portion of judgment even when lien has been assigned to third-party tortfeasor. *Raisola v. Flower Street Ltd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1009, 252 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Under *Lab. Code § 3856(c)*, when two attorneys are involved rendering services on behalf of their respective clients, the employer and the employee, in action against third-party tortfeasor award of fees to each attorney as based not on services benefitting both parties, but rather on service rendered in each instance by attorney in effecting recovery for benefit of party represented. *Walsh v. Woods (1986) 187 Cal. App. 3d 1273, 1278, 232 Cal. Rptr. 629*

Under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)*, amount of judgment in action begun by employee against third party and awarded to plaintiff's employer for reimbursement of compensation benefits paid to plaintiff as subject to deduction of costs and attorney's fees when resulting award was produced solely through active efforts of plaintiff's attorney in successfully prosecuting suit to judgment even though employer was represented by its own attorney if attorney did not actively participate in case. *Walsh v. Woods (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 764, 768, 184 Cal. Rptr. 267* (remanding case for finding on issue of attorney participation)

[d] Comparative Negligence

Raising issue of employer's concurrent negligence by affirmative defense in defendant third-party tortfeasor's answer. *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 842, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *Burrow v. Pike (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 384, 392-393, 235 Cal. Rptr. 408*

Raising issue of employer's concurrent negligence by cross complaint of defendant third-party tortfeasor against employer. *Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1053-1055, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Third party sued by employee for injuries sustained in course of employment as not barred by Workers' Compensation Law from filing cross complaint for comparative indemnity against insurer who fraudulently concealed existence of

injury from employee, as such conduct goes beyond normal role of insurer in compensation scheme intended to protect worker. *Chase Chemical Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 229, 239, 205 Cal. Rptr. 469*

Principles of comparative negligence as applicable to employers' subrogation rights within workers' compensation system. *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 832-833, 846-847, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* (modifying rule of *Witt v. Jackson (1961) 57 Cal. 2d 57, 17 Cal. Rptr. 369, 366 P.2d 641* , and *Roe v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 884, 117 Cal. Rptr. 683, 528 P.2d 771* , which prevented negligent employer from obtaining any reimbursement of benefits paid or credit toward future workers' compensation liability when injured employee recovered from third party, to allowemployer reimbursement or credit against workers' compensation obligations that exceed proportionate liability employer would incur for indemnification of third party under comparative system of allocating tort responsibility among multiple wrongdoers); *Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1052, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855*

[e] Credit Against Compensation Liability

Workers' compensation attorney's fees are considered "compensation" under *Lab. Code § 3861* and are subject to a statutory credit for third-party recovery. *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 579, 585-586, 61 Cal. Rptr. 2d 794*

When worker slipped and fell on spilled liquid detergent, employer and building management that failed to clean spill were concurrently negligent; employer's liability for purposes of credit against future indemnity and medical costs under *Lab. Code § 3861* was greater than 5 percent as a matter of law due to employer's obligation to provide a safe workplace. *Bonner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1990) 225 Cal. App. 3d 1023, 1036-1037, 275 Cal. Rptr. 337*

Application of *Lab. Code § 3732*, requiring that Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] be given as credit against its liability amount equal to injured employee's recovery from third-party tortfeasor, as not retrospective when employee was injured prior to its enactment but received award from Fund subsequent to effective date of statute. *Sobiniak v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 448, 451, 202 Cal. Rptr. 789*

Employer's comparative degree of negligence, determined by jury in prior strict products liability action arising out of work-related accident, as making employer joint tortfeasor, precluding employer's insurer from receiving credit for amount of damages attributed to employer's negligence. *Anderson-Cottonwood Disposal Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 135 Cal. App. 3d 326, 331, 185 Cal. Rptr. 336*

Compensation liability against which *Lab. Code § 3861* credit applies as including penalty assessed for incorrect payment of temporary disability. *State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 933, 940-941, 182 Cal. Rptr. 171*

Employer adjudicated concurrently negligent as entitled to application of comparative negligence principles to any credit claim. *Curtis v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 668, 683, 180 Cal. Rptr. 843*

Employer's failure to raise possibility of credit for amount awarded to employee in third-party action, or to reserve appeals board jurisdiction over issue in original compensation proceeding, as not waiving subsequent right to claim credit. *Hodge v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 501, 510, 176 Cal. Rptr. 675*

When third party's negligence was subsequent to and exacerbated employee's work-related injury, employer as entitled

to credit for employee's recovery against third party only with respect to portion of compensation benefits paid as result of third party's exacerbation of injury. *Hodge v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 501, 515, 176 Cal. Rptr. 675*

County as entitled to credit, to be applied against future workers' compensation to injured employee, for injured employee's award recovered from third party. *Herr v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 321, 329, 159 Cal. Rptr. 435*

Effect of *Lab. Code §§ 3858* and *3861* as being to vest in and continue in Workers' Compensation Appeals Board exclusive jurisdiction to determine compensation, even though action against third party to recover for injured employee's injuries is brought before jurisdiction of board is invoked. *Nelsen v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 472, 478, 89 Cal. Rptr. 638*

[f] Damages and Liability

Trial court erred by deducting amount of workers' compensation lien purchased by defendant from judgment prior to determining that defendant obtained a more favorable judgment than the settlement offered under *Code of Civ. Proc. § 998*; *Code of Civ. Proc. § 998* determination should be made before workers' compensation benefits are deducted from judgment. *Poire v. C.L. Peck/Jones Bros. Construction Corp. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1832, 1842-1843, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631*

Lab. Code § 3956(d) as unimbiguously requiring that workers' compensation lien be satisfied out of judgment recovered by injured employee against third-party tortfeasor and not out of verdict; verdict and judgment as properly referring only to plaintiff-employee and to third-party tortfeasor when employer elected to abstain from participating in third-party action and to claim lien on judgment. *Manthey v. San Luis Rey Downs Enterprises, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 782, 788-789, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265*

Amount of workers' compensation lien as required to be taken in partial satisfaction of judgment against third party after it is entered; offsetting amount of compensation lien against verdict as error. *Manthey v. San Luis Rey Downs Enterprises, Inc. (1993) 16 Cal. App. 4th 782, 789, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265*

Method of computing injured employee's recovery against third-party tortfeasor as proper when proportionate amount of employee's negligence is first substracted from total award and proportionate amount attributable to employer's negligence up to amount of workers' compensation benefits paid is then subtracted. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1162-1163, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Third-part tortfeasor as jointly liable with employer for all economic damages, but with respect to noneconomic damages, third party's liability as several only and limited to his or her comparative fault. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1159-1160, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Employer and employee as entitled to verdicts and judgments in third-party action setting forth their respective rights, but damages must be segregated between them to prevent double recovery against third party. *Demkowski v. Lee (1991) 233 Cal. App. 3d 1251, 1258-1259, 284 Cal. Rptr. 919*

While negligent employee's recovery from third-party tortfeasor will be reduced in proportion to his or her own degree of fault, employee's award as required also to be reduced by amount of workers' compensation benefits receivedfrom nonnegligent employer in order to prevent double recovery and employer receives from judgment reimbursement for amount of workers' compensation benefits it has paid. *Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transportation Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 258-259, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29*

When there is no finding of negligence on part of employer, jury verdict as not reducible for workers' compensation benefits paid; reduction in jury verdict as proper only when third-party tortfeasor is entitled to setoff because of employer's concurrent negligence, to which principles of comparative neligence apply, and only then as to compensation benefits paid as of time of trial and not for future compensation benefits. *Curtis v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 668, 683, 180 Cal. Rptr. 843*

Third-party tortfeasor as liable for only his or her proportional share of responsibility, even when that share is less than compensation benefit paid by employer's compensation carrier. *Finney v. Manpower, Inc. (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 1066, 1071, 177 Cal. Rptr. 74*

Third-party tortfeasor who establishes that injury to worker was concurrently caused by negligence of employer as entitled to have judgment against him reduced by amount of workers' compensation benefits already paid, but not benefits to be paid. *Patterson v. Sharp (1970) 10 Cal. App. 3d 990, 996, 89 Cal. Rptr. 396* ; *Slayton v. Wright (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 219, 230-234, 76 Cal. Rptr. 494*

Principle that judgment against third-party tortfeasor is reduced by compensation paid by employer whose negligence contributed to injury as not extending to benefits required to be paid by employer in the future. *Gastelum v. City of Torrance (1969) 2 Cal. App. 3d 582, 583-584, 82 Cal. Rptr. 732* (death benefits payable in installments); *Slayton v. Wright (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 219, 232, 76 Cal. Rptr. 494* (permanent disability benefits payable in future)

[g] Discovery

In third-party action by injured employee against manufacturer and distributor of power press, trial court improperly referred discovery dispute involving production of documents to referee when discovery issues were not sufficiently complex or time consuming so as to require referee. *DeBlase v. Superior Court (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 1188, 1196-1197, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 224*

Trial Court issued a protective order that: (1) allowed plaintiff's counsel to disclose trade secrets and other confidential information to counsel in similar cases only if plaintiff's counsel executed a stipulation agreeing to be bound by the order, and (2) required plaintiff's counsel to notify the defense counsel when disclosure was made. *Raymond Handling Concepts Corp. v. Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Alameda (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 584, 590-591, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 885*

[h] Dismissal

Action was barred by one-year statute of limitations under former *Code of Civ. Proc. § 340(3)* and equitable tolling doctrine did not apply to extend plaintiff's time to file action against defendants, when plaintiff sustained industrial injury in 1997, filed application for workers' compensation benefits in 1998, joined defendants in workers' compensation proceeding in 1999, months after statute of limitations had expired, with no proceeding of any sort filed against defendants within period of one-year statute of limitations, so defendants had no timely notice of potential claim against them that would justify application of equitable tolling doctrine, and plaintiff filed present civil action against defendants in 2007, almost 10 years after his injury. *Aguilera v. Heiman (2009) 174 Cal. App. 4th 590, 596-602, 95 Cal. Rptr. 3d 18*

Doe defendant as properly dismissed in third-party action when defendant was not named and served within the one-year statute of limitations for personalinjuries [former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*]; injured worker as not having the right to intervene in his own third-party action following a complaint in intervention by another intervener in the third-party action and bring back into the action a Doe defendant who had been previously dismissed from that action

because of the worker's failure to name and serve the Doe defendant within the one-year statute of limitations. *Taito v. Owens Corning (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 798, 801-803, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687*

Dismissal of entire third-party action, including compensation insurer's complaint in intervention as proper pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 583.410* for delay in prosecution when during the four years following the filing of the complaint the only action taken by the insurer was to participate in one deposition and to exchange interrogatories, and when the insurer consented to drop its case from the civil active list after the plaintiff dropped her case from judicial arbitration, and thereafter the insurer failed to file an at-issue memorandum or otherwise prosecute its case. *Wagner v. Rios (1992) 4 Cal. App. 4th 608, 611-612, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 731*

Date original complaint is filed as beginning five-year period of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 583(b)* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 583.310-583.360*) for dismissal for failure to prosecute as to intervener in workers' compensation action, although complaint in intervention was filed later. *Johnson v. De Santos (1983) 148 Cal. App. 3d 566, 571, 196 Cal. Rptr. 145* (nevertheless holding five-year period was tolled as to intervening compensation carrier because of plaintiff employee's election for arbitration in which carrier had not joined)

Trial court as erring in failing to grant defendant's motion to dismiss action for personal injuries, based on faulty repair of vehicle that allegedly led to accident, for plaintiff's failure to serve summons and complaint within three years after action was filed [*Code Civ. Proc. § 583.210*] because defendant had filed answer to complaint in intervention by employer to recover workers' compensation benefits paid to plaintiffs; filing of answer to complaint in intervention that was subsequently dismissed with prejudice at request of intervenor as not constituting general appearance in main action so as to relieve plaintiffs of duty to timely serve summons and complaint. *Duckett v. Superior Court (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1419, 1422-1425, 255 Cal. Rptr. 733* (distinguishing on facts *Rhode v. National Medical Hosp. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 528, 155 Cal. Rptr. 797* , and disagreeing with *Rhode*'s view that complaint in intervention is inextricably linked to main action)

[i] Employer's Right to Notice of Third-Party Action

Employee's failure to give employer notice of employee's action against third party, as required by *Lab. Code § 3853*, until two months before trial and one month before mandatory settlement conference, was insufficient as matter of law, even though employer may have had actual notice of action. *O'Dell v. Freightliner Corp. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 645, 656-657, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 774*

Employee as having duty to give employer notice of impending settlement of action with third party, but no such duty to notify is imposed on third party. *O'Dell v. Freightliner Corp. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 645, 657, 662-663, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 774*

Employer as having no standing to move to set aside dismissal of employee's third-party action pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 473*, on grounds that employee failed to notify employer of that action, when employer is not a party to the action; employer as limited to suing employee for breach of duty to notify or to taking a credit against future compensation payable to employee. *O'Dell v. Freightliner Corp. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 645, 658-662, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 774*

[j] Firefighter's Rule

County probation corrections officer's assumption of risk included risk of being injured during training, so that firefighter's rule barred officer's civil action against training company and instructor, and no statutory exception was applicable. *Hamilton v. Martinelli & Associates (2003) 110 Cal. App. 4th 1012, 1023-1030, 2 Cal. Rptr. 3d 168*

Police officer not barred from bringing civil action against owner and driver of truck whose alleged negligence caused collision that injured officer while driving to respond to domestic disturbance, since defendants' alleged negligence was independent cause separate from misconduct that summoned officer. *Terry v. Garcia (2003) 109 Cal. App. 4th 245, 252-253, 134 Cal. Rptr. 2d 565* .

Restaurant cook whose assault on fellow employee in restaurant kitchen led to presence of police officer, who announced his presence to cook, owed duty of care to officer, notwithstanding firefighter's rule. *Yamaguchi v. Harnsmut (2003) 106 Cal. App. 4th 472, 480-481, 130 Cal. Rptr. 2d 706*

Statutory exceptions to firefighters' rule do not apply to fellow public safety members jointly engaged in discharge of their duties, and public safety members were "jointly engaged" in ongoing car chase, even though not engaged in formally coordinated efforts, and even though one group of officers was ignorant of specific nature of chase. *McElroy v. State of California (2002) 100 Cal. App. 4th 546, 548-549, 122 Cal. Rptr. 2d 612*

Police officer bitten by another officer's police dog at scene of an arrest was barred by "firefighter's rule" from suing other officer's employer for his injuries because bitten officer was engaged in dangerous activity; both officers shared objective to effect a felony arrest under dangerous conditions; duty of care officers owed to public under these circumstances precluded their owing duty of care to each other; and hazard posed by police dog was inherent in activity the public hired officers to perform. *Farnam v. California Highway Patrol (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1448, 1455, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 642*

Public lifeguard injured while involved in a rescue was barred by "firefighter's rule" from pursuing tort action against employer and co-worker, pursuant to *Calatayud v. State of California (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1057, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202, 959 P.2d 360* . *City of Oceanside v. Superior Court (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 269, 285, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 621*

"Firefighter's rule" did not bar claim by police officer who was shot by man after responding to a 911 call when man's wife affirmatively misstated to police officer that her husband was not violent, since risk that someone would deceive officer about suspect's violent tendencies is not an inherent risk of police officer's job; wife of man who shot police officer owed officerduty of care under *Civ. Code § 1714.9* not to affirmatively misrepresent nature of hazard officer encountered in responding to 911 call. *Boon v. Rivera (2000) 80 Cal. App. 4th 1322, 1330, 1333, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 276*

"Firefighter's rule" did not bar claim against manufacturer of garage door opener by firefighter injured in a garage fire after the garage door malfunctioned, where the malfunction was independent of the fire. *Stapper v. GMI Holdings, Inc. (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 787, 796, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 688*

"Firefighter's rule" barred action by police officer against psychiatrist for negligent care, where officer was shot by psychiatric patient after responding to a call of shots being fired and court found that risk of being shot while on duty in response to such a call is one the officer assumes under the "firefighter's rule"; psychiatrist's failure to warn police department of the shooter's homicidal feelings toward his work supervisor pursuant to *Civil Code Section 43.92* did not abrogate application of the "firefighter's rule" since psychiatrist had no reason to know that shooter may have been homicidal toward officer. *Tilley v. Schulte (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 79, 85-86, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497*

Civ. Code § 1714.9(a)(1) exception to firefighters' rule did not apply to plaintiff police officer who was injured by fellow officer while they were jointly engaged in discharge of their duties. *Calatayud v. State of California (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1057, 1072, 77 Cal. Rptr. 2d 202, 959 P.2d 360*

"Firefighter's rule" barred recovery of damages for personal injuries suffered by off-duty deputy sheriff when he confronted and struggled with, then shot and killed, suspected burglar who had broken into garage of apartment building where the deputy lived. *Hodges v. Yarian (1997) 53 Cal. App. 4th 973, 980, 62 Cal. Rptr. 2d 130*

Privately employed safety supervisor required to engage in periodic fire-fighting duties have cause of action against third party for injuries caused by third party's negligence in starting fire; claim as not barred by firefighter's rule or doctrine of assumption of risk. *Neighbarger v. Irwin Industries, Inc. (1994) 8 Cal. 4th 532, 547, 34 Cal. Rptr. 2d 630, 882 P.2d 347*

Federal court following *Civ. Code § 1714.9(e)* and reviewing and following California Supreme Court and court of appeal cases. *Vasquez v. North County Transit District, 292 F.3d 1049, 1056-1060 (9th Cir. 2002)*

[k] Indemnity

General contractor's indemnity claim against subcontractor for injuries to subcontractor's employee was barred when indemnification clause was never signed by subcontractor, rendering it ineffective under *Lab. Code § 3864*. *Robert E. Blake v. Excel Environmental (1997) 104 F.3d 1158, 1162*

Trial court erred in denying employer's motion for summary judgment on issue of third party's claims for express indemnity when indemnity provision in equipment lease agreement between employer and equipment lessor was unenforceable under *Lab. Code § 3864* since agreement was not signed by equipment lessor before the date of employee's injury. *Hansen Mechanical, Inc. v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 722, 731-732, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 47*

Lab. Code § 3864 as requiring that signatures of all parties to indemnity agreement be affixed to agreement prior to occurrence of employee's injury;indemnity agreement as not binding when indemnitee signed agreement only after employee's injury. *Nielsen Construction Co. v. International Iron Products (1993) 18 Cal. App. 4th 863, 869, 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 497*

[l] Intervention

Any person having interest recognized by law in subject matter of judgment, which interest is injuriously affected by judgment, as being party aggrieved and entitled to be heard on appeal; appellant's interest as required to be immediate, pecuniary, and substantial, and not nominal or remote consequence of judgment. *Burrow v. Pike (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 384, 392, 235 Cal. Rptr. 408* (appeal from judgment by employer who filed and subsequently dismissed complaint in intervention in employee's action against third-party tortfeasor)

To ensure that both employee and employer recover their damages from third-party tortfeasor, regardless of which one of them sues, and in order to enable third party to settle all claims in only one lawsuit, statutory scheme (*Lab. Code § 3853*) as authorizing employee and employer to intervene in each other's actions, and right to so so as unconditional when intervention is made before trial commences. *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 n.2, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455*

[m] Jurisdiction

Under California choice of law principles, Dominican Republic law governed personal injury action brought in California superior court against employer for injuries suffered by California resident in course of employment in that country pursuant to employment contract entered into in California, when Dominican Republic had particular interest in applying its law to incidents occurring within its borders, plaintiff would receive all workers' compensation benefits to which she might be entitled under either jurisdiction and Dominican Republic's social security system's benefits, employer's Dominican Republic workers' compensation insurer had already paid plaintiff's medical treatment bills of $110,000, lawsuit plaintiff was attempting to bring against her employer was not permitted under Dominican Republic

law, and allowing plaintiff to sue for tort damages under California law would seriously undermine California's workers' compensation exclusivity principles. *Tucci v. Club Mediterranee, S.A. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 180, 189-194, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 401*

Workers' compensation insurer as assignee within meaning of former *Code Civ. Proc. § 117.5* (*now see Code Civ. Proc. § 116.420*) and therefore unable to sue third-party tortfeasor in small claims court to recoup compensation benefits paid to injured employee. *Allianz Insurance Co. v. Municipal Court (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 1043, 1046, 179 Cal. Rptr. 334*

[n] Liens

Employer or its workers' compensation carrier as permitted to assign to third-party tortfeasor its rights to lien on any recovery by worker from third-party tortfeasor for workers' compensation benefits paid. *Raisola v. Flower Street, Ltd. (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1004, 1008-1009, 252 Cal. Rptr. 726*

Appeals board as erring in awarding employee's attorney priority lien for fees against compensation to be paid payable in advance of deduction of credit against settlement proceeds in employee's third-party action when entire amount of compensation to be paid, including penalties, is offset by credit against amount received by employee in settlement of his claim against third-party tortfeasor as that would result in employer's having to pay an amount in excess of that awarded in compensation proceeding. *State Compensation Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1982) 130 Cal. App. 3d 933, 942, 182 Cal. Rptr. 171*

[o] Reimbursement and Off-Set for Compensation Benefits Paid

Employer could pursue reimbursement from third-party defendants for workers' compensation benefits paid to employee, when applicant and third party reached settlement in third-party action. *Bailey v. Reliance Ins. Co. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 449, 455-457, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149*

Third-party tortfeasor as entitled to seek offset of award against third party based on amount of workers' compensation benefits paid to or owed on behalf of employee, even if employer has not joined as a party in employee's action, filed complaint in intervention, or sought to interpose a lien; accordingly, in third-party action in which employer is determined to be concurrently negligent, court as required to deduct employer's percentage share of employee's total recovery from third party's liability, up to amount of compensation benefits assessed against employer. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1161-1162, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Third-party tortfeasor as not precluded from seeking offset of workers' compensation benefits paid to employee, even though tortfeasor had stipulated to good faith settlement of another tortfeasor that included employer's lien; settling tortfeasor's waiver of its right to assert any offset as not binding on nonsettling tortfeasor. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1165-1166, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Concurrently negligent employer as entitled to either credit or reimbursement for amount by which its workers' compensation liability exceeds its proportional share of injured employee's recovery, even though negligent employer is barred from reimbursement for any workers' compensation benefits paid to injured employee; injured employee's damages assessed in third-party action as having to be reduced by amount of workers' compensation benefits received since double recovery not allowed. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1160-1161, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Rule against double recovery as not barring assignment of employer's lien for workers' compensation benefits to injured employee who, in asserting lien in third-party action, does so in capacity of assignee of employer or insurer and not as "plaintiff." *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1164-1165, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Employer's failure to file claim for reimbusement in liquidation proceeding against third-party tortfeasor's insurer within six months after notice of such proceeding as required by *Ins. Code §§ 1021* and *1063.1* as not defeating employer's right to file lien against any judgment recovered by employee in employee's personal injury action; employer as able to enforce lien against third-party torfeasor or, if damages have been paid to employee, againstemployee under *Lab. Code § 3862*; employer as authorized to apply for lien in employee's pending third-party action at any time before satisfaction of judgment (*see Lab. Code §§ 3857, 3858*) and, hence, application for lien can be made after statute of limitations has barred employer from bringing independent action or after entry of judgment has barred employer from intervening. *Burrow v. Pike (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 384, 394-395, 235 Cal. Rptr. 408*

Civ. Code § 3333.1(b), precluding collateral source that has provided medical expenses to plaintiff in medical malpractice case from obtaining reimbursement from medical malpractice defendant, as not unconstitutional as applied to city, which under the statute was barred from seeking reimbursement for workers' compensation benefits paid to policeman who suffered heart attack while on duty and subsequently sued hospital and doctors for negligently causing brain damage during heart surgery. *Barme v. Wood (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 174, 179-182, 207 Cal. Rptr. 816, 689 P.2d 446*

City as not entitled under *Lab. Code § 3852* to recover compensation and other benefits paid to city policeman whose action for damages for injuries sustained in accident had been dismissed pursuant to "fireman's rule," which is applicable to policeman; because employer's action under *Lab. Code § 3852* is derivative of employee's right to sue, employer who has paid benefits to injured employee cannot collect reimbursement from party who is immune to suit by employee. *Hubbard v. Boelt (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 882, 882-885, 190 Cal. Rptr. 15*

In injured employee's action against third-party tortfeasor, employer as no longer precluded from recovering reimbursement of its workers' compensation payments due to its own negligence; recovery for workers' compensation benefits of employer who was concurrently negligent as limited to excess of those benefits after deducting employer's proportionate share of employee's damages. *Jarvis v. Southern Pac. Transportation Co. (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 246, 257, 191 Cal. Rptr. 29*

Third-party tortfeasor and his insurer, which purchased, for one half its face amount, lien claim from employer's compensation insurer, which had become insolvent, as properly allowed setoff in face amount of lien against judgment for employee in latter's action against third-party tortfeasor. *Quinn v. Warnes (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 309, 314-318, 192 Cal. Rptr. 660*

Employer adjudicated concurrently negligent as entitled to application of comparative negligence principles to any reimbursement claim. *Curtis v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 668, 683, 180 Cal. Rptr. 843*

Comparative negligence principles as applicable to employer's right to reimbursement from third-party tortfeasor so that concurrently negligent employer is limited to recovering amount by which its workers' compensation liability exceeds its share of tort damages. *Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 334-336, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068* ; *Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 844-845, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *Del Monte Corp. v. Superior Court (1982) 127 Cal. App. 3d 1049, 1052, 179 Cal. Rptr. 855*

Employer as entitled to full reimbursement for compensation payments when third-party defendant's tort liability is established in amount equal to or in excess of such expenditure. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 929, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987*

Nonnegligent employer, or its workers' compensation carrier, as entitled to complete reimbursement from third-party

tortfeasor for amount paid to employee in compensation benefits, to extent that tortfeasor is proportionately liable for employee's damages. *Kemerer v. Challenge Milk Co. (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 334, 338, 164 Cal. Rptr. 397*

Jury determination that alleged third-party tortfeasor's negligence was not proximate cause of any injury to employee as defeating employer's right to reimbursement for workers' compensation benefits paid. *Mendenhall v. Curtis (1980) 102 Cal. App. 3d 786, 790-794, 162 Cal. Rptr. 569*

[p] Settlement

Good faith settlement of claim for damages made between third-party tortfeasor and employee as precluding action by county retirement board against third party for disability benefits it paid to employee, although retirement board did not receive statutorily mandated notice under *Lab. Code § 3860* or consent to settlement under *Lab. Code § 3859*; when third-party defendant has absolutely no knowledge of possibility of subrogation claim, burden of failure to comply with notice and consent statutes as falling on employee and not third party, and retirement board as confined to action against injured employee to recover reimbursement for benefits paid. *Board of Administration v. Glover (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 906, 911, 196 Cal. Rptr. 330, 671 P.2d 834*

Pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3853, 3859,* and *3860(a),* when employer fails to adequately notify its employee of its subrogation lawsuit and proposed settlement involving alleged third-party tortfeasor and fails to obtain employee's consent to settlement of that suit, and when settling alleged third-party tortfeasor, prior to settlement, was or reasonably should have been aware of possibility of employee's claim for damages against tortfeasor, alleged tortfeasor cannot use mere settlement and dismissal of employer's subrogation action to bar employee from maintaining action for damages against alleged tortfeasor. *McKinnon v. Otis Elevator Co. (2007) 149 Cal. App. 4th 1125, 1128, 1131-1137, 57 Cal. Rptr. 3d 723*

Third-party settlement offer signed by parties' counsel but not by litigants was unenforceable under *Code of Civ. Proc. § 664.6*. *Burckhard v. Del Monte Corp. (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1912, 1919, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 569*

Compensation insurer as not without remedy for the collection of its proportionate share of the settlement of a third-party action of which it had no notice when the insurer is entitled to bring a separate action against the employee to collect its proportionate share, including a quasi-contractual cause of action and an action for breach of the statutory duty to notify the insurer of the impending satisfaction of judgment. *Abdala v. Aziz (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 369, 378-381, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 130*

[q] Statute of Limitations

Complaint in intervention by employer or compensation carrier filed in employee's action as timely, even if filed after statute of limitations has run, provided statute had not yet run at time employee's complaint was filed and complaint in intervention was filed before trial. *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 872, 885, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 826, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455*

Employer's complaint against third-party tortfeasor as required to be filed within one year from date of employee's injury (see former *Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*) and not from date workers' compensation benefits were paid. *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 868-886, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363*

Asbestosis victims death triggered statute of limitations set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 340.6* for legal malpractice claim; statute of limitations not tolled under exceptions set forth in *Code Civ. Proc. § 340.6*. *Gailing v. Rose, Klein & Marias (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 1570, 1577, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 381*

Statute of limitations did not bar applicant's second amended complaint for general negligence that changed situs of his accident when second amended complaint related back to filing of original complaint since it was based on the same facts and injuries. *Idding v. North Bay Construction Company, Inc. (1995) 39 Cal. App. 4th 1111, 1115, 46 Cal. Rptr. 2d 149*

Doe defendant as properly dismissed in third-party action when defendant was not named and served within the one-year statute of limitations for personal injuries [*Code Civ. Proc. § 340(3)*]; injured worker as not having the right to intervene in his own third-party action following a complaint in intervention by another intervener in the third-party action and bring back into the action a Doe defendant who had been previously dismissed from that action because of the worker's failure to name and serve the Doe defendant within the one-year statute of limitations. *Taito v. Owens Corning (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 798, 801-803, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687*

Right of employee to intervene in employer's action against third party tortfeasor before trial commences as unconditional; right of employer and employee to intervene in timely filed action of the other as not dependent on their own compliance with statute of limitations. *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 n.2, 826, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455*

In action by insurer against third-party tortfeasor, *Lab. Code § 3853* as granting unconditional right to injured employee to intervene in suit at any time prior to trial, even though employee's claim was presented more than one year after injury (statute of limitations for personal injury suits). *Jordan v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 202, 206-211, 172 Cal. Rptr. 30*

Complaint in intervention filed by employer's compensation insurer in action by injured employee against third party as not barred by statute of limitations when plaintiff's complaint was timely filed, although complaint in intervention was filed almost three years after employee's injury. *Harrison v. Englebrick (1967) 254 Cal. App. 2d 871, 873, 874, 62 Cal. Rptr. 831*

[r] Subrogation

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852*, workers' compensation carrier stated cause of action against alleged third-party tortfeasors for recoupment of death benefits carrier paid to deceased employee's survivor, who was actual dependent of employee but who had no standing to bring wrongful death action against alleged tortfeasors, and carrier's right to sue was not limited to its status as subrogee of survivor, and wrongful death statute, with its limited standing provisions, was irrelevant in determining carrier's right to sue. *Fremont Comp. Ins. Co. v. Sierra Pine, Ltd. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 389, 394-401, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80*

Workers' compensation law as not imposing a duty on a compensation insurer to pursue its subrogation rights at all or in any particular manner, since subrogation is a right and not an obligation; trial court as properly dismissing employer's complaint against its insurer alleging that the insurer was negligent in not actively pursuing its subrogation rights against a third party who was responsible for the employee's injury, even though the employer alleged it would have received a refund of some increased premiums if the insurer had recovered from the third party. *New Plumbing Contractors, Inc. v. Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1088, 1093-1095, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

Employer who becomes obligated to pay workers' compensation benefits to an employee injured by a third party as having the right to recover the total amount of compensation paid in addition to damages for which the employer was liable; if the employer is insured for workers' compensation liability, the insurer as having the right to be put into the position of its insured against a third party who is legally responsible to the insured for the loss for which the insurer has both insured and paid. *New Plumbing Contractors, Inc. v. Nationwide Mutual Ins. Co. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 1088, 1093, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 469*

Lab. Code § 3852 as allowing employers subrogation rights whenever, and to whatever extent, an employee suffers a subsequent tortious injury that also increases the employer's liability for compensation, whether or not the subsequent injury is industrial or nonindustrial. *Abdala v. Aziz (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 369, 375, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 130*

Employer's action under *Lab. Code § 3852* as derivative of employee's right to sue, and employer that has paid benefits to injured employee as not able to collect reimbursement from party who is immune to suit by employee. *Hubbard v. Boelt (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 882, 884, 190 Cal. Rptr. 15* (defendant immune to suit by policeman employee under fireman's rule)

Employer or its compensation insurer as entitled to sue third-party tortfeasor to recover money paid to state pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4706.5* (death of injured employee without dependents) because such payments are not taxes but compensation within meaning of *Lab. Code § 3852* (providing for recovery from third-party tortfeasors of compensation paid by employer). *Travelers Insurance Co. v. Sierra Pacific Airlines (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 1144, 1155-1157, 197 Cal. Rptr. 416* ; *Associated Indemnity Corp. v. Pacific Southwest Airlines (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 898, 904-907, 180 Cal. Rptr. 685*

Employer's recovery under *Lab. Code § 3852* (subrogation action against third-party tortfeasor) as limited to damages proximately caused by injury; burden of establishing proximate cause as on employer. *Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 928, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987*

Although employer's right to recover against negligent third party, or to lien employee's judgment against that party, is legislative recognition of equitable doctrine of subrogation, those rights as being wholly statutory. *Nelsen v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 472, 477, 89 Cal. Rptr. 638*

Essential allegations in action against estate. *Fidelity & Cas. Co. of New York v. McMurry (1963) 217 Cal. App. 2d 767, 32 Cal. Rptr. 243*

Right of insurance carrier to bring independent action to recover medical, hospital and burial expenses after obtaining a lien for death benefits in a wrongful death action by the employee's heirs. *v. Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection & Ins. Co. (1956) 143 Cal. App. 2d 646, 299 P.2d 928*

[s] Uninsured Motorist Insurance

Employee injured by uninsured motorist while acting within course and scope of employment as entitled to make claim under uninsured motorist coverage provided by employee's automobile insurance policy as well as filing workers' compensation claim against his or her employer. *Rangel v. Interinsurance Exchange (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 1, 8, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 783, 842 P.2d 82*

Insurer as having no duty to pay its insured benefits under uninsured motorist provision until insured's workers' compensation claim is resolved. *Rangel v. Interinsurance Exchange (1992) 4 Cal. 4th 1, 17, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 783, 842 P.2d 82*

Ins. Code § 11580.2, relating to uninsured motorist coverage in motor vehicle liability policies, as contemplating that worker who is entitled to workers' compensation for injury caused by negligence of uninsured third-party motorist may also make claim for uninsured motorist coverage, but *Ins. Code § 11580.2(h)* as providing that recovery under uninsured motorist coverage shall be reduced by amount paid under workers' compensation law. *Rankin v. West American Ins. Co. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 829, 836, 149 Cal. Rptr. 57*

[t] Waiver of Rights

Waiver by nonnegligent employer of subrogation rights against third-party tortfeasor for compensation paid as inuring to benefit of injured employee or employee's dependents, as case may be, as payments received by them from a collateral source, and not to benefit of third-party tortfeasor. *De Cruz v. Reid (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 217, 227, 70 Cal. Rptr. 550, 444 P.2d 342*

Waiver of subrogration rights by employer who was concurrently negligent as not barring third-party tortfeasor's assertion of such negligence so as to reduce any judgment against third party tortfeasor by injured employee or employee's dependents. *De Cruz v. Reid (1968) 69 Cal. 2d 217, 227, 70 Cal. Rptr. 550, 444 P.2d 342*

Injured employee's purchase of employer's lien for workers' compensation benefits and employer's waiver of right to lien as not barring third-party tortfeasor found partially liable to employer from asserting offset for these benefits. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1167-1168, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Settling tortfeasor's waiver of its right to assert any offset as not binding on nonsettling tortfeasor; nonsettling tortfeasor as not waiving its right to assert offset by agreeing that settlement was in good faith. *Engle v. Endlich (1992) 9 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1165-1166, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 145*

Employer's waiver of right to reimbursement as not constituting waiver of its right to a credit. *Curtis v. State of California ex rel. Dept. of Transportation (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 668, 683, 180 Cal. Rptr. 843*

[72] Treating Physicians

When responding to employee's request to change physicians during 30 days following date of injury, employer, in order to retain control, including retention of power to designate primary treating physician, must follow notice provisions of *Lab. Code § 4601* and Admin. Dir. Rule 9781, which provisions have been held to require that notice to employee name specific physician being designated by employer, specifically indicate that notice is being given in response to employee's request to change physicians, and make clear that designated alternative physician is primary treating physician. *Pinkerton, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1019, 1027-1030, 107 Cal. Rptr. 2d 787*

Limitation of "one time change of physician" set forth in *Lab. Code § 4601* does not apply to applicant who was exercising her right to control medical treatment by selecting her own physician. *Ralphs Grocery Co. v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd. (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 820, 829, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 197*

[73] Uninsured Employers

Workers' compensation insurer's civil action against illegally uninsured employer for reimbursement of award of benefits to employee for cumulative trauma was permitted by *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)* as exception to exclusive remedy rule, and jurisdiction of action was not limited to Appeals Board. *Graphics Arts Mutual Ins. Co. v. Time Travel Internat., Inc. (2005) 126 Cal. App. 4th 405, 413-415*

Penalty assessed against employer for failure to have workers' compensation coverage would not be set aside, since subsequent reinstatement of employer's lapsed coverage to include retroactively date of penalty assessment could not invalidate penalty assessment. *Leo's Assocs., Inc. v. Department of Indus. Relations (2004) 120 Cal. App. 4th 628, 631-632, 15 Cal. Rptr. 3d 594*

Employer as not relieved of penalty under *Lab. Code § 3722* for failure to secure workers' compensation insurance coverage at the time investigator issued stop order against employer pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3710.1* notwithstanding that, immediately after stop order was issued, employer obtained insurance providing coverage for the hours preceding and including investigator's visit; *Lab. Code § 3722* as providing for imposition of penalty at the moment stop order issues. *Woodline Furniture Mfg. Co. v. Department of Industrial Relations (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1653, 1658-1659, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 17*

[74] Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund

Limitation of liability specified by *Lab. Code § 3716.2* precludes imposition of sanction against UEBTF pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5813* for bad-faith actions or tactics that are frivolous or intended solely to cause unnecessary delay. *Duncan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2008) 166 Cal. App. 4th 294, 300-304, 82 Cal. Rptr. 3d 664*

UEBTF may not be joined in any proceedings unless legal person or entity has been identified as illegally uninsured employer in application and special notice of lawsuit and that employer has been served with application and special notice of lawsuit in manner provided for service of summons in Code of Civil Procedure. *Rea v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 625, 644-652*

Uninsured employer's obligation to reimburse UEBTF for award of workers' compensation benefits that UEBTF paid to injured employee is not excise tax for purposes of federal bankruptcy law and is, therefore, dischargeable in bankruptcy proceedings. *George v. Uninsured Employers Fund (9th Cir. 2004) 361 F.3d 1157, 1162-1164*

Action before W.C.A.B. to obtain judgment against uninsured employer, which is prerequisite to the UEBTF's obligation to pay benefits, is not barred by bankruptcy discharge injunction, nor is bankruptcy court order necessary for W.C.A.B. action to proceed. *In re Munoz (9th Cir. 2002) 287 B.R. 546, 550, 554-556*

Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] as created to provide source of funds for injured workers whose employers have failed or refused either to obtain workers' compensation insurance coverage or to qualify as self-insurers for employers' liability; Fund as designed to be financed from various penalties that may be assessed against uninsured employers as well as from state tax revenues. *DuBois v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 382, 388-389, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523, 853 P.2d 978*

Liability of Uninsured Employers Fund [now called the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund] for payment of award of workers' compensation benefits as derivative rather than vicarious; employer as primarily responsible for payment of award even when Fund has participated and is ultimately required to pay award; Fund as not liable to pay any amount in excess of, or different from, amount awarded against uninsured employer. *DuBois v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 5 Cal. 4th 382, 390, 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 523, 853 P.2d 978*

Suit to recover damages against individual employees of UEF [now called the UEBTF] by plaintiff against whose property lien had been filed by UEF, alleging federal civil rights claim and several state law claims, barred by federal claim by statute of limitations and California Government Claims Act (i.e., *Gov. Code § 821.6*), respectively. *Javor v. Taggart (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 795, 799-800, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 174*

[74A] Utilization Review

When deciding whether to approve or deny injured employee's request for medical treatment, employer must conduct utilization review pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4610* and may not, as alternative to utilization review, elect to dispute request for medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4062*, which permits only *employees* to use its provisions to object to employers' decisions regarding treatment requests. *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals*

Bd. (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 230, 233-234, 236-237, 239-245, 79 Cal. Rptr. 3d 171, 186 P.3d 535

Procedures and timelines governing objections to treating physician's recommendation for spinal surgery are contained in *Lab. Code §§ 4610* and *4062* and in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 9788.1, 9788.11,* and *9792.6(o),* as elucidated by Appeals Board en banc. Cervantes v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 1336, 1338, 1341-1346, 1351-1355 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)

[75] Vocational Rehabilitation

WCAB en banc held that: (1) repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5* terminated any rights to vocational rehabilitation benefits or services pursuant to orders or awards that were not final before January 1, 2009; (2) no saving clause was adopted to protect vocational rehabilitation rights in cases still pending on or after January 1, 2009; (3) vocational rehabilitation statutes that were repealed in 2003 do not continue to function as "ghost statutes" on or after January 1, 2009; (4) effective January 1, 2009, the WCAB lost jurisdiction over non-vested and inchoate vocational rehabilitation claims, but the WCAB continues to have jurisdiction under *Lab. Code §§ 5502(b)(3)* and *5803* to enforce or terminate vested rights; and (5) subject matter jurisdiction over non-vested and inchoate vocational rehabilitation claims cannot be conferred by waiver, estoppel, stipulation, or consent. Weiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 74 Cal. Comp. Cases 736, 737, 742-758 (Appeals Board en banc opinion)

Even if WCAB assumed that some vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance was indisputably due to employee prior to January 1, 2009, this does not mean that employee's right to this vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance had vested, since statutory right vests through final order or award, but no final order or award of vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance was made in present case, and repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5* extinguished employee's right to such award. Weiner v. Ralphs Co. (2009) *74 Cal. Comp. Cases 958, 962-964 (Appeals Board en banc opinion) , pet. for writ of rev. filed* 9/28/2009

Court of appeal followed *Weiner v. Ralphs Co.* and held that October 2008 WCAB decision that affirmed WCJ's January 2008 award of vocational rehabilitation benefits to employee was not "final" decision, so that employee lost all rights to vocational rehabilitation benefits as of January 1, 2009, repeal of *Lab. Code § 139.5*. *Beverly Hilton Hotel v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2009) 176 Cal. App. 4th 1597, 1604-1611, 99 Cal. Rptr. 3d 50*

Amendments to *Lab. Code § 4646* are procedural in nature and thus apply to injuries occurring prior to January 1, 2003, date on which amendments went into effect, as well as to injuries occurring after that date. *Pebworth v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2004) 116 Cal. App. 4th 913, 917-919, 10 Cal. Rptr. 3d 832*

Employer's letter sent to employee, who had been terminated following industrial injury, indicating that it "would have offered" employee specified alternative position "had he not been terminated for breaching the attendance policy," did not constitute actual offer of alternative position. *Robertson v. W.C.A.B. (2003) 112 Cal. App. 4th 893, 899-901, 5 Cal. Rptr. 3d 485*

Rehabilitation Unit's grant of employer's request to terminate liability for rehabilitation services had no effect on Appeals Board's continuing jurisdiction to act on employee's timely petition, filed with Board, to reopen and reinstate vocational rehabilitation. *Martino v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2002) 103 Cal. App. 4th 485, 490, 126 Cal. Rptr. 2d 812*

Writing letter to employer requesting vocational rehabilitation is sufficient to constitute an "initial" request for services, even when letter is not sent torehabilitation unit; timely request for vocational rehabilitation does not become untimely solely because interruption ends beyond the limitations period. *Martinez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 1079, 1085-1086, 101 Cal. Rptr. 2d 406*

Undocumented employee is not entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits when employee is unable to return to work solely because of immigration status, since providing undocumented worker with greater benefits than those available to legal workers violates *equal protection clause of the United States Constitution*. *Del Taco v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 79 Cal. App. 4th 1437, 1442-1443, 94 Cal. Rptr. 2d 825*

Appeals Board loses jurisdiction to award further vocational rehabilitation benefits following an interruption of services for a defined period of time and more than five years after the date of injury, absent an express reservation of jurisdiction. *Sacramento County Office of Education v. W.C.A.B. (2000) 82 Cal. App. 4th 107, 118, 97 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699*

Salary benefits paid under *Lab. Code § 4800.5* to California Highway Patrol officer during participation in vocational rehabilitation were in lieu of temporary disability benefits but not in lieu of vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance and therefore were not credited toward the *Lab. Code § 139.5* $16,000 vocational rehabilitation cap. *Sabath v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 286, 292, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1*

Employer's offer of alternate seasonal work to injured ski instructor was sufficient to meet requirements of *Lab. Code § 4644(a)(6)(B)*, even though the alternate work was provided only during the ski season and not for 12 consecutive months. *Henry v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 68 Cal. App. 4th 981, 985-986, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 631*

Leave of absence salary benefits paid to police officer under former *Lab. Code § 4800* during officer's participation in vocational rehabilitation was not in lieu of vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance; Legislature did not intend that portion of leave of absence benefits, in maximum weekly amount of $246 as provided in *Lab. Code § 139.5(c)*, be included in calculating vocational rehabilitation benefits that must be provided to injured police officer under $16,000 vocational rehabilitation cap; employer was not entitled to apply $246 per week credit against vocational rehabilitation cap during period officer received leave of absence benefits under former *Lab. Code § 4800* while participating in vocational rehabilitation. *Edgar v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 1, 19-20, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 83*

Applicant's possible ineligibility to participate in vocational rehabilitation does not preclude entitlement to benefits during period between application for benefits and date WCAB makes finding of qualified injured worker status. *Johnson v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 197, 202, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 422*

Injured employee who was QIW pursuant to stipulation was entitled to VRTD benefits retroactive to date of employee's demand for benefits, or to earlier date if evidence showed earlier date applied; employer entitled to credit against retroactive payments for temporary disability or other duplicative benefits made to injured worker after date of employee's demand for vocationalrehabilitation benefits. *Estrada v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 1458, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 176*

WCAB as correctly determining that *Lab. Code §§ 4850* and *4853* terminated city's liability for vocational rehabilitation maintenance allowance (VRMA) on date of detective's retirement; legislative history of relevant statutes indicates intent that VRMA be treated as form of temporary disability and, like temporary disability, must terminate upon disability retirement for employees covered by *Lab. Code §§ 4850* and *4853*. *Ritchie v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1174, 1189, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 722*

Qualified employee as having statutory right (*Lab. Code § 139.5*) to rehabilitation and right to continued payment of temporary disability benefits from moment of his or her choice to undergo rehabilitation; employer as having primary duty for making rehabilitation available, which includes duty to inform employee of potential right to rehabilitation; if employer breaches its duty of notifying employee, employer as obligated to pay temporary rehabilitation benefits from date of its breach. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 340, 340 n.6, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Statutory scheme as envisioning that vocational rehabilitation will be provided injured worker before final decision is reached on nature and extent of his or her permanent disability. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 340, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Employee as entitled to receive vocational rehabilitation benefits during evaluation period despite ultimate determination that he or she is not a qualified injured worker if worker in good faith provides prima facie evidence to support request for rehabilitation benefits. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 340 n.6, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Vocational rehabilitation as particularly effective in case of partially disabled employee with progressive disease whose health precludes his or her returning to former job but whose physical condition may still allow worker to pursue another occupation. *General Foundry Service v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 331, 340, 228 Cal. Rptr. 243, 721 P.2d 124*

Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 139.5*, employers as having mandatory duty to provide rehabilitation benefits to employees who seek them. *LeBoeuf v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1983) 34 Cal. 3d 234, 242, 193 Cal. Rptr. 547, 666 P.2d 989*

Order of WCAB denying injured worker's claim for retroactive vocational rehabilitation temporary disability benefits (for injury occurring before 1990) as not res judicata regarding worker's subsequent claim for these benefits when worker's initial claim was denied before he was found to be both medically and vocationally qualified for these benefits and when his subsequent claim was denied after he had been found to be so qualified. *Belmontez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 786, 795-796, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405*

Qualified injured worker as entitled to vocational rehabilitation temporary disability benefits (for injury occurring before 1990) beginning on date on which worker first requested rehabilitation; allegation in application filed with WCAB that parties have dispute regarding vocational rehabilitation as sufficient request for those benefits. *Belmontez v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 786, 794-795, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 405*

Employee as not qualified injured worker for purposes of award of vocational rehabilitation benefits when, although she was unable to return to work at her former position for same supervisor because of injury to her psyche, she was able to return to equivalent position with same employer; concept of "qualified injured worker" as focusing on performance of duties within labor market, and as not focusing on identity of persons with whom or under whom injured worker performed those duties. *Save Mart Stores v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 720, 723-727, 4 Cal. Rptr. 2d 597*

Request for vocational rehabilitation benefits as required to be supported by medical evidence. *Malloy v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 1658, 1662-1663, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 820*

Once Rehabilitation Bureau (now Rehabilitation Unit of the Office of Benefit Determination) has determined that employee is qualified injured worker under *Lab. Code § 139.5*, employer as having duty to develop rehabilitation program for worker so that worker may return as soon as possible to maximum self-support. *Armodia v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 554, 560, 249 Cal. Rptr. 156*

History of *Lab. Code § 139.5* as indicating legislative intent to encourage employees to enroll in rehabilitation programs and to place on employers primary duty of promptly making rehabilitation services available. *Pereira v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 1, 5, 241 Cal. Rptr. 302*

[76] Voluntary Services

Lab. Code § 3352(i), excluding from workers' compensation any person performing voluntary service for public agency or private, nonprofit organization who receives no remuneration for such services other than meals, transportation, lodging, or reimbursement for incidental expenses, as inapplicable to student medical student providing services to hospital as part of externship program required to obtain degree when program was mandatory, student's services were not voluntary, and hospital presented no evidence that it was private, nonprofit organization, and, even if it had, training received by student constituted sufficient remuneration to make *Lab. Code § 3352* inapplicable. *Barragan v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 637, 648-650, 240 Cal. Rptr. 811*

[77] Work Place

Employee as not able to sue employer for injuries resulting from employer's failure to comply with employer's duties as landowner or to provide safe place to work. *Jones v. Kaiser Industries Corp. (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 552, 561, 237 Cal. Rptr. 568, 737 P.2d 771*

Workers' compensation law as compensating employees for injuries arising out of unsafe work place conditions, including enhanced compensation under *Lab. Code § 4553* in cases involving serious and willful employer misconduct. *Spratley v. Winchell Donut House, Inc. (1987) 188 Cal. App. 3d 1408, 1411-1412, 234 Cal. Rptr. 121*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsCosts & Attorney FeesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIBenefit DeterminationsCumulative & Successive DisabilitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentRecreational ActivitiesWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesWillful Misconduct

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.357

§ 577.357 Law Reviews

[1] Workers' Compensation System--In General

DeVader, *Reducing Managerial Distress About Stress: An Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives for Reducing Stress-Based Workers' Compensation Claims, 31 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1 (1990)*

Note, *Tackling Workers' Compensation in California: The Margolin-Bill Greene Workers' Compensation Reform Act of 1989, 21 Pac. L.J. 853 (1990)*

Erlich, *Inside the Workers' Comp Mess*, 8(10) Cal. Law. 53 (1988)

Note, *Scientific Decisionmaking in Workers' Compensation: A Long Overdue Reform, 59 S. Cal. L. Rev. 911 (1986)*

Note, *California's Going and Coming Rule in Workers' Compensation: A New Model for Consistency, 36 Hastings L.J. 969 (1985)*

Comment, *Indemnity Clauses and Workers' Compensation: A Proposal for Preserving the Employer's Limited Liability, 70 Cal. L. Rev. 1421 (1982)*

Note, *Associated Construction and Engineering Co. of California v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board: Comparative Negligence in the Workers' Compensation System, 68 Cal. L. Rev. 895 (1980)*

Bouret, *The California Going and Coming Rule: A Plea for Legislative Clarification, 15 Cal. W.L. Rev. 116 (1979)*

Mastoris, *The Statutes of Limitation in Workers' Compensation Proceedings, 15 Cal. W.L. Rev. 32 (1979)*

Comment, *Employee or Independent Contractor: The Need for a Reassessment of the Standard Used Under California Workmen's Compensation, 10 U.S.F. L. Rev. 133 (1975)*

Larson, *The Conflict of Laws Problem Between the Longshoremen's Act and State Workmen's Compensation Acts, 45 S. Cal. L. Rev. 699 (1972)*

Colvin, *Appellate Review in Workmen's Compensation and the Approaching Demise of the Substantial Evidence Rule, 21 Hastings L.J. 647 (1970)*

[2] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

Comment, *The Employment-Related Emotional Distress Morass: Confusing Signals From California's Courts and Legislature, 21 Pac. L.J. 1035 (1990)*

Comment, *Cole v. Fair Oaks Fire Protection District: Exploring the Parameters of the Normal Risks of Employment Test, 19 Pac. L.J. 303 (1988)*

Note, *Workers' Compensation Exclusivity and Wrongful Termination Tort Damages: An Injurious Tug of War? 39 Hastings L.J. 1229 (1988)*

Note, *Dual Capacity in California: A Premature End to an Equitable Doctrine? 59 S. Cal. L. Rev. 205 (1985)*

Comment, *Indemnity Clauses and Workers' Compensation: A Proposal for Preserving the Employer's Limited Liability, 70 Cal. L. Rev. 1421 (1982)*

Miller and Goldstein, *Double, Double, Toil, and Trouble: Dual Capacity and Worker's Compensation in California, 13 U. West L.A. L. Rev. 111 (1981)*

Tomita, *The Exclusive Remedy for Workers' Compensation for Intentional Torts of the Employer: Johns-Manville Products v. Superior Court, 18 Cal. W.L. Rev. 27 (1981)*

Comment, *Determining the Compensability of Mental Disabilities Under Workers' Compensation, 55 S. Cal. L. Rev. 193 (1981)*

Note, *Johns-Manville Products Corp v. Superior Court: Intentional Aggravation of Injury as an Exception to Exclusive Workers' Compensation Remedies, 69 Cal. L. Rev. 1230 (1981)*

Peach, *Limitation on an Employer's Immunity in Special Employment Situations, 15 Cal. W.L. Rev. 477 (1980)*

Comment, *Comparative Negligence in the Workers' Compensation System, 68 Cal. L. Rev. 895 (1980)*

Larson, *Nonphysical Torts and Workmen's Compensation, 12 Cal. W.L. Rev. 1 (1975)*

Comment, *The Scope of the Exclusive Remedy Clause in California Worker's Compensation Act: Should It Include Third Party Actions for Loss of Consortium? 10 U.S.F. L. Rev. 252 (1975)*

Demler, *Remedy for the Intentional Torts of a Workmen's Compensation Carrier, 1 Pepperdine L. Rev. 54 (1973)*

[3] Third-Party Actions

Love, *Retaliatory Discharge for Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim: The Development of a Modern Tort Action, 37 Hastings L.J. 551 (1986)*

The California Supreme Court Survey--A Review of Decisions: July 1981-December 1981, 9 Pepperdine L. Rev. 939, 1058 (1982)

Note, *Associated Construction and Engineering Co. of California v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Board: Comparative Negligence in the Workers' Compensation System, 68 Cal. Law Rev. 895 (1980)*

A Critique of the Justification for Employee Suits in Strict Products Liability Against Third Party Manufacturers, 25 UCLA L. Rev. 125 (1977)

Note, *Third Party and Employer Liability After Nga Li v. Yellow Cab Company for Injuries to Employerss Covered by Workers' Compensation, 50 So. Cal. L. Rev. 1029 (1977)*

Note, *Roe v. Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board: Something Fishy in California Workers' Compensation Law, 27 Hastings L.J. 637 (1976)*

Lasky, *Subrogation Under the California Workmen's Compensation Laws--Rules, Remedies and Side Effects, 12 Santa Clara L. Rev. 1 (1972)*

Comment, *Workmen's Compensation: The Impact of the Witt v. Jackson Rule on the Law of Third Party Settlements, 17 UCLA L. Rev. 651 (1970)*

Note, *Attorney's Fees in Third Party Actions, 21 Hastings L.J. 717 (1970)*

Note, *Workmen's Compensation and Third Party Suits: The Aftermath of Witt v. Jackson, 21 Hastings L.J. 661 (1970)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityCourse of EmploymentGoing & Coming RuleWorkers' Compensation & SSDICompensabilityInjuriesPsychological InjuriesWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesComparative & Contributory NegligenceWorkers' Compensation & SSDIRemedies Under Other LawsExclusivityExceptionsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIThird Party ActionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.358

§ 577.358 Text References

[1] Workers' Compensation Principles--In General

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 1, (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Insurance, § 12*; vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 2-20, 118-258, 366-384 (10th ed. 2005)

[2] Filing a Workers' Compensation Claim

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 1, §§ 1.16-1.37 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Workers' Compensation*, §§ 259-302, 385, 386 (10th ed. 2005)

[3] Initiating Proceedings to Collect Benefits

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.22-13.91 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 385-389 (10th ed. 2005)

[4] Filing and Service of Papers

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 388-390 (10th ed. 2005)

[5] Arbitration

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 19 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

[6] Settling Claims

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 16 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Workers' Compensation*, §§ 354-361 (10th ed. 2005)

[7] Stipulations and Requests for Award

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 16, §§ 16.70-16.85 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 390-391 (10th ed. 2005)

[8] Pre-Hearing Proceedings and Hearings

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 17, §§ 17.1-17.44, ch. 18, (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 390, 394-401 (10th ed. 2005)

[9] Findings and Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

California Workers' Compensation Practice, chs. 20, 21 and 23 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 394-433 (10th ed. 2005)

[10] Payment and Enforcement of Awards

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.6-8.24; ch. 20, §§ 20.23-20.49 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 405-413 (10th ed. 2005)

[11] Judicial Review

California Workers' Compensation Practice ch. 22 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 434-451 (10th ed. 2005)

[12] Exclusive Remedy Principles and Exceptions

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Workers' Compensation*, §§ 20, 24-29, 31-47, 49-55, 57-105 (10th ed. 2005)

[13] Third-Party Actions

California Worker's Compensation Practice ch. 1 §§ 1.38-1.47 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th *Ed. 2000*)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 27, 40-41, 43-47, 49-55, 57-105 (10th ed. 2005)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Workers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsAlternative Dispute ResolutionWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsHearings & ReviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewWorkers' Compensation & SSDIAdministrative ProceedingsSettlementsWorkers' Compensation & SSDIDefensesExclusivity Provisions

194 of 194 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.359-577.369

[Reserved]

§§ 577.359[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
1. Filing Workers' Compensation Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.370

§ 577.370 Attorney's Fees Disclosure Statement [Lab. Code § 4906(e); 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135] [DWC Form 3]

[1] FORM Attorney's Fees Disclosure Statement [Lab. Code § 4906(e); 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135] [DWC Form 3]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC Form 3, a disclosure statement relating to attorney's fees. When an employee's injury occurred on or after January 1, 1990, counsel is required to furnish the employee with this form at the initial attorney consultation [*Lab. Code § 4906(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134-10135.1*]. The form must be signed by the employee and the attorney, and copies provided to the employee and to the employer, or to the employer's insurer or third-party administrator, if either is known, within 15 days of execution of the form by the employee and attorney [*Lab. Code § 4906(e)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10134, 10135.1*].

The disclosure statement provides general information concerning workers' compensation attorney's fees, sets forth the range of attorney's fees customarily approved by the appeals board, and includes the telephone number of the Office of Benefit Assistance and Enforcement where the employee may receive answers to questions concerning workers' compensation benefits [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10134*; *see also Lab. Code § 4906(e)*].

The foregoing is the English-language version of the form. A Spanish-language version is also available from the Division of Workers' Compensation.

For further discussion, see *§ 577.41[1]*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 20, § 20.01[4]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 17, §§ 17.6-17.12 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
1. Filing Workers' Compensation Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.371-577.372

[Reserved]

§§ 577.371[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
1. Filing Workers' Compensation Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.373

§ 577.373 Employee's Claim for Workers' Compensation Benefits [Lab. Code § 5401; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10118.1] [DWC Form 1]

[1] FORM Employee's Claim for Workers' Compensation Benefits [Lab. Code § 5401; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10118.1] [DWC Form 1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC Form 1, for use by an employee, his or her agent, or, in case of death, his or her dependents in filing a claim for workers' compensation benefits [*Lab. Code § 5401*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10136*-10142]. Copies are available at district offices of the Employment Development Department and the Division of Workers' Compensation [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*].

[3] Form and Content

The employer's portion of the claim form may include information pertinent to the employer in addition to the information included on the official form, including a logo or other employer-identifying information, but inclusion of such information does not impose additional duties or prohibitions on the employee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10138*].

The claim form consists of an original and three copies [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10138*]. The form must be made available in both English and Spanish [*Lab. Code § 5401(b)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.43*.

[4] Filing and Service of Claim Form

The completed claim form must be filed with the employer [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*]. A claim form is deemed filed when

it is personally delivered to the employer or received by the employer by first-class or certified mail [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*].

The claim form must be filed with the employer prior to the injured employee's entitlement to late payment supplements under *Lab. Code § 4650(d)*, or prior to the employee's request for a medical evaluation under *Lab. Code §§ 4061* or *4062* [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*]. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1994, the filing of the claim form with the employer tolls the time limitations for commencing proceedings for workers' compensation benefits set forth in *Lab. Code §§ 5405* and *5406* until the employer denies the claim or the injury becomes presumptively compensable under *Lab. Code § 5402(b)* [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*]. For purposes of this provision, a claim form is deemed filed when it is personally delivered to the employer or mailed to the employer by first-class or certified mail [*Lab. Code § 5401(d)*].

[5] Employer's Duties

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, the employer must provide the injured employee or, in the case of death, his or her dependents with a copy of the claim form, along with a notice of potential eligibility for workers' compensation benefits, within one working day of receiving notice or knowledge of an injury that results in lost time beyond the employee's work shift at the time of injury or that results in medical treatment beyond first aid, or of the employee's request for a form [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*]. For these purposes, the term "first aid" means any one-time treatment, and any follow-up visit for the purpose of observation, of minor scratches, cuts, burns, splinters, or other minor industrial injury, which do not ordinarily require medical care. This one-time treatment, and follow-up visit for the purpose of observation, is considered first aid even though provided by a physician or registered professional personnel. The term "minor industrial injury" does not include serious exposure to a hazardous substance as defined in *Lab. Code § 6302(i)* [*Lab. Code § 5401(a)*].

If the employer's claims administrator obtains knowledge that the employer has not provided a claim form, the administrator must provide one to the employee within three working days of obtaining knowledge that the form was not provided [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(b)*]. If the administrator cannot determine if the employer has provided the employee with a claim form, the administrator must provide one within 30 days of the date the administrator has knowledge of the claim [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(c)*].

Within one working day of receipt of the completed claim form, the employer must date the form and provide a dated copy to its claims administrator and to the employee, dependent, or agent who filed the claim form [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10140(a)*]. The employer must also provide its insurer with a dated copy of the completed form [*Lab. Code § 5401(c)*].

[6] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.03[2]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 1, §§ 1.16-1.22, ch. 13, § 13.114 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
1. Filing Workers' Compensation Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.374-577.389

[Reserved]

§§ 577.374[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.390

§ 577.390 Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 1A]

[1] FORM Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 1A]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of an application for adjudication of claim for compensation benefits. The application must be on forms prescribed and approved by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*]. A separate application must be filed for each separate injury for which benefits are claimed, even if the employer is the same in each case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10401*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

The statute of limitations applicable to an ordinary claim for medical, surgical, hospital, and disability benefits is *Lab. Code § 5405*, discussed under *§ 577.25[2]*.

Venue is at the district office where the application for adjudication is filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83*.

[3] Service of Application

Upon filing an Application for Adjudication, the filing party or lien claimant must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

For further discussion of service of the application and other documents, see *§ 577.108*.

[4] Additional Allegations and Information

Additional allegations are required in cases involving serious and willful misconduct by the employer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445*; *see § 577.396*], subsequent injury cases [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*; *see § 577.397*], and *Lab. Code § 132a* cases (employer discrimination against employee for filing or making known intention to file an application for adjudication) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10447*]. In such cases, the additional allegations may be attached to the foregoing form or alleged in a separate application for adjudication of claim.

In an occupational disease or cumulative injury case, the application must state the names and addresses of all employers liable under *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)*, the places of employment, and the approximate periods of employment during which the employee was exposed to the hazards of the occupational disease or cumulative injury [*Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*].

For a form of petition to compel joinder when the application fails to comply with this requirement, see *§ 577.430[1]*.

[5] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.05* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.25-13.57 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 387-388 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.391

§ 577.391 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Disability Compensation for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408] [WCAB Form 1]

[1] FORM Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Disability Compensation for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408] [WCAB Form 1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of an application for adjudication of claim for compensation benefits. The application must be on forms prescribed and approved by the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*]. A separate application must be filed for each separate injury for which benefits are claimed, even if the employer is the same in each case [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10401*].

The foregoing form is a reproduction of the form prescribed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10965* (repealed January 1, 1994) (WCAB Form 1) for use by an injured worker to apply for workers' compensation disability benefits with respect to an injury occurring on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10965*]. An application may be filed at any time there is a bona fide dispute after service of the claim form required by *Lab. Code § 5401* (discussed under *§ 577.42[2][b]*). The reverse side of the first page of the form contains instructions for filling out the application and other information relating to the proceeding and to arbitration of the dispute. Copies may be obtained at any WCAB office.

The statute of limitations applicable to an ordinary claim for medical, surgical, hospital, and disability benefits is *Lab. Code § 5405*, discussed under *§ 577.25[2]*.

Venue is at the district office where the application for adjudication is filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5* [*8 Cal.*

Code Reg. § 10408].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83*.

[3] Service of Application

Upon filing an application for adjudication, the filing party or lien claimant must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

If the party filing the application is an unrepresented injured employee, an unrepresented dependent of a deceased employee, or a lien claimant or non-attorney representative of a lien claimant who falls within one of the exceptions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)*, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on all parties and lien claimants, including the filing applicant, who are listed either on the application, on the proof of service to the application, or on the address record (if an address record was previously created for an earlier application).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*].

For all other parties and lien claimants, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, on the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Upon receipt of the conformed copy of the application, the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative) must forthwith serve a copy of the conformed application on all other parties and lien claimants who are listed on the application or on the proof of service to the application, and, if it is an initial application, concurrently notify all other parties and lien claimants of the assigned adjudication case number and venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*].

[4] Additional Allegations and Information

Additional allegations are required in cases involving serious and willful misconduct by the employer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445*; *see § 577.396*], subsequent injury cases [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*; *see § 577.396*], and *Lab. Code § 132a* cases (employer discrimination against employee for filing or making known intention to file an application for adjudication) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10447*]. In such cases, the additional allegations may be attached to the foregoing form or alleged in a separate application for adjudication of claim.

In an occupational disease or cumulative injury case, the application must state the names and addresses of all employers liable under *Lab. Code § 5500.5(a)*, the places of employment, and the approximate periods of employment during which the employee was exposed to the hazards of the occupational disease or cumulative injury [*Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*]. For a form of petition to compel joinder when the application fails to comply with this requirement, see *§*

577.430[1].

[5] Cross References

1 Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.05* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.58-13.67 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 387-388 (10th ed. 2005)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.392

§ 577.392 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1990, or on or After January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408, 10412(b)] [DIA WCAB Form 2]

[1] FORM Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408, 10412(b)] [DIA WCAB Form 2]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of an application for adjudication of claim for death benefits. The application must be in writing on forms prescribed and approved by the WCAB [*see Lab. Code § 5500*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*].

The foregoing is a reproduction of the form prescribed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10412(b)* (repealed January 1, 1994) (DIA WCAB Form 2) for use by the dependents of a deceased worker to apply for workers' compensation death benefits with respect to an injury occurring before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994. The reverse side of the form contains the notice that "filing and service of a declaration of readiness (DIA WCAB Form 9) [*see § 577.399[1]*] is prerequisite to the setting of a case for hearing." It also contains instructions for filling out the application and other information relating to the proceeding. Copies may be obtained at any WCAB office.

The statute of limitations applicable to a claim for death benefits is set forth in *Lab. Code § 5406*, discussed under *§ 577.25[2]*. For discussion of the definitions of "dependency" and "dependents," see *§ 577.14[2]*.

Venue is at the district office where the application for adjudication is filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83*. See also, *§§ 577.390*, *577.391* and *577.393*.

[3] Service of Application

Upon filing an application for adjudication, the filing party or lien claimant must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

If the party filing the application is an unrepresented injured employee, an unrepresented dependent of a deceased employee, or a lien claimant or non-attorney representative of a lien claimant who falls within one of the exceptions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)*, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on all parties and lien claimants, including the filing applicant, who are listed either on the application, on the proof of service to the application, or on the address record (if an address record was previously created for an earlier application).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*].

For all other parties and lien claimants, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]:

1. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, on the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative).

2. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Upon receipt of the conformed copy of the application, the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative) must forthwith serve a copy of the conformed application on all other parties and lien claimants who are listed on the application or on the proof of service to the application, and, if it is an initial application, concurrently notify all other parties and lien claimants of the assigned adjudication case number and venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. When the application is filed in a death case in which there is a bona fide issue as to partial or total dependency, the filing party must serve a copy of the application on the Department of Industrial Relations, Death Without Dependents Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10501*].

[4] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.05 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.68-13.76 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.393

§ 577.393 Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990, and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408] [WCAB Form 1A]

[1] FORM Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5503]--For Death Benefits for Injuries Occurring On or After January 1, 1990 and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10408] [WCAB Form 1A]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of an application for adjudication of claim for death benefits. The application must be in writing on forms prescribed and approved by the WCAB [*see Lab. Code § 5500*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*].

The foregoing form is a reproduction of the form prescribed by *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10965* (repealed January 1, 1994) (WCAB Form 1A) for use by the dependents of a deceased worker to apply for workers' compensation death benefits with respect to an injury occuring on or after January 1, 1990 and before January 1, 1994 [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10965*]. The reverse side of the first page of the form contains instructions for filling out the application and other information relating to the proceedings. Copies may be obtained at any WCAB office.

The statute of limitations applicable to a claim for death benefits is set forth in *Lab. Code § 5406*, discussed under *§ 577.25[2]* . For discussion of the definitions of "dependency" and "dependents," see *§ 577.14[2]*.

Venue is at the district office where the application for adjudication is filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5501.5* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10408*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83*. See also, *§§ 577.390 -577.392*.

[3] Service of Application

Upon filing an application for adjudication, the filing party or lien claimant must concurrently serve a copy of the application and any accompanying documents on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(e)*].

If the party filing the application is an unrepresented injured employee, an unrepresented dependent of a deceased employee, or a lien claimant or non-attorney representative of a lien claimant who falls within one of the exceptions of *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10228(c)(5)(A)-(C)*, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*]:

> 3. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on all parties and lien claimants, including the filing applicant, who are listed either on the application, on the proof of service to the application, or on the address record (if an address record was previously created for an earlier application).
>
> 4. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(f)*].

For all other parties and lien claimants, the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]:

> 3. Must serve a conformed copy of the application on the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, on the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative).
>
> 4. If it is an initial application, must concurrently give notification of the assigned adjudication case number and venue.

Upon receipt of the conformed copy of the application, the filing party or lien claimant (or, if represented, the filing party or lien claimant's attorney or other representative) must forthwith serve a copy of the conformed application on all other parties and lien claimants who are listed on the application or on the proof of service to the application, and, if it is an initial application, concurrently notify all other parties and lien claimants of the assigned adjudication case number and venue [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. Such service is deemed service of a conformed copy of the application for purposes of *Lab. Code § 5501* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10400(g)*]. When the application is filed in a death case in which there is a bona fide issue as to partial or total dependency, the filing party must serve a copy of the application on the Department of Industrial Relations, Death Without Dependents Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10501*].

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.05*

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.77-13.79 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.394

§ 577.394 Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 10]

[1] FORM Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [DWC/WCAB Form 10]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of the form of answer [*see Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5505*] prescribed by the WCAB for use by the defendant in answering an application for adjudication of claims.

The answer must be in writing, conform to the form prescribed by the WCAB, and set forth the particulars in which the application is alleged to be inaccurate or incomplete and the facts on which the defendant intends to rely [*Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5505*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484*]. Additional matters may be pleaded as deemed necessary, but a general denial is not an answer [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

Evidence on matters and affirmative defenses not pleaded in the answer will be allowed only on such terms and conditions as the WCAB or WCJ may in their discretion impose [*Lab. Code § 5505*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83[2]*. See also, *§§ 577.390*, *577.391* and *577.395*.

[3] Time to File Answer

An answer to each application for adjudication must be filed and served 10 days after service of the declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 5505*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10480*].

[4] Employee's Serious and Willful Misconduct

If the employer seeks to reduce the compensation payable to the employee because of the employee's serious and willful misconduct [*see Lab. Code § 4551*], the allegations of serious and willful misconduct must be separately pleaded in the answer and must set out in sufficient detail the specific basis on which the charge is founded so that the adverse parties and the WCAB may be fully advised [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10440*]. The allegations may be set forth on a separate document and attached to the official form. For general discussion of serious and willful misconduct of an employee, see discussion under *§ 577.17[1]*.

[5] Text References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, §§ 25.22-25.24 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, §§ 13.136-13.142 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 389 (10th ed. 2005)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.395

§ 577.395 Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500(a), 5505]--For Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990 and Before January 1, 1994 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484; former 8 Cal. Code Reg. 10969] [WCAB Form 2]

[1] FORM Answer to Application for Adjudication of Claim [Lab. Code §§ 5500(a), 5505]--For Injuries Occurring on or After January 1, 1990 [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10484; former 8 Cal. Code Reg. 10969] [WCAB Form 2]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of the form of answer [*see Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5505*] prescribed by the WCAB (WCAB Form 2) pursuant to former Rule 10969, for use by the defendant in answering an application for adjudication of claims relating to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990. Former Rule 10969 was repealed by the WCAB effective January 1, 1994. Until a new form of answer is approved by the WCAB, it would appear that with regard to claims involving injuries occuring on or after January 1, 1994, a defendant may use either the form set forth in former Rule 10969 or the form set forth in former Rule 10488 for injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1990 (*see § 577.394*). Until a new answer form is promulgated, counsel should contact the local workers' compensation district office to determine which form is being accepted.

Pursuant to former Rule 10969, the answer must be in writing, conform to the form prescribed by the WCAB, and set forth the particulars in which the application is inaccurate or incomplete and the facts on which the defendant intends to rely [*Lab. Code §§ 5500, 5505*; *see* former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10969*]. The answer may allege affirmative defenses and bona fide issues not raised in the application, but must respond to each substantive issue raised in the application [former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10969(e), (g)*]. The answer may also contain any objection to the application on the following grounds [former *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10969(h)*]:

- There are no bona fide issues;

- Specific efforts have not been made to resolve disputed issues; or
- The proceedings requested are inappropriate.

Evidence on matters and affirmative defenses not pleaded in the answer will be allowed only on such terms and conditions imposed by the WCAB or the workers' compensation judge holding the hearing [*Lab. Code § 5505*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.83[2]*. See also, *§§ 577.390, 577.391* and *577.394*.

[3] Time to File Answer

An answer to each application for adjudication must be filed and served 10 days after service of the declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 5505*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10480*].

[4] Employee's Serious and Willful Misconduct

If the employer seeks to reduce the compensation payable to the employee because of the employee's serious and willful misconduct [*see Lab. Code § 4551*], the allegations of serious and willful misconduct must be separately pleaded in the answer and must set out in sufficient detail the specific basis on which the charge is founded so that the adverse parties and the WCAB may be fully advised [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10440*]. The allegations may be set forth on a separate document and attached to the official form. For general discussion of serious and willful misconduct of an employee, see discussion under *§ 577.17[1]*.

[5] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, §§ 25.22-25.24 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.34-5.37 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 389 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.396

§ 577.396 Allegation of Entitlement to Increased Benefits Because Injury Caused by Employer's Serious and Willful Misconduct [Lab. Code §§ 4553, 4553.1; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445]

[1] FORM Allegation of Entitlement to Increased Benefits Because Injury Caused by Employer's Serious and Willful Misconduct [Lab. Code §§ 4553, 4553.1; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440, 10445]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name*],	)	
Applicant,	)	CASE NO.
vs.	)	_____
_____ [*name*],	)	ALLEGATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO IN-
Defendant.	)	CREASED BENEFITS BECAUSE OF EMPLOY-
	)	ER'S SERIOUS AND WILLFUL MISCONDUCT
	)	

Applicant _____ [*name*] alleges that the injury to _____ [*applicant or name of deceased employee*] described in the attached application for adjudication of claim was caused by serious and willful misconduct on the part of the employer as follows:

FIRST THEORY
(Failure to Provide Safe Place to Work)

1. At all times herein mentioned, defendant _____ [*name of employer*] was, and is, _____ [*specify type of business entity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California].

[2. At all times herein mentioned, _____ (*name*) was defendant's _____ (*specify title, e.g.,* managing officer).]

3. On _____ [*date*], _____ [*applicant or name of deceased employee*] [hereinafter "the employee"], while employed by defendant as _____ [*job title or description of work*], was engaged in the performance of his/her duties in the course of his/her employment at _____ [*address*] under the immediate supervision and direction of _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify title, e.g.,* defendant's managing officer].

4. On the above stated date, at about _____ [*time*], _____ [applicant *or* the employee] was directed by _____ [*name*], _____ [*specify, e.g.,* defendant's managing officer], to _____ [*describe work during which injury occurred*].

5. At all times herein mentioned, defendant willfully and with knowledge that serious injury to _____ [applicant *or* the employee] was a probable result _____ [*specify, e.g.,* failed to furnish and use safety devices and safeguards for the benefit of _____ (applicant *or* the employee), failed to adopt and use methods and processes reasonably adequate to render _____ (applicant's *or* the employee's) employment and place of employment safe, and failed to do those things reasonably necessary to protect the life and safety of _____ (applicant *or* the employee)], in that _____ [*specify in detail specific act or omission on which charge of serious and willful misconduct is founded*].

6. As a proximate result of the serious and willful misconduct of the defendant, as herein alleged, _____ [*describe the accident that occurred and the applicant's or employee's involvement in it*].

[*EITHER, if applicant is the injured employee*]

7. As a further proximate result of the serious and willful misconduct of the defendant and the accident, applicant sustained serious injuries resulting in _____ [*specify, e.g.,* temporary and permanent disability, loss of work from _____ (*date*), to _____ (*specify date or* the present), and the need for medical treatment (at various times) _____ (between _____ and _____ (*dates*) *or* commencing on the date of the accident and continuing to the present)].

[*OR, if applicant is a dependent*]

7. As a further proximate result of the serious and willful misconduct of the defendant and the accident, the employee sustained serious injuries resulting in his/her death.

[*CONTINUE*]

SECOND THEORY
(Violation of Safety Order)

8. Applicant incorporates herein Paragraphs 1-4, inclusive, and 6 and 7 of the First Theory.

9. _____ [*Identify safety order violated*], entitled _____ [*specify title of order*] (hereinafter, "the safety order"), [providing _____ (*quote in full if desired*),] was applicable to the work being performed by _____ [applicant *or* the employee] on _____ [*date of injury*], in that _____ [*describe conditions making safety order applicable*].

[*EITHER*]

10. The safety order and the conditions making it applicable to _____ [applicant's *or* the employee's] work at the time of injury were known by _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*name*), defendant's _____ (*e.g.*, managing officer)].

[*OR*]

10. The condition making the safety order applicable was obvious, created a probability of serious injury, and the failure of _____[defendant *or* _____ (*name*), defendant's _____ (*e.g.*, managing officer)] to correct the condition constituted a reckless disregard for the probable consequences.

[*CONTINUE*]

11. The safety order was violated by _____ [defendant *or* _____ (*name*), defendant's _____ (*e.g.*, managing officer)] in that _____ [*describe specific manner in which order was violated*].

12. The violation of the safety order as herein alleged proximately caused _____ [applicant's injury *or* the death of the employee] in that _____ [*specify manner in which violation constituted the proximate cause*].

WHEREFORE, applicant requests that the amount of compensation otherwise recoverable be increased one half, together with costs and expenses not to exceed $250.00, as authorized by *Labor Code Section 4553*.

Dated at _____ [*city*], California, on _____ [*date*].

_____ [*signature*]

Applicant

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Applicant

[*Attach proof of service. See § 577.108[5].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used by an injured employee or a deceased employee's dependents to seek increased compensation on the ground the injury or death was caused by the employer's serious and willful misconduct [*see Lab. Code § 4553*]. The form set out above is drafted on the assumption that it will be attached to the official WCAB form of application for adjudication of claim [*see* forms in *§§ 577.390 -577.393*]. If attached to the official form of application, the attachment should be referred to and incorporated by reference in the official form, in the space provided for describing the nature of the dispute.

Alternatively, the applicant may submit a separate typed application for adjudication of claim containing the allegations set forth in the foregoing form [*see* 1 *Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 5, § 5.01[2][l]* (Matthew Bender); California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, § 5.23 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)]. A separate typed application may be used when an official application has not yet been filed (allowing the WCAB to open a file on the matter and give it a number pending filing of the application), or when the serious and willful misconduct is alleged after the official application is already on file. If a separate typed application is filed, it would only place in issue the additional compensation afforded by statute for serious and willful misconduct. Therefore, an official application must be filed as well to claim other benefits. If a separate application is filed, it should conform as closely as possible to, and contain all the information required by, the official general form (unless such a form is already on file).

Regardless of whether filed separately or attached to an official WCAB application form, and irrespective of the date of injury, any allegation of serious and willful misconduct must comply with the requirements of *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10440* and *10445*, discussed in *§ 577.396[4]*. The statute of limitations applicable to a claim of increased compensation based on an employer's serious and willful misconduct is *Lab. Code § 5407*, discussed in *§ 577.25[e]*.

Although an insurer may provide insurance against the expense of defending a suit for serious and willful misconduct, it is prohibited from insuring against the additional compensation recoverable for such misconduct [*Ins. Code § 11661*; *see Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd. v. Ind. Acc. Com. (1953) 40 Cal. 2d 656, 662, 255 P.2d 431* ; *Imperial Irrigation Dist. v. Chubb/Pacific Indemnity Group (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 317, 320, 321, 157 Cal. Rptr. 733]* . Hence, the employer's insurer should not be named as a party. Because it may defend the proceeding, however, it should be served with a copy of the application. If the employer is self-insured or uninsured and represented by counsel, a copy should be served on counsel.

For further discussion, see § 57.17[2]. See also, *§§ 577.390 -577.393*.

[3] Serious and Willful Misconduct

The claim may be filed if the employee was injured by reason of the serious and willful misconduct (a) of the employer or his or her managing representative; or (b) if the employer is a partnership, of one of the partners or a managing representative or general superintendent; or (c) if the employer is a corporation, of an executive, managing officer, or general superintendent. The amount of compensation otherwise recoverable is increased by one half, together with costs and expenses not to exceed $250 [*Lab. Code § 4553*].

For general discussion of an employer's serious and willful misconduct, see *§ 577.17[2]*.

[4] Pleading Requirements

All allegations that an injury was caused by the serious and willful misconduct of the employer must be separately pleaded and the pleading must set out in sufficient detail the specific basis on which the charge is founded so that the adverse parties and the WCAB may be fully advised [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10440*]. If the charge is based on more than one theory, each theory must be separately set forth [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10445(a)*]. If the charge is predicated on the violation of a particular safety order, the application must allege the following [*Lab. Code § 4553.1*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10445(b)*]:

- The correct citation or reference of the safety order;
- The specific manner in which the order was violated;
- The specific manner in which the violation proximately caused the injury or death; and
- That the safety order and the conditions making it applicable were known to and violated by a particular named person, either the employer or a representative as designated in *Lab. Code § 4553*, or that the condition making the safety order applicable was obvious, created a probability of serious injury, and the failure of the employer or its representative to correct the condition constituted a reckless disregard for the probable consequences.

[5] Service of Form

All documents other than those specified in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10500* and *10501* (discussed under *§ 577.108*) must be served by the parties or lien claimants [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505*]. Such documents must be served on all attorneys or agents of record unless a party or lien claimant is unrepresented, in which case service must be made directly on the party or lien claimant [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10510*].

For discussion of service of papers in workers' compensation proceedings, see the discussion under *§ 577.108*. For discussion of the methods of proving service in civil actions, as well as a form of proof of service by mail that may be adapted for use to prove service by mail in a workers' compensation proceeding, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[6] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.05[4]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.23-5.26 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 316-324 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.397

§ 577.397 Application for Subsequent Injuries Fund Benefits

[1] FORM Application for Subsequent Injuries Fund Benefits

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use in a subsequent injury case to claim benefits from the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund. Additional compensation for subsequent injuries is covered by *Lab. Code §§ 4751-4755*. It has been suggested that, to avoid the running of the period of limitation within which the claim may be filed [*see* [4], *below*], applicants would be well advised to join the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund with the employer in every proceeding seeking permanent disability benefits [*Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 56, 65-66, 84 Cal. Rptr. 140, 465 P.2d 28]* . In any case, the fund should be joined before the extent of the employer's liability is determined to avoid a relitigation of that issue by the fund that could result in the employee being faced with conflicting decisions with respect to the benefits to which he or she is entitled [*see Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 403, 409, 115 Cal. Rptr. 204]* .

Claims against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund must be by written application. The application must set forth the date and nature of the industrial injury, together with all factors of disability alleged to have preexisted the injury [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*]. Allegations of additional factors must be made by amended application [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form

in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

See also, discussion under *§§ 577.390, 577.391*.

[3] Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund

A permanently disabled employee who sustains a subsequent permanent injury may not receive compensation for the subsequent injury from his or her employer in excess of that allowed for the subsequent injury alone. Therefore, the employer is not liable for the combined effect of the disabilities, but only for that portion due to the later injury [*see Lab. Code §§ 4663(a), 4664*]. When a permanently partially disabled employee receives a subsequent compensable injury, however, the degree of disability caused by the combination of both disabilities is greater than that which would have resulted from the subsequent injury alone, and the combined effect of the injuries is a permanent disability equal to 70 percent or more of total, the employee may apply for benefits from a fund administered by the State Compensation Insurance Fund, known as the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund [*see Lab. Code §§ 4751, 4754*]. The employee is entitled to compensation from the fund in the amount of the difference between the amount payable for the last injury, and the total disability percentage, provided that either of the following conditions applies [*Lab. Code § 4751*]:

- The previous disability or impairment affects a hand, an arm, a foot, or an eye, and the permanent disability resulting from the subsequent injury affects the opposite and corresponding member to the extent of 5 percent of total, without adjustment for age and occupation; or

- The permanent disability resulting from the subsequent injury, disregarding adjustment for age and occupation, is equal to 35 percent or more of total.

A "qualified alien" may also apply for benefits from the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund, but must fill out Form UEF-1, "Statement of Citizenship, Alienage, and Immigration Status for State Public Benefits" [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 15740(e)(3)*; *see also 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 15741*].

[4] Filing and Service of Application

An application against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund may be filed by the injured worker with the original application for workers' compensation benefits [*see §§ 577.390, 577.391*] or thereafter [*see Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 56, 61-62, 65-66, 84 Cal. Rptr. 140, 465 P.2d 28]* . There is no statute specifying a period of limitation within which the application must be filed to avoid being barred. Under case law, however, a claim against the fund is barred if not brought within five years from the date of injury, as set forth in *Lab. Code § 5410*, if during that period the worker knew or could reasonably be deemed to have known that there was substantial likelihood that he or she was entitled to subsequent injuries benefits [*Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 74, 76, 84 Cal. Rptr. 151, 465 P.2d 39]* .

Conversely, if the worker, prior to expiration of the five-year period, did not know and could not reasonably have been deemed to have known that there would be substantial liklihood that he or she would become entitled to subsequent injuries benefits, the application against the fund will not be barred if he or she files a proceeding against the fund within a reasonable time after learning from the WCAB's findings on the issue of permanent disability that the fund has probable liability [*Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Workmen's Comp. App. Bd. (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 56, 65, 84 Cal. Rptr. 140, 465 P.2d 28* (disapproving inconsistent langauge in *State, Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1962) 198 Cal. App. 2d 818, 18 Cal. Rptr. 458* , and *Subsequent Injuries Fund v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1960) 178 Cal. App. 2d 55, 2 Cal. Rptr. 646*)].

Applications against the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund must be filed with the WCAB and a copy served by mail on the Fund, in accordance with *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10507* and *10505*. If joinder of the Subsequent Injuries Benefits Trust Fund is ordered by the WCAB or the WCJ, the applicant must forthwith file and serve an application as above [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10940*].

[5] Service of Medical Reports

Any party who has previously filed medical reports must, unless service is waived, forthwith, and in no case later than 30 days prior to the mandatory settlement conference, serve copies of the reports on the Fund [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10946*].

[6] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 8, § 8.09*; *ch. 25, § 25.05[7]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.29, 5.30 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 297-300 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.397A

§ 577.397A Document Cover Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.1]

[1] FORM Document Cover Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

All documents must be filed with document cover sheets and document separator sheets [*see § 577.397B* (document separator sheet)]. A completed document cover sheet must be the first page of each individual document or set of documents filed at one time in the same case. The cover sheet provides space for information regarding 15 companion cases. Only the pages filled out need to be filed. The requirements regarding use of document cover sheets do not apply to any unrepresented employees, unrepresented dependents, or unrepresented uninsured employers who do not have ready access to document cover sheets [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(b)*].

For further discussion of document cover sheets, see *§ 577.104*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.397B

§ 577.397B Document Separator Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.2]

[1] FORM Document Separator Sheet [DWC-CA Form 10232.2]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

All documents must be filed with document cover sheets [*see § 577.397A* (document cover sheet)] and document separator sheets. If an individual document includes an attachment, a completed document separator sheet must precede the attachment, and, if an individual document includes multiple attachments, a document separator sheet must precede each individual attachment. A document separator sheet must not be placed between a document and the proof of service for that document. However, when one proof of service is used for multiple documents, a document separator sheet must precede the proof of service. A list of document titles is provided with the document separator sheet form and posted on the DWC website (http://www.dir.ca.gov/forms.html). These document titles must be used on a document separator sheet to describe the attached document. The document separator sheet requires the filer to list the product delivery units [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(bb)*; *see also § 577.12A[1]*] and the date and the author of the attached document. The requirements regarding use of document separator sheets do not apply to any unrepresented employees, unrepresented dependents, or unrepresented uninsured employers who do not have ready access to document cover sheets and document separator sheets [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(b)*].

For further discussion of document separator sheets, see *§ 577.104*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form

in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.398

§ 577.398 Petition for Appointment of Guardian ad Litem and Trustee [Lab. Code § 5307.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402] [DIA WCAB Form 8]

[1] FORM Petition for Appointment of Guardian ad Litem and Trustee [Lab. Code § 5307.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402] [DIA WCAB Form 8]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of the form (DWC WCAB Form 8) prescribed by the WCAB for use to secure the appointment of a guardian ad litem and trustee for a minor or incompetent injured employee or dependent of a deceased employee [*see Lab. Code § 5307.5(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402*]. Blank forms may be obtained at any WCAB office. For the tolling of the statute of limitations until a guardian is appointed, see *§ 577.25[3]*.

If the applicant is a minor or incompetent, the application for adjudication must be accompanied by the foregoing petition. If the minor has the right of nomination, the nomination must be included in the petition [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10402*; *see § 577.81*].

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 24, § 24.05[1]*; *ch. 31, § 31.21* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.31-5.33 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 374 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.399

§ 577.399 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed [DWC-CA Form 10250.1]

[1] FORM Declaration of Readiness to Proceed [DWC-CA Form 10250.1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10250.1, which is used to have a case set for mandatory settlement conferences, status conferences, priority conferences [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10301 (v), (z), (dd)*], or any other hearing. The Appeals Board may, in its discretion, designate a party or lien claimant, or their attorney or agent of record, to make service of notices of the time and place of hearing, orders approving compromise and release, awards based on stipulations with request for award, and any interim or procedural orders. In deciding whether to exercise this discretion, the Appeals Board may consider whether service by it would be more efficient and cost-effective because most or all of the parties, lien claimants, attorneys, or agents of record to be served have specified e-mail or fax as their preferred method of service. If discretion is exercised so as to require designated service, the party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent of record designated to make service must retain the proof of service and not file it unless ordered to do so by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(a)*; *but see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(b)* (exceptions)].

Applications or petitions may not be placed on calendar for mandatory settlement conferences, status conferences, priority conferences, expedited hearing, or any other hearing unless one of the parties has filed and served a declaration of readiness to proceed in the form prescribed by the Court Administrator. The declaration of readiness must be served on all other parties and lien claimants [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(a)*].

All declarations of readiness to proceed must state under penalty of perjury that the moving party has made a genuine, good faith effort to resolve the dispute before filing the declarations of readiness to proceed, and must state with specificity those efforts [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(b)*]. A false declaration or certification by any party, lien claimant, attorney, or representative may give rise to proceedings under *Lab. Code § 134* for contempt or *Lab. Code § 5813* for sanctions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(c)*]. If a party or a lien claimant is represented by an attorney or representative, any

declaration of readiness filed on behalf of the party must be executed by the attorney or representative [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(d)*].

For discussion of declarations of readiness to proceed, see *§ 577.88*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

It may be filed with the application for adjudication [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10250(a), 10582*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.88*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.08* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 6, §§ 6.17-6.24 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.400

§ 577.400 General Caption for Use on Paper Filed With WCAB

[1] FORM General Caption for Use on Paper Filed With WCAB

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No._____]	)
vs.	)
_____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)]	)
[*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]	)
	CASE NO. _____ _____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]

_____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a general form of caption which may be adapted for use on papers filed with the WCAB either before or after the filing of an application for adjudication of claim.

If filed after the application for adjudication has been filed, the parties would be referred to as "applicant" and "defendant," as designated in the application. If someone other than the injured employee is the applicant (e.g., dependents in a death case), the name and address of the employee must be included in the caption [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10360*].

Ordinarily, printed forms provided by the WCAB are used for the original pleadings [*see §§ 577.390[1] -577.393[1], 577.394[1], 577.395[1]*].

For additional discussion of captions, see *§ 577.101* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.401

§ 577.401 WCAB--Data Entry Sheet

[1] FORM WCAB--Data Entry Sheet

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is an illustration of the WCAB Data Entry Sheet that must accompany all filings in which no case number has been previously assigned. This includes the following:

- The Application for Adjudication [*see §§ 577.390 -577.393*].
- A Compromise and Release Agreement [*see §§ 577.460 -577.462*].
- Stipulations with Requests for Award [*see § 577.470*].
- Petitions seeking recovery under *Lab. Code § 132a*.
- Pre-application filings for cases involving injuries between January 1, 1990 and December 31, 1993, in which no case number was previously assigned by the WCAB.

Copies of the form may be obtained at any WCAB office.

For additional discussion, see *§ 577.102*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
2. Initiating Proceedings Before the Appeals Board

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.402-577.409

[Reserved]

§§ 577.402[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.410

§ 577.410 Subpoena [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530] With Proof of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 30]

[1] FORM Subpoena [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530] With Proof of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 30]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 30 for use by a party to subpoena a witness to testify. On request, the WCAB will issue subpoenas in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985* and *1987.5* and *Gov. Code § 68097.1* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*; *see* discussion under *§§ 577.147, 577.148*]. For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, subpoenas must contain, in addition to the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*, an affidavit that a claim form has been duly filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5401(d)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*]. Copies of the foregoing form may be obtained at any WCAB office.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.43* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.9-8.11 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.411

§ 577.411 Subpoena Duces Tecum [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530], Declaration for Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.5, 2015.5], and Declaration of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 32]

[1] FORM Subpoena Duces Tecum [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530], Declaration for Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1987.5, 2015.5], and Declaration of Service [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10505(c)] [DIA WCAB Form 32]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 32 for use by a party to subpoena a witness to testify and produce documents, papers, books, and records [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1985, 1987.5, 2015.5; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*].

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, subpoenas duces tecum must contain, in addition to the requirements of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1985*, an affidavit that a claim form has been duly filed pursuant to *Lab. Code § 5401(d)* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.147*. See also *§ 577.410*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.43 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, § 8.14 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.412

§ 577.412 Petition for Order to Compel Employee to Submit to Medical Examination and to Suspend Employee's Right to Begin or Maintain Proceeding for Collection of Workers' Compensation [Lab. Code §§ 4051, 4053, 4054, 5703.5]

[1] FORM Petition for Order to Compel Employee to Submit to Medical Examination and to Suspend Employee's Right to Begin or Maintain Proceeding for Collection of Workers' Compensation [Lab. Code §§ 4051, 4053, 4054, 5703.5]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____] vs. _____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)] [*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*)	CASE NO. _____ _____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]

Employee's Social Security No. _____]

_____

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*specify, e.g.,* the defendant in this proceeding *or* the workers' compensation carrier for _____ (*name of employer*)].

[*EITHER, if no application for adjudication has been filed*]

2. _____ [*Name of worker*] claims to have been an employee of _____ [*name of employer*] and that on _____ [date], he/she sustained an injury arising out of and occurring in the course of his/her employment.

[*OR, if application has been filed*]

2. On _____ [*date*], an application was filed by _____ [*name of worker*] alleging that on _____ [*date*], he/she sustained injury arising out of and occurring in the course of his/her employment with _____ [*name of employer*] and claiming temporary and permanent disability compensation.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. On _____ [*date*], petitioner delivered a writing to the employee requesting that he/she submit to a medical examination by _____ [*name*], M.D., to be conducted at the latter's office located at _____ [*address*] on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*].

4. The examination was arranged at a time and place that gave due consideration to the convenience of the employee and to his/her physical condition and ability to attend. Petitioner offered to pay, and is still willing and able to pay, all costs in connection with the examination [and did, in fact, pay the employee for travel and other expenses in advance of the scheduled examination date].

5. Without any cause whatsoever, the employee failed and refused to report for the examination.

6. The examination is necessary to enable petitioner to be informed concerning the nature, extent, and causes of the employee's injury, illness, or disability, if any, and to defend against the employee's claim for continuing temporary disability and other workers' compensation benefits.

WHEREFORE, petitioner requests that an order issue:

1. Requiring the employee to report to _____ [*name*], M.D., at _____ [*address*] on or before _____ [*date*], and to submit to a medical examination; and

2. Admonishing employee that his/her failure to appear for the above examination shall result in suspension of his/her right to maintain any proceeding for collection of compensation and forfeiture of his/her right to disability payments for

the period during which he/she refuses to submit to the examination; and

3. Granting all other and further relief that may be necessary and proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[*Attach proof of service. See § 577.108[5].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a petition for use to secure an order compelling an employee to submit to a medical examination after the employee has refused to do so [*see generally Lab. Code §§ 4050-4054, 5703.5*]. As noted in § 577.156, if an employee fails or refuses to submit to a medical examination after being requested to do so by the employer under *Lab. Code §§ 4050, 4051*, or obstructs the examination, the employee's right to begin or maintain a proceeding to collect compensation is suspended during the period of such failure, refusal, or obstruction [*Lab. Code § 4053*]. Furthermore, if the employee fails or refuses to submit to an examination after being directed to do so by the WCAB or by a WCJ, the employee's right to disability payments accruing during the period of failure, refusal, or obstruction is barred [*Lab. Code § 4054*].

For a discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see *§ 577.108*.

[3] Failure to Submit to Examination

Although neither the Labor Code nor the WCAB regulations clearly specify the procedure to be followed when an employee fails or refuses to submit to a medical examination, the foregoing petition apparently may be filed either before or after the employee files an application for adjudication of claim, as a preliminary step to the employer's terminating payment of disability benefits under *Lab. Code § 4054*. If the employee has filed an application already, the employer may also wish to include in the answer [*see §§ 577.394, 577.395*] allegations regarding the employee's previous failure to submit to a medical examination requested by the employer under *Lab. Code §§ 4050, 4051* and request a finding that the employee's right to maintain the proceeding is suspended pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4053*. Note, however, that, although the right to maintain the proceeding is suspended in such cases, the Labor Code and WCAB regulations do not appear to allow dismissal of the application. At the very least, the applicant is entitled to notice and an opportunity to be heard before the case may be dismissed for failure to submit to a medical examination [*see Roth v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 452, 457-460, 97 Cal. Rptr. 605]* .

The Labor Code and WCAB regulations also do not indicate the procedure the employer should follow if the employee fails or refuses to submit to an examination after an award has already been entered by the WCAB. Apparently, however, the employer, at the very least, should seek an order compelling the employee to submit to an examination before terminating payment of any disability benefits on this basis [*see Lab. Code § 4054*]. For general discussion of supplemental proceedings after entry of an award, see *§ 577.220* et seq.

If an application is on file, the number of the case and the usual caption showing the title and cause should be specified [

see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10301(y), 10450; *§ 577.400*]. If no application is on file, the possibility that the injury occurred as the result of an industrial injury should be set forth.

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 22, § 22.07[2]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 7, § 7.62 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.413

§ 577.413 Petition for Order Directing [Exhumation and] Autopsy [Lab. Code §§ 5706, 5707; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10342(c)]

[1] FORM Petition for Order Directing [Exhumation and] Autopsy [Lab. Code §§ 5706, 5707; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10342(c)]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____]	)	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	_____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]
_____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)]	)	
[*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]		

_____

Petitioner hereby requests an order directing an [exhumation and] autopsy and, in support thereof, alleges:

1. Petitioner [is, and] was on _____ [*date*], the workers' compensation insurance carrier for _____ [*name of employer*], which was the employer of _____ [*name of deceased worker*], who died on _____ [*date*].

[*EITHER, if no application for adjudication has been filed*]

2. Petitioner is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that a claim will be made that the death of _____ [*name of worker*] was due to an injury arising out of and occurring in the course of his/her employment by _____ [*name of employer*]. Should such a claim be made it will not be possible to make a determination of liability in the absence of an autopsy showing the cause of death.

[*OR, if application for adjudication has been filed*]

2. The application for death benefits herein claims that the death of _____ [*name of worker*] was due to an injury arising out of and occurring in the course of his/her employment by _____ [*name of employer*]. An autopsy on the body of the decedent will be of material assistance in determining the cause of death.

[*CONTINUE*]

3. Petitioner will pay all reasonable and necessary expenses in connection with this autopsy, and nominates _____ [*name*], M.D., to perform the autopsy.

WHEREFORE, petitioner requests that an order issue:

1. Directing and authorizing the performance of an autopsy on the body of _____ [*name of deceased employee*] by _____ [*name*], M.D., or any other physician licensed to practice in the State of California;

2. Directing and authorizing that an autopsy surgeon take, for expert microscopic or pathological examination, all specimens that may be reasonably necessary for a determination of the decedent's cause of death;

[3. Directing and authorizing the exhumation of the decedent's body for these purposes;]

4. Directing petitioner to pay reasonable and necessary expenses in connection with the [exhumation,] autopsy[,] and microscopic or pathological examination; and

5. Granting all other and further relief that may be necessary and proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a petition for use to secure an order directing that an autopsy be performed on the body of a deceased worker who allegedly died as the result of an injury sustained in the course of his or her employment. The form also includes optional language to require exhumation of the body, if necessary [*see Lab. Code § 5707*].

If an application is on file, the number of the case and the usual caption showing the title and cause should be specified [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10301(y), 10450*; *§ 577.400*]. If no application is on file, the possibility that death occurred as the result of an industrial injury should be set forth. The name of the pathologist or other qualified physician who is to do the autopsy should be specified so that he or she can be duly appointed. The WCAB will ordinarily issue an order for autopsy without a hearing. If the dependents, or a majority of them, having custody of the body refuse to allow the autopsy, however, it shall not be performed [*Lab. Code § 5707*; *see* discussion in *§ 577.156*]. In such a case, at the hearing on any application for compensation, there is a disputable presumption that the injury or death was not due to causes entitling the claimants to workers' compensation benefits [*Lab. Code § 5707*].

For a discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see *§ 577.108*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 31, § 31.12* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 17, § 17.112 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.414

§ 577.414 Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1]

[1] FORM Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____,	)	
Applicant	)	CASE NO.
vs.	)	_____
_____,	)	MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA
Defendants.	)	DUCES TECUM
	)	
	)	

TO DEFENDANTS AND EACH OF YOU:

Please take notice that Applicant moves to quash Defendant's _____ [*name of defendant*] Subpoena Duces Tecum directed to _____ [*specify witness*] seeking the production of "ANY AND ALL MEDICAL RECORDS ... "

1. The subpoena is over broad.

2. The subpoena is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence.

3. Defendant's attempt to obtain "any and all" records on Applicant violates Applicant's legitimate rights to privacy.

4. The subpoena fails to comply with *Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)* in that the affidavit affixed thereto is merely conclusory, stating that the matter sought is necessary and relevant. Defendants are required to state under penalty of perjury "in full detail the materiality of the material sought to the issues involved in this case" [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985(b)*].

5. The subpoena is so over inclusive and over broad it would generate production of material not relevant to the workers' compensation case and would invade Applicant's right to privacy.

6. A copy of the subpoena and affidavit are attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.

WHEREFORE, Applicant respectfully requests that the enclosed Order Quashing/Limiting Subpoena Duces Tecum issue forthwith.
Dated: _____.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

_____

[*name of attorney*]

[*name of law firm*]

[*street address of law firm*]

[*city/state/zip code of law firm*]

[*telephone number of law firm*]

State Bar No. _____

Attorney for Applicant

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above* is for optional use by a party whose personal records are subpoenaed and who moves to quash or modify the subpoena, on the grounds that the subpoena requests the disclosure of privileged information or constitutes an invasion of privacy [*see Code of Civ. Proc. § 1987.1*]. A Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum is the only remedy to prevent a witness from producing original records sought by the subpoena duces tecum [*see Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530*].

[3] Service of Motion

The Motion to Quash, along with a copy of the subpoena, and the form letter should be served on the requesting party at least five days before the date of production. The notice must specify the specific grounds on which production of the personal records should be prohibited. The motion must also be served on opposing counsel, the copy service directed to copy the subpoenaed records, and the medical provider from whom the records are being sought [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*].

For further discussion, see *§ 577.147*. See also *§ 577.410*.

[4] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 25, § 25.43 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 17, § 17.48-17.51 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.415

§ 577.415 Order Limiting Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1, 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530]

[1] FORM Order Limiting Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code Civ. Proc. § 1987.1, 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10530]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____,	)	
Applicant	)	CASE NO.
vs.	)	_____
_____,	)	ORDER LIMITING
Defendants.	)	SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM
	)	
	)	

Pursuant to Applicant's Motion To Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum and good cause appearing therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

That Defendant's Subpoena Duces Tecum dated _____ [*date*] to _____ [*specify witnesses*] shall be limited to only the following records: medical records regarding the _____ [*specify medical records*]. Any other medical records are excluded from the subpoenas and shall not be produced.

Defendant is ordered to notify, in writing, each witness whose records were subpoenaed forthwith that only the records set forth above are to be produced, and that all other records are not to be produced. Defendant shall send copies of its written notice to Applicant's counsel.
Dated: _____.

_____

Workers' Compensation Judge

[2] Use of Form

When a subpoena has been served requiring the attendance of a witness or the production of books, documents, or other items before the Appeals Board, the Board on motion by a party, a witness, or a consumer as described in *Code of Civil Procedure Section 1985.3*, or on its own motion after notice and opportunity to be heard, may make an order quashing the subpoena entirely, modifying it, or directing compliance on certain terms or conditions, including protective orders. A prepared copy of the form in [1], *above*, may be filed along with the Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum.

For further discussion of subpoenas and motions to quash, see *§§ 577.410*, *577.411* and *577.414*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 25, § 25.43 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 17, § 17.48-17.51 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.416

§ 577.416 Letter to Physician Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3]

[1] FORM Letter to Physician Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum [Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3]

[*Date*]

[*Name and address*]

Re: _____

Gentlepersons:

This office represents _____ [*name of applicant*] in [*his* or *her*] workers' compensation case. Recently you were served with an invalid and illegal Subpoena Duces Tecum by the defendants in that case. A copy of the subpoena is attached.

This office has filed a Motion to Quash that subpoena since it is without legal authority. You are being served with a copy of the Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum.

Please be advised that until a Court rules on this matter you should not release any records. If you do release any records prior to the time the Court issues an order, you may be liable for compensatory and punitive damages as well as attorneys fees and costs.

You should disregard the subpoena until the Judge rules.

Very truly yours,

_____

[*name of attorney*]

Attorney at Law

cc: _____

[2] Use of Form

The letter in [1], *above* may be sent to the medical provider advising the provider that no records should be produced or disseminated until the Appeals Board rules on a Motion to Quash the Subpoena Duces Tecum. The letter should not be sent to the Appeals Board; rather, the letter and a copy of the subpoena, and the Motion to Quash should be directed to the custodian of records or another person qualified to certify the records [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222*].

Failure to provide notice in the form of a letter to the witness or medical provider that a Motion to Quash is being sought does not invalidate the motion to quash or modify the subpoena, but it may be raised by the witness or medical provider as an affirmative defense in any action for liability for improper release of records [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*].

For further discussion of subpoenas and motions to quash, see *§§ 577.410*, *577.411* and *577.414*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 25, § 25.43 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 17, § 17.48-17.51 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.417

§ 577.417 Letter to Copy Service Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum

[1] FORM Letter to Copy Service Regarding Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum

[*Date*]

[*Name and address*]

Re: _____

Gentlepersons:

You have issued a _____ subpoena at the request of _____ in the case of _____ [*name of case*]. The subpoena is legally invalid for multiple reasons.

Do not accept any records from _____ [*name of witness*] in this matter until the Judge has ruled on the Applicant's Motion to Quash Subpoena Duces Tecum. Only if the Judge allows the subpoena to go forward should you receive records, copy them and disseminate them.

If you have already received any records from _____ [*name of witness*] you must return them to _____ [*name of witness*] immediately. If any copies have been made of the records they must be destroyed immediately.

Please note that if you disseminate these records while the Motion to Quash is pending you may be liable for compensatory and punitive damages, costs, attorneys fees and fines for contempt of Court.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

_____

[*name of attorney*]

Attorney at Law

[2] Use of Form

The letter in [1], *above* may be sent to the copy service advising the service that it has issued a subpoena at the request of the named party and that the subpoena is invalid. The copy service should also be notified that a Motion to Quash has been filed, that the service should not accept records from the "witness" or "medical provider," and that the records should be returned immediately if procured. The letter should not be sent to the Appeals Board; rather, the letter and a copy of the subpoena, and the Motion to Quash should be directed to the custodian of records or another person qualified to certify the records [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10222*].

Failure to provide notice in the form of a letter to the copy service that a Motion to Quash is being sought does not invalidate the motion to quash or modify the subpoena, but it may be raised by the copy service as an affirmative defense in any action for liability for improper release of records [*Code of Civ. Proc. § 1985.3(g)*].

For further discussion of subpoenas and motions to quash, see *§§ 577.410*, *577.411* and *577.414*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 25, § 25.43 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 17, § 17.48-17.51 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
3. Discovery

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.418-577.419

[Reserved]

§§ 577.418[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.420

§ 577.420 Request for Informal Rating (by Insurance Carrier or Self-Insurer) [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167] [DEU Form 201]

[1] FORM Request for Informal Rating (by Insurance Carrier or Self-Insurer) [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167] [DEU Form 201]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DEU Form 201 for use by an insurance carrier or a self-insured employer to request an informal rating from the Disability Evaluation Unit. The form should be used for all injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1991 [*see Lab. Code § 4067.5*]. All requests for ratings must be made in the manner prescribed and on forms provided by the Adminstrative Director. An informal rating will be issued only when no application for adjudication of a claim has been filed with the WCAB [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10167*].

For discussion of informal permanent disability ratings, see *§ 577.45[4][c]*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 32, § 32.05[4]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 16, § 16.15 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.421

§ 577.421 Employee's Disability Questionnaire [DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU)]

[1] FORM Employee's Permanent Disability Questionnaire [DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU), Employee's Disability Questionnaire, which must be provided to an unrepresented injured worker by the insurance carrier or self-insurer before the worker's scheduled examination by the Qualified Medical Evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(b)*]. The questionnaire may be reproduced by automated office equipment or other means as long as the printed content and layout of the form are identical to that in the foregoing form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10161.1*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

The injured worker will be instructed to complete the questionnaire and to provide it to the Qualified Medical Evaluator at the time of the examination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(b)*]. The medical evaluator must submit the following items:

- The questionnaire;

- A completed DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination, which must be supplied to the medical evaluator by the insurance carrier, self-insurer, or injured worker [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*; *see § 577.422*]; and

- The evaluator's formal medical evaluation, to the Disability Evaluation Unit.

Once the Unit has received all of these documents from the medical evaluator, it will prepare the summary rating determination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(a)*].

A request for a formal medical evaluation will not be considered received until all of these documents are received in the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit having jurisdiction over the injured employee's area of residence. Any requests received without all the required documents will be returned to the sender [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(e)*]. On request, the Unit will provide a listing of its offices with their respective areas of jurisdiction [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*].

[3] Cross References

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.422

§ 577.422 Request for Summary Rating Determination of Qualified Medical Evaluator's Report [DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU)]

[1] FORM Request for Summary Rating Determination of Qualified or Agreed Medical Examiner's Report [DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination of Qualified Medical Evaluator's Report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10161(b)*]. The form may be reproduced by automated office equipment or other means as long as the printed content and layout of the form are identical to that in the official form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10161.1*]. The form is one of the documents that constitute an injured employee's properly prepared request for a summary rating [*8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10160(a)* (unrepresented workers), 10160.5(a) (represented workers)].

For injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1991, and before January 1, 1994, if the injured worker is represented by an attorney, an informal request for a summary rating is often requested because of the backlog of cases needing summary ratings. If, for some reason, an informal request has not been made, the person requesting the summary rating must complete DEU Form 101 and submit it, together will all medical reports and medical records concerning the case, to the Qualified or Agreed Medical Evaluator [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(a), (b)*]. Once the medical evaluator has completed the evaluation, the completed medical evaluation report must be sent together with the completed DEU Form 101 to the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit designated on the form, with copies sent to the party or parties requesting the evaluation [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(b)*]. Once the Unit has received these documents, it will prepare a summary rating determination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(a)*]. If a case is settled after a rating has been requested but before the rating is issued, the person who requested the rating must notify the Unit office that the case has been settled [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.5(d)*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

For further discussion of summary rating determinations, see *§ 577.45[4][d]*.

[3] Unrepresented Employees

If the injured employee is not represented by an attorney, the request must be completed by the insurance carrier, self-insurer, or injured worker and sent, together with all medical reports and medical records relating to the case, to the Qualified Medical Evaluator before the employee's scheduled examination. A copy of the request must also be served on the opposing party [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*]. When a summary rating determination has been requested, the medical evaluator must submit the completed DWC-AD Form 101 (DEU), together with a completed DWC-AD Form 100 (DEU), Employee's Disability Questionnaire, which was submitted by the employee prior to the examination [*see § 577.421*], the evaluator's formal medical evaluation, and a document cover sheet and a separator sheet, pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10232(b)* (these sheets to be served on only the Disability Evaluation Unit), to the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit having jurisdiction over the employee's area of residence, with a copy to the parties [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(d)*].

A list of the Unit's offices with their respective areas of jurisdiction is available from the Unit on request [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(c)*]. Once the Unit has received all of these documents from the medical evaluator, it will prepare the summary rating determination [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(a)*]. A request for a formal medical evaluation will not be considered received until all of these documents are received in the office of the Disability Evaluation Unit having jurisdiction over the injured employee's area of residence. Any requests received without all the required documents will be returned to the sender [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160(e)*].

[4] Cross References

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.423

§ 577.423 Request for Summary Rating Determination of Primary Treating Physician's Report [DWC-AD Form 102 (DEU)]

[1] FORM Request for Summary Rating Determination of Primary Treating Physician's Report [DWC-AD Form 102 (DEU)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-AD Form 102 (DEU), Request for Summary Rating Determination of Primary Treating Physician's Report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10161(c)*]. The form is used to obtain a summary rating determination from a Disability Evaluation Unit based on the primary treating physician's report [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9785*]. The form may only be used if the injury occurred on or after January 1, 1994, and the injured worker is unrepresented [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1*]. The form may be reproduced by automated office equipment or other means as long as the printed content and layout of the form are identical to that in the official form [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10161.1*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

To request a summary rating determination based on the report of the primary treating physician, the carrier, self-insured employer, or employee must file this form along with a copy of the primary treating physician's report, if the report has not already been filed in EAMS, with the Disability Evaluation Unit *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1(b)*]. A copy of the request and the report must also be served on the non-requesting party, along with proof of service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10160.1(c)*].

For a discussion of summary rating determinations, see *§ 577.45[4][d]*.

[3] Cross References

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 32, § 32.05[3]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 5, § 5.60 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.424

§ 577.424 Request for Consultative Rating [DWC-AD Form 104 (DEU)]

[1] FORM Request for Consultative Rating [DWC-AD Form 104 (DEU)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-AD Form 104 (DEU), Request for Consultative Rating [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166*]. The form may be used by the WCAB, WCJs, WCJs Pro-Tempore, Settlement Conference Referees, Arbitrators, and Information and Assistance Officers to request a consultative rating for a represented injured worker [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(a), (b)*]. The form may also be submitted to the DEU by employers, injured workers or their respective representatives to make reasonable requests for consultative rating determinations [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(c)*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

For a discussion of consultative rating determinations, see *§ 577.45[4][e]*.

[3] Purpose of Requesting Consultative Rating Determination

Consultative rating determinations may be requested to determine the ratable significance of factors, review proposed compromise and release agreements for adequacy, determine commuted values, resolve occupational questions or any other matter within the expertise of disability evaluators [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(b)*].

[4] If Application for Adjudication Has Been Filed

No consultative rating determination will be provided for a case in which an application for adjudication of claim has been filed without prior written authorization of the Appeals Board, a WCJ, a WCJ pro tempore, a settlement conference referee, an arbitrator, or an information and assistance officer. If an application has been filed, the disability evaluator may require that any request for consultative rating determination be accompanied by the Appeals Board file [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10166(e)*].

[5] Cross References

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, Ch. 32, § 32.05[5]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, Ch. 5, § 5.62 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
4. Permanent Disability Ratings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.425-577.429

[Reserved]

§§ 577.425[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
5. Joinder and Dismissal of Parties

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.430

§ 577.430 Petition to Join Omitted Employers in Occupational Disease or Cumulative Injury Case [Lab. Code § 5500.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10380]

[1] FORM Petition to Join Omitted Employers in Occupational Disease or Cumulative Injury Case [Lab. Code § 5500.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10380]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____] vs. _____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)] [*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]	CASE NO. _____ _____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]

_____

Petitioner _____ [*name*], _____ [*status, e.g.,* a defendant herein], applies for an order joining other employers as parties defendant and in support of this request avers:

1. The application of _____ [*name*] states that between _____ and _____ [*dates*], he/she developed _____ [*specify* occupational disease *or* cumulative injury], which arose out of and occurred during the course of his/her employment during that period.

2. Applicant was in the employ of petitioner from _____ to _____ [*dates*], and at no other time.

3. Other employers who employed the applicant during the alleged period of exposure to the hazards causing the applicant's _____ [occupational disease *or* cumulative injury] are as follows: _____ [*specify name of each of the other employers and dates or approximate dates of employment by each*]. All or part of applicant's alleged _____ [occupational disease *or* cumulative injury], if shown to have been industrially caused, arose out of and occurred in the course of applicant's employment by the foregoing named employers.

WHEREFORE, petitioner requests that an order issue directing that _____ [*names of other employers*] [and all other employers of applicant during the period _____ to _____ (*dates*),] be joined as defendants in this proceeding.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a petition for use by a party to request the joinder of other persons or entities as parties defendant in a case arising out of an occupational disease or cumulative injury [*see Lab. Code § 5500.5(b)*; *see also* discussion under *§ 577.144*]. For a discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see *§ 577.108* . See also Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 26, § 26.01[2][c]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 7, § 7.60 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 352 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
5. Joinder and Dismissal of Parties

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.431

§ 577.431 Petition to Dismiss Improperly Joined Insurance Carrier [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570]

[1] FORM Petition to Dismiss Improperly Joined Insurance Carrier [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____]	CASE NO. _____
vs.	_____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]
_____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)] [*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]	

Petitioner _____ [*name*], a defendant herein, hereby requests its dismissal from this proceeding and in support of its request avers:

1. The application of _____ [*name*] states that applicant received an injury arising out of and in the course of his/her employment with defendant _____ [*name of employer*] on _____ [*date of injury*], and that petitioner _____ [*name of insurance carrier*] was the employer's insurance carrier on that date.

2. Petitioner _____ [*name*] was not the insurance carrier of _____ [*name of employer*] at the time of injury, and _____ [has never been, and is not now, the insurance carrier for that employer *or* ceased to insure that employer for workers' compensation liability on _____ (*date before injury*) *or* did not begin to insure that employer for workers' compensation liability until _____ (*date after injury*)].

[3. On the date of applicant's injury, the employer's compensation insurance carrier was _____ (*name*).]

WHEREFORE, petitioner requests that it be dismissed as a party to this proceeding and that it be granted all other and further relief that is necessary and proper.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a petition for use by an insurance carrier that has been improperly joined as a defendant in a workers' compensation proceeding to obtain its dismissal from the case. Dismissal of improper or unnecessary parties may be made by interlocutory order [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10570*].

For further discussion on dismissal of parties, see *§ 577.144*. See also *§ 577.430*.

[3] Cross References

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 7, § 7.59 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
5. Joinder and Dismissal of Parties

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.432-577.439

[Reserved]

§§ 577.432[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
6. Attorneys

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.440

§ 577.440 Substitution of Attorneys [Code Civ. Proc. § 284; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 36]

[1] FORM Substitution of Attorneys [Code Civ. Proc. § 284; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 36]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 36 for use by a party to substitute attorneys. Copies may be obtained at any WCAB office [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 284*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*].

Substitution or dismissal of attorneys must be made in the manner provided by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 284, 285*, and *286* [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 284* authorizes substitution

- On the consent of both the attorney and client filed in the case or entered in the minutes; or
- By order on application of either attorney or client.

Code Civ. Proc. § 285 requires notice of the substitution be given to the adverse parties.

Code Civ. Proc. § 286 covers the situation in which an attorney dies, is removed or suspended, or ceases to act as such. For further discussion of these statutes, see Ch. 72, *Attorney Practice and Ethics* .

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 20, § 20.03*

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.47-5.49 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
6. Attorneys

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.441

§ 577.441 Notice of Dismissal of Attorney [Code Civ. Proc. § 285; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 37]

[1] FORM Notice of Dismissal of Attorney [Code Civ. Proc. § 285; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774] [DIA WCAB Form 37]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 37 for use by a party to give adverse parties notice that the party has dismissed his or her attorney and in effect substituted himself or herself in propria persona [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 285*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10774*]. Copies may be obtained at any WCAB office. For further discussion, see *§ 577.440*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
6. Attorneys

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.442-577.449

[Reserved]

§§ 577.442[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
7. Dismissing Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.450

§ 577.450 Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Claim Has Been Denied (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)]

[1] FORM Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Claim Has Been Denied (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(a); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)]

NOTICE REGARDING WORKERS'
COMPENSATION CLAIM

Date(s) of Injury: _____ [*date(s)*]
Name of Employee: _____ [*name*]
Name of Employer: _____ [*name*]
Claims Administrator: _____ [*name, address, telephone number*]
Claim Number, if any: _____ [*number or* N/A]

You applied for workers' compensation benefits. A copy of your claim form is attached. We have not heard from you since we sent you a letter denying your claim on [date]. Your case has been inactive for at least 180 days. If you are still claiming benefits, you must file an Application for Adjudication of Claim with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board within 180 days of the date this notice is served on you. The date of service is listed at the bottom of this form. IF YOU DO NOT FILE THE APPLICATION BY THE DEADLINE, THE CLAIM WILL AUTOMATICALLY BE DISMISSED "BY OPERATION OF LAW." This means you will not be able to claim benefits for the injury or illness listed on the claim form unless you file the Application for Adjudication of Claim by the deadline. Please call me at [*telephone number*] if you want more information or help figuring out the deadline for filing an Application.

You can get the Application form, help figuring out the deadline for filing an Application, and information about your claim by calling the State of California Division of Workers' Compensation Information and Assistance Office. [*telephone number of office closest to injured worker's residence*]. You may hear recorded information by calling

1-800-736-7401. You may also consult an attorney.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name of Claims Administrator Representative*]

Date Notice Is Served: _____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the employer's claims administrator seeking to dismiss an injured employee's claim for benefits by operation of law for an injury that occurred before January 1, 1994, when the claim has been denied and there has been no activity for at least 180 days [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)*].

The text of the form is specifically prescribed by regulation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)(1), (c)*], and the blanks must be completed by the claims administrator to specify the information described in brackets [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)(2)*]. A copy of the employee's claim for must be attached to the claim form prior to service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(c)*].

For further discussion of dismissal of inactive claims, see *§ 577.43[6]*.

[3] Service of Form

The form must be served on the employee in the manner prescribed by the Code of Civil Procedure for service of summons [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(a)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10 et seq.* (rules of service)]. If the employee is represented by an attorney, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the attorney by personal delivery or first class mail. When no Application for Adjudication of Claim has been filed, but the WCAB has assigned a case number to the matter because of a pre-Application filing, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the Appeals Board with proof of service made according to Rule 10975 of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10975*].

The date of service must be inserted by the claims administrator or process server to accurately reflect the date service is effected in accordance with the Code of Civil Procedure [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(a)(2)*].

[4] Determining When Claim Is Not Inactive

For purposes of this form, a claim is *not* inactive, and therefore not subject to dismissal by operation of law if, during the 180 days before the notice is served [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(e)*],

- The employee has demanded payment or provision of any type of benefits;
- The claims administrator knows that there are benefits due and unpaid;
- Treatment has been rendered for the industrial injury;
- There has been a medical-legal evaluation of the employee;
- There has been a deposition with regard to the claim; or

- The claims administrator has other knowledge that the employee is actively pursuing the claim.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
7. Dismissing Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.451

§ 577.451 Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Benefits Have Been Furnished (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)]

[1] FORM Notice of Dismissal of Inactive Claim by Operation of Law When Benefits Have Been Furnished (Injuries Occurring Before January 1, 1994) [Lab. Code § 5404.5(b); 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)]

NOTICE REGARDING WORKERS'
COMPENSATION CLAIM

Date(s) of Injury: _____ [*date(s)*]

Name of Employee: _____ [*name*]

Name of Employer: _____ [*name*]

Claims Administrator: _____ [*name, address, telephone number*]

Claim Number, if any: _____ [*number or* N/A]

You applied for workers' compensation benefits. A copy of your claim form is attached. Your case has been inactive for at least 180 days.

Your right to workers' compensation benefits will end on [insert date--either five years from the date of injury or one year from the last furnishing of benefits, whichever is later], unless you file an Application for Adjudication of Claim by that date. That date is [*insert either* five years from the date of you injury *or* one year from the date of the last benefit provided to you].

IF YOU DO NOT FILE THE APPLICATION BY THE DEADLINE, THE CLAIM WILL AUTOMATICALLY BE DISMISSED "BY OPERATION OF LAW." This means you will not be able to claim benefits for the injury or illness listed on the claim form unless you file the Application for Adjudication of Claim by the deadline. Please call me at [*telephone number*] if you want more information.

You can get the Application form and information about your claim by calling the State of California Division of Workers' Compensation Information and Assistance Office. [*telephone number of office closest to injured worker's residence*]. You may hear recorded information by calling 1-800-736-7401. You may also consult an attorney.

_____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name of Claims Administrator Representative*]

Date Notice Is Served: _____

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the employer's claims administrator seeking to dismiss an injured employee's claim for benefits by operation of law when a claim form has been filed for an injury that occurred before January 1, 1994, benefits have been furnished, and there has been no activity for at least 180 days [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)*].

The text of the form is specifically prescribed by regulation [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)(1)(c)*], and the blanks must be completed by the claims administrator to specify the information described in brackets [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(b)(3)*]. A copy of the employee's claim for must be attached to the claim form prior to service [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(c)*].

The date of last furnishing of benefits is the later of the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10120(b)(2)*]:

- The latest date the employee received medical or rehabilitation services; or

- The latest date that payment of any compensation benefit was mailed or personally delivered to the employee or service provider.

For further discussion of dismissal of inactive claims, see *§ 577.43[6]*.

[3] Service of Form

The form must be served on the employee in the manner prescribed by the Code of Civil Procedure for service of summons [*Lab. Code § 5404.5(b)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 415.10 et seq.* (rules of service)]. If the employee is represented by an attorney, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the attorney by personal delivery or first class mail. When no Application for Adjudication of Claim has been filed, but the WCAB has assigned a case number to the matter because of a pre-Application filing, the claims administrator must also serve a copy of the notice on the Appeals Board with proof of service made according to Rule 10975 of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(d)*; *see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10975*].

The date of service should be inserted by the claims administrator or process server to accurately reflect the date service is effected in accordance with the Code of Civil Procedure.

[4] Determining When Claim Is Not Inactive

For purposes of this form, a claim is *not* inactive, and therefore not subject to dismissal by operation of law if, during the 180 days before the notice is served [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10141(e)*],

- The employee has demanded payment or provision of any type of benefits;
- The claims administrator knows that there are benefits due and unpaid;
- Treatment has been rendered for the industrial injury;
- There has been a medical-legal evaluation of the employee;
- There has been a deposition with regard to the claim; or
- The claims administrator has other knowledge that the employee is actively pursuing the claim.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
7. Dismissing Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.452

§ 577.452 Request for Dismissal by Employee [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780] [DWC WCAB Form 43]

[1] FORM Request for Dismissal by Employee [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780] [DWC WCAB Form 43]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC WCAB Form 43 for use by an employee to request dismissal of the proceeding without prejudice. Except as provided in *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10562* (failure to appear), 10582 (inactive cases), and unless good cause to the contrary appears, orders of dismissal of claim forms for injuries occurring on or after January 1, 1990, and before January 1, 1994, and orders of dismissal of applications for adjudication for injuries occurring before January 1, 1990, or on or after January 1, 1994, must be issued forthwith when requested by the employee [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780*].

For a discussion of dismissals, generally, see *§ 577.155*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, § 23.11[4][b]* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
7. Dismissing Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.453

§ 577.453 Petition for Dismissal by Defendant [Lab. Code § 5507; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10445, 10562, 10582]

[1] FORM Petition for Dismissal by Defendant [Lab. Code § 5507; 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10445, 10562, 10582]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____] vs. _____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)] [*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]	CASE NO. _____ _____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]

Defendant _____ [*name*] hereby requests that the application for adjudication herein be dismissed without prejudice for the following reasons(s):

[*Specify all appropriate grounds for dismissal, such as the following*]

1. The application shows on its face that the applicant is not entitled to compensation in that _____ [*specify how fact is shown*].

2. The application was filed on _____ [*date*], and was not activated for hearing within one year thereafter.

3. It appears of record that the applicant was served with the notice of hearing on _____ [*date*], but failed to appear at the hearing, either in person or by attorney or agent.

4. The applicant has claimed that his/her injury was the result of the willful and serious misconduct of the employer but failed to state the basis of the claim in his/her application.

[*CONTINUE*]

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Defendant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a defendant to petition for an order dismissing the application [*see* discussion in *§§ 577.83, 577.143[2], 577.155* and *577.396*]. For a discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see *§ 577.108* .

[3] Notice of Intention

All orders of dismissal, except those requested by an applicant, will issue only after service of a notice of intention allowing at least 15 days for the applicant to show good cause to the contrary [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10780*].

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 25, § 25.26* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 6, § 6.44; ch. 7, § 7.58 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
7. Dismissing Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.454-577.459

[Reserved]

§§ 577.454[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.460

§ 577.460 Compromise and Release [DWC-CA Form 10214(c)]

[1] FORM Compromise and Release [DWC-CA Form 10214(c)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10214(c) for use in compromising an employee's claim for workers' disability benefits and releasing the employer and its insurer from further liability [*see Lab. Code §§ 5000, 5003*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10874*].

Paragraph 2 of the form is the release clause, providing that the employee releases the employer and the employer's insurer of all liability for the specified industrial injury. It specifically includes release of liability to the employee's "dependents, heirs, executors, representatives, administrators or assigns." Paragraph 2 concludes with the following limitation: "Execution of this form has no effect on claims that are not within the scope of the workers' compensation law or claims that are not subject to the exclusivity provisions of the workers' compensation law, unless otherwise expressly stated."

Paragraph 4 provides that, unless otherwise expressly stated, the agreement releases all claims of the employee's dependents to death benefits relating to the injury covered by the agreement. It adds that the parties have considered the release of these benefits in arriving at the sum of money set forth in the agreement, and it concludes that any addendum duplicating the language of this paragraph is no longer necessary and is not to be attached.

Paragraph 5 states that, unless otherwise expressly ordered by the Appeals Board or a WCJ, approval of the agreement does not release any claim the employee may have for vocational rehabilitation benefits or supplemental job displacement benefits.

Any accrued claims for *Lab. Code § 5814* penalties are included in this settlement unless expressly excluded.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A.*

For forms for use in death cases and third-party cases, see *§§ 577.461*, *577.462*, respectively.

For a general discussion of compromise and release agreements, see *§ 577.130* et seq.

[3] Execution and Attestation or Acknowledgment

Every release or compromise agreement must be duly executed, and the signature of the employee or other beneficiary must be attested by two disinterested witnesses or acknowledged before a notary public [*Lab. Code § 5003*].

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 29, § 29.03[1]*

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, § 13.20 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.461

§ 577.461 Compromise and Release--Dependency Claim [DWC-CA Form 10214(d)]

[1] FORM Compromise and Release--Dependency Claim [DWC-CA Form 10214(d)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10214(d) for use by the dependents of a deceased employee to compromise their claim for workers' death benefits and to release the employer and its insurer from further liability [*see Lab. Code §§ 5000, 5003, 5004*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10874*]. For discussion of persons who are dependents, see *§ 577.14[2]*. For a general discussion of compromise and release agreements, see *§ 577.130* et seq. See also, *§ 577.460*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

[3] Service of Compromise and Release

When a compromise and release is filed in a death case in which there is a bona fide issue as to partial or total dependency, the filing party must serve copies of the document on the Department of Industrial Relations, Death

Without Dependents Unit [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10501*].

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 29, § 29.03[4]*

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, § 13.40 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.462

§ 577.462 Compromise and Release--Third Party [DWC-CA Form 10214(e)]

[1] FORM Compromise and Release--Third Party [DWC-CA Form 10214(e)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10214(e) for use as a compromise and release agreement between the employee and the employer after settlement of a claim against a third party for injury to the employee [*see Lab. Code §§ 3860(f), 3861, 5000, 5003*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10874*]. Paragraph 4 of the Instructions of the form requires that a copy of the settlement agreement with the third-party tortfeasor, if in writing, be attached. For a discussion of third-party liability and limitations on the rights of the employee and employer to settle their claims against the third party, see *§ 577.335[3][a]*. For a general discussion of compromise and release agreements, see *§ 577.130* et seq. See also *§§ 577.460, 577.461*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 29, § 29.07*

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 13, § 13.41 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.463

§ 577.463 Information Guidelines for Submission of Settlement Documents

[1] FORM Information Guidelines for Submission of Settlement Documents

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used as a reference or settlement checklist by parties to aid in the settlement of workers' compensation claims by way of compromise and release agreements [*see §§ 577.460 -577.462*] or stipulations with request for award [*see §§ 577.470, 577.471*]. WCJs may choose to refer to this form to identify inadequacies in proposed settlement documents or when requesting additional information from settling parties.

The informational sheet was developed to help claims personnel and others involved in the settlement of workers' compensation claims avoid problems that frequently arise when drafting settlement documents for submission to the WCAB. The form attempts to cover common problems that frequently exist in proposed settlement agreements, causing delays in approval by the WCAB. In addition, the form attempts to set forth the most important settlement requirements in a single document that can be quickly consulted.

Use of this form is completely voluntary. It is intended solely as a reference and need not be completed by the parties, filed, or served.

For further discussion regarding the settlement of workers' compensation claims by way of stipulations with request for award or compromise and release agreements, see *§§ 577.120 et seq., 577.130* et seq.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, § 23.11[2]*; *ch. 26, § 26.06[2]*; ch.

29 (Matthew Bender)

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.464

§ 577.464 Settlement of Prospective Vocational Rehabilitation Services [RU 122 (Voc. Rehab.) § 10133.22]

[1] FORM Settlement of Prospective Vocational Rehabilitation Services [RU 122 (Voc. Rehab.) § 10133.22]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

In 2003 the legislature abolished the workers' compensation vocational rehabilitation program, repealing *Lab. Code §§ 139.5, 4635-4647*, and *5405.5* [*see* Stats. 2003, ch. 635, §§ 14, 14.3, 16]. In its place, the legislature created a "supplemental job displacement benefit" for specified workers who are permanently partially disabled, to be used for retraining. The new system applies only to injuries occurring on or after January 1, 2004 [*see § 577.45[2A]*]. Consequently, the form in this section may be used only for pre-2004 injuries.

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of RU 122 (Voc. Rehab.) § 10133.22 for use as an agreement between the employee and the employer to settle prospective vocational rehabilitation services for injuries on or after January 1, 2003 [*see Lab. Code §§ 4644(a)(8), 4646(b), (c)*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10131.2, 10133.22*]. Copies of the form may be obtained from the Department of Industrial Relations website: www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms. As explained in the instructions on page 5 of the form, the form is to be submitted to the applicable Rehabilitation Unit district office. For a discussion of settlement of vocational rehabilitation services, see *§ 577.131[2]*. For a general discussion of compromise and release agreements, see *§ 577.130* et seq. See also *§§ 577.460, 577.461, 577.462*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the

implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A.*

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 35, § 35.54 (LexisNexis)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
8. Settling Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.465-577.469

[Reserved]

§§ 577.465[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
9. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.470

§ 577.470 Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(a)]

[1] FORM Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(a)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10214(a) for use by the parties in a disability case to stipulate to the facts and to request issuance of an award [*see Lab. Code § 5702*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10496*]. For further discussion of stipulations with request for award, see *§ 577.121*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

In death cases, a different form is used for making the stipulation, [*see Lab. Code § 5702*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10496, 10501*; *see also § 577.471*].

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, § 23.11[2]*; *ch. 26, § 26.06[2]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, § 5.43 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 390-391 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
9. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.471

§ 577.471 Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(b)]

[1] FORM Stipulations With Request for Award [DWC-CA Form 10214(b)]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10214(b) for use by the parties in death cases to stipulate to the facts of the employee's death, the status of the employee's dependents, and request the issuance of a Findings and Award consistent with the stipulations [*see Lab. Code § 5702*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10496*, *10501*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

For further discussion of stipulations with request for award, see *§ 577.121*. See also *§§ 577.390 -577.392*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 23, § 23.11[2]*; *ch. 26, § 26.06[2]*

(Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 5, §§ 5.43 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Workers' Compensation*, §§ 390-391 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
9. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.472

§ 577.472 Stipulation and Award and/or Order

[1] FORM Stipulation and Award and/or Order

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form, DWC WCAB Form 5, is sometimes used when the parties stipulate to some matter at issue at the hearing, or when the parties' attorneys are willing to "submit" an issue when they cannot get authority from their clients to agree to it, but are willing to have the issue decided without a hearing. The form contains a waiver of *Lab. Code § 5313*, which requires that the Appeals Board and the WCJs set forth in writing the evidence relied on and the reasons or grounds upon which any decision is made. By waiving this statute, and thus waiving the creation of a record, the parties are effectively waiving the right to reconsideration of the issue.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
9. Stipulations and Requests for Award

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.473-577.479

[Reserved]

§§ 577.473[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
10. Lien Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.480

§ 577.480 Notice and Request for Allowance of Lien [DWC/WCAB Form 6]

[1] FORM Notice and Request for Allowance of Lien [DWC/WCAB Form 6]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC WCAB Form 6 for use by a lien claimant to request a lien against any compensation recovered by an injured worker or his or her dependents [*see Lab. Code § 4904*; *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10770*]. For discussion of liens, see *§ 577.260*.

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 30, §§ 30.20-30.23

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 17, §§ 17.35-17.38 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 408 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
10. Lien Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.481

§ 577.481 Stipulation and Order to Pay Lien Claimant

[1] FORM Stipulation and Order to Pay Lien Claimant

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

This form in [1], *above*, is used by many lien claimants and defendants to reduce a lien settlement to a written stipulation and to obtain an enforceable Order reflecting the stipulation. It is often used when a lien settlement is reached at a conference or trial.

For discussion of liens against compensation, see *§ 577.260*. See also *§ 577.480*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
10. Lien Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.482

§ 577.482 Declaration of Defendant re Resolution of Liens

[1] FORM Declaration of Defendant Re: Resolution of Liens

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above,* when completed with specific information regarding lien settlement efforts, is accepted by many WCJ's as evidence that satisfactory efforts have been made to resolve outstanding liens. In order to avoid supplementary proceedings, the WCAB strongly encourages settlement of all outstanding liens at the time an applicant's case is settled by Compromise and Release Agreement or Stipulations. WCJ's are instructed to insure that the defendant has made reasonable efforts to settle liens before an Order Approving Compromise and Release or an Award on Stipulations issued.

For discussion of liens against compensation, see *§ 577.260*. See also *§§ 577.480, 577.481*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
10. Lien Claims

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.483-577.489

[Reserved]

§§ 577.483[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
11. Prehearing Proceedings and Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.490

§ 577.490 Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing (Trial) [DWC-CA Form 10252.1]

[1] FORM Declaration of Readiness to Proceed to Expedited Hearing (Trial) [DWC-CA Form 10252.1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DWC-CA Form 10252.1, promulgated by the Court Administrator, for use to request an expedited hearing and decision [*see Lab. Code § 5502(b)*]. In cases in which an expedited hearing is appropriate, the hearing must be held, and a determination as to the rights of the parties made and filed, within 30 days after filing of the declaration of readiness to proceed [*Lab. Code § 5502(b)*].

The form must be filed with a an application for adjudication of claim [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(a)*].

Effective November 17, 2008 [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 10210*-10297 (Rules of Court Administrator, including regulations relating to Electronic Adjudication Management System (EAMS))], DWC requires (with a handful of exceptions) that all documents designed and created by DWC to be read by electronic scanners be used in place of the previous, equivalent DWC forms. These new forms, called "optical character recognition forms" (OCR forms) [*see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10210(x)* ("OCR form" defined)], may be downloaded and saved, then filled in and printed, as needed, with the printouts being filed with DWC and served on other parties and attorneys, as required by regulations. The form in [1], above, is one such form. Readers should check, periodically, DWC's website for further developments in the implementation of EAMS. DWC's website address is: http://www.dir.ca.gov/dwc/dwc_home_page.htm

For discussion of EAMS, see *§ 577.12A*.

[3] Entitlement to Expedited Hearing

When injury to any part or parts of the body is accepted as compensable by the employer, a party is entitled to an

expedited priority hearing and decision upon the filing of an application for adjudication of claim and a declaration of readiness to proceed pursuant to *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250* establishing a bona fide, good faith dispute as to any of the following [*Lab Code § 5502(b)*; *8* Cal. Code Reg. § 10252(a)]:

1. The employee's entitlement to medical treatment pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4600*.

2. The employee's entitlement to, or the amount of, temporary disability indemnity payments.

3. The employee's entitlement to vocational rehabilitation services, or the termination of an employer's liability to provide these services to an employee.

4. The employee's entitlement to compensation from one or more responsible employers when two or more employers dispute liability as among themselves.

For discussion of expedited hearings, see *§ 577.172[3]*.

[4] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 26, § 26.02[1]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 1, § 1.8; ch. 6, §§ 6.9, 6.17 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. Special Supp. 1990)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
11. Prehearing Proceedings and Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.491

§ 577.491 Pre-Trial Conference Statement [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

[1] FORM Pre-Trial Conference Statement [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, was developed for use at the time of the Mandatory Settlement Conference (MSC) preceding a hearing. If the case is not resolved at the MSC, the parties are required to complete and file this form, noting the specific issues in dispute, each party's proposed permanent disability rating, and listing the exhibits and witnesses to be presented at trial [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)*]. The form is also used as a notice of hearing, and provides space for the WCJ to enter any orders or dispositions arising at the MSC.

Although the form provides space for multiple case numbers, many WCJs require that the parties complete a separate pre-trial conference statement for each case. Some judges prefer the parties to complete the pre-trial conference statement used in multiple party cases [*see § 577.492[1]*], which provides summary information concerning matters involving multiple dates of injury or continuous trauma claims involving multiple employers and/or insurance carriers.

For further discussion of mandatory settlement conferences and conference statements, see *§ 577.157[4]*.

[3] Failure to Disclose Evidence

Discovery closes on the date of the MSC. Evidence not disclosed in the Pre-Trial Conference Statement or obtained after the conference is inadmissible unless the proponent of the evidence demonstrates that the evidence was not available or could not have been discovered by the exercise of due diligence prior to the settlement conference [*Lab. Code § 5502(e)(3)*; *see § 577.157[4]*].

[4] Filing and Service

The Appeals Board may, in its discretion, designate a party or lien claimant, or their attorney or agent of record, to make service of notices of the time and place of hearing, orders approving compromise and release, awards based on stipulations with request for award, and any interim or procedural orders, such as a pre-trial conference statement. In deciding whether to exercise this discretion, the Appeals Board may consider whether service by it would be more efficient and cost-effective because most or all of the parties, lien claimants, attorneys, or agents of record to be served have specified e-mail or fax as their preferred method of service. The party, lien claimant, attorney, or agent of record designated to make service must retain the proof of service and not file it unless ordered to do so by the Appeals Board [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(a)*; *but see 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10500(b)* (exceptions)].

The WCJ may choose to personally serve the Pre-Trial Conference Statement on a particular party.

For a discussion of service of papers and proof of service, see *§ 577.108* .

[5] Penalties

A false declaration or certification by any party, lien claimant, attorney, or representative may give rise to proceedings under *Lab. Code § 134* for contempt or *Lab. Code § 5813* for sanctions [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10250(c)*].

For further discussion of penalties and the WCAB's power to punish for contempt, see *§§ 577.12[3][b]*, *577.194*.

[6] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 26, § 26.04[2]* (Matthew Bender)

http://www.dir.ca.gov/DWC/forms.html

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
11. Prehearing Proceedings and Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.492

§ 577.492 Pre-Trial Conference Statement (Multiple Parties) [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

[1] FORM Pre-Trial Conference Statement (Multiple Parties) [DWC-CA Form 10253.1]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, was developed for optional use at the time of the Mandatory Settlement Conference (MSC) as an adjunct to the Pre-Trial Conference Statement [*see § 577.491[1]*], when an injured worker has multiple injuries which occurred on different dates and/or a continuous trauma claim which involves multiple employers and/or insurance carriers. Because the information on this form is not as detailed as that required on the Pre-Trial Conference Statement, WCJs have the option of using this form or requesting the parties to fully complete a separate Pre-Trial Settlement Conference Statement for each date of injury. Thus, before completing this form, the parties should check with the assigned judge to determine whether the form may be used.

For further discussion, see *§§ 577.157[4], 577.491*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 26, § 26.04[2]* (Matthew Bender)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
11. Prehearing Proceedings and Hearings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.493-577.499

[Reserved]

§§ 577.493[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.500

§ 577.500 Petition for Certified Copy of Award [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820]--By Person Entitled to Benefits Under the Award

[1] FORM Petition for Certified Copy of Award [8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820]--By Person Entitled to Benefits Under the Award

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
DIVISION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*name of employee or other applicant*], _____ [Applicant *or* Employee] [_____ (*address*)] [Employee's Social Security No. _____]	)	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	_____ [*Title of document, e.g.,* PETITION FOR _____ (*specify*)]
_____ [*name of employer*] _____ [Defendant *or* Employer] [_____ (*address*)] _____ [*name*], Insurance Carrier [_____ (*address*)]	)	
[*If applicant is someone other than injured employee, add following:*] [_____ (*name of employee*), Employee _____ (*address*) Employee's Social Security No. _____]		

_____

Petitioner _____ [*name*] is the applicant in the above-entitled case and hereby requests a certified copy of the _____ [*describe, e.g.,* Decision and Award] herein made by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board for the purpose of having judgment on the award entered in the superior court and execution issued. In support of this request, petitioner states:

1. On _____ [*date*], the Appeals Board issued its _____ [*e.g.,* Decision and Award] awarding applicant _____ [*specify amount and terms of award*].

2. _____ [*Specify whether proceedings are pending on reconsideration or judicial review, whether a petition for reconsideration or writ of review has been filed, and whether the decision has become final* .]
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

[Applicant *or* Attorney for Applicant or other authorized representative]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by a person awarded benefits by the WCAB to request issuance of a certified copy of the findings and award or other final order of the WCAB for the purpose of having judgment entered and execution issued by the clerk of the superior court [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*; *see Lab. Code § 5806*]. If the request is granted, the copy will issue on payment of the fee prescribed by rules of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers' Compensation (formerly the Division of Industrial Accidents) [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*]. The request may be made by the person entitled to benefits under the award or by the person's attorney or authorized representative [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*]. For discussion of awards, generally, see *§ 577.191*.

[3] Form and Contents of Petition

The request must be in writing and must state the following [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10820*]:

- Whether proceedings are pending on reconsideration or judicial review;
- Whether a petition for reconsideration or writ of review has been filed; and
- Whether the decision, a certified copy of which is requested, has become final.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.501

§ 577.501 Petition for Reconsideration [Lab. Code § 5902; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842] [DIA WCAB Form 45]

[1] FORM Petition for Reconsideration [Lab. Code § 5902; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842] [DIA WCAB Form 45]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 45 for use to petition the WCAB for reconsideration of a final order, decision, or award made by the WCAB or by a workers' compensation judge [*see Lab. Code § 5902*]. Copies of the form may be obtained at any WCAB office.

[3] Grounds for Reconsideration

The sole grounds on which reconsideration may be sought are as follows [*Lab. Code § 5903*]:

- The workers' compensation judge or WCAB acted without or in excess of its powers;

- The order, decision, or award was procured by fraud [*see Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 287, 293 n.5, 148 Cal. Rptr. 325]* ;

- The findings of fact are not justified by the evidence [*see Gillette v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 20 Cal. App. 3d 312, 320-322, 97 Cal. Rptr. 542]* ;

- Petitioner has discovered new material evidence that he or she could not, with reasonable diligence, have discovered and produced at the hearing [*see Royal Globe Ins. Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 84 Cal. App. 3d 287, 292-293, 148 Cal. Rptr. 325* (evidence in question was not newly discovered)]; or

- the order, decision, or award is not supported by the findings of fact [*see Michon v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 917, 923-925, 93 Cal. Rptr. 476]* .

[4] Form and Contents

The petition must set forth specifically and in full detail the grounds on which the petitioner considers the final order, decision, or award to be unjust or unlawful, and every issue to be considered, and must contain a statement of any evidence or other matters on which the applicant relies [*Lab. Code § 5902*]. It must fairly state all the material evidence relative to the point or points at issue, and each contention must be separately stated and clearly set forth [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842*]. Copies of documents that have been received in evidence or that have been made a part of the WCAB's legal file must not be attached as exhibits [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842*]. Documents attached in violation of this rule may be detached from the petition and discarded [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10842*]. A petition that contains no more than allegations of the statutory grounds for reconsideration unsupported by specific references to the record and principles of law involved may be denied [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10846*].

If reconsideration is sought on the ground that the findings are not justified by the evidence, the petition must set out specifically and in detail how the evidence fails to justify the findings [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10852*]. If reconsideration is sought on the ground of newly discovered evidence or that the decision was procured by fraud, the petition must contain a specific and detailed offer of proof providing the following information [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10856*]:

- The names of witnesses to be produced;
- A summary of the testimony to be elicited;
- A description of any documentary evidence to be offered;
- The effect the evidence will have on the record and on the prior decision; and
- As to newly discovered evidence, a full and accurate statement of the reasons why such testimony or exhibits could not reasonably have been discovered or produced before submission of the case.

The petition may be denied if it fails to meet these requirements or is based on cumulative evidence [*8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10856*].

Any objections, irregularities, or illegalities, other than those set forth in the petition, are deemed waived by the petitioner [*Lab. Code § 5904*].

For further discussion of filing petitions for reconsideration, see *§ 577.212*.

[5] Verification

The form in [1], *above*, must be verified [*Lab. Code § 5902*].

[6] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 28, §§ 28.20-28.23 (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 10, §§ 10.15-10.32 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 418-420 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.502

§ 577.502 Petition to Reopen [Lab. Code § 5803; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10454] [DIA WCAB Form 42]

[1] FORM Petition to Reopen [Lab. Code § 5803; 8 Cal. Code Reg. § 10454] [DIA WCAB Form 42]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 42 for use to petition the WCAB to reopen an order, decision, or award [*see Lab. Code §§ 5803*, *5804*; *see also § 577.222*].

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 31, § 31.04[4][a]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 12, §§ 12.6-12.19 (Cal. C.E.B. 3d ed. 1985)

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, §§ 426-429, 432 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.503

§ 577.503 Petition for Commutation of Future Benefits [Lab. Code § 5100] [DIA WCAB Form 49]

[1] FORM Petition for Commutation of Future Benefits [Lab. Code § 5100] [DIA WCAB Form 49]

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is a reproduction of DIA WCAB Form 49 for use by either party to request an order that the compensation payable be commuted to a lump sum to be paid forthwith or at some future time [*see Lab. Code § 5100*]. Copies of the form may be obtained from any WCAB office. For discussion of commutation of awards, see *§ 577.244*.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 27, § 27.02

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 23, § 23.63 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.504

§ 577.504 Notice of Intent to Seek Multiple Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM Notice of Intent to Seek Multiple Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[*Name of Attorney*]
[*Name of Law Firm*]
[*Street Address*]
[*City, State, Zip Code*]
[*Telephone Number*]
State Bar No. _____
Attorney for Applicant

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*Applicant's Name*], Applicant	)	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK MULTIPLE PENALTIES
_____ [*Defendants' Names*], Defendants.	)	(*Lab. Code § 5814*)

TO DEFENDANTS HEREIN, _____ AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Applicant _____ [*name*] hereby gives Notice of Intent to seek separate or additional penalties for each separate and distinct act of delay or failure to pay benefits.
Dated: _____
.....

_____

..... Attorney for the Applicant

Attachments:

Proof of service by mail

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, may be used by an injured employee to notify the employer or carrier that the employee is seeking multiple penalties under *Labor Code § 5814* for an unreasonable delay or refusal to pay compensation due, either before or after an award is issued. The purpose of the form is to put the employer or carrier on notice that the employee is seeking separate penalties for each separate and distinct act of delay. Failure to provide such notice to the employer or carrier may preclude the employee from seeking multiple penalties.

For a general discussion of multiple penalties for delay or non-payment of compensation, see *§ 577.243[4][d]*. See also *§ 577.505[1]*, for petition for penalty form.

[3] Separate and Distinct Acts of Delay

When multiple, separate penalties are sought for more than one distinct act of delay, the employee must give the employer or carrier timely notice of his or her intent to claim multiple or successive penalties in the same penalty proceeding. The bare allegation that a penalty for unreasonable delay in payment of compensation is being sought is not sufficient to raise the issue of liability for multiple or successive penalties [*see Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, § 10.40[5], ch. 27, § 27.12[2][d]* (Matthew Bender); California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.22-8.24 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)].

[4] Filing and Service

This form should be filed prior to the petition for penalties in those cases where multiple penalties are sought. The notice must be served on the employer or carrier.

[5] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, § 10.40[5], ch. 27, § 27.12[2][d]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.22-8.24 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.505

§ 577.505 Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[*Name of Attorney*]
[*Name of Law Firm*]
[*Street Address*]
[*City, State, Zip Code*]
[*Telephone Number*]
State Bar No. _____
Attorney for Applicant

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*Applicant's Name*], Applicant	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. _____
_____ [*Defendants' Names*],	)	PETITION FOR PENALTIES
Defendants.	)	(*Lab. Code § 5814*)

Petitioner alleges that multiple payments of benefits have been unreasonably delayed and seeks an Order of this Board assessing multiple penalties against all of these unreasonably delayed payments of temporary disability, permanent

disability and medical benefits pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 4600, 4650, 5800* and *5814*, and in support thereof, alleges that:

Count 1

1. On [*date*] Defendants issued their first temporary disability check, paying benefits from [*date*] to [*date*].

2. This payment was not made within a reasonable time.

3. There was no genuine medical or legal doubt as to the Defendants' obligation to pay this compensation.

4. Said failure to pay properly constituted an unreasonable delay in benefits.

Count 2

1. On [*date*], Defendants issued their first temporary disability check, paying benefits from [*date*] to [*date*].

2. This check did not pay benefits in accordance with *Lab. Code § 4650(a)*.

3. There was no genuine medical or legal doubt as to the Defendants' obligation to pay this compensation.

4. Said failure to pay properly constituted an unreasonable delay in benefits.

Count 3

1. On [*date*], Defendants issued their first temporary disability check, paying benefits from [*date*] to [*date*].

2. This check did not include the penalty assessment as mandated by *Lab. Code § 4650(d)*.

3. This check did not include interest as mandated by *Lab. Code § 5800*.

4. There was no genuine medical or legal doubt as to the Defendants' obligation to pay this penalty and interest.

5. Said failure to pay properly constituted an unreasonably delay in benefits.

Count 4

1. On [*date*], Applicant was declared permanent and stationary by Dr. _____, who also described permanent disability consisting of a limitation to light work.

2. The Defendants have not paid any permanent disability advances.

3. There was no genuine medical or legal doubt as to the Defendants' obligation to pay this compensation.

4. Said failure to pay properly constituted an unreasonable delay in benefits.

Count 5

1. The earnings of the injured worker were found to be $_____ per week.

2. Pursuant to *Lab. Code § 4661.5*, the injured worker's temporary disability rate as of [*enter two-year anniversary date*] was [*enter current maximum or 2/3 of average weekly wage, whichever is less*].

3. On [*date*] Defendants issued a temporary disability check incorrectly paying benefits at the rate of $_____ per week.

4. There was no genuine medical or legal doubt as to the Defendants' obligation to pay compensation at the proper rate.

5. Said failure to pay at the correct rate constituted an unreasonable delay in benefits.

Count 6

1. At all times pertinent, Dr. [*name of treating physician*] was the authorized treating physician.

2. By report of [*date of medical report*], Dr. [*name of treater*] prescribed a _____. More than thirty days have elapsed from the request and this appliance has not been authorized despite repeated requests.

3. By report of [*date of medical report*], Dr. [*name of treater*] requested a referral to [*name of facility or treater*] for _____. More than thirty days have elapsed from the request and this referral has not been authorized.

4. The Defendants have not produced any medical report or other evidence indicating that the requested diagnostic study and mode of treatment are not reasonable or necessary. No petition to change the treating physician has been filed. The refusal to authorize this treatment constitutes an unreasonable refusal to provide benefits.

Count 7

1. Defendant failed to pay the injured worker the 10 percent increase in benefits as a self-assessed increase as required by *Labor Code § 4650(d)* at the time it made the late payment. The benefit remains unpaid.

2. In *Farris v. Industrial Wire Products (2000) 65 Cal. Comp. Cases 824* , the Appeals Board en banc held that " ... when a 4650(d) penalty has been unreasonably delayed, the 10 percent penalty under section 5814 for that unreasonable delay applies to all payments of the underlying species of disability indemnity (past, present, and future), ... as increased by the section 4650(d) penalty amount." (65 Cal. Comp. Cases 824, 829 .) (See also *Moulton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.Moulton v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 837, 65 Cal. Comp. Cases 1259* , *E & J Gallo Winery, PSI v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Vega) (2001) 66 Cal. Comp. Cases 1547* (writ denied).) In *Peter Kiewit Sons, Inc. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Garland) (1998) 63 Cal. Comp. Cases 331* (writ denied), the Appeals Board imposed two penalties on permanent disability indemnity because defendant failed to pay at the correct rate and failed to assess self-imposed penalty under Labor Code § 4560.

3. The failure to timely pay the Labor Code § 4560(d) amount and the delay in payment of that penalty to the present constitutes an unreasonable delay in the payment of indemnity due the injured worker entitling _____ [him *or* her] to a penalty under *Labor Code § 5814*.

Count 8

1. The Findings and Award issued herein on [*date*]. That award required payment of substantial benefits, which were both unpaid and late. The amount of unpaid disability indemnity by the defendant's own calculations, amounts to $_____.

2. *Labor Code § 4650(d)* provides that if any indemnity payment is not made timely, the amount of the late payment shall be increased 10 percent and shall be paid, without application, to the employee.

3. A "good faith" belief on the part of the defendant that the benefits are not payable does not excuse the obligation to pay the *Labor Code § 4650(d)* penalty when an Award of the appeals board requires payment.

4. In *Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.Rhiner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1993) 4 Cal. 4th 1213, 1227, 58 Cal. Comp. Cases 172, 183* , the Supreme Court stated that the penalty under *Labor Code § 4650(d)* is " ... a self-executing, strict liability provision, that applies only to delays in the payment of temporary or permanent disability payments ... " (See also *Christian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.Christian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 505, 517* ; *Mote v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.Mote v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 56 Cal. App. 4th 902, 910, 62 Cal. Comp. Cases 891, 895* ; *State of California v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Ellison)State of California v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Ellison) (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 128, 139, 61 Cal. Comp. Cases 325, 333* .)

5. In *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Stuart)State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Stuart)State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Stuart) (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1209, 1213, 63 Cal. Comp. Cases 916, 918* , the Supreme Court again observed that " ... if a payment is late, that individual payment is automatically increased by 10 percent, and this penalty [under *Labor Code § 4650(d)*] applies irrespective of the reason for the delay."

6. In *Gangwish v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (2001) 89 Cal. App. 4th 1284, 1293* , the Court of Appeals discussed the purpose that the legislative purpose of enacting the changes to *Labor Code § 4650* was to promote prompt payment of benefits and certainty of timing. "The new legislation also included increased compensation for late payment as an incentive, apart from the increased compensation for unreasonable refusal or delay under section 5814." (66 Cal. Comp. Cases 584, at 590-591 .)

7. The condition for imposition of penalty under *Labor Code § 4650(d)* is that a periodic payment of temporary or permanent disability is delayed. It is the delay that triggers the entitlement to the penalty, which is a "self-executing, strict liability" (see *Rhiner, Christian, Mote supra*), which "applies irrespective of the reason for the delay" (see *State Compensation Insurance Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Stuart)* , supra), the purpose of which is "to promote prompt payment of benefits and certainty of timing." (see *Gangwish* , supra)

8. The failure to timely pay permanent disability indemnity that the Findings and Award determined to be due requires a *Labor Code § 4650(d)* penalty at the time of payment.

Count 9

1. The failure of the defendant to pay the *Labor Code § 4650(d)* penalty on the delayed permanent disability awarded entitles the applicant to an additional penalty under *Labor Code § 5814*. As discussed above regarding Count 7, the failure to pay, or the delay in the payment of a *Labor Code § 4650(d)* penalty gives rise to increasing the benefits in accordance with the provisions of *Labor Code § 5814*.

2. In this case, applicant's attorney wrote to defendant's attorney on [*date*], and specifically requested the voluntary payment of the *Labor Code § 4650(d)* penalty. Defendant has failed to pay.

As to all Counts, a Notice of Intent to Seek Multiple Penalties was properly served upon the Defendants.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner prays for penalties to be assessed as follows:

1. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count One.

2. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count Two.

3. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 3.

4. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 4.

5. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 5.

6. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 6.

7. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 7.

8. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 8.

9. A 25-percent penalty, up to $10,000, whichever is less, against delayed payments alleged in Count 9.

10. All other relief under the law.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Attorney for the Applicant

Dated: _____

Attachments:
Exhibits
Proof of service by mail
Proposed Order

[2] Use of Form

IMPORTANT NOTE: Practitioners should be aware that SB 899 (Stats. 2004 Ch. 34) added new *Labor Code § 5814(g)*, which provides that "[n]otwithstanding any other provisions of law, no action may be brought to recover penalties that may be awarded under this section more than two years from the date the payment of compensation was due." Whether or not this section applies to injuries and/or delayed compensation before June 1, 2004, and/or during the period June 1, 2004 through December 31, 2004, is not clear and is the subject of litigation.

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a petition for penalties which may be used by an applicant seeking penalties under *Labor Code § 5814* if payment of compensation is unreasonably delayed or refused, either before or after an award is issued.

For a general discussion of penalties for delay or non-payment of compensation, see *§ 577.243[4]*. See also *§ 577.504[1]*, for form of notice required when seeking multiple penalties.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, § 10.40, ch. 27, § 27.12[2]* (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.6-8.24 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.506

§ 577.506 Answer to Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[1] FORM Answer to Petition for Penalties [Lab. Code § 5814]

[*Name of Attorney*]
[*Name of Law Firm*]
[*Street Address*]
[*City, State, Zip Code*]
[*Telephone Number*]
State Bar No. _____
Attorney for Defendants _____

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

_____ [*Applicant's Name*],	)	
Applicant	)	CASE NO. _____
vs.	)	ANSWER TO PETITION FOR PENALTIES
_____ [*Defendants' Names*],	)	(*Lab. Code § 5814*)
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

_____

COME NOW Defendants, [*Defendants' names*], in answer to the Petition for Penalties filed by the Applicant herein, admit, deny, and allege as follows:

Count 1

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 1.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

5. Defendants further aver that they have voluntarily paid the delayed benefit along with a 10-percent penalty on the delayed benefit within the time frames outlined in *Labor Code § 5814(b)*.

6. Defendants deny that they were provided notice of Applicant's treatment, nor were they afforded the opportunity to control care in accordance with *Labor Code § 4616 et seq.*

7. Defendants deny that the care that Applicant self-procured was reasonably related to the claim form that Applicant filed.

Count 2

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 2.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 3

1. Defendants deny each and every one of the allegations of Count 3.

2. Defendants further deny that any of the payments referred to in the petition were delayed.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, and that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 4

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 4.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 5

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 5.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 6

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 6.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 7

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 7.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to the liability for the medical treatment requested.

3. Defendants allege that any denial or delay of the requested medical treatment was based on the reasonable use of the Utilization Review process described in *Labor Code § 4610* and *8 Cal. Code Reg. § 9792* et seq.

4. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

5. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less that 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

Count 8

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 8.

2. Defendants deny that there was any delay in the payments of benefits such as to provide for a self-assessed increase as provided for in *Labor Code § 4650(d)*.

3. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit.

Count 9

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 9.

2. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business, or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable in light of the complexity of the payments under the Findings and Award.

3. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

4. Defendants further aver that they have voluntarily paid the delayed benefits along with a 10-percent penalty on the delayed benefit within the time frames outlined in *Labor Code § 5814(b)*.

5. Defendants further aver that if a penalty under *Labor Code § 5814* is to be granted, the total maximum penalty is $10,000, without regard to the number of different species of benefits that were delayed.

6. Defendants further aver that no attorney fees should be awarded under *Labor Code § 5814.5*, since Applicant's Petition for Penalties was not a Petition to Enforce Award because the Award had been paid prior to the Petition for Penalties.

Count 10

1. Defendants deny the allegations of Count 10.

2. Defendants allege that, at all times pertinent, there existed a genuine doubt as to liability for the allegedly delayed amounts.

3. Defendants further aver that if there was a delay, it was a reasonable delay, occurring in the normal course of business or that the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

4. Defendants further aver that if a penalty is to be awarded, the appropriate penalty is an amount considerably less than 25 percent of the delayed benefit, taking into consideration previously paid amounts pursuant to *Labor Code § 4650*.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

In addition, the Answering Defendants allege all of the following as separate and affirmative defenses:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Failure to State Facts Sufficient to Constitute the Imposition of a Penalty

As and for a first separate and affirmative defense to the Petition for Penalties herein, the Answering Defendants allege that the Petition fails to allege facts sufficient to constitute the imposition of a penalty, andfurther fails to allege facts sufficient to entitle Applicant to the relief sought, or to any relief whatsoever against the Answering Defendants.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Fault of Third Parties

As and for a second separate and affirmative defense to the Petition for Penalties herein, the Answering Defendants allege that the Applicant in the Petition seeks damages against the Answering Defendants for the acts or omissions caused in whole or in part by the acts or omissions of third parties for whom the Answering Defendants bear no legal responsibility, and fails to entitle Applicant to the relief sought, or to any relief whatsoever against the Answering Defendants.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Previously Resolved

As and for a third separate and affirmative defense to the Petition for Penalties herein, the Answering Defendants allege that the alleged delays occurred prior to an order as defined in *Labor Code § 5814(c)* and accordingly are conclusively presumed to have been resolved.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Statute of Limitations

As and for a fourth separate and affirmative defense to the Petition for Penalties herein, the Answering Defendants allege that whatever compensation was allegedly due was due more than two years prior to the filing of the Petition for Penalties and accordingly is barred by *Labor Code § 5814(g)*.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
Labor Code § 5814(b)

As and for a firth separate and affirmative defense to the Petition for Penalties herein, the Answering Defendants allege that as to any delays in the payment of compensation, Defendants have voluntarily paid the delayed benefit along with a 10-percent penalty on the delayed benefit within the time frames outlined in *Labor Code § 5814(b)*.

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Penalties are authorized under *Labor Code § 5814* when payment of compensation has been unreasonably delayed or refused. Not all delays are unreasonable. In the landmark case of *Gallamore v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1979) 23 Cal. 3d 815, 828, 153 Cal. Rptr. 590, 591 P.2d 1242* , the Supreme Court cautioned, "In penalty cases the board should proceed with a view toward achieving a fair balance between the right of the employee to prompt payment of compensation benefits, and the avoidance of imposition upon the employer or carrier of harsh and unreasonable penalties." In the case of *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Stuart) (1998) 18 Cal. 4th 1209, 1216, 77 Cal. Rptr.2d 528, 959 P.2d 1204* , the Supreme Court commented on the showing necessary to establish an unreasonable delay: "A reasonably short delay attributable to human error cannot, standing alone, be considered unreasonable. In requiring a finding of unreasonableness as the trigger for a section 5814 penalty, our Legislature intended something *beyond the mere existence of any delay in the payment of benefits*." (emphasis added) In fact, in its earlier *Kampner* decision (*Kampner v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 376, 150 Cal. Rptr. 222*), the court held that, under appropriate circumstances, a short delay of an additional few days was not in itself unreasonable.

"The touchstone of a section 5814 penalty is a delay or refusal to pay benefits that is *unreasonable*." (*Stuart, supra, 18 Cal. 4th at p. 1214* (emphasis by court)) An unreasonable delay or refusal occurs when there is no genuine doubt that benefits are owed from a medical or legal standpoint. (*Kerley v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1971) 4 Cal. 3d 223, 93 Cal. Rptr. 192, 481 P.2d 200*)

The procedures and standards for evaluating the appropriateness of a penalty enhancement are clearly enunciated in the leading cases. The initial burden is on the employee to establish entitlement to the benefit and delay in its provision. The burden then shifts to the employer to establish that a delay was reasonable. (*Kerley, supra*)

In determining whether a given delay is unreasonable, the Board must look beyond simply the number of days that benefits were delayed, but rather consider all of the relevant circumstances, including the reason for the employer's action or inaction. (*Kampner, supra*) Mere inadvertence, causing a brief delay, may not support the imposition of *Labor Code § 5814* penalties. (*County of Sacramento v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (Souza) (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 726, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 780*)

With all due respect to the allegations of the petition, an inquiry into the circumstances of the administration of this claim will reveal that the delays complained of were, for the most part, occasioned by the realities of the business of processing claims, and thus not unreasonable, since this is the type of delay that would have occurred in the normal course of business. The question to be answered is how long the procedure should have taken, as opposed to any "delay" at all.

With respect to the question of multiple penalties, *Christian v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 15 Cal. 4th 505, 63 Cal. Rptr. 2d 336, 936 P.2d 115* , instructs that those penalties have been approved only when the refusal of, or delay in payment of, benefits necessarily involved separate and distinct unreasonable acts by the insurance carrier. Multiple penalties may be imposed when there are separate classes of benefits, individual claims for payment of reimbursement of medical or travel expenses, or a repeated refusal or delay in payment of a benefit after the same conduct had already been found by the Board to be unreasonable and a priorpenalty imposed, or some analogous, legally significant event

such as a stipulation of liability by the carrier had intervened between the first act for which a penalty was imposed and the second act. Multiple penalties do not apply when repeated delays in paying a benefit arise out of a single, unreasonable act by the employer and there is no subsequent legally significant event establishing the employer's liability.

Lastly, we ask that you to consider that, in *Gallamore*, the court admonished the Board to strike "a fair balance between the right of the employee to prompt payment of compensation benefits, and the avoidance of imposition upon the employer or carrier of harsh and unreasonable penalties." (*Gallamore, supra*)

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that no penalties should be assessed, because the delays complained of were not unreasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Attorney for the Defendants

Dated: _____

Attachments:
Exhibits
Proof of service by mail
Proposed Order

[2] Use of Form

IMPORTANT NOTE: Practitioners should be aware that SB 899 (Stats. 2004 Ch. 34) added new *Labor Code § 5814(g)*, which provides that "[n]otwithstanding any other provisions of law, no action may be brought to recover penalties that may be awarded under this section more than two years from the date the payment of compensation was due." Whether or not this section applies to injuries and/or delayed compensation before June 1, 2004, and/or during the period June 1, 2004, through December 31, 2004, is not clear and is the subject of litigation.

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates an answer to a petition for penalties that may be used by a defendant in responding to an applicant seeking penalties under *Labor Code § 5814* and alleging that payment of compensation is unreasonably delayed or refused, either before or after an award is issued.

For a general discussion of penalties for delay or non-payment of compensation, see *§ 577.243[4]*. See also *§ 577.505[1]*, for a petition for penalties, and § 577.504[1], for form of notice required when seeking multiple penalties.

[3] Cross References

Hanna, California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 10, § 10.40, ch. 27, § 27.12[2] (Matthew Bender)

California Workers' Compensation Practice, ch. 8, §§ 8.6-8.24 (Cal. C.E.B. 4th ed. 2000)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
12 Awards, Reconsideration and Supplemental Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.507-577.509

[Reserved]

§§ 577.507[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
13. Judicial Review of Administrative Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.510

§ 577.510 Petition for Writ of Review [Lab. Code § 5950; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)]--By Injured Employee or Dependent of Deceased Employee

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Review [Lab. Code § 5950; Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)]--By Injured Employee or Dependent of Deceased Employee

[IN THE] COURT OF APPEAL
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
_____ APPELLATE DISTRICT

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF REVIEW
THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS	)	[*Lab. Code § 5950*]
BOARD OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, and	)	
_____ [*names*],	)	
Respondents.	)	

[TO THE HONORABLE (PRESIDING JUSTICE AND ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE) COURT OF APPEAL, _____ APPELLATE DISTRICT:]

Petitioner requests issuance of a writ of review for the purpose of inquiring into and determining the lawfulness of the _____ [*specify order, decision, or award, e.g.,* Findings and Award], made and filed on

_____ [*date*], by respondent Workers' Compensation Appeals Board (hereinafter "Appeals Board"), and in support thereof alleges:

1. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [*name of employer*] (hereinafter "employer") was[, and is,] _____ [*specify capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California authorized to transact, and transacting, business as a _____ (*specify*), in _____ County, California], and _____ [*name of insurance company*] was, and is, a corporation duly authorized to transact, and transacting, business as a workers' compensation insurer in California, with its principal place of business in _____ County, California, and at all times herein mentioned insured the employer against liability arising under the California workers' compensation law.

2. On _____ [*date*], _____ [petitioner *or* _____ (*name of worker*) (hereinafter "petitioner's decedent")] was employed by the employer as a _____ [*specify job position*]. On that day, _____ [petitioner *or* petitioner's decedent] sustained the following-described injury:_____ [*briefly describe injury*]. The injury arose out of the employment and occurred in the course of the employment as follows: _____ [*briefly describe manner in which injury was sustained*]. The injury resulted in _____ [*briefly describe general effects of injury, e.g.,* petitioner's total disability to work for a period of _____ months *or* the death of petitioner's decedent].

3. On _____ [*date*], petitioner filed an application for adjudication of claim with the Appeals Board. Thereafter, on _____ [*date*], a hearing in the matter was held before a workers' compensation judge. The matter was submitted for decision and on _____ [*date*], the workers' compensation judge issued his/her _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Findings and Award], a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A and made a part hereof.

4. On _____ [*date*], within the time prescribed by law, petitioner filed with the Appeals Board a petition for reconsideration, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

[5. The Appeals Board referred the matter to the workers' compensation judge from whose decision reconsideration was sought. On _____ [*date*], the workers' compensation judge prepared, served, and submitted to the Appeals Board his/her Report and Recommendations, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit C and made a part hereof.]

6. On _____ [*date*], the Appeals Board issued its order _____ [denying the petition for reconsideration. A copy of the Order *or* granted reconsideration and, after reconsideration, issued its decision _____ (*specify, e.g.,* affirming) the _____ (*e.g.,* Findings and Award) filed by the workers' compensation appeals judge. A copy of the Decision] is attached hereto as Exhibit D and made a part hereof.

7. The _____ [*specify order, decision, or award, e.g.,* Findings and Award] was _____ [without or in excess of the Appeals Board's powers *or* procured by fraud *or* unreasonable *or* not supported by substantial evidence *or* not supported by the findings of fact] in that _____ [*specify*].

[*ADD, if claim is that the decision is not supported by substantial evidence*]

[8. All the material evidence relative to the point at issue is _____ [set forth in the Statement of Material Evidence appended to this decision, which, by this reference, is incorporated herein *or* as follows: _____ (*summarize testimony and any statments in writings introduced in evidence relative to the point, and attach to this petition as an exhibit and incorporate by reference a copy of each writing referred to*).]

[*CONTINUE*]

9. Petitioner has no right to appeal from the Findings and Award or from the order denying reconsideration and has no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy or any remedy other than by writ of review.

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. That a writ of review issue out of this court to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board, directing it to certify fully to this court at a specified time and place the records and proceedings of the cause so that the same may be inquired into and determined by this court;

2. That following the inquiry and determination by this court, the _____ [*specify, e.g.,* Findings and Award be annulled];

3. That _____ [*specify particular relief desired, e.g.,* the court further declare that as a matter of law _____ (petitioner *or* petitioner's decedent) was acting in the course and scope of his/her employment when the injury was sustained and that the cause be remanded to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board for further proceedings consistent with that declaration]; and

4. That petitioner be granted such other and further relief as may be proper and just in the premises.
Dated: _____.

Respectfully submitted,_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[Verification.]

[STATEMENT OF MATERIAL EVIDENCE]

[*If the claim is that the decision is not supported by substantial evidence and all material evidence relative to the claim is not set forth in the body of the petition (see Paragraph 8), set forth that evidence in this statement. The statement should summarize all testimony and any written statements introduced in evidence relative to the point. A copy of any writing referred to should be attached as an exhibit and incorporated by reference.*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an injured employee or the dependents of a deceased employee to seek judicial review of an order, ruling, decision, or award of the appeals board. It may be modified for use by an employer to seek review of an adverse order, ruling, decision, or award [*see Lab. Code §§ 5810, 5950, 5952*]. In the latter case, the petition may include a prayer for an order directing the appeals board not to take any further proceedings in the matter and for an order staying or suspending, in whole or in part, operation of the appeals board's order, ruling, decision, or

award pending the court's determination of the petition for writ of review [*see Lab. Code § 5956*; for the undertaking required as a prerequisite to a stay order, see *Lab. Code § 6000*].

For discussion of judicial review, see *§ 577.280* et seq.

[3] Contents of Petition

The petition must include, as exhibits, copies of the following documents [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)(1)*]:

- Each order, decision, or award to be reviewed; and

- The workers' compensation judge's minutes of hearing and summary of evidence, findings and decisions, and his or her report and recommendation on the petition for reconsideration.

If it is claimed that the decision is not supported by substantial evidence, the petition must fairly state and attach copies of all the material evidence relative to the point at issue [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)(2)*].

Effective July 1, 2006, each party other than the Appeals Board must comply with the requirements of *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.208*, concerning serving and filing a Certificate of Interested Entities or Persons. The petitioner's certificate must be included in the petition and must appear after the cover and before the tables. If the petitioner fails to file the certificate as required, the clerk will notify the petitioner that the certificate must be filed within 10 days and that failure to comply will result in the court's striking the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(c)*].

[4] Format and Copies

The petition for writ of review may be typed or printed in accordance with court rules as to format [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(a)*]. It must have a cover containing the title of the case, the designation of the paper (Petition for Writ of Review), and the name, address, California State Bar membership number, and phone number of the attorney filing the petition [*Cal. Rules of Ct, Rule 8.204(b)*]. The cover should be red [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.40(b)*]. An original and four copies of the petition must be presented to the clerk of the appellate court for filing [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.44(b)(3)*].

Recycled paper must be used for an original brief or other paper filed with a reviewing court and for all copies of a brief or other paper whether filed with the court or served on other parties. The use of recycled paper for the cover of the brief is encouraged [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.204(b)(10)*].

For the format requirements of petitions filed in a court of appeal and related procedures and forms for use in review proceedings, see Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of.*

[5] Verification and Supporting Papers

The petition must be verified and accompanied by a memorandum [see *Lab. Code § 5954*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 1069*; *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.486(a), (5)*]. It must also be accompanied by proof of service of two copies on the appeals board in San Francisco and one copy on each party who entered an appearance in the proceeding before the appeals board and whose interest is adverse to the petitioner. Service on the board's local district office is not required [*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 8.495(a)(3)*].

[6] Cross References

Hanna, *California Law of Employee Injuries and Workers' Compensation, ch. 34, §§ 34.11, 34.12*

California Workers' Compensation Practice (3d ed, Cal. CEB 1985), Ch. 11, *Judicial Review*, §§ 11.1, 11.24-11.49

Witkin, Summary of California Law, vol. 2, *Worker's Compensation*, § 438 (10th ed. 2005)

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
A. Administrative Procedures and Proceedings
13. Judicial Review of Administrative Proceedings

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.511-577.519

[Reserved]

§§ 577.511[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.520

§ 577.520 Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] or in Intervention [Code Civ. Proc. § 387; Lab. Code § 3853]--By Insurance Carrier Against Third-Party Tortfeasor [Lab. Code § 3852]

[1] FORM Complaint for Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] or in Intervention [Code Civ. Proc. § 387; Lab. Code § 3853]--By Insurance Carrier Against Third-Party Tortfeasor [Lab. Code § 3852]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT _____ [FOR DAM-
_____ [*name*],	)	AGES *or* IN INTERVENTION]
[and DOES I through _____,]	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
Defendant(s)[; _____ (*name*),	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
Intervener].	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]
	)	

_____

_____ [Plaintiff alleges *or* Intervener joins with plaintiff herein and alleges]:

1. At all times herein mentioned, _____ [plaintiff *or* intervener] _____ [*name*] was, and now is, _____ [*specify form of business organization, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California], authorized to write workers' compensation insurance in California, and at all times herein mentioned insured _____ [*name of employer*] (hereinafter "the employer") against liability to its employees for compensation benefits under the Workers' Compensation Law of the State of California.

2. At all times herein mentioned, the employer was the employer of _____ [*name of employee*] (hereinafter "the employee").

[3. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise, of defendants DOES I through _____ are unknown to _____ [plaintiff *or* intervener], who therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names, and will amend this complaint to show their true names and capacities when ascertained.]

4. Defendant _____ [*name*] is, and at all times herein mentioned was, [_____ (*specify capacity if not a natural person, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ and authorized to transact business in California, and was and is] _____ [*specify status giving rise to duty to injured employee, e.g.,* engaged in the manufacture of _____ (*product causing injury*) *or* the owner of _____ (*describe property the negligent use of which proximately caused the injury*)].

5. On _____ [*date*], at about _____ [*time*], while the employee was _____ [*describe employee's activities at time of injury, e.g.,* driving a [*date*] _____ (*describe vehicle*) in a southerly direction over and along _____ (*name of street, road, or highway*) in the _____ (city *or* county) of _____ (*name*) at its intersection with _____ (*name of street, road, or highway*)], he/she sustained injuries, as hereinafter alleged, whicharose out of and occurred in the course of his/her employment [and from which he/she died].

6. _____ [*Allege tort giving rise to liability, e.g.:* At the time and place the injuries were sustained, defendants, and each of them, _____ (*describe act(s) or omission(s), e.g.,* so negligently owned, maintained, operated, and repaired their above described vehicle) as to cause _____ [*specify circumstances of accident, e.g.,* it to collide with the vehicle being driven by the employee].

7. As a proximate result of the _____ [*specify tort, e.g.,* negligence] of defendants, and each of them, the employee sustained _____ [severe bodily injuries *or specify injuries*] [from which he/she died].

8. As a proximate result of the _____ [*e.g.,* negligence] of defendants, and each of them, and of the resulting injuries sustained by [, and the death of,] the employee, _____ [plaintiff *or* intervener] has been obligated to pay, and has paid, workers' compensation [death] benefits to _____ [the employee *or* _____ (*name(s)*), who is/are the (sole) dependent(s) of the employee (hereinafter "the employee's dependent(s)") *or* the California State Department of Industrial Relations pursuant to the provisions of *Section 4706.5 of the Labor Code*] [*if limited civil case, specify amount of damages, e.g.,* as follows:

a. Temporary disability benefits in the amount of $_____;

b. Permanent disability benefits in the amount of $_____; and

c. Medical benefits in the amount of $_____].

[9. _____ (Plaintiff *or* Intervener) is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that it will be required

to pay further disability benefits and sums for medical care and treatment for an indefinite time in the future, and _____ (plaintiff *or* intervener) prays that when the _____ (extent of this liability is *or* total amount of such expenditures are) ascertained this complaint (in intervention) may be amended accordingly.]

WHEREFORE, _____ [plaintiff *or* intervener] prays judgment against defendants, and each of them, for:

1. Workers' _____ [compensation *or* death] benefits paid to the _____ [employee *or* employee's dependent(s) *or* California State Department of Industrial Relations] [in the amount of $_____];

2. Future disability benefits and costs of medical care and treatment according to proof;

3. Costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. Such other and further relief as this court deems just.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for [Plaintiff *or* Intervener]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the _____ [*specify title, e.g.,* President] of _____ [plaintiff *or* intervener] _____ [*name of corporation*] and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing complaint [in intervention] and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters that are therein alleged on information and belief, and, as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a complaint for use by a workers' compensation insurance carrier (or by the employer if self-insured) to sue a third-party tortfeasor to recover the workers' compensation benefits paid as a result of an injury to or death of an employee in the course and scope of his or her employment [*see Lab. Code § 3852*]. The form may be used to commence an original action or as a complaint in intervention by the carrier in an action commenced by the

injured employee [*see* discussion under *§§ 577.332[6], [7]*]. For when the complaint must be filed, see discussion under *§ 577.332[8]*. For general discussion of third party actions, see *§ 577.330* et seq.

For additional or alternative allegations that may or must be included, depending on the nature of the specific tort involved, see the chapter in this publication covering that tort or subject, for example, Ch. 83, *Automobiles: Bringing the Action* , Ch. 380, *Negligence* , and Ch. 460, *Products Liability* .

For a comprehensive procedural guide that chronologically outlines all the procedures in a typical civil action brought in a California state court, see Ch. 2, *Procedural Guide for Civil Actions* .

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

[3] Specification of Damages

In an unlimited civil case in superior court brought to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case or whether it is a limited civil case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq., and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*].

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* .

[4] Allegations

The complaint alleges the following:

- Plaintiff's standing as the employer's workers' compensation insurance carrier (Paragraph 1);

- the defendant's duty to the class of persons of which the employee is a member (Paragraph 4) [*see Civ. Code § 1714*, and, e.g., Ch. 460, *Products Liability* (duty of a manufacturer of products not to place defective products into the stream of commerce) and Ch. 421, *Premises Liability* (duty of an owner of property to exercise due care in its management so as not to injure others)];

- injury to the employee arising out of and in the course of his or her employment, establishing plaintiff's duty to pay compensation benefits (Paragraphs 2, 5 and 7) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3282, 3333*; *Lab. Code § 3600*];

- defendant's tortious conduct, that is, defendant's breach of duty to the employee (Paragraph 6) [*see Civ. Code § 1714*];

- defendant's breach of duty as the proximate cause of the employee's injuries (Paragraph 7) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*];

- that plaintiff suffered a loss in the form of having to pay benefits as a result of defendant's breach of duty to the employee (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3282, 3333*]; and

- the amount of plaintiff's damages (Paragraph 8) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3333*; *Lab. Code § 3852*].

An optional allegation is included for use to allege the probability of additional compensation payments being required before the present action is adjudicated, that is, additional detriment and damages (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282, 3333*].

The court of appeal has held that, pursuant to *Lab. Code § 3852*, a workers' compensation carrier stated a cause of action against alleged third-party tortfeasors for recoupment of death benefits the carrier paid to a deceased employee's survivor, who was an actual dependent of the employee but who had no standing to bring a wrongful death action against the alleged tortfeasors. The court held that the carrier's right to sue was not limited to its status as subrogee of the survivor and that the wrongful death statute, with its limited standing provisions, was irrelevant in determining the carrier's right to sue [*Fremont Comp. Ins. Co. v. Sierra Pine, Ltd. (2004) 121 Cal. App. 4th 389, 394-401, 17 Cal. Rptr. 3d 80]* .

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

[5] Pleading Employee's Cause of Action

If the employee has failed to file an action against the third-party tortfeasor, the foregoing complaint may allege the employee's damages, even if the employee has not been joined as a party [*State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Matulich (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 528, 530-531, 131 P.2d 21* ; *see* *County of San Diego v. Sanfax Corp. (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 862, 873, 140 Cal. Rptr. 638, 568 P.2d 363* ; *Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 826, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455]* .

[6] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (section repealed on January 1, 2006, unless a later-enacted statute deletes or extends the repeal date)], verification will requireany answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[7] Intervention

[a] Generally

Normally, leave to file a complaint in intervention may be obtained by noticed motion or by ex parte application. For forms for use in seeking leave to intervene as well as a form of order granting intervention, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

For discussion and forms for use in seeking to intervene in the action of another, see Ch. 395, *Parties* .

[b] By Employee

The employee may also intervene in a pending action by the employer or its compensation carrier against the third-party tortfeasor [*Buell v. CBS, Inc. (1982) 136 Cal. App. 3d 823, 825 n.2, 186 Cal. Rptr. 455* ; *Jordan v. Superior Court (1981) 116 Cal. App. 3d 202, 206-211, 172 Cal Rptr 30* ; *State Comp. Ins. Fund v. Matulich (1942) 55 Cal. App. 2d 528, 529-530, 131 P.2d 21* ; discussion under *see §§ 577.332[6], [7]*]. For forms of complaints for damages that may be used by the employee to sue the third-party tortfeasor either by a complaint in intervention or an original action, see the appropriate tort title in this set.

[8] Service of Complaint on Employee

If used as an original complaint, a copy of the foregoing complaint must be served forthwith on the employee personally or by registered mail [*Lab. Code § 3853*; *see § 577.521*].

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

[9] Burden of Proof and Evidence

An employer seeking reimbursement for compensation benefits bears the burden of establishing that the defendant's negligence is the proximate cause of the employee's injuries and the amount of tort damages reasonably resulting therefrom. In a third-party tort action, the defendant must be permitted the opportunity of presenting evidence to the contrary, and this is so whether the claim is asserted by an employee for his or her own injury, or by an employer (or its carrier) for reimbursement of compensation paid [*Breese v. Price (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 923, 930-931, 176 Cal. Rptr. 791, 633 P.2d 987]* .

[10] Cross References

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and forms for use in actions in subrogation generally, see Ch. 536, *Subrogation*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.521

§ 577.521 Notice of Filing of Complaint Against Third Party [Lab. Code § 3853]--By Employee or Employer

[1] FORM Notice of Filing of Complaint Against Third Party [Lab. Code § 3853]--By Employee or Employer

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*], Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	NO. _____
_____ [*name*], [and DOES I	)	NOTICE OF FILING OF COMPLAINT
through _____,] Defendant(s).	)	
	)	

_____

You are hereby notified that on _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*name of employee or employer*] filed the _____ [attached *or* enclosed] complaint for damages in the _____ Court of _____ [*name of court*], Civil No. _____, against defendant _____ [*name*]. This action is based on an injury sustained by _____ [plaintiff or name of employee] on _____ [*date*], arising out of and in the course of his/her employment with _____ [plaintiff *or name of employer*], which was insured for workers' compensation liability at the time of the injury by _____ [*name of insurance carrier*]. This copy of the complaint is delivered to you pursuant to the provisions of *Section 3853 of the Labor Code*.

Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an injured employee or his or her employer to give notice to the other of the filing of a complaint against a third-party tortfeasor for damages arising out of the injury for which workers' compensation benefits were paid.

Under *Lab. Code § 3853* prior to its 1980 amendment, the employee or employer filing a third-party action was required forthwith to give written notice of the filing to the other. As amended, *Lab. Code § 3853* requires only that a copy of the complaint be forthwith given to the other. Under both the original and amended versions of the statute, delivery must be personal or by registered mail and proof of the service must be filed in the action (*see § 577.332[10]*).

Although the foregoing notice is no longer required, counsel may nevertheless wish to include it, or a formal letter, with the copy of the complaint delivered, particularly where the complaint is delivered by registered mail, to notify the recipient of the reason for it.

For forms of proof of service by mail, which may be adapted for use when service is by registered mail or when delivery is made in person, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.522

§ 577.522 Complaint for Compensatory Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Injured Employee Against Negligent Employer Who Failed to Secure Compensation Under Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3706]

[1] FORM Complaint for Compensatory Damages [Civ. Code § 3333] by Injured Employee Against Negligent Employer Who Failed to Secure Compensation Under Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3706]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name of employee*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Negligence)
_____ [*name of employer*], and	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
DOES I through _____, Defend-	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
ants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. Defendant _____ [*name of employer*] is, and at all times mentioned herein was,

_____ [*capacity, e.g.,* a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of California with its principal place of business in _____ (*city*), _____ County, California].

2. Defendants Doe I through Doe _____, inclusive, are sued herein under fictitious names. Their true names and capacities are unknown to plaintiff. When their true names and capacities are ascertained, plaintff will amend this complaint by inserting their true names and capacities herein. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the fictitiously named defendants is responsible in some manner for the occurrences herein alleged, and that plaintiff's damages as herein alleged were proximately caused by those defendants. Each reference in this complaint to "defendant," "defendants," or a specifically named defendant refers also to all defendants sued under fictitious names.

3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned each of the defendants, including all defendants sued under fictitious names, was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of this agency and employment.

4. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into _____ [a written *or* an oral] agreement for the employment of plaintiff by defendant _____[*describe general nature of work, e.g.,* to perform construction work for defendant's construction company]. Pursuant to this employment, defendant _____ [*name of employer*] was required to secure payment of workers' compensation benefits as required by *Labor Code Section 3700*.

5. Plaintiff subsequently entered into employment pursuant to the above-described agreement.

[6. _____ (*Allege any specific duty of care imposed on employer by statute or regulation*).]

7. _____ [*Allege facts showing defendant's duty of care in particular, e.g.,* At all times mentioned herein, defendant owned, maintained, controlled, operated, and provided a certain _____ (*specify, e.g.,* scaffolding) for use by employees, including plaintiff, in performing work.]

8. _____ [*Allege defendant's breach of duty of care, e.g.,* Defendant negligently maintained the _____(*specify, e.g.,* scaffolding) in a dangerous and unsafe condition, in that _____ (*specify*).]

9. _____ [*Allege plaintiff's injury and causal relationship with defendant's breach of duty of care, e.g.,* On or about _____ [date], plaintiff was using the _____ (*specify, e.g.,* scaffolding) for an intended purpose, namely _____ (*specify*), in the course and scope of plaintiff's employment, at _____ (*place*). Plaintiff was then and there injured, as more particularly alleged hereinafter, as a proximate result of _____ (*specify, e.g.,* the scaffolding's breaking and causing plaintiff to fall two stories and strike the ground).]

10. As a proximate result of the acts and omissions of defendant, plaintiff was hurt and injured in his/her health, strength, and activity, sustaining injury to his/her nervous system and person, all of which have caused, and continue to cause, plaintiff great mental, physical, and nervous pain and suffering. [Plain tiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that these injuries will result in some permanent disability to him/her.] As a result of these injuries, plaintiff has suffered general damages [in the amount of $_____].

[*EITHER*]

11. As a further proximate result of defendant's acts, plaintiff has been damaged in that he/she has been required to

expend money and incur obligations for medical services, X rays, drugs, and sundries reasonably required in the treatment and relief of the injuries herein alleged [in the sum of $_____].

[*OR*]

11. As a further proximate result of the acts of defendant, plaintiff has incurred, and will continue to incur, medical and related expenses. The full amount of these expenses is not known to plaintiff at this time. Plaintiff will move to amend this complaint to state the amount when it becomes known to him/her, or on proof thereof.

[*EITHER*]

12. As a further proximate result of the acts of defendant, plaintiff was prevented from attending to his/her employment at a _____ [wage *or* salary] of _____ [*specify amount and term, e.g.*, $2,000.00 per month] for a period of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, 2 months] and thereby lost earnings to his/her damage [in the sum of $_____].

[*OR*]

12. As a further proximate result of the acts of defendant, plaintiff was prevented from attending to his/her employment at a _____ [wage *or* salary] of _____ [*specify amount and term, e.g.*, $2,000.00 per month] for a period of _____ [*specify, e.g.*, 2 months] as of the date of this complaint and continuing for an as yet undetermined period. Plaintiff thereby has lost and will lose earnings in an as yet unascertained amount. Plaintiff will seek to amend this complaint at such time as the amount is ascertained. [As a further proximate result of the acts of defendant, plaintiff's present and future earning capacity has been greatly impaired. The exact amount of this loss is not known to plaintiff at this time, and plaintiff will move to amend this complaint to state the amount when it becomes known to him/her, or on proof thereof.]

[*CONTINUE*]

13. [On _____ (*date*), in a proceeding entitled _____ (*specify*), No. _____, the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board made and entered findings and conclusions determining that at the time of the injury suffered by plaintiff as alleged herein, plaintiff and defendant were subject to the workers' compensation insurance and safety laws, and that] [D]efendant failed to secure the payment of compensation in one or more of the ways specified in *Labor Code Section 3700*.

14. A copy of this complaint _____ [has been *or* forthwith will be] given to the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund by _____ [personal service *or* certified mail], and proof of such service _____ [is attached hereto *or* will be filed herein].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For general damages [in the sum of $_____];

2. For medical and related expenses _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

3. For lost earnings, past and future, _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

4. For interest as allowed by law;

5. For costs of suit incurred herein;

6. For reasonable attorney's fees; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION (*if desired*)

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an employee to obtain damages from an employer who has failed to secure compensation pursuant to the workers' compensation and insurance laws [*see Lab. Code § 3706*]. For discussion of actions against uninsured employers under *Lab. Code § 3706*, see *§ 577.312[2]*.

Such an action may be maintained only if the workers' compensation law is otherwise applicable to the employee [*see Lab. Code § 3706* (action may be brought by employee); *see also Lab. Code § 3352* (persons excluded from definition of "employee")]. For a complaint for use in the case of excluded employment, see *§ 577.522[1]*.

An action may also be maintained by the dependents of an employee who died from his or her injuries [*Lab. Code § 3706*]. For discussion and forms for use in actions by an employee's dependents, see Ch. 181, *Death and Survival Actions*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions* .

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints* .

[3] Allegations

In an action under *Lab. Code § 3706*, the complaint must allege the following [*see Coleman v. Silverberg Plumbing Co. (1968) 263 Cal. App. 2d 74, 79, 69 Cal. Rptr. 158* ; *Mantonya v Bratlie (1948) 33 Cal. 2d 120, 124-125, 199 P.2d 677* ; *see also § 577.22*, for discussion of who is employer and employee subject to workers' compensation requirements]:

- There was an employer-employee relationship between plaintiff and defendant, pursuant to which defendant was required to secure payment of workers' compensation (Paragraphs 4 and 5); and

- The employer failed to carry workers' compensation insurance in violation of *Labor Code § 3700* (Paragraph 13).

This complaint also alleges that a copy of the complaint was sent to the Uninsured Employers Benefits Trust Fund as required by *Lab. Code § 3708.5*.

The findings and conclusions of the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board on questions of fact are conclusive and final and are not subject to review [*Lab. Code § 5953*]. Thus, if the WCAB has determined that defendant (employer) failed to secure compensation as required by *Lab. Code § 3700*, that fact should be alleged (Paragraph 13).

There is a statutory presumption that an injury to an employee of an uninsured employer was a direct result of, and grew out of, the negligence of the employer. The burden of proof is on the employer to rebut this presumption [*Lab. Code § 3708*]. Nevertheless, the elements of negligence should be alleged because the presumption is a rule of evidence only, and it does not relieve the injured employee of the burden of pleading facts showing a cause of action based on negligence [*see Graybiel v. Consolidated Ass'ns, Ltd. (1936) 16 Cal. App. 2d 20, 25-26, 28, 60 P.2d 164]* . Therefore, the complaint alleges the following four elements of a cause of action for negligence [*see, e.g., Miglierini v. Havemann (1966) 240 Cal. App. 2d 570, 572, 49 Cal. Rptr. 795]* :

- The existence of a duty of care owed by defendant to plaintiff;

- Breach of that duty by defendant;

- Damage to plaintiff; and

- A causal relationship between the defendant's breach of duty and the damage suffered by plaintiff (Paragraphs 6-9).

The foregoing form also contains allegations of general damages (Paragraph 10), special damages for medical expenses (Alternative Paragraphs 11), and special damages for lost earnings (Alternative Paragraphs 12). The first alternative of Paragraph 11 alleges a fixed and known amount of medical expenses. The second alternative is for use if the amount of medical expenses is not known at the time when the complaint is filed. The first alternative of Paragraph 12 alleges a fixed and known amount of lost earnings. The second alternative is for use if the total amount of lost earnings cannot yet be ascertained and the plaintiff's future earning capacity has been impaired.

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used* .

[4] Specification of Damages

In an unlimited civil case in superior court brought to recover damages for personal injury or wrongful death, the

complaint must not state the amount of actual or punitive damages demanded [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*].

Otherwise, the amounts claimed as damages must be alleged [*Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10(b)*] or an equivalent statement must be included, for example, a statement that the damages for a particular loss or harm sustained [*see Civ. Code §§ 3281, 3282*] are not known and that leave will be sought to amend the complaint to state the exact amount when ascertained. If this is done, counsel must remember to seek leave to amend the complaint to so state before judgment.

No claim for punitive damages may state an amount sought regardless of the nature of the case or whether it is a limited civil case [*Civ. Code § 3295(e)*].

For discussion of and forms for requesting and stating the amount of damages sought when they are not stated in the complaint, see *Ch. 177, Damages, § 177.40* et seq., and Ch. 205, *Defaults and Default Judgments* [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 425.11, 425.115*].

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers* .

[5] Verification

Although verification of this complaint is not required [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 128.7(a)* (section repealed on January 1, 2006, unless a later-enacted statute deletes or extends the repeal date)], verification will require any answer to be verified in an unlimited civil case in the superior court [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 92(b), 446*]. Verification will also preclude a general denial in an unlimited civil case, and will preclude a general denial even in a limited civil case when the action is a claim assigned to a third party for collection [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(d)*]. For further discussion see Ch. 26, *Answers* .

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification* .

[6] Cross References

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For discussion and forms relating to pleading a cause of action for negligence, see Ch. 380, *Negligence*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.523

§ 577.523 Allegation--Employment Excluded From Workers' Compensation Law Coverage [Lab. Code §§ 2800, 2801]

[1] FORM Allegation--Employment Excluded From Workers' Compensation Law Coverage [Lab. Code §§ 2800, 2801]

On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, plaintiff and defendant entered into _____ [a written *or* an oral] agreement for the employment of plaintiff by defendant _____ [*describe general nature of work, e.g.,* to perform domestic and household services]. Pursuant to the terms of this agreement, plaintiff was not an employee within the meaning of California's workers' compensation law in that _____ [*specify reason and cite statutory exclusion, e.g.,* under *Section 3352(h) of the Labor Code*, plaintiff earned less than $100 in wages from defendant during the 90 calendar days immediately preceding the date of the injury hereinafter alleged].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates allegation in a complaint by an employee against his or her employer based on the employer's negligence. The form alleges that the employment relationship between the parties is one that is excluded under workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code §§ 3351-3352*]. This allegation may be substituted for the allegation in Paragraph 4 of the complaint in *§ 577.522[1]*.

Such a civil action is subject to the special rules of *Lab. Code § 2801*, which define and limit the employer's defenses. For discussion, see *§ 577.312[3][b]*. For a form for an affirmative defense alleging the plaintiff's negligence in such an action, see Form 162. See also, *§ 577.522*.

[3] Pleading Alternative: No Mention of Employment Relationship

As an alternative to the use of this form, the plaintiff may plead the action as any other negligence action, without reference to any employment relationship between the parties. Such a pleading puts the burden on the defendant to raise

any possible exclusive remedy issue as an affirmative defense [*see Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 224, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . However, any reference in the complaint to an employment relationship should be accompanied by the pleading of facts that remove the case from the exclusive remedy principle [*see Halliman v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 46, 50, 209 Cal. Rptr. 175]* . In this case, such an allegation would set forth facts that establish excluded employment. For further discussion, see *§ 577.311[3]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.524

§ 577.524 Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Willful Physical Assault by Employer [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Willful Physical Assault by Employer [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name of employee*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Assault and Battery)
_____ [*name of employer*], [and	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
DOES I through _____,] De-	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
fendants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Allegation of defendant employer's capacity. See Paragraph 1 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation. See Paragraph 2 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

3. [*Agency allegation. See Paragraph 3 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

[4. *Allegations of contractual employment relationship between plaintiff and defendant, if desired. See Paragraphs 4 and 5 of compalaint in § 577.522[1].*]

5. On or about _____ [*date*], at _____ [*location*] in _____ [*city*], California, defendant _____ [*name*] _____ [*state all acts of defendant that placed plaintiff in fear of a harmful or offensive contact, e.g.,* drove a fork lift truck directly toward plaintiff, who was standing with his back to an interior wall and unable to escape].

6. In doing the acts as alleged above, defendant intended to cause, or to place plaintiff in apprehension of, a harmful contact with plaintiff's person.

7. As a result of defendant's acts as alleged above, plaintiff was in fact placed in great apprehension of a harmful contact with plaintiff's person.

8. Immediately thereafter, defendant _____ [*name*] _____ [*state all acts of defendant that constituted a harmful contact with plaintiff, e.g.,* did in fact strike plaintiff with the forklift truck that he was driving].

9. In doing the acts as alleged above, defendant acted with the intent to make a contact with plaintiff's person.

10. At no time did plaintiff consent to any of the acts of defendant as alleged above.

[11. _____ (*Allege any specific physical injuries suffered by plaintiff, e.g.,* As a proximate result of the acts of defendant as alleged above, plaintiff suffered several cracked ribs, a dislocated hip, and numerous contusions and abrasion over his body).]

12. [*Allegation of general damages. See Paragraph 10 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

13. [*Damages allegation for medical expenses. See alternative Paragraphs 11 of complain in § 577.522[1].*]

14. [*Damages allegation for lost earnings. See Alternative Paragraphs 12 of complaing in § 577.522[1].*]

15. The aforementioned conduct of defendant was willful and malicious and was _____ [intended to harm plaintiff *or* in conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights and safety]. Plaintiff may therefore recover an award of punitive damages.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment on both causes of action against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For general damages [in the sum of $_____];

2. For medical and related expenses _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

3. For lost earnings, past and future, _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

4. For punitive damages;

5. For interest as allowed by law;

6. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 577.522[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a complaint for damages caused by a willful physical assault committed by an employer against an employee. Such an action is an express statutory exception to the exclusive remedy principle of workers' compensation law, permitting the employer to bring a civil action against the employer [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)*]. For further discussion, see *§ 577.314[2]*. See also, *§§ 577.522* and *577.523* and Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* .

[3] Allegations

In addition to incorporating standard allegations of capacity, fictitiously named defendants, and agency, this form contains the following necessary allegations of the elements of causes of action for assault and battery [*see Barbara A. v. John G. (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 369, 375, 193 Cal. Rptr. 422* (battery); *Lowry v. Standard Oil Co. (1944) 63 Cal. App. 2d 1, 6-7, 146 P.2d 57* (assault)]:

- Defendant's act that placed plaintiff in fear of a harmful bodily contact (Paragraph 5),
- Defendant's intent to cause the apprehension (Paragraph 6);
- Plaintiff's actual apprehension of the contact (Paragraph 7);
- Defendant's act that produced the harmful contact or battery (Paragraph 8);
- Defendant's intent to make the contact (Paragraph 9); and
- Plaintiff's lack of consent to defendant's conduct (Paragraph 10).

For discussion, see Ch. 58, *Assault and Battery* .

This complaint contains an optional paragraph to allege any specific bodily injury that plaintiff may have received as a

result of the defendant's conduct (Paragraph 11). Standard damages allegations for general damages for pain and suffering and for compensatory damages for medical expenses and lost income are also incorporated (Paragraphs 12-14). An allegation for punitive damages is also included (Paragraph 15).

Paragraph 5 alleges the employment relationship between the parties. This paragraph is optional because the burden is on the defendant to plead and prove the applicability of the exclusive remedy principle of workers' compensation law [*see Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 224, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470]* . If the plaintiff alleges the relationship, the complaint must also show sufficient facts to show an exception to the exclusive remedy principle [*see Halliman v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 46, 50, 209 Cal. Rptr. 175]* . This requirement is met by allegations of a willful physical assault by the employer [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)(1)*]. For further discussion, see § 522.311[3].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.525

§ 577.525 Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Aggravation of Work-Related Injury by Fraudulent Concealment [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)]

[1] FORM Complaint for Compensatory and Punitive Damages [Civ. Code §§ 3294, 3333] by Injured Employee Against Employer--Aggravation of Work-Related Injury by Fraudulent Concealment [Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name of employee*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES
vs.	)	(Fraudulent Concealment of Industrial Injury)
_____ [*name of employer*], and	)	[Amount demanded _____ (exceeds
DOES I through _____, Defend-	)	*or* does not exceed) $10,000]
ants.	)	[LIMITED CIVIL CASE]

Plaintiff alleges:

1. [*Allegation of defendant employer's capacity. See Paragraph 1 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

2. [*Fictitious name allegation. See Paragraph 2 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

3. [*Agency allegation. See Paragraph 3 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

[4. *Allegations of contractual employment relationship between plaintiff and defendant, if desired. See Paragraphs 4 and 5 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

5. _____ [*Allege conditions of employment or occurrence of event that caused plaintiff's initial work-related injury, e.g.,* At all times herein mentioned, defendant was engaged in the business of milling, manufacturing, and packaging asbestos. Plaintiff's employment contract required that he/she work in proximity to all aspects of defendant's business, and thus during the period of his/her employment, he/she was continuously exposed to asbestos.]

6. _____ [*Allege initial work-related injury, e.g.,* As a proximate result of being continuously exposed to asbestos, plaintiff developed frequent instances of pulmonary infections and dysfunctions.]

7. _____ [*Allege defendant's fraudulent concealment of plaintiff's condition and its cause, e.g.,* Defendant has known since _____ (date), that long exposure to asbestos or the ingestion of that substance is dangerous to health, yet concealed this knowledge from plaintiff, advised him/her that it was safe to work in proximity to asbestos, and failed to provide protective devices to prevent plaintiff's exposure to asbestos. By _____ (date), defendant learned that plaintiff was suffering from a pulmonary disease but failed to inform plaintiff that his/her illness was caused by exposure to asbestos or to take any measures to cure the disease or to prevent plaintiff from further exposure to asbestos. Doctors retained by defendant were neither qualified nor supplied with adequate information regarding the risk of asbestos exposure. Defendant failed to advise these doctors of the development of pulmonary disease in plaintiff or of the fact that the disease was the result of the working conditions at defendant's place of employment.]

[8. _____ (*Allege any further actions of fraudulent concealment, if appropriate, e.g.,* In addition to the foregoing acts designed to conceal from the plaintiff the nature and cause of his/her illness, defendant willfully failed to file a First Report of Occupational Injury or Illness with the State of California regarding plaintiff's injury, as required by law).]

9. Each of the acts and omissions described in Paragraphs 6 and 7[, and 8,] was done falsely and fraudulently by defendant, with the intent to induce plaintiff to continue to work in a dangerous environment. Plaintiff was ignorant of the risks involved and would not have continued to work in such an environment if he/she had known the facts.

10. _____ [*Allege specific aggravation of physical injuries suffered by plaintiff, e.g.,* As a proximate result of the acts of defendant as alleged above, plaintiff developed pneumoconiosis, lung cancer, and other asbestos-related injuries].

11. [*Allegation of general damages for pain and suffering. See Paragraph 10 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

12. [*Damages allegation for medical expenses. See alternative Paragraphs 11 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

13. [*Damages allegation for lost earnings. See alternative Paragraphs 12 of complaint in § 577.522[1].*]

14. [*Punitive damages allegation. See Paragraph 15 of complaint in § 577.524[1].*]

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment on both causes of action against defendant(s) as follows:

1. For general damages [in the sum of $_____];

2. For medical and related expenses _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

3. For lost earnings, past and future, _____ [in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof];

4. For punitive damages;

5. For interest as allowed by law;

6. For costs of suit incurred herein; and

7. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

[*Verification, if desired. See § 577.522[1].*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a complaint by an employee against his or her employer to recover damages for the aggravation of an injury or disease because the employer fraudulently concealed the injury from the employee [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*; *Johns-Manville Products Corp. v. Superior Court (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 465, 477-479, 165 Cal. Rptr. 858, 612 P.2d 948]* . Such a cause of action is an exception to the exclusive remedy principle of workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*; *Johns-Manville Products Corp. v. Superior Court (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 465, 477-479, 165 Cal. Rptr. 858, 612 P.2d 948]* . For further discussion, see the § 577.314[3]. See also, *§§ 577.522, 577.524*.

[3] Allegations

In addition to incorporating standard allegations of capacity, fictitiously named defendants, and agency (Paragraphs 1-3), this form sets forth the following allegations:

- The general conditions of employ ment leading to the injury (Paragraph 5);

- The initial onset of industrial injury (Paragraph 6);

- The acts of the defendant employer of fraudulently concealment of the disease and its connection to the employment from the employee (Paragraphs 7 and 8); and

- The ultimate extent of the injury attributable to the aggravation caused by the fraudulent

concealment (Paragraph 10).

Paragraph 9 alleges plaintiff's reliance on defendant's conduct. Such an allegation may not be required, in that an action under *Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)* does not appear to be one for common-law fraud [*see Foster v. Xerox Corp. (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 306, 309-312, 219 Cal. Rptr. 485, 707 P.2d 858* (complaint pleaded on strict-liability theory held sufficient; apparently no allegation of plaintiff's reliance on defendant's conduct); *see also Civ. Code §§ 1709, 1710*; *South Tahoe Gas Co. v. Hofmann Land Improvement Co., (1972) 25 Cal. App. 3d 750, 765, 102 Cal. Rptr. 286* (elements of tort of fraud); *but see Chase Chemical Co. v. Hartford Accident & Indemnity Co. (1984) 159 Cal. App. 3d 229, 242, 205 Cal. Rptr. 469* (finding cause of action for fraudulent concealment against insurer insufficient for failure to allege facts on which common-law fraud element of duty to disclose may be predicated)]. For discussion of common-law fraud, see Ch. 269, *Fraud and Deceit* .

Paragraphs 11-13 incorporate standard allegations of general damages for pain and suffering, special damages for medical expenses, and special damages for lost earnings. Paragraph 14 incorporates an allegation for punitive damages [*see Civ. Code § 3294*; *see also McDonald v. Superior Court (1986) 180 Cal. App. 3d 297, 300-303, 225 Cal. Rptr. 394]* . Only the plaintiff's damages that were proximately caused by the aggravation of the original injury because of the fraudulent concealment may be recovered. However, the defendant has the burden with regard to apportionment [*Lab. Code § 3602(b)(2)*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
1. Complaints for Damages

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.526through 577.529

[Reserved]

§§ 577.526[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
2. Affirmative Defenses

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.530

§ 577.530 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Employee's Action Barred by Exclusive Remedy Principle of Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3602(a)]

[1] FORM Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Employee's Action Barred by Exclusive Remedy Principle of Workers' Compensation Law [Lab. Code § 3602(a)]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE _____ [*specify, e.g.,* FIRST THROUGH FIFTH] CAUSE(S) OF ACTION, defendant alleges:

1. At the time and place of plaintiff's alleged injury, plaintiff was an employee of defendant, was performing service growing out of and incidental to his/her employment, and was acting within the course of his/her employment. Therefore, plaintiff's exclusive remedy is that provided by Workers' Compensation pursuant to *Sections 3201-6208 of the Labor Code*.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates an affirmative defense in an answer to a complaint for damages brought by an employee against his or her employer for an injury that is within the exclusive remedy principle of workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code §§ 3600(a)* (conditions of compensation), 3602(a) (exclusiveness of remedy)]. This form may be inserted into a general form of answer, to be found in Ch. 26, *Answers* .

The defendant has the burden of pleading and proving that a civil action is barred by the exclusive remedy principle [*Green v. City of Oceanside (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 212, 224, 239 Cal. Rptr. 470* ; *see § 577.311[3]*]. Therefore, this defense should always be included in any answer to a complaint by an employee against an employer unless an exception to the principle is conceded.

[3] Pleading Affirmative Defenses

Defenses set forth in an answer must be separately stated. Each defense must refer to the causes of action that it is intended to answer in a manner by which it may be intelligibly distinguished [*Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(g)*]. For further discussion, see Ch. 26, *Answers* . If the defense appears on the face of the complaint, the objection may be made by a demurrer to the complaint [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 430.30(a)*; *see also Colombo v. State of California (1991) 3 Cal. App. 4th 594, 599, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 567* ; *Halliman v. Los Angeles Unified School Dist. (1984) 163 Cal. App. 3d 46, 50, 209 Cal. Rptr. 175* (if facts indicating applicability of exclusive remedy principle appear on face of complaint and no facts are alleged to bring action within exception to principle, complaint is subject to demurrer)].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
2. Affirmative Defenses

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.531

§ 577.531 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Lack of Jurisdiction Due to Pending Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Proceeding

[1] FORM Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Lack of Jurisdiction Due to Pending Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Proceeding

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* SECOND)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE _____ [*specify, e.g.,* FIRST THROUGH FIFTH] CAUSE(S) OF ACTION, defendant alleges:

1. The court has no jurisdiction to proceed with plaintiff's action, because on _____ [*date*], an application for compensation relating to the same injury that is the subject matter of plaintiff's action, entitled _____ [*specify*], WCAB No. _____, was filed with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. The WCAB, therefore, has exclusive jurisdiction to proceed in this matter.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an employer as an affirmative defense to an action by an employee brought subsequent to an application for workers' compensation benefits on account of the same injury. The employer may seek to have the civil action abated in court until the issue of the exclusive jurisdiction of the workers' compensation laws can be decided by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board [*see Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386* ; *Taylor v. Superior Court (1956) 47 Cal. 2d 148, 151, 301 P.2d 866]* .

This form is for use if it is clear that the employee's remedies of civil damages and workers' compensation are mutually exclusive, but the proper remedy turns on a finding of facts. For example, the issue may be whether the injury will be deemed to have occurred within the course of employment within the meaning of workers' compensation law [*see Lab. Code § 3600(a)*]. In such a case, the tribunal first assuming jurisdiction retains it to the exclusion of all other tribunals in which the action might have been initiated [*Busick v. Workmen's Comp. Appeals Bd. (1972) 7 Cal. 3d 967, 976, 104 Cal. Rptr. 42, 500 P.2d 1386]* .

The affirmative defense presented in this form will be of no avail if the issue is whether one of the statutory exceptions to the exclusive remedy principle applies. In such a case, there is concurrent jurisdiction, and the employee may pursue both remedies, subject to principles of set-off [*Lab. Code § 3600(b)*]. For further discussion, see *§§ 577.319*, *577.530*.

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
2. Affirmative Defenses

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.532

§ 577.532 Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Negligence of Plaintiff [Lab. Code § 2801]

[1] FORM Employer's Affirmative Defense [Code Civ. Proc. § 431.30(b)(2), (g)]--Negligence of Plaintiff [Lab. Code § 2801]

AS A [_____ (*if more than one, specify number, e.g.,* FIRST)] SEPARATE AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE _____ [*specify, e.g.,* FIRST THROUGH FIFTH] CAUSE(S) OF ACTION, defendant alleges:

1. At the time and place of the accident alleged in the complaint, plaintiff himself/herself did not exercise ordinary care, caution, or prudence to avoid the accident, and the resulting injuries, if any, sustained by plaintiff were proximately caused and contributed to by the negligence of plaintiff in that _____ [*set out acts of plaintiff constituting negligence*].

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use as an affirmative defense to be included in an answer to a complaint charging an employer with negligence proximately resulting in personal injuries to an employee not subject to compensation under the workers' compensation and insurance law [*see Fonseca v. County of Orange (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 361, 367, 104 Cal. Rptr. 566]* . The form alleges the contributory (or comparative) negligence of the employee as a proximate cause of his or her injury.

In such an action, contributory negligence is not a bar to recovery if the employee's negligence is slight and that of the employer is gross in comparison [*Lab. Code § 2801*]. This statute has not been construed or amended since the adoption of principles of comparative negligence and the demise of contributory negligence as a complete bar to a negligence action in 1975 [*see Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal. 3d 804, 828-829, 119 Cal. Rptr. 858, 532 P.2d 1226]* . Therefore, the effect of "gross" negligence on the part of the employee in comparison to "slight" negligence on the part of the employer is an open question. For further discussion, see *§§ 577.312[3][b], 577.530*.

Defendant is permitted to allege that plaintiff was negligent in and about matters alleged in complaint and that such negligence contributed to plaintiff's injury. *Singer v. Superior Court (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 318, 323-324, 5 Cal. Rptr. 697, 353 P.2d 305* .

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
2. Affirmative Defenses

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 577.533through 577.539

[Reserved]

§§ 577.533[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
3. Lien Claims and Credit Against Compensation Liability

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.540

§ 577.540 Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] and Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Notice of Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1010] and Supporting Declaration [Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	MOTION AND NOTICE OF MOTION FOR LIEN
_____ [*name*],	)	AGAINST JUDGMENT[, SUPPORTING DECLAR-
Defendant.	)	ATION OF _____ (*name*), AND
_____ [*name*],	)	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORIT-
Lien Claimant.	)	IES]
	)	[Telephone Appearance]
	)	Date: _____
	)	Time: _____
	)	Location: _____
		Judge: _____
		Date Action Filed: _____
		Trial Date: _____

_____

To each _____ [*identify party, e.g.*, plaintiff] named above, and to the attorney of record for each such party:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that, on _____ [*date*], at _____ [*time*], or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in [_____ (Department *or* Division) _____ of] this court, located at _____ [*street address*],_____ [*city*],_____ [*identify party, e.g.*, defendant] _____ [*name*] will, and hereby does, move for an order allowing it a first lien for workers' compensation benefits paid to plaintiff _____ [*name of employee*] against the amount of the judgment rendered in this action on _____ [*date*], in favor of plaintiff. The motion will be made on the grounds that the lien claimant has paid to the plaintiff workers' compensation benefits for the same injuries that are the subject of this lawsuit and is entitled to reimbursement from the judgment herein rendered.

The motion will be based on this notice of motion, on the _____ [affidavit(s) *or* declaration(s)] of _____ [*name(s)*] and the memorandum of points and authorities served and filed herewith, on the records and file herein, and on such evidence as may be presented at the hearing of the motion.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Lien Claimant _____ [*name*]

SUPPORTING DECLARATION OF _____ [*name*]

I, _____ [*name*], declare:

1. I am _____ [*identify declarant, e.g.*, an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before all the courts of the State of California and the attorney of record herein for _____ (*name of insurance carrier*) (hereinafter, "the lien claimant") or other statement as appropriate].

2. At all times herein mentioned, the lien claimant was[, and is,] a corporation [incorporated and] duly authorized to do business in the State of California as a workers' compensation insurance company.

3. At all times herein mentioned, the lien claimant was the workers' compensation insurance carrier for _____ [*name of employer*] (hereinafter "the employer"), pursuant to a policy of workers' compensation insurance, under which the lien claimant was obligated to pay workers' compensation benefits to those employees of the employer who sustained injuries arising out of and in the course of their employment.

4. On _____ [*date of injury*], plaintiff _____ [*name of employee*] (hereinafter "the employee") was an employee of the employer, and sustained injuries that arose out of and in the course of his/her employment.

5. The above-entitled action is by the employee against the third-party tortfeasor to recover damages arising out of the same happening for the same injuries.

6. As a proximate result of the injuries sustained by the employee, the lien claimant has been obligated to pay, and has paid, the following benefits to the employee: _____ [*specify, e.g.:*]

a. Temporary disability benefits in the amount of $_____;

b. Permanent disability benefits in the amount of $_____;

c. Medical benefits in the amount of $_____.

[7. In addition to the total amount of workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee, the lien claimant has been required to pay the following sums: _____ (*specify any salary, wage, pension, or other emolument paid in addition to compensation benefits*).]

[WHEREFORE, the lien claimant requests the allowance of a first lien in the amount of $_____ against the balance of a judgment in favor of plaintiff, _____ (*name*), after the court has ordered payment of plaintiff's litigation expenses and attorney's fees.]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Lien Claimant _____ [*name*]

[MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES]

[*Add points and authorities supporting motion, if desired*]

Respectfully Submitted,_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Lien Claimant _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by the employer's compensation carrier, which has paid workers' compensation benefits to an injured employee, to secure a lien against a judgment rendered in favor of the employee in an action by the employee against a third-party tortfeasor. The court will, on application of the insurance carrier, after the payment of expenses and attorney's fees from the third-party judgment, allow as a first lien against the amount of the judgment, the amount of the carrier's expenditure for compensation benefits [*Lab. Code § 3856(b)*].

The declaration should set forth facts establishing the grounds of the motion and should be made and executed by a person having personal knowledge of the facts [*see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2002(1), 2003, 2009, 2015.5*; *Evid. Code § 702*].

If the motion is made before judgment [*see* discussion under [3], *below*], it would appear that the application should be filed separately from the notice of hearing; that is, the application should take the form of a written motion, and a subsequent notice of hearing, set on a date following the judgment, should be prepared and served. For a discussion of written and noticed motions, see Ch. 372, *Motions and Orders* . For further discussion of lien claims, see *§ 577.335[2][a]*.

[3] Filing Motion

Prior to the 1959 enactment of *Lab. Code § 3856* and repeal of the former section, it was held that the application for a lien could be filed at any time before judgment was satisfied [*see Duprey v. Shane (1952) 39 Cal. 2d 781, 796, 249 P.2d 8* ; *Jacobsen v. Industrial Acci. Com. (1931) 212 Cal. 440, 448, 299 P. 66* ; *Dighton v. Martin (1935) 4 Cal. App. 2d 401, 403, 41 P.2d 197]* . Subsequent to 1959, the rule appears to be that the employer, or its compensation carrier, who does not intervene or file a separate action can file its application for a lien before judgment, but under *Lab. Code § 3856(b)*, the court may not allow the lien until after judgment and after the payment of the expenses and attorney's fees. Certainly, the court cannot, on the hearing of the motion to establish a lien before trial, determine whether the employer's right to reimbursement is defeated [in whole or in part] because of the concurring negligence of the employer [*see* Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Fabian (1964), (Los Angeles County Superior Court No. 814000, order denying without prejudice compensation carrier's motion for order imposing a first lien on any judgment rendered in favor of plaintiff, which was set for hearing before judgment)].

[4] Supporting Papers

Although not expressly required by the Civil Law and Motion Rules (*Cal. Rules of Ct., Rules 3.1100-3.1362*) [*see Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1103*], the better practice is to prepare, serve, and file a memorandum with the foregoing notice of motion if there is any question about the moving party's right to a lien or its amount [*see* generally *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1005, 1010*]. The form and content of the memorandum are covered in *Cal. Rules of Ct., Rule 3.1113*. For discussion and forms, see Ch. 417, *Points and Authorities* .

[5] Amount Claimed and Supplemental Applications

When a lien is sought at the time of entry of judgment, it should be for the amount of expenditures for compensation made to that date [*see Lab. Code § 3856(b)*]. A supplemental application may be made at any time before the judgment is satisfied for the amount of any additional expenditures by the employer or its carrier for compensation subsequent to the original order [*Lab. Code § 3857*].

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
3. Lien Claims and Credit Against Compensation Liability

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.541

§ 577.541 Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Order Granting Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003]

[1] FORM Proceedings to Secure Lien Against Third-Party Judgment [Lab. Code § 3856(b)]--Order Granting Motion [Code Civ. Proc. § 1003]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

[*or other as appropriate*]

	)	
_____ [*name*],	)	NO. _____
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LIEN
vs.	)	AGAINST JUDGMENT
_____ [*name*],	)	[*Lab. Code § 3856(b)*]
Defendant;	)	Date: _____
_____ [*name*],	)	Time: _____
Lien Claimant.	)	Location: _____
	)	Judge: _____
	)	Date Action Filed: _____
	)	Trial Date: _____

_____

The motion of _____ [*name of insurance carrier*], the lien claimant, for an order allowing a first lien against the judgment herein rendered in favor of plaintiff came on regularly for hearing by the court on _____ [*date*]. Moving lien claimant appeared by counsel _____ [*name*]; plaintiff appeared by counsel _____ [*name*][; defendant appeared by counsel _____ (*name*)].

On proof made to the satisfaction of the court that the motion ought to be granted,

IT IS ORDERED that the motion be, and it hereby is, granted, and that _____ [*name of lien claimant*] have a first lien in the sum of $_____ against the balance of the judgment after plaintiff's litigation expenses and attorney's fees have been paid.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*signature*]

Judge of the _____ Court

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, illustrates a formal order granting the lien claimant's motion for a lien [*see Lab. Code § 3856(b)*; *see also § 577.540*].

[3] Enforcement of Lien

Any employer or the employer's workers' compensation carrier entitled to and who has been allowed and has perfected a lien on the judgment or award in favor of an employee against any third party for damages occasioned to the same employer by payment of compensation, expenses of medical treatment, and any other charges under the Workers' Compensation Law, may enforce payment of the lien against the third party, or, in case the damages recovered by the employee have been paid to the employee, against the employee to the extent of the lien, in the manner provided for enforcement of money judgments generally [*Lab. Code § 3862*]. For discussion and forms for use in enforcing money judgments, see *Ch. 254, Executions and Enforcement of Judgments, § 254.40* et seq. For further discussion of enforcement of liens, see *§ 577.335[2][b]*.

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 577 WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PART IV. FORMS
B. Civil Actions Against Employer or Third-Party
3. Lien Claims and Credit Against Compensation Liability

51-577 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 577.542

§ 577.542 Petition for Credit of Third-Party Judgment Against Compensation Liability [Lab. Code § 3861]

[1] FORM Petition for Credit of Third-Party Judgment Against Compensation Liability [Lab. Code § 3861]

[*Caption. See § 577.400[1].*]

Petitioner alleges:

1. Petitioner was [and is] the workers' compensation insurance carrier for _____, the employer of _____ [*name of employee*] (hereinafter "the employee"), at the time the employee sustained an industrial injury on _____ [*date*].

2. Pursuant to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board's Findings and Award issued on _____ [*date*], petitioner is required to pay _____ [*specify, e.g.:*]

(a) Permanent disability benefits in the amount of $_____; and

(b) Future medical benefits in the amount of $_____.

3. Under the Findings and Award there is a balance of $_____ unpaid for _____ [*describe benefits*] [and an indefinite amount due and to become due for the award of continuing medical benefits].

4. The injury to the employee was the result of the negligence of a third party, and a _____ [judgment *or* settlement] has been obtained and satisfied against the third party in the amount of $_____. [The court ordered a total of $_____ to be paid from the judgment for litigation expenses, attorney's fees, and a lien for compensation benefits paid, leaving a balance of $_____.]

5. Petitioner is entitled, under *Section 3861 of the Labor Code*, to a credit for the _____ [balance of the judgment *or* settlement] against its liability for compensation due or to become due under the Findings and Award.

WHEREFORE, petitioner requests that the Appeals Board make and issue its order allowing a credit to petitioner in the amount of $_____ against petitioner's liability for workers' compensation benefits.
Dated: _____.

_____ [*firm name, if any*]

By: _____ [*signature*]

_____ [*typed name*]

Attorney for Petitioner _____ [*name*]

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is for use by an employer or its insurance carrier to petition the appeals board for an order allowing as a credit against the amount of compensation to be paid, the balance of the amount recovered against a third-party tortfeasor by judgment or settlement after deduction of the expenses of litigation and attorney's fees and any amount used to reimburse the employer or its insurance carrier for compensation benefits paid [*see Lab. Code § 3861*].

[3] Credit Allowed

The appeals board will allow as a credit to the employer or its insurance carrier against liability for workers' compensation the amount of any recovery by an employee for his or her injury, either by settlement with or after judgment against a third-party tortfeasor that has not been applied to the payment of expenses or attorney's fees pursuant to *Lab. Code §§ 3856, 3858*, and *3860*, or has not been applied to reimburse the employer [*Lab. Code § 3861*; *see also § 577.335[4]*].

[4] Comparative Negligence of Employer

[a] Determined in Judicial Forum

When the comparative fault of the employer, employee, and third-party tortfeasor has been determined in the third-party action, and the employer thereafter seeks to invoke the credit of *Lab. Code § 3861* against future payments, the appeals board should deny the employer credit until the ratio of his or her contribution to the employee's damages corresponds to his or her proportional share of fault. Once the employer's workers' compensation contribution reaches this level, he or she should be granted credit for the full amount available under *Lab. Code § 3861* [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 843, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684]* . That is, the employer is entitled to credit once it has paid the employee a threshold amount of benefits equal to its own proportionate share of the employee's total civil damages, and it is not obligated to first pay benefits equal to the combined share of both the employee and the employer prior to invoking the statutory credit [*Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 338, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068]* .

[b] Determined by Appeals Board

When the issue of an employer's concurrent negligence arises in the context of his or her credit claim based on a third party settlement, the appeals board must determine the appropriate contribution of the employer because the employee's recovery does not represent a judicial determination of tort damages. Specifically, the board must determine the following:

- The degree of fault of the employer; and
- The total damages to which the employee is entitled.

The board must then deny the employer credit until the ratio of his or her contribution to the employee's damages corresponds to the employer's proportional share of fault. Once the employer's workers' compensation contribution reaches this level, the employer should be granted a credit for the full amount available under *Lab. Code § 3861* [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 843, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 333, 341-342, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068* ; and *Kramer v. Cedu Foundation, Inc. (1979) 93 Cal. App. 3d 1, 8, 155 Cal. Rptr. 552]* . Workers' compensation benefits previously paid by the employer must be included in calculating the employer's credit threshold, and the employer's credit threshold must be reduced by any amounts the employer receives by way of lien settlement from the third party [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 766, 771-772, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* .

By way of example, assume an employee receives $20,000 in workers' compensation benefits, later sues a third party to recover for the same injury, and settles the case without the consent of the employer. Out of the settlement, the employee actually receives, after payment of expenses and attorney's fees within the meaning of *Lab. Code § 3861*, the sum of $25,000. (Out of the settlement, a nonnegligent employer would normally be entitled to reimbursement of the full $20,000 it paid and to a credit against its future liability of the $5,000 balance [*see Lab. Code § 3860(b)*, discussed in *§ 577.335[3]*].) Suppose the employee then seeks further benefits from the appeals board, and his or her employer claims a credit in the amount of the $25,000 settlement recovery. Under the foregoing principles, the board would then determine the employer's degree of fault and the employee's total damages. Should the board find the employer free of negligence, the employer would receive the benefit of the entire $25,000 settlement as a credit against future payments. Were the board, however, to determine that the employer was 50 percent negligent, and that the employee is entitled to $100,000 in damages, then the employer could not claim a credit until he or she contributed an additional $30,000 in benefits. The employer would then have contributed a total of $50,000 to the employee's recovery, or 50 percent of the employee's total damages of $100,000, and the ratio of his or her contribution to the employee's damages would correspond to his or her degree of fault [*Associated Construction & Engineering Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 829, 843 n.10, 150 Cal. Rptr. 888, 587 P.2d 684* ; *see Rodgers v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 330, 336, 204 Cal. Rptr. 403, 682 P.2d 1068]* .

Had the employer received any settlement from the third party for workers' compensation benefits paid to the employee, the employer's credit threshold would be reduced by that amount. For example, if the employer had received $10,000 from the third-party tortfeasor as settlement of its $20,000 workers' compensation lien, the employer would not be entitled to claim credit until it paid the employee an additional $40,000 in workers' compensation benefits [*Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd. (1997) 58 Cal. App. 4th 766, 771-772, 68 Cal. Rptr. 2d 265]* .

88 of 88 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 578 RESERVED

51-578 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated Chapter 578

RESERVED

Chapter 578RESERVED

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated 579.syn

§ 579.syn Synopsis to Chapter 579: ZONING AND PLANNING

§ 579.01 Scope of Chapter

§ 579.02 Cross References

§§ 579.03through 579.09 [Reserved]

§ 579.10 Governing Law

§ 579.11 Relationship of Zoning and Planning

§ 579.12 Zoning Agencies and Tools

[1] Advisory Agencies

[2] Cities and Counties

[a] Agencies

[b] Plans and Ordinances

[c] Permits

[3] Coastal Commission

[4] Distinguished From Unconstitutional Taking of Property

[5] Raising Constitutional Issues

[a] Direct Challenge

[b] Collateral Attack in Eminent Domain Proceeding

§ 579.13 Zoning Generally

[1] Exercise of Police Power

[2] By General Law Cities and Counties

[a] Ordinance and Regulation

[b] Initiative or Referendum

[3] By Chartered Cities and Counties

[a] Ordinance and Regulation

[b] Initiative

[c] Applicability of State Regulations

§ 579.14 Legislative Versus Administrative Acts

[1] Limitation on Initiative and Referendum Power

[2] Judicial Review

§ 579.15 Preservation of Historical Property

§ 579.16 Open Space

[1] General Preservation

[2] Conservation of Agricultural Land

[a] Overview of Williamson Act

[b] Contents of Contract

[c] Enforcement of Contract

[d] Nonrenewal of Contract

[e] Cancellation of Contract

[f] Farmland Security Zones

[g] Agricultural Conservation Easements

[3] Timberland Preserve Zones

[4] Agricultural Land Stewardship Program

[5] Protection of Rangeland, Grazing Land, and Grassland

§ 579.17 Discrimination Prohibited

[1] Against Particular Parcels

[2] Against Particular Persons

§§ 579.18-579.29 [Reserved]

§ 579.30 Governing Law

§ 579.31 Purposes of Zoning

[1] Protecting Most Appropriate Use of Land and Maintaining Property Values

[2] Traffic Considerations

§ 579.32 Types of Uses and Zones; Control Methods

[1] Adoption of Ordinances

[2] Accessory Uses

[3] Conditional Uses

[4] Commercial Zones

[5] Residential Zones

[a] Protection of Home Life

[b] "Family" Restrictions

[6] Minimum Lot Sizes

[7] Setbacks

[8] Aesthetic Considerations

[a] Valid Objective

[b] First Amendment Limitations

[c] Architectural Policy

[d] Height Restrictions

[9] Cluster and Planned Unit Developments

§ 579.33 Spot Zoning

§§ 579.34-579.49 [Reserved]

§ 579.50 General Plan

[1] Adoption Is Mandatory

[2] Contents of General Plan

[3] Adoption of General Plan

[a] Legislative Act

[b] Procedures

[c] Effect of Adoption of General Plan

§ 579.51 Specific Plans

[1] Preperation Is Permissive

[2] Contents of Specific Plan

[3] Procedures Affecting Specific Plan

[4] Effect of Adoption of Specific Plan

[5] Assessment of Fees

§§ 579.52-579.69 [Reserved]

§ 579.70 Local Control Over Regulations

[1] Policy to Maximize

[2] Minimum Procedural Standards

[3] General Powers

[4] Statutory Limitations on Power

[a] Uniformity Within Zones

[b] Solar Energy Systems

[c] Manufactured Homes and Mobilehomes

§ 579.71 Enactment Procedures

[1] Generally

[2] Hearing Required

§ 579.72 Public Hearings

[1] Notice by Publication or Posting

[2] Notice by Mail or Delivery

[3] Notice to Blind, Aged, and Disabled of Hearing on Drive-Through Facility Permit

[4] Requests for Notice

[5] Failure to Receive Notice

[6] Continuances

§§ 579.73-579.89 [Reserved]

§ 579.90 Interim Ordinance

[1] Statutory Provision for Urgency Measure

[2] Purposes Served

§ 579.91 Holding Zone

§§ 579.92-579.109 [Reserved]

§ 579.110 Board of Zoning Adjustment

§ 579.111 Board of Appeals

[1] Generally

[2] Decision Requires Public Hearing

§ 579.112 Issuance of Variance or Permit

[1] Impermissible Conditions

[2] Fees

§ 579.113 Variances

[1] Grounds for Granting

[2] Challenging Constitutionality of Ordinance

[3] Unnecessary Hardship

[4] Special Circumstances

[5] Attachment of Conditions to Avoid Privilege

[6] Special Parking Rules

[7] Relationship to Legislative Zoning

§ 579.114 Conditional Use Permit

[1] Generally

[2] Criteria for Granting

[3] Challenging Issuance or Terms of Permit

[4] Revocation; Vested Rights

[5] Modification

§§ 579.115-579.129 [Reserved]

§ 579.130 Local Power

[1] Regulation of Construction and Removal of Buildings

[2] Permit Requirement

§ 579.131 Effect of State Provisions

§ 579.132 Expiration and Extension of Permits

§ 579.133 Effect of Change in Zoning Law

§ 579.134 Revocation

§ 579.135 Vested Rights

§ 579.136 Review

§ 579.137 State Building Codes

§ 579.138 State Housing Law

[1] Governing Statutes and Application of Law

[2] Statewide Standards

[3] Local Modification of Standards

[4] Challenge to Statewide Application

[5] Fees

§ 579.139 Individual Appeal of Application of Rule

§ 579.140 Enforcement

[1] Local Departments

[2] Inspections

§ 579.141 Violations

[1] Preliminary Notice to Correct

[2] Notice to Tenants

[3] Commencement of Abatement Proceedings

[4] Summons and Service

[5] Repair or Demolition of Building

[6] Relief Pending Order

[7] Notice of Action

[8] Penalties

[9] Restrictions on Abatement Proceedings

§ 579.142 Transfer of Ownership of Property in Violation

§§ 579.143-579.159 [Reserved]

§ 579.160 Nonconforming Uses

[1] Lawful Existing Use

[2] Actual Use

[3] Change or Expansion Prohibited

[4] Vested Rights to Extractive Uses: Diminishing Asset Doctrine

[5] Termination by Amortization

§§ 579.161-579.179 [Reserved]

§ 579.180 California Coastal Act

§ 579.181 Land Within Coastal Zone

§ 579.182 Implementation of Coastal Act

[1] California Coastal Commission

[2] Role of Local Government

§ 579.183 Policies Governing Coastal Development

§ 579.184 Development Controls

[1] Development Defined

[2] Necessity of Permit

[3] Permit Procedures

§ 579.185 Permit Required From State Commission

§ 579.186 Standing of Applicant

§ 579.187 Issuance of Permit

§ 579.188 Permit Not Necessary

[1] Generally

[2] Prior Permit

[3] Urban Areas

§ 579.189 Hearings Before Commission

§ 579.190 Permit Without Hearing

[1] Emergencies and Specified Nonemergency Developments

[2] Minor Developments

§ 579.191 Vested Rights

[1] Generally

[2] Confirmation of Claim

§ 579.192 Appeals to Commission

[1] Before Certification of Local Coastal Program--Appealable Decisions; Standing

[2] Time Limits for Filing

[3] After Certification of Local Coastal Program

[a] Standing

[b] Appealable Decisions

[c] Grounds for Appeal

[d] Time Limits for Filing Appeal

[4] Patently Frivolous Appeals; When Appeal Is Considered Filed

[5] Commission Decision to Hear Appeal

[6] Action on Appeal

§ 579.193 Reconsideration of Permit

§ 579.194 Violations of Coastal Act

[1] Notice of Violation

[2] Action to Restrain

[3] Penalties

[4] Transferability

[5] Remedies Not Exclusive

§§ 579.195-579.209 [Reserved]

§ 579.210 Standing

§ 579.211 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

§ 579.212 Expedited Procedure for Review of Permit Decisions Involving First Amendment-Protected Expressive Conduct

§ 579.213 Rules of Procedure

§ 579.214 Harmless Error Rule

§ 579.215 Resolution of Zoning Disputes by Court-Initiated Mediation

§ 579.216 Review of Quasi-Judicial Acts

[1] By Administrative Mandate

[2] Variance

[3] Conditional Use Permit

[4] Variance and Permit Decisions--Priority on Court Calendar

[5] Limitation of Issues

[6] Pleading

[7] Developer Is Indispensable Party

[8] Scope of Review

[9] Standard of Review

[10] Res Judicata Effect

[11] By Writ of Review (Certiorari)

§ 579.217 Review of Ministerial Acts

§ 579.218 Review of Legislative Acts

[1] Presumption of Constitutionality

[2] Consideration of Regional Welfare

[3] Certainty Requirement

[4] Effect of Changed Circumstances

[5] By Traditional Mandate

[6] By Declaratory Relief

[7] By Injunctive Relief

[8] By Action for Inverse Condemnation

[9] Period of Limitation

§ 579.219 Low or Moderate Income Housing

§ 579.220 Joinder of Types of Relief

§ 579.221 Review of Ordinance Consistency With General Plan

[1] Required

[2] Enforcement Action

[3] Applicable to Charter Cities

§ 579.222 Review of Decisions Under California Coastal Act

[1] Decisions of Commission

[2] Decisions of Local Agency

§ 579.223 Actions to Challenge General Plan

[1] Traditional Mandate

[2] Time for Hearing

[3] Bringing General Plan Into Compliance

[a] 120-Day Time Limit

[b] Housing Element

[4] Remedies Available Pending Local Entity Compliance

[a] In General

[b] Exclusion of Project Required to Be Consistent

[c] Temporary Remedy

[5] Certain Housing Development May Not Be Enjoined

[6] Residential Housing

[a] Presumption Governing Low Income Housing

[b] Revocation of Building Permit Impermissible

[7] Reference of Action

[8] Environmental Effect

[9] Application

§§ 579.224-579.239 [Reserved]

§ 579.240 Inspections Require Consent

§ 579.241 Enforcement by Government Entity

[1] Civil or Criminal

[2] Estoppel From Enforcement

[3] Notice of Enforcement Action

[a] Recordation

[b] Vacation

[4] Statute of Limitations

§ 579.242 Injunctions

[1] Availability Generally

[2] Preliminary Injunctions

§ 579.243 Actions by Private Persons

[1] Injunctions

[2] Damages

[3] Mandate to Compel Action by Administrative Officer

[4] Period of Limitation

§ 579.244 Defenses

[1] Authorized Use

[2] Invalid Ordinance

[3] Unconstitutional Application of Ordinance

§§ 579.245-579.259 [Reserved]

§ 579.260 Governing Law

§ 579.261 Subdivision Map Act

§ 579.262 Definitions

[1] Subdivider

[2] Subdivision

[a] Generally

[b] Subsequent Subdivision

[c] Environmental Subdivision

[3] Local Agency

[4] Local Ordinance

[5] Tentative Map

§ 579.263 Projects Outside Scope of Act

[1] Generally

[2] Regulation by Local Agency

§ 579.264 Local Control

§ 579.265 Map Requirement

[1] Governing Statutes

[2] Tentative and Final Map

[3] Vesting Tentative Map

[4] Parcel Map

[a] When Required

[b] Waiver

§ 579.266 Map Procedures

§ 579.267 Tentative Map

[1] Notice of Filing

[2] Filing

[3] Staff Recommendation

[4] Procedure When Advisory Agency Exists--Decision or Report

[5] Decision

[6] Report

[7] Procedure When No Advisory Agency Exists

[8] Approval Conditioned on Availability of Sufficient Water Supply

[9] Expiration

§ 579.268 Final Map

[1] Preparation

[2] Filing

[3] Approval

§ 579.269 Factors Governing Map Decisions

[1] Generally

[2] Tentative Map or Parcel Map

[a] Prerequisites

[b] Disapproval Mandatory

[3] Final Map

§ 579.270 Approval Conditioned on Indemnification

§ 579.271 Obligations of Subdivider

[1] Dedication of Land

[2] Reservation for Public Uses

[3] Fees

§ 579.272 Appeals

[1] By Developer or Tenant From Advisory Agency Action

[2] From Appeal Board Action

[a] When Appeal Board Acts

[b] When Appeal Board Fails to Act

[3] By Adversely Affected Person

[4] Notice Requirements

§ 579.273 Hearings Under Act

[1] Required for Signficant Deprivation of Property Right

[2] Notice and Attendance

§ 579.274 Reversion

[1] Generally

[2] Prerequisites to Reversion

[3] Effect of Reversion

[4] Filing of Parcel Map for Reversion

[5] Resubdivision Without Reversion

§ 579.275 Exclusion

[1] Procedure

[2] Effect

§ 579.276 Effect of Noncompliance With Act

§ 579.277 Violation of Act

[1] Permit Precluded

[2] Conditional Permit

[3] Certificate of Compliance Available

§ 579.278 Notice of Violation

[1] Notice of Intention to Record

[2] Determination of Violation

§ 579.279 Certificate of Compliance

[1] Request by Owner or Vendee

[2] Conditional Certificate

[3] Contents of Certificate

[4] Antiquated Subdivision Maps

§ 579.280 Review of Decisions Under Subdivision Map Act

[1] Limitation Period

[2] Priority on Court Calendar

[3] Mediation of Disputes Involving Subdivision Map Act Time Limits

[4] Standard of Review

[a] Approval of Tentative Subdivision Map

[b] Approval of Final Subdivision Map

§ 579.281 Subdivided Lands Act

§ 579.282 Subdivided Lands and Subdivision

[1] Within Subdivided Lands Act

[2] Exempt From Subdivided Lands Act

§ 579.283 Public Report

[1] Application

[2] Issued by Commissioner

[3] Denial of Public Report

[a] Grounds

[b] Objection to Denial

§ 579.284 Desist Order

[1] Grounds for Issuance

[2] Review Procedure

§ 579.285 Violations

[1] Injunctive Relief

[2] Accrual of Cause of Action

[3] Misrepresentation

[4] Recission of Contract

§ 579.286 Regulation of Time-Share Developments

[1] The Vacation Ownership and Time-Share Act of 2004 (VOTSA)

[2] Scope and Application of VOTSA

[a] Projects That Must Be Registered

[b] Exempt Projects

[c] Effect of VOTSA on Time-Share Plans Registered Before July 1, 2005

[3] Registration Requirements

[4] Public Report

[5] Prohibited Marketing Practices

[6] Resolution of Disputes Between Time-Share Interest Owners or Association and Developer

[6A] Regular and Special Assessments

[7] Investigation of Violations and Enforcement of VOTSA

[8] Owners' and Association's Right to Relief

§ 579.287 Interstate Land Sales

§ 579.288 Definitions

§ 579.289 Exemptions

§ 579.290 Acts Prohibited

§ 579.291 Revocation of Contract or Agreement

§ 579.292 Civil Liabilities

§ 579.293 No Limitation of Rights

§ 579.294 Injunctions and Investigations

§ 579.295 Penalties

§ 579.296 Jurisdiction and Venue

§ 579.297 Interplay With State Law

§§ 579.298-579.309 [Reserved]

§ 579.310 California Legal Forms

§ 579.311 California Real Estate

§ 579.312 California Environmental Law

§ 579.313 Federal Statutes

§ 579.314 State Statutes

[1] Building Regulations

[2] Cemeteries

[3] Coastal Lands

[4] General

[5] Judicial Review

[6] Plans

[7] Zoning Regulations

§ 579.315 Federal Regulations

§ 579.316 State Regulations

§ 579.317 Decisions

[1] Accessory Uses

[2] Administrative Mandate

[3] Adult Entertainment Zoning

[4] Aesthetics

[5] Building Permits

[6] California Coastal Act

[a] Definition of Development

[b] EIR

[c] In General

[d] Permits

[e] Vested Right

[7] Conditional Use Permit

[a] Application

[b] Approval

[c] Condition

[d] Estoppel

[e] Expiration

[f] Review

[g] Standards

[8] Constitutional Challenges

[a] Deprivation of Property

[b] Discriminatory Zoning

[c] Due Process

[d] Equal Protection

[e] First Amendment Impact

[f] Free Exercise of Religion

[g] Method of Challenge

[h] Right of Privacy

[9] Declaratory Relief

[10] Dedication

[11] Development Agreements

[12] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[13] Enforcement of Zoning Ordinances

[a] Against Municipality

[b] By Government Entity

[c] By Private Persons

[14] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

[15] Families

[16] Federal Preemption

[17] General Plan

[a] In General

[b] Amendment

[c] Consistency of Specific Plan

[d] Consistency of Zoning With Plan

[18] Interim Ordinances

[19] Judicial Review in General

[20] Nonconforming Use

[a] Amortization Period

[b] In General

[21] Notice and Hearing

[22] Particular Zone Requirements

[23] Purposes of Zoning--Traffic Considerations

[23A] Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act

[24] Traditional Mandate

[25] Variance

[a] Conditions

[b] Grounds

[c] Review

[26] Vested Rights

[27] Waiver

§ 579.318 Attorney General Opinions

§ 579.319 Law Reviews

§ 579.320 Text References

§§ 579.321-579.339 [Reserved]

§ 579.340 California Legal Forms

§ 579.341 California Real Estate

§ 579.342 California Environmental Law

§ 579.343 Federal Statutes

§ 579.344 State Statutes

§ 579.345 Federal Regulations

§ 579.346 State Regulations

§ 579.347 Decisions

[1] Certificate of Compliance

[2] Development Fees

[3] Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

[4] Subdivided Lands Act

[5] Subdivision Map Act

[a] In General

[b] Effect of Noncompliance with Act

[c] Extension

[d] Map Approval

[e] Noticed Hearing

[f] Periods of Limitation

[g] Remedies

[h] Vesting Tentative Maps

§ 579.348 Attorney General Opinions

§ 579.349 Law Reviews

§ 579.350 Text References

§§ 579.351-579.369 [Reserved]

§ 579.370 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]--Zoning Ordinance Unconstitutional and Void [U.S. Const., Amends. V, XIV § 1; Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Constitutional Challenges

[a] Generally

[b] Method of Challenge

[4] Allegations

[5] State Statutes

[6] Decisions

[7] Cross References

§ 579.371 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Denial of Variance

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] State Statutes

[5] Decisions

§ 579.372 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Conditional Use Permit Issued Subject to Invalid Condition [Gov. Code § 65909]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

[4] Decisions

§ 579.373 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Compel Issuance of Building Permit

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Allegations

§ 579.374 Summons for Enforcement of State Housing Law [Health & Safety Code § 17990]---Judicial Council Form SUM-145

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Summons

[4] Summons Procedure

§§ 579.375-579.389 [Reserved]

§ 579.390 Petition to Exclude Real Property From Subdivision [Gov. Code § 66499.22]

[1] FORM

[2] Use of Form

[3] Contents of Petition

[4] Jurisdiction

[5] Notice of Petition

[6] Hearing

[7] Decree

[8] State Statutes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART I. SCOPE

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.01

§ 579.01 Scope of Chapter

This chapter discusses zoning and planning. The legal background analysis is divided into subparts, discussing use zoning and the purposes of zoning [*see § 579.30* et seq.], general and specific plans [*see § 579.50* et seq.], zoning ordinances [*see § 579.70* et seq.], interim zoning [*see § 579.90* et seq.], variances and conditional use permits [*see § 579.110* et seq.], building permits [*see § 579.130* et seq.], nonconforming uses [*see § 579.160* et seq.], the coastal zone [*see § 579.180* et seq.], and judicial review and enforcement [*see § 579.210* et seq.]. It includes a form of complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief from an unconstitutional zoning ordinance [*see § 579.370*], and petitions for writ of mandate to review administrative decisions [*see §§ 579.371 -579.373*].

This chapter also discusses the Subdivision Map Act [*see § 579.260* et seq.]. It also discusses the Subdivided Lands Act, the regulation of time-share developments, and the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, which contain provisions controlling the development and sale of subdivisions and other subdivided lands.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementEnforcementEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART I. SCOPE

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.02

§ 579.02 Cross References

For discussion relating to notice requirements for proposed change in the use of a cemetery for other than cemetery purposes, see Ch. 180, *Dead Bodies and Cemeteries*

For discussion of eminent domain, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain and Inverse Condemnation*

For additional coverage of zoning, planning, and the Subdivision Map Act, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 60, *Zoning* , Ch. 61, *Subdivision Regulation* , and Ch. 62, *Planning* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawEminent Domain ProceedingsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawInverse CondemnationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART I. SCOPE

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.03through 579.09

[Reserved]

§§ 579.03[Reserved]

5 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.10

§ 579.10 Governing Law

The necessity for compensation for the public taking of private property is governed by *U.S. Const., amends. V, XIV § 1*, and *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19*. Planning and zoning is governed generally by *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*, and by city and county ordinances and regulations.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsEminent Domain & TakingsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseLocal PlanningReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.11

§ 579.11 Relationship of Zoning and Planning

Although local planning embraces zoning, the converse does not hold true. While not devoid of planning, zoning does not include the whole of planning. Zoning is a separation of the local legislative body into districts, the regulation of buildings and structures, according to their construction and use, and the regulation of the nature and extent of land uses. Planning has a much broader connotation. It is concerned with the physical development of the community in relation to its social and economic well-being, according to a master plan based on comprehensive surveys of present conditions and the prospects of future growth. It is an exercise of the state's inherent authority to have recourse to those measures that may serve the basic common moral and material needs [*O'Loane v. O'Rourke (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 774, 780, 42 Cal. Rptr. 283]* . Zoning changes can promote rational and orderly land-use planning. Zoning changes must conform to the city's general plan, which must in turn conform to requirements established by state statute [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 524, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* .

For detailed coverage of zoning and planning, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Chs. 60 *Zoning* , and 62 *Planning* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseLocal PlanningReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.12

§ 579.12 Zoning Agencies and Tools

[1] Advisory Agencies

The Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is governed by *Gov. Code §§ 65025-65049*. It is responsible for developing state land use policies, coordinating planning of all state agencies, and assisting and monitoring local and regional planning, but OPR has no direct operating or regulatory powers [*see Gov. Code § 65035*]. Similarly, a regional district may develop a regional plan setting forth a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of that region. That plan is advisory only, and does not bind local planning [*see generally Gov. Code §§ 65060-65060.8*].

[2] Cities and Counties

[a] Agencies

Each city and county has the power necessary to carry out the purposes of *Gov. Code §§ 65000-66499.58* (planning and land use), either through an assigned planning agency or through its legislative body. The legislative body of each city and county may assign the functions of the planning agency to a planning department, one or more planning commissions, administrative bodies or hearing officers, the legislative body itself, or any combination thereof, as it deems appropriate. In the absence of such an assignment, the legislative body will carry out all the functions of the planning agency [*Gov. Code § 65100*].

[b] Plans and Ordinances

Each planning agency must prepare, and the legislative body of each city and county must adopt, a general plan for that city or county [*see Gov. Code § 65300*]. The planning agency may prepare specific plans for the systematic implementation of the general plan for adoption by the legislative body [*Gov. Code §§ 65450, 65453*]. Revision and implementation of the general plan through the administration of specific plans and zoning and subdivision ordinances is a function of the planning agency [*see Gov. Code § 65103*].

The legislative body of any city or county may adopt zoning ordinances [*Gov. Code § 65850*]. County or city zoning

ordinances must be consistent with the general plan of that county or city [*Gov. Code § 65860(a)*]. That legislative body may establish a board of zoning adjustment, an office of zoning administrator, and a board of appeals to hear and decide on applications for variances, conditional use permits, and other permits [*see Gov. Code §§ 65900, 65901*].

The development of subdivisions is governed by the Subdivision Map Act which sets forth statewide requirements, but which vests powers of regulation and control in the legislative bodies of cities and counties [*see Gov. Code §§ 66410-66499.37, 66411, 66420*]. The statewide building requirements set forth in *Health & Safety Code §§ 17910-17995.5* are generally enforced by the planning or building department designated to do so by each city and county [*see Health & Safety Code § 17964*].

[c] Permits

As a practical manner, zoning decisions are based on the permit process, which involves an application for a permit, review of the application, and a decision by the administrative agency. Review of that decision may be available as part of the administrative process, and is available through judicial review. Even if a zoning ordinance does not require a permit for a specified use, typically a building permit will be required. Moreover, a zoning ordinance may necessitate a conditional use permit or a variance for specified uses. The map requirement for development of a subdivision is very similar to a permit. Development within the coastal zone requires a coastal development permit.

[3] Coastal Commission

If land is within the coastal zone, it is within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission, and applications for development permits will be made to the local government, with rights of appeal to the commission [*see generally Pub. Res. Code §§ 30330-30355, 30600-30627*].

[4] Distinguished From Unconstitutional Taking of Property

All zoning restricts an owner regarding the uses that can be made of his or her property, thereby possibly resulting in some sort of diminution in the value of property [*see Mid-Way Cabinet etc. Mfg. v. County of San Joaquin (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 181, 188-192, 65 Cal. Rptr. 37]* . However, the federal and state governments are prohibited from taking private property for public use without just compensation [*U.S. Const., Amends. V, XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19*].

The conflicting concepts of the constitutional mandate which states that compensation must be paid when private property is taken for a public purpose and the police power to zone under which compensation need not be paid are not clearly differentiated and each case must stand or fall on its own particular facts [*Southern Pac. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 38, 46, 51 Cal. Rptr. 197]* . Where that line will be drawn is essentially a question of reasonableness. The determination of reasonableness is a factual one encompassing the interests of the public, the appropriateness of the means, and the oppressiveness of the action [*Dahl v. City of Palo Alto (ND Cal. 1974) 372 F. Supp. 647, 648]* .

An ordinance that on its face results in a mere diminution in the value of property is not per se improper. However, if the zoning regulation is so unreasonable or arbitrary as to deprive a person of the complete use and enjoyment of his or her property, it may be unconstitutionally excessive [*Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* . An amendment to a zoning ordinance may be an unconstitutionally excessive regulation. For example, when an ordinance contained a provision for a special use permit, amendment of that ordinance eliminating the possibility of that permit may be unconstitutional when the use formerly allowed by the permit is the only suitable use of a parcel of land, thereby depriving the landowner of substantially all reasonable use of the property [*see North Sacramento Land Co. v. City of Sacramento (1983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 576, 579-580, 189 Cal. Rptr. 739]* .

Although a development pemit under a zoning ordinance may include conditions that would be considered a public taking of private property ifnot attached to the permit, there must be a nexus between the prohibition or restriction on the landowner and the public purpose advanced as justification for the prohibition. For example, a coastal development permit to build a home conditioned on the landowner conveying an easement allowing the public to pass along a beach, imposed to further the governmental interest of preserving the public's access to and view of the ocean, was held to be invalid as a public taking without compensation [*Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n (1987) 483 U.S. 825, 836, 107 S. Ct. 3141, 97 L. Ed. 2d 677* (suggesting that requiring an easement from the street to the beach or for a view point might have been so related to the stated governmental interest as to be a valid condition)]. If the essential nexus is found, there must be an inquiry into whether there is a "rough proportionality" between the conditions imposed on approval of the permit and their impact on the property owner's proposed development. No precise mathematical calculation is required, but the local governmental entity responsible for ruling on the permit must make some sort of individualized determination that the conditions imposed are related both in nature and extent to the projected impact of the proposed development [*see* *Dolan v. City of Tigard (1994) 512 U.S. 374, 391, 114 S. Ct. 2309, 129 L. Ed. 2d 304* (approval of building permit conditioned on dedication of portion of applicant's property for flood control and traffic purposes was unconstitutional taking)].

The constitutional property rights preserved to the individual are held in subordination to the rights of society. Incidental damages to property resulting from governmental activities or laws passed in the promotion of the public welfare are not considered a taking of the property for which compensation must be made [*HFH, Ltd. v. Superior Court (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 508, 513-515, 125 Cal. Rptr. 365, 542 P.2d 237]* . For example, an ordinance prohibiting a landowner from removing rental units from the housing market by conversion or demolition without a removal permit is valid. Adequate housing for its residents is a legitimate government interest, and since the regulation did not interfere with the owner's primary, investment-backed expectations and did not render the owner unable to receive a reasonable return on his or her investment, there was no taking of property [*Nash v. City of Santa Monica (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 97, 102-103, 207 Cal. Rptr. 285, 688 P.2d 894]* .

Great financial losses should not be inflicted on an individual property owner when the benefits to the public are negligible, but public welfare and public convenience do control [*Consolidated Rock Products Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 515, 532, 20 Cal. Rptr. 638, 370 P.2d 342]* . A zoning ordinance will be upheld, against a due process attack, unless its provisions are clearly arbitrary and unreasonable, and have no substantial relation to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare [*Nash v. City of Santa Monica (1984) 37 Cal. 3d 97, 103, 207 Cal. Rptr. 285, 688 P.2d 894]* .

If, however, a zoning regulation is ultimately held to be unconstitutional as a taking of property, the landowner is entitled to compensation for the period during which the regulation deprived the landowner of all use of his or her land [*First Lutheran Church v. Los Angeles County (1987) 482 U.S. 304, 320, 107 S. Ct. 2378, 96 L. Ed. 2d 250* (this compensation requirement apparently is limited to the situation in which the owner is deprived of all use of its property; it is not required in the case of normal delays in obtaining building permits, changes in zoning ordinances, variances, and the like)].

[5] Raising Constitutional Issues

[a] Direct Challenge

A landowner alleging that a zoning ordinance has deprived him or her of substantially all use of his or her land may attempt through declaratory relief or mandamus to invalidate the ordinance as excessive regulation in violation of *U.S. Const., amend. V*, and *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19* [*Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 273, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* .

A challenge asserting that a zoning statute or ordinance is facially unconstitutional is made by an action for declaratory

relief [*see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 276-277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* . Injunctive relief is also available to prevent the enforcement of, and the expenditure of public funds on, a facially unconstitutional ordinance [*see State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 250-252, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* . For a form of complaint challenging the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance, see *§ 579.370*.

On the other hand, neither declaratory nor injunctive relief is appropriate to challenge an administrative decision applying an ordinance to the land of an individual property owner. In that case, a writ of administrative mandate would be the proper vehicle for review [*see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 276-277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)* ; *State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 249, 251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *see also §§ 579.371 -579.373*].

The California Supreme Court has held that a landowner may not elect to sue in inverse condemnation and thereby transmute an excessive use of the police power into a lawful taking for which compensation in eminent domain must be paid [*Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* . However, although a landowner may not use inverse condemnation to compel the exercise of eminent domain prospectively with respect to an unconstitutional regulation, and the governmental entity remains free to abandon or modify the regulation, orto choose to exercise eminent domain, the landowner is entitled to compensation for the period of time during which the regulation denied that landowner the use of all of his or her land. This compensation requirement, however, is limited to the situation in which the owner is deprived of all use of its property [*First Lutheran Church v. Los Angeles County (1987) 482 U.S. 304, 321, 107 S. Ct. 2378, 96 L. Ed. 2d 250]* . The U.S. Supreme Court expressly stated that it was not dealing with the questions that would arise in the case of normal delays in obtaining building permits, changes in zoning ordinances, variances, and the like [*First Lutheran Church v. Los Angeles County (1987) 482 U.S. 304, 321, 107 S. Ct. 2378, 96 L. Ed. 2d 250]* . For discussion of inverse condemnation, see Ch. 247, *Eminent Domain and Inverse Condemnation* .

[b] Collateral Attack in Eminent Domain Proceeding

Although typically a collateral attack on zoning is not permitted in an eminent domain proceeding, when the condemner purporting to exercise its police power by enacting a zoning ordinance has in reality discriminated against a particular parcel or parcels of land to depress their value with a view to future takings in eminent domain, the condemnee may attack the validity of the invalid zoning ordinance in the eminent domain action and, if successful, require that his or her property be valued free of the zoning restrictions [*People ex rel. Dept. of Public Works v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 960, 965, 109 Cal. Rptr. 525* ; *see Toso v. City of Santa Barbara (1980) 101 Cal. App. 3d 934, 949, 162 Cal. Rptr. 210* (action by former holder of option to purchase land, not landowner); *Peacock v. County of Sacramento (1969) 271 Cal. App. 2d 845, 856-863, 77 Cal. Rptr. 391]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.13

§ 579.13 Zoning Generally

[1] Exercise of Police Power

A local legislative body has the right to divide land into districts and prescribe regulations for its use, consistent with the reasonable exercise of the police power. However, that police power is not unlimited, and regulation of the use of property must be reasonable. Local governments may not impose restrictions that are oppressive, unnecessary, or unreasonable on the use of private property or the pursuit of useful activities [*Skalko v. City of Sunnyvale (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 213, 215-216, 93 P.2d 93]* . It is not required that the proscribed use of each individual lot in a zone will have a negative effect on the surrounding property if the zoning plan, as a whole, promotes the objectives of the police power [*Hamer v. Town of Ross (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 776, 788, 31 Cal. Rptr. 335, 382 P.2d 375]* . The zoning power has a much wider scope than the mere suppression of the offensive uses of property; it may be invoked not only negatively, but constructively and affirmatively for the promotion of the public welfare [*see* *Clemons v. City of Los Angeles (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 95, 103-104, 222 P.2d 439]* .

The segregation of residences, industries, commercial, and mercantile businesses of diverse kinds to particular localities is within the local police power, and bears a rational relation to the health, safety, and general welfare of the community. In recognition of the fact that the introduction of some uses, such as business or industry, into some districts, such as a strictly uniform residential district, operates in some measure to lower the value and depreciate the desirability of surrounding property, a city may establish and maintain residential and quasi-residential districts and exclude all nonconforming and conflicting uses from those districts [*see* *Fourcade v. San Francisco (1925) 196 Cal. 655, 662, 664, 238 P. 934* ; *Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 743, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

Property owners have no vested right to continuity of the zoning of the general area in which they reside [*Robinson v. City of Los Angeles (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 810, 816, 304 P.2d 814]* . A change in the zoning restrictions in an area does not impair the enforceability of existing deed restrictions. In other words, while rezoning makes possible a change in an area, it cannot by itself create the change [*Seaton v. Clifford (1972) 24 Cal. App. 3d 46, 52, 100 Cal. Rptr. 779]* .

[2] By General Law Cities and Counties

[a] Ordinance and Regulation

A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws [*Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7*]. *Gov. Code §§ 65800-65912* provide for the adoption and administration of zoning laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations by general law counties and cities.

[b] Initiative or Referendum

The powers of initiative and referendum are reserved to the people and may be exercised by the electors of each city or county under procedures provided by the Legislature [*Cal. Const., art. II, § 11*; *art. IV, § 1*; *see Elec. Code §§ 3700-3720, 4000-4021* (county and city initiatives, respectively); *Elec. Code §§ 3750 et seq., 4050-4061* (county and city referenda, respectively); *see also* Ch. 302, *Initiative, Referendum, and Recall* [. These procedures may be used to enact zoning ordinances [*see Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 588, 593, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473]* . These procedures do not apply to cities governed by charter rather than by general law [*Cal. Const., art. II, § 11*; *Elec. Code § 4061*; *see § 579.13[3]*].

The notice and hearing provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 65853-65857* do not apply to zoning by initiative [*Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 596, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473* ; for discussion of *Gov. Code §§ 65853-65857, see § 579.71*]. Although zoning by initiative is not required to provide the notice to landowners required of legislative zoning by *Gov. Code § 65856*, affected landowners have the opportunity to present their case to the electorate [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 524, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* . A zoning ordinance adopted by initiative may not be amended or repealed except by a vote of the people, absent a provision otherwise [*Elec. Code § 4013*; *C-Y Development Co. v. City of Redlands (1982) 137 Cal. App. 3d 926, 932, 187 Cal. Rptr. 370]* .

[3] By Chartered Cities and Counties

[a] Ordinance and Regulation

A chartered county or chartered city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations with respect to its affairs, subject only to restrictions and limitations within its charter, so long as the ordinance or regulation is not in conflict with general laws [*see Cal. Const., art. XI, §§ 5, 7*; *see also Regents of University of California v. City of Santa Monica (1978) 77 Cal. App. 3d 130, 135-137, 143 Cal. Rptr. 276]* .

[b] Initiative

For its own government, a county or city may adopt a charter by majority vote of its electors. An election to amend, revise, or repeal the charter may be proposed by initiative or by the governing body [*see Cal. Const., art. XI, § 3*]. The initiative power may extend to all local legislation, including zoning ordinances [*see Bayless v. Limber (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 463, 468-470, 102 Cal. Rptr. 647* ; *see also Civ. Code § 3536*].

An initiative measure limiting municipal growth that is inconsistent with the general plan cannot be construed as an amendment to the general plan if there is no basis in the title, ballot summary, or elsewhere in the ballot materials to support the conclusion that the voters both understand that the initiative amends the general plan and that they intend to do so. If an initiative is a zoning ordinance and is inconsistent with the general plan, the initiative is invalid [*Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek (1990) 52 Cal. 3d 531, 540-546, 277 Cal. Rptr. 1, 802 P.2d 317]* . An initiative that does not directly amend a city's general plan but directs the city council to amend the plan is invalid as beyond the power of initiative [*Marblehead v. City of San Clemente (1991) 226 Cal. App. 3d 1504, 1509-1510, 277 Cal. Rptr. 550]* .

An initiative is not proper when the power to make the decision has been delegated by the Legislature to the legislative

body, such as when a statute authorized the board of supervisors to enact ordinances for development fees [*Committee of Seven Thousand v. Superior Court (1988) 45 Cal. 3d 491, 500-507, 247 Cal. Rptr. 362, 754 P.2d 708]* . An initiative that requires the vote of the electorate on a general plan amendment for an annexation also is invalid because annexation procedures are a matter of state-wide concern and therefore are not subject to municipal initiatives [*L. I. F. E. Committee v. City of Lodi (1989) 213 Cal. App. 3d 1139, 1146-1148, 262 Cal. Rptr. 166]* .

Zoning by initiative process in a chartered city does not have to conform to the notice and hearing requirements applicable to ordinances that are enacted by a legislative body. A hearing on a legislative matter is held to inform the lawmakers of relevant facts and policy considerations; it is not held to protect individual rights, property, or otherwise. Unless constitutionally compelled, the requirements for lawmaking by the legislative process should not be imposed on lawmaking by the initiative process. The electoral process itself normally provides both notice and an opportunity to be heard to all electors, by written arguments and otherwise [*Bayless v. Limber (1972) 26 Cal. App. 3d 463, 468-470, 102 Cal. Rptr. 647* ; *see Elec. Code § 4017*].

[c] Applicability of State Regulations

If a chartered city has an ordinance that pertains to a purely municipal matter, it is not automatically invalid because it is in conflict with general state laws or because state laws have been enacted that cover the same subject. However, for matters that are of statewide concern, chartered cities remain subject to and controlled by applicable general state laws if it is the intent and purpose of those general laws to occupy the field to the exclusion of municipal regulation [*City of Los Angeles v. Department of Health (1976) 63 Cal. App. 3d 473, 479, 133 Cal. Rptr. 771]* . Thus, when intended to be applicable through out the state, state zoning laws apply to chartered cities.

Although *Gov. Code §§ 65100-65763* (local planning) and *Gov. Code §§ 65800-65912* (zoning regulations) do not generally apply to chartered cities, there are some notable exceptions, among them the applicability of the procedural standards and rules set forth in *Gov. Code § 65804* [*Gov. Code §§ 65700, 65803, 65804*]. Chartered cities must adopt general plans containing the mandatory elements of *Gov. Code § 65302* [*Gov. Code § 65300*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 65302, see § 579.50[2]*]. *Gov. Code § 65008*, prohibiting discrimination in actions pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 65000-66499.58* (planning and land use), and *Gov. Code § 65104*, describing allowable fees, specifically apply to chartered cities. Additionally, *Gov. Code §§ 65590, 65590.1* (low and moderate income housing within coastal zone), *Gov. Code §§ 65913, 65914* (housing development approvals), and *Gov. Code §§ 65915-65918* (incentives and density bonuses) all apply to chartered cities [*Gov. Code §§ 65700, 65913.9, 65918*, respectively].

Often, the application of statewide zoning provisions to chartered cities is a reflection that the topic is a matter of statewide concern [*see, e.g., Gov. Code §§ 65850.5, 65913.9*]. Indeed, in declaring legislative policy toward open-space zoning, *Gov. Code § 65561* says that it is necessary to provide for the development of statewide coordinated plans for the conservation and preservation of open-space lands and thus includes charter cities within that goal [*Gov. Code § 65561(d)*]. The state statutes governing local regulation of solar energy systems apply to chartered cities [*Gov. Code § 65850.5*]. *Gov. Code § 65852.3* pertaining to manufactured homes is also specifically applicable to charter cities.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationInitiative & ReferendumGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsChartersGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsOrdinances & RegulationsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsPolice PowerReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.14

§ 579.14 Legislative Versus Administrative Acts

[1] Limitation on Initiative and Referendum Power

The powers of referendum and initiative apply only to legislative acts by a local governing body [*Yost v. Thomas (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 561, 569, 205 Cal. Rptr. 801, 685 P.2d 1152]* . The adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan is a legislative act [*Yost v. Thomas (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 561, 570, 205 Cal. Rptr. 801, 685 P.2d 1152]* . Similarly, the enactment of zoning ordinances or amendments are legislative acts; the size of the area or the number of property owners affected is not relevant [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 515-516, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* . Administrative decisions, such as variances, use permits, subdivision maps, and similar proceedings are adjudicative [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 522, 522 n.11, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* .

The formal name of an act of local authorities, such as whether it is called an ordinance or a resolution, is not determinative of its legislative or administrative nature. Actions that relate to subjects of a permanent or general character are considered to be legislative, while those that are temporary in operation and effect are not. Acts constituting a declaration of public purpose or policy and making provisions for ways and means of its accomplishment, may be seen as legislative. The crucial test is whether the action is making a new law or executing a law already in existence. Administrative acts are those that are assigned to the executive department or necessary to be done to carry out legislative policies already declared by the legislative body [*O'Loane v. O'Rourke (1965) 231 Cal. App. 2d 774, 783-784, 42 Cal. Rptr. 283]* .

Acts of a local governing body which, in a purely local context, would otherwise be legislative may become administrative in a situation in which the state's system of regulation over a matter of statewide concern is so pervasive that it converts the local legislative body into an administrative agency of the state. However, state regulation of a matter does not necessarily preempt the power of local voters to act when there is wide discretion to a local government not only to determine the contents of its land use plans, but to choose how to implement those plans. Thus, the California Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30000 et seq.*], does not preclude a referendum on a local land use measure affecting the coastal zone adopted by the local governing body after the California Coastal Commission has approved

the city's land use plan, because the local government has wide discretion in implementing the plan [*Yost v. Thomas (1984) 36 Cal. 3d 561, 569-573, 205 Cal. Rptr. 801, 685 P.2d 1152]* .

[2] Judicial Review

In addition to their origin, there are significant distinctions between legislative and administrative actions. A zoning ordinance is reviewable by ordinary mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1084*], while an administrative decision is reviewable by administrative mandate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]. A zoning ordinance does not require explicit findings, and is valid if it is reasonably related to the public welfare, while administrative decisions must implement established standards and rest on findings supported by substantial evidence [*Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 522, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565* ; for discussion of judicial remedies in zoning cases, *see § 579.210* et seq. and *§ 579.240* et seq; for general discussion and forms relating to traditional mandate proceedings, *see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* ; for discussion and forms relating to administrative mandate proceedings generally, *see* Ch. 474 et seq., *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLegislationInitiative & ReferendumGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsOrdinances & RegulationsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.15

§ 579.15 Preservation of Historical Property

To promote the preservation of property of historical significance, the Legislature may define that property and provide that when it is enforceably restricted, it will be valued for property tax purposes only on a basis that is consistent with its restrictions and uses [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 8*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseHistoric Preservation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.16

§ 579.16 Open Space

[1] General Preservation

To promote the preservation of open space lands, the Legislature may define open space land and provide that when that land is enforceably restricted to recreation, enjoyment of scenic beauty, use or conservation of natural resources, or production of food or fiber, it will be valued for property tax purposes only on a basis that is consistent with its restrictions and uses [*Cal. Const., art. XIII, § 8*]. This open space amendment was not adopted to require counties and cities to establish land preserves. Rather, it was adopted to eliminate tax controversy; it reconciled assessments based on restricted open space uses with preexisting constitutional requirements that property be assessed at its full cash value [*Kelsey v. Colwell (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 590, 595, 106 Cal. Rptr. 420]* .

A variety of statutory schemes have been enacted in furtherance of perceivedopen space needs. For example, open space easement provisions [*Gov. Code §§ 51050-51065*], the Open Space Easement Act of 1974 [*Gov. Code § 51070 et seq.*], and the Roberti-Z'berg-Harris Urban Open-Space and Recreation Program Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 5620 et seq.*]. In recognition of the tax and assessment concerns associated with land earmarked as open space, provisions governing open-space subventions [*Gov. Code §§ 16140-16154*] and the valuation of open space land subject to an enforceable restriction [*Rev. & Tax. Code §§ 421-430.5*] were also enacted. These open space preservation provisions are distinct from the open space land portion of the general plan of a city or county [*see Gov. Code §§ 65560-65570, 65910*].

[2] Conservation of Agricultural Land

[a] Overview of Williamson Act

Perhaps the most widely used open space provision is the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (also known as the Williamson Act) [*Gov. Code § 51200 et seq.*]. The Williamson Act was a response to the rapid and virtually irreversible loss of agricultural land to residential and other developed uses and the disorderly patterns of suburban development that mar the landscape, require extension of municipal services to remote residential enclaves, and interfere with agricultural activities [*Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 850, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623 P.2d 180* ; *Honey Springs Homeowners Ass'n v. Board of Supervisors (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1122, 1130, 203 Cal. Rptr. 886]* .

The state aims envisioned by the Williamson Act must be correlated with local environmental and community needs, including long-range community planning [*Honey Springs Homeowners Ass'n v. Board of Supervisors (1984) 157 Cal. App. 3d 1122, 1143, 203 Cal. Rptr. 886* ; *Kelsey v. Colwell (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 590, 594, 106 Cal. Rptr. 420]* .

The Williamson Act empowers any city or county having a general plan to establish agricultural preserves consisting of lands devoted to agricultural uses and related compatible uses. The owners of agricultural land within those preserves may enter into annually renewable contracts that restrict the land to open space use for at least 10 years. In return, the landowner is guaranteed a relatively stable tax base, founded on the value of the land for open space use only and unaffected by its development potential. Once the contract has not been renewed, taxes on the property gradually return to the level of taxes on comparable nonrestricted property, as the term of restriction draws nearer to expiration [*Sierra Club v. City of Hayward (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 840, 850-852, 171 Cal. Rptr. 619, 623* ; *see generally Gov. Code §§ 51230, 51236, 51240, 51242, 51244, 51246*; *Rev. & Tax. Code § 426*].

For additional coverage, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 70, *Agricultural Perservation* (Matthew Bender).

[b] Contents of Contract

Every Williamson Act contract must provide for the exclusion of uses other than agricultural and those compatible with agricultural uses, for the duration of the contract [*Gov. Code § 51243(a)*]. The construction and maintenance of utility, communication, or agricultural laborer housing facilites are usually compatible uses. Conditions to permit and encourage compatible use of the land, particularly public outdoor recreational uses, may also be imposed [*Gov. Code § 51238*; *see Gov. Code §§ 51238.1-51238.3*]. The contract may provide for restrictions, terms, and conditions, including fees, more restrictive that those required by the Act [*Gov. Code §§ 51240, 51242*]. A similar contract must be offered under appropriate similar terms to other landowners within the same agricultural preserve [*Gov. Code § 51241*]. The terms of every contract, including a description of the subject land, will be recorded in the appropriate county recorder's office and serve as notice to all persons under the recording laws [*Gov. Code § 51248*].

[c] Enforcement of Contract

The county, city, or landowner may bring any court action necessary to enforce a Williamson Act contract, including an action to enforce the contract by specific performance or injunction. An owner of land may bring any action to enforce a contract on land with an exterior boundary within one mile of his or her land. An owner of land under contract may bring any action to enforce a contract on land located within the same county or city [*Gov. Code § 51251*]. For forms for bringing actions on a contract, see Ch. 140, *Contracts* , and Ch. 528, *Specific Performance* ; for forms for bringing an action for injunctive relief, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[d] Nonrenewal of Contract

If either party to a Williamson Act contract chooses not to renew the contract, that party must give written notice of nonrenewal to the other party. A nonrenewing landowner must serve notice at least 90 days before the renewal date; a nonrenewing city or county must serve notice at least 60 days before the renewal date. On receipt of a nonrenewal notice a landowner may make a written protest [*Gov. Code § 51245*]. On notice of nonrenewal by either party, the existing contract remains in effect for the balance of the contract period remaining [*Gov. Code § 51246(a)*].

Notice of any proposal to disestablish or alter the boundary of an agricultural preserve must be published, and must be given to the owner of the affected land, to each owner of land under contract within one mile of the land to be removed, and every city within one mile, as well as the local agency formation commission [*Gov. Code §§ 51232, 51233*].

[e] Cancellation of Contract

The landowner may petition the county board of supervisors or city council for cancellation of a Williamson Act contract for all or part of the contract land. Tentative approval for cancellation may be granted if the board or council finds that cancellation is consistent with the purposes of the Williamson Act or is in the public interest [*Gov. Code § 51282* (includes descriptions of what is consistent with purposes of Williamson Act and what is in public interest); *see Gov. Code § 51280.1* (cancellation and alternative use)].

Before the cancellation of any contract, there must be a public hearing with notice sent to every owner of land under contract within the same agricultural preserve and within one mile of the exterior boundary of the contract land [*Gov. Code § 51284*]. Any owner of any property located in the county or city in which the agricultural preserve is situated may protest the proposed cancellation [*Gov. Code § 51285*].

Any action to set aside a decision concerning cancellation on the grounds of noncompliance with the Williamson Act must be brought within 180 days from the council or board action and is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* (writ of mandate to review administrative proceedings) [*Gov. Code § 51286(a), (b)*; for procedure and forms, *see* Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , through Ch. 474C, *Procedures in Reviewing Agency Decisions* [. However, if the gravamen of an action to set aside a cancellation is based on a challenge to the assessor's fair market value assessment of the property, the action is based on a liability created by statute, that is, the assessor's duty to determine the fair market value as though it were free of a Williamson Act restriction, and is therefore subject to the three-year limitation period of *Code Civ. Proc. § 338(a)* [*People Ex Rel. Dept. of Conservation v. Triplett (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 233, 251, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 610]* .

[f] Farmland Security Zones

An optional program within the Williamson Act allows a landowner or a group of landowners to petition county boards of supervisors to create farmland security zones that enable landowners who have Williamson Act contracts to rescind their traditional 10-year rolling contracts to enter into 20-year rolling contracts [*see Gov. Code § 51296.1*]. To qualify for a farmland security zone contract, the land must be predominantly prime farmland or be included in the Important Farmland Series Maps [*Gov. Code § 51296.8*; *see Gov. Code §§ 51201(c), 65570*]. In return for committing their land to a farmland security zone, landowners receive the benefits oflower property tax bills [*Gov. Code § 51296.2(a)*; *see Rev. & Tax. Code § 423.4*], and exemption from parcel taxes, annexation, and designation for school use [*see Gov. Code § 51296.2(b)*].

[g] Agricultural Conservation Easements

A landowner whose land is subject to a Williamson Act contract may petition a city or county to enter into an agreement to rescind the contract in accordance with the Act's cancellation provisions [*see Gov. Code § 51282*; *see also § 579.16[2][e]*] in order to simultaneously place other land under an agricultural conservation easement, consistent with the purposes and requirements of the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program [*see Pub. Res. Code § 10200 et seq.*; *see also § 579.16[4]*], provided the local governing body makes specified findings [*Gov. Code § 51256*]. The agreement will not take effect until it is approved by the Secretary of Resources [*Gov. Code § 51256.1*].

With certain exceptions, one or more cities or counties may adopt a plan for forming an agricultural conservation easement under *Gov. Code § 51256* with respect to multiple transactions within one or more specific areas, and submit the plan to the Director of Conservation for his or her approval. The plan may be approved only on a finding that it is consistent with the provisions of § 51256. Thereafter, individual transactions must be approved if they are consistent with the approved plan [*Gov. Code § 51256.2(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 51256(b), (c)* (exceptions)].

[3] Timberland Preserve Zones

The California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982 is set forth in *Gov. Code § 51100 et seq.* It was enacted in

acknowledgment that forest resources contribute substantially to the state's economy and environment and that the state's increasing population threatens to erode the timberland base and diminish forest resource productivity through pressures to divert timberland to urban and other uses and through pressures to restrict timber operations when in conflict with nontimberland uses [*Gov. Code § 51101*]. The Timberland Productivity Act furthers the state policy to maintain the optimum amount of the limited supply of timberland, to ensure its continued availability, to discourage unnecessary conversion of timberland, to discourage expansion of urban services into timberland, and to encourage investment in timberlands based on reasonable expectation of harvest by including all qualifying timberland in a timberland preserve zone [*Gov. Code §§ 51102(a), 51103*]. The Act does not preempt the authority of local government to limit timber harvesting in designated zones other than those timberland preserve zones designated under the Act [*Big Creek Lumber Co. v. County of San Mateo (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 418, 426-428, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 159]* . Local zoning ordinances that speak to the location of timber operations, but not to the manner in which they are carried out, are not preempted [*Big Creek Lumber Co. v. County of Santa Cruz (2006) 38 Cal. 4th 1139, 1157* (Forest Practice Act and California Timberland Productivity Act did not preempt county ordinances restricting timber harvesting operations to specific areas and regulating areas where helicopter operationsassociated with harvesting could occur)].

Parcels zoned as timberland production are zoned for an initial term of 10 years, and an additional year is added on each anniversary date unless a notice of rezoning is given [*Gov. Code § 51114*]. Those parcels will be zoned to restrict their use to growing and harvesting timber and to compatible uses [*Gov. Code § 51115*]. Zoning a parcel of land as a timberland preserve zone gives rise to a presumption that timber operations may be reasonably expected to and will occur on that parcel [*Gov. Code § 51115.1(a)*; *see Pub. Res. Code § 4527(a)(1)* ("timber operations" defined)]. Changes to any nonconforming use are limited to ordinary maintenance and repair, except that no change that enlarges or tends to make more permanent any nonconforming use will be permitted. If any nonconforming use ceases for a period of at least one year, subsequent use must conform to the Timberland Productivity Act [*Gov. Code § 51115.2*].

The designation of a timberland preserve zone is not irrevocable and a timberland parcel may be rezoned pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 51130-51146*, which include the rules governing the assessment of the parcel and a tax recoupment fee.

For further coverage of timberland preserve zones and the California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 80, *Forestry Development* (Matthew Bender).

[4] Agricultural Land Stewardship Program

A primary purpose of the Agricultural Land Stewardship Program Act of 1995 [*Pub. Res. Code § 10200 et seq.*] is to encourage voluntary, long-term private stewardship of agricultural lands by offering landowners financial incentives to maintain such lands in agricultural use [*Pub. Res. Code § 10202(a)*]. It is a separate program from the Williamson Act and cannot be construed to overrule, rescind, or amend any of the Williamson Act's requirements [*Pub. Res. Code § 10226*].

The Act establishes a program for grants from the Department of Conservation to local governments and nonprofit organizations, subject to prescribed requirements and in accordance with prescribed procedures, for acquisition of agricultural conservation easements, which restrict the development or improvement of land for any purpose other than agricultural production [*see Pub. Res. Code § 10211*]. The Program establishes a fund from which grants are made. The financial sources include gifts, donations, proceeds from general obligation bond sales, funds appropriated by the Legislature, and federal grants or loans [*Pub. Res. Code § 10230*]. Proposed easements must meet specified criteria that relate both to the physical characteristics of the parcel to be restricted and to the city or county's commitment to agricultural conservation [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 10251, 10252*].

[5] Protection of Rangeland, Grazing Land, and Grassland

The Rangeland, Grazing Land, and Grassland Protection Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 10330 et seq.*] establishes a program to accomplish the following [*see Pub. Res. Code § 10331*]:

- Prevent the conversion of rangeland, grazing land, and grassland to more intensive agricultural uses as well as nonagricultural uses;

- Protect the long-term sustainability of livestock grazing; and

- Ensure the continued wildlife, water quality, watershed, and open space benefits from livestock grazing.

The Act establishes a program for grants from the Wildlife Conservation Board for the acquisition from property owners of conservation easements over qualified property. Grants may also be given to other state agencies, local public agencies, and nonprofit organizations for the same purposes [*Pub. Res. Code § 10334*]. For discussion of agricultural conservation easements, see *§ 579.16[2][g]*. For coverage of conservation easements generally, see *Ch. 240, Easements, § 240.12[3], [5]*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseAgriculture & FarmlandReal Property LawLimited Use RightsEasementsConservation EasementsTax LawState & Local TaxesReal Property TaxAssessment & ValuationValuation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.17

§ 579.17 Discrimination Prohibited

[1] Against Particular Parcels

A local legislative body may not unfairly discriminate against a particular parcel of land, and the courts may properly examine the scheme of classfication and determine whether it has been applied fairly and impartially in each instance. The mere fact that some hardship is experienced is not material. An individual cannot complain of incidental injury if the power is exercised for proper purposes of public health, safety, morals, and general welfare, and if there is no arbitrary and unreasonable application in the particular case [*Wilkins v. City of San Bernardino (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 332, 338, 175 P.2d 542]* .

Zoning ordinances found to be invalid and unreasonable as applied to particular property fall roughly into the following four categories [*Wilkins v. City of San Bernardino (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 332, 340, 175 P.2d 542]* :

- When the zoning ordinance attempts to exclude and prohibit existing and established uses or businesses that are not nuisances;

- When the restrictions create a monopoly;

- When the use of adjacent property renders the land entirely unsuitable or unusable for the only purpose permitted by the ordinance; and

- When a small parcel is restricted and given less rights than the surrounding property, as in the case of a lot in the center of a business or commercial district limited to use for residential purposes, thereby creating an island in the middle of a larger area devoted to other uses.

[2] Against Particular Persons

Any action under the Planning and Zoning Law [*Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*] by a city, county, or other local governmental agency is null and void if it denies to any individual or group of individuals the enjoyment of residence,

landownership, tenancy, or any other land use because of any of the following reasons [*Gov. Code § 65008(a)*]:

- The lawful occupation, age, race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, or disability of that person [*see Gov. Code § 12955(a), (d), (m), (p)(1)*];

- The method used by an individual or group to finance any residential development; or

- The income level of persons who intend to occupy any residential development.

The prohibition of discrimination based on familial status does not apply to specialized housing specifically designed and intended for older persons or senior citizens [*Gov. Code § 65008(a)(1)(B)*].

No city, county, city and county, or other local governmental agency may, in the enactment or administration of ordinances under *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*, prohibit or discriminate against any residential development or emergency shelter due to the method of financing, or the lawful occupation, age, race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, or disability of the owners or intended occupants, or because it is intended for occupancy by persons and families of very low, low, moderate, or middle income [*Gov. Code § 65008(b), (c)*; *see Gov. Code § 12955(a), (d), (m), (p)(1)*]. No city, county, city and county, or other local governmental agency may impose different requirements on a residential development or emergency shelter that is subsidized, financed, insured, or otherwise assisted by a governmental entity, than those imposed on nonassisted developments, except as provided in *Gov. Code § 65008(e)* [*Gov. Code § 65008(d)(1)*]. Nor may a city, county, city and county, or other local governmental agency, because of the lawful occupation, age, race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, familial status, source of income, or disability of the owners or intended occupants, or because the development is intended for occupancy by persons and families of very low, low, moderate, or middle income, impose different requirements on these residential developments than those imposed on developments generally, except as provided in *Gov. Code § 65008(e)* [*Gov. Code § 65008(d)(2)*; *see Gov. Code § 12955(a), (d), (m), (p)(1)*].

A city, county, or city and county may, however, extend preferential treatment to residential developments or emergency shelters assisted by a governmental entity or intended for occupancy by persons and families of low, moderate, or middle income [*Gov. Code § 65008(e)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawContractual Relations & HousingGeneral OverviewCivil Rights LawContractual Relations & HousingProperty Rights (sec. 1982)General OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsPolice PowerReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
A. Introduction to Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.18-579.29

[Reserved]

§§ 579.18[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
1. In General

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.30

§ 579.30 Governing Law

Zoning is largely governed by city and county ordinances, which are enacted within a framework of state statutes. General plans are governed by *Gov. Code § 65300 et seq.*, while specific plans are governed by *Gov. Code § 65450 et seq.* Zoning ordinances are governed by *Gov. Code § 65800 et seq.* Interim ordinances are controlled by *Gov. Code § 65858*. Variances and conditional use permits are governed by *Gov. Code § 65900 et seq.* Building permits are controlled generally by *Health & Safety Code § 17910 et seq.* The California Coastal Act of 1976 is set forth in *Pub. Res. Code § 30000 et seq.*

Judicial review is governed generally by *Civ. Code § 3422*, Code Civ. Proc. § 526 (injunctions), *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1060* (declaratory relief), 1085, 1086 (traditional mandate), and 1094.5 (administrative mandate). Review of decisions of the Coastal or regional commissions is governed by *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30801, 30802*. Actions to challenge a general plan are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763*, and to review its consistency are governed by *Gov. Code § 65860(c)*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
1. In General

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.31

§ 579.31 Purposes of Zoning

[1] Protecting Most Appropriate Use of Land and Maintaining Property Values

The primary purpose of comprehensive zoning is to protect others, and the general public, from uses of property that will, if permitted, prove injurious to them [*Consolidated Rock Products Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1962) 57 Cal. 2d 515, 524, 20 Cal. Rptr. 638, 370 P.2d 342]* . Planning and zoning ordinances traditionally seek to maintain property values, protect tax revenues, provide neighborhood social and economic stability, attract business and industry, and encourage conditions which make a community a pleasant place to live and work [*Van Sicklen v. Browne (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 122, 128, 92 Cal. Rptr. 786* , overruled in part by *Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279*]. Basically, most zoning decisions are designed to protect the most appropriate use of land and conserve property values [*see Melton v. City of San Pablo (1967) 252 Cal. App. 2d 794, 801, 61 Cal. Rptr. 29]* .

Zoning regulates land use in many ways and zoning regulations involve a variety of criteria. Thus, a zoning restriction (1) may be based on the type of land use within a zone, specifying residential, commercial, industrial, or some other use, (2) may regulate signs and billboards, lot size and setback requirements, the intensity of land use, offstreet parking, and loading requirements, and (3) may also regulate land use based on aesthetic considerations, specifying an historical or other objective standard [*see Gov. Code § 65850*; *Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 743-744, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

[2] Traffic Considerations

The state has plenary power over streets and highways and has preempted the entire field of traffic control [*see Veh. Code § 21*]. The Legislature has delegated some authority to local governments to regulate traffic within their jurisdictions in *Veh. Code §§ 21100-21116*. This authority is very strictly construed and may not be expanded. Thus, unless expressly provided with the authority by the state, a city has no authority over vehicular traffic control [*Rumford v. City of Berkeley (1982) 31 Cal. 3d 545, 549-550, 183 Cal. Rptr. 73, 645 P.2d 124]* . The state has expressly given cities limited authority over traffic patterns in furtherance of their general plan [*see Gov. Code § 65302(b)*]. Specifically, a city may prohibit access to streets by various roadway design features, such as barriers, as part of the

implementation of the circulation element of its general plan [*Veh. Code § 21101(f)*].

Even though traffic control is in the hands of the state, the implication of traffic patterns on land is not totally irrelevant to local planning. A zoning decision based in part on a desire to limit the density of the area in order not to further burden public streets and highways may be upheld as a valid promotion of the public safety [*see Spindler Realty Corp. v. Monning (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 255, 271, 53 Cal. Rptr. 7]* . Additionally, the creation of a serious traffic hazard is sufficient grounds for local authority to deny an additional driveway access [*Delta Rent-A-Car Systems, Inc. v. City of Beverly Hills (1969) 1 Cal. App. 3d 781, 786, 82 Cal. Rptr. 318]* .

Traffic may be an important part of the zoned land use. If so, objections based on the volume of traffic may be inappropriate. For example, an objection to heavy traffic use was without merit in a commercial zone. Traffic, in the form of delivery trucks and store patrons, was a reasonable commercial use of land [*see San Francisco v. Safeway Stores, Inc. (1957) 150 Cal. App. 2d 327, 332, 310 P.2d 68]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewTransportation LawPrivate VehiclesTraffic RegulationGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
1. In General

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.32

§ 579.32 Types of Uses and Zones; Control Methods

[1] Adoption of Ordinances

Under its basic zoning powers, the legislative body of any county or city may, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65800 et seq.*, adopt ordinances that do any of the following [*Gov. Code § 65850*]:

- Regulate the use of buildings, structures, and land as between industry, business, residences, open space, including agriculture, recreation, enjoyment of scenic beauty, use of natural resources, and other purposes.

- Regulate signs and billboards.

- Regulate (1) the location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size of buildings and structures, (2) the size and use of lots, yards, courts, and other open spaces, (3) the percentage of a lot that may be occupied by a building or structure, and (4) the intensity of land use.

- Establish requirements for offstreet parking and loading.

- Establish and maintain building setback lines.

- Create civic districts around civic centers, public parks, public buildings, or public grounds, and establish regulations for those civic districts.

The local legislative body may also regulate, pursuant to a content neutral ordinance and under prescribed circumstances, the time, place, and manner of operation of sexually-oriented businesses [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(a)*]. In this context, a "sexually-oriented business" is one whose primary purpose is the sale or display of matter that, because of its sexually explicit nature, may, pursuant to state law or local regulatory authority, be offered only to persons over

18 [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(b)*]. A local legislative body is also authorized to enter into a legally sanctioned and appropriate cooperative agreement, consortium, or joint powers authority with other adjacent cities or counties regarding regulation of established negative secondary effects of these businesses and their proximity to churches, schools, residents, and other businesses located in adjacent jurisdictions [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(d)*].

Thus, land may be zoned into different areas based on the types of land uses allowed within that zone. For example, a commercial zone allows the operation of a commercial enterprise. Similarly, a residential use zone is designed for residential use and may restrict uses that are nonresidential in nature. A zone may be validly restricted to specified types of uses deemed to be compatible in that type of area [*see Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 743, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

Within each zone, three types of uses may be allowed: primary, accessory, and conditional. Most ordinances define what the primary use within a zone is, explicitly provide for a variety of accessory uses, and allow some compatible conditional uses only after prior approval, or a permit. Thus, in a residential zone the primary use may be restricted to various types of residences; accessory usesmay include storage of construction materials, rental of rooms, and erection of accessory buildings; and conditional uses may include temporary carnivals and hiking trails [*see Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 743-744, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

In addition, zoning ordinances will typically provide other detailed restrictions on land use, such as banning the keeping of certain animals, front and side yard setbacks, area requirements, and regulation of vehicle storage [*see Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 744, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

[2] Accessory Uses

Most ordinances list the permitted primary uses in a zone and then explicitly provide for permissible accessory uses and buildings normally incidental to the primary uses. If an ordinance is silent on accessory uses, and does not state what uses are permissible accessory uses, administrative and judicial interpretations may be made. For example, the home occupation exception is often explicitly described in the zoning ordinance as a permissible accessory use in a residential zone [*County of Butte v. Bach (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 848, 865, 218 Cal. Rptr. 613]* . When an ordinance is silent on accessory uses, and does not include any residuary clause, such as one allowing uses customarily incidental to the primary use, reasonable uses will be permitted [*Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 744, 748-749, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

The application of zoning use restrictions to a particular set of facts is subject to investigation by the courts and each case is determinable on its individual merits. Thus, whether a property owner in a residential zone can be deprived of the right to pursue on his or her premises activities incidental to an unrestricted use when those activities do not interfere with the primarily residential character of the district or affect the aesthetic values sought to be preserved, is a question of degree. He or she may not be deprived of the right to engage in the normal activities incidental to a use not prohibited by the ordinance, for this is the nature of an accessory use [*see City of Beverly Hills v. Brady (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 854, 856-857, 215 P.2d 460* ; *see also Greenfield v. Bd. of City Plan. Commrs. (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 515, 517, 45 P.2d 219* (storage allowed as accessory use by ordinance authorizing businesses requiring storage)].

An ordinance may condition acceptable accessory uses. For example, if an ordinance provides that accessory uses are those uses customarily incidental to and subordinate to residential use which do not involve a commercial enterprise, an incidental commercial use that might be acceptable under a different residential ordinance, is not permissible [*see Jones v. Robertson (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 813, 814-819, 180 P.2d 929]* . In a residential zone, accessory uses are commonly limited to persons who use that property as their principal residence. Thus, use of a house as a law office when the attorney's primary residence was elsewhere would not be allowed [*County of Butte v. Bach (1985) 172 Cal. App. 3d 848, 865-866, 218 Cal. Rptr. 613]* .

[3] Conditional Uses

Conditional uses are those uses permissible in a zone subject to prior approval, or a permit [*Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 744, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* . A conditional use is one that is generally compatible with the other uses within a zone, but has the potential of being incompatible. Thus, before granting a conditional use permit, the local legislative body will consider its effect on the public welfare [*see Sports Arenas Properties, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 808, 814-815, 221 Cal. Rptr. 538, 710 P.2d 338* ; *see also § 579.114* for discussion of conditional use permits].

[4] Commercial Zones

It is not the proper function of a zoning ordinance to restrict competition or to protect an enterprise that may have been encouraged by a prior zoning classification [*Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 475-476, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304]* . When the restrictions of a zoning ordinance create a monopoly, that ordinance may be invalid and unreasonable as applied to particular property [*see Wilkins v. City of San Bernardino (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 332, 340, 175 P.2d 542]* . However, so long as the primary purpose of a zoning ordinance is not to regulate economic competition, but is to subserve a valid objective pursuant to a city's police powers, that ordinance is not invalid even though it might have an indirect impact on economic competition [*Van Sicklen v. Browne (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 122, 128, 92 Cal. Rptr. 786* , overruled in part by *Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279*]. This does not mean, however, that a zoning ordinance is valid only when the ordinance has merely an "indirect impact" on economic competition, and never when the regulation of economic competition is a direct and intended effect of the ordinance [*Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279, 296-297, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442, 159 P.3d 33* , *disapproving Van Sicklen v. Browne (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 122, 92 Cal. Rptr. 786* ; *Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. City of Turlock (2006) 138 Cal. App. 4th 273, 41 Cal. Rptr. 3d 420* , to the extent language in those cases could be read to suggest otherwise]. Even when the regulation of economic competition reasonably can be viewed as a direct and intended effect of a zoning ordinance or action, so long as the primary purpose of the ordinance or action--that is, its principal and ultimate objective--is not the impermissible private anticompetitive goal of protecting or disadvantaging a particular favored or disfavored business or individual, but instead is the advancement of a legitimate public purpose--such as the preservation of a municipality's downtown business district for the benefit of the municipality as a whole--the ordinance reasonably relates to the generalwelfare of the municipality and constitutes a legitimate exercise of the municipality's police power [*Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279, 296-297, 59 Cal. Rptr. 3d 442, 159 P.3d 33]* .

Ordinances formulated to regulate useful business enterprises are subject to investigation in the courts, with a view to determining whether the ordinance is a lawful exercise of the police power or whether, under the guise of enforcing police regulations, there has been an unwarranted and arbitrary interference with the right to carry on a lawful business, to make contracts, or to use and enjoy property [*Pacific Palisades Asso. v. Huntington Beach (1925) 196 Cal. 211, 217, 237 P. 538, 237 P. 538]* . However, an ordinance is not constitutionally defective when it classifies for residential use land that would yield a greater profit if used for business purposes. The fact that two parcels of property that are similar in nature but zoned differently does not make the zoning unreasonable due to economic regulation [*Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 477, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

A municipality is not permitted, under the guise of regulating business and segregating it to a particular district, to grant a monopoly to business establishments and enterprises already situated in unrestricted districts[*Pacific Palisades Asso. v. Huntington Beach (1925) 196 Cal. 211, 216, 237 P. 538, 237 P. 538]* . Such a situation arose when planners divided a town into two districts, one devoted to residential uses and the other to business uses. The planners did not make adequate provision for the business district, but limited it to a small area which was already fully occupied by businesses. Business enterprises already established in that area were thereby favored to the exclusion of any future businesses; in essence a monopoly was created by that unreasonable restriction [*In re White (1925) 195 Cal. 516, 520-521, 234 P. 396]* . In contrast, a statistical indication that the population of an area warrants more commercial

enterprises than currently exist does not prove anything in the absence of a showing that the districts or zones in which those enterprises may be operated have been so constricted as to show an intent to shut out newcomers. A municipality cannot be held responsible for economic conditions with which it had nothing to do that might prevent an individual from securing desirable locations [*Safeway Stores v. City Council, San Mateo (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 277, 287-288, 194 P.2d 720]* .

Although a city may not regulate business competition through zoning, its decision whether or not an area should be zoned as commercial will be upheld absent an abuse of its discretion. Thus, the presence of commercial pockets in an area is not determinative when the immediately surrounding parcels are not zoned commercial. Nor is the fact that an owner may enjoy greater benefits or an enhancement of the value of his or her property [*see* *Safeway Stores v. City Council, San Mateo (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 277, 285, 194 P.2d 720]* . Moreover, a zoning decision may be based on a perceived proliferation of a type of land use in a neighborhood already adequately serviced in that particular business enterprise [*Van Sicklen v. Browne (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 122, 125-126, 92 Cal. Rptr. 786* (service station), overruled in part by *Hernandez v. City of Hanford (2007) 41 Cal. 4th 279]* .

[5] Residential Zones

[a] Protection of Home Life

Zoning establishing districts devoted to strictly private residences or single-family dwellings, from which are excluded businesses or multiple dwelling structures, as part of a comprehensive and systematic plan, is a legitimate exercise of the police power [*Wilkins v. City of San Bernardino (1946) 29 Cal. 2d 332, 337, 175 P.2d 542]* . Both single-family residential areas and minimum size lot areas have been allowed. While this zoning may cause a financial hardship to some, the benefit to society outweighs that hardship. A single-family dwelling restriction insures a homogeneous development of the neighborhood so that the quiet of the home will not be disturbed by the relative confusion and bustle of apartment buildings or the greater activity connected with commercial or manufacturing establishments [*Hamer v. Town of Ross (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 776, 790-792, 31 Cal. Rptr. 335, 382 P.2d 375]* .

Homogeneous residential zones are established to promote family life--to provide a safe, healthful, and aesthetic environment in which to raise a family--and those uses of property deleterious to this goal are excluded. Aesthetic considerations are a minor objective, and the more important consideration is that of preserving the basic character of a residential neighborhood for residential purposes [*Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 746, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

The restrictions on uses of property in a residential zone are a protective measure for the individual owner, and are also included to insure that a homemaker would not be deprived of the reasonable use of his or her premises. The residential use of property includes the broad sphere of home activities as they existed in common law. These activities include much more than the simple use of a house and grounds for food and shelter, and extend to the use of a home as a social institution, for the private religious, educational, cultural, and recreational advantages of the family. It includes those customary activities that make the home more comfortable and enjoyable, such as gardening, certain recreational activity, and the enjoyment of certain hobbies. The scope of such activity is circumscribed only insofar as it may not assume a commercial or public character, or constitute a health or safety hazard to the neighborhood. Clearly, a predominantly commercial use of property within a residential zone is prohibited. But even a semblance of commercial activity, incidental to the use of residential property, such as the establishment of a home occupation, may be an excludable use if it might affect the residential character of the neighborhood. Thus, when there is external evidence of such activity--the altering of a residential structure, or the storage of commercial vehicles on the property--it may be a use that is incompatible with a residential neighborhood and would accordingly be characterized as a non-residential use [*Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 746-750, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

An ordinance that prohibits commercial use of residential property for lodging for periods of more than 30 consecutive

days is valid and is not a taking of the property [*Ewing v. City of Carmel-by-the-Sea (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1579, 1586-1595, 286 Cal. Rptr. 382]* .

[b] "Family" Restrictions

Zoning that attempts to restrict residential districts to a single family living in a dwelling may be subject to constitutional attack, even though the purpose of the ordinance is framed in terms of density and parking needs as valid public welfare concerns. Thus, a zoning ordinance that prohibited more than five unrelated persons from living together in a house in a single-family dwelling zone was unconstitutional under the right to privacy afforded by the California constitution [*City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 123, 128-134, 164 Cal. Rptr. 539, 610 P.2d 436]* . Although the United States constitution provides similar protection,it is not as broad in scope [*see Village of Belle Terre v. Boraas (1974) 416 U.S. 1, 2-8, 94 S. Ct. 1536, 39 L. Ed. 2d 797]* .

[6] Minimum Lot Sizes

An ordinance prescribing a minimum lot size is valid as a promotion of the public health and general welfare [*see Clemons v. City of Los Angeles (1950) 36 Cal. 2d 95, 103-104, 222 P.2d 439]* . Frequently homogeneous residential zoning includes a minimum lot size requirement. This promotes homogeneous development of the neighborhood, and tends to insure adequate light and air and relieve congestion [*Hamer v. Town of Ross (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 776, 790-792, 31 Cal. Rptr. 335, 382 P.2d 375]* . A refusal to rezone a parcel so that it could be subdivided was an abuse of discretion when almost all of the neighboring parcels were smaller than any of the planned lots and the rezoning would have conformed to the zoning of most neighboring lots [*Ross v. City of Yorba Linda (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 954, 959-963, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638]* .

However, this type of restrictive zoning is not always warranted. Thus, a zoning requirement setting forth a one acre lot limitation may be unwarranted when the property so zoned is located in an area of smaller parcels, thereby making it an island of one acre minimum lot size zoning in an area of substantially less restrictive zoning [*Hamer v. Town of Ross (1963) 59 Cal. 2d 776, 781-783, 31 Cal. Rptr. 335, 382 P.2d 375]* . A refusal to rezone a parcel so that it could be subdivided was an abuse of discretion when almost all of the neighboring parcels were smaller than any of the planned lots and the rezoning would conform to the zoning of most neighboring lots [*Ross v. City of Yorba Linda (1991) 1 Cal. App. 4th 954, 959-963, 2 Cal. Rptr. 2d 638]* .

In addition, if a zoning regulation prescribing minimum lot sizes is primarily designed for the development of new districts, but is framed in terms that renders it applicable to areas that have been fully improved and which cannot be made to conform to the new scheme, it must be applied reasonably. When an ordinance does not contain an exception concerning its application to old districts developed under different standards, it will be assumed that it was enacted with the understanding that it would not be given effect when the result would be to oppress the property owners without accomplishing any good whatsoever. Thus, a zoning ordinance that provides for a minimum width and area of lots will usually be invalid and unenforceable against an owner in an older, noncomplying district [*see Morris v. City of Los Angeles (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 856, 862-863, 254 P.2d 935]* .

[7] Setbacks

Ordinances imposing minimum setback requirements from the street, as well as minimum dimensions for sideyards and back yards, are valid [*see Christensen v. Thurber (1953) 120 Cal. App. 2d 517, 518-521, 261 P.2d 312]* . Strict limitations on a property owner's ability to construct accessory structures within the minimum setback area or yard areas have been upheld, recognizing that allowing structures in those areas would render a setback ordinance of little real efficacy [*Town of Atherton v. Templeton (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 146, 150-152, 17 Cal. Rptr. 680]* .

Analysis of a setback ordinance is not based on whether it is wise, but whether the city acted oppressively and

irrationally, exceeding its authority in imposing harsh and unreasonable standards not based on the public welfare [*Thille v. Board of Public Works (1927) 82 Cal. App. 187, 192, 255 P. 294]* . For example, a setback ordinance was unconstitutional as applied to an individual parcel, thereby supporting the issuance of a building permit without compliance with the setbacks, when enforcement of the setbacks would have resulted in a usable parcel of only 10 square feet. Confiscation, or virtual confiscation, of lands by zoning cannot be upheld [*Hoshour v. County of Contra Costa (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 602, 608, 21 Cal. Rptr. 714]* . However, if that confiscation would have been the result of a self-induced hardship, such as might have occurred if the landowner had originally owned a lot of sufficient size, but disposed of part of the property, the ordinance will be enforced [*see Town of Atherton v. Templeton (1961) 198 Cal. App. 2d 146, 154, 17 Cal. Rptr. 680]* .

[8] Aesthetic Considerations

[a] Valid Objective

A state may legitimately exercise its police powers to advance aesthetic values. The concept of the public welfare is broad and inclusive, and represents spiritual, physical, aesthetic, and monetary values [*City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent (1984) 466 U.S. 789, 805, 104 S. Ct. 2118, 80 L. Ed. 2d 772]* . Aesthetic regulation is permissible if it is reasonably related to the public safety and welfare [*see Novi v. City of Pacifica (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 678, 682, 215 Cal. Rptr. 439]* . Indeed, an ordinance precluding the issuance of a site development permit if there is insufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance was upheld as a valid exercise of zoning power. Its intent was to avoid ticky-tacky development, and among its objectives was the avoidance of linear monotony and massive bulky appearance and the achievement of a small scale village atmosphere [*Novi v. City of Pacifica (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 678, 682-683, 215 Cal. Rptr. 439* (ordinance withstood charge of vagueness)].

Because it is within the police power to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, and well-balanced, the improvement of the appearance of its community is within the authority of cities. Two different reasons have been cited as justification for this: the tourist industry in which aesthetic considerations assumeeconomic value, and the impossibility of present day city planning without some sort of aesthetic control [*Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848, 858-863, 164 Cal. Rptr. 510, 610 P.2d 407* , rev'd on other grounds, *453 U.S. 490, 521, 101 S. Ct. 2882, 69 L. Ed. 2d 800 (1981)]* . The encouragement of tourism and its impact on the local economy may also support enforcement of aesthetic requirements based on preservation of buildings with historical significance [*see Bohannan v. City of San Diego (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 416, 422, 106 Cal. Rptr. 333]* .

Similarly, zoning ordinances designed to protect the views of existing buildings are valid. Thus, an ordinance providing a mechanism for owners of buildings to voice objections and have those objections be considered prior to the issuance of a building permit for construction or modification that would impair their view is valid [*see Ross v. City of Rolling Hills Estates (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 370, 374-376, 238 Cal. Rptr. 561]* .

Generally, zoning standards are permitted a substantial amount of vagueness, and unless the restriction impacts on the right of expression, a zoning standard is sufficient if the administrative body is required to make its decision in accord with the general, health, safety, and welfare standard [*see Novi v. City of Pacifica (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 678, 682, 215 Cal. Rptr. 439]* . When aesthetic considerations control, general criteria for evaluation of the appropriateness of the structures are sufficient; minutely designated standards are not required [*see Bohannan v. City of San Diego (1973) 30 Cal. App. 3d 416, 424-425, 106 Cal. Rptr. 333]* . Even though aesthetic zoning regulations allow a fair amount of discretion, they may not be unreasonable or arbitrary. Thus, an ordinance prohibiting the parking of large commercial trucks in a low density rural zone in which the use of large vehicles and machinery is common, could not be justified by aesthetics [*see In re Scarpitti (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 434, 440-441, 177 Cal. Rptr. 387]* .

[b] First Amendment Limitations

An attempt to advance aesthetic values may sometimes result in an incidental restriction on expression. Thus, any aesthetic restriction that restricts expression must be narrowly tailored if it is to be justified as a reasonable regulation of the time, place, or manner of expression [*City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent (1984) 466 U.S. 789, 808, 104 S. Ct. 2118, 80 L. Ed. 2d 772* (city ordinance prohibiting posting of signs on public property is not violative of *First Amendment*)]. Ordinances regulating the erection of signs in the name of aesthetics appear most sensitive to this form of constitutional attack. For example, an ordinance making it unlawful for anyone to erect a sign without first obtaining a permit from the city planning director, who was given considerable latitude in that decision, was unconstitutional. Although the aesthetic interest the city sought to further through the sign ordinance was a proper interest, because there were no definite or objective guidelines for issuance or denial of the permit, it acted as a prior restraint [*City of Indio v. Arroyo (1983) 143 Cal. App. 3d 151, 158-161, 191 Cal. Rptr. 565]* .

By comparison, a sign prohibition that is restricted to those areas of a city deemed to be of special cultural, historic, or scenic importance was upheld. There, the city's interests in reducing traffic hazards and beautifying vital areas of the city outweighed any incidental infringement on *First Amendment* rights, especially since the ordinance left abundant alternative forums for the same communication. Moreover, a sign ordinance may validly allow all forms of on-site advertising while prohibiting off-site messages [*City and County of San Francisco v. Eller Outdoor Advertising (1987) 192 Cal. App. 3d 643, 659-660, 237 Cal. Rptr. 815]* .

[c] Architectural Policy

A zoning ordinance may require conformance with a specified type of architecture; implementation of an architectural policy is within a city's zoning authority for a variety of reasons. An architectural policy appears valid as an aesthetic regulation [*see generally Novi v. City of Pacifica (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 678, 682, 215 Cal. Rptr. 439]* . Moreover, it could be likened to a use regulation, because requiring a building to conform to a design might, as a practical matter, limit its use to or prevent its use for a specific purpose. Similarly, such a policy could easily be used to regulate the location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size of buildings. Additionally, an architectural policy very likely would overlap the field of regulation granted a planning commission in the exercise of its authority to review the plans for buildings within civic districts in order to assure a orderly development in the vicinity [*Laguna Beach Taxpayers' Asso. v. City Council of Laguna Beach (1960) 187 Cal. App. 2d 412, 415-416, 9 Cal. Rptr. 775* ; *see Gov. Code § 65800*]. However an architectural policy is characterized, it is permissible if it is reasonably related to the public safety and welfare [*see generally Novi v. City of Pacifica (1985) 169 Cal. App. 3d 678, 682, 215 Cal. Rptr. 439]* .

[d] Height Restrictions

Whether or not a city has implemented an architectural policy, it may impose height regulations on buildings throughout the city or in particular and limited districts. The physical peculiarities of the city as a whole or of specific areas within the city may be considered in enacting height restrictions, as well as assurance of sunlight [*see Brougher v. Board of Public Works (1930) 107 Cal. App. 15, 22, 290 P. 140]* .

[9] Cluster and Planned Unit Developments

The terms "cluster development" and "planned unit development" are sometimes used interchangeably, although they have slightly different meanings. "Planned unit development" describes a tract of land absolvedfrom conventional zoning to permit clustering of residential uses and perhaps compatible commercial and industrial uses, and permitting structures of differing heights. "Cluster development" is a device for grouping dwellings to increase dwelling densities on some portions of the development area in order to have other portions free of buildings [*Orinda Homeowners Committee v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 768, 772, 90 Cal. Rptr. 88]* .

Neither a cluster development nor a planned unit development is in conflict with *Gov. Code § 65852*, which requires

that regulations must be uniform for each class or kind of building or use of land throughout the zone. A residential planned unit development does not conflict merely because the units are not uniform, that is, they are not all single family dwellings and perhaps the multi-family units differ among themselves. *Gov. Code § 65852* does not require the units to be alike even as to their character, whether single family or multi-family, but aims at the general objective of uniform land use within each land zone [*Orinda Homeowners Committee v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 11 Cal. App. 3d 768, 773, 90 Cal. Rptr. 88]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing CodesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UsePlanned Unit DevelopmentsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseZoning Methods

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
1. In General

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.33

§ 579.33 Spot Zoning

Spot zoning refers to the rezoning of a particular parcel of property which restricts the use of that property while it leaves all similarly situated property subject to the provisions of the comprehensive zoning ordinance [*Kissinger v. City of Los Angeles (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 462-463, 327 P.2d 10]* . Spot zoning may be the result of zoning or rezoning. The granting of a variance does not create a spot zone [*see Rubin v. Board of Directors (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 119, 124, 104 P.2d 1041]* . Similarly, the allowing of a nonconforming use does not create a spot zone [*see Safeway Stores v. City Council, San Mateo (1948) 86 Cal. App. 2d 277, 280-281, 194 P.2d 720]* .

The propriety of rezoning a parcel as a spot zone is a matter of legislative determination and courts will not generally interfere. For example, a court refused to interfere with a city's refusal to change the zoning of an individual parcel when the facts indicated that the parcel was in no different situation than the surrounding property and all were being treated alike [*Tandy v. City of Oakland (1962) 208 Cal. App. 2d 609, 612-613, 25 Cal. Rptr. 429]* . Of course, if the rezoning of a parcel as a spot zone is inconsistent with the general plan of the enacting city or county, that spot zone may be challenged as inconsistent with the general plan [*see Gov. Code § 65860(b)*; *see also § 579.221*].

If the spot zoning evinces a discriminatory design against a property user, the courts will give weight to evidence disclosing a purpose other than that appearing on the face of the regulation to determine whether the scheme of classification has been applied fairly and impartially in each instance [*see G & D Holland Construction Co. v. City of Marysville (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 989, 994, 91 Cal. Rptr. 227]* .

Spot zoning is valid when long term changes in the neighborhood have created conditions compatible with the proposed new use. The very basis for the action--neighborhood change--provides the reclassification with a practical assurance of stability. Thus, an increase in population may render an agricultural classification unsuitable and justify rezoning a parcel to multiple family residential [*Scrutton v. County of Sacramento (1969) 275 Cal. App. 2d 412, 419-420, 79 Cal. Rptr. 872]* .

Spot zoning may be invalid as discriminatory zoning against a particular parcel of land. Thus, an ordinance that

arbitrarily rezoned a parcel of property to single family residential, a use to which it could not economically be put, because it was located between multiple dwelling development and commercial development, discriminated against its owner, when it permitted all other property similarly situated and zoned to continue in the former use [*see Kissinger v. City of Los Angeles (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 462-463, 327 P.2d 10]* . Spot zoning was also discriminatory when its purpose was to help a city prevent the development of discontinued railway rights-of-way for other than street purposes [*see People ex rel. Dept. Pub. Wks. v. Southern Pac. Trans. Co. (1973) 33 Cal. App. 3d 960, 963-965, 109 Cal. Rptr. 525]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawContractual Relations & HousingFair Housing RightsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming UsesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpot Zoning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
1. In General

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.34-579.49

[Reserved]

§§ 579.34[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
2. General and Specific Plans

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.50

§ 579.50 General Plan

[1] Adoption Is Mandatory

Each planning agency must prepare, and the appropriate legislative body must adopt, a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city, and of any land outside its boundaries that, in the planning agency's judgment, bears relation to its planning. Chartered cities must adopt general plans that contain the mandatory elements specified in *Gov. Code § 65302*, discussed in *§ 579.50[2]* [*Gov. Code § 65300*]. The general plan may be adopted in any format convenient to the legislative body and must be prepared by the planning agency so that all or individual elements of it may be adopted. The legislative body may adopt all or part of a plan of another public agency if that plan is sufficiently detailed and its contents are appropriate [*Gov. Code § 65301(a)*].

The legislative body of a newly incorporated city or newly formed county must adopt a general plan within 30 months of its incorporation or formation, unless an extension is granted by the state Director of Planning and Research [*Gov. Code §§ 65360, 65361*; *see generally Gov. Code§§ 65035, 65040, 65067-65067.3* (role of office of Planning and Research in assisting local planning)].

[2] Contents of General Plan

The general plan must address the elements specified in *Gov. Code § 65302* to the extent that the subject of the element exists in the planning area. The degree of specificity and level of detail of the discussion of each element must reflect local conditions and circumstances [*Gov. Code § 65301(c)*]. However, *Gov. Code § 65301(c)* is not to affect the requirements of *Gov. Code § 65302(c)* (housing element provisions), or the authority of the Department of Housing and Community Development to review housing elements pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 50459* [*Gov. Code § 65301(c)*].

The general plan must consist of a statement of development policies and include diagrams and text setting forth objectives, principles, standards, and plan proposals. It must include elements addressing land use, circulation (transportation), housing, conservation, open-space, noise, and safety [*Gov. Code § 65302*]. If the general plan limits the

number of housing units that may be constructed annually, the adoption of that provision must contain findings that justify reducing the housing opportunities [*Gov. Code § 65302.8*].

The general plan may include any other elements or address any other subjects that, in the judgment of the legislative body, relate to the physical development of the county or city [*Gov. Code § 65303*].

The general plan must be consistent with the airport land use compatibility plan required by *Pub. Util. Code § 21675* [*Gov. Code § 65302.2*]. Every county in which there is an airport must establish an airport land use commission that is charged with ensuring compatible land uses in the vicinity of new airports, coordinating planning to provide for the orderly development of air transportation, and preparing airport land use planning [*see Pub. Util. Code §§ 21670, 21674*]. Airport land use commissions are governed by *Pub. Util. Code §§ 21670-21679*. When there is no airport land use commission, special procedures allow an interested party to initiate superior court proceedings to postpone the effective date of a zoning regulation [*see Pub. Util. Code § 21679*].

[3] Adoption of General Plan

[a] Legislative Act

The adoption of or any amendment to the general plan or any part thereof is a legislative act that is reviewable pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* [*Gov. Code § 65301.5*].

[b] Procedures

The planning agency must provide opportunities for public involvement through public hearings and any other means the planning agency deems appropriate during the preparation of the general plan or amendment to the general plan [*Gov. Code § 65351*]. It should also refer any proposed action to affected public agencies, allowing them at least 45 days to comment before any action by the legislative body, although failure to do so will not affect the validity of any action [*Gov. Code § 65352*].

If the county or city has a planning commission, prior to making its written recommendation on the proposal, the commission must hold at least one public hearing after complying with the notice provisions of *Gov. Code § 65090* [*Gov. Code §§ 65353, 65354*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 65090, see § 579.72[1]*]. If a proposed general plan or amendments to a general plan would affect the permitted uses or the intensity of uses of real property, notice of the hearing must also be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65091(a)(1)-(3)*. If the number of owners to whom notice would be required to be mailed is greater than 1,000, a local agency may, in lieu of mailed or delivered notice, publish notice pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65091(a)(4)*. For discussion of notice requirements under *Gov. Code § 65091*, see *§ 579.72[2]*. The legislative body must also hold at least one public hearing before adopting or amending a general plan [*Gov. Code § 65355*].

The legislative body must act by resolution of a majority of its total membership to adopt or amend a general plan. It may approve, modify, or disapprove the planning commission's recommendation, although a substantial modification must be referred to the planning commission for its consideration [*Gov. Code § 65356*].

[c] Effect of Adoption of General Plan

Copies of the adopted or amended general plan must be sent to all affected public entities and be made available to the general public [*Gov. Code § 65357*].

There are prescribed limitations on the frequency of amendments to the general plan [*see Gov. Code § 65358*]. However, the legislative authority to amend general plans is not an implied limitation on the right to amend general plans by exercise of the local right of initiative. That right has been upheld by the California Supreme Court [*see*

DeVita v. County of Napa (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 763, 792-797, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699, 889 P.2d 1019] .

The general plan must be compared to any other plan applicable to the same areas or matters affected by it, and the other plan amended as necessary to make it comply with the general plan [*Gov. Code § 65359*].

After the legislative body has adopted all or part of a general plan, the planning agency will investigate and make recommendations regarding means of implementation and provide an annual report on the status of the plan [*Gov. Code § 65400(a)*]. Proposed public works, acquisition or disposition of real property, and construction of public buildings must be submitted to the planning agency for a report regarding conformity with the general plan [*Gov. Code §§ 65401, 65402*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive & General PlansReal Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive Plans

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
2. General and Specific Plans

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.51

§ 579.51 Specific Plans

[1] Preperation Is Permissive

After the legislative body of a city or county has adopted a general plan, the planning agency, either on its own or after direction from the legislative body, may prepare specific plans for the systematic implementation of the general plan for all or part of the area covered by the general plan [*Gov. Code § 65450*]. However, no specific plan may be adopted or amended unless the proposed plan or amendment is consistent with the general plan [*Gov. Code § 65454*].

[2] Contents of Specific Plan

A specific plan must include a statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the general plan. It must also include (1) text and diagrams detailing the distribution, location, and extent of the uses of the land, (2) the proposed distribution, location, extent, and intensity of essential facilities, standards by which development will proceed, (3) standards for conservation and utilization of natural resources, and (4) a program of implementation measures [*Gov. Code § 65451*].

[3] Procedures Affecting Specific Plan

A specific plan will be prepared, adopted, and amended in the same manner as a general plan, except that a specific plan may be adopted by resolution or by ordinance and may be amended as often as necessary [*Gov. Code § 65453(a)*; for discussion of the adoption of a general plan, *see § 579.50[3]*]. A specific plan may be repealed in the same manner as it is required to be amended [*Gov. Code § 65453(b)*].

[4] Effect of Adoption of Specific Plan

Copies of the documents adopting or amending the specific plan must be sent to all affected public entities and be made available to the general public [*Gov. Code § 65456(c)*].

No zoning ordinance may be adopted or amended within an area covered by a specific plan unless it is consistent with

the adopted specific plan. Nor may a local public works project, a tentative map, or a parcel map be approved if inconsistent with the adopted specific plan [*Gov. Code § 65455*]. Certain residential projects that are undertaken to implement and that are consistent with a specific plan for which an environmental impact report was certified after January 1, 1980, are exempt from the requirements of *Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.* (California Environmental Quality Act) [*Gov. Code § 65457*; for discussion of CEQA, *see* Ch. 418, *Pollution and Environmental Matters* [.

[5] Assessment of Fees

After adopting a specific plan, the legislative body may impose a specific plan fee on persons seeking governmental approvals that are required to be consistent with the specific plan. Additionally, a city or county may require a person requesting adoption, amendment, or repeal of a specific plan to deposit with the planning agency an amount equal to the estimated cost of that action prior to any agency action [*Gov. Code § 65456(a), (b)*]. A reasonable fee may be charged for a copy of the specific plan [*Gov. Code § 65456(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseLocal Planning

21 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
2. General and Specific Plans

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.52-579.69

[Reserved]

§§ 579.52[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
3. Zoning Ordinances

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.70

§ 579.70 Local Control Over Regulations

[1] Policy to Maximize

Gov. Code §§ 65800-65912 set forth statewide zoning regulations to provide for the adoption and administration of zoning laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations by counties and cities, and to implement local general plans. Except for *Gov. Code §§ 65910-65912* (open-space zoning) and *Gov. Code § 65913.1* (zoning vacant land for residential use), the regulations are intended to provide only a minimum of limitation in order that counties and cites may exercise the maximum degree of control over local zoning matters [*Gov. Code § 65800*].

[2] Minimum Procedural Standards

Gov. Code § 65804 contains some very broad procedural standards and rules governing the conduct of local zoning hearings to insure at least a modicum of uniformity and public access to zoning matters. These standards apply to all local zoning agencies, including chartered cities [*Gov. Code § 65804*]. The standards require the local agencies to do the following [*see Gov. Code § 65804*]:

- Develop and publish procedural rules for conduct of their hearings so that all parties will have advance knowledge of the procedures to be followed. These rules must incorporate the procedures required by *Gov. Code § 65854* for public hearings and notice in connection with proposed zoning ordinances and ordinance amendments [*see §§ 579.71* and *579.72*].

- Insure that, on written request made before the date of a hearing, a record of any contested proceeding is made and preserved, a copy of which must be available at cost, and for which the local agency may require a deposit.

- Make public before or at the beginning of the hearing any staff planning report; such reports must be a matter of public record.

- Include in the record of any hearing held on an application for a change of zone for parcels of at least 10 acres, a staff report with recommendations and the basis for the recommendations.

[3] General Powers

The legislative body of any county or city may, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65800 et seq.*, adopt ordinances that do any of the following [*Gov. Code § 65850*]:

- Regulate the use of buildings, structures, and land as between industry, business, residences, open space, including agriculture, recreation, enjoyment of scenic beauty, use of natural resources, and other purposes.

- Regulate signs and billboards.

- Regulate (1) the locations, height, bulk, number of stories, and size of buildings and structures; (2) the size and use of lots, yards, courts, and other open spaces; (3) the percentage of a lot that may be occupied by a building or structure; and (4) the intensity of land use.

- Establish requirements for offstreet parking and loading.

- Establish and maintain building setback lines.

- Create civic districts around civic centers, public parks, public buildings, or public grounds, and establish regulations for those civic districts.

The local legislative body may also regulate, pursuant to a content neutral ordinance and under prescribed circumstances, the time, place, and manner of operation of sexually-oriented businesses [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(a)*]. In this context, a "sexually-oriented business" is one whose primary purpose is the sale or display of matter that, because of its sexually explicit nature, may, pursuant to state law or local regulatory authority, be offered only to persons over 18 [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(b)*]. A local legislative body is also authorized to enter into a legally sanctioned and appropriate cooperative agreement, consortium, or joint powers authority with other adjacent cities or counties regarding regulation of established negative secondary effects of such businesses and their proximity to churches, schools, residents, and other businesses located in adjacent jurisdictions [*Gov. Code § 65850.4(d)*].

The local legislative body may divide its area into zones of whatever number, shape, and area it deems appropriate [*Gov. Code § 65851*]. It may also enact special provisions governing second residential units pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65852.2*.

[4] Statutory Limitations on Power

[a] Uniformity Within Zones

If a city or county has divided its territory into zones, all regulations must be uniform for each class, kind of building, or use of land throughout each zone, but the regulation in one type of zone may differ from those in other types of zones [*Gov. Code § 65852*].

[b] Solar Energy Systems

Because of the state's policy to promote and encourage use of solar energy systems [*see Civ. Code § 801.5(a)(1), (2)*; *Gov. Code § 65850.5(g)(2)* ("solar energy system" defined)] and to limit obstacles to their use, a local legislative body must administratively approve an application to install a solar energy system by issuing a building or similar

nondiscretionary permit. The requirements of local law must be limited to those standards and regulations necessary to ensure that the system will not have a specific, adverse impact on public health or safety [*Gov. Code § 65850.5(a), (b)*; *see Health & Safety Code § 17959.1*]. If a local government denies an application for a use permit to install a solar energy system, it must make written findings based on substantial evidence in the record. The findings must include the government's basis for rejecting potential feasible alternatives for preventing the potential adverse impact on public health or safety [*Gov. Code § 65850.5(c)*].

[c] Manufactured Homes and Mobilehomes

The local political entity may not prohibit the installation of certified manufactured homes and mobilehomes or preclude mobilehome parks from land zoned for residential use [*see Gov. Code §§ 65852.3, 65852.7*; for discussion of zoning regulations specific to manufactured homes and mobilehomes, *see* Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks* [.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Energy & Utilities LawSolar & Biomass IndustriesReal Property LawMobilehomes & Mobilehome ParksSubdivisionsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
3. Zoning Ordinances

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.71

§ 579.71 Enactment Procedures

[1] Generally

A zoning ordinance or an amendment to a zoning ordinance that changes any property from one zone to another or imposes any regulation listed in *Gov. Code § 65850* not previously imposed or removes or modifies any *Gov. Code § 65850* regulation, must be adopted in the manner set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 65854-65857* [*Gov. Code § 65853*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 65850, see § 579.70[3]*]. Any other amendment to a zoning ordinance may be adopted as other ordinances are adopted [*Gov. Code § 65853*].

If the legislative body has required the planning commission to study and report on a proposed zoning ordinance or amendment and the commission fails to act,that failure is deemed an approval of the proposal [*see Gov. Code § 65853*].

[2] Hearing Required

The planning commission must hold a public hearing on the proposed zoning ordinance or amendment, the notice for which must be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090*, and if the permitted uses of real property are affected, pursuant to the additional notice requirements of *Gov. Code § 65091* [*Gov. Code § 65854*; *see § 579.72*]. After the hearing, the planning commission must render its written recommendation to the legislative body. That recommendation must include the reasons for the recommendation, the relationship of the proposed ordinance or amendment to applicable general and specific plans, and must be transmitted in the form and manner specified by the legislative body [*Gov. Code § 65855*].

After receiving the commission's recommendation, the legislative body must hold a public hearing. Although no action on a proposed amendment need be taken if the proposed amendment was to change property from one zone to another and the recommendation was against the amendment, if local ordinance provides otherwise or if an interested party makes a written request for a hearing, a hearing must be held [*Gov. Code § 65856*]. The legislative body may approve, modify, or disapprove the recommendation of the planning commission. However, any suggested modification that was not previously considered by the commission must first be referred to it for report and recommendation without a public

hearing. Failure of the planning commission to act is deemed approval of the modification proposed [*Gov. Code § 65857*]. The legislative body is not required to make express findings of facts concerning the public purpose of the ordinance or its relation to the police power [*Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 473, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304]* .

A zoning ordinance that imposes new zoning requirements and prohibits second units is void if it was adopted without public notice or a public hearing [*Sounhein v. City of San Dimas (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1255, 1259-1260, 14 Cal. Rptr. 2d 656]* .

A "streamlined zoning process," under which the county gave notice of a hearing before the board of supervisors before the planning commission made its recommendation on a proposed amendment to the zoning ordinance, violated the Planning and Zoning Law [*Environmental Defense Project of Sierra County v. County of Sierra (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 877, 881, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 474*]. When a planning commission is required to hold a hearing and make a recommendation, the board hearing notice cannot be published until the commission (1) has completed its hearing, (2) adopted its recommendation, and (3) formally delivered the recommendation. Furthermore, the board hearing notice must include the commission's recommendation [*Environmental Defense Project of Sierra County v. County of Sierra (2008) 158 Cal. App. 4th 877, 893, 70 Cal. Rptr. 3d 474*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
3. Zoning Ordinances

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.72

§ 579.72 Public Hearings

[1] Notice by Publication or Posting

When a provision of *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* requires notice of a public hearing to be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090*, notice must be published pursuant to *Gov. Code § 6061* (one-time publication) in at least one newspaper of general circulation within the jurisdiction of the local agency conducting the proceedings at least 10 days before the hearing, or if there is no newspaper of general circulation, the notice must be posted at least 10 days before the hearing in at least three public places within that jurisdiction. The notice must include the date, time, and place of the public hearing, the identity of the hearing body or officer, a general explanation of the matter to be considered, and a general description, in text or by diagram, of the location of the real property, if any, that is the subject of the hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 65090, 65094*]. A local agency may also give notice of the hearing in any other manner it deems necessary or desirable [*Gov. Code § 65090(c)*].

[2] Notice by Mail or Delivery

When a provision of *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* requires notice of a public hearing to be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65091*, notice must be given in several ways. Notice of the hearing must be mailed or delivered at least 10 days before the hearing to all of the following [*Gov. Code § 65091(a)(1), (3), (4)*]:

- The owner of the subject real property and the owner's duly authorized agent;
- The proposed applicant;
- Each local agency expected to provide essential facilities or services to the project whose ability to provide those facilities and services may be significantly affected; and
- All owners of real property within 300 feet of the real property that is the subject of the hearing.

If the statute requiring a Section 65091 notice is the Subdivision Map Act [*see Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*], notice must also be given to any owner of a mineral right on the property who has recorded a notice of intent to preserve those rights [*Gov. Code § 65091(a)(2)*; *see Civ. Code § 883.230* (notice of intent)].

If the number of persons to whom notice would be mailed or delivered is greater than 1,000, a local agency, in lieu of mailed or delivered notice, may provide notice by placing a display advertisement of at least one-eighth page in at least one newspaper of general circulation within the local agency in which the proceeding is conducted at least 10 days before the hearing. If the notice is mailed or delivered to the owners of real property within 300 feet of the subject real property, the notice must also either (1) be published pursuant to *Gov. Code § 6061* (one-time publication) in at least one newspaper of general circulation within the local agency that is conducting the proceeding at least 10 days before the hearing, or (2) be posted at least 10 days before the hearing in at least three public places within the boundaries of the local agency, including one public place in the area directly affected by the proceeding [*Gov. Code § 65091(a)(4), (5)*]. The notice must include the date, time, and place of the public hearing, the identity of the hearing body or officer, a general explanation of the matter to be considered, and a general description, in text or by diagram, of the location of the real property, if any, that is the subject of the hearing [*Gov. Code §§ 65091(b), 65094*]. A local agency may also give notice of thehearing in any other manner it deems necessary or desirable [*Gov. Code § 65091(c)*].

[3] Notice to Blind, Aged, and Disabled of Hearing on Drive-Through Facility Permit

Whenever a local agency (1) considers adopting or amending policies or ordinances affecting drive-through facilities; or (2) holds a hearing regarding a permit for a drive-through facility or a modification of such a permit, the agency must incorporate, when necessary, notice procedures to the blind, aged, and disabled communities to facilitate their participation in any hearing on, or appeal of the denial of, such a facility. This notice requirement applies to charter cities as well as general law cities [*Gov. Code §§ 65090(d), 65091(d)*].

[4] Requests for Notice

When a provision of *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* requires notice of a public hearing to be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090* or *65091*, the notice must also be mailed or delivered at least 10 days before the hearing to any person who has filed a written request for notice with either the clerk of the governing body or with any other designated person. The local agency may charge a fee reasonably related to its costs and may require each request to be annually renewed [*Gov. Code § 65092(a)*]. "Person" includes a California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission [*Gov. Code § 65092(b)*].

[5] Failure to Receive Notice

The failure of any person or entity to receive notice given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 6500 et seq.*, or pursuant to the procedures established by a chartered city, does not constitute grounds for any court to invalidate the actions of a local agency for which the notice was given [*Gov. Code § 65093*].

[6] Continuances

Any public hearing conducted under *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* may be continued from time to time [*Gov. Code § 65095*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
3. Zoning Ordinances

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.73-579.89

[Reserved]

§§ 579.73[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
4. Interim Zoning Measures

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.90

§ 579.90 Interim Ordinance

[1] Statutory Provision for Urgency Measure

Without following the standard procedures for adopting a zoning ordinance, the legislative body of a county, city (including a charter city), or city and county, to protect the public safety, health, and welfare, may adopt as an urgency measure an interim ordinance prohibiting any uses that may be in conflict with a contemplated general plan, specific plan, or zoning proposal that the legislative body, planning commission, or the planning department is studying or intends to study within a reasonable time. The urgency measure requires a four-fifths vote of the legislative body for adoption. That interim ordinance will have no further force and effect 45 days from its date of adoption. After notice pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090* and public hearing, the legislative body may extend the interim ordinance for 10 months and 15 days and subsequently extend the interim ordinance for one year. Any extension also requires a four-fifths vote for adoption. No more than two extensions may be adopted [*Gov. Code § 65858(a)*].

Alternatively, an interim ordinance may be adopted by a four-fifths vote following notice pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090* and public hearing. As in the case of an interim ordinance enacted without notice, it will have no further force and effect 45 days from its date of adoption. After enacting the ordinance in this manner, it may be extended for 22 months and 15 days on a four-fifths vote after notice pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65090* and public hearing [*Gov. Code § 65858(b)*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 65090, see § 579.72[1]*].

When any interim ordinance has been adopted, every subsequent interim ordinance, covering the whole or a part of the same property, will automatically terminate and be of no further force or effect on the termination of the initial ordinance or any extension thereof [*Gov. Code § 65858(e)*]. However, on termination of a prior interim ordinance, the legislative body may adopt another interim ordinance if the new ordinance is adopted to protect the public safety, health, and welfare from an event, occurrence, or set of circumstances that differs from the event, occurrence, or set of circumstances that led to the adoption of the prior ordinance [*Gov. Code § 65858(f)*]. Such a new interim ordinance that was in existence on or before April 14, 1997, may not be invalidated if challenged pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65858(e)* (discussed *above*) [*see* 1996 Stats., ch. 129, § 2].

The legislative body has no power to adopt or extend any interim ordinance unless the ordinance contains legislative findings that there is a current and immediate threat to the public health, safety, or welfare, and that the approval of additional subdivisions, use permits, variances, building permits, or any other applicable entitlement for use that isrequired to comply with a zoning ordinance would result in a threat to public health, safety, or welfare [*Gov. Code § 65858(c)*]. In addition, if an interim ordinance has the effect of denying approvals needed to develop projects with a significant component of multifamily housing, that is, projects in which multifamily housing consists of at least one-third of the project's total square footage, the ordinance may not be extended unless the local legislative body makes written findings supported by substantial evidence on the record that all of the following conditions exist [*Gov. Code § 65858(c)*; *see Gov. Code § 65858(h)*]:

- The continued approval of the development of multifamily housing projects would have a specific, adverse impact on the public health or safety;

- The interim ordinance is necessary to mitigate or avoid this specific, adverse impact; and

- There is no feasible alternative to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid this specific, adverse impact, as well or better, with a less burdensome or restrictive effect, than the adoption of the proposed interim ordinance.

"Specific, adverse impact" means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they exist on the date the proposed ordinance is adopted [*Gov. Code § 65858(c)(1)*]. "Development of multifamily housing projects" does not include the demolition, conversion, redevelopment, or rehabilitation of multifamily housing that is affordable to lower income households, or that will result in an increase in the price or reduction of the number of affordable units in a multifamily housing project [*Gov. Code § 65858(g)*].

Ten days before the expiration of an interim ordinance or any extension, the legislative body must issue a written report describing the measures taken to alleviate the condition that lead to the adoption of that ordinance [*Gov. Code § 65858(d)*].

While the statute permits a local legislative body to adopt an interim ordinance prohibiting any uses that may conflict with a general plan being studied, an interim ordinance that prohibits the formal processing of development applications, such as a tentative subdivision map, is invalid [*Building Indus. Legal Defense Found. v. Superior Court (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1410, 1420, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828]* .

The limitations imposed by *Gov. Code § 65858* are applicable to moratoriums passed by initiative as well as those enacted by the legislative body. The legislative history of *Gov. Code § 65858* indicates that it is applicable to all moratoriums even though its specific language refers only to acts of the legislative body [*Bank of the Orient v. Town of Tiburon (1990) 220 Cal. App. 3d 992, 999-1004, 269 Cal. Rptr. 690] , overruled in part by Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 743* .

Neither rezoning nor the expiration of a moratorium prevents the application of the statute's requirement that the moratorium and any subsequent moratorium or extension must expire after two years [*Martin v. Superior Court (1991) 234 Cal. App. 3d 1765, 1769-1772, 286 Cal. Rptr. 513]* .

[2] Purposes Served

An interim ordinance is designed as a stop gap or incubation period zoning ordinance. It is a recognition that development of a zoning plan takes time, and it would be destructive to the plan if, during the period of its incubation,

parties seeking to evade its operation could be permitted to enter on a course of construction that might progess far enough to defeat in whole or in part the ultimate execution of the plan [*Metro Realty v. County of El Dorado (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 508, 515, 35 Cal. Rptr. 480* (decided under former *Gov. Code § 65806*)]. As a temporary device to preserve the status quo pending adoption of a comprehensive zoning plan, an interim ordinance may require a development permit to assure that priceless resources are not irreversibly committed to uses that would be inconsistent with the plan ultimately developed [*see State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 253-255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* (Coastal Plan)].

There is no notice requirement for an interim zoning ordinance [*see Gov. Code § 65858*]. The reason no notice is required is that the ordinance is an urgency measure, the very purpose of which to preserve the status quo would be destroyed if notice and hearing were required. When the permanent plan and a zoning ordinance thereunder are before the county for adoption, notice and a hearing will be required [*Metro Realty v. County of El Dorado (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 508, 518, 35 Cal. Rptr. 480]* .

Interim ordinances are required to be reasonable; reasonableness in this connection is a matter of degree. A temporary restriction on land use may be a mere inconvenience when the same restriction indefinitely prolonged might possibly metamorphize into oppression [*Metro Realty v. County of El Dorado (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 508, 516, 35 Cal. Rptr. 480]* .

An interim ordinance may not be used to authorize a use formerly prohibited or to permit construction of a permanent structure. Such an ordinance would indicate an attempt to circumvent the statutory scheme of community development and the requirements of due process by misuse of a device designed only to maintain the status quo pending the completion of a comprehensive plan [*Silvera v. City of South Lake Tahoe (1970) 3 Cal. App. 3d 554, 555-558, 83 Cal. Rptr. 698]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
4. Interim Zoning Measures

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.91

§ 579.91 Holding Zone

Some land uses possess characteristics of such unique and special form that their automatic inclusion within a designated zone is impracticable. Thus, some zoning ordinances leave certain areas unclassified concerning the uses permitted, but provide that certain uses within those areas may be carried on only under a permit. Known as holding zones, these zones are frequently appropriate in rural areas where their rural character will be maintained only until some definite trend toward particular uses begins to develop. Classification as a holding zone recognizes that these areas have not reached a point of development warranting more specific regulation. This scheme forestalls a future claim that such a use, if not carried out under a terminable permit, had become a nonconforming use under restrictive zoning that might later be established [*see Castiglione v. County of San Diego (1971) 15 Cal. App. 3d 880, 883-884, 93 Cal. Rptr. 499]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
4. Interim Zoning Measures

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.92-579.109

[Reserved]

§§ 579.92[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.110

§ 579.110 Board of Zoning Adjustment

The local legislative body may, by ordinance, establish a board of zoning adjustment, an office of zoning administrator, or both [*Gov. Code § 65900*]. If neither is established, the local planning commission will exercise all of the functions and duties of that board or administrator [*Gov. Code § 65902*].

The board of zoning adjustment or zoning administrator will hear and decide applications for variances and conditional uses or other permits when the zoning ordinance provides therefor and establishes determination criteria. The board or administrator may exercise any other powers granted by local ordinance, and may adopt all rules and procedures necessary or convenient [*Gov. Code § 65901(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.111

§ 579.111 Board of Appeals

[1] Generally

The local legislative body may, by ordinance, create and establish a board of appeals [*Gov. Code § 65900*]. If a board of appeals is not established, the local legislative body will exercise all of its functions and duties [*Gov. Code § 65904*].

The board of appeals hears and determines appeals from the decisions of the board of zoning adjustment or the zoning administrator. Procedures for those appeals are as provided by local ordinance. The board may reverse or affirm, wholly or partly, or may modify the order, requirement, decision, or determination appealed from, and may make that order, requirement, decision, or determination as should be made, and that action will be final [*Gov. Code § 65903*].

[2] Decision Requires Public Hearing

Except as otherwise provided by *Gov. Code §§ 65900-65909.5*, a public hearing must be held on (1) an application for a variance from the requirements of a zoning ordinance, (2) an application for a conditional use permit, or equivalent development permit, (3) a proposed revocation or modification of a variance, use permit, or equivalent development permit, or (4) an appeal from the action taken on any of those applications [*Gov. Code § 65905(a)*]. Notice of that hearing must be given pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65091* [*Gov. Code § 65905(b)*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 65091*, *see § 579.72[2]*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.112

§ 579.112 Issuance of Variance or Permit

[1] Impermissible Conditions

No local governmental body, or any agency thereof, may condition the issuance of any zone variance or building or use permit on either of the following:

- The dedication of land for any purpose not reasonably related to the use of the property for which the variance, building, or use permit is requested.

- The posting of a bond to guarantee installation of public improvements not reasonably related to the use of the property for which the variance, building, or use permit is requested [*Gov. Code § 65909*].

[2] Fees

The local legislative body may establish reasonable fees for the processing of use permits, zone variances, or zone changes pursuant to the procedures required or authorized by *Gov. Code §§ 65800-65912* or local ordinance. Those fees cannot exceed the amount reasonably required to administer the processing of those permits or zone variances. The fees will be imposed pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 54990-54994* (local agency service fees and charges) [*Gov. Code § 65909.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesBondsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseImpact FeesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.113

§ 579.113 Variances

[1] Grounds for Granting

A variance sanctions a deviation from the standard set by the general zoning ordinance. Any variance granted must be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning laws [*Zakessian v. City of Sausalito (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 794, 801, 105 Cal. Rptr. 105]* . A variance will not be granted for a parcel of property that authorizes a use or activity that is not otherwise expressly authorized by the zone regulation governing the parcel of property [*Gov. Code § 65906*].

Variances are to be granted only when, because of special circumstances applicable to the property, including size, shape, topography, location or surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance deprives the property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification [*Gov. Code § 65906*]. In addition to *Gov. Code § 65906*, local ordinance may provide guidelines for granting variances [*see Broadway, Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 771-772 ns. 3, 4, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810]* .

The granting of a variance rests largely in the discretion of the body designated by the ordinance for that purpose. The board's action will not be disturbed in the absence of a clear showing of an abuse of discretion [*Bringle v. Board of Supervisors (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 86, 89, 4 Cal. Rptr. 493, 351 P.2d 765* ; *City of Santa Clara v. Paris (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 338, 341, 142 Cal. Rptr. 818]* .

[2] Challenging Constitutionality of Ordinance

The application for a variance necessarily admits the constitutionality of the ordinance under which the city officials charged with the duty of administering a zoning ordinance are asked to exercise a discretion. Thus, an applicant may not challenge its constitutionality before the administrative body. However, once the decision of the administrative body is final, the applicant may assert in a judicial proceeding that the zoning law is unconstitutional as applied to his or her property [*Minney v. City of Azusa (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 12, 28-29, 330 P.2d 255 , appeal dismissed, 359 U.S. 436, 79 S. Ct. 941, 3 L. Ed. 2d 932 (1959)]* .

[3] Unnecessary Hardship

The essential requirement of a variance is a showing that a strict enforcement of the zoning limitation would cause unnecessary hardship; the burden of showing hardshipis on the applicant [*PMI Mortgage Ins. Co. v. City of Pacific Grove (1981) 128 Cal. App. 3d 724, 731, 179 Cal. Rptr. 185]* .

A variance is appropriate when the hardship is unique to the particular property owner seeking the variance. Unnecessary hardship clearly occurs when the circumstances of a particular parcel of land place its owner at a disadvantage vis-a-vis other landowners in the zoning district [*Zakessian v. City of Sausalito (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 794, 799-800, 105 Cal. Rptr. 105]* . Only that type of hardship that inheres in the particular property is recognized, such as inability to use it for purposes of its existing zoning due to the prevailing uses of surrounding property. A variance for undue hardship is grounded in conditions peculiar to the particular lot as distinguished from other property in the use district [*Minney v. City of Azusa (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 12, 31, 330 P.2d 255 , appeal dismissed, 359 U.S. 436, 79 S. Ct. 941, 3 L. Ed. 2d 932 (1959)]* .

Self-imposed burdens cannot legally justify the granting of a variance. Thus, the developer's adoption of superior building standards cannot support a hardship rationale [*Broadway, Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of PermitAppeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 778, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810]* . Although financial hardship alone ordinarily will not constitute unnecessary hardship, it may be considered along with other circumstances [*Zakessian v. City of Sausalito (1972) 28 Cal. App. 3d 794, 802, 105 Cal. Rptr. 105]* .

[4] Special Circumstances

Variances are required to be granted because of "special circumstances" applicable to the property [*Gov. Code § 65906*], a concept that the California Supreme Court has interpreted as emphasizing only undefined disparities between properties [*Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 520, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12]* . The disparities need not be physical, but may include, for example, a disparate impact of land use regulations on some properties in a particular zone [*Craik v. County of Santa Cruz (2000) 81 Cal. App. 4th 880, 890, 96 Cal. Rptr. 2d 538]* .

Examples of special circumstances justifying a variance vary with the facts of each case. For example, the requisite special circumstances existed when compliance with the ordinance requirement for a certain number of parking places would result in maintaining vacant and unused parking spaces and would not contribute to relieving traffic congestion, which was the stated purpose of the requirement [*Siller v. Board of Supervisors (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 479, 485-486, 25 Cal. Rptr. 73, 375 P.2d 41]* . Special circumstances were also found so as to uphold a variance granted to allow expansion of a resort hotel that had been built before the enactment of a zoning ordinance that only allowed cottage-type hotels. The hotel had been so designed and built, including irreplaceable matured landscaping, that it could never comply with the cottage requirement, without having a detrimental effect on the scenic drive adjacent to the hotel and destroying the aesthetic, architectural, and historic character and integrity of the hotel. The proposed project, however, would add only one building and would preserve the hotel's existing features, and result in a sleeping room density less than that of the only other hotel in the identical zoning classification [*Miller v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 539, 546-548, 176 Cal. Rptr. 136]* .

On the other hand, special circumstances justifying the granting of a variance were found not to exist based on the property's unusual subsoil condition when that condition bore no logical relationship to the variance requested. Nor did the factor of including attractive architectural features constitute an extraordinary condition applying to the intended use of the property that might have justified a variance under the ordinance in question [*Broadway, Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 774, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810]* . Also, profit motive is not an adequate ground for a variance. A distinction is drawn between those circumstances that prevent a builder from profitably developing a lot within the strictures of the planning code and those conditions that simply render a

complying structure less profitable than anticipated. To justify granting a variance on this basis, there must be a finding that the developer could not earn a reasonable return on the investment if the building complied with the code requirements [*Broadway, Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 775-776, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810* ; *see Hamilton v. Board of Supervisors (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 64, 68-70, 75 Cal. Rptr. 106]* .

[5] Attachment of Conditions to Avoid Privilege

Any variance granted is subject to those conditions that assure that the adjustment thereby authorized will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations on other properties in the vicinity and zone in which that property is situated [*Gov. Code § 65906*; *see Gov. Code § 65909*, discussed in *§ 579.112[1]*]. Explicit conditions may be attached to a variance to preserve the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance. When a variance is granted on reasonable conditions, the landowner cannot later claim that the ordinance is invalid as applied to his or her property [*Bringle v. Board of Supervisors (1960) 54 Cal. 2d 86, 90, 4 Cal. Rptr. 493, 351 P.2d 765]* .

If the property can be put to effective use, consistent with its existing zoning, without the deviation sought, a variance is not appropriate, even if it would make the applicant's property more valuable, enable him or her to recover a greater income, or provide relief from the cost of complying with the existing restrictions. Profit motive, attractive architectural features, benefit to the community, and practical difficulty do not justify a variance. A variance based on those factors would confer not parity, but privilege [*Hamilton v. Board of Supervisors (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 64, 69-70, 75 Cal. Rptr. 106* ; *see Gov. Code § 65906*].

[6] Special Parking Rules

Notwithstanding *Gov. Code § 65906*, a variance may be granted from the parking requirements of a zoning ordinance in order that some or all of the required parking spaces be located offsite, including locations in other local jurisdictions, or that in-lieu fees or facilities be provided instead of the required parking spaces, if both the following conditions are met:

- The variance will be an incentive to, and a benefit for, the nonresidential development.

- The variance will facilitate access to the nonresidential development by patrons of public transit facilities, particularly guideway facilities [*Gov. Code § 65906.5*].

[7] Relationship to Legislative Zoning

Radicial alteration of the nature of an entire zone is a proper subject for legislation, not for piecemeal adjudication by an administrative agency through the granting of variances for large parcels [*Topanga Asso. for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 522, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12* (variance for 28 acre parcel leads to suspicion that so large a parcel may not be sufficiently unrepresentative of realty in a zone to merit special treatment)].

Nor is annulment of legislative zoning a proper purpose of a variance. Thus, the granting of variances has no precedential value. Ill-advised or illegal variances do not furnish grounds for a repetition of the wrong. If that were so, one variance would sustain as well as compel others, thereby nullifying the general regulation [*Minney v. City of Azusa (1958) 164 Cal. App. 2d 12, 32, 330 P.2d 255 , appeal dismissed, 359 U.S. 436, 79 S. Ct. 941, 3 L. Ed. 2d 932 (1959)* ; *see Miller v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 122 Cal. App. 3d 539, 547, 176 Cal. Rptr. 136* (although variance granted to another owner is not by itself a special circumstance justifying granting of a similar variance, it is relevant in assessing "privileges enjoyed by other property" element of *Gov. Code § 65906*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Real Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive PlansReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & VariancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.114

§ 579.114 Conditional Use Permit

[1] Generally

Various terms have been used to refer to the conditional use permit (CUP), including use permit, special use permit, and exceptional use permit [*see, e.g.,* *Metcalf v. County of Los Angeles (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 267, 272, 148 P.2d 645* (exception); Rohan, Zoning and Land Use Controls, Ch. 44, *Uses By Review,* § 44.01]. A CUP can be issued only if the local zoning ordinance has established criteria for determining such matters [*Stoddard v. Edelman (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 544, 548, 84 Cal. Rptr. 443* ; *see Gov. Code § 65901*]. Ordinarily, a zoning ordinance permits certain uses for an area and permits other uses only after consideration by an agency regarding whether the proposed other use will be in the best interests of public convenience and necessity and not contrary to the public welfare. Generally, a use requires a CUP because it could be incompatible in some respects with the applicable zoning. Once granted, the CUP does not permit uses other than those authorized by the permit or by the zoning ordinance without a permit [*Sports Arenas Properties, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1985) 40 Cal. 3d 808, 814-815, 221 Cal. Rptr. 538, 710 P.2d 338* ; *Neighborhood Action Group v. County of Calaveras (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1183, 203 Cal. Rptr. 401]* .

Traditionally, the conditional use permit has enabled the local legislative body to exercise some measure of control over the extent of certain uses, such as service stations, which, although desirable in limited numbers, could have a detrimental effect on the community in large numbers [*Neighborhood Action Group v. County of Calaveras (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1183-1184, 203 Cal. Rptr. 401* ; *see* *Upton v. Gray (1969) 269 Cal. App. 2d 352, 357, 74 Cal. Rptr. 783]* .

A conditional use permit runs with the land, and the successor in interest succeeds to any benefits that the original owner enjoyed under the permit issued. The successor in interest is also subject to the limitations in the permit and can assert no greater rights than the original permittee enjoyed [*County of Imperial v. McDougal (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 505, 510, 138 Cal. Rptr. 472, 564 P.2d 14]* .

[2] Criteria for Granting

The standards established by local ordinances for granting CUPs vary from very general to very specific, and have almost uniformly been judicially approved. Under the general welfare standard a permit may be issued if it is found that the proposed location of the use will be desirable to the public convenience or welfare and will be in harmony with the various elements and objectives of the master plan. This is not too vague to be valid [*Stoddard v. Edelman (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 544, 548, 84 Cal. Rptr. 443* ; *see Gov. Code § 65901*]. It is a near impossibility to devise standards to cover all possible situations in which a use permit can be issued [*Garavatti v. Fairfax Planning Com. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 145, 150, 99 Cal. Rptr. 260]* . In general, a determination that a permit applicant has satisfied the standards imposed by local ordinance is sufficient to justify granting the permit; findings outside those required by the ordinance, such as a finding that the applicant has not violated the terms of a previously-issued CUP, are not required [*Baird v. County of Contra Costa (1995) 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93]* .

The granting of a CUP does not constitute rezoning and does not require observance of rezoning procedures [*Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 266, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328]* . A conditional use permit is appropriate if it is shown that its use is essential or desirable to the public convenience or welfare and at the same time that it will not impair the integrity or character of the zoned district [*Mitcheltree v. City of Los Angeles (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 791, 795, 95 Cal. Rptr. 76]* .

Conditional use permits may be issued to allow a variety of uses. Some examples include (1) a planned residential development [*Concerned Citizens of Palm Desert, Inc. v. Board of Supervisors (1974) 38 Cal. App. 3d 257, 261, 113 Cal. Rptr. 328]* , (2) construction of a mobilehome park [*Jones v. City Council (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 724, 727, 94 Cal. Rptr. 897]* , and (3) construction of airplane hangars [*Mitcheltree v. City of Los Angeles (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 791, 797, 95 Cal. Rptr. 76]* .

Ordinances that purport to regulate the location and operation of adult businesses are subject to challenge under the *First Amendment* [*see, e.g.,* *Renton v. Playtime Theatres, Inc. (1986) 475 U.S. 41, 50, 106 S. Ct. 925, 89 L. Ed. 2d 29* ; *Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 191, 197-198, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194]* . While courts have accorded some deference to such ordinances if they do not completely ban restricted activity and serve a substantial governmental interest unrelated to suppression of speech, an ordinance must nonetheless be sufficiently specific to withstand the challenge that it is so vague that it constitutes an unconstitutional prior restraint [*Smith v. County of Los Angeles (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 990, 995, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680* ; *Dease v. City of Anaheim (C.D. Cal. 1993) 826 F. Supp. 336, 342]* . The criteria to be applied by local authorities in making a permit determination must be sufficientlyprecise to meet the constitutional requirement that they be narrow, objective, and definite [*see Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham (1969) 394 U.S. 147, 150-151, 89 S. Ct. 935, 22 L. Ed. 2d 162]* . Applying this standard, the Court of Appeal held that a Los Angeles conditional use permit ordinance that purported to regulate adult businesses was unconstitutionally vague because it required those making decisions based on the ordinance to exercise too much subjective discretion [*Smith v. County of Los Angeles (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1004-1008, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680]* . The ordinance required that operation of an adult business at a requested location could not "adversely affect the use" of schools, parks, playgrounds, places of worship, or similar uses within a 90-foot radius. The adult business likewise was required to be "sufficiently buffered" from "residentially zoned areas within the immediate vicinity so as not to adversely affect" those areas. Furthermore, its exterior appearance could not be "inconsistent" with commercial structures within the immediate neighborhood [*see* *Smith v. County of Los Angeles (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 990, 996, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680]* .

[3] Challenging Issuance or Terms of Permit

Administrative mandate is appropriate to challenge the issuance or denial of a conditional use permit [*see* *Wheeler v. Gregg (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 348, 362, 203 P.2d 37* ; *see also § 579.317[7]*]. If the local general plan is defective, a CUP granted by that local legislative body may be successfully challenged [*Neighborhood Action Group v. County of Calaveras (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 1176, 1184-1186, 203 Cal. Rptr. 401* ; for discussion of challenges to general plans, *see § 579.223*]. However, the requirements for the plan need not be formally approved and adopted before authority

vests in relation to granting a CUP [*see Mitcheltree v. City of Los Angeles (1971) 17 Cal. App. 3d 791, 796-797 n.4, 95 Cal. Rptr. 76]* .

A permittee who fails to challenge the limitations imposed on him or her by the permit, waives any right to object [*County of Imperial v. McDougal (1977) 19 Cal. 3d 505, 510-511, 138 Cal. Rptr. 472, 564 P.2d 14]* .

[4] Revocation; Vested Rights

Once a use permit has been properly issued, the power of a municipality to revoke it is limited. If the permittee does nothing beyond obtaining the permit, it may be revoked. However, when a CUP has been properly obtained and in reliance on it the permittee has incurred material expense, he or she acquires a vested property right. Once a permittee has a vested right, the CUP may be revoked only if the permittee fails to comply with reasonable terms or conditions of the permit or if there is a compelling public necessity. Such a compelling public necessity may exist when the conduct of a business constitutes a nuisance [*O'Hagen v. Board of Zoning Adjustment (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 151, 158, 96 Cal. Rptr. 484]* .

Because a conditional use permit is a property right that runs with the land rather than a personal right of the permitee, when property that is subject to a CUP is transferred, the new owner accedes to the same rights under the permit as the previous owner, which includes any vested right to continuance of the permit so long as the new owner complies with the permit's original terms and conditions [*Malibu Mountains Rec., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 359, 369-370, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25]* .

[5] Modification

By contrast, the general health, safety, and welfare standard is a sufficient standard for the administrative body to apply in modifying a conditional use permit. Thus, when the application for a permit had represented that the proposed store would operate for specified hours, but the permittees did not abide by that representation, modification of the CUP to require shorter hours was valid because it was based on the public safety, health, and welfare [*Garavatti v. Fairfax Planning Com. (1971) 22 Cal. App. 3d 145, 147, 150-151, 99 Cal. Rptr. 260]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesReal Property LawTortsNuisanceGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
5. Variances and Conditional Use Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.115-579.129

[Reserved]

§§ 579.115[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.130

§ 579.130 Local Power

[1] Regulation of Construction and Removal of Buildings

The legislative body of a city may regulate the building, construction, and removal of buildings within the city [*Gov. Code § 38601(b)*; *see Cal. Const., art. XI, § 7*]. Additionally, the legislative body of a city may do any of the following [*Gov. Code § 38660*]:

- Regulate the construction of and the materials used in all buildings, chimneys, stacks, and other structures and in foundations and foundation walls.

- Regulate the construction, repair, or alteration of buildings pursuant to former *Health & Safety Code § 15153* (*now see Health & Safety Code § 17951*, relating to fees and approval of alternative regulations to those prescribed by the State Building Standards Code).

- Prevent the erection and maintenance of unsafe building walls, chimneys, stacks, or other structures.

- Provide for the summary abatement, destruction, or removal of unsafe structures and of unsightly or partially destroyed buildings.

- Regulate the construction and location of drains and sewers.

- Regulate the materials used in wiring structures for electricity and in piping them for a water, gas, or electric supply, and regulate the manner of that piping.

- Prohibit the construction of structures not in conformance with its regulations.

[2] Permit Requirement

As part of its police power, a city or county may require a permit as a condition precedent to the erection of a structure on privately owned property [*see O'Hagen v. Board of Zoning Adjustment (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 151, 158, 96 Cal. Rptr. 484]* . The granting or denying of building permits is a local affair over which a city or county hassupreme control subject only to the rule that it must exercise sound discretion [*Agnew v. City of Los Angeles (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 820, 827, 12 Cal. Rptr. 507]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.131

§ 579.131 Effect of State Provisions

No building permit may be issued unless the proposed construction is consistent with the local open space plan [*Gov. Code § 65567*; *Elysian Heights Residents Assn., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 21, 28-29, 227 Cal. Rptr. 226]* . However, there is no similar restriction on issuance of building permits in *Gov. Code § 65860*, which requires that zoning ordinances be consistent with the general plan. Thus, if a building permit conforms to existing zoning, opponents of the permit may not challenge the decision to issue it for failure to conform to the general plan, even though the zoning is subject to such a challenge [*Elysian Heights Residents Assn., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 21, 28-31, 227 Cal. Rptr. 226]* .

The issuance of a building permit may not be conditioned on the dedication of land for a purpose not reasonably related to the use of the property for which the permit is requested, or the posting of a bond to guarantee installation of public improvements not reasonably related to the use of the property for which the permit is requested [*Gov. Code § 65909*].

If a local ordinance controlling building permits has not adopted an advisory state zoning provision, that provision will not control the issuance of a building permit [*see Elysian Heights Residents Assn., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1986) 182 Cal. App. 3d 21, 28-31, 227 Cal. Rptr. 226* (building permit not required to be consistent with general plan)]. If the local ordinance has adopted advisory state provisions, compliance with those provisions will be mandatory before the permit will be issued [*see Wesley Investment Co. v. County of Alameda (1984) 151 Cal. App. 3d 672, 677-680, 198 Cal. Rptr. 872* (*Gov. Code § 65920 et seq.* development projects)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.132

§ 579.132 Expiration and Extension of Permits

Many ordinances controlling the granting of building permits provide for an expiration date when a permit will expire if the construction for which the permit was granted has not begun. Typically, the intent is to prevent a person from reserving land for future purposes when that person has no good faith intent to presently commence the proposed use, and extension periods are usually available. The granting or denying of the extension may be subject to the same type of discretion as applied in the initial granting of the permit. An abuse of discretion in failing to grant an extension may occur if the standard applied to determine the good faith of the permittee is unreasonable [*Morgan v. County of San Diego (1971) 19 Cal. App. 3d 636, 641, 97 Cal. Rptr. 180]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicenses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.133

§ 579.133 Effect of Change in Zoning Law

The mere application for a building permit or the submission of plans that comply with the law in existence at the time of that submission do not entitle an applicant to the issuance of the permit, if in the interim between administrative denial of the permit and the appeal from that denial, an ordinance has been enacted that would prohibit the project contemplated [*Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 125, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111]* .

Even after a permit has been issued, it may be revoked by an administrative body on the basis of a subsequent change in the zoning laws unless the permittee has made substantial improvements in good faith reliance on the permit [*Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 125, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.134

§ 579.134 Revocation

A city or county does not have unlimited discretion in revoking permits, and once a permit has been issued, the power to revoke it is limited. If the permittee does nothing beyond obtaining the permit or fails to comply with reasonable terms or conditions expressed in the permit granted, the proper authorities may revoke it. But a permit may not be revoked arbitrarily without cause [*San Marino v. Roman Catholic Archbishop (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 657, 669, 4 Cal. Rptr. 547 , cert. denied, 364 U.S. 909]* .

In determining that a validly issued permit should be revoked, the governing body acts in a quasi-judicial capacity. In revoking a permit lawfully granted, due process requires that it act only on notice to the permittee, on a hearing, and on evidence substantially supporting a finding of revocation. A revocation without notice, hearing, or reception of competent evidence is inoperative and of no legal force [*San Marino v. Roman Catholic Archbishop (1960) 180 Cal. App. 2d 657, 669, 4 Cal. Rptr. 547 , cert. denied, 364 U.S. 909]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.135

§ 579.135 Vested Rights

The doctrine of vested rights, grounded in the constitutional protection of property from deprivation without due process of law, provides that when a permittee in good faith has undertaken substantial construction and incurred substantial liabilities in reliance on a permit, his or her right to the permit and to the use authorized thereby becomes immunized from impairment or revocation by subsequent governmental regulations [*Highland Development Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 169, 186, 215 Cal. Rptr. 881 , overruled in part by Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 743* ; *see U.S. Const., amend. V, XIV § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19*].

The rights that may vest through reliance on a permit are no greater than those specifically granted by the permit itself [*Blue Chip Properties v. Permanent Rent Control Bd. (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 648, 660, 216 Cal. Rptr. 492]* . The reliance must be on the permit under which the person is claiming the vested right. Thus, substantial expenditures incurred in constructing a garage for which a building permit had been obtained could not support a vested rights argument on a driveway access permit [*Highland Development Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 169, 186-187, 215 Cal. Rptr. 881 , overruled in part by Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 743*].

Neither the existence of particular zoning nor work undertaken pursuant to governmental approvals preparatory to construction of buildings can form the basis of a vested right to build a structure that does not comply with the laws applicable at thetime the building permit was issued. Thus, when construction of a 10-story building was divided into two phases, substantial expenditures made in reliance on phase one permits which were expressly limited to construction of the first four stories and basement, did not result in a vested right for completion of the building [*see Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 885, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161 , cert. denied and appeal dismissed 454 U.S. 1074]* .

Although a vested right is immune from divestment through ordinary police power regulations, it may be impaired or revoked if the use authorized or conducted thereunder constitutes a menace to the public health and safety or a public nuisance [*Highland Development Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1985) 170 Cal. App. 3d 169, 186, 215 Cal. Rptr. 881 ,*

overruled in part by Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 743].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional Limits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.136

§ 579.136 Review

Traditional mandate is usually appropriate to compel the issuance of a building permit, because most local ordinances governing their issuance provide that compliance with the code requirements is all that is required and no discretion is afforded the department charged with their issuance [*see Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 883, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161 , cert. denied and appeal dismissed, 454 U.S. 1074]* .

However, administrative mandate is the appropriate remedy by which to consider a claim that the denial of a building permit was based on the applicant's failure to comply with an invalid condition [*Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 128, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.137

§ 579.137 State Building Codes

There are a variety of building provisions that have statewide application. In addition to some isolated and very specific provisions, there are several important building codes. Among them are:

- Hospital Seismic Safety Act of 1983 [*Health & Safety Code § 129675 et seq.*].
- Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986 [*Health & Safety Code § 16000 et seq.*].
- Earthquake protection standards [*Health & Safety Code § 19100 et seq.*].
- Access to public accommodations by physically handicapped persons [*Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq.*].
- California Factory-Built Housing Law [*Health & Safety Code § 19960 et seq.*].

These building codes are enforced in different manners. For example, the Hospital Seismic Safety Act of 1983 and the Essential Services Buildings Seismic Safety Act of 1986 provide generally for the approval of building specifications by the enforcement agency before construction begins [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 129760-129770, 16011, 16016*]. Earthquake standards are enforced by a separate permit process, while access to public accommodations is enforced by the city or county building department [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 19130-19133, 19958*]. Finally, while all factory-built housing must be approved by the Department of Housing and Community Development, enforcement and inspection of the installation of factory-built housing is typically performed by local authorities [*see Health & Safety Code §§ 19969, 19991-19992*].

Another building code with a major impact throughout the state is the State Housing Law, set forth in *Health & Safety Code § 17910 et seq.* Because it has a pervasive influence and is probably the most detailed of the statewide codes, some of its procedural provisions are highlighted in § 579.138.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing Codes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.138

§ 579.138 State Housing Law

[1] Governing Statutes and Application of Law

The State Housing Law is set forth in *Health & Safety Code § 17910 et seq.* The State Building Standards Law is set forth in *Health & Safety Code § 18901 et seq.*, and the California Building Standards Code is set forth in *Health & Safety Code § 18935 et seq.*

The State Housing Law does not apply to any building regulated by *Health & Safety Code § 18000 et seq.* (manufactured housing), or 19960 et seq. (factory-built housing), unless those parts specifically require its application [*Health & Safety Code § 17911*; for discussion and forms relating to zoning regulation specific to mobilehomes, *see* Ch. 369, *Mobilehomes and Mobilehome Parks*].

[2] Statewide Standards

The rules and regulations promulgated under the State Housing Law and building standards published in the California Building Standards Code, relating to the erection or construction of buildings or structures, do not apply to existing buildings or structures or to buildings or structures on which construction is commenced or approved before the effective date of those rules. However, rules, regulations, and building standards relating to use, maintenance, and change of occupancy do apply to existing buildings and structures as well as those approved for construction [*see Health & Safety Code § 17912*].

Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the building standards adopted and submitted by the Department of Housing and Community Development for approval under the California Building Standards Code, and the other rules and regulations, which are contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, are adopted by reference [*see Health & Safety Code § 17922(a)*].

The provisions published in the California Building Standards Code and the regulations promulgated under *Health & Safety Code § 17922* will be applicable to any city or county that does not amend, add, or repeal ordinances or

regulations to impose those requirements or make changes or modifications in those requirements on express findings. The provisions and regulations become effective 180 days after publication of the California Building Standards Code by the California Building Standards Commission [*Health & Safety Code § 17958*]. The 180-day period set forth in the statute merely establishes an effective date for new versions of the code and doesnot bar local entities from making amendments, additions, or deletions more than 180 days after publication [*California Apartment Assn. v. City of Fremont (2002) 97 Cal. App. 4th 693, 700-701, 118 Cal. Rptr. 2d 603]* .

[3] Local Modification of Standards

No local enforcement agency may prohibit the use of materials, appliances, installations, devices, arrangements, or methods of construction specifically permitted by the department to be used in the alteration or repair of existing buildings, but those things or methods may be specifically prohibited by local ordinance as provided by *Health & Safety Code § 17958.5* [*see Health & Safety Code § 17922(f)*].

The building department of any city or county may approve the use of an alternative material, appliance, installation, device, arrangement, or method, or work on a case-by-case basis if it finds that the proposed design is satisfactory and that the proposed alternative is satisfactory and is, for the purpose intended, at least the equivalent of that prescribed by the California Building Standards Code [*see Health & Safety Code § 17951(e)*].

Except as provided in *Health & Safety Code §§ 17958.8* (alteration and repair of existing building) and 17958.9 (moving apartment houses and dwellings), any city or county may make changes in the provisions adopted pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17922* and published in the California Building Standards Code or other regulations thereafter adopted pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17922* to amend, add, or repeal ordinances or regulations that impose the same requirements as are contained in the provisions adopted pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17922* and published in the California Building Standards Code or the other regulations adopted pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17922* or to make changes or modifications in those requirements on express findings pursuant to *Health & Safety Code §§ 17958.5* and *17958.7* [*Health & Safety Code § 17958*].

Except as provided by *Health & Safety Code § 17922.6* (minimum noise insulation regulations), in adopting ordinances or regulations pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17958*, a city or county may make changes or modifications in the requirements contained in the provisions published in the California Building Standards Code and the other regulations adopted pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17922*, including but not limited to green building standards, that it determines, pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17958.7*, are reasonably necessary because of local climatic, geological, or topographical conditions [*see Health & Safety Code § 17958.5*]. The local governing body must make an express finding that the modification or changes are reasonably necessary. The finding, together with the modification or change expressly marked, must be filed with the department. No modification or change is effective until the filing has been made [*see Health & Safety Code § 17958.7(a)*].

The State Housing Law is intended to preempt local regulation. A city ordinance that is stricter than the State Housing Law is invalid unless findings are made about local conditions requiring stricter standards [*Briseno v. City of Santa Ana (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1378, 1381-1383, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 486]* .

Grading standards contained in a county building code, which were adopted pursuant to and in conformity with the State Housing Law, were not purely local law and did not conflict with PUC rules and regulations and thus could be enforced against a public utility with respect to its grading of access roads located on property over which the utility held an easement for maintenance of its electric transmission lines [*Leslie v. Superior Court of Ventura County (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 1042, 1047-1049*].

[4] Challenge to Statewide Application

Except as provided in *Health & Safety Code § 17922.6* (minimum noise insulation regulations), any person, firm, corporation, or governmental agency that opposes the application of any applicable building standard published in the California Building Standards Code or any other rule or regulation adopted by the department within a particular local area may request a hearing before the local appeals board regarding the matter. If the local appeals board determines after the hearing that because of local conditions it is not reasonable for that standard, rule, or regulation to be applied in that area, it will have no application within that local area [*see Health & Safety Code § 17925*].

[5] Fees

The governing body of any county or city, including a charter city, may prescribe fees for permits, certificates, or other forms or documents required or authorized by the State Housing Law or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law [*Health & Safety Code § 17951(a)*]. It may also prescribe fees to defray the enforcement costs [*see Health & Safety Code § 17951(b)*]. If the local enforcement agency fails to inspect permitted work for which fees have been charged within 60 days of receiving a notice of completion, the permittee is entitled to reimbursement of the permit fees. The right to reimbursement must be disclosed on each permit or on a document that accompanies each permit [*Health & Safety Code § 17951(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing CodesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseImpact Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.139

§ 579.139 Individual Appeal of Application of Rule

Except as provided in *Health & Safety Code § 18945* (appeals), the director of the Department of Housing and Community Development or his or her designee will hear appeals brought by any person regarding the application of any rule or regulation promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law to that person when that person is alleging that the application or enforcement of any other rule or regulation by the department under the facts and circumstances is an erroneous or unlawful application or enforcement of the other rule or regulation by the department. Any appeal will be submitted through the designated local agency [*Health & Safety Code § 17930*].

Any appeal alleging erroneous or unlawful application by the department of a building standard published in the California Building Standards Code may be brought pursuant to *Health & Safety Code §§ 18945-18949* (appeal to State Building Standards Commission) [*Health & Safety Code § 17930*].

A decision of the director or his or her designee made pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17930* is final, except for that action as may be taken by a court or required by law [*Health & Safety Code § 17932*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsEmployees & OfficialsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing Codes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.140

§ 579.140 Enforcement

[1] Local Departments

A city or county may designate and charge a department organized to carry out the purposes of the State Housing Law with the enforcement of the provisions published in the California Building Standards Code, the provisions of the State Housing Law, and other rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare as set forth in *Health & Safety Code § 17921* [*see Health & Safety Code § 17964*; *see also Health & Safety Code § 17962* (enforcement of regulations relating to fire and panic safety reside in fire chief)].

The provisions published in the California Building Standards Code, the provisions of the State Housing Law, and other rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law pertaining to the erection, construction, reconstruction, movement, enlargement, conversion, alteration, repair, removal, demolition, or arrangement of apartment houses, hotels, or dwellings are enforced by the building department of the city or county [*Health & Safety Code § 17960*]. Those provisions pertaining to maintenance, sanitation, ventilation, use, or occupancy of apartment houses, hotels, or dwellings are enforced by the city's or county's housing or health department or an authorized environmental agency [*see Health & Safety Code § 17961*]. Those provisions pertaining to fire prevention, fire protection, and fire safety generally are enforced by the chief of the local fire department or fire protection services district [*see Health & Safety Code § 17962*].

When there is no local enforcement agency charged with enforcement, the Department of Housing and Community Development will enforce all applicable provisions pertaining to apartment houses, hotels, or dwellings [*see Health & Safety Code § 17965*].

[2] Inspections

Any officer, employee, or agent of an enforcement agency may enter and inspect any building or premises whenever necessary to secure compliance with, or prevent a violation of, any provision published in the California Building

Standards Code, the provisions of the State Housing Law, and other rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law that the enforcement agency has the power to enforce [*Health & Safety Code § 17970*]. The consent of the owner or occupants is necessary to enter a dwelling between 6 p.m. and 8 a.m., and if they are absent from the dwelling, a court order is necessary [*see Health & Safety Code § 17972*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing Codes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.141

§ 579.141 Violations

[1] Preliminary Notice to Correct

If any building is constructed, altered, converted, or maintained in violation of any provision of, or in violation of any order or notice giving a reasonable time to correct that violation issued by an enforcement agency pursuant to the building standards published in the California Building Standards Code, the provisions of the State Housing Law, and other rules and regulations promulgated pursuant to the State Housing Law, or if a nuisance exists in any building or on the lot on which it is situated, the enforcement agency will, after 30 days' notice to abate the nuisance, or violation, or to notice to abate with a shorter period of time if deemed necessary by the enforcement agency to prevent or remedy an immediate threat to the health and safety of the public or occupants of the structure, institute any appropriate action or proceeding to prevent, restrain, correct, or abate the violation or nuisance [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(a)*].

If any building is maintained in a manner that violates any provisions of the State Housing Law, applicable building standards published in the State Building Standards Code, any other rule or regulation adopted pursuant to the State Housing Law, or any provision in a local ordinance that is similar to a provision in the State Housing Law, and the violations are so extensive and of such a nature that the health and safety of residents or the public is substantially endangered, the enforcement agency may issue an order or notice to repair or abate [*Health & Safety Code § 17980.6*]. An order or notice pursuant to Section 17980.6 must be provided either by both posting a copy of the order or notice in a conspicuous place on the property and by first-class mail to each affected residential unit, or by posting a copy of the order or notice in a conspicuous place on the property and in a prominent place on each affected residential unit. The order or notice must include the name, address, and telephone number of the agency that issued the notice or order; the date, time, and location of any public hearing or proceeding concerning the order or notice; and information that the lessor cannot retaliate against a lessee pursuant to *Civ. Code § 1942.5* [*Health & Safety Code § 17980.6*].

A notice to repair is not required by *Health and Safety Code § 17980.6* to inform the property owner that receivership is a potential consequence of failure to correct or abate the identified violations, nor does the statute call for the disclosure of intent to seek a receivership at some point in the future [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905,*

922, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027]. Furthermore, in *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez* the notice to repair was not rendered invalid by its failure to identify its statutory basis. However, the California Supreme Court encouraged enforcement agencies to do so in their notices to repair [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 922, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*]. Finally, Section 17980.6 does not mandate the specific caption "Order or Notice to Repair or Abate." Thus, a notice to repair captioned "Notice and Order to Comply" was not invalid [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 922, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*].

[2] Notice to Tenants

Tenants in a building must be provided with copies of any of the following [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(c)(1)*]:

- The notice of any violation that affects the health and safety of the occupants and that causes the building to be substandard pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17920.3* or in violation of *Health & Safety Code § 17920.10*.

- An order of the code enforcement agency issued after inspection of thepremises declaring the dwelling to be in violation of any provision described in *Health & Safety Code § 17980(a)* [*see § 579.141[1]*].

- The enforcement agency's decision to repair or demolish.

- The issuance of a building or demolition permit following the abatement order of an enforcement agency.

Each document provided must be provided to each affected residential unit by the enforcement agency that issued the order or notice [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(c)(2)*; *see Health & Safety Code § 17980.6(a)* (prescribed manner for providing documents)].

By requiring that any order or notice be posted "in a conspicuous place on the property," *Health and Safety Code § 17980.6* (notice to repair or abate; *see* [1], *above*) provides for notice reasonably calculated to apprise the owner and others that the property has been found by the applicable enforcement agency to be in violation of specified building standards and that repair or abatement of the violations is demanded. Because it would be unreasonable and a violation of due process to hold an owner accountable for building code violations and repair demands without providing adequate notice of such matters, the conspicuous-posting requirement is an essential component of Section 17980.6 intended primarily for the protection of the owner. However, in *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez*, in which the property owner challenged the appointment of a receiver, the California Supreme Court held that the city substantially complied with this requirement by personally serving the property owner with the notice to repair [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 925, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*]. Furthermore, because the provisions requiring notice to each affected unit are intended for the informational benefit of tenants, the property owner was in no position to rely on them as a basis for invalidating subsequently issued receivership orders [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 926, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*].

[3] Commencement of Abatement Proceedings

Whenever the enforcement agency has through inspection determined that the building is a substandard building, it will commence proceedings to abate the violation by repair, rehabilitation, vacation, or demolition of the building. It will not require the vacating of a residential building unless it concurrently requires expeditious demolition or repair [*see Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)*].

[4] Summons and Service

Service of summons in the manner provided in the Code of Civil Procedure is sufficient for any action or proceeding brought pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.* [*Health & Safety Code § 17988*; *see* Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*]. The time to file a written pleading in response to a summons in an action brought pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.* is 10 days [*Health & Safety Code § 17990*]. For a copy of Judicial Council Form SUM-145 (Summons--Enforcement of State Housing Law), see *§ 579.374*.

Except under conditions immediately affecting health or safety, every notice or order issued pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.* must be served five days before the time for doing or refraining from doing the thing to which it pertains [*Health & Safety Code § 17989*].

[5] Repair or Demolition of Building

The owner has the choice of repairing or demolishing. However, if the owner chooses to repair, the enforcement agency will require that the building be brought into compliance according to a reasonable and feasible schedule for expeditious repair [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)(1)*].

The enforcement agency may require vacation and demolition or may itself vacate the building, repair, demolish, or institute any other appropriate action or proceeding, if any of the following occur [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)(1)(A)-(C)*]:

- The repair work is not done within the period required by the notice [*see § 579.141[2]*].
- The owner does not make a timely choice of repair or demolition.
- The owner selects an option that cannot be completed within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the enforcement agency, for any reason, including an outstanding judicial or administrative order.

In its decision, the enforcement agency will give preference to the repair when it is economically feasible to do so, without having to repair more than 75 percent of the dwelling, as determined by the enforcement agency, and will give full consideration to the needs for housing as expressed in the housing element of the local jurisdiction [*Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)(2)*].

A notice and order to demolish within 120 days that does not provide the owner with the opportunity to select repair over demolition violates *Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)* and the owner's due process rights when immediate demolition is not required for health or safety reasons. Further, if a notice to repair or demolish has been given to a prior owner, due process requires succeeding owners be put on notice that the city has offered an option to repair or demolish, and on notice as to the time within which the option must be exercised [*Hawthorne Savings & Loan Assn. v. City of Signal Hill (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 148, 159-163, 23 Cal. Rptr. 2d 272]* .

Health & Safety Code § 17980.7 empowers a receiver of substandard property to sell the property or to take any other action respecting the property as the court may authorize [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 930, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*]. In *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez*, the California Supreme Court upheld the trial court's approval of the receiver's application to demolish the substandard building, despite the owner's desire to have the building repaired. The Supreme Court held that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in authorizing the receiver to contract for demolition on finding that the property was uninhabitable and that rehabilitation was "not economically feasible" [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 933, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*]. The evidence presented to the trial court amply demonstrated that the nature of the known code violations were extensive and supported its determination that the property was uninhabitable and that rehabilitation was not

economically feasible. In addition, therewas nothing to suggest the trial court approved a fraudulent, unfair, or oppressive course of action [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 933, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*].

The statutory right under *Health & Safety Code § 17980(b)(1)* to choose whether to repair or to demolish a building that is substandard or a nuisance did not aid the property owner in *City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez* because it is part of a different, albeit related, statutory scheme that authorizes enforcement agencies to take actions concerning substandard buildings without involving a receiver. Nevertheless, the owner's wish to repair the property and to continue living there with his family was a legitimate factor for the trial court to consider. However, that factor did not mandate judicial disapproval of the demolition alternative, especially in view of the economic information presented [*City of Santa Monica v. Gonzalez (2008) 43 Cal. 4th 905, 934, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 483, 182 P.3d 1027*].

[6] Relief Pending Order

An enforcement agency that institutes any action or proceeding pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.* may, by verified complaint setting forth the facts, apply to the superior court for an order granting the relief for which the action or proceeding is brought until the entry of a final judgment or order [*Health & Safety Code § 17981*]. If any notice or order issued by an enforcement agency is not complied with within a reasonable time as specified in that notice or order, the enforcement agency may apply to the superior court for an order authorizing it to remove any violation or abate any nuisance specified [*see Health & Safety Code § 17982*].

[7] Notice of Action

Any enforcement agency that institutes an action or proceeding pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.* must record a notice of the pendency of the action or proceeding in the county recorder's office of the county where the property affected by the action or proceeding is situated. The notice will be recorded at the time of the commencement of the action or proceeding and has the same effect as the notice of pendency of action provided for in the Code of Civil Procedure [*see Health & Safety Code § 17985(a)*].

The enforcement agency will record a notice of final disposition of any action or proceeding in the county recorder's office where the property affected by the action or proceeding was recorded immediately following final resolution [*Health & Safety Code § 17985(b)*].

Any notice of pendency of action or proceeding may be vacated on the order of a judge of the court where the action or proceeding is pending. A certified copy of the order of vacation may be recorded in the office of the recorder [*see Health & Safety Code § 17987*].

[8] Penalties

Any person who violates any provision of the State Housing Law, the building standards published in the California Building Standards Code, or any other rule or regulation promulgated under the State Housing Law is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000, byimprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both [*Health & Safety Code § 17995*]. A subsequent conviction within a five-year period for violations at the same property is punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both [*Health & Safety Code § 17995.1*].

Any person found in contempt of a court order or injunction pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17910 et seq.* for a subsequent time within a five year period for violation at the same property is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000, by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or by both [*Health & Safety Code § 17995.2*].

If the subsequent conviction is for a violation that endangers the immediate health and safety of residents or the public, is the result of the defendant's habitual neglect of customary maintenance, and displays a flagrant lack of concern for health and safety, it is punishable by a fine not exceeding $5,000 and by imprisonment of not less than six months but not exceeding one year. To impose this penalty the trier of fact must find at least four serious violations of statutorily listed health conditions [*see Health & Safety Code § 17995.3*]. A similar punishment is available under those conditions when the person has been found in contempt of a court order or injunction for a subsequent violation [*see Health & Safety Code § 17995.4*].

[9] Restrictions on Abatement Proceedings

No local ordinance may permit any action or proceedings to abate violations of regulations governing maintenance of existing buildings, unless the building is a substandard building or the violation is a misdemeanor [*Health & Safety Code § 17922(g)*].

The housing appeals board may, in cases of extreme hardship to the owner-occupants or tenants of dwellings, provide for deferral of the effective date of orders of abatement. Any such deferral terminates on any sale or transfer of the dwelling by the owner-occupant, but not if the dwelling is occupied by a tenant other than the owner-occupant [*Health & Safety Code § 17959.4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing Codes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.142

§ 579.142 Transfer of Ownership of Property in Violation

The sale or other transfer of property to a third party will not render moot an administrative or judicial action or proceeding pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17980 et seq.*, including an action under *Health & Safety Code § 17982*, instituted by an enforcement agency, or a receiver on behalf of an enforcement agency, against the owner of record on the date that a citation for, or other notice of, a violation was issued [*Health & Safety Code § 17991(a)*].

If property is sold or otherwise transferred to a third party during the period between the issuance of the notice of violation and the abatement of the violation, or any related administrative or judicial actions, within five days after the sale or transfer occurs, the transferor must record a Notice of Conveyance of Substandard Property with the county recorder where the property is located. The notice must identify the name and address of the buyer or transferee, and it must be executed with a signature that the information is true and correct, under penalty of perjury [*Health & Safety Code § 17991(b)*]. The transferor must also provide the following information to the enforcement agency within the same five-day period [*Health & Safety Code § 17991(c)*]:

- If the seller or transferor is not an individual, the name, address, and driver's license number or identification card number of each individual who has an interest in excess of 5 percent in the entity which is selling or transferring the property.

- If the buyer or transferee is an individual person, that person's name, address, and driver's license number or identification number.

- If the buyer or transferee is not an individual person, the name, address, and driver's license or ID card number of each individual who has an interest in excess of 5 percent in the entity that is the buyer or transferee.

Any person who obtains an ownership interest in any property after a notice of pendency of an action or proceeding was recorded with regard to the property pursuant to *Health & Safety Code § 17985*, or any other notice of a violation was

recorded with the county recorder of the county in which the property is located, and when the notice has neither been withdrawn nor expunged, will be subject to any order to correct a violation, including time limitations specified in a citation issued pursuant to *Health & Safety Code §§ 17980* and *17981*, or any other properly recorded notice of a violation [*Health & Safety Code § 17992*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing Codes

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
6. Building Permits

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.143-579.159

[Reserved]

§§ 579.143[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
7. Nonconforming Uses

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.160

§ 579.160 Nonconforming Uses

[1] Lawful Existing Use

A nonconforming use is a lawful use existing on the effective date of the zoning restriction and continuing since that time in nonconformance to the ordinance. Nonuse is not a nonconforming use, and reuse may be prohibited when a nonconforming use has been voluntarily abandoned [*Hill v. City of Manhattan Beach (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 279, 285-286, 98 Cal. Rptr. 785, 491 P.2d 369]* .

Typically, zoning ordinances include a provision permitting the continuance of a nonconforming use because of the hardship and doubtful constitutionality of compelling the immediate discontinuance of nonconforminguses [*County of San Diego v. McClurken (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 683, 686, 234 P.2d 972]* . The exemption may either exempt an existing use altogether or allow a limited period of continued operation adequate for amortization of the owners' investment in the particular use [*see, e.g.,* *National Advertising Co. v. County of Monterey (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 875, 83 Cal. Rptr. 577, 464 P.2d 33* ; *Livingston Rock etc. Co. v. County of L.A. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 121, 272 P.2d 4]* .

Generally, an ordinance may not operate to immediately suppress or remove from a particular district an otherwise lawful business or use already established [*City of Los Angeles v. Gage (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 442, 453-454, 274 P.2d 34]* . However, because each zoning district is an appropriate area for the uses permitted by the zone plan in that area, and the existence of other uses tends to impair the development and stability of the area for the appropriate uses, pre-existing nonconforming uses are not perpetual. Thus, provisions that deny the right to add to buildings devoted to an existing nonconforming use, to resume a nonconforming use after a period of nonuse, to extend or enlarge an existing nonconforming use, and to substitute new buildings for those devoted to an existing nonconforming use are valid. In addition, an ordinance that requires termination of present nonconforming uses within a reasonable time may be permissible [*City of Los Angeles v. Gage (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 442, 453-454, 459-460, 274 P.2d 34* (elimination of existing uses over reasonable period held not to constitute taking of property or to necessarily restrict its use so that it cannot be used for any reasonable purpose)]. An ordinance may otherwise authorize revocation of the allowance of a nonconforming use when it can be done without impairment of constitutional rights. Thus, an ordinance allowing

revocation after a noticed public hearing, when it is found that the nonconforming use is a public nuisance or is exercised in a manner that was detrimental to the public health or safety is valid [*Livingston Rock etc. Co. v. County of L.A. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 121, 128, 272 P.2d 4* ; for discussion and forms relating to public nuisance, *see* Ch. 391, *Nuisance*].

[2] Actual Use

It is the activity of the owner in the use of his or her property at the time it becomes subject to a zoning ordinance, not his or her plans regarding the future use of the property, that determines the scope of the nonconforming use excepted from the restrictions imposed by the ordinance. The property owner acquires a vested right to continue a use actually instituted, not to capitalize on anticipated profit [anderson v. *City Council (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 79, 88-89, 40 Cal. Rptr. 41]* . An application by the owner for a building permit does not establish a vested right by actual use until the permit has been issued and the owner has expended considerable funds in reliance on it [*see Spindler Realty Corp. v. Monning (1966) 243 Cal. App. 2d 255, 269, 53 Cal. Rptr. 7* , *cert. denied, 385 U.S. 975 (1967)]* .

[3] Change or Expansion Prohibited

The continuance of a nonconforming use is a continuance of the same use and not some other kind of use [*County of San Diego v. McClurken (1951) 37 Cal. 2d 683, 688, 234 P.2d 972]* . The use need not be identical, but must be substantially the same or similar. In determining whether a nonconforming use is the same before as after the application of a zoning ordinance, each case must stand on its own facts. Changes or additions to an existing nonconforming use are not protected when they make the use more noisome, enlarge it, or make it more permanent [*City of Los Altos v. Silvey (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 606, 609-611, 24 Cal. Rptr. 200* ; *see Sabek, Inc. v. County of Sonoma (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 163, 166-168, 235 Cal. Rptr. 350]* . Under some circumstances, such as those where the nonconforming use involves mining or quarrying operations, the "diminishing asset" doctrine will be applied as an exception to the general rule prohibiting expansion of the existing use [*see Hansen Bros. Enterprises v. Board of Supervisors (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 533, 553-559, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 907 P.2d 1324]* . For further discussion, see *§ 579.160[4]*.

Essential maintenance repairs may be made to nonconforming uses, but those repairs cannot be relied on to defeat zoning legislation dictating the eventual liquidation of those nonconforming uses [*National Advertising Co. v. County of Monterey (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 875, 880, 83 Cal. Rptr. 577, 464 P.2d 33* , *cert. denied, 398 U.S. 946* , *disapproved on another point in Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848* , *that was overruled on other grounds in Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1981) 453 U.S. 490, 521, 101 S. Ct. 2882, 69 L. Ed. 2d 800 (1981)*]. An example of an essential repair would be the temporary removal of corrals to grade for proper drainage when the maintenance of a dairy herd was the valid nonconforming use [*City of Fontana v. Atkinson (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 499, 503-507, 28 Cal. Rptr. 25]* .

[4] Vested Rights to Extractive Uses: Diminishing Asset Doctrine

Unlike other nonconforming uses of property that operate within an existing structure or boundary, extractive uses, such as mining and quarrying, anticipate extension of mining into areas of the property that were not being exploited at the time a zoning change caused the use to be nonconforming. The question thus arises whether this extension is a prohibited expansion of a nonconforming use into another area of the property. In California the answer is a qualified "no" under the "diminishing asset" doctrine--an exception to the general rule banning expansion of a nonconforming use that is specific to extractive enterprises [*Hansen Bros. Enterprises v. Board of Supervisors (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 533, 553, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 907 P.2d 1324]* .

The very nature of an extraction business such as mining or quarrying is the continuing use of the land, and this use is what is endorsed by theconcept of a nonconforming use. The diminishing asset doctrine holds that an owner of a

nonconforming use may sometimes be found to have a vested right to use an entire tract even though only a portion of the tract was used when the restrictive zoning ordinance was enacted. The determining factor is whether the nature of the initial nonconforming use, in light of the character and adaptability to that use of the entire parcel, manifestly implies that the entire property was appropriated to that use before the restrictive ordinance was adopted. The landowner's mere subjective intention or hope to extend the use over the entire tract is insufficient. Successful application of the diminishing asset doctrine requires objective evidence that the owner intended to expand operations, and that this intent existed at the time of the zoning change [*Hansen Bros. Enterprises v. Board of Supervisors (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 533, 553-559, 48 Cal. Rptr. 2d 778, 907 P.2d 1324* ; *see McCaslin v. City of Monterey Park (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 339, 329 P.2d 522]* .

[5] Termination by Amortization

A city seeking to eliminate nonconforming uses may pursue two constitutionally equivalent alternatives: (1) it can eliminate the use immediately by payment of just compensation or (2) it can require removal of the use without compensation following a reasonable amortization period [*Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848, 881, 164 Cal. Rptr. 510, 610 P.2d 407 , overruled on other grounds, 453 U.S. 490, 521, 101 S. Ct. 2882, 69 L. Ed. 2d 800 (1981)]* .

Zoning legislation may validly provide for the eventual termination of nonconforming uses without compensation if it provides a reasonable amortization period commensurate with the investment involved. The determination of the length of a reasonable period of amortization is not merely a matter of accounting. It involves a process of weighing the public gain to be derived from a speedy removal of the nonconforming use against the private loss which the removal of the use would entail. The reasonableness of an amortization period as applied to each structure depends in part on facts peculiar to that structure. Such facts include the cost of the structure, its depreciated value, remaining useful life, the length and remaining term of the lease under which it is maintained, and the harm to the public if it remains standing beyond the prescribed amortization period. If the amortization period prescribed by the ordinance is a reasonable one, the fact that the city arrived at that period by a formula which did not include every one of the relevant considerations does not render the ordinance unconstitutional [*Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848, 882-884, 164 Cal. Rptr. 510, 610 P.2d 407 , overruled on other grounds, 453 U.S. 490, 521, 101 S. Ct. 2882, 69 L. Ed. 2d 800 (1981)]* .

Use of a reasonable amortization scheme allows the owner of the nonconforming use, by being afforded an opportunity to make new plans, to at least partially offset any losses suffered. Any loss suffered is spread out over a period of years and that owner enjoys a monopolistic position by virtue of the zoning ordinance [*City of Los Angeles v. Gage (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 442, 460, 274 P.2d 34]* . The landowner has the burden of proving the invalidity of the amortization period as applied to each of his or her structures [*Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego (1980) 26 Cal. 3d 848, 884, 164 Cal. Rptr. 510, 610 P.2d 407 , overruled on other grounds, 453 U.S. 490, 521, 101 S. Ct. 2882, 69 L. Ed. 2d 800 (1981)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming UsesReal Property LawMiningGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming Uses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
7. Nonconforming Uses

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.161-579.179

[Reserved]

§§ 579.161[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.180

§ 579.180 California Coastal Act

The California Coastal Act of 1976 (Coastal Act) is set forth in *Pub. Res. Code § 30000 et seq.* Among the purposes of the Coastal Act is to protect and maintain the quality of the coastal zone, to maximize public access to the coastal zone, and to assure balanced utilization of coastal zone resources [*Pub. Res. Code § 30001.5*].

For additional detailed coverage of the Coastal Act, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 66, *Coastal Zone Regulation* (Matthew Bender).

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.181

§ 579.181 Land Within Coastal Zone

"Coastal zone" means that land and water area of California from the Oregon border to the border of Mexico, extending seaward to the state's outer limit of jurisdiction, including all offshore islands, and extending inland generally 1,000 yards from the mean high tide line of the sea. In significant coastal estuarine, habitat, and recreational areas it extends inland to the first major ridgeline paralleling the sea or five miles from the mean high tide line of the sea, whichever is less. In developed urban areas, the zone generally extends inland less than 1,000 yards. The coastal zone does not include the area of jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, nor any area contiguous thereto, including any river, stream, tributary, creek, or flood control or drainage channel flowing into that area [*Pub. Res. Code § 30103(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 66600 et seq.* (jurisdiction of San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission)].

The coastal zone boundary has been revised for various cities and counties [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30150-30176*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.182

§ 579.182 Implementation of Coastal Act

[1] California Coastal Commission

The California Coastal Commission was created by the California Coastal Act of 1976 [*Pub. Res. Code § 30300*]. The commission, unless specifically provided otherwise, has the primary responsibility for implementing the Coastal Act. It is the state coastal zone planning and management agency, and may exercise any and all powers set forth in any federal act that relate to the planning or management of the coastal zone [*Pub. Res. Code § 30330*; *see, e.g.,* Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (*16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1464*)]. Additional powers and duties of the commission are set forth in *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30331-30344*.

The commission reviews the proposed local coastal program of local governments within the coastal zone, and will either certify or refuse to certify that plan [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30512-30513*]. It performs a similar review and certification process with amendments to the local coastal program [*Pub. Res. Code § 30514*]. The commission also hears appeals from local government action on development permits [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30602*, 36303].

Although several provisions within the Coastal Act specifically refer to regional commissions, those commissions have been eliminated. Except as otherwise provided in the Coastal Act, the state Coastal Commission has succeeded to all the obligations, powers, and duties of the regional coastal commissions that existed before Coastal Commission termination on July 1, 1981 [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30305, 30331*].

In the absence of a specific authorization, no state agency may exercise any powers or carry out any duties or responsibilities established by the Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30400*]. The Coastal Act provides that all state agencies must carry out their duties and responsibilities in conformity with the Coastal Act, and delineates the interrelationships between the commission and state agencies with possibly conflicting authority [*Pub. Res. Code §§ 30402, 30401, 30403-30420*].

In *Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Commission* [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com.*

(2002) 128 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869 , review granted, 132 Cal. Rptr. 2d 527)], the Third District Court of Appeal held that the appointment structure of the California Coastal Act, which gives the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly the power not only to appoint a majority of the Coastal Commission's voting members but also to remove them at will, contravened the separation of powers clause of the California Constitution. The court reasoned that by retaining the unilateral power to remove at will the majority of the voting members of the Commission, the legislative branch impermissibly controlled the Commission's executive function of implementing the Coastal Act. Accordingly, the court held that the trial court properly enjoined the Commission from granting, denying, or conditioning permits and from issuing and hearing cease and desist orders.

In response to *Marine Forests Society*, in February 2003 the Legislature amended *Pub. Res. Code § 30312* to provide that the Senate Committee on Rules and Assembly Speaker may appoint members to the Coastal Commission for fixed four-year terms (expanded from the prior two-year term) while the Governor keeps the authority to appoint members for two-year terms. Only the gubernatorial appointees serve at the pleasure of the Governor. Each legislative appointer must appoint two members to serve two-year terms and two members to serve four-year terms to set in motion a staggered cycling of fixed terms [2003 Stats., ch. 1, ABX2 1].

The California Supreme Court granted review in *Marine Forests* and reversed the court of appeal [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1, 57-58, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 30]* . The Court concluded that as amended, the statutory provisions governing the composition of the Coastal Commission do not violate the separation of powers clause of the California Constitution. The Supreme Court found that the history of the State Constitution, as well as case law, made it clear that the California Constitution, unlike the United States Constitution, does not categorically preclude the Legislature from enacting a statutory provision authorizing the Legislature itself to appoint a member or members of an executive commission or board [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1, 43, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 30]* . Rather, the Court concluded that the California separation of powers clause precludes the adoption of a statutory scheme authorizing the legislative appointment of an executive officer or officers whenever the statutory provisions as a whole, viewed from a realistic and practical perspective, operate to defeat or materially impair the executive branch's exercise of its constitutional functions. The Court found that the amended versions of *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30301* and *30312* do not violate that standard [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1, 45, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 30]* .

The parties also requested, in light of the court of appeal's conclusion that the prior statutory scheme was unconstitutional, that the Supreme Court clarify the status of the numerous actions that were taken by the Coastal Commission during the period in which the prior statutes were in effect. The Court stated that even if it assumed that the prior version of the statutes violated the separation of powers clause, the past actions of the Commission could not properly be set aside on that ground. The Court stated that the applicable statute of limitations would bar a present challenge to most of the Commission's prior actions [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1, 54, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 30]* . The Court further stated that even with regard to those cases in which a timely separation of powers challenge to the Commission's composition had been raised and remained pending, under the "de facto officer"doctrine, prior actions of the Commission could not be set aside on the ground that the appointment of the commissioners who participated in the decision might be vulnerable to constitutional challenge [*Marine Forests Society v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 36 Cal. 4th 1, 54-55, 30 Cal. Rptr. 3d 30* , citing *In re Redevelopment Plan for Bunker Hill (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 21, 37 Cal. Rptr. 74, 389 P.2d 538* (given existence of de jure office, "persons claiming to be public officers while in possession of an office, ostensibly exercising their function lawfully and with the acquiescence of the public, ... The lawful acts of an officer de facto, so far as the rights of third persons are concerned, are, if done within the scope and by the apparent authority of office, as valid and binding as if he were the officer legally elected and qualified for the office and in full possession of it")].

[2] Role of Local Government

Each local government lying, in whole or in part, within the coastal zone must prepare a local coastal program for that

portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction. Amendments to a local general plan for the purpose of developing a local coastal program will not constitute an amendment of a general plan [*Pub. Res. Code § 30500*; *see Gov. Code § 65358* (amendment of general plan); *see also* discussion of general plans in § 579.50[3]]. Procedures governing the establishment of a local coastal program, including certification of the local plan by the state commission, are set forth in *Pub. Res. Code § 30500.1 et seq.*

The authority to issue coastal development permits is delegated to the respective local government after its land use has been certified [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5*]. Any development within the coastal zone requires a coastal development permit, which can be obtained from the local government in whose jurisdiction the land to be developed is located [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.183

§ 579.183 Policies Governing Coastal Development

The Coastal Act sets forth detailed standards of public access in compliance with *Cal. Const., art. X, § 4*, and provides for maximum access, conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse [*Pub. Res. Code § 30210*; *see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30211-30214* (other public access provisions); *see also Pub. Res. Code §§ 30530-30534, 30610.3* (coastal access program)]. The Coastal Act also establishes policies regarding recreation, marine environment, land resources, development, and industrial development [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30220-30224, 30230-30237, 30240-30244, 30250-30255*, and *30260-30265.5*, respectively].

The policies articulated in *Pub. Res. Code § 30200 et seq.* are the standards by which the adequacy of local programs and the permissibility of proposed developments subject to the Coastal Act are determined. In the case of a conflict between policies, *Pub. Res. Code § 30007.5* (resolution of conflicts) will be used to resolve that conflict [*Pub. Res. Code § 30200*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.184

§ 579.184 Development Controls

[1] Development Defined

"Development" means, on land, in or under water, the placement or erection of any solid material or structure; discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid, or thermal waste; grading, removing, dredging, mining, or extraction of any materials; change in the density or intensity of use of land, including, but not limited to, subdivision pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (*Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*), and any other division of land, including lot splits, except when the land division is brought about in connection with the purchase of that land by a public agency for public recreational use; change in the intensity of use of water, or of access thereto; construction, reconstruction, demolition, or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public, or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes, kelp harvesting, and timber operations that are in accordance with a timber harvesting plan submitted pursuant to the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973 (*Pub. Res. Code § 4511 et seq.*) [*Pub. Res. Code § 30106*]. Because, like a subdivision of land or a lot split, a lot line adjustment is a division of land and can result in changes in the density or intensity of the use of property, a lot line adjustment is a "development" and therefore subject to the permit requirements of the Coastal Act [*La Fe, Inc. v. Los Angeles County (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 231, 240, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217]* .

[2] Necessity of Permit

In addition to obtaining any other permit required by law from any local government or from any state, regional, or local agency, any person wishing to perform or undertake development in the coastal zone, other than a facility subject to *Pub. Res. Code § 25500* (certified power facility) and specified emergency work on public service facilities and state highways, must obtain a coastal development permit [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600(a), (e)*]. A coastal development permit will not be required for any development on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, or for any development by a public agency for which a local government permit is not otherwise required [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600(b)(2)*].

[3] Permit Procedures

Before certification of its local coastal program, a local government may establish procedures governing the issuance of a coastal developmentpermit. If the local government does not opt to establish those procedures, a coastal development permit may be obtained from the commission or from the local government as provided in *Pub. Res. Code § 30519* (delegation of development review authority) or § 30600.5 [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600(b)-(d)*].

The state commission must adopt minimum standards for public notice, hearing, and appeal procedures to govern local government review of permit applications [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5(e)*; *see 14 Cal. Code Reg. § 13050 et seq.*]. Before the delegation of authority to issue coastal development permits, a local government, after appropriate notice and hearing, will adopt an ordinance prescribing the procedures to be used in issuing those permits. Each ordinance must incorporate at least the minimum standards for public notice, hearings, and appeals and must contain provisions that prohibit the issuance of a permit for any development that may conflict with the ordinances that are being prepared to implement the certified land use plan [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5(f)*]. After delegation of authority to issue coastal development permits, a permit will be issued by the respective local government or the commission on appeal, if that government or commission on appeal finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the certified land use plan [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5(c)*].

Any action taken by a local government on a coastal development permit application may be appealed to the commission pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 30602*. The commission will hear an appeal, unless it determines that the action taken by the local government raises no substantial issue regarding conformity with the certified land use plan. Failure by any local government to act within any specified time limit constitutes an action taken [*Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.185

§ 579.185 Permit Required From State Commission

Prior to certification of the local coastal program and, when applicable, in addition to a permit from local government pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 30600(b)* or *(d)*, a coastal development permit must be obtained from the commission for any of the following [*Pub. Res. Code § 30601*]:

- Developments between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line of the sea when there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance.

- Developments not included within first item, *above*, located on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, stream, or within 300 feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff.

- Any development that constitutes a major public works project or a major energy facility.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.186

§ 579.186 Standing of Applicant

When the applicant for a coastal development permit is not the owner of a fee interest in the property on which a proposed development is to be located, but can demonstrate a legal right, interest, or other entitlement to use the property for the proposed development, the holder or owner of any superior interest in the property will not be required to join the applicant as coapplicant. However, all holders or owners of any other interests of record in the affected property must be notified in writing of the application and invited to join as coapplicant. In addition, prior to the issuance of a coastal development permit, the applicant must demonstrate the authority to comply with all conditions of approval [*Pub. Res. Code § 30601.5*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingPersonal StakeEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.187

§ 579.187 Issuance of Permit

Prior to certification of the local coastal program, a coastal development permit will be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with *Pub. Res. Code § 30200 et seq.* and that it will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a conforming local coastal program. A denial of the permit on the ground that it would prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a conforming local coastal program must be accompanied by a specific finding that sets forth the basis for that conclusion [*Pub. Res. Code § 30604(a)*].

After certification of the local coastal program, a coastal development permit will be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the certified local coastal program [*Pub. Res. Code § 30604(b)*].

Any permit that is issued or any development or action approved on appeal is subject to reasonable terms and conditions to ensure that the development or action will be in accordance with the terms of the Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30607*]. Any condition attached to a permit must substantially advance the governmental interest it furthers. Thus, a coastal development permit to build a home conditioned on the landowner conveying an easement allowing the public to pass along a beach, imposed to further the governmental interest of preserving the public's access to and view of the ocean, has been held invalid [*Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n (1987) 483 U.S. 825, 834-837, 107 S. Ct. 3141, 97 L. Ed. 2d 677* (suggesting that requiring an easement from the street to the beach or for a view point might have been so related to the stated governmental interest as to be a valid condition)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.188

§ 579.188 Permit Not Necessary

[1] Generally

No development or any portion thereof that is outside the coastal zone is subject to the coastal development permit requirements of the Coastal Act. Moreover, nothing in the Coastal Act authorizes the denial of a permit on the ground that the proposed development within the coastal zone will have an adverse environmental effect outside the coastal zone [*Pub. Res. Code § 30604(d)*; *see Sierra Club v. California Coastal Com. (2005) 35 Cal. 4th 839, 848-849, 28 Cal. Rptr. 3d 316* (in making permit decision regarding development inside coastal zone, commission may consider impacts in coastal zone of portions of project outside coastal zone and may properly act to prevent those impacts to extent they are related to development inside coastal zone; however, commission may not deny permit request solely on basis of impacts within coastal zone that will result from proposed development outside coastal zone)].

Notwithstanding any provision in the Coastal Act, no coastal development permit is required for the following types of development and in the following areas [*Pub. Res. Code § 30610*]:

(1) Improvements to existing single-family residences. However, the commission will specify, by regulation [*see 14 Cal. Code Reg. § 13250(b)*], those classes of development that involve a risk of adverse environmental effect and will require that a permit be obtained.

(2) Improvements to any structure other than a single-family residence or a public works facility. However, the commission will specify, by regulation [*see 14 Cal. Code Reg. § 13253(b)*], those types of improvements that involve a risk of adverse environmental effect, adversely affect public access, or involve a change in use contrary to any policy of the Coastal Act. For those improvements, a permit will be required.

(3) Maintenance dredging of existing navigation channels or moving dredged material from those channels to a disposal area outside the coastal zone, pursuant to a permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

(4) Repair or maintenance activities that do not result in an addition to, or enlargement or expansion of, the object of those activities. However, if the commission determines that certain extraordinary methods of repair and maintenance involve a risk of substantial adverse environmental impact it will, by regulation [*see 14 Cal. Code Reg. § 13252(a)*], require that a permit be obtained.

(5) Any category of development, or any category of development within a specifically defined geographic area, that the commission, after following the requisite procedures, has described or identified and with respect to which the commission has found that there is no potential for any significant adverse effect on coastal resources or on public access, and that when the exclusion precedes certification of the applicable local coastal program, that the exclusion will not impair the ability of local government to prepare a local coastal program.

(6) The installation, testing, and placement in service or the replacement of any necessary utility connection between an existing service facility and any development approved pursuant to the Coastal Act. However, the commission may, when necessary, require reasonable conditions to mitigate any adverse impacts on coastal resources, including scenic resources.

(7) The replacement of any structure, other than a public works facility, destroyed by a disaster. The replacement structure must conform to applicable existing zoning requirements, must be for the same use and in the same location as the destroyed structure, and must not exceed the floor area, height, or bulk of the destroyed structure by more than 10 percent.

(8) Any activity anywhere in the coastal zone that involves the conversion of any existing multiple-unit residential structure to a time-share project, estate, or use [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11212(x)*]. If any improvement to an existing structure is otherwise exempt from the permit requirements of the Coastal Act, no coastal development permit will be required for that improvement on the basis that it is to be made in connection with any exempt conversion. The division of a multiple-unit residential structure into condominiums (defined in *Civ. Code § 783*) is not considered a time-share project, estate, or use.

(9) Any proposed development that the executive director finds is a temporary event not having any significant adverse impact on coastal resources within the meaning of the commission's guidelines.

[2] Prior Permit

No person who obtained a vested right in a development prior to the effective date of the Coastal Act (January 1, 1977), or who obtained a permit pursuant to the former Coastal Act is required to secure approval for the development pursuant to the Coastal Act. However, no substantial change may be made in that development without prior approval having been obtained under the Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30608*]. There is no distinction made between a person who has obtained a vested right and is therefore exempt and a person who obtained a permit under the former Coastal Act [*Pardee Construction Co. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 471, 478, 157 Cal. Rptr. 184]* .

When, prior to the effective date of the Coastal Act, a permit was issued and expressly made subject to recorded conditions that are not dedications of land or interests in land for the benefit of the public, the owner of the real property that is the subject of the permit may apply for modification. Unless so modified or deleted, any condition imposed on a permit issued pursuant to the former CoastalAct remains in full force and effect [*Pub. Res. Code § 30609*].

[3] Urban Areas

Urban land areas will be excluded from the permit provisions by the commission, after public hearing, on request by a local government, when that area is either a residential area zoned and developed to a density of four or more dwelling units per acre or industrially zoned and developed on or before January 1, 1977. Additionally, the commission must find

that locally permitted development will be infilling or replacement and in conformity with the surrounding community and that there is no potential for significant adverse effects on public access. However, no area may be excluded unless more than 50 percent of the lots are built on, to the same general density or intensity of use [*Pub. Res. Code § 30610.5(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementIdentification & DelineationEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.189

§ 579.189 Hearings Before Commission

The commission must provide for a de novo public hearing on applications for coastal development permits and any appeals brought pursuant to the Coastal Act. It must give to any affected person a written public notice of the nature of the proceeding and of the time and place of the public hearing. Notice must also be given to any person who made a written request for notification [*Pub. Res. Code § 30621(a)*].

A hearing on the application or appeal will be set no later than 49 days after the date on which the application or appeal is filed with the commission [*Pub. Res. Code § 30621(a)*]. The commission is only required to open the hearing within 49 days. At the initial hearing, it must determine whether it has jurisdiction and may then continue the matter to a later date [*Encinitas Country Day School, Inc. v. California Coastal Commission (2003) 108 Cal. App. 4th 575, 585,133 Cal. Rptr. 2d 551* (commission lost jurisdiction to hear appeal when it merely opened and continued hearing within 49-day period)]. A requirement that the hearing be concluded within 49 days would be unreasonable and create administrative impossibilities. Staff and environmental review would not be available in the 49-day period[*Coronado Yacht Club v. California Coastal Com. (1993) 13 Cal. App. 4th 860, 869-872, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 10]* .

The commission must act on the application or appeal within 21 days after the conclusion of the hearing [*Pub. Res. Code § 30622*].

The operation and effect of an action by any local government is stayed pending a decision by the commission on appeal [*Pub. Res. Code § 30623*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.190

§ 579.190 Permit Without Hearing

[1] Emergencies and Specified Nonemergency Developments

The executive director or an appropriate local government authority may issue a permit without complying with normal procedures for notice and hearing in cases of emergency, other than those described in *Pub. Res. Code § 30611*, and for the following nonemergency developments [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624(a)*]:

- Improvements to any existing structure;
- Any single-family dwelling;
- Any development of up to four dwelling units within any incorporated area that does not require demolition;
- Any other development not in excess of $100,000 other than any division of land; and
- Any development specifically authorized as a principal permitted use and proposed in an area for which the land use portion of the applicable local coastal program has been certified.

A permit for any of these specified nonemergency developments will not be effective until after reasonable public notice and adequate review time has been given [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624(a)*].

One-third of the commissioners or the members of the local governing body may subsequently override the issuance of a permit for a nonemergency development and require the application to be processed by the usual procedures [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624(b), (c)*].

[2] Minor Developments

After a local coastal program has been certified, a local government may waive the public hearing requirement on a permit application for a "minor development" if [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624.9(b)*]:

- Notice that a public hearing will be held on request of any person is given to all persons who would otherwise be required to be notified of a public hearing as well as any other persons known to be interested in receiving notice; and

- No request for public hearing is received by the local government within 15 working days from the date this notice is sent.

The notice must include a statement that failure by any person to request a public hearing may result in loss of that person's ability to appeal to the commission any action taken on the permit application [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624.9(c)*].

For these purposes, a "minor development" is a development that the local government determines meets *all* of the following requirements [*Pub. Res. Code § 30624.9(a)*]:

- It is consistent with the certified local coastal program;

- It requires no discretionary approvals other than a coastal development permit; and

- It has no adverse effect either individually or cumulatively on coastal resources or public access to the shoreline or along the coast.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.191

§ 579.191 Vested Rights

[1] Generally

If a property owner has performed substantial work and incurred substantial liabilities in good faith reliance on a coastal development permit issued by the government, he or she acquires a vested right to complete construction within the terms of the permit. Once a landowner has secured a vested right, the commission may not, by virtue of a change in the Coastal Act, prohibit construction authorized by the permit the owner has relied on [*see Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 72-73, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15]* . A vested right is a property right protected by the constitution, and a failure to exercise that vested right to its fullest extent does not affect its vested character. Thus, a landowner exempt from the permit requirement of the former Coastal Act due to vested rights based on building permits, did not lose those vested rights by allowing the building permits to lapse [*Pardee Construction Co. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 471, 474, 479, 157 Cal. Rptr. 184]* .

Preparatory work does not give rise to a vested right when it is done with knowledge that one or more additional permits will be required for actual construction, and the commission may apply the laws actually in effect at the time the additional permits are sought [*see Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 73, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15]* . For example, the permit exemption of *Pub. Res. Code § 30608* based on a vested right was found not to protect a landowner who constructed a water system and water storage tanks without acquiring the necessary building permit [*see Tosh v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 388, 393-396, 160 Cal. Rptr. 170]* .

[2] Confirmation of Claim

A developer who claims exemption from the permit requirement of the Coastal Act on the grounds that he or she has a vested right to continue development must seek confirmation of that claim and may not first assert it as a defense to an action by the commission to enjoin further development [*Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 63, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15* ; *see Pub. Res. Code § 30608* and its discussion in *§ 579.188[2]*]. Although the commission is the administrative tribunal charged with making the initial determination of a

vested rights claim under the Coastal Act, that procedural authority in no way changes the constitutional character of the vested right. The commission has no authority to limit or deny a previously recognized vested right basis for exemption [*Pardee Construction Co. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 471, 480, 157 Cal. Rptr. 184]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional Limits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.192

§ 579.192 Appeals to Commission

[1] Before Certification of Local Coastal Program--Appealable Decisions; Standing

Before its local coastal program has been certified, any local government action on a coastal development permit application may be appealed to the state commission by the executive director, any person (including the applicant), or any two members of the commission [*Pub. Res. Code § 30602*].

[2] Time Limits for Filing

The appeal must be filed within 20 working days after receipt of the notice required by *Pub. Res. Code § 30620.5(c)* or the local government decision will be final [*Pub. Res. Code § 30602*]. A decision is also final even when an appeal is filed, if the appeal is determined to be patently frivolous by the executive director and the filing fee that is therefore imposed is not deposited within five working days [*Pub. Res. Code § 30602*; *see Pub. Res. Code § 30620(d)*]. For discussion of frivolous appeals, see *§ 579.192[4]*.

[3] After Certification of Local Coastal Program

[a] Standing

After a city or county's local coastal program has been certified, certain permit decisions may be appealed to the state commission by the applicant, any aggrieved person, or any two members of the commission [*Pub. Res. Code § 30625(a)*]. An "aggrieved person" has been broadly defined to include residents or citizens of California or persons with a pecuniary or proprietary interest in the subject of the appeal [*Klitgaard & Jones, Inc. v. San Diego Coast Regional Com. (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 99, 110, 121 Cal. Rptr. 650]* .

[b] Appealable Decisions

A post-certification local government permit decision is appealable only if it concerns one of the following [*Pub. Res.*

Code § 30603(a)]:

(1) A development approved by the local government between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line of the sea when there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance.

(2) A development approved by the local government that is not included in (1), *above*, and that is located on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream, or within 300 feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff.

(3) Developments approved by the local government that are not included in (1) or (2), *above*, that are located in a sensitive coastal resource area [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30502(c)*].

(4) Any development approved by a coastal county that is not designated as the principal permitted use under the approved zoning ordinance or zoning district map [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30500-30534*].

(5) Any development that constitutes a major public works project or a major energy facility.

[c] Grounds for Appeal

Appeals of post-certification local government permit decisions are limited to an allegation that the development does not conform to the standards set forth in the certified coastal program or the public access policies in the Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30603(b)(1)*]. If the appeal is from the denial of a permit for a major public works or major energy facility, the grounds for appeal are limited to an allegation that the development conforms to the standards set forth in the certified local coastal program and the public access policies in the Coastal Act [*Pub. Res. Code § 30603(b)(2)*].

[d] Time Limits for Filing Appeal

Once a local government has taken action on a permit application, it must send notification of that action to the commission by certified mail within seven calendar days of the date the action was taken [*Pub. Res. Code § 30603(d)*]. Any appeal of that action must be filed within 10 working days of the date the commission receives the local government's notice. If the 10-day period passes with no appeal being filed, the decision becomes final [*Pub. Res. Code § 30603(c)*]. A decision also becomes final even when an appeal is filed, if the appeal is determined to be patently frivolous by the executive director and the filing fee that is therefore imposed is not deposited within five working days [*Pub. Res. Code § 30603(c)*; *see Pub. Res. Code § 30620(d)*]. For discussion of frivolous appeals, see *§ 579.192[4]*.

[4] Patently Frivolous Appeals; When Appeal Is Considered Filed

When the applicant or any person other than members of the commission or a public agency requests an appeal of a local government action, whether before or after certification of a local plan, the executive director must determine whether the appeal is patently frivolous. The determination must be made within five working days after the commission receives the appeal. If such a determination is made, the appeal will not be considered filed unless a $300 filing fee is deposited with the commission within five working days of receipt of the executive director's determination. If the commission subsequently determines that the appeal raises a substantive issue, the filing fee will be refunded [*Pub. Res. Code § 30620(d)*].

An appeal that is properly submitted is considered to be filed only under the following circumstances [*Pub. Res. Code § 30621*]:

- The executive director determines that the appeal is not patently frivolous;

- The five-day period for the executive director to determine whether an appeal is patently frivolous expires without a determination; or

- The appellant pays the filing fee within the prescribed five-day period.

[5] Commission Decision to Hear Appeal

The commission will hear an appeal unless it determines the following [*Pub. Res.Code § 30625(b)*]:

- With regard to local government permit decisions before certification of the local coastal program, that there is no substantial issue regarding conformity with the Coastal Act's coastal resources, planning, and management policies [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30200-30265.5*].

- With regard to local government post-certification permit decisions, that there is no substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which the appeal was filed [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30603(b)*, discussed in *§ 579.192[3][c]*].

- With regard to appeals after certification of a port master plan, that there is no substantial issue with respect to conformity with that plan.

[6] Action on Appeal

Once the commission has accepted an appeal, it must set the matter for de novo hearing and provide notice as required by *Pub. Res. Code § 30621(a)*. For discussion of the hearing and notice requirements, see *§ 579.189*. The commission must act on the appeal within 21 days after the hearing is concluded [*Pub. Res. Code § 30622*], at which time it may approve, modify, or deny the proposed development [*Pub. Res. Code § 30625(a)*]. If the commission fails to meet this time limit, or fails to meet the 49-day limitation for setting the hearing [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30621(a)*], the local government decision appealed from will be deemedfinal, unless the permit applicant waives these time limits [*Pub. Res. Code § 30625(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.193

§ 579.193 Reconsideration of Permit

The terms and conditions of any coastal development permit granted by the commission may be reconsidered to correct any information contained in those terms and conditions [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30626*].

A request for reconsideration of the denial of an application for a permit or terms or conditions imposed on the permit may be made under the following procedures [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30627(a), (b)*]:

- Only an applicant for a permit is eligible to request reconsideration.

- The request for reconsideration must be made within 30 days of the decision on the application for the permit.

- The basis for the request for reconsideration must be either that there is relevant new evidence that, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, could not have been presented at the hearing on the matter, or that an error of fact or law has occurred that has the potential of altering the regional commission's initial decision.

- The commission has the discretion to grant or deny a request for reconsideration.

A decision to deny a request for reconsideration is not subject to appeal [*Pub. Res. Code § 30627(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.194

§ 579.194 Violations of Coastal Act

[1] Notice of Violation

When the Coastal Commission is the legally responsible coastal development permitting authority, or when a local government or port governing body requests the Commission to assist in resolving an unresolved violation, and the executive director has determined that real property has been developed in violation of the Coastal Act, he or she may cause a notification of intention to record a notice of violation (NOV) to be mailed by regular and certified mail to the owner of the property at issue. The notice must (1) describe the real property, (2) identify the nature of the violation, (3) name the owners, and (4) state that if the owner objects to the filing of the NOV, he or she will be afforded the opportunity to present evidence on the issue of whether a violation has occurred [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(a), (h)*]. The owner will then have 20 days to object to the filing of the NOV. If no timely objection is made, the NOV will be filed in each county in which all or part of the property is located [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(b)*].

If the owner files a timely objection, a public hearing will be held at which the owner may present evidence as to why the NOV should not be recorded [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(c)*]. If, following the hearing, the Commission finds that a violation has occurred, the NOV will be recorded. If there is a finding that no violation occurred, a clearance letter will be issued to the property owner [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(d)*].

When the NOV is properly recorded and indexed, it will be considered notice of the violation to all successors in interest in the subject property. It is for informational purposes only, however, and does not constitute a defect, lien, or encumbrance on the property [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(e)(2)*]. Once the violation has been finally resolved, a clearance letter will be mailed to the owner and a notice of rescission will be recorded in each county office in which the NOV was recorded. The notice will indicate that the NOV is no longer valid and has the same effect as a withdrawal or expungement under *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.61* [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(f)*].

An NOV may not be issued until (1) existing methods (excluding the commencement of formal administrative or judicial proceedings) for resolving the violation have been utilized and (2) the property owner has been made aware of

the possibility that a NOV will be recorded [*Pub. Res. Code § 30812(g)*].

[2] Action to Restrain

Any person may maintain an action for declaratory and equitable relief to restrain any violation of the Coastal Act. On a prima facie showing of a violation of the Coastal Act, preliminary equitable relief will be issued to restrain any further violation of the Act. No bond will be required [*Pub. Res. Code § 30803*].

Any person may maintain an action to enforce the duties specifically imposed on the commission, any governmental agency, any special district, or any local government by the Coastal Act. No bond will be required [*Pub. Res. Code § 30804*]. *Pub. Res. Code § 30804* appears to be designed to make traditional mandate available to enforce ministerial duties imposed on the commission by the Coastal Act [*Pacific Legal Foundation v. California Coastal Com. (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 169, 169 n.5, 188 Cal. Rptr. 104, 655 P.2d 306]* .

Any person may maintain an action for the recovery of civil penalties provided by *Pub. Res. Code § 30820* or *30821.6* [*Pub. Res. Code § 30805*]. *Pub. Res. Code § 30805* provides standing for private individuals to enforce the Coastal Act, but it does not mean that the penalties will be paid to them. All penalties under the Coastal Act are paid to the state [*see Sanders v. Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. (1975) 53 Cal. App. 3d 661, 670-678, 126 Cal. Rptr. 415* ; for discussion and forms pertaining to private individuals bringing an action in the name of the people or the attorney general, *see* Ch. 483, *Quo Warranto*].

The Coastal Commission may obtain a cease and desist order against violations of permit requirements [*Pub. Res. Code §§ 30809-30810*]. Anyperson may bring an action to enforce the order and seek penalties for its violation [*Pub. Res. Code §§ 30803, 30805, 30821.6*].

[3] Penalties

Any person who performs or undertakes development in violation of the Coastal Act may be civilly penalized by a superior court in an amount not exceeding $30,000 but not less than $500 [*Pub. Res. Code § 30820(a)(1)*]. Civil liability may also be imposed for any other violation of the Coastal Act in an amount that cannot exceed $30,000 [*Pub. Res. Code § 30820(a)(2)*]. In addition to any other penalties, any person who intentionally and knowingly performs any development in violation of the Coastal Act will be subject to a civil fine of not less than $1,000 nor more than $15,000 per day for each day in which the violation occurs [*Pub. Res. Code § 30820(b)*].

[4] Transferability

Any civil action under the Coastal Act by, or against, a city, county, or city and county, the Coastal Commission, a special district, or any other public agency must, on motion of either party, be transferred to a county or city and county not a party to the action or to a county or city and county other than that in which the city, special district, or any other public agency that is a party to the action is located [*Pub. Res. Code § 30806(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. §§ 397, 410.10-410.70* (venue); for discussion and forms relating to change of venue, *see* Ch. 571, *Venue* [.

[5] Remedies Not Exclusive

The provisions of *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30800-30824* are in addition to any other remedies available at law [*Pub. Res. Code § 30800*].

In addition to any other remedy provided by *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30800-30811*, any person, including the Coastal Commission, may bring an action to restrain a violation of the terms and conditions of an urban exclusion imposed pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 30610.5*. In any such action the court may grant whatever relief it deems appropriate to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the urban exclusion [*Pub. Res. Code § 30808*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureEquityReliefCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementPermitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
8. Coastal Zone

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.195-579.209

[Reserved]

§§ 579.195[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.210

§ 579.210 Standing

A petition for a writ of mandate must be brought by a party beneficially interested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Although *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, governing administrative mandamus, does not specify the beneficial interest requirement, cases involving administrative mandamus have applied that requirement [*see Silva v. City of Cypress (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 374, 376, 22 Cal. Rptr. 453]* . Zoning cases often combine a petition for a writ of mandate with a complaint for declaratory relief. The declaratory relief action requirement that there be an actual controversy between the parties relating to their rights appears to be met when a beneficial interest is shown [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 121, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724]* .

Beneficial interest may be shown through residence or personal right or interest in the area affected or some other showing by the petitioner that he or she would be detrimentally affected or aggrieved [*see Silva v. City of Cypress (1962) 204 Cal. App. 2d 374, 376-377, 22 Cal. Rptr. 453]* . A resident landowner may be aggrieved by suffering a special damage distinguishable from that suffered by the public at large, perhaps through a decrease in property value or a restriction on the use of his or her property [*see Tustin Heights Assn. v. Bd. of Supervisors (1959) 170 Cal. App. 2d 619, 636-637, 339 P.2d 914]* .

Ownership of property is not mandatory, but some sort of injury or adverse affect is. For example, a corporation composed of residents in the affected area who would suffer an injury if the challenged project was allowed to proceed had standing, even though the corporation itself did not own property. The adverse affect on its members was sufficient [*Residents of Beverly Glen, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1973) 34 Cal. App. 3d 117, 121, 109 Cal. Rptr. 724]* . Indeed, residence within the boundaries of the local legislative body with zoning control is not required if an adverse affect can be shown. Thus, landowners outside the municipal limits whose property adjoined the property subject to the zoning have been held to have standing to challenge the zoning decisions of the municipality that affected their property [*Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 549, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawThe JudiciaryCase or ControversyStandingGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.211

§ 579.211 Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

When an administrative remedy is provided by statute, relief must be sought from the administrative body and that remedy exhausted before the courts will act. Unless exhaustion of administrative remedies is alleged in the petition or complaint, the pleadings may be subject to a general demurrer [*see Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106-107, 280 P.2d 1* (writ of mandate); *Igna v. City of Baldwin Park (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 909, 911-912, 88 Cal. Rptr. 581* (declaratory relief)].

As long as administrative remedies have been exhausted as to other issues in the case, a landowner may raise constitutional issues for the first time on judicial review of the administrative decision [*State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 250-251, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281* ; *see Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.5*; *Metcalf v. County of Los Angeles (1944) 24 Cal. 2d 267, 272, 148 P.2d 645* (exception application); *Dunham v. City of Westminster (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 245, 249-250, 20 Cal. Rptr. 772* (variance)].

There are several exceptions to the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies. Thus, remedies need not be exhausted (1) when the subject matter of the controversy lies outside the agency's jurisdiction, (2) when pursuit of an administrative remedy would result in irreparable harm, (3) when the agency cannot grant an adequate remedy, or (4) when the agggrieved party can positively state what the agency's decision in that particular case would be [*Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761]* . Also, a facial challenge to the constitutionality of a local ordinance in the form of a cause of action for violation of federal civil rights under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* is not barred by the exhaustion doctrine [*Yee v. City of Escondido (1993) 503 U.S. 519, 112 S. Ct. 1522, 1532, 118 L. Ed. 2d 153* ; *Del Oro Hills v. City of Oceanside (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1078, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 677* (facial challenge based on claim of lost profits not sustainable)].

For full discussion of the doctrine of exhaustion of administrative remedies and the exceptions to it, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityExhaustion of RemediesCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityExhaustion of RemediesAdministrative Remedies

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.212

§ 579.212 Expedited Procedure for Review of Permit Decisions Involving First Amendment-Protected Expressive Conduct

An action to review the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit or other entitlement for expressive conduct protected by the *First Amendment*, such as a license for the operation of a so-called adult business, is entitled to priority and subject to an expedited procedure for judicial review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*]. These procedures were enacted in response to Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas [Stats. 1999, ch. 49, § 2; *see Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (9th Cir. 1998) 154 F.3d 1097]* , which held that the Las Vegas business licensing ordinance was on its face a prior restraint of speech that violated the *First* and *Fourteenth Amendments* because it failed to provide for prompt judicial review of a license denial [*Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (9th Cir. 1998) 154 F.3d 1097, 1100-1102]* .

The expedited procedure permits either the public agency or the permit applicant to bring the action for judicial review. If the permit applicant brings the action, the action must be in the form of a petition for writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, as appropriate [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(2)*]. Within five court days after receipt of written notification from a permit applicant that the permit applicant will seek judicial review of a public agency's action on the permit, the public agency must prepare, certify, and make available the administrative record to the permit applicant [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(1)*].

The party bringing the action must file and serve the petition for writ of mandate on the respondent no later than 21 calendar days following the public agency's final decision on the permit. The title page of the petition must contain the following language in 18-point type: "ATTENTION: THIS MATTER IS ENTITLED TO PRIORITY AND SUBJECT TO THE EXPEDITED HEARING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES CONTAINED IN SECTION 1094.8 OF THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE" [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(3)*]. The court clerk must set a hearing for review of the petition no later than 25 calendar days from the date the petition is filed. Moving, opposition, and reply papers must be filed as provided in the California Rules of Court. The petititoner must lodge the administrative record with the court no later than 10 calendar days in advance of the hearing date [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(4)*]. Following the hearing

the court must render its decision "in an expeditious manner consistent with constricutional requirements in view of the particular facts and circumstances," but no later than 20 calendar days after the matter is submitted or 50 calendar days after the date the peititon is filed, whichever is earlier [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(5)*].

If the presiding judge of the court in which the action is filed determines that the court will be unable to meet any of the above deadlines applicable to it, the presiding judge must request the temporary assignment of a judicial officer to hear the petition and render a decision within the above time limits, pursuant to *Gov. Code § 68543.8*. This request will be entitled to priority [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(e)*]. The parties to the action may jointly waive the above time limits [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(f)*].

A public agency may adopt an odinance or resolution that contains a description of the permits or entitlement issued by the public agency that are eligible for this expedited judicial review [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(c)*].

The United States Supreme Court has held that the *First Amendment* requires that an adult business ordinance provide both for prompt judicial review of the denial of a license and also for a prompt judicial decision. However, strict time limits do not apply. The requirement of a prompt judicial decision was met when the ordinance provided that an administrative decision could be appealed to the state courts [*City of Littleton v. Z. J. Gifts D-4, L.L.C. (2004) 541 U.S. 774, 124 S. Ct. 2219, 159 L. Ed. 2d 84]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsFreedom of SpeechGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.213

§ 579.213 Rules of Procedure

Formal rules of evidence or procedure applicable in judicial actions and proceedings do not apply in any proceeding subject to *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* (planning and zoning) except to the extent that a public agency otherwise provides by charter, ordinance, resolution, or rule of procedure [*Gov. Code § 65010(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewEvidenceProcedural ConsiderationsRule Application & InterpretationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.214

§ 579.214 Harmless Error Rule

No action, inaction, or recommendation by any public agency, its legislative body, or any of its administrative agencies or officials, on any matter subject to *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* will be held invalid or set aside by any court on the ground of the improper admission or rejection of evidence, or by reason of any error, irregularity, informality, neglect, or omission regarding any matter pertaining to petitions, applications, notices, findings, records, hearings, reports, recommendations, appeals, or any matters of procedure subject to *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*, unless the court finds that the error was prejudicial and that the party complaining or appealing suffered substantial injury from that error and that a different result would have been probable if the error had not occurred. There is no presumption that error is prejudicial or that injury was done if the error is shown [*Gov. Code § 65010(b)*; *see Mack v. Ironside (1973) 35 Cal. App. 3d 127, 130, 110 Cal. Rptr. 557* (decided under former *Gov. Code § 65801*)]. The failure to consider the rights, desires, suggestions, and welfare of an entire class of landowners affected by a zoning action may be an error leading to a different result [*Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 550, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137* (decided under former *Gov. Code § 65801*)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.215

§ 579.215 Resolution of Zoning Disputes by Court-Initiated Mediation

Once an action has been filed, disputes involving the following matters may be resolved by mediation:

- A public agency's approval or denial of a development project [*Gov. Code § 66031(a)(1)*].

- A failure to meet time limits of the Permit Streamlining Act [*Gov. Code § 66031(a)(3)*; *see Gov. Code § 65920 et seq.*].

- The adequacy of general or specific plans [*Gov. Code § 66031(a)(6)*; *see Gov. Code § 65100 et seq.*].

- The validity of any zoning decision made pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65800 et seq.*, which provide for the adoption and administration of zoning laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations by counties and cities, as well as the implementation of general plans.

The mediation process may be initiated by invitation from the court within five days after the deadline for the respondent or defendant to file a response to the action [*Gov. Code § 66031(b)*].

If the parties accept the court's invitation to mediate the dispute, all time limits with respect to the underlying action will be tolled while the mediator conducts the mediation [*Gov. Code § 66032(a)*]. The mediator is chosen according to prescribed procedures [*Gov. Code § 66031(c)*]. If the parties do not accept the court's invitation or if they cannot agree on a mediator, the civil action will proceed. The court is not permitted to draw any implication from either party's refusal to mediate [*Gov. Code § 66031(d)*]. Every 90 days after commencement of mediation, the civil action will be reactivated unless the parties either arrive at a settlement and implement it, or agree by written stipulation to extend the mediation for another 90 days [*Gov. Code § 66032(d)*].

If the mediation does not resolve the action, the court has discretion to schedule a settlement conference. If the action is

subsequently tried on its merits, the same judge who presided at the conference will preside at trial [*Gov. Code § 66034*]. In the event the mediation is unsuccessful and the action goes to trial, the following will apply: (1) *Evid. Code § 703.5*, which precludes the mediator from testifying at trial; and (2) *Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*, which govern evidentiary issues in mediation proceedings and, among other things, limit the use at trial of evidence derived from mediation proceedings [*Gov. Code § 66032(e)*; *see Evid. Code § 1119*]. The Judicial Council is authorized to adopt rules, forms, and standards necessary to implement the mediation procedures [*Gov. Code § 66035*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionMediationsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseGeneral Overview

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.216

§ 579.216 Review of Quasi-Judicial Acts

[1] By Administrative Mandate

Administrative mandamus is available to inquire into the validity of quasi-judicial actions of administrative agencies. It is available only when the order or decision sought to be reviewed is the result of a proceeding in which by law a hearing is required, evidence is required to be taken, and the determination of the facts is the responsibility of the administrative agency. It applies only when the agency has been called on to make a factual determination in the exercise of a quasi-judicial function [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*].

Administrative mandate is the appropriate form of review in several types of zoning decisions, including decisions involving the following:

- Variances [*see Siller v. Board of Supervisors (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 479, 481, 485-486, 25 Cal. Rptr. 73, 375 P.2d 41]* ;

- Conditional use permits [*see Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137]* ;

- Tentative maps under the Subdivision Map Act [*see Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 651 n.2, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556]* ; and

- Review of decisions under the Coastal Act [*see Pub. Res. Code §§ 30801, 30802*].

With limited exceptions [*see McLain Western # 1 v. County of San Diego (1983) 146 Cal. App. 3d 772, 777, 194 Cal. Rptr. 594]* , a party who is displeased with an agency decision, but nonetheless complies with it andthen sues for damages will be unsuccessful because the party did not first seek review by administrative mandamus [*Rezai v. City of*

Tustin (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 443, 448-451, 453, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 559 ; *City of Santee v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 713, 716-718, 279 Cal. Rptr. 22* ; *Pfeiffer v. City of La Mesa (1977) 69 Cal. App. 3d 74, 76, 78, 137 Cal. Rptr. 804]* .

When a public agency makes a decision regarding the issuance, revocation, suspension, or denial of a permit or other entitlement for expressive conduct protected by *U.S. Const., amend. I*, either the public agency or the permit applicant or permit holder may bring an action for expedited judicial review of that decision [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8*]. If the permit applicant or permit holder brings the action, it must be in the form of a petition for writ of mandate pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* or *1094.5* [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8(d)(2)*]. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.8* was enacted in response to a decision of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in a case involving zoning relating to adult bookstores and judicial proceedings necessary to protect *First Amendment* expressive conduct rights with regard to decisions of public agencies regarding permits [*see Baby Tam & Co., Inc. v. City of Las Vegas (9th Cir. 1998) 154 F.3d 1097]* . For discussion of and a form for a petition for writ of mandate for expedited judicial review of a public agency's decision relating to a permit involving expressive conduct protected by the *First Amendment*, see Ch. 59 *Assemblies, Meetings, and Demonstrations* .

For general discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*, see Ch. 474, *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions* , et seq.

[2] Variance

The granting or denying of a variance is an administrative or quasi-judicial function [*Allen v. Humboldt County Bd. of Suprs. (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 158, 163, 50 Cal. Rptr. 444]* . Review of variance proceedings is appropriate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546 n.4, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137* ; *Briggs v. City of Rolling Hills Estates (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644-648, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29]* . The decision is within the discretion of the designated administrative body, and its decision will not be disturbed without a clear and convincing showing of an abuse of that discretion [*Allen v. Humboldt County Bd. of Suprs. (1966) 241 Cal. App. 2d 158, 163, 50 Cal. Rptr. 444]* . Traditional mandamus is not available to review the decision denying a variance [*Rubin v. Board of Directors (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 119, 126-127, 104 P.2d 1041]* .

[3] Conditional Use Permit

Issuance of a conditional use permit (CUP) is an exercise of quasi-judicial or administrative power; it is not an exercise of legislative power [*Wheeler v. Gregg (1949) 90 Cal. App. 2d 348, 362, 203 P.2d 37]* . Review of local planning commission proceedings regarding a CUP is appropriate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137* ; *Rezai v. City of Tustin (1994) 26 Cal. App. 4th 443, 448, 31 Cal. Rptr. 2d 559]* . Traditional mandate is not available to review the decision denying a CUP [*Garden Grove Congregation v. City of Garden Grove (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 136, 140-142, 1 Cal. Rptr. 65]* .

The courts have no authority to interfere with the denial of a use permit except on a clear and convincing showing of fraud, illegality, or abuse of discretion [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 575, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* ; as for example, when the property owner is deprived of a fair hearing under state law on a permit application appeal [*see Clark v. City of Hermosa Beach (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1169-1170, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223]* . The same rules apply to a challenge of the validity of conditions attached to the grant of a conditional use permit [*see Mid-Way Cabinet etc. Mfg. v. County of San Joaquin (1967) 257 Cal. App. 2d 181, 182, 192-193, 65 Cal. Rptr. 37]* .

[4] Variance and Permit Decisions--Priority on Court Calendar

All actions brought pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65907* will be given preference over all other civil matters before the court, except probate, eminent domain, and forcible entry and unlawful detainer proceedings [*Gov. Code § 65907(a)*].

[5] Limitation of Issues

In an action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul a finding, determination, or decision of a public agency made pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* (planning and land use) at a properly noticed public hearing, the issues raised are limited to those raised in the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the public agency by the time of the public hearing, except when the court finds either of the following [*Gov. Code § 65009(b)(1)*]:

- The issue could not have been raised at the public hearing by persons exercising reasonable diligence.

- The body conducting the public hearing prevented the issue from being raised at the public hearing.

If a public agency desires the provisions of *Gov. Code § 65009(b)* to apply to a matter, it must include a specified warning in any public notice issued [*Gov. Code § 65009(b)(2)*].

The application of *Gov. Code § 65009(b)* to causes of action brought pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65009(d)* [*see § 579.219*] applies only to the final action taken in response to the notice to the city or county clerk. If no finalaction is taken, then the issue raised in the cause of action brought pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65009(d)* will be limited to those matters presented at a properly noticed public hearing or to those matters specified in the notice given to the city or county clerk pursuant to § 65009(d), or both [*Gov. Code § 65009(b)(3)*].

[6] Pleading

A proceeding in mandate is subject to the general rules of pleading applicable to civil actions, except as otherwise provided in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067-1110b*. Therefore, it is necessary for the petition to allege specific facts showing an abuse of discretion. If those facts are not alleged, the petition is subject to general demurrer or the court is justified in denying the petition out of hand [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . The petition must also allege exhaustion of administrative remedies or it will be subject to a general demurrer [*see Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106-107, 280 P.2d 1]* .

[7] Developer Is Indispensable Party

When the action challenges a specific zoning decision that applies to a specific project, the developer of the project is an indispensable party, and the action must be dismissed if the developer was not joined within the relevant limitation period [*Beresford Neighborhood Assn. v. City of San Mateo (1988) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1180, 1188-1189, 255 Cal. Rptr. 434]* . Developers are not indispensable when the challenge is to a general plan and the determination will apply to all developments in an area [*Buena Vista Gardens Apartments Assn. v. City of San Diego Planning Dept. (1985) 175 Cal. App. 3d 289, 220 Cal. Rptr. 732]* .

[8] Scope of Review

The review is limited to whether there was a want or an excess of jurisdiction, whether there was a fair trial, and whether there was any prejudicial abuse of discretion. Abuse of discretion is shown by failure of the administrative agency to proceed as required by law, failure of the findings to support the decision, or failure of the evidence to support the findings [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *Topanga Asso. for Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 506, 514-515, 113 Cal. Rptr. 836, 522 P.2d 12]* .

An agency's findings are adequate if they formally incorporate findings made by others, for example, factual findings in a staff report [*Dore v. County of Ventura (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 320, 327-328, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 299]* . Inadequacy of a single finding does not necessarily undermine the denial of a permit when other, adequate findings are made unless

the findings are so intertwined that a failure of one could reasonably lead the local decision making agency to reconsider its decision to deny a permit [*Saad v. City of Berkeley (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 1206, 1213-1216, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 95]* .

[9] Standard of Review

In an administrative mandamus proceeding the proper standard of review is the substantial evidence test, that is, whether there was substantial evidence before the local agency to support its decision. Any reasonable doubts must be resolved in favor of the administrative findings and decision. However, as a matter of law, written findings of fact in an administrative decision are insufficient when they merely recite statutory language [*City of Carmel-by-the-Sea v. Board of Supervisors (1977) 71 Cal. App. 3d 84, 91-92, 139 Cal. Rptr. 214]* . Moreover, when a local ordinance provides that an agency must expressly state the agency's findings and must set forth the relevant supportive facts, there is no presumption that its ruling rested on the necessary findings and that those findings are supported by substantial evidence [*see Broadway, Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 772-773, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810]* . No new evidence may be received by the court [*Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 573, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664]* . Nor does the court have the right to judge the intrinsic value of the evidence or to weigh it [*Siller v. Board of Supervisors (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 479, 481-482, 25 Cal. Rptr. 73, 375 P.2d 41]* .

When a fundamental vested right is involved, such as the right to continue a 35-year legal nonconforming use as a tavern, the independent judgment test is the appropriate standard of review [*Goat Hill Tavern v. City of Costa Mesa (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1519, 1525-1530, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 385 , citing Strumsky v. San Diego County Employees Retirement Ass'n (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 28, 32, 112 Cal. Rptr. 805, 520 P.2d 29* ; *see Malibu Mountains Rec., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 359, 367-369, 79 Cal. Rptr. 2d 25* (revocation of conditional use permit)]. Whether an administrative zoning decision substantially affects a fundamental vested right is decided on a case-by-case basis. While no exact formula exists for making this decision, courts are less sensitive to preservation of purely economic interests [*see Metropolitan Outdoor Advertising Corp. v. City of Santa Ana (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1401, 1403-1404, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 664]* .

[10] Res Judicata Effect

A proceeding in mandamus to review administrative proceedings does not bar an action challenging the constitutionality of the underlying ordinance. Although the same type of evidence may be used in the two actions, the issues are not the same and the denial of relief under the administrative remedy is not res judicata on the constitutional question[*H.W. Rohl Co. v. County of San Diego (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 707, 710-711, 28 Cal. Rptr. 196]* .

[11] By Writ of Review (Certiorari)

The writ of certiorari may also be an appropriate remedy to test the proper exercise of discretion by a local board exercising its quasi-judicial powers [*Livingston Rock etc. Co. v. County of L.A. (1954) 43 Cal. 2d 121, 128-129, 272 P.2d 4]* . The writ of certiorari, however, may only be granted by the court when an inferior tribunal, board, or officer, exercising judicial functions, has exceeded its jurisdiction and there is neither an appeal nor any plain, speedy, and adequate remedy [*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1067, 1068*; for discussion and forms relating to the writ of certiorari, *see* Ch. 492, *Review (Certiorari), Writ of*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewSubstantial EvidenceEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.217

§ 579.217 Review of Ministerial Acts

Traditional mandamus is available to compel the performance of a ministerial act [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*]. It may be appropriate in a zoning case to compel ministerial actions by an administrative agency when the petitioner has complied with the controlling ordinance [*see Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 571-572, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664* (zoning clearance)]. It will not lie to control discretion within the area lawfully entrusted to the administrative body [*Hilton v. Board of Supervisors (1970) 7 Cal. App. 3d 708, 713, 86 Cal. Rptr. 754]* . A writ of mandate may be issued to any inferior tribunal or board to compel the performance of an act that the law specially enjoins, such as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station. It may also issue to compel the admission of a party to the use and enjoyment of a right to which he or she is entitled, and from which he or she is unlawfully precluded by that inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; for general discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085, see* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* [. The writ issues when there is not a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy, in the ordinary course of law. It may only be issued on the verified petition of the party beneficially interested [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*; *Flora Crane Service, Inc. v. Ross (1964) 61 Cal. 2d 199, 203, 37 Cal. Rptr. 425, 390 P.2d 193]* .

Traditional mandate is commonly appropriate in zoning and planning decisions that involve the following:

(1) A final map under the Subdivision Map Act [*see Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 653 n. 4, 655-656, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556]* .

(2) An action to challenge a general plan for noncompliance with *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* [*Gov. Code § 65751*; *see § 579.223*].

(3) The issuance of building permits [*see Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 883, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161 , appeal dismissed and cert denied0, 454 U.S. 1074* ; *see also West Coast Advertising Co. v. City & County of San Francisco (1967) 256 Cal. App. 2d 357, 359, 64 Cal. Rptr. 94* (some discretion may be allowed in determining whether to issue a building permit when a pending ordinance not yet enacted would render proposed

building illegal)].

Exhaustion of administrative remedies is a prerequisite to a writ of mandate [*Pan Pacific Properties, Inc. v. County of Santa Cruz (1978) 81 Cal. App. 3d 244, 249-251, 146 Cal. Rptr. 428* ; *Stone v. Turton (1963) 220 Cal. App. 2d 417, 418-422, 33 Cal. Rptr. 853]* .

Mandate is available to control an official's actions when that official is required and authorized to do a prescribed act on a prescribed contingency. Indeed, that official may also be liable for any damages sustained as a result of his or her conduct, as might be the case when a building inspector intentionally and arbitrarily refused to grant a building permit [*Ellis v. City Council (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 490, 497, 35 Cal. Rptr. 317* ; for discussion of claims against public entities and officers, *see* Ch. 467, *Public Entities and Officers: Enforcement of Judgments Against Public Entities* [.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinancesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.218

§ 579.218 Review of Legislative Acts

[1] Presumption of Constitutionality

An ordinance restricting land use is valid if it has a real or substantial relation to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare. To be unconstitutional, an ordinance must be clearly arbitrary and unreasonable, and have no substantial relation to the public health, safety, morals, or general welfare. Ordinances are presumed to be constitutional and come before the court with every intendment in their favor. If the validity of the ordinance is fairly debatable, the legislative judgment must be allowed to control [*Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 601-607, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473]* . The court's review of a zoning ordinance is not restricted to its impact on existing facilities. The court may look to the future and assume that development will proceed harmoniously with the requirements of the ordinance [*see Robinson v. City of Los Angeles (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d 810, 815-817, 304 P.2d 814]* . Although the motives influencing the legislative body may not be considered by the court, when the facts show an attempt to exercise the police power in a manner that oppresses or discriminates against an individual, the court may consider the evidence disclosing a purpose other than that declared by the ordinance [*Kissinger v. City of Los Angeles (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 454, 462, 327 P.2d 10]* .

[2] Consideration of Regional Welfare

Municipalities are not isolated islands remote from the needs and problems of the area in which they are located. Thus an ordinance, althoughreasonable from the limited viewpoint of the enacting municipality, may be unreasonable when viewed from the larger perspective of surrounding communities. For example, a municipal ordinance may impact the supply and distribution of housing for an entire metropolitan region. If its impact is limited to the city boundaries, the inquiry may be limited accordingly. However, if an ordinance may strongly influence an entire metropolitan region, judicial inquiry must consider the welfare of that region. In determining whether a challenged ordinance restriction reasonably relates to the regional welfare, the trial court should forecast the probable effect and duration of the restriction, identify the competing interests affected by the restriction, and determine whether the ordinance, in light of its probable impact, represents a reasonable accommodation of the competing interests. In ascertaining whether a

challenged ordinance reasonably relates to the regional welfare, the extent and bounds of the region significantly affected by the ordinance should be determined as a question of fact by the trial court [*Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 607-609, 607-608 n.24, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473* ; *see Northwood Homes, Inc. v. Town of Moraga (1989) 216 Cal. App. 3d 1197, 1201-1203, 265 Cal. Rptr. 363* (initiative stopping development of 113 units had no significant effect on regional housing supply)].

[3] Certainty Requirement

A zoning ordinance that lists the permitted and prohibited uses within given zones is not subject to attack for lacking the requisite certainty under due process standards. Indeed, many ordinances use that format. The mere fact that a landowner must search the zoning ordinance to discover the scope of permitted uses within a zone, cannot alone render that ordinance vague and uncertain. However, if a permitted use is ambiguous, then the range of impliedly proscribed uses is equally unclear. A specific itemization of proscribed uses within a given zone is not mandated by due process, if from a fair reading of the ordinance, the acts proscribed are reasonably clear [*see Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 743, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733]* .

Most zoning ordinances provide that a violation of their provisions constitute a misdemeanor, and provide a penalty for that violation. A zoning ordinance with a penal provision that either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that persons of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ concerning its application, violates the first essential of due process. Although mathematical exactitude is not required, reasonable certainty is. While the dangers of discriminatory enforcement and ex post facto punishment posed by vague penal provisions must be considered in construing zoning ordinances, liberal regard will be given to legislative intent in order to give effect to the salutary objects of the law [*Sechrist v. Municipal Court (1976) 64 Cal. App. 3d 737, 745, 134 Cal. Rptr. 733* ("residential use" not too vague)]. By contrast, when the zoning ordinance does not impose criminal sanctions for a violation, it appears that a lesser standard of certainty may be sufficient to uphold it. For example, in upholding an ordinance one court rationalized its finding by saying that a court would have no trouble ascertaining what the writers had in mind [*In re Valterza (1940) 37 Cal. App. 2d 682, 685, 100 P.2d 337]* .

[4] Effect of Changed Circumstances

Even though valid when adopted, a zoning regulation may become invalid due to changed circumstances. Thus, an originally valid ordinance may later prove to be confiscatory. Earlier compliance with the regulation does not forfeit the right of protest when the regulation becomes intolerable through the changed conditions [*Skalko v. City of Sunnyvale (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 213, 216, 93 P.2d 93]* .

[5] By Traditional Mandate

Traditional mandate may be used to challenge the consititutionality of zoning actions of the legislative body, that is, the validity of a zoning ordinance or actions taken with respect to rezoning of property [*Ensign Bickford Realty Corp. v. City Council (1977) 68 Cal. App. 3d 467, 472-473, 137 Cal. Rptr. 304* ; *see Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1980) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 522, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565]* .

[6] By Declaratory Relief

An action for declaratory relief is proper to test the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance [*see Agins v. City of Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* .

A complaint for declaratory relief in a zoning case must allege an existing actual controversy regarding the ordinance in question [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *C. Dudley De Velbiss Co. v. Kraintz (1951) 101 Cal. App. 2d 612, 615-616, 225 P.2d 969]* . For example, an action for declaratory relief is appropriate when a landowner alleges that a zoning

restriction destroyed almost all the reasonable value of his or her property [*Skalko v. City of Sunnyvale (1939) 14 Cal. 2d 213, 214, 216, 93 P.2d 93]* . Moreover, when a landowner brings an action for declaratory relief to establish his or her zoning rights on his or her property, neighboring property owners are parties in interest and entitled to intervene in that action [*Weiner v. City of Los Angeles (1968) 68 Cal. 2d 697, 706, 68 Cal. Rptr. 733, 441 P.2d 293]* .

The court's jurisdiction to entertain an action for declaratory relief is conditioned on a completion of any administrative procedure, even when the statute sought to be enforced by the administrative agency is challenged on constitutional grounds [*Igna v. City of Baldwin Park (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 909, 911-912, 88 Cal. Rptr. 581* ; *Dunham v. City of Westminster (1962) 202 Cal. App. 2d 245, 249-250, 20 Cal. Rptr. 772]* . That jurisdictional requirement may be waived in limited circumstances, however [*see Hoshour v. County of Contra Costa (1962) 203 Cal. App. 2d 602, 605-606, 21 Cal. Rptr. 714]* .

Actions for declaratory relief will be set for trial at the earliest possible date and will take precedence over all other cases, except older matters of the same character and matters to which special precedence may be given by law [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3(a)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3(b)* for precedence of action combined with declaratory relief action].

For a form of complaint for declaratory relief challenging the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance, see *§ 579.370*. For discussion of declaratory relief actions generally and additional forms, see Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* .

[7] By Injunctive Relief

An aggrieved person, that is, one who is specially interested in the sense of being irreparably injured by enforcement of an allegedly invalid zoning ordinance, may enjoin enforcement of that ordinance against himself or herself if it is unconstitutionally applied or otherwise invalid [*see Johnston v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 31 Cal. 2d 66, 71, 187 P.2d 686* ; *Greenfield v. Bd. of City Plan. Commrs. (1935) 6 Cal. App. 2d 515, 518-519, 45 P.2d 219]* . For example, injunctive relief is appropriate when a zoning ordinance is discriminatory [*McCaslin v. City of Monterey Park (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 339, 347-348, 329 P.2d 522]* .

As with all injunctions, injunctive relief in zoning cases is governed by *Civ. Code § 3422* and *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*. Injunctive relief is not available when there is an adequate remedy at law. For example, injunctive relief is not available to challenge the decision of a planning commission, because administrative mandamus is appropriate and provides an adequate legal remedy [*Triangle Ranch, Inc. v. Union Oil Co. (1955) 135 Cal. App. 2d 428, 438, 287 P.2d 537]* .

[8] By Action for Inverse Condemnation

Although the California Supreme Court has held that a landowner may not elect to sue in inverse condemnation to contest the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance as an unconstitutional taking, the United States Supreme Court has held that such an action must be available, at least when the ordinance deprived the landowner of all use of its property [*First Lutheran Church v. Los Angeles County (1987) 482 U.S. 304, 315, 107 S. Ct. 2378, 96 L. Ed. 2d 250* ; *see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)* ; for further discussion, *see § 579.12[5][a]*].

[9] Period of Limitation

Except as provided in *Gov. Code § 65009(d)* (relating to low or moderate income housing [*see § 579.219*] and challenges to the adequacy of general plan housing elements, respectively), no action or proceeding may be maintained in any of the following cases by any person unless it is commenced and service is made on the legislative body within 90 days after its decision [*Gov. Code § 65009(c)*]:

(1) To attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the decision of a legislative body to adopt or amend a general or specific plan. This does not apply when an action is brought based on the complete absence of a general plan or a mandatory element of the plan, but does apply to an action attacking a general plan or mandatory element of the plan on the basis that it is inadequate. The limitation period applies to adoption or amendments of a general plan made within the 120-day period. When an action is brought challenging the validity of a general plan based on amendments to the general plan within 120 days of the amendments, only the effect of the amendments may be challenged, and challenges to the validity of other parts of the general plan are barred by the 120-day limitation period [*Garat v. City of Riverside (1991) 2 Cal. App. 4th 259, 280-284, 3 Cal. Rptr. 2d 504 , overruled in part by Morehart v. County of Santa Barbara (1994) 7 Cal. 4th 725, 743*].

(2) To attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the decision of a legislative body to adopt or amend a zoning ordinance [*see Gonzalez v. County of Tulare (1998) 65 Cal. App. 4th 777, 782-785, 76 Cal. Rptr. 2d 707]* .

(3) To determine the reasonableness, legality, or validity of any decision to adopt or amend any regulation attached to a specific plan.

(4) To attack, review, set aside, void, or annul a legislative body's decision to adopt, amend, or modify a specific portion of a development agreement, when the agreement, amendment, or modification was adopted on or after January 1, 1996.

(5) To attack, review, set aside, void, or annul any decision on matters related to local government procedures involved in dealing with conditional use or other permits [*see Gov. Code §§ 65901, 65903*], or the validity of any condition attached to a variance, conditional use permit, or any other permit.

(6) Concerning any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done, or made before any of the decisions listed in 1-5, *above*.

On expiration of the time limits provided for in *Gov. Code § 65009*, all persons are barred from any further action or proceeding [*Gov. Code § 65009(e)*].

Gov. Code § 65009 applies to charter cities [*Gov. Code § 65009(f)*]. Except for challenges to post-1995 developments agreements [*see* (4), *above*], *Gov. Code § 65009* is applicable to those decisions of the legislativebody of a city, county, or city and county made pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.* on or after January 1, 1984 [*Gov. Code § 65009(h)*].

Except as provided in *Gov. Code § 65009(d), Gov. Code § 65009* does not affect any law prescribing or authorizing a shorter period of limitation than that specified herein [*Gov. Code § 65009(g)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewConstitutional LawThe JudiciaryCase or ControversyConstitutionality of LegislationPresumptionsEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.219

§ 579.219 Low or Moderate Income Housing

Certain actions or proceedings brought in support of the development of housing projects that meet the requirements for housing for persons and families with low or moderate incomes [*see Health & Safety Code § 50079.5*], or very low incomes [*see Health & Safety Code § 50105*], or middle-income households [*see Gov. Code § 65008*] must be commenced and the legislative body served within one year after the accrual of the cause of action [*see Gov. Code § 65009(d)*]. An action under *Gov. Code § 65009(d)* cannot be maintained until 60 days have expired following notice to the city or county clerk by the party bringing the cause of action, or by his or her representative, specifying the deficiencies of the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance. The cause of action accrues 60 days after notice is filed or the legislative body takes a final action in response to the notice, whichever occurs first. A notice or cause of action brought by one party pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65009(d)* will not bar filing of a notice and initiation of a cause of action by any other party [*Gov. Code § 65009(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil Rights LawContractual Relations & HousingFair Housing RightsEconomic DiscriminationEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsPublic Health & Welfare LawHousing & Public BuildingsLow Income HousingReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.220

§ 579.220 Joinder of Types of Relief

Different methods of judicial relief may be combined in zoning cases. For example, an action to enjoin enforcement of a zoning ordinance is often joined with an action for declaratory relief [*see, e.g., Morris v. City of Los Angeles (1953) 116 Cal. App. 2d 856, 857, 254 P.2d 935]* . Additionally, a petition in mandamus is also commonly combined with a declaratory relief action [*see, e.g., Floresta, Inc. v. City Council (1961) 190 Cal. App. 2d 599, 612, 12 Cal. Rptr. 182]* . When a form of judicial relief is combined with an action for declaratory relief, the combined action may be given priority on the court calendar on noticed motion and a showing that the action requires a speedy trial [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1062.3(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureDeclaratory Judgment ActionsState JudgmentsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.221

§ 579.221 Review of Ordinance Consistency With General Plan

[1] Required

City and county zoning ordinances must be consistent with the applicable general plan [*Gov. Code § 65860(a)*; *Resource Defense Fund v. County of Santa Cruz (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 800, 806, 184 Cal. Rptr. 371]* . The consistency requirement applies to zoning ordinances adopted by initiative or referendum as well as those adopted by legislative bodies [deBottari v. *City Council (1985) 171 Cal. App. 3d 1204, 1212-1213, 217 Cal. Rptr. 790* ; *see City of Irvine v. Irvine Citizens Against Overdevelopment (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 868, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797]* . Consistency requires that the various land uses authorized by the zoning ordinance be compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the general plan [*Gov. Code § 65860(a)*; *City of Irvine v. Irvine Citizens Against Overdevelopment (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 868, 879, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797* ; *Corona-Norco Unified School Dist. v. City of Corona (1993) 17 Cal. App. 4th 985, 994, 21 Cal. Rptr. 2d 803]* .

With the exception of Los Angeles, the consistency requirement does not apply to charter cities [*Gov. Code § 65803*]. However, charter cities are not precluded from adopting consistency requirements that are similar to those required of general law cities [*see Gov. Code § 65803*; *City of Irvine v. Irvine Citizens Against Overdevelopment (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 868, 875-876, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797]* .

In the event that a zoning ordinance becomes inconsistent with a general plan by reason of amendment to that plan, or to any element of that plan, that zoning ordinance must be amended within a reasonable time so that it is consistent with the general plan as amended [*Gov. Code § 65860(b)*].

Interim measures available to challenge a general plan are governed by *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763*. For a discussion of *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763*, see *§ 579.223*.

[2] Enforcement Action

Any resident or property owner within a city or county may bring an action or proceeding for writ of mandate in the superior court to enforce compliance with the consistency requirement. The action or proceeding must be commenced and service on the legislative body must be made within 90 days of the enactment or amendment of any new or existing zoning ordinance [*Gov. Code § 65860(b)*; *see Code Civ. Proc. § 1084 et seq.* (governing writ of mandate)].

[3] Applicable to Charter Cities

Gov. Code § 65860 applies in charter cities with a population of two million or more to a zoning ordinance adopted prior to January 1, 1979, which zoning ordinance must be consistent with the general plan of that city by July 1, 1982 [*Gov. Code § 65860(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseInitiative & ReferendumGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsChartersReal Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive PlansReal Property LawZoning & Land UseInitiative & Referendum

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.222

§ 579.222 Review of Decisions Under California Coastal Act

[1] Decisions of Commission

Any aggrieved person has the right to judicial review of any decision or action of the California Coastal Commission by filing a petition for a writof mandate in accordance with the provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* within 60 days after that decision or action has become final [*Pub. Res. Code § 30801*].

For purposes of *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30513(c)*, *30625*, and *30801*, an "aggrieved person" means any person who, in person or through a representative, appeared at a public hearing of the commission, local government, or port governing body in connection with the decision or action appealed, or who, by other appropriate means prior to a hearing, informed the commission, local government, or port governing body of the nature of his or her concerns or who for good cause was unable to do either. "Aggrieved person" includes the applicant for a permit and, in the case of an approval of a local coastal program, the local government involved [*Pub. Res. Code § 30801*].

[2] Decisions of Local Agency

Any person, including a permit applicant or the commission, aggrieved by the decision or action of a local government that is implementing a certified local coastal program or certified port master plan, or is exercising its powers pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 30600.5*, which decision or action may not be appealed to the commission, has the right to judicial review of that decision or action by filing a petition for writ of mandate under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* within 60 days after the action or decision has become final. The commission may intervene in that proceeding on a showing that the matter involves a question of the conformity of a proposed development with a certified local coastal program or certified port master plan or the validity of a local government action taken to implement a local coastal program or certified port master plan. Any local government or port governing body may request that the commission intervene. Notice of the action against a local government or port governing body must be filed with the commission within five working days of the filing of the action. When an action is brought challenging the validity of a local coastal program or certified port master plan, a preliminary showing must be made prior to proceeding on the merits concerning why that

action should not have been brought pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 30801* [*Pub. Res. Code § 30802*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewReviewabilityStandingEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementEnforcementEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.223

§ 579.223 Actions to Challenge General Plan

[1] Traditional Mandate

Any action to challenge a general plan or any element thereof on the grounds that the plan or element does not substantially comply with the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* (scope of general plans) must be brought pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* [*Gov. Code § 65751*].

[2] Time for Hearing

All actions brought pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65751*, including the hearing of any such action from the decision of a lower court, will be given preference over all other civil actions before the court in the setting for hearing or trial. All those actions will be speedily heard and determined [*Gov. Code § 65752*].

The petitioner must request a hearing or trial on the alternative writ or peremptory writ of mandate, and any other party may request a hearing or trial, within 90 days of the date the petitioner files the petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65751*. If no request is filed within 90 days of the date that petition is filed, the action or proceeding may be set for hearing or trial, dismissed on the motion of any party other than the petitioner, or dismissed on the court's own motion [*Gov. Code § 65753(a)*].

Within 30 days of the filing of the request for a hearing or trial pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65753(a)*, the court will set a date for a hearing or trial on the action or part of an action brought pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65751*. The hearing or trial will be set to be heard at the earliest possible date, but not more than 120 days after the filing of a request for hearing under *Gov. Code § 65753*. The court may continue for a reasonable time the date of the hearing or trial on written motion and a finding of good cause. However, if the court grants a continuance to a respondent, it must, on the written motion of the petitioner and on the petitioner meeting the requirements of *Gov. Code § 65757*, grant the relief provided in *Gov. Code § 65757* as temporary relief. But the court will not enjoin any housing developments that comply with applicable provisions of law and that may be developed without having an impact on the ability of the city or county to

properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element [*Gov. Code § 65753(b)*; *see § 579.223[4][c]*].

[3] Bringing General Plan Into Compliance

[a] 120-Day Time Limit

In any action brought to challenge the validity of the general plan of any city or county, or any mandatory element thereof, if the court, in a final judgment in favor of the plaintiff or petitioner, finds that the general plan or any mandatory element of a general plan, does not substantially comply with the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* [*Gov. Code § 65754*]:

(a) The city or county must bring its general plan or relevant mandatory elements thereof into compliance with the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* within 120 days.

(b) The city or county (including the chartered cities specified in *Gov. Code § 65860(d)*) must, in accordance with *Gov. Code § 65860*, bring itszoning ordinance into consistency with its general plan or relevant mandatory element or elements thereof within 120 days after the general plan has been amended in accordance with *Gov. Code § 65754(a)*.

[b] Housing Element

Notwithstanding *Gov. Code § 65585(b)* (ordinary time frame for review of amendments to plan), the planning agency of the city or county must submit a draft of its revised housing element or housing element amendment at least 45 days prior to its adoption to the Department of Housing and Community Development for its review, notifying the department that the element is subject to the review procedure of *Gov. Code § 65754*. The department will review the draft element or amendment and report its findings to the planning agency within 45 days of receipt of the draft. The legislative body will consider the department's findings prior to final adoption of the housing element or amendment if the department's findings are reported to the planning agency within 45 days after the department receives that draft element or amendment [*Gov. Code § 65754*].

[4] Remedies Available Pending Local Entity Compliance

[a] In General

The court will include, in the order or judgment rendered pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65754*, one or more of the following provisions for any or all types or classes or developments or any or all geographic segments of the city or county until the city or county has substantially complied with the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* [*Gov. Code § 65755(a)*]:

(1) Suspend the authority of the city or county pursuant to *Health & Safety Code §§ 17910-17995.5*, to issue building permits, or any category of building permits, and all other related permits, except that the city or county will continue to function as an enforcement agency for review of permit applications for appropriate codes and standards compliance, prior to the issuance of building permits and other related permits for residential housing.

(2) Suspend the authority of the city or county pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 65800-65912* to grant any and all categories of zoning changes, variances, or both.

(3) Suspend the authority of the city or county pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 66410-66499.37* to grant subdivision map approvals for any and all categories of subdivision map approvals.

(4) Mandate the approval of all applications for building permits, or other related construction permits, for residential housing where a final subdivision map, parcel map, or plot plan has been approved for the project, where the approval

will not impact on the ability of the city or county to properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element, and where the permit application conforms to all code requirements and other applicable provisions of law except those zoning laws held to be invalid by the final court order, and changes to the zoning ordinances adopted after that final court order that were enacted for the purpose of preventing the construction of a specific residential development.

(5) Mandate the approval of any or all final subdivision maps for residential housing projects that have previously received a tentative map approval from the city or county pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 66410-66499.37*.

(6) Mandate that notwithstanding the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 66473.5* and *66474*, any tentative subdivision map for a residential housing project will be approved if all of the following requirements are met:

> (A) The approval of the map will not significantly impair the ability of the city or county to adopt and implement those elements or portions thereof of the general plan that have been held to be inadequate.
>
> (B) The map complies with all of the provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 66410-66499.37*, except those parts that would require disapproval of the project due to the inadequacy of the general plan.
>
> (C) The approval of the map will not affect the ability of the city or county to adopt and implement an adequate housing element.
>
> (D) The map is consistent with the portions of the general plan not found inadequate and the proposed revisions, if applicable, to the part of the plan held inadequate.

[b] Exclusion of Project Required to Be Consistent

Any order or judgment of a court that includes the remedies described in *Gov. Code § 65755(a)(1), (2),* or *(3)* will exclude from the operation of that order or judgment any action, program, or project required by law to be consistent with a general or specific plan if the court finds that the approval or undertaking of the action, program, or project complies with both of the following requirements [*Gov. Code § 65755(b)*]:

(1) That it will not significantly impair the ability of the city or county to adopt or amend all or part of the applicable plan as may be necessary to make the plan substantially comply with the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307* in the case of a general plan, or *Gov. Code §§ 65450-65457* in the case of a specific plan.

(2) That it is consistent with those portions of the plan challenged in the action or proceeding and found by the court to substantially comply with applicable provisions of law.

The party seeking exclusion from any order or judgment of a court pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65755(b)* has the burden of showing that the action, program, or project complies with its provisions [*Gov. Code § 65755(b)*].

[c] Temporary Remedy

During the pendency of any action described in *Gov. Code § 65754*, the court may, on a showing of probable success on the merits, grant the relief provided in *Gov. Code § 65755* as temporary relief. In any order granting temporary relief, the court will not enjoin during the pendency of the action any housing developments that comply with applicable provisions of law and that may be developed without having any impact on the ability of the city or county to properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element. Any housing developments permitted to proceed during the pendency of the action will not be subject to the restrictions specified in *Gov. Code § 65754(a)* or *(b)* as part of any final judgment [*Gov. Code § 65757*].

If the court orders any temporary relief in an action or proceeding subject to *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763*, any party to the action may file with the court a written request that the court make a final determination in the action or proceeding, and the court will thereafter make a final determination and enter judgment within 180 days of the date the request was filed, unless the party who filed the request files a withdrawal of the request with the court prior to the filing by the court of its memorandum of intended decision [*Gov. Code § 65758*].

[5] Certain Housing Development May Not Be Enjoined

During the pendency of any action described in *Gov. Code § 65754*, or when issuing a final judgment in favor of the plaintiff or petitioner finding that the general plan or any element thereof does not conform to the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307*, the court will not enjoin the development of any housing development with respect to which all of the following conditions are met [*Gov. Code § 65754.5(a)*]:

(1) The legislative body has approved a development project (defined by *Gov. Code § 65928*), for housing or a specific plan for the housing development, and determined the development project for housing or the specific plan to be consistent with the general plan.

(2) The legislative body has certified an environmental impact report or a negative declaration for the development project for housing or for the specific plan for housing pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*), and no legal action was brought within the applicable statute of limitations period relating to that environmental impact report or negative declaration.

(3) The owner of the land on which the housing project is proposed to be developed, in satisfaction of any requirements imposed and in reliance on any action taken by the city or county pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65754.5(a)(1), (2)*, has irrevocably committed at least $1,000,000 for public infrastructure, including, but not limited to, roads and water and sewer facilities.

(4) The proposed housing development may be developed without having an impact on the ability of the city or county to implement an adequate housing element or to properly adopt an adequate housing element if the court determines, in the pending action, that the general plan or plan element is inadequate. The court will apply the provisions of *Gov. Code § 65760* to determine whether a housing development will have an impact on the ability of the city or county to properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element.

Gov. Code § 65754.5 applies to any legal action pending on January 1, 1984, and to every action commenced on or after that date [*Gov. Code § 65754.5(b)*]. *Gov. Code § 65754.5* will not be construed to preclude a public agency from exercising discretion, in a manner authorized by any other provision of law, to alter plans, zoning, or subsequent development approvals applicable to those lands, or from enacting and enforcing further regulations on their use [*Gov. Code § 65754.5(c)*].

[6] Residential Housing

[a] Presumption Governing Low Income Housing

In determining whether a housing development will have an impact on the ability of the city or county to properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element, the court will consider all relevant factors. There is a conclusive presumption that any housing development, 25 percent of which units are affordable to persons and families of low or moderate income (defined in *Health & Safety Code § 50093*), can be developed without having an impact on the ability of the city or county to properly adopt and implement an adequate housing element, except when the approval of a housing development may prevent the city or county from complying with the final judgment of the court [*Gov. Code § 65760*].

[b] Revocation of Building Permit Impermissible

In no event will any court grant as relief in any action brought pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* the revocation of any building permits or related permits for the construction of residential housing that has been issued prior to the filing of the complaint in that action. Nothing in *Gov. Code § 65761* will be construed as a limitation on the ability to bring an action and to grant relief for a violation of *Gov. Code §§ 65560-65570* [*Gov. Code § 65761*].

[7] Reference of Action

If the court orders a reference of any action brought pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* or pursuant to any provision of law that grants a court the authority to appoint expert witnesses, monitors, masters, or other third-party judicial assistants used in complex litigation, the personso appointed must report their findings to the court within not more than 90 days following that reference [*Gov. Code § 65756*].

[8] Environmental Effect

In any action brought under *Gov. Code § 65759* [*Gov. Code § 65759*]:

(1) The provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*), will not apply to any action necessary to bring its general plan or relevant mandatory elements thereof into compliance with any court order or judgment under *Gov. Code § 65759*.

(2) The court for good cause shown may grant not more than two extensions of time, not to exceed a total of 240 days, in order to meet the requirements imposed by *Gov. Code § 65754*.

Even though CEQA does not apply, the local agency will prepare an initial study, within the time limitations specified in *Gov. Code § 65754*, to determine the environmental effects of the proposed action necessary to comply with the court order. If as a result of the initial study, the local agency determines that the action may have a significant effect on the environment, the local agency will prepare, with the time limitations specified in *Gov. Code § 65754*, an environmental assessment. The local agency must include notice of the preparation of the environmental assessment in all notices provided for the amendments to the general plan proposed to comply with the court order. The environmental assessment will be deemed part of the general plan and will only be reviewable as provided in *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* [*Gov. Code § 65759(a)(1)*].

The local agency may comply with the provisions of CEQA in any action necessary to bring its general plan or relevant mandatory elements thereof into compliance with any court order or judgment under *Gov. Code § 65759* so long as it does so within the time limitations specified in *Gov. Code § 65754* [*Gov. Code § 65759(a)(4)*].

[9] Application

Nothing in *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* prohibits a court from invalidating any development permit based on failure to comply with the Subdivision Map Act (*Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*), the California Environmental Quality Act (*Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*), the planning and zoning law (*Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*), or other applicable laws [*Gov. Code § 65762*].

The procedures and remedies set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* will not be construed to affect the substantive standards of court review of a general plan or of other local government land use decisions. Its remedies are interim measures that have no application after a general plan has been revised to substantially comply with state law [*Gov. Code § 65762*]. Actions to enforce ordinance compliance with a general plan are governed by *Gov. Code § 65860*. For discussion of *Gov. Code § 65860*, see *§ 579.221[1]*.

The provisions of *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* apply to all actions, proceedings, and causes of action set forth therein, whether commenced or alleged by the filing of a petition, complaint, cross-complaint, complaint in intervention, or otherwise. Nothing in *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763* will be construed to create any cause of action in or to confer standing to sue on any person, entity, public officer, or state or other public agency [*Gov. Code § 65763*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive & General PlansEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive PlansReal Property LawZoning & Land UseState & Regional Planning

81 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
I. Review of Zoning and Planning Decisions

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.224-579.239

[Reserved]

§§ 579.224[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.240

§ 579.240 Inspections Require Consent

Even though routine inspections of private property by local authorities in furtherance of public safety programs or zoning ordinances are a less hostile intrusion than the typical police search for the fruits and instrumentalities of crime, the freedom from unreasonable searches afforded by the *Fourth* and *Fourteenth Amendments* is applicable [*Camara v. Municipal Court (1967) 387 U.S. 523, 527-534, 87 S. Ct. 1727, 18 L. Ed. 2d 930]* . Thus, if a landowner refuses to consent voluntarily to an inspection of his or her premises as called for by a local zoning ordinance, a warrantless search is not permitted. The provisions of *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1822.50-1822.60,* governing the issuance of warrants for routine administrative inspections, must be adhered to by public officials [*see Currier v. City of Pasadena (1975) 48 Cal. App. 3d 810, 814-817, 121 Cal. Rptr. 913* ; *County of Contra Costa v. Humore, Inc. (1996) 45 Cal. App. 4th 1335, 53 Cal. Rptr. 2d 647]* . For further discussion of administrative searches, see Ch. 471, *Investigations by Public Agencies* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsSearch & SeizureScope of ProtectionCriminal Law & ProcedureSearch & SeizureWarrantless SearchesGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional Limits

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.241

§ 579.241 Enforcement by Government Entity

[1] Civil or Criminal

Many zoning ordinances provide that violation of the ordinance is a crime, thereby making criminal remedies available to the government entity in its enforcement efforts. Civil enforcement of zoning ordinances, in the form of injunctive relief, has in the past been justified by reference to nuisance law. However, recent cases indicate that a violation of a valid zoning ordinance itself constitutes a sufficient showing to permit civil enforcement [*see City of Santa Clara v. Paris (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 338, 341-342, 142 Cal. Rptr. 818]* . Of course, if the violation is also a public nuisance, the government entity may bring an action in nuisance. For discussion relating to public nuisance, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* .

Enforcement of city zoning ordinances is the duty of administrative officers and the city attorney [*Taliaferro v. Wampler (1954) 127 Cal. App.2d 306, 309, 273 P.2d 829* ; for discussion of enforcement by private citizens, see *§ 579.243*].

[2] Estoppel From Enforcement

Estoppel against government enforcement of zoning ordinances is rare and only occurs when (1) the city or county acted affirmatively, (2) the party seeking to assert the estoppel acted in reliance thereon, and (3) the city or county then attempted to alter its position to the detriment of that innocent party [*see City etc. of San Francisco v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 749, 756, 20 Cal. Rptr. 378]* .

Mere inaction in enforcement or permitting some persons to violate a zoning regulation does not preclude its enforcement against others. Unless the lax enforcement of an ordinance is the result of an intentional or arbitrary scheme to discriminate, it does not violate any constitutional right [*City etc. of San Francisco v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 749, 755, 20 Cal. Rptr. 378]* . It is similarly stated that no vested right to violate a zoning ordinance may be acquired by continued violations [*see Acker v. Baldwin (1941) 18 Cal. 2d 341, 346, 115 P.2d 455* ; *Donovan v.*

City of Santa Monica (1948) 88 Cal. App. 2d 386, 396, 199 P.2d 51] .

[3] Notice of Enforcement Action

[a] Recordation

Any agency that institutes a judicial action or proceeding to enforce zoning regulations may file a notice of the pendency of that action or proceeding in the county recorder's office of the county where the affected property is situated. The notice will be filed at the time of the commencement of the action or proceeding, and, on its recordation, that notice will have the same effect as a notice recorded pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 405.20* (filing lis pendens or notice of action with recorder). The notice will be recorded and indexed in the index of grantors and any other relevant index [*Gov. Code § 65908(a)*; for discussion of *Code Civ. Proc. § 405 et seq.*, see Ch. 348, *Lis Pendens*].

[b] Vacation

Any notice filed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65908(a)* may, on motion by a party to the action or proceeding, be vacated on an appropriate showing of need therefor by an order of a judge of the court where the action or proceeding is pending. A certified copy of that order may be recorded in the same office of the recorder where the notice of pendency of action is recorded. On that recordation the notice of pendency of the action or proceeding will not serve as constructive notice of any of the matters contained therein nor create any duty of inquiry in any person [*Gov. Code § 65908(b)*].

The order of vacation will not be appealable, but the party aggrieved by that order may, within 20 days after service of written notice of the order, or within such additional time up to 20 days as the court may, within the original 20 days allow, but in no event later than 60 days after entry of the order, petition the proper reviewing court to review that order by writ of mandate. No order of vacation will be effective, nor will it be recorded in the office of any county recorder, until the time within which a petition for writ of mandate may be filed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65908(b)* has expired [*Gov. Code § 65908(b)*].

[4] Statute of Limitations

Code Civ. Proc. § 343, which provides that an action must be commenced within four years after the cause of action accrues, is applicable to an action by a city or county in enforcing a zoning ordinance. If the zoning ordinance provides that the violator is deemed guilty of a separate offense for each day during which any portion of the violation is committed or permitted, there is a continuing violation and the statute runs from the last such violation [*City of Fontana v. Atkinson (1963) 212 Cal. App. 2d 499, 508-509, 28 Cal. Rptr. 25* (city seeking to enjoin unlawful extension or enlargement of nonconforming use and unlawful rebuilding was not barred due to continuing violation)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.242

§ 579.242 Injunctions

[1] Availability Generally

A zoning ordinance that does not provide that a violation of its provisions is a crime and provide criminal sanctions is enforceable by injunction [*City of Stockton v. Frisbie & Latta (1928) 93 Cal. App. 277, 285, 270 P. 270]* . However, even if the zoning ordinance prescribes a criminal penalty for violations, an injunction is available if that criminal penalty seems inadequate [*Sapiro v. Frisbie (1928) 93 Cal. App. 299, 303-305, 270 P. 280]* .

The right of a city to bring an action for injunctive relief depends only on a violation of the zoning ordinance [*City of Santa Clara v. Paris (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 338, 342, 142 Cal. Rptr. 818* (failure to comply with variance condition)]. That violation may be enjoined without any necessity of showing that the violation constitutes a nuisance [*City etc. of San Francisco v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 749, 756-757, 20 Cal. Rptr. 378]* . Indeed, a city has the right to injunctive relief to enforce a zoning ordinance, even when the injunction requires the landowner to remove alterations made to a building in violation of the ordinance [*City of San Mateo v. Hardy (1944) 64 Cal. App. 2d 794, 796-797, 149 P.2d 307]* .

[2] Preliminary Injunctions

If a zoning ordinance that a governmental entity is seeking to enforce by injunction specifically provides for injunctive relief, when the entityestablishes that it is reasonably probable it will prevail on the merits, a rebuttable presumption arises that the potential harm to the public outweighs the potential harm to the defendant. If the defendant shows that he or she would suffer grave or irreparable harm from the issuance of the preliminary injunction, the court must then examine the relative actual harms to the parties. Once the defendant has made such a showing, an injunction should issue only if--after consideration of both the degree of uncertainty of the outcome on the merits, and the consequences to each of the parties of granting or denying interim relief--the trial court concludes that an injunction is proper [*IT Corp. v. County of Imperial (1983) 35 Cal. 3d 63, 72, 196 Cal. Rptr. 715, 672 P.2d 121]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsPreliminary & Temporary InjunctionsCriminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.243

§ 579.243 Actions by Private Persons

[1] Injunctions

An owner of private property may bring an action to enjoin violations of a zoning ordinance that effect his or her property, when that property is in the same vicinity as the property on which the violation is occurring and that owner suffers a different type of injury or an injury of greater degree than that suffered by the public generally. For example, although the operation of a cafe or grocery store does not have a deleterious effect on the public generally, it may have such an effect on surrounding property owners when constructed in a residential zone [*Hopkins v. MacCulloch (1939) 35 Cal. App. 2d 442, 453-454, 95 P.2d 950* ; *see Taliaferro v. Wampler (1954) 127 Cal. App. 2d 306, 310, 273 P.2d 829]* . Private actions are not restricted to individuals, and a citizen's committee may have standing to sue when its members are property owners residing in close proximity to the parcel at issue. Standing has been found when each member of the committee had an interest in the enforcement of the ordinance peculiar to that member and each would have suffered special damage distinguishable from that suffered by the public at large as a result of the violation [*Simons v. City of Los Angeles (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 496, 501, 161 Cal. Rptr. 67]* .

Code Civ. Proc. § 731a places a limit on injunctive relief available to the private sector in certain zones. It provides that when manufacturing, commercial, or airport uses are expressly permitted within a zone, no person, firm, or corporation will be restrained by the injunctive process from the reasonable and necessary operation in that zone of any use expressly permitted, nor will that use be deemed a nuisance without evidence of the employment of unnecessary and injurious methods of operation [*Code Civ. Proc. § 731a*; for further discussion, see Ch. 391, *Nuisance* [.

[2] Damages

The violation of the provisions of a zoning ordinance prohibiting any unauthorized nonconforming use of premises constitutes an actionable wrong against each member of the community for whose particular welfare that ordinance was enacted, remediable at the suit of the persons specially injured thereby [*McIvor v. Mercer-Fraser Co. (1946) 76 Cal. App. 2d 247, 253-254, 172 P.2d 758]* .

[3] Mandate to Compel Action by Administrative Officer

Even though other remedies may exist, mandamus lies to compel an administrative officer to enforce an ordinance that imposes a mandatory duty on him or her to do so [*Blankenship v. Michalski (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 672, 674, 318 P.2d 727]* . For example, a writ of mandate to compel an administrative officer to issue an arrest warrant for a violation of a zoning ordinance was properly granted when that officer's duty was mandatory [*see Wilson v. Edgar (1923) 64 Cal. App. 654, 655-657, 222 P. 623]* .

Mandamus cannot be employed to control the exercise of discretion by an administrative officer. For example, mandamus to compel a city attorney to commence proceedings to abate operation of a pharmacy alleged to be in violation of the zoning ordinance was properly denied when that ordinance permitted the attorney some discretion to determine whether a violation had occurred, and there was no abuse of that discretion in determining there was no violation [*Blankenship v. Michalski (1957) 155 Cal. App. 2d 672, 674-676, 318 P.2d 727]* . In response to an appropriate application, the court may compel administrative action, but it may not substitute its discretion for the discretion properly vested in the administrative officer [*Lindell Co. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1943) 23 Cal. 2d 303, 315, 144 P.2d 4]* .

[4] Period of Limitation

An action by a private party for injury to real property resulting from a violation of a zoning ordinance has a three year statute of limitation [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 338(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming UsesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.244

§ 579.244 Defenses

[1] Authorized Use

There are a variety of defenses available to the charge of violation of a zoning ordinance, although not all of them are applicable in every case. An obvious defense is that the use is specifically authorized, as is the case when the questioned use is incidental to a permissive use, especially when that use does not interfere with the general character and aesthetic harmonies of the district [*City of Beverly Hills v. Brady (1950) 34 Cal. 2d 854, 857, 215 P.2d 460]* .

[2] Invalid Ordinance

Another defense is that the ordinance is invalid. A zoning ordinance may be unconstitutional if it amounts to an uncompensated destruction of aprivate property right [*see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 273, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)]* . A zoning ordinance may also be invalid because it is inconsistent with the general plan [*see Gov. Code § 65860(a)*; for discussion of actions under *Gov. Code § 65860, see § 579.221*]. An ordinance that is inconsistent with the general plan is invalid at the time it is enacted [*Sierra Club v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 698, 704, 179 Cal. Rptr. 261]* . Another ground of invalidity is vagueness. A zoning ordinance is invalid for vagueness or uncertainty when no one can know what use is or is not permitted and no procedure is prescribed whereby it may be ascertained [*People v. Binzley (1956) 146 Cal. App. 2d Supp. 889, 890-891 , 303 P.2d 903]* .

A zoning ordinance may also be invalid if it makes an improper delegation of authority. When restrictions imposed on the use of property are unnecessary, unreasonable, and oppressive, and absolute legislative discretion is delegated to the planning commission, that ordinance will be unconstitutional [*People v. Perez (1963) 29 Cal. Rptr. 781]* .

[3] Unconstitutional Application of Ordinance

Finally, one charged with violation of a zoning ordinance may assert as a defense improper application or construction

of that ordinance by the enforcing agent. An alleged violation of an ordinance was successfully defended when it was shown that the proposed interpretation would lead to uncertain results through defective notice, discriminatory enforcement, and ex post facto punishment [*see In re Scarpitti (1981) 124 Cal. App. 3d 434, 439-441, 177 Cal. Rptr. 387* (landowner parking large commercial dump truck used in his livelihood at his residence did not violate ordinance in rural residential zone)]. The construction of zoning ordinances is ruled by the same rules as general statutes [*City of Norwalk v. Auction City, Inc. (1960) 186 Cal. App. 2d 287, 290, 8 Cal. Rptr. 781* ; for discussion of the rules of statutory interpretation, *see* Ch. 531, *Statutes and Ordinances* [.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental FreedomsJudicial & Legislative RestraintsOverbreadth & VaguenessConstitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsEminent Domain & TakingsEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

87 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
B. Zoning and Planning
9. Judicial Review
II Enforcement of Zoning and Planning Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.245-579.259

[Reserved]

§§ 579.245[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.260

§ 579.260 Governing Law

The Subdivision Map Act is contained in *Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.* In addition, the subdivision of property may be governed by local ordinances adopted pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act. The Subdivided Lands Act is set forth in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.* The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act is set forth in *15 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.261

§ 579.261 Subdivision Map Act

The Subdivision Map Act (the Act) establishes general statewide criteria for land development planning and delegates authority to cities and counties to regulate the details of subdivisions [*Benny v. City of Alameda (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1010-1011, 164 Cal. Rptr. 776]* . The Act and the ordinances passed in conformity with it have several purposes, such as: (1) to regulate and control the design and improvement of subdivisions, with proper consideration of their relation to adjoining areas; (2) to require the subdivider to install streets and drains; (3) to prevent fraud and exploitation; and (4) to protect both the public and the purchaser [*Tiburon v. Northwestern P. R. Co. (1970) 4 Cal. App. 3d 160, 175, 84 Cal. Rptr. 469* ; *Pratt v. Adams (1964) 229 Cal. App. 2d 602, 605-606, 40 Cal. Rptr. 505]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.262

§ 579.262 Definitions

[1] Subdivider

"Subdivider" means a person, firm, corporation, partnership, or association who proposes to divide, divides, or causes to be divided real property into a subdivision for himself, herself, or itself or for others. However, employees and consultants of those persons or entities, acting in that capacity, are not "subdividers" [*Gov. Code § 66423*].

[2] Subdivision

[a] Generally

"Subdivision" means the division, by any subdivider, of any unit or units of improved or unimproved land, or any portion thereof, shown on the latest equalized county assessment roll as a unit or as contiguous units, for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing, whether immediate or future. Property will be considered as contiguous units, even if it is separated by roads, streets, utility easement, or railroad rights-of-way. "Subdivision" includes a condominium project as defined in *Civ. Code § 1351(f)*, a community apartment project as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004*, or the conversion of five or more existing dwelling units to a stock cooperative as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11003.2* [*Gov. Code § 66424*].

An agreement that a seller could use a portion of a lot until the seller's adjacent lot was sold or the seller died did not create a subdivision because it was not a division for purposes of sale or lease of property [*Robinson v. City of Alameda (1987) 194 Cal. App. 3d 1286, 1288-1289, 239 Cal. Rptr. 926]* .

[b] Subsequent Subdivision

Nothing in *Gov. Code § 66424* prevents a purchaser of a unit of land created under the provisions of the Act or a local ordinance, fromsubdividing the land one or more times, pursuant to the provisions of the Act prior to the time that an equalized county assessment roll has been completed reflecting the creation of the unit proposed to be subdivided [*Gov. Code § 66424.1*].

Nothing in *Gov. Code §§ 66410-66424.6* prevents the same subdivider of a unit of land created under the provisions of the Act or a local ordinance, from making consecutive subdivisions of the same parcel or any portion of it. Further, local agencies must not prohibit consecutive subdivisions of the same parcel or portion thereof either by the same subdivider or a subsequent purchaser because the parcel was previously subdivided. However, the local agency may impose appropriate conditions or requirements on the consecutive subdivisions [*Gov. Code § 66424.1*].

[c] Environmental Subdivision

An "environmental subdivision" is a subdivision of land for biotic and wildlife purposes that meets specified conditions. Among other things, the parcel must consist of at least 20 acres, and be encumbered by an easement to ensure compliance with the goal of maintaining and preserving the biotic or wildlife character of the land [*Gov. Code § 66418.2*].

The concept of environmental subdivisions represents an effort to provide a market-based solution for developers and landowners who either need to satisfy local government-imposed mitigation conditions on development of environmentally sensitive lands, or who own land that cannot be developed due to environmental designation. For example, as a condition to approval of a proposed subdivision, a local government may require a subdivider to permanently protect an acre of wildlife land for every acre of habitat that the proposed development would convert to housing. By creating an environmental subdivision at another location, a developer can satisfy the mitigation condition and still proceed with its development. Environmental subdivisions are also intended to provide a landowner who cannot develop its property because it has been designated wildlife habitat with the possibility of an economic return on its investment by designating it an environmental subdivision and transferring it to a developer looking to satisfy mitigation conditions off-site.

[3] Local Agency

"Local agency" means a city, county, or city and county [*Gov. Code § 66420*].

[4] Local Ordinance

"Local ordinance" refers to a local ordinance regulating the design and improvement of subdivisions, enacted by the legislative body of any local agency under the provisions of the Act or any prior statute, regulating the design and improvements of subdivisions, insofar as the provisions of the ordinance are consistent with and not in conflict with the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act [*Gov. Code § 66421*].

[5] Tentative Map

"Tentative map" refers to a map made for the purpose of showing the design and improvement of a proposed subdivision and the existing conditions in and around it and need not be based on an accurate or detailed final survey of the property [*Gov. Code § 66424.5(a)*]. A "vesting tentative map" refers to a map that meets the requirements of *Gov. Code §§ 66424.5(a)* (tentative map) and 66452 (filing map) [*Gov. Code § 66424.5(b)*; *see § 579.267* (notice and filing of tentative map)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.263

§ 579.263 Projects Outside Scope of Act

[1] Generally

The Subdivision Map Act does not apply to any of the following [*Gov. Code § 66412*]:

(1) The financing or leasing of apartments, offices, stores or similar space within apartment buildings, industrial buildings, commercial buildings, mobilehome parks, or trailer parks.

(2) Mineral, oil, or gas leases.

(3) Land dedicated for cemetery purposes under the Health and Safety Code.

(4) A lot line adjustment between four or fewer existing adjoining parcels, when the land taken from one parcel is added to an adjoining parcel, and when a greater number of parcels than originally existed is not thereby created, if the lot line adjustment is approved by the local agency, or advisory agency [*see, e.g., San Dieguito Partnership v. City of San Diego (1992) 7 Cal. App. 4th 748, 755-759, 9 Cal. Rptr. 2d 440* (lot line adjustment exception not limited to minor adjustments or to only two adjacent parcels; but applicable to adjustments to nine adjacent lots when no additional lots were created)].

(5) Boundary line or exchange agreements to which the State Lands Commission or a local agency holding a trust grant of tide and submerged lands is a party.

(6) Any separate assessment under *Rev. & Tax. Code § 2188.7* (tax on improvements).

(7) The conversion of a community apartment project [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004*] to a condominium [*see Civ. Code § 783*], when specified statutory requirements are met.

(8) Unless a parcel or final map was approved by the legislative body of a local agency, the conversion of a stock

cooperative as defined in *Bus.& Prof. Code § 11003.2* to a condominium as defined in *Civ. Code § 783*, when specified statutory requirements are met.

(9) The leasing of, or the granting of an easement to, a parcel of land, or any portion thereof, in conjunction with the financing, erection, and sale or lease of a windpowered electrical generation device on the land, if the project is subject to discretionary action by the advisory agency or legislative body.

(10) The leasing or licensing of a portion of a parcel, or the granting of an easement, use permit, or similar right on a portion of a parcel, to a telephone corporation exclusively for the placement and operation of cellular radio transmission facilities, if the project is subject to discretionary action by the local advisory agency or legislative body.

(11) Leases of agricultural land for agricultural purposes, which are defined as the cultivation of food or fiber, or the grazing or pasturing of livestock.

(12) The leasing of, or granting an easement to, a parcel of land in conjunction with the financing, erection, and sale or lease of a solar electrical generation device on the land; provided the project is otherwise subject either to review under local agency ordinances regulating design and improvement or, to other discretionary action by the advisory agency or legislative body.

(13) The leasing of, or granting an easement to, a parcel of land in conjunction with a biogas project that uses agricultural waste or byproducts from the land where the project is located and reduces overall emissions of greenhouse gases from agricultural operations on the land; provided the project is otherwise subject either to review under local agency ordinances regulating design and improvement or, to discretionary action by the advisory agency or legislative body.

The Act is also inapplicable to the financing or leasing of any parcel of land, or any portion thereof, in conjunction with the construction of commercial or industrial buildings on a single parcel, unless the project is not subject to review under other local agency ordinances regulating design and improvement. Nor is it applicable to the financing or leasing of existing separate commercial or industrial buildings on a single parcel [*Gov. Code § 66412.1*].

The Act does not apply to the creation of second units pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65852.2*. However, it does apply to the sale or transfer of those units [*Gov. Code § 66412.2*]. Moreover, when so provided by local ordinance, the Act does not apply to subdivisions of four parcels or less for construction of removable commercial buildings having a floor area of less than 100 square feet [*Gov. Code § 66412.5*].

[2] Regulation by Local Agency

Each local agency may, by ordinance, regulate and control subdivisions not within the Act, provided that those regulations are not more restrictive than the regulations for those subdivisions within the Act, and provided that those regulations are not applied to short-term leases of a portion of the operating right-of-way of a railroad corporation unless public policy necessitates the application of those regulations to those short-term leases [*see Gov. Code § 66411*].

Notwithstanding the fact that a local ordinance may permit the parcel map requirement to be waived in favor of requiring a tentative map [*see Gov. Code § 66428*, discussed in *§ 579.265[4]*], any improvements that are required for a division of land that is not a subdivision of five or more lots must be limited to dedication of rights-of-way or easements, and construction of reasonable off-site and on-site improvements for the parcels being created. Construction requirements for these off-site and on-site improvements must be noticed by a certificate that is (1) on the parcel map itself, (2) in the instrument that evidences the waiver of a parcel map, or (3) in a separate instrument. The certificate must be recorded on, concurrently with, or before the parcel map or the instrument waiving the parcel map is filed for record [*Gov. Code § 66411.1(a)*].

Unless required by the public health and safety or as a prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area, the subdivider cannot be required to fulfill any requirements to construct off-site or on-site improvements until either (1) the local agency has issued a permit or other grant of approval for development of the parcel, or (2) the time construction of the improvements is required pursuant to any authorized agreement between the subdivider and the local agency. If there is no agreement and the public agency finds that fulfillment of the construction requirements is necessary for either the public health and safety or as a prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area, the subdivider may be required to fulfill the requirements within a reasonable time after the parcel map is approved or a waiver granted, but before a permit or other approval for the development is issued [*Gov. Code § 66411.1(b)*]. Although the local agency cannot require that the improvements be finished before approving the parcel map, it can require the developer to provide security to insure that the improvements will be completed [*see 62 Ops. Cal. Atty. Gen. 175, 176-179 (1979)]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.264

§ 579.264 Local Control

Regulation and control of the design and improvement of subdivisions are vested in the legislative bodies of local agencies [*Gov. Code § 66411*]. They impliedly have the power to adopt supplementary regulations pursuant to the Act, when that power is not expressly granted by the Act, provided the regulation is reasonably related to the purposes of the Act [*Soderling v. City of Santa Monica (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 501, 506, 191 Cal. Rptr. 140]* . However, local ordinances that are inconsistent with the language and apparent intent of the Act are invalid [*Benny v. City of Alameda (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1011, 164 Cal. Rptr. 776]* .

In performing its functions under the Act, a local government must follow the Act's procedures, the purpose of which is to preserve the affected parties' procedural safeguards. A city failed to fulfill its obligations under the Act when it refused to accept and process a developer's tentative map application pending the receipt of a determination from the Department of Health Services as to whether or not the parcel to be developed was a hazardous waste property. In holding that the city must accept and consider the developer's application for tentative map, the court of appeal noted that nothing in the statutes governing local land use regulationexcuses a local government from following the statutorily mandated procedures when a hazardouswaste issue is suspected. The court further noted that the Planning and Zoning Law in general, and the Subdivision Map Act specifically, provide multiple means and opportunities to ensure the public health and safety as part of the procedural process [*see* *Beck Development Co., Inc. v. Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 1160, 1200-1203, 52 Cal. Rptr. 2d 518]* .

Each local agency must, by ordinance, regulate and control subdivisions for which the Act requires a tentative and final or parcel map. In the development, adoption, revision, and application of that ordinance, the local agency must comply with the provisions of *Gov. Code § 65913.2* (guidelines governing exercise of authority) in developing and applying the ordinance. The ordinance must specifically provide for proper grading and erosion control, including the prevention of sedimentation or damage to offsite property [*Gov. Code § 66411*]. The agency must also regulate and control the initial design and improvement of common interest subdivisions as defined in *Civ. Code § 1351* [*Gov. Code § 66411*].

In carrying out the provisions of the Act, each local agency must consider the effect of ordinances and actions adopted pursuant to the Act on the housing needs of that region and balance those needs against the public service needs of its

residents and available fiscal and environmental resources [*Gov. Code § 66412.3*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsAdministrative BoardsReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.265

§ 579.265 Map Requirement

[1] Governing Statutes

The necessity for tentative, final, and parcel maps is governed by *Gov. Code §§ 66425-66431* [*Gov. Code § 66425*].

[2] Tentative and Final Map

A tentative and final map is required for all subdivisions creating five or more parcels, five or more condominiums as defined in *Civ. Code § 783*, a community apartment project containing five or more parcels, or for the conversion of a dwelling to a stock cooperative containing five or more dwelling units, except when [*Gov. Code § 66426*]:

- The land before division contains less than five acres, each parcel created by the division abuts on a maintained public street or highway and no dedications or improvements are required by the legislative body;

- Each parcel created by the division has a gross area of 20 acres or more and has an approved access to a maintained public street or highway;

- The land consists of a parcel or parcels of land that has approved access to a public street or highway that comprises part of a tract ofland zoned for industrial or commercial development, and that has the approval of the governing body concerning street alignments and widths;

- Each parcel created by the division has a gross area of not less than 40 acres or is not less than a quarter or a quarter section; or

- The land is being subdivided solely for the creation of an environmental subdivision pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66418.2* [*see § 579.262[2][c]*].

A local ordinance may require a tentative map when a parcel map is required by *Gov. Code §§ 66425-66431*. If the local

ordinance does not require a tentative map when a parcel map is required by the Act, the subdivider has the option of submitting a tentative map, or if the subdivider desires to obtain the rights conferred by *Gov. Code §§ 66498.1-66498.9* (development rights), a vesting tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66428*]. For further discussion, see *§ 579.265[3]*.

[3] Vesting Tentative Map

A subdivider is permitted to file a vesting tentative map whenever the Subdivision Map Act requires a tentative map to be filed [*Gov. Code § 66498.1(a)*]. This confers a vested right to proceed with development in substantial compliance with the ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the time the application is deemed complete or approved [*Gov. Code § 66498.1(b)*]. This procedure is intended to provide greater statutory protection to subdividers than was afforded under the common law vested rights doctrine [*Bright Development v. City of Tracy (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 783, 792, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618]* . Because a subdivider will be bound by the local ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the time the map application is deemed complete, due process requires that the subdivider have actual or constructive notice of those ordinances, policies, and standards, including any development fees [*see Kaufman & Broad Central Valley, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1588-1589, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 904]* . It may be possible, however, for a local agency to provide in its ordinances, policies, and standards for increases in fees that may take place after a vesting tentative map is deemed complete. But provision for an increase in fees must provide reasonable notice of the nature of any fee increase and the manner in which it will be calculated. A general fee escalation provision in the original ordinances, policies, and standards, by itself, is not sufficient notice [*Kaufman & Broad Central Valley, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1589, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 904]* .

[4] Parcel Map

[a] When Required

A parcel map is required for the five types of subdivisions described in *Gov. Code § 66426(a)-(e)* as exceptions from the requirement for tentativeand final maps [*Gov. Code § 66426(f)*; *see § 579.265[2]*]. A parcel map is also required for subdivisions for which a final or parcel map is not otherwise required by *Gov. Code §§ 66425-66431*, unless the preparation of that parcel map is waived by local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66428*].

A parcel map is not required for either of the following [*Gov. Code § 66428(a)*]:

- Subdivisions of a portion of the operating right-of-way of a railroad corporation (defined in *Pub. Util. Code § 230*) that are created by short-term leases; or

- Land conveyed to or from a governmental agency, public entity, or public utility, or for land conveyed to a subsidiary of a public utility for conveyanceto that public utility for rights-of-way, unless a showing is made in individual cases, on substantial evidence, that public policy necessitates a parcel map.

[b] Waiver

A local agency must, by ordinance, provide a procedure for waiving the requirement for a parcel map imposed by the Act, including the requirements for a parcel map imposed by *Gov. Code § 66426*. The procedure may include provisions for waiving the requirement for a tentative and final map for the construction of a condominium project on a single parcel. The ordinance must require a finding by the legislative body or advisory agency that the proposed division of land complies with those requirements that have been established with regard to the following: area, improvement and design, floodwater drainage control, appropriate improved public roads, sanitary disposal facilities, water supply availability, environmental protection, and other requirements of the Act or local ordinance. In any case, when the requirement for a parcel map is waived by local ordinance pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66428*, a tentative map may be required by local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66428*]. A local agency must act on an application for parcel map

waiver within 60 days of the time the application is deemed complete under *Gov. Code § 65943* [*Gov. Code § 66451.7*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.266

§ 579.266 Map Procedures

The procedures set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 66451-66472.1* govern the processing, approval, conditional approval, disapproval, filing, and mediation of tentative, final, and parcel maps. Local ordinances may modify those procedures to the extent authorized by *Gov. Code §§ 66451-66472.1* [*Gov. Code § 66451*]. The local agency may establish reasonable fees for required or authorized procedures [*Gov. Code §§ 66451.2, 66451.3(c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.267

§ 579.267 Tentative Map

[1] Notice of Filing

When a subdivision is to be created from the conversion of residential real property into a condominium project, community apartment project, or stock cooperative project, the subdividing owner must give notice of the intention to convert to each tenant at least 60 days before filing the tentative map [*Gov. Code §§ 66427.1(a)(2)(A), 66452.18*; for discussion and forms relating to condominiums, *see* Ch. 124, *Condominiums and Other Common Interest Developments*]. Additionally, at least 60 days before filing the tentative map, the subdivider must give notice of that filing to each person applying for rental of a unit of the subject property immediately prior to the acceptance of any rent or deposit from the prospective tenant by the subdivider [*Gov. Code §§ 66427.1(a)(2)(A), 66452.17(a)*]. Failure to provide the requisite notice will result in the subdivider paying specified monies to the formerly prospective tenant [*Gov. Code § 66452.17(c)*].

[2] Filing

A tentative map must be filed with the clerk of the advisory agency or, if there is no advisory agency, with the clerk of the legislative body, or with any officer or employee of the local agency that may be designated by local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66452(a)*].

[3] Staff Recommendation

Any report or recommendation on a tentative map by the staff of the local agency to the advisory agency or legislative body must be in writing and a copy served on the subdivider and on each tenant of the subject property, in the case of a proposed conversion of residential real property to a condominium project, community apartment project, or stock cooperative project, at least three days prior to any hearing or action on that map by the advisory agency or legislative body [*Gov. Code § 66452.3*]. The subdivider may collect fees for expenses incurred [*Gov. Code §§ 66451.2, 66452.3*].

[4] Procedure When Advisory Agency Exists--Decision or Report

If an advisory agency exists, it may be authorized either to make an initial decision on the map or merely to draft a report on the map for the legislative body [*see Gov. Code § 66452.1(a), (b)*].

[5] Decision

If the advisory agency is authorized by local ordinance to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the tentative map, it must take action within 50 days after its filing and report its action to the subdivider [*Gov.Code § 66452.1(b)*]. The advisory agency must comply with the time periods of *Pub. Res. Code § 21151.5* (environmental impact report), within the time limits of *Gov. Code § 66452.1*. However, if an environmental impact report is prepared, the 50-day time period is not applicable, and the advisory agency must render its decision within 45 days after certification of the environmental impact report [*Gov. Code § 66452.1(c)*; for general discussion of environmental impact report requirements, *see Ch. 418, Pollution and Environmental Matters, §§ 418.34 -418.36*].

If no action is taken on a tentative map by the advisory agency, the tentative map is deemed approved as filed, insofar as it complies with other applicable requirements of the Act and local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66452.4(a)*]. A map cannot be deemed approved if it does not comply with all applicable requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and local ordinance [*Pongputmong v. City of Santa Monica (1993) 15 Cal. App. 4th 99, 104-105, 18 Cal. Rptr. 2d 550* (map not deemed approved when tenant approvals required by local ordinance were obtained through coercion and misrepresentation)]. Once a tentative map is deemed approved, the subdivider is entitled to request and receive a written certification of approval [*Gov. Code § 66452.4(b)*].

An advisory agency that is faced with expiration of the prescribed time limits for it to act on an application for a tentative map may not disapprove the map solely because the time limit is about to expire; there must be additional reasons for disapproval [*Gov. Code § 66451.4*].

Gov. Code § 66452.4 is silent on the effect of the agency's failure to act when it has no final authority to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the tentative map.It appears that failure of the advisory agency to act within 50 days triggers the 30-day period within which the legislative body must act, and the failure of that body to act within 30 days would be deemed an approval of the map [*Benny v. City of Alameda (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1012-1013, 164 Cal. Rptr. 776* ; *see Gov. Code § 66452.2*, discussed in *§ 579.267[6], [7]*].

[6] Report

If the advisory agency is not authorized by local ordinance to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the tentative map, it must make its written report of the tentative map to the legislative body within 50 days after its filing [*Gov. Code § 66452.1(a)*]. The advisory agency must comply with the time periods of *Pub. Res. Code § 21151.5* (environmental impact report), within the time limits of *Gov. Code § 66452.1*. The 50-day time period then begins after the environmental impact report is certified, a negative declaration is adopted, or it is determined that the project is exempt [*Gov. Code § 66452.1(c)*].

At the next regular meeting of the legislative body following the filing of the advisory agency's report with it, that body must set a date for consideration of the tentative map. That date must be within 30 days, during whichtime the legislative body must approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove the tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66452.2(a)*]. The local agency must comply with the time periods of *Pub. Res. Code § 21151.5* (environmental impact report), within the time limits of *Gov. Code § 66452.2* [*Gov. Code § 66452.2(c)*; for general discussion of environmental impact report requirements, *see Ch. 418, Pollution and Other Environmental Matters, §§ 418.34 -418.36*].

If no action is taken on a tentative map by the legislative body within the specified time limits, the tentative map is deemed approved as filed, insofar as it complies with other applicable requirements of the Act and local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66452.4(a)*].

[7] Procedure When No Advisory Agency Exists

If there is no advisory agency, the clerk of the legislative body must submit the tentative map to the legislative body at its next regular meeting. The legislative body must approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove that map within 50 days after submission [*Gov. Code § 66452.2(b)*]. The local agency must comply with the time periods of *Pub. Res. Code § 21151.5* (environmental impact report), within the time limits of *Gov. Code § 66452.2*. The 50-day time period then begins after the environmental impact report is certified, a negative declaration is adopted, or it is determined that the project is exempt [*Gov. Code § 66452.1(c)*; for general discussion of environmental impact report requirements, *see Ch. 418, Pollution and Other Environmental Matters, §§ 418.34 -418.36*].

If no action is taken on a tentative map by the legislative body within the specified time limits, the tentative map is deemed approved as filed, insofar as it complies with other applicable requirements of the Act and local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66452.4(a)*].

A local legislative body that is faced with expiration of the prescribed time limits for it to act on an application for a tentative map may not disapprove the map based solely on the fact that the time limit is about to expire; there must be additional reasons for disapproval [*Gov. Code § 66451.4*].

[8] Approval Conditioned on Availability of Sufficient Water Supply

The local legislative body or the advisory agency (to the extent that the latter is authorized by local ordinance to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove a tentative map) must include as a condition in any tentative map that includes a subdivision consisting of a residential development of more than 500 dwelling units, a requirement that a sufficient water supply be available. Proof of the availability of a sufficient water supply must be requested by the subdivision applicant or local agency, at the agency's discretion, and must be based on written verification from the applicable public water system within 90 days of a request [*Gov. Code § 66473.7(b)*; *see Gov. Code § 66473.7(a)(1), (2)* ("subdivision" and "sufficient water supply" defined for these purposes)].

The condition does not apply to any residential project proposed for a site that is within an urbanized area and has been previously developed for urban uses, or when the immediate contiguous properties surrounding the residential project site are, or previously have been, developed for urban uses, or housing projects that are exclusively for very low and low-income households [*Gov. Code § 66473.7(i)*].

[9] Expiration

An approved or conditionally approved tentative map will expire 24 months after its approval or conditional approval, or after any additional period of time that may be prescribed by local ordinance, not to exceed 12 months [*Gov. Code § 66452.6(a)(1)*]. However, this expiration time may be different under some circumstances. For example, if the subdivider is subject to a requirement of at least $178,000 to construct, improve, or finance public improvements outside the boundary of the tentative map, the expiration time may be extended [*Gov. Code § 66452.6(a)(1)*; *see Gov. Code § 66452.6(a)(2)* (amount adjusted for inflation each calendar year beginning January 1, 2005)]. That time may also be changed due to a development moratorium imposed after approval of the tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66452.6(b)* ; *see Ailanto Properties, Inc. v. City of Half Moon Bay (2006) 142 Cal. App. 4th 572, 48 Cal. Rptr. 3d 340* (*Gov. Code § 66452.6(b)(1)* limits to five years length of any moratorium-related tolling of tentative map's expiration, and does not address length of moratorium itself)].

The period of time specified in *Gov. Code § 66452.6(a)(1)*, including any local discretionary extension of up to six years granted pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66452.6(e)*, does not include the period of time during which a lawsuit involving the approval or conditional approval of the tentative map is or was pending in court, if the stay of the time period is approved by the local agency pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66452.6*. After service of the initial petition or complaint in the

lawsuit on the local agency, the subdivider may apply to the local agency for a stay pursuant to the local agency's adopted procedures. Within 40 days after receiving the application, the local agency must either stay the time period for up to five years or deny the requested stay. Thelocal agency may, by ordinance, establish procedures for reviewing the requests, including, but not limited to, notice and hearing requirements, appeal procedures, and other administrative requirements [*Gov. Code § 66452.6(c)*].

The expiration of the approved or conditionally approved tentative map will terminate all proceedings and no final map or parcel map of all or any portion of the real property included within the tentative map will be filed with the legislative body without first processing a new tentative map. Once timely filing is made, subsequent actions of the local agency, including, but not limited to, processing, approving, and recording, may lawfully occur after the date of expiration of the tentative map. Delivery to the county surveyor or city engineer will be deemed a timely filing [*Gov. Code § 66452.6(d)*]. This language prohibits a subdivider from filing a final map after the tentative map has expired. However, the language "once a timely filing is made, subsequent actions of the local agency, including, but not limited to, processing, approving, and recording, may lawfully occur after the date of expiration of the tentative map" authorizes the local agency to approve a timely filed application for an extension of a tentative map [*Bodega Bay Concerned Citizens v. County of Sonoma (2005) 125 Cal. App. 4th 1061, 1070, 23 Cal. Rptr. 3d 327]* .

In 2008, because of the depressed housing market with subdividers facing the prospect of having their tentative and parcel maps expire before they could obtain financing or have their projects be economically viable on completion, legislation was enacted to extend by 12 months the expiration date of any tentative or vesting tentative map or parcel map that had not expired on July 15, 2008, but was due to expire before January 1. 2011 [*Gov. Code § 66452.21(a)*]. The extension is in addition to any other statutory extensions [*Gov. Code § 66452.21(b)*; *see Gov. Code §§ 66452.6, 66452.11, 66452.13, 66463.5*]. The determination of whether a map expires before January 1, 2011, will count only those local discretionary extensions of time pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66452.6(e)* approved on or before July 15, 2008, and any additional time in connection with the filing of a final map pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66452.6(a)* for a map that was recorded on or before July 15, 2008. The determination does not include any development moratorium or litigation stay [*Gov. Code § 66452.21(d)*]. In 1993 and 1996, extensions were granted under similar economic circumstances and, although any affected maps have undoubtedly expired, the legislation remains part of the Subdivision Map Act [*see Gov. Code §§ 66452.11, 66452.13*].

In 2009, the Legislature amended the Act to extend, for an additional 24 months, the expiration date of any tentative or vesting tentative map, or parcel map for which a tentative or vesting tentative map has been approved, that (1) was in existence on July 15, 2009, and (2) will not expire before January 1, 2012 [*Gov. Code § 66452.22(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 66452.22(d)* (determining whether map expires before January 1, 2012)]. The extension also applies to any legislative, administrative, or other state agency approval pertaining to a development project included in the map, provided the approval had not expired on July 15, 2009 [*Gov. Code § 66452.22(c)*]. These extensions are automatic, and in addition to all other discretionary and mandatory extensions available under the Act [*Gov. Code § 66452.22(b), (c)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState RegulationReal Property LawWater RightsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.268

§ 579.268 Final Map

[1] Preparation

After the approval or conditional approval of the tentative map and before the expiration of that map, the subdivider may have the real property included within the map, or any part thereof, surveyed and a final map thereof prepared in accordance with the approved or conditionally approved tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66456*]. Under some circumstances, a subdivider may file multiple final maps [*see Gov. Code § 66456.1*]. The filing of a final map on a portion of an approved or conditionally approved tentative map will not invalidate any part of that tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66456.1*].

[2] Filing

A final map or parcel map conforming to the approved or conditionally approved tentative map, if any, may be filed with the legislative body for approval after all required certificates or statements on the map have been signed and, when necessary, acknowledged [*Gov. Code § 66457(a)*].

If the subdivision lies entirely within the territory of a city, the map must be filed with the city. If the subdivision lies partially within two or more territories, the map must be filed with each, and each territory must act on the map [*Gov. Code § 66457(b)*].

[3] Approval

The legislative body must, at the meeting at which it receives the map or at its next regular meeting, approve the map if it conforms to all the Act requirements and any local subdivision ordinance applicable at the time of approval orconditional approval of the tentative map and any rulings thereunder. If the map does not conform, the legislative body mustdisapprove the map [*Gov. Code § 66458(a)*; *see Soderling v. City of Santa Monica (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 501, 505, 191 Cal. Rptr. 140]* .

If the legislative body does not approve or disapprove the map within the prescribed time and the map conforms to all

requirements and rulings, it will be deemed approved [*Gov. Code § 66458(b)*]. The legislative body that is faced with expiration of the prescribed time limits for it to act on a final map may not disapprove the map solely on the basis that the time limit is due to expire; there must be additional reasons for disapproval [*Gov. Code § 66451.4*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.269

§ 579.269 Factors Governing Map Decisions

[1] Generally

A local agency must disapprove a map for failure to meet or perform any of the requirements or conditions imposed by the Act or local ordinance enacted pursuant to the Act. Local ordinance may provide a procedure for waiver of the Act's provisions when the failure of the map is the result of a technical and inadvertent error that, in the determination of the local agency, does not materially affect the map's validity [*Gov. Code § 66473*].

In considering tentative or final maps of proposed subdivisions, the local agency is bound by a requirement of public access to public natural resources, and must protect public access to the stream banks of public waterways, including rivers, streams, ocean coastlines, bay shorelines, lakes, and reservoirs [*see Gov. Code §§ 66478.1-66478.14*].

[2] Tentative Map or Parcel Map

[a] Prerequisites

No local agency will approve a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, unless the legislative body finds that the proposed subdivision, together with provisions for its design and improvement, is consistent with the general plan [*Gov. Code §§ 65300-65307*] or any specific plan [*Gov. Code §§ 65450-65457*]. A proposed subdivision is consistent with a general or specific plan only if the local agency has officially adopted such a plan and the proposed subdivision is compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the plan [*Gov. Code § 66473.5*]. The consistency standard does not require an exact match between a proposed subdivision and the applicable plan; rather, it means that the subdivision must be in agreement or harmony with the plan [*Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704, 717-718, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* ; *Greenebaum v. City of Los Angeles (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 391, 406, 200 Cal. Rptr. 237* ; for discussion of the general plan and specific plans, *see §§ 579.50, 579.51*].

In determining whether to approve or disapprove an application for a tentative map, the local agency must apply only those ordinances, policies,and standards in effect at the date the local agency has determined that the application is

complete pursuant to *Gov. Code § 65943*. However, if the local agency has formally initiated proceedings to amend applicable ordinances before receiving the complete application, the local agency may apply any policies in effect on the date it approves or disapproves the tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66474.2*].

A local government may approve a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if an environmental impact report was prepared with respect to the project and a finding was made pursuant to *Pub. Res. Code § 21081(c)* that specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report [*Gov. Code § 66474.01*]. For general discussion of the environmental impact report requirement, see Ch. 418, *Pollution and Other Environmental Matters* .

[b] Disapproval Mandatory

A legislative body of a city or county must deny approval of a tentative map, or a parcel map for which a tentative map was not required, if it makes any of the following findings [*Gov. Code § 66474*]:

- That the proposed map is not consistent with applicable general plans as specified in *Gov. Code § 65451*.

- That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is not consistent with applicable general and specific plans.

- That the site is not physically suitable for the type of development.

- That the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

- That the design of the subdivision or the proposed improvements are likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat.

- That the design of the subdivision or type of improvements is likely to cause serious health problems.

- That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of, property within the proposed subdivision.

The legislative body must also deny approval of a tentative map, or parcel mapfor which a tentative map was not required, if it finds that either (1) the resulting parcels following subdivision would be too small to sustain their agricultural use [*see Gov. Code § 66474.4(b)*; *but see Gov. Code § 66474.4(c)* (when legislative body may approve subdivision with parcels smaller than those specified)], or (2) the subdivision will result in residential development not incidental to the commercial agricultural use of the land, *and* the legislative body finds that the land is subject to any of the following [*Gov. Code § 66474.4(a)*; *see Gov. Code § 66474.4(k)* (amendments made to § 66474.4 in 2001-2002 Regular Session of Legislature apply only to contracts or easements entered into on or after January 1, 2003); *see also § 579.16*]:

- A contract entered into pursuant to the California Land Conservation Act of 1965 before the contract's last three years [*see Gov. Code § 66474.4(f)*; *see also Gov. Code § 51200 et seq.*];

- An open-space easement entered into on or after January 1, 2003 [*see* Gov. Code § 51074 et seq.];

- An agricultural conservation easement entered into on or after January 1, 2003 [*see* Gov. Code § 10260 et seq.]; or

- A conservation easement entered into on or after January 1, 2003 [*see Civ. Code § 815*].

The legislative body's authority to approve a tentative or parcel map with regard to land subject to one of these easements is not limited, however, if the resulting parcels can sustain uses consistent with the easement's intent or purposes [*Gov. Code § 66474.4(h), (i)*].

[3] Final Map

A final map must be disapproved only for failure to meet or perform requirements or conditions that were applicable to the subdivision at the time of approval of the tentative map. That disapproval must be accompanied by a finding identifying the requirements or conditions that have not been met or performed [*Gov. Code § 66473*].

A legislative body must not deny approval of a final or parcel map if it (1) has previously approved a tentative map for the proposed subdivision and (2) finds that the final or parcel map is in substantial compliance with the previously approved tentative map [*Gov. Code § 66474.1*].

The conversion of rental property to condominiums is considered to be a subdivision under the Subdivision Map Act. A local legislative body may not approve a final map for a subdivision to be created from the conversion of residential rental property into a condominium project, a community apartment project, or a stock cooperative unless that body finds that each tenant of the proposed conversion project and each person applying to rent a unit in the residential property to be converted has received or will have received all applicable notices and rights required under the Act [*Gov. Code § 66427.1(a)(1)*; *see Gov. Code § 66427.1(a)(2)* (list of notices)]. For further discussion of these requirements, see *Ch. 124, Condominiums and Other Common Interest Developments, § 124.19*.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesCondominiumsConversionsReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState RegulationReal Property LawWater RightsNonconsumptive UsesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive Plans

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.270

§ 579.270 Approval Conditioned on Indemnification

Under prescribed circumstances, a local agency may require, as a condition for a tentative, parcel, or final map application or approval, that the subdivider or its agent, defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the local agency or its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the local agency as a result of the action or inaction of the local agency, advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body in reviewing, approving, or denying the map [*Gov. Code § 66474.9(a)*]. Any condition imposed must include the requirement that the local agency promptly notify the subdivider of any claim, action, or proceeding and that the local agency cooperate fully in the defense. The local agency's failure to fulfill the requirement eliminates the subdivider's responsibility [*Gov. Code § 66474.9(b)(2)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Contracts LawContract Conditions & ProvisionsIndemnityReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.271

§ 579.271 Obligations of Subdivider

[1] Dedication of Land

Local ordinance may impose a requirement of dedication or irrevocable offer of dedication of real property within the subdivision for streets and alleys, including access rights and abutter's rights, drainage, public utility easements, and other public easements [*Gov. Code § 66475*]. Dedications may also be required for bicycle paths, local transit facilities, easements to insure the receipt of sunlight, park or recreational purposes, and elementary schools [*see Gov. Code §§ 66475.1-66475.3, 66477, 66478*]. For discussion of dedication generally, see Ch. 183, *Dedication* .

Land dedicated other than for open space, parks, and schools must be returned to the subdivider if the public entity determines that the public purpose for which it was dedicated no longer exists. This requirement applies only to land dedicated on or after January 1, 1990 [*Gov. Code § 66477.5*].

[2] Reservation for Public Uses

A local ordinance may require that areas of real property within the subdivision be reserved for parks, recreational facilities, fire stations, libraries, or other public uses. The required reservation must be in accordance with an adopted specific orgeneral plan, in effect for at least 30 days before the filing of the tentative map, that contains policies for public use. The reserved area must be of a size and shape that permits the balance of the property to develop in an orderly and efficient manner and that does not make development of the remaining subdivision land infeasible [*Gov. Code § 66479*].

[3] Fees

Fees may be imposed by local ordinance for defraying the costs of constructing planned drainage and sanitary sewer facilities, bridges, major thoroughfares, and ground water recharge facilities [*Gov. Code §§ 66483, 66484, 66484.5*]. When the subdivider installs improvements for thebenefit of the subdivision, local ordinance may require the improvements to contain supplemental size, capacity, number, or length for the benefit of property not within the subdivision, although the subdivider will be reimbursed for those supplemental costs [*Gov. Code §§ 66485, 66486*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationProcedureReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseImpact Fees

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.272

§ 579.272 Appeals

[1] By Developer or Tenant From Advisory Agency Action

The subdivider, or any tenant of the subject property, in the case of a proposed conversion of residential real property to a condominium project, community apartment project, or stock cooperative project, may appeal from any action of the advisory agency with respect to a tentative map to the appeal board established by local ordinance, or if none, to the legislative body [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(a)(1)*].

Any appeal must be filed with the clerk of the appeal board, or if there is none, with the clerk of the legislative body, within 10 days after the action of the advisory agency from which the appeal is being taken [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(a)(2)*]. When the appeal has been filed, the appeal board, or legislative body, must set the matter for hearing. The hearing must be held within 30 days after the date of a request filed by the subdivider or appellant. If there is no regular meeting of the legislative body within the 30-day period, the appeal may be heard at the legislative body's next regular meeting for which notice can be given, or within 60 days from the date of receiving the request, whichever period is shorter. The decision must be rendered within 10 days following the hearing's conclusion [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(a)(3)*]. The decision must be supported by findings that are consistent with the Subdivision Map Act and any local ordinance adopted pursuant to that Act [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(e)*].

[2] From Appeal Board Action

[a] When Appeal Board Acts

The subdivider, any tenant of the subject property, in the case of a conversion of residential real property, or the advisory agency may appeal from the action of the appeal board to the legislative body [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(b)(1)*].

Any appeal must be filed in writing with the clerk of the legislative body within 10 days after the action of the appeal board from which the appeal is being taken [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(b)(1)*]. After the filing of an appeal, the legislative body must set the matter for hearing, which must be held within 30 days after the date the hearing request was filed. If there is no regular meeting of the legislative body within the 30-day period, the appeal may be heard at the legislative

body's next regular meeting for which notice can be given, or within 60 days from the date of receiving the request, whichever period is shorter. The decision must be rendered within 10 days following the hearing's conclusion [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(b)(2)*]. The decision must be supported by findings that are consistent with the Subdivision Map Act and any local ordinance adopted pursuant to that Act [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(e)*].

[b] When Appeal Board Fails to Act

If there is an appeal board and it fails to act on an appeal within the specified time limit, the decision from which the appeal was taken is affirmed and an appeal of that decision may be taken to the legislative body as provided in *Gov. Code § 66452.5(b)*. If no further appeal is taken, the tentative map, insofar as it complies with applicable Act requirements and local ordinance, will be deemed approved or conditionally approved as last approved or conditionally approved by the advisory agency [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(c)(1)*].

If the legislative body fails to act on an appeal within the specified time limit, the tentative map, insofar as it complies with applicable Act requirements and local ordinance, will be deemed approved or conditionally approved as last approved or conditionally approved [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(c)(2)*].

[3] By Adversely Affected Person

An interested person adversely affected by a decision of the advisory agency or appeal board may file an appeal with the legislative body concerning any decision of the agency or appeal board. Any appeal must be filed with the clerk of the legislative body within 10 days after the action of the advisory agency or appeal board that is the subject of the appeal. On the filing of the appeal, the legislative body must set the matter for hearing. The hearing must be held within 30 days after it was requested by the subdivider or appellant. If there is no regular meeting of the legislative body within the 30-day period, the appeal may be heard at the legislative body's next regular meeting for which notice can be given, or within 60 days from the date of receiving the request, whichever period is shorter. The hearing may be a public hearing for which notice must be given in the time and manner provided [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(d)(1)*].

On conclusion of the hearing the governing body must, within 10 days, declareits findings based on the testimony and documents produced before it, the advisory board, or the appeal board. It may sustain, modify, reject, or overrule any recommendations or rulings of the advisory board or appeal board and may make findings that are not inconsistent with the Act or local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(d)(2)*]. The decision must be supported by findings that are consistent with the Subdivision Map Act and any local ordinance adopted pursuant to that Act [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(e)*].

[4] Notice Requirements

Notice of each hearing provided for in *Gov. Code § 66452.5* must be sent by United States mail to each tenant of the subject property, in the case of a conversion of residential real property to a condominium project, community apartment project, or stock cooperative project, at least three days prior to any hearing [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(f)*]. This notice requirement will be deemed satisfied if the notice complies with the legal requirements for service by mail. Fees may be collected from the subdivider for expenses incurred [*Gov. Code § 66452.5(f)*; *see Gov. Code § 66451.2*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsCivil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesCondominiumsConversionsReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.273

§ 579.273 Hearings Under Act

[1] Required for Signficant Deprivation of Property Right

Whenever approval of a tentative subdivision map will constitute a substantial or significant deprivation of the property rights of otherlandowners, the affected persons are entitled to reasonable notice and an opportunity to be heard before the approval occurs. For example, a landowner who claimed that the particular details of a plan would cause him injury in that the lots in the proposed subdivision were topographically unsuited for residential construction, that the design of the subdivision would hinder access to his property thereby creating substantial traffic and parking congestion, and that the county's environmental assessment of the project was inadequate, alleged a sufficient deprivation to require a hearing [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 616, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134]* . As the first step in the subdivision map process, the tentative subdivision map is the principal time at which a deprivation of property rights would be asserted. For discussion of the approval of tentative subdivision maps, see *§ 579.269[2][a]*.

The nature, content, and timing of the requisite notice are within the determination of the affected local government. However, depending on the magnitude of the project and the degree to which a particular landowner's interests may be affected, acceptable techniques might include notice by mail to the owners of record of property situated with a designated radius of the subject property, or by the posting of notice at or near the project site, or both. Notice must occur sufficiently prior to a final decision to permit a meaningful predeprivation hearing to affected landowners [*Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 618, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134]* .

[2] Notice and Attendance

Unless otherwise provided, notice of a hearing held pursuant to the Act must be given pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 65090* and *65091*. If the proposed subdivision is a conversion of residential real property to a condominium project, community apartment project, or stock cooperative project, the notice must also be given by the local agency by United States mail to each tenant of the subject property, and must also include notification of the tenant's right to appear and be heard. These requirements may be satisfied by service of the notice in compliance with the requirements for service of legal process by mail [*Gov. Code § 66451.3(a), (b)*; for discussion of *Gov. Code §§ 65090, 65091, see § 579.72*].

Any interested person may appear at the hearing and be heard [*Gov. Code § 66451.3(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationReview of Initial DecisionsReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.274

§ 579.274 Reversion

[1] Generally

Subdivided real property may be reverted to acreage pursuant to *Gov. Code §§ 66499.11-66499.20*3/4[*Gov. Code § 66499.11*]. Reversion proceedings may be initiated by the legislative body on its own motion or by petition of all of the landowners within the subdivision [*Gov. Code § 66499.12*]. The petition by the landowners must be in the form prescribed by the local agency and include the contents set forth in *Gov. Code § 66499.13*. A noticed public hearing must be held [*Gov. Code § 66499.15*].

[2] Prerequisites to Reversion

Subdivided real property may be reverted to acreage only if the legislative body finds that the dedications to be abandoned by the reversion are unnecessary for present or prospective public purposes and one of the following applies [*Gov. Code § 66499.16*]:

(1) All owners of an interest in the real property within the subdivision have consented to the reversion; or

(2) None of the improvements required to be made have been made within two years from the date the final or parcel map was filed for record, or within the time allowed by agreement for completion of the improvements, whichever is later; or

(3) No lots shown on the final or parcel map have been sold within five years from the date that map was filed for record.

As conditions of reversion, the legislative body must require the following [*Gov. Code § 66499.17*]:

- Dedications or offers of dedication necessary for the purposes specified by local ordinance following reversion.

- Retention of all previously paid fees if necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act or local ordinance adopted pursuant to the Act.

- Retention of any portion of required improvement security or deposits necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act and local ordinance adopted pursuant to the Act.

[3] Effect of Reversion

Reversion will be effective on the final map being filed for record by the county recorder. Thereafter, all dedications and offers of dedication not shown on the map will be of no further force or effect [*Gov. Code § 66499.18*].

[4] Filing of Parcel Map for Reversion

A city or county may authorize a parcel map to be filed under *Gov. Code §§ 66499.11-66499.29* for the purpose of reverting to acreage land previously subdivided and consisting of four or less contiguous parcels under the same ownership. That map must be accompanied by evidence of title and nonuse or lack of necessity of any streets or easements that are to be abandoned. Any streets or easements to be left in effect after the reversion must be delineated on the map. The filing of the map with thecounty recorder will constitute legal reversion to acreage and abandonment of all streets and easements not shown on the map. It will also constitute a merger of the separate parcels into one parcel and be shown as such on the assessment roll. On the parcel map used for reverting acreage, a certificate must appear signed and acknowledged by all parties having any record title interest in the land being reverted, consenting to the preparation and filing of the parcel map [*Gov. Code § 66499.20*1/4].

[5] Resubdivision Without Reversion

Subdivided lands may be merged and resubdivided without reverting to acreage by complying with all the subdivision requirements of the Act and local ordinance. The filing of the final or parcel map will constitute legal merging of the separate parcels into one parcel and the resubdivision of that parcel. Any unused fees or deposits previously made will be credited pro rata towards any similar requirements applicable at the time of resubdivision. Any streets or easements to be left in effect after the resubdivision must be delineated on the map. The filing of the map with the county recorder will constitute legal merger and resubdivision of the land, and abandonment of all streets and easements not shown on the map [*Gov. Code § 66499.20*1/2]. *Gov. Code § 66499.20*1/2 applies only when there is a previously-recorded subdivision map. When there are recorded easements and no recorded subdivision map, the filing of a subdivision map that does not delineate the easements does not render them abandoned [*Negron v. Dundee (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 1502, 1506-1508, 271 Cal. Rptr. 381]* .

When a parcel map requirement may be waived pursuant to a local ordinance adopted under *Gov. Code § 66428*, property may be resubdivided without reversion as long as the property owner complies with the local ordinance requirements. For example, a resubdivision was accomplished when, as required by the county waiver ordinance, a unilateral agreement was recorded setting forth, among other matters, a statement signed by the owner and subdivider under penalty of perjury attesting that all the conditions of approval had been met. When the unilateral agreement was endorsed by the county director of planning and recorded, a subdivision was deemed effective [*see Gomes v. County of Mendocino (1995) 37 Cal. App. 4th 977, 44 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93]* .

A city or county may authorize the merger of contiguous parcels under common ownership without reverting to acreage. That ordinance will require the recordation of an instrument evidencing the merger [*Gov. Code § 66499.20* 3/4].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:

Real Property LawOwnership & TransferTransfer Not By DeedDedicationGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseComprehensive Plans

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.275

§ 579.275 Exclusion

[1] Procedure

All or any portion of the real property included within the boundaries of a subdivision may be excluded from that subdivision and the recorded map altered or vacated, in accordance with the procedures set forth in *Gov. Code §§ 66499.21-66499.29* [*Gov. Code § 66499.21*]. An exclusion proceeding is initiated by filing, in the superior court of the county in which the subdivision is located, a petition signed by the owners of at least two-thirds of the total area of the real property sought to be excluded [*Gov. Code §§ 66499.21, 66499.22*; *see § 579.390*].

After a petition for exclusion has been filed, public notice of the hearing on the petition must be given [*see Gov. Code § 66499.24*]. If no objection is filed, and the petitioner produces satisfactory evidence of the necessity of the exclusion, that the petitioners are the owners of two-thirds of the area sought to be excluded, and that there is no reasonable objection to making that exclusion, the requested exclusion may be ordered [*Gov. Code § 66499.25*].

If a material objection is made to the petition, the court will hear that objection and may adjourn the proceedings to such time as may be necessary on proper notice to the petitioners and objectors [*Gov. Code § 66499.26*].

[2] Effect

A certified copy of the court decree excluding any real property or ordering the alteration or vacation of any recorded map will be recorded in the office of the county recorder of the county in which that real property is situated [*Gov. Code § 66499.28*]. At that time, a copy of the new map will be filed for record with the county recorder, and a copy will also be filed with the local agency. A reference to this map will be sufficient identification of the real property for reassessment purposes [*Gov. Code § 66499.29*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.276

§ 579.276 Effect of Noncompliance With Act

No person shall sell, lease, or finance any parcel of real property or commence construction of any building for sale, lease, or financing thereon, except for model homes, or allow occupancy thereof, for which a final or parcel map is required by the Act or local ordinance, until a map in full compliance with the provisions of the Act and local ordinance has been filed for record by the recorder of the county in which any portion of the subdivision is located [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(a), (b)*].

Conveyances of any part of a division of real property for which a final or parcel map is required by the Act or local ordinance will not be made by parcel or block number, initial or other designation, unless and until that map has been filed for record by the recorder of the county in which any portion of the subdivision is located [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(c)*].

Gov. Code § 66499.30(a), (b), and *(c)* does not apply to any parcel of a subdivision offered for sale or lease, contracted for sale or lease, or soldor leased in compliance with or exempt from any law (including a local ordinance), regulating the design and improvement of subdivisions in effect at the time the subdivision was established [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(d)*].

Nothing in *Gov. Code § 66499.30(a), (b)* prohibits an offer or contract to sell, lease, or finance real property or to construct improvements thereon when that sale, lease, or financing, or the commencement of that construction, is expressly conditioned on the approval and filing of a final subdivision map or parcel map, as required under the Act [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(e)*]. However, a contract for the purchase and sale of four acres of real property that allowed the purchaser of the property who was the drafter of the contract to complete the purchase if, at its election, the four acres were made into a legal parcel by recording a final map or if the buyer "waived" the recording of a final map was void at its inception. The contract allowed the sale of a parcel of real property before the final map had been filed without being "expressly conditioned" on the approval and filing of a final subdivision or parcel map. It was therefore void as a matter of law at the time it was executed [*Sixells, LLC v. Cannery Business Park (2008) 170 Cal. App. 4th 648, 653-654, 88 Cal. Rptr. 3d 235*].

Nothing in *Gov. Code § 66499.30(a)-(c)*, inclusive, in any way modifies or affects the provisions of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.2* (public report applicable to subdivided lands transaction) [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(f)*; for discussion of the rules governing subdivided lands transactions, *see § 579.281*].

For purposes of *Gov. Code § 66499.30*, the limitation period for commencing an action, either civil or criminal, against the subdivider or an owner of record at the time of a violation of the Act, will be tolled for any time period during which there is no constructive notice of the transaction constituting the violation, because the owner of record, at the time of the violation or at any time thereafter, failed to record a deed, lease, or financing document with the county recorder [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(g)*].

Each violation of the Act by a person who is the subdivider or an owner of record, at the time of the violation, of property involved in the violation is punishable by imprisonment in the county jail or in the state prison for a period not exceeding one year, by a fine not exceeding $10,000, or by both fine and imprisonment. Every other violation of the Act is a misdemeanor [*Gov. Code § 66499.31*].

The Act does not bar any legal, equitable, or summary remedy to which any aggrieved local agency or other public agency, or any person, firm, or corporation may otherwise be entitled, and any aggrieved entity or person may file a suit in the superior court of the county in which any real property attempted to be sold, leased, or financed in violation of the Act or local ordinance enacted pursuant to the Act is located, to restrain or enjoin any attempted or proposed subdivision or sale, lease, or financing in violation of the Act or local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66499.33*].

Any deed of conveyance, sale, or contract to sell real property that has been divided, or that has resulted from a division, in violation of the provisions of the Act or local ordinance enacted pursuant to the Act, is voidable at the sole option of the grantee, buyer, or person contracting to purchase, or his or her heirs, personal representative, or trustee in insolvency or bankruptcy within one year after the date of discovery of the violation. However, the deed of conveyance, sale, or contract to sell is binding on any successor in interest of the grantee, buyer, or person contracting to purchase, other than those above enumerated. It is also binding on the grantor, vendor, or person contracting to sell, or his or her assignee, heir, or devisee [*Gov. Code § 66499.32(a)*; *see Munns v. Stenman (1957) 152 Cal. App. 2d 543, 554, 314 P.2d 67* (decided under former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11540*)]. For general discussion and forms for use by a purchaser in rescinding a contract for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Any grantee, or his or her successor in interest, of real property that has been divided, or has resulted from a division, in violation of the provisions of the Act or local ordinance, may, within one year of the date of discovery of that violation, bring an action in the superior court to recover any damages he or she has suffered by reason of that division of property. The action may be brought against the person who divided the property in violation of the Act or local ordinance and against any successors in interest who have actual or constructive knowledge of that division of property [*Gov. Code § 66499.32(b)*].

This remedy does not limit or affect in any way the rights of a grantee or his or her successor in interest under any other provision of law [*Gov. Code § 66499.32(b)*]. For general discussion and forms for use by a purchaser in seeking damages based on a misleading contract for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Neither the voidability nor the damage remedy is available in connection with the conveyance of any parcel of real property identified in a certificate of compliance filed pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66499.35* or identified in a recorded final or parcel map, from and after the date of recording [*Gov. Code § 66499.32(b)*; for discussion of *Gov. Code § 66499.35*, *see § 579.279*]. This limitation is intended to prevent a challenge to a deed based on an allegedly invalid property division that has been previously adjudged as proper. Thus, it denies a buyer the option of voiding the contract whenever a certificate of compliance, parcel map, or final map exists to ratify the seller's compliance with the Act. However, it does not preclude a buyer from voiding a sale when the seller has violated the Act and, by doing so, has also violated the certificate of compliance, parcel map, or final map [*Le Gault v. Erickson (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th*

369, 374, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 692] .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTollingReal Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.277

§ 579.277 Violation of Act

[1] Permit Precluded

No local agency shall issue any permit or grant any approval necessary to develop any real property that has been divided, or resulted from a division, in violation of the Act or local ordinance enacted pursuant to the Act if it finds that development of that property is contrary to public healthor safety. The authority to deny that permit or approval applies whether the applicant was the owner of record at the time of the violation, is the current owner of record, or is a vendee of the current owner of record pursuant to a contract of sale of the real property. It applies whether or not the applicant had actual or constructive knowledge of the violation at the time of the acquisition of his or her interest in that property [*Gov. Code § 66499.34*].

[2] Conditional Permit

If a city or county issues a permit or grants approval for the development of real property that has been divided, or resulted from a division, in violation of the Act or local ordinance enacted pursuant to the Act, it may impose only those conditions that would have been applicable to the division of the property at the time the applicant acquired his or her interest in that real property, and that had been established at that time by the Act or local ordinance [*Gov. Code § 66499.34*; *see Keizer v. Adams (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 976, 980-981, 88 Cal. Rptr. 183, 471 P.2d 983* (decided under former Subdivison Map Act)]. However, when the applicant was the owner of record at the time of the initial violation, and by a grant of the real property, created parcels in violation of the Act or local ordinance, and that person is the current owner of record of one or more of those parcels, then the local agency may impose those conditions as would be applicable to a current division of the property. Moreover, if a conditional certificate of compliance has been filed for record under *Gov. Code § 66499.35(b)*, only those conditions stipulated in that certificate will be applicable [*Gov. Code § 66499.34*].

[3] Certificate of Compliance Available

The issuance of a permit or grant of approval for development of real property, or with respect to improvements completed prior to the time a permit or grant of approval for development was required by local ordinances in effect at

the time of the improvement, or with respect to improvements completed in reliance on a permit or grant of approval for development, constitutes "real property which has been approved for development," for the purposes of *Gov. Code § 66499.35(c)*. On request by the person owning the real property or a vendee of that person pursuant to a contract of sale, the local agency must issue a certificate of compliance for the affected real property [*Gov. Code § 66499.34*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.278

§ 579.278 Notice of Violation

[1] Notice of Intention to Record

Whenever a local agency has knowledge that real property has been divided in violation of the provisions of the Act or local ordinance, it must cause to be mailed by certified mail to the then current owner of record of the property a notice of intention to record a notice of violation, describing the real property in detail, naming the owners, and stating that an opportunity will be given to the owner to present evidence. The notice will specify a time, date, and place for a meeting at which the owner may present evidence to the legislative body or advisory agency why the notice should not be recorded. The notice must also contain a description of the violations and an explanation of why the subject parcel is not lawful under *Gov. Code § 66412.6(a)* or *(b)* [*Gov. Code § 66499.36*].

[2] Determination of Violation

The meeting between the owners and the local agency must take place no sooner than 30 days and no later than 60 days from the date of mailing. If, within 15 days of receipt of the notice, the owner of the real property fails to inform the local agency of his or her objection to recording the notice of violation, the legislative body or advisory agency will record the notice of violation with the county recorder. If, after the owner has presented evidence, it is determined that there has been no violation, the local agency will mail a clearance letter to the then current owner of record. If, however, after the owner has presented evidence, the legislative body or advisory agency determines that the property has in fact been illegally divided, it will record the notice of violation with the county recorder. The notice of violation, when recorded, will be deemed to be constructive notice of the violation to all successors in interest in that property. The county recorder will index those names of the fee owners in the general index [*Gov. Code § 66499.36*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPriorities & RecordingGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming Uses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.279

§ 579.279 Certificate of Compliance

[1] Request by Owner or Vendee

Any person owning real property or a vendee of that person pursuant to a contract of sale may request, and a local agency must determine, whether that real property complies with the provisions of the Act and local ordinances enacted pursuant to the Act [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(a)*]. In determining whether a parcel complies with the provisions of the Act and of local ordinances enacted pursuant to it, the presumption of lawful creation set forth in *Gov. Code § 66412.6(b)* is not operative [*Gov. Code § 66412.6(b)*]. On making a determination of compliance the city or county will cause a certificate of compliance to be filed with the recorder of the county in which the real property is located. The local agency may impose a reasonable fee to cover the cost of issuing and recording the certificate of compliance [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(a)*].

A certificate of compliance must be issued for any real property that has been approved for development pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66499.34* [*Gov.Code § 66499.35(c)*]. Because the Subdivision Map Act specifically exempts any parcel that was sold in compliance with or exempt from any law regulating the design and improvement of subdivisions in effect at the time the subdivision was established, a certificate of compliance must be issued on request for those parcels as well. This also applies to parcels that were created before 1893 when the subdivision of land was first regulated in California [*Lakeview Meadows Ranch v. County of Santa Clara (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 593, 599, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 615* ; *see Gov. Code § 66499.30(d)* (exempting from current law parcels that complied with law in effect at time they were subdivided)].

When a certificate of compliance is recorded, it is a conclusive determination that parcels have not merged, and any claim of merger must be reviewed by challenge to the merger determination and not by a later nuisance action against the landowner [*Stell v. Jay Hales Development Co. (1992) 11 Cal. App. 4th 1214, 1226-1228, 15 Cal. Rptr. 2d 220]* .

[2] Conditional Certificate

If a local agency determines that the real property is not in compliance, it will issue a conditional certificate of compliance. A local agency may, as a condition to granting a conditional certificate of compliance, impose those

conditions that would have been applicable to the division of the property at the time the applicant acquired his or her interest therein, and that had been established at that time by the Act or local ordinance. However, when the applicant was the owner of record at the time of the initial violation and, by a grant of the real property, created parcels in violation of the Act or local ordinance, and that person is the current owner of record of one or more of those parcels, then the local agency may impose those conditions that would be applicable to a current division of the property. On making that determination and establishing those conditions the city or county will cause a conditional certificate of compliance to be filed with the recorder of the county in which the real property is located. That certificate will serve as notice that the fulfillment and implementation of those conditions will be required prior to subsequent issuance of a permit or other grant of approval for development of the property [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(b)*].

Compliance with those conditions will not be required until a permit or other grant of approval for development of that property is issued by the local agency [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(b)*].

[3] Contents of Certificate

A certificate of compliance must identify property and state that the division of the property complies with applicable provisions of the Subdivision Map Act and relevant local ordinances [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(a)*]. The certificate or conditional certificate must also include all of the following information as well as any other information the local agency deems necessary: (1) the name or names of the owners of the parcel or parcels; (2) the assessor parcel number or numbers; (3) the number of parcels for which the certificate or conditional certificate is being issued and recorded; (4) the legal description of the parcel or parcels for which the certificate or conditional certificate is being issued and recorded; (5) any conditions to be fulfilled and implemented before a permit or other grant of development approval will be issued; and (6) a prescribed notice stating the effect of the certificate [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(f)(1)*].

A recorded final map, parcel map, or official map will constitute a certificate of compliance with respect to the parcels of real property described in it [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(d)*]. An official map prepared pursuant to *Gov. Code § 66499.52(b)* will constitute a certificate of compliance with respect to the parcels of real property described therein and may be filed for record, whether or not the parcels are contiguous, so long as the parcels are within the same section or, with the approval of the city engineer or county surveyor, within contiguous sections of land [*Gov. Code § 66499.35(e)*].

[4] Antiquated Subdivision Maps

Certificates of compliance may be obtained without compliance with Subdivision Map Act requirements for parcels of a subdivision that were offered for sale or lease, contracted for sale or lease, or sold or leased in compliance with, or under an exemption from, any law regulating the design and improvement of subdivisions in effect at the time the subdivision was established [*Gov. Code § 66499.30(d)*]. This exemption may apply to parcels created before 1893 when the subdivision of land was first regulated in California [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 999, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103* ; *Lakeview Meadows Ranch v. County of Santa Clara (1994) 27 Cal. App. 4th 593, 599, 32 Cal. Rptr. 2d 615]* . For purposes of this exception, a subdivision is deemed established on the date of recordation of the final map or parcel map [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 999, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103* ; *Gov. Code § 66412.7*]. In the case of (1) maps filed for approval before March 4, 1972, and subsequently approved by the local agency, or (2) subdivisions exempted from map requirements by a certificate of exception applied for before this date and subsequently issued by the local agency under local ordinance, the subdivision will be deemed established on the date the map or application for a certificate of exception was filed with the local agency [*Gov. Code § 66412.7*].

In the absence of an applicable subdivision statute, ordinance, or regulation, an antiquated subdivision map [*see Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 996, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103* ("antiquated subdivision maps" are subdivision maps recorded before 1893)] does not in and of itself establish subdivisions or create legal

parcelsfor which certificates of compliance must be issued [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 1006, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103]* . In *Gardner*, the Supreme Court reasoned that because *Gov. Code § 66499.30(d)* recognizes only parcels or parcel sales that were made in compliance with or were exempt from the provisions of any law "regulating the design and improvement of subdivisions in effect at the time the subdivision was established," the logical inference was that *Gov. Code § 66412.7*'s requirement of approval for maps filed before March 4, 1972, must likewise be related to subdivision design and improvement. The Court therefore concluded that *Gov. Code §§ 66412.7* and *66499.30(d)* protect subdivisions that either already were approved by local agencies, or were deemed exempt under previous subdivision laws in effect at the time the subdivisions were established [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 1000, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103]* . The map at issue in *Gardner*, which was recorded in Sonoma County in 1865, did not qualify under these statutes because there was no statewide mechanism generally authorizing local agencies to review or approve subdivision maps before 1893 and there was no other subdivision statute, ordinance, or regulation specifically authorizing public agency approval of subdivisions in Sonoma County in 1865 [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 1000, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103]* .

Furthermore, unlike a modern-day final map or parcel map, which on recordation ordinarily converts what was formerly a single parcel into as many separate lots as appear on the map, the recordation of an antiquated subdivision map without something more such as a conveyance would not have worked a legal subdivision of the property shown on that map. Thus, property owners who recorded subdivision maps in Sonoma County in 1865 generally remained free to deed parcels and lots as they desired without regard to the depicted subdivisions [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 1002, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103]* . It was undisputed in *Gardner* that the property in question remained intact under sequential owners throughout its history. Consequently, the plaintiffs could not fit their case within the decisions recognizing the establishment of subdivisions by conveyance [*Gardner v. County of Sonoma (2003) 29 Cal. 4th 990, 1003, 129 Cal. Rptr. 2d 869, 62 P.3d 103]* .

A map that was undisputedly recorded in compliance with subdivision map laws in effect in 1915 was not valid under the Subdivision Map Act, because the statutes in effect in 1915 did not regulate the design and improvement of subdivisions as required by *Gov. Code § 66499.30(d)* [*Witt Home Ranch., Inc. v. County of Sonoma (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 543, 564, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 123*]. As a result of this decision, the Act's grandfather provisions do not validate subdivision maps approved under the statutes in effect from 1893 (the date of the state's first regulation of private subdivision maps) through 1915 [*Witt Home Ranch., Inc. v. County of Sonoma (2008) 165 Cal. App. 4th 543, 548, 81 Cal. Rptr. 3d 123*]. The reasoning of *Witt Home Ranch* was subsequently applied by a court holding that maps recorded in compliance with the 1907 statewide subdivision map law do not come within the scope of the Subdivision Map Act grandfather clause [*Abernathy Valley, Inc. v. County of Solano (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 42, 51, 92 Cal. Rptr. 3d 459]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
GovernmentsLocal GovernmentsLicensesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal Regulation

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.280

§ 579.280 Review of Decisions Under Subdivision Map Act

[1] Limitation Period

Any action or proceeding to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the decision of an advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body concerning a subdivision, or any of the proceedings, acts, or determinations taken, done, or made prior to that decision, or to determine the reasonableness, legality, or validity of any condition attached thereto, including, but not limited to, the approval of a tentative or final map, must be commenced, and service of summons effected, with 90 days after the date of the decision. Thereafter all persons are barred from any such action or proceeding or any defense of invalidity or unreasonableness of that decision or of those proceedings, actions, or determinations [*Gov. Code § 66499.37*]. The requirement that service of summons be within 90 days is mandatory and not subject to equitable tolling. Failure to satisfy it will subject a complaint to mandatory dismissal [*Maginn v. City of Glendale (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1102, 1108-1110, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639]* .

Moreover, even if an action is brought within the statutory period, it may be barred by laches if an unjustified delay has operated to the injury of another. For example, laches might bar an action if the affected landowner expended substantial time, expense, and effort in processing the application with the county over a lengthy period of time and expended substantial additional time, money, and expense based on the approved application to his or her detriment [*Resource Defense Fund v. County of Santa Cruz (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 800, 809-810, 184 Cal. Rptr. 371]* .

[2] Priority on Court Calendar

Any proceeding based on a decision of an advisory agency, appeal board, or legislative body will take precedence over all matters of the court calendar except criminal, probate, eminent domain, and forcible entry and unlawful detainer proceedings [*Gov. Code § 66499.37*].

[3] Mediation of Disputes Involving Subdivision Map Act Time Limits

Once an action has been filed, a dispute involving a failure to meet time limits specified in the Subdivision Map Act may be resolved by mediation [*Gov. Code § 66031(a)(3)*]. The process may be initiated by invitation from the court

within five days after the deadline for the respondent or defendant to file a response to the action [*Gov. Code § 66031(b)*].

If the parties accept the court's invitation to mediate the dispute, all time limits with respect to the underlying action will be tolled while the mediator conducts the mediation [*Gov. Code § 66032(a)*]. If the parties agree to mediate, a mediator is chosen according to prescribed procedures [*Gov. Code § 66031(c)*]. If the parties do not accept the court's invitation or if they cannot agree on a mediator, the civil action will proceed. The court is not permitted to draw any implication from either party's refusal to mediate [*Gov. Code § 66031(d)*]. Every 90 days after commencement of mediation, the civil action will be reactivated unless the parties either arrive at a settlement and implement it, or agree by written stipulation to extend the mediation for another 90 days [*Gov. Code § 66032(d)*].

If the mediation does not resolve the action, the court has discretion to schedule a settlement conference. If the action is subsequently tried onits merits, the same judge who presided at the conference will preside at trial [*Gov. Code § 66034*]. In the event the mediation is unsuccessful and the action goes to trial, the following provisions will apply [*Gov. Code § 66032(e)*; *see Evid. Code § 1119*]:

- *Evid. Code § 703.5*, which precludes the mediator from testifying at trial; and

- *Evid. Code § 1115 et seq.*, which govern evidentiary issues in mediation proceedings and, among other things, limit the use at trial of evidence derived from mediation proceedings.

The Judicial Council is authorized to adopt rules, forms, and standards necessary to implement the mediation procedures [*Gov. Code § 66035*].

For discussion of *Evid. Code §§ 703.5* and *1115 et seq.*, along with general discussion of mediation, see Ch. 31, *Mediation* .

[4] Standard of Review

[a] Approval of Tentative Subdivision Map

Approval of a tentative subdivision map is a quasi-judicial act subject to judicial review for abuse of discretion under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* [*Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 651 n. 2, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556* (decided under prior law)].

[b] Approval of Final Subdivision Map

Approval of the final subdivision map is a ministerial act reviewable by ordinary mandamus pursuant to *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*. Once the tentative map is approved, the developer often must expend substantial sums to comply with the conditions attached to that approval. These expenditures will result in the construction of improvements consistent with the proposed subdivisions, but often inconsistent with alternative uses of the land. Consequently, it is only fair to the developer and to the public interest to require the governing body to render its discretionary decision whether and on what conditions to approve the proposed subdivision when it acts on the tentative map. Approval of the final map thus becomes a ministerial act once the appropriate officials certify that it is in substantial compliance with the previously approved tentative map [*Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 653 n. 4, 655-656, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556* (decided under prior law)].

However, when a tentative map is approved subject to conditions and those conditions remain unfulfilled, approval of a final subdivision map is not a ministerial act [*Soderling v. City of Santa Monica (1983) 142 Cal. App. 3d 501, 509, 191 Cal. Rptr. 140* ; *see Gov. Code § 66473*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawJudicial ReviewRemediesMandamusAdministrative LawJudicial ReviewStandards of ReviewAbuse of DiscretionCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionMediationsReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial Review

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.281

§ 579.281 Subdivided Lands Act

The Subdivided Lands Act is contained in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.* It is a limited economic regulation of the use of real property imposed to protect the members of the public exposed to that land use. Its object is the prevention of fraud and sharp practices in a type of real estate transaction peculiarly open to those abuses [*People v. Byers (1979) 90 Cal. App. 3d 140, 148, 153 Cal. Rptr. 249]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.282

§ 579.282 Subdivided Lands and Subdivision

[1] Within Subdivided Lands Act

"Subdivided lands" and "subdivision" refer to improved or unimproved land or lands divided or proposed to be divided for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing, whether immediate or future, into five or more lots or parcels [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000(a)*]. Those terms also include improved or unimproved land or lands, lot or lots, or parcel or parcels, of any size, in which, for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing, whether immediate or future, five or more undivided interests are created or are proposed to be created. However, certain undivided interests are excluded [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000.1*].

Additionally, "subdivided lands" and "subdivision" include (1) any planned development, as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11003*, containing five or more lots; (2) any community apartment project as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004*, containing five or more apartments; (3) any condominium project containing five or more condominiums, as defined in *Civ. Code § 783*; (4) certain stock cooperatives, as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11003.2*, having two or more shareholders; and (5) any limited-equity housing cooperative, as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11003.4*. In addition, any accompanying memberships or other rights of privileges created in, or in connection with, any of these forms of development, as well as any interests or memberships in any owners' association created in connection with any of these developments, are also subject to the Subdivided Lands Act. Time-share plans, exchange programs, incidental benefits, and short term product subject to the Vacation Ownership and Time-Share Act of 2004 [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11210 et seq.* (operative July 1, 2005), discussed in *§ 579.286*] are not subdivisions or subdivided lands for purposes of the Subdivided Lands Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004.5*].

The leasing of apartments in a community apartment project as defined in *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004* is also subject to the Subdivided Lands Act [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000*].

[2] Exempt From Subdivided Lands Act

Land or lands sold by lots or parcels of not less than 160 acres that are designated by such lot or parcel description by government surveys andthat appear as such on the current roll of the county in which those lands are situated are not

"subdivided lands" or a "subdivision" within the meaning of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000*, unless that land or lands are divided or proposed to be divided for the purpose of sale for oil and gas purposes [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000(a)*].

The Subdivided Lands Act does not apply to the leasing of apartments, offices, stores, or similar space within an apartment building, industrial building, commercial building, or mobilehome park, as defined in *Health & Safety Code § 18214*. However, leases in a mobilehome park are subject to the Subdivided Lands Act when acceptance of a mandatory term of more than five years is a prerequisite to tenancy [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000(a)*].

The Subdivided Lands Act does not apply to the proposed sale or lease of lots or other interests in a subdivision in which lots or other interests are either [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.3*]:

- Limited to industrial or commercial uses by zoning; or

- Limited to industrial or commercial uses by a declaration of CC&Rs that has been recorded in the official records of the county or counties in which the subdivision is located.

The Act does not apply to subdivided land that is offered or proposed to be offered for sale, lease, or financing by most public agencies [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.6*].

For transactions entered into on or after January 1, 2001 [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.35(c)*], the Subdivided Lands Act does not apply to the proposed sale or lease of five or more lots, parcels, or other interests in a subdivision or the sale of one or more lots or parcels when the subject property is intended to be further subdivided into five or more lots, parcels, or other subdivision interests to any person who acquires the property in order to engage in the business of constructing residential, commercial, or industrial buildings, or for the purpose of resale or lease to persons engaged in such a business. To qualify for this exemption, the purchase or lease agreement (or a separate disclosure document) must include a statement or provision that the purchaser or lessee is required to comply with the applicable provisions of the Subdivided Lands Act before offering for sale or lease any lot, parcel, or other subdivision interest acquired pursuant to the exemption [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.35(a)*].

Finally, the Subdivided Lands Act does not apply to subdivisions that are offered for sale in California, but located entirely outside California [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000(c)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 10249.1* ("subdivision" defined for purposes of regulating out-of-state land promotions)].

Although not exempt from the Subdivided Lands Act itself, some situations do not require a notice of intention [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 11010.4, 11010.7*; *see also Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.10* (alternative requirements)].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.283

§ 579.283 Public Report

[1] Application

Except as otherwise specifically provided, any person who intends to offer subdivided lands within California for sale or lease must file with the Department of Real Estate an application for a public report consisting of a notice of intention and a completed questionnaire form. The notice of intention must contain specified information about the subdivided lands and the proposed offering. The information required in the notice includes the identities of the owner and subdivider, the legal description and area of the land, the condition of title to the land, a statement of the terms of disposition of the land, including copies of proposed contracts, any provisions for public utilities, and other essential information [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010*].

If the developer proposes to create a senior citizen housing development, as defined in *Civ. Code § 51.3*, through phased development and marketing of subdivision interests, additional information is required [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010.05*].

[2] Issued by Commissioner

In subdivisions for which a notice of intention is required, no person shall sell, lease, or offer for sale or lease in California any parcels in a subdivision without first obtaining a public report from the Real Estate Commissioner [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.2*]. The Commissioner will make an examination of any subdivision and issue to the subdivider a public report authorizing the sale or lease of the parcels within the subdivision. The report will contain the data obtained in accordance with *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11010* and that the Commissioner determines is necessary [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018*].

Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.5 provides for the issuance of a public report on specified findings by the Commissioner.

[3] Denial of Public Report

[a] Grounds

The grounds for the denial of a public report are the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018*]:

- Failure to comply with any of the provisions of the Subdivided Lands Act or pertinent regulations.
- The sale or lease would constitute misrepresentation to or deceit or fraud of the purchasers or lessees.
- Inability to deliver title or other contracted interest.
- Inability to demonstrate that adequate financial arrangements have been made for all offsite improvements.
- Inability to demonstrate that adequate financial arrangements have been made for any community, recreation, or other facilities included in the offering.
- Failure to make a showing that the parcels can be used for the purpose for which they are offered; and in the case of a subdivision being offered for residential purposes, failure to make a showing that vehicular access and a source of potable domestic water will be available.
- Failure to provide in the contract or other writing the use or uses for which the parcels are offered, together with any covenants or conditions relative thereto.
- Agreements or bylaws to provide for management or other services pertaining to common facilities in the offering, which fail to comply with the regulations of the Commissioner.
- Failure to demonstrate that adequate financial arrangements have been made for any guaranty or warranty included in the offering.

[b] Objection to Denial

Any subdivider objecting to the denial of a public report may, within 30 days after receiving the order of denial, file a written request for a hearing. The Commissioner will hold the hearing within 20 days unless the party requesting the hearing requests a postponement. If the hearing is not held within 20 days after request for a hearing is received plus the period of any requested postponement or if a proposed decision is not rendered within 45 days after submission and an order adopting or rejecting that proposed decision is not issued within 15 days thereafter, the order of denial will be rescinded and a public report issued [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11018.3*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.284

§ 579.284 Desist Order

[1] Grounds for Issuance

Whenever the Commissioner determines from available evidence that a person has done any of the following, that person may be ordered to desist and refrain from those acts and omissions or from the further sale or lease of interests in the subdivision until the condition has been corrected [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019(a)*]:

- Violated or caused the violation of any provision of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.* or the regulations pertaining thereto.

- Violated or caused a violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17537*, *17537.1*, or *17539.1* (representations to public regarding contests or prizes) in advertising or promoting the sale of subdivision interests.

- Failed to fulfill representations or assurances with respect to the subdivision or the subdivision offering on which the Department relied in issuing a subdivision public report.

- Failed to inform the Department of material changes that have occurred in the subdivision or subdivision offering that have caused the subdivision public report to be misleading or inaccurate or that would have caused the Department to deny a public report if the conditions had existed at the time of issuance.

[2] Review Procedure

On receipt of that order, the person to whom the order is directed must immediately discontinue activities in accordance with the order [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019(b)*]. Any person to whom the order is directed may, within 30 days of its service on him or her, file with the Commissioner a written request for a hearing to contest the order. The Commissioner will then assign the matter to the office of Administrative Hearings to conduct a hearing for findings of fact and determinations of the issues set forth in the order [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019(c)*].

If the hearing is not commenced within 15 days after receipt of the request or on the date to which continued with the agreement of the person requesting the hearing, or if the decision of the Commissioner is not rendered within 30 days after completion of the hearing, the order will be deemed vacated [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019(c)*]. Service and proof of service of an order issued by the Commissioner pursuant to *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019* may be made in a manner and on those persons as prescribed for the service of summons in *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 415.10-417.40* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11019(d)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Administrative LawAgency AdjudicationDecisionsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsGeneral OverviewAdministrative LawAgency AdjudicationHearingsRight to HearingStatutory RightReal Property LawPurchase & SaleContracts of SaleGeneral OverviewReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.285

§ 579.285 Violations

[1] Injunctive Relief

Whenever the Commissioner believes from satisfactory evidence that a violation of the Subdivided Lands Act has occurred or is about to occur, he or she may bring an action against the violator or would-be violator to enjoin that person from continuing that violation or doing any acts in furtherance of that violation. Additionally, when the circumstances warrant it, a receiver may be appointed to manage the defendant's business [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 10081*].

[2] Accrual of Cause of Action

For the purpose of calculating the period of any applicable statute of limitations in any action or proceeding, either civil or criminal, involving any violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.*, the cause of action will be deemed to have accrued not earlier than the time of recording, with thecounty recorder of the county in which the property is situated, of any deed, lease, or contract of sale conveying property sold or leased in violation of *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.* and that describes that lot or parcel. Moreover, any such action may be maintained at any time before the recording of those instruments [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11021*].

[3] Misrepresentation

It is unlawful for any owner, subdivider, agent, employee of that subdivision, or other person with intent directly or indirectly to sell or lease any subdivided land, to authorize, use, direct, or aid in the publication, distribution, or circularization of any advertisement, radio broadcast, or telecast concerning subdivided lands, that contains any statement, pictorial representation, or sketch that is false or misleading [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11022(a)*]. However, unless the publisher, employee, or printer of the publication has actual knowledge of its falsity or has an interest either as an owner or agent in the subdivided lands so advertised, he or she is not liable [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11022(c)*].

Marketing advertisements may be, but are not required to be, submitted, along with a prescribed fee, to the Department of Real Estate for approval before they are disseminated. If disapproval of the submitted advertisement is not communicated within 15 days, it will be deemed approved. The Department, however, is not precluded from

disapproving a later use of the same or similar advertising [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11022(b)*].

[4] Recission of Contract

A person who has made an offer to purchase an interest in certain undivided interests in which five or more undivided parcels were created as defined in Bus. & Prof. Code § 11001.1 has the right to rescind any contract resulting from the acceptance of that offer until midnight of the third calendar day following the day on which the offer to purchase was executed [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000.2(a)*]. The owner must, in accordance with Real Estate Commissioner regulations, clearly and conspicuously disclose the right of rescission to all prospective purchasers of undivided interests, and must furnish to each offeror a form with which to exercise that right [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000.2(b)*].

For general discussion and forms for use by a purchaser in rescinding a contract for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

The availability of rescission is limited to executory contracts between purchaser and subdivider. Subsequent purchasers of subdivided land do not have standing to seek rescission of the original sale from the subdivider to the subsequent purchaser's predecessor in interest [*Drake v. Martin (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 984, 995-996, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingState RegulationCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & RestitutionReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.286

§ 579.286 Regulation of Time-Share Developments

[1] The Vacation Ownership and Time-Share Act of 2004 (VOTSA)

The Vacation Ownership and Time-Share Act of 2004 (VOTSA) [*Bus & Prof. Code § 11210 et seq.*], which went into effect on July 1, 2005 [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11288*], provides for the disclosure to purchasers and prospective purchasers of time-share plans and exchange programs, as defined, by time-share developers and exchange companies. It requires specified time-share plans offered for sale in California or created and existing in California to comply with specified fee, registration, notice, and disclosure requirements with regard to oral and written communications, including the issuance of a public report by the Real Estate Commissioner.

Time-share plans, exchange programs, incidental benefits, and short-term products that are subject to VOTSA are not "subdivisions" or "subdivided lands" within the meaning of the Subdivided Lands Act, and are exempt from other specified provisions of existing law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11004.5(g)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.* (Subdivided Lands Act)].

Regulation of time-share plans and exchange programs is an exclusive power and function of the state [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11280(a)*]. However, no provision of VOTSA can be construed to violate any zoning, subdivision, or building code or other real estate use law, ordinance, or regulation [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11280(b)*].

[2] Scope and Application of VOTSA

[a] Projects That Must Be Registered

VOTSA applies to all of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11211.5*]:

- Time-share plans with an accommodation or component site in California [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11212(a), (f), (z)* ("accommodation," "component site," and "time-share plan" defined)];

- Time-share plans without an accommodation or component site in California, if those plans are sold

or offered for sale to any individual located in California;

- Exchange programs *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11212(l)*; and

- Short term products [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11212(v)* ("short term product" defined)].

The application of VOTSA to single site time-share plans and component sites of multisite plans that are located outside California that are offered for sale or sold in California is somewhat limited [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11211.5(d)*].

[b] Exempt Projects

VOTSA does not apply to any of the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11211.5(b)*]:

- Time-share plans, whether or not an accommodation is located in California, consisting of 10 or fewer time-share interests.

- Time-share plans, whether or not an accommodation is located in California, the use of which extends over any period of three years or less.

- Time-share plans, whether or not an accommodation is located in California, under which the prospective purchaser's total financial obligation will be equal to or less than $3,000 during the entire term of the time-share plan.

Use of an exchange program by owners of time-share interests to secure access to other accommodations does not affect the exemption described in the first bullet, *above* [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11211.5(b)(1)*].

[c] Effect of VOTSA on Time-Share Plans Registered Before July 1, 2005

All registrations of time-share plans that were in effect on July 1, 2005, remain in full force and effect and will be considered registered pursuant to VOTSA [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11219(b)(1)*]. These plans must fully comply with VOTSA when they seek amendment or renewal of their existing registrations. While an amendment or renewal is pending, the existing registration will continue in full force and effect [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11219(b)(2)*].

Any existing injunction or temporary restraining order that prohibits unregistered practice of time-share developers, time-share plans, or their agents is not invalidated by the enactment of VOTSA and will continue to have full force and effect on and after July 1, 2005 [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11219(c)*].

Time-share plans that are registered as Qualified Resort Vacation Club Projects under prior law will continue to operate under that law notwithstanding VOTSA [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11219(a)*].

[3] Registration Requirements

Any person who, to any individual located in California, sells, offers to sell, or attempts to solicit prospective purchasers to purchase a time-share interest, or any person who creates a time-share plan with an accommodation in California, must register the plan with the Commissioner, unless the plan is otherwise exempt [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11226(a)*; *see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11225* (exemptions)]. A developer, or any of its agents, may not sell, offer, or dispose of a time-share interest in the state unless [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11226(b)*]:

- All necessary registration requirements are provided and approved by the Real Estate Commissioner;

- The sale, offer, or disposition is otherwise permitted by VOTSA; or
- An order revoking or suspending a registration is in effect.

In this context, the terms "sells," "offers to sell," and "attempts to solicit prospective purchasers" include any written or oral communication that is disseminated or otherwise used in California for the purpose of inducing a resident to travel outside California for a required presentation with the primary intention of causing the person to purchase time-share interests located outside California [*10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2805.5*].

[4] Public Report

A developer must prepare a public report that fully and accurately discloses the facts concerning the developer and time-share plan that are required by VOTSA and its implementing regulations. The report must be provided to each purchaser of a time-share interest in any time-share plan at the time of purchase. It must be written and dated, and the purchaser must certify its receipt in writing [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11234*]. There are different content requirements for the report depending on whether it is for (1) a single site time-share plan [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11234(a)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2809.1*], (2) a specific time-share interest multisite time-share plan [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11234(a), (b)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. §§ 2809.1, 2809.2*], or (3) a nonspecific time-share interest multisite time-share plan [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11234(c)*; *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2809.3*].

The Commissioner must issue a final public report if all registration requirements have been met and if all deficiencies and substantive inadequacies in the application for final public report have been corrected [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11227(a)*].

The term of a final public report is five years, but may be renewed on application and submission of any additional information the Commissioner may require [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11228*].

The Commissioner may refuse to issue a public report if the applicant fails to comply with any provisions of VOTSA and its implementing regulations [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11229(b)*].

[5] Prohibited Marketing Practices

VOTSA includes numerous, specific prohibitions on marketing practices related to misrepresentation of information and failure to give disclosures required to be made to prospective purchasers [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11245*; *but see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11217*]. A violation constitutes a public offense punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11287*].

[6] Resolution of Disputes Between Time-Share Interest Owners or Association and Developer

Any procedure provided for in a sales contract or in the time-share instruments implemented after July 1, 2005, for resolving a dispute or claim between a time-share interest owner and a developer, or any provision in the time-share instruments implemented after July 1, 2005, setting forth terms, conditions, and procedures for resolving a dispute of a claim between an association and the developer, must, at a minimum, provide that the dispute or claim resolution process be conducted in accordance with the following rules [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11275(a)*]:

- The developer must advance the fees necessary to initiate the dispute or claim resolution process, with the costs and fees, including ongoing costs and fees, if any, to be paid as agreed by the parties. If they cannot agree then the costs and fees are to be paid as determined by the person or persons presiding at the dispute or claim resolution proceeding or hearing.

- There must be a neutral or impartial person to administer and preside over the claim or dispute resolution process.

- The selection of the person who will administer and preside over the claim or dispute resolution process must be made within a specified period of time, which in no event may be more than 60 days from initiation of the claim or dispute resolution process. The person selected may be challenged for bias.

- The venue of the claim or dispute resolution process must be in the county where the time-share is located unless the parties agree to some other location.

- The claim or dispute resolution process must be commenced in a prompt and timely manner.

- The claim or dispute resolution process must be conducted in accordance with rules and procedures that are reasonable and fair to the parties.

- The claim or dispute resolution process must conclude in a prompt and timely manner, including the issuance of any decision or ruling.

- The person presiding at the claim or dispute resolution process must be authorized to provide all recognized remedies available in law or equity for any cause of action that is the basis of the proceeding or hearing. The parties may authorize the limitation or prohibition of punitive damages.

If the claim or dispute resolution process provides or allows for a judicial remedy in accordance with the laws of California, it will be presumed that the proceeding or hearing satisfies the provisions listed above [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11275(c)*].

[6A] Regular and Special Assessments

The owners' association is permitted to levy regular and special assessments against the time-share owners and to secure a lien against delinquent assessments [*see Bus. & Prof. Code § 11265*]. Assessments are delinquent 30 days after they become due unless the time-share instrument provides a longer period. If an assessment is delinquent, the association may recover the following [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11265.1(a)*]:

- Reasonable costs incurred in collecting the delinquent assessment, including attorneys' fees;

- A late charge not exceeding 10 percent of the assessment or $10, whichever is greater, unless the time-share instrument specifies a smaller amount; and

- Interest on the delinquent assessment, reasonable fees and costs of collection, and reasonable attorneys' fees.

Regular assessments are exempt from execution by the association's judgment creditor only to the extent necessary for the association to perform essential services, such as paying for utilities and insurance. The exemption does not apply to [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11265.1(b)*]:

- Consensual pledges, liens, or encumbrances that have been approved by the owners;

- State tax liens; or

- Liens for labor or materials supplied to common areas.

[7] Investigation of Violations and Enforcement of VOTSA

Responsibility for investigating violations of VOTSA and enforcing its provisions falls on the Real Estate Commissioner [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 11282-11284*].

Violations of specified provisions of VOTSA are public offenses punishable by fine and/or imprisonment [*see Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 11286, 11287*].

[8] Owners' and Association's Right to Relief

Any time-share interest owner or association may bring an action for damages or injunctive or declaratory relief against a developer, seller, or marketer of time-share interests, or an escrow holder, or the managing entity for a violation of VOTSA. This right to relief does not exclude other remedies provided by law [*Bus. & Prof. Code § 11285*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Antitrust & Trade LawConsumer ProtectionFalse AdvertisingState RegulationCivil ProcedureAlternative Dispute ResolutionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesTimesharesReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.287

§ 579.287 Interstate Land Sales

The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act is set forth in *15 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.* Designed to protect against fraud in interstate land sales, it insures that the buyer is informed of the facts necessary to make an informed decision about whether or not to purchase property [*see Law v. Royal Palm Beach (5th Cir. 1978) 578 F.2d 98, 99]* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.288

§ 579.288 Definitions

"Subdivision" means any land that is located in any state or in a foreign country and is divided or is proposed to be divided into lots, whether contiguous or not, for the purpose of sale or lease as a part of a common promotional plan [*15 U.S.C. § 1701(3)*].

"Common promotional plan" means a plan, undertaken by a single developer or a group of developers acting in concert, to offer lots for sale or lease. Where that land is offered for sale by that developer or group of developers acting in concert, and is contiguous or is known, designated, or advertised as a common unit or by a common name, that land will be presumed, without regard to the number of lots covered by each individual offering, as being offered for sale or lease as part of a common promotional plan [*15 U.S.C. § 1701(4)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawSubdivisionsGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.289

§ 579.289 Exemptions

Unless the method of disposition is adopted to evade the Full Disclosure Act, its provisions do not apply to various types of real estate sales and leases. Among the types of real estate sales and leases to which the Full Disclosure Act does not apply are [*15 U.S.C. § 1702(a)*]:

- The sale or lease of lots in a subdivision containing less than 25 lots.

- The sale or lease of any improved land on which there is a building, or the sale or lease of land under a contract obligating the seller to erect such a building within two years.

- The sale or lease of lots to any person who acquires those lots for the purpose of engaging in the business of constructing residential, commercial, or industrial buildings or for the purpose of resale or lease of those lots to persons engaged in those businesses.

Additionally, unless the method of disposition is adopted to evade the Full Disclosure Act, its provisions requiring registration and disclosure do not apply in several instances. Among these instances are [*15 U.S.C. § 1702(b)*]:

- The sale or lease of lots in a subdivision containing fewer than 100 lots.

- The sale or lease of lots in a subdivision, if within 12 months not more than 12 lots are sold or leased, and the sale or lease of the first 12 lots in that subdivision in any subsequent 12-month period.

- The sale or lease of lots in a subdivision in which each of the lots is at least 20 acres.

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.290

§ 579.290 Acts Prohibited

It is unlawful for any developer or agent, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means of interstate commerce or of the mails with respect to the sale or lease of any nonexempt lot unless a statement of record regarding that lot is in effect and a printed property report is furnished to the purchaser in advance of the signing of any contract; and when any part of the statement of record or the property report contains an untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact or to display to prospective purchasers or lessees promotional material that is inconsistent with information required to be disclosed in the property report [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(a)(1)*].

It is unlawful for any developer or agent, directly or indirectly, to make use of any means of interstate commerce or of the mails with respect to the sale or lease of any lot not exempt under *15 U.S.C. § 1702(a)* to employ any device, scheme, or artifice to defraud, or to obtain money or property by means of a material misrepresentation, or to engage in any transaction, practice, or course of business that operates or would operate as a fraud or deceit on a purchaser [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(a)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDuty to Disclose

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.291

§ 579.291 Revocation of Contract or Agreement

Any contract or agreement for the purchase or lease of any nonexempt lot may be revoked at the option of the purchaser or lessee until seven daysafter it has been signed or until a later time required pursuant to state law [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(b)*].

If the required property report was not given to the purchaser or lessee in advance of his or her signing the contract or agreement, that contract or agreement may be revoked at the option of the purchaser or lessee within two years from the date of its signing [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(c)*].

Any contract or agreement for the purchase or lease of any nonexempt lot that does not provide the statutorily required notice regarding breach or default may be revoked at the option of the purchaser or lessee within two years from the date of its signing [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(d)*]. *15 U.S.C. § 1703(d)* does not apply to the sale of a lot for which, within 180 days after the signing of the sale contract the purchaser receives a warranty deed [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(d)*].

If a contract or agreement is revoked pursuant to *15 U.S.C. § 1703(b), (c),* or *(d),* if the purchaser or lessee tenders to the sell er or lessor an instrumentconveying his or her rights and interests in the lot, and if the rights and interests and the lot are in a condition substantially similar to the condition in which they were conveyed or purported to be conveyed, that purchaser or lessee is entitled to all money paid [*15 U.S.C. § 1703(e)*]. For general discussion and forms for use by a purchaser in rescinding a contract for the sale of real property, see Ch. 569, *Vendor and Purchaser* .

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesRescission & Restitution

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.292

§ 579.292 Civil Liabilities

A purchaser or lessee may bring an action at law or in equity against a developer or agent if the sale or lease was made in violation of *15 U.S.C. § 1703(a)*. In such a suit, the court may order damages, specific performance, or such other relief as the court deems fair, just, and equitable. In determining that relief, the court may take into account, but not be limited to, the following factors [*15 U.S.C. § 1709(a)*]:

- The contract price;
- The amount actually paid;
- The cost of any improvements to the lot;
- The fair market value of the lot or leasehold at the time relief is determined; and
- The fair market value of the lot or leasehold at the time that lot was purchased or leased.

A purchaser or lessee may bring an action at law or in equity against the seller or lessor (or successor thereof) to enforce any rights under *15 U.S.C. § 1703(b), (c), (d),* or *(e)* [*15 U.S.C. § 1709(b)*].

The amount recoverable in a suit authorized by *15 U.S.C. § 1709* may include, in addition to matters specified, interest, court costs, and reasonable amounts for attorney's fees, independent appraiser's fees, and travel to and from the lot [*15 U.S.C. § 1709(c)*].

Every person who becomes liable to make any payment under *15 U.S.C. § 1709* may recover contributions as in cases of contract from any person who, if sued separately, would have been liable to make the same payment [*15 U.S.C. § 1709(d)*].

Generally, an action maintained under *15 U.S.C. § 1709* must be brought within three years after the date of signing the

sale contract or lease, or within three years after the violation was or should have been discovered [*15 U.S.C. § 1711*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesAttorney Expenses & FeesGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesCosts & Attorney FeesCostsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesDamagesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesSpecific Performance

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.293

§ 579.293 No Limitation of Rights

Any condition, stipulation, or provision binding any person acquiring any lot in a subdivision to waive compliance with any provision of *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* is void [*15 U.S.C. § 1712*].

The rights and remedies provided by *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* are in addition to any and all other rights and remedies that may exist at law or in equity [*15 U.S.C. § 1713*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawPurchase & SaleRemediesGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.294

§ 579.294 Injunctions and Investigations

Whenever it appears that any person is engaged or about to engage in any acts or practices that constitute or will constitute a violation of the provisions of *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* or of any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant thereto, the Secretary may bring an action in any federal district court to enjoin those acts or practices, and, on a proper showing, a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order will be granted without bond. The Secretary may transmit evidence to the Attorney General who may institute the appropriate criminal proceedings [*15 U.S.C. § 1714(a)*].

The Secretary may make those investigations deemed necessary to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any provision of *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* or any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant thereto, and may require or permit any person to file a written statement regarding all the facts and circumstances concerning the matter to be investigated. The Secretary may publish information concerning any violations [*15 U.S.C. § 1714(b)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesInjunctionsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.295

§ 579.295 Penalties

Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* or the rules and regulations prescribed pursuant thereto, or any person who willfully, in a statement of record filed under, or in a property report issued pursuant to *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720*, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state any material fact required to be stated therein, will, on conviction, be fined not more than$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both [*15 U.S.C. § 1717*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Criminal Law & ProcedureCriminal OffensesMiscellaneous OffensesGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.296

§ 579.296 Jurisdiction and Venue

The district courts of the United States, the United States courts of any territory, and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia have jurisdiction of offenses and violations under *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* and under the rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto. Those courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the state courts of all suits in equity and actions at law brought to enforce any liability or duty created by *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720*. Any such suit or action may be brought in the district wherein the defendant is found, is an inhabitant, or transacts business, or in the district where the offer or sale took place, if thedefendant participated therein. No case arising under *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720* and brought in any state court of competent jurisdiction will be removed to any court of the United States, except when the United States or any officer or employee of the United States in his or her official capacity is a party [*15 U.S.C. § 1719*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureJurisdictionSubject Matter JurisdictionJurisdiction Over ActionsConcurrent JurisdictionCriminal Law & ProcedureJurisdiction & VenueGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.297

§ 579.297 Interplay With State Law

15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720 does not prevent or limit the authority of the state or local government to enact and enforce with regard to the sale of land any law, ordinance, or code not in conflict with the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act [*15 U.S.C. § 1708(e)*].

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

126 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART II. LEGAL BACKGROUND
C. Subdivision Map Act and Related Laws

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.298-579.309

[Reserved]

§§ 579.298[Reserved]

127 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.310

§ 579.310 California Legal Forms

For discussion and forms relating to building permits and seeking relief from zoning ordinances, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 30B, *Zoning, Building and Environmental Entitlements and Permits* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative Procedure

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.311

§ 579.311 California Real Estate

For discussion of general zoning regulations, including variances, conditional use permits, and nonconforming uses, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Chs. 260- 265; for discussion of zoning enforcement and judicial review of zoning decisions, see Chs. 280- 283; for discussion of building permits, see Ch. 423, *Building Codes* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming Uses

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.312

§ 579.312 California Environmental Law

For detailed coverage of zoning regulations, including types and methods of zoning, conditional use permits and variances, constitutional and nonconstitutional limits on zoning power, nonconforming uses, and judicial review of zoning restrictions, see Manaster and Selmi, California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 60, *Zoning* (Matthew Bender); for discussion of general and specific plans, see Ch. 62, *Planning* ; for discussion of the California coastal zone, see Ch. 66, *Coastal Zone Regulation*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseNonconforming UsesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseZoning Methods

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.313

§ 579.313 Federal Statutes

Coastal Zone Management Act. *16 U.S.C. § 1451 et seq.*

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). *42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNational Environmental Policy ActGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.314

§ 579.314 State Statutes

[1] Building Regulations

State Housing Law. *Health & Safety Code § 17910 et seq.*

State Building Standards Law. *Health & Safety Code §§ 18901, 18949.31*

State Building Standards Code. *Health & Safety Code §§ 18902, 18935 et seq.*

Reconstruction standards for earthquake hazardous buildings. *Health & Safety Code §§ 19160-19168*

[2] Cemeteries

Required notice under *Gov. Code §§ 65091-65094* when application is made to use cemetery for other than cemetery uses. *Gov. Code § 65096*; *Health & Safety Code § 8120*

[3] Coastal Lands

State Coastal Conservancy. *Pub. Res. Code § 31000 et seq.*

California Coastal Act of 1976. *Pub. Res. Code § 30000 et seq.*

San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program. *Pub. Res. Code § 31160 et seq.*

[4] General

Planning and Zoning Law. *Gov. Code § 65000 et seq.*

Dedication of land for schools as condition for approval of residential development. *Gov. Code § 65970 et seq.*

Procedures for adopting certain fees. *Gov. Code § 66016 et seq.*

Procedures for protesting residential development fees. *Gov. Code § 66020 et seq.*

Official Maps. *Gov. Code § 66499.50 et seq.*

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). *Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq.*

Airport land use commission. *Pub. Util. Code § 21670 et seq.*

[5] Judicial Review

Injunctions. *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Action for declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*

Traditional Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*

Administrative Mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

California Coastal Act review. *Pub. Res. Code §§ 30801, 30802*

Actions challenging local government decision. *Gov. Code § 65009*

Rules of evidence and procedure. *Gov. Code § 65010*

Challenge to general plan. *Gov. Code §§ 65750-65763*

Review of general plan. *Gov. Code § 65860*

Review of variances and conditional use permits. *Gov. Code § 65907*

Notice of enforcement. *Gov. Code § 65908*

[6] Plans

General plans. *Gov. Code § 65300 et seq.*

Specific plans. *Gov. Code §§ 65450-65457*

[7] Zoning Regulations

Zoning regulations. *Gov. Code § 65800 et seq.*

Adoption of regulations. *Gov. Code § 65850 et seq.*

Variances and conditional use permits. *Gov. Code § 65900 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseAdministrative ProcedureReal Property LawZoning & Land UseBuilding & Housing CodesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseJudicial ReviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseSpecial Permits & Variances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.315

§ 579.315 Federal Regulations

Implementation of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. *40 C.F.R. § 6.100 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNational Environmental Policy ActGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.316

§ 579.316 State Regulations

Coastal development permits. *14 Cal. Code Reg. § 13050 et seq.*

Implementation of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines). *14 Cal. Code Reg. § 15000 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral Overview

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.317

§ 579.317 Decisions

[1] Accessory Uses

When commercial and residential zones were on opposite sides of an alley, use of residentially-zoned portion of alley to gain access to building in commercially-zoned area constituted commercial accessory use in violation of zoning restrictions of residential district. *Teachers Ins. & Annuity Assn. v. Furlotti (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 1487, 1495, 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 455*

Zoning ordinance that prohibited commercial use of dwelling when assistants were employed was valid and did not violate privacy rights. *City of Los Altos v. Barnes (1992) 3 Cal. App. 4th 1193, 1199-1202, 5 Cal. Rptr. 2d 77*

[2] Administrative Mandate

Administrative action of board is overturned only on clear showing of abuse of discretion. *Rubin v. Board of Directors (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 119, 126-127, 104 P.2d 1041* ; *Garden Grove Congregation v. City of Garden Grove (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 136, 140-141, 1 Cal. Rptr. 65*

Administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* was appropriate remedy to challenge city's decision, which required removal of nonconforming patio as condition to grant of variance. *Briggs v. City of Rolling Hills Estates (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644-648, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

Federal civil rights claim under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* challenging city's zoning decision, which required removal of nonconforming patio as condition to grant of variance, was barred by plaintiff's failure to petition for administrative mandamus under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*. *Briggs v. City of Rolling Hills Estates (1995) 40 Cal. App. 4th 637, 644-648, 47 Cal. Rptr. 2d 29*

In administrative mandamus proceeding, court is limited to reviewing record before board and as not to substitute its

opinion on facts. *Patterson v. Board of Supervisors (1947) 79 Cal. App. 2d 670, 671-672, 180 P.2d 945*

[3] Adult Entertainment Zoning

First Amendment requires that adult business ordinance provide both for prompt judicial review of denial of license and also for prompt judicial decision. *City of Littleton v. Z. J. Gifts D-4, City of Littleton (2004) 541 U.S. 774, 124 S. Ct. 2219, 159 L. Ed. 2d 84*

City could rely on 1977 study showing association between areas with high concentrations of adult establishments and high crime rates in support of ordinance prohibiting operation of more than one adult entertainment business in the same building, even though study did not consider secondary effects of combined operations in a single building. *City of Los Angeles v. Alameda Books, Inc. (2002) 535 U.S. 425, 122 S. Ct. 1728, 1734, 152 L. Ed. 2d 670*

Injunction against enforcement of adult entertainment business zoning was proper based on finding of serious hardship to adult businesses because of lack of adequate number of potential relocation sites that met zoning criteria. *Topanga Press, Inc. v. Los Angeles (9th Cir. 1993) 989 F.2d 1524*

Adult theatre zoning is unconstitutional when its separation requirement precludes reasonable alternative sites for adult theatres. *Walnut Properties, Inc. v. City of Whittier (9th Cir. 1988) 861 F.2d 1102*

Zoning ordinance that restricted area for adult entertainment establishments was valid when all commercially zoned areas were available for these establishments and space was available in commercial area; private landowners' refusal to rent to adult entertainment establishments was not relevant. *City of National City v. Wiener (1992) 3 Cal. 4th 832, 847-849, 12 Cal. Rptr. 2d 701, 838 P.2d 223*

Theatre is adult theatre for zoning purposes if theatre shows adult films are regular and substantial course of conduct. *People v. Superior Court (Lucero) (1989) 49 Cal. 3d 14, 26-28, 259 Cal. Rptr. 740, 774 P.2d 769*

City ordinance forbidding adult businesses within 100 feet of freeway was unconstitutional on its face; purpose of avoiding visual blight could be addressed by less intrusive means, such as appropriate sign and exterior requirements. *Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 199-200, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194*

City ordinance prohibiting location of adult businesses within 400 feet of any area zoned residential was unconstitutional as applied to business that would be located within 400 feet of single wedge-shaped vacant residential lot in industrial zone next to freeway. *Gammoh v. City of Anaheim (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 186, 197-198, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 194*

Inclusion of adult newsracks in adult entertainment zoning is unconstitutional as violation of *First Amendment* right of free speech. *Sebago, Inc. v. City of Alameda (1989) 211 Cal. App. 3d 1372, 1381-1386, 259 Cal. Rptr. 918*

[4] Aesthetics

Advancement of esthetic values is legitimate exercise of state police powers; public welfare is broad and inclusive concept and represents spiritual, physical, aesthetic, and monetary values. *City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent (1984) 466 U.S. 789, 805, 104 S. Ct. 2118, 80 L. Ed. 2d 772*

Ordinance imposing height limitations on pre-existing foliage was legitimate exercise of city's police power. *Echevarietta v. City of Rancho Palos Verdes (2001) 86 Cal. App. 4th 472, 479, 103 Cal. Rptr. 2d 165*

Zoning ordinance preserving views and sunlight against unreasonable obstruction by tree growth and providing for private enforcement advanced aesthetic values and was reasonable exercise of police power. *Kucera v. Lizza (1997) 59 Cal. App. 4th 1141, 1148, 69 Cal. Rptr. 2d 582*

Ordinance that provided for discretionary review to consider effect of construction on neighborhood was valid even though it allowed prohibition of building that met zoning requirements; ordinances requiring considerationof aesthetics are valid under police power. *Guinnane v. San Francisco City Planning Com. (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 732, 736-742, 257 Cal. Rptr. 742*

Sign regulation is valid when it expressly prohibits signs characterizing person or object in only certain areas of city, permits them in other areas with conditional use permit subject to zoning administrator approval if they are desirable and in character with area, and sign shape, not message, is determinative. *City of Salinas v. Ryan Outdoor Advertising, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 416, 433, 234 Cal. Rptr. 619*

On-premises business sign is protected as property right and is limited *First Amendment* free speech right; size, location, and other physical attributes of sign is subject to regulation in interests of public safety and aesthetics; prohibition of nonoffensive name on sign simply because it may attract undesirable clientele is unconstitutional violation of right to free speech. *Kuhns v. Board of Supervisors (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 369, 376, 181 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Signs and billboards are subject to reasonable regulation through police power; size, location, and other physical attributes of sign and number of signs that may be posted, affixed, or installed are subject to regulation; classification of advertising signs is not to be arbitrarily made for mere purpose of classification, but must be based on some distinction, natural, intrinsic, or constitutional, which suggests reason for and justifies particular legislation. *Carlin v. City of Palm Springs (1971) 14 Cal. App. 3d 706, 712, 92 Cal. Rptr. 535*

[5] Building Permits

City estopped from revoking building permit on ground building's size violated city building code; permit was issued following settlement of litigation over permit requirements, and city had ample opportunity to review both building plans and settlement agreement before granting permit. *Congregation Etz Chaim v. City of Los Angeles (9th Cir. 2004) 371 F.3d 1122, 1124-1125*

Plaintiff's building permit did not give it vested rights in proposed redevelopment agency plan or in parking spaces allocated to it in proposed parking facility, when permit contained no commitment on part of agency to provide parking spaces and because this right could not be created by estoppel under facts of case. *Boone v. Redevelopment Agency of City of San Jose (9th Cir. 1988) 841 F.2d 886, 893*

Party challenging plan review and building permit fees under *Gov. Code § 66014* must seek prospective fee reduction under *Gov. Code § 66016* and may not seek refund of allegedly excess fees under *Gov. Code § 66020*. *Barratt American, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cucamonga (2005) 37 Cal. 4th 685, 699, 37 Cal. Rptr. 3d 149, 124 P.3d 719*

Action seeking removal of conditions imposed by ordinance on building permit was timely under *Gov. Code § 65009(c)(1)(E)* even though plaintiff raised facial rather than as-applied challenge, because action was brought within 90 days of final decision imposing conditions. *Travis v. County of Santa Cruz (2004) 33 Cal. 4th 757, 767, 16 Cal. Rptr. 3d 404, 94 P.3d 538*

Transit development fee imposed after issuance of building permit was valid when permit contained condition that developer participate in assessment district or similar mechanism for transit and fee actually imposed was similar to assessment district. *Russ Bldg. Partnership v. City and County of San Francisco (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 839, 845-854, 244*

Cal. Rptr. 682, 750 P.2d 324

Increased in-lieu affordable housing fee to be paid by developer on issuance of building permits for market-rate housing was not "reasonably justified" within meaning of development agreement because there was no reasonable relationship between amount of fee as increased and deleterious public impact of development. *Building Industry Assn. v. City of Patterson (2009) 171 Cal. App. 4th 886, 898, 90 Cal. Rptr. 3d 63*

Statute of limitations set forth in *Gov. Code § 65009(c)(1)(E)* applied to action challenging city planning department issuance of building permit. *Honig v. San Francisco Planning Dept. (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 520, 524, 528, 25 Cal. Rptr. 3d 649*

Building permit properly denied on aesthetic grounds; applicant's claim that denial was arbitrary and capricious was not sufficient to state claim for violation of substantive due process under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* without showing that applicant was deprived of protected property interest. *Breneric Associates v. City of Del Mar (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 166, 182-183, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324*

Developer challenging change of zoning and other local actions based on alleged substantive due process violation under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* had no vested right on which to base its claim due to fact that it had not applied for nor received building permit for its project. *Stubblefield Construction Co. v. City of San Bernardino (1995) 32 Cal. App. 4th 687, 708, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 413*

[6] California Coastal Act

[a] Definition of Development

Use of settling pond and waste disposal area was within definition of development in *Pub. Res. Code § 30106*, which includes placement of any solid material and disposal of any dredged material. *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 58, 62, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15*

Development includes placement on land of any structure, including 18,000 gallon propane tank; structure includes any building, road, pipe, flume, conduit, siphon, aqueduct, telephone line, and electrical power transmission and distribution line. *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 76-77, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15*

Lot line adjustments constitute "development" within meaning of *Pub. Res. Code § 30106*, for which permit or waiver is required under *La Fe, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles (1999) 73 Cal. App. 4th 231, 240, 86 Cal. Rptr. 2d 217*

[b] EIR

EIR for aquarium that did not consider alternative sites on waterfront that would not require fill was adequate when all waterfront sites were analyzed and no sites that did not require fill were identified. *Save San Francisco Bay Ass'n v. San Francisco Bay Conservation Etc. Com. (1992) 10 Cal. App. 4th 908, 919-922, 13 Cal. Rptr. 2d 117*

[c] In General

Commission's decision involves discretion; issuing of permit requires delicate balancing of effect of each proposed development on coastal environment; development must not have any substantial adverse environmental or ecological effect or irreversibly commit coastal zone resources, and must enhance environment of coastal zone. *State v. Superior*

Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 247-248, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281

Before certification of local coastal plan, Coastal Commission or other permit issuing agency has authority to designate property as environmentally sensitive habitat area and deny permit on that basis. *Douda v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1193, 72 Cal. Rptr. 3d 98*

When project approval is appealed to California Coastal Commission and Commission issues permit after conducting de novo proceeding, subsequent administrativemandamus challenge naming local governmental entity but not Commission is vulnerable to claim that Commission is indispensable party. *Kaczorowski v. Mendocino County Bd. of Supervisors (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 564, 569-570, 106 Cal. Rptr. 2d 14*

Coastal Commission properly determined that wetlands existed on proposed development site. *Kirkorowicz v. California Coastal Com. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 980, 987-988, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 124*

City was not required to obtain Coastal Commission approval before implementing and enforcing interim ordinance imposing height and density restrictions on development in coastal zone, because ordinance was not in conflict with Coastal Act and did not authorize a use other than those designated in local coastal plan. *Conway v. City of Imperial Beach (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 78, 88-89, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 402*

Coastal commission had authority to deny certification to coastal plan that allowed oil and gas development on Santa Cruz island and did not sufficiently limit residential development. *Pier Gherini v. California Coastal Com. (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 699, 705-710, 251 Cal. Rptr. 426*

In reviewing regional commission decision, state commission is required to exercise its independent judgment to decide if conformity with statewide standards has been achieved. *City of Chula Vista v. Superior Court (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 472, 488-490, 183 Cal. Rptr. 909*

Commission is authorized to require dedication for public parking through its power to provide access consistent with needs for public safety and to protect public rights, private property owners' rights, and natural resources areas from overuse; provision requiring parking for use to be made of land involved is proper, to require landowner to dedicate property for free public parking far beyond his or her own land use requirements is improper. *Liberty v. California Coastal Com. (1980) 113 Cal. App. 3d 491, 502-503, 170 Cal. Rptr. 247*

Rule of exhaustion of administrative remedies is applicable in Coastal Act cases. *La Costa Beach Homeowners Assn. v. Wayne (1979) 89 Cal. App. 3d 327, 330-332, 152 Cal. Rptr. 355*

Coastal Act creates chain of responsibility; regional commission has responsibility to adjudicate propriety of granting or denying permit, recognizing regional effect on ecosystem; on appeal, state commission takes unlimited look at same request by de novo public hearing, reviewing regional effect and statewide effect of proposed development. *REA Enterprises v. California Coastal Zone Conservation Com. (1975) 52 Cal. App. 3d 596, 605, 125 Cal. Rptr. 201* (decided under former Coastal Act)

Denial of building permit during preparation of coastal zone plan was not taking of property for public use without compensation, even when denial was result of Department of Parks and Recreation expressing interest in and intent to acquire that property. *Briggs v. State of California ex rel. Dept. Parks & Recreation (1979) 98 Cal. App. 3d 190, 203-205, 159 Cal. Rptr. 390*

[d] Permits

Placement of 18,000-gallon propane tank after effective date of Coastal Act was change or new development for which permit is required, even though rest of operation was exempt from *Coastal Act. Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 76-77, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15*

Coastal Commission must make findings to support grant of permit for development in environmentally sensitive habitat area on basis that denial of permit would effect unconstitutional taking. *McAllister v. California Coastal Commission (2009) 169 Cal. App. 4th 912, 942, 87 Cal. Rptr. 3d 365*

Coastal Commission properly granted permit although addition to home would partially block view of sea; in providing that "permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views" [*see Pub. Res. Code § 30251*] Legislature did not intend that permits be denied for all projects that infringed in any way, no matter how minimally, on any view, no matter how limited. *Farr v. Coastal Commission (2009) 173 Cal. App. 4th 1474, 1479-1480, 93 Cal. Rptr. 3d 710*

Coastal Commission lacked jurisdiction to designate proposed development site as an environmentally sensitive habitat area on appeal of local government's grant of coastal development permit. *Security National Guaranty Inc. v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 159 Cal. App. 4th 402, 425, 71 Cal. Rptr. 3d 522*

Coastal Commission acted within its jurisdiction in imposing mitigation fee on homeowners' association in connection with permit to build a seawall; Commission was not limited by *Pub. Res. Code § 30235* ("seawalls ... shall be permitted when required ... to protect existing structures ... and when designed to eliminate or mitigate adverse impacts on local shoreline sand supply") in the type of conditions it could impose in granting such permit. *Ocean Harbor House Homeowners Association v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 215, 241, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 432*

Mitigation fee imposed by Coastal Commission on homeowners' association in connection with permit to build seawall did not effect an unconstitutional taking. *Ocean Harbor House Homeowners Association v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 163 Cal. App. 4th 215, 241, 77 Cal. Rptr. 3d 432*

Doctrine of equitable estoppel did not bar Coastal Commission from ordering homeowner to remove private three-hole golf course from around house and restore area to its native sand dune vegetation in accordance with applicable restrictions on landscaping, even though property had been in visible violation of coastal development permit conditions for 18 years. *Feduniak v. California Coastal Com. (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 1346, 1380, 56 Cal. Rptr. 3d 591*

Following Coastal Commission proceedings on appeal of development permit, property owner could not state cause of action against the county under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) because county's determinations were superseded by Coastal Commission's environmental review. *McAllister v. County of Monterey (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 253, 294, 54 Cal. Rptr. 3d 116*

Coastal Commission may not include boaters' "right to a view" of coastline as factor to deny or restrict development permits in coastal zone. *Schneider v. California Coastal Comm'n (2006) 140 Cal. App. 4th 1339, 1348, 44 Cal. Rptr. 3d 867*

Coastal Commission had authority to allow Malibu property owners to delete permit conditions requiring on-site view corridors and to substitute off-site view and access mitigation. *La Costa Beach Homeowners' Assn. v. California Coastal Commission (2002) 101 Cal. App. 4th 804, 817, 124 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*

Coastal development permit was activated on approval of final subdivision map, and therefore did not expire even though construction was commenced prior to permit expiration date. *Trancas Property Owners Assn. v. City of Malibu (1998) 61 Cal. App. 4th 1058, 1061-1062, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 131*

Vested right was not acquired by permanent construction under emergency permit and Commission was not estopped

from requiring removal of construction. *Barrie v. California Coastal Com. (1987) 196 Cal. App. 3d 8, 14-20, 241 Cal. Rptr. 477*

Former Pub. Res. Code § 27401 (*now see Pub. Res. Code § 30601*) provides for interim permit procedure, with two-thirds vote needed for approval, for developments in particularly sensitive area. *Patterson v. Central Coast Regional Com. (1976) 58 Cal. App. 3d 833, 847, 130 Cal. Rptr. 169*

[e] Vested Right

Developer claiming exemption from permit requirement of Coastal Act on grounds of having vested right to continue development was required to seek confirmation of vested right claim by regional commission; developer was unable to first assert claim in defense to action by regional commission to enjoin further development. *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 63, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15*

Vested rights doctrine protects property owners from changes in zoning or other land use regulations that occur before completion of owner's coastal development project; vested right to complete project arises only after property owner has performed substantial work, incurred substantial liability, and shown good faith reliance on coastal development permit. *Halaco Engineering Co. v. South Central Coast Regional Com. (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 52, 64-65, 227 Cal. Rptr. 667, 720 P.2d 15* ; *Tosh v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 388, 392-393, 160 Cal. Rptr. 170*

Filing of vesting tentative map in 1990 did not deprive Coastal Commission of jurisdiction to deny development permit on appeal based on policies enacted after tentative map was filed. *Charles A. Pratt Construction Co. v. California Coastal Commission (2008) 162 Cal. App. 4th 1068, 1074-1075, 76 Cal. Rptr. 3d 466*

Property owners acquired no vested right in development under *Pub. Res. Code § 30608* resulting from tentative map approval under former California Coastal Act when that approval was conditioned on property owners conveying scenic easement to county and obtaining permit for water system from county health department and they failed to comply with either condition, even though they expended substantial sum of money and performed approximately 80 percent of work. *Tosh v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 99 Cal. App. 3d 388, 392-396, 160 Cal. Rptr. 170*

1976 Coastal Act did not terminate vested right that existed under law prior to its passage; Coastal Act does not make distinction in exemptions between person with vested right and person who obtained permit under former *Coastal Act. Pardee Construction Co. v. California Coastal Com. (1979) 95 Cal. App. 3d 471, 479-480, 157 Cal. Rptr. 184*

[7] Conditional Use Permit

[a] Application

Lessee has standing as owner to apply for conditional use permit. *Shell Oil Co. v. City and County of San Francisco (1983) 139 Cal. App. 3d 917, 920-921, 189 Cal. Rptr. 276*

[b] Approval

Determination that permit applicant has satisfied local ordinance standards is sufficient to justify granting permit; findings outside those of ordinance, such as finding that applicant has not violated terms of previously-issued conditional use permit, are not required. *Baird v. County of Contra Costa (1995) 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 93*

[c] Condition

Condition of approval of use permit that is specifically related to individual is invalid because conditional use permit regulates land, not individuals; any condition imposed must relate to property and not to particular applicant. *Sounhein v. City of San Dimas (1996) 47 Cal. App. 4th 1181, 1187, 55 Cal. Rptr. 2d 290*

Condition that conditional use permit not be transferrable with property was invalid. *Anza Parking Corp. v. Burlingame (1987) 195 Cal. App. 3d 855, 858-860, 241 Cal. Rptr. 175*

[d] Estoppel

County was not estopped to assert invalidity of conditional use permit, when builder knew that permit issued to former landowner had expired, when no construction had commenced prior to expiration, and there was no evidence that any extension would have been granted. *Strong v. County of Santa Cruz (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 720, 722-727, 125 Cal. Rptr. 896, 543 P.2d 264*

[e] Expiration

Permit that was to expire within one year unless substantial evidence of use was in progress did not expire when funding had been sought, professionals hired, property purchased, and plans submitted even though construction had not actually begun. *Community Development Com. v. City of Fort Bragg (1988) 204 Cal. App. 3d 1124, 1129-1130, 251 Cal. Rptr. 709*

[f] Review

Ninety-day limitations period (*Gov. Code § 65009(c)*) applied to proceeding challenging board of supervisors' decision granting conditional use permit on ground a supervisor had conflict of interest in violation of *Political Reform Act. Ching v. San Francisco Bd. of Permit Appeals (1998) 60 Cal. App. 4th 888, 891, 70 Cal. Rptr. 2d 700*

Period of limitations for review of decision to issue conditional use permit. *Hawkins v. County of Marin (1976) 54 Cal. App. 3d 586, 592-593, 126 Cal. Rptr. 754*

[g] Standards

Los Angeles conditional use permit ordinance that purported to regulate adult businesses was unconstitutionally vague because it required those making decisions based on ordinance to exercise too much subjective discretion. *Smith v. County of Los Angeles (1994) 24 Cal. App. 4th 990, 1004-1008, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 680*

Federal law regulating satellite dishes preempted local law and required specific aesthetic standards in zoning ordinance requiring conditional use permit to install satellite dish. *Hunter v. City of Whittier (1989) 209 Cal. App. 3d 588, 596-598, 257 Cal. Rptr. 559*

[8] Constitutional Challenges

[a] Deprivation of Property

Zoning ordinance that is so unreasonable or arbitrary as to virtually deprive landowner of complete use and enjoyment of his or her property is unconstitutionally excessive under *U.S. Const., amend. V*, and *Cal. Const., art. I, § 19.* *Agins*

v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)

[b] Discriminatory Zoning

Zoning action is not overthrown absent physical facts requiring conclusion that ordinance is unreasonable; when spot zoning or other restriction on particular property evinces discriminatory design against property user, evidence disclosing purpose other than that appearing on face of regulation is given weight by court. *G & D Holland Construction Co. v. City of Marysville (1970) 12 Cal. App. 3d 989, 994, 91 Cal. Rptr. 227*

[c] Due Process

Developer failed to establish that city's delay in processing its permit application constituted violation of substantive due process, because there was reasonable explanation on face of the complaint for every delay in city's eventual approval of application; condition included only in developer's permit and no others did not support claim for violation of equal protection, because city did not intentionally treat developer differently than other developers. *North Pacifica LLC v. City of Pacifica (9th Cir. 2008) 526 F.3d 478, 485-486*

County's decision to rezone landowner's property deprived landowner of protected property interest, and thus landowner was entitled to constitutional due process prior to deprivation; individual notice to landowner was required because county specifically changed zoning of landowner's land on receiving request to make change to restrict its use after county had published notice of proposed general plan amendment that did not include change. *Harris v. County of Riverside (9th Cir. 1990) 904 F.2d 497, 503-505*

Applicant's claim that city's denial of building permit was arbitrary and capricious was not sufficient by itself to state claim for violation of substantive due process under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*; applicant had to show deprivation of protected property interest. *Breneric Associates v. City of Del Mar (1999) 69 Cal. App. 4th 166, 182-183, 81 Cal. Rptr. 2d 324*

In action under *42 U.S.C. § 1983*, landowner's interest in approval of development project permits did not rise to level of property interest that is constitutionally protected; thus, city council's denial of permits did not violate landowner's procedural and substantive due process rights, although he was denied fair hearing under state law. *Clark v. City of Hermosa Beach (1996) 48 Cal. App. 4th 1152, 1177-1187, 56 Cal. Rptr. 2d 223*

Land developer's action for deprivation of due process, equal protection, and just compensation in inverse condemnation under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* against city and county based on regulations severely limiting development of parcel of land was not ripe for adjudication when there was no final decision on developer's applications for annexation of parcel by city, zoning variances, and building permit. *Long Beach Equities, Inc. v. County of Ventura (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 1016, 1041-1042, 282 Cal. Rptr. 877*

[d] Equal Protection

City's refusal to rezone to higher density was not denial of equal protection when based on rational basis of protection of neighborhood values. *Nelson v. City of Selma (9th Cir. 1989) 881 F.2d 836*

City ordinance that allowed second units in single-family residential zones only if person occupying second unit was property owner or his or her dependent, or owner's or dependent's caregiver, violated *equal protection clause* of California Constitution because it effectively classified permissible users of second units. *Coalition Advocating Legal Housing Options v. City of Santa Monica (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 451, 462, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802*

Local ordinance that limited number of persons over age 18 who could live in non-owner-occupied single-family residences in targeted areas violated equal protection because no significant relationship existed between stated purpose of ordinance, which was to alleviate overcrowding of single-family dwellings, and non-owner-occupied classification contained in ordinance. *College Area Renters & Landlord Assn. v. City of San Diego (1996) 43 Cal. App. 4th 677, 686-688, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 515*

[e] First Amendment Impact

Zoning ordinance requiring conditional use permit for operation of adult bookstore is subject to strict scrutiny because it impacts on *First Amendment* right. *City of Imperial Beach v. Escott (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 134, 137, 171 Cal. Rptr. 197*

[f] Free Exercise of Religion

City's denial of application to rezone property to build college for religious education did not violate applicant's *First Amendment* rights or Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000; city's zoning requirements were general laws of neutral application and there was no evidence that city enforced its ordinance in discriminatory manner. *San Jose Christian College v. City of Morgan Hill (9th Cir. 2004) 360 F.3d 1024*

Denial of conditional use permit to use house in residential neighborhood as church was not violation of free exercise of religion; ordinance did not preclude use of home as church in other areas and city had interest in protecting neighborhood. *Christian Gospel Church, Inc. v. City and County of San Francisco (9th Cir. 1990) 896 F.2d 1221*

[g] Method of Challenge

City's refusal to rezone to higher density was not denial of equal protection when based on rational basis of protection of neighborhood values. *Nelson v. City of Selma (9th Cir. 1989) 881 F.2d 836*

Ordinance was not subject to constitutional attack in administrative mandamus proceeding; proper remedy was action for declaratory relief. *Gong v. City of Fremont (1967) 250 Cal. App. 2d 568, 574, 58 Cal. Rptr. 664*

[h] Right of Privacy

City ordinance that allowed second units in single-family residential zones only if person occupying second unit was property owner or his or her dependent, or owner's or dependent's caregiver, violated state constitutional right of privacy. *Coalition Advocating Legal Housing Options v. City of Santa Monica (2001) 88 Cal. App. 4th 451, 461, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 802*

[9] Declaratory Relief

Action for declaratory relief was not available to attack administrative order, but will be regarded as petition for writ of mandate for purposes of ruling on general demurrer. *Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137*

[10] Dedication

Requirement that portion of property be dedicated for street widening as condition for zoning change was improper when zoning change would not increase traffic. *Rohn v. City of Visalia (1989) 214 Cal. App. 3d 1463, 1474-1477, 263 Cal. Rptr. 319*

[11] Development Agreements

Development agreement that instituted zoning freeze at planning state of large real estate development did not unconstitutionally contract away county's right to exercise its police power in future. *Santa Margarita Area Residents Together v. San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors (2000) 84 Cal. App. 4th 221, 232, 100 Cal. Rptr. 2d 740*

[12] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Developer who was not ultimate developer of housing and thus not in usual position of developer seeking building permits, was not exempt from requirement to exhaust administrative remedies as prerequisite to filing as-applied challenge to local growth control ordinance. *Del Oro Hills v. City of Oceanside (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1077, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 677*

Facial challenge to constitutionality of local ordinance in form of cause of action for violation of federal civil rights under *42 U.S.C. § 1983* is not barred by exhaustion doctrine. *Del Oro Hills v. City of Oceanside (1995) 31 Cal. App. 4th 1060, 1077-1078, 37 Cal. Rptr. 2d 677*

[13] Enforcement of Zoning Ordinances

[a] Against Municipality

Municipality owning property within another municipality was subject to latter's zoning ordinances; private person suffering identifiable harm by violation of ordinance was entitled to bring action against violating municipality. *Nestle v. City of Santa Monica (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 920, 939-940, 101 Cal. Rptr. 568, 496 P.2d 480* (municipal airport located in residential zone of neighboring city)

[b] By Government Entity

Right of local legislative body to bring action for injunctive relief is dependent only on violation of zoning ordinance. *City of Santa Clara v. Paris (1977) 76 Cal. App. 3d 338, 342, 142 Cal. Rptr. 818*

Mere inaction in enforcement of zoning regulations against some persons does not preclude its enforcement against others. *City etc. of San Francisco v. Burton (1962) 201 Cal. App. 2d 749, 755, 20 Cal. Rptr. 378*

[c] By Private Persons

Person who suffers identifiable harm due to violation of municipal zoning law has right to sue private violator for compensatory damages and injunctive relief. *Nestle v. City of Santa Monica (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 920, 939-940, 101 Cal. Rptr. 568, 496 P.2d 480*

Citizen's committee comprised of property owners residing in close proximity to parcel in violation had standing to bring enforcement action. *Simons v. City of Los Angeles (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 496, 501, 161 Cal. Rptr. 67*

[14] Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

Petitioner for writ of mandate to compel issuance of building permit on ground that zoning ordinance was unconstitutional was not required to exhaust administrative remedy of application for variance when evidence was overwhelming that city council rezoned area because petitioner intended to build project there. *Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761*

Action attacking city zoning ordinance was subject to demurrer without leave to amend when plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedies, knew of applicable administrative procedures, and had not incurred building expenses immediately prior to en actment of ordinance. *Igna v. City of Baldwin Park (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 909, 911-914, 88 Cal. Rptr. 581*

Applicant does not waive rights to object to validity of ordinance affecting his or her property by proceeding under statute and exhausting administrative remedies to secure variance or conditional use permit. *Garden Grove Congregation v. City of Garden Grove (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 136, 143, 1 Cal. Rptr. 65*

[15] Families

Zoning ordinance that restricted occupancy of home to members of single family and defined "family" as only limited categories of related persons was violation of due process. *Moore v. East Cleveland (1977) 431 U.S. 494, 498-500, 97 S. Ct. 1932, 52 L. Ed. 2d 531*

Local ordinance restricting land use to one-family dwellings and defining "family" as persons related by blood, adoption, or marriage or as two persons living and cooking together but not related by blood, adoption, or marriage was constitutional. *Village of Belle Terre v. Boraas (1974) 416 U.S. 1, 2-8, 94 S. Ct. 1536, 39 L. Ed. 2d 797*

Zoning ordinance prohibiting more than five unrelated persons from living together in house in single-family dwelling zone was unconstitutional under California constitution's right to privacy. *Santa Barbara v. Adamson (1980) 27 Cal. 3d 123, 128-134, 164 Cal. Rptr. 539, 610 P.2d 436*

Zoning ordinance prohibiting more than three unrelated persons from occupying one house in residential zone was unconstitutional, even though there were overcrowding and parking problems; zoning ordinance designed to prevent overcrowding, minimize traffic and parking congestion, and avoid undue financial burden on schools and other public facilities must be based on floor space and facilities rather than biological or legal relationships. *Chula Vista v. Pagard (1981) 115 Cal. App. 3d 785, 791-800, 171 Cal. Rptr. 738*

[16] Federal Preemption

Private contractor constructing building to be leased to federal agency was not exempt from local regulation. *Smith v. County of Santa Barbara (1988) 203 Cal. App. 3d 1415, 1422-1424, 251 Cal. Rptr. 1*

[17] General Plan

[a] In General

Memorandum of understanding between cities and county providing that each jurisdiction's general plan amendments related to particular parcel were ineffective unless other parties to memorandum enacted like amendments constituted

impermissible delegation of local jurisdiction's power to adopt, review, and amend general plan. *Alameda Land Use Assn. v. City of Hayward (1995) 38 Cal. App. 4th 1716, 1724-1725, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 752*

Gov. Code § 65300.5 requirement of internally consistent policy among elements of general plan was violated when precedence clause in plan subordinated open space and conservation element in cases of conflict with land use element. *Sierra Club v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 126 Cal. App. 3d 698, 704, 708, 179 Cal. Rptr. 261*

California Environmental Quality Act applies to amendment of general plan and Environmental Impact Report was required. *City of Santa Ana v. City of Garden Grove (1979) 100 Cal. App. 3d 521, 526-534, 160 Cal. Rptr. 907*

[b] Amendment

Exercise of local power of initiative is proper means of amending general plan notwithstanding statutorily-prescribed amendment authority of local legislative body. *DeVita v. County of Napa (1995) 9 Cal. 4th 763, 777-784, 38 Cal. Rptr. 2d 699, 889 P.2d 1019*

[c] Consistency of Specific Plan

To be "consistent" with general plan, specific plan must (1) be compatible with general plan, (2) not frustrate general plan's goals and policies, and (3) include definite, affirmative commitments to mitigate adverse effects of general plan. *Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Board of Supervisors (2001) 91 Cal. App. 4th 342, 378-379, 110 Cal. Rptr. 2d 579*

[d] Consistency of Zoning With Plan

Zoning changes must conform to local general plan and must reasonably relate to welfare of affected region. *Arnel Development Co. v. City of Costa Mesa (1981) 28 Cal. 3d 511, 524, 169 Cal. Rptr. 904, 620 P.2d 565* ; *Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 609-610, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473*

Zoning ordinance is consistent with city's general plan when, considering all of its aspects, ordinance furthers objectives and policies of general plan and does not obstruct their attainment. *City of Irvine v. Irvine Citizens Against Overdevelopment (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 868, 879, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 797*

When city is granted extension of time to adopt general plan and has proposed amendment to general plan, application for development is required to conform to proposed general plan. *Harroman Co. v. Town of Tiburon (1991) 235 Cal. App. 3d 388, 394-396, 1 Cal. Rptr. 2d 72*

City was not required to rezone land to higher density even though general plan allowed higher density when there was evidence of inadequate parks, lack of sidewalks, traffic bottlenecks, and inadequate schools. *Mira Development Corp. v. City of San Diego (1988) 205 Cal. App. 3d 1201, 1213-1215, 252 Cal. Rptr. 825*

When general plan lacks mandatory element that is directly involved in project being reviewed, zoning change is not valid. *Guardians of Turlock's Integrity v. Turlock City Council (1983) 149 Cal. App. 3d 584, 594-597, 197 Cal. Rptr. 303*

Denial of permit to convert apartment to condominiums was appropriate when evidence showed violations of building code and inconsistency with general plan. *Rasmussen v. City Council (l983) 140 Cal. App. 3d 842, 848-849, 190 Cal. Rptr. 1*

Absence of valid general plan or valid relevant elements thereof precludes enactment of zoning ordinances. *Resource Defense Fund v. County of Santa Cruz (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 800, 806-807, 184 Cal. Rptr. 371*

Injunction against subdivision activity until county adopted adequate general plan was proper. *Camp v. Board of Supervisors (1981) 123 Cal. App. 3d 334, 354-358, 176 Cal. Rptr. 620*

[18] Interim Ordinances

Gov. Code § 65858, which authorizes adoption of interim ordinances prohibiting any uses that may be in conflict with contemplated general plan, specific plan, or zoning proposal that legislative body, planning commission, or planning department is studying or intends to study within reasonable time, does not authorize adoption of interim ordinance that prohibits formal processing of development applications. *Building Industry Legal Defense Foundation v. Superior Court (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1410, 1420, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 828*

[19] Judicial Review in General

Declaratory relief action is proper to test constitutionality of zoning ordinance, but not appropriate method for judicial review of administrative decisions; complaint for declaratory relief improperly brought to review administrative decision is treated as petition for writ of mandate. *Hill v. City of Manhattan Beach (1971) 6 Cal. 3d 279, 287, 98 Cal. Rptr. 785, 491 P.2d 369*

Administrative mandamus is exclusive remedy for owner to challenge condition in conditional use permit. *City of Santee v. Superior Court (1991) 228 Cal. App. 3d 713, 718-720, 279 Cal. Rptr. 22*

When agency acts in two capacities simultaneously and performs two functions, which are subject to different standards of review, with only one decision, review of that determination must be by more stringent standard; thus, if board of supervisors in its discretionary (legislative) role determines change in general plan and in its ministerial (quasi-judicial) role approves private development plan in one decision, that decision is reviewed by stricter substantial evidence test of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* rather than arbitrary and capricious test of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*. *Mountain Defense League v. Board of Supervisors (1977) 65 Cal. App. 3d 723, 727-729, 135 Cal. Rptr. 588*

[20] Nonconforming Use

[a] Amortization Period

Facts of individual case was controlling in determination of whether or not amortization period prescribed by legislation providing for eventual discontinuance of nonconforming uses was reasonable and commensurate with investment involved and so may validly apply to particular property and use at issue. *National Advertising Co. v. County of Monterey (1970) 1 Cal. 3d 875, 879, 83 Cal. Rptr. 577, 464 P.2d 33*

Local zoning legislation requiring termination of nonconforming uses is valid if it provides for reasonable amortization period, considering investment involved; reasonableness is dependent on interplay of many factors, including depreciated value of structures to be removed, their remaining usefullife, and harm to public if they are left standing. *City of Salinas v. Ryan Outdoor Advertising, Inc. (1987) 189 Cal. App. 3d 416, 423-424, 234 Cal. Rptr. 619*

Nonconforming use was terminable after amortization period when property owner failed to establish that amortization period was unreasonable; reasonableness of amortization period was indicated by facts showing property owner had no

investment in permanent property improvements, lease expired during amortization period, and cost of removing nonconforming materials was negligible. *Castner v. City of Oakland (1982) 129 Cal. App. 3d 94, 96-97, 180 Cal. Rptr. 682*

Zoning ordinance prohibiting parking of large commercial trucks in residential neighborhood where defendants had always parked their truck had 14-month amortization period, which was time from adoption of ordinance to enforcement; amortization period was reasonable because it did not deprive defendants of investment in either house or truck. *People v. Tolman (1980) 168 Cal. Rptr. 328*

[b] In General

"Permitted conditional use," defined in San Francisco Planning Code as property use that lawfully existed on effective date of new zoning controls, distinguished from "nonconforming use" on ground permitted conditional use provision did not require uses to be brought into compliance with Code. *Tenderloin Housing Clinic, Inc. v. Astoria Hotel, Inc. (2000) 83 Cal. App. 4th 139, 146, 98 Cal. Rptr. 2d 924*

Burden is on landowner to establish that nonconforming use preexisted zoning ordinance. *City and County of San Francisco v. Board of Permit Appeals (1989) 207 Cal. App. 3d 1099, 1108-1109, 255 Cal. Rptr. 307*

Zoning ordinance requiring immediate discontinuance of nonconforming use that existed when ordinance was adopted was deprivation of property without due process of law unless use was public nuisance. *City of Los Altos v. Silvey (1962) 206 Cal. App. 2d 606, 609, 24 Cal. Rptr. 200* ; *McCaslin v. City of Monterey Park (1958) 163 Cal. App. 2d 339, 346-347, 329 P.2d 522*

[21] Notice and Hearing

Property owner had right to notice of specific general plan change affecting only a few property owners. *Harris v. County of Riverside (9th Cir. 1990) 904 F.2d 497*

Due process requires notice and hearing only in quasi-judicial or adjudicatory settings and not in adoption of general legislation; general zoning legislation may be enacted without affording affected landowners notice and hearing. *San Diego Bldg. Contractors Assn. v. City Council (1974) 13 Cal. 3d 205, 210-211, 118 Cal. Rptr. 146, 529 P.2d 570*

[22] Particular Zone Requirements

San Bernardino County general plan classification of "Desert Special Service Center," was not zone, but isolated area in DL (desert living) zone in which commercial development was allowed on site-by-site basis by issuance ofconditional use permit. *United Outdoor Advertising Co., Inc. v. Business, Transportation & Housing Agency (1988) 44 Cal. 3d 242, 249-251, 242 Cal. Rptr. 738, 746 P.2d 877*

Ordinance was not precluded from requiring different things from property owners in areas zoned differently; property owners in different zones were in different positions and dedication of land for access purposes was not required in all zones. *Southern Pac. Co. v. City of Los Angeles (1966) 242 Cal. App. 2d 38, 49-50, 51 Cal. Rptr. 197*

[23] Purposes of Zoning--Traffic Considerations

City creating cul de sac pursuant to *Veh. Code § 21101(f)* is not required to find that street is "no longer needed for

vehicular traffic" as provided in *Veh. Code § 21101(a)(1).* *Save the Sunset Strip Coalition v. City of West Hollywood (2001) 87 Cal. App. 4th 1172, 1181, 105 Cal. Rptr. 2d 172*

[23A] Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act

County's denial of conditional use permit for construction of Sikh temple on land zoned for agricultural use, despite applicant's agreement to numerous conditions and recommendation by county planning commission that permit be granted, violated *Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act. Guru Nanak Sikh Soc'y of Yuba City v. County of Sutter (9th Cir. 2006) 456 F.3d 978, 992*

City's denial of application to rezone property to build college for religious education did not violate applicant's *First Amendment* rights or Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000. City's zoning requirements were general laws of neutral application and there was no evidence that city enforced its ordinance in discriminatory manner. *San Jose Christian Coll. v. City of Morgan Hill (9th Cir. 2004) 360 F.3d 1024, 1035*

[24] Traditional Mandate

Local assessment committee appointed to advise county on application for permit to expand hazardous waste site did not have "beneficial interest" required by *Code Civ. Proc. § 1086* for standing to challenge county's subsequent approval of permit. *Laidlaw Environmental Services, Inc. v. Kern County (1996) 44 Cal. App. 4th 346, 351-353, 51 Cal. Rptr. 2d 666*

Mandate proceeding to compel county to grant permit for permitted use of property was properly denied when plaintiff failed to exhaust administrative remedy in form of discretionary conditional use permit that, if granted, would have given plaintiff everything sought in judicial action. *Sabek, Inc. v. County of Sonoma (1987) 190 Cal. App. 3d 163, 165-168, 235 Cal. Rptr. 350*

Traditional mandate is not available to review conditional use permit decision. *Garden Grove Congregation v. City of Garden Grove (1959) 176 Cal. App. 2d 136, 140-142, 1 Cal. Rptr. 65*

[25] Variance

[a] Conditions

Conditions may be attached to variance to preserve general purposes and intent of zoning ordinance. *Cow Hollow Improvement Club v. Board of Permit Appeals (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 160, 183, 53 Cal. Rptr. 610*

[b] Grounds

Self-imposed burdens, such as developer's adoption of superior building standards, are not legal justification for granting variance. *Broadway Laguna etc. Assn. v. Board of Permit Appeals (1967) 66 Cal. 2d 767, 778, 59 Cal. Rptr. 146, 427 P.2d 810*

Variance improperly granted gasoline station that was nonconforming use in residential area; because there were no other gas stations located in same geographic area, station owner could not show he was deprived of useafforded to other properties in same zone and vicinity. *Stolman v. City of Los Angeles (2003) 114 Cal. App. 4th 916, 928-929, 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 178*

Lot's location in "fringe area" of one zone was not acceptable justification for variance; surrounding lots in nonconformance with law were not justification for variance. *Cow Hollow Improvement Club v. Board of Permit Appeals (1966) 245 Cal. App. 2d 160, 178-179, 53 Cal. Rptr. 610*

[c] Review

Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5 is applicable in reviewing validity of zoning variance. *Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546 n.4, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137*

[26] Vested Rights

Allocation of specific units under interim development ordinance did not create vested rights when allocation was conditioned on application for building permit within specified period. *Consaul v. City of San Diego (1992) 6 Cal. App. 4th 1781, 1796-1801, 8 Cal. Rptr. 2d 762*

[27] Waiver

Governmental body is unable to waive requirements of ordinance enacted for public benefit; county is unable to waive its right to insist on application for extension of use permit. *Strong v. County of Santa Cruz (1975) 15 Cal. 3d 720, 727, 125 Cal. Rptr. 896, 543 P.2d 264*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewEnvironmental LawZoning & Land UseConditional Use Permits & VariancesGovernmentsLegislationStatutes of LimitationsTime LimitationsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseZoning Methods

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.318

§ 579.318 Attorney General Opinions

Local agency is prohibited from charging building permit and similar fees, based on Uniform Building Code Valuation Tables or otherwise, that are more than estimated reasonable cost of providing services rendered unless fee amounts are approved by electorate; fees charged by local agency are invalid to extent they exceed reasonable costs of providing services rendered. *76 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 4, 8-11 (1993)*

Coastal Act's provisions for approval of amendments to certified local coastal program or land use plan by Coastal Commission are applicable to charter cities. *70 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 221 (1987)*

City or county is not permitted, without Coastal Commission approval, to authorize or prohibit, by ordinance, including one adopted by initiative or referendum, use of land in coastal zone when use is not permitted or prohibited by local coastal program or land use plan certified by Commission. 70 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 220-221 (1987)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsChartersReal Property LawZoning & Land UseImpact FeesReal Property LawZoning & Land UseInitiative & ReferendumReal Property LawZoning & Land UseOrdinances

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.319

§ 579.319 Law Reviews

Alperin and King, *Ballot Box Planning: Land Use Planning Through the Initiative Process in California, 21 Sw. U.L. Rev. 1 (1992)*

Galowitz, *Interstate Metro-Regional Responses To Exclusionary Zoning, 27 Real Prop., Prob. & Tr. J. 49 (1992)*

Comment, *Land Use by, for and of the People: Problems With the Application of Initiatives and Referenda to the Zoning Process, 19 Pepperdine L. Rev. 99 (1992)*

Comment, *Shifting Sands and Shifting Doctrines: The Supreme Court's Changing Takings Doctrine and South Carolina's Coastal Zone Statute, 79 Cal. L. Rev. 207 (1991)*

Liebmann, *Suburban Zoning--Two Modest Proposals, 25 Real Prop. Prob. and Tr. J. 1 (1990)*

Bittle, *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission: You Can't Always Get What You Want, But Sometimes You Get What You Need, 15 Pepperdine L. Rev. 345 (1988)*

Falik and Shimko, *The "Takings" Nexus--The Supreme Court Chooses a New Direction in Land-Use Planning: A View from California, 39 Hastings L.J. 359 (1988)*

Note, *Instant Planning--Land Use Regulation by Initiative in California, 61 S. Cal. L. Rev. 497 (1988)*

Note, *Environmental Restrictions or Land Use Regulation--The Supreme Court Draws a Distinction: California Coastal Commission v. Granite Rock Co., 23 U.S.F. L. Rev. 123 (1988)*

Geraci and Nabozny-Younger, *Damages for a Temporary Regulatory Taking: First English Evangelical Lutheran Church v. County of Los Angeles, 24 Cal. W.L. Rev. 33 (1987-1988)*

Alperin, *AB 283--A Zoning Consistency Odyssey, 17 Sw. U.L. Rev. 1 (1987)*

Comment, *Fear and Loathing on the California Coastline: Are Coastal Commission Property Exactions Constitutional? 14 Pepperdine L. Rev. 357 (1987)*

Slimp, *The Sovereign Commission: of Coastal Permits, Continuing Jurisdiction, and Vanishing Local Independence, 16 Sw. U.L. Rev. 699 (1986)*

Note, *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center: Rational Basis With a Bite? 20 U.S.F. L. Rev. 927 (1986)*

Comment, *Land Use Planning in the Coastal Zone: Protecting a Sensitive Ecosystem with Transferable Development Credits, 21 Santa Clara L. Rev. 439 (1981)*

Comment, *Public Access and the California Coastal Commission: A Question of Overreaching, 21 Santa Clara L. Rev. 395 (1981)*

Note, *City of Santa Barbara V. Adamson: New Protection for Alternate Life Style Decisions, 14 Loyola L. Rev. 359 (1981)*

Note, *Single-Family Zoning: Ramifications of State Court Rejection of Belle Terre on Use and Density Control, 32 Hastings L.J. 1687 (1981)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Constitutional LawBill of RightsFundamental RightsEminent Domain & TakingsEnvironmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseConstitutional LimitsReal Property LawZoning & Land UseInitiative & ReferendumReal Property LawZoning & Land UseZoning Methods

137 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.320

§ 579.320 Text References

Rohan, Zoning and Land Use Controls, Ch. 26, *Coastal Zone Management* (Matthew Bender)

Land Use Law, Ch. 4, *The Zoning System* (Matthew Bender)

California Zoning Practice (Cal. CEB 1969), Chs. 7, 9, 11, 12

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawNatural Resources & Public LandsCoastal Zone ManagementGeneral OverviewReal Property LawZoning & Land UseZoning Methods

138 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.321-579.339

[Reserved]

§§ 579.321[Reserved]

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.340

§ 579.340 California Legal Forms

For discussion and forms relating to the Subdivided Lands Act, Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act, and Subdivision Map Act, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 30 *Subdivision Regulation* , (Matthew Bender)

For discussion and forms relating to the Vacation Ownership Time-Share Act of 2004, see California Legal Forms, Ch. 34 *Condominiums and Other Common Interest Developments*, Pt. D, *Time-Share Projects* , (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesTimesharesReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.341

§ 579.341 California Real Estate

For discussion of the Subdivision Map Act, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 290- 292 (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of the regulation of subdivided land sales, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 424, *Regulation of Subdivided Land Sales* (Matthew Bender)

For discussion of the regulation of time-share developments, see California Real Estate Law and Practice, Ch. 425, *Regulation of Time-Share Developments* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesTimesharesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.342

§ 579.342 California Environmental Law

For detailed coverage of subdivision regulation, see California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice, Ch. 61, *Subdivision Regulation* (Matthew Bender)

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.343

§ 579.343 Federal Statutes

Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act. *15 U.S.C. §§ 1701-1720*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.344

§ 579.344 State Statutes

Out of state land promotions. *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 10249-10249.93*

Disclaimer requirement for offerings related to subdivided land entirely located outside California, but within United States. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10249.8*

Disclaimer requirement for offerings related to subdivided land outside United States. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 10249.9*

Subdivided Lands Act. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11000 et seq.*

Vacation Ownership and Time-Share Act of 2004. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11210 et seq.*

Violation of specified provisions of Subdivided Lands Act as penal offense. *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11023*

Procedure for imposing fees as condition of approval of development projects. *Gov. Code § 66000 et seq.*

Subdivision Map Act. *Gov. Code § 66410 et seq.*

Subdivision Map Act review. *Gov. Code § 66499.37*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesTimesharesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState RegulationReal Property LawZoning & Land UseImpact Fees

144 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.345

§ 579.345 Federal Regulations

Interstate Land Sales Registration Program. *24 C.F.R. § 1710.1 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.346

§ 579.346 State Regulations

Subdivided lands. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2790 et seq.*

Time-Share Projects. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2805 et seq.*

Environmental impact evaluation of subdivided lands. *10 Cal. Code Reg. § 2820 et seq.*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Environmental LawZoning & Land UseGeneral OverviewReal Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesTimesharesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.347

§ 579.347 Decisions

[1] Certificate of Compliance

Developer who lost all interest in property following foreclosure lacked standing to maintain mandamus action to compel county to issue certificates of compliance for property. *County of San Luis Obispo v. Superior Court (2001) 90 Cal. App. 4th 288, 295, 108 Cal. Rptr. 2d 753*

[2] Development Fees

Heightened scrutiny of development conditions required by U.S. Supreme Court for determining whether compensable regulatory taking has occurred applies to development conditions that require payment of monetary fee (rather than requiring possessory dedication), at least when governmental conditions requiring monetary exactions are imposed on individual and discretionary basis, rather than generally or ministerially. *Ehrlich v. City of Culver City (1996) 12 Cal. 4th 854, 865, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 242, 911 P.2d 429*

[3] Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act

Defendants' voluntary ceasing of selling land was no defense to suit for injunctive relief brought by *Secretary. Lynn v. Biderman (9th Cir. 1976) 536 F.2d 820, 825*

Developers served with subpoenas duces tecum issued in course of investigation under Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act were entitled to protective order prohibiting administrator from writing letters to their customers advising them they had right to void their contracts and receive refund. *Lynn v. Biderman (9th Cir. 1976) 536 F.2d 820, 826-827*

When defendant is not developer or agent, defendant must have assisted or participated in fraud in violation of

Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act in order to be liable as aider or abettor. *Fuls v. Shastina Properties, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1978) 448 F. Supp. 983, 990*

Papers properly filed and accepted by state are accepted as appropriate and complete statement of record for purposes of Interstate Land Sales Full *Disclosure Act. Happy Investment Group v. Lakeworld Prop., Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1975) 396 F. Supp. 175, 185*

Tolling of statute of limitations required showing that defendants concealed from plaintiffs basic facts forming cause of action and that plaintiffs were ignorant of facts through no fault of their own. *Happy Investment Group v. Lakeworld Prop., Inc. (N.D. Cal. 1975) 396 F. Supp. 175, 188*

[4] Subdivided Lands Act

Buyer who rescinded real estate contract with developer on learning that developer had violated Subdivision Lands Act was entitled to attorneys' fees pursuant to attorneys' fees clause in contract, even though buyer elected to "void" contract. *Yuba Cypress Housing Partners, Ltd. v. Area Developers (2002) 98 Cal. App. 4th 1077, 1083, 120 Cal. Rptr. 2d 273*

Right to rescind contract subject to Subdivided Lands Act is limited to executory contracts between purchaser and subdivider; thus, subsequent purchaser of subdivided land does not have standing to seek rescission of original sale from subdivider to subsequent purchaser's predecessor in interest. *Drake v. Martin (1994) 30 Cal. App. 4th 984, 995-996, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 704*

[5] Subdivision Map Act

[a] In General

When developer had secured final subdivision map approval to convert units to condominiums and had satisfied requirements established by state law, later enacted ordinance regulating condominium conversions was not applicable to approved conversions. *CUPity of West Hollywood v. Beverly Towers, Inc. (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1184, 1190-1194, 278 Cal. Rptr. 375, 805 P.2d 329*

Subdivision Map Act did not preempt city's attempt to regulate condominium conversion in connection with rent control law. *Santa Monica Pines, Ltd. v. Rent Control Board (1984) 35 Cal. 3d 858, 868-869, 201 Cal. Rptr. 593, 679 P.2d 27* (overruled on other grounds in *City of West Hollywood v. Beverly Towers, Inc. (1991) 52 Cal. 3d 1184, 1191-1192, 278 Cal. Rptr. 375, 805 P.2d 329* (noted *above*))

Subdivision Map Act does not control land division by probate court in setting aside probate homestead because state law overrides local ordinance. *Wells Fargo Bank v. Town of Woodside (1983) 33 Cal. 3d 379, 384-390, 189 Cal. Rptr. 41, 657 P.2d 819*

Filing of subdivision map is insufficient to exempt one from subsequent zone change. *Palmer v. Board of Supervisors (1983) 145 Cal. App. 3d 779, 783, 193 Cal. Rptr. 669*

Subdivision Map Act allows local ordinances relating to matters covered by Act. *Benny v. City of Alameda (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 1006, 1011, 164 Cal. Rptr. 776* (overruled on other grounds in *The Pines v. Santa Monica (1981) 29 Cal. 3d 656, 664, 175 Cal. Rptr. 336, 630 P.2d 521*); *Longridge Estates v. City of Los Angeles (1960) 183 Cal. App. 2d 533, 538-539, 6 Cal. Rptr. 900* (construing former *Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 11500-11628*)

[b] Effect of Noncompliance with Act

Gov. Code § 66499.32(b), which denies buyer the option of voiding contract whenever certificate of compliance, parcel map, or final map exists to ratify seller's compliance with Subdivision Map Act, is inapplicable when any of those documents constitute proof of violation; although senior lienholder who foreclosed on lot in improperly subdivided parcel had option to void contract, he elected not to do so, and junior lienholder who foreclosed on entire merged parcel had no standing to void deed for that lot. *Le Gault v. Erickson (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 369, 374, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 692*

[c] Extension

Extension of subdivision map beyond 10-year limit to 13 years was possible by mandatory extension if discretionary extension used during initial 10-year period. *California Country Club Homes Ass'n v. City of Los Angeles (1993) 22 Cal. Rptr. 2d 917*

[d] Map Approval

Once developer has complied with conditions attached to approval of tentative subdivision map and submitted final map corresponding to tentative map, approval of final map by county board of supervisors is ministerial. *Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 648, 655-656, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556*

When parcels in subdivision are resubdivided by subsequent parcel map recorded in compliance with Subdivision Map Act, new parcel map amends provisions of any previously recorded parcel map made in compliance with *Subdivision Map Act. Christian v. Flora (2008) 164 Cal. App. 4th 539, 542, 78 Cal. Rptr. 3d 892*

While project is not required to be in perfect conformity with each and every general plan policy, nature of policy and nature of inconsistency are critical factors that must be considered; inconsistency with general plan policy that was fundamental and mandatory was fatal. *Families Unafraid to Uphold Rural Etc. County v. Board of Supervisors (1998) 62 Cal. App. 4th 1332, 1341-1342, 74 Cal. Rptr. 2d 1*

Statutory requirement that proposed subdivision map be consistent with general plan does not require exact match between proposed subdivision and applicable general plan; rather it requires map to be "in agreement or harmony with" the plan. *Sequoyah Hills Homeowners Assn. v. City of Oakland (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 704, 717-718, 29 Cal. Rptr. 2d 182* ; *Greenebaum v. City of Los Angeles (1984) 153 Cal. App. 3d 391, 406, 200 Cal. Rptr. 237*

If approval of tentative subdivision map is conditioned on performance of work that requires building permit, when permit is sought landowner must comply with all applicable laws, including those enacted after conditional approval of tentative map. *Hazon-Iny Development, Inc. v. City of Santa Monica (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 1, 9-11*

Express finding of consistency with applicable general plan is legal prerequisite of approval of proposed map; tie votes of council and planning commission does not constitute requisite findings. *Woodland Hills Residents Assn., Inc. v. City Council (1975) 44 Cal. App. 3d 825, 832-838, 118 Cal. Rptr. 856* (decided under former *Bus. & Prof. Code § 11526.2*)

[e] Noticed Hearing

When approval of subdivision map constitutes significant or substantial deprivation of property rights of other landowners, those landowners are entitled to reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing prior to approval. *Horn v.*

County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 605, 615, 156 Cal. Rptr. 718, 596 P.2d 1134

When approval of tentative subdivision map will constitute substantial or significant deprivation of property rights of other landowners, those landowners are entitled to reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard before approval occurs. *Kennedy v. City of Hayward (1980) 105 Cal. App. 3d 953, 960-961, 165 Cal. Rptr. 132*

[f] Periods of Limitation

Ninety-day service of summons requirement in *Gov. Code § 66499.37* applies to CEQA causes of action concerning a subdivision. *Friends of Riverside's Hills v. City of Riverside (2008) 168 Cal. App. 4th 743, 754, 85 Cal. Rptr. 3d 695*

Action challenging city council's decision to merge lot with adjacent parcel and thereby preclude residential use of property was subject to 90-day statute of limitations in Subdivision Map Act rather than longer limitations period set forth in *Mitigation Fee Act. Fogarty v. City of Chico (2007) 148 Cal. App. 4th 537, 544, 55 Cal. Rptr. 3d 795*

Service of summons within 90 days is mandatory under *Gov. Code § 66499.37* and not subject to equitable tolling. *Maginn v. City of Glendale (1999) 72 Cal. App. 4th 1102, 1109, 85 Cal. Rptr. 2d 639*

Limitation period of *Gov. Code § 66499.37* applies to action for declaratory relief asking that expiration date of tentative map be tolled. *Presenting Jamul v. Board of Supervisors (1991) 231 Cal. App. 3d 665, 670-672, 282 Cal. Rptr. 564*

When extension of effective period of tentative map specifically authorized by local ordinance is challenged as unlawful, *Gov. Code § 66499.37* statute of limitations begins to run at time extension is granted; limitation period does not begin again on approval of final map. *Griffis v. County of Mono (1985) 163 Cal. App. 3d 414, 421-423, 209 Cal. Rptr. 519*

Limitation period of *Gov. Code § 66499.37* is applicable when conduct of local agency is called into question, whether under traditional mandate of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1085* alleging violation of ministerial duty or under administrative mandate of *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5* alleging abuse of discretion. *Kirk v. County of San Luis Obispo (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 453, 460, 202 Cal. Rptr. 606*

Failure to seek judicial review of denial of certificate of compliance under *Gov. Code § 66499.35* within limitation period of *Gov. Code § 66499.37* bars judicial review. *Kirk v. County of San Luis Obispo (1984) 156 Cal. App. 3d 453, 460-461, 202 Cal. Rptr. 606*

Laches due to unjustified delay bars action attacking decision regarding subdivision even though brought within time constraints of *Gov. Code § 66499.37*. *Resource Defense Fund v. County of Santa Cruz (1982) 133 Cal. App. 3d 800, 809-810, 184 Cal. Rptr. 371* ; *Holt v. County of Monterey (1982) 128 Cal. App. 3d 797, 801-802, 180 Cal. Rptr. 514*

Gov. Code § 66499.37 requires that decision must be judicially attacked within stated number of days of that decision; when decision approves map and attaches conditions, period begins to run from date of decision, not from date on which conditions must be performed. *Timberidge Enterprises, Inc. v. City of Santa Rosa (1978) 86 Cal. App. 3d 873, 885-886, 150 Cal. Rptr. 606*

[g] Remedies

Claim of violation of due process in processing subdivision map act application is ripe for review when subdivision map is rejected. *Herrington v. County of Sonoma (9th Cir. 1987) 834 F.2d 1488*

Subdivision Map Act does not require innocent purchaser to suffer for violation of Act by his or her grantor, of which he or she has neither knowledge nor means of discovery; local authority may require innocent purchaser, as condition to issuance of building permit, to comply with reasonable conditions and to perform reasonable improvements as could have been required of grantor before subdivision by Act and local ordinance at time of sale to purchasers. *Keizer v. Adams (1970) 2 Cal. 3d 976, 980-981, 88 Cal. Rptr. 183, 471 P.2d 983*

Developers whose subdivision application was denied could not assert estoppel against city based on city's prior recommendation that "clustered" design would comply with city's open space policies, when developer had obtained no permits or preliminary approvals and city's recommendation did not address project's consistency with other important policies. *Toigo v. Town of Ross (1999) 70 Cal. App. 4th 309, 323-324, 82 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649*

Subdivider was liable to public entity for breach of contract to install improvements when water and sewer systems were defective. *County of Mariposa v. Yosemite West Associates (1988) 202 Cal. App. 3d 791, 805-812, 248 Cal. Rptr. 778*

[h] Vesting Tentative Maps

Due process notice requirement implicit in vesting tentative map statutes [*Gov. Code §§ 66498.1-66498.9*] limits increases in developer's fees to those for which adequate standards for determining scope and extent of fee increases are in place at time vesting tentative map is deemed complete. *Kaufman & Broad Central Valley, Inc. v. City of Modesto (1994) 25 Cal. App. 4th 1577, 1589, 30 Cal. Rptr. 2d 904*

Vesting tentative map statutes [*Gov. Code §§ 66498.1-66498.9*] require prior notice, either actual or constructive, as condition to imposing local ordinances, policies, and standards on applicant who is entitled to rely on complete vesting tentative map. *Bright Development v. City of Tracy (1993) 20 Cal. App. 4th 783, 798, 24 Cal. Rptr. 2d 618*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewCivil ProcedureRemediesWritsCommon Law WritsMandamusReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.348

§ 579.348 Attorney General Opinions

Subdivider, tenants, and advisory agency may appeal tentative map determination made by city advisory agency or appeal board; any interested person adversely affected by determination may obtain review by filing complaint. *73 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 338, 341 (1990)*

Legislature may enact statute that prohibits persons affected by parcel or tentative map determination from appealing to governing body of city; but that action may notbe accomplished by a charter provision. *73 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 338, 345, 347 (1990)*

County must issue certificates of compliance for lots that were described on map properly recorded under predecessor statute to Subdivision Map Act, as well as local ordinances enacted thereunder. *74 Ops. Cal. Att'y Gen. 149 (1991)*

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Civil ProcedureJusticiabilityStandingGeneral OverviewGovernmentsLocal GovernmentsChartersGovernmentsState & Territorial GovernmentsLegislaturesReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.349

§ 579.349 Law Reviews

Note, *The Pines v. City of Santa Monica: Redefining the Focus of California's Subdivision Map Act, 16 Loy. L. Rev. 61 (1983)*

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.350

§ 579.350 Text References

Powell, The Law of Real Property, Ch. 70A, *Federal Regulation of Interstate Land Sales--The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act* (Matthew Bender)

Rohan, Zoning and Land Use Controls, Ch. 45, *Subdivision Controls* (Matthew Bender)

California Subdivision Map Act Practice (Cal CEB 1987), Chs. 1-10

Guide to California Subdivision Sales Law (Cal CEB 1974), Ch. 2, *Applicability of the Subdivided Lands Act*, §§ 2.1-2.23

Anderson, American Law of Zoning, Vol 3, Ch. 19 *Subdivision Controls*, §§ 19.01-19.48

Miller and Starr, Current Law of California Real Estate, (2d ed), Vol. 4, Ch. 24, *Subdivisions and Condominiums*, §§ 24:33-24:57, 24:58-24:80

Legal Topics:

For related research and practice materials, see the following legal topics:
Real Property LawCommon Interest CommunitiesCondominiumsGeneral OverviewReal Property LawPurchase & SaleInterstate Land Sales Full Disclosure ActReal Property LawSubdivisionsLocal RegulationReal Property LawSubdivisionsState Regulation

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART III. RESEARCH GUIDE
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.351-579.369

[Reserved]

§§ 579.351[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.370

§ 579.370 Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]--Zoning Ordinance Unconstitutional and Void [U.S. Const., Amends. V, XIV § 1; Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)]

[1] FORM Complaint [Code Civ. Proc. § 425.10] for Declaratory Relief [Code Civ. Proc. § 1060] and for Preliminary [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)] and Permanent Injunctions [Civ. Code § 3422]--Zoning Ordinance Unconstitutional and Void [U.S. Const., Amends. V, XIV § 1; Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Plaintiff,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF,
_____ [*names*],	)	AND FOR PRELIMINARY AND PERMANENT
Defendants.	)	INJUNCTIONS
	)	[*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)*; *Civ. Code § 3422*; *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 526, 527(a)* 1060]
	)	

_____

Plaintiff alleges:

FIRST COUNT
(Declaratory Relief)

1. Defendant is _____ [County *or* _____ (*name of city*), a municipal corporation organized and existing under the constitution and laws of the State of California and situated in _____

County], California.

2. Defendant _____ [board of supervisors *or* city council] is the legally constituted legislative body of _____ [*name of city or county*] consisting of individual defendants _____ [*names*]. One of the duties with which defendant is charged is enacting ordinances dividing the _____ [city *or* county] or portions thereof into zoning districts in accordance with the promotion of the public welfare.

3. Defendant _____ [*specify administrative agency, e.g.,* planning commission] is a duly constituted appointive body of defendant _____ [city *or* county] consisting of individual defendants _____ [*names*]. Oneof the duties with which defendant is charged is classifying and reclassifying private real property according to its location withinzoning districts in accordance with the promotion of the public welfare, for the purpose of recommending to defendant legislative body the enactment or amendment of ordinances zoning that real property.

4. Plaintiff is, and at all times herein mentioned was, _____ [*state facts showing plaintiff's standing to challenge the ordinance, e.g.,* the operator of coin-operated flipper amusement games who desired to install those games at various game arcades located throughout the city].

5. On _____ [*date*], the _____ [the city council of _____ (*name of city*) *or* the board of supervisors of _____ County] enacted a comprehensive zoning ordinance entitled _____ [*title*]. That ordinance _____ [*set forth briefly what the ordinance did, e.g.,* regulated the use of property throughout the city by regulating the allowable commercial operation of games throughout the city]. _____ [Section(s) _____ (*specify section(s) relevant to dispute*) of that ordinance provide(s) as follows: "_____" *or* A true copy of the ordinance is attached to this complaint as Exhibit A and made a part of this complaint].

6. _____ [*State ultimate facts establishing that the ordinance is unconstitutional on its face, e.g.,* The ordinance prohibits the commercial operation of mechanical games involving the use of flippers, which are games of skill, but allows commercial operation of other types of games involving skill, thereby establishing an invidious discrimination between operation of flipper games and operation of other skill games and other recreational and sporting activities that are predominantly of skill].

7. Under defendant's comprehensive zoning ordinance, a person aggrieved by a zoning action of defendant may _____ [*specify the administrative remedies and appeals provided for by the ordinance*].

[*EITHER*]

8. On or about _____ [*date*], plaintiff _____ [*set forth the steps taken by plaintiff in complying with the administrative remedies and attach copies of any written rulings*].

[*OR*]

8. _____ [*State why exhaustion of administrative remedies would have been futile, e.g.,* Defendant city council expressly enacted the above-described ordinance to prevent plaintiffs from operating his/her games within the city].

[*CONTINUE*]

9. Plaintiff has pursued and exhausted all administrative remedies available to him/her in attempting to obtain relief from the above-described ordinance. There is no provision for further appeal from those decisions, and by reason thereof, plaintiff has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law.

10. An actual controversy exists between plaintiff and defendant relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties.

11. Plaintiff contends that the above-described ordinance is unconstitutional _____ [*specify basis of contention, e.g.,* in that it is based on an unreasonable and arbitrary classification between commercial games and establishes an invidious discrimination between flipper games and other skill and recreational or sporting activities that are predominantly of skill in violation of the *Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution* and *Article IV, section 16(a) of the California Constitution*]; whereas defendant contends that the above-described ordinance is a reasonable exercise of the police power and has a reasonable relation to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.

12. Plaintiff desires a judicial determination of his/her rights and a declaration that the above-described ordinance is invalid.

13. A judicial determination is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that plaintiff may ascertain his/her rights and duties under the above-described ordinance.

SECOND COUNT
(Injunctive Relief)

14. Plaintiff refers to and herein incorporates Paragraphs 1-9 of the First Count.

15. Defendant's enforcement of the ordinance, unless and until enjoined and restrained by order of this court, will _____ [*specify particular facts establishing grounds for preliminary injunctive relief, e.g.,* cause great and irreparable injury to plaintiff in that plaintiff will be unable to operate his/her coin-operated flipper games within defendant city].

16. Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law for the injuries currently being suffered in that _____ [*specify any additional facts tending to show grounds for permanent injunctive relief, e.g.,* if defendant is allowed to continue its enforcement of the above-described ordinance, plaintiff will be permanently prohibited from operating his/her coin-operated flipper games within defendant city in that the arcade owners will fill their arcades with the games allowed under the ordinance, and will not have any room left for plaintiff's games].

WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays judgment as follows:

On the FIRST COUNT:

1. For a declaration that the above-described ordinance is unconstitutional, invalid, and void on its face.

On the SECOND COUNT:

2. For issuance of preliminary injunction and permanent injunction restraining and enjoining defendants from _____ [*specify, e.g.,* enforcing the zoning ordinance enacted on _____ (*date*)];

On BOTH COUNTS:

3. For costs of suit herein incurred;

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form of complaint is for use by a plaintiff to bring an action for declaratory relief to determine the constitutionality of a zoning ordinance. The form contains a second count for use to seek injunctive relief from enforcement of the ordinance.

The ground alleged for the unconstitutionality of the ordinance is that it is based on an arbitrary and unreasonable classification that establishes an invidious discrimination between the plaintiff and other persons similarly situated [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)*; *see Cossack v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 726, 734, 114 Cal. Rptr. 460, 523 P.2d 260]* .

CAUTION:

A complaint seeking preliminary injunctive relief must be either verified or accompanied by affidavits (or declarations under *Code Civ. Proc. § 2015.5*) in support of the allegations of the complaint [*Code Civ. Proc. § 527(a)*]. If relying on a verified complaint instead of affidavits (or declarations), counsel must plead evidentiary facts that would entitle plaintiff to the relief sought [*see E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1* ; *San Juan G. Co. v. San Juan R. etc. Assn. (1939) 34 Cal. App. 2d 159, 174, 93 P.2d 582]* . For discussion, a procedural checklist, and additional forms necessary to obtain a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, see Ch. 303, *Injunctions* .

[3] Constitutional Challenges

[a] Generally

If an ordinance is clearly arbitrary and unreasonable and has no substantial relation to the public health, safety, morals,

or general welfare it may be unconstitutional [*see Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore (1976) 18 Cal. 3d 582, 601-607, 135 Cal. Rptr. 41, 557 P.2d 473* ; *see also § 579.218[1]*]. An ordinance may also be subject to constitutional challenge when it creates discriminatory spot zoning [*see Kissinger v. City of Los Angeles (1958) 161 Cal. App. 2d 454, 460, 462-463, 327 P.2d 10* ; *see also § 579.33*].

[b] Method of Challenge

An action for declaratory relief and an action seeking injunctive relief from enforcement are only appropriate to challenge the constitutionality of an ordinance that is allegedly unconstitutional on its face [*see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)* ; *State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 250-252, 255, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* . When the ordinance is allegedly unconstitutional as applied to an individual property owner, administrative mandate is the appropriate form of relief [*see Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)* ; *State v. Superior Court of Orange County (1974) 12 Cal. 3d 237, 249, 115 Cal. Rptr. 497, 524 P.2d 1281]* .

[4] Allegations

The first cause of action in the above complaint alleges: (1) defendant's capacity (Paragraphs 1-3); (2) plaintiff's capacity (Paragraph 4); (3) the enactment of the ordinance (Paragraph 5); (4) the facts indicating that the ordinance is unconstitutional on its face as a violation of equal protection of the law based on an arbitrary classification (Paragraph 6) [*U.S. Const., amend. XIV, § 1*; *Cal. Const., art. IV, § 16(a)*]; (5) plaintiff's exhaustion of available administrative remedies or the futility of doing so (Paragraphs 7-9) [*see Igna v. City of Baldwin Park (1970) 9 Cal. App. 3d 909, 911-912, 88 Cal. Rptr. 581* ; *see also Ogo Associates v. City of Torrance (1974) 37 Cal. App. 3d 830, 834, 112 Cal. Rptr. 761* (futility); for discussion of the exhaustion requirement, see Ch. 474 et seq., *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*]; and (6) the existence of an actual controversy and the necessity for a judicial determination (Paragraphs 9-13) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*; *see also* Ch. 182, *Declaratory Relief* [.

The second cause of action in the complaint incorporates by reference the paragraphs setting forth the necessity for relief and alleges (1) facts to support preliminary injunctive relief (Paragraph 15) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 526*; *E.H. Renzel Co. v. Warehousemen's Union (1940) 16 Cal. 2d 369, 373, 106 P.2d 1]* ; and (2) any additional facts necessary to support permanent injunctive relief (Paragraph 16) [*see Civ. Code § 3422*; *see also* Ch. 303, *Injunctions* [.

[5] State Statutes

Injunctions. Civ. Code § 3244; *Code Civ. Proc. § 526*

Action for declaratory relief. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1060*

[6] Decisions

Zoning ordinance is unconstitutional when it is so unreasonable or arbitrary as virtually to deprive landowner of complete use and enjoyment of his or her property. *Agins v. Tiburon (1979) 24 Cal. 3d 266, 272-273, 277, 157 Cal. Rptr. 372, 598 P.2d 25 , aff'd, 447 U.S. 255, 259, 100 S. Ct. 2138, 65 L. Ed. 2d 106 (1980)*

Equal protection of laws requires that classification be reasonable, not arbitrary, and must have some ground of difference so that all persons similarly situated are treated alike. *Cossack v. City of Los Angeles (1974) 11 Cal. 3d 726, 734, 114 Cal. Rptr. 460, 523 P.2d 260*

Ordinance is improperly and unlawfully discriminatory when it confers particular privileges on class arbitrarily selected from larger class of persons all of whom stand in same relation to privileges granted and between whom no reasonable difference exists to justify inclusion of one and exclusion of another. *Looff v. Long Beach (1957) 153 Cal. App. 2d 174, 181, 314 P.2d 518*

[7] Cross References

For alternative allegations as to agency, capacity, and residence of parties, and fictitious name allegations, see Ch. 20, *Allegations Commonly Used*

For alternative forms of captions and introductions, see Ch. 108, *Captions and Introductions*

For discussion and forms relating to the format of complaints, see Ch. 123, *Complaints and Cross Complaints*

For discussion and forms relating to damages and pleading damages, see Ch. 177, *Damages*

For discussion of jurisdiction in California courts in general, see Ch. 323, *Jurisdiction: Personal* , and Ch. 324, *Jurisdiction: Subject Matter*

For alternative forms of prayers, see Ch. 420, *Prayers*

For discussion and forms relating to service of summons generally, see Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers*

For forms of allegations showing proper venue, see Ch. 571, *Venue*

For alternative forms of verification, see Ch. 572, *Verification*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.371

§ 579.371 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Denial of Variance

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Denial of Variance

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name* (*s*)],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*]
Respondent(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner represents:

1. Petitioner is, and at all times herein mentioned was, the owner of land located at _____ [*address*], _____ [*city*], _____ County, California, more particularly described as follows: _____ [*set forth legal description*].

2. Respondent is _____ [County *or* _____ (*name of city*), a municipal corporation organized and existing under the constitution and laws of the State of California and situated in _____ County], California.

3. Respondent _____ [*specify administrative agency, e.g.,* board of zoning adjustment] is a duly

constituted appointive body of respondent _____ [city *or* county] consisting of individual respondents _____ [*names*]. Respondent is charged with the duty of administering the planning code of _____ [city *or* county].

4. Respondent _____ [board of supervisors *or* city council] is the legally constituted legislative body of _____ [*name of city or county*] consisting of individual respondents _____ [*names*]. One of the duties with which respondent is charged is hearing and determining appeals from decisions of respondent _____ [*specify administrative agency, e.g.,* board of zoning adjustment].

5. Petitioner intends to _____ [*briefly describe plans for development of property, e.g.,* construct a 19-story apartment building with 190 dwelling units for residency by middle income persons on his/her above-described property].

6. According to the comprehensive zoning ordinance of _____ [*name of city of county*], development within the zone in which the above-described property of petitioner is located _____ [*set forth applicablezoning requirement, e.g.,* requires one off-street parking space for every dwelling unit within a multiple dwelling structure].

7. _____ [*Describe request for action made to respondent, e.g.,* Petitioner filed an application with respondent for a variance from the off-street parking provision of the zoning ordinance in which he/she requested that the number required be reduced by one-half].

8. *Government Code Section 65905(a)* requires _____ [*name of city of county*] to hold a public hearing on an application for a variance from the requirements of a zoning ordinance. Respondent is required to exercise its discretion in making a decision on a variance application.

9. On _____ [*date*], the required hearing was held. The evidence presented at the hearing indicated that _____ [*set forth facts, e.g.,* his/her apartment building is designed for persons of middle income, of whom only 50 percent have cars and that there are three public garages within two blocks of his/her property which have consistently high vacancy rates]. On _____ [*date*], petitioner received notice of respondent's decision denying his/her request for a variance. [A copy of that decision is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of this petition.]

10. _____ [*Set forth reasons why the decision is claimed to be invalid, e.g.,* Respondent's decision is invalid as an abuse of discretion because the stated purpose of the off-street parking requirement is to relieve traffic congestion, and not allowing petitioner a variance will in no way serve that purpose while creating an unnecessary hardship for him/her].

[11. *Exhaustion of administrative remedies allegation. See § 579.370, Paragraphs 7-9.*]

[12. Respondent's actions in denying petitioner's requested variance were frivolous, and petitioner has become and is obligated personally to pay his/her counsel _____ (*name*), attorney's fees _____ (in the sum of $ _____ *or* according to proof) as a result of being forced to exhaust his/her administrative remedies and bringing and maintaining this proceeding.]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. That the court issue a peremptory writ of mandate ordering respondent _____ [city *or* county] to grant petitioner the variance requested;

[2. For attorney's fees _____ (in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof)];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Petitioner

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceedings. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signature*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a person to petition for a writ of mandate to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision that a variance not be granted [*see Siller v. Board of Supervisors (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 479, 485-486, 25 Cal. Rptr. 73, 375 P.2d 41* ; *see also § 579.113*]. It may be modified for use to petition for a writ of mandate in other zoning decisions in which the administrative body exercises its discretion, such as a conditional use permit or a tentative map under the Subdivision Map Act [*see Scott v. City of Indian Wells (1972) 6 Cal. 3d 541, 546, 99 Cal. Rptr. 745, 492 P.2d 1137* and *Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 651 n. 2, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556* (decided under prior law), respectively].

The form is adapted from the fact situation in *Siller v. Board of Supervisors (1962) 58 Cal. 2d 479, 25 Cal. Rptr. 73, 375 P.2d 41* .

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Points and authorities customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[3] Allegations

The petition alleges: (1) the petitioner's standing (Paragraph 1); (2) the respondents' identities as the decision makers (Paragraphs 2-4); and (3) the necessity for and holding of an evidentiary hearing in which respondent exercises its discretion (Paragraphs 7-10) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*; *see also* Ch. 474 et seq., *Availability of Judicial Review of Agency Decisions*].

Optional paragraphs are also included to allege (1) that attorney's fees were incurred due to repondent's frivolous conduct (Paragraph 12) [*see Gov. Code § 800*]; and (2) that plaintiff exhausted any available administrative remedies; they must be exhausted if they exist, but not all zoning ordinances provide additional remedies after the hearing (Paragraph 11) [*see Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106-107, 280 P.2d 1]* .

[4] State Statutes

Administrative mandate. *Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5*

[5] Decisions

Award of attorney's fees is allowable under *Code Civ. Proc. § 1021.5* (private attorney general theory) in action against planning agency to compel compliance with *Subdivision Map Act. Margolin v. Regional Planning Com. (1982) 134 Cal. App. 3d 999, 1001-1007, 185 Cal. Rptr. 145*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.372

§ 579.372 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Conditional Use Permit Issued Subject to Invalid Condition [Gov. Code § 65909]

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Review Administrative Decision [Code Civ. Proc. § 1094.5]--Conditional Use Permit Issued Subject to Invalid Condition [Gov. Code § 65909]
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086* 1094.5; *Gov. Code § 65909*]
Respondent(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner represents:

1. [*Petitioner's capacity. See § 579.371, Paragraph 1.*]

2. [*Identity and capacity of respondents. See § 579.371, Paragraphs 2-4.*]

3. Petitioner intends to _____ [*describe plans for development of property, e.g.*, construct a church, with an adjoining parking lot and meeting hall].

4. According to the comprehensive zoning ordinance of _____ [*name of city or county*], the zone in which the above-described property of petitioner is located _____ requires a conditional use permit

_____ [*specify petitioner's use, e.g.,* for construction and operation of a church].

5. On or about _____ [*date*], _____ [*allege compliance with conditional use permit procedures, e.g.,* petitioner filed an application with respondent for a conditional use permit. A public hearing was held on that application, and on or about _____ [*date*], respondent made its decision, and sent a copy to petitioner. [A true copy of that decision is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of this petition].

6. Respondent issued the requested conditional use permit, conditioned on _____ [*specify conditions attached to conditional use permit issued to petitioner, e.g.,* petitioner's dedicating the back one-fourth of the above-described property for use as a public baseball field].

7. *Government Code Section 65909* provides that no conditional use permit may be conditioned on _____ [the dedication of land for any purpose *and/or* the posting of a bond to guarantee installation of publicimprovements] not reasonably related to the use of the property for which the permit is requested.

8. _____ [*Set forth reasons why the condition is impermissible, e.g.,* The dedication condition imposed on petitioner by respondent is prohibited because it is not reasonably related to the use of the property as a church].

[9. *Exhaustion of administrative remedies. See § 579.370, Paragraphs 7-9.*]

[10. Respondent's actions in imposing the above-described condition on the conditional use permit it granted to petitioner were frivolous, and petitioner has become and is obligated personally to pay his/her counsel _____ (*name*), attorney's fees _____ (in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof) as a result of being forced to exhaust his/her administrative remedies and bringing and maintaining this proceeding.]

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. That the court issue a peremptory writ of mandate ordering respondents to remove the conditions attached to the conditional use permit issued to petitioner;

[2. For attorney's fees _____ (in the sum of $_____ *or* according to proof)];

3. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

4. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 579.371.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a person to petition for a writ of mandate to obtain judicial review of an administrative decision conditioning the issuance of a conditional use permit on impermissible conditions [*Gov. Code § 65909*; *see Nollan v. California Coastal Commission (1987) 483 U.S. 825, 107 S. Ct. 3141, 97 L. Ed. 2d 677* (requirement that easement be conveyed in return for use permit may constitute unconstitutional taking of land under U.S. Const., art. V, and *amend.*

XIV, unless requirement substantially advances legitimate state interests; requirement that does not further the same legitimate purpose that denial of permit would is invalid); *Dolan v. City of Tigard (1994) 512 U.S. 374, 386-391, 114 S. Ct. 2309, 129 L. Ed. 2d 304* (once it is found that conditions imposed on approval of permit advances legitimate state interest, there must be some sort of individualized determination that conditions are related both in nature and extent to projected impact of proposed development); *see also Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc. (2005) 544 U.S. 528, 125 S. Ct. 2074, 2086-2087, 161 L. Ed. 2d 876* (rule articulated in *Nollan* is not whether exaction would substantially advance *some* legitimate state interest but rather whether exaction would substantially advance same interests that land use authorities asserted would allow them to deny permit altogether)]. With appropriate modifications, this form may be used when the impermissible condition is attached to the issuance of a variance or building permit [*see Gov. Code § 65909*].

For discussion of conditional use permits, see *§ 579.114*.

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Points and authorities customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges (1) the necessity for the conditional use permit and its issuance (Paragraphs 3-5); and (2) the attachment of prohibited conditions to the conditional use permit that was granted (Paragraphs 6-8) [*Gov. Code § 65909*].

[4] Decisions

To be constitutional, exaction must substantially advance same interests that land use authorities asserted would allow them to deny permit altogether. *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc. (2005) 544 U.S. 528, 125 S. Ct. 2074, 2087, 161 L. Ed. 2d 876*

Conditioning approval of building permit on applicant's dedication of portion of its property for flood control and traffic purposes is unconstitutional taking because conditions were not "roughly proportional," i.e., related in nature and extent, to projected impact of expansion of applicant's place of business. *Dolan v. City of Tigard (1994) 512 U.S. 374, 386, 114 S. Ct. 2309, 129 L. Ed. 2d 304*

Requirement that landowner convey public easement running along beach in return for building permit is unconstitutional taking of property because requirement did not have sufficient nexus with legitimate police power purpose of preserving access to and view of beach. *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission (1987) 483 U.S. 825, 107 S. Ct. 3141, 97 L. Ed. 2d 677*

Administrative mandate is appropriate remedy when alleging that denial of permit was based on applicant's failure to comply with invalid condition. *Selby Realty Co. v. City of San Buenaventura (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 110, 128, 109 Cal. Rptr. 799, 514 P.2d 111*

Zoning officials are not allowed to deny permit as means of coercing applicant to comply with separate and entirely unrelated provisions of zoningordinance. *Ellis v. City Council (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 490, 497, 35 Cal. Rptr. 317*

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.373

§ 579.373 Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Compel Issuance of Building Permit

[1] FORM Petition for Writ of Mandate [Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086]--To Compel Issuance of Building Permit

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

_____ [*name*],	)	
Petitioner,	)	NO. _____
vs.	)	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
_____ [*name(s)*],	)	[*Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1086*]
Respondent(s).	)	
	)	
	)	

Petitioner represents:

1. [*Petitioner's status as landowner within jurisdiction of respondent. See § 579.371, Paragraph 1.*]

2. Respondent is _____ [County *or* _____ (*name of city*), a municipal corporation organized and existing under the constitution and laws of the State of California and situated in _____ County], California.

3. Respondent _____ [*specify administrative agency, e.g.,* Building and Safety Department] is a duly constituted and appointed body of respondent _____ [city *or* county], under the direction of _____ [*name*], the appointed and qualified Director. One of the duties with which respondent is charged is issuing building permits to applicants under the planning and zoning ordinance of _____ [city *or* county].

4. Petitioner _____ [*set forth activity requiring building permit, e.g.,* wants to build a swimming pool in her backyard].

5. According to the comprehensive planning and zoning ordinance of _____ [city *or* county], a building permit for _____ [*specify, e.g.,* construction of a swimming pool] requires _____ [*set forth construction requirements*] and provides that once these requirements are met, that building permit must be issued by _____ [*specify administrative agency, e.g.,* the Building and Safety Department].

6. Petitioner has complied with all the requirements set forth in that ordinance, and filed an application for a building permit indicating complete compliance with the code requirements.

7. Respondent has a clear, present, and ministerial duty to issue the requested building permit to petitioner. Respondent has refused to issue the permit and continues to refuse to issue the permit.

8. [*Exhaustion of admininstrative remedies allegation. See § 579.370, Paragraphs 7-9.*]

9. As a proximate result of respondent's failure to issue the requested building permit, petitioner has sustained damages _____ [*specify nature and extent of damages, e.g.,* in that she has already executed building contracts and purchased building materials], all to petitioner's damage in the sum of $_____].

10. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, other than the relief sought herein, in that _____ [*set forth facts showing lack of recourse, e.g.,* there is no other authority from whom petitioner can obtain the required building permit].

WHEREFORE, petitioner prays:

1. That the court issue an alternative writ of mandate commanding respondent to issue the building permit to petitioner or show cause before this court at a time specified by court order why it has not done so and why a peremptory writ should not issue;

2. That on return of the alternative writ and the hearing of the petition, this court issue a peremptory writ of mandate ordering respondent to issue the building permit to petitioner;

3. For compensatory damages in the sum of $_____;

4. For costs of suit herein incurred; and

5. For such other and further relief as the court may deem proper.

_____ [*signature*]

Attorney for Petitioner

[*Verification. See § 579.371.*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by a person whose application for a building permit has been denied to petition for a writ of mandate to compel the planning department to issue a building permit and to seek damages [*see Court House Plaza Co. v. City of Palo Alto (1981) 117 Cal. App. 3d 871, 883, 173 Cal. Rptr. 161 , appeal dismissed and cert denied, 454 U.S. 1074, 102 S. Ct. 623, 70 L. Ed. 2d 607* ; *Ellis v. City Council (1963) 222 Cal. App. 2d 490, 499, 35 Cal. Rptr. 317]* . It may be modified for use to petition for a writ of mandate in other zoning decisions in which actions of the administrative body are ministerial, such as approval of a final map on completion of the conditions of the tentative map already approved under the Subdivision Map Act [*see Youngblood v. Board of Supervisors (1978) 22 Cal. 3d 644, 653 n. 4, 655-656, 150 Cal. Rptr. 242, 586 P.2d 556* (decided under prior law)].

CAUTION:

A petition for a writ of mandate must be verified [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1086*]. Proof of service on each respondent and real party in interest of a copy of a petition that seeks an alternative writ must accompany the petition when it is offered for filing except when, in its discretion and for good cause, the court has granted the application for the writ ex parte [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1107*; for a discussion of serving the petition, see Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition* [. Points and authorities also customarily accompany a petition filed in a superior court, although they do not appear to be expressly required by statute. When no alternative writ is sought, proof of service of a copy of the petition need not accompany the application, but proof of service of a copy of the filed petition must be lodged with the court prior to a hearing or any action by the court [*Code Civ. Proc. § 1088.5*].

[3] Allegations

This petition alleges: (1) the petitioner's standing (Paragraph 1); (2) the respondents' duty to issue and the petitioner's right to receive the permit (Paragraphs 2-7) [*see Code Civ. Proc. § 1085*; *see also* Ch. 481, *Public Works*]; (3) exhaustion of administrative remedies (Paragraph 8) [*see Temescal Water Co. v. Dept. of Public Works (1955) 44 Cal. 2d 90, 106-107, 280 P.2d 1]* ; (4) compensatory damages (Paragraph 9) [*see Civ. Code § 3333*]; and (5) lack of an adequate legal remedy (Paragraph 10) [*see Phelan v. Superior Court (1950) 35 Cal. 2d 363, 366, 217 P.2d 951* ; *see also* Ch. 358, *Mandate and Prohibition*].

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.374

§ 579.374 Summons for Enforcement of State Housing Law [Health & Safety Code § 17990]---Judicial Council Form SUM-145

[1] FORM Summons for Enforcement of State Housing Law [Health & Safety Code § 17990]---Judicial Council Form SUM-145

Click here to view image.

[2] Use of Form

The form in [1], *above*, is the Judicial Council-approved form of summons for mandatory use in the enforcement of the State Housing Law [*see Health & Safety Code § 17990*]; Judicial Council Form SUM-145; *see also § 579.141[4]*].

This form is available in an interactive, electronic format in LexisNexis(R) Automated California Judicial Council Forms, which may be accessed at *www.lexisone.com* for an individual or monthly charge. A noninteractive version in PDF format also is available at *www.lexisone.com* at no charge.

[3] Contents of Summons

The manner in which the blanks are to be filled in and boxes checked is self-explanatory.

[4] Summons Procedure

The issuance and service of a summons in a civil action is governed by *Code Civ. Proc. §§ 412.10-417.40*. See Ch. 518, *Service of Summons and Papers* .

156 of 157 DOCUMENTS

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
A. Zoning and Planning

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated §§ 579.375-579.389

[Reserved]

§§ 579.375[Reserved]

LexisNexis®

California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated

Copyright 2010, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

Volume 51: Vexatious Litigants thru Zoning and Planning-Chs. 573-579
Chapter 579 ZONING AND PLANNING
PART IV. FORMS
B. Subdivision Map Act

51-579 California Forms of Pleading and Practice--Annotated § 579.390

§ 579.390 Petition to Exclude Real Property From Subdivision [Gov. Code § 66499.22]

[1] FORM Petition to Exclude Real Property From Subdivision [Gov. Code § 66499.22]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF _____

	)	
	)	NO. _____
IN RE PETITION TO EXCLUDE REAL PROP-	)	PETITION
ERTY FROM SUBDIVISION	)	[*Gov. Code § 66499.22*]
	)	

_____

Petitioners allege:

1. _____ [*Describe real property within subdivision from which exclusion is sought by reference to the recorded map or by another accurate survey*].

2. Petitioners constitute the owners of _____ [*specify proportion of at least two-thirds*] of the total area of the real property proposed to be excluded from the above-described subdivision.

3. Petitioners request that the following property be excluded from the above-described subdivision: _____ [*describe real property to be excluded by reference to the recorded map or by another accurate survey*].

4. Petitioners request exclusion of the above-described property for the following reasons: _____ [*set forth reasons*].

5. As far as is known to petitioners, the following persons are owners of real property situated within the boundaries of the area sought to be excluded: _____ [*set forth names and addresses of persons*].

6. A map showing the boundaries of the subdivision as it will appear after exclusion and alteration is attached to this petition as Exhibit A and made a part of this petition.

WHEREFORE, petitioners pray as follows:

1. For an order directing the clerk of the court to give notice of the filing of this petition, and to fix a time and place for hearing as prescribed by law.

2. For the court to enter an order excluding the above-described real property from the above-described subdivision and to further order the alteration or vacation of the recorded map.

[3. For such other and further relief as the court may deem equitable.]

Residence	Date	Name
_____	_____	_____ [*signature*]
_____	_____	_____ [*signature*]
_____	_____	_____ [*signature*]
_____	_____	_____ [*signature*]

[*COMPILE signatures of the owners of at least two-thirds of the total area of property sought to be excluded*]

VERIFICATION

I, _____ [*name*], am the petitioner in the above-entitled proceeding. I have read the foregoing petition and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

_____ [*date*]

_____ [*signatures of all petitioners*]

[2] Use of Form

This form is for use by the owners of land within a subdivision to petition to exclude their land from that subdivision. It

is filed with the county surveyor and clerk of the board of supervisors of the county in which the subdivision or the portion thereof sought to be excluded is situated [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*; *see § 579.275*].

CAUTION:
This petition must be verified [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*].

[3] Contents of Petition

The petition must (1) accurately and distinctly describe the real property sought to be excluded by reference to the recorded map or by any accurate survey (Paragraph 3) [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*]; (2) set forth the reasons for the requested exclusion (Paragraph 4) [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*]; (3) show the names and addresses of all owners of real property in the subdivision or in the portion thereof sought to be excluded as far as they are known to the petitioners (Paragraph 5) [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*]; (4) be signed and verified by the owners of at least two-thirds of the total area of the real property sought to be excluded (Paragraph 2) [*Gov. Code § 66499.22*]; and(5) be accompanied by a new map showing the boundaries of the subdivision as it appears after the exclusion and alteration, with numbered or lettered designations of the parcels excluded and showing the acreage of each (Paragraph 6) [*Gov. Code § 66499.23*].

[4] Jurisdiction

The superior court of the county in which the subdivision is situated has jurisdiction over the petition [*Gov. Code § 66499.21*].

[5] Notice of Petition

On the filing of a petition for exclusion of property from a subdivision, a judge of the superior court will make an order directing the court clerk to give notice of the petition. The notice will be given once a week for not less than five consecutive weeks and will be by publication in a newspaper of general circulation within the county, or if there is no newspaper published therein, by posting in three of the principal places in the county. However, if any portion of the property is situated within a city, notice is given in the same manner but within that city. The notice is required to state the nature of the petition and explain that any person may file a written objection to the petition at any time before the expiration of the time of publication or posting. On expiration of the notice time, an affidavit showing that publication or posting must be filed with the clerk of the court [*Gov. Code § 66499.24*].

[6] Hearing

If no objection has been filed, the court may proceed without further notice to hear the petition. If during the hearing the petitioners produce to the court satisfactory evidence of the necessity of the exclusion of the real property, that the owners of two-thirds of the area of the real property sought to be excluded are the petitioners, and that there is no reasonable objection to making that exclusion, the court may proceed to exclude the real property sought to be excluded, and order the alteration or vacation of the recorded map and enter its decree accordingly [*Gov. Code § 66499.25*]. If a material objection is made to the petition, the court will proceed to hear that objection and may adjourn the proceedings to such time as may be necessary on proper notice to the petitioners and objectors [*Gov. Code § 66499.26*].

[7] Decree

A certified copy of the decree granting the petition and a new map are filed with the county recorder [*Gov. Code § 66499.28*; *see § 579.275[2]*].

[8] State Statutes

Form of verification. *Code Civ. Proc. § 446*

Exclusion does not affect public street or highway. *Gov. Code § 66499.27*